UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 90—PART 8

JANUARY 10, 1944, TO MARCH 24, 1944

(PAGES A3 TO A1476)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

A Layman's View of Christian Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest honors that has come to me in my lifetime was an invitation to speak from the pulpit of Roberts Park Church, of Indianapolis, on the evening of Sunday, January 2, 1944. Roberts Park Church is one of the famous churches of Methodism, and Rev. S. L. Martin, its minister, is an outstanding leader of religious thought and purpose. In my address I stressed the idea that we have wandered too far from sound basic principles in both temporal government and religion. In temporal government we need to cast aside political and economic fallacies and get back to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I pointed out that malignant bureaucratic excrescences have grown up which infringe upon free enterprise and impede the functioning of our Government as it was originally planned—the best form of government ever known to mortal man. In a broader sense I contended that the overshadowing question confronting us and the entire human race is how to get back to God, and the sooner the world gets right with God, the sooner it will right itself. I expressed the view that after all of the travail, the tears, and suffering through which the human race is now passing, no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages, and there can be no peace of the ages that does not write into permanent international relations the Christian principles of mutual helpfulness and understanding. To the end that Christians may be preparing to do their part toward the reconstruction of the world on principles of Christian faith, out of the ashes of the present conflict, I advocated the calling of a conference of religious leaders of the world to be held in the city of Washington as soon as practicable. In these troubled times when we are all groping for the light and are earnestly and prayerfully seeking to find ways to save civilization from the horrifying dangers that threaten it, any well-meant suggestions are, I believe, deserving of evaluation. I hope that my humble contribution may not be deemed unworthy of the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I thank my fellow Members for the consent which they have unanimously and generously given to have it printed therein. The subject of my lay sermon was "A Layman's View of Christian Service," and I spoke as follows:

Dr. Martin and members of Roberts Park Church, I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your gracious invitation to be with you at this evening hour of worship.

To me, this is a hallowed neighborhood—a neighborhood of precious memories. As a boy and as a man I have witnessed many notable gatherings in this distinguished place of worship, and as I stand here tonight there arises a long train of recollections. I see before me the images of many great men, ministers, and laymen of this church, each of whom in his own time and way made his worth-while contribution to the service of the Master and the progress of the human race.

But there are other reasons, too, why this neighborhood of Indianapolis pulls on my heartstrings. Forty-seven years ago my bride, who still abides with me and whose hair is now as snow-crowned as my own, and I began housekeeping in two upstairs rooms in the old brick row that is still standing on the south side of Vermont Street, between Pennsylvania and Delaware Streets, half a square from here. I do not exaggerate when I say that our lives in those halcyon days were measured in superlatives. We were superlatively poor and we were superlatively happy. In every way we answered the description of James Whitcomb Riley's immortal verse by being "so happy and so poor." We had spent all the money we had on a glorious 3-day honeymoon trip to Louisville and Cincinnati, cities which in those horse-and-buggy days represented to our youthful minds the outside perimeter of the earth, and we ate off of a dry-goods box until we could save enough money from my meager earnings as a newspaper reporter to buy some kitchen furnishings.

Well, we are doing a little better now. We have a modest home which we own and we have kitchen utensils adequate to any ordinary occasion but our greatest possession is our family of four children and six grandchildren. And I know you will pardon my weakness, and excuse the impropriety of my utterance, when I say that my bride of 47 years ago is just as lovely today as she was then, and I only wish she were here tonight to enjoy with me the warmth of your generous hospitality.

It may seem a bit incongruous that a hardened old newspaperman like myself should be seen occupying a pulpit in this house of worship. There may be some persons who would be more inclined to associate newspapermen with the opposite camp. But this much must in justice be said of the true and trained newspaperman: He has a highly cultivated faculty of observation. No one should be better qualified than he, from both experience and analytical instinct, to find the lessons embedded in nature and revelations, or to realize the simple truth and beauty of these lines of Shakespeare:

"And this our life, exempt from public haunt
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks
Sermons in stones and good in everything."

In my long career as a writer and legislator, spanning more than half a century in Indianapolis and Washington, it has been my fortune to be pretty close to the heart of things. I have known oceans of good people—just God's run of the mine—and occasionally I have been able to discern genius on its starry track. It is my purpose tonight, with your indulgence, to present the evidence that has made me aspire to be a Christian and some of the reasons for the faith that is within me. All of us are the beneficiaries of God's boundless love and why should not we laymen tell about it if we can find an audience and the spirit moves?

MY TEXT

If it is permissible for a layman to quote a text from Holy Writ, I would like this evening to direct your attention to Matthew, twenty-second chapter, thirty-sixth to thirty-ninth verses:

"Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

"Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

"This is the first and great commandment.

"And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

A few days ago in rummaging among the innumerable titles in the Library of Congress, as is my wont, I accidentally ran across one that intrigued me immensely. That title read "A Guide to Understanding the Bible."

The author is a theologian of such high eminence that his name is known around the

world. The title caught my fancy and aroused my profound interest. Of course, I want to know more about God. Who does not? I was captivated by the thought that by reading A Guide to Understanding the Bible I might be able, under the direction of this learned clergyman, to get a better understanding of the great eternal Divine Spirit whom we love and worship.

Exercising my privilege as a Member of Congress I withdrew the book from the library and took it home with me. The young lady who made out my borrowing slip smiled as if she thought I was getting into pretty deep literary water—a fact that I soon found out for myself.

My favorite working place at home is our dining-room table. I hope you will not consider this a measly play on words, or infer from it that I am inordinately fond of eating. Our dining-room table is a capacious table amid cheerful and comfortable surroundings, and I have found it to be a splendid place to work with pencil and paper, as well as with knife and fork.

That night on returning from the Library, after the dishes were cleared away, I opened the book on the dining-room table before me and waded in. The more I read the more bewildered I became. My understanding of the Scriptures instead of getting better got rapidly worse. It was soon bogged down in a morass of hair-splitting, theological terminology.

I read and read and read and the more I read the more obfuscated I became, and the less I knew about the Scriptures, God or anything else. This is in no sense an impeachment of the profundity and piety of the author of the book, but rather a confession of my own limitations.

I was about to throw up the sponge in despair when I thoughtlessly reached over to the centerpiece on the table, a dish filled with ripe fruit, and from the heaped-up mound I took from the top a big orange and began to toy with it. It was a beautiful specimen, which California's golden sun had painted a brilliant yellow. My mind was in a contemplative mood, and without realizing what I was doing, I removed the peeling and lifted out the luscious segments with my fingers, each segment seemingly divinely designed as a morsel of convenient size for the eating, the entire delicious ensemble surrounded by a covering to protect it from contamination until it reached the human mouth.

GOD'S IMPRIMATUR ON ALL NATURE

A flash of inspiration came over me and I exclaimed:

"Here I have found God!"

The Creator, whom I could never discover in a million years in the learned disquisition of the eminent theologian, perhaps due to the incapacity of my mind, I could see, clear as noonday and dazzling as sunlight in that orange. All of the richness of the world's greatest Library in Washington with its vast collection of theological works could not portray the God of the Universe as He is portrayed in the works of His creation.

From that small object lesson of God's all-embracing and everlasting providence my imagination took on a broadening range and as I looked about me my poor finite understanding grappled with a captivating vision of the magnitude of our inheritance from the Father of us all. The limitations of the human mind are such that at best we see as through a glass darkly, but we know—we cannot help knowing if we exercise our thinking and reasoning powers—that creation was not an accident but the fulfillment of a great plan, and that back of that plan is infinite love and kindness. In the great cathedral of St. Paul's at London is the tomb of Sir Christopher Wren, the genius who designed the famous edifice, and on this tomb is this inscription:

Si monumentum requiris, circumspice. (If you would see his monument look around.)

So if you would behold God, just look around. Look at our beautiful world, "where every prospect pleases and only man is vile." Can anyone behold the beauty of a carnation, a chrysanthemum, or a gardenia, or survey the star-lit heavens above him on a cloudless night and say in his heart that there is no God? God's imprimatur is on all nature.

Can anyone who has been enthralled by the radio have any doubt that there is a Divine mind that originates such wonders? Back in 1925, when radio was in its incipiency, I was crossing the ocean on the way to Europe. Twenty miles in the wake of our ship was a tramp steamer which had on board a very sick man and there was no doctor to attend him. The physician on our boat prescribed for him day after day by radio with such excellent results that by the time we reached England he was out of danger.

Occasionally I am invited to speak over coast-to-coast networks and once, when I introduced Charles A. Lindbergh to his first American audience after his flight to Paris, my voice was heard by short wave around the world. The other night when I was to speak over the Mutual Broadcasting System, I arrived at the studio in Washington a little ahead of time and found the program manager in a reflective mood.

"Do you know," he said, "that we who arrange these programs, who are up against radio all of the time day and night, do not understand radio? When we throw the human voice thousands of miles across plains and mountains and continents, as your voice will soon be thrown, we do not know what does it. Radio is one of God's mysteries."

He spoke truly. Radio is, and always will be, one of God's mysteries, unseen and unfathomable, but as genuine a testimonial to God's providence as the blessed rain that causes the crops to burgeon forth or the sunshine and the shadow that chase each other over waving fields of wheat and corn.

GOD SEEN IN THE PROCESSES OF THE PLANETS

The discoveries of the astronomers, marvelous as those discoveries are, do not reveal where, among all of the starry corridors, is the Supreme Ruler whose will establishes order in the universe; and yet I cannot imagine a more amazing or more convincing revelation of divinity than the orderly processes of the planets. A story was told to me recently of an astronomer, an expert in reading the heavens, who predicted that 75 years hence certain heavenly bodies would be in a certain relative position observable only from a point 10,000 miles away. The astronomer died. His son, to whom he had made the prediction, lived the allotted span of life, and he, too, died.

When the time approached the astronomer's grandson journeyed 10,000 miles to the point of indicated observation, and he saw through the telescope exactly what his grandfather 75 years before had predicted would come true. Asked if the phenomenon had taken place as forecast by his grandparent, he said:

"Yes; on the exact second."

Can anyone imagine what would happen to the universe if there were not a living God to keep the planets in their orbits?

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," says the first sentence of the first chapter of Genesis.

That sentence is the most startling and meaningful utterance to be found in all literature. The greatest story of all time is told in exactly 10 words, the story of cosmos emerging from chaos.

It is the story of God, the Architect, the loving Father of us all, creating a cosmic commonwealth of infinite beauty and making it ready for His children. Vast, fertile plains to yield the things that sustain life, great rivers that flow in majesty to the seas, cascades that dance and sparkle in the sunlight, mountain slopes that rise in towering grandeur to the very feet of the Creator. In the depths of the earth God deposited untold billions of tons of coal to warm the human family, in the waterfalls he placed power without limit to drive the wheels of commerce. All things that make for prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the human race are embraced in God's gift to man on the morning of creation.

HOME, SWEET HOME

Just as we can see God if we look around us with eyes of discernment, so we can hear Him if we listen with ears attuned to His presence. We hear Him when we listen to the ministers, faithful men of God, preach the way and the truth and the life. We hear Him when we listen to the grand music of the choirs that fills the vast cathedral aisles. We hear Him when we listen to the deft touchers of the organ's keys. I listened to Him in Tomlinson Hall nearly 50 years ago when I heard Nordica sing Home, Sweet Home. Friends, God is not far away. He is with us all the time. We can see Him in the change of seasons, in the planting and the harvesting, in the wealth of summer and autumn's rich content; in the unfailing reproduction year after year of earth's bounteous largess to sustain the human family. Is anyone so blind that he cannot see in these recurrent miracles of nature a loving God, or Father, keeping watch above His own? We can see Him not only in the infinite and perfect provisions He has made for human needs, but we can see Him in acts that come to our attention daily, some commonplace, some dramatic. We can see Him in countless events and episodes of our everyday lives. I saw Him when I was a boy 19 years old on a bed of suffering from typhoid fever for many months, and the neighboring farmers in Fayette County, Ind., worked in the fields all day and then came in relays to my bedside at my father's home to nurse me through the long vigils of the night. To this hour I think it was their goodness more than medicine that kept me alive.

SACRIFICES OF MOTHER LOVE

We can see God in the sacrifices of the mother who bends over the washtub to secure for her children the educational advantages to enable them to grow and bloom and to so live that when the end comes they may take their place among the stars by the side of their Creator. We can see Him in the deathless devotion of the wife who toils to provide hospital care for a husband who she knows can never get well, and when with blinding tears she plants a last kiss on his brow before she commits his body to the grave, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust.

Oh, the instances where God appears in human relations are as countless as the sands of the sea, for God is love and love has myriads of forms and molds of expression. Emerson, the incomparable philosopher, contributed one of the most beautiful thoughts in all of our literature when he said: "Love is our highest word and it is the synonym for God."

There is a touch of God in every good act, however insignificant it may seem, and if we could only realize how far a good act goes in a distraught world I am sure we would all highly resolve to perform more and better good acts. This reflection has borne upon me heavily on occasions when it seemed to me my performance fell far short of the goal we should set.

The sweetest smile I ever saw on the face of a child was my reward for a favor I did for a little Cuban girl a year or so ago—a favor so infinitesimal I have repented its inadequacy a thousand times. My wife and I were eating in a restaurant in Habana and time after time ill-clothed and apparently hungry little urchins came up to our table to ask us for alms. I had almost emptied my pocket of coins when this little girl appeared and in an appealing voice asked for money to get something to eat. I had just a nickel of change left and I gave it to her, and she disappeared in the direction of the kitchen. I had forgotten all about her, when I observed her signaling to me as she was making her exit through a milling crowd that jammed the restaurant. As she reached the door with a smile of gratitude I shall never forget till my dying day, she held up for my inspection half a dozen slices of old dry bread she had bought with her nickel. I went out to find her but she had vanished in the throng.

I have thought ever since that that was a $5 case which I muffed by handling it on a nickel basis. It was the memory of that incident which prompted me to suggest a moment ago that we should perform not only more good acts but better good acts.

It is a peculiarity of the human mind that it yields to method, and it will accomplish more under a methodical directive than it will if governed by haphazard impulse. That is why the Boy Scouts' slogan "A good deed a day" is so appealing and effective. I believe that every person, old as well as young, might profit by the Boy Scout example if he would create in his own life a department of good works and would establish a methodical record of service by striving earnestly, zealously, prayerfully, to see how many good acts he could perform regularly day in and day out under the aegis of that "department." Of course, such a psychological tutelage over one's soul involves considerable exercise of the imagination but it would be conducive, I think, to beneficent method and regularity, which, if we so will, can be made great factors in Christian living.

DUTY OUTLINED IN CHARACTERS OF LIVING LIGHT

One who earnestly seeks Divine guidance will find in the Bible many revelations that illuminate the pathway to a Christian life. Some of these are so clear and plain that they seem like the finger of God pointing the way. Nearly 2,000 years ago the Saviour of men drew aside the veil and revealed the nature of genuine Christian service, the kind of service that is pleasing in the sight of God, in one of the most beautiful passages to be found in all Biblical literature, when he said:

"For I was anhungered and ye gave Me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave Me drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in;

"Naked, and ye clothed Me; I was sick and ye visited Me; I was in prison and ye came unto Me;

"Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

In this passage we find a Christian's duty outlined in characters of living light. If it were the only revelation in the entire Holy Scriptures it would be sufficient in itself to give poise and direction to every sincere person who desires to fulfill the obligations of a Christian.

With the world shaking from the terrific impacts of war and the forces of death and destruction lapping every shore, what is the Christian's duty? I recently wrote to a dozen of the most eminent clergymen in America, asking them to give me their best judgment in reply to that question. I was especially impressed by a sentence in the answer of the late Bishop James E. Freeman, of the Episcopal Church.

"Obviously, our first duty is to be loyal not only in word but in spirit to Jesus Christ," wrote Bishop Freeman. As a layman, I agree perfectly with the noted divine. Above all, we must stay true to the Master. With so many un-Christian forces unleashed throughout the world now is the time of all times for Christians to hold the line. We cannot catch hold of the world situation with one grip and change it, but we can help if we will practice the Christian virtues, each in his own sphere, as we have never practiced them before, so that Christianity may be constantly demonstrating itself and may have its utmost leavening effect in a world gone sour. If we are to save the world for Christ, a good place to start is right here at home, and a good way to begin is to resolve that we will give our lives in all sincerity to the service of the Master. Shakespeare in the Merchant of Venice described vividly the influence which a good deed has in a naughty world, and the Saviour Himself gave us the cue for our present-day responsibility when he said on the Mount:

" 'Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.' "

I like to think of Christianity in these times of cataclysmic woes in its old biblical sense as a leaven. A leaven has no usefulness or effect, unless it mingles with the mass it is to leaven.

So Christianity, to be a good leaven in a world that so much needs saving, must be of the world and part of the world, just as Christ, who came to save men, was of the world and part of the world. I disagree utterly with some of the ministers and laymen of our churches who contend that Christians should keep aloof from these great human problems lest they drag the church into politics. Christ had no such squeamishness about the word "politics" when he drove the money changers from the temple. The church has a divine mission to heal and to save, and it needs to be dragged into every situation, if you want to put it that way, where its healing and saving influence may be exercised.

It is far beyond my capacity to attempt to prescribe all that Christians should do in the present world situation that has been forced upon us by totalitarian aggression and tyranny, culminating in the brutal and perfidious attack at Pearl Harbor, but I think, first of all, as Bishop Freeman thought, that we should be true Christians and that we should keep clear in our vision and high in our faith the eternal things amid the tempests of the temporal.

CHRISTIANITY'S GREATEST OPPORTUNITY

There is no doubt in my mind that Christianity is confronting its greatest test and its greatest responsibility in the opportunity that is opening before us to reconstruct a new and better world out of the ashes of the present conflict. The chaos we are bound to face when the belligerents lay down their arms will be a tremendous challenge to united Christian effort. We must prepare to meet that challenge. We must not permit the world to slip into paganism. Plans for the cooperation of religious forces all around the world cannot be undertaken too soon. I would like to see a conference of religious leaders of all countries held at the earliest possible date for the erection of bastions of Christianity so strong and solid that they will serve as the foundations of a new world order—an order that will restore harmony in human relations, atone for the agonies the world is now suffering, and justify the sacrifices of our beloved dead. Since America is absolutely unselfish in its efforts to serve mankind and since it is the leading Christian nation, in which the hope of humanity largely rests, I would like to see this conference held in the city of Washington, where I believe would be found the best environment to arouse and direct Christian effort in its mission of world rescue. This is no time for Christians to rest on their oars. The world will not be saved by wishful thinking. There must be planning. There must be cooperation. There must be hard, practical thinking. Now is none too soon to take steps to bring into action all of the Christian forces, everywhere. We as Christians should be alerted to the supreme task that is ahead of us in order to be prepared in will and in spirit to meet the problems which will become more apparent as great events develop. After all of humanity's suffering and sacrifice no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages, and there can be no peace of the ages that is not founded on Christian faith. We hear a good deal these days about a peace based on force, but a peace based on force alone would be erected on shifting sands. No peace will stand the test of time that does not write into permanent international relations the Christian principles of mutual helpfulness and understanding.

Christians, the hour of destiny draws near. We are facing epochal decisions. New shapes will soon be beaten out on the anvils of the world, and we must be prepared to do our part. Let us not fail the Master. We have a world to conquer. Let us solemnly resolve that our precious boys who died in Tunisia, in Sicily, in Italy, and at Guadalcanal shall not have died in vain. Let us gird ourselves for the battle that will be the world's Armageddon—the battle to save the world for Christ. When we save it for Christ we will be saving it for humanity. As we see the cherished landmarks of civilization going down in smoldering ruins we say—and we mean it—that this must be the war that will end all wars, but we will have more wars if we have the same old causes, inherent in ungodliness and selfishness, that make for wars. As an antidote for wars let us busy ourselves erecting the Cross of Christ. The time is ripe for an "Onward, Christian Soldiers" movement that would rock the world.

Let us take the long-range view and so plan from this time forward that when we get on the other side of this awful agony, we may discover our new world, the world which our Saviour envisioned and for which He gave His life; a world of peace, sweet peace, permanent peace, with its unshakable and everlasting foundation, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

WE SHOULD GET BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS OF GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

The trouble with us today is that we have wandered too far from the fundamentals. The fundamentals of sound temporal government are to be found in the Constitution of the United States and the accompanying Bill of Rights.

On the basis of those fundamentals the founding fathers fabricated a system of free government—the best the world has ever known—simple, economical, effective, and adequate to all of our needs. In the long course of years malignant bureaucratic excrescences have been piled high on the original structure which obscure to a degree the primal purposes and impede the functioning of our Government as it was originally planned. We need to cast aside political and economic fallacies and to get back to the Constitution. But the overshadowing question confronting us and the entire human race now is how to get back to God. The world would not be in the fix it is today if it had not wandered from God. The sooner the world gets right with God, the sooner it will right itself.

And here is where God's revelations come into the picture. Just as we see the face of God in His works of nature, so we can, if we will, see His face in the chart of social relations which He proposes for all men and women on this earth. That chart is to be found in the Bible and it is not necessary even to read the entire Bible to find that chart, for it is epitomized in the words of our text:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is time for all human beings to turn to that chart and give it serious and profound thought. If we would shape our conduct to conform to that divine mandate, we would bring ourselves into harmony with God's beautiful universe and would establish heaven on earth. The antidote for the poisonous miasmas of hate that now envelop the world is a deluge of Christian kindness. To attempt to carry out God's will and usher in the heaven of our dreams involves the highest sense of individual responsibility. It must not be a case of "let George do it." Each one of us must find in his heart the feeble spark of love for our neighbor and cultivate it until it becomes a flaming passion to be of service to others. If God's command, cited in our text, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," should become the ruling motivation of the world, vast sections of the earth would be liberated from the yokes that oppress them, myriads of human beings who are now mere numbers in the machinery of tyrants would be restored to the dignity of men and women, and gladness, light, and thanksgiving would replace the gloom and heartaches and despair of the world's darkest night.

PLENTEOUS PROVISION FOR ALL

The Creator of this beautiful world made plenteous provision to sustain the lives of all the millions that might ever inhabit it. There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth, if they would but agree to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, forget their hatreds, lay down their guns, and go to work. When the present cataclysm is over, there must inevitably be a large-scale readjustment that will take into consideration the economic needs of the entire human family. I have always believed that Christ spoke with supreme authority and divine vision when He taught us to pray:

"Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven."

If I have caught the significance and implications of Christ's life and mission, this means that we may join God's eternal kingdom right here on earth, and by availing ourselves of the innumerable opportunities that are offered to help others, we may earn our place in the eternal kingdom and walk in strength and rectitude until we meet the Father face to face.

HEAVEN WILL BE A COMMONWEALTH OF GOODNESS

A true conception of God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood visualizes a great commonwealth at whose table is always spread a feast of love, and whosoever will may come. It will not be a close corporation and there will be no special privilege. There will be no snobbishness, no false aristocracy, and the measure of men and women will be their goodness. I would not for a moment deprecate education and art and the drama and music and all the other finer things of life, but the very finest of all things in life is the ability and willingness to toil and sacrifice for others. In my long career as an observer of human values I have found virtue more often in hovels than in palaces. Some of the best and noblest persons I have ever known had none of the advantages of education as we understand scholarship. They could not construct a correct sentence to save their lives, and in writing they used lower case for the personal pronoun, but they had hearts of pure gold, and no sacrifice was too great for them to make for those they loved. They were imbued with the spirit of the Master.

We do not need to delve deeply into the theological profundities to be good Christians and good men and women. What we do not understand we may accept on faith. It is enough if we love God with all of our minds and all of our strength and all of our understanding, for if we truly love Him we will be everlastingly seeking ways to do His work on earth. Loving service will cease to be a task and will become a privilege. A long time ago I wrote a motto which it seemed to me, as it seems to me now, was a suitable guide for us in this vale of tears.

It reads as follows:

"We can do nothing better, we can do nothing finer, we can do nothing grander than to help our fellow mortals over the rough places of life."

The girls in my office, who comprise as splendid and capable an office staff as any Member of Congress ever had, had this motto beautifully framed and placed over my desk one Christmas Day and there it remains. Modestly, modestly may I say that it is a motto I would like to live up to. It is, I believe, another way of expressing the words of our text: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." I plead tonight for a simple, practical form of Christian service that fits the everyday needs of humanity. I believe, as sincerely as I ever believed anything, that if we do all the good we can, in all the ways we can, to all the people we can, just as long as we can, we will lead lives that will be acceptable in the sight of our Maker and as the evening of life approaches we will walk serenely toward the sunset with God's everlasting arms around us.

JESUS THE ALTOGETHER LOVELY

And in all of our lives of service, until the end comes and we fall asleep, we would do well to keep in the foreground of our minds the sweetest and most majestic character of all the ages, whose life from the manger to the cross is a rainbow of hope for all of the human race. He was the only person that ever lived who was altogether lovely. He gave all for humanity until there was nothing he had not given. We need to think of Him to activate our sympathies for the poor and unfortunate of earth and to inspire us to perform deeds of goodness as He did when he walked among men. We need to think of Him to enrich our spirituality and to lead the way to the only life of real happiness, which is a life of service to others. There is in the State of Indiana a wonderful painting of the Saviour, by Titian, owned by an Indiana man, which portrays with touching pathos the agony of the cross. In that picture the genius of the great artist has epitomized with a mastery that goes straight as an arrow to the human heart the sacrifices of the Son of Man for the remission of sins. I wish that every day of our lives all of us could see that picture for the memories it recalls, for the sense of duty it inspires. We need to be sobered and seasoned in ways of right living by a comprehension of the Saviour's unfathomable love for us and the suffering endured by that great human God in order that you and I, and whosoever will, may find the way through service to eternal life.

"Near the cross, O Lamb of God,
Bring its scenes before me;
Help me walk from day to day
With its shadows o'er me."

Address to Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made to Federal employees in northwestern Ohio on December 27, 1943:

It has occurred to me that in times of stress and strain, confusion and doubt, and even fear over the immediate as well as the distant future, many of us are unduly concerned and alarmed largely because of lack of perspective; dwelling solely on the ebb and flow of our current tides, we come to regard our period as the most critical of all time and ourselves as the first real voyagers on a troubled and unchartered sea of uncertainty, dissent, turmoil, and strife and, consequently, we are prone to believe that on us must devolve the grave risks and serious responsibilities of setting the initial course and steering the ship of destiny for the first time safely to port.

History denies and destroys the illusion.

Mark carefully just this one instance: Speaking in the House of Commons on March 11, 1873, in opposition to a bill sponsored by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Disraeli said:

"You have despoiled the economy. You have threatened every corporation and endowment in the country. You have examined into everybody's affairs. You have criticized every profession and vexed every trade. No one is certain of his property, and nobody knows what duties he may have to perform tomorrow. This is the policy of confiscation as compared with that of concurrent endowment."

That, my friends, was Disraeli and Gladstone at it 70 years ago, even though it sounds like Willkie and F. D. R. at it today.

Certainly no one would deny the seriousness of our problems or discount the legitimate doubts and fears that assail every thinking individual among us, but we would do well to recognize and ponder these two well established truths: One—"there is nothing new under the sun"—and, two—"history is constantly repeating itself."

Because we are not unworthy of our heritage—as a people we are demonstrating that fact through the courage and heroism of our sons on the fighting fronts and the miracle of our war production record on the home front—we will not flounder or perish in the stormy gales that now beset us. We will not fail in our immediate and prodigious task of winning complete and final victory, and by the same token we will not fail in meeting the tremendous problems of readjustment which will confront us in the post-war period. Never shall we be found wanting in unflinching courage, unflagging perseverance, faith in ourselves and in our future.

It has been indicated to me that as a group you are interested in hearing what Congress is thinking about the post-war period. While it is true that there are now a few congressional committees surveying and considering the problems of the post-war period, Congress as a whole is not by any means concentrating its attention on that period, and I will tell you why—Congress knows the score.

Permit me to digress at this point to explain that I am fully aware that all "smart" candidates for public office should be peren-

nial harbingers of good news, perpetually optimistic in their predictions, and seemingly oblivious to any and all obnoxious facts. That time-worn and admittedly successful political formula, however, should and must be abandoned by every responsible public official having at heart, first, the interests of our gallant men on the fighting fronts, the people at home, and the Nation as a whole because the crisis through which we are passing is too perilous, too dangerous, and as yet too much hangs in the balance to permit the playing of politics.

Those of you who are familiar with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know that daily through the congressional mill pours a vast avalanche of words, of varying opinions and viewpoints, but some of you may not realize that Congress is constantly working in the light of confidential facts disclosed behind the doors of congressional committees in executive session, with press and radio excluded, where military authorities and other high-ranking Government officials "take down their hair" for the information of the representatives of the people. Indeed, even out of the ever-buzzing conversation and speculation going on in the privacy of the cloakrooms of the House and Senate frequently can be heard the stark facts out of which the restrained or shaded headlines of next week's or even next months' newspapers will be made.

Aside from the established normal channels that the Congress has at its disposal for obtaining complete factual information and keeping realistically and accurately abreast of the score, to illustrate the exceptional means which occasionally are invoked in order to "keep the eye of Congress focused on the ball" permit me to cite a rather momentous occasion which took place only a matter of weeks ago. Late one afternoon to the desk of every Member came a notice from the War Department summoning all Members to a conference at 8:30 o'clock the following morning. To that conference came General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, and a galaxy of military experts from both Army and Navy, some of whom had just returned from the battle fronts, with their maps, charts, and motion pictures, to address the representatives of the people and answer their questions. If here or there did exist any Members harboring the comfortable illusion of an easy and speedy military victory, certainly they were thoroughly disillusioned by the close of that conference, during which all the cards were placed face up on the table, with the military heads of the armed forces reviewing and crystallizing the accumulated data previously sifted in on Congress, summing up the score to date, and, to the best of their ability, explaining and anticipating the military obstacles and objectives of the succeeding months and predicting the hoped-for score of the future.

And so when I say that Congress knows the score both abroad and at home, I mean just that, and it is for that reason that Congress as a whole is not yet actively dealing with the problems of the post-war period.

I would not leave with you the impression that our outlook is overly discouraging or unduly bleak and pessimistic, but I would remind you that despite the fact that the first faint rays of victory are beginning to stream across our horizon, the road to Berlin is as yet a long, muddy, and bloody one, and the watery route to Tokyo still must be made by patient fighting and heavy casualties from one Jap-infested, insect- and disease-ridden island to another. Stacking the totals of manpower, materials, skill, and determination of the United Nations against those of the enemy, there can be no doubt of our ultimate triumph, but between now and the day of victory lie as yet untold sacrifice and unmeasured effort. Congress is well aware of the grim, distasteful, and unpopular facts, and is facing the situation as it exists, which explains why there is less talk of post-war plans and problems in the national legislative halls than there is in other quarters.

You may recall that Charles E. Wilson, vice chairman of the War Production Board, speaking at the annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers early this month, said:

"Too many people are trying to position themselves for the post-war period long before the country is out of danger, and long before our fighting men have had any chance to position themselves."

With the United Nations now on the offensive and preparing to move into large-scale aggressive operations, the War Production Board has called for an over-all increase of at least 20 percent in war production during 1944. On the basis of the cold, stark, unvarnished facts, there is more than a possibility of some of us being a bit premature in concentrating too heavily just now on the problems of demobilization and the post-war period; indeed, on the record of the facts, it would be more propitious, safe, and wise for all of us to "keep our eye on the ball," on the business of winning the war, and bracing ourselves for greater effort and more and heavier sacrifice.

Narrowing our discussion to specific aspects of the as yet definitely limited attention Congress is according the problems of the post-war period, I would suggest that one way to keep a line on the direction in which the wind is blowing on problems of demobilization, reconversion, and post-war plans generally would be to follow the activities and reports released by the special investigating committee of which Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, is chairman, and the special committee on post-war economic policy and planning of which Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, is chairman.

Prior to and since Pearl Harbor, the Truman committee has kept a careful and watchful check on the economic angles of the war production program and has rendered great service not only in correcting blatant errors and preventing flagrant extravagance and waste but in assembling facts and statistics which will serve to help clarify and decide many post-war controversies and accounts with which the Federal Government will be required to deal. To date the Truman committee has published 25 reports bearing on the various phases of the war-production program.

The George Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning is of comparatively recent origin, having been established only last March, but already it has issued one report entitled "A Program for a Dynamic Democracy" which is attracting Nation-wide attention, and just a few weeks ago released a preliminary report based on the findings of a series of hearings on the cancelation of war contracts, industrial demobilization and reconversion, and the disposal of surplus plants and property. The work of the George committee is only in its initial stages but its purpose is clear-cut and its activities are definitely launched.

It can be said that the work of the Truman committee is formulating a detailed and concrete background of the entire war-production effort, and the work of the George committee is laying the foundation for a solution of the economic problems that will emerge with the transition of the national economy from a war to a peace basis. Out of the studies that have been made thus far by both committees one unanimous conclusion has been reached—war to peace is much more complicated than peace to war. There can be no gainsaying the fact that it will require the best thought, the most sincere effort, the utmost cooperation and the utilization of our every capacity, public and private, to intelligently solve the post-war problems with the least shock and a minimum of hardship to the Nation as a whole.

And now to further narrow this discussion to the field of post-war Government activities, in which you as a group are specificially interested, much as I would like to assume the role of seer and prophet, permit me to preface what follows here with an explanation that at the moment the crystal ball is out of order, the neighbors have borrowed the ouija board and, seriously, because as yet too many questions remain undecided, I can't come up with the answer in which you are interested. Under the circumstances, the most that I, or anyone else for that matter, can honestly do is to outline a few suggestions or pose as many alternatives for your consideration.

Insofar as the scope of Government activities in the post-war period is concerned, I believe that much will hinge on the answer to this question: To what extent will the economic system of free enterprise in this country be restored? Or putting it another way: To what extent can and will private banking, industry, and commerce meet the challenge of prompt reconversion and immediate expansion to peace-time economic needs, creating and maintaining, or failing to do so, the necessary level of employment opportunities for the people as a whole?

A fact that is not generally recognized but that is nevertheless true, is that our national economy is now on a totalitarian basis, unavoidably and necessarily so. Under the pressure of involvement in a war against totalitarian aggressors who had marshaled all their resources, human and material, we ourselves were compelled to adopt similar methods—we and our allies would not have been able to produce what it took to halt the march of Berlin and Tokyo had we not established practically complete authoritarian control of the use of our men and materials—but there would be little point in blinking the fact that the utilization of these resources has been directed from Washington without regard to its effect upon the post-war period or upon civilian business and our system of competitive free enterprise. While few would argue the necessity of the process adopted during the past 3 years, or discount that during periods of emergency the main functions of government of necessity must be regulation and control, an examination of what has transpired during the past 3 years, with the Government the chief buyer and the big boss, can leave little doubt as to the coming struggle for the restoration of the normal system of free enterprise under which this country developed, thrived, and prospered, affording to more people a higher standard of living than any other economic system devised by man. Already there are signs that the battle lines are being drawn between the advocates of arbitrary private power in the field of banking, commerce, and industry and the advocates of arbitrary Government power for control of the post-war economic system. In my judgment, if the ultimate and maximum interests of all the people are to be served, neither will score a complete victory, but until such time as private enterprise has had opportunity to demonstrate its ability and willingness to meet the test of the demands of the post-war period, and Government likewise has had opportunity to demonstrate its willingness to relinquish its superpowers and cooperate, via the route of incentive taxation and a general lifting of the unnecessary controls and artificial restraints, thus enabling private enterprise to meet the test to the full extent of its capacity, any answer to the question of the probable scope of governmental activities

in the post-war period will continue to be sheer guesswork and pure speculation.

As to the existing situation in Federal employment, all Members of Congress can attest from the deluge of protests received from the taxpayers at large to the widespread dissatisfaction which is felt throughout the entire country over the vast, top-heavy Government pay rolls that have been built up. At the close of the last World War, November 1918, 917,760 civilian employees were in Government service, but as of April 1943 there were 3,008,519 civilian employees in Government service, 55 percent of whom are not employed directly in connection with the war effort. The continuing avalanche of protests over this situation has had its effect on Congress, and through the functions of two congressional committees can be discerned the handwriting on the wall. One of these committees is the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, composed of 6 Members of the Senate and 6 Members of the House, of which Senator BYRD, of Virginia, is chairman, and Congressman DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, is vice chairman; the other is the House Committee on the Civil Service, of which Congressman RAMSPECK, of Georgia, is chairman, and which, under specific authority and direction from the House is conducting a searching investigation into civilian employment in the Government service, the expressed objective of such investigation being to determine "whether such number of employees is necessary and whether their skills are used to the best advantage." Both these committees have released highly critical reports relating the almost fantastic details of the haphazard fashion by which, under the exigency of war, there was being superimposed on an already enormous Federal pay roll additional employees who over a solid 7-month period were being hired at the rate of 100,000 every 30 days. The Ramspeck report bluntly states: "Under the impact of war hysteria some Government officials were hiring on the erroneous theory that production necessarily increases in proportion to manpower. Stemming from this fallacy was the virtually senseless, helter-skelter policy of packing typists, statisticians, economists, and every conceivable type of clerical workers into Government buildings scarcely large enough to hold them." Those of you who have wended your way through the Commerce Building or the Pentagon Building in Washington will more readily realize the significance of that statement.

Within the span of a few short months, 1,345 voluntary complaints came to the Ramspeck investigating committee from Federal employees largely based on lack of work and unfair practices, of which skip-grade promotions, in clear and open violation of the Civil Service Classification Act, appears to be the most flagrant and definitely is responsible not only for the unnecessary waste of Government funds but for the destruction of morale throughout the entire Federal service. A case picked at random from the Ramspeck report, issued October 13 last, states: "Mr. B graduated from college 4 years ago. He took a clerical position in the field with the National Youth Administration at $1,440 per annum and subsequently became a personnel supervisor for that agency; about 18 months ago he transferred to Washington into another Government agency and was made position classification analyst at $2,600 a year. Mr. B today is 26 years old and makes a salary of $4,600 annually as a supervisory classification analyst." The Ramspeck report cites numerous such success stories, while other Federal employees of long and faithful service and experience are frozen in their jobs at from $1,620 to $2,240 a year. The reports of both the Byrd and Ramspeck investigating committees make forthright denouncements of the inefficiency, extravagance, and waste that now honeycomb the entire structure of Federal employment, and both committees have made concrete recommendations that the structure be decreased, reorganized, and placed on a sound basis of efficiency and economy, contending that this can be done without in any way interfering with the war effort. Both these committees are working close to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and while to date the activities of the Byrd and Ramspeck committees have served only as a danger signal against further useless hiring of Government employees—the curve of Federal hiring having dropped by 50 percent since November 1942, thus placing a substantial brake on excessive hiring—for answers to some of the questions that may be uppermost in your minds just now I suggest that you observe carefully the activities of the Byrd and Ramspeck investigating committees.

It is held that by effecting as soon as possible these necessary reforms within the Government service itself the problem of post-war demobilization of Federal employees will be alleviated. Certainly it is a foregone conclusion that the thousands of civil-service employees, men and women, who have gone into uniform to answer the call to the colors and who return able to work will be restored to their Federal jobs at the close of the war. Doubtlessly the Congress will give active consideration to the bill proposing optional retirement, regardless of age, to those civil-service employees who have had 30 or more years of Federal employment, thus clearing the way for the retention of younger employees.

In answer to the question as to the scope of Federal activities following the close of the war, tragically enough we can only predict with absolute certainty that one branch of the Federal Government will expand—the Veterans' Administration, which will continue to take care of the injured and disabled who will return from the far-flung battle fronts, and the immediate dependents of our heroic war dead. All other answers to the question of post-war Federal activities are still in the making, and as yet one guess is as good as another.

For the present our one concern should be to get on with the war, to speed the day of victory as much as we can, having faith in ourselves and in our ability to cross our future bridges as we come nearer to them.

Thank you, and may the new year bring to each and every one of you continuing strength and courage to meet your respective tasks, strong in the conviction that, despite time, tides, and wars, "God's still in His Heaven."

The Fighting Seabees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, just recently we celebrated the second anniversary of a comparatively new branch of our military service—the fighting Seabees. A short 2 years ago the first battalion was founded and already they have written a glorious page into the history of this war. Organized primarily as construction battalions for the Navy, their services are now in demand by almost every branch of the service on fighting fronts all over the world.

"Can do" is their motto, and the manner in which they have lived up to it is rapidly becoming legendary. They can repair anything from a watch to a battleship, and frequently do, and they make impossible tasks look commonplace. Now at full strength, approximately 260,000 officers and men, they command the respect and admiration of the Army, the Navy, and the marines, and they deserve the everlasting thanks of the entire country.

Typical of the Seabees' ability to work or fight, or do both as the occasion demands, is the following article from Time Magazine:

RESISTANCE BURIED

From the Treasury Islands attack recently came a legend of Seabee workmanship: a lone bulldozer man had wiped out a Jap gun emplacement. Last week came the details.

An hour after the landing, Fireman (1st cl.) Aurelio Tassone, of Milford, Mass., was roaring along on his 20-ton 'dozer when he spotted an enemy strongpoint. Skirting the coconut-logged bunker, he came at it from the rear. Bullets banged off the big blade which he had raised as a shield. The tractor rolled on like its armored offspring, the tank.

As he went over the log fort, Tassone expertly dropped his blade. The pill box collapsed. Methodically, as if he were smoothing a rough spot in a road, Tassone bladed earth over it. After the battle, the hasty grave was shoveled open; twelve bodies and a large new gun were exhumed.

Probably the best explanation of the remarkable construction records and ingenuity attributed to the Seabees is the fact that each individual is used for the kind of work he has been trained to do. They serve under officers who are engineers and construction men and who know their jobs. Officers and men all speak the same language, a fact which no doubt contributes greatly to their unity of purpose. Their morale, according to one apparently well-informed observer, is higher than an eagle's dandruff.

President Roosevelt, in his congratulatory message to the Seabees on their second anniversary, said in part:

Your war effort is outstanding because you accomplish three great purposes which enable our fighting forces to carry on the offensive. You build, you fight, and you repair. You are prepared to repeat the operation whenever necessary—you go forward together.

On the same occasion, Secretary of the Navy Knox said:

Every major amphibious operation of the Navy has found Seabees among the first to land. Almost every airfield, supply depot or other installation the Navy has built since Pearl Harbor has been a Seabee record for speed and ingenuity. And in bitter battles like Guadalcanal or Tarawa, you have shed your blood to earn a share of victory.

To Capt. John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, goes the credit for launching the original Seabee plan with the enthusiastic endorsement of Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Not long ago I had the privilege of witnessing the impressive welcome which Admiral

Moreell gave to returning officers and men of two Seabee battalions after a year and a half duty overseas. His well-chosen words on that occasion I desire to make a part of my remarks at this point:

Officers and men of the construction battalions, particularly those just returned from overseas, it is a pleasure to have with us today a visitor from Washington, our Chief, Admiral Ben Moreell.

Admiral MOREELL. Admiral Smith, officers and men of the Fourteenth and Seventh, officers and men of the Construction Battalions in general. I made this trip from Washington for the particular purpose of participating in the welcome to the Fourteenth and the Seventh to God's country. It is with the greatest pride, and at the same time deep humility, that we remember the accomplishments of these two battalions in the south Pacific, where we have been, and still are, in such dire need of devoted services. Two weeks from today will mark the second anniversary of the authorization for the First Construction Regiment. In those 2 years we have gone far and done much. Our men, your companions, are scattered all over the world, in every active theater of war. We have done work in Newfoundland, in Iceland, in the United Kingdom, in north Africa, in west Africa, South America, the Caribbean, Panama, and the west coast of South America, in Alaska, in the Hawaiian group, the south Pacific, and in the southwest Pacific, and I say with the greatest pride that from all those various active theaters of war, some more active than others, the reports that have come back to us of the spirit, the loyalty, the devotion, and the ability of our officers and men are truly inspiring. We have a long road to go. There is a great deal to be done. We face the future with complete confidence in our ability to carry out orders of our Commander in Chief. In that same spirit we have framed our slogan "Can do," and when the road is ended and glorious victory has come to us, it is my expectation, in fact I look upon it confidently, that we will merit the commendation of the people of this country, and to the "Can do" there will be added another slogan, which we can carry with us to the end of our days, the slogan "Well done." I'm glad to be here with you today. It is a privilege to be joined with officers and men of your caliber in the privilege which has been conferred upon us, the privilege to serve; there is no greater privilege in these days. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, emblazoned on the Seabees' banner are these words: "We do the difficult immediately. The impossible takes a little longer." Their original slogan "Can do" has now grown to "Can do, will do—did." All honor to them.

Some Comments About Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, it might be well to point out to the people throughout the country some of the cowardly attacks which have been made upon Congress for mistakes that have been committed by bureaus and bureaucrats. It is popular to condemn the House of Representatives and also the Senate for everything that is wrong, while we all know that the administrative officials take credit for everything that is constructive.

Some years ago when this was a popular pastime, and was indulged in by certain powerful interests, I put a speech in the RECORD, and I headed it "Cowardly attacks on Congress." Congress needs no defense, but the bureaus and the bureaucrats need to do a lot of explaining. My colleague from Minnesota the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON inserted some remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 89, page A5692, in which he pointed out that we now have 104 parent boards and bureaus, and 2,241 lesser organizations, all a part of the Government agencies, which I have on other occasions said were overlapping, and were adopting numerous policies which meant ruin to the domestic economy of our Government.

These numerous Government agencies overlap, adopt inconsistent policies, and in my opinion are doing a real injury to the American people.

On Tuesday, January 4, 1944, in the Times-Herald, published here in the District of Columbia, there appears an article which I think challenges the attention of every Member of Congress. This article was called to my attention by an official of the Office of Price Administration when I asked him for information on the question of sugar. I realize that there must be price controls, but I have never felt that the extensive system of rationing, in which we have indulged, could be justified.

Some time ago I talked with a groceryman here in Washington who called my attention to the fact that with the enormous supplies of pork, people could not get it because of the O. P. A. rationing system.

In my opinion, there has been the same sort of bungling and mistakes in connection with the matter of rationing sugar.

The people throughout the country are demanding that Congress do something to discontinue the ignorant and foolish policies of the bureaus and bureaucrats who are now in control of the Government.

On October 18, 1943, I introduced House Joint Resolution 173, which provided for the establishment of joint congressional committees to visit with the bureaucrats, find out what they were doing, and advise them how to carry on the executive functions of the Government.

Other resolutions along similar lines have been introduced by many of my colleagues. I commend all of these resolutions and bills to you for careful consideration as the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress convenes.

This article in the Times-Herald for January 4 speaks for itself and is a powerful indictment of the War Food Administration. It is as follows:

GROSS WASTE LAID TO W. F. A. IN MEAT, BUTTER HOARDING

(By Bert Wissman and Tina Marranzano)

Charging gross waste and inefficiency in the War Food Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation last night laid the Nation's present civilian shortage of perishable foodstuffs squarely on the doorstep of the W. F. A.

Through an official spokesman, the O. D. T. charged:

1. W. F. A. has bought and hoarded such tremendous stocks of butter, meats, and frozen commodities that the Nation's storage facilities are filled to capacity, with no space available for storing spring and summer crops which should be processed to prevent spoilage.

HAS CONTINUED TO HOARD

2. W. F. A. has continued buying and hoarding despite this apparent condition.

3. W. F. A. does not even know how much it has bought, so frenzied has been the purchase spree.

4. W. F. A. does not know where all this food is stored.

5. W. F. A. does not know what percentage of food stored is held by commercial operators and what percentage by their agency.

6. W. F. A., as a result of this short-sighted policy, has been responsible, indirectly at least, for tremendous losses in meat, eggs, and canned milk.

FOOD MUST BE RELEASED

An immense loss of food and revenue will be the inevitable result unless a large part of this hoarded food is released for civilian consumption, freeing space which will be needed to store spring and summer crops, the spokesman, John F. King, warned.

[John F. King is assistant to Samuel Botsford in charge of O. D. T.'s Storage and Railway Information Division. Botsford is information director.]

As of December 1, there were 176,045,000 pounds of butter in storage, 64 percent more than the average held for the 5-year period 1937–41, according to W. F. A. statistics.

While American housewives clamored in vain at corner grocery stores for butter, even at 16 ration points per pound, the W. F. A. hoarded millions of pounds. Recently, however, the W. F. A. has been forced to release some which was in danger of becoming rancid, and converted it into "Carter's Spread," King declared.

IS BUTTER SUBSTITUTE

"Carter's Spread" is a mixture of linseed oil and butter used widely in restaurants and institutions as a substitute for the real article.

The O. D. T. spokesman criticized the W. F. A. policy of releasing butter for shipment to Russia, stating he had been informed the Russians had expressed a reluctance to take it.

"Russians should not be encouraged to take butter," King said. "It never was a staple item on the regular family diet. Surplus butter should be turned over to Americans."

LAMB STORAGE UP 657 PERCENT

King pointed out that examination of official W. F. A. statistics shows that the amount of lamb held in storage as of December 1, 1943, had increased 657.7 percent over the 1937–41 average.

The same compilations show that there is 197.6 percent more beef being held and 155.9 percent more frozen cream in storage.

Stocks of frozen fruits and vegetables are at an all-time high of nearly 500,000,000 pounds, a 94-percent increase over the 1937–41 5-year average. Other products which show tremendous jumps are as follows:

Frozen eggs, 70.4 percent; frozen poultry, 43.7 percent; frozen pork, 47.1 percent, and frozen trimmings (kidneys, livers, etc.), 81.8 percent.

King revealed that his agency had sent three letters to the W. F. A. recently urging that large supplies of canned and frozen goods be released for distribution by the Office of Price Administration.

SOME ITEMS RELEASED

As a result, W. F. A. released some stocks and O. P. A. followed with an announcement reducing the point values for frozen vegetables and removing canned string beans from the ration list, he pointed out.

On January 1, it was recalled workers in 18 Philadelphia meat-packing plants dumped an estimated 1,000,000 pounds of meat products into huge vats to be turned into fat and fertilizer. The action was necessary to prevent spoilage, meat packers said.

Although there is some available space for canned goods, storage facilities for frozen products and perishables are crammed full. In the Washington metropolitan area all space was full as early as November 15, it was stated.

Three weeks ago 30 refrigerator cars of beef arrived in the District, it was recalled, and because of a lack of storage space it was at first decided to return the shipment to packers. Later, temporary space was found for the shipment.

SAME IN OTHER CITIES

Storage figures from other cities also show the dearth of space. Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Louis all advise that space is better than 90 percent filled. What is available is for quick turnover items, such as fish, which is rarely kept more than 3 or 4 days, it was said. Actually this means there isn't any space available for anything except quick turn-over items.

A recheck of the warehouse situation with railroad officials confirmed in full the dearth of warehouse space and the fact that perishable foodstuffs jammed all available facilities.

A. F. Swinburne, assistant to the chairman of the Car Service Division of the American Association of Railroads, declared warehouses all over the country are chock full of foodstuffs, including rationed items that people would like to be able to buy.

This information also was confirmed by William E. Hall, director of public relations for the association.

The O. D. T. spokesman said that a large amount of New Jersey spinach was not processed during the last crop because of a lack of warehouse facilities and declared that the O. D. T. is fearful the occurrence will be repeated in many places throughout the country.

W. F. A. IGNORED WARNINGS

Surveys made months ago by the Storage Division of the O. D. T. showed the warehouse situation was even then becoming critical, he added, stating that the W. F. A. evidently chose to ignore O. D. T. findings.

Questioned about the large amount of frozen food being held, William Broxton, marketing specialist of the W. F. A., said he was unable to supply figures on the total of food stored in lockers throughout the country, nor even the amount held in storage by his agency.

The following W. F. A. figures, released by King, admittedly not entirely accurate, furnish some idea of the tremendous amount of frozen foodstuffs being held in storage:

	Dec. 1 (in pounds)	Nov. 1 (in pounds)	Percent increase over 1937–41 average
Frozen fruits	239,413,000	243,547,000	----
Frozen vegetables	194,370,000	190,243,000	----
Total frozen vegetables and fruits	433,783,000	433,790,000	94.0
Frozen cream	35,670,000	39,196,000	155.9
Butter	176,045,000	211,229,000	64.0
Frozen eggs	173,019,000	242,264,000	70.4
Frozen poultry	197,382,000	140,230,000	43.7
Frozen beef	169,846,000	120,820,000	197.6
Frozen pork	131,172,000	105,050,000	47.1
Frozen lamb	31,074,000	23,207,000	657.7
Frozen trimmings	113,533,000	104,010,000	81.8
Total	1,461,524,000	1,419,706,000	156.9

The Price of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 20 last, in an extension in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I set forth a letter from Gov. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, dealing with the price of oil. I am now in receipt of a letter, under date of January 5, 1944, from Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, discussing Governor Dempsey's letter. Under leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks Administrator Bowles' letter, which is as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1944.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I have noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 20 the letter which you had inserted from Gov. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, dealing with the price of oil. Since you have shown this interest in the matter, I wish to give you the facts regarding O. P. A.'s position.

It is not true, as stated in the letter, that oil "exploration is at a standstill." Wildcat drilling has been greater in the past 3 years than it was previously. Here are the number of wildcat wells drilled: 1937, 2,224; 1938, 2,638; 1939, 2,589; 1940, 3,038; 1941, 3,264; 1942, 3,219; 1943, 3,307.

However, in view of the great petroleum demands of war, we need to drill more wildcat and other wells than ever before. The Office of Price Administration believes that to get more wells drilled special inducements should be offered.

It is also important to keep in operation "stripper" wells, reaching the end of their productivity. Figures on well abandonment in 1943 are not available, but the 5,422 wells abandoned in 1942 were the fewest abandoned in any year since 1932. However, in view of war needs, the Office of Price Administration favors offers of special inducement to keep "stripper" wells in operation.

The Petroleum Administrator for War has suggested a 35-cent-per-barrel increase in crude petroleum prices to accomplish these purposes. The first letter from Governor Dempsey suggested a 50-cent increase in such prices.

The Office of Price Administration will not object to any reasonable financial inducement per barrel being paid on the output of new wells or "stripper" wells, if recommended by the Petroleum Administrator. All it objects to is extending these inducements to the output of all other wells which already have been drilled and which need no inducement whatever to reach maximum production.

Payment of 35 cents a barrel on the output of new wells will cost about $55,400,000 in 1944. Such a payment on the output of "stripper" wells will cost about $78,750,000. That makes a total of $134,190,000. But an over-all price increase of 35 cents a barrel will cost the United States Government alone, on its oil purchases, not less than $175,000,000. In addition, it will needlessly cost the public $350,000,000.

A 50-cent-per-barrel inducement on the output of new wells and stripper wells would cost $191,700,000. But a 50-cent-per-barrel over-all price increase would cost the Government $250,000,000 on its oil purchases; and in addition cost the public $500,000,000.

If the oil industry were losing money under present prices there might be a reason for an over-all price increase, but such is not the case. Twenty-one big oil companies, both producing and refining, averaged a combined income of $495,869,000 before taxes for the period 1936–39. In 1940 they made $496,864,000; in 1941, $818,965,000; and in 1942, $696,140,000. These were earnings before taxes. After taxes they had a combined average income of $430,504,000 in the period 1936–39. In 1940 they made only $411,027,000; but in 1941 they made $622,041,000, and in 1942, $461,061,000.

Lest it be thought that these profits came entirely from refining, here are the figures for 26 companies engaged only in crude oil production.

Before taxes: 1936–39 combined earnings (average) $23,342,000. 1940, $13,723,000; 1941, $24,730,000; 1942, $33,427,000.

After taxes: 1936–39 combined earnings (average), $21,846,000. 1940, $12,410,000; 1941, $22,093,000; 1942, $27,730,000.

Figures for the first 6 months of 1943 show a gain over those for the first 6 months of 1942.

Under these conditions the only sound policy will be to confine inducements to the people who need to be induced. That will get maximum oil productivity, yet save the Government itself $40,000,000 in 1944 and the public—including the people of Oregon—$350,000,000; or even more if a 50-cent-per-barrel inducement or price increase were made.

A 35-cent-per-barrel price increase will in 1944 cost private passenger-car drivers $2.97 each. It will cost every householder heating with oil $17; every truck operator, $10.06; every farmer using a tractor, $4.96 (many Oregon farmers operate trucks, tractors, and passenger cars). And not one extra well will be drilled or one extra stripper well be kept operating over the number that will be drilled or operated if inducements are limited to new well and stripper well output. These increased financial burdens upon the people of Oregon will have no effect, save to increase the profits of the oil companies, which already—except for stripper well operators—are doing extremely well.

The second letter of Governor Dempsey to Governor Snell, which you entered in the

RECORD, withdraws the suggestion that a 50-cent increase in oil prices be made and suggests that instead oil prices be brought up to parity—that being the average of all prices, based presumably on its 1926 price relationship. That woud increase the price of crude petroleum by over 73 cents per barrel. To view the effect of this proposal just double the figures given relating to a 35-cent increase.

It would cost the Government more than $350,000,000 on its oil purchases, or over $80,000,000 more in 1944 than payment of similar inducement on the output of new and stripper wells. And it would cost the public needlessly more than $700,000,000, raising the profits of the oil companies to fantastic proportions.

Moreover, it would bring down upon Congress and the administrative agencies a deluge of demands from other groups whose prices are below their 1926 parity. There are 300 out of 889 items in the cost of living index that are below their 1926 parity. To bring them up to parity would increase the cost of the war by approximately $13,500,000,000.

Finally, parity is a price relationship. If you bring the prices of goods farmers buy up to parity you immediately increase farm parity prices. This in turn will call for another rise in parity prices for the things the farmers buy. Thus you set in motion an automatic spiral of inflation that will send prices sky high and increase the costs of the war by billions of dollars.

Since 1926 many technological improvements have been made and the volume of output of many articles has been increased, with a sharp reduction in production costs. To return to the 1926 price relationship would be to deny the public the benefit of lowered production costs, to disrupt our economy, to greatly increase the costs of the war, to increase the profits in some industries to fantastic proportions, and to guarantee a runaway inflation.

Just take one item—magnesium. To bring it up to 1926 parity would increase the cost of the war $1,577,000,000. Surely, we don't want to make even a start on such a program. Extending the parity-price idea is economic dynamite.

I shall appreciate it if you will forward this statement to Governor Snell, so that he may get a true picture of the oil-price situation. Perhaps you will wish to enter this letter, too, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the interest of full understanding of the facts.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Henry B. Steagall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the recent and unexpected death of Representative Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama, was a great shock to many of his friends, including myself.

I became acquainted with him while serving during the last 6 years as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which he was chairman. His never-failing good humor, his sense of justice, and his keen intellect endeared him to all of the committee's members. We shall miss him greatly. The Congress lost one of its outstanding members. The State of Alabama has lost one of its ablest and best loved sons; the Nation one of its finest statesmen, and I have lost a good friend.

Ration Tokens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., December 30, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: The seriousness of the situation that confronts the transit industry throughout the United States if the current O. P. A. ration-token program is permitted to go into effect prompts me to restate the position of the transit industry in this matter, particularly in the light of tests made during the last few days, which was the earliest date that the proposed O. P. A. ration tokens were available to us. I am also taking the liberty of reviewing, for your information, the record of our contact with your office on this important matter.

At frequent intervals from July 8, 1943, to September 13, 1943, representatives of the American Transit Association kept in touch with Mr. Joseph A. Kershaw, Chief, Ration Banking Branch, O. P. A., concerning the size of the proposed ration tokens.

In a letter to Mr. Kershaw dated August 4, 1943, we advised him that a token with a diameter of 0.900 inch by 0.105 inch in thickness, then under consideration, would cause no interference in the operation of transit fare boxes and turnstiles.

On at least five different occasions between August 11 and September 13, Mr. Bernard Kerbel of Mr. Kershaw's office, advised us that a definite decision had been made to adopt a token of these dimensions.

On October 5 we were advised by Mr. Kershaw that tokens with a thickness of 0.105 inch were unavailable but that vulcanized fiber tokens with a diameter of 0.900 inch and a thickness of 0.050 inch could be obtained. He inquired whether a token of such dimensions would give us difficulty.

On October 7 we wrote Mr. Kershaw in part as follows:

"Now that it appears that you cannot obtain a fiber token of this thickness (0.105 inch) and will have to use something of the order of 0.050 inch, it would be necessary to increase the diameter of the tokens to at least 1 inch in order to keep these tokens out of our fare boxes."

No reply was received to this letter, but an O. P. A. news release of October 13 stated that a contract had been awarded for tokens with a diameter of 0.88 inch. Under the circumstances we decided to do nothing further about the matter, although we anticipated that some difficulty might be encountered by a few companies. We were, accordingly, startled to receive a letter from Mr. Kershaw dated November 22, 1943, stating that a decision had been made two or three days earlier to use tokens with a diameter 0.642 inch and a thickness of 0.050 inch.

On November 23, we protested this action both to Mr. Kershaw and to Mr. Walter Straub by telephone and on November 24 made a formal protest in writing.

On November 26, our general counsel, Mr. C. D. Cass, wrote you a letter of protest, enclosing a copy of our letter of November 24 to Mr. Straub.

Since that time we have been represented at three conferences on this matter—two with Colonel Houston, and one with officials of the Osborne Register Co. and the Dayton Acme Co. in Cincinnati, which we attended at Colonel Houston's request, and at which several officials of O. P. A. and O. E. M. were present.

At these conferences various questions were raised by representatives of the Government and of the Osborne Register Co. regarding the effect of dropping the 0.642-inch tokens into transit fare collection devices. We have, accordingly, been glad to cooperate in every possible way in making or in arranging for tests which provide as fully as possible in the limited time available, detailed information on the difficulties which will arise. These tests of the proposed official O. P. A. ration tokens made by representatives of the American Transit Association, by representatives of the Osborne Register Co. and by representatives of O. P. A. have conclusively demonstrated the following:

1. The 0.642-inch ration tokens will jam and render inoperative every type J electric fare box manufactured by Johnson Fare Box Co., of which there are approximately 18,000 in use at the present time.

2. These ration tokens will register exactly as a transit fare token in approximately 26,000 Type D open hopper Johnson fare boxes which accept and register transit fare tokens.

3. The 0.642-inch ration tokens will not register as a fare in approximately 14,000 type D open hopper Johnson fare boxes which do not have a pick-up for transit fare tokens. The O. P. A. ration token will, however, be accepted in the box, will ride on the plate of the counting mechanism and will eventually jam the box and render it inoperative.

4. The 0.642-inch ration tokens will operate all Perey turnstiles which are operable by a 0.650-inch transit-fare token. When inserted wet, the turnstile is released so that it continues to turn freely without the insertion of additional tokens, thus permitting the passage of an indefinite number of passengers without the payment of additional fare, but registering each passage as a fare.

5. These ration tokens will either jam or not operate Perey turnstiles which are operable by a dime.

6. They will not operate the nickel turnstiles in New York City.

In all there are approximately 5,500 of the Perey turnstiles in use on transit systems. In addition there are about 750 installed where they are used for various other purposes. It should be noted particularly that these turnstiles when used by transit companies are installed in subways, elevated lines, and other prepayment areas (as at large war plants) where particularly heavy passenger movements are concentrated. An individual turnstile in many locations handles up to 10,000 passengers per day.

7. The 0.642-inch ration tokens will register as a dime in the money meters manufactured by Rooke Manufacturing Co. These hand coin collectors are used on the Fifth Avenue Coach Co. lines in New York City and by street collectors of the New York City Omnibus Corporation.

8. The 0.642-inch ration token can be successfully passed in substitution for a transit fare token in open hopper type D Johnson fare boxes and in turnstiles, although in a certain percentage of cases the insertion of a ration token in the open hopper box will be detected by the operator. The difficulty of detection upon insertion in a turnstile is much greater because few of these turnstiles are under direct supervision of an employee of the transit company.

The fact that tokens of a 0.642-inch size would cause difficulty in the operation of transit fare boxes and turnstiles was made known to O. P. A., and strongly emphasized in the course of the correspondence and conversations between representatives of the American Transit Association and O. P. A. in the period July 8 to September 13, 1943.

On the other hand, officials of the Osborne Register Co., who, it has been stated, assured O. P. A. that the 0.642-inch size of token would not cause difficulty in the operation of vending machines, have admitted that they had given no consideration to the effect of this size of token in transit fare boxes and turnstiles. Tests which have since been made by officials of that company on transit fare boxes and turnstiles in Cincinnati confirm the results of tests made by us in New York City on December 21 and 22, copies of which were filed with Colonel Houston. Confirming tests have also since been made by the Philadelphia Transportation Co., reported to Mr. Kershaw, and by the Boston Elevated Railway, reported to Mr. Field.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the seriousness of the situation that will arise if a large number of the 0.642-inch ration tokens are permitted to be issued. We also feel that the record of the way in which the transit industry has been treated in this matter entitles us now to prompt remedial action by your office.

The transit industry is carrying in excess of 60,000,000 passengers daily on streetcars, busses, and rapid-transit trains throughout the United States. Fares are paid in coins in denominations of 1 cent, 5 cents, 10 cents, and, to a limited extent, 25 cents, plus about 100,000,000 fare tokens having a diameter of 0.650 inch—only 0.008 inch larger than the proposed O. P. A. ration token—and a thickness of 0.050 inch—exactly that of the O. P. A. ration token. The introduction of two billion or more ration tokens of approximately the same size as our transit fare tokens will, as we have conclusively proved, interfere with, put out of operation, or register as fares when inserted in the great majority of fare boxes and turnstiles used in connection with our operations.

In the light of the above, we strongly urge upon you the advisability of stopping at once the plan to use ration tokens in the 0.642-inch size.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES GORDON,
Managing Director.

Let Those in the Armed Forces Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the message of the President Christmas Eve I felt that it would not only be an inspiration to the men and women on the war front but to those on the home front.

The President's statement in reference to the plans to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion greatly appealed to me as did his words which were assurance to the children of today that in the end there will be no wars for generations to come.

We all want, as the President said, peace now, but a lasting peace.

The President gave his assurance to those overseas that it is the purpose of their Government to win this war and to bring them home at the earliest possible time.

Following that statement came a warning. He said:

> And we here in the United States had better be sure that when our soldiers and sailors do come home they will find an America in which they are given full opportunities for education, rehabilitation, social security, employment, and business enterprise under the free American system—and that they will find a government which, by their votes as American citizens, they have had a full share in electing.

Mr. Speaker, who has a better right to have a full share in electing the officials who will run the Government than the men and women in the armed forces? To me those words were a challenge to the Congress of the United States to immediately provide ways and means to guarantee to these men and women that they would have an opportunity to vote in the coming elections. There is a group that raises the State rights issue. What are State rights in comparison to the right of men and women who are willing to give their lives for their country to vote? I predict the House by a great majority will pass a bill that will provide positive assurance all will be able to cast their ballots and have them counted. I say, bring that bill to the floor no matter in what form because I know it will finally be perfected so that no one will be denied the right to vote.

It would be a tragic mistake to do otherwise.

In the end those that preach State rights will prove to be a very small minority.

Resolutions of Clarke County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Clarke County (Iowa) Farm Bureau at Osceola, Iowa, held its annual meeting recently and adopted a comprehensive and forward-looking set of resolutions. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to include therein these resolutions:

We believe—

1. The underlying principle of rationing of scarce supplies is fair. This program of sharing deserves our cooperation to the fullest extent.

2. A good distribution of soybean-oil meal to bean-producing farmers will bring larger quantities of beans to market. All livestock producers should be able to obtain a fair share of protein supplies. Amounts for commercially mixed feeds must bear some restriction.

3. Farm machine parts, repairs, and additional critical machines must be made available without delay if waste of manpower and crops is to be avoided.

4. The Agricultural Adjustment farm program (A. A. A.) should definitely be continued—adjusted to fit wartime conditions. Soil-conservation features are especially important for maintaining large crop production. Payments to farmers should be limited for soil-building practices.

5. Wherever possible, parity prices should be achieved by farmers at the market place, rather than through Government payments.

6. R. E. A. transmission lines—serving farm families through nonprofit cooperatives—should be exempt from taxation.

7. The system for reporting income taxes should be greatly simplified.

8. All Government agencies must operate with a minimum of red tape and overlapping—some may have to be eliminated—if we are to carry on the war effort with equality of sacrifice.

9. To help bring a lasting victory, we must pay debts, buy War Savings bonds, prevent waste, strive for understanding and economic balance among groups, discourage speculative trading in land, work together, and produce required food to the limit of our ability.

10. In post-war planning, the farmer must not be a forgotten man.

11. The work of the State school committee deserves our consideration and support. A committee of farm men and women to study the needs of Clarke County should be set up.

12. Our 1944 extension program of educational assistance for the farm and home as adopted here today should have the backing of our entire membership to the end that it may benefit every farm family in the county.

13. That oleomargarine should be substituted for butter, wherever possible, in lend-lease shipments and that butter be retained for use of American armed forces and civilians and that our Congressmen be petitioned to act accordingly.

How Can the Democrats Win in 1944?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. Melville Broughton, Governor of North Carolina, at America's Town Meeting of the Air, Town Hall, New York City, Thursday, January 6, 1944:

> An authentic answer to the question here propounded would bring a very high premium. In American politics, however, there is no exclusive formula or "secret weapon." Issues forged upon the anvil of public discussion, records examined in the white light of public opinion, are the determining factors.
>
> It may be deemed unfortunate that for the first time in 132 years of our history we will this year be engaged in a national election while involved in a war with foreign powers.

Our democracy will thus be put to its supreme test, but we need have no fear. Of one thing we may be certain: This Nation will not elect as its President any man who, by his record or utterances prior to this war or since, has shown any lack of zeal for the cause for which we fight or who is wanting in forthright determination and definite program for a durable and just peace, internationally guaranteed, with full American participation.

Since a national election, even in so grave an emergency, is constitutionally inevitable, we may anticipate the fullest discussion of every issue, whether related to domestic or foreign affairs. This is the American way and has been from the beginning. Outside of absolute requirements of military necessity and nation l safety, there should be no attempt to exclude any governmental or political subject from discussion in this campaign.

The Democratic Party is the oldest political party in the world today. In its more than a century and a quarter of continuous existence, victory and defeat, triumph and disaster have been its portion. It has survived them all. Can it win in 1944?

As an approach to the answer, I would observe that the Democratic Party is by tradition and conviction a liberal party. It cannot win in any other role or with other than liberal leadership. Virtually every time it has offered a conservative or reactionary candidate the party has lost. With possibly one exception, the party has won the national election every time it was led by a truly liberal candidate. The Democratic Party can win in 1944 only as a liberal party with a liberal candidate.

It cannot be denied that the Democratic Party has lost ground on domestic issues. Nearly all competent political observers predict that on these issues alone the party is in grave danger of defeat. Many recent events strengthen this view. Can the party improve its position in the domestic field? I think it can and should.

What has been responsible for this manifest loss of strength? Time allotted to me permits only a mention of some of the more significant reasons:

1. There is a growing apprehension that the program of the Democratic Party involves the extinction of free enterprise. The American people believe in free enterprise. The Democratic Party traditionally has espoused free enterprise, free to profit but not to exploit either labor or the public, free to grow but not to monopolize. True liberalism is inseparably linked with free enterprise. Opportunity is of the essence of liberality. Any thinking or planning that constitutes a threat to free enterprise should be stripped out and publicly disavowed.

2. Too much bureaucratic regulation is irksome to the average American citizen even though designed for his benefit. The Democratic Party, of course, did not originate the bureau. It is a governmental antique. But the increase of bureaucracy in recent years, with involved questionnaires and interminable and frequently contradictory directives, is unquestionably one of the chief causes of a growing opposition to the party. Elimination and simplification in this field would greatly enhance the chances of the party in 1944.

3. It is undeniable that the party has lost substantially in farmer support. The farmer is essentially an individualist. He feels that there are entirely too many different agencies trying to regulate him. He also feels that labor and financial groups have been favored to the disadvantage of the farmer. This situation cannot be overlooked if victory is to be won.

4. The people are becoming apprehensive over what they consider nonessential public spending. The average American is ungrudging in his willingness to spend whatever is necessary to win the war, but he wants more of old-fashioned thrift and economy applied to other public spending; and even in the war program he deplores any wanton recklessness of expenditure. A nation with an unprecedented and growing public debt cannot ignore this sentiment.

5. Small businesses are in jeopardy in the United States. The war has accentuated this trend but there is danger of virtual extinction. It would be a tragic paradox if the Democratic Party, perennial champion of the small businessman and individual opportunity, should fail to offer a reassuring program for this group.

6. State governments, Democratic and Republican alike, are apprehensive over a growing tendency toward Federal encroachment upon the rights of States. States, North and South, East and West, are united in their determination to resist all encroachments not necessary for the war program and to insist upon full restoration of State's rights when the war is over. This is not an outmoded sentiment. The States mean business. It is an issue which the Democratic Party cannot ignore. Traditionally it is a State's rights party and this principle must be reasserted.

7. The Southern States are in great political turmoil. They resent what they consider unwise and unwarranted attempts of the national administration to interfere in matters of purely State concern. Delicate race relationships, which are being worked out with mutual understanding and good will, are frequently endangered by ill-advised activities which are deplored by leaders of both races. State regulation of forestry, employment, voting privileges, aviation, seed and fertilizer inspection, and many other traditional and constitutional rights are threatened. Freight-rate inequities shackle the industrial growth of many southern sections. These are some of the conditions which have stirred sentiments of resentment if not revolt in the South. They must be reckoned with. They can and will be settled within the party. The South will support the Democratic ticket in 1944.

8. The threat of post-war unemployment gravely disturbs the soldier in the field and the laborer on the home front. This is post-war problem No. 1. The Democratic Party, to win favor, must advance a program that will give assurance on this point. Such program cannot be predicated on any basis of charity or relief. The returning soldier, even as the laborer on the home front, wants a job and not a dole. He is a self-reliant man who seeks only the opportunity to earn a comfortable living for himself and his family. No program of public works alone will offer the solution, though such will undoubtedly be necessary to supplement employment made available by private industry. The surest answer to this problem is to give industry the fullest opportunity for growth and expansion with reasonable profit incentive in a program in which management and labor alike can enjoy reasonable benefits.

It, of course, will be well understood by the people that many objectionable or burdensome policies in domestic affairs have been inevitable consequences of the war situation. Furthermore, when the people calmly review the whole picture of the domestic scene they will not overlook the long list of constructive and permanent achievements of the present administration which not even the Republican Party will dare to challenge.

If the outcome is somewhat doubtful on domestic issues, what of issues arising out of the conduct of the war and the program for peace? Here the Democratic Party has all the advantage. This is its greatest assurance of victory in 1944. Fighting the war is, of course, not a partisan endeavor. The blood of Democrats and Republicans alike is being shed for the cause of victory. But destiny has placed the Democratic Party in power in the midst of this global struggle, even as in the First World War. Ineptitude, blundering, or failure of leadership under such circumstances would logically and inevitably doom the party in power to disastrous defeat. The contrary is the record. The war is being magnificently directed, and production has exceeded all estimates and met all requirements. Victory is assured and the Nation resoundingly approves.

In its program for peace, in its formulation of principles for international guaranty of a just and durable peace, the Democratic Party, under the leadership of the President and the Secretary of State, has justified the confidence and hopes of the people. The people will be slow to take these all-important and destiny-freighted responsibilities out of the hands of a party that has demonstrated such notable capacity.

On this all-important issue of peace and international relationships, the Republican Party is not only lacking in background and experience but is hopelessly divided. Only 2 weeks ago the most recently defeated Republican candidate for President sharply challenged as isolationist a statement issued by his immediate predecessor in defeat. Similar discordance of view has been manifested by recent utterances of other Republican leaders. Upon such incertitude and division the people will be unwilling to rest their hopes for a world free of war, a future of happiness and prosperity.

I have not been asked to discuss this question in respect to candidates. Such consideration at this time would be premature and speculative. The question propounded is: "How can the Democrats win in 1944?" I believe they can and will win, and I have sought to state some of the conditions upon which victory can be assured.

Overseas Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, our merchant marine is engaged in an internationally competitive field. It should never be handicapped either by legislative or administrative action in meeting the demands such competition creates. It is my understanding that all competitive maritime nations have sanctioned the development of air transportation by their maritime interests.

The Civil Aeronautics bill, H. R. 3420, recently reported to the House by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, should be amended to give the American shipping industry an even break with their foreign competitors.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent granted to me to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial recently published by the San Francisco Examiner, I invite the attention of the House of Representatives to the following editorial:

OVERSEAS AIR LINES

Because of a curious conflict between two Government departments, which can only be adjusted by Congress, modern development of the American merchant marine after the war is jeopardized.

The issue is whether or not American steamship companies may operate overseas airlines supplementing their sea-borne trade.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority, by a tortuous interpretation of an old law, has ruled that such ship operators may not operate airlines along their steamship routes.

The Maritime Commission, coming to the aid of the shipping industry, has urged an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act which will permit such operation. The commission has appealed to Representative LEA, of California, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to remove the discrimination.

The issue was presented here recently in a speech before the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club by William K. Jackson, vice president and general counsel of the United Fruit Co., a company with vast shipping interests.

As Mr. Jackson showed, the great American shipping companies are best qualified to develop foreign commerce, and the airplane will be a dominant factor in foreign commerce after the war.

With close Government control over shipping, aviation and foreign commerce, the public would be protected against any imposition arising from affiliation of ship lines and airlines.

America faces a stiff job in developing its shipping lines. Before the war 70 percent of our foreign commerce was carried in foreign ships. To reduce that adverse ratio, American shipping must have all the rights enjoyed by foreign lines, consistent with American standards of ship operation. No legislation restricting those legitimate rights should be imposed.

Congress should act quickly to clear the air of the legalistic clouds which would hinder the development both of shipping and overseas aviation.

H. R. 3817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, for simplification of the tax-calculation problems of millions of our people under the pay-as-you-go procedure, I introduced in the House, December 9, 1943, a bill, H. R. 3817, relating to the current payment of the individual income tax not withheld at the source.

The Congress is aware that under the present internal-revenue statutes, and as a result of the pay-as-you-go legislation enacted in 1943, all small businessmen—the corner grocers, meat dealers, pharmacists, restaurateurs, and so forth, professional people, like physicians, dentists, lawyers, and also the farmers, and others are compelled to grope in the dark when figuring their financial obligations to Uncle Sam.

The law now requires all these people whose individual income tax cannot be withheld from wages to file with their collector of internal revenue, on or before the fifteenth day of March, a declaration estimating their taxable income for the entire current year.

Such taxpayers writing me their views have described themselves as bewildered and have urged a practical method.

I now propose in my bill that small businesses, professional people, farmers, and the others whose tax is not collectible by withholding be allowed to pay income tax on actual earnings only, rather than on estimated earnings; that they be given an extension of 30 days' time for filing of a quarterly declaration, that is, an extension from March 15 to April 15, and, similarly, from June 15 to July 15, from September 15 to October 15, and from December 15 to January 15; and that the tax required to be paid with their declarations shall be only the tax due on taxable incomes for the preceding quarter, rather than an estimated tax on income only partly earned and mostly anticipated.

The complaint of the taxpayers affected against the present law is that they cannot anticipate on the eve of the March 15 deadline their income for 9½ months thereafter, which income is certain to fluctuate and cannot be estimated either upon the basis of their known income of the first 2½ months of the year or according to what their income was the preceding year. Although the existing law permits them to make a quarterly payment, such payment is required to be one-fourth of their estimate of tax for the whole year, by which requirement they must undertake to estimate their income for the whole year. They feel that they are certain to overpay or underpay their Federal Government, and they object to the strenuous guesswork on factors unforeseeable, to the penalty with which they are threatened if they make too bad a guess, and to the necessity of having to wait after the tax year—and perhaps for a long time after—for a refund of whatever they have overpaid.

The present guess plan is unpopular and the country is demanding a change.

In effect, these millions of taxpayers are not on a pay-as-you-go basis, in my opinion—not when they have to pay any part of their income tax in advance on a guess.

I am asking people writing me to make known to the House Committee on Ways and Means their support of House Resolution 3817, so that the committee will be advised as to the difficulties created by pay-as-you-go in its present provisions for all those people whose individual income tax is not collectible by withholding at the source.

Passage of House Resolution 3817 will, in my judgment, place every individual in the Nation actually on a current tax-payment basis. The people affected by this bill will then be paying as they go, and they will be paying when they know.

Unity for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in a nation that is struggling to maintain every ounce of unity in order to bring to an end more quickly the greatest war in all its history, there is one thing that should be minimized to the greatest degree possible; that one thing is the mixture of the war effort and partisan politics. In a two-party government such as ours, a complete separation of the two is probably too much to be hoped for, but certainly every one of us, in public life and out, can strive to reduce this problem to an absolute minimum.

Since coming to Washington, I have been appalled at the degree to which we are divided among ourselves; at the extent to which we are working at cross purposes instead of toward the one all-important goal—victory as quickly and as completely as possible. Internal conflicts of all kinds are seriously hindering our progress toward this goal. We see capital and labor fighting each other; rural districts fighting urban ones; the South against the North and sometimes both against the West; one profession against another. In brief, we are concentrating a dangerous amount of our effort on petty quarrels with one another instead of uniting against the common enemy.

Two special problems seem to be especially critical. The first is the loose talk—always on a partisan basis—about certain of our military men running for the Presidency. The name of General MacArthur has frequently been mentioned in this connection, and already many MacArthur-for-President clubs have been organized throughout the country, especially—strangely enough—in those areas where isolationist sentiment still prevails. Likewise the name of General Marshall has been suggested as a possible candidate, although the public interest in his candidacy has been less than in that of General MacArthur. To my mind such talk hurts the war effort beyond measure. General MacArthur is a Republican; General Marshall is a Democrat. Both men are among the greatest military geniuses alive today, and the efforts of both are being directed toward getting us into Berlin and Tokyo with the least expense in time and men and money. In my judgment, those who advocate either man as a Presidential candidate are contributing to the already too great disunity and are definitely harming the war effort itself. In our Civil War the fact that the former commanding general of the Army of the Potomac ran against Abraham Lincoln was not conducive to a united North; the same situation in greatly accentuated form exists in this war.

The second special problem centers around the soldier-vote bill. We have taken close to 9,000,000 young men—and a great many young women as well—torn them from their home ties, and placed them in danger of death itself in order that America may live. Certainly these young men and women should not be denied the most precious heritage of a democratic form of government—that of expressing themselves as to their choice of Representative, Senator, and President. A bill was recently introduced into the Senate setting up effective and remarkably simple machinery to permit these citizens to vote. However, the bill is now emasculated beyond all recognition, having been amended until it bears

little resemblance to the original proposal. The principal reason for such action was the fear on the part of certain politicians that the total vote of the men in the service would hurt their particular vested jobs—a fear due to certain sectional or partisan considerations.

There is still a chance that this bill will be passed in something resembling its original form, as it must still come to the House, and there is increasing sentiment there for complete participation by those in the armed services. This is a fundamental issue which cannot be dodged. Personally, I intend to do everything possible to see that all those in the service of their country have the chance to express themselves at the polls in 1944. To fail to work toward that end would be to fail the Nation itself in this war crisis.

The Battle of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I am including an address delivered by me in Omaha on December 30, 1943, and given over radio station WOW on that date:

Fellow Nebraskans, 18 months ago, I said, "The decisive battle for freedom in this generation will be won or lost in America." That battle is now under way. It is the battle of Washington. I have as your Representative today two great responsibilities. One is to work for the kind of Government that will win the war quickly and preserve freedom at home. Secondly, I have the obligation to keep you informed on the management of your Government. As a member of the minority party, my vote currently is often little more than a protest, but my usefulness in challenging the majority to correct its failures, and in keeping you informed, is only limited by my ability and political courage.

No thoughtful citizen could be assigned to my task in Washington without being awed by the fearful dangers which confront us. America faces problems as grave as those which daunted Washington at Valley Forge and discouraged Lincoln before Gettysburg. More Americans are in military uniform, more Americans face death in battle, more intricate problems confound our economic life, and more American homes are broken by the absence of a father, mother, brother, or sister, than ever before in our history.

With these stern realities confronting us, we at home need desperately to understand the duties of the citizen during time of trial and danger.

What I would like to be able to tell you is something about the progress of the war on the military fronts where your boys are. However, my information is limited to the dispatches or news which has passed military censorship and which you already know. I know that because of American labor and industry the American soldier is splendidly equipped—and will overcome the armored might of fascism on the battlefield. But, your energies and mine should not be dissipated guessing at military events or distracted by glamorously staged side shows to the war. No citizen can shrug off his responsibility for the protection of freedom by saying, with pious hypocrisy, "This is war." The citizen obsessed with war earnings will find these dollars to be fool's gold unless we begin to win victories on the home front.

War, which makes many restrictions appropriate, is the time when liberty in a republic may be lost permanently. The battle of Washington is against unconditional surrender to the chains of fascism under the cloak of war necessity. What is fascism? The Encyclopaedia Britannica says, "The pattern of fascism is command from above and obedience from below." Measure that definition against life in America today and you will know how real this danger is. Then the question becomes, "What are we doing to neutralize this danger?"

I am not disturbed by the inconveniences and minor dislocations of war. Whether the temperature in my house when I get up in the morning is uncomfortable and my morning breakfast lacks some tasty foods is not, in itself, important, but the fact that Government orders control my life down to these minute details is dangerous.

The transportation we use is controlled by governmental order. Working hours and earnings are controlled by governmental order. "Conform or perish" was the edict of Hitler. "Conform or perish" is the edict from the bureaucrats in Washington. The fact that generally only minor inconveniences have resulted thus far only parallels the early approval with which the Germans accepted nazi-ism.

Let me give you an example right here in our own back yard, where a new industry known as quick-frozen eviscerated poultry has been developed. In this new process, poultry is completely prepared for table use here where it is raised. This industry has meant a new market for the farmer, jobs for labor, and opportunity for business. Today most of these plants are closed. Why? The bureaucrats at Washington fixed prices below the cost of doing business. As a result, farmers lost markets, labor is unemployed, and business stagnates. Of course, this loss is unnoticed now, but the post-war effects of this bureaucratic action may hurt this whole area.

In every nook and cranny of American life the blighting hand of bureaucracy, like a deadly plague, is striking down free enterprise. In the first 6 months of 1943, 86,000 businesses closed. Your returning soldier boy cannot go back to his old job if regulations have strangled and the bureaucrats have held a funeral for the business which employed him. No muster-out pay or grandiose rehabilitation schemes are an acceptable substitute for opportunity in the old job. The soldiers I talk to want no "humbug."

They know that the prisoner in the penitentiary has the four freedoms. He has freedom of speech; he can think and say what he pleases. He has freedom of religion; he chooses from a variety of religious services. He has freedom from fear and freedom from want. Yet, no one would contend that the inmate of a penitentiary enjoys freedom. In America today no man can start a business, no man can even become a farmer, without securing numerous governmental approvals, which are issued or withheld at the whim of individual bureaucrats.

These controls, talked about so glibly in Washington, are the chains in which a slave people walk. We wear those chains now. Once they are locked in place, our future is doomed. No camouflage, no slogans, no war distractions, no emergency conditions must be allowed to obscure that hard reality.

The failures of Government must not always be used as a springboard to more drastic governmental controls. Let me illustrate: Inflation is our most difficult domestic problem. Government created that problem; Governmental deficit spending has been the basic cause of every disastrous inflation in history. Years back financial authorities constructively pleaded for a balanced budget to avoid inflation. They were laughed at and given the smug answer by Washington that inflation was not a danger. A sound currency is more important to America's future than victories on far-flung battle fronts.

As Government spends hundreds of millions in faraway places, pleas for economy by some of us in Congress fall on deaf ears. These billions must be paid by the common people of America. Today, as never before, the American taxpayer is the forgotten man.

For years, the American people have looked to Government for material blessings, instead of demanding wise and careful leadership based on the eternal moral and spiritual values. We have allowed physical pleasures to have priority over righteousness and justice. Now we find that without a spiritual and moral foundation these so-called good things of life are soon swept away. The dream of the more abundant life is gone.

The crying need today is for the Government to obey the standards of integrity that it demands of its citizens. Government that glibly breaks its promises, again and again, is the largest contributor to the moral delinquency that is wrecking civilization's greatest hope—the American home and fireside. There is a great deal of talk in Washington about juvenile delinquency. Unless we raise our children right, all our extravagant post-war plans will go as sour as the Neutrality Act which was going to prevent war. Juvenile delinquency grows out of parental delinquency, and the parental delinquency that is eating away like a cancer at the home life of this country springs from governmental delinquency.

The people of the world are pleading and praying for honest leadership. Leadership that will say what it means and mean what it says. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is more than a scriptural phrase. It is the final measure of men and government.

In the "Battle of Washington," the job of supplying our armed forces with the weapons of war is being won. But in the battle to preserve the American way of life, we have been in constant retreat. In my judgment, no people in history have had a more solemn and sacred trust than our obligation to these loved ones in uniform. We at home will be false to every heritage of America if we allow anyone to change America while patriots are dying on foreign battle fields. We should be holding America in trust while they are gone.

When the boys return, the American people will have the right to make this country a socialistic state, adopt communism as a way of life, or even subject themselves to the tyranny and arrogance of a military dictatorship. But no one has any right to move in this direction now.

The dangers of national disunity and disintegration are real. The basic causes are, first, the governmental Pearl Harbor policy of covering up the facts or resorting to half truths; second, the long-continued reckless-spending policy that is straining the foundations of our monetary system; and, finally, the manipulating within the administration to bring about communism or socialism by wrapping the American flag around it. These conditions are the open sores that threaten America in the "Battle of Washington."

What is the constructive solution for these difficulties? For 90 percent of our troubles, I offer the proposal of Abraham Lincoln in a similar period of national crisis. Lincoln said, "I have faith in the people. Tell them the truth and the Nation will be saved."

This war, regardless of its origins, is now the responsibility of all the American people. It's their war. It's their boys who are doing the fighting and the dying. They should know the facts about it. Treating them like children, under the excuse of war censorship, is an insult to both their intelligence and their patriotism.

The unity and mutual trust that America must have for victory in the war and the peace to follow can only be achieved by the elimination of these causes of disunity and distrust. The administration can heal these wounds by genuine curative action. The only way the "Battle of Washington" can be won is for the President and Congress, working together, to provide the people of this country with honest government, careful legislation based on American principles, and wise administration. In that achievement, government at Washington will make its greatest possible contribution to human welfare, both during this war and the peace to follow.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Texas, over the Columbia network from radio station KEYS, Corpus Christi, Tex., on January 4, 1944:

Good evening, fellow Americans: Ladies and gentlemen, permit me to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for the time granted me tonight. I think it proper for you to know that I speak to you tonight as a Member of the Congress of the United States, a Member of the House of Representatives, and as one of those through whom your voice as the people and as individuals is heard in the halls of state.

Almost every day I read in the papers and hear on the floor of the House that the American people are not conscious of the fact that a great war is going on, that the American people don't know in the great majority of cases that the United States is at war, that the American people think that the war is about over, and that we can let down. Yes, I read and hear, as you do, this constant diatribe against both the intelligence and the patriotism of us Americans. I believe that I am at least reasonably sane. I don't believe these things that we read and hear are true.

There is another line too which is considerably harped upon and to which I call your attention. It appears both in the newspapers and in the statements of public men. It is constituted of the sort of back-handed attack upon this, that, and every other kind of American who does not perchance agree with those who use this line of attack. I hear everywhere charges that among us are many—too many Americans—who are unwilling to make sacrifices; that there are among us too many who would be profiteers. I don't believe smears along this line, either.

Not long ago some good friends of mine in government, men in positions of high public trust made strenuous and able appeals to the American people for unity.

They were not quite explicit enough as to just what kind of unity they meant. One of them requested that certain groups "lay that pistol down." Another suggested that those who were in disagreement with certain regulations and directives desist in their opposition to them for unity's sake. It is about all of these things that I would talk to you tonight, in order to make things as clear as I can. I am calling upon the very best that is in me, and I only wish that my attainments were far greater than they are. This I know, that confusion has ever been the enemy of attainment. I know that as a Nation here on the home front we are in the midst of the greatest confusion that has ever beset us since our nativity. By tracing things to their origin we gain more rightful ideas of them and understand them better.

If a doctor or a surgeon can ascertain the cause of the malady of his patient—if not incurable—he may work a cure. However, if he treats that patient with cure-alls, panaceas, and other forms of treatment not adapted to the cause of the ailment and its correction, he can only effect a cure as a cowboy might put it—by the grace of God and green apples.

It seems to me that some of our problems on the home front are being attacked by this method of hit-or-miss treatment.

Now let us backtrack a little. First, we must know whether we on the home front are fighting this war with the same objective which fires our heroic sons—yes, and our daughters—on the real and far-flung battlefronts in this world conflict. In other words, what are we fighting for?

As a humble American Congressman, for my part, I believe young Americans everywhere are fighting to preserve our American way of life. They are fighting to preserve our country. They are fighting so that when this mass malignity which afflicts the whole world is over they may come home to an America which has been kept fit for them to live in—an America filled with the opportunities that only the American way has afforded to citizens of the United States; yes, since the Stars and Stripes first became the emblem of the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

For my part here at home, if these be their objectives, I fight shoulder to shoulder with them—with the no-surrender sign up as long as God gives me life to strive to attain these ends.

Follow me just a moment. The forms into which governments that have prevailed throughout the history of the world may be divided are, first, governments which arise out of the people; second, governments which arise over the people. Mark this distinction well for the purpose of this discussion. Our Government belongs to this first class. So let us subdivide again our form of government, one by election and representation functioning as a democracy; second, governments by hereditary succession; and, third, those governments which have ever been spawned by defeatism, born of the idea that the "state is our salvation," such as fascism, socialism, nazi-ism, etc., are totalitarian and may only function under rigid dictatorships. The first of these, the republican, our form of government, arises out of the people deriving all of its just powers from the governed people and exercising these powers by and with their sanction. Our form of government is republican in form and democratic in character. Under our form and system, a constitution is a thing antecedent to government which is in fact the creature of such constitution.

The Constitution of the United States was born as the result of the use of God-given and directed reason on the part of drafting forefathers. The quality of reason was again required on the part of the people in the various States in the exercise of the prerequisites of ratification by State legislatures or by the people assembled in State conventions. When these steps were accomplished, according to the Constitution itself, the United States of America was born, the seeds of the American way of life were planted and bore final fruit. This fruit is best exemplified as to its quality when with more than 8,000 years of the history of mankind behind us we find no single instance when any other nation was ever called upon by Almighty God to shoulder responsibilities comparable to those which the United States bears today.

I beg of you, with all the earnestness and emphasis which I can muster, to keep this brief analysis in mind; first, that our government of the people, for the people, and by the people is a government which arose out of and not over the people; second, that it was born of reason under God and with true and imperishable faith in Him; that this Government was born of the Constitution of the United States, and that because of this Government of ours the American way of life came into being—a way of life that is known to none of God's children under heaven save to us. I beg of you bend close your minds and your hearts that you may grasp the true significance of the oath of office of those who serve you in high positions of public trust in the halls of state.

The American way of life is founded on democratic ideals which in turn are supported irrevocably—and I pray eternally—by faith in the concept that reason in the long run controls Americans; second, faith in the American individual and his true worth, if left free to develop and do his part in the American way.

As to No. 1, of course, man is impelled and motivated by a host of emotions and prejudices—desire, greed, lust, hate, envy, etc. But then, too, he is immobilized in his effective power by confusion, uncertainty, etc. But so long as we as Americans can feel a just pride in saying—each individual one of us—"I am an American," and as long as that truly means that each of us has high moral concepts and virtue in the long run, reason will prevail.

Again I repeat I refuse to tolerate the thought that Americans cannot be trusted to do the reasonable thing. Of all of the dangerous defeatist ideas that have been advanced, this one, in my opinion, brings more real danger to us than any other. It may be that those who utter this thought and who continually advance the need for more and more restrictions, regulations, directives, and "red tape" are overcautious, overtrained, and, I think, in many cases, too highly educated.

From these conditions come those graduates of the school of reformers who have, throughout all history, been responsible for the major human catastrophes and tragedies which mar and spoil the pages of the history of mankind.

Two things can bring us back into the cycle of recurrent evidences of major human catastrophes in history. One will be this continued lack of confidence in us, the people, that we will do the reasonable thing by those who man the oars of the ship of state. The other will be our evidencing a lack of militant and intelligent vigilance in thwarting their designs. If these two combine, they will bring us to the most tragic page in the history of this world which will be read by generations of Americans who follow. And if this happens, it should haunt us through eternity into which we of this generation pass when we shuffle off this mortal coil.

Our republican democracy is the only form of government which accepts reason as the basis for man's right to freedom and liberty. It is a form of government which more nearly recognizes reason as the basic difference between man and animals which herd and are driven to toil and slaughter.

In speaking to you tonight and addressing you as fellow-Americans, I speak to you as individuals, as individual compatriots in this tragic hour, and I pray you will grant me a confidence like that which I grant you. Never was a truer saying than that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that must be practiced in our case by upholding and defending the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. There must be some clarion cry which can be heard throughout the confines of this great land of ours—yes, heard and heeded. There must be something to this American way of life which even in

the midst of the dark and confusion which surrounds us we can all see clearly, and here it is, I think—I join those friends of mine who ask for unity of purpose among all Americans. I do not mean servile unity, but American unity in support of the fountain from which the American way of life pours forth and in support and defense of the foundations of ours underlying and upholding this fountain, the Constitution of the United States properly interpreted and backed up by a united people.

We have before the Congress a bill which is the center of one of the most vicious maelstroms in the sea of confusion which engulfs us. This bill generally is known as the antisubsidy bill. I supported it with all the earnestness of my being as an American. The Congress has come to no conclusion. Really, there is a temporary halt on the part of Congress by reason of recessing which required an extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a temporary period. I supported the antisubsidy bill for two reasons in voicing my opposition to a wide-open subsidy program for the people of the United States. I cannot and never will believe that American business and the American people exclusively are dependent upon the Federal Government for their salvation. If this should happen—God forbid this should ever become true—it will only be because and when our Government is no longer a government which arises out of the people, but only when it becomes a government over the people. The very idea of dependence is utterly repulsive to my way of thinking because dependency begets subservience, and the men and women that I know and love that constitute the people of the United States of America will have to change immeasurably in form and stature to become the crawling, servile creatures of such a monster.

Again, too, to those who plead for unity, may I say to my way of thinking that if this unity require submission to the idea that Americans are mendicants, it would be just as easy for me to agree with the idea that we could stop this war by yielding in submissive unity to the ideas, ideals, and plans of Hitler and Tojo.

Yes; this would stop the war. A great American once said, and I quote: "We prefer war in all cases to tribute in any form and to any people whatsoever."

So, my friends, we had better stop, look, and listen concerning this subsidy program before we so avidly proclaim that we need it badly enough to charge our grocery bills to those who are fighting this war in fact for us, and to their children and to coming generations. Such dependence begets subservience, and it will suffocate the very germs of American virtue, and if we fix the tentacles of this octopus upon our fair land we will have erected and put into operation the factories which will produce fit tools for the design of misguided ambition and vicious and harmful ideology.

Let us analyze this subsidy proposal briefly. Time will not permit more than a brief analysis. First, if the Congress permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to subsidize producers and distributors and so forth for the benefit of the consumers, it will mean that the Congress will have financed a means for the disintegration of the American way of life as we know it. Second, the Congress will have financed an already tested and tried-out confusion, which means that this confusion will continue. Everyone knows that we have had shortages in almost every commodity since the beginning of the operations of the present O. P. A., and these subsidies are required for the making of adjustments in the economic structure because of the maladjustments occasioned by ill-advised, and in some cases, illegal regulations issued by the O. P. A. together with Government or so-called Executive directives.

Third—and don't be surprised—but if Congress allows payment of blank-check funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the establishment of its far- and wide-flung subsidy program, this program will be put into effect by regulations and directives, and you will have no voice in it as the American people, because these directives and regulations with the force and effect of law will not be enacted or drafted by your representatives in Congress.

Fourth, one of these proposed plans to be effectuated by regulation, and, shall I say, and/or directives, is one which provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall purchase all of the products of certain needed commodities which it will then reallocate to be redistributed and sold through agencies of its selection.

Take, for instance, citrus fruit. Plans are already drawn to put this plan into operation. Think this over and see what it means. Your brains are just as good as mine. And while you are thinking, listen to this, as I read from article I, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States:

"All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Does the Congress defend and uphold the Constitution when it knows that the vast spending power involved in this proposed subsidy program means that it is to be administered under and by virtue and direction of regulations and directives with the full force and effect of law which are not drafted by the Congress—oh, no—but drafted and put into effect by individuals who were not elected by the people but who hold appointive office and who are, therefore, not responsible to the people, and that when any citizen shall be found in contravention of these regulations or directives, or both, that he will not be tried in a duly constituted court such as contemplated by the Constitution and before a jury of his peers, but he will be tried in an O. P. A. court from which he has no appeal? Can I, as a Representative of the American people, sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, tolerate this as being in accordance with my oath of office? I don't think so. And if you think that the American way of life is worth living and fighting for, I believe you think and agree with me.

Now, let us go a little further in this subsidy thing. Those who advance the subsidy theory say, for instance, that it is either subsidies or a general increase in the cost of living. This fantastic allegation may sound plausible unless one considers the alternative to subsidies. Simply stated, it is controlled adjustment of demand and supply based upon flexibility in pricing. Under such a plan, as demand increases prices would increase. As price increases induced production demand is overtaken by supply and then prices decrease. That has been always the American way. As a matter of fact, subsidies continued long would mean an inevitable increase in the cost of living as they inevitably mean an increase in the real dangers of inflation. First, subsidies of the kind contemplated do nothing to induce production, but in fact discourage it. Ask any beef cattleman or any farmer. And as a result, if subsidies are inflicted, supply soon may be expected to decrease, and as a consequence of more persons with more purchasing power bidding more money for less goods, the pressure for price increases resulting from subsidies would be greater and persist longer than in the case of the natural alternative.

The argument that it is either subsidies or a general increase in the cost of living rests on no other foundation than the age-old strategy employed by those who brought Socialist states into being, that your opponent is doing what you know you are doing and thus attempts to divert your attention from your own guilt.

Another charge, it is consumer subsidies or inflation. This charge almost answers itself in the American forum of reason. First, any price increase does not mean inflation. There was a general increase in the price level during the last World War that was much greater than anything that has taken place during a corresponding period in this war, yet there was no inflation. This charge is also as fantastic as it is untrue, because it attempts to delude the American people into believing that consumer subsidies are not inflationary where they have a much greater and more fundamental inflationary effect upon conditions than any price increases that might reasonably be expected or anticipated. Again, guilt cannot long be concealed by charging that opponents are doing the same thing. It is not a choice between consumer subsidies and inflation. It is a case of consumer subsidies and much more and quicker inflation than otherwise.

Another one: The proponents say an increase in the cost of living means that there must be wage increases. This is like the old moot question, "Which came first, the hen or the egg?" When the Price Control Act of 1942 became law in January of that year, it never touched the main factor in a price structure—wages and earnings. A mad rush had already taken place on the part of labor leaders to get every possible advantage before the expected amendment to the Price Act took place. This came in October 1942, following a period of almost unprecedented political wage gyrations. So far as those most vociferous for concealed subsidies are concerned, it must be pointed out that they had already got their wage increases. That was the cause of the price increase which was made inevitable and which has since only partly run out, the inescapable course to which all were automatically committed once these wage increases were put into effect.

And then they say opponents of subsidies have no alternative to propose—which, of course, is sheer bunk. The entire cattle industry, for instance, offered a plan, which was accepted by Chester Davis, then War Food Administrator; Prentiss M. Brown, then O. P. A. Administrator; and by General Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States Army, but this plan was not put into effect because the subsidy boys would have been out of court.

In the last World War, controlled prices worked quite successfully in the United States. Similar and clear-cut measures should be taken in this country now, before the almost criminal impotence which has been evidenced condemns this Nation to something far worse than German inflation, the Mississippi Bubble, etc.

The alternative to subsidies, and I will give you one now, is the creation of a proper price-control agency given necessary discretionary power to act. The paper shortage of this Nation could be much helped by doing this and then putting to use the countless volumes of embalmed printed regulations and red tape now dragging this Nation toward starvation. There are all kinds and more of the same class of argument for these subsidies, but my imagination is not fertile enough to cope with the factory of foreign ideology which spawned this theory. They never run out of ammunition and paper. And an American who hews to the line can't go so far afield from fact and shoot fancy in his gun. When somebody suggests, "Lay that pistol down," I hope that suggestion is heard and heeded by those who are shooting at our constitutional form of republican democracy based on reason and a faith in God.

I have never believed that there could be two war fronts as far as the United States was concerned. The home front and the World War front must be identical in both

objective and patriotic backing if what we are fighting for, the continuity of the American way of life and of our system of government, is the goal. I cannot make an argument upon an appeal which is based upon more or less rash assumptions, but I can and do present this plea for American unity to preserve on the home front those priceless attributes which make up the source of that pride which you feel when they ask you where you are from and you say, "I am an American."

The very soul of the American people is made up of their faith, and I propose this challenge from the Book of the God in whom we trust: "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

Taking Inventory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, every good businessman takes an inventory or "takes stock" at the close of each year to determine profits or losses, to learn whether the year just closed was a good year or a bad year. Now that the President has officially declared the New Deal era ended and has announced that the era ahead shall be known as the Win the War Era, the American people, interested stockholders in the now defunct New Deal, are entitled to an inventory to determine whether New Deal assets balance or outweigh New Deal liabilities. In making such an inventory and in attempting to strike a balance, we believe the following items should be placed on the credit side of the New Deal ledger:

First. Our Federal deposit insurance laws that guarantee bank deposits and tend to establish a sound banking system.

Second. Our Social-Security System that provides old-age pensions and unemployment-insurance compensation.

Third. Our minimum-wage and maximum-hours labor laws.

Fourth. The Securities and Exchange Commission—with all its faults.

While these assets, like all new ventures in the field of legislation, are far from being perfect, and while we concede they need revision and clarification, yet we believe they constitute progress in the right direction and should properly be classed as New Deal assets.

The following items we would place on the debit side of the New Deal ledger:

First. Unlimited deficit spending, resulting in a huge national debt and heavy taxes—entirely aside from regular war expenditures.

Second. A great, growing, and dangerous concentration of power in the Federal Government—over and above necessary war powers.

Third. Unnecessary and unreasonable bureaucratic control over American business and the private affairs of American citizens—entirely aside from necessary war controls.

Fourth. A complete failure in handling or solving our labor problems, which has resulted in the present chaotic labor situation.

Fifth. The creation of over 2,000 new Government bureaus and commissions during the New Deal era, which has resulted in an increase in the Federal pay roll from $1,000,000,000 per year when the New Deal took over to $6,000,000,000 per year where it is at present; also an increase from 570,000 Federal civilian employees to 3,250,000, Federal civilian employees.

The American people, contributing stockholders in the Federal Government, must decide now whether the New Deal assets outweigh the New Deal liabilities, and they must also decide now whether they want the same management to continue to operate their business for the next 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the President's official act in closing out the New Deal set-up, and his announced intention to resume business under the new name, "Win the War"—but under the same old management—The Milwaukee Sentinel of Friday, December 31, 1943, discussed quite thoroughly the situation that confronts the American people as a result of the President's action. Because this editorial supplements and enriches my own thought on this subject, I include it as a part of these remarks, for the consideration of my colleagues in the House:

THE TWILIGHT OF THE NEW DEAL

So now the White House commands us all to forget about the New Deal.

We are admonished that Mr. Roosevelt wants to discard its soiled and tattered name and to substitute some new political moniker like "the win the war party."

Of course, the obvious purpose of that maneuver is to label all opposition to the fourth-term candidate as "the lose the war party."

That unjust and unscrupulous designation will include a vast multitude of good citizens.

It will include all those who are opposed to the New Deal and have been ever since they began to understand it.

It will include all those who are opposed to Caesarism and to self-perpetuation in public office.

It will include all those who are opposed to demagogic taxation.

It will include all those who are opposed to labor-union racketeering.

It will include all those who are opposed to a swollen bureaucracy of millions of payrollees.

It will include all those who are opposed to a cowed and subservient Congress.

It will include all those who are opposed to a truckling or complaisant judiciary.

It will include all those who are opposed to putting and keeping Communists in governmental jobs.

It will include all those who are opposed to regimentation of the people.

It will include all those who are opposed to the socialization of industry.

It will include all those who are opposed to the confiscation of private property and private incomes.

It will include all those who are opposed to unnecessary censorship of the press and radio.

It will include all those who are opposed to secret treaties, entered into without the advice and approval of the Senate.

It will include all those who are opposed to making a partisan political machine of the armed forces.

It will include all those who are opposed to the appointment to lucrative New Deal sinecures of "lame ducks" repudiated by the people.

It will include all those who are opposed to factional strife and class conflict in America.

It will include all those who are opposed to the wholesale purchase of ballots by the payment of Treasury bounties to favored groups.

It will include all those who are opposed to Federal connivance with corrupt State and municipal political machines.

It will include all those who are opposed to squandering the people's money on eccentric and visionary projects.

It will include all those who are opposed to boondoggling at home or abroad.

It will include all those who believe in supporting and obeying the Constitution of the United States.

It will include all those who believe in the faithful preservation of State's rights whereby the rights of the people of the States are protected.

It will include all those who believe in government by laws, not by men.

It will include all those who believe in free enterprise instead of collectivism.

It will include all those who believe in the American principle of protective tariffs.

It will include all those who believe in reinforcing and enforcing the selective immigration laws.

It will include all those who believe in the right of every American to enjoy the just rewards of his own ability and diligence.

It will include all those who believe in the profit motive.

It will include all those who believe that industrial and commercial concerns should be permitted to accumulate and utilize reserves out of earnings.

It will include all those who believe that individuals should be permitted to accumulate savings and to invest their own money in legitimate ventures.

It will include all those who believe in family inheritances and in philanthropic bequests and benefactions.

It will therefore include all those who believe in the proven benefits of capitalism.

It will include all those who believe that persons indicted by Federal grand juries should be tried in their own districts and not be transported or required to appear elsewhere to be tried among strangers at great expense and jeopardy to themselves.

It will include all those who believe that politicians should be subject to the same high rules of morality and honesty as businessmen are expected to be.

It will include all those who believe in integrity, a virtue which the New Deal has often extolled but seldom exhibited.

In sum; Mr. Roosevelt's prospective "lose the war party" will include more than half of the population of the country and a good deal more than half of the States.

Particularly, it will include millions upon millions of devotedly patriotic Americans who are helping America to win the war—whose sons and brothers are helping to fight the war—and without whose loyal sacrifices and labors America would surely be defeated.

Would it not be an action of utter baseness to seek a partisan advantage by falsely identifying these good citizens as desiring their country's misfortune because their political opinions on constitutional and domestic issues happen to be their own and at variance with the policies of Mr. Roosevelt's discredited New Deal?

Mustering-Out Pay for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE PURPLE HEART,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1944.

Hon. RANULF COMPTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR COMPTON: Pursuant to our conversation some short time ago relative to legislation now pending before Congress, S. 1543 and H. R. 3799, bills to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, please permit me to, on behalf of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, express to you personally and for the record, the feeling and attitude of the Military Order of the Purple Heart toward such legislation.

Assuring you of our appreciation for interest displayed by you as a Member of Congress and of the Military Order of the Purple Heart in support of this legislation, we beg to remain.

Sincerely,

FRANK HALEY,
National Service Director.

S. 1543 provides for mustering-out payments in sums ranging from $500 to $200 under provisions outlined in the act and further provides that mustering-out payment shall not be made to any officer holding a rank above that of colonel in the Army or of any equivalent rank in any of the other branches of the armed services of the United States. This bill passed the Senate December 17, 1943.

H. R. 3799, now before the Committee on Military Affairs, differs in two major respects with the Senate bill: (1) In that it reduces the maximum amount of mustering-out pay from $500 to $300; and (2) in that it reduces the rank from colonel to captain in the Army or of the equivalent rank in other branches of service as eligible to receive mustering-out pay.

As to the first provision in H. R. 3799, reduction in maximum amount of mustering-out pay, $300 as compared with $500 provided in the Senate bill 1543, much may be said for and/or against H. R. 3799 as it applies to the maximum amount in the bill, and we will not enter into any lengthy discussion of that phase of the bill, as there are other questions involving wounded discharged veterans which we, as an organization composed exclusively of men having been wounded in combat with an enemy, are vitally interested in.

As to the second provision in H. R. 3799, fixing the rank of captain in the Army or the equivalent rank in other branches of the armed forces as the highest ranking officer eligible for muster-out payment, the Military Order of the Purple Heart is definitely opposed to this. It being our contention that this provision constitutes a rank injustice to men that are just as human, just as much a soldier as the captain or the private, and in this war as fully exposed to enemy fire and the danger of becoming a battle casualty. Aside from the fact that it may only be due to the fortunes of war that many men have been promoted to higher rank, their liabilities after discharge from service may well be as great as those of lower ranks. We therefore support the provision contained in the Senate bill 1543, including officers up to the rank of colonel as eligible for mustering-out pay and oppose the lower rank provision in H. R. 3799. Other bills have also been introduced in Congress providing assistance to men being discharged from service in various ways.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart strongly urges Congress to enact legislation without any further delay providing immediate financial support of the thousands of wounded and disabled veterans from this war already discharged from Army and Navy hospitals and from the service, who, pending the exceedingly slow process in having their claims adjudicated by the Veterans' Administration, are left stranded without any visible means of support, unable to work or find immediate work, having shed their blood in defense of our flag and country; being of no further use in the service, they are set adrift.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart must and will insist that these wounded veterans be properly cared for at all times starting with the day they are discharged from service; as an organization composed of men knowing full well the horrors of war, we stand pledged to, by all honorable means, work for the enactment of legislation that will save these blood brothers of ours from a repetition of what happened to us after the end of the World War.

Crepe on the Doors of 500,000 American Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the official report on the air war as presented under date of January 4, 1944, by Gen. H. H. Arnold is the most lucid, comprehensive, and courageous presentation that has been made by any Government official from the beginning of the present war. General Arnold occupies a most unique position in that he has been a pioneer for aviation for more than one-quarter of a century. When Billy Mitchell was demanding an air program, General Arnold was one of a very limited number of men in the Army of the United States that took sides with Mitchell and that shared his views as to the indispensable part that could be played through control of the air. Under his brilliant and able leadership the impossible has become the possible and from 1938 the total military personnel in the Air Forces has increased from 21,125 to the present force of 2,385,000 in 1944. The military airplane production under his splendid leadership in 1938 represented a total weight of air frames of 5,500,000 pounds and in 1943 this has increased to 667,000,000 pounds. It is today accepted that control of the air and control of the sea marks the end of German and Japanese power and that from now on they are destined to lose battles and it is but a question of time when both will be defeated.

The proposition that the United States furnish more than 70 percent of the armed forces to be utilized in the invasion of Germany, coupled with the growing demand that the invasion begin at the earliest possible date, can mean but one thing—the loss of upward of 500,000 American boys. Personally, I can see no great harm that would result in a prolongation of the war for a period of perhaps 3 months, provided that during this period the Air Forces continue to bomb German territory and German-held territory—since from the character of destruction that has been wrought during the past 30 days, invasion might then be possible at the end of a 3-month period without imperiling the lives of too many of our American boys. The reports that have emanated from Germany in those sections where intensive bombing has taken place, like Berlin, indicate that the loss of lives in this one city alone has to date been in excess of 250,000.

A continuance of bombing on an increased scale might result, within a period of 60 to 90 days, in an overthrow of the Hitlerites, making unnecessary the bloody invasion and hand-to-hand fighting by our boys, which would result in crepe on the doors of more than 500,000 American homes. I have been repeatedly asked the question by men in the service and others during the Christmas vacation, What is America fighting for? And provided we proceed on the invasion of Germany without bombing for a period of 3 months, it becomes an impossible question to answer, since there is but one answer—we are fighting to destroy the manhood of America for the benefit of other nations.

I do not want to see crepe on the doors of the homes of 500,000 American boys, provided we can prevent it; and I believe by following the judgment and the leadership of General Arnold in the bombing of German-held territory for a period of 3 months, we can prevent it; and it is clearly our duty to do this in the interest of America and American boys, American mothers, and American homes.

The contribution of General Arnold to the winning of the war has been summarized in an editorial published in the Boston Daily Record of Jahuary 10, 1944, which is here presented:

AN ACHIEVEMENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Army Air Forces, is right in saying that the American people are entitled to know the impressive and inspiring story of their magnificent military aviation establishment.

He is unquestionably right that American military aviation is now the largest and most powerful, the most efficient, and the best manned in the world.

He is especially right that the credit for the building of this tremendous and wonderful establishment belongs to our 130,000,000 American people.

It is a grand report on the American air forces which General Arnold is now able to make.

And we may be sure that General Arnold takes a particular and profound pleasure and satisfaction in making it.

General Arnold is not a "Johnny-come-lately" among military aviation advocates.

He knew that at the beginning of this war, and long before the war, American military aviation was pathetically and almost fatally deficient.

He knew the martyred Billy Mitchell was right about the shortcomings of American military aviation.

He knew that the near-annihilation of American air forces in the Pacific was something we had long asked for by being unprepared, and that what we suffered at the hands of the Japanese in Hawaii and the Philippines was the price and penalty of our unpreparedness.

No American airman approved of our pre-war aviation policy, and General Arnold liked it least of all.

That is why he makes his present report with such pleasure and satisfaction.

It is indeed a grand report.

It discloses that the personnel of the Army Air Forces, which totaled only 101,227 men in 1941, has now reached the huge aggregate of 2,385,000 officers and men.

It discloses that our pitifully small force of 1,157 combat planes available in 1941 has been stepped up to the tune of a 15 months' production rate of 145,000 planes.

Our aeronautical production since Pearl Harbor is in a realm little short of the miraculous, as General Arnold recites.

Up to last October 31, the American air forces had flown 250,000 combat sorties against the enemy.

It had expended more than 40,000,000 rounds of ammunition in combat.

It had consumed nearly 2,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline.

It had destroyed, probably destroyed, and damaged a total of 13,867 enemy planes.

And in addition to all this, American aeronautical production reached the stage in these years of war which enabled it to export 26,900 planes to our allies.

As General Arnold summarizes this marvelous achievement of the American people:

"Two years after Pearl Harbor, we have reached the moment when the basic change in our strategic position has become apparent to all.

"It is now plain that for us the beginning has ended, and that for our enemies the end has begun.

"After a period of desperate, if resourceful, maneuvering with consistently outnumbered forces, the United Nations have mounted and are about to mount greater crushing aerial forces on every front.

"The Army Air Forces are now in the process of fulfilling a historic and decisive mission."

This is indeed the achievement of all of the American people.

It has been achieved by and because of the beneficial and efficient and productive system of American free enterprise.

It is the product and the reward and the protector of our free, democratic American way of life, and of the free institutions we maintain and the principles and ideals to which we adhere.

War Relocation Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, a high-school teacher, under a year contract to the city of Macomb school board, was refused a release from her contract because there was no teacher available to fill her place. In spite of her contract, she quit her position for a higher-paid position offered her by the War Relocation Authority to teach the Japs. What the home folks are now thinking would be best told by the following editorial in the Macomb Journal under date of December 18, 1943:

Students of Macomb High School have lost the services of their history teacher. The Macomb board of education was financially unable to meet the salary offer of the War Relocation Authority, which "pirated" the teacher, in violation of her teaching contract, to obtain her services in the teaching of young Japs and young Jap-Americans.

In the view of W. R. A. the Japs come first. W. R. A. has no interest whatsoever in the welfare and education of American youngsters. W. R. A. is not only disloyal in its interests but is unethical in that it was a party in the Macomb case to the breaking of a teacher's contract.

W. R. A. is powerful because it has available for spending millions in public funds—public funds supplied in part by the parents of the American college students whose desks have been taken over by Japs, and by the parents of Macomb school children whose history teacher will henceforth devote herself to the enlightenment of the young Nipponese.

W. R. A. can and does virtually force colleges to accept Jap students. These Jap students, who are of the age of military service, occupy seats which would be occupied by American 18-year-olds if these American 18-year-olds were not in uniform, ready to give their lives, if need be, to subdue the savages who are the blood relatives of the Japs who have their college seats.

The millions in public funds it has available enables W. R. A. to take its pick of teachers to look after the education of the younger generation of its pets. What happens to the American youngster whose teacher has been "pirated" is presumably something for the parent, who is helping to pay the bill for W. R. A., to worry about. W. R. A. certainly is not concerned.

W. R. A. was not even concerned when the parents of some of these Jap students built a still at the Tule Lake relocation center and launched prosperous bootlegging careers. W. R. A. was not concerned about the waste and theft of food by its charges. W. R. A. was concerned only briefly when some of its lifter-uppers were threatened and chased indoors by their rebellious charges.

W. R. A. is rotten and dizzy to the core and should be done away with. The agency charged with shepherding the Japs in America should have a new name and all new personnel.

The new chief should either be able to see some facts that are perfectly plain or Congress should write a list of rules and directions for him.

It is not contended that all of the Japs and Japanese-Americans are disloyal. The percentage of disloyal may be very small. But even if all of them are loyal they should expect no privileges beyond the privileges enjoyed by Americans.

Is it so important that young Japs continue their education without interruption when practically all young Americans are in the uniform of their country? Young Americans have not only seen their educations interrupted; some have been forced to leave wives and babies.

Is there any honor or justice in a system which encourages teachers, under contract to teach American children, to break contracts and take higher pay to teach young Japs?

Can there be any confidence in an agency which has permitted bootlegging, vandalism, arson, and other crimes among the dangerous aliens in its charge?

W. R. A. represents an extreme in cockeyed justice. It is cockeyed justice of a kind to choke on.

But better than choking, write your Representatives in the National Congress. Write your district Congressman and your Congressman at Large. Write both of your Senators. These men help to control the purse strings of the agency that stole the history teacher; the agency that cannot bear to see an interruption in the educational programs of the youthful Japs we unfortunately have on our hands.

Write your Representatives in the National Congress but practice the same restraint in the choice of words that we practiced in this blurb. The use of profanity violates postal regulations.

Soldiers in Demand for Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article and editorial:

SOLDIERS IN DEMAND FOR VOTE—HIT STATE PLAN—SAY UNIFORM BALLOTING LAW NEEDED

ALGIERS, January 7.—The Stars and Stripes, published for several hundred thousand American soldiers in this theater, declares in an editorial to appear in Saturday's issue that soldiers polled by the Army newspaper are overwhelmingly in favor of participating in United States elections this year and calls upon Congress to enact a uniform balloting law.

LITTLE TIME TO SPARE

The two-column editorial, a rarity in the Stars and Stripes, expresses disappointment in a Senate-approved measure which leaves soldier balloting up to the States.

Soldiers believe, it says, that they would be unable to make proper use of the franchise unless Congressmen passed some kind of uniform law making it simple for citizen soldiers to vote.

They asked the question: "Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each has to proceed through various State methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective States? The process takes months, and we have little time to spare."

The editorial continues: "The writers, members of a single battalion representing every section of the Nation, said soldiers on the front want to fight, and they want to vote. We on the front are determined to use bullets and ballots.

"The theme of other letters has been that men and women in uniform are under the same obligation to exercise the franchise as civilians."

The editorial quotes the majority of soldiers as feeling that a Congressman's remark that they were more concerned with the fate of the Varga girl than with voting was in bad taste, and that the vote issue was too fundamental to be made the subject of a "wisecrack."

Referring again to its poll, the paper says soldier letters and statements indicate that they are primarily concerned with the right to vote for its own sake, and reflect the belief

that members of the American citizen army, even if outside the continental limits of the United States, retain the basic rights and privileges of citizenship.

They do not feel they are asking Congress for any special privilege. They feel they are asking for a simple right.

It adds that the nearer the soldiers have been to the fighting, the more st ongly they feel on the subject, as the Naples edition has received more mail about it than the African editions.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a radio address delivered by me on December 30, 1943, on the state-of-the-Nation program over WHN, New York:

One of the most important pieces of legislation that is before Congress has to do with the renegotiation of war contracts. Most people have been giving their attention to the taxes that have been or may hereafter be imposed upon them. But equally important to the raising of revenue for the successful conduct of the war is the necessity of seeing that a new crop of war millionaires is not developed as in World War No. 1.

Time after time it has been said that profit should be taken out of war. To many that was only a platitude; to others it meant an obligation to be enforced as far as it reasonably could be.

To the credit of American business it should be said that the majority of businessmen have not sought to make excessive profits, but there are always some who, even while the men in service are giving up their lives for their country, are complaining that the Government is impeding American initiative and American incentive by restricting their profits.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee before which hearings on renegotiation were held, I had the opportunity to hear first hand the testimony of witnesses representing business and also to study the testimony given before the Naval Affairs Committee and I have come to the definite conclusion that renegotiation is necessary, not only from the Government point of view but actually in the interest of business itself.

When you find business concerns of their own volition coming to the Government and saying, "We are making too much profit—our original estimates were too high," it typifies the American businessman of foresight who has over the years built up goodwill and who does not want to be accused of war profiteering.

On the other hand, you have companies that have in the years prior to the war made little or no profit and they think this is the time for a financial killing. I have in mind one company that lost money practically every year from 1930 through 1939—then came the war work and in 1942 that company made $17,000,000 profit and vigorously opposed any reduction of that excessive profit. I have in mind a witness who protested most vigorously that he was opposed to war profiteering. On cross-examination I showed that in 1940 his salary was $60,000 per annum and in 1942 it was $205,000 per annum. If those cases are not indicative of war profiteering, I simply don't know what a war profiteer is. To me it is unconscionable to permit such situations to continue and I think the only way to prevent their continuance is through renegotiation of their contracts.

The Army and Navy are doing a splendid job of renegotiation. Too much credit cannot be given to Under Secretary of War Patterson and Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and their splendid staffs. They have already saved the Government more than $5,500,000,000—twice as much money as the new revenue bill will produce in additional tax receipts. In these days when we are beginning to scrape the bottom of the barrel for revenue to carry on the war, $5,500,000,000 means a great deal to the American taxpayer. The present law can be improved, but the drive to cripple it should be defeated.

Governor Schricker's Plan for Voting by Men and Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, believing that every man and woman in the overseas service of the United States is entitled to register his or her choice for candidates for all offices in the coming elections I have today introduced a bill which is intended to guarantee that right.

Surely the men who are offering their lives on the fighting fronts to preserve our cherished liberties and the American way of life are entitled to vote without qualifications, restrictions, or limitations for the men and women they want to manage our public affairs.

The bill I have introduced may properly be designated as the Indiana Plan. Its author is Gov. Henry F. Schricker of our State.

Its merit is its simplicity.

Under this plan the Federal Government's part in soldier voting would be limited to the distribution of application cards to those in the armed services. The application card would be substituted in lieu of the registration systems of the various States. Otherwise the voting methods of the States would operate in their entirety. Thus the complications and costs of the numerous other plans proposed and the likelihood of lawsuits that would result from upsetting regular State procedure would be avoided.

Other plans pending before Congress give the servicemen and women the right only to vote for candidates for Federal offices. This limitation will not satisfy the soldiers and it will not satisfy the country. I predict that it would be bitterly resented by men and women in the service who, in many instances, would be more interested in candidates for local and State offices than in candidates for Federal offices. Under Governor Schricker's plan the soldier and the women in the service would have the opportunity to vote all of the ballots presented to the other voters of his or her home State.

One of the highly commendable features of Governor Schricker's plan is that the men and women abroad who avail themselves of its provisions will be complying with all of the laws of the States in which they have their home residences. This means that elections will be conducted under the tried and tested laws of the various States, and will insure legality of elections. If some complicated plan of voting involving many innovations is adopted it is almost certain that defeated candidates will be encouraged to bring suits without end and there is likely to be a turmoil of litigation.

Governor Schricker's plan is, I think, a very worth-while product of his usual sound thinking, simple, direct, with much to recommend it. I am glad to introduce it in the form of a bill, and I hope it will have the meticulous and careful consideration which I believe it deserves. For further information I submit a copy of a letter which our Governor has written to Senator GREEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 31, 1943.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Answering your telegram of December 31, I am pleased to advise that I have definitely decided to call a special session of our general assembly early in the new year to consider legislation relative to absentee voting for our men and women in the armed service.

I feel that I can assure you that the people of Indiana are almost unanimous in their support of any needed changes in our election laws that will make this possible.

I have given considerable thought to the several bills on this subject now before the Congress, and I make bold to suggest that a much simpler plan should be adopted. Since the Constitution delegates to the States the responsibility of setting up the election machinery, I feel that it would be dangerous and unnecessary to abridge this right even in times of war.

To make possible the right of suffrage for those in the armed services we will need the fullest cooperation between the Federal and State Governments, and to this end I should like to make the following simple suggestion:

1. Let the Congress provide for the distribution of application cards to every man and woman in the armed service. This should be done as early as possible in the coming year.

2. These cards should be addressed to the secretary of state of the State in which the soldier claims residence, and on the reverse side should carry the application for ballots and the recital of a few pertinent facts concerning the voter's qualification.

3. The voter should be required to sign this application in the presence of a commissioned officer, and the card should also give the post-office address to which the ballot should be mailed.

4. Upon the arrival of these cards at the office of the secretary of state, they would be forwarded to the home counties of the applicant and the local election board could determine the eligibility of the voter, and also the precinct where his vote should be registered.

5. Every State now having a registration law could easily adopt an amendment which

would recognize the application card in lieu of the existing registration requirements.

6. Under this plan our State could forward the Federal, State, and local ballots to every applicant and he could participate in the entire election.

7. The ballots should be returned in a suitable envelope, addressed to the election clerk in the home county of the applicant, and on the reverse side should carry the signature of the voter properly attested by a commissioned officer in the armed forces.

Under this plan the Federal Government would be obliged only to furnish and distribute the application cards to those in the armed services, wherever they may be, and thus would avoid the complications and cost of the present plans now before the Congress.

I think you will agree that it would be next to impossible for the States to undertake such a distribution or to make much headway in trying to locate these absentee voters. If these cards could be returned to the States on or before August 1, I am of the opinion that most of these men and women would have an opportunity to participate in the election. We would have 3 full months in which to mail the ballots to the voters and to receive them in the home counties in time for the election.

We would feel very greatly honored if your committee would give thoughtful consideration to this rather simple plan. We know that it would work admirably in Indiana, and I am persuaded that it could be made effective in all of the States of the Union. Under this arrangement the soldier would be voting under the same conditions and same laws that pertain to all other voters of his State.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

The text of the bill I have today introduced embodies the essential features of the Governor's idea and leaves the details to be worked out in committee. It is as follows:

An act to provide a plan of voting for men and women in the armed services of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That as soon as possible after the passage of this act the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall arrange to distribute application cards to every man and woman in the armed services.

These cards shall be addressed to the secretary of state of the State in which the serviceman or woman claims residence. The reverse side of the card shall carry the application for ballots and the post-office address to which the ballots shall be mailed and a few pertinent facts concerning the voter's qualification.

The voter shall be required to sign this application card in the presence of a commissioned officer.

Upon the arrival of these cards at the office of the secretary of state they shall be routed to the home counties of the applicants to enable the local election board in each instance to determine the eligibility of the voter and the precinct where his or her vote should be registered.

The ballots, after being marked by the voters in the usual manner prescribed by law, shall be returned in a suitable envelope addressed to the election clerk of the home county of the applicant. The reverse side of the envelope shall carry the signature of the voter, properly attested by a commissioned officer of the armed forces.

It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that every State now having a registration law should adopt by appropriate legislation an amendment which would recognize the application card in lieu of the existing registration requirements.

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act to provide a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942, is hereby repealed.

Misconceptions About the Lea Civil Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the many misconceptions which someone, or some group, has given out in regard to the Lea civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420.

After the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, certain groups and individuals have attempted to spread misinformation over the United States in opposition to the bill. I do not at this time care to state who compose this opposition, but their identity is apparent to many, or to those who will investigate.

I have examined many letters and other material which have been sent out to create opposition to the bill. I frankly state that a careful analysis will show that this supposed information is not true, and there is not a living mortal who can, after honest examination of the bill, say that these statements are true.

There are some 32 points, absolutely untrue, which these so-called opponents say are in the bill. As I have stated, and will state on the floor of the House, all 32 are untrue.

In order to show the misstatements which have been made, I will list and comment upon each of these 32 points as follows:

A. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT FOSTER MONOPOLY

1. It has been said that the bill grants a monopoly of air transportation to the existing air lines.

This is untrue.

The present Civil Aeronautics Act, in section 2, provides for competition in air transportation, and in numerous other provisions has clear safeguards against monopoly and restraints upon competition. Thus the act provides for "competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air transportation system." In this and other provisions there are stronger guaranties of competition than will be found in any other transportation legislation, and they are in no way modified by the Lea bill. The Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled that "the act seeks a state of competition among air carriers." In fact, despite the wartime equipment shortage, the C. A. B. recently authorized a company not previously certificated to institute a new air line.

B. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

2. It has been said that the bill will foster a Government monopoly of air transportation.

This is untrue.

The whole bill contemplates civil aviation privately owned and operated.

C. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT EXCLUDE THE STATES FROM THE FIELD OF CIVIL AVIATION

3. It has been said that the bill will completely destroy States' rights in the civil-aviation field and that the States cannot even regulate private flying.

This is untrue.

Except for commercial air transportation, the States' power of regulation is affected only in two respects: First, the basic Federal safety requirements must be observed, and second, there shall be no burdens imposed on interstate flights. See section 802 (b) of the bill. It is well known that regularly scheduled air-line operations are but a small part of total flying. And in nonscheduled flying, commercial transport for hire in 1941 amounted to less than 4 percent of all nonscheduled flying. Hence, subject only to the two very reasonable conditions indicated above, the States will continue to have power over the overwhelmingly major part of civil aviation.

4. It is said that the bill sets up a new declaration of national sovereignty which involves a violation of States' rights.

This is untrue.

Section 4 of the bill contains a declaration of national sovereignty in our air space, which, with one minor and insignificant change, is taken word for word from the existing law, and is included in the Lea bill only because that bill is codifying present civil aviation law. The declaration of sovereignty states that the national sovereignty in the air space above the United States is declared to be possessed and exercised completely and conclusively by the United States of America. This means that Congress will be reaffirming the fact that in our air space no foreign nation and no combination of nations is to be permitted to exercise national sovereignty. Our own air space is not to be thrown open to the world. This declaration in turn was, when originally adopted, based upon the Habana Convention on Commercial Aviation, to which this Nation is a signatory and which declares that each signatory party "has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory and territorial waters."

5. It has been said that the bill declares that the United States possesses the air space.

This is untrue.

The bill, as already explained, only reiterates existing laws in providing that the United States possesses national sovereignty in the air space, just as it possesses national sovereignty on land.

6. It has been said that in providing that the Administrator shall consult with appropriate State agencies in connection with a development program for air-navigation facilities, the bill does not go far enough; apparently there is some

thought that there should be a requirement that the Administrator must abide by a joint decision in which the State agencies participate. Present law provides for construction of air-navigation facilities without any consultation with State agencies. The Lea bill recognizes, in section 308, that in working out a program for the development of our civil-airways system of radio-range stations, ground beacons, and other air-navigation facilities, there must be consultation with representatives of State governments. In this respect the State agencies are given recognition decidedly beyond anything in present law. But to go further and provide that State agencies must participate in the actual decision would be wholly impracticable. Our radio-range and beacon-light system never could have been constructed under any such cumbersome process.

D. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT IMPAIR THE STATES' POWERS TO TAX

7. It has been said that the bill strikes a blow at State gas taxes. It has even been said that the bill prohibits State taxation of aviation.

This is untrue.

The bill does not prohibit or regulate any taxation. The bill, in section 802 (c), merely provides for a study of multiple taxation and similar burdensome types of taxation which are contrary to the public interest, and calls for a report to be made to Congress on this subject. It does not impair or affect any State-taxing power.

E. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH STATE AIRPORT ZONING LAWS OR IMPAIR STATE POWERS TO ESTABLISH AND REGULATE AIRPORTS

8. It has been said that the bill would prevent the States and municipalities from enacting and enforcing their own zoning laws.

This is untrue.

The bill specifically encourages State and municipal zoning laws. Indeed, one reason that the committee did not provide for Federal enforcement of airport zoning is that it entertained the hope that the States and municipalities would take the initiative in this matter.

9. It has been said that the bill gives a Federal agency "the exclusive right" to locate airports and to fix the terms and conditions on which they may be established.

This is untrue.

The bill in section 304 simply empowers the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, where Federal funds are to be expended upon an airport in the future, to prescribe conditions which will result in public use of the airport on fair and reasonable terms, assure that the airport will be suitably maintained and that the approaches to the airport will be cleared and protected. This provision is a proper means for preventing waste of such Federal funds as Congress may from time to time permit to be appropriated for airport development.

10. It has been said that the bill gives the Federal Government the power to regulate the administration of all airports.

This is untrue.

Aside from the power to prescribe conditions in connection with Federal expenditures in order to prevent waste, as just referred to, the Federal power is limited to prescribing traffic rules governing the taxying of a plane on an airport. This is to assure that taxying procedures and turns will be uniform in order to avoid confusion when a flier lands at a strange airport. See also item 15 below.

F. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT GIVE THE FEDERAL AGENCY ARBITRARY POWER OVER AIRPORTS

11. It has been said that the bill so defines the term "airport" as to include a man's own backyard, which he uses for his personal purposes and that this results in Federal regulations being applicable thereto.

This is untrue.

As already shown in item 10, the Federal regulations applicable to airports are traffic rules governing taxying. Furthermore, section 601 (b) of the bill specifically provides that Federal regulations shall not apply "to aircraft operation upon any privately owned airport if, due to the limited use of such airport" such application is not necessary for safety purposes. As explained in the committee report—at page 14—this will exclude from the regulation "small privately owned airports used primarily by the owner thereof for his own private purposes."

12. It has been said that the bill authorizes the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to grant exclusive rights to the use of airports and similar facilities.

This is untrue.

The bill rather provides, in section 304 (b), that no exclusive right for the use of any airport or other air navigation facility upon which Federal funds have been expended may be granted unless the Administrator approves the granting thereof in the interest of safety. In other words, where Federal funds are spent on an airport, the airport owner cannot grant an exclusive right to some favored individual for the use of that airport except so far as necessary to confine use thereof in the interest of safety and except when the Administrator approves the action as necessary for safety purposes. This provision is designed to make certain that where Federal funds are expended on an airport the benefits thereof will be most widely available. It definitely does not grant to the Administrator any power to confer exclusive rights. Everything in the bill relating to the subject is designed to prevent the granting of exclusive rights.

13. It has been said that the Administrator would have the power to condemn and acquire any airport without notice.

This is untrue.

The power of condemnation granted by the law is very limited. Moreover, as will be seen from section 302 (c) of the bill, the courts are given the power to stay the taking of possession of any property to be condemned until the court has determined whether the acquisition is necessary. Condemnation without notice could not possibly occur.

14. It has been said that the bill would require the closing of many landing areas satisfactory for small aircraft, because of the zoning provisions.

This is untrue.

The zoning provisions of the bill do not authorize any action by the Federal Government to enforce zoning standards except to the extent of making available to the airport owner—typically a municipality—a Federal condemnation procedure for the purpose of condemning the necessary air space in the approaches to an airport, and this procedure can be resorted to only at the request of the airport owner, and only if the Federal Government is to be reimbursed for any condemnation award, and the whole procedure is subject to complete judicial review not only as to the amount of the award but also as to the necessity for the condemnation. Furthermore, there is not the slightest basis for any suggestion that an airport used by small aircraft having a safe glide angle of, say, 10 to 1 would have to be zoned at a glide angle for larger aircraft, or that, if such an airport were not zoned for the glide angle for larger aircraft, it could not be used by the smaller aircraft.

15. It has been said that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics can close an airport without a hearing, if zoning standards promulgated in connection with that airport have not been complied with.

This is untrue.

Section 3105 (d) of the bill provides that after notice and hearing the Administrator shall prohibit or limit the use of an airport for commercial air transport operations, if a structure in the vicinity, not complying with the zoning standards, constitutes a serious hazard to air navigation. Under present law, the Administrator or the C. A. B. can close airports without any hearing whatsoever. The Lea bill protects the airport owner by guaranteeing notice and hearing, and the power to close or restrict use of the airport is strictly limited to a case where zoning standards have been promulgated and have not been complied with and where a serious hazard exists as a result thereof, and the power to close the airport or to place limitations upon its use is limited to the use of the airport by commercial air transport operations. The bill confers no power to close an airport so far as all other flying activities are concerned.

G. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT AFFECT THE REGULATION OF SURFACE CARRIERS OR OTHER UTILITIES

16. It has been said that the bill would permit the Civil Aeronautics Administration to regulate surface carriers with respect to a continuous air-surface shipment or trip.

This is untrue.

The definitions of foreign and domestic air commerce and air transportation refer to carriage by aircraft in commerce, whether such commerce moves wholly by air or partly by air and partly by other means. It will be seen that it is only the carriage by aircraft which constitutes the subject of the definitions and therefore the subject of regulation by the act. The reference to commerce moving partly by air and partly by other means is merely to negate any possible

implication that on a joint movement the carriage-by-aircraft portion of the movement is not subject to the act. A comparable phrase in the Motor Carrier Act obviously does not mean that the nonmotor part of a joint movement is subject to the Motor Carrier Act. The phrase in question is in the present Civil Aeronautics Act and it has never been suggested that it means that anything other than the carriage-by-aircraft portion of a movement is subject to the act.

17. It has been said that the bill would set a precedent supporting exclusive Federal regulation of motor and rail transportation.

This is untrue.

As explained in the committee report, air commerce, and the regulation thereof, presents a unique situation. The report states, at page 8:

> In the case of surface transportation it is desirable that Federal regulation be limited to interstate movement, and, in some cases, to intrastate movement having a specific effect upon interstate traffic. However, in the air, a wholly different problem is presented.

H. THE LEA BILL WOULD NOT CAUSE CONFUSION IN THE GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY FOR CIVIL AVIATION

18. It has been said that the bill creates a new commission and that this will result in undesirable confusion in setting up a new agency during the war emergency.

This is untrue.

No new commission is created. The bill merely changes the name of the existing Civil Aeronautics Board to Civil Aeronautics Commission and moves the whole C. A. A. organization—already complete in itself—out of the Department of Commerce. This should result in the performance of their war work with greater expedition and efficiency.

I. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT PROVIDE ADDITIONAL BURDENSOME REGULATION FOR CIVIL AVIATION

19. It has been said that the bill would require a Federal license for every mechanic and for every person employed by a manufacturer.

This is untrue.

Federal licenses are governed by the definition of "airmen" appearing in section 1 (7) on page 10 of the bill. The only mechanics subject to licensing are mechanics who are members of the flight crew or who are directly in charge of aircraft inspection, maintenance, overhaul or repair work. In this respect the definition is identical with present law. As to employees of aircraft manufacturers, the new definition of airman liberalizes present law. As already indicated, an employee of a manufacturer would come under the definition of airman only if he has charge of aircraft inspection, maintenance, overhaul, or repair work, but the Lea bill adds to present law a broad power to exempt such persons entirely where they are employed by a manufacturer.

20. It has been said that the bill imposes regulation on aircraft service and repair stations would mean supervision of their location and type of service provided, and require publication of contracts covering supplies and materials, and so forth.

This is untrue.

There is not a word in the bill that comes anywhere near having the result indicated. The only provision of the bill remotely related to this point is section 606, which is taken from, and merely codifies, present law which has been in effect for years. This provides that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics may issue certificates for aircraft repair shops, certifying that the shop meets the minimum standards prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Commisison, which standards have to do with safety matters. The bill does not prohibit operation of a repair shop without a certificate. It does not require any repair shop to get such a certificate. It simply provides, as does present law, that if a repair shop meets certain safety standards it can get a certificate which records that fact and which can thereupon be exhibited to the world showing that that repair shop measures up to the Government's standards with regard to safety matters affecting air navigation.

21. It has been said that the bill makes the Federal safety regulation for air navigation more complicated and that, therefore, personal private aircraft cannot be flown if the bill passes.

This is untrue.

The provisions of the bill on safety regulation merely codify and clarify the provisions of present law and, in the interest of uniformity, make the law applicable to all air navigation, both on and off civil airways. The bill will benefit the private aircraft owner since he will be able to fly anywhere by getting only one license and following only one set of rules. Likewise the bill protects private persons by assuring them notice and hearing and judicial review where, under present law, provision therefor is uncertain.

22. It has been said that the bill adds additional regulation to the manufacture of aircraft.

This is untrue.

The bill does not add any regulation for aircraft manufacturers to present law. It simply continues in effect the present set-up, under which aircraft to be navigated must have been manufactured in accordance with the usual production certificates. But by assuring uniform application of this safety regulation, the bill will be of inestimable value to aircraft manufacturers since it will guarantee that they may manufacture according to uniform specifications applicable throughout the country.

23. It has been said that the bill imposes burdensome regulation upon the contract carrier by air.

This is untrue.

The bill provides for economic regulation of contract carriage by air of the type which is applicable to contract carriage by motor under the Motor Carrier Act. Such regulation is not restrictive or harmful. On the contrary it is absolutely indispensable to sound development and to the prevention of the kind of cutthroat and unethical operations which were very nearly ruinous to the trucking industry before the adoption of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935. In essence, the regulation is limited to the matter of securing a license covering the points or the areas in which operations are to be conducted, to the publication of tariffs showing minimum rates, and to the regulation of minimum rates. And very broad power of exemption is conferred in order to exclude unnecessary regulation. The Motor Carrier Act has not harmed or restricted the development of the trucking industry—it has greatly improved conditions in the trucking industry. Provision for a similar type of regulation in the case of contract carriage by air will assure sound conditions for air trucking.

24. It has been said that the bill gives the power to regulate the hours of work for employees of contract carriers by air in a manner that goes beyond the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This is untrue.

The bill does confer power upon the Civil Aeronautics Commission to prescribe maximum hours so far as necessary for safety purposes. In view of the growing knowledge concerning the dangers to passengers as well as to persons on the ground that may come from fatigue due to insufficient rest for employees having a direct connection with flight operation, it is important that simple maximum-hour regulations be provided to the extent necessary to assure safety in air navigation. That is all that this maximum-hour provision amounts to. However, the bill does place air contractors and their employees under the Railway Labor Act—which is purely a collective-bargaining statute. Persons so made subject to the Railway Labor Act are not subject to the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act or to the National Labor Relations Act.

25. It has been said that the bill would require Federal certificates for fixed-base sightseeing flights.

This is untrue.

The economic regulation of the bill applies only to commercial transportation for hire from one point to another.

J. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT IMPOSE STRICTER REGULATION ON THE CONTRACT CARRIER THAN ON THE COMMON CARRIER; THE REVERSE IS TRUE

26. It has been said that under the bill common carriers may engage in charter service without being regulated but that regulation is provided for contract carriers.

This is untrue.

Common carriers, under the bill, as under present law, are subject to very severe regulation. There is a provision in the law which permits common carriers to conduct charter trips or other special services off their regular lines, but subject to regulations prescribed by the commission. Since such operations are therefore already subject to very strict commission regulation, it is unnecessary that such operations should also be made subject to the new provisions of the bill affecting contract carriers specifically. This is simply in the interest of avoiding duplicating regulations.

K. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR AN IMPROVIDENT AVIATION TRAINING PROGRAM

27. It has been said that the bill gives the Federal Government the power to engage in aeronautical training activities in competition with private enterprise.

This is untrue.

Section 309 of the bill contains the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act which have worked so well since its adoption in 1939. But in continuing such provisions one important change is made to the effect that the authorization for Government training, which is in existing law, is eliminated. Any future civilian pilot training program, under this bill, would have to be conducted entirely under contract with private persons. See section 309 (b) of the Lea bill. As explained in the committee report at page 21, "The Government cannot engage in training directly and thereby compete with private enterprise."

28. It has been said that the bill is unfair to returning soldiers by continuing in effect the civilian pilot training law.

This is untrue.

The bill only provides a basic authorization. It restricts training to available appropriations, if any, which Congress may choose to make in the future. In the appropriation acts Congress can provide for any veterans' preference that may from time to time appear desirable. Moreover, veterans will need transition training to equip them for civil flying. A man cannot move from the controls of a military plane to those of a civil commercial plane without substantial transition training. Continuing the civilian pilot training law in effect will provide a means for carrying out such a transition training program if Congress later decides to do so.

29. It has been said that the bill, by continuing the civilian pilot training law in effect, provides for training pilots for the air lines at public expense.

This is untrue.

The statement shows an utter misunderstanding of the civilian pilot training courses. They offer primary training only—typically the first 35 hours of flight time. It takes approximately 3,000 hours or more to become an air-line first pilot.

L. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT REGULATE INSURANCE OR PUT THE GOVERNMENT IN THE INSURANCE BUSINESS

30. It has been said that the bill provides for Federal regulation of aviation insurance and puts the Government in the insurance business.

This is untrue.

The bill only provides, in section 1106, that the Commission shall study aviation insurance, consult with State agencies regulating aviation insurance, and make reports to Congress. Surely Congress is entitled thus to secure information on a matter which so profoundly affects all phases of aviation.

M. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT FAIL TO PROVIDE FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

31. It has been said that the bill provides for no adequate court review.

This is untrue.

In section 1006 (a) of the bill the provisions of existing law for court review are continued and strengthened. Full judicial review is provided for every order of the Commission, and the action of the Administrator is in turn subject to the Commission's orders with respect to safety regulation, which thus brings safety regulation under full judicial review, whereas under present law the situation is uncertain.

N. THE LEA BILL DOES NOT SUPPRESS THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL AIR TRANSPORTATION

32. It has been said that the bill would give a Federal agency the power to prohibit all intrastate flying activities.

This is untrue.

The bill provides that commercial transportation for hire shall be subject to Federal regulation, whether such transportation occurs between points in the same State or between points in different States. In such provisions the bill simply recognizes that interstate and intrastate commercial transportation by air are so intermingled that most effective regulation and promotion can and should be accomplished under one law. There is no suggestion anywhere in the bill that intrastate transportation can be prohibited. So far as flying other than transportation for hire is concerned, the bill provides that the present Federal safety regulation will apply uniformly throughout the country. This is in the interest of simplicity and safety. In making such provision, the bill does not change the nature of the existing safety regulation. It does not add new burdens to the private flyer. It simply assures the private flyer that so long as he follows the Federal safety regulations he can fly from one State to another without having additional regulations imposed upon him. And it does not prevent a State from regulating such flying which occurs entirely within its own borders in any way it may see fit, so long as the State regulation is not inconsistent with the basic Federal safety requirements.

CONCLUSION

Every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recognizes that there may and will be different types of aircraft which will come into use in commercial and in private flying. Nothing in this civil aviation bill will prevent experimentation with any type or prevent its use in commerce or private aviation. In fact, the committee's interest in encouraging experimentation is evidenced by section 603 (d) of the bill, which, if adopted, will for the first time include in our civil aviation law specific power for the issuance of experimental aircraft certificates.

The members of the committee are equally concerned in assuring that, consistent with safety, private flying be relieved of the more complicated regulation of the sort to which commercial flying is necessarily subject. Therefore the committee included in section 601 (b) of the bill a definite mandate that the Civil Aeronautics Commission shall recognize the differences between commercial and ordinary private flying, and in its various safety regulations shall make proper classification which will give effect to such differences.

We all know that civil aviation is still in its infancy and is still in an experimental stage. There will be future sessions of future Congresses. Future legislation will be required as civil aviation progresses. Those interested, whether manufacturers of aircraft, commercial operators, domestic or foreign, or private fliers, may rest assured that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as all future committees, will do their duty to pass such legislation as may be necessary in the public interest for the safety of the Nation in time of peril and for the commercial and other benefits to the Nation in time of peace.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce takes great pride in the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which, as every fair-minded man will agree, has been of the greatest value to our country through the aviation progress which it made possible. The present bill, H. R. 3420, is a carefully prepared measure bringing the Civil Aeronautics Act up to date and looking to the continued progress of civil aviation for the future.

Additional Veterans' Preference Should Be Given for Civil-Service Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter I have received from the president of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, with reference to giving all veterans and widows of veterans additional points when they seek civil-service employment. I have felt for a long time that additional points should be given all veterans and widows of veterans.

JANUARY 3, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your letters of November 3 and December 18, 1943, inquiring as to the possibility of increasing the number of extra points on civil service examination ratings now granted to honorably discharged veterans, to their widows, and to the wives of certain disabled veterans. I am sorry that in the pressure of work, there has been this delay in my reply.

In granting additional examination points to veterans, the commission is governed by the Executive Order of February 16, 1942. This order, which relates to appointments under War Service Regulations, is identical in all essential respects to the Executive Order of June 24, 1938, which was applicable to pre-war appointments. Both orders, which are based upon the Act of Congress, approved June 18, 1929, provided in effect that:

1. Five points in addition to the earned ratings be granted to applicants who establish official proof of honorable separation from the armed forces.

2. Ten points be added to the earned ratings of the following: (a) honorably discharged veterans who establish the present existence of service-connected disability; (b) honorably discharged veterans who are over 55 years of age and who furnish official evidence of entitlement to pension for disability which does not necessarily have to be service-connected; (c) retired veterans under the same circumstances as granted to the discharged veterans in (a) and (b); (d) widows of honorably discharged deceased veterans and (e) the wives of the veterans named in (a) (b) and (c) when the veterans, themselves, are disqualified by reason of the disabilities for which monetary benefits are in effect.

On Saturday, December 18, 1943, the President of the United States transmitted to Congress the sixtieth annual report of the United States Civil Service Commission, and your attention is respectfully invited to the commission's recommendation that Congress enact legislation delegating to the President during the war and for 5 years following the war, authority to direct the Commission to restrict competition for the public service to veterans for such positions as may be listed by the President. Matters pertaining to the improvement of opportunities for the employment of veterans in the Federal service are at present under discussion and your suggestion concerning the additional points will be given consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Message of the Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of Dwight H. Green, Governor, to the sixty-third general assembly, first special session, Illinois, January 7, 1944:

To the members of the sixty-third general assembly, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago the sixty-second general assembly was called into extraordinary session to deal with problems arising out of the declaration of war. Today the sixty-third general assembly is called into session to address itself to the problem of preserving the right to vote for Illinois men and women in the armed forces of the United States. It will probably not be seriously debated that those who are carrying the burden of the country's war are entitled above all others to the right of franchise. One of the sacred rights which they are fighting to protect is the right of free elections.

The Congress of the United States has been attempting for more than a year to deal with the question of voting by those in the armed services. Up to this time its efforts have borne little fruit.

Under the Constitution of the United States the power of Congress over elections is extremely limited. Section 4 of article I provides that the times, places, and manner for holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature, but Congress may at any time make or alter such regulations. That is the only power over the manner of holding elections that is given to Congress in the Constitution of the United States.

With reference to the election of President, it is provided in section 1 of article II that the State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, the number of electors to which the State may be entitled. By the same section Congress may change the time of choosing electors but is given no power to prescribe the manner of choosing them.

The Federal Constitution gives no power to Congress to deal with the elections of legislative, executive or judicial officers in the State.

If Congress were, therefore, to keep within the bounds of its powers, it might prescribe a method of voting by the soldiers for Senators and Representatives in Congress. But that would be an extremely abbreviated right. Congress could not pass a binding statute giving to those in the armed services the right to vote for President—or Presidential electors—or for Governor or other State officers or for members of the legislature or for county officials.

The conclusion of Congress, therefore, to request the States to deal with the problem presents the only possibility of securing to the brave men and women in our armed forces a complete and unabridged right to vote.

At the regular session this general assembly performed a monumental task in adopting an election code which consolidated, harmonized, and placed in logical order all of the election laws of this State. At that time the legislature took advantage of the work of the commission for the codification of the election and primary laws, making such changes and additions to the work of that commission as the legislature deemed proper and suitable.

Admittedly, the absent-voters provision of our statute is imperfect as applied to the requirements of voters spread over the entire world. The present act provides that the application must be filed within 30 days before the election or primary. Thereafter the ballot must be sent to the voter and returned. This brief time would render impossible the effective use of this procedure by many men in the armed services.

Our first problem, therefore, is to enlarge the time for filing applications. Those who studied the matter at my request in the attorney general's office and in the legislative reference bureau came to the conclusion that it would be far more advisable to incorporate a new article in the election code than to attempt a piecemeal amendment of the present article XIX, which deals with absent voters.

Consequently, a new article providing a complete system for voting by those in the armed services should be set up. Under such an article application should be authorized to be filed by any man or woman in the armed forces of the United States at any time within 100 days before an election or primary, but not later than 5 days before the day of election. The forms for application should be made obtainable by anyone upon request from the county clerk. In that way interested civic organizations, political bodies, newspapers, and others may cause forms for application to be sent to service men and women even before the 100 days begin to run.

The plan should then contemplate that the applications be held by the county clerk or by the board of election commissioners until the ballots can be prepared.

The time of the preparation of the ballots presents our second difficulty. Under present statutes it is impossible to prepare a ballot for the primary or election until within less than 30 days before a primary or election. In some instances, dependent upon the happening of certain events, that time may be reduced to 26 days.

In order to enlarge that time, it is suggested that the time for filing petitions for the primary be advanced to provide that the first filing date shall be 76 days and the last date 60 days before the primary rather than the present 66 and 50 days, respectively. It will also be necessary to amend the provisions for independent petitions by setting the time for filing them much earlier. If, then, the time for withdrawals is reduced and the time allowed to the various officers for the making of certifications is cut down it will be possible to prepare a ballot by the 45th day before a primary or election.

Combining the two thoughts, a service man or woman could file an application at any time within the 100 days before a primary or election. Beginning with the 45th day before a primary or election the county clerk or the board of election commissioners could have ballots on hand to send out.

The hearings before the Military Affairs Committee in Congress and the recent statements of the Secretaries of War and of the Navy indicate that a ballot could within 45 days be sent to and returned from any person in the armed forces anywhere in the world.

This right can be made available for the primary of 1944 if your honorable body will act promptly in the adoption of the necessary legislation. If laws were enacted with an emergency clause by January 15, approximately 85 out of the 100 days would still remain within which applications could be filed. I therefore respectfully urge upon you that the necessary amendatory act be adopted as early as consistently possible with the proper consideration by you as the legislative branch of our Government.

The third problem that confronts us is that of registration.

The general assembly of this State by three acts has set up a comprehensive system of registration. I believe it is not an overstatement to remark that our registration system is one of the best in the United States and is well calculated to protect the sanctity of the ballot and prevent fraudulent voting. The first of the registration acts was the city election law of 1885; the next was in 1937, pertaining to Cook County, and the third was the act of 1941 applying to counties of less than 500,000 inhabitants.

The 1941 act applying to the downstate counties did not become effective until 1942, and by that time many of our men and women were already in service and have had no opportunity to register under that act. In the territory covered by the other two acts, many of the men and women have moved to other places of residence, and some have failed to register. From areas throughout the State there are thousands of other service men and women who have reached the voting age since entering the service. They have had no opportunity to register. An exception to the registration acts is, therefore, imperative in order to extend to those in the service the full right to vote.

It is, therefore, suggested that the new article dealing with voting by service men and women provide that the application contain a statement of qualification and that this, when signed and sworn to, be accepted in place of registration.

It is my firm opinion that if these recommendations in substance are adopted by your honorable body, Illinois will have a modern, workable plan of voting for those in the service. It may well be that your work would become a model for the entire Nation.

At the regular session of 1943 amendments were made to section 7–19 and 16–3 of the election code to provide for the preparation of war ballots by the secretary of state. If the plan suggested in this message be adopted by the general assembly the provisions of the two sections named would be inconsistent with it.

The system of war ballot voting set up by the amendments to those two sections was

makeshift and in its very nature was imperfect. Its imperfections are numerous. No one is to be criticized for those imperfections because the entire question was in a fluctuating state due to the efforts of Congress to set up a system.

However, if the general assembly now adopts a comprehensive and thorough plan of voting by service men and women those sections naturally should be amended to repeal the amendatory matter added at the regular session.

I believe that I address you on a subject in which there is a basic unanimity among all the members of your honorable body regardless of party. This is not a partisan issue. The opportunity of those in service to vote is a requirement of good government and fair play that transcends all party lines. I have taken the privilege of conferring with chosen leaders of your body on both sides of the chambers in an effort to work out a sincere, workable and effective plan of voting by the armed services. I can conceive of no greater tribute to the brave men and women who wear the uniform of their country than a unanimous vote upon these legislative proposals.

Respectfully submitted.

DWIGHT H. GREEN, *Governor.*

A Reckless Indictment

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the smear campaign now being carried on against Congress by pressure groups and selfish interests, the following editorial from the Progressive, with which is combined La Follette's magazine, founded by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., under date of January 3, 1944, speaks for itself.

In these days of confused thinking and irresponsible charges against Congress, I think it very appropriate that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have an opportunity to get the viewpoint of this magazine.

We have to contend with a lot of pressure groups which infest Washington, and various sections of the country. They have the answer to every question. They are always right, and the other fellow is always wrong, and anyone who disagrees with them is subject to unlimited and reckless criticism. It has been my honor and privilege to serve in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. No group of men could have been more eager to support the Government in its war effort. The administration has been denied no legislation which would contribute to the winning of the war.

I have been somewhat curious to know why the radio commentators and the newspaper columnists have attempted to blame Congress for our domestic problems. None of us are infallible, but people who like to do straight thinking should place blame where it belongs.

I realize that the columnists and the radio commentators have a tremendous influence on public opinion. I think our people ought to inquire into their background before taking everything they say for granted. Most of them write the stuff they do because they get paid for it. Most of them represent industrial organizations and advertising mediums, and they get pay checks because of these facts. One, for example, represents the soap industry, and his income depends entirely upon the type of propaganda he puts out about the affairs of the Nation so long and so far as his publicity suits the industrialists who pay him each month for his type of publicity. Another, for example, represents the cigar industry. All of them wield tremendous influence, but the public should know and understand that all of them have a particular background, and reflect the views of the different interests they represent.

So far as the House of Representatives is concerned, it reflects the views, fairly accurately, of the American people. The individual members are not infallible, and the Divine Ruler of the Universe has granted to each of us the privilege of making occasional mistakes. We face difficult decisions on controversial matters, and we do the best we can in coming to a conclusion.

I have had occasion in the past to criticize different Government agencies, and shall continue to do so. The job of Congress is to enact legislation, and administrative officials, under our Constitution, are to carry out the policies of this legislation. During the year 1943, they made many mistakes, and the demagogues and the opportunists and the politicians have now tried to alibi and blame these mistakes on Congress. Too many people forget that we have three branches of government, the executive branch, which is charged with the administering of the law, the legislative branch, the House and the Senate, which pass legislation, and the judiciary branch of government which determines what laws are constitutional.

While Congress needs no defense, I do feel that in the interests of accuracy this editorial from the La Follette magazine is very much in point, and it is as follows:

A RECKLESS INDICTMENT

The recent adjournment of Congress provided our totalitarian liberals with another opportunity to smear the legislative branch of the Federal Government to the greater glory of the executive department. These recurring attacks on Congress are, of course, perfectly consistent with the credo of the totalitarian liberals who are prepared to embrace fascism at home in the name of destroying it throughout the rest of the world.

In their headlong rush to blame Congress for anything and everything that goes wrong, the newspaper columnists and radio commentators have lately been hammering at the lawmakers for failure to stand by the President in holding the line against inflation.

The simple truth is, however, that for all its brave phrases and good intentions, the Roosevelt administration has mostly itself to blame for the botched job. Its administrative practices have been incredibly stupid and confusing and have created chaos when clarity was needed, vacillation when decisiveness was urgent, and frozen formulas when flexibility would have saved the day.

The weakness of the Roosevelt administration's position was summed up recently in two editorials—one in the arch conservative New York Times, which wants to keep wages frozen, and one in the progressive weekly, Labor, railroad brotherhood's publication, which has been fighting for higher wages.

The New York Times was alarmed at the way the President "has violated every sound administrative principle" in the railway wage dispute. "He has failed to lay down clear rules. He has failed to delegate power clearly, and to one top agency alone. He has failed to support the administrators and agencies to whom he has delegated power * * *."

Labor offered a sharper indictment of the Roosevelt administration's failure in these words:

"Congress is not solely responsible for the failure to control prices or to place the burden of taxation on the shoulders best able to bear it. The administration is also to blame, and in many respects, even to a greater extent than Congress. * * * Labor repeats that since the beginning of the war emergency, no honest attempt has been made to enforce the laws Congress has enacted to restrain the profiteers."

Every observant American knows that Congress has acted unwisely on a number of occasions recently and that in a democracy like ours those errors must be held up to the pitiless light of publicity. But criticism becomes destructive of the very aim of democracy when it takes the form of a constant smearing and sneering at Congress as an instrument of a free government.

In analyzing the indiscriminate denunciations of Congress a year ago, Dr. Charles A. Beard, dean of American historians, reached a conclusion which we would like to borrow for our own today:

"If such statements [that Congress has betrayed the faith of the people] are true, then representative government is dead in the United States and merely awaits the kind of funeral that Hitler provided for the German Reichstag, and, more ominous still, the people of the United States, who elected these Senators and Representatives, are incapable of self-government. In that case, what have we to look forward to except one-man tyranny of some variety?

"Fortunately, the wholesale indictment of Congress is unjustified. In my judgment, it is not true to the facts of history. It is one-sided, undiscriminating, and reckless.

"The indictment betrays a profound misconception of the work actually done by Congress. It lacks all constructive vision, and, more, the promulgation and reiteration of such criticisms so unqualified in nature shake public confidence in constitutional Government—one thing certainly worth fighting for in this age of self-imposed slavery and tyranny by conquest."

An American Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Boston Daily Globe of December 30, 1943:

AN AMERICAN UTOPIA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Believing in the democratic principle that the best way to clarify an issue is to debate it, I should like to discuss an article by my old friend, Mr. William Hard, which appears in the Reader's Digest for December under the

title "American Internationalism." It is a curious article in that Mr. Hard is vehemently and eloquently against a policy which no serious person, so far as I know, has advocated, and he is in favor of the policy to which the United States and its allies are in fact committed by the Moscow agreements.

What is Mr. Hard against? He is against giving "eternal American sanction and protection to every existing boundary of the British and Russian Empires." Has anyone made such a preposterous proposal? If so, who? Has Britain or Russia asked us for any such eternal American sanction and protection? If so, when? If Mr. Hard had seen the Moscow agreements before he wrote his article, he would have known that the only commitment of force which Mr. Hull made was that the four powers would take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy. Though it may not seem obvious at first glance, this commitment to prevent a revival of German and Japanese military power and aggression is sufficient to prevent great wars in this generation. No sensible person would ever think of making eternal commitments about anything in politics.

Is Mr. Hard against this commitment? He is not. He says definitely that he is in favor of an agreement to keep Germany and Japan disarmed for a time. He is, therefore, in favor of the actual policy of the United States Government and of its allies. His elaborate objections are directed against a policy which no one is following.

We had no alliance before this war. The grand alliance which is now fighting this war did not exist before this war. If Mr. Hard's basic truth is true or basic, it should have followed that our not having alliances, our shunning them as poison, should have as he says, helped in uniting the world. But what actually happened was exactly the opposite: Owing to the fact that Britain, Russia, China, and America were isolated from one another and not allied to resist them, Germany, Italy, and Japan formed an alliance for aggression which very nearly conquered most of the world. The lack of an alliance against aggression invited the formation of an aggressive alliance.

We may go further and say that we must maintain the grand alliance of the United Nations until the time comes when present enemies can safely be admitted as equal members in a universal society. If we do not do this, then what we shall get is not Mr. Hard's Utopia of a world without alliances, but two or more dangerously antagonistic coalitions or alliances. Mr. Hard may feel he can still indulge himself in the illusion that the United States needs no allies. But he must not imagine that any other country could or would risk its future on such an illusion.

If we rejected the agreement made at Moscow and approved by the Connally resolution—call it what you will, a concert, the nuclear alliance of a general international organization—what will happen? What is inexorably bound to happen? The British, the Russians, the Chinese, and the other United Nations, will have to shop around to find a substitute for the system of security we have rendered unworkable. If they cannot have the grand alliance which now exists, how long would it be before they began to consider tempting offers from Germany or Japan or from both? Can anyone doubt that if we dissolve the alliance of the United Nations, we shall not get Mr. Hard's World Union but new combinations of threatened and threatening groups of states?

We must have a look also at Mr. Hard's affirmative suggestion that the correct model of a world organization is the Pan American Union, in which all states are equal and none is committed to anything. I share his admiration for the Pan American Union. But I must say that he is ignoring the facts of life when he supposes that the world of great powers can be organized on this model. He is begging the question which we have to answer.

For the republics of the Western Hemisphere are within the reach of only two great military powers—the United States and Great Britain, which together insulate this hemisphere from the military powers of the old world. The plants in a hothouse are beautiful but they do not flourish in the open weather. Let Mr. Hard consider what would be the condition of South America if Germany and Japan had won this war. Then there would have been gone the insulation which has given this hemisphere its unique history. Using the developments in the Argentine as a clue and a sample, he will soon see why the Pan American Union, though admirable in all respects, is in no sense a model of how peace is to be maintained in this great and dangerous world.

The Use of Subsidies as an Aid in Control of Prices During Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I present a manuscript, entitled "The Use of Subsidies as an Aid in Control of Prices During Wartime," appearing in the November 1943 issue of Dun's Review:

THE USE OF SUBSIDIES AS AN AID IN CONTROL OF PRICES DURING WARTIME

(J. P. Watson, director, Bureau of Business Research, University of Pittsburgh)

Proposals to use subsidies as aids in price control were given only grudging and limited approval by Congress a short time ago. Almost simultaneously with the reopening of the national legislative session, after the summer recess, the Office of Price Administration announced further tightening of price controls and more use of subsidies in the process. In view of the limits of available appropriations, the subsidy programs could hardly be very extensive for very long without congressional review of the subsidy policy. Since the seats of policy in O. P. A. are now reserved by law for businessmen, we may assume corresponding reservations on the congressional carpets when the subsidy policy comes up for hearing. Therefore, it is none too early to study the problem of subsidies.

Proposals to use subsidies in connection with the price-control program are aimed at limiting or preventing the interference which price control might otherwise cause in the supply of important commodities. With respect to some goods, the objective is to maintain or to increase their production without increasing their prices. With respect to other goods, the objective is to maintain their output, or to minimize curtailment in their output, after rolling back (decreasing) their prices. Thus, the proposed subsidies are meant to help bolster up weak spots in the wartime economy.

In view of the multiple services of Government and the significant services supported by private donations, it is obvious that many of our wants are met partly or wholly without specific reference to price. In what we call the business system, however, price is of primary importance.

In spite of the merits of the price system, obviously it does not work evenly. In a competitive market at a given time, the prices for all parts of the supply of a commodity gravitate to about the same level (differences in grade and in associated service being allowed for). The costs of the various parts of the supply, however, ordinarily differ in a considerable range. With reference to the prevailing price, then, the higher-cost portions of the supply represent spots of competitive weakness. In the war program, such weaknesses in the supply of war goods or of essential civilian supplies are of national concern.

To recognize the persistent fact of inequality of costs, it is necessary only to recall well-known inequalities in such major factors as managerial talents; plant design; plant location, as it relates to supplies, labor, or market; natural resources; skill and morale of labor; taxes; or patent rights. It is well known that there are often quite significant differences in cost among plants of the same firm, among machines in the same plant, and even among shifts at the same machine. Numerous changes in competitive positions take place, but inequality of costs remains.

At almost any price level, then, it is likely that some portion of the capacity for producing any particular commodity is out of use, because costs of possible additional production are too high to be covered by the prevailing price. If the price falls, or if costs rise in relation to price, more of the capacity becomes idle. In view of the uneven behavior of prices, the proportion of capacity that is idle or is threatened with idleness may be much greater in some industries than in others.

In times of peace, it has been our tradition to leave innumerable small weaknesses and many larger ones in our productive system to be ironed out in the market, that is, to permit supply and demand to be drawn together through price adjustments. But even for times of peace, we have a record of very notable special aid to some businesses and some regions through such provisions as shipping subsidies; land grants; public loans; homestead grants; special provisions of credit; irrigation projects, canals, locks, and dams; preferential tax concessions; protective tariffs; and import quotas. Although we need not agree that all such aids have been wise, we can hardly deny that the current proposals of subsidy fit into a long and varied experience in dealing with weak spots in our economy. And in this greatest of all wars, the need to employ special economic measures is much more acute than it ever was before.

In the discussion of subsidy as an aid in the wartime price control, there are suggestions of two methods of application. One is subsidy on the whole supply of a commodity; the other is subsidy on merely the higher-cost part of the supply, that part which is needed but which presumably would not be produced at the price that has been fixed or is about to be fixed.

SUBSIDY ON WHOLE SUPPLY

Subsidy on the whole commercial supply of a commodity is illustrated by the present subsidy on butter.

In ordinary times, when effective demand for a commodity increases in relation to the supply, the increase of demand shows up in the market through larger offerings of money per unit of goods; that is, by increase of prices. When the price increases, if costs do not rise correspondingly, some producers already in operation are encouraged to operate higher-cost facilities or more shifts; and other producers, who have not been able to operate at the old price, can go into produc-

tion. Thus the supply is increased in answer to higher prices. When the price falls, of course, if costs do not fall correspondingly, the process is reversed, the supply being decreased by curtailment of operation in higher-cost shifts and at higher-cost machines and plants.

In this ordinary working of the market, after time for adjustments, it is broadly true that the price paid per unit for the whole supply must be high enough to cover the cost per unit of the most costly part of the supply put on the market.

For purposes of illustration, assume that there is demand for an increase in the number of units of commodity A. Suppose that, in usual market terms, an increase of $1 in price would be required to bring out the additional supply. After the increase, the producers would receive the old price plus $1 for each unit of the whole supply, including that which previously they had delivered profitably at the lower price.

Suppose, however, that, for war reasons, it was decided to prevent the increase of price but, instead, to pay a subsidy of $1 per unit on the whole supply. Under these conditions, the total supply and the total payment received by all producers would be the same as if the increased price, without subsidy, had been paid.

But, since the total paid to the producers would be the same under the controlled price with this subsidy on the whole supply as it would under the uncontrolled price without the subsidy, and since, additionally, there would be administrative costs, what advantage might there be in using the subsidy? There might be significant benefits gained in the fight on specific price pressures and on the general inflationary tendency.

Since the price of one commodity is, very frequently, a highly important element in the costs of a number of other commodities, an increase of the price of one commodity often would directly stir the necessity of increasing a number of other prices. In view of the pyramiding effect of successive mark-ups (an effect like that in compound interest), the cost to the public of preventing the increase might be much less than the total of the several increases that would otherwise result.

Aside from the direct effect of an increase on the costs of other producers, an increase of the price of one commodity, in times like these, suggests increases on other commodities, without necessary regard for increase of cost. Therefore, preventing increases at key points would help to reduce the general tendency to mark up prices.

In addition to having a direct effect on costs and on the general tendency to raise prices, any such increase is likely, through its influence on the cost of living, to intensify the demand for higher wage rates. Exactly as raising one commodity price suggests raising others, including those not necessitated by a rise of production costs, so one wage increase suggests others, including those not necessitated by a rise in the cost of living. Therefore, prevention of increase in the price of important cost-of-living items is certainly a means of reducing strains in the wage structure.

Just as preventing some increases would reduce the necessity of other increases, rolling back a price would relieve existing pressures for other increases and reduce the tendency for other such pressures to develop.

REDUCES PRICE PRESSURES

But mere price control, whatever its desirability, is not a fundamental cure for inflation. In addition to preventing or relieving numerous specific pressures for increase of particular prices, however, the subsidy method would to some extent help directly in reducing the general inflationary pressure. Taxation, with all its imperfections, draws off much of the money which otherwise would be used in bidding up the prices of short supplies (black-market bidding included). Spending such money as subsidy to simulate production would be definitely anti-inflationary. Even with respect to that part of the subsidy which might be paid from loans, not including loans from commercial banks, the immediate effect would be anti-inflationary (the later effect depending on tax policy).

In summary, then, the possible benefits from holding certain prices back and using the subsidy for the whole supply would be to relieve the upward pressure of costs on numerous other prices, to reduce the psychological influence toward other price increases, to reduce the pressure of labor for higher rates, and to help relieve the general inflationary pressure. Since this form of subsidy equals the immediate price saving on the particular commodity, the benefit must be evaluated as an aid in reducing specific price pressures and the general inflationary tendency.

Whatever the merit of paying a subsidy on the whole supply of a commodity in order to get an increase of that supply, we should note that it would give to producers increased profits on the lower-cost part of the supply in the same way as would the increase of the prevailing price on the product of that industry. The significance of this item will appear more clearly in the following section.

SUBSIDY ON HIGHER-COST PART

Ordinarily, when the price of a commodity is increased, the supply is increased only by some higher-cost increment whose production had not been considered profitable at the lower price; when the price is decreased, the supply is curtailed only by the stoppage of the higher-cost part of the output, the part whose continued production is not considered profitable. Out of this fact arises the suggestion that subsidy be paid merely on the increment required to bring the supply up to the amount needed, or, in the instance of price reduction, merely on the higher-cost portion whose production is threatened by a price roll-back. An example of subsidy for the more costly increment is the existing subsidy in the copper industry.

So far as concerns merely the direct reduction of pressures on prices, the probable effect of this method does not seem to differ from that in which the subsidy is paid on the whole supply. But in the relation between subsidy paid and price savings effected, it does differ significantly. Therefore, it seems to differ significantly in its probable effect on the general inflationary tendency.

To see this difference, consider the following hypothetical example. Assume that, for a commodity whose price and supply have been adjusted competitively, the current delivered price is $100 a unit and the supply being delivered is 1,000,000 units a year. Assume that known conditions of capacity and costs show that there could be produced and delivered an additional supply of 500,000 at $110 a unit and another increment of 250,000 units at $120 a unit.

The price being paid for 1,000,000 units is $100,000,000. If the price were held at $100 and over-all subsidies were paid, the total paid to producers would be $165,000,000 for 1,500,000 units, or $210,000,000 for 1,750,000 units. To get the increase by price without subsidy would require the same payments to producers.

But suppose that, holding the price at $100, we should pay subsidy only on the increments, namely, $10 a unit on the 500,000 and $20 a unit on the other 250,000. The total of price and subsidy then would be one hundred and fifty-five million, instead of one hundred and sixty-five, for 1,500,000 units, or one hundred and eighty-five million instead of two hundred and ten, for 1,750,000 units.

Here the delivered price sufficient to sustain production would be paid on each part of the supply. On the supply of 1,500,000, however, this method would prevent the payment of $10,000,000 in extra profits on the low-cost million units. On the supply of 1,750,000, it would prevent payment of $20,000,000 in extra profits on the low-cost million and $5,000,000 of extra profits on the medium-cost 500,000.

Thus the highly important difference in dollars-and-cents terms seems to suggest the desirability of limiting subsidy to the higher-cost part of the supply, if it is administratively feasible.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Administrative costs are unavoidable in any subsidy program. It seems likely, however, that the probable cost has often been exaggerated and the offsetting savings too much ignored.

We have price-fixing, and we seem certain to keep on having it during the emergency. In fixing a price ceiling without subsidy, the Office of Price Administration obviously must estimate what effect a given price change probably would have on production. The same information would be the basis of estimating what effect a change in the combination of price and subsidy would have on production. If, in the absence of better information, the O. P. A. is forced to depend on tentative statistical answers in fixing a price without subsidy, they could do the same in fixing a different price to be supplemented by subsidy.

Since the effect of the subsidy could not be forecast exactly, a careful running record of production would be necessary, to show whether the supply was too little or too much. Exactly the same watchfulness, however, is already a duty with reference to supply under the influence of price ceilings without subsidy.

The main net increase of administrative cost lies in the task of getting the extra payment to the producer who is eligible to receive it. A subsidy on the whole commercial supply of a commodity would mean extra payment to every producer contributing to the commercial supply. In numerous fields of production, the number of producers is not forbiddingly large. In a number of others that have large numbers of producers, the number of main assembly channels—such as grain elevators, cotton warehouses, and stockyards at slaughter points—is small enough to be manageable. If the subsidy were only on the excess of production over previous levels, administration with respect to any claimant producer would be more complex and delicate, but those previously at capacity would not be eligible claimants.

With all practical qualifications, of course, the reaches of subsidy administration would be long and numerous. There is no clear evidence, however, that the reaches of price administration without subsidy can be shorter and less numerous if we really want price control to work.

Thus, although an administrative task of considerable proportions is indicated, it is also indicated that much of the required administrative procedure already exists, or should, in price-fixing without subsidy. Moreover, reduction of the strong general tendency to raise prices by devious means would noticeably ease the task of enforcement. Finally, even a considerable administrative cost would be small in comparison with the Treasury savings we could expect if we could prevent a significant part of the compounded mark-ups on our enormous governmental purchases.

If the net additional cost of administration, as such, seems probably not to be the basis for conclusive objection, what other factors seem likely to explain the strong fight

against the use of subsidies as aids in the control of prices?

No doubt much of the objection would be found to lie in the widespread conservative individualism in this country, which tends to assert toward any significant proposal of change in attitude of "I'm from Missouri; show me." Toward many proposals the attitude is desirable. Proposals often are given such foggy presentation, or are so befogged by intemperate attack, that they appear to merit the attitude of skepticism. But time after time in this war major plans which appeared to be lost under loud attack have come out with quiet acceptance—because those who asked to be shown insisted on an honest view.

One brand of objection represents individualism in a more definitely business setting. There is a prevalent objection that whatever the Government subsidizes it controls. The objection would make better sense in times of peace. At present the Government is expected to exercise the controls that are necessary to win the war. The subsidy proposal is a proposal to induce action on the monetary basis, with due regard for costs and profit sufficient to justify delivery.

OTHER OBJECTIONS

It is alleged by some that the higher-cost increments cannot be practically identified and that, therefore, it is impractical to restrict subsidy to these higher-cost increments. Actually, producers are continually making decisions to increase, to sustain, or to decrease production by actions affecting specified productive units, such as plants, machines, mines, oil wells, farm tracts, dairy cows, brood sows, or fishing boats, or affecting the number of shifts at a given plant or machine, or affecting the number of workers on a given shift.

In other words, typical business actions, if they are not to be called random, must be assumed to stem from knowledge sufficient for decisions about higher-cost parts of the output. Producers, making like decisions, could agree or decline to offer additional output in return for prevailing price, plus assured subsidy on the increment, and there appears to be no clear reason for supposing that there need be any greater discrepancy between cost and total realization on the increment than there would be between cost and price without subsidy.

There is also an objection that price control with selective subsidy at the higher-cost levels, in preventing extra profits on goods of lower cost, puts a penalty on efficiency, a premium on inefficiency. No one can deny that some producers are more efficient than others. Likewise, one cannot deny that there are other very important factors of difference in cost which even efficient managers can change only in part and slowly. Observe differences in the richness of owned or accessible natural resources; varied effects of technological changes, viewed in relation to existing commitments and in relation to patent rights; varied effects of geographic shifts of market, in relation to the heavy impediment of past commitments; great regional inequalities in the impacts of changing labor cost, in terms of community differences in both growth of demand for labor and development of unions. The obvious test of circumstances is that the same management, though highly efficient, may make money at one plant and have to close down another as a dead loss. The obvious survival of the less efficient indicates the limited magic of the efficient.

OBJECTION IS WEAK

But even if lower costs should be attributed largely to greater efficiency, this objection that efficiency would be penalized would stand on a weak leg. Price controls were not instituted until, in general, prices were high and volume large. The subsidy proposals, even with price roll-back, are aimed at only some small fraction of total price and some relatively small increment of the total supply. That is, the alleged penalty, even if true, would, at its worst, relate to only the additional profit advantage that might otherwise accrue on the increase of supply.

Although not always so intended, this objection is in effect an argument that all producers should get as much under price control as they would without it. It is, therefore, equal to a plea for abolition of price control. Unfortunately, it does not provide for abolishing the war. Since the ordinary freedom to adjust supply to price has been temporarily blocked by enemy actions, requirements of our allies, and requirements of our own war program, abolition of price controls during the war would be economic nonsense and ethical outrage.

Certainly many effective price controls are needed; and, with respect to some of the weak spots, use of subsidy has merits in avoiding an inflationary trend.

CURRENT GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

These estimates of payments are based on the most recent data available in November 1943, but obviously such annual rates cannot be accurate as the subsidies depend on changing conditions including crop yields. The figures are available through the cooperation of the O. P. A. Division of Research. * * * Any such brief tabulation omits much that is significant, interesting, and complex. Petroleum, for instance, involves a plan under which payments to the petroleum industry for extra costs of wartime substitute methods of transportation are offset through a Government sponsored pool by revenues from authorized price increases, collected and remitted by the oil companies.

FOODS

[Estimated annual rate in millions of dollars]

Commodity	Costs	Paying agency
Butter:		
Including Government purchases	80	R. F. C.
Civilian purchases	65	R. F. C.
Canned vegetables	30	C. C. C.
Cheddar cheese	25	C. C. C.
Cooking and salad oils	20	C. C. C.
Corn price adjustment	5	C. C. C.
Dried beans	8	C. C. C.
Fluid milk	5	C. C. C.
Meat:		
Including Government purchases	425	R. F. C.
Civilian purchases	285	R. F. C.
Milk (dairy feed payments)	60	C. C. C.
Peanuts	10	C. C. C.
Peanut butter	15	C. C. C.
Potatoes	20	C. C. C.
Prunes	7	C. C. C.
Raisins	7	C. C. C.
Soybeans	10	C. C. C.
Sugar beets	10	C. C. C.
Sugar transport	40	C. C. C.
Truck crops	6	C. C. C.
Wheat for livestock feed (fiscal year, 1944)	70	C. C. C.

NONFOODS

Aluminum	6	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Chilean nitrate of soda	7	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Coal	25	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Copper, lead, and zinc	78	R. F. C. (M. R. C.).
Domestic ores	25	R. F. C. (M. R. C.).
Fibers	4	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Imported metals	25	R. F. C. (M. R. C.).
Jewel bearings	8	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Nicotine sulphate	2	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Petroleum	102	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Petroleum coke	3	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Tires	20	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).
Wood pulp	1	R. F. C. (D. S. C.).

The agencies are: Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, Defense Supply Corporation, and Metals Reserve Company.

Obstructing the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Dallas Morning News:

OBSTRUCTING THE PRESS

The newspaper press of the Nation, with a very few individual exceptions, has given the Government and its agencies every possible form of cooperation in the war effort. In giving space to rubber and metal scrap and other conservation efforts, in voluntary compliance with censorship and in helping to maintain public morale through understanding of the fateful issues involved, the newspapers have left nothing to be asked. Many Government agencies have acknowledged this cooperation. But in one instance at least the Government has not shown a willingness to return the cooperation.

Since the day of John Peter Zenger, the tradition of the free press has become so firmly established in this country that its overthrow or serious diminution through the usual process of censorship would be difficult. But in the far-flung regimentation of today there is one avenue of approach for a "squeeze" on the newspaper press. It is through control of the newsprint paper supply. The products of the press are largely intangible in form. But the output of intangibles—news and comment—is in proportion to the supply of the one tangible material—paper.

A recent action of the War Production Board cannot be put down definitely as an attempt to obstruct the newspaper press, but it can be listed as either that or a gross miscalculation of national needs and its own duty to meet them. The facts are as follows: Recently the W. P. B. ordered a reduction of 23.6 percent in use of newsprint beginning with the first quarter of 1944. In this the press acquiesced. There had been a statement by the Canadian paper mills that their production would be seriously limited next year because of manpower shortage. But, after the W. P. B. had issued its order, the Canadian mills issued a new statement that conditions had improved and that a cut of only 5 percent would be necessary. But did the W. P. B. alter its own order of a reduction in newsprint consumption? It did not. Instead, it took the typically bureaucratic tack by announcing that it would buy the Canadian surplus to form a newsprint stock pile.

Now the Canadian mills announce that any paper not sold for immediate consumption in the United States will be allotted to their overseas markets. However, even this eventuality does not budge the W. P. B. Newspapers of the Nation must be cut 23.6 percent, it insists, even if the paper is available for all but a 5-percent cut.

This policy is difficult to understand. The W. P. B. has given no reasons further than to mention the contingency of a serious newsprint shortage later in 1944 and to hint at the need of much newsprint in connection with the military campaign in Europe. Neither of these makes sense, especially in view of the decision of the Canadian mills to sell any surplus overseas. A better explana-

tion or an amendment of the order to make it consistent with latest Canadian production estimates is due the newspaper press and its readers.

Not All Dams Are Damnable!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. MUNDT Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am extending my remarks herewith by including an article written by me entitled "Not All Dams Are Damnable," which was published in the December issue of Outdoor America, the official magazine of the Izaak Walton League of America. It deals with the projected development plan for the Missouri River.

The article follows:

NOT ALL DAMS ARE DAMNABLE—AN OUTLINE OF THE CONSERVATION ASSETS OF THE PROPOSED MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT

(By Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Congressman from South Dakota)

We of the Izaak Walton League—not without reason—have come to look with some skepticism upon vast engineering projects designed to divert natural water flow or to dam it up in giant reservoirs to generate power. We have learned from experience that in many instances the interests of conservation are relegated to a back seat when planners get out their trestle boards and start developing programs to improve upon nature. It is right, therefore, that we examine searchingly any new proposal for engineering plastic surgery upon the face of Mother Earth to make sure that it does not destroy more of permanent value than it will create. By the same token we should examine proposed projects open-mindedly in order that we may commend the good as vigorously as we condemn the bad. It is neither scientific nor sensible that we should proceed on the basis that all dams are damnable.

My native State of South Dakota affords a splendid laboratory demonstration today to the effect that dams which are properly designed and wisely built can expand recreational and conservation assets just as certainly as improper and unwise dams can destroy them. Back in 1932 and 1933 the South Dakota Bi-Partisan Game and Fish Commission (three Republicans, three Democrats), under the leadership of its then director, Oscar Johnson, and of its engineer, Dan Loucks, began in earnest to attack the demons of dust, drought, and drainage which were doing so much to upset the wildlife recreational facilities of our great hunting and fishing paradise.

Extensive surveys were made throughout the State to determine where and how drainage projects could be liquidated, how dams could be built to impound additional water to restore natural lakes and ponds, and how highway construction could proceed on enlightened engineering principles, so that instead of comprising a great series of drainage ditches paralleling the highways and escorting water out of the State through culverts and bridges it might help to serve as a device for impounding needed water. Plans and specifications were also drawn for the creation of well over a thousand fish-sustaining lakes by strategically placed dams which trapped run-off water in reservoirs suited for the creation of attractive artificial lakes. A program for tree planting and landscaping of the shore lines of these lakes was developed.

Actual construction along the lines above indicated was well under way before the great depression disrupted our domestic economy and brought the Federal Government into play to help finance public-serving projects. When the Federal Government's program of labor-providing projects came into being and additional "free" (sic) money from Washington was available for matching purposes, South Dakota was the one State in the Union with a complete program of water utilization and conservation projects ready for actual construction. The result was that the Sunshine State rapidly became dotted with lakes and ponds and no longer do dust storms and "black blizzards" sweep over our prairies, Dams have contributed mightily to the rehabilitation of the water resources of the State of South Dakota.

CREDIT IS DUE THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

Throughout the whole program of rehabilitating the water and recreational facilities of South Dakota, the State division of the Izaak Walton League (father of the State's famed six-man, bipartisan game and fish commission set-up) which has always worked in close harmony with the game and fish department, was a prime mover and substantial supporter of the movement. Sportsmen enjoying the splendid fishing and hunting of which the State is justly proud know that they owe a real debt of gratitude to the Izaak Walton League for the fact that their investment in a hunting or fishing license today pays such fruitful dividends.

THE MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT—ANOTHER CONSERVATION ASSET

The presently proposed Missouri River project is a river-long, valley-wide, all-time, all-purpose river improvement and utilization program being advocated today by the Missouri River States Committee, of which Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, is the chairman. In brief, the project calls for a series of all-purpose dams to be built on the upper Missouri River and its tributaries. The committee is composed of the Governors and two associates of each of the Missouri River States: Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. Educational meetings were held this summer in each of these eight States and it was my privilege to accompany Governor Sharpe on the entire tour, visiting with each of the eight governors, and meeting with the members of the Missouri River States Committee and the citizens of each commonwealth to discuss thoroughly and consider all arguments pro and con relevant to the proposed project. This trip included a personal tour of the Fort Peck project in Montana, as well as the areas devastated by floods in the lower reaches of the Missouri River in Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri.

Col. Lewis A. Pick, division chief of the United States Army engineers in Omaha until recently assigned to active duty in the Orient, is the author of the proposed Missouri River project which for the sake of brevity is coming to be known as the Pick plan. However, Colonel Pick would be the first to recognize the important contributions which have been made by conservationists, engineers, scientists, and private citizens in all of the eight States in the development of this valley-wide program. High on the list of those making important suggestions and proposals are officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service as well as the conservation authorities of the respective States which are served by the Missouri River. Col. Miles Reber, who is now in charge of the divisional office of the United States Army Engineers in Omaha, is also making some mighty helpful contributions to the program.

The Pick plan for the development utilization, and conservation of the water resources of the Missouri River is now in Washington undergoing study and examination by the various departments of our Government which are interested and affected by river improvement activities. Before it is finally presented to Congress, it will have been passed on by a number of different Government agencies and every possible attempt will have been made to coordinate the interests of all affected parties and interests so as to get the maximum in constructive results from the river program. This program is decidedly what backers delineate it as being—an all-purpose program for utilizing the water of the Missouri River. Conservationists, of course, are particularly interested in the recreational aspects of the program and in how it serves to affect finned, furred, and feathered creatures along the course of the river. It is encouraging to note, therefore, that it appears from an examination of both the river valley itself and the engineering plans for the river that without exception all of the changes which would be brought about by the river utilization program are on the credit side of the ledger, conservation-wise.

It is not contended, of course, that the damming and improvement of the great Missouri River, longest river in the United States, is being proposed solely or even in the first instance as a conservation measure, as were, for example, the water-impounding dams built in South Dakota during the drought program. The driving impetus behind the Pick plan for the Missouri River is a combination of both safety and economic factors. The fact that these can both be served while the supplemental advantages of wise steps in conservation are achieved is, however, important to the backers of the proposal and it is a fundamental concern to conservationists throughout the country. Too often we find a clash between economic and conservation interests which results in either one factor or the other being sacrificed. Members of the Izaak Walton League realize that when such a conflict occurs, it is usually the interests of conservation which suffer. It is especially gratifying therefore, to find a vast project being planned which gives due consideration to the interests of conservation and which contemplates a number of changes in the original plan of nature, all of which are in the form of conservation dividends for the people of the entire valley.

Growing out of one of the most severe and devastating floods in the history of the river which occurred this spring and which rivaled if they did not equal the epochal floods of 1881, demands for flood control of the Missouri's rampant waters started deluging Washington all the way from North Dakota down to the mouth of the Mississippi River. Great damages were sustained by the destruction of transportation routes, stoppage of work in vital war industries, flooding of mines in Kansas, retardation of badly needed crops in South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas; and ruination of farm lands through the imposition upon them of debris, sand, and rubbish. Many lives were lost during the flood, livestock drowned, bird life disrupted, nesting areas destroyed, fish left landlocked, trees uprooted and pitiable havoc was wrought along many hundreds of miles of river frontings as the Missouri River ran wild with the uncontrollable power of water gone on a rampage. So much for the safety factor, which precipitated the demand for engineering action on the Missouri River.

Now a word about the economic factors before outlining the conservation dividends which the proposed river-development program would procure. From Sioux City, Iowa,

southward river transportation has long been one of the dreams of the midwestern farmer. Midwesterners in all lines of activity have also longed for a means to transport lumber, coal, steel, and other heavy nonperishable commodities to middle America by water. Thus navigation interests below Sioux City seek a control of the floods and a stabilization of the river channel so that wherever it is feasible river navigation can be made possible. Added to the desire for protection against floods and the dream of river navigation are two other factors of vital significance to the people whose permanent homes are in the Missouri River Valley. One of these is the reclamation of semiarid lands where soil is rich but rainfall short. Irrigation engineers envision the possibility of reclaiming from a semiarid state of uselessness some 4,000,000 acres of land which lack only dependable moisture to be suitable to farm and cultivate. Finally, there is the matter of power. While the proposed dams on the Missouri River are low-head dams unsuited to the development of vast quantities of power, the water impounded does make possible the production of the power needed to pump irrigation water up over the ledges and to leave some over to help supply the needs of small industries and of rural electrification. Power enough would be generated also to make possible as a national defense measure the development of the great manganese fields near Chamberlain, S. Dak., which are the largest in the world, but which need cheap power to make their utilization economically feasible. Thus three significant economic factors argue for the adoption of the Pick plan, in addition to the even more imperative argument of controlling the floodwaters which so frequently destroy both life and property.

WHAT ARE THE CONSERVATION ASSETS IN THE PICK PLAN?

However, as Waltonians, you and I are primarily interested in a look-see at the conservation dividends to accrue from such a project entailing as it does the ultimate expenditure of perhaps $500,000,000 and the construction of a series of dams in the main stem of the Missouri River and some of its more important tributaries east of the Rocky Mountain area. Let us examine the situation item by item.

Dividend No. 1

The first dividend, of course, is the elimination of the serious negative factors now helping to make the Missouri River the "biological desert" and the "conservation calamity" which it is. By protecting the lowlands along the river in the six lower States, it will eliminate the destruction of great areas of woodland, nesting places for birds, and feeding and breeding areas for both our feathered and our furry friends. No longer will swirling onrushes of water crash down upon birds sitting on eggs or protecting their fledglings in the fields and woods along the river when the unpredictable Missouri overreaches its banks and carries all before it to destruction. No longer will fish life be swept out of the river into pot holes and low places only to be left to die when the receding floods waters leave them there to perish or fall prey to fish pirates. By protecting what we already have in wildlife and in breeding and nesting areas along the river, we shall reap our initial dividend from the proposed adoption of the Pick plan.

Dividend No. 2

Today, the Missouri River is unsuited to most forms of fish life because of its oversilted condition. Natives refer to it as being "too thin to plow and too thick to drink," and old timers swear that the waters rushing to the Gulf leave "a trail of dust" behind them. W. G. Sloan, reclamation engineer of Denver, Colo., maintains the construction of the proposed tributary dams will avert emptying into the Missouri most of its serious sources of silt and that the dams in the main stem of the Missouri will provide sediment basins which will clarify the rest of the water so that fish life can grow in the river in abundance. That this is no theorist's dream is already evident from the fact that at Fort Peck a great lake has been established with a hundred miles of clear blue water impounded in which a large variety of fish life is already flourishing in abundance.

Dividend No. 3

The five main dams planned for the main stem of the Missouri River will provide great bodies of calm water suitable for resting places for ducks and geese which utilize the river valley as one of the greatest flyways in America for migratory birds. These great reservoirs could all be made bird sanctuaries and along their shore lines a greatly increased hatch of ducks is certain to accrue.

Dividend No. 4

The addition of perhaps 4,000,000 acres of cultivatable land to an area already famous as having the best pheasant hunting in North America is in itself of major significance to all Waltonians. This land, today, is too arid to support bird life but once supplied with water the State bird of South Dakota, his majesty the ring-necked pheasant, will thrive on these acres as it now does on similar acres in the entire area where there is water sufficient to raise the feed upon which the pheasant has thrived so miraculously. And with the pheasant will also develop enlarged populations of hungarian partridge, grouse, quail, and other bird life dear to the heart of every man who owns a gun and a dog. In this area, too, once it has dependable moisture, can be raised trees to help break the ravages of winter winds and thus to add protection for our feathered friends who brave the cold and the snow to supply us with sport during the warm days of autumn.

Dividend No. 5

One of the proposed dams in the Missouri, the one near Garrison, N. Dak., would divert a part of the floodwaters of the Missouri (and it should be emphasized that floodwaters only will be diverted) into Devils Lake and into the headwaters of the James River. By this operation the restoration of Devils Lake is assured through adding to the recreational and conservation resources of North Dakota and the entire Northwest one of the greatest inland bodies of water in the entire area. Drought and unwise farming, coupled with drainage, have virtually destroyed the water levels of once famous Devils Lake. The reclaiming of this great lake will add a fishing and hunting rendezvous for thousands of sportsmen and will provide a resting area for hundreds of thousands of ducks and geese winging their annual voyage up and down the central part of North America.

Some alarm has been felt in some quarters, until the facts were understood, that diversion of a portion of the Missouri River floodwaters into Devils Lake and into the James River might deplete the water of the Missouri to the point of jeopardizing conservation assets already present in that river. There are two compelling answers to such fear: In the first place, as it now exists, the Missouri River is almost bankrupt of conservation assets, since silt and flowing mud and shifting courses and periodical floods combine to make what I have already referred to as a "conservation calamity." In the second place, it will be only floodwater which is diverted from the Missouri River; only the water which now wreaks destruction on both man and Nature in the lower reaches of the river will be turned aside at Garrison to serve a constructive purpose for Nature and for man in an area farther north. Thus, this diversion will pay dividends in conservation, both by protecting the assets downstream and by promoting and projecting new assets in the North Dakota area.

Other dividends of smaller consequence might be tabulated but I do not want to belabor the record. It is hoped that pollution can be kept from the revitalized and unsilted river basin, that trees will soon flourish where even prairie grasses now find it difficult to grow. It is certain that swimming, boating, and picnicking advantages will attract outdoors lovers to the area. Whatever clear water and rich soil can do to increase the hospitality of nature to fish, to birds, and animals will be done as a result of the proposed Missouri River development project. As stated in the October issue of the South Dakota Conservation Digest, published by the game and fish department of that State, "Development can be carried on as planned without needless destruction of natural beauty, without retarding, but rather fostering, the growths of wildlife and the environment necessary for wildlife propagation. The conservationists of the regions affected, we are sure, are all for this great project."

Waltonians in the eight States which I visited while investigating and studying this project during the past summer assured me that here was a project on which they could unite, here was an engineering plan on the right side of the conservation ledger, here was a long-time program toward which all might work with the realization that for all future time oncoming generations would enjoy a better environment because today's generations were engaged in fruitful building. We Waltonians should continue to oppose projects which detract from nature, which impoverish or commercialize nature. Likewise, we should support those projects which work hand in hand with what nature has provided so that a more intelligent citizenry can more greatly enjoy a more bountiful nature. Willy-nilly opposition to an engineering project is as unwise as unquestioning support of everything which comes from the engineer's planning board. All dams are not defensible. But neither are all dams damnable. Wise conservation practice requires that we Waltonians sift the bad from the good and that we support the latter with all the zeal which we devote to our opposition of the former. By so doing we shall continue to command the respect of the general public and to exercise great influence in the places of decision while at the same time we shall render our maximum service to conservation by promoting what we need and by protecting what we have.

Argentina and Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States is very much concerned by the recent overthrow of the legally constituted government in Bolivia by a pro-Axis military clique, and Secretary Hull has issued a statement upon that subject, and there appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star a well-considered editorial entitled "Argentina and Bolivia," commending Secretary Hull's position, and under consent granted, I submit same herewith:

ARGENTINA AND BOLIVIA

Secretary Hull's statement on Bolivia strongly suggests that our relations with Argentina are entering the crisis stage. Exchanges of information between us and 18 other American republics, according to Mr. Hull, are yielding increasing evidence that the new revolution-created Bolivian regime is the creature of a conspiracy engineered by forces outside Bolivia and unfriendly to the defense of the Americas. The Secretary's language is not explicit as to names, but it plainly points to the Argentine Government and constitutes a charge whose seriousness cannot be exaggerated.

Ever since it came to power through the revolution of last June, the Ramirez regime of Argentina has been showing itself unfriendly to the defense of the Americas. It is the only Government in this hemisphere that still maintains diplomatic relations with the Axis. It is the only Government in this hemisphere that permits the agents of the Axis to circulate freely and carry on whatever activities may be helpful to their countries in the war against the United Nations. It is the only Government in this hemisphere that has not lived up to the inter-American pledges in respect to pan-American solidarity against Germany and Japan. And, finally, it is the only Government in this hemisphere deliberately and ostentatiously engaged in destroying the processes of democracy within its own borders.

Considered against this background, there appears to be considerable substance to the growing belief among the other Americas that Argentine conspirators have had a hand in the Bolivian coup. Uruguay, Chile, Brazil, and other South American countries—perhaps even more than the United States—have direct and immediate reasons to be concerned, for if an outside source has succeeded so readily in effecting an internal revolutionary change in Bolivia, it is not unthinkable that the same source may try to bring about the same results elsewhere. Presumably, with Britain following suit, the 18 Americas consulting with us will refuse to recognize the Bolivian regime and probably break with the Argentine Government if the present strong suspicions are definitely confirmed.

The critical nature of the situation cannot be doubted. Mr. Hull's statement plainly indicates that Bolivian nonrecognition and severance of relations with Argentina are wholly possible, if not probable. And this in turn, although it threatens the greater hurt to the Villarroel and Ramirez regimes, implies more than a little inconvenience for the United Nations, especially because Argentine wheat and beef are important to Britain and because Bolivian tin plays a large role in the Allied war effort. At the root of all the trouble, apparently, is an ambitious, pro-Axis military clique in both countries. It is too bad that this irresponsible minority has been able to do so much mischief, but perhaps strong action by the United States and the 18 like-minded Americas will be its undoing.

Illinois Believes That the Nation's Defenders Should Have Full Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit for the consideration of the Congress a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois memorializing the Congress to provide free air-mail service for absentee ballots for men and women now serving in the armed forces.

There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and I am advised that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is offering an amendment to this bill which makes this provision.

I hope this bill will become a law, for certainly while these men and women are defending their country the Government owes it to them to grant free air mail to make their applications for and to return their ballots to the proper election officials. If they are good enough to fight for their country, they are good enough to vote for the officials of the country they are fighting to defend.

The Governor of Illinois has called the general assembly in special session to make all necessary amendments to the present absentee voters laws of the State of Illinois so that applications may be made and ballots be sent to those serving in the armed forces in ample time for them to vote and have their ballots returned prior to election day.

The people of Illinois believe that the Nation's defenders should have full right of suffrage the same as they would have if they were at home. During the recess I talked to a large number of soldiers and sailors, as well as many civilians, and they were unanimous in their statements that those serving in the armed forces should not only have the right to vote for Federal officers but should have the right to vote for every officer from President down to coroner.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution, which was adopted by the house of representatives of the General Assembly of Illinois on January 7 and approved by the senate January 8, 1944, and I hope that the same will receive favorable consideration.

House Joint Resolution 2

Whereas the legislature of this State is convened in extraordinary session for the purpose of preserving and extending the suffrage rights of those of its electors who are serving in the military and naval forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the paramount obligation of the several State governments to strengthen and facilitate that sacred right of suffrage; and

Whereas a principal difficulty to the complete exercise of that right in the forthcoming primaries and elections will be the cost of air-mail transportation of war ballots to and from persons in the military and naval services; and

Whereas it is within the power of Congress to aid in this problem immeasurably by making provision for free air-mail transportation of such ballots both in the distribution thereof to servicemen and servicewomen and in the return of such ballots to the election officials in the States; and

Whereas provision of this kind will afford to persons in the military and naval services the kind of opportunity to vote to which they are justly entitled and will insure their maximum participation in the primaries and elections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois at the first special session thereof (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully but urgently memorialize the Congress of the United States, for the reasons stated in the preamble hereof, to enact such legislation as may be necessary to provide for free air-mail transportation of primary and election ballots to and from persons serving in the military and naval forces of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state immediately to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house January 7, 1944.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate January 8, 1944.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

A Poem by Two American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe this poem written by two American soldiers on duty in a far off corner of the world is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its clean, simple expression of the loyalties, the hopes, the courage, and the faith of these men should be a source of deep inspiration to all who read it. I am both proud and humbly thankful to have been the schoolteacher of one of these men.

DREAMS

On the shores of foreign soils
In the wastes of desert heat.
In the jungles with mosquitoes
You will find men hard to beat.

They are boys from your home town
They also come from mine.
They're protecting liberty
With all help and aid divine.

Things which they are fighting for
Are the pillars and the towers
Which we call democracy
O'er this great land of ours.

On a lonely rock-strewn isle
In the middle of the sea,
That's where we are dreaming
Of the things that used to be.

Of our fathers and our mothers,
Of our girl friend's fond caress,
Of the other pleasant things
Which made up our happiness.

We are dreaming of the dates
Which we'll have when we return
To the good old U. S. A.
Where the welcome home fires burn.

Then the dreams of moonlit nights
I will have once more with you,
Then the folks at home will have
Many dreams and prayers come true.

This poem is something which we feel.
It is our spoken dream and prayer
Of how we all intend to fight
Until it's quiet over there.

We shall hold out against the foe
On the land and in the ocean's spray,
For peace and quiet and liberty
Until once more they're here to stay.

—*Pvt. Donald Wheeler.*
Pvt. (1st cl.) Philip A. Woodworth.

Mrs. Roosevelt Forgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 7, 1944:

MRS. ROOSEVELT FORGETS

It is unfortunate that the President's wife, of all people, should be the one to resurrect what should be a thoroughly disproved fallacy.

Mrs. Roosevelt is sound, of course, in observing that men who are serving their country in far corners of the earth, mingling with strange people, risking their lives daily, killing because they must kill, suffering tortures from heat, insects, and wounds, will have an altered outlook on life when they return. It could not be otherwise.

But isn't she doing an injustice to our men in uniform and a disservice to us at home who look forward to their return when she says that the American serviceman has "lost his regard for human life" and his belief in the essential decency of his fellow man?

There were other prophets of gloom, 25 years ago, who had all of us fairly shivering in our boots with dire predictions such as she voices now. Veterans would come back with blood lust in their hearts. Veterans would be packing six-shooters on the street and shooting men down for an unkind word or a dirty look. Veterans had lost all respect for law and human rights.

All of which just didn't happen and just wasn't true. Some veterans stole and some veterans committed murder and some veterans became the tools of master criminals. There are always some men in any group who go wrong. But the number of veterans involved in serious crimes, as we remember the reports now, was surprisingly and disproportionately low.

Crime statistics are fairly concrete and in this instance they prove that Mrs. Roosevelt is wrong when she says enemy treachery has destroyed, in our servicemen, what she calls "trustfulness" and "belief in the fair and square thing."

Mrs. Roosevelt should be reminded, also, that soldiers in fox holes and sailors at sea are in far closer and more constant contact with fellow American servicemen than they are with the treacherous Jap or German. Does a man lose trustfulness when he sees, every day, evidences of teamwork and interdependency? Does he lose trustfulness when he witnesses the thousands of instances of self-sacrifice and heroism among his comrades?

Our other veterans who came back from France and Germany didn't show much evidence that battle had dulled moral or spiritual values. In most cases, the veteran of '19 dropped back into civilian life, got a job, married the neighbor's daughter and became active in the local lodge, church, and commercial club. He attended the monthly Legion meeting and repeated his pledge to support "law and order"—although he may have taken an illegal drink or two afterward.

He was, in other words, the same sort of American he had been raised to be and which he was before he went to war. He was, if anything, a little more tolerant of his fellow man, a little more considerate of his neighbor, a little more orderly in his dress and habits, a little straighter and a little stronger in body. Military life had taught him such things. And his son will be at least his equal.

The "Drys" Are Again on Rampage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, while some 10,000,000 of our youth are in uniform both here and abroad, the camel seeks to get his nose in under the tent. The "drys" are again creeping up on the Nation to make it a Sahara. Our soldiers can fight and die for their country, but they cannot be trusted with a cocktail or a glass of beer.

The "drys" conveniently forget the last prohibition holocaust—the ginger jake, the needled beer, the bathtub gin, the Bowery hootch which took a terrific toll of life. The hip-pocket flask became the badge of youth. The speak-easy and the "blind pig" were the rendezvous of the socialites and the guttersnipes. Hijackers and rum runners attained the wealth of Croesus. They became the "glamour boys." They drove the "coach and six" through the statute.

Justice lay prostrate. Crime mounted. The Nation was helpless.

The drys call such a cost of prohibition trifling. Any revival of the mischief is unthinkable. Yet, next week one of the subcommittees of the House Judiciary Committee will be the scene of a farce-comedy—a hearing on the Bryson bill, which seeks to "goosestep" the Nation into dryness and disgrace.

Note the haste of the drys to get through with their sordid business before the boys come home. Unless the Nation watches out, the comedy will become a bitter tragedy.

I am confident that the House Judiciary Committee of which I am ranking member—much less the House—will never approve such a monstrous measure. Yet, strange things happen. The drys are as resourceful as they are ruthless. It was recently bruited about that they are back with a bank roll of $10,000,000 for lobbying, and money talks.

The common sense of the Nation must assert itself and pour vials of wrath upon the blue noses and Carrie Nations of hatchet fame.

Three States are dry—supposedly dry—Kansas, Mississippi, and Oklahoma. Yet, in those three States, thousands and thousands take out retail and wholesale Federal liquor licenses. They freely peddle their wet goods. In other words, Kansas, Mississippi, and Oklahoma are thoroughly wet, yet, they would make the Nation dry.

I say to my distinguished colleagues in the dry States who approve the Bryson bill: "Cast out the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote of thy brother's eye."

We repealed prohibition. It must stay repealed. The curtain shall never again be raised on that tragedy.

Save Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Spencer, Iowa, in my congressional district, is a progressive community of 6,600 people. It is a beautiful city built by faith of friendly neighbors and is the home of the Clay County Fair, one of the largest and most successful fairs in the Midwest. It also has a wide-awake chamber of commerce which is always in close touch with public opinion. Just recently this chamber of commerce adopted resolutions relating to our national welfare which could well serve as a model for every patriotic community in the Nation. The resolutions are as follows:

Realizing that the responsibility of post-war adjustment, and the employment of labor should, and will, naturally fall upon American business, particularly the comparatively small business concerns of our country, and believing in the principle of individually owned, operated, and controlled business, and in view of the fact that the method, extent, and character of taxation is a dominant and vital factor in all business life, your committees on taxation and legislation respectfully present for your consideration, the following resolution to be brought to the attention of each of our Iowa Congressmen, Senators, and other chambers of commerce of the State of Iowa;

Whereas the ultimate object of our war effort is to preserve to us, and to our posterity, the American way of living, and the continuation of our constitutional right of the pursuit of happiness, and the right to live as a free people with the opportunity to fortify ourselves, and our posterity against the fear of hunger and fear of encroachment upon our religious liberty; and

Whereas the United States of America has attained its present place among the nations of the world by means of the development of its natural resources by private enterprise, free from unnecessary governmental control or undue burdens brought upon it through taxation; and

Whereas it is our sincere hope and belief that, in the not too-distant future, private enterprise will need to undertake the problems of post-war adjustments in order to preserve our American way of living; and

Whereas the ultimate well-being of American labor, American agriculture, and American business depends upon a sound governmental economic policy, no one class being able to enjoy lasting prosperity at the expense of others,

Be it therefore resolved, That the Congress of the United States shall continue to make

such appropriations as may be necessary to adequately finance our present war effort and to assist our allies in such manner as in their opinion will result in the earliest possible termination of our present conflict; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will foster and encourage individual enterprise in our country, relieving such enterprises, insofar as possible, from unnecessary governmental interference and from the danger of governmentally subsidized competition; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will relieve American business from the burden of taxation made necessary in financing or supporting any plan, or scheme, of socialistic economy, fostered and promulgated by bureaucratic control, regulation, and interference in private affairs, all in conflict with the fundamental principles of our free American Government; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary in connection with post-war planning to assure that any plan, or system, of public works to provide mass employment shall be limited to work, public in nature and permanent in character, and shall be carried out by means of private contracts let on the basis of competitive bids, free from unnecessary Government regulations and/or interference; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will further permit and encourage the building of capital reserves by private enterprise, through the medium of reasonable profit, for use in the financing by such enterprise, post-war adjustment and activities, thereby enabling private enterprise to furnish maximum employment for those now in our armed forces or engaged in war industries; be is further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary to make available funds for the war effort through domestic economy, thereby eliminating the necessity of increasing the tax burden upon either corporate or individual incomes, and in this connection, during the present emergency and the period of post-war readjustment we make the following suggestions:

1. The freezing of present rate of Social Security Tax.

2. The elimination of unnecessary, obsolete, and overlapping bureaus.

3. The elimination of governmental activity resulting in competition with private enterprise.

4. Turning back to the respective States the responsibility of regulating and controlling all affairs not necessarily national in scope.

5. Rewarding, rather than penalizing, individual effort, initiative, and economy, thereby increasing the number of potential taxpayers.

Dated this 17th day of December 1943 at Spencer, Iowa.

Respectfully submitted.

GILBERT S. JAMES, *President*.
J. H. PETERSON, *Secretary*.

A Well-Rounded Veterans' Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, believing that the rehabilitation of returning servicemen is a greater present need to be considered than future rewards, the Milwaukee Journal, early in 1943, assigned a staff writer at full time to study the facilities existent and those planned for the future. Sixty-one articles came forth as a result of this study. Mr. Frank Sinclair, of the Journal staff, is the author of the articles and has done a monumental piece of journalism and a great service to all veterans. By way of summary, Mr. Sinclair, on behalf of the Journal, sets forth the following conclusions on present veteran needs and future plans. They merit the careful consideration of all Members of Congress. As a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee I am glad to endorse these conclusions.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The United States should launch an immediate speed-up of all programs and all planning for the rehabilitation of the veterans of World War No. 2 in order to accommodate the increasing flow of men coming out of the armed forces on medical discharges.

It must accelerate:

The construction of additional veterans' hospitals.

The procurement of more personnel to man veterans' hospitals.

The enlargement of other veterans' administration staffs.

The handling of claims for pensions.

The machinery for retraining handicapped veterans.

The machinery for helping veterans into jobs.

These are among the improvements that observers say should be made to make the lot of the returning veteran easier as he tries to find his place again in civil life. They are the paramount necessities shown in the survey of veterans' needs by the Journal.

The Nation further needs to place the administration of all matters pertaining to the welfare of veterans under one bureau, preferably the Veterans' Administration, to simplify procedure by:

Giving the Veterans' Administration master control over the administration of all veterans' benefits existing now or promulgated in the future.

Allowing it to utilize the machinery of any other Government agency to help veterans.

Giving it jurisdiction over the vocational training of non-service-connected disabled veterans as it now has over the service-connected.

Authorizing it to coordinate all Federal services now assisting veterans to get jobs.

There is also need for:

Simplification of all regulations affecting veterans.

Unification of all laws now on the books or to come.

Then there is a call for the creation of a planning group that would—

Make an expert study of all veterans' laws now on the books.

Analyze the whole veterans' problem.

Come forth with a master plan.

It is essential that the historic hit-and-miss method of letting Congress generate veterans' legislation, either on its own or at the request of veterans' organizations, be put upon a more orderly basis, for—

This war will create 14,000,000 veterans and thus give birth to many new problems of veterans' aid.

The Nation will be spending billions of dollars for years for hospitalization, medical care, pensions, education, make-work projects, unemployment compensation, farm and home loans, and discharge bonuses for veterans.

These great expenditures will be an invitation for political logrolling.

And future raids on the National Treasury by bonus armies would be averted by establishment of a rounded-out program of veterans' assistance.

Toward all these ends it would be desirable now for—

Each House of Congress to have only one committee to which all veterans' legislation would go.

Congress to establish a joint committee of both Houses to study the whole veterans' question.

In any master program generated to aid World War No. 2 veterans there should be recommendations that—

All members of the armed forces be given a sum of money upon discharge to purchase civilian clothing and to tide them over until they get on their feet again.

Veterans unable to get work after discharge be entitled to unemployment compensation for a limited time.

All men and women who served in the armed forces be given credit toward old-age pensions at a fair rate for their time in uniform.

The above three benefits to be retroactive to veterans discharged before enactment of any such legislation.

Federal loans be available to veterans to help them repay old debts.

Thought be given to making loans available for the purchase of farms, small business, or homes.

Free education be made available to all veterans whose schooling was interrupted by the call to service.

Preference be given to honorably discharged veterans in private as well as Government employment.

Demobilization when the war is over be as rapid as is conducive to orderly process and that it be dovetailed with the demobilization of war industry.

When peace comes, members of the armed forces be discharged only to jobs through a furlough system permitting the individual to go home to look for a job and to return to camp if he fails.

War plants to be changed over to consumer production as soon as they no longer are needed in the war effort, even while the war is on, so as to make jobs, especially for veterans.

Plant for a Federal public-works program to be in readiness to be put into effect should the return to peace bring an upset in economic conditions, causing widespread unemployment.

All benefits voted for veterans to apply to all who served during the defense emergency period prior to December 7, 1941, since such persons now are entitled to only so-called peacetime benefits.

Meantime, it is essential that as men and women are discharged from service for honorable reason, they be more fully informed of benefits already theirs for the asking and in accordance with their eligibility.

To assure the carrying out of this program with the greatest good to each veteran of this war, it is also desirable that:

The Veterans' Administration be given the status of a war agency to entitle it to priorities in constructing materials and manpower under a rating second only to the Army and Navy.

There be unstinted continuation of the present high-grade medical, surgical, and hospital attention given the wounded, accidentally injured, and sick in the armed forces.

Military hospitals continue as long as they have surplus beds available to keep their patients until they are ready to go home or to return to duty.

There be assurance that the Veterans' Administration shall remain as an independent agency and not be absorbed by the Federal Security Administration or any other branch of the Government.

Consideration be given to granting a pension immediately upon filing a claim where the military record shows line-of-duty disability, the pension to be subject to revision upon further checking or appeal by the veteran.

The Army be required to discontinue its practice of asking some men about to be discharged to sign a waiver that their condition was not due to military service.

And, lastly, many observers hold that the care of the veteran should be entirely the responsibility of the Federal Government, which took the men and women from their homes, and the States should not be called upon to share the burden.

Poland's Borders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 8, 1944:

POLAND'S BORDERS—THE BASIC ISSUES EXAMINED

(By Barnet Nover)

Three issues are dominant in the increasingly bitter dispute regarding the Polish-Russian boundary.

The first has to do with the history and ethnography of the eastern border region which became part of the Republic of Poland following the resurrection of that nation in 1918.

The second has to do with the validity of the plebiscite carried out by the Russian occupation authorities in the Polish area annexed by the Soviet Union in the autumn of 1939, following the fourth (the German-Russian) partition of Poland.

And, third and most basic of all, is the question whether a great power has the right to set aside unilaterally a territorial arrangement it had accepted and solemnly pledged to respect.

The historic background of eastern Poland is exceedingly complicated. Depending on what date is chosen as the point of departure a good case can be made out on the basis of part ownership for the inclusion of the region in Russia. But at least as good a case can be made out for its continued retention by Poland.

It is true that part of the region, namely, eastern Galicia, was never Russian, but during the century and a quarter of Poland's eclipse was under Hapsburg rule. It is also true that the territory west of what is known as White Russia had been under Russian rule. In fact a large part of Poland was ruled by the Czars.

Nor can the rightness or wrongness of the respective claims to the disputed area be judged solely on the basis of ethnographic factors. A large number of Ukrainians and a much smaller but still considerable number of White Russians inhabit the region. But the decision regarding their future nationality cannot be made ex parte on the basis of a population's race, language, and cultural affiliations.

On that basis Germany would have a claim to two-thirds of Switzerland, and France to a good part of Belgium. Given the divergent Russian-Polish claims justice demands that the people themselves be given a free and uninhibited opportunity to choose their allegiance.

The Russians, for their part, insist that precisely this was done in all the regions occupied by Russia following the deal with the Third Reich.

Thus a writer in Pravda, the same writer who took Wendell Willkie so violently to task as a "political gambler" who is "muddying the waters" because of an article he wrote recently for the New York Times, speaks of the "democratic plebiscite" that was held in the annexed regions.

But if the Soviet Government is convinced that the peoples of the Baltic States and of eastern Poland are as unanimously in favor of their inclusion in Russia as those 1939 plebiscites would indicate it should not object to a repolling of those inhabitants.

More important is the question of treaty observance.

Soviet spokesmen are very careful not to base any claim to the disputed region on the treaties with Russia signed with Germany in 1939. Yet it was, in the first instance, on the basis of those treaties that Russia moved into and annexed eastern Poland, an annexation which the Polish Government has never recognized and which neither Great Britain nor the United States ever recognized.

Indeed, 8 days after the German invasion of Russia, the Soviet Government signed a treaty with the Polish Government in which it was stated that:

"The Government of the Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity."

Now, if this declaration has any meaning at all, it means that on July 30, 1941 (the date of the signing of the Soviet-Polish Pact), Russia gave its approval to the restoration of the status quo regarding the Polish-Russian border. Unless, therefore, an agreement to that end is reached by Russia and Poland, the reannexation of eastern Poland by Russia would be in flat contradiction of that and earlier pledges by the Soviet Government.

Both Poland and Russia are our allies. Both have deserved well of the world, Poland for having been the first to resist Hitler by force of arms, Russia for the magnificent fight she has made against the German invaders.

Should Russia, regardless of its past pledges, unilaterally go ahead with her plans to annex eastern Poland and any other areas she deems essential to her security, nobody can stop her from doing so. Certainly neither Great Britain nor the United States could do so. But such unilateral action by Russia would tend to undermine the foundation of that public law which the allies are now trying to rebuild and make a mockery of the Moscow and Tehran declarations which were hailed with such unrestrained enthusiasm by the entire civilized world.

Taxes on Federally Owned Properties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the question of tax-free Federally owned property should receive immediate attention. Practically every political subdivision in the country is affected. Many counties are facing serious financial problems because so much property has been removed from the tax rolls.

Last summer a subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Lands started a complete investigation of the problem. The subcommittee visited California. While in San Francisco, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, invited me to attend the hearings. I congratulate the committee for investigating this important subject. The people are entitled to relief.

Under date of December 23, 1943, the Call-Bulletin of San Francisco published an editorial captioned "Should United States go free on taxes?" The article has attracted much attention on the Pacific coast, and I am sure it will prove of interest to citizens in every State of the Union. Under permission granted me to address the House, I quote the editorial in full, as follows:

SHOULD UNITED STATES GO FREE ON TAXES?—ACTION BY SAN FRANCISCO SUPERVISORS RAISES KNOTTY NATIONAL PROBLEM

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, in its refusal to cancel taxes against 86 pieces of federally owned property within the city, has opened up a field of discussion of Nation-wide interest.

Since there is no expectation that such action will result in payment of taxes by the Federal Government, it has the appearance of futile action at first glance.

But closer examination shows that the board has a sharper weapon in its hands than the first glance reveals.

The fact that unpaid and unforgiven taxes standing against a property prevents a clear title, will present the Federal Government with a knotty dilemma when it attempts to pass the property back to private ownership.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

And just in case it may seem to some people that the San Francisco board is playing dog in the manger about this matter, let us look at the record.

The Federal Government has acquired ownership of thousands of properties in San Francisco, ranging from hotels and office buildings to residential lots.

This has shunted about $1,600,000 in annual taxes, or 20 cents in the tax rate, onto the remaining taxpaying residents of the city.

And in the meantime, the Federal Government in its role as property owner gets the benefit of police, fire, and other protection scot free—with the rest of the city paying the bill.

Plainly the situation is out of joint.

And it is not a local situation.

OWNS HALF OF CALIFORNIA

In California the Federal Government owns 52 percent of all the land, leaving the owners of the remaining 48 percent to pay all the taxes.

In one county in California, Trinity, 95 percent of the land is federally owned and nontaxpaying.

One county in Wyoming, Jackson, is wholly federally owned.

So is 80 percent of the entire State of Arizona.

And that is the picture the country over, in varying proportions, of course, and it is getting worse a lot faster than it is getting better.

Unless national pressure on the Federal Government, patterned after the pressure now being applied by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, results in a change of Federal law to permit payment of taxes, the time is going to come when Federal ownership will put such a tax burden on the rest of the country that private ownership will be prohibitive.

Obviously something has to be done about it.

PARTIALLY RIGHT ANSWER

While it is not altogether clear that the action by the San Francisco board is the whole answer, it is at least partially the right answer.

The Federal Government has unquestionably gone hog wild in its purchase of land throughout the country, and it is on thin ice in pleading the war as justification.

The famous Stevens Hotel in Chicago is properly cited as one instance of hasty and costly Government purchase, found unusable in the end, and probably unnecessary and unwise in the beginning.

Plenty of other examples will undoubtedly turn up elsewhere in the country.

Congress is going to find this whole problem squarely in the middle of its lap one of these days, and when it does it will be forthright action of the type taken by the San Francisco board which will force the issue.

Income-Tax Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, never before has Congress faced the necessity of enacting legislation making it mandatory that the Treasury Department create a simplified income tax return form.

Last year Congress passed, and the President approved, a new tax bill. There were two chief reasons for the enactment of that particular tax bill: First, to bring in a larger percentage of the income taxes due the Treasury through a pay-roll deduction plan, and, second, to simplify the forms that taxpayers would be required to submit to the Collector of Internal Revenue. The determination of the particular forms to be used is definitely an administrative matter, although the House Ways and Means Committee has felt free to suggest to the Treasury Department that it use a simple form.

This request was made last fall but, instead of sending out a simple form, I am sure that every citizen who has seen the new form 1040 will agree that it is the most complicated income-tax return ever devised by any Government. There is no sound reason under the sun that would prevent the experts in our Treasury Department from developing a simple return. Governor Dewey, of New York, has just brought into being a simplified form for citizens of New York who pay State income taxes. There are just seven questions to be answered by the taxpayer, and any citizen of New York can fill out his return in about 10 minutes. For the approximately 30,000,000 people whose income is derived from wages or salary, a very simple form could be devised. The Internal Revenue Bureau must know the total amount of the annual wage or salary; the amount deducted by the employer and the number of dependents, if any, of the taxpayer. Congress could undoubtedly help if it would pass a simple measure allowing each taxpayer an exemption of say $100 for unearned income such as interest on bank deposits or a few small dividends from stock or bonds.

It is gratifying to learn that the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the ranking minority member are in perfect agreement that bringing about a simplified form should be the first task of the Ways and Means Committee, now that Congress has reconvened. The local Collectors of Internal Revenue are not responsible for this complicated form—neither is the Congress. The responsibility is definitely in the lap of the so-called experts in the Treasury Department, who seem more interested in making work for income-tax experts than they are in devising a simplified tax form.

Red Cross Must Be Given Right To Aid Civilian as Well as Military Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Secretary of State Hull:

DECEMBER 27, 1943.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The idea of the Red Cross was first brought to light in a pamphlet, published in 1862, entitled "Un Souvenir de Solferino," written by the Swiss physician, Henri Dunant, wherein the world was called upon to "care for the sick and wounded in time of war." Out of that germ of an idea was born the International Red Cross, "the greatest mother of them all."

Its main object is "in time of peace as well as in time of war to act as a benevolent intermediary between governments, peoples, and nationalities for the purpose of itself carrying out or making it possible for others to carry out the task of relieving sufferings arising out of war, sickness, or disaster."

As was pointed out in a splendid article by Kurt R. Grossman in the Congress Weekly of November 12, 1943, its founder was deservedly given the Nobel prize of 1901.

A number of Geneva conventions have been signed to amplify and implement the original idea of the Red Cross so that now, among other things, the Geneva bureau of the Red Cross can locate the missing, arrange for exchange of letters between war prisoners and relatives, conduct inspections of camps of war prisoners, and certain types of interned civilians. Any violation of the conventions may be pointed out by the Red Cross to the power complained of. The United States adheres most carefully to the Convention of 1929, which was ratified by Congress on January 7, 1932.

Prior to this war, apparently, no provisions were made in the treaties that would control the establishment of a definite program of assistance to civilian populations similar to that accorded to prisoners of war. Until this war, history has never recorded such wholesale deprivations of life, limb, and property nor such forced migrations of people, leading to the designation of "stateless," as well as cruelties and atrocities inflicted upon civilians. The tales of sadistic cruelties in the concentration camps visited upon Jews and other persecuted minorities are bloodcurdling and horrendous.

Whether Germany would have lived up to any Red Cross convention requiring humanitarian treatment to all civilian prisoners is problematic, although, truth to tell, the American Red Cross reveals that Germany adheres fairly well to its obligations concerning military prisoners of war. There have been certain infractions, but, in general, the Nazis have obeyed the terms of the convention. Of course, this is not true with reference to the Japanese.

The lack of foresight and wisdom on the part of the statesmen of the world to develop Red Cross treaties concerning all interned civilians must as soon as possible be remedied. It is hoped, therefore, that as soon as the time is appropriate you will in the spirit of humanity initiate proceedings looking forward to the adoption by all warring nations, in fact, by all civilized nations, of such conventions that the sick and the wounded and the defenseless who as civilian victims of the war are detained or interned in prison camps will come within the scope of the International Red Cross' activities.

Of course, I am aware that Germany has entered into an agreement with several of the warring nations, among them the United States, England, and Denmark, wherein these countries pledged themselves to humanitarian treatment of interned civilians, but such agreements do not cover all detained civilians and where it suits Germany's purpose best, she terms such civilians "stateless." Thus, when it comes to civilian Jews who are not nationals of either the United States or Great Britain, the Nazis are utterly unrestrained in fury and degradation. Hitler has vowed to make Europe Judenrein and is proceeding in his plan for the destruction of all Jews, but only after intense suffering. The International Red Cross looks upon the excruciating horrors of pogroms, massacres, and tortures of the Jews in the ghettos and concentration camps with helplessness.

I have asked the American Red Cross why the International Red Cross could not demand that the interned Jewish and non-Jewish civilians deemed "stateless" by the Nazis that they be accorded treatment equal to prisoners of war. I was told there was no way to bring force to bear upon the Nazis; there was no treaty upon which to base an appeal and that, finally, the American Red Cross has importuned the authorities that the savageries of the Nazis be at least tempered, but to no avail. The American Red Cross faces a blank wall. It cannot cross belligerents' lines and investigate measures for relief.

When the Germans were found to have mistreated some war prisoners we retaliated. The Nazis rejoined by even crueler treatment. When we increased the punishment the Germans increased their intensity of revenge until both sides agreed to call halt. Thus it can be seen that retaliation degrades us to the level of the Nazis and amounts, finally, to utter frustration.

Assuredly, every effort must be made as soon as possible to accord the "stateless" confined to concentration camps the status equal to that of prisoners of war.

In conclusion, it is earnestly hoped that there will be developed a regard for the rights and dignity of all men so that there might be brought into being appropriate treaties between nations to the end that all civilians be treated honorably and decently and in the fulsome purpose for which the Red Cross was originally devised.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

Mining Claims on Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, mining is contributing enormously to the upbuilding of the United States. Mining is one of the main factors in producing wealth in the golden State of California. Every American associates mining with California. Everyone remembers "The days of old, the days of gold, the days of '49."

But, Mr. Speaker, the people of my State are disturbed over certain proposals to change the mining laws. The proposals emanate from Federal bureaus here in Washington. As part of my remarks, I quote resolutions adopted by the board of directors, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, on December 21, 1943:

Whereas since the year 1866 it has been the policy of the Federal Government of the United States to throw open to location by individuals such of the public lands of the United States as may be found to contain metals capable of being mined in paying quantities; and

Whereas in reliance on this declared national policy, the principal domestic economy of several of the Western States of the country, and the principal economic resource supporting many counties in all of the Western States has been built up through the production of minerals by private enterprise and with the use of private capital; and

Whereas it is now reported from authentic channels, including certain Members of Congress and in the statements made by the present Secretary of the Interior, in support of Senate Resolution No. 53 on July 23, 1941, that the Department of the Interior and the General Land Office in that Department are supporting and favoring a change in the national policy so as to provide—

(a) The requirement for Federal recordation of new and outstanding mining locations and annual reports on assessment work on such claims, with a view to canceling the same by action of the Federal Government if such requirements are not met; and

(b) To substitute for location and patenting of public lands to private individuals a mineral-leasing system which would normally require the development of these lands under Government supervision and the payment of royalties thereon to the Government; and

Whereas such a leasing system will constitute only another step in the direction of bureaucratic Government control over legitimate private industry and the restriction and hampering of private enterprise, all of which is contrary to the fundamental principles under which the economic prosperity of the United States was built up: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, acting upon recommendation of its mining committee, does hereby vigorously protest these reported plans to expand the Government leasing system of public lands so as to cover those lands which are valuable for their metal content, to require Federal recording of location notices and proofs of annual labor, and to exact royalties from and extend the bureaucratic control of the general land department over the free enterprise of prospectors and locators who for nearly a century past have been responsible for the discovery and production of the valuable metal resources of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce urges a discontinuance of the present reported policy of the General Land Office in protesting all applications for mineral patents in mining regions requiring technical and unreasonable demonstration of mineral values in advance of full development of the properties where the location of claims with respect to proven lodes and ledges is such that no reasonable doubt of this value for mineral purposes can exist. In this connection the chamber urges a return to the former policy of the land department in encouraging the development of properties in such proven mineral areas through the liberal granting of patents where the same are applied for and reasonable compliance with the statutory conditions has been shown; and be it further

Resolved, That the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce reaffirms its belief that the maximum development of our public resources and mineral lands will be accomplished through encouraging private initiative, private prospecting, private development, and private production of these resources, and that the experience of nearly a century has demonstrated the soundness of our present mineral land laws as applied to the location and patenting of such of those lands as are or may be found to be valuable for their metal content; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Representatives in Congress, to the public and mining industrial press, with a view to a united stand in opposition to this socialistic program.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit herewith a radio interview over the N. B. C. network on Friday, November 12, 1943, in which I was interviewed by Richard Harkness, and an article by myself published in the December 1943 issue of the Washington News Digest:

RADIO INTERVIEW BY RICHARD HARKNESS, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1943

Mr. HARKNESS. Congress is heading into one of its most bitter fights in years. The fight will be a showdown on food subsidies. The President wants not only to continue the present program of rolling back prices; he wants to enlarge it. Congress, which must authorize the appropriation, is openly antagonistic to the President's plan. The vehicle for this subsidy fight is a bill extending the life of the New Deal's Commodity Credit Corporation. A House committee says it is all right to continue the agency. It adds a provision specifically banning all subsidies after next January 1. This measure is going to the House floor next Thursday. The administration is ready to put its full force behind the removal of this subsidy ban. Last Monday I asked Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, to outline the case for subsidies. This evening Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, will present the case against Government roll-backs. Briefly, WRIGHT PATMAN made two points for subsidies, two points on which the administration is basing its case. The first point is this: When Congress passed the Price Control Act it directed the President to hold the cost of living to the level of September 15, 1942. The administration claims that to carry out this order from Congress the President must subsidize. The second point follows this line of reasoning: If we do not hold prices down, labor will demand higher wages. We will have strikes, and, as in the coal strike, we will be forced to increase wages. Then, in turn, will come still higher prices and we will be in a spiral of inflation. Here is Representative HOPE to answer the administration's argument.

Mr. HOPE. Thank you, Mr. Harkness. It is fair that you should give your listeners both sides of this highly important issue. That way, after listening to the arguments on both sides, they can make up their own minds. You just outlined the administration's two contentions on why we should have subsidies. Let us examine them. It is true that Congress directed the President to stabilize prices, as far as practicable, on the basis of the levels existing on September 15, 1942. The point overlooked by the advocates of subsidies is that this act also directed the President to stabilize wages and salaries. This directive gave the President some leeway. He was authorized to make adjustments in all three items to the extent that he found them necessary in the effective prosecution of the war, or to correct gross inequalities. However, we must return to this one fact. The clear intent of Congress was to hold down prices, wages, and salaries—all three. Let us look at what has happened since September a year ago.

Full-time hourly earnings in manufacturing industries have increased 8 percent. Weekly earnings, or take-home pay, have increased 11 percent. Total manufacturing pay rolls, including both salaries and wages, have increased 21 percent—and that does not include the big wage increase given to the coal miners the other day. In the same period the cost of living has increased between 4 and 5 percent. In other words, the average employed worker is better off financially today than he was a year ago. If you want to trace these figures back to the beginning of the war, they are even more striking. Since then hourly earnings have increased 42 percent. Weekly earnings are up 70 percent, and the cost of living only 22 percent.

Mr. HARKNESS. Administration men tell me, Mr. HOPE, they are worried most about inflation resulting from labor's demands for more pay.

Mr. HOPE. Taking the administration's own argument on this point, it simply comes down to this: We must either pay a part of the consumer's food bill and increase his wages, or have our war effort sabotaged by strikes and labor trouble. I, personally, have too much confidence in the fundamental patriotism of the working people of this country to believe that anything like that is going to happen. True, some leaders of organized labor are threatening strikes and walk-outs unless their demands are met. I am not passing on the merit of their claims. There may be inequities which should be corrected, as is provided in the Price Control Act. Where an inequity is shown, adjustments

should be made. I do say, however, that the general relationship between prices and wages furnishes no justification for general wage increases at this time.

Mr. HARKNESS. Right at that point, let me ask you this: If the cost of living does go up, won't that have an inflationary effect?

Mr. HOPE. In the first place, the threat of inflation comes more directly from this subsidy plan than from anything else. Our greatest danger of inflation at the present time comes from our excess purchasing power—$40,000,000,000 this year. We have that much more money to spend than there are goods to buy. Food subsidies will increase this buying power still further. What the Government is saying to consumers, in effect, is this: "We will pay a percentage of your grocery bill each month, and give you a check at the end of the month for your share." Isn't that just the same as an increase in wages? Isn't that inflationary? Here is another point. We would be going into this subsidy program blindly. Sometime ago the President suggested food subsidies totaling as much as $2,000,000,000 per year.

Some labor leaders have suggested even more. Can anyone contend that the inflationary gap won't be increased by that amount, unless we roll back wages and profits also?

Mr. HARKNESS. I have received quite a lot of mail recently, Mr. HOPE, on this subsidy issue. One point so many people make is that school teachers or persons living on pensions—people, that is, who have fixed incomes—find the increased cost of living almost impossible to meet.

Mr. HOPE. It is true there are some people whose incomes have not been increased, but the number is not nearly as large as you might suppose. In many instances other members of the family are working, so that the family income has been increased considerably. Assuming, however, that there are some cases of real hardship where people are living on fixed incomes, should the Government pay a part of my grocery bill and your grocery bill when we can afford to pay it? This country now has the greatest national income in its history, yet we are spending only 21 percent of that income for food. And now the Government wants to pass on a part of that bill to soldiers and sailors who are now offering their lives all over this world for $50 a month. In effect, subsidies mean that, while we are safe here at home earning more money than we ever did before, the administration wants to wait until our fighting men come home and present them with the biggest grocery bill in world history. That is no exaggeration, because that actually is the case. Two billion dollars in food subsidies mean increasing the national debt by that amount. Who will pay it? Well, most of it will be paid by the young people of our present generation, including the men and women now in the Army and Navy. If our subsidy bill gets bigger, perhaps all members of the next two or three generations will have to pay for the food we are eating in this war boom.

Mr. HARKNESS. As the President outlined this new subsidy program, he made one important point. He emphasized the fact that subsidies are to be only temporary—only for the war emergency.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, Mr. Harkness; I realize that is one of the administration's main arguments. But the facts being what they are, I think it is easy to see why a majority of the Members of Congress do not feel that food subsidies are justified. Outside of being inflationary now, subsidies at this time would be a direct threat to our war effort and to our post-war recovery. They will add to the national debt. Everyone is agreed on that. Let us take a look at the situation when the war is over. We are going to have a drop in wages. We are going to have unemployment. If in a boom time like this it is necessary for the Government to pay part of our food bill, what will be the situation after the war when incomes are down, and when we have millions of people living on unemployment compensation? Can anyone argue that subsidies can be discontinued under those conditions?

I could go on and list many other objections to subsidies. One is that experience has already shown that subsidies can, and will, be used to regiment and control business and agriculture. Another is that a program of this type spreads pretty fast after it gets started. We started to roll back the prices of butter and meat. Now, all sorts of other subsidies are being proposed. Unless the administration is prohibited by legislation, we may expect to see a continuing increase in subsidy payments. It is an easy way out of a problem to say, "Oh, well, let's pay a subsidy." The record of this administration shows that on too many occasions it has followed the policy of buying itself out of trouble instead of meeting the issue and settling it in a forthright way.

Mr. HARKNESS. Thank you, Representative HOPE. Now, by way of summary, you have brought out this evening these main points against the President's subsidy program: First, instead of being antiinflationary, subsidies increase purchasing power and are in themselves inflationary. The workingman is, generally speaking, well off financially, even though the cost of living has gone up. Subsidies, once started, must continue into the post-war period, and, finally, subsidies only mean putting off the payment of our grocery bill.

[From the Washington News Digest of December 1943]

I know of no subject on which there is more confusion than on subsidies. That is because there are subsidies and subsidies. The Steagall bill now being considered in Congress prohibits consumer subsidies on agricultural products or articles manufactured therefrom. It goes no further. The purpose of these subsidies is to pay a part of everybody's food bill, irrespective of their ability to pay it themselves. There are numerous other subsidies, such as those on copper and other strategic materials, of vital importance to the war effort. Their continuation is not a matter of controversy at this time.

The subsidies covered in the Steagall bill are properly called consumer subsidies. They are paid in some cases to farmers, in others to processors, but the payment is passed on to the consumer through an adjustment of ceiling prices. The consumer benefits to the same extent as if the subsidy were paid directly to him, although in some cases the intended aid is ineffective due to the prevalence of black markets.

During weeks of discussion but one argument has been advanced for consumer subsidies. This argument is set out in the minority report on the Steagall bill, as follows: "The only protection against increased wages is the maintenance of the present price structure. If prices are increased, demands for increased wages will follow immediately. If these demands are resisted, production of essential war equipment will be impaired." Substantially the same argument is advanced in the President's recent food message.

This argument implies that if workers demand higher wages there is nothing to do but to grant these demands, irrespective of their merit. If that is true, then price control has broken down already. There is no use trying to maintain it longer. Those who take this viewpoint apparently consider consumer subsidies as a program of appeasement toward organized labor, a program which has already had its Munich in the recent settlement of the coal strike.

Since the beginning of the war, hourly earnings in manufacturing industries have increased 42 percent; weekly earnings, 70 percent; and the cost of living, 22 percent. In September 1942, legislation was passed directing the President to stabilize both wages and prices at the levels existing on September 15, 1942. This directive of Congress has not been carried out. Increases since September 1942 are as follows: Full-time hourly earnings in manufacturing industries, 8 percent; weekly earnings, 11 percent; total manufacturing pay rolls, 21 percent; and cost of living, between 4 and 5 percent. In other words, the average factory worker is better off financially today than he was a year ago and far better off than when the war began. There are people whose incomes have not increased, but their numbers are not as large as supposed. Most families have had substantial increases in income, both from increased wages and because additional members of the family are working.

It is thus seen that there is no justification for the demand for food subsidies on the ground that wages have fallen behind living costs. That does not mean demands will not be made for increases, and it is reported that the C. I. O. is determined to break the Little Steel formula, irrespective of what may be done in the way of food subsidies. The subsidies now in force had no effect upon the policy of the United Mine Workers in the recent strike. Certainly, there is nothing to indicate that a continuation or expansion of the food-subsidy program will in any way modify or do away with demands for wage increases. Whether we are to have a spiral of inflation depends upon whether the administration is courageous enough to resist unjustified demands for increased wages on the part of our highest-paid and best-organized workers.

What are the objections to consumer subsidies? In the first place they are inflationary. They have the same effect as wage increases. They give the consumer expanded purchasing power without additional goods to purchase. They increase the amount of money available for purchasing on the black market. They result in no increase in production.

Such subsidies are objectionable also, because, once started, they are bound to expand. At present they involve the expenditure of $800,000,000 annually. The President has talked of $2,000,000,000 or more per year. Some advocates of subsidies have used even higher figures. Being in the nature of an appeasement, the extent to which subsidies will go depends solely upon the demands of those advocating them.

Can we get rid of food subsidies after the war? We are today paying a smaller proportion of our national income for food than ever before. If it is necessary for the Government to pay a part of the country's food bill now, how will it be possible to deny similar demands after the war when unemployment and reduced wages confront us?

Processors and farmers object to subsidies, because they have been, and are being, used to regiment and control those who receive them. If space permitted, numerous instances could be cited to prove these objections are justified.

Subsidies are objectionable, also, because in too many cases they are used as a substitute for a real solution of the problem. If the President had carried out the direction of Congress to stabilize wages and prices, there would be no demand for subsidies today. It is such an easy way out of a problem to say, "Let's pay a subsidy," and the record of this administration shows that on too many occasions it has followed the policy of buying itself out of trouble instead of meeting the issue fairly and squarely.

One of the arguments of the proponents of subsidies is that opposition to them comes from pressure groups and that this opposition does not represent the real sentiment of the country. It is true that organized groups of citizens have appeared before Congress, some for subsidies, some against. The real opposition to subsidies, however, has come

from the great mass of the American people who are worried about Government extravagance and our mounting national debt. They do not feel that it is morally or economically sound for the Government to borrow money to pay a part of the household expenses of its citizens at a time when those citizens as a whole are better able to pay them than ever before. More especially, they do not like the idea of passing such a debt on to their children and to the men who are now serving their country at the battle front. They stand on the traditional American principle of paying their own way. They know that regimentation and control are the inevitable accompaniments of subsidies and they are fed up with regimentation and control from Washington. They want to do everything possible to win the war, but they feel that subsidies and their accompanying evils are hindering rather than helping the war effort. Congress, in opposing subsidies, has been listening, not to pressure groups but to the collective common sense of all the people.

The Lea Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the minority report on the civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420, argues that the bill deliberately fosters a monopoly of air transportation on the part of the four largest domestic air lines. The minority's argument is quite unsound and overlooks essential provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act, important decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and fundamental matters of transportation history.

The minority report states that 81 percent of our domestic air-transportation business is done by 4 companies and the remaining 19 percent by 15 companies. These figures are somewhat inaccurate. Excluding All-American's pick-up service, there are only 16 domestic companies in operation.

It is true that four companies—25 percent of the total—received 78.1 percent of the total domestic revenue, based on the 12 months ending July 1943.

STATE REGULATION WILL NOT PREVENT MONOPOLY

The minority report argues that H. R. 3420 emphasizes air transportation as a national business and that this fosters "monopoly." Presumably the minority report's point is that assertion of State jurisdiction over air transportation would present continued concentration of such a large portion of air transportation revenues in the present 25 percent of the domestic air lines. Both history and economics destroy the minority report's argument.

HISTORY OF OTHER FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION

There has always been State regulation of rail and bus transportation. But despite such State regulation—which has been vigorously applied—there is a greater concentration of control of rail and bus business than in the case of domestic air transportation.

RAIL

The class I railroads receive about 98 percent of rail operating revenue. There are 124 companies constituting these roads. They operate a total of 229,282 miles. Their total operating revenues for the first 9 months of 1943 were $6,711,485,071.

Thirty-one of these companies—that is, 25 percent of the total—received 81 percent of the revenue and operated 74 percent of the mileage. This is a larger concentration of revenue than in the case of the domestic air lines, and a much larger concentration of mileage operated.

Further analysis shows that the first six railroads, only 4.8 percent of the total class I roads, received 39.4 percent of the revenue—a greater percentage concentration than will be found in any similar percentage of the 16 domestic air lines.

Moreover, if we take only the rail passenger business, a still greater concentration is shown than in domestic air transportation. The comparison on the basis of passenger business is more appropriate since air-line business is so largely a passenger business.

Twenty-one railroads—about 15 percent of the total—received 80 percent of the total passenger revenue.

BUS

So far as the bus business is concerned there is already a similar situation, although the consolidation and merger of companies is still continuing. Taking the class 1 carriers alone, for the calendar year 1942, the 35 largest carriers, representing 25 percent of the total, received $216,582,605 of a total passenger revenue for all such carriers of $269,143,363, or 80.1 percent of the total. In these figures those members of the Greyhound system which are under one management company are treated as a single company. That one system alone received 43.03 percent of the total revenue of the class 1 bus carriers. And the first 5 bus companies, only 3.57 percent of the total number of the class 1 carriers, received 55.79 percent of the total revenue.

Thus actual experience with vigorous and extensive State regulation in the rail and bus field shows that such regulation does not prevent or impede conditions which the minority report terms "monopolistic."

ECONOMICS OF LOCAL TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

The minority report further suggests that the Lea bill would tend to exclude independent local operations in view of its emphasis upon the national character of air transportation.

But the minority report itself says that:

> Local operations cannot be self-supporting in most instances unless also conducted as feeder lines to the trunk-line air carriers.

This statement confesses the essential fact that there can be no such thing as an economical operation by air if the operation is purely localized and isolated. The operation must be tied in as a part of the national system if it is to survive. The separate feeder company will be dependent upon the revenue to be derived from feeding business into the trunk carrier, which means interstate business. The very name "feeder" implies precisely that.

Consequently the local feeder operator would have to meet the regulation of the Federal law in any case. All that the Lea bill does is to relieve him of the wholly unnecessary burden of having to comply with two different sets of laws—State and Federal—with all the needless expense and involvement that that entails.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT FOSTERS COMPETITION

The Civil Aeronautics Act preserves and protects competition. It does not foster monopoly. It not only expressly outlaws monopoly but also expressly calls for competition. It is the only transportation legislation which does so clearly require that competition be preserved.

Furthermore, the Civil Aeronautics Board has interpreted the law in that spirit. In denying a proposed merger between United Air Lines and Western Air Lines in 1940, the Board said:

> The act seeks a state of competition among air carriers to the extent required by the sound development of the industry. The maintenance of such a constructive competition, we believe, will be best served at the present state of the industry's development by a reasonably balanced system of air transportation in every section of the country.

In an opinion rendered on August 13, 1943, the Board added this very significant pronouncement:

> It would seem to be a sound principle that since competition in itself presents an incentive to improved service and technological development, there would be a strong although not conclusive presumption in favor of competition on any route which offered sufficient traffic to support competing services without unreasonable increase of total operating cost.

This statement was made in deciding that one of the smaller air lines should be authorized to compete between Los Angeles and San Francisco, although two of the large trunk carriers were already furnishing service there, and such service was not shown to be inadequate.

And in an opinion in a case decided on November 2, 1943, one of the Board members said:

> The attainment of an improved balance in our air-transportation system through the expansion of our smaller air carriers, where such expansion is economically and geographically sound, seems to me to merit the serious consideration of this Board.

The Air Transport Association, composed of all the air lines, large and small, has filed a statement, officially approved by its board of directors, in the C. A. B. feeder investigation, pointing out the need for securing a more balanced system of air carriers. Thus all the air lines, large and small, support the policy of the C. A. B. to secure a more balanced system. And the C. A. B. is interpreting the Civil Aeronautics Act as that act was written—to prevent monopoly.

Therefore extension of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as proposed in the Lea bill to all air transportation, will simply make fully applicable the principles which are designed to prevent domination of air transportation by a favored few.

PRESENT EXTENT OF FOUR AIR LINES NOT RESULT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

The portion of the business now done by the four largest air lines is not the result of the Civil Aeronautics Act. It is the result of the conditions prevailing before that act was adopted. These air lines attained their position in the days before regulation.

The reason for their position is readily found. The Post Office Department started to build an air-mail system between the larger centers, and, with rare exceptions, it would not provide for service by more than one carrier between the same points.

Yet of the total air-line stops, the 20 largest points serve 34 percent of the total population of the country. The 284 points served by air-line stops today on the present system include 64 percent of the total population. It would take the addition of 116 points to increase the percentage of population served from the present 64 percent to 76 percent.

Obviously, therefore, a policy such as the Post Office Department had before the Civil Aeronautics Act of allowing generally only one carrier to carry the mail between the same points meant that only three or four carriers would be serving the places where most of the business was concentrated. For population is so concentrated in areas served by such a relatively few points that no other result would have been possible under such a policy.

It is safe to say that if the Civil Aeronautics Act had been in effect 10 years ago there never would have been the disparity in size between the air lines which the C. A. B. inherited.

C. A. B. IS CORRECTING DISPARITY BETWEEN AIR LINES

While the Civil Aeronautics Act has been in effect since August of 1938, it must be remembered that no new route cases have been entertained since Pearl Harbor until very recently, due to the war and the shortage of equipment. Therefore the C. A. B. had only about 3 years from the time it settled down to business in which to begin rectifying the disparity in size between air lines which had resulted from the conditions prevailing before 1938.

During that time it made substantial progress. For the year ending June 30, 1938, the route miles of the four largest air lines represented 61 percent of the total. By the last fiscal year, however, that percentage had fallen to 52 percent. In other words, the route-mile relative position of the smaller air lines has improved by approximately 25 percent under the Civil Aeronautics Act—even though the C. A. B. had available only about 3 years in which to take action. Had the smaller carriers not run into war conditions and equipment shortage this improved route-mile position undoubtedly would have resulted by this time in a sharply improved relative revenue position as well.

CONCLUSION

The minority report contends that there is a monopoly in air transportation. It contends that the Lea bill by extending the Civil Aeronautics Act would foster this monopoly.

In the first place, the alleged monopoly is not as acute as the monopoly conditions in rail and bus transportation, where State jurisdiction has always existed, as the minority would have it for the air. So leaving the Civil Aeronautics Act limited to the strictly interstate business will not lessen the monopoly.

Furthermore, local operations cannot grow up free of Federal regulation, for, as the minority report itself confesses, such operations in the air field are dependent on interstate business. Therefore, for such operations the Lea bill will mean less regulation and expense and burden of Government than otherwise, since it will provide for only one set of regulation instead of duplicating regulation.

Likewise, Civil Aeronautics Act provides for competition and against monopoly. The C. A. B. has interpreted and applied it in that light. The industry supports the C. A. B.'s view.

Finally, the C. A. B. has already made substantial progress in correcting a disparity in size between the air carriers—a condition which it inherited from the days before the Civil Aeronautics Act. This progress has been especially notable in view of the short time available due to the intervention of the war.

There is every reason to believe that if the Civil Aeronautics Act is extended as provided in the Lea bill a healthy balance between air carriers will be attained. For then the Civil Aeronautics Commission will be able to apply the constructive principles of the act throughout the air-transport system.

Child Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me recently over the radio:

One of the burning problems which all the world is interested in is child care. The Chelsea Defense Council, feeling that during the month of December the emotions of our people could be more easily aroused to this vital problem, designated 1 week in this month for their child-welfare program. This program has not only been endorsed in Chelsea, the district I represent in Congress, but has received the endorsement of all our community organizations. It deserves the support of everyone, regardless of race, creed, or color in this tremendously important problem.

All of us realize, of course, that there can be no satisfactory substitute for the loving care that parents bestow on their children and for the benefits their children enjoy.

But in these days when so many mothers are turning out the munitions and other products which are speeding our march to victory, something must be done to relieve them of the understandable anxiety engendered by the fact that while they are at work, their little ones may not be watched over carefully enough; may not get the food and rest and general guidance which they need.

As a Member of Congress, I have had occasion to study official data on child welfare. Also, while a member of the Legislature of the State of New York for many years I have given careful attention to this very vital problem. I have thus been in a position to discover that much of the success that we have achieved in obtaining women replacements for the men who have entered the services has been vitiated by the turnover among women, which is larger than among men, worried as these mothers are about their children.

Likewise, a good deal of the absenteeism among women employees—a problem which must be eliminated if there is to be no delay in our march to Berlin and Tokyo—results from the same understandable anxiety.

Clearly, then, some arrangement must be made, and promptly, to solve this situation.

That is why the child-care centers, with their scientifically trained personnel eager and able to give the little ones loving, personal attention, can make their contribution, and as a Member of Congress I intend to use my best efforts to bring this about.

In my district in Chelsea we are fortunate in having child-care centers which have been in existence for considerable periods, have proved their worth and won the community confidence, and are now prepared to embrace the larger number of children in need of such facilities today.

I intend to urge upon my colleagues in Congress to establish child-care centers throughout the breadth and width of our land.

We must help those unfortunates who have lost their helpmates and who have families of children and who find it necessary to go to business. They must and should be a part of this program.

Now permit me to quote from a statement issued by the chairman of the committee on child care of the Chelsea Defense Council:

"While the boys of Chelsea are fighting on every front for the freedom and future of our children, we, aware that more and more of our women are leaving their homes to replace men joining the armed forces, seek to acquaint every family with the facilities near their home for the care and recreation of their children. We wish to determine every family's needs for child care and to explain to every family the importance of proper child care and after-school recreation for their youngsters.

"We know that men fight better and women work better when children are safe. Children today are getting less attention than in peacetime Children today need more care because they are living in wartime.

"Children grow up only once. It's our responsibility to see that the first time counts."

If mothers cannot be with their children at home during the day, we must find places in our community where children can be well cared for and where they may be able to obtain help. Such community centers will prevent juvenile delinquency and will be a deterrent to crime, which is so prevalent among our youth today.

Arctic Bus Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress last year I had an opportunity as a member of the House Committee on Territories to make a thousand-mile bus trip of the Alaska highway, which was recently completed and is doing an excellent job in furthering our war effort and furnishing means of contact between continental United States and Asia.

Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, aide de camp to Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, of the Northwest Service Command, has written a very interesting and informative article on the bus trip over this highway, which appeared in the Argus in the Christmas number 1943. The article, which I include as a part of my remarks, is as follows:

ARCTIC BUS RIDE

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger[1])

I am on a bus. I am riding on the most famous road in the world. The hills twist and pass. I look around me in the bus. It is the same kind of bus on which I might ride from my home in Portland, Oreg., to Seattle or San Francisco. It is exactly the same as the busses which daily serve Calgary, Alberta, and Atlanta, Ga., and Omaha, Nebr.

But this bus is not headed for Seattle or San Francisco or Calgary or Atlanta or Omaha. It is bound for Alaska. Since 1865 adventurous men have dreamed of traveling by land to Alaska. Now I am doing it—in a Greyhound bus. As if to emphasize the dramatic nature of our destination, the bus winds down a hill and rolls majestically across the suspension bridge half a mile long which spans the Peace River.

I look around me again. My fellow passengers are soldiers. Some are in the Air Corps, some the Engineers, some the Medical Corps, some the Quartermasters. Many of them are returning from furlough. Others are going to duty in the North for the first time. Most of them are silent. Near the back of the bus an Air Corps corporal plays Clementine on a harmonica.

We jounce on. The wheat farms of the Canadian plains begin to thin out. Fences and fields give way to dark brushland. The last threads of civilization are thin here. It has been several hours since we heard the final shrill farewell of a locomotive on the Northern Alberta railhead at Dawson Creek.

The shadows of evening commence to stretch like long fingers across the countryside. It is nearly dark when the bus stops at the United States Army camp at Blueberry, and we have our dinner. We eat pork chops and mashed potatoes in silence. Everyone is busy with memories—of family, friends, girls, all being left behind as the big blue and white bus moves on.

A tall Air Corps sergeant slips into the seat beside mine. He feels like talking. He is going to Fairbanks to duty. What is Alaska like, he wants to know. Does it really get 65° below at Whitehorse? Are there any girls in Alaska? Is the food good? How long do I think the war will last? Where do I come from?

He gets around to showing me a picture of his "tomato" back home. He takes it out of his wallet tenderly. She's a cute little cuddler, he tells me. Have I got a girl? I tell him about a long-legged girl with a trilling laugh. He listens seriously. Then we sit in silence for a while, companions in nostalgic misery.

Night has blacked out the land by now. I fold an Army blanket over me and settle across my seat on the bias. Sleep comes quickly. We all awaken as the lights in the bus flash on, hours later. We are at Fort Nelson, where the road turns sharply westward toward Alaska. I look at my wrist watch. It is 4 in the morning.

Two men have been driving our bus, each alternately sleeping and taking a turn at the wheel. Now two other drivers take over. E. R. Bavin, of Edmonton, and Grant Thompson, of Cranbrook, British Columbia, are replaced by Ray and Fraser Maxwell, brothers from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

As the bus leaves Fort Nelson, its fuel tanks replenished, the soldiers settle back to sleep once more. But I am wide awake; the sleep has been coaxed from me. I sit up in front and talk to Fraser Maxwell. I learn that all these drivers are men from the western Canadian division of the Greyhound Lines. They have come north voluntarily, signing up for stretches of 6 months each. If they stay the full 6 months, they get a vacation of 2 weeks at home. Most of them come from Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Vancouver, and Saskatoon.

Ten miles northwest of Fort Nelson the bus stops with a jerk. "Best coffee and pound cake on the road," Fraser Maxwell explains. We get out in the dark and hurry to a long lighted building. It is cold. At stools in front of a lunch counter we sit with mackinaw-clad construction workers and eat. The flunky grumbles when I ask for hot chocolate.

We climb back into the bus. The soldiers are still asleep. We are in the North Country now and the early winter darkness is loath to leave. Not until 8 o'clock does the first faint glow of dawn brush the sky. I look out the window. The plains have given way to mountains. We weave through the northern reaches of the Canadian Rockies. The timbered slopes stiffen into gaunt cliffs. Like crenelated battlements, granite crags frown down on the highway.

At Summit Lake, astride the Continental Divide, we have breakfast. I look at the daily menu tacked on the wall of the Army relay station. It tells me that First Lt. Edmond Waters commands the detachment stationed in this upland wilderness. And I learn what the soldiers at this remote mountain post will eat for the day:

Breakfast: Farina, tomato juice, hot cakes, fried ham, butter, jam, coffee.

Dinner: Onion soup, crackers, braised pork steak butts, canned sweetpotatoes, creamed cabbage, butter canned corn, lettuce, and pineapple salad with mayonnaise, baked apples, bread, butter, coffee.

Supper: Baked macaroni and cheese, canned Vienna sausage with hot sauce, string beans, sliced tomatoes, sweet mixed pickles, celery, raisin rolls with icing, bread, butter, peanut butter, coffee.

The soldiers are alert and wide awake as the bus rolls down the Pacific slope. Their songs mingle with the rhythmic noise of the bus. They sing Don't Sit Under the Apple Tree and When the Lights Go On Again. Then older tunes claim their attention. They go to work on O Susanna, and Alouetta, and I've Been Working on the Railroad. The harmonica player has joined in, and a Medical Corps private has produced an accordion which swells the chorus.

I lean back in my seat and look out at the twisting peaks. For eight decades men have dreamed of traveling by land to Alaska. Lincoln, Seward, Bulkley, Kennicott, Collins, Teddy Roosevelt, Tony Dimond, Will Rogers, Mackenzie King—great names in history and great names in the history of the North—all at one time or another envisioned this experience which I was having. Overland to Alaska. The Alaska highway. It was a travel legend to conjure with, ranking with the Burma Road, the Oregon Trail, the Khyber Pass, the Union Pacific, the Cariboo Road, the Northwest Passage.

And so we rolled on across the British Columbia uplands. Ever north and west our course persisted. We bounced past the old Hudson's Bay store at Lower Post, and I remembered the story that Jean Louis Coudert, Catholic bishop of the Yukon, had told me. Only a year earlier he had reached his parishioners at Lower Post by traveling by dog team, canoe, and on foot. It was a rugged journey he had made with a Royal Mounted constable and an Indian guide. Now he could get there in a Greyhound bus.

I wondered what the old voyagers who built the log buildings at Lower Post would have thought had they seen our bus passing at 45 miles an hour. In a way, I am sure it would have astounded them more than the four-motored bombers soaring majestically overhead.

At the Watson Lake relay station, the Maxwell brothers gave up their driving posts and wearily sought out the barracks reserved for bus drivers. Their places were taken by Bill Cherlenko, of Lethbridge, and Fred Emms, of Calgary. It was Fred's first week on the highway, and he was still goggle-eyed at the experience of driving for a thousand miles and not coming to a single town or village. "Some wilderness," expressed his primary reaction.

On we rolled, toward our second sunset on the road. I thought of Fred's comment. We had been traveling nearly 35 hours and averaging 25 miles an hour, yet we had not come to any settlement. Here on the North American continent was an immense forest and mountain fastness, dotted only by isolated Indian villages, Hudson's Bay stores and mounted police posts; and now by relay stations and airports of the R. C. A. F. and the American Army.

Some day many Americans and Canadians—nay, people from all the lands of the globe—might make this journey. But now for the duration of the war, it would be an experience confined to those associated directly with the war effort; soldiers and their officers, civilian construction workers, Mounties, R. C. A. F. personnel.

Already many illustrious personages had seen all or part of the highway by bus—the Governor General of Canada and his wife, the Princess Alice; Congressman Homer Angell of Oregon, Senator James Scrugham of Nevada, Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York, Delegate Anthony J. Dimond of Alaska, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, the Federal Works Administrator; Frederic A. Delano, former head of the Burlington Lines.

"You would not think," Congressman ANGELL had said, "that it would be possible to ride so far in any one direction and still see nothing except wilderness. The journey on this road is a tribute to the United States Army Engineer troops, and their civilian associates, whose toil cut a road through these endless forests and mountains."

Our bus jounced on. We cross the headwaters of the Yukon River, and looked down

[1] For the past 16 months Capt. Richard L. Neuberger has been stationed at Whitehorse in the Yukon as aide to Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, builder of the Alaska Highway. Captain Neuberger recently wrote in the Saturday Evening Post that theirs was the coldest post under the American flag last winter. When he entered the Army in the early summer of 1942, Neuberger took leaves of absence as a feature writer for the Portland Oregonian, as correspondent in the Northwest for the New York Times and as a member of the Oregon State Legislature.

at the greenish torrent which would end its individuality in the Bering Sea, 2,100 bleak miles away at St. Michael. I wondered what Jack London, who had taken boatloads of Klondikers through these uplands, would have written about our bus with its load of soldiers. I am sure he would have gone back through the skein of all our lives and woven a tale to match those of the men who traveled here by dog sled and hand-hewn raft.

As we rolled along the road that the soldiers built, I thought about the divergent beginnings—and the probable divergent destinies, too—of the men riding with me, and of the men along the road. I had just learned from Corporal Phur, the Signal Corps photographer, that he once had hiked, alone, all the way from the Alaska Railroad to Timberline on Mount McKinley; and that he had shipped on a steamer which tried the Northeast Passage above Siberia and the grim Lena River. And at the Coal River relay station I had eaten bacon and eggs cooked by Pvt. James Carson, who had been the golf professional at the famous Big Foot Country Club in Harvard, Ill.

And I thought about the soldiers who had hacked this road out of the wilderness—soldiers from Nebraska and Florida and Vermont and Pennsylvania; clerks and lawyers and blacksmiths and truck drivers, Jews and Protestants and Catholics and agnostics; big men, small men, fat men, and lean. A Catholic commanded the regiment which hacked through the mountains into Whitehorse, a Jew was the first officer to give up his life on the road, a hard-hitting white regiment—the Three Hundred and Forty-first—slashed through the wilderness between Fort St. John and Fort Nelson, and a unit of Negroes kept friendly pace with their efforts by bridging the icy waters of the Sikanni Chief River in only 84 hours, standing in a glacial torrent to their armpits to do the job.

And as the sun came up again and our bus chugged across the Yukon solitudes, it seemed to me that in the universality of this job we had proof undeniable that the spirit which thrust the railroads across the continent and sent Lewis and Clark to Oregon was still alive in the American people.

Private Initiative Needs Revitalizing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Private Initiative Needs Revitalizing," written by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and published in the January 1944 issue of Domestic Commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INITIATIVE NEEDS REVITALIZING

(By Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce)

As we enter the New Year and our third year of active participation in World War No. 2, the need for preparing for the reconversion period by all segments of business grows daily more imperative.

Nor is this need contingent on an imminent victory. The precise day, month, or even year when peace will be declared is not for us to predict. But we do know it will come and that we will be among the victors.

However, it is possible that this most disrupting of all wars will end suddenly. There will be no time to plan calmly and intelligently for a smooth transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

MANY WHOLESOME INDICATIONS

To be sure, there are many wholesome indications that post-war plans are in progress. Topflight members of the free-enterprise system and civic and business organizations are already hard at work seeking the solutions to apparent problems before they arise.

But what of the thousands of smaller business firms without any affiliation with groups and lacking adequate managerial skill to plan for their future? What is happening to that basically American characteristic—private initiative, the quality that impels men to broaden their vision, take risks?

War has created an abnormal economy. Production of machines of destruction and equipment for our fighting forces has superseded everything else. More than that, it has been necessary to leap far past what we ordinarily considered our capacity. We have had to turn out more ships and tanks, guns and planes, than the pre-war durable goods they have replaced on our assembly lines. It has also been necessary to weave more wool and cotton, rayon and nylon, than was manufactured for civilian use. We have had to raise and process more food; build more merchant vessels to transport war matériel to our own armed services and those of our allies.

And so it is not surprising that our national product has grown to approximately $180,000,000,000 a year; our national income to about $150,000,000,000.

BIG BUSINESS' WARTIME ROLE

It is significant to note at this point that the major production and consequently the larger share of profits are in the hands of big business. These facts are perfectly natural in a wartime economy. Only the highly organized large industries of our country could have wrought the conversion and production miracles that we are already taking for granted, and only through such miracles have we been able to convert and advance to offensive warfare.

However, it now behooves us to give careful thought to all business outside the inner circle of our highly profitable present economy. How is this largest segment of our free-enterprise system faring?

Certainly these smaller units have survived considerably better than anticipated in January 1942.

Stocks of goods proved to be greater than predicted. Substitute materials surpassed expectations, and those traits inherent in American businessmen—grit and tenacity and hard work—have not waned. As a result, manufacturers unable to produce for war, wholesalers, retailers, and those in service lines have remained in business in larger numbers than was thought possible.

INEVITABLE HARASSMENTS

Despite this, the fact remains that they have been harassed by manpower shortages, material scarcities, transportation difficulties. They have been restricted by the many necessary Government regulations. They have been burdened by excessive taxes.

As long as the war lasts these problems will remain. For this reason the outlook for smaller business establishments is serious—one that deserves the most studied consideration and definite, constructive planning.

Indeed, steps must be taken now if these important private enterprises are to play their essential roles in the peacetime era to come, and what are these roles?

First, small business must be stable and prosperous for the good of the entire economy, for it is an axiom that big and small business are dependent on each other. Without the smaller, the larger firms would cease to function smoothly and prosper as they have prospered in the past.

Second, our employment goals can never be reached unless there are thousands and thousands of small employers. Any doubt of this should be quickly dispelled when considering estimates made by the Department of Commerce. According to these, there were in 1939 more than 2,750,000 small business concerns in the United States. Employers and employees in these enterprises numbered more than 8,350,000 people.

Surely we can't afford to be without this reservoir of jobs and profits.

A third small business role concerns its essentiality to small community life. Our Nation is predominantly made up of small towns and cities. Their business life is predominantly in the hands of smaller establishments. When they all financially the entire community suffers. And whether the wartime expediency of decentralization in manufacturing remains after the war or not, the many small producers and distributors will be needed in a thriving state.

Fourth, small enterprises must be maintained because they are the essence of democracy. Without them private initiative with its accompanying risk-taking will be stifled. Without them the democratic system as we have known it will cease to exist.

The Department of Commerce in discharging its mandated responsibilities—to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States—continually seeks to uphold and strengthen all segments of business, the small no less than the large units. Since Pearl Harbor, however, it has been particularly aware of the dangers arising from war-created changes in the normal pattern of our economy.

SMALLER UNITS NEED SUPPORT

Today this Department sees the danger of a concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a relatively few private enterprises in the post-war period if less powerful businesses are allowed to become impotent and enervated, if private initiative is not encouraged.

President Roosevelt in his message to Congress, April 29, 1938, in answer to which the Temporary National Economic Committee was authorized, went directly to the heart of the problem in these sentences:

"* * * the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becames stronger than the democratic state itself. That, in its essence, is fascism—ownership of government by an individual, a group, or by any other controlling private power.

"* * * the liberty of a democracy is not safe if its business system does not provide employment and produce and distribute goods in such a way as to sustain an acceptable standard of living. * * *

"The small businessman is unfortunately being driven into a less and less independent position in American life. * * *

"Business enterprise needs new vitality and the flexibility that comes from diversified efforts, independent judgments, and the vibrant energies of thousands upon thousands of independent businessmen. * * *

"But generally over the field of industry and finance we must revive and strengthen competition if we wish to preserve and make workable our system of free private enterprise.

"The justification for private profit is private risk. We cannot safely make America safe for the businessman who does not want to take the burdens and risks of being a businessman."

In conclusion, the President described the inquiry then proposed as "a program to preserve private enterprise for profit by keeping it free enough to be able to utilize all our resources of capital and labor at a profit * * * a program whose basic purpose is to * * * turn business back to the democratic competitive order."

The Department's agreement with this philosophy is proved by its broad policy defined in these fundamentals of a free and democratic economy.

1. That uncontrolled concentration of wealth and the accompanying trend toward monopolies are not healthy to the national economy.

2. That the rights of free entrance into and exit from business should not be abridged.

3. That small businessmen are entitled to a fair chance and full opportunity in the competitive system.

4. That voluntary investment of capital in business enterprise, under the profit system, should be encouraged.

5. That the access of small business to capital and long-term credit should be facilitated.

6. That small enterprise should be helped to improve its management methods and practices.

7. That small business should be assisted to develop its opportunities through access to experience-tested research and business counsel; and

8. That the management talents of business leaders within communities should be stimulated to coordinated action in the interest of community self-help.

PLANS BROADEN AID

In addition to sponsoring these policies, the Department, through its Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, has formulated plans to broaden its program of specfic aids to business.

The new program calls for the preparation and distribution of (1) external studies which will apply to all industries and trades collectively, and (2) internal studies which will apply to specific industries or trades or individual enterprises.

Under each of these two major classifications projects will be conducted in problems of management-administration and of operation. Such studies, it is felt, will compensate to a marked degree for the lack of research and statistical facilities, plus other managerial skills possessed by large companies.

The Bureau with its rich storehouse of economic data is the logical agency in Government to fill this gap.

Thus, the Department of Commerce is demonstrating its belief in a free competitive system of enterprise. Within its capacities it will constantly seek to increase and to improve its contributions to the system. It will continue to fulfill its obligation to represent business interests in Government; make known to policy-making agencies its problems and requirements.

But as we view the year ahead of us with all its uncertainties the necessity of broad and deep and all-inclusive planning for the reconversion period appears in the foreground. In this picture we see smaller enterprises standing side by side with the larger. All need to prepare now for the post-war period.

We in Government and business leaders and private organizations can formulate the plans. But to make them work there must be a virile, courageous, and revitalized upsurge of private initiative.

America Needs Deeper Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "America Needs Deeper Faith," delivered by me at All Souls Unitarian Church, Washington, D. C., on January 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are looking into the dawn of the crisis in our generation. Like the sunrise of every new day, the dawn of this new year radiates hope and sparkles with opportunities.

As no man rises higher than his ideals, so no nation or world of men will rise higher than their faith in their God, in one another and themselves.

Therefore, at this moment, and throughout this year of opportunity, let us make sure that our faith is as broad, as high, and as deep as our opportunity. It must be as broad as the world, for horizons are a thing of the past, as high as the heavens and as deep as the soul.

The opportunities, the sorrows, and the hopes of this year will be deeply personal as well as national and world-wide. Let each of us, therefore, within himself today unbuckle the limits on his faith, let each of us resolve to be as great of soul as he can be. In doing so let us also remember that there is nothing too small as well as nothing too great for the Father of Man with whom we seek to associate ourselves. There is no such thing as comparative size in heaven, or on earth if the will of God, as we so often pray, be done on earth as it is in heaven. Our effort, therefore, should be to do the most we can to understand and to help to meet the daily broadening, rising, and deepening opportunities for service to God and man, as the horizons of today give way to the miracles of tomorrow.

A glimpse of one simple change in the physical opportunity for a new and greater faith has come to us with the plane and the radio. A mention of it may help to lift us a bit from behind the blinders of the past and to see more clearly the new dimensions of the life of tomorrow.

For the first time man can travel to, and see, humanity the world around in a few hours. He can talk to them, even now, all at once. Man's physical power for good and for evil has multiplied accordingly. God has given man a precious new talent. It is for man to develop its use in the service of God.

Flying is a direct help in the development of personal faith in God and man. It develops more faith to fly than it does to walk. He who flies feels inevitably a lively interest and faith in the laws of nature and the miracles of science. He who flies experiences a grateful realization of the faith he can place in his fellow men—be they the designers and workmen who built the plane, the mechanics who serviced it or the radiomen and pilots who guide it. Every passenger has a peculiarly deep faith in and sentiment for his pilot. He who flies also develops a deeper faith in his won purposes for he is willing to risk that flight for the added time and opportunity that it will give him to carry out his purposes.

The young people of today and the future know more of this than we. Courage is a product of faith. The courage of our young flyers is something new in the world. The young fliers of today who are fighting our front-line battles of the air are developing, in a school where life and death both are teachers, a faith in God, in their fellow men and in themselves, that is almost inconceivable even to their own parents.

It is, therefore, for all the world, an especially for us in America, to be worthy of this new opportunity and to fit it with a faith that will meet it fully. It is for us to be sure that in our daily lives, in our Government, in our churches and in all our purposes and plans we are equal to the opportunity that is ours and for which so many fight and for which so many have given, or soon will give, their very lives.

There is a deep religious message to be brought to the world on this. It will be a message full of the suffering and the longing of the starving, the oppressed and the wounded. It also will reflect the hopes of the ages and of our youth for a standard of peace and of justice worthy of the sacrifice made for it. It will seek to make sure that every thought and act of tomorrow shall be consistent with the broadest, the highest and deepest thoughts of man.

This morning I shall touch upon the governmental phase of it. I shall try to draw added faith and confidence for our future from the example of those who in like time of crisis have displayed a faith in God, and man and themselves that marked progress in their time equal to the progress we seek in ours.

Eleven generations ago there was founded in America a unique government based solely upon faith and character. This took place when, on November 21, 1620, the Mayflower Compact was signed on that little ship in Massachusetts Bay. That compact demonstrated the faith of which I speak. The Pilgrims held a patent from the Virginia Company granting them rights to soil and to local self-government in Virginia. The hazards of weather had brought them to Massachusetts where their patent had no legal effect. Being without an authorized government for their proposed colony, anarchy on a small scale impended.

Reduced to the bare elements of their personal resources, Elder Brewster and the other Pilgrim Fathers invoked their common faith in God as the basis of their purpose on earth. Relying upon Him, one another, and themselves, they cut the Gordian knot of legal entanglements by establishing their own government responsible to God and themselves. Armed with this charter, the strength of which was in the character of its signers, they landed on Plymouth Rock and the history of organized freedom began in America.

The Mayflower Compact long remained the colony's fundamental source of authority. These fearless, religious men did not hesitate to let their religious faith show them the way. They had drafted what was a natural extension to civil circumstances of the customary church covenant founded upon the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It was helped to demonstrate that man is worthy to be trusted.

Five generations later, equally difficult crises faced the signers of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Again deep faith in God, in man, and in themselves guided the authors.

We miss the major significance of our Declaration of Independence if we read it merely as a recital of complaints against George III. Its authors intended it also as an expression of universal truths to which freemen could always adhere.

It is the vitality of these truths that has given direction to America. It is to this source that we will do well to return to set our course before we embark on the uncharted seas of world-wide human relations.

Abraham Lincoln, in 1858, in the face of America's greatest internal crisis admirably demonstrated the scope of the reasoning behind our Declaration of Independence.

He said of his forefathers and ours, "These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the

Creator to his creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all his creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

A few years later Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation and the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States were adopted to prohibit slavery and the denial or abridgment of the right of citizens to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Having thus adjusted our internal affairs to the scope of Lincoln's interpretation of the original principle of our Declaration of Independence, we have steadily sought to develop here a society dedicated to individual liberty. Our progress has been a beacon of hope to oppressed humanity.

Today we approach another crisis. We are in the midst of the second attempt of certain nations in one generation, to subject the world, by force, to their dictation. Again we are fighting a life-and-death struggle in the old contest between individual liberty and perpetual slavery. Again, at unspeakable cost, the forces of freedom are beginning to win. Again, we shall give all that is necessary, even to life itself, to make the victory for freedom complete.

Yet, unless that victory leads to a just and lasting peace with reasonable assurance of stability and of rising standards of individual liberty and happiness the victory will not be worthy of the high price paid for it.

From the front a young man wrote to his mother: "Please don't change the furniture in the living room, please don't change the pictures on the wall, please don't change a thing on the mantelpiece. I want to see home, when I come home, in the way I think of it and dream of it." Putting that in a larger sense, this young man says to America, through his mother, that he wants to see America, when he comes home, the way he thinks of it and dreams of it—a land of freedom, opportunity, and peace for himself, his wife, his children, and his children's children—well worthy of the price which he and his companions are paying for it.

We owe it also to humanity to demonstrate the soundness of what we preach. To do this we must face concrete issues within our country, within our hemisphere, and around the world as realistically as our forefathers faced the issues of their time. There will be military, economic, social, political, and spiritual issues. Each solution will be difficult, but for each there is the same touchstone—that of the deep faith in God and man on which America was founded. Each proposal must pass the test of contact with that stone in order to be consistent with the purpose of America.

Within our country we have already the essential forms and structures of governmental, business, social, and religious freedom based upon our Declaration of Independence. Our need is to apply them with a vigorous renewal of the faith they were created to serve. They exist not for the suppression of the individual but for expression of his will. The genius of American Government lies not in dictation and discipline but in freedom and fairness. We need to breathe into our every governmental act full faith in our fellowmen and full faith in ourselves. In concrete terms this calls for: Universal educational opportunities for advancement, the greatest possible freedom of religious thought and expression, the greatest possible opportunity for personal initiative and advancement compatible with corresponding opportunities for the rest of the people. It means everlasting faith that all of us are the children of the same God and that any governmental policy that forces the interests of the people as a whole to yield to the special interests of any individual, or of any group or bloc of individuals is a signpost on the road away from freedom and toward domination. Policies based upon a fair and equal opportunity for all are the only ones consistent with our fundamental principles. Policies which combine unfair benefits to many personal groups or blocs for their own advantage to the disadvantage of the whole amount to an abdication of the trusteeship for the people as a whole in favor of a trusteeship for a part of the people.

Wherever individual initiative can proceed it should be encouraged to do so up to the point where it would injure the public unless restrained or where the public needs protection against unfair practices. It is for the benefit of the public that the individual, without fear or favor, shall have the opportunity to prosper. This policy calls for faith in the individual and for fairness both toward him and by him. Likewise it prohibits the use of arbitrary force or unfairness by him, for him, or for the Government itself. Economic dictatorship is as dangerous to the individual as any political dictatorship. There is no more room for economic slaves and masters than for political slaves and masters. Lincoln may well have referred to both in his exposition of true democracy.

Lincoln wrote: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." Those are the inspired words of Abraham Lincoln. He wrote: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master" of someone else to be my slave.

His faith was in the freeman, neither slave nor master. He preferred to be free rather than to be master. That is the faith on which real freedom depends. It is the answer to the specious reasoning of benevolent dictatorships. A master is as much a badge of slavery as is his slave. Faith in the capacity of freemen to govern themselves is the expression in terms of government of the principle of individual liberty as opposed both to perpetual slavery and to allegedly benevolent despotism. It is the expression in practical community life of the principle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is as fundamental as it can be. It places the responsibility and the opportunity fully with the individual. Any shifting of this faith from the free common man, except as he directs it, lessens his opportunity to develop or to use his personal capacities in accordance with his ideals. Only when you have more faith in the wisdom of allowing men to govern themselves than in the wisdom of even your directing them what to do, do you have the faith of our founders and of Lincoln.

It is upon this faith in the individual man that our Nation is founded, and I believe that it is upon this faith that its salvation depends. I believe that man justifies this faith and the progress of mankind depends on man's increasingly deeper faith in his God, his fellowman, and himself.

In the Western Hemisphere, we face a similar situation on a broader scale. Again we have a structure developed in the interests of freedom through our Pan American Union to serve all members of the Union with mastery by none over the rights of others. The need here again is to implement the machinery we have with a common standard of faith in God, in man, and ourselves. While each nation is expected to be the guardian of its own interests and of its own citizens, its action in relation to other nations and other citizens should be taken with a view to seeking fairness to itself and permitting individual liberty to others rather than seeking mastery by any arbitrary force.

In the world as a whole, however, we need to create structures as well as to implement them with vigorous faith. It is here then that we need to set our course with special care.

We seek freedom from mastery and from slavery on an international scale comparable to our freedom from mastery and slavery on a personal scale. Having won the opportunity for this international freedom from the domination of the Axis only by the greatest of sacrifices of blood, sweat, and tears, our first obligation will be to establish a physical security for that freedom corresponding to the strength demonstrated in the winning of it. As long as the world-wide championship team of United Nations that will have won this global war remains intact, there will be reasonable assurance that the resulting peace will remain intact from a military point of view. If any member, however large or small, were to leave that team, that act would at once create uncertainty. Such uncertainty would lead to efforts to offset it by military preparations or alliances. Therefore, as a practical matter, in the field of world affairs our first responsibility to our young men is to make sure that all of the United Nations, including America, remain at least as much united in time of peace as they are in time of war.

I have great hope that, strengthened by the tragic lessons of two world wars in one generation, the united and associated nations of the world will sustain an international agreement amongst them with the same dependability that the signers of the Mayflower Pact sustained their personal compact. If the present standards of civilization are to progress or even hold their own, it must be clear by now that some standard of good faith is necessary among the nations comparable to that which was established among themselves by the peace-loving Pilgrim Fathers lest they be destroyed by the lawlessness of the others, either from within or without their colony. The instinct of national self-preservation, under modern conditions of world warfare, should be as urgent a uniting force as was the community instinct of self-preservation on the wild and hostile coasts of early New England. The German forces seeking mastery of the world for the second time in 25 years have taught the peace-loving nations of the world that to abandon each other means defeat and slavery, while to support each other means victory and freedom. If experience can teach anything, this lesson never will be forgotten. If the nations of tomorrow will but put their own faith more deeply in their own free people, I believe that those people will demand both the continued unity of the Allies and the maintenance of the peace once it has been won. If we believe in this, we the people of America should lead the way.

Buttressed by the penalty of another world war for failure to do so, I believe that the leaders of the world will yield to the demand of the people of the world that they be permitted to live at peace with each other and that they undertake together to maintain that peace against all lawless aggressors as they have maintained internal peace against lawbreakers amongst themselves.

Political, economic, social, spiritual issues will arise but none are insoluble if the people concerned have a common faith in each other and in themselves.

Where authority is vested in the free people themselves, or in their freely chosen representatives, they have faith in themselves and in each other and there is comparative peace. Only where authority is separated from the free people themselves can the old curse of mastery and the fear of the loss of it enter in.

The duty of the people of America is to keep their own purposes and practices clear and high. This Sunday, as we the people of America meet in our churches, our offices, our homes—yes, as we meet in our military and naval units—we have a special duty to perform. Let us give our deepest appreciation to those who have given their all or who have suffered for our cause. Let us pledge our every effort and aid to those who are carrying on. Then let us renew our own understanding of America. Let us refresh our faith in the freedom which is America that we may make it more real. Let us say with Lincoln, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master," and let us mean it, especially the last clause. "I would rather be free and doing my share than be a master of someone else who is to do my share for me. To make this possible I will do my full share both in peace and in war." That is the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, that is the faith of our forefathers. "This expresses my idea of democracy," said Lincoln. "Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." That is the true brotherhood of man. That is consistent with the complete fatherhood of God.

Let this elemental American faith shine out from our hearts and lives today. Let us deepen our faith in God, in man and in ourselves until we can say on our own accounts, "As I would not be slave so I would not be a master of someone else to do my share. I am doing my full share for freedom, and as a freeman, in the armed forces, or in my home, in my church, in my factory, in my business, in my city, in my country, in my hemisphere or in my world. I am free and I am glad to do my share and more, so that I may stay free."

Let us make sure of this so that when the young men come home from the front they shall find here for themselves, their wives, their children, and their children's children the cordial, the strong, the inspiring America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave" of which they think, of which they dream and for which they fight.

The Bank of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota has been much criticized for launching a scheme of State ownership. The Bank of North Dakota was one of the State-owned industries set up by the Nonpartisan League, and after several years' trial at the banking business, no party in North Dakota can now be found who will openly advocate the abolition of this institution. This bank stood through all of the 9 Dust Bowl years and during the depression which began in North Dakota in the fall of 1920, and the following bank statement challenges any privately owned bank in the United States. The board of managers of this bank are: The Governor (a Democrat), the attorney general (a Republican), and the commissioner of agriculture and labor (a Republican).

An examination of this statement will reveal the fact that undivided profits and reserves now amount to $270,287.33 more than the capital stock. In other words the people of North Dakota now own a great financial institution that has paid for itself, and as time goes on the profits of this institution will decrease the tax burden of every taxpayer in the State.

The statement follows:

The Bank of North Dakota—Statement of condition Dec. 31, 1943

RESOURCES

Cash and due from banks	$10,659,892.54
U. S. Government securities	39,623,050.00
State bonds and certificates	1,953,000.00
Municipal securities	2,447,527.36
Less reserves from profits	414,919.14
Total	2,032,608.22
Bills receivable:	
Loans to State institutions	1,986,209.75
Other collateral loans	17,296.55
F. H. A. title II loans	135,936.75
Total	2,139,443.05
Less reserves from profits	30,125.46
Total	2,109,317.59
Bank building and site	1.00
Furniture and fixtures	1.00
Real estate owned and sold on contract	18.00
Total	20.00
Total resources	56,377,888.35

LIABILITIES

Deposits of treasurers of Government funds:	
Demand	$23,457,594.60
Time	18,900,305.92
U. S. Treasury war-loan account	1,411,433.75
Other deposits:	
Demand	6,224,252.80
Time	2,055,194.64
Total deposits	52,048,781.71
Cashiers' and certified checks outstanding	58,819.31
Original capital investment	2,000,000.00
Undivided profits and reserves	2,270,287.33
Total liabilities	56,377,888.35

(All securities are carried at par value or cost, whichever is lower.)

New Year's Day Message by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by President Roosevelt on January 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many of us in the United States are observing this first day of the new year as a day of prayer and reflection and are considering the deeper issues which affect us as part of the family of nations at a crucial moment in history. It is fitting on this day that we direct our thoughts to the concept of the United Nations which came into being on another and infinitely bleaker New Year's Day 2 years ago.

It was but 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor that the Declaration by United Nations was promulgated at Washington. Twenty-six nations subscribed immediately, eight more have adhered subsequently, all pledging themselves to stand together in the struggle against common enemies.

Two years ago the United Nations were on the defensive in every part of the world. Today we are on the offensive. The walls are closing in remorselessly on our enemies. Our armed forces are gathering for new and greater assaults which will bring the downfall of the Axis aggressors.

The United Nations are giving attention also to the different kind of struggle which must follow the military phase, the struggle against disease, malnutrition, unemployment, and many other forms of economic and social distress.

To make all of us secure against future aggression and to open the way for enhanced well-being of nations and individuals everywhere, we must maintain in the peace to come the mutually beneficial cooperation we have achieved in war. On the threshold of the New Year, as we look toward the tremendous tasks ahead, let us pledge ourselves that this cooperation shall continue both for winning the final victory on the battlefield and for establishing an international organization of all peace-loving nations to maintain peace and security in generations to come.

Relief for Starving Children of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] on January 8, 1944, concerning Senate Resolution 100, having to do with relief for the starving children of Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Through the courtesy of this station I have been asked to use this period in discussing a resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator TAFT and myself known as Senate Resolution 100 and designed to initiate action which, it is hoped, will result in some measure of relief for the starving children of various countries in Europe now occupied by the Axis Powers.

It is urged that I explain as explicitly as possibly in the brief period allotted to me the genesis and purpose of the resolution. To do this it would be well to eliminate some confusion in thinking due to various pro-

posals to feed needy populations in the war areas. This explanation is necessary because there has been misconception that several of these proposals overlap in their purpose and effect.

When an area which has been occupied by the Axis Nations in invaded countries has been liberated through action of our military, it is inevitable that we find therein tremendous need for food, medical, and rehabilitation assistance for the people dwelling in those communities, who have been systematically robbed during the Axis occupation. The immediate responsibility is one for the military forces who have accomplished the liberation, but obviously their supervision must be of short duration, because their job is to pursue the vanquished forces of the enemy, and, in addition to this military demand on their time and effort, they are not equipped in organization or funds for sustained relief effort. It is essential that at the earliest opportunity the military be enabled to turn over to some United Nations organization the burden of feeding and assisting these liberated peoples. To do this work we have in process of formulation and establishment an organization known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This group will be adequately financed and will have a stupendous work to do, but their work cannot commence until the Axis armies have been driven from these areas, such as has been accomplished in north Africa, Sicily, and parts of Italy. But there are unfortunate countries in Europe that have been under Axis domination since their invasion by Germany the first year of the war—such nations as France, the Low Countries, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and many others. During the years of occupation Germany has bled these nations white of resources and supplies, of manpower, foods, and medicines. Because it has been to her interest to feed the men sufficiently to enable them to work in German industrial plants, these men have received reasonable amounts of food. But this feeding, as well as supplies sent to Germany itself, has been at the expense of the other helpless segments of the populations. The children, the aged, and, in many instances, the mothers have been subjected to such deprivation as to result in the death of many thousands through starvation, disease, and neglect, and the rapid deterioration of millions of others who will reach the end if not speedily assisted. It is for the purpose of providing some assistance to alleviate the dire needs of these people that the resolution referred to has been introduced in the Senate.

Many objections are immediately apparent in attempting this relief. First and foremost is the fact that early in the war Great Britain had imposed a food blockade against the Axis Powers and has been attempting to make the blockade effective through preventing the importation of foods into these areas. To get food to the children, the expectant mothers, and the most helpless would mean that such food would have to enter through the blockade and through agreement of the nations concerned, which immediately raises the question as to whether this could be done without making these additional food supplies available to Germany and her allies, rather than to those whose distress it is planned to relieve.

Other questions are raised as to the extra burden on shipping and on our food supplies and our available funds for purchase and payment. These objections seemed strong enough for many months to seriously jeopardize all humanitarian thoughts of assistance. But recently there has been such substantial change in the situation and such increased need for these helpless ones that it seems to those most closely in touch with conditions that the time has come when the help can properly be given. I shall list several of these changed conditions.

First, most of the occupied countries have their own funds available in this country and elsewhere for the purchase of the needed food supplies.

Second, shipping is available from neutral scurces such as Swedish ships for the transportation of these supplies without extra burden on our war shipping.

Third, needed food supplies can be purchased in Latin America and elsewhere without imposing a tremendous extra burden on our own supplies.

Fourth, the supplies can be distributed through the International Red Cross under neutral supervision without any appreciable danger of the supplies reaching the Axis, or being diverted to their use.

Fifth, these neutral agencies can carefully check to see that the supplies made available are supplemental to the rations now being received by the needy ones so that other foods may not be shipped out to Germany in lieu of the supplies sent in.

Every one of these situations has been met by actual experiment in the case of Greece, where, during recent months, there have been shipped from Turkey and from the United Nations large supplies of food for the starving without one pound being diverted to Axis use and through the utilization of the neutral shipping and sources of supply.

In addition to what I have just described, there is high military authority for the statement that there is little merit to the suggestion that the Axis would derive any military advantage from a broadening of the Greek experiment and that there is every reason to say that a great psychological advantage would be secured in counteracting the sentiment which Germany has been carefully fostering among these suffering people, to the effect that Germany would be glad to help them get food, but cannot do so because the Allied Nations are deliberately starving them, through the food blockade.

I do not have time to discuss the undoubted values in seeking to conserve these children for the needs of civilization in rebuilding the post-war world. These values are very real and very apparent to anyone who gives the matter thought. But even if they did not exist, every instinct of humanity calls for every possible action on our part to alleviate the pitiful conditions existing in these countries. The specter of mass starvation among friendly and noncombatant women and children is a tragedy that every compassionate heart in America wants to avert.

Dr. Kerschner, who testified before the Senate subcommittee relative to his own experience in assisting in the feeding of children in France, said that in some areas 70 percent of the children are now tubercular or pretubercular. Particularly moving were his statements that practically all of the children of the occupied countries are losing weight and have ceased growing, and that the normally made waistbands of the garments for children would not begin to go around the starvation-bloated stomachs of these little ones, and that there is no doubt that a whole generation of children are perishing.

I do not believe I could use the remaining minutes to better advantage than to quote verbatim from a recent statement issued by the Federal Council of Churches in America:

"Two years ago we joined in opposition to propaganda for the feeding of continental Europe. We were led to that action by these considerations: (1) Conditions demanded no such general relief as was proposed. Proponents of the scheme grossly exaggerated the extent of need. (2) The plan put forward was as impracticable as it was unacceptable. It could not have operated without substantial assistance to the Axis. (3) The scheme would have imperiled the British blockade, upon which depended the security of Great Britain. (4) The campaign in behalf of the scheme sought to coerce the British and American Governments by dividing American opinion. (5) The principal proponents of the scheme were isolationists or pacifists and their propaganda was being used to block effort for effective aid to Great Britain.

"At the same time, we pledged our efforts to explore every possibility for assistance to the stricken peoples of Europe which would not strengthen their conquerors. We believe that the time has now come when their present desperate condition must be faced, and limited and supervised methods for their relief must be taken.

"Today, after 2 years, the situation is radically different. (1) Privation is rapidly deepening into starvation. Unless such necessities as powdered milk and vitamins are made available, a very considerable proportion of the population of Belgium and possibly other nations may perish before the war's end. (2) Great Britain no longer stands on the defensive as solitary guardian of freedom for all. (3) America's place in the struggle is determined, and the peril of alienating sentiment in this country from Great Britain no longer exists. (4) The Allies are moving toward an offensive which will need the maximum physical and moral assistance of the subjugated peoples. (5) The spokesmen of the conquered nations are pleading with the British and American Nations for minimum assistance for the succor of their children. (6) Precisely the measures proposed to aid these people have been in operation for many months for the relief of starvation in Greece with the full approval of the Allied Governments. (7) The plan advocated has precedent at every essential point and involves no exceptions to the strict enforcement of the blockade which have not already been approved for relief to France, as well as to Greece.

"The plan proposes the provision of limited quantities of dried milk and vitamins to children, nursing and expectant mothers, and invalids only, the supplies to be purchased in the United States or South America, transported in neutral ships to a neutral port, transhipped in sealed cars to the areas of want, and distributed directly to those in most desperate need under the supervision of a responsible and trustworthy commission of neutral Red Cross officials.

"The supplies are available; money is at hand for their purchase; ships are ready for their transport; conditions and safeguards are identical with those now functioning in Greece; and the actual consummation would become operative only on the unconditional agreement of the Axis Powers to these terms and, in the event of any violation on their part, the operation could at once cease."

It seems to me that the statement which I have just quoted from the Federated Council of Churches, which organization strenuously opposed this action 2 years ago and which now whole-heartedly supports it, is a particularly cogent presentation of the original objections and the elimination of those objections under conditions which now pertain.

The resolution introduced in the Senate was reported unanimously to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee 2 days before the recess of Congress, with a recommendation that it be passed. It is probable that the resolution will be called up on the floor of the Senate for action early in the coming week. It is not probable that there will be the slightest opposition to it or a single vote cast against it. It simply provides that the people of the United States, through their Senate, express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment to other distressed areas and thereby prevent the impending tragedy of mass starvation in the occupied countries. It urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavor as quickly as possible to work out with our allies and the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and other governments the setting up of definite relief for all the stricken

and hungry countries in the occupied area where the need is now the most acute. But it cautions that this relief must be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protections of the native and imported food supplies with the most rigid safeguards that no military advantage may accrue to our enemies either in their civilian populations or armed forces.

Under existing circumstances we perhaps can now do no more than the resolution provides, but under every urge of humanity, Christianity, decency, and sympathy, we certainly can do no less. God willing, we shall liberate these areas within the coming months, but these children and these mothers need food now, or thousands cannot survive until the days of liberation. Enlightened self-interest, as well as every dictate of humanity and Christian charity demands our help, not next fall but now.

Duties of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post there is printed an editorial which contains some very wise, pertinent observations, worthy of most serious consideration. I quote the following:

Federal encroachment upon the domain of the States has made tremendous headway in recent years. That trend has been fostered by social and economic changes that have brought the people of all sections closer together and encouraged centralization of governmental powers. However, the broadened scope of Federal activities is in part an outcome of the States' failure to discharge the legislative responsibilities that fall within their jurisdiction. Hesitant, dilatory response to the changing needs of a dynamic society, or sometimes no response at all, have caused the American people to turn increasingly to Congress for the legislative relief that they fail to receive from their own State governments.

This trend toward concentration of authority in the hands of Federal officials is bound to gain headway unless the States counter it by positive measures of self-reform. One of the most important objectives of reform should be the removal of constitutional strait jackets that hamper legislative freedom of action. Now is the time for the States to get ready to deal with post-war problems by streamlining cumbrous and outmoded constitutions and junking antiquated laws so as to insure flexibility of their post-war legislative machinery.

I do not take too much stock in such terms as "outmoded," "ideology," "new concepts," "fuller of life," "American way of life," "freedom from fear," "freedom from want," "freedom from the danger of want," which may be interpreted as freedom from the necessity to practice the virtues of thrift, industry, and economy, and from the doing of one's own thinking and providing.

During my examination I have discovered nothing more destructive of that which a people must preserve in order to maintain free government, than the notion that everything must be provided for them by the Government.

Thomas Jefferson wrote to du Pont de Nemours these words:

You love them (the people) as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses, and I love them as adults whom I freely leave to self-government.

Even our States have not entirely escaped the blight of our growing dependence upon the Federal Government as a superguardian and provider, as we have moved away from the democratic philosophy of Jefferson, and the plan of nature for the development of human fitness, into the destructive bureaucratic philosophy of the Frenchman. Jefferson did not mean the people are to be abandoned by the Government, and neither does nature mean that. Government must provide a democracy in opportunity and keep that door of opportunity open. The weak must be protected against the strong. Facilities must be provided for the common benefit and the general interest, but the individual cannot, without the surrender of freedom and without the loss of the ability to remain free, escape the responsibility of life and those hazards and uncertainties of living from which come the interest and development possible during our short existence on this earth.

As we examine the present and look into the future, it is evident that the States must equip themselves to move quickly and efficiently in the resumption of the responsibilities of general democratic government. There is no chance for an efficient Federal Government, functioning as the agency of our democracy through its normal constitutional machinery, until it shall have been relieved of its governmental overload of non-Federal duties. On the other hand, there is no chance of the States preserving their vigor and governmental efficiency except by the resumption and exercise of their normal reserve powers and duties of general government.

As is indicated in this editorial, the States should look over their governmental machinery now, modernize it wherever possible; increase their efficiency exactly as an engineer would do with regard to the machinery of a factory soon to be called upon to increase its capacity and efficiency. One of the indispensable requirements, if these non-Federal powers are to be got away from Washington, is that the States not only be willing but be prepared to receive and efficiently exercise them.

Christmas Observances in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Christmas address delivered by me over the radio on December 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fundamentally, our Christmas observances do not change. Despite the horrors of war, human nature is not altered. The birthday of Him who planted His spirit in the souls of men means a great deal to the hungry hearts of people everywhere.

Let me tell you a story of World War No. 1 illustrating that truth.

It was Christmas Day, 1914. A strange Christmas, much like this one in 1943. Many of us hardly dared to utter the greetings or sing the Christmas songs; some said the words were now a mockery. Then, to our amazement and shame, there came the news that the true spirit of Christmas had manifested itself right on the battlefield. Across those war-torn fields rang out, from the English side and from the German side, the lovely old Christmas carols. The guns ceased firing, a great stillness came, songs of hate turned to hymns of peace.

A British Tommy scrambled over the top, his arms full of packages of cigarettes from his buddies, and carried them across No Man's Land to the German trenches. He came back laden with sweets and souvenirs—presents from the Boches. It is a wonderful thing for us to remember that on one of the saddest Christmas Days the world has known the old faith was born anew out there on the battlefield. If the men on the battle front can do that surely we here at home can keep alive in our hearts the spirit of Christmas.

Why, even one of our most beautiful Christmas poems takes cognizance of war. When our own country was torn asunder by civil war, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote:

"I hear the bells on Christmas Day,
The old familiar carols play,
And wild and sweet
The words repeat
Of peace on earth, good will to men."

But then came war; the poet sang on:

It was as if an earthquake rent
The hearthstone of a continent
And made forlorn
The household born
Of peace on earth, good-will to men.

And in despair I bowed my head
"There is no peace on earth," I said
For hate is strong
And mocks the song
Of peace on earth, good-will to men.

Then pealed the bells more loud and deep
"God is not dead, nor doth He sleep;
The wrong shall fail
The right prevail
With peace on earth, good-will to men."

We are forced to admit that there is much cause for worry and anxiety. We hope for better times, but we ought to know that we cannot improve the times unless we improve ourselves. The mood of the times is often one of despondency. Robert Louis Stevenson speaks of one whose entrance into any company was like the bringing of a lighted candle into a darkened room. It is a great thing to be able to do that.

Ten million of our boys and girls in the services on Christmas Eve throughout the world will be looking to the skies—seeing there the Star of Bethlehem and thinking that that same star shines on the old home and loved ones so far away.

They are thinking not alone of this Christmas, because after all, Christmas is a day of memories. It is a day for the reunion of the family—a day for worship and gratitude—gratitude for the message of the Christ, which provides the antidote to war hate, as illustrated by my story of a few moments ago.

These boys and girls of ours are remembering other years, and the Christmas tree in the parlor at home. They are thinking of the crisp snow, crunching underfoot as they walked the old familiar paths at home. They are wondering, and we are wondering, too, when again we will all meet around the Christmas tree in the old homestead.

It does not take a far step of fancy for us to imagine these boys of ours celebrating the birth of the Christ Child—no matter where they are—in the steaming jungle, some way or another they will have His tree hung and festooned with gay decorations they have gathered in their inimitable American way from places we cannot imagine. I will vouch there is even an exchange of presents—that theirs is the true spirit of Christmas and will give nothing bought in stores, but something of their own, far beyond the value of anything we might exchange in our homes here, for their offerings come from the heart.

With this boy of ours, or our neighbor's boy, are men baptized by fire—men who have fought together and who love each other as only men can who are dependent upon each other for their very existence.

The men of our services are singing men—they've always been singing men. I can visualize them on some tiny spot in one of the four corners of the earth, on this Christmas Day, singing the Christmas carols they learned at home, in the church, and in the school; and I have no doubt but what the spirit of Christmas, with all its inner meaning, will be theirs.

Undoubtedly, in camps, on the ships, the chaplains of the Army and Navy will bring to them the message of the Christ Child. "Fear not," said the Angel of the Lord to the shepherds, "for I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

For these gallant men, the "Peace on earth, good will toward men," sung on the first Christmas by the angels, will be a new battle hymn of the republic.

The Name which is above every other name, and the spirit of service personified by His life and teachings, have lighted a candle in this dreary world, which burns ever brighter as time goes on. Across the space of 2,000 years, the unstained radiance of the Star of Bethlehem shines even through the blacked-out rooms of dark streets, and through the carnage and hate of war, with the everlasting light of hope and faith for all mankind to see and especially for those who sit in the shadow of darkness.

The love of humanity is imbedded deep in the souls of men. The spirit of Christ will survive the attacks of all the evils throughout the centuries. It will continue to survive always; above the clash of arms, the triumphant song of Christmas will resound.

May I wish for all of you, my friends, and for this beloved country of ours, and for poor, tired humanity everywhere, the "peace that passeth all human understanding."

And to our allies, to all those brave people in the occupied countries this is the dawning of a new day. Christmas for the first time since 1939 means something to these millions who have been in virtual slavery. Hundreds of thousands of youngsters undoubtedly are hearing for the first time tales of the birth of the Christ Child and old St. Nick who fills children's stockings at the fireplace. Perhaps by next year they will be celebrating this holiday as we do.

Post-War Disposal of United States War Material and Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by Gus Rener which appeared in the publication Aeronaut, published by the P–4 V Committee of the Aeronautical Products, Inc., under the W. P. B. productions for victory plan:

I wonder why all this hellatabulla that our economists are worrying about, "What the United States Government is going to do after this war with all the equipment and material we will have on hand." Well, nobody is asking me, so I will tell you.

The Government should sell this excess equipment and material now, now! Yes, sir, sell that material and equipment to the American public right now, with delivery after the war. This plan is easy, not at all complicated, for it is as A B C; for example, you desire to purchase a jeep, a good used jeep for delivery after the war. First you will contact the military material disposal center in your State and sign a purchase agreement for umpteen dollars and then purchase umpteen dollars of Victory bonds at so much every pay or in one lump sum. When the war ends you have for yourself a jeep and the Government has disposed of their excess equipment now. Furthermore, your Victory bond purchase has hastened peace on the double-quick. The same procedure could be used in the sale of trucks, trailers, clothing, cars, planes, boats, food, machinery, buildings, tents, etc., in fact any material and equipment that the Government will have in excess after the war.

It is conservatively estimated by experts that the United States Government will have over $30,000,000,000 of excess material and equipment at the end of the hostilities. Therefore I estimate that the Government can sell at a fair price over $15,000,000,000 worth of this excess to the American public without too much trouble—right now, and not give it away after the war to foreign nations and profiteers.

The present demand for the after-the-war excess material and equipment should not in any way interfere with the switch from war production to peacetime production of civilian goods—because the purchase of a pair of military shoes by a hunter will not in anyway stop his demand for a pair of dress shoes. It must be remembered that this excess military equipment would be sold mostly to civilians while the post-war peacetime production will be sold to our returning soldiers. Let us not mix up the civilian demand for military material and equipment and the soldiers post-war demands for civilian goods. This problem is no problem at all, if the demands and sale to each group thereto are dealth with on a horse-sense rule. The contrary elements would be those foreign nations and our profiteers who are selfishly and anxiously awaiting to take the American taxpayers for another post-war trip to the cleaners like they did after the last war.

Furthermore each State and city and county should be given an opportunity to purchase a number of armored cars for the State police—city police and sheriff staffs—to be held in readiness for major disturbances and riots. Can you imagine what a few of these armored cars properly staffed by our police would have done to eliminate the victious murders committed during the Detroit race riot?

My plan is simply to sell the excess material and equipment to our American people now, allow them to safely utilize that excess buying power that is presumably floating around to a good purpose. The American public cannot purchase goods now because all our producing powers are converted into war channels. Then why not allow them to benefit somewhat from this by purchasing what of this wartime goods they can now for after-the-war deliveries?

Furthermore the Government would have the use of that money now when we need it.

So in conclusion I repeat—sell that excess after-the-war material and supplies now when the people who are paying the bills have the money to purchase them. Sell that excess now—for future delivery.

Meat-Price Manipulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address and memorandums:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE WALTER C. PLOESER BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHOLESALE AND NON-SLAUGHTERING MEAT PROCESSORS, FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE MEDINAH CLUB, CHICAGO, ILL.

Gentlemen, I well recall months ago when this organization was in swaddling clothes. At a meeting in New York, we were all greatly worried because of widespread disruption and much disaster in the meat industry. A number of your members told me on that occasion that they were ready to close business. They felt somewhat hopeless in the fight against the destructive O. P. A. policies. You who were there will remember my challenge to you to keep going and to fight. With few exceptions you have kept going since that date. You have fought for the good of the war effort and the civilian supply of the country. Some important battles have been won but the meat industry is by no means out of the woods.

I need not relate the history of the Government's management of the meat-supply problem of the Nation under price control and the War Food Administration before that date. The history of that brief and important period clearly relates a very destructive policy so far as the small and independent packers, the wholesalers, and the retailers are concerned. Many believed that governmental policies then and now are designed in such a way that the entire program plays into the hands of the big packers and to the detriment of the small units in the industry.

Few of us want to believe that anyone who professes a faith in the American system of free enterprise would be guilty of suppressing any branch of small business. It does not take a genius to see that the small-business units of the Nation, of whatever industry, are the keystone of free enterprise. As long as these small units exist in great number there is a guaranty of competition which is absolutely necessary to a free economy.

We all know that the moves made by the independent branches of the meat industry for the benefit of the Government's program were seldom supported by the big packers. We also know that the O. P. A. admitted that about 40 percent of the independent packing industry was being forced out of business. This is all a matter of record. O. P. A. refused to act and allowed the condition to persist.

Last July 3 a group, representative of the independent branches of the meat industry, developed a meat plan which was called the Ploeser program. It was presented by me to the responsible officials of the Government. It kept faith in every detail with the President's "hold the line" order. It was endorsed

by your organization and by the independent packers. It has the silent support of many others afraid to come out publicly, and this included some very sincere people in the O. P. A. This program embodied the very basic principle of ceiling prices at all levels. You know what has happened since. There has been a series of dodges and feints on the part of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration.

A few days ago a certain document came to my attention. This document was prepared by an important O. P. A. official of the meat and fish branch. I have a copy in my possession. It is a most severe indictment of price manipulation for the benefit of the few and of injury to the Nation. I am not prepared to pass my final judgment on the subject at this moment, but I assure you that it is of the greatest concern to you and to the people of the Nation. Accordingly, I am asking my chairman of the House Small Business Committee to hear these charges plus additional charges which have been well prepared by the Department of Justice.

This document which is now in the files of the O. P. A. has received no attention by superior officials in O. P. A. It is a story of the manipulation of price control which, if true is a story of a major disaster in war management. If true, it is a story of a dire threat in the post-war period for small business.

This paper, thoroughly documented, reveals that what seemed to be a blundering program to all sincere people, was in reality a careful manipulation by some of the big packing interests and Government agencies.

It reveals how the false inflationary stop known as the meat subsidy was applied in order to patch up the blunders resulting from bad management.

This indictment charges that certain Government agencies have conducted themselves in complete disregard for the President's "hold the line" order. You and I know that for a long time the O. P. A. operated in complete disregard of the act of Congress creating price control.

This indictment lends evidence to the fact that when in the middle of the muddle, when a courageous War Food Administrator sought to carry out the authority granted him, the very head of the Government failed to stand firm with the result that the entire anti-inflation program has been weakened.

Rather than pass hasty judgment I will do everything in my power to have the Small Business Committees, both House and Senate, review this paper and conduct an exhaustive investigation of the entire matter.

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 21, 1943.

To: James F. Brownlee, Jean F. Carroll, Henry M. Hart, Jr., Carl A. Auerbach, Arval L. Erikson.

From: J. D. Hyman, chief counsel, Meats, Fats, and Oils Branch.

Subject: Attached report on meat-price control.

The accompanying report concludes that the War Meat Board is not interested in effective price control; and that the activities and influence of the Board, far from making the slightest contribution to effective price control, have been consistently inflationary. These conclusions are fully documented by written records. It is therefore unnecessary to add that, in the judgment of the writer, they are supported by the evidence of a year's intensive contact with the industry.

In protest proceedings, the Big Four have taken the position that they are entitled to a bookkeeping profit on fresh-beef operations. Our data show they never received it, but that, on the contrary, the industry normally carried on fresh-beef operations at a loss. The War Meat Board's report on the beef problem proposes alternative courses of action all of which would give the large packers a profit on fresh-beef operations. No mention is made on the historical facts. And no consideration is given to the crucial difference between the situation of the small, nonprocessing slaughterer and the integrated packer, a difference which creates our most serious price-control problem. This conduct is an almost contemptuous disregard of price control.

The conclusions of this report must, at the very least, govern the attitude with which we receive price recommendations of the War Meat Board.

It may be noted that the apparent success of the War Meat Board in guiding price-control policy has led to requests for the formation of other similar groups.

PRELIMINARY—CATTLE AND BEEF INDUSTRY

1. Assure cattle industry that approximate level of present prices will prevail. Ask Vinson for decision regarding passing on to consumers the necessary price increase or secure subsidy at packer level.

2. Establish cattle ceilings and ceilings at all levels to consumers. Give War Meat Board current responsibility for maintaining proper balance in live-cattle prices between various markets—all to revolve around prices pegged at Chicago.

3. Recognize need for seasonal variations in price. Must bear some relationship to normal flow to markets.

4. Change relative levels between grades of beef to discourage sending feeder cattle to slaughterers. Modify roll-back subsidy so that feeders can compete for feeder cattle. Packers now have unfair edge.

5. Establish quota or allocation system for all slaughterers so as to provide fair distribution of live cattle to all slaughterers—must stick.

6. Review all margins at all slaughter-processing-distributing levels—with help of industry. Give War Meat Board responsibility to recommend needed changes now (and currently needed changes later) in margins and allowances.

7. Put teeth into licensing system. Extend license system to cover wholesalers, processors, slaughterers, retailers, industrial users, and institutional users. Revoke license of willful, flagrant, or continual violators (due process of law).

8. Educational work for American Meat Institute.

(a) Back up home-front pledge with advertising.

(b) Pledge all elements of meat industry to live up to spirit of meat rationing and price control.

(c) Establish industry control to smoke out black-market operators and bring them to legal justice.

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 21, 1943.

To: Mr. Jean F. Carroll, Director, Food Price Division.

From: J. D. Hyman, chief counsel, Meat, Fish, Fats, and Oil Branch; Arval L. Erikson, Head, Meat Section.

Subject: Cattle and beef industry.

In the absence of Mr. Elkinton, we are submitting a brief discussion of the points raised in your preliminary memorandum on the above subject.

1. An increase in retail meat prices is absolutely out of the question. The heart would be cut out of the administration's roll-back program. And in the face of the enormous current profits of the meat packing industry, a general subsidy is not legally necessary and would be indefensible. Our real problem now in meat-price control arises from the loss being suffered by numerous nonintegrated cattle slaughterers. We are proposing a differential subsidy to take care of them. With that, it should be possible to hold present meat prices without causing any substantial decline in prevailing cattle prices.

2. We are now continuing our work on cattle ceilings, and we should be prepared with a plan for immediate use if and when needed. But we cannot legally fix prices at Chicago and delegate to the War Meat Board, directly or indirectly, the power to establish ceiling prices for cattle at all other markets. Moreover, it would be indefensible to give such power to a group which is dominated by and reflects primarily the interests of the Big Four.

3. With the inevitable large number of items, seasonal variations in price would destroy the effectiveness of our dollar-and-cents retail ceilings on meat. Our experience with several commodities has shown the difficulty of educating consumers and retailers to an understanding of fluctuating dollar-and-cents prices. Except in connection with lamb, the industry never seriously urged that seasonal price changes for meats were necessary. Moreover, the conditions which caused seasonal price fluctuations are largely eliminated by a demand situation which permits sellers to obtain ceiling prices at all times.

4. Until a policy is evolved as to the desired amount of cattle feeding, the existing relationships between grades of beef cannot intelligently be changed. So far, W. F. A. has not laid down any policy. If greater spreads are necessary, they should be secured by reducing the price on the lower grades, not raising the price on the higher grades.

5. A system of allocating cattle to slaughterers should be worked out, especially if cattle ceilings prove to be necessary. It should be noted, however, that an allocation system would be an instrument of oppression for the small packers if operated in conjunction with the fixing of cattle ceilings by the big packers as proposed in paragraph 2.

6. We cannot legally delegate to the War Meat Board power to determine processing margins and profits, apart from the ethical or political aspects of the problem. Our experience for over a year has shown that the industry almost invariably recommends prices which we have found on analysis to be unduly high.

7. Broader application and stricter use of licensing controls are desirable.

8 (a). The public relations aspect of meat control should be primarily the responsibility of this Office, not the American Institute.

8 (b) and (c). While the Office welcomes the cooperation of the industry in uncovering violations, and several cooperative arrangements to that effect are operating successfully, it is the policy of the Office not to allow any industry to control our use of the statutory sanctions or to use extralegal sanctions to enforce our regulations. The discretion necessarily involved in applying sanctions should not be lodged in those who may be subject to the pressure at other considerations.

THE WAR AGAINST MEAT-PRICE CONTROL

FOREWORD

The objectives of the Office of Price Administration in regulating one of the scarcest commodities, meat, is to provide for the requirements of our armed forces, assist our allies, and make available an equal share to each consumer at prices no higher than those prevailing on September 15, 1942. Meat is indeed scarce for, notwithstanding the greatest production ever achieved in our history, the needs of our troops and of our allies, coupled with our enormous civilian demand made possible by an unprecedented purchasing power, are so great that the supply is still insufficient. Unless proper controls were developed to achieve these fundamental purposes, meat would go only to the highest bidders; our civilian population and our armed forces would be engaged in out-

bidding each other for the commodity; the funds appropriated to prosecute the war would be dissipated in this competition; and the struggle for higher wages in order to keep pace with the rising cost of living would lead to domestic unrest and inflation.

The program necessary to realize the objectives is nearly completed. However, without a total war mobilization program, which binds each force to the common purpose, the program remains in danger, ever subject to an undoing which will spell inflation. The needs of our fighting men and of those of our allies have been given first consideration. After estimating the quantities which they must have, the remainder of meat is rationed to our civilians on a fair and equitable sharing basis. This is achieved through the use of a system of point rationing. Meat prices are established on a geographical zone basis at retail and wholesale levels. Wholesale and retail cuts are standardized throughout the United States and prices are fixed by grades. Retail stores are divided into two classes and the prices throughout the zone for each class are uniform. Thus each consumer should pay substantially the same price for the same grade and cut within the geographical area. Retail prices are calculated to provide a fair and equitable margin to protect retailers through the war emergency. This has been accomplished by building fair and equitable retail margins on fixed wholesale prices.

One major task remains undone which threatens to upset this fundamental war purpose. The price of the raw material, livestock, is uncontrolled. Contrary to all expert opinion shared in Government, industry, and producer spheres, wholesale price control has proven unable to maintain a level of livestock prices which permit a profitable operation on the part of a substantial number of slaughterers. The steady rise of livestock prices has already driven many small packers and wholesalers out of business—those prices are advancing to devastating levels. It is now the purpose of the O. P. A. to control the price of livestock. In doing so, a fair and equitable margin must be fixed for packers, wholesalers, and processors, as has been done for retailers. This is not to say that the needs of farmers and producers will be ignored. A fair price is contemplated for farmers and producers, adequate to encourage and maintain the optimum of production according to our labor and feeding resources. To the extent that a necessary level of livestock prices conflicts with the established level of wholesale and retail prices, subsidies or purchase and resale by the Government are necessary. These techniques may also prove essential to preserve nonintegrated or partially integrated segments of the industry.

Unfortunately, all interests are not directed toward the purposes stated here. Small packers and wholesalers have implored and petitioned their Government for this program. Large packers and producers are more than noncooperative. They have undertaken to frustrate it. The following report reviews their program and the steps which they have taken to achieve it.

Vacillation has brought meat-price control to a critically dangerous stage. While O. P. A. hesitates and flounders about for its next move, strong and powerful forces lurking behind the scenes and clothed with Government authority are steadily pressing a program which, if successful, will be the death blow to price control and the stabilization program. If meat control, the most significant commodity, fails, there is great likelihood that it will carry the rest of the cost-of-living commodities with it. The course charted by those who would destroy the stabilization program crystalizes into a double pronged attack. Constant pressures directly brought by the industry and indirectly exerted through the Army, F. D. A., the War Meat Board, and legal proceedings, are focused on O. P. A. to increase wholesale meat prices; no effort or suggestion has been put forward by these forces to fix the cost of livestock. Secondly, recognizing the possibility of livestock ceilings, notwithstanding their opposition, they have carefully laid the groundwork for a level of livestock ceilings which is too high and will breach wholesale and retail prices.

An analysis of the events of the past 6 months clearly reveals the formation of a coalition between the big packers acting under the guise of the American Meat Institute and farm inflationary officials of the Department of Agriculture. This coalition finds its official spokesman in the War Meat Board which has already undertaken to carry out the program of the American Meat Institute and which has met with consistent success in O. P. A. The infiltration of industry representatives into responsible Government posts, the support of a radio commentator, pressure lobbying before Congress and the agencies and the resort to litigation are some of the tactics employed to insure the success of the program. These charges we recognize are serious; they must, therefore, be carefully documented.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN

On February 23, 1943, the American Meat Institute appointed a committee to study wartime industry problems in order that proper recommendations might be made to appropriate Government officials.[1] That committee, in turn, appointed 22 different committees which undertook 55 assignments. The committees were made up of more than 200 of the best qualified men in their respective lines, representing all segments of the industry. Some of these committees stayed in session practically continuously for from 1 to 3 weeks.[1] From the reports which trickled out of those conferences to O. P. A. officials, there appeared to be sharp disagreement in almost every committee. Small packers were squarely opposed to large packers. There was no agreement between these groups over any of the detailed considerations of the meat price regulations. Finally, a report[1] dated March 19, 1943, was issued and submitted to the Director of Economic Stabilization through his agricultural adviser, Marvin Jones, to the Price Administrator and to Claude Wickard, then Food Administrator as well as Secretary of Agriculture. The report was ingenious, since it avoided any attempt to reconcile the differences of its committeemen over specific details of price control and appeared to unite them behind a program on which they could all agree, a simple and harmless panacea which would obviate all price control. Throughout, these conferences were dominated by the Big Four, which controlled the "screening committee" to which each subcommittee made final report.

The keynote on which the program was founded was that demand was out of balance with supply at prevailing controlled prices. This was due to the abnormal demand caused by war procurement agency needs and the enormous consumer purchasing power. Measures were needed which would control the demand and relate it to the available supplies, and then normal economic factors would come back into operation.

To achieve these results and permit the economics to operate with a minimum of Government controls, the plan recommended:

1. The Army needs come first; those must be ascertained and provided for. (No technique was suggested for assuring the satisfaction of those needs.)

2. A fixed quantity provided for the civilian population must be determined and earmarked. (Consumer rationing was recommended but the quantities allotted were not to be obtained by allocation techniques. Weekly planning was to achieve the latter.)

3. Lend-lease requirements, too, must be planned and obtained from the supply so that a tight allotment of available supply must never be more than 100 percent at any time.

4. To balance the demand as outlined in 1, 2, and 3, each week's available supply must be known and slaughter must be controlled by a quota-permit system.

5. The plan contemplated the establishment of an organization, a meat management board, which would balance the two economic factors on a weekly and even daily basis. The Government must furnish rigid enforcement of the rationing and slaughter control methods to effectuate the plan.

A fortuitous observation is injected in the plan which is then contradicted by the fundamental conclusion. "Proper price relationship must be established all the way from the livestock producer and feeder through slaughtering and processing to effective retail price levels." Now of itself, this seems to imply a program of over-all price control as a complement to the five points above. This is completely negated, however, by the principal conclusion—"with full control of slaughter and effective control of the three elements of demand (war procurement agencies, civilian, and lend-lease)[2] all other controls become unnecessary. An efficient job can be done at these two levels only. * * * It should be possible by capable management in a central control office to regulate the total tonnage needed by kind, allocation to each of the three major outlets so that the relationship of this total tonnage demand to the total tonnage of available supply will create from day to day a price level which the Government Administrator chooses."

The report continues to make the point that the methods adopted by the Government were improper and as a result inequities among different groups developed. Consequently, to achieve the program, certain interim and temporary measures are necessary during the transition from existing controls to the proposed plan. The interim procedures recommended were:

1. Equitable and proportionate delivery by all eligible packers to armed forces;

2. During the early stages of formal consumer rationing, it will be necessary to maintain wholesale and retail price ceilings. The attempt of the meat-management program should be to bring actual prices under such control that they will not be pressing on ceilings. When the ability to do this has been demonstrated, the plan is working and price ceilings can be eliminated.

3. While ceilings remain, prices must be adjusted in proper relation one with another. This means that as long as ceilings are a limiting factor Government business must yield a return comparable to civilian business. (The meaning of comparable return was not elucidated.)

4. In view of the time necessary to effectuate the program, the board of directors of the institute adopted a resolution which included the following conclusions:

(a) There should be an immediate increase of wholesale pork prices or else during the interim live-hog ceilings should be fixed and hogs allocated.

(b) No plan is workable or practical for ceilings on cattle, calves, sheep, and lambs.

(c) Until supply and demand are brought into balance, wholesale prices should be increased.

---

[1] A copy of the report Principles Underlying the Proper Solution to Wartime Meat Problems is appended as exhibit A. The American Meat Institute is chiefly financed and dominated by the Big Four.

[2] Matter in parentheses added.

Now the essential features of the plan were no innovation; consumer rationing, specific retail price control and slaughter quota control were in the course of preparation by the Government agencies concerned and were near issuance when the plan was conceived. The principal packers and the institute knew of these facts. They had been consulted on many technical matters, though many small firms who did not come to Washington and were not informed by those who had consulted were in the dark.

Coordination of demand and supply was meritorious and the Government accepted it. However, there were numerous facts which the plan did not account for. The bypassing of wholesalers and nonslaughtering processors in sales of fresh meat, the development of monopolistic tendencies behind the price line, the method of allocation in meat management without specific allocation, the problem of allocation without a specific price, the interim proposals of wholesale price increases to keep pace with livestock price increases and the absence of demonstration that livestock prices would not pursue the new carcass levels, were some of the problems which troubled O. P. A. and which the industry did not undertake to clarify. During March and April, live-hog prices had gone to unprecedented highs since the World War No. 1 period, and O. P. A. was striving for the issuance of a live-hog regulation. Hundreds of protests were filed by small pork packers and processors. Nothing in the plan served to explain how live-hog prices would not exceed their already too high levels if O. P. A. accepted the proposal and increased pork prices. Even the qualified reference to live-hog ceilings was merely lip service on the part of the institute. When the proposal of the Meat Institute plan became known in London, it apparently caused some consternation. As a result, the President's special emissary, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, cabled the following message through the State Department to an official of the Department of Agriculture:

LONDON, *March 29, 1943.*

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington.

(For Appleby, Agriculture; from Harriman.)

I would like to reemphasize some points made in detailed reports on mechanism of food control which I have sent Mr. Hendrickson. United States program as reported here seems particularly weak in area of prerationing controls. Structure appears contrary to whole British experience which shows that simple consumer rationing plus general reservation orders or unadorned points plan are not sufficient to provide degree of control required for proper distribution. Unless there is specific and positive Government action to assure that that supplies are assembled and distributed to the right place at the right time all evidence here indicates that rationing system will break down with supplies wasted, rations not met, queuing, considerable portions of supply flowing in black market, and generally most undesirable situation from point of view of conservation of supplies, equitable distribution, nutrition, and morale. More specifically, British experience strongly indicates that only really effective device for securing necessary tight control of inflow into system, avoiding impossible price situations, assuring proper allocation of supplies, and effecting maximum economy in manpower and transport is monopoly purchase and sale of essential commodities by Government or unified Government-supervised trade organizations. Simple back-flow of points is not sufficient in itself to achieve these ends. If full bottlenecking of supplies is impossible next best thing is Government purchase and sale of portion of output to be used as balancer supply to be shipped to shortage areas rapidly as need arises. Other devices felt here to be essential for fully effective control including licensing of all handlers and consumer and retailer registration with suppliers, emphasize that these full-scale controls are only felt to be necessary for commodities which are essential to the diet and in seriously short supply and particularly for commodities in this group which are perishable. Where these conditions are present, however, feeling here is very strongly that there is no really effective alternative to devices mentioned above and that increasingly difficult situation is inevitable unless the United States moves toward adoption of them with, of course, such adaptations as are necessary to meet special United States conditions, as rapidly as possible.

MATTHEWS.

The Economic Research Section of O. P. A. independently reviewed the program of control by rationing alone and concluded that prices would continue to rise and in turn destroy the rationing system.[3]

In April 1943, 1 month after the issuance of the Meat Institute report, a new organization appeared with a program for solving wartime meat problems.[4] It called itself the Livestock and Meat Council, and 107 organizations subscribed to its program. One hundred and six of the subscribers were livestock producer and distributor organizations and the one hundred and seventh was a packer organization, the American Meat Institute. The program was verbatim the institute plan of March 19, 1943, with one notable exception—no reference was made to interim live-hog ceilings or to any consideration of the problems of livestock ceilings. Instead the institute plan would completely solve the problem. The Meat Institute had enlisted the producers' organizations and with them the farm block in the fight against price control. Suddenly a new authority on meat problems took to the air. Fulton Lewis, Jr., took credit for the plan and held a series of conferences with the Price Administrator designed to bring about unqualified acceptance. But O. P. A. price officials were still intent upon establishing the much needed hog ceilings and persisted in pressing that issue. Because of their efforts, they were constantly smeared and slandered by the air arm of the attack. In exchange for support from the producer organizations and their political allies, the Meat Institute yielded its position of a temporary or interim need for live-hog control in favor of no need whatsoever.

The Food Distribution Administration was placed under the authority of Mr. Chester Davis on or about April 19, 1943. Immediately the staff of that agency was expanded and packing industry representatives were placed in important administrative or consultative posts. Mr. G. B. Thorne, vice president of Wilson & Co., one of the Big Four, was named meat consultant. Mr. Wells Hunt, of the Schluderberg-Kurdle Packing Co., one of the largest packing houses east of Chicago, was also appointed meat consultant. Mr. Thorne was mentioned in the industry as one of the authors of the Meat Institute plan of March 19, 1943.

In May 1943 considerable pressure was brought on O. P. A. by representatives of the packing industry, the American Meat Institute, and the War Food Administration of the F. D. A. to join in the formation of a meat board for the purposes of coordinating supply and demand of meats. The plan was supported by the Army and broadly stated the revised program of the Meat Institute. The operating price officials in O. P. A., while in agreement with most of the stated objectives, feared some features proposed.[5] The board was to be composed principally of W. F. A. and industry representatives. O. P. A. was to have two members, one for price and one for rationing. The board was to be established in Chicago rather than in Washington. The board was to have authority to recommend price action to O. P. A. Because of the personnel, purpose, and operating techniques, the major concern was that the revised institute plan was being foisted upon O. P. A. and its opportunity to appraise the plan and developments independently would be encroached and eliminated. The industry was taking over with its plan for increased wholesale prices. O. P. A. felt its responsibility to the President's hold-the-line order of April 8, 1943, to a much greater extent than was being exhibited by W. F. A. and the industry. Pressed between the stabilization program on one hand and organized pressure, now from an official agency, for wholesale price increases, O. P. A.'s position would be made untenable, especially without subsidies. Nor did O. P. A. expect industry pressure exerted for price increases to be predicated upon production needs. The internal dissatisfaction which developed over the War Meat Board as it was taking form, culminated in an agreement by J. K. Galbraith on the recommendation of Mr. A. C. Hoffman, then Food Director and presently a W. F. A. official, committing O. P. A. to the board and transferring the supervision of the O. P. A. representative from the Meat Price Executive to the Food Director. In connection with the appointment of the O. P. A. representative, a delegation of packers called upon the Price Administrator. In response to an inquiry, they informed Mr. Brown that in their judgment no member of the meat price branch of O. P. A. was qualified to sit as the O. P. A. representative to the War Meat Board. Instead, they recommended Mr. Wells Hunt. The plan was in operation.

II. THE WAR MEAT BOARD FUNCTIONING AS THE MEAT-MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION UNDER THE REVISED INSTITUTE PLAN

Within a short period after its organization, the War Meat Board's activities fell into a definite pattern:

1. Constant pressuring for numerous wholesale price increases in the meat regulations and allocation by price.

2. Other price-increase measures intended to avoid W. F. A.'s responsibility to support its own hog-support price. (That hog-support price was fixed without approval; was increased without approval, and is artificially high.)

3. Conduct which constitutes a complete disregard for the President's "hold the line" order of April 8, 1943, and the Price Administrator's statutory responsibilities.

4. Official adoption of the revised institute plan as the method of handling the distribution of beef.

5. A deliberate failure to consider problems of livestock ceilings, while laying the groundwork for an unjustified high level of livestock ceilings.

---

[3] See report Does Meat Rationing Make Meat Price Control Unnecessary? (May 17, 1943), appended hereto as exhibit B.

[4] A copy of this report is appended as exhibit G.

[5] See exhibit D, letter of Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, to Chester C. Davis, War Food Administrator, May 5, 1943.

Clearly the problems of meat management or balancing supply and demand received a minimum of the Board's attentions.

(a) Pressuring for numerous wholesale price increases

The War Meat Board has consistently brought pressure for price increases in the wholesale meat regulations. Many of those have been reluctantly granted by O. P. A. The basic premise which the Board uses is that it is attempting to equalize Army prices with civilian prices in order to obtain the supplies for the Army. Many months were spent by O. P. A. in working out the price relations. Innumerable conferences were held with the industry. The industry had constantly held that the cost of doing business through branch outlets was properly calculated by O. P. A. and that the use of the equivalent sum as the carload discount in civilian sales was proper. However, the Big Four representatives, while showing no additional costs on sales to war procurement agencies, vigorously opposed the same discount on those sales. The reason was obvious; they were going to bypass wholesale quantity and distribution and expected that burden to fall on the competing smaller packers, but they knew they would have to supply the major portion of the Army business. So they were agreeable to a discount which fell on their competitors but which they would avoid. On the other hand, during the early stage of formulation when O. P. A. proposed a fixed price level with an addition permitted for middlemen distributors, the same big packers vigorously objected that this was discriminatory, that it was without historical justification, that it would compel them to close a thousand branch houses, and that they would be immediately compelled to take the matter to court.

In the absence of any showing that additional costs were incurred in Army business which were not incurred in civilian business, O. P. A. steadfastly insisted that no price differential was appropriate, that it would not adopt the policy of allocation by price, nor would it undertake pricing by reference to the highest realization obtainable in processing. O. P. A. further stated that any increase in Army prices would permit the sellers doing such business to bid more for livestock and thereby increase the squeeze on the more numerous small packers not engaged in such business. The Big Four accounted for about 90 percent of Army procurement. (This was prior to the adoption of the set-aside order by F. D. A. which the institute and Big Four vigorously opposed notwithstanding their proposed interim recommendation for equitable delivery by all eligible packers.)

On April 30, May 1, 3, and 4, 1943, the Meat Price Section of O. P. A. met with a committee of the American Meat Institute to discuss the problem of maintaining price parity between Army and civilian sales. All of the industry objections with respect to discount technics were reviewed and refuted by O. P. A. The other matters which made for unbalance were in the course of correction by amendment. A comprehensive report of the meetings was prepared for the Deputy Administrator, a copy of which is appended hereto as exhibit E. That report was reviewed with representatives of F. D. A., who became the officials of the War Meat Board and the Army.

Immediately protest was made. Only price increases would satisfy the F. D. A. officials. The Army was concerned about its procurement and efforts directed by the packers to force O. P. A.'s hand would interfere with it. They felt compelled to go along. More pressure was exerted. And the War Meat Board came into existence considering the entire problem from a single perspective—price increases.

In fact, Mr. Wells Hunt, the O. P. A. price representative to the Board, clearly revealed this purpose. In his report to that Board (minutes of June 22, 1943, p. 6) after reviewing his authority, Mr. Hunt indicated that the Board "have had two or three specific items to put in (to O. P. A.) as test cases. One of these is quantity discounts. We made a specific and definite recommendation. It was acted upon. Word was passed along, yesterday afternoon at 2 p. m., that, effective today, an amendment would be out canceling the present discounts and reinstating the ones that existed just prior to the ones now in effect. * * * Order was issued directly by Mr. Brown reinstating the set-up, status quo, as before. * * * I have every reason to believe, in view of this one test case, that we have a precedent established."

In quick succession each week brought new recommendations for price increases. Reduce carload discounts, eliminate wholesaler discounts, provide wholesaler additions, give special additions for new wrapping, icing, packaging, weighing, shrinkage—just increase prices. Not once did the Board consider a solution by way of price reduction, or fixing a margin through livestock price control. Each recommended increase, however meritorious (scarcely any valid cost evidence has been submitted) drove small packers into more desperate squeezes and pressed against a retail margin already tightened. At no time would the Board consider the problem for stabilization. The consistent policy of recommending price increases culminated in the report on the beef situation, approved by the Board on July 14, 1943. This will be discussed more fully at a later point.

(b) Price increase measures intended to avoid W. F. A.'s responsibility to support its own hog support price

As part of the Food Administration's program to bring about an expansion of live-hog production because of war needs, it was generally conceded that some assurance must be given to producers that they will not face speculative losses in cooperating. The Government agencies were in general agreement that a support price should be fixed for a stated period and if prices paid by packers went below the support price, the Government would purchase the hogs at the support price. Thus farmers would have a floor as assurance against their expansion. However, after consultation with Mr. A. C. Hoffman but disapproval by the Price Branch as to the appropriate level for the support price or its effect on established wholesale pork ceilings and the stabilization program, Mr. Wickard in November 1942, announced a support price of $13.25 per hundredweight.

On October 22, 1942, O. P. A. had issued Revised Maximum Price Regulation No. 148 establishing specific dollars and cents prices on dressed hogs and wholesale pork cuts. This regulation was in conformance with the act of October 2, 1942. Mr. Henderson, then Price Administrator, in the presence of Mr. Wickard, testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [6] that the regulation was based on hogs at $13.75 to $14 per hundredweight, Chicago; that at those live prices the regulation reflected a fair and equitable margin to pork processors, and that if live hog prices did not settle to the levels indicated "we will probably have to consider a recommendation which will insure that." Mr. Henderson referred to live-hog ceilings and had on other occasions requested that Mr. Wickard agree to their issuance. The support price of $13.25 per hundredweight was regarded as too high in view of the level needed to maintain a fair and equitable wholesale level and as leaving too little room for seasonal fluctuation.

Shortly after his succession to the Office of War Food Administrator, Mr. Chester Davis, without consultation with any member of the Meat Price Section, but with the approval of A. C. Hoffman, who informed Price Administrator Brown in the matter, increased the support price from $13.25 to $13.75 per hundredweight. The Department of Agriculture, quite apart from the effect of that action on the price regulations and the hold-the-line order, was committed to purchase hogs at $13.75 per hundredweight from the farmers, and the agency was without a program, funds, or personnel to accomplish its promise. It was gravely concerned on how to save itself when the price of live hogs started to break sharply in May of 1943.

By mid-April it became clear that live hog ceilings were supported by nearly all slaughterers, with the exception of the Big Four and some of the large independents. As to the latter, their increased volume through large Government sales and their extensive sales of profitable byproducts gave them cost savings not enjoyed by their smaller competitors. They could afford to pay the high hog prices—and chose to do so rather than take higher profits, knowing that high hog prices were stifling their competition. But they had not yet achieved perfect liaison with War Food Administration and with the producers.

As a result, on April 20, 1943, there was convened, pursuant to a prior agreement between the War Food Administration and the Price Administrator, a meeting for the ostensible purpose of considering and analyzing a hog ceiling regulation proposed by O. P. A. The meeting was attended by packers, wholesalers, producers, and retailers. Food Administrator Davis opened with a strong statement to the effect that hog ceilings would be imposed if the hog price did not drop appreciably within the next 3 weeks. This statement was notable because it indicated a united opinion among the interested Government agencies—a rare unanimity at that time and during the several months thereafter. The statement together with the seasonal increase in hog marketings had the desired result. For once confronted with a solid defense on the part of the Administration, the small group which had been out to sabotage livestock ceilings and price control temporarily gave up the attack insofar as pork was concerned. Hog prices declined to proper levels. The industry urges that the decline was due to rationing, effective in April. The same rationing program applied to beef, and in the same way as it applied to pork. Yet beef prices did not decline. The reason for continuing high beef prices is that there has never been an integrated effort by the executive agencies to control cattle prices—a fact well known to those who benefit by high cattle prices.

The rest of the meeting convened on April 20 was meaningless. Dominated throughout by Department of Agriculture officials opposed to livestock ceilings, it drifted into aimless discussion, and O. P. A.'s proposed ceiling was not even considered. Producers and big packers joined in the determined effort to avoid developing the technique of livestock price control; but they were still desperately worried by the Government commitment to put a ceiling price on live hogs.

On the other hand, the Meat Institute began to take credit for the break in hog prices. It was pointed out that the institution of rationing and the formation of the War Meat Board had broken the live-hog market. Meat management was a success. Fulton Lewis, Jr., acclaimed that his plan was working and packers were getting their margin and retail prices were not increasing. There were even sales reported below retail

[6] Investigation of the administration of the farm feature of the Anti-Inflation Act, October 26, November 10 and 20, 1942, pp. 52–56.

ceilings. Now was the time to scrap the entire price-control program. It was privately reported that in addition to other factors the big packers had gotten together with livestock commission men to bring down the price of hogs. They were not willing to rely too strongly upon the meat-management plan to prove the correctness of their assertion. Both Mr. Lewis and the institute omitted to mention the cattle situation; the same controls were applicable there, but cattle prices remained steady or rose.

In all this context the matters troubling the War Meat Board, when it met on June 22, 1943, were not difficult to appraise. The F. D. A. representatives were searching for ways to avoid paying the support prices. The report of the meeting is revealing.

"Mr. FRASER. It is hard to recommend an increase in price to keep hogs from going down when you have an increased run in hogs, and, presumably, your cost of operating is probably no higher than it was some time back when you had less hogs."[7]

The Board considered several alternatives to keep hog prices from going below the support price. Finally,

"Mr. FRASER. We still do not have an adequate answer if hogs break the floor. What would be your opinion of letting custom slaughtering contracts?"

(This would imply that the Army, and principally F. S. C. C., would support the price by purchasing live hogs at the floor or higher and having them custom slaughtered.)

"Colonel LOGAN. What is accomplished by protecting the floor at $13.75 other than saving the Department of Agriculture some money?

"Mr. FRASER. Our interest is in protecting the commitment of the War Food Administrator.

"Colonel LOGAN. Adjusting supply and demand is the job of this meat board, even if that adjustment means going through the floor."

The question was then avoided by the recommendation of Mr. Fraser in appointing a committee to bring in definite recommendations on how the War Meat Board is going to support the hog floor.

It is interesting to note that the O. P. A. price representative had a proposal for saving the Department of Agriculture from this embarrassment.

"Mr. HUNT. You have a series of alternatives of processing, each one of which gives you a different green realization, and, therefore, a different live relationship. Natural tendency is through those channels which give the highest green realization and working those departments and those processing channels to their capacity. Giving an illustration—if you make a price adjustment on frozen pork that takes it out of the penalty position."

It seems clear that Mr. Hunt wanted frozen dressed carcasses to have a price which reflected the same profit as that obtained in processing pork in the numerous ways. Since F. S. C. C. would be purchasing increased quantities of frozen carcasses and curtailing its processed pork purchase for the next several months, it would satisfy the Department of Agriculture representatives. Later on, the processed pork prices will obviously be out of line with green cut prices and require a corrective change—upward.

On June 23, 1943, the committee of pork consultants, presumably operating on the assignment of Mr. Fraser, submitted its report on "Maintaining floor $13.75 Chicago, live weight of hogs, 240–270 pound average."[8] This report is appended hereto as exhibit F.[8] Nine suggestions designed to save supporting the hog price were made. Two of them required O. P. A. action:

"3. Freezer allowance of approximately 50 cents per hundredweight and increase box differential of 25 cents. The marked weights at time of product going to freezer would be great aid to packer and the manpower situation if Government agencies would accept these first marked weights and perhaps with the shrinkage allowance."

* * * * *

"9. Quantity discounts."

The recommendations with respect to their suggestions—industry pork consultants—are amusing. They have the plan and cost accounting can be relied upon to give it merit.

"After giving consideration to the above proposals, we have selected as a means of maintaining the floor of hogs by selecting and asking for an allowance under No. 3 of approximately 50 cents freezer allowance and also a raise in the box differential of 25 cents. We would then ask for changes to be made in No. 9, quantity discounts. Our suggestion would be to cancel all quantity discounts on pork products now in effect and allow only one discount of 50 cents per hundredweight on carload sale. Also permit wholesalers to have mark-up on pork provisions of 50 cents per hundredweight and should be included in the applicable prices recommended in lieu of the 50 cents per hundredweight or the carload discount."

It should be noted that this recommendation is not made because of general unfairness or inequitableness in the regulation; its effect on retail ceilings is of no concern to its proponents; but it is urged as necessary as the means of maintaining the floor.

Throughout the subsequent considerations of the War Meat Board it is evident that the sole concern with respect to pork is to protect F. D. A. and that price manipulation is the method.

On July 13, 1943 (p. 2 minutes W. M. B.) Mr. Morgan reporting for Lend-Lease indicated that "the problem of freezing differentials was quite important in the efforts being made to acquire larger purchases of frozen meat. * * *" Mr. Daigneau the industry pork consultant, indicated that while frozen pork offerings were gratifying, "still the inequities remained with regard to boxing and freezing." (p. 2) Mr. Daigneau submitted his official report on this matter—"Although the offerings for frozen pork for the past 3 weeks have been gratifying, the fact still remains that there is a definite inequity in freezer allowances, boxing allowances and freezer shrink. We have made specific recommendations on these inequities and we would like to urge that pressure be brought to bear to bring about the acceptance of these recommendations." This matter reference is to O. P. A.

Other references serve to demonstrate that the principal concern of the War Meat Board is:

Minutes of July 13, 1943, p. 3: "Mr. Morgan said he had gone over Mr. Robert's report on canned meat and had agreed that it was quite important that F. D. A. curtail canned meat purchases to about the bases he suggested, provided there is assurance that it won't be a bearish effect on the hog market. The most profitable way to handle this meat is through the cans and if we are going to support the price of hogs, we ought to buy it in the most profitable way. * * *"

Minutes of July 14, 1943, p. 1: "Mr. Daigneau said it would not make any difference. (NOTE.—Here consideration had been given to even more ideas that would avoid supporting the support price.) Everything that has been proposed to keep these hogs at the support level contemplates the ability of the packer to slaughter them. The only answer is keeping the hogs on the farm and marketing them no faster than they can be killed."

"Mr. Meyer said he agreed. Packers in his locality could not kill any more than they are now killing."

"Mr. Fraser said you have your noninspected kill and your local slaughter. They look pretty bad with hogs selling below the support price and preventing nonquota slaughterers from killing this past week."

Minutes of July 14, 1943, page 2: "Mr. Fraser said it seemed to him that right now we are in a very critical time for getting this frozen pork. We have about the next 2 or 3 weeks to get September-October requirements of frozen pork and the fact that everybody in the industry knows that the freezing allowance is under consideration is a material hindrance in getting offers of frozen pork."

Exhibit 4, July 13, 1943: Report of Committee on Canned Meat: "We believe that a curtailment of the canned-meat purchases should be developed, but not put into effect until hog-price-support level is out of danger."

Minutes of July 20, 1943, W. M. B. (F. S. C. C. procurement report): "We are driving for larger offerings of frozen pork and plan to reduce purchases of cured meat items, which are not particularly needed, from packers who are not offering us what we consider reasonable quantities of frozen pork. * * * We aim to restrict our purchases of canned meat to about 18,000,000 pounds and believe lard purchases should be curtailed as soon as such action can be taken without endangering of the hog-price floor."

All of these excerpts and the events which occurred independently serve to demonstrate that while promulgating an unjustified and artificially high support price, F. D. A. was aware that its procurement of processed pork was virtually completed, that its termination of buying came at a time coincidental with the heavy hog runs, that to avoid its responsibility to its support price some measures had to be found to keep up the price of hogs. In order to achieve these purposes, two significant measures were necessary—(1) a profit incentive had to be held out for packers to sell huge quantities of fresh pork rather than processed pork, and (2) provisions had to be made for long-time storage allowances. All price recommendations from the War Meat Board affecting pork were calculated to relieve F. D. A. of its responsibility to support the support price.

(c) Conduct which constitutes a complete disregard for the President's hold-the-line order of April 8, 1943, and the Price Administrator's statutory responsibilities

From the two previous points it is unmistakably clear that the War Meat Board and its W. F. A. members as well as the industry members have utterly ignored the Executive order of April 8. No recognition has been given anywhere by the War Meat Board to the problem of holding the line on the most important cost-of-living commodity, meat. The direct and joint responsibility in that directive, which devolved with equal force upon the War Food Administrator received no attention. There is no doubt today concerning Mr. Chester Davis' disagreement with the stabilization program, but his resignation has not served to alter the policy of the operational officials of that agency, who are in turn acting as price officials through their posts on the War Meat Board.

The statutory responsibilities of the Price Administrator are broader than his duties under the President's orders. His, and his

[7] P. 910, minutes of the War Meat Board, June 22, 1943. It should be noted that the Board's minutes are not verbatim transcript but a résumé. All of the discussion does not get into the record.

[8] Exhibit F from minutes of War Meat Board, week June 22, 1943.

alone, is the duty to provide generally fair and equitable regulations.

When the Price Administrator suspended the generalized quantity discounts (which were introduced to effectuate the discount structure of the price regulations and establish price equality for Army and civilian sales) at the request of the War Meat Board, that Board was asked to submit a fair and equitable alternative plan which would not breach the retail price levels. The Board's proposal was the reduction of the carload discount, elimination of wholesaler's quantity discount, and provision of a full wholesaler's premium. Since the retail price ceilings were predicated upon those discounts, the retail margin was as tight as possible, according to the report of the O. P. A. Retail Distribution Branch, and retail prices could not be increased. The War Meat Board, through its price representative, was advised that any recommendations had to be governed by those three factors. No consideration was given them. The Board convened a retailer advisory committee, which, anxious to obtain meat, reported that it was more important that the proposals be adopted which in effect raised prices than to consider the question of a squeeze caused by the plan. That committee then refused to acknowledge any ability on the part of the retail trade to absorb the increase, and thus reserved the right to contest the retail price margins as unfair and inequitable. Notwithstanding this untenable situation, the Board urged the adoption of its proposal and submitted the Retail Advisory Committee report as evidence of the general approval on the part of the packing industry and the retail industry of the Board's proposal.

At the meeting of the Board on June 24, 1943, Mr. Hunt, the O. P. A. price representative, indicated "that at a slaughterers'-retailers' and producers' conference with (the Director of Economic Stabilization) Judge Vinson, a suggestion was made that all wholesale ceilings be removed on meat for 30 days. Mr. Hunt indicated that he was asked to get the opinion of the Board on this suggestion. (It does not appear who asked him to do this.) Mr. Hunt then reported that he had attended a retail mass meeting in Cincinnati to which he had been delegated by Mr. Prentiss Brown. The recommendations of this mass meeting were that a food czar be appointed and that wholesale meat ceilings should be removed, but not at retail level." (Discussion followed.)

"It was the unanimous opinion of the members of the Board, present at this meeting, that this was an opportune time to present the Board's recommendations to the O. P. A. These were to be written up and forwarded to Mr. Hunt, who was to leave for Washington that afternoon. This was done, and copies of the memorandum to Mr. Hunt are attached. See attachment No. 11." (All matters in quotes from W. M. B. minutes of June 24, 1943, p. 1.)

The Board on the same day wired its chairman, Mr. H. E. Reed, Livestock and Meats Branch, W. F. A., at Washington, D. C., to deliver a statement to Mr. Hunt entitled "Statement by War Meat Board With Reference Proposed Suspension of Wholesale Ceilings on Beef," instructing him that temporary suspension is not advisable at this time because price advance would adversely affect retailers and encourage widespread violation, resulting in wholesale-price structure getting completely out of control. Then, without any knowledge concerning the effect on retail margins and with complete indifference to the matter, the instructions proceeded:

"The Board agrees that the situation is so serious with respect to cattle and beef that prompt action must be taken to prevent complete chaos in the cattle and beef industry, and it is suggested that as an alternative to the proposal of suspending wholesale ceilings an upward adjustment be made in wholesale price ceilings on beef, variety meats, hides, and fats, and that this be done promptly. This action would serve as a safeguard in the prevention of run-away prices and as a protection to the retailer. It would also provide relief from the squeeze on slaughterers without rendering serious injury to other segments of the trade."

This is meat management in operation—rationing and the balancing of supply with demand bringing down prices so as to obviate the need for price control. Rather than to permit run-away wholesale prices from crushing the retailer's margin and compelling him to breach his ceilings, we shall protect him by a regulated squeeze upon his margin. It must be assumed that he is less likely to violate the law when he is legislated into hardship, or perhaps it was calculated to bring into position one more force to destroy price control. Ignorance cannot be imputed to a group of experts who reason that if livestock prices are bid so high as to cause a diminution of slaughter and loss to slaughterers in the presence of fixed meat prices and unprecedented demand, then the solution is to be found in increasing the meat prices. The Board stood ready to "submit promptly a detailed statement containing specific recommendations as to the amount of the roll-up recommended on each grade and type of product involved."

(d) The Board has officially adopted the revised meat institute plan as the method of handling the distribution of beef

That the actions of the War Meat Board and the Big Four were calculated to disrupt price control could be determined only by reviewing those actions cumulatively and in their historical development. However, in a document unanimously approved by the Board on July 14, 1943, the whole scheme is consolidated.

Mr. Scott, the principal beef consultant, indicated (W. M. B. minutes, July 13, 1943) that the "report of War Meat Board on the present cattle and beef situation, which was submitted to the War Food Administration, the Price Administrator, and the Quartermaster General,"[9] is based on the recommendations of the advisory committee and the result of discussions had at various meetings of the Board. The advisory committee is composed of packers, mostly the larger ones; and Mr. Scott, when not serving as principal beef consultant to the War Meat Board, is the head of the Swift & Co. beef department.

The report is divided into three parts:

(1) The present situation, (2) causes of the present situation, and (3) recommendations.

There are five points which show the present situation:

(1) Cattle slaughter has declined sharply in 1943 as compared to 1942.

(2) The reduced slaughter and Army procurement leave an acute shortage of supplies for the civilian population.

(3) (a) Black-market operations are extensive.

(b) Illegitimate operators bid the market to a point which squeezes legitimate operators.

(c) There is a sharp trend toward combinations of packers and retailers; the former to avoid the wholesale ceilings, the latter to assure a meat supply. This causes maldistribution and is another factor in bidding up livestock prices to the detriment of slaughterers operating under the wholesale ceilings.

(d) Canning companies have acquired packing-house facilities, another bidding-up influence in livestock market.

(4) Cattle feeders are emptying their feed lots and not making replacements, due to narrow spreads between prices of grain fed cattle and feeders and uncertainty as to future.

(5) Ranges are heavily stocked with cattle which will soon be coming to market. A large proportion should go to feed lots. Unless price incentive is established, there will be no feeding, and marketing would be seriously impaired by seasons of glut and scarcity.

Four causes are ascribed to the present situation. The first is that cattle prices are too high in relation to the dressed-meat wholesale prices. This has been O. P. A.'s contention for some time. However, the report submits an analysis that the squeeze is much more severe than the O. P. A. studies indicate. This is due to a difference in statistical techniques which is being analyzed by the O. P. A. Price Section.

The second cause is, in fact, no cause. It is an analysis intended to preclude the obvious answer to the first cause, namely, that cattle prices should be lowered and controlled as the means of correcting the present situation. To avoid such a reasonable result it undertakes to establish that cattle prices are abnormally low in relation to hog prices. The War Meat Board calculated the average of the annual percentage relationships of cattle prices over hog prices for an extended period, and applied that average percentage to the artificially high support price to reach a conclusion as to what the price of cattle should be. The problems of production or feeding were not reviewed. Just why the minimum level of cattle prices had to be tied to a hog price level which the proponents cannot justify is not elucidated. As a result of these assumptions, the War Meat Board determined that the minimum price of choice cattle necessary to correct the present situation would be $19.66 per hundredweight, or about $2.50 higher than the highest monthly average price reached so far, which has been squeezing packers.

It should be noted that the O. P. A. price section has correlated the prices of hogs and cattle for the same period by reference to direct price relationships and has determined that the price of cattle reflected in using the $13.75 hog price is $14.84 for choice cattle. This is a difference of almost $5 per hundredweight. This represents the first clear stand that the War Meat Board has taken on live cattle prices. It is their jumping-off point for increased wholesale prices and for an inflationary high level of cattle ceilings if they are compelled to face that alternative.

The third cause asserted is that cattle feeding costs have increased. The Board makes the point that the spread between grades of fed cattle has dwindled with low-grade cattle selling up so close to high-grade cattle that it is unprofitable for feeders to carry on their operations. At another place the Board therefore proposes that the spreads between fresh meat prices be widened. If a short market and intense demand have resulted in the absence of grade price control at the producer's level, in the bidding up of low-grade cattle to the point where it crowds high-grade cattle prices and results in an unprofitable operation for feeders, it is difficult to understand how the widening of the prices between the grades of fresh meat will achieve the margin for feeders.

The fourth cause for the present situation is that the ceiling price for cattle byproducts are alleged to be too low. But if cattle prices are relatively too high with byproduct prices too low, then an increase in byproduct prices would seem likely to do nothing more than further increase cattle prices.

[9] A copy of this report is appended as exhibit G.

The Board then undertakes to draw a number of conclusions from its assumptions and analysis.

1. The Board says that if no change is made in cattle prices reflected by present ceilings and subsidy, there will be seasons of glutted markets and curtailment of feeding resulting in reduced tonnage, with attendant black marketing and excess accumulations of cattle on ranges.

2. To avoid the above situation the Board says it will be necessary to adjust the reflected price of choice and good cattle upward to at least the level of the prevailing price for these grades. Now the Board is not talking about livestock ceilings. To achieve this purpose it proposes that one or any combination of the following be pursued:

(a) Raise retail and wholesale prices for beef and beef variety meats;

(b) Raise ceiling prices on hides, tallow, and edible oils;

(c) Increase subsidies on cattle.

Again the solution is thrust out that to relieve the wholesale squeeze caused by unduly high raw material prices, which are not held in check by packers' prices, the packer prices should be raised. It is incongruous to see the proposal for increased subsidies coming from Mr. Scott, whose company with the rest of the Big Four vigorously lobbied against the use of any subsidies. Apart from that Mr. Scott should know that the Congress has vigorously opposed the subsidy roll-back, has deferred final consideration of the matter, and has received some assurance of no further extension of subsidies during the recess.

3. The conclusion goes on to recommend that if O. P. A. will adopt the first two, it may as well go the whole way and widen the spread between the grades of meat. This was a gesture for the benefit of the feeder who is well represented in the council of 106.

The fourth and fifth points go on to demonstrate the level of cattle prices which O. P. A. should reflect in increasing wholesale meat prices, and it should be noted that on this matter the Board's calculation and O. P. A.'s vary sharply.

The sixth point in the conclusion fully reveals the Board's firm adherence to the revised institute plan. It rebukes F. D. A. for its failure to strenuously control and enforce the slaughter permits. It insists upon more successful enforcement on the part of O. P. A. (10,000 investigations and more than 1,000 actions have been taken thus far on meats by O. P. A.). It charges, and correctly, that the retail price structure is being violated and that black markets flourish. It reprimands O. P. A. for not acting more quickly on price matters that obviously need correction (wholesale increases). It proclaims its obligation to balancing supply and demand, a matter which has received little of its attention, and reiterates the need for successful rationing.

Touching the crucial point, the Board then recognizes that it has not recommended price control of livestock but more increases of wholesale prices. The incongruous position of relieving high cattle prices by making higher meat prices is too glaring to be ignored even by the Board.

"A question that naturally arises in connection with any consideration of increasing returns for beef and byproducts is whether such changes will not merely result in a corresponding rise in cattle prices and consequently no change in the present squeeze in the margins of slaughterers. The conclusions of this study are that normal margins for processors will be restored if supply and demand are brought into balance and that restoration of margins by any other means will prove to be only temporary."

The Board here frankly adopts the revised institute plan. It goes further in taking an unmistakable stand against livestock ceilings. Its allegiance to the wishes of the big packers is amplified when it enumerates the only methods of bringing demand and supply into balance.

"Bringing demand and supply into balance requires:

"1. An effective meat rationing program;

"2. An effective control of slaughter;

"3. An increase in beef production with as even a flow of marketing through the year as possible;

"4. Intelligent management of the meat supply through proper coordination of the Government's procurement program with the available supply and the requirements of the rationing program."

The sham of meat management as the whole answer to the problem of meat control is evident, the fallacies in it have been fully analyzed. A point of factual demonstration should be conclusive. A representative of the American Meat Institute, Mr. A. P. Davies, made a 6 weeks' tour of England, studying price and rationing control, as a guest of the British Government. All of their operations and offices were thrown open for his observation. In a 45-page confidential report to the Institute, Mr. Davies fully explained the operation of the British system. Operating under a system of the most far-reaching meat management or balancing of supply and demand, including Government purchase of all livestock, the operation of packing houses on a service basis, and rigid rationing, the British nevertheless maintain specific price control for two grades of meat at retail and for as many as ten grades of livestock. Yet the British problems of meat management are much simpler—fewer cattle, shorter distances and no concentrated feeding problems, less packing industry integration. After examining Mr. Davies report, the writer asked why the British had to resort to price control, having such rigid meat management. It was emphasized that inflation is inevitable without price control at all levels.

On March 26, 1943, Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., general counsel of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, an organization of more than 500 small packers, wrote the Price Administrator in defense of the O. P. A. Meat Section and registered his opposition to the revised institute plan. That letter appended as exhibit H, speaks for itself; we quote some pertinent observations:

"Just why Mr. Lewis (Fulton Lewis, Jr.) goes out of his way to oppose price ceilings on live hogs, which are also opposed by the big packers, we leave to public inference. * * * The officials whom Mr. Lewis so severely condemns have realized the unfairness of fixing prices on products without fixing prices on the raw materials. * * * The essence of Mr. Lewis' plan, which happens by accident to be the same as that of some of the big packers, is to scrap the whole price-control program and substitute rationing all along the line. * * * The big packers favor rationing instead of price control. Truly conceived, rationing is a method by which a fair and reasonably adequate share of a product reaches a consumer. * * * It is a prostitution of rationing to use it as a means of attaining a particular level of prices which somebody wants. * * * What the public needs is fair and firm control of prices all along the line—at the producer level, the processor level, the wholesaler and jobber level, and at the retail level. * * * Our objective should be to round out the present policy of price control instead of making an abject surrender and turning the thing over to the 'industry' with an inevitable trend toward monopoly. Neither the consuming public nor the producers can afford to see prices controlled by a few powerful private interests. * * *

"We have no particular love for Government regimentation, but we realize that our Nation is engaged in a very serious war and we believe that inflation must be prevented at all hazards. What would be more apt to cause inflation than to put the question of meat prices back into the hands of the industry? So strong is the demand for meat, and so short the supply, that a return to full and uncontrolled bidding in the market would cause ruinous spiraling of prices.

"Let me warn you that there is something deeper here than a mere fight over prices. There is the more basic question whether the Government is to remain in control of this situation or whether 'industry' is to control it. * * * What is more certain than that a surrender of price control over such a vitally important food product as meat would play right into the hands of those who seek inflation for their own selfish advantage? The Government is now facing a very severe test in the matter of price and wage control. The people can be protected only if the Government has the courage to take a firm stand against those who seek, at this crucial hour, to surrender a vital sector in the battle line against inflation. * * * Such ceilings (hog) will retain Government control, prevent inflation, avoid handing to various pressure groups a new argument for higher wages and commodity prices, wipe out the black market, insure fair returns to both producers and processors, and put meat on counters now empty."

(e) O. P. A. price representation on the War Meat Board

It is highly significant that the O. P. A. Price Division has no representation on the War Meat Board capable of submitting O. P. A.'s point of view or able to present the considerations, statutory limitations and problems which were the basis on which price actions have been formulated. There is no member there who can pose the facts as O. P. A. sees them; no one who has even demonstrated an interest.

Instead the Price Division is represented by an industry man who prior to his appointment spent very little time pondering the many difficult considerations involved in price control. The entire conduct of the price representative points to the conclusion that he acts as an industry member of the Board assigned to execute its plan. It has been reported to the price executive that while on the pay roll of the agency, he remains on the pay roll of his company, the Schluderberg-Kurdle Packing Co., of Baltimore, Md.

Neither reports from other sources, nor inspection of the few copies of the board's minutes (which have been made available to the price branch by rationing members) reveal that Mr. Hunt has at any time defended the actions of the agency he is supposed to represent; instead he has been a champion, spokesman, and advocate of general price increases and the adoption of the revised meat institute plan. Notwithstanding instructions from the Food Director, Mr. Hefflebower and the price executive, Mr. Elkinton, to cease his efforts for price increases and propose to the board that efforts be directed to the development of livestock ceilings, no word has come that Mr. Hunt has pursued these instructions or that the board has considered them independently. The cattle and beef report discussed in II (d) above is the answer to O. P. A.'s directive to its W. M. B. representative.

No agency or body can function when its responsible representatives are operating against its purposes and mandates. From the very inception of the board, the W. F. A. officials and the Meat Institute cooperated with each other to block the appointment of an O. P. A. representative to the board who is sympathetic with O. P. A.'s purposes and anti-inflation control, who knows the prob-

lems and facts concerning those purposes, and who will act as O. P. A.'s spokesman, demanding a full review of the problems from the point of view of price control. There is a basis for reconciliation of the interest of F. D. A. in maintaining and increasing production of livestock with the interest of O. P. A. in firmly holding the line on retail prices so as to avoid setting in motion an inflationary spiral. If high farm prices are necessary to maintain or achieve the production our war efforts require—and F. D. A. has never suggested this—then we have a common interest in subsidies or a buy-and-sell program. If there is not sufficient force in the analysis to convince those officials to stand firmly before the onslaught of the farm pressure groups who are struggling for farm price inflation, then this matter must be put to those responsible for the formulation and administration of the stabilization program. The desire of some F. D. A. officials to maintain good relations with the farm bloc because their future work will involve dealing with it, cannot be permitted to undermine the program; the alliances with big business and farm lobbies must be exposed and destroyed.

It is evident where the O. P. A. representative's interests lay, when at the outset of the board's program of price increases he informed the board that he had put a test case to O. P. A. and had established a precedent. His participation in discussions for the removal of wholesale meat prices, his avoidance of livestock ceiling price discussion, his omission to transmit all W. M. B. minutes and documents to the Food Director or the Price Executive, while each serious, remains nonetheless anticlimactic. For with his first test case he set in motion a rapid succession of price increase demands which have been staggering the price section, diverting its far too limited personnel from the work necessary to go forward with the price-control program to the burden of defending and justifying its past actions to the industry and F. D. A. officials.

III. OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE INDUSTRY AND OTHERS DIRECTED TOWARD WRECKING THE PRICE PROGRAM

The large packers are exerting mass pressure in other directions to destroy meat price control. They have embarked on a full program of statutory protests and litigation in the courts to upset the regulations. From another direction they are pressing the Army in a so-called drive for "practical price equality" which is a subtle device to turn price control in the direction of the big packers and overthrow the regulations.

In the last few months, the Big Four have deluged O. P. A. with a mass of formal protests; unlike the many protests received from small packers which demand livestock price control, the big packers attack the regulations as illegal because, among other things, there is no livestock price control. They are intending to drive O. P. A. between Scylla and Charybdis and their actions fit the revised meat institute plan neatly. On one hand they have mobilized the producers' organizations, the Institute, the War Meat Board, the farm bloc and Government officials against any price control of livestock and on the other hand they are driving through the courts to have the regulations held illegal because of the absence of livestock ceilings. This program is not so inconsistent as it may appear, for if the influences are strong enough to prevent livestock control, then the Administrator would have to yield the price line. It is a reasonable gamble that he will not throw the price line wide open; this is too detrimental to the President's stabilization program. The Administrator would be compelled to grant controlled increases.

From the point of view of the large packers this result would be ideal; to the extent that advancing livestock prices may have begun to affect them they are relieved, but because of their complete integration, the rest of the packers are not so well relieved. They are again free to use their extensive processing operations to bid up further the price of livestock, while they grind their less fortunate brethren against the price wall and drive them out of business. Secondly, such a result permits them to increase their profits. The bulk of accumulated inventories of meats in cold storage are held by the big packers. The cattle which were purchased and stored at prices which afford them a break even or profit at present ceilings will be sold at certain or larger profits under the advance price level. The bulk of the packers who operate from slaughter to sale and have no inventories are transferred from one squeeze to another.

The press during the past 6 months has been replete with accounts of wholesalers, jobbers, nonslaughtering processors, and small slaughterers who were forced to discontinue business either because they could not obtain meat for sale or because livestock prices have gone to levels which insure only a loss. Each closing has turned more of the field over to the Big Four. Large eastern markets which historically have been dominated by small independent packers and wholesalers are now thrown open to the Big Four gratuitously. The gains are enormous and without risk; for it was not the greedy activities of the monopolists which drove out and destroyed free competition—it was the activities of the Government and price control; the giants only performed a public service, they made available the meat to areas that were without it and without operators who could produce it. Insurmountable will be the task of the Antitrust Division on some tomorrow.

A brief explanation is necessary to understand the operations of the industry. Beef or pork, cattle or hogs, are not worth the same price to each packer. Quite apart from the question of degree of efficiency between different packers in the same operation, the degree or extent to which further integration and processing is undertaken determines the highest price which the packer can spend for livestock. Consequently, the selling price of the fresh or green carcass and the application of slaughter-test costs do not reflect the profit or loss between fresh meat selling prices and raw-material costs. The curing of hides, rendering of fat, production of fertilizer, hamburger, sausage products, cured and processed pork, hotel-supply meats, and canning are but a few of the integrated secondary operations which all join together to reflect the amount which the packer can afford to pay for the animal. Obviously, the more extensive the integration, the greater the ability to pay more for animals. The operations of the Big Four are the most extensive in the industry and also include soap manufacture, medicinal chemical production, production of leather, poultry, eggs, milk, and dairy products among others.

There is another major factor which has frequently been acknowledged off the record by packers, but which naturally they will not come forward to prove. That is that fresh pork and fresh beef are generally slaughtered at a loss or infrequently on a break-even basis, and that the profits are obtained from secondary processing.[9a] The object of the dominant influences in the industry in this direction would be twofold: First, to prevent others somewhat smaller from meeting with such financial success as to rise to challenge the giants and secondly, to keep balance among the giants so that one cannot grow so powerful as to devour the others. Nor can anyone substantially by-pass the slaughter operation to gain in the processing end of the industry, because the processing depends upon the slaughtering for the raw materials.

The ability of the nonintegrated or partially integrated packers to survive in the past could only have been due to (1) greater service, (2) more careful selection of product, (3) assumption of greater credit risks, (4) control of small and limited markets thoroughly combed, in which giant competitors were disinterested or which they could not so thoroughly service, and (5) higher prices. All of these factors probably accounted for the existence of numerous small sausage makers and processors, plus the factor of (1) superior products or (2) inferior products at cheaper prices.

Before returning to the main point, it must be remembered that the certainty with which this appraisal of the industry is made is predicated upon numerous discussions held with industry members and the facts gleaned from those discussions. The formal proof must await a comprehensive cost investigation of the industry. That investigation is the key to successful price control under our regulatory structure, and would be the basis of an equalizing subsidy system calculated to place all packers on an equal basis for the duration of the period of war and inflationary threat.

One of the strong evidences of the intention of the big packers to drive for regulated price increases without livestock control through the use of litigation is found in the recent Swift protest to amendment No. 12 of the beef regulation (Revised Maximum Price Regulation No. 169). That protest objects to the granting of a price differential to independent hotel supply houses for the sale of fabricated meat cuts to purveyors of meals higher than the one granted on sales from packing plants or branch houses. In the formulation of the revised beef regulation, O. P. A. held a series of conferences with members of the industry in November 1942. In considering the wholesaler problem, one similar to this, O. P. A. recognized that there was no historical justification for a higher price for wholesalers than that received by packer's branch houses, but fearing the by-passing of the wholesaler if the justified discounts were adopted, recommended the higher price for wholesalers. Immediately, the Big Four representatives objected. They pointed out the absence of historical justification; they argued that they performed the same services, and Mr. Paul Smith, vice president of Swift & Co., pleaded that such action would compel the packers to close a thousand branch houses. There was threat of immediate court action. O. P. A., persuaded by their objections, attempted to compromise by keeping the discount as small as possible and giving the wholesalers an overage of 25 cents per hundredweight.

At a later date, meetings were held with industry representatives concerning the establishment of specific dollars and cents prices for fabricated meat cuts. It was agreed by all segments of the industry engaged in the hotel supply business that the independent nonslaughtering operators required a higher margin than did the packer. Mr. Vear, head of the hotel supply department of Swift & Co., joined in that agreement and acknowledged that differential pricing was equitable and proper. In a report and recommendation transmitted to O. P. A. by the War Meat Board, O. P. A. was urged to eliminate the wholesaler's discount, reduce the carload discount and grant wholesalers a full premium. That report was drafted by Mr. A. L. Scott, beef consultant to War Meat Board and head of the beef department of Swift & Co., and had been considered by a committee of the American Meat Institute as

[9a] Evidence of this is now a matter of public record, having been made so by O. P. A. in protest proceedings affecting Armour & Co. and 16 other packers.

well as the Board. In support of this recommendation, Mr. Scott's report[10] stated that meat middlemen for procurement purposes needed to pay the same price for meat that packers were selling at, and that to stay in business they needed an overage; it clearly inferred that O. P. A. had properly recognized this principle in granting peddlers and hotel supply houses an overage, and should do so for wholesalers. And now Swift & Co. formally protests to O. P. A. that they perform the same functions as independent hotel supply houses and peddlers, O. P. A. is discriminating against them in not allowing them the same price as the independent hotel supply house for its sales of fabricated meat and as the peddler has for his sales. Such allowances would only serve to provide Swift & Co. more money to put into the livestock market.

We may expect within a short time a protest to Mr. Scott's recommendation of the wholesaler overage by Swift & Co. on the grounds that they perform the same distribution services as a wholesaler and should have the same selling price.

In the past, an ill-advised general adjustment provision for war procurement sales was issued. Supplementary Regulation No. 9 and Procedural Regulation No. 6 provided for price adjustment if a ceiling impeded or threatened to impede production for war procurement purposes. Hundreds of applications were denied on meats on the grounds that such adjustment would dislocate the cattle market and drive packers not engaged in sales to the Government out of business, since those receiving the adjustment would bid up cattle prices. The sales generally involved the same commodity sold to the Army as sold in the civilian market. Among others, the Big Four protested the denials, and Armour & Co. took the matter into the emergency court of appeals. For technical reasons the court of appeals remanded the denials to O. P. A. for further action. Recognizing the inapplicability of this adjustment provision to the meat situation, O. P. A. belatedly withdrew the provision. Thereupon three of the Big Four protested the withdrawal of the adjustment as making the regulation unfair and inequitable. In other words, the position of the Big Four is that O. P. A. must grant them cost plus on their Army sales, else the regulations violated the Emergency Price Control Act and the act of October 2, 1942.

In its struggle for cost plus on Army business the big packers have intermittently withheld bidding. The Quartermaster General has been reluctant to use his requisitioning authority and has only occasionally resorted to the use of priority orders. But the Quartermaster General is firmly impressed with the arguments made by the packers that they do not have practical price equality in selling to the Army and therefore would do so at a loss, or at a greater loss than in civilian business. Withholding of meat has seriously impeded Army procurement and, not unnaturally, has led Army officers to join in demands for price increases. These demands were firmly resisted by O. P. A. on the grounds that no evidence was presented to show greater costs involved in Army business than is involved in civilian business. If civilian costs had gone down because of lower selling costs, then the civilian price should be lowered. If civilian costs had gone up, the amount provided in the cost of doing business should be increased but offset by an equivalent reduction in the base price, so that retail prices would not be disturbed. (See exhibit E.) Alarmed because of short receipts, however, the Army joined hands with the industry in the fight against the discount structure. Other war procurement price increases have been made where O. P. A. found them justified.

Motivated by a desire to avoid any impediment to procurement, the Army recently joined in a proposal requesting the exclusion of all war procurement agencies from price regulations and giving them virtually unlimited authority to negotiate prices. We do not know where this proposal was born, but the War Meat Board and the packers have had a hand in it. As shown in a previous part, the War Meat Board sought a flat 50 cents per hundredweight allowance for freezing fresh pork. This was to facilitate supporting the hog support price. O. P. A. made provision only for the costs involved in freezing and for monthly storage.

At the meeting of July 20, 1943, Mr. Reed, chairman of the Board, called for a report on freezing allowance (p. 3, minutes, W. M. B.).

"Mr. Hunt said it was reported last week that an amendment had been written incorporating a different method of providing for the freezer allowance; that amendment was in the position for signature at that time. He was advised yesterday that the amendment was so far through, O. P. A. did not want to retract it, and it is due to go to the Register the first part of this week, about Wednesday. It will allow 10 cents plus second month's storage if you freeze in your own plant. If it goes outside for freezing, you get the commercial rate plus the second month's storage rate, if you keep it for more than 30 days. Also plus 10 cents cartage. Mr. Daigneau said the Board made a recommendation of a flat 50 cents and the pork consultants are not withdrawing it. Mr. Reed said that recommendation had been transmitted. Considerable discussion followed in regard to difficulties that will be encountered by Government procurement agencies in purchasing frozen meats under the terms of this amendment and what further action the Board should take."

The record discloses that immediately following the above discussion Mr. Walter Netsch, of Armour & Co., moved the following:

"That the specific ceiling on Federal procurement be removed and be replaced by one general maximum-price regulation with respect to procurement by the Federal Government or any agency thereof, authorizing any Federal agency to pay for materials and services not in excess of the rates the vendor thereof realized on those materials and services under the highest comparable civilian maximum-price regulation. Mr. Robert seconded the motion, which was stated by Mr. Reed. Motion carried unanimously."

This was the foundation for practical price equality. The Army purchases carcass beef or frozen boneless beef. The packers can take the same carcasses and process substantial portions into ground beef, cured beef, fabricated cuts, and sausage. Those processed item prices would establish the rates which the vendor thereof realized on these materials and services under the highest comparable civilian maximum price regulation. That would determine the price for carcass meat to the Army; the highest possible realization in the civilian market through processing would determine the price which the Army is to pay for the raw material unprocessed. This is practical price equality. But as will be shown, this recommendation did not originate with Mr. Netsch. Someone gave it to him.

At the meeting of the following day, Wednesday, July 21, 1943, Mr. Scott said he did not approve Mr. Netsch's motion "if it is to be tied up with letting the individual packer state what the services and charges should be." (Variable pricing would permit all packers to recover a profit which would relieve their squeeze.) Here we quote the minutes:

"Considerable discussion followed. It was decided to get the exact wording of the F. D. A. recommendation covering the subject so that the War Meat Board's recommendation covering the subject could be constructed in that light. Mr. Reed remarked that from now on, while he is in the chair, he will not entertain a motion unless it has been thoroughly discussed. Mr. Reed agreed to phone Major Olmstead at Washington, to get the wording from him, which he proceeded to do."

At a later point:

"Mr. Reed then reported on his conversation with Major Olmstead in Washington. He said Major Olmstead stated the wording of the recommendation was correct. Mr. Reed said he had raised the question of leaving the thing wide open as to whether these prices are to be determined by negotiation between us or the Federal agencies and the packer, whether we are to determine them or whether the packer is to determine them. Major Olmstead had answered—that is right, it is wide open. Discussion followed. Mr. Reed said he would convey the Board's attitude to Major Olmstead personally; that he thought it would be done better by discussing it with him than by writing him a letter. It was agreed that Mr. Reed should do this."

The minutes do not reveal the board's attitude.

Recently, the procurement agencies formally presented to O. P. A. the correctly worded proposal. To aver that pressure, a program of practical price equality was conceded. Thus the forces gather from day to day.

JEROME J. JACOBSON.

AUGUST 14, 1943.

[10] Quotation from Recommendations of the War Meat Board to the O. P. A. Price Representative, July 1, 1943:

"Any middleman operating in the meat business has special problems under present conditions, and in each case must have a special solution to his problem if he continues in business.

"The principal categories of middlemen are hotel-supply houses, peddlers, nonslaughtering processors, and wholesalers.

"In all of these categories the procurement problem is important. Each middleman must be put in a position of being able to compete with other buyers for meat without the disadvantage of being forced to buy at a lower price than other buyers competing for the same product. Therefore, all middlemen should be given the same buying price set-up.

"After the procurement problem is solved, the middleman must have a set-up which permits him to sell at enough of a mark-up over cost to provide living margin.

"This living margin has been provided for all categories of middlemen except the wholesaler. Therefore, the problem is to provide the wholesaler with a buying and selling price set-up that will permit a living margin."

New Year's Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address in the nature of

New Year's greetings, delivered by me over the radio on January 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Never before have I been so impressed with the wonder of radio. I can sit here in Washington and reach my friends throughout the State by this medium, as readily as if I were sitting at your fireside.

This 1st day of the year is a day on which we pause to take inventory of the past twelvemonth, and to look into the future at the days which reach ahead. We must not be too optimistic as we look forward. We must not make the mistake of "resting in the traces" and counting our victories before they are won.

Barring miracles, and short of some sudden unexpected collapse in the ranks of our enemies, 1944 may well be one of the sternest years in our history, a year in which crucial battles must be fought, a year in which the needs of our armies will demand much of us here on the home front—more even than we have heretofore been called upon to do.

We have many victories to look back upon in the year we are bidding goodbye, but so far as the United States is concerned, it is my opinion and that of the well-informed in Washington, that the actual shooting war is just entering the all-out stage. Despite the unquestioned significance of our many land, sea, and air victories, we have been fighting only on the outer perimeter of our enemies' defenses. We now face the grim days that must come before the final and complete defeat and collapse of our enemies. Those days will probably witness the assault on the actual home fronts of our enemies—especially in the European theater, where we may well look forward to victory within this new year.

But before that victory is attained, we must be prepared for the fiercest, bloodiest kind of fighting. Any other assumption is mere foolhardiness, no matter how enthusiastic we may be over victories already achieved, nor how optimistically we look toward victory in the days to come. And because this is so, because the battles of 1944 will be on a grander scale, a more violent scale than previous ones, because the noise will be louder, the flames higher, the thunder louder, the cost greater, we here on the home front must be prepared for great sacrifices but not by far as great as those our fighting men will be making on the shooting front.

Our morale and our spirit must be stepped up so that we may lend greater support in matériel and morale to those boys on the seas and shores and interiors of the entire globe.

On the Wisconsin home front we must be prepared for our great task of not only continuing the high productivity of food which has been our record in the past year, but of increasing it. We must plant lands never before planted, our processing of canned foods and fruits must be even greater than in the past year, our dairy products must be produced in even greater quantities, while on the production front we must step up our output—for this will be the peak year.

The clock ticks, and the moment draws nearer when our armed forces will clash with a redoubtable inhuman foe, while on the home front we must be prepared to meet a no less redoubtable problem—the maintenance of the country our boys have left—the maintenance of the precepts and principles of our great Nation. With uplifted hearts we must look forward to the time when they will return from the fighting fronts to the home we are preparing for them here.

The forepart of December I spent a few days in Wisconsin and from my visit I look forward to this ensuing year conscious of the bravery and gallantry, the knowledge and faith with which the people of Wisconsin face the future. During my visit there, I noted with pride the fine spirit so evident in the hundreds of you it was my pleasure to meet. We are confronted with a formidable year, but not one of you whom I met did I find facing it with anything but the highest fortitude and hope, and plans for a better world of the future. That is the American spirit. That is the spirit of a Nation composed of 48 States, each working as an entity but also as a part of a great Nation with faith in itself and its future. We cannot be licked, because that is the American spirit.

I hope there are enemy agents reporting to their fatherland. I hope there are, for it must be disheartening indeed to them to note the splendid spirit of our people. For though we are facing the day-to-day horrors of armed conflict, our minds and our hearts go far beyond that into the future, to build stronger and better not only for ourselves but for the whole world, even those countries of our enemies. There is no malice within us. There is only the desire to get this job done and to proceed from there to the higher, nobler tasks of the years of peace which follow.

We must not look on these war days as dark days, or days without hope. From the trouble and the turmoil of this war will come readjustments of economic standards, improvements in machinery, in medicine, science, and agriculture—all contributing to a fuller life.

"We will never learn," is a cry oft heard when war clouds darken the sky, but this time we might take pause to consider social reforms that have already taken place, and apply them to the yardstick of the future. This has been a war of the common man, you and I, and the world has already felt the impact of man's changed ways of thought and conduct. It is my opinion that now more than ever before in the history of man, we may look forward to a world of nations bound together in a common unity with a common thought of peace and good will. He of the "great masses," as we have been wont to call the great numbers of our fellow men, is a fellow now of wide horizons, a man who has traveled in far places under strange conditions, who has fought and survived as an individual, and who will not readily return to a way of life over which he will abandon his rights as an individual.

We have been asked, and we have readily complied, to sacrifice many of our God-given rights, rights ours by the right of birth in the United States of America, for the successful prosecution of the war against the enemies of all mankind. Those rights have been given up cheerfully and willingly, but only temporarily. Our next ruling generation, the generation now fighting in arms on far fronts, will have new concepts of the world to come when they return with a world-wide, cosmopolitan viewpoint.

We spend every working hour toward the defeat of our enemies, but we do not plan their fate, and there is no meanness or vindictiveness or vengence in our plans for the peace and the victory that will be ours. We are assured of that victory. We know it will come. We are proceeding in deadly earnest to assure that it comes at the earliest possible moment.

Our concepts are still those of 1776. We are not fighting to conquer—we are fighting to free. We are fighting to bring peace to the whole world, and to that end alone our hearts and our minds and our efforts are devoted. Our production of the implements of war is but a necessary means to that end; but our final objective is a great world of united nations, living together in peace and harmony, with but one desire—the establishment of a world whose concept is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all men.

May I wish for you, my friends, a new year rich with blessings.

Y. M. C. A. Starts Its Second Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Y. M. C. A. Starts Its Second Century" delivered by me over radio station WRC, at Washington, D. C., on January 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A movement that outlives a generation demonstrates a vitality of its own. A movement that outlives three generations and stretches around the world demonstrates a vitality that belongs to the ages and to humanity. The Young Men's Christian Association has done this.

In 1944 the Young Men's Christian Association starts its second century of service to God and man. It has become a vital part of the life of man the world around. As Christianity has lifted the hearts, minds, and spirits of men, women, and children around the world in the last 1,943 years, so, in a smaller but thoroughly consistent manner, the Young Men's Christian Association has contributed to the lifting of the hearts, minds, and spirits of the young men of the world in the last 100 years.

It serves in more than 60 countries through a total of 10,000 branches. It ministers to the bodies, minds, and souls of the young men of the world. It lifts their ideals and unites their spirits at the very time when their decisions are most responsive and vigorous, and are most influential in shaping their lives. It rises above race, color, and creed. It develops understanding of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which are the foundations of enduring peace.

Today it is helping our young men win the war against despotism and for enduring peace and freedom. After the war has been won, the Young Men's Christian Association will be a priceless agency of health, mental stimulation, and religious inspiration in the development of a high standard of life worthy of the price paid for it on the battlefield.

The Young Men's Christian Association was founded in London by George Williams, June 6, 1844. It spread to America and here blossomed into full flower. Today it has over 2,500,000 members and participants divided among more than 1,000 American communities. Millions more people in America are interested contributors, volunteers, and former members.

It has spread around the world. It serves all nationalities, races, and religious faiths. In the Orient and Far East its members—participants and supporters—include Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, and Confucianists, as well as Jews and Christians of the Protestant and Catholic faiths. In Poland, Rumania, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Peru, and Mexico its membership is predominantly Catholic. In the United States it provides "a home away from home" for hundreds of thousands of young men migrating to large centers. In 1942 it operated 70,000 beds in Young Men's Christian Association dormitories. These were occupied more than 20,000,000 times, which suggests that one-half a million young men were accommodated for an average of 40

nights each. In reality, some stayed for longer and others for shorter periods because the Young Men's Christian Association cares for the newcomer and the stranger quite as much as for the settled resident. To the Young Men's Christian Association every young man is infinitely important.

While the Y. M. C. A. concentrates upon young men, it reaches boys and men of all ages. It helps the peasant boys of 8 or 9 in India or China and the downtown newsboys in our American cities. It inspires mature leaders throughout the world to guide its business and spiritual policies.

It has pioneered in physical education, health, and sanitation in India, Egypt, China, Korea, Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico. It has introduced basketball, baseball, football, athletic contests of many other kinds, vocational training, and schools of higher education in China, Korea, India, and most of the countries of Europe and South America. It has contributed to mass education in China. It has fostered Rotary Clubs and Boy Scout troops in the Far East, Orient, and South America. It has encouraged racial and religious tolerance and helped governments combat crime, disease, famine, and social inequalities.

In America the Y. M. C. A. emphasizes dependable companionship and the development of sound character. It organizes camping, helps the Boy Scouts, establishes night schools, pioneers in vocational guidance and trade schools. It promotes physical education and sports, fosters the father-and-son movement which it established, develops thrift, and emphasizes the value of the practice of the principles of Christianity and of the development of genuine religious faith as the foundation of character.

In the war it is one of six agencies conducting U. S. O. services for America's armed forces and is responsible for one-third of the total program. In China the Y. M. C. A. is the counterpart of the U. S. O. Four hundred Chinese Y. M. C. A. secretaries are on active service with Chinese troops.

Its 1,200 associations in the United States provide many services to men on leave or furlough. Its foreign branches help the servicemen overseas.

It serves our predraft-age boys through physical-fitness programs. In social, recreational, or religious activities it offsets juvenile delinquency. Seven thousand Hi-Y Clubs in our high schools and many local citizenship programs help to fit our boys for the responsibilities of citizenship and for leadership in our self-governing Nation which must draw its leadership from its whole people.

The Y. M. C. A. is responsible for the spiritual, recreational, and social welfare of 6,000,000 prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention. Its neutral secretaries visit war prison camps in both the United Nations and Axis countries.

It has helped millions of suffering refugees in Europe and the Far East.

In the immediate post-war period the Y. M. C. A. will be of priceless value. Not only will its dormitories, gymnasiums, and schools be invaluable but its civic and religious services will be like havens in a storm for those adrift. Its long experience in developing robust health, trained minds, and religious faith as a basis of good character and good citizenship will put many a young man on the road to happiness and keep him there. Its devotion to the fundamentals of our free Government, which is based on faith in God and the individual man, will make it an all-important agency in the development of post-war civic stability.

In its second century the Y. M. C. A. will face still greater opportunities. Man will come closer to man the world around. Peace in the world of tomorrow will depend more than ever upon the breadth of character of its people and upon their practice of the great Commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," under conditions in which the whole world will be more of a neighborhood than ever before.

The survival of civilization and the development of prosperity will depend on many things. One practical factor will be the ability of man to produce an increasingly great amount of food and other articles for use at home and abroad. This will depend largely upon the increasing ability of men to work together. Man will depend more than ever upon the inventions, methods, materials, and products of his fellow man. The health, intelligence, and purposes of everyone everywhere, both as a producer and a purchaser, will mean more to the rest of the world than ever before. This will put a premium not only upon scientific, economic, and political advancement but also upon efforts, like those of the Y. M. C. A., to develop the personal health, minds, and ideals of young men everywhere.

This increased productivity of the world will depend directly upon world-wide peace, stability, and reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. This will put a premium upon common understanding of one another by men everywhere.

Such an understanding will be helped by the deepest appreciation of the simple principles taught by Christianity, by our Declaration of Independence, by Abraham Lincoln, and by the Y. M. C. A. They are that all men are created equal and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness in their own way. It is for us to seek reasonable, tolerant, constructive means for applying these principles to others, as well as ourselves, among 2,000,000,000 of widely differing heritages, languages, habits, cultures, and points of view. This will call for more than multiplying the example of our 4,000,000 American forefathers by 500. It will call for the development of the individual man to meet the new needs of his time, with as full an appreciation of his fellow man's views of freedom as his own, combined with an understanding of their common interest in the stability and welfare of humanity as a whole.

The future will increase rather than decrease the need for the Y. M. C. A. as a movement rising above all distinctions among men and dedicating itself in the broadest sense to the service of God and man.

The Y. M. C. A. enters its second century deserving of our thanks and of our vigorous cordial support.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Green-Lucas-Worley bill provides the quickest possible way, and the most sensible and uniform method, for men and women in the armed services to vote in all elections while they are away from home. Federal ballot legislation is the only practicable way to give the servicemen and servicewomen their right to vote. To comply with absentee voting requirements of 48 different States, as proposed by some Members of Congress, would cause such confusion to the War and Navy Departments that it simply would be impractical in operation.

A year and a half ago Congress passed Public Law No. 712, specifically providing that no member of the armed forces was to be compelled either to register or to pay a poll tax in order to vote in a Federal election. Therefore, State rights are not being jeopardized or violated, and those who are opposing the Green-Lucas-Worley bill are merely doing so because they know that the vast majority of our soldiers will vote for President Roosevelt, their Commander in Chief. The opposition is using subterfuge and political chicanery to defraud the soldier boys of their right to vote.

I shall most definitely oppose the reactionary Republicans, together with the poll-tax Congressmen, who are viciously fighting to disfranchise our men and women who are fighting and dying in defense of democracy.

Address by Hon. Alfred M. Landon to Republican "Freshman" Senators and Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, to the Republican "freshman" Senators and Representatives while he was in Washington the first week in December 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am going to start off by telling you I think you are doing a good job, and, what's of infinitely greater importance, the country, in its first expression since your election, believes you are doing a good job.

The people believe in the positive policies of the Republican Party as established in the Congress and by the Republican State administrations.

Some seem to think the minority party is on trial in the Congress, when actually it is the majority party that is charged with the responsibility of government of the Nation. The majority party always has to accept the responsibility. It is the minority party's duty constantly to prod. Despite Candidate Roosevelt's personal policies in conducting our war, we are united in our determination to win a complete, final, and conclusive victory.

In charting our future course it is now proposed that both parties adopt in their national platform similar declarations on foreign policy. But just what foreign policy does the President stand for?

Such a course would accelerate the danger of a drift toward one party in our country.

It would be tragic for a few men writing the platform to cheat the people of the right to decide life-and-death questions, or any other issue, for that matter. Remember that in the immediate future the course of our foreign policy may well decide whether or not the next generation of Americans, like this generation and the last generation, is to be drafted for service overseas. Is the Republican Party prepared to sign a blank check on that?

This administration's record on foreign policies is as uncertain as on domestic policies. That record shows no one can be sure what it will do next.

On major items of great importance, let's look at the record. In both 1932 and 1936 Mr. Roosevelt campaigned as a pacifist and isolationist. In 1932 he categorically repudiated the whole League of Nations concept. In 1932 Mr. Hoover was denounced by the present administration crowd for being an internationalist. In 1936 I was denounced for being the tool of munition manufacturers.

In 1936 two large delegations called on me requesting my commitments to the Neutrality Acts passed in 1937, which prevented us from selling arms to Great Britain. I declined to do so. Presumably Mr. Roosevelt did, because he signed them.

In 1939 Mr. Roosevelt recommended the amendment of the Neutrality Acts he had signed in 1937 and the adoption of the cash-and-carry amendment.

In 1939 he proposed to the great enthusiasm of the isolationists the new doctrine attempting to create the 300-mile quarantine zone around the entire Western Hemisphere.

In 1940 he was a candidate making promises with which we are familiar.

In 1941 he supplemented the Cash and Carry Act which he had signed in 1939 and the abortive 300-mile neutrality zone with his interpretation of the Lend-Lease Act, which went beyond the plain intent of the Congress. And to this very day the basis of our lend-lease relations are obscure. The President sent a lend-lease report to the Congress a few months ago, and the next day recalled certain important paragraphs.

In 1941 he signed the Atlantic Charter. In 1943 the ink was hardly dry on the Moscow arrangement before we find high-ranking Russian interpretation differing from the administration's interpretation on several vital points of the Moscow general principles promulgated as a guide to world peace. And we still do not know whether the Russian interpretation is in accord with our interpretation of the Atlantic Charter, which was also issued as a guide to our policy for world peace.

Stand by the President in his policies for world peace! How can we, when he doesn't stand still long enough? Furthermore, the Moscow arrangement is only a mere beginning, although a good beginning, in the discussion of the many problems that jeopardize peace in the world. It is predicated on military emergency, and whether desired international political unity will ensue remains to be seen.

We find in the field of foreign policies the same uncertainty that exists in domestic policies and that was so destructive of prewar business recovery. That continual change and uncertainty will be just as great a handicap to post-war business and jobs for everyone after the war as it was before.

It is a mistake to assume that the original New Dealers were born of the uncertainty of the times.

The contention of the original New Dealers that our complex industrial organizations had expanded beyond our political institutions appealed to many citizens.

But regardless of the causes that gave the administration power, it discarded its original planners who believed in the capitalistic system and replaced them with those who thought the capitalistic system was wrong. They seized the opportunity to substitute the totalitarian state of a foreign pattern for the American system of a multitude of little independent businesses.

For 6 years our efforts to get going again in the way of full employment were hamstrung by the altering character of Mr. Roosevelt's administration.

President Roosevelt may or may not have grasped the fundamental change in the direction his administration was headed. The winds of political exigency have always set his course.

The life-term candidate's lively sense of the dramatic; his ruthless, realistic political practices; his willingness to take short cuts dangerous to the Republic by scrapping democratic processes on top of the power centered in his office, have created the seedbed for the totalitarian planners.

It also has created a confusion of ideas that has destroyed the stability of government so essential to national prosperity. For no one can be sure what our ambitious President will do next. Uncertainty rules. The penalties on producers of all kinds, especially in these days of expanded Government power, are swift and disastrous.

When real Democrats look behind the curtain of party solidarity and analyze the administration's denials and denunciations, its confusion of policy, and continual crises, they see the clay feet of a totalitarian state. The admitted totalitarian leaders in the world frankly confess that they built their power by keeping their public uncertain and confused and by moving the people out of one crisis into another.

There has been only one consistent policy, and that on the part of a little group planning to establish the totalitarian state. That one unchanging policy has shown itself in tax legislation; in the National Recovery Act; in all kinds of department rulings and regulations. It is the policy I repeatedly referred to in 1936 as hanging a millstone around the neck of the little fellows.

But you naturally inquire how can that be when the administration professes so much love for the little fellow and so much hate for the big fellow.

It is because the dominant New Dealer's plan contemplates the complete elimination of the little fellow and turning the country over to the big fellow, so that Government can then take over all business, industry, and agriculture. They know as between monopolies and Government the people will and should choose the Government.

And, of course, once that is done the next step is inevitable—regulating and controlling of labor so that the big independent labor union is no more; the totalitarian state is then established.

The greatest problem of all—foreign and domestic—is how can we enjoy the benefits of mass production keeping our standard of living the highest in the world and at the same time preserve the equality of opportunity for the individual. Government must preserve that opportunity for the individual as it must conserve its natural resources. The New Deal has not found the answer because the little fellow has taken a tremendous beating under the present administration.

The answer is in a combination of many things. Antitrust proceedings under existing legislation, higher inheritance tax to redistribute inherited capital and power, regulations administered to protect the little fellow, and the fostering of cooperatives. Further, we must eliminate vested interests in government the same as in business. Third and fourth terms are the meat upon which such vested political interests feed.

But let the answer be found without the campaign of hate and name-calling that resulted in more men on the dole, under the Roosevelt administration, than under any previous administration in our entire history.

If we are to have prosperity and harmony in this country the major interests—labor, industry, agriculture, finance, and government—must all work together.

Government should be setting the example of the spirit of America which is the spirit of a free people. If we don't work together we won't be long either free or self-governing.

The Government must operate under that principle and the people must never forget it.

I have no fear of post-war unemployment if business is relieved of the constant uncertainty of the Roosevelt administration and a sound fiscal policy is adopted. Nonmilitary expenses can and should be cut 25 percent. The Republican drive for frugality and economy must be made effective by legislation. The Roosevelt administration never has realized that inflation can be met by economy and production as well as by taxation. The administration has sown about every kind of seed that will produce inflation. It has dodged at every turn its responsibility of formulating a definite revenue-raising, excess-money-absorbing tax bill. Business can adjust itself to any definite condition but it cannot adjust itself under the changing and uncertain policies of the Roosevelt administration.

Therefore the greatest and most important element for post-war reconstruction is an era of confidence in government.

Inasmuch as 11 years have demonstrated the impossibility of such an era under the present administration, the only answer is to get a new leader, as was done in England when Chamberlain was dropped. Just as Chamberlain was the great international appeaser, so Roosevelt has been for 11 years the great appeaser in our domestic affairs. Thus do we drift in an economy of doubt, uncertainty, and expediency. Again let me emphasize, one of the great independent functions of a minority in a republic is investigation and checking up on the party in power. I know you realize the importance of reducing and keeping the arrogant and strutting bureaucrats within due bounds of the law. Government directives have supplanted legislation, and too often these decrees are punitive. This business of some little whippersnapper of a bureaucrat being a law unto himself must stop. The restoration of the basic rights of the States and the constitutional rights of the individual is one of the big issues involved in the next campaign. The Republicans and real Democrats in Congress should now, through the investigations of congressional committees, make a study of all legislation and departmental commissions, and bureaus operating under it, and formulate new legislation which will clearly define and limit this purpose and manner of operation.

I realize the Herculean task involved and that some of you have already been working to remove the confusion, errors, and subversive purposes in the present hodgepodge accumulations of laws, amendments, and interpretations. I cannot conceive of anything more constructive in meeting the problems of post-war reconstruction.

The people who elected you expect you to do that very thing. The last elections show that the people feel their Government is taking away their rights permanently and rightly fear that under the Democratic local administrations in office, no fight would be made to return those rights.

Many voters are changing parties to make sure that the rights that belong to them will be returned to them after the war—that the rights belonging to Kentucky, for instance, will be returned to Kentucky after the war.

Of course, the New Dealers fear the factual investigation of congressional committees. They accuse these committees of all kinds of errors. But the fact remains that the factual reports of congressional committees on domestic and foreign affairs are invaluable to our country in the successful prosecution of

the war and they will be equally valuable in preparing for the problems of peace.

To mention one subject highly in need of a thorough investigation—we need to know about our war stock pile. With the best of reasons the advance estimates may well be high. We can remember the disastrous effects of the stock pile at the end of the last war. A restudy and the opportunity for a more careful appraisal may, in fact I believe will, save the disastrous effects of the stock piles in the post-war era—save billions of dollars in taxes and save rationing now on many commodities. So the stock of supplies bought by conflicting agencies competing with each other should be checked to see if it is not compatible with national safety to reduce some of them now.

There are many questionable executive matters to be investigated, checked, and reported to the American people. There is not only the report of the five Senators on the failure to protect American interests, but it has just been revealed that lend-lease funds are being used for internal improvements of other countries.

That is a shocking application by the administration of the theory and purpose of lend-lease.

As a result of weather exigencies and administration policies we are facing a real cut in food production.

The terrific difficulties in world cooperation are commencing to break through the surface. The problems ahead are exceedingly dangerous. I believe it is in the interest of America that the Republican Party avoid endorsing the so-called agreements reached at Moscow until much more precise and definite information as to their nature is available. I believe it would be reckless and short-sighted to endorse the Moscow arrangements or any other arrangements that might be construed as commitments before we know definitely what those arrangements are.

Personally, I am apprehensive that Moscow settled little outside of the military arrangements. It can be blown up as a great achievement only because everything in relation to the arrangement is so completely indefinite. I can find no evidence that the Russians have yielded 1 inch in regard to their well-known territorial aspirations or political ambitions in Europe, the consistency of which with the Atlantic Charter is obscure.

Sooner or later these and many other vital questions must be settled.

I hope with all my heart that my apprehensions are unfounded. But everything in relation to the Moscow Conference is so hazy, except the Russian statements, which always have been frank and honest regarding their intentions. It is quite possible that the Russians take one view of the conference, and the administration takes another—a contrary view. Here then are the seeds of a tragic misunderstanding. Pledges of intention and promises to consult are useful but not the hard part. We should reserve our judgment to see how they will be carried out.

In other words, we are living today on our own aspirations and hopes which are all too likely to be sadly disappointing.

For the Republican Party to assume that these hopes as yet have actual substance would be to accept responsibility for a probable disillusionment later. I believe it is now the administration's strategy to angle the G. O. P. into accepting a part of this responsibility so that when the show-down comes the Republican leadership might be held partially accountable by the electorate.

I believe it would be disastrous for the country if the Republican Party endorsed the Moscow political arrangement on which the contracting parties have already placed conflicting interpretations.

Of course, if there is tangible evidence of constructive international agreements, these should be supported. The assumption that such agreements have been made, when there is no evidence to bear out that assumption, most decidedly argues against an endorsement.

There is a campaign developing to persuade both parties to adopt similar declarations of foreign policies when no one can be sure what the administration's foreign policy is now or will be.

Furthermore, in view of the administration's record of irregular shortcuts, and bypassing or ignoring the clear intent of Congress, who can trust it?

Time and time again the clear meaning of words have been twisted or distorted and the intent of Congress has been altered and expanded by Executive decrees.

One thing alone is certain under the left wing New Dealers, our foreign policy will be shaped and interpreted to make it necessary to keep in effect the despotic regulations and management of business, labor, and agriculture. The restoration of the rights of the States and basic American rights of the individual is one of the big issues involved in the next campaign.

It will not come at the end of the war, if the little dominant group of New Dealers planning a foreign patterned national socialist state are not kicked out at the next election.

The inevitable end of their policy will be the destruction of individual opportunity and enterprise and ultimately the Republic, and the destruction of collective bargaining by free and independent labor unions.

Certainly the gravity of world and domestic affairs calls for the orderly democratic process and the presentation to the electors of the Republic, a constructive viewpoint. I fully respect the motives of some who are initiating the movement for complete agreement on the whole issue of foreign policy. But I believe the record of this administration and the history of popular government demonstrates that it would work out to the detriment of the country as a whole and especially is that true when mass propaganda to the Army is being urged by our pseudo liberals.

It is of vital importance that the party lines should now be drawn for next November against life-term candidate Roosevelt and the group of managers for the totalitarian state.

I believe there are developing dangers to our Nation which the Republican Party must confront intelligently, firmly, and cooperatively. We must act courageously and decisively if these dangers are to be avoided and our country is once more put on the high road of sound government.

International problems are of the greatest importance.

The sacrifices of our fighting forces must be translated into enduring world tranquility. If we do less, we will not have kept the faith. But always we must remember world tranquility, like charity, begins at home, and we cannot go out and do our full share in reorganizing, rehabilitating, and regenerating the world when our own domestic affairs are not well ordered.

Presentation of Wisconsin Flag to Mayor of Philadelphia—Address by Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on the occasion of the presentation of a Wisconsin State flag to the mayor of Philadelphia for use in connection with the display of State flags in Independence Hall, on March 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor for me to be present with you people today, in this hallowed hall. Independence Hall is a patriotic shrine for all America. It is a cathedral of American hopes and American ideals.

As we step across its threshold we embrace the memories of those great men who lived in the formative period of our Nation. Here in this very hall Washington and Jefferson, Franklin and Adams, Hamilton and Lee, Hancock, Sherman, Morris, Rush, Wilson, and Livingston, and other great nation-builders met and discussed the affairs of state.

Every schoolboy knows the story of Independence Hall. It is the first place we want to see when we come to Philadelphia. My visit here today brings back pleasant memories of former years when, as a young man, I walked through these sacred halls.

As I entered the building today, I felt the same thrill, the same fervor that I did in my first visit.

The history of this building dates from that chilly morning in 1732 when the 30 members of the Provincial Assembly met in the still uncompleted Statehouse.

This building on that sultry Fourth of July in 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence receive the signatures which made it official. It was here on July 16, 1775, that Washington was given command of the Continental Army. It was here on July 9, 1778, that the Thirteen Colonies were welded into a union by the ratification of the Articles of Confederation.

It was here on September 17, 1787, that the Constitution was drawn. It was here in 1848 that the draped body of John Quincy Adams lay in state in the same room where his father had fought for independence. It was here some 4 years later that a funeral procession bearing torches arrived at midnight with the body of Henry Clay.

This building saw Independence Square thronged with people singing deliriously as Richmond fell. It was here just 2 weeks later that a double file of soldiers marched in lockstep to the south door of Independence Hall bearing on their shoulders the casket of the martyred Lincoln.

Independence Square is alive with the memories of the famous 100 working days with George Washington presiding in his high-backed chair, and turning now and then to speak to the aging Benjamin Franklin.

Independence Square saw the creation of the Federal Government and the Constitution, the Army, the Navy, and the mint. It was here that the Jay Treaty was debated and ratified. It was here that Washington was inaugurated for a second term. It was here on September 17, 1796, that he delivered his farewell address.

Independence Square for three-quarters of a century was the stage on which the great drama of a new nation was unfolded. We could say of Independence Square, as Byron said of Greece, "Where'er we tread, 'tis haunted holy ground."

The corporeal heritage of those stirring days lives here in Philadelphia, but the spirit of independence and freedom which was born in these halls lives today in the hearts and minds of men and women and children all over America. It is a proud part of the birthright of every American. It is a part of the heritage of each of our States.

I come from a section of the country about which the founding fathers knew little or nothing, but down through the years we, too, have lived and breathed in the spirit

of this glorious heritage whose shrine is here in Philadelphia. I bring to Independence Hall today the flag of a State about which the founding fathers scarcely dreamed

Of course, Wisconsin's vast area of some 56,000 square miles had already been traversed by the French explorers. That French period began with Jean Nicolet's voyage to the heart of Wisconsin in 1634 and it ended with the Treaty of Paris in 1763. It was a period when Wisconsin was a far-flung fringe on the French-Canadian life which had its heart along the St. Lawrence River. It was through the historic gateway of the St. Lawrence River that Wisconsin was discovered and explored more than three centuries ago by the men of New France.

It is not my purpose to discuss here today the history of this land crossed by the great glaciers more than a million years ago. It is not my purpose to tell you a story of timber and trapping, of the stark daring of frontier life in the northland, of the century when we were the favored recruiting ground of the French, of the courageous explorations by the missionaries, of the alliance which the Wisconsin Indians made in 1778 with George Rogers Clark.

It is not my purpose to discuss the two centuries of romance which preceded the days when Wisconsin emerged from the winding Indian trails unto the broad highways of a great agricultural, dairying, and industrial State.

I am interested, however, in recalling to your minds the fact that when John Jay and John Adams went to Paris to join Benjamin Franklin, the fate of the West and the fate of Wisconsin was at stake. There was a treaty signed on September 3, 1783, and under the terms of that treaty, Wisconsin was included in the United States.

Again at the time of the War of 1812, the fate of Wisconsin was dependent upon a European treaty. The Treaty of Ghent ended European control in the Northwest, and Wisconsin Territory was still a part of the United States.

It is well today that in this birthplace of independence we recall that this Wisconsin flag represented a territory once dominated by European control.

For the most part, during the Revolutionary days, my State was a land of virgin forests, inhabited only by the painted tribesmen of Wisconsin. Its towering pines reached upward to the sky, and its great lakes, Superior and Michigan, and the great Father of Waters, the Mississippi River, were known only to few, and they only thought of them as names associated with distant lands.

But now, thank God, this State which I have the honor to represent in the United States Senate is one with the Original Thirteen. We are one country—one people.

It is a great happiness I am experiencing today. I bring to you the flag of my Commonwealth to be placed in this sacred depository along with the other State flags as a symbol of national unity. Each of our flags becomes a part of the greater flag—the red, the white, and the blue—of America. Each flag symbolizes a star in the firmament of the United States.

This Commonwealth, which I have the honor of representing and which was little known in the days when this Nation was born, now has a population comparable to that of the Thirteen Original Colonies. In the State of Wisconsin we have great and beautiful cities, fertile farm lands, sparkling brooks, thousands of inland lakes, and great rivers—a land singularly blessed by the Creator, and extending from the rolling hill country of southern Wisconsin to the pine-crowned Apostle Islands of the Chequamegon Bay of Lake Superior and from the rugged western sentinel cliffs of the Mississippi to the broad expanse of sandy beaches fronting Lake Michigan.

Wisconsin, thoroughly American, is a melting pot of the strong races of the world—races who have met here and formed a great sturdy and industrious people.

Though, according to the rich historical lore of Wisconsin, our State made provisions for a flag as early as 1863, it was not until 1913 that our State flag was officially adopted. Since our State flag consists of the State coat-of-arms, it is interesting for us to briefly consider the history of the great seal and the coat-of-arms of Wisconsin.

Our State was admitted to the Union on May 29, 1848, and on June 21 of that year the first great seal of the State was engraved. Governor Nelson Dewey didn't like the first great seal of the State, however, and in 1851 he took steps to have a more satisfactory one provided. We are told that when he went to New York he carried with him a design which had been prepared at his request by Chancelor John H. Lathrop, of the University of Wisconsin.

It was said that Governor Dewey took the design with him with the intention of having it engraved. According to the story, as he was walking down Wall Street, he met Edward G. Ryan, afterward Chief Justice of the Supereme Court of Wisconsin. Governor Dewey showed Mr. Ryan the design and Mr. Ryan pointed out several features which he disapproved. That discouraged Governor Dewey and he abandoned the design.

Then the two men sat down together on the steps of one of the banks on Wall Street and worked out the design which is today the present coat-of-arms and the great seal of the State. The new seal was practically a reproduction of the seal of 1851, though some changes were made.

The coat-of-arms of the State of Wisconsin is in reality a part of the State seal and consists of a quartered shield—the quarters bearing respectively a plow for agriculture, an arm and hammer to represent manufacturing, a shovel and pick to represent mining, and an anchor to represent navigation.

In the center of the shield there is a smaller shield with 13 upright bars as shown in the coat-of-arms of the United States. Around the smaller shield is a double circle or garter on which appears the motto of the United States "E Pluribus Unum." The motto and seal of the United States were both included as symbols of Wisconsin's loyalty to the Union.

Beneath the larger shield is a pyramid of pig lead and a cornucopia or horn of plenty. The lead indicates Wisconsin's mineral wealth and the cornucopia indicates the general resources for prosperity in Wisconsin.

There are two supporters of the larger shield. The dexter or right supporter is a sailor holding a coil of rope which represents labor by water. On the left or sinister side there is a yeoman with his left hand resting on a pick. He represents labor by hand.

Just above the shield is the form of the badger from which our State derives its familiar designation as the Badger State. Above the crest on a banner is the word "Forward," the motto of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I present this flag not only to be a part of a State display of flags, but to emphasize that unity of purpose, that oneness of ideals by which we as a Nation may go forward.

Here in Independence Hall today, it is well for us to reconsecrate ourselves to the beliefs which first found their expression in this hallowed place; to rededicate our lives to the cause which was born in Independence Square to recovenant our faith in our way of life; to rekindle in our hearts the fervor and the flame of loyalty and devotion of a united people to the United States. There are challenges today as great as those which confronted the men who from this hall began a crusade which has given us the greatest land and the greatest people which the world has known since the beginning of time.

It is my hope that we will meet the challenge of this ruthless era with the same sincerity and abiding faith which characterized the men of Independence Hall. In that high hope, Mr. Chairman, I present this flag as a symbol of Wisconsin's devotion to the unity of this great land.

Men Make the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address recently delivered by Rear Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, entitled "Men Make the Navy."

Attention is called not only to the high praise given to the enlisted men but to the following statement:

Anyone holding the notion that the Japanese can be quickly subdued after the defeat of Germany should talk to men who have come back from the Pacific. These men know that the toughest battles are yet to be fought. They know that the fight will be harder and longer and the cost in the lives of our men will be greater than the expectations expressed by those who are remote from the realities of this war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate the opportunity Hanson Baldwin, the distinguished military editor of the New York Times, has given me to tell you about the men of the Navy, about your son and the son of the neighbor next door.

A bluejacket, attempting to describe himself, recently wrote:

"A sailor is a man who gets too little sleep, does every imaginable job at any imaginable hour, never knows where he is going, can seldom tell where he's been—yet accepts the worst with complete resignation, and last, but not least—he really kinda likes it."

The description is incomplete. The bluejacket failed to mention that the sailor will face any ordeal unafraid. He failed to mention a bluejacket quality which arises in combat. That quality is valor.

Men make the Navy. It is an old axiom of the sea that a good ship with an inferior crew is seldom a match for a good crew with an inferior ship. It should be the source of assurance and pride to Americans to know that in this war the United States Fleet is fortunate in having both good ships and able men to sail in them. It is the quality of these men which has accounted in large part for our initial success at sea and it is their quality which holds the promise of eventual victory.

In the short time since the outbreak of hostilities we have succeeded in building the greatest and most powerful fleet in the history of the world. A similarly remarkable accomplishment is the fact that in that short time we have also been able to find, train, and man our fighting ships with unprecedented numbers of men from civilian pursuits who, by their performance, have proved themselves worthy of the finest traditions of the Navy.

The large majority of men who now man our Navy have come from our farms and out of our factories and offices. They had little or no tradition in the sea. Most had never before been afloat on the broad blue ocean. Three years ago the total strength of the Navy in men and officers was 161,000. Today that strength is approximately 2,400,000. These men have had to learn a new art; they have had to acquire it rapidly and put it to use quickly.

The launching of a ship is only the beginning of the task of creating a great Navy. The end of that process is battle with the enemy. Everyone is familiar with the beginning and end of this process; our great shipbuilding program; our successes in combat at sea. But few understand the middle process, the hard, tedious, exacting period in which new ships and raw recruits are molded into one efficient instrument of destruction. It is during this process as well as in combat that the American bluejacket proves his worth.

From the beginning of his service the bluejacket pursues a continuous process of training. At boot camp he learns to drill, to get along with his fellows and he acquires a little of the language, traditions, and ways of the Navy. He learns a new trade or, if he has a trade, finds where best his special skill may be employed. This is an important process, for the Navy is an organization of experts. Above and below deck the modern warship is a vast and complicated mechanism and to assure the proper maintenance and control of this mechanism, the men aboard her must become specialists.

The bluejacket may go on to further training ashore and then to sea to join the fleet or advance base forces.

He finds life afloat an exacting routine. He must always be on his toes and alert. His work is never done. In enemy waters he may be on continuous duty for 24 or 36 hours and sometimes longer. While he is ordinarily on duty 8 out of every 24 hours, there is always a great deal of ship-keeping, repairing, and drill to consume the hours not spent on watch. Even aboard modern fighting ships, where every possible provision has been made for the comfort of the men, life is confining. He may be weeks away from shore; months and even years away from home.

Yet his morale is high, he is proud of his job and he is performing it with competence and spirit. He is the backbone of our fleet. Without his patience, skill, and dependability our ships could not be the great fighting weapons they have proved to be. Without his keen sense of duty and cool courage under fire, success in combat would be impossible.

I am not referring to outstanding acts of spectacular heroism. I mean the kind of courage which must be expected aboard ship, but which, when it is demonstrated, never fails to be impressive. The bluejacket's courage and ingenuity is most frequently shown in his ability to perform his duty under grim circumstances in perfect coordination with his shipmates, working and fighting as a team.

The record of courageous group action is written in every report of battle in this war. Universally these reports contain the highest commendation of the commanding officer for both men and officers.

Here is an excerpt from the action report of the commanding officer of an aircraft carrier which took part in the Battle of the Coral Sea:

"The performance of all personnel was magnificent. I cannot say too much in praise of the conduct of the personnel, of the officers and men of the ship and her squadrons. The finest traditions of the naval service were upheld in every respect. Every last officer and man performed his duty with the greatest credit to himself, his family, and his country."

A report of the encounter of a United States battleship with a Japanese force contains this paragraph:

"The conduct of the entire complement, officers and men, without exception, was highly exemplary. Particularly noteworthy was the performance of machine-gun crews and other exposed station personnel. The efficiency of machine-gun crews and the tenacity with which they individually and collectively served their guns was so universally noted that it is almost impossible to single out individuals for special commendations without doing injustice to all others."

From a cruiser, which suffered the heaviest enemy fire, comes the following account:

"Investigation has brought to light nothing but the most courageous performance of duty on the part of every officer and man.

"Control parties and gun crews in the exposed positions stood to their stations under a most devastating fire of shell, shrapnel, and splinters.

"In the engine rooms and fire rooms, officers and men worked in the dark, in gas masks, and in thick smoke and great heat from the fires above, to maintain power until their efforts were no longer effective. Then blindly, hand in hand, and supporting the wounded they opened the armored hatches and made their way either forward or aft to the upper decks. Drills blindfolded have prepared them for just such a contingency."

I have quoted from these action reports because in the ordeal of battle the qualities of men are given their clearest test. Yet the record of the men in the Navy is not confined to battle reports. Commanding officers in combat areas and in all branches of the service—surface forces, air arm, submarine service, construction battalions, amphibious forces, the medical and engineering corps—reports from all of them reflect abundant gratitude for the caliber of men going out to the combat zones.

What I have said about the courage and devotion of the bluejacket can be said with equal emphasis about the Naval Reserve officer. Too little public recognition is given to the splendid and vital role which the Reserve officer is playing in the success of the Navy in this war. With the exception of top command of the largest vessels and posts requiring long experience and training in naval tactics, the great majority of officers in the fleet are Reserves.

With a fleet of considerably more than 30,000 vessels of all types, and with a supply of some 6,500 regular Navy officers—exclusive of those in aviation and engineer duty—the vital role which the Reserve Naval officer must play in this war can readily be seen. Aboard our battleships and cruisers and in Naval aviation between 85 and 90 percent of the officers are reserves. Reserves account for approximately 75 percent of the officers on our newest type destroyers. In the normal complement of our submarines, 50 percent of the officers are reservists. And aboard our old destroyers, our new destroyer escorts, and on submarine chasers, torpedo boats, auxiliaries of all types and in our amphibious forces, young reserve officers account for nearly 100 percent of the officer personnel; less than 1 percent are officers of the regular Navy.

Two or three years ago, the average reserve officer, like the average bluejacket, was in a civilian job or civilian school. He entered the Navy for the duration. He brought with him a deep sense of duty to his country, his American ingenuity and resourcefulness, and in most instances, the professional training he acquired in civilian pursuits. The rest the Navy taught him. He has had considerable war experience since Pearl Harbor and he has advanced rapidly in accordance with his ability to demonstate his capacity for new and higher duties.

The Navy has found, for instance, that the reserve officers with early experience in command of armed guard crews aboard merchant vessels have proved a continuing source of officers for combatant ships, small craft, and amphibious forces. With the urgent need for large numbers of competent officers, age has proved no bar to promotion where able performance of duty has been demonstrated.

In the invasion of Sicily the officers who brought our troops ashore were ensigns and junior lieutenants in command of landing craft. A war correspondent provided a clear description of their part in that engagement when he said:

"After being with them through this operation, I must say my respect for the Navy is great. The personnel for this great task had to be built as quickly as the fleet itself. There were 1,000 officers staffing these new-type invasion ships, and less than 20 of them were regular Navy men. The rest were all erstwhile civilians trained almost overnight into seadogs. The bulk of the assault craft came across the ocean under their own power. They are flat-bottomed and not addicted to deep-water sailing. Their skippers were all youngsters of scant experience. As one Navy man said, this heterogeneous fleet was navigated across the Atlantic mainly by spitting into the wind.

"Fewer than a third of the sailors on our ship were regular Navy. And most of that third hadn't been in the Navy many years. Most of our crew were young peacetime landlubbers who became sailors only because of the war and who were longing to get back to civil life."

In every ocean where this war is being fought—on the surface, below it and above it, and on enemy beaches—officers and men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard are writing a valiant chapter in the history of the United States.

These men are fighting and dying for you and me. Naval casualties in the war so far have reached a total of 33,303. Our men on the fighting fronts are encountering great hardships with a smile so that you, their families, may be secure in this great free country of ours.

But you have a responsibility too. You must back them up. They can only do their best when they know their families and friends are wholeheartedly behind them. Write them often; write them encouraging letters; let them know that what they are doing is being appreciated at home.

The men of the Navy face this new year with confidence. Yet they know it is folly to speculate on a date for victory. Anyone holding the notion that the Japanese can be quickly subdued after the defeat of Germany should talk to men who have come back from the Pacific. These men know that the toughest battles are yet to be fought. They know that the fight will be harder and longer, and the cost in the lives of our men will be greater than the expectations expressed by those who are remote from the realities of this war.

They know that our enemies still possess vast reserves in material and personnel not yet brought into operations on the battlefield and on the high seas. In spite of the Navy's many successes since Pearl Harbor, the main Japanese battle force is still intact and remains a constant threat that must inevitably be dealt with.

Our fighting men know the temper of the enemy. They know that he is cruel, cunning, and ruthless, and endowed with extraordinary stamina when his back is against the wall.

The road to Tokyo and final victory is long and hazardous. We at home must condition ourselves to this fact and resolve to strive unceasingly to do all we can to lighten the burden of those who are bearing the brunt of battle overseas and on the seas. To keep faith with these men, we must abandon the habit of speculating on a time schedule for the future progress of the war and we must dedicate all our energy and determination to the tremendous job ahead.

Proposed Extension of Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Proposed Extension of the Social Security Program, With Special Reference to Health and Medical Aspects," delivered by I. S. Falk, Director, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, at the Massachusetts Conference of Social Work, at Boston, Mass., on December 2, 1943. I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

Historically, it is peculiarly fitting that this conference should consider the health aspects of social security plans. It was here, in Massachusetts, that the public health movement of the United States received much of its first great impetus. And it is especially significant that in the classical Report of the Massachusetts Sanitary Commission (1850), Lemuel Shattuck saw and showed clearly not only the interrelations among poverty, sickness, and dependency but also the potential role of health services in the welfare of society and the pursuit of happiness.

In the 93 years which have elapsed since the appearance of the Shattuck report, there have been advances in environmental sanitation and other aspects of public health which have transformed society. Medicine has become a science and has attained high levels of effectiveness. But we have yet to organize our health services so as to assure the availability of modern medical services to all who need them and can benefit from them. The proper test is not that health is better today than it was a decade or a generation or a century ago or in some other country, nor that medicine and public health accomplish more now than then. By such comparisons, health provisions were good in 1900 or perhaps even in 1850. The valid test is whether we do well and effectively today what we know how to do and can do. By this test we find no ground for complacence.

For this audience I do not need to review the fundamental importance of health measures and of medical care in the prevention of destitution and in the building of a strong and democratic society. You see in your own work the extent to which sickness, disability, and postponable death destroy the economic independence of individuals and families. You know that much suffering and dependency could have been prevented by adequate and timely service. You are aware of the opportunities for therapy or rehabilitation which are missed because there is no way of paying for needed services. Those of you who have been especially concerned with the problems of children know to what extent we are failing to utilize modern medicine to protect and strengthen the generation which will soon inherit this country.

The public was shocked by the number of young men—about half of the first 3,000,000 called up to serve in the armed forces—who were rejected because of diseases and physical defects, many of which could have been prevented or were still remediable.

There is widespread and insistent public demand that these and similar conditions shall not continue; that our country shall come into the heritage of health services and health security made possible by the progress of science and the wealth of our resources.

This demand has not come primarily because of new or startling discoveries in the laboratory or clinic. It has emerged, by almost imperceptible degrees, from public education—from knowledge of what modern medicine can do through effective and general application, and from awareness that there are ways of accomplishing such application. It is therefore not surprising that the demand for strengthened and broadened health services takes practical form within the framework of plans for social security.

The fullest measure of security rests upon the assurance of opportunity to work and earn a living in an economy organized to produce abundantly. To whatever extent this goal is met, social security must also include provision for continuity of income during periods when family livelihood is threatened by sickness or by the unemployment or premature death of the breadwinner, or his disablement or retirement in old age. Worldwide experience has shown that social security in this narrower sense of income maintenance can be most effectively attained through comprehensive contributory social insurance measures supplemented by public assistance to meet individual need. New plans for social security will not be complete nor economically sound unless they include measures designed to make available to every member of the community certain basic services—among the most important of which are the health services.

II

The objective of an adequate health program for our times can be stated very simply. We must assure, for all persons, access to all essential services, including both preventive and therapeutic services, according to the medical need and without regard for the ability of the individual to pay at the time the services are received.

With some important exceptions which I shall mention later, this country has in peacetime a nearly adequate volume of medical facilities and a nearly adequate number of physicians. Unfortunately, neither the facilities nor the medical personnel are distributed throughout the country entirely in relation to the need for services. Moreover, the existing resources of facilities and personnel are not in fact available to large numbers of persons who cannot surmount the barrier of costs which stands between them and the doctor, the laboratory, or the hospital. Large numbers of persons go without badly needed care, hesitant to undertake financial burdens or reluctant to accept "charity" or "free services" even where these are available. The practice of modern medicine, moreover, calls for the use of a variety of necessarily costly laboratory techniques and specialized skills and equipments which are not available in the office of the individual doctor. With every passing year, medicine becomes a more intricate and more complicated science, demanding the coordinated skills of general practitioners, specialists, laboratory technicians, and the hospital. Our modern medical schools train young men and women to practice coordinated medicine, as members of groups and teams. Yet—outside of hospitals—medicine continues to be practiced primarily by more or less isolated individuals. Though organized practice develops, its growth is at less than a snail's pace. Each advance in medical science underscores the need to solve problems relating to the costs of medical care and the need to coordinate services.

The financial solution—access to needed services without barriers of cost—may be attained through either of two major patterns. Both community health services and individual medical care may, like education, be provided as a public service. According to this pattern, governmental agencies would finance the program from general tax revenues, and would provide all needed facilities and hire all needed personnel. Every member of the community would be entitled to call upon these services to whatever extent he needed them. This would be "public medicine" or "State medicine"—using these as descriptive terms rather than emotional epithets. We have a great deal of public medicine now, and its volume grows steadily.

On the other hand, the community health services alone—sanitation, control of communicable diseases, and other public-health measures—might continue as governmental services, supported from general taxation, while medical services for the individual would be provided through a contributory social insurance system. In this case, medical care would be financed through regular contributions to a social insurance trust fund made by all employed workers—whether self-employed or employed by others. These contributions would entitle insured workers and their dependents to receive all needed services without further payment; the doctors, laboratories, hospitals, and other groups would be paid for their services by the social insurance fund. Contributions might also be made on behalf of other groups in the population—social insurance beneficiaries, recipients of public assistance, persons engaged on public works projects, persons in the armed forces—who would thus become members of the social insurance system and entitled to medical care on the same basis as workers who had contributed from their earnings. Thus, virtually the entire population would receive individual medical services through the social insurance system.

You will readily appreciate that the first of these two major alternatives—public medical service—would involve the more extensive changes in present medical practice. Many persons argue that because it offers the greater—perhaps the only—assurance that medical care will be available to everybody who needs it, public medical care is the alternative to be preferred. In countries where modern medical facilities and trained personnel are very limited, government provision of hospitals and clinics and operation of these facilities with salaried medical personnel may offer the greatest promise of speedy and effective health protection. For the United States, however, it might not be considered as practicable or, at any rate, as acceptable a pattern.

At all events, directing my attention primarily to social insurance possibilities, I shall not explore further the possibilities of a general public medical service. I shall discuss at this time only the question whether we can achieve all our major objectives through coordinating community health services provided by general tax funds and individual medical care financed through social insurance. A properly designed social insurance system, built upon existing medical practices and arrangements, can assure access to needed medical services for 90 percent or more of our population at the outset, and eventually for every group which should obtain such service through the social insurance system. Such a plan would have a solid financial foundation.

The medical services of a comprehensive social insurance system should, of course, be coordinated with the cash benefits—which assure continuity of income when earnings are interrupted by temporary or permanent disability—thus providing the means of subsistence without which medical care may be meaningless.

III

If the objectives discussed earlier are to be achieved, the social insurance system would cover all workers. Building upon the present old-age and survivors insurance system, we might say that in addition to the employments now covered, it should include agricultural labor, domestic service, Government employment, employment for nonprofit institutions, self-employment in both agriculture and business, and miscellaneous employments now excluded. With such a coverage, the insured workers and their dependent wives and children would normally constitute about 85 percent of the population. As I suggested earlier, other persons—such as the needy and social insurance beneficiaries—might be qualified to receive medical care through contributions to the social insurance system made on their behalf.

Under a unified social insurance system of which medical care insurance was a part, there would need to be only a single contribution to the insurance fund for all types of benefits. Employers would submit one payroll report, and self-employed persons a a single report of income. The same earnings records would serve for determining rights to any type of benefit. The funds available for particular types, however, might be segregated. It would seem necessary to set aside a definite proportion of the contribution income to pay for medical services.

Ideally, the social insurance system should include provisions for any needed medical service—services of the general practitioner and the specialist, use of laboratory and X-ray facilities, hospitalization, dental care, home nursing, and prescribed drugs, medicines and appliances. At the outset, however, it may be necessary to provide more limited benefits—not because people are unwilling to pay for all types of services, but because we lack facilities and trained personnel to furnish some of the services to all persons who need them and would seek them if the present barriers of cost were removed. This is the situation particularly with respect to dental care. Home nursing presents similar problems, in addition to the need for extensive adjustments in the arrangements under which the service would be furnished. Consequently, it would be wiser to omit these services at the outset, but to provide for their inclusion as soon as practicable. It may also be undesirable for the social insurance system to meet the costs of any except unusually expensive medicines and appliances.

With these limitations, the insured worker and his family would still have access to a group of medical services which lend themselves to sound integration: care from the family physician, together with specialist services, laboratory and other diagnostic and therapeutic facilities, hospitalization, and unusually expensive prescribed medicines and appliances. This limited program provides a suitable base from which to build toward the more comprehensive provisions. Initially, an amount equal to 3 percent of pay rolls would probably suffice to furnish insured persons with the guaranteed services and commodities, and to provide adequate remuneration to doctors, hospitals, laboratories, and others.

In a Nation-wide, comprehensive system of social insurance there must be central determination of policies and standards to assure equitable treatment of all members of the system. But the actual administration of the social-insurance benefits should be highly decentralized. Benefits would be claimed at or through local social-insurance offices, and all determinations requiring knowledge of local conditions or individual circumstances would be made in the local communities.

In the case of medical-care benefit, it is particularly important to distinguish between the functions of centralized policy making and decentralized operation. In the first place, the social-insurance system would build upon existing facilities, personnel and arrangements, utilizing existing practitioners, hospitals, laboratories, and other personnel and facilities. It need not and should not interfere in any way with the essential professional aspects of medical practice or with the internal management of hospitals.

When medical-care benefits first become available, most persons who have a family doctor would presumably continue to go to him. Others would select a doctor from among all those available in the community. The only essential change which the insurance arrangement makes between physician and patient is in the method of payment. Instead of paying for medical service at the time it is received—when perhaps he can least afford it—or incurring a heavy debt, or unwillingly accepting free care or going without needed care because he cannot pay, the insured worker would pay for medical care for himself and his family by small deductions from his earnings when he is employed. Instead of each family's carrying the cost of its own care, whether that cost is very light or unbearably severe, every worker would pay only his proportionate share of the average cost. Every employed person can afford to contribute an average percent of his earnings; it is the unequal incidence of individual medical costs which makes them a burden to the individual and a threat to family security.

Just as each worker could choose his doctor from among all licensed practitioners of medicine who wished to participate in the insurance arrangement, so every doctor would have the right to accept or reject patients. Social insurance would enable the doctor to engage more fully in the practice of medicine, utilizing all modern techniques and laboratory aids, calling on specialists for advice or service when needed, without concern for the individual patient's inability to pay. The doctor would also know that he would be paid for all his services to insured persons.

The arrangements to pay doctors might take several forms, among which the doctors in each locality would choose whichever they preferred. Doctors might be paid according to established fee schedules for each home visit, office visit, and so on. Fee schedules could be uniform for the entire country or might vary from one region or place to another, taking account of variations among communities in customary fees and in overhead costs of practice.

The method of payment which has come to be preferred by physicians in Great Britain, after considerable experience with fee schedules, is known as the capitation method. Under this method the doctor received a fixed amount per year for each person who chooses him, whether he is called upon to give much or little or no service to any particular individual during the year. This method requires that every insured person specify his intention to be on some doctor's list. So that doctors do not lose income to which they are entitled, capitation payments are made not only for those who have chosen a doctor but also for those who have not. Such payments and adjustment are, of course, made locally and not from the central office.

Doctors who so choose might also be paid on a salary basis, whole time or part time. Or a combination of various methods might be used. Provision should also be made for equitable payments to organized groups of doctors.

The hospitals, like the doctors, should be free to choose the method by which they would be paid. In discussions which we have had with hospital administrators and official committees of the hospital associations, it has been generally agreed that payment should be made direct to the hospital, whether by assignment of a fixed benefit amount for each day of hospitalization or by payment of the reasonable cost of minimum necessary services, within fixed minimum and maximum limits. The method of payment to hospitals should not and need not interfere in any way with the hospital's control of its own customary management and affairs.

With such a general framework for medical services furnished through social insurance, the current pattern of professional relationships among people, doctors, and hospitals would not be changed in any basic way. This is the virtue of health insurance to those who wish to build by slow and measured evolutionary processes on the status quo.

IV

If the approach to a health-insurance plan is primarily with respect to existing financial problems, the tendency is to leave treatment of the qualitative problems largely to the operation of forces and trends working within the professions. This is not to say, however, that an insurance plan designed along these lines should be or can be indifferent to the need for safeguarding and constantly improving the quality of services provided as insurance benefits. On the contrary, when contributions are compulsory, government cannot avoid responsibility for the quality of the benefits.

In a system which builds upon the existing and available resources in professional personnel, hospitals, and other facilities, I suggest that at least the following six provisions are essential to protect and promote the quality of the medical services—

1. Access to necessary specialist and consultant services;

2. Special rates of payment for services of the specialist when furnished by physicians who meet professional standards certifying their special skill;

3. Access to necessary laboratory and related aids to diagnosis and treatment;

4. Payments for hospital care furnished in institutions which meet medical and hospital professional standards applicable to institutions furnishing general or limited varieties of service;

5. Specifications which aid the development of organized group practice and coordinated medical, hospital, and community health services; and

6. Financial support for professional education and for research.

In establishing professional standards, the insurance system should obviously be expected to lean heavily upon standards developed by professional organizations. A competent advisory council, with adequate professional representation, would be essential.

The professional specialty boards have already done basic spadework in certifying most of the qualified specialists in medicine. Large problems remain, but desirable solutions can undoubtedly be found by administrators working in close collaboration with advisory bodies.

In designating hospitals entitled to receive payments, the social-insurance system may be guided by existing accrediting procedures long accepted by the Nation's hospitals. Institutions which cannot meet all the standards applicable to large urban or metropolitan hospitals might nevertheless be accredited for all or limited varieties of cases, if their service is adequate to promote the health and safety of the hospitalized persons. The social-insurance system might also encourage the development and use of qualified institutions for the care of the chronic sick or of corresponding facilities associated with general hospitals, thus providing more appropriate treatment for chronic patients and reserving the more elaborate and more expensive facilities of the general hospital for acute cases.

The general policies for the acceptance of participating hospitals, the designation of specialists, and the arrangement for paying

doctors and hospitals should be determined centrally for the social-insurance system. This is a function of the administrator, guided by consultations with appropriate professional and other advisory bodies. The application of these policies, however, should be carried out through a thoroughly decentralized administration, operating at every level of administration, from the central to the local, with the help of advisory bodies which include representatives of the persons who furnish and those who pay for the benefits.

I have stressed the point that a social-insurance system would be built upon existing facilities and existing arrangements for medical care, changing primarily the methods of payment. I do not wish, however, to give the impression that our health services would remain in their present stage of development. By striving to give every doctor access to all necessary diagnostic and therapeutic aids in the treatment of every patient, whatever that patient's economic circumstances, the system would advance the practice of medicine toward the standards which now prevail in the better hospitals or clinics. By removing the barriers of cost which today cause many persons to postpone seeking medical advice, it would stimulate early diagnosis and treatment and thus the prevention of much illness and disability. By guaranteeing the doctor a fair payment for his services it would enable doctors to practice in areas and communities which at present cannot provide him with a decent living. By guaranteeing payment for hospital service it would encourage the building of hospitals and health centers in communities which can find the capital funds for such construction if they are assured of a continuing operating income.

There is an additional obligation to take certain direct measures to improve the adequacy of existing health and medical services. Either from the social-insurance funds or from other public funds, money should be made available to construct hospitals and health centers in communities which cannot raise the necessary capital. Moreover, as indicated before, to advance the skill and knowledge which will promote prevention of disease, and to assure progressive improvement in the quality of medical care, the social-insurance system might properly set aside a small fraction of the contribution income for the support of research and of professional education and training.

V

Having said this much about quality of care, I add a few words more in anticipation of disagreements which my remarks will invite.

Among physicians who accept the need for medical-care insurance, some will criticize the plan I have outlined as far too conservative and too timid. In particular, this group will object especially to permitting fee-for-service as one method of payment.

There is little doubt that some of the most serious deficiencies of present-day medical practice result from the fee-for-service method of payment, because it discourages early, preventive, or adequate care, especially among people of modest means, at the same time that it puts a premium on excessive treatment in some cases, inadequate treatment in others, and various types of fee-splitting practices. Some of these objectionable features of fee-for-service would be carried over into the insurance system despite precautions which may be taken. While the patient would no longer be barred from needed services, there would be a risk that some doctors would load unwarranted service charges on the insurance fund. Since the aggregate amounts available for all payments to doctors would be limited, the result could be a competition for patients and for volume of service almost as inimical to professional standards as that which occurs today. Through the downward prorating of physicians' bills if they are excessive, the insurance fund can be protected against extreme unwarranted costs. For the rest the problem would be largely a matter of intra-professional controls.

I think that practitioners here, like physicians in Great Britain, would turn to a capitation or a salary basis of payment because they would learn by experience that these methods are more satisfactory for them as well as for their patients. Nevertheless I do not agree that the insurance system should bar the fee-for-service method. So long as a majority of doctors prefer or insist upon a fee basis, I think it should be accepted by the social-insurance system. At the same time it should give full opportunity for the development of organized group practice where this arrangement is preferred by doctors and insured persons. In other words, I am taking the position that the insurance system should build upon what we have now and at the same time should build toward better arrangements by leaving latitude for change and improvement as rapidly as change is desired by or is acceptable to those who are most concerned.

I will dismiss with a few words certain misleading criticisms of medical-care insurance which are being broadcast across the Nation. At this point I use carefully disinfected language.

1. Medical benefits furnished through social insurance are not "free medicine" or "free care." It is of the essence that social insurance is contributory and that people pay for what they get.

2. Expenditures for medical care through social insurance need be no greater than the amounts the population already spends, hit and miss. In supporting a larger volume of service and better service, more would be spent for the types of service included as insurance benefit than is customarily spent for them. Such an increase would be offset by savings from curtailing present levels of expenditures for useless services and services now furnished uneconomically. Moreover, coming in regular, budgeted, and average amounts, the insurance costs would not be burdensome or catastrophic for anyone, even if in the aggregate they were somewhat larger than the total amount now spent individually for medical care. We would absorb them in an orderly fashion into the streams of our economy, just as we have absorbed the contribution costs of workmen's compensation, old-age and survivors' insurance, and unemployment compensation.

3. The medical insurance system would not destroy the "private practice" of medicine. It would strengthen and preserve the really essential elements of private practice—competition for patients or for annual income on the basis of satisfactory service, not on the size of a fee; free choice of doctor by the patient and the right to change; the right of the doctor to accept or reject patients; the right (and also the obligation) of the professions to participate in the determination of all matters of high policy which affect the practice of their professions; and the opportunity of the practitioner to be wholly concerned with his patient's medical needs irrespective of the patient's pocketbook.

4. The medical-insurance system would not weaken or destroy our voluntary hospital system. On the contrary, it would preserve to these hospitals their control over their own institutions and would guarantee them increased and assured continuity of income so that their service to the public may be larger and better.

5. The medical-insurance system need not and should not ignore noninsured needy persons. As I pointed out earlier, through payments made on their behalf by public agencies, the needy could be made entitled to the services provided for self-supporting families. Thus, one class of service would be available for all—with dignity and self-respect for the patients, while physicians would be released from the concern to distinguish pay from part-pay and free patients. This arrangement would be more satisfactory than present or prospective programs of medical assistance, even with the improved financial arrangements under the Social Security Act already recommended by the Social Security Board.

VI

With what assurances or what hopes can we look forward to more adequate health protection than the people of the United States now have?

The formulation of objectives and methods is only the beginning. As you know, a specific program of action was recently proposed to Congress through a bill (S. 1161) introduced in the Senate by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and in the House (H. R. 2861) by Representative DINGELL. That bill is notable in that for the first time it sets forth a comprehensive national program of contributory social insurance, including medical-care provisions in sufficient detail to provide a basis for public discussion. Submitted by its sponsors not as a final blueprint but as a basis for public discussion, its proposals deserve and invite thorough consideration, reasoned debate and constructive criticism.

I believe that the great majority of the people of this county know that the objectives of medical care insurance are sound; and they want more adequate service and are prepared to pay for it. The public and all the agencies of the Government most directly concerned—legislative and executive—need the help of persons with professional background and knowldge to bring to light what is unsound in any specific plan that is proposed, and what are the sound and constructive changes which may be desirable.

We have not much time for public education and discussion if we are to grasp the opportunity of achieving a comprehensive and well-designed system of social security in our time. If we wait until the potential disruptions and crises of the post-war period are upon us before taking action, we may find ourselves with a hastily devised and inadequate relief program, rather than a soundly conceived social insurance system. Once the general principles of a social insurance program have been agreed upon, time is needed to work out detailed plans and procedures and administrative machinery. We could probably move fairly rapidly in extending the cash benefit system, in which a substantial framework already exists. No responsible administrator would, however, want to begin operation of a medical care insurance plan until he had had adequate time for consultation with all the professional and lay groups whose interests and knowledge and skills should be utilized in developing detailed policies and procedures.

A period of full employment like the present is the most favorable time for initiating a contributory social insurance program. The initial impact of the contributions would be more easily borne by workers and employers than at any other time. The new contributions will have a deflationary effect on the economy whenever a beginning is made. Deflationary pressures are needed now; they might not be wise in the immediate post-war period.

If we extend social insurance coverage to all types of employment during the war, the great majority of the workers will come to the end of the war with rights to cash benefits in case of unemployment, sickness, disability, retirement, or the death of the breadwinner and with access to medical care for themselves and members of their families. If we wait to extend the system until a period of limited employment, it may be years before large groups of workers could qualify for insurance protection.

If we decide now that we want medical-care insurance and if we develop the detailed plans now, the tens of thousands of doctors who are serving in the armed forces will, upon their return, find opportunities for civilian service, and with more latitude for individual choice as to how and where they will serve than they have had before. If each returning doctor must make his way back into individual practice wherever his chances seem best for establishing an adequate livelihood, it may take a long time to bring about a relocation of doctors and medical facilities in accordance with the medical needs of the population.

Now—before the war ends—is the time to plan the peace for the years ahead. Such planning must be global. But it must also be national and local. And it must comprehend not only political security, but economic and social security—freedom from want and from the fear of want—in order that men may live lives of dignity and human worth. Social security thus appears as a necessary condition for men to be free and independent.

I believe there is increasing recognition that health protection would be among the most valuable, the most potent for the future, of all the benefits from a comprehensive program of social security.

Termination of Government Fixed-Price War-Supply Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Hon. James F. Byrnes on January 8, 1944, regarding termination of Government fixed-price war-supply contracts.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Director of War Mobilization today issued a directive to all procurement agencies making immediately effective a uniform article for the termination of Government fixed-price war-supply contracts, and a statement of principles to be followed by such departments in determining costs.

The directive was based upon a recommendation by Mr. B. M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock. Mr. Baruch is in charge of the special unit in the Office of War Mobilization established by Director Byrnes to deal with war and post-war adjustment problems. Mr. Hancock is associated with Mr. Baruch in that work and is Chairman of the Joint Contract Termination Board, composed of representatives of the various departments, which Board has agreed to the article and the statement of principles today made effective for all departments.

In releasing the recommendation of Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock, Director Byrnes stated that the Office of War Mobilization would keep in touch with the various departments in order to see that the policies adopted were made effective. He said that the unit headed by Mr. Baruch had made great progress in considering other phases of contract termination and in the development of policies to govern the disposition of surplus property.

Director Byrnes said it was an important step toward eliminating the delay in a contractor getting his money and delay in the employee getting a job.

Following is a letter from Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock to Director Byrnes, transmitting the uniform termination article and statement of principles:

"Herewith we are transmitting with our approval, and the recommendation that they be made effective, a uniform termination article for Government fixed-price war-supply contracts and a statement of principles on the determination of costs, which have been drafted and unanimously agreed upon by the Joint Contract Termination Board, established at your direction on November 12, with representatives of the major war procurement agencies—War and Navy, Treasury, Maritime Commission, the R. F. C. subsidiaries, and the Foreign Economic Administration.

"To facilitate war procurement and because of the need to insert this termination article into new war contracts and to give contractors the earliest opportunity to have this article included in their existing contracts, the joint board has asked that the termination article and cost statement be announced immediately, in advance of the broader program of contract termination policies on which we are working and which we will recommend to you.

"This termination article and cost statement deal with only two of the many aspects of contract termination policies. They fill a long-felt need for a clear definition of what are the rights of the Government and contractors when war contracts are terminated; a definition that will be fair to contractors while protecting the Government, and the same definition to bind all of the war procurement agencies.

"The termination article and cost statement are not intended to cover and should not be confused with the many other aspects of contract-termination policies including such questions as payments and loans, settlement procedures, the keeping of adequate records and protection of the public interest, the special problems of subcontractors, appeals, company-wide settlements, the disposal of property, and the need for legislation. All of these problems are enmeshed in many difficulties which are being cut through and will be reported on to you.

"The fact that the termination provisions in Government war-supply contracts are to be simplified and made uniform is an important contribution to and can be described as the first step in developing a full set of clear-cut, workable policies on contract termination; but it is only the first step.

"We trust there will be no speculation that our release of this termination article reflects a belief in an early end of the war. Contracts are being terminated and settled regularly as the needs of war change. The unifying and simplifying of the Government's contracts is a war measure, as well as a preliminary step in preparing for demobilization.

"To clarify some of the questions that are not covered in this termination article and cost statement, our objectives on some of the unsettled problems might be stated:

"1. How to apply the principles of this uniform termination article to subcontractors is under careful consideration. A number of serious administrative problems are involved that require further study. Our objective is to have the same principles of contract settlement apply to subcontractors as well as prime contractors.

"2. As to payment, our object is quick payment of what the Government owes so that our great productive capacity can be fully utilized for war and peace—destroying the dangers of unemployment and inflation.

"3. The development of the necessary safeguards to protect the Government's interest in both the settlement of contracts and the disposal of property, including not only adequate records but also protective methods for the prevention and detection of fraud.

"4. On the clearance of Government-owned materials and equipment from the plants of both prime and sub contractors, we have set for ourselves the objective of assuring prompt clearance with a dead line of not later than 60 days after the filing of inventory lists, and with manufacturers having the right to remove and store this property at an earlier date at their own risk.

"Manufacturers will benefit from having this termination article in their contracts. It will assure uniform handling of their claims by all of the agencies with which they have contracts, eliminating possible conflict and confusion over varying contract provisions; it will make for swifter and more equitable settlement, give manufacturers a clear definition of their rights; reduce litigation.

"The desirability of having a standard termination article for all agencies has been generally recognized. It has been advocated by business groups, independent organizations, the procurement agencies themselves as well as several important committees of Congress, including those headed by Senators GEORGE and MURRAY.

"Efforts to develop such a uniform termination clause have been going on within the Government for more than a year and a half. The fact that agreement has been obtained in these last weeks is a tribute to the fine, cooperative spirit with which the Joint Contract Termination Board and its staff has functioned and to the reparatory work that has been done by the other agencies, particularly that done under the auspices of the War Production Board.

"The article applies only to domestic contracts, not foreign. Consideration is being given to certain other exceptions and an approved list of such exceptions will be issued soon. Obviously, where the sums involved are so small or the time of the contract is short, the termination article is not needed.

"In drawing up this article, the joint board was under instructions to protect the Government's interests fully, not giving contractors more than they are entitled to under existing contracts, but to assure them their just and fair rights. The termination article necessarily is a merging of the many types of contract termination provisions that have been used by the agencies and will not fit all cases perfectly. Differences between this article and existing contracts will be outweighed by the advantages of the unified, simpler, and speedier procedure for settling contracts which this uniform termination article makes possible.

"Both the termination article and cost statement are confined to broad, workable principles, with details left to be covered in administrative regulations, manuals, and instructions. Many points were not included because they were questions of detail which will require constant refinement in the light of experience and could be handled best by regulations which can be revised readily and which are more easily adjusted to special cases.

"Briefly summarized, the termination article provides that the Government may terminate a prime contract at any time by giving notice, which is the common provision in existing contracts. What the contractor must do on receiving his termination notice is set forth. Contractors will be paid for all completed articles at the contract price.

"Two types of settlement are provided for: One, for the contractor and the Government to agree upon a fair and reasonable settlement through negotiation; the second, if such negotiations prove unsuccessful, for

settlement through the application of a specified formula.

"Of particular interest, is the margin of profit allowed on work which the contractor has begun but has not completed. Clearly, the simplicity of a flat, uniform rate of profit would yield enormous administrative benefits in easing the problems of settlement for both contractors and the Government. However, under certain conditions, a single flat rate might give excessive profits, as where a manufacturer's costs consisted largely of assembling an inventory of raw materials.

"Accordingly, a profit formula was devised which (a) limits the aggregate profit in all cases to a maximum of 6 percent, and (b) further limits to a maximum of 2 percent the profit on unprocessed inventory, and only to the extent that this inventory is properly allocable to the contract. Both these rates of profit are maximums and there will be instances where only a fraction of a percent profit will be allowed on raw materials. Obviously no profit will be allowed except on work done or costs incurred.

"We have felt that it would contribute to fair and speedy settlement, with protection for both the Government and the contractor, to set forth a specified, though not too rigid, yardstick for measuring profit.

"The cost statement is based upon the recognition only of those costs that are properly allocable to the contract and only to the extent that they are quantitatively reasonable for the performance of the whole contract. In determining these costs, recognized accounting practices are to be used. The cost statement goes further to clarify some of the uncertainties that have arisen in the minds of contractors as to which costs are properly allocable to the contract and which are definitely excluded.

"In bringing the drafting of this termination article and cost statement to decision and conclusion, our thinking has been that the interests of both contractors and the Government will be best served by a clear definition of their mutual rights and obligations and by preparing the ground for prompt settlement on the basis of those rights and obligations."

The following is the text of the directive order to all procurement agencies issued by Director Byrnes:

"The uniform termination article for Government fixed price war supply contracts and the statement of principles on the determinations, adopted by the Joint Contract Termination Board and approved by the War and Post-War Adjustment Unit of the Office of War Mobilization, are hereby made effective.

"The termination article shall be used to the fullest extent practicable in all new war contracts and contractors shall be given the earliest practical opportunity to have the article included in existing contracts.

"Situations in which it is deemed impracticable to use the termination article should be promptly reported to this Office for further instructions.

"UNIFORM TERMINATION ARTICLE FOR FIXED PRICE SUPPLY CONTRACTS

"Article termination at the option of the Government: (a) The performance of work under this contract may be terminated by the Government in accordance with this article in whole, or from time to time in part, whenever the contracting officer shall determine any such termination is for the best interests of the Government. Termination of work hereunder shall be effected by delivery to the contractor of a notice of termination specifying the extent to which performance of work under the contract shall be terminated, and the date upon which such termination shall become effective. If termination of work under this contract is simultaneous with, a part of, or in connection with, a general termination (1) of all or substantially all of a group or class of contracts made by the Department for the same product or for closely related products, or (2) of war contracts at, about the time of, or following, the cessation of the present hostilities, or any major part thereof, such termination shall only be made in accordance with the provisions of this article, unless the contracting officer finds that the contractor is then in gross or wilful default under this contract.

"(b) After receipt of a notice of termination and except as otherwise directed by the contracting officer, the contractor shall (1) terminate work under the contract on the date and to the extent specified in the notice of termination; (2) place no further orders or subcontracts for materials, services or facilities except as may be necessary for completion of such portions of the work under the contract as may not be terminated; (3) terminate all orders and subcontracts to the extent that they relate to the performance of any work terminated by the notice of termination; (4) assign to the Government, in the manner and to the extent directed by the contracting officer, all of the right, title, and interest of the contractor under the orders or subcontracts so terminated; (5) settle all claims arising out of such termination of orders and subcontracts with the approval or ratification of the contracting officer to the extent that he may require, which approval or ratification shall be final for all the purposes of this article; (6) transfer title and deliver to the Government in the manner, to the extent and at the times directed by the contracting officer (i) the fabricated or unfabricated parts, work in process, completed work, supplies, and other material produced as a part of, or acquired in respect of the performance of, the work terminated in the notice of termination, and (ii) the plans, drawings, information, and other property which, if the contract had been completed, would be required to be furnished to the Government; (7) use his best efforts to sell in the manner, to the extent, at the time, and at the price or prices directed or authorized by the contracting officer, any property of the types referred to in subdivision (6) of this paragraph; provided, however, that the contractor (i) shall not be required to extend credit to any purchaser and (ii) may retain any such property at a price or prices approved by the contracting officer; (8) complete performance of such part of the work as shall not have been terminated by the notice of termination; and (9) take such action as may be necessary or as the contracting officer may direct for protection and preservation of the property, which is in the possession of the contractor and in which the Government has or may acquire an interest.

"(c) The contractor and the contracting officer may agree upon the whole or any part of the amount or amounts to be paid to the contractor by reason of the total or partial termination of work pursuant to this article, which amount or amounts may include a reasonable allowance for profit, and the Government shall pay the agreed amount or amounts. Nothing in paragraph (d) of this article prescribing the amount to be paid to the contractor in the event of failure of the contractor and the contracting officer to agree upon the whole amount to be paid to the contractor by reason of the termination of work pursuant to this article shall be deemed to limit, restrict, or otherwise determine or affect the amount or amounts which may be agreed upon to be paid to the contractor pursuant to this paragraph (c).

"(d) In the event of the failure of the contractor and contracting officer to agree as provided in paragraph (c) upon the whole amount to be paid to the contractor by reason of the termination of work pursuant to this article, the Government, but without duplication of any amounts agreed upon in accordance with paragraph (c), shall pay to the contractor the following amounts:

"(1) For completed articles delivered to and accepted by the Government (or sold or retained as provided in paragraph (b) (7) above) and not theretofore paid for, forthwith a sum equivalent to the aggregate price for such articles computed in accordance with the price or prices specified in the contract;

"(2) In respect of the contract work terminated as permitted by this article, the total (without duplication of any items) of (i) the cost of such work exclusive of any cost attributable to articles paid or to be paid for under paragraph (d) (1) hereof; (ii) the cost of settling and paying claims arising out of the termination of work under subcontracts or orders as provided in paragraph (b) (5) above, exclusive of the amounts paid or payable on account of supplies or materials delivered or services furnished by the subcontractor prior to the effective date of the notice of termination of work under this contract, which amounts shall be included in the cost on account of which payment is made under subdivision (1) above; and (iii) a sum equal to _____ percent[1] of the part of the amount determined under subdivision (i) which represents the cost of articles or materials not processed by the contractor, plus a sum equal to _____ percent[2] of the remainder of such amount, but the aggregate of such sums shall not exceed 6 percent of the whole of the amount determined under subdivision (i), which for the purpose of this subdivision (iii) shall exclude any charges for interest on borrowings;

"(3) The reasonable cost of the preservation and protection of property incurred pursuant to paragraph (b) (9) hereof; and any other reasonable cost incidental to termination of work under this contract, including expense incidental to the determination of the amount due to the contractor as the result of the termination of work under this contract.

"The total sum to be paid to the contractor under subdivisions (1) and (2) of this paragraph (d) shall not exceed the total contract price reduced by the amount of payments otherwise made and by the contract price of work not terminated. Except for normal spoilage and to the extent that the Government shall have otherwise expressly assumed the risk of loss, there shall be excluded from the amounts payable to the contractor as provided in paragraph (d) (1) and paragraph (d) (2) (i), all amounts allocable to or payable in respect of property, which is destroyed, lost, stolen, or damaged so as to become undeliverable prior to the transfer of title to the Government or to a buyer pursuant to paragraph (b) (7) or prior to the 60th day after delivery to the Government of an inventory covering such property, whichever shall first occur.

"(e) The obligation of the Government to make any payments under this article: (1) shall be subject to deductions in respect of (i) all unliquidated partial or progress payments, payments on account theretofore made to the contractor and unliquidated advance payments, (ii) any claim which the Government may have against the contractor in connection with this contract, and (iii) the price agreed upon or the proceeds of sale of any materials, supplies, or other things retained by the contractor or sold, and not otherwise recovered by or credited to the Government, and (2) in the discretion of the contracting officer shall be subject to deduction in respect of the amount of any claim of any subcontractor or supplier whose subcontract or order shall have been terminated

[1] Not to exceed 2 percent.

[2] To be established at a figure which is fair and reasonable under the circumstances.

as provided in paragraph (b) (3) except to the extent that such claim covers (i) property or materials delivered to the contractor or (ii) services furnished to the contractor in connection with the production of completed articles under this contract.

"(f) In the event that, prior to the determination of the final amount to be paid to the contractor as in this article provided, the contractor shall file with the contracting officer a request in writing that an equitable adjustment should be made in the price or prices specified in the contract for the work not terminated by the notice of termination, the appropriate fair and reasonable adjustment shall be made in such price or prices.

"(g) The Government shall make partial payments and payments on account, from time to time, of the amounts to which the contractor shall be entitled under this article, whether determined by agreement or otherwise, whenever in the opinion of the contracting officer the aggregate of such payments shall be within the amount to which the contractor will be entitled hereunder.

"(h) For the purposes of paragraphs (d) (2) and (d) (3) hereof, the amounts of the payments to be made by the Government to the contractor shall be determined in accordance with the statement of principles for determination of costs upon termination of Government fixed-price supply contracts approved by the Joint Contract Termination Board, December 31, 1943. The contractor for a period of 3 years after final settlement under the contract shall make available to the Government at all reasonable times at the office of the contractor all of its books, records, documents, and other evidence bearing on the costs and expenses of the contractor under the contract and in respect of the termination of work thereunder."

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR DETERMINATION OF COSTS UPON TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT FIXED-PRICE SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The following is the statement of principles for determination of costs upon termination of Government fixed-price supply contracts approved by the Joint Contract Termination Board, December 31, 1943, referred to in paragraph (h) of the uniform termination article applicable to the termination of fixed price supply contracts at the option of the Government:

"1. General principles: The costs contemplated by this statement of principles are those sanctioned by recognized commercial accounting practices and are intended to include the direct and indirect manufacturing, selling, and distribution, administrative, and other costs incurred which are reasonably necessary for the performance of the contract, and are properly allocable or apportionable, under such practices, to the contract (or the part thereof under consideration). The general principles set out in this statement are subject to the application of any special provisions of the contract. Certain costs are specifically described below because of their particular significance, and, as in the case of other costs, should be included to the extent that they are allocable to or should be apportioned to the contract or the part thereof under consideration.

"(a) Common inventory: The costs of items of inventory which are common to the contract and to other work of the contractor.

"(b) Common claims of subcontractors: The claims of subcontractors which are common to the contract and to other work of the contractor.

"(c) Depreciation: An allowance for depreciation at appropriate rates on buildings, machinery, and equipment, and other facilities including such amounts for obsolescence due to progress in the arts and other factors as are ordinarily given consideration in determining depreciation rates. Depreciation as defined herein shall not include loss of useful value of the type covered by subparagraph (f).

"(d) Experimental and research expense: General experimental and research expense to the extent consistent with an established prewar program, or to the extent related to war purposes.

"(e) Engineering and development and special tooling: Costs of engineering and development and of special tooling; provided that the contractor protects any interests of the Government by transfer of title or by other means deemed appropriate by the Government.

"(f) Loss on facilities—conditions on allowance: In the case of any special facility acquired by the contractor solely for the performance of the contract, or the contract and other war production contracts, if upon termination of the contract such facility is not reasonably capable of use in the other business of the contractor having regard to the then condition and location of such facility, an amount which bears the same proportion to the loss of useful value as the deliveries not made under the contract bear to the total of the deliveries which have been made and would have been made had the contract and the other contracts been completed, provided that the amount to be allowed under this paragraph shall not exceed the adjusted basis of the facility for Federal income-tax purposes immediately prior to the date of the termination of the contract, and provided further that no amount shall be allowed under this paragraph unless upon termination of the contract title to the facility is transferred to the Government, except where the Government elects to take other appropriate means to protect its interests.

"(g) Special leases: (1) Rentals under leases clearly shown to have been made for the performance of the contract, or the contract and other war production contracts, covering the period necessary for complete performance of the contract and such further period as may have been reasonably necessary; (2) costs of reasonable alteration of such leased property made for the same purpose; and (3) costs of restoring the premises, to the extent required by reasonable provisions of the lease; less (4) the residual value of the lease; provided that the contractor shall have made reasonable efforts to terminate, assign, or settle such leases or otherwise reduce the cost thereof.

"(h) Advertising: Advertising expense to the extent consistent with a prewar program or to the extent reasonable under the circumstances.

"(i) Limitation on costs described in subparagraphs (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h). In no event shall the aggregate of the amounts allowed under subparagraphs (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) exceed the amount which would have been available from the contract price to cover these items, if the contract had been completed, after considering all other costs which would have been required to complete it.

"(j) Interests: Interest on borrowings.

"(k) Settlement expenses: Reasonable accounting, legal, clerical, and other expenses necessary in connection with the termination and settlement of the contract and subcontracts and purchase orders thereunder, including expenses incurred for the purpose of obtaining payment from the Government only to the extent reasonably necessary for the preparation and presentation of settlement proposals and cost evidence in connection therewith.

"(l) Protection and disposition of property: Storage, transportation, and other costs incurred for the protection of property acquired or produced for the contract or in connection with the disposition of such poperty.

"2. Initial costs: Costs of a nonrecurring nature which arise from unfamiliarity with the product in the initial stages of production should be appropriately apportioned between the completed and the terminated portions of the contract. In this category would be included high direct labor and overhead costs, including training, costs of excessive rejections, and similar items.

"3. Excluded costs: Without affecting the generality of the foregoing provisions in other respects, amounts representing the following should not be included as elements of cost:

"(a) Losses on other contracts, or from sales or exchanges of capital assets, fees and other expenses in connection with reorganization or recapitalization, anti-trust or Federal income-tax litigation, or prosecution of Federal income-tax claims or other claims against the Government (except as provided in paragraph 1 (k)); losses on investments; provisions for contingencies; and premiums on life insurance where the contractor is the beneficiary.

"(b) The expense of conversion of the contractor's facilities to uses other than the performance of the contract.

"(c) Expenses due to the negligence or willful failure of the contractor to discontinue with reasonable promptness the incurring of expenses after the effective date of the termination notice.

"(d) Costs incurred in respect to facilities, materials or services purchased or work done in excess of the reasonable quantitative requirements of the entire contract.

"(e) Costs which, as evidenced by accounting statements submitted in renegotiation under section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, were charged off during a period covered by a previous renegotiation, may not be subsequently included in the termination settlement if a refund was made for such period, or to the extent that such charging off is shown to have avoided such refund.

"4. To the extent that they conform to recognized commercial accounting practices and the foregoing statement of principles, the established accounting practices of the contractor as indicated by his books of account and financial reports will be given due consideration in the preparation of statements of cost for the purposes of this article.

"5. The failure specifically to mention in this statement any item of cost is not intended to imply that it should be included or excluded."

When "Peace Breaks Loose"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful men and women everywhere are giving much thought and study to the postwar world and more particularly to its rehabilitation. Here at home we face a tremendous task in reconverting back to peacetime production. In the devastated areas of Europe and Asia the problem is even greater because there they will have to rebuild and restore without the tremendous resources to draw upon that a beneficent Providence has endowed us with.

Nation's Business for December 1943 contained an article entitled "When Peace Breaks Loose" that sets up a pattern that can be used by many of the occupied countries, once the war is over.

It has been my pleasure to know Dr. Hans Bull for nearly a quarter of a century. He is an experienced businessman, a sound student of world affairs and anything that he has to say upon the subject of post-war rehabilitation is worthy of most serious consideration. Dr. Bull was a frequent visitor to our shores before World War No. 2 broke out. Indeed, he left Norway on a business trip to America ony 2 days before the invasion and has been unable to return to his home since because of war conditions. I venture the prediction that when the time comes for Norway to set her house in order, the Norwegian people will avail themselves of Dr. Bull's vast and varied experience to help lead them back to the path of self-sufficiency. I am prompted to insert Dr. Bull's interview with Art Brown in the hope that his program for rehabilitation may have the fullest possible degree of publicity both here and abroad as it is equally applicable to all occupied countries. The article follows:

WHEN "PEACE BREAKS LOOSE"

(By Art Brown)

Norway is one nation which expects to solve its post-war economic problems without getting something for nothing.

Norway will look to America for financial and material help after the war, but on a businesslike basis. She believes that, given an opportunity to sell her goods and services, she will be able to buy and pay for what she needs to rebuild her national economy.

Norway's people, although the Nazis have stripped them of machinery, farm equipment, locomotives, and ships, have never given up.

Norwegian soldiers and airmen trained in Scotland and Canada have fought the enemy in some of the hardest battles of the war.

Norway's merchant marine also has been of great aid to the United Nations.

"The services of Norway's fleet," said a British general recently, "have been equal to an army of 1,000,000 men."

One Norwegian tanker alone has crossed the Atlantic 45 times, with and without convoy, and has delivered to England sufficient high-octane gasoline for 39 bomber raids of 500 planes each, with enough left over to provide 1 week's gas for 900,000 cars in the East.

Now that defeat of the Axis seems certain—and there is likelihood that Germany may be forced to shorten her lines by pulling out of the Scandinavian Peninsula even before the war ends—Norway is not letting up in her fight. But she is looking ahead and is planning not to be caught unprepared for peace.

In Washington, Hans Bull, former commercial counselor for the Norwegian Embassy, has had much to do with Norway's post-war planning.

"Our reconstruction program," says Mr. Bull, "is not yet complete. We are, in fact, just getting under way. Norway's full strength has been, and is being, directed toward helping defeat the Axis. But there are certain things which we know must be done to rebuild our country—and we have some ideas about how we'd like to go about it."

MUST PREVENT STARVATION

Before rebuilding can begin, Mr. Bull points out, Norway must act to prevent internal disturbances, unrest, unemployment, and starvation. Norway wants to restore her business, industry, agriculture, transportation, and shipping as early as possible. She wants to rebuild her productive facilities, develop her natural resources, restore her standard of living, and help other nations restore theirs.

"Most urgent," says Mr. Bull, "is to give our people bread and butter. We must arrange to get emergency supplies into our land the moment the enemy surrenders or withdraws from Norway. Otherwise our people will starve, half-starve, or, at least, march backward for many years, even generations.

"Huge stocks of food, clothing, medicines, and fuel are flowing out of America every day to the various military fronts. It may be that, to meet our most drastic shortages, some of those supplies which happen to be on the high seas when peace comes and for which there will be no further military need, can be diverted to our shores for civilian use, and paid for at current international prices.

"It would be better to put some of those excess supplies to immediate use to help relieve suffering in 800,000 homes than to have them stored away in military warehouses, perhaps for months or even years. Besides, it would help speed up the unloading of ships and make them more quickly available for carrying men and materials back to America or to the Far East."

Norway is about as large as New Mexico, and less than half as large as Texas. About a third of her 3,000,000 population live on farms.

In farm products, Norway was self-sufficient before the war, except for cereals (of which she imported 600,000 tons a year), and crops which can be raised only in warm climates. About 70 percent of Norway's farm income came from livestock. Before the invasion, she had 2,000,000 head of cattle and horses, 2,000,000 sheep, and 1,000,000 goats and pigs.

Since the Nazi occupation, Norway's livestock population has been cut in half. The rate of reduction is now increasing, because of the growing shortage of food. Recently, Germany requisitioned 300,000 head of cattle.

Before the war, Norway had 4,000,000 hens, and plenty of fresh eggs. Today, both chickens and eggs are almost impossible to find. The few chickens that remain are suffering from malnutrition.

Norway will look to America for livestock with which to restock her farms—and for, at least, 150,000 good milk cows to help restore her dairy industry.

"In the United States," says Mr. Bull, "there are hundreds of thousands of Norwegian-American farmers who have a deep interest in the homeland and who want to have a part in its rehabilitation. These farmers, working through Norwegian-American organizations, are planning to raise Jersey and Holstein heifers to be sent to the farms of their fathers, brothers, cousins, and friends in Norway."

The chickens with which to reestablish Norway's poultry industry could also come from America. This industry, it is estimated, can be rebuilt to its pre-war proportions within 18 months after peace comes by importing 60,000 selected pullets and about 6,000 roosters. The resultant eggs would be hatched in incubators on a mass-production basis, and the baby chicks distributed to the farms throughout the country.

Norway has always been a maritime nation—and has no intention of going out of the shipping business. Before the war her merchant fleet was the third largest in the world, having passed Japan's late in 1939. Norway's cargo fleet, incidentally, was created entirely through private initiative, without Government subsidy.

SHIPPING LOSSES ENORMOUS

The war has played havoc with Norway's shipping. Losses have been enormous. Not only has a large percentage of the country's oceangoing vessels been sent to the bottom, but almost all the coastwise and fishing fleet has been confiscated or destroyed.

Norway plans to rebuild her shipyards, and to build and buy new ships after the armistice. But to obtain tonnage for immediate use, she is hoping that arrangements can be made whereby the United States—instead of tying up her surplus cargo vessels (and paying for maintenance) as was done after World War No. 1—will turn many of these vessels over to experienced Norwegian shipowners to operate on a long-time charter basis. Besides paying a rental fee for the use of the ships, the Norwegians would agree to keep them up—and to return them if and when the United States needed them in case of war.

Norway's factories have been taken over by the Nazis and, in many cases, the machinery and equipment, removed and shipped to Germany. Norway's mines have been destroyed or partially destroyed. Power plants have been wrecked or have worn out. War losses, occupation costs (more than $1,000,000,000) and wartime printed money have put a severe strain on the country's currency.

What can Norway do, or hope to do, to get back on her feet economically—and to pay her own way?

New equipment and repair parts needed to put the farms and factories back into production will have to come from outside the country.

To be able to buy those goods, the businessmen of Norway will need purchasing power, and to create that purchasing power, they will have to produce and sell goods abroad—goods which they cannot produce until they obtain the supplies and equipment needed to put their productive facilities in working order.

It sounds like a merry-go-round. What is the starting point?

TO PREVENT INFLATION

The first step, says Hans Bull, will be for the Norwegian Government to stabilize the country's currency—to guarantee a fixed and definite value for Norway's monetary unit of exchange in relation to the American dollar. Otherwise, there will be danger of runaway inflation.

To stabilize the currency and to create confidence at home and abroad in Norway's monetary system, it is expected that the Norwegian Government will back up the currency by maintaining in its national bank (the Bank of Norway) a guaranty fund of $50,000,000 and probably more in addition to $80,000,000 in gold which Norway succeeded in getting out of the country ahead of the invasion.

In the field of business, private enterprise will be encouraged to do the reconstruction job with as little interference from the Norwegian Government as possible.

For working capital—the initial purchasing power with which to obtain goods from the United States and other countries—the Norwegian businessmen will borrow from their local banks or direct from the Bank of Norway, giving what security they can. The local banks will borrow direct from the Bank of Norway.

Payment of the bank loans, however, must be guaranteed by the government which, in turn, must obtain large and cheap loans from abroad.

In cases where Norwegian firms have established credit in America, they will, it is assumed, arrange to borrow funds here for long and short term self-liquidating undertakings.

With the currency stabilized, and armed with initial purchasing power, Norwegian businessmen will be able to buy the durable goods, machines, replacement parts, materials, and supplies they must have to get under way. Then, as the wheels start turning again in their own land, they will have products to sell abroad—pulp, paper, food, textiles, wood, whale oil, animal fats, metals,

nitrates, etc. In time their loans will be retired, their purchasing power will be strengthened, and their trading can turn more and more to consumer goods paid for with Norwegian money, goods, or services.

To protect the exchange rate, the Norwegian Government will doubtless have to regulate the trade balance, at least, at the start. That will mean that no businessman will be allowed to buy such a large quantity of any one particular item, that—by borrowing money with which to pay the bill—he would curtail other and perhaps more necessary purchases by other businessmen.

DEPENDS ON FOREIGN TRADE

Because Norway's determination is to pay her own way in the post-war world, her reconstruction program will hinge on the building up of her foreign trade, selling her goods to the world to buy goods which she needs but cannot produce herself.

In cases where existing high tariffs now hamper the sale of Norwegian exports to the United States, Norway is hoping that a mutually satisfactory trade treaty, or trade reconstruction agreement in treaty form, can be worked out.

"This trade agreement," says Mr. Bull, "should include the mutual aims of the two countries for a certain period, say 10 or 20 years. It should be in two steps: A preliminary plan to go into effect the day the enemy surrenders; and a final plan to be worked out and agreed upon within, say, a year after the war.

"War conditions, wartime organization, and, in Norway's case, the fact that almost all our experienced businessmen, industrialists, and shipping leaders were caught within Norway have, in some cases, resulted in an unsatisfactory situation and loss of good will," adds Mr. Bull.

"Not the least important reconstruction work will, therefore, be that the business organizations on both sides of the Atlantic should come together and rebuild a foundation of mutual understanding and confidence.

"The differences, if any, are superficial and temporary and can, and should be, removed. But the ties that bind us together are fundamental and have their roots in our similar lives and aims.

"Norway's business and industrial organizations—Norges Industri Forbund (industry association), Norges Handelsstand (trade association), Norges Rederforbund (shipowners), etc., will he ready to function and to work closely with America when peace comes.

"I hope that similar organizations in America are making their plans for carrying on business with us as soon as the enemy surrenders—and that may happen suddenly—any time now—and we should not again be caught unprepared when 'peace breaks loose.'"

Implementing the Economic Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that in his message to Congress today the President laid down what he called an economic bill of rights and made the statement, "I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights—for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do," I ask unanimous consent to make note here of the fact that on March 31, 1941, the Temporary National Economic Committee, which was created by resolution of the Congress, filed its report, which was the result of almost 3 years of study of the economic system. The report of that committee does implement the economic bill of rights outlined in the President's message.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the recommendations of the committee may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

At the same time I desire to call attention to the fact that the report to which I have referred, which is Senate Document No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, is still available at the office of the Superintendent of Documents.

I also desire to have printed in the RECORD a personal statement which I made and which was included in the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer of the cost of printing, which is $360.

There being no objection, the summary and the personal statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL PURPOSES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Temporary National Economic Committee has continually kept in mind the comprehensive purposes outlined in the President's message. It has never prosecuted or persecuted any witness or industry. Abuses have been disclosed during the course of the committee's activities which were reprehensible in the extreme. More often, however, have its investigations shown the awareness of industrial leaders of acute economic dislocations and their honest efforts to deal with them in the public interest.

The committee's recommendations are not punitive. We do not proceed against particular individuals or industrial concerns. Rather, we seek to recommend remedies for those fundamental ills which affect all or major parts of the eccnomic system.

We have constantly been aware that equally important as the specific recommendations for legislation are those self-appraisals and reforms voluntarily instituted by industry as a result of questions raised and information disclosed in the hearings and studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee. Abundant evidence in the files of the committee, further amplified by numerous conferences between the committee's staff of experts and leading industrial executives, proves the beneficial results obtained from the presence of the committee in the Nation's Capital during these recent years of critical economic adjustment.

The more than 20,000 pages of direct testimoney, covering the interrogation of 552 leaders of American industry and the 3,300 technical exhibits presented in the hearings of the committee, supplemented by 43 monographs on important economic problems, have assembled a bcdy of information replete with suggestions and recommendations for the improvement of ou" national economic life. While the Temporary National Economic Committee cannot assume author's responsibility for these hundreds of suggestions, we have been particularly careful to present under our imprint a body of information essential to an understanding of the operation of our economic system and which will prove most useful to the legislative and administrative branches of government, to industrialists, labor leaders, and citizens generally in their search for solutions of our economic ills.

The collection of this information has proved a stimulus to Government agencies entrusted with the enforcement of laws intended to prevent restraint of trade. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust activity has repeatedly declared that the investigations of the Temporary National Economic Committee have provided information which has led to the correction of many monopoly practices. The allocation of special research studies to various Government departments has enabled their experts to become well acquainted with a body of newly assembled information which furnishes them with data long needed in the conduct of their affairs.

Not the least of the contributions of the Temporary National Economic Committee to the solution of the problems pointed out in the President's message has been the dissemination of its findings of fact in over 230,000 volumes distributed to Members of Congress and State legislatures, university and college libraries, research institutions, industrial organizations, Government agencies, and interested private citizens. Communications received by the Committee show the use to which this material is being put, indicating that the information, conclusions, and recommendations will have continuing and profound effects in shaping the thinking of individuals and groups, leading eventually to an informed public opinion of that high quality which insures the preservation of our free competitive economy as the American way of life.

We do not suggest that the protracted investigations of the Temporary National Economic Committee have solved with finality the many problems besetting the national economy. On the contrary, we have been made acutely aware of the fact that many of these problems are of a continuing nature, requiring constant vigilance and frequent special investigation in order to disclose and prevent monopoly practices from exerting a disastrous effect upon our system of free enterprise. We have come to certain positive conclusions, some of which are here assembled as specific recommendations for the better functioning of the economy. These we offer to the President, to the Congress of the United States, and to our fellow citizens in the belief that they are all intended to promote an ever-increasing level of well-being for our people.

THE LOWER THIRD

Most of the hearings and studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee developed evidence that many of our more serious problems of economic imbalance are due to the sad plight of more than a third of our people whose meager incomes, unstable employment, unhealthful living conditions, and limited cultural opportunities constitute a substantial drag on the economy's forward march toward recovery and expansion.

It appears that while action to restore competition in those sectors of the economy where monopolistic restraints are in evidence will aid these poorly circumstanced citizens, nothing short of a program specifically designed to amplify their daily diet, to train them for suitable occupations, to make available the benefits of low-cost housing, and to give them opportunity to develop their cultural attributes will suffice to eliminate this serious threat to democracy and our economic system.

We therefore commend such efforts as the food stamp plan, slum clearance, and low-cost housing, the extension of hospital and medical facilities, and the development of vocational and cultural programs for the less

privileged of our people, to the end that they may become as speedily as possible fully participating, responsible members of the community.

[Approved without objection.]

PASSING ON THE TECHNOLOGICAL GAINS

The Temporary National Economic Committee rejoices in the endless march of discovery, invention, and innovation which has made possible the relatively high level of living enjoyed in the United States. We insist that nothing be done which would prevent the fullest application of human ingenuity and use of all material equipment for the benefit of our citizens. Yet we have witnessed major dislocations in our economy which stem in considerable part from the failure of the industrial system to pass on in due proportions to all participants—management, labor, and capital claimants—the great technological gains of mass production and distribution of goods.

The dependence of most of our working population for a livelihood on jobs over which they cannot exercise control and the nature of the industrial economy which renders management incapable of maintaining stable employment have set in motion a series of reforms which have greatly improved the social security of our people. But the technological character of our dynamic industrial system raises other problems which must be met. Our hearings revealed widespread technological displacement of workers, loss of skill of employed workers, and severe unemployment due to technological change.

No one element in the economic system can be made responsible for the proper disposition of the gains of increasing technology. We insist that a free competitive system offers the best opportunity for the widest participation in such gains achieved through a reduction in prices of goods, in the stimulation of new industries, and extension of existing ones, fuller employment, reduction of working hours, increase in consumers' purchasing power, and a more equitable distribution of the value added by manufacture. Consequently the recommendations made here for the maintenance of a competitive productive system and a free market place should have a salutary effect in passing on the gains of technology to all who participate in our economic life.

[Approved without objection.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF A. FORD HINRICHS, SUBMITTED FOR ISADOR LUBIN, COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

There has been a tendency to disregard the full costs of technological advance. In particular, almost no accounting is made of the waste and costs involved in scrapping human skills. Our hearings revealed widespread technological displacement of workers, loss of skill of employed workers, and severe unemployment due to technological change.

While the present defense emergency lasts, these problems may not appear severe nor their consequences alarming. Once this emergency program has passed, however, sharp dislocations of employment are inevitable. Now is the time to institute certain changes which will ameliorate conditions in the post-defense period. I therefore recommend that—

1. Industry and labor organization should develop joint studies of the means of effecting technological change with minimum hardship to the workers involved. They should mutually provide for advance notices of dismissal in labor contracts.

2. Legislation should be enacted providing for the payment of dismissal wages and retraining programs for technologically displaced workers.

3. The social-security laws should be immediately amended to extend unemployment compensation to cover more adequately the dismissal of workers from defense industries.

DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

The concentration of economic power has caused the development of our productive and distributive mechanism frequently without primary concern for efficiency and economy in the production and distribution of goods. Attempts of various localities to lure factories from other cities and efforts by some industrialists to escape the more enlightened practices of advanced communities have fostered unsocial movements of industries. Ghost towns have appeared frequently without economic or social justification.

Moreover, in the present emergency the National Government is confronted for the first time with the practical problem of the proper location of important industries, a problem which will have widespread influence on the economic practices of the country.

The Temporary National Economic Committee urges upon the President, the Congress, the States, and local governments, and private enterprise, that serious attention be given to the manifold economic and social problems involved in the proper location of our strategic industries. Our investigations offer ample evidence of the dangers of size and concentration of plants and industries. We therefore submit to all public and private bodies responsible for industry location the desirability of decentralizing industry to the end that the maximum economic benefits can be secured from plants operated at their most efficient size, the depressing aspects of the factory system be prevented, and the American way of life be preserved.

[Approved without objection.]

THE CURTAILMENT OF PRODUCTION—THE STIMULATING OF COMPETITION

Evidence presented to the Temporary National Economic Committee for many of our basic industries showed definite curtailment of production by monopoly concerns or dominant industrial groups in order to maintain prices and insure profits. The interests of other segments of the economy and the welfare of consumers were often disregarded. The present emergency brought these unhealthy conditions into national prominence and remedies are sought to cope with them.

The basic solution of curtailed production for selfish ends is to be found, however, in the development of competing industries and firms. In this period of Government aid for defense purposes, it is urged that the Congress and the President allocate funds in such a manner that monopoly control of basic products be eliminated to insure an adequate supply at competitive prices, so that, furthermore, competition may develop which will prove effective in the peacetime period following the defense effort.

[Approved without objection.]

PRICE DISCRIMINATION AND PRICE-FIXING LAWS

The free competitive system which has been so largely responsible for the high production and wide distribution of goods is seriously threatened in many State and local markets by the passage and enforcement of laws which, while seeking to curb monopoly and encourage local independent businesses, frequently use price fixing as the means to that end, resulting in uneconomic and unsound practices which undermine the effectiveness of competitive price in providing the advantages of mass production to the largest number of consumers.

[Approved without objection.]

GENERAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

During the course of the Temporary National Economic Committee's investigations of the concentration of economic power many problems were examined which encompass several aspects of the economic system and hence require more than localized treatment to effect beneficial changes. Recommendations concerning these more inclusive problems are presented here.

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS

If the democracies of the world are to organize the peace and freedom for which they are fighting and this organization is to be accomplished without disorder, they must first decide what kind of organization they want and how it is to function. It will not do merely to drift, as unfortunately we have been drifting nor to putter around with patchwork remedies intended to restore an economic structure that is already dead. If we are to have a democratic order in the new world instead of an order fashioned on the philosophy of a Hitler or a Lenin, it must be an order which is adjusted to the social and economic mechanisms of the twenty-first century instead of to those of the nineteenth.

The upheaval in which this generation is caught proceeds from the failure of leadership, here and throughout the world, to comprehend that the nineteenth century is as completely an era of the past as the eighteenth. Efforts to solve our problems of unemployment and underinvestment by the means and methods of the past were foredoomed to collapse, not because the principles on which leaders acted were wrong, but because the methods were not suited to the times.

It is generally agreed, for example, that competition must be maintained as the principle of our economy, for everyone seems to acknowledge that the alternative to competition is some form of concentrated Government authority which might easily destroy democracy. But the sort of competition of which most observers seem to think when they are considering the chaotic conditions which enmesh us is the competition of individuals, using the tools and working within the limitations of the last century. The record of this committee is full of comment by some of the wisest observers who came before us, in which the personal pronouns "he" and "him" were used to designate the units of modern competition although, as a matter of fact, the economic behavior of individual competitors is no part of our problem. What we are concerned with is the behavior of the huge collective groups which use the tools of the twentieth centry and are not hampered by any of the limitations of the nineteenth century which retained the business of that era within local boundaries and to the jurisdiction of local government.

It is lack of comprehension of this simple fact that is destroying democracy—destroying it here in America as well as in Europe. Democracy, which surely comprehends economic as well as political freedom for the natural person, cannot endure when the natural person cannot shape the policies and the activities of the collective agencies which control all the materials of his economic life. The American ideal of living has not changed, but the forms of our economic life have changed and most radically. The new forms of industrial organization are such that competition has become a vastly more difficult status to maintain, and the American ideal of free living for people is not nearly so easy of achievement as before organizations superseded men in the economy.

The new aspect of competition in our era and the much more insecure position of the natural person may be illustrated by the story of aluminum in the present defense effort. Production of aluminum, controlled for more than a quarter of a century by a single huge unit, was restricted, not by the capacity of people to use aluminum nor even their need for it, but by the will of the organization which produced and sold it. That will was swayed, not by any public judgment of what output or price should be, but solely

by the private judgment of the rulers of the organization which produced and sold it. The absolute control of this organization could not be disturbed by any natural person because no natural person acting by himself could produce aluminum in competition with the monopoly. Aluminum is not the product of individual enterprise. It is the product of modern collective enterprise. It can be produced only by machines and capital that the individual cannot command.

But no group of individuals would institute competition on their own resources either, although plenty of raw material was available. The obstacle here was the unwillingness of the owners of private capital to venture their own money in industrial competition with entrenched monopoly. Too much was at stake to warrant the risk of loss.

This was the situation when it became clear that the successful defense of democracy imperatively required an increased supply of aluminum. The increase is being obtained, not by the free private enterprise we all want to defend and perpetuate, but by government, that ogre before which business and free men tremble! The Congress of the United States appropriates $32,000,000 out of an empty Treasury to build a new T. V. A. dam to produce electric power for the monopoly to expand its output. Another agency of the Government advances $20,000,000 of nonexistent public money to loan to another large organizaiton, which, thus backed by public credit, is willing to compete with the monopoly. But to make this competition effective, the new organization must also rely on public electric power, and so Congress is called upon to appropriate additional funds to expand the Bonneville public power project so that competition between organizations may be brought about to produce aluminum to save democracy and preserve to men their right to individual freedom.

The workers who will man the new plants and furnish the labor to operate the machines that will be used to produce the aluminum necessary to keep men free will be recruited from the four corners of the land for temporary jobs in a new environment, but with no certainty of employment when peace and democracy have been saved and the war demand for aluminum subsidies; no certainty, unless, indeed, democracy finally awakens to the fact that the central problem of our time is how to adjust the economic organizations the modern world must have to the American ideal of living which we have cherished since the founding of the Nation.

This is a task for statesmen, statesmen in business and in government, who are capable of giving form and substance to the new organization for democracy—the democracy of the future. Unless such an organization is formulated now, the jibes of Hitler at the futile pluto-democracies will echo and reecho from the ruins of London Bridge across a world in which the irreligious, authoritarian state is supreme and from which human liberty shall have been banished by arbitrary power.

Ours is the era of organization in the field of industry and commerce. And ours is the responsibility of determining the form and nature of the organizations with which the generations of the future must work. Already in our own country, by our own legislation, there have been erected organizations which are the prototypes of those developed by the so-called alien philosophies of Europe, and if we wish to avoid the danger of Nazi, Communist, or Fascist trends, we shall do well to identify the characteristics of those orders and wherein they differ from democracy.

Socialism, whether it be of the Nazi or communistic variety, is the negation of the concept of private property. The concept of Fascism preserves the system of private property, but for only a part of the community, and that part much the smaller.

Under the Fascist concept, the preponderant part of the community is confirmed in its dependence upon the small group in whose hands private ownership of large segments of property has been concentrated. Under neither scheme is there any hope for the masses to enjoy a free and stable opportunity to use their own property to sustain their economic existence. On the contrary, they are condemned to be the pawns of the state.

The democratic concept preserves the institution of private property and guarantees to the masses a free and stable opportunity to labor and to possess the fruits of their toil.

The germs of each of these systems are apparent in our own economy.

The Bituminous Coal Act, for example, has set up an order in that industry which is not without its resemblance to the Fascist order. The deposits of coal are privately owned by small groups who are by law released from the burdens of competition. They are given the right, through the decisions of a Government bureau, to exact from the general public prices sufficient to maintain the industry. The workers must be content with wages secured to them by the efforts of a single big union which is Nation-wide in its operation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is not without some aspects of socialism. A vast plant, built by public funds, employing thousands, and affecting the lives and welfare of millions, it is managed by a small board without responsibility to agencies like the Civil Service Commission or the General Accounting Office which supervise ordinary political bureaus. It is an example of a public corporation which is not subject to the control of the persons most directly affected by its operations except remotely through the power of the Congress to alter the law. The board is in complete authority, and appropriations are sought from Congress only for plant expansion, not at all for operation.

Recently a measure was introduced in Congress to set up another such public corporation to administer the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, an organization which would establish in the States a function which would intimately affect the economic life of the people of the States in which operating and even that of adjacent States in which it had no plant.

The public corporation of this type is no new experiment. The device was used effectively during the World War to build a new merchant marine, to handle the grain and sugar problems, and to finance private enterprise. The War Finance Corporation which financed many essential industries through the war and protected many an agricultural producer during the depression that followed the war was the model for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation produced by the depression of 1929.

In every instance they were organizations formed for the public good, successful and unsuccessful in their operation, but often engaging in businesses of the type once regarded as solely the function of private enterprise. The alteration of our economy was such, however, that private enterprise was not equal to the task, and the new organizations had to be set up. Disregarding their success or failure, the efficiency or inefficiency of their operation, we face the fact that they are collective institutions, and they are managed for but not by the persons whose interests are affected.

Similarly, the private industrial corporation, as already pointed out, is frequently a huge collective enterprise affecting the entire national community, owned by a few, managed by still fewer, and bound together with other similar enterprises and financial institutions by a variety of devices in an industrial and commercial empire which does not possess the characteristics we call democratic. This development, in turn, has led to the establishment of Government bureaucracy, the maze of which defies explanation.

The task of democracy is to preserve the freedom and independence of the individual in this economic and political complexity and the obvious first step is to differentiate between the economic organizations which are essentially national in scope and those which are essentially local and at the same time definitely and clearly to fix their powers, responsibilities, and duties. The simple way to do this is to provide a national rule for the national corporations that carry on national commerce. The suggestion has been made over and over again by the statesmen of the last 50 years. It has been rejected because of an inherent fear that it would lead to political domination of the States by the Federal Government.

Some of those who have opposed the proposal have pointed out that the respective States have a complete legal right to regulate the activity within their borders of corporations created by other States. The right exists but has seldom been exercised. Indeed, in the nature of things it cannot be successfully exercised because so much business is essentially national in scope and the economic power of the corporations which carry it on is so great that individual States fear to place themselves at a possible disadvantage by imposing requirements which other States would not lay down. The result has been that we have witnessed in America the steady progress of centralism—centralism in business, centralism in labor, centralism in agriculture, centralism in government. The very consequence which it was feared would follow from a system of Federal charters or licenses for corporations engaged in interstate and foreign commerce has proceeded from the failure to adopt that formula, and simultaneously, with the development of centralism the economic impotence of the States and of local communities has become more and more striking.

The principal instrument of the concentration of economic power and wealth has been the corporate charter with unlimited powers—charters which afforded a detour around every principle of fiduciary responsibility; charters which permitted promoters and managers to use the property of others for their own enrichment to the detriment of the real owners; charters which made possible the violation of law without personal liability; charters which omitted every safeguard of individual and public welfare which common sense and experience alike have taught are necessary.

Among those to suffer the worst effects of the failure to require national standards for national corporations are, it is almost possible to say, the businessmen of the Nation who have been taught to fear a national charter law. Because the local corporation and the small corporation have no protection against the unfair and improper activity of the large corporation, little business has seen a constantly increasing portion of the Nation's business pass into the hands of big business.

Throughout the 50-year period during which the Government establishment at Washington has steadily grown, little businessmen have always been told by the opponents of a charter system that they, the little ones, would be the victims of Government interference and control, if a national charter system were adopted. The system was not adopted and the little businessman finds himself compelled to deal with both the bureaucrat and the monopolist.

A national law which would prohibit interlocking directorships would eliminate one of the principal causes of concentration and would injure no local or small corporation.

A national law which would make corporation directors trustees in fact as well as in law would protect investors big and little and would injure no local or small corporation.

A national law which would raise a barrier to business dealings by corporation officers and directors for their own personal profit with the corporations they manage would protect investors and all honest business enterprise.

A national law which would make corporation officers and directors civilly liable personally for violations of the antitrust laws which they themselves conceived and directed would protect all business.

A national law which would clearly define the scope of subsidiary corporations and one which would standardize intercorporate financing would remove two of the causes of concentration.

These and other necessary reforms could be effected by a national charter law without in the slightest degree impairing State sovereignty. Indeed, such provisions would have the very opposite effect because they would abolish the principal means by which the concentration which has undermined local economic sovereignty has been effected.

So long as those who want to voyage at will upon the seas of interstate and foreign commerce wihout responsibility to the public may obtain unlimited charters from the States there is no efficient means of safeguarding the general welfare, for even the regulatory powers of agencies like the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission are not sufficient to prevent the evils which arise from loose State charters.

If it be desirable to foster small business and encourage independent economic development in the States, if it be desirable to improve the fiduciary standards of the modern business corporation and protect investors, the simple way is to strike at the cause and prevent the practices that are condemned instead of trying vainly to correct and punish wrongs after they have been committed.

National standards such as are suggested here would require no expanding bureaucracy to administer. They would clothe no Government employee with discretionary power. They would have the simple effect of raising the corporate standards of the entire business world and thereby would liberate business from the dangers of arbitrary power whether exercised by monopoly or Government.

In the absence of legislation of this kind, it will be quite impossible to escape the continued multiplication of Government boards and commissions. Free independent enterprise will continue to be condemned to wage an unequal battle with concentrated power and the progress of concentration will make inevitable the development of more discretionary Government tribunals to protect the masses. We must either keep business organizations within bounds or accept some form of concentrated government.

The Temporary National Economic Committee, therefore, endorses the principle of national standards for national corporations and recommends that Congress enact legislation to that effect.

[Approved. Dissenting: Sumners, Reece, O'Connell, and Pike.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF MESSRS. REECE, PIKE, AND O'CONNELL

Messrs. Reece, Pike, and O'Connell dissent from the position taken by the majority on national standards for national corporations, for the following reasons:

First, the statement does not express definitely what it is that is being recommended. For instance, it is not clear whether statutory prohibitions of certain corporate practices are envisaged, or whether complete charters for national corporations are contemplated, or both. Without determining precisely what standards of corporate practice should be imposed, a recommendation that national standards for national corporations be adopted is not meaningful.

Second, the statement inadequately discusses the specific purposes which would be achieved by the adoption of national standards for national corporations, but there is an unfortunate implication that their adoption would solve all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power.

Third, the proposal for national standards for national corporations proceeds largely on the theory that simple legislative prohibitions of business conduct hostile to competitive enterprise will be sufficient to eliminate the conduct inimical to the business structure this committee seeks to preserve. In fact, like the provision in the Panama Canal Act denying permission to monopolies to use the Panama Canal, the recommendation of the majority naively assumes that the so-called standards will be self-executing.

It should be emphasized that we are not opposed to legislation which would outlaw specific corporate practices which have been proved to this committee to facilitate the undue concentration of economic power. This the proposal of the majority does not purport to do.

STIMULATING INVESTMENT

The voluminous testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee conclusively demonstrated the potential capacity of the American economy to produce an abundance of goods and services. We are committed to the purpose of making that potential capacity the actual quantity of goods and services available to the people of this Nation. We reject as un-American and unrealistic the belief that the limits of economic achievement have been reached in the United States.

The hearings and studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee have disclosed the restraints placed on the competitive system by the concentration of economic power with respect to the disadvantages under which small independent business labors in attempting to operate successfully. Important avenues of credit for small business have either disappeared or so altered in their conditions as no longer to be readily available. Yet small business is the seed-bed of a growing system of free enterprise upon which a healthy industrial economy depends. Its encouragement is essential to a dynamic economy.

The social desirability of new enterprise and new employment is so great that Congress can well consider the advisability of material reductions in the rate of taxation on returns which come from investments in new, independent businesses. The advantages to be derived by the whole economy from the opening of new fields to investment and commercial activity would more than offset any financial loss in returns from the higher brackets under the income-tax law.

This does not blind us to the facts developed concerning the lack of private investment sufficient to absorb in economic production the savings of our citizens during the past decade or more. Vast hoarding of unused capital has resulted. It cannot be denied that the present system of production and distribution permits the amount set aside in savings to increase at a much faster rate than the national income itself increases, causing an imbalance of serious proportions. Nor is the answer found in continued Government spending to counterbalance the accumulation of unused savings in a relatively few hands. The ultimate answer must be in such a stimulus to private enterprise that an expanding economic endeavor will immediately put all savings to work in providing the capital required for a more adequate standard of living for all our people.

No single remedy will achieve this result. Many of the recommendations offered in this report will go far, in combination, to effect it. An equitable tax system will do much. A wise program of aid to the underprivileged to increase their purchasing power will do a great deal. Strict enforcement of existing antitrust laws and more adequate antitrust legislation to prevent monopoly and insure a system of free competition in a free market will accomplish great things. It is an important axiom that we cannot maintain an economy of mass production unless we have an economy of mass consumption. The only practical way of preserving our democratic institutions is to pass on the benefits of our technology in lowered prices and increased standards of living to our entire population. A combination of the above remedies will remove many of the restraints and uncertainties which have retarded the investment of capital in new enterprise. They are recommended by this committee as essential in stimulating the use of capital which will adjust the imbalance between savings and investments.

[Approved without objection.]

A PROGRAM FOR BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH

One of the striking facts of experience in national economic policy formulation during the past decade, amply demonstrated by the experience of this committee, and more recently emphasized by the pressing problems of industrial mobilization confronting the national defense authorities, is the inadequacy of factual information concerning the structure and functioning of our industrial economy. President Roosevelt pointed to this deficiency in his message to Congress of April 29, 1938, specifically referring to it in section VI (7).

Looking to the post-war period we all know that business and Government will be confronted with a new, complex, and difficult situation. We shall be able to make the necessary adjustments and keep the economy functioning at a high level only if we anticipate and provide the factual requirements which are essential for intelligent appraisal and proper action. Fact gathering must be continuous so that essential economic information will be available to businessmen, to Government, and to the public.

We recommend, therefore, that the work of the Department of Commerce in the field of business and economic research be developed to provide for an adequate flow of current data on our national economy—on production, orders, inventories, productive capacity and resources, and related matters; for the investigating and tracing the movement of goods from the producer of raw materials through the manufacturing and distributing processes to the ultimate consumer; for the study and dissemination of information on efficient business practices and techniques; for the study of trade and business fluctuations and conditions which affect the national economy. Should adequate powers not be in existence to provide the basic data essential for this program, provision should be made to remedy this deficiency, but it is not intended to recommend that the subpena power be made available.

Further, we recommend that essential research in other agencies necessary to provide a comprehensive and integrated record of the current functioning of the economy such as, for example, the studies on occupational outlook and productivity now conducted by the Department of Labor, and the general economic investigations and the corporation report projects of the Federal Trade Commission be adequately supported and provision made for filling any essential gaps.

[Approved without objection.]

FOREIGN PATENT CONTROLS OVER AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Ample testimony on cartels before the Temporary National Economic Committee and other information which has come to the committee from governmental sources indicate that the interchange of patents between American and foreign concerns has been used as a means of cartelizing an industry to effectively displace competition. The production of vitally important materials, such as beryllium, magnesium, optical glass, and chemicals, has been restrained through international patent controls and cross-licensing which have divided the world market into closed areas. As a result, the capacity of American industry to produce these materials is not adequate to meet the needs of the defense program. The present international emergency further attests the need for a strong policy with respect to the control exercised by foreign governments and their dependent industries over American concerns through the patent system. The committee decries this situation and recommends that appropriate legislation be enacted to remedy it.

The further recommendation is made that the patent laws be strengthened so that no application for patent may be filed in a foreign country until specific permission has been obtained from the proper agency in this Government. This will prevent results detrimental to American interests following upon the use of a patent by a foreign government or its agents.

[Approved without objection.]

MAINTAINING A FREE MARKET

The American system is based on the maintenance of a free market wherein the products of farm and factory are offered for sale in competition which insures the movement of the greatest quantity of goods at the lowest possible price. Many restraints on the free market have developed which impair the functioning of the economy, and burden consumers with unwarranted charges. Consequently, the Temporary National Economic Committee recommends the removal of these hindrances as well as the adoption of measures which will increase the competitive activity of the market place.

RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE LAWS

The Miller-Tydings Enabling Act, which legalizes resale price maintenance contracts in interstate commerce, results in some of those economic and social practices to be expected from private price-fixing conspiracies. The legal sanction of such practices tends to undermine the basic tenets of a competitive economy, and introduces rigidities into the pricing of certain goods which restrain trade. Consequently we recommend to the Congress the repeal of the Miller-Tydings Enabling Act.

[Approved. Dissenting: O'MAHONEY, SUMNERS, REECE, TAYLOR.]

THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM

Extensive hearings on basing-point systems showed that they are used in many industries as an effective device for eliminating price competition.

During the last 20 years basing-point systems and variations of such systems, known technically as zone pricing systems and freight equalization systems, have spread widely in American industry. Many of the products of important industries are priced by basing point or analogous systems, such as iron and steel, pig iron, cement, lime, lumber and lumber products, brick, asphalt shingles and roofing, window glass, white lead, metal lath, building tile, floor tile, gypsum plaster, bolts, nuts and rivets, cast-iron soil pipe, range boilers, valves and fittings, sewer pipe, power cable, paper, salt, sugar, corn derivatives, industrial alcohol, linseed oil, fertilizer, and others.

The elimination of such systems under existing law would involve a costly process of prosecuting separately and individually many industries, and place a heavy burden upon antitrust enforcement appropriations.

We therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation declaring such pricing systems to be illegal.

Because such systems have resulted in uneconomic and often wasteful location of plant equipment, it is recognized by this Committee that the abolition of basing-point systems should provide for a brief period of time for industries to divest themselves of this monopolistic practice.

The committee is not impressed with the argument that a legislative outlawing of basing point systems will cause disturbances in the rearrangement of business through a restoration of competitive conditions in industries now employing basing-point systems. Such disturbances may be costly to those who have been practicing monopoly. But the long-run gain to the public interest by a restoration of competition in many important industries is clearly more advantageous.

[Approved without objection.]

INTERSTATE TRADE BARRIERS

Testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee has established the serious impairment of interstate trade due to State and local trade barriers erected to prevent the free flow of goods. While isolated cases do not loom large in the national economy, the aggregate effect is detrimental. We therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation establishing a continuing committee on Federal-State relationships which shall be charged with the responsibility of collecting current information as to trade practices between the States, and of devising ways and means of preventing or restraining uneconomic barriers to trade.

[Approved without objection.]

GOVERNMENT PURCHASING

The Federal Government has, over the years, come to play an increasingly important role as a purchaser of materials and supplies of all sorts, and is now a major purchaser in many fields. This long-term trend is now continuing at an accelerated pace, largely due to the demands of the defense program. Substantial evidence has been presented to the committee indicating that the Government has often been imposed upon by sellers operating in concert, through the submission of identical bids or other collusive practices.

The problems inherent in Government procurement are complex in the extreme. However, legislation is not the crying need, but rather the intelligent application of well-known principles to the purchasing function. The committee calls attention to the fact that the record made before it constitutes a substantial reservoir of factual material which should be of immense value to those clothed with the responsibility for purchasing on behalf of the Government. The committee urges that the purchasing function be centralized in one agency to the greatest extent possible, and that procurement be planned, as to time, place, and amount, in such manner as to obtain the needed goods at the lowest price and without dislocating the general economy. We cannot stress too much the necessity for complete coordination of the activities of all Government purchasing agencies, particularly during this present period of national defense.

[Approved without objection.]

ANTITRUST

In its examination of the extent and economic effects of the concentration of economic power in private industry, the committee concerned itself more with industrial monopoly than with any other single subject. In so doing, the committee held extensive hearings on specific industries such as steel, petroleum, copper, sulfur, glass containers, beryllium, and distilled spirits, as well as the construction and automotive industries. Some of the industries studied received more detailed examination than others, but in each case an effort was made to develop the pattern of the industry, the extent of the concentration of control and the devices used to achieve and maintain that control. The record also contains substantial evidence of the performance of the trade association, a development of increasing importance in recent years.

As a result of the studies made, the committee has arrived at certain conclusions as to desirable ways of better meeting the problem of monopoly. It is important that it be made clear at this point that the recommendations hereinafter made are all premised on the proposition that the public policy evidenced by the Sherman Act and by the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts holds as good today as it did when this legislation was enacted. All of this committee's recommendations are in furtherance of that public policy, and in this connection it is significant that in all the hearings held before this committee no witness so much as suggested any substantive change in the basic philosophy of those laws.

It is also important to point out that the recommendations are made in the light of world conditions as they exist today and of the national defense effort which is considered by all to be of first importance. The steps we recommend are, in the judgment of the committee, not only consistent with the conditions this country faces today but also are things that must be done if we hope to cope successfully with the economic problems of our time. It will avail us nothing to carry a gigantic defense program to a successful conclusion if in so doing we lose sight of the basic philosophy of our American economy—a competitive system of private capitalism.

In this field, the committee makes the following recommendations:

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

The extended study of the concentration of economic power made by this committee leads inevitably to recommendations to strengthen the enforcement of the antitrust laws. No hope of preventing the increase of evils directly attributable to monopoly is possible, no prospect of enforcing and maintaining a free economic system under democratic auspices is in view, unless our efforts are redoubled to cope with the gigantic aggregations of capital which have become so dominant in our economic life.

The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are the agencies clothed with the responsibility for enforcing the statutes which Congress has so wisely enacted to curb monopoly and to free enterprise from the restraints of price fixing, collusive agreements, and other restraints of trade. Confronted with the present-day American economy, they are admittedly undermanned and meagerly budgeted. No law, and particularly no law of the type here discussed, can be stronger than the zeal and resources of the agencies of enforcement into whose care it is entrusted. We strongly urge the absolute necessity of providing funds for these agencies adequate to that task which confronts them.

[Approved without objection.]

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN ANTITRUST LAWS

The Committee believes that legislation is clearly indicated as necessary in order that the struggle against monopoly and the uneconomic concentration of economic power in private hands be carried on with better

effect than heretofore. Our suggestions follow: [1]

1. Patent laws

No one can read the testimony developed before this Committee on Patents without coming to a realization that in many important segments of our economy the privilege accorded by the patent monopoly has been shamefully abused. It is there revealed in striking fashion that the privilege given has not been used, as was intended by the framers of the Constitution and by the Congress, "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts," but rather for purposes completely at variance with that high ideal. It has been used as a device to control whole industries, to suppress competition, to restrict output, to enhance prices, to suppress inventions, and to discourage inventiveness.

We have certain specific recommendations to make which, in our judgment, are clearly called for by the record before us. It should be emphasized, however, that if the pattern of control which has been achieved through the patent monopoly continues in spite of the changes we suggest, and it is entirely possible that it will, a complete reexamination of our patent laws should be made with a view to determining whether, under present-day conditions, they are calculated to achieve their avowed purposes.

Indicated changes in the patent laws divide naturally into two general classes—procedural and substantive. In its preliminary report to the Congress, dated July 17, 1939, the committee made certain recommendations with respect to the patent laws. Some of the procedural changes recommended have since become law. Subsequent examination of the problem has confirmed our belief that substantial changes are needed, including some in addition to those already recommended.

(a) Licensing of patents.—In order to eliminate the use of patents in ways inimical to the public policy inherent in the patent laws, as well as that of the antitrust laws, we recommend that the Congress enact legislation which will require that any future patent is to be available for use by anyone who may desire its use and who is willing to pay a fair price for the privilege. Machinery, either judicial or administrative, should be set up to determine whether the royalty demanded by the patentee may fairly be said to represent reasonable compensation or is intended to set a prohibitive price for such use.

This proposal is intended to prevent the suppression of patents as well as to provide for their availability for use in an equitable manner in any industry where they are a major factor.

[Approved. Dissenting: SUMNERS and TAYLOR.]

(b) Unrestricted licenses.—We recommend that the owner of any patent be required to grant only unrestricted licenses, and that he not be permitted to impose restrictions upon the buyer in sales of patented articles. In other words, the holder of a patent should not be permitted to restrict a licensee in respect of the amount of any article he may produce, the price at which he may sell, the purpose for which or the manner in which he may use the patent or any article produced thereunder, or the geographical area within which he may produce or sell such article. There should be a further prohibition against any other restriction which would tend substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly unless such restriction is necessary to promote the progress of science and the useful arts.

[Approved without objection.]

(c) Recording of transfers and agreements: We recommend that any sale, license, assignment, or other disposition of any patent be evidenced by an instrument in writing and that the same be required of any condition, agreement, or understanding relating to any sale or disposition of any such patent, and that in any such case a copy of such written instrument be filed with the Federal Trade Commission within 30 days after execution. There should, of course, be a substantial monetary penalty for failure to file as required.

[Approved without objection.]

(d) Limitation on suits for infringement: In order to prevent the use of litigation as a weapon of business aggression rather than as an instrument for adjudicating honest disputes, we recommend legislation which will provide that no action, based upon a charge of infringement of any patent, whether for damages, for an injunction, or for any other relief shall be permitted against any licensee under a patent or against any purchaser or licensee of any article unless the plaintiff has previously secured a judgment against the grantor of the license or the manufacturer of the article for infringement in connection with the granting of such license or the sale of such article.

[Approved without objection.]

(e) Forfeiture of patent for violation: If any person who owns any interest in or right under a patent violates any of the prohibitions described in paragraphs (a) and (b) above, his interest therein should be forfeited, such forfeiture to be brought about in a civil action against such person by the United States. Any patent or interest therein so forfeited should become a part of the public domain.

[Approved. Dissenting: TAYLOR.]

(f) Single Court of Patent Appeals: In order to improve the existing mechanism for the issuance of patents and the determination of disputes relating thereto, we recommend the creation of a single Court of Patent Appeals with jurisdiction coextensive with the United States and its Territories. Such a court would replace the present 11 different and independent jurisdictions and should do much to assure uniform treatment of patents and to reduce the time and cost of patent litigation.

[Approved without objection.]

(g) Limitation on period of patent monopoly: The life of a patent should be so limited that it will expire not more than 20 years from the date of the filing of the application, thus obviating the possibility of prolonging the patent monopoly by keeping an application pending in the Patent Office a long time. This would mean that if an application were kept pending in the Patent Office for more than 3 years, the 17-year term of the patent granted would be to that extent decreased.

[Approved without objection.]

2. Trade associations

The existence of over 1,500 national and regional trade associations and approximately 6,000 State and local associations formed to promote and protect particular segments of American industry, and the frequency with which such associations are found engaged in practices which prevent the operations of a freely competitive economy, urges the necessity of more adequate regulations of their activities in the public interest. We recommend that all trade associations whose participating members are engaged in interstate commerce be required to register with an appropriate Federal agency and to file periodical reports of their activities. All such associations should also be required to give adequate publicity to all of their activities. The effect of such a requirement should be to facilitate the enforcement problems of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Trade Commission and should tend to make business covenants open covenants openly arrived at.

This committee also believes that the time has come to make a clear legislative proscription of certain types of activity on the part of trade associations. Specific activities of trade associations which are calculated to or tend to achieve results not in harmony with the fundamental tenets of the antitrust laws should be unqualifiedly prohibited.

[Approved without objection.]

3. Corporate mergers

The committee has given serious consideration to the problem of corporate mergers and consolidations, this process being recognized as one which has for years hastened the growth of the concentration of economic power and has contributed in major part toward the elimination of competition. Section 7 of the Clayton Act forbids the acquisition of stock in competing companies where the effect is or may be to lessen competition. That law has fallen far short of gaining its objective, in part because the law does not prohibit the acquisition of assets of competing corporations, thus affording a convenient way of circumventing the obvious intention of the law. The committee, in its preliminary report, recommended that section 7 of the Clayton Act be amended so as to include within its prohibitions the acquisition of assets of competitors under conditions applicable to stock under the existing law.

The committee again urges the enactment of such a law, but feels that additional legislation is indicated, its purpose being to halt the merger process in its inception, rather than to continue to attempt to do so through case by case litigation after the event. We propose that the Federal Trade Commission be given authority to be fixed by the Congress to forbid the acquisition of the assets and property of competing corporations of over a certain size unless it be made to appear that the purpose and apparent effect of such consolidation would be desirable. The authority given would, of course, relate to capital assets of competitors and not to inventory or stock in trade.

The standards which the administrative tribunal would be required to apply to each case should follow the general standards inherent in the existing antitrust laws but should be made as precise and definitive as possible.

It is suggested for the consideration of the Congress that no such merger should be permitted unless its proponents demonstrate—

(a) That the acquisition is in the public interest and will be promotive of greater efficiency and economy of production, distribution, and management;

(b) That it will not substantially lessen competition, restrain trade, or tend to create a monopoly (either in a single section of the country or in the country as a whole) in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which such corporations are engaged;

(c) That the corporation involved in such acquisition do not control more than such proportion of the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which they are engaged as Congress may determine;

(d) That the size of the acquiring company after the acquisition will not be incompatible with the existence and maintenance of vigorous and effective competition in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which it is engaged;

(e) That the acquisition will not so reduce the number of competing companies in the trade, industry, or line of commerce as materially to lessen the effectiveness and vigor of competition in such trade, industry, or line of commerce;

(f) That the acquiring company has not, to induce the acquisition, indulged in any unlawful methods of competition or has not

[1] Senator King, formerly a member of the Committee, has prepared a statement indicating his views with respect to the existing patent laws. The position he takes is somewhat at variance with the views herein expressed. His statement will be found in hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee, Part 31–A, pp. 18025–18057.

otherwise violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended.

The committee further recommends an outright prohibition on the acquisition of stock in or holding company control of competing companies with suitable exceptions for bona fide investments and the control of true subsidiaries by parent corporations. These recommendations would, in the opinion of the committee, tend to (1) outlaw stock acquisition and the holding company as methods of combining competing corporations without disturbing the legitimate use of the holding company device in the relations between parent and subsidiary companies, (2) strengthen the administrative authority of the agencies entrusted with the administration of the new law, thus avoiding the vexatious limitations upon the powers of enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission, (3) clarify to a degree the substantive standards governing the legality of the combination of competitors, (4) employ the administrative rather than the judiciary in the initial application of standards which are as much economic as legal, and (5) substitute prevention for punishment by requiring approval in advance of any integration rather than compulsory dissolution after the evils of concentration have been suffered by the public.

The committee wishes to have it clear that in its judgment the advance administrative ruling, hedged in and safeguarded as we have indicated, may profitably be used in the merger field but may not safely be used in connection with the operation of the antitrust laws generally. As to them, improvement lies in the possibility of legislative clarification which will, over a period of time, make more certain the laws and their meaning, and their application to particular types of business conduct.

In the legislative revision this committee proposes in connection with the problem of mergers and consolidations it should be so drafted to make it clear that it does not apply to corporations subject to the jurisdiction of such administrative agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

[Approved without objection.]

4. Penalties

In its preliminary report to the Congress this Committee pointed out the inadequacy of existing civil remedies under the antitrust laws, as well as the inappropriateness of the criminal remedies in many cases. The Committee then recommended the enactment of legislation which would subject corporations and corporate officers violating the antitrust laws to more stringent civil penalties than exist at the present time. The Committee is still convinced of the validity of its earlier recommendation, and again urges the enactment of such legislation. A bill introduced in the Senate on June 28, 1939 (S. 2179) would, if enacted into law, carry into effect the recommendations here made. The Committee also points out that the maximum criminal penalty, by way of fine (and the courts are reluctant to punish a criminal violation by imprisonment) is $5,000. This amount is clearly inadequate as a deterrent to businessmen or to groups of businessmen whose incomes are in the millions, and the Committee therefore recommends that the maximum limit for fines be raised to at least $50,000, leaving discretion with the court to assess the penalty according to the means and circumstances of the defendant and according to the extent to which it has profited by the violation of the act.

[Approved without objection.]

5. Federal Trade Commission as a master in chancery

The committee recommends that the Federal Trade Commission Act be amended to provide that on request of the Attorney General the Commission, or any member thereof, may hear evidence and make findings of fact and conclusions of law in any pending antitrust proceeding. These findings should be made advisory to the Federal court under whose jurisdiction the case is pending, and that court should be in a position either to pass finally on the Commission's findings and conclusions, refer the report back for additional information, or hear further testimony itself.

[Approved without objection.]

INSURANCE

The Temporary National Economic Committee has made the most extensive study of life insurance since the well-known Armstrong investigation conducted by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes in 1906. During the intervening period since then, life insurance has grown to be one of the largest businesses in the United States. Its influence reaches out through the capital structure of enterprise and the millions of policyholders whose savings are entrusted to its care until it can truly be characterized as a national enterprise of first importance. Consequently, the findings of the Temporary National Economic Committee in its prolonged deliberations will have a substantial influence on the development of a major American industry.

Life-insurance business is regulated by the States. Our studies have disclosed conditions which lead to the following recommendations which are respectfully made for the consideration of the several States in which these companies are domiciled:

1. Insurance commissioners should be appointed by a responsible executive (in all cases subject, of course, to confirmation by the proper State body) and their selection should only be made with regard for the appointee's experience and qualifications.

2. The tenure of office of the insurance commissioner should be increased substantially and insofar as possible competent commissioners should be continued in office regardless of their political affiliation.

3. The salaries of insurance commissioners should, if possible, be substantially increased.

4. Insurance commissioners should not be obliged to undertake any duties other than the regulation and supervision of insurance companies.

5. There should be substantial increases in the budget for insurance departments of most States.

6. The personnel of most insurance departments should be increased. The work of an insurance department should be undertaken only by full-time qualified employees whose pay is sufficient to make them conscious of their responsibilities and free from insurance company or political influence. The employment of special outside examiners should be discontinued. The development of a civil service in State insurance departments is highly desirable. Companies should no longer be required to pay the salaries of examiners. If they must be charged for examination, the necessary amount should either be collected by a lump-sum charge set in advance and paid by the company directly to the State treasury or preferably be collected through an appropriate State tax.

7. State insurance supervisory officials should strengthen examination procedures particularly in respect to companies domiciled within their State. The desired improvement would include more frequent examinations in some States, more competent examiners, greater publicity to and full release of all examination reports, and the undertaking of examination which would give greater attention to the insurance operations as contrasted with the purely financial aspects of the business.

8. Closer regulation and supervision of agency practices is required. Present laws for licensing agents are all too frequently administered purely as revenue measures. Agents should be required to show more adequate training, better prospects for financial success, and greater knowledge of the life-insurance business. Furthermore, State supervisory officials should give more attention to such matters as company training courses, sales contests, compensation arrangements, etc.

9. The number of policy forms should be reduced, and greater attention given to establishing standardized policy forms or policy provisions acceptable in all States. The present confusion in this field is most undesirable.

10. State supervisory officials should more closely scrutinize activities of officers and directors and generally make more thorough checks on the competence and activities of company managements.

11. The life-insurance business should be conducted on a competitive basis, with emphasis on management efficiency rather than sales promotion. No intercompany agreements should be permitted the effect of which is to prevent any company from developing actuarially sound service and sales techniques.

12. A fundamental change in the conduct of industrial insurance should occur. Otherwise, its eventual elimination may be necessary. The primary responsibility for the change lies with the companies issuing such insurance and the States which supervise them.

[Approved without objection.]

[In addition to the above, Commissioner Sumner T. Pike, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, personally recommends a liberalization of investment laws to permit life-insurance companies to invest a relatively small percentage of their funds in common stocks which would stimulate healthier financial structures and have a wholesome effect on the economy. Accordingly, he suggests that the respective States give consideration to liberalizing their laws in this direction.]

Without interjecting the Federal Government into the general field of insurance regulation, it is possible to utilize Federal powers in a direction which will strengthen State regulation and make it more effective. There are admittedly areas where State regulation is severely handicapped by reason of the interstate character of the life-insurance business. If forthright steps are not taken now to plug the gaps where State regulation cannot do an effective job and to prevent relaxations of regulatory standards in several States such as have occurred in the past to the disadvantage of numerous policyholders, State regulation may eventually decay and all-inclusive Federal control will be required. Accordingly:

1. A Federal statute is recommended preventing life-insurance companies from using the mails, the radio, or other means, or instrumentalities of interstate commerce to sell insurance in a State where they have not been lawfully admitted to do business.

2. The National Bankruptcy Act should be amended to permit any State insurance commissioner to apply to the appropriate United States district court to bring about the liquidation or reorganization of a life-insurance company. If a company should be adjudicated bankrupt, the designated Federal agency or its nominee should be appointed to act as conservator and adviser during the readjustment of the company's affairs.

3. Officers and directors of insurance companies operating in more than one State should be prohibited by Federal statute from using their positions for improper personal gain either directly or indirectly. The statute should also declare life-insurance officials not only in fact but in the eyes of the law trustees required to adhere to the strictest

fiduciary standards, and appropriate civil and criminal penalties should be provided.

4. It is recommended that an appropriate committee of Congress or some designated agency of the Federal Government be directed to conduct a thorough investigation of all forms of fire, casualty, and marine insurance.

[Approved without objection.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, ON A NATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEVELOP NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS

It is a fundamental rule of democratic society, as already pointed out in this report, that authority over the society proceeds from the whole and not from any part of it. It follows from this that the organizations which affect the whole should be amenable to the whole and should derive their authority from the whole. Organizations, which from their very nature must of necessity influence the political or economic life of a democracy, must be of a character to reflect the will of the members rather than the will of the leaders.

Democratic society is willing to permit the individual to exercise the utmost freedom because no individual acting alone can so injure the entire community (except in the case of crime) as to justify the withdrawal of individual liberty. This is not the case, however, when organizations become so large and powerful that by weight of numbers, by wealth or power they threaten or affect the public welfare. In such instances the public has the right to define the nature and the form of the organization, not for the purpose of regimenting it but for the sole purpose of making certain that the organization shall operate in the public interest.

For this reason, since it appears that as a result of economic concentration there are not only huge corporate business and industrial organizations which intimately affect the entire national economy, but also trade associations, agricultural associations, consumers' organizations and labor unions, as well as pressure groups of various kinds, all of which are beyond the jurisdiction of local political subdivisions, I am personally of the opinion that the Congress, which represents all the people, should, by legislation, lay down definite standards of organization and activity for all such groups. This would be no easy task, but it seems to be preeminently a necessary one, for if the people of America in order to make the defense of democracy effective have found themselves obliged to coordinate all their forces and resources for the purposes of war, it seems clear that a similar coordination must be made effective if we are to establish the coming peace upon an unassailably democratic basis.

The mark of our economy has been largely one of restricting production for the purpose of maintaining price. That policy is to be found everywhere, but the defense crisis teaches us that stimulated production, not restricted production, is our great need. If, under the impetus of war, we are eliminating all restriction on production surely the demonstrated economic needs of millions teach us that we should have the same policy in peace. Only thus can we hope to distribute equitably among all the people the abundance nature provides.

The termination of the war effort, putting to an end, as it may very suddenly, the industrial activity now gaining tremendous momentum, will bring with it problems more critical and more fraught with danger than those which followed the collapse of 1929. Unless the democratic society of America shall have prepared in advance for this hour there will be no alternative except Government action, which will necessarily be as inconclusive as the action which has heretofore been taken. The unsolved problems of post-war depression will be heaped upon the unsolved problems of pre-war depression and it is difficult to say how, in these circumstances, democracy can survive unless democracy prepares for peace now.

Therefore I recommend that the Congress by an appropriate statute call a national conference of the various organizations representative of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers, which have for years been working on the diverse phases of the economic problem. The duties of such a conference would be twofold; first to define the nature and democratic responsibility of such organizations—business, labor, agriculture, and all—and, second, to define a formula for stimulated production under the impetus of peace rather than war.

Freight-Rate Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on January 10 this year, before the Atlanta (Ga.) Rotary Club, Mr. C. E. Childe delivered an address entitled "Freight-Rate Discriminations—the Nation's Post-War Transportation Problem No. 1." Mr. Childe is a member of the Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, and is an outstanding expert on the question of freight rates and transportation in general. As a member of the Board he has been making a special study of freight-rate questions for the past 2 or 3 years. His opinion on the subject of freight rates is therefore entitled to full weight and consideration, and I ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The South has shown, especially in recent years, very lively concern about freight rates. The Transportation Board of Investigation and Research, of which I am a member, is also interested in the subject. Our Board was created by the Transportation Act of 1940 to make investigations and reports to the President and Congress on the relative economy and fitness of rail, highway, and water carriers, to determine the service for which each is best adapted, and what policies should be adopted so that each type of carrier can best be developed to provide a national transportation system adequate for our national commerce and national defense. We have been studying the performance of the carriers, the cost and efficiency of their services, the traffic handled and the rates charged throughout the country. We have made a special investigation of the railroad rate structure and its effect upon the economic development of the country. From the studies we have made and are making, I have personally come to the conclusion—and it should be understood that I am today giving you my individual views—that the first essential of providing an adequate national transportation system is the readjustment of the freight rates and rate relationships of the railroads and other carriers, so that each rate will be fairly compensatory for the service performed, so that every shipper and locality will receive equal treatment in relation to the service rendered by the carrier, and every type of transportation can find its true economic place by attracting the traffic which will come to it through the charging of rates fairly related to its costs. I shall try to give you some of the facts and reasons on which my conclusions are based.

Everybody who gives any thought to the subject realizes that because transportation is a vital necessity in the production and distribution of goods, the growth and prosperity of a nation or a region are profoundly affected by the cost and dependability of transportation service. Every civilized people looks upon transportation, because of its primary importance, as a public service to be promoted and regulated or operated by the state for the general welfare, rather than a mere private enterprise of the carriers. It has been a settled rule of law, running back through the centuries, that the services and charges of common carriers must be just and reasonable, and must be extended to all alike, without unjust discriminations. The doctrine of equality of opportunity became a basic principle governing transportation services, even before we adopted it as the cornerstone of our whole democratic system of government.

But the adoption of a rule is one thing, and enforcement is another. The transportation history of the United States has been a constant struggle for better and more economical transportation, and to eliminate discriminations. The railroads have, from a very early date, considered it to their interest to discriminate in their rates and charges—to charge what they thought the traffic would bear, rather than to make like rates for like services to all customers. Preferential rates were made when railroad managers thought they were necessary to attract or hold traffic, and were denied where such necessity was not recognized. In practical effect this has given large shippers, controlling much traffic, lower rates than smaller shippers; localities enjoying the competition of numerous carriers—especially where there was competition between rail and water carriers—lower rates than localities not having the benefit of such competition.

Carriers tried to make up their losses on competitive traffic by charging higher and higher rates on noncompetitive traffic. These processes operated practically unchecked during the period of rapid railroad growth of the past century. The whole rate structure became a fabric of discriminations. Of course, this was very satisfactory to those who were getting the benefit of preferential rates. Many an industry and many a community owed its growth to such preferences. But the resulting disadvantages and injustices to others became intolerable. The courts provided inadequate remedies for enforcement of the law of equality of treatment. Congress, after much deliberation, attempted to remedy the situation by passing, 57 years ago, the original Interstate Commerce Act, which created the Interstate Commerce Commission for the express purpose of wiping out discriminations and forcing the railroads to charge just and reasonable rates to everybody alike. No legislation was ever more enthusiastically hailed as the dawn of a new era of opportunity, on the one hand, and more bitterly resisted, on the other, as destructive of private enterprise and prosperity. Litigation in the courts and technical defects made the act ineffective for 20 years. Amendments by Congress, in 1906, made the law workable. Since that time, by numerous amendments and additions strengthening the act, the Interstate Commerce Commission has been given powers to prescribe and establish such rates as it considers to be just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, not only for railroads, but also for pipe lines, highway, and water carriers.

This has provided machinery for wiping out discriminations, but the process of wiping them out has proved to be slow, uncertain, and expensive. Over all these years discriminations have become powerfully entrenched in the railroad-rate structure. Large interests, communities, and localities, which have been benefited by discriminations, consider it necessary for their well-being that they be continued—even that they have a vested right in their continuance. Conservatism is always slow to adopt changes which are disturbing to established institutions.

Reluctance to change long-established practices under which investments have been made and business has been built up, has frequently made difficult the removal of inequalities. In the process of deciding complaints, inequalities have been condoned or approved and precedents established giving sanction of law to the very practices which the law was intended to condemn.

The Interstate Commerce Commission sits much like a court, deciding rate complaints on the evidence brought before it, according to its best judgment in the light of the legislative policies laid down by Congress and interpreted by the courts. The Commission has succeeded in wiping out many discriminations; many others however have been found by the Commission not to be unlawful within the meaning of our present statutes; and still many others have not been touched because they have not been brought formally before the Commission for determination and disposition, or because proof of unlawfulness has not been adequate.

Some technical requirements that must be met to prove that discriminations are unlawful are: First, the conditions under which the transportation service is rendered must be shown to be substantially similar and, second, it must be shown that the discrimination is injurious and, third, the carrier committing the discriminatory act must have the power to correct it. Differences in competitive conditions, and in the degree of competition between carriers are regarded as a justification for inequalities in rates; and, since differences in competitive conditions are the principal cause of discriminatory rates, this makes the motive the justification of the act, and throws the door open for the maintenance of discriminatory practices where the stresses of carrier competition have resulted in granting preferences to localities and industries to the disadvantage of others.

A great obstacle to the removal of discriminations has been that, until recently, very little has been known about the cost of rendering a particular transportation service. It has been known, of course, that costs varied roughly with the distance, but it has been thought that cost per mile varied with the density of traffic, and was higher where the traffic was relatively light, and lower as the volume of traffic became greater. Under this theory, of course, regions of heavy traffic density would be entitled to lower rates than those where traffic had not been built up. Later studies have proved this theory to be false. We know now that the cost of handling traffic a given number of miles averages about the same in one part of the country, as compared with another. In the meantime, however, a great many rate decisions have been handed down approving lower rate levels in regions enjoying heavy density of traffic than in those of lighter traffic density.

Regional rate inequalities have caused some of the most serious difficulties. The regional development of the railroads in the East, South, and West, with few railroads crossing the regional boundaries, resulted in the establishment of separate and unlike systems of rates in each of these areas. In the eastern region, extending north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers, from the Mississippi to the Atlantic coast, where population and industrial development were more advanced and widely diffused than in the others, there was an early tendency toward uniformity of rates, and the policy of the railroads was to make rates on raw materials and finished products which were favorable to the production and distribution of manufactured products throughout the territory.

The southern and western roads followed quite different rate-making theories and practices. The southern roads were built from the ocean, Gulf, and river ports into the interior; each road tried to develop traffic to and from its particular ports, moving the raw products of the interior to the ports and manufactured products inward. Later, as the lines interconnected and consolidated a few main interior railroad centers, such as Atlanta, were given rates competitive with the ports, but, generally speaking, rates between interior points in the South were kept on much higher levels than rates to and from the ports. Manufacturing in the South was very limited, so there was little inducement to establish rates for the widespread development of local industries. In individual cases, special rates were made for the products of southern factories. The policy of the southern railroads was to make relatively low rates for the movement of southern raw materials through the ports and gateways, and relatively high rates on manufactured products from the gateways with still higher rates for local traffic between the small interior points. Where competition existed between rail and water lines, rail rates were drastically lowered to take the business away from the water carriers. There was little semblance of uniformity or equality in the rate structure that grew out of these policies.

In the West, as in the South, rates were made up to encourage the movement of raw materials, with little regard to the development of manufacturing, except in individual instances. The main terminals and gateways were given preferred rates over other points.

Interterritorial rates were not established between any of the regions, except where they were forced by competition. As a rule, the interterritorial rates were the combination of the rates to and from the border point, making a through charge from a point in one territory to a point in another much higher than the rate for similar distance within either of the two territories.

Under the Commission's regulation, rates have become more uniform within each region, but dissimilarities of rates in one region as compared with another have been largely retained. In the three main rate territories—the South, the East, and the West—these rate dissimilarities have been so great as to constitute a distinct bar to commerce between the regions, and have tended to perpetuate within each region the pattern of development that was already there, with manufacturing predominating in the East and the production of raw materials predominating in the South and West.

During all of this time that rates were becoming established on regional lines, vast and revolutionary economic changes were taking place. Big industries and mass production were supplanting small industries and handcrafts. Farms were becoming mechanized. Our pioneering days were coming to an end. We were losing our export markets for agricultural products, and forced to turn to our own factories, more and more, to use our raw products, to supply our finished goods, and to provide employment. The East was better adapted, economically and by its transportation rate structure, to profit by these new conditions than the South and West. The population and the wealth of the country centered more and more in the eastern manufacturing districts, and the disadvantages of the southern and western raw-materials-producing areas became relatively greater than ever.

The First World War gave a temporary burst of prosperity to the whole Nation. Agricultural and industrial output greatly expanded, with the industrial expansion mostly in the East. Wages, prices, and rail rates were greatly increased. Transportation demands and shortages made us keenly aware of the need for more and better transportation facilities. Amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, immediately after the war, placed added responsibilities upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to maintain adequate railroad rate levels and preserve railroad financial credit.

Billions of dollars of added capital went into enlargements and improvements of railroad facilities. The Federal Government inaugurated a vastly enlarged program of water-navigation improvements. The Panama Canal was opened to commerce. The great fleet of ocean vessels that we had built during the war were put to use in coastwise, foreign, and intercoastal trade. The private automobile came into universal use, and induced us to build a network of hard-surfaced highways all over the Nation. Over these highways the motortruck, which had come into extensive use for the first time in the war, quickly became an important and indispensable carrier of freight. New pipe lines were built to supply the needs of the motorcars for gasoline. The agricultural boom collapsed with the end of the war, but the expansion of industry and transportation proceeded at a dizzy pace—with the greatest expansion in the East—until the great depression hit us in 1929. Our vastly enlarged transportation now had to try to live on only 50 percent of the 1929 traffic. Waterway and highway facilities continued to expand during the depression, as part of our public works program, and air carriers, another war baby, aided by public airport and airway construction, began to loom up as a new competitor.

The railroads, alarmed at last over the threat to their supremacy as a near-monopolistic transportation agency, began to clamor for increased regulation and taxation of their competitors, for curtailment of the Government program of water and highway improvements, and for greater leeway to allow them to cut rates as they saw fit, to meet competition of water and highway carriers. The railroad rate structure, with relatively high rates on manufactured articles and other traffic, formerly thought to be noncompetitive, was entirely unsuitable for the new competitive conditions. Highway carriers and water carriers stepped in to take the high-rated traffic, and new water routes in the interior took part of the lower-rated bulk traffic.

These new competitive conditions were especially disturbing to railroad rates in the South and West, where it appeared they would provide at least a partial remedy for the rate disadvantages of shippers and industries in those areas. With the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads embarked upon a new and vigorous program of cutting rates where necessary to hold their traffic, in the face of the new competition. New rate discriminations appeared. Carrier revenues suffered. The Commission joined with the carriers and shippers, who felt that the new conditions were operating to their disadvantage, in urging more regulation. Congress was persuaded to place the motor carriers, with some exceptions, under regulation of the Commission in 1935, and the water carriers in 1940. Since then, as a means of stabilizing the rate structure, the rates of motor carriers, and to a lesser extent of water carriers, have been made to conform more or less closely to the railroad-rate pattern. It is realized, however, that this is a temporary stopgap, and the real problem of devising a rate structure which

will permit each type of transportation to develop in its proper economic field and enable shippers to get the benefits of each, remains to be solved.

The Second World War has only temporarily ended the economic problems of the depression. With the close of the war, it will be more important than ever that we have economical and efficient transportation to maintain full production and employment throughout the country. We know now, as we never did before, that we must maintain a transportation plant in this country capable of quick enlargement to handle all peak and emergency loads. It was pure luck that we had a surplus transportation capacity when we entered the war. Without it, we might have lost the war. We cannot afford to trust to luck in such a vital matter in the future. But what are we going to do with all our ships and airplanes, the new barges on the rivers, the new pipe lines, the new trucks and busses, the locomotives and cars that will be built in our war-enlarged factories, as soon as they stop building for war? And how many factories can be kept going, against the handicap of discriminatory freight rates?

Undoubtedly, the public will demand that each form of transportation be given fair opportunity to render the best and cheapest transportation service it is capable of giving. But neither efficiency nor economy comes through cutthroat competition, under which the larger and stronger carriers deprive smaller operators of adequate traffic and thereby increase their costs and decrease their efficiency, and finally force them out of business, while at the same time the stronger carriers weaken themselves by performing uneconomic services at inadequate revenues. Nor does the public benefit by such cutthroat competition, which breeds greater and greater rate discriminations and inequalities, gives the benefit of low rates to shippers and localities where competition for traffic is heaviest, and penalizes those in the lighter-traffic areas, adds to the advantages of those already strong and deprives others of the opportunity to compete.

The establishment of a proper rate structure lies at the heart of the transportation problem and of the economic problems which will immediately confront us as we pass from war to peace. The only rate policy which can possibly give each type of transportation a fair chance to develop, give the public the benefits of the inherent advantages of each type of carrier, and give every industry, throughout all parts of the United States, a fair economic chance to produce and market its products and maintain full employment, is one which will provide uniform treatment for all sections by maintaining rates for every type of commodity and for every length of haul which bear their fair share of the cost incurred by the carrier performing the service.

The Board of Investigation and Research, in a summary report filed with the President and Congress last spring—House Document No. 145—and in a more voluminous detailed report filed in the fall—House Document No. 303—found that the existing regional differences in class rates were not justified by differences in cost of rendering the service in the various regions, by differences of the composition of the traffic, or by any other transportation conditions; that, in view of the similarity of these conditions throughout the United States, Congress should amend the Interstate Commerce Act, declaring that it is in the interest of a proper development of the country as a whole to establish a uniform classification of freight and a uniform scale of class rates for transportation of freight by railroad throughout the United States, with only such departures from uniformity in particular cases as may be necessary to provide adequate transportation service or adequate carrier revenues in particular areas, or otherwise to correct inequitable conditions. The Board recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to prepare a proposed uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates, and after holding hearings giving everybody an opportunity to present their views and criticisms; to establish within 3 years such new uniform classification, and rates, with such exceptions as were found to be justified. It was the Board's view that, without such a specific declaration of policy by Congress, the Commission could hardly be expected within a reasonable period of years to revise the rate structure in a way different from and contrary to the customs and practices, and its own rulings of the past. After the filing of the Board's report, a number of bills were introduced and are now pending in both Houses of Congress, which are intended to carry out the Board's recommendations. It is expected that hearings will be held on the bills in the near future, by the Interstate Commerce Committees of the House and Senate.

The railroads are bitterly opposing these bills, and through their representatives and spokesmen throughout the country are urging shippers and the public generally to write their Senators and Congressmen, demanding that the bills be defeated. Pamphlets have been published by the Association of American Railroads and by various regional associations, giving their arguments against the bills. A pamphlet reflecting these arguments has also been issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Shippers of the Eastern States, actively supported by the Governor of New York, the Governor of Indiana, and other eastern Governors and State officials, have organized what they call a National Freight Rate Conference, to oppose these bills in order, according to a recent Indianapolis newspaper story, "to offset the attempts of Southern States to clip by congressional legislation the rate-making powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Opposition has also been expressed to the bills by some spokesmen for southern shippers of heavy commodities, who consider it would be injurious to the movement of their products on special commodity rates, if southern rates were equalized with the East. There has even been some opposition voiced on the part of those who are seeking uniform rates for the South, on the ground that legislation should not be attempted while their complaints demanding equalization are pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission for decision.

The railroad arguments are that freight rates are now and must continue to be made to meet the varying needs of commerce and shippers throughout the country; that the present rates encourage manufacturing, as well as the production of raw materials in the South and West; that the proposed bills would freeze the rate structure into an arbitrary, rigid uniform pattern under which commerce could not move; that raw material rates would be increased drastically from southern and western producing points to eastern markets; while rates on manufactured goods would be drastically reduced. This, it is urged, would enable eastern manufacturers to take the business away from southern and western manufacturers in their local markets, and both the raw materials and finished goods of the South and West would stop moving; and thus, according to the arguments, everybody, including the railroads, would be ruined.

The industrial interests in the eastern States agree generally with the railroad arguments, except they deny that the eastern manufacturers would gain any advantage over southern and western manufacturers. They fear, on the contrary, that the eastern manufacturers would be put out of business through the loss of their present rate advantages, and that this would cause a shifting of industry from the East to the South and the West. Aside from this inconsistency, the opponents are unanimous in condemning the bills as a vicious form of political or legislative rate making, and that Congress, by usurping the functions and overriding the policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission, would cause great injury to the commerce of the country, which has been built up under the present rate system.

These arguments, it seems to me, quite obviously misrepresent what these bills are and what they would accomplish. To charge that a declaration of transportation policy by Congress would be political rate making overlooks the fact that Congress has the sole power and duty to declare transportation policy, and that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a creature of Congress, has no power to act except through the directions given to it by Congress through specific legislation. The Interstate Commerce Act, in its entirety, is nothing but a declaration by Congress of transportation policy and of the manner in which it shall be carried out. The proposed bills would not take away from the Interstate Commerce Commission its powers, but would simply give the Commission the policy under which it is to act, leaving to the Commission the carrying out of that policy—which is just what all of the other provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act do at the present time. It is equally absurd to contend that the bills would require the substitution of an arbitrary, inflexible system of rate making, unsuited to the needs of commerce, for a flexible, workable system which is designed to meet commercial needs. The bills would only require uniformity of rates where no good reason exists for inequality. They would merely give practical effect to the long-recognized, but long-violated, principle of equality of opportunity by substituting the rule of equal rates for equal services for the rule of charging all the traffic will bear; and by substituting for the rule that discriminations are right unless they are proved to be unlawful, the rule that discriminations are unlawful unless they are shown to be right. Such a rule of rate making could be harmful only to those who enjoy unwarranted preferences and advantages.

What about the argument that the present system of rates has promoted manufacturing, as well as raw material production in the South and West? You have heard it stated that the South is developing industrially by leaps and bounds; that during the past 20 years it has had greater relative growth of industry than any other part of the country; that present freight rates do not discriminate against southern manufacturers or keep their products out of the East, but are protecting southern manufacturers against the competition of the eastern manufacturers in southern territory. What are the facts?

The comparative development of the South and East, as of the year 1939—the last prewar year—may help to give you the answer. The figures I shall give for the South are for the eight Southeastern States comprising southern rate territory—Louisiana and Virginia are not included because Louisiana is mostly in southwestern rate territory, and Virginia is mostly in eastern rate territory. For the East, I have taken the States from Wisconsin and Illinois east, and north of the Ohio River, including Virginia and West Virginia, which comprise eastern rate territory.

Southern territory comprises 13 percent of the Nation's area. It contains 16 percent of the population and 16 percent of the gainful workers of the country. Eastern territory has 15 percent of the area, 53 percent of the population, and 55 percent of the gainful workers. The East, with an area only slightly greater, has more than three times as many

people and gainful occupations as the South. This is not because the South lacks natural resources, but because the East is a highly developed manufacturing area and the South is not. The South provides employment for about the same number of men as the East in producing raw materials—each area employs 39 percent of the United States total. But in manufacturing and construction, the South employs only 12 percent and the East 69 percent of the United States total. The South has more farmers than the East—30½ percent of the Nation's total is in the South and 26½ percent in the East. The South has a few more workers in forestry and fishing than the East—the percentages being 36 for the South and 34 for the East. But, in mining, the South falls far below the East—13 percent of the Nation's total is in the South and 54 percent in the East. This is not because the South lacks minerals.

The coal resources of both areas are of high quality and practically unlimited in quantity. But the coal production of the South is only one-eighth of the production of the East, and more than half of the South's relatively small coal production is shipped to eastern consumers. Of the all-important industrial mineral, iron, the South's natural resources are far ahead of the East's. The South's iron-ore reserves are more than 1,500,000,000 tons, greater even than Minnesota's. The East's iron resources are negligible—the ore for its steel industry comes from Minnesota. Yet the South converts less than one-tenth as much iron ore into steel as the East. Over a third of the South's scanty iron and steel production consists of pig iron. Nearly a fourth of that is shipped to the East as a raw material for further manufacture. The South's whole production of iron and steel is substantially less than its consumption—which is only 6 percent of the national consumption—whereas the East produces nearly 90 percent of the Nation's iron and steel, and consumes nearly 80 percent.

In dollar values of things produced, the disparities between the South and the East are striking. Here are the figures: In 1939, the South's gross agricultural income was 16 percent of the United States total. The agricultural income of the East was 34 percent of the country's total—the East's farm products were worth more than twice those of the South. The East's forest products had a value slightly more than those of the South; the South's percentage of the United States total was 23 and the East's 24. The mineral products of the East had 6 times the value of the minerals of the South. In total value of raw materials, the East was nearly 3 times as well off as the South; the southern percentage being 13 and the East's 34, of the United States total. The value of the South's manufactured products was only 8 percent of the United States total, and of the eastern manufacturers, 72 percent. In total value of raw and manufactured products combined, the South had 9 percent of the Nation's total and the East, 65 percent. This corresponds with the percentages of income in the two areas, which were for the South 9 percent, and for the East 64 percent of the United States total.

This situation is, of course, reflected in the volume and character of the South's railroad tonnage, as compared with the East. The Board's study of railroad traffic moving in 1939 shows that the South shipped only 12 percent of the national rail tonnage, and received only 10 percent. A third of the tonnage shipped went outside of the South and 20 percent of the tonnage received came from outside of the South. The East shipped 60 percent of the Nation's total tonnage, of which only 5 percent went outside the East. It received 64 percent of the Nation's tonnage, of which only 11 percent came from outside the East. Further light on the South's relatively small outflow and inflow, and its relative dependence upon outside markets, both for its raw materials and finished products, and on the relative self-sufficiency of the East, is gained by looking at the tonnage of raw materials, semiraw and processed commodities, and finished manufactures. In the raw materials group, the South shipped 12 percent of the Nation's total and 36 percent of its production went outside of the South. The East's production of raw materials was 61 percent of the Nation's total, and only 3 percent was shipped out. Of semiraw and processed materials, the South produced 15 percent of the Nation's total, and shipped out 25 percent of that; the East produced 48 percent and shipped out only 6 percent. In the finished manufactured articles group, the South produced only 7 percent of the Nation's total, and, even of that small production, shipped out 45 percent, whereas the East produced 76 percent of the national tonnage of finished goods and sent only 14 percent of that outside of its own territory. It is true that, during the past 20 or 30 years, some lines of manufacturing in the South have had a substantial growth, but the southern manufacturing industries which comprise a sizable proportion of the Nation's total are relatively few. The greatest growth, according to the traffic statistics, has occurred in the textiles, tobacco, furniture, a few kinds of paper and pulpboard, and aluminum. Desirable as these additions to the South's manufacturing production have been, they still fall far short of what would seem to be the South's reasonable possibilities in these lines. About 40 percent of the raw cotton of the South and Southwest (other than export), shipped in 1939, moved north for manufacturing, and a large part of the South's textiles consist of the rougher and simpler fabrics—the North still leads in the manufacture of the finer finished goods. The East manufactures more tobacco than the South—a third of the South's tobacco leaf is still shipped north for manufacturing. The South is better supplied with the raw materials for furniture manufacturing than is the East, but the South produces, in terms of tonnage, only a third of the furniture, other than metal, and only 7 percent of the metal furniture. The East produces more than half of the furniture, other than metal, and more than three-fourths of the metal furniture.

The South produces 18 percent of the wrapping paper, 25 percent of the paper board, 10 percent of the building paper; the East produces 59 percent of the wrapping paper and bags, 53 percent of the paper board, 75 percent of the building paper, and practically monopolizes the production of high-grade paper and paper articles. The South and the East together make most of the aluminum of the country. The South ships its aluminum to the East for manufacturing; aluminum articles are made almost exclusively in the East. The South ships most of its peanuts to the East and buys back from the East its peanut candy and other peanut products. The South's cottonseed oil goes north for production into soap and food products. The South produces 20 percent of the fruits and vegetables of the country, as compared with 21 percent produced in the East. But the South produces less than 4 percent of the canned food products and the East produces 55 percent.

These figures make clear where the South's troubles lie. Its manufacturing production is very low in relation to the East. Its lack of factories limits its production of raw materials, especially of minerals and high-grade agricultural products, limits its population and its job opportunities, and cuts its average income, per employed person and per capita, to less than half of that of the East. The South has two workers producing raw materials to one producing manufactured goods. That does not mean that the South is producing too many raw materials—its raw material tonnage is in fact far below the East's; but simply that it is not manufacturing enough, even, of the raw materials it produces. The East has three workers engaged in manufacturing to one producing raw materials, but the East has as many raw materials workers as the South, and the value of their products is three times the value of the southern raw products. The East is using its raw products, as well as a substantial percentage of the raw products of the South and the West and by so doing provides in one corner of our country, containing only 15 percent of the area and not disproportionately supplied with natural resources, more than 53 percent of our people with better jobs and higher incomes than any other part of the United States.

In order to attain a comparable prosperity, the South needs to increase its production of raw materials; it needs greater and more diversified agricultural production; it needs, above all, to convert more of its raw materials into finished products.

Someone may point to the new war industries which have been established in the South and say the picture I have been giving you of your economic development is now out of date. It is true you have more industrial plants now than you had in 1939, but so has the East and so has the West. The relative situation has not substantially changed. Proportionately, more war factories have been located in the East than anywhere else, and, according to a recent study of the Census Bureau, there has been a net loss of industrial workers from the South and gain in the East since the war began.

If the South is to develop diversified manufacturing, conditions must be attractive for small miscellaneous industries of all kinds, as well as for large industries. In terms of freight rates, every manufacturer, no matter where he is located, should have, as nearly as possible, equal treatment compared with his competitor in shipping both raw materials and finished products. In the East such a rate policy prevails now and has prevailed for years. As a general rule, any manufacturer, large or small, shipping between any two points in eastern territory, has a mile-for-mile parity, or an approximate parity of rates on his in-bound raw materials and on his out-bound finished products. In the South, on the other hand, favorable rates on either raw materials or finished products must be obtained by individual negotiation and voluntary concessions granted by the carriers, or through long-drawn-out, expensive proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The long-standing policy of southern railroads of making rates individually for each industry, on the basis of what they think the traffic will bear, is unfavorable to the growth of miscellaneous manufacturing, especially small manufacturing, throughout the area.

It is my opinion that a congressional declaration of policy requiring the removal of rate inequities would be beneficial, rather than harmful, to carriers and shippers of all kinds, as well as to the general public in every part of the country. Such a declaration would help, rather than hamper, the Interstate Commerce Commission in carrying out its duties, because it would provide a definite rule of rate-making, giving clear authority to depart from the outworn traditions, precedents, and findings of the past. It would help the South and the West, by affording them greater opportunity to develop their unused natural resources, provide greater employment, and higher incomes and standards of living. It would help the East, because the East cannot permanently prosper if the development and prosperity of the rest of the Nation are retarded. Greater production and higher living standards in the South and West mean more business and more customers, in the long run, for eastern business. It would help the railroads and the other carriers, because greater production and higher living standards would mean more traffic, and the elimination of discriminatory rates would

provide fair opportunity and fair compensation to every carrier.

I think it is, therefore, of very great importance at the present time that you in the South should continue to support your Senators and Congressmen, your Governors and State officials, and shippers' organizations who are fighting against discriminatory freight rates; that you should urge, and enlist if possible, the support of people in other parts of the country who believe in the doctrine of equality of opportunity, as an economic as well as a political principle; that you should ask for this support, not only in the West but in the East, and among railroad and other transportation men, as well as from citizens generally; that you should ask the railroads and other supporters of the propaganda against the pending anti-freight-rate-discrimination bills, to reexamine their arguments against the bills, and if they find that their arguments are false or mistaken, to withdraw them. There should be no sectionalism, no partisanship, no strife between big shippers and small, or between railroads and shippers or between railroads and other carriers, in the determination of a sound transportation policy for our country. And you should let your Senators and Congressmen know that you will support any efforts that they make to establish fair and nondiscriminatory rates throughout the whole United States.

Ratio of Americans to British in Proposed Invasion of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Boston Post on the subject of the ratio of Americans to British in the proposed invasion of Europe.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT 3-FOR-1 RATIO

The charge hurled against certain Congressmen that their criticism of the 3-for-1 ratio of Americans to British in the proposed invasion of Europe tended to make for disunity is fallacious. Once this matter was made public by Senator JOHNSON it was bound to be discussed, and it is better to have the facts brought out into the open than to try to hush-hush the case.

Unity among the "big four"—America, Britain, Russia, and China—is going to be very essential for keeping the peace after the war; and to develop and preserve this postwar unity it is vitally necessary that frankness and fairness be practiced during the war. It was the disillusionment of the American people over the selfishness of the Allies at Versailles, with the secret treaties made by them during the war, and even secret deals pulled off at Versailles, while President Wilson was proclaiming the ideals of the League of Nations, that caused America to turn completely isolationist in 1920.

In reply to the criticism over the 3-for-1 ratio of sacrifice to be made in the invasion of Germany, the American Chiefs of Staff now say that the proportion of troops each nation will furnish is not to be made public. It is "a military secret which the Germans will not learn from any official source in this country."

However, the Chiefs of Staff do not deny the 3-for-1 ratio; and when Senator JOHNSON of the Senate Military Affairs Committee declared that America was being committed to furnish 73 percent as against 27 percent for Britain he very probably knew what he was talking about.

Further, the Chiefs of Staff are not quite fair when they point out that the British population is only about one-third that of the United States, and, therefore, imply that the 3-for-1 ratio is based on the population resources. Britain is not alone concerned in this war. The life of the British Empire is at stake as well. As was explained in this column the other day, taking only the principal white component parts of the British Empire, that is, the United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, there is a population of 77,000,000, or more than half of our 135,000,000. In addition, other parts of Africa and India, also within the British Empire, have 340,000,000 population. Is there no way of drawing upon these immense reserves when the Empire is fighting for its life?

Again our Chiefs of Staff say there are a considerably larger number of British than American troops in the Mediterranean war theater. That is not really true as regards north Africa, Sicily, and Italy, where the fighting has been going on. In these battle fronts the American and Free French forces probably were quite as large as the British contingents. The considerably larger number of British troops in the Mediterranean area has been concentrated for several years in the so-called Middle East, in Iran, Iraq, and Syria where there has been no fighting.

Even if the British had a few more divisions in that whole Mediterranean area than we, it would hardly offset the fact that we have a big war on our hands in the Pacific, which we are fighting with practically no help except for the little Australia can furnish.

Some months ago, in addressing the American Congress, Mr. Churchill said that after Germany was defeated the British would then help us beat Japan. The inference plainly was that the whole might of the British Empire was to be concentrated against Germany. But now, when the big push against Germany is to be made, America is being called upon to furnish three men for each man supplied by Britain.

OUR 3 FOR 1

The statement by Senator JOHNSON of the Senate Military Affairs Committee that for the invasion of Europe America will be called upon to furnish 73 percent of the troops, while Britain will supply only 27 percent, has so far aroused curiously little comment. Perhaps when the half million or more American casualties, which we are told this invasion will cost, begin to be made public a few months from now, the question why America must bear such a seemingly disproportionate share of the load will come up for more discussion.

It is to be presumed that our military chiefs have gone over this matter very carefully, and that in the circumstances they have come to the conclusion that this is a fair ratio of the fighting strength. But on the basis of population the demand that we furnish three soldiers for every one supplied by the British Empire seems unduly high.

Taking merely the principal white component parts of that empire, the United Kingdom has 46,000,000, South Africa 10,000,000, Canada 11,000,000, and Australia and New Zealand another 10,000,000. Here is a total of 77,000,000 against our maximum of 135,000,000. On this basis our share should not be more than two for one.

But, in addition, the British Empire controls territory in Africa with 50,000,000 more population, and in the British Indian provinces is a population of 290,000,000. We have been told that for the last several years the Indian native army, mostly volunteers, has amounted to some 2,000,000 well-trained soldiers.

We might go further and ask, what about the 21 United Nations in Central and South America who have declared war on the Axis? We have supplied them with hundreds of millions in material and credits, so that they could help defeat the common enemy. Are they going to fight now or stand by as spectators?

Surely the war picture has changed greatly in the last two years, since the days when President Roosevelt was saying that we must take every measure "short of war" to bring down the Axis. It is a far cry from the day that Mr. Churchill boasted, "Send us the tools and we will do the job."

Then we were supposed to be merely the arsenal of democracy. But since then we have spent more on the war than all the other United Nations combined. We are incurring heavy casualties in the Pacific against a desperate and powerful enemy; and now we are called upon to supply most of the boys who are to die in the invasion of Europe.

This, as we have said, may be necessary in the circumstances. But our military chiefs ought to make it absolutely clear to the American people why they must make this awful sacrifice. The vague statement that Britain lacks reserves is not enough. Now, when the knockout blow is to be delivered, is the time to use every ounce of reserve force.

Post-War Reemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Jewish Veteran for December 1943, on the subject of post-war reemployment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is one conference that will never be held but which we of the Jewish Veterans often reflect upon and wish could be brought about.

In our mind's eye we see it in session. There is no hall or amphitheater now in existence big enough to hold those who belong in that conference. For in this imagined meeting, the millions of American employers will come together in convention to determine what they will do after the war for the full reemployment of our human resources in a peaceful, regenerated, vitally hopeful United States.

In our mind's eye we see ourselves putting in a bid to speak to that conference of America's employers, of the businessmen whose faith in our future, whose vision, whose broadmindedness will mean so much in the transition to and through the years of peace. The appeal that we would make to those in solemn convention assembled will end with this challenge:

"Will you resolve to tolerate no discrimination in the business world, to permit no employment tests other than those of competence?

"Will you resolve that the curse of 'gentiles only' and other variants of the same restrictive spirit shall henceforth be expunged from our economic life?

"We, the organized Jewish Veterans of the United States, of whom 250,000 fought in the last war; whose sons and brothers in still larger numbers are now in the armed forces, turn to you, out of our anxieties, to ask:

"Will you, as patriotic Americans, do your best to sustain not only America's economy but also America's basic tradition of equal opportunity?"

We can imagine that such a challenge to a convention of all of America's employers would trouble a good many. And some would get up to say that that subject is not on the agenda. And they would be right except insofar as the future of the American spirit is eternally on the agenda of all our affairs.

And some would get up and say, not without a measure of justice, that theirs is not the responsibility to change social attitudes.

To which we would grant that it is not their responsibility alone; but that it is their responsibility by example, to lead the way for a fuller and broader expanse of the spirit of fair play which has marked America's history.

And other rationalizations will be given and still others. And there will be a great reluctance to act.

This is the conference that we see in our mind's eye.

And somehow, born out of our great hopes, we dare imagine one brave industrialist and gradually others emerging at this conference to say:

"We accept the challenge. We will take our full share of the responsibility. We will do away with discriminatory employment, with artificial barriers to men and women of skill. We will demonstrate that American business knows the validity of the full and free exchange of ideas and people as well as of commodities. We will testify by our employment policies our faith in the traditional competitive system."

In our mind's ear we hear such bold American business leaders speaking up, forthrightly, forcefully—and having their way with their fellow businessmen.

And we know that as such men of vision are to be found, American business enterprise will be as vigorous in the future as it has been in the past. As such courageous American businessmen speak up, they will make our economic system strong, wholesome, and enduring; and demonstrate that the days of American courage and vision and fairness are not of the past only but that there still sounds a clarion call to a majestic future.

Subsidy Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from E. A. McCornack, manager of the Eugene (Oreg.) Fruit Growers Association, which voices a protest against subsidies. The logic of the reasoning in this communication has such merit, in my opinion, that I request that the entire letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of the Congress and the public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE FRUIT GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Eugene, Oreg., December 31, 1943.

Senator RUFUS HOLMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLMAN: Within a few days you will again be on the spot as the administration uncorks the strategy and opens up with its big guns to beat Congress down on this matter of subsidies. There will be a strong drive to convince Congress that a compromise is the only solution. The administration will see to it that this compromise is not only a face saver for themselves but contains the essentials of their working policy.

You are more familiar with most of the reasons farmers and businessmen of the country are against the subsidy plan than I am—its inflationary trend, the building up of a huge indebtedness that the people of tomorrow must pay that the people of today may live easier and have more to spend, the necessity of more and higher taxes incident to its operation, etc.—but you may not be so familiar with the farmers' objection to the underlying principles of the thing.

The subsidy plan means just this. Without much regard as to the farmer's cost of production, agencies of government will set a price on a commodity, say 20 cents, which is 5 cents below the cost of production. This is the one and only price and the farmer delivers his crop and receives 20 cents. He does this on the pledge of Government that he will in due course receive as a subsidy an additional sum which will, when added to the ceiling price, bring him a return that will cover cost and give him a reasonable profit or reward for his investment and labor. If we are willing to concede that the elimination of all speculative reward is a good thing for the farmer and for society, this subsidy formula looks reasonable on paper. As a matter of fact and practice, however, the farmer is in the nine hole from the start. He has parted with his 25 cents product for 20 cents. The 5 cents unrecovered cost, and, we will say, 5 cents legitimate profit are not his until a determination has been reached by this and that authority in Washington. One authority is charged with determining what his costs should be in the production of this product. Another will audit his books to determine what his costs are. A third must arrive at the maximum profit figure which the farmer should be permitted and still another must show that the payment of such a subsidy permitting such a profit will not throw the farmer out of line with other social and industrial factors.

Not one of these decisions can or will be made without the intervention of most of the active policy-making agencies in Washington, including the Congress itself, for by this time the price of the farmers 25 cents product has become a national issue to which all interested elements of society are a party. The price of peanuts would kindle a regular political bonfire.

John farmer does not like the prospect of this. He dislikes the uncertainty of reward, he dislikes the prospect of having to maintain paid representatives in Washington to represent him and offset the activities of the operatives of labor, consumer, processor and competing agricultural sections, domestic and foreign. He does not like to go into politics with his business affairs and above all he does not like the prospect of entering a way of life wherein he first sells at a loss and then begs at the gates of the White House and on the steps of the Capitol for enough more to make a living. We ask how labor would react to such a formula for their wages and how business generally would respond to working against a Washington-determined permissive cost and a permissive profit. I sincerely hope you use the utmost effort to prevent this pernicious formula from becoming fixed on our American agriculture.

Very truly yours,

E. A. MCCORNACK,
Manager, Eugene Fruit Growers Association.

Income Tax Payments Simplified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter mailed to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, by Shelby M. Allen, tax consultant, 504 Broadway, Gary, Ind.:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 whereby every individual—subject to certain limitations—must make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year is imposing a definite hardship on the small businessmen (not incorporated) and the professional man not subject to the withholding tax.

I have been confronted with the task of assisting in the preparation of a considerable number of the estimated tax reports due on September 15, 1943. Business and professional men in general have complained and criticized the taxing authorities for creating a tax law which compels them to make an estimate of the business operations for advanced periods. On September 15, 1943, these taxpayers did have 8 months' operations on which to base their full year's estimate. However, with business conditions uncertain, lack of merchandise, and shortage of manpower, the estimates were a difficult problem for the conscientious taxpayer.

The estimate of tax for the year 1944, due to be filed on or before March 15, 1944, will be a far greater task for a large number of taxpayers than the third and fourth quarter estimates for the year 1943. The results, in my opinion, will be that most taxpayers will make estimates of little or no tax for the first three-quarters of the year and will wait until the fourth quarter to estimate a fair tax based on actual operations.

I believe that a Federal income tax based on the first three months' actual operations, allowing one-fourth of the personal exemption, to be filed and paid in the following month, would be far more accurate, easier to prepare, cause less confusion in the mind of the taxpayer, and result in a larger tax being collected by the Government during the first three quarters of each year than under the existing method.

The second quarter return should be prepared from the cumulative totals for the first 6 months' actual operations, allowance being granted for one-half of the personal exemption. The tax would then be computed and credit taken for the payment made on the first quarter's tax. This, if followed through the year, would result in the same total tax but would place these taxpayers on a current payment basis, rather than a deferred basis, as will result from the estimated plan now in use.

The preparation of these quarterly tax reports for business and professional men would be completed at the same time as their quarterly social security reports, quarterly withholding reports, quarterly employment-security reports, and quarterly State tax reports, thus eliminating four extra tax dates with which the average taxpayer is now overburdened.

The above submitted plan should be effective on all taxpayers (not subject to the present withholding tax).

Respectfully,

SHELBY M. ALLEN,
Tax Consultant.

Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. LANE POWERS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]:

There are always plenty of funny gags circulating on Broadway about Congress. The truth is that there is no more patriotic or harder working group of men and women anywhere.

Do you know that the 531 Members of Congress have 183 sons and daughters in the armed services? Several sons of Congressmen and Senator have given their lives for America already, and others have been reported missing in action. One hundred and eighty-two Members of Congress served their country in uniform in World War I.

So what makes some people on the outside think the Members of Congress are not so patriotic as they are? That Congressmen don't care as much about the outcome of the war as they do? Do Congressmen differ violently in their opinions? Have you, for example, agreed with everyone you've talked to today about everything?

Do Congressmen compromise? Would they ever get anything settled if they didn't compromise frequently? Would you, in your business, art, or profession? Incidentally, don't you always speak disparagingly of your Congressman and threaten not to vote for him again when you think he isn't representing your opinion? Yes, and so does everyone else in the country. That's why most Congressmen say what they do and behave as they do. They are representing their constituents all over the country. They represent—I said represent—I said reflect—I said accurately mirror—all the many, many shades of opinion of 435 sections of the United States.

By the way, do you know the number of your Congressional District and your Congressman's name? If you don't should you really criticize the kind of people *we* send to Congress?

And another thing: Except for the American doughboy, no one walks as much as the American Congressman who has to hike back and forth miles per day from the Capitol to his office—from quorum call to visiting constituent.

The miracle is that any Congressman has any time to think. And the real miracle is that, although the American people have been taking potshots, making snide remarks, and, in many another way belittling and belaboring their Congress—year in and year out for over 150 years, the country hasn't done so badly, has it, with its 78 Congresses? So, bad as it is—do you know a better Congress anywhere in this whole world? Name it, my friend, name it.

The Anti-Christ of Regimentation and Restriction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of an address delivered by William Duncan Kilpatrick on November 30, 1943, at First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Washington, D. C.:

THE ANTI-CHRIST OF REGIMENTATION AND RESTRICTION

Now, of all times, should men and nations not only become aware of the dangers of this mental method of secret and unseen manipulation and influence but most of all should they become aware that the only remedy or instrument of protection from such influences lies in the teachings and practice of true Christianity as expounded in Christian Science. Too long has the Christian world dwelt in blissful ignorance of the hidden and unseen forces of occultism and evil. Altogether too long has the operation of the Christ in the human consciousness been limited by the bonds of ecclesiastical ignorance, bigotry, form, and superstition. Too long has a personal and limited sense of God, Christ, and man bound to earth the enlightening and liberating influences of reason and revelation. If this world is to approach a realization of the greater and more abundant life it must open its eyes to the demands and teachings of true Christianity.

Christianity means freedom not only for the man who practices it but for the nation whose citizens proclam and live it. A nation can demonstrate and put into practice only as much of the truth taught by Jesus as is understood and known by its citizenry, and until a full and clear sense of the teachings of Jesus, as outlined in Christian Science, is understood by men there can be no full, complete, and satisfactory example of true democratic government. In Christianity as outlined by Jesus, the only limitations that reveal themselves to the earnest and honest student are those limitations which prohibit and penalize acts of moral turpitude on the part of men and nations. There is nothing in all the teachings of the Master that would justify the regimentation, supervision, and control of one individual human mind by another individual human mind. There is nothing in the moral law—and the moral law must be the law of all nations sooner or later—that prevents a man from making a mistake.

Men are as often taught and instructed by their mistakes as they are by their successes, and to deprive an individual of the lessons and benefits of his own mistakes by legislative enactment which imposes upon him the whims and theories of some other individual just as capable of being mistaken, is taking the Christ out of the democratic order. Every man should be free to conduct his affairs from the standpoint of his own individual demonstration and communion with God and anything that takes away that right is unChristian and undemocratic. Human regimentation, restriction, and planning whereby one individual becomes the tool and victim of another's idea of how the victim should govern himself, leaves God out of the question completely and places one human consciousness under the control of another human consciousness.

The Christian nations of the world are now united in one stupendous struggle to insure to humanity the security, the peace, and the freedom which the Christ always brings to those who love and obey the dictates of God. A mighty war is being waged that you and I may escape the horrors of a totalitarian order whereby governmental paternalism is substituted for individual independence and freedom. A mighty war is being fought that you and I may conduct our affairs according to the dictates of our own conscience. A war is being fought that men may worship the God of their own choosing without the interference of state or ecclesiasticism. A war is being fought that men may sow, reap, and harvest as God may direct and not at the instance of bureaucratic dictation. A war is being fought that labor and industry may enjoy the fruits of their own efforts and that one shall not become the victim of the other. A war is being fought that will insure the profits of righteous effort without the threat of confiscatory statutes. A war is being fought to insure to all mankind the benefits of individual initiative and endeavor. A war is being fought that the vision of the Puritan fathers may again possess the consciousness of men and that the state may reassume its position as a creature of the people rather than that the people become the vassals and pawns of the state. God grant that this war be not fought in vain.

Comment on the Book Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD comment on the book Under Cover, of which John Roy Carlson is the author. The comment appears in the Jesuit Seminary News, New England Province, of the issue of December 1943.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER COVER

(By John Roy Carlson)

This book is a bewildering mass of fact-finding data supposedly dug up from underground Fascist activities whose purpose was to undermine our Government and reshape our traditional way of life according to the Hitler pattern. The author, a self-appointed detective, spent 10 years spying on the spies within our midst. If published 5 years ago this book might have served some useful purpose, but long before the book saw the light of publication, the F. B. I. placed in prison many of the persons named in this book, while other dangerous characters have long since been so utterly discredited that their names and influence have become anathema for all time in American life. The book is 5 years too late, since most of the data of the book was printed in the trustworthy daily press during the past 5 years.

John Roy Carlson is the pen name of an Armenian-born, but naturalized, citizen of the United States. It strikes us a bit silly that the author disguises his real name since he reveals practically everything else about himself and his family. What puzzles us much more is his statement that for 10 years he was a sworn collaborator with secret destructive agencies and yet aroused no serious suspicion that he was a voluntary, unofficial stool pigeon against his friends. Either the author is endowed with phenomenal detective abilities or his former friends were history's worst ignoramuses or perhaps the author is a lyrical victim of the superman complex.

However, taking the author at his self-value, he escaped with his family from all the horrors and tyrannies of the Old World and out of gratitude, and patriotism for his adopted country, he set out to expose and condemn America's enemies from within. Now, our F. B. I. operates silently, that is, without publicity or fanfare, and perhaps no country of history was ever blessed with such an efficient organization. But Mr. Carlson was restless, so he appointed himself a one-man spy organization to entrap America's internal enemies. At the outset, his motives were certainly patriotic, but the end never justifies any or every means regardless of truth, justice, and honor. Patriotism, like every other noble virtue, must choose and use only noble means to achieve the noble end in view. For example, perjury, lying, slander would degenerate patriotism into a sort of frenzied fanaticism like Hitlerism.

The author is obsessed with an inborn hatred of fascism but fascism itself can be described as a denatured hatred of human souls. Catholics understand that hatred of any human being, even the worst personal enemy, is an intrinsic evil. Moreover, hatred blinds, it deranges the whole mind and the nervous system; it, therefore, becomes even unsuitable as a means of retribution. Our typical American soldier is so filled with genuine love for country that he hasn't room in his heart for hatred of the enemy. Besides, two wrongs never make a right. Even to hasten victory the thoroughbred American would not take one goosestep to give external honor to Hitler nor should our statesmen use one word of Goebbels' propaganda tactics. The double supposition is wrong, namely, that such tactics are permissible and suitable.

It is not for us to say whether Mr. Carlson stays entirely within the libel law in coupling innocent Americans with subversive agencies or whether the America First movement was so apparently un-American from the start but we are definitely certain that the author himself is very un-American in implying that anticommunism is fascism and that criticism of the President impedes the war effort. Many Americans are bitterly disgusted with the stale hoax of the poisoned American press that is still stupidly trying to identify Spain with the Axis. Smearing an innocent man is the only instrument of attack available to the religious and political crackpots in our country's history. Quite a large group of sincere, patriotic Americans had isolationist views prior to Pearl Harbor. To attempt to smear pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists is most unjust and dishonorable, hence, it is un-American. The author claims that his super-super detective ingenuity tracked down a Swedish Nazi, named Tietzow. He then quotes this disreputable Quisling as saying—"Senator DAVID I. WALSH saw eye to eye with him politically." Whether this smearing device and similar statements about other innocent men is a violation of the law of libel is not for us here to decide but it does show a desire to besmirch and injure an innocent man without incurring the penalty of the law. If our courts of justice provided a way for a whole city to indict an offender for libel, Boston would easily win a verdict against Mr. Carlson for his incredible injustice against that city. Father George T. Eberle, S. J., writing on this same subject for America, states that this book may be useful as a "Who's who among crackpots." If so, that is the only asset of the book.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, among the best of the many excellent statements appearing in American newspapers on the subject of national unity is one which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar on January 6. It was written by the editor, Edward J. Meeman, and is as follows:

"JUST TELL THE FOLKS AT HOME TO STICK TOGETHER"

(By Edward J. Meeman)

Before Ernie Pyle left the Mediterranean to spend his recent vacation in this country, he called on General Eisenhower.

"Is there anything you want me to tell the folks at home when I get there?" Ernie asked.

"Oh, just tell them to stick together."

Those words of General Eisenhower may be the most poignant of this war.

They were uttered by a fighting man who had led fighting men in accomplishing two great historic feats—the invasion of north Africa and the invasion of fortress Europe. A success had been won that was miraculous in that immense difficulties were overcome and the cost in lives was held to a minimum.

The miracle was accomplished because men stuck together—the Navy stuck by the Army, the merchant marine stuck by them both, the airmen stuck by the infantry, and the infantry stuck by everybody else. Americans stuck by the British, and the Frenchmen stuck by Americans. There was no right or left, for both right and left arms were needed to strike blows for freedom, without which there can be no right or left.

And the fighting man who was the head and heart of this miracle had only a modest request to make of the folks back home for whom this miracle was passed:

"Oh, just tell them to stick together."

Can we folks back home stick together? It is the greatest question we face, greater than any of the little questions we allow to divide us. It is a more fundamental question than winning the war, for if we don't stick together we may lose it, and if we win it without having learned to stick together our victory will turn to ashes.

It has been a question since men came to this continent with a dream of finding unity in diversity. Could the colonists stick together? Could the States stick together? And now it is still a question: Can the people of the United States stick together?

Shall labor, business, and farmers be partners in one grand commonwealth, contributing and sharing together—or shall they be snarling enemies, tearing themselves and the commonwealth into miserable shreds? Shall Congress be the august deliberative body of a sovereign people or the abject victim of preying pressure groups? Shall the Government be the instrument of democracy, pointed to a single great end of national well-being, or the battleground of conflicting personal ambitions? Shall business yearn for the bad old days when the public was cheated and labor exploited, or rejoice that those days are gone forever? Shall labor profit by the example of what happened to ruthless captains of industry, or will they insist on learning that lesson for themselves, to the agony of all of us? Shall our politics be a contest in patriotism, or a wrestling match in the gutter?

"Just tell the folks at home to stick together."

"Sure, I'm ready. We could do it if it wasn't for so-and-so."

Certainly there are lots of folks who can be blamed for our lack of national unity. For the truth is, we're all to blame. But it is blaming other folks that tears this Nation apart.

Let each individual look to himself; let each group look to itself to see what needs to be corrected in order that he may meet and work with others in broad tolerance and inexhaustible patience and good will.

What man would not give his life for his country? Should it be so much harder to lay aside prejudice, and bickering, and scheming, and jockeying, and "politicking"?

Could we not have a conference, truly national, of labor, business, farmers, and government, Republicans and Democrats in which we could find that happy unity of comradeship for which our hearts yearn while our stubborn wills keep us out of it?

It would be a glorious day if such a conference were held, and at its conclusion this radiogram, signed by all present, could be sent:

"Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, western front, Europe. The folks back home are sticking together."

On to Victory!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is necessarily absent because of illness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "On to Victory," written by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, and published in the American Legion magazine for December 1943.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON TO VICTORY!

(By Warren H. Atherton, national commander, the American Legion)

Twenty-five years ago we Legionnaires took the pledge to serve God and country.

Now is the time to deliver on that pledge as never before.

Somebody has to convince the American public that war is not a picnic, a get-rich-quick racket, a birthday binge.

Somebody has to replace the thousands who are being killed and maimed and repay the billions that are being shot away. We at home should not wax fat while our sons do the dying today and the paying tomorrow.

Human beings are selfish enough to take for themselves and let others do the putting.

It is our job to make people realize that everyone who is not putting lead into the enemy with a gun has to put his whole stack into the pot for backing the attack.

It isn't going to be pleasant to make people play less and put more. They will resent having to work more and get less. They will cry when they have to pay more taxes and do with less luxuries, comforts, and necessities.

We know this tough task has to be done. It is our job to get it done.

We must begin by setting the example. In our daily jobs, you must be a better carpenter, farmer, engineer, doctor, shipbuilder, or plane builder, and I must be a better commander than any of us has ever been before.

As the Legion, we will have to do the best job that we have ever done. That means more rehabilitation and fewer smokers. That means more child welfare and less banquets. That means more Americanism and not so many parades. That means more bonds bought, more blood given, more scrap collected, more civilian defense duty, and fewer medals.

During the year I will issue a few special calls to participate in national war campaigns. I expect, and I think the Nation expects, that you will keep that pledge of a quarter century ago by tremendous response. Work, not wind, will win the war.

Revision of the Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address I delivered over Station WHN, New York, on December 30, 1943, entitled "Revision of the Laws":

Mr. Walton, my colleagues, and ladies and gentlemen, to WHN I am grateful for making available this time that my distinguished colleagues from New York and I might rereport on the state of the Union.

They have told you of the constructive legislation they sponsor and support.

With all of it, I am in accord.

But may I tell you briefly of a particular phase of the legislative work with which I, as chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, am charged.

That committee seeks not to introduce bills nor to enact laws—we would prefer to see fewer, not more, laws passed—but rather its principal work is to make available to the public, to the bench and the bar, in convenient and understandable form, all the public laws enacted by Congress.

We have adopted this as our slogan "Making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws." Have you, whether you are a lawyer or not, tried to read some of the bills that are introduced? Have you tried to determine what their objectives are and whether they attain them, and how they affect existing law?

A candidate for election as Member of the House of Representatives, a few years ago, said he would repeal a law a day.

He is no longer a Member of Congress and he served many more days than laws he repealed.

Each year, for the past few, I have introduced bills intended to repeal several hundred sections of law and our committee is presently engaged in a comprehensive revision and restatement of the laws relating to crimes and the judiciary.

All this is designed to remove from our body of laws those acts that are now duplicated, redundant, obsolete, or superseded, all of which laws will be specifically repealed by us.

Our ultimate objective is to enact all the permanent and general laws within the 50 titles of the present United States Code so as to have a permanent framework within and around which all future new and amendatory legislation may be drafted.

Then and only then will it be possible to draft legislation so that you and I will readily understand it. The greatest law-making body in the world should have the greatest body of laws and the best legislative drafting system in the world.

We owe it to you, the public, and to ourselves, the legislators, to clarify existing laws and to see to it that future laws will be so drafted that their effect will be easily understood.

To this task, the Committee on Revision of Laws is dedicated and to it I am pledged.

For, however necessary and constructive a piece of legislation may be, its provisions must be set forth in simple, straightforward and understandable language.

Yes; making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws.

No More Sanctuary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on the Congressional Record of the Air, Station WHN, New York, Monday, January 10, 1944:

It isn't often that a paragraph of Nazi propaganda hits hard enough to compel attention. But, listen: "The wild, hysterical shouting over the doom of European Jewry affords striking proof of the insidious duplicity of the enemy's propaganda. Through many years, the democracies would have had time to give their professed love for Jewry practical expression by opening their frontiers to these Jews, for clearly the Jews could never hope to stage a comeback in Germany—this much had been certain ever since the Nuremberg laws. Yet, while on the one hand, shedding crocodile's tears for the Jews, one made sure, as was seen from the straying Jewish refugee boats, that the door remained locked to all * * *." This appeared in the June 20, 1943 issue of Hitler's own paper.

And poignantly, withal ironically, in parallel denunciation, a Polish Jew, Szamuel Zylielbojm, living in relative comfort until a suicide, left a note. "By my death," he wrote, "I wish to express my strongest protest against the inactivity with which the world is looking on and permitting the extermination of Jewish people. I know how little human life is worth, especially today. But as I was unable to do anything during my life, perhaps by my death, I shall contribute to destroying the indifference of those who are able and should act in order to save now, maybe at the last moment, this handful of Polish Jews who are still alive, from certain annihilation."

That this tragic gesture, a mingling of hope and despair, which should have been a whiplash to our conscience, remains but a study in futility is an indictment of our humanity. I make bold to say that this country, rich in its past heritage as the asylum for the oppressed and persecuted, today, during the greatest mass murders of all history, offers no more sanctuary.

Let us search the record. As the fury of Hitler's persecutions, murders, and deportations rose in intensity and scope, the Evian Conference on Refugees was called in 1938 at the instance of President Roosevelt. Thirty-two nations participated. The humanitarian impulse that had fathered the conference died beneath the weight of indifference. Something, however, that looked good in print evolved, the Intergovernmental Conference on Refugees. With the announcement of its creation, the doomed victims of Hitlerphobia caught a glimmer of hope. The glimmer turned to despair as the horrors deepened. Five years later in early 1943—10 years since the beginning of the Hitler regime and after 2,000,000 lay slain and 4,000,000 faced extinction, the Bermuda Conference on Refugees was called, this time attended by delegates sent by Great Britain and the United States. Recommendations were made to widen the orbit of activities of the feebly functioning Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees in London, true enough, but after 10 years of explorations, two conferences on refugees, the countless official protestations of horror, the Bermuda conferees solemnly announced: "Victory is the only solution." Solution for whom, wraiths and spirits?

Officially, there was and is to be no recognition of the special plight of the Jew in Nazi-controlled Europe. While other persecuted minorities faced the tragedies of deportation, forced labor, and other forms of slavery, the Jew alone faced death for being born Jew. That difference had been made a Reich state policy, a difference between life and death. Whether we would it so or no, that difference remains, and all our talk of refusal to face the line of differentiation in no way changes the fact, the fact of the prison for the Dutch, the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, but the grave for the Jew.

But there were those upon whom the 2,000,000 dead and 4,000,000 awaiting death impressed the need for urgent action. On March 15, 1943, the Congress of the United States by concurrent resolution expressed its condemnation of Nazi Germany's "mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children." On November 9, 1943, a resolution was introduced in the House and Senate calling for the creation by the President of a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany. Certainly, a quiet enough and dignified approach in the face of wholesale slaughter. The Baldwin-Rogers resolution, as it is termed in the House, at long last recognized the unique tragedy of the Jew, recognized that he alone had been singled out for total extinction. It faced an incontrovertible fact; it faced conditions, not theories.

It was then at the hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to which the bill had been referred, that Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of policies relating to refugees in the State Department, distinguished himself as a betrayer of human values. Seeking to discourage favorable action on the resolution, Mr. Long cited figures on immigration, endeavoring to show

our beneficence, how our arms were outstretched in welcome to the distressed and helpless. He left the Nation with the impression that 580,000—mostly Jews—had been admitted into this country, and since we had been so magnanimous, no further action was necessary on the part of Congress. He did not, of course, reveal that the 580,000 visas were not quota visas, having nothing to do with refugees. They merely embraced nonquota immigrants, such as students from all parts of the world, professors, ministers, aliens who were resident in the United States who were traveling abroad, and immigrants from nonquota countries such as Canada, Mexico, Central, and South America. This covered, mind you, a 10-year period. Actually those who came as refugees during the decade number 182,956. This, in a 10-year period, when sanctimonious mouthings poured forth in profusion in sympathy for the disinherited. Within the framework of our present immigration statutes, 150,000 could be admitted yearly. Multiply that by 10 and count then those who might have had but were denied the haven of liberty and life and freedom to worship God.

Mr. Long indicated that the passage of the bill might indicate dissatisfaction with the work of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. Well, we are not satisfied. I do not call the work of a committee rescuing a trickle of Jews from neutral countries work that leaves nothing more to be desired. The creation of the commission would not terminate the work of the Intergovernmental Committee; rather it would supplement and integrate all rescue work.

He defended the State Department's callous ruling that no applicant can be admitted who has relatives remaining abroad in occupied Europe. Thus is the sentence of doom visited upon those seeking our shores. It is a shabby excuse, this expedient appraisal of internal security. In essence, to guard our country from spies entering as refugees is merely a problem of administration; that and nothing more. Yet implementing its use is equivalent to a death sentence. Have we no pity and have we no shame?

I have watched the Interdepartmental Review Committee of the State Department's Visa Division move with cold-blooded deliberation in granting a visa, indifferent to what every passing moment may mean. Those who have had occasion to deal with the Review Committee know I do not exaggerate. The attitude throughout is "presumed guilty until found innocent."

How can Mr. Long boast of the United States as a haven of refuge when the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice reveals that entries of aliens during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, were the lowest in 80 years? Mr. Long did not trouble to make this fact known to the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

It is time for men of compassion, for men of true democratic stature to redeem the ineptitudes and prejudices of our conduct relating to refugees and potential refugees. It is time that men took charge who know it as a problem where humans are the pawns, not checkers. But only an enlightened people can do it. Only with the sanction of the people, the will to see the need, can we meet the greatest challenge that has ever been placed before us. Do not the dignity, the security, and honor of the living rise above neatly patterned, blue-ribboned regulations?

Let us not forget, lest we betray our forebears, that each of us, Americans all, traces his ancestry back to an immigrant, one who bravely welcomed a new life in a new land. The need for the enriching new blood, the establishment of new trades and industries, for new settlers to cultivate and dwell on the land is as much with us as it has ever been. Our might and our proud destiny arose out of this mingling of many bloods.

It is an old fear, this fear of the newcomer. In 1797, a Representative from Massachusetts said, "When this country was new, it might have been good policy to admit all, but it is so no longer." More than a hundred years ago, in 1833, we were warned not to open our doors: "Then," said the nineteenth century American writer harking back to an earlier period, "we were few, feeble, and scattered, now we are numerous, strong, and concentrated." The same attitude prevails today in our State Department which, to me, is an admission of, I shall not say prejudices, stagnation. Does Mr. Long actually believe that we have gone as far as we can go in our country's development? Surely his faith is greater than that.

But I must turn back to that which is foremost. I cannot believe that the people of these United States who through every world disaster, fire, flood, starvation, or massacre, have given unstintingly of their generosity and welcome will remain inert in the face of the great tragedy that has befallen a people. We are not like that.

Yet, if the Breckinridge-Long attitudes prevail, I am disturbed in heart and mind.

At the base of the Statue of Liberty is a plaque containing glorious lines written by the poetess Emma Lazarus as follows:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
Send them, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

If Breckinridge Long continues to wield in the State Department the scepter of power, that lamp must be blacked out and a sign hung around the neck of the Goddess of Liberty, "No more sanctuary."

Bill of Rights for Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily Mirror:

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR OUR VETERANS

"A bill of rights for the service men and women of this war."

That is the apt and fitting title of the bill that has been introduced into Congress by the American Legion.

It is high time Congress and the bureaucratic dawdlers and politicos in Washington understood that the American service men and women in this war to save the country from two devouring enemies have rights—rights as inviolable and as inalienable as any the Constitution guarantees to civilians.

In an exclusive message to William Randolph Hearst, Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, says that this "bill of rights" is being introduced in Congress after surveying conditions in 34 States, adding that the Legion has now a "sensible, over-all program for the care of veterans."

There can be no doubt in any good American mind that the Legion has presented to the Nation a sound and sensible basis of veteran relief.

The chief points in the Legion bill are:

1. Mustering-out pay and unemployment compensation.
2. Loans for the purchase of homes and farms.
3. A program enabling those whose education was interrupted to continue it.
4. Concentration of veterans' affairs in the Veterans' Administration.
5. General tightening up and streamlining of compensation and care of wounded and disabled veterans.
6. Integration of all programs to aid returning veterans to find jobs.

Besides this, there are demands for a "strictly mustering-out pay"—as follows:

Five hundred dollars for 18 months or more of service; $400 for less than 18 months, but more than 12 months; $300 for less than 12, but more than 6 months. Also a veteran will get $100 the day he is discharged. The balance is to be paid in monthly installments of $100.

The object of this bill—which should be earmarked "Rush" in Congress—is to cut bureaucratic red tape which has already put some of our veterans into the charity line; also to act as a pattern for the general rehabilitation and transition of our men from military life to peacetime pursuits.

Other admirable provisions in this Legion measure are: No wounded or handicapped serviceman can be released from the Army or Navy unless full provision has been made for his care and rehabilitation, and no officer or enlisted man shall be required to sign a statement regarding the origin of his or her disability.

That a man or a woman has suffered a disability in the armed service of the United States should be sufficient reason for relief.

The American Legion has done a patriotic, human service in sponsoring this "bill of rights" for the defenders of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution.

Back the Legion!

Wire your Representative and Senators that you endorse this measure and also the Hearst proposition that every honorably discharged serviceman shall be provided with a year's pay besides the Legion's mustering-out provision, for immediate payment for immediate needs.

We must never have tin-cup veterans on the streets of our cities again.

Time To Enact Federal Pension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time our thoughts naturally revert to peace and good will, but we face the reality of war and strife throughout the entire world. In our all-out effort to win victory and peace, we must not overlook an opportunity to improve our American way of life.

I feel that now is the most important time in history to enact a sound national old-age pension program. I signed the discharge petitions in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. I have been an early advocate of uniform national old-age pensions. I shall continue my efforts along this line until a fair and square deal is given to our senior citizens.

War Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the Smith-Connally bill was before Congress it originally embodied the provision of the first Smith bill which had passed the House in 1941, immediately before Pearl Harbor. That bill prohibited sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, froze the closed shop, provided for an accounting of union dues collected, and sundry other provisions. The Connally Senate bill gave the Government the power to take over struck plants, penalize strikers who walk out after the Government had taken possession, and gave legislative authority to the War Labor Board. A combination of both bills was voted out of the House Military Committee. When the bill came to the floor of the House, a substitute bill sponsored by Mr. HARNESS (Republican), of Indiana, was agreed to by the House. This substitute proposal was largely intended to meet the coal-mine crisis and embodied only a few of the provisions contained in the Military Committee version. It did, however, penalize workers who strike after the Government had taken over the mine or plant. The Harness substitute went to conference and the two Houses adopted the greater part of it. It was necessary to give and take in order to pass any labor legislation at all. The Administration leaders in Congress insisted that the legislation must be tempered down before the President would sign it. Without regard to the fact that little was left in it. After Congress overrode the veto, the labor leaders set out to defeat any Member of either Senate or House who supported the bill. Their next step was to start a movement to repeal the act.

More recently John L. Lewis asked $2 a day raise in pay for United Mine Workers. He probably hoped for a compromise of about $1.30 a day. After 400,000 miners walked out the Government surrendered, the result being an increase in pay to the miners of about $1.70 a day. It has been open season since Lewis' victory. This condition will grow worse on the theory that "If he can bring the executive department to its knees, why cannot I?" Strikes and threats of strikes mount on the eve of our all-out test in battle. The idea is left with the people of the country that sacrifice for the good of the public welfare is ignored, while threats and coercion are rewarded.

The Connally-Smith-Harness Act could have been used as the necessary weapon against the coal strikes because of the criminal penalties it provided. But the President didn't see fit to make use of it.

The trifling with the destiny of this Nation must not be further tolerated. There is no 40-hour week, time and a half for overtime, absenteeism, or strikes on the battlefields of Italy, England, the Aleutians, or in the southwest Pacific.

The President will deliver his annual state of the Union message next week. He will speak the will of the people if he will say: "I am the elected Chief Executive of this Republic. I am not going to countenance strikes during this war. I will not only sign legislation to prohibit war strikes, but I call upon you as representatives of the American people to enact legislation with teeth in it outlawing walk-outs in wartime." Regardless of whether he asks for the passage of strike legislation, it is the duty of the Congress to act speedily and pass legislation prohibiting strikes in war plants, whether the plants are in Government or private possession.

Rehabilitation of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief but informative address entitled "Rehabilitating Our Servicemen," delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on the National Radio Forum on January 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The basic thought in regard to the veteran's welfare after the war or after his period of training was incorporated in the Selective Service Act when that act become law. This provision was an amendment of my own which called for the restoration of the serviceman to his job. In other words, before the American citizen was called into service at all it was contemplated by our Government that that service would disturb his ordinary life to such an extent that it might upset his entire economic well-being.

Since we got into the war our thoughts have naturally turned toward the welfare of the returned soldier, whether such soldier be man or woman. The most interesting phase of our thought is that one which recognizes the fact that that which we do for the soldier is not only for his own good and his family's good but actually for the good of the whole body politic and our economic economy. I want to stress that fact because it is in a sense a unique idea for government to think of its own well-being in terms of taking care of those whom it calls to service.

Now, of course, in war no government can ever do for those who give their lives what it ought to do. Surely the boy and the girl who sacrifice their lives for their country have given their all. There is nothing that can be done for them excepting to place them in a position of honor. This the Government does, and yet in honoring the serviceman, it honors his friends, his neighbors, and his community. The Government also provides insurance for those who are left behind. The insurance idea was President Wilson's great contribution in an attempt to take some of the sting out of war as far as individual sacrifice is concerned.

Since the last war we have done much for the veterans. It has become a national policy to do it. Since the beginning of this war we have planned better than ever before and more logically. We have planned both, as I have said above, from the standpoint of the veteran's welfare and from the standpoint of the Nation. Already the veteran's rehabilitation law has come into existence. In theory any veteran with a service-connected disability is taken care of in some way. He is trained so that he can take a place in industry. If he needs hospitalization, he gets it. If he needs a pension, he gets that. However, since everyone knows there is a period of adjustment, and that it takes some time for the Government to do its necessary paper work in taking care of the veteran, there might be a period when real want may come into his life if he isn't assisted; therefore, the mustering-out pay bill was introduced. This act will give the veteran some allowance during the period of adjustment.

We should not fail to mention here another of our changed theories in regard to our soldiers and that is one of providing allowances for the soldier's dependents. The mustering-out pay bill has already passed the Senate, its first great hurdle; rehabilitation is law, and we are now working upon the third great bill to provide for the returning soldier's welfare; that is, the Soldiers' Training and Education Act.

I have been associated with all of these measures and am now the author of the Servicemen's Education and Training Act. This bill will give to those returning soldiers who want it a year's education at Government expense with a year's subsistence allowance of $50 a month while he is training. This bill will make it possible, if it becomes a law, for the soldier boy whose education was interrupted to continue his education; and for those who are properly qualified and selected the education may continue for 4 years. Since the soldier's education and training will be entirely on a voluntary basis, that is, the Government will make the offer to the returning soldier, and he will accept it if he wishes to, no one knows how many of our soldier boys will apply for this education and training. We do know, however, that the task will tax the ability of all our educational institutions that now exist. The variety of training needed and required will be as broad as our whole educational system. There will be a place in the scheme for private, public, and endowed schools, for elementary, secondary, and college institutions. The more diverse the training the greater will be the benefit to the Nation economically and socially. The whole aim of the bill is based upon the theory of placing the soldier boy back in that type of life from which he came or helping him to reach that to which he aspires. Never has a government offered a greater opportunity to its returned soldiers.

The Rehabilitation Act was necessary and it was statesmanlike. The mustering-out pay bill is just; it gives to the soldier what he has earned. The Education and Training Act not only bespeaks justice but also it is a national necessity in order that the Nation will not lose its future leadership. This educational bill is evidence of the human interest in men and women which this democracy of ours demands.

The world may be put back years as a result of the war. The men and women who are called to fight have all made sacrifices, all great and some ultimate, but the healing influence of the education and training bill upon those who will receive its benefits and upon the communities in which they in future life will live, offers a blessing of immeasurable consequence. The soldier boys and girls who embrace the opportunity will

know the worth of living in the blessed land of America.

The administration's interest in providing generously for the serviceman's welfare and its plans to provide for his future as a veteran, show very definitely that the present government is grateful for the invaluable services performed by the soldier, sailor, and marine.

Address by the President From Hyde Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the President, and broadcast from Hyde Park, N. Y., on December 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just returned from extensive journeyings in the region of the Mediterranean and as far as the borders of Russia. I have conferred with the leaders of Britain and Russia and China on military matters of the present—especially on plans for stepping-up our successful attack on our enemies as quickly as possible and from many different points of the compass.

On this Christmas Eve there are over 10,000,000 men in the armed forces of the United States alone. One year ago 1,700,000 were serving overseas. Today this figure has been more than doubled to 3,800,000 on duty overseas. By next July that number will rise to over 5,000,000.

That this is truly a world war was demonstrated when arrangements were made with our overseas broadcasting agencies for time to speak today to our soldiers, sailors, marines, and merchant seamen in every part of the world. In fixing the time for the broadcast we took into consideration that at this moment here in the United States and in the Caribbean and on the northeast coast of South America, it is afternoon. In Alaska and in Hawaii and the mid-Pacific it is still morning. In Iceland, in Great Britain, in north Africa, in Italy, and the Middle East it is now evening.

In the southwest Pacific, in Australia, in China, and Burma and India it is already Christmas Day. We can correctly say that at this moment, in those far eastern parts where Americans are fighting, today is tomorrow.

But everywhere throughout the world—throughout this war which covers the world—there is a special spirit which has warmed our hearts since our earliest childhood—a spirit which brings us close to our homes, our families, our friends, and neighbors—the Christmas spirit of "peace on earth, good will toward men."

During the past years of international gangsterism and brutal aggression in Europe and in Asia, our Christmas celebrations have been darkened with apprehension for the future. We have said, "Merry Christmas—Happy New Year," but we have known in our hearts that the clouds which have hung over our world have prevented us from saying it with full sincerity and conviction.

And even this year, we still have much to face in the way of further suffering, and sacrifice, and personal tragedy. Our men, who have been through the fierce battles in the Solomons, the Gilberts, Tunisia, and Italy, know, from their experience and knowledge of modern war, that many bigger and costlier battles are still to be fought.

But—on Christmas Eve this year—I can say to you that at last we may look forward into the future with real, substantial confidence that, however great the cost, "peace on earth, good will toward men" can be and will be realized and insured. This year I can say that. Last year I could not do more than express a hope. Today I express a certainty—though the cost may be high and the time may be long.

Within the past year—within the past few weeks—history has been made, and it is far better history for the whole human race than any that we have known, or even dared to hope for, in these tragic times through which we pass.

A great beginning was made in the Moscow Conference in October by Mr. Molotov, Mr. Eden, and our own Mr. Hull. There and then the way was paved for the later meetings.

At Cairo and Tehran we devoted ourselves not only to military matters; we devoted ourselves also to consideration of the future—to plans for the kind of world which alone can justify all the sacrifices of this war.

Of course, as you all know, Mr. Churchill and I have happily met many times before, and we know and understand each other very well. Indeed, Mr. Churchill has become known and beloved by many millions of Americans, and the heartfelt prayers of all of us have been with this great citizen of the world in his recent serious illness.

The Cairo and Tehran Conferences, however, gave me my first opportunity to meet the Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, and Marshal Stalin—and to sit down at the table with these unconquerable men and talk with them face to face. We had planned to talk to each other across the table at Cairo and Tehran, but we soon found that we were all on the same side of the table. We came to the conferences with faith in each other, but we needed the personal contact, and now we have supplemented faith with definite knowledge.

It was well worth traveling thousands of miles over land and sea to bring about this personal meeting, and to gain the heartening assurance that we are absolutely agreed with one another on all the major objectives—and on the military means of obtaining them.

At Cairo, Prime Minister Churchill and I spent 4 days with the Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek. It was the first time that we had had an opportunity to go over the complex situation in the Far East with him personally. We were able not only to settle upon definite military strategy, but also to discuss certain long-range principles which we believe can assure peace in the Far East for many generations to come.

Those principles are as simple as they are fundamental. They involve the restoration of stolen property to its rightful owners, and the recognition of the rights of millions of people in the Far East to build up their own forms of self-government without molestation. Essential to all peace and security in the Pacific and in the rest of the world is the permanent elimination of the Empire of Japan as a potential force of aggression. Never again must our soldiers and sailors and marines be compelled to fight from island to island as they are fighting so gallantly and so successfully today.

Increasingly powerful forces are now hammering at the Japanese at many points over an enormous arc which curves down through the Pacific from the Aleutians to the jungles of Burma. Our own Army and Navy, our Air Forces, the Australians and New Zealanders, the Dutch, and the British land, air, and sea forces are all forming a band of steel which is closing in on Japan.

On the mainland of Asia, under the Generalissimo's leadership, the Chinese ground and air forces, augmented by American air forces, are playing a vital part in starting the drive which will push invaders into the sea.

Following out the military decisions at Cairo, General Marshall has just flown around the world and has had conferences with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz—conferences which will spell plenty of bad news for the Japs in the not too far distant future.

I met in the Generalissimo a man of great vision and great courage and remarkably keen understanding of the problems of today and tomorrow. We discussed all the manifold military plans for striking at Japan with decisive force from many directions, and I believe I can say that he returned to Chungking with the positive assurance of total victory over our common enemy. Today we and the Republic of China are closer together than ever before in deep friendship and in unity of purpose.

After the Cairo Conference, Mr. Churchill and I went by airplane to Tehran. There we met with Marshal Stalin. We talked with complete frankness on every conceivable subject connected with the winning of the war and the establishment of a durable peace after the war.

Within 3 days of intense and consistently amicable discussions, we agreed on every point concerned with the launching of a gigantic attack upon Germany.

The Russian Army will continue its stern offensives on Germany's eastern front, the Allied armies in Italy and Africa will bring relentless pressure on Germany from the south, and now the encirclement will be complete as great American and British forces attack from other points of the compass.

The commander selected to lead the combined attack from these other points is Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. His performances in Africa, Sicily, and Italy have been brilliant. He knows by practical and successful experience the way to coordinate air, sea, and land power. All these will be under his control. Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz will command the entire American strategic bombing force operating against Germany.

General Eisenhower gives up his command in the Mediterranean to a British officer whose name is being announced by Mr. Churchill. We now pledge that new commander that our powerful ground, sea, and air forces in the vital Mediterranean area will stand by his side until every objective in that bitter theater is attained.

Both of these new commanders will have American and British subordinate commanders whose names will be announced in a few days.

During the last 2 days at Tehran, Marshal Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and I looked ahead to the days and months and years which will follow Germany's defeat. We were united in determination that Germany must be stripped of her military might and be given no opportunity within the foreseeable future to regain that might.

The United Nations have no intention to enslave the German people. We wish them to have a normal chance to develop, in peace, as useful and respectable members of the European family. But we most certainly emphasize that word respectable—for we intend to rid them once and for all of nazi-ism and Prussian militarism and the fantastic and disastrous notion that they constitute the "master race."

We did discuss international relationships from the point of view of big, broad objectives, rather than details. But on the basis of what we did discuss, I can say even today that I do not think any insoluble differences will arise among Russia, Great Britain, and the United States.

In these conferences we were concerned with basic principles—principles which involve the security and the welfare and the standard of living of human beings in countries large and small.

To use an American and ungrammatical colloquialism, I may say that I got along fine with Marshal Stalin. He is a man who combines a tremendous, relentless determination with a stalwart good humor. I believe he is truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia; and I believe that we are going to get along well with him and the Russian people—very well indeed.

Britain, Russia, China and the United States and their allies represent more than three-quarters of the total population of the earth. As long as these four nations with great military power stick together in determination to keep the peace there will be no possibility of an aggressor nation arising to start another world war.

But those four powers must be united with and cooperate with all the freedom-loving peoples of Europe, and Asia, and Africa and the Americas. The rights of every nation, large or small, must be respected and guarded as jealously as are the rights of every individual within our own republic.

The doctrine that the strong shall dominate the weak is the doctrine of our enemies—and we reject it.

But, at the same time, we are agreed that if force is necessary to keep international peace, international force will be applied—for as long as it may be necessary.

It has been our steady policy—and it is certainly a common-sense policy—that the right of each nation to freedom must be measured by the willingness of that nation to fight for freedom. And today we salute our unseen allies in occupied countries—the underground resistance groups and the armies of liberation. They will provide potent forces against our enemies when the day of invasion comes.

Through the development of science the world has become so much smaller that we have had to discard the geographical yardsticks of the past. For instance, through our early history the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were believed to be walls of safety for the United States. Time and distance made it physically possible for us and for the other American Republics to obtain and maintain our independence against infinitely stronger powers. Until recently very few people, even military experts, thought that the day could ever come when we might have to defend our Pacific coast against Japanese threats of invasion.

At the outbreak of the First World War relatively few people thought that our ships and shipping would be menaced by German submarines on the high seas or that the German militarists would ever attempt to dominate any nation outside of central Europe.

After the armistice in 1918, we thought and hoped that the militaristic philosophy of Germany had been crushed; and being full of the milk of human kindness we spent the next 15 years disarming, while the Germans whined so pathetically that the other nations permitted them—and even helped them—to rearm.

For too many years we lived on pious hopes that aggressor and warlike nations would learn and understand and carry out the doctrine of purely voluntary peace.

The well-intentioned but ill-fated experiments of former years did not work. It is my hope that we will not try them again. No—that is too weak—it is my intention to do all that I humanly can as President and Commander in Chief to see to it that these tragic mistakes shall not be made again.

There have always been cheerful idiots in this country who believed that there would be no more war for us, if everybody in America would only return into their homes and lock their front doors behind them. Assuming that their motives were of the highest, events have shown how unwilling they were to face the facts.

The overwhelming majority of all the people in the world want peace. Most of them are fighting for the attainment of peace—not just a truce, not just an armistice—but peace that is as strongly enforced and as durable as mortal man can make it. If we are willing to fight for peace now, is it not good logic that we should use force if necessary, in the future, to keep the peace?

I believe, and I think I can say, that the other three great nations who are fighting so magnificently to gain peace are in complete agreement that we must be prepared to keep the peace by force. If the people of Germany and Japan are made to realize thoroughly that the world is not going to let them break out again, it is possible, and, I hope, probable, that they will abandon the philosophy of aggression—the belief that they can gain the whole world even at the risk of losing their own souls.

I shall have more to say about the Cairo and Tehran conferences when I make my report to the Congress in about 2 weeks' time. And, on that occasion, I shall also have a great deal to say about certain conditions here at home.

But today I wish to say that in all my travels, at home and abroad, it is the sight of our soldiers and sailors and their magnificent achievements which have given me the greatest inspiration and the greatest encouragement for the future.

To the members of our armed forces, to their wives, mothers and fathers, I want to affirm the great faith and confidence we have in General Marshall and Admiral King, who direct all of our armed might throughout the world. Upon them falls the great responsibility of planning the strategy of determining when and where we shall fight. Both of these men have already gained high places in American history, which will record many evidences of their military genius that cannot be published today.

Some of our men overseas are now spending their third Christmas far from home. To them and to all others overseas or soon to go overseas, I can give assurance that it is the purpose of their Government to win this war and to bring them home at the earliest possible date.

And we here in the United States had better be sure that when our soldiers and sailors do come home they will find an America in which they are given full opportunities for education, rehabilitation, social security, employment, and business enterprise under the free American system—and that they will find a Government which, by their votes as American citizens, they have had a full share in electing.

The American people have had every reason to know that this is a tough, destructive war. On my trip abroad, I talked with many military men who had faced our enemies in the field. These hard-headed realists testify to the strength and skill and resourcefulness of the enemy generals and men whom we must beat before final victory is won. The war is now reaching the stage where we shall have to look forward to large casualty lists—dead, wounded, and missing.

War entails just that. There is no easy road to victory. And the end is not yet in sight.

I have been back only for a week. It is fair that I should tell you my impression. I think I see a tendency in some of our people here to assume a quick ending of the war—that we have already gained the victory. And, perhaps as a result of this false reasoning, I think I discern an effort to resume or even encourage an outbreak of partisan thinking and talking. I hope I am wrong. For, surely, our first and foremost tasks are all concerned with winning the war and winning a just peace that will last for generations.

The massive offensives which are in the making—both in Europe and the Far East—will require every ounce of energy and fortitude that we and our allies can summon on the fighting fronts and in all the workshops at home. As I have said before, you cannot order up a great attack on a Monday and demand that it be delivered on Saturday.

Less than a month ago I flew in a big Army transport plane over the little town of Bethlehem, in Palestine.

Tonight, on Christmas Eve, all men and women everywhere who love Christmas are thinking of that ancient town and of the star of faith that shone there more than 19 centuries ago.

American boys are fighting today in snow-covered mountains, in malarial jungles, and on blazing deserts, they are fighting on the far stretches of the sea and above the clouds, and the thing for which they struggle is best symbolized by the message that came out of Bethlehem.

On behalf of the American people—your own people—I send this Christmas message to you who are in our armed forces:

In our hearts are prayers for you and for all your comrades in arms who fight to rid the world of evil.

We ask God's blessing upon you—upon your fathers and mothers, wives, and children—all your loved ones at home.

We ask that the comfort of God's grace shall be granted to those who are sick and wounded, and to those who are prisoners of war in the hands of the enemy, waiting for the day when they will again be free.

And we ask that God receive and cherish those who have given their lives, and that He keep them in honor and in the grateful memory of their countrymen forever.

God bless all of you who fight our battles on this Christmas Eve.

God bless us all. God keep us strong in our faith that we fight for a better day for humankind—here and everywhere.

The Demobilization Problem in 17 Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article:

NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1943.

Senators, Congressmen, Governors of the 17 arid and semiarid States.

GENTLEMEN: Re the demobilization problem in 17 Western States I am enclosing herewith copy of a statement on the relative severity of the post-war demobilization of servicemen and industrial workers by States, as taken from the Monthly Labor Review of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It is believed that to the extent that the irrigation, reclamation, and water conservation programs of your State can be prepared to absorb those demobilized from the services and from war industry, that every effort should be made to bring that about. We know of no more important or patriotic services which can be rendered during 1944

than in preparing worth-while Nation-building employment for the immediate post-war period.

Now is the time to press potential post-war reclamation projects, and of course your cooperation in advancing projects is always helpful.

Sincerely yours,

F. O. HAGIE,
Secretary-Manager.

[From the Monthly Labor Review (July 1943) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor]

RELATIVE SEVERITY OF POST-WAR DEMOBILIZATION BY STATES

The relative severity of the post-war demobilization problem for each State may be said to depend upon the size of its excess labor supply during the reconversion period, in relation to its pre-war capacity to provide employment. It may therefore be measured by the ratio of the total number of demobilized persons in the State to the employment in 1940. The group of demobilized persons will include members of the armed services who may be expected to return to the State, as well as industrial workers within its borders who will lose their jobs as war production is curtailed.

This article gives an estimate of the reemployment problem presented in the various States by these demobilized persons. The estimate depends upon four assumptions, which are not intended as predictions but do provide a convenient basis for a preliminary analysis: (1) That the war will be ended both in Europe and Asia by December 1944, at the peak of the war production effort; (2) that the United States will maintain an armed force of 2,500,000 in the early post-war years; (3) that war production will be rapidly curtailed to the level of post-war defense requirements; and (4) that industrial reconversion and expansion to high levels of civilian production will proceed as rapidly as physical and technological factors will allow, with no delays caused by financial difficulties or uncertainty of markets. Use of this last assumption means that the magnitude of the coming reemployment problem is, if anything, understated.

As is indicated in the map on page 2 there are dramatic contrasts in the severity of the demobilization problems which the different States will experience. Michigan, with its converted automobile industry, will have the gravest situation. It appears that there will be almost 6 ex-servicemen or former war workers for every 10 persons employed in the State in 1940. Connecticut, long a center of the munitions industry, will also be seriously affected, with a ratio of demobilized persons to pre-war employment of nearly 49 percent. Washington and Indiana will have ratios of 45 percent.

The next group includes eight States in which the problem of demobilization will be somewhat less severe, with demobilization ratios ranging from over 35 to 42 percent. These States are California, Kansas, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Utah.

In a considerably larger group, containing 17 States, the impact of demobilization will be relatively lighter, either because the volume of war industry is not very large or because the high pre-war level of peacetime employment offers a relatively favorable prospect of absorbing the surplus. The demobilization rates for these States—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin—range between 24.7 and 34.3 percent.

It is significant that even in the 20 remaining States (including the District of Columbia) with ratios under 24.7 percent, the demobilization problem will in no case be less than 19 percent of pre-war employment. These States comprise a large part of the South and Southwest, as well as of the northern plain and northwest mountain areas. In these regions the development of war industry has been light, and the chief problem will be the placing of returned servicemen.

Three general comments are relevant. First in no State is the problem negligible. A sudden expansion in the labor supply of only one-fifth, relative to normal labor requirements, is enough to cause serious disturbance unless foreseen and prepared for. Second, the gravity of the problem for each State will depend chiefly on the expansion of the industrial base during the war, since the demobilized servicemen will constitute a fairly constant proportion of the population and of the pre-war employment in each State. Third, even where the problem is not acute over the State as a whole, there may be violent local dislocations for which preparation will be necessary.

NUMBER OF DEMOBILIZED PERSONS, BY STATES

In the accompanying table are given the estimates upon the basis of which the map was constructed. The national total of 8,500,000 men to be demobilized from the armed services is derived by subtracting the assumed 2,500,000 post-war armed force from the published estimates of a peak armed force of 11,000,000. The State totals were derived by dividing the 8,500,000 national total according to 1940 State population ratios, adjusted for sex and age distribution. It was assumed that servicemen will return to the States from which they were inducted.

The national total of slightly over 6,000,000 demobilized industrial workers was derived by estimating for each of 14 manufacturing industries (1) a rate of contraction of munitions production, and (2) the most rapid possible rate of expansion of civilian production, as explained above; and totaling the differences between December 1944 employment and lowest subsequent employment for each industry. The number of demobilized industrial workers in each State was derived by computing ratios of State to total employment in December 1944 for separate manufacturing industries, from forecasts of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Employment Security, or from census data; applying these ratios to the indicated total demobilization for each industry; and totaling the results for each State. This assumes that demobilized industrial workers will, in the first instance, constitute a problem for the States where they held war jobs, either by seeking new jobs, drawing unemployment compensation or relief, requiring retraining services, or in other ways.

If a count of war jobs is made on the basis, not of war industry but of war output not required in the post-war period—ships and planes in excess of peacetime needs, and ordnance items such as guns, ammunition, and tanks—a smaller national total (4,600,000) of industrial demobilization is obtained. This, however, would understate the industrial demobilization problem for the Nation as a whole and for all but 11 States, since in most cases the number of workers permanently displaced by the contraction of specialized munitions production will be less than the number temporarily disemployed by the reconversion of war industry in the broader sense.

It should be noted that the figures on industrial demobilization minimize the actual reemployment problem in the sense that they do not include job shifts within a given industry which produce no net contraction of employment. It should also be observed that all demobilization figures are totals for the reconversion period as a whole and do not measure unemployment at any particular time.

Military and industrial demobilization, related to pre-war employment, by States

State	Number of persons (in thousands)				Demobilized persons as percent of 1940 employment
	1940 employment [1]	Demobilized persons			
		Armed forces	Industrial workers	Total	
United States [2]	45,166.0	8,500.0	6,070.0	14,570.0	32.3
Alabama	893.8	172.6	88.6	261.6	29.2
Arizona	150.2	32.3	1.1	33.4	22.2
Arkansas	583.9	118.2	16.0	134.2	23.0
California	2,525.3	482.0	577.6	1,059.6	42.0
Colorado	349.7	70.6	22.4	93.0	26.6
Connecticut	680.5	113.0	218.5	331.5	48.7
Delaware	102.6	17.9	17.3	35.2	34.3
District of Columbia	308.9	50.2	21.7	71.9	23.3
Florida	683.3	125.0	30.3	155.3	22.7
Georgia	1,107.4	196.4	49.6	246.0	22.2
Idaho	158.6	34.0	.2	34.2	21.6
Illinois	2,874.4	523.6	390.2	913.8	31.8
Indiana	1,151.7	214.2	304.3	518.5	45.0
Iowa	862.8	153.8	40.4	194.2	22.5
Kansas	583.8	108.8	111.0	219.8	37.6
Kentucky	847.6	172.6	22.0	194.6	23.0
Louisiana	771.1	152.2	53.1	205.3	26.6
Maine	279.0	49.3	35.0	84.3	30.2
Maryland	690.9	125.0	165.5	290.5	42.0
Massachusetts	1,534.8	266.9	223.2	490.1	31.9
Michigan	1,825.0	350.2	717.7	1,067.9	58.5
Minnesota	931.5	176.8	35.8	212.6	22.8
Mississippi	727.5	131.8	18.2	150.0	20.6
Missouri	1,297.1	232.9	122.2	355.1	27.4
Montana	185.6	36.6	2.2	38.8	20.9
Nebraska	433.4	79.9	18.0	97.9	22.6
Nevada	41.5	8.5	1.5	10.0	24.1
New Hampshire	176.0	29.8	18.4	48.2	27.4
New Jersey	1,569.1	281.4	327.8	609.2	38.8
New Mexico	140.3	33.2	.3	33.5	23.9
New York	4,974.5	913.8	500.1	1,413.9	28.4
North Carolina	1,208.7	225.2	22.6	247.8	20.5
North Dakota	200.4	40.0	.1	40.1	20.0
Ohio	2,345.0	440.3	506.0	946.3	40.4
Oklahoma	658.7	145.4	46.1	191.5	29.1
Oregon	389.8	70.6	58.5	129.1	33.1
Pennsylvania	3,230.2	639.2	579.3	1,218.5	37.7
Rhode Island	264.7	45.9	48.4	94.3	35.6
South Carolina	661.1	115.6	20.0	135.6	20.5
South Dakota	204.5	39.1	.2	39.3	19.2
Tennessee	941.7	181.0	51.2	232.2	24.7
Texas	2,138.4	423.3	140.7	564.0	26.4
Utah	148.9	34.0	19.7	53.7	36.1
Vermont	125.1	21.2	4.8	26.0	20.8
Virginia	933.1	175.1	92.3	267.4	28.7
Washington	607.7	115.6	158.9	274.5	45.2
West Virginia	519.1	119.8	37.0	156.8	30.2
Wisconsin	1,060.8	198.0	134.9	332.9	31.4
Wyoming	86.6	17.8	0	17.8	20.6

[1] From 1940 Census of Population.
[2] Differences between United States totals and sums of State components are due to rounding of figures.

Military and industrial demobilization, related to pre-war employment, for the 17 Western States [1]

State	Number of persons (in thousands)				Demobilized persons as percent of 1940 employment
	1940 employment [2]	Demobilized persons			
		Armed forces	Industrial workers	Total	
Arizona	150.2	32.3	1.1	33.4	22.2
California	2,525.3	482.0	577.6	1,059.6	42.0
Colorado	349.7	70.6	22.4	93.0	26.6
Idaho	158.6	34.0	.2	34.2	21.6
Kansas	583.8	108.8	111.0	219.8	37.6
Montana	185.6	36.6	2.2	38.8	20.9
Nebraska	433.4	79.9	18.0	97.9	22.6
Nevada	41.5	8.5	1.5	10.0	24.1
New Mexico	140.3	33.2	.3	33.5	23.9
North Dakota	200.4	40.0	.1	40.1	20.0
Oklahoma	658.7	145.4	46.1	191.5	29.1
Oregon	389.8	70.6	58.5	129.1	33.1
South Dakota	204.5	39.1	.2	39.3	19.2
Texas	2,138.4	423.3	140.7	564.0	26.4
Utah	148.9	34.0	19.7	53.7	36.1
Washington	607.7	115.6	158.9	274.5	45.2
Wyoming	86.6	17.8	0	17.8	20.6
17 Western States	9,063.4	1,771.7	1,158.5	2,930.2	32.5

[1] Based on Relative Severity of Post-war Demobilization by States, Monthly Labor Review (July 1943) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
[2] From 1940 Census of Population.

Men and Women in the Armed Forces to Receive Specific Instructions and Information Upon Discharge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the War Department recently has gotten out a new form called Report of Separation, for the information of discharged soldiers, which sets forth clearly their rights, duties, and privileges, and directs them to those governmental agencies which can give them help.

It is a very commendable piece of work and I want to see that it is thoroughly advertised, because I do not know of any greater obligation we have to our boys in the armed services than to help them reestablish themselves in civilian pursuits just as quickly and with the least amount of inconvenience and annoyance as may be practicable.

The Army and Navy Register of December 18, 1943, carries an item on this new form, and I am going to include it as a part of my remarks, because it brings out all of the salient points.

For instance, here is one passage:

There is a reemployment committeeman attached to every local selective-service board who will act as your personal representative in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself after discharge. He will assist you either in getting your old job back or in getting you a new job if your old job is not available. He will act in your behalf with the other Government agencies concerned.

I hope every Member will read this item I shall insert. It shows that the Army is awake to the responsibility of seeing that the boys are properly looked after when they shall have laid down their arms.

[From the Army and Navy Register of December 18, 1943]

DISCHARGED SOLDIERS' RIGHTS, ETC.

In furtherance of its policy to facilitate the return of the discharged soldier to his proper place in civilian life, the War Department has announced it has adopted a single document which not only clearly informs him of his rights, duties, and privileges, but also is designed to give him adequate information to those governmental agencies which can help him.

The new form, called Report of Separation, replaces seven forms and five letters hitherto required. The soldier receives one copy, while others go to the Veterans' Administration, the State director of selective service for his State for the information of his local board, the reemployment committeeman of that local board, the veterans' employment representative in the local office of the United States Employment Service, and the Adjutant General's office of the Army.

The soldier's copy is certification of his status as a veteran. It informs him that if he is registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, he must report to his local board that he has been separated from the armed forces, and that if he has not registered he must do so. He is reminded that as a civilian he has the same obligations under the act as any other.

The soldier is advised that if he desires his former employment and is entitled to it under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act, he must apply to his former employer within 40 days after his discharge. The certificate also points out that if he saw active military service on and after December 7, 1941, and has been honorably discharged, he has the right to apply to the Veterans' Administration for hospitalization and domiciliary care, disability pension, or vocational rehabilitation, if entitled to them under the law.

For his assistance and advice the following information is given:

"There is a reemployment committeeman attached to every local selective-service board who will act as your personal representative in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself after discharge. He will assist you either in getting your old job back or in getting you a new job if your old job is not available. He will act in your behalf with the other Government agencies concerned.

"Army Emergency Relief has been established by the War Department to furnish temporary emergency financial aid and other services to soldiers and their dependents. Assistance is extended to all eligible military personnel, including persons discharged since September 16, 1940, regardless of rank, grade, branch, or component and to their dependents, irrespective of relationship. A. E. R. officers are located at posts, camps, air fields, and in most principal cities. You may apply by mail or in person to the A. E. R. officer at any of these places.

"The United States Employment Service maintains contacts with employers and will assist you in securing work if you have had no previous job, or if for any valid reason your old job is not available. In each local U. S. E. S. office you will find a Veterans' Administration employment representative.

"The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of rehabilitating themselves for civil life. They handle your pension claims and your service-connected vocational rehabilitation.

"The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, which operates under the State Department of Education in each individual State, will assist you in your training and education if it is necessary for you to learn a new trade or profession before returning to civil life.

"You may obtain information concerning Federal employment at any post office or any civil-service office.

"The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army. Its field directors at Army camps and hospitals and chapters in every home community will assist you and your family in solving your personal and family problems. They will arrange temporary financial assistance when you require it and will help you in filing and presenting claims for pensions or other Government benefits.

"On your request the United States Armed Forces Institute will undertake to provide records of courses taken by you while in the service for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies. In addition, the Armed Forces Institute will give you, on application, special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges and will provide reports of the results of these examinations. For either or both of these services you are required to pay the institute's regular membership fee of $2. No other payment is required. Inquiries should be addressed to the Commandant, United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis."

The discharged soldier is advised to keep in force all of his Government insurance which he can, as one of his most valuable assets. Full instructions are given to him on the subject.

The report of separation gives pertinent information about the individual. It includes considerable personal data, his character at discharge, his military and civilian occupations, the cause of his separation from the service, and the type of his discharge.

The present procedure was arrived at through experience during the present war and in the World War. It is recognized that modifications in procedure may be necessary from time to time in the light of changing circumstances.

Byrd Hammers Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Morris, from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

IN WASHINGTON WITH GEORGE MORRIS

BYRD HAMMERS AWAY

WASHINGTON, December 23.—Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Monday, filed the eleventh report of the progress of the committee since it was appointed September 20, 1941. In a little more than 2 years, the committee, with an annual budget of $10,000, the report points out, has been instrumental in saving the Government $2,117,543,231.

The activity of the committee resulted in exposure of the uselessness of the C. C. C., W. P. A., N. Y. A., and various other extravagant and wasteful agencies, and is directly responsible for abolishing many of them and reducing the expenditures of others, where administration pressure was too strong to permit them to be abolished entirely.

Among other gratifying results, the committee has compelled a reduction to be made in Federal personnel by 134,395 since last June. Among the agencies in which the committee has forced retrenchment are the Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, domestic branch of the Office of War Information, National Resources Planning Board, and Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The program which the Byrd committee will undertake in the immediate future is investigation of large unexpended appropriations in the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration, with the view to returning these unexpended balances to the Treasury Department.

The committee will continue its insistence on reduction of the number of Federal civilian workers, nonessential employees, investigation of all Government loan corporations, and lending agencies, with the view to determining if economies can be effected by consolidation and elimination of various agencies doing practically the same work or duplicating each other in part.

Senator BYRD insists that at least 400,000 more nonessential employees of the 3,095,463 should be dispensed with; he will insist on

eliminating overlapping personnel and functions, and endeavor to bring an end to indiscriminate hiring.

The committee will continue its drive against needless travel and communications expenses, strict accounting of automobile use, and other expenditures costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually. For example, the committee points out that within the Department of Agriculture there are 20 lending agencies separately functioning and all doing practically the same kind of work.

The public will not overlook the fact that throughout its activity in seeking to eliminate waste and nonessential expenditures, the committee has been confronted with administration hostility and resistance on every hand. At no time in the experience of the committee has the administration made a voluntary reduction of nonessential expenditures or shown the slightest interest in eliminating extravagance.

On the other hand, each time the committee has sought to bring about economy and efficiency, the administration has sent a parade of witnesses to justify expenditures, and the witnesses have been fortified with misleading figures and statements described as facts, which the limited staff of the Byrd committee has had to break down and analyze without having access to actual facts and conditions.

It has been an uphill and at times discouraging job, but Senator BYRD has shown persistence and determination which has inspired the support and confidence of the members of his committee. Without that determination the committee might easily have deteriorated into an apologist for conditions, rather than taking the more difficult course of exposing many, some of which bordered on actual scandal.

The Byrd committee points out why economy is necessary at this time, even though there may have been times when the country could have afforded to throw away money. The committee report points out that Government expenditures for the fiscal year which ended on June 30 were $78,182,348,641, or more than double the expenditures of the previous year. The average monthly expenditures for war purposes alone were more than $6,000,000,000, or more than $8,000,000 an hour.

The Federal debt of $61,000,000,000 at the beginning of the war has risen to $170,000,000,000. The per capita debt has been quadrupled in 4 years. In 1938, the debt was $285. Today it is $1,204. "In more realistic terms," the report points out, "the present debt of each taxpayer in the country is about $3,500. The interest on this debt is $2,700,000,000 a year." The report estimates that $41,000,000,000 in taxes will be collected this year and that the deficit will be $57,000,000,000.

The committee declares that there can be no illusion as to this debt, "for it must be paid." It rejects the "new philosophy of public debt" that continual pump priming is an economic necessity and maintains that public confidence in financial integrity is necessary to the economic stability of the country.

The committee reminds Congress that people will hold it accountable for wasteful and extravagant appropriations and expresses the hope that Congress "will continue to participate actively in this endeavor to provide a checkrein on runaway nonessential spending wherever it is found."

Undoubtedly the country will respond to the facts as well as the implications contained in the Byrd report and insist upon Congress doing its part in promoting economy and preserving the solvency of the Government.

Welfare of Servicemen and Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, generous consideration for the welfare of servicemen and veterans has been uppermost in the minds of many Members of the Senate. Our distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, have joined with Members of the House in legislation which will be of great benefit to the representatives of the armed forces, active or retired. The legislation here proposed is very comprehensive, and it is to be hoped that the efforts of these distinguished Senators will be consummated and the service men and women will receive the deserved recognition.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Democratic Digest, giving a very clear presentation of the efforts of these gentlemen in behalf of soldiers, sailors, and marines.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGING THE GAP

Today the men who are on the beaches of Tarawa, over the skies of Berlin, or before the plains of Rome are heroes. Tomorrow they must not be just—apple sellers.

The problem of swinging America from a wartime to a peacetime basis is one for which we must plan carefully. And our first obligation is to those who have given the most—the men and women in the armed services.

Almost from the moment he signed the Selective Service Act, the President began to think of the future of those the country was calling on to make a greater economic sacrifice, and perhaps to make the greatest sacrifice, and to take definite action to care for their special needs.

As the war has progressed, and as the problems of D-day have taken on shape and sharpness, the President has expanded his program for the minimum of action to which he feels the members of the armed forces are entitled over and above that taken for other citizens.

In the past few weeks the President has sent two messages to Congress requesting legislation which will help tide the returning service men and women over the period when they first return to civilian life, and until they get the thing they want more than anything else, a job.

On October 27 the President sent a message asking for legislation to make it possible for those young men and women whose education was interrupted by the war to continue their schooling and technical training when peace comes. His message was based on a report submitted to him by a committee of educators whom he appointed, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem at the time he signed the bill calling 18- and 19-year-old boys into the Army.

This message has now been translated into a bill and introduced by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It provides that:

"All members of the armed forces—men and women—who have served at least 6 months and who have been honorably discharged may apply for a year's free schooling. Selections will be made on the basis of aptitudes and skills. Each State will have full charge of the program in its State, and will choose the high schools, colleges, and business and technical schools which will give training. Those chosen for training will receive free tuition and $50 a month for other expenses if single, $75 if married, with $10 for each child. There is a further provision that a limited number of ex-service men and women may be selected for their special aptitudes to continue technical or professional studies for a further period of 1 to 3 years. Those men and women may receive a loan of an additional $50 a month which is to be paid back later."

On November 23, the President sent a second message to Congress outlining three further steps he feels are desirable.

The first concerns mustering-out pay, and is covered by legislation introduced immediately in the Senate by Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY, and in the House of Representatives by Representative ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky:

"Payment to a service man or woman, up to the rank of a captain in the Army and lieutenant (senior grade) in the Navy on mustering out of amounts up to $300, depending on the length of service. The first installment of $100 is to be paid on discharge, and remainder in two other payments.

"As the Digest went to press, the Senate had passed amendments to the bill which raised the top mustering-out pay to $500 for service overseas and in Alaska 18 months or more; to $200 for service in the United States for less than a year, with other proportionate increases depending upon length of service; and had made all members of the armed forces up to and including the rank of colonel or equivalent eligible for payments."

The second step deals with unemployment insurance and is covered by a bill introduced by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, and Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina. It provides for:

"Payment to unemployed veterans up to 52 weeks, beginning at $15 a week for a single man or woman, an additional $5 for one dependent, $7.50 for 2, and $10 for 3, with $25 as the ceiling. Payments would be made for unemployment occurring within 15 months after demobilization."

The final step, and certainly one of the most important, is likewise included in the Wagner-Doughton bill, and calls for:

"Credit toward old-age and survivor insurance for the period of service at a basic wage rate of $160 a month, whether or not the service man or woman was paying social-security taxes before induction. This would prevent reduction or loss of social-security benefits to those who were in covered employment before going into the armed services, and would begin a social-security account for those whose employment was not covered by the Social Security Act."

This legislation, the President feels, will round out the program set up for the special protection of members of the armed forces. In his message of November 26 the President summarized this program:

"The fighting men and women have taken out $90,000,000,000 of insurance—policies ranging from $1,000 to $10,000—which Uncle Sam provides at very low rates.

"The Government has guaranteed premiums and is already obligated to the sum of $135,000,000, on regular insurance policies.

"Congress has provided for hospitalization and medical care for all veterans, and for vocational rehabilitation of those who need it.

"It has voted generous pensions for those disabled, or the families of those killed.

"Numerous other measures protect men and women in uniform from creditors, give them special reemployment rights, and provide maternity care for the wives and infants of enlisted men."

Peace may still be a long way off on the battlefields of Europe and Asia, but when it comes, it may come with stunning suddenness. Today is the time to get ready for that peace. As the President has said:

"We must have plans and legislation ready for our returning veterans instead of waiting until the last moment. It will give notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down."

Cruel Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cruel Indifference," published in the Baltimore News-Post of December 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRUEL INDIFFERENCE

There is a sharp and shameful contrast between the New Deal's cruel indifference to the needs of our own discharged war veterans and its lavish solicitude for the people of "foreign" nations all around the earth.

Many of these countries have not asked for the money. Some of their responsible leaders do not want the money, but they get it just the same.

The New Deal pressed it upon them.

The Roosevelt administration is economy-minded only in the matter of relieving distress among Americans who have served their country in the armed forces.

In every other direction it squanders the taxpayers' money with limitless abandon.

Through the secret operations of lend-lease it pours the money of American taxpayers into half the nations of the earth by the billion and makes no real accounting to the taxpayers or to their representatives, the Members of Congress.

It is pouring $6,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money into a series of gigantic boondoggles in Latin America—and it was doing that secretly, too, until Senator HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska, returning from a recent tour of Latin America, told the American people how their money was being misused and wasted there.

With the same debased inventive ingenuity that characterized the New Deal's 10-year leaf-raking spree at home, the New Deal's expeditionary force of boondogglers finds amazing and shocking ways to waste money in Central and South America.

In the United States the New Deal denies the veterans of this war a single day's pay beyond the date of his discharge.

But in Venezuela the New Deal is stocking the lakes and streams with game fish to make good sport for outdoor Venezuelans.

In Honduras, where there are very few automobiles, and in San Salvador, where there are fewer still, the New Deal is building automobile highways to provide work and wages for the native unemployed.

At home the New Deal government does not even give a suit of civilian clothing to an honorably discharged veteran.

In Honduras it is buying farms and giving them to people, and it is guaranteeing to support the people on the farms until they become self-supporting, if it takes 20 years.

In our own country the New Deal leaves the disabled war veteran to his own pitiful resources for the first 3 to 8 months after his discharge.

At the end of that time, if he has not in the meanwhile died of hunger or exposure or from lack of medical treatment, the creaking machinery of bureaucracy will have ground out a niggardly disability allowance or perhaps even a provision for hospital treatment.

But in Ecuador the New Deal is undertaking to rehabilitate the veterans and victims of a South American war.

In Ecuador's Eloro Province, largely wrecked in the recent struggle between Ecuador and Peru, American tax money is being expended to provide food and shelter for returning refugees; to present some of them with farms; to restore their health and build roads and in general to set them on their way to happiness and prosperity.

The New Deal government that so tenderly cherishes the victims of that distant foreign war must no longer be permitted to ignore the victims of our own war—the veterans who have sacrificed and suffered to advance our cause toward victory.

Congress must compel the administration to accord our war veterans the help and consideration they have earned.

It must enact at once a law providing a continuance of pay, civilian clothing, medical treatment, and hospitalization as needed, all to be forthcoming at the time of the greatest need—immediately upon the veteran's discharge from service.

Let us give our fine Latin-American neighbors any real help they need to make them stronger and more self-reliant, which does not, of course, mean insulting their dignity and intelligence with boondogglers.

But let us first meet our own urgent and inescapable human responsibility in our own country.

Need for Veterans General Hospital in the County of Essex, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of Lawrence Post, No. 1549, Lawrence, Mass. The resolution was forwarded to me by John P. Dowd, commander, and Roswell Ward, adjutant.

Whereas there is need in the county of Essex in the State of Massachusetts, veterans' facility to care for the influx of disabled veterans who are returning daily; and

Whereas these veterans require medical and hospital care constantly and must travel long distances to other veterans' facilities in Massachusetts; and

Whereas it is almost impossible to obtain bed space in veterans' hospitals in the surrounding of Essex County of Massachusetts because of a heavy load being carried at the present time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That at a regular meeting of Lawrence Post, No. 1549, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, city of Lawrence, Mass., the members of this post unanimously voted to support a movement to petition Congress and the Director of Veterans' Administration, Frank T. Hines, to have a veterans' general hospital built in the county of Essex; and be it further

Resolved, That if a hospital cannot be built some erected building suitable for a hospital be renovated for the care of veterans who reside in the county of Essex; and be it further

Resolved, That if inconvenient to build or renovate a hospital some private hospital be taken over by the Veterans' Administration in said county and be set up for the convenience of local veterans.

Take the Profits Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 8, 1944:

TAKE THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR

The report just made by Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, and concurred in by half a dozen other Senators, detailing the enormous war profits of 100 American corporations, might usefully stir a sharp public reaction against recent Congressional moves toward emasculation of war contract renegotiation laws.

The published list, showing profits running into the millions even after payment of taxes, including excess-profits taxes, thunders home in dramatic fashion a refutation of general business assertions of reduced wartime earnings. The fact is, many businesses, even business as a whole, is profiting hugely, unbearably, and unwisely from the war.

What has happened to all the fine determination of the middle 1920's and the '30's to take the profits out of war?

True, the results have not been wholly negative. Many of the inflationary controls in effect today, notably price ceilings, had their genesis in the plans of Bernard B. Baruch made 15 years ago to keep general costs down so that war goods might be bought at more normal prices.

The difficulty, which was easily foreseeable but most difficult to avert, was that the mobilization and the conversion to war production had to be accomplished under extreme pressure.

While some firms had a peacetime experience that might guide them fairly accurately in judging costs—a shoe manufacturer turning to Army shoes, for example—many others, powder puff manufacturers, gasoline pump makers, automobile plants and so on, undertook contracts hastily thrust upon them with only the scantiest notion of what to charge.

This, naturally, left a confused situation as to profits and left the old campaign to take the profits out of war looking a mite shell-shocked. That was where renegotiation came in.

The armed services had retained the right to check up on contracts after they were fulfilled and to renegotiate those involving excessive profits. On paper this seems fair, and to utter the words is simple. Actual practice, however, presents many difficulties.

One of these is sheer volume. The Truman committee estimated there might be 85,000 contracts to be renegotiated. This would require several years to consummate and would tie up records, loans, and other assets of corporations for an unjustifiably long time, and might seriously hamper reconversion. Another difficulty is that of finding accurate standards for judging fair costs and profits. And this is further complicated by the fact that the party to the contract who is the buyer becomes under renegotiation in effect both prosecutor and judge.

Still another difficulty is that renegotiation reaches the profits of war contractors but not those of nonwar producers whose profits tend to raise the inflationary level and bring a higher price structure all around.

The trend in Congress has been to simplify by focusing on the large, prime contractors and letting the small fry go.

Some people's notion of simplification is simply to let profits swell as they may. This would be a sorry end for all our high aspirations of a decade ago, and, as Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, Under Secretary of War Patterson, Mr. Wilson, of the War Production Board, and many others, have recently warned, sows the seeds of bitterness and reaction when, in the post-war years, the story of war profits becomes more fully discernible.

There may be a better way out of the renegotiation problem, but it is not yet fully limned. The important thing is to maintain a lively public interest in seeing that this proper method is found, and that the suggestion of hopelessness advanced in some quarters is not accepted.

Western Regional Research Laboratory, Albany, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including herewith an article from the Albany Times, under date of December 24, 1943, regarding the Western Regional Research Laboratory located at Albany, Calif.

I visited this laboratory last August and was amazed and immensely pleased with the work and wonderful results obtained by this laboratory under the skillful and intelligent leadership of Dr. T. L. Swenson, director.

The article in the Albany Times is as follows:

Four years ago, in October 1939, Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials laid the cornerstone of the Western Regional Research Laboratory at 800 Buchanan Street in Albany. The purpose of this laboratory and its three sisters, the Southern in New Orleans, the Eastern in Philadelphia, and the Northern in Peoria, Ill., was defined in 1938 when the act creating these laboratories was passed, as the development of industrial outlets for farm products. The four laboratories serve four regions and are administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. Progress during the 4 years in the Western Laboratory is the subject of this article, which is based on information obtained through the courtesy of the Director, Dr. T. L. Swenson.

LABORATORY BUILDING

What is the laboratory like inside? Opening off most of the corridors are numerous laboratory rooms, where the scientists conduct experiments. Fully half of one wing, however, is one large room, several stories high, equipped with power and hoists suitable for the handling of manufacturing machinery that is similar to commercial equipment. An operating unit of such equipment is called a pilot plant. This room is used for regional laboratories are similarly equipped.

The visitor will find equipment for vegetable dehydration in the Western Laboratory's pilot-plant room now, along with equipment for other types of research. The laboratory also has pilot-plant equipment for the freezing of vegetables, fruits, and poultry. In the years to come it will be possible to make replacements and readapt the equipment to new needs, as they arise.

DEHYDRATION OF VEGETABLES, FRUITS, AND EGGS

Leaders in Government and industry realized, before Pearl Harbor, that in event of war this country would dehydrate large quantities of foods. With U-boats along sea lanes, long distances to go, large areas to conquer, and armies to transport, we required a means of conserving shipping space and the metals used in cans. Dehydration—reducing the water content of food to a very low amount—offered not only a means of saving weight and space, but a means of preserving foods.

But research was needed because only a very few vegetables had ever been dehydrated with complete success and other foods also offered problems. The Western Laboratory was chosen as a suitable place for much of the research needed to make dehydrated vegetables satisfactory for their purpose, and certain phases of research on dehydrated fruits and eggs were also assigned to its staff.

In vegetable dehydration the problem was large, and every phase—from location and construction of plant to quality of finished product—has been and continues to be covered by the research here. The researchers have studied plant layout, costs, selection of raw product, preparation, blanching, dehydration, packaging, storage, and quality testing, and their findings have been reported directly to industry. Staff members have participated in several training schools, in which technical people met with industrial people. One of these was held last fall in the Western Regional Laboratory, the other immediately thereafter in Rochester, N. Y. Universities, leaders in the food and allied industries, and Federal agencies cooperated wholeheartedly in these training schools. Last May the Western Laboratory held a dehydration school for representatives of State agricultural colleges.

It is impossible at present, Director Swenson points out, to measure and evaluate all of this work. Commercial plants are fairly well established and are producing at the rate of about a billion pounds of dehydrated foods a year, about a third of which is vegetables. This estimate does not include dried fruits, which were well established before the war. The Western Laboratory is conducting research on certain phases of fruit dehydration, particularly spray drying of juices and pulps, and also on storage and quality retention in dried egg powder.

To the question whether research on dehydration could be stopped soon, Dr. Swenson replied that that is both undesirable and impossible. The establishment of new industries, he says, offers new opportunities for research and new improvements to the industry and new benefits to the consumer. Examples are greater efficiency in production and better retention of quality in the product.

FROZEN FOODS

During recent years the frozen-food industry has grown rapidly. Particularly significant has been the recent increase in use of frozen foods by the armed forces. Estimates from reliable sources show that the armed forces are using frozen vegetables, for example, at the rate of about 71,000,000 pounds per year and that this year's quota of frozen vegetables will be about six times that of last year. Such foods offer savings in container materials, as well as convenience in handling wherever facilities are available and in addition they have fine quality.

Recently the Western Laboratory has developed improved methods of handling fruits from the field on through to the frozen product, a new frozen fruit dessert that can be made in ice-cream making equipment, a satisfactory formula for frozen pork and beans, new waste-saving formulas for frozen broccoli and asparagus, and other new methods—all beneficial to the industry and the consumer. The new laboratory has absorbed the former Frozen Pack Laboratory of Seattle, and in addition the Fruit and Vegetable Chemistry Laboratory of Los Angeles is now under its direction; as a result it is able to continue work that was begun earlier and to make use of personnel with experience and familiarity with frozen pack problems, as well as with other problems related especially to fruits and vegetables.

NEW PRODUCTS

The Western Regional Laboratory works on a great many projects not directly concerned with foods, with objectives closely related to wartime industrial problems. The other regional laboratories are similarly engaged and, to illustrate, some of their accomplishments are mentioned here, as obtained from a brief general report on all four laboratories recently made by Dr. W. W. Skinner, chief of the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, which is part of the Agricultural Research Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Research is under way on rubber, industrial alcohol, smokeless powder, plastics, industrial proteins, essential drying oils, synthetic fibers, rot-proofing of sandbag material, rubberless cotton firehose, substitutes for cork and for palm and other industrial oils, conservation of leather, and many other important projects. The Northern Laboratory, for example, has made a rubber substitute from soybean oil, but since soybean oil is being diverted to food purposes, other oils have been studied recently and found suitable as substitutes. The same laboratory has developed a new type of lignin plastic from wastes; this plastic can be used as a replacement for metals for many purposes. The Southern Laboratory recently announced a substitute for palm oil used in producing tin and terneplate and also sheet steel, and also a substitute for cotton linters (in short supply) in the manufacture of smokeless powedr. Apple sirup, a development of the Eastern Laboratory, is now in commercial production and is used as a replacement for glycerin in the tobacco industry. Glycerin is required in the making of explosives.

Not every project can be mentioned here, of course. Those mentioned below are some of the more promising ones under investigation in the Western Laboratory, in addition to the dehydration and freezing of foods. The brief descriptions were supplied by Director Swensen.

A shortage of tartrates was threatened by the war, and the development of a tartrate industry in this country seemed dependent on the discovery of methods suitable for production of tartrates from grape wastes on a fairly large scale. A pilot plant is now in

operation at Lodi, Calif., in cooperation with industry. The method was developed in the Western Laboratory.

Because of the recent discovery of such products as tyrothricin, gramicidin, penicillin, and others, which are performing wonders in medicine, there is great interest in new ways to grow the micro-organisms that produce the new drugs. The Western Laboratory is working on fruit and vegetable wastes in an effort to determine their suitability for such purposes, and at present an asparagus-butt juice seems promising as a medium for the growth of micro-organisms and is being tested by a number of pharmaceutical and microbial products manufacturers.

Fruit pectin has many possibilities. Researchers have produced a liquid apple pectin concentrate for use in jams and jellies, a pectin that will jell juices with little added sugar, a modified pectin that substitutes for imported gums in ointment bases, and other products.

Inexpensive and waste fats and oils are under study in an effort to produce new plasticizers, designed to impart flexibility to certain types of plastics, and new ingredients for paint oils and soaps.

A new type of fiber—a true fiber—has been developed that offers promise; it can be made from such proteins as waste egg white, feathers, and hoofs.

Recently a group of research workers, headed by Dr. A. K. Balls, was transferred from Washington to the Western Laboratory. This change of location came at the time of announcement by the group of a new method, developed by its members, of obtaining alcohol from wheat by a much less expensive process than any previously known. It is cheaper because it almost eliminates the requirement of malt. The method is being installed in commercial plants in various places.

Better Public Health Awaits Better Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address dealing with the subject of an adequate system of medical care, delivered by Dr. J. W. Mountin, of the United States Public Health Service, before the Association of Internes and Medical Students in New York City on November 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If a group such as the Association of Internes and Medical Students were to define the characteristics of a desirable medical service for the future, I believe the concensus would be something like this:

1. The service should be the best that modern medical science affords.

2. It should be equally available to all persons, regardless of economic status or geographical location.

3. It should protect the interests of both patient and physician.

4. Prevention of disease and disability should be a paramount consideration.

5. The scheme should advance scientific research, encourage professional development, and improve administrative practices.

How well does medicine, as it is organized today, measure up to these criteria?

With respect to item one, the performance of present-day American medicine is very spotty. We hear much about the necessity of preserving the high quality of medical care. This truism simply ignores the fact that much of the medical care received by the people of this country is below standard. People who have money to pay and discernment to select a good physician can obtain medical service of the highest quality. On the other hand, a large proportion of the people are denied good medical attention either because they cannot afford it or because there are no well-qualified practitioners in the community. Attendance by midwives at childbirth and lack of medical attention during terminal illness is still common in many regions. People in rural areas are as a rule much less adequately served than city dwellers. Many older doctors, especially in rural communities, are not familiar with the newer and more effective techniques. Quackery and cultism are by no means dead, and self-medication with worthless nostrums is prevalent.

Item number 2. The most striking defect in the present scheme of medical service is that many people receive no medical care or only an inadequate amount of care. The dependent and low-income groups are most seriously affected. Higher in the economic scale are those who may be termed medically indigent; they cannot buy care under the present system without depriving themselves of other basic necessities. Finally, even persons of moderately substantial means have difficulty meeting the cost of serious or prolonged illness. The proportion of our population which does not fall within one of these hardship categories is very small indeed.

Item number 3. As far as relative benefits are concerned, the doctor fares better than the patient under the existing system. There has been much loose talk about the doctor-patient relationship, the right of the patient to choose his physician, and other attributes supposedly peculiar to the present system of medical practice. In reality it is the physician who enjoys most of the amenities of the relationship. He can choose his patients and continue to serve them if he pleases. Theoretically patients have a corresponding right of choice, but often they are not able to exercise it. Unless the patient can afford the fee he can only appeal to the doctor's sympathy or sense of professional responsibility. Besides, even when there is complete freedom of choice, a physician is likely to be selected in anything but a discriminating manner.

Item number 4. Preventive medicine and hygiene. In this respect we have come far in this country. The level of public health is high, but it is uneven in different parts of the country. Some sections have almost no public-health services, and others have inadequate ones. Such progress as we have made—and I want to repeat that it is considerable—can be attributed only in small measure to the prevailing scheme of medical practice. In fact, a fee-for-service system is inimical to the practice of preventive medicine.

Such preventive services as periodic physical examination and certain types of immunization are optional measures. The patient is not motivated to seek them because he feels ill, and he cannot be sure that they will meet a specific need in his case. Therefore, if a fee is charged, he is inclined to forego the service, especially if his financial condition is such that in order to obtain it he must deny himself something else which he feels is more necessary or desirable. For these reasons the preventive aspects of medical care have been developed by public-health agencies, for the most part independently of curative medicine. This separation of two complementary services is not a good arrangement.

Improvement in the health and vigor of the Nation depends not so much upon further advances in orthodox public-health programs as it does upon a more aggressive approach to those health problems which are a part of medical practice.

With regard to the fifth and last item—improvement of scientific and professional status, achievement has been remarkable. Of this achievement, the medical profession can justifiably be proud. Prior to 1900 American medical education was chiefly in the hands of proprietary schools and was of a low order. Little scientific research was conducted. All this has been changed, and full credit is due to the profession for its efforts in changing it. The good intentions of the profession, however, would have been of little avail had it not been for the generous and sustained support of public officials and interested laymen. State legislatures enacted increasingly stringent laws to protect graduates of improved schools against competition from the products of the diploma mills. Philanthropy and taxation made large sums of money available for research and medical education. It may be well to recall that at no time during this extraordinary period of development did Government or the lay public show hostility to the medical profession. On the contrary, the improvements for which the profession now seems inclined to take exclusive credit would not have been possible without popular support.

Now I should like to outline some of the suggested remedies for our present shortcomings and examine some of the stock objections raised by many doctors.

In order to bring better medical care to sections of the country now poorly served, some mechanism must be developed to place young, well-trained doctors in areas which no longer attract medical graduates. Only in this way can the process of attrition which is tending to create medical vacuums in many place be stopped. This process has been considerably accelerated by the war. Closely allied with the physician shortage in these areas is the lack of hospitals and clinics. Such facilities must be provided before doctors can be induced to go there, and before an acceptable standard of medical care can be provided. Since most of these areas are not well situated economically, I know of no way in which either the needed doctors or hospitals can be supplied except through some form of Government assistance.

The extension of medical services to those people who do not now get medical attention, or who do not get enough of it, demands a change in methods of financing. There is an inherent lack of logic in the present system which requires that the sick person bear the cost of illness at the very time when his income has stopped or is much curtailed. For the great majority of people, the cost of illness cannot be budgeted. Sickness is not an experience that is desired; consequently there is not the normal incentive to set aside money for it. The individual cannot predict when he will be sick, nor can he foretell the seriousness or duration of the ailment.

These uncertainties can be resolved, however, by application of the insurance principle, that is, by pooling the illness experience of groups or of the population as a whole. We are said to be the most insured people in the world. Before enactment of the Federal Social Security Act the great bulk of insurance was carried by people in the upper income brackets against such hazards as death, fire, and personal liability. Since then the Federal Social Security Act has demonstrated that small payments made periodically into a fund will help to provide many people a degree of economic security which they never

had before. Three other facts are obvious on the basis of this experience: (1) An element of compulsion is necessary to assure contributions from all in the insured group; (2) taxation offers the surest and most economical method of collecting the amounts due; and (3) when sums of such magnitude are involved Government is the most appropriate carrier.

A bill designed to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act to include health insurance is now before the Congress. Whatever the merits or defects of this particular bill, physicians should realize that the subject of health insurance will remain on the public agenda until better and more economical medical care is made available.

Minimum public-health services, of course, should be extended to every part of the country as quickly as possible. Aside from this need, however, further substantial advances in public health and preventive medicine must await the development of a method of supplying more and better medical care. The majority of the 40 percent of our male youth rejected for military service are not suffering from illnesses of defects which fall within the traditional scope of public health practice. They are afflicted with ailments which result in the most part from lack of good medical attention.

The argument most frequently used by those who object to the remedies I have mentioned is that they will involve the socialization of medicine. The truth of the matter is that, although medicine is not today a social service, it has advanced a long way in that direction. And this trend has benefited not only the public but the medical profession as well.

About the beginning of the present century it became evident even to the rank and file of the profession that the requirements of modern medical education could not be met through schools supported by fees from students. These feeble institutions were replaced by medical schools organized as departments of the larger universities. Medical schools and their allied teaching hospitals then received generous support from private endowments and appropriations by legislative bodies. Today medical education, even to the payment of tuition and student maintenance, is publicly supported as part of the military training program.

As I stated before, the medical profession, for its own protection and advancement, surrendered to public authority such a far-reaching power as the determination of eligibility to engage in medical practice.

Formerly the sick poor received only such care as private physicians of charitable institutions felt inclined to give. Today, though not equally in all communities, some public provision is made for those who cannot pay the physician or hospital. While the care given is often inadequate, the use of tax funds for the purpose has clear legal sanction. Twenty-three percent of all general hospitals, and 50 percent of all general hospital beds, are maintained largely at public expense.

Institutional care of the insane and of the tuberculous have long been among the publicly administered medical functions. Rehabilitation of the crippled has recently been added to the list. In the past few years several States have made provision for the care of cancer patients.

Some 4,000,000 veterans of previous wars are entitled to receive full medical care in Government hospitals at public expense. Those now in the armed forces, have readily available the best service American medicine has to offer. Yet the doctors who render the services are under the strictest regimentation and the patients have no freedom to choose the doctors who treat them. When the men and women in the military forces return to civilian life they will automatically become eligible for the benefits accorded other veterans. Recently Congress appropriated a substantial sum of money to provide maternity care for wives of enlisted men, as well as medical supervision for their infants during their first year of life.

The Federal and State government also supports much of the medical research that is done. It exercises control over the purity and potency of drugs and biological products. In the case of a new and scarce drug such as penicillin, only the Government can assure equitable distribution of the limited supply.

The foregoing account of tax-supported activities show clearly that government is both a large contributor and large operator in the field of medical care. In short, it shows that American medicine is already socialized to a considerable degree, and that much of its excellence is due to the socialization.

Despite the claim that compulsory health insurance is a foreign and un-American system, we have had it in this country for many years. All but one State have compulsory workman's compensation plans which insure workers against the cost of injuries sustained on the job. Twenty-five States provide such benefits in cases of occupational diseases. These plans have been accepted by the organized medical profession, which, however, steadfastly maintains that compulsory insurance against illness not connected with work is an evil thing which must not be tolerated.

There are economic and social forces at work which make it increasingly necessary for people to meet the hazards of existence through cooperative and planned enterprise. Since the industralization of the country began, a constantly growing proportion of the population has become dependent on wages. Even on the farms, tenancy and industrialized agriculture are replacing the old system of small individual holdings. A marked falling off in employment or a rapid rise in the cost of living precipitates larger numbers of people into the dependent or medically indigent classes. A scheme of medical care based on the individual fee for service is not adapted to the fluctuations of an industrial economy based on free enterprise.

In a country as large as the United States there are certain to be marked sectional differences in climate, fertility of soil, natural resources, and accessibility to markets. Through their own efforts all people cannot hope to be equally productive, yet their needs are basically the same. Hence the necessity of equalizing opportunities to share in those services that are essential for human welfare and development.

The returning soldiers are certain to be a potent influence in shaping social patterns of the future. They will have had experience in collective action. As physicians, nurses, hospital corps men and as patients, they will have witnessed what the best kind of medical care can accomplish under the most adverse conditions. Therefore, they are not likely to be impressed with such shibboleths as regimentation, salaried doctors, the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship, and other straw men set up in opposition to collective action through civil agencies. They will be dissatisfied with any system that leaves people of low income to the meager mercies of charity. They will not agree that farmers should go without hospital care simply because a proprietary institution cannot operate profitably in a sparsely settled area.

Another factor which will undoubtedly serve to increase governmental participation is the decrease in private funds available for the support of medical education and research. The detrimental effects of this decrease would undoubtedly be felt now in medical education if the Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies had not undertaken to subsidize medical schools and students as a part of the war program. In view of the heavy levies upon private incomes necessary to pay for the war, it is almost certain that research will not be so heavily endowed with private funds as in the past. Therefore, taxation offers the only hope of preventing deterioration in education and stagnation in research.

There is one other important consideration. As more and more funds are devoted to social security, the Government's financial stake in the health of the people increases. In a democratic government this means that the public is directly concerned in its own welfare and security. In its own interest, therefore, the public may be expected to effect those changes which will bring the best results to the greatest number with the least cost.

Price of Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Price of Contempt" published in the New York Daily Mirror of December 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE OF CONTEMPT

Is there any project of the New Deal that does not degenerate into a racket?

Lend-lease, for instance.

Lend-lease was originally intended to lend money and lease material to those countries allied with us in the war against Germany.

But, according to Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, returned from a trip through 20 Latin American countries, we are spending $6,000,000,000 in those countries on "wasteful and unnecessary projects which are breeding hate, suspicion, and contempt for this country."

The question will be asked by all tax-paying Americans, who, of course, desire the friendliest relations with all American countries, Why are such colossal sums from our Treasury being poured into countries not actively at war with Germany or Japan?

This, as Senator BUTLER says, has made even South Americans suspicious.

If a man comes regularly to your house and hands you a bundle of money you naturally think he is either coocoo or else he has something up his sleeve that is not good for your general health.

There's Peru, for instance. Nothing is more incredible and mysterious than our lend-lease activities in regard to that country.

Peru has defaulted to us on $81,600,000 in bonds. In spite of that fact the American Export-Import Bank gave it added credit of $30,000,000, according to Senator BUTLER in his lend-lease report to Congress.

This good-neighbor policy seems to be a one-way affair.

Lend-Lease has practically passed out of the hands of the representatives of the people, which is the Congress of the United States, and is in the hands of the bureaucrats, who are acting like King Midas on an indefinite bender.

The people of the United States of America are too busy to follow closely just what Washington is doing with their money, but it will come no doubt, as a distinct shock to them to know that Congress has got to be told what Harry Hopkins, et al., are doing with it.

Vice President WALLACE arises to denounce Senator BUTLER'S revelations of the billions

that are being poured into Latin America as a shocking slur on our Latin American allies.

There is certainly no slur on South or Central America in revealing the expenditure of these sums.

The shocking slur is, rather, on us—on our Congress, our waste, our stupidity.

There is a lend-lease resolution of inquiry buried somewhere in congressional archives.

Better dig it out now.

It is time the people knew for a certainty just how far the New Deal squandermaniacs consider war a minor activity of the international pawnbroking business.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a letter from Fred W. Blaisdell, executive director of the Better Government Association, of Chicago, Ill., which points out some of the problems that must be considered in writing a bill providing for the soldier vote:

JANUARY 3, 1944.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSBEY: In reply to your recent letter, I am glad to give you my conclusions in regard to the serviceman's voting problem. Ever since the question was first raised in Congress I have been reading and studying the various bills presented. All of them seem to suffer from one fatal defect—they are not practicable. And in this letter I want to comment on some of the practical considerations involved.

I shall pass over the questions of constitutionality involved in Federal control of voting, only pointing out what so many forget—that we do not vote for President in this country, but that the citizens of the several States vote for State electors, who, in turn, elect the President. You will agree that it would be deplorable to have the results of the election thrown into the courts because of questions of constitutionality. Even after the lapse of 67 years, the Hayes-Tilden contest is an unpleasant subject for many of us.

In discussing the practical side of the problem, I shall assume that you consider the election of the legislative branch of the National Government—Senators and Representatives—as important as the election of the Executive. I, for one, am unalterably opposed to allowing the serviceman to vote for President only. Such a limitation is a travesty on our whole system of government. If the serviceman is to be allowed to vote, he should be allowed to vote the entire ticket—national, State, county, and city.

Let's consider, then, the election of National Representatives as a practical problem. I pick Representatives because the Congress undoubtedly has power to control the election of these legislators. See article I, section 4, paragraph 1, of the Constitution.

There are 435 Representatives to be elected next year. Seven of these are elected at large in States where other Congressmen are elected by districts.

One of these Congressmen at Large is elected in Illinois. Candidates for Congressman at Large in Illinois will appear on all State ballots, and the same is true in other States where Congressmen at Large are elected, namely, Connecticut, Florida, New York (2), Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Also, in Arizona, New Mexico, and North Dakota, in each of which States 2 Congressmen are elected, all voters vote for both Congressmen. There are, thus, 425 separate congressional ballots from which the right one must be selected for each individual voter.

It follows that any Federal agency created to take charge of servicemen's voting would have to have 425 separate ballots for distribution just to vote for President, Senators, and Representatives. All of these ballots would have to be distributed to all points where servicemen are assembled, for in the present make-up of our Armed Forces men from different States are inextricably mingled. Incidentally, it should be pointed out here that many of these servicemen are not of voting age, and some of them are not citizens.

Now, let's carry this a step further. How are we going to get the right ballot into the hands of the individual serviceman? Are we going to assemble and train a great new Federal authority and send its members into every part of the world where voting will be done to take charge of the voting? If so, are we not going to have to send two men to each spot—one to represent each of the major parties? Will not any such arrangement be under suspicion of political influence? Or shall we leave the matter of distribution in the hands of Army and Navy officers, who have some few other matters to attend to?

Let's suppose the officers are in charge. There is a man from Illinois who comes up for a ballot. The officer says, "What congressional district do you live in?" Your experience, of course, has taught you that most citizens do not know the number of the congressional district in which they live, and many do not even know the name of their Congressman. In the majority of cases, the serviceman can only give his home address. I can give you eight addresses on Halsted Street in Chicago, each of which is in a different congressional district. Of course, the Federal Government can supply the officer with a reference manual, giving the congressional district of each separate address. Such a manual would be considerably larger than an unabridged dictionary. I have on my desk a book giving the ward and precinct of all addresses in Chicago. It is a volume of 369 pages. And we have New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, and some 25 or 30 other major cities in which there is more than one congressional district. How much time is it going to take to get the right ballot into the hands of every member of a single company?

But why limit the serviceman to voting for President, Senators, and Representatives? Should he not also have the right to vote for the Governor of his State? And if for Governor of his State, should he not also have the right to vote for State senators and State representatives? Without laboring the argument, let me point out that there are 51 senatorial districts in Illinois, 19 of which are, in whole or in part, in the city of Chicago. And the boundaries of these senatorial districts are entirely different from the boundaries of congressional districts.

Also if the serviceman comes from Illinois, should he not have the right to vote for State's attorney in his county? There are 102 counties in Illinois.

As a practical matter, the best possible solution to the difficult problem of servicemen's voting is to have local election boards handle the vote through absentee ballots. If this is done, the serviceman will receive automatically the precise ballot on which he must express his choice, and he will have the opportunity to vote for all offices to be filled—Federal, State, county, and municipal—from President down to dog catcher. The problem of distribution will be no more difficult than distributing the serviceman's mail. There will be no necessity for setting up a new and extensive instrumentality, probably inexperienced and inefficient. There are some difficulties attendant on this method, but they are insignificant compared with the Federal control proposition. Legislation needed is about as follows:

1. Legislation by the Congress:

(a) Making it mandatory on the various services to furnish State officers with the names, home addresses, service addresses, age, and citizenship status of all men in service.

(b) Authorizing the printing and distribution to the States of distinctive envelopes and return envelopes for service ballots.

(c) Making it mandatory on the services to expedite the delivery and return of absentee ballots. In this connection, it might be noted that the mailing requirements under this plan would probably throw less of a burden on the services than any probable Federal plan, for if a dozen men are stationed at one point, it would only be necessary to send them 12 ballots instead of several hundred ballots from which the right ones must be chosen.

(d) Setting the date for soldier voting about 2 weeks ahead of the regular election date. There is some doubt about the constitutionality of such legislation, but if it is not done, we may not know the results of the election until 2 weeks or so after the regular election date. This election date problem arises in connection with every plan for servicemen voting.

2. Legislation by the States (special sessions of the legislature necessary in many cases):

(a) Arranging for distribution to proper county and city election boards of the names received from the services.

(b) Changing present laws to permit the printing and mailing of absentee ballots at least 2 weeks prior to the date now set. Under present Illinois laws, there is not sufficient time allowed for ballots to be sent out of the country and returned.

(c) Supplementing, if necessary, Federal legislation changing the voting date.

Just a word about voting in primary elections. Most States now have primaries. In some, and Illinois is one of them, the voter is required to ask for the ballot of his chosen party. When you yourself go to the polls, you have to ask for a Republican ballot. I do not believe the Federal Government has the power to change or modify this requirement of the Illinois law. Many servicemen might fear the consequences to themselves if they were to ask for a Republican ballot. However, as voters, they should have the right to do so if they so desire.

In this global war, citizenship voting is a complex and difficult problem. I can see no reason for believing that Senators and Congressmen who have voted against the Federal voting bills so far presented have been motivated by any other consideration than an honest desire for a practical solution.

With all good wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

FRED W. BLAISDELL,
Executive Director.

Deduction of Life-Insurance Premiums From Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, 1943, I introduced H. R.

3736 providing for deduction of life-insurance premiums from income-tax returns. An individual's family, estate taxes, and inheritance taxes should be protected by life insurance.

The bill provides for deduction of life-insurance premiums paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year as premiums on life-insurance policies upon his own life or upon the life of his spouse or upon the life of any dependent of the taxpayer, to an amount which in any taxable year does not exceed 10 percent of the taxpayer's net income or $1,000, whichever is the lesser.

State Strait Jackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

STATE STRAIT JACKETS

The controversy over antipoll-tax and soldier-vote legislation has brought the issue of States' rights conspicuously to the fore of late. As a result attention is being increasingly directed to the need for reforming State constitutions so as to permit the States to meet more of their own political, social and economic problems.

Many State governments are at present seriously handicapped by constitutional limitations upon legislative action. Moreover, the elimination of hampering constitutional provisions through amendment has been made unnecessarily difficult and time-consuming for many of the States. As a result, constitutional provisions that may have been introduced in response to popular sentiment remain often as obstacles to legislation desired by a majority of the people. Such is probably the case in some of the Southern States that still retain poll-tax laws, removable only by constitutional amendment.

Federal encroachment upon the domain of the States has made tremendous headway in recent years. That trend has been fostered by social and economic changes that have brought the people of all sections closer together and encouraged centralization of governmental powers. However, the broadened scope of Federal activities is in part an outcome of the States' failure to discharge the legislative responsibilities that fall within their jurisdiction. Hesitant, dilatory response to the changing needs of a dynamic society or sometimes no resuponse at all, have caused the American people to turn increasingly to Congress for the legislative relief that they fail to receive from their own State governments.

This trend toward concentration of authority in the hands of Federal officials is bound to gain headway unless the States counter it by positive measures of self-reform. One of the most important objectives of reform should be the removal of constitutional strait jackets that hamper legislative freedom of action. Now is the time for the States to get ready to deal with post-war problems by streamlining cumbrous and outmoded constitutions and junking antiquated laws so as to insure flexibility of their post-war legislative machinery.

Court Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3270 contains the most unusual piece of legislation ever attempted in the United States. The major fire insurance stock companies of the United States were informed against by the Attorney General of the United States, charged with violation of the Sherman antitrust laws.

The case came up in the southern district of Georgia and the presiding judge at Atlanta sustained the demurrers filed by the defendants. In other words, the presiding judge held that the business of fire-insurance companies domiciled in one State and doing business in others was not interstate commerce. The Government appealed the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it now is and is as yet undecided.

The defendants, before a decision is announced, now seek to have Congress pass an act declaring that such business is not interstate commerce and thus deprive the Supreme Court of making any decision and forcing it to follow the direction of Congress.

The best argument I have read against this bill was made by the Honorable CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Congressman from Indiana. His speeches on the subject may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His argument seems to me unanswerable. It took nerve to make this argument, since his law firm represents a large number of insurance companies. The Washington Post has been so impressed with these arguments that on January 4 and January 7 the following editorials appeared:

[From the Washington Post of January 4, 1944]

FIRE INSURANCE

The major fire insurance stock companies of the United States are trying to take out an insurance policy against the Supreme Court. They were indicted by the Department of Justice for violating the Federal antitrust laws. It is the contention of their spokesmen, who are both numerous and vocal, that the antitrust laws never at any time applied to the insurance industry, never were intended to apply to it, on the ground that insurance is not commerce. A district court of the United States upheld this view. But the Department of Justice appealed its case to the Supreme Court, which will probably render a decision in the matter very soon.

Despite all their vehement insistence that they do not come within the purview of the antitrust laws, the fire insurance companies did not care to run any risks with the Supreme Court. So they introduced in Congress a wonderfully simple piece of legislation. It seems worth quoting here in full as a model for all groups or industries which might like to avoid the sometimes irksome and restrictive provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

"Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in anywise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States."

Simple, isn't it? Why, it would save the Supreme Court all the trouble of figuring out for itself the scope of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Even in a season when special pleading before Congress appears to be the vogue, this insurance bill ranks, by a wide margin, as the most extraordinary example of group advantage ever presented to a legislature. Representative CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, characterized the bill very well, we think, when he said: "This legislation is simply the unconscionable and immoral attempt to interfere with orderly judicial procedure, to strike at the very roots of the existence of an untrammeled and unfettered judicial system by legislative enactment, which is equally as subject to public censure as the attempt made in 1937 to do the same thing by executive interference."

As is so often the case in issues of this sort, the pleaders for immunity from Federal law are piously chanting that they are defenders of States' rights. Perhaps this is a shrewd tactic in a Congress ridden by sectionalism. But it is also arrant nonsense. The fire-insurance companies will remain just as subject to State regulation as they are now if they are found to fall within the scope of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. They will simply be compelled to cease conspiring with one another across State lines for the purpose of restraining trade. Even if the Federal Government undertook to regulate the insurance industry, which is not now proposed, State laws regarding them would not be abrogated. The Federal Government regulates railroads and banks; yet both are subject at the same time to State governance. It entails no diminution of the rights of the States to afford them Federal assistance in safeguarding the general welfare.

[From the Washington Post of January 7, 1944]

FIRE EATER

The most shocking fact about H. R. 3270, the insurance bill, is that it received the approval of the Judiciary Committee of the House. This bill, reduced to its naked intent, would grant to the fire insurance industry of the country an immunity from the antitrust laws—in effect, imposing, as we see it, a legislative restriction upon the Supreme Court. And this at a moment when the Court actually has before it an indictment of certain fire-insurance companies on the basis of which it will determine whether they are engaged in interstate commerce and therefore subject to the provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. It is proposed, in short, that Congress interfere with the ordinary course of justice in behalf of a particular litigant. Senator O'MAHONEY succeeded in blocking a hasty endorsement by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. But a majority of the House group showed no hesitation in putting its imprimatur upon this flagrant invasion of the judicial province.

The insurance bill might, indeed, have moved to easy enactment in the House had it not been for the integrity, energy, and acumen of one man—Representative CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana. This Congressman, after the most painstaking research, prepared a careful analysis both of the legal improprieties of H. R. 3270 and of the discriminatory rates imposed by insurance companies under their present freedom from Federal regulation. He exposed the purposes of the insurance lobby. He demonstrated beyond contest the utter irrelevancy of the States' rights pleas entered by the bill's sponsors. For his pains he was ignored by the

very people who should have been most concerned with what he had to say.

Having inserted his analysis of the insurance bill into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. LAFOLLETTE distributed copies of it to every member of the House Judiciary Committee and gave notice that he would defend his arguments on the floor on December 15. When he rose to speak on that date not a single member of the committee showed either the courtesy or interest to be present. Their absence is an unhappy commentary on the legislative process. For this is a constitutional issue of real significance. And the Constitution can be undermined as well by indifference as by venality. Mr. LAFOLLETTE's penetrating study of the insurance issue illuminates the sometimes tedious columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We commend it as edifying reading to all Congressmen who failed to hear him speak.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1943, I discussed in this House the question of the Presidential policy of rolling back prices on farm products and the accompanying payment of subsidies. I then discussed the two measures known as the anti-inflation bills previously enacted by the Congress. This legislation contained the exact provisions insisted upon by the President of the United States when the bills were before the Congress for its approval. The President assured the Congress and the country that if given these laws he could and would prevent inflation. No informed person questioned his authority to do exactly as he then promised to do. It must be apparent to everyone that at that time inflation had already developed.

Mr. Roosevelt's failure to stop inflation and his attempts to justify the subsidy-payment program upon the grounds that he, working through the agencies which he himself set up, does not have the power to do the job in any other way, and that the only manner in which inflation can be stopped is through borrowing money, thereby increasing the national debt and using this money to pay a part of the food bill for the people of the United States, are, in the light of an opinion handed down by the United States Emergency Court of Appeals on December 15, 1943, nothing less than pure "baloney."

I stated in my remarks on November 23 that the President can stop inflation exactly where it now is, that he needs no further legislation or power. Every day prices are changed by order of the Office of Price Administration. The O. P. A., the agency which the President himself set up for the purpose, can and does fix prices from time to time.

It must have been a shock to Mr. Roosevelt when the Emergency Court of Appeals, in disposing of the five cases, handed down what will be known as one of the most comprehensive and illuminating opinions which cleared any doubt whatsoever as to the powers of the O. P. A. to do exactly as I stated on November 23 they could do. The court went out of its way to thoroughly cover the whole subject and to dispel any doubt as to the authority of this governmental agency.

Mr. Roosevelt's attempt to shift the responsibility for the growing inflation from his shoulders to the Congress of the United States is fully disclosed by the opinion of the court. It must be clear to informed and thinking persons that the President had in mind something other than stopping inflation when he asked for a program which in itself creates inflation. It is understood that the rollback of prices on agricultural products and payment of subsidies is only the beginning of the program; that some of the wild-eyed and long-haired gentry who appear to be running our domestic affairs have in mind subsidizing everything, giving to the bureaucrats the power to fix prices and pay subsidies. If this program is successful, just how far will we be from dictatorial socialism? Our hats are off to the Emergency Court of Appeals.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the court follows:

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

No. 47: Philadelphia Coke Co., complainant, against Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, respondent.

No. 50: Connecticut Coke Co., complainant, against Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, respondent.

No. 51: Rainey-Wood Coke Co., complainant, against Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, respondent.

No. 52: Koppers Co. (Minnesota division), complainant, against Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, respondent.

No. 53: Koppers Co. (Seaboard division), complainant, against Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, respondent.

Heard at Philadelphia October 4, 1943. Decided December 15, 1943.

Mr. Gilbert W. Oswald, with whom Mr. William A. Schnader was on the brief, for complainants.

Mr. Morton Meyers, attorney, with whom Messrs. George J. Burke, general counsel; Thomas I. Emerson, associate general counsel; Nathaniel L. Nathanson, associate general counsel, and Maurice Alexandre and Irving Schwartz, attorneys, all of the Office of Price Administration, were on the brief, for respondent.

Before Maris, chief judge, and Magruder and Laws, judges.

Maris, chief judge: The complainants are independent[1] manufacturers of coke and coke-oven gas and represent the major independent production of coke-oven gas in the United States. Their practice is to sell coke-oven gas to utility companies under long-term contracts which specify a basic price for the gas and contain an adjustment clause under which the price of the gas sold is varied on a fixed scale in proportion to increases or decreases in the cost of the coal from which the gas is produced. Contracts of this type are presently in force in the case of each of the complainants except the Philadelphia Coke Co. For reasons which need not here be set out that company's contract with the Philadelphia Gas Works Co. for the sale of coke-oven gas contains an adjustment clause which is based on increases in the cost of the production of water gas by the Gas Works Co. rather than in the cost of coal to the Coke Co.

On April 28, 1942, the Price Administrator issued the general maximum price regulation under which the prices of commodities generally, including the complainants' coke-oven gas, were frozen at the highest prices charged by the sellers during March 1942. Within 60 days thereafter complainants filed their protests against the general maximum price regulation as applied to the sale and delivery of coke-oven gas by them under their existing contracts. Thereafter the Administrator denied the complainants' protests, whereupon they filed the complaints now before us.

At the outset we are met with the question whether the Emergency Price Control Act authorized the issuance by the Administrator of a general over-all regulation of prices such as the general maximum price regulation here complained against. While the complainants disclaim any intention of making a general attack upon that regulation, such an attack is implicit in their contention that the act does not authorize the application of the regulation to their sales of coke-oven gas. They base this contention upon the proposition that the general maximum price regulation may, under the terms of the act, only be applied to a commodity if the prices of that commodity have risen or threatened to rise to an abnormal, unwarranted, or excessive extent and upon the asserted fact that the prices of their coke-oven gas have not risen or threatened to rise to that extent.

Passing, for the moment, the question of the validity of the complainants' assertion that the prices of their product have not risen or threatened to rise to an extent inconsistent with the purposes of the act, it will be observed that if the general maximum price regulation is construed as applicable only to prices which are affirmatively shown to be rising or threatening to rise it ceases to be an over-all price regulation, but is in effect merely an aggregation of regulations of the prices of those individual commodities whose prices have been shown to have risen or threatened to rise to an extent inconsistent with the act. We must, therefore, consider whether the act authorizes the Administrator to issue an over-all regulation fixing maximum prices for all commodities upon a finding of a general threat of inflationary price increases throughout the economy but without an individual finding in the case of each commodity regulated that its prices have risen or threatened to rise to an abnormal, unwarranted, or excessive extent.

In the early stages of an inflationary movement it may well be that the individual regulation of those commodity prices which are more particularly affected will be sufficient to halt the movement. There comes a time, however, in the course of an unchecked inflationary movement when it gains such momentum that inflationary pressures with their resulting rises and threats of rises in prices make themselves felt throughout the whole economy. Does the act authorize a general over-all regulation of all commodity prices if and when this stage is reached? Section 2 (a) of the act specifically provides that "Whenever in the judgment of the Price Administrator * * * the * * * prices of * * * commodities have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this act, he may by regulation or order establish such * * * maximum prices as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act." This is a specific authorization to the Administrator to establish maximum prices by a single regulation when the prices of commodities generally have risen or threaten to rise to an undue extent. That Congress contemplated the exercise of this authority

[1] That is, they are wholly unaffiliated with the public utility companies to whom they sell their coke-oven gas.

through the imposition of a general overall price ceiling, if it should be found necessary, appears from the legislative history of the act.[2]

The complainants strongly contend that the act is intended to prevent only those price rises which are found to be abnormal, unwarranted, and excessive and that it is not intended to confer and does not confer power to prevent all rises in prices. Section 1 (a) of the act states it to be among the purposes of the act "to stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents" and "to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices." The act contains no definition of the terms thus used, however, and they must, therefore, be given their ordinary meaning in the light of the kind of danger which the act is intended to combat. Since it is the danger of uncontrolled inflation with which the act is concerned, we may assume that only those price increases are to be deemed abnormal, unwarranted, or excessive which may have a tendency to bring on or accelerate an inflationary movement. Since in the early stages of such a movement small increases in the prices of some commodities may have no such tendency, they may for that reason be considered as normal and not excessive. When the movement reaches a point, however, at which inflationary pressures begin to appear in commodity prices generally throughout the entire economy it becomes true that any increase, however small, in the price of a single commodity may be inflationary both in origin and effect and may, therefore, fairly be described as abnormal within the meaning of the act. (See *Lincoln Savings Bank* v. *Brown*, 137 F. 2d 228 (E. C. A. 1943); *Spaeth* v. *Brown*, 137 F. 2d 669 (E. C. A. 1943).)

As we have seen, the first stated purpose of the act is "to stabilize prices." To stabilize has been defined as "to make or hold steady; to prevent fluctuations; as, to stabilize prices." Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, page 2449, definition 2. To stabilize prices in an economy the whole of which is under general inflationary pressure involves holding them steady against any and all increases even though it may not be apparent that such increases have been brought about by inflationary pressure or that they will in their turn tend to increase such pressure upon the prices of other commodities. In a complicated economy such as ours the phenomena of price increases are the result of a complex of causes, the interaction of many economic forces. When inflationary pressure is one of the major forces operating in the economy it is wholly unrealistic to consider the price of a single commodity as in an economic vacuum and say that no threat of an inflationary increase can be discovered. Each commodity price must then be considered in the light of the fact that it forms an integral part of the whole price structure.

We conclude that if and when an inflationary movement reaches the point where it can fairly be said that inflationary pressures have so permeated the price structure that there exists in the case of substantially all commodities a threat of price increases which if permitted to take place will have an inflationary effect, all further price increases of all commodities are to be regarded as abnormal within the meaning of the act and are, therefore, subject to regulation by the Administrator. We are thus brought to the question whether at the time of the issuance of the general maximum price regulation on April 28, 1942, the inflationary movement in the United States had reached that point. In the preamble to the general maximum price regulation the Administrator expressed his judgment upon this matter as follows:

"In the judgment of the Price Administrator the prices of commodities and services generally have risen and are threatening further to rise to an extent and in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942."

His conclusion was based upon developments in the economy of the country which he summarized in the statement of considerations accompanying the regulation in the following language:

"A gap has appeared between the supply of goods and services which is available and the purchasing power or demand of the people who wish to buy these goods and services. This gap is widening. Both military and civilian demand have increased vastly in recent months. War expenditures, which totaled $1,000,000,000 in March 1941 and $2,000,000,000 in December 1941, rose to nearly $3,000,000,000 in March 1942. In December 1942, on the basis of present authorizations, these expenditures will exceed $6,000,000,000.

"Civilian demand has its source in income payments to individuals by the Government and by industry. The rate of monthly increase in these payments has advanced from one-half of one percent in the months immediately following the outbreak of the war in September 1939 to 1 percent, to 1½ percent, and since March 1941 to 2 percent. There is evidence of a further acceleration in this rate of increase in the future.

"The supply of civilian goods and services available for purchase from this income is diminishing. Manpower, materials, and machinery are being devoted to the production of planes, ships, tanks, and guns instead of to the production of civilian goods and services. The supply of such civilian goods and services will be progressively reduced by approximately 1 percent per month for the balance of this year.

"During 1941, it is estimated, individual income totaled $92,000,000,000. Of this amount $18,000,000,000 was accounted for by personal taxes and individual savings, and $74,000,000,000 was spent on consumers' goods and services.

"During 1942, at the present rate of increase of income payments, individual income will total $117,000,000,000. Of this amount, it is estimated $31,000,000,000 will be saved or paid to the Government in personal taxes and $86,000,000,000 will be spent.

"The supply of goods and services available for civilian use totaled $74,000,000,000 in 1941. During 1942, the supply will total $65,000,000,000, computed on the basis of 1941 prices. Making allowance for the increase in prices which took place prior to April 1, 1942, the supply will total $69,000,000,000.

"Thus, demand in 1942, unless limited, will exceed supply by $17,000,000,000."

The complainants offered no evidence to disprove the facts thus relied on by the Administrator and we must accordingly accept them as correct (*Montgomery Ward & Co.* v. *Bowles*, — F. (2d) —; E. C. A., Nov. 5, 1943). In our opinion they disclose a situation which justified the Administrator under the authority conferred upon him by the act in imposing a general over-all ceiling upon the prices of all commodities including those whose prices had not risen or given evidence of a threat of an imminent rise. The extent of the inflationary pressure exerted by a pool of excess purchasing power as large as $17,000,000,000 in a single year staggers the imagination. Its existence presented in 1942 and still presents a frightful peril to the Nation. Certainly the existence of this tremendous pressure justified the conclusion of the Administrator that the whole price structure was threatened with inflationary increases.

In his first quarterly report to Congress the Administrator made the following statement in explanation of his action:

"Price control had been extended on a piecemeal basis to each spot where inflation threatened. Formal and informal controls combined had brought half of the economy under control at the wholesale level. To stabilize the remainder of the economy at the wholesale level by piecemeal methods would require hundreds, if not thousands, of additional individual price actions. To stabilize retail prices on a similar basis would require almost innumerable individual price schedules.

"This type of approach presented extremely difficult mechanical and administrative problems. But this was not the important point. The prime question that had to be considered and resolved was whether a serious inflation could be averted by a piece-meal program. The time had come for a reappraisal of the general situation.

"As to prices themselves, it was clear that most of the major components of the general index of wholesale prices were moving up sharply. Inflationary pressures were spreading from one commodity to another—from local segments of the economy to the entire business structure. Pressure on prices was no longer specific and local, it was becoming general."

After the issuance of the general maximum price regulation and in the light of this explanation by the Administrator of his reasons for issuing it Congress twice enacted amendments[3] of the Emergency Price Control Act and three times appropriated[4] funds to carry on the activities of the Office of Price Administration, in each case without expressing disapproval of the general maximum price regulation or in any way restricting the use for its enforcement of funds appropriated to the Office. We are justified in drawing the inference that the Administrator's interpretation of the act as giving him authority to issue an over-all price regulation has met with congressional acceptance and approval. *Norwegian Nitrogen Co.* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 294, 313 (1933)); *Costanzo* v. *Tillinghast* (287 U. S. 341, 345 (1932)).

What has been said disposes of the complainants' contention that the general maximum price regulation should not be applied to the prices of their coke-oven gas for the reason that those prices have not risen or threatened to rise to an extent inconsistent with the purposes of the act, but that, on the contrary, those prices are fully stabilized under the provisions of the long-term contracts under which the gas is sold. Moreover, those prices are not in fact stabilized, as the complainants assert. On the contrary, there is a very real threat of an increase in the prices of complainants' gas to an extent inconsistent with the purposes of the act. It is true that the complainants' sales contracts do definitely fix the prices at which the complainants may sell their gas, both now and for some time to come. In this sense it might be said that their prices are stabilized. But this does not mean that the purchasers of the gas are not presently threatened with increases in the price. On the contrary, the very terms of the contracts make it certain that, except for the intervention of the General Maximum Price Regulation, the prices of the complainants' coke-oven gas will increase as the price of the coal from which the gas is produced increases.

---

[2] See hearings on H. R. 5990 before House Committee on Banking and Currency, 77th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 862, 863; hearings on H. R. 5990 before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 213; Senate Rept. No. 931, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 14; remarks of Senator BROWN in the Senate on January 7, 1942, 88th CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 52.

[3] Act of October 2, 1942, 56 Stat. 767; act of July 16, 1943, Pub. Law 151.

[4] Act of July 25, 1942, 56 Stat. 711; act of October 26, 1942, 56 Stat. 996; act of July 12, 1943, Pub. Law 139.

Thus, a very definite threat of an increase in the price of coke-oven gas faces complainants' customers. That such an increase, if permitted to take place, will involve an inflationary pressure upon the utility companies which purchase the gas from the complainants cannot be doubted. It is of no significance that since those companies are themselves subject to rate regulation they may be unable without approval of the regulatory authorities to pass such an increase on to the ultimate consumers. The Emergency Price Control Act is not directed at the stabilization of retail prices alone but gives authority to stabilize prices at every level of production and distribution. Its stated purpose is not only to protect consumers from inflationary increases in the prices of the commodities they must buy but also to afford similar protection to persons engaged in business. The complainants' argument that the peacetime operation of their price-adjustment clauses has not resulted in an increase in the price of the gas to the ultimate consumers does not convince us that such an increase would not result if the inflationary movement in our present wartime economy should get out of hand. Certainly we cannot assume that the utility commissions which fix the rates charged by complainants' customers would be deaf to what well might be justifiable requests for rate increases under such circumstances.

We conclude that the Emergency Price Control Act authorized the Administrator in April 1942 to impose a ceiling upon the prices of the complainants' coke-oven gas by means of a general over-all regulation. The question remains whether the general maximum price regulation, as applied by the Administrator to the sale of the complainants' coke-oven gas, complies with the requirement of the act that it shall be generally fair and equitable, or whether, as the complainants contend, its application to the sale of their product is arbitrary and unreasonable and, therefore, invalid.

The act very properly lays down certain standards to which maximum price regulations shall conform. One of these is that such a regulation shall be generally fair and equitable in its application to the sellers of a particular commodity. In other words a regulation fixing the maximum price to be charged by the sellers of a community must be fair and equitable in its application to the group of sellers considered as a whole. If its application to a major portion of the industry is unfair or inequitable, it does not meet this standard. The act does not require, however, that a regulation shall protect each individual member of the industry in the enjoyment of his customary profits. *United States Gypsum Co.* v. *Brown* (137 F. 2d 803 (E. C. A. 1943)).

The act also directs the Administrator in issuing price regulations to take account of all relevant factors which he finds to be of general applicability, including "general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity" (section 2 (a)). Here again the act is concerned only with factors of general applicability in the industry. The complainants argue that this provision requires the Administrator to make adjustment for general increases in costs of production and transportation, independent of the question of the state or degree of profit or loss of a given seller or his industry. We do not so read the act. The Administrator must act in the light of all the relevant factors. He cannot rely upon one while ignoring others equally relevant. For it may appear that increased costs in some directions will be offset by other factors which tend to decrease costs and increase profits. See *Chatlos* v. *Brown* (136 F. 2d 490 (E. C. A. 1943)); *Spaeth* v. *Brown* (137 F. 2d 669 (E. C. A. 1943)).

The complainants urge that it is unreasonable and arbitrary for the Administrator to freeze the price of their coke-oven gas rigidly at the level of March 1942, while at the same time permitting large increases in the price of the bituminous coal from which their gas is manufactured. It is conceded that such increases have been permitted by amendments which the Administrator has made to Price Regulation No. 120 regulating the price of bituminous coal. The complainants' contention is that it is basically unfair and unreasonable to freeze the price of one commodity processed from another without adjustment to large increases in the cost of the basic material. The argument thus is based upon the proposition that it is unfair, unreasonable, and contrary to the intention of the act for the Administrator to issue a regulation which operates to prevent a manufacturer or dealer in commodities from passing on to his customers increases in his costs regardless of whether those increases have actually prevented him from realizing a reasonable profit upon his operations.

The present complainants have stated expressly that they do not base their complaints upon the ground that the application of the General Maximum Price Regulation to the sale of coke-oven gas has prevented the independent producers of that gas as a group from realizing a reasonable profit upon that business. If such were the case a different situation would be presented which might afford valid grounds for contesting the application of the regulation to the complainants. Moreover the Administrator concedes that it is his statutory duty to revise his price regulations from time to time if upon considerations of all relevant factors, of which general increases in costs is one, it appears that the regulation is no longer generally fair and equitable to the industry. Therefor, if after the issuance of a regulation a general industry-wide increase in costs of production and transportation should take place which results in an unreasonable decrease or in a complete wiping out of the profits realized by the industry, that fact would doubtless afford new grounds for protest of the regulation. See *Chatlos* v. *Brown*, 136 F. 2d 490 (E. C. A. 1943). The fact, however, that the regulation prevents the complainants from passing on to their customers a part of their increased costs by charging the increased prices which their existing contracts authorize does not of itself render the application of the regulation unfair or inequitable as to them.

The complainants say that since in any event the price of gas to the ultimate consumers would not be affected, the sole effect of the regulation is to give to their utility company customers an unsolicited release from their existing contractual obligations to absorb a portion of the increased cost of the manufacture of the gas and to impose the whole burden of the increase upon the complainants. This, they say, does not in any way effectuate the purposes of the act. But, as we have seen, the complainants' premise cannot be sustained and without it the point is of no validity. It will unquestionably be necessary for the Administrator, in carrying out the enormous task assigned to him, to authorize increases here and there in the price structure from time to time as he has done in the case of bituminous coal. These increases may become necessary in order to stimulate the production of some commodities in the quantities required by the Nation or in order that the price regulations applicable to other commodities may continue to be fair and equitable in the light of changing costs and profits. Such increases will no doubt be inflationary in their effect, and, therefore, abnormal, even though they are necessary in order to carry out the statutory mandate that price regulations shall not bear unfairly and inequitably upon the industry regulated. When such price increases do have to be made at a particular level in the price structure it does not follow that corresponding increases must be made at all other levels. On the contrary, such corresponding increases may be wholly inconsistent with the purposes of the act, since one of its primary purposes is to protect the vast army of salary and wage earners from having to bear the brunt of all such increases. Consequently when such price increases are permitted it is the duty of the Administrator, so far as possible, to require them to be absorbed at some appropriate intermediate stage in the process of production and distribution at which there may be an existing margin of profit reasonably sufficient to absorb them. The complainants have made no showing that they do not have in their industry a margin of profit sufficient to absorb the increased cost of coal. In the absence of any such showing it cannot be held that the Administrator was not acting within the limits of his statutory discretion or that he was arbitrary or unreasonable in requiring the complainants to absorb the increase.

The complainants next contend that the application of the General Maximum Price Regulation to their business places the long-term contracts upon which their entire business structures have been founded in jeopardy of being declared invalid. We are not impressed with this contention. The complainants rely for its support upon the case of *In re Kramer & Uchitelle* (288 N. Y. 467, 43 N. E. 2d 493 (1942). In that case the seller under a contract for the sale of merchandise as to which a price regulation had subsequently established a lower price than that fixed in the contract refused to make delivery under the contract. The court held that the seller was excused from performance, saying: "By act of government there was complete frustration of performance excusing the seller from performance as matter of law." The situation with which we are confronted in the present case is wholly different, however. Here if the complainants promptly elect to carry out the contracts at the prices fixed by the regulation the utility companies who purchase the gas can hardly object for they are in fact benefited by the application of the regulation since its sole effect is to suspend the operation of the contract clauses which provide for an increase in the prices which they must pay. But this we need not decide since we are satisfied that even if the necessary incidental effect of the regulation is to invalidate the contracts it may not for that reason be regarded as arbitrary or unreasonable in its application to the complainants.

The effect of the acceleration clauses in the complainants' contracts is to regulate the extent to which increases in their costs may be passed on to their customers by way of increased prices for their gas. But, as we have seen, it is one of the primary functions of the Price Administrator to determine at what stage in the processes of production and distribution necessary increases in the prices of raw materials and in other costs are to be absorbed. It is for him to decide, after considering the whole economy of the country and all the factors which bear upon the question, whether such increased costs are to be absorbed immediately by the manufacturer or whether they are to be passed down, by way of increased prices, to be absorbed at a later stage in the process of distribution or at the consumer level. The possible prejudice to the complainants' existing contracts is undoubtedly one of the factors for the Administrator to consider in deciding this question in their case, but it is not a necessarily decisive factor, and insofar as the complainants by these contracts have sought to settle this question for the future in their industry they have encroached upon the legislative power which Congress has delegated to the Administrator.

The contracts, insofar as they provide for increased prices, accordingly cannot stand as against the judgment of the Administrator that the purposes of the act require that the increased costs to which the contracts refer ought not to be passed on to the complainants' customers in the form of increased prices. As was said by Justice Holmes in *Dillingham* v. *McLaughlin* (264 U. S. 370, 374 (1924)): "The operation of reasonable laws for the protection of the public cannot be headed off by making contracts reaching into the future." See our discussion of a similar contention under the rent control provisions of the act in *Taylor* v. *Brown* (137 F. 2d 654 (E. C. A. 1943), cert. den., — U. S. — (Nov. 15, 1943)). The Administrator's judgment is, of course, based upon the proposition that the application of the regulation to the complainants' industry is generally fair and equitable. As we have already indicated, a different question might well be raised if it appeared that the margin of profit in the complainants' industry will be unreasonably impaired thereby. The complainants, however, have made no such showing here.

The complainants contend that the general maximum price regulation as applied to their business violates section 2 (h)[5] of the act in that it destroys their fundamental and established business practice of selling coke-oven gas at a base price continuously adjusted to changes in the cost of coal. It may be conceded that in a broad sense this is a business practice but we are clear that it is not a business practice within the meaning of section 2 (h) of the act. On the contrary, it is what may fairly be described as a pricing practice and is, therefore, unquestionably within the regulatory power of the Administrator. It would wholly destroy the effectiveness of the act if section 2 (h) were to be construed as placing it beyond the power of the Administrator to deal with established business practices which directly affect the fixing of the prices of commodities. It is obvious that any control of prices will directly interfere with those business practices which relate to the fixing of prices. It was only to make sure that the Administrator would not go beyond his price-regulating function and engage in an effort to reform business practices which were not directly related to prices that section 2 (h) was inserted in the act. See *United States Gypsum Co.* v. *Brown*, 137 F. 2d 803 (E. C. A. 1943).

Finally, the complainants contend that the General Maximum Price Regulation as applied to their sale of coke-oven gas violates the Fifth Amendment. For the reasons already stated, we think that the regulation as applied to the complainants' sales is within the war power of Congress and accordingly does not deprive the complainants of their property without due process of law. (See our discussion of a similar contention arising under the rent-control provisions of the act in *Taylor* v. *Brown*, 137 F. 2d 654 (E. C. A. 1943), cert. den. — U. S. — (November 15, 1943).)

The complaints are dismissed.

Laws, Judge, concurring: I agree with the disposition of these cases and generally with the views stated in the opinion of the Court, but since there are statements with which I differ and since they may affect future cases, it may be useful to state my views respecting them.

In my judgment the record before us does not establish, as the opinion of the court in effect states, that any increase in the price of coal to producers of coke oven gas would have a tendency toward inflation and therefore the price of coke oven gas might be controlled by the Administrator. In the usual case any price increase whatever might tend toward inflation because it would affect, or tend to affect, the public. But the industry here concerned is different from most of those affected by the regulation. The consuming public does not purchase directly from the industry, but from utility companies supplied by it. Protection is afforded against increased prices to the public through regulation by public-utility commissions, since they approve only rates which will yield returns on investments similar to those the Administrator ordinarily would allow. Throughout this industry, long-term contracts customarily have been made. By them, increases in prices of coal, the principal product used in the manufacture of the gas, are divided between producers of the gas and their utility company customers. According to the record it has not been the practice in previous years to pass these increases on to consumers. Public-utility commissions would not permit increases in the rates charged by the public utility companies upon a showing only that there had been coal price increases within the range of previous years. Therefore, it seems to me purely theoretical to reason that the consuming public is threatened with increases in prices simply because of an increase in coal prices paid by the industry. If and when prices of coal rise beyond the heights of previous years (increases may occur only when the Administrator finds they are required by the act), there may be a threat to the public of a price rise, and then is the time when the regulation properly might be applied to the coke oven gas industry. In view of these circumstances I think it does not appear affirmatively from the record that at the time of the issuance of the General Maximum Price Regulation there was, because of actual or threatened increases in coal prices, such a threat of inflation as would justify the imposition of a price freeze by the Administrator upon the coke oven gas industry. Therefore, if this were the only basis for finding a threat of inflation, I believe complainants would be entitled to relief. Granting the right of the Administrator to issue a general over-all regulation, nevertheless if later he had been shown that the regulation, insofar as the coke oven gas industry was concerned, was not necessary in order to protect the public, but had only the effect of interfering with important contracts between producers, it would have been arbitrary and unreasonable as to that industry and should have been lifted.

However, in the coke oven gas industry and in the industries using its goods and services, there may be threats of rises in production costs other than costs of coal and these rises combined with those in coal costs may menace consumer prices. The record before us is barren of any showing that there are no threats of rises with respect to these items. Since complainants have the burden of showing such a cumulative threat did not exist, and their evidence fails in the respect mentioned, the views which I have expressed contrary to those in the opinion of the Court do not afford a basis for their relief.

I am not in accord with the statement in the opinion that because business practices in an industry may fairly be described as pricing practices they are within the regulatory power of the Administrator. I think this statement is too general. As we said in *United States Gypsum Co.* v. *Brown* (137 F. 2d 803 (E. C. A. August 19, 1943)), if business practices tend to cause evasion or circumvention of price regulations, the Administrator may control them. But unless the practices, whether they relate to pricing or not, have some such tendency, the Administrator has no right to interfere with them. As I perceive, there may be no clear distinction in many cases between "business practices" and "pricing practices." But if it be granted a distinction can be established in every case, nevertheless this test is not necessarily determinative of whether the practices may or may not be interfered with by the Administrator. The test laid down in the gypsum case, supra, is both simple and decisive, and I think should control. Complainants have not satisfactorily shown that their practices, which have been interfered with have not had a tendency to cause evasion or circumvention of the Administrator's control of prices in the coke oven gas industry, and thus again the view which I hold does not affect the disposition of the cases before us.

With the foregoing comments, I concur in the conclusion reached that the complaints should be dismissed.

[5] "(h) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

Politics—Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the York (Pa.) Dispatch of January 10, 1944:

POLITICS—POLITICS

Not only did the President take over the railroads, he gave the railroad workers increases totaling approximately 11 cents an hour, more than they were holding out for. In the case of the steel workers he rode right over the War Labor Board and surrendered completely.

Admittedly it was done with consummate skill. It almost appeared as if the administration had finally stood its ground against labor and had demonstrated its iron to the Nation. What hypocrisy! The administration surrendered in both cases not only completely but without even a fight.

The President has won only a temporary peace and an uneasy one. The issue at stake in the steel crisis was not retroactive pay at all and everyone knows it.

What point would there be over the retroactive pay issue if the steel workers are not fighting for increased wages? So clearly the President knew very well when he overrode the W. L. B. that he was indicating to the steel workers that the steel wage ceiling is to be punctured.

And when that ceiling goes up so does everything else, because the administration itself made that industry the Nation's arbitrary percentage-wise yardstick.

What the administration has done is to play politics once more with labor. If the administration were sincerely devoted to the idea of holding the line, it would fight tooth and toenail to hold it. But on every occasion, at every threat, at every turn, the administration surrenders.

Nineteen forty-four must mean a lot to the President.

Shall We Save Our Allied Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an address delivered by my colleague, Congressman ROCKWELL, over a national radio broadcast, January 5, 1944, on the question, Shall we save our allied children?

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to talk to you for a few minutes about the 10,000,000 babies and children of the occupied countries of Europe. A whole generation of these children, sons and daughters of the democracies of France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and Poland are slowly starving to death because of the lack of proper food. If allowed to continue through another winter, the whole future of Europe will be affected. If something is not done and done at once, the Allied countries of Europe will be afflicted by a generation of stunted and diseased children and by the distorted, subnormal minds that follow. Moreover, if we make no effort to help them, our relations with these friendly peoples will be affected for many years to come.

Belgian officials estimate that if war continues through 1944 and nothing further is done, 20 percent of the Belgian population will have perished. Polish representatives estimate that this war will cost the lives of 50 percent of their people. Disease spreads alarmingly, due to malnutrition. In 1941, the last date available, the mortality rate for children in Holland under 4 years of age increased 31 percent, and the death rate for adolescents increased 43 percent. Today 35 percent of the Belgian children are tubercular, due to dietary deficiency, tuberculosis having increased 800 percent since 1940.

A Frenchman who recently escaped from France states that the average person there has lost 35 pounds in weight. Practically all the children of the occupied countries have ceased to grow. Dr. Howard E. Kershner, who had 4 years' experience directing relief work in Europe, saw at first hand the conditions existing in France. In his statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he said, "No matter what the terms of peace, a well-fed Germany will have a great post-war advantage over the tubercular, starvation-reduced victims of malnutrition of the occupied countries. Neither well-populated cemeteries nor misshapen, undersized children with subnormal minds and twisted personalities are fit material with which to reconstruct democracy in Europe. Hitler's proud boast that the Germans are a superior race would then be true. People who eat are indeed superior to those who starve."

Why has the work of feeding the children in these conquered countries not been attempted during this World War as it was in the last World War? The answer is that the continent of Europe is under a very strict war blockade which was instituted by Great Britain as a weapon against Germany. So far all attempts to have the blockade lifted to permit passage of neutral mercy ships carrying food for these unfortunate people have failed. When Britain was first attacked and was fighting alone with her back to the wall, such a blockade may have seemed necessary. Many now feel, however, that if our Government at this time would request the relaxation of this blockade to permit certain foods to pass through under direction of the International Red Cross, and after receiving promises from Germany that it would not be molested, Britain would cooperate in doing so.

Senate Resolution 100, introduced by Senators GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, and ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, seeks to accomplish this purpose. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, after extended hearings, has reported out the resolution with its unanimous approval and it should be voted upon shortly after Congress reconvenes. A similar resolution, House Resolution 117, is in the House Foreign Relations Committee but has not been acted upon. These resolutions state the need for such relief and respectfully urge the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, to work out as quickly as possible a systematic relief policy, in cooperation with the British Government. The governments of Sweden and Switzerland and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, would join in the arrangement to aid the stricken and hungry countries where the need is most acute. The relief would be furnished on the basis of agreements between the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies so that no military advantage would accrue to the civil population or to the armed forces of the invading nation. Should these resolutions pass, our State Department would feel that it had the backing of Congress and of the people of the United States in making this request of the British Government, and that country would know that the people of America desired that this request be granted.

Now, to answer a few questions that may be in your mind. Is there shipping available to carry on such a project? The Swedish ports have considerable tonnage lying idle, because, as a neutral nation, she cannot use her ships to transport war materials. She would be glad to have these ships employed to carry food to these stricken countries. In past relief work, both in this war and in the First World War, all neutral ships used for such a purpose were plainly marked day and night and were given safe passage by all belligerents. Therefore, this food would be shipped in neutral ships that could not be otherwise used in the war.

Can the food be spared for these suffering allies without causing additional rationing and more shortages of food in the United States? Testimony indicated that except for a little additional grain, the United States would not be required to supply any of the food. The bulk of the supplies needed for these children—meat, milk, fats—would come from South America and South Africa and would come from stores not being used in the allied war effort. My firm conviction is that our American people would gladly tighten their belts a little to help feed these babies and young children, but the records indicate sufficient food in other countries exists and that this would not be necessary. There are 500,000 tons of lend-lease food a month being sent to our allies. Fifty-one thousand additional tons a month would feed the 10,000,000 babies in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

Who will pay for all this? The small democracies of Europe, with the possible exception of Poland, have funds blocked in this country which their governments in exile say they would gladly use to make the purchases for the starving children and other unfortunates interned in their respective countries. The costs to us as a Nation would, therefore, be negligible. To sum up, it is not a question of ships, it is not a question of food, it is not a question of finance; it becomes solely a question of policy.

The most important consideration is whether or not the proposed plan would in any way aid the enemy. If it would prolong the war 1 day and thereby cost more soldiers' lives, we should not undertake to put it into effect. But in looking at the actual experiences of men who have administered relief in Belgium in the last war, in Spain during the Civil War, and in Poland and France and Greece in this war, the conclusion is inescapable that no benefit, direct or indirect, would accrue to the enemy if a proper agreement between the belligerents is used as a basis, and if the International Red Cross conducts the feeding along the lines followed in the past. The plan of Herbert Hoover, who, you will recall, was in charge of Belgium relief in the last war, was adopted for Greece. Our own State Department is authority for the fact that the Germans do not take any of the 19,000 tons of food going to Greece each month, and that the operation is of no benefit to Axis economy, and that it is saving the Greeks. Since the Germans do not take the food going to Greece and since they did not take our food in France, it is reasonable to assume that they would not take food which we might send to save the children of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

But suppose, for argument, they did take it; what would be the result? President Hoover stated that if Germany should take all the food that might be shipped at one time under the plan, it would amount to not to exceed one meal each for the German civilian. Any such action would immediately bring the operation to an end. We would have done our part toward saving the children. What a resentment would arise against our enemies, and we at least shall have tried!

The men who handled the feeding and the relief operations during the last war and in this war up to the time of our entrance in it, all testified to its feasibility. Maurice Pate, who has had experience in three relief operations, save unequivocal endorsement to the plan. He said, "I can state from my personal experience during the last war where a billion dollars of food and other relief were shipped in, that the Germans did not take domestic food out of Belgium, and that the food we sent in went 100 percent to the people for whom it was intended." He added, "To show you with what discipline that operation was run, if a German officer would endeavor to buy, or would succeed in buying, from a Belgian peasant a pound of butter and that fact became known—and all over the country the check of neighbor on neighbor was very close—the German officer was severely disciplined by the German authorities. And the Belgian peasant who sold the butter was taken into a Belgian court and very severely punished." Mr. Pate stated further that he was now directing the operations for sending supplies to our own American and Allied prisoners in Europe, and that these goods go through safely and without loss to the people for whom they are intended.

An operation of the kind contemplated would be supervised by Swiss and Swedish citizens and by the International Red Cross. Reports of the proceedings would be kept down to the minutest detail. In directing the commission for Polish relief before we got into the war, there was shipped into Poland, food, supplies, and clothing for children, amounting to approximately 6,000,000 pounds. The entire loss in this operation extending through the years 1940 and 1941, from the time the goods left this country, through the ports in Italy, over the railroads of Europe, into warehouses in Poland and children's institutions, amounted to forty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent. This shows the meticulous care the Red Cross takes in such matters.

If these starving children were sitting on our doorstep or were where we could see them, the American people would insist that

help be given them at once. Because they are 3,000 miles away and an army is between, it is easy to shut our eyes and refuse to see. For the sake of humanity and for the sake of good will between our allies now and after the war, let's get behind these congressional resolutions. By so doing we would indicate to the Department of State that we desire to save these remaining starving children of our allies if it can be done without jeopardizing our war effort. If we do not do so, it will be difficult to explain why we send food, clothing, and medical supplies through the blockade to European prisoners, and yet let their children die from starvation because we are not sufficiently interested to ask that the Allied blockade be opened sufficiently to allow necessary food to be sent to them. We hear many speak of a lasting peace after this war. What more practical way for a permanent peace than through saving these unhappy children of the great democracies of Europe.

If you feel as I do, that these children should be saved, why not write your Senators and Representatives in Washington tonight.

Thank you and good night.

Massachusetts Faces Business Adjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by Dr. Melvin T. Copeland, chairman of the Massachusetts Committee on Post-War Readjustment, December 30, 1943, at a luncheon held by the Governor of the State of Massachusetts in Boston:

The task assigned to the Massachusetts Committee on Post-War Readjustment is that of facilitating, insofar as possible, the reemployment in private occupations of men and women returning from service with the armed forces and workers released from war industrial production. For 2 years the committee has been working to stimulate the employers of the Commonwealth to do what they can to be prepared to give post-war jobs.

Many employers and the labor organizations of the State have been at work getting ready for the changes ahead. They have accomplished much, and there is still more that they can do by being prepared to meet their own problems. There are also certain national problems, however, which can be met only by the Federal Government, and the sooner the Federal Government establishes sound policies for meeting those problems, the more effective can become local preparations for giving employment.

The progress of the war, its changing requirements of equipment and matériel, and the end of the growth and development phase of war production have brought about what Army and Navy officials call a period of war adjustment. It is essential to recognize that many problems which had been supposed to be post-war problems are already beginning to appear in this period of war adjustment. In fact, the following three phases of war adjustment now seem to be likely:

1. Previctory period, from now until the end of the European war.

2. Inter-V-Day period, between the end of the European war and the end of the Asiatic war.

3. Final adjustment period, after all of the shooting stops.

There is much evidence that many of the most serious problems of adjustment will come in the first period and will not be precipitated by a military armistice but more by the immediate prospects of a certain victory. There are two matters of Federal policy which will particularly affect the rapidity with which private nonwar employment can be given when the time for large-scale readjustment comes. These are: (1) Contract termination, and (2) the release of materials for civilian production.

If the settlement of terminated war contracts is delayed for 6 months or more after the major termination the effect will be to cause widespread unemployment in spite of our local efforts. Similarly, if materials are not released for civilian production as promptly as they can be spared from the war program, that delay also will cause unnecessary unemployment. When the time for reemployment comes, we shall have the productive capacity, many of the materials, an ample supply of labor for production, and a vast, pent-up demand from industry and consumers. Uncertainty, fear of depression, and failure of the Government agencies to effect prompt settlement of terminated war contracts can lead to serious depression and widespread unemployment, but such a result is unnecessary.

CONTRACT TERMINATION

The problems of war adjustment arising out of terminated war contracts are not in the indefinite future. They are with us now. We have had several cases of contract terminations here in Massachusetts recently, and it seems likely that the changes in military plans and needs may cause a substantial increase in contract terminations in the near future, and many more when the war in Europe is finished. In some instances the terminated contracts may be replaced, but in other cases the new contracts are of quite a different sort and will go elsewhere. Consequently, we have the problems of war adjustment arising out of terminated contracts already facing us.

PROMPT FINAL SETTLEMENTS

In order that we may avoid serious unemployment when a large number of war contracts are terminated, the settlements of those contracts must be prompt and the settlements as negotiated should be final in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation. Otherwise there will be uncertainty and delay in the pick-up of civilian production. These prompt, final settlements, furthermore, must apply not only to prime contracts but also to subcontracts all the way down the line. The prompt, final settlements, in fact, are especially important for many subcontractors, some of whom are small concerns with limited financial resources and without large legal staffs with which to carry on prolonged and involved negotiations. How many subcontractors there are in Massachusetts I have not been able to ascertain, but unquestionably they are numerous.

In the settlement of terminated war contracts, the interests of the Federal Government must of course be protected. But if industry is stagnated, while a lot of red tape is being unwound and double and triple checks are being made, the Government will lose far more through the falling off in tax receipts and through the payments for unemployment relief than the occasional losses which may arise out of errors in prompt settlements. Massachusetts, like other States, also will suffer a loss of revenue, and the State and the cities and towns will have to face a rise in relief costs if our war industries are prevented from promptly resuming civilian production.

Prompt settlements of terminated war contracts also are essential in the interests of fair play. At the end of the last war some contractors, especially the smaller ones who were rather hard up for cash, accepted offers of settlements made by the Government agencies which the contractors felt were substantially less than they were entitled to, but they accepted those terms rather than incur the risk of going broke while their claims were dragging through the courts and large lawyers' fees were piling up, I already have encountered several cases within the last 6 months here in Massachusetts where smaller contractors likewise have accepted settlements on terminated war contracts which they felt were unfair but which they did not deem it wise to take to court because of the delays and legal expenses involved. Some contractors may seek to impose on Uncle Sam, but Uncle Sam also is frequently a hard bargainer, especially when he can delay settlement of claims of contractors with small financial resources.

I understand that several bills have been introduced into Congress providing for partial payment on a terminated war contract or subcontract after a certified claim has been submitted by the contractors. In general I am in sympathy with the purpose of these bills, and I will not undertake to discuss the merits of the individual proposals. It will help measurably to prevent unemployment if funds can be provided to contractors promptly after they submit certified statements of their claims. They will need the cash in many cases for the purchase of raw materials and for meeting pay rolls.

REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT WORK

There is another provision which needs to be taken care of in arranging for the termination of war contracts and which has received far too little attention. This is means for clearance on work in process and inventory on hand. When a claim is presented, typically it will include certain amounts for these items, and the contracting agency must make a check on the validity of the claim. The work cannot be taken out of the machines or inventory removed until authorized by the contracting agency. Hence, until a check has been made, the machinery must remain idle, and the floor space in which war materials and partially finished goods are carried in the plant cannot be used for civilian production. We must have provisions for prompt check on claims for work in process and inventory in order to give clearance and free the machines for civilian production. Contractors also should be authorized to remove war materials from their plants to be stored at Government expense where civilian production otherwise would be hampered. If these provisions are not made, many workers will be unemployed.

SUBCONTRACTORS' CLAIMS

The question of how the small subcontractor, perhaps two or three stages down the line, is going to obtain prompt settlement on his terminated contracts is one of the most difficult aspects of this whole problem. I am very apprehensive that there will be a lot of small business concerns here in Massachusetts whose existence may be jeopardized while they are waiting to get paid for work they have done in good faith on subcontracts for war work. The best suggestion that I have to offer on this is that in each area where there is a substantial amount of war production a local settlement committee should be appointed by some Federal authority which can act under certain conditions. I suggest that any prime contractor or subcontractor with a settlement claim of less than perhaps $100,000 should be authorized to take his claim to the local settlement committee if he has not received payment within 30 days from the submittal of his claim to the superior contractor or to the Government contracting agency. The local settlement committee then would examine this claim

and if it deemed it substantially correct it could authorize an advance payment on that claim and also authorize the clearance of work in process from the machines and the storage at the risk of the Government of any inventory covered by the claim. Perhaps someone can develop a better proposal than this, but so far I have learned of no other concrete suggestion which provides the necessary safety valve which such an arrangement as this would give. It would be tragic if a lot of small business concerns were wrecked and their workers thrown into idleness because of their inability to cut through the red tape involved in getting their claims settled.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONTRACTORS

While making these statements with regard to action by the Federal authorities, I recognize, also, that business concerns which hold war contracts have a responsibility on their part to facilitate speedy settlement of terminated war contracts. They have the responsibility for preparing their claims accurately and speedily and presenting them in proper form. Some progress has been made toward getting a recognition of the part that industry must play in this respect, and currently more and more experience of this sort is now being gained. The contracting services of the Government, I know, have a very helpful attitude toward this situation, and the local office of W. P. B. has established a regional advisory service for war plants faced with problems resulting from contract termination. That is a very helpful development.

Legislation to make possible the prompt settlement of terminated war contracts is needed now. It will be unsafe to wait until there is a deluge of contract terminations to rush through legislation on short notice. The problem is too complicated to be dealt with effectively in that way.

MATERIALS FOR CIVILIAN PRODUCTION

In addition to making provision for the settlement of terminated war contracts, there is also the task of facilitating the flow of materials for civilian production as soon as those materials can be spared from war purposes I hope that we shall not have unemployment here in Massachusetts because needed materials, which are physically in existence in the United States, are unavailable for use by manufacturers as a result of legislative or administrative restrictions. The existing legislation vesting the priority power in the President, which power of the President is delegated to the Chairman of the War Production Board, is probably adequate to govern the flow of materials, but it may be necessary for the Congress to make sure that the administration of the priority power by the War Production Board is directed effectively toward the speedy and smooth resumption of civilian production. The War Production Board should be expected to eliminate its limitation orders, its conservation orders, and its allocation systems just as rapidly as the needs of the war program permit.

Because of their effects on plans for reemployment, I foresee that these problems of settling canceled/contracts and securing the supplies of raw materials for civilian production will presently be matters of widespread concern here in Massachusetts.

To summarize, my specific recommendations are that legislation should be enacted to cover the following points:

A. SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS

1. The terminated contracts should be settled by negotiation by the contracting agencies of the Government, and the negotiated settlement should be final in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation.

2. Prompt partial payments amounting to a fairly large percentage of the claim should be assured to each contractor upon submittal of a certified statement of the claim, subject, of course, to a penalty for perjury.

3. Local settlement committees should be empowered to authorize partial payments when a delay of over 30 days occurs on the part of the Government agency.

4. Contracting agencies should be required to give prompt clearance of claims on work in process. There should be clear-cut procedures for authorizing the removal of Government-owned inventories and machines, with storage at Government expense, in order that civilian production may be started.

5. The dilemma of the subcontractors must be resolved. At the present time the Government exercises the right of approving all payments in settlement of subcontracts but does not assume any responsibility to the subcontractor, with the result that the subcontractor in many cases cannot secure action by either the prime contractor or the contracting agency. I suggest that the local settlement committees proposed above should be empowered to approve settlement of subcontracts if a delay occurs in approval by the contracting agency.

B. DECONTROL OF MATERIALS

1. As soon as war conditions permit, the rules for the release of scarce raw materials should be revised, with a view to facilitating the rapid resumption of civilian production.

A Magnificent Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Indianapolis and Indiana are very proud of the great pharmaceutical house of Eli Lilly & Co., which has processed its millionth blood donation without a cent of profit. This record is in keeping with the fine, generous spirit which this firm always has manifested in the service of our country and which long ago brought to it the recognition of an Army-Navy E award. Commenting on the company's contribution to the blood campaign, which means so much in saving the lives of our precious boys, the Indianapolis News says editorially:

LILLY'S CONTRIBUTION

In the midst of charges that some concerns are making an unholy profit from war contracts it is heartening to learn that the Indianapolis laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co. have processed 1,000,000 blood donations entirely on a nonprofit basis.

In addition to performing this service at cost, the expense involved has been decreased constantly through the introduction of more efficient methods.

There certainly could have been nothing unethical if the Indianapolis pharmaceutical house had sought a minimum profit for the work it has been doing.

Donations of blood at Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit, Cincinnati, Louisville, Columbus and Indianapolis have been converted into live-saving plasma at the Lilly plant, involving the installation of new equipment and the employment of much additional skilled personnel.

The patriotic Americans who donated this blood, however, got nothing for their contributions and the Lilly Co. determined that its connection wiht the effort to strengthen the wounded on every fighting front should be entirely shorn of private gain. From beginning to end, it has been and is—a magnificent job.

The Gates Must Not Be Closed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Mirror of January 4, 1944:

THE GATES MUST NOT BE CLOSED

When Congress reconvenes on January 10 it should take up the Gillette-Taft-Baldwin-Rogers resolution.

This resolution calls for the formation of a Presidential commission to create machinery, in conjunction with the United Nations, to rescue the millions of Jews who are now being systematically exterminated by the Nazis and their Quislings.

When the Presidential commission gets to work, one of the first things it should do is to seek the abrogation of the Chamberlain "White Paper" of May 1939.

At present, Palestine is being administered by Great Britain in conformity with the policy embodied in the "White Paper," by virtue of which Jewish immigration into Palestine is now limited and is to be practically stopped after March 31, 1944. The Jews are to be reduced to a permanent minority of 33 percent in the country and the sale of land to Jews is to be practically prohibited.

A DIRECT REPUDIATION

This is a direct repudiation on England's part of the League of Nations Mandate and the Balfour Declaration incorporated in the mandate of 1917.

According to this declaration, Palestine was to become a national Jewish home under the protectorate of England.

In 1939, after the Jews had created a modern civilization in what was practically an Arabian desert, England turned her back on her solemn promise of 1917.

This perfidy of Britain toward the Jews was denounced by no one more vigorously than by Winston Churchill in Parliament in the debate on the "White Paper" in 1939 when he said:

"MR. CHURCHILL'S REGRET

"As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself by silence or inaction to what I must regard as an act of repudiation.

"I regret very much that the pledge of the Balfour Declaration, endorsed as it has been by successive governments, and the conditions under which we obtained the mandate have both been violated by the Government's proposal.

"I select one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of an Arab majority. That is a plain breach of a solemn obligation."

As the Palestine Mandate was ordered by the League of Nations, it cannot be abrogated even by Great Britain herself without the consent of the League.

A SOLEMN OBLIGATION

But the League did not give its consent to the 1939 abrogation.

The action then of England in limiting immigration into the Jewish homeland and

of stopping it entirely next March is, as Mr. Churchill so vigorously says, "an act of repudiation" and a "plain breach of a solemn obligation."

It is, therefore, it seems to us, the bounden duty of Congress in passing the Gillette-Taft-Baldwin-Rogers resolution, and also the duty of the President, to request—or demand—of England that she abrogate the provisions of the White Paper of 1939 and again throw Palestine wide open to the sorely oppressed and harried Jews of occupied Europe.

How can England and the United States demand of Soviet Russia that she live up to the terms of her obligations to us if we stand idly by while England breaks her solemn promise to the Jews in regard to Palestine?

As the American Palestine Committee says, "The gates of Palestine must not close in 1944."

Discharges for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone will be interested in the following correspondence which I have received from the Bureau of Naval Personnel with reference to the types of discharges given to enlisted men of the Navy.

Like many of my colleagues I have been receiving an increasing number of complaints from discharged servicemen who were either dissatisfied with or ashamed of their discharge certificates. In all too many cases the complaints were more than justified and the Navy Department has now recognized this fact by making some very desirable changes.

I am pleased to state that when specific cases were called to the attention of the Bureau of Naval Personnel prompt action was taken to correct errors that had been made. However, this method would prove cumbersome and unsatisfactory where literally thousands of individual cases are involved. Consequently, the Navy Department has adopted a new form of discharge certificate recently and the change has been officially authorized by the Secretary of the Navy.

Unless a serviceman's record is so bad that he must receive an unfavorable discharge then he is most certainly entitled to a discharge under honorable conditions. He has served his country in its direst need and the very least we can do is to offer him the highest honor a grateful country can bestow.

The letters referred to above are as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Receipt is acknowledged of your recent letter relative to discharges of enlisted personnel of the naval service.

Three types of certificates are presently issued to enlisted personnel upon their discharge from the naval service. These three certificates are termed: Honorable discharge; certificate of discharge under honorable conditions; certificate of unfavorable discharge.

The honorable discharge is awarded in three instances:

(a) To enlisted personnel upon expiration of enlistment.

(b) To individuals discharged for disability incurred in the line of duty and not as a result of their own misconduct, regardless of length of service.

High marks in proficiency in rating and conduct must have been maintained by the individual concerned in both instances (subparagraphs (a) and (b) above) in order to qualify him (her) for honorable discharge.

(c) To personnel discharged as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty and resulting from action against an organized enemy and not the result of own misconduct, regardless of previous conduct and proficiency marks and regardless of length of service. Any exceptional cases where the commanding officer is of the opinion an honorable discharge should not be given, must be referred to the Bureau of Naval Personnel for final decision.

The certificate of discharge under honorable conditions is issued for the following reasons, regardless of length of service:

(a) Expiration of enlistment where the individual's marks in proficiency in rating and conduct do not warrant an honorable discharge.

(b) Medical survey where the disability presented—

(1) Was not incurred in line of duty.

(2) Existed prior to enlistment or induction.

(3) Was incurred in line of duty, not result of own misconduct, but marks in proficiency in rating and conduct are not sufficiently high to warrant an honorable discharge.

(4) Was a result of individual's own misconduct—in such cases character "indifferent" is awarded.

(c) Convenience of the Government because of erroneous induction or other reasons considered to be for the benefit of the Government.

(d) Own convenience in order to accept a commission in another branch of the armed forces, to accept appointment to the Military Academy, Naval Academy, or Coast Guard Academy as cadet or midshipman.

(e) Dependency existing prior to enlistment or arising subsequent thereto only under extremely urgent conditions and where the exigencies of the service will permit.

(f) Minors discharged in accordance with existing instructions based on enacted legislation.

(g) Unsuitability by reason of—

(1) Immaturity.

(2) Personality defects existing prior to enlistment which disqualify the individual for naval service.

(3) When directed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel for other reasons.

(h) Inaptitude where the individual concerned has clearly demonstrated his inability to cope with service conditions and there is no evidence that he will be able to adapt himself to the requirements of naval life in the future.

The character of discharge shown on the certificates of discharge under honorable conditions may be either "good" or "indifferent" as warranted by the record of the individual concerned.

The certificate of discharge under honorable conditions is now issued in accordance with a recent change authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, in lieu of the certificate of discharge previously issued "under satisfactory conditions."

The certificate of unfavorable discharge is issued by reason of—

(a) Unfitness (character undesirable), where an individual has demonstrated total unfitness for retention. In this category are:

(1) Those who repeatedly commit petty offenses not necessitating trial by court martial.

(2) Habitual shirkers.

(3) Those of unclean habits.

(b) Desertion without trial (character undesirable).

(c) Trial and conviction by civil authorities (character undesirable).

(d) Fraudulent enlistment (character undesirable).

(e) Sentence of court martial:

*(1) Bad conduct—summary court martial.

*(2) Bad conduct or dishonorable—general court martial.

*When so sentenced and the findings of the court martial are approved by competent authority.

I trust that the foregoing will assist in the clarification of the types of discharges issued to members of the naval service and the reasons therefor.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. BLEDSOE,
Captain, United States Navy, Director of Enlisted Personnel.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Referring to your telephone call on January 7, 1944, concerning recent changes in certificates of discharge issued enlisted men of the Navy, and supplementing the Bureau's letter of January 3, 1944, you are advised that the types of certificates of discharge, designated for convenience as Forms BNP 660, 661, and 662, respectively, which when reprinted will be designated as Forms NavPers 660, 661, and 662, formerly bore the headings: "Honorable discharge," "Certificate of discharge," "Discharge."

No change has been made in the honorable discharge, Form BNP 660.

The following will illustrate changes made in Form BNP 661:

Old certificate:

"CERTIFICATE OF DISCHARGE, UNITED STATES NAVAL SERVICE

"This is to certify that (name, service number, and rating), United States (Navy or Naval Reserve), has this day been discharged from (ship or organization) and the United States Naval Service with (character of discharge) discharge under satisfactory conditions."

New certificate:

"CERTIFICATE OF DISCHARGE UNDER HONORABLE CONDITIONS, UNITED STATES NAVAL SERVICE

"This is to certify that (name, service number, and rating), United States (Navy or Naval Reserve), has this day been discharged from (ship or organization) and the United States Naval Service under honorable conditions.

Dated this —— day of ————, 19—, at ————. Character of discharge, ————."

The heading on Form BNP 662 was changed from "Discharge" to "Certificate of unfavorable discharge." No other change was made in this certificate.

The Bureau will be pleased to change any certificates to conform to the recent change authorized by the Secretary of the Navy upon request of the individual concerned.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. BLEDSOE,
Captain, U. S. N., Director of Enlisted Personnel.

Income-Tax Blanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the income-tax blanks prepared by the Treasury Department for use of the taxpayers of America are impossible to understand. It seems inconceivable that a group of gentlemen in the Treasury Department would deliberately concoct and put into effect a blank to be used by the taxpayers which few tax experts themselves can comprehend. This letter by Mr. Harrison which I am inserting represents the thinking of a large section of the citizens. It is high time that the Treasury Department and this Congress begin to simplify the tax forms so that the ordinary individual can make out his return without violating the law.

RAVENNA, NEBR., *January 5, 1944.*

Mr. A. L. MILLER, Congressman,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in a state of collapse over the most nauseating mess of tripe ever spread before the American people, and to all appearance the United States Government intends to make the people take it and like it, threatening severe penalties for any neglect or failure.

It is estimated that this sickening conglomeration will be sent to 50,000,000 people and taxpayers. At least 50,000,000 of them will be stunned into silence, being unable to find words to express their feelings politely, and not in command of a brand of profanity sufficiently vitriolic to fit the facts. During the past few weeks I read with some amusement the comments of newspapers and columnists, only to find on receiving the blanks that they were worse than the most vivid descriptions.

While the December estimates were being prepared about 200 taxpayers in this community came to me for assistance in preparing the blanks. Most of them will return, limp and helpless, bearing the incomprehensible set of documents now being thrust upon them. How can I face them? I am convinced that no man, sane or insane, can complete a set of returns with any assurance that they are correct. It would be a perfectly safe wager at long odds that if every Member of the House and Senate was required to complete a set no two of them would appear alike.

It is about time for Congress to put on a suit of armor and tackle this problem with a determination to do something. As a first move I suggest that the colony of education-mad professors, theorists, and dreamers be put in the guardhouse (or dog house) and a half dozen $75-a-month rural school teachers be employed to take their places. Then tell the teachers what you want and leave it to them to devise a set of forms and instructions that a man of ordinary intelligence will be able to understand.

Unless something is done before another years rolls around I contemplate there will be a taxpayers strike and that many millions of good citizens will refuse to make a return or pay a tax until the rules and regulations are so presented that they will know what it is about.

Personally, I will not support or vote for any man fo relection or reelection to the House or Senate unless he pledges himself to see that some relief is found and this income-tax proposition presented in a sane and reasonable manner. It has progressively grown worse since its inception. I believe in it implicitly, but believe that this idiotic blundering in its preparation and application should be brought to a close.

Respectfully yours,

J. H. HARRISON.

Steamships and Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine is one of the four principal arms of our national defense. In the development of post-war plans for transoceanic travel, every possible restriction upon its proper expansion in this highly competitive international field of our economy should be removed. H. R. 3420, the Civil Aeronautics bill, should be amended so that it will not freeze the present law which places a severe handicap upon our merchant marine.

Information at our disposal indicates that every competitive maritime nation is sanctioning the development of international air transportation by their maritime interests. We must encourage similar development by the American merchant marine to successfully meet this competition.

In accordance with the unanimous consent granted me, I include herewith an editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle dealing with this question:

STEAMSHIPS AND PLANES

A matter of extreme consequence to American shipping after the war and to American overseas commercial aviation as well has been taken up with Congress by the Pacific American Steamship Association, backed by other organizations interested in foreign trade.

This is the removal of disabilities at present preventing steamship companies from operating overseas air services, even between the United States and its own Territories and possessions.

Apparently it was not the purpose of Congress in enacting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit surface carriers from participating in overseas aviation. The act contains no specific ban. However, language in it has been so interpreted by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is to clear up this point and remove any such ban that the Pacific American Steamship Association and others have petitioned Congress.

The reasons which support this petition are clear. They are concerned with post-war maintenance of the ability of American shipping to compete with foreign shipping. They have to do with healthy competition in commercial aviation itself. They involve the question of justice to existing steamship companies.

Before the war foreign countries were encouraging their steamship operators to undertake air services as adjuncts to their surface carrying. This policy has not been abandoned abroad. Air service can be so useful an adjunct to surface lines that our steamship operators will be handicapped in competition with the foreign if they cannot avail themselves of aviation.

The public advantage in healthy competition in commercial air transport is too manifest to need much telling. It will mean on the oversea routes more, and more alert, service to the public. This movement to get Congress to take off the present ban on surface carriers engaging in air service puts no hindrance whatever on the purely aviation transport companies. It will, however, give them competition. That will be wholesome and it will also be fair to the existing steamship lines which have built up the foreign trade and the contacts which now produce air business as well as surface business. There is no reason why a steamship company which has created the trade channels and developed the relations should be debarred from undertaking the resulting air business in favor of a brand new air company stepping in to enjoy a traffic for which it did not lay the foundations.

A case in point is the Matson line, which wishes to supplement its surface carrying between the mainland and our Pacific territories and possessions with air service. Over many years the Matson line has developed the commerce that now produces air business; it has the trade contacts and relations and facilities to go into this business naturally. It appears to have a right to do so. It also appears that it would be in the public interest to utilize its existing contacts, relations and facilities in this way.

Three bills now before Congress deal with the Civil Aeronautics Act. Two of these, the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, and the Reece bill, H. R. 3491, do not, as they now stand, meet the need of removing this ban on steamship companies engaging in air service. The Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 3421, specifically provides that nothing in the Civil Aeronautics Act shall be construed to prevent a steamship company from owning or operating air carriers between the continental United States and its territories and possessions, or between them.

As the Lea bill appears to have the legislative right of way, the simplest thing to do would be to amend the Lea bill to include the Bulwinkle proviso. This is what is now being urged. It should be done.

Address by Mr. Tris Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on the night of December 24 Mr. Tris Coffin, an outstanding news analyst, delivered an address over radio station WTOP which I think echoed the prayers of the 130,000,000 people who comprise the American Nation. His broadcast expressed in meaningful and moving language the hope of the American people that this war can end with a peace that will be permanent and secure—a hope which has been strengthened by the President's masterful Christmas Eve address. It is a pleasure and a privilege to present Mr. Coffin's address for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was as follows:

A few minutes ago President Roosevelt voiced a profound hope. A hope that men

have prayed for and died for through the ages.

In his sobering Christmas Eve message, the President said, "I say to you that at last we may look forward into the future with real, substantial confidence that, however great the cost, peace on earth, good will toward men, can be and will be realized and insured."

He drew the outlines of a world where the strong will protect, but not dominate, the weak. A world where bullies and aggressors will be stopped before they can strike down and enslave. A world where nations will live together as useful citizens.

The formation of a new world order emerges out of his words. The four most powerful nations—the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China—will be, in a sense, the protectors and guarantors of peace. They will form an international force to patrol the world.

But Mr. Roosevelt strongly rejected the principle that so many power combines have fallen heir to, that the strong shall deminate the weak. He said emphatically that each small nation must have its own independence—within those bounds to which all civilized peoples subscribe.

This principle, he made clear, carries over into Asia, whose people have been dominated and ruled, both well and unwisely, by a succession of Oriental despots and occidental powers. This principle, if completely carried out, will be revolutionary and certainly will in time change the whole political and economic shape of the world. In Asia, the teeming millions have not enjoyed the benefits of mass education, free labor, or self-government.

The Roosevelt doctrine for Germany will be approved by all those who fear so much the searing effects of brutal retaliation. He said the German people will be given the opportunity to develop in peace as useful and respectable members of the European family. His use of the word "develop" is important. This is taken to mean that the complete return of Germany to full membership in a world order must, of necessity, be a slow process of education. Mr. Roosevelt plainly stated that first of all the rotten core of nazi-ism and Prussian militarism must be cut out and destroyed.

Likewise, the President said Japan must be completely eliminated as a potential aggressor force. He did not say how this would be accomplished, or what would be the fate of the Japanese people. This is not taken to mean that the problem has not been thought out. Instead, some experts contend that the time is not ripe to discuss in any more detail the future of Japan.

A good many cynics will say that what Mr. Roosevelt said tonight was not new—that idealists from the time of Christ have expressed the same hopes, but that the troubled world has bled and fought without interruption. They will resign themselves to forecasting that our children—now sleeping with happy thoughts of tomorrow—must go out on the battlefields a generation hence.

The President backed up his confident prediction with some hard facts and some real achievements.

Many had believed the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences were not possible. Or, that if they were held, they would break up in disagreement. Those holding these views said it was impossible for four such divergent powers ever to hold together. As a matter of fact, the Germans have said it so often they believe the Allies will divide before the war is over. They, the Germans say, would give them the chance to win the peace.

President Roosevelt's comments on these conferences is significant. He said, "We had planned to talk to each other across the table at Cairo and Teheran; but we soon found we were all on the same side of the table. We came to the conferences with faith in each other. But we needed the personal contact. And now we have supplemented faith with definite knowledge."

In other words, the four major Allies have discovered a communion of interests that is stronger than their differences. And, they have agreed on a basic formula for meeting the complex political problems to come.

Close students of American foreign policy credit it with a combination of realism, political shrewdness, and idealism. The first two are used to win the objects of idealism. Some observers are comparing Mr. Roosevelt's handling of foreign affairs with his handling of social legislation in the pre-war days of the New Deal.

The Shipping Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce of January 10, 1944:

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK

(By Stanley Ferguson)

ADMIRAL LAND'S WARNING

Admiral Land, in his talk before the United Nations forum on air transport last week, put his finger on the crux of the controversy over the participation of American shipping lines in overseas air services. He pointed out that if the Civil Aeronautics Board continues to block the establishment of integrated sea-air services, American operators will tend to seek the protection of foreign flags under which no such restrictions exist.

The Admiral's warning called attention to something which does not seem to have been fully understood by those who are attempting to restrict ship operators to the surface of the ocean. Ocean shipping operations cannot be subject to the same sort of regulations as may be applied, say, to a manufacturer of iron castings whose chief competitors are subject to the same laws as apply to himself. Certain Government regulations may be distasteful to the manufacturer or the owner of a fleet of trucks, but they do not as a rule discriminate against him to the benefit of his competitors, as the C. A. B. seems bent upon doing in the case of ocean shipping lines.

A large number of American shipping companies normally encounter their most severe competition from foreign-flag lines. In one way or another they must adjust their rates, schedules, and services to meet this competition. Obviously, if they are to be subjected to restrictions from which their closest competitors are exempt, they can hardly be expected to sit down now and plan for the new ships and services that will be required not only to maintain the type of merchant marine that national policy demands, but to provide employment for thousands of newly trained seamen and scores of the shipyards and other industries depending to a greater or lesser extent upon the size and activity of the American-flag cargo fleet.

Shipowners do not have any preeminent rights to the air over the routes on which they normally operate. Many of them feel no need for complementary air services, and indicate no intention of applying for them. It is right and proper that the Government should require each applicant to demonstrate the need for a new service, and his financial ability to keep it in operation. But it is not proper to assume that because, as a practical matter, no new services can be established until after the war, that nothing need be done about the problem at present.

A clear-cut assurance that shipowners will not be discriminated against when the time comes to establish air services is a necessary prerequisite to the development of sound post-war plans for the operation of United States-flag merchant ships. Until this assurance is given many such plans will have to be held in abeyance. Congress should act in the matter without delay.

The Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to answer each of the very proper and pertinent questions asked by Malvina Lindsay in the Washington Post under date of Monday, January 10, 1944. The answer is the New Deal. Under the philosophy of the New Deal, scarcity, not plenty, has been its national program. It has required incapacity raised to the *n*th degree, extending over a period of 10 years to achieve the present scarcity of the necessities of life, and to regiment 130,000,000 supposedly free citizens. Scarcity of food, clothes, and other necessities and an ever lengthening regimentation will be the order until the New Deal is removed root and branch from the offices of government.

THE GENTLER SEX

(By Malvina Lindsay)

"I WANT TO KNOW WHY * * *"—

AN AVERAGE HOUSEWIFE SPEAKS UP

I want to know why about a lot of things. Why is there a shortage of children's clothing when we have just gone on a national shopping spree on jewelry, purses, neckwear, fancy lingerie, and other frippery? Why, as the American Home Economics Association reports, is there a great need for underwear for children under 15 years of age, when $10 hand-painted neckties and $12.50 lace-trimmed silk panties are available among Christmas luxury items? Why are children in Northern States in need of heavy stockings, coats, and underwear when we have just had a stampede for negligees and fur coats?

I want to know why fabrics should be so sleazy; why housewives of 25 States have complained in the Home Economics Association's survey that much yard goods is not worth the time and trouble of making it into garments; why they say they can't get outing flannel when black chiffon lingerie, glitter dresses, and $39.95 handbags have been available for newly rich warworkers? Also, why if you are a size 32 you have to buy nightgowns, slips, etc., in size 38 so you will be able to get into them after the first shrinkage in the wash?

I want to know why cotton goods is scarce in view of the fact that this country, at its entry in the war, had around 11,000,000 bales of cotton in storage and has had two bumper crops since. I want to know if Army, am-

munition and lend-lease requirements are taking all the cotton (and if they are that's all right with me) or if the labor shortage is responsible for lack of cotton fabrics and garments. And if the latter is true, I want to know why apparently all the textile workers have gone to war and all the gadget makers been deferred. And also why people whose unspent money was burning holes in their pocketbooks have been saying they had to buy luxury goods because there were no household necessities or utility goods on the market.

I want to know why, ever since Pearl Harbor, we have had these constant wool scares with the accompanying frantic grabs of suits and dresses by hoarders, yet we continue to see "100-percent virgin wool" garments featured each shopping season. Also, why we have so many cheaply made dresses with too much trimming, and not enough simply made ones without trimming. And particularly why designers of clothes and other wartime goods haven't met more effectively the challenge of combining utility and beauty.

I want to know why all these situations exist. And, if I find that it is a necessary part of wartime life for me to wear spangles this summer instead of a cotton dress, and to buy a lapel gadget instead of underwear for my children, then I will do it as patriotically and with as good grace as possible. But if not, I want to know who is to blame and what I can do about it. I particularly want to know why, in the face of this Nation's colossal tragedy and testing, the trivia of life continues to be so greatly emphasized both in the supply of and demand for goods. And why, when we stand on the eve of our greatest battle and our greatest sacrifice, we are continuing to run after baubles and thus give the manufacturers the excuse to say they are providing what the public wants.

The Butter Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for several months I have been trying to help particularly those people producing less than 1,000 pounds of butter per month. I have hopes that a newly announced policy concerning producers of less than 1,000 pounds of butter per month will be beneficial to our smaller butter producers.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, December 30, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 3 asking three specific questions with respect to the butter program.

Your first question deals with price ceilings on sales of butterfat by farmers. There is no price ceiling on such sales. There is, of course, a price ceiling under which the creamery must sell butter and this limits within a narrow margin the price that can be paid the farmer for butterfat. What the creamery, in fact, does with the butter payment received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to consider that payment as part of the income received for sales of butter and buy butterfat on that basis.

The second question deals with sales of butter by farmers. Under the dairy feed payment program, farmers selling butter rather than butterfat are paid at 80 percent of the butterfat rate established for the area. This rate is practically identical to that paid for butterfat, since, on the average 4 pounds of butterfat will make about 5 pounds of butter.

Your third question deals with the provision limiting R. F. C. payments to those producing over 1,000 pounds of butter per month. It is our understanding that this limitation was originally incorporated in order to eliminate the administrative expense incident to handling many small accounts. It has recently been changed, however, and now the producer of any quantity of creamery butter is eligible to make application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the 5-cent per pound subsidy payment.

We believe this answers your questions, but if you need additional information on this subject please advise us.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

Will Democracy Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include a very able and very, very timely address by Mr. Lester Edge, an attorney of Spokane, Wash., delivered before the Spokane Bar Association December 17, 1943.

Mr. Edge raises many questions of great importance to us at this time. He does not ask us to agree with him—he does ask that we freely and frankly discuss these questions.

The President's speech raises the questions of rights and we must, it seems to me, decide whether rights are inalienable or whether they are extended by a patronizing government. If government has these rights to extend—from whence did they come? Certainly they had to come from the people themselves.

The address of Mr. Edge follows:

I trust no one here thinks this paper is influenced by any political considerations. These are the reflections of an American who has been a recipient of the bounties of this country, appreciates his obligations, and views with concern the tendency of this time.

That I am not critical of democratic ideals is attested by the fact that within the last 2 years I stood at the tomb of Jefferson and of Jackson, and with uncovered head and contrite heart commended them to our Creator and concluded with the wish that they were here now.

For brevity's sake I will read, that our members may have an opportunity to discuss, if they so desire, and cordial invitation is extended to them to do so, particularly if they can throw some real light on this very serious matter. I will attempt to describe briefly the situation as I see it and endeavor to suggest a remedy.

All lawyers are familiar with the type of government intended by the Revolutionary fathers. Our Federal Constitution specifically guarantees to every State a republican form of government, not a democracy, and specifically provided that the Constitution be ratified by the conventions of the States, as the fathers were fearful of the clamor of the mob and the siren voice of the demagog incidental to a popular vote.

The Government thus established was not the type that we have today—it was a republican or representative form of government, intended for a republic, not a democracy, and under which the Republic operated for more than 100 years, and during which time we fought successfully four wars without regimentation, canfiscation of wealth or dictatorship, which is the Government of the moment. It may not be germane to remark that all of these wars, with a modicum of sense, could have been avoided, but, like all wars, they were brought about by men who do not have to pay the supreme sacrifice.

Under the Government of the fathers, a frugal and self-reliant people carved happiness for themselves and their descendants from the bounties of nature of this country. It developed a type of men and women who made this country great, and there wasn't any smooth-tongued politician trailing along behind them as they toiled, telling them our Government would take care of them if they loafed on the job.

I am not impressed by the argument of some who speak of the great opportunities of the pioneers of those days, and claim that such opportunities do not now exist. Any sensible man would sooner attempt to carve his future, and that of his family, from the areas of a settled country where every foot of land is under private ownership, than to undergo the hardships of the trekking pioneers who crossed the plains—and I speak from some childhood memories on this subject.

We were a restless people, unwilling to let well enough alone. During the last few decades the attitude of many of our people toward their responsibilities in life changed, and the republican or representative form of government was practically destroyed when we provided for the election of Senators by popular vote, adopted the direct primary and its fellow travelers, the initiative, the referendum and recall, which introduced an almost pure democracy and weakened the cornerstones of the Government originally formed.

In this presence I wish to apologize for the fact that in my youthful idealism and patriotism and belief in the unselfishness of our people, I thought these changes were proper. I have changed my mind. This system, however, would have worked satisfactorily had we not by the same act of its installation opened the door to the demagogue and the promising type of candidate for public office, who were quick to sense their opportunities to appeal to the selfish instincts of our people, instead of to their impulses of self-denial and patriotism. With this type of candidate came his progeny—the pressure groups to whom he catered. They have multiplied rapidly in number and in strength, and their demands increased until we have today upon our laps numberless crying infants looking for Government help and unwilling to practice self-denial, thrift, and industry on their own account and without Government help.

The balance of power is now held by pressure groups, some of whom do not hesitate to strike behind the lines when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle and the future of our country is tottering in the balance. This is at least a mild form of treason and should be dealt with accordingly.

Some of these groups openly advocate the abandonment of the capitalistic system in whole or in part; but all are of one mind in that they generally desire to better them-

selves at the expense of those not in their particular group.

Our sister state of Canada is closer in form of government to the system carved by our forefathers than we are. Their senators of the Dominion Parliament are appointed by the Crown. The result of it is that Canada has been given men that the poet might well have had in mind when he wrote the following:

"God give us men. The time demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men of whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking."

Its senators are appointed for life and constitute a balance wheel stabilizing the Dominion Government, now almost bled white by the dogs of a war not of their making.

The problem now confronting us is: Can our form of government be preserved? We cannot and will not change back. We must try to make the best of it.

The conditions operating in this country today warrant the conclusion that unless some change is made our Government will fail. Whenever taxes reach the point where private enterprise is hopelessly unattractive, the average citizen ceases to struggle, but starts looking for some way of eking a mere subsistence. That we are close to that point is the considered conclusion of the writer and of many intelligent Americans who have written and spoken on the subject, in addition to the scores with whom I have come in contact.

Democracy is a beautiful ideal and could be well sustained by an unselfish people; but it cannot stagger along under the load that has been placed upon it. It simply cannot bear the burden of supporting the individuals and organizations that claim to have a lien upon it. When a country over a period of many years has a form of government that cannot pay its way, it must be conceded to be unsuccessful.

Knowing as we do that if it does fail we may go to something worse, common sense dictates that we should make every effort to save it. It is preferable to socialism, chaos, or some other condition maybe now unthought of. And if it does fail, and we have made no effort to save it, we have no one to blame but ourselves. I suggest the following:

First, since the greatest evils of our country are waste, extravagance, and inefficiency permitted under policies that are strangling our Government, every good citizen must arise and denounce those policies and those who are responsible for them, until the evil is remedied or at least lessened as much as possible. We must keep the fire bell ringing continuously to awaken our people to the gravity of the situation. It is the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government to support the people.

Existing waste and extravagance is shocking to any honest man, but we have seen so much of it that it now passes rather unnoticed. And it would not be so vital were it not sustained by borrowed money which, in my opinion, our Government can never repay and the taxpayers will not voluntarily raise the money to pay it. The existence of a war, or a depression, is less than no excuse for this condition—we have been through such before. It is not unpatriotic nor talking politics to denounce it wherever and whenever we observe it. In fact the reverse is true and such disapproval will tell the world that we are proceeding on stable plans and doing business on a business basis. We must expose the situation so vigorously that it will ring in the ears of those responsible for it wherever they turn.

The overhead of national, State, and local governments must be reduced no matter what it entails. A large percentage of those now holding Government jobs must return to private life. Bureaus, commissions, and the hangers-on must be cleaned off the slate. If any citizen has a grievance, there are ample facilities for its adjustment. The present baneful influence is manifested everywhere by many defense workers now receiving wages so generous as never before dreamed of, and which enable them to save funds as against the day of unemployment, which is sure to come. But lamentably few are doing so, asserting that they will be taken care of anyway at the public expense. These people, in the day of unemployment, should be confronted with the inquiry as to what wages they received in our war effort and what they did with them as bearing on their right to relief.

There is no one in this gathering who does not know of these evils; and yet we remain silent for fear of being accused of hampering the war effort, when if we were extremely vocal on the subject we would be aiding the war effort and assisting in stabilizing our Government.

Pressure groups must know that our Government does not question their right to organize, but it will question the righteousness of their demands and, in fact, the demands of anyone seeking public funds. They should be kept away from our legislative halls, or at least required to register and file a statement of their receipts and disbursements. The citizen must know that it is his duty to support himself, and not the duty of the Government to support him, unless he be indigent or unfortunate. He should know this himself, but if he doesn't it should be made plain to him by men who will not mince words on the subject.

We must attempt to eradicate the professional office seeker who prefers a soft political berth to the moil and struggle incidental to making a precarious living suitable to his abilities in private life. Candidates seeking public office should be required to file with their candiacy, and it is a simple matter to do so, an oath that they will make no misstatements or false promises during their campaigns, and be held liable for its violation. This would frighten away most of the present crop of candidates now cluttering up the body politic and would make it necessary to call on citizens to hold public office as a part of their debt to society.

Every ship must occasionally go into drydock for the cleaning off of its barnacles. Our ship is overdue for that operation, and it should be no longer delayed, war or no war. I believe there is a decided majority of our people holding this view, but they are unorganized. Perhaps it is time for forming a party or organization known as the American Party, pledged to do this very thing. The members must have the spirit of the forefathers and pledge everything they have to this end and, in the language of our Declaration, pledge to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Every citizen should scan every governmental act that comes under his observation and expose everything of a suspicious nature, even though he may occasionally be wrong. He should take turns at ringing the fire bell.

I have dedicated myself as one of the bell ringers and will ring it on my own account, or on any authentic information given me, and feel that it is my sacred duty to do so. The situation is difficult, but not impossible, and if we do this our country will have a new birth of freedom.

Radio Broadcast by Rupert Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Rupert Hughes on January 1, 1944:

A new word has come in with the new year. Since we can't have new clothes, new cars, new tires, new much of anything but nuisances, a new word is a nice thing.

This word is silly enough and sharp enough to give a little tang to the jaded palate and the coated tongue that follow a New Year's Eve.

Being coined by a Republican, the new word is naturally a bit bitter. It was coined by the Representative of South Dakota, KARL E. MUNDT. It is a quaint word—"Gwibit." It is made of the initials of a bureau Mr. MUNDT offers to the administration.

The New Deal has just about used up our alphabet in finding titles for its bureaus. It was about driven to seeking help from the Russian alphabet—which has 36 letters; including 12 vowels, and 1 simply lovely consonant made up of SZCZ's and pronounced—but it can't be pronounced. It has to be sneezed; and it would blow out your radio if I snoze it.

One helpful book says it can be best represented by what goes on in our language when the bull gets in the china shop and we speak of "smasht china." Cut out the "sma" and the "ina," and what's left is that compound Russian consonant—sh-ch—a perfect letter for the bureaucrats' latest bureau.

But Congressman MUNDT prefers the simple word "Gwibit" made up of a not so imaginary group that he calls the guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic Idea-Throatcutters. Those initials spell Gwibit. Mr. MUNDT goes on:

A Gwibit gets on the Government pay roll and maintains low visibility all year. The menace of the Gwibit is not so much from the standpoint of salary as the amounts of the people's money he spends as agent for the Government. I hope that some day a song writer will write a song entitled "Pencil Packing Papa, Lay That Checkbook Down."

But this joyous New Year's Day is no time to be talking of anything as empty as checkbooks.

In gaining the new word, "Gwibit," we are losing an old favorite. The President has asked that people stop talking about the New Deal. He is tired of it.

It always was a rather strange expression. Politics is the only game I ever heard of in which one new deal could last for 11 years without ever moving on to the other players, or giving them a chance even to cut the cards.

The Republicans have always said that the New Deal was dealt from the bottom of the deck and the top cards were never handed around at all. But those are partisan words and not to be taken seriously. Bitter partisans also cry that what we want is not a new deal but a new deck.

We are promised just that when the war is over. The four aces are to be the "four freedoms." Of the suits I suppose that the diamonds represent lend-lease; hearts are brotherly love among all nations; clubs are for the international police force; and spades

are to dig the grave of the great god of war and bury him forever.

But now that the New Deal is dead—and admits it, dead by its own request—people who can hardly remember back a dozen years have forgotten just what it was. It might be well to recall a few of its principles as proclaimed in 1932.

Of course, a platform is not to be taken too seriously. It is a place to make speeches from, or give a show on, or dance on, and then depart about your real business. And yet the Democratic platform for 1932 did say these solemn words: "A party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and the people are entitled to know in plain words the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

A covenant, a contract, these are a few of the pledges. Read 'em and weep. Or I'll read 'em—you weep. I quote the pledges:

First. "An immediate and drastic reduction of Government expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent, in the cost of Federal Government."

Second. "A Federal budget annually balanced within revenues."

Thirteenth. "A firm foreign policy including: Peace with all the world; no interference in the internal affairs of other nations."

"We condemn the open and covert resistance of administrative officials to every effort made by congressional committees to curtail the extravagant expenditures of the Government."

Those are a few of the trump cards of the New Deal. They were the first cards discarded. And they have never been played. Uncle Sam sat down to what he supposed was a game of contract bridge and he lost his shirt before he discovered that he was in a game of strip poker with everything wild except the joker.

There was a flurry of economy at first, consisting chiefly of a drastic cut in the benefits paid by veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War, and a flat 10 percent cut in the pensions to Civil War veterans.

After that the fun began. The national debt was doubled. The Economic Conference was broken up. Then bureau building began. We were pulled out of the depression so rapidly that only 17 other countries beat us in the climb back to normal. Then came another depression. And then a bigger and better World War.

The President ends the old year by saying that he'd like to drop the words "New Deal". He is tired of them. That makes it unanimous. The New Deal is dole.

And yet—sometimes a player throws down a hand that another player could have played so well that he could have won the jack pot.

The end of the war is going to leave us in another frightful chaos. If the policy of borrowing ourselves rich and drinking ourselves sober is continued, it can only mean chaos chaoticized, confusion worse confounded.

What if the Republicans—or some new party—should take up that New Deal and really deal it? It reads pretty well when you look at it again in its virginal beauty unsullied by trial. Look at the promises again. Read 'em and hope. I quote again:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction in governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance."

"Maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay * * *."

"A sound currency to be preserved at all hazards * * *. Unemployment and old-age insurance under State laws. * * * A firm foreign policy including no interference in the internal affairs of other nations * * * continuous publicity of political contributions and expenditures * * *."

"We condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities * * *. We condemn the open and covert resistance of administrative officials to every effort made by congressional committees to curtail the extravagant expenditure of the government."

Those were the words of 1932. Somebody ought to give them a trial. The results might be surprising—especially to those who issued the proclamation and promptly forgot it.

On this New Year's Day, let us turn to something cheerful. If we cast our eyes far enough back and very swiftly, not even glancing at the intervening landscape, we can see how far we have come. We can take courage for the heavy climb ahead of us—up out of the bloody valleys of death of this red war, up over the mountains of debt still growing in front of us faster than we climb.

We might look back to January 1, 1775. Then there was no United States—merely a cluster of Thirteen Colonies, united only in their hatred of taxation by a central government—a hatred that still glows in the American heart. We have never been schooled in the foreign ideology that the government gives and the government takes away—and only what it has given.

In 1775, Patrick Henry made eloquent speeches.

"Give me liberty or give me death" and things like that; yet John Adams said:

"At the Virginia Convention, Colonel George Washington of Virginia made the most eloquent speech that ever was made. Says he: 'I will raise 1,000 men, subsist them at my own expense, and march, myself at their head, for the relief of Boston.'"

On January 1, 1775, nobody had ever seriously mentioned the word "independence." January 1, 1776, found a ragtag army drawn up around Boston. July 4, 1776, we declared for independence. Then came defeat after defeat, disaster and disintegration. On Christmas 1776, Washington made a surprise come-back at Trenton.

January 1, 1777, began hopefully, but January 1, 1778, found Washington's men at Valley Forge, part of them still without shelter. Thirty-five hundred of that little army were barefoot and otherwise naked. When Washington followed the troops to Valley Forge, he traced their march by the red footprints their naked, bleeding feet left in the snow of the icy roads.

The soldiers had no blankets, little food, little medicine. Their horses died of starvation in such numbers as to menace what little health the sick and freezing soldiers had. When they found supplies, they harnessed themselves to the wagons with grapevines and often, dragging the wagons up a little hill, fell on their faces and were too weak to rise.

Those were the men who built this Republic. George Washington wrote at that time: "Naked and starving as they are, we cannot enough admire the incomparable patience and fidelity of the soldiers."

All his life he begged his people and posterity to avoid permanent alliances with other nations. That warning was never so much needed as now.

It is not isolationism to keep our Republic intact and separate. We have never practiced true isolation. From our earliest days we had foreign trade. We had to import nearly everything except food. When the Revolution broke we had almost no factories. We did not even make woolen garments. At Valley Forge Capt. Allen McLane's brave cavalry was dressed in uniforms made out of his own table linen and sheets. They had no overcoats. Our generals came out to drill in their bathrobes.

It was to Valley Forge that the first news came of the French alliance. The Spanish sent an agent there and we were soon allied with Spain. We had the friendship of other nations and borrowed money and supplies from them.

Our poor little 13 ragged colonies were befriended by the vast and wealthy Russian Empire. And now we are saving the Russian Soviets in their effort to drive the invader from their soil. When the *Scharnhorst* was sunk last week, she was attacking a convoy protected by the British Navy—a convoy of American supplies—more of those thousands of planes, thousands of tanks, tens of thousands of trucks, tons on tons of munitions and food we have been pouring into Russia by way of the Arctic and the Tropics.

It is glorious to look back to those January firsts. How far we have come! How marvelously we have prospered by following the paths mapped out for us by our founding fathers!

Yet now there are those who counsel us to throw overboard all that wisdom and heroism and achievement, all the grandeur and the power and the freedom of our Nation; dump them into an international caldron of toil and trouble and let them bubble away.

We have best helped other nations by first helping ourselves. Their hope is our strength.

We are fighting all over the world to crush a malignant power in Europe and another in Asia that threatened our freedom and our very existence. We are saving ourselves and the world. After the inevitable victory, are we to settle down in Europe and Asia and Africa and meddle with the affairs of every people under the sun?

As always in our history, there are Americans trying to goad us into an international merger. In 1776 they wept at the Declaration of Independence. They wanted us to stay in the British Empire. Now they want us to join in a federation of the world. According to them, an isolationist is one who tries to keep his beloved country aloof from the whirlpool at the foot of the cliff and a reactionary is one who believes in keeping a bridle and a bit on a horse and a good set of brakes on a car.

At the edge of a precipice it is not progress or love of mankind to plunge forward into the quicksands of world politics. It is a time for jamming on the brakes and going into reverse—getting back to the great highway of Americanism—and continuing on the road that began on the way to Valley Forge and went on from there. There were bloody footprints on that highway. Our men are shedding American blood again all about this one world. But they must come home to one Nation indivisible, inseparable, and indissoluble in any pandemonium of all the devils in all the peoples.

May all our New Years find us united as the forever United States of America under the Stars and Stripes forever.

As of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my

remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cecil B. Dickson, from the Binghamton Press:

AS OF TODAY

(By Cecil B. Dickson)

WASHINGTON.—Our third Christmas in our Second World War comes Saturday.

Thousands of families will sit down to a turkey-laden table to feast in the observance of the birth of Christ.

There will be millions of vacant chairs at these tables.

Many of the chairs never again will be occupied by a beloved son or father.

It may be many Christmases before the rightful owners of millions of the chairs can occupy them again.

The first war Christmas was observed under the shotk of disaster and defeat at Pearl Harbor.

The second war Christmas was observed with restraint and hope of victory within the year.

Now the third—a war boom Christmas—is upon us and victory still is far away.

Something has happened to our people in the past year.

The willingness to sacrifice diminished to the vanishing point.

The spirit of volunteer service lessened.

Necessary war restraints, themselves actually only minor irritations, developed into major political issues on the home front.

With our men fighting and dying in far off jungles, in the frozen north, the blistering African heat, over death-strewn Europe, in frigid Atlantic and torpid Pacific waters, our people seemed to forget that unless we win this war, peace never will be restored for us.

The picture of America on this third war Christmas is disgraceful.

It is one of selfishness, greed, and disunity.

Workers are striking or are threatening to stage strikes that may wreck our own war effort, at least prolong the war and cause the needless death of thousands of our young men.

Certain businessmen are fighting, not for victory, but for blood money in war profits.

Reformers and long-hairs in the Government are trying to use the war to gain their selfish ends, to destroy the very government for which our boys are fighting.

Farmers are clamoring for higher prices, labor for higher wages, both of which may destroy the Nation through inflation.

Politicians are being dishonest in their statements and actions for political advantage.

Mr. and Mrs. Average American Citizen are spending money like it was something to dispose of before the day of judgment.

They stand in line for hours to buy a bottle of liquor. They brag about getting meat, gasoline, and stockings from the black marketeers.

It is useless to try to pin the blame for this condition.

We all are to blame.

For one reason or another, be it lack of love for our country or because we are inured to shock, we have failed and allowed our leaders to fail to face our and their responsibility.

We let our leaders in Government misunderstand our true feelings. When they were so incapable of understanding and so lacking in perception of our willingness to sacrifice, we all lost.

Instead of bowing in humility at this third war Christmas, we are crassly materialistic in our celebration.

Another Christmas comes in 1944.

Much will transpire before then because the fortunes of war are imponderable. Reverses always are conceivable.

We cannot expect that there will be peace on earth and good will to men by Christmas 1944.

A million American boys may lie under the sod of foreign fields.

Forces of organized dissatisfaction that are working so hard for selfish gain in this country may have us in the throes of uncontrollable inflation.

Our political leadership may be changed as well as that of our allies and our enemies.

All men must pass, and change is inevitable.

Our good fortune in this war may leave us.

We all may be forced to suffer as have the families of 131,000 fallen men.

We may yet feel the pinch of hunger, the breath of danger, and the silence of death.

But whatever may happen, my greatest hope is that before next Christmas we Americans engender a love for our great Nation—a love so strong that it will prevent us as well as our enemies from destroying that which God and our forefathers gave us.

Message of Gov. Henry F. Schricker in Regard to the Freight Rate Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement recently made by Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana, dealing with the interterritorial freight rate controversy which has caused so much agitation lately. The Governor's statement is so eminently fair, I think it should be read by everybody. It is as follows:

I understand that the primary purpose of this conference is to consider the freight-rate problem now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission and Congress. I am aware that there has been much publicity about this question and that the Governors of some of the States of certain sections of our country have obtained Nation-wide publicity by writing articles and making speeches about how their particular section or State has been abused as a result of improper freight-rate charges.

There have been in some instances, I am afraid, some rather veiled threats about what might happen in the event the Interstate Commerce Commission does not decide this controversy in the manner that certain sections of the country want it decided. In addition there has been introduced in Congress several bills which, if passed, would result in throwing freight-rate fixing into the lap of Congress, there to become a political football to be kicked around by sectional and political logrollers.

I recognize that the fixing of proper freight rates is a very complicated procedure. It requires much study and long association with the problem to clearly understand the mechanics of fixing freight rates and to determine whether or not any given rates are just and proper. Naturally my duties as Governor and the duties of any other Governor permit little time to make a study and to acquire sufficient knowledge on the subject to discuss it with authority and understanding. Of necessity the problem must be left to others.

I recognize, however, that it is a very important problem. A recent report of the National Resources Planning Board tells us that the annual freight bill of the Nation is $20,000,000,000. This constitutes one of the largest single items of expense in our national economy. I am well aware that there are those who feel that the present freight rates give certain advantages to certain sections of the country with resulting disadvantages to others. If that is true, it should be corrected. I am certain that you all agree with me that our section of the country wants no advantage in the form of more favorable freight rates over any other section. On the other hand, no other section of the country should desire or receive any advantage in freight rates over our section.

It seems to me that the only proper way to equalize freight charges in the various territories and sections of our country is to leave the matter to the sound discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be determined by that Commission after proper hearings and the assembling of all the facts involved. This important agency of our National Government has been in existence for many years and has rendered a very valuable service throughout its existence. I doubt if any Federal agency is more highly respected than the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has always tried to be fair and insofar as I know its integrity has never been questioned. It certainly can be depended upon, therefore, to act fairly and judiciously in the controversy which now exists. It certainly is most improper to attempt to bludgeon or threaten this Commission into deciding a controversy in favor of any particular section, or the way that any particular section wants it decided, by threats of political recrimination and the stripping of authority in the event the decision is not what some people and sections desire.

This attempt to influence the jury, so to speak, should not be tolerated in our national life. It tends to create sectionalism and disunity at a time when national unity is most important. I urge this conference, therefore, to go on record and say to the Interstate Commerce Commission that as far as we are concerned, we want no special privileges. If any inequalities exist which favor us, then they should be corrected. If any inequalities exist to the detriment of our section of the country, they should likewise be corrected. The determination, however, of whether or not there are any inequalities should be based upon the evidence and not upon pressure exerted by any section or group. If this matter is handled in this way, then I have every faith, as I am sure you have, in a proper solution of the problem, by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I think it might be proper to mention that the States represented by this conference have a very important task confronting them after this war is over. There is unquestionably a greater concentration of labor engaged in war work in the North and East than in any other section. This places upon industry and government in this section a special obligation in the post-war readjustment period, to see that this labor is profitably employed in industries with the least possible dislocation or relocation of the people involved.

Freight rates will play a very important part in the post-war readjustment. While we do not ask or desire any advantage in freight rates, we should, at the same time, endeavor to see that we do not suffer any disadvantage because the results of improper or disadvantageous freight rates for our section would make the problem of post-war readjustment in this highly industrialized section all the more difficult. I mention this because it is just one more reason why the freight-rate problem should be left up to a fair and impartial tribunal such as the Interstate Commerce Commission to settle, free from any undue pressure from any group or section of our country.

In closing, therefore, let me urge upon you to use whatever influence you may have to see that this problem is settled fairly and judiciously by a tribunal which has dealt successfully with such questions for many years.

Tolerance—The Keystone of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely address, entitled "A New Year's Message—Tolerance, the Keystone of Americanism", delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] over station WMAL, Washington, D. C., on the National Forum program, December 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Across the years of my public life, the idea has often occurred to me that the foundation stones of the Christmas spirit are to a very great extent made of the same elements as those upon which the founding fathers so solidly set the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. No American should ever forget the forces responsible for the coming of the Pilgrims to these shores, or of the social, political, and economic injustices of the Old World from which issued every subsequent stream of immigration to our benevolent hills and valleys. The relative absence of opportunity to rise in the economic order; the lack of occasion to advance in public service; the nonexistence of a spiritual order allowing for the worshiping of God in harmony with the individual conscience; racial antagonisms conceived in narrowness of mind and personal greed and satisfied in the halls of human tears, suffering, misery, and death; all of these are the constituent features of those backgrounds intimately and directly responsible for the steady flow of men, women, and children to our shores, seeking in our America that peace and contentment symbolized by the immortal declaration that the Creator has endowed all men with the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In line with the experience of every American, I have been a disturbed witness to all forms of human intolerance; to a form of conduct which has been so aptly described as "man's inhumanity to man." In my studied opinion, it is absolutely impossible to think of a condition more contrary, or more categorically opposed to the very essence, the veritable marrow, of our form of government, than intolerance, be it racial, religious, political, social, or economic. In other terms, I cannot reconcile myself to the possibility of a really solid American lifting a finger, raising a hand, penning a word, or voicing a thought in conscious support of the hideous forces of intolerance, the poisonous fangs of which our fathers came here to escape.

During this Christmas season, which beyond the semblance of a doubt is in the midst of the most critical period of the history of the Republic, it behooves every American to ponder the values of our form of government, and to make every effort to strengthen and perpetuate the principles of real Americanism, unsoiled by the dirt of narrowness, prejudice, and hypocrisy.

In our America homes have been built, children reared, and life enjoyed by men of every nation, of every color, and of every religious and political inclination. The sons and daughters of American colonials and European immigrants today grace every field of worthy endeavor, and all have contributed to the formation of that magnificent structure which we call America. From Maine to California, from the Dakotas to the Gulf, in the Pacific, European, and Asiatic theaters of war, the muster rolls of American armies and battle fleets are honored with the names of every breed of men, all serving their God and their country so that your children and mine may live to enjoy the blessings of a just and honorable world. Colin Kelly reached the heights of heroism in the Philippines; James Patrick Devereux and his men fought to the death on Wake Island; Doug Munro led the Coast Guard boats sent to rescue marines from a beleaguered beach at Guadalcanal; Art Wermuth was a "one-man army" at Bataan; Dan Deleo led his squad for 3 weeks behind the German lines in Tunisia; Aram Parunack was the world's first pilot to land and take off from Greenland's treacherous icecap; Joe Martinez died on Attu with his white-hot gun still at his blood-soaked shoulder; Myer Levin, William Chang, Alex Betlejewski, and George Lamptropoulos gave their lives on various battlefields, so reads an endless list of American boys sweating, fighting, and dying for America; boys whose people came from every nook of creation but a few years ago to seek a decent place in which to ply their honest labors. I am quite certain that in the fox holes of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Tunisia, and Bataan our boys did not stop to inquire into the name, complexion, racial precedence, religious faith, or political or labor affiliations of their companion. These superficialities faded into insignificance in the face of that greater category to which they all belonged: Americans facing an enemy which would destroy their homes, their institutions, and their hallowed ideologies.

It is a comparatively simple task to determine whether a man is an American or whether he only pins this label on himself to be used as a megaphone for his personal aggrandizement. The tenets established by the founders of the Republic are as plain in the language in which they are expressed as they are high-principled and just in their conception. Either a man believes in them or he does not. Our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution and our Bill of Rights were not formulated with the idea that each citizen could add to or detract from these documents as his individual whims and prejudices might suggest. The substance of these precious papers are the fruits of calm and placid intellects unruffled by the stresses and strains of small and degrading motives; and anyone who does not live up to their sum and substance is not worthy of the name American.

We are all familiar with the consistency with which racial, religious, and economic strife manifest themselves in our country. It cannot be denied that all of this is the illegitimate offspring of the prejudice of one racial or economic group against another whose color, creed, or idea happens to differ from its own. It has been stated often that prejudice flows in the blood of humankind, and there are many so-called practical men who adhere to the argument that because we have never been free of it, we never will. With every consideration for the difficulties involved in running contrary to human nature, I will never become wedded to the notion that these conditions will ever prevail. To me this is a negative, a defeatist philosophy, which admits that we might as well continue, and thus nurture, our inborn evil traits and give up all hope for a better human order. In the face of all obstacles, I will persevere in pleading for tolerance; tolerance of one racial group for another; tolerance of organized labor with regard to the processes of organized business and industry; tolerance of one religious faith toward another which may be a system apart; tolerance of the so-called practical businessman for the ideas and efforts of the legislator; and tolerance of the legislator for the oft-labeled impracticality and idealism of the academician. We cannot avoid the circumstance that all of the groups referred to, taken as a whole, constitute the life-giving elements of our American way of life. Remove any one and America will be different. So long as the progress of our great country has brought about the existence of these political, social, and economic factors, it is nothing other than common sense that we should all plead for the maintenance of harmonious relations between them; this, if we are to witness the steady progression of our American institutions toward the sacred goals envisioned by the framers of our Constitution.

Do we believe in our form of government or do we not? Certainly every literate American is, or should be, familiar with the content and meaning of our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights. We should all thank God for the fact that across the years of our history the really great men and women which America has produced did believe in these documents. This truth explains the hard-won but steady progress of our American institutions; I say hard-won progress because those giants who were and always are in the vanguard of American civilization have dragged behind them, by dint of sweat and suffering, the ugly chains of prejudice and intolerance attached to them by those self-labeled Americans whose personal interests have blinded them to what was best for the Nation.

The greatness of your America and mine has stemmed from the infinite variety of its backgrounds. Its greatness in the future will depend upon our willingness and determination to live together in harmony, in peace, and in understanding. This is the core of my plea to my fellow Americans during this holy season; this is the foundation upon which I beseech the citizenry of our land to strain every moral and spiritual sinew toward the projection of the spirit of Christmas, the spirit of the Christian tradition, into the difficult years which lie ahead; all of this so that our children and our children's children may be able to look upon an America bathed not only in the comfortable warmth of God's sunlight, but also in that contentment of mind and spirit which can only flow from the dominance of true brotherhood as embraced by the Christian ideal of peace on earth and good will toward men.

Operation of Air Transport Business by American Shipping Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under interpretations placed upon the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the American merchant marine was placed in a dangerous position in meeting competition from foreign shipping interests. In the consideration of H. R. 3420, that danger must be removed.

H. R. 3420 should be amended to provide that nothing in section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, shall be construed to prevent or restrict American steamship companies from engaging in air commerce. Other friendly maritime nations with whose shipping interests the American

shipping companies must compete are being encouraged in the development of air service in conjunction with their surface shipping.

In accordance with the unanimous consent granted to me to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article which appeared in the Financial News, London, England, on November 26, 1943, attention is invited to the following, which reports the action of Mr. Justice Bennett in the Companies Court, authorizing the Blue Star Line, Ltd., to amend its articles of incorporation to permit it to engage in air service:

BLUE STAR AIR POWERS TO BE LIMITED TO SHIPPING ROUTES—CHANGE IN OBJECTS APPROVED BY COURT

Mr. Justice Bennett, in the Companies Court yesterday, permitted an alteration in the objects of the Blue Star Line, Ltd., to enable the company to operate an air transport business in connection with its shipping business. He would not permit the company to carry on a separate air business.

Blue Star Line is one of the five companies concerned in the formation, announced in the Financial News on November 2, of a separate company for the purpose of operating air services between the United Kingdom, the Continent, and South America. The other four are Royal Mail, Pacific Steam Navigation, Booth Steamship Co., and Lamport & Holt.

At the time of the announcement of the formation of a separate company by the five companies mentioned, it was added that the routes proposed were on those on which the companies already ran sea services. The air services would be complementary, affording passengers a choice of air or sea journeys.

Yesterday's hearing began when Mr. Bowyer, counsel for the company, outlined the proposed alteration. The judge pointed out that under the memorandum the company would be able to carry on the air business as a separate business entirely. What had been proved, however, was that the air business could be conveniently added to the shipping business.

COMPANY'S INTENTION

Mr. Bowyer said it was not the company's intention to carry on a separate air business. But, he submitted, the proposed alteration was within the power of the appropriate section if the company at some later stage wished to carry on an independent air business.

Mr. Justice Bennett said he did not see why, in confirming the alteration, he should not put the company upon terms to alter the objectionable clause. Unless people could be made to realize that it did not pay they would continue to do it, and he thought it was time it was stopped.

Mr. Bowyer read an affidavit in which it was stated that the company at present carried on an extensive shipping business with considerable success. The airplane would play an increasingly important part in the affairs of the nation and the world, and if shipping companies were to hold their own they must be prepared to carry on air transport in all parts of the world.

MR. JUSTICE BENNETT'S VIEWS

Mr. Justice Bennett said the way the company's resolution was framed would enable it to carry on a separate air business. He thought it should be limited to the establishing, carrying on, and running of air transport business in connection with the shipping business. He would confirm the alteration of objects subject to an addition being made to the resolution that the air transport business should be carried on in conjunction with the shipping business.

Better Treatment for Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an excerpt from a very interesting talk on January 10 by Mr. Thomas Dorgan, clerk, superior court, Suffolk County, Mass., at a meeting in Boston of the Veterans of Old Dorchester Post, No. 65, of the American Legion:

There is no question about the disability of any fighting man who has lost a part of his body—arm, leg, foot, hand, eye, or ear—or who has been disfigured in battle or war accidents.

Before the fighting man leaves the hospital, the examining doctors should be required to pass on his disabilities. Papers should be sent out from the hospital to Washington.

A special division should be established at every veterans' hospital for this purpose.

No veteran who has lost parts of his body or been dismembered should be required to make trips to veterans' bureaus after his discharge from the military hospital, for examinations and for filling out additional papers.

His disabilities were self-evident at the time he was at the military hospital. The facts of battle speak for themselves.

When he is discharged from the military hospital, his mind should not be troubled with the details of red tape, worry about making out his claims for disabilities.

The Nation owes this service to the fighting men who have come out of battle bearing scars that will endure to the grave.

The practice of requiring disabled men to make claims at veterans' bureaus after their discharge from the military hospital is cruel, senseless, and inhumane.

Because it has always been that way does not mean that it should continue to be done in the old, stupid, ineffectual, inefficient way.

Imagine what it will be at the end of the war when there will be untold thousands of wounded men discharged from hospitals.

The veteran of the battle should have the comfort of knowing that the moment after his discharge from the military hospital his just claims for his physical sacrifices will be given prompt action.

He must not feel that he is penniless until he is able to visit a veterans' claim bureau and appeal for compensation.

1. Any veteran incapacitated in the line of duty should be cared for before he is released to the Veterans' Bureau. For instance, a soldier partly cured should not be forced out of the Army. He should be given treatment in the Army until he is cured, or until the doctors say he can't be treated any more. In this way the soldier would still receive his Army pay and not be in his home a pauper, with his family being forced to strain their meager finances to support him. The Army has a solemn and sacred duty to care for these wounded men. The public has a solemn responsibility to make sure that the Government is not allowed to mistreat these men. Sending them home only half cured is mistreating them.

2. When a soldier or sailor is released from the hospital, he should be given not only his fare home but the transportation. As it is now, sailors, for instance, released in San Diego have to get their own tickets. When they can't get reservations on the trains, they are forced to use some of their fare money for food and lodging. Then, of course, they haven't got the fare home.

The Legion and 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a New Year's radio address given by John Towle over Station WIBW on the American Legion program, January 2. Mr. Towle, of Topeka, is the department historian of the Kansas Department of the American Legion, a member of the National Reemployment Committee of the Selective Service, a grand knight of the Knights of Columbus, and a member of the executive committee of the State association of county assessors. I find this address of so much interest that I am extending it here for the benefit of many others:

A new year was ushered in less than 24 hours ago—perhaps not so gayly as in past years because we all realized the immensity and the seriousness of the problems confronting us; we paused to contemplate what the future has in store—we cannot predict that 1944 will bring us victory on the many foreign fronts on which our boys are fighting, but as to whether we win the victory on the home front, before the new year, which is still in swaddling clothes, dies on next December 31, the victory or defeat will be known.

We will do all in our power to have our boys at home with us next Christmas, but the enemy, despite our every effort, may not be entirely subjugated by that time; however, the coming months will say as to whether we have done our part to achieve victory at home. The year 1944 will be momentous in the history of our country.

The American Legion Magazine for December quoted editorially with complete approval from the Indianapolis News as follows:

"The time has come for the people of the United States to ask whether their Government intends to keep on playing Santa Claus to the world. American foreign policy is becoming a joke all over the world. The war aim of every one of the Allies, except the United States, has been made clear. Britain is fighting for its empire. Winston Churchill has made no bones about that. And even though many Americans disagree with his insistence on empire, they have applauded his forthrightness and candor. Russia is fighting not only for her national independence, but for buffer states. China is out to do away with extraterritorial rights for all time. The Netherlands is looking toward the restoration of empire. The Free French movement is pinned to the reestablishing of the French colonial empire. Every one of America's Allies knows what it wants and what it is fighting for. And yet the United States keeps on insisting on paying the major share of the bills, on providing the food and the equipment and the manpower for some vague freedoms which even to stanch liberals seems empty in view of the administration's actions in certain diplomatic situations. Is it true that the United States is fighting for

the empires of its allies? Is this Nation's manpower to die for the conquering of some other power's colonial territory? Are American taxpayers to pay for the establishing of some other nation's trade routes?

"What, then, is the United States foreign policy? Is it to establish freedoms all over the world that this Nation has not yet obtained for itself?"

These are the issues which will be settled, and I believe, definitely and decisively this year. Legionnaire Clif Stratton, of the Capital's Washington Bureau, on Christmas Day, quoted the following from an address of Malcolm McDermott, Duke University, North Carolina.

"I can think of nothing more cruelly deceitful than to tell the American youth on the battle fronts, that they are fighting for democracy, if in reality they are to return to be governed by a brand of German national socialism. We ought to let them know what they are fighting for. The guise in which the movement is being clothed in this country would be ludicrous, were it not for the tragedy of the thing. The entire process of putting the citizens in a governmental strait jacket is constantly called liberalism. A liberal government, properly defined, is one which leaves its citizens to develop their own capacities and resources, to learn by their own mistakes, and to control their earnings. Do we now want to abandon our system of government and turn to one that has wrought unhappiness and disaster to every people who have tried it?"

These are serious thoughts—we have a decision to make this year which will not only vitally affect each and every one of us but the entire future of our country—we will either demand a return to the Constitution or will repudiate the founders of our country. We will either follow the advice of such outstanding legionnaires as Alf M. Landon, Harry H. Woodring, and Andrew F. Schoeppel or we will accept the fate of regimentation of practically every other country of the world.

My faith in the love of freedom and liberty, that is inherent in every American, assures me that we will take the only course open to us—I am confident that the 130,000,000 Americans will not repudiate the Father of our Country and the other champions of our Nation which made it great. In our fight at home to preserve our democracy, every man and woman who does not join, is aiding its destruction. Good citizens are recognizing this in ever-increasing numbers; there may be a few misguided citizens and partisans with bad public records to defend, who charge that to criticize in time of war impedes the war effort, aids the enemy, and is therefore disloyal. That blanket indictment is supposed to muffle all criticism but it does not deceive any thinking citizen.

Abraham Lincoln had this to say:

"It isn't only the right of the citizen, but it is his duty to criticize the administrators of government in wartimes as well as peacetimes when, in his opinion, the administrators are doing things inimical to or destructive of our Government."

I therefore appeal to all my fellow citizens to awaken to the dangers confronting us—hundreds of millions of human beings live in a spiritual and physical enslavement in which fear is the dominant psychological characteristic. What we forget is that most of these enslaved human beings once were free. They once published and read newspapers and magazines and books of their own choice. They once worshipped God according to the dictate of their own conscience without persecution. All of us can remember a free France, a free Germany, a free Italy. It seems only yesterday when the news dispatches from these countries described not less, but more, liberty. What happened to these liberty-loving peoples? What destroyed their spiritual life? What fearful tornado tore them from their roots?

Failing to discharge their civic responsibilities as good citizens, they were enslaved when their power was usurped by dictators.

Let us take cognizance of these disasters, for we in the United States stand on the brink of a similar disaster. All private enterprise in this country is threatened by policies promoted by persons who believe that the "rebuilding of America," to use their own phrase, must be done by bureaucratic dictation to private enterprise and controlled largely by government spending and subsidy. These advocates would substitute a government-planned and a government-dominated economy in the place of free enterprise. This substitute is incompatible with every form of freedom. Great concentration of power anywhere and everywhere results in tyranny.

It is only when the American people fully comprehend the dire results of concentration that they will take the necessary action. The opportunity to assert themselves is theirs this year. I am sure they will take advantage of this right and assure themselves of liberty as against regimentation—freedom as against tyranny. Our heritage is too priceless, our stake in the future is too great. We must know our rights and liberties, and, knowing them, dare maintain them unto death.

Legionnaire Alf M. Landon asked in an address in Milwaukee 2 weeks ago just how the principles of the Moscow Conference and Teheran Conference would be applied. Instead of receiving an answer, he was rebuked by the "fellow travelers." Milt Tabor, of the Topeka Daily Capital, last Tuesday also asked a pertinent question: He wanted to know why we were to furnish 73 percent of the army necessary to invade Europe as against 27 percent to be supplied by Great Britain. To this moment no reasonable answer has been given.

We celebrated last week the birth of Christ. Because of His birth, this week we honor the holy innocents who were slain by Herod. We are forcibly reminded that the world has its modern Herods—400,000 children of Poland have died since that country was invaded by Hitler and Stalin. These two Herods of the twentieth century now vie with others who because of their pride and greed and pagan lust for power have made the world a terrible nightmare.

Twenty-five years ago the American Legion took the pledge to serve God and country. I am proud to say that this pledge has been faithfully kept; and when our boys return from war our ranks will be increased by millions who will join us in seeing that America will receive a rebirth of freedom and liberty. The Kansas Department of the Legion will have a big share in the reconstruction of the Nation because of the vision and leadership of such outstanding members as Harry H. Woodring, former Governor and Secretary of War, and other well-known men prominent in the affairs of the Nation and State. We pledge our membership, which will be composed of veterans of World Wars No. 1 and 2, to greater service for God and country, and that we will continue the policy that has made the American Legion one of the dominant organizations of our country.

Because we pledge ourselves to God and country we recognize the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and recognize that the common law is Christ applied to jurisprudence. Until leaders throughout the world accept this fact, until leaders in our own country return to the Christian principles which were embodied in our Bill of Rights by Washington, Jefferson, and others, chaos will continue to reign. To fight for the return of the God-given rights of man is our goal, and we will not rest until it is achieved.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a portion of a letter received from Mr. Frank Nelson, a farmer at O'Neill, Nebr. Mr. Nelson is out there on the firing line, helping to produce the food needed in the country. He is far enough away from the confusion and turmoil of Washington to see the entire forest and not just the trees. Believe me, the farmers of this country are putting forth a Herculean effort not only to produce food and buy bonds and do their part in helping to bring this war to an early conclusion. A portion of Mr. Nelson's letter is as follows:

The first thing we farmers want done is to win this war quickly. We don't want to win it in a manner that will cost us our representative form of government or it will be a meaningless victory.

If we are going to roll back farm prices, which has already been done, we should not advance salaries or commodities or rents or contracts or anything else.

We are getting less for our products than in the last war, yet I am told that the consumer pays more on a good many things. Is this caused by higher labor costs or by excessive profits or by the extra help needed to make out all of the reports demanded by the different Government agencies?

Hogs are $13.45 at Sioux City, Iowa, if you have the proper weight and can get rid of them before they get too heavy. You are penalized as high as $2 per hundred if your weight is too high or too low or if the hogs are not finished even though they are within the proper weights. Most of them desire 50 cents to $1 a hundred. There is no profit in these hogs that bear the penalty, but there is lard that they are asking every housewife to save for ammunition, and there is extra meat that they will want before this war is over.

We have been blamed time and again as a class for failing to do our part, but most of the time without knowledge of the facts. We are short of manpower, we are short of machinery. We have long distances to cover and are short of gas and rubber, some of which was taken from us and sent back east for pleasure driving. With all of these handicaps, we will do our best and come through unless it is an impossible task that is asked of us.

We ask no overtime, pay of time-and-a-half, nor extra for Sundays or holidays. We are not out on strike to force the Nation to submit to our demands in a time of great crisis.

Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, the remarks in this letter are pregnant with the ideas and thinking of the farmers and ranchmen in Nebraska. I hope the C. I. O. leadership in this House will stop blaming the farmers for the high cost of living, when as a matter of fact many of the things they now buy from the farmer is cheaper than it was a year ago. If the farmer is to continue to

produce he must be given the machinery, the help and guaranteed a reasonable profit for his efforts.

A Fighting Sailor Writes of Conditions on the Home Front

REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is intensely interested in what soldiers and sailors, particularly on foreign duty, are thinking and saying. For that reason I want the Members and the country to hear the contents of a remarkable letter I received yesterday from a fighting sailor on active duty in the Pacific.

The letter is self-explanatory and needs no descriptive adjectives from me. It is human and terrible in its feeling of futility, and is an indictment that can be quashed only by a complete change of attitude and policy on the home front. The Navy officer was prompted to write me by some remarks of mine carried in his ship's newspaper in the Pacific. He is not known to me, nor I to him. His theme is not the same as that in my quoted remarks, but is an expression of his own feelings and those of his shipmates on a subject giving us all great concern today.

The original letter and the envelope bearing the official stamp and signature of the Navy censor on a ship at sea is on file in my office. Here is the letter:

U. S. S. "Coos Bay,"
January 2, 1944.

Representative Compton.

Dear Sir: As executive officer of a combat ship of the United States Navy now operating in an advanced battle area in the south Pacific, I feel that it is my duty to speak—my perhaps insignificant feelings—on a matter which has had a direct deteriorating influence on the members of our crew. My position charges me with all personnel problems, that is why I speak—fully realizing that I am sticking my neck out; though my office and my commission mean much to me, they mean nothing in comparison to my loyalty to my country.

Last week we received the news that our railroads had been taken over by the Government—what a dastardly crime against a country for those men to strike. Then we heard it was the steel unions that were next to strike. My God, I ask you, Haven't these strikers sons and brothers in our fighting forces? As Christ said on the cross: "Forgive them for they know not what they do." That was Christ, a supernatural person with great power of forgiveness, but they certainly must realize that we who are going through a constant hell will not forgive them.

We are out here not fighting for a new idealistic world, we are fighting for the world we knew, the life we lived in the past. Proof of that is the manner in which we recall our good times; praying, hoping to return to our wives and sweethearts as we remember them—just as they were, not changed. We are being sold out by the American people who are not honestly making an effort to maintain things as they were. Yes, they'll work in a shipyard provided they receive five times the pay they deserve. I am only one in millions whose hopes are being crushed along with those of our men. I have a young wife 21 years of age with a baby that I have never seen. It was as difficult for millions of others as it was for me to pass Christmas and New Year's away, but I was thoroughly slapped today when I read the enclosed cut from our ship's newspaper (a Washington report of railway and steel strike threats). I was too late to keep it from their hands. Tears came into eyes that have survived great naval battles, men who have fought and killed: "What's the use, where are we getting?" they asked. In the same paper was the announcement that the magazine Esquire was not to be sent through the present class of mails. What right has anyone to change these things that we are fighting for without our consent? Esquire is not only a magazine, it is an institution. In our recent advance attack on a Jap island a Jap bomb struck its target killing several men in surrounding fox holes. As one particular 20-year-old lad was carried mutilated and quite dead from his fox hole, it was noticed that he clutched a picture of a Varga girl in his dead fingers; he had not wanted to risk leaving this picture in his tent at the mercy of the Japs. These boys have so little; they have and hold foremost their memories, they eat and sleep as catch-can; they work and die gladly for a people, a Nation, an ungrateful America.

I mentioned that I am sticking my neck out. Yes; I am—I'm proud to do so. That's the trouble today, those who know what's going on are afraid to talk. Our boys were up most of the night, we had four raids last night in all—then daylight broke and we gave thanks for the light that we might see the enemy. Tired but not in the least ruffled these men were piped to breakfast after the dawn where the morning press was handed to them.

Perhaps the movies have the perfect manner of painting pictures that pull at the strings of one's heart, but no movie at any time could possibly portray the silent, distressing, the damnable, discouraging look these boys had when they read the news (of the strike). "God damn them," cried one young fellow with a wife and two children at home. There was no reply to his words—just a silent echo throughout the mess hall. One by one the boys quietly left.

I was present at the first landing in Africa. I've been bombed by the French, Germans, Italians, and now the Japs. My last ship was torpedoed from under me, then they strafed us with machine guns while we swam through the water. They sank the life raft that I had pulled myself upon, throwing me back into the water—by a miracle I was uninjured. I passed through the States many months ago on my way to the Pacific Fleet to again be at sea—I requested it—I wanted it. En route I stopped in St. Louis and spoke to a group—a large group composed of many controlling labor, etc. I was asked to speak to them in a sort of "just to be nice way." I fooled them; I accepted and I told them what I thought and what I believed without permission from anyone. I know I hit home because when I finished everyone of that assembly stood up and a brief silence prevailed as I left the platform. At least I have had one chance to talk to them and I'd give my life to be able to talk to them again. We have a double battle—one with our external enemies, the other with our internal enemies.

Sincerely,

Lt. W. F. James.

P. S.—Thanks for sticking up for Esquire and what it stands for. Just thought I'd let you know how we feel about things for you seem to have the guts to talk.

The Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a great deal is being said these days about post-war employment and unemployment. Organized industry, the administration, the Congress, and the people at large are wondering how we are to produce and distribute the goods and services necessary for the removal of the fear from want of our own people, to say nothing about the nationals of other countries.

There was recently published in the Liberal Advocate, volume VII, No. 92, a brief statement which stimulates our thought. This appears to be a reprint from the Ottawa Citizen. I submit it as a contribution to present-hour discussion:

THE REAL ISSUE

Recently in Britain Herbert Morrison made a speech in which he said that full employment had never been achieved in peacetime by any but a totalitarian state, but that in Britain they were going to make a great effort to achieve full employment after the war.

Lord Melchett in a letter to the Times of London takes up this question and says:

"I do not believe there is any recorded case of a totalitarian state providing full employment except in conditions of preparation for war. It follows that the problem of full employment does not lie in the field of political organization, nor indeed solely within the field of industry, which, based upon science, is capable of progressive expansion of output per man. The problem of the modern world is to provide the population with mass purchasing power to absorb the output of mass production. This lies within the field of finance, and calls for a research effort of an order comparable to the effort directed to scientific research."

The leaders of the Liberal Party, the Progressive Conservative Party, and the C. C. F. Party are all agreed in the belief that "full employment" can be attained by "full production." But full production is not the real problem. It is full consumption, as Lord Melchett says. So long as this problem, which is a financial question, is ignored, most of the talk of "full employment" remains merely talk.

Strikes in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what should be done to prevent wartime strikes?

The natural response of the average citizen is, "There ought to be a law."

I agree; but what kind of law? It must be a law that has public support; it must be fair to industry, labor, and Government; it must not be too harsh to be enforceable; it must not be so mild as to be ineffective; to make strikes unlawful and subject to criminal penalties has an appealing sound to those angered by repeated repudiation and violation of the no-strike pledge. There are two reasons why such a drastic course is not practical:

First, it would not be practical, for example, to put 300,000 coal miners in jail for striking and would not produce any coal.

Second, the average workman who is a member of a union has little or no choice in whether he strikes or not. He is ordered to strike or to work. If he disobeys union orders, the discipline is strict and drastic, the union may take away his union card and with it the right to work and feed his family.

One of the basic reasons for wartime strikes is the failure of the Government to recognize and protect the rights of American citizens to work and earn a living for themselves and families. I will not believe that men with sons and brothers in the armed forces will willingly sabotage the war effort by interrupting the flow of essential military supplies. But when the union officials order them to stop work, they must stop or run the risk of losing union membership and with it the right to work.

I believe we can stop strikes without putting anyone in jail; or depriving labor of any right it ought to have.

Labor laws have given labor leaders tremendous powers, but have imposed no responsibilities. The grant of such powers should be accompanied by a definite responsibility in the exercise of those powers.

When supposedly responsible labor leaders fail to meet their responsibility; and abuse the powers granted by Congress, those leaders should be replaced by others who will recognize their responsibility and so control their members that work stoppages will not occur.

Strikes and work stoppages do not occur without the connivance or actual direction of union leaders. To say that they cannot control their members is to say that they are not responsible or competent leaders.

The fact is that whenever the union leaders have ordered strikers back to work they have gone. No individual or private organization should have the power to compel free citizens to work or refrain from working. It makes the union boss more powerful than the Government, as has been repeatedly shown, to the shame and humiliation of the American public. This is fundamentally wrong. But what legislation would be effective?

I think the answer is simple.

Congress has granted special privileges to labor unions not enjoyed by other organizations or citizens. If they prove unable or unwilling to exercise those special privileges in a way not to endanger the war effort, they should be deprived of these privileges for the duration. A simple act of Congress declaring wartime strikes to be against the public interest; and prohibiting any union or union official from representing as the bargaining agent the workers in any plant where a work stoppage occurred, would, in my judgment, definitely and finally put an end to strikes for the duration of the war.

Union leaders will, of course, assail the proponents of such a proposal with their usual barrage of bluff, bluster, and abuse, but no Member of Congress ought to be afraid of being placed in the same class with Judge Vinson, Justice Byrnes, Eddie Rickenbacker, and General Marshall, all of whom have been subjected to violent and intemperate attacks because they had the courage to place the safety and welfare of their country above the selfish interests of a minority group.

Let us see how well the union leaders have kept their much vaunted no-strike pledge. Let us look at the record, the official record of labor statistics. The latest available official figures of the Labor Department show there were in the month of November 1943, 300 strikes involving 500,000 workers with 2,825,000 man-days lost, followed in December by threatened strikes in the entire transportation system and the entire steel industry.

For the 11 months of 1943, to December 1, the Labor Department says there have been 3,425 strikes. To the labor leader who piously proclaims almost daily that labor has faithfully kept its no-strike pledge, I say what about the 3,425 times that you violated the pledge in the first 11 months of 1943?

Perhaps he will say that those 3,425 strikes were small and inconsequential; the Labor Department says they involved 3,059,000 workers. Three million and fifty-nine thousand workers in 11 months of the most critical period of the war laid down their tools and went on strike. Perhaps he will say that the 3,425 strikes were brief, did not cost the war effort much. The Department of Labor says that 12,785,000 man-days were lost by strikes in the first 11 months of 1943.

If anyone claims that 12,785,000 man-days lost forever do not hurt the war, let him translate this lost time into ships and planes and bombs and bullets that were not produced. Ask MacArthur's men in the tropic jungles if they could have used those ships and planes, bombs and bullets.

With these official figures, it is idle for labor leaders to bluff and bluster and beat their breasts and repeat the old and often repeated untruth that they have faithfully kept their no-strike pledge. The strike situation is deplorable and dangerous and has been since before the war started. It is like sitting on a keg of gunpowder that may explode at any minute. The policies pursued up to now have been inadequate. Nothing is to be gained by quarreling about what should or might have been done in the past. Let us look hopefully to what is being done in the present and toward what may be done in the future. The question now is what must be done to prevent a recurrence of recent strikes and threatened shutdowns.

Whatever may be said in criticism of those responsible for the present situation, the fact should not be overlooked that the House of Representatives on four separate occasions has by overwhelming record vote passed comprehensive legislation to forestall and prevent the strike situation in which we now find ourselves. I am confident that with the right leadership from the right quarter, the House is ready to act again.

The Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of the Lea bill, proposed by the commissioner of aeronautics for the State of Connecticut:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
DEPARTMENT OF AERONAUTICS,
Hartford, Conn., January 7, 1944.

Do you know what the Lea bill H. R. 3420, now before Congress, would do to aviation?

Do you know that it would—

1. Make it unlawful for a flight operator (or any other airplane owner) to take pay passengers for a ride over town unless licensed as an air contractor?

2. Make it unlawful for a flight operator to carry cargo or passengers from one town to another unless licensed as an air contractor?

3. Place all intrastate air commerce under a super bureau in Washington?

4. Set a precedent for surface transportation which might include railroads, bus lines, trucking companies, taxicabs, private automobiles, water transportation, etc.

I guess you know it would be practically impossible for the little fellow, due to the cost of prosecuting an application in Washington and other restrictive provisions, to qualify as an air contractor.

You know the little fellow, the flight operator, at your airport and mine, is the one who pioneered aviation. You know that he is the one who came through and trained thousands of pilots for the armed forces when they were caught unprepared.

You know that he is the one who will build up aviation in every community owning an airport.

You know that he needs passenger and charter flights to stay in business.

Do you know that he would have to meet impossible requirements to qualify as an air contractor?

I guess you know the air-line companies do not have to meet these requirements—that their present air-line certificates are sufficient.

Would you like to verify the above?

Then read carefully because much of it is cleverly hidden.

Pages 10, lines 6 to 10, inclusive, which defines an air contractor.

Page 12, lines 9 to 14, inclusive, which defines domestic air commerce.

Pages 59, line 10, to page 68, line 25, which provides for the licensing of air contractors.

Do you know that this bill would empower the Administrator to prescribe traffic and other rules and regulations governing the use of all airports? It would.

Do you think communities should build and maintain airports without the right to control them?

I guess you know what would happen to all our present and proposed airports if such a bill should become law.

Would you like to check on this? Read carefully lines 3 to 14 inclusive on page 78.

Do you know that the Administrator could grant exclusive rights for the use of all airports and navigation facilities upon which Federal funds have been expended?

I guess you know that there are practically no airways or airports in the United States where Federal funds such as W. P. A., N. Y. A., P. W. A., or C. A. A. have not been expended.

Do you know that all airports upon which Federal funds have been expended would be subject to confiscation by the Federal Government?

Do you think legislation like this, which by the way, sets a precedent that could be extended to railroads, highways, public utilities such as power and water, parks, public buildings, etc., is good legislation?

I guess you know what the taxpayers would think of a deal like this.

Want proof? Read carefully lines 24 and 25 on page 26. Also lines 1 to 12 inclusive on page 27.

Do you know that practically everyone in the aviation industry including the thousands of people working in factories producing aircraft, aircraft engines, instruments, parts, and accessories would be subject to licensing by the Government?

I guess you know what kind of a bureaucratic machine—Federal unionism, or whatever you want to call it, could be set up under a law of this kind.

Do you think a precedent of this kind that could be extended to the automotive industry on the pretext of safety should be established?

Check this. Read the following very carefully this time: Lines 14 to 25 inclusive on page 10 and lines 1 to 3 inclusive on page 11.

Now read lines 21 to 24 inclusive on page 72 and lines 1 to 11 inclusive on page 73.

Do you know that the Federal Government would be allowed, even encouraged, to go into the aviation business? Do you think it should compete with established flying schools? Do you think the Administrator should be allowed to set the wages of instructors, mechanics, medical examiners, etc.?

I guess you know what would happen to flying schools trying to compete with the Government in business.

I guess you know how much chance they would have of staying in business, paying wages at standards set by the Government.

Proof? Read the following. Read carefully because the significance and meaning are well concealed. On the surface it doesn't appear too bad: Page 29, lines 18 to 25, inclusive; page 30, lines 1 to 25, inclusive; page 31, lines 1 to 11, inclusive.

Do you know that this bill contemplates putting the Federal Government in the aviation-insurance business? Do you think we need more Government in business?

I guess you know what Government competition would do to established insurance companies?

For verification read page 113, lines 1 to 24, inclusive; page 114, lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Do you know that if a pilot violated an order or regulation issued by the Bureau or the Administrator, the aircraft would be subject to lien for the penalty?

I guess you know how such a law would affect the rental of aircraft?

Look this up: Page 113, lines 1 to 24, inclusive; page 114, lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Do you believe in more and larger bureaus in Washington?

Do you believe that bureaus should have unlimited power to make laws and prescribe penalties?

Do you believe in Government-controlled monopoly?

Do you believe the record of Federal bureaus justifies the creation of more of them?

Do you believe the rights of States, counties, and cities should be relinquished and our entire national economy dictated in Washington?

Or do you believe—

In free American enterprise.

In the rights of the individual.

In less Government in business.

In less regimentation.

In the future development of aviation.

In the right of thousands of American airmen to continue their chosen profession when the war is won.

In giving our airmen, many of them the most brilliant minds in aviation, a voice in writing laws that will vitally affect their future.

You do?

Then you had better be doing something about it. Do not minimize the danger, bureaucrats and monopolistic-minded individuals are working hard for this bill.

Maybe you had better write to your Congressman. Time is short, lots of telegrams might be better.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. LOCKHART,
Commissioner of Aeronautics.

Claims of Discharged Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I have received from the Veterans' Administration with reference to expediting the claims of veterans who have been discharged. Action of a positive nature must be taken immediately to expedite these claims:

DECEMBER 24, 1943.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am in receipt of your letter of December 21, 1943, to which was attached a letter received by you from a friend commenting upon the statement made by National Commander Warren H. Atherton, of the American Legion.

The letter addressed to you is particularly concerned with the procedure set up to expedite the adjudication of the claims of veterans of this war discharged for disability. This procedure provides for the collection of certain records essential to the adjudication of the veteran's claim, namely, a copy of his physical examination report at the time he entered active service, the clinical records covering his hospital treatment while in service and a copy of his certificate of discharge for disability by the military authorities and the forwarding of these records to the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration at the time of his discharge from the service, or as soon thereafter as possible. These records are then distributed by the receiving office of the Administration to the field station having jurisdiction of the veteran's home address for adjudication.

The procedure has not functioned as smoothly as could be desired, and there has been delay. However, both the military authorities and the Administration are giving careful study to the problem with a view to speeding up the process as much as possible.

In order that you might be made aware of what is being done by the Veterans' Administration in the furtherance of expediting the adjudication of disability claims, I desire to advise you that a group of Veterans' Administration employees was installed at Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1943, for the purpose of adjudicating claims for disability pension filed by servicemen discharged for disability. A study is being made in cooperation with Army and Navy officials to ascertain the number of Army and Navy hospitals from which the number of dischargees for disability per month will warrant the installation of similar groups of Veterans' Administration employees. Since these groups will function to a large extent as independent offices, requiring versatility and adaptability of the employees assigned, only the most experienced personnel will be detailed for this duty.

As of November 30, 1943, 110 rating boards were authorized at the various field stations and 215 additional rating boards have been authorized since that date, making a total of 325 rating boards in all. These additional rating boards will be placed on duty as quickly as members can be recruited. A rating board, as you are aware, consists of a rating specialist, medical; rating specialist, claims; and rating specialist, occupational. Plans have been made to train additional rating specialists and staff adjudication personnel in the several field offices, supplemented by central office personnel when required. Plans have also been made to train additional contact representatives at several of the larger Veterans' Administration field offices.

In order that you might be made cognizant of the work that has been accomplished in the adjudication of disability claims of World War No. 2 veterans, I should like to advise that as of November 30, 1943, 102,444 cases of disability claims had been adjudicated. Of this number 33,742 cases were allowed. On November 30, 1943, the Veterans' Administration was paying disability pensions to 33,057 living veterans of World War No. 2, of which number 28,415 were receiving pensions for disabilities incurred on or after December 7, 1941, and the sum which was paid out on this account during the month of November was approximately $1,725,000. During this same month of November approximately $1,049,000 was paid out to dependents of 14,392 veterans who have lost their lives on account of service in the present war. As of November 30, 1943, approximately $8,223,000 had been paid out in pensions to disabled veterans of World War No. 2 from the beginning of the war up until that date, while during the same period $8,443,000 had been paid out to dependents of veterans who lost their lives as a result of service.

I feel that it is needless for me to assure you of my keen personal interest in the prompt and expeditious adjudication of these disability claims and I want you to know that all possible steps are being taken looking to the acceleration of the work of adjudication.

Permit me to express my appreciation of your interest in the well being of veterans.

Complying with your request, the enclosure submitted by you is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Simplification of Government Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter from Maj. Gen. Robert Wood Johnson, retired. General Johnson in this letter speaks as one who knows. He has worked in Government and in the Army and he has had plenty of experience. He realizes that the country is suffering from too much government, that government has become too complicated and that the attention of Congress should be directed to correcting this situation. This attitude will find, I am sure, a ready response on the part of all Republican Members of the House and many of the Democrats. Only the "Dr. New Deals" will object.

The letter follows:

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., *January 10, 1944.*
The Honorable FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Government is the scourge of the world. Whatever government touches is crippled or destroyed in the vast majority of cases. It is true that occasionally a government bureau does a good job for a little while, but sooner or later it becomes a blight on the body politic. No one man nor group of men nor party can be held responsible for the developments of the past 15 or 20 years, but all men today are gaining an understanding of our errors of omission and commission

My recent experience in traveling throughout the United States points in one direction: The people want less central government and more home government.

The purpose of this letter is to bring these observations to your attention and to point out that we must not wait for the end of the war to bring about the needed correction. We will fight a better war through the adoption of those essentially American principles that have served us so well in war and in peace. This country is too big and too diversified to be capable of central operation.

One important segment of our problem is that of inflation and the threat of greater inflation. The cure for inflation is production, and those of us who have an intimate understanding of this country believe that the productive capacity of the United States is greater than our most optimistic estimates, and the peak has not been obtained.

An incident which happened a few days ago is an indication of what I have in mind. A week or two before Christmas the press was giving much attention to the fact that merchants were asking $1 per foot for Christmas trees, and there were many complaints and suggestions that the O. P. A. should do something about it. A few days later the trade discovered that there were more Christmas trees than people who wished to buy them, and the price collapsed. This pattern is age-old. It was unnecessary to hold meetings and enlarge many more agencies—at least in respect to Christmas trees.

There is every reason to believe that we are producing or can produce enough to satisfy the military needs and to support a high standard of living for our civilian population during this war. Should my suspicions be borne out, it will then be possible to give serious consideration not to the best technique of establishing a price or controlling an inventory but to abandoning the entire conception and obliterating the Government agency except for the few remaining true shortages that may exist. This reasoning not only applies to the O. P. A. but to the W. P. B. and other agencies established to meet an emergency that no longer exists or which exists to a very limited degree.

My experience in Washington leads me to conclude that it is rarely a question of how we should do the job, but it is more often a question of turning the problem back to those who know about it, namely, the man who produces the goods and the man who uses the goods, and allowing them to find their own solution. If the circumstances are so severe as to warrant Government intervention, then let's give attention to the production of enough of the item in question as to make the controls no longer necessary.

We have sold ourselves the idea that we must emulate the enemy to win the war. This is largely a fallacy. Our efforts should be in a reverse direction. We should emulate the enemy as little as possible because it is our fundamental belief, in which I heartily join, that the American way of life is better not only in peace but in war. This is no longer a matter of opinion. The record of the people in production here in America proves that we have out-produced and will continue to out-produce any nation anywhere.

It seems to me that we have come to a time when you and your colleagues might well give attention to the simplification of the Government processes, to the decentralization of central government back to the States, and to the elimination of Government controls to the greatest possible degree.

Please accept my best wishes for the coming year. I sincerely hope that you will be able to carry on your arduous responsibilities, as I know from my many friends on Capitol Hill how difficult your job is.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON.

Armed Forces Should Have Voice in Coming Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to me, I am including herein an address which I delivered over radio station WHN, in New York City, on December 30, 1943, dealing with uniform Federal legislation facilitating voting by the armed forces.

The address follows:

Fellow Americans, we are justly proud of the institutions which form the basis of our democracy. We have long been the envy of the world because of the freedom which we enjoy in our country. Our people are presently engaged in this World War to preserve that freedom for ourselves and our posterity.

Next November the country will face a vital national election. There is now no point in discussing the issues. In the time allotted to me it would be impossible. We shall elect a President and Members of both Houses of Congress. They will have much to say in the shaping of our own national future and also the program for the preservation of world peace.

In these sorrowful days, we are mindful of the debt which we owe to our men in service. No one, I am sure, would intentionally advocate depriving them of any right which is theirs. Yet, by the failure of the Congress, thus far, to unite on uniform Federal legislation, facilitating voting by the armed forces, we, here at home, are actually depriving them of the right to vote.

In his Christmas Eve address President Roosevelt revealed that 3,800,000 of our men and women are fighting on foreign soil. It is further expected that their ranks will be increased to 5,000,000 by July of next year. Millions of others are serving in their country, away from their homes.

There can be no dispute with the proposition that the members of the armed forces, wherever they may be, should have a voice in this coming election. They have a vital stake in its outcome. They have ideas of their own, whether some of us like them or not, and they have the right to express those ideas.

The Senate of the United States has recently passed the Eastland-McKellar bill, which leaves the soldier voting entirely in the hands of the individual States. The practical effect of this bill is to disfranchise our servicemen.

State election procedures are weighed down with intricate regulations. The restrictive poll tax must be paid in a number of States before the right to vote can be exercised. In many of the States there are complex rules governing absentee voting. Registration by the soldiers before they can vote is required in a great many others.

Under the terms of the Eastland-McKellar bill, the only way in which these requirements, and others, can be avoided would be for each State to enact special legislation covering this subject. In this connection it is important to point out that the legislatures of 40 of our States will not meet before January 1945. There is no assurance that special sessions will be called. Hence, the only remedy which is left is to provide Federal legislation covering the subject.

Under the terms of the Lucas-Green bill, there would be provided a system of Federal supervision of the voting of the armed forces by a joint Democratic and Republican committee. The passage of this bill would insure without question the right of each member of the armed forces to cast his ballot in time for the national election.

Let us forget the petty sectional jealousies and the narrow prejudices which have made their appearance in the fight to retain food subsidies and now threaten this very important legislation which seeks to do justice to our servicemen.

Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a telegram received from citizens of Yugoslavian descent resident in Kansas City, Kans., regarding conditions in the country of their ancestry:

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
January 11, 1944.
The Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

DEAR SIR: This telegram comes from the organizations listed below, of which many of the members thereof did in the last war fight side by side with you. We have enjoyed your leadership in the American Legion here in our city, and we know that you have always fought not only here but will in Congress for what you believe to be right. We believe our Government has given promises and commitments to King Peter and his Minister of War, Gen. Draza Mihailovich, of Yugoslavia, and they in turn, together with the Serbian people, are fighting and dying because of their belief in the word of our country, and we beg of you to do all in your power to assist we American citizens of your district who are interested in the welfare of their former country Yugoslavia, to see that this country of ours stays with these people

over there who have so loyally and faithfully performed their promises to this country by fighting and dying to make not only their Nation but the world safe for democracy.

Very truly yours,

Lodge No. 43 of Serbian National Federation, S. N. Pavlica, president, Eli Vunovich, secretary; Local of Serbian National Defense Council of America, P. G. Stipanovich, president, Mark Terbovich, secretary; Serbian Orthodox St. George's Church, Rev. D. Milakov, M. Uzalac, president, M. Sumonja, secretary; Serbian Ladies' Circle, Millie Skoropan, president, Mildred Supica, secretary.

Induction of Hon. Joseph A. Gavagan as Justice of the Supreme Court, State of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks I wish to include an article from the New York Law Journal reporting the proceedings at the induction of our former colleague, Hon. Joseph A. Gavagan, as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

The induction ceremonies for Supreme Court Justice Joseph A. Gavagan were held Monday morning at trial term, part XII, of the Supreme Court, New York County.

Congressman WALTER A. LYNCH acted as chairman and introduced the speakers, among whom were former Postmaster General James A. Farley, United States Attorney James B. M. McNally, Congressman DONALD L. O'TOOLE, former Assemblyman Benjamin B. Mittler, Rabbi Harold T. Mashioff, Reverend Father Patrick J. O'Donnell and Norman S. Rein. There was a considerable assemblage of members of the bar and other friends of the inductee. The chairman in his remarks noted especially the presence of Congressmen MARTIN J. KENNEDY, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, and LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI.

It is regretted that space limitations this morning prevent the publication of all addresses in full.

The proceedings, in greater part, were as follows:

Congressman LYNCH. It is a distinct honor and pleasure to be here this morning to greet your Honor on this first day when you have ascended the Bench and on the attainment of your highest ambition. I come before you this morning in a threefold capacity, as a member of the class in law school which you and I attended together more than 25 years ago, as a member of the bar, and, thirdly, as a colleague of yours in the House of Representatives.

I shall discuss those 25 years first for a moment. When I think of you and others in the class of good old Father Sheeley, that master of jurisprudence, one of the greatest lecturers on that subject that this country has ever known, I do not know whether he had prophetic vision or whether it was just wisdom of the years, but I can recall him after a particularly brilliant remark on your part, when he peered down over those glasses of his, bowed his shaggy head and said: "Gavagan, some day you will be a supreme court judge." And how true it was. After 25 years, here you are a supreme court judge. And yet we all knew it in the class in those days. We knew that at one time or another in the career that was going to be yours, you would ascend the bench of the supreme court and we had no doubt that you would add honor and luster to that bench.

As a member of the bar I am pleased to be here to address the court this morning for the reason that we, as members of the bar, are particularly concerned with the type of judge before whom we are called upon to practice. You have had a distinguished career as an attorney. You have had experience in trying cases in all the courts. You have had an opportunity to add to that experience the legal training which you received from the Fordham University Law School and which has developed as the years have gone by. We of the bar feel certain that that experience of yours, with your natural legal talent, will be a great adjunct in the manner in which you dispose of the cases that are brought before you.

You have a sense of humor and I take it that that is one of the things that a judge must have, or should have, almost at all times. You have the ability to penetrate a question with quick precision and come to right conclusions. So, as a member of the bar, I am pleased that you were elected a supreme court judge, because you will add to the distinction and the ability of the bench.

Finally, as a colleague of yours from the House of Representatives, I am pleased to be here, and, at the same time, there is a feeling of regret because we lose from the comradery of the House one who has been there now for 14 years, when you were first elected to the Seventy-first Congress and to each succeeding Congress. You have attained high position in the ranks of your party and became ranking member of one of the most important committees that exists in the House. So, while we give you up to the judiciary, the legislative branch of the Government suffers a distinct loss, and we, who are your friends in Washington, who have associated with you during the years, feel that loss keenly. Yet we are overjoyed that today your ambition has been attained, your ambition which, through all the years, over a quarter of a century during which I have known you, has been but one thing, and that was that your mother would be there on the day that you were elected to the supreme court and would take your induction oath. Today your mother is here, your dear wife is here, who has been companion and counselor for the years past, and between the two you sit. You can justly say, "Indeed, my wish has been fulfilled. I have attained the supreme court judgeship as I always desired, and I attained it when my mother and wife could see me put on the robe for the first time."

If the court pleases, I desire at this time to ask one of our most distinguished American citizens to address the court; one who is known throughout the country, loved throughout the country by all who know him, and admired by all those who have heard of him, and everyone has, of course, heard of him. I present him now not as a member of the bar. But he has a motion which he will make, say a few words, a motion of good will toward you, the Honorable James A. Farley.

Former Postmaster-General FARLEY. Congressman Lynch, Judge Gavagan, and friends of Judge Gavagan gathered here, on this most delightful occasion:

Judge Gavagan, this is the first time I have ever been in court under circumstances such as these. I say to you with all the sincerity at my command, there is no occasion that I have ever attended of this character that gives me any greater pleasure than your presence here today. I recall full well when you and I went to the assembly just 20 years ago. I remember full well the days we rode up in the trains together, and how we settled all questions of State with Joe Flynn, of blessed memory, God bless him; Tom Burchill and Lester Patterson, and others, and the evenings after the sessions were over in the Ten Eyck Hotel. Down through the years, you and I have been close and most intimate friends. Like Congressman LYNCH, I, too, have known of your ambitions. I know how you hoped to see the day when you would become a member of this dignified court and that you would have the pleasure of having your dear mother and your dear wife present on that occasion. Very few men have that privilege and I am sure that you and everyone else who knows you as intimately as I do, know how you have felt in regard to that situation.

You made a splendid record in the New York State Assembly. You made a splendid record in Congress. May I say to the court (and off the record), Joe and I didn't always agree, but that didn't prevent us from being the firmest of friends. There wasn't anyone more pleased than I when I saw he received the nomination from both parties in the recent election. It is a great tribute to you and I am sure that you will merit the confidence reposed in you by the citizens of this judicial district. I know you will go on to still greater honors. You will perform the duties efficiently and well because you have character, you are honest, and you are intelligent. Lawyers and those who plead before you in this courtroom will, I am sure, be dealt with justly.

May I say to you: many, many years of success, health, and happiness. I sincerely hope and trust that we will all be around when you reach the age of 70 to congratulate you.

Congressman LYNCH. If it please the court, I desire to present to you Rabbi Harold T. Mashioff.

Rabbi MASHIOFF. I suppose that is an official order from the judge. This, I presume, is the counsel table, though I have not come to plead a case.

Judge Gavagan, distinguished guests, and not least among us, the friends and neighbors of our community: For the moment I am so overcome that, for the first time in my career, I find it rather difficult to summon words wherewith to express the thoughts that well up in my heart and my mind.

There is a great deal of rejoicing today in our community because our favorite son, for whom we had hoped and prayed for many years, to whose heartstrings ours have been attuned, to whom we have looked for guidance, for leadership, for advice and counsel, for inspiration, for comradeship and friendship, has been elevated to a high position in the administration of justice, which is the firmest pillar of good government and the very foundation of democracy in our country.

It is altogether fitting and proper and entirely significant that present here this morning is the beloved mother of Joe Gavagan and his spiritual leader, Father O'Donnell. Many have made reference to that already and many have said that Joe is fortunate that his mother is here this morning, and I add that he is fortunate also that Father O'Donnell is here this morning. Perhaps, putting it more correctly, I may say that Joe is here this morning because his mother is here this morning and Joe is here this morning because Father O'Donnell is here this morning. His beloved mother, in the true spirit of faith, has raised Joe and led him in the path of duty, of service, of righteousness, and in his very cradle, as she bent over him and prayed that he might be not merely a source of pride and joy to her but a source of honor to God, to his religion, to his community; she guided his faltering steps along life's highway until he was strong enough and firm enough in his convictions to walk alone, but even then she always hovered over him lovingly, watched over him, guided and inspired him; and I say again,

Joe, though I, and all of us, appreciate the inherent qualities of erudition, of honesty and sincerity that you possess, I attribute a great measure of your success to your beloved mother. Equally, and on the other side, always guiding you from your very childhood when you were old enough to enter within the sanctified sphere of your church, Father O'Donnell guided and instilled in you the seed of justice, of compassion, of love, of devotion, fear of God, recognition of the rights of all people; and to you the Sermon on the Mount and the inspired teachings of Christ, of the prophets of the Testament, and of the holy fathers were to you a light that determined your every thought and deed and action.

We are come here this morning joyfully to participate in this ceremony, for it is not only your great occasion—we feel that it is ours—and I assure you that each and every one of us feels at this moment that, sitting there and gracing that bench of justice is a piece of each and every one of us. We are sitting there with you, and we will continue at all times to sit there with you. We feel that we have had a share in it because you have given us of your friendship and your devotion. Our hearts are here this morning; our hearts will always be here.

I need not in the presence of distinguished jurists, I need not in the presence of worthy lawyers, speak of your ability as a lawyer. We all know about that. Congressman LYNCH has testified to that from the mouths of your early teachers. We are come to bear testimony to the sterling qualities of your character, to your sense of justice, your sense of decency, your determination to do the right at all times. That is what we have come to speak of, and it is in that spirit that we are all come to rejoice. Somehow, we all feel that at this very moment each of us has been elevated to the bench.

On behalf of my people, the Jewish people, all our community have always regarded you highly, have always felt a keen sense of appreciation for your efforts in championing their cause, even as you have championed the cause of all peoples; you have always stood forth with them in the face of criticism and often endangered your own position; because you went forth as a crusader who championed the right of oppressed and persecuted people—on behalf of these people, even as on behalf of all the citizenry of our community, we are come to wish you well and to bestow upon you our blessing. We fervently hope and pray that God may bestow upon you His blessing, that He may grant you peace and long life and good health and happiness, that you may continue to serve the entire community as you have in the past, and that the reward of your justice shall be honor and glory and peace forevermore.

Congressman LYNCH. If the Court pleases, I desire to present to you at this time one of the most distinguished members of the bar, who is presently holding the high office of United States attorney for the southern district of New York, the Honorable James B. M. McNally.

United States Attorney MCNALLY. If Your Honor please, Congressman LYNCH, both Mrs. Gavagan—Yes, ma, it's me, Jim—and friends and neighbors of Judge Gavagan: I listened with great interest when Congressman LYNCH told of Judge Gavagan having entered law school with him. I think that a man's character is often exemplified by his deeds in life. I believe that the sitting justice had the strangest and most varied career in law school of any man I ever knew, through no fault of his own. Let me relate it to you in part.

He entered law school with Judge LYNCH and he had scarcely finished his first year when a bout with pneumonia knocked him out for a full year; then they raised the law school course from 2 years to 3. He was back for another year and finished his second year when, as a member of the First New York Cavalry, he was called to the Mexican border in 1916, and he was out for another full year. He was back for part of another year when, as a member of the Regular Army enlisted reserve, he was called into active service in World War I and he was away from law school for 2 more years. So it took him 7 years to finish a 3-year course, and he ended up by having the highest marks in the class and was graduated cum laude.

We who know you so well and love you so well know that you bring to this bench a strong and vigorous mentality. We know your studious qualities, how you love the law and love the lawbooks. We know your inate sense of right and wrong taught you at your grand old mother's knee. We know that come rack, come rope, you will work even justice between every man and woman who comes before you, without fear, favor, bias, prejudice, or sympathy.

We, your friends and neighbors, congratulate you on coming to this court and congratulate the court on having you as one of its members. We collectively, jointly, and severally ask a kind and omnipotent Providence to watch over you at all times as you sit upon that bench, to give you the intellect to see what is right and the courage that you have always had to do the right thing.

Congressman LYNCH. If the Court please, I desire at this time to present to you one who has been your spiritual counselor through life, one who has watched your success with great feeling and deep admiration. It happens that, in addition to being your close friend, he happens now to be pastor of the church in which I am a parishioner, Rev. Patrick J. O'Donnell.

Rev. Father O'DONNELL. Your Honor, Your Honor's mother, ladies, and gentlemen, on this solemn occasion, so momentous to the individual concerned because of the great honor conferred upon him, so important to the venerable judiciary, whose tradition of dignity and scholarship and jurisprudence must be ever enhanced, so essential to the well-being of the State whose very existence depends upon just laws, capably interpreted, and impartially administered, on this occasion we invoke the Master of the universe to shower His blessing on him and on this hour, that in him legal luminaries of the past may find a worthy successor, and in this hour and in this induction, the State would have assurance of the unbiased and happy application of its rules for human conduct. May the great God who is the giver of good gifts, who is the judge of the living and the dead, who is the author and the arbiter of the natural law from which all laws are derived, guide him when he sits on the bench and wears the robes of his office. When he wears these robes, he wears, too, the vicarship of the Creator in his judgment of men and their affairs. May the God whom he represents, as he represents the State, give him the gift of understanding, of human tolerance, of infinite patience, of deep knowledge, and all the other qualities and endowments pertinent to the personality of a Supreme Court judge. May the divine light of truth shine through every well-studied decision. May he be strengthened through all equivocal conclusions, logically and irrefutably deduced from premises and evidences, it will be his duty to sift. May he bear his dignity with the ever-increasing respect of his colleagues and the ever-increasing confidence of the lawyers, litigants, and people. God grant that in the days to come even the Supreme Court, with its high prestige and noble past, will come to look upon him as an ornament and that the people will ever look up to him as a courageous champion of rights and an intrepid umpire of their legal claims, rights, and perhaps perplexities.

Judge Gavagan asked me to say a prayer for him and I have said it, and I may give expression, I suppose, to some personal emotion and word it aptly in the phrases of one to whom a great honor was once bestowed in the time of the psalms: Magnificat anima mea Dominum. He can translate that, I think.

I will say nothing, as enough has been said, about Judge Gavagan's scholarly career and his working his way through school as a boy and taking care of his mother and younger brothers and sisters, as a boy should. I know that in 1920 or thereabouts he began his career of law. Since he was admitted to the bar, he has consistently practiced the law. He is therefore familiar with the technique and ethics and procedure of every kind of court, and he has had ample opportunity to make every angle and theory of law cognizant to him. He began making law and participating in the making of law in the assembly in 1922, continued there, I think, till 1929, and from then on he was a Member of Congress, and I am sure I can speak for you when I say that we think he is now adequate to take on the more personal, the more individual, responsibility of judging; and, as he found it easy to make laws, that he will be capable of meeting the more difficult requirements of applying general laws to specific instances.

So, not to keep you very long, I am sure he will recall a little of his old time Latin when I address to him the classic remark: Ad multos annos, prospere procede et regna.

Congressman LYNCH. One of the things that lawyers should know is not to tire a judge too long with argument or procedure. Now, there is no intention on the part of us here this morning to tire you so early in the morning, and at the same time we feel that the weight of those judicial robes for the first time wears rather heavily on your shoulders. If it is in order, might I suggest a recess?

Justice GAVAGAN, Judge Lynch, distinguished guests, my family, and my friends: I would feel it unworthy of me and not at least consonant with my character were I to adjourn at your very gracious suggestion without a word. After all, I am still an Irishman and always insist at least on being heard.

This is without doubt the happiest moment of my life, and I have had many happy moments, but today, as I stand here in this hall of justice, seeing fulfilled the heart wish of a boy born in this city, who has come up the hard, hard way, I rejoice not for myself but for that for which I or one like me stands. There are a few whom I miss here today. I rejoice that my early religious and hard taskmaster is here and I wish to say to him and to all of you, I tried to be true and loyal to the great principles that you and your cloth inculcated into me; there are three, reverend sir, of your cloth in heaven today who, with you, did more, with the exception of my mother, to develop my character and make this event possible. One, the late Reverend Patrick J. Healey, also the late Reverend Terence J. Sheeley, and the late Reverend Edward J. Tracy. To them and to you, reverend sir, as long as I live, my gratitude will always go forth in my prayers for them and my solicitude for you. For, without your help, without your inspiration and your zeal for my success, I don't think it would have been possible.

There is another who did much in my early life to encourage me, to aid me, and to help me, who is not with us today. I refer to my first wife, now deceased. Mine has been a hard but happy way, and through it all, even when disappointment came, when bitterness assailed, and loss of hope and despair possessed me, into my ears came the words of my mother, "You will succeed. You will still succeed." If I have succeeded, it is because God in His wisdom has blessed me with the greatest mother in all the world, and given to me as my wife one of the sweetest ladies in all the world. To you, Dorothy, you have been patient, you have been kind in spite of an overawing ambition of, I hope, a loving Irishman. My friends know, for I have

often repeated it to them, that this day would be as tinsel were not my mother here.

To you, mother, I have now reached the pinnacle of your ambition. To you, what I have of character and what I have of patience and what little I may have of learning, I owe to you. I rejoice that as a youngster, I heeded your oft-repeated admonition, to give to you in lifetime, the rose, and not in death, when its gorgeous aroma would mean nothing to you. I have tried to bring to you the rose in life. I now have reached that pinnacle that in your faith you knew, I would reach, and I am saying to you now, mother, thank God you are here. Your son has achieved your life's ambition and I lay it at your feet and now I say to you with all the earnestness of my soul, consummatus est; it is finished, it is accomplished.

Labor and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered last evening over the Columbia Broadcasting System by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and, I believe, with a congressional record as free as is that of any Member of Congress from bias against organized or unorganized labor, it was with great concern and profound interest that I learned of the statement on January 1 by an anonymous high Government spokesman to the effect that the threatened railroad strike, which, by the way, did not occur, has had serious repercussions on the conduct of the war.

The commotion resulting from this statement, now widely attributed to the Army Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall, has been great. Understandably so. It is the first incident for the past many years that a high-placed Government official has spoken without reservation, without dissimulation, with utter and biting candor, on the contentious, politics-riddled and often misrepresented subject of labor relations.

I do not know who made the statement attributed to General Marshall. But for the purposes of this address, I will assume he did make the statement and discuss the entire episode from that standpoint.

In my judgment, the American people, collectively and individually, will be eternally in debt to General Marshall for his wise counsel and leadership, for his statesmanlike conduct and foreknowledge, for his cool, reasoned, quiet but firm and determined guidance during this crisis. I believe I am but reflecting the sentiment of the entire Congress in saying that he is one of the greatest military men in the history of our country. His are rare qualities which have stood our Nation in good stead in its greatest test in history.

General Marshall doubtless has had many feelings toward the attitudes and operations of civilians and civilian organizations since the war began. I am sure he would have voiced his feelings without restraint many times previously had he not felt that in his role as the leader of our wartime Army it would be improper to do so. I feel, therefore, that if he made the statement so widely imputed to him, that it was under the most extreme necessity that he did so, and that he was motivated alone by our military needs and consideration for the millions whose lives we have entrusted to his command. By extreme necessity, I mean that General Marshall must have come suddenly against an unavoidable fact that recent happenings in civilian attitudes and acts had unquestionably seriously interfered with the conduct of the war, that American lives would be forfeited as a result, for every soldier knows that anything which lessens the fighting morale of a single soldier increases the peril of all. War is a teamwork affair. I have the conviction that the statement attributed to him was not directed against labor any more than it was directed against any element of our Nation which, through a failure to appreciate the interrelation of all elements of our economy in this total war, might have heedlessly or thoughtlessly so conducted itself as to delay or add to the cost of our ultimate victory and thereby produce more loss of life.

The pros and cons of the railway strike and of the action of the President in directing the Army to assume control over the railway system of the country will not be entered into here. I know perhaps better than many how complex this situation is, and that there are real pros and cons, and not cons only, or pros only. However, a discussion of this phase of the problem is not germane to the purpose of my address.

General Marshall's statement, I repeat, I conceive to be a statement of fact—and of military fact, if you please—not an indictment of labor in general, railway unions in particular, or any other element of our society. It was a statement reminding the American people of the intensely close interdependency of all elements of our society in winning the war; it was a sharp warning that our national goal, so long as our destiny remains in the military balance, is the winning of the war, not peacetime problems, not profits, not salary increases, not the winning of a temporary advantage by one civilian group over another. It was a simple and vivid declaration that if we conduct our civilian activities without regard to our military activities, that if we divorce our civilian attitudes from our military needs, we must surely reap the inevitable long lists of dead and wounded, depleted resources, and wasted war matériel.

With this my interpretation of General Marshall's statement, I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with his thought, with him personally, and, further, with the manner in which he made the statement, and the time it was made. The merits of the issue raised by the railway unions are of little consequence in contrast with the national effort to win the war. By the same token, the greedy struggle after profits on the part of some industrialists are also of no importance and must not be tolerated. It is high time that selfishness, the pursuit of personal advantage, the ceaseless struggle to promote one economic group over another must be eradicated from our thinking and actions. We must unitedly seek victory. We must work in concert, without interruption, irrespective of our personal feelings, until victory is won. It is my conviction that the true meaning and intent of General Marshall's statement will have been entirely lost and deliberately distorted if its thesis is not broadened in its application to all elements of the Nation rather than to labor alone. And if this interpretation is made I cannot see how any thinking citizen, how any responsible Member of Congress, or other Government official can do otherwise than wholeheartedly agree with and give thanks to General Marshall for having so jarred to thoughtfulness our citizens and Government as to cause a reappraisal of the fundamentals upon which our victory depends.

The patriotism of any single element of America's economic life was not questioned by General Marshall. I have every confidence that he realizes as fully as any other thinking person that as a whole the laborers of the Nation have done a splendid job, that they have produced articles of war in amounts almost beyond imagination, and that their sons are demonstrating the same unalloyed patriotism on the fighting fronts as are their fathers, their mothers, and their sisters and brothers on the production front. The fact is, patriotism is not the issue raised by General Marshall. The issue he has brought to the forefront is indifference versus crisis. It is loose action in face of peril. It is right attitude or disaster. The issue is whether we shall continue wrangling as usual, competing with one another as usual, or subordinate our preferences to the national need. The message is there to be read by business; by professional politicians; by coal miners; by teachers; by doctors; yes, by labor. The decision General Marshall has given us to make is whether we will work together sufficiently to permit the application of all our Nation's force at the time it is needed where it is needed. And it would come with singularly bad grace, as in the case of the railway crisis, that at a time when we all know a mighty military effort is in the immediate offing, that any of us, or any groups of us, should act in such manner as would sacrifice needlessly the lives of our soldiers.

It was this situation which doubtless prompted the statement. It is this situation which prompts my address. So long have we struggled in the typical American fashion, in the characteristic competitive spirit for which we are no noted as a people, that it is most difficult for us to realize we are now dealing with death. It is hard to realize that every wasted minute at home is reflected in lost opportunity and flowing blood on the battle front. What is my little effort worth? we ask. What effort on my part alone can in any manner affect the stupendous military effort of the Nation? All war is merely a combination of individual efforts. Who can determine the important one?

It is high time we looked within ourselves to find the source of the trouble. Are we all doing what we can to win the war? Are we all contributing without restraint to the common cause? Are we seeking personal advancement from the national crisis? Are we subordinating our sons' and daughters' lives and welfare on the fighting front to our selfish desires, to a grasping after the almighty dollar, to our personal aims and competitive squabbles?

Perhaps General Mrshall, through his soldierly candor and bluntness, through his known integrity and honor, through his fearlessness and personal dedication to the national need, has given us a renewed, long-overdue opportuity for our rededication to what each of us knows within our heart is urgently needed: Unity and a common willingness to sacrifice without stint that our cause may prevail. To unite our home front with the battle front. To blend our all with the all which our soldier son or daughter offers.

Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] at the Jackson Day dinner held at Springfield, Mo., January 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be with you here this evening. Aside from the genuine satisfaction I always have when attentding a Democratic meeting, I am pleased to be in a State which always stands out in my mind as one of the important seats of Democratic faiths, beliefs, and ideals.

Missouri has contributed mightily to this Nation of ours and greatly has she contributed to the Democratic Party. I have heard it said that Missouri is neither East nor West, North nor South, but she is American, a State that is typical of the solid and substantial things which have made this Nation great. This great section of the country may well be called the heart of America.

In things substantial and worth while, and also from a political standpoint, Missouri is more than an ordinary State. Her sons have served in almost every phase of political life. Some of them have made tremendous imprints upon the life and the history of this Nation. She has produced great Democrats. In nearly every crisis of the Nation's history, some Missouri Democrat has been of outstanding prominence in the Nation's affairs. In the Congress of the United States, her sons have wielded great influence. No Missouri Democrat, and for that matter no Democrat, will forget the name of that great and illustrious son of hers who served so long in the strong and vigorous leadership of the Nation and the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, the Hon. Champ Clark. His name is an honored and revered memory in the heart of every true Democrat of this great State.

Would that it were possible for me to talk more of the history and doings of great Missourians, and especially of great Missouri Democrats. Time does not permit that, but I cannot let the opportunity pass without mentioning the names of present illustrious Democrats from this State who serve with us in the halls of Congress. Able men in the House of Representatives, BELL, of Blue Springs, SLAUGHTER, of Kansas City, CANNON, of Ellsberry, ZIMMERMAN, of Kenneth, COCHRAN, of St. Louis, are all Democrats serving their districts and their Nation well. Important positions are held by these Representatives of yours in the House. Their influence and weight are felt in all matters of national legislation as well as in party councils and affairs. Loyal Democrats, stalwart Americans, they truly reflect the ideals and sentiments of their constituents.

I trust you will not think it out of place for me to indulge now in a little self-complacency and say, "I told you so." Whether out of place or not, I cannot refrain from reminding you that nearly 4 years ago I made a political speech in your State. That speech was made in behalf of an able and conscientious statesman, a man who then was finishing his first term in the Senate of the United States. I told that fine audience in Kansas City that I had served with this man from the day he took the oath as a Senator; that I had watched his work and was familiar with the high character and patriotic purpose with which he approached every duty. I urged his reelection and predicted that if he were returned to the Senate, the Democrats and the people of Missouri would be proud of the conduct and record of HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Tonight I return to Missouri, and with pardonable pride I point to the record which he has made since his reelection in 1940, a record which has passed far beyond the borders of his native State; one which I say to you, his fellow citizens, has made every Democrat in this Nation and every American thankful for the work and services of your own junior Senator. Missouri may point with pride to that record and rejoice at the accomplishments of her son, as all America rejoices.

When any State contributes an outstanding Member of the Senate, it has done well, but when it contributes two noteworthy and outstanding Senators at the same time, perhaps that is an exception. Such seems to be a habit of Missouri, and especially of Missouri Democrats. On more than one occasion Missouri has been represented in the Senate by able and distinguished Democrats at the same time. The present is no exception.

I have said the name of Champ Clark is honored and revered by every Missouri Democrat. That name and the traditions of that great statesman are carried honorably in the Senate today by the illustrious son, your senior Senator, the Honorable BENNETT CHAMP CLARK.

BENNETT CLARK and I have not always agreed on matters of legislation. Many times we have fought shoulder to shoulder together; at other times we have separated and have gone different ways. I cannot say when we did disagree whether he disagreed with me or I with him. Whichever way it was, is not material. I think probably we have been more often together than we have been apart, but this thing I do know that when I have not been of the same mind with Bennett, I have paused and reexamined my own position. For I prize the judgment and opinion of Senator CLARK most highly. There isn't a better-trained man in the fundamentals of democratic government in this country than BENNETT CLARK. He has literally grown up in the atmosphere and environment of government. No man in Washington is better schooled in the philosophy and the practical operation of Government than he.

But to be a real statesman, one needs more than background, education and experience; honesty of intellect, integrity of purpose and the courage of strong conviction are essential in the making of a genuine leader in the field of statecraft. BENNETT CLARK possesses all of these. He is known and honored by Democrats and Republicans alike for the deep convictions he holds on all important questions. His intellectual honesty forbids any evasive stand. His integrity keeps him working actively on matters of national interest. All of these things, training, experience, ability, integrity, forthright independence of view and courage of conviction, make BENNETT CLARK one of the outstanding legislators of the Nation. Those qualities are needed in Congress today? They will be needed to a far greater extent in the trying days which lie ahead of this Republic of ours.

The Congress of the United States has been condemned and criticized as lacking initiative, courage and independence of thought and action. Whether the charge be true or untrue it never applied to BENNETT CLARK. He wears no man's tag or label. Conscientiously he has fought with and for the administration when he believed its course to be in keeping with sound traditions of democratic government. With equal fearlessness he has never hesitated to oppose even the leadership of his own party, when he believed that leadership to be wrong. I can pay BENNETT CLARK, or any other man, no greater compliment than this. For his devotion to duty and to democratic principles, for his ability, integrity and above all for his forthright courage I respect and admire your senior Senator. Greater tribute I cannot bring.

Whatever may be your local considerations and conditions, and of such I should not speak, and neither should I nor do I attempt to influence any decision of yours at this meeting tonight, I cannot refrain from saying, as one who served closely with him for more than 10 years, that BENNETT CLARK is an able statesman, worthy of the great inheritance from his great family and worthy of you who elected him. He is needed in the Senate.

As I have said, Missouri Democrats are fortunate in their two Senators and their Representatives in the House. The trust imposed in them by their colleagues, their integrity and ability, their years of service—all combine to give them highly important places in the party's councils and on important and powerful legislative committees. It is in these strong, influential committees that the real work of the Congress is done. From these committees, under our rapidly expanding system of Federal jurisdiction, comes legislation which influences and in many instances guides and directs the affairs of almost all America, from her most humble to her highest and most powerful citizen.

Indeed, as the complex and complicated economic, political, and social fibers of today are woven into a closer, stronger, and more complete fabric, our need for strong characters, able and experienced statesmen and leaders in the National Congress becomes more and more urgent. In the crises facing our people today we realize more than ever the compelling necessity for men of courage, intellect, vision, experience, integrity, and character in the Congress. We—and you—are fortunate that the Democratic Representatives serving from this State in the Congress are men of that caliber.

The Democratic Party throughout the Nation during past years of control carried a tremendous responsibility. When it became apparent that Europe was to be thrown into the turmoil of war by the self-seeking Hitler, our Commander in Chief Franklin Delano Roosevelt, called upon the Congress and the citizens of our Nation to prepare for its defense. It was then foreseen by some of our leaders that vast expenditures of money would be necessary to provide the implements of war. Early in 1941 there was set up in the Senate of the United States a committee whose members were authorized and directed to make a continuing investigation of all phases of the national defense program. This committee was created with the full accord of the majority Members of the Senate. At its head was placed your great Missourian, HARRY TRUMAN. It has been my privilege to serve as a member of this committee since its inception, and to work with its chairman most intimately.

We, the members of the Democratic administration, were determined that in the transition from a peacetime economy to one of war, the billions of dollars to be spent on the armament program would be efficiently and economically expended to insure maximum production with minimum expense. The duties of Congress include the passing of laws and the voting of money to make them work. The duty of our committee is to make certain that these laws are carried out and the money spent efficiently and economically; that when mistakes are made—as inevitably some will be—they be corrected at once.

From the records of the Truman committee you will find many matters that have been criticized openly and vigorously. Our one thought has been to win the war as quickly as possible. The administration itself has not taken the position of hiding mistakes but its policy has been to bring them out in the open so that they can be corrected speedily.

Foregetting the dark and gloomy days of only a few short years ago, there is being proclaimed as something newly discovered the doctrine of free enterprise and private initiative by Republican spokesmen. As a Democrat, for such has always been my faith, I believe in free enterprise. I believe in equality of opportunity and free competition, but in my Democratic doctrine there never

was, never has been, never will be, room for the ruthless exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few.

There must be ample room in this country for free enterprise—room for every citizen to have the right to achieve and progress according to his capability and his industry and integrity. There must be ample room in this country to be an individualist, to be free, and to be independent. That is our democratic concept of free enterprise. That is the concept of free enterprise that has been advocated by our party since the days of Thomas Jefferson. It is not the concept of free enterprise which had been held and carried through the days of Republican domination of affairs in America. Theirs was a free enterprise of the groups of sinister finance and industry, who not only sought but almost succeeded in monopolizing business and industry to the extent that there was no individual initiative and no free competition. Where were these advocates of opportunity for the individualistic effort in 1932? Yes, we Democrats believe in free enterprise and private initiative in the full and true meaning of those terms, but we mean it for all and it will be only through a continued Democratic administration that the chaos of this war will be unraveled so that every individual in America may truly enjoy free enterprise. God forbid that the monopolistic corporations, selfish groups, and individuals will ever be given the privilege of exploiting citizens of these United States and denying free enterprise to the many.

No. We cannot forget 1933 when Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath as President of the United States. Conditions then were ripe for almost anything. Is human memory so short that it is necessary to refer to the conditions of agriculture then? Do we have to recall and think back a few years to the long lines of fear, almost terror-stricken depositors standing in front of the banks in every town of this country? Is it necessary to be reminded of the price of corn and wheat, hogs, cattle, and cotton? Can we ever forget the millions of men and women walking up and down the highways and streets looking for jobs? Do we forget that these conditions developed under Republican theories of free enterprise? That was the condition only in part—when Franklin Roosevelt was sworn to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States and became President of this country in what was possibly the gravest economic crisis in our history. In sublime manner he imparted to America some of the courage which was his. In bold and vigorous fashion, almost overnight he restored the financial structure of America and brought free enterprise and the capitalistic system back on its feet once again.

And so from the dark days of the Republican system of free enterprise, from the chaos and fear which were its aftermath—Franklin Roosevelt led us into our rightful heritage as American citizens.

Today the fighting men of our country are offering their lives that this heritage might be maintained. On land, on sea, and in the air these fighting men of ours are carrying the war to our enemies on their own territory. Americans today are fighting—as they always have fought—with honor and with glory.

We are now in the third year of this terrible war. We are spurred by the grim determination to wage this war relentlessly on all fronts and on all seas until all those who have chosen to live by the sword have perished by it. We now have neither the time nor the inclination for self-appraisal. But when the time comes for the historians to write the record of our participation in this great struggle they will undoubtedly state that at this present period we had reached the turning point of the war. The successes of our arms, both on land and sea, are only an indication of the greater victories which must lie ahead. Surely this year will bring victory to our armed forces in the European theater of war. Our fighting men, we confidently believe, will win their part of the war on that front. Japan will in due time collapse before the gallant men of the United Nations.

We have grimly resolved that no sacrifice is too great for the end we must attain—the complete defeat of the aggressors who so seriously threatened democratic existence and ideals. To win this victory our people are prepared to see their sons die and to return wounded from the battle; to offer their goods, their minds, and their muscles for the benefit of the country we love. Because we have reached this state of mind and have made this high resolve, victory must and will be ours.

Actuated by this high resolve to exert every ounce of our strength and to spare ourselves no sacrifice until we have won, every American must become a part of our industrial or agricultural or military establishments. Everyone must bear his full share and burden. There is a fair measure of that effort in the machines labor sends to the front; in the food our farmers produce for us and our allies. There is a great satisfaction in seeing such tangible results. When labor fabricates a rifle for our Army or a shell for our Navy, or when agriculture produces a bushel of wheat for our brave Chinese, British, or Russian allies, there is grim delight in seeing the definite product that is tipping the scales in favor of the democracies.

I resent critics of the administration saying that America's effort in the war is without plan or coordination, and often wonder if they are trying to win a war or an election. True, in preparations for war we have been at a grave disadvantage when compared with the position of dictator nations who deliberately planned a world conquest and who were able to impose their ruthless will upon the deluded and quaking subjects who were forced to follow the evil banners of their dictatorship. In this great peace-loving country where every individual is guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, no one ever dreamed of planning a war of aggression. Any leader who would have suggested that we should plan a war of aggression and gear our national economy to such a plan, would not have been merely ostracized—he would have risked seclusion in a padded cell.

On the other hand, those who willed and brought on this terrible war had everything to gain personally and nothing to lose. They were free, for their own selfish advantage, to exploit their deluded masses to the limit. For years they fanatically planned and schemed to force their barbaric ideologies upon the free peoples of the world and to this end they concentrated all their war-making capacities. Their systems of government were organizations for war, and in order to continue in existence they had no alternative but to wage war, and they did.

There were people who sensed our danger from these irresponsible lunatics. Our President certainly was the first to cry that real danger lurked in the mad vaporings of Hitler and Mussolini. In 1937 he suggested that the aggressor nations be quarantined. For that sane advice his adversaries then shouted "Warmonger."

We can be thankful that the President and this administration had the vision to make such a defense program as was possible before we became engaged in the war. We owe much to those who advocated and forced the adoption of that program.

And as we go marching toward certain victory, we must also make the plan for a lasting and just peace. To win a military victory alone would be futile unless we lay a foundation in our post-war world that will secure some guaranty against future aggressive wars. Surely there is no other man in the United States who has been in such constant touch and knows all the ramified problems and details of our negotiations with the nations of the world and the plans for final victory than our present Commander in Chief. In the critical period of the transition from war to peace should we not avail ourselves of the proven leadership, the unique experience, and knowledge of such a man.

George Washington aptly spoke on one occasion regarding the number of terms which a President should serve (and I quote): "Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no impropriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who on some great emergency should be deemed universally most capable of serving the public." I like that expression of George Washington's. It speaks my own thought far better than I can express it. We are in the midst of the greatest emergency this country has ever known, the outcome of which will decide whether democracy itself shall continue to endure anywhere in the world. No emergency can be greater than that.

With a lifetime spent in the service of State, national, and international affairs, Franklin Roosevelt has been in daily touch and contact with the most minute details of our affairs, domestic, and foreign. Probably there is no man in the world with greater knowledge of world affairs than our President.

The year 1944 upon which we are just entering will be a year of fate, a year of great decisions, a year of destiny. In every course we pursue, in every decision we make, may rest the fate and destiny of our own Nation and perhaps the fate and destiny of all peace-loving and democratic nations of the world. We live in no ordinary days. Great moments require great men. This is no year for the advancement of little ambitions of little men who would sit in the seats of the mighty. It is no year for the glad-hander.

Our own party will be confronted with decisions of far-reaching effect. In the midst of war, and surely before peace terms can be agreed upon, we shall be required to nominate and elect a President of the United States for the next 4 years. In ordinary times we might indulge in difference between factions, groups, or sections, and win or lose without too much danger to party or to country. We can afford no chances now. We as Democrats must make the right selections in our primaries and conventions, and we as Americans must make our right choices in the election. We must not fail our country in her time of stress and need.

What I have said is not said in a spirit of partisanship. The issues of today rise above partisan or personal ambitions. My remarks about the President were made without the knowledge of him or any of his advisers. I do not try to sway Democrats into any course of conduct in their conventions. What I am saying is that we must forget every consideration save one and one alone, and that is the welfare of America and the preservation of her institutions of government.

The enemy yet remains to be conquered. A peace which shall provide some measure of safety for the world from the horror and dread of war remains yet to be accomplished. To win the war and make a just and, above everything, a durable peace is our first concern and it must transcend all others.

Nothing must be allowed to hinder the war effort and everything must be done to bring soon and quickly the glad day of a complete victory, which shall and must include an honorable and lasting peace, else it be no victory at all. To this plow we have put our hands; there must be, there can be, there will be, no turning back.

Think not that the enemies, the Hitlers and Tojos, do not know as well as we, all that this year portends. Think not that they will be unmindful of the year 1944 and the election in America.

What could give them, the enemy, greater heart, greater courage, than the defeat of their chief opponent by his own people, yea, even by his own party? What would we think if the Churchill government in Great Britain should be overthrown in a political upheaval? What if the members of his own party should reject Mr. Churchill now and eject him from party position and honorable office?

Franklin Roosevelt has led our Nation in her hour of peril, which at Pearl Harbor was indeed an hour of almost despair. Shall we be less appreciative of our own countrymen than we are of leaders of other nations?

I say this in no spirit of partisanship. While this is a Democratic meeting—and I take pride in my affiliation with the Democratic Party—nevertheless, in this year of fate and decisions which we shall make are of far more consideration than partisan gain or advantage.

The first thought uppermost in the mind of every loyal American is to win the war as quickly as possible. To achieve this end no person has striven harder than has President Roosevelt.

We and our allies are on the offensive; we are carrying the war to the enemy on every battle front. On the land, the sea, and in the air our gallant fighting men are winning the war at the cost of their own blood and lives. To back them in their superb effort, every citizen of this country must lay aside everything which would cause any weakening of our strength or any strengthening of the enemies' morale. Continued prosecution of the war along present lines must bring ultimate victory.

Already the enemy in many places is about to reach the cracking point. Hitler and Tojo know full well the strength of our mighty offensive has been encouraged and bolstered and led by the vigor in which Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and, yes, Joe Stalin, have pressed for complete victory. They, the enemy, would give anything to deprive us of the leadership of our President in this year of crisis. Nothing would be more heartening to them than the defeat of Franklin D. Roosevelt. So, regardless of partisanship and without regard to the personal or political fortunes of the man, and expressing my own personal view only, I want the brave and gallant leadership of Franklin Roosevelt to continue throughout the war and until the grave problems of peace have been solved. When that glad day arrives I shall join Democrats in picking a worthy successor. We shall establish no dynasty in America, but neither shall we foolishly deprive ourselves of a great leader when we need him the most.

I repeat, I express only my own thoughts, but they are serious conclusions arrived at from what I believe to be best for my country.

Strongly, in this new year, which, will be a year of great and momentous decisions, I reiterate my firm belief in the victory our fighting men are going to win before this year is over. The ruthless, cruel, barbarous, military German machine shall crumple and fall before the advancing armies of the Allied Nations. Japan sooner or later will receive that complete and total defeat which she deserves.

These are things our fighting men are going to accomplish. May it be before 1944 ends. But, to win these victories, the boys who wear our uniforms and march under the Star-Spangled Banner must have the support of every American citizen at home. Petty differences and strife, which do not amount to much to us, are looked upon by our enemies as important manifestations of internal disorder. They must all end. Criticism, fault finding, and back biting only add to the strength of the enemy and postpone the day of his final defeat.

What profit can any of us gain if by our disputes and differences we win some slight thing for ourselves but which causes even a few more days of war, in which a few more American sons shall die? What gain or profit can we place against the lives of the boys we have sent forth to battle for us?

What if gasoline rationing does seem to be a nuisance when we can't get all we need for every use. The gallons of that precious fuel which are saved by our nonuse may be carrying some American boy flying the treacherous air waves to victory over the enemy. Lack of that fuel, even a few gallons, may send that same boy crashing to death and destruction.

Are the regulations of the O. P. A. too hard to bear? Is price control too bad and too hard to take? I would not for a minute assume that these regulations are perfect, but this thing I know, that without price control and without the strong efforts of the Office of Price Administration, the deadly foe of inflation could and would strike every American home to the complete disaster of all.

Shall we have subsidies on farm products, roll-backs, or whatever they may be called? Are the farm groups irritated at such a program, and is there deadly conflict between those who labor and those who produce farm products as to what procedure should be adopted?

When we think of these controversies, let us also also remember that both those who till the soil and those who labor with their hands in industry here in America are better off today than persons similarly engaged or employed in any other nation of the world. And before we get too bitter and too controversial, let us never forget that.

Let us never forget that this is a single war, a war in which we are all engaged, every man, woman, and child.

The bitterness of disputes and confusion and disorder at home, again I repeat, only bring strength and heart to the enemy and again postpone the final day of victory.

The farmers of America have done a magnificent job in the production of food. Labor has done a magnificent job keeping our war products moving on the assembly and over the transportation lines. Throughout my career in the Senate, I have always supported, almost without exception, the just demands of both labor and agriculture. I expect to continue to support just demands in the future, but today I want to see a truce declared on every dispute and every difference, to the end all our energies be devoted to winning the war. Wartime is not a time for profits; let the greedy remember that; it is not a time for partisanship; it is not a time for contest between or among different factions or groups; it is a time for patriotism, a time for sacrifice, a time for unselfish devotion to the cause for which we fight.

The whole psychology of the Hitler theory of war and conquest was based upon one thought alone. His slogan was "Divide and conquer." By intrigue, subterfuge, deceit, and dishonesty he sought to keep the nations of the world divided until he could conquer and subdue them one by one. On that program he went a long way and almost succeeded. We of the United Nations learned by cruel and bitter experience that his program to divide and conquer meant for us to divide and die. To offset that we united and we are winning. United, we shall continue to win.

Division at home was another weapon with which Hitler hoped to win. He openly stated that the democracies were so divided and disunited that they could not effectively wage war. We are not divided; we are not disunited. In the magnificent program of the war management, labor, industry, and agriculture have united to produce the great accomplishments which have been made, and with which victory is being won.

But, the controversies which I have mentioned—strikes, threats of strikes, excessive profits, petty disputes, political discord—are magnified, distorted, and exaggerated by the enemy until they are led to believe that we at home are nearing collapse. That is the thing that I am talking about and against—why I urge that, whatever our complaints, real or unreal, that they all be put aside and forgotten until after the war is over and peace comes once again.

May 1944 indeed be a year of patriotic devotion to this country of ours. May all the decisions we make this year be based solely upon what is best for the welfare of America and her people.

On that theme I am content to rest the fortunes of my party and the safety and happiness of our people.

Democrats, this is indeed a year of destiny for our party and our country. God grant that we may meet that destiny as fearlessly as our sons are daily meeting their destinies on the battlefields of the world.

Method of Voting by Members of Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on December 24, 1943, over the N. B. C. network, on his bill to provide a method for members of the armed forces to vote in time of war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In September 1942, the Congress, by an overwhelming vote, enacted legislation providing a special method for voting in time of war for members of the armed forces. Since that time one Nation-wide election, that of November 3, 1942, has been held under the provisions of that Federal act.

In that bill the Congress dispensed with the necessity of registration and the payment of a poll tax, but in no way attempted to remove the qualifications of any voter under the law of the State of his respective residence. This law proved totally ineffective. Twenty-nine million voters went to the polls in 1942. Approximately 5,000,000 men were in the service. Out of that number, only 28,000 valid war ballots were cast in 40 States. These figures prove conclusively that the mechanics of the present law do not give to those Americans in the armed forces an opportunity to vote. With a full realization of such inadequacy I started research work for the purpose of amending the basic law to the end that the Federal ballot be taken to every member of the armed forces irrespective of where they might be serving. I said then and I say now that all political parties in the coming election must be represented fully, adequately, and honestly on every ship, every island, every continent, wherever our troops carry the Stars and Stripes.

After much study and discussion with officials in the War and Navy Departments, various secretaries of state and others, Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island, and I introduced legislation to amend the present law to make it workable. Under our proposal a nonpartisan Ballot Commission is set up to prepare the ballots and pass them on to the Army and Navy, who, in turn, assume the responsibility for taking the ballots directly to

the field or the ship where the armed forces are training or fighting. A day would be designated by the commanding officers for service men and women to cast their ballots. The days would vary, depending upon military conditions. Nothing is to be done that is not practicable and compatible with military operations.

At the suggestion of the Honorable Frederick Cook, Republican secretary of state of Massachusetts, we set up in the bill what is known as a write-in ballot. It is one that every serviceman can understand. After he prepares and seals his ballot in secret, certifies under oath to his qualifications, which are printed on the back of the envelope, he then turns it over to his commanding officer, who collects all the ballots at the post, and, through plane priority, will have them on their way to the United States within 24 to 48 hours after the ballots are cast. They are returned to the Ballot Commission. The Commission segregates the ballots and sends them to the respective secretaries of state. They in turn segregate and send the ballots to the proper election officials in the counties in which the voters reside. Let me emphatically state that the Ballot Commission has absolutely nothing to do with either the actual casting or the counting of the votes. Republican and Democratic Senators who defeated this protective measure contend that this legislation is unconstitutional in that it invades the rights of the States to carry on their own elections.

My friends, the Lucas-Green bill is an emergency measure. I boldly assert that it is not a question of destroying States' rights; it is a question of protecting human rights. Members of the armed forces cannot be relegated to a condition of second-class citizenship.

If the long arm of Uncle Sam can reach out and take men from the homes, the farms, the factories, the shops, and the cities and send them to every part of the globe to defend our liberty against a foreign tyranny, then by the same token he must find a way to give those same men an opportunity to vote in a Presidential election, the results of which may shape the destiny of this Nation for the next hundred years to come.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that "the President is vested with the executive power of the Nation. The importance of his election and the vital character of its relationship to and effect upon the welfare and safety of the whole people cannot be too strongly stated." With this sound admonition, I submit that under no circumstances can we permit the Eastland amendment, which emasculates the Lucas-Green bill, to become the law. The Eastland amendment says it is the duty of the States and not the Federal Government to see that those in the service have an opportunity to vote. My friends, this proposal will not work. Such political distortion will disfranchise in the 1944 election eight to ten million of America's most noble and heroic men and women.

Senators must know that the 48 States cannot handle effectively these veterans' votes. The National Government has complete control over the discipline and activities of the armed forces. Everyone knows about our difficulties of communication, and of transportation. Everyone knows that World War complications compel us to use simplicity and uniformity to get a Federal ballot to our fighting men and women. The States, with Federal, State, and county candidates on the ballot, cannot achieve this simplicity and uniformity, even with Federal cooperation.

In the 48 States there are 48 different methods of voting. As an example, 8 States have 20 days or less absentee voting privileges. Thirty-three States have a limitation of 30 days or less, and 14 out of the 33 require that a particular form of application for absentee ballot be used by the absentee voter. Let me take my own State of Illinois as an example of how the absentee voting law works: Whether an Illinois soldier, sailor, or marine is in this country or outside the continental limits of the United States, he first must ask his county clerk to send him a form for making application for a ballot. That is one mail service. The county clerk sends the application to the one making the request. That is the second mail service. The soldier returns the application to the county clerk making a third mail service. The county clerk then sends a ballot to the applicant, the fourth mail service. The soldier marks the ballot and returns it to the county clerk, the fifth mail service. In addition, under Illinois law the applicant must swear to his qualifications. Can you imagine those serving in the armed forces in Asia, Africa, and thousands of other foreign spots going through all these acts in order to vote? What an absurdity.

That isn't all—legal and transportation experts of the Army have made a careful calculation of the time it would take for five mail plane services from Springfield, Ill., to the various theaters of war outside the continental limits of the United States, based upon the average time of air carriage by the service in wartime. The following information comes direct from Colonel Cutler of the Army who is very familiar with this legislation. From a point in a North American area to Springfield, Ill., five mail services, including a minimum time for distribution, would require 38 days. From an overseas point in the European area to Springfield, 61 days. From an overseas point in the Pacific area to Springfield 71 days. From a point in the Far East to Springfield, 86 days. Remember, in Illinois only 30 days are available for absentee voting. So, my friends, you can see that not a single Illinoisan at war serving outside the continental limits of the United States will have an opportunity to vote under the absentee voting laws of the State of Illinois, and very few serving in this country would. What is true of Illinois is true with the great majority of the States.

I wish it were possible for servicemen throughout the world to vote for not only Federal officials, but every State and county official as well. However, taking Illinois again as an example, we would have to send to every camp in the world 102 different kinds of ballots, because of different county candidates running in each county. Multiply this by 48 and then speculate on the chaos and confusion when thousands of ballots start flying around the globe in every direction at the same time. To expect the Army and the Navy to handle efficiently these ballots and provide plane priorities would be as sensible as going to the top of the Empire State Building, on a windy day, opening a bag of feathers and expecting them to drop at a particular destination at a designated time. The Army and Navy can't do the impossible. They have said so, emphatically. They can handle 1 ballot in 1 election and 1 only—the people understand this. Their disappointment in the defeat of the Lucas-Green bill is turning to indignation. Many editorials express that viewpoint in demanding affirmative and early action by Congress. Letters from parents of boys in the service show plainly their unyielding resentment. Servicemen have written me requesting legislation guaranteeing their wartime political rights, but they can't get them under the Eastland amendment. It is a snare and a delusion—a mockery on the opportunity for men and women of the armed forces to vote in 1944.

My fellow Americans, if these citizen soldiers defending the Republic in our greatest crisis are denied a part in the civil administration of this Government, it is time to inquire, who is worthy of it? The sailor at Pearl Harbor can lose a leg, but he cannot vote. The soldier in Italy can lose an arm, but he cannot vote. The marine at Tarawa can shed his precious blood, but he cannot vote. My friends, if this should come to pass, then the America that I have learned to love and revere has failed in the hour of her greatest peril. I cannot believe—I will not believe, that America eternally grateful to the finest and bravest group of warriors ever marshaled under any banner will fail to meet headlong this undemocratic and unjustifiable challenge. If a boy is good enough to stop a bullet—he is good enough to cast a ballot.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Foreign Policy," delivered by me over Wisconsin radio stations on January 7.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a result of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences, there has now emerged a definite pattern of officially proposed international relationships in the post-war world.

As we all know, the Moscow Conference was held on October 19 to October 30. The chief participants were Secretary of State Hull of the United States, Foreign Minister Eden of Great Britain, and Foreign Commissar Molotov of the Soviet Union. The Chinese Ambassador to Russia was a signatory to its most important declaration.

The Moscow Conference paved the way for the Cairo and Teheran Conferences. The Cairo Conference was held on November 22 to November 26. Its chief participants were President Roosevelt of the United States, Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China.

The Teheran Conference, which was held on November 28 to December 1, had as its chief participants, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Premier Stalin of the Soviet Union.

The pattern which has emerged is a hopeful one. It is specifically outlined in article 4 of the joint declaration signed at Moscow between the representatives of the governments of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

Article 4 jointly states that the four great powers "recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practical date, a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to the membership of all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

On Friday, November 5 last, the United States Senate by a vote of 86 to 6, approved this plan for post-war international organization providing only that any treaty made by the Government of our own country to give it effect "shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Let me repeat by way of emphasis:

The pattern officially proposed by the four major powers for the post-war world, is one of international cooperation of sovereign and equal peace-loving states.

And let me repeat further by way of emphasis:

The Senate of the United States has officially approved this pattern but has specifi-

cally declared that any attempt on the part of our Government to implement it shall be through due constitutional process only. The Senate declaration is a flat disapproval of any attempt to commit this country to any post-war plan through Executive agreement. It is reassertion in the international field of our traditional constitutional system of checks and balances.

I should like to point out in passing that the official pattern proposed at Moscow and further outlined at Cairo and Teheran is almost identical with a resolution adopted by the Republican Party convention of my own State at Appleton, Wis., in June 1943. This resolution says:

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled, That it is our considered conviction that at the conclusion of this war the United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace; be it further

"Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin believes that world peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together.

"The Republican Party of Wisconsin believes this common ground can and must be found and an international reign of law and order developed."

The official Four Power pattern is also identical with the declaration adopted by the advisory council of the National Republican Party at Mackinac Island last summer. This declaration insists that it is necessary to have "responsible participation of the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

These declarations of the Republican Party represent the sincere convictions of an overwhelming majority of the party. They represent the sincere convictions of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

And they are in agreement with the officially expressed convictions of the present administration and its Democrat Party leadership.

In his address to the joint session of the Congress on November 18, Secretary of State Hull emphasized that the sovereign equality of all States is the foundation stone "upon which the future world organization should be built."

"I should like to lay particular stress on this provision of the declaration," he said.

Quite obviously, this official pattern so definitely outlined by the leaders of the four great Allied powers should close the door against any utopian notions of a superstate in which to house a planned world economy. It should close the door against any notions of a world police force as the instrument of a world superstate. Quite obviously, it insists, as Republican leaders had previously insisted, that the world's best hope for a durable peace, can only be found in the active and continued cooperation of free and equal and sovereign peoples.

And quite obviously, this forthright rededication to the principle of equal sovereignty has been a sharp disappointment to men in high places in the present American Government. Quite obviously, it closes the door against the dreams of our superplanners for a world W. P. A., a world R. F. C., and a world O. P. A.

Quite obviously it closes the door against all world blueprints. But quite obviously, our superplanners will reopen the door if they can. They will attempt to twist the avowed official purposes of this Government to their own purposes as they have twisted them before. Quite obviously, we can keep the door closed only when we retire our superplanners to private life. And if recent election returns are any indication, that is exactly what we propose to do.

There has been, of course, a great deal of nonsense written and spoken about the impossibility of having a world organization of equal and sovereign nations. Our superplanners like to point out to us that such an organization is a contradiction in terms.

They tell us that a sovereign power is a supreme power, independent of and unlimited by any other power. And they throw the dictionary at us to prove it.

No nation, large or small, they declare, can join any world organization without yielding up some part of its sovereignty. Otherwise, they insist, any world organization would be only a pretext and a mockery, without effective authority to regulate world affairs.

But because of the very nature of sovereignty, they argue, if any part is yielded, it is all yielded. Otherwise, it would not be supreme, independent, and unlimited.

Consequently, they conclude triumphantly, when United States Senators vote for a resolution calling for a world organization of equal and sovereign states, these Senators are indulging in mere shadow boxing. Of course, if United States Senators are indulging in cheap and mean trickery on such a grave and all-important matter, then so is the President of the United States and his Secretary of State. So are the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Premier-Marshal of the Soviet Union, and the Generalissimo of the Chinese Republic. All are pledged to this post-war world pattern. And they are pledged definitely. It is an abominable insult to question the sincerity of any one of them.

As a matter of fact and as a matter of common sense, there is nothing at all contradictory in free and equal and sovereign states organizing to promote world peace and world justice.

World peace and world justice can only be organized in freedom. To attempt to organize it otherwise would be a real contradiction of terms, a real contradiction of purpose. No civilized nation is supremely sovereign in the extreme sense. No civilized nation undertakes to exercise its sovereign power with reckless independence, in reckless disregard of the rights of other equal and sovereign nations. Only Hitler and his henchmen believe in such extreme and reckless sovereignty. That is why we are fighting and smashing Hitler and Hitlerism.

All civilized nations recognize the higher law of justice and decency and humanity. It is true, of course, that nations now civilized have violated accepted modern standards of international decency in the past. But it is because civilization has been a development, a slow and painful development, that we may hope all nations which belong to the civilized tradition will in the future adhere loyally and faithfully to the standards which all have come finally to accept as fundamental.

So there is no contradiction at all in the earnest purpose of sovereign states to organize in the support of these standards. To suggest such a monstrous paradox is to suggest that we are now sending our sons out to fight and die for a fraud. Again, the suggestion is an abominable insult. It is an insult to our most fundamental values, our sincerest convictions, our most cherished hopes.

Americans of common sense and sincere purpose—and they are in the overwhelming majority—realize, of course, that so far our officials have only proposed a mere pattern for post-war international organization. They realize that the pattern must be given effective implementation. They realize that is, that organizing to preserve the post-war peace is a matter of reaching satisfactory agreements with other sovereign peoples on many vexing problems which still confront us. They realize that such agreements must not only satisfy Americans, they must satisfy Britons or Russians or Chinese or Frenchmen or many other peoples who may have a direct and essential interest.

They realize, in short, that in working out these agreements, compromises must be found, compromises which will not violate essential justice or too flagrantly disregard any essential national interest.

They realize, too, that in attempting to reach these compromises, antisocial Americans and Britons and Russians and Chinese and Frenchmen and others may undertake to bring what pressure they can to promote their own particular individual or group interests. They realize that even sincere Americans and Britons and Russians and Chinese and others will press as urgently as possible to promote their own various and entirely legitimate national interests.

Notwithstanding all this, real Americans will be only too willing to undertake to protect our own national interests in this international game of give and take. Real Americans are accustomed to such undertaking. It is what they call the system of free enterprise, and enterprise regulated by law and without violation of any essential justice. It is a system in which the rewards go to men or nations of ability and courage and fair dealing, it is our traditional American system on a world scale. It is the only system which can promote a world really free.

It should be obvious, assuredly, that only Americans who have real faith in our historic system should be entrusted with its fuller projections on a world scale. It should be obvious beyond all question that only Americans who believe in our own system without reservations, hidden or open, should be entrusted with the important task of protecting and promoting legitimate American interests in the four corners of the earth.

Most important of all legitimate American interests is our deep interest in a reasonable national security, a security which right reason demands and which can be sought without unreasonable demands on the equal rights of others.

To insist on such security is in no way to indict the good faith of the great powers now working with us to win this war and to win the peace which must some day follow. We expect them each to give every consideration to their own reasonable security. Freedom from fear has its international as well as its individual implications. We have a right and a duty to insist that we shall be as secure as we may reasonably provide against any dangers which the future may one day hurl at us.

I shall discuss this question in detail in another radio broadcast.

Vote for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement appearing in the New York Times of Monday, January 10, 1944, under the title, "Sure, You're for the Soldier Vote—Is Congress?" signed by 636 leading persons in the entertainment industry engaged in entertaining our servicemen.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURE, YOU'RE FOR THE SOLDIER VOTE—IS CONGRESS?

Whether Americans in uniform can vote in the next elections will be decided in a few days by your representatives in Washington.

The question is: Will Congress pass effective legislation, or make a polite bow to democracy with a bill which says members of the armed forces can vote—but in effect disfranchises them. That's just what the Senate did last month in rejecting the original Green-Lucas bill which provided for Federal supervision of soldier voting. The Senate tossed soldier balloting right back to the States—a hopeless procedure, complicated by 48 different sets of rules and regulations, many of which do not even provide the apparatus for soldier voting.

Now the Congress has a new chance to express the real will of the American people and give the armed forces a real vote by passing legislation carrying the full force of the original Green-Lucas bill.

What happens will largely depend on the action you take.

As the law now stands, the same thing will occur in next fall's elections that occurred in 1942. Out of all the millions of service men and women then eligible to vote, less than 30,000 votes actually got counted. Why? Because the machinery was too complicated. The same machinery will be too complicated in 1944. Can it be that some Members of Congress are against letting the soldiers vote?

By passing the Scanlon bill, which is identical with the original Green-Lucas bill, Congress can guarantee Federal supervision of soldier voting. This bill actually delivers a ballot to every eligible member of our armed forces throughout the world and insures that these ballots will be counted.

American men and women fight for your right to vote. Will you write for theirs?

Send a telegram or letter immediately to:

1. Both your Senators, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
2. Your Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Tell them to support and vote for legislation providing complete Federal supervision of soldier voting. Tell them that in all fairness it must pass to preserve the American way.

The soldier-vote committee of the entertainment industry has now been formed to continue to fight for Federal supervision.

JOAN ALEXANDER,
Acting Chairman.
JOHN COBURN TURNER,
Acting Secretary.

These are among the 636 individuals in films, music, radio, and the theater who are proud to contribute this advertisement as their part in this critical issue of democratic rights:

Joan Alexander, Kenny Baker, Peter Barry, Jackson Beck, Harry Bellaver, Leonardo Bercovici, Gertrude Berg, Milton Berle, Kermit Bloomgarden, June Blythe, Ben A. Boyar, J. Edward Bromberg, Joseph Buloff, Joseph Burstyn, Harry Carey, Marc Connelly, Norman Corwin, Laird Cregar, Russel Crouse, Howard Da Silva, Jerry Devine, Lee Dixon, Alfred Drake, Muriel Draper, Peter Donald, Mrs. Arnaud D'Usseau, Jerome Epstein, Jules Epstein, Philip Epstein, Elspeth Eric, Judith Evelyn, Howard Fast, William Feinberg, Jose Ferrer, Virginia Field, Arlene Francis, William Friedberg, Martin Gabel, Nadine Gae, Frank Gallop, Betty Garde, Will Geer, Art Gentry, Ira Gershwin, Jay Gorney, Woody Guthrie, Uta Hagen, Oscar Hammerstein, II, E. Y. Harburg, Jack Harrison, Moss Hart, Teddy Hart, Helen Hayes, Rita Hayworth, George Heller, Jane Hoffman, Celeste Holm, Emily Holt, Philip Houston, Sam Jaffe, Victor Jory, Joseph Julian, Beatrice Kay, Virginia Kaye, Alan Kent, Jerome Kern, Adelaide Klein, Arthur Kober, Berry Kroeger, Peg La Centra, Paula Laurence, Anton M. Leader, Rosetta Le Noire, Howard Lindsay, Norman Lloyd, Marx B. Loeb, Philip Loeb, Alan Lomax, Sylvia Lowy, Francia Luban, Peter Lyon, Nila Mack, Jack Manning, Ranald R. MacDougall, Charles Martin, George Mathews, Groucho Marx, Harpo Marx, Jessica Maxwell, Robert Maxwell, Sara Ann McCabe, Byron McGrath, Sanford Meisner, Allan Meltzer, Eve Merriam, Mitchell Miller, Zero Mostel, Lyn Murray, John Neher, Doris Nolan, Sono Osato, Harry H. Oshrin, Ethel Owen, Raymond Paige, Dorothy Parker, Ted Patrick, S. J. Perelman, Peggy Phillips, Minerva Pious, Marc Platt, John Powers, Pearl Primus, Victor M. Ratner, Alan Reed, Quentin Reynolds, Paul Robeson, Edward G. Robinson, William N. Robson, Mrs. Harold Rome, Jonas Rosenfield, George Ross, Robert Russell, Sue Ryan, Victor Samrock, Stefan Schnabel, Thelma Schnee, Norman Schur, Vivienne Segal, Katharine Sergava, Anne Seymour, Dinah Shore, Viola Brothers Shore, Herman Shumlin, Everett Sloane, Sydney Smith, Hester Sondergaard, Louis Sorin, Charles Stark, Paul Stewart, Dorothy Stickney, Chester Stratton, Theodore Strauss, Gloria Stuart, Deems Taylor, Franchot Tone, Victor Trasoff, Mrs. Shepard Traube, John Coburn Turner, Fred Uttal, Carl Van Doren, Vera-Ellen, Harold Vermilyea, Sam Wanamaker, Margaret Webster, Tex Weiner, Orson Welles, Ruth Weston, Arleen Whelan, Dick Widmark, Mary Lou Williams, Rhys Williams, Tommy Wonder, Barry Wood, Monty Woolley, members of Carmen Jones Co., Columbia Symphony Orchestra, Connecticut Yankee Co., Doughgirls Co., Listen Professor Co., New Dance Group, Oklahoma Co., One Touch of Venus Co., Othello Co., Rosalinda Co., Three's A Family Co., Winged Victory Co., Ziegfeld Follies Co.

National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In giving consideration to the recommendation made by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress for the enactment of a national service law, we must take into account whether there is any need for such legislation, what its effect will be on the morale and efficiency of workers, and whether it will impair vital democratic principles.

The American Federation of Labor has been unwilling to extend approval to compulsory service legislation because we are thoroughly convinced that the substitution of involuntary servitude for willing and voluntary cooperation in the war effort is bound to be disastrous in its effects.

The record shows that free labor in free America is more efficient and capable of greater individual and collective production than forced labor employed in totalitarian countries. The record shows that free labor in America has accomplished miracles of production. Why endanger the high efficiency of production we have achieved? This is the question Congress must answer when it considers the President's proposals.

We are all agreed that strikes should not occur during the war emergency and that it is our solemn duty to prevent them. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the American Federation of Labor gave a no-strike pledge to the President of the United States. As president of the American Federation of Labor, I have never since then ordered a single strike or approved or condoned one. The record shows that not a single national strike has been put into effect by a union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor since Pearl Harbor. When local strikes have occurred, we have promptly exerted every influence to terminate them as quickly as possible. That is the official policy of the American Federation of Labor.

Great Britain has a national service act. It has failed to prevent strikes in that country. Factual comparisons show that there were more strikes, proportionately, in Great Britain than in the United States in 1942.

In the nations conquered by the Nazis hostages are indiscriminately executed when the Nazis cannot find the actual perpetrators of alleged sabotage. Innocent people are punished when the guilty cannot be apprehended. This vicious practice has shocked our sensibilities and aroused our indignation. Yet the same principle could be applied here through enactment of a national service law. The millions of workers who have never gone on strike during the war emergency, those who have served faithfully in the war production plants of the Nation during long hours and extra shifts, would be punished by conscription and the stigma of involuntary servitude merely because a small percentage of workers had engaged in unauthorized and illegal strikes.

Summing up, the American Federation of Labor resolutely opposes enactment of compulsory national service legislation for the following major reasons:

1. It will not prevent strikes. The experience of Great Britain proves that. Britain has a national service law. It has not stopped strikes. In 1942 the number of strikes in Britain was greater proportionately than in the United States.

2. It will not solve manpower problems. The War Manpower Commission's Policy Committee, composed of management, labor, and agricultural representatives, declared unanimously only 2 months ago that "the American people will provide greater output under a voluntary system than under one of compulsion and regimentation."

3. It threatens to undermine our basic concepts of democracy. There is no real comparison between drafting men for service in the armed forces of the country and drafting them for service in private industry, operating for private profit. As eminent an authority as Mr. Bernard Baruch has publicly warned against this.

Overseas Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Association of Commerce of Centerville, Iowa, on the subject of further legislation relating to aviation. In the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa there is no community having more interest in development of aviation than Centerville and the association of commerce not only has fostered and developed an excellent

airfield for the city but has spent a great deal of time and thought on the betterment of aviation both nationally and internationally.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Centerville Association of Commerce, Centerville, Iowa, is definitely in favor of the preservation of free enterprise and a sound basis of overseas air transportation in line with the preamble, as laid down by the domestic air carriers of the United States, as follows:

1. Free and open competition, world-wide, subject to reasonable regulations by the appropriate governmental agencies.

2. Private ownership and management.

3. Fostering and encouraging by the Government of the United States of a sound world-wide air-transportation system.

4. Freedom of transit in peaceful flight, world-wide.

5. Acquisition of civil and commercial outlets required in the public interest; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of Congress representing Iowa, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, with a respectful and urgent appeal for support of the policies of free enterprise in any and all legislation concerned with post-war commercial, overseas air transportation.

The American Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered over the National Broadcasting System on Friday, December 17, 1943, from New York City on the subject The American Free Enterprise System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed, as follows:

The American free enterprise system means to me the business system which grew up in America under our constitutional guaranties of freedom of the individual. It means the opportunity for an individual to engage in any business of his own free choice in order to make a livelihood. Under our system it means more than making a living. It means the opportunity to elevate one's standard of living, based upon the ability of the individual through the use of free initiative and by diligent application to work—to raise his standard of living. It is the opportunity to succeed under a competitive system in proportion to one's ability, application of his talents and hard work, so that he accomplishes a reward which those less diligent are unable, or unwilling, to accomplish for themselves.

Under our form of government the individual is presumed to be restricted in his business activities only so far as is necessary for the good of the whole and to preserve equal opportunity for all.

When I was a young man and had great difficulty in making a living, I sometimes thought things were not divided as they should be. I paused and studied our American system, with its rights and opportunities, and decided the accomplishment of many desired objectives were open to those who are willing to work and apply themselves in the ways which lead to accomplishment.

The American business system stimulates the individual to the creation of new things and new ways of doing things which, under our Constitution and so-called patent legislation, benefits and rewards the individual, and he, through his creative genius brings benefits and better things to the people for their welfare and happiness.

Even Abraham Lincoln, who certainly was interested in the so-called ordinary citizen said, "Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise."

Apparently in Lincoln's day, even when the free-enterprise system had only partially matured, he recognized the great value of preserving it in such a way as to give equal opportunity to all and to make it possible for those who work and save to become interested in or owners of business.

The way to determine the value of a system is to compare it with other systems which have as their objective the accomplishment of the same or similar things. The objective of the free-enterprise system is, first, the earning of a living for one's self and those dependent upon him. The second objective is to earn, create, and receive more than is necessary for the making of a living, and thus bring comfort and security in advancing years. Third, its objective is to excel in accomplishment.

All the systems which are unnecessarily dominated or completely controlled by government through political agencies interfere with the individual's right to choose his occupation, his right to accomplish many things in his own interest—with due regard for others—and his right to keep the reward which comes to a freeman through accomplishment. All that we have or may secure through our own efforts as freemen is subject to the will and approval of the majority of the citizens in our republican form of government. That is probably why Lincoln said, "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Frequently those who have been less fortunate than others, either through their own faults or from causes beyond their control, feel they had rather live under a system which levels all people to one standard, than to protect and preserve our free enterprise system. They are mistaken—the destruction of those who have been successful does not aid those who have not been successful. Our objective as a nation should be to preserve this great system and cure any defects that have grown up in it, thereby preserving equal opportunity for all.

As I review the events of the world it seems clear that whenever and wherever free enterprise with the right to use private initiative with reward as an incentive for accomplishment has been destroyed, or wherever that reward has been made insecure, unsafe, or destroyed by the acts of the state, then the rights of freemen likewise have been destroyed. They may call such a government a system of free men, but it can only be so in name. The destruction of the free enterprise system in America means the destruction of the rights and opportunities of those in the ranks of labor as well as those in the ranks of capital. It, therefore, means the destruction of the rights and opportunities of the vast majority of us—because the vast majority are found in the ranks of labor.

We must all strive to make selfishness into enlightened self-interest, with due regard for the rights of all, and equity and justice in human relations as our great objective. The only way we can hope to have free men continue their support of any system is based upon their approval of that system and the opportunities it provides for all who serve to the best of their ability under the system. The objective of all must be the same—accomplishment for the individual and the people as a whole. Voluntary cooperation toward that end is the only way a free people can continue to operate as masters of the state rather than servants of the state.

Let us remember that even though our men make the finest soldiers in the world, they would have been helpless and have fallen like chaff before the wind if our free enterprise system had not enabled us to produce more and better implements of war in 2 years than the Axis Powers have been able to produce in 10 years.

Against our will and wish, but from the necessity of fighting to protect all that we have been—are—and hope to be—our business has become the production of devastation and death upon an unprecedented scale. Our accomplishment has been almost miraculous. We never could have made this accomplishment except for a foundation of industrial plant production that was built up in this country in the last 150 years through the stimulation of private initiative under our American free enterprise system. American industry has not merely multiplied every form of military requirement upon an unprecedented scale but it has improved every weapon in the light of experience upon the battlefields. It has served as the army behind the Army, and the workers in these plants have done a magnificent job when viewed from the over-all picture.

Under the free enterprise system the workers of today can be management and owners tomorrow. That opportunity for individual development is not to be found in systems where the individual has sacrificed his right to use free initiative as payment to a paternalistic state for accepting the citizen's responsibilities in solving all of his problems. Rights always involve responsibilities.

We have, to a substantial extent, left the main road of free enterprise and unless we return to it and reestablish the rights of free individual initiative with government as a servant to the people, to regulate only in the interest of all, I predict our American system will be but a recollection of the past. We cannot survive half free and half Government-enslaved. We are much more than half controlled now and were substantially dominated even prior to the war. Liberty is freedom, but freedom is not free. Are you, Mr. American Citizen, willing to pay the price of preserving freedom for our people in a world that is confused, misguided, and misled by those who seek power rather than the opportunity of service to the people?

Let us remember that 10 months after Pearl Harbor King George informed the British Parliament:

"The United States is furnishing my people and my allies with war supplies of all kinds on a scale unexampled in history."

Ten months after the declaration of war the president of our largest airplane engine company told us that the engine horsepower production of the company was double that of Great Britain and equal to that of Germany. Machine-tool production, the first necessity of mass production, doubled and redoubled. In no time we were rifling machine guns in one-thirtieth of the former time. We reduced the roughing of shells from 12 minutes to thirty-odd seconds; bored airplane propellers in 20 minutes which shortly before had taken 8 hours.

I could continue repeating accomplishments of this kind. Suffice it to say, through these accomplishments we took command of the air. I refer especially to that because the warplane is a new production and one continually changing in design and power. We produced not only the most powerful engine ever known, but in the shortest period of time we transformed automotive mass production, with its single-purpose tools, into the volume maker of the fluid warplane, ever changing to give American pilots a superior weapon with which they, with our allies, have gained control of the air. In a

few months' time an engine built in Connecticut was disassembled beside an engine built in Chicago. The parts were mixed up and reassembled into two composite engines, both of which passed their tests. No matter where our engines may fly in this wide world, parts will be completely interchangeable without any refitting of any sort.

Unit prices have continued to decline on practically all war materials and the decline ranges from 12 to 34 percent. The flow of invention and discovery has been from us to our allies. We have placed at the service of our allies not merely our capacity for production, which was made possible by the free enterprise system but also our native ingenuity, including our inventions, designs, patents, and experience. We have given more than we have received

Let every American pause and think carefully about the preservation of this great American enterprise system as the only basis which gives freemen employment of their own choice and an opportunity to excel and succeed.

New Deal controls, restrictions, and bureaucratic rulings, which displace a proper rule by established law, cannot survive under the same roof as free enterprise. Nothing can be successful with two masters. We must choose between having the Government control our whole lives or we must accept our full responsibilities and control the Government. Fair laws for labor, fair laws for management and capital, and decent respect for the rights of each and every group that makes up our American way of life are vital if we wish to remain freemen in fact as well as name.

Let every American remember that victory abroad including the establishment of a fair, sound, and enduring peace is so interwoven with the problem of preserving our rights as freemen at home under our established form of government that the two cannot be separated. The solution of the domestic problems is vital if victory abroad would mean real victory for the American people as one of the great leaders of the world.

No system is ever perfect. The development of the people, coupled with the ever-increasing population, will require changes, but those changes should be made by the representatives of the people, either in established law or in constitutional amendments, accomplished strictly in accord with the provisions of the Constitution itself.

Those who think lightly of the Constitution and the overriding of its provisions should remember that the people throughout the world who lost their liberties have done so by disregarding their fundamental laws and principles of government because of emergency. Emergency justifies restrictions and regulations intelligently conceived and fairly spread, but even those restrictions should go no further than is necessary. They should be made in accord with the provisions of the Constitution and should be discontinued immediately when the emergency ceases. The only hope for this country lies in an understanding of our rights and responsibilities and the acceptance of the responsibilities on time in order to preserve our rights. God willing we will succeed.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's Washington Post:

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

(By Mark Sullivan)

SOLDIER VOTE

President Roosevelt, in his message Tuesday, came out for soldier voting—and on that everybody agrees. In spite of an impression created to the contrary, there is no person in Congress, and probably no human being in the United States, who does not want every soldier to vote. The only question is one of method. And the question of method presents real difficulty—as has been discovered by the men in Congress who have given long and patient work to the problem. Soldier voting will be achieved, but only by still further patient work in Congress, and also by the States.

Mr. Roosevelt, with easy simplicity, uses the phrase, "the right to vote." Important in that phrase is the period with which Mr. Roosevelt stops. Soldier voting for what offices? For some offices—but not for others?

Soldier voting means voting for all offices, from President down to county sheriff. It means voting for all Federal offices—President, Vice President, and Members of Congress; and also for all State and local offices—Governor, members of the legislature, mayors, school directors.

Any proposal which would draw a line between the two—which would give soldiers complete opportunity to vote for Federal officials, but less opportunity to vote for State officials—is not adequate soldier voting. To treat voting for Federal officials as a superior function and voting for State officials as inferior would be a further step in that subordination of the States which already has gone so far as to cause alarm.

This is the objection to some of the proposals which would have soldier voting conducted mainly or wholly by the Federal Government. Some proposals for voting by Federal action would give complete opportunity for voting for Federal officials, but do not provide equal opportunity for voting for State offices.

On the other hand, proposals that soldier voting to be conducted by the States contemplate that the soldier shall have full and equal opportunity to vote for all offices, Federal as well as State and local.

As between the two, Mr. Roosevelt comes out for soldier voting by Federal action. He says that soldier voting by State action is not practicable. As of today he is right. In order that soldier voting be conducted by State action, it is necessary that some States make changes in their existing laws and regulations about voting. Among other steps, they must extend the time permitted for absentee voting. Adequate time for soldiers to vote, in the judgment of persons who have studied the problem, would be 90 days. And States must, of course, waive ordinary regulations, such as personal registration, or payment of poll taxes in the States which have such taxes.

Mr. Roosevelt says the States will not do this in time. But the fact is the States are already doing it. Some States are doing it in regular sessions of the legislature. In some half dozen other States, special sessions of the legislature have been called. In at least one State, Georgia, a special session of the legislature has already been called, sat for 5 days, made the necessary changes in its election laws, and adjourned.

Contrary to Mr. Roosevelt, the evidence is that the States are aware of their responsibility, and are acting upon it. The States are acting because they know that failure to act by them will create justification for the demand by Mr. Roosevelt and others that soldier voting be conducted by the Federal Government.

The States know, and the people are learning, what was put in solemn words in a radio address by Gov. William H. Wills, of Vermont, last Saturday night. Governor Wills recited Vermont's historic resistance to centralization of government, distant from the people—as practiced before the Revolution by the British Crown, and as practiced later by the Federal Government at Washington. Then Governor Wills declared:

"Vermonters today are just as wary of centralized government—and with real reason now to be suspicious."

Allowing Precious Source Material for Alcohol To Be Drained Into the Sewer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted, repeatedly, on this floor and in representations to Government bureaus and agencies, to impress upon Federal officials the economy of utilizing waste products from pulp sulfite mills for the manufacture of ethyl alcohol for industrial purposes. I advocate this program because, in so doing, the Government would be able to purchase a vast quantity of alcohol at an amount per gallon less than one-quarter the average price now being paid by the United States for such product. In addition, I advance as another argument that the utilizing of such sulfite waste liquor for alcohol would be a considerable aid in the reduction of the pollution of our national streams and waterways and, therefore, be consistent with a sound conservation program.

The Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., has been an outstanding protagonist of this crusade. Its eminent executive director, Mr. Kenneth A. Reid, has repeatedly and eloquently urged that the Federal Government cooperate with pulp mills so as to give the Government the benefit of cheap alcohol, while, at the same time, materially mitigating the menace of pollution of our national waterways.

In the February 1943 issue of Outdoor America appears an editorial by Kenneth A. Reid which feelingly and persuasively discusses this subject matter.

Here is the editorial:

CRITICAL MATERIALS THROUGH THE SEWER

Through the biggest publicity campaign ever undertaken by the Nation, citizens are urged to save, conserve and deny themselves so critical materials needed for war may be available in sufficient quantity. Did you ever stop to think, however, that prior to the war the economic structure of this country was built on exactly the opposite philosophy—a philosophy based not upon consumer need, but upon producer greed? "Break your empty bottles"—"Buy beer in convenient tin cans, just throw the empty cans away"—"Buy a second car for your family's health and enjoyment" were typical. Our whole business economy, if economy it could be called, was founded on an economy of waste.

Now war has brought us squarely face to face with the fact that rubber, aluminum, steel, copper, oil and wood are vital to the war effort and that the supplies are limited. We have been the most wasteful people on

the face of the globe and if out of this war we learn that needless waste of natural resources is not good business at any time, the war will not have been in vain.

The greatest present waste of critical materials is through the discharge of industrial sewers. In peacetimes pollution of public waters by the effluent from steel mills, coal mines, pulp and paper mills, distilleries, canneries, dye works, and what not, has been decried for its destruction of public aquatic values and its impairment of public water supplies. Today we are beginning to realize that in addition to this evil effect of pollution, we are wasting through the sewers thousands of tons of critical materials. Recoverable iron is being wasted into public waters by the millions of tons in the effluent from steel mills and coal mines. Sulfuric acid and other valuable byproducts are being wasted along with it. In one feasible process for steel mill pickle liquors and acid coal mine wastes, magnesium is also recoverable in large quantities. In the vile smelling wastes of sulfite paper mills are many recoverable byproducts important to the Nation's war effort—and vanillin to flavor our ice cream.

For a dozen years the Swedes have been making alcohol from these wastes. A year ago one of the largest pulp and paper mills in the Puget Sound area requested authorization from the War Production Board to construct such a byproduct plant to produce alcohol for use in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. Testimony before the Senate committee indicated that alcohol could be produced from these wastes at approximately half the present market price. Yet no authorization was given, and we are apparently committed to a program of making alcohol from such a critical product as petroleum, and such a staple one as grain; meantime ignoring the opportunity to eliminate destructive water pollution and produce alcohol in the same operation.

In Kentucky distillers are working full time on war contracts for alcohol and the added pollution from their untreated waste discharges has become an increasingly serious problem for Kentucky streams. Like practically all other industries, these distillers know perfectly well how to treat their wastes and they also know that they can recover from them marketable byproducts such as cattle feed. Prior to the war they staved off, through powerful political influence, the capital expense of installing treatment plants; now their excuse is that they cannot get priorities for the materials needed to build the plants. We presume after the war is over we will hear that with the drop in business they can't afford it. Powerful industrial interests have for many years, by one subterfuge or another, dodged their clear-cut responsibility to society to take care of their polluting wastes before they are discharged into a stream. They have preferred having the public bear this treatment expense at the intake of a water-treatment plant.

For a great many years the bulk of the above-mentioned industries, plus a long list of others, for which feasible methods of treatment are well known by the industries themselves, have been poisoning public waters and wantonly destroying public aquatic values. Today, in wartime, the countless thousands of tons of valuable aquatic food which would be available except for pollution, but which is lost by reason of it, take on a more serious aspect. In addition, hundreds of thousands of tons of critical materials urgently needed for the war effort, and which are recoverable from these polluting wastes, are now being thrown away into the streams. If we are really serious about saving critical materials and putting them to the Nation's war use, it is time we be consistent about it and stop the tremendous waste that goes on 24 hours a day through the sewer outlets of thousands of industries throughout the country.

KENNETH A. REID.

In this connection there is also a recent statement issued by the same Kenneth A. Reid, which is as follows:

A FOUR-WAY LOSS

Last September we pointed out in the pages of Outdoor America that in February of that year the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. had petitioned W. P. B. for priorities on the necessary materials for constructing a treatment plant for recovery of alcohol from its sulphite paper mill wastes. The company was willing to foot the bill for the treatment plant by which it estimated a recovery of 2,500,000 gallons of alcohol through a commercially profitable process developed, and for a number of years in practical use, by the Swedes. The company also testified that if the same process were used by the other pulp and paper mills in Oregon and Washington alone the output of alcohol for the manufacture of synthetic rubber would be at least 25,000,000 gallons per year, and alcohol could be produced by this method at approximately half of the then market price. More recently the Chicago Tribune has been constructing an alcohol plant at its Thorold, Ontario, paper mill.

W. P. B. refused the priorities necessary for the construction of the treatment plant on the grounds that the plants already under construction or planned for the manufacture of alcohol from petroleum and grain products would be sufficient for the Nation's war needs, apparently ignoring the important consideration that petroleum was then a critical material and grain was likely to become one, while sulphite paper mill wastes were not only a waste but also a very great public nuisance.

On May 5, 1943, the Senate Rubber Investigation Committee, headed by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, opened a drive on the Government alcohol industry to prevent the tremendous waste of the stillage or slop which can be salvaged from the manufacture of alcohol from grain by the installation of screens and driers. More than a year ago, the committee recommended that such installations be made, but the War Production Board refused to grant priorities necessary for such installations.

According to the committee, Government alcohol industry is now using grain at the rate of 10,000,000 bushels a month, and under the present program this consumption of grain for the manufacture of alcohol will be increased to five and one-half to six million tons a year. Think what that would add up to in billions of loaves of bread or thousands of fat steers. By known processes, such as are presently used by the Hiram Walker Distilleries at Peoria, Ill., and a few others, the committee estimates that 1,500,000 tons of proteins for cattle feed, worth $52,500,000 annually, could be salvaged if the stills were equipped for such recovery. This one and one-half million tons of stillage, or distillery slop, now going to waste could be an important contribution to the Nation's meat production—another "must" in the war program.

We don't pretend to know all the answers and we don't want to advocate anything that will impair the Nation's war effort, but here's the way the score looks to us:

1. Five to six million tons of grain are taken from the food supply of humans and livestock for the manufacture of alcohol.

2. One and one-half million tons of excellent cattle feed, or in dollars 52.5 million, thrown into the river and wasted.

3. Countless tons of food fish and other aquatic life lost to the Nation through the polluting effects of dumping this stillage into the streams, plus hundreds of miles of streams rendered useless or costly and undesirable for municipal or industrial water supply, for stock watering, or for the recreational use and enjoyment of the public; a menace to public health and an affront to the eyes and nostrils.

4. Additional hundreds of miles of public waters similarly affected by not recovering the presently available noxious wastes now pouring into our streams from pulp and paper mills, which, if recovered and processed, would furnish a major part of the alcohol quota and save that much grain.

There is the score, and there is a minus sign on every one of the four points. The whole system reeks of the rankest sort of extravagance and waste at a time when there is no excuse for any waste of any usable product, according to the Government's own formula for the guidance of the people.

If the Nation had a superabundance of everything except the steel and the other critical materials needed for the construction of these alcohol treatment plants the position of the War Production Board causing this fourfold waste might be justified in the name of the war effort. But the grain used is critical, cattle feed is at a premium, and the destruction of fish food are all important losses to the war effort.

If it is not within the province of the War Production Board to consider this whole problem in its broad aspects and take into the consideration the whole train of loss and waste of important food products resulting from its policy of saving a few critical materials, then it would seem to be the duty of Congress to take the matter in hand so that we will not continue the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy that wastes tons of needed food products on a continuing basis in order to save pounds of metal on initial capital installations.

It would seem that W. P. B. may need a new slide rule, or a formula with a multiple factor of four, to arrive at fair comparative values in allocating priorities.

Which Way America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. SCHUETZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following wartime message by Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, Illinois National Democratic committeeman:

WHICH WAY, AMERICA?

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, it goes without saying that I am glad to be with you today. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to exchange views with you.

I suppose that I was invited to address this gathering partly because I happen to be the mayor of a great city in the adjoining State of Illinois, possibly also because I happen to be the Democratic national committeeman from Illinois.

SPEAKS AS AN AMERICAN

Presumably I am here to make a Democratic speech. But it is impossible to make a Democratic speech, for I come here today not as a Democrat, not as a representative of any political party; I come here merely as a representative American citizen.

And I am not here to talk politics. I am not here to attempt to convince anyone or instill in the mind of anyone that my party

is the greatest, or that our Democratic leaders are the greatest in the Nation just because they happen to be Democrats.

There can be no party lines at this time.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL

It is true that when this great world crisis struck, our leaders of the Democratic Party headed the Government, and it was their responsibility to meet this crisis. Whatever has been accomplished by those in charge of the affairs of the Nation, who happen to be Democrats, has been accomplished not for the good of the Democratic Party but for the benefit of and in the interests of all the people of the United States. Those achievements must be credited not alone to our Democratic leaders but to the citizens of the United States, whose cooperation has made those accomplishments possible.

So I come here not to speak alone for the people of my party or of my city. I am interested in the outcome of events that must affect not only Chicago and Illinois and Milwaukee and this great State of Wisconsin but the entire Nation.

I speak of Chicago because, of course, I am most familiar with my own city and its people and because what has happened in Chicago is typical of the Nation.

STAND BEHIND COMMANDER IN CHIEF

In Chicago we have probably the greatest melting pot in the world, a mixture whose origin represents 62 different dialects, a city whose people have cooperated 100 percent in every phase of the war effort, and who have stood solidly behind our Commander in Chief in loyal support of his leadership.

It is impossible to harness the thinking, the action, of those 4,000,000 Chicagoans. They are working together in harmony and cooperation, not because they are driven into line, but because they recognize what would happen if Hitler were to win. They recognize that only by working together is victory possible. They are working in support of principle, not party.

There can only be one issue at this time, the winning of the war. And I am here to add my little mite in an effort further to build up that spirit and morale of our people, who in turn, through their actions, build up the morale of the boys in the fighting lines.

The purpose of this convention, the responsibility of this convention, is the further stimulation of that interest, to let our men in the armed forces know that the tremendous sacrifices which they are making are worth while, let them know that here at home we are determined to do everything within our power to match them in service and sacrifice and loyalty to our Commander in Chief.

NATION NEEDS LOYALTY NOW

Never has there been greater need of loyalty, of patriotic devotion to the ideals upon which this Nation was founded. Never in the history of this democracy has our country been faced with a situation so crucial, so momentous in its effect on our future, as that which we face today. Never has so much depended upon our thoughts, our actions, our plans, and never has there been more need of intelligent thinking, unity of action, and courageous, fearless leadership.

And, thank God, we, as American citizens, and yes, as Democrats and loyal supporters of our Commander in Chief, can rejoice that we have such leadership.

No one can doubt the strength of this leadership. The results, the records, speak for themselves. It would be hard to find another decade in the life of the American Nation so filled with constructive, progressive results, and certainly no such measure of progress was ever achieved in any nation in the face of such overwhelming odds.

CONDITION OF ALL IMPROVED

It is impossible to mention one single phase of our American life, one single economic group of our American people, whose condition today is not infinitely improved.

Every worker has the protection of old-age benefit and unemployment insurance, under a national social-security program.

For the first time since this Nation was founded, the rights of labor are recognized and protected under the collective bargaining provisions of the Wagner Act.

Millions of acres of farm lands have been conserved and saved from destruction through the comprehensive long-range soil-conservation program. And no one should know beter than the people of Wisconsin how the condition of the farmers has been improved.

Thousands of businesses are live, profitable enterprises today that would have perished in bankruptcy save for the broadened policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

HOMES OF MILLIONS SAVED

Millions of citizens still possess homes from which they would have been dispossessed without the aid supplied them by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

There is not time to list them all, but in business, finance, industry, farming, labor, manufacturing, in all walks of life, the record is the same. It is one of progress accomplished through straight thinking, intelligent planning.

Mistakes, yes. For no one, no group of human beings can attain perfection.

Yet how can anyone forget the conditions of 1932?

How can anyone refuse to recognize how steadily, how far we have marched ahead since those days?

RECALL "PROSPERITY AROUND THE CORNER"

The entire Nation was at its lowest financial ebb. Nothing planned for the return to a stable economy. Prosperity was always just around the corner, but never in sight.

Banks and business houses toppling into bankruptcy like so many dominoes. Farmers in open rebellion with riots and bloodshed over the seizure of their farms because of unpaid mortgage payments. Twelve million Americans walking the streets in a hopeless search for work. Bread lines in every city, and children starving in a land of plenty. Men, women, and children following garbage trucks to the city dumps to salvage bits of food.

Those were the conditions that our present administrative leadership had to shoulder as its responsibility and to overcome.

They tackled the job, disheartening and huge as it was. They followed through, and won.

ADMINISTRATION MEETS WORLD CRISIS

It was with that same sort of courage and fearless leadership that this administration, with President Roosevelt as Commander in Chief, met the world crisis.

What would have happened to this country, what would have happened to the world, if the United States, under this fearless leadership, had not decided to cast its destiny on the side of the Allies?

What would have happened if our military training program had not got under way when it did, or if the United States had not been in the background as a bulwark for our fighting allies to be dependent upon for aid short of war before our entrance into the conflict? What would have happened without lend-lease to provide food and a continuous stream of munitions, planes, and ships so vitally needed?

PREPAREDNESS AVERTED DISASTER

Without all this Russia certainly would have fallen after that first terrible onslaught. England would have been beaten to her knees. And the spirit of the Czechs, the Poles, the Dutch, the Norwegians, and the French, would have been completely broken.

If the United States, through its leaders, had not established itself as the arsenal of democracy, the last ray of hope for freemen throughout the world would have been shattered, and the world today, including ourselves, would be living under the mastery of Hitler.

There was only one nation, even at that time, mighty enough in manpower, wealth, and resources, to save the world. That nation was America!

The leaders of our country recognized this. It was plain to every thinking man, who sincerely had the interest of his country at heart. It was clear to every one of these who was not blinded by political hatred and selfish prejudices.

ROOSEVELT FOREWARNED NATION

Our Commander in Chief saw it clearly, and expressed it as long ago as October 5, 1937, here in the Middle West at Chicago, when he made his "quarantine of the aggressor nations" speech. In that speech he clearly defined the obligation of the United States, of the people of this Nation, to stand together with the nations who are now our allies, to protect ourselves and the world from slavery.

Yet despite the overwhelming necessity, our leaders were forced to fight every inch of the way, for every step taken for the protection of America. The response to this courageous leadership was the cry of "warmonger" against our Commander in Chief, and accusations against all of our country's leaders that they were conniving to steer us into a war that could be avoided by making a deal with Hitler.

The events since that time have proved to the world how sound our leaders' judgment was, and how false the accusations hurled against them.

CHARTS COURSE FOR AMERICA

Despite this tempest stirred up by short-sighted, small-minded men, for political purposes, our Commander in Chief continued to chart the course for our Nation calmly, with wisdom and courage. Not once has he been swayed by partisan considerations, and not once has an appointment been made for the conduct of the war along party lines.

He did not ask whether a man was a Republican or a Democrat; all he asked was, "Can you help us do the huge job that lies before us?"

It is with that kind of leadership that our country has been able to accomplish the truly miraculous output of production, and only by following that course have we been able to mobilize the cooperative spirit of America into the united might of a nation fighting a total war.

GREATEST ARMY IN WORLD

This all-powerful accomplishment is all the more amazing when it is remembered how swiftly—how efficiently—our Army, then one of the smallest in the world, was expanded and trained into what is today the greatest, the best organized, the best clothed, and best fed army of fighting men in the world—and despite the tremendous pressure brought to bear to hurry our new Army into action, they were not sent until they were fully hardened, fully trained, completely equipped to meet the enemy.

This is no time to drop our guard.

Let's remember that now we still have with us those same small-minded men who, for motives of personal gain or vindictive prejudice, would hamstring the efforts of our leaders by petty political maneuvers at the expense of victory.

The same men who cried, "Keep us out of war!" are now proclaiming that the war is as good as won.

WAR IS NOT OVER

This war is not over. No one can yet predict with any certainty the day or the month or the year when it will end. Such propaganda is one of our greatest enemies today and Hitler's strongest ally.

Hitler knows that he cannot win. He knows that his only hope is to slow us down, weaken us with a false optimism, so that he can win a stalemate—a stalemate out of which he can build a new army for another attempt in the future to enslave the world.

This wave of optimism has already had a noticeable effect. Our people are letting down. They are buying fewer War bonds. Donations to the Red Cross blood bank, so vital for the saving of soldiers' lives, are falling off. In salvage, in the conservation of grease and fats, critically needed for ammunition, work in the war plants, enlistments of women in the WAC's and WAVES and SPARS, and all phases of our war effort, there is evidence of a decline in our national morale. People are seemingly engrossed in the reckless spending of war wages and war profits, with no concern for inflation and little serious thought of the war itself.

NO TIME TO STOP

This is no time to stop! We must drive on, increasing our speed and our energy, not lessening it. Every day lost on the production line, every bond that is not purchased, every let-down of any sort means a longer war and more lives sacrificed.

Let's not forget, it was lack of equipment that slowed down Hitler in Russia. It was lack of equipment that prevented his knock-out invasion blow at England!

Imagine our own boys on the battle fronts, hungry for lack of food, helpless for lack of equipment and ammunition that failed to arrive because of a break-down on our home front! No, that must not be allowed to happen. Now more than ever is the time when every effort counts. There must be no stalemate, no false peace that would leave the fires of this war smoldering, to be fanned into the flames of a new war 20 years from now.

STRICKEN EUROPE FIGHTS ON

In the stricken countries of Europe, the peoples struggling for freedom have been starved and bombed and tortured, but they have not let down. They have not lost their will to fight, to resist, to struggle.

They still fight on, even knowing that detection of their underground activity will mean death for themselves and their families. In Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Greece, in Yugoslavia, in Holland, and Norway, all the occupied countries, the people know what slavery means and would rather die than give up hope of regaining their liberty.

The morale, the spirit of American people likewise must stand firm and unflinching, for more damage can be done through weakened morale on the home front than by the loss of battles on the fighting front.

WE MUST WIN THE PEACE

Now, more than ever before, must there be a continued, courageous, clear-thinking leadership. Even with the end of the war our victory will only be half complete. Our battle to win the peace, a just and lasting peace, will be a fight more grim, more beset with danger, than the bloody battles in the fields of war. Upon the peace that is achieved depends not only the immediate future of our country, but the effects of that peace are certain to cast their reflection on the lives of many generations to come.

We must continue to have a militant government to lead us to a swift, decisive victory, a government headed by courageous men who can be depended upon to plan courageously and act decisively in order that peace, when it comes, shall not render that victory an empty one. A government strong enough to enforce that peace will not only insure the future of America but of the whole world.

Our men, when they come home, must be assured of the opportunity for profitable employment.

GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE LEAD

The production lessons we have learned in the war should bring good times after the war. And our Government must be intelligent, forceful, dynamic, to put into action the lessons of science and industry, of production and distribution, that we have learned, and make certain they will not be forgotten.

The benefits of our industry and our increased knowledge, our tremendously expanded inventive genius developed during the war, must be thrown open for the enjoyment of all our people, and the opportunities to enjoy them distributed justly.

It is a huge job that will demand not only a high level of statesmanship, but the understanding support of every citizen.

AVOID POLITICAL ISSUES

Realizing this, as everyone must, emphasizes that it could be nothing but disaster to inject political issues into a situation upon which depends our very destiny as a nation.

There can be but one issue. We are either for or against the boys in our armed forces. We are either for or against those who are commanding our armed forces, from our Commander in Chief on down. We are either for or against the effort that is required for total victory in this war.

During this war every member of our armed forces, from the Commander in Chief to the private, has learned the value of complete teamwork. That same lesson has been learned by millions of our private citizens.

IT MUSTN'T HAPPEN HERE

The stake in our future is too great to be imperiled now by allowing false motives to take the place of straight thinking and unified cooperation and effort. The ego of false leaders has caused the downfall of many a country. We cannot allow that to happen to America.

Just as no individual can stand alone and be self-sufficient, so no city, no community, no nation can exist by itself. The tremendous progress of aviation during the past few years has made this globe a world of neighborhoods, and we will be living in a world where the well-being of one country depends on the well-being of all countries. We adopted this as a principle when we cast in our lot with the Allies.

Our progress in the world depends upon our ability to understand and cooperate with the other countries of the world for our common good. And that principle holds good a thousandfold here at home.

DECRIES ANGLING FOR VOTES

There has been, and is today, too much angling for votes and too little regard for progress.

It is the inclination of too many to take the easiest way, the one which will cause least struggle and personal inconvenience, instead of the intelligent way of viewing and deciding problems for the best good of the Nation. It is up to every citizen to stand militantly for the principles of democracy, disregarding all discrimination because of race, color, religion, or politics.

We are proud to be Democrats. We are proud of our party's record. But we must be Democrats not as a tradition to be followed blindly because our fathers were Democrats but as a living faith in the principles on which our country was founded, and as the highest expression of those principles for which we are fighting today.

TIMES CALL FOR COOPERATION

And as Democrats we must conduct our campaigns not in a spirit of hate of those who differ with us but in the knowledge that the times call for the most constructive, understanding leadership, and support of that leadership, from all corners of the Nation. We want to do a constructive job, a job which demands the cooperation of every loyal citizen.

Now, more than ever, a united front, a unity of thought and action is not only essential—it is imperative.

There can be no doubt that the people are still solidly behind such a program. And when their voice is heard, it is certain to indicate a nation still solidly behind their armed forces, their President and Commander in Chief, still solidly behind those who are running the war and working for an intelligent peace.

WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

They want this war won quickly.

They want the victory to be decisive.

They are determined that the groundwork shall be laid for a decent, lasting, just peace.

And when the people speak of these things they will be speaking not alone for this country, but for peace and freedom and justice for all people throughout the world.

You men and women meet today in the same spirit as did the Continental Congress of 1774, which bound the Colonies for the first time in a common cause, the struggle to establish the principles of democracy.

WHICH WAY, AMERICA!

Today we are again at the fork in the road. Ahead lies either disunity, conflict and decay, or singleness of purpose, determined devotion to the goal of progress set by that great humanitarian and courageous leader of men, our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt.

The Strange Case of Prof. Arnold Bergstraesser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Johannes Steel is one of our most gifted and brilliant writers and radio commentators. For him I entertain profound admiration and affectionate regard. He has the courage of his convictions. He is not intimidated by considerations of expediency, nor coerced by what some mistakenly regard as the precepts of good taste in connection with his observations on national and international affairs.

He has been in the forefront of international thinking for many years. He has contended that the United States implement its profession of devotion to the "four freedoms" by insisting that democracy shall prevail in the countries of Europe. He has deplored our collaboration with Fascists and quasi-Fascists. He has denounced our trafficking with the decadent nobility. He has pointed out how absurd it is for us to hope to convince the oppressed residents of the occupied European countries with our bona fides while permitting devotees of reaction of all forms to dictate phases of our foreign policy.

Recently, in the New York Post, he discussed the strange case of Prof. Arnold Bergstraesser. Here is a German gentleman whose record in Germany, even after 1933, was strange and mysterious, yet we find him on the faculty of the University of Chicago, instructing young American officers with reference to situations they will encounter in German areas, when we have driven the enemy back that far. But let Johannes Steel tell you the intriguing tale in his own words.

STEEL FILINGS—THE STRANGE CASE OF PROFESSOR BERGSTRAESSER

(By Johannes Steel)

From time to time we have called attention in these columns to the phenomena of pan-

German thought which is sweeping through American academic circles.

In that category I would put Prof. Arnold Bergstraesser, of the University of Chicago, who is instructing young American officers who will some day presumably administer occupied territories.

Bergstraesser is instructing them in what is called German Areas Study.

The case of Professor Bergstraesser had its genesis between 1933 and 1936 when he was teaching at such institutions as the University of Marburg. There, the organizers of a course entitled "The Younger Generation In Germany; Its Attitude and Essence, Presented by Its Members," picked him to present Nazi youth to the "members of the race and foreign guests" who were to be initiated into the new order.

During that period Bergstraesser also wrote his Nation and Economy, which was published by the same Nazi publishing firm which issued the works of such Nazi theoreticians as Adolf Bartels.

THE PATTERN OF THE NAZI

In his own book, Bergstraesser refers in approving terms to the new order in Germany. In fact a close study of Bergstraesser's writing and teaching in German schools reveals an intellectual pattern parallel to that of the Nazis in several respects. He was a member of the National Socialist Professors Corporation. In 1934 he joined the German Society for Geopolitics and Military Science, and so became one of the members of the general staff of the famous Haushofer Institute, from which Hitler's brain trust was selected.

In 1937 Bergstraesser appeared in the United States because, as he insists, he "finds it impossible to further teach in Germany."

A year after his arrival here, however, a Nazi publishing firm in Frankfurt announced a new book series entitled "Studies of the Idea of State and Nation," edited by the good doctor.

The day after Pearl Harbor, Bergstraesser was taken into custody by Federal authorities. He was asked whether he had had contacts with Fritz Wiedeman, the German consul general in San Francisco and chief of Hitler's espionage organization operating in conjunction with the Japanese.

He was also questioned about the content of his courses at Scripps College and of a number of lectures delivered on the west coast.

RELEASED TO THE CAMPUS

In January 1942, he was suddenly released. On September 10, 1942, he was rearrested. In February 1943, he was let out again. His second release was followed by his appointment to the University of Chicago.

His releases from custody were obtained through the intervention of Dr. Heinrich Bruening, former Chancelor of the German Reich and now littauer professor of government, graduate school of public administration, Harvard University.

And thereby hangs another tale which we will tell some other time.

The Soldier Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is our hope to report the soldiers and sailors absentee voting bill to the House this week with perfecting amendments, to enable the men and women in the armed forces of the United States to vote in the coming election, and to leave the election machinery in the hands of the States.

The States are cooperating in every possible way. I have in my hand now a law recently passed, unanimously by the legislature of the State of Georgia, not only wiping out the restrictions which have prohibited the men and women in the armed forces from voting by absentee ballots in the past, but eliminating any necessity for applications for the ballots at all.

I am inserting this law in the RECORD today as a model. We ask the other States to pass similar laws in order that this matter may be straightened out, and that every man and woman in the armed forces who is qualified to do so may vote by absentee ballot in the coming elections.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting the law just passed by the legislature of Georgia.

It read as follows:

ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA, 1944

An act to provide for Georgia men and women in military service of the United States of America to participate in elections and primaries; to define terms; to proclaim purposes; to provide for registration; to provide for the issuance of ballots to those who are already registered; to amend and revise laws relating to the time of holding elections, primaries, and conventions; to provide for the time of qualification of candidates; to provide for the furnishing, voting, return, and counting of ballots in primaries and elections; to absolve and abolish poll taxes against the military; to create a war-ballot commission; to define the duties and authorities thereof; to make provisions relating to registration and voting by the military; to provide for the costs thereof; to provide for the termination of this act; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia:

SECTION 1. The purpose of this act is to make provision for Georgia men and women in the military service of the United States to participate in county, State, and national elections, and in party primaries in liberalizing the statutes of this State and by making provision for such participation.

SEC. 2. This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purpose of the general assembly in its enactment.

SEC. 3. The State selective service, all military organizations, and citizens of this State are charged with the duty of cooperating with election and party officials in carrying out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 4. The term "military" as used in this act shall mean enlisted and commissioned members, male and female, of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components who are citizens of Georgia.

SEC. 5. The tax collectors or tax commissioners of the several counties shall provide for the military a registration card in form as follows:

"I do hereby affirm that I am a citizen of the United States; that I have resided in the State of Georgia 1 year and in the county of ---------- for 6 months immediately preceding the date of my induction into the military service of the United States; that my address at the time of my induction in the military service was ---------- Street, or R. F. D. ------, ---------- town; that I possess the qualifications of an elector required by the constitution of Georgia; that I am not disfranchised from voting by reason of any offense committed against the laws of Georgia; and that I am ------ years of age. Dated this ------ day of ----------, 19-----.

----------"

(Signature)

The signing of the aforesaid registration card containing the required information shall be in all respects equivalent to signing the voters' book and shall not require attestation.

Any member of the military, his relative or friend, is authorized at any time to request from the tax collector or commissioner the aforesaid registration card, and in making said request shall furnish the name and address of the military member, and upon receipt of such request it shall be the duty of the tax collector or commissioner to send the same to the member of the military, and the tax collector or commissioner shall number the said registration forms and shall keep a permanent record book in his office, in which he shall record the number of the card, the name of the member of the military for whom the registration card is sought, the name and relation, if any, of the person requesting the card, and the date the card is furnished, and such other information necessary to identify said registrant; provided further, however, for good and sufficient cause made known to the tax collector or commissioner, he may furnish to the military voter a duplicate registration card, noting the fact in the book hereinbefore referred to.

The member of the military receiving and executing the aforesaid registration card shall place the same in an envelope addressed to the tax collector or commissioner of his county and mail the same. It shall not be necessary to use registered mail.

When such registration is completed, signed and returned to the tax collector or tax commissioner of the county it shall by him be placed in a suitable permanent record book and form a part of the voters' registration list. Upon receipt by the tax collector or commissioner of the said registration, the name of the member of the military so registering shall be placed upon the registration list as an elector and registered voter, and shall be certified as such by the registrars; provided, however, the said member of the military is otherwise qualified.

SEC. 6. In all cases where the voter is already registered and otherwise qualified, application may be made for a ballot without the necessity of reregistration as is in this act elsewhere provided, and upon proof satisfactory to the registrars of the service of said voter in the armed forces, a ballot shall be mailed to the voter as herein provided. Entries shall be made in the books herein specified as to the voter's registration as a member of the armed forces, and as to the issuance of a ballot to him.

SEC. 7. Nothing contained in the present laws of Georgia as to the time that the registrars shall complete their work and file the list of registered voters shall in any way abridge the right of a member of the military to be certified by the registrars at any time as a registered voter. The registrars shall include on the list of registered voters all members of the military who have registered in accordance with the provisions of this act and who are otherwise qualified.

SEC. 8. In order to allow more adequate time for the participation of members of the military in elections and party primaries, the following provisions are enacted in lieu of those now provided by law:

1. All candidates for National and State offices or the proper authorities of the political party nominating them, shall file notice of their candidacy, giving their names

and the offices for which they are candidates, with the secretary of state, at least 90 days prior to the regular election. All candidates for district and county offices either by themselves or by the proper authorities of the party nominating them, shall file notice of their candidacy with the ordinary of the county at least 90 days before the regular election.

2. Whenever any political party shall hold primary elections for nomination of candidates for office for Governor, statehouse officers, Members of Congress, United States Senators, judges of the superior courts, justices of the supreme court, judges of the court of appeals, solicitors general, and members of the general assembly, which are by law voted on one and the same day throughout the State, said primary may be held on such date as may be fixed by the State executive committee of such party, and the State executive committee is authorized to fix such time for the said primary, second primary, or party convention as it may determine without respect to the time now provided by law as the date on which the said primary, second primary, or convention shall be held.

SEC. 9. Every member of the military registered and qualified shall vote at the precinct in which the courthouse of the county is located.

SEC. 10. The Governor shall furnish the several ordinaries all blank forms necessary for the general elections in sufficient time for the ordinaries to have the ballots printed at least 70 days before election day.

SEC. 11. Upon the request of any member of the military, his relative or friend, it shall be the duty of the ordinary to furnish such military voter at the address given at the time the request is made a ballot for the use of the military voter in casting his vote in the general election. The ordinary in furnishing the said ballot shall number same and in a permanent record book provided for the purpose he shall inscribe the number of the ballot, the name of the military voter for whose use it has been furnished, the name of the person requesting the same and the date the ballot was furnished: *Provided, however,* That the ordinary is authorized to furnish a duplicate ballot for good and sufficient cause to the military voter: *Provided further, however,* That a notation shall be made thereof in the book hereinbefore referred to. Said ordinary in furnishing said ballot to such military voter shall also furnish a self-addressed envelope for the return of such ballot to such ordinary.

SEC. 12. The member of the military marking and casting his ballot in a general election shall sign the same on the back thereof, place the ballot in an envelope addressed to the ordinary of the county in which he is a registered voter, write on the envelope the word "ballot" and mail the same. Attached to the ballot furnished by the ordinary for the use of the member of the military in voting shall be instructions as to the signing, marking, voting, and return of the same. Such military voter in returning the aforesaid ballot shall not be required to post the same by registered mail or to have the same certified or notarized by any person or persons.

SEC. 13. It shall be the duty of the county registrars in any primary election held by any political party for the nomination of candidates for the office of Governor, statehouse officers, Members of Congress, United States Senators, judges of the superior courts, justices of the supreme court, judges of the court of appeals, solicitors general, and members of the general assembly, to furnish to any member of the military who is a registered and qualified voter and who is a member of the political party holding the said primary a ballot for the use of the military voter who is a member of the said political party in casting his vote in the said primary election. Said request to the registrars can be made by the member of the military, his relative or friend, and in making such request applicant shall give the name and address of the military voter. The registrars so furnishing the said ballot shall number the same and in a permanent record book provided for the purpose, he shall inscribe the number of the ballot, the name of the military voter for whose use it is intended, the name of the person requesting the same, and the date the ballot was furnished: *Provided, however,* the registrars are authorized to furnish a duplicate ballot for good and sufficient cause to the military voter: *Provided, further, however,* That a notation shall be made thereof in the book hereinbefore referred to. Such registrars in furnishing said ballot to such voter, shall also furnish a self-addressed envelope for the return of such ballot to such registrars.

SEC. 14. The member of the military marking and casting the said ballot in said primary election shall sign the same on the back thereof, place the ballot in an envelope addressed to the county registrars of the county in which he is a registered voter, write on the envelope the word "ballot," and mail the same. Attached to the ballot furnished by the county registrars for use of the member of the military in voting in said party primary election shall be instructions as to the signing, marking, voting, and return of the same. Such military voter in returning the aforesaid ballot shall not be required to post the same by registered mail or to have the same certified or notarized by any person or persons.

SEC. 15. When duplicate ballots are furnished to military voters in general or primary elections, only the first ballot received shall be counted.

SEC. 16. It shall be the duty of the ordinary in case of general elections, and the duty of the county registrars in case of primary elections, to receive all ballots from members of the military up to and including the election hours of the day of election and to keep the said military ballots in a safe and private place unopened until the day of the election. Upon receipt of the ballot by the ordinary or the county registrars, as the case may be, the said official shall write the date of the receipt of the said military ballot on the envelope containing same. On the day of the election such official shall, in the presence of the election managers, open the envelope containing the military ballot, determine the name of the voter casting the same, and record the receipt of his said ballot, and the date received, in the permanent record book maintained by the said official for such purpose. The election managers shall then determine from the list of registered and qualified voters the eligibility of the military voter in question to cast the said ballot and, if found properly registered and qualified, the ordinary or the county registrars, as the case may be, shall deposit the ballot in the regular ballot box with the approval of the election managers.

SEC. 17. It shall be the duty of the board of registrars to make and file with the election managers of the precinct in which the courthouse of the county is located a full and complete list of registered and qualified voters for the entire county.

SEC. 18. There is hereby created a State War Ballot Commission composed of the Governor, the president of the senate, the speaker of the house, the attorney general, and the secretary of state, which said Commission is authorized and empowered to make any and all provisions and regulations necessary to effectuate the operation of this act and to cooperate with Federal authorities in facilitating and expediting the handling of registration and balloting by military voters. The said War Ballot Commission is also directed to cooperate with State, county, and political party officials in all matters relating to the registration and voting of members of the military in elections and party primaries. The said Commission is also empowered and authorized to settle and determine all questions of law, procedure, and regulation governing the registration and voting of persons in the military.

SEC. 19. All poll taxes which may have accrued or which may hereafter accrue during his military service against members of the military, residents of this State, be and the same are hereby abolished, repealed, and remitted.

SEC. 20. All expense in connection with the mailing of registration cards and ballots to members of the military as provided in this act shall be borne by the counties.

SEC. 21. The terms and provisions of this act shall expire and become extinguished upon the convening of the general assembly in regular session next after the termination of the present war.

SEC. 22. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act be and the same are hereby repealed.

Approved January 7, 1944.

Flood-Free Johnstown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Sid A. Weinschenk entitled "Flood-Free Johnstown." The title of the article describes the existing situation correctly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD-FREE JOHNSTOWN

(by Sid A. Weinschenk)

(As a member of the staffs of the Johnstown Tribune and the Johnstown Democrat, Mr. Weinschenk covered all phases of the movement to obtain flood protection for Johnstown, from its inception in 1937 to its successful conclusion in November.)

"So you are from Johnstown, Pa. I know that town. That's the place they have floods."

For a century Johnstowners have been greeted all over the world in the above manner. But those days are gone forever. No longer will residents of the Cambria County metropolis be greeted as being from a town that has floods. This statement is not father to the wish. It is an accomplished fact, for Johnstown will no longer be annoyed by Old Man River overflowing the banks of the Stony Creek and Conemaugh Rivers. This remarkable transition of affairs has been brought about through the expenditure of $8,670,000 by the Federal Government, under the supervision of the United States Army Engineers in widening and deepening the channels of the rivers in Johnstown. The flood protection project was completed and finally inspected by the United States Army Engineers on November 27, 1943.

Johnstown has long been known for its distinctions. Among these are that the city is the center of one of the largest bituminous coal areas in the Nation. It is in the forefront as a steel producing center. It also has the finest set of high-water marks on its buildings of any community in the United States. These high-water marks, however,

as a result of Johnstown now being a floodless city, will be eradicated from all Johnstown buildings at the end of 6 months. During that period progressively Johnstowners plan a series of events to celebrate the fact that Johnstown is now, and henceforth always will be, a city not confronted by the flood menace.

How was this remarkable change brought about? The complete story would probably fill volumes, but the highlights of the courage and ingenuity of Johnstowners, ably assisted by United States Army Engineers, which brought about the transition can be detailed here.

The first extreme flood in Johnstown occurred in 1833 when the rivers rose to 26.6 feet above flood stage. Following that time, and up to 1937, the city was visited by 23 floods, the most disastrous, of course, being the one of May 31, 1889, when the South Fork Dam broke, letting loose the waters that caused the loss of 2,300 lives and property damage running into millions.

It was the flood of St. Patrick's Day 1936, however, that brought insistent demands from the people of Johnstown that action be taken to curb the waters of the two rivers.

The damage in Cambria County amounted to $42,240,000, exclusive of losses suffered by utilities and railroads. Most of the damage occurred in Johnstown and vicinity. The river rose to 20.2 feet above flood stage.

Following the 1936 flood, the Chief of the United States Army Engineers ordered the Pittsburgh district engineer to investigate and report on the flood situation of Johnstown with the view of developing a flood-control plan. This action was taken under a Federal act. As a result of the investigation, it was planned to provide reservoirs for water storage in an area adjacent to Cambria County. Later it was discovered, however, that the plan was not feasible and the proposed project was abandoned.

The people of Johnstown and Cambria County were not discouraged. Aroused by the flood of May 1937, the controller of Cambria County proposed that the county, if necessary, expend $2,000,000 in widening and deepening the river channels so as to afford flood protection to the city. The proposal instantly won the support of the county commissioners, the Johnstown Tribune, and the Johnstown Democrat. It is to the credit of men who were city or county officials at the time, and to the two Johnstown newspapers that today Johnstown is a floodless city.

The controller's proposal was approved by a Cambria County Grand Jury in June 1937. As a result of this action, numerous visits were made to Washington by city and county officials, Johnstown newspapermen, and representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, and otherse to interest Federal authorities in the proposed plan to widen and deepen the river channels. The delegations had the whole-hearted support of Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, from the time the plan was originally proposed until it was completed.

The proposition was placed before Brig. Gen. Edwin Markham, Chief of the United States Army Enginers. The general, on being told that Cambria County was willing to expend $2,000,000 of its own funds to obtain flood protection, seemed flabbergasted. To the Cambria Countians the general said:

"You are the only fellows I know who ever offered to spend their own county money to gain flood protection. I most certainly agree that something should and must be done to do away with the constant menace of floods in Johnstown."

General Markham's attention was called to the fact that President Roosevelt speaking in Johnstown on August 31, 1936, said:

"We want to keep you from having those floods again. The Federal Government, if I have anything to do with it, will cooperate with your State and community to prevent further floods."

General Markham called in several of his aides and a decision to provide flood protection for Johnstown by widening and deepening the river channels was made. The general pointed out, however, that they fly in the ointment was the fact that Congress would have to enact special legislation if the project were to be undertaken. General Markham stated that he would have the necessary legislation drawn up. Later this was done and the proposed bill was given to Senator GUFFEY, who turned it over to the late Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, who guided the measure to success.

Following is the bill, later enacted into law by Congress, which assured flood protection for Johnstown:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes,' approved June 22, 1936, as amended by act of Congress approved April 27, 1937, is hereby further amended to provide that, if, in the execution of the project for a reservoir system for the protection of Pittsburgh, it is found that geological and engineering conditions make it impracticable to construct a reservoir to provide protection for the city of Johnstown, Pa., flood protection shall be provided for said city by channel enlargement or other works: *Provided,* That the total estimated construction cost of the entire project shall not be increased."

As a result of the passage of this legislation, Johnstown today has the biggest and best channel improvement in the United States. The United States Army engineers, in accepting the project when it was completed on November 27, 1943, confirmed the statement that Johnstown's flood problem has been effectively solved.

Before work on the Johnstown Rivers was begun, however, the United States Army engineers conducted hydraulic tests at the United States Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., so that nothing in the plan would be left to guesswork. Hundreds of model tests were made. As a result of these tests, work to widen and deepen the Johnstown River channels was begun on August 23, 1938.

The project was constructed in six units. The work involved the excavation of 2,989,300 cubic yards of muck and dirt. For the revetments, 156,631 cubic yards of concrete were utilized, while 485,600 cubic yards of dirt was used to make the necessary fills.

To gain an idea of the immense scope of the work, it might be pointed out that if the excavated dirt could be piled in a heap in Central Park, Johnstown, which is 240 feet square, it would reach to a height of 1,420 feet, or 172 feet higher than the Empire State Building. With the concrete used in the project you could build a highway 20 feet wide with a thickness of 8 inches, which would run approximately 62 miles.

The length of the project extends 9 miles. Starting on the Conemaugh River below Dornick Point the stream was widened and deepened for a distance of 3.52 miles. Along the Little Conemaugh River similar steps were taken for 1.53 miles, while on the Stony Creek River and ending at the Moxham-Ferndale bridge work was done for 4.05 miles. Numerous obstacles were overcome by the United States Army engineers in directing the flood-protection work to a successful conclusion. The obstacles included the following:

Numerous bridge and pipe-line crossings as well as ends of pipe outlets were involved; disposal sites had to be found for a large amount of excavated material; a great deal of work was done along the river banks; construction could be carried on in the channels only during the low-water seasons, while the war created a scarcity of materials, equipment, and labor.

Despite all these handicaps, Johnstowners, led by executives of the Johnstown newspapers, did not become discouraged with the advent of war. A short time prior to Pearl Harbor, Congress had failed to appropriate funds for the sixth and final unit of the project. Funds for flood-control projects were tied in a knot, and only those expenditures which could be justified as necessary defense measures were sanctioned.

Investigation showed that an appropriation of $1,058,000 would be necessary before the contract for the final unit could be awarded. Unless this unit was started and completed the entire project would not have completely served its purpose.

In order to obtain legislation by Congress for this appropriation it was found necessary to gain the approval of the United States Army engineers, which was comparatively a simple matter, as these engineers had from the beginning given their complete support to the project. However, there were stumbling blocks, as the approval of the Office of Production Management, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of War had to be obtained. It can well be imagined that these obstacles were tough ones, as practically all flood-protection work was placed under a ban. The Johnstowners, however, convinced Washington authorities beyond a doubt that the completion of the Johnstown flood-protection plan was essential to the war effort. The plan was finally given complete approval by the Washington authorities after the facts had been laid before them time after time by a representative of the Johnstown newspapers.

In retrospect it might appear that Johnstown's fight to keep Old Man River away from its doors was a comparatively easy one. It was not. But all the effort that was expended both by Johnstowners of former years and those of today has proved to be more than well worth while. The people of Johnstown, during the many hazardous years when it appeared that the business section of the city might, to a great extent, be eliminated by flood waters, maintained the highest degree of courage. If medals were given to men in civies as well as to soldiers, scores of Johnstowners would be decorated for the fight they waged under difficulties to obtain flood protection for their city.

These men were undaunted by discouraging conditions. When the flood waters came on St. Patrick's Day 1936 and wiped out the stocks of numerous merchants in the heart of the city these men could have easily become discouraged and moved to other fields. However, they stuck by their guns and reopened their stores, determined that Johnstown business would some day be bigger and better than ever. Due to their determination that day has arrived. No longer will people throughout the world say:

"So you are from Johnstown, Pa. I know that town. That's the place they have floods."

Instead they will become conscious of this slogan which has been adopted by the "Flood Free Jonstown" Observance Committee:

"Flood-Free Johnstown—a good place to live, to work, to do business."

If you don't believe these facts are correct you are cordially invited to visit the city to view the most remarkable and efficient flood-protection project ever placed in operation.

The Right of Soldiers Freely To Vote in Federal Elections Should Not Be Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are justifiably aroused at

the apparent denial to men and women in the armed services, as well as in the merchant marine, of facilities for voting in the 1944 elections. The American people will not be hoodwinked by specious, technical arguments. We must implement our professions of devotion to the democratic process by making it easy for men and women in the armed services to cast their votes in the Federal elections this year.

A recent editorial in the Kent News Journal, a leading weekly newspaper in the State of Washington, published at Kent, Wash., sums up the situation aptly.

Here it is:

A FUNDAMENTAL PRECEPT DENIED

If the recent action of Congress in refusing to make provisions for voting by members of the armed forces is not rescinded, it appears that some millions of American citizens will be deprived of their constitutional right to cast a ballot in national elections. Congress has refused to act and has returned the problem to the States where, if left there, it will result in disenfranchisement of the servicemen, due to the unwieldy State systems.

It hardly matters that it may be argued pro and con that politics might enter into any national plan of voting for service men; it does matter that because of the suspicions and lack of cooperation of Congress our members of the armed forces will not have the opportunity to exercise the democratic prerogative of casting their votes for the candidates of their choice.

It is a far cry from the normal precepts of democratic processes that the very men who are out there fighting for and dying for democratic principles should be deprived of its fundamental precept—the privilege of voting.

In the same connection, by the consent of my colleagues, I insert a resolution adopted by a conservative organization of my home State, to wit, the Vancouver Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc. In this resolution, the members urge that a plan for granting to men and women in the armed services the right to vote in Federal elections should be on a national, rather than a State, basis.

Here is the resolution:

Whereas the Vancouver Junior Chamber of Commerce has a large number of its members serving in the armed forces, overseas and at home; and

Whereas the Vancouver Junior Chamber of Commerce is cognizant of the American principles which all of our men in uniform are fighting to safeguard and foster; and

Whereas these men are risking their lives in defense of the American way of living, including the right of franchise and the representative form of government; and

Whereas there has been considerable agitation and debate over the extension of voting rights to men serving in the armed forces, and far from their homes, and no plan or accord has been reached by Congress to extend a means of exercising the right of franchise to our fighting forces: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Vancouver Junior Chamber of Commerce requests Congress to enact a national law, giving all servicemen, including those overseas, a vote on all national and State elections. This plan must be on a national, rather than a State, basis and conducted on a bipartisan basis.

VANCOUVER JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
L. D. JONES, *Secretary*.

Capital for New Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there will be a post-war period. If the goods and services required by our own people to remove from their hearts the fear of want are produced it will be necessary for tremendous employment of workers in the post-war period. Under our philosophy of government and enterprise it is necessary for someone to save and thus accumulate and later invest in productive facilities.

Our Declaration of Independence, our Federal and State Constitutions, and our courts have heretofore acknowledged and protected the right of private property.

Under the private-enterprise system someone must invest money. There must be venture capital. It is necessary for someone to assume a financial risk.

The investor, management, and the individuals who perform the bench work and who keep the goods moving through the production line, together with the consuming public, constitute the four primary elements which are involved; and when we add to these Government supervision we have the five major factors which must be coordinated in order to produce goods for our people.

Recently Commissioner Judge Robert E. Healy, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, addressed a letter to Mr. Dudley Harmon, of the New England Council, Boston, Mass. The views of Judge Healy are so important I submit them for the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 4, 1943*.

Mr. DUDLEY HARMON,
Executive Vice President,
The New England Council,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HARMON: Thank you for the record of the recent meeting of the New England Council. As a New Englander and a former member of the council I find the discussion of the problem of securing venture capital for New England enterprises deeply interesting.

The problem is not an easy one either in New England or elsewhere. It is not easy even to find competent advice as to the mechanical, scientific, and technical aspects of a new venture to say nothing of the business and commercial chances, the risk that the buying public won't want it or that it can't produce a profit. But the immediate topic is securing capital.

None of the addresses seems to me to suggest an answer. They do a useful service in pointing out how and why certain established financial institutions do not or cannot risk money entrusted to them in a fiduciary or quasi-fiduciary capacity in new or untried ventures. Under existing laws and regulations new ventures are not for savings banks and insurance companies whose investments are limited to legals. There are those who rank proposals to allow those institutions not only to invest a limited portion of their funds in an approved list of common stocks but to underwrite them, as English insurance companies may do, as sacrilegious. New ventures are hardly commercial bank material. Then the open-end investment trusts can hardly put a large portion of their capital into them for the reasons (and I think they are generally sound) given by their representatives at your meeting. Testamentary trusts and trusts inter vivos can hardly be expected to espouse them; in fact, under the statutes, wills or indentures controlling most of them, such investments would not be permissible. Even when permissible few institutional trustees can devote the time or can afford to take the risks to their prestige necessarily incidental to going into new ventures. One of our statisticians, with how much soundness I cannot say, told us a few years ago that he believed the total capital in this country tied up in testamentary and living trusts approximated the astounding total of $60,000,000,000 and the total tends to increase. When there is added the capital of savings banks, insurance companies, commercial banks, and open-end investment companies, the total sum, pretty much immobilized so far as new ventures are concerned, is impressive and somewhat discouraging. Other retarding elements involved are: (1) the failure of the tax laws to encourage new ventures because of (a) tendency of the tax laws to tax capital gains at relatively high rates while the risk-taker may have to stand a large share of his own losses, and (b) failure of the tax laws to provide appropriate corporate income-tax concessions to struggling enterprises; and (2) the aura approaching disrepute which so often surrounds new promotions.

What are the remedies? That is the really important question which the addresses you sent me answer slightly or not at all. I doubt if the complete solution can be had from the aforesaid institutions, or from established enterprises, which are doing extensive and valuable research in their own shops. I cannot pretend to know the answers. But I have some suggestions which I am willing to record.

1. As to taxes: Revise the tax laws (a) so that gains resulting from risk-taking in new ventures or sick established ventures receive some kind of an appropriate preferential tax treatment, and so that full deductions for losses in the same direction are allowed on attractive terms; and (b) so as to provide for a specified number of years corporate income tax exemption of that part of the income of new ventures which is less than a specified return on actual paid-in capital. (It will probably be necessary to so limit such a provision as to prevent its extension beyond the field of new ventures.)

2. As to promotions: Make them respectable by getting the most respectable elements in the business and financial communities into them in positions of control or important influence.

3. As to the merits of the venture: Divide the country into regions. In each of them establish a committee of scientists and technical and practical production men, and men equipped by training and experience to advise as to details of capitalization, who will examine and report to the committees described in my next paragraph as to the feasibility and risks of the project from every angle and as to the general limits and forms of profits to which the promoters and risk-takers may be fairly entitled. Through State and Federal statutes make available to this committee or bring them in as members thereof, the best talent and advice available in the State and Federal Governments and departments. For example: Men from the Bureau of Mines on mining ventures, men from the S. E. C. on capitalization and statistics derived from the reports of other enterprises in the same or allied fields. This would by no means exclude similar men drawn from private industry or universities. They should most certainly be included whenever available.

4. As to obtaining capital: In the regions establish a committee or corporation, whose function would be to supply capital to get the enterprise started. Its own capital would

be supplied from private sources. Whether the Government should be asked or permitted to contribute is a matter to be considered. The members could be chosen in various ways. For example: In New England by the New England Council, or by Presidential appointment, as in the case of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, especially if a Federal charter were obtained or if the corporation were set up as it might be under a new Federal statute to be devised, or if Federal funds were involved. (Possibly the committee suggested under No. 3 could be part of this committee or corporation. This committee or corporation could well be given a special tax status.) Having concluded that the venture was a risk worth taking the committee or corporation could make the initial investment. In most cases it preferably should be in common stock and initially there should be no other capital. The committee or corporation could judge the point at which a public offering of the stock should be made or capital sought through public offering of bonds or preferred stock. One basic principle would be for the committee to get out and the public to get in when the committee judged best and as soon as possible. I would hope that the committee's capital could be used over and over again; that losses in unsuccessful ventures could be made up in successful ventures, or that losses could be compensated for in profits. You see I am thinking in terms of a kind of revolving fund.

On an over-all basis the objective of the committee would not be to make money but to promote worthy ventures and to provide opportunities for investment, to create employment, and to make good on the prophecy that private industry can provide jobs whether or not there is a post-war depression. Men from State and Federal departments could be brought in as members or advisers, though not in a controlling capacity. I am convinced that if another depression comes and if private industry will not organize with or without Government aid, financial or otherwise, to accomplish these objectives, the Federal Government ought to set up its regional committees or corporations along the lines described in (3) and (4), staffed with men drawn from its departments and implemented by Federal money.

The ideas I have outlined could be adapted readily not only for the launching of new enterprises but for the aid of small businesses, especially in smaller communities which, after all, are the backbone of America. And a committee of the type suggested in (3) would be of tremendous help even to men who are not seeking capital but who are seeking aid and light as to the feasibility of ideas or possible ventures they have in mind.

So often here we see very sincere men obsessed with a belief in enterprises or contrivances which obviously have no merit. I have never seen anyone more sincerely convinced of anything than the man who once testified before us concerning the infallibility of his doodlebug for locating gold deposits. The peddling by high-pressure methods of securities in risky new ventures to persons of small means and little understanding of either securities or business is one of the regrettable reasons for the present unfortunate standing of new promotions.

I admit these views are pretty general and leave many important details unsettled, but they do have some elements of definiteness and they can be chewed on. At least they have the merit of going beyond telling how the job can't be done.

Turning now to a somewhat different aspect of these problems, I find of especial interest the statements of William F. Mortor, of State Street Investment Corporation, and Merrill Griswold, of Massachusetts Investors Trust, made at the meeting. They deal with the possibility of participation in venture capital investments by open-end management investment companies. As you know, the Commission is charged with the administration of the Investment Company Act of 1940. That act contains certain provisions which were designed to enable open-end investment companies to contribute to the development of new industrial enterprises. Section 12 (e) of the act, speaking generally, authorizes investment companies to form a corporation to engage in the business of "underwriting, furnishing capital to industry, financing promotional enterprises, purchasing securities of issuers for which no ready market is in existence, and reorganizing companies or similar activities." The capital of such a company cannot exceed $100,000,000. No investment company may invest more than 5 percent of its assets in such a company, and the stock of such company must be originally issued or sold for investment to registered investment companies only. The purpose of this section of the statute was to enable open-end companies to supply risk capital to industry without encountering the difficulties in direct investments of this type which Mr. Morton described in his statement. You will recall that Mr. Morton set forth the following three factors which he stated inhibited direct investment in risk enterprises by open-end companies: First, because of the redemption feature of such companies, they must remain highly liquid; second, their personnel is not suited to the study and investigation of new and promotional enterprises; and third, investors would not be attracted to portfolios which included substantial amounts of securities of lesser-known companies. The venture capital company contemplated by section 12 (e) of the act was devised to overcome these objections. Since no open-end company is permitted to invest more than 5 percent of its assets in such a company the liquidity of the open-end companies is substantially preserved. The limitation on investment in such venture capital companies to registered investment companies overcomes Mr. Morton's objection that the public would not readily invest in this type of company. It was also felt that a venture capital company of the type permitted by section 12 (e) of the act would have sufficient capital to enable it to attract a personnel experienced and qualified to investigate and invest in promotional opportunities. The inclusion of section 12 (e) in the 1940 act grew out of suggestions made during the hearings on the bill by witnesses called by the industry (particularly Dr. Sprague) before the Senate Committe on Banking and Currency. I attended all the hearings on the bill as a representative of the S. E. C., and at no time was there voiced the slightest objection to section 12 (e) as written. In fact, when the bill with section 12 (e) in its present form came before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. Griswold said:

"We are, however, now satisfied entirely with the bill, and it is the result of a great amount of work which has been done on it by the industry in collaboration with the S. E. C." (Printed hearings of June 13 and 14, 1940, p. 79.) Later he said: "Well, I would like to assure you that this measure has the practically unanimous approval of the open-end companies as it is now drafted" (p. 81).

In view of those latter facts, I am somewhat surprised by Mr. Griswold's statement that the act is inadequate in that it does not permit participation by the large manufacturing companies in the financing of venture capital companies authorized under section 12 (e). I acknowledge, of course, Mr. Griswold's right to review his judgment in the light of further experience and reflection. There is nothing in the Investment Company Act of 1940 to prevent manufacturing companies investing in venture companies or forming venture capital companies. What 12 (e) does not permit is the formation of such companies by open-end trusts in company with manufacturing companies. Mr. Griswold's criticism is based on the premise that such manufacturing companies alone have the requisite "know how" for investment in promotional enterprises. I am inclined to disagree. This criticism overlooks the fact, as I have stated, that a company of the character described in section 12 (e) should, if it had sufficient capital, be able to retain a personnel experienced in venture capital investments or qualified to appraise them. I question whether the manufacturing companies have a monopoly of this kind of intelligence or that if they have they wouldn't be willing to have it drawn upon by the regional committees. I may point out that several of the closed-end investment companies have and are now engaged in investment in promotional enterprises. I should like further to point out that based on Mr. Morton's statement that New England open-end management investment companies alone possess aggregate assets of approximately $400,000,000; such companies, under the act, would be able to organize a venture capital company, pursuant to section 12 (e), with an initial capital of $20,000,000.

I am not speaking for the Commission. The views and suggestions herein are solely my own.

Very truly yours,

ROBT. E. HEALY,
Commissioner.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I made over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., on January 5, 1944:

As we enter the decisive period of the war in Europe, confident that the coming spring and summer campaigns will bring about the utter destruction of nazi-ism, it is well for us to consider the situation on the home front.

The domestic scene has many vexing and unsolved problems. One in particular is the cause of much concern in Washington and that is the problem of inflation—or how to control the spiral of rising prices.

The military picture is brightening and the morale of our troops is excellent, but how about the morale or spirit of the folks back home? Are we cooperating with the same sense of loyalty, discipline and self-sacrifice to insure success in overcoming our problems on the home front?

The enemy receives aid and comfort as he watches us tolerate a black market and remain indifferent to the upward pressure on prices. For the enemy knows the disastrous effects of run-away prices from his own experience—the inflation that Germany suffered during the 1920's. In all candor, we do not anticipate that you, the average housewife, will ever reach the point when you will be forced to carry a wheelbarrow full of paper money to the market to buy a couple of loaves of bread. But, prices are going up and it is a duty we owe to ourselves and to the Nation to become aware of this danger and to take an active part in our Government's efforts to achieve price control.

In the First World War, we ourselves experienced the economic upheaval of the inflation-deflation sequence. From the out-

break of the war in 1914, through 1920, the general price level of goods and services went up over 100 percent. The purchasing power of the dollar went down to 50 cents. Within a year of the boom peak of 1920, prices collapsed by as much as 45 percent. Bankruptcies swept the business world, labor experienced widespread unemployment and agriculture was ruined by wholesale foreclosures of farm properties.

Make no mistake about it—the enemy has secret weapons, and one of them is his reliance on our complacency—his hope that we may lose on the home front the victory we gain on the battle fronts.

The danger of inflation in this conflict is greater than it was in the last. We are, for the first time, fighting a major war in the air. This is a mechanized war and a total war. Our fighting men are on 57 points all over the face of the globe. The task of supplying these far-flung battle stations is an enormous problem and the costs for that effort will be heavy.

The First World War cost $30,000,000,000, or one-quarter of our national income. During the present war, we have spent over $150,000,000,000, or over half of our national income—and the end is not in view.

This great expenditure of money breeds the germs of inflation. Workers have more dollars to spend and fewer goods to buy. In 1943, $142,000,000,000 in purchasing power was distributed to the people. But in that same period, only $88,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods and services were produced. Of the remaining $54,000,000,000, the Government siphoned $16,000,000,000 in taxes. That leaves a surplus of $38,000,000,000 in spendable money, which if set in motion to bid for scarce goods, would blow the lid off prices and lead to a runaway, ruinous inflation. Fortunately, our people have cushioned much of this potential dynamite in War bonds and war savings, and the danger of a spending spree is slowed down but not stopped entirely.

Prices are slowly rising due to the inflationary pressure of surplus spendable money. The issue is not whether prices will go up—but how fast and how far they will soar.

What do the official records say?

Thus far in this war the cost of living has gone up only 26 percent.

What about the future?

The upward spiral of prices may be controlled only if America becomes price conscious.

President Roosevelt focused attention on this angle of civilian defense in his hold-the-line order.

You—the consumer—must hold that line. You alone can keep the cost of living down.

The Office of Price Administration was established to help you in that effort. Insofar as Government price control is concerned, enforcement activities are limited to the task of seeking out and prosecuting the deliberate violators. The O. P. A. seeks to promote cooperation and understanding as between the retailer and the consumer to achieve a voluntary and successful price-control program in your community.

This is where you, the consumer, must assume your share of the national effort to keep food bills down. Cut out the O. P. A. list of top legal prices from your newspaper and take that price list with you when you shop. Your butcher and your grocer for instance must have these ceiling price lists prominently displayed and the prices charged by the storekeeper must be no more than these top prices. If wrong prices are displayed or if no prices are displayed, write to the price panel of your local War Price and Rationing Board. If you are overcharged, get an itemized sales slip and mail it in. The price panel will study your complaint and then ask the retailer to comply. When necessary, O. P. A. will take legal action against merchants who are willful violators of price-control regulations. Your name will never be used without your permission in the investigation of any price violation complaint you may make.

Again I would like to emphasize that we are all partners in price control, each with a separate job to do.

1. Your Government: Its job is to set top prices that are fair to all sizes and kinds of stores and to all shoppers; see that everyone knows what these prices are and to investigate every reported violation and make sure that it is stopped.

2. Your storekeeper: His responsibility is to know the lawful ceiling prices; never to charge more than those top prices, to mark his selling prices clearly on every listed item and to give an itemized sales slip on request.

3. You: Your job is to know lawful top prices and never pay more when you shop and to report any violation or overcharge to the price panel of your rationing board in writing.

As a last and final resort to maintain price control, you, the consumer, have a right to bring action against the merchant who overcharges.

A. In any court of competent jurisdiction.

B. Within 1 year after delivery is completed.

C. For $50 or for 3 times the amount of the overcharge, whichever is higher.

D. Plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as determined by the court.

Ninety or ninety-five percent of the merchants with whom you deal are men of integrity who are willing to assist in any way they can to help in our Nation's war effort. Occasionally, you may find a storekeeper who, through carelessness or ignorance, does not comply with price-control regulations. When such a case comes to light, your price panel will call the storekeeper and talk it over with him in a neighborly manner, giving him the opportunity through information to correct his prices. Remember, every reputable, honest merchant is able and willing to explain to you in a satisfactory manner, the reasons supporting his prices.

You, the housewives, millworkers, clerks, and public servants must be vigilant in this home-front campaign to keep the lid on prices. Other elements in our communities also stand to suffer by inflation. The purchasing agents, the savings banks, insurance companies and the beneficiaries of their policies, the old-age pensioners, the disabled veterans, the dependents of our soldiers and sailors, the endowed institutions of religion, science, and education—all of you must organize, individually or collectively, to defeat the enemies within our communities who seek to profit through the misery of war.

In your own hands, you have the weapons to defeat inflation.

The Office of Price Administration and the public-spirited citizens who serve on your local price panel feel certain that education on price control will bring about compliance from the great majority of our storekeepers and merchants.

However, the few willful violators of price ceilings must be reported and punished. In this way, you can do something to keep down the rising cost of living. For remember that price rises in wartime are dangerous because wages always lag behind prices. The few merchants who charge more than legal prices are a menace, not only to your pocketbook but also to the patriotic, law-abiding merchants in your community.

The common welfare of our Nation calls for stability in our wartime economy. The special interests call for inflation. The public is unorganized, inarticulate, and impotent. The special interests are organized, vocal, and powerful. We, your representatives in Congress, are faced with constant pressure by special interests seeking to profiteer through inflation. We need your help, and your support to hold the line against the enemies within.

We ask you, the housewives, to enlist in this public campaign to save the home front. The Office of Price Administration needs your volunteer services for 2 hours each week to visit 20 retail stores, helping on posting and pricing. The procedure is simple, you will find that most merchants will appreciate your help and you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you can do something for the war effort right in your own neighborhood. Call in person or write to the price clerk of your local war price and rationing board and volunteer as a price panel assistant.

Our men and our women in the armed forces depend on you to be price-conscious to keep the home front strong for their return.

Role for Congress in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, I insert an extract of an article by Mr. Merlo Pusey, appearing in the Washington Post of January 11, 1944, entitled "Role for Congress in 1944," which should give the Republican membership something to think about. The extract from the article follows:

WARTIME WASHINGTON

(By Merlo Pusey)

ROLE FOR CONGRESS IN 1944

When the Seventy-eighth Congress assembled a year ago it brought with it many new hopes. The congressional rubber stamp had been thrown away. It was obvious that the new House and Senate would have minds of their own. So there was great expectation of a renaissance of Government by representatives of the people. In considerable measure that expectation has been disappointed.

Now that the Seventy-eighth Congress is beginning its second half, it is a good time to inquire why its record of last year was not more impressive. The chief reason, it seems to me, is that so much of what Congress did was negative in effect. It revolted against the administration's inflationary roll-back subsidies, but it did not devise any other means of holding volatile farm prices in check. On the contrary, it seemed to be eager to kick various prices further up the spiral.

There was ample reason also for the revolt against the vote-luring tax program offered by Secretary Morgenthau. But why should Congress relax after knocking out an ill-conceived Treasury proposal? The need for mopping up surplus income to check inflation and help pay for the war is growing more acute every day. It calls for bold strokes such as a sales tax or twelve to fifteen billion dollars in compulsory savings. Any courageous attack on the inflation perils that are beginning to engulf us would be better than the petty revenue measure which is now en route to enactment.

Congress generated an enormous amount of righteous indignation over the administration's faltering labor policy. But this also came to nothing more than enactment of the Connally-Smith Act over the President's veto. That act has proved ineffective in administration. Congress might better have passed a stiffer remedy for wartime strikes even at the risk of having a veto sustained. At least that would have given the country some positive

leadership toward accomplishment of what has to be done.

Even on the question of the soldier vote the Senate took a negative attitude. It ran into a constitutional tangle with the Lucas-Green bill and temporarily abandoned the struggle to make soldier voting a reality. It can certainly take a more constructive line without junking the constitutional qualifications prescribed for voters in Federal elections.

Congress will be under constant temptation in this election year to kick the administration around, for the Republicans and anti-new dealers are usually in control. But this is about the worst time in our history for obstruction merely for the sake of playing politics. Such a course might easily recoil upon Congress more severely than upon the President. And every Member knows that Congress has no prestige to spare.

Congress ought to realize, moreover, that it cannot take leadership away from the President in time of war or other emergency without disastrous consequences. What it can do is to supplement that leadership where it is weak. Congress can, if it has the foresight and courage, substitute stern and realistic policies for the administration's soft and flabby tactics on the home front. It can rebuke the special-interest groups that are knocking at its doors as well as those that are knocking at the door of the White House.

The really grave danger is competition between Congress and the President in coddling pressure groups on the home front. Competition of that sort has already gone much too far. In the end it is likely to defeat the political purposes behind it, for the great majority of the American people are primarily interested in getting on with the war.

A negative policy that seems to be chiefly concerned with knocking down what the administration attempts to do will not identify Congress with this dominant but unorganized win-the-war sentiment. Something more is clearly needed, and that something, it seems to me, is more positive congressional action in those fields where administration policy is so confused and faltering. The people want to see that Congress is capable of moving forward with the President, or without him when the need arises, as well as of exposing and criticizing executive shortcomings.

A Returned Warrior's Reaction to the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a letter from a young sergeant in the Army Air Corps, who has engaged in more than 50 bombing missions over enemy territory, together with my reply.

I hope that every Member of Congress and everybody concerned with our war-production program will read this letter. Everyone in this House knows my own position in this matter, but I am sure that if the other Members knew this young man as I do and would read his letter this Congress would enact legislation which would once and for all put a stop to these unjustifiable strikes in our war industries.

Again, I call the attention of the Congress to my bill, H. R. 992, which, in my opinion, if enacted would stop these strikes for the duration. But I plead with you to enact some legislation with some teeth in it regardless of whether it is my bill or the bill of someone else. These boys whom this Congress has called into the Nation's service to fight and die in this global war have a right to expect this. They will hold us to a strict accountability if we do not act and act now. The letter follows:

JANUARY 5, 1944.

DEAR MR. COLMER: In opening, I would like to introduce myself to you. I am the son of Mr. James R. Goff, of Lucedale, Miss., who has been your friend and supporter for many years. I have met you twice in your home town of Pascagoula, Miss., but I doubt if you can recall the meetings, since at that time I was only a small boy.

I have recently returned from the European theater of operations, where I served a tour of duty as engineer and gunner on a heavy bomber. I was retired and returned to the States as an instructor and am now stationed here.

I served for 11 months as a member of the Eighth Air Force Bomber Command. While serving in a combat zone I was privileged to fly with some of the bravest and best men our Nation is capable of producing. We were fighting at that time some of the most bitterly contested aerial battles of this war. I am not trying to play the part of a hero; I did only what any good American would have done. I am merely acquainting you with the actual facts. During my tour of operations I saw 80 percent of my original squadron go down. For the heavy bombers of the Eighth that is a low percentage.

We were all scared stiff every time we took off. Loss percentages such as we had are enough to scare any man. The point is, that in spite of being afraid, in spite of an almost uncontrollable longing to see home again, we flew. As a result, the industrial cities of Europe no longer exist, and the United Nations have defeated the submarine menace. As a result of the same spirit in all our fighting forces the German nation is staggering and on the verge of total collapse.

On my return to the United States I was, to put it mildly, shocked. On every side I heard complaining. There were no tires, no gasoline, and food was rationed. In every paper, every magazine there were endless complaints. I fully appreciate the right of free speech and free press, but some of the complaints I heard would result in official action in England, death in the rest of Europe.

And then, on top of all the complaints, labor began striking again. The stab in the back we received at Pearl Harbor we survived, because it was at the hands of the enemy. The stab in the back that our fighting forces are now receiving from the hands of labor organizations we will survive because the morale of our fighting forces is very high. We of the fighting forces are determined to retain a free America as the greatest nation on earth, in spite of labor, if need be.

However, there is something radically wrong. What it is, I have no way of knowing at present. The fault does not lie in our fighting forces. I know that because I have fought with them. From my position, it seems that official Washington lacks the intestinal fortitude to take the necessary action. Perhaps I am wrong, because I am not thoroughly familiar with the situation. The fact remains, however, that our fighting men are dying in the field for the lack of equipment, and labor is refusing to produce that same equipment. It is not an ideal situation.

Our armed forces today number far greater than at any time in our history. At the present, our hands are tied—we have the job of defeating the other half of the world. However, I would like to remind official Washington that the war will soon end. Close to 10,000,000 men will return to civilian life, and a voting status. At that time, if not before, we will know who is at the bottom of the confusing medley that is the labor situation today. The Legion after this war will be the most powerful political organization in the history of our Nation, and if the present administration lacks the intestinal fortitude to pass the necessary legislative action, we will find an administration which will take action. If necessary, men from among our own members.

I am writing not for myself, but for every soldier who unselfishly left home for an indefinite period in hell. We are determined that the United States shall retain her position as the most respected Nation on earth, regardless of the cost in lives and material—and it is our lives. Is Washington willing to force labor to forget their personal greed and govern themselves by the same determination? If it is not, then I would advise every Member of Congress to vote against the bill granting voting privileges to soldiers.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES P. GOFF.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1944.

DEAR JIM: I have your letter of January 5. Yes, I remember you most pleasantly as a teen-age son of my old friend, Jim Goff, Sr. When I was down home on a brief visit during the recess of Congress last fall I visited your home town of Lucedale and saw your father and a number of other people. I learned from them that you had recently been home after completing your fiftieth bombing mission over enemy territory. I was made happy by the knowledge that you had been spared the fate of so many of your comrades who engage in these highly hazardous bombing expeditions, and I was also proud of the glorious achievements made by you that we in this country might continue to be spared the fate of so many peoples of the world and that this country might continue as a great Nation.

I want you to know that as your Representative in the Congress of the country for which you have fought so valiantly, I deeply appreciate the candor of your letter. I wish it had been possible for you to have written a similar letter to the President of the United States—the Commander in Chief of our armed forces—General Marshall, the labor leaders, and every Member of Congress, but since this is impractical, I am taking the liberty of inserting your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may come to the attention of them all. I am doing this on my own initiative, and I hope that it will not cause you any inconvenience or discomfort.

Moreover, in view of the fact that you have been out of the country, I think I owe it to you and myself to say that my own record as your Representative in the Congress on the matter of these unjustified strikes in our war industries and the necessity for sacrifice by our people on the home front reflects the fact that I am and have been all the way through this unfortunate war in accord with your views. I believe the record will disclose that I have been in the forefront of the fight in the Congress to do something about this deplorable situation. This is no self-serving assertion. I think had I done less I would have found it most difficult to answer your letter and to answer those for whom you have a right to speak.

To substantiate this statement, I am quoting below from a statement which I made before the House Military Affairs Committee on April 22, 1943:

"Chairman MAY and members of the Military Affairs Committee, more than a month before the dastardly attack upon Pearl Har-

bor by the Japanese, and at a time when this country was beginning its preparedness for the European war which we all realized was more or less inevitable, and at which time our productive capacity was being curtailed by unjustified strikes, I introduced H. R. 6826, which was referred to this committee; but no action was taken thereon. At that time Mr. John L. Lewis, the president of the United Mine Workers, and possibly the most disturbing element in our industrial life today, was threatening to tie up the coal mines of the country in a general strike—even as he is today. No action having been taken on the bill, and Mr. Lewis' demands having been met, I reintroduced the bill at the beginning of this session of Congress. It was referred to this committee and is before you for consideration today.

"Prior to the beginning of our preparation for this war, which was grossly interfered with by unjustifiable strikes, I had been the voluntary recipient of the endorsement of the labor heads. I recall that on one occasion I was the only man from my delegation who voted for a bill in which labor was very much interested and brought down upon my head the condemnation of many of my constituents. But, Mr. Chairman, my code in this great crisis of the country, when the freedom of us all is involved, provides for sacrifice from us all. I believe that a man engaged in a war industry has no more right to strike than a member of our armed forces has to desert the colors. I believe that one's responsibility to his Government and his fellow citizens is as great as the other's. I believe that the services of the man who digs the coal, who makes the steel, and who manufactures the guns, ships, and planes are just as necessary, and that he is just as patriotic, as the man who dons the uniform, who fires the guns, and who sails the ships of war. But by the same token his obligation to his country and to his fellow man is just as sacred. I say with equal force and truth that no man has a right to grow rich out of the blood, the sweat, and the tears of our war effort.

"My bill would seek to do four things:

"First, it would make a conspiracy to bring about a strike in a war industry unlawful and punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

"Second, it would automatically reclassify a man within draft age enjoying deferment from active service, regardless of the grounds for his deferment, and make him subject to immediate military service if, while employed in a war industry, he went on strike.

"Third, it would repeal the 40-hour week for the duration.

"Fourth, it would limit the profits gained from war contracts by the war contractors to a maximum of 6 percent.

"That, Mr. Chairman, is briefly what my bill provides. You have a number of other bills under consideration. I have no pride of authorship and would not insist upon the reporting of my bill. In fact, I should be perfectly agreeable to seeing this committee report its own bill, provided it would meet the problems which face the country in its war effort.

"We hear a lot today about the no-strike compact which was entered into by the labor heads and the Government. And yet statistics reveal the fact that there have been hundreds of strikes in vital war industries since that time. The labor leaders' answer to that is that these are 'wildcat' strikes over which they have no control—that they do not approve or condone them. And yet they object to the Government stopping them. It is difficult to understand why these labor leaders who say that there will be no strikes would object to the Government's assistance to them in carrying out their part of the compact. It seems rather to me that they should welcome such assistance.

"I said that the labor leaders had agreed to desist from strikes, but that did not mean all of them for we read a few days ago that Mr. John L. Lewis said that he and his organization were not bound by that compact.

"Again, the argument is made that any legislation which would attempt to curtail these wildcat strikes, or any other strikes, which latter class the leaders of labor have covenanted with this Government not to call, would be unwise, untimely, and a slap in the face of labor. This, again, is hard to reason. Why could it not be argued with equal force that the law against sabotage and saboteurs which was recently passed by the Congress was objectionable to all patriotic Americans? Or to carry the analogy further to an absurdity, one might just as well argue that laws against murder should not be enacted because they would become offensive to honest, God-fearing men. But to make the comparison still more analogous, why could it not be argued with equal fervor that the Selective Service Act which drafts young men into the armed services is an insult to them?

"I am one of those who believe that the average laboring man engaged in a war industry is just as patriotic as the average young man who bares his breast to the enemy upon the seven seas or upon foreign soil. I believe that he wants to see this war won as speedily and quickly as anyone else. I believe that he is against strikes in defense industries. I believe that he wants to keep the faith with the boys over there. And, more than that, I believe that he is entitled to the protection of his Government in his desire to do an honest day's work in an honest fashion to the end that this war may be speedily consummated by his efforts in furnishing the fighting boys with the sinews of war. Moreover, I believe that he realizes that he has possibly more at stake than anybody else involved because he realizes that if we should lose this war the right to organize and the right to high standards of labor in this country may both be lost and that he, too, may become a human token on the slave markets of Berlin, Tokyo, and Rome."

Moreover, by virtue of my activities in behalf of some legislation on this subject of strikes, I was designated by the Rules Committee of the House, of which I am a member, to report the so-called Smith-Connally bill to the floor of the House, where I called up that bill and had charge of the consideration of the rule therefor.

We have now begun the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The Smith-Connally bill, which was passed over the President's veto, has proved, as I predicted it would, to be inadequate to meet the situation. I am again pressing for the enactment of my bill, or some other legislation which can be agreed upon which would meet the objectives sought by us all. I still believe that the same Congress which has the right to draft our men into the armed forces to endure the unspeakable hardships of modern warfare has the right and authority to enact legislation that will prevent interruption of the production of the planes, the guns, and the ships, and all other implements of warfare necessary to bring this holocaust of bloody warfare to the speediest possible victorious conclusion. And I am very much in hopes that the Congress and the administration will exercise the intestinal fortitude to which you refer.

I am glad to know that you are still in this country, for I fully realize that you need the rest and relaxation which you so richly deserve after your experience in behalf of your country. And I pledge you as your Representative in Congress that I shall continue my efforts in this matter.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

WM. M. COLMER.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me say that I do not believe there is a single citizen of the country who would want to deprive the service men and women of voting in the Presidential election this year. Certainly, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the members of our armed forces having an opportunity to cast their ballots for the candidates of their choice. I do, however, want their ballots to be counted. I want their ballots to be lawful ballots.

Congress has no power to extend the right to vote to the men and women in the various services. The only thing Congress can do is to set up the machinery to assist the soldiers in obtaining ballots and expediting their delivery to the various States of the Union to be counted. For Congress simply to pass a law to extend the right to vote to our fighting men would be a very easy task. But to do so is outside the jurisdiction of Congress. The State governments, and the State governments alone, have the power to establish voting qualifications.

Now, let us see why it is that Congress does not have the power to extend the voting right to servicemen. I quote from the supreme law of the land—the Constitution of the United States—that every public servant has sworn to defend; article I, section 2, says this:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Therefore, says the United States Constitution, unless a voter is qualified to vote for members of his own State legislature, he has no qualifications to vote in any national election at all. That is to say, in my State, the State of Arkansas, for a man to be qualified to vote for a candidate for the Arkansas Legislature, he must be 21 years of age, must have resided in the State for 1 year, in the county 6 months, and the voting precinct 30 days. Until he has done all of these things, he cannot vote for members of the legislature of Arkansas. As I have pointed out, the Constitution of the United States says that that a person cannot vote for President or Vice Presidential electors or for a United States Senator or Representative in Congress unless he is qualified under State law to vote for the members of his own State legislature.

Should Congress enact a law giving soldiers the right to vote, it would mean nothing as they could not vote anyway unless they were qualified to vote for members of their own State legislature.

If Congress went ahead and passed a law, and under such law ballots were sent to millions of our fighting men who would vote and return them, such ballots could not be counted by the election boards of the States. The ballots would

be thrown out—through an election contest—and the election for President would have to be decided by the House of Representatives.

The Senate recently rejected the Green-Lucas Federal ballot bill—and passed a measure sponsored by Senators EASTLAND, MCCLELLAN, and MCKELLAR, which would leave the whole question of elections and voting back to the States for determination. By this action, the Senate has demonstrated the highest type of statesmanship. Should the House agree to the Senate bill, it would be a great victory for constitutional government in America.

Andover's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Monday, January 10, 1944:

ANDOVER'S RECORD

Good work, Andover.

Nine hundred and sixty-seven pints of blood and 45 tons of paper is the public contribution during the past week to the war effort.

And both efforts were conducted under great stress of circumstances and under great handicaps. The Red Cross officials and the salvage committee officials have every right to be proud of their accomplishments.

The Andover blood bank had a quota of 1,250 pints. The fulfillment of that demand seemed certain until the current wave of sickness made great inroads into the list of volunteers. There were many cancelations and in only a small percentage of them was there any effort to supply substitutes. It was discouraging for those workers who were striving to attain the quota as it meant practically double the ordinary effort. The mobile unit arrived and there was nothing to do but work as diligently as possible toward the goal. That seemed possible when nature interfered again with the heavy snowstorm. Despite everything, however, Andover rolled up a total contribution of 967 pints, less than 300 short of the quota. In view of all the difficulties this really was a most remarkable showing.

During the same period Andover's live-wire salvage committee was plugging for the waste paper collection and urging all to put forth a great effort. Plans had been made for collections in Lawrence, Methuen, and North Andover for Saturday and in Andover on Sunday. Lawrence, Methuen, and North Andover postponed their collections until next Saturday because of storm conditions and the tying up of trucks and men on storm-clearance work. Andover, however, went through with the collection according to schedule. Despite the snow conditions and low temperature, Chairman Emmons directed the 35 volunteer drivers and 60 boys from Punchard High and Junior High School to a record collection of 45 tons, 19 tons better than the last collection in November.

Andover has certainly given her neighboring communities something to think about and aim at. The postponed collections at Methuen and North Andover will be held next Saturday and Lawrence, although not yet announced, will probably collect on the same date. Andover's record might well give rise to some rivalry that could result in the establishment of records also at Lawrence, Methuen, and North Andover. The waste paper is badly needed in the war effort, and it is hoped that the other communities do relatively as well as Andover.

Well done, Andover.

Allowances to Discharged Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I make this request to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD because I want the RECORD to show that I am in favor of legislation that will give to the discharged veterans an allowance in keeping with the tenure and the nature of their services. I want to commend the Military Affairs Committee of the House for the prompt and efficient manner in which it has given consideration to this very important legislation. I hope that the committee will bring forth a bill that will meet the universal approval of the Members of this House. I feel that in these days of tenseness and with the uncertainties that are bound to come with peace terms, that those who have broken away from their home ties should be given some assistance with which they can again prepare themselves for their place in the everyday activities of the Nation.

Of course, it would be impossible for the Government to adequately compensate these men and women who have made this great sacrifice, but it will be at least a gesture of appreciation by the Congress of the United States. It was by virtue of the action of the Congress of the United States that these young men and women were called into the service. For that reason it is right and fitting that the Congress of the United States should recognize their separation from the service with something more than an honorable discharge. I expect to support any reasonable legislation to bring about this much-desired result, and I hope that the bill brought out by the Military Affairs Committee will meet with the approval of all of us.

Subsidy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the Honorable J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture for the State of West Virginia, which sets forth the position of farmers relative to the question of subsidies. In view of Commissioner McLaughlin's wide experience and careful study of this subject, I believe that the Congress and the public should have the benefit of his views concerning this controversial matter. The letter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Charleston, December 31, 1943.

Hon. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROHRBOUGH: Immediately after your reconvening in Washington on January 10, you will be confronted again with the question of subsidy legislation.

Having had numerous contacts with farmers and groups of farmers, agricultural workers, and small businessmen in this State, and also meeting with farm groups in other States, I desire to bring to your attention the information gained and make clear to you the position and opinion of the farmer, who is very much disturbed.

Farmers do not want subsidies, and will not be in a very happy state of mind if they are continued to be forced upon them.

Subsidy is not helping the farmer for the reason that the price of feeds and materials that he must use in his operation in every instance have advanced more than enough to wipe out a subsidy when he receives it. The farmer, therefore, is left where he was, if not in a worse position, by having received it.

In some instances where Congress has provided subsidy supposed to go to the farmer, he has never received it. He further believes that if Congress continues to pass legislation which increases the cost of his operation, it should also provide legislation that will give him a fair price for his product, especially when he is working 75 to 80 hours a week in farm production, while others are only working 48 hours per week.

The farmer believes that it is the responsibility of Congress to take immediate action to provide proper legislation to allow him fair prices for his product.

May I respectfully suggest that subsidy be done away with. To those who are not able to meet the increased prices of food, provide the stamp plan and pass legislation that will give the farmer an equal opportunity with other groups. If some remedy is not found, the farmer will have neither a happy nor a prosperous new year.

Respectfully,

J. B. MCLAUGHLIN,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

1944 Elections Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a very interesting and helpful elections calendar for 1944, showing all the dates on which various actions are required in California, for the May and August primaries and for the November general election. The calendar has been prepared by the California State Chamber of Commerce, and this is a simple and easy method of providing a means for distributing it to men

and women of that State to whom it will be of very real value.

1944 ELECTIONS CALENDAR FOR CALIFORNIA, MAY PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY, AUGUST DIRECT PRIMARY, AND NOVEMBER GENERAL ELECTION

February 2, 1944: Last day to be naturalized or otherwise become a citizen, in order to register for the May Presidential primary election.

February 17, 1944: Last day on which political party not otherwise qualified may file petition to qualify for place on May Presidential primary ballot. Prior to this date the petition must have been left with the county clerk for examination and certification (226,429 good signatures necessary).

February 28, 1944: First day to circulate and secure signatures to nomination papers for party delegates to national conventions.

March 1, 1944: Last day for chairman of State central committee of each party to notify secretary of state of number of delegates to which the State is entitled in the national convention.

March 10, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to certify to county clerks the number of delegates to which each party in the State is entitled in the national party convention.

March 23, 1944: Last day to leave nomination papers for candidates for delegate to national party conventions with county clerk for examination and certification.

March 23, 1944: Last day to register or transfer in order to vote in May Presidential primary..

April 1, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to certify to county clerks the list of candidates for nomination as party delegates to national convention.

April 3, 1944: County clerks furnish secretary of state with statement of total number of registered voters, as of March 23, showing registrations by party, as well as those registered voters who declined to state any party affiliation.

April 7, 1944: Before this date county clerk prepares sample ballot for Presidential primary election and prepares lists of candidates for delegates to national party convention, showing names of Presidential candidates to whom the delegates are pledged.

April 7-27, 1944: County clerks mail sample ballots and lists of candidates for delegates to party conventions to each registered voter.

April 12, 1944: First day for voters, other than members of the armed forces, to apply for absentee ballots for May Presidential primary. A member of the armed forces may make such application at any time after he is notified that he is to leave the State or to be confined to camp.

April 27, 1944: Last day for any voter, whether in armed forces or not, to apply for absentee ballot.

May 1, 1944: Forty days before the date on which final filings of initiative petitions must be made with county clerks, if full 20 days are allowed for examination and certification of signatures by clerks, in order to qualify for November ballot.

May 2, 1944: Presidential primary election, to choose delegates to national party conventions, to nominate party candidates for President of the United States. (Voters moving within 40 days before the election to another precinct in the same county may vote in their former precinct. Voters who move from one county to another within 90 days before an election lose their registration.)

May 8, 1944: Last day on which absentee ballots may reach county clerks, in order to be counted.

May 18, 1944: Last day for county officials to complete official canvass of votes.

May 22-26, 1944: Between these dates cadidates for judicial office must file declaration of intention to become candidate for that office.

May 23, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to compile and file in his office statement of canvassed returns filed with him by county clerks, from May Presidential primary.

May 31, 1944: Last day to be naturalized or otherwise become a citizen, in order to register for August direct primary. First day to leave with county clerk for filing or examination and certification declarations of candidacy for offices to be filled in August primary, or for which nominees are to be chosen in the August primary.

June 5-12, 1944: Between these dates county clerk computes the number of members of county central committees for each political party allotted to each supervisorial or assembly district (except Los Angeles County).

June 6, 1944: County clerks furnish secretary of state with statement of total number of registered voters, as of May 26, showing registrations by party, as well as those registered voters who declined to state any party affiliation.

June 9, 1944: Initiative petitions should be left with county clerks on or before this date for examination and certification to the Secretary of State, if they are to appear on the November ballot (178,764 good signatures necessary).

June 10, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to mail press release inviting submission of arguments for or against measures to be submitted to vote by the legislature.

June 15, 1944: Last day on which political party may file petition to qualify for place on August primary ballot. Prior to this date the petition must have been left with the county clerk for examination and certification. (226,429 good signatures necessary.)

June 24, 1944: Last day to secure signatures of sponsors for candidates for August primary election. Last day to leave necessary documents with county clerk for filing or examination and certification.

June 29, 1944: Last day to file initiative petitions with secretary of state if they are to appear on November ballot. Petitions filed with county clerks by June 9 must be examined and certified to secretary of state before this date.

June 30, 1944: Last day for secretary of state or county clerk to file nomination papers for August primary election. Last day for filing suggested arguments on legislative propositions with secretary of state.

July 15, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to certify to county clerks the list of candidates eligible to be voted on in August direct primary election.

July 17 to August 15, 1944: Justices of the supreme court and of the district court of appeal may file declarations of candidacy for reelection between these dates.

July 20, 1944: Last day to register or transfer in order to vote in August direct primary election.

July 31, 1944: County clerks furnish secretary of state with statement of total number of registered voters, as of July 20, showing registrations by party, as well as those registered voters who declined to state any party affiliation.

August 4, 1944: Before this date, county clerk prepares sample ballot for August direct primary election, one ballot for each party, and one non-partisan ballot. Last day a candidate's name may be omitted from ballot because of death.

August 4-24, 1944: County clerks mail appropriate sample ballot to each registered voter, either the ballot for his own party or the non-partisan ballot, if he has failed to state his party preference.

August 9, 1944: Last day to become naturalized or otherwise become a citizen in order to register for the November general election. First day for voters, other than members of the armed forces, to apply for absentee ballots for August direct primary. A member of the armed forces may make such application at any time after he is notified that he is to leave the State or to be confined to camp.

August 14, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to mail press release inviting submission of arguments for or against initiative and referendum measures which are to appear on November ballot.

August 24, 1944: Last day for any voter, whether in the armed forces or not, to apply for absentee ballot in August direct primary election.

August 29, 1944: Direct primary election, to choose party nominees for offices of State assemblymen, State senators, Members of House of Representatives, one United States Senator; also to nominate candidates or elect certain nonpartisan officers, judges, and county officials. (Voters moving within 40 days before the election to another precinct in the same county may vote in their former precinct. Voters who move from one county to another within 90 days before an election lose their registration.)

September 5, 1944: Last day on which absentee ballots may reach county clerks, in order to be counted.

First day to circulate and leave with county clerks for examination and certification, nomination papers for independent candidates for offices to be filled in November general election.

Last day for filing arguments for or against initiative and referendum measures to appear on November ballot.

September 8, 1944: First day to file with county clerks or secretary of state, independent nomination papers for candidates for offices to be filled in November general election.

September 12, 1944: All county central committees (except Los Angeles County) meet.

September 13, 1944: Last day for candidates in August direct primary to file statements of campaign expenditures.

September 14, 1944: Last day for county officials to complete official canvass of votes.

September 16, 1944: Last day on which Governor may nominate persons for justice of supreme court or district courts of appeal, when incumbent does not wish to be a candidate to succeed himself.

September 18, 1944: Last day for candidate nominated at August direct primary by write-in, to withdraw name from general election ballot.

September 21, 1944: State conventions of all political parties held in Sacramento. This year conventions nominate Presidential electors whose names appear on November ballot.

September 22, 1944: Before this date county clerk must ascertain who is chairman of the county central committee and certify same to secretary of state.

State central committee of each political party meets in Sacramento.

September 23, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to compile and file in his office statement of canvassed returns filed with him by county clerks for August direct primary. Before this date secretary of state must certify to the county clerks the amendments and ballot propositions to be voted on and furnish copies of the ballot pamphlet.

September 23-28, 1944: Between these dates any association spending more than $1,000 to influence voters with respect to ballot propositions must file first statement of receipts and expenditures.

September 28, 1944: Last day for leaving nomination papers for independent candidates for offices to be filled in November general election with county clerks for examination and certification. Last day to register or transfer in order to vote in November general election.

September 28-October 23, 1944: County clerk must begin mailing of sample ballots for November general election, and mail

copies of ballot pamphlet to all registered voters.

October 3, 1944: Last day to file with county clerks or secretary of state nomination papers for independent candidates for offices to be filled in November general election. Last day any vacancy affecting a partisan office, which vacancy occurs by reason of disqualification of the candidate, can be filled by the appropriate party committee.

October 7, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to certify to county clerks the names of candidates, offices for which they are candidates, party designations, etc., for the November general election.

October 9, 1944: County clerks furnish secretary of state with statement of total number of registered voters, as of September 28, showing registrations by party, as well as those registered voters who declined to state any party affiliation.

October 13, 1944: Last day on which the death of a nominee will be recognized as grounds to permit party organization to fill vacancy on ballot, and last day for certification by appropriate party committee of a person to fill such vacancy.

October 18, 1944: First day for voters other than members of the armed forces to apply for absentee ballot for November general election. A member of the armed forces may make such application at any time after he is notified that he is to leave the State or to be confined to camp.

October 26–31, 1944: Between these dates any association spending more than $1,000 to influence voters with respect to ballot propositions must file first supplemental statement of receipts and expenditures.

October 27, 1944: Mailing of sample ballots for November general election must be completed by county clerks.

November 2, 1944: Last day on which any voter, whether a member of the armed forces or not, may apply for absentee ballot for November general election.

November 7, 1944: General election to choose Presidential electors, all State assemblymen, one-half of State senators, all Members of the House of Representatives, one United States Senator, certain nonpartisan judicial and county officers. (Voters moving within 40 days before the election from one precinct to another in the same county may vote in their former precinct. Voters who move from one county to another within 90 days before an election lose their registration.)

November 13, 1944: Last day on which absentee ballots may reach county clerks, in order to be counted.

November 14, 1944: Last day for county officials to complete official canvass of votes.

November 22, 1944: Last day for candidates in November general election to file statements of campaign expenditures.

December 7, 1944: Last day for associations spending more than $1,000 to influence voters with respect to ballot propositions to file second supplemental statement of receipts and expenditures.

December 16, 1944: Last day for secretary of state to compile and file in his office statement of canvassed returns filed with him by county clerks, for November general election.

Soldier Vote Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the American Youth for Democracy at the conference held in Chicago, January 10, endorsed the provision of the original Lucas-Green bill as the best measure to assure rights of vote to 10,000,000 men and women in service. They firmly endorse the principle of a uniform Federal ballot and protest against leaving the issue to the 48 States to handle the voting and ballot procedure.

The resolution adopted at the conference follows:

RESOLUTION ADDRESSED TO HOUSE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at an emergency conference on soldiers' vote legislation, sponsored by American Youth for Democracy, attended by 250 delegates and individual participants from 20 trade unions, 9 youth organizations, 6 civic groups, and 4 college clubs.

This conference was held Sunday, January 9, at the Central Y. M. C. A. College in Chicago.

"The emergency conference for Federal soldiers' vote legislation held Sunday, January 9 at the Central Y. M. C. A., Chicago, wholeheartedly endorses the provisions of the original Lucas-Green bill.

"We consider this, by far, the best measure introduced into Congress to guarantee to all our service men and women the opportunity to exercise their fundamental right to vote in the 1944 elections.

"We firmly endorse the principle of a uniform Federal ballot for all servicemen.

"Our hearts burn with indignation against those who are making a political football out of this vital issue to advance their selfish, partisan political interests.

"To deny the need for effective Federal legislation is, in essence, to deny our servicemen that elementary right of citizenship in our democracy, the right to vote, which they are defending with their very lives.

"The editorial in Stars and Stripes dramatically expresses the sentiment of our fighting servicemen overseas for a simple, uniform, Federal ballot, and against leaving the issue up to the 48 States to handle.

"Our armed forces are now preparing to launch the decisive battles in Europe and Asia which will bring final victory over the Axis.

"It would indeed be tragic and shameful if at this very moment the Congress of the United States should fail to perform its simple duty of voting the franchise to our 10,000,000 men and women in uniform under a fake smoke screen of State's rights.

"This emergency conference, therefore, calls upon Congress to back the attack for victory in 1944 by immediately passing legislation based on the provisions of the original Lucas-Green bill, to insure our fighting men the right to have their voices heard in the vital 1944 elections.

"We feel such action will be greeted with support from the American people, and will be welcomed with enthusiasm by our front-line fighters for democracy."

Prohibition Would Destroy the Morale of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that attention should be given at this time to House bill 2082, which has as its purpose to bring about by statute prohibition during the period of the emergency. Nothing, in my opinion, would be more harmful to the morale of the armed forces. There are at the moment about 10,000,000 men and women in uniform. They are willing to lay down their lives that the people of this country might enjoy the liberties and freedom to which they are entitled under our Constitution. Are we insuring domestic tranquillity or granting the blessings of liberty as set down in the preamble of the Constitution by taking up this legislation? On the contrary nothing will result but disunity and resentment.

So important is the question of national prohibition I have always felt, based upon our previous experience, it should not be passed on by the Congress but by a direct vote of the people even though it might be necessary to amend the Constitution to bring that about. Under such conditions in computing the vote I would urge that State lines be abandoned in order that a State with less than a million people could not offset the vote of a State with over 10,000,000 people. The majority of the Nation as a whole should determine the decision in the end.

Now, I want you to hear the voice of those in the armed forces who are in Europe. This message came to me in the form of an editorial published in a daily paper known as the Stars and Stripes. It is published under the direction of Brig. Gen. F. H. Osborn and Col. Theodore Arter of the Special Service Section, S. O. S., of the European theater as well as Africa, Italy, and so forth. I now quote from that editorial and, remember, this is the language of those whom we depend upon to bring Germany to its knees. I quote:

They are at it again in America, and even as in the days of World War No. 1 we may yet hear that America is dry.

Most of us in the United States armed forces could not be classed as violently opposed to liquor control for most of us believe in moderation. On the other hand, there are few of us who could be included in the group of Americans who felt "the noble experiment" was a huge success.

It is with alarm therefore that we learn of the growing political strength of the anti-liquor crowd in the United States.

Taking advantage of wartime conditions and restrictions the new prohibition group is working night and day for legislation which will give America prohibition in fact if not in name. * * *

Rationing is playing into their hands and gives them a good excuse, and no opportunity is missed to use this excuse in their efforts to limit the production and distribution of liquor of all types.

We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made quick fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress an attempt was made to pass a bill in the Senate to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the supervision of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval

establishments. The two issues were joined in the bill.

Secretary of War Stimson in a letter to the Committee endorsed that part of the bill which had as its purpose the elimination as far as possible of venereal diseases. Then commenting on the other sections of the bill he said:

The War Department fully realizes that from the viewpoint of efficiency and moral standards, an Army in which drunkenness is nonexisting is highly desirable. However, knowing the frailties of human nature and realizing that habits of temperance or intemperance are developed long before the individual becomes a soldier, the War Department is convinced that temperance cannot be attained by prohibition applied to its personnel any more than it can be attained by prohibition applied to the Nation at large, and experience has proven that the problem can only be solved by the application of practicable and tolerant measures applied in a logical manner. Fortunately our presently existing laws provide an ideal framework for such control. Briefly stated these laws forbid the sale of or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations, but permit the sale of beer and light wine of not more than 3.2 percent alcohol content by weight. Under these laws, announced War Department policy and regulations prohibit the sale or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations but permit the sale of soft drinks, including beer and light wines containing not more than 3.2 percent alcohol by weight on those reservations located in States whose laws permit such sales at such places. Such sales are not permitted, however, on reservations located within any State, territory, or district, whose laws do not permit such sales within its borders. This policy has caused a degree of temperance among Army personnel which is not approachable in civil communities now, nor was as high a degree of temperance attained either in or out of the Army during the days of national prohibition. Under this policy, military personnel are encouraged to remain on the reservation (their home) and enjoy refreshment under conditions conducive of temperance.

Experience has proven that the present policy of the Department is the most effective way to insure temperance, and it would be regrettable indeed should the Congress, in its effort to assist in the matter of attaining temperance among military personnel, enact legislation which would destroy the advancements made and return to the Department the difficult problem of combating bootleg operations.

On Guard for Both Consumer and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an example of its effectiveness which happens to involve mention of my home city gives me a suitable opportunity to direct attention to the good works of the Federal Trade Commission. I have been awaiting such an opportunity because these good works, perhaps since they proceed day in and day out, during war days and peaceful times alike, are too often taken for granted.

The Commission is continually on guard for both the consumer and the average businessman. It has, of course, tremendously important tasks in connection with actions that result in restraint of interstate commerce. It has almost equally essential responsibilities as a clearing house for information about corporations and trade practices. As a matter of fact, when President Wilson asked the Congress to create the Commission he pointed to the public's demand for an instrument of information and publicity. The Commission is, as well, charged with significant duties in respect to associated businesses engaging in foreign trade.

But in addition to, and perhaps over and above, all these responsibilities, the Commission, as a result of being empowered to act under the 11 potent words which fixed its jurisdiction and declared that unfair methods of competition in commerce are hereby declared unlawful, has become an instrument for assuring justice to both consumers and businessmen where the natural forces are inadequate or the courts for one reason or another for practical purposes are out of reach.

In this truly momentous field the Commission is doing creative work of tremendous significance in addition to weeding out specific unfair practices as part of its everyday task. For it is actually defining, shaping, and clarifying the term "unfair trade practice." And that is a requirement which has been a challenge for centuries.

The remarkable efficacy of the Commission's approach to this problem lies, I think, in its unique power to investigate practices thoroughly and then to act, when it feels justified in acting, in a manner that puts common sense first and is not necessarily restricted by precedent. It can proceed to stamp out an unfair practice, once it concludes it is unfair, even though that particular practice has never theretofore happened to have been technically adjudged an unfair trade practice.

As a result it can break new ground in respect to the understanding and defining of unfair trade practice while simultaneously freeing the daily flow of commerce of the weeds of specific unfair methods. Practically daily it uproots this or that unfair action, but it is even more important that with equal consistency it is making clearer the boundaries encompassing unfair methods of competition in commerce. And that is a creative contribution of the first rank, one which I venture to predict will over the years receive greater recognition than it does currently from us under whose eyes it is being actually shaped.

The specific instance of this great work of the Commission which I mention as giving me a desired and fitting opportunity to make these remarks, is typical. It is also an amusing, if a somewhat discouraging, commentary on the gullibility of Americans in both hemispheres. And therefore it is an excellent demonstration why on that score alone the Federal Trade Commission is a national necessity.

Apparently a resident of my home city—Brooklyn, where you will gather, more than a tree grows—noticed a sentence in a newspaper which indicated money-making possibilities to him, world conditions being what they are. This sentence read, in part:

To promote Pan-American cultural relationship and to advance the cause of hemispheric solidarity.

The Brooklynite proceeded, the Commission finds, to place this sonorous sentence at the bottom of some good-looking stationery, at the top of which he put Who's Who with a smaller "in the Western Hemisphere" underneath. He next, the Commission—which has, as you will gather, caught up with him—complains, wrote on this letterhead thus embellished to those actually listed in Who's Who, and apparently thousands of others, informing them with considerable solemnity they had been recommended for inclusion in his proposed work, the intention of which he divulged with corresponding ceremoniousness as being "to aid in bringing about closer ties between the peoples of North and South America through a more intimate knowledge of their leaders in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics and public affairs."

In other words, each recipient of this message was by inference given a more than knightly accolade by the Brooklynite, the sword of honor in this unique ceremony of award apparently being replaced by the sonorous sentences and the embellished letterhead, the award being no less than continental leadership in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics, or public affairs. Imagine the effect of such honor being bestowed in wartime by form letters. Undoubtedly leaders in both continents are going to be dangerously oversupplied on Victory Day, along, I fear, with a number of other equally perishable items.

I should mention that his address in Brooklyn was hardly in keeping with an intercontinental picture such as this Brooklynite was painting. Indeed, some might suggest that no Brooklyn address would be entirely so, but I naturally would dispute that, although agreeing that his particular address, which the Commission reports is 3145 Brighton Sixth Street, while that for the place at which the literature was actually handled is 1029 Brighton Beach Avenue, would not quite fit in with hemispheric notability and accolades of continental leadership.

To overcome this particular difficulty, he merely hired a mailing address with a Fifth Avenue, New York City, number. With this magic number added to the rather considerable attractions I have already mentioned, the Commission says he gathered in $25,000 in cash and $25,000 in orders to be billed.

And what is even more astounding, with no more than this letterhead I have described to go by, certain gentlemen of repute, whom he now quotes in seeking more cash and orders, wrote in high praise of his proposition.

For example, a brigadier general of our Army:

Since my service in Latin America, I have become an ardent advocate of closer relationship with South America. Your publication is one of many contributing factors.

And a certain major, who is styled a former military attaché in all Central America:

I think you are doing a fine work and if my war work were not so tense, I would do more for you.

And a vice president of a corporation:

I believe the publication which you are preparing should be of great benefit in cementing happy relations with our southern neighbors.

But I will not encourage embarrassment by quoting others who wrote to the Fifth Avenue number the use of which had been hired as a substitute for 1029 Brighton Beach Avenue, Brooklyn. But I do wish I knew how many would have written as they did if the Brooklyn address had been used.

If all that is not sufficiently arresting, there is the added fact that a brother-in-law signing these widely mailed letters and assuming the operative responsibility for this endeavor to promote Pan-American cultural relationship and to advance the cause of hemispheric solidarity, was all the time following his actual daily vocation assisting a Brooklyn electrician as a helper. So, the Commission found, these distinguished gentlemen were writing to a Fifth Avenue address but their letters and the checks and the orders were going to the electrician's helper working in Brooklyn.

All this might be put down as merely something in the day's work of the Commission happening to be unusually bizarre, were it not for the exploitation of the inter-American situation for purposes of personal profit. Those in our sister republics who expected a place among our leaders in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics and public affairs as a result of this solicitation, would most certainly have a right to lower their opinion of us if disappointed. And their good opinion is most important to the national interest at any time, and all but transcendently so today. It follows that, far from being merely an amusing matter in the day's work of the Commission, this actually is a situation of extreme importance in time of war.

That the Commission so recognizes is shown by the thoroughgoing complaint it has issued, which I feel should be given wide circulation both because of these national considerations of the moment, and as well the fact that it supplies an example of the excellent work of the Commission as a vigilant protector of consumer and businessman alike. It therefore follows:

[United States of America, before Federal Trade Commission. In the matter of Julius C. Schwartz, Freda Schwartz, and Rubin Rocker, individuals, and W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., a corporation. Docket No. 5108]

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Julius C. Schwartz, Freda Schwartz, and Rubin Rocker, individuals, and W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., a corporation, hereinafter referred to as the respondents, have violated the provisions of said act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest hereby issues its complaint, stating its charges in that respect as follows:

Paragraph 1. Respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz are husband and wife and reside at 3145 Brighton Sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. Respondent Rubin Rocker is the brother-in-law of respondent Julius C. Schwartz, and resides at 1085 Simpson Street, The Bronx, New York, N. Y. Respondent W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. The individual respondents have dominant control of the editorial and sales policies and business activities of the said corporate respondent, and own or control all of its corporate stock. All of said respondents have acted in concert in doing the acts and things hereinafter alleged. Respondents' principal office and place of business is at 1029 Brighton Beach Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., although they maintain a mailing address at 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Paragraph 2. Respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz are now, and have been for several years last past, engaged in the publication and sale of books of biographical reference, including, among others, books entitled "Who's Who in the Clergy," "Who's Who in Law," and "Who's Who Among Physicians and Surgeons."

Respondent Rubin Rocker is now, and for several years last past has been engaged in assisting respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz in the publication and sale of said books of biographical reference.

During the space of more than 2 years last past all of the respondents named herein have been, and are now, engaged in securing subscriptions and biographical sketches for, and otherwise promoting a proposed publication to be entitled, "Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere," which publication has not yet been issued from the press. Respondent Julius C. Schwartz is the actual owner of said publication and manager and promoter of the various activities in connection therewith. Respondent Rubin Rocker is the nominal head of said enterprise, but in reality is only a screen or cover for the activities of respondent Schwartz. During the year 1941 respondent Rubin Rocker, acting in cooperation and conjunction with, and at the instance of, respondent Julius C. Schwartz, filed in the office of the New York county clerk a certificate of doing business under the fictitious name and style of Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere. Subsequently on or about August 10, 1943, said individual respondents caused a corporation to be organized under the laws of the State of New York under the name of "W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc.," and caused to be transferred to it all of the assets of the business formerly operated by respondent Rubin Rocker, doing business as Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere.

Respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz, in connection with the sale and distribution of the books of biographical reference heretofore published by them and issued from the press, including Who's Who in the Clergy, Who's Who in Law, and Who's Who Among Physicians and Surgeons, have caused said books, when sold, to be shipped from their place of business in the State of New York to the purchasers thereof located in States outside of the State of New York, and in the District of Columbia.

Said respondents, together with the respondents Rubin Rocker and W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., in connection with the solicitation for the sale, and the sale of the proposed new publication to be entitled "Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere" have maintained, and now maintain activities of a commercial and business nature involving intercourse and communication with numerous individuals located in States other than the State of New York. All of the respondents named herein maintain, and have maintained at all of the times hereinbefore mentioned, a course of trade in commerce between and among the various States of the United States, and in the District of Columbia.

Paragraph 3. In the course and conduct of their said business, respondents are now and have been in competition with corporations, firms and individuals engaged in the sale and distribution of books of biographical reference in commerce among and between the various States of the United States and in the District of Columbia. Among such competitors are many who do not engage in unfair or deceptive acts or practices in connection with the sale of their products in said commerce.

Paragraph 4. Beginning in the year 1899 there has been published and distributed by the A. N. Marquis Co., Chicago, Ill., a copartnership composed of Wheeler Sammons and Dorothy Sammons, and their predecessors in interest, a biennial volume of biographical sketches and data concerning thousands of living Americans notable in the fields of letters, education, business, and public affairs. This book is entitled "Who's Who In America," and is commonly known and generally referred to by members of the public as Who's Who. The contents of the biographical sketches in the successive volumes are protected by copyright, and the title "Who's Who" is trade-marked by the publishers of said volumes. For many years Who's Who In America has been published in a distinctive red binding with gold lettering, and the biographical matter has been set in a distinctive style and format, so that the book can be, and is, readily identified. It has become the only recognized authoritative volume of biographical sketches of national interest published in the United States, and it has gained an outstanding and favorable reputation for reliability and is in widespread use in libraries, schools, colleges, newspaper offices, and business concerns for reference purposes.

Who's Who in America is a book of hemispheric scope, and contains biographical sketches of prominent men and women in South America, Central America, Mexico, and Canada, as well as in the United States. The publishers of Who's Who in America also publish a monthly supplement containing biographies of persons prominent in the various countries of the Western Hemisphere and bearing upon its cover a map of the entire Western Hemisphere. Said publishers are presently collaborating with Stanford University in the preparation of the third edition of a volume entitled "Who's Who in Latin America," which is sponsored and financially supported by the United States Government through the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, in the interest of friendly relationships with the Latin-American republics.

Paragraph 5. By reason of its reputation for accuracy, reliability, and selectivity built up and established over a period of more than 40 years, Who's Who in America has become known and identified in the minds of the public generally as an authoritative compilation of biographical sketches of outstanding and notable individuals in both North and South America. To the public generally the words "Who's Who" have come to indicate and mean only one certain publication, i. e., the red volume Who's Who in America, and one sole and exclusive publishing source, i. e., the A. N. Marquis Co., publishers of Who's Who in America. To the public generally the words "Who's Who" mean also Who is notable, and to them a Who's Who means a person whose biography is included in Who's Who in America. The use of such words in the name of a publication, or in connection therewith, constitute a representation to the public that such publication is a compilation of the biographies of notable people, selected and qualified by, and edited under, the rigid and exacting standards established and enforced for many years by the

publishers of Who's Who in America. A large portion of the public associates the words "Who's Who" not only with a high standard of selectivity, accuracy, and reference value, but also with a single and exclusive publishing source. The use of such term in the title of a book of biographical reference or in connection therewith constitutes a representation to the public that such publication is a product of the publishers of the long-established and well-known Who's Who in America.

Paragraph 6. Several years ago respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz began the publication of certain volumes purporting to include a selective list of biographical sketches of persons prominent in various professions or classifications, beginning with the publication of Who's Who in American Jewry, and continuing with Who's Who in Government, Who's Who in the Clergy, Who's Who in Law and Who's Who Among Physicians and Surgeons. All of said volumes bore titles which included the words "Who's Who," and said books closely resembled in style, format, and binding the well known Who's Who in America.

Said respondents followed the plan of contacting certain individuals whose names were secured through mailing lists, professional lists, telephone directories, and other sources, and soliciting them to furnish biographical information for publication in the forthcoming work. If such information was furnished, it was prepared in the form of a proof sheet and returned to the individual for correction, together with a card providing for purchase for cash or reservation of a book upon publication. Purchase or reservation of a copy was in most instances sufficient to insure the inclusion of the biography of the purchaser in the published work.

Many of the individuals thus solicited were not and are not generally recognized as being persons of outstanding attainment or importance in their respective fields or professions, and the inclusion of their biographical sketches in the published work usually depended upon whether they ordered or paid for a copy of the book. If the biographical sketches of such individuals were included in the published work, such inclusion naturally had and has the result of giving them a reputation and importance to which they were not and are not entitled, thus tending to mislead and deceive clients and prospective clients or other members of the public who used such book for reference purposes.

Furthermore, said respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz, in soliciting said biographical sketches, made a practice of soliciting many of the individuals listed in Who's Who in America. Many of such individuals furnished information or biographical material to said respondents in the mistaken belief that said respondents were, or were connected with, or associated with, the publishers of Who's Who in America, or that they maintained the same high standards of selectivity as the publishers of that publication. Others of such individuals failed to respond to such solicitations, and in such cases said respondents pursued the practice of copying or lifting the copyrighted biographical sketches contained in Who's Who in America and inserting such sketches or garbled versions thereof in their own published work without the knowledge or consent of the biographee.

The books of biographical reference heretofore published by the respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Freda Schwartz, including Who's Who in the Clergy, Who's Who in Law, and Who's Who Among Physicians and Surgeons contained the names of many individuals of no outstanding importance or reputation in the particular professions involved, and omitted the names of many outstanding and notable individuals. Said books were not truly selective, but included biographies of many unimportant persons who had responded to solicitation or had purchased or reserved copies for their personal use, while it excluded many truly notable persons, who should have been included in any truly selective list.

Paragraph 7. The publication by said respondents of books containing the words "Who's Who" in their titles, but not otherwise compiled or prepared in accordance with the high standards established for many years by the publishers of Who's Who in America, had and has a tendency and capacity to deceive the purchasers thereof into the belief that their biographical sketches would be included in a truly selective volume of a type or class comparable to Who's Who in America, published by the same publishers under the same rigid standards of selectivity, when such was and is not the fact. It also had and has the tendency and capacity to deceive members of the general public, particularly librarians, students, newspaper editors, writers, and others making extensive use of reference books, into the belief that said books included the biographical sketches of most or all of the prominent and notable members of the particular profession involved, and excluded the unimportant and obscure, when such was not the fact.

Paragraph 8. Beginning in the year 1941 the respondents Julius C. Schwartz and Rubin Rocker began the preparation of a new Who's Who volume to be called Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere. They selected a Fifth Avenue mailing address in New York City, and caused letterheads to be printed representing that the proposed publication would be a biographical encyclopedia designed to promote pan-American cultural relationships and to advance the cause of hemispheric solidarity. Using methods similar to those employed in the publication of Who's Who in the Clergy, Who's Who in Law, and other Schwartz Who's Who publications, as heretofore set out, said respondents began to circularize thousands of prospective biographees whose names were obtained from various mailing lists, Who's Who books and other sources. The usual method of approach was to represent to the customer by a form letter that his name had been recommended for inclusion in the forthcoming edition of Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere. Respondents in said letter stated, "This volume is intended to aid in bringing about closer ties between the peoples of North and South America through a more intimate knowledge of their leaders in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics and public welfare." Respondents enclosed with said letter a questionnaire to be filled out and returned, following receipt of which a draft of the proposed biographical sketch would be sent by respondents for correction and approval. The letters of solicitation were signed "R. Rocker, associate editor," and all of the business connected with said enterprise was carried on ostensibly by respondent Rubin Rocker as the responsible owner, manager, and promoter of said enterprise.

Said respondents have collected to date more than $25,000 in cash from members of the public who have purchased copies thereof prior to publication, and also have received an additional $25,000 in unpaid subscriptions from members of the public who have reserved copies to be delivered and paid for upon publication and delivery of said book.

Paragraph 9. Many of the persons who have thus paid for or reserved copies of the forthcoming Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere have done so under the false and erroneous belief that it is to be a truly selective biographical compilation of all of the outstanding and important leaders in the countries of North and South America, when such is not the case. Many of the individuals who are to be included in said book are not leaders in connection with, and do not hold positions influential in respect to hemispheric solidarity or in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics and public welfare of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. The book was not and is not designed or intended to aid in bringing about closer ties between the peoples of North and South America, but is merely a commercial scheme or promotion to enrich its promotors, the respondents herein.

Many others of the persons who have subscribed for or paid cash in advance of publication for said work, or who have contributed their biographical sketches or other data to be published therein, have done so under the false and erroneous belief that it has been compiled, authorized or otherwise sponsored by, or connected with, the well known and authoritative Who's Who in America or the publishers thereof.

Furthermore, the respondents herein are not financially, professionally or otherwise equipped either to undertake the editorial duties or to assume the financial risks and burdens involved in the publication of so extensive and ambitious a project as Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere. They have no educational or professional background or qualifications which would fit them adequately to select or pass upon the qualifications of individuals to be included in such a book, and they lack sufficient capital to undertake the exhaustive research and expense necessarily connected with such a book. If sufficient copies thereof are not sold or reserved prior to publication, said proposed book may never actually be published, to the manifest and substantial loss and injury of the purchasing public.

Paragraph 10. The use by the respondents of the aforesaid acts, practices, and methods in connection with the offering for sale and sale of books of biographical reference in said commerce has had, and now has, the tendency and capacity to, and does, deceive and mislead members of the public, and unfairly to disparage and defame the products of competitors, thereby inducing the purchase by a substantial number of the purchasing public of respondents' books and unfairly diverting trade to the respondents from their competitors in commerce between and among the several States of the United States and in the District of Columbia, to the injury of said competitors and the public.

Paragraph 11. The aforesaid acts and practices of the respondents, as herein alleged, are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors, and constitute unfair methods of competition and unmerce within the intent and meaning of the fair and deceptive acts and practices in com-Federal Trade Commission Act.

Wherefore, the premises considered, the Federal Trade Commission, on this 29th day of December A. D. 1943, issues its complaint against said respondents.

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given you, Julius C. Schwartz, Freda Schwartz, and Rubin Rocker, individuals, and W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., a corporation, respondents herein, that the 4th day of February A. D. 1944, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, is hereby fixed as the time, and the offices of the Federal Trade Commission in the city of Washington, D. C., as the place, when and where a hearing will be had on the charges set forth in this complaint, at which time and place you will have the right, under said act, to appear and show cause why an order should not be entered by said Commission requiring you to cease and desist from the violations of the law charged in the complaint.

You are notified and required, on or before the 20th day after service upon you of this complaint, to file with the Commission an answer to the complaint. If answer is filed and if your appearance at the place and on the date above stated be not required, due notice to that effect will be given you. The rules of practice adopted by the Commission with respect to answers or failure to appear or answer (rule IX) provide as follows:

"In case of desire to contest the proceeding the respondent shall, within 20 days from

the service of the complaint, file with the Commission an answer to the complaint. Such answer shall contain a concise statement of the facts which constitute the ground of defense. Respondent shall specifically admit or deny or explain each of the facts alleged in the complaint, unless respondent is without knowledge, in which case respondent shall so state."

* * * * *

"Failure of the respondent to file answer within the time above provided and failure to appear at the time and place fixed for hearing shall be deemed to authorize the Commission, without further notice to respondent, to proceed in regular course on the charges set forth in the complaint.

"If respondent desires to waive hearing of the allegations of fact set forth in the complaint and not to contest the facts, the answer may consist of a statement that respondent admits all the material allegations of fact set forth in said complaint and to have authorized the Commission, without further evidence or other intervening procedure, to find such facts to be true.

"Contemporaneously with the filing of such answer the respondent may give notice in writing that he desires to be heard on the question as to whether the admitted facts constitute the violation of law charged in the complaint. Pursuant to such notice, the respondent may file a brief, directed solely to that question, in accordance with rule XXIII."

In witness whereof the Federal Trade Commission has caused this, its complaint, to be signed by its secretary and its official seal to be hereto affixed, at Washington, D. C., this 29th day of December A. D. 1943.

By the Commission.

A. N. Ross, *Acting Secretary.*

COMPLAINT 5108—BIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE BOOKS

The Federal Trade Commission has issued a complaint charging a Brooklyn corporation and its three owners with unfair and deceptive practices in connection with the publication of a series of purported Who's Who biographical reference books which allegedly resemble in style, format, and binding the well-known and recognized volume entitled "Who's Who in America," published and distributed exclusively since 1899 by the A. N. Marquis Co. of Chicago.

Named in the complaint as respondents are the corporation known as W. W. in the Western Hemisphere, Inc., and the individuals who own its stock and control its policies, Julius C. Schwartz, his wife, Freda, and his brother-in-law Rubin Rocker. They have their principal place of business at 1029 Brighton Beach Avenue, Brooklyn, and a mailing address at 315 Fifth Avenue, New York. Their publications include Who's Who in American Jewry, Who's Who in Government, Who's Who in Law, Who's Who in the Clergy, and Who's Who Among Physicians and Surgeons. These volumes, the complaint charges, do not possess the high standard of selectivity, accuracy, and reference value characteristic of Who's Who in America.

The complaint alleges that the respondents' most recent promotion is the proposed publication of a Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere, for which they have been securing biographical sketches and soliciting subscriptions for more than 2 years. Although the volume is not off the press, the respondents allegedly have collected more than $25,000 from persons who purchased copies prior to publication and have received unpaid subscriptions totaling an additional $25,000.

Thousands of prospective biographees, whose names were obtained from various mailing lists, telephone directories, and other sources, were contacted by form letters in which, the complaint charges, the respondents represented that their forthcoming Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere would be "a biographical encyclopedia designed to promote pan-American cultural relationship and to advance the cause of hemispheric solidarity" and "is intended to aid in bringing about closer ties between the peoples of North and South America through a more intimate knowledge of their leaders in the arts and sciences, commerce and industry, politics and public welfare."

According to the complaint, the proposed book is not being promoted for the purposes stated; many of the persons whose biographies are to be included are not leaders in hemispheric solidarity; it is not designed to bring about closer ties between the peoples of North and South America, but is merely a commercial scheme designed to enrich its promoters. The complaint points out that the publishers of the authoritative Who's Who in America are presently collaborating with Stanford University in the preparation of the third edition of a volume entitled "Who's Who in Latin America," which is sponsored and financially supported by the United States Government through the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

The complaint alleges that many of the persons who have subscribed to, or paid cash in advance for, the respondents' Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere, or who have contributed biographical sketches for inclusion therein, have done so under the false impression that it has been compiled, authorized, or otherwise sponsored by the publishers of Who's Who in America. Furthermore, the complaint continues, the respondents are neither financially nor professionally equipped to undertake the editorial duties or assume the financial risks involved in the publication of so ambitious a project as Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere, and if sufficient copies are not sold or reserved prior to publication, the proposed book may never be published, to the manifest and substantial loss and injury of the purchasing public.

None of the Who's Who books published by the respondents, the complaint charges, is truly selective, as the public is led to believe, but each includes biographies of many unimportant persons who had responded to solicitation or had purchased copies for their personal use, and excludes many notables who should be in any truly selective list. The complaint also alleges that the respondents made a practice of soliciting many of the individuals listed in the competing Who's Who in America; that many of such persons furnished biographical material in the mistaken belief that the respondents were connected with, or maintained the same high standards of selectivity as, the publishers of Who's Who in America; and that when others failed to furnish biographical material, the respondents pursued the policy of "lifting" copyrighted biographical sketches from Who's Who in America and inserting them, or garbled versions thereof, in their own published works, without the knowledge or consent of the subjects. The complaint charges that in most instances the purchase or reservation of a copy of one of the respondent's Who's Who books was sufficient to insure the inclusion therein of the biography of the purchaser.

The complaint alleges that the practices and methods used by the respondents deceive and mislead the purchasing public, tend to unfairly disparage and defame the publications of competitors, and constitute a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, all to the prejudice of the public and competitors.

Twenty days are granted the respondents to answer the complaint.

COMMENTS

"Since my service in Latin America, I have become an ardent advocate of closer relationship with South America. Your publication is one of many contributing factors." (C. A. Willoughby, brigadier general, U. S. Army, General Headquarters, Southwest Pacific Area.)

"I want to congratulate you very sincerely for the volume which you propose publishing in Who's Who, which will undoubtedly do a great deal toward helping to bring our peoples together and making the ties between North and South America even stronger." (Tomas Pacanins, Governor of the State of Aragua, Venezuela.)

"I am sure the volume will help maintain knowledge between the countries of America and establish closer relations and understanding of the nations in this hemisphere." (Dr. Cuervo Rubio, Vice President, Republic of Cuba.)

"You will, I am confident, render a useful service to the people of both continents, and I wish you all success with this project." (Dr. Harold W. Bradley, Stanford University.)

"Such an encyclopedia will be of great benefit to our countries." (Fernando Flores B., Vice Consul of Costa Rica at Los Angeles, Calif.)

"Allow me to congratulate you for the good work of bringing closer together peoples of North and South America." (Dr. Arthur Saint-Pierre, professor of social sciences, University of Montreal.)

"I think that your project has immense possibilities in the field of inter-American relations, and I should be pleased to help you in any way I can." (Dr. J. C. Lyons, University of North Carolina.)

"I will admit that your idea of a Western Hemisphere Who's Who is most admirable and likely to prove useful to many and justify itself its value as an important reference work." (Dr. John Spargo, director-curator, Bennington Historical Museum and Art Gallery.)

"Please accept my heartiest congratulations for the publication of Who's Who in the Western Hemisphere, a work which has long been needed and which will greatly contribute to pan-Americanism in general." (James Christie, chief Brazilian section, international division, National Broadcasting Co., Inc.)

"I think you are doing a fine work and if my war work were not so tense, I would do more for you." (Maj. J. M. Rafferty, U. S. A., formerly United States military attaché in all Central America.)

"I believe the publication which you are preparing should be of great benefit in cementing happy relations with our southern neighbors." (Frank J. Stevens, vice president, American Lava Corporation.)

DESERVED PRAISE OF THE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Speaker, the chairmanship of the Commission rotates annually among its five members. The chairman for this year is the Honorable Robert E. Freer, who is serving his second incumbency.

To Chairman Freer and his four associates, two of whom, the Honorable William A. Ayres and Judge Ewin L. Davis, served for many fruitful years here in the House, I feel this a most appropriate opportunity to extend congratulations both for good works already done and in anticipation of those ahead.

American War Dads of Greater St. Louis Oppose Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following resolution which

was adopted by the American War Dads of Greater St. Louis opposing any legislation that will take away from the members of the armed forces the rights that were theirs under our Constitution before they entered the service:

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that there will be from time to time attempts made to pass legislation that will take away from the members of the armed forces the rights that were theirs under our Constitution before they entered such branches of the armed forces.

Whereas our boys are now fighting on 32 fronts to restore at least a semblance of liberty and freedom to all classes of people in every section of the globe: Therefore be it

Resolved, by we, the members of the Greater St. Louis Council of the American War Dads, assembled and meeting in St. Louis, notify the Congressmen and Senators representing us in this district, That we are commanding them to watch carefully the rights of our sons who are in the service and to see to it that if any legislation is presented that would deprive these boys of any right that was theirs when they entered the service, that such legislation be deferred until such time that every man in the armed forces of this Government can have an opportunity to express his opinion upon it and thereby insure our sons that they will not lose at home the precious heritages that have carried them into the raging conflict in order that they might extend the same rights to others; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Council of the American War Dads in Kansas City, requesting that they notify all chapters of the American War Dads to take similar action.

American War Dads of Greater St. Louis Demand That Congress Provide for Members of the Armed Forces To Exercise the Right of Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I include as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the American War Dads of Greater St. Louis demanding that the Congress pass a law that will enable members of the armed forces to exercise the right of suffrage:

Whereas there are now millions of our boys away from their homes, many of them outside of the continental limits of the United States of America, fighting and dying in order that American might live; and

Whereas such boys, were it not for the crises in which their Government now finds itself, would be at home exercising their right of suffrage as citizens of this country at the ballot box; and

Whereas it is now, under the laws existing, impossible for them to exercise such rights which in effect, deprive them of the ballot and force them to accept elected officials who may or may not be contrary to their idea of the type and kind of official who should represent them; and

Whereas by being deprived of the use of the ballot, certain ideas and changes in Government may or may not be made that are contrary to their belief as citizens of this Government; and

Whereas these millions of our men have offered themselves as a sacrifice upon the altar of liberty in order that justice and freedom might be relieved of its shackles: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the American War Dads of the Greater St. Louis Council, in meeting assembled in St. Louis, unanimously command our Representatives in both Congress and Senate to see that such changes in laws and regulations are made that will enable our boys to cast their ballots and not be disfranchised even temporarily; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the national headquarters of the American War Dads with instructions that it be forwarded to every chapter of the American War Dads that they might issue the same command to their Representatives in Congress and Senate.

Labor and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Raymond Gram Swing over Station WMAL, Washington, D. C., Tuesday evening, January 4, 1944:

Rumors of a coup d'etat in Bulgaria are not confirmed and may not be true. But Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary are close to the brink of explosive events. The war is reaching its climax, the Russian armies are driving closer to their borders, the days of allied invasions are near, Turkey may be entering the war, and these satellites of the Axis are having to ask themselves where their greater safety lies, in pulling away from the Axis, or risking everything on the ability of Germany to prolong the war to a stalemate. The satellite countries are going to choose their course soon, for if they don't do it soon, they may lose all choice. They will choose by a process of weighing known facts. It will be a mental performance, in which what they think will determine what they do. The weight of the evidence convinces them that Germany can't win the war, and that Germany may not be able to hold out to a stalemate. But the German ministers in the satellite capitals have their network of influential men, who have their influence on the affairs of state. The Germans were able to promise a magnificent military victory until Stalingrad. Then for a time they could tell what the U-boats were doing to keep America away from the continent. Then as they suffered defeat on land and sea they could make political promises. The United States and Britain were going to fall apart, and they could quote confidently any number of statements and news reports on that score. It turned out that the Americans and British so far as the war is concerned, became the most harmonious partnership of allies that a great war has ever produced.

So the next promise was that the Anglo-Americans would never come to an agreement with the Soviet Union, and here again plenty of statements and news reports were available to prove that case to the hilt. But the Moscow and Teheran Conferences demonstrated that the three major allies are forming a team. In the satellite capitals this must have appeared astonishing, but it was true. So the final great political hope could be held out, one that Hitler had banked on from the beginning, that the United States would be unable to fight the war because America would be unable to maintain internal unity. This argument could be supported by fact after fact. There was the rising conflict in the United States, where the Roosevelt administration had lost the support of the majority in Congress. Then came the rising tide of strikes, which reached the first crest with the coal strike. The Government had to seize the mines. And this was followed by the threatened rail and steel strikes. This time the Government seized the railroads, but not through a civil agency. The Army itself took over the roads. Things like that looked liked preludes to revolution. America, the hope of the Allies, was fulfilling the predictions of Hitler; so it could be represented reasonably in those satellite capitals. America was going to pieces. That would be accepted by the pro-Germans in the satellite lands as a fact, and it would look like a fact, even to those not so pro-German. Hadn't they better wait and see? Perhaps Germany could hold out to a stalemate. The leaders in satellite countries would weigh their decision in these terms.

You will perhaps recognize in this analysis the thinking of any responsible Allied war leader watching events in the Balkans. He would see the satellite countries wavering on the brink of decision. If the decision to desert the Axis should come soon the Balkans would then be open to the Allied armies, and Germany would be seriously and probably fatally affected. The war would be shortened. That would bring the ultimate victory at a much smaller expenditure of lives. It would save perhaps hundreds of thousands of American lives. But if the open discord of American life should be misjudged in the satellite countries and be accepted as proof that the United States is on the verge of a break-down, then the war would be prolonged, and the lives lost which greater national unity might have saved. I have given the analysis at some length. I believe it states more accurately what was in the mind of the high military personage quoted recently than some of the reports of what he said in his now famous off-the-record conference. He did not speak about an uprising in Germany itself, he talked primarily about the satellite countries. And he did not point an accusing finger at labor as such. He pointed to a condition in the United States. This condition is one that can affect the length of the war.

Assuming, as everyone is doing, that the high military personage was General Marshall this should be clear, General Marshall is not a politician, nor that special phenomenon, a statesman. He is first, last, and always a soldier, probably one of the great soldiers of all time. As soldier and Chief of Staff, he is responsible for victory, and he is responsible for human lives, more immediately responsible for more of them than any man in our history.

As a soldier he would speak of what a soldier puts first, victory and human lives. And as a soldier, he would not point a finger of accusation against this or that element or faction or party or group in the United States, but would give his analysis in terms of victory and human lives. Whether or not it is appropriate for a soldier to do this, and to have his views communicated to the country, is not much to dispute about. For the Nation, too, is concerned with victory and human lives. Whether it would have been better to have spoken openly, so that only his own words and views were communicated, and had the authority of his name and position and world reputation, is another matter. It happens that what he said has been widely and unfortunately misinterpreted. It has been accepted as an attack on labor, and not as a vivid and sincere analysis of the

effect of the condition in the United States on the length of the war.

Labor, certainly, is an element in that condition. But th speaker was not analyzing the elements in the condition. He was analyzing the war, and the satellite countries in particular. He was talking in terms of human lives. And he was, in effect, pleading that the men responsible for behavior on the home front, think in terms of human lives. He was pleading, in effect, that the home front join the war, the war he knows about, where victory is calculable, where months make the difference of hundreds of thousands of American lives. If his plea is heard in those terms it might have great consequences. For it would bring this country up with a start to consider the cost of conducting public affairs in wartime with the extravagance and license common to their conduct in times of peace.

Here I may be permitted to repeat some thoughts presented before in these broadcasts. The condition of America is not one to be diagnosed glibly. It isn't all the fault of labor, for labor made its pledge not to strike on the undertaking of the administration and of Congress to hold the price level. The price level has not been held, partly because the methods of the administration were inadequate, partly because Congress has changed its course and just before the recess was on the point of giving up control of certain prices altogether.

Nor is the only trouble that the administration is unwilling to crack down on labor, and anyone who says it is should think it through, and define just what are at the disposal of the administration—an antistrike law was passed to provide the powers. But it was so drafted that it actually legalized some kinds of strikes, and its enforcement machinery was utterly impracticable. Far better would have been the passage, long ago, of a national service act, in which civilians voluntarily imposed on themselves the same duties of service as they demanded of soldiers. But that was avoided, because in the early stages of the war, many thought we could manage home affairs better with voluntary methods, even though we didn't trust to fighting the war with volunteers alone. Nor is the fault only with Congress. As I have said before, Congress is and must be the cockpit where special interests seek their own advancement. There is no single fault to segregate. There is no culprit, no one to beat down and punish so that the rest of us can get back to prosecuting the war. The American way, the democratic way, is one of inherent confusion. And this year the American way brings us to a Presidential election, and asks of us to unite to fight a war abroad while we all busily fight each other at home.

The answer, obviously, is not that democracy should be suspended, and that we turn totalitarian so as to win a war against totalitarians. Nor would it be less than a calamity for our democracy if the remarks attributed to General Marshall should be twisted and deformed in such a way as to bring a deep and lasting cleavage between the armed forces and organized labor. We have amazed the world with our production record, which the men in the Army should appreciate best of all. But the basic problems remain to be solved. Is the price level to be abandoned? And if it is, is labor to be expected to lose purchasing power? Are the efforts to knock out the teeth from the renegotiation of war contracts going to succeed, and give us a glut of war profits? Or are we capable of returning to the concept, once vivid but now almost forgotten, of fighting the war with equal sacrifice for all? The whole tenor of our public life is now keyed to the sharp conflict of group against group for special advantage. And many eyes are fixed on how this will affect, not the war but the outcome of the election. I repeat, there is nothing reprehensible or blameworthy in this. It is the normal democratic way. Only this is not a normal time. And the danger to the United States is often disregarded, doubted or even denied.

Now, over the clamor and discord of the national scene, is heard the voice of a soldier, who has said, simply and truthfully, disunity costs lives, maybe hundreds of thousands of American lives. He asks the Nation to weigh what it does in terms of lives, to measure the latitude it permits itself by taking account of the cost in lives. For a war is being fought, not the war of wages and prices, or of farmers and industrial workers, or of wages and profits, or over the incumbent in the White House next year, but a war of national survival to which the lives of the Nation's best young men have been dedicated. This soldier has spoken movingly since these lives are his unique responsibility. And in speaking, he has offered the Nation a yardstick with which to measure its action in this fateful year of 1944.

Lend-Lease: The Accounting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me I insert a very interesting and intelligent résumé of the work of the Lend-Lease Administration under the direction of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius. This report is by Mr. Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Washington Post of January 11, 1944, which I find exceptionally informative and a reading of which I feel should serve to quiet those Members who have been attacking the administration and effect of the Lend-Lease Act. The article is as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

LEND-LEASE: THE ACCOUNTING

Mr. Stettinius has done as much and perhaps more than any man in Washington to show how to set up a war agency and how to conduct it without bureaucratic feuds and without obscurity and confusion. An essential element of his success in administering lend-lease has been that he and his small but exceptionally competent staff have always known what they were doing and have not only been ready to tell but have insisted upon telling Congress what they were doing and why they were doing it. Much will be said by historians about the contribution of lend-lease to the defense of the United States and to the Allied victory. A good deal should also be said about how the manner and spirit of the Stettinius administration earned and held the confidence of Congress.

We now have beside the official reports and the testimony before the committees, a very readable and engaging book on lend-lease by Mr. Stettinius himself. It is a personal report to the Nation made at a time when lend-lease is a going concern, and it must be read by all who wish to discuss the problems of lend-lease which lie ahead of us.

Lend-lease was authorized by Congress in the winter of 1941. At that time Great Britain stood alone against Germany. The fall of Britain would have given Germany the mastery of the continents of Europe and Africa, and of the whole shore line, of the sea and air bases, facing North and South America, and of the arsenals and shipyards and aircraft plants of all of Europe. At that same time China stood alone against Japan; the collapse and capitulation of China would have given Japan a vast and well-nigh impregnable base on the mainland of Asia from which to expand her aggression in the Pacific. At that time the United States had a one-ocean and not very modern navy and almost no air force, a minute army, no well-defended outposts in Alaska, the Philippines, Guam, or in South America, and the United States had for modern warfare virtually no war industry.

These were the conditions under which lend-lease aid to Britain and China was in literal truth an indispensable measure "to promote the defense of the United States." No one will ever be able to say whether without this pledge of support from Congress it would have been possible for Britain and China to hold on. But we can measure the importance of their holding on when we realize that only now—3 years after the adoption of lend-lease—do we have a Navy, an Air Force, an Army, a merchant marine, and a war industry, adequate to play a deciding part in the war against our enemies. And even now, when we are fully mobilized after 3 years of prodigious effort, what would be the prospect if our allies had been defeated, and we stood alone?

If there are any who still ask themselves why could we not have let the Japanese conquer China and the oil and rubber lands of the South Pacific, and Australia—and why could we not let the Nazis conquer the British Isles and France and the Atlantic coast of Africa, and get control of the Portuguese and Spanish islands in the Atlantic—if there are any who still ask these questions, let them consider what would be the position of the United States if it stood alone between the Japanese-German Alliance in the two oceans. How big a navy and air force and army would we have needed in order to defend Alaska, Hawaii, the great bulge of Brazil, the approaches to the Panama Canal, and our own coastal shipping?

And for how long a time would we have had to stand guard, fully mobilized and armed to the teeth, in order to make reasonably sure we would not be attacked, as we were at Pearl Harbor, and attacked in both oceans at once? What promises could we have obtained from Hitler and Tojo that they would not perpetrate several Pearl Harbors? And if we could have gotten no promises that we dared to rely upon, as indeed we could not have, then we could never have demobilized and we would have had to live as an armed camp and a threatened fortress forever on the alert.

These are the reasons why, being unarmed and altogether unprepared for war in 1941, we had to invent the device of lend-lease. We could have avoided it only if in the 20 years preceding the war we had maintained our armaments, had fortified our strategic outposts, and had been willing to take combined action with other nations to resist aggression when it first appeared and while it was still not tremendously formidable. Lend-lease was the means by which we saved ourselves from the worst consequences of our mistakes. With it we reinforced the ramparts that were manned by the British, the Chinese, the Russians, the Fighting French, and our other allies and behind those ramparts we have had 3 years time to gather our forces.

Measured by the results the cost of lend-least has been a trifle. Between March 11, 1941, when lend-lease became law and November 30, 1943, the last date for which figures are available, the cost of lend-lease has been 13.5 percent, or less than one-seventh, of our war expenditures. In fact these figures do not convey the full truth. For if we had not lend-lease, and if we had lost our allies, or even if they had been so weakened that they could not take the offensive, the war would certainly have been longer than it is going to be, and our expenditures,

great as they are, would have had to be infinitely greater.

The details of the lend-lease operations and the settlements after the war ends have to be examined in this true perspective. If they are, the American people will never consent to having this great enterprise, which has served them so well in their most perilous hour, made the object of carping criticism and of a higgler's bargain.

Lend-lease was devised to defend the Republic. They will wish the settlements to be made by men who seek above all to heal the wounds of war and to restore confidence, good will, and tranquillity to this suffering planet.

Our Fighting Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of a very comprehensive address delivered by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the subject of the United States Navy.

The address, delivered before the City Club of Boston, follows:

As we reach the end of this year of 1943, we have already entered into our third year of participation in this war. In speaking of the United States Navy on this occasion, I wish to preface my remarks by saying that we begin this third year of war in a better position and with far better prospects for victory than on any date since December 7, 1941. And, conversely, our enemies are in so much worse a position that in 2 short years they have changed their tune to their home folk from exultant boast to worried apology. As Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox said in his Christmas message to the uniformed personnel of the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, standing their watches at battle stations on all the oceans of the world, "1944 will be the big year of this war."

As we prepare to welcome in the new year, we are just now beginning to see the outlines of the whole picture of this world conflict. We are beginning to see in much clearer detail the size of the job which is ahead of us and we are able to look at the equipment and resources which are available to our hands. I can tell you in all sincerity that we are now reaching the stage where the task ahead of us no longer dwarfs the size and the power of our ability to accomplish this task. The United States and our allies of the United Nations have at last grown to the strength necessary and more than necessary to perform the job that lies ahead of us.

To give you a clearer idea of what I mean, and speaking from the standpoint of the Navy alone, let me show you some statistical pictures of our present strength and of the strength we expect to reach within the coming months. At the end of this year the United States Navy was the biggest in all its history. But this is only the beginning.

Since June 1940 the Navy has been granted authorization by Congress for expenditure in the amount of $94,000,000,000, including defense air funds.

By the end of 1944 the Navy will have the unprecedented number of 41,179 vessels of various types and sizes, as compared with its strength at the end of 1939 of 1,091 vessels. In September 1939 the Navy's shipbuilding program planned construction of 17 combatant vessels. Today this ship construction totals into the thousands. During the First World War this country had a slogan which told of a production goal which aimed at a ship a day. During the year 1944 the Government and private shipyards will deliver combatant vessels to the Navy at the rate of 3 ships a day—and in this figure I do not include small landing craft and auxiliary vessels. In fact, I can now announce to you, and I believe that this is the first time the announcement has been made, that within the coming month of January 1944 the Navy will have completed its projected 2-ocean fleet a full 2 years ahead of schedule. In short, the Navy is now using in battle and in fleet operations many ships which were not supposed to have been delivered until 1946 and 1947.

By the end of 1944 our combatant ship strength will be close to equal that of all the rest of the world combined.

Our naval shipbuilders have been turning out well over one-half million tons a month, a monthly rate which is almost twice the annual rate of 3 years ago. There are directly engaged in building our Navy vessels about 770,000 men at the present time, which compares with 127,000 in 1940. Besides these, in subsidiary manufacturing plants there are over 2,000,000 men contributing to the construction of these ships, a total of about 3,000,000 men responsible for major feats of construction, and who have set records never equaled before. For example, a destroyer escort is now launched less than 5 days after the keel is laid, and this same vessel is delivered into service 25 days after the keel is laid. It requires more man-hours to do this work now than it did to construct a destroyer in World War No. 1. The record for those destroyers was 45½ days. On the average the building times have been shortened almost 50 percent. Today we are delivering each quarter year about the same dollar value of naval vessels as comprised the entire naval shipbuilding program of the period from 1916 to 1922. Speed is a requisite of war production. The ultimate measure of the success of any war program, and in relation to a shipbuilding program is the number of new vessels complete and ready for action, which are turned out. No naval construction program of comparable size and speed has ever been accomplished by any other nation.

The picture in Naval aviation is even brighter than the one presented by ship production. In fact, production of naval aircraft presents one of the brightest pictures in the entire war effort of this Nation. The number of aircraft under procurement for the Navy has been 82,000. At present the Navy is taking delivery of more than 2,000 planes a month, and this figure is still going up. The training program of naval aviation is at present turning out 30,000 pilots and more than 100,000 enlisted men. As a figure of speech, I might add that these training totals are also going up and at a proportionate rate almost equal to the number of Japanese planes which are going down in combat.

The over-all personnel picture for the naval service is likewise bright. At the current rate, the Navy, during each 3 months, turns out from its training schools as many men as were in the entire Navy in 1939. The personnel in 1940 was approximately 155,000 officers and men; it is now 2,400,000; it will be 3,000,000. In this respect, let me repeat to you the assurances handed me by the Navy that at present our fighting forces afloat are faced by no manpower problem which cannot be surmounted. From the standpoint of discipline and morale, conditions are the best in the Navy's entire history. I think every American citizen today can be proud of the Navy as a tightly organized, hard working and hard fighting outfit, which asks only that it be given a chance to meet the enemy face to face.

As is true with many other phases of our war production, the Navy's output of combat ships, equipment, and material will reach its all-time peak in the first quarter of the coming year, and it will level off at this all-time high. This is the clearest of all indications that our fighting services afloat are now receiving the tools they need, and in the right number. Despite the leveling off of production, the year 1944 will again see all previous records broken. The reason for this, of course, is the fact that the leveling off process will take place at the very highest production average.

In addition, however, to our own bright prospects from the standpoint of manpower, training and naval production, there is every likelihood that the coming year might and possibly will see an addition to our forces in the Pacific as a result of successful changes in the European picture. I do not mean to stand here and tell you that Germany will not last through another year of war. It is not the part of overoptimism, however, to count on such a happy event as a very likely possibility. It is no secret to tell you that such an outcome is one of our principal aims and one of the goals toward which the combined forces of the United Nations are working with all their might.

We must keep in mind that in the last war the primary task of the Navy was transporting an army overseas, supplying it, and guarding the lines of communications to one theater. In this war we are guarding the lines of communication on both coasts, through the Caribbean, about the Canal, to South America, Alaska, Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand; we are protecting the life line to England; landing and supporting military operations to Africa, Sicily, Naples, and those that will support the third and the fourth fronts. The submarine menace has been brought under control by increased service and air strength both on the coast and in the convoys.

We must keep in mind that besides doing these things the primary theater for the Navy is in the Pacific, where its task, in brief, is to get at the Japanese and destroy them. The Navy and the Marine Corps got off the ground at Pearl Harbor and by pluck and determination fought the Japanese to a standstill and are turning him around. Our boys now hold the initiative in the Pacific and have the necessary superiority to continue the offensive. The Japanese are being driven back toward Japan. Our position improves almost daily. By the end of the summer the Navy should force the Japanese Fleet to fight it out or return to home waters; and whatever it is to be, soon thereafter the home islands of Japan will feel the might and the lash of the American Fleet and its air force.

The next 12 months will see the greatest number of fighting ships enter the struggle of any like period of the war.

Upon the collapse of the Axis forces in Europe it is reasonable to expect that our forces in the Pacific will be strengthened by a very comfortable percentage. In witness of this fact let me quote you two excerpts from a speech made by Prime Minister Churchill in London on June 30, 1943. Mr. Churchill said, in speaking of the over-all picture—and I quote: "We, the United Nations, demand from the Nazis, Fascist, and Japanese tyrannies unconditional surrender. By that we mean that their will power to resist must be completely broken and that they must yield themselves absolutely to our justice and mercy. It also means that we must take all those farsighted measures which are necessary to prevent the world from being again convulsed and wrecked and blackened by their calculated plots and ferocious aggression."

But he used even stronger words than that in speaking of the Japanese enemy. Addressing the London Guildhall, he said these

words: "I stand here to tell you today, as I told the Congress of the United States in your name, that every man, every ship, and every aeroplane in the King's service that can be moved to the Pacific will be sent and will be there maintained in action by the peoples of the British Commonwealth and Empire in priority over all other interests for as many flaming years as are needed to make the Japanese in their turn submit or bite the dust."

But let us consider the possibility that Hitler will still be fighting at the end of 1944. Should this possibility prove to be a fact, there is still no comfort to be found therein by the Japanese Empire. Just recently we learned that the German Fleet had been severely whittled down in a gallant action off the tip of Norway. It is reasonable to assume that this whittling-down process will continue as long as Hitler dares risk a unit of his disappearing sea forces in action against the combined American and British Navies. And, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that before the end of 1944, certain fleet units now operating in Atlantic waters might be freed for action in the Pacific. Whether this comes to pass or not we stand on the definite certainty that the vastly increased forces of our own fleet will be sent to the Pacific area as fast as they are commissioned and available for combat.

I think it is no secret to any of us when I predict that the coming year will see the fleet units of the Land of the Rising Sun experience one or more Pearl Harbors in reverse. Our Navy today has the strength to unleash these attacks on the Japanese enemy. Our Navy has the ships, the guns, the planes and the men. Our Navy has the determination—our Navy has plenty of plain American guts. Just when it will come, I cannot tell you, nor would I venture to predict what our own losses might be. But I do feel it is safe for me to ask you to keep a watch on the headlines in the days and weeks and months to come. Sooner or later I assure you that you will see big black headlines which will make very black news in Japan.

Within the last few months our fighting naval forces in the Pacific have encountered the utmost difficulty in finding Japanese surface units which were willing to offer a battle. This condition cannot last forever. As the Japanese are slowly pushed backward and as their outer perimeter of defense is made smaller, they will sooner or later have to risk their major combat units against our own forces. I am confident, and I think you are confident, of the outcome of such a battle. Our Navy has prepared for it, is ready for it and earnestly hopes to bring it about.

We all know, of course, that the war in the Pacific is principally an amphibious one. In this connection, the Congress has recently authorized and approved the construction of some 80,000 landing craft. The production emphasis has now been placed on the completion of these vitally necessary vessels. That the Navy has asked for this type of ship and in such a vast number, is very clear evidence that our combined Army and Navy forces in the Pacific expect and intend to move steadily forward into territory now held by the Japanese enemy. Just how or when these landing craft will be used is not for us to say. We know that the Japanese will find out in due time—and much to their sorrow.

In all the Navy's accomplishments in this war, however, there is one shining achievement which stands out above all others. That is the welding together of our Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps into a single, compact, tight-fighting unit in which the spirit is "one for all and all for one." This spirit of unity, I might point out, also extends to those Army units which are working with the naval forces in the Pacific warfare.

The American people should be proudest of all of the spirit of the men in our Nation's naval service. This spirit and this morale have never been higher. Examples of individual heroism are of such character and in such astounding number that the job of future historians will be amazingly complicated when these historians come to write the story of this war. In our Navy so many men have done so much that the record of their achievement and courage and self-sacrifice is beyond belief. You and I are fortunate in having as the defenders of our Nation and our national honor, such men as today go to make up the rank and file of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps. We have seen them in action, and we know that they have no superior anywhere in this world. They are Americans all. They will take us through to victory. May God bless them and crown their efforts with the success which is their due.

Grants of Land in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I introduced a bill, H. R. 3920, providing for two very modest grants of lands in the State of New Mexico. One is for a State institution known as the Carrie Tingley Crippled Children's Hospital, at Hot Springs, N. Mex., and the other is for vocational trade schools.

Before discussing these two proposed grants, let me say that the people of my State have been and will ever be grateful for the generous, far-sighted, and conservative manner in which the Congress has handled the disposition of lands acquired when that territory came under our flag almost a century ago.

Within the boundaries of the State there are 78,422,815 acres of land. In early days, most of it was unappropriated because the early Spanish-speaking settlers, who had been there for several centuries, were unacquisitive, pastoral people who asked for nothing more than a small patch of ground on which to live and a few acres on which to graze their stock.

Prior to and at the time New Mexico was admitted as a State, the Congress set aside a portion of these lands for common school purposes. In addition, it set aside to the State, in trust, a little over 2,000,000 acres for the benefit of certain then known institutions and purposes. The Congress reserved, however, and the Government now owns, approximately 26,000,000 acres in my State. The Congress wisely reserved these lands for future disposition, anticipating not only the Government's own interest in locating and setting aside national forest reserves and national parks and monuments, but also, no doubt, the future needs of this young and quite undeveloped State.

The Federal Government, by now, has selected and set aside a little over 10,000,000 acres for national forest reserves and national parks and monuments, leaving a balance of approximately 16,000,000 acres of public domain not homesteaded or otherwise appropriated and which it still holds. The people of the State are now asking for two modest additional grants of 225,000 acres each, out of these holdings.

As I have stated, a little over 2,000,000 acres were set aside for various institutions of the State, including, among others, the State university and other schools and colleges; an insane asylum; schools for the deaf, dumb, and blind; and a hospital for old miners. We did not then have a hospital for children.

It was not until 1937 that such an institution came into being. Within its limited capacity it has done work of immeasurable value to the State. It is a wholly State-owned hospital supported by public funds. It was, no doubt, in anticipation of such additional institutions which would need stimulation through land grants that the Federal Government reserved and has withheld from homestead entry such a large portion of the public domain.

With the large amount of property taken from the tax rolls through Federal acquisitions of land for Government use in late years, the State is finding it more and more difficult to provide sufficient funds for this and similar public purposes.

The people of the State, particularly northern New Mexico, have for some years been asking for trade schools—permanent institutions which will train the youth of that area to be useful, self-supporting citizens.

I have, heretofore, referred to the Spanish-speaking people who were settled in the territory at the time of its acquisition. They continued to live along the banks of the Rio Grande and other small streams and to eke out a bare living from their small holdings. In the course of a century, they have multiplied until their land is insufficient for their barest needs. A ray of hope was seen when, through national agencies, trade education was encouraged and brought within the reach of some.

This fine start should be expanded, particularly through any encouragement that can be given to the State to establish permanent trade schools.

With a small grant which will make possible the creation of one or two trade schools in the more populated areas, implemented by State appropriations, we will have taken a step forward which should have been taken many, many years ago.

Those good people, hedged in on very small holdings, starting life under a handicap by reason of inadequate familiarity with the language of the country and unable to compete with the industrial life of those who have followed from other States, come before you asking only that some of the land which once surrounded them and which would have provided for their increase, be set aside to their State in trust and on condition that the proceeds thereof be used for trade schools. It is a modest request, which, as their Representative, I place before the Congress.

Uniform Federal Ballot for Voting by Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent, which I have received, I am presenting for printing in the RECORD a statement embodying a resolution by a group of religious, civic, and labor organizations advocating legislation to provide for a uniform Federal ballot to facilitate voting by the members of the armed forces, together with the names of the organizations, which were represented at the meeting, which had been called by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and myself. I am also presenting for inclusion in the RECORD report of a survey made by the National Opinion Research Center on this all-important question and which demonstrates the fact that public sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of immediate action on the part of Congress to enable our servicemen to exercise the franchise:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY GROUP OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE QUESTION OF SOLDIER VOTING

We, the representatives of undersigned organizations, wish to take a firm stand in favor of the soldier vote. We will back and work for legislation which guarantees our fighting forces a simple, uniform Federal ballot. We insist upon a Federal ballot, because it is obvious that this is the only method by which our service men and women are going to be able to cast effective votes in the crucial 1944 elections. It is our conviction that the issues of constitutionality and States' rights which have been raised against the Federal ballot for soldiers voting in Federal elections are misleading issues. The American people have a strongly felt moral obligation to those who are fighting for them. Of prime importance is the moral obligation to guarantee our soldiers and sailors the right of the ballot.

The following organizations concurred: Railway Labor Executives Association; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers; Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; Brotherhood of Railway Conductors; Methodist Women's Division; Women's Trade Union League; Women's Auxiliaries of C. I. O.; National Council of Negro Women; The Farmers' Union; The Lawyers' Guild; American Federation of Labor; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers; International Association of Machinists; Hotel and Restaurant Employees Alliance; Regular Veterans Association; Congress of Industrial Organizations; United Automoble Workers; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers; United Steel Workers; C. I. O. Maritime Committee; International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

The following organizations sent observers: National Catholic Welfare Conference; Disabled American Veterans of World War; National Grange.

PUBLIC FAVORS BY 2 TO 1 FEDERAL HANDLING OF SOLDIER VOTE—OVERSEAS VOTING POSSIBLE, SAY 3 OUT OF 4 AMERICANS

DENVER, January 7, 1944.—By a preference of 2 to 1, the public favors Federal rather than State responsibility for soldier balloting in the elections next November, according to last-minute results of a Nation-wide spot-check survey by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver.

More than 9 out of every 10 Americans in all walks of life believe that men and women in the armed forces should be able to vote in the coming Presidential election, and more than 7 out of 10 think that voting can be made possible for most men in the armed forces overseas and on shipboard.

Of the questions National Opinion Research Center asked on the subject of the soldier vote, the most significant read:

"Which one of these two plans, to give men and women in the armed forces a chance to vote in the coming Presidential election, do you prefer?

	Percent
"1. To pass a Federal law providing for the Army and Navy to give ballots to all men and women over 21 in the armed forces	58
"2. To have each State send ballots to men and women over 21 in the armed forces who will be eligible to vote under the laws of their States	30
"Undecided	7
"Armed forces overseas should not vote	5
"Total	100"

When this same issue was presented in different words, the results were almost identical:

"Which do you think should be in charge of seeing that men overseas are given a chance to vote in the coming Presidential election, the Federal or the State Government?

	Percent
"Federal	57
"State	26
"Undecided	12
"Armed forces overseas should not vote	5
"Total	100"

Persons favoring Federal handling of the soldier vote stress the greater efficiency and uniformity obtainable under this method, and the fact that any matter concerning the armed forces is a Federal rather than a State responsibility. As one executive put it: "The Federal Government has the facilities for unifying it. Otherwise there would be 48 different ways of handling it."

Those who favor State supervision of balloting say they fear that under Federal control of soldier voting States' rights would be ignored and State eligibility regulations disregarded. A Pennsylvania farmer feels that "the Federal Government has enough responsibility. Each State has its own laws such as residential time of living in a said district and if taxes aren't paid they can't vote."

FIVE PERCENT THINK SOLDIERS SHOULD NOT VOTE

Before asking the above questions, N. O. R. C. ascertained how people feel about soldiers' voting by asking:

"Do you think that men and women over 21 in the armed forces who are stationed outside of this country should be able to vote in the Presidential election next November, or don't you think they should?

	Percent
"Yes, should	92
"No, should not	5
"Undecided	3
"Total	100"

The main reasons given by those against soldiers' voting is that they "won't know the men who are running" or that "they cannot be reached."

The 95 percent who either think the armed forces overseas should vote or are undecided were asked this direct question:

"Do you think it can be made possible for most men in the armed forces overseas and on ships to vote in the Presidential election next November?

	Percent
"Yes	75
"No	11
"Undecided	9
"Total	95"

Thus it would seem that if the majority of the American people had their way all service men and women would be given an opportunity to vote in the coming Presidential election and the Federal Government would shoulder the responsibility for seeing that it is done.

This scientific survey by the National Opinion Research Center sampled a typical miniature of the population of the United States, with the proper proportion, in each geographical section, of rich and poor, young and old, men and women, Democrats, Republicans, and nonvoters.

The National Opinion Research Center is an opinion-finding organization. As such, it simply reports the results of national surveys made by its personally trained staff of over 200 interviewers throughout the United States. The center is an academic institution working under a grant from the Field Foundation and the University of Denver.

A spot-check survey is conducted by the center's regular personally trained interviewing staff throughout the United States. It consists, however, of fewer interviews than N. O. R. C.'s regular surveys. This survey includes 478 interviews. Statistically these are sufficient to be within 6-percent correct, 99 times in 100, on all questions reported in this release.

Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me recently to my constituents:

DEAR FRIENDS: Every American should know all about his flag. Therefore, I am sending you the United States Marine Corps Flag Book which I hope will be of interest.

I firmly believe Old Glory is the most beautiful significant emblem of freedom the world has ever known.

The Stars and Stripes must wave forever unchanged over the land of the free and the home of the brave. To this end, I promise you my constant effort in Washington.

Remember also, that I am able to help you with a lot of problems these dark days. Is your boy in the service well? Have you heard from your husband lately?

Have you received allotments yet for you and your children? Their daddy will fight harder if he knows they are taken care of. Your little ones must eat.

Write me any time. Let me know what I can do to lift the heavy burdens you carry on your shoulders and in your hearts.

Hoping for early victory and wishing you the best, I remain,

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Address Before Republican National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Republican National Committee on January 10, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Republican National Committee, State chairmen and vice chairman, fellow Republicans, and friends of the radio audience, I stand humbly before you tonight as successor to Congressman J. William Ditter in the chairmanship of the National Republican Congressional Committee. In the tragic death of Bill Ditter the party and the Nation lost an upright gentleman, a sagacious leader, and a great patriot. I pledge you that, so far as in me lies, I will carry on the task which he advanced with such distinction and success.

It will be my specific task to elect Republican Congressmen in 1944. I am charged with the duty of increasing the number of Republican Congressmen from the present robust 208 to a point where we will have an imposing majority. It is my duty to search for facts, not to encourage with baseless optimism. So when I say to you tonight that after the elections of 1944 we shall have a Republican House of Representatives I am telling you only what competent study of our national situation has convinced me is the fact.

In the years of New Deal dominance Congress sank to its lowest point in the estimation of the American people. It ceased to be an independent legislative body and became a mere "rubber stamp" in the hands of the President and his untrustworthy advisers. Congress ceased to represent the people of the United States. It became a mere subservient, enacting committee for the New Deal administration.

Seated in the House were only 89 Republicans, fighting valiantly but vainly. Today there are 208 Republicans in the House, and a sturdy and capable company of United States Senators, fighting just as valiantly, but no longer fighting a hopeless battle. I am proud of our Republicans in Congress even as the country is justifiably proud of them. Congress has reestablished itself in the trust of the American people. Joined with a few real Democrats, the Republican leadership in Congress has been independent, vigorous, constructive. It has erected itself as a strong rampart between the freeman, the free American, and those who would make him the mere subject of a state, burdened by bureaucracy and punished by reckless prodigality—a state which would no longer be the Republic of our forefathers, a state which would be something new and strange, a welter of regimentation, totalitarianism, dictatorship, and spurious socialism. Between the American people and this unholy intention your Republicans in Congress have stood firm and determined. They have given you a preview of the kind of government you may expect when Republican leadership has been established from top to bottom.

I say to you that America may well be proud of its Congress, reborn and reestablished under decent, able, courageous Republican leadership.

But it is not enough to win the House of Representatives. It is not enough to win the Senate. This country cannot move forward into an enlightened, secure future until we have gone to the very root of the matter and shall have moved the New Deal with all its Palace Guard out of the White House, and have installed in the people's mansion a man, a Republican, whose voice shall be the voice of the people, whose will shall be the will of the people, and whose administration shall be carried out inside the framework of the Constitution, not outside the Constitution as though it were some unnecessary fence hampering his personal ambitions and whims.

Only when the occupant of the White House shall once more be such a man can this country lift up its back-breaking burdens and face the future with reasonable confidence that it can win through this welter of danger, debt, oppression, uncertainty, and incompetence to the solid ground of a safe, secure, and serene future.

First, before any other consideration of any nature, we must enter the approaching political campaign with cold, grim determination to win this war, and to win it quickly. We must demonstrate to the people of America that the minute to change horses in the middle of a stream is that moment when the new horse can cross the stream more quickly, more efficiently, and without spilling its burden.

I believe with all my heart and mind that a Republican success next November will result in such an acceleration of our war effort, abroad and at home, that victory, the thing for which we all yearn, will be brought nearer to us by months if not by years.

The making of war is a matter best left to men who have been trained in the art of war. On the military fronts, we have been making war splendidly. We have, with miraculous speed and under the ablest military leadership in all history, brought our Army, our Navy, our Air Forces to a point of efficiency where they are the wonder of the world. The Republican Party, the Republican Congress, the Republican President, would see to it that this great leadership would neither be hampered nor altered. George Marshall is an American general, not the general of any political party. General Eisenhower is an American general, not a party general. MacArthur belongs to every American. Our admirals, King and Halsey, were trained and put there by the Nation and belong to the Nation. The Republican Party guarantees to the country that these irreplaceable men shall continue; that the war shall be fought under their skill and under their command. This is a matter above and beyond all politics.

But the Republican Party guarantees more than that. It guarantees that these military leaders shall receive from the home front such support and aid as they never have had before—such support and aid as could never be given them, and has not been given them, by a New Deal, ridden by bureaucracy, honeycombed with incompetence, made inefficient by swarms of social termites who see in the war only an opportunity to advance the day when their impractical notions, their alien intentions, shall be made the law of the land. The Republican Party will see to it that this war is fought as a military and not as a political campaign.

It will bring to bear the full productive genius of our people. It will foster decent industry instead of hamstringing it. It will give every man, every machine, every factory a chance to do his or its share. It will see to it that every laborer, every artisan, every farmer, every miner, every manufacturer, not only does his share, but receives his share in decent, reasonable, proper, and just consideration.

What every mother, every father, every wife, every child desires is a quick, an overwhelming victory over our enemies, and to get our boys back home as quickly as possible. It shall and will be the foremost purpose of the Republican Party to give them their heart's desire.

In this war America has made, is making, and will continue to make the greatest investment in all history. It is investing millions of its sons and billions of its dollars. It is investing its comfort and convenience. It is investing everything, ponderable and imponderable, that it possesses.

It is only right that the American people should realize on their investment. We propose to assure this realization.

The American people do not want a profit in lands to be conquered; they do not want a profit in spheres of influence, or in peoples to be exploited. They do want and will insist upon having a profit paid in the coin of lasting peace, in opportunity for each man to work out his own destiny under a free, republican form of government. They will insist that the things that forced America into this war shall not arise again. The return the American people demand upon their investment is that America shall again become American, shall continue, so long as time shall endure, to be American, the land of opportunity, the land of free enterprise, the land of individual initiative and economy. The return Americans demand is that once more they shall be free and independent with a future before them to use as their several abilities and qualifications shall make possible.

We have patriotically submitted to rationing, to regulations, to necessary, and even unnecessary regimentation. We will gladly submit to any device that will advance victory by a day. But we submit to this only that we may conquer a foreign enemy.

When peace shall come there must be assurance that the precious freedoms and rights that we have surrendered shall be returned to us. We must be given back our liberty. We must be freed of annoyances, of invasions of our privacy, of restrictions which cramp and hamper our lives. We must be relieved of spying and coercion, we must be allowed to work, to invest and to save without making out a bureaucratic blank for every move we make, every object we buy or sell, every breath we draw. We must again be permitted to run our grocery stores, our meat markets, our farms, our little enterprises and our big enterprises from which we hope to draw a decent living and a reasonable security. There must be an end to snooping into our ice boxes. We must have for recreation the hours we now spend in filling out forms. We must again live as God meant us to live and not as some bureaucrat in Washington thinks he would like us to live.

That is what the Republican Party means to you. The instant a restriction becomes unnecessary we will abolish it. The moment a right or a liberty can be returned to you, it shall be returned.

This is the solemn pledge of the Republican Party to every citizen: You shall again be free, living in a free country. This war shall not be used to deprive any man or

woman, permanently, of any right or privilege or freedom that properly should be his.

These things the Republican Party does not promise without giving you clear evidence of its intention and its ability. I have spoken of the accomplishments of Republicans in Congress.

Today we have 26 Governors of 26 of our sovereign States. We can do no better by way of guaranty of the future than to point to definite accomplishments in the recent past. In 26 States Republican administrations have established high records of efficiency, economy, statesmanship. These have been Republican accomplishments, inspired by Republican ideals, made facts by Republican efficiency. We have given proof of what we can do when entrusted with State governments. That is sure evidence of what we could do if entrusted with the National Government.

In a few years we have accomplished much. We have proven our good faith. We have demonstrated young, liberal, forward-looking, and yet sound principles and practices of government. We have proven ourselves in Massachusetts, in Connecticut, in New York, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Illinois, in Michigan, in Nebraska, in California, to mention but a fraction of the States where we have given proof.

There are words in the Book which I will quote to you because they bear upon this point:

"Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things."

It has been given to the Republican Party in recent years to be faithful over but a few things; increasingly has it been given the opportunity to be faithful over more things. In no instance has it failed. In every instance it has performed more than it has promised.

Therefore I say to you tonight that upon its record of administration, of accomplishment alone, the Republican Party is entitled to your respect, your confidence, your trust—and your votes.

The hope of a tranquil and secure, a happy and prosperous future for this land we love lies in the Republican Party. If you entrust it with the high duty of governing this land of ours it will not fail you.

Violation of War Labor Disputes Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, written by me to the Attorney General of the United States:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I desire to direct your personal attention to a flagrant violation of the criminal provisions of section 9 of the War Labor Disputes Act, commonly known as the Conally-Smith Act. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., in an article in the February 1944, issue of the American Magazine, outlines the objectives of the so-called C. I. O. Political Action Committee. The article is entitled "Labor's Political Aims," which aims are clearly indicated in the article as designated to influence, if not control, the national elections in 1944.

Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O. and author of the article, on page 28, makes this statement: "The various C. I. O. unions have made an initial contribution of $700,000."

Section 9 of the Connally-Smith Act makes it unlawful for any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, and provides that an officer of any labor organization who consents to any contribution by the organization shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

Mr. Murray is president of the C. I. O. The article is a defiant confession of the violation of the statute.

A number of other officers of the union are named in the article as parties actually engaged in carrying on the unlawful enterprise.

I respectfully request that you present the whole matter to a Federal grand jury forthwith, with a view to the indictment and prosecution of those engaged in this conspiracy to control the national elections of 1944.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

Protect Our Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

WHY CUT NEWSPRINT?

Because of the reduction in the production of newsprint paper due to the war all newspapers have had to cut down the size of their publications. For many months the Post-Tribune has published fewer pages than has been its habit and now for this year a further reduction has been made in the allowance of paper.

That means fewer pages of the Post-Tribune will be published in 1944 than in 1943. Newspapers have looked at the facts and accepted the conditions set by them. However a new problem has entered the picture and newspapers generally are wondering whether some interest other than the Nation's good is the determining factor in the newsprint field.

Last fall the Canadian paper mills estimated that during 1944 they could supply 182,000 tons of newsprint monthly to American customers (most of our newsprint is made in Canada). But on December 19 the Canadian suppliers announced that they would be able to furnish 200,000 tons a month.

However, the very next day, December 20, the War Production Board announced that American newspapers would be held to the use of 182,000 tons. Anything over would be put in a stock pile, W. P. B. said. But the stock pile idea was quickly given up when it was shown that newsprint could not be stock piled because of the numerous sizes of the rolls, the inadequate storage facilities, and the extra shipping involved.

Then the W. P. B. changed its tune and said the additional 18,000 tons a month would be used for war purposes. But the Associated Press was told in Montreal that paper for war purposes is made of chemical pulp and that ground wood pulp, the raw material of newsprint, could not be used.

But that isn't all the story. Standard newsprint, weighing 32 pounds, enters the country free of duty. Congress made the law, but the Treasury set the standard. But it has been determined recently that 30-pound newsprint and possibly 28 pound will run on the newspaper presses and turn out a readable journal.

By cutting down the weight of the paper more of it could be turned out with the pulp available but the Treasury refuses to change the standard. Newspapermen want to know why. The feeling is developing that someone in authority in Washington is trying to make the publication of newspapers as difficult as possible.

It is more likely that some small-sized bureaucrat is showing his authority. But whatever the reason the standard should be changed and the newspapers should be permitted to use whatever newsprint can be manufactured. There would be no sense in any other decision.

Transoceanic Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the position taken by aeronautical interests in friendly maritime nations toward the operation of air lines by their international shipping interests are of particular interest to Congress at the present time.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported H. R. 3420 which would freeze existing law so as to continue the severe handicap this places upon our own merchant marine through the interpretations which have heretofore been placed on the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This bill must be amended so as to eliminate that handicap.

Under the permission which has been granted to me to extend and revise my remarks, I include therein the following editorial which recently appeared in a British magazine, and I call the attention of Members of Congress to the unselfish attitude being taken by aviation interests of Great Britain in this matter. After pointing out that five leading shipping companies of Great Britain have combined their interests and applied for "consents and permits" to operate air lines between the United Kingdom, the Continent and South America, Flight, which represents itself as the "First Aero Weekly in the World," and which is published in London, England, goes on to editorialize in the following language:

Nor need there be any suspicion that the shipping companies want to control air transport for the purpose of killing a possible rival. They stand to gain much by using it as an ally. Heavy cargoes will always go by

sea, for speed seldom matters much in their case and cheapness of transport does. For passengers in a hurry, mails, and other urgent matter the transport of the future is undoubtedly by air. The vast, speedy liners of the past were a tremendous drain on the resources of the companies. Aircraft are 10 times as fast as any ship, and now offer quite as much comfort and luxury as is necessary. The future should lie with large, fast aircraft and steamers of moderate speed.

Yet one more advantage can be seen in the participation of shipping companies in air transport. Those companies may not as yet understand all about aircraft, but they can buy that knowledge. What they do understand is traffic, and how to make it pay. They have ample resources of capital, and great experience of transport as a subject, which some air-line operators have not always had. In fact, an alliance between aircraft and ships is a thing to be cordially welcomed by all who have the interests of air transport at heart.

Telegram of the President of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram to the President of the United States:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 6, 1944.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

At this fateful moment when Soviet troops are crossing the borders of allied Poland without offering a guaranty of her territorial integrity, I consider it my duty to declare that at this very moment the truthfulness of the Atlantic Charter is being verified. The Atlantic Charter affirmed that the United States will not recognize acts of violence. The Atlantic Charter was born of noble traditions established by many Presidents of our country, who strove to base international relations on morality. These traditions were gloriously maintained by you, Mr. President, when you signed on December 21, 1936, the Inter-American Declaration committing yourself and your successors to the principle that territorial changes effected through violence shall not be recognized in the Western Hemisphere. The extension of this principle through the Atlantic Charter, of which you are the coauthor, to embrace the whole world constituted an appeal to the peoples of Europe to continue resisting Germany and a pledge that their blood shall not have been shed in vain. Poland trustingly shed her blood most profusely. American acquiescence, in face of Soviet Russia's official confirmation of her decision to keep her share of the loot grabbed with Hitler, may be interpreted by the people of Europe and the Western Hemisphere as a sign of approval and coresponsibility of and for the acts of violence directed by Soviet dictatorship against Poland, the first member of the United Nations.

Yours most respectfully,
MAXIMILIAN F. WEGRZYNEK,
President, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent.

The Soldiers' Vote Bill—National Lawyers Guild Supports the Lucas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from the National Lawyers Guild:

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD,
New York, N. Y., January 7, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The issue primary to the soldiers' vote discussion is stated in the following words of Senator Green (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 22, 1943, p. 9790): "Basic to the institution of democracy is the right of qualified voters to participate in the election of their representatives to the Congress of the United States and in the election of their President and Vice President. The men and women who are most intimately engaged in this struggle should have an opportunity to exercise the right to vote which they are fighting to preserve. As individuals they deserve this opportunity. As a group, they constitute such a large part of the electorate that any national election in which they did not participate could hardly be called representative."

The objections which have been urged to the Lucas bill, are, in truth, directed to this issue. Although these objections take devious forms, being couched in terms of States' rights, it is now clear that they are intended to accomplish the result of disfranchising upward of 10,000,000 voters in the armed forces. It would be error not to understand this, and to suppose that the opposition does not consciously intend that disfranchisement. Examination of the reasons variously urged against the soldiers' vote bill will demonstrate their insubstantiality.

In 1942 the Congress overwhelmingly passed Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress (in the House the vote was 248–53, and in the Senate only 5 votes were counted against it). Section 2 of that law provided "no person in military service in time of war shall be required as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax, or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof." It provided as well that the requirements of registration should be dispensed with.

In practice this law was found so cumbersome of administration that only 28,000 votes of millions eligible were cast under it. Accordingly the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections undertook extensive revisions; it was finally determined that a new law should be drafted. It may be observed that the only formidable issue raised in debate was concerned with the features of the bill which were and are already law. This point is vividly realized in reading the splendid statement by Senator GLASS, of Virginia, issued on December 12. Precisely the same arguments which did not persuade the Congress last year found force in the current debate to defeat the bill in the Senate.

The principle most strongly relied upon was the alleged unconstitutionality of Federal interference with the prerogative of the States to determine the qualifications of voters. It should be observed that the proposed law does not affect age and residence requirements. The only respect in which the question arises is as to the requirements of registration and payment of poll taxes which, as has been observed, are already law.

The constitutional issue can be faced frankly. The proposed Lucas legislation is constitutional. Congress has not been troubled by such doubts in numerous other situations strictly analogous to this phase of the status of soldiers and sailors. Thus, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 1178; 50 U. S. C., sec. 51, App.), undertakes to protect them in the following ways:

1. Court action against them may be stayed until the completion of military service.
2. Statutes of limitations are tolled during military service.
3. Evictions of their families are prohibited.
4. Installment contracts into which they have entered are not to be treated as breached.
5. Mortgages upon their property may not be foreclosed.
6. Sale of their property to satisfy tax assessments is forbidden.

No serious challenge has been leveled against any of these provisions. And there is no basis for serious challenge of a federally administered soldiers and sailors' vote law. The Constitution expressly grants to the Congress power to regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives (art. I, sec. 4). The Lucas bill undertakes no more than that specifically assigned function. It specifies the time, place, and manner in which members of the armed forces, obliged to take arms against world fascism, may cast their ballots. Note may be taken of the amendment accepted in the Senate by proponents of the bill under which the ballot commission, to be composed of two members from each of the major parties, was made a purely ministerial body, with no duty other than to collect the votes and transmit them, unopened, to the local precincts in each State to be counted by local State officers.

The real States' rights argument is not directed against the new provisions of the bill; it is directed against the law already in existence, the sections which exempt soldiers from payment of the poll tax.

The States' rights attack is not founded in law or in good faith. The congressional opponents of the Lucas measure have two purposes in attempting to defeat the measure: (1) To preserve the privileged basis of voting in the South, and (2) cutting down the body of voters in the 1944 Presidential election. There is in truth, whether tacitly or by agreement, an unholy alliance between northern Republican and southern Democratic reaction seeking to employ the instrumentality of deprivation of suffrage as a method to destroy national unity.

Examination of the strong practical reasons which require Federal intervention to supply the mere mechanics of the vote for members of the armed forces will show how this unholy alliance expects to accomplish its purpose.

Senator AUSTIN said, during the course of debate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9817, Nov. 22, 1943): "We canvassed other ways, such as State legislation; that is, by having each State provide its own system; but that was found to be utterly futile. It would be necessary to have a session of the legislature of every State of the Union to enact such legislation, and then to consider reaching all the boys. They are not, as they used to be, gathered together in regiments by States. The famous Vermont regiment of former wars could be easily reached. Anyone in the State of Vermont knew where that regiment was all the time. In the old days ballots could have been delivered to that regiment for marking and casting. It cannot be done now. Our boys are scattered all over the world in all arms of the service. In the administration of 48 different laws we would have the greatest confusion in the world and

meet with utter futility. As a matter of fact, under the law as it is today—a statute which we ourselves enacted—only 28,000 votes out of millions were collected." This point was strongly emphasized by the statement of the Army given to the Senate committee:

"From an overseas point in the North African area to Springfield, Ill., 6 days by plane.

"From an overseas point in a European theater to Springfield, Ill., 11 days.

"From an overseas point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill., 13 days.

"From an overseas point in the Far East area to Springfield, Ill., 16 days.

"It is to be remembered, however, that the State absentee balloting procedure involves at least 3 carriages for each serviceman and in 14 States apparently 5 carriages. Thus the table becomes—

"Overseas point in North America area, 22 days.

"European theater, 37 days.

"Pacific theater, 43 days.

"Far East area, 52 days.

"In such States as require the use of a particular type of application form, and hence, five carriages, the times stated would be increased by at least 40 percent."

Reliance on State procedure contemplated by the Senate bill finally passed would mean, in effect, that the overwhelming majority of soldiers out of the country would not be able to vote. Difficult though it may be to draft a bill to permit soldiers and sailors to vote when away from home, the task must be accomplished. As Senator LUCAS observed on November 29 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10064): "We cannot take a chance on disfranchising 6,000,000 men in the most important election this country has held since the days of Abraham Lincoln." To which may be added the words of Senator AUSTIN on November 22 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9816): "In my opinion there is a binding obligation on me to extend to the soldier on the battle front the opportunity to exercise the vote for which he is giving his blood."

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT W. KENNY,
President.

MARTIN POPPER,
National Executive Secretary.

Government War-Contract Terminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recommendations of the Government War Contract Termination Committee and the board of directors of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce on Government war-contract terminations:

1. The departments and agencies of the Government should be granted legislative authority to negotiate settlement of all claims arising from termination of war contracts and subcontracts where such termination is for the convenience of the Government, with specific authority, in the interest of over-all settlement, for delegation of negotiation by one or more departments to the department primarily concerned.

Specific additional legislative authority should be herein granted (a) empowering contracting officers to amend all contracts now outstanding; first, to incorporate a uniform termination clause and termination procedure uniform to all the departments, as adopted by cooperative action of all the departments and second, to eliminate provisions of Government contracts which grant to the contracting officer or to any other department of the Government the right to finally determine as final arbiter any facts which may be in dispute between the Government and any contractor, to the end that such disputes may be arbitrated, or (failing arbitration) so that the contractor or the Government shall have ready access to the courts to determine on appeal the equitable rights of both parties under such contracts, whether they are incident to performance, breach, or termination. (b) Such legislation should specifically authorize recognition as a part of the cost of termination of Government contracts of the amounts of dismissal wages certified by contractors and subcontractors in settlement of claims where dismissal is certified to have been occasioned by such termination. Such dismissal wage should be limited in amount to not exceeding 4 weeks' straight-time pay, the same to be not in addition to but adjusted on account of any dismissal pay or pay in lieu of notice required by the terms of preexisting labor contracts or by the terms of State law. (c) Appeal from decision of the settlement officer should be granted to the district courts or to the Court of Claims. (d) Government agencies and contracting officers should be authorized to refer to arbitration disputes which arise out of contracts or their settlement after cancelation, by amendment to the United States Arbitration Act or similar legislation.

2. The departments of the Government should have clear and statutory authority to use existing and new appropriations for the purpose of making final settlements and advance payments in connection with the termination of contracts. Subject to a preliminary review for a period of 30 days or such other period as may be prescribed in the contract, the legislation should require payment of 75 percent of the prime contractor's claim as certified and verified by him, including 75 percent of claims of subcontractors submitted through the contractor; and such advance payments to contractors and for subcontractors should be authorized in an amount not exceeding 90 percent. In the case of disagreement between prime contractors and subcontractors, the departments should be authorized to make settlements excluding such disputed claims and to assume the liability of the contractor in connection therewith. The committee approves proposals contained in proposed legislation now pending that excess advance payments over amounts finally determined to be due should be treated as loans, repayable with 6 percent interest, except that prime contractors should not be held financially responsible for advances made by them to subcontractors.

3. While all emphasis should be placed upon rapid settlement and prompt advance and partial payments, the committee is convinced that as a safeguard against undue delay in settlements, statutory authority should be granted to the War Department, the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, and other departments of the Government to guarantee loans by financing institutions to prime contractors and subcontractors for a percentage up to 100 percent of amounts claimed to be due over and above or in addition to advance or partial payments, such guaranties to be executed by the Federal Reserve banks, as fiscal agent of the United States, acting for the services, generally in the same manner and under the same procedure as is now followed under Executive Order 9112, and Regulation V of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

4. The contracting officers negotiating settlements should not be held liable for excessive advance payments or settlements, in the absence of fraud or collusion. Government officers charged with the responsibility of negotiating settlements upon termination should be freed from the present requirement of laws, regulations, and contract provisions which prohibit the determination of a just and equitable settlement if the same be at variance with strict provisions of contract or regulation or involve the settlement of technical legal rights.

5. Final settlements negotiated by the contracting officer should be final and conclusive except for fraud. Review by the Comptroller General should be limited to the following: Review for fraud; the legal authority of the contracting officer to make the settlement in accordance with law; and the adequacy of available appropriated funds.

6. In order to protect the Government and the public from abuse of the powers hereinabove recommended, penalties for fraud or collusion in the assertion of claims or in overpayment of any contractor should be clarified and sharpened, both as against the guilty officer and the contractor, including triple penalty for overpayments fraudulently obtained.

Mustering-Out Pay for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon this Congress to enact legislation granting adequate mustering-out pay to discharged servicemen of World War No. 2. In the Seventy-seventh Congress and again in this Congress, I introduced H. R. 1701 which provides for mustering-out pay of $100 per month for 12 months following discharge and which also provides social-security benefits to all discharged servicemen. H. R. 1701 is sound in principle and should be adopted; or, if not H. R. 1701, a similar measure carrying out its sound principles. There should be no delay in enacting mustering-out legislation for our servicemen, and the responsibility rests with this Congress.

I wish to include as part of my remarks several telegrams I received from commanders and leaders of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars of Allegheny County, Pa., which clearly set forth their support of mustering-out legislation:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*

Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

Please give your immediate support to the veterans' legislation now before Congress, especially the mustering-out pay for these men. This legislation is much needed and cannot be passed too quickly.

SALVATORE CANCELIERE,
Past County Commander and Chairman of the National Defense Committee, Department of Pennsylvania American Legion.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

I urge you to act immediately to help our honorably discharged veterans of this war. They deserve this help. Please support the legislation in their behalf, especially mustering-out pay equal to a year's Army pay. This is a good way to thank them for their service to our country.

EARL SEITZ,
State Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. Congressman SAMUEL A. WEISS,
House Office Building:

In line with the policy of our State and national organizations, I urge you to give your immediate support to the legislation now before you dealing with adequate mustering-out pay for honorably discharged veterans of this war.

JOHN G. RAINEY, Sr.,
National Vice Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

As Americanism chairman, American Legion, Allegheny County, I urge you to support all veterans' legislation, particularly mustering-out pay for honorably discharged veterans.

JOHN H. SHENKEL,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

America's discharged veterans need your help. I urge you to support all legislation in their behalf, particularly adequate mustering-out pay for these men. Our national and State legislative committees have gone on record in favor of this legislation, and I cannot emphasize too much its need.

JAMES E. REILLY,
Allegheny County Council, Disabled American Veterans.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

America's discharged veterans of this war deserve a better deal from the Government they served than they have been receiving. I urge you to support in their behalf mustering-out pay equal to at least a year of Army pay. This legislation needs your immediate attention.

Dr. WILLIAM A. KNOER,
Allegheny County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pittsburgh.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 6, 1944.*
Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Member of Congress:

I urge you to support the legislation necessary to rehabilitate America's honorably discharged veterans of this war. These men need all the help they can get. They deserve this help in recognition of their service to our country. Particularly I urge you to support adequate mustering-out pay for these men.

CHARLES R. HALEY,
Past County Commander and Chairman of the Service Bureau Committee, Allegheny County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The F. E. P. C. Is Put on a Hot Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article by John Chamberlain, which appeared in the Philadelphia Record of January 9, 1944:

THE F. E. P. C. IS PUT ON A HOT SPOT
(By John Chamberlain)

Malcolm Ross, now head of the F. E. P. C. (Fair Employment Practices Committee), is on a hot spot.

Under President Roosevelt's Executive Order No. 8802, his organization has the authority to hold hearings and to point out an employer's and a labor union's duty to eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment or union membership because of race, creed, color or national origin." But Executive Order No. 8802 may or may not be construed in law to imply sanctions, the use of the police power and the courts to make the elimination of discrimination a reality. Lacking the power to summon the police, the F. E. P. C. can be ignored south of the Mason and Dixon's line and even north of it.

The legal twilight zone in which Mr. Roosevelt and his colleagues operate protects southeastern railroads and unions in their contractual agreement to keep nonpromotable—i. e., Negro—men from handling the better railroad jobs.

In the South, when locomotive firing and stoking were hot, dirty, back-breaking jobs, the railroad firemen were Negroes and nobody cared. But recently an automatic stoker and the use of the Diesel engine have combined to make firing a cleaner, far more pleasant introduction to the career of railroading. Accordingly, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have made very unbrotherly agreements with the southeastern carriers to nail down the better firing and stoking jobs for members of the white race.

By the terms of a 1941 contract, only promotable, i. e., white men, can be employed on locomotives with mechanical stokers or Diesel engines. The Negroes have been Jim-Crowed back to the old hand-stoked locomotives on the jerkwater runs.

What can the F. E. P. C. do about this? It has already certified its charges of bias to the President. But as the law stands, what can Roosevelt do to back up his committee? Under the United States Constitution no one can be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. For all practical purposes, if a Negro is refused a job it may result in deprivation of liberty or even life. But legally a court could argue that an employer has the right to hire whomsoever he chooses. And a labor union, being a free association, has the legal right to limit its membership.

Since it is extremely unlikely that a southern court would ever back up the claims of the F. E. P. C., how is Malcolm Ross to proceed with his case? I do not know. The successful attempt to legislate jobs for Negroes would in effect establish a numerus clausus, if that is the correct Latin for the practice of guaranteeing so much work or so much space to so many people of a given race, color, or sect. No doubt Negroes would be glad to get good jobs on any terms. But Jews have been kept out of great universities by the tacit application of numerus clausus.

Defining racial employment practice by legislation is a two-edged sword; it implies that one's rights are limited by percentages, which is repugnant to the principles of both the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

The proponents of giving the F. E. P. C. legal teeth would argue, of course, that they are only interested in creating opportunity and scope for sheer ability. But who is to be the judge of ability? If a court is to be the judge, it would reduce job hiring to a question of personalism that would be anti-Negro in any community where the white judges are anti-Negro anyway.

The question of the F. E. P. C. versus the southeastern railroads and the brotherhoods becomes a vicious circle no matter which end one starts from. But this does not mean that one should fold one's hands and let Hitlerite prejudice take its course. If the railroad brotherhoods cannot be coerced in law, it is quite possible that they can be shamed into observing humane standards of conduct.

Malcolm Ross has the power of publicity to draw upon. If he cannot persuade the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen to cease discriminatory practices, why doesn't he take his case to the labor movement as a whole? Or why not openly invite a Negro march on Washington of the sort proposed by A. Philip Randolph of the Pullman porters?

Pressure from labor and the northern Negroes means pressure on Roosevelt, who knows where the votes come from in crucial States. And pressure on the President might result in an effective personal appeal to southern Democrats, who can't wholly desire to see their party commit hara-kiri next November.

Somehow the cancer of racial bias has got to be cut out of the American body politic. It can't be legislated out, for men's hearts aren't changed by administrative orders that are nonenforceable in law. Only education, moral pressure, constant shaming by the invocation of public opinion, can do the necessary job of surgery.

The creation of the F. E. P. C. has vastly improved the conditions of hiring in Detroit and other northern communities simply by putting the moral force of Government request behind a public opinion that might otherwise be random or spasmodic. Can't something be done to bring moral pressure to bear on the southern railway workers? After all, they are part of a national labor movement.

Resolutions of Nebraska Farm Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Farm Council at its meeting held January 4, 1944. The Nebraska Farm Council is represented by C. Y. Thompson, president of the Nebraska Farm Bureau

Federation; Chris Milius, president of the Nebraska Farmers Union; B. V. Holmes, master of the State grange; Ole Hansen, Equity Union of Nebraska.

These resolutions represent the opinions of the great majority of the Nebraska farmers on these several vital matters. I hope the resolutions are read and carefully considered by the Federal agencies dealing with these farm problems. If the Federal agencies would accept the considered judgment and advice of the farmers who are on the firing line and producing the needed food for America and the world, there would be less confusion and regulations in the production of food.

The resolutions follow:

Under conditions that now exist in the United States a subsidy paid to decrease the price of food to consumers is inflationary and not in the public interest. In proof of this statement the following facts are submitted:

1. A rapid increase in a national debt is inflationary. The national debt of the United States increased from $45,000,000,000 in December 1940 to $165,000,000,000 in October 1943. Every dollar paid out by the Federal Government as a subsidy to decrease the price of food increases the national debt by that amount.

2. Students of money and credit are agreed that Government loans secured from banks are more inflationary than loans secured from individuals. Since more than two-fifths of the present debt is held by banks and the Government is selling as large a volume of bonds to private investors as it can, and depending on the banks to furnish the balance needed for war expenses, it follows that every dollar paid out as a subsidy must be borrowed from a bank.

3. Because labor has had practically full employment at high wages, while about one-half of the productive capacity of the country has been used to produce war materials, the supply of goods available for civilian use has not been large enough to meet demand. The national income for 1943 probably exceeded $145,000,000,000. Taxes took about $21,000,000,000, leaving $124,000,000,000 in the hands of consumers. The value of consumer goods purchased apparently amounted to about $89,000,000,000. The balance of $35,000,000,000 was available for savings. Part of this was invested in Liberty bonds and other forms of savings, but at least $15,000,000,000 and probably as much as $20,000,000,000 is available for the purchase of goods. This is the inflationary gap that can readily cause higher prices. This inflationary gap is increased by the amount paid out by the Government to decrease the price of food.

4. A decrease in prices paid to agricultural producers will result in a decrease in production under existing conditions. The Bureau of the Census estimates that the farm population decreased by over 3,000,000 between July 1, 1940, and January 1, 1943, not including members of the armed forces. The migration from farms to cities was the result of city industries being able to pay higher wages than farm operators were able to pay. The large crops of 1942 and 1943 were produced and harvested only because farm operators and their families worked 60, 70, and sometimes even 80 hours per week during the growing season. Probably more farm work was done by women and growing children in 1943 than in any preceding year since the Civil War. Milk production has already shown a decrease. Any further decrease in the number of experienced farm workers will result in a decrease in the production of farm products.

5. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has estimated that factory hourly earnings in 1943 were 465 percent of factory hourly earnings in the years 1910–14. In spite of the decrease in the number of hours worked per week, factory weekly earnings in 1943 were 400 percent of weekly earnings in 1910–14. The cost of farm products increased only about 92 percent during these same years. Since weekly wages have increased more than three times as much as the price of farm products, labor is apparently able to pay the small increase in food prices that is necessary to maintain production.

6. The small increase in the price of food that would be represented by any food subsidy so far proposed would not be a serious drain on the incomes of industrial workers, because the incomes of workers have increased by a greater amount than the amount that it has been proposed to pay out as subsidies. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has estimated that the average nonfarm family which has an income of about $2,400 spends approximately 20 percent of its income for food. Since only about 55 percent of the retail price of food is returned to the farmer, agriculture receives only about $264 from the family with a $2,400 income. If the farm price of food should rise 10 percent, the increase in cost would take but a small part of the increase in incomes received by industrial workers.

7. The payment of a subsidy to keep down food prices will probably have little influence upon requests for wage increases. Many requests for wage increases have been made during the months that food subsidies have been paid. During these same months wage increases have been granted that give to the men and women who receive them a far greater increase in income than would be added to the cost of the food they consume by dropping the subsidies. The truth of the matter is that wage increases will be requested whether or not a subsidy is paid to keep down the price of food products, and if the precedent which has been very definitely established during the past 3 years is followed these increases will be granted. The two most important issues that are concerned with food subsidies are as follows: (1) Shall the increased prices that are essential to maintaining the food supply be paid now or shall they be paid by a future generation of taxpayers? (2) Shall we attempt to keep down inflation by paying costs now, or shall we adopt the inflationary policy of paying a subsidy to decrease food prices?

8. Wage increases are the most important cause of increases in the cost of living, because by far the greater part of the cost of producing nearly all goods and services is payments made for labor. In 1942, 70 percent of the national income was paid out as wages and salaries. Increases in wage rates per hour are necessarily accompanied by increases in price, unless efficiency in production is increased to equal the increase in wages.

9. Subsidies to decrease food costs to consumers are not necessary at this time for the following reasons:

(a) At no preceding time in the history of the United States, with the possible exception of the bottom of some depression period, would the wages received for 48 hours of work in our major industries buy as large an amount of food at farm prices as today.

(b) During no preceding year in our life as a Nation has the purchase of essential foods taken as small a part of the national income as in 1943.

10. Subsidies are objectionable not only for economic reasons but because they are debasing. They put farmers on a handout basis, tie them to bureaucratic rulings and subject them to being pushed around.

If it is necessary to pay farmers a higher price for butterfat, livestock, and other farm products in order that they can continue to produce, they should be paid these prices in the open market, like freemen, and not be compelled to go to a Government office to collect part of the price as a dole. It is unfair to compel farmers to suffer the indignity of having to line up periodically at a Government counter in order to get a fair price for his products.

Disposition of Surplus War Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the constructive action taken by the Republican National Committee, meeting in Chicago, on January 11, 1944, in adopting the resolution offered by Hon. G. Mason Owlett, national committeeman from Pennsylvania, calling for a study on methods for preventing a flood of surplus American-made goods coming back into this country from abroad duty-free after the war.

Mr. Owlett, who for many years was the leader in the State Senate of Pennsylvania, and who is one of the State's leading lawyers, has made a very accurate study of this problem, and is well aware of the chaos that immediately followed the close of the last war when large supplies of goods which had been shipped abroad were sold at auction at ridiculously low prices and then were permitted to be brought into this country free of any tariff and sold at prices far under the cost of production in this country. Senator Owlett has rendered a commendable service to his own great State of Pennsylvania and the entire United States in presenting this problem to the Republican Party.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the very constructive address delivered by Senator Owlett upon the presentation of the above resolution, which is likewise included herein:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE G. MASON OWLETT

It is my opinion that post-war America faces a grave economic crisis unless a suitable provision is created by Congress at once to prevent American-made war merchandise, now accumulating in foreign territory, from being brought back to these shores at bargain prices, duty-free, to flood our domestic markets, dislocate our national economy, and disrupt post-war efforts for stabilized employment.

These surpluses of distressed merchandise, lying idle and unwanted in foreign lands and subject to disposal by auction, present a major post-war problem which may wreck our entire economic structure. At the end of the First World War the unregulated, homeward flow of American-made war goods in the hands of sharp business practitioners helped to swamp our home markets, clog normal channels of commerce, and demoralize our industrial empire.

I cannot believe that we want a repetition of the tragic experiences which beset American commerce at the end of World War No. 1 and continued for 6 years, creating irreparable damage. The lack of wise legislation

following World War No. 1 gave racketeering elements and foreign trade the modus operandi by which they could conduct unrestricted raids upon lucrative American markets with our own outraged industry helpless to stem the tide.

The dire effects of this failure to be ready after the close of World War No. 1 became so apparent that by 1922 Congress amended the provisions of the law and limited the free entry of American-made goods returning from foreign lands. This amendment excluded importations of distressed war merchandise so that American industries could recapture their own markets and thrive once again under the American system of competitive enterprise. The belated enactment of this provision, however, did not nullify the damage. Most of the goods were already here. American industry faced a long, hard pull to shake off the crippling effects of our unpreparedness for peace. In 1938 the present Federal Government, in its revision of the administrative provision of the Tariff Act, repealed the 1922 provisions, so that today, as we approach the end of World War No. 2, we find ourselves in exactly the same situation which contributed so largely to the chaos after World War No. 1.

Those who remember the economic slump which followed the First World War will possibly recall stories of how racket operators and high-pressure bargainers cornered and bought up huge stocks of materials abroad at ridiculously low prices and returned them to our domestic markets, duty free, to create a profiteer's paradise, ruining and embarrassing the American enterprise system.

There is nothing on the statute books today to prevent the same shady operators and the same high-pressure bargainers from giving a repeat performance. I am, therefore, taking up the time of this committee to bring this issue to your attention, and to ask you to act now upon the resolution which I will offer, as the time is here for Congress to act on this serious threat.

The horrible lessons of the post-war nightmare following World War No. 1 provide us with no mere assumptions or theories as we contemplate the problems of our future post-war economy. Whatever the headaches and tribulations spawned by World War No. 1, they will be an idyllic dream compared to the staggering dislocations which are certain to plague our national economy at the close of the present global conflict. The star-gazing planners and theorists have given us nothing constructive in the way of a post-war antidote to relieve the distress and suffering which are the first cousins of economic chaos.

We should remember that as far back as 1918, "free traders" now parading under the banner of "internationalists," were talking glibly of a "new freedom," a world league, and the unconquerable position the United States would hold as a world power when the war was over and all economic barriers were removed.

The people were lulled by the oily importunings of these visionaries. The armistice, instead of revealing us as an unchallenged industrial sovereignty, found us handcuffed in the face of incessant onslaughts by low-cost foreign trade.

We must bring ourselves to realize that America's destiny in the post-war era will not be solved by chattering apostles of political intrigue. Instead, we must resolve ourselves into a Nation of direct actionists, unafraid of any course which imposes upon us the unmistakable need for protecting the bastions of our own hard-won economy.

Today we face the world as the richest and most powerful Nation. Our industrial machine has become the greatest producer of armed destruction the world has known, a fact readily acknowledged by Premier Stalin at Teheran when he doffed his cap to the magic of American enterprise. It would be a tragic miscarriage of justice if that mighty machine were turned against us in the peacetime reconversion period because Congress failed to understand that the promiscuous return of distressed war surpluses totaling billions of dollars would scuttle our domestic markets and render American industry impotent to parry the low-cost competition of cheap foreign goods. Unless Congress acts to nullify this menace, we can expect foreign commodities to bombard our home ports with an intensity that will deaden the pulse of American enterprise.

In this hour of universal crisis, we have helped to relieve the sufferings of dejected people everywhere. If, in the past, we had followed the specious theory of free trade espoused by noisy world league advocates, we would not have had the tremendous, almost unbelieveable resources with which to conduct total war. We can continue to take this lead only while we remain rich, strong, and powerful.

We cannot afford to be sophomoric in our approach to the problems which will descend like a swarm of locusts upon us when the last shot ending World War No. 2 has been fired. We need have no illusions about the future and what will be expected of each of us if we are to prevent tax-beleaguered, free enterprise from disappearing. Post-war America plainly will be confronted with a situation which will challenge the intelligent consideration of every man and woman in whose heart the love of freedom, and of country beats strongly.

The contrasting costs of the First and Second World Wars give us cause to ponder the fate of this Nation. The First World War cost the American people $75,000,000,000 and it required 6 years to liquidate the surpluses of that struggle. Already Congress has appropriated $344,000,000,000 to underwrite the cost of the present conflict and there is no telling where it will end. If the harrowing readjustments of the First World War are any indication, it will take at least 10 to 15 years to liquidate the huge and cumbersome surpluses of this war. Add to this the disconcerting fact that at war's end, the Federal Government will own or control mountainous stocks of raw, semifinished, and finished materials of every description stretching from coast to coast. Likewise, an incalculable number of Government-owned manufacturing plants and military establishments will present a ponderous and tricky problem in liquidation. It is estimated that the total value of these pyramiding war piles and surpluses, plants, and military installations subject to liquidation and disposal at the close of the war will be approximately $75,000,000,000. Anyone can see that these vast holdings will not be liquidated by looking through the green glass of political optimism.

I realize that today among us are unctuous disciples of a world league in which all trade barriers would be down. This may be a charming theory on paper to promote world peace and harmony—if not political attention—but economic realists, not faddists, recognize it as a fallacious scheme which would topple us from the industrial pinnacle we have achieved through generations of trial and struggle. We also know that the promise of world peace used by these theorists as the object of their beautiful plans cannot be realized in this manner. You will remember that as far back as 1934, we were told by prominent oracles of Washington bureaucracy that we had to let down the bars to preserve world peace—and then followed World War No. 2.

We know that the nostrums and panaceas of the "free traders" failed utterly to work at the close of World War No. 1. What guaranty do we have that the same threadbare theories, disguised by a new coat of paint, will meet any better fate?

There will be little solace in contemplating a United Nations for peace if, after war, this country is wracked by violent internal eruptions or it is unable to meet the commercial competition of foreign nations.

The moment peace is signed and blockaded ports are reopened foreign products in infinite quantities will be on their way here across the seven seas. If we fail to set up proper defenses against flooded American markets, we will be false to ourselves and our families, false to our country, and doubly false to the valiant men of our armed forces who look to us as keepers of the home-front faith from which there must spring the jobs and opportunities they will have won by the bayonet and the gun. Theirs must be a priority on tomorrow in America.

If action is deferred until after the war, our foreign competitors might have 6 months, or possibly a year, in which to unload their commodities on our market and bankrupt many of our industries, some of which have come into existence during the war.

The free-traders seem unwilling to explain how business can meet the challenge of post-war employment if the administration's trade policies provide no protection for home industries against the boring tactics of foreign enterprise.

The question which naturally suggests itself is, Are we going to blunder along as we did after World War No. 1 in combating the evils of post-war surpluses and cheap foreign goods, or are we going to plan ahead and thus give heed to historic fact?

Who among us, with the peace, safety, and welfare of the Nation foremost in mind, wants a throwback to the calamitous days of the early twenties, when American industry was the victim of a shocking travesty on our economic leadership, our industrial ingenuity, and our personal independence and initiative?

The rise or fall of American commerce depends upon what we say and do now to keep American enterprise inviolate so that all men, enjoying its beneficence, can take refuge in the security and contentment their own achievements confer.

Whereas during this World War there is being accumulated abroad vast quantities of material of American origin and manufacture incident to the prosecution of the war that will be surplus or distressed merchandise when hostilities cease; and

Whereas this material, costing billions of dollars to produce, will at the conclusion of World War No. 2, find its way back into the American markets for sale, at handsome profits to the sellers in this market but below our cost of production; and

Whereas, following the close of the last World War, similar merchandise, estimated however at one-tenth the amount now reposing abroad, came into this country free of duty to the great embarrassment of many of our industries and the ruination of others, with the consequent loss of thousands upon thousands of American jobs. At the close of the last war this situation contributed to a period of industrial depression for 5 or 6 years of such severity that Congress belatedly amended the provisions of law and limited the free entry of American-made goods returning to this country to those "which were imported by or for the account of the original person who exported them from the United States," thus excluding these distressed goods and permitting our own industries to recapture their own markets, and rehabilitate their peacetime enterprise; and

Whereas this salutary provision which would have prevented a repetition of this distressing situation at the close of this war was repealed by the present administration at Washington in 1938, leaving us at the present time in the same condition as we were at the close of the First World War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican National Committee, assembled in Chicago, Ill., at a time when attention is being given to the problems of post-war America, to the em-

ployment of our returning soldiers, and to the preservation and promotion of peacetime industry, calls upon the Republican Post-War Advisory Council to give immediate consideration to this problem with a view of recommending such legislation as will prevent the free return of American-made goods into this country at landed costs less than our current cost of production; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Republican National Committee be, and he hereby is, authorized to ask the Republican Post-War Advisory Council to make a study of the amount of goods and material of foreign origin which is apt to find its way into this market following the close of the war, with a view of compiling the history of our tariff, its present necessities, and the ascertainment of all facts which call for legislation to foster and preserve American enterprise and provide employment for the millions of veterans who will be returning to civil life and war workers who have produced the record-shattering armaments which are winning this war, and that this committee be asked to prepare such data and report to the platform committee of the Republican National Convention of 1944.

Enactment of Lea Aviation Bill Urged Editorially

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorials which recently appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, the Bangor News, the Martinsburg Journal, and the Charleston Mail, in support of aviation legislation:

[From the San Francisco Call Bulletin of December 6, 1943]

OUR FUTURE IN THE AIR—CONGRESS IS AWAKENING TO THE NEED OF PLANNING NOW FOR POST-WAR ERA

It has been stated repeatedly—and it is a matter that cannot be emphasized too strongly—that San Francisco's post-war prominence and prosperity will be measured to a great extent by the city's development as a center of commercial aviation.

And it is the conviction of all who cherish the American way of doing things—the way of doing things for which we now are fighting—that the aerial commerce of the future must be permitted to grow under private auspices subject only to such governmental influences as will be beneficial alike to the aviation industry and the public that it will serve.

If San Francisco is to become the western center of an aerial commerce developed under those conditions, it is essential that consideration be given now to the many and complex factors involved, and that sound and far-sighted regulations be promulgated for the salvaging of as much as possible of our tremendous wartime aerial structure and the reconversion of the salvaged elements to civilian uses.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

To effect this end a considerable amount of legislation will be necessary, and it is proper that the Congress should concern itself with such legislation at this time, even while giving its primary consideration to matters bearing directly upon the war.

A measure in line with this view introduced recently is H. R. 3420, which now is awaiting consideration under the joint sponsorship of Representative CLARENCE LEA, of California, and Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, of North Carolina.

It is among the purposes of the bill to perpetuate the beneficial provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, which have so successfully facilitated the expansion of civilian aviation to meet wartime needs, and to supplant with a central authority many of the conflicting local and Federal laws and regulations now in force.

The bill would create, as an arm of Congress and independent of Executive domination, a civil aeronautics commission, which would function in a relationship to privately owned air lines similar to that of the Interstate Commerce Commission to privately owned railways.

DEVELOPMENT ENCOURAGED

The measure would provide a basis for a long-range program of airport and airway development and for the encouragement of all phases of private and miscellaneous flying.

The bill was drafted after some 9 months of study by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and has the endorsement of most groups interested in the development of commercial flying.

The chief criticism of the measure is that it emphasizes too strongly Federal control and permits too little State and local control of airports and airways. But that is beside the point. Such inequalities, if they exist, can be eliminated by study, conference, and revision.

The point is that the bill is a step in the right direction. It is a measure that has arisen out of a great need and its introduction is welcome evidence that Congress is taking cognizance of that need.

It is to be hoped that H. R. 3420, and other similar measures that circumstances may warrant, will be brought up promptly for consideration.

[From the Bangor (Maine) News of November 27, 1943]

WATCH THE AIR CLOCK

Either this week end or early next week the National House of Representatives will go into a final wrestle over a bill upon which depends the near future of America's post-war commercial aviation. That means one of our country's largest chances to larger horizons. Yet, if Americans don't look out, the chance will be rolled under or brushed aside in the present congressional turmoil. The chance will be lost.

Aviation has grown like Jack's beanstalk in these last few years. The bill in question—the Lea bill, or civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420—is a badly needed revision and a frank extension of the already outmoded aeronautics legislation of 1938. H. R. 3420 demands a permanent commission for the clarification and codification of air-traffic law and air-traffic's development.

The bill places contract air carriers under economic regulation. It provides discounts for quantity transportation. It puts air employees under the Railway Labor Act. It makes sane airport zoning possible. In short, as its proponents say, it "contains the most contructive proposals ever formulated for the broad encouragement of private flying," and, in the words of the Boston Herald's big basso, Bill Cunningham, it will "standardize all commercial-aviation regulations, making them the same in all States."

A fortnight ago, these editorials pointed out the needs which the Lea bill has been framed to meet and thus answered the only vocal objection made—the complaint that domestic aviation control ought to be left in the hands of the States:

"State sovereignty is a precious heritage that is being increasingly threatened; it sadly needs safeguarding. But here it would seem is a case where State control might easily lead to 48 different brands of confusion.

"Should post-war aviation develop as it promises to do and ought to do, there will have to be uniformity in such matters as its traffic regulation, safety, standards of installation and equipment, and ownership responsibility. Long commercial flights will be faster and more frequent, traversing some States in a matter of minutes. Unless all travel recognizes the same traffic laws, real danger, as well as countless mix-ups will develop. For safety's sake alone, clear understanding will be necessary in the departments of control, dispatching, zoning, and airport facilities, not only during emergencies, but during regular runs.

"If what we want is efficiency, then these and similar considerations should be the Federal Government's responsibility. There will still be plenty for the States to do. * * * Not much of a case can be made out for the application of State restrictions upward to the stratosphere."

What was true on November 14 is true on November 27. If a hurried or timid House of Representatives turns down H. R. 3420, it will be doing another sort of turning, too. It will be turning back America's air clock certainly 5 years, perhaps 25.

[From the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal of November 29, 1943]

CIVIL AIR CONTROL

Enactment of the Lea-Bailey bill seems vital to the sound promotion and development of all phases of civil aviation—a matter in which this city has a growing concern in view of plans now under way to expand the facilities at Shepherd Field tremendously by extension of the runway facilities under work that is scheduled to start in the spring.

It is most important that the necessary foundation for the immediate post-war period be laid now. Other nations are preparing for rapid development as soon as the war is over. America must keep herself abreast in this matter.

Under this agency the multitude of details needed to assure orderly development of aviation would be planned and carried out. It would not interfere with State's rights but would provide uniform rules and methods so there would be no handicap to flying in different States.

This would make permanent the civilian pilot-training act, provide for aviation instruction, work out long-range programs for airport and route construction, plot development of air-mail contracts—a phase also of immediate interest locally because of inclusion within the past week of this city in a proposed mail pick-up schedule—and many other details required for smooth progress in aviation.

Furthermore civil aviation must be ready for immediate expansion on a sound basis at the war's end in order to provide enduring jobs for thousands of returning men from service. A long-range program of airport construction and development, a growing market for aircraft factories manufacturing both private and commercial planes and an expanded commercial national and international air transport system, if worked out in an orderly way, will offer tremendous new opportunities for stable employment.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Mail of November 24, 1943]

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

Of a piece with the widespread concern about the world of tomorrow when aviation will be a compelling force in the everyday lives of the people of the world, there is a current tendency to look closely at aviation, its problems and what can be seen of its future

around the corner of time. A part of this notice of a new factor in our existence is the pending Lea-Bailey bill; if enacted in Congress, it will do for aviation what creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission did for the surface carriers. It will, among other things, accomplish the highly desirable end of reestablishing the Air Safety Board and will change the name of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to Civil Aeronautics Commission, giving that body an independent status above and beyond the capricious whim of any member of the executive branch of Government.

Among its more important provisions, however, is its clarification of domestic freedom of the air. It will establish once and for all—as such a point should be established—the national and international character of air transportation. Even the most fanatic friends of decentralization of Government will be forced to admit that there are some matters for governmental regulation which do not fit into any scheme contemplating a voice for State governments. Such chaos existed, prior to the war, in the field of highway transportation, for instance, that legislation recognizing the interstate aspect of truck transportation was a very real possibility.

An airplane flying from coast to coast in 9 hours obviously cannot be subject to State laws governing its operation during the 50 or 60 minutes it would take that particular plane to cross West Virginia's territory. To free that plane from whimsical restrictions that a State legislature might place upon its crew, mechanical condition and operation during that brief time when it is within a State's particular section of the atmosphere is the object of the Lea-Bailey bill.

It is sound statesmanship to anticipate these sort of situations before they arise by enacting their solutions. For that reason, the Lea-Bailey measure needs to be passed while there remains a minimum of problems. The solution will be much easier of attainment at the present time than at a later date.

Past Is Prologue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Everett (Mass.) Leader-Herald of January 6, 1944. This hopeful message for the new year built around a familiar theme, is worth being read by all of us:

PAST IS PROLOGUE

"What is Past is Prologue" is carved in the enduring stone of that great marble building which houses The Archives of the United States.

"Past is Prologue." The dictators whose insane lust for power laid waste one continent and whose mad dreams reached across oceans to engulf us, should have paused at these words and considered their meaning—before the onslaught of our aroused armies swept them into oblivion.

"Past is Prologue." What is our past but a struggle for freedom for all oppressed and disheartened people—religious freedom, political freedom, economic freedom? The founding fathers, beloved of every patriotic orator, incorporated this urge for freedom in the classic phrases of the preamble to the Constitution and in the Bill of Rights, which is the Magna Carta of our freedom.

"Past is Prologue." The past is useful in determining what the future shall be. With the past this Nation possesses we could not have turned aside from the cries for help rising from the victims of the new oppression, those helpless people whose only fault was that their ways were the ways of peace, and that they had possessions the gangster overlords of Europe and Asia coveted. With our past record we could not have turned away like the Pharisee from the wounded traveler. For us—with our heritage of action for freedom—binding up the injured as did the Good Samaritan was not enough. The fight was ours. The task was plain. We had to help the robbers from the Jericho Road.

"Past is Prologue." But the past is fulfilled only as the desire for a better future which it had inculcated into our hearts and minds, bears fruit. The past is but the prologue to the future—and we must make the future better.

"Past is Prologue." To keep the promise of the past we must stand firm now and fight to preserve the right. We must not compromise with evil. We must put into practice the truth by which we hold sovereignty over this Nation: "That all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The task is great, but the past has trained us for the needs of the present. We can and will do all that is demanded of us i · the new year ahead.

Mississippi Valley Flood-Control Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to have printed in the RECORD part of the addresses and proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, at a meeting held in New Orleans, La., on December 21, 1943, it is my opinion that this meeting was one of the outstanding flood-control gatherings of all time due to the character of the addresses delivered at that meeting by such distinguished personages as Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president, Mississippi River Commission; Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and Hon. Will M. Whittington, chairman, House Committee on Flood Control. It is my opinion that these addresses are most informative and timely, as well as inspiring, and it is my hope that every Member of the Congress of the United States will find time to read the same, and which are printed herein. Mr. Speaker, I call especial attention to the address of the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control, which address I consider one of the finest I have ever heard on the subject of flood control. Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana, president of the association, presided over the sessions of the convention, and representatives attended the meeting from the States of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The theme of the meeting was "Hold That Line."

POST-WAR PLANS FOR THE ALLUVIAL VALLEY

(By Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president, Mississippi River Commission)

Planning is one of the most overworked words in the language at this time. The idea seems current that if we just do a tremendous amount of planning, all our problems will be solved. Many experts are in the post-war planning business in every line of human endeavor. Often, in reading of such plans, there arises in the minds of thoughtful people some doubt as to whether the experts know just where they are now, which way they want to go, what they propose to use to go on, where they will be when they get to where they are going, and what they will do when they get there. Most of all, one wonders whether anyone will go with them.

Planning in itself is not an end product. It is of no value unless it lays down a practical course of action which, if followed, will take us from our present situation, which we thoroughly understand, to a definite objective which we are convinced, after careful examination, is worth hard work to attain.

A sound post-war plan for the alluvial valley, therefore, must start with an accurate estimate of the situation now confronting us. You may recall that at your annual meeting a year ago I traced for you the history of navigation on the Mississippi River, reviewed briefly the long battle which had been waged by the people of the alluvial valley to obtain protection from floods, and described the existing project and its state of completion up to that time. Since you are all familiar with the works which have been authorized, it seems unnecessary to recount them, but rather to bring you up to date on what has been accomplished since your last meeting, so that you may know exactly where we stand today.

The War Production Board has deferred the construction of certain elements of the project for the duration of the war because they require considerable quantities of steel. The Cairo, Ill., river wall, the Enid and Grenada dams and reservoirs of the Yazoo Basin headwater project, two railway bridges, and one highway bridge over the Morganza floodway, floodgates in the west guide levee, a navigation lock in the east guide levee of the Atchafalaya floodway, and the extension of the Morgan City floodwall were so classified.

On the other hand, the War Production Board ruled that the completion of the remaining elements of the project is essential to the war effort.

On the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress reduced the annual appropriation in the last appropriation measure, approved June 2, 1943, to $14,000,000.

The carry-over from the preceding year and the new funds are being used to bring the main line levees where most deficient in grade up to the 1941 grade, to maintain the navigation channels, to place absolutely necessary bank revetment, to carry on levee and channel work in the St. Francis Basin, and levee and channel work in the Yazoo headwater project, to complete the White backwater levee and to finish the highway and railway bridges across the Morganza floodway at the latitude of Krotz Springs.

As you know, the alinement of the river from mile 280 below Cairo to mile 737 below Cairo has been radically changed during the last 10 years by cutting off long bends and by other dredging operations. This work has reduced flood heights in varying degrees between Memphis and Natchez and has shortened the length of the navigation channel by some 170 miles between Memphis and Baton Rouge.

Levee grades have been adjusted to correspond to the estimated crest flow lines of the project flood in the improved channel and without the Eudora floodway, the floodway

having been eliminated from the project by the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941. The adjusted levee grades are referred to as the 1941 levee grade.

The levees are massive embankments 25 feet high or more and 240 feet or more through at the base. Frequently they have wide seepage berms extending landward from the landside toe.

The levee at Cairo, Ill., on the Mississippi River side has been raised to the 1941 grade. A setback levee on the Ohio River side with 1941 grade is under construction. On the east bank between Hickman, Ky., and slough Landing Neck are 22½ miles of levee, all of which require raising to the 1941 grade.

The Birds Point-New Madrid floodway is completed except for the degrading of the fuse-plug section to a grade corresponding to 55 feet on the Cairo gage. From Commerce, Mo., to the White River on the west bank 271 miles of levee required raising to attain the approved 1941 grade. This work has been completed or is under contract on 112 miles of levee.

From the head of the Yazoo Basin to the Yazoo River on the east bank, 71 miles of levee out of a total of 236 miles requiring raising to the 1941 grade have been completed or are under contract.

Between Yancopin on the Arkansas River and Old River on the west bank the 1941 grade necessitated work on 263 miles of levee. Seventy miles have been completed or are under contract. All but 11½ miles of the old Eudora fuse-plug levee between Yancopin, Ark., and Vaucluse, Ark., have been completed to the new grade or are under contract. The Congress has just passed the second deficiency appropriation bill, which includes an appropriation of $5,000,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries. When this $5,000,000 becomes available, the raising of the remaining 11.5 miles of the fuse-plug levee between Yancopin and Vaucluse will be placed under contract. The grade revision on the east bank opposite will also be contracted for.

With the completion of contracts in force the White River backwater levee will be finished, except for about 4 miles of very low levee required along the high ground along Oldtown Lake, and some adjustment at the fuse-plug sections.

Of the works for the protection of the St. Francis Basin from headwater floods, the Wappapello Dam is completed and in operation. Levees on Little River are completed except those required for protection of the Elk Chute drainage district. Levees on the right bank of the St. Francis River below Tulot, Ark., and on the left bank below Black Oak are completed. All channel work is under contract. Levees on the St. Francis River below the Wappapello Dam and above Tulot required under the project cannot be constructed until local interests furnish the required levee rights-of-way.

The project for the protection of the Yazoo Basin from headwater floods includes four reservoirs: One on the Coldwater, one on the Little Tallahatchie, one on the Yocona, and one on the Yalobusha. Channel rectification and enlargement work on the Coldwater, Little Tallahatchie, the Tallahatchie, the Yocona, the Yalobusha and Yazoo Rivers, and Cassidy Bayou and levees supplement the reservoirs.

Two of the flood-control dams, Arkabutla on the Coldwater and Sardis on the Little Tallahatchie, are completed and in operation. Channel work is 48 percent completed. Work is under contract on Cassidy Bayou and on most of the levees north of Darling.

No work has been done on the authorized levees for the protection of the Yazoo River backwater area nor on the Red River backwater area near the mouth of Black River.

South of Old River the levees on the main river and the Bonnet Carre spillway are practically completed. The guide levees of the Morganza floodway, the east guide levee of the Atchafalaya floodway from Morgan City northward; the west guide levee from the vicinity of head of Berwick Bay northward, and the levees along the upper Atchafalaya River are generally completed except for the correction of minor deficiencies in grade due to consolidation of embankments, flow-line adjustments, foundation deficiencies, and the closure of openings left for highways, railways, a lock in the east guide levee, and floodgates in the west guide levee.

The Wax Lake outlet and Charenton drainage canal with their highway and railroad bridges are completed.

Of the three railway and two highway bridges provided for the Morganza floodway one railroad bridge and one highway bridge are nearing completion.

No work has been done as yet on the improvements authorized for Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, and Cocodrie, La.

The project depth of 9 feet is maintained at low stages by 5 dredges in the Memphis district, 2 in the Vicksburg district and 2 in the New Orleans district. When the river falls from high stages some of the crossings are shoal and require dredging to establish a definite channel of project dimensions. Due to changes of the currents as the banks cave and the river meanders, crossings are constantly changing in location. Dredging done at the beginning or during the low-water season is often obliterated by sand caved out of banks and deposited on crossing during the following high water. Crossings tend to cut out and deepen during low water, and after dredging has been done to get good alinements for navigation, a crossing will hold its depth or even increase it, if the river stays low. A rise of sufficient height to put sand again in motion may shoal or change the location of the channel and make additional dredging necessary. In the maintenance of the navigation channel between Cairo and Baton Rouge so far this calendar year the Government's dredges have moved 50,000,000 cubic yards of sand at 75 different locations.

In the Memphis district between Cairo and the mouth of the Arkansas, the most difficult part of the river in which to maintain project depths, a typical channel report at very low stage shows 5 crossings out of a total of 74 on which there was only 9 feet of water. Three had 10 feet, six, 10½ feet, 13 had 11 feet, 8 had 11½ feet and the balance 12 feet or over.

The extensive realinement of the river by the cutting off of long bends and by the other dredging operations during the past 10 years has shortened the distance along the low-water navigation channel between Memphis and Baton Rouge by about 170 miles. Quite a number of troublesome crossings have been eliminated and the reduced mileage has more than compensated for the swifter currents encountered at high stages. These benefits cannot be retained if the present good alinement of the channel is lost.

In the last year the river has carried all the freight that the equipment of the barge lines and private operators could handle. Some 60 barge lines and operators have been fully occupied, largely in moving oil, gasoline, sulfur, and other commodities essential in the war effort.

One of the outstanding services which the river has performed so far in this war is the movement of Government vessels to the sea from Great Lakes and up-river shipyards, where they are built. The principal vessels in this movement are destroyer escorts, fleet submarines, tank landing ships, tankers, and freighters. These vessels could not reach the ocean by way of the St. Lawrence, since they are too long to pass through the St. Lawrence Canal locks. The inland waterway system of the Mississippi, Ohio, and Illinois has made it possible for extensive shipbuilding operations to be carried on at many inland locations. Over 800 vessels have already successfully come down the river, and the movement has only begun.

In its meandering the river is always caving its banks and working toward the levees at many points. At some locations the movement is slow and regular. At others it is rapid and erratic. The rate of bank caving depends upon the materials in the bank and direction and force of the attack against it.

The realinement of the river has reduced the heights of major floods by about 12 feet at Arkansas City and about 7 feet at Vicksburg, with lesser reductions above Arkansas City and below Vicksburg. The straightening of the river has increased its flood slope and current velocities. Increased velocities cause increased bank caving and meander. Unless the river is held approximately in its present alinement it will regain a considerable portion of its former length by creating new bends and extending existing ones. This, of course, would sacrifice a proportional part of the reduction in flood heights which has been obtained through shortening the stream and would involve a loss of the cost of doing much of the channel work which secured those reductions. It would also require an increase in levee grades to compensate for loss in the stream's flood-carrying capacity.

When it becomes evident that the river is going to breach the levee line one of three possible actions must be taken. A levee loop farther back from the river must be built; the bank caving must be halted by revetment work; or under some conditions, extensive dredging operations may divert the current from the caving bank. Each is a major operation.

A levee loop or set-back must extend far enough upstream and downstream to insure that neither of its connections with the existing levee will lie within the danger zone and it must be far enough back behind the existing levee to give promise of a long useful life. Generally a set-back will have a length of 2 to 4 miles, and usually such a loop contains so large a yardage of earth that it is impracticable to build it in one working season. If, for any reason, such as lack of funds, the work cannot be started in time, or if the river speeds up its rate of bank caving, a serious situation develops.

Usually a set-back is not a permanent cure of the trouble. There are many points where the river is now near the third successive levee location made within the past 15 or 20 years. Moreover a set-back sacrifices the highest and best land. The river makes as much land as it destroys but what it makes is a sand bar across the channel from the setback. The accretion will not be fit for cultivation in a lifetime and can never be protected at any reasonable cost. Each set-back is a local retreat of considerable magnitude. But in the aggregate, over a term of years, the results are almost unbelievable. For example, the lower Yazoo levee district has about the same length of levee line now that it had when the district was organized. But none of the existing levee is on the original location and since 1880 the district has lost 305 miles of levee by set-backs.

At the present time four large set-backs of main Mississippi levees and six set-backs of Arkansas River levees in the alluvial valley are under construction. These set-backs will cost $4,700,000. The main line levees are now threatened at other points where the river is already altogether too close for comfort. The proximity of the river to the levee and the rapid rate of bank caving at Francis (mile 369) in the Yazoo Basin where a set-back has only recently been completed are causes of anxiety. A somewhat similar situation also exists at Fitler (mile 553) also in the Yazoo Basin. Other points where the river is already too close to the main line levee are Island No. 8 (mile 50), Island No. 9 (mile 54), Porter Lake (mile 260), Walnut Bend (mile 280), Goodrich (mile 561), Torras (mile 771), and Morganza (mile 795).

If the river's alinement is good at the location where caving threatens a levee, the bank may be held by revetment work. Alinement is good if the curvature is moderate and the alinement both up and down stream for several miles is also good. As a general rule revetments are successful where used as training works for the maintenance of good alinement. When so used they prevent a good alinement from deteriorating and setting up a series of destructive changes for a long distance downstream.

In some situations it has been possible so to improve the alinement of the channel by extensive dredging operations as to remove the attack from a caving bank and thereby to save the levee line. Any such operation involves the pumping and deposition in the right location of several million cubic yards of sand. With the dredge, sand can be moved out of the channel. Sometimes the dredge spoil can be placed where it will serve a useful purpose by directing flow in the channel. The dredge can close chutes and auxiliary channels and thus concentrate all flow in the main channel. It can cut off points which protrude beyond a good bank alinement and which give an undesirable direction to currents. Good alinement may be obtained by dredging, but it cannot be held for long by dredging alone.

The dredge is a cutting tool. Bank revetment is a holding tool. Each supplements the other, and both must be used if the river is to be reasonably controlled.

The river now has the best alinement, the best navigation channel, and the greatest flood-carrying capacity it has ever had. It will gradually deteriorate unless this good alinement is maintained. A huge sum has been invested in the levee system, and further improvements in the nature of seepage berms, impervious riverside blankets, and highways on the levees will be made in the future. Such improvements cannot well be made when the levees are subject to being set back to avoid being breached by the river.

Document No. 90, Seventieth Congress, which was enacted into law by the act of May 15, 1928, visualized the progressive revetment of caving banks to protect the foundations of the levees and to stabilize the river both for flood control and navigation.

The following is quoted from that report:

"131. Channel stabilization: Since the levees within the limits of this project are to be greatly enlarged, they will be much more expensive than heretofore, so something must be done to avoid the frequent moving of them from the proximity of caving banks. In addition, the river cannot be regulated for low-water navigation until the banks are made stable; this both to keep the channel in one place and to stop the enormous dumping of earth into the river by bank caving. A general bank-protection scheme must be carried out."

The great levee system designed to protect the alluvial valley from major floods is rapidly approaching completion. With the system in its present advanced state, the control of the meander of the river has become the most urgent and difficult problem confronting those responsible for the safety of the valley and the mainfenance of free, easy, and unobstructed navigation channels from Cairo to the sea.

The Government has invested over $282,000,000 in the levee system. The local people have invested over $247,000,000. If these investments are to give the maximum possible return, every fertile acre which the levees protect from river overflow should be brought into cultivation. Many acres, however, are too wet for cultivation or are too often flooded by local run-off because tributary streams are obstructed by timber growth, willows, drift, and other debris. A considerable number of tributary streams in the valley have a definite history of navigation by steamboats, showing that they must have carried larger flows than they can now. A systematic restoration to their former condition as main arteries of discharge in the interest of flood control and the construction by local interests of main and lateral drainage ditches connecting with such natural streams would appear to be a good business proposition.

In June we experienced floods exceeding record heights on the Arkansas, and within 0.1 foot of the record at Georgetown on the White River. You will recall that last winter you worked out a plan for guarding the levees against sabotage in time of high water; also that, in view of the labor shortage, the Department had approved assigning available Engineer troops to work under the direction of the district engineers on levee maintenance should a flood emergency occur. The civilian-guard system worked very well. The levees on the White River and on the north bank of the Arkansas were saved by the splendid work of the officers and men of five regiments of engineers from Camp Claiborne and several separate pontoon companies.

The foregoing gives a general idea of what has been accomplished in the past year and of our present situation in the alluvial valley with respect to flood control and navigation under the approved project for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

There are other works in progress in the alluvial valley, or in prospect, which I believe are of interest to your association. The widening and deepening of the Intracoastal Canal to 125 feet by 12 feet from New Orleans west to Texas will shortly be completed. The new canal with dimensions of 150 feet by 12 feet from New Orleans to the Rigolets by passing Lake Pontchartrain was completed last July.

This splendid port of New Orleans, the natural ocean gateway of the great central valley of the continent, is urging another ship channel to the Gulf for ocean vessels. The Congress has called for a report on the proposition, which is being prepared. The pending River and Harbor bill contains an item authorizing a 40-foot channel from New Orleans to the Gulf by way of Southwest Pass.

A favorable report has recently been submitted for the improvement of the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon in the interest of flood control in southeast Arkansas and northeast Louisiana.

A report is being prepared to determine whether navigation on the Red River to Shreveport, La., by means of a lateral canal will prove economical and desirable. Another report on the desirability of modifying the navigation project on the Ouachita to Camden to obtain greater depths is also in preparation.

The Food Administration and the War Production Board have approved the immediate execution of the authorized flood control and navigation project on the Vermilion River and Bayou Teche in south Louisiana in the interest of greater rice production.

So much for our present position in the alluvial valley. We can say at least that we know where we are.

Now what should be our present objective and our post-war objective?

Our present objective should be to keep navigation on the river free, easy and unobstructed so that war materials may continue to move, and to strengthen our defenses against floods by every legitimate means which will not interfere with the war effort so that the alluvial valley and the Nation will not suffer a flood disaster during this war.

A post-war plan for the alluvial valley should not be just a blueprint of desirable things which we would like to have and a set of resolutions to be circulated for a day, then filed away and forgotten in the expectation that a benevolent Government will urge us to dig them out and thereupon will hand us what we want on a silver platter. It should be a declaration of faith, or, if you please, a platform, and a plan of action, to guide your organization now and in the post-war years until your objectives are attained. It should serve to get all your members to push in the same direction.

In my humble opinion, it should be of wider scope than simply working for the early completion of the existing project now authorized. I believe you might well consider taking an active part in the solution of all flood-control and navigation problems in the alluvial valley, whether under laws for the Mississippi River project, general flood control, or for rivers and harbors.

I therefore take the liberty of suggesting that in your plans, both now and for the post-war years, you give consideration to the following needs of this valley:

The early completion of the main-line levee system to the 1941 grades and sections.

The completion of the bridges across the Morganza and West Atchafalaya floodways and the operation of the Morganza floodway at the earliest opportunity to test it out.

The completion of the Atchafalaya floodway, including the floodgates and lock in the guide levee and the levees below Morgan City.

The completion of the projects for headwater flood control in the Yazoo and St. Francis Basins.

The stabilization of the main river for the purpose of making the levee system safe from river attack and in order to retain the existing flood-carrying capacity and improve the channels for navigation and flood control.

The construction of seepage berms on the landside and impervious blankets on the riverside of levees wherever seepage is a problem.

The construction of more extensive and better roads on the levee crowns.

The completion of the works for the protection of the Yazoo and Red River backwater areas.

The restoration of the discharge capacity of tributary streams within the alluvial valley so that they may serve as drainage outlets for drainage ditch systems.

The completion of the flood-control projects for Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, and Cocodrie; the Teche-Vermilion and the Mermentau.

The encouragement at all times of shipping on the inland waterways and through the ocean ports of the alluvial valley.

This would constitute a practical, commonsense, down-to-earth program. There can be no doubt about its justification. But it will take a lot of work on your part to see it through. The high order of ability and great energy of your officers and the intelligence and drive of your membership gives assurance that you will succeed.

Army Engineers in War and Post-War

(By Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army)

It is always a pleasure to meet with the membership of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association—and your distinguished president could not have chosen a more charming place in which to meet than the city of New Orleans. Here the people of this far-famed city live at the foot of the greatest watershed on the American Continent, or I might say the greatest watershed in the world. This great Mississippi Valley—gift of the Old World to the New—is now regiving fully and freely of its unparalleled energies to restore the Old World's civilizations. By the good works of its citizens, the State of Louisiana has taken a front rank in this war by which we of America propose to repay the contributions of France to our common cause of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

As an Army engineer, I wish to express my personal tribute to those members of the engineering profession and construction industry who have helped us convert from our peacetime construction tasks to the challenging job of engineering an unconditional victory. I am well aware of the great sacri-

fices which the people in this area have made in the conversion of the construction industry to war. In place of levees and drainage systems and highway improvements, we have turned every resource of American construction talent to making this Nation truly the arsenal of democracy.

We have built munitions and powder plants and tank arsenals and aircraft assembly plants. We have built troop cities and military airfields; we have built warehouses and new ports of embarkation. Since the beginning of the military construction program in June of 1940 we have undertaken for the Army of the United States an $11,000,000,000 building program, of which approximately 95 percent is now in place and in use. The Corps of Engineers is proud of its accomplishments in this building program, and we take pleasure in saluting the architects, engineers, and contractors of the country for the part they played in such an unprecedented undertaking. So much for military construction. Let us now turn our minds to the civil works of the Corps of Engineers.

Picture the Mississippi—grandest of rivers—navigable now for 2,000 miles from Minneapolis to the Passes. View the intracoastal waterways, one of which crosses the mouth of the Mississippi. Envision the harbors which dot the shores of the oceans, the Gulf and the Great Lakes. While we have planned and prosecuted our navigation projects in the interests of peace and prosperity, they are as useful as though they had been planned for this very emergency.

As to flood control in the lower valley, we find that the condition today is a complete vindication of the foresight exhibited throughout the years by your association, and a ringing rebuff to those who shook their doubting heads at projects now so well planned and completed. Think of what a disaster it would be—what a terrible setback to the war—if we were to have another 1927 flood in the lower Mississippi Valley. While it may be said that such an occurrence at present is out of the bounds of reasonable probability, we should leave no stone unturned in the maintenance of our levee systems nor as to the security of the lives and property of this great valley. The projects now on the books of Congress must be completed as soon as the war will permit, and weakness in the existing flood-protection system, if any, must be corrected in any event. As one eyewitness to another, I think I am safe in saying to this audience that the threat of 1937 was enough for me, and it should be enough for you.

May the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association continue with ever-increasing zeal the good work it has been doing in the public interest. Your organization is interested in the development and protection of the Mississippi Valley and particularly that part which extends from Cairo to the Gulf. Your levee boards have concretely demonstrated their interest over a long period of years.

Public works for the economic development of the water resources of the United States have long contributed to a forward-looking program of national progress. In war or in peace, the benefits of flood control, navigation, and related works add materially to our national strength. In order that projects may be coordinated into developments of greatest possible benefit, sound and comprehensive planning is essential.

For more than a hundred years the Corps of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of War, has carried on river and harbor and flood-control work for the Federal Government. It is, therefore, a privilege for me, as Chief of Engineers, to appear on your program and to tell you about our Nation-wide program of civil works.

During periods of normal flow, our rivers bear the shipments of commerce, turn the wheels of industry, and supply water for other beneficial uses. When floods come, however, rivers are transformed into raging giants of destruction, driving people from their homes, ruining farm crops, destroying soil and improvements, demoralizing transportation, and taking a toll of life either directly or from resulting epidemics. As late as last spring we had serious floods on the Wabash, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, and White Rivers. Thank God those waters did not "gang up" with another 1937 Ohio River flood.

The total volume of river and harbor and flood-control work entrusted to the Corps of Engineers over a period of more than a century aggregates more than $3,000,000,000, not including the cost of the Panama Canal. This work has provided and kept thousands of miles of inland waterways navigable and has made millions of acres of land and the improvements on that land, free from the threat of recurring floods.

It does not seem too visionary to picture a future in which we shall fully develop the ultimate possibilities of our river systems.

Flood control and navigation projects are not imposed by administrative directive from above. They develop from needs expressed at the grass roots. The Corps of Engineers as the civil works agent of the War Department constitutes, in effect, an engineering service for the people of the United States, represented in the Nation's Congress. This engineering service has given more than a century of responsible performance.

Flood-control investigations and plans, insofar as the Corps of Engineers is concerned, have always been geared to the larger aim of fullest effective utilization of all the water resources of a basin. A watershed is a natural unit, and the planning of a favorable equilibrium of the forces in one watershed so regards it. A good example is the Missouri, where our navigation and channel improvement works have resulted in pegging the river down to one fixed bed for the first time in its meandering history. With a stabilized and measurable channel, we are now in a position to build flood control into that river system.

As I have said on other occasions, the Corps of Engineers has accumulated in factual reports on more than 200 rivers more detailed information than is possessed by any other nation of the world on its water resources. In addition to more than 1,500 navigation and flood-control projects completed or under way, comprehensive plans involving upstream reservoirs, main-channel levees, channel improvements, and allied works have been approved and initiated for 9 of the major river basins of the United States.

A backlog of flood control and navigation projects involving an expenditure of between three and four billion dollars, and well distributed throughout the United States, is ready for legislation and initiation as soon as conditions make such a construction program advisable. The work can be started immediately and be carried on at any rate within appropriations made by Congress.

The condition we now face, of course, is the war, to the successful conclusion of which we have bent every resource in our engineer reservoir. What we have learned in our civil-works program about soil strengths and the work capacity of heavy mechanical equipment has contributed to feats of military engineering which have astonished the world. Heavy earth-moving equipment, designed originally in large measure for flood-control projects, is now recognized as combat machinery for its work on airdromes, military roads, and other war-essential projects in every theater of operation.

Within the last 3 weeks the Secretary of War has stated that we are now in the second phase of this war, which he called the drag, as distinguished from the onset. In this period, he reminds us, we must strike the great decisive blows for which we have prepared and we must be prepared to read long casualty lists, to absorb soul-shocking blows, to determine whether we can stand up under them, see them through, and have enough reserve to hammer home the third phase, the finish, the kill, to unconditional surrender.

It has been my privilege to observe this war in some of the theaters—in England, in north Africa, and now, upon a recent trip, in the Central, South, and Southwest Pacific I have seen our engineer troops at work and viewed their magnificent accomplishments. I have seen the ultimate lines to which our transportation system has carried the products of our matchless mass industry. In answer to some of the optimistic statements I have heard following cut-backs of contracts and the closing of some manufacturing facilities, in face of bulging warehouses and depots, let me say that we are not yet getting enough construction equipment and materials in places where they are vitally needed to facilitate the sledge-hammer blows to drive home a settlement with Tokyo and Berlin.

Take air power alone. Multiply your biggest field down here in the South three or four times and set the result into constellations of similar and mutually supporting airfields and you have a picture of the basing of one single area of offensive-defensive air operations. Instead of the conventional landing strips, hangars, and administration buildings of commercial aviation, picture landing strips, revetted hard standings, and control stations widely dispersed for safety, and all connected by miles of taxiways and roads. Then dot them with countless bombers and fighter planes and the ground crews and supplies to maintain them. That was our first need in the South and Southwest Pacific, and that we have. Thus we now have what it takes to make the Japs sit up and take notice.

It has been a job of great proportions, with some bases lying as far from the nearest other as the distance I have just flown from Washington to New Orleans. It has been an unprecedented job of the Engineer-Air Force team, for whether the landings at a key place be amphibious or by glider and parachute, you face the jungle. Unknown terrain filled with swamps and bayous, such as the first explorers encountered in Louisiana, test the ingenuity of the engineer, the durability of his heavy equipment, and the speed with which he can overcome these handicaps.

The air lanes to the South and Southwest Pacific, over which I have just flown, were pioneered and maintained by those same engineers, military and civilian, with whom we have all worked for years; and with the same kind of bulldozers, graders, shovels, and carry-alls you have come to know so well.

The vast airfields in England, from which we now pour destruction into Hitler's roofless fortress of Europe, were built largely by American engineer units and almost entirely by American-made heavy equipment. The ever-advancing fighter and bomber fields we built in north Africa spelled the doom of the "unbeatable" hordes of Rommel. They made possible the air cover which enabled the Allied forces to occupy and operate such ports as Tunis, Bizerte, and Bone. And the airfields and port facilities we have built and rehabilitated in Sicily and southern Italy have further advanced our armed forces toward the throat of Hitler.

Twenty-four hours after our landings in Sicily, engineers had carved out a landing field from a wheatfield and had it supplied and in operation. Engineer troops in that campaign built impossible roads over impassable terrain with incredible speed. The port of Naples in Italy is an example of the diversity of engineer operations. Drinking water had to be supplied by distillation units which pumped salt water into one end and portable water out of the other. Docks, wharves, quays have to be repaired; and utilities had to be restored to service. Not only

in this combat zone, but in all other combat zones, our engineer units are performing in their traditional way of doing things. But we have allies in this war. What have they been doing?

Great Britain not only stemmed the tide of the Nazi onslaught in the air over her own cities for 1 long year all alone, but she hung on to the port and bastion of Gibraltar, even when the Mediterranean was effectively closed to Allied shipping. Her tough sons clung to Malta, the most bombed place in history. Tenaciously she preserved her hold on the Suez Canal when backed up against the very gates of Alexandria, and she still rules the Indian Ocean. She held sway in Iraq and Iran and Trans-Jordan. She drove the Italians out of the Red Sea area.

Had she not done so, what would have been our chances of success in the north African campaign? How could Russia have been supplied from the South? What else might have prevented a union between Germany and Japan in India? These, my friends, are questions requiring solemn thought.

And what of Russia? The German perpetrators of a continuous series of wars of agression can answer that question. They can answer it in terms of whole armies stopped, defeated, captured, or slaughtered. A sad day for Hitler when he attacked that great nation.

When we commenced our military operations after Pearl Harbor, I was many times constrained to remind people that we were fighting a coalition war. China was hanging on—isolated—by her very fingernails. Russia was trading scorched-earth square miles for time in which to prepare for great counter-offensives. England was engaged in a tug-of-war with Rommel in Africa; she was fighting the Luftwaffe in her own skies and the submarine wolf packs in the Atlantic off her shores. We were just getting started—almost too late.

In those days the Allied coalition amounted to separate wars with some exchange of information, little coordination and no over-all strategy. It was then that we were most vulnerable to the potent weapon of "divide and conquer" at which the Nazis were such past masters and which was well-imitated by their partners in crime. Let it be said that there was more than a modicum of success along this line. Many were the innocent fingers pointed at the Russians and Great Britain and many a tongue wagged with stories about our allies, all manufactured in Dr. Goebbel's own poison-mind factory.

Until October of 1942 our operations were almost entirely defensive and the fate of the world hung in the balance. But now you know a different story. China is still in the war, as the Japs well know, and she is being bolstered, day by day, despite almost insuperable obstacles. Germany has been hammered back by the Russians in the east and by the British, French, and Americans in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Italy herself—the real Italy—gladly stepped out of the war. The blitz over England has now become the blitz over Hitler's ill-gotten continental European possessions. The U-boat wolf packs have had some of their teeth drawn. On all sides, impending invasion has Hitler trembling in his boots. Looking him squarely in the eye, we await the joinder of the issue on a large scale.

In the Far East we have waged a successful war on the perimeter of Japan's new Asia. We are much farther away from his vitals than we are from the Nazi's—and the going is at least as tough.

Within the last few weeks our coalition war has become a matter of definite and unified strategy. At Cairo, Japan's obituary was read in advance and now in battle we must make it effective. In Teheran, Hitler's scheme of "divide and conquer" became translated by Stalin himself to the words "complete agreement."

Now we are ready to strike those final blows. From here on let all of us—together—go on to conquer.

FLOOD CONTROL AND POST-WAR PUBLIC WORKS

(By Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, chairman, House Committee on Flood Control)

As we assemble today we have 60 centuries of flood control and other improvements of rivers behind us. When we think of flood control, we think of great engineers and great public works.

The Egyptians constructed dikes and reservoirs in the early dawn of history. Menes was the first king of the first dynasty. Some authorities place his reign about 4,000 years before Christ. Others place it 5,000 years before the Christian era. His flood-control project, according to the Greek historian Herodotus, appears to be the first undertaking of its kind on record. Levees were constructed to protect the ancient city of Memphis. Dams were built to provide water for the arid lands. Lake Moeris, a huge reservoir constructed by the Pharaohs of the twelfth dynasty, was accounted one of the seven wonders of the world.

Four thousand years ago the Egyptians built a canal 100 miles long to connect the waters of the Nile and the Red Sea. Canals were constructed in other countries in ancient times. The 1,200-mile Grand Canal of China, begun 2,500 years ago, is still the world's longest canal.

While ancient Egypt was struggling to regulate the waters of the Nile, Babylon controlled the waters of the Tigris and Euphrates. Elaborate canals and ditches were built to supplement the works of nature by Babylon 4,500 years before Christ.

The Romans maintained the ancient Egyptian flood control and river works so efficiently that Egypt was the chief granary and one of the richest provinces of the Roman Empire.

One of the oldest Chinese classics tells us how China suffered under a widespread deluge 4,200 years ago. The Emperor called in the great engineer Yu. He controlled the floods. The people called him the Great Yu. In ancient times the works of engineers were appreciated. After the death of Emperor Shun, Yu became the Emperor of China, because he saved lost land from the river.

Holland was reclaimed from the sea. It is largely a man-made country. Its system of dikes and canals was begun by the Romans. The land has influenced the people, and the people have influenced the land in Holland as in no other country. There is an old Dutch saying, "God gave us the sea, but we made the land."

The structures built by the Egyptians are the oldest in history. The great pyramids, marvels of engineering, were constructed 5,000 years ago. "All things fear time, but time fears the pyramids."

The longer one lives the more one is impressed by the close connection between ancient and modern times. In both the ancient and modern world engineers have played a chief part in all civilizations. They made marvelous contributions to the civilizations of antiquity. They have left their monuments in systems of canals in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, in great reservoirs like the Fayum in the upper Nile, in the Pyramids of ancient Egypt, in the Great Wall of China, and in the aqueducts and highways of the Roman Empire. Herodotus tells us of the great works of the architect Rhoecus of Samos as he speaks of his marvelous reservoir works and of the great temple of Herah. An aqueduct was constructed by King Hezechiah to supply the city of Jerusalem long before Christ.

The United States leads the world in engineering and engineering structures. Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams will each impound larger volumes of water than the far-famed Assuan Dam in the upper stretches of the Nile. The Panama Canal is the greatest artificial waterway ever built by the hand of man. The levees along the lower Mississippi River have required more than three times the excavation of the Panama Canal, and they are the most massive structures in the history of mankind.

In time of war, engineers have always constructed the weapons of destruction. They build the tanks, the airplanes, the battleships, and the structures essential for the advance of the armies. No profession has contributed more to the progress of mankind than the engineers.

Rivers have served man in the past. They have molded peoples and they have contributed to progress. In the future as in the past rivers will make nations great.

Rivers interest me. They fascinate me. They have always influenced the course of civilization. They have a character all their own. They flow through the years and through the lands and they flow across civilizations. They make history. They bring life and they bring destruction. They are the friends or they may be the enemies of man. Man himself makes the final choice.

Rivers are just as important in peace as in war. The great Russian and German battles have been fought over the Don, the Donets, and the Dnieper Rivers. The most famous campaigns of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant were along the Tennessee and the Mississippi Rivers. Rivers influence the course of war, but they influence the course of peace no less than war.

There are small rivers that are just as important as large rivers. There are small men who are just as great as large men. Important rivers, like important men, are not always large in size. Many of the most important rivers in the world are comparatively small while the names of others much larger are seldom heard.

Of all rivers, the Mississippi is the most marvelous. Below the Missouri its waters are muddy. South of Cairo it flows into the Gulf of Mexico through the alluvial valley. The valley averages from 20 to 80 miles in width. Above the mouth of the Missouri its waters are green. There are beautiful palisades and wonderful limestone cliffs that tower far above the green waters. In the upper stretches the falls of St. Anthony are not only beautiful, but they are renowned in song and story. The Indians spoke of the Mississippi as the Big River. When we think of the Mississippi River, we think of power and of glory. It is not only the longest but it is the greatest navigable river in all the world. It loses none of its interest and its fascination as it travels toward the sea.

While national flood-control appropriations, except in emergencies to protect war plants, have been discontinued for the duration, it is a source of satisfaction that appropriations for continuing the enlargement and raising of the levees in the vital middle sections of the Mississippi River in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi between Memphis and Baton Rouge, as provided for in the Flood Control Act of 1941, have been continued. Great progress toward the completion of the adopted project has been made during the current year. It is essential that additional appropriations shall be made until all of the levees, as provided by the act, shall have been raised and strengthened. Without the cooperation of the citizens of the lower valley the enlargement and strengthening of the levees would have been impossible. It is imperative that the adopted project be completed in order that the lower valley may be protected against the next great flood.

The losses in lives and property in the floods of 1943 in the mid-continental area

focused public attention not only upon the necessity of renewing flood-control appropriations following the war but upon the vital importance of enlarging and extending flood-control appropriations. The Committee on Flood Control conducted hearings during the month of June ,and the hearings embraced not only the damages of the 1943 and other recent floods but covered all of the flood-control projects on which the chief of engineers had submitted favorable reports since the Flood Control Act passed August 18, 1941. An emergency appropriation of $10,000,000 was authorized and made for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works threatened or destroyed by recent floods.

The committee plans to report and to urge that Congress adopt early in 1944 a comprehensive flood-control bill to provide for authorizations for flood-control improvements following the war and to include all projects in all of the river basins of the country on which favorable reports have been submitted since August 18, 1941.

The existing backlog of flood-control authorizations is insufficient to meet the demands of post-war construction. In fact it is not large enough for peace. There are projects that have been approved but not authorized at an estimated cost of more than $2,000,000,000. Plans are ready. Only authorizations are needed.

The Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1941 have approved works at an estimated cost of some $3,000,000,000, but only partial authorizations aggregating $1,000,000,000 for the initiation and construction of the more important works have been made. Congress manifested foresight. Additional authorizations will provide for the immediate construction, as I have stated, of approved flood-control works and projects and of projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers in the past 2 years.

The works in the lower Mississippi Valley were tested in 1937, and the flood of 1943 proved that Old Man River had been bridled and harnessed. The local protective works along the Ohio River were tested as they withstood the floods in the fall and winter of 1942. The history of floods in the United States and other countries is well known. The forces of nature have been constant through the centuries. Floods are no more frequent today than formerly, but because of the progress and advancement of civilization the destruction is much greater. The time for argument and disputation with respect to the methods of solving flood problems has passed. All factors of safety have been utilized. Levees, flood walls, reservoirs, cut-offs, spillways, channel improvements, and diversions have been authorized and constructed. The policy and the program are sound. Unparalleled progress in flood control has been made in the United States. The improvements began along the lower Mississippi River. More progress in the control of floods has been made in the United States in the past 15 years than in the preceding 150 years, or for that matter, in the preceding 1,500 years. We know that floods cannot be prevented, but we know that they can be controlled. The act of 1928 first proclaimed that flood control is a national problem. A national policy for flood control was first adopted in 1936.

There is a reason for the success of the program. All planning and all construction are under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. They are the outstanding flood-control engineers of this or any other country and of this or any other age. Substantially $1,000,000,000 for national flood-control projects have been authorized outside of the lower Mississippi Valley. More than $600,000,000 have been authorized for the Mississippi River.

Flood control, like science, knows no finality. The adopted projects are flexible and can be expanded. All works as authorized will be utilized in the program of expansion. Flood control is neither final nor static. As new problems arise, new solutions will be found.

The accomplishments of the United States Corps of Engineers have been characterized by courage, by initiative, and by genius. Experiments as well as studies and experience have been utilized. The cut-offs that have shortened the lower Mississippi River between Helena and Baton Rouge substantially 138 miles, tested as they have been by actual floods, are among the monumental engineering achievements in flood control.

Power advocates and conservationists often foster projects under the guise of flood control. Water is the most valuable of our natural resources. It should neither be wasted nor polluted. It should be utilized for the benefit of man. There is a place for soil conservation and there is a place for reforestation. There is a place for the development of power. Soil conservation and reforestation must supplement and not supplant flood-control works. Water uses and water conservation should be provided where feasible in the building of dams. Power should be developed wherever practicable, in the construction of reservoirs. The public should be advised whether the works are primarily for power. They know there is a difference between flood control and soil conservation and reforestation. They know that floods obtained in the United States before the white man cut a tree or plowed a furrow. They know that a full reservoir is essential for the development of power, but they also know that an empty reservoir is essential for the storage of floodwaters. All existing flood-control acts provide that penstocks in reservoirs shall be installed by the engineers where there are probabilities that power may be developed. The methods of flood control contemplate that floodwaters shall serve and not destroy man. There is a place, therefore, in the flood-control program for the multiple-purpose reservoir. Wherever practicable and wherever feasible, such reservoir should be constructed.

We hear a great deal of post-war planning. We heard much of planning during the great depression that followed the crash of 1929. Much of the proposed planning is too theoretical. It is impractical. Too many professional planners cover too much territory, so to speak. They embrace too many activities with the result that there is no definite information for legislation for specific improvements that are urgently demanded and that are entirely practical. Many of the so-called related activities are only remotely connected with the important activities. There is delay. There is confusion. Congress and the country are entitled to better studies and to sounder planning. Only tried and true planning should be used. There is universal agreement that both the planning and execution of flood control and river improvement works should be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

Total war must be followed by total peace. The immediate task is to win the war but when the war is won, when war production stops, and when our armed forces are demobilized, serious unemployment problems will arise. The problems of peace will be almost as difficult as the problems of war. Wishful thinking is not sound planning. Careful study, more careful planning, and immediate preparation are essential. Prompt action now is imperative to provide for economic conditions then.

There is a place for private as well as public construction. Each has a definite field. There are local public works that should be promoted and financed by the State, county, and city. There are other public works that should be provided by the Federal Government. Victory is our first objective, but true patriotism transcends war. It demands adequate planning for peace. Otherwise the sacrifices of our armed forces will be in vain. There is no place for the dole or the work-relief program. They would only add to the economic ills following war. Public works contemplate long-range planning. They should provide now for construction then. They must be fully planned if they are to be Federally financed. They include flood-control works and highway construction.

We are fighting to preserve our way of life. The profit motive has contributed to our greatness and to our success. Private initiative is the capstone of American progress. It must be preserved and encouraged. There must be no conflict between private and public works. Public works, therefore, must not compete with the works that may be properly provided for through private enterprise. In all public works the benefits should exceed the costs.

Flood control will not require any additional agencies or bureaus. The rivers of the United States have been studied. Plans have been made. There will be no occasion for additional agencies. There will be no occasion for the waste and extravagance of unemployment periods. Many programs will be proposed under the guise of public works, but every proposal should be studied and tested, and it should meet the requirements of sound public works. First, the project should have practical utility. Secondly, it should be economically sound. Thirdly, it should be of a type not to compete with any facilities that can be provided by private enterprise. Flood control meets the test for Federal works.

There is no valley in all the world comparable to the Mississippi Valley. It lies between the Alleghenies and the Rockies and between the Lakes and the Gulf. It is more important than any other valley on the face of the earth. The future of the United States will be determined by the development of the valley. Factories will be safer with the mountains separating them from the seas. The soil of the Mississippi Valley is the most fertile of this or any other country. It is not too much to say that the civilization of the valley will determine the civilization of the United States.

There are some dangerous trends. There is too much complacency. Many act as if the war were won. I would be less than frank if I did not sound a note of warning. The war is by no means won. The road to victory is hard and difficult. We have just reached the fringes of the Japanese Empire. We have not invaded Germany. There are no evidences of an internal collapse in Europe. There must be an end to the rosy dreams of victory. The war will be prolonged by our believing that we are on the eve of final victory over either of our enemies. Despite reverses, notwithstanding losses, Germany still has the best-trained army in the world. Although Hitler lost 20 divisions in the defeat at Stalingrad, Germany has reequipped 60 new divisions since that time. Germany has more fighting men under arms today than at any time during more than 4 years of war. No collapse of Germany can be expected in the near future. In the Pacific, after 2 years, we have done but little more than establish supply lanes to Australia in our drive toward Tokyo.

We are engaged in a global and a total war. Many Americans have not realized the meaning of war. We do not know what sacrifice means. We are thinking more of profits and wages and salaries. We do not know the meaning of denial. We are eating more and wearing better clothes and making more money than ever before. War has not come to our cities nor to our country. Many of us know only what we read in the newspapers or hear over the radio about war. It has not

been brought home to us. Victory will not come until all have sacrificed. When we contemplate the heroism of the brave boys in the sky, on the sea, and on the land in the foxholes of the Pacific, and in the rugged hills of Italy, when we think of their suffering and of their sacrifices, we realize that we do not know what sacrifice means. I am thinking of the widow in the district that I represent. She has four sons in the armed services. She is working in a defense plant. It is easy to find fault. What do we know about the suffering of fox holes and submarines? We have had ample coffee and sugar, food and clothing. We have given up none of the comforts of life and have only given up a few luxuries, but selfishness obtains.

Disunity is often encountered. Too many are thinking of profits. Too many are thinking of improving their position or the position of their group. Too few are making sacrifices to win the war. Let us rededicate ourselves and our fortunes to the supreme job of winning the war. Victory comes first. The supreme aim of America in fighting the greatest of all wars is to save America, and the supreme rehabilitation following victory is the rehabilitation of America. Germany and Japan must be destroyed. The price will be great. The bloodiest battles of the War between the States were fought after Vicksburg and Gettysburg. The bloodiest battles are ahead. The price in blood and treasure will stagger the imagination. No Jap prisoners are being taken. On Tarawa Island the casualties of the Marine Corps were 1,026 dead and 2,557 wounded. I give you the order of the day when the island was attacked: "The Japanese have been taught that their highest duty is to die for their Emperor. It is up to you to see that no Jap soldier fails in this duty." Five thousand were killed. There were no prisoners at Tarawa, I repeat, nor in any other battle or engagement with Japs.

We must gird ourselves for the difficult days ahead. We must not repeat the mistakes of the First World War. General Pershing was right when he insisted upon the unconditional surrender of Germany. He insisted that the American Army march down the main street of Berlin. There must be no main street in Berlin. There must be no main street in Tokyo. Hitler and Tojo must bite the dust. There must be unconditional surrender.

The disunity of some can only delay. I believe, however, that the people of the United States are united for victory and that they are determined to end total war by sinking deep the sword of victory into the hearts of Germany and of Japan.

With victory we plan for a fairer day and a better land. We look forward to the dawn of the day when we can turn from war with its engineering for destruction to peace with its engineering for construction.

RESOLUTIONS

The Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, representing the levee and drainage districts in the States of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, adopted the following resolutions while assembled in annual convention in New Orleans, La., December 21, 1943:

I

"*Resolved,* That the project for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley and for its improvement, from the Head of Passes to Cape Girardeau, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, be prosecuted at the maximum rate consistent with the national all-out war effort and that work be concentrated on the completion of those main Mississippi River levees between the Arkansas and Red Rivers that have not been brought to the 1941 project grade and section, in order that said levees may be prepared to give full protection against the project flood which might occur at any time in the future."

II

"*Resolved,* That the time has come when we must stop retreating from the Mississippi River. We call on the War Department forthwith to determine upon a policy to confine the river to a reasonably stable channel in the interests of flood control and navigation. The main line levee system represents an investment of $529,000,000. Of this the Federal Government has appropriated $282,000,000, while $247,000,000 has come from the toil and sweat of farmers on both sides of the river from Cape Girardeau to the Gulf. Heretofore it has been more economical in most cases of attack to construct a set-back levee than to revet the caving banks. That is no longer good economy. Every retreat from the encroachments of the river means that we surrender our higher and best lands and construct the set-back levee on lower land having more unstable foundation. At long last we must resolve with the continued partnership of the War Department to hold the main-line levees in their present positions by nailing down the river channel with dredging and an enlarged program of bank revetment. We strongly favor the proposed project to deepen the Mississippi River from 9 to 12 feet from Cairo to Baton Rouge in the mutual interest of flood control and navigation."

III

"*Resolved,* That construction of those features of the Morganza floodway which have been delayed or suspended due to the war emergency be resumed at the earliest practicable time and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of active hostilities of the present war in order that this floodway may be operated with maximum efficiency and effectiveness for the benefit of the entire alluvial valley and with minimum inconvenience to the area it traverses."

IV

"*Resolved:* That in full recognition of the need for a large-scale post-war construction program to provide peacetime employment for demobilized fighting men and for the many workers who will no longer be required on war production, the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association strongly recommends that the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Committees of the House of Representatives report favorably from time to time flood control and river and harbor bills, beginning early in the year 1944, with the view to increasing the backlog of worthy public improvements that may be prosecuted with dispatch throughout the post-war period. The construction of flood control and navigation projects constitutes an excellent and approved method of providing both direct and indirect employment of large numbers of people."

V

"*Resolved:* That the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association hereby reaffirms its faith and confidence in the Corps of Engineers, who are exceptionally qualified to handle skillfully large administrative organizations without permitting waste, inefficiency or questionable practices of any kind, and who are amply prepared and fully capable of prosecuting any civil program that the Congress and the President may assign to them at this time or in the post-war period."

VI

"*Resolved,* That as pioneers in flood control and the conservation of water resources in the United States, it is our firm conviction that the Federal planning, execution, operation, and maintenance of public improvements for flood control and allied purposes are being administered to the best interest of the public and the National Government by the departments of the government presently authorized to prosecute such improvements. We reaffirm our recommendations that the respective and well-defined functions now established by law to be performed under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, those under the Department of Agriculture, and those under the Department of the Interior, respectively, continue to be performed by these agencies. We repeat our opposition to the creation or extension of valley authorities."

VII

"*Resolved,* That we adopt as a long-range program the following projects to be prosecuted vigorously at the earliest practicable time and in any event not later than the cessation of active hostilities in the present war:

"Completion of the main-line levee system to the 1941 grades and sections.

"Completion of the bridges across the Morganza and West Atchafalaya floodways and the operation of the Morganza floodway at the earliest opportunity to test it out.

"Completion of the Atchafalaya floodway, including the floodgates and lock in the guide levee and the levees below Morgan City, La.

"Completion of the projects for headwater flood control in the Yazoo and St. Francis Basins.

"Stabilization of the main river for the purpose of making the levee system safe from river attack and in order to retain the existing flood-carrying capacity and improve the channels for navigation and flood control.

"Construction of seepage berms on the land side and impervious blankets on the river side of levees wherever seepage is a problem.

"Construction of more extensive and better roads on the levee crowns.

"Completion of the works for the protection of the Yazoo and Red River backwater areas.

"Restoration of the discharge capacity of tributary streams within the alluvial valley so that they may serve as drainage outlets for drainage ditch systems.

"Completion of the flood-control projects for Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, and Cocodrie; the Teche-Vermilion and the Mermentau.

"Encouragement at all times of shipping on the Inland Waterways and through the ocean ports of the Alluvial Valley.

"In grateful recognition of the support we have received from the Nation in solving the Mississippi River flood problem, we pledge our cooperation to flood sufferers everywhere, and particularly where flood problems arise on the tributaries of the Mississippi River."

VIII

"*Resolved,* That with thankful recognition of the progress our armed forces are making all over the world toward bringing this war to a victorious end, with sympathetic consideration for the less fortunate multitudes elsewhere in the world, and with the firm determination to do our part in the interest of restoring our beloved America and the world to peace and happiness, the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association pledges its full support to the President of the United States and offers to serve the national cause in every way possible."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the "four freedoms" have been resuscitated.

We will never believe there were no secret treaties at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran.

Every major act in the Capitol from now till November will be tinted with the fourth term. You cannot get away from it.

A national service act would be good yet if it did not fall into the hands of a natural dictator, with continuing ambitions.

What is the use of a Nation-wide service law if "war workers will not be disturbed in their present jobs"? It is as clear as mud.

Take your choice, "charming idiots," from the last annual message; "suspicious souls," "unseeing moles," "noisy minority," "pests," "self-seeking partisanship."

If it had been "planned that way" to correct the errors after the other war, why did not we have universal conscription with the draft law, or at least from Pearl Harbor?

The Treasury has inserted a question on your income-tax blank, asking the amount of your War bonds. The obvious purpose is to get your number so they can tell you what to buy, or else.

The new proposal for super-duper highways destroys the old and satisfactory Federal aid to States, which was equally matched and jointly administered. Now all must be all from Washington from sun to sun and coast to coast.

Go Chicago. How prophetic these words from the 1860 platform: "That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government." Of the 11 Republican conventions in the "Windy City," 7 produced winners.

The big three and Mr. Hull are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution, "and so am I," said the President. Some others of us are also conversant with the fact that the Supreme Court is packed and that the good old Constitution is every week being circumvented.

Tom Dewey Tops Big Midwest Presidential Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this is the season of straw votes, political predictions, and Presidential polls. Of general interest, therefore, is the following tabulation of results obtained in the Presidential poll being conducted by the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., largest Republican newspaper in its five-State area. All voting in this poll is monitored by representatives of this newspaper, so that accuracy is assured and so that no duplicate voting can take place. Consequently the results obtained can be accepted as giving a clear-cut report of the Presidential preferences of Middle Western Republicans in their choice for President.

The poll also reveals the significant fact that President Roosevelt has lost better than 24 percent in South Dakota since 1940, which is a switch of sentiment much larger than generally expected even by students of popular trends, who have recognized the Nation-wide swing away from the New Deal administration.

DEWEY GETS 43 PERCENT OF ALL G. O. P. VOTES IN POLL, WILLKIE 23—STASSEN RUNS THIRD—OTHERS TRAIL BEHIND—ERIC JOHNSTON STRONGEST OF "DARK HORSES"—ROOSEVELT STRONG

(By the Poll Editor)

Results to date in the Argus-Leader Presidential poll in South Dakota show that Gov. Tom Dewey has received more than 43 percent of the votes cast for leading potential candidates for the Republican nomination, while Wendell Willkie, his closest competitor, is running a fraction under 23 percent.

In order of ranking, the leading Republican candidates are: Dewey, 43 percent; Willkie, 23 percent; Stassen, 19 percent; MacArthur, 8 percent; and Bricker, 6 percent. Votes for minor or unnamed candidates are not included in the foregoing percentages.

BYRD IS RUNNER-UP

In the Democratic field, where only Roosevelt is mentioned as a possibility, the President holds approximately 94 percent of the straw vote, with the rest divided equally between Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, and some unnamed candidate, and one lone vote cast for Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Voters casting ballots wrote in the names of BYRD and Hull or indicated they were in favor of some unnamed Democrat.

JOHNSTON GETS 3 PERCENT

On the Republican side, the voters wrote in names of seven "dark horses," with only Eric Johnston of Seattle, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, getting an appreciable vote. His total, however, is less than 3 percent of that cast for all candidates in the Republican field.

Others who have friends and admirers in the Republican camp are: Pat Hurley, former Secretary of War; Alf Landon, former Kansas Governor and 1936 Presidential candidate; Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio; Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan; former President Herbert Hoover; and Congressman JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, House Republican leader.

ROOSEVELT SLIPS

Although Roosevelt continues as the strong man in the Democratic ranks, it is indicated that he is slipping substantially in South Dakota.

The Argus-Leader poll shows 90 persons who voted for Roosevelt in 1940 are chalked up for some Republican candidate in 1944.

Expressed in another way, this means that Roosevelt has lost better than 24 percent in South Dakota since 1940.

The Republicans also have lost some strength, a total of 18 persons expressing their choice for Roosevelt after having voted for Willkie in 1940. The loss for Republicans is only 1.7 percent.

Latest reports in the Argus-Leader poll were received from Wagner, where customers at the Conger Coffee Shop were handed ballots, and from Garretson, where a poll was taken at a meeting of Henry G. Fix Post of the American Legion. The vote:

Wagner Coffee Shop customers: Republican—Bricker, 1; Dewey, 19; MacArthur, 4; Stassen, 1; Willkie, 3. Democratic—Roosevelt 16. Shift—Democrat to Republican, 3.

Garretson Legion Post: Republican—Dewey, 7; MacArthur, 3; Stassen, 7. Democratic—Roosevelt, 2; Byrd, 1. Shift—Democrat to Republican, 4.

With these results, the aggregate votes in 35 different groups or organizations polled in the State were as follows:

Republican—Bricker, 63; Dewey, 437; MacArthur, 81; Stassen, 191; Willkie, 240; unnamed, 4; Hurley, 1; Landon, 1; Johnston, 35; Taft, 4; Vandenberg, 2; Hoover, 2; Joe Martin, 1.

Democratic—Roosevelt, 259; Hull, 1; Byrd, 8; unnamed, 8.

Shift—Democrat to Republican, 90; Republican to Democrat, 18.

Post-War Problem No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposal of Mr. Lawrence F. Quigley, commandant of the soldiers' home at Chelsea, Mass. Since this proposal is one that is offered to us by the commandant after a great deal of study and experience with the physically disabled who have come under his immediate supervision at the hospital, and is a most worth-while recommendation, it should have the consideration of every Member of Congress:

To the Members of the Congress:

The war poses a single question, a single problem: How can victory be achieved?

By contrast, peace will pose myriads of questions and problems. Chief among them is, What shall we do for and with the physically or mentally handicapped veteran? This problem is both humanitarian and economic. As the war progresses and casualties mount, no purpose will be closer to the hearts of the people than that which concerns those members of the armed forces who have suffered physical, mental, and emotional wounds.

When the problem has assumed its ultimate proportions—which will be when the war is over and all the halt and the lame have been mustered out of the service—government, business, and industry will be faced with the stern necessity of devising some practicable plan for utilizing such capabilities as these partially disabled men possess. Otherwise, our economic system will be compelled to bear the burden of supporting hundreds of thousands of handicapped veterans in idleness or semi-idleness.

The general public is not yet aware, or at least not fully conscious, of the fact that the armed forces have already discharged and sent back into civilian life a very large number of men who, for various reasons, were found unfit for military service. Some of them are also unfit for ordinary civilian occupations, but so great is the present demand for workers that most of them have succeeded in obtaining employment. This has kept from the general public full knowledge of the danger in this situation, but it will be revealed when jobs are no longer so plentiful and competition from the physically and mentally normal job-seeker will inevitably push the subnormal workman out of his job and force him into the ranks of the unemployed.

That, and nothing less, is what is in prospect for many of the servicemen already released. The prospect is no brighter for the serviceman who will come back to civilian life tomorrow or next year with handicapping disabilities. He must be rehabilitated, by removing the disability if possible, and, if that is not possible, then he must be trained for some special type of work which he can be made capable of performing.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING CLASSES, BUT—

Fortunately, the Government has already set up the machinery for accomplishing this very purpose; first, through hospitalization, and, secondly, through vocational training courses. Unfortunately, owing to the Government's failure to provide adequate compensation for trainees and their families, eligible servicemen are not enrolling in these vocational classes, with the result that so far these classes exist in theory only; they are hardly more than myths.

Will it astonish you, as it did me, to learn from apparently authentic sources that less than 300 servicemen had enrolled in these vocational classes up to a month ago? If this statement seems preposterous, utterly unbelievable, may I suggest that you consult the Director of the Veterans' Bureau for either confirmation or refutation?

This is all the more disturbing when one bears in mind the high percentage of inductees that within a few weeks or a few months after induction are discovered to be unsuited for military service and thereupon are discharged. Also, according to Army and Navy medical officers, we must expect a higher percentage of wounded in this war than in World War No. 1. Col. H. D. Offutt, chief of the hospitalization section of the Army Surgeon General's Office, said recently: "The type of 'block busters' now used, the tremendous explosive power of shells and torpedoes, the terrible burns that come from gasoline and oil are crippling more men than the shot and shell of the last war."

That, coupled with the fact that there are two and one-half times more men in the armed forces, and likely to experience actual combat service, should prepare us for the possibility of hundreds of thousands of wounded. All but a small fraction of the wounded survive, and a truly marvelous job of mending broken bodies is being done, but rehabilitation is lagging far behind the accomplishments of our physicians and surgeons. Unless we do more, much more, to train our physically salvaged casualties for useful employment, the resulting social and economic tragedy will stand as an indictment of our resourcefulness and a reproach to the conscience of every man occupying a place of power in the governmental, economic, and social structure of the Nation.

WHAT THE HANDICAPPED CAN DO

Is it possible to reclaim the partially disabled, to transform them from liabilities into assets, to make them valuable members of society? The answer is, "Yes." Cases without end could be cited, but a few will serve the purpose. Roscoe Drummond, a member of the Christian Science Monitor's Washington staff, after exhaustive investigation, said in the December 24, 1943, issue of the Monitor: "The United States Civil Service Commission reports that physically handicapped workers have been placed in positions ranging from clerical to unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled jobs in heavy Government industry.

"A large number of blind persons are employed at air fields.

"An armless telephone switchboard operator works at a large Government hospital.

"A one-armed auto mechanic is employed in the motor pool in the Quartermaster Department at a port of embarkation.

"A blind girl at an Army air depot sorts bolts and nuts by touch. She works with unbelievable speed.

"A blind radio technician is known as the only man who can repair airplane radios without removing them from the plane.

"Of 87 employers answering a questionnaire on accident rate, 49 reported it lower for handicapped employees, 36 reported it the same as for the unhandicapped, and 2 reported it higher for the handicapped.

"This proves," added Mr. Drummond, "that the physically handicapped workers are relatively not handicapped at all in their faculties and their functions, and that there are unlimited opportunities to use them in work where their apparent handicaps are irrelevant."

It proves to me that partly disabled servicemen, if their skills are developed through proper study and practical training, can be made self-supporting, an asset instead of a liability to society. Vocational training is the best and most practicable program, and the most worthy of full exploitation, that has yet emerged from this war. It ought to be made available, in practice as well as in theory, to the tens of thousands of servicemen who are now eligible, and the far greater number that eventually will be eligible, for its benefits. That can be brought about by raising the pay of trainees to an amount sufficient to enable them to live and meet their obligations while pursuing their courses of study.

DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY

Under existing law and regulations, the serviceman who is to be discharged because of disability is assisted in completing his claim at the camp or hospital from which he is to be separated. The claim, together with his medical records, is forwarded to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration in the State in which the serviceman resides. The claim is then presented to a rating board, which considers all the available evidence and determines the amount of the pension, if any. This rating board then decides whether the disability in question constitutes a handicap. If it does, the serviceman is declared eligible for a course in vocational training.

TRAINEES' PAY

While pursuing the training course, the trainee will receive from the Government, if he is single, $80 a month plus $10 a month for each dependent parent. If he is married he will be paid $90 a month plus $5 a month for each child and $10 a month for each dependent parent. The Government pays all tuition and material costs.

As superintendent of the Chelsea, Mass., Soldiers' Home and Hospital I have talked with approximately 1,000 discharged servicemen of the present war. I invariably urge them to take advantage of the opportunity to obtain further education and training and thus to prepare themselves for more useful and better paid jobs, jobs perhaps better suited to their capacities than the ones they held before being inducted into the service. They tell me, almost without exception, that their obligations are such that they cannot meet them on the pay they would receive as trainees.

Assuming that some of these men have no such obligations as they pretend to have, that they are either indifferent to the thought of self-improvement and its long-term rewards or merely greedy for immediate big wages in war industry, I still am very sure that many of them are sincere and would enroll for vocational training courses if they could do so without actual sacrifice to their dependent families.

PROPOSED PAY RATES

I propose, therefore, that the present pay of trainees, $80 a month for single men and $90 a month for married men, be increased to $100 a month and $150 a month, respectively, the additional allowance for children and dependent parents to remain as at present. The first month's pay to the serviceman eligible for vocational training well might be given to him on the day of his discharge.

If this higher rate of pay should be granted and the advantages of these vocational training courses brought more forcefully to the attention of eligible servicemen by everyone connected with the program, I am convinced that a very satisfactory percentage of these men would take advantage of this opportunity. If I am correct in this assumption, every extra dollar thus paid out by the Government would prevent the expenditure of $100, perhaps even $1,000, in the years to come.

WE CAN AFFORD TO REBUILD MEN

Spending a dollar now to save many, many dollars in the not too distant future is economically sound, not to mention its humanitarian aspects—the better, fuller, more secure life it would insure to these thousands of servicemen and their families. To say, as some will, that we cannot afford to pay $150 a month to a married serviceman to enable him to fit himself for a vocation more profitable to himself and his family and more useful to his country and his community would indeed be to place the dollar equation above the human equation. A nation that can afford to spend $90,000,000,000 a year to wage war can afford to spend a few millions of dollars to rebuild and strengthen the broken bodies and the shattered minds of the men who did their part in achieving the victory.

I submit this proposal in the firm belief that its adoption by the Congress would constitute a longer step than any that has yet been taken toward a solution of the vexing problem of what to do for the handicapped serviceman and how to do it. This problem will not wait. It is here now. It needs to be solved now. The way to solve it is to stop throwing reclaimable handicapped men out of the armed forces back into a civilian economy which is not organized to assimilate them.

We should not shrink from the application of drastic measures to remedy a situation which if allowed to drift will probably drift onto the rocks. Money we can well afford, but we cannot afford to have untold thousands of bruised and battered minds left unmended to suffer the tortures of ostracism and in turn to become both a burden and a reproach to us who chanted songs of praise when action and a healing hand were needed.

Respectfully,

LAWRENCE F. QUIGLEY.

Education for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in introducing H. R. 3957 at this time, I am motivated by the idea that we should prepare now to rehabilitate our veterans—wounded or well—as they return. The task of caring for the veterans should not be left to hasty action at the last moment when hostilities cease. Some steps have already been taken, and wisely, toward providing mustering-out pay for the approximately 1,000,000 men who have been discharged from the armed services thus far, to

allow more liberal hospital and medical care for the incapacitated, and to extend pensions to the disabled.

Meantime, Selective Service will assist all veterans to get their former jobs back after discharge, provided they are still fit to do the work and the status of the employer has not changed so that rehiring would be an undue hardship on him. It is proceeding on the policy of giving the veteran the benefit of any doubt.

The Veterans' Administration is setting up an enlarged service to provide vocational rehabilitation for every veteran whose disability, whether from wounds, accident, or disease, requires that he be retrained before he can earn his living. Its service will be made available to every veteran whose condition occurred in the line of duty.

For those who become incapacitated from causes other than those in line of duty and who must be taught new work to become useful, the Federal Office of Education of the Department of the Interior has launched a program of vocational rehabilitation. This work will be done in collaboration with the departments of civilian vocational rehabilitation of each State.

And for every veteran, man or woman, discharged with honor from any branch of the military, the War Manpower Commission's employment service is making itself available to find them a job. This service is offered to all, whether disabled or not.

All these benefits, in my opinion, do not completely fulfill our obligations to the returning veterans. We must, in addition, assume our responsibility for the continued education of our service men and women. Under the bill I am introducing today the Government will pay a flat sum of $50 a month for veterans who desire to return to school to finish their education. In addition, married veterans will be paid $25 for their wife and $10 for each child.

The Government will also pay the tuition and buy the books, tools, or other educational supplies. It will be necessary for the student to maintain a passing grade in the majority of his subjects during the first year and in all his subjects in the following years.

There will be no limitation on the course to be pursued by the veteran student and he may, if he so desires, take medicine and dentistry, which usually take more than 4 years for completion. The Government shall make regular payments for all courses, provided the student fulfills his part of the program.

Public and private schools will be allowed to participate in this program providing they are duly accredited by a recognized accrediting association or the State board of education.

I am offering this bill for the consideration of Congress because I am convinced of the need for this kind of legislation. This measure not only partially compensates for services rendered to the Nation but it also recognizes and assumes an obligation we owe. These veterans will have the opportunity to acquire a good education, to enter the line of business they are most interested in, and thus to become more useful and better satisfied citizens.

It is imperative for the Government to consider immediately the necessary plans and programs for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this World War. The confusion and chaos which faced the veterans of 1917–18 must not be allowed this time.

There are many things this Nation must do for its sons and daughters in the armed services. But before we pass too many laws we should be certain to place the administration of all matters pertaining to the welfare of veterans under one bureau, the Veterans' Administration. If we give this control to the Veterans' Administration, simplify procedure, and bring about a unification of all laws now on the books or to come, we shall be laying a solid foundation for the future.

The 15,000,000 veterans who will come out of this war are going to create many new problems. It is essential, therefore, that veterans' legislation in all its phases be put on a more orderly basis.

We shall be spending billions of dollars for years to come for medical care, pensions, loans, and education. This money must not be used for political purposes, but must be used for the betterment of the veterans only. The Veterans' Administration is the logical agency to handle these huge funds, because it is an independent agency and one in which the veterans themselves have confidence.

The care of the veterans should be primarily a Federal responsibility. It is a repayment in part for the Government to furnish free education for its veterans because they are our best citizens and we must help to prepare them for the responsibilities they must assume when they return. If this country is good enough to defend—and it is—then it must be good enough to take care of the veterans who will bring us victory. This Government taught them the science of war—it must now help teach them the arts of peace.

A National Labor Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A National Labor Code," written by Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the Waltham Watch Workers' Union, and published in the November 1943 issue of the American Watch Worker, together with a letter from Mr. Cenerazzo, relating to a national labor code.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTHAM, MASS., *January 11, 1944.*

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I am writing you regarding our experience since my conversations with you regarding the formulation of the national labor code, as provided for in S. 1307, in April 1943. At that time I was president of the Waltham Watch Workers' Union, which was then affiliated with the International Jewelry Workers' Union, A. F. of L. Our organization, the Waltham Watch Workers' Union, had difficulty with the international union in trying to get that organization to be a protective union to protect their interests. New rules were often put through by the general executive board or the president of the international union without regard to the constitution of the organization.

The international union had a membership of 8,100 people and the Waltham Watch Workers' Union had a membership of over 2,000.

The Waltham Watch Workers' Union desired the Elgin Watch Co. employees and the Hamilton Watch Co. employees associated with their organization in order to carry on more effectively in the battle to protect 10,000 skilled American workmen and their families against the increasing encroachment of watch movements from Central Europe. This development could only mean the transfer of employment from America to Switzerland and the consequent destruction of an industry that meant much to the United States.

Even though the international union at its convention in June 1942 had voted to organize these people, the international officers refused to move. In August 1943 an election was held. The Waltham Watch Workers' Union voted by secret ballot in a public school in the regular manner set forth and used in the city election, using the city ballot box. The election was held under the auspices of an election board, which was elected by the membership at an open meeting. Then the ballots were counted and certified and then sent to New York as prescribed by the constitution. The votes were counted in New York by a canvassers' board committee of the international union. No representatives of the local were allowed to be present at the international offices when the ballots were recounted.

A recount was requested by the Waltham Watch Workers Union due to the fact that the canvassing board reported that discrepancies in the count from 50 to 150 votes occurred in the votes counted by the Waltham Watch Workers election board and the International Union's appointed canvassing board. This request for recount was denied.

Three local unions requested the American Federation to investigate the affairs of this organization. To date, no action has been taken by the A. F. of L. on this matter, even though the executive council received a letter addressed to it on this matter.

On October 28, 1943, the Waltham Watch Workers Union by unanimous vote dissolved its organization and returned a pro-rata share of the funds to each of its members and organized a new independent union known as the Waltham Watch Workers Union, Independent. The leadership of the Waltham Watch Workers Union, Independent, then organized the Hamilton Watch Workers Union to which a majority of the employees of the Hamilton Watch Co. of Lancaster, Pa., now belong and a petition for certification is now pending before the fourth regional office of the National Labor Relations Board in Philadelphia.

The advisory council of the Elgin National Watch Makers Employees Association and job committeemen have unanimously voted to transfer from their organization and

recommend to the membership of their organization the Elgin National Watch Makers Union. The three organizations are banding together into the American Watch Makers Union. The American Watch Makers Union is modeling itself as a national union patterned after this national labor code as a truly democratic union with full publicity as to its finances as audited by certified public accountants and with a committee of three trustees. It is pledged to elect its officers by Australian ballot and to negotiate its contracts subject to the will of the membership by secret ballot. The national labor code is being followed closely in the functioning of this organization.

I enclose a copy of my statement on the general principles of labor organization involved in this situation.

I write as one active throughout my life in labor organizations and one vitally concerned with sound progress in the labor movement.

Cordially yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO.

[From the American Watch Worker]

A NATIONAL LABOR CODE

(By Walter W. Cenerazzo)

As one reads magazine articles, newspaper editorials, and the expressions of columnists—or studies the discussions in the Halls of Congress and various State legislatures—he realizes that the antagonistic attitude toward labor unions is based primarily on a false premise—that all labor leaders and all union activities aim to exploit union members.

Experience proves to those who are really acquainted with the affairs of trade-unions, that the great majority of unions are operated on the principles of democracy, and their leaders are men of unquestioned integrity and ethical conduct, equal to those found in any walk of life.

The problem of labor and its leaders is one of education—to present to the general public the principles, thoughts, and actions of the 90-percent majority, and in this way circumvent hostility before it finds unwarranted expression by legislation that will be detrimental to both the union members and their officials.

In all fairness, it must be acknowledged that labor leadership is somewhat at fault in allowing this feeling of hostility against labor unions to rise to such a high degree.

Why is it that the officials of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have not as yet submitted a real, workable code of procedure and operational practice to their affiliated unions? The membership of the various unions is made up of a cross section of the American public, and even among this group of union members, facts and figures are needed to prove that the majority of unions are operated on the basic principles of democracy and are served with a decent, honest leadership.

This thesis advocates a national labor code governing operations and procedure for labor unions. In 9 out of 10 cases, no change would be necessary in union operational methods, yet it will correct conditions in the small minority which cause organized labor to be the target of snipers.

A national labor code should be promulgated comprising the following basic principles:

1. An adopted constitution.
2. Election of officers.
3. Financial reports.
4. Negotiation of contracts.
5. Penalties for nonobservance.

CONSTITUTION

The constitution of a union should be proposed and submitted in printed or typed form and copies made available to every union member, 7 days before the date of its proposed adoption. It should be thoroughly discussed at open meetings of the union and then submitted to a referendum vote by ballot.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Nomination of officers should be at an open meeting of the union membership, elections to be held 2 months following the nomination. In this interim, nominated candidates for office would inform the members of their aims and policies. In plants where eight or more union members are employed votes would be taken. Where less than eight are employed, voting would be at an established central polling place.

The purpose would be to establish a similar system of voting as is now in use in city, State and National elections—the direct primary system of allowing the names of all candidates to be placed on the ballot; also to utilize the precinct method of voting in union elections. Through a procedure as outlined, a large percentage of votes are cast and all eligible to vote have the opportunity to express their choice.

ELIGIBILITY

The same qualifications as those required of persons allowing their names to be offered as candidates for public office should be required of those seeking office in a union. They should be registered voters in the community in which they reside; their character should be of such a caliber as to stand the searchlight of publicity. Surely if a person is acceptable as a municipal official, there could be no objection to his being a candidate for office in a union. The question may arise of where a dues-paying member and a loyal union man, who is not a citizen, would be barred from holding union office, such procedure being classed as taxation without representation. One need but look at the system of voting in his community and realize that aliens own their own homes, pay taxes to the city, State and Federal Government, but are prohibited from voting or holding public office, because they have not qualified for citizenship.

The Australian ballot should be used at all elections, both local and international, and the referendum system of voting as applied in municipal or State elections should be observed. Election of officers should be on a fixed date, and held every 2 years. All local officers' terms should be uniform as to the expiration date.

If such an election procedure was in effect in all local unions, no undesirable person could maintain himself in office. An informed membership would remove him. Under democratic principles it would be the duty of the membership to decide whether or not to retain an official in office. Errors of judgment on the part of the membership may possibly happen, but even though they may err in judgment it could not be held as an indictment of the character of the organization or unions as a whole.

The question of representation would be decided by the union members and the officers they elect would be their responsibility, because the selection would be made according to rules formulated by the national labor code. It must be agreed that the system of voting in city, State, and Federal elections is just and equitable, and if the unions, through a national labor code, conformed to such a system, there would be little, if any, criticism.

The procedure in the election of the officers to the international unions should be either at a convention, by delegates who would be voted for at the local union elections, comparable to the conventions of the major political parties, held every 2 or 4 years, or national officers could be elected at regularly instituted elections by popular vote which is the preferable way.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

A national labor code should demand the issuance of quarterly financial reports containing a detailed statement of all income, and its source. Also a complete report of all expenditures. These reports should be audited by an elected board of three trustees and certified by a public accountant. A copy should be sent to every union member.

Under such a plan every member would know the exact financial standing of his union, and what happens to the money he contributes toward its support. He would then be privileged to question any transaction at the regular meeting of the union.

Much has been said and written during the past about the need of secrecy regarding the funds of the union. Anyone interested in the financial stability of a union need only ascertain the number of members and multiply this figure by the dues so as to arrive at the monthly income. By deducting the general expenses, plus the salaries of the paid officers, the balance in the treasury is arrived at. It is a fallacy to base the strength of a union on its treasury balance. Many organizations are strong even though they do not have a large treasury surplus. Large surpluses do not prove strength. A union with 1,000 members and a strike fund of $150,000, paying a weekly benefit of $10 would be bankrupt in 15 weeks.

Published financial reports would obviate the necessity for filing of reports with State or Federal bureaus, as is being advocated in several quarters.

Under a national labor code no increase or decrease in dues or assessments against the members could be adopted except by a majority vote, by ballot, at a regularly constituted election.

NEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

A national labor code should contain a clause specifying that an elected committee of five accompany the officers of the union to all meetings with the employers' committee when contracts are being negotiated. This procedure would give a broader knowledge of the intricate details of negotiations and, at the same time, instill a feeling of confidence throughout the membership of the union as a whole.

The proposed contract should be posted in all affected plants 7 days prior to the date of voting on its acceptance. Such a procedure would permit all the members to study and analyze the contract. It would eliminate a great deal of misunderstanding and obviate the influence of agitators. Through the use of the ballot, members could express their personal viewpoints as to the justice and fairness of a contract.

METHODS OF OBSERVANCE

The method of observance of a national labor code is relatively simple. Congress should enact legislation incorporating the suggestions made herein. Enforcement would be in the hands of the members of the unions. Should a member feel that the code was being violated, he could secure relief in the Federal courts, where a hearing would be given. The procedure might well be compared with the bank clerk accused of embezzlement, or the stockbroker charged with violation of the Securities Exchange Act. There would be no need of investigating bureaucracies or the so-called social theorists delving into the affairs of a union. There would be no need of incorporating unions.

Under a corporation status unions and their officers could be held liable for the acts of its membership. At times, groups of union men, swayed by emotion, have walked out on an illegal strike, without knowledge of the officers of the union, until the walk-out actually occurs. Why penalize the balance of

the union members and the officers through injunctions and lawsuits?

Union officials do everything in their power to maintain the terms and conditions of a contract, and there are few occasions where an employer has found the union not observing them. If voidance of a contract is factual, the employer has relief in court by an injunction, but the union officers are not held responsible for the illegal acts of a member or members, who they cannot control.

The purpose of this thesis is to awaken among union members and their leaders the possibilities which can be unfolded. Out of discussion and deliberation will come a labor code founded on the basic principles of true democracy. Labor should, and must, have a code under which it can operate and serve its undefined mission. Who is there that can define democracy? Who shall say where the democratic principles of Jefferson have been fulfilled? Labor must have a code—a charter of both freedom and responsibility, or it will strain and sweat in a possible strait jacket fashioned by public opinion, whose emotions have been swayed and influenced by unjust and unfair criticism brought about through the actions of a small minority of unions.

Instead of criticism, an expression of thanks should be extended to the majority of American union men, who have chosen the ideals of trade-union philosophy as a medium of expression, rather than the ideologies of the many other isms.

When legislation is enacted it should correct abuse by the minority—not abuse the majority.

Address by Hon. Alfred M. Landon at Republican Party Committee Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, delivered at a meeting of the Republican Party committee at Milwaukee, Wis., and broadcast by him the night of December 13, 1943, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every few decades the world has been ravaged by war. It is as if this globe were susceptible to a periodic plague. Or as if each generation of mankind, coming to manhood, must succumb, in a lesser or greater degree, to the virus of war. So it is today, and our first job is to win this war. It must be a complete, final, and conclusive victory.

Many attempts have been made to immunize mankind to the plague of war. All of these attempts have failed. This is not the fault of the average man. It is the fault of selfish and incompetent leadership. The average man has been behind every attempt to banish war. He has cooperated fully. He has given unstintingly to the cause of peace. It is human leadership which has failed. The average man longs for peace—longs for peace forevermore.

Today once again in Moscow, in Cairo, in Teheran, world leaders have gathered to banish war from the face of the earth.

The Moscow agreement, so far as we can ascertain, is an expression of the principles of peace and world cooperation based on justice and decency. The American people are for those principles. Of all the nations of the world, they know what justice and decency and cooperation mean. And they are more than willing to do their share. And they want to do their share as Americans, without regard to their national origins, and without regard to the petty prejudices that many people try to inject into this problem. Americans want creative fellowship with the other peoples of the world. They want an international organization and the international understanding which will promote this creative fellowship. And they do not want an international organization or international agreements which use force for the perpetuation of world injustice.

But because of past failures in the attempts to attain peace and attain justice for the people of the world, Americans today are asking serious questions. They are saying: "The principles of the Moscow Conference and the Teheran Conference are fine, but how are they going to be applied?" They read in the Teheran Declaration the statement of President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill that "We are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace," and Americans ask: "Just what, in practice, does this mean?"

Americans have a right to ask these questions and they have a right to be answered—answered honestly and in detail. And they have a right to ask these questions and to be answered without being faced with the charge of being anti-British or anti-Russian, or as being regarded as having committed something almost treasonable. The American people are not anti-British or anti-Russian. They are simply pro-American, and they are proworld peace. It is a tragic state of affairs when a pro-American point of view becomes at once antisomething else.

Far from being anti-British or anti-Russian or something almost treasonable, the asking of such questions and the discussion of the answers is a matter of duty—the duty of citizenship. And if the party system means anything, it certainly is one of the responsibilities of the Republican Party to ask these questions and seek answers that the American people can understand.

Only a believer in the totalitarian form of government would suggest discussion of such questions should be banned—that the opposition party ought to shut up and go out of business.

Every believer in democracy and in the party system of government knows that democracy can only live so long as the minority is recognized as an integral part of the system. This minority helps make the system function effectively. To ask questions, to demand answers, to criticize, to advise—these not only are the right of the minority in a democracy; they are its pledged and bounden duty—they are its pledged and bounden duty because only in that way do we get the discussions, the debates, and the explanations and clarifications upon which the people may make intelligent decisions upon the issues confronting our Nation.

It is not the duty of the minority—of the opposition party—to agree with the majority, or the party in power, and certainly it is not its duty to agree until it knows all the facts—until it can agree out of a conviction founded upon knowledge.

Whenever I am in Washington I always make a point of calling upon Secretary Hull—a man for whose integrity and ability I have the highest regard. Now recently it has been widely suggested that both parties should adopt an identical plank in their 1944 platforms with regard to foreign policy. Mr. Hull knows that I am a firm believer that politics should end at the water's edge.

So when I was in Washington 2 weeks ago I called on the Secretary of State to discuss this whole problem with him. I was not interested in arguing for or against identical planks. The Secretary knows that I am well aware that something may happen on the battlefields in the next few months which would make it almost essential for the safety of our country for the two parties to have identical planks. What I wanted to talk over with Mr. Hull was the practical problems involved, as of the present, in connection with this general proposal.

These practical problems, as I said to him, are three.

1. Before the Republican leadership could write or agree to a plank they would have to have a full and detailed report on what has taken place at these conferences and all the background and the implications of any agreements or understandings that have been arrived at, either orally or in writing. In brief, they would have to have the kind of a full, detailed and complete report that the Secretary of State is expected to make to the President following any important foreign conversation and negotiation.

2. There would have to be agreement between the two parties as to the exact wording of the plank—agreement as to every word and every comma. And equally important there would have to be agreement as to just what these words mean—and they must mean exactly the same thing to both parties and not be subject to a different interpretation.

3. Having agreed to such wording and its meaning, if the Republican Convention adopted the plank, there would have to be a firm commitment—a commitment the keeping of which would not be open to question—that the Democratic Party in its convention would adopt the exact same plank, without so much as the change of a word. And if there was so much as the change of a word we would have to have a commitment that Mr. Hull would repudiate the plank.

Now, I recognize that such conditions as these may not be easy to meet, but would anything less than this be fair to the American public. I submit that it would not be fair. If the President in any administration is told he has blank check powers, that he can just go ahead and shoot the works without having to face open public discussion, what becomes of democracy?

There are two sides to every question. The public has a right to have those two sides presented. As I said earlier, under extreme emergency, it might become necessary to waive that right. But there is no such emergency in sight at present. And before we waive the right of the American public to hear both sides of a question, not only must such an emergency be real, but as well it must be evident—evident to the public. Only in that way can our people be sure that their rights will be protected—that someone will not simply claim that such an emergency exists as an excuse for destroying their right of full, free, and frank discussion.

There is something more important than harmony. And that is the right of the American people to discuss and decide issues. And that is especially true when those issues involve their lives, their property, and their sacred honor, now and for generations to come. There should be no more censorship of a party than there is censorship of the press.

No one has yet quite dared suggest—although some bureaucrats have come close to it—that the press and the radio should accept the foreign policy of the administration without question.

It is just as much the duty of the minority within the limits of military necessity to

ferret out the truth and present it to the public as it is of the press. And it is just as important that the minority feel absolutely free to discuss policies pro and con as it is for the press and radio commentators to discuss them. If you muzzle the minority, you must also muzzle the press and the radio. Freedom of discussion, the search for truth, the right to disagree, are not matters that can be rationed. The truth not only will make us free; it will keep us free.

No one is more deeply anxious than I am to begin the building of institutions of law and order in the international field. We must develop processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations and the means for shaping security against future aggressors. That is an objective to which the common conscience of mankind should be dedicated. We must settle this issue right this time.

And upon the foundations of peace there must be erected the edifice of economic stability. We have all learned from bitter experience how easy is the transition from acute economic dislocation to war or to the threat of war. And so, as we look abroad, we realize that our task will not be over merely because the guns have ceased firing. There will still lie ahead the problem of assisting by every appropriate measure in the restoration of the normal economic processes. A chaotic Europe, a chaotic Asia, would undermine our best efforts and defeat our highest purposes. We have made a huge contribution in this war. After the war we shall be called upon to make an investment, small by comparison, but essential to make our wartime contribution good.

We must come to look upon this essential post-war expenditure as part of the cost of the war—part of the cost of attaining the purposes for which the war is being fought.

We of the Republican Party have no fear of these issues. We know that false optimism about the peace is just as dangerous as false optimism about the war. We can be counted on to do whatever in our national interest the situation requires, to do it efficiently, and to do it promptly and well. And when at the proper time we bring forward a constructive program for economic rehabilitation, for both abroad and at home, the country will understand that it is based upon practical wisdom tinged with idealism, rather than starry-eyed dreaming, unchecked by any sense of the practical.

When this war is over it is my conviction that there will lie ahead the opportunity for one of the greatest forward movements in human liberty and in human well-being that the world has ever seen. Whether this opportunity is to be seized or lost will depend in no small measure on how we conduct ourselves in the United States. I think that we Republicans are alive to this opportunity, and as our program develops between now and next November the country will understand that we can be trusted to seize the opportunity which is ahead of us.

And I am sure the Republican Party can be trusted to perform the task in accord with American fashion and in conformity with American principles. The American people, as a free and self-governing people, have a right to be taken into the full confidence of those who participate in international agreements. For it is the American people who will be committed to carry out the responsibilities involved. In plain conformity with the wording of the Constitution the Senate should be represented on any delegation entering into any foreign commitments. "Open covenants openly arrived at" is not an empty phrase. It is the difference between democracy and totalitarianism.

America hopes, with the help of its allies, to put the world in order, so that decency and freedom can walk this earth again. To do this America must be sure that her own house is in order. Let us seek help wherever we may find it and listen to advice wherever it may be given. This is practical world statesmanship. This is real international cooperation. This is just plain, ordinary, everyday American common sense.

Comment on Proposed National Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a lead man in one of our shipyards who comments upon the recent address by the President and upon labor conditions in the shipyards. I submit the letter for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1944.

Senator RUFUS HOLMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For the first time I feel it proper to address a letter to my Congressman.

Twenty minutes ago the President concluded his talk on the air, endeavoring to enlist support for the national service legislation. I find myself unable to find words to express my strong feeling against such legislation on the part of Congress as the President desires, because—

1. The President admits this legislation is not necessary to the winning of the war.

2. We all have given up, for the duration, many of those freedoms we're supposed to be fighting for, but the freedom of each person to earn his livelihood as he sees fit should not be abridged under any circumstances.

3. As Commander in Chief of the armed forces the President is dictator over some 10,000,000 souls. Why should he wish to dictate to the remaining millions? Certainly he has more power now than anyone else ever had. This, it seems, should be sufficient.

4. People drafted into war industries would not be good workers; at least, not as good as if they went in voluntarily. In spite of the job freezing locally, most workers still believe they are freemen. Surely they could not believe this (and work accordingly) if they were compelled to serve.

I am a leadman in a shipyard here in Portland and am 30 years of age, am satisfied with my job and am happy to serve my country. My deferment has been and is II–B, since I have no children, and should I be called into the armed service I would go willingly.

But in this shipyard, and in the others here in Portland, men are being actually laid off for lack of work. Many things I could tell you along this line, if time and space permitted. Suffice it to say, however, I do not believe the need of a national service act will be thought very great by the workers in these war plants when they know all the time there are workers being laid off for lack of work.

I have not read editorial comment on the President's speech, and the statements I have made are strictly my own. On behalf of myself and Mrs. ——— we shall appreciate anything you can do to save this last remaining freedom. Oh, yes; I should tell you Mrs. ——— is employed in a war plant also.

Sincerely,

———.

P. S.—Please communicate my feelings to the other Representatives of Oregon, or if it would be better if I wrote them also, kindly advise me so.

The Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of January 10, 1944, entitled "Food-Stamp Plan."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD-STAMP PLAN

One of the more important matters which await the returning Congress is the problem of assisting those American families whose living standards actually have been impaired as a result of wartime conditions. And this, for the most part, is limited to families whose actual incomes have not kept pace with the rise in living costs.

The administration has wanted to accomplish this through its general subsidy program—a program that would reduce prices for everyone alike, the rich as well as the poor, the beneficiaries as well as the victims of war conditions. Under this plan a family might have had a 100-percent increase in income since the beginning of the war. Yet it would receive the same subsidy benefit as another family which has had no increase, or perhaps even a reduction, in income. This is the principal objection to the administration program, and it is an objection which has not been met by any of the arguments advanced by administration supporters.

Recently, however, a sensible alternative has been suggested—that the subsidies be directed to the relief of persons who really need relief. This would be done through the adoption of a food-stamp plan, the details of which remain to be worked out, but which presents no insuperable difficulties.

The War Food Administration has endorsed this plan with reservations. In practical effect the reservations apparently nullify the endorsement, but the latter is important, nevertheless, since it puts the W. F. A. on record as believing that the stamp plan is feasible from an administrative standpoint. In approving the plan the food agency specified that its endorsement was contingent on the continuance of the present $1,000,000,000 general subsidy program. It also estimated that the stamp plan would cost $3,000,000,000. In other words, the W. F. A. is willing to accept both the general subsidy program and the stamp plan, although it douses the latter with cold water by placing an extremely high estimate on its cost.

This position is lacking in realism. In the first place, Congress is not going to approve

both the stamp plan and general subsidies. Second, if food prices can be controlled satisfactorily for everyone at a maximum cost of $1,500,000,000—which is the administration's own figure—it is difficult to see why a subsidy program designed to help only a minority of the people should cost twice as much. The fair assumption is that this estimate was intended more to kill the stamp plan than to help it along. The fact remains, however, that this plan, which would restrict governmental aid to persons whose incomes are small and who have not had increases commensurate with the rise in living costs, is the only sound one. Certainly there is no reason under the sun why future generations of taxpayers should be called upon to pay the bill for present-day subsidies to persons whose pay checks, in relation to living costs, are larger than they have ever been before.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials appearing in the issue of January 12, 1944, of the Morning World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., one entitled "Draft-Everybody Law," the other entitled "The Unwritten Paragraph," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT-EVERYBODY LAW

"As you know," said Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Congress, "I have for 3 years hesitated to recommend a national service act."

But he recommends it now.

He recommends a law which "* * * will make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in this Nation."

The national service act which the President advocates is, of course, nothing but a universal draft. If it were passed the Government would have the power to seize any civilian American and assign him to whatever job Washington, in its wisdom, might deem appropriate.

If the President has been procrastinating for 3 years (that would be since 11 months before Pearl Harbor) on the draft-everybody plan, why does he suddenly find it wise and inescapable now?

He offers a number of philosophic arguments, none of which have immediacy. They were as good on December 8, 1941, as they are today, and would not have been particularly persuasive at any time.

While the President's message was being read, Missouri's famed Senator TRUMAN was making a speech in New York.

He said this country's output of war matériel has been so tremendous that about "$6,000,000,000 of Army contracts and about $2,000,000,000 of Navy contracts have had to be canceled."

"This is only the beginning," continued the Senator, "and almost daily during the coming year you will see newspaper notices of contract cancelations, or plant shutdowns, of elimination of graveyard shifts, and of reduction in employees."

Senator TRUMAN certainly is not an irresponsible. He knows better than most what is going on in the land. His statement quite thoroughly explodes the Presidential argument that the time has come when "every able-bodied adult" should be made available for war production.

It may be that the President wants a draft-everybody law chiefly to put an end to war-industry strikes. He is known to be bitter on that subject.

But if so he is asking for a mighty dangerous weapon to do a relatively simple job.

A number of plans have been advanced for outlawing strikes without going to great extremes. As a matter of fact the Smith-Connally Act gave promise of being somewhat effective before it was emasculated at the demand of Mr. Roosevelt and his bureaucrats. There are some who believe that the law as it stands, aided by the War Labor Board, might have prevented most strikes, except for the bumbling interference of other Government agencies.

At any rate, if the President is now sufficiently aroused to want to end strikes, regardless of political repercussions, it would seem wiser to try gentler methods first.

This much can be said for the service-act plan: It would be the perfect flowering of our own particular brand of totalitarianism.

Already, as a result of war stringencies, the Government dominates industry and tells business what it may buy and what it may sell. It tells individuals how far they may drive, what (within limits) they may eat, and how warm they may keep their houses. If, now, the bureaucracy were also given the power to say where every American should work, and how long, and for how much—there wouldn't be much left of America.

But the bureaucrats would be in Utopia.

THE UNWRITTEN PARAGRAPH

There was an unwritten paragraph in the President's speech which spoke more eloquently than all the 3,000 written words.

We mean the paragraph dealing with economy.

It simply wasn't there.

Mention was made of most other war problems, but the issues raised by the Byrd economy committee, the Truman committee, and countless common Americans the Nation over were treated with the deepest disdain.

But perhaps we are being naive.

We have almost forgotten, for the moment, that the Republic's debts are not important, because we merely owe them to each other.

Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by George Gelder, of Berkeley, Calif., relating to post-war planning.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF., *December 9, 1943.*
WEST OF SACRAMENTO BOYS,
Berkeley, Calif.

DEAR FELLOW MEMBERS: At our last regular meeting a letter was received from the mayor of our city wherein he called for ideas from our organization relative to post-war planning and, more especially, how it would affect the city of Berkeley.

I respectfully submit some of my personal views in connection therewith, with the recommendation that they be considered, along with the ideas of other members, in the hope that the mayor's letter will be given proper consideration.

The mayor's communication attempts to confine any post-war plan to our own city. At the outset, I submit that this would be impractical for the reason that such a plan should be Nation-wide and not confined to any one city, except as to those things affecting strictly local matters, such as housing, through proper building and health regulations, strict economy in the operation of city government, and a low tax rate with corresponding reduction in assessed valuations.

Among the "four freedoms," for which our soldiers are now supposed to be fighting, are freedom from fear and freedom from want. If and when these two freedoms are truly and genuinely made effective, then, indeed, their fight will not have been in vain insofar as the suggested post-war planning is concerned.

It is my opinion that two essential things are necessary and mandatory if we are to bring real happiness to the vast majority of our people, namely, (a) crush out monopoly, and (b) a real, just, old-age pension system on a national scale.

Monopoly and wealth concentration must be eradicated by law, otherwise all post-war planning will be in vain. Monopoly has directly caused more misery than any other one thing. It has been, and will continue to be, the cause of internal wars and strife; it has toppled kings from their thrones; it has crushed out small and independent business; and it has controlled legislative bodies as well as the executive and judicial branches of Government. It will drive disaster to dictators, whether economic or political, who thwart the masses in their effort to achieve a better standard of living and greater economic security. People revolt against that philosophy of unnecessary scarcity, in normal times, which has been the philosophy of private monopoly.

Monopoly fosters a condition wherein and whereby the means of production is entirely controlled by a comparatively small number of individuals. Thus, the means of distribution and price fixing is likewise controlled with the result that, in normal times, the small and independent merchant, as well as the great masses of working people, are subjected to hard times and even poverty.

When 90 percent of the wealth of this Nation, as well as the entire world, is controlled by less than 10 percent of the people, it can readily be seen that no successful post-war plan can be successfully worked out until and unless this condition is changed. There must be a more equal distribution of all wealth so that all people, including the small merchant as well as the great masses of working men and women, upon whom, after all, the country depends, can be assured of fair profits and decent living conditions in normal times.

Employees should receive wages commensurate with decent standards of living, proper food, proper clothing, proper opportunity to educate their children, and all the benefits which are supposed to accrue to human beings as the result of the great inventions of and before our time. Unless this is considered, any post-war plan will be but an empty gesture and our soldiers who return from a victorious campaign will have fought in vain.

The gravest menace to our Nation today is this accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few. Money is power, and this power reaches into every nook and corner of the

country. Combinations are formed which have driven and will drive small business out of existence. The greed of these frenzied finance manipulators is not satisfied until they have cut wages to the bone and make the farmer sell his products for less than the cost of production.

At this time, owing to war conditions, there is greater prosperity. But these are not normal times and the proposed post-war plan should have in mind the preparation for peacetime conditions. We should provide now for the readjustment problem which will confront us when not alone the men and women return by many thousands to their homes from the war fronts but provision should now be made for the millions who will be thrown out of employment when the war production period is over. There should be no more bread lines, no more closing of banks, no increase in slum districts and no more mass poverty such as existed following the First World War.

Post-war planning should not be a veritable Tower of Babel and be composed of merely a great number of voices. If those who are our so-called leaders will practice real Christianity and not merely profess to be Christians; if big business will set aside its selfishness and mad desire for profits and more profits; if men will be men and not greedy monsters; in a word if we "would do unto each other even as we would that others would do unto us," then a post-war plan can be created which will bring the greatest happiness to the vast majority of all our people as it should be.

When this war shall end, and victory is ours, the peace terms, in my judgment, will have to be written in the interest of the people who are going to live for those are the ones who might have to fight the next war. Many things must be forgotten, such as commercialism, financial power, greed, profits, and special interests. They must be forgotten and those who are going to live must have an opportunity to live as decent and respectable human beings without the fiend of want and the wolf of care everlastingly knocking and gnawing at their doors.

Any post-war plan should have in mind these principles: "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none," and the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "With malice toward none but charity to all."

The change-over from war industry to peacetime industry should be done as quickly as possible so that the transition will not cause any more unemployment than absolutely necessary. Wages should be kept up to a point where men and women will be able to buy the common necessaries of life at reasonable prices. This cannot be done, however, if the milk trust, the steel trust, the food trust, the clothing trust, the chain stores' combinations, the bank trusts, and similar organizations control the peace conferences and the post-war plans.

A carefully planned public works program aided by the largest post-war road-building program in history also will continue to prevent any large-scale unemployment, possibly for several years. All public works programs should be developed with strict regard to their cost and the ability of the taxpayers to finance them. If taxes are kept at their present levels and people have not sufficient incomes to live properly, they just cannot pay taxes and hard times and poverty will again be abroad in the land.

We must not stint in caring for our returning armed forces. They have left their homes, their jobs, and their families at the call of their country. They have given everything they have, even life itself, to fight for freedom and the preservation of democracy and free institutions. We must not let them down. Their suffering is great enough now without letting them suffer from the pangs of hunger, fear, and want after their victorious efforts in behalf of the sweetest freedoms known to peace times—freedom from fear and freedom from want. It is up to those in the high places, those with influence and power, to prepare for not alone their comforts, in the future, but the comforts of the working men and women of America, as well as the small and independent merchants and farmers.

Speeches, blueprints and plausible plans will do little to obviate the possibility of post-war economic dislocation and neither organized nor unorganized labor or the employers can plan effectively without planning and working together to the end that, as human justice dictates, there shall be not alone fair profits on the one hand but decent wages and living and working conditions on the other hand.

If the powerful money interests, who have their eyes on China, with its millions of 5- to 10-cents-a-day labor, and no taxation, are to determine the post-war plans, then all I can say is God help the great masses of liberty-loving American people. These ultrafinanciers do not build great manufacturing plants in China and other cheap labor countries because of any love or humanitarianism in behalf of the people of those foreign countries. They do it so as to get manufacturing done as cheaply as possible and thereby increase their already tremendous profits.

Unless any post-war plan takes into favorable consideration the welfare of the vast majority of our people you might just as well stop before you begin.

Respectfully,

GEORGE GELDER.

Price of Hogs and Hog Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I know you will be interested in a comparison of prices on hogs and hog products on November 11, 1918, and on November 11, 1943, and the following figures compiled by Mr. Emmett C. Gardner, county extension director of my home county, Johnson County, Iowa, and appearing in the Iowa City Press-Citizen of Friday, January 7, 1944, will give you some important information that should be borne in mind during the consideration of food subsidies. With live hog prices nearly 25 percent lower in 1943, it is amazing to note that retail prices of the meats listed are from 16 to 80 percent higher than the 1918 level. Here is the article as it appeared in the Iowa City Press-Citizen January 7:

COMPARES WAR FARM PRICES—HOG AND HOG-PRODUCTS PRICES LISTED BY E. C. GARDNER

Farmers are sometimes blamed for the high cost of living but when a comparison is made of what the farmer received for his product in 1918 and at the present time, and the price the consumer paid in 1918 and at the present time, anyone can figure out that the farmer should not receive all the blame for the so-called high consumers prices, according to Emmett C. Gardner, county extension director.

The following prices on hogs and hog products are taken as of the Friday prior to November 11, 1918, and November 11, 1943, and is proof that the prices farmers receive for their products is not always the determining factor in the retail price that enters into the high cost of living and inflationary trends:

	1918	1943
Market price for hogs, Nov. 11	$17.30	$13.15
Retail prices:		
Pork roast	.22	.35
Pork tenderloin	.25	.45
Pork chops	.35	.41
Picnic hams	.25	.31
Sugar-cured hams	.30	.35

Taxes Must Be Simplified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to income taxes is most distressing and confusing. The righteous wrath of thoughtful Americans is directed at Washington, because of the muddle and the difficulty which is encountered in making a tax return. The forms are lengthy, difficult, and ambiguous. There are too many forms to fill out. In many cases, the cumbersome, complicated and bewildering tax return is more painful than the amount of the tax. Every good American wants to pay his share of taxes. The enactment of the first income tax law was a little over 30 years ago. At that time, the rates were low and only a very few people were required to pay a tax. Since that time, tax laws have been added one upon another until today we have what is properly termed a "hodgepodge."

The organization of the Congress and our system of procedure very definitely fixes the responsibility for the tax program. That party which is in control is responsible for the tax bills, as well as Treasury regulations, the make-up of the forms and questionnaires, and the method of collection. It is fitting and proper that responsibility be fixed, so that the citizens may give credit where credit is due and properly direct their criticism. The Constitution provides that all tax laws shall originate in the House of Representatives. It has long been the established procedure that the party in control shall have at least 15 Members on the Ways and Means Committee and that the minority party shall have not to exceed 10 Members. The party in control always has a majority of at least 5 votes, so that they can carry out their tax program. The Ways and Means Committee writes the tax bills. The other Members of Congress usually must be content to vote "yes" or "no" on

a tax bill. We must either accept or reject it in its entirety.

The American people are demanding a simplified system of determining their net taxable income and a simple, straightforward method of applying the tax rate. I think they are entitled to that. Upon coming into power, the first job of the Republicans will be to simplify the taxes.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I wish to insert a copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Republican Conference held in the House Chamber on January 13, 1944:

Be it resolved by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives in conference assembled, That we unanimously go on record as favoring a drastic simplification of income-tax returns so as to enable persons of ordinary intelligence to fill them in without the assistance of expert legal help and we call upon the Treasury Department to take immediate steps to accede to the universal demand for such action.

Annual Message of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the period following the end of the war, we will be faced by no problem of greater importance on the home front than that of providing gainful employment. For this reason it is encouraging to realize that plans are now being formulated to cope with the situation.

In his annual message to the legislature, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, has made a sensible and practicable recommendation in connection with the problem mentioned above. Much interest has been shown in his proposal, which is set forth in the following excerpt from Governor Dewey's speech.

There has been favorable editorial comment in many leading newspapers. Editorials appearing in the Buffalo Evening News and the New York Times are set forth below:

[From the New York Times of January 6, 1944]

GOVERNOR URGES FUNDS BE SAVED FOR RECONSTRUCTION, VETERAN AID—ADVOCATES NEW METHOD OF SELECTING JUSTICES AS REBUKE IN AURELIO CASE, ASKS CHANGE IN SUCCESSION TO GOVERNORSHIP

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, January 5, 1944.

To the Members of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Since we last met, the armed forces of our country and our allies have made great strides on the road toward victory. In that progress our State, with its 13,500,000 people has taken a vital and increasing part. In every aspect of the relations between city and country, between capital and labor, between agriculture and business, between your State government and its people, between men of good will in both great political parties there has been unity in the war effort in the State of New York. I have absolute confidence that this precious unity will continue and grow even stronger as we enter the final, desperate stages of this dreadful conflict and that victory will surely and before too long rest on the arms of the free people of the world.

One year ago we pledged ourselves to a program of grave and formidable tasks. Thanks to the wholehearted and generous cooperation of your honorable bodies, every one of those pledges was fulfilled. But this is a continuing task. The end is not in sight. Since the bloodiest battles are still ahead on the fighting front we shall need to put forward even greater effort and sacrifice on the home front.

Moreover, the advances of our fighting forces have already brought closer the inevitable problems of a victorious peace. Some of these problems are not merely ahead of us; they are right here on our doorstep. We must proceed, forthwith, not merely to meet them but to welcome them.

STATE FINANCES—POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION FUND

In its finances our State is more happily situated than it has been at any time since the late 1920's. Every department of State government has tightened its belt, worked harder, been more careful in its handling of the public's funds. I can confidently report that good management has started to show up a better service to our people.

The financial position of the State has also been much aided by the full employment of men and of industries arising out of the war effort and by reduced expenditures resulting from the necessity of postponing normal purchases, repairs, and new undertakings so as not to interfere with the war effort.

As a result, I am happy to report to you that I expect the cash balance in the general fund on March 31, the end of this fiscal year, to amount to some $140,000,000.

Naturally there have already been many helpful suggestions about how to use the State's surplus. In general they are of two kinds: Some groups suggest that the surplus be used to reduce taxes; other groups are eager to see the surplus given away to aid them or their particular cause. Either tax reduction or increased spending at this time would, in my judgment, be unsound and irresponsible. We must never forget that this is not a normal surplus. It does not reflect either normal receipts or normal expenditures. It has come to us out of the hurricane of war. It can be, it must be, safeguarded to meet post-war needs.

Too often fiscal policy has followed the treacherous course of reducing taxes in relatively good times only to be confronted with the black necessity of increasing taxes in hard times. We must avoid that pitfall. The existing level of taxes can be borne more easily now than could higher taxes after the war. The incomes from which taxes must be paid are today at the highest point in our history. It is to be hoped that income after the war will continue favorable, but that is something no one can know for sure. One thing we do know for sure. After the war the State will be called upon to meet many increased demands and the present tax structure will again be under the age-old pressure for expansion.

Even before this war the State's physical plant had been allowed to run down at the heel. The specter of continually theatening deficits robbed our highways of proper maintenance and needed expansion. State buildings were not repaired to the extent demanded by the ravages of time. Too little equipment was replaced and too little new equipment was acquired. If men and materials were available today we should have been busy repairing many of these deficiencies and the State would not have anything like so large a surplus. It would be spending the money that has gone into the surplus on the reconstruction and improvement of its wasting plant and equipment. When men and materials are again available the State's surplus will bring them together. It can and must be a vital factor in contributing to post-war employment in our State.

The highways are being taken care of on the surface but many of them are wholly inadequate to meet the demands of modern traffic. Steel structures and woodwork on State properties cannot be painted and floors and roofs are receiving only temporary repairs. Many of these conditions had existed for years before we entered the war. Some we have improved for the efficient operation of the State government but most remain to be done. If we seem, here and there, to be fighting a losing battle with wear and tear it is because we do not wish to use any of the men and materials needed to win the more important battles that are being fought around the world today.

Our mental hospitals, with more than 100,000 patients, are overcrowded by 20 percent and the buildings and equipment are deteriorating at an accelerated pace. After the war we must expand the capacity of these institutions to provide more space for the care of patients and restore the physical plant on a broad basis. The shortage of manpower and other war conditions have prevented the opening of some new State facilities and have forced the closing of sections of other institutions. But these facilities are not idle. They are being used by the Federal Government. The War Department is using for hospitals, supply depots and training, three large State institutions and portions of others. When the war is over these properties will again have to be manned by the State.

All of this means that we are building a great backlog of construction, repair, deferred services and equipment purchases that must be financed after the war.

When the men in our armed forces and the workers in our war plants return to their peacetime occupations they have a right to expect that we, at least, shall have done our part to help create employment opportunities. The State can contribute to the creation of these jobs by having ready a substantial program of reconstruction. Through the Post-War Public Works Planning Commission, the Department of Public Works, and other agencies the State has been preparing blueprints of necessary and worthwhile work. But it is not enough to prepare blueprints. We have seen too much blueprinting which involved, in effect, "blue sky" financing by government. We must prepare not only blueprints but also the means of soundly financing the works projected by the State.

Ordinarily it takes many months to perfect measures for financing capital outlay programs, to secure their adoption by the legislature and, after that, actually to raise the needed funds. That is true whether the financing comes from taxation or from borrowing. But the State of New York is in the fortunate position of being able to face the responsibilities and the opportunities of the post-war period strengthened by a large accumulated surplus.

If we were to dissipate this money now we would be adding fuel to the threatened forces of inflation; we would be wilfully injuring the war effort; we would be contributing to the economic dislocations which may follow the war.

If, on the other hand, we husband these savings against the inevitable rainy day, we can help to finance out of them a post-war program of necessary deferred works. Let us not forget that the stimulus of public spending can be nullified by the burden of taxes and debt erected to finance it. But a post-war program of public works and of rehabilitation financed out of wartime savings can be a real, a healthy, and a sound stimulus to our economy. By the proper use of these funds at the proper time we can contribute to the economic and social rehabilitation of the men and women who will return from our armed forces, seeking once more to find their places in a going peacetime economy.

This State surplus is not ours to spend at this time or to give away in the remission of taxes. It has come to us out of savings and out of the war. As such, we hold it only as trustees. It belongs as much, indeed more, to the men who are fighting this war. When they return it must be available to meet the needs of that critical period.

Accordingly, I recommend that your honorable bodies create a post-war reconstruction fund, separate from the general fund, and that you transfer to this reconstruction fund the entire surplus of $140,000,000. Appropriations should, of course, be made from this reconstruction fund as they are needed for the purposes for which it is created and temporary borrowing by the State during low income months within a fiscal year should be from this fund, and, accordingly, without interest, rather than from private lenders at interest.

I earnestly hope that for the sake of the State's 1,000,000 fighting men, for the sake of the working people of our State, for the sake of the safe financial future of the State itself, we can make this $140,000,000 reconstruction fund chapter 1 of the laws of 1944.

Most of this money will not be needed until peace comes. I therefore propose, further, that all the unappropriated balances in the reconstruction fund be made available for immediate investment in the securities of the United States Government.

Thus our State surplus will go to work at once to help our country finance the war, and will then be available at once to help finance the peace.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of January 6, 1944]

AN ADMIRABLE MESSAGE

Governor Dewey's message to the legislature is a notable document, one that will command Nation-wide attention for the clarity of its exposition respecting problems of general concern. It shows a statesmanlike grasp of affairs and charts a course that the Federal administration well might follow for a happy issue out of many of its difficulties.

The State has fared well under Governor Dewey. With the close of the fiscal year, March 31, it will have an accumulated surplus of about $140,000,000. There are those who would make this an occasion to reduce taxes still further; others who would have the State enter upon a program of spending. But, says Governor Dewey: "The State surplus is not ours to spend at this time or to give away in the remission of taxes. It has come to us out of savings and out of the war. As such we hold it only as trustees. It belongs as much, indeed more, to the men who are fighting this war. When they return it must be available to meet the needs of that critical period."

The Governor would safeguard this surplus in a "post-war reconstruction fund" from which to finance public works during the period of transition from wartime to peacetime economy. The physical plant of the State is run down at the heels. Hospitals for the care of mental patients are badly overcrowded, other institutions have been neglected, and highway construction has been held up. Programs for rehabilitation and new construction have been prepared; and when peace comes they will go forward and provide employment for men now in the armed services and workers in war plants. The procedure recommended by the Governor is eminently wise.

While the State, with local governmental units cooperating, can do much to relieve such conditions of unemployment as may develop after the war it cannot solve the whole problem. "We must never forget," says Governor Dewey, "that the heart of the economic life of America is business and industrial enterprise. It provides the great preponderance of employment opportunities for our people. We who are responsible for the governmental policy of New York State have an ever-present obligation to keep this concept in mind." This is quite different from the New Deal concept. He has the Division of Commerce, which will soon be expanded into a department, at work on a program to encourage business development and so stimulate job opportunities in the State.

The taxpayers get full consideration from Governor Dewey. He recommends continuance of the 25-percent reduction with respect to personal income returns. Further, he calls for revision of the business corporation tax so as to provide for a more equitable spread of taxes and thus "encourage business and financial corporations to carry on their functions in this State." Because of the unfairness which marks the distribution of this burden the State in recent years has lost many business organizations and financial corporations to other States. The Governor does not stop there; he has had the State Tax Commission simplify income-tax returns for persons whose incomes are derived from wages, salaries, commissions, pensions, interest, dividends, partnerships, estates or trusts so that the computation of taxes is made a 10-minute job.

Washington has talked about taking action to assist the discharged war veterans, but as yet it has done nothing in their behalf. Governor Dewey, who estimates that about 100,000 veterans will return to the State this year, recommends that maximum unemployment insurance law benefits be open to all returned veterans who may have to seek jobs.

However, he would have these benefits come out of general State revenues rather than the insurance fund. He would have the State concern itself, too, about veterans whose education has been interrupted by the war. The State education department now is making an inventory of opportunities for them in the institutions of higher learning in the State.

The Governor calls for integration of the social services. As it is they are a patchwork—with one service piled on another to the point of confusion. He is also intent on assuring the needy sick a high order of medical care under a program which, unlike that proposed by the Wagner bill in Congress, would preserve the integrity and freedom of the medical profession. The legislature is urged to take steps to prevent a repetition of the scandals that developed in connection with workmen's compensation, with workmen and their families cruelly cheated.

In the opinion of Governor Dewey the judicial system needs bolstering to prevent a repetition of the situation that developed in New York City—"when a person who owed his nomination to disreputable characters was elected to the bench" of the supreme court. He proposes a constitutional amendment which would give each judicial district the option of changing the method of selecting supreme court justices. In this connection he urges consideration of the Missouri plan, under which justices are appointed for a probationary period, with a full term following if the justice makes good.

These are the highlights in an admirable message, one which deserves general reading. It represents leadership of the high order, in which initiative is backed by character and courage.

[From the New York Times]

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S MESSAGE

There is a long-standing tradition that the annual message of the Governor of New York shall recommend a complete program of legislative action for the year, and Governor Dewey's message yesterday conforms to this pattern. It deals with subjects ranging all the way from the acquisition of rights-of-way for highways to reform of the administrative machinery for public welfare. There are many points of special interest along the way. The Governor announces the good (and timely) news that the State tax commission has prepared a simplified tax form, one page in length, "easily understood, and capable of being filled out by an average taxpayer in 5 to 10 minutes." He recommends a revision of corporation taxes which will encourage post-war business to locate in this State. He has some suggestions to make in the matter of a new system of electing judges, though here the question may be raised whether his proposed reform goes far enough. He makes some interesting and useful proposals in the fields of post-war employment, constitutional amendment, and medical care.

But the subject of greatest immediate interest and importance in the message is the Governor's recommendation in the matter of the cash balance in the State treasury, which is expected to amount to $140,000,000 by the end of March. Noting that this surplus is essentially a windfall—"it has come to us out of the hurricane of war"—Mr. Dewey is opposed to the dissipation of this sum either through additional wartime spending or through a reduction of present taxes. More wartime spending would only be "adding fuel to the threatened forces of inflation." Reduction of taxes would be inadvisable and unwarranted, since "the existing level of taxes can be borne more easily now than could higher taxes after the war." The Governor therefore proposes that the entire surplus of $140,000,000 be transferred to a post-war reconstruction fund, to be kept at hand for "the inevitable rainy day" and to be used when the war is over to finance a program of public works and rehabilitation which will then be badly needed.

This is a sound common-sense proposal which ought to have the warm approval of the legislature. A reconstruction fund created now, out of savings, can do far more effective work in the post-war years than any similar fund created by new borrowing. For, as the Governor remarks in a comment which all post-war planners who rely on public spending would do well to note: "Let us not forget that the stimulus of public spending can be nullified by the burden of taxes and debt erected to finance it."

Polish Freedom Urged—Annexation by Russia Believed Danger to Atlantic Charter

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I desire to include the following letter from the New York Times of January 9, 1944:

POLISH FREEDOM URGED—ANNEXATION BY RUSSIA BELIEVED DANGER TO ATLANTIC CHARTER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial on December 30, To the Poles and the Russians, offers an honest and courageous warning. It has long been needed. Outbidding each other in their rivalry as ultra-orthodox champions of Russia, commentators in a few eastern cities have developed an extravagant sectarian position. It has little relation to the attitude of the country at large. That in turn does not fit in with what seems to be the prevailing mood in England.

This localized outcry, appealing to what may be termed our intellectual proletariat, may therefore become dangerously misleading. It finds notably little response, for example, in that broad section which corresponds only in theory to the Labor Party in Britain. Paradoxically enough, the danger now comes not from orthodox reactionaries but from these self-appointed spokesmen who are turning friendship for Russia into something approaching a vested interest.

RUSSIAN ANNEXATION DANGER

Taking up a defiantly wolf-and-the-lamb interpretation of Russia's relations with her western neighbors, they now attempt to scold and bully the country into the view that the one and only test of anti-isolationism is a willingness to sign in advance a blank check for any territorial or political demands Russia may put forward in eastern Europe. The effect of this reckless course will be the direct opposite of what is intended. An international reign of law cannot be based upon the desires and ambitions of any one country.

You point out very properly that for the Russians to deal with the whole question of their western frontiers "as exclusively their own affair, to be handled in their own way and on their own terms," would be "in defiance of the terms of the Atlantic Charter," and that the result would be "to drive American opinion in the direction of isolation."

If Russia handles the thing in this way there will remain no other direction. On her own initiative she would have plunged for isolation at the very outset. To annex three countries and large portions of three others, embracing an immense alien population and an extent of territory larger than the German Empire, is rather a large order. For the Russians to settle this issue by a mere decree "as exclusively their own affair, to be handled in their own way and on their own terms," would offer the clearest possible definition of isolation.

HITLER OBSERVED FORMULA

The argument that "the thing has already been settled" only drives the point home more sharply. Hitler's territorial adventures were launched with exactly this formula. This fait accompli type of solution would invite others to bind themselves by the restraining principles of the Atlantic Charter while leaving Russia a free and uninhibited outsider. After this beginning the rest of the United Nations would be no more than a collection of disappointed spectators.

Whatever the compelling necessities of that surrender, the relinquishing of the Sudetenland to Hitler did not strengthen the faith of the world in the concept of collective security. This second Munich on a far vaster scale would shatter the whole promise of a new international order. The Atlantic Charter constitutes the only foundation we have for that: a foundation formally accepted by the United Nations. To dynamite it by default, in the fashion proposed, would shatter any possible faith in the new structure. For Britain and America now to give their private assent would merely complete the shattering process, and no human power could put the fragments together. Who could erect a new system of security on the sham foundation of promises abandoned in advance? Long before the elections of 1944 the Atlantic Charter would have become as dead as the Dred Scott decision.

To withhold our assent does not imply a break in our cooperation in the war or in the general policy of friendship with Russia. Ever since June 1941, without any agreement on these essential points, our relations have become steadily closer. We cannot prevent Stalin from seizing the territories in question, but we can at least save ourselves from the ignominy of giving our blessing. We can draw the line at being bluffed or bullied into the role of a shamefaced accessory. Along the very line of reasoning now proposed, Italy, Poland, Russia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria in turn saw fit to join hands with Hitler. They, too, could not help it. Are they better or worse off today?

NO RESPECT FROM YIELDING

The appeal to fear, Mr. Churchill pointed out years ago, in the end never achieves its purpose. Does anyone suppose that we shall gain Stalin's respect by yielding to it in this instance?

The slogan of "strategic necessity" offers the flimsiest and most fugitive excuse for returning to the frontier arranged between Hitler and Stalin in 1939. Along that "bastion" the Soviet armies had been organizing their defense for a year and a half when Hitler finally delivered his blow. The German advance drove forward without halting straight across the Stalin line and the Dnieper; it slowed down only after it had overrun Smolensk. This drastic experience offers a striking test of the military value of the 1939 frontier; the "deep western zone of defense" served merely to scatter and weaken the Soviet armies. A fair and decent racial frontier could not possibly be weaker. If the protective space concept is to be followed as a basis of military security, the Russian frontier must be pushed westward to Berlin.

Russian security in the west rests wholly upon making it impossible for German military power to be built up to the point of being able to venture upon another challenge. No Chinese wall can do the trick; the solution must be imposed within the borders of Germany. With this achieved, the independence of Finland and the Baltic states does not enter in as a military factor. They offered not the slightest danger before 1939; in the future as in the past Germany could be the only possible hostile naval power in the Baltic. The nearby Finnish frontier offered, in reality, not the slightest threat to Leningrad. Detroit, with the proper arrangement of lying phrases, could be displayed as fatally exposed to the fire of Canadian 25-pounders. Is this peril to be averted by "recovering" southern Ontario?

In reality, this whole outcry for unconditional surrender to Stalin is essentially isolationist in character. (Some of the most strident voices in its behalf are being raised by those who were screaming isolationists up to the very moment of Pearl Harbor.) Like the Neutrality Act in 1937, this surrender looms up as a means of avoiding challenging difficulties; of washing our hands of problems it would be more courageous to face. What is offered us is the sham assumption that in Stalin's firm hands quiet will reign throughout eastern Europe once and for all. A corresponding assumption prevailed when Poland was partitioned in 1795 and 1815. On much the same lines, leading figures still in our midst hailed not so long ago the advent of Mussolini and Hitler as instruments of permanent European order.

WE MUST UNDERWRITE PEACE

Instead of washing our hands of these issues, it means plunging into them up to the armpits—formally pledging ourselves to engagements which no American dreams of being called on actually to carry through. This essential point was briefly indicated in the Times some weeks ago, when you noted that on the results of the discussions at Moscow depended the whole character of the peace we would be called upon to underwrite. This single word brings out the essential point so commonly forgotten:

It is not in the least a case of our standing aside while frontiers in Europe are settled by Europeans. We shall have to underwrite the settlement made. The basic principle of a more secure international order is that every nation involved will engage itself to maintain the settlements laid down. The settlement affirmed so categorically by the Russian press means nothing more or less than the general horse trade arranged between Hitler and Stalin in 1939. Is there any right to suggest that the American Government has ever considered assenting to this? For Secretary Hull to accept it would mean a complete surrender of the position our Government has maintained up to the present time.

It is singularly misleading to suggest that the real issue now at stake is in any way involved in American party alinements. You point out shrewdly the possibility of the Republicans exploiting the Polish vote in four pivotal States in the coming elections. Why interpolate the Poles and the Republicans? They were not present at Moscow or Teheran, and if the result proves an indefensible solution, it will at least not be their doing. The Polish vote that alarms you will be the symbol of an overwhelming reaction that would sweep the country—Democrats and Republicans alike. Would the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. react in any different way from Polish voters?

POLISH ISSUE IS SERIOUS

Although shrewed practical politics, your comment is a parochial whittling down of an issue that now faces not only the United States but our allies as well. How many of the United Nations will accept the fate now being held out so blithely to Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania Poland, and Rumania? If the chance were given, they would line up almost solidly on the side of the Polish vote you foresee in the coming elections. If this is the issue, how many Americans will vote differently?

Would the Democratic Convention adopt a plank guaranteeing the Hitler-Stalin pattern of territorial acquisitions by Russia? If presented to Congress today as a joint resolution, how many votes would such a project receive? No Democratic caucus would even touch such a notion. It would have the vociferous support of the Honorable MARCANTONIO. He would have a scattered following of lunatic fringers and peace-at-any-price people of various sorts. In all, would there be 50 votes out of the House and Senate together?

It will involve no sacrifice in any sense for Russia to turn to a different and sounder solution. In no possible way could she gain as much prestige and solid support as by doing so without delay. We, in any event, could never recover from the total and universal discredit of associating ourselves with Stalin in refusing this. No human power can force the country to back such a policy during the post-war years.

T. H. THOMAS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 5, 1944.*

Springs Mills Win Army-Navy E

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure and a great deal of pride that I went down to my home town, Lancaster, S. C., some days ago, for the presentation of the Army-Navy E award to the Springs Cotton Mills. It is no common thing for any industrial plant to win this coveted award. It is a very rare thing for each of a chain of seven mills to be so honored.

The seven plants of the Springs Mills have been averaging about 80 percent of production for various Government departments. They have increased their production to where they are operating every Monday morning until Saturday night all available machinery. They now employ about 9,600 and consume about 200,000 bales of cotton a year. They spin 22,000,000 miles of yarn a week and weave 2,800 miles of cloth per week. So far they have not been late in delivering a Government order, nor have they had one rejected for failure to meet Government standards.

As evidence of the splendid relationship of management and labor, it is only necessary to point to the fact that none of the Springs Mills has had a single shut-down due to absenteeism. Though they have had 2,000 men and women leave the plants to go into the armed forces, they still expect to continue their peak of production indefinitely.

The Springs Mills were founded and nurtured through infancy by the late Col. Leroy Springs, of Lancaster. His son, Col. Elliott Springs, now president of the chain, has, too, become distinguished in this field, urged on by the inspiration of a pioneer father.

It is widely known that Elliott Springs is an ace of our World War No. 1 Air Force. It is also well known by those closest to him that were his personal wishes gratified, he would now be flying a pursuit plane on the fighting front.

The management and personnel of the Springs Mills, from the president down, fully realize that this war must be won at any cost and are willing to make any sacrifice to win it. The workers of these mills are one in their determination for victory. They are of the pioneer stock of the South, the best people on earth. They are determined that our war effort shall not be hampered by strikes, no matter what their personal grievances may be. They realize that the home production front must cooperate with the battle front to win this war. It would be well for agitators in other parts of the country to heed their example.

The following is an excerpt from Gen. Clifford L. Corbin's presentation remarks:

When they (our servicemen) come back, stern with memories of the hardships of battle, they will want to know if you have done your part to provide them with the tools of war. On that day the men and women of the Springs Cotton Mills will be able to look them squarely in the eyes. You will be wearing the Army-Navy E pin as your pledge that you kept faith with them while they were gone.

Colonel Springs' speech of acceptance follows:

It is a great privilege to represent the men and women who have earned the right to work under this E flag. Every member of this organization has contributed an equal part to the effort which is being recognized today. Because this flag was awarded to all seven of our plants, only one official ceremony was permitted; but this flagpole is symbolic of each plant, and the words spoken here today are intended for the ears of every employee of the Springs Cotton Mills.

We are all proud of our record—proud that as 2,000 of our fellow workers have left our plants to join the armed forces other members of their families have come forward to take their places, and proud that each of our 7 plants has been awarded the minute-man flag for the purchase of War savings bonds.

For years we have taken pride that here at Lancaster was the biggest print-cloth mill in the world, but we would have lost such pride could we not have changed that print cloth to meet the needs of those who represent us in the front ranks of the real battle line.

As this award signifies, all of our plants made this same change and, without exception, made it with no loss of production. We realize that our efforts are as nothing compared to the sacrifices and dangers of those who are uniformed in our cloth; but we can be permitted the satisfaction that the highest peak of production was reached after Pearl Harbor, though many of the new fabrics had never been attempted before. This increase was made possible only by the determination of the individual worker and the loyal coordination of all.

General Corbin and Captain Needham, our goal is still ahead of us, and there will be no slackening until we reach it. This recognition today will serve as a warning to all of us that our cooperation must continue so that our individual efforts may not be wasted.

On behalf of the men and women who have won this honor at Lancaster, at Fort Mill, at Eureka, at Springstein, at Gayle, and at Kershaw, I accept this award with the deepest humility and the greatest appreciation.

Farewell to a Phrase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHICAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an editorial from the New Orleans (La.) Item of recent date. The editorial is entitled "Farewell to a Phrase." It deals with the President's recent attempt to rid himself and his followers of what has become almost an epithet. I refer to the President's suggestion that the name "New Deal" be laid aside and a new one acquired. He suggested "Win the War" as the cognomen of his party, thereby inferentially arrogating unto himself and his followers the sole right to be recognized as among those interested in and contributing to the winning of the war. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

FAREWELL TO A PHRASE

The President's announcement that "New Deal" is an outmoded expression, that it was designed to meet conditions in 1932 and that this is 1943, seems to have startled a lot of Washington wiseacres. They are all agog about this revelation that Mr Roosevelt intends to seek a fourth term.

We in New Orleans are quite a ways off from the center of activity along the Potomac. But it seems to us that anyone who has not realized that Mr. Roosevelt has already long been running for a fourth term ought to be taken out behind the Library of Congress Building and told some of the elementary facts of political life.

Mr. Roosevelt was running for a fourth term when he put off action on the teen-age draft until the 1942 congressional elections were behind him. He was running for a fourth term when he let John L. Lewis and his half-million miners tear up the Little Steel wage formula and dance on the pieces. And he is running just as much—but no more—for a fourth term when he recognizes the country-wide odium into which the term "New Deal" has fallen, and seeks a more palatable slogan.

What the Nation wants to know is not whether the consignment of "New Deal" to the oubliette is an index to Mr. Roosevelt's desire to remain in office, but whether the administration proposes to change merely the label and not the philosophy for which it stands. Are the hands now to be those of Esau while the voice continues to be that of Jacob?

New Deal is not merely a tag line. It means a type of regimented and centralized paternalism which possibly might have been the only way out of a topsy-turvydom in which hungry people could not get enough to eat while farmers were producing too much food, and those who lacked sufficient clothing could not obtain more when the South was producing too much cotton. Since swift action was imperative, the New Deal treated the symptoms rather than the disease by paying Iowans not to raise pigs and Louisianians not to raise sugar or cotton.

The conditions which called for such alleviative rather than curative measures no longer obtain. We are confronted on every hand by shortages—shortages of leather for shoes, steel for kitchen utensils, meat for dinner, rubber for tires. To continue to prescribe for that malady the remedies compounded for a commodity surplus is—as we have perhaps too frequently pointed out—the last word in folly.

It is not the label, therefore, but the thing it labels, that is in bad odor today. The author of New Deal recognizes that the words are now unpopular. But they are unpopular only because the things they stand for have lost favor. Of what avail to find a new phrase, then, if we are still to talk about a quart of free milk for Hottentot babies and if we continue, enlarge, and strengthen government by bureaucratic control instead of by popular voice?

If this simple truth is ever recognized at Washington, Mr. Roosevelt's displeasure over the use of the New Deal label may indicate not that he is running for a fourth term, but on the contrary that he will not run. He is still running for it today, of course, just as he has been for more than a year. But if he should ultimately come to realize that the philosophy rather than its label lies at the root of popular displeasure,

we may find that he will not be running next July.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Item evidently is a gentleman of high intelligence, excellent judgment, and with a facility to editorialize not always found in those exercising that function. He states:

We in New Orleans are quite a ways off from the center of activity along the Potomac. But it seems to us that anyone who has not realized that Mr. Roosevelt has already long been running for a fourth term ought to be taken out behind the Library of Congress Building and told some of the elementary facts of life.

He then adds:

Mr. Roosevelt was running for a fourth term when he put off action on the teen-age draft until the 1942 congressional elections were behind him.

The editor apparently believes this was the first time the President ever gave the country a glance at his real ambitions. Certainly he could not have been listening in when Mr. Roosevelt at Philadelphia on June 27, 1936, delivered his speech of acceptance of the nomination for his second term. Otherwise he probably would have reached the conclusion which I at that time reached. My wife and I sat before the radio and listened with much interest to what the President had to say. Among other things, he stated:

They (speaking of peoples in foreign countries) begin to know that here in America we are waging a great and successful war. It is not alone a war against want and destitution and economic demoralization. It is more than that; it is a war for the survival of democracy. We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world.

I accept the commission you have tendered me. I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war.

Of course, as is customary with him, he did not speak with complete frankness and expressly state that he reserved unto himself the right to determine for himself when the war was over, or that economic wars may be carried on indefinitely if those in high authority desire to do so. In all probability, and in the light of what has happened since, that thought had not entirely escaped him.

When he made the above statement I turned to Mrs. Woodruff and said:

My dear, that is the gentleman's announcement of his candidacy in 1940, in 1944, and in as many other Presidential elections as he may later desire to become a candidate.

I make no claim of being a prophet, and I assume that a great many others who heard that speech were similarly impressed.

Power feeds upon more power. The more power the ambitious get the more they want. Mr. Roosevelt's attitude that night, together with what he said and how he said it, indicated to me he proposed to continue indefinitely to, in the words of his closest adviser and friend, Mr. Hopkins, "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

Mr. Speaker, both he and Mr. Hopkins are still with us, and what a mess they and their wild-eyed dreamers and bureaucrats have made of our domestic affairs.

In view of the President's untimely, unfortunate, but evident desire to misappropriate all recognition for love of country, for loyalty—yes, for that brand of loyalty which places life itself on the altar of the country's freedom—it seems timely to review the position of the Republican Party on this question as given to the country on September 7, 1943, at Mackinac Island, Mich., by the Republican post-war advisory council. In making its report to the council, the committee on foreign policy and international relations said:

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for (1) its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation; (2) its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies; and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings, we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the House to the first, the very first recommendation the council will make to the committee on resolutions of the Republican National Convention at Chicago in June. It is as follows:

Therefore we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

Mr. Speaker, I now invite attention to the last paragraph in the resolutions which reads as follows:

The Council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

Mr. Speaker, we were speaking to all Americans whether they were Republicans, Democrats, New Dealers, Socialists, or Communists. We neither directly nor indirectly suggested that they abandon their party affiliations. We did not wrap ourselves in a cloak of partisanship and assume an attitude that only those marching under the banner of our party could qualify as patriotic citizens. We have always recognized the fact that citizens in every walk of life, regardless of their race, their color, their creed, their political affiliations, or their economic standards, in times of national emergency have vied each with the other in demonstrating their high degree of patriotism by serving their country in the way in which they can give their best service.

We Republicans are on record as desiring to see this war through without partisanship being indulged in by any party or group. This is the policy to

which we shall cling regardless. If the leaders of the New Deal can restrain the prompting of their ambitions sufficiently to follow our lead, it will be most helpful in the win-the-war effort.

Sacrifice of Individual Freedom Through Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the danger to our form of government under a program of food subsidies as proposed by the Roosevelt administration has aroused the opposition of all patriotic citizens. This ancient device for introducing wholesale corruption into the body politic has no place in any free country in which the people aspire to remain sovereign and free.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert the treatment of Government subsidies, by L. A. Harper, department of agricultural economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.:

SUBSIDIES

(By F. A. Harper, department of agricultural economics, Cornell University)

The question of subsidies is confusing for many reasons. Many kinds of subsidies are possible. They may be paid to consumers, to marketing agencies, to producers, to the professions, or to any mixture of these or any segment of one or more of them. They may be paid on a variety of bases, of which the principal ones are "flat" and "differential." They may be proposed for a variety of intended purposes—to save us money, to prevent inflation, to cause inflation, to stimulate consumption, to stimulate production, to make price controls effective, to reduce inequalities of incomes, to protect those whose position has been disadvantaged by the war (white-collar workers, etc.), etc.

The subsidy question is further complicated by being a mixture of economic, political, ethical, social, and other considerations.

In view of all these confusing aspects, it is not surprising that the public is confronted with all sorts of statements—both true and false, both pro and con. Adding to the confusion is the fact that authorities are in violent disagreement.

Only by taking the question apart into smaller segments, and carefully analyzing each, can we hope to arrive at a sound appraisal of the entire question of subsidies.

WHAT IS MEANT BY A SUBSIDY

A subsidy can be thought of as any device whereby some individuals, or units of government, or business units receive funds or benefits other than in exchange for economic goods or services which they produce.

The current controversy is related to a food subsidy, proposed for administration by the Federal Government. Irrespective of the final plan, as to the basis of payment and the recipients of the payments, one thing is certain which identifies it as a subsidy, the government will not itself be producing or marketing food with this subsidy money. Instead, it simply performs the function of passing out the subsidy money.

A subsidy is not a new thing, though it has often gone by some other name. We have had many of them, both large and small. They have been used, in the main, under circumstances where the free market would not support the recipient without the subsidy. Persons who cannot work, or who cannot find jobs, are paid subsidies; we call them relief or welfare payments. We have also paid subsidies for the early development of the railroads, for air mail, and for maintenance of a merchant marine—all of which, at the time, either were not self-supporting or would not develop as rapidly as we wished without the subsidy.

Most governmental operations are not basically subsidies. The distinction is an important one, and is not always noted.[1] They produce for us some goods or services which might, instead, be produced by individuals or corporations; we would then call it business. An excellent illustration is the Postal Service, which is quite similar to the nongovernmental business of the express service. Similarly the Government—Federal, State, or local—performs for us other economic services like education, police, road building and repair, and the national defense.

The essential feature of any subsidy boils down to this: it involves the passing out of Government money, and has the effect of redistributing wealth or relative incomes. This is due to the fact that there is no economic cornucopia from which we can draw the funds for subsidies. The cost must be borne by someone. If the costs of the food subsidy were to be borne by the receivers in proportion to the benefits, there would be no redistribution involved, nor would it be a subsidy, in reality—at least, the process would clearly be futile.

The money for the subsidy may come out of current taxes, or it may be paid for by adding to the governmental debt. Neither source of funds changes its status from that of a subsidy. In fact, every governmental deficit can be thought of as a subsidy, because presumably it is a means whereby someone else at a later date will have to pay the costs of someone's present income.

We need not vote a subsidy in order to have one in wartime. The extremely large current governmental deficits are, in essence, subsidies. To grant further subsidies under that name is simply to increase the amount of wartime subsidy, which is already in existence in sizable proportions.

WHO WILL RECEIVE SUBSIDY PAYMENTS? WHO GETS THE BENEFITS? FLAT AGAINST DIFFERENTIAL PAYMENTS

A food subsidy, being a benefit to someone paid out of the Federal Treasury, might be expected to be paid to whomever it is intended to benefit. If the intent is to hold down prices—to prevent inflation—and at the same time supply consumers with quantities of food that would require higher prices to producers and marketers, then its clear intent is to benefit consumers. It is hoped by the subsidy to avoid the higher cost to consumers, that would normally require them to pay in the form of higher prices.

One way to accomplish this would be to give all consumers the subsidy in the form of payments in money from the Federal Treasury. But they might spend it on something other than the food for which it was intended. So it is deemed necessary to give them the benefits in lower food prices. Actually this distinction is not what it seems at first, because the money saved from the food bill is available to spend on something else; so lower food prices are really little or no different from cash payments to consumers in the first place, to spend on whatever they wish.

The food-subsidy money presumably will be paid to producers or to some of the middlemen agencies, or to both. To pay it to producers or distribution agencies, with a corresponding lowering of retail food prices, accomplishes the same purpose as cash payments to consumers, and does it with less administrative expense and trouble.[2]

After deciding which group will receive the subsidy payments, there is still the question of the basis on which payment will be made within that group. Let us say that food subsidies are to be paid to producers. Will each farmer receive an equal amount? Or will all receive a uniform rate for each unit of output? Or will they receive a payment for each unit of output over and above some specified quantity? Or will it be paid on some basis relative to costs? Full treatment of these alternatives becomes very involved.

WILL SUBSIDIES SAVE US MANY TIMES THEIR COST?

The belief is widespread that subsidies would save us many times their cost. Such a viewpoint amounts to thinking of subsidies as some sort of investment, on a national basis, that assures us of a profit amounting to several hundred percent. It is difficult to see how a nation can invest in itself and realize a large profit, simply by passing out some subsidy money. A subsidy, being a redistribution process, cannot in the true sense of the word have a profit; but if it could have a profit, it most certainly could also have a loss.

The complexity of subsidies have made them a most fertile area in which people's economic thinking can become confused. When wishful thinking is planted in such a fertile area, many reasons are found to explain the hoped-for result. Subsidies are no exception.

No less than five distinctly separate explanations can be found to explain the statement that subsidies will save us many times their cost (i. e., a "profit" of several hundred percent). There may in addition be other explanations that have not come to this writer's attention.

The basis for the five reasons, which are advanced to explain why food subsidies will be profitable, are:

1. The pyramiding of increases in the farm price of food, resulting from the percentage mark-up system of figuring marketing margins.
2. The marginal producer theory, in stimulating production.
3. The key-point theory, as related to the spiral of price increases.
4. The Government as a consumer theory.
5. The proof shown in the price indexes.

For most of these claims, if we are to believe that subsidies will yield savings amounting to several times their cost, we might well wonder why not subsidize our entire cost of living—in fact, our entire national economic activity. The claim that $6 or $7 is saved for every dollar of cost would indicate that a complete subsidy would reduce our cost of living by about 85 percent. This is an enticing thought, and we might wonder if the economic burden of our existence could not be reduced even farther by subsidizing the subsidy.

THE PYRAMIDING OF INCREASES IN THE FARM PRICE OF FOOD

One basis for the claim that subsidies will yield savings amounting to several times their cost relates to the manner in which marketing agencies establish their margins, or charges. It is assumed that marketing agencies set their charges on a percentage-of-cost basis, rather than at fixed rates per unit of product. Consequently, it is assumed that a rise in prices to farmers would bring a pro-

[1] See reference No. 14.

[2] See reference No. 12, which also includes a good clear discussion of flat against differential subsidies.

portionate rise in the margins of all the successive chain of marketing agencies. For instance, assume that before the price rise, farmers were receiving $1 and marketing agencies $1, of a $2 retail price. Then, if we wished to increase the price to farmers by 10 percent, so as to stimulate production, it would result in a rise in the retail price to $2.20 ($1.10 to farmers, and $1.10 to marketing agencies); that is, the rise would be double the increase going to farmers. By using subsidies, we would pay the farmers $1 in the open market and 10 cents in subsidies. The subsidy money would be sort of handed to them behind our backs, or "under the counter," so that the marketing agencies would have no basis for raising their margins. The subsidy plan, then, would cost $2 of retail market price plus 10 cents of subsidy money, or a total of $2.10. The subsidy device, in this illustration, would save 10 cents, or half the amount of total rise in retail price that would occur if subsidies were not used. This is the line of reasoning, in the argument as presented.

The first question is, Do marketing agencies arrive at their margins that way? Some do, but others fix their margins or charges as specified amounts per unit of product. Transportation charges, for instance, are almost entirely on a package, volume, or weight basis, and only in an extremely remote sense do they bear any relationship whatsoever to changes in the price of the product. What part of all our marketing charges are priced one way, and what part the other?

Had the originators of this claim investigated some excellent data available in another agency of the Government, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, they would have found some useful but discouraging evidence. These figures show, for the last 30 years and for a fixed quantity of food, the returns to farmers and the charges of all marketing agencies.

An estimate of marketing costs based on the assumption that they will change proportionate to changes in the prices paid farmers for food is far from our actual experience. The error of such an assumption has been increasing in general over the 30-year period, and for the last 10 years one would be about 83 percent wrong in that assumption. Expressed another way, 83 percent of marketing costs for the last 10 years have apparently been based on a fixed dollar rate, and only 17 percent based on a fixed percentage mark-up such as would increase or decrease with changes in prices paid to farmers for food.

The reason why marketing margins and charges are mostly based on a fixed dollar rate, rather than to be related to the buying price of the food, is that marketing costs are mostly wages which change slowly. In fact, since 1921 marketing margins show only slight recognition of the increases and decreases in prices paid to farmers. Most marketing agencies perform a service on what amounts to a fee basis, and the size of the fee depends on wage rates more than anything else.

The evidence for the last 10 years can be applied to present farm prices and marketing costs, to estimate and compare the effect of a subsidy plan with that of allowing a rise in farm prices to occur in the market place.

The retail cost of a family's food basket in mid-1943 was at the rate of $451 yearly, of which $255 went to producers and $196 went to the marketing agencies (table 1, column 1). Now assume that it is considered necessary to give producers a 10-percent increase, in order to stimulate food production. The argument for the subsidy scheme, as outlined above, would lead us to expect the retail cost to rise to $496 (column 2). Actually this is a sizeable exaggeration, and we should instead expect a retail cost of $480 (column 3), based on the action of marketing agencies during the last 10 years.

TABLE 1.—*Rising food prices as compared with a subsidy payment, as affecting total food costs*

[Annual dollar cost of food for a typical workingman's family]

	Actual figures for mid-1943	Comparison of results, if farmers are allowed a 10-percent increase		
		Rise allowed in the market place		Rise paid as subsidy to producers
		As assumed by subsidy proponents	Probable, based on past experience	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Paid to producers	$255	$280	$280	$280
Paid to marketers	196	216	200	196
Retail cost	451	496	480	476
Administration expenses	None	None	None	(?)
Total cost to public	451	496	480	476+?

Compared with the $480 probable cost, what would be the cost under a subsidy plan, whereby producers were given the same 10-percent increase in returns? It would be $476 (column 4), or only $4 less, ignoring administrative costs. This $4 compares with the unfounded expectation of a saving of $20 ($496−$476). Probably even the $4 saving is temporary; marketing margins might soon increase to the $200 figure even under the subsidy plan.

The administrative costs of the subsidy plan are not to be ignored either. The present analysis affords no basis for estimate. But it seems quite conservative to expect that the total cost of the subsidy plan, including administration, would be as much or more than the cost if we allowed the price to rise in the market place as usual.

THE MARGINAL PRODUCER THEORY, IN STIMULATING PRODUCTION [3]

A leading argument of proponents of the subsidy scheme is that "each dollar spent on subsidies would save $6 or $7 in our cost of living." This enticing discovery has been attributed to O. P. A., and until recently it has been quoted without supporting evidence. If evidence exists it has been carefully protected from public view by a veil of mysticism. However, recently this veil has been removed for us by a leading columnist,[4] He says that this mysterious power of subsidies arises from their use on a differential basis, whereby some new producers are enticed into production by paying them—and no one else—a subsidy in lieu of a higher price. If, instead, we used a higher market price for everyone the cost of living to the Nation would be increased by many times the amount involved in a differential subsidy scheme. That is the way the argument goes, to explain this power of subsidies.

The explanation of this columnist is revealing. So far as I know, the public has never been informed that food subsidies were to be used on this differential basis. If this is right, are we not being deceived in the argument for subsidies? Are not some attempting to acquire support of subsidies through use of an argument which is applicable—if at all—only to differential subsidies, when, as a matter of fact, they intend to use subsidies only on a flat basis?

We cannot quite ignore the possibility that this columnist is right, namely, that they are to be used on a differential basis. At least, let's look at the principal supporting argument, that they will save us many times their cost.

First, let us look at the practical workings of such a scheme, as against the theoretical possibilities claimed for it. To actually apply a differential subsidy on this basis would require that payment be made only where it will bring out more production; in no instance is it to be paid to anyone who, as a result, would have a greater profit but no more production. Visualize what this means. It means the necessity for complete cost accounts on all producers of all products to be subsidized. Not alone that; we would need cost account budgets for everyone not now a producer who could become one for each product—which includes every nonproducer in this country and every foreigner who might be allowed to enter the country. And that is not all; this marginal production, to be brought in by the subsidies, could be from other fields on the farms of present producers, and so we would need cost budgets on each field of present producers which is not now being used for that crop.

How many separate cost accounts would be necessary? There are 6,000,000 farmers, plus some 50,000,000 other gainfully employed persons who could become farmers, plus some millions of foreigners who could become farmers here. How many food products would be involved? There are 118 food products listed in Agricultural Statistics, and many others not listed. There are innumerable fields per farm. Multiply some such figures together, and as a conservative estimate the figure is fantastic. The problem is far different from that of paying a differential subsidy to a few copper producers.

It may be said that all these accounts would not be necessary, but that is not so. The accomplishment of the plan, in bringing forth increased production at a lower cost, would be in direct proportion to the completeness and accuracy of these accounts. To fail would be to fail from the start in realizing these theoretical possibilities of a differential subsidy. One could not run a differential subsidy as O. P. A. has been run, where we have depended largely on patriotism mixed with periodic official threats—and a prosecution now and then—to carry out the enforcement of price-fixing. With a differential subsidy, you must know precisely to whom to send the checks.

What this accounting would cost can be only a guess. Based on our experience here at Cornell, where we have kept complete cost accounts since 1913, it would cost $900,000,000 annually, and would require an accounting staff of 400,000 persons, to keep them on all farms in the United States. This does not include any charge for the time of farmers who keep the basic records. That cost would be only for present farmers, and would not include records for nonfarmers who should receive subsidies so as to pull them into production, nor does it include records for marginal fields on present farms. Whatever the cost, it would be tremendous in both dollars and manpower, and should be deducted from the theoretical possibilities of subsidies. These 400,000 (plus) persons, if put to work on farms, might increase food production by an amount that would make the gain in production from subsidies appear silly, by comparison. Our anticipated gain in food might well turn out to be a loss.

The probable inaccuracy of the accounts is important. Anyone who has ever done cost accounting knows how difficult it is to attain accuracy, even for a trained staff working with owners who want the correct answer

[3] See Subsidy Question Raised, the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1943, p. 22.

[4] See reference No. 11.

above anything else. What would be the accuracy for 400,000 green accountants getting the data from owners who know that the subsidy they receive will depend on the results of these accounts?

But let's assume that, in dollars, we still have some saving left after paying all these costs. Is that all gain? Let us say that we would avoid a $3 increase in the cost of living by the use of $2 ($1 of subsidy payments and $1 of accounting and administrative costs). Proponents argue that this saves the people $1. But that is not so, because the $1 figure of supposed saving ignores the fact that much of it would come back to the people (the Government) through increased income taxes. All who would be enjoying higher profits because of the higher market price would be confronted with increased income taxes. If the tax rates aren't high enough, we can raise them—even up to the point of complete confiscation of the $1, if we wish.

It may be said that the argument of confiscation of profits through taxes breaks down, because of tax evasions that cannot be avoided. But by the same incapacity, we cannot fairly administer a differential subsidy plan, which would require similar information to give us the relative costs of producers.

Lastly, are we to enter a period when high costs, due to the inefficiencies, dishonest records, and other causes alike, are to be rewarded by a subsidy? Even under the strain of war, with its confusion and disruptions, we should hesitate to take such a step without most careful thought as to where it leads. Such a policy, if carried to the extreme, would seriously affect our standard of living, and would make vivid to the people of the United States the need for freedom from want.

THE "KEY POINT" THEORY, AS RELATED TO THE SPIRAL OF PRICE INCREASES

One explanation for a possible "profit" from subsidies is that certain key points exist in our economic and price structure, so that a dollar applied there will save several dollars of cost elsewhere. Even if one believed this to be untrue, to disprove it would be about as difficult as to prove that ghosts did not exist somewhere—one would first have to look everywhere at once, and find no ghosts there.

The marginal producer idea, previously discussed, is one possible concept of this key point theory; so is the farm price, in the belief that marketing agencies pyramid their charges with increases in the farm price.

Another and perhaps more frequently mentioned key point has to do with the use of subsidies as a sort of bargaining device for use with groups that have the ability and the inclination to force upon us much higher wages or higher prices. Subsidies are claimed to be a substitute and preventive, and therefore are thought to be a profitable investment for a nation. Some, who honestly view subsidies as an evil, somewhat reluctantly support them as the lesser of two evils. One authority, for instance, has said, "A flat subsidy may in certain circumstances be the lesser of two evils, if the only real alternative is a general wage increase."

The Little Steel formula involves application of the key-point theory. By this plan, a gesture was made of tying basic wage rates to an index of the cost of living for January 1, 1941. By this plan, the cost of living was to become an automatic gage for the determination of wage rates, which makes of those items in our official index of the cost of living a sort of key point in our price structure. If it becomes necessary to give greater returns to producers and to marketing agencies, it is hoped by the use of subsidies to grant them this increase, and at the same time keep the official price index from rising. So, it is hoped, subsidies would become an economy measure, and also a means of preventing further inflation.

For any plan like the Little Steel formula, the real question is whether or not labor or other groups will agree to a plan, and stick by it, whereby their total income is tied to prices of only a portion of the things for which they spend their incomes. Will they refrain from further demands, for instance, if some plan like subsidies is used to hold down the prices of certain items involved in the agreement, while other items are allowed to rise appreciably in price? Current events seem to indicate that the answer is "No."

Despite the Little Steel formula, hourly wage rates in manufacturing industries have gone up about twice as much as the cost of living, and the weekly incomes of people have gone up more than three times as much as the cost of living.

This economical power of subsidies could arise only if our general wage structure could, by agreement, be tied to only a few subsidized items. Preferable would be to tie wages to some one minor item, like vanilla extract, so that the cost of the subsidy payments necessary to hold its price down would be small; if we could accomplish approval of such a scheme, great power of economy could be claimed for the subsidy plan. If, on the other hand, the groups involved should demand inclusion of prices of absolutely all items of their expenditure, this economical power of subsidies would disappear completely; it would then become simply a matter of shifting part of the cost of things, that should reasonably be paid for by consumers in these prosperous times, to the Federal Treasury, with an increase in the public debt to be borne by someone else in future years.

A demand for higher wages, of $1 a day, would be a demand for some $19,000,000,000 increase in the yearly income payments to our present working force in the United States. A food subsidy of $1,000,000,000 annually, which some say would be more than adequate if used wisely on this key-point basis, is equivalent to 5 cents a day. If it is impossible to block by direct methods the inflationary demand for a $1 wage increase, proponents of the subsidy plan hope that the demand can be placated by this indirect approach, and a cost of 5 cents of subsidy money. This might succeed until the recipients realized the difference between the $1 and what amounts to 5 cents; its success could not be expected to last any longer than that. If there originally existed an irresistible demand for a $1 increase, it would seem that an irresistible demand for 95 cents would still exist. Or, they might demand and obtain later the $1 originally requested, making a total of $1.05 as the outcome of what was thought to be a 5-cent expenditure to prevent the $1 raise in wages.

The question of key points in other situations would seem to follow closely that given above, relative to a wage increase. Whatever its validity and usefulness, the process would seem to boil down to fooling someone by a sort of horse-trading deal. If that is the case, the problem of fair wages and fair prices to different groups might just as well be threshed out in the first place, on its true merits and above the table. If we cannot refute on its merits an unreasonable demand, what chance is there that we can succeed in squelching it by some process of deception? And if the demand is a reasonable one, to reduce it by deception is unfair.

The key point concept is closely related to the question of subsidies as a means of controlling inflation. (See the section, Will Subsidies Prevent Inflation?)

THE GOVERNMENT AS A CONSUMER THEORY

The Government now is a highly important consumer of goods and services which the Nation produces. Its present importance as a consumer is largely because of the war effort. Thus, it is argued, anything we can do to hold down prices will save the Government a great deal of cost it otherwise would have to pay. The effect is supposed by some[5] to be so great that the use of subsidies will save, in governmental costs, far more than they cost us.

Although this argument is one form of explanation for expecting subsidies to be profitable, it is basically dependent on the power of subsidies to prevent inflation, and so will be discussed later under that heading.

It is sufficient here to point out that the Government consumes only a fraction of the total production of the items to be subsidized. For instance, if the Government subsidizes a product, on a flat basis, and purchases only 20 percent of it, the direct cost of the subsidy would certainly be five times the direct saving to the Government for the quantity it buys. The Government could not save, in its purchases, more than the cost of the subsidy until its purchases increased to some figure of more than 100 percent.

THE PROOF SHOWN IN THE PRICE INDEXES

Evidence purporting to show that subsidies accomplish wonders is frequently given for this country, for England, and for Canada, in the form of price indexes of a selected group of commodities, including those that are subsidized. Price indexes thus used are misleading, under the circumstances.

Let us look at a simple illustration. Suppose we are threatened with inflation of the price of salt. People have plenty of money and want salt so much that they are willing to boost its price from 8 cents to 10 cents. To prevent inflation we might keep the market price at 8 cents and pay the other 2 cents in the form of a subsidy. The figure of 8 cents would be the nominal market price and would be the one found in any market survey of prices. The true figure of cost, however, is 10 cents—8 cents paid by the purchaser in the market place plus 2 cents paid by all the people of the country collectively in the form of a governmental subsidy. This is not controlling inflation; it is nothing more than obscuring the inflation that is really taking place.

By the same process, we could pay all the 10 cents of the price of salt by governmental subsidy. It would amount only to a shift in the price of salt from the users, individually, to the people of the country, collectively. The price, in the sense of the real and ultimate cost to the people, would still be 10 cents. Ignoring the question of the wisdom of the Government giving free salt to its citizens, this illustrates how market prices of subsidized items fail to show the progress of inflation.

Thought of this way, indexes of cost become meaningless if we look only at the market price of subsidized commodities. Likewise, any "index" of prices of commodities (the average market prices of several commodities) becomes a useless measure of the true cost to the country—and of the progress of inflation—as we include more and more subsidized products. These are the sort of indexes commonly used to "prove" that in countries using subsidies, they have returned many times their cost, or have prevented inflation. Such evidence is a delusion.

Great success in the use of subsidies has been claimed, for instance, for Great Britain. The index of market food prices has been pointed to as evidence. The true cost of food eaten by the British should include the cost of the subsidy to Britain, and the value of food supplied to the British by lend-lease or other sources for which the British people need not pay as market price for some of what they buy. What would the food price index show if these additional items

[5] See reference No. 14.

were added to the market price, as they should be in answering the question of the true economy of a subsidy? Whatever the answer, it is certain that we cannot find the correct answer in the official index of the market price of food.

WILL SUBSIDIES PREVENT INFLATION?

The argument that subsidies are necessary to head off inflation has been, after all, the principal basis for support of the plan. Nearly everyone fears inflation and many are ready to support any proposal that they think holds even a faint hope of stopping it.

White-collar workers, who favor food subsidies as a preventive of the inflation which is squeezing them, and all others concerned with the danger of inflation, might well ponder whether the proposal would turn out to be a cure, or a cause of more inflation.

Whatever amount of subsidy money is passed out to consumers, either directly or indirectly, is inflationary. This is because it increases the money in consumers' hands to be spent on available goods and services, without a corresponding increase in the quantity of goods and services to be bought with the money. Such a condition—too much money for the goods and services—is what caused our inflation problem in the first place, for which subsidies are now brought forth as a preventive. Our present inflation problem arises from a doubling, since 1939, in the income of the average family, and an increase of over two and one-half times in money in circulation, without any corresponding increase in goods and services that might absorb it without increasing prices. More money added to what is already an excess, whether Government money or other, increases rather than decreases the discrepancy between money and goods; and so it adds to the inflationary force.

The fact that the Government is a consumer does not change the fact that more money without more goods is inflationary. If the Government was the only consumer, and used all the goods, such subsidy money would still be inflationary by the amount of the subsidy.

If the Government passes out subsidy money equivalent to 10 percent of the consumer purchases of goods and services, we would have every reason to expect 10 percent of inflation. Then, if we had accepted subsidies as a preventive of inflation, the next logical step would be to try more cure; if we passed out 20 percent more next time, we would have every reason to expect a total of 30 percent inflation (10 plus 20). And so we would have started toward uncontrolled inflation, that would be stopped only when we changed our mind about subsidies as a cure for inflation, and stopped applying more and more subsidies.

It is important in this connection to distinguish again between two sorts of governmental activity. Some, like the postal system, schools, roads, and the defense program, are similar to the production and marketing of goods and services by private or corporate businesses. If their cost is fully financed by taxes or other income of the Government, the process is not inflationary no matter what the magnitude of their operations; in fact, it is no more inflationary than is the operation of a corporation which produces something and sells it at cost.

For food subsidies to be noninflationary, it would be necessary for the Government to take away from the people an amount of money equivalent to the subsidy cost. One way would be to sell the commodities it has produced with the subsidy money, much as it sells stamps to reimburse itself for the money passed out to pay for the expense of the Postal System; but it does not itself produce any commodities, and so does not have them for sale So it would have to increase taxes by the amount of the subsidies. This is not apparently contemplated, and so the subsidy plan is almost purely inflationary. In fact, instead of contemplating increased taxes to prevent the inflationary effect of subsidies, we find subsidies proposed by some as an alternative to increased taxes, as a means of warding off the inflationary force already upon us.

In the early thirties we paid out subsidies to unemployed persons and others as a means of causing inflation (or stopping deflation); we did it as a means of getting more money into circulation. Now we find subsidies advocated as a means of preventing inflation. Certainly both can't be right.

Subsidies are often mentioned as an alternative of higher wages or higher controlled prices. They may be the same, or more, or less inflationary when thought of that way. How they compare will depend on the size, in dollars, of the two alternatives. Of course, if the people are demanding a dollar of increased income and can be inveigled into accepting 50 cents of subsidy instead, then subsidies would be only half as inflationary as the wage increase. But they might demand the dollar later anyhow, and then subsidies would have the effect of increasing the inflation by half. But both are inflationary, and the only way to avoid inflation is to prevent both.

The New York Times points out clearly [6] that the differential type of subsidy "is not much different in principle from the cost-plus type of Government contract." It is generally conceded that the cost-plus contract is distinctly inflationary, because it tends to discourage efficiency, and to remove all the normal resistances to paying (inflationary) higher wages and prices for materials. If the differential subsidy amounts to the same thing under another name, we should realize that for the same reasons it too has a distinctly inflationary influence, rather than serving as a preventive of inflation.

Subsidies, it seems, fail completely as a means of stopping the inflation that is now very much under way in the United States. If we start them in a small way with the expectation that they will stop rising prices, and it turns out instead that they generate further inflationary rises, we are likely to assume that the failure was due to insufficient subsidy in the first attempt. Then we would logically try more and more subsidies, generating more and more inflation which we were attempting to stop. We would then be in a subsidy spiral, indulged in as a means of preventing an inflation spiral—which is really the same thing in its final outcome.[7]

This is not to predict that the United States is with certainty on its way toward uncontrolled inflation. But we should recognize that uncontrolled inflation would not descend upon us instantly. It creeps upon nations as a result of their individual and governmental actions and enactments. Subsidies are one step in that direction. It may not be too early to note the similarity in the expansion of money in circulation in Germany during World War No. 1 and in the United States since 1939. Germany did not experience the crisis of its uncontrolled inflation until 1923. But the 1923 debacle was simply the culmination of a continuous growth of money in circulation which in its first 5 years looked very similar to that of the United States during the years from 1939 to 1943.[7] We may well be concerned over the possibility of serious inflation resulting from a widespread belief in the United States that large increases in the Federal debt are justified to prevent both rising prices and falling prices—which leaves only that occasional interval between inflation and deflation for the Federal debt not to grow.

COULD SUBSIDIES BE USEFUL IN CORRECTING MALADJUSTMENTS RESULTING FROM THE WAR?

Many groups in our population believe that subsidies would help to correct the sacrifices that war imposes upon them.

A general subsidy to everyone could not possibly help everyone—in terms of goods for their living. Passing out money is not the same thing as producing goods. And it is the production of the country, not the money in our pockets, that limits our average consumption. Consumption cannot be raised by mailing out Government checks, if the limiting factor in their living is already insufficient goods available for them to buy. The estimate of $37,000,000,000 of excess consumer money in the United States for 1943; over and above taxes and the cost of goods and services available for them to buy at current fixed prices, is grim evidence of the fact that insufficient money is not the reason why the average person cannot live better than he now does.

Some groups have suffered during the war far more than others, in terms of the living their incomes will afford them. The outstanding group in this position is the white-collar group, or part of it, who have had little or no increase in incomes at a time when living costs have risen 22 [8] percent. The way to help their position is to correct it, specifically. This group will not be helped by an over-all subsidy which everyone receives, because, with the higher prices that would result, the goods that could be bought by each group remain the same as it was before.

If we are to believe the official price and income figures, the average person must be living about one-sixth better in 1943 than in 1939, in terms of goods and services bought.[9] In addition, huge amounts are being saved for future spending, in the form of cash, bank accounts, War bonds, reduced debts, and insurance. Family incomes have about doubled since 1939. Prices have gone up some, and taxes have been increased, but these have failed by far to absorb the increased incomes. So, we find no evidence in these figures to justify a general subsidy to all groups.

Any plan to correct maladjustments growing out of the war must be specific, not general. Furthermore, it would seem that we could afford correction without recourse to public subsidies.

COULD SUBSIDIES BE USEFUL IN INFLUENCING PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF CERTAIN PRODUCTS?

Normally we are satisfied with an economic system in this country whereby production of each product is guided by the wishes of consumers as reflected in the market place. If we want more potatoes, we bid them up in price and, as soon as they can do so, farmers reflect their recognition of this fact by a larger planted acreage. If fewer are wanted, there are lower prices and a lower acreage. Of course, the weather and other influences on yields makes impossible any fine adjustment of supply.

Even in wartime we may not want to generally alter this system. But in rare instances perhaps we do.

One condition where we might wish to use a public subsidy to alter this system can be illustrated by the current potato situation. Last spring, principally because of too low fixed prices for potatoes during the winter, and the shortage of other vegetables, we ran out of potatoes. "White market" prices were favorable and "black market prices" were

---

[6] See reference No. 12.
that the differential type of subsidy "is not
[7] See reference No. 18.

[8] National Industrial Conference Board index.

[9] Cornell University, Department of Agricultural Economics, A. E. 466.

fantastic, during the late marketing season. As a result of this condition, and the pleas of the Government for more potatoes, the acreage planted in 1944 was increased by about one-fourth. To top it off, the weatherman was kind to the crop, and we had a crop of about 470,000,000 bushels, or 10 percent more than the largest crop we ever had. Normally, with the consumption of potatoes highly stable for even wide fluctuations in price, the 1944 crop would have sold for little or nothing in producing areas distant from market. Then, in 1945, a sufficient number of potato growers would be discouraged to the point where the crop might be reduced to 325,000,000 bushels (or some other figure)—far below our normal consumption. The public might well be so concerned over such a prospect that they would choose to take steps now to prevent it. The first step has, in fact, already been taken by the Government, a support or loan price has been established to insure a good acreage for planting next year, provided the price can be maintained throughout the marketing season and provided all the 1943 crop can be disposed of at these prices. But trouble is about to begin in another way. Consumption is difficult to predict under current conditions, but it appears likely that not all the 1943 crop will be consumed at these high support prices. Much lower prices would have to prevail in order to induce consumers to consume them all. If we drop the price, we might as a result have too few potatoes as a 1944 crop. If we maintain the price, some of the 1943 crop is likely to be wasted. A subsidy to induce consumption, and at the same time maintain the producer price, is a possible answer. Because of the importance of potatoes as an excellent and cheap food, that can be produced in great quantities per acre, we might wish to use subsidies on potatoes this year as a sort of wartime measure.

Another illustration of the use of subsidies to influence production and consumption is as a means of inducing, or bribing, consumers into a shift in their type of diet. If we are to be of much help in feeding the rest of the world it will be necessary for us to shift our diet to include more of the primary foods (crops, like cereals, soybeans, peanuts, beans, etc.) and less of the secondary foods (like meats) which require for each calorie they contain something like seven calories of primary foods used in their production. A hiatus arises from the fact that people do not like a diet of primary foods and want a diet with as high a proportion as possible of the secondary foods. With current unprecedented levels of consumer incomes, consumers are trying to shift away from primary foods, rather than toward them. All this leads to the conviction that we have but three alternatives to choose from, (1) we could squeeze the consumers' incomes down to the point (in buying power) where they had to shift toward the primary foods as the product of necessity, (2) we could bribe them into shifting their diet by a subsidy on the price of the primary foods we want them to use more of, (3) we can let the whole business go and thus fail to accomplish a shift in our diet, and fail to deliver to any large extent on our promises of food to other nations. As between these alternatives it is conceivable that we might choose the subsidy route.

These illustrations may sound like a contradiction of the statement in an earlier section, where it was said that the Government would not itself be producing or marketing food with this subsidy money. It is true that the Government would not itself produce the commodities, but the subsidy money might be used in an attempt to stimulate production (by increased returns) or to stimulate consumption (by lower consumer cost) of certain products. The subsidy method is questionable wherever the necessary production and consumption could be obtained through the ordinary means of market price. The question is, for products where we have good reason to want greater production than can be induced by the price consumers can pay, and are willing to pay, as market price, are we justified under these circumstances in bribing some additional production with a subsidy? In general, in the present situation, we should not forget the $37,000,000,000 of excess spending power in the United States when deciding whether or not the average person is able to pay the necessary price for his food. Furthermore, the results of improper price relationships established by O. P. A. should not be confused with inability of consumers to pay the proper market price; for such situations, readjustment of O. P. A. prices is a possible solution, as well as a subsidy.

Use of subsidies for purposes like these are as different from their use in attempting to control inflation, or any of the other purposes previously mentioned, as is black from white. Yet a subsidy check received by any of us for one purpose is identical in appearance to one received for another. Therein lies the danger, and the fear, of using subsidies for any purpose whatsoever. So long as the differences in purpose are as obscure as they seem to be, for the public and for many officials, the question may fairly be raised as to how we can insure the use of subsidies only for a certain specified purpose. Distinction in use calls for a high degree of both understanding and integrity.

GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS THAT WOULD GO WITH SUBSIDIES

The receipt of subsidy payments from the Government carries with it the sacrifice of some degree of individual freedom. This conclusion is a matter of clear historical record, where any similar program has been involved. It seems to be axiomatic that the two go together. We may gladly accept both, or choose neither.

A LITTLE HISTORY ABOUT SUBSIDIES

Subsidies are not new in history. They have been tried—both large and small—at least as far back as the second century before the birth of Christ, and probably as far back as there have been governments.

We can always profit from the work of historians. Consideration of their findings is a cheap substitute for repeating costly experiments that have been tried before, and found wanting.

Doubtless some subsidies used in history might fairly be judged as worthy of their cost; others not. It may well be, for instance, that the public subsidy of research, education, and the early development of certain industries may give us the powerful advantage of time in developments destined to come sooner or later anyhow, and which we might well subsidize in order to have their benefits sooner. Those sorts of things are something like buying time, or accelerating advancement. Synthetic rubber might well turn out to be one of these, but we shall have to wait to find out.

As to food subsidies, we could find many, many illustrations in history. Perhaps one of the most interesting is found in the recorded history of ancient Rome, in the second century B. C.[10] This historian tells us that Caius Gracchus "brought forward and carried through, with enthusiastic clapping of every pair of hands in Rome that were hardened with labor, a proposal that there should be public granaries in the city, maintained and filled at the cost of the state, and that corn should be sold at a rate artificially cheap to the poor free citizens. * * * The privilege was confined to Rome, because in Rome the elections were held, and the Roman constituency was the one depositary of power. The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the state, to crowd the circus and to clamor at the elections, * * * but certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid highest for their voices. Excuses could be found, no doubt, * * * and in the intrusion upon Italy of a gigantic system of slave labor. * * * It was the deadliest blow which had yet been dealt to the constitution. * * * The utmost that could be ventured in later times * * * was to limit an intolerable evil, and if one side was ever strong enough to make the attempt, their rivals had a bribe ready in their hands to buy back the popular support. * * * The powers which * * * he desired to use for high purposes of statesmanship * * * broke in his hands. * * * The vagabond part of the constituency was well contented with what it had obtained, a life in the city, supported at the public expense, with politics and games for its amusement. * * * (Finally) * * * riots broke out and extended day after day. Caius Gracchus was at last killed * * * and under cover of the disturbance 3,000 of his friends were killed along with him. * * * The storm was over."

Of course, this is only one instance.[11] We are now living in an enlightened world, 2,000 years later. We are not so barbaric. Perhaps we are more adept at administration of such things, and have greater resourcefulness of will power with which to abandon a gratuity before it becomes a fixed habit. But we should first be certain of these differences, or of others equally satisfactory, before we conclude that the outcome would be greatly different in our day.

LIST OF SOME REFERENCES ON SUBSIDIES

1. What About Food Subsidies? by Willford I. King, professor of economics, School of Commerce, New York University, New York, N. Y., June 23, 1943.

2. Subsidies or Wage Boosts?, article in Business Week, June 26, 1943.

3. Subsidies Are Attempt to Halt Upward Climb of Cost of Living, Iowa Farm Economist, volume IX, No. 6, June 1943.

4. Inflation Is On Our Doorstep, by F. A. Harper and W. M. Curtiss, The Conference Board Economic Record, July 1943.

5. Foreign Wartime Subsidies, Economic Record, National Industrial Conference Board, August 1943, volume 5, No. 8, New York, N. Y. (The National Industrial Conference Board is planning to publish another similar article dealing with domestic subsidy problems.)

6. Food, Subsidies, Bureaucracy, by J. D. Miller, president emeritus, National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., September 13, 1943.

7. Subsidies and Inflation, by S. E. Harris, American Economic Review, September 1943.

8. Shall We Pay to Buy for Less (57 Members of Congress express their views on consumer food subsidies), published by United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., September 1943.

9. Message to Congress on food, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, November 1, 1943.

10. Effect of Price Ceilings and Subsidies on Milk Production, by Leland Spencer, November 3, 1943.

11. The A B C of Subsidies, by Walter Lippmann, New York Herald Tribune, November 23, 1943.

12. Subsidies: Two Kinds, editorial in the New York Times, November 26, 1943.

13. A Vote of No Confidence, by Heptisax, New York Herald Tribune, November 28, 1943.

14. The Case for the Subsidies, by Walter Lippmann, New York Herald Tribune, December 4, 1943.

15. Address of Albert S. Goss, master, before the seventy-seventh annual session of

[10] See reference No. 16.

[11] For other interesting experiments with subsidies see reference No. 18.

the National Grange, Grand Rapids, Mich., November 10, 1943, pages 12 to 16.

16. Caesar: A Sketch, by James Anthony Froude, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880, especially pages 31 to 35.

17. Subsidies and Wartime Price Control, by Harry Gunnison Brown, American Journal of Economics and Sociology, July 1943.

18. Subsidies in Europe, editorial in the New York Times, November 28, 1943.

19. Holding the Line, editorial in the New York Times, December 9, 1943.

Too Late, as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of January 12, 1944:

TOO LATE, AS USUAL

In asking Congress to enact a national service law, drafting every able-bodied man and woman—with "appropriate exceptions"—needed for service in essential industry, President Roosevelt yesterday made the statement that he hesitated for 3 years to make such a recommendation. The President is filling his usual role of locking the stable after the horse has been stolen.

The President said such a plan would prevent strikes. How would it? Congress recently enacted a law over his veto making strikes punishable with heavy penalties. But it did not stop the coal strikes or the recent steel strike, nor would it have prevented the railroad men from going on strike if they wanted to do so. You cannot jail 500,000 miners or the same number of steel workers or a million railroad men.

Great Britain has an Emergency Powers Act under which she can conscript all women from the ages of 18 to 31 and all men from 18 years to 50. In the main, it has worked well, but it has not prevented strikes. Nothing will prevent strikes but public condemnation.

Had a national service law been passed following Pearl Harbor it might have prevented strikes and much other mischief. We might not have had so much interference with production and so many attacks on wage and price stabilization. The cost of living might have been held down and inflation kept from getting a head start.

The kind of a law Mr. Roosevelt now urges will be found in the terms of the Austin-Wadsworth bill, but this bill has been buried in committee for months. There has been no public demand for its enactment.

The national mind has cooled toward the war. The American people foolishly think the danger is over. The Government has done nothing to break down this smug and complacent attitude. Its Office of War Information has not been keyed to this activity. Selfish interests have been hammering at the doors of Congress. Violations of ration regulations have been widespread. Black markets have defied discovery and prosecution.

Generally the people of the United States have not bowed to the yoke of duty and service. We have turned the spiritual side of the picture to the wall and indulged in all manner of roistering while our men are dying in the South Pacific jungles and in the mountains of Italy.

To this extent the Government has been derelict. It may well be that the need for a national service law is great. We are on the eve of mass military movements in which the casualties will mount into the hundreds of thousands. Our enemies are still strong and desperate. They are contesting every foot of the way. They have taken great aid and comfort out of our folly. As General Marshall has said, this folly is prolonging the war, with its lists of dead, wounded, and missing.

Congress can enact the law President Roosevelt wants, but it is too bad it was not urged by him 2 years ago when the national mind was stunned because of the turn of events.

Wartime Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Galveston Daily News of January 7, 1944:

WARTIME PROHIBITION

Permanent restoration of national prohibition, either by congressional enactment or popular vote, while millions of citizens are serving in the armed forces would be manifestly unfair to them. It might be a different matter if service men and women were allowed a full opportunity to vote on the question. Unfortunately, no practical method has been found of insuring their complete participation in any election, and it seems unlikely that any will be.

The argument loses most of its force, however, when applied to prohibition as a strictly wartime measure. It is doubtful in the extreme if Congress has authority to restore prohibition permanently by statute, and the question is not likely to be placed before the people as a constitutional amendment. Congress' emergency powers probably are broad enough to sanction a wartime prohibition statute. Certainly it has passed emergency laws which appear to have no clearer constitutional warrant.

So it would seem that the principal question involved in the Bryson bill, on which committee hearings will begin next week, is one of expediency. Would prohibition of intoxicating liquor—defined in the Bryson bill as any beverage containing more than one-half of 1 percent alcohol by volume—for the duration of the war and until after demobilization of the armed forces materially promote the war effort?

There is a good deal of evidence that hangovers contribute to absenteeism in war plants—to what extent is a highly debatable question. It would be a wonderful thing if a completely sober nation could be insured for the duration and, for that matter, for all time. The trouble is, we have no assurance that merely prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages would have that effect. Thirteen years of national prohibition failed to achieve complete sobriety, or anything approaching it. Some still argue that the benefit of prohibition outweighed its undesirable social effects, but it is doubtful indeed if a majority of the American people, even without the service vote, would sanction a return of prohibition as a permanent thing.

Whether the same evil effects would recur under wartime prohibition may be a debatable question. It would be difficult for the moonshiner and home brewer to operate while sugar is rationed. Nevertheless, reports of the State liquor control board show a significant increase in the illicit liquor traffic paralleling the growing scarcity of legal liquor supplies. The latter condition probably is a temperance factor tending to restrain the casual drinker. But experience has shown that there is a minority which will go to any extreme to satisfy an appetite for alcohol—and there will always be those ready to pander to it for profit.

Although it has revived the prohibition debate, there is very little chance that the Bryson bill will pass, even if it comes to a vote.

Voting by Service Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Governor of the State of Florida:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1944.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Governor, Tallahassee, Fla.

DEAR GOVERNOR HOLLAND: I always hesitate to make any suggestion to the Governor concerning affairs of the State of Florida, and as you know, in the past I have always declined to do so; but there is a question now before the United States which not only involves the Congress but also our State, and that is the privilege of service men and women to vote.

I heard a news commentator report that Georgia was the first State in the Union to pass a law providing for service men and women to vote. This I know, of course, is not true because our legislature passed such a law at the last session. However, while this law gives service people the right to vote I am afraid that it does not facilitate the objective. I have read the law very carefully, and knowing the primary laws of Florida as I do I do not see how it is possible for all the service men and women at home and on the battlefields of the entire world to vote under this law, although I may be incorrect.

There is no question in my mind but that the Green-Lucas bill did involve States' rights. A friend of mine who is high in administration circles and has been since the early days of this administration recently told me that there was no question but that the inner circle planned to abolish the poll tax through this bill, or go as far as possible in this direction. He informed me that he had discussed this matter recently with the inner circle and had assured them that they must of necessity forget such a plan and compromise on a bill which would make it possible for service men and women to vote. I do not care to disclose this man's name because it may be embarrassing to him and I did not ask his permission, but he is thoroughly reliable and knows what he is talking about.

Even though States' rights are involved, I cannot see what it would avail us to protect

States' rights and even indirectly fail to secure the rights of the individual. Therefore, if I am compelled to choose between one of the two I must of necessity choose to support the rights of the individual and unless the State has or will make provision for service men and women to vote I must vote for a Federal law giving them that right. I cannot conceive of any way that I could justify myself in refusing to do so.

I therefore suggest that you ask the Attorney General to examine the present laws of Florida and if necessary that a special session of the legislature be called for the purpose of making this privilege practicable to service men and women under our primary and general election laws.

With kind personal regards, I beg to remain.

Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

Resolutions of Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some general resolutions adopted by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association in their annual meeting assembled at Kearney, Nebr.

I have called the Agriculture Department's attention to the fact that it is most desirable that an early announcement of the 1944 sugar-beet prices and labor costs be made.

This beet program should be separate from the bean or any other program which might be connected with the subsidy payments. For many years now the beet growers have received an incentive payment for the raising of sugar beets. The beet growers of my district are anxious to raise more beets because there are so many other benefits derived from the growing of beets. I refer to the beet tops, the feeding of livestock and the fertilizer which results. It is not just the sugar alone which makes the growing of beets desirable.

For too long a time there has been a group in the Agriculture Department who have not been favorable to the raising of beets in this country. They seem to prefer to bring their sugar in from Cuba or some of the other islands. This attitude is wrong and these individuals should either change their way of thinking or be eliminated from the Department of Agriculture. They have no place in the building of an American economy.

The beet program should be announced immediately. The farmer wants to cooperate but in order to do so he must know what price to expect for his beets. The farmer needs to plan his machinery and labor operations. He needs to have a sympathetic and intelligent administration of the farm program.

The resolutions follow:

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA BEET GROWERS' ASSOCIATION IN ANNUAL MEETING ASSEMBLED AT KEARNEY, NEBR., DECEMBER 6, 1943

Resolution 1

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has said that food will win the war and write the peace. Our western sugar-beet farmers are ready and anxious to extend their utmost efforts in producing as great a quantity of sugar as the industry's facilities permit. We are convinced, however, that all farmers, if they are to contribute their full share to our Nation's all-out war effort, must have proper and adequate equipment and supplies, and facilities near at hand for repairing and maintaining this equipment.

We believe that this can best be done by continuing the flow of these items through the regular manufacturer and dealer channels, and the supplying of all needed materials and equipment to the small businesses in farm localities who are so all-important to the successful and efficient operation of our farms.

Resolution 2

We urge that the Government labor determination be made at as early a date as possible, that the grower may have same prior to grower-processor signing.

Resolution 3

Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That we consider the present ceiling on sugar inadequate to meet the rising costs of production and that any ceiling prices established on sugar during the emergency should be established in view of increasing production costs.

Resolution 4

All State organizations, members of national organizations, are requested, in accordance with their usual methods of procedure, to present the program adopted at this meeting to their national organizations with the request that they join in making it a unified national program.

Resolution 5

Farmers still maintain the position that we want parity price in the market place for our products rather than subsidies. In addition, where war needs demand the expansion of some war crop, we grant that farmers may justifiably be supported in the production of such crops, but the Department of Agriculture should not ask the production of such crops in areas where such crops are not adapted.

Resolution 6

Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, That the Department of Agriculture be requested, in the determination of labor rates for the 1944 season, to take into consideration the difference in field conditions where segmented seed is properly used, and to establish a different and lower rate for labor in fields properly planted with segmented seed.

Resolution 7

Unconditional surrender on the part of the enemy is the immediate object of Nebraska agriculture. To its achievement, we of the Central Nebraska Sugar Beet Growers' Association pledge our unlimited efforts and sacred honor that the principle of government "of the people, for the people, and by the people, shall not perish from the earth." For 2 successive years, we have fulfilled, and again accept our responsibility for increased food and fiber for our armed forces, allies, and our own people. But to accept this, we must have adequate and/or competent manpower, essential machinery, and supplies made available, and prices of farm products must be such, if we can be kept in a position where we can produce to our utmost. In addition, we need administration of all the programs that affect farmers to be placed in the hands of the cooperating farmers, who know local problems and conditions, and who are the people that can intelligently and sympathetically administer them.

Recognition of Meritorious Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief item from the Waterways Journal of January 8, 1944, containing a well deserved acknowledgement of the loyal service of Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, retired. This period, during which we are fighting the greatest of all wars on a half-dozen far-flung battle fronts, is a period of unprecedented opportunity for the young and vigorous personnel of our armed forces to render conspicuous service to the country and to earn well-merited glory for themselves. Almost every day of this period, however, some competent, loyal, gallant officer reaches the age of compulsory retirement, and through no other fault than those of advancing years and failing vigor, passes into the comparative obscurity of retirement with a record of meritorious service more or less unrecognized. Colonel Powell, but recently retired, has just such a long, fine, unblemished record in both the military and civil fields of engineering. Since rendering military service throughout the last war, he has been in responsible charge of extensive public works in different parts of the country, and it can be said with truth that he left each of these areas a better place for his having labored there.

The article referred to is as follows:

COL. R. G. POWELL RETIRED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

(By Charles J. Gramp)

CINCINNATI, January 6.—The godfather of the modern Ohio River got out of uniform January 1 despite the best efforts of river organizations to keep him in. His name is Col. Roger G. Powell, resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and former United States division engineer here. He is now 62, over the statutory age limit, and must retire.

NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Colonel Powell is author of the so-called Powell plan for development of the Ohio, including a half-billion-dollar flood-control program and a long-range post-war improvement of navigation facilities. As district, sector, and division engineer here from 1925 to 1938, he was largely responsible for completion, in 1929, of the 9-foot navigation channel the full 981 miles of the Ohio. He also drew up standard regulations and signals for use of the locks. Previously each lock master exercised his own ideas, and

they varied from lock to lock. The Ohio Valley Improvement Association and the Mississippi River System Carriers' Association joined in urging the War Department to retain Colonel Powell on active duty on grounds that his work was financed from river and harbor appropriations rather than regular War Department funds. They also argued that the Corps of Engineers required so much technical training that a man was likely to be gray before reaching high rank, and that this training, at public expense, should be used despite a man's years. However, the decision stood and shortly Colonel Powell will return to his Logansport, Ind., home.

To the Poles and Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of December 30 relates to a subject in which millions of Americans are vitally interested. It is their hope that when this war ends, Poland will be restored as a free, independent nation. She deserves the help of the United States Government.

TO THE POLES AND RUSSIANS

As the Russian armies, driving west on winter's winds in a renewal of their great offensive, rout the German forces beyond Kiev and approach the pre-war borders of Poland, a situation threatens to arise which will test the statesmanship of the United Nations. Of all the political problems which this war has raised, the potential conflict between Polish nationalism and Russian strategy is admittedly the most difficult and the most explosive. On the manner in which this problem is settled may depend not only the prospect for peace in eastern Europe but the attitude of the United States toward the whole question of post-war collaboration.

American opinion, friendly to both Poles and Russians, is sufficiently disinterested to make a fair appraisal of the points at issue. For the Poles we feel the warm sympathy which Americans traditionally have for small countries buffeted by misfortune. We remember that this war began over the specific question of Poland's right to survive as an independent nation. We honor the courage with which the Polish people fought against hopeless odds in defense of their own homeland. We do not forget that in the Atlantic Charter we have pledged ourselves, in company with our Allies, to approve "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned"; to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," and to do our best "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them," and we take these pledges seriously.

At the same time, aware of all this, we are also aware that in the matter of territorial changes the Russians have a case. The present eastern frontier of Poland cannot properly be considered either sacred or unalterable when it includes, as it does, some millions of White Russians, Ukrainians, and Lithuanians, and when it was established, as it was, by force of Polish arms in the moment of Russia's greatest weakness following the end of the First World War. The Russians have made a gigantic contribution to the cause of the United Nations in this war. Of all the great Allied Powers they are the closest neighbors of Germany. They are entitled to credence when they say that their interest in a revision of the Polish border rises not from a desire for more territory, as such, but from the necessity of possessing a strategic frontier which will give them more adequate protection against any recurrence of German aggression.

From the point of view of all the United Nations, the present deadlock holds elements of great danger. The existing disagreement between the Russians and the Poles has already given German propaganda its best opportunity in years to foster suspicion and resentment. If the Russians now cross the old Polish frontier with this dispute still unresolved; if they then proceed to treat the eastern part of Poland as if it were automatically, and by their own unilateral decision, Russian territory; and if the Poles, as they may, then take up hidden arms in a desperate if hopeless defense against what will seem to them to be a new invasion, the unity of the Allied world will be jeopardized. Meantime, even without the worst of these things happening, there are, from our own special American point of view, two real and present dangers in the situation.

The first of these is that the Poles, despairing of aid from other quarters, will attempt to carry their case to the American electorate by injecting it as an issue into next year's Presidential campaign. There are certain important pivotal States—New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Michigan among them—in which the Polish vote might readily be the decisive factor in a close election. All politicians are aware of this. All politicians will be tempted to fish in troubled waters in 1944. And on the theory that the Polish vote can easily be turned against the present administration there are Republican politicians who may find it profitable, for purely partisan reasons, to champion the cause of Poland against Russia in the next election.

The result of such a political alliance, assuming that the Polish leaders were willing to enter into it, would be unfortunate from every point of view. It would divide the American people on a question of foreign policy. It would split the country into pro-Polish and pro-Russian factions. It could easily end by accomplishing nothing useful for the Poles and at the same time wrecking all hope of good American relations with Russia in the post-war years.

The second danger is that the Russians themselves will do this wrecking by choosing to regard any settlement of the Polish problem as exclusively their own affair, to be handled in their own way and on their own terms, without reference to the effect on American sentiment.

Such a settlement can no doubt be achieved if the Russians wish to have it this way. It is obviously true that the United States will never send an army to defend the eastern Polish border. But a settlement made in this way could have unfortunate results for both Russia and the United States. For, while Russia could easily enough obtain her "strategic frontier," she would lose the support of American opinion, and therewith the assurance of American aid in the event of a new war, if this country became convinced that the settlement was made high-handedly, in disregard of Poland's legitimate interests and in defiance of the promises of the Atlantic Charter.

In this case the result of Russia's action would be to breed cynicism in the United States about the character of the post-war settlements and to drive American opinion in the direction of isolation.

It is too late in the day to hope for a settlement in detail of the Polish-Russian problem before the swiftly moving Russian armies cross the old border into pre-war Poland. But what can reasonably be sought, and what would do more than any other single act to cement Russian-American friendship in the long years to come, is a broad statement of policy toward Poland by the Russian Government in complete harmony with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter. This could be done with good grace and complete consistency by the Russian Government, since the Soviet-Polish agreement of July 30, 1941, declares that "the U. S. S. R. recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity."

The Atlantic Charter itself provides, ready-made, the language for a new statement. It would be necessary only to apply specifically to the case of Poland the broad declaration of the Charter that the Russians seek "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned"—in other words, that they wish to incorporate into the Russian state and into the Soviet system no peoples who do not choose to go there willingly, after a free plebiscite to be held under the auspices of Russia's principal partners in the European war.

If Marshal Stalin were boldly to make such a declaration at this time the effect would be profound. This single act would put an end to the whole Russian-Polish disagreement, for the Poles would be bound to accept such a declaration in good faith. It would close the last door to the persistent efforts of the German propagandists. It would lift the already great prestige of Russia in this country to a new high plane of confidence and understanding. For the Russians it might mean the loss of a few square miles of territory on a strategic frontier. But the new and revolutionary tactics of war in the air have now made a few square miles of territory meaningless, and as against this loss the Russians could count on having the great military power of the United States at their side and as their ally in the event of a new threat to their western border.

For the Russians, as for ourselves, the stakes are high. The opportunities for statesmanship are undeniable.

Voting by Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, there is presently pending before the proper jurisdictional committee of the House a bill to provide ways and means or a method of voting for our service men and women. I sincerely hope that the committee may, without further delay, present to this House their recommendations providing a simple way or method for these fine service men and women to vote. I would like to make it possible for them to vote in all their respective primaries and then in the general elections, and so far as I am concerned, I am willing to waive all red tape including the assessment and

payment of poll taxes and to say to them in simple language, "You are qualified to fight for America or you would not be in the service, so you are without further effort certainly qualified to vote in all primaries and elections."

I would like the voting to be conducted under the election laws of the several States, if possible, but I am willing to go as far as is necessary to insure to them the right to vote. If the committee should find that there is not sufficient time to provide a method for these service men and women to vote under the laws of the several States, then in that event, I desire to provide a Federal way for them to vote for the duration of the present emergency, and not only to permit them to vote but actually provide them with an opportunity of voting. I say let them vote under the State laws if possible and feasible; if not, provide Federal procedure, but by all means provide them with the opportunity of voting. We should not be quarreling about the method so much—we are not dealing with unknown people—they are not of foreign nationality—they are American service men and women, American heroes fighting for their country. As an exserviceman myself of World War No. 1, I think I know how they feel. They know they should have the right to vote. Many of them desire to vote. The American people want them to vote. Every Member of Congress is desirous of extending them the right to vote. Yes, the spirits of the framers and signers of our Federal Constitution are hovering over us in this august chamber today and they are saying, "Find a way. We did not mean to deprive them of the right to vote when we wrote the Constitution—let them vote."

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, presented yesterday before the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express the deep appreciation of the American Legion to Senator CLARK, as chairman of the veterans' subcommittee, and to Senator GEORGE, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, for granting me this privilege of appearing before you. I should also like to take this occasion to express my organization's gratitude to each and every member of the veterans' subcommittee and of the Senate Finance Committee for the veterans' legislation they have reported to the Senate and which has been enacted into law.

I am elated that more preparation is being made today for World War No. 2 veterans than was made in 1917–18 for World War No. 1 veterans.

You, Senator CLARK, having been the first national commander of the American Legion, and knowing the conditions which prevailed for returning World War No. 1 veterans in 1917–18, realize the value of making this preparation. Many of you Senators who, in 1919 and the early 1920's, assisted returning World War No. 1 veterans know the necessity of being prepared for hundreds of thousands of returning veterans—both the disabled and the able-bodied.

Many of you will recall the large number of agencies and bureaus which were endeavoring to solve the problems of returning veterans during those years. The situation became so confusing that it bordered on chaos. Finally, a commission was appointed to make a full study and submit recommendations for solutions. Congress played the leading part in this investigation and it resulted in the creation of the Veterans' Bureau on August 9, 1921. Authority had been centralized in Washington for the handling of claims and from that day on a process of decentralization was started—first into districts and later into regions throughout the country. Additional liberalizing measures were passed, principally in June 1924 and in July of 1930. The World War Veterans' Act became a charter of liberal provisions for ex-service people of the First World War. The act of July 3, 1930, established the Veterans' Administration, as we now know it, combining therein all existing functions of the Government pertaining exclusively to veterans of the armed services.

The forward march of the liberal program in behalf of the Nation's defenders was temporarily halted by the passage of the so-called Economy Act on March 20, 1933. When the full effect of this legislation was realized by the American people and the Congress, steps were taken within approximately 1 year to recoup nearly all that had been lost. The past decade has seen a further liberalization, adjustment, and reconcilement of various provisions in behalf of former members of the armed forces. It also brought the end of peace and the advent of a war which most certainly will produce more war veterans than this or any other country will have had at any one time.

The transition from peace to war in a democracy such as ours is necessarily attended by many drastic and rapid changes. The American Legion along with many other individuals and groups of citizens endeavored to anticipate and prepare for the emergency months before the attack at Pearl Harbor. Our organization was particularly concerned with the adequacy of the program and procedures of the Veterans' Administration in its many functions of hospitalization, insurance, disability compensation, appeals, guardianship, etc.

During the past 25 years the Legion has developed a very extensive system of service on claims and rehabilitation. Manning this enterprise are 300 full-time national, State, department, county, and post service officers and several thousand volunteer service officers and auxiliary workers. These people are in close touch with the many branches of the Veterans' Administration and send in from time to time their observations and recommendations.

In order that I might have the latest possible information on how all this big establishment of the Veterans' Administration was functioning, I requested a survey of pending claims of those World War No. 2 veterans who have already returned. Most of the States responded, and over 1,500 individual cases were cited, showing that some place along the line the peacetime procedures of handling claims were not keeping up with the wartime pace. Battle casualties were being discharged without adequate provision as to their compensation, claims, vocational training, and domiciliary needs. Earlier in 1942 and 1943 we found and reported the cases of many who had broken down during the period of preparation for actual combat, and were being released to city, county, and State authorities in many cases as if they were guilty of some infraction of the law. These men had become afflicted in their mental and nervous make-ups, and a great number of them needed only home environment and brief periods of institutional care to be restored to their normal way of life.

The situation, however, became so shocking that the Legion, with the support of other veterans' organizations, sponsored, and Congress enacted into law, the hospital provisions of Public Law No. 10, placing men and women of this war on an equal basis with other war veterans. It took several weeks for this law to become effective, but it has cured many of the old procedures of discharges from active service and care by the Veterans' Administration.

In respect to claims, the recent survey showed indefensible delays due to a variety of causes. Some of the machinery used in peacetime by the Veterans' Administration was too slow to adequately cope with the rating of World War No. 2 cases. Such items as clinical records from the Army and Navy, the lack of adequate personnel in the Adjudication Division of the Veterans' Administration, the absence of Veterans' Administration representatives at discharge points, the assignment of claim numbers, and the fiscal arrangement of issuing checks in settlement of claims all contributed to these delays. In other words, there were too many "procedural luxuries" followed in peacetime which made the system inadequate to cope with war.

The results of the survey, with 14 individual examples, and constructive recommendations for correcting the old situation, were made available to the Congress of the United States, the Veterans' Administration, the public, and the press during the first days of December 1943. The effect was instantaneous and favorable. For instance, during the month of December several administrative steps were taken by the Government, all aimed to expedite the handling of cases and claims of World War No. 2 discharges. Let me cite a few of these changes:

1. War Department Circular No. 315, dated December 4, 1943, authorizes Veterans' Administration personnel to function at military installations. Rating boards and contact representatives have already been assigned to a number of military hospitals in keeping with this authorization.

2. The Navy Department designated its discharge centers at San Diego, Calif.; Great Lakes, Ill.; Portsmouth, Va., as the discharge points where Veterans' Administration representatives and rating boards may start functioning.

3. Clinical and hospital records of dischargees will be submitted to these Veterans' Administration representatives at the discharge points where they are functioning instead of to the nearest regional office, thus obviating delay in transmittal from that office to offices having jurisdiction in dischargees' home States.

4. Assignment of C numbers expedited, both in the field and at central office, with blocks of such numbers assigned to the boards functioning at discharge centers. The Legion is recommending further that each regional office, especially the large ones, also

be assigned a group of these numbers instead of having to call upon central office for each individual assignment.

5. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs called upon all regional managers to send in their recommendations and appoint a committee of managers, which is now sitting to assist the Administrator and his staff to place the Veterans' Administration on a wartime basis.

6. The Veterans' Administration was given a No. 1 priority for personnel, placing it on a par with the War and Navy Departments in calling for, procuring, and retaining essential and qualified personnel to carry on the wartime work for veterans. This recommendation has its influence upon the War Production Board, which is now engaged in analyzing the Veterans' Administration needs for material, equipment, construction, and supplies.

7. As of November 30, 1943, there were 110 rating boards authorized and functioning at the various field stations of the Veterans' Administration. Since that time 215 additional boards have been authorized and these will be set up as soon as personnel is obtained. This gives a definite indication of the accelerated pace of preparation during the last 45 days.

There are a number of other progressive changes being made administratively which, I feel, will be stimulated by congressional endorsement.

LEGION'S OMNIBUS BILL

In view of the foregoing, therefore, I have reached the conclusion that many of these items should have legislative authority and that such authority should also exist for other phases of this entire matter. As national commander of the American Legion, I appointed a special committee to come to Washington to study all problems affecting World War No. 2 veterans. After days of study the special committee submitted to me the so-called Legion's omnibus bill which was introduced in the Senate as S. 1617 by Senators CLARK, GEORGE, WALSH of Massachusetts, CONNALLY, LUCAS, CARAWAY, BREWSTER, BROOKS, GURNEY, VANDENBERG, and WILEY. At this point I should like to express the Legion's and my personal appreciation to the cosponsors of this measure.

TITLE I

The first section declares by law that the Veterans' Administration shall be, and is constituted, an agency of the United States vital and essential to the successful prosecution of the present war. In other words, we are asking Congress to make this agency a war agency, and remove any doubt as to the role it plays in the war effort. Already it has cared for over 31,000 sick and disabled veterans of this war, and they are returning in need of hospital care in ever-increasing numbers. The latest report shows over 9,000 are now occupying hospital and domiciliary beds. Priorities, not only for personnel, but also for equipment, supplies, construction, and matériel should be established by law.

The President some months ago approved the speeding up of the 10-year construction program of the Veterans' Administration. Last May he charged the Federal Board of Hospitalization with the duty and program of reviewing all hospital, convalescent, and domiciliary activities operated by all agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of providing adequate beds and services, preventing duplication of services, and determining the need for additional facilities. Under these two Presidential authorizations the Veterans' Administration is making plans for the future hospital load. The bill before the committee has the effect of directing the Administrator and the Federal Board to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital beds for war veterans, to enter into agreements and contracts whereby the permanently constructed Army and Navy institutions may be used by the Veterans' Administration when not needed by the armed forces.

There is also provision for exchange of facilities as circumstances may demand during the prosecution of the war. Another important authorization included in this proposal is that the Administrator shall establish regional offices, suboffices, contact units, and subordinate offices in centers of population where there are no facilities at present, or where facilities are not readily accessible. For instance, such centers as Los Angeles, St. Louis, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Atlanta, Columbia, New York, and Boston all have Veterans' Administration facilities in their respective vicinities, but none of them is readily accessible to disabled men and their folks who come for assistance and advice. This is due primarily to the fact that after these cities are reached the people must find other means of conveyance to get to the actual Veterans' Administration offices, located several miles distant from the main city in each instance. In Boston the regional office is downtown, and the American Legion is advocating that it be retained there rather than being combined with the new facility at West Roxbury.

This measure also grants the Administrator authority to place in Army and Navy installations Veterans' Administration personnel for adjudication of claims of men and women about to be discharged from service. In addition, it will permit the Administrator to place experienced contact personnel in such installations for the purpose of giving advice and assistance to those who may not be interested in a disability pension claim but who will be in need of advice as to continuation of insurance, employment, and other items. This has been partially accomplished by administrative orders. We want congressional endorsement of this.

It is also provided that a man or woman shall not be released from active duty until his or her certificate of discharge and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery. This has been found necessary because many instances have arisen where men and women have been discharged without sufficient money to reach their homes, or in a few instances without a certificate of any nature to establish their actual military or naval status. There are many cases that might be cited under this paragraph, but I shall call your attention to only one which recently came to the attention of the American Legion. This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1943, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat with the Japanese in Guadalcanal; penetrating wound right side of head produced by grenade." This caused a half paralysis, and he was honorably discharged on a certificate of disability July 3, 1943. Although his claim was filed the same date, he did not have sufficient funds to care for himself and his dependent mother, and he had to wait for 4 months before he received any payment for his wound. This and hundreds of similar cases will be taken care of if Congress passes this law with this provision. I may also comment that it is not intended by this measure to hold a man in service against his will or to deprive him of any furlough to which he may be entitled.

Probably no one single bit of procedure has incensed dischargees from the Army and the Navy as much as the antiquated and repudiated system of requiring statements from men and women about to be discharged regarding the origin, the incurrence, and the aggravation of their disabilities. We have protested repeatedly and constantly to both the Army and the Navy, and some progress has been made toward the modification of the purpose of such statements and their requirement at time of discharge. Although the Veterans' Administration determines service connection and line of duty for the purposes of compensation claims irrespective of the notations made by the service department, these statements do have an adverse effect, not only in subsequent claims, but upon the morale of the men when they are being discharged. Many of them have told us that they were practically forced to sign statements to the effect that their disease or injury arose before service and was not aggravated by such service. In their desire to get home they have been willing to sign statements which they believed at the time constituted a waiver of their right to file claims against the United States. Notwithstanding the fact that the War and Navy Departments have advised us that no dischargee is to be forced to sign such a statement, and moreover, despite the assurance that henceforth such statements will be taken only for the purpose of acknowledging receipt of information as to the decisions of the boards of survey and C. D. D. boards. The American Legion believes it is time to have this practice discontinued and that such discontinuance be made a matter of law.

In respect to aid by veterans' organizations, the American Legion has been advised that its accredited representatives may appear before the rating boards of the Veterans' Administration which have been, and are to be, installed at certain Army and Navy discharge centers. However, I do not feel such authority is sufficient in view of the experience and talents of the hundreds of recognized service officers of veterans' organizations throughout the country. They should also be permitted to visit and assist hospitalized men at any ime. The American Legion, through its three wartime national commanders, has approached the War and Navy Departments for recognition of all of these men and women but without success. Thus it has become necessary to ask for legislative authority.

The next portion of our bill reinstates section 23 of the World War Veterans' Act. This has been applicable to and for veterans of the First World War for many years. This provides that in case any person has been discharged or dismissed from active service as a result of a court-martial trial, thereby losing all rights under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Administrator may review the records and if he finds that at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in the court martial the person was insane, such person may have his rights restored.

The next section authorizes and directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consult with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for the purpose of establishing boards of review in the War and Navy Departments, whose duties shall be to review the type and nature of any discharge or release from active duty which a former officer or enlisted man or woman may feel to be adverse to his or her interest. The method of setting up these boards is left to these high officials. The Legion is interested primarily in their purpose. We hope with congressional approval to make available to the dissatisfied dischargees who many times have justifiable complaints, an opportunity to appear before a board cloaked with authority to make changes or amendments to any discharge document based upon all pertinent evidence. It is desired that the new boards will add to the veterans' means of getting correct documents, and not to detract in the least from any right of review which they may now have.

TITLE II

Mustering-out or demobilization pay

It will be noted that the next title of S. 1617 pertains to a mustering-out or demobilization pay. Of course, we of the Legion know that the Senate has already passed the demobilization pay bill, and that in all probability the other branch of Congress will act upon such a measure within a few days. However, we submitted it as part of our general over-all plan as one of the Legion's steps to carry a World War No. 2 veteran from his predischarge days to his adjustment in civilian life.

Our mustering-out or demobolization proposal envisages a pay ranging in amounts from $100 to $500, based on length of service without regard to rank. Provision was made for payment of the benefit to those who have already been discharged and to the dependents for those who have died since discharge. We did not regard this as adjusted compensation. It is our thought on this subject that adjusted compensation should be left for the determination of World War No. 2 veterans. With the thought that speedy action will be taken on mustering-out or demobilization pay, therefore, we can pass over this section without further consideration.

TITLE III

Education of veterans

This title pertains to the education of returning World War No. 2 veterans. It will be noted that the language of the bill amends Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, and provides that any person who served in the active military or naval service and who was honorably discharged after 90 days or more service, whose education has been interrupted by active service, shall upon application to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be entitled to continue his education or training, including such vocational, professional, or technical refresher courses as may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. A single person would be entitled to a training allowance of $50 per month, a married person to $75. No course of training or education in excess of 4 years would be approved nor would any training be extended beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

I particularly call your attention to the proviso which would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consult with and utilize the services and facilities of the various State departments of education. I should also like to direct your attention to the last section of the title which would amend Public Law 16 (the Vocational Training Act for service-connected disabled World War No. 2 veterans), Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943, by deleting the date December 6, 1941, and substituting the date August 27, 1940. The purpose of this amendment is to care for those who were injured under conditions which already simulated war, and which occurred between the dates August 27, 1940, and December 6, 1941.

This title appears to be a rather extensive one but it will be appreciated that a large portion of the title covers administration.

To thousands of mothers and fathers of boys and girls in service this part of the American Legion bill is most important. The national emergency and the war itself have necessitated an education of the youth of our country in the armed program of national defense and in the art of destroying persons and property of those who would attack this country. Millions and billions of dollars have had to be expended preparing our armed forces for active warfare as the best defense against the enemy. This has entailed the schooling of men in all kinds of destructive processes from hand-to-hand combat to the gigantic bombing operations over land and sea.

Such training and such education, necessary as they are during war, will require a period of guidance and adjustment after hostilities cease which a well-regulated and sympathetic educational system will provide. The American Legion feels that this can best be realized under the direction of the Veterans' Administration whose officials and staffs understand veterans, and, an agency which in turn is understood by the ex-service people of this country.

There is another thought that might be cited. Just how many of the returning troops will avail themselves of this program we cannot say. Some have estimated from 5 to 10 percent. Whatever the number it is the experience of the American Legion, following the last war, that hundreds of these will start in civilian pursuits after separation from service with no established disability connected with service, and will within 1, 2, 3, or more years break down from some insidious disease, injury, or hidden damage incurred in service. Many of these men may have their status changed while they are following their educational and vocational courses from non-service-connected beneficiaries to service-connected, who are provided for under Public, 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. This whole group, both service-connected and non-service-connected, should be under the Veterans' Administration.

There may be some comment as to the extent to which the Government should underwrite tuition, fees, books, material, and equipment for these educational courses. The Legion in sponsoring this bill has specified a modest amount for maintenance or training allowance. We have no objection to a reasonable limitation placed upon the expenditures in any given case for the other purposes mentioned.

I should like to make the observation that the date August 7, 1940, appears in title III in the first and last paragraphs. That should be August 27, 1940. The latter is the approval date of Public Resolution 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, which authorized the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into the active military service, and that is the date that should appear at the two points in the title.

TITLE IV

Home and farm aid to veterans

This part of our proposal provides for a loan system operated by the United States Veterans' Administration through the several States to aid veterans in the purchase of homes or farms. A list of qualifications for any State plan to be approvable is set forth in the title, and the Administrator is empowered to pass upon and approve any plan which he believes to be feasible and which fulfills the conditions and limitations specified.

TITLE V

Employment of veterans

We believe that we must now establish a capable and sympathetic employment service to be available to veterans when they return from their service with the armed forces.

We respectfully recommend that this function should be vested in the Veterans' Administration so that the veteran will not be shunted from pillar to post to obtain information as to his rights.

As I have stated, the Congress, at the earnest request of the veterans' organizations, recognized this principle over a decade ago when all veteran functions were coordinated in one bureau, now known as the Veterans' Administration. The capable manner in which that agency has functioned over the years should indicate that such a step was wise and now should be extended to meet the new problems as they confront our World War No. 2 veterans.

The Congress in 1933, by the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act, likewise recognized that the employment-placement of veterans constituted a special problem and the veterans were entitled to special attention and consideration. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act a Veterans' Employment Service was established with a representative in each State to ascertain that veterans were receiving proper job placements from the State employment services.

The Veterans' Employment Service was originally placed in the Department of Labor, later in the Federal Security Agency, and now is in the War Manpower Commission as part of the United States Employment Service.

While only a part of these other Government agencies, it has too often developed that the Veterans' Employment Service, being an incident to their original function, was considered by these Government agencies as a stepchild. The veteran has suffered thereby. We believe this situation cannot continue if the Nation proposes to do its full share in returning the veteran to gainful employment.

Under the present set-up, the responsibility for the employment of veterans is vested in the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service System.

We believe this responsibility, except for the enforcement of the selective-service provisions for reemployment or reinstatement in former positions, should be placed with the Veterans' Administration. The latter could utilize the existing facilities of the United States Employment Service. Later, if the services are transferred to the respective States, the Veterans' Administration could use the State services.

The Veterans' Employment Service, under the Veterans' Administration, would recommend vocational guidance in the military, naval, and veterans' hospitals and in the demobilization centers before the veteran is discharged, with placement upon completion of their training.

This service, if properly staffed and adequately financed, will do the job that all of us seek to do for these veterans. We must prepare now if this service is to properly function and activities coordinated for the benefit and convenience of the veteran.

TITLE VI

Unemployment allowances

Pending the period between discharge and placement in proper employment we consider it to be the obligation of the Federal Government to make a financial provision for the veteran.

We believe that these veterans should not be required to resort to the State unemployment compensation acts for several reasons:

1. Their services were rendered the Federal Government and the period of readjustment is a Federal responsibility;

2. Uniform treatment should be accorded all veterans, which is not possible under the existing State acts, due to the variation in the waiting periods, payment, and duration;

3. Many, possibly 50 percent or more; do not come under the existing State acts and therefore are ineligible for benefits;

4. This financial obligation if placed on the respective State Unemployment Compensation Funds, might endanger the whole structure erected in the States for all citizens.

We, therefore, propose that a reasonable allowance be made to all veterans during a reasonable period of unemployment. When returned to work this allowance would cease and they could then be eligible under the respective State acts.

The amounts we recommend are as follows:

Fifteen dollars per week if single.

Five dollars added for one dependent.

Eight dollars added for two dependents.

Ten dollars added for three or more dependents.

These allowances would be payable up to 52 weeks, but could be payable over a 24-month period after final payment of mustering-out pay. For example, if a veteran is unemployed for 12 weeks during the specified period, he would receive this allowance. If employed at the expiration of that time his allowance would stop. If later (in the 24-month period) he is again unemployed, he would again start to receive his unemployment allowance. While employed, as I stated before, his credits under the State unemployment compensation acts would accumulate and he should, after a 2-year period, have sufficient credit under the existing State acts to then receive State benefits when unemployed.

We believe that proper employment adequately compensated is better than any unemployment allowance that may be devised. The American Legion is, therefore, striving in every way possible to aid in having job opportunities available for these veterans as they return. We are cooperating with all elements, public and private, to this end. The American Legion's creed is that, "If America is to be free, when victory comes we must provide the means to be free, viz, jobs."

Because our first aim is to secure employment for those veterans, we have conditioned the payment of these allowances pending employment, upon the veteran making himself available for suitable work if presented. We have surrounded the payment of these allowances with many of the conditions required under the respective State unemployment compensation acts.

Because the veteran must make himself available for work we are recommending that the existing State facilities be used. This method will avoid unnecessary expense or duplication in the payment of these allowances.

We are likewise recommending that the administration of the payment of these unemployment allowances to veterans be vested in the Veterans' Administration. This is purely a temporary allowance and a temporary condition applicable to veterans, and we, therefore, do not consider that it should be confused with or mingled with civilian social-security measures or under civilian social-security administration.

Our Security and the Islands of the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Security and the Islands of the Pacific," delivered by me over radio station in Wisconsin last evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Four Great Allied Powers, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China are now definitely pledged to establish at the earliest possible date after the war, a general international organization.

They are pledged to an organization "based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The pledge was first issued at the Moscow Conference. It was reaffirmed at the Cairo Conference and at the Teheran Conference.

As I have pointed out in a previous radio address, this declaration of post-war purpose constitutes a broad pattern of the sort of world we propose to rebuild after this war. It proposes the only sort of world in which free States and free peoples can work and live in freedom. Within its broad outlines, it offers wide opportunity for the free expression of legitimate national interests. The proposed organization is not designed as a super-State to be administered by super-planners. It is designed as a free association of equal sovereign States pledged to maintain international peace and security.

Consequently, we may define the legitimate interests of member States as all interests which do not threaten world peace.

Obviously, when we speak of world security, we are speaking of a world order in which each free state may be reasonably free from unprovoked attack. We are speaking of a world in which all peoples may feel reasonably secure in going about their legitimate business. We are speaking of a world in which all peoples may feel free to compete actively and even aggressively with each other for a fair share of the world's business and a rightful share of the world's goods, secure in the knowledge that they will not become victims of the brutal and capricious assault of some all-powerful neighbor.

Obviously, too, the Four Great Powers could not undertake to sponsor such a world system unless each were convinced that it could achieve its own reasonable security without in any way jeopardizing the security of any other.

It is because the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China are convinced that there is no actual conflict of security between them that they can so readily and effectively undertake to organize the entire world for peace and security.

At the Cairo Conference which followed the Moscow Conference, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China drafted a declaration of historic importance which pledged the three great Allies to strip from the imperial Japanese bandits all their loot of the last half century.

The Cairo declaration said:

"The three great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggressions of Japan.

"They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion.

"It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands of the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all territories which Japan has stolen from China, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

"Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.

"The aforesaid Three Great Powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course, Korea shall become free and independent."

We can all agree most heartily with the general content of this declaration. We can all agree most heartily that Japan must be stripped of all her loot. We are all determined that the Japanese war lords must be taught a lesson that no future war lords will ever forget. They must be taught that international brigandage no longer pays.

Americans will welcome the Cairo declaration, too, because it not only pledges to restore to China territories seized by Japan but because it marks final recognition of China as one of the free and equally sovereign powers of the earth.

Americans will cordially welcome also, the pledge given to recognize a free and independent Korea at the earliest possible date. The 23,000,000 Koreans, a people with their own centuries-old culture, were among the first victims of Japan. For 30 years they have been subjected to the ruthless treatment of the Tokyo war lords. They are entitled to walk again in the sunlight.

I should like, however, to call your attention to other features of the Cairo declaration. I should like to call your attention to what is not said as well as to what is said.

Japan will be expelled from all territories which she has seized in her violence and greed, the declaration pledges, yet nothing is said about what will happen to these territories.

The obvious inference, of course, is that Burma, Malaya, Singapore, and Hong Kong will be returned to the British, the Dutch East Indies will be returned to the Dutch, Indochina will be returned to the French, the Philippines will be returned to the trusteeship of the United States, Thailand will be restored to independent status, and the various larger and smaller islands of Polynesia will be returned variously to Great Britain, the Netherlands, Australia, and Portugal.

All of this can be done, it is obvious, under the declaration that none of the three powers seeks to gain and none has thought of territorial expansion.

Now please do not misunderstand me. I am not criticizing this particular statement of post-war purpose. It is entirely probable that the various peoples of the British, Dutch, Portuguese, and French far eastern empires will be much better off under imperial rule than under governments of their own upper castes. And it is entirely probable that, as each of these peoples becomes capable of real self-government, each may be granted dominion status along the lines pioneered by the British Commonwealth of Nations.

So, I am not criticizing the Cairo declaration. I should like to point out, however, that it offers no blueprint for a brave new world. It is a flat declaration of the Allied Powers that we each intend to return after this war to our pre-war status in farther Asia and the far Pacific.

We are going to strip Japan of all her loot of the past 50 years. It happens that she took most of the loot from us so we are merely going to take back again lands we once held.

The United States has pledged, of course, that when the Philippines are returned to our trusteeship, we intend to cooperate in making these islands into a free and independent state. Of the purposes of our other allies, we have the word of Mr. Churchill that he is not acting as His Majesty's first minister, to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire.

Let me emphasize again, I am not criticizing these proposals and prospects. I am merely calling attention to the world in which we live, I am merely emphasizing that if we are to cooperate with Great Britain, Russia, and China in building a post-war world order, we must cooperate on terms acceptable to Britons, Russians, and Chinese.

But we should also realize that Britons, Russians, and Chinese, have an equal obligation to cooperate on terms acceptable to us.

That is why I am frankly concerned and I believe we should all be frankly concerned about the disposition of those Pacific islands which Japan seized or occupied since 1914.

The United States not only has an historic interest in these islands, we have a much more direct and immediate interest as a matter of national security.

I am speaking now in particular about the island groups we know as the Carolines, the Marianas, and the Marshalls.

Before our war with Spain in 1898, most of these islands belonged to Spain. We did not want them, so Spain sold them to Germany. At the outset of the First World War, Japan seized them from Germany. At the close of that war, we still did not want them, but neither did we want Japan to have them.

At the peace conference after the close of the First World War, Baron Nobuaki Makino, former Japanese foreign minister, declared bluntly that Japan entered the war against Germany for the sole purpose of getting the islands and demanded definite possession of them.

Our own President Wilson rejected the Japanese demand. Instead, he urged that the islands be placed under the newly devised mandate system. They were, and the mandate to supervise them was given to Japan, with the distinct provision that not one of them be fortified.

We all know how the mandate system worked. We all know how quickly Japan broke that particular promise.

These particular islands are mostly mere specks in the ocean, extending some 1,200 miles north of the Equator and dotting the ocean for some 2,500 miles east and west.

But in this modern aerial age, each of these 623 islands is a potential airfield base, and we have learned to our cost that Japan has made many of them real and deadly airfield bases. We have learned to our bitter cost, indeed, at Tarawa, in the British Gilberts, which Japan seized only after Pearl Harbor, how much blood must be spent to recover even one of the smaller of these islets, once they have fallen into enemy hands. We have learned that each of them may well be worth an entire task force full of airplane carriers.

We know now, even if we did not realize it in 1919, that these islands in unfriendly hands close our direct communications not only with south China and the Philippines—we know they stand between us and our direct routes to the Dutch East Indies, to Australia, and New Zealand. We know they guard the way from Pearl Harbor to the southwest Pacific. We know, too, that they guard the way from the southwest Pacific and farther Asia to Hawaii and our own west coast.

I submit to you that the United States has a very direct and vital interest in what happens to these islands.

I submit to you that there is no violation of the Cairo declaration to insist that we have an interest in these islands because of our own reasonable and understandable interest in our own national security.

These scattered coral islets can in no sense be considered territorial gains or repossessions in the same sense as such densely populated major islands as Java or such heavily populated lands as Burma and Malaya and Indochina.

But as outer defenses of our own west coast, as stepping stones and lines of communication with the densely populated lands of southwestern Asia and its islands, the three ocean groups are of major importance to this country.

I have said before, and I repeat, an overwhelming majority of Americans sincerely accept the proposed pattern for a post-war world organization; an overwhelming majority of Americans are sincerely determined that this great Nation shall do its full part in the hopeful current attempt to build a post-war world of peace and security.

But I must also repeat and reemphasize—it is a matter of mere prudence that the United States take every reasonable precaution for its own security.

And mere prudence dictates that the United States shall have a direct and positive title to such of the Marshall, the Carolines, and the Marianas as may be necessary to promote our reasonable security.

As far as we know, the President and his advisers may intend that we shall have such direct and positive title. But as far as we know, the President and his advisers have no such intent. They have not told us what their intentions are.

Other great powers, now our allies, are seeing to it that their own outer ramparts are secure. Other great powers, now our allies, are taking it for granted that they have a legitimate right and duty to provide for their own security even as they undertake to help promote world security. We, the people of the United States, have a similar right and duty. We should see to it that our right is fully exercised and that our duty to our own country is fully discharged. We should see to it particularly in such a vast area of vital importance to us as the island groups of the western mid-Pacific.

Encroachments on Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Private Enterprise Must Assert Itself Against Further New Deal Encroachments" delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] from Fort Worth, Tex., on December 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One feels a great hesitancy in talking publicly on any other subject than getting on with this war and having it over with. It is foremost in our thoughts; it has saddened our hearts and sorely tried our souls. My apology for assuming your interest in what I have to say is that we must, even as the war goes on, consider our future after the war.

By the kind invitation of Mr. Harold Hough, of WBAP, I venture to talk to you tonight about our post-war problems. The selective-service law, under which 10,000,000 of our young men have been called to the colors, provides, as far as possible, that these men when demobilized shall be reemployed in their old positions. The assumption of this, of course, is that the job will be there when the war ends; otherwise it would prove to be an empty promise. The further assumption is that the business will prosper sufficiently to keep the men employed. Business men, therefore, have more than a selfish interest in the preservation of their business. They have a legal and moral responsibility to make their voices heard for the benefit of our soldier sons. They must speak up against every measure which may make the survival of their business under the free enterprise system difficult or impossible. At the present time tens of thousands of little businesses are going to the wall. The necessity of obtaining war supplies quickly has necessarily, but we hope temporarily, concentrated Government business into the hands of large companies, to the hurt of the smaller ones.

When the war ends, and we pray it may be soon, these young men want to get back to their homes and their jobs, and it is our duty to maintain these homes, and to maintain a condition that will make it possible for these returning boys to have jobs. A mustering-out pay of a few hundred dollars is probable, no doubt, but when we hand a check to these frustrated boys this is not our full responsibility. A future must be planned, and an opportunity must be afforded for these boys to find their places in activities in which they may best be suited. We will have difficulties and complicated problems in this respect, but we must set ourselves to the problems and find a solution for them. This must be our primary consideration. We are interested, yes, in all the peoples of all the countries of the world, but we are primarily interested in our own country and our own people, and interested in the system that has made this country the greatest country of all, and a country that is the envy and aspiration of peoples everywhere. We want to be helpful to all people, but we want to keep our own country strong and virile, as an example to the rest of the world, and a country to be emulated. We want to maintain our standard of living, and don't want to lower it by a gratuitous bestowal of our resources to the people of every land. We want to do all we can to help them to help themselves, and that is the greatest help that one can have.

To provide these jobs, vast amounts of private capital must be forthcoming and employed. It requires approximately seven thousand dollars' worth of tools and plant facilities for each job. This capital will come out of hiding and Government bonds when the Government ceases war on businesses. Unless the Government does cease war on business, the Government will become more and more the only employer of labor. This means national socialism and the loss of liberty at home, which would be a sad commentary upon the struggle of our young men to restore liberty in foreign lands.

The Government now has billions of dollars' worth of industrial plants. Is it the plan to continue to operate these Government plants, in competition with whatever private industry is left? I hope not. What will happen to the 50 billions or more of unused war supplies, available for civilian use after the war, in thousands of items? What will be done with reference to the high taxes, a fixed and prior charge against all earnings? Would they be left at such a high level to engage in socialistic ventures, and make it hopeless for private business, and especially new business, to continue? Excessive taxes are a greater threat to the working man than excessive profits. High taxes are a fixed charge against business, and will also be a serious threat to the ability of American business to sell its products in world trade.

These are all serious questions, and must be met by government with the aid and counsel and advice of men in business. We must pay our debts and have an opportunity to pay them as we continue our business. If we can have a sound government, we can have a sound economy, and I have no doubt but what trade will be expanded and income increased to where this staggering debt can be gradually reduced; but it will require the most arduous labors, and demand the best minds, to achieve that end. It will require that government lift its heavy hand, that business may go about its way in an intelligent, fair, and honest effort. Businessmen and business have a responsibility for the kind of government we have. If we have good business, we have good government; and when I talk about business I include every factor that enters into it, employers and employees, everyone engaged in gainful employment under a free enterprise system.

Now, let's take a look at the condition of our business today, and what it may be

planned to be after the war is over. I feel that the people want to continue business under what we call the free enterprise system. I feel the people want as little government in business as possible. The people want their local government to be maintained and not be just economic zones, or regions, about which we hear so much today. I hope the people still feel that the least governed people is the best governed people. We have been governed entirely too much. We concede that during the war and the emergency created by it, it is essential and necessary for strong regulation of our lives and actions, for a concerted war effort, and during a war we will have less opportunity and privilege of following our own personal freedoms and desires. We know that human selfishness must be restrained, and during the emergency of war compulsion is unavoidable; but what we are objecting to is the planning of our lives and of our opportunities after the war.

I have just recently read a book published by the Brookings Institution. The title of the book is "How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business." The Brookings Institution is, as you know, devoted to the public service through research and training, and has for its purpose the development of sound national policies. It is an endowed institution, endowed by private capital. It is managed and operated by patriotic, public-spirited men. It is conducted in the interest of the general welfare. I have only time to refer briefly to the subjects discussed in this book I have mentioned. There is the commandeering and operation of business, such as may result from strikes that affect the public interest. Do we have strikes in our own industries, and have they not been produced by a collaboration of the politicians in government and the politicians in the labor unions? Have not our people suffered, been harassed and annoyed, by this partnership between labor unioneers and government politicians? We find another heading in this book "Entry into business," and you will find provisions there similar to what we have in our own country today, under what we are pleased to call the "licensing system." You find control of supply of capital, and we control it through taxation, and what we often call progressive taxation. Germany has control of the supply of labor, they have control of the volume of profits, control of termination of business, the obtaining of compliance with the regulations, evasion of control, and likewise slowness of control. How like our own situation today. How like a pattern to the New Deal bureaucracy that has so annoyed us! This is fast becoming a government of bureaus, and they take the place of the institutions and departments and branches of government created by and contemplated by the Constitution. This more and more applies to every activity.

The oil business is particularly close to me, and close to many of us who live in this portion of the country. I want to give you some of the high spots that indicate what government has in mind with reference to that branch of business. This doesn't apply to war alone, it applies to peace as well. Let's start out by observing some of the propaganda that is being disseminated today, such as that we are running out of oil.

Those who shout that we are running out of oil and that when we have produced the 20,000,000,000 barrels now in sight we will be washed up, are either dishonest or absurdly ignorant. Every oilman of experience knows that it is vicious propaganda to say that we are faced with an immediate oil famine. As a matter of fact, our present estimated known crude reserves of 20,000,000,000 barrels at the present rate of consumption are sufficient for 13 years of war, or 15 to 20 years of peace. Experience amply justifies the hope that future petroleum discoveries in the United States will exceed our total past discoveries. These past discoveries aggregate some 45,000,000,000 barrels. The declaration that the 20,000,000,000 barrels of known reserves constitute our total domestic petroleum supply ignores our proven reserves of natural gas. By use of modern equipment and the application of proven scientific technique, our known natural-gas reserves, according to experts in this field, may be counted on for an additional seventeen to twenty billion barrels of liquid petroleum. This propaganda of shortage and scarcity also ignores the fact that American enterprise over the past 30 years has acquired from twenty to twenty-five billion barrels of proven foreign reserves. Thus, realistically, Americans can take comfort in the fact that we are actually fortified with a presently known reserve of from sixty to sixty-five billion barrels of crude oil. Nor does this figure take into account increased production from secondary methods. It is conceivable that this total may be boosted to seventy-five or eighty billion barrels by advanced production technique.

Petroleum engineering is making fast strides. Estimates of recoverable reserves in the great East Texas field alone have been increased approximately 2,000,000,000 barrels by petroleum engineers on account of increased production efficiency in that field. The cry that we are running out of oil is part and parcel of the New Deal philosophy of shortage and scarcity and is a mere prelude to the taking over of the oil industry by this New Deal administration. It is true that discoveries during the past few years have not kept pace with our withdrawals, but this decline in our rate of discoveries is largely attributable to low prices, shortages of critical materials and manpower. Given the incentive of a fair price and the necessary critical materials, together with a normal supply of manpower, it is estimated within the industry that twice as many exploratory wells would have been drilled. Whatever dereliction may be attributable to the industry is a reflection of governmental restrictions and interference.

None but the most naive can possibly fail to recognize that the New Deal is attempting to take over the oil business both at home and abroad. The principal authority for the statement that we are running out of oil is Harold Ickes, who hopes to stampede the public into accepting another phase of New Deal national socialism. Only recently, Mr. Ickes asserted that he is "convinced that the Department of the Interior should be the responsible operating agency of the Government in all matters relating to petroleum reserves." The words "operating agency" become realistically significant to the ears of every oilman in America.

The initial step in the New Deal's plan to take over the oil business was the formation of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation with charter powers to borrow unlimited amounts of money, to loan money to other corporations, and to buy the stock of other corporations, together with the declared purpose of engaging in all phases of the oil business in competition with American citizens. The powers of this corporation, although confined to exploration and refining in foreign fields, leave the Corporation wholly free, however, to market petroleum and petroleum products anywhere within the continental United States. The charter, by its own terms, may be amended from time to time, and undoubtedly men with ambitions, such as Mr. Ickes, will lose no time in attempting to take over the development and operation of our petroleum interest in the public lands and naval reserves.

All sensible men know that when Government moves in, private enterprise moves out. Private industry cannot compete with Government. Government has access to the public purse with no responsibility to stockholders. A Government corporation can, and usually does, operate without regard to income and outgo. There is no obligation or necessity for it to make a profit. Government corporations, by their very nature, are without restraint and cannot be trusted to become competitors or partners of private enterprise. The lamb cannot safely lie down with the lion.

Prior to the New Deal the history of this country has been a long and splendid story of the accomplishments and ingenuity of native genius encouraged by political and social concepts which have enabled us to become the greatest industrial nation in the world. Through the instrumentality of private enterprise we have discovered and developed our petroleum resources more rapidly than any other people on earth. The methods we have employed could not succeed in any other than an atmosphere of democratic free enterprise. Not only are we exploring the petroleum frontier of our own country, but American enterprise has and is today exploring the far-flung petroleum frontiers of the world.

The petroleum industry has performed a great and patriotic service to America during this war, but in some manner Mr. Ickes seems to have gotten the idea that he is the man who makes the wheels go round in the oil business. Of course, we all know that is not true. The production and refining of petroleum, whose products have been furnished to our armed forces around the world, are accomplishments of the men of the industry. The industry has sent to Mr. Ickes some of the best men in its ranks, who are giving unselfishly of their time and ability, without hope of publicity, praise or reward. It is the acme of demagoguery for anyone so inexperienced in the industry as Ickes to step forward in national publications to take the credit for such magnificent service.

The creation of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is a shocking effrontery to our concept of private enterprise. Not only this, but it is an instrumentality which may readily involve this Government in dangerous and entangling difficulties with foreign governments. The ownership by the United States Government of property interests in other countries will be a growing source of future international disputes and will contribute to those international feelings which help to arouse national pride and hatred and bring about wars. Such action is not compatible with the announcement of respect for complete sovereignty and integrity of all nations.

Such minds as Ickes' argue that America should desert the traditional freedom of private enterprise and follow the examples of Great Britain and France, or perhaps that of Russia, where oil, like everything else, is a monopoly owned and managed by government.

It is also argued that the operation of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is necessary to insure this country a supply of petroleum for future civilian and military needs. I take issue with this statement. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not a barrel of discovered or undiscovered reserves, wherever it may be stored under the earth's surface, that can be searched out and produced any more quickly, economically, or more capably, by Government than by private industry under our system of traditional freedom of private enterprise.

There is no place in our Government for Petroleum Reserves Corporation. In my opinion, it should be dissolved and liquidated at the earliest possible moment, and those inexperienced and ignorant but ambitious

people who would destroy our form of government should, by law, be prohibited from engaging this Government in private business.

The only thing the petroleum industry needs to insure this country an adequate supply of oil as long as oil is available anywhere in the world is the assurance that it will be free of Government restrictions and interference, and be assured of a fair margin of profit for its efforts. There is no one more desirous of seeing the price for crude oil raised than I am, but in this connection I am constrained to say that we must not desert our basic principle of Government by asking the Congress to legislate prices. It is no more proper for Congress to fix the price of crude oil by legislation than it is to fix the price of food, clothing, building materials, and the thousands of other items we consume daily.

The fixing of prices by Congress is a precedent which I do not believe the people of America, and more particularly the members of the oil industry, want. It is certainly obvious that if Congress exercises its power to effect an increase in the price of crude oil it may at some future time exercise the same power to reduce the price of crude oil. Surely oilmen will recognize that in the near future it may become politically popular to reduce the price of crude oil. The dangers of Congress raising or lowering prices in response to the urgings of various pressure groups are so great that Congress should refrain from ever entering the field of price regulation. The fixing of prices by legislation is the antithesis of a free economy which in the past has made America great—a principle that has preserved the opportunities, freedoms, and privileges under which the petroleum industry has grown and prospered. The most effective thing Congress can do with respect to assisting the oil industry in securing a price raise would be to abolish the O. P. A. and recall the authority in this regard that has been delegated to the President. If the industry were free from artificial economic restrictions, I have no doubt that the price of crude oil would seek its own level, compatible with supply and demand, and I have no fear that such true economic level would tend to or result in inflation. There seems to be little danger of inflation in a country that drains off 95 percent of earnings through excess-profits taxes, unless it can be said that such tax rate may in itself lead to inflation. I hope the oil industry will recognize the dangers of urging Congress to launch itself upon the perilous venture of fixing prices by legislation.

What I have said about the oil business applies to the cattle business, to farming, and every other activity. A great horde of bureaus have been built up, ostensibly to administer the laws of Congress. These bureaucrats pay very little attention to acts of Congress. They make their own interpretations, they usurp powers not intended by Congress. The operation, and the intended operation, is to destroy and discourage business. This whole thing has been built up for that purpose. It has been built up for the purpose of perpetuating in office those whose minds are pliant under the influence of an aggressive leader.

All the flood of words coming from the synthetic statement about new social gains, bold social engineering, and security from the cradle to the grave, although clothed in the language of democracy and constitutional government, cannot disguise the fact that our democracy is being throttled through bureaucratic control of business and administrative regulation.

Let's call a halt to all this. In the words of Washington, "Let no one but Americans be placed on guard."

It is time for all American businessmen, big and little, workers and all, and farmers, to insist that when this war is over we adopt policies which will encourage the chance-taking by investors in the building up of present businesses and the starting of new businesses. American businessmen must come out of the dog house, and fight for the survival of the form of government under which they operate. Here in Texas you have the instance of Mr. Biggers, the owner of a little printing shop in Houston, Tex. He prepared a list of the tangle-foot alphabetical bureaus which operate as the dead end of American business. The first few hundred which he printed created such a demand that more than a million copies have now been distributed. This shows conclusively that the people are tired of these bureaus, and tired of being pushed around by them. It proves that they are ready to turn away from false prophets, and enlist behind sound, honest leadership.

This is no longer a matter for party consideration. It is a concern that must be of paramount importance to every American. No interest must come ahead of it. He must have his Government restored to him. At its last convention in Omaha, the American Legion adopted a resolution that: "Freedom of enterprise is of importance equal to the 'four freedoms' of the Atlantic Charter." This war of classes in this country must be stopped. If a man makes money honestly, he cannot make it without profit to everyone who buys his product. Henry Ford accumulated a large fortune in a highly competitive field, without Government subsidies or advice, by producing a better car for a lower price, which millions of people were glad to buy. Men of means today have become too timid. It is time for businessmen to stop being appeasers to this trend toward national socialism in this country. It is time for them to get into the field of public affairs and fight for humanized capitalism, for a square deal for both owner and investor, and for a prosperous and united America. It is foolish to assert that Government can own or manage business and still preserve political and religious freedom. When Government is the sole employer, all civil rights vanish. No one then dares to oppose the Government. As Kipling said:

"This is the law, and the law shall run
till the earth in its course is still,
That he who eateth another's bread
shall do that other's will."

Frontiers of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Acid Test," written by William Philip Simms. It has to do with the frontiers of Poland.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACID TEST

(By William Philip Simms)

While Russia's unilateral decision "fixing" Poland's frontiers will have no effect on military phases of the war, informed opinion here is that it gravely jeopardizes post-war collaboration, so far at least as America is concerned. Perhaps it dooms such collaboration altogether.

Ironically, the Moscow pronouncement was headlined here on the day that President Roosevelt was telling Congress of the unity of Russia and China with Britain and America in their recognition that "the best interests of each nation * * * demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace."

To make such a peace system possible, it is observed, the Atlantic Charter was devised by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. The Allies would "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other," and there would be no territorial changes "that do not accord with the expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

Subsequently, these aims were ratified by every member of the United Nations, including the Soviet Union. Moreover, in 1942 Russia signed a 20-year mutual-assistance treaty with Britain based on the same principles. In addition, she had already signed pacts with Poland—in 1932, 1934, and 1941—recognizing Polish frontiers.

As recently as last November, at the Moscow Conference of Russian, British, and United States foreign ministers, the above peace aims were further implemented by an agreement "to set up machinery for ensuring the closest cooperation between the three Governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops." An advisory commission was set up in London to study these questions and "make joint recommendations to the three Governments."

When Italy collapsed and the reconstruction of the Italian state became a live issue, London and Washington invited Moscow to participate on a basis of equality.

China was brought into the play and the Big Three became the Big Four. Thereupon it was agreed that at the earliest practicable date they would organize an association of nations, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, to preserve the peace, if necessary by force.

It was upon these formal assurances and commitments that the United States Senate pledged itself, by overwhelming majority, to place America alongside the other nations in maintaining a just and lasting peace.

Now Russia has undertaken to redraw the map of Europe in violation of these and other commitments. Her action places the whole post-war collaboration proposition on an entirely different basis. Poland is the test.

United Nations circles here are dismayed. The smaller ones are frankly frightened. They feel the ground slipping from under them. They say that something more important even than frontiers is involved. At stake is a vital principle which, if sacrified, will destroy international good faith for a long time.

In other words, Russia's stand has now placed the whole post-war peace organization, as envisaged here, in the balance.

Address by Secretary Knox to the Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

delivered by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, at the annual dinner of the Greater Cleveland Council of the Boy Scouts of America, in Cleveland, Ohio, January 14, 1944.

This address is of vital interest to the American public for in it Secretary Knox comes out for universal military training.

I think this is worthy of the consideration of every American citizen, and I hope that the subject of universal military training may have the attention of this Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All around the world today there are men fighting on the land and in the air and on the sea who learned their first lessons in love of country and flag, in devotion to their country's cause in peace or war, as Boy Scouts. Who can measure the proportions of the debt which the whole country owes in this hour of greatest crisis to the Scout movement? Surely it cannot be gainsaid that those who learned the fundamentals of patriotism and citizenship as members of some troop of Boy Scouts are among those who know what they are fighting for.

In the early days of the Republic, when our forefathers were engaged in carving homes and communities from the wilderness, such an organization as the Boy Scouts was unnecessary. The boys and young men of those days learned the lesson of devotion, and courage, and love of flag, and country, in the hard way. When America consisted almost solely of sparse settlements along our Atlantic seaboard, when men and women began their migration westward through the mountains and across the Prairies, subduing a continent, the boys were taught to care for themselves in the open, to read the signs of Nature in woods and fields, to handle a gun, and to shoot straight, because that was the price of survival.

But when the wide reaches of the West had been won, when great cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific had sprung up, when the days of Indian uprisings had disappeared, when creature comforts multiplied with the growth of cities, and there was no longer a frontier to the westward—then some means of teaching young America to be self-reliant became necessary. Obviously our boys and young men should not be permitted to grow up without those virile qualities which must always be a part of the equipment of freemen. It was in the presence of this need that the Boy Scout movement was born, and throughout the long and successful life of the Boy Scout organization this need has been filled in some small degree. The enlarged need of such training will grow more obvious as life in the United States leaves further and further behind the hard and dangerous living conditions of pioneer times.

There is no sounder truism than this—only the men who are fit to be free, remain free. To put it another way, we shall remain free, in this great country of ours, only so long as we are willing, and able, to fight to maintain our freedom. And this applies where the danger to our freedom comes from enemies from without, who would conquer us by force, or enemies from within, who by subversive methods, by the wiles of demagogs, by the selfish pursuit of special privilege, strive to destroy our free institutions, and take our liberties from us. While this second danger from within is a real one, against which we must be militantly on guard, it is the first and main danger to which I would like to address myself tonight.

We shall be free from the danger of destruction and conquest, from without, only if we are sufficiently strong, and sufficiently courageous, to defeat force, from without, by the disposition and the employment of greater force of our own. Only a few years ago, had I come to you, and warned you that within the course of a few years, we, in the United States of America, would be confronted by a would-be conqueror, possessing immense military resources, and seeking world domination, against whom we should have to summon the last reserves of our strength in all-out war—had I come to you thus, you would have looked upon me with derision, and laughed my words to scorn. And yet, that is precisely where we find ourselves tonight, as I speak to you. Never have such dangers threatened the liberties of our people as during the past 3 or 4 years—dangers which continue to the very present.

At a time when we are straining every resource, shouldering a frightful burden of debt, sending millions of our young men to desperate battle in Europe, and in the Far East, building a huge fleet, strong enough to dominate the seven seas, and turning out, in unprecedented numbers, aircraft to sweep the skies; who, under these circumstances, will dare to say that such dangers will never come again? Certainly, it is the part of prudence, a requirement for our future safety, that we assume that they may. If this is true, then regard for our future safety demands that we shall so organize the lives of our men and women that they will never, in the future, be lacking in those stern qualities, which free men and women must always possess, if they are to remain free.

Has it ever occurred to you, my friends, that, under Divine Providence, human affairs are so ordered that effort, and sacrifice, and discipline are inevitably and invariably the price of progress. God did not intend, very evidently, that the human family was going to be "wafted to Heaven on flowery beds of ease." He wisely ordained that the human race must fight its way to Heaven because, in His infinite wisdom, He knew that refinement of character, and loftiness of soul, was exclusively the fruit of sacrifice, and labor, and self-discipline. It has been so from the beginning of mankind, and I have no doubt will continue to be until the final chapter is written.

If you have followed me in what I have said thus far, you will go with me, I am sure, while I pursue this subject with reference to some of our domestic policies, the need for, and the wisdom of which, this devastating war has highlighted.

There is, as you know, in the Navy Department, the United States Marine Corps. This is probably one of the finest fighting organizations the world has ever known. It has a wonderful tradition and its officers and men have illumined with their courage and sacrifice many of the most glorious pages of our history. It undoubtedly has as fine an esprit de corps as may be found in any military organization anywhere. And, as the basis for this indomitable spirit, it has always been found necessary to have the foundation of physical fitness. So high are the physical and other standards required of marines that, in the present war, only one man in five, of the hundreds of thousands of young men who have applied for admission into the corps, were able to pass the rigorous requirements.

Here is unquestionably a danger signal which we should not ignore. Why is it that fewer than 20 percent of American youths could pass the examinations for admission to the Marine Corps? Perhaps I can best answer that question by repeating a statement made to me by one of the officers of the marine training station, at New River, recently. He said:

"We are compelled to teach these men everything. They have forgotten how to walk, because it was easier to ride, and something to ride in was almost always available. They can't carry a pack because most of them have never known what it was to use their shoulders. They don't know how to take care of themselves out of doors because almost all of them have never lived out of doors. Their muscular endurance is trifling because they have seldom used their muscles. They can't fire a gun because most of them have never handled weapons, and they can't hit anything they shoot at because only a trifling fraction have ever been taught marksmanship.

"In a war like this," he continued, "whether to the east or the west, where the rule is kill or be killed, they come to us unfit, and we have to make them fit."

That they are doing this successfully the marines have attested at Guadalcanal, at Bougainville, at Tarawa, and only the other day at Cape Gloucester. Therefore, in the unfitness of American youth, so startlingly shown by the very high percentage of young Americans who could not pass the reasonably moderate tests of service in the Army and Navy—more than 25 percent being rejected for physical reasons—there lies a profoundly important lesson for us. We must, in the future, spend more time, thought, and money in improving the physical qualities of our people.

You here in Cleveland and the United States who support the Boy Scout movement are doing what you can, but it is far from enough. The task is one which cannot be discharged by a small percentage of generous and thoughtful people who interest themselves in movements such as the Boy Scout movement. It is a problem so vast and so important that it must engage the careful attention of the entire country, and be supported out of the public purse.

Any program, having for its purpose the building of a strong and more virile race of American citizens, must find its beginnings in the care of mothers and infants. All too many American babies come into the world handicapped at the very start by the lack of that care at birth and in young childhood which supplies the foundation for vigorous adult life. Most of the ills which disqualified the young men from military service in this war were the direct result of lack of care, or ignorance, or poverty of the parents, while they were children. Malnutrition, lack of care of the eyes, and teeth, and ears—these were the most prolific causes of physical disabilities among young men and young women of today. Our first concern, therefore, in any program for national physical well-being must be care for children. This can take many forms but certainly should include frequent medical examination in the public schools in order to correct physical deficiencies at their beginnings.

The second step is one which your organization is designed to supply. That is to teach the city-bred boys and girls how to take care of themselves out of doors; to teach their legs how to walk, and to teach their arms how to lift and carry, and teach their minds how to accommodate themselves in comfort out under the open skies. As we move farther and farther from pioneer conditions, this sort of training for boys and girls becomes more and more important. The lessons taught us in this war, if we take them seriously, ought to result in a swift upsurge in Boy Scout and Girl Scout work. Indeed, I am not sure that Scouting ought not to be made a part of our public-school curriculum and thus extend its benefits to all boys and girls everywhere. Certainly the lessons which Boy Scout training can teach a boy are just as important as any other single subject he may be taught in school.

And now we come to the third important link in the task of building a strong and virile America in the future. It has to do with the young man, when he reaches an age when military service can be expected of him in

time of war—say between 17 and 19 years of age. Normally this would be about the age most boys finish high school and either go to work or go to college. That would be the ideal time in a boy's life when a year of his time should be given to his country for the purpose of training him physically, and mentally, and spiritually for citizenship, the first duty of which is service in defense of his country in case of emergency.

Surely we must have learned from our present experiences that there is no safety, or peace, in unpreparedness. The unspeakable folly of the theory that we are more likely to resort to war, or become involved in war, because we are reasonably prepared against the danger of war, has been made so plain that few will be found to deny it. Therefore, I believe, thoroughly, that one of the best measures we can take to insure that our individual liberties will be preserved, and that free Americans will remain free, is to require that every boy, when he attains the age of 17, or 18, shall be required to spend at least 1 year in training on land, or at sea, against the possibility that some time, in his younger manhood, his services may be required to help protect the country. During such a year, especially if his period of service should chance to be in the Navy, he will be given training that will not only make him a good Navy man, but he will also be trained in one, or many skills, or crafts, which could be useful in later life. The same is true in lesser measure of service in the land forces. Certainly, all of such young men would be given physical training of the highest value, would be instructed in the expert use of firearms, would be taught how to live comfortably in the open, and would be taught lessons in patriotism, love of country, and devotion to flag, which are an essential part in the education of every American.

Such a system of universal training is in complete harmony with the democratic ideal. No one should be exempt; rich and poor, boys from the city and boys from the farm, boys of all races and religions, all should be made to shoulder a common responsibility of personal preparedness, as a shield for the future security of our country. I can think of scores of benefits which would flow from an intelligent use of this principle. Properly used, a year's service with the colors would provide, for every young man, a chance to enjoy the benefits of occupational guidance. Under such expert direction many a boy would find himself, and pursue after that, that training best suited to his capacity and predisposition. Healthy habits could be instilled, which would last for the rest of his life. Helpful education in democratic government could be imparted; the responsibility of citizenship, under a popular form of government could be taught. The list might be prolonged.

I venture if our people have the wisdom, growing out of the experience of this war, to institute a system of universal training we will reap in that way many highly valuable benefits from our war expenditures. It is my profound conviction that now is the time to begin the agitation for such a system of training.

As a people we are still shocked to discover that more than half our young men are physically unfit. We have just had driven home to us the necessity of an adequate preparedness. We now know that peace, of any worth-while duration, may only be expected if we are prepared to put force behind it. The wisdom of the maintenance of an adequate navy, an adequate air force, and an adequate army, is now widely recognized.

Furthermore, the country will find itself at the conclusion of hostilities with five or six million men abroad consumed with anxiety to get home. And yet the retention of many of them, because of the unsettled nature of the world when hostilities cease, will be paramount. It would be infinitely better if we could set up the machinery for a universal training law while the war was still on, and then say to these millions of young men overseas: "You have borne the heat and the burden of the war. You have won. You have earned the right to come home and go back to the pursuits of peace. We are sending to take your place a sufficient number of young men who have taken their military training so that all of you who want to return at once can do so." Such a plan would provide us instantly with enough young men, anxious and eager for the experience, to fill all our needs overseas in the period of adjustment immediately following the close of hostilities.

And there is another factor which would tend to support a program of training to be instituted while the war is still on. All over the country we will find, when this war is finished, literally thousands of training camps with adequate buildings and equipment for the training of these young men. They are available in more than ample proportions. They would provide ideal surroundings for the annual call to the colors for training under this principle. Also, there will be available at the close of hostilities an abundance of the instructors and officers required by such a system of training; young men who would be glad to stay in the service if their service was made permanent, or reasonably so.

Of course, I do not expect immediate action on these suggestions. But I do know that the time is already here when we should be thinking about these things, and getting ready to do something about them. I know you love your country. I know you are devoted to its principles, but love and devotion are not enough. We have got to find practical ways in which to display that love, and effectuate that devotion. This great war, which is still only at its beginnings, has shown us how, in one way, we can display our concern for our country's future—and the one way I emphasize tonight, is deliberately to set about correcting one of our more glaring weaknesses, which the war has disclosed—our physical weakness and our physical unreadiness. To this cause I summon you, not only as patriotic men and women, but as fathers and mothers.

Surely all of us will admit how much greater is the enjoyment of life when good health is one of its assets. And so, I give you in my concluding thought, for the days of the future, a healthy young America; a young America that knows how to march, that knows how to carry a heavy load, that knows how to take care of itself out-of-doors, that knows how to handle a gun and become expert in its use; a young America that will not be deficient in that virile fitness which is the price of liberties maintained, and freedom defended.

Into Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Into Poland" published in the New York Daily Mirror of January 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO POLAND

The fact that the "red" armies have crossed the Polish frontier and the announced intention of the Premier of the Polish Government-in-exile to go to Washington in a few weeks throw a black shadow over Russo-American and Russo-English relations.

Will Communist Russia now try to communize Poland?

And if she sets out to conquer Poland—and therefore communize her against her will—will that not be a violation of the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and, in fact, a repudiation of the very reasons for which the democracies are fighting this war—that is, to prevent powerful nations from subjugating smaller ones?

A little history will throw a great deal of light on just what Russia contemplates in regard to Poland, for she does contemplate, according to her Ambassador to Mexico, Constantin Oumansky, reconquering that half of Poland which she got from Hitler in September 1939 as her price for remaining neutral.

Back in July 1932 Russia and Poland signed a treaty of nonaggression and agreed on their respective frontiers.

STALIN'S SCAPEGOAT

In May 1934 this treaty was renewed until the end of 1945.

So when Russia took over half of Poland by force of arms in 1939 she ruthlessly and cynically violated her agreement to respect Poland's national sovereignty and frontiers.

But in 1941, when the German armies began to advance on Moscow, Stalin hurriedly made another pact with Poland, returning to the frontier status quo of 1932 and 1934.

Now that the Russian armies seem to be victorious she is, so her own Mexican Ambassador admits (and Marshal Stalin has not specifically denied it), ready to return to the frontier of 1939 that she agreed on with Hitler.

But as Russia is headed toward Berlin, there is every reason to believe that she will subjugate all of Poland in transit.

And that is the reason for the coming visit of the Polish Premier to the White House.

He naturally would like to know what President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are, as friends and protectors of Poland, going to do about it if Stalin takes over Poland.

The perfidiousness of Stalin was never more clearly revealed than in his dealings with Poland, with which the Kremlin has severed all diplomatic relations, refusing to recognize the Polish Government in exile in London.

Stalin must know that if he persists in his imperialistic designs on Poland, the Baltic and Balkan States, he will lose the support of both the United States and England, drive a fatal wedge between the Allies and, what is more terrible than all, sow the seed of another war—just when we shall have victory within our grasp.

BROKEN PLEDGES

Red Russia, by her continued perfidies, became not only the progenitor of this war when she gave Hitler in August 1939 the go-ahead signal to conquer Europe, but she is thus, from all present appearances, possibly instigating another war, for it is incredible that the United States and England will stand idly by and see communistic Russia take over all the vast territory to the west of her, right up to the German and Italian borders, without raising a hand to defend the Atlantic Charter, of which Russia is a signatory.

In the face of all this comes the incredibly gullible Wendell Willkie with a slogan, "Don't stir distrust of Russia."

It is Russia herself which for 25 years has been sowing distrust.

She has not only broken her pledges to Poland and the Balkan States but she has plotted revolutions against established forms of government in many countries, including our own.

Within 2 months, if there is no Russian reversal, Anglo-American statesmanship and the Atlantic Charter will undergo their supreme test.

The Tax on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Here's Why There's Nothing To Spread on Your Bread," appearing in the Reader's Digest of December 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S WHY THERE'S NOTHING TO SPREAD ON YOUR BREAD

(By Harland Manchester)

Iowa State College has been publishing a series of pamphlets about wartime food production. Oswald H. Brownlee, of the faculty, wrote one of them. In simple, businesslike fashion Mr. Brownlee stated that there is a serious butter shortage, that feed and farm labor are so scarce there is little chance of overcoming it, and that margarine is just as nutritive and palatable and much cheaper to produce. He concluded that, if housewives can't get butter, they ought to have more margarine.

The moment the pamphlet came from the press, there was the very devil to pay. Blasts of anger shattered the calm of Iowa, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas, and dairymen demanded Brownlee's scalp. Newspapers scoffed at college professors, and suggested wholesale resignations. The battle still rages. Late communiques report that Brownlee is absent on leave, that Dr. T. W. Schultz, his department chief, has chucked his job and escaped to Chicago, and that President Friley, of Iowa State, has placated the dairy interests by disowning the heretical tract.

This is just one episode in a fantastic series of outrageous maneuvers by the dairy interests to bar a cheap and wholesome food from millions of kitchens. This goal has been won by the use and misuse of every imaginable type of legislative weapon. The dairymen's lobbies have piled so many taxes on taxes and have contrived so many hampering regulations that two-thirds of the retail grocers of the United States do not consider it worth the effort to stock margarine on their shelves.

Here are the facts: Margarine, made by churning a pure vegetable oil—usually cottonseed or soybean—with skimmed milk, salt and other minor ingredients, has been approved unanimously by recognized health authorities as the nutritive equal of butter. It is now fortified with vitamin A to bring it up to butter standard in that respect. It is flavored to taste so like butter that it is not always possible to tell the difference. Its content is regulated by law, and its manufacture and sale supervised by the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

Margarine sells in most parts of the country—if you can get it—for less than half the price of butter, and is rationed at 6 points a pound compared with the 16 points now required for butter.

Fatty table spreads are both physically and psychologically essential. Butter is now so short, as every housewife realizes, that it cannot wholly fill this need; perhaps not again until after the war. If we are to have something to spread on bread, that something must be margarine.

Despite this national nutrition crisis, margarine is still cooped up in a legislative hoosegow. It remains the only pure food the free sale of which is restricted by Federal taxation. Twenty-seven States add further taxes. A bewildering network of State tariff walls and petty regulations is intended to force the people to buy butter or nothing. In times of peace, this is completely indefensible. At a time when we are locked in the fight of our lives, it approaches sabotage.

Here are some of the restrictions: The margarine manufacturer has to lay out $600 for an annual Federal license; then he pays a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound if the margarine is colored; a quarter of a cent if it's white. The wholesaler's Federal license costs $480 if he deals in the colored kind, $200 for white. After that there are retailers' licenses.

On top of the Federal imposts, your State slaps its own. Wisconsin bans the sale of colored margarine entirely. It soaks the manufacturer of white margarine another $1,000; levies a sales tax of 15 cents a pound; sells licenses to wholesalers for $500, to retailers for $25, to restaurants for $25, and to boarding houses for $5. If the Milwaukee housewife decides to buy her margarine across the State line, then she must in addition buy a $1 license for the privilege of using it in her own home, and send the State 6 cents for each pound used. These restrictions have kept the product out of the State for years; only recently, because of the butter shortage, have retailers been able to afford licenses.

Wisconsin leads the shameful parade, but it would take a volume to list the measures by which 45 other States prevent people from buying a cheap food that is good for them. You can go to the store and buy a quarter-pound brick of butter, but makers must package margarine by the pound, and retailers are not allowed to divide it. This makes it unpopular with light housekeepers, and with shoppers of low income. The retailer has a similar headache; the wholesaler can't split a case for him.

Margarine is white when first produced, and can be made the color of butter by the addition of a harmless vegetable dye—the same dye, by the way, which the butter makers themselves use. But Federal and State taxes on colored margarine are so heavy that it hardly ever appears on the market, and the consumer buys it white, along with a paper of coloring matter. The nuisance of coloring the margarine, of course, tends to discourage its use.

If a restaurant colors its own margarine, it becomes a factory in the eyes of the law, and must pay $600 for a Federal manufacturer's license. It must also, in many States, decorate the walls with blatant placards reading, "Margarine served here in place of butter," which affects some diners' appetites.

Eighteen States ban or restrict margarine in State-supported hospitals or other public havens, and only four have had the grace to lift the ban for the duration.

A few weeks ago the revenuers cracked down in Virginia on the Home for Incurables and the retreat of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Unable to get butter, those in charge managed to obtain white margarine with its envelopes of dye, and colored it in the kitchen. Thus they had become illicit margarine manufacturers, and were fined for their heinous crime. But the dairy interests were protected and it was a famous victory.

In their family circle the dairy people make no bones about their real intent. The Dairy Record of June 18, 1941, says it briefly and to the point: "In short, the dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of oleomargarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine have been outlawed."

In pursuit of their ruthless course the dairy interests have played a leading role in the erection of the vicious network of State trade barriers, which in circumvention of the clear meaning of the Constitution bids fair to chop up the country into jealous, wrangling principalities of trade. For example, when Wisconsin established the present high margarine tax, cotton-growing Alabama boycotted Wisconsin road machinery and cheese.

There are many evidences that taxpayers, even in the great dairy States, are becoming scornful of the petty parochialism of their lawmakers. Papers throughout the Midwest Dairy Belt bristle with letters from consumers who demand tax-free margarine. The butter interests have in a way done margarine a service in branding it a "cheap substitute." That's what families want now.

It is hard to see what good the hobbling of margarine does to the dairy industry. Careful research has shown that such measures have not increased the sale of butter. The yield from the various taxes is hardly enough to pay the cost of collection. This open conspiracy has one effect and only one: it deprives consumers of an inexpensive food, and since many people can afford little butter even when it is plentiful, it bars fatty table spreads of any kind from millions of American tables.

Other new food products are constantly being developed, and some of them will probably turn out to be deplorably cheap and nutritious. The system of margarine curbs furnishes a pernicious pattern for strangling their distribution. These curbs should be destroyed without delay. A bill now before the House (H. R. 2400), introduced by Representative HAMPTON P. FULMER, of South Carolina, provides for the repeal of all Federal taxes and licenses upon margarine and those who make and sell it. It lies within the power of voters to force the passage of this bill.

Good dairy butter is excellent stuff and everyone loves it. But in the words of the late Senator Bankhead, its producers "ought to be satisfied to sell their great, appealing commodity upon its merits in the free market of the country."

Philippine-American Collaboration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and brilliant address entitled "Philippine-American Collaboration," delivered by the Vice President of the Philippines, Hon. Sergio Osmeña, at the Rizal Day program held by

the Filipino community of Chicago, Ill., on January 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow countrymen and friends, Rizal Day is a national holiday observed by Filipinos everywhere. Coming at a propituous time about the end of the year, it affords us the opportunity to rededicate ourselves for the coming year to the lofty ideals and noble aspirations that made Jose Rizal a symbol of redemption, not only of the Filipino people, but also of other peoples of the world struggling for freedom.

In the roll of Filipino heroes, there are others who figure prominently and who have earned our admiration and respect, but none of them has won, as greatly as Rizal has, the universal love of our people and the general respect of the outside world. The reason for this is obvious. More than any other man, he had given himself completely and unselfishly to the cause of hi- people. With his writings, he broadened the vision of the masses; with his martyrdom, he gave them an example of supreme devotion to the native land. It was he who, in the dark hour of our history, lighted the torch of freedom which Spanish oppression could not extinguish.

When America came to the Philippines, succeeding Spain, she found the torch of Philippine freedom already aflame. Far from stifling it, she unselfishly stimulated its growth and radiance. One of her first official acts in the islands was to proclaim Rizal Day a national holiday. But she did more than this. She proclaimed to the world that she was holding the Philippines in trust for the Filipinos—for their interest and welfare, their freedom and happiness. And as she pledged, so also she fulfilled.

It is unnecessary for me to recite at length the progress achieved by us during the 45 years of American trusteeship. The record is well known to all. Suffice it for me to say that no people under the guidance of another have achieved so much as we have within the same period of time.

Not only have we gained recognition of all the essential rights and liberties that Rizal stanchly strove for; we have also made tremendous strides in the economic, social, educational, and political fields, thus constituting our country one of the most progressive nations in the Far East. As a fitting climax to her Philippine policy of liberation, America, recognizing our capacity for self-government, set the date for independence.

Our people were pe ıcefully engaged in the preparation for the responsibilities of independence when, in December 1941, Japan suddenly attacked. In the bitter struggle against a numerically superior and better-equipped invading army, thousands of Filipino soldiers fell by the side of their American comrades in arms.

But they did not die in vain. Their prolonged and determined resistance forced Japan to divert large contingents from other war fronts, thereby delaying the fall of the East Indies, Malaya, Singapore, and Burma and thwarting the Japanese program for an early invasion of Australia, New Zealand, and the junction of the German and Japanese forces in India. They also afforded the United States precious time to repair the destruction wrought by Japan's perfidious attack on Pearl Harbor, and enabled our allies in the Pacific to bolster their defenses and to prepare to deal counterblows at the common enemy.

Forty-five years of constructive association with America has afforded the Filipinos the opportunity to develop and prove their capacity for self-government, winning through peaceful negotiations formal recognition of that capacity and a bilateral agreement for the orderly establishment of independence on July 4, 1946. Four months of bloody and heroic struggle on Bataan has tested the strength of this title to independence and has proved Filipino capacity to shoulder the responsibilities of independence. Today, we have not only America's pledge that Philippine independence will be established and protected, but also the prospect of being declared a separate and self-governing nation before 1946, the date originally set for independence.

The question naturally arises whether after the proclamation by the United States of Philippine independence, this Philippine-American cooperation should be continued and maintained.

I propounded this same question in a speech I delivered in Manila back in 1939, wherein I reviewed the many years of harmonious Philippine-American relationship. I ventured then to offer an affirmative answer. Now, with perfect American-Filipino comradeship, as shown in the epic of Bataan, and with America's offer of protection and her other pronouncements in the course of this struggle, there can be no doubt about postwar collaboration between the United States and the Philippines. The logic of events, the inescapable obligations arising from this war, and the common interests of both peoples, make this collaboration not only advisable but also necessary. It will find expression in many fields. Let me explore a few of them.

The war will necessarily leave its tragic marks on our beloved country. Destruction will be widespread, sufferings will be acute, poverty and hunger will be rampant. Years of privation and hardships will have diminished the physical resistance of the masses, making them easy victims of disease. Adequate and immediate relief will therefore be imperative. Food, clothing, and medical care must come first. It is hoped that side by side with the American Red Cross, accompanying our advance troops, will be a Philippine Red Cross.

Apart from the problem of relief in general is the rehabilitation of our farms and industries. This will require provisions of seeds, fertilizers, farm implements, and work animals. In this undertaking we should give particular attention to the needs of the small landowner who may have lost his only carabao and his only nipa hut.

Provision must be made for the reconstruction of our industrial establishments and the restoration of ruined properties, both public and private. This includes, among other things, provincial and municipal buildings, schools, churches, hospitals, highways, and bridges.

In addition, we shall have to face the manifold problems arising from the closing and insolvency of our banks, insurance and credit institutions; the adulteration of our currency with unsound enemy issues; the impairment of the basis of taxation, and the disruption of our public-school system as a result of the closing of many schools and of the antidemocratic indoctrination of children in the few institutions which have remained open. Without delay, all the schools in operation before the war should be reopened in order to resume an education of patriotism, democracy, and humanitarianism. Whatever the program of relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction is finally decided upon—and the items I have discussed are only a part of it—we are already assured of America's help and collaboration. Responding to the recommendations of the President of the United States, the Senate has approved a joint resolution which provides for the organization of a commission of Americans and Filipinos, charged with the study of the relief and rehabilitation problems of the Philippines. To this commission is also entrusted the task of surveying the economic situation in the islands with a view to their economic stabilization and the formulation of a plan for future trade relations between the United States and the Philippines.

As will be remembered, provision was made for the 10-year transition period of the Commonwealth in order, among other things, to enable the Philippines to stabilize her economy with an eye to her future independent existence. This preparation was already at an advanced stage when war broke out and everything built up was destroyed. It will be within the province of the joint commission, when organized, to study how to make up for the lost years and to recommend measures for the reestablishment of such commercial relations with the United States and other countries as will assure us a reasonable level of public and private prosperity.

The policy of free exchange of commodities prescribed by Congress has brought material benefits to the Philippines and economic advantages and profits to American labor, exporters, and businessmen. This economic tie has so affected Philippine economy that the major export industries of the Philippines have become dependent upon the American market, necessitating a reasonable period of readjustment. This record of economic collaboration will serve as a basis upon which to formulate a post-war commercial relationship which will redound to the lasting benefit of both countries.

The defense plans of the Commonwealth, formulated with the advice of the American Military Mission headed by General MacArthur, were in the process of execution when Japan struck. With the reconquest of the islands we shall resume this work, making such adjustments as new circumstances and experience will require. American technical assistance will continue to be needed. Moreover, our program should be worked out with full consideration not only of our own defense needs but also of the future military necessities of the United States.

This brings us to the question whether, after independence, mutual collaboration in defense measures will be advantageous both to the United States and to the Philippines. It can truly be said that during the last four decades there has been American-Philippine collaboration for defense. The United States Navy maintained its principal base for the Asiatic Fleet at Cavite, and the United States Army had camps and airfields at several points. The Army relied very largely on Filipino soldiery—Scouts, and later the Philippine Army—to fill its ranks. That the inadequacy of these forces rendered ineffective their defense against a vastly superior power does not argue against the intrinsic value of military collaboration. It only emphasizes the need for strengthening the military establishment. The maintenance of adequate naval and air bases across the Pacific, anchored in the Philippines and supported there by Filipino troops, will assure the mutual protection of both the United States and the Philippines and preserve the Pacific Ocean for the peaceful purposes of all nations. To the Philippines such plans are vital to its security, liberty, and growth. To the United States such plans should aid greatly in the defense of the sea and air approaches to your western shores. In a joint resolution, already passed by the Senate and now pending in the House, the President of the United States is authorized to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Philippines for the selection of suitable bases in the islands. I have reasons to believe that the United States may confidently expect from us full cooperation in this regard.

In the cultural field cooperation between the two countries has a logical foundation in the fact that for over three centuries Filipino culture has been based on western ideas. Throughout the long period of Spanish rule the Philippines imbibed Christianity and much of the Greco-Roman culture and philosophy of Mediterranean Europe. During a part of this long association the commercial intercourse and spiritual communion between the mother country and the colony were carried on by way of Mexico through the proud and rich galleons plying in the Manila-Acapulco trade, thus bringing Mexico and the Philippines into close and intimate relations. Mexican soldiers settled in some numbers in Luzon, and several of our most important vegetable and fruit crops were direct introductions from Mexico. The architecture of some of our churches shows the influence of Aztec ornamentation.

With the eclipse of Spain as a world power Mexico, along with most of her other American possessions, became an independent state, and for the ensuing 75 years Spain dealt directly with the Philippines. Subsequent to the liberalization of the Spanish trade policy and the opening of the Suez Canal the people of the Philippines came into profitable commercial and literary contact with the whole of southern and western Europe and Great Britain.

When, as a consequence of the Spanish-American War, the United States replaced Spain as the principal contact of the Philippines with western influence, Filipino political thought absorbed the essential principles of Anglo-Saxon democracy, the English language became the common tongue, the American systems of public schools and public health were adopted, and American methods in commerce and finance were practiced.

For centuries the Philippines has been linked with the peoples not only of the east but also of the west, both old and new. Thus Filipino culture is eclectic; to the original Indo-Malayan foundation there have been added Asiatic, Latin, Mexican, and Anglo-Saxon elements. Today the Filipino way of life is the occidental, the Christian, the democratic way of life. It is, therefore, natural that intimate cultural relations will continue between the Philippines and the United States, and that these relations will extend and improve.

In the political field, cooperation between the United States and the Philippines is most logical. After having worked together for the building of the Philippine nation, the United States and the Philippines can in the years to come devote their joint efforts to the solution of the manifold post-war problems. As a daughter republic of the United States and as a new birth of liberty in the Far East, the Philippines can serve as a vanguard of democracy and as a beacon of hope in that part of the globe. If, through the Philippines, the influence of American democracy can reach less fortunate peoples of Asia, then the cause of world peace will be greatly served. Moreover, the Philippines is peculiarly qualified to serve as America's bridge of good will to the peoples of Asia. As the veritable token of America's handiwork, the Philippines stand also as a vivid example of the success of the policy of trusteeship—the policy which the nations of the west can and must follow for all dependent peoples everywhere. To these dependent peoples, a free and independent Philippines symbolizes the goal that can be attained not by distrust, bloodshed, and violence, but by friendship, und rstanding, and collaboration. Thus, by remaining close political allies, the United States and the Philippines will make great contribution toward the building of a new world of peace, justice, democracy, and freedom.

The day of our liberation is not far off. The forces of freedom are on the march in the Pacific as in other war fronts. The final triumph of American arms in the Philippines is inevitable and so is Philippine independence. Philippine independence—the crowning event of Filipino-American partnership in the task of nation-building—will not essentially change American-Philippine relationship. The ties of friendship and the spirit of collaboration will endure. In a free Philippines, America will continue to find a loyal partner in the defense and the furtherance of the ideals and policies which the two countries hold in common. America may rest assured that the Philippine Republic, born out of the sufferings of Rizal and of other Filipino heroes and martyrs, including those who fought on Bataan and others who are fighting still, will know how to cherish and defend its freedom, and that the Filipino people, whom she has so unselfishly helped in attaining self-government and independence, will always remain a friendly and a grateful people.

Labor's Political Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., entitled "Labor's Political Aims," which is published in the current issue of the American magazine, with an introductory statement by the editor of the magazine. The article deals with the C. I. O. forming a political action committee. I feel that the article should find a permanent place in the RECORD in order to show what the attitude of labor is toward the Congress and the administration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S POLITICAL AIMS

(For the first time in American history, union labor has formed a national political organization—the C. I. O. political-action committee. Although not a distinct political party, its avowed purpose is to throw its weight into the crucial 1944 campaign, and into future elections. This organization may affect our whole political, social, and industrial economy. Eventually it may touch the lives of all of us, whether we like it or not. American public opinion can, we believe, be depended upon to evaluate properly these aims and policies, and the sooner a discussion of them starts, the better. For this reason we bring to our people the political program of organized labor as expressed by one of its most powerful leaders. Mr. Murray's article should clarify the picture for you.—The Editor.)

One basic principle on which progressive labor leaders are agreed today is that labor cannot be prosperous unless the country as a whole is prosperous. We work steadily, of course, to advance the interests of our union membership; but we realize that those interests are, in the long run, linked up closely with the interests of the farmers, of business and professional men, of white-collar men, and of the general public.

Certain recent developments in Washington, we of the C. I. O. believe, have taken an unfavorable turn for the public interest and prosperity, as well as for the interests of labor. Congressional fumbling with such vital matters as taxation and inflation control threaten our economic structure. The inefficiency and shortsightedness of certain of the war agencies are impeding the war effort.

These and other events have convinced us that labor must become a more influential political factor in the future than it has been in the past. Therefore, we have determined upon an important step.

For the first time in American history, the forces of labor are now setting up a Nation-wide organization to protect the political rights of the workingman, as well as the rights of the returning soldier, the farmer, the small businessman, and the so-called common man. This organization is called the C. I. O. political-action committee.

But while the committee is being initiated and led nationally by the C. I. O., it is seeking and obtaining enthusiastic local support from other labor groups, from farmers, and from liberal and progressive elements in both major parties.

The committee is set up with national offices in New York and Washington, and with 14 regional offices covering every one of the 48 States. The various C. I. O. unions have made an initial contribution of $700,000.

This is not a labor party or a third party. There is no present intention to form such a party.

We believe, however, that the political action committee, through its legally exercised educative powers, will have more influence on events in the crucial year of 1944, than any third political party could wield. But no matter what the results are in 1944, the committee will not relax its efforts. It will continue as a permanent organization, a mighty force devoted to keeping the great majority of Americans vigilant and alert in guarding their proper political interests.

This is something new in American politics. And it is a new departure for American labor to lead, and pour its funds into, a national movement devoted to the general welfare just as much as to the particular interests of labor groups. We did not take this fateful step without deep thought and long discussion. We were impelled to action by the happenings of the last year or two, by a growing reactionary trend, and by the critical prospects raised by the elections in 1944 and the eventual reversion to a peacetime economy.

During the 1942 elections, millions of our best young men were busy with their military training or in actual combat with the Japs and Germans. They did not have much time to think of politics. Millions of our workers, toiling in the factories to make weapons for the fighting men, were apathetic about going to the polls. After all, labor had won many gains and reforms since 1932, and workers were lulled into a false security.

As a result, many reactionary and antilabor men, including Democrats as well as Republicans, won election to Congress and to State offices. (The same trend continued, on a smaller scale, in the 1943 elections.)

In consequence, the present Congress has witnessed the most vicious and continuous attack ever made on labor and labor's rights. Fortunately, most of these were parried, but it has been a hard fight. Meanwhile, and even more seriously, this Congress has betrayed the general public interest in such fundamental matters as taxation and inflation control.

The entire tax program has been confused, complicated, and inequitable.

The failure to control inflation has been a scandal and a disgrace. Acting chiefly under the pressure of the so-called farm bloc, which is really made up mostly of big business and profiteering middlemen masquerading as farmers, Congress has systematically crippled all effective efforts to hold down the cost of living, and has opened the door wide toward a really dangerous inflation.

This is not by any means a blow at labor alone. It hurts every soldier's dependent living on a fixed allotment; every person earning a relatively fixed income; every person owning war bonds; every person who tries to save something for the future or provide for his family through insurance; every person who benefits or hopes to benefit by Social Security. And, finally, it leads on toward all the inflationary dislocations which can sicken the economic and social life of the Nation.

These are just a couple of examples, but they show what can happen when public apathy allows ignorant, selfish, and short-sighted men to get into Congress. And it makes us dread to think what might happen if such men should be in control when the terrific problems of the war's end arise. The political-action committee will work to prevent the reelection of men like these.

Meanwhile, the action of many administrative agencies in Washington has been far from satisfactory. Labor appreciates that President Roosevelt has traditionally been a friend of the workers, and it realizes that he is now deeply engrossed in the vast problems of global war, sometimes to the exclusion of urgent domestic issues. But it notes with regret that some of the wartime agencies created under this administration have a pronounced antilabor bias. And we note further that some of these agencies are so inefficient, bungling, and overlapping in their functions as to hurt the public interest and retard the prosecution of the war.

Here again we can see how the influence of a political action committee is needed, in the interests of both labor and the general public.

We were further spurred to create this committee by our recollection of what happened at the end of the last war. We remember what pledges were made in that war, and we remember how those pledges were broken.

At the end of a hard war the ordinary man, whether soldier or worker, wants to relax a little from the tension. He wants to enjoy a little of the pleasures of victory and peace. He wants to forget all about problems and troubles for a bit.

This gives a golden opportunity for the reactionary politicians, the speculators, monopolists, big-money and get-rich-quick boys. They have never tired themselves out working for the war, and so when the peace comes they are fresh for the fray and for plunder.

People of that sort, after the last war, were the power behind the scenes in the Ohio gang which, under the soothing cry of "back to normalcy" brought in the era of the 1920's, with its speculation, its stock gambling, its false and uneven prosperity, its paper profits, its playboy millionaires, and its final boom and busts of 1929, dissolving into the misery and depression of the early 1930's.

Nobody, except a selfish few, wants to see it happen that way again. It was bad enough last time. This time, with a far greater war on our hands, and consequently with far greater problems of converting back to peace, such reckless courses might shake the foundations of the very democratic system we have been fighting for.

We, of the C. I. O., and of labor generally, believe in the democratic system. We believe that the people, once they understand the issues, will decide them wisely. We believe that the years immediately ahead are the most critical we have ever faced—"the years of decision"—when new patterns will be formed. And we believe that the people, tired and confused by war and post-war's problems, will need, as never before, to be kept alert and informed as to their political interests.

That is why we have taken the unprecedented step of organizing, on a national scale, the C. I. O. political-action committee; that is why we are backing it with our freely given money; and that is why we invite all liberal men of good will, whether Democratic or Republican, whether union or nonunion, whether farmers or workers or small businessmen or men in the professions, to join with us in clarifying the political issues ahead.

The committee, established by the C. I. O. executive board, has been unanimously confirmed by vote of the recent C. I. O. constitutional convention in Philadelphia. The committee is made up of Sidney Hillman, chairman; Van A. Bittner, vice chairman; R. J. Thomas, secretary; Sherman Dalrymple, and Albert J. Fitzgerald.

Sidney Hillman, head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, has had a distinguished career in the labor movement. He is known to employers as well as to workers for his integrity, fair-mindedness, economic wisdom, and fighting qualities. Joint head with William Knudsen of the Office of Production Management, he helped to break bottlenecks and get the great wheels of our war-production machine rolling.

As assistant to Hillman we have secured the services of C Benham Baldwin, former head of the Farm Security Administration, a man who knows as much about problems of the ordinary farmers as any man in America, and a brilliant young administrator.

Hillman has already had conferences and meetings in Philadelphia, Birmingham, Dallas, Minneapolis, Detroit, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Cincinnati. He was surprised by the size and spirit of each turnout

Our first step will be a drive for registration of voters for all local and national elections in 1944. In this we start with a nucleus of 5,000,000 C. I. O. members and their families—a total of perhaps 14,000,000. Of course, we do not expect all these to vote the same way—the C. I. O. has no dictatorial characteristics—but the vast majority of our membership holds to similar liberal political principles.

Apart from our own membership, we want to see the largest possible registration of all voters, because we believe the great majority will support a constructive program if it is put before them.

Our first objective, of course, is to win the war, and then to cooperate generously with our allies—Britain, Russia, and China—in building a better world. We are opposed to both isolationism and American imperialism.

Having helped to conquer tyranny abroad, the United States in peace must conquer unemployment and poverty at home. We have proved, in war, that this Nation can produce a Niagara of armaments and materials.

We are leaders in the fight to increase allotments for soldiers' dependents. We will fight for appropriate monetary rewards to soldiers for their extraordinary services. But the greatest reward our Nation can offer to men returning from the wars is the assurance of a job. Full employment for all is the absolute must for America after the war. From that all else follows. With that the following essentials can be assured to everyone:

A job at union wages, or a farm, business, or profession that pays.

A well-built home decently furnished.

Good food, clothing, and medical care.

Good schooling for children, with an equal chance for healthy and happy growth.

An income through social insurance in case of unemployment, sickness, old age, or early death of the wage earner.

Farm operators, sharecroppers, wage earners, businessmen, professional men, and housewives—all can enjoy genuine freedom from want and fear, if we, as a nation, are only determined to achieve it.

The details of how this can be accomplished have been under long study by the C. I. O. post-war planning committee. Here I can touch only a few of the high points:

If the war in Europe were to end suddenly, the Nation would be utterly unprepared to handle the profound dislocations which would quickly result. Therefore, the Government must promptly develop sound policies. It must help businessmen clear their plants of half-finished goods and to get working capital for converting to civilian production. It must allow workers severance pay to help see them through the unemployment of the reconversion period. It must plan new uses for shipyards, arsenals, and new plane plants which otherwise might fall idle for several years.

The Government owns $20,000,000,000 worth of factories—a new form of public domain, as important as our western lands were a century ago. These must be used to benefit the people rather than the few. If private enterprise can pay a fair price for them, and can operate them with reasonably full production and employment, well and good. But if business cannot or will not operate these plants under proper conditions, or allows them to fall idle, Government must be prepared to operate these plants in the public interest.

Labor dislikes planned scarcity and high prices. With full production, prices can be low and wages high, and still leave a margin for a fair profit for business.

Disaster comes by accident, but prosperity today comes only by planning. Therefore, we believe the Government should at once set up a Federal agency to plan for transition to full peacetime consumption, employment, and production. It should be headed by a policy board, with representatives from agriculture, labor, and Government.

The Government should plan, now, for a vast post-war program to build better houses, roads, playgrounds, hospitals, and schools.

We believe in the free enterprise, initiative, and inventive genius of the American people. We do not believe in the kind of free enterprise which, in recent years, has meant the freedom of big corporations and monopolies to squeeze small businessmen to the wall, or the freedom to corner and suppress new inventions. All such practices are inimical to the full employment which we demand.

In man's long history there come short periods of time which profoundly influence his way of life for centuries thereafter. We are living in such a period today.

No one knows to what extent a democracy can plan its future in advance. But we must make the effort. The labor movement has a special responsibility, because ours is one of the largest organizations in the Nation. And our political action committee is our instrument for carrying out that responsibility.

We are, for the present, committed to no man or political party. We shall, in the next few months, have our organization perfected and its general principles agreed upon.

We shall then, before the national conventions of the two major parties, hold a national meeting or conference of our own. We shall draw up and present to the American people a specific set of principles for the general welfare. Then, after the political conventions, we can decide what action to take regarding the two parties and the individual candidates, whether for State or National offices or for the Presidency.

Overhauling the Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an article entitled "Overhauling the Cabinet—the Taft Plan, Here Dusted Off and Updated, Would Give Us Better Secretaries and More Efficient Government—Without a Constitutional Amendment." This article written by Judge Jerome Frank appeared in the January edition of Fortune magazine. Judge Frank's analysis of the inadequacy of our present Cabinet and legislative methods is excellent. In view of the reluctance to modernize our governmental machinery, I see no possibility of the dual secretaryship plan being adopted and I am doubtful of it being of value if adopted. The passage of H. R. 327, to make it possible for heads of agencies to appear on the floor of the House for reporting and questioning would accomplish the purpose Judge Frank has in mind.

The engaging and thoughtful article is as follows:

Most of the current criticisms of President Roosevelt's relations to his Cabinet deal with the subject as if those same criticisms had not been directed at all previous Presidents. The critics forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt inherited an established system and one that it is peculiarly difficult to revise in wartime.

In the year 1790, Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, was sponsoring a bill to fund the public debt. He asked leave to defend this important measure before the House of Representatives, then in the second session of the First Congress. The congressional enemies of the bill, fearful of Hamilton's brilliance in debate, induced the House to deny him this privilege, which in all probability would have been granted to a less forceful secretary. This handful of Congressmen failed to thwart the passage of the measure, but they succeeded in creating a lasting precedent. From that day to this, no American Cabinet officer has appeared on the floor of either the House or the Senate.

In marked contrast is the British system that not only allows but requires all Cabinet members to attend Parliament for questioning and debate. In peacetime, the Ministers answer parliamentary inquiries concerning their departments for three-quarters of an hour each day, 4 days a week. Thanks to these day-to-day contacts with Parliament, a British Minister is constantly in the center of public attention. His capacities are easily estimated. If he is a mediocrity, his defects are revealed. If he is a man of outstanding ability, he becomes one of the leading figures of the country.

Our own practice, fortuitously created, has for many decades had the unfortunate effect of obscuring both the abilities and inefficiencies of the members of our Cabinet. A competent secretary may actually appear to be a mediocrity. More crucial in its effect on our national welfare, the bunglings and ineptitudes of incompetent secretaries can be and, in our history, often have been glossed over and concealed. We have denied ourselves the benefits of the pitiless publicity made possible by the British system, in which administrative acts or omissions are promptly subjected to criticism in the House of Commons. The English, unlike us, have "government by discussion."

Our secretaries, to be sure, have always made formal speeches, filed written reports with Congress, and appeared before congressional committees. But in discharging any of those functions a secretary may be but a Charlie McCarthy, with an accomplished ghost writer as his Edgar Bergen. The answers of a chief administrator to questions posed him by a legislative committee are often those of his astute subordinates, smooth, second-hand answers that he could never get away with in congressional debate. Moreover, as committee meetings are often poorly attended and as their discussions are not open to Senators and Representatives except those who are committee members, press coverage is usually scant. A secretary debating or explaining his Department's activities in a full legislative session would make a front-page story.

With Cabinet incompetence and mediocrity too easily obscured, careless appointments have too often been made. One recalls the scandalous appointment by President Harding of Harry Dougherty, an ill-equipped and unscrupulous lawyer, as his Attorney General. Only under our system would John Sherman, when old and failing, have been designated by President McKinley as Secretary of State. Grant's first Secretary of State, Washburne, is said to have been half illiterate; his first Secretary of the Navy, prominent only as a successful war profiteer, was innocent of all naval knowledge. Even President Taft, later an ardent proponent of changes in our Cabinet system, chose some of his own secretaries somewhat haphazardly. Little wonder that most of our secretaries have not compared with the Ministers in England where the Cabinet has generally consisted of the ablest men in the majority party. During the past hundred years many American Cabinet officials have been chosen merely because they were personal friends of the President or in recognition of services in the election campaign. Often unknown to the country before their appointment—sometimes not previously acquainted with one another—not seldom have they passed into a speedy oblivion when they quit office.

Besides carelessness in Cabinet appointments, cavalier treatment of their Cabinets by several Presidents can be chalked up against our system. During the first 2 years of his administration, Andrew Jackson wholly dispensed with Cabinet meetings. Woodrow Wilson called none during the entire period of World War No. 1. Such practices would have been unthinkable had the Secretaries been expected to respond orally to questions in Congress. Because of these practices, a critic has described the Cabinet as an "amorphous body of chief clerks."

NOT THE CONSTITUTION'S FAULT

The Constitution does not compel adherence to our present system. There is only scant reference to the secretarial body in the Constitution, and the specific word Cabinet is not even used. There is no constitutional requirement that the President treat his department heads as a group or confer with them en masse. In England it is the usual rule for a member of the Cabinet to have a seat in Parliament. That particular device our Constitution forbids in a blanket provision applicable to all employees of the national Government: "No person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." But all the other practices of our Cabinet system are matters of usage or custom that can be changed without any constitutional amendment.

The Constitution does not prohibit Cabinet officials from participating in congressional debate. Suggestions that they should so participate have several times been made. Such a plan was proposed early in our history by Story, one of our most learned and certainly one of our most conservative Supreme Court Justices. Bills embodying such a plan were introduced in Congress in 1864, 1886, 1921, 1924, and 1943. (The last, introduced by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, is still in committee.) After careful study, a House committee in 1864 endorsed such a bill, which it said, "will require the selection of the strongest men" as Cabinet officers. "It will bring those strong men into contact, perhaps into conflict * * * and thus stimulate their abilities and their efforts * * *" Garfield, when he was in Congress, argued on behalf of such a bill. Similar measures have been urged by Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Taft.

Taft first promoted this plan in an earnest message to Congress in December 1912. In 1915, as an ex-President, he again attacked the subject in a series of lectures on the Presidency. At that time he stated: "I am strongly in favor of a change in our existing system by which the importance and influence of Cabinet officers shall be increased." They "should be given access to the floor of each House to introduce measures, to advocate their passage, to answer questions, and to enter into debate as if they were Members—without, of course, the right to vote." Taft said his plan would induce Presidents to use greater care in choosing their secretaries and would insure that the head of each department, because apprehensive of questions that he must answer, would become more familiar with, and more closely supervise, the activities of his subordinates. The new procedure, he argued, would also "give the President what he ought to have—some direct initiative in legislation and an opportunity, through the presence of his competent representatives in Congress, to keep each House advised of the facts in the actual operation of the Government." Aware, through painful experiences while he was Secretary of War, of the problem of unnecessary friction between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, he went on to say: "The time lost in Congress over useless discussions of issue that might be disposed of by a single statement from the head of a department, no one can appreciate unless he has filled such a place." That problem, as our newspapers daily make clear, still exists and is as yet unsolved.

Under our present system, it is only through the press that quick communication between administrators and legislators is possible. Secretary Knox, returning from his investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster, first reported his conclusions to the newspapers, not to Congress—a typical instance of our roundabout methods that did not even give surprise to an accustomed public. It is through a press conference that a Secretary makes reply if his department has been subjected to a congressional attack. This awkward situation could not have its parallel in any efficient business concern.

Congress itself, although not recognizing the source of its irritation, is constantly irked by the lack of immediate information from the Cabinet. It is defective communication that accounts for much unfounded hair-trigger congressional criticism of the executive branch. The remedy rests primarily with Congress, initially to blame for the barriers to direct and common-sense contacts. Until those barriers are removed, Congress cannot be an effective critic of the Executive, and the Executive cannot come to grips with Congress as critic.

The Taft plan would call for greater cohesion among the heads of departments,

and between them as a group and the President. The English Cabinet system results in joint Cabinet responsibility; the entire Ministry is held accountable for any important blunder or misconduct of any minister. In our Government, the head of one department has no responsibility whatever for the conduct of another department head. So we had the spectacle in President Harding's Cabinet of outright dishonesty on the part of Secretary Fall, in connection with the oil leases, for which no one considered his colleagues in any way at fault. One member of that Cabinet, Hoover, was later elected President, and another, Hughes, was subsequently made our Chief Justice.

Opponents of the Taft plan say that it would render Cabinet officers too independent of the President, that they might commit him, by their utterances in Congress, to policies with which he did not agree. There is some slight danger of that sort; but it could be avoided by more frequent intensive conferences between the President and the Cabinet.

Another related objection is that, if Cabinet officers become more prominent, they would seek to become rivals of the President for succession to his office. But our present system has not prevented such competition. Several Vice Presidents have competed with their Presidents. And so, too, have Secretaries: Chase, while in Lincoln's Cabinet, constantly angled for the Presidency; there are those who say that Hoover, when he was Coolidge's Secretary of Commerce, was making efforts to procure the Presidential nomination; and we can still recall James Aloysius Farley's rivalry with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Indeed, the alleged objection is an advantage. It is desirable that more men should have the opportunity to show that they are Presidential timber. The increased prominence of Cabinet officers that would ensue from their frequent appearance in Congress would serve to bring to public notice larger numbers of possible Presidential candidates with demonstrated capacity.

Still another objection made to the Taft proposal is that it would result in the adoption of the English scheme of government and would disrupt our basic constitutional pattern, which precludes the merger of legislative and executive branches. It is true that in England the Cabinet, which supervises the executive branch of the Government, is also part of and dominates Parliament, so that the Prime Minister, the head of the Cabinet, unlike our President, combines authority over administration with virtual control of all major legislation. For, although in theory the English Cabinet, as a sort of parliamentary steering committee composed of the chiefs of the majority party, holds office at the pleasure of Parliament and is dismissible at a moment's notice, in reality Parliament is run by the Cabinet. A competent English observer remarks that the "Cabinet, by combining legislative and executive authority, in effect rules the nation"; another Englishman goes so far as to speak of "Cabinet dictatorship."

Few Americans favor our adopting such a fusion of legislative and executive direction, the abandonment of the traditional doctrine of the separation of powers embodied in our Constitution. But there is no need to fear that the Taft plan will so result. Neither the President nor any Cabinet officer will become a Member of Congress or obtain the power over legislation possessed by the English Cabinet.

No formal legislation is needed to put the Taft plan into action. Simple changes in the rules of the House and the Senate could immediately eliminate the ill effects of a 1790 accident that we have unwisely institutionalized. By such changes, Cabinet officers can be authorized to speak in Congress; by Presidential order they can be required to do so.

THE REAL DANGER IN THE TAFT PLAN

Taft said that an "English Cabinet officer must have qualities not now required of a member of the President's Cabinet." That comparison invites scrutiny of the way in which an English Minister performs his duties, a scrutiny that reveals a grave flaw in the English Government. Cabinet control of administration, as distinguished from legislation, is, for the most part, but nominal. In fact, administration is largely conducted by permanent officeholders unknown to the voters and subject to little real check by the Cabinet—although to a far less degree, this same weakness already affects our Government. Here we come upon a cogent objection to the Taft plan, one which its critics have not noted. That plan, unless in some manner modified, might cause the problem of effective administrative control to become as serious here as it now is in England.

It is well to remember in this connection that the English Cabinet system also derives from an accident. George I and George II were Germans unable to speak English, and therefore unable to take part in discussions at meetings of their Ministers. This incapacity gave rise to a practice that gradually developed into the constitutional principle of the Ministry's independence of the Crown and led to the Cabinet's present authority over both legislation and administration. Control of legislation and policy came to be regarded as paramount, with the result that the Ministers who are the heads of departments are primarily legislators, and so much occupied with their parliamentary tasks that they have little time to allot to their departmental administrative duties. Accordingly, administration in each department is largely in the hands of a permanent staff of expert professional ("nonpolitical") administrators, at the head of which is an under secretary. Cabinet officers come and go as one political party succeeds another in office, but the members of these expert administrative staffs, including the under secretaries, are career men who usually hold office for life.

Certain Anglophile American critics of our Government urge us to emulate this English civil service which they claim has the advantages of expertness, political neutrality, and continuity in administration. Many English critics of the English Government are less laudatory. Their comments suggest that the English Government has the defects of its virtues. They say that, as a minister is merely in titular charge of a department, he is usually no more than a rubber stamp for his civil-service subordinate; a minister has been described as in "pupilage" to his permanent under secretary. As Muir, an English writer, puts it, "An omnipotent cabinet, with the immense but concealed power of bureaucracy behind it, is the dominating fact of the British system."

Although such descriptions are probably exaggerated, they point to a disturbing aspect of the English Government. The British Labor Party, when in office in 1924, was badly hampered by the permanent civil-service employees who were hostile to the novelties of that party's program. We can picture the equivalent in present-day America by supposing that an anti-New Deal President were to be elected, to find that dogmatic believers in New Deal policies had been frozen into key positions in all government departments. The problem is not now altogether unknown in our Government. A bureau chief in one of our Government departments, a career man, once indiscreetly boasted to me that he could and, in many ways, did silently frustrate the policies of his Secretary—whom he considered an annoying and transient amateur, an intruder whose foolish whims he must, whenever possible, quietly circumvent. To my own knowledge, the permanent chief of an S. E. C. division succeeded, by "dragging his feet," in blocking for more than a year an important administrative reform desired by the Commissioners. The farm-relief law of 1933—the Agricultural Adjustment Act—represented a fundamental shift in agricultural policy that many career employees of the Department of Agriculture resented and whose execution they often sabotaged. Were the Taft plan adopted without modification, bureaucratic resistance to change might well increase in our Federal Government, because of the frequent attendance of secretaries in Congress and their consequent absence from their departments. Even now the amount of time our Secretaries must spend on policy formulation interferes with their attention to departmental operations.

Expertness, disinterestedness, continuity in administration, these indispensable requirements for effective government are provided only through a permanent "nonpolitical" staff. No less indispensable in a democracy are experimentation, flexibility, inventiveness, qualities requiring a temper of mind not usually fostered by permanent office holding—whether in a government, a giant private corporation, or a university. To gain the advantages both of the civil-service system and of the rotation-in-office procedure is a fundamental problem of democratic government.

A SOLUTION: TWO KINDS OF SECRETARY

As a solution to this problem I suggest the creation of two types of Cabinet posts, a plan that frequently occurred to me during the years in which I served successively under several secretaries and had the opportunity to observe other Cabinet officers in action. Here, in tentative outline, is my proposal, which is not designed to accomplish the same purpose as the Taft plan but with which it can and should be correlated.

The President will be authorized to appoint for administrative work one group of Cabinet officers, each of whom will supervise a permanent department staff, headed up by a permanent (career) official. Each of these "departmental" or "administrative" secretaries will also be assisted by one or more under secretaries of his own choosing and removable by him. Another group of Cabinet officials, secretaries "without portfolio," will devote themselves exclusively to questions of policy, advising the President on such matters as have recently been within the jurisdiction of the National Resources Board. The policy secretaries will thus work as a group, and will be adequately staffed with experts. However, each policy secretary will specialize in some field, one of them acting as a specialist in fiscal matters, another in labor, another in transportation, and so on. All members of the Cabinet will appear before Congress, but the departmental secretaries will there discuss departmental administration, not policy questions.

The solution of several problems would be aided by the device of appointing secretaries with differentiated functions. A Cabinet officer working primarily as an administrative secretary can learn and control to a far greater extent than is now possible the activities of his permanent staff and will be far less subject to domination by his expert career subordinates. Under our present dual-purpose secretary system, a secretary who concentrates on departmental administration has little time or energy to expend on painstaking yet imaginative consideration of broad-range policy questions, while a secretary who interests himself extensively in such questions usually skimps on his job of department management. As I have learned from first-hand observation, some secretaries who have signal administrative aptitudes are weak in regard to policy, and oth-

ers who are wanting in the qualities of an able administrator could be excellent Presidential advisers with respect to broad policy; seldom does one man possess both kinds of talent.

With the Cabinet as it has been and is now organized, a policy measure is usually discussed by the President with the head of but one department. A tax bill, for instance, will often be considered solely by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. Yet a tax law will affect all phases of American life because of its repercussions on all industries, and on labor, agriculture, the banks, the security markets. To restrict consideration of a proposed labor law to a conference between the President and the Secretary of Labor is to disregard the ramifying impacts of such legislation. Similar comments apply to a program for farm relief; not only farmers, but city dwellers, railroads, and other interests will be vitally affected. Indeed, almost all important legislation involves issues national in scope. At a minimum, such matters should be the subject of interdepartmental conferences; but in American history such conferences have seldom been held. More than previous Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been aware of this problem. He has experimented with the expedient of appointing coordinators; but ingrained departmental jealousies and pride are so strong that the life of a coordinator is hard, and he is seldom successful—as Donald Richberg found out in 1935 and as the unusually able former Justice James Byrnes seems now to be discovering.

Were a suggestion such as I have outlined adopted, all proposed legislation would be primarily within the province of the policy secretaries. They would ascertain the views of the administrative secretaries through interdepartmental committees on many subjects, such as fiscal policy, foreign affairs, labor, agriculture, transportation. The Secretary of Agriculture, for example, would deal primarily with the administration of farm legislation and play but a secondary role in the formulation of new farm laws. As the policy secretaries would have Cabinet rank, equal in dignity with that of the administrative secretaries, they would not face the difficulties that have heretofore been encountered by coordinators of lesser status.

Our existing system, demanding of Cabinet officers ability in the two fields of administration and policy, often yields inefficiency in both, but particularly in the realm of policy, since the position of the Cabinet in our Government has stressed its administrative function. As an unfortunate consequence, certain of our Presidents have turned to "kitchen cabinets" to aid them in formulating broad general policies. A President, of course, has the right to consult whom he chooses, but his frequent recourse to the views of unofficial advisers is sure to provoke criticism. The public resentment against Andrew Jackson's "kitchen cabinet" still echoes. Colonel House, holding no office, became a storm center when President Wilson made it a practice to rely on his advice about highly important matters not discussed with the Cabinet. In his diary, House narrates McAdoo's complaint that "he was with the President when the despatch came from Admiral Mayo concerning his demand on Huerta to salute our flag and the President never even mentioned the matter to him." "McReynolds, Houston, Lane, and all the others," said House, "had the same story to tell." Several members of Grant's Cabinet resigned because they did not know what Grant was up to; they said that he had never asked their views on any subject.

The days of peace, when this war is won, will bristle with policy problems for our Presidents. Official policy secretaries would be immensely useful, and the Taft proposal would improve the workings of both Congress and the executive arm. No improvements in governmental machinery will provide panaceas. A government is not a machine; it consists of men, and can be no better than the men who compose it. But the ablest men in government office cannot function well if they are balked by antiquated institutions. Democracy, if it is to survive, must be efficient. Our present Cabinet system is anything but that.

Liquidation of Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles, one by Frank R. Kent, who writes under the heading "The Great Dame of Politics," and the other by Westbrook Pegler, who writes under the heading "Fair Enough." Both these gentlemen, in the articles to which I have referred, interest themselves in the maneuvers made by Mr. Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, in connection with his statement in Madison Square Garden the other night, to the effect that he was eliminating his organization as a party, and was proceeding from then on as an association.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

The announcement, through Mr. Earl Browder, that in the coming campaign the Communist Party will go out of business as a political party is interesting for a number of reasons. It will be recalled that Mr. Browder, official head of the American Communists, was freed from prison a year or so ago by Mr. Roosevelt "in the interests of national unity."

How pardoning Mr. Browder, whose party Mr. Roosevelt's Attorney General had branded as engaged in subversive activities, promoted "national unity" was never explained by the President or anyone else. On the contrary, a good many held the view that the only unity promoted was that of administration political support and that, in principle, the Browder pardon was identical with the patronage favors given Mr. Frank Hague, the unsavory New Jersey boss, and others of the same ilk, who have been in the New Deal political camp since 1932—and still are.

One thing which stands out in this most recent Communist decision is the flattering imitation of the President by Mr. Browder. Just as Mr. Roosevelt tosses the name, New Deal, into the discard (or tries to), so Brother Browder substitutes for the words, "Communist Party," the words "Communist Association." And just as Mr. Roosevelt seeks to convey the idea that the New Deal is over and henceforth all New Dealers are interested solely in winning the war, so does Mr. Browder neatly convey the idea that the Communists will no longer wage war on the system of free enterprise.

One is as patently phony as the other. The primary purpose of the New Deal now, as it has been in the past, is the indefinite continuation in power of the New Deal and the "New Dealers." And the primary purpose of the Communist Association is the same as that of the Communist Party—to wit, the overthrow of the American system of government and the substitution of one on communistic lines. The present Communist leadership is not entitled to credit for sincerity. Ever since 1933, when the New Deal was fully revealed, it has been a settled Communist conviction that the best way of achieving the Communist objective was through the New Deal.

The basis of this belief was that a period of chaos is essential before the change can be made. The argument—and a sound one, too—was that the New Deal tends toward a chaotic condition out of which communism is most likely to emerge. In that, most thoughtful conservatives agree with the Communist leaders. In at least one of their party conventions the Communists officially declared that "the New Deal points in our direction," which accounts for the fact that as a party for 10 years it has consistently supported the New Deal in everything and on all occasions. The one exception was in the matter of foreign policy. In the early days of the war, it was distinctly isolationistic so far as America was concerned, and only swung over to the Roosevelt foreign policy after Hitler attacked Russia. Up to that time its sympathies were on the other side and the sudden attack left it in an absurd position. Now, on all points, the Communists see eye to eye with the administration. Mr. Browder was ahead even of Senators GUFFEY and PEPPER in demanding a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt, just as he had demanded a third term.

So far as diminishing the Communist influence in the next election, the abandonment of its position as a political party will enhance it, in that it will enable the party vote to be cast solidly for Mr. Roosevelt or the New Deal candidate, instead of having it partly diverted by the presence of a Communist Party candidate on the ballot. The truth is that this renunciation by the Communist Party of the name "Communist Party," its expressed determination to work within the two-party system, and its declaration favoring free enterprise are all part of a perfectly obvious plan not to mix less in American politics but more. In brief, the Communist Party and its leaders have not changed their spots. Their methods, their motives, and their objectives remain the same, just as Mr. Roosevelt's remain the same.

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, January 12.—A long time ago in Chicago a state's attorney, or county prosecutor, named John E. W. Wayman decided that vice must go and, to that end, closed up the South Side area known as The Line, where impropriety had been rife for years and years under political license and by common consent.

"Now," Mr. Dayman said in effect, brushing his hands and turning to other matters, "vice is gone." Which was reasonably true, although for some time after there were tappings on the panes along dark streets at night, possibly mere echoes of a long past or the work of ghosts. But Mr. Wayman neglected to say where vice had gone and the honest citizen was left to find out soon that it had moved into the apartment just across the hall from his own, or the house next door. Vice went everywhere in Chicago and has never been efficiently segregated from that day to this.

And now that the dice are warm I should like to make the point that the dissolution of the Communist Party by decision of its national committee, as announced by Earl

Browder, the general secretary of the party, presents a parallel in our politics. Mr. Browder has invited his following to move into the Democratic and Republican Parties, disguised as respectable capitalists, and to join the church in a manner of speaking and holler hallelujah but to remain Communists just as the dispossessed ladies of The Line remained what they were by night although they talked of groceries and leaky sinks and the care and feeding of children with their unsuspecting neighbors across the back-porch railings during the day.

This is not altogether a new device of the Communists. For years many of them have refused to live within the stockade of the Communist Party, pretending to be nothing more sporty than liberals or New Dealers but committing communism on the quiet in universities, Government bureaus, and unions of the C. I. O. A few were caught by the fly cops of the Dies committee but most of the suspects were acquitted by friends in power and the complaining officers denounced as political prigs who would give a girl a bad name for smoking a cigaret or showing a little bit of leg. These part time, or amateur, Communists joined youth movements, consumers' and shoppers' groups and leagues, councils and congresses against fascism and for democracy which were, in fact, political dives or cesspools of communism but, if picked up in a raid, the defense was always that they were just studying art. But, at least, the more hardened and abandoned Communists were easily identified by their sullen and defiant contempt of the American form of government and could always be found where they belonged, which is to say, in the party. A light hung outside the door and the color of the light was red.

Now, however, all of them, including the worst, are scattered all over town, Communists still but preaching "free enterprise" according to instructions; and their talk is to be cleansed of such profanities as nationalization of the banks, railroads, coal, and steel.

"It is my considered judgment," Mr. Browder said, "that the American people are so ill-prepared, subjectively, for any deep-going change in the direction of socialism that post-war plans with such an aim would not unite the Nation but further divide it." And "we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively in the post-war period."

Perhaps my view is uncharitable, but one is made skeptical by past performances and remembers that Mr. Browder up to a certain point, at which Hitler attacked Russia, was fiercely opposed to this war for that capitalistic system which he now embraces and to the whole program of the United States to defend herself. And the Communist Party, as such has become such a miserable slum, shunned even by its rich and gamey patrons of hereditary wealth, that there would seem to be very practical reasons why the comrades have decided to abandon the old sway-backed dump and scatter.

Governor Arnall's Excellent Message to Georgia Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the message of the able and far seeing Governor of Georgia, Ellis Arnall, to the general assembly of that State, delivered on January 3, 1944, at which time Governor Arnall asked the Georgia Legislature to pass the soldier-vote bill. The case for giving the men and women in the armed services a real chance to vote is forcibly presented. The Legislature of Georgia followed the recommendation of Governor Arnall, and was the first to take action on this subject. The address is as follows:

THE ARMED FORCES AND THE ELECTION

Our country has been at war for more than 2 years. The men of Georgia's National Guard have been on active duty for almost 4 years, for the most of which time they have been on foreign assignment. Almost a quarter of a million men and women of our State are in the armed services of our country.

In 1944 we will hold a general election and party primaries of exceptional importance.

I tell you today, it is necessary that provision be made for these men and women in the services to exercise their right to vote.

They desire to exercise that right. Their fellow citizens, by overwhelming ratification of the amendment reducing the voting age, which this general assembly submitted to the voters last year, have expressed their determination that their sons and daughters, their brothers and sisters, who are serving our common country, shall not be disfranchised.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that Congress may enact some measure permitting those in the services to vote for Federal officials; for electors for President and Vice President, for Senators and for Congressmen. But such a measure, even if it were legal and were enacted speedily into law by the Congress, could not permit service men and women to vote for State and county officials. It could not provide for participation in party primaries by men and women in the services. In Georgia, the local and State primaries are usually the equivalent of election. It is in the primary that the great majority of our boys and girls overseas and in the camps wish to vote. Provision for this requires substantial changes in our election laws.

Therefore, I have asked the General Assembly of Georgia to meet and to consider and to enact legislation that will permit qualified citizens of Georgia now in the services to participate in the State elections, and that will permit qualified members of any political party to vote in the primaries held by that party.

We must recognize, however, that it will be utterly impossible to see to it that every man and woman in the military service participates in our elections. Time and distance and military secrecy are difficult to conquer. It will not be possible for American soldiers interned in Japanese prison camps to exercise their elective franchise. It will not be possible for those on duty at secret assignments in inaccessible places throughout the world to participate. But we can do our best to afford them the opportunity. We can keep the record straight.

I know that it is at no small sacrifice that the members of the general assembly meet at this session. There are innumerable obligations at home to be fulfilled as the year begins. However, if the votes of your fellow citizens who are defending our common country on seven seas and upon six continents and in the air above Fortress Europe, are to be counted in the primary and the election held this year, prompt action through legislation is needed.

We have heard a great deal in recent debates in Congress, in recent speeches and articles about States' rights.

The preservation of States' rights depends, I am convinced, upon a ready acceptance by the States of their responsibilities.

The primary responsibility of any government is the preservation of the individual rights of the citizens, of which the political and civil rights are the most important because all other rights depend upon their free exercise.

That is the tradition in Georgia. It has been the practice in Georgia since the elections held in the days of Button Gwinnett and in the days of Archibald Bulloch. It was the practice in Georgia in the days when our Nation was plunged into the desolating strife of the War between the States.

It is a tradition solidly grounded upon firm principles. In this Nation, we do not resort to the militaristic scheme of a huge standing army; we rely upon a civilian army, a citizens' army; we trust in the courage and loyalty, the honor and patriotism of the youth of our Nation.

The tradition of a patriotic citizenry springing to arms in the defense of the liberties that alone can make life dear is strong in Georgia. From that eventful morning when Oglethorpe's handful of colonists crushed at Bloody Marsh the trained and picked professional soldiers of Spain, through the agonies of military occupation during the Revolution that was broken through the resourcefulness and courage of Georgia irregulars, through the sad and gallant days when members of Georgia companies marked their ballots around the campfires of the Army of Northern Virginia, our State has preserved the belief that the citizen soldier is no less citizen because he has laid aside for the moment the cap and gown of the scholar, the tools of the artisan, or the plow of the farmer, to bear arms in defense of his home, his freedom, and his honor.

Provisions for absentee voting by soldiers were simple in 1777 and 1861. The number of individuals involved was proportionately smaller than today. Generally the units were made up of men from the same State and, in very many cases, from the same county.

Today the sons of Georgia are farther from their native land than Vicksburg or Richmond. Today they are scattered, except for those in the National Guard, and march shoulder to shoulder with boys from Vermont and Oregon and Kansas.

The simple measures, sufficient to insure their participation in the elections of 1777 and 1861, are inadequate to safeguard their voting in 1944.

But the principle remains unchanged. We must not deprive any man of his voice in our Government because he has been called by that Government to the supreme test of his loyalty to his country and his fellow citizens.

The honor of Georgia would be sullied, the faith of Georgia would be broken, the tradition of Georgia would be dishonored if the men driving through the perilous jungles of New Guinea or standing sentry in the desolate wastes of Iceland, or aboard some vessel of our Navy in the Sea of Japan, should be deprived of their voice in the Government of their country, their State, or their Nation because we took no action upon this problem.

Accordingly, I have asked the members of the general assembly to come to our State capital and study the question and seek a way by which the votes of our citizens absent upon high duty to our Nation may be recorded.

The legislation that I believe is desired by the people of Georgia in this emergency would provide, among other things, for a simple system of registration for the members of our military so that those not now registered may easily do so. Provision should be made for moving up our primaries, elections, and qualification dates, where necessary, so as to afford sufficient time for the casting of ballots

by men and women in service. Sufficient time should be given so that those at far-stretched outposts who are qualified to participate in our primaries and elections may do so. We must abolish the poll tax as an assessment and prerequisite for voting against the men and women in the military service of our country.

It is my recommendation to the assembly that a war ballot commission be created to harmonize voting laws and to serve as a tribunal to expedite and facilitate soldier voting. Such a war ballot commission could serve as an agency to which the Federal Government could give its cooperation in carrying out the purposes of an act of the Georgia General Assembly providing for soldier voting. The legislation enacted should simplify absentee voting. It should provide an easy way of obtaining a ballot, and an easy way for returning it to the election holders. It is my recommendation that the proposed legislation be temporary, terminating upon the convening of the next regular general assembly after the end of the present war.

The effect of such legislation simply would be that all persons who, if they were in their home county, could vote in a general election can vote in the general election, and that all persons who, if they were at home could vote in the primary, can vote in the primary. The legislation would not increase the number of persons eligible to vote above the number that would be eligible if they were at home instead of abroad or in a training camp. It would not reduce the qualifications for voting. It would aim at one thing and only one thing: facilitating the voting by the men and women in service, assuring them of the right of participating in the government of the country they are defending.

Such measures are in the tradition of this State, which, historians believe, probably was the first in the Nation to provide for the counting of votes by its men in the service during the period of the War between the States. It would be peculiarly fitting for Georgia to be the first State of the Union to enact such legislation in this war.

I have emphasized the participation of the men and women now in service in the primary and in the election of State and local officers, because without action by the State through its general assembly they could participate effectively in neither, no matter what action was taken by the Congress. However, there has been no measure enacted by Congress dealing with the votes of those in service for Federal officers. There is grave possibility that no valid, effective, and constitutional legislation will be or can be enacted.

I may say that this view is shared by Georgia's distinguished senior Senator, WALTER F. GEORGE, one of the Nation's great constitutional lawyers as well as a public servant with a high sense of responsibility and lofty ideals of patriotism.

Senator GEORGE, as you know, has been deeply interested in the subject of voting by those in service. His own flesh and blood wear the uniform of our country; one of his sons already has paid the last full measure of devotion to its cause. For that reason, in part, no doubt, no less than because of his deep faith in the orderly processes of democratic government, Senator GEORGE has suggested State action as a needful safeguard to insure that the votes of Georgia service men and women reach the ballot box.

There are certain unanswerable arguments demanding that action be taken to insure the sanctity of the soldiers' ballots.

Foremost is the thesis of democratic principles. In this free Nation, we believe that government exists solely by the will of the people; we believe that every citizen has a right to participate in making the laws by which he must live and in selecting the officials who shall administer those laws; we believe that the welfare of our country in time of peace can be entrusted to the votes of our people, and that its security in time of war can be maintained by their service in its cause.

We do not believe that a boy is unfit to be a citizen and a voter because he risked his life in the Salerno landing. We do not believe that a girl is unfit to be a citizen and a voter because she served her country as a "grease monkey" in the WAC or as a nurse in an up-front hospital or as a weather watcher in the WAVES.

I hope that Georgia will not see the day when the uniform of our country will be the badge of disfranchisement for the man or woman who wears it.

There is likewise the vital question of the interest these young men and young women—10,000,000 in the Nation, more than 200,000 of them from Georgia—have in the future of our country.

They will come back to us after the war. This is their home. This is their country. If it is a country worth dying for, it must be a country worth living in. Whether it passes through the transition period of the post-war years into a prosperous, busy nation, where individual rights are respected, depends upon the type of Government that we have on every level—local, State, and National—on the day when the war ends.

The public officials chosen this year will shape the peace. The President chosen next November and his Cabinet will write the peace treaty; the Senate of which a third of the Members are chosen this year will consider that treaty; the Congress chosen this year will provide the funds and levy the taxes and write the laws to implement the peace. The State legislature chosen in the fall primary will consider the issues in our State developing in the changing world; they will even pass upon a revision of our basic constitutional law. The local officials chosen in 1944 must be the ones to handle the difficult problems of converting communities from a war basis to one of peace.

It is imperative that the men and women who serve in this war have a share in writing the peace and in shaping the post-war world.

That world will belong to their generation and to their children. They will have saved it from the menaces of foreign enemies and totalitarian ideologies. If in their absence, through injustice to them, democracy is subverted by the cynicism of us at home, by denying them the stature of freemen and citizens to a vote, the consequences may well be serious.

They unquestionably will feel a deep resentment against the men and the system that denied them their rights. They will feel that the plans for America or Georgia or their home county made without their consent are not binding upon them. They will feel that they have been defrauded of their birthright while they were risking their lives to preserve our own.

Likewise, I believe that we need in public affairs the special values that these fine young men and women will bring. Although the Selective Service Act has reached to those in the thirties, the bulk of the armed forces of America, especially those serving overseas, is made up of those in their twenties together with those of the teen age group that, in Georgia, have been given the franchise.

The issues that we will confront at the ballot boxes in 1944 will be tremendously important. They involve America's place in world affairs and America's domestic policy in the post-war transition period.

Upon those issues we well may take guidance from the men and women who fight, who possess yet enthusiasm and audacity and courage and unselfishness.

Christmas morning, Mrs. Arnall, my little son, and I drove to Newnan to gather around the family hearthstone. My younger brother was there, granted 7 days' leave on his way to take special training for duties that shortly will carry him overseas. He was a little taller, a little broader, a little more mature than when I last saw him. With the tremendous earnestness of young men, his mind was upon two things: the job he had to do and the world he was coming back to when that job was over.

That is what all of them are thinking about, these young men that you pass every day on the street, some of them laughing and joking and others with their minds apparently off in a cloud somewhere. All of them, your sons and your younger brothers and the boy next door, and thinking about the job they've got to do and the world that they will face when they come back from doing it.

They deserve and they must have a hand in the shaping of that world.

A fitting sense of gratitude to those who have ransomed our way of living and our very lives at the cost of their comfort and their lives, demands that we give those in our country's service a voice in the management of its affairs.

The right to vote is far from complete recompense to a man who has waded ashore under a hail of machine-gun bullets on some South Pacific beach head, and spent days and nights on short rations in a fox hole while Zeros droned overhead, and hacked his way through miles of tangled jungle infested by poisonous snakes, stinging insects, and Jap snipers. There is neither gold enough, nor honors enough, nor medals enough to repay a man for that.

But the knowledge that his fellow citizens back home recognize the degree of his sacrifice, and are willing to go to the trouble to see that he is treated as a full citizen of the Nation for which he fights, is the one type of repayment unworthy neither of the Nation nor its heroes.

Democracy is not well served nor its cause furthered when the men fighting for its triumph are denied a share in the government of their country. One of the criticisms that the apostles of Hitler's totalitarian doctrines has leveled at the democratic countries is that they are unable to act in time of crisis, that their techniques of representative government have worn out, that legislative bodies have lost their effectiveness.

I think, in Georgia, we have given them a demonstration that this is not true. We have proved that democratic government can be efficient and that effective solutions to our problems can be found by the representatives of the people.

The accomplishments of the Georgia General Assembly during the 12 months that have just passed have been illuminating illustrations of how a democratic, constitutional representative system can work. You have given proof that State governments can solve the problems of their citizens. The basic reforms submitted by the assembly in the regular session, the enactment of penal reform legislation in the historic 5-day session in September have advanced the interests of our State tremendously, as well as enhancing its reputation in the eyes of those outside its borders and giving our own citizens a renewed pride in their Commonwealth. I am deeply grateful for the cooperation that the assembly has given to my administration, and I believe that Georgia's citizens are grateful to you for your sincere patriotism and your accomplishments on behalf of our State.

I am convinced that this assembly will dispose of the issue of votes for the men in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other services and for the women in the WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, and MARINES with the same sound judgment, decisively rapid action and lofty sense of obligation to our citizens that you

displayed in the past in considering other measures for the public welfare.

There can be no just opposition to permitting the soldiers to vote. Only those who deplore the bombings of Berlin and Hamburg in a spirit of mock piety, and plead for an understanding with Japan at the expense of the freedom of one of our great allies, and find extenuations for the black treachery of Hirohito and the infamy of Hitler while lashing our own national war leadership with vicious vituperation can desire that the ballot be denied to our fellow citizens who—at this very moment—are fighting for our common country on every front from the mountain passes of Italy to the barren atolls of the Gilberts.

I do not wonder that the defenders of totalitarian doctrines, the advocates of dictatorship, the exponents of prejudice and distrust and hatred, the advocates of the profiteers and "black market" racketeers, the fellow travelers of the Bundists and the admirers of the "firm methods" of Hitler and Hirohito, should be opposed to the soldiers' voting. They can expect small comfort for these theories and their advocates from the men and women in service, who have offered their blood as the price of our liberty and their living bodies as a shield for our Nation against foreign proponents of these same pernicious doctrines.

But the great majority of Georgians and of Americans desire that those serving our common country, whether overseas or in training camps, be their equals and their partners in the selection of our public officials.

If we cannot have confidence in the young men who are piloting Flying Fortresses and operating tanks and carrying rifles, if we cannot trust the young women who have put on their country's uniform to release men for combat duty at the front, then we have nowhere to turn.

The measure submitted to you, the members of Georgia's General Assembly, providing a method by which the voices of Georgia's men and women in our armed forces may be heard on public affairs, is a reaffirmation of our faith in those who are risking their lives to preserve our way of life. By permitting these, our fellow citizens, to vote, Georgia again will have evidenced its trust in the valor and loyalty of its sons and in the courage and honor of its daughters. Georgia again will have led the way.

Unstable Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, few people appreciate what is happening to the currencies of the several nations today when we take into consideration the money situation in the five continents of the world—the inflation in China and the depreciation of paper money in the other countries with gold worth $63 an ounce in India and $66 an ounce in Egypt and $44 per ounce in Argentina. It is not too much to say that the money systems of the world are more unstable today than they were in the depression years of the early 1930's. A financial condition discussed in a letter to the Wall Street Journal by a student of money and a successful businessman, President E. S. Pillsbury, of the Century Electric Co., is submitted herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., January 5, 1944.

To the EDITOR WALL STREET JOURNAL,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have been noting Mr. N. W. Trice's comments, in your December 28th issue, upon your editorial, "Russia Likes Gold," in which you describe gold as "about the most realistic and least ideological thing in the world, as far as use is concerned." In commenting upon this, Mr. Trice contends that India's high appraisement of gold is due to superstition. He finds Russia's interest in gold is due to her gold mines and that ours ought to center around our gold stock at Fort Knox, with especial reference to finding a foreign market for it.

Such conclusions indicate failure to recognize the ability to make dependable measurements of value in terms of a precious metal, silver or gold, for example. Such views leave the whole monetary problem up in the air, and although they may have been entitled to serious consideration a few thousand years ago, the twentieth century seems too late for them, since with no ever-normal granaries our Nation was supplied with its needs during the last century and well into this century through gold measurements. For example, during the last century we raised enough wheat with a reasonable carry-over and never an unreasonable one, through the operation of the gold standard. This would have been impossible without dependable measurements of value that, as the carry-over became scant, or more than sufficient, effected a correction through automatically readjusting the price to take care of the irregularity.

Mr. Trice appears also to be afraid of what exporting our gold at Fort Knox is likely to do to our foreign trade. The following quotation from an article by Mr. W. A. Manford ought to help him and any others troubled by such consideration:

"There is no need for any nation (like the United States of America, that produces over 95 percent of what it consumes) with an intelligent economic system, to export more than enough to pay for its needed imports. Whenever goods are produced the total cost of producing them, including interest and profits, reaches someone's hands as purchasing power and thus automatically enables the Nation to purchase its total product. The market for all goods, other than those we must export to pay for our needed imports, is right in our own country, raising the standard of living of our own people."

The parenthesis has been added because obviously the author's conclusion applies only to economic units large enough to, in considerable measure, stand on their own feet. If, for example, our Nation were split into 48 units, each might be even more dependent upon the economic systems of its neighbors than upon its own. For this reason Europe probably needs a United Nations of Europe even more than we needed a United States of America before 1776.

What the United States of America lacks at present is an intelligent economic system. Having had such for a long time, we are now running by guess and by God, as someone has expressed it. When we are ready to reinstall a dependable monetary system, that gold at Fort Knox will be a major factor in facilitating our return to a monetary set-up capable of doing a job for our trade abroad as well as at home.

We need currency that will tell the truth about the supply and demand situation in our commodity and service markets. The gold at Fort Knox has the attributes and is of sufficient volume to do our job—one that our limitless currency never did and never can do. Here is one of its deficiencies:

For several years we have been adding to our circulation at the rate of 100 percent per annum of our normal requirements until we now have over four times as much currency in circulation as we had a decade ago. Talk about superstition. If money changers accepted this currency at its face value, where the conditions, as in Asia, are such that it can probably not be cashed until after the war, they ought, indeed, to be checked up for sanity. Fifty-percent discounts are being reported for our currency under the conditions indicated, but we can look for most anything except stability where risks of such magnitude are involved. Currency that sells abroad at 50-percent discount is awfully sick and needs attention forthwith.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD addresses on the subject of veterans' legislation, delivered by me over the radio on December 28, 1943, and January 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1943

We have passed legislation in the Senate giving our returning war veterans several hundred dollars upon their discharge from service—a monetary mustering-out payment is not sufficient. Certainly we should have profited from the chaos and confusion that was the aftermath of World War No. 1, when our veterans were passed from hand to hand, many of them going to premature graves unable to determine until the last moment what their Government was providing for them.

Finally, 12 years after the armistice, an organization was created for veterans' relief—the Veterans' Administration—and this confusion was avoided; but at great costs, costs that may be reckoned in bonus marches and breadlines, in stark death and privation.

The problems of World War No. 1 were minor compared to the problems that we face in the post-war years of this decade. We have 10,000,000 men whose lives are pawn in this greatest of world holocausts. We have a million of them on the streets now. We can delay no longer in providing not only mustering-out payment but a long, far-sighted program to fit these men again into the civilian life from which they were wrested and thrust into the flame, blood, deprivation, and death of war. They are not the lads we sent forth from our homes a few short months ago. They are men who have seen their buddies fall and writhe in death around them. They are fighters who have been stained with their own and their buddies' blood. They are soldiers, some of whom have come back physically mutilated. Thousands of others have come back with their spirits shattered, their self-confidence shaken, their minds seared with memories they will never forget. We cannot hand these boys a pocketful of money, give them a pat on the shoulder and send them out on the streets. They need counsel and advice. They

need constant overseeing and assistance until they have refitted themselves into normal everyday life and are ready again to face the normal everyday problems of life.

This is not a question for us to consider after the armistice. It is a problem for us to consider now—not en masse but as individual, personal cases. We cannot do this by legislation. It is a job for administration. It is a job for a centralized, coordinated administration. There must not be any buckpassing in dealing with our veteran. His problem is an individual problem to be handled by an individual.

I have proposed before the Congress of the United States that such steps be taken, and taken immediately. The Veterans' Administration, recognized by all authorities on veterans' rehabilitation as an efficient organization which has done its job in the past competently and well, is now in existence. It has been in existence since 1930. In that time it has handled hundreds of thousands of cases, millions of veterans' problems, and hundreds of millions of dollars. Given further authority to meet these new problems, the funds for an expanded personnel, and the administrative set-up to handle this increased number of men and their involved problems, and we and the veterans can rest assured that the problem will be handled well and expeditiously. Then is the time for legislation. If additional laws, if additional appropriations, if additional facilities are needed, Congress can create them on the advice of the Veterans' Administration, qualified to recommend them.

Already set up are numerous State and Federal organizations which can assist in the solution of one of the greatest problems of this war, the reemployment and reestablishment of our returning soldiers and sailors as civilian workers.

There is much to tell you of the problems of the veteran, but I am not going to attempt to tell it to you secondhand. Here in the studio beside me is Sgt. Buck Hendricks, 21-year-old commando who lost his shattered leg after a land mine exploded in Tunisia nearly a year ago. Sergeant Hendricks has been in hospitals in Africa, at sea, and presently here in Washington. He has talked with thousands of boys intimately and knows his problem and theirs. Sergeant Hendricks, what is the veteran's problem?

Sergeant HENDRICKS. We are facing more than a problem, Senator WILEY. We are facing a whole new life; and I might say, our chief concern is not only what is going to be done for us, but when it is going to be done. We know there is much discussion, but we have seen little action. So far, all we have heard is about mustering-out payments. I can tell you, Senator WILEY, that they will not go any way at all toward helping us. If anything, most of the fellows will spend it in a day or two and be worse off than when they started, unless the money is handed to them for a specific purpose. If they know they have a job to go back to, or if they know they are going to school, or if they know they are going home, and it is all planned out before they are discharged, that is what will happen. If not, I believe most of them will jam into the cities closest to their place of discharge, spend their money, and then not know what to do next.

Why can't arrangements be made to talk to us during the most critical period of our lives, while we are lying in a hospital, when we are worried and have nothing to do but worry about what we are going to do? If we knew our individual problem was the concern of another man, also as an individual, whom we knew by name and who would have available to him all the records concerning us, our minds would be greatly relieved. He could advise us and tell us what we might expect ahead of us. He would have all our records, preservice and service, at hand, and after consulting with us he could decide what best future lay ahead for us.

While we are lying around camp, or while we are lying in bed in a hospital, we could be studying and refitting ourselves for civilian life. When we went into the Army, we had schools and classes because they wanted to teach us things of value in our Army life. But they don't seem to care much about how we go back into civilian life.

Senator WILEY. What you fellows want, son, is a chance?

Sergeant HENDRICKS. Yes, sir. In one way or another. They want to be preparing for their job in civilian life, whether it is school or a job. If it is a job, they would like to know what kind of a job and what they can do to best prepare themselves for it. Honestly, Senator, if we just had some individual interested in us, who knew what our problem was and was working on it, it would be the greatest relief in the world to us, and I know it would be to the other fellows after the war.

Senator WILEY. Thank you, Sergeant Hendricks. That was Sergeant Hendricks, who lost a leg in Tunisia. You have heard his story and the story of other lads in his own words. His desires are simple ones; his requests are easy to satisfy. Certainly we must keep faith. Again I repeat, the rehabilitation of veterans is an administrative problem. Sergeant Hendricks has told you how he feels and how his buddies feel. Upon discharge the Veterans' Administration will know the veteran's history, past and present. Furthermore, they will know it from weekly medical check-ups in the future. A field representative discussing his problem with him will know to what position in life he is best suited. Our veteran will know where he is going, what he is going to do before he is handed two or three hundred dollars and a discharge.

Squabbling on veterans' legislation must stop. This is the paramount question of the moment. Congress, I am certain, will devote its full attention to it, and we can expect in the immediate future that our returning boys can look forward to our guidance and counsel through specialized men assigned to that duty and the job of getting him a job. Good night.

JANUARY 3, 1944

In speaking to my radio audience tonight on my bill, S. 1566, I wish to preface my remarks by saying that our first and primary job is to win the war. We should do nothing that would in any way operate to take from that job the effort and the energy required for it.

However, even in the midst of war, it is well for us to have foresight and lay the plans that will result in the greatest good for the Republic, and especially for our boys who are in the armed services. Adequately handling the problems of rehabilitating those of our veterans who need rehabilitation is indeed a primary problem.

I believe there is a great deal of meat in the statement I recently received from the commander of a veterans' post in my own home State. I quote: "Senator WILEY, the veteran who serves outside the continental limits of the United States is a very special problem. Sick or seemingly well, wounded or not, he is in most cases a thoroughly confused person on his arrival back home. It is altogether reasonable to see that such men have a readjustment period. God knows they deserve it."

We shall have probably 10,000,000 men in the active service of this country when the war with Germany ceases, and, besides this number, probably 2,000,000 more who have been in the service needing rehabilitation. We can probably figure on 2,000,000 remaining in the services for some time after peace comes. You and I know that probably one-third of the men in active service never had a job or vocation. They were boys taken from the high schools, colleges, and homes of America. Not having left a job when they entered the service, there will be no specific job open for them when they return. This presents the problem of siphoning back into civilian life 3,000,000 men who had no jobs.

There will probably be another 3,000,000 men, or more, who had jobs, who, if they are physically and mentally fit, will find those jobs waiting for them. But in this category we have to remember that there will be a large number who will not want to go back to the old job. They will have acquired training, knowledge, and skills which will make them desire other activities than those in which they were engaged before they entered the services.

Then there is a third class, composed of the men who are physically injured and the men who, as this veteran of the First World War said, "are confused," mentally upset, due to the hell of war.

We have taken all these boys out of the peace of America and put them into the military service of the Nation, where they have been scarred and seared by the experiences of war. We cannot, if we do our duty, simply pay these boys when they come back a sum of money called mustering-out pay and say that our obligation is performed.

I have this situation in mind: A lad who has been seriously injured. He is in the hospital and will possibly remain there 5 or 6 months. When he comes out he will be crippled for life. What are we doing about that chap? Are we saying that we can square that obligation by simply having the doctors and nurses look after him in the hospital and then pay him a lump sum or a pension when he is discharged? This man has a mind. While he is in the hospital he can be guided and directed; he can be enthused with the thought that life still can be a thing of adventure. Edison was deaf, and he was so "dumb" the school teacher said he would never amount to anything. Steinmetz, the great American scientist, was humpbacked, and yet we are told that he ranked second only to Edison.

Now, while this boy is in the hospital the Government should begin then and there to create in him a desire to accomplish. He should have educational facilities in the hospital and afterward. Many a man who has lost a limb has gone into the professions or some other mental work and become a very useful and worth-while citizen. Our boys want jobs, and the boys who are physically handicapped want to know that they can stand on their own feet again, figuratively speaking, and become useful citizens of the Republic. Brains are what count, and these boys, with their vast experience, if given a break, will use those brains and that experience in the interest of the Republic. But if we fail them, if we permit them simply to be regarded as wounded animals, then we indeed miss the mark and miss the opportunity that is ours.

My bill contemplates that the over-all authority for looking after the veterans shall be the Veterans' Administration. This Government agency, with its background of constructive work, with its lessons learned in the school of experience, is in a position to give of its vast knowledge in handling this problem. This agency should be authorized, of course, to make use of other agencies of State and the Nation. All qualified agencies will be needed. But when we think of these veterans we think, first, of men who will escape physical and mental injury and who may return at once to civilian life; and, second, of those who may not be injured physically but who will be scarred mentally and who will need spiritual rehabilitation.

This, I say, is the job of the Government that called them into service. It requires

the utilization of the best minds in the Nation during that period when the boys come back into this country and before they are discharged. No boy should be discharged who is in need of physical or mental, or both types of rehabilitation. We took millions of these men who were getting ready for college. That avenue, of course, is open to those who want it when they come back. But we should get the machinery into operation.

I have said that the Veterans' Administration will utilize the services of many agencies. I mean that, including the Army and the Navy; for as these boys come back, the company commander should see to it that every boy fills out a personal information blank. Every boy should be examined, and if, as I have stated, he is physically and mentally fit, and has a job, he can be discharged quickly. But if he falls into the other classifications, the Government should see that adequate guidance and direction are given, as well as adequate assistance. I repeat, mustering-out payments, except in the case of men physically and mentally fit and having a job, will not constitute adequacy.

That is why I introduced my bill, S. 1566, into the Senate, because I believe that no other agency or agencies are qualified individually except the Veterans' Administration to have the over-all authority. As I said before, the job will be so large, so tremendously challenging, that the Veterans' Administration will utilize and should be empowered to utilize every other constructive agency to do the job.

The Fighter's Right to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, January 18, 1944:

THE FIGHTER'S RIGHT TO VOTE

The soldier vote is the sort of ghost that will not down. The issue is still very much alive a month and a half after the Senate dropped the Green-Lucas bill, which would have provided Federal supervision of the balloting, and adopted a substitute measure handing all the responsibility back to the States. Indeed, Senator LUCAS has testified that he believes the original bill could now pass the Senate. Meanwhile the House Elections Committee has reported the substitute Eastland-McKellar-McClellan proposal by a vote of 7 to 5. There will be a minority report, backed by Chairman EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, and a fight will be made on the floor for something more than a meaningless gesture in favor of the service franchise.

Army and Navy officials have stated that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to administer 48 State election laws among soldiers and sailors scattered all over the globe. Senator GREEN, querying 48 Governors on their plans, had 41 replies. Fourteen States have called or held legislative sessions to revise their absentee-voting laws. Eight are satisfied with the laws they now have. Seventeen are waiting for Congress to act. Two contemplate no action. These prospects can hardly be called brilliant.

The proposed compromise bill would require the Army and Navy to distribute uniform ballots, which would be filled out under proper safeguards by the men and women in the armed services, the Red Cross, and the merchant marine. These would be delivered by free air mail to the appropriate State officials, and the counting would presumably be done in the voter's home district. Charges of violations of the election laws would be dealt with by the State courts.

It is difficult to see how such a proposal as this can be regarded as an infringement of States' rights. Anything less, certainly, would be an infringement of the rights of the men and women who have left their homes and are risking their lives for all the States and all the people.

Problems of the Dairy and Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. John Williams, a farmer in my district, living at Old Chatham, Columbia County, N. Y.

Mr. Williams is one of our best farmers, keeps exceptionally good records on his costs, and I feel that his letter relates, in a very clear way, the serious condition we find existing on the dairy and poultry farms here in the East.

The letter follows:

GOOD HOPE FARM,
Old Chatham, N. Y., January 14, 1944.

Hon. JAY LEFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JAY: I was very gratified the other day to receive a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from your office, carrying your very excellent speech of December 14 on the subsidy question. I also gathered, from the brief discussion that we had on the matter at New Paltz, that we are in agreement on the question of incentive subsidy versus consumer subsidies. As you may read in the press daily, if you take the trouble, certain aspects of the farm situation are chaotic. The present run on the hog market is perhaps normal in view of surplus hog population and the threat of lower prices. It really is the old law of supply-demand operating regardless of Government edict. However, should this rush to market continue, and should the hog prices remain relatively unfavorable (it is now lower than any month since March 1942) it is very possible that within the year we shall be suffering from an acute shortage of pork products. I doubt very much, by this time, if the average raiser of hogs has any confidence in a price structure that may be promised by the Government. The so-called floor on certain picked weights has not worked out with any marked degree of fairness to producers. Action to maintain confidence in a fair price structure would seem urgently called for in the immediate future.

As far as the beef market is concerned price ceilings have been deliberately set at a figure which precludes the production of good beef by most producers, and if you will look into the refrigerator rooms of any of the large packing companies and see the amount of scrubby beef that is hanging there and which is being sold to the consumer at pretty high retail prices, you can get some idea how badly we are doing, and how badly the consumer is being treated. Somebody in Washington remarked, last year, that in wartime we could not permit ourselves the luxury of producing choice and prime beef. I doubt very much if we can afford to have the average beef animal killed two or three hundred pounds under efficient weight. The potential beef loss is staggering, yet there is no other course open so long as the price ratio between the ceiling on beef and the cost of producing, as measured by labor and feed, are so badly out of just relationship. It is common gossip among beef men that they are being punished because in 1933 they refused to go along with triple A and slaughter all of their beef calves. This is a vicious thought, but the results of beef ceilings certainly do not allay suspicion. The only price control that has saved the beef situation at all is the artificially low price on corn, which has raised hob with the dairy and poultry industry.

Perhaps today the two farm enterprises, which are suffering the most are dairying and poultry. They represent, of course, the larger farm endeavor of the majority of our Eastern States, and provide the perishable products that are most in demand in our eastern centers of population. According to the conservative figures of a bulletin from the University of Connecticut, the over-all cost of dairy farming, as represented by feed prices, cow prices, and farm wages, have increased in aggregate more than 40 percent since December 1941. Since then the price received on milk has increased less than 10 percent. The figures I mention are for the State of Connecticut, which is faced perhaps with the most serious problem. The poultry industry, as you are well aware of, from many indignant outbursts on the part of your constituents is, at the present moment, suffering from even worse price disorders. For the past few weeks the egg market can only be characterized as tragically chaotic. Where the blame rests I do not know, but I have no doubt as to the result. If not corrected immediately, there will result very heavy cancelations on orders for new chicks. The result will be an abnormal shortage in the number of pullets going into production in the late fall months of 1944 and a serious shortage of both eggs and poultry.

If you will study the dairy and poultry industry, there are two factors which are causing most of the trouble. There are, of course, innumerable controls affecting both of these. The most serious dislocation is probably the cost of labor. Farm labor costs are inextricably joined to factory wages and it is only fair that they should be. There is no sound reason why a man or woman working on a farm should receive a disproportionately lower income for the work than a man or woman working in a war plant. My own experience is that the average farm wage in the area in which I live has increased about 75 percent since 1941. As pointed out above, the price of milk has increased less than 10 percent. Egg prices today, according to the commodity figures of the New York Times, are more than 25 percent under where they were a year ago. This relationship unquestionably is in a large part responsible for the continual decline in milk production in the New York milk shed, which in November was 15 percent under the same months in 1942. In fact, I believe the New York milk pool for November was the lowest on record. To the best of my knowledge this decline has not been checked as yet. As mentioned above, if the poultry situation is not corrected, there is every reason to believe that a similar drastic decline in the production of eggs and poultry will make its appearance.

As to the feed situation: I enumerate the cost of certain feeds for November 1942, November 1943, and January 1944. They still show an unchecked rise in cost to the farmer, with absolutely no just compensating rise in return for his produce. I include no cost for corn, as it has not been obtainable in the East for many months, and still isn't.

	November 1942, per ton	November 1943, per ton	January 1944, per ton
Oats	$46	$63	$65
Barley		60	62
Soybean meal	48	64	64
Linseed meal	42	58	58
Laying mash	57	73	74
18 percent dairy	50	63	65

The above increases are substantial and possibly represent top figures, as the administration belatedly placed ceilings on oats and barley at the highest price in 23 years. The increase in soybean meal and linseed meal was made by the Government itself, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the trust or monopoly handling those two commodities. The increase in oats and barley was brought about by farmers outside of the Corn Belt being forced to compete against each other for short supplies of these two commodities, as it was impossible to purchase any corn at the then ceiling price. Throughout these months nothing was done and no efforts were made to adjust the ceilings on farm produce in relation to increasing costs.

It is my emphatic belief that a fair price to farmers does not mean inflation, and I consider it grossly unfair that the farmers should be asked to carry the main burden of such deflationary efforts as are being made. If you will examine the index numbers in the latest farm economic bulletin of the department of economics at the State College of Agriculture, you can get a rather accurate picture of these various factors affecting the farmer. In the year 1918 earnings of factory workers stood at 164; in September 1943 they stood at 382. The cost of living in 1918 stood at 153, and in September 1943 the increase had been held to 175. Certainly an extraordinarily good job, but a job extremely favorable to organized labor. Farm prices, particularly the New York farms, stood at 186 in 1918 and were still at 186 in September 1943. Prices of articles the farmers buy stood at 173 in 1918 and 165 in September 1943. These figures show conclusively that we have been able to increase wages in this country because our increase in production has held down living costs. To repeat, this must be looked upon as a truly successful economic effort. The trouble with price controls on farm produce would seem to be that no fair consideration was given to the close relationship between farm-wage costs and factory-wage costs and that rigid ceilings were imposed on the cost of produce to the consumer without like ceilings being imposed on certain commodities which are essential to the production of such consumer items, milk, eggs, poultry, etc. If we care to gamble on the possibility of an early peace, we probably will struggle through satisfactorily; but should the conflict be long continued, I fear that a drastic decrease in farm production of farm commodities may set in, with a resultant unfair and unnecessary pinch on the consumer. It certainly should be noted that the consumer paid less of his income for food in 1943 than any year on record. The latest figures I have seen on the amount of income paid by organized labor for food declined from 35 percent in 1918 to something like 20 percent in 1943. If farm prices are at such an artificially low relationship in the present period, I have the gravest fears as to where they may go in the deflationary period that is certain at some time to follow the close of hostilities. It must always be borne in mind that our great depressions have first started with a collapse in the price of farm commodities. That such depressions can be caused by low prices for farm commodities is extremely reasonable if one considers the overwhelming proportion of land in this Nation that is given over to farming enterprises.

In light of the above there should be no question as to the necessity for consumer subsidies (with the unfortunate exception of the fixed-income group). The factory worker does not need cheaper food as he already is receiving the cheapest food on record. I view with the gravest apprehension the further removal of the cost of farm produce from the tried realm of economics into the realm of politics. Historically it has been disastrous to every nation in history that has ever followed such a course. Although I personally do not feel that consumer subsidies are inflationary, I do not propose to debate that issue here as I believe that inflationary or not the facts prove that consumer subsidies are not needed at the present time. What is vitally needed is an overhauling of the price structure (in so long as it is necessary to operate under price controls and there seems no doubt that for the duration they are necessary). It would seem essential that the prices for certain farm commodities be brought in just relationship. If this is not done we, and the world, might not, but we probably will, suffer from artificially reduced farm production. It would not seem that the remedies, except for political reasons, should be too hard to attain.

I hope the above may be of some assistance to you in judging farm problems as they may arise in Congress. I told you that I would write this letter 2 months ago, but it is probably wise that I have waited as certain current conditions have increasingly aggravated the over-all picture. Don't be afraid to be called a member of the farm bloc if there is such a thing. Do what you can, and I assure that your constituents will continue to appreciate your work as they have in the past. The comment is very favorable in this county.

With the best of luck to you.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN.

P. S.—There is a good possibility of my being able to make Washington within the next 2 or 3 weeks. Will let you know just as far in advance as possible.

P. P. S.—Since dictating the above I have seen the Department of Agriculture figures showing that the number of sheep and lambs on feed is the smallest in 4 years, and that the number of cattle on feed is down 16 percent from last year. Add your milk decline to this, consider a like result in hogs, poultry, and eggs, brace yourself for the clamor for food, and look for a good Kansas tornado shelter. You can't fool all of the farmers all of the time. They have been matching their wits against supply and demand far too long.

North Dakota the Bread Basket of the World

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to this body and to the country in general the production record of the farmers of North Dakota for the season of 1943, as set forth in the following table:

North Dakota

Commodity	Production			Acreage		
	1943	Average, 1937–41	1943 as percent of 1937–41	1943	Average, 1937–41	1943 as percent of 1937–41
Crops:	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Percent*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Percent*
Wheat	154, 156, 000	88, 437, 000	174	8, 500, 000	8, 740, 000	97
Corn	25, 335, 000	21, 017, 000	121	1, 188, 000	1, 109, 000	107
Oats	70, 924, 000	38, 098, 000	186	2, 228, 000	1, 816, 000	123
Barley	63, 648, 000	28, 781, 000	221	2, 826, 000	1, 859, 000	152
Flaxseed	15, 052, 000	2, 563, 000	587	2, 168, 000	564, 000	384
Irish potatoes	22, 100, 000	13, 539, 000	163	182, 000	143, 000	127
	Number	*Number*				
Pigs saved	1, 855, 000	752, 000	247			
Lambs saved	825, 000	653, 000	126			
Cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1	[1] 1, 780, 000	1, 256, 000	142			
Raised on farms:						
Chickens	13, 725, 000	7, 097, 000	193			
Turkeys	788, 000	1, 424, 000	55			
Production on farms:	*Dozen*	*Dozen*				
Eggs	51, 750, 000	27, 916, 000	185			
	Pounds	*Pounds*				
Milk	2, 226, 000, 000	1, 984, 000, 000	112			

[1] Jan. 1, 1944 (forecast made by livestock goal committee).

All crops except turkeys were increased, ranging from an increase of 12 percent in the case of milk to an increase of 587 percent in the case of flaxseed.

The falling off in turkeys can be accounted for largely by reason of two factors: The limited supply of hatching eggs available and the wet season. The absence of grasshoppers that swarmed over the country when the Dust Bowl was at its worst probably had something to do with it.

In the case of wheat, and North Dakota has practically no winter or soft wheat, we find a production of over 154,000,000 bushels or 25 percent of the wheat consumed annually in the United States, and since this was hard wheat North Dakota gets credit for producing in 1943, 50 percent of the hard wheat grown in the United States.

In the case of flaxseed North Dakota produced in 1943 over 15,000,000 bushels, or 35 percent of all flaxseed raised in the United States.

Pigs saved increased in 1 year by more than a million. Milk increased only 12 percent for the reason that farmers were so busy raising grain and other foods that they didn't have time to devote to dairying. When crops fail, however, milk increases; North Dakota does not make a business of dairying and turns to it only when forced by circumstances to do so.

In the case of potatoes the crop increased in 1 year more than 8,000,000 bushels, the total crop being over 22,000,000 bushels. The total potato crop in the United States was 464,656,000. This tremendous increase in North Dakota tells the story of the energy and determination of the farmers to produce food.

There are other startling facts in these figures. The average yield of wheat from 1937 to 1941 was 88,500,000 bushels. This year there was an increase of 65,719,000 bushels, and this increase was produced on less acreage than the average acreage for the same period. The drop in acreage for 1943 was 240,000 acres. This speaks volumes for the method of farming that has been developed under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. No one can visit North Dakota without being aware that all fields are farmed the same way—mostly strip farming—and that the results seem identical in every section of the State. While one strip is devoted to wheat, the next strip is being carefully tilled for the next year. By this method on the summer-tilled idle land the weeds are destroyed and the moisture conserved. The old method of raising, and being penalized for, foul seed has been replaced. The crops are clean and the farmers are not paying freight on millions of tons of weed seed to be given away at the terminals.

Speaking for the Department of Agriculture regarding the production of food in North Dakota, G. F. Geissler, director, western division, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, says:

The figures in the attached table on the production accomplishments of North Dakota's farm people tell in terse fashion the vigor and earnestness with which they are carrying out their important war roles. It is a story of great accomplishment in our war effort and a heavy contribution to the national food-production record for 1943.

Certainly, it summarizes a story in which North Dakota can take great pride. I know that you realize that this summary tells only the results, while the dramatic part of the story is the courage and resourcefulness of your farm folks in overcoming obstacles which many regarded as insurmountable. Against the year's production obstacles, it is an amazing accomplishment and a tribute to the patriotism and stamina of North Dakota's farm people.

You will note by the table that shifts in normal production patterns were made by your farmers to meet war needs, with flaxseed production an outstanding example.

Another story which this table tells is one of dividends being returned from the investment in recent years in our most important resource—our soil fertility. Higher yields are being obtained on many farms as a result of improved farming practices and soil conserving practices which farmers have adopted and utilized through the agricultural conservation program. Congress built a bank of soil fertility which is paying important dividends today by encouraging farmers through payments to maintain and improve the fertility of their soil.

All agencies of the Department of Agriculture cooperated in presenting to farmers the general picture of the Nation's huge 1943 food requirements. Farmer-elected committeemen of the A. A. A. contacted all farmers personally to assist them in making plans for their farms that would result in maximum contributions to the war effort. They also advised them regarding production aids such as price supports, machinery rationing, labor, transportation, etc. A similar procedure will be followed in presenting 1944 food needs to farmers.

Since our committeemen will again be working with food production throughout 1944 and will be administering numerous programs to aid production, it will be a privilege for me to report to you from time to time regarding the progress of the production effort. If, at any time, you wish to call upon this office for information, it will be a pleasure to serve you.

Mr. Speaker, this phenomenal production was accomplished in face of the greatest shortage of labor in the history of the State. With 100,000 of her sons and daughters serving in the armed forces and in war-production plants, yet the work was done and the crops saved. There was a united will to produce food and the normal manpower was supplied short-handed farmers working day and night, by women, by children too young for the task, by businessmen, professional men and women closing their offices and driving to the nearest fields, by commercial and other civic clubs forming work battalions, by the United States Army sending troops into the harvest fields. In no class were the people of North Dakota too proud to go into the fields as common laborers and save this bountiful crop which nature had permitted.

Personally, I saw a boy of 10 operating a combine with no other help. This boy was harvesting, threshing, and delivering the grain to grain tanks, keeping this complicated machine in order and oiled.

That in short tells the story of the determination of the people of North Dakota to win this war. That same spirit exists on the fighting fronts. The story of the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry in the South Pacific in bravery, heroism, and sacrifice has no equal in this or any other war.

Each and every other State is making a similar contribution, and with this united spirit I say to you now, that nazi-ism and fascism are doomed. The attempt of a few leaders on this earth to crush free people by murder, rape, slavery, and wholesale slaughter will come to a final reckoning and those whom they have attempted to crush will preside over the tribunals that will condemn them.

The Service Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter I received from the Honorable Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of the city of Detroit, urging the passage of a uniform system by the Congress to enable the members of our armed forces to vote in the election this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there an objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. As a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, I indeed regret that a majority of that committee saw fit to report a bill pertaining to the service vote, which in reality is but a gesture, and although approximately one-fifth of the voters of this country are now in the armed forces, if the bill, as reported, is enacted into law, it cannot possibly accomplish the desired results, and the men and women in our armed forces—despite all you hear to the contrary—will not be able to cast their votes in the election this year.

Under the power of the Constitution, Congress declared war on our enemies and also enacted other legislation which has placed our men and women in our armed forces in every theater of this global war, and in my opinion, Congress has the same authority to provide legislation of a national character that will enable the Army and Navy in a simplified and uniform law to take the ballots to the members of our armed forces wherever dispersed and return them to the respective States. It is quite apparent that 48 States cannot do the job because in the last national election out of approximately 4,000,000 men and women in our armed forces, only 28,000 ballots were cast.

I sincerely trust that the membership of this House will substitute the Worley bill (H. R. 3982) for the Senate bill, as amended and reported out by a majority of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. The provisions of the Worley bill will make certain that the men and women in our armed forces will be given the privilege of casting their votes for national officials in the election this year.

I am indeed pleased that the common council of the city of Detroit has formally memorialized Congress to this effect and are erecting booths throughout the city to facilitate the signing of petitions to the Congress, urging the passage of satisfactory legislation that will enable the men and women of our armed forces to cast their vote for national officers in the next election.

Under the permission just granted by the House to revise and extend my remarks, I will insert herewith a communication from His Honor, Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of the city of Detroit.

CITY OF DETROIT,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
January 13, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN LESINSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In my opinion every opportunity should be extended to our soldiers to vote in the elections this year.

It has been made plain in Congress, in the public press, and on the radio that there is no objection to soldiers voting.

However, no feasible method for soldiers to vote has been proposed except that outlined in the original Green-Lucas-Worley bill, without the crippling amendment added by the Senate.

The fundamental arrangement should be for a simplified uniform ballot, distributed by the Federal authorities, with the customary local authorities counting and tabulating the votes of their respective soldier voters.

The Common Council of the City of Detroit has formally memorialized Congress to this effect and, on petition from citizens, has ordered booths erected in Grand Circus Park and elsewhere to facilitate signing of petitions to Congress urging the passage of such legislation.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD J. JEFFRIES, Jr.,
Mayor.

Amendment of Selective Service Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, so great has become the shortage of pulpwood and other materials used in the manufacture of paper products, that unless immediate relief is extended to this industry, our war effort will be gravely impaired. Because of manpower shortages, pulpwood production has recently reached a new low requiring the curtailment of most plants engaged in making newspaper print and other paper products which are vitally needed to carry on many other industries. This shortage threatens to strike a blow at our free American press by cutting down newspapers to the danger point. It will also disable in marked degree industries engaged in the packaging and wrapping of war goods, including food, munitions, supplies, equipment, and other essential military accessories.

While only some of the mills have been forced to close down completely up to this time, most of them are operating at a greatly reduced scale. With further curtailments in immediate prospect, I am most apprehensive that unless these conditions are relieved at once, very serious consequences will ensue. The conditions this bill seeks to remedy are Nation-wide and are not confined to any one section of the country. Several of the large pulpwood mills in the Northwest are already closed, while others in the eastern part of the country are on the verge of closing.

Many lines of so-called household paper have been affected and with supplies running short in retail stores, the public is bound soon to feel the impact of this situation. I earnestly hope that Congress will speedily enact this legislation and that the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service System will promptly issue appropriate regulations sending badly needed labor to the stricken areas of the country.

Our newspapers, magazines, and other publications have been cut down approximately 25 percent and I am fearful that our free American press will be put in jeopardy if further curtailments are found necessary.

The bill reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to defer registrants engaged in timber or pulpwood logging operations

Be it enacted, etc., That section (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. (k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor or in timber or pulpwood logging operations essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work."

For Our Returning Heroes

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress must give the matter of rehabilitation of our returning heroes deep study. Congress means to restore every returning veteran to usefulness and self-confidence. A soldier who is in need of Government aid or maintenance should not have to ask for it. Every man or woman who receives an honorable discharge from the services and who is disabled or unable to obtain employment should be considered for a pension. Our returning heroes should not have to wait for, or beg for, a pension.

For those who have been injured or disabled, there should be adequate hospitalization until they are ready to accept employment and to take the places in society they held before entering the service of their country. Our veterans should receive free treatment in Government hospitals until they have fully recovered. If they are disabled and their condition is caused or aggravated by service, they are entitled to hospitalization. Their health must be insured so that they will be able to take over their old jobs that are waiting for them or any other jobs that they prefer.

Those who left a university education to enter the service should have the right to continue their education after their discharge at the expense of the Government for at least as long a period as they have served their country, or as long as their interests and the interests of the public are benefited thereby.

Those who attended college or a university should have their tuition and incidental fees paid by the Government, and these allowances should also be made to married men who desire to continue their education.

Those who do not care for further college education, and who need or request a vocational training should be given vocational training in the various vocational schools throughout the country at Government expense. Such vocational training should be designed for returning members of the services who have had no previous training or who desire to brush up on the training or skill they have in order to go back to their prewar occupations on an equal footing with others.

Returning veterans who lived on farms before they entered the service, and who wish to reestablish themselves on farms should be given Government assistance to purchase tracts of good land upon easy and reasonable terms so that they may become good and successful farmers and farm owners.

The Government and the people should cooperate to make the load of the returning veteran easier as he reestablishes himself in civil life. The necessary machinery must be set in motion to help returning veterans into jobs. Veterans who are unable to get work immediately after discharge from the service should be entitled to unemployment compensation until they do find employment. To afford work and jobs for returning veterans as well as for the civilian population, all war plants in this country should be changed over from war production to civilian consumer production just as soon as these plants are no longer needed in the war effort.

To assure all returning veterans of adequate medical, surgical, and hospital care, the Government should enact a program of construction of veterans' hospitals throughout the land to supplement the military hospitals already in existence. In my opinion the Army should discontinue its practice of asking returning veterans who are about to be discharged to sign a waiver of all claim against the Government for physical disability due to military service.

The Making of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given by Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, on the radio on December 25.

This address was a part of the program of the Metropolitan Opera, and I feel sure that it will be of great interest to the Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the day dedicated throughout the western world to peace. This is a day of war also—like another. It is not strange or inappropriate that we should dedicate a day of war to peace. Nevertheless, the war that changes everything changes this day also. There is an irony in the talk of peace in time of war that edges the familiar words until they wound us. This is the day of peace, the words say. But to us they say, One day out of how many days? And of what peace?

When we speak to each other of peace in the welter of blood and of agony in which the world now lives, of men dying day after day in unimaginable numbers and by every death—by mutilation with iron, by drowning at sea, by calculated torture, by cold, heat, hunger, disease, by every death by which men have died before and by many deaths unknown until this generation—when we use the words for peace to each other in this time of war, the irony answers us: What peace?

Is it the old lethargic peace we mean, the peace of the twenties and thirties, the peace that lasts from one war till the next? Is the peace we mean the peace of those who say, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof"? Is the peace we mean the peace of those who used to tell us, "If we leave them alone, they'll leave us alone"; of those who used to tell us, "It takes two to make a war"; of those who used to say, "The Atlantic is 3,000 miles across and the Pacific is broader"; of those who used to sit back in the soft seats of the afternoon automobiles and refuse to be bothered? Is it this peace, the fatuous peace, the irresponsible peace, the peace that has killed more men in the last 4 years than the war makers; is it this we mean when we talk about peace on this Christmas?

Or is it another peace we mean? Is it the new peace the wise men are starting to talk about, now that the war will be won? Is it the new peace of the hard-headed men who know what the score is, who know all the answers; the new peace of those who are learning to say that God helps those who help themselves; that God's on the side of the heavy battalions? Is it the peace of those who tell us the best treaty of peace is the biggest Navy; of those who say, "If the oceans aren't wide enough, widen the oceans"; of those who say, "Grab for the bases, hang onto the islands, buy up the airways, build a fence to the stratosphere, lock the gate, kick the foreigners out, and lock the gate after them"? Is it the hard-headed peace, the strong-arm peace, the loud-mouthed peace, the peace that is war in suspense, war without motion, the lasting peace that will last while the gun is aimed, while the Army is ready to march, while the bombers are ready? Is it this we mean by peace in the year of Tarawa, in the year of Salerno, in the year of the Russian dead and the dead on the deserts? Is the peace we mean the armed peace, the war without warfare, the peace that devours the peacemakers, bleeding them white, rotting their liberties, raising the stones themselves of the earth to hate them? Is it peace by the sword and to end by the sword we mean?

We have heard the word both ways in the time we live in. We have heard the fatuous speech about peace being something that comes of itself if you hate war hard enough, something you get without effort or struggle by wanting it—the way the Dutch and Norwegians got it by wanting it. We have heard the realistic speech about peace being something you get if you're strong and you take it, something you get with a whip like a tiger's obedience—the way the Nazis have got it in Norway and Holland—the way the hard-headed men have always got it—and lost it—losing themselves and their nations.

And which do we mean? Which will we say we mean to the young men living and dead who deserve to know what we mean? Shall we tell them the peace we mean is the armed peace, the peace imposed at the point of a gun by an army of millions? Shall we tell them the peace we mean is the fat peace, the negligent peace, the slumbering peace of the automobiles on the Sunday afternoons in the croon of the radios—the peace that comes of itself without effort and goes without effort?

Or is there a different peace we mean when the irony cuts at us? Is there a peace of which we can speak without shame to those who have died for peace, as we've told them, and those who have not yet died? Is there a peace that a man can speak of with honesty facing the millions living and those dead?

It is there that the irony cuts at us most when we talk of peace on this Christmas. We know that the young who die will die because we did not make a peace before when the last war ended. We know that the young who die will die to buy us a second chance to make a peace. We know that when we talk of peace they remember this. The word has the taste of shame in our mouths when we speak it.

It is right we should feel shame. We are a generation guilty of two wars within 20 years, and the second we could have prevented with wisdom and courage. We are a generation which failed to make the peace we owed to the dead of one World War, who were our brothers; and we talk now of peace to the living and dead of another war, who are our sons.

But nevertheless if we are a guilty generation we are fortunate also. We have learned what our failure was while the chance of action remains to us. Time that does not often return to the things done and the things not done has returned for us. What we failed before to do from sickness of heart and from lethargy, letting the old men trick us with their tempters' talk of a world reverting to normalcy—what we failed to do out of folly and falsehoods before, time has given us one more chance to do.

And we know what must be done. We know that peace must be made. We know that peace is a thing to be made, not accepted; a thing to be made, not reduced to a treaty on paper; a thing to be made as a city is made, as anything great and difficult is made, by labor, by labor in common, by labor in common of all whom it touches, by continuing labor, increasing labor, labor that does not end with a meeting or conference, labor that does not limit itself to a few men in a room at a table, labor of peoples, labor of nations.

We have talked about making peace before but peace has never been made in the world's history. Peace has been put upon paper. Peace has been faked with a great army and navy enforcing fear. But peace has never been made in human history as a positive thing, a created thing, a thing that the peoples create and in common to serve them, a positive structure and fabric of common peace constructed by labor in common of science and learning for life's sake and for hope in it.

Our generation knows, as no generation before it has ever known, that peace must be made. Our generation knows that it will have its second chance to make a peace. If we mean when we talk of peace on this Christmas that peace will in truth be made when the war is won—that nothing this time will stop us from making peace—that neither lies nor deceptions nor tricks nor our own weariness will prevent us—if we mean this we can speak of peace to the living and dead without shame. If we do not mean it—if it is less than this we mean—if we mean it with reservations, with caution, with carefulness—then let us in common decency be quiet and not talk of peace. For nothing is true or honest in the talk of peace but our own purpose. And the choice is ours.

Address by the Vice President at Meeting of Governors of Southern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last evening, January 17, 1944, a conference of southern Governors was held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., to consider the problem of discriminatory freight rates affecting the industrial development of the South and the West. On that occasion the Vice President of the United States delivered a very able address offering constructive advice on the subject, the development of the productive resources of the South and the West. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After this war we must make full use of all our productive resources. Such full use of resources on a national scale requires the fullest development of regional economies in the South, the Southwest, the Middle West, and the Far West. Every enlargement in the income of one region increases the markets for the goods and services produced by other regions. The Southern Governors' Conference has long devoted itself to promoting the industrialization of the South by both regional and national action.

The South, like the West, has suffered from a lack of balance in its economy. Too great dependence upon cotton, lumbering, and mining has exposed the South to extreme fluctuations of income. The South's failure to achieve a balanced economy explains many of its ills—restricted opportunities for southern business and industry, a loss of many young people to the North, low per capita incomes in comparison with the rest of the country, and lower standards of living.

You are all acquainted with the causes of economic backwardness in the South. You can supply chapter and verse to illustrate each of the situations which has handicapped the South and kept it in a colonial status. Your products have been discriminated against by State trade barriers. Your manufacturers have been excluded from markets by discriminatory differentials in transportation costs. Industries have suffered from lack of capital, capital being withheld because the expansion of southern enterprises would compete with other businesses in which the bankers were already interested. Where industrial developments have taken place there has often been absentee ownership that has operated southern plants in the interests of perpetuating control over national markets through Pittsburgh-plus price schemes and other monopoly devices. In short, the failure of the South to build a balanced regional economy can be told in terms of vested interests seeking to protect uneconomic profits through control of finance, control of productive capacity, mo-

nopolistic pricing of transportation services, and control of markets.

If we are agreed as to the problem and its causes, what shall be the solution? We must continue to seek a solution in constructive action that will eliminate the causes and not merely deal with symptoms. We must seek a national solution, not a narrowly regional one, for the highest standard of living for the people of each region is to be found in a progressive national economy, not in a series of isolated regional economies. Inasmuch as the solution must be sought in national measures as well as in regional action, you must join forces with like-minded leaders in other sections of the country. Such a program will certainly meet with an enthusiastic response from the Governors of western States and should appeal to any Governor of New York who is genuinely interested in the general welfare. You all know that regional action that is incompatible with a sound national economy offers no solution—trade barriers in the South are no solution for trade barriers erected against southern products elsewhere; depressed southern wage levels are no answer to other handicaps under which some southern manufacturers operate. No solution is sound which does not promote an expanding national income and an equitable distribution of that income.

What measures are essential to assure the full development of a balanced economy in the South?

First, there must be free access to national markets for southern products. Interstate trade barriers must be removed. These barriers have been erected to give special favors to selfish interests that have succeeded in using the powers of Government for their own profit and to the detriment of the plain folks.

Free access to national markets requires the removal of discriminatory freight rates which handicap southern businessmen who seek to sell in national markets. Whatever the historic origin of the country's freight-rate structure, there is no doubt that its perpetuation, through private rate bureaus and private rate-making conferences, effectively stifles the expansion of southern industry. I have urged that this private rate-making machinery be stripped of its power to continue its monopolistic pricing of transportation services and that the Interstate Commerce Commission should protect the public interest in accordance with the direction of Congress.

Second, there must be free access to capital markets. At present, all industrial developments that must appeal to the capital markets for funds to establish or expand their operations are subject to a veto by the New York money market, whose dominant bankers are already interested in established enterprises in virtually every industry and who are naturally not eager to facilitate the establishment of competing firms. The breaking of the monopoly power of financial groups is a task for the Federal Government. But the ultimate solution must be found in the development of regional capital markets that will take the savings of the region and direct them into regional industry. The Southern Governors' Conference can do a job of permanent importance by enlisting local business and financial leaders in a movement to establish such regional capital markets.

Third, there must be access to new technologies and industrial know-how. Through control of patents, the larger enterprises in many industries are able to stifle the launching of new undertakings in the South and elsewhere. The solution here must be national—a revision of our patent laws to make them serve the fundamental purpose for which the founding fathers created our patent system, namely, to "promote progress in science and the useful arts," and not to serve as the vehicle for the establishment of protected industrial preserves.

Fourth, there must be a supply of trained manpower. The end of the war will find the country with the largest reserves of trained manpower in its history. But the industrial arts progress, and there is a constant need for men with new skills and new training. The several States may well undertake to provide industrial training in conjunction with their local industries, for those preparing to enter industry, as well as for those already in industry who wish to qualify for better jobs.

Fifth, there is the question of management. In place of absentee control and direction of regional industries and plants as part of the strategy of some national or international combine, there must be independent local managements seeking to promote the growth and expansion of local enterprises. This state of affairs will be advanced by the growth of regional capital markets, aided by appropriate Federal action to maintain truly competitive conditions throughout industry.

If we create sound regional economies, we shall have won the first battle to achieve full use of our productive resources. Every community in the Nation will benefit from measures which raise living standards in any region.

Servicemen—They Are Thinking As Well As Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the men and the women coming home they will demand an accounting. It may be well then that we read some of their letters. The following is from the Letters From the People column of the January 6 issue of the News-Palladium, Benton Harbor, Mich.:

I want to show you a bit of hallowed ground—it is the Arlington Cemetery of the South Pacific; it is the Valhalla of American servicemen. I'm going to show you this bit of ground, but it will be done the hard way. Come with me up Sealark Channel on that dawn of August 7, 1942. The feeling of living in a vacuum tells you that this is the thing that these men have waited for so long. Like actors that have rehearsed well their lines, the marines and sailors stand there in the hush of the opening curtain.

Yes, Mr. Striker, I want you to stand at the rail with these men, nerves drawn as taut as a violin string—mouth dry, eyes strained to the breaking point, breath coming in short gasps of fear—that awful feeling of nothingness in the pit of your stomach. The objective comes into view, the time has come for these men to step out on the stage, and they know full well that death plays the leading role in this theater. There they go over the side of the big transport, Tom Jones, Dick Brown, Harry Smith, hand-over-hand they crawl down the cargo nets into their small craft that is to take them to a rendezvous with that death. You know it's death—it is in the destiny of these men. An attempt at a small joke, a few scattered laughs, as the small craft pull away from the protection of the mother ship.

The first objective is reached—the coconut grove at the water's edge. Men are down never to rise again, but like some great tidal wave, other men move up to take the places of the fallen. The main objective is an airfield beyond that fringe of coconut trees, and as though God Himself has pulled the curtain on this brutal stage, their movements become vague and finally obliterated and these movements become lost to you. The uncertainty, the utter feeling of helplessness leaves the element of time suspended in the hellish hot sun of the tropics.

Close your eyes, Mr. Defense Plant Worker, close them tight; it is another day, in another month; your hands are gripping another rail, the inevitable coconut-tree rail that separates the living from the dead in these areas of war. You can open your eyes now, Mr. Coal Miner, open them wide. Yes, the seeds that have been planted have grown into bloom; the bloom is the row upon row of white crosses that meet the eye. These men have paid the price in full for just 7 small acres of ground, but 7 of the most important acres of ground ever owned by Uncle Sam. Restful, isn't it? peaceful and quiet—yes, quiet with eternal peace. Read the epitaphs, Mr. Labor Leader, they tell a story in themselves—America, the land of the free. One sees the Star of David beside a pair of rosary beads owned by some Irishman. A captain of marines and a colored boy from Georgia sleep side by side—a lieutenant from Indiana, a sailor from North Dakota, an aviator from Ohio, from here, from there, from every star in the flag, a cross in the ground. Tom Jones, Dick Brown, Harry Smith. It's their home now, some 7,000 miles from home. These men were making $50 a month, Mr. Striker, $50 a month, room and board.

Mr. John L. Lewis, look up into the misty blue of yon mountain top that frames this cemetery. Is that a vision I see? Is that the murmuring of the trade winds, or is it some message He is trying to convey to you and yours? I believe I hear it; I think it is a message, and the murmuring seems to say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

"For the want of the nail the shoe was lost, for the want of the shoe the horse was lost, for the want of the * * *." We got some news out here the other day, Mr. Labor Leader, the kind of news that hurts, the kind of news that makes a man wonder if this thing is worth the price. No! Not in money, Mr. Defense Worker, but in something that you seem to have lost.

When you were a kid you studied about the American heritage of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Read it again and then again; study it; delve back into the pages of American history and show me anything in the American creed of living that will justify your wartime strikes. Come out here with us in these South Pacific waters and stay a while. Eat our chow, sleep in our sacks, watch us work, help us fight these jungle flies, help us kill dangerous, malaria-bearing mosquitoes. Walk with us through the mud and the slime of the swamps of these jungle islands; walk with us in the sweltering, sultry, steamy heat of a noonday sun. There isn't any air conditioning out here, Mr. C. I. O., and there isn't any way you can strike for it, either. You haven't even the time to think about it.

Come with me to the bridge over the jungle river. I want you to see someone who would make you ashamed of that extra 50 cents an hour you get in your pay envelopes. He's just a 17-year-old kid that the brass hats put on duty at this infrequent bridge for the simple reason that he isn't sure of himself any more. Did I hear you ask what's wrong with him? He was on a destroyer that took three "fish" amidships and blew up, Mr. Twenty-Dollars-a-Day-Man. His brother was on that ship, too. There were but a few survivors from a crew of 300, and his brother

was not among them. He's plainly shell-shocked. Talk to him a while, watch him; he'll break your heart, man, if you have one. Did you ask how much money he makes—$50 a month, Mr. Welder, $50 a month, room and board.

Here's a guy I want you to meet—a left-handed marine. What's so remarkable about that? I should make myself clear. He's learning to be a left-handed marine. A Jap slashed off his right hand at the wrist as he was climbing out of a fox hole on Guadalcanal He is making $50 a month, room and board. His room, since last August, has been a stinking, muddy hole, and his board has been canned, untasty food—when he has time to eat it. Ask him how nearsighted the Jap is reputed to be. He'll tell you that in a morning check-up no less than 25 of his buddies were found dead at their posts, shot through the head, Mr. Slacker. Found 7,000 miles from home in a God-forsaken hole on a God-forsaken bit of land. Not very nice to hear about, is it? But it's the brutal truth. Think about it the next time you sit over a big steak dinner in your comfortable home.

See that boy sitting over there on that hatch cover, Mr. A. F. of L.? He's only 22—just a boy, maybe the one that lived down the street from you. He looks down in the mouth; doesn't he? Why shouldn't he? Sometime this week his wife is going to have a baby, but he's not going to be there when it happens. He has to stay out here for the duration. Don't you suppose he is thinking something like this: "1945—now if this damn thing is over by then my kid will be almost 3 years old. Hell, I'll be a stranger, not only to my kid but the wife will hardly know me any more. But one thing about it, the Government will give me an extra twelve a month for the little shaver. Wonder if it's a boy or a girl; hope it's a boy. I wonder if my wife is well. Please, God, she doesn't die—she can't die—I've got to get home." Fifty dollars a month, Mr. Coal Miner, $50 a month, room and board.

What are you going to do, Mr. Railroader, when the eerie sound of the air-raid siren sends out its warning cry over Los Angeles, 'Frisco, Seattle, Middletown, Peoria—the small and the large, they're all bomb sights. Those eggs the Japs lay weigh 500 pounds apiece—Be sure one isn't laid in your front yard—your children may be out there. What are you going to send up in the sky, Mr. Striker, to fight off those madmen from Japan—dollar bills? Don't think it can't happen over here.

A ship is bringing in a cargo today that you might be interested in, a cargo of human suffering. Come down to the quay with me and witness the transition of young America. Yes; there is the familiar little locomotive and her white-painted coaches, each carrying the red cross of mercy on its side. She is here to take away these human derelicts; it's an old story to her. A little to the left of the train is a great Army band standing rigidly at attention. The big hospital ship slowly comes into her berth, and as the ground crew makes her fast to the wharf, one hears the band softly playing the music these men loved so well: My Old Kentucky Home, Beautiful Ohio, On the Banks of the Wabash.

The men on the wharf become tense; the music has a sound to it that is of the infinite as all eyes are strained toward the slowly descending gangway. The first man of these thousands of battered troops tortuously feels his way to the ground the band strikes up the Star-Spangled Banner as soldier after soldier follows in his wake.

But what is this? What is wrong? These men have to be led. They aren't sure of themselves as they stumble and fumble their way down to Mother Earth. Mr. John L. Lewis, look into eyes that are open, but see not. Watch lips that move, but say nothing. Look at the stumps dangling from their bodies that once were arms and legs. Look into the souls of these shell-shocked, fear-ridden, malaria-sick men that are not men but sacks of skin and bones. Nerves gone, minds temporarily damaged, bodies numb from being stretched on the searing, tearing rack named war.

Yes, Mr. C. I. O., these men that are no longer men, have paid part of the price with their arms and their legs, their eyes, their nerves—but stay a while, don't leave me now. Do you hear the bugle in the far distance blowing taps, it has an unearthly sound and it is for the unearthly that it is being played. The band in an undertone plays on and one hears their music as though they were playing in a thick, gray fog. The big boom on the hospital ship swings downward and picks up the last of her cargo—the wicker baskets of the dead. Look around you, man. Those are tears you see in the eyes of these hard-bitten veterans, they who have just witnessed a scene from God's greatest of plays. Life and Death. The baskets are lowered to the cold concrete of the dock and draped with the flag that they gave their lives for. Their work is done, their race is over, these men have paid their price in full.

Yes, Mr. Defense Plant Striker, these men were getting $50 a month, $50 a month, room and board.

On and on it goes, things too horrible to mention in black and white, unbelievable things, things that would make your hair stand on end; the story of the five Sullivan brothers on the cruiser *Juneau*, the one about Schmidt, Diamond, and Rivers, marine on Guadalcanal, the story of the Coral Sea, Wake Island, the Argonne, Belleau Wood, Bull Run, Gettysburg, Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill—the cradles of our liberty. Each battle, each life sacrificed that in some future date men and women like you and I can live and worship and talk in the peace and security of an American people united.

Address by the Postmaster General at Syracuse, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, at Syracuse, N. Y., on Saturday, January 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many years of pleasant association bind me to Syracuse and its people. It is especially pleasing for me to be with you tonight. United as we are in a common cause, I know we have been thinking along the same lines. It is good for us to be here.

Some of our friends who differ from us, think that we look to our Jackson dinners as occasions for sounding the clarion of political partisanship. But if they bore responsibility as we bear the responsibility, in days such as these, they would think and talk more in terms of the interests of America.

It is true that throughout the years, the Democratic Party has drawn inspiration and strength from the spirit of Andrew Jackson. In the last decade we have invoked Jackson's name when the times cried out to us to steel ourselves in service to the Nation. Then, the need was to bring to the common man, for whom Jackson fought, the devoted service of government. In Jackson's name, and true to Jackson's principles, we prevailed. Tonight we gather again and once more the spirit of Andrew Jackson pervades our hearts. If in the past, devotion to Jackson's principles was needed in the guidance of America, the present hour pleads for men consecrated to that patriotism for which Andrew Jackson stood.

These times are so grave, the problems confronting America so serious, and their correct solution so vital—that the decisions we reach during this year of 1944 will have a profound effect upon the whole world and upon the future of civilization.

Jackson was more than a fighter and more than a patriot. He was a great American. Let us who walk in his tradition ask ourselves—as that blunt, patriotic, great man would ask—What is our responsibility to our country as the majority party in this election year?

It is a time for taking stock. We must look at the serious present needs, we must look to the sobering future and we can be guided only by the past. The people of America know what confronted our party in 1933, after 12 years of inaction and irresolution by the opposition. The Democratic administration met the challenge of the times. It offered leadership, leadership based on the firmest of all foundations—the welfare of the Nation. In the ensuing years this Democratic administration achieved its program—it established, in our America, the right of men to work to support their families, it provided social security, insured savings, protected investors, and it sponsored an intelligent agricultural policy to give our farmers a chance to win economic freedom. It is a story of action, action boldly taken on a simple principle, the welfare of America.

In this election year the responsibility of the Democratic Party is an even greater one. It is our solemn duty to bring home to the American people the necessity of placing in control of the affairs of Government a Congress and an administration determined not only to win the war but to win the peace and to preserve America.

As men and women devoted to a responsible party, what are we called upon to do? In terms of the war, the peace, and the future of America, let us examine the situation.

No one, not even our friends of the opposition, would deny that the Democratic administration has fulfilled its responsibility in the conduct of the war. Our task was to provide military leadership, to raise and equip armed forces to save the Nation from the blackest danger in its history. The best equipped, the most admirable Army and Navy in American history have taken the initiative away from the enemy, they have forced his vaunted war machine into reverse gear. More than this, the administration moved boldly and courageously to weld the United Nations into a single, terrible weapon.

The manhood of the Nation, given this direction, will win this war. As a party, what are we doing for peace? With deliberation, I say to you that in my lifetime no more important issue has arisen. I say that those in American public life never before were faced with so momentous a question. The responsibility before long will be for the party in control of the American Government to win a peace. If America's leaders succeed, they will have done their duty and America will have triumphed despite great obstacles. If they fail, they will hurl another insult to the aspirations of mankind. They will have failed the dead who fell fighting

for us, the living who suffer, the unborn who shall be summoned to die when the trumpets of war next sound the retreat from reason.

Well, what are we doing about it? Thank God, our record is sound. I know the days and nights of anxiety of the President and those associated with him. I know their consecration to this one task—the study, the labor that has gone into it. The months to come will reveal the story of their accomplishment. They are building the structure of peace. They work for America and for humanity. They are earnest in their work. They shall not fail.

When peace comes—and pray God it will be soon—new problems will come with it. In the past the Democratic Party refused to tolerate a situation where the breadwinner walked the streets in a futile search for work. The Democratic Party now is determined that the conversion from war to peace will not bring about such a situation again. We mean what we say. Our party abhors futility and inaction. In grave international problems, as in domestic matters, the Democratic Party has shown itself capable of sensing the needs and applying the remedy. As we looked reality in the face in the past, we shall face reality courageously in the future.

One problem that is already with us, which grows in importance with each passing day, illustrates how a responsible political party must rise to the Nation's defense. In enlightened America, even school children know how serious is the threat of inflation. In the face of such a threat, America has a right to demand that responsible political parties grapple with the problem and cooperate to save the Nation.

This Democratic administration, standing where it has always stood, faced the issue and instituted a program. To do so, it had to impose controls—controls new to America, controls which the administration recognized would be distasteful and unpopular. The Democratic administration saw its duty and the Democratic administration is doing its duty.

In seeking support and advice from all elements, the administration manifested its readiness to take the issue of inflation control out of the realm of politics. To the shame of some, it must be said that they not only failed to point to a better way but they failed to cooperate—they failed to meet their obligations to the people of America.

The record will show that some told the wage earner that wage stabilization was unsatisfactory, and at the same moment told the farmer that control of farm prices was undesirable. The record will show that some told consumers that inflation control was not worth its price in the inconvenience of rationing. It will be for them to answer to the charge of attempting to divide the people of America against themselves. Those who did these things did not seek the welfare of the United States. They sought power. And the farmer, the wage earner, the investor, and the home owner know that if given power they would do to them as they did in the past.

We shall go before the country in this campaign year of 1944 and report to the country what we did, and we shall not be afraid. We shall concede that gas rationing is unpopular. We shall concede that butter is scarce. We shall concede that wage stabilization is not popular with everyone and we shall concede that price control is not popular with everyone. But we shall tell the people of America that we are more concerned in preserving our country than in winning an ephemeral popularity. We shall leave the jokes to those who would base jokes upon their country's peril.

Critical years face America just beyond November 1944. America needs an administration in control of the affairs of Government which is worthy of responsibility. Inaction, letting things take care of themselves, fostering one sectional group and penalizing another social group—such policies do not point the path to solution of the problems which will confront this country.

My friends, we who are gathered here tonight in memory of that great American, Andrew Jackson—we know the spirit and the patriotism, the principles and the ideals—of the Democratic Party. We know the capacity of our party to face reality—we know our party's record of service to America as a whole and we know our achievements.

Possessed of this knowledge, fired with this faith, we have a responsibility as patriots—it is for us to bring the truth to the people. Given the truth, the people will see to it that we prevail.

"Don't Nail His Ears to the Post"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of January 18, 1944:

"DON'T NAIL HIS EARS TO THE POST"

Instructors in the diminishing art of equitation, or horseback riding, are accustomed to tell their students to keep a light rein on the horse's mouth. It gets better results out of him than yanking and jerking at the bit.

The mayor, we think, might ponder this principle in dealing with what he sees as a rising tidal wave of anti-Semitism in New York City. We thought he was heavy-handed day before yesterday when he put Patrolman James L. Drew on station WNYC to apologize to New Yorkers for an offense of which Drew had been twice cleared.

The alleged offense consisted in not liking Jews. Police Commissioner Valentine first investigated Drew and cleared him; then a committee appointed by the mayor and made up of ex-Police Commissioner George V. McLaughlin and ex-Judges Frederick E. Crane and Edward R. Finch, of the court of appeals, upheld Valentine's decision. Then the mayor caused Drey to apologize on the Sunday City Hall radio program, anyway. Why?

This city is now the biggest city in the world, and the finest, with the handsomest buildings, best restaurants and hotels and saloons, best theaters and parks and hospitals, etc., etc., to be found anywhere. It got that way because its almost limitless assortment of racial and religious groups were able to get along well together.

Racial and religious prejudices do exist, and it is fatuous to pretend they don't. It's natural for most Jews to prefer Jews to Catholics and Protestants; for most Catholics to feel that they have an edge on Protestants and Jews; for most Protestants to harbor ideas of superiority over Jews and Catholics.

But New Yorkers have been able to keep those natural feelings in the background—just as when you go to a party you don't walk up to some other guest and say, "I never did like Catholics, anyway, and I don't like you." We've had a grand and productive party on Manhattan Island and surrounding territory for many generations.

Of late, however, agitators have been trying to split us up into warring racial and religious groups. The times are favorable to these persons' efforts, because the war tragedies and atrocities in Europe have aroused old ancestral racial loyalties here.

Street fights by kids, for example, have been magnified into signs of a rising wave of anti-Semitism. Kids always did fight. The way for the cops to handle such a street brawl is to give each reachable kid a boot in the pants and thereby break it up—not to tell it to the papers as an anti-Semitic sign and portent, and thereby drag a lot of parents into the trouble.

Such exaggerations of the actual facts can stir up a great deal of envy, hatred, and malice, and these feelings can snowball into a serious situation. Some of the above-mentioned agitators are well aware of this danger, and are going ahead regardless, because it makes circulation for them. Others are sincere, but the results are the same.

By continually striving to make mountains out of interracial molehills, these agitators may finally be able to make actual mountains. The consequences to New York can be disastrous.

We think Archbishop Francis J. Spellman struck the sane, sensible, and realistic chord in his January 11 message to Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee, now active in genuinely combating racial disunity in America:

"I trust your noble efforts to be helpful in overcoming religious and racial animosities will bear fruit and will promote mutual respect, understanding, and tolerance among all groups of Americans."

That is how we got to be the Nation we are—via "mutual respect, understanding, and tolerance among all groups of Americans."

As for the agitators who are promoting racial disunity while going through the motions of fighting it, we are reminded of a story from Puritan days in Massachusetts.

It seems that the Puritan coppers arrested a man for something—kissing his wife on Sunday, perhaps—and were dragging him off to the hoosegow, followed by a mildly interested crowd. A voice in the back of the crowd began to scream: "Don't nail his ears to the post. Don't nail his ears to the post." This old-time propaganda expert kept repeating his cry, and the man didn't get to the hoosegow. The crowd presently snatched him from the cops and nailed his ears to the post.

Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement the very able address rendered on Tuesday last, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. I have attempted to make a very careful study of article I, section 2, of the Constitution, which vests in the respective States the rights to determine the qualifications of the voters in Federal elections.

This study convinces me that the right to vote for Members of Congress is not derived from the constitution and law of the State in which they are chosen, but has its foundation in the Federal Constitution. Consequently, Congress, by appropriate legislation, may protect such a right. The States may not prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such; but the qualifications prescribed by the States for electors of the most numerous branch of their

legislature are adopted by the Constitution for this purpose; but this does not make the statutes and constitutional provisions of the various States in reference to the qualifications of electors part of the Constitution or laws of the United States. When article I, section 2 of the Constitution was drafted the property qualifications of the voters in the different States, as well as other requirements, were so varied that it was concluded to let the practice in each State determine who should be qualified to vote for a candidate for a seat in the United States House of Representatives.

To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule—

Wrote Hamilton in the Federalist—

would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.

It should be clear that the right to vote and the qualifications of the electors for a Federal election is vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States. In other words, the States have no inherent right to dominate the field of determining qualifications for the electors in a Federal election. Therefore, I wholeheartedly agree with my colleague's conclusion that Congress, acting under the war powers—article I, section 8, Constitution of the United States—can preserve the sacred right of suffrage to those in the armed forces by now prescribing the qualifications, regardless of the adoption by the Constitution of the qualifications prescribed by the States for electors. I, for one, see no reason why this House should not immediately adopt legislation to permit our personnel in the armed services to cast their vote in the Federal election if it is not feasible or possible to permit them to vote in both Federal and State elections.

The Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Clinton County Republican News of December 2, 1943, published by Schuyler L. Marshall, at St. Johns, Mich., comes the following editorial. It has something to say about the city reporter's opinion of the farmer. It reads:

WHO IS DUMB AND SELFISH?

For many years we have read the reports of Blair Moody, of the Detroit News staff, writing from Washington, D. C. Mr. Moody is a bright young man. He knows his Washington. We believe he is an honest writer—telling things as he sees them. Recently he has been the pivot man on the News in its fight against inflation. He has referred to the farmers as "dumb and selfish" in their demand for the abolition of subsidies.

In an editorial the News last week reasoned that farm-acreage prices were up, that many farms were changing hands, and, therefore, farming must be a profitable venture or this condition would not exist. In an adjoining commentator column another writer prints an intelligent analysis of milk production, taking the dairy-cow cost from calf to cow—a sort of cradle-to-the-grave account.

It seems to us that some big newspapers, like some big politicians, rate farmers about alike. We can see no good reason for it unless big newspapers are published in metropolitan areas where farmers and farming do not exist. They have the consumer complex. They roar about an extra cent a quart for milk and cheerfully pay 40 cents for a highball. Farmers, we all know, represent a dwindling percentage of the country's population (also circulation and votes), but as their ratio dwindles their importance grows.

We have heard city men sneer at this.

Our only answer was, and is, that every person we know, from millionaire to factory worker, clerks, and newspaper editor, has to eat. There is nothing to eat but food; there is no way to produce food except from mother earth; there is no one who is qualified to do that job efficiently and economically except experienced farmers.

There are several answers to the increase in the sale price of farm acreage. We will try to explain it to our big city neighbor in language and terms he can understand. Farmers, like city folks, have been denied the opportunity for 2 years to spend their money for automobiles, electric refrigerators and radios. They have been spending some of their cash in improvements to their buildings and lands. That increases a farm's value. More important has been the scared money from towns and cities. Drive 50 miles in any direction from Detroit and note the farms with elaborate buildings, generally painted white, and with white board fences. You don't find that kind of a lay-out on many producing farms—largely on the farms that are the "playthings" of wealthy city men.

The farm with elaborate buildings and the white fences (a la Kentucky blue grass style) is generally not practical—but—the price the city man paid for that acreage has been a definite influence on the price of farm land. The city man paid too much. His extravagant methods, backed by the city-made fortune, raise hob among his neighbors who are trying to make a living from that source alone. Many examples of what we mention here can be found in Livingston County and on into Detroit on the Grand River route.

Perhaps another answer comes in the fact that many of the successful city men originated on a farm. When they have made their wad they want to "play" with a farm. It is a respectable pastime, healthy, and gives a measure of seclusion which so many wealthy people crave—seclusion, saddle horses and a place to let their hair down. This is not farming of the sort that feeds the Nation. The matter of raising food in quantities to feed the millions who produce no food, is generally not done in palatial buildings and behind white board fences.

We regret reading Mr. Moody's reference to farmers as "dumb and selfish." If that were true Mr. Moody and his fellow Washington correspondents would not eat as well as they do. Farmers as a class, the country over, are generous. If they weren't, they would not be working an average of 82 hours a week as a recent survey showed. The average age would not be 52 years, if farming were a highly profitable soft snap—there would be more young fellows attracted to it. If farmers were dumb and selfish, they would not have had their gray-haired wives in the fields doing the work of a man this past summer—a condition brought about by the competing high wages paid in war industries.

In many, if not most, of the Washington and metropolitan inspired farm discussions, very little consideration is ever given to labor costs. Believe it or not, Mr. Moody, the old-fashioned dumb hired man is a thing of the past, if he ever did exist. It takes brains and skill to successfully operate a productive farm. In fact, so skillful and versatile have these bright young farm boys proven that the Army, Navy, and Air Corps are delighted to get them. Add to this the fact that farming is not one industry—it is a score or more, as wise old Herbert Hoover has repeatedly pointed out. There are a few crops where seasonal help of the hand-labor variety can be used successfully. The year-around job, however, is in the hands of men of keen judgment, years of experience and business acumen. If that were not true, you city folks would not eat.

The farmer himself would not be loathe at times to admit he is dumb. When he sees a spread of anywhere from 50 to 1,000 percent between what he receives and what the consumer pays, he sometimes gets to thinking he is a pretty poor businessman. But this is not the type of dumbness that Mr. Moody referred to.

A Campaign Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of July 13, 1944:

A CAMPAIGN DOCUMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

A Republican Congressman declared at once that the President's message is a campaign document. The Congressman might pause and reflect on what he has said.

He has said that Mr. Roosevelt has chosen as a platform in a political year the following planks: That taxes shall be raised; that wages shall not be raised; that prices shall not be raised; that profits shall be limited; that every able-bodied man and woman shall be made liable for national service.

These proposals violate all the known rules of politics which, as everyone knows, are that taxes must not be increased in an election year, that the way to win votes is to be in favor of increasing the wages, the prices, and the profits of the largest number of organized pressure groups, and finally that the voters must be treated as long-suffering individuals who may expect much from the Government but have no duty to inconvenience themselves.

Our Congressman is, therefore, saying that Mr. Roosevelt thinks it is good politics in the year 1944 to propose the very things which no other politician has ever regarded as anything but straight political suicide.

Now, how shall we explain this extraordinary performance? We all know that Mr. Roosevelt is just about the shrewdest and most successful practical politician of our time. Nobody has ever doubted that. He may be, and indeed he is, an administrator who cannot resist producing three headaches when one headache would be quite enough; who when he needs a suit of clothes will find three tailors, will tell each of them to make one leg of the trousers, will let each of them guess which leg he is working on, and will then appoint a fourth tailor to coordinate the trousers. But that Mr. Roosevelt knows American politics is not to be denied.

If, then, this message is Mr. Roosevelt's idea of a campaign document, certain things follow: Mr. Roosevelt must think that the great majority of the American people would wish to do any sensible thing which they believe will hasten the victory and will prevent this war from ending, as all other wars have ended, in a chaos of unemployment and crazy prices and bad money. He must think that, painful as it now seems to vote taxes, to hold down wages and prices and profits, and to call the voters for national service, by next autumn it may be very awkward, even politically dangerous, for a public man not to have been recorded in favor of these measures. (This Congressman has colleagues who are hoping that no one will remember that over the years they have rarely been recorded in favor of measures which might have prevented this war, of measures to be prepared for it.)

When the votes are cast next autumn, they will express the feelings of the people not on what routine politicians now think the people think now but on what are the conditions then. And by next autumn, as the President and Commander in Chief has better reason to know than anyone else, the war will be at its climax. Ten million men will be in arms, and that 10,000,000 will have behind them here at home their families and their friends; for all of them the quickest, surest, and least costly ending of the war must outweigh any consideration of money, of their civilian privileges, or of their personal convenience. In short, when the young manhood of the Nation is living dangerously and heroically, the best part of the Nation may judge the politicians by what they did to win the war, rather than by what they did to cater to selfishness, laziness, and self-indulgence.

The usual rules of political behavior may not work at a time when so many Americans are doing such unusual things as storming the coasts of Europe and fighting in the jungles of New Guinea. If the Congressman is right that this message is a campaign document, he ought then to ask himself whether perchance it may not be a good campaign document. It would not be the first time in this war that a program of victory by blood, sweat, and tears has proved to be a better way of retaining the people's confidence than a menu of pap, applesauce, and eyewash.

In any event now that the Congressman has found out what is Mr. Roosevelt's campaign document, it is time that he began playing the same kind of politics. He might find that it is very good politics. And he might also find a certain satisfaction in it—the satisfaction, when the stakes are life and death not money and votes, of not stooping to the meaner natures of men but of doing his duty. That might be a durable satisfaction to find in these days which our descendants will remember long after they have forgotten who carried the Twelfth Congressional District.

America—and Appointments With World Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Madison, Ind., January 17, 1944:

The subject matter which you have asked me to discuss has opened up before me such tremendous implications, as I have thought about it in the preparation of this speech, that I have concluded, that had I fully comprehended its significance when I accepted your invitation, in due humility, I would most assuredly have asked you to change it to one with which I felt myself capable of coping. However, I did not realize this until it was too late for me to withdraw from the tremendous problem I had, in my early thoughtless moment, agreed to undertake. It is necessary for me to say this, because I want you to believe me when I say that I do not assert the omniscience demanded by the subject assigned me but, having accepted your invitation, I hope you will believe me when I say that I speak to you humbly and with a full consciousness of the burden imposed by the task which I have assumed.

It is not only true, but inevitable that mankind has appointments with world destiny—ancient appointments, imposed upon man at the time of his creation. That portion of mankind which lives within the territorial boundaries and under the Government known as the United States of America cannot avoid or escape these destinies. It follows that the people of the State of Indiana, and the people of the city of Madison, in that State, cannot avoid or escape these destinies. Since we cannot avoid or escape them, then, notwithstanding the fact that the problems are tremendous, if we face them with a proper understanding of the inherent inadequacy of any group of people, and with the inherent inadequacy of any one speaker to measure them, we find then, and only then, that it is proper for us to searchingly seek for an understanding of these destinies and the obligations imposed upon us as a minute segment of mankind—to search for a solution, and, perhaps, in some small measure, to make a contribution toward their solution and thus assume part of the responsibility imposed upon us by our God as part of the price of the privilege of living.

Furthermore, this town of Madison, Ind., is the typical American town. We can certainly presume that this selection was not the result of haphazard, chance selection. It must be true also that the thinking, the hopes, the aspirations of the residents of this community are typical of those of our people. This being true, are we not to hope ardently that what we do and say here may, in some measure, be worthy of the highest aspirations and the most courageous resolutions lying quietly, but calmly awaiting fulfillment, in the secret recesses of the composite hearts and souls of the people of America.

Recognizing my own fallability, I recognize that no one human can possibly particularize, either upon world destiny or America's appointment with it. One who did that would be guilty of the grossest arrogance. At best, we are forced to sketch and generalize, recognizing that by doing so, we may be charged with evading the issue or with wasting our time upon self-evident truths, but I am inclined to believe that while the economists, political scientists, and social scientists, by their research and their investigation, render a real service in laying before us the symptoms arising out of our erroneous conduct, that too often the cures which they suggest relieve immediate economic, political, or social irritants, but do not provide us with permanent cures. This is true because man alone, by his fallacious thinking or his cowardly refusal to accept the obligations required of him by his correct thinking, creates the economic, political, and social conditions in which he lives. I am willing to admit that many men, as individuals, are often molded, in a large measure, by their environment, but I will not admit that man as a whole is dominated by or eternally controlled by the economic or political systems under which he lives, because such an admission denies that man essentially is a spiritual being and, as such, the most dignified creature on the face of the earth; such an admission not only overlooks the fact that man alone is responsible for the conditions under which he lives, but also that he is the only person who has the inherent capacity to cure these errors. The responsibility is man's, not God's.

I believe that democracy is the destiny of the world. I believe this because it is the only concept which is consonant with my belief that man is inherently spiritual. This is the source of his dignity. Man is made not only in God's image, but to image God. That is, to absorb, reflect, and thereby create Godliness on earth. If this is not true, then why did Jesus of Nazareth teach us to pray: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven"? For it is only by and through man that God can work on earth. Jesus also taught us: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The second shows us the nature of the first; the first discloses the only source from which the fulfillment of the second can come.

A dynamic, growing, ever unfolding democracy, then, is man's destiny—the world's destiny. Democracy in its fullest and final development—the manifestation of God's will on earth.

But, if democracy is dynamic, before we can possibly plot or envision its future, we are obligated to examine and probe its present state of development, not particularly in the world outside of the United States, because we know relatively so little real truth about that, but rather, here in the United States where we live, and are presumed to have some knowledge of the extent to which democracy has developed and is operating. Yet, before we can examine, we must have rules by which we can test the facts we intend to examine. In short, we must attempt a definition of basic democracy—remembering as we attempt to define, that upon the first and second commandments "hang all the laws and the prophets."

Believing then that true democracy is the practicing of the will of God on earth, as best revealed by the Hebraic-Christian ethic, is it not logical that we should search that ethic for our rules. For democracy means more than the meaning which most of us get from the standard dictionary definition: "Government by the people." It is a philosophy and an ethic which must be practiced not solely in the field of government or political relations, but it is an ethic and a standard which permeates all man's relations with man on this earth, including racial, social, and economic, as well as governmental. Indeed, the application of democracy to government is only necessary because man needs laws to restrain him when he fails to practice democracy in these other relationships.

I am not sufficiently trained in ethics or the humanities to profess to give but a few of the rules of conduct upon which basic democracy rests, but are not these some of the standards of conduct required of man when he professes his adherence to the democratic way of life, namely: That above all he must be intellectually honest; that he must accord to other men the right of free speech if he demands it for himself; that he must accord to other men honesty of ballot if he is to demand it for himself; that he must accord to other men freedom to express themselves and to acquire a fair share of the material things if he desires to attain them for himself; and, as a corollary, men who enjoy special privileges or special prerogatives over other men

must let go of them and surrender them if their possession tends to keep some other man, despite his efforts, from attaining his fair share of economic reward—a reward commensurate again with his own effort; that if he demands rights, he must assume responsibility; that if he demands the right to determine his destiny, he must assume, without quibbling or without fear, the responsibilities of any decision in which he has had a right to participate, even if it turns out to be erroneous and costly to himself. He must not ask others to bear the burden of his own mistakes, his own venality, or his own sloth.

But, in the final analysis, what are these things? Are they not rules of conduct required by the Golden Rule? Are they not rules of conduct required of man by the Second Commandment? And, finally, do we not know that, although students of religion and ethics tell us that there is great universality in religious thought and ethical teachings of all the great religions, the essence of Christ's teachings was the doctrine of constructive action? What good will come to mankind if we only acknowledge a thing to be true and fail to act upon it? Is it not written: "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selfs"?

For it is not enough to worship blindly. We must know why we worship. We must understand that man must act, he must do, he must perform, according to the dictates of the Christianity he professes. Christianity is a religion for living, not "Pie in the sky, bye and bye." We live to be free by service to others. Our souls leave our bodies on this earth in the condition which we have developed them by our acts during the time we have stayed here.

You practical men of commerce, how long would you keep a bookkeeper who correctly added columns of figures in his head all day and went home at night leaving your books as clean and blank as they were at 8 o'clock in the morning? The requirement that we act upon the things which we profess to believe is the most practical rule of life. Our failure to act is more inexcusable than our failure to understand. Too long have the elder rulers of the world shed the blood of its youth as a sacrifice for their dastardly, cowardly inaction. How can we of this generation face these youths and our God if we blindly continue, and with cowardliness embrace, the man-made errors, misconception, and prejudices of the past?

I hope you will not charge me with being tedious; I believe that we cannot make progress until and unless we undertsand the source of this concept called democracy, and a few of the principles and standards inherent in it, as well as the conduct and responsibility required of those who profess a belief in it, or a desire to see it extended in our country into the fields of racial, social, and economic relationships where, at present it is honored more in the breach than by the practice. I have strived to justify and to evolve for you a fundamental philosophy for the people who live in the United States of America; so that, by expanding our understanding of democracy and perfecting our practice of it, we may move toward our destiny, and, as and if, we present to the peoples of the world a more perfect manifestation of man's purpose and destiny on the earth, we may persuade them, by our example, to give to us and to the world, their contribution also to the fulfillment of man's destiny. All this the people of the world must do so that there may be hope in the world; so that man may more speedily attain to his destiny with a minimum of squalor, prejudice, suspicion, hate and the sacrifice of blood, which these evil spiritual forces, running unchecked in the world by a living, dynamic democracy, will continue to demand of man to quench their insatiable lust for blood.

I have attempted to state a philosophy and its inherent principles and standards in order that we may, in the future, by deductive reasoning from this philosophy and these principles, so established and accepted, measure and test our conduct and practice of democracy in all of man's relationship with man on all that part of the surface of the earth where man has created the Government known as the United States of America. I have done this because I am convinced that heretofore man—a spiritual being—has bowed down before the material things of the earth and the evident maldistribution of the material things of the earth, and has almost solely relied upon the processes of inductive reasoning and the examination of existing facts as a method of proving the existence of inequities in man's enjoyment of material things. By this process we have discovered so-called rules in a so-called science of economics; but we have failed to discover our fortiori, the true rule, because we have had no standard by which to test the validity or invalidity of the premises under which we have conducted our economy.

I think this is true because the inductive reasoning is inherently only suited to the observation of facts existing in the world of materially things. It is a method wholly unsuited to furnish guides for the conduct of spiritual human beings. Certainly, to date, the process has developed no over-all general rule calculated to serve as a standard for the future, by which the errors of the past may be avoided. If this is true, and I think it is, is it not then incumbent upon us to desert our process of the past and to make an earnest attempt, at least, to search out and evolve a general philosophy and ethic and standard, measured always, by the dignity of the individual, and tested, always, by the rule: Does this action give the greatest opportunity to the individual to expand and grow in dignity, a dignity measured, in turn, by the trusteeship he performs for his fellow man? Surely, since the process of inductive reasoning which we have been following has given us, at best, palliatives and not cures, we can lose nothing by striving to discover the truth and to develop our capacity to practice it.

I hope now that we can apply, in just a few instances, our understanding of the Hebraic-Christian basis of democracy and the application of this principle into some of the fields of human relationships in this Nation in which we live.

We have been fortunate in having many great political philosophers who have set us splendid examples of the application of democracy in the field of government. First, Jefferson presented us certain immutable truths in the Declaration of Independence, and we take nothing from his stature when we acknowledge his indebtedness to the prevailing philosophies of Lock and Montesquieu, then in existence.

In the Declaration of Independence he said:

"That to secure these rights (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness), governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

But what have we done to refresh our understanding of the truths therein expressed? On what Fourth of July did we last read with understanding the Declaration of Independence, or give due reverence to the great democratic truths set out in it? When was the last time that the American people refreshed their understanding of their individual dignity embodied in the words "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"? With all the lip service given to democracy by all the patriotic organizations in America and the "committees to preserve the Constitution," when did we last understand that men fought and died in order that we may have a country based upon this principle—"That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness"? Is it not a desecration of a holiday to let it pass without this instrument ever being published or read before the people, by or before any group of people? What right do we have in this country to a holiday on the fourth day of July in each year when we have grown so unmindful of the principles upon which this Government was founded, that we devote the day to firecracker shooting, ball game attendance, roistering, radio-listening and other equally inappropriate activities?

And how many of us know that the ninth amendment to the Constitution of the United States again reaffirms the inherent dignity of man in this language:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

How many of us understand that the language in this amendment "retained by the people" is a reaffirmation of the dignity of man which was insisted upon as a prerequisite to the signing of the Constitution?

And if we know that the language is there, how many of us read it with understanding of the significance of the words "certain rights * * * retained by the people"?

And how many of us know that the tenth amendment to the Constitution says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

And if we know that this language is in the Constitution, how many of us read with understanding the words "the powers not delegated * * * are reserved * * * to the people"? How many of us understand that the use of the word "delegated" distinctly implies that man alone, as declared in the Declaration of Independence can create governments by a delegation of his individual sovereignty and that the political philosophers who wrote our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution understood that man delegated authority of his own free will and that no government existed without his free will; and that the citizens of the United States have still retained all of the sovereignty which they have not delegated; so that if, in their will, they desire to institute a new government, having jurisdiction over all or any part of the surface of the earth, that they still retain and enjoy and hold inviolate the right to create such government for any purposes which they may see fit?

And how many of us have given thought to the fact that the Government of the United States is essentially a federation of States; that it has inherently within it many rules and principles which, with intelligent modification to suit new conditions, might well serve as the pattern which the peoples of the world might adopt, if they choose or elect to join with us, if indeed we shall have the courage to join with them, to establish a government, initially with very limited authority, to administer the problems of the world; and how many of us understand that the peoples of the world are not anxious, necessarily, to come into a government with us, and not necessarily any more anxious than

we are? Indeed, how many of us know or understand that the people of the Thirteen States, who accepted the Constitution of the United States, had no great desire—no overwhelming desire—to create a national government? How many of us understand that it took more days to go from Boston, Mass., in 1787, to Charleston, S. C., than it does hours today to go by airplane from the city of Madison, Ind., to the city of Moscow, Russia? And how many of us understand or remember that at the time these separate States agreed to unite and create the United States of America there was a greater difference between the social customs and thinking and the economy of New England and that of the agricultural, slave-owning States of the South than there exists between that existing in the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics today? How many of us understand that the average man then living in the Northern States, who was too poor to afford the exorbitant costs of travel and generally too poor to enjoy the benefits of the meagerly informed press of his day, knew less about the social customs and the economic way of life of the people of the South than you and I know about the social customs and the economic life of most of the nations who inhabit the other continents of the earth? And, finally, how many of us have thought about these things with understanding—with an open mind—searching for the truth?

Again, and much more recently, there was a great man in America who, on November 19, 1863, among other things, said this:

"It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Do we really acknowledge that not only was this man speaking a great truth with reference to the application and the concept of democracy in the field of government, and redeclaring for us the principle that governments are created of the people; that they are administered by the people, and that they should be administered for the people; and that these things are true solely because man is spiritual and man has dignity.

Do we know that this man led a great segment of the people of the United States into a war; yes, through a Gethsemane and up to the cross of death and bloodshed, rather than to temporize with the moral obligations arising out of our then splendid understanding of democracy and its application to the racial field, namely, that black-skinned men were human beings and not chattels and cattle?

Today when we speak of democracy; today when we profess a belief in Christianity, which teaches us that God "hath made of one blood all men for to dwell on all the face of the earth"; today when we should know that this thing we call democracy rests upon the Christian ethic, including the one which I have just read, are we not guilty of smugness and complacency if we even dare to think we can come to our appointment with world destiny and say to the world: "Follow us in the practice of democracy," when the people of three-fourths of the surface of the earth—millions of whom have never heard of, or do not acknowledge our Christianity—practice democracy in the field of racial relationships in a manner which should make us bow our heads in shame? This question of racial equality—which is only saying that men are spiritually the same no matter what the color of their skin may be, must be faced and accepted by our acts as well as our words, if the ultimate destiny of men is to reach that degree of democracy which fully reflects the kingdom of God on earth.

True, the problem is not one-sided, nor are the obligations of democracy laid upon white-skinned men alone, because the ethics of democracy require of all men responsibility and an understanding of the nature of prejudices which, again, are spiritual things, which imprison man's mind more securely than buildings of iron and steel can imprison their bodies. We white-skinned men must remember that we of the majority race are under obligation, imposed by our God-sourced democracy, to rid ourselves of our prejudices and our erroneous preconceptions—erroneous, if you please, in the light of the teaching of God. But, it is also incumbent upon the black-skinned men, once we evidence a firm resolution and desire and purpose, by words and practices, to fight against this tremendous thing called prejudice, to make it easier for us to do so by accepting responsibility and fulfilling it; by asserting the right to live under the doctrine of racial democracy affirmatively, quietly, peacefully, and without hate or rancor. Indeed, it is proper and necessary to call attention of the citizens of the United States of the Negro race that the adoption of force or any of its counterparts—exaggerated statements, crowding, pushing, asserting of right just because of color without regard to accomplishment—will do more to destroy the honest effort of the white men of good will in the United States to free themselves from the prejudices arising out of their erroneous thinking than all of the efforts of these other white men, who do not wish to recognize that democracy must become operative in the field of racial relations, although we must admit that many of them honestly do not understand that their objection arises out of a prejudice, the extent of whose control over their capacity to calmly rationalize, they have been unable to analyze or to overthrow.

America today is working toward this fulfillment of its destiny; the task is arduous and a tremendous strain upon the emotions and nervous system and minds of our citizens. At this time we can ill afford the thoughtless clatter of white women with boarding-school attitudes, on the one hand, or the inflammatory words or actions of black men, who also fail to understand that hate, no matter what the indignities may have been which have engendered it, has never in the history of the world solved a serious social problem bloodlessly.

And, finally, we cannot meet our appointment with destiny, either in the United States of America or in the world, unless by the process of deductive reasoning from an enlightened understanding of the nature of democracy and the principles and obligations inherent in it, we seek out a solution of the social and economic problems which confront man. It is in this field that man has made the least advancement all over the surface of the earth. I do not know enough facts with reference to the operation of the social and economic system of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to deny or admit that they have brought democracy to a higher degree of application in this field than any of the other people of the earth. Solely for the purpose of my thinking tonight, I am willing to admit that this is true. But, to me, it seems clearly apparent that under the Russian system democracy operates so inadequately in the field of government that I am not willing to pay that price for all of the claimed advances in the economic. Democracy as man's destiny must function fully and freely in every human relation; otherwise man will never attain his destiny, which is spiritual freedom, full democracy, God's kingdom on earth.

I freely admit that in the field of racial relationship the Russians have undoubtedly effected this accomplishment. But I plead in behalf of our people, as against those who would denounce us too freely for our shortcomings in this matter, the fact that in this country our forefathers adopted the erroneous idea that black-skinned men were not human and could be enslaved. This error was tragic, but it is evidence to support the truth of my position here tonight, that the principles and philosophies and ethics of democracy come from God and that when man violates them by an erroneous act, designated by most religious thinkers as a sinful act, he sets in motion forces of evil which, unless he can overcome them by the application of the democratic process, must always be settled by force with its accompanying misery and bloodshed.

When the first black slave landed on that part of the shores of America which is now the United States, the feet of the then unborn thousands of men who died in the Civil War were sent marching back in eternity. I am not alone in this, for Thomas Jefferson, viewing the status of slavery with his great understanding of the spiritual source of the democratic concept, over a hundred and fifty years ago, said:

"There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of slavery among us. * * * Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever."

Tragically, also, we too soon forgot or, indeed, never understood, the true significance of Lincoln's message at Gettysburg when he said:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

There was already in existence the idea of freedom for the white-skinned man. What new birth could Lincoln have referred to but the birth of full freedom for the black-skinned man? We might well pause and pray here tonight, that our God will cleanse the white man of his prejudices and the black man of his hate, so that the hope of Lincoln may be realized without bloodshed, through our devotion to democracy as God has shown us the way to its realization.

I have digressed to include that part of our history, in order to recall it to those who so violently call to our attention the accomplishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in this question of the application of democracy to racial relationships, because I do not believe that, as a whole, the white man of Russia has had to overcome the prejudices which first captured us, when we conceived of the idea that if a black man could be enslaved, he must be an inferior man. Indeed, just as war's only recompense is the fact that its horrors act as a catalyst to fuse the honorable fighting man of the world into a brotherhood without regard to class, creed, or color, so, to some extent, uniform misery, privation, and serfdom, oppressing all races, must have the effect of doing the same thing; so that out of his history of privation, the citizen of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has obtained the boon of freedom from racial prejudice. It seems not improper to ask him, but more particularly, those Americans who think we cannot solve our system without adopting his, to recall these facts of history and to understand their effects upon man before they criticize us too severely.

I apologize for the digression and ask you to let me return to a discussion of the obligations which democracy requires of us if we would meet our destiny and apply it to that field of human relationship which we now call economics. Economics, I think, is

a term applied to the production, distribution, and ownership of material things; it is supposed to have rules of its own, which men have discovered largely by the exercise of the process of inductive reasoning. As I have previously pointed out, I seriously question the validity of many of these so-called rules, discovered or evolved by such processes.

The development of this speech to this point has taken so much from me, and has, in turn, required you to listen so long, that I can only sketchily outline my thinking with reference to the democratic philosophy when applied to this field.

Indeed, it is, of course, a subject which of itself will demand the best thought of all of the people of good will, not only in this country, but in the world. But this I know—that if democracy is dependent upon the belief that all things on earth must evolve around the individual in order that he may accomplish his fullest dignity, then we must measure all of our conclusions with reference to this subject of economics by that standard. It requires a complete trusteeship by all of us who have anything to do with the ownership, production, or distribution of material things. It is not one-sided, demanding an immediate surrender by those who own much to those who own little; but, I think, it demands that those who receive emoluments out of the operation of this system, must receive them with the consent of all the individuals concerned with the operation of an enterprise—this is my definition of free enterprise. For just as governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, so eventually must the powers and the rights of individual men, over the management and control of the material things of the earth, be instituted by the men who were immediately concerned with the ownership, the production, and the distribution of material things, and the compensations which any person engaging in these activities shall be entitled to receive must come with the consent of those concerned. And those concerned, I believe, must be all of the people involved in the operation, providing, however, that the people who assert this right—a right to participate in determining their destiny, insofar as that involves a share in fixing the rewards of others—must also assume the responsibility for any erroneous decisions or any willful, slothful, or wrongful acts and not claim or assert the right to impose the effects of their own slothfulness, their own inefficiency, their own venality, or their own lack of good judgment upon others—either permanently or temporarily.

Let me point out that Jesus of Nazareth said "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Abraham Lincoln, recognizing that the great truths which control the successful conduct of man come from God, reminds us that "A nation cannot exist half slave and half free." Is it not a logical conclusion from those statements of fundamental truths that we pause to note that industry, which is actually a human operation wherein one kind of capital, called property, owned by individuals or shareholders, and another kind of capital, called jobs, owned by people who work, is now trying to operate with one set of managers for the shareholders and another set for the workers? The cleavage is fundamental. Industry cannot continue to operate this way without each group eventually trying to capture the political system, by force and bloodshed, if necessary, so as to destroy the other. Therefore does not necessity demand that we must conclude that the ultimate solution of the problem, by resort to deductive reasoning, will demand we search for a solution whereby the two will become fused by the intelligent use of the democratic process, which the Christian ethic demands us to use? Palliatives, suggested by any so-called economic rules, discovered by inductive reasoning, are inevitably doomed to failure.

Again, while we must admit that all people apparently are not born equally endowed with intellect, with character, with health, or with strong bodies, we must recognize also that these things often may be the result of heredity or, at least, of forces not solely attributable to maladjustments arising from the imperfections of the application of democracy in the fields of government, racial relationships and social relationships and economics. But there is an obligation inherent in Hebraic-Christian thinking that man must not impose undemocratic barriers in any field upon the opportunity of every child born to reach the fullest dignity within the limits of his mental and physical inheritance, his capacities and his own conduct.

In the field of economics, this brings us to the proposition of questioning the extent to which the right of the inheritance of property, as now practiced, is consistent with the democratic concept. Certainly God has taught us, and man has observed that he comes into the world with nothing and that he takes nothing with him when he goes. On the other hand, worth-while men, conscious of the probability that they will die before their wives and children or others who may be dependent upon them, are motivated by a desire which, I think, is consistent with their true dignity, to make provision for those whom they love or who are dependent upon them after they are gone. The animal does this to the extent, at least, of caring for the young until they are able to care for themselves. And surely man is more dignified than the animal.

Admitting this truth, should we not now reexamine our existing preconceptions of the right of man to devolve property, in an attempt to discover the ultimate role which our democracy based upon the Christian ethic demands of us? This will require earnest, calm thinking. Solely to stimulate debate, may I suggest that maybe it should be limited to the home and those personal things which families hold dear for sentimental reasons, the land which a man can work, the tools of his trade or profession and beyond that, an annuity for life for his wife or those others who are dependent upon him, either because of old age, youth or infirmity, plus a further amount necessary to enable his children to be fairly trained and educated to the fullest extent their free choice of a trade or profession, their capacities and, above all, their own efforts, entitle them.

Certainly we know now that millions of children are born to compete in a society in which thousands, purely because of material possessions, have an unconscionable advantage, purely unrelated to the mere fact of birth. We may well ask, Why has our professed democratic sense of fair play been dormant so long on this question when we have so clearly applied the same rule to so many other of our human activities? We would not consider a race to be either a fair contest or one calculated to show the relative hereditary merit or developed skill of the racers, if 10 men started on a mile race from scratch, one with a quarter-mile advantage, and one with a half-mile advantage.

I would also like to point out that while I do not believe that basically the desire to own things is really as strong as the power which comes from ownership, I am inclined to believe that men would have less undemocratic desire to monopolize either the ownership, control, or the management of property during their lives if they lived in a democratically ruled economic system which, by fair, democratic methods, placed a limitation upon their power to devolve it upon others after their death, consistent with the demands of the true Christian ethic.

It is necessary, before leaving this thoroughly undeveloped and immature discussion of the operation of the concept of democracy in the field of economics to call attention again to the fact that before men who do not now participate in the decisions which are made in the industries in which they work, can assert honestly and effectively the right to do so, they must demonstrate, not only to those who presently manage the industry of the United States, but also to all of the other members of society, who are not immediately concerned with the operation of that industry, but are vitally affected indirectly by its efficient operation, a capacity for democratic conduct among themselves and for responsibility, individual and group, which all the ethics of democracy justly demand of them. I point this out because I am convinced that there are many men of good will now owning or managing our economic system under its present state of development, who are insisting upon the right to do so largely because they have a feeling that they can manage it better, not only for themselves or for owners whom they represent, but also for the greater good of society as a whole.

If it be said that this is a form of economic paternalism comparable to governmental paternalism, which man rejects as inconsistent with the operation of democracy in the field of government, I admit that this is true, but I point out that the one great virtue of the democratic concept is that it is the means by which a solution of all of man's problems may be accomplished without resort to force. And it follows that if it is possible under our system—and I claim that it is—by democratic methods in the fields of social and economic relations and, if necessary, in the field of government, to bring about the operation of democracy in the field of economics, those who work in any industry must remember that all of the rest of society are as interested in the efficient operation of industry as they themselves are in democratic participation in the operation of that industry. For any system, which proposes democratic participation in its conduct, must also give almost positive assurance to the rest of mankind that it will be more efficiently operated and conducted so as to give greater benefits to all the other members of society. For if this is not true, then the new system will only desecrate, rather than dignify the democratic concept.

In other words, men must be convinced that the operation of democracy in the field of economics will better them as individuals or at least leave them as well off as individuals before they will voluntarily go along with other men who are demanding the right to participate in the conduct of industry. Of course, the consent of all concerned must come through democratic methods.

Now, I am not asserting any opinion as to the relative efficiency of operation of an economic system in which there is greater participation by those who work in an industry in the making of its decisions and consequently in the making of their own destiny, than under the way our system operates at the present time. I want no argument, at this time, either with those who say the new system will work better, or with those who say it will work less efficiently. But, I am pointing out that there is always the obligation arising out of the inherent nature of man, which consequently makes the obligation a part of the democratic process, that people generally and rightfully ask more of those who newly assert a right to rule than they do of those with whom they have had an experience, unless that experience is so terrible that man will grasp at any straw in order to bring about a change. This being true, men of fair mind and good will will accept this obligation imposed upon them by these normal reactions of man and will, without complaint, demonstrate so completely their capacity to participate in the conduct and management of industry by

their conduct of their own affairs, prior to the time they assert that right, that they can more easily convince all other segments of society that they bring progress and not a mere change of masters.

I do not know that I am necessarily doing any new thinking; I am only determined to think as honestly as I can in the hope that I might thereby make some contribution to the subject matter you assigned me. But I do know this: that man today must not be afraid to think; they must not be afraid of the consequences of being misunderstood; they must not be afraid of the consequences to themselves of freely expressing their thoughts even though they may subsequently be demonstrated to be erroneous. If, by so doing, they stimulate discussion and thereby advance the search for truth. The appointments of the people of the United States with world destiny will not be realized through the efforts of those who seal their lips or sit on their hands.

Surely in this day when thousands of men are dying heroically, those of us who remain at home must live courageously.

Soldiers' Absentee Voting Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the men and women in our armed forces will get to vote in the coming election if the opposition will quit stalling and help us bring to the floor of the House and pass the bill which passed the Senate, and which has been reported to the House with certain perfecting amendments.

I call on the chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. SABATH of Illinois, now to call the Committee on Rules together tomorrow, or this afternoon, and bring that bill out and let us pass it, so as to provide a way for everyone in our armed forces to vote in the coming election.

The statement was made in the press on yesterday to the effect that if we passed this bill the President would veto it. That is absolutely ridiculous. The President would not dream of vetoing this bill and knocking the men and women in our armed forces out of a vote; and if he should veto it, we would pass it over his veto with a landslide.

I am used to passing veterans' legislation over Presidential vetoes; I began back during the Harding-Coolidge administrations.

We are going to see to it that these service men and women have the right to vote in the coming election, for every candidate from President to constable.

I am tired of this stalling around trying to keep us from getting this bill to the floor of the House. I again call on the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to call the Rules Committee together for that purpose at once, so they can vote out the rule and bring this measure to the floor of the House for a vote without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address which I delivered over the radio a few nights ago on this subject.

The address referred to follows:

My fellow Americans, I wish to talk to you for a few moments tonight about pending legislation to enable the men and women in our armed forces to vote by absentee ballot in the coming election.

This morning the Committee on Election of President, Vice President and Representatives in Congress, of which I am the ranking majority member, reported, with certain perfecting amendments, the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan bill which passed the Senate some time ago.

This measure provides that these ballots, postal cards, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails, to the men and women in our armed forces throughout the world. The Secretaries of War and Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, are required to take the necessary steps to effect the delivery of such postal cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, and to give them priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war.

It also calls upon the authorities of the various States to cooperate in every possible way in providing for these men and women to vote by absentee ballots, and to expedite and facilitate the sending of these ballots so that they may be voted and returned in ample time for the election.

Under this measure, every qualified individual in our armed forces would have the opportunity to vote, not only for President, Vice President, Senators and Representatives in Congress, but they would also have the opportunity of voting for State, county, and local officials, from Governor down to constable. While under the so-called Green-Lucas bill, provision would be made only for voting for national officers—President, Vice President, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress; and even then the name of the candidate would not appear upon the ballot, but the soldier would either have to write in the name of the candidate or his party designation, and then, as I have said, he would not get to vote for local officials.

The Green-Lucas bill attempted to fix the qualifications for voters, in flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States. It attempted to usurp the election machinery of the various States. It would probably have resulted in having the election thrown into the courts in every State in the Union, resulting in confusion, if not chaos, at a time when we need harmony above everything else.

Now remember this: I don't care what any propagandist on either side tells you, there is not a Member of the United States Congress who does not want the men and women in our armed forces to vote in the coming election. The question is, How that can be done in a constitutional way, without overriding the State laws or usurping State election machinery?

We have reported out this bill, which, as I said, has already passed the Senate, and we have added amendments which we feel will meet every legitimate objection. It will enable the men and women in our armed forces to vote in a constitutional election, and will leave the election machinery in the hands of the various States, where the Constitution placed it.

The contention has been made that there will not be time enough to get these ballots from the various States to the individual voters in our armed forces and back before the election. That is pure nonsense; it will not take as long to get these ballots to them and back in that way as it would to send them around through a Federal election commission, which would probably be expanded into a vast bureaucracy, with all its slowdown implications and ramifications.

Every State in the Union that has not already done so, is preparing to move its primaries, or nominating conventions, up so as to permit the transmission, execution, and return of these ballots in ample time to be counted in the election returns.

This would prevent interference with the voters, or tampering with the ballots, by any Federal agency or bureaucracy, and would guarantee to the voters in our armed forces a free and untrammeled ballot.

It is being charged by certain left-wing radicals that we southern Democrats are in an "unholy alliance" with northern Republicans on this all-important issue—one of the gravest constitutional questions that has been raised in the Congress of the United States in 50 years.

As a southern Democrat, I want to say that there is nothing unholy about patriotic Americans, North and South, joining in an attempt to preserve the Constitution of the United States. It was not considered an unholy alliance when George Washington and Benjamin Franklin joined forces to create that sacred document, or when Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton worked for the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution is our ship of state, and upon its preservation depends the liberty, the happiness, and the hopes, not only of this generation, but of our posterity for generations to come.

Southern Democrats and northern Republicans have fought all over the deck of that ship for more than 75 years, over methods of operation and procedure, but they have never tried to blast the bottom out of the boat. We are now fighting to preserve it.

If we should ruthlessly violate the Constitution, override State laws, and usurp the election machinery of the various States, then we will probably have dealt a mortal blow to our constitutional form of government, which it took our forbears 2,000 years to build.

For my part, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for more than 10 years, I can say without boasting that no man has worked harder to try to take care of the men who have fought our battles in time of war than I have. Besides being the author of many laws for the benefit of the veterans and their dependents, I introduced and fought through the amendment last year raising the base pay of our men in the service to $50 a month—and some of the very men who are criticizing me now voted against that amendment on a roll call.

Let me say again that I am more than anxious to see that the men and women in our armed forces are given the opportunity to vote, but I want it done in a legal way, and that is what our bill provides.

They are fighting to save the Constitution of the United States and to preserve those institutions which are based upon it, along with our way of life, which it guarantees. While they are waging that fight for the preservation of American institutions on the battle fronts of the world, it is our duty to guard and protect that Constitution, to preserve the American way of life, and perpetuate its sacred institutions for them to enjoy when they return.

Let me say in conclusion that if we, as Members of Congress, have the right to set aside the Constitution of the United States in this instance, then we would have the right to further set it aside and call the election off entirely, and in that way perpetuate ourselves in office for the duration. Then

we could continue the duration indefinitely, even after the fighting ceased. That would be the end of the Republic and the end of virtually everything else for which our brave men are now fighting.

May a just Providence that is guiding them through the dark hours of this terrible struggle guide and direct the Congress of the United States in the preservation of those sacred institutions for which they fight—now and for all time to come.

May we, the recipients of American liberty—that proud heritage of patriotism conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry—may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time, and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this great Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips.

Minnesota State Federation of Labor Passes Resolution for Constitutional Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere appreciation of their action that I include with my remarks herewith a resolution passed by the Minnesota State Federation of Labor at their annual convention last fall:

Resolution 7

Whereas article 1, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall have power to coin money, and regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin"; and

Whereas Congress has substantially failed to exercise this power and has permitted the power to create the medium of exchange of the Nation to fall into private hands, thus bringing about at present a situation where the Nation, in order to supply its own credit for purpose of national defense or the accommodation of increased production, is compelled to issue interest-bearing bonds and transfer ownership of such bonds to private banks in exchange for newly created credits upon their books; and

Whereas there has developed in the method of conducting commercial banks in the United States the custom of lending the private credit of such institutions under the guise of lending money; and

Whereas such credit, transferable from one depositor to another by the check or order of the depositor or any other person in his behalf is now generally accepted in payment of debts, thus in effect providing an uncontrolled and privately created circulating medium of exchange which performs the functions of money in disregard of article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the uncontrolled alternate expansion and contraction of this synthetic medium of exchange induces recurrent periods of uncontrolled and disorganizing inflation followed by disastrous periods of equally uncontrolled deflation, bankruptcy, and distress; and

Whereas it has become necessary to the safety and welfare of the Nation that inflation and deflation alike be prevented and that a stable buying power be maintained in the dollar; and

Whereas these aims and purposes can only be accomplished if Congress acts to end the existing dependence of the United States upon a privately created and destroyed bank-credit medium of exchange and to substitute therefor a dependable medium of exchange, not based on debt but put into circulation without increase in the public debt in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federtion of Labor is in favor of legislation as embodied in the Voorhis bill—H. R. 118—which has for its objective the restoring to Congress the sole exercise of its power to regulate the value of money, prohibiting the creation of money or any substitute for money through private sources, maintaining a stable purchasing power of the dollar, restoring and maintaining full employment and production, and other purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress, each member of the Banking and Currency Committee in both Houses of Congress, the Finance Committee in the Senate, the Ways and Means Committee in the House, and the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee in the House.

The Cost of Living—The Little Steel Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal to the effect that the advancing cost of living justifies an increase in wages, the discarding of the Little Steel formula.

Having no independent knowledge of my own, I insert below from Nation's Business for January 1944, an article which should throw some light on the merits of the controversy. It is as follows:

LITTLE STEEL, WHAT NEXT?

Despite widespread claims to the contrary, both hourly and weekly earnings of industrial workers have increased more rapidly than living costs.

This is shown by analysis of the Department of Labor's own monthly figures, which have not, however, been published in such a way as to provide comparisons which present the full picture. The comparisons have now been worked out by the department of manufacture of the United States Chamber of Commerce, which explains that, while the Little Steel formula has restrained increases in straight-time wage rates, the effect of additional hours worked and of overtime has pushed both the hourly and weekly earnings ahead of the rise in living costs.

The Little Steel formula, in effect, provides that if any group of workers averaged less than a 15-percent increase in hourly wage rates from January 1, 1941, to May 1942, "their established peacetime standards have been broken."

Actually, the United States Chamber points out, comparisons between hourly wage rates and the indexes of the cost of living are of slight significance; in practical effect the determining factor is what the worker takes home in his pay envelope. The analysis of official Government figures shows that not only the weekly or "take home" earnings have increased far more than the cost-of-living index, but that hourly earnings likewise have stepped up at faster pace.

Here are the comparisons:

From January 1941, the base month of the Little Steel formula, to September 1943, the cost-of-living index increased 23 percent.

Weekly earnings increased 66 percent.

Hourly earnings increased 45 percent.

From September 1942, the base at which prices and wages were ordered stabilized under the Price Control Act, the cost-of-living index increased 5 percent.

Weekly earnings increased 17 percent.

Hourly earnings increased 11 percent.

From August 1939, the last month before the European war broke out, to September 1943, the cost of living index increased 26 percent. Weekly earnings increased 87 percent. Hourly earnings increased 59 percent.

The Government's index of living costs shows a rise of 22.8 percent in the cost of all items covered in the period from January 1941 to September 1943.

In contrast to this rise of 22.8 percent in living costs, the weekly earnings of iron and steel industry workers jumped 58 percent and their hourly earnings 38 percent; in the automobile industry the figures were 54 and 31 percent, respectively; in nondurable goods 53 and 35, in food 40 and 26; in chemical and allied products 56 and 36; in petroleum and coal 61 and 30; in rubber products 56 and 36; electrical machinery 46 and 32; transportation equipment 66 and 51; nonferrous metals and their products 60 and 42; lumber and timber basic products 65 and 47; furniture and finished lumber products 61 and 43; textile mill products and other fiber manufactures 54 and 48; tobacco manufacturers 55 and 24; in miscellaneous industries 63 and 41.

In not a single industry listed in the study did both weekly and hourly earnings fail to keep well ahead, and in most cases far ahead, of the increase in living costs.

Cost of living in large cities

[Indexes, 1935-39=100]

	Sept. 15, 1943	Percentage increases, September 1943 from—		
		September 1942	January 1941	August 1939
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
All items	123.9	5.2	22.8	25.7
Food	137.4	8.5	40.5	47.0
Clothing	132.5	5.3	31.6	32.1
Rent	108.0	----	2.9	3.5
Fuel, electricity, and ice	107.7	1.4	6.8	10.5
Housefurnishings	126.3	2.2	26.2	25.5
Miscellaneous	117.0	5.0	14.8	16.5

Earnings and hours of work of industrial workers

	Earnings and hours (averages), September 1943	Percentage increases, September 1943 from—		
		September 1942	January 1941	August 1939
All manufacturing:		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Weekly earnings	$44.39	17	66	87
Hourly earnings	$0.993	11	45	59
Hours per week	44.7	5	15	17
Durable goods:				
Weekly earnings	$51.06	15	68	92
Hourly earnings	$1.098	10	47	60
Hours per week	46.5	4	14	20

Letter of Maj. Reagan McCrary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from an old friend of mine, Maj. Reagan McCrary, of the Eighth Air Force, who is better known to New Yorkers as Tex McCrary, radio commentator and newspaperman:

DEAR JIMMIE: This is a Christmas story. It's about a little Englishman, or rather a Scotsman, named Corp. James McLoughlin, from Broughty Ferry Road, Dundee. He used to work for a shipping line that ran an importing business on the side. He was a salesman in one of their retail stores.

Over his counter went oranges and bananas and dates and olives and pineapples and dozens of other things that came from far places—places to which "Chipper" McLoughlin had never been. As a matter of fact, Chipper had never been anywhere, not even to London, not even out of Scotland—until the war. And then he crossed the Channel with the short-lived British Expeditionary Force.

He was soldier and stretcher bearer and surgeon and grave-digger before the end—and the end came quickly and brutally. They were driven back to the cliffs at St. Valery—right to the edge of the Channel. They flopped over the edge and made a last stand on the ledges above the surf below. The Huns pushed on, their machine guns clawed the top of the cliffs, and shredded any man who stuck his head into line of fire.

Chipper got his tin hat knocked off and the top of his head creased—Chipper was always letting curiosity out-argue discretion. But finally they had to surrender—and the conquering division was Rommel's No. 1 panzer outfit. Rommel himself was on hand. And as the Tommies came up over the edge of the cliff to surrender, a German officer stood on the nose of a steaming tank and shouted in good English:

"So, you are beaten, Britishers. Look behind you now. There across the Channel lies your England. Look at it for the last time—because within 7 days, we shall be there, and it will be ours."

You know the old saying that "all Englishmen live upon an island, and each Englishman is an island unto himself" * * * there never was a better proof of that than Chipper McLoughlin, Scotsman.

He looked up at the German officer, grinned, and said, quite loud enough for all to hear: "B———, Jerry!"

And the German officer had a pretty good idea what Chipper meant. He barked an order, another German slugged Chipper with the butt of a Luger. Chipper went down, and out, but grinning.

Well, you remember what happened after the Huns got to the Channel. They got no farther. I don't know how you feel about Dunkerque, but, personally, I'm grateful to the guys on the beaches who fought so well, even in retreat, that Hitler knew he was not ready to invade Britain. And how about Chipper?

He marched into Germany, a prisoner of war—but still and forever "an island unto himself." That march was torture. But we have it from a buddy of Chipper's that never once, even in sleep and sickness, did that grin go from Chipper's face.

It must have been hell for the Huns, seeing that grin always there. I have it from lots of prisoners of war that the only people inside Germany who ever smile are the dead and the prisoners. Yes; that must be tough.

Well, they tried pretty hard to wipe that grin off the face of Chipper McLoughlin. They told him that Britain was beaten, that Hitler had decided to give the bombers of the Luftwaffe the pleasure and the honor of winding up the job, now that the ground troops had had the supreme satisfaction of beating the British on the field of battle. And Chipper could hear the bombers roaring out toward Britain from one of the early prisons where they kept him. But still he did not believe that Britain was beaten or even badly bent. And still the grin was there.

But in the fall, in the days of the blitz, they gave the prisoners American newspapers, and our headlines did make it seem as though Britain would not, could not, last long. And so Chipper's smile was a little strained going into December, and sometimes when the lights were down, so was the smile. And that's when he began to cook the plan that got him the truth, every night, direct from London.

With packets of Red Cross food, and cigarettes, he bribed a guard to get the "loan" of all the keys to the prison—not the keys that would get him outside, but only the keys to the inside doors, so that he could move around inside the prison. From these keys impressions were made in candle tallow; and from these impressions, rough keys were made that gave Chipper the run of his prison. And that's how Chipper got to listen to the British news broadcasts every night in the officers' club while the guards slept.

And, as Chipper learned to speak German, he told his prison-keepers each day how the war was really going, long before they got it from their phony communiqués. And now Chipper's smile was rampant, belligerent, again. Maddening to all Nazis who saw it.

Over the prison radio, Chipper heard Christmas services from home—by far the most beautiful he had ever heard. From that day on, Chipper was an "island of cheer" in the prison. And always his audacity fed on his conviction that the Huns were losing the war.

For instance, toward the end of stay in prison, he robbed the Huns of the services of a couple of regiments of Italians—it happened like this. After Italy checked out of the war, the Germans made prisoners of their former allies. Droves of them came into the same prison camp where Chipper and his outfit were cooped up.

They were a sad lot. Everything possible had been done to make them miserable in body and in spirit. They were stripped of their Italian uniforms and dressed like clowns in old uniforms dug out of some ancient storeroom, uniforms that the Italians and the French wore in World War No. 1. Everybody laughed at them. They were given all the dirtiest jobs.

And that's how one of them got shot. A young Italian was put to picking up papers around the yards. Like all prison camps, there was a double barbed-wire fence around this one, and a sharpshooter's tower at every corner; machine guns ready. This young Italian, quite innocently, poked his arm through the inner wire to reach for a piece of paper that had blown just outside. The guard saw him, leveled his gun, and, without warning, chopped the young Italian to pieces.

Everybody saw it. Everybody was very quiet as two stretcher bearers came out, picked up the crumpled form, dumped it into a blanket, carried it away.

Next day a big-shot Nazi general arrived at the camp, and all the Italians were lined up in parade formations to listen to the big shot make a speech, a speech full of promises to all the gallant, brave, and unfortunate Italians who had been betrayed into this criminal alliance with the butcher nations of England and America; just sign up with the German Army, the mighty conquering German Army, and your uniforms and new weapons and new equipment and the finest living conditions will be restored to you, so that you can go to the Russian front and fight to save Europe from bolshevism.

Now, the Italians did not want to fight the Russians, nor did they care particularly whether or not Europe was saved from bolshevism, but they did want new uniforms, and they didn't like being prisoners, so they were all about to sign up on the first dotted line that was poked at them.

At that moment of wavering, Chipper McLoughlin, that "one-man island of resistance," went into action. With a pal, he went into the morgue, got the dead Italian soldier, the one killed by the guard, put him on a stretcher, covered the body with a blanket, then raced out across the enclosure where all the Italians were gathered—nobody stopped them—it looked like an emergency case.

And just as they passed the front of the packed Italians, Chipper neatly planted one foot on a corner of the blanket, and, as they ran, the dead boy was uncovered for all his comrades to see. That did the trick. There was a whisper through the crowd; then a murmer, and then a growl; they remembered.

And so the Nazi general got no recruits that day for the Russian front. Chipper never saw the Russian front, but he knows a lot about it; you see, Chipper got to be a medical orderly in the German hospital; lots of the British worked at such jobs. And that's how he got to talk to many of the Germans who had been wounded on the Russian front; there were dozens of cases of boys with feet so badly frostbitten that they had to be amputated.

And Chipper knows how many of these men deliberately poured water into their boots to guarantee frostbite; anything was preferable to staying at the Russian front and lose your life. As a soldier Chipper knows what has to happen to an army before men will pour water in their boots.

And Chipper can remember how when first he was in prison camp and would work among the civilians, they were all lifting their hands in obedient and fanatical heils. But since the winter of 1942–43, Chipper has not seen a dozen heil salutes.

But all this was indirect evidence of limping, waning German morale. Chipper McLoughlin was human; he longed for the sight of Germans being killed, and then one day he got what he wanted. It was a Saturday.

Everybody had been told that Sunday would be a big day; all the prisoners were to be taken to the nearby assembly plant for Focke-Wulf fighter planes, just outside the northeast German city of Marienburg to see Hermann Goering dedicate a magnificent new runway—the runway that was to be used for testing the new Focke-Wulfs before they went up into the battle of Germany against the Forts and Libs of the Eighth Air Force.

But Goering got scooped on his opening—because at 7 minutes to noon on Saturday, an angry cloud of Fortresses flew over the prison—and all the prisoners whipped off their shirts and waved and yelled—and almost as if in response to the waving shirts, bombbays opened, and down came the tumbling compact pattern of bombs—there had not been such accurate bombing anywhere in the battle of Germany as this special show for the boys at Marienburg prison camp.

They were all called into service to clear away the wreckage of the plant and haul out the dead Germans. Chipper cannot remember when he had more fun—poking and pulling at the delightful wreckage of another German factory; says Chipper: "It was every bit as bloody good fun as opening Christmas parcels."

Chipper's home now, a repatriated prisoner. He's had his 30-day leave. He's got a new wife, and started a new son that he expects to be born on a new Armistice Day. And, oh yes, he's back in a combat outfit again. "I want to go back across the Channel again—it will be a verrry very diff-errrrent kind of a warrr this time, eh, Yank?"

The best new year.

TEX.

Capt. Sigfrid Ericsson of the "Gripsholm"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the following radio program was one of the most interesting presented to the public during the year of 1943:

INTERVIEW WITH CAPT. SIGFRID ERICSSON, MASTER OF THE "GRIPSHOLM," AND MR. GEORGE HANSON, PASSENGER TRAFFIC MANAGER OF THE SWEDISH-AMERICAN LINES, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1943, OVER STATION WHN, NEW YORK

Mr. LANG. The WHN special features department presents the fourth in a series of programs concerning the recently arrived repatriate ship, *Gripsholm*. Tonight, Walt Dennis, WHN special events director, and I will interview Capt. Sigfrid Ericsson, master of the *Gripsholm*—and Mr. George Hanson, passenger traffic manager of the Swedish American Lines.

Today, when the sea lanes throughout the world are filled with ships of death and destruction, one ship stands out as a beacon light of liberty and happiness—the *Gripsholm*. Today, when battleships and cruisers are targets for suffering and misery, a ship sails the seas as a "happy" ship—a ship of joyful people, people who are returning to their native land for the first time since before Pearl Harbor. The master of this "happy" ship, the *Gripsholm*, is indeed the Good Samaritan of the seas—a man whose duty it is to protect and care for the men, women and children placed in his charge—a man who makes that duty not a duty but a real joy for everyone whom he meets. That man is Capt. Sigfrid Ericsson, master of the repatriate ship *Gripsholm*—a seafaring Scandinavian—a man decorated and knighted by two kings. WHN is more than proud this evening to bring you this special interview with Captain Ericsson. First, to give you a few of the high lights in the Captain's colorful career, we present Mr. George Hanson, of the Swedish-American Lines, who will give us the background of Captain Ericsson's service with the Swedish-American Lines. Mr. Hanson, how long has Captain Ericsson been with your line?

Mr. HANSON. In the spring of 1920, Sigfrid Ericsson started with the Swedish-American Lines as junior officer on the *Stockholm*. He remained with the *Stockholm* for 8 years and then was transferred to the *Drottningholm* as chief officer. The same year he was again transferred to the *Gripsholm* as chief officer, where he stayed for 7 years. Then, for a year, he was chief officer of the *Kungsholm*, serving as acting captain on these various ships from time to time. In 1934 he became captain of his old ship the *Drottningholm*. Just 2 days before the invasion of Norway, Captain Ericsson docked the *Drottningholm* at Gothenburg, Sweden, where she was laid up for a year.

Mr. LANG. Did Captain Ericsson bring the *Drottningholm* to New York?

Mr. HANSON. Yes; in the spring of 1941 Captain Ericsson left Gothenburg for New York—then took the ship to Lisbon loaded with European diplomats, newsmen and other enemy aliens. From Lisbon, the ship came back to New York with American diplomats and newsmen who had been caught in Europe at the outbreak of war.

Mr. LANG. This was Captain Ericsson's first experience with repatriates, I believe. What did he have to say concerning their reaction?

Mr. HANSON. I think I'll leave that for the Captain to tell you. He has some very interesting stories.

Mr. LANG. Then suppose you continue with something of his history.

Mr. HANSON. Gladly. In the spring of 1942, Captain Ericsson took over as master of another of his old ships, the *Gripsholm*, and made his first trip to Laurenco Marques, in Portuguese East Africa with Japanese envoys and dignitaries as his passengers. This was his first repatriation trip on the *Gripsholm*. But, I'm getting a little ahead of my story. You see, Captain Ericsson has another title—that of Sir Sigfrid.

Mr. LANG. Yes; I understand he's been knighted.

Mr. HANSON. That is a story in itself. I wish the captain would tell the story himself, but inasmuch as he is a very modest man, I'm going to tell it for him. Many sea stories have been told and written about the terrific winter storms around Iceland and Greenland. In the winter of 1939, Captain Ericsson, as master of the *Drottningholm*, received an S O S from a Norwegian sealing fleet, just below Iceland. The sealing expedition consisted of six ships, three of which were in distress. Captain Ericsson immediately changed his course and headed straight into the storm. It was impossible to learn the exact location of the first ship, for she had only a radio telephone, no radio. Going 360 miles out of his way, Captain Ericsson took the *Drottningholm* to the approximate locality of the foundering ships. The captain praised his ship as a true queen of the seas. Again the captain talked to the ship in distress and since it was late evening, and a rescue was impossible until dawn, told her to stand by. The next morning, the captain tried to find the ship, but all trace of her was lost. In the meantime, another S O S had been received from another ship of the sealing expedition. This ship, also was in distress, so again Captain Ericsson set out to help—this time knowing the location of the ship since it had a radio, and the *Drottningholm* direction finder could plot the correct location from the radio beam. On arriving at the location he found the vessel still afloat, but since the storm was still raging—snow, sleet, and wind of a hurricane force—he put a lifeboat out back of the *Drottningholm*, maneuvered his ship above the sealer, and told the men on it to jump into the lifeboat as it was cut to drift past the sinking ship. By this strategy all aboard were saved—achieving a rescue almost impossible considering the storm. Meanwhile, a third ship in distress had been helped by another rescue craft—the three other sealing vessels made port safely and Captain Ericsson turned back on his course and arrived safely at his destination 3½ days late.

Mr. LANG. What decoration did he receive for this heroic rescue?

Mr. HANSON. Captain Ericsson was made a commander of the Order of St. Olaf, by King Haakon, of Norway, and was knighted by King Gustav, of Sweden.

Mr. LANG. An extremely interesting man, the captain. Now, suppose we hear from him in person. Walt Dennis, will you present Captain Ericsson to our audience?

Mr. DENNIS. I'll be glad to, Bill Lang. [Describes captain. Stories.]

Captain ERICSSON. The trips are planned very carefully by a number of interested governments and agencies. American interests are handled by the Swiss Government. Japanese interests are taken care of by the Spanish Government. Placement of the persons aboard ship is worked out by the American State Department so far as the *Gripsholm* is concerned. I want to say that this planning worked out very well indeed on our trips. Refueling, taking aboard of supplies, checking the vessel in and out of ports of call, all went smoothly and we had no trouble with anything going wrong at all.

Mr. DENNIS. Speaking of the placement of the Japanese passengers, Captain, I presume, they were assigned space according to rank and station in life?

Captain ERICSSON. Not necessarily. Comfort is of first importance. Everything possible is done to make it easy and comfortable for the passengers, for to us, whether they're Japanese, Americans, or Germans—they're passengers of the Swedish-American Lines and must be made comfortable. The elderly persons are assigned to lower berths near the dining room. We always carry two doctors and six nurses to be sure that our passengers are well cared for.

Mr. DENNIS. On this last trip over with the *Gripsholm*, did you have any trouble of any kind with the Japanese repatriates?

Captain ERICSSON. No trouble whatever. They were all well cared for and well fed—including the three insane persons on board. There were many small children on board—young Japanese who had been born in America and who knew only the English language. Schools and lectures were conducted on board by Japanese educators who, too, were returning on the *Gripsholm*. Most classes were in Japanese language instruction.

Mr. DENNIS. It seems to me that the adjustment for these children and for the adults too, will be rather severe when they return to Japan.

Captain ERICSSON. It will be. In fact, a significant event occurred when we docked at Mormugao, where all the Japanese repatriates were to transfer to the Japanese ship.

Mr. DENNIS. What happened?

Captain ERICSSON. Naturally we knew the exact number of passengers on board—and when all had disembarked, we checked and discovered that two were missing. Two little girls—about 8 or 9 years old.

Mr. DENNIS. What had happened?

Captain ERICSSON. We immediately started a search of the ship and finally found the two small stowaways, hiding in one of the bathrooms. It seemed they didn't want to leave the ship—they wanted to come back to America.

Mr. DENNIS. A lot of us can readily understand their feelings. For to many of these people who have been born here, America represents their homeland far more than the land to which they are returning. But, another thing, Captain Ericsson, we noticed in the pictures of the Americans who returned with you this last trip, that many of them were very poorly dressed. Was the same thing true of the Japanese?

Captain ERICSSON. Certainly not on the first trip the *Gripsholm* made. Of course, most of the first group of passengers were diplomats and other well-to-do persons. They had vast amounts of new luggage and the finest of clothes which they were taking back with them from America. But, you mention the clothing worn by these passengers who just returned. You should have seen them when we picked them up.

Mr. DENNIS. Rags to riches, was it?

Captain ERICSSON. It was indeed. Had it not been for the Red Cross packages which the passengers received at Mormugao, and the shopping they did at Port Elizabeth and

at Rio, our passengers would indeed have been ragged.

Mr. DENNIS. To get back to the Japanese repatriates. You say they gave you no trouble in any way?

Captain ERICSSON. None. In fact, they offered to help the crew by standing watch. The European repatriates did the same thing. They seemed anxious to help in any way they could.

Mr. DENNIS. Perhaps they were a little frightened of planes or subs.

Captain ERICSSON. Not at all unlikely.

Mr. DENNIS. Did you sight any subs on any of your trips?

Captain ERICSSON. We were questioned several times by men of war and by planes, and I can say we were carefully watched.

Mr. DENNIS. What, besides the schools and lectures, did the *Gripsholm* offer the Japanese repatriates in the way of entertainment?

Captain ERICSSON. We have three motion-picture studios—and although we had to be careful to show no propaganda movies—we did receive an odd request for one particular show from the passengers.

Mr. DENNIS. What movie was that?

Captain ERICSSON. Yankee Doodle Dandy.

Mr. DENNIS. That's really something. How on earth does showing Yankee Doodle Dandy get by on your propaganda ban?

Captain ERICSSON. That was a special request by the Japanese themselves. We also showed Gentleman Jim, Seven Sweethearts, and Who Done It.

Mr. DENNIS. Naturally we're all vitally interested in our own American repatriates. Just what thing about them impressed you most, Captain Ericsson?

Captain ERICSSON. Well, I believe the thing which impressed me most of all was their astonishment and delight at the food we served them. Some of them were extremely thin and undernourished, and there, too, we had a problem. We had to feed them the right kind of food, but because of their condition, we had to be very careful not to permit them to have too much. At first we gave them only soft food—soups, chicken, plenty of milk—in fact, we kept barrels of fresh, sweet milk on deck at all times so they could have as much as they wanted, as often as they wanted it. Later, of course, we changed their diet to more substantial food.

Mr. DENNIS. What food did they seem to appreciate most?

Captain ERICSSON. I believe it was ice cream—why, the first serving after they got on board was a half ton of ice cream.

Mr. DENNIS. Sounds like a real job for the cooks.

Captain ERICSSON. It was that. On the last round trip, we served 500,000 meals.

Mr. DENNIS. That's a lot of dishes to wash, too, Captain. Did you follow the custom of having guests at your table, Captain?

Captain ERICSSON. No; we didn't. On the repatriation trips we made it a point not to encourage any conversation concerning the experiences of our passengers. Sweden is a neutral state and our position on the *Gripsholm* followed our government's official position.

Mr. DENNIS. A very logical policy, Captain Ericsson. But a few moments ago you mentioned the work of the Red Cross. I understand you also carried on the *Gripsholm* a great many packages to the persons imprisoned in Japan.

Captain ERICSSON. Yes. On the first trip of the *Gripsholm* we carried 318 tons of food, medicines, and clothes from the Red Cross to the Americans still held by Japan, including war prisoners. On the second trip, we had 1,400 tons of food, gifts, and medicine for the prisoners.

Mr. DENNIS. On the return voyage, did you bring any gifts for the Japanese prisoners here in the United States.

Captain ERICSSON. The Red Cross in Japan sent several hundred tons of goods and other things to Japanese prisoners of war. On our first trip to Laurenco Marques, the packages we carried did not get to Japan as the Japanese officials refused to take them to Japan. However, on the second voyage, when we had many hundreds of tons more, the Japanese did load it, but only after we had urged them to do so through their representative on the *Gripsholm*, Paron Hayashi. A British captain at Mormugao who supervised the stevedores during the loading operations, worked on the Japanese ship people and finally got all the American 1,400 tons of packages loaded for Japan, in addition to 60 tons of British supplies. He was a worker, that fellow.

Mr. DENNIS. Apparently, then, Captain, on the last trip the Japanese attitude has changed a bit toward the softer side.

Captain ERICSSON. Yes, indeed. There was quite a change between the two voyages.

Mr. DENNIS. That, I know, is good news for the many persons here in the States who have sent packages to their sons and husbands and brothers who are in prison camp in the Far East. You mentioned the entertainment offered to the Japanese repatriates on the trip over. I suppose the Americans also had movies

Captain ERICSSON. Yes; movies and schools and lectures—just as the Japanese did. You see, there were over 600 missionaries on board the *Gripsholm*—many of whom had been educators and teachers in Japan. They conducted classes and lectures on American history and on the history of India and of Japan—thus to give our returning Americans a better understanding of the country to which they were returning, as well as the countries from which they had come.

Mr. DENNIS. One thing has come to my mind, Captain Ericsson; did our returning Americans, aside from their ragged clothing and loss of weight, show any other particular signs of their internment?

Captain ERICSSON. There was one sign I did notice—one thing which I believe should be brought to the minds of all Americans. When these Americans who had been imprisoned first came on board, naturally they had to stand in line for inoculations, for identifications, and for lifeboat drill and countless other matters. They seemed naturally to fall into line—to be accustomed to lines—to having to wait for food and clothing and help of any kind. These were the things they'd been doing since their internment—these were the things to which they were accustomed. Of course, like all real Americans, they soon shed these outer characteristics of meekness and resignation. Good food, warm clothing, plenty of the candy and cokes they had almost forgotten, brought new life, new energy, a new color to these people. Believe me, Mr. Dennis, one of the most gratifying parts of my job is to see these people come back to normal health under the care we give them.

Mr. DENNIS. I can understand your feelings exactly, Captain Ericsson, and I agree with you wholeheartedly that we Americans should appreciate the fact that when we stand in line for new tires, more gasoline, ration books, or movies, we're doing it in the name of freedom and liberty—not in bondage or slavery as have these people on the *Gripsholm* who have just returned. Before we hear a parting message from Captain Ericsson to the American people, let me take a few moments to speak for Captain Ericsson and for Station WHN on something we are now very familiar with, namely, to emphasize again the care and thoughtfulness behind the repatriation voyages by the agencies concerned. We would like particularly to mention the grand help the American Red Cross has been, both here and overseas. Enough may never be said for this truly humanitarian organization. The American State Department, the Public Health Service, the Swiss and Spanish Governments, the American Export and Swedish American Lines, and the many other religious and lay groups which have made these voyages possible and so comfortable for our people, are due tremendous appreciation. For Station WHN we wish to extend our appreciation to Mr. Hilmer Lundbeck, Sr., and his son, Hilmer, Jr., to Mr. Naboth Hedin, of the Swedish-American News Agency, to the Office of Censorship, to our own State Department and to the Third Naval District, United States Navy, for making these broadcasts possible and for working them out with us. And now, here's Bill Lang.

Mr. LANG. All right, Walt. Thank you, Captain Ericsson and Mr. Hanson. I wonder, captain, if you have any closing remarks you'd like to pass on before we say goodnight?

Captain ERICSSON. I would like to say that I hope the people of America will look closer into what they have and appreciate what they have at present. I hope, too, that they realize what they may lose in the future before this is all over. They have to be strict with themselves, and in that respect really show appreciation for what they have.

Mr. LANG. Thank you very much, Captain Ericsson. Your thoughts are shared by every one of the 1,500 repatriates on the *Gripsholm*. I know—and also by every straight-thinking American in this country we all love. You, Captain Ericsson, will soon again go out on the *Gripsholm*—the happy ship, the ship of mercy—with you at the helm as the good Samaritan. Thousands of our Americans now interned in foreign camps are looking forward eagerly to your next voyage, and the next after that—hoping, praying that they may be on the list of passengers of the good ship *Gripsholm*. In saying goodnight, Captain Ericsson, we say, too, Godspeed and many more voyages on the happy ship *Gripsholm*.

Captain ERICSSON. Thank you, Mr. Lang.

A Medal for Nancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "A Medal for Nancy," copyrighted by J. C. McManemin, Jr., of the Maxon, Inc., advertising agency for the Weatherhead Co., of Cleveland, Ohio. The timely article is as follows:

Little Nancy Jane is only 6. She stood alone, with all the inborn dignity of childhood, in that historic room amid the admirals, the Senators, the great and near-great grown-ups.

She heard a deep, resonant voice say: "For conspicuous gallantry over and beyond the call of duty, the Congress of the United States of America awards the Congressional Medal of Honor to Marvin Clayton, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, killed in action at the victorious Battle of Midway." And then a blue ribbon passed over her head. And, looking down, she saw a gold medal at the end of the ribbon nestling against her dress.

Little Nancy Jane is only six. She is too young to understand the words of the citation—not quite old enough to realize that this blue-ribboned gold medal is the highest honor our Nation can bestow on its heroes.

But not too young to know that never more will she feel those strong, gentle hands tucking in her blanket, or hoisting her high in the air for a morning kiss, or patiently guiding her pencil as she scrawls a birthday greeting to Grandma.

Little Nancy Jane is only 6—and fatherless. However long actual fighting goes on—this war means sacrifice for little Nancy Jane for the rest of her life.

Every single second lost today on our production lines, every hoarded bit of food, rubber, and metal, every moment of complacency or face-saving or temporizing, means more children become fatherless.

Each of us owes something to Nancy Jane's dad, and to Nancy Jane.

"The men and women of Weatherhead sponsored this message. Most of us have near relatives in uniform—sons, husbands, brothers—sisters and daughters, too. Our task is not dramatic, but it is vital to every single big weapon. For years we have been making for peacetime purposes the same fittings and devices we are making today. However, responding to the urgent war needs of the Nation, we have found ways of producing them in greater quantity than ever before—more than a million every 24 hours. So, you see, our skill is also one of the great weapons for winning the war and for building the kind of world we're all fighting for.

"ALBERT J. WEATHERHEAD, Jr.,
"President."

Dr. George Otis Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Otis Smith, of Skowhegan, Maine, who died on January 10, 1944, was for many years Director of the United States Geological Survey and later Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

By profession Dr. Smith was a geologist and was first engaged in geological work in Michigan, Utah, Washington, and in New England. He was located in these several States in the years intervening between 1893 and 1908. From 1896 he was assistant geologist, geologist in 1907, and served continuously as Director of the United States Geological Survey from the date last mentioned until 1930, except in 1922 and 1923, when he was a member of President Coolidge's Coal Fact Finding Commission. In 1920 he was awarded the Daly Gold Medal by the American Geological Society.

From December of 1930 until November 1933, he was Chairman of the powerful Federal Power Commission, newly organized, and to which he was appointed by President Hoover.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by John L. Fysche, editor of the Independent-Reporter, Skowhegan:

DR. GEORGE OTIS SMITH

It is not often that Skowhegan has given to the Nation a man of so great importance as was Dr. George Otis Smith. His activities in Washington made him a national figure. His sudden passing Monday in Augusta shocked the entire citizenry.

It is with a sense of gratitude that it now occurs to us that we as a community have been greatly blessed in that the last decade of Dr. Smith's life was spent with us. It is fortunate in many respects, not alone because of his ready response in giving of his vast fund of information from the pulpit and the platform—not alone because of his generous philanthropies, or because of the genuine service he gave in his church and social relations, but because Skowhegan people have become acquainted with him. His friendships of earlier years were more or less retained through his frequent but brief visits here during the years of his important career in the National Capital. But his acquaintance with those of a younger generation who had grown up during his absence or had been newcomers in the town and were holding responsible positions, was not general. The same was true of the children, who must have received a lasting impression of his gentle personality.

So it is good that the last 10 years of Dr. Smith's life were spent in the community whose traditions he loved, in whose present he found joyous contentment and for whose welfare he held fond ideals. It was good to see Dr. Smith working in his garden. It was good to visit him in his home where the humble as well as the great received honorable attention. It was good to feel his strength in the community; in the chamber of commerce of which he was a leading founder, and in the Rotary Club where he was heard and admired. The hospital and the library were among his closest interests and his church was a constant theme of his consideration. He had built up a splendid teamwork with the community.

It is for us who remain to not only treasure his memory and to recall his achievements which were far beyond the ken of average mortals, but it is for us to follow his ideals—to try as best we can to bring to pass the visions he realized for Skowhegan. In so doing we will, indeed, show our continued respect to his memory, and will constantly realize the greatness of a man whose friendships ranged from those holding the highest estate which the country afforded down to the humblest citizens of Skowhegan. His earthly efforts will bear rich fruits for Christianity, education, and enterprise.

Lt. W. J. Grayson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution passed by the Disabled American Veterans, Foothill Chapter, Department of California, is fitting recognition of the heroism of Lieutenant Grayson and the sacrifice of his family:

Whereas the citizens of Monrovia, Arcadia, and Sierra Madre, represented by a joint committee, are at this time petitioning the Federal authorities at Washington, D. C., to construct, in the foothills of this territory, one or more of the many Government hospitals so urgently needed for the accommodation and rehabilitation of the injured and maimed of this war; and

Whereas it has been the long and well-established policy of the Government to dedicate and name such hospitals in commemoration of those who, on the field of battle, "have offered up their last full measure of devotion"; and

Whereas First Lt. W. J. Grayson was one of the first of the present conflict, of this territory, to give up his life in deadly combat against a ruthless enemy of our country, thus becoming a symbol of all the heroic dead of this and other wars, an example of courage, loyalty, devotion, and patriotism that will forever remain an inspiration to the highest and noblest attributes of mankind, to all future generations—

"Nor shall their glory be forgot
While fame her record keeps
Or honor points the hallowed spot
Where valor proudly sleeps."

Therefore be it

Resolved by Foothill Chapter, No. 55, Department of California, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., this 12th day of December in the year of our Lord, 1943, That we respectfully urge and request the United States Government, through the afore-mentioned committee, to dedicate and name the first military hospital constructed and completed in this territory the Lieutenant Grayson Memorial Hospital, to the end that said hospital, so long as it shall stand, will be a monument in commemoration of, and tribute to, the heroic dead of this district; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution be engraved and presented to the family of First Lt. W. J. Grayson, deceased; that a certified copy be sent to the afore-mentioned committee, a copy to the Honorable H. JERRY VOORHIS, Congressman, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Speech of Senator Glenn, of Illinois, Defending President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, browsing through the literary department of the 5-and-10-cent store recently I came upon a book at reduced price entitled "The Best of American Wit and Humor," edited by J. B. Mussey.

In turning over the pages my attention was directed to the caption, "Congressional Record, issue December 18, 1930," subtitle "A Speech by Senator Glenn, of Illinois," replying to an attack on President Hoover by Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee—a bachelor.

Inasmuch as I am a fellow Illinoisan I eagerly read the excerpts from a speech delivered by a former Senator from my State. Verily, times have changed since 1930 in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. Thirteen years ago Senator Glenn and those of his political party were vigorously defending their President. Today many of the members of Senator Glenn's party are indulging in

panzer perorations against the President of the United States. Is it not just another case of "whose ox is gored"?

Anyway, read the excerpts from the speech of the Honorable Otis M. Glenn, Republican, former Senator from the State of Illinois, in defense of the then President, Herbert Hoover—Republican—and compare it with some of the speeches that recently have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Instead of teaching faith and confidence in the Government of the United States, every day or so an attack is made upon the President of this Nation. I say if it were not an act of ignorance it would be almost an act of treason.

When I think of the charge made on the floor of the Senate that the President of the United States has probably taken Government funds to build a road to his summer camp, I think how small, how utterly almost insane it is to make that charge against this man, and be we Republicans or be we Democrats, whether or not we believe in all the things the President of the United States has done—and there is disaffection on this side as there is on the other, division here as there is over there—I think the people of the United States are entitled to know, as we know here, that instead of being a poltroon, a thief, an embezzler, a misappropriator of public funds, a disloyal citizen of the United States, no man in all the history of the Republic holding that highest position of all positions in the world has rendered more sincere, more unselfish, more unfailing service than the present President of the United States.

Rising in the morning at 7 o'clock, the President is at breakfast at 8 o'clock or so, not alone or with the members of his family, but every day having with him, in order to save his precious time, people from this or the other section of the United States with whom he desires to talk, to confer, in order that he may learn something of their views of the great problems of America. Then into his office before 9 o'clock, meeting there until 1 o'clock one after the other delegations from all over this Nation—Senators, members of the Army and of the Navy, diplomats, people of every class and character and stratum of our American commonwealth. Then to lunch, again with people from whom he is seeking some light upon the great problems of the land, and all afternoon chained to his desk like a slave, working for America, as he honestly and sincerely believes to be to its interest. Then to dinner, not a private social gathering with his family and his intimate friends but again with people assembled there, rich and high, humble, poor, coming there to talk over the problems of our Nation, in order that no time may be wasted of his busy day.

After dinner, not retiring to seek relaxation and rest, or to a game of cards or for small social talk, but meeting again with the leaders of America, be they leaders of labor or leaders of capital; everybody, anybody, from whom he can learn something as to the proper solution of the problems of America.

Then to bed; and they tell me that even in the night this man, unfaithful to America as some are saying, awakens, and works in his bed for an hour or two upon the things he did not find time to deal with during the day.

That is a joke to the Senator from Tennessee, because he does not know that kind of industry; he knows nothing of it; and he condemns the President now because he goes to a summer camp a few week ends in the year, taking with him, as we all know, people with whom to continue his discussions of these important subjects. If the marines have done a little work upon that road there to make life a little easier for this man, and perhaps to make his life a little longer, I say it is the best expended money that has ever been spent by the Marine Corps of the United States.

What a shameful thing it is to condemn the President for those things, I think it is time to say, in this time of disaster and unemployment. I know there are many upon the other side of the aisle who will agree with me—and I say it sincerely—that if this man were a Democrat I would take the same position I am taking here today. This is not a time for cheap politics. It is not a time for a man to seek the newspaper headlines so that it can be broadcast all over Tennessee that Senator MCKELLAR made another attack upon the President of the United States.

I may say that this charge that this man has not accounted for a fund appropriated largely for the relief of starving and hungry children comes from a man who does not and cannot really know the love for children which President Hoover has within his heart, because I submit that no man who has reared no children of his own, no bachelor, can feel the same impulses of love and affection for childhood as does the present President of the United States of America, a proud father, an indulgent President, a lover of childhood, an honest man.

Address of Rear Admiral Louis E. Denfeld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, assistant chief of naval personnel, over the Blue Network January 2, 1944:

I appreciate the opportunity Hanson Baldwin, the distinguished military editor of the New York Times, has given me to tell you about the men of the Navy, about your son and the son of the neighbor next door.

A bluejacket, attempting to describe himself, recently wrote:

"A sailor is a man who gets too little sleep, does every imaginable job at any imaginable hour, never knows where he is going, can seldom tell where he's been—yet accepts the worst with complete resignation, and last, but not least—he really kinda likes it."

The description is incomplete. The bluejacket failed to mention that the sailor will face any ordeal unafraid. He failed to mention a bluejacket quality which arises in combat. That quality is valor.

Men make the Navy. It is an old axiom of the sea that a good ship with an inferior crew is seldom a match for a good crew with an inferior ship. It should be the source of assurance and pride to Americans to know that in this war the United States Fleet is fortunate in having both good ships and able men to sail in them. It is the quality of these men which has accounted in large part for our initial success at sea and it is their quality which holds the promise of eventual victory.

In the short time since the outbreak of hostilities we have succeeded in building the greatest and most powerful fleet in the history of the world. A similarly remarkable accomplishment is the fact that in that short time we have also been able to find, train, and man our fighting ships with unprecedented numbers of men from civilian pursuits who, by their performance, have proved themselves worthy of the finest traditions of the Navy.

The large majority of men who now man our Navy have come from our farms and out of our factories and offices. They had little or no tradition in the sea. Most had never before been afloat on the "broad blue ocean." Three years ago the total strength of the Navy in men and officers was 161,000. Today that strength is approximately 2,400,000. These men have had to learn a new art; they have had to acquire it rapidly and put it to use quickly.

The launching of a ship is only the beginning of the task of creating a great navy. The end of that process is battle with the enemy. Everyone is familiar with the beginning and end of this process: our great shipbuilding program; our successes in combat at sea. But few understand the middle process, the hard, tedious, exacting period in which new ships and raw recruits are molded into one efficient instrument of destruction. It is during this process as well as in combat that the American bluejacket proves his worth.

From the beginning of his service the bluejacket pursues a continuous process of training. At boot camp he learns to drill, to get along with his fellows, and he acquires a little of the language, traditions, and ways of the Navy. He learns a new trade or, if he has a trade, finds where best his special skill may be employed. This is an important process, for the Navy is an organization of experts. Above and below deck the modern warship is a vast and complicated mechanism and to assure the proper maintenance and control of this mechanism, the men aboard her must become specialists.

The bluejacket may go on to further training ashore and then to sea to join the fleet or advance base forces.

He finds life afloat an exacting routine. He must always be on his toes and alert. His work is never done. In enemy waters he may be on continuous duty for 24 or 36 hours and sometimes longer. While he is ordinarily on duty 8 out of every 24 hours, there is always a great deal of ship-keeping, repairing, and drill to consume the hours not spent on watch. Even aboard modern fighting ships, where every possible provision has been made for the comfort of the men, life is confining. He may be weeks away from shore; months and even years away from home.

Yet his morale is high, he is proud of his job, and he is performing it with competence and spirit. He is the backbone of our fleet. Without his patience, skill, and dependability our ships could not be the great fighting weapons they have proved to be. Without his keen sense of duty and cool courage under fire, success in combat would be impossible.

I am not referring to outstanding acts of spectacular heroism. I mean the kind of courage which must be expected aboard ship, but which, when it is demonstrated, never fails to be impressive. The bluejacket's courage and ingenuity is most frequently shown in his ability to perform his duty under grim circumstances in perfect coordination with his shipmates, working and fighting as a team.

The record of courageous group action is written in every report of battle in this war. Universally these reports contain the highest commendation of the commanding officer for both men and officers.

Here is an excerpt from the action report of the commanding officer of an aircraft carrier which took part in the Battle of the Coral Sea:

"The performance of all personnel was magnificent. I cannot say too much in

praise of the conduct of the personnel, of the officers and men of the ship and her squadrons. The finest traditions of the naval service were upheld in every respect. Every last officer and man performed his duty with the greatest credit to himself, his family, and his country."

A report of the encounter of a United States battleship with a Japanese force contains this paragraph:

"The conduct of the entire complement, officers and men, without exception, was highly exemplary. Particularly noteworthy was the performance of machine-gun crews and other exposed station personnel. The efficiency of machine-gun crews and the tenacity with which they individually and collectively served their guns was so universally noted that it is almost impossible to single out individuals for special commendations without doing injustice to all others."

From a cruiser, which suffered the heaviest enemy fire, comes the following account:

"Investigation has brought to light nothing but the most courageous performance of duty on the part of every officer and man.

"Control parties and gun crews in the exposed positions stood to their stations under a most devastating fire of shell, shrapnel, and splinters.

"In the engine rooms and fire rooms, officers and men worked in the dark in gas masks, and in thick smoke and great heat from the fires above, to maintain power until their efforts were no longer effective. Then blindly, hand in hand, and supporting the wounded, they opened the armored hatches and made their way either forward or aft to the upper decks. Drills blindfolded have prepared them for just a contingency."

I have quoted from these action reports because in the ordeal of battle the qualities of men are given their clearest test. Yet the record of the men in the Navy is not confined to battle reports. Commanding officers in combat areas and in all branches of the service—surface forces, air arm, submarine service, construction battalions, amphibious forces, the Medical and Engineering Corps—reports from all of them reflect abundant gratitude for the caliber of men going out to the combat zones.

What I have said about the courage and devotion of the bluejacket can be said with equal emphasis about the Naval Reserve officer. Too little public recognition is given to the splendid and vital role which the Reserve officer is playing in the success of the Navy in this war. With the exception of top command of the largest vessels and posts requiring long experience and training in naval tactics, the great majority of officers in the fleet are Reserves.

With a fleet of considerably more than 30,000 vessels of all types and with a supply of some 6,500 Regular Navy officers—exclusive of those in aviation and engineer duty—the vital role which the Reserve naval officer must play in this war can readily be seen. Aboard our battleships and cruisers and in naval aviation between 85 and 90 percent of the officers are Reserve. Reserves account for approximately 75 percent of the officers on our newest type destroyers. In the normal complement of our submarines, 50 percent of the officers are reservists. And aboard our old destroyers, our new destroyer escorts, and on submarine chasers, torpedo boats, auxiliaries of all types and in our amphibious forces, young Reserve officers account for nearly 100 percent of the officer personnel; less than 1 percent are officers of the Regular Navy.

Two or three years ago, the average Reserve officer, like the average bluejacket, was in a civilian job or civilian school. He entered the Navy for the duration. He brought with him a deep sense of duty to his country, his American ingenuity and resourcefulness, and in most instances, the professional training he acquired in civilian pursuits. The rest the Navy taught him. He has had considerable war experience since Pearl Harbor and he has advanced rapidly in accordance with his ability to demonstrate his capacity for new and higher duties.

The Navy has found for instance, that the Reserve officers with early experience in command of armed guard crews aboard merchant vessels have proved a continuing source of officers for combatant ships, small craft, and amphibious forces. With the urgent need for large numbers of competent officers, age has proved no bar to promotion where able performance of duty has been demonstrated.

In the invasion of Sicily the officers who brought our troops ashore were ensigns and junior lieutenants in command of landing craft. A war correspondent provided a clear description of their part in that engagement when he said:

"After being with them through this operation, I must say my respect for the Navy is great. The personnel for this great task had to be built as quickly as the fleet itself. There were 1,000 officers staffing these new-type invasion ships, and less than 20 of them were Regular Navy men. The rest were all erstwhile civilians trained almost overnight into seadogs. The bulk of the assault craft came across the ocean under their own power. They are flat-bottomed and not addicted to deep-water sailing. Their skippers were all youngsters of scant experience. As one Navy man said, this heterogeneous fleet was navigated across the Atlantic mainly by spitting into the wind.

"Fewer than a third of the sailors on our ship were Regular Navy. And most of that third hadn't been in the Navy many years. Most of our crew were young peacetime landlubbers who became sailors only because of the war and who were longing to get back to civil life."

In every ocean where this war is being fought—on the surface, below it, and above it, and on enemy beaches—officers and men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are writing a valiant chapter in the history of the United States.

These men are fighting and dying for you and me. Naval casualties in the war so far have reached a total of 33,303. Our men on the fighting fronts are encountering great hardships with a smile so that you, their families, may be secure in this great free country of ours.

But you have a responsibility too. You must back them up. They can only do their best when they know their families and friends are wholeheartedly behind them. Write them often; write them encouraging letters; let them know that what they are doing is being appreciated at home.

The men of the Navy face this new year with confidence. Yet they know it is folly to speculate on a date for victory. Anyone holding the notion that the Japanese can be quickly subdued after the defeat of Germany should talk to men who have come back from the Pacific. These men know that the toughest battles are yet to be fought. They know that the fight will be harder and longer, and the cost in the lives of our men will be greater than the expectations expressed by those who are remote from the realities of this war.

They know that our enemies still possess vast reserves in material and personnel not yet brought into operations on the battlefield and on the high seas. In spite of the Navy's many successes since Pearl Harbor, the main Japanese Battle Force is still intact and remains a constant threat that must inevitably be dealt with.

Our fighting men know the temper of the enemy. They know that he is cruel, cunning, and ruthless, and endowed with extraordinary stamina when his back is against the wall.

The road to Tokyo and final victory is long and hazardous. We at home must condition ourselves to this fact and resolve to strive unceasingly to do all we can to lighten the burden of those who are bearing the brunt of battle overseas and on the seas. To keep faith with these men, we must abandon the habit of speculating on a time schedule for the future progress of the war and we must dedicate all our energy and determination to the tremendous job ahead.

Problems of Cattle and Hog Feeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent holiday recess of Congress I spent several days back home in the Seventh Iowa District, during which time I had the opportunity to talk to numerous cattle and hog feeders about their existing problems.

Now, unless the O. P. A. can be awakened and brought to their senses, and quickly, our greatest source of food supply will be greatly curtailed. Iowa farmers and stock raisers want to help in every way possible to keep us all well fed in order to win the war at the earliest moment.

Listen to what this Iowa farmer has to say. Let the O. P. A. take heed:

MALVERN, IOWA, *January 3, 1944.*

Mr. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you at this time as one of the many cattle feeders who are facing the most serious condition that has existed in a long, long time.

First, our labor costs are up 20 to 28 percent, not only on the farm but it enters into every load of corn, feed, or protein brought into the feed lot. For instance, 1 year ago, I was paying $42 per ton for protein; today it costs $62 per ton. Corn was 74 cents per bushel; today it costs $1.05. Hay was $8 per ton; today costs $20. Still we are expected to produce beef at lower prices than we got last year with the added roll-back. I am willing, like most other true American farmers and feeders, to work and help win the war with food, but pray tell me why the feeder should be singled out and supposed to have to carry the load of holding inflation while labor and all industry have their share in raised wages and prices. Repairs on our worn-out equipment, such as feed grinders, ensilage cutters, etc., are not only hard to get but are nearly doubled in price.

Now, I am not in favor of subsidies. In the first place, as I see it, they would not favor the producers in the least, and if something is not done at once to encourage the feeder instead of the tactics they are taking to discourage, there will be the most awful shortage of fed cattle in less than a year that this country has ever seen. I would recommend letting these hogs go point free before they get into the worst mess they have seen.

Suppose the Government had urged you to raise more hogs and in fact all you could raise at a guaranteed price, and the fact that they are only able to handle so many each day. If something is not done the feed supply will be all used up holding these hogs

until they can handle them. According to Government figures it will take until April to clear this supply of hogs. If such is the case and nothing is done to relieve this congested condition, there will not be enough corn to feed dairy cows, poultry, let alone beef cattle. With the wheat outlook as it is for the coming year and the feed grains disappearing as they are, what are we going to feed the world on in the next 12 months?

I am just an everyday farmer and feeder and have 275 cattle on feed at the present time and only ask for a fair shake. But when the feeder fills up his lots with cattle and then the Government steps in and rolls back the prices and raise miners' etc. wages, it just doesn't make sense. There are many cattle that are not bringing first costs and with the extra costs there will be very few cattle feeders that will be out of the red. What about 25 cent eggs in the Corn Belt and 65 cents in Washington, D. C.

Yours for a square deal.

WALTER HARRISON.

Conscription of American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my most vigorous opposition to President Roosevelt's proposal for the universal conscription of American labor. Adoption of the President's program, in my opinion, would inaugurate a system of slave labor in America. It would give the President complete direction and control over the lives of millions of free American workers. It would defeat the very principles we are fighting for in this war.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial The Die Is Cast, from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, of Friday, January 14, 1944:

THE DIE IS CAST

Mr. Roosevelt probably paused at his Rubicon for some little time before gambling his political future against the future of the American Republic.

Looking backward, he saw one political victory after another—victories which have made him a little drunk with power; victories which have certainly nourished his ego. Looking ahead, he doubtless envisaged one last crowning victory in the form of an enormous consolidation of new power. And such power, if secured, could actually have no other net effect than that of producing an all-embracing dictatorship.

These are strong words, but if they are strong it is only because the occasion demands them.

The time has passed when such things may be discussed in thinly veiled phrases. The last shred of the mask of the political claque which has called itself the New Deal is at last stripped away, and this group stands clearly revealed as willing to stake everything on one supreme bid for totalitarian power.

The time has passed, long since, when the Nation's people may ignore the handwriting on the wall.

After a long publicity campaign conducted through his friendly columnists and the mouthpieces of the oligarchy and of a few camp-following pseudo unionists traveling in strange company, the President at last has deemed the time is here for another bold coup d'état. On the pretext of needing vast powers for the control of labor, he has asked Congress for a national service law. Thus, the ambitious man casts the die.

National service is a fraudulent and cynical catch phrase meaning labor draft. Under a law such as Mr. Roosevelt proposes, he could shift one worker, or thousands, from one spot to another, make them work at whatever job his menials picked out, and for whatever pay he thought they should have.

Those who choose today to ignore the warning will live to regret that they did not take up their weapons at an earlier date.

If such a law is passed, the Republic is gone. If such a law is passed, personal liberty is dead.

Make no mistake about this. Read the President's own message. Look at the Austin-Wadsworth bill which provides for labor conscription, and then decide whether such an act is designed for a free nation, or one under monarchial control.

Labor conscription is slavery. It is involuntary servitude, of the sort we were thinking about when we outlawed Negro slavery with the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Under Negro slavery, no man, woman, or child of colored blood could call his body his own. He was a chattel, to be sold or traded, shifted from one spot to another, or torn from his family, at the whims of his owner.

Thus it will be with every working man or woman in America, if the President is accorded the power he now strives for, and which no honest American with the interests of the Nation at heart ought ever to seek.

This bold striking out for ultimate Federal power over the lives of 130,000,000 Americans, is, after all, no particular surprise to those who have watched the New Deal's whole career with ever-increasing alarm. By easy stages and under the pretext of emergency and war, Mr. Roosevelt and the men who travel in his entourage, have moved in slowly, gradually but definitely trimming away the liberties that Americans had taken for granted since 1783.

The people have tolerated the encroachment for many reasons.

Some were blind to the President's intent.

Some refused to believe that we could so meanly lose the freedoms that had become a part of our way of life, and were thus taken for granted, like the air we breathe.

Some were too lethargic to protest; some were afraid to speak out.

Some actually have fallen in with the idea that a totalitarian state would be successful, and so have played into the hands of those who would enslave this Nation as other politicians have enslaved the nations of Europe.

Note that Mr. Roosevelt says he had held off for 3 years before asking for a labor-slavery bill.

We can believe that, but we do not believe the reasons he employs.

If he has postponed this move for 3 years, it is because he did not conceive that the time was yet ripe. Now, obviously, he thinks the time is ripe, and that he must strike now, or forever lose his hold on America.

He senses that his power is slipping, and seems to know in his heart that another free American election will end his long and tiresome regime.

If he has the power to transport workers from one area to another, willy-nilly, and under the pretext of "aiding the war effort," he can disfranchise millions of voters because of the State laws which require one to live in the State a specified length of time, before being eligible to cast a ballot.

He could not stop the election, perhaps; but he could make it a mockery.

You will note, too, that he assures us suavely that only a few persons will be affected by administration of the law.

Can we believe that? Is this not the same man who also assured us, and repeated it again and again and again, that our boys would never be sent to fight a foreign war? Is not this the same man who pledged a reduction of Federal expenditures by 25 percent?

Repeatedly he has promised us things that did not happen, and guaranteed to prevent things which he later encouraged; and so his assurances have lost most of their value. By such tactics, of course, he and his camp followers have succeeded in carving away our liberties until only a few essential ones remain—and those, to say the least, are in precarious positions.

If he now gets the vicious legislation which he proposes, Mr. Roosevelt will get what he has moved toward incessantly since he took office. And the chains of feudal tyranny will, for the first time since George III, be fastened once more upon America.

Unless we are prepared to submit to a literal, all-out Fascist state, the labor-slavery legislation must be resisted with every force at our command.

Polish Day Fourth War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address by Brig. Gen. J. E. Barzynski, commanding general, Chicago quartermaster depot, at the Polish Day observation of the Fourth War Loan drive at Carson Pirie Scott & Co.:

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Treasury has set aside the period January 18–February 19 for the Fourth War Loan drive. This great campaign in which our Government is making a direct appeal to each and every one of its citizens for additional financial support calls for our most earnest consideration.

You have no doubt heard many arguments urging you to buy War bonds. To begin with, I would say that the advantages of doing so are so great that instead of being requested to buy bonds it would be more reasonable that we fight for the privilege and opportunity to make these investments, for the purchase of a War bond is generally regarded as the best and safest investment known. Nowhere will you find a safer place to locate your money, and the Government is paying approximately 3 percent for the loan. Speaking from a purely materialistic point of view, these advantages are extremely important to us individually when we stop to think that so many people so often make unfortunate investments that turn out to be a total loss and find themselves with no money to protect them against old age and unemployment.

Buying War bonds is, in the case of many of us, the beginning of a saving habit. All of us know people who go along without laying aside any money for the future. Such people are improvident, always hard up, always borrowing money from their friends. A saving habit would add to their reputation and dignity. Certainly it is an advantage and a source of personal pride and satisfaction

to be regarded as a substantial member of one's community—one who has a bank account, one who is a Government bond holder even in a modest way.

Now I would like to extend my argument to the obligations we have in this matter. We should buy War bonds and more and more of them, because our Government has asked us to do so. The Government needs our support, and we cannot turn Uncle Sam down in this grave emergency. Our Government is financing itself in this war, partly through taxation and partly through the sale of War bonds. I ask you to consider the fact that, besides waging war on the combat front, we also must carry on a fight on the home front. One of our greatest home-front problems is the fight against inflation, which occurs when the demand exceeds the supply, when everybody wishes to buy but there aren't enough goods to go around. In other words, there is surplus money in our pockets that we wish to spend and we outbid each other for the small quantities of goods that are available for sale. One way to prevent such inflation is to place the idle money into War bonds and thereby get it out of circulation. It has been said that if the public would invest a substantial part of its income in War bonds, the danger of inflation would be very remote.

The Government needs all the money it can raise to carry on the war to a prompt and successful ending. That, we understand, and yet many of us seem to be annoyed when the subject of buying War bonds comes up. Let me tell you that war demands sacrifices on our part, but you cannot call buying War bonds a sacrifice. It is just a wise saving investment. It may be that to do this we will be obliged to give up some of our comforts and pleasures temporarily; it may be that we may have to put up with some inconveniences, but certainly that is not a very heavy price to pay. It is just a small part of our share of service on the home front. If we stop to consider how well off we are in comparison to the misery, starvation, and extreme suffering of people in so many other parts of the world, we cannot help but realize how fortunate we are—life is so good to many of us and the war is so far removed from most of us that we may well feel ashamed of our reluctance to support our Government financially to the limit. If you are buying bonds, buy more of them, and buy them with the firm intention of keeping them until they mature. Buying them one day and cashing them 3 or 4 months later is not playing the game.

It is assumed that most of us have been purchasing bonds. It is now a question of buying more of them; it is a question of everyone buying at least one more bond during the Fourth War Loan drive.

This day has been set aside all over the country as Polish Day in the Fourth War Loan drive. I feel that we, the Americans of Polish ancestry, clearly and thoroughly understand the meaning of sacrifice for the public good, and the meaning of freedom and free institutions. Poland has been invaded many times, has been scourged with fire and sword, starvation and murder. This is again happening in the present war, yet we know that the Polish Nation is unconquerable and will recover again as so many times in the past. Certainly in comparison with that history we can fully appreciate the great blessing of being Americans; we can more fully appreciate the blessing of liberty and opportunity; the high standard of living; the comfort and well-being that this blessed country of ours provides us with. Certainly we of Polish ancestry are the last people on earth that should hesitate to support our Government in something so simple as investing our money to the limit in War bonds.

This great opportunity to invest in the safest and soundest securities known is no sacrifice—it is really a privilege for which we should be thankful. I know that we, the Americans of Polish ancestry, will respond to this appeal of the United States Government very generously and to the very limit of our ability just as our boys are responding to the call of arms in our Armed Forces.

Rubber From Sulfite Paper Mill Wastes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1943, I made a speech in the House of Representatives on the subject Cheap Alcohol for War—We Can Do It in the Pacific Northwest. In the course of that address, I pointed out that a valuable source material for manufacture of ethyl alcohol was being poured into our streams and waterways, instead of being utilized for industrial purposes. In that speech, I stated that the Puget Sound Pump and Timber Co., of Bellingham, Wash., had pioneered in a crusade to have the Government provide priorities and facilities whereby such sulfite waste liquor may be availed of by the Government for alcohol, at a cost of from 18 to 20 cents per gallon, as compared with the average price now paid by the Government for such alcohol of 90 cents per gallon.

This speech has attracted Nation-wide attention. It is being reprinted in the current number of Outdoor America and various other publications. My attention has been called to an informative article in a past issue of Outdoor America, discussing the same subject matter, from the standpoint of conservation and the reduction of pollution of our streams and waterways. The article is written by Kenneth A. Reid, executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc. Here it is:

SYNTHETIC RUBBER FROM SULFITE PAPER MILL WASTES

(By Kenneth A. Reid)

The discharge of raw wastes from sulfite paper mills constitutes one of the worst scurces of pollution to the public waters of the United States. The paper mills, private and governmental agencies, have studied this waste-disposal problem for many years and it is fair to say that feasible methods of treatment or disposal are known. At least one mill does a profitable job in the recovery of byproducts, one of which is vanillin, from which vanilla extract is made. Why, then, do not all sulfite paper mills treat their wastes and make additional profits from marketing their byproducts and thereby greatly reduce the pollution of America's waters? Simply because they look upon waste treatment as a cold-blooded business proposition. The one mill mentioned has its process patented. It does not wish it to be generally used because it believes the present profitable market for the byproducts would be flooded, the prices would go down and the operation of the treatment plant might show a loss rather than a profit.

Now America is at war. Rubber is the No. 1 critical material. The principal sources of raw rubber have been cut off by our enemies. We are supposedly searching for large sources of supplies from which synthetic rubber can be made and there is no time to lose in getting down to business on the matter. Alcohol is one of these source materials.

HEARINGS HELD

In an effort to find out what was holding up synthetic-rubber production, the subcommitee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate held hearings starting in March and continuing through July of this year. On April 2, John J. Underwood, representing the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, gave some interesting testimony before the committee. Mr. Underwood submitted a letter dated February 11, 1942, to the War Production Board, covering a formal proposal of the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. to make for the Government as an aid to the Government's program of producing synthetic rubber, 2,500,000 gallons of alcohol from processing its sulfite waste liquors now being discharged raw into Puget Sound, at an over-all cost of the alcohol ready for shipment of 18 to 20 cents per gallon. This is approximately half of the present market price of alcohol.

Mr. Underwood pointed out that in this process of making alcohol, critical material like petroleum would not be used, but that on the contrary the alcohol would be made from the waste products of the sulfite waste liquor now going to waste, and constituting through such wastage a serious pollution problem of the Nation's waters.

In this connection he advised the Senators that his company was constantly harassed with suits for polluting public waters; that his company had just fought off a suit for $5,000,000 for polluting the waters of Puget Sound. Therefore, the production of alcohol from sulfite waste liquors would not only aid the Government's synthetic-rubber production program, but would also be of inestimable value to the public in greatly reducing the pollution from sulfite paper mills.

SWEDES SUCCESSFUL

Mr. Underwood stated that while the capacity of the one plant proposed would be only 2,500,000 gallons of alcohol per annum, that the combined potential capacity of the sulfite paper mills in Washington and Oregon would be not less than 25,000,000 gallons of alcohol per year. He further advised the Senators that the alcohol production process proposed was not an experimental one, but on the contrary was a tried and proven process that had been used successfully in Sweden for several years and that in Sweden today 12,000,000 gallons of alcohol per year were being produced from waste sulfite liquor, and that this alcohol was being used by the Swedes in alcoholic beverages and in gasoline to increase the octane rating of the latter.

Another pertinent statement of Mr. Underwood's was that in normal times the competition in the pulp business comes from these Scandinavian countries and that they have a very decided advantage over American pulp and paper mills because of the recovering of alcohol, sulfur, and other byproducts from their waste sulfite liquor, from which they make a profit and thereby reduce their pulp and paper costs.

BOARD REFUSAL

The reply of the War Production Board was a refusal on the ground that critical materials such as steel, would be required for the construction of such treatment plants, and the expectation that existing plants and those authorized for the production of rubber from grain and petroleum products, would meet all demands.

We do not pretend to know the intricacies of the problem confronting the War Production Board in the production of alcohol as a base for synthetic rubber. We do contend, however, that if alcohol can be made from sulfite paper-mill wastes, now causing a serious loss to the Nation in fish, oysters, and aquatic life, and that this alcohol can be produced at about one-half the present market price, that this matter deserves a most thorough and sympathetic consideration from the War Production Board. It is a golden opportunity to kill two birds with one stone, and one of those birds will be of lasting value to the Nation long after the synthetic-rubber emergency is over.

From a perusal of these hearings it would appear that there is a three-cornered fight amongst the agriculturalists, petroleum producers, and pulp and paper mills, for the Government business of alcohol production, with the two former apparently on the inside track and the latter still on the outside looking in.

Considering the Nation's need for additional fish and oyster supplies during the war emergency, and the tremendous destruction of these aquatic resources by the discharge of untreated paper-mill wastes, it would certainly seem sound reasoning on the part of the War Production Board to favor the production of alcohol from sulfite paper-mill wastes rather than from such a critical material as petroleum.

From the record, production of synthetic rubber from sulfite paper-mill wastes would appear to be the most economical process, and the Nation would receive as a cost-free extra dividend from such process the restoration of vast and valuable aquatic areas, now rendered worthless by paper-mill pollution. We, as well as the Senators of the committee, are unconvinced that the action of the War Production Board was a wise one when all things are considered.

The Forest Service and the Derry Parachute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service is still carrying on its job of protecting Federal forests and the work which it inaugurated to get men and supplies to isolated areas is still being continued. Mr. Frank Derry, who has done such fine work in developing parachutists and the idea of parachuting, has contributed the Derry slotted chute, which allows an operator to guide his chute more easily and land within a smaller area. Frank Derry has seen the need for a development such as this, and to him we owe thanks for the increased margin of safety to our forest and primitive areas.

The Army and the Coast Guard have both recognized the value of the type of parachute training developed by the Forest Service and Mr. Derry. Let us not forget that the Forest Service is contributing in many other lines as well to the protection of our resources and to the winning of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an account of the new slotted parachute developed by Frank Derry. It is taken from the Christian Science Monitor of January 15, 1944:

"SMOKE JUMPERS" LAND ON SPOT WITH NEW SLOTTED PARACHUTE

BUTTE, MONT.—Invention and subsequent patenting by the United States Forest Service of the Derry slotted chute is what has made possible the recent announcement from Washington that forest chute jumpers would train all year.

From saving forests to saving human lives is the development made by the possibility of precision landings with this new parachute, which has been in use in training "smoke jumpers" of the Forest Service of region 1, with headquarters at Missoula, Mont. But let Ralph L. Hand, forester for 22 years and now head of the Planning and Aerial Control Division under the Office of Fire Control, tell the story.

"Since 1935," says Mr. Hand, "we have been dropping supplies and equipment in isolated spots, and in 1939 began experimenting with dropping men in the Chelan National Forest at Winthrop, Wash., and in the spring of 1940 in region 1 at Seeley Lake, 60 miles northeast of Missoula.

COVER WIDE AREA

"Region 1 protects an area of over 8,000,000 acres of forest, or nearly 15,000 square miles of practically roadless country. This means that many spots could not be reached short of 1 or 2 days on foot or horseback, which could be reached by plane in as many hours.

"It was decided in 1940 that this area, with headquarters at Missoula, was best adapted to 'smoke jumping,' and all training was centered here. In the 4 years about 80 fires of the type potentially dangerous have been suppressed by 'smoke jumpers.'

"In 1940 the late Dr. L. P. Martin, of Missoula, asked for training and thus became, so far as we know, the first to train as a parachute doctor to carry aid to backwoods cases.

"Then with the war, during the winter of 1942-43, came requests for training from the United States Coast Guard and the Army Air Corps. The Coast Guard got the first action and sent a group to Seeley Lake to be trained during the summer of 1943.

FAMILIAR WITH WORK

"Among the reasons why the Forest Service was chosen for this training are the familiarity of our members with jumping into mountainous and timbered country at high elevations, the woodsmanship of our personnel, and our familiarity with other types of rescue work. By means of our Derry slotted chute, we have made a study of a chute which can be maneuvered, and our training techniques are designed for precision landing.

"In ordinary weather, under favorable conditions, a man who has had about 12 jumps can usually land within a 50-foot circle. We have tried that by laying 14-foot streamers crossed, and have had men land on the spot where they crossed."

The chute was designed by Frank Derry, the only man now with the project from outside the Forest Service, and who bears the title of chief instructor and parachute technician. Mr. Derry has had 12 years of experience with parachutes, from the day when he used to take part in aerial shows.

OPENING SHOCK EASIER

The parachute first used in 1939 was known as the lobed chute, and was steered by flaps and guide lines. The model Mr. Derry has developed is simpler and has an easier opening shock, besides cutting down the oscillation of the chute. The slots stabilize the chute, letting the man down more slowly.

Known as the Derry slotted chute, the movement is done by means of two 7-foot slots, one on each side of and equidistant from the center rear panel, with a guide line from the bottom to each slot. By pulling on one guide line the slot on that side closes, and the slot on the other side opens, letting the air fill it and thus turning the chute around. The principle is the same as guiding a team of horses. All forestry chutes have forward speed.

Cuba Opposes Spanish and Argentine Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 14, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Cuba is one of our good neighbors which deserves praise for its outspoken opposition to the pretensions, propaganda, and antidemocratic activities in Latin America of both Spanish falangism and Argentine fascism.

Certain governments, including our own, have too long given the impression of appeasing the pro-Axis betrayers of liberty who are still entrenched in Madrid and Buenos Aires because the democracies have lacked the courage to break off relations and apply economic sanctions which would result in the fall of these regimes of tyranny.

Cuban and other Latin American progressives have been far more realistic and courageous in denouncing Spain and Argentina than has our State Department, demanding a break in diplomatic relations with Franco and Ramirez, neither of whom represents the will of the democratic but oppressed common people.

Cuba's government and officials, and especially the outstanding chief of the watchful Cuban national police, General Benitez, have long been aware of Falangist activities. Under General Benitez, Cuban detectives have rounded up numerous Spanish and other agents of falangism and Hitlerism seeking to sabotage Cuba's fine contribution to United Nations victory.

Most Cuban journalists, radio commentators, and officials are much more alert and hostile than certain United States diplomatic officials to the danger of hemispheric security and world democracy presented by Spanish and Argentine fascism. Cuban thinkers—along with Chilean, Mexican, Uruguayan, and other Latin American leaders—have spoken out far more sharply than our State Department, particularly since the resignation of the brilliant Sumner Welles, who, along with Vice President WALLACE, is greatly admired in Latin America. Both Welles and WALLACE are accepted throughout the hemisphere as the best-informed United States statesmen who have helped President Roosevelt make his good-neighbor policy a success.

Latin American progressives, however, fear what our Department of State seems unwilling to fight effectively—namely, close cooperation between the Spain of Franco and the vicious military dictatorship in Argentina of General Ramirez and Colonel Peron, the foes of freedom of labor and the press.

Spanish-Argentine ties are largely in the form of big Argentine shipments of grains in exchange for Spanish iron, steel, and other key materials. As the alert Christian Science Monitor pointed out on January 7, Argentina seems more anxious to secure Spanish iron than to save cereals to feed Europe, which is so soon to be liberated. Argentina's Fascist rulers plan to remain a dangerous center of totalitarianism in the New World, as Nazi fascism nears its end in the Old World. If we let Argentina succeed, we will lose the peace.

Cuba is an inspiring contrast to Argentina, and while I am on the subject of Cuban services to the United States and Latin America in curbing Falangist espionage, sabotage, and propaganda, I would like to pay brief tribute to Cuban culture. Cubans have, in the four decades since we helped them achieve independence from the reactionary Spanish monarchy, developed notable cultural institutions, and a distinguished array of artists, musicians, poets, and writers. In addition to many prodemocratic newspapers, radio stations, and magazines, Cuba has created one of the largest national universities in Latin America, and valuable libraries and scholarly organizations. Cuban music is now well known in the United States. Contributions of vital Afro-Cuban culture also deserve wide attention here, and are receiving it today thanks to the Pan American Union and to the Office of Inter-American Affairs under Nelson Rockefeller, who for years has been a notable collector of Latin-American art for the Museum of Modern Art in New York.

I bring to the attention of the Congress portions of two articles from the New York newspaper PM of January 5, 1944. PM has pioneered in exposing the Falangist program and menace to our security and to world peace by printing articles by authorities like Allan Chase and H. R. Southworth, who was formerly on the staff of the Library of Congress and is now ably serving overseas with the O. W. I.

FRANCO'S FALANGE GETS FINANCIAL BOOST AS ITS RADIO SMEARS UNITED NATIONS UNITY

(By Victor H. Bernstein)

Franco's Spain, which, during the last few months, has been trying to give the impression that it is liberalizing its laws and swinging in sympathy to the United Nations cause, has just adopted a national budget more than trebling the amount to spend in the coming year for its most characteristically Fascist organization, the Falange, Spain's equivalent of the National Socialist Party.

Moreover the Falange radio in Madrid, despite official protestations of pro-Allied friendships emanating elsewhere from the Spanish capital, continues the broadcasting of anti-Allied propaganda aimed at dividing the Big Three.

Falange funds are used not only for domestic Spanish development of the party but for propaganda purposes abroad. Falange has a department devoted exclusively to the propagandizing of Spaniards and Spanish-speaking peoples abroad, just as the National Socialist Party has its foreign agency.

At the same time that the Falange budget was increased, the amount for Spain's Ministry of Education was cut almost three-quarters.

THE NAZI LINE

Typical of recent Falangist broadcasts from Madrid lately is one made yesterday which follows the straight Nazi line on the Teheran Conference. Said the Spanish propagandist:

"Stalin laid down his demands in an authoritarian manner before Churchill and Roosevelt and they had no alternative but to sign everything in order to avoid a breach with the Soviets.

"These demands go far beyond the Russian borders and include important bases in Scandinavia, Central Europe, Balkans, and Asia Minor. Besides, Churchill and Roosevelt consented to the Soviets being the only armed force in Europe after the war.

"Churchill also rejected aid for Chiang Kai-shek and refused to mobilize the Indian army for this purpose."

These statements, of course, are not only in line with Berlin's propaganda but have not the slightest basis in fact, and have in many details already been specifically denied in Washington, London, and Moscow. Moreover, the tone of the broadcast is such as to create not only Anglo-American distrust of the Soviet Union, but to divide the Americans from the British.

BIG FRANCO DRIVE IN SOUTH AMERICA

(Allan Chase, author of the best seller Falange: The Axis Secret Army in the Americas, has been conducting for years his own private war on the secret Axis organizations that have been conspiring to set up Fascist dictatorships in Latin America and the Philippines. Mr. Chase is a former news service reporter and magazine editor.)

(By Allan Chase)

Franco's new budget contains two items which spell danger in big black letters to the United Nations:

The state appropriation for the Falange has been tripled.

The state funds for education, already minute, have been further whittled down to a sliver.

The increase in the size of the Falange appropriation constitutes the more immediate menace. The program of the Falange has never been a secret, even though admirers of Franco, like United States Ambassador Hayes, never seem to have read it. The famous Twenty-six Points of the Spanish State have been printed in vast quantities in Spain and in Latin America, in English as well as in Spanish. Franco storm troopers carry this creed of Falangismo in special little leather-covered illuminated books. The Spanish press prints the credo regularly.

Let me cite point III. The English version is from a book published by the Falange in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in 1936. It runs:

"We have the will of an empire and assert that the historic legacy of Spain is the empire. * * * Regarding the Latin-American countries we intend to tighten the links of culture, economic interests, and of power. Spain claims to be the spiritual axel (sic) of the Spanish world as a recognition of her universal enterprises."

FOR "NEW ORDER"

Now this is plain speaking, as is the opening of point VI:

"Our state will be a totalitarian instrument * * *"

And point XXVI:

"The traditionalist Spanish Falange fights for a new order * * * to establish it against the existent (sic) government, it resorts to revolution."

If the Falange, the only legal party in Spain, is Fascist, the Falange organizations created in Latin America and the Philippines by the Ibero-American Institute of Berlin—the organization which controls the Falange—are no less Fascist. Any doubts that they were created primarily to implement point III of the 26 points were dissipated on January 2, 1942, when the Cuban secret police seized Luis Roldan, the former chief of the Falange of Colombia, as he was preparing to sail from Habana to Spain.

Among Roldan's papers was found a document proving that in 1938 Franco had sent a letter to the Falange of Colombia promising armed aid for a Fascist putsch in Bogota as soon as the Spanish war was won. And 3 days after General Benitez arrested Roldan in Habana, the Japanese Imperial Government decorated the Spanish Falange of the Philippines for their aid in the capture of Manila. The chief of the Philippine Falange was and is the Spanish consul-general to Manila, one Jose del Castano.

SPAIN'S PHONY NEUTRALITY

There is, of course, a somewhat cruel joker in the deck. Spain is not an empire on the march but a Nazi colony captured, with the aid of world appeasement, in 1939. The Nazis have their own reasons for at least officially denying this victory. One of these reasons became plain with the fall of Manila. Another reason is plain to those hundreds of merchant seamen who have seen American and British oil going to the Nazis via "neutral" Spain. But the most important reason is that the facade of even a phony imperial Spain gives the Nazi overlords a powerful grip on Latin America.

One of the most powerful political and economic blocs in Latin America and the Philippines is composed of thousands of Spanish landowners, merchants, and publishers, who have always remained Spanish, always invested the profits in their New World ventures in Spanish enterprises. This bloc had a vested interest in reaction both in Latin America and in Spain.

The birth of the Spanish Republic in 1931 hit the very sensitive pocketbook nerve of this bloc. The Republic opened thousands of free schools, free clinics, recognized collective bargaining rights, passed New Dealish social legislation. All these gains meant higher taxes, and higher taxes meant lower profits for the absentee investors. Then, too, the birth of the Republic in the motherland meant that the democratic idea was strengthened in Hispanic America. This, too, affected the landowners and the merchants.

With the Axis invasion of Spain in 1936, this Spanish bloc in the New World saw a chance to recoup its fortunes in the old country. They rushed to join the branches of Falange Exterior; they were proud openly to hail Hitler and Mussolini as "glorious allies"; and they linked their destinies to the fortunes of the Axis.

They have never renounced this alliance. Relations between Argentina and Falangist Spain, always close under Castillo, are closer still under Ramirez. The blunt truth is that a United Nations victory would ruin this powerful and wealthy bloc of Spanish landowners and merchants in the New World. It would mean the return of the Republic to Spain and it would be the signal for a real revival of democracy in Latin America * * *.

FALANGE EXTERIOR ALIVE

If the Falange Exterior was formally dissolved, the Spanish embassies and consulates in Latin America were not closed. They remain wide open and today, as before the hour the Falange Exterior officially ceased to be, every Spanish consulate, every Spanish embassy has its Jose del Castano, whose chief

job is to supervise Falangist activities in the country to which he is accredited.

Such a man was Juan Adriensens, one of the men who organized the Falange in Cuba. When General Benitez's secret police made things too hot for him, Adriensens was made vice consul in New York. Here he supervised the work of the Falange until he was exposed in my book and quietly recalled to Spain lest he be called before the congressional inquiry into Falangist activities Representative JOHN M. COFFEE (Democrat, Washington) is trying to set up.

In the Portuguese Legation in Mexico City there is a man named Ibanez Serrano, who signs his letters with the title of "unofficial representative of the Spanish state." (Spain does not enjoy diplomatic relations with democratic Mexico.) His chief job is to supervise the ideology of the Sinarquistas, a partially armed Fascist organization of over 500,000 members. The military leaders of the Sinarquistas are officers of the Franco army. The press attaché of the Spanish Embassy in Buenos Aires, Jose Ignacio Ramos, not only supervises the Falange there but also meets regularly with the envoys of Japan and Germany to determine a unified propaganda line.

The primary function of the Falange in the Western Hemisphere in 1944 is to prepare the ground for the projected Ibero-American bloc on which George von Schnitzler, chairman of the German dye trust, has been working on in Madrid since July 1943. One of the prime authors of the Falangist State, von Schnitzler represents that group of German financiers who today control Spain. If they lose Germany in this war, if they are really kicked out, they propose to start all over in Spain. With the von Schnitzlers pulling the strings in the background, the plan is to have a totalitarian post-war Spain become the cornerstone of an Ibero-American bloc of nations which would include Spain, Portugal, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru, and certain other Hispanic states.

The Falange has been preparing for this in Latin America since 1936. It has not been without its triumphs. Even if the Nazis find it expedient to drop Franco in favor of a Bourbon Monarchy, the resultant totalitarian Spain will retain its appeal for those wealthy Spaniards in the New World who have a vital stake in Spanish reaction.

* * * * *

It is of interest to note that last week, when the Ramirez Junta outlawed all political parties in Argentina, at the same time it passed a decree making Catholic education obligatory in all Argentine schools. From this to the closing of nonclerical schools and the state support of clerical education is but a matter of a few short steps. This was the educational picture in Spain under Alfonso. The new Franco budget indicates only too clearly that under the Falange, Spanish education has gone back to 1930—which is to say, back to the Middle Ages.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of policy with respect to the merchant marine adopted by the Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce at a meeting held in Boston, Thursday, December 30, 1943, and an editorial from the Boston Herald:

The Maritime Association of the Port of Boston is deeply concerned about the post-war development of overseas and foreign trade between New England and the rest of the world. Traditionally we have been pioneers and leaders in extending and expanding our foreign trade, and this section of the country has had a larger dependence upon foreign trade than any other part of our country. It is of prime importance, therefore, that our overseas transportation facilities by sea and air be adequately developed to take care of our trade requirements.

We wish to approve the position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce in the report of its special committee on international transport. We not only urge the enlargement of our merchant marine to meet the greater responsibilities we have had to assume on all the seven seas, but we also urge the fullest possible expansion of commercial air transport as one means by which world trade may be most quickly restored. Steamship companies with their trained personnel and extensive business contacts and many years' experience in foreign trade have exceptional qualifications for the development of this new means of transportation.

The best available estimates made by experts indicate that the plane is expected to take away from steamships from 50 to 80 percent of the passenger, mail, and express business. This prospective loss of revenue may imperil the continued operations of some American-flag steamship lines or may force the payment of larger subsidies by the Government to subsidized lines, or the payment of subsidies to lines not heretofore subsidized. Many of the largest and strongest foreign-flag steamship companies have announced their intention to operate air service in conjunction with their steamship service, and many foreign air lines owned by steamship interests are operating under license from their governments. It is necessary that American steamship companies be permitted to meet this competition on a basis of equality, and it is not in the public interest that they be further handicapped or restricted in the use of a new means of transportation which may be freely used by their foreign competitors.

The maintenance of a strong American merchant marine is so vital to our national defense and security that we urge the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Congress to take immediate steps to remove the discriminatory administrative rulings or provisions of law which would prohibit American-flag steamship companies from owning and operating air service where this would be in the public interest. Only two American air lines are now engaged in overseas transportation out of the United States, and before others are permitted to make investments in this field to the prejudice of the steamship companies, the question of the right of steamship companies to participate in overseas air transportation should be settled.

We approve the position of the United States Maritime Commission in its letter of November 11, 1943, to Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of January 11, 1944]

STEAMSHIPS AND PLANES

One of the important questions facing Congress is the treatment to be accorded steamship companies in the ownership and operation of air services in overseas commerce. Three bills are pending, the Lea bill, H. R. 3240; the Reece bill, H. R. 3491; and the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 3241; but none of them answers the question satisfactorily for the steamship companies. They have therefore joined the United States Maritime Commission in asking for a Lea bill amendment which simply declares in effect that a steamship company shall not be denied a certificate of convenience and necessity to operate air services solely because it is a steamship company.

The passenger steamship companies are confronted with an especially critical situation. All of their vessels were taken in 1941 and 1942 by the War Shipping Administration. The best information indicates that they will not be returned to their owners until about all of our troops have been brought home after the war is over and the tonnage is no longer needed abroad. Many of these vessels were so substantially changed that it will take months to recondition them for commercial service after they are returned. This means that the American steamship companies may be out of the passenger business for several years.

Moreover, it is estimated that half of the passenger ships may have been lost by enemy action. The companies are not allowed to replace them now, and even after orders are placed with the shipbuilders, it will probably take a year and a half or 2 years to get the new craft. The type of ship to be built must also await a determination of our air policy.

Only steamship companies have had all of their equipment taken for war work. The air companies surrendered about half of their facilities, but have been able to do more than their normal business with the half left. It also seems clear that airplanes in large numbers will be in private commercial use long before the passenger vessels are returned to their owners.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has scheduled for May the submission of evidence and final hearing of all applications for certificates for air services to Central and South America. Six steamship companies and 15 or 20 air line concerns will apply. The board has indicated already, however, its intention to adhere to its prior ruling, which excludes steamship companies. Unless Congress makes it clear very soon that it did not intend to discriminate against the steamship companies, they may be severely prejudiced by the future action of the Board. In the absence of remedial measures, all of the companies will be severely penalized and some of them may be forced out of business.

In many cases the steamship companies have given years and spent large sums in developing passenger travel to the various regions of Central and South America, but, with one or two exceptions, the air corporations have never operated in these areas and have not made large investments on overseas air service to them. It seems grossly unfair that the well-established, efficient steamship companies should be excluded from using planes for passenger service at the very time when, through no fault of their own, they cannot have the use of their own vessels.

Call for Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle:

CALL FOR JIM FARLEY

Unless the Democratic Party is ready to bow itself out of the national picture and let the Republicans run the Government for goodness knows how many years, some changes must be made in the high command. Even now it may be too late to shore up the crumbling foundations and prevent the house from toppling over.

That there is no person better qualified to bring the needed changes about than "Big Jim" Farley is a well-known fact. That he would be willing to accept a truce with President Roosevelt and work whole-heartedly for party welfare is not so well known. However, the need for his services is so great and the time in which to make repairs is so painfully short, it would be well worth while to make an effort to put him back into service.

If Democratic Party affairs are to continue under the direction of Harry Hopkins, a Republican victory in 1944 is a foregone conclusion regardless of who is selected as the nominee. But with Jim Farley taking charge of things it would be a different matter entirely.

Beyond all doubt the Democratic Party is in for rough sledding in 1944. Even had there been no mistakes on the part of new dealers, the Republicans would have a better than even chance of victory; for the people are approaching the point where they are ready for a change in administrations. But mistakes have been made and will continue to be made, and it will take shrewd planning to give Democrats a fighting chance in 1944.

Better than anyone we know, Jim Farley is capable of uniting the party into an effective fighting organization. Unless the politicos want to lose their jobs in 1945 they'd better make overtures to him.

Liberation of Sovereign Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I received from Chapter No. 21, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., Schenectady, N. Y., containing a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of their chapter held on 19th day of December 1943.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CHAPTER NO. 21,
Schenectady, N. Y., January 5, 1944.

Hon. BERNARD J. KEARNEY,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution has been adopted at the mass meeting held the 19th day of December 1943, at P. N. A. Hall, Schenectady, N. Y., sponsored by Chapter No. 21 of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc.

"We, Americans of Polish origin, assembled at P. N. A. Hall, Schenectady, N. Y., to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the recreation of the independent Republic of Poland, solemnly declare that:

"Whereas the liberation of sovereign Poland is the first condition of true victory, just as the liberation of sovereign Belgium was the first condition of victory in the last World War;

"Whereas the reconstruction of a free Poland, undiminished in her borders in the east and rectified in her borders in the west, is an indispensable condition of permanent peace in Europe and the most substantial assurance for the United States against involvement in future wars;

"Whereas the recreation of the sovereign state of Poland with undiminished borders is an obligation assumed by humanity towards the Polish nation, which through its decision to resist German aggression gave the free nations of the world the chance to prepare for victory;

"Whereas the Polish Nation paid for this the supreme price measured by the death of every tenth Pole and the banishment from its ancient domains of one-third of the Nation by both aggressors;

"Whereas the return of sovereignty to those nations which lost it by force is a solemn pledge and obligation assumed by the United States and Great Britain expressed before all humanity in the Atlantic Charter;

"Whereas Great Britain has obligated herself through her treaty with Poland signed in full awareness of the conspiracy between Germany and Russia on August 25, 1939, to defend against any aggressor threatening her integrity and independence;

"Whereas failure to fulfill these pledges and obligations would be an act of dishonor and betrayal on the part of those who invoke the sanctity of law in calling on the suppressed European nations to continue their resistance: Be it solemnly

"*Resolved*, That we unite our efforts and pledge ourselves to defend the principle that obligations are sacred, to defend the Atlantic Charter, to defend the rights of enslaved nations, to defend the sacred rights of the Polish Nation, based on Poland's moral credit earned by her bravery and martyrdom; to continue to demand the release from Russia of hundreds of thousands of Polish deportees;

"Furthermore we here assembled condemn and declare as endangering victory, ignoble, dishonorable, and contrary to right and justice all attempts aimed at endorsing the criminal action of the predatory powers of more than a century ago in again partitioning Poland and renewing the slavery of the Polish Nation."

MICHAEL A. REKUSKI,
Chairman.
JOSEPH S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary.

Taxes on Federally Owned Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 10, 1944, under unanimous permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called attention to the serious tax-loss problem facing almost every county in the United States. The Federal Government is taking over so much property that shrinkages in tax receipts are really serious. As part of my remarks I quoted an article from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of December 23, 1943. Along the same lines I submit an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of January 11, 1944. The editorial, captioned "The Federal land grab," reads as follows:

THE FEDERAL LAND GRAB

Governing bodies of the cities and States throughout the Nation are beginning to take notice of the fact that the land-grabbing Federal Government is drying up the source of tax revenues upon which all government depends for support.

In San Francisco, the board of supervisors reports that Federal properties now constitute 18 percent of all taxable land within the city.

The removal of these properties from the tax rolls has shifted an annual burden of $1,600,000 to the diminished total of privately owned property remaining in the city—representing about 20 cents in the tax rate.

The San Francisco board contends that since Federal property gets the same fire and police protection and the same benefits of schools, streets, and the whole range of tax-supported municipal enterprise that private property enjoys, it should therefore pay taxes in the same proportion.

Accordingly, the San Francisco board has refused to cancel taxes levied against 86 pieces of Federally owned property within the city, and the delinquent taxes thus left standing against the property will raise a serious question of title if the Federal Government ever attempts to sell it back to private owners.

The position thus taken by the municipal government in San Francisco should be of great interest to the rest of the country.

The problem is by no means local to San Francisco.

Pleading various excuses, including the familiar excuse of war necessity with which the Federal Government has tried to justify so many of its excesses, the numerous bureaus and departments of the United States Government have become the greatest landowners in the country.

They own 80 percent of the total land area in the State of Arizona.

They own 52 percent of the total land in California.

Ninety-five percent of all the land in Trinity County in California is Federally owned.

The county of Jackson in Wyoming is wholly owned by the Federal Government.

This is the most vicious activity of Government in the history of the American Nation.

It is not primarily a war activity, although the war has of course given it impetus through the necessity or excuse it creates for the acquirement of vast properties for cantonments, munitions plants, maneuvering areas, etc.

It represents a studied scheme to give the Federal Government a strangle hold on all land in the country and to lessen the resources and weaken the powers of the various States and to destroy private ownership.

With control of the land, control of the people is inevitable.

How can cities and States continue to levy sufficient taxes for the support of all their functions against a mere fraction of their areas without bringing about a condition of tax confiscation?

State and municipal government throughout the United States is already in dire straits for adequate revenues, because of huge and excessive Federal taxation.

With excessive Federal land ownership added to excessive Federal taxation, how are the institutions of State and local government to survive, and indeed how is democratic America to survive?

It will take far more than isolated protest and resistance, of the type raised by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, to prevent the undermining of democratic America by an all-powerful Federal State.

All American cities, and all of the State and indeed all of the American people must be aroused to recognition of their danger.

As Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas said recently:

"In weakening the States we weaken the whole fabric of free government.

"The inescapable price of free government is that we exercise it.

"The most destructive force in the world is nonuse.

"If we do not use our powers of self-government in the States, we will awaken one day to find that self-government has passed irrevocably out of our hands * * *.

"The States must resume the status of responsible sovereign agencies of general government, or democracy cannot live in America."

Chips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Chips not a person? Why, who said so? Read the newspaper article that I am inserting following my remarks before answering. Now, what do you say? Why, my colleagues, a dog that can sense danger as did Chips, then, being so full of love for his buddies as to be forgetful of self, rush through machine-gun fire to stamp out that danger in order to save the life of his buddies, is not only a person, he is a personage.

If the courts can solemnly determine that a soulless, heartless, bloodless, fleshless corporation fashioned by man, not out of flesh and blood but out of dry parchment, and incapable of entertaining the higher emotions of the soul, such as love and courage and compassion, is a "person" within the meaning of the Constitution, Secretary Stimson should have no trouble in construing the word "persons" appearing in the war regulations providing for the award of the Silver Star to include dogs like Chips who, though classified by the unknowing as dumb animals, on that fateful day in Sicily exhibited the highest, noblest attribute of man in unhesitatingly showing a willingness to lay down his life for his friends.

What is in a name, anyway? If Chips' act of heroism had been performed by General Eisenhower himself, it would not have made the act one whit more heroic.

Mr. Secretary, give Chips his Silver Star—he earned it and is entitled to it—and a grateful Nation will applaud. And when our boys come home you will find that the other heroes of the Silver Star will take pride in the fact that service, not names, stands back of their awards.

[From Washington Daily News of January 15, 1944]

"SKULL-DOGGERY" LOOSENS CHIPS' GRIP ON MEDAL

Army regulations today threatened to deny Chips his Silver Star—at least officially—but it can't detract from the glory of the dog hero of the Sicilian campaign.

War Department rules stipulate that the award can be made only to "persons." Chips, being half German shepherd and half Eskimo husky, doesn't quite qualify.

Chips was awarded the Silver Star for capturing an enemy machine-gun post single-handed—or single-footed—by Maj. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, Jr., commanding general of the Third Infantry Division of the Seventh Army. General Truscott apparently didn't think about that word "persons," and now the War Department has to decide the delicate problem.

THE ACHIEVEMENT

This is what Chips did, according to official records.

"After landing on Beach Blue, east of ————, at 0420 the morning of — July 1943, Chips and his handler advanced about 300 yards inland under a flurry of flares and tracer bullets.

"After maneuvering through machine-gun fire they approached what appeared to be a native grass hut. Suddenly a hidden enemy machine gun began firing from the hut on troops on the beach.

"Unhesitatingly, Chips wrenched his leash from his handler's hand, dashed into the hut, teeth bared, and vigorously attacked the enemy gun crew. After a few seconds, the gun ceased firing, loud yelling could be heard and out of the hut one of the crew came running, Chips tearing at his neck."

MORAL AWARD, ANYWAY

"The second crewman soon followed, his hands raised high in surrenaer. American soldiers quickly took charge of the prisoners. Chips' courageous act single-handedly eliminated a dangerous machine-gun nest and caused surrender of its crew."

If the Army decides that regulations prevent Chips from getting his Silver Star, possibly nothing else will happen except that the award will not be officially recorded.

But plenty of people in and out of the Army want to see Chips get his due. They say if a dog like him can't be decorated, something ought to be done about it.

A search of War Department records failed to reveal either a Distinguished Service Cross or a Purple Heart citation which had reportedly been given Chips in addition to the Silver Star.

Newspapers: Free, White, and Eligible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of Broadcasting:

NEWSPAPERS: FREE, WHITE, AND ELIGIBLE

Whatever the motivating force, the F. C. C. redeemed itself in some measure by dismissing the newspaper-ownership proceeding. The effect of the unanimous decision is to retain the status quo. Applications will be considered on their individual merits, whatever the business of the applicant, but the effort will be against concentration of control.

It has been that way for years. Some members of the Commission, possibly a majority, look askance upon newspaper ownership. The decision was an about face for them. And the action, therefore, was the maximum that could have been expected. The Commission was on the spot, by vitue of insistent demand from Congress. The decision, while not the millenium, is an expression against discrimination among licensees.

UGLY EPISODE ENDS

Thus ends (perhaps only for the present) one of the ugliest episodes in the annals of so-called administrative law. An estimated $250,000 in taxpayers' funds was spent on the inquiry during its 3 years of pendency. Station and newspaper files were rifled in the process to "get" something on newspaper stations or press associations. Newspaper-owned stations spent thousands in self-defense. Thus the Commission leaves the issue exactly where it found it. By the action the F. C. C. really decides to let well enough alone.

To one man, more than any other, must go the credit for the Commission's action. It was Commissioner T. A. M. Craven who unswervingly held for dismissal. During the last few weeks there were efforts to compromise and equivocate and to quibble about words, so that newspaper stations would remain undisturbed (for the present), while future acquisitions would be blocked. At one point the vote appeared to be 5 to 1 against Commissioner Craven. He stood his ground. The sheer logic and force of his dissenting views, plus the apathetic view of important personages in Congress, brought the Commission around.

There are others who battled vigorously for this result. Harold V. Hough, Fort Worth broadcaster, who was instrumental in organizing the newspaper-radio committee and served as chairman from its inception in 1941, kept the opposition forces together. Without flag waving or bombast, he carried the fight. He should get a medal.

The story of that final meeting last Thursday isn't public. But it is known that Commissioner Norman S. Case was a pillar in bringing about the compromise. He was instrumental in changing the views of the majority which sought to place an additional burden of proof on newspaper owners.

Having adopted the principle of considering applications on their merits, we trust the Commission will see fit to reconsider its arbitrary order against "duopoly" or multiple ownership of stations in the same or overlapping areas. The same standard, it is evident, should be applied to future acquisitions of FM, television, and facsimile stations by standard broadcasters or other qualified applicants.

But this determination should not be left to the F. C. C. It should be set out clearly and unambiguously in the law. The Newspaper Radio Committee wisely has reiterated its position that clarifying legislation by Congress should be enacted and included in the White-Wheeler bill now pending before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. Such a provision should apply to all applicants, so long as they are in a lawful business.

A MONUMENT TO CRAVEN

The story of the newspaper case reflects the best aspects of bipartisan government, whatever the political labels of the incumbents. Commissioner Craven, usually flanked by Governor Case, has represented a militant minority on virtually every policy issue. He stood his ground on the newspaper issue. The Commission felt it had to have an unanimous vote. He won.

Commissioner Craven's term expires in June. He has indicated a desire to return to private life. There is even some question about reappointment because of his opposition to bureaucratic inroads upon private business.

Whatever the outcome, the dismissal of orders 79 and 79-A, stands as a monument to T. A. M. Craven.

Leave Control of Insurance With the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3269, H. R. 3270, and S. 1362 all have one objective—to retain for the several States supervision of insurance. In other words, reaffirm the understanding for years that insurance is not interstate business.

No doubt, every Member of Congress has received hundreds of communications about this legislation. Great interest has developed in San Francisco. Under date of January 8, 1944, the San Francisco Chronicle commented editorially on the subject. The Chronicle urges passage of the measure. The article is a careful review of the proposition, and I am sure it will be of interest to Americans everywhere.

INSURANCE

Senators BAILEY and VAN NUYS have introduced in the Senate a bill that does no more than affirm "the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States," and that the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Fair Trades Act do not apply to insurance.

A few years ago no such bill would have been necessary. It would have been deemed a statement of the obvious, a redundant affirmation of the continuing decisions of the Supreme Court. For three-quarters of a century the Supreme Court has uniformly held that insurance is not commerce, therefore not subject to Federal antitrust laws, and that its regulation belongs to the States.

Times have changed. The Justice Department, in its zeal to harass business and to bring everything under Federal control, has for several years been persistently assailing insurance. Fourteen months ago it brought suit against several fire-insurance companies charging violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The acts charged happen to be well established as lawful and proper under State regulation.

Like many other Justice Department charges against business which it has exploited loudly out of court for headlines but which have not stood up under judicial examination, this one against the fire-insurance companies was thrown out by the Federal court which heard it at Atlanta.

Now the Justice Department has appealed, to carry to the Supreme Court its argument that insurance is commerce, hence, within the control of the Department of Justice and Federal antitrust statutes.

In view of the Supreme Court's long and consistent record on this point this appeal should not be feared. However, seven of the nine Justices are now New Deal appointees, many of them chosen for their social and economic views rather than for their legal and judicial abilities. What Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 condemned in the Republicans his administration has now surpassed. He charged that the Republican machine had reached out "even to the Supreme Court of the United States." The New Deal has now almost all of that Court.

The simple statement proposed by Senators BAILEY and VAN NUYS—it has also been introduced in the House—is intended to put the intent of Congress on this point beyond question by anyone.

Nor is there any reason why it should be questioned. State regulation of insurance business, developed by trial and error over a long period, has proved satisfactory. There is no demand from policyholders, who are the interested parties, that the companies be brought under Federal regulation. The introduction of Federal regulation into this business would bring endless conflict with State laws, which have developed in accordance with varying conditions in different parts of the Union. Governors of States are vigorously opposing it and urging the passage of the Bailey-Van Nuys bill. There is no reason for this Federal interference except the desire of New Deal zealots to extend their control to everything.

Dear Mr. Morgenthau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Repository, of Canton, Ohio:

DEAR MR. MORGENTHAU

(By Truman Twill)

DEAR MR. MORGENTHAU: In reply to your recent communication concerning form 1040 and optional form 1040A dealing with salary, wages, other compensation, for personal services, dividends, interest or annuities (see footnote A) I declare under the penalties of perjury that this material has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge and belief is the most abtruse document that has caused me pain (or anguish) since I examined (see line 3) the small print on my insurance policies.

However, since you have allowed a reasonable allowance for exhaustion, wear, and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) I shall bear with you if at any time during the year you, too, have received gifts (see footnote B) not pursuant to any fiduciary capacity (see instruction covering fiduciary capacity). I shall also be glad to take up with you and any other dependents (including persons over 18 incapable of providing their own livelihood) the forgiveness feature of aforesaid documents, though it does seem to me, sir, that where you refer to a married person not living with husband or wife: 25 percent (plus 2 percent of each dependent) of line 4, but not more than $500 (plus $100 for each dependent) you must have meant married persons living with husband or wife if only one return or a joint return is filed, or head of family; 40 percent (plus 2 percent for each dependent) of line 4, but not more than $1,000 (plus $100 for each dependent) but I am in no mood to quibble about this. Maybe you knew what you meant.

Rest assured that my every waking moment till March 15 will be concerned with such remarkable facts as that stated in your communication (p. 4, line 21) where it says, to wit and to woo: This will be true unless the 1943 tax was less than the 1942 tax, in which case the forgiveness will be figured on the 1943 tax. Whether the 1942 or the 1943 tax liability is the greater is determined on the basis of the tax liability before the allowance of credits against the tax for amounts withheld at the source, without regard to interest or penalties, and without regard to the unforgiven portion on the tax. I have never heard it said any plainer.

Please note in passing, however, that since my books are not kept on an accrual basis (see item 17, p. 273, book II, ch. 3) I am not sure whether I am the head of a family and connected by blood relationship or a property loss from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or theft not compensated for by insurance claiming 10 percent of whichever amount is smaller, but do not enter more than $300. It looks like a toss-up—feels like one, too. And as for the Victory tax net income and the interest and ownership of taxable Government obligations, how are the folks, Mr. Morgenthau, and we hope you are the same. See schedule C (1) or (2) and include it in item 16, column 2, page 1. And remember this is no joint.

T. T.

(Footnote A: See instruction 7.)
(Footnote B: See footnote A.)

Opposes Flag-Waving Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter I have received from the commander of Chapter No. 5, Disabled American Veterans, in Omaha, which indicates the interest with which veteran organizations have in a sound solution of the problem of the returning soldier:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Omaha, Nebr., January 13, 1944.

Mr. HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading about the farce the Congress and Senate of this country is making over the soldiers' and sailors' discharge bill, I could not help writing you in the hope that you may see your way clear to read this letter in the House or at least show it to a few of the Members who are making a political football out of the disabled men who are being discharged every day.

They may not like some of the things I am going to say in this letter, and I don't care whether they do or not, because what I am writing you is coming from one who knows what he is talking about, and I am not dependent on a few votes to hold my job.

There are thousands of men who are being discharged every day on account of their injuries or disabilities, who haven't a chance in the world to get a job on account of their physical condition, and by the time they are able to get compensation, they could starve to death a dozen times over, and then these flag-waving politicians yell about what wonderful things they are doing or going to do for the ex-servicemen of our country.

The day war was declared arrangements should have been made to take care of these men, instead of waiting for 2 years, and then no doubt taking another year to agree on any one bill.

The only real patriotic move to make, and do it right now, is to take care of these men just as quickly as possible—take care of the men who made it possible to save our coun-

try, and in that way save the jobs for some of our Senators and Congressmen who wouldn't have had jobs if it weren't for the disabled veterans of this country.

Let's cut out spending millions on some proposition up in Canada, where there is a serious question whether it is worth 5 cents or not, and give the real Americans of this country, the disabled American veterans, what they deserve, and what they have coming.

Respectfully yours,

CLIFFORD G. HAMMOND,
Commander and Service Officer, Omaha Chapter 5, Disabled American Veterans.

Fly Blamed for Retiring of Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frederick Woltman from the New York World-Telegram:

FLY BLAMED FOR RETIRING OF ADMIRAL

(By Frederick Woltman)

The charge that Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox practically cashiered and then retired the Navy's pioneer and top authority in radio communications, Rear Admiral Stanford C. Hooper, as a result of pressure by James C. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, may shortly be given a complete airing in Washington, it was learned here today.

The sensational story, which has caused wide comment and indignation in upper naval and other Government circles, has never been told in full. Parts of it are scattered through thousands of pages of sworn testimony before the congressional committee investigating the F. C. C.

Buried in the testimony is one charge made in an official Navy report that Chairman Fly placed above the interests of national defense his desire to keep the support of the Communist-controlled C. I. O. American Communications Association.

Another charge in the same report to Secretary Knox is that the F. C. C. head "consistently opposed any move to assure the loyalty" of the strategically placed radio operators in the United States merchant marine.

A third charge is that Mr. Fly "refused to turn over" to the F. B. I. for investigation the Commission's file of these operators' fingerprints. (The F. B. I. subsequently got the fingerprints, 7 months after Pearl Harbor and a year after the Department of Justice first asked for them.)

These charges were made May 14, 1942, in a confidential memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy by Admiral Hooper then Director of the Navy's Radio Liaison Division. Within 2 weeks, Admiral Hooper was put on "detached" for service in the relatively minor post of inspector of radio equipment in the Western Electric plant at Chicago. He replaced a $4,000-a-year civilian.

On January 1, 1943, he was retired at the age of 58, after 40 years in the Navy.

"PRACTICALLY CASHIERED"

Last July Tunis A. M. Craven, F. C. C. Commissioner under Mr. Fly, testified under oath that Admiral Hooper (whom he did not name at the time) "was practically cashiered and placed on the retired list * * * at the instigation and insistence of the Chairman of the F. C. C."

He was asked by Eugene L. Garey, counsel to the congressional committee: "Has the chairman of the F. C. C. ever visited reprisals on members of the armed forces who have opposed his will?"

The Federal Communications Commissioner replied: "I think he has influence in cases where reprisals were visited. * * * That is a well-known fact among the armed services."

The congressional committee examined high Navy and Army officers in private with the consent of the War and Navy Departments. Admiral Hooper was scheduled to be one of Mr. Garey's first witnesses in the public hearings.

After transcripts of the private testimony were turned over to the Secretaries of War and Navy, as had been agreed upon, President Roosevelt issued an order forbidding anyone in the military forces from appearing at the public hearings.

Chairman Fly and other witneses are expected to be called before public hearings within the next few days.

ADMIRAL'S RECORD

Admiral Hooper's long Navy service record, according to the testimony, includes:

1. A letter dated October 15, 1937, from Admiral William D. Leahy, now the President's Chief of Staff, stating that "Captain Hooper is primarily responsible for the organization, development, and high state of efficiency of the Naval Communications Service."

2. A letter dated October 15, 1937, from the late Claude A. Swanson, then Secretary of the Navy, stating that Captain Hooper's work "places him and the United States Navy in a leading position throughout the world in the field of radio communications."

3. A third letter, dated May 19, 1937, from former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels declaring that "the Navy and the country as well owe a large debt to Captain Hooper for his vision and to the early recognition of the importance of wireless and his able and practical efforts to broaden this important service."

In an earlier memorandum Admiral Leahy said that Admiral Hooper was "primarily responsible for bringing about many improvements in the radio art, notably long-life transmitting and receiving vacuum tubes * * * simultaneous multiwave communication in the fleet, remote control, the depth finder * * * sound-oscillator apparatus, direction finders for shipboard use, and the practical application of long-distance radio and direction finder to aircraft."

BUILT DIRECTION FINDER

Hooper also, according to the Leahy report, "built the shore-direction-finder system of the Navy."

Admiral Hooper first incurred the enmity of the Communist leadership of the C. I. O. Communications Association in February 1941, when he urged Congress to investigate the presence of both Communists and Nazis aboard United States ships as radio operators. At this time the A. C. A. officially backed the American Peace Mobilization, which opposed the defense program, and the Communists were cooperating with the Nazis.

He charged that the C. I. O. union was 100-percent Communist controlled.

As a result of Admiral Hooper's efforts, the Navy under a wartime emergency law barred about 50 of the operators, some 10 or more of whom then were or had been officers of the A. C. A. The C. I. O. union laid down a barrage against high Navy and other Government officials; ultimately, at Secretary Knox's direction, the Communists among the 50 were reinstated and permitted to ship as radio operators.

Meanwhile, the F. C. C. had collected some 250,000 fingerprint records of people in all phases of the communications industry, including the radio operators. Beginning 5 months before Pearl Harbor, the F. B. I. and Navy and Military Intelligence sought the records to check for possible criminal and subversive backgrounds in their own general files.

REFUSED BY FLY

This was refused by Chairman Fly, the congressional testimony shows. His reason was that the consent of the communications unions would first have to be secured since the fingerprints were originally obtained solely as a citizenship check.

On December 20, 1941, the F. B. I. wrote Joseph P. Selly, A. C. A. president, "to secure an expression of your considered judgment on the problem confronting the Commission with reference to the proposal to turn over to the F. B. I. the fingerprint records of communications employees." Similar letters were sent to the A. F. of L. and independent union heads.

The unions objected, and Mr. Fly continued to withstand repeated requests by J. Edgar Hoover, F. B. I. Director, that the prints be turned over. It was not until late in June 1942 that the F. C. C. sent its first batch of fingerprint records.

Admiral Hooper in the meantime had sent the May 14 memorandum to Secretary Knox, stating "the Navy Department considers undesirable the situation" whereby Mr. Fly is ex officio Chairman of the Wartime Defense Communications Board.

FOUGHT WIRE TAPPING

He cited the charges listed above along with others, including the allegation that the F. C. C. head "opposed legislation permitting wire tapping which would have permitted checking of the telephone to Japan before Pearl Harbor and might have prevented disaster."

Admiral Hooper alleged also that Mr. Fly "opposed stopping Japanese-language broadcasts in Hawaii, a factor which led to the disaster."

"The chairman of the Defense Communications Board," he stated, "by action and by public utterance, has shown that his primary interest is in keeping the support of the C. I. O. communications union, has constantly opposed our interests, and not national defense."

Admiral Hooper was detached as director of the Navy's radio liaison division about 2 weeks later.

A month and a half before that, on April 13, the F. C. C. chairman flew to Atlanta, Ga., to deliver the opening address of the national convention of the A. C. A. He greeted President Selly, praised the union's all-out war effort, and urged the radiomen to disdain backwash Fascist efforts to pit labor against employer and both against the Government.

President Selly introduced Mr. Fly as "a man who has been our opponent at times—and, we have found, a powerful opponent. But the record now shows he is on our side."

Water Power in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am

inserting in the RECORD a speech on water and its uses, given by Mr. Dennis Dellwo, secretary of the Flathead Irrigation Service, before the December meeting of the Montana Reclamation Association at Bozeman, Mont.

Mr. Dellwo is one of our foremost irrigation and reclamation experts and when he says anything he knows whereof he speaks. He has devoted a lifetime to a thorough understanding of our water problems in western Montana and he has the well-merited esteem of our people out there.

It is a real pleasure for me to call to the attention of the Congress Mr. Dellwo's remarks before the Montana Reclamation Association. The speech, quoted below, is from the Ronan Pioneer, of Ronan, Mont.

DELLWO ADDRESSES BOZEMAN MEETING—SECRETARY OF FLATHEAD IRRIGATION SERVICE STRESSES DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

Addressing a meeting of the Montana Reclamation Association at Bozeman recently, D. A. Dellwo, of Charlo, secretary of the Flathead Irrigation Service for many years, discussed the urgent need for immediate development of the vast resources of the State in order to preserve the rights of the water power within the State. The text of his address follows:

"Mr. Chairman and friends of Montana and of irrigation, coming in, as we three 'Knights of the canvas dam' are coming in, on the caboose of the program, I suppose my paper should not be found to overlap the splendid ones read here yesterday and this forenoon, but nevertheless, it does, for the reason that I have been entirely too thoroughly interested in the program to take time to keep my paper up to the minute. It, however, is only slightly out of tune with the other papers, but upon a point which I consider fundamental.

"The thought seems to prevail here that the projects to be sponsored by this organization must be financially sound to the extent that they positively must pay out, that is, I suppose, the land and the land operator must pay out. I feel certain that in the case of many projects, construction costs will be spread over areas other than the irrigable area of the project. I feel sure that in some cases the costs will be spread over the United States as was some of the costs of even the early projects, through what were politely called charge-offs.

"Over on the Flathead project we are working on a plan to move the construction charge right into town if you please. We have a set-up over there which is unique, and peculiar to the Flathead. It took us a long time to get it under way. I hope we can give you something definite on our plan at some later meeting of this organization.

"There is so much that could be said about so many things which concern us at this time that it is difficult to sort them out and to stress those which we should get at first. The necessity for someone's doing the job which this organization has laid out for itself seems now to be undisputed. I think we all agree that Montana can come into its own only by organized push."

POST-WAR ERA

"After the world again relaxes following its present spasm a terrible reaction will set in. That reaction can be stemmed and prevented from developing into civil strife which might become worse than international strife only by keeping people busy. If we can expend billions of dollars a month making war and know we are going to recover from that kind of spending, we most certainly can expend lesser sums in the pursuits of peace.

"I think there is no doubt that immediately following the close of the war the most tremendous program of construction, private and public, of goods to be consumed as well as of permanent improvements, vast residential areas, both rural and urban, roads, bridges, and dams, but chief among them, irrigation and drainage projects, on a scale never before seen by man will be put into motion.

"The States lying along the western seaboard and those nestling among the peaks of the Rockies will be the scene of the larger part of that activity, because there lie the greater opportunity and the greater need for improvement. There lie still the vast open spaces wherein men might find abode and peace. Montana, with its 145,000 square miles of area and its scant half million of population, should have a large part in all this."

MOUNTAIN EMPIRE

"In this great empire of the mountains is to be found untouched, wealth beyond the powers of man to calculate—in the air, on the surface, and beneath the surface. The contribution of the winds which annually strip their billions of tons of distilled water from the surface of the sea and carry them far inland and far aloft to points where they will be of greatest value to man as they course their way back and down to the regions of their birth, releasing to man as he wills to take it, a part of the inexhaustible energy with which they were infused by its power which lifted them, could not even be imagined. In its forests, in its rocks, in its sands, mountains of substance useful to man are found at the opportune time.

"In the northeast corner of our broad State we find a mountain of the most efficient and easily prepared insulating material. Far inland in the State of Washington another mountain nods to man; and, going thither, he finds that which he most needs, an endless stock pile of magnesite. The war effort needs crystals, quartz crystals for radio sets, and lo, on a slope north of Hot Springs children at play find them lying on the surface.

"Many of our dam sites and sites of our larger canals are made hazardous by the presence of loose material deposits; so Nature, in her beauty and in her determination to make available that which man needs, placed large stores of bentonite where it could be found with which those leaky places can be made impervious.

"However, I suppose in the midst of this vast endowment the greatest contributing factor in man's progress in these Western States is their falling waters. States like ours, lying amongst the topmost peaks of the continent, have the larger interest in this natural asset for the reason that those waters in their cycle of rising from the sea and flowing back to it are flowing away from us and toward the people lower down. It is our chosen job as an organization to see to it that the fall of our water is utilized while it is still in Montana. Not because there is a State line down there, but because that part of our falling waters which is not used at the higher elevations is lost to the people, both lower down as well as those higher up.

"It seems, then, that our organization came into being with a legitimate object and at a very opportune time. If we fail, our failure will be from lack of energy. Last summer the need for an organization like ours was brought very forcefully to our minds, especially to ours over on the west side. Interests far downstream, acting either rightly or wrongly, under color of war necessity, sought to take over a part of the falling water and storage space in the north half of Montana's west slope. The tribute to be exacted from us was to be full measure, pressed down and running over—that is, they proposed to fill Flathead Lake until it slopped through the mountain passes to stabilize a power development lower down which had been too greatly overplanned. We didn't let them do it.

"Something like 3,000 people, furiously angry, gathered at Kalispell, many of them from distant points, and poured their wrath, righteous wrath, we thought, upon the heads of those who were promoting this scheme to despoil our country, in such volume and with such heat that they hastily withdrew and promised faithfully that never again would they reach covetous hand into our treasury nor step despoiler's foot over our threshold. But we had only the emergency, bucket brigade type of organization with which to work. That was the 'Pearl Harbor' of western Montana. We then woke up.

"After that emergency had passed temporarily, thoughtful people over the State realized more fully than before that sitting and planning, or just sitting, is not enough to preserve to us the use of that which expends itself through nonuse and which someone else is ready and willing to make full use of. Pointing out that we have many thousands of acres of land ultimately irrigable and many power sites capable of development will not hold a water right.

"If we continue to permit our waters to flow unused down to Grand Coulee, then, of course, a well-grounded presumption arises that we do not need the use of those waters, and of course plain justice and the inhibitions against willful waste, forbid our holding and not using that which is needed by someone else. We must convert our plans into action, and our action must be with more than the due diligence spoken of my lawyers. It must be with sufficient diligence to beat the other fellow to the draw. If he draws this water first it will be his."

RESOURCES OF STATE

"We have large areas which can be made productive through irrigation, and we have many sites where water can be impounded for either irrigation or power. High efficiency equipment makes it possible to generate power at costs low enough to permit the pumping of water to bench lands rich in fertility but out of reach of gravity sources. In our section of the State those areas run into the tens of thousands of acres. In the plains area they run into the hundreds of thousands of acres. So then, in addition to our legitimate object and our opportune time, we have an abundance of material to go to work upon.

"In Mr. Treloar's district the world knows by now that Hungry Horse Canyon has been yawning and waiting for development all these eons of time, but Mr. Treloar and his associates have not been yawning. They have been pounding at the gates of the United States Treasury for a full generation, and eventually will get results. I believe plans for both the Hungry Horse storage and power development for a large irrigation project east of Kalispell are well under way.

"A large project in the vicinity of Hot Springs covering many thousands of acres is in the early stages of study. This project would involve a rather stupendous pumping and tunneling system. In the same manner it has been proposed to irrigate a considerable area west of Polson."

MISSION RANGE PROJECT

"Much attention has lately been given by the Ronan Commercial Club and the Missola Chamber of Commerce to a large irrigation and subjugation project conceived and promoted by I. M. Brandjord, of Ronan. The first essential in the development of the Brandjord project (Mission Range project), is additional sources of water. This could be secured through a tunnel from Turquoise Basin high in the Mission Range, concerning which rather extensive studies have been made by the engineer staff of the Flathead project.

"There has been a tendency on the part of those most active in promoting the irrigation of new areas adjacent to the Flathead irrigation project, to attempt to have those areas attached to that project. I believe it to the advantage of those new projects to be promoted as new and independent ventures. Give them a new name and everything. That might be a good general policy. One thing more I want to stress, and I feel sure this will become fundamental in the promotion of water and land utilization from now on. Presumably, the projects which gave promise of the quckest and greatest returns have already been completed. Many of the proposals with which this organization will be active will require a long hard pull to get them over. They will be characterized as unsound investments, etc., sometimes rightly, of course. We are, however, going to have to recognize a new kind of investment, and it is not unsound."

INVESTMENT RETURNS

"A financier who handles other people's money as well as his own, must see to it that his investments return money dividends. Our new kind of investment is going to be a social investment, and the dividends returned to us will be in kind."

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and poem:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 31, 1943.

HORACE C. CARLISLE, Esq.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARLISLE: I wish to thank you, in the President's behalf, for your letter of December 25, with which you enclosed a copy of your poem May I assure you, too, that he is most appreciative of your generous words of commendation of his Christmas Eve address.

With best wishes for the New Year,
Very sincerely yours,
GRACE G. TULLY,
Private Secretary.

ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO MANKIND'S HEART

Our President, on Christmas Eve,
Reminded us again
That this day we, across the sea,
Have near four million men,
More than two times the number
That we, a year ago,
Had sent afar, to win the war,
Begun by Freedom's foe.

Our country has in uniform
More than six million men
In training for this savage war,
And they're determined, when
All these that are in training
Join those now fighting for
A world-wide peace, that they'll not cease
Till they have won the war.

Thruout the whole world, everywhere,
Wherever our boys are,
The Christmas time's alluring chimes
Above the wails of war,
Responsive to the chorus
That comes to them again,
On mem'ry waves, assures the Braves
Of peace, good-will toward men.

Tho "Merry Christmas" we have said,
And "Happy New Year," we,
The past few years, have had our fears,
Lest, from across the sea,
Our land might be invaded
By Freedom's deadly foes,
And that their bombs might wreck our homes
Before its fatal close.

And, tho we still have much to face
Before this war is won,
We think the foe, by now, should know
That we have "just begun
To fight," and are determined
To never, never cease
To fight till we, on land and sea,
Have won this war for peace.

But we, this year, on Christmas Eve,
Have reason to rejoice
That Providence, to our defense,
Came when, as with one voice,
Our prayers we skyward lifted
To Him whose own we are,
And He has led us thru the dread,
Thus far, in this World War.

The Churchill-Stalin-Roosevelt
Discussions, face to face,
Have caused the foe, no doubt, to know
That something's taking place—
If their oneness of purpose
Continues to prevail,
Mad Hitler's fight 'gainst Freedom's right,
He knows is sure to fail.

These spokesmen from three continents
In all points seem agreed,
That nations must, who in God trust,
From tyranny be freed,
That each one, unmolested,
May work out, undismayed,
Its own design, " 'neath its own vine
And fig tree, una'raid."

When Germany is overcome,
It is the Allies' plan,
With all their might, to press their fight
Against their foe, Japan—
Remembering Pearl Harbor,
At which our minds revolt,
The sneaking Japs will then, perhaps,
Deplore their foul assault.

When Hitler's military force
Shall all have been destroyed,
Those Germans who wish to pursue,
In peace, and unannoyed,
Their innate way of living
Will find, to their surprise,
In truth, that we will prove to be
Their real friends, in disguise.

And when the military force
Of Japan is no more,
We'll change no maps, but put the Japs
Back where they were before
Their troops invaded China
Where, with a bloody hand,
They dared to claim, in Japan's name,
Much of their native land.

Great Britain and United States
And Russia, earth's Big Three,
With their allies, today comprise
Three-fourths of those that be
Determined on securing
Peace for all nations who,
With all their might, both pray and fight
For God's dream to come true.

Altho our chief objective now
Is Germany's defeat,
We're glad to know that our sneak foe,
Japan, is on retreat—
When Germany surrenders,
And we have bound her fast,
With all her might, Japan will fight,
Down to the very last.

The rights of every nation must,
However great or small,
Respected be, on land and sea—
God made them for us all—
If force be necessary
To keep down future wars,
It, far and wide, will be applied,
Led by the Stripes and Stars.

Back when the Armistice was signed,
And war-whoops all were hushed,
The German will to rob and kill,
We thought, was justly crushed;
But twenty-five years later
She undertook in vain,
To subjugate and dominate
The whole wide world again.

The people of the world want peace—
For it they'll go to war,
And fight till death takes their last breath,
On battle-fields afar.
If called, they'll be transported,
Regardless of their birth,
Far, far away, that Freedom may
Not perish from the earth.

Japan and Germany, 'tis hoped,
Will come to realize
That never can they form a plan
To banish from the skies
The Star of Hope that's shining
In God's eternal Blue,
Whose beauty-beams and glory-gleams,
Can make Life's dream come true.

The chief aim of our Government
Is, first, to win the war,
Then win the peace, which we'll not cease
To keep on fighting for—
The peace past understanding
Will keep all nations free,
And dissipate all greed and hate,
"From sea to shining sea."

May men and women everywhere—
Oh, God, bless all of them—
Look to the Star that shone afar,
High over Bethlehem,
For safe, assuring guidance,
Thru these war-weary years,
And pray "Thy will be done," until
The Prince of Peace appears.

Up from our hearts go prayers to God
For all our men in arms,
And those dear girls, pure human pearls,
Who, in spite of alarms,
Have, for the war's duration,
Laid their young lives upon
The altar there, with this one prayer,
"Not my will, Thine be done."

O may the comfort of God's grace
Be granted to all those
Whose silent wails disgrace the jails
Whose dismal walls enclose
Their bodies, but whose spirits,
Free as the outside air,
Soar past the blue, where dreams come true,
Upon the wings of prayer.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

(Tune: O Little Town of Bethlehem.)

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 16, 1944:

THE SERVICE VOTE

It is unfortunate that the House Elections Committee has seen fit to endorse, with a few minor amendments, the Senate-approved resolution on absentee balloting by the millions of men and women in our armed forces. This would leave the whole problem up to the States, despite the recent joint statement by the War and Navy Departments

that such a procedure would be virtually impossible to administer effectively. It ignores, too, what President Roosevelt pointed out in his message to Congress last Tuesday—the simple and obvious fact that if this method is followed, the overwhelming majority of our soldiers, sailors, and marines will have no opportunity to vote. Under any plan, large-scale voting by the men and women in service will be difficult enough to handle, but the leave-it-to-the-States plan can hardly be described as a plan at all. What is needed is a simplified and uniform system, and this system can be had if Congress will take favorable and prompt action on some such proposal as that offered by Democratic Senators GREEN and LUCAS or the Republican substitute offered by Senators AUSTIN and LODGE. Under either of these, the service vote would be greatly facilitated and expedited through a Federal ballot. Fortunately, despite the stand taken by the House committee, there is still a good chance for the passage of a constructive measure initiated from the floor of the Senate or House. In any case, we must hope for one. Otherwise, the very same Americans who are bearing arms to uphold our free way of life will be deprived of one of the fundamental prerogatives of that life.

Resolution of Brewers Board of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

BREWERS BOARD OF TRADE, INC.,
New York, January 5, 1944.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Brewers Board of Trade at their meeting held on January 3, 1944.

In view of the serious aspects of the legislation referred to in the resolution, your consideration of this communication is most earnestly invited.

Very truly yours,

G. A. WALSH,
Executive Secretary.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States a bill, H. R. 2082, known as the Bryson bill, the effect of which, if enacted into law, would be the prohibition for the duration of the present war, of the manufacture and sale of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent of alcohol by volume; and

Whereas the executive officers of the corporate members of this Brewers Board of Trade have in the past directly, as citizens and not as manufacturers, felt the vicious impact of similar sumptuary legislation, and noted its evil economic and moral effects upon the people of the United States; and

Whereas such executive officers, as citizens of the United States in their personal and individual capacities and without motives of self-interest or personal gain, but with profound sincerity and integrity and law abidingly interested in the public good, believe that the enactment of such legislation at this, or at any other time, would invite a return of the admitted evils of the Volstead era with disrespect of law and order and outright crimes of violence rampant and unrestrained; and

Whereas now, if at any time, respect for law and order should be encouraged and not discouraged; and

Whereas an invitation to devious avoidances of law at a time when the people, because of the war effort, are more readily able to pay the high tributes exacted by violators of the law will more surely impair the morals of the people and more surely incite to crime and violence and strike at the moral and economic heart of the Nation; and

Whereas such legislation would invade seriously upon the revenues of Government at a time when they are most sorely needed to insure the victory; and

Whereas such legislation would infringe upon the rights of those bearing arms in the defense of their country deprived by circumstance of the right to speak for themselves: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this legislation should be opposed; and further

Resolved, That this resolution be memorialized to each of the Representatives of the people of the State of New York in both Houses of the Congress.

Liberty for Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 17, 1944:

LIBERTY FOR OUR TOWN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The biggest news of many a day for people who work and make their livings in Washington, D. C., broke this last week end. A 10,000-ton Liberty ship left New York City Thursday, and Saturday afternoon tied up at a pier here within sight of Jefferson Memorial and half a mile from the head office of the War Shipping Administration.

Never before has a 10,000-ton ship come up the Potomac. And though this one voyage was just a publicity stunt to let people know the Fourth War Loan is beginning, still it is of immeasurable value to us, locally.

The point is: A 10,000-ton ship can come up to Washington any time. All we have to do is make the occasion for the call. Washington can become a commercial seaport of the world after this war if it only troubles itself to do so.

We can at last take advantage of a natural opportunity that intrigued George Washington himself, and has been alternately played with and neglected by the generations since.

A look at any map of the Atlantic coast will help you to see why the Father of Our Country wanted to see a great seaport here.

Note how the Chesapeake Bay digs inland from Norfolk, Va., and how the Potomac cuts even further inland. In the early days, the little packets and schooners used to run up the Chesapeake, the Potomac, and even the creeks and inlets now filled with silt to pick up tobacco, fish, furs, and such things. They brought back manufactured British goods.

Alexandria was the fashionable headquarters for these shippers.

Many, if not most, of the beautiful old houses you see in Alexandria today were built by captains of Colonial schooners, and later of the very earliest clippers.

Washington believed that Alexandria had only to show some chamber of commerce zip to supplant New York as the main port of America.

That does seem queer today, but he had logic on his side. If the Colonials of this section had really been drivers they could have done the job.

Full credit must be given Washington for doing all he could about it. First he jogged Alexandria to get into the shipping competition full force.

Then he went over to Georgetown, head of navigation on the Potomac, and started booming for a canal to cut through the wild Maryland-Virginia back country and tap into the Midwest.

On page 106 of the Atlas of American History (one of the most interesting books we've run across in many a day, incidentally) you can see Washington's proposition as it worked out.

The canal was actually built along a route Washington surveyed. You don't have to look in a book to see where it started.

Take a walk in Potomac Park next chance you get and look at the locks of the Chesapeake and Potomac Canal in Georgetown section that starts at the foot of K Street. That's the one.

That canal served a great purpose in the opening of America beyond the Alleghenies.

It is today just a relic of wasted opportunity, insofar as Washington—including the District, Alexandria, and the next-door counties of Maryland and Virginia—is concerned.

We tossed over to Baltimore all the commercial vigor and profit we might have had these past 144 years, in order to be the elegant Capital.

But its history is interesting, we think, and draws attention to the fact that Washington has been, and could be, more than a mere marble mausoleum.

The arrival of that 10,000-ton Liberty ship Saturday was opportunity knocking again, as opportunity very, very seldom does.

Of course, everybody concedes that Washington, after the war, will be headquarters for much transoceanic flying.

The censor probably won't throw too much of a fit if it is pointed out that even now people do leave Washington by air for distant points.

There is no reason to think the case will be less later.

And it is announced by the Federal Government that after the war a system of express highways to the West will be strung through here.

The Potomac River bridge system will be improved, no doubt, to include another railroad bridge.

Why don't we get busy now making sure that our water transportation system is brought up to date, too?

The bay and the river are there. The channel is deep enough for oceangoing ships and barges to parade right in here.

Washington certainly does consume materials that can be hauled by water cheaper and better than by train.

For instance, the building trade is one of our principal businesses here. Lumber, stone, plumbing, etc., could come by water cheaper than any other way. Same for coal, oil, and paper, of which Washington is a tremendous consumer.

Sure, we'd like to see newsprint brought in here by ship and seagoing barge. Who wouldn't? As a matter of fact it was beginning to be done before the war, and after the war we hope to do it again on a far greater scale.

There are many other businesses here which could profit greatly from water transportation. And as the local businesses profit, the whole community profits.

Liberty ships will give Washington liberty from the transportation bottlenecks that today choke it in the business of doing business.

Let's have them in fleets, after the war.

National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1944.

Representative MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MARTIN: The American Federation of Labor is opposed to the enactment of a national service law. Because during the period which has intervened since Pearl Harbor we have fought and won the battle of production, such legislation at this time is highly unnecessary. Furthermore the enactment of such legislation would represent the substitution of a form of totalitarianism for our democratic processes. It is of the utmost importance that we preserve our democratic processes, our democratic form of government, and our democracy itself while waging a war against totalitarianism.

In giving consideration to the recommendation made by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress for the enactment of a national service law, we must take into account whether there is any need for such legislation, what its effect will be on the morale and efficiency of workers and whether it will impair vital democratic principles.

The American Federation of Labor has been unwilling to extend approval to compulsory service legislation because we are thoroughly convinced that the substitution of involuntary servitude for willing and voluntary cooperation in the war effort is bound to be disastrous in its effects.

The record shows that free labor in free America is more efficient and capable of greater individual and collective production than forced labor employed in totalitarian countries. The record shows that free labor in America has accomplished miracles of production. Why endanger the high efficiency of production we have achieved? This is the question Congress must answer when it considers the President's proposals.

We are all agreed that strikes should not occur during the war emergency and that it is our solemn duty to prevent them. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the American Federation of Labor gave a no-strike pledge to the President of the United States. As president of the American Federation of Labor, I have never since then ordered a single strike or approved or condoned one. The record shows that not a single national strike has been put into effect by a union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor since Pearl Harbor. When local strikes have occurred, we have promptly exerted every influence to terminate them as quickly as possible. That is the official policy of the American Federation of Labor.

Great Britain has a National Service Act. It has failed to prevent strikes in that country. Factual comparisons show that there were more strikes, proportionately, in Great Britain than in the United States in 1942.

In the nations conquered by the Nazis, hostages are indiscriminately executed when the Nazis cannot find the actual perpetrators of alleged sabotage. Innocent people are punished when the guilty cannot be apprehended. This vicious practice has shocked our sensibilities and aroused our indignation. Yet the same principle could be applied here through enactment of a national service law. The millions of workers who have never gone on strike during the war emergency, those who have served faithfully in the war production plants of the Nation during long hours and extra shifts, would be punished by conscription and the stigma of involuntary servitude merely because a small percentage of workers had engaged in unauthorized and illegal strikes.

Summing up, the American Federation of Labor resolutely opposes enactment of compulsory national service legislation for the following major reasons:

1. It will not prevent strikes. The experience of Great Britain proves that. Britain has a national service law. It has not stopped strikes. In 1942 the number of strikes in Britain was greater proportionately than in the United States.

2. It will not solve manpower problems. The War Manpower Commission's policy committee, composed of management, labor, and agricultural representatives, declared unanimously only 2 months ago that "the American people will provide greater output under a voluntary system than under one of compulsion and regimentation."

3. It threatens to undermine our basic concepts of democracy. There is no real comparison between drafting men for service in the armed forces of the country and drafting them for service in private industry, operating for private profit. As eminent an authority as Mr. Bernard Baruch has publicly warned against this.

In the name and in behalf of six and a half million members of the American Federation of Labor, I appeal to you to oppose the enactment of a national service law and to vote against such a measure which may be presented to Congress for adoption.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The National Labor Relations Board in Retrospect and Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a statement by a former colleague, the Honorable John M. Houston, now a member of the National Labor Relations Board. This article, National Labor Relations Board in Retrospect and Prospect, first appeared in the Labor Relations Reporter of January 10, 1944:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

(By John M. Houston)

To understand the present, the historians say, we must know the past. Last year I was appointed to take part in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act which was 7 years old at that time, and had already built up a considerable body of law. Here, I propose to take stock of some of the accomplishments of this law, whose principles at one time were most bitterly fought and whose cardinal principle of collective bargaining today is more widely accepted than ever before. Here, I propose to examine and restrict myself to the record, to take inventory of the past so that all concerned may be able to appraise the present, and thereby more intelligently gage and prepare for the problems ahead.

Since Pearl Harbor, the National Labor Relations Board has conducted over 8,000 elections in which more than two and one-fourth million war workers cast their votes.

Daily, the Board receives 30 new cases.

Daily, these new cases represent requests for elections which outnumber 2 to 1 charges of employer unfair labor practices.

Daily, 13 secret ballot elections are conducted.

Every working day of the week, throughout the Nation, more than 3,500 war workers go to the polls, without interrupting production, to choose their collective bargaining representatives.

Daily, the Board disposes of 10 unfair labor practice cases before formal action—thus relieving the employer of any extensive and expensive litigation by stressing settlements, and withdrawal and dismissal of cases without merit.

Only one Board decision and order a day is issued involving employer unfair labor practices.

This is the picture of the National Labor Relations Board at work, if we were to choose an average day during the past year of war.

What does the above picture represent? What does it reflect of the Government's handling of employer-employee relations in time of war? It shows the N. L. R. B. an experienced and tested agency geared to the tempo of war needs, its underlying principles becoming generally accepted by employers and employees alike. It shows an agency whose overwhelming work is concerned with the orderly resolution of questions of representation so that employers may know with whom they are to bargain. It shows the Board being called upon much more frequently to extend the democratic election process into labor relations, rather than being called in to police charges of illegal employer practices.

The long-range implications of this picture can be measured only in terms of what has preceded and in the nature of the tasks confronting us in the post-war period.

As to the past, suffice it to say that Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 out of 50 years of experience which demonstrated that to stifle the will to collective bargaining was to invite industrial unrest and strife, often a type of private warfare destructive of life and property. For 2 years that law was a dead letter, flouted as unconstitutional and its administrators enjoined from its enforcement. Then the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the act in 1937; the Board's functions and activities started to undergo a series of changes, continuing today, which may be classified conveniently in three stages.

First, the Supreme Court decisions upholding the validity of the law led to a deluge of cases upon the Board. The number of cases

filed increased about 1,000 percent; over 12,000 cases, of which approximately 65 percent were charges of unfair labor practices, involving more than 3,000,000 workers, were before the Board in the year following April 1937. Internecine strife within the labor movement, resort by organized labor to the Board instead of to the strike weapon, and employer readiness to challenge and test the full effect and meaning of the law all combined to present the Board with an assignment of the first magnitude: To improve its administrative procedures so as to handle these cases expeditiously and hack away at its backlog of cases, while at the same time clearing up through litigation many questions as to the act's application.

It was in this period that the Board saw, as a result of its efforts, the introduction of written trade agreements into the mass-production industries and their extension into industries theretofore only sparsely covered. Likewise, the Board noted the act's effects upon industrial peace; while the number of workers involved in strikes for recognition continued to diminish, the number of employees in Board cases, and the number of cases themselves, continued to increase. In addition, toward the end of this first period, the percentage of unfair-labor-practice cases appeared to take a dip downward.

The opening of the second stage of the Board's development, about simultaneous with the start of the defense program, was marked by the agency's operation practically on a current basis, the backlog of cases of the preceding period having been cleared away. As new plants were opened and operations expanded, as labor's organizational activities broadened and competition among the labor unions intensified, the Board again found itself with a case load second only to the hectic year of 1938. But this time the picture was different: The blueprints of procedure had been drawn and tested, and the legal issues as to employer and worker behavior under the act had, for the greater part, been settled in the preceding years. The ratio of representation cases to all cases filed was about 50 percent, compared with 71 percent in 1937. Comparatively few of the unfair-labor-practice cases embodied the fundamental conflict between industrial policy and the rights guaranteed the workers that the earlier historical cases represented. And more important, there had been a constant increase in the number of collective-bargaining contracts, as employers expressed greater willingness to conduct their labor relations in conformity with the principles of the act.

As more than half of the Board's cases involved defense industries which demanded the most expeditious handling, the Board quickened its administrative pace. Defense cases were given a priority in handling. Certain procedures were streamlined. Greater authority and responsibility were delegated to its field agents. A system of liaison with other Federal departments interested in defense production was established.

The third, and current, period of the Board's growth and work may be said to have begun with Pearl Harbor. The advent of war found the Board's procedures and policies, already whetted by the experiences and demands of the defense program, mature and fully developed for the even greater demands of a war economy. Even more encouraging was the acceleration of the trend already noticeable in the preceding period; the heightened movement away from unfair labor practice cases toward the orderly determination of representatives preparatory to collective bargaining. Since Dec. 1, 1941, approximately 65 percent of the cases filed with the Board were petitions for elections; representation cases outnumbered unfair labor practice charges 11,972 to 7,068. In the past year more election cases were filed than in any of the Board's 8 years; the number of charges of illegal employer acts was the lowest since 1938.

Even more heartening than the shift to election cases was the manner in which these cases were regarded by the parties and subsequently disposed of by the Board. More than half of the election cases witnessed the consent of all parties, both employers and labor unions, to resolve the question of representation by ballot or pay roll check, and then agreeing on all the details and methods of the determination. In these so-called consent cases, a third party, the Board, is not required to conduct hearings or issue formal orders as to the conduct of the ballot. In effect, the parties themselves recognize the existence of a question in the plant, work out the details for its resolution, avail themselves of the balloting machinery extended by the Federal Government, agree to abide by the results, and thereby advance collective bargaining that much further.

The significance of the Board's wartime preoccupation with election cases cannot be overestimated. It has been stated in the past, and it bears restatement, that elections are an integral part and a necessary step in collective bargaining. Experience has shown that collective bargaining normally follows union recognition based on an election. The resulting negotiations not only lead to the laying down of mutually acceptable working conditions, embodied in a contract, but also to provision for procedures to handle day-by-day grievances. The importance of such links in the chain of today's labor relations, when all parties are submitted to wartime strains and tensions, need not be dwelt upon.

The impact of the war further underscored the need filled by the Board's election machinery. The job of production was assigned to converted factories, expanded facilities, and new plants. The war plant suddenly found itself peopled with workers and managers heretofore strangers to it and to each other. As is normal in time of war, trade-union membership increased. Furthermore, organized labor was divided and highly competitive. All these elements combined to form a low-pressure area in the Nation's labor relations. In the absence of the Board's election machinery there would have been no way to settle the primary question of union recognition. However, unions and employers accepted the machinery made available under the Labor Relations Act, and an overwhelming proportion of labor pledged and observed a no-strike policy, secure in the belief that controversies and questions over recognition would be resolved through resort to a speedy poll supervised and protected by the Federal Government. This is borne out by the two and one-fourth million ballots which the Board has counted since Pearl Harbor.

It should not be inferred from the emphasis on representation cases that unfair labor practice cases no longer represent an important and essential part of the Board's work. While it is true that employers generally respect the law, cases involving flagrant violations are still being filed and the Board adjudicates these charges in order to fully effectuate the purposes of the act. In the last year, for instance, the Board was able to close 86 percent of its unfair labor practice cases without resort to formal action; remedy of unfair labor practices resulted in the reinstatement of about 8,300 workers and the award of more than two and one-fourth million dollars in back pay.

Cumulating the statistics of the Board's work since 1935 the record shows that more than 58,000 cases have been filed with it. Approximately 7,000 decisions have been issued. Over four and one-half million valid votes have been cast in about 16,000 elections. The act has been the subject of court litigation in over 520 instances. Orders of the Board have been enforced by the United States Supreme Court in 40 of the 42 cases reviewed. In the various Circuit Courts of Appeals, 470 Board orders were contested and 402 of them enforced.

These statistics of Board cases are presented, not to boast that the agency has been and continues to be busy in the performance of its assigned task but rather to state en masse the thousands of individual situations, often filled with bitterness and strife, which have been handled under the orderly process of law. And, as for the figures on court litigation, it should be reassuring to all concerned that there has been so frequent agreement between the administrators of the act and the highest judicial authority. Attention is also directed to these thousands of cases as the source of the stream of principles and experiences in the presence of which parties need no longer be in doubt as to their respective duties and responsibilities under the act. Through frequent interpretative decisions these principles emerged:

1. The employer must maintain a strict neutrality as to the collective activities of his employees.

2. Where an employer reaches an agreement with representatives of his employees he cannot refuse to embody the terms of that agreement into a written and signed contract.

3. Employees who engage in unlawful violence automatically remove themselves from protection of the act.

4. The integrity of the Board's election machinery will be fully protected so as to permit a fair test of the employees' desires as to representation. To both employers and unions, where their individual conduct has been questioned, to both the Board has said: "The preelection conduct of the parties is a matter of grave concern to the Board because of its effect upon the requisite freedom of choice. * * * To require a nice measurement of the actual coercive or intimidating effect of misconduct on the results of the election would place an undue burden on the objecting party and the Board. * * * We believe that the purposes of the act will best be effectuated by a strict enforcement of elections rules and an equally strict observance of them by the representatives of the interested parties."

These are the tenets which have withstood the tests of the courts and which the Board has been weaving into the policies governing employer-employee relations. Under ordinary circumstances the administrators of any law so often approved by the courts and more widely accepted than ever before would have nothing more serious ahead than refinements of procedure and exploration of border-line situations. That mild future cannot lie ahead for this Board. Operating as it does in a controversial field of human relationships as the only permanent Federal agency integrated with the courts, the Board must be alive to the existing problems and administrative remedies appropriate in this employer-employee relationship in time of depression, defense preparations, and war. Now it must gird itself by sufficient appropriations to weather present demands, retention of experienced personnel, and application of its basic principles for the gargantuan tasks ahead.

The remaining period of the war and the shift to a peacetime economy will present a test to our way of life unprecedented in our Nation's history. The field of employer-employee relations, as will be the case with our entire social structure, will be subjected to forces of strain, shock, and disturbance. To start reconversion efforts is to run the gauntlet of cut-backs in production, downgrading of employees, and mass lay-offs. The post-war period is sure to intensify these problems and to add several of its own, such as the return of millions of men and a resultant situation where more than one, and possibly a group, will present themselves as

claimants for the one and same job. It would be a costly, if not fatal, luxury to complicate the adjustment of these employer-employee problems by reverting to old prejudices or by slighting the experiences which have been gained under the orderly processes of law. It will be great temptation for some, once they are freed from the directives and other pressures imposed in time of war, to free themselves from self-discipline and to attempt selfish gains at the expense and hurt of others.

If there are some who are nostalgic for the ease with which this country slipped back after the last war into a feeling of disregard for worker organization, let them recall the labor upheavals of 1919. Also let them not be unmindful of the substantial segment of American employers who have come to acknowledge that collective bargaining and the negotiation of labor agreements are civilized and useful devices. If there are others who are inclined to enter into collusive arrangements—such as the employer who wishes to choose the union for his employees or the union official who wishes to secure for himself the fruits of a contract—may they remember that the employees' rights to designate their bargaining representatives also implies the right to change these representatives.

Judging by the past and the present—the Board always being busiest and called upon most frequently in times of industrial tension—the period ahead again promises to invoke the full exercise of the Board's procedures and principles. Some of the discernible problems for the Board have been indicated above. Others will involve the investigation of thousands of charges of discrimination, real or fancied, resulting from mass lay-offs and transfers; the determination of the continuing effect of labor contracts which have outlived shut-down war plants or those only partially operative; the determination anew of proper bargaining units in plants shrinking in size.

In the challenge of these and similar questions the Board is sustained, and indeed heartened, by the knowledge and experience that the prevention or remedy of unfair labor practices and the orderly determination of representatives have operated to remove causes of dissatisfaction which might otherwise have hampered production. Through each of these types of activity the Board has encouraged the practice of collective bargaining. And surely, in the days ahead, there will be an important place for the procedure of collective bargaining on which to build sound labor relations which are essential for full production, whether in war or in peace.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein, for the benefit of the Congress and the various Federal departments and agencies, a letter and statement I have just received from the Clark County (Ohio) Federation of Approved Rural Organizations relative to matters of the utmost importance to American agriculture, as follows:

Having performed his end of the bargain, the farmer tries now to appraise the situation. He cites the current operation of price controls as evidence that he is being made the victim of unfair discrimination.

A concrete example to which he points is the large margin between the various weights of hogs. A ceiling price has been placed on all hogs of more than 140 pounds in weight but a floor price has been set only on hogs weighing within the range of 200 and 300 pounds.

In theory this does not appear to inflict a hardship on the producer. It was the intent of the Government that the floor price would effectively support the prices of hogs outside the floor guaranty. In practice, however, this has not held true.

In current marketing, hog processors are taking advantage of the market glut to the detriment of the farmer. For every lot of hogs within the floor or support price, the buyer requires an equal number of hogs outside the support price, for which the farmer receives prices from $1 to $2 lower. Even hogs included in the floor price are subject to strict grading which brings price average down well below the floor.

A survey of local markets shows that buyers have inaugurated certain rules which put the hog producer to a distinct disadvantage. Many instances have been uncovered where farmers have attempted to sell their floor guaranteed hogs only to be informed that shipping facilities were not available at the time. Buyers, however, the same day were willing to take all the hogs of weights not guaranteed under the floor price, at heavy discounts.

All this is happening at a time when the farmer sees no reduction of pork prices to the consumer. The cheaper hogs are processed by the packer and reach the consumer's table at the same retail price as top hogs. On all the hogs he buys, the packer receives a subsidy of approximately $1.30 a hundred pounds, provided only that he pays the floor price for hogs ranging between 200 and 300 pounds.

The year 1944 will be a momentous year in the history of the United States. It will be a year of decision on the battle front. On the farm front it must be a year of increased production, calling for the highest morale and the utmost effort on the part of farmers.

In 1943, the farmer was asked to increase his production of major farm crops and livestock. The Government calls for a 12-percent increase in pork production, a 2-percent increase in sheep and lambs, a 3-percent increase in milk, a 6-percent increase in eggs, a 10-percent increase in soybean acreage, and an increase in corn acreage sufficient to support a largely expanded livestock program.

Relying on the belief the Government would not let him down, the farmer, in spite of serious handicaps of a labor and farm-machinery shortage, accepted the challenge in good faith and produced record crops. He was aided by an exceptional crop and harvest season.

The farmer now faces even a more difficult task in 1944, when weather conditions do not present a too favorable omen for a repetition of another growing season comparable to 1943. Scarcities of livestock feeds, especially concentrates, is one of the serious handicaps he confronted. Still, production goals must be achieved to bolster the war effort. To achieve these goals requires a high state of morale and fixed determination of purpose.

As 1944 entered its first week, the farmer was confronted by a serious break-down of prices and marketing facilities—vividly evidenced in the current market gluts of hogs and eggs. Coming as it did at the close of a year when, inspired by patriotic motives, he achieved what had been deemed impossible, the current market demoralization causes him to wonder if the present marketing facilities and price structure again will fail him.

In 1943 the Government called upon the farmer for a 6-percent increase in egg production. Right now when the farmer must plan his 1944 poultry program he has seen the price he receives for eggs drop 25 cents a dozen.

Farmers now are being asked by the Government to effect an increase of 50 pounds of milk for each cow in his herd. Yet the request is made without giving the dairyman any assurance that the price structure will be maintained at levels to make such production possible.

The effect of this break-down in hog and egg prices has started an avalanche of selling of sows and layers. In recent weeks many brood sows have left the farm and now the marketing of laying hens has reached an all-time peak.

It is, facing these discouragements, that the farmer starts his planning for 1944.

THE CLARKE COUNTY FEDERATION OF APPROVED RURAL ORGANIZATIONS,
ALLEN W. CRAIG, *President.*
HARRY C. CLICK, *Secretary.*

Resolution of Implement Dealers Association of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 8, 1943, I addressed the Implement Dealers Association of the State of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. At the close of the convention the following resolutions were adopted unanimously by the membership:

Whereas the grim realities of war have touched every member of this association; and

Whereas men in responsible positions in Government allege that there is a food shortage and have called upon the State of Wisconsin for record production of its protective foods; and

Whereas, the farmers of this State cannot achieve the food-production goals without the assistance of workable mechanical power equipment, the following resolutions are adopted with the full knowledge that this country is engaged in a great global conflict.

FARM EQUIPMENT SERVICE AND PARTS MEN

Whereas the Wisconsin retail farm equipment trade has been in fact responsible for the maintenance of the mechanical power farm equipment in Wisconsin, notwithstanding the fact that some Government office holders assert that the farmers are capable of repairing their own machines; and

Whereas Selective Service and other Government subsidized industries have taken over half of the normal skilled farm equipment mechanical personnel; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association sought the help of the Department of Agriculture on a training program of over-age service mechanics; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture was not disposed to face the issue; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association placed an order with the United States Employment Service for skilled parts and service men; and

Whereas it is assumed that the United States Employment Service was unable to

furnish any farm equipment parts or service men; and

Whereas the Wisconsin retail farm equipment trade will do the best it can, but disclaims any further responsibility for the efficient maintenance of the used farm machinery now on Wisconsin farms unless the small nucleus of farm equipment mechanics and parts men are left in the Wisconsin retail farm equipment shops; and

Whereas the Selective Service has the right to classify the farm equipment mechanic and parts men in a deferred classification: It is therefore

Resolved, That this convention petition the Selective Service to properly classify a bona fide farm equipment parts and service mechanic registrant in his proper classification after his essentiality has been certified by his proper U. S. D. A. War Board.

TAXATION

Whereas it is necessary for all groups of society to share the tax burden equally; and

Whereas certain discriminatory Federal-tax exemptions exist in regard to cooperative organizations: It is therefore

Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring an adjustment on these conditions, equalizing the tax burden for all segments of society.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Whereas the farm-equipment service dealer uses a considerable amount of gasoline in the routine of making service calls on the farms needing farm-equipment service; and

Whereas the farm-equipment dealers do not have time to waste gasoline or rubber tires making unnecessary trips to the rationing board and other governmental agencies: It is therefore

Resolved, That this convention petition the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation to furnish bona fide farm-equipment dealers enough gasoline rations to carry on the necessary service functions regardless of the influential standing of the individual dealer.

NEW FARM EQUIPMENT

Whereas Wisconsin agriculture has the responsibility of producing the Nation's greatest amount of protective foods; and

Whereas Wisconsin did not receive a sufficient share of farm-equipment production in 1941 when the raw-material stringency first became apparent; and

Whereas Wisconsin agriculture has never been compensated for the 1941 shortage of farm equipment; and

Whereas the Wisconsin farmer does a day's work compared to grain farmers before he gets into the field; and

Whereas some crops went back into the soil because of inadequate machinery: It is therefore

Resolved, That this association call upon the proper agency to release the 20 percent of the pool hold-back share to Wisconsin farm-machinery allotments.

TRADE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Whereas the principles set forth in the report of the National Association Post-war Planning Committee will give the farm-equipment trade a code of ethics permissible under Federal statutes and trade commission orders; and

Whereas the principles contained in the report adhered to by both branches of the trade will raise the business standards and will compel retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers to give better service to Wisconsin agriculture: It is therefore

Resolved, That this convention adopt these principles and that they become a standard of trade practice for the Wisconsin implement trade upon the termination of the military conflict.

SALVAGE

Whereas the Government officials in charge of salvage operations claim that scrap materials are still necessary to the war effort; and

Whereas the members of the Wisconsin Implement Dealers' Association would rather see too much scrap on hand than too little; it is therefore

Resolved, That the members of this association continue to assist to the best of their ability in the collection of salvage until the war is over.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas these United States of America became the greatest Nation in the world under a federal union composed of sovereign States with the powers of each defined under the Constitution; and

Whereas a government by executive bureaus beyond the reach of the people is destroying democratic and representative government; and

Whereas this trade has had the experience of operating under laws springing from Executive war powers; and

Whereas government by Federal bureau heads in place of representative government stifles efficiency and enterprise, and breeds corruption; it is therefore

Resolved, That the members of this convention pledge themselves to work for those candidates for office regardless of party labels whose philosophy is the return of representative government after the war.

Whereas God in His infinite wisdom has taken from the midst of the implement fraternity, the following members: Charles E. Bartlett, Gustave F. Borchart, John P. Stettbacher, John Stewart, and Henry Wegner; it is therefore

Resolved, That this convention pause a moment from its deliberations in memory of our departed brothers, and that the secretary be instructed to spread this memorial on the records of the convention and send a copy of this resolution to the families of the deceased.

Renegotiation of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

DALLAS, TEX., *January 13, 1944.*

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

In your consideration of impending legislation dealing with renegotiation, taxation, and cancelation of contracts, you hold the key to the present welfare and future existence of medium-sized, self-financed industry in the Southwest. This fact cannot be too forcibly impressed upon our legislative representatives. Thus, this appeal is respectfully submitted in the confident belief that, realizing the tragic situation confronted by their section's industry, the Southwest's official spokesmen in the legislative bodies will provide all possible protection that these medium-sized self-financed industries may survive to make their inestimable contributions to the war effort and to the peace to follow. The following points I implore you to give utmost consideration as vital to the continued existence of your section's industry, which, on the whole, is medium sized and self-financed. (1) Few of the Southwest's young industries have a broad pre-war base on which to establish a favorable tax base. As a result, they are being limited to an average earning of 2 percent after taxes and after renegotiation in comparison to an approximate average of 6 percent allowed large industries in other sections. This is unequal taxation; comprises an unequitable dual standard. (2) In renegotiation as now practiced, large industries are being allowed fabulous advertising expenses and reserves for reconversion to peacetime manufacture, whereas boards handling cases of medium-sized industries do not allow the same proportionate reserves. This in essence is plainly unequal renegotiation—a double standard. (3) In settlement of contract cancelations medium-sized industries are not being allowed contract costs for numerous items such as advertising and post-war reserves, whereas large industries are being allowed these items. These practices result in unequal cancelation standards and a double system. During the war expenses of most medium-sized self-financed industries have exceeded earnings. Today this industry, after 3 successful years of operation solely for the war effort, is frozen tighter than before it entered war work. This is entirely the result of unequal taxation, unequal renegotiation, and unequal cancelation standards. It is practically impossible for this company to meet its post-war obligations because of the pressure of a squeeze play between renegotiation, taxation, and cancelation, each operating independently of the other but each endeavoring at the sacrifice of equality and fairness to set its own respective record. Justice cannot be invoked without differentiating between privately financed, medium-sized industries and Government subsidized plants. Executive boards are not, under the present systems, giving due consideration to the hazards and risks and borrowed capital of self-financed industries. This appeal to all representatives and patriots of the Southwest to safeguard and protect our infant industries does not contain any of the elements of charity. These industries can take care of themselves if given equal consideration with the Nation's large industries, such as General Motors, du Pont, and others. These infant industries of the Southwest are not organized or financially equipped to maintain lobbies such as are maintained by large industries. Right now those in public places can render a service to the Southwest unparalleled since the heroic deeds of the patriots of the Alamo. Appearing before the Ways and Means Committee recently, I was convinced that Representatives and Senators are sympathetic to fair play for medium-sized, self-financed industries, but, under present administration by executive bureaus, these principles of fair play endorsed by the Congress are not being carried out. This message is respectfully submitted in the hope it will be of constructive assistance by citing existing flaws and that I may at this time contribute my share to help the Southwest break the bonds of colonization in respect to other established industrial sections that did grow strong because our Congress once provided them with a protective tariff. Today our southwestern industries need this same protection and encouragement to the fullest extent.

J. P. TRAVIS,
Universal Corporation.

National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Sentinel-Tribune of Bowling Green, Ohio:

NATIONAL SERVICE LAW

In asking Congress to pass a national service law, President Roosevelt has placed on our representatives in the House and Senate a grave responsibility.

Recurring strikes in America—some from very trivial causes—have made many people feel that something drastic must be done to assure the fullest support for the 10,000,000 men whose lives are put in jeopardy by their service in the Army or Navy. They feel that patriotism alone will not assure this support.

The alleged fact that, despite heavy taxes and legal limitation of profits, some people are getting rich as a result of this war, lends additional weight to this feeling that something drastic must be done.

With many there is a feeling that each and every person, during wartime, ought to be compelled to shoulder as full responsibility for carrying on the conflict to a successful conclusion through civilian activities as that which soldiers and sailors, inducted into the fight service with or against their will, have placed on them, a responsibility which, if shirked, may mean disgraceful imprisonment for years or execution.

From one viewpoint it is only fair to compel every individual to yield to the Government every bit of help during a war that it is possible for him or her to give regardless of personal preferences.

Yet, under our system of law making and selection of our President, danger lurks in making it possible for the President and his assistants to tell every man just when and where he may work. It would make of the President an absolute dictator; and, because he has the right to veto any bill presented to him by Congress, the only way in which such power might be taken from him against his will would be by each house of Congress overriding his veto by a two-thirds majority.

If the English system of choosing its chief executive were in vogue in the United States, conferring of such powers would not have the same danger to the liberties of the people. In England the premier enjoys extraordinary powers through the acquiescence of duly elected representatives of the people. The House of Commons can unseat a premier by refusing to support his policies. In the United States the President holds his office for 4 years regardless of his policies being in accord with the ideas of Congress or not; and, under the New Deal Supreme Court, the Constitution has been interpreted in a way that would send the shivers down the back of Thomas Jefferson and other forefathers of the Nation who sought to preserve the powers of local self-government and to preserve personal initiative.

At the present time the President of the United States has the wartime power of taking over any private property desired for the job of making war; and the interpretation of that need rests on his sole judgment. He has the power—and his bureaus exercise it—of rationing whatsoever is desired, of telling every farmer what he may plant for sale or what livestock he may sell. He has the power—and the responsibility—of arresting and prosecuting anyone who individually does or conspires to do anything that will interfere with the wartime laws and needs of war. He can prosecute strikers or employers who conspire to prevent war work and thereby play the part of traitors by "giving aid and comfort to the enemy." Workers are now frozen to their jobs and cannot take others without getting a release on the ground of availability.

The presumed reason for a national service act is to prevent future strikes or threat of strikes. It would seem a simple thing to revise the antistrike law so as to give it the "teeth" which is in the ceiling-price law and rules. If it is right to fine a widow woman $1,500 for violating the national law relative to rental of houses and apartments, is it not right to punish those who hold up war production? In order to make malcontents do their patriotic duty, it is necessary (in view of all the other wartime provisions) to make the country's entire population's work subservient to the will of the President and his assistants through whom the actual selections would be made?

Isn't it a good deal like a school teacher whipping all his pupils because some one of them had broken into his desk?

So Congress has a grave responsibility in discussing this proposal of Mr. Roosevelt and in acting upon it one way or the other. Certainly, the all important thing is for every individual so to act as to help win this two-ocean war in the shortest time possible.

If to do that a national service law is necessary, then it must be enacted; but it is a dangerous expedient; and, if necessary, it should have such definite time limits—a few months at most—as to make it automatically expire at a certain definite date of the calendar and not dependent on the conclusion of peace. If found good, it could be reenacted every 3 months. Shortness of time for such a law to be in effect would at least serve to deter its great and dangerous abuse.

Relief of Starving Children of Occupied Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to present some observations by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times, showing the urgent and tragic need for immediate relief work among the starving children of occupied Europe. It is difficult for the Christian people of America to understand why our Government has not taken steps looking to the salvation of the millions of innocent victims of a war for which they are in no way responsible. The American people are not satisfied with the President's explanation that Britain will not permit a relief program being inaugurated. They remember how the Turkish Government defied Britain in sending needed relief to the starving people of Greece. When Britain saw that Turkey was determined, she tactfully and diplomatically acquiesced. Shall it be said that the Turkish Government has more courage than the American Government?

ABROAD—WHILE EUROPE WAITS THE CHILDREN ARE DYING

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

A recent report of the International Labor Office expresses in startling figures one of the underlying preoccupations of the European delegates to the Relief Conference at Atlantic City. The report is on "The Health of the Children in Occupied Europe," and gives a picture of a steadily increasing excess of deaths over births and, in particular, of the appalling mortality rate among children under 15. It is a survey of a process of depopulation and ebbing vitality, of the decimation of the rising generation, which must have incalculable effects on the future.

The number of children dying quietly of hunger and cold in the occupied countries far exceeds the number of civilians killed in the deadliest air raids. In sum, it exceeds even the hundreds of thousands hounded to death in concentration camps and ghettos and forced migrations. Of the three wars the Nazis are waging there is good reason to believe that the war of starvation claims more victims than the war of terror or the campaigns in the field.

The U. N. R. R. A. conference deals with the staggering problems of post-war relief. It is drafting a program to be put into effect the instant hostilities cease, and by its emphasis on the "day after" strengthens the feeling that we are entering the last stages of the conflict.

Whether that is so depends only on the capacity and the will of the Nazis to prolong the fighting. The outside world, including the neutrals, the satellite, and the subjugated nations, is convinced that Germany is already beaten. So, it appears from many reports, are great numbers, perhaps the majority, of the Germans themselves. But so far there is nothing to indicate that either the Nazi leaders or the Army chiefs have relaxed the iron discipline which holds the nation in a vise.

TERROR AND DESPERATE HOPE

Nazi fanaticism is still a factor to be reckoned with. It has two formidable instruments—on one hand the Himmler terror machine staging daily demonstrations that defeatism means death, and on the other that desperate hope of a miracle, of dividing the enemy or wearing him out, that runs like a chorus through all the recent home-front propaganda. It is interesting to note that in his Munich speech Hitler harked back to his assumption of power as "the most miraculous victory of faith over what seemed in actual fact impossible." He is still thinking in terms of his conquest of Germans. Until the final crash he will probably continue to believe in his star.

Near or far, however, the end is certain, and this certainty brings the prospect of going home very close to the governments-in-exile. In Atlantic City these governments are looking at their countries not as they appeared when the conquerors took over but as they are today, torn and looted, embittered by long waiting and enfeebled by long privation. And what they see as the graph of misery unrolls before them explains the difference of temper which causes the continental nations and Russia to stand out in a body against the American and British willingness to modify, if circumstances require it, the rule that enemy countries will get no free relief.

It explains, too, a growing pressure for some action now. The representatives of the occupied countries are thinking of the attitude of the people at home. They are echoing the voices from home as they ask if post-war relief will not come too late to save the children. Every once in a while this question obtrudes on the deliberations. The French, especially, and after them the Belgians and the Norwegians, are beginning to wonder if a limited amount of food to keep the children alive cannot be distributed in advance of the armies of liberation.

IT IS LATER THAN WE THINK

The Quakers and the Help the Children Committee have long pleaded for this relief

expedition. They argue that the refugee governments have the necessary funds, South America has the surplus food, the Swedes have the ships, and the International Red Cross is ready to do for France, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia the same job it is doing in Greece. The ocean of human suffering is so wide and deep that the world has grown callous to all cries for pity, even the cries of children, but on the assumption that such a project could be carried out—obviously a large and doubtful assumption—the political arguments for attempting it at this late day are even stronger than the humanitarian.

One is because it is late. There is no longer any danger that the dribble of food that might save the most destitute children in the occupied countries could help the Germans to win the war. Nothing less than Hitler's miracle could now do that. The second is that a small advance installment might lighten the post-war relief problem out of all proportion to its amount. The third is that it would revive the courage and spirit of parents who have to watch their children fade away under their eyes.

The paramount reason is that it will help foil the Nazi plot to make the neighboring nations so weak that in defeat the Germans will still be relatively strong. If the first solution of the problem of Germany is a powerful Europe, certainly the first step to that end is to stop the decimation of the youth of the United Nations.

A Mother's Tribute to Her Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the millions of mothers in the United States whose boys are in the armed forces have undergone great anguish and have manifested the highest patriotism while their boys are away from home, fighting in the defense of their country.

Confirming this statement, a mother of three boys in the armed forces, Mrs. E. G. Tolar, of Ennis, Tex., has written a little poem which I have asked permission to incorporate in my remarks.

Mr. and Mrs. Tolar had three sons enter the armed forces when our country went to war. One of them, Master Sgt. Reginald D. Tolar, was in the Air Corps and was killed in line of duty in an airplane crash on December 22, 1942.

Ernest G. Tolar, Jr., is now in the Navy and has been for many months.

The third and youngest son, William Thomas Tolar, seaman first class, is now in a naval hospital, recovering from injuries received while serving in the Navy in the southwest Pacific area, having been on a number of dangerous missions in that combat area.

While all three of the boys were living, before any of them were injured, and immediately after their third son entered the armed services, their mother wrote the poem which I submit herewith:

AMERICA'S SONS

America,
A heritage I give;
I love you.
I give you—
My three sons!

America,
They heard your call,
Their sacrifice is all—
My three sons!

America,
Though near or far,
True they are—
My three sons!

America,
On sea or land,
They'll take their stand—
My three sons!

America,
Until victory is won,
And duty is done,
They are—
Your three sons!

—Z. D. TOLAR.

Food Production Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1941 Congress passed an act extending the Commodity Credit Corporation. In that act it was provided that a support price on nonbasic agricultural commodities would be "85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor." Under the act of October 2, 1942, this floor or support price to the producers of nonbasic agricultural commodities was raised to 90 percent of parity. Under this legislation the farmer who produced any commodity, with the exception of the six basic crops, namely, cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, would be assured of a floor price of 90 percent of parity. Food production in 1942 and 1943 was greatly expanded as a result of the passage of this legislation.

Not all farm products have brought the returns to the farmer in accordance with the 90-percent parity provisions written into the law for these nonbasic commodities. Without regard to the fact that commitments were made to the farmers of the Nation that they might expect to receive the floor price of 90 percent for such products, the Government of the United States has not carried out the expressed provisions of congressional acts.

Recently a letter was addressed to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture asking for parity prices on hogs and eggs in the month of December 1943. A reply was received dated January 7, 1944, from the Chairman of the Crop Reporting Board, Joseph A. Becker, showing the parity price as of December 15, 1943, on hogs per hundred pounds as $12.20, and eggs per dozen as 44 cents. The parity price of eggs being 44 cents a dozen, 90 percent of such price is 39.6 cents per dozen, which is guaranteed the farmer by law. Yet the producers of eggs in Arkansas and other States of the Union are receiving from 24 cents to 28 cents per dozen for their eggs, or 11 to 15 cents per dozen below the floor price guaranteed by law. The producers of hogs are receiving 7 cents or less per pound for their hogs weighing under 200 pounds. In order to insure the complete fulfillment of commitments made to producers who have expanded their production of nonbasic agricultural commodities for war purposes, I have introduced a bill making it mandatory that the Government fulfill all the commitments made by it to farmers. This bill should be enacted at once to the end that adequate food production in 1944 may be assured. We are not only confronted with increased demands for food for the members of our armed forces but also for other war and civilian demands.

It would be discouraging to ask the farmer in 1944 to further increase production of food necessities when the Government has not even complied with commitments made them in 1942 and 1943. The farmer has lived up to everything that was expected of him and more besides. This was done because of his patriotic desire to increase his production in wartime. It is imperative that all commitments made by the Government to the farmer be fulfilled.

Yakima Ridge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news release, issued by the Bureau of Reclamation, concerning the awarding of contracts, totaling more than a million dollars, to construct 36 miles of main canal on the Roza division of the Yakima project in my district.

These contracts, together with others previously let and additional ones to be awarded in the immediate future, will extend the 50 miles of canal now in operation to within 5 miles of its full length—90 miles. Through this construction the present acreage irrigated—9,500 acres—will be increased in 1944 to 33,700 and by 1945 to 47,000 acres. This will constitute an important addition to the Nation's capacity for agricultural production in this crucial time of war. Ultimately the divison will serve 72,000 acres.

The Yakima project, where I have my home, offers a graphic demonstration of

the desirability and the indispensability of Federal reclamation as a national policy for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Before the Bureau of Reclamation brought water to the land by utilizing the flow of the Yakima River and its tributaries and by building six storage reservoirs, land in the region was valued at from $1 to $5 per acre and the worth of the entire valley did not exceed $1,000,000. Today open crop land brings $65 to $135 per acre and good bearing orchard land from $150 to $750. The total estimated value of land served by the Bureau alone is about $75,000,000. About 430,000 acres are now irrigated in the region.

The project is of national importance, helping to support many industries in all parts of the country. It is estimated that more than half of the new wealth produced in the Yakima area each year is expended for products made by the industries of the East, including automobiles, building material, clothing, home furnishings, tobacco, farm machinery, radios, jewelry, and magazines.

The project stands out as a prudent investment of Federal funds. About $35,000,000 has been expended to date, which under contracts with water users will be repaid over a period of years. Exclusive of the Roza division, now being developed and on which repayment contracts are not yet in effect, the Yakima project has repaid about 98 percent of the amount currently due, a record which compares favorably with any type of business. Already the project has repaid 63 percent of the total construction costs.

Crops raised in 1942 were valued at $44,500,000—25 percent more than the construction costs to date. Since 1911, 2 of the 4 divisions of the project have produced crops valued at $255,000,000—nearly 40 times the total investment in the two divisions, $6,400,000.

Direct credit for the growth of the Yakima Valley can be given to the construction of irrigation facilities. No more impressive illustration of value of conservation of water and land resources can be found. Since 1910 the population of the counties in which the project lies—Klickitat, Yakima, Kittitas, and Benton—has doubled, increasing from 78,387 in 1910 to 142,659 in 1940. In contrast the population of 5 adjacent counties, where wheat raising and grazing predominate, dropped from 51,526 in 1910 to 47,196 in 1940. This, to me, is a convincing demonstration of how Reclamation affords an assured foundation for the building of communities.

The Bureau of Reclamation news release follows:

Award of contracts, totaling more than a million dollars, to construct a 34-mile section of the Yakima Ridge Canal of the Bureau of Reclamation's Yakima irrigation project in eastern Washington, was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. The construction will make irrigation service available for war food production in 1944–45 on 25,600 additional acres of land on the Roza division of this project.

On the recommendation of Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore, the Secretary approved the award of a contract for 11 miles of canal (between mile 59 and 70) to Axel Osberg and C. H. Ludberg of Seattle, Wash., which bid $447,034.50, and of a contract for 15 miles of canal (between mile 70 and 85) to Northwestern Engineering Co., Inc., of Rapid City, S. Dak., which bid $252,306. All of this work must be completed in 400 days.

The Secretary also awarded a contract for the construction of 8 miles of canal (between mile 50 and 59) to Scheumann and Johnson of Seattle, which bid $127,845, and a contract for a 3-mile wasteway to Sather & Sons, of Spokane, Wash., which bid $235,266. Part of this work must be completed in 160 days and all of it in 350 days.

The construction will complete 85 miles of the 95-mile long canal. Bids will be called for in the near future for construction of the remaining 10-mile section and later for the construction of lateral canals and sublateral canals to take the water from the main canal to the various new farms.

About a month ago, Secretary Ickes awarded a contract for the construction of laterals and sublaterals elsewhere on the Roza division which would provide irrigation service by the early part of the growing season of 1944 to 5,300 acres. The 9,000 acres under cultivation on this division this year yielded large quantities of vital war foods, including potatoes, beans, and alfalfa for beef and dairy herds. The Bureau provides a full or partial supply of water to 330,000 acres on the Yakima project.

The extension of irrigation on the Yakima project is an important part of the war food program of the Bureau of Reclamation. Under this program the Bureau will extend irrigation service to about 800,000 additional acres in 8 western States by 1945 if critical materials and manpower permit it to maintain existing schedules.

Simplify the Income-Tax Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, wherever I go lawyers, accountants, and businessmen stop me and tell me their complaints about the new income-tax forms. They want to pay their taxes. They are patriotic and are doing their share, but these complicated forms have created all sorts of problems.

If these forms stump the experts like the accountants and the lawyers, what can you expect from the average wage earner? I predict sleepless nights and headaches for a multitude of our population.

When they try to decode these forms they will find themselves in a maze of mathematical difficulties. One of the greatest morale builders would be an immediate simplification of the income-tax forms. I urge the Ways and Means Committee to act now, as otherwise we will all suffer from nightmares, even worse than the Lord Chancelor in Iolanthe.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 6, 1944]

HIS TAX SONG—D'ALESANDRO AWAKE NIGHTS

Declaring he is at a loss as to how to make out his income-tax return properly and calling on the House Ways and Means Committee for immediate simplification of income-tax forms, Representative D'ALESANDRO yesterday broke into song to relieve his perplexity.

Paraphrasing the Lord Chancelor's famous narrative in Gilbert and Sullivan's Iolanthe, Mr. D'ALESANDRO's baritone arose in the following:

When I'm lying awake with a dismal headache and repose tabooed by anxiety,
I conceive I may use language I choose to indulge in without impropriety;
For my brain is on fire, the bedclothes conspire of usual slumber to plunder me.
Is it my income tax, or my Victory tax? Did I add when I should have divided?
Or, maybe multiplying would do just as well.
Enter on this line, postpone on that line, one-half is forgiven—or is it?
Which is the larger and which is the smaller and, if not, why?
Get another form to enter this schedule, and look at that line—no this line—any line may do.
Take a number from 1 to 10—then what? I'm sure I don't know.
Depreciation, fiduciaries, tax-exemptions, medical expenses, better call a doctor, or an accountant, let him call the doctor.
Now I'm a regular wreck, with a crick in my neck,
No wonder I snore, for my head's on the floor,
And I'm needles and pins from my soles to my shins,
But the darkness has passed, and it's daylight at last, and the night has been long, and so has my song, and thank goodness they're both of them over.
Hooray, it's now March 16th.

The last line is wishful thinking. But Mr. D'ALESANDRO said the song was his answer to scores of people who have been asking his advice about filling out income-tax returns.

H. R. 3736

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter from a personal friend of mine in support of my bill, H. R. 3736, which is as follows:

HOME STATE LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., January 12, 1944.

Mr. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: Thanks for your letter of December 14. I haven't answered sooner because I have been sick in bed and I am now dictating this letter from my bed at home.

I think your bill 3736 is fine, but I don't know how it will go over in Congress. It occurs to me that every Senator and Congressman ought to vote for it. I don't suppose there is any of them that don't carry insurance, and that is a means of providing for an estate at very little expense to the Government in the deduction on income tax.

The President has been so solicitous in looking after the welfare of the Nation I would think he would have some sympathy for the man who is smart enough to carry a little insurance on himself and his dependents.

With my kindest wishes.

Very truly yours,

JOE D. MORSE,
HOME STATE LIFE INSURANCE CO., OF OKLAHOMA.

Kansas Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter written by Mrs. R. S. Pichler, of Beloit, Kans., which was published in the Washington Post of January 17. Mrs. Pilcher is a resident of my congressional district.

This letter comes as a stream of clean spring water into a polluted stream of confused thinking. My mail indicates that Mrs. Pichler expresses the sound, sane, and constructive criticism of a great majority of the citizens of Kansas and the Middle West.

My personal opinion is that our Nation cannot expect to achieve greater and nobler things, unless and until we have a rededication of our people to the higher and moral values of life. The Nation needs a rededication and reconsecration to the principles laid down by our Creator. I want to commend to you a study of this letter:

KANSAS POINT OF VIEW

It is a long-standing custom among politicians to visit various parts of the country to sound out public opinion. Due to restrictions on travel and the necessity for staying close to Washington to keep up with the pressing details of administration, it has not been possible for politicians to keep in as close touch with the general public as before. This is a bad thing for the politicians and a most unfortunate circumstance for the general public, because there has been a gradual drawing away by our political leaders from the real needs and thoughts and viewpoints of the majority of the American people. The result is that our Government no longer represents public opinion as it is today.

Because of this I feel that people in different regions should make the effort to bring their thoughts and opinions to the attention of our elected officials. It is with this thought in mind that I will try to express as briefly and as concisely as possible what I believe to be the opinion of the majority of the Kansas mothers.

I do not want to create the impression that the opinions are those strictly and exclusively of the mothers of Kansas. I am convinced these views are shared by the majority of all the people of Kansas and those in neighboring States. Yet I would hesitate to speak for as large a group as this. Instead, by limiting myself to the Kansas mothers, I believe I can speak with greater authority.

The women of Kansas have watched with disapproval the failures, the blunders, and the lack of unity and cooperation in our National Government.

We have had a Government policy guided by compromise and appeasement. The pressure groups have been satisfied and quieted. The Government policy has been to do what is easiest and most convenient rather than what is best and most necessary. The capitulation by the Government to John L. Lewis is a glaring example of this national policy of compromising national interest and welfare to the selfish demands of one pressure group. Less sensational compromises have been made right along, and although they may have been less sensational they have been just as detrimental to the national economy and interest. National economy has never been an important consideration in the administration of President Roosevelt. He has always spent liberally of Government money to finance pet schemes of his own or his wife for social reform. The people of Kansas often opposed these trends toward socialism and always disapproved squandering public money for unnecessary purposes.

Kansas mothers are particularly concerned about the war and the management of the home front. They want to make sure that their boys are fighting under circumstances which will be least dangerous and most advantageous to them. They want to know that efforts are being made to keep the country in a condition which will make the homecoming of those boys a cheerful and happy prospect. They want to be convinced that when our sons return they will return to a country that is sound financially and has favorable prospects for their future.

The present administration has not provided us with the assurance we need. There has been too much bickering, too much compromise with special interests and pressure groups, too much fighting among the bureaucrats, and too many Washington officials playing politics.

The New Deal has outlived its usefulness and we need a reshuffling of the deck. We need to get out of Washington those individuals who believe that our country can best be run by the guiding hands of a few inspired individuals. We need to get into the high offices of National Government men who are convinced that our country is self-reliant and the people are capable of managing their own affairs. We need national leaders who trust the wisdom of the mass of the people and have confidence in free enterprise and private initiative.

We need, too, a revival of religious spirit and character development for the people of our Nation. Such a revival should have its inspiration from our central Government. Our churches can support but cannot initiate such a movement. Our schools can help but cannot give public enthusiasm to this need. We need to introduce to our people once more the simple and common virtues of honesty, truth, and tolerance. We have been living in an artificial and superficial paradise. Our people have abandoned standards of common decency, good morals, and right living.

For such a decline in the moral and spiritual standards of our national life, our present Government is not entirely to blame except for its failure to recognize a general trend and do something to halt it. The Government has adopted a negative attitude toward these things. We need a Government which will recognize the spiritual and moral needs of our people and provide the inspiration and leadership which people must have to arouse in them the enthusiasm for the good things of life.

Mrs. R. S. PICHLER.

BELOIT, KANS., *January 1.*

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include in this extension of remarks a speech delivered by me on January 1, 1944, over radio station KXEL, Waterloo, Iowa:

I wish to thank radio station KXEL for this opportunity to speak to the people of the Third Iowa District about some of the problems now facing the country.

One of the first matters up for consideration after January 10 will be that of consumer subsidies. On this subject there is some difference of opinion in Congress and in the country.

At the outset it should be mentioned that production subsidies or incentive payments to increase production are not involved. That matter was considered when the first Price Control Act was passed, and that law authorizes such subsidies. It has always been the claim of Congress that consumer subsidies and roll-backs were not included.

The copper program affords a good illustration of the production subsidy. Prior to the war the demand for copper established a certain price. Some high-cost mines were not able to produce at that figure. The increased demand for copper in the war made it necessary that those mines be worked. The Government therefore had the choice of either raising the price of copper to all producers or of paying part of the expense of operating the high-cost mines—which in effect meant paying them more for their product. The payment of such a subsidy keeps down the price of copper, insures the maximum production, and is a brake on inflation. Payments for the production of hemp or for increasing the growth of soybeans are other examples of this type of subsidy.

The consumer subsidies about which the dispute is now raging is something entirely different. Here is the way it operates: Assume that the price of butter at retail is 50 cents per pound. By Government order the price to the consumer is rolled back to 45 cents—the 5-cent differential being paid out of the Treasury of the United States to the producer. The producer gets no more for his product; the consumer simply pays less. Under the proposed program the savings to the individual consumer would not be much. If he consumes 1 pound of butter per month, the butter subsidy would therefore reduce his grocery bill 60 cents per year. The consumer subsidy now being proposed would cost the Government about $1,100,000,000 annually. The complete program as envisioned by some proponents would amount to $5,000,000,000 per year.

We are now operating on borrowed money. Any amount paid out in subsidies must be added to the national debt for future generations to pay, including the soldiers now getting much less than any other group in America.

For the year 1943 the national income was $142,000,000,000, the largest in the history of the country. Of that amount we spent for food about $25,000,000,000. We are now paying for food a smaller percentage of our income than before the war. During 1943 we spent for clothing $12,500,000,000 and for liquor $6,000,000,000. In the face of these figures it seems rather preposterous to pass on part of our grocery bill to our children. If history is to be believed, they will have trouble enough in their day paying the debts and generally cleaning up the mess we have made. If at a time when the national income is the highest in history we cannot pay our own way, when will we be able to do so? Furthermore, a consumer subsidy is very expensive to operate. It will require a large Government bureau to handle it, thereby making further inroads on available manpower. If we embark on this subsidy program, we will find that it does not check the cost of living. Then there will be a demand for further payments. The regimentation

will increase. The national expenditures will increase. The national debt will increase.

For the last 12 years this, the richest country on the earth, has been operating in the red. Faced with many problems we have found no solution except the lavish expenditure of Government money and the mortgaging of the future. The national debt will probably rise to $300,000,000,000, or about $2,300 for every man, woman, and child in America—a mortgage of $9,000 on the home, the savings, and the earnings of every family of four in America. We may dodge the unpleasant facts all we will, but remember there is such a thing as national bankruptcy.

The day is coming when the American people must have a heart-to-heart talk with their Government and insist that the national finances be put in order.

In view of this fact, therefore, we should not sanction further expenditure unless it can be shown to be in the interest of all, including our own children.

But proponents of consumer subsidies say they will keep down the cost of living—that they will prevent inflation. The proof of their statement is sadly lacking. In fact, tested by ordinary rules of economics they would appear to be highly inflationary.

Inflation and deflation are due to an abnormal relation between the supply of goods to buy and the money with which to buy them. If the supply of goods is high and the amount of money is low, we have a period of deflation. If, on the other hand, there is a scarcity of goods and plenty of money, we have a period of rising prices or inflation.

During times of war the Government puts everyone to work making equipment for fighting. Wages are raised; the amount of spendable money is greatly increased. At the same time it restricts or even prevents the manufacture of many things people wish to buy. For example, instead of the 750,000 civilian trucks being produced annually before Pearl Harbor, the allotment for 1944 is 81,000. The needs of our armed services and our commitments under lend-lease also make great demands on the supply of food. In other words, every large war sets the stage for rising prices. The cost of living in almost every country engaged in this war has risen more rapidly than it has in America.

Therefore, to put a brake on inflation the Government should do two things. First, it should decrease the amount of spendable money or at least immobilize it. Second, it should strive for maximum production of such necessary things as food.

The consumer subsidies have just the opposite effect. By assuming part of the cost of food, it adds to the store of spendable money. By the uncertainty of its operation, a consumer subsidy discourages maximum production.

For some time now we have had a roll-back and subsidy on butter, yet during that time the production of butter has steadily decreased. Unless steps are taken to maintain and even increase the amount of butter, there will be higher prices and decreased supply in spite of any subsidy that may be paid by the Government.

Columnists and radio commentators from the industrial sections of the country accuse the opponents of consumer subsidies of having no program to keep down living costs. Of course, that is not true. We do have a program but it is too harsh for their pampered taste.

We have suggested the following: First, a drastic reduction in Government expenditures. In spite of the fact that we are spending billions for war, our nonwar expenditures are almost as high as they were during the depression. We have built great bureaus to take care of certain emergencies. Now, these emergencies are over, but the bureaus linger on. The famous green bay tree never flourished as does the average Government bureau.

Last spring the House abolished the National Resources Planning Board by the simple expedient of refusing further appropriations. However, most of the personnel were simply taken on by another bureau. We refused to extend the life of the Guffey Coal Act, therefore releasing for war work some 3,000 employees. But most of them will still be found in other departments of the executive branch. We are getting to be a government of, by, and for bureaus.

Representative government with its three independent branches has almost ceased to exist. Appointed officials now make rules and regulations which have the force and effect of laws. Every day these regulations and directives are published in the official register. It is almost a day's work to read them. They are written in such involved language that when you are through reading them you are more confused than when you started. These same bureaus prosecute citizens for violating their regulations. They then round out the day's work by passing sentence in their own cases. From many of these sentences there is no adequate appeal to the courts.

Of course, in time of war, it is necessary to vest certain powers in the executive branch of the Government. Adequate control over prices, overproduction, overdistribution is necessary. But such control should only be such as has some relation to the winning of the war. The war should not be used as an excuse for putting the Government into activities that might be handled by the State, by the local communities, or by the people themselves. There are many of us who still think the people know how to do a lot of things without being told by the Government.

In addition to drastic cuts in spending, the next step to hold inflation should be to encourage maximum production, particularly of food. Much trouble has been caused by confusing and contradictory policies. What happened in regard to cattle is a good illustration. The Government demand for meat bid up the price of cattle from the ranges of the West. The purchase prices of these cattle made it difficult for the feeder to put them through the feed lots for the price he was allowed to receive under the ceilings. As a result many feeders were compelled to quit. For example, one Iowa man who normally handled 3,000 head of cattle a year is now feeding 600. The normal and economical way for cattle to be marketed is through the feed lots. The interference with that process has reduced to some extent both the quantity and quality of meat.

In order to reduce the confusion, we have long been advocating that a single food administrator be appointed to have complete authority over the production, distribution, and rationing of food. Such a step would, at least so far as the Government is concerned, increase maximum production.

A great deal of our trouble is due to the failure to adopt a sensible price-control law in the first place. There is no way to regulate prices without controlling each and every element that enters into final cost. I have always thought we made a great mistake in not adopting the Baruch plan which called for a freezing of all prices, and of all elements entering into prices, including cost of raw material, salaries, and wages. The failure to take this step has resulted in great inequities in the wage structure. Many workers in war industries are getting unusually high wages, while others, just as deserving and often much more skilled, are denied an increase.

The over-all picture is this. The cost of living over the country has gone up 23 percent. Industrial wages over the country have gone up 63 percent. But the increases have been very irregular. About 45 percent of the people have had an increase in their income. Of the remaining 55 percent some are receiving the same and others even less. The 23-percent increase in the cost of living is a real hardship to this latter group. Instead of a consumer subsidy for all, it has been suggested that we adopt a modified stamp plan, which would enable these low-income groups to buy food at lower prices.

Another important question is that of soldier voting. In spite of accusations from certain quarters, practically everyone is in favor of extending the vote to our armed forces. The only question is, How can it best be done? The Green-Lucas bill proposes that it be handled entirely by the Federal Government. It proposes a commission which would, in its own way, hand out ballots on which the soldier could indicate his choice. Two serious objections have been urged to such a plan. First, there is grave doubt of its constitutionality. Under the Federal Constitution most of the details of the conduct of elections are left to the States. In the second place, such a plan would not give the soldiers the right to vote for State or county candidates.

The alternative proposal is that the matter of voting be handled by the States through their absent voter programs. Many States will need to make changes in their present laws to meet existing conditions. The Federal Government would cooperate as the agent of the States in getting the ballots to the members of the armed forces. This latter plan will probably be the one adopted. Governor Hickenlooper is to be congratulated on calling an early special session of the legislature to make the necessary changes in our law.

Congress will also soon have before it the question of the control of insurance companies. For years, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that insurance is not interstate commerce and is therefore subject to State rather than Federal control. The various States have accordingly built up insurance departments for the regulation of companies operating within their borders.

Some time ago Attorney General Biddle began a criminal suit against a number of insurance companies in Georgia, alleging that they were violating the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The district judge followed the decisions of the Supreme Court and dismissed the cases. The Attorney General has appealed, apparently with the intention of persuading the Supreme Court to reverse its previous decisions. Such a holding would pave the way for Federal control of insurance. To prevent this, bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate to reaffirm the view of Congress that regulation should remain with the States. There are many people in Washington anxious to bring all insurance under the domination of the National Government, and the bills will be vigorously opposed. I trust the Congress will not permit the building up of another gigantic bureau to regulate insurance, now being well handled by the States.

Early in the year the House will consider the regular appropriation bills, making available funds to run the Government for the coming fiscal year. Drastic cuts should, and I believe will, be made.

Expenditures under the lend-lease program should be particularly scrutinized. Every dollar necessary for our fighting forces, or to bring the war to a speedy conclusion, will be promptly appropriated. However, it has now become evident that we are embarking on a world-wide spending spree not of military value. We are in danger of becoming an international Santa Claus. We have made large loans to South American countries. We are spending for the war far more than any other nation. For example, during the last fiscal year our war expenditures were $75,000,000,000 as against $23,000,000,000 for our principal ally, the British Empire. We are depleting our national resources such as oil and iron at an alarming rate.

We must do our full duty in destroying our common enemies even though the cost be high. But let us put an end to the popular notion that we, single handed, intend to solve all the problems of the entire world, or to operate a global W. P. A. for the benefit of all. When the firing ceases, we will find plenty of troubles, right in our own country. In the long run we will learn that more real friends are made by treating all peoples justly than by loaning them money.

For years our Constitution has been a model for all nations desiring representative government. Our equality of opportunity has released the energies and the genius of millions of people. We have been an inspiration for all desiring to be free. Now we are fighting to maintain that form of government and that way of life. We are certain to win that struggle. But the day is rapidly approaching when we must fight another war for that same purpose. Great forces are moving in this country which threaten the very existence of the Republic. There are those who would destroy constitutional safeguards for some immediate advantage to themselves. They forget that the same government which can take away from others to give to them may some day take away from them to give to someone else.

America was once hailed as the last, and best, hope of mankind on this earth. I am convinced that it still is. While our soldiers are fighting all over the world for freedom, let us not permit it to be stolen from us at home.

Although we disagree on many things, there is one subject on which there is complete accord. The war must be won. Our enemies must be decisively defeated. Thanks to our Army and Navy and Air Force, we are now on the road to victory. But the war is far from ended. There will still be days and months of anxiety. This is not the time to let down. It is not the time to strike. It is not the time to begin maneuvering, for post-war profit or advantage. The hardest job of the war is now facing our soldiers—the invasion of Europe. But General Eisenhower has promised us victory this year, if we give our armed forces the support to which they are entitled. The Congress—and the people—have the utmost confidence in the men who are directing our campaigns. By working together we will make 1944 a year of great victory.

I thank you and I wish for all of you a happy new year.

The President's Modern Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, January 16, I find an outstanding editorial based upon the recent message of the President where he advocated a modern Bill of Rights. Under the permission granted me, I include this editorial as part of my remarks:

A MODERN BILL OF RIGHTS

The bill of economic rights, presented by the President in his message to Congress, has been handled meagerly by most of the press, if at all. Mr. Roosevelt's recommendation of a national service law perhaps merited more immediate attention. But the new bill of rights, eight principles upon which security and happiness might be built, gives the war new purpose for the average man.

This outline of economic democracy has received confused and conflicting interpretations according to the politics, prejudices, or principles of the interpreter. Some ask if it is not a blatant bid for popular support in '44. Others read into it domestic application of what they are pleased to call Mr. WALLACE'S Hottentot-coddling program or "a world-wide WPA." Still others consider it a plan for further centralization, an intent to guarantee these benefits through Government patronage and at the expense of private enterprise.

It should be emphasized first that these are rights to which the President believes men are entitled, rights which they should be guaranteed by society and not by the State except as an instrument of society. He does not go half so far as the Conservative Party of Britain, which recently presented to Churchill plans for extensive social insurance at home and the solution of unemployment problems abroad. Nor does he even take startling strides beyond the social legislation of the past 10 years. What he is propounding, as a matter of fact, expresses many of the convictions of the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and other enlightened leaders of American business and industry.

Further mists are lifted when the new bill of economic rights is reexamined in the penetrating light of the President's last press conference in December. At that time he reviewed the ministerings of Dr. New Deal and concluded with the need for a new program, one definitely not based on our diseased national condition in 1932 but fitted to the needs of a newer age in a newer world.

This age must cope with the conversion of fabulously expanded industry to peacetime prosperity. It must keep employables employed—which is impossible without the hearty cooperation of private enterprise and the investment of private capital. It must offer not only more employment but more security, better health, more recreation, more homes. It must recognize that economic isolationism is a thing of the dead and derelict past.

What does the President believe constitutes economic security, which should be the right of man in a highly industrialized society, just as political freedom should have been his right in feudal or autocratic or agrarian society?

"The right to a useful and remunerative job," or the right to work, is already letter of the law, so far as members of the armed forces are concerned. The job guaranty in the Selective Service Act will return soldiers, sailors, marines to their lathes and looms, their tools and typewriters. St. Louis is one of hundreds of cities now considering public works that will extend that right to civilian employables during the period of industrial demobilization. Congress now prepares to consider a road-building program that will serve the same purpose, and the State governments are blueprinting similar projects.

The economic concept that full post-war employment will enrich our domestic market, open foreign markets, and keep our standard of living from tobogganing to the valley of 1933 is held by all but the most fusty industrialists. Economic right No. 1 simply urges that a man's abilities be utilized by his country for the good of all—banker and baker, cobbler and capitalist—and reminds that our industrial economy is great enough to fulfill just such a mission.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation" has been on the logical way to realization since the Wagner Act, the wage-hour law, and other measures were passed to make effective the principle of collective bargaining and to eliminate substandard wages. Similarly, the right of farmers to a just return for their products has been guaranteed by a series of enactments.

The right of businessmen to be free from domination by monopolies and from unfair competition is the principle of the antitrust laws. The right of investors to be protected against fraud and chicanery is guarded by laws regulating stock markets and the issuance of securities. The right to adequate protection from economic fears in old age, illness, accident, and unemployment is the principle of the Social Security Act.

What of the right of every family to a decent home? Problems of slum clearance and respectable housing are not alone the considerations of U. S. H. A. They are being studied by every progressive community in the country. What of the right to a good education? The shocking percentage of illiterates revealed by the draft makes it imperative that we address ourselves to a situation that borders on national scandal.

What of the "right to adequate medical care and an opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health"? This is but one provision of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, a logical extension of the Social Security Act, which would set up a system of Federal insurance covering medical and hospital care, as well as extending old-age pensions to 15,000,000 people not now covered, and a system of Federal grants-in-aid for State assistance to the needy not otherwise covered by social insurance. It is a far less ambitious program than the British Beveridge plan or the Conservative Party's substitute proposal.

There have been and will be charges that the new bill of economic rights is a pipe dream of Utopia—a fantastic ideal state impossible of realization. Yet soberly, before passing judgment on it, let us look back to the bitter post-crash years. They present, in reflection, a half-remembered bad dream of bonus marches, angry farmers spilling milk on its way to market, Okies and Arkies chugging wearily across the land with their jalopy loads of shabby possessions. Recall the transient camps, the undernourished urchins selling pins and shoelaces from door to hostile door, the "Hoover hotels" and bums' jungles, bread lines, soup kitchens, and Apple Annies.

Fill in the drab spectacle with bank failures, suicides, jobless, restless youths hanging around the corner drug store, "Spare a dime?" boys, families of homemade gypsies looking for crops to harvest, hopeless of ever settling anywhere. Remember that the land of opportunity became the land of despair and disillusionment, and reread the President's warning words: "People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made."

To realize the ends of the bill of economic rights naturally presupposes the greatest harmony between government and private enterprise. If such harmony exists, and surely it must, Mr. Roosevelt's goals can be substantially attained by the brains and energy—yes, the genius—of the American people.

They are something to dream of and work for—those eight human principles. It might not be too much to say that upon the quest for their realization depends the survival of democracy as we know and love it, as we hope to retain it, live by it and progress under it.

Uncle Sam Remembers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks

in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an informative article pertaining to the painting of Lafayette at the Speaker's left, I am hereby including a sketch prepared by Mrs. Murdock for the benefit chiefly of junior and senior high-school students. However, so full of information is this article that I feel it worth while to place it before older citizens as well as the young. During the 7 years I have sat in this Chamber facing the Speaker's desk and studying the portrait of the illustrious Washington on the Speaker's right and the illustrious Lafayette on the Speaker's left, I have never fully informed myself concerning the paintings of these two great men we wish to remember and honor.

It is not enough that the mere names of Washington and Lafayette should be preserved in our memory. Patriotic and purposeful remembering requires that we know more than those names. I feel that the presence of these paintings together with facts concerning them is a part of our historic heritage which belongs to every citizen of our country. Naturally, the picture of George Washington has been widely reproduced, especially the Stuart portrait, in textbooks and in other forms and may be found in every school, every patriotic assembly hall, and in most homes—or at least should be found presented for view and a perpetual remembrance. Portraits of Lafayette are not so common as they should be in order to remind us sufficiently of the noble Frenchman who sacrificed so much for America's freedom.

Mrs. Murdock, as a student of history, finds a great storehouse of material for patriotic and inspiring research here in the Nation's Capital. The article I am including herewith is one of a series under the title, "Uncle Sam Remembers," which she has prepared for Arizona schools. I have encouraged her study particularly today for I feel that in these awful times when the fate of our country hangs in the balance and American institutions are struggling for survival, the most effective kind of inspirational influence is needed by every citizen, young and old.

It is a significant fact that the establishment of Mount Vernon as a memorial to the Father of our Country appropriately included a room for Lafayette, and later when the Arlington House was made a memorial to Robert E. Lee it also included a room dedicated to Lafayette. Both of these are in nearby Virginia but not convenient enough to recall Lafayette daily to our memory. However, the painting by the noted Dutch artist is immediately before our eyes throughout every session and if we read the history of the American Congress we will find that our forebears in this great national legislative body delighted to honor Lafayette in person as well as to preserve his likeness for us and later generations.

The article follows:

MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE

Uncle Sam has restored Lee Mansion as a memorial to Robert E. Lee, but one room is reserved as a memorial to Lafayette. The Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union has restored Mount Vernon as a memorial to George Washington, but one room is reserved as a memorial to Lafayette. It should be so.

Why do the American people cherish the name of Lafayette above that of any other foreign citizen, and why did the Congress of the United States observe the one-hundredth anniversary of the death of General Lafayette as a memorial day on May 29, 1934? All because as a nation we are indebted to Lafayette for personal service and sacrifice during Washington's struggle to uphold the independence of the Colonies, and for the financial and military aid of the French Government during the Revolution.

At the age of 19 this young army captain, Lafayette, left the French nobility and his inherited ease to offer himself and his wealth to America in her fight for liberty. When he visited the American Commissioners in Paris at that time (1776) and learned that the Americans in France could not afford to fit a ship for the patriotic Frenchmen and that Dr. Franklin advised him to abandon his plan until there were better chances of success, it is reported that Lafayette said:

"Hitherto I have only cherished your cause; now I am going to serve it. The lower it is in the opinion of the people, the greater effect my departure will have, and since you cannot get a vessel I shall purchase and fit out one, to carry your despatches to Congress and me to America."

Upon arrival in America he sent a letter to the Continental Congress containing these words:

"I had no sooner learned about America than I became fondly attached to her cause. As soon as I realized she was fighting for her freedom, I burned with the desire to shed my blood for her."

The Continental Congress passed the following resolution on July 31, 1777:

"Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette, out of his great zeal to the cause of liberty, in which the United States are engaged, has left his family and connections, and at his own expense come over to offer his services to the United States without pension or particular allowance, and is anxious to risk his life in our cause: *Resolved*, That his service be accepted, and that in consideration of his zeal, illustrious family, and connections he have the rank and commission of major general in the Army of the United States."

The loyalty of this young Frenchman to General Washington won him the great general's undying friendship. At one time Lafayette wrote to Washington, "I am now fixed in your fate and I shall follow it and sustain it as well by my sword as by all means in my power." He was wounded at Brandywine, but, with a devotion of the whole ragged Continental Army, Lafayette was at Washington's side when Cornwallis surrendered.

Read a portion of a letter Washington wrote to Lafayette after they had parted for the last time.

"In the moment of our separation, upon the road as I traveled, and every hour since, I felt that love, respect, and attachment for you, with which length of years close connection, and your merits have inspired me. I often asked myself as our carriages distanced whether that was the last sight I ever should have of you, and, though I wished to say 'No,' my fears answered 'Yes.' "

Lafayette made a farewell visit to America, arriving in July 1824 and remaining until September 1825. Washington's old war tent that he had used during the Revolution was set up in the unfinished rotunda of the old Capitol Building and there Lafayette was greeted by the Members of Congress and other public officials.

When he later visited the House of Representatives he responded to the welcome of the Congressmen in these words:

"My obligations to the United States, sir, far exceed any merit I might claim. They date from the time when I have had the happiness to be adopted as a young soldier—a favored son of America. They have been continued to me during almost half a century of constant affection and confidence, and now, sir, thanks to your most gratifying invitation, I find myself greeted by a series of welcome, 1 hour of which would more than compensate for the public exertions and sufferings of a whole life."

On December 23, 1824, Speaker Henry Clay read the following letter to the House of Representatives written from Paris by the Dutch artist, Ary Scheffer:

"Sir, I sent by the ship *Cadmus* * * * a full-length portrait of General Lafayette, painted by me, which I pray you to do me the honor to accept for the Hall of the House of Representatives, over which you preside.

"As the friend and admirer of General Lafayette and of American liberty, I feel happy to have it in my power to express in this way my grateful feeling for the national honors which the free people of the United States are at this moment bestowing on the friend and companion in arms of your illustrious Washington—on the man who has been so gloriously received by you as the Nation's guest."

This friend of Washington, this friend of the United States, this friend of freedom, visited every State in the Union during the last stay in America—and everywhere the people remembered. Huge crowds cheered the grand old patriot at every stop. At one such reception an old veteran in Continental uniform approached Lafayette and presented the distinguished visitor one-half of a blanket that he said Lafayette had torn from his own blanket to share with him at Valley Forge—the old soldier had cherished that bit of blanket for 50 years.

At no place, however, was Lafayette received with such memory and affection as at Arlington House by George Washington Parke Custis, Washington's adopted son. Lafayette recalled that the first time he had seen Mr. Custis was on the veranda at Mount Vernon during the Revolutionary War. The little boy had a feather in his hat and was holding the great Washington by one finger. Said Lafayette to Custis when reminiscing about Washington:

"At Monmouth I commanded a division, and it may be supposed I was pretty well occupied; still, I took time amid the roar and confusion of conflict to admire our beloved chief, who, mounted on a splendid charger, rode along the ranks amid the shouts of the soldiers, cheering them by his voice and example, and restoring to our standard the fortunes of the fight. I thought then as now that never had I beheld so superb a man."

During this last visit to America Lafayette went by steamboat and barge out to Mount Vernon for the last visit to the tomb of Washington. Mr. Custis at this time presented the aged general a ring containing a lock of Washington's hair, which the adopted son had cherished through the years. Among other tributes on this day, Mr. Custis said, "The child of Mount Vernon presents you with this token containing the hair of him, whom, while living you loved, and to whose honored grave you now pay the manly and affecting tribute of a patriot's and a soldier's tear."

General Lafayette pressed the ring to his heart and replied, "The feelings which at this moment oppress my heart do not leave the power of utterance. I can only thank you, my dear Custis, for your precious gift and pay a silent homage to the tomb of the greatest and best of men, my paternal friend."

President John Quincy Adams bade farewell to Lafayette at Washington City on September 7, 1825, with these words:

"We shall look upon you always as belonging to us, during the whole of your life, and as belonging to our children after us. You are ours by that more than patriotic self-devotion with which you flew to the aid of our fathers at the crisis of our fate; ours

by that unshaken gratitude for your services which is a precious portion of our inheritance; ours by that tie of love stronger than death, which has linked your name, for the endless ages of time, with the name of Washington."

Farmer's Income Is at Peak but He Still Has Complaints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roland M. Jones, which appeared in the New York Times of January 16, 1944:

FARMER'S INCOME IS AT PEAK BUT HE STILL HAS COMPLAINTS—HE GRUMBLES OVER RATIONING AND CEILINGS, AND HE WORRIES ABOUT MARKETING

(By Roland M. Jones)

OMAHA, NEBR., January 15.—War has stimulated the Corn Belt farmer to the greatest production he has ever attained, has returned him his greatest income and has given him his biggest grouch.

A sample of the production record is furnished by Iowa which set new marks last year with 640,000,000 bushels of corn, 21,000,000 head of hogs, 7,000,000,000 pounds of milk, and 326,000,000 dozens of eggs. For this and other crops and livestock marketed, its farmers received $1,750,000,000, double the income of 1941 and a third greater than that of 1942.

This works out to an average per farm of $8,300. Although operating costs have to be deducted from this gross it still figures out to a pretty snug reward for a production job well done, under a good many adverse circumstances.

RED TAPE HIS TROUBLE

The wonder naturally arises as to what kick the farmer has, when he is apparently doing so well. Ten years ago his complaint was uttered with the voice of despair, today it is the rumbling of anger. It is anger over having to get official permission to do so many things, anger over the feeling that, well as he may have been doing, something rightfully his is being withheld from him.

If he wants a piece of machinery he must go before a rationing board and get a priority. If he wants to keep a son at home to help with the work, he must go before a draft board and get a deferment. If he wants to hire a worker for the harvest, the chances are he won't get one except by application to a Government employment agency, and maybe not then. If he wants the full value for his milk he must take his milk or cream check to another official and ask for his subsidy.

CEILINGS DISLIKED

The biggest current dissatisfaction is over subsidies and ceilings. The two are indissolubly linked. While subsidies get major vocal attention it is with the thought of ceilings in mind, for subsidies give an excuse for ceilings, and ceilings prevent collection from the consumer of what the farmer thinks he is able and willing and ought to pay for his food.

Having reached the peak of hog production the farmer now feels aggrieved because he cannot market the bulk of them all at once. The limit of packing-house capacity to process the supply has been reached and no immediate opening of the bottleneck is in sight. Some predict the middle of March before hogs can again move freely to market without the danger of and expense of carry-overs.

Actually the farmer suffers little, if any, hurt from having to hold his hogs a few weeks. They simply continue to put on more weight, which means they will bring still more money. The fear is that they may grow to more than the 300-pound limit on which support prices apply.

Taxpaying by Guessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH MRUK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, with reference to my bill, H. R. 3817, discussed by me in the RECORD of January 10, I wish to present to the Congress some typical comments of taxpayers who favor the pay-as-you-go revision which this measure proposes for all taxpayers whose individual Federal income tax is not collectible by withholding at the source.

Mr. Raymond C. Stangle, 28 University Court, Eggertsville, N. Y., says this:

Here is a real chance to do something fine for the small businessman and merit his appreciation in the year 1944.

As you know, all businessmen must estimate their tax for the year 1944 by March 15, 1944, and pay one-quarter of such estimate at that time. Why could not such estimate be put on a practical basis of the first 3 months of 1944's business and such payment be on the actual figures as shown by a businessman's books for the first 3 months of 1944, and payment made in April 1944 for the first 3 months, just like he pays his social security on his employees. (He would not then be trying to pay on the full year's business. He cannot foresee what's ahead in the estimated period. That's just as bad as trying to pay on last year's income when you are out of a job.) Then, likewise, the next 3 months' business could be paid on—and so during the entire year he would be on a pay-as-you-go system, on actual figures and not guessing.

I am in the accounting and income-tax business, and get around a great deal among the smaller business people such as grocers, jewelers, druggists, restaurant owners, etc. These people do not all have bookkeepers on a full-time basis, and some are altogether without bookkeepers. Imagine the confusion and hair-tearing there will be next March 15 unless some relief is offered in the way of a practical plan for figuring. Surely our tax experts can work this out for small business.

Pay-as-you-go applying only to individual income taxpayers, corporations are exempt from the requirement of estimating tax and continue to pay their taxes on actual figures, once a year as before. Why should not small businessmen also pay on actual figures?

Mr. George J. Keller, manager, George Keller Machinery Co., 1807 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y., has written me:

In our business, which is the distribution of machine-tool equipment, it is just utterly impossible to estimate what our income would be for the year 1944, or any other year, as early as March 15. Our business depends entirely upon demand, and it surely would take a prophet with supernatural powers to forecast, with any degree of accuracy, the amount of business that might be handled in any one year.

Want you to know that I appreciate your stand in this matter, and that you have my wholehearted support.

From Mr. E. H. Breckon, 115 Woodward Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y., I have received this comment:

Of all the rules and regulations that I have ever encountered, the present law concerning the current payment of the individual income tax not withheld at the source is the most asinine, unworkable, and unbusiness-like proposition.

We are asked to pay a tax that is not due or earned or realized on.

In business one does not pay interest until it is earned, on notes and mortgages.

This law compels one to guess at something. Think of the retail business of the country trying to guess in March what business it will do during the holiday shopping season in December.

I am a retired person, living upon my investments, mostly stocks and bonds. Last year in December my dividends were large, but this year I am certain that they are going to be less. If I do not put my guess at what my dividends prove to be I am liable to a fine—and if I overestimate I can wait for a refund, and when do I receive it?

Even soldiers who have been disabled in the service of their country are subjected to long delays in payment of money due them, just because of red tape. What else can the taxpayers expect?

For 35 years I was in retail business, and I know what it means to estimate income. We usually expect business to be good, but we oftentimes are mistaken.

Give us 15 days after each quarter to report; make it workable and not guesswork.

There we have the views of three representative persons, a retired businessman whose income is from his investments, the manager of a machine-tool equipment company, and a member of the accounting profession.

I hope that the Congress will give serious consideration to these points of view and to H. R. 3817.

There has come to my attention a quote from a Washington newspaper column:

Internal revenue officials will scrutinize carefully the December 15 income-tax returns of farmers—who were exempt from the September 15 return. Reason: Farm accounting is generally a casual business, and many farmers make only a wild guess of their income.

As my source of this quote declares, "several million farmers will not enthuse over" that attitude on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The fact is that upon millions of other taxpayers whose individual income tax cannot be collected by withholding at the source, for the reason that they are not wage earners, but, instead, small business and professional people, and others, there has been imposed a requirement that they guess—and many of them, having absolutely no basis for estimating, in advance of earning, what they may earn, subject to many conditions, between the 15th day of March and the 31st day of December, admit, and are complaining, that they will be guessing wildly.

For the correction of what is obviously a grave mistake in the pay-as-you-go plan as written last year into the internal revenue law, I have introdueed H. R. 3817; and I trust that this measure will be studied and acted upon by this Congress.

Conscription of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution from International Brotherhood, Electrical Workers, Local Union B–53, of Kansas City, Kans., and a copy of my letter to them. The resolution and letter follow:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD,
ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Kansas City, Kans., January 11, 1944.

HONORABLE SIR: At regular meeting of Local Union No. B–53 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers the following resolution was adopted which we urge you to consider in voting for total conscription:

"Resolved—

"Whereas for some Americans to gain wealth and economic advantage in war prices, war profits, and war wages, through the spilling of the blood of other Americans, is not in keeping with our traditions of liberty and justice for all; and

"Whereas there are powerful enemies of labor who are using the national emergency as a guise, under cover of which they would strike at the very heart of organized labor; and

"Whereas the internal strife which would inevitably result, would we strike back at these same forces in the conventional manner, could only hinder the victory program and help our enemies, and realizing that to let those same forces continue this subterfuge, could only lead to disruption of our productive processes and to ultimate chaos, and thereby help to establish the very conditions at home which we are seeking to destroy abroad.

"Therefore, in our earnest desire to be free of all internal conflict, to establish unity, and to coordinate all our productive capacities to the fullest extent, this organization urges total conscription of all men, machines, materials, and money, with national service from all and profits to none."

Fraternally,
THOS. L. VAUGHAN,
Recording Secretary Local Union B–53.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1944.

Mr. THOMAS L. VAUGHAN,
Recording Secretary, Local Union B–53, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,
Kansas City, Kans.

DEAR MR. VAUGHAN: This wil' acknowledge receipt of the resolution of your local relative to total conscription.

For over 20 years, along with many other members of the American Legion, I tried to sell the program of universal service. We received little, if any, thanks; we met with great resistance, especially from subversive groups which sought to weaken our national defense.

Note how closely the language of your resolution follows that of the American Legion and the fact that it limits such conscription to time of war.

"Bring into service of the country, in time of war, capital, industry, resources, services, and manpower, with special privileges or profits for none and equal service for all."

The American Legion believed when the time came for young men to be conscripted and to leave all behind, that that was the time for action—action which would have stabilized wages on a peacetime basis, costs on a peacetime basis, profits as they might be, not above, and in most cases below those of peacetime.

To accomplish this, the American Legion and other veterans' organizations, have had before Congress since 1921 bills ready for immediate enactment, the most comprehensive being in 1936 and subsequent years. Some of our suggestions have been adopted piecemeal.

During all these years we pleaded for support for our program with little encouragement, so it is particularly heartening to read such a resolution as you sent, even at this late date—a resolution which although it does not specifically so state, we assume must be meant to apply in time of war only.

In all probability had we been successful in our efforts there would not have been the spiraling costs, the war debt would have been less than half, the transition from war to peace would have required fewer adjustments and less economic dislocation; and possibly there might have been no necessity for consideration of adjusted compensation for those in our armed forces.

Whether there would have been fewer labor disturbances is problematical, but I am inclined to think there would have been few, if any, for most, if not all, of the causes would have been absent. It is pleasing to know that our labor leaders abhor, and have kept a firm resolve against, work stoppages for any reason in time of war. All of us were encouraged by the sentiment expressed recently by a union official in connection with the Cramp shipbuilding strike when he said, according to the press, "any member failing to return will be aiding the enemies of our union and our country" and, "this union will not sanction or condone any action which would delay construction of these ships in the slightest degree."

Further encouragement is found in the comment of another union official in Akron, to the effect that "any grievance that could be settled after a plant closed could be settled before production was halted."

The views of these men, I am sure, from the tone of your resolution, must be much the same as yours.

However, as yet, no method has been devised to unscramble an egg. Hence, it may be much too late to inaugurate such a comprehensive program.

It is doubtful that labor conscription is now necessary in view of statements from high places. Mr. McNutt has stated that a national service act would not solve manpower problems. Secretary of Labor Perkins reports that wartime employment has reached its peak and coming months may bring an increasing decline in employment.

I am still keenly interested in this program, so if your organization has any specific plan or suggestions as to how this can now be done I shall appreciate receiving them, for I still believe, as you do, in the justice and right of equal (national) service for all and special profits for none.

If matters come before the House relating to this question as the result of hearings which are scheduled to begin this week I shall hold in mind your resolution.

Our first job is to win the war, regardless of cost to ourselves, and I sincerely trust that continued undiminished efforts of all of us, workers and fighters, will bring us an early victory, assured us by General Eisenhower, if we each do our part.

Sincerely,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

Misconceptions About Lea Civil Aeronautics Bill—H. R. 3420—Created by Proponents of Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A22, Congressman BULWINKLE inserted under extension of remarks some comments about the Lea Civil Aeronautics bill, H. R. 340. There are 32 points mentioned in these remarks which attempt to clear up some of the objections which have been advanced in the minority report on this legislation. The opponents of the Lea bill are supporting the Reece bill, H. R. 3491, which bill adopted 21 of the 26 principles set forth in the majority report on the Lea bill.

The Bulwinkle memorandum, in my opinion, instead of clarifying an already confused situation, adds further confusion in an obvious attempt to draw a red herring across the trail of the real issues. I am, therefore, submitting these comments on the Lea bill and the Bulwinkle memorandum but am limiting them to those five major principles to which the minority objects and which we desire to reemphasize.

As a matter of convenience, I am listing below the five major objections of the minority of the House committee to the Lea bill so that the major issues may be kept fully in mind in subsequent discussions:

1. It destroys States' rights.
2. It creates confusion by reorganizing during the present emergency the aviation regulatory system, thereby retarding the war effort.
3. It tends to promote a monopoly for existing air lines.
4. It authorizes almost unlimited subsidies that may greatly increase our tax burden.
5. It authorizes the training at public expense of new aviation employees to compete for jobs with the millions of veterans after the war.

These principles are set forth and briefly explained in the minority report, House Document No. 784, dated October 20, 1943, pages 41 to 49. They are discussed more in detail by Congressman WOLVERTON of New Jersey in his remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A5524–5527.

I will attempt to cover the more important statements in Mr. BULWINKLE'S

memorandum, following so far as possible his order of treatment, but under the general headings of the five major principles above referred to.

I. MONOPOLY

Mr. BULWINKLE states:

A. The Lea bill does not foster monopoly.

The Bulwinkle remarks state that the Lea bill does not change the present Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. If that were true, why pass the Lea bill in this respect?

Under that act, 19 air carriers have secured control of the air-transportation industry, and of these 19 lines, 4 lines control approximately 81 percent of the traffic. Naturally these air lines do not desire that the Lea bill should change the situation but rather should strengthen it in their own private interests.

I dealt with this subject in some detail in my extension of remarks printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, starting at page A4792, under the heading of "Who changed Monro on monopoly?" I still stand on these remarks. I do not desire to repeat in detail these remarks as they are already a matter of record, but I do desire to refer to certain features to emphasize again the obvious attempt of the Big Four to preserve their monopoly.

My statement that four major lines control 81 percent of the traffic was supplied by a speech by Mr. C. Bedell Monro, president, Pennsylvania-Central Air Lines Corporation, delivered on September 30, 1943. Mr. Monro explained in great detail the monopoly of the "big four," namely, the American, the United, the Eastern, and the Transcontinental and Western Air. Anyone who reads that speech is convinced of the monopoly of the Big Four. However, within 1 month after delivery of that speech Mr. Monro back-tracked, as fully explained in my remarks of November 12, 1943. What caused Mr. Monro to turn a flip-flop in 4 weeks? Somebody "cracked the whip." Mr. Monro's line, and other of the smaller lines, are dependent for much of their traffic upon the four major air lines by way of connections. If they desire to extend their lines into territory served by the four major air lines, they would be met by serious opposition. It is reasonable to suppose that Mr. Monro was told, "If you do not play ball with us, we will not play ball with you. We are in the saddle."

A few excerpts from Mr. Monro's speech of September 30, 1943, are enlightening on the question of monopoly, as follows:

> Thus there appears to be a most serious economic unbalance, a virtual monopoly on the part of the four largest air lines of the most lucrative routes in the country—a situation with potentialities as explosive to the sound economic growth of aviation as a load of block-buster bombs—a situation which, if left uncorrected, can reduce to a minimum our ability to offer gainful employment to our returning servicemen in an industry which should lead all others in expansion and resultant job opportunities.
>
> * * * * *
>
> As air travel became accepted more widely by the American public, it was only natural that the gulf between those carriers established in "fat" territory and those established in "lean" territory widened enormously. And those companies in the latter category, with vision for the future, together with the necessary drive and energy, could expand only to such points and in such areas where the smaller degree of traffic potential was a grave handicap. With few exceptions, any incursions into more fertile fields, embodying as it did direct competition, were originally prohibited by law and later prevented by policy of the Government agency—the Civil Aeronautics Board—which since 1938 has had jurisdiction over our industry.
>
> * * * * *
>
> No, as stated before, there can be no quarrel with what has happened in the past, nor blame for any company group, or agency. Issue should be taken, however, with the present complete disregard on the part of the larger carriers of self-evident facts when, with control of at least 81 percent of the business of the country, those carriers have laid plans and are seeking additional operating certificates for direct competition with the smaller carriers for a substantial proportion of the remaining 19 percent. And certainly for the immediate and future public interest, issue should be taken with any policy which will either perpetuate or intensify a virtual monopoly, even though such monopoly were created originally by force of circumstances.

These statements deal largely with so-called trunk-line air transportation. With respect to local lines, the Civil Aeronautics Board conducted an investigation in relation to local feeder and pick-up lines in October and November 1933. These hearings were quite extensive and many persons appeared in support of the institution of such local feeder and pick-up lines, independently of the so-called trunk lines, and advanced cogent reason therefor. These persons included not only individuals but representatives of existing transportation companies, of State authorities, of local communities, and the like. The position of the trunk-line carriers is best exemplified by the testimony of Mr. Hugh Knowlton, director of research and post-war planning of Eastern Air Lines, on October 22, 1943:

> The existing air carriers are already on the scene geographically, and for this reason alone would appear to be best qualified to give service to such of the smaller communities in the United States as may desire and as may be able to justify on economical grounds.

Mr. Knowlton presented considerable testimony in an attempt to prove that the existing transcontinental air carriers are the only qualified groups to operate feeder lines. This is pure monopoly.

Mr. Knowlton further said:

> We cannot too strongly urge the Board to pause before opening the air-transportation field to inexperienced applicants motivated primarily by desire to get on the air band wagon.

The expression by representatives of the air industry speak for themselves. Monopoly is the keynote. There is even a glaring rift among the air transportation carriers themselves with respect to the question of future expansion.

In concluding his address of September 30, 1943, Mr. Monro summed the matter up as follows:

> To sum up the situation—on the one hand there are 4 large carriers which are or should be self-sufficient in their enjoyment of 81 percent of the Nation's air-transport business. On the other hand there are 12 carriers, which, because of territorial traffic insufficiency, would have, for the most part, operated at a substantial loss without substantial subsidy. And fundamental to a really great expansion of the entire industry is a reduction in the rate structure of all air lines. The larger air lines will be in a position to lower passenger and express rates, but what will happen to the smaller carriers who will be forced to meet such reduction. Unless economic balance is restored, the necessary cycle of an industry which has within it every element of greatness cannot be put into motion—the cycle of lower rates, greater expansion—greater expansion, greater employment.
>
> * * * * *
>
> If monopoly of any kind is permitted, if a virtual monopoly through economic unbalance is not corrected, then the air-transport industry cannot help but fail miserably to meet its obligations and responsibilities in the reconstruction period. Such failure will severely harm not only our industry but other industries as well as hundreds of communities throughout the country. And we shall have to say to those returning from the battle fronts, "Sorry, boys, no jobs. We just couldn't win our campaign at home."

Mr. Speaker, the shift in the position of Mr. Monro from September 30 to October 25 shows conclusively the confusion that exists even in the minds of the air executives as to what should be done in aeronautics legislation.

II. STATE AND LOCAL RIGHTS

Mr. BULWINKLE under a number of headings attemps to show that the Lea bill does not interfere with State and local rights in respect to the air transportation industry.

That the Lea bill does interfere with State and local rights in the field of domestic aviation has been shown many times. For example, the minority report in House Document No. 784, dated October 20, 1943, calls attention to the provisions of the Lea bill which impair or exclude State and local rights—pages 41–43. Also in the extension of remarks by Mr. WOLVERTON in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A5524–A5527, some of these provisions are set forth in detail.

From an examination of these two documents and the provisions referred to, any Member of Congress can judge for himself.

The Bulwinkle memorandum, however, attempts to confuse the issue by a series of misleading statements and inaccurate references with respect to the present law and the Lea bill. The Bulwinkle memorandum makes the following statements under the headings indicated:

B. The Lea bill does not provide for Government ownership.

C. The Lea bill does not exclude the States from the field of civil aviation.

D. The Lea bill does not impair the States' powers to tax.

E. The Lea bill does not interfere with State airport zoning laws or impair State powers to establish and regulate airports.

F. The Lea bill does not give the Federal agency arbitrary power over airports.

N. The Lea bill does not suppress the development of local air transportation.

The Bulwinkle remarks contend that the Lea bill does not depart in any way from the present law with respect to State and local rights, and cities, by in-

direction, as authority therefor a statement contained in the Aeronautics Act of 1926, which provisions, it is stated in the Bulwinkle memorandum and earlier dissertations on this subject, vested in the Federal Government complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States to the exclusion of everyone else. It is most important to note that the act of 1926 referred only to foreign aircraft, which provision would be repealed—see page 156 of the majority report, House Document No. 784—and the following substituted therefor in the Lea bill:

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY OF AIR SPACE

SEC. 4. The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States, including the air space above all inland waters and the air space above those portions of the adjacent marginal high seas, bays, and lakes, over which by international law, treaty convention, or otherwise, the United States exercises national jurisdiction (p. 16, Lea bill).

This declaration of policy in the Lea bill, in connection with the other provisions, clearly indicates that it is not confined to foreign commerce but is specifically to apply to all domestic commerce as well, whether interstate or intrastate.

Mr. BULWINKLE argues that there is nothing new about this declaration of policy in that, with one minor and insignificant change, it is taken word for word from the existing law and is merely a reaffirmation of a policy adopted by Congress in 1926. This is a major, not a minor, change. The act of 1926 referred only to foreign aircraft. The Lea bill extends the declaration to all domestic commerce, whether interstate or intrastate, and to purely private local flying. The declaration in the Lea bill grants complete and exclusive rights to Federal authority. This clearly is all-inclusive. Local commercial and private fliers must come to Washington. All State and local control over all intrastate or local flying is completely wiped out. Domestic commerce and domestic transportation are defined on page 12 of the Lea bill to include all commerce which is not foreign commerce and foreign transportation; namely, all commerce, whether interstate or intrastate. The Lea bill repeals the definitions in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 of interstate commerce and of foreign commerce and of interstate transportation and foreign transportation, and is substituting therefor the definitions of domestic commerce and domestic transportation as compared with foreign commerce and foreign transportation. It has wiped out any distinction between interstate and intrastate domestic commerce. In other words, it is designed to exclude completely the State and local government from any regulation or control whatsoever from their constitutional rights with respect to intrastate and local commerce and transportation, and under the taxation clause the rights of the State and local authorities to tax the air industry without the consent of the Federal Government.

Pages 89 and 90 of the Lea bill refer to so-called cooperation with States, Territories, and possessions, in respect to regulation and taxation.

On page 90, lines 1 to 3, it is provided:

No regulation of air carriers, air contractors, or foreign air carriers shall be valid unless provided for or consented to by the Congress.

Further phases in this paragraph merely serve to emphasize the exclusive Federal purpose.

On page 90, starting at line 11, the Federal authorities are directed to consult with State and local authorities to avoid multiple taxation. However, attention is called particularly to lines 19 to 22 with respect to any taxation by State or local authority:

which has the effect of unduly burdening or unduly impeding the development of air commerce, which taxation is hereby declared to be inconsistent with the public interest.

I can just imagine the predicament of the representatives of the several States in considering tax legislation. Apparently they must go to Washington and consult with Federal bureaucrats as to how far they may be allowed to go in proposing any taxation upon the air industry, including gasoline used by the industry, but even a temporary clearance, coupled possibly with many conditions, would not be final. The final arbiter of whether or not a State or local tax is unduly burdensome is vested in the Federal authorities. This, obviously, is a very sweeping power and while probably unconstitutional, merely adds to the confusion and doubt created by this and other provisions of the Lea bill.

By indirection, the Lea bill attempts to limit and impair the constitutional right of the States and local authorities in the matter of taxation. The drafters of the bill realize this could not be done directly. So it was provided that the Federal authorities could decide—under the above-quoted declaration of policy—when, in the superior judgment of the Federal authorities, such State and local taxation might constitute an undue burden upon or an undue impediment to the development of air commerce, whether interstate or local.

In other words, the Federal authorities could nullify and in practical effect veto State and local legislation.

ZONING AND REGULATION OF AIRPORTS

With respect to airport zoning and the establishment and regulation of airports, a mere reading of the provisions of the Lea bill, starting on page 33 and extending through to page 41, coupled with what has been heretofore said with respect to the exclusion of State and local rights, would convince any impartial person that the Lea bill does interfere with airport zoning and the establishment and regulation of airports by State and local authorities. While the Federal administrator is empowered to consult with State and local authorities, his decision and the regulations promulgated by him are final.

LOCAL AIR TRANSPORTATION FEDERALLY CONTROLLED

With respect to the suppression of development of local air transportation, the Bulwinkle memorandum attempts, on page A23, under point 32, to show that while the Lea bill provides that commercial transportation for hire shall be subject to Federal regulation, whether interstate or intrastate, the suggestion is made that this does not in any way suppress the development of local air transportation. The answer is obvious.

The statement is made that no suggestion anywhere in the bill indicates that intrastate transportation can be prohibited. Of course, intrastate transportation cannot be prohibited by Federal fiat. But intrastate transportation by air can be retarded and kept suppressed through the provisions of the bill which require anyone who desires to engage in intrastate transportation by air to go to Washington for the privilege. Many persons who desire to engage in such transportation on a modest scale could not, of course, afford the expense of applying. Experience under the Motor Carrier Act has shown this in respect to small interstate operations. Intrastate operations by motor vehicle are, of course, subject to local State jurisdiction.

The Lea bill would subject to control at Washington all proposed or existing intrastate transportation by air, even though such transportation might be only a matter of a few miles, entirely local in its nature, and unrelated to any so-called necessity for national uniform regulation.

The Lea bill would suppress the development of local air transportation. In recent hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board, the so-called trunk-line air carriers, while not actively opposing the development of feeder lines or local lines, nevertheless, for the most part, stated that such lines should be developed by existing so-called experienced air carriers to the exclusion of local interests. This is merely another example of the desire of the existing carriers to preserve the monopoly which they now have in the air business in the continental United States.

III. SUBSIDIES

The Bulwinkle statement does not deal directly with the question of subsidies for obvious reasons.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, section 302 (a), provides, "the Administrator shall not acquire any airport by purchase or condemnation." The Lea bill repeals this provision. Why? To open wide the door for almost unlimited subsidies. This can be seen by looking at page 72 of the committee report.

The Lea bill—under sections 302 and 303, pages 72–74 of committee report and related provisions—is an authorization without any limit. If what some air enthusiasts are claiming should prove true, the Lea bill could ultimately result in Federal funds being allotted to airports in an amount approaching the present national debt. When one contemplates the pressure of different localities for airports, it will be seen how difficult, if not impossible, it will be to deny appropriations. The time to stop such raids on the Federal Treasury for the benefit of private industry and not the public is now by not enacting the Lea bill.

IV. SURFACE CARRIERS

The Bulwinkle memorandum makes the following statement:

G. The Lea bill does not affect the regulation of surface carriers or other utilities.

It is agreed that the Lea bill does not attempt to regulate transportation by surface carriers, particularly in the manner suggested in the Bulwinkle memorandum. It does, however, by indirection, attempt to exclude surface carriers, whether engaged in domestic or foreign commerce, from engaging in the air transportation business.

Section 408 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 contains certain limitations and conditions upon the right of surface carriers to acquire control over air carriers. In a well-known case, known as the American Export decision, the Civil Aeronautics Board undertook to interpret this provision, and after extensive litigation, not only held that under the evidence the American Export Steamship Lines should not be allowed to acquire control of a subsidiary air carrier but also went on to say that surface carriers practically were prohibited from instituting new air lines under section 401.

Section 401 deals with the issuance of certificates for new operations by air. This section does not contain the limitations and conditions of section 408 (b), which latter deals with acquisitions of control. However, the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the American Export decision legislated the limitations and conditions of section 408 (b) into section 401. The Board, of course, had no authority to do this.

However, this decision has created great confusion. If the 1930 act is amended by an extensive bill such as the Lea bill, without any correction of this confusion, there might be justification for an argument that the Congress accepted the Export decision as correct and therefore, by indirection, the Congress did amend section 401 without specifically referring thereto.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is correct when he states that the Lea bill does not amend the 1938 act in this respect by any specific provision. However, in the Reece bill, namely, H. R. 3491, the minority has attempted to correct this situation by a specific amendment to section 401, reaffirming the provisions of the present 1938 act granting equal rights to surface carriers to institute new operations by air without the restrictions of section 408 (b).

It should also be stated that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] himself has introduced House bill 3421, which specifically deals with section 408 (b) in connection with the matter of acquisition of control by surface carriers of existing air lines. It is agreed that hearings will be held on this bill. Passage of the Lea bill would serve merely to create further temporary confusion, pending the clearing up of the matter upon due consideration under the Bulwinkle bill.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION

The Bulwinkle memorandum states as follows:

H. The Lea bill would not cause confusion in the Government's administrative agency for civil aviation.

The statement is made that no new commission is created but that the Lea bill merely changes the name of the board to commission. However, it is also stated that the Civil Aeronautical Authority organization is removed from the Department of Commerce in toto. In other words, an attempt is made to slur over and minimize the very substantial major change in organization proposed in the Lea bill.

The President's letter of June 4, 1943, on this subject is now familiar to all Members of Congress, but the following excerpt therefrom is hereinafter set forth as a matter of convenience:

I question, moreover, the advisability at a time when there is a paramount need for the performance by the administration and the board of services of vital importance to the armed forces, of providing, in a measure, otherwise restricted to the accomplishment of more or less recognized betterments in the operative procedures of the existing agencies, for such a major organization of these agencies as would be contemplated by the proposal in question. I fear that the consideration, enactment, and putting into operation of such a reorganization plan would so distract the attention of officials and employees of these agencies, and so impair their working efficiency as to seriously interfere with the contribution that they could otherwise make in the interest of securing successful civil aviation assistance in the conduct of the war.

The Lea bill does much more than is inferred from Mr. BULWINKLE'S memorandum. It creates a new independent commission. The Civil Aeronautics Board now is within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. The President objects to any disturbance of the present arrangement in time of war, and his letter gives his reasons therefor.

It is obvious that this is not the time to create a new independent Federal agency, subject to no control except by future legislative process, which, as everyone knows, is not calculated to deal with emergencies. The President, under his war powers, has the authority to deal with emergencies and may do so at any time in the event that the present administrative set-up should not meet the war requirements.

The present administrative set-up has functioned efficiently during the war emergency, and there is no evidence from any source to justify any change at the present time in this administrative set-up.

Air transportation from a domestic commercial standpoint is of course important and will develop rapidly after the war. Up to the present time the volume of traffic carried by the air lines in commercial transportation has been relatively small in comparison with the volume of traffic carried by the surface carriers and handled by the forwarding companies under jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Rather than to create any new independent commission at the present time, it would be more logical, if any correction in the present administrative organization might appear to be helpful to the war effort, to place air transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This would be the logical method by which it should be handled if the war emergency develops any necessity for a change in the present administrative organization. It is well to bear in mind that there has been vested, by successive acts of Congress, over a period of a great many years, jurisdiction in the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate transportation in the interest of the development of a coordinated national system of transportation. The latest expression of this policy is contained in the Transportation Act of 1940, and is quoted here for convenience by way of emphasis (act of September 18, 1940; quotation marks supplied):

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions; all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail "as well as other means," adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

VI. TRAINING OF AIR PILOTS, MECHANICS, AND TECHNICIANS

The Bulwinkle memorandum contains the following statement:

K. The Lea bill does not provide for an improvident aviation training program.

The Lea bill will deprive veterans of jobs after the war.

The Lea bill retains most of the provisions of the Civil Pilot Training Act of 1939. The fact that it does so is cited as justifications for sections 309–310—pages 29–32.

However, conditions have changed. Reasons for training, at Federal expense, of pilots, technicians, and mechanics, which training assisted very materially in the development of aviation both commercially and in the war effort, have ceased.

Millions of war veterans will return at the end of the war. Most of these veterans are young men, inexperienced in any other line of endeavor. While commercial aviation after the war has a great future, it cannot possibly take care

of the many returned war veterans qualified to engage therein as pilots, technicians, mechanics, and the like.

The Lea bill would aggravate the situation by training through a Federal subsidy the younger generation in schools and colleges, aero clubs, and the like, throughout the United States, to fit them for jobs in commercial aviation as pilots, mechanics, and technicians. Obviously, this would merely aggravate the situation in relation to the problem of securing jobs for returned war veterans who are already thoroughly qualified.

The provisions of the Lea bill with respect to such training are uncalled for and represent another instance of the lack of sound consideration underlying a number of the provisions of the Lea bill.

But why should the Federal Government train employees for any industry? They do not do it for forms of transportation other than the air industry, nor do they do it for any other business. The commercial air industry should train its own employees and not expect the Federal Government to pay for such training.

CONCLUSION

The statement is made by way of conclusion in Mr. BULWINKLE'S remarks on page A25 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1944, to the effect that—

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce take great pride in the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which, as every fair-minded man will agree, has been of the greatest value to our country through the aviation progress which it made possible. The present bill, H. R. 3420, is a carefully prepared measure, bringing the Civil Aeronautics Act up to date, and looking to the continued progress of civil aviation for the future.

There can, of course, be no disagreement with the first sentence, and I take pride in my participation in the enactment of the 1938 act. With regard to the second sentence, which appears to be a hopeful wish on the part of sponsors of the Lea bill, the confusion already created in various discussions with respect to the Lea bill indicate very clearly that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House could not possibly take any pride in the passage of the Lea bill.

As a matter of fact, the statement that the Lea bill is a carefully prepared measure is indefensible. No hearings were held on H. R. 3420. Only 8 days of hearings were held on the original Lea bill, H. R. 1012—official record of hearings February 2 to 12, 1943. These hearings were held on short notice. Only aviation enthusiasts largely representing the Big Four, which control 81 percent of the business, already prepared, had an opportunity to be heard. In view of the complicated character of the bill, other persons were not in a position to appear as they had not had sufficient time following introduction of the bill to give it adequate study and consideration. The very next day after these 8 days of hearings, namely, on February 13, 1943, H. R. 1012 was reported to the House. Following this, 3 additional days of hearings were held early in March, commencing on March 3, 1943. See official record of hearings. Reference to the official record shows very clearly that these additional hearings were in the nature of ex parte testimony and for the most part ex parte documents and letters.

H. R. 3420 makes major changes in H. R. 1210 without notice to anyone. No one interested in the sound and orderly development of post-war aviation had an opportunity to be heard. The members of the House committee had only 24 hours to consider the proposed majority report.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce itself is widely split on the bill. This is shown not only by the minority report of the opponents of the bill but also the reservations orally made by several individual members who voted for the majority report.

The aviation industry itself is split wide open in respect to the Lea bill.

One of the many indications of this wide split within the industry was the action at a 3-day meeting recently called by Col. Roscoe Turner, president of the National Aviation Trades Association, when representatives of the leading organizations in the aviation field adopted a resolution opposing the Lea air-regulation bill. The meeting was attended by delegates from the National Aeronautics Association, the Air Transport Association, the personal aircraft committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the Aircraft Dealers and Manufacturers Association, and the National Aviation Trades Association. Aeronautical insurance groups were represented by Maj. Reid Chambers.

The resolution adopted by this meeting in connection with the Lea bill, reads as follows:

Resolved, That having carefully considered pending House bill H. R. 3420 and having the interest of aviation as well as the public interest in mind, we hereby declare that our position with reference to such bill is as follows:

1. We are definitely in favor of the general regulation of the aviation industry by the Federal Government except as to purely local features which are properly the subjects for State legislation.

2. While H. R. 3420 contains some features which are forward steps and improvements over the existing law, nevertheless, in view of the fact that its many undesirable features so outweigh its advantages any attempt to eliminate its objectionable provisions by amendment would be impracticable, we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to the passing of House bill H. R. 3420 and recommend that the bill do not pass, and further recommend that a new attempt be immediately made to draft and introduce a substitute bill, fair to all aviation interests and beneficial to the public and that further hearings thereon be held and that all interested parties present their views thereon to the end that such new legislation may be a help rather than a determent to the progress of aviation.

In its 1942 report to the Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Board proposed a few relatively unimportant amendments to the 1938 act and then stated:

In view of the existing demands upon the efforts of all concerned arising from the national emergency, the Board does not urge, in presenting these amendments, that they be considered at the present time by Congress. However, it is believed that consideration should be given to them as conditions permit.

On the day following the report of H. R. 3420, the House unanimously adopted House Resolution 307—October 21, 1943—introduced by Mr. BULWINKLE, which resolution contained the following provision:

That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation, and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

This investigation furnishes adequate opportunity for all those interested in the promotion of air transportation to present their views at public hearings before the House committee. Thus the House committee will be afforded the opportunity to arrive at more sound conclusions as to the legislation that may be necessary for the sound development of post-war air transportation, commercial or private, in which we are all interested.

Radio Address of Raymond Gram Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

After the Teheran Conference the declaration signed there by Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill was summed up in this headline by an American periodical: "If it can be believed, it solves everything; if it cannot, it is a colossal fraud." Let us look at this headline for a moment. It seems to demand that one shall be able to believe that everything will be set right, and if not, it is ready to cry cheat and betrayer. It reduces human affairs to simple totalities, all good or all wrong, all worthy or all despicable. The memory of one man might well temper such immature and frantic emotion. That man is Woodrow Wilson, whose birthday is today, and to whom I am going to devote the rest of my broadcast. For the impact of Wilson's life on our time is even greater than on his own. It surely teaches that there is no universal solvent, no short cut to the heights of serenity. There is truth, but truth must prevail, and to prevail means to contest and overcome. Great truths have never prevailed by having been stated. Woodrow Wilson stated the attainability of peace based on justice aided by collective force. But to state was not enough. One can be sure the three leaders at Teheran also saw the truth. But for them to bespeak it achieves little. The truth still must prevail, must contest, and must overcome. It is the same truth which Wilson saw, and it did not prevail in his time. So a reference to the failure of his time and to the failure of Wilson himself is peculiarly appropriate to this time and to today. Everyone in this Nation, and in nearly the whole

world, is engaged in the contest over that truth. For unless this war ends in durable peace one must ask if civilized life itself is not the great illusion, or to use the language of the headline, a colossal hoax.

It is quite early, by the clock of history, to see Woodrow Wilson without the blurs and distortions of partisanship. He was one of the leaders, who, receding into past time, take on stature. The memory of the web of his daily life drops away and the meaning of his whole endeavor becomes clear. One can see him today, not as he seemed in his day, a man who ultimately failed in his mission, but as a prophet who had the vigor to work for the immediate attainment of a vision. It has taken many decades to see Jefferson and Lincoln in their true greatness, and it may still be too soon to see how Wilson measures up to the standards of greatness over the ages. We all have an inkling of it. For the story of mankind is long, and when it reached the last war, Wilson became the first leader in that long history who saw the possibility of collective peace, and had power to work for the creation of what he saw. The world had been changing, the families of nations were crowding in on one another, and war had to be faced at last as their greatest problem. It is a rare distinction to have been the political leader in that time, the first of all time, to hold forth a realizable promise that peace could be built and made secure. It is a rare distinction that this leader should have risen from the ranks of American citizenship, and should have voiced the spiritual and realistic wisdom of the American people. He and his country erected a milepost on the highway of ideas. And in the perspective of history that is a distinguished monument. It belongs with other mileposts like the belief in the freedom of conscience and thought, and belief that human slavery cannot be vindicated, the belief that government must be with the consent of the governed. You may be thinking that Wilson's milepost is not so important because he failed, and his America failed with him. Collective peace was not established. This war has come despite Wilson, and despite the aggregate wisdom of Wilson's time. That, however, would be saying merely that truth which has not prevailed is not true.

To speak of Wilson's failure, and of the failure of America with him, might be the text of an exhortation to the America of today not to fail. But I think that would be preaching to the converted. For this war has ended isolation, and without isolation there can be no persuasive isolationism. The peace to come is certain to be a collective peace. It will be collective, not because that is a beautiful concept which stirs men to highest aspirations, but because it will be a dire necessity. The difference between this time and Wilson's is that we now know it is a dire necessity. In 1920 we didn't. Wilson knew it was, and his final words, the last he ever spoke for publication, burned with his knowledge. "I cannot," he said, "refrain from saying I am one of those who have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist Providence before, and I have seen the destruction, as will come upon these again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

Another tempering thought comes from contemplating Wilson's failure. It is an exhortation, too, but not to action alone, but to patience. The peace to come, the collective peace, is not going to be perfect. The relationships with other nations will not be washed pure of grit and freed from friction. The building of collective peace is a new enterprise, less than a quarter of a century old in man's long history. We have just a little experience to fall back on and few ready principles to refer to, and there is only one school in which to acquire skill in these matters—the school of trial and error.

The greatest menace to the peace to come may turn out to be disillusionment. People are going to find that everything is not solved, and they may cry out that they are victims of a colossal hoax. But people in a democracy ought to know better than to be disillusioned. For democratic life is a perpetual falling short of the best, it is a continual compromise between the forward drive and the backward pull. Democratic life is different from autocratic life in that everyone shares the responsibility for what it brings forth, and since everyone is responsible, the unceasing conflict can go on without violent revolution.

Collective peace is going to be like democratic life. It too will demand compromise, it too will fall constantly short and it will be a joint responsibility. And so, as the nations fail, they still can persist in working toward the goal without lapsing into the violence of revolution, for that is what the next war would be. So, one of the dangers in anticipating the peace is to be painting it in pure colors. We must not expect international society to be better and finer than national society. For it won't be. We have worked to improve national society for many generations. The job isn't finished, and never can be finished. But such as it is, it is the product of long service, much and deep conflict, and great and loyal devotion. International society is something we are about to build. Trying once more, after a failure there is going to be collective security, obtained through collective responsibility. To make this succeed as well, say, as a country like America is going to take long service, much conflict and loyal devotion. It is not going to be a world in which everything awry clicks automatically into place. Self-government was never learned overnight. The wise exercise of collective responsibility is not going to be learned at any peace conference.

The quintessence of Wilson's faith was that peace must be based on justice, and that it must be organized by the major force of mankind. Having the liveliest sense of human freedom and a scholar's grasp of the nature of good government, he knew that peace between free peoples could not be made of any other elements than those in the peace between free individuals.

What he expounded to the world during the last war and after it was the applications of democratic truths to the conduct of international affairs. So what he advocated was the fullest expression of what we can be grateful to call the American heritage. But he was blazing new trails, and his own country was not sure that the American heritage was suited to universal application. Many Americans quite humanly shunned increasing the responsibilities of their country. After this war many will want to shun them. But, as I said, this war has ended isolation.

It is well, now during this war, to recognize and acclaim the Americanism of Wilson's political thought. He called his domestic policy the new freedom, his international policy might well have been called the new Americanism. What was new, in each instance, was a change in structure. The early America of agrarian simplicities had become complex with industry and finance. The nations of the world which once had sprawled over the spaces of the globe were jostling each other. To both new structures Wilson strove to apply the insight and wisdom which had made possible the birth and growth of the free American Nation. He found the new domestic and international structures intricate and confounding. But Wilson's genius was an American genius, instilling into these confusions the essence of the American tradition.

It is well to recognize the work for a durable peace as an American enterprise. The collective security to come may not look any more like an American institution than did the League Council and League Assembly. The new covenant of the new league, if that is what it will be called, will not resemble any sacred American charter. But thanks to Wilson, and to his great American forebears, the new society of the peoples will be largely and deeply indebted to the best that America has brought forth.

If I have any sense of Wilson, the man, I don't believe he would want much time devoted in thoughts such as these to eulogy. Being a prophet with the training of a historian, he was uniquely devoted to the idea, and the only eulogy he would crave would be to have his idea perceived as truth. He was among the rare and great men of state who warmed all their thought and utterance at the fires of morality. No man ever believed more devoutly that right becomes might. No man ever believed more profoundly that peace grows only in the soil of justice.

He had the gift of utterance not matched among Presidents since Lincoln. And though the incisiveness and clarity of his words no longer are felt as they were by the last generation, more than we perhaps realize, we are imbued with his spirit and are following now his prophetic leading.

We are grateful to feel that Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln walk with us in our America; we should as gratefully acknowledge the guiding companionship of Woodrow Wilson.

Report of Julius E. Warren, Commissioner of Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on S. 1509

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and report:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, January 13, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At my request, Julius E. Warren, commissioner of education, has examined the contents of Senate bill 1509, which concerns the education of returning soldiers and sailors. He has also conferred with various educational leaders in the Commonwealth.

I enclose herewith a report to me that he has prepared on this subject. It includes the points that he believes are essential if the bill is to achieve its objective of being of the most benefit to the returning veterans. He is, I am, and I feel confident that you are also, a firm believer in the principle that adequate and generous provisions should be made for the boys and girls of our armed forces to complete their education, which has been interrupted by war service.

At the same time, we here in Massachusetts have always believed that the education of our children is a responsibility for local and State government, and I hope it always will continue as such. It therefore becomes mighty important in order to maintain this principle of government, and at the same time to recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to take care of its war veterans, that the provisions in this bill make it clear that the administration of this

act will be left in the hands of the individual States under general policies formulated in Washington. The ninth and tenth paragraphs of Commissioner Warren's letter point to the necessary provisions to carry out this principle of government.

I am taking the liberty of sending you this memorandum on this most important subject for your consideration. I know that the commissioner of education, or any of our State authorities, will give you any further information that you may desire.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boston, January 10, 1944.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth,
Statehouse, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL: At your request I have discussed with leaders of education in this State, Senate bill No. 1509 (dated as of November 3) and with their help have analyzed the intent and purpose of the proposed law, together with the machinery for putting the program into operation. I am advised that since the bill was introduced it has been rewritten to include some changes which seem essential for efficient and economically sound operation.

Since the purpose of the bill is to provide for all war-service persons suitable opportunities to continue or to complete their formal education in approved educational institutions, and thus stop the gap caused by the war interruption of the various kinds of educational experience needed by young men and women who are to participate in the stable and effective operation of a democracy, I would report to you that in my judgment the bill as finally enacted should include the following provisions:

1. Availability of 1 year of educational experience to any war-service person honorably discharged after September 16, 1940, serving for a period of at least 6 months in the armed forces of the United States, in the merchant marine, or any of the auxiliaries thereto, who desires to continue or complete his formal education and who is qualified to meet the admission requirements of the educational institution or training agency which he selects and who continues to make in that institution satisfactory educational progress.

2. Participating educational institutions should include:

(a) Elementary and secondary schools; trade schools; scientific, technical, and vocational training institutions.

(b) Apprentice and in-service training opportunities in business and industrial establishments (which provide State and Federal compensation regulations) and operate under the supervision of the State Board of War Service Education herein created by this act.

(c) Any institution of higher education, including junior colleges approved by the State Board of War Service Education herein created by this act.

3. Each war-service person should receive a maintenance payment of $50 a month if single, $75 a month if married, with $10 a month for each dependent child during such time as he may be in full-time attendance in an approved educational institution.

4. The approved educational institution should be paid from Federal funds the full amount of tuition, laboratory, library, and other fees regularly charged by such institution for each war-service person enrolled and in full-time attendance.

5. These payments should not be made for any given recipient over a period longer than 1 calendar year, except for certain specially qualified persons within quotas to be established by the national agency, who may receive such payments for a maximum period of 3 additional calendar years. The entire educational experience for each recipient should not extend beyond a period of 6 calendar years from the date of his discharge, with initial enrollment to be effected within a period of 12 months from the date of discharge.

6. The educational institution which has been approved by the State board of war service education herein created by this act shall have the right—

(a) To determine qualifications for admission of war-service persons;

(b) To select from the applicants those whom it is willing to admit; and

(c) To pass upon satisfactory progress of its war-service students.

7. Each war-service person shall be free to select the educational institution in which he wishes to enroll within or outside his State and choose the course or courses which he desires subject to the approval of the educational institution concerned.

8. Machinery should be created in connection with the operation of this act which will provide educational and vocational counseling and guidance to the persons eligible for training.

9. For the Federal administration of this act there should be created an agency within the United States Office of Education whose function should be to formulate policies and procedures necessary to assure the effective operation of the program, to set up State quotas of trainees, etc., and to distribute funds through the appropriate educational agency set up within the individual States.

10. To carry out the provisions of this proposal within the State, a State should, by legislative enactment, designate any existing State board of education or create a new board to be called the State board for war-service education. Pending such action by the legislature, the Governor should designate or create such a board whose functions would essentially be:

(a) Approval of educational institutions of the State.

(b) Setting up and maintaining guidance and counseling services to be available to the ex-service personnel in the State.

(c) Certifying persons who are eligible to receive various types of education and training.

(d) Determining fees to be charged for educational services wherever those fees are in doubt.

(e) Adopting rules and regulations necessary for the effective operation of the program within the State.

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS E. WARREN,
Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts.

World Peace Addresses at United Nations Forum, January 17, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD five brief addresses delivered upon the subject of world peace by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], by myself, and by Hon. A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METHODS OF ENFORCING THE PEACE

(Address of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, United States Senator from Kentucky and majority leader of the Senate, before the United Nations Forum at Constitution Hall, January 17, 1944)

Ladies and gentlemen, in the brief time at my disposal I could not be expected to draw plans and specifications or a blue print of proposals or suggestions to make or preserve or enforce peace at the conclusion of this war.

We all realize that our first duty is to win the war, so that we may have peace. Then we must make a just and honorable peace; and in the making of this peace we must so organize the world that it may be preserved.

This war will have been fought in vain, and all the expenditure in blood and treasure to fight and win it will have been largely unprofitable, if out of it there cannot come some sort of effective and enforceable guaranty that no similar catastrophe shall be permitted to befall the human race in the future.

I do not mean to imply that the sacrifice of blood and treasure is not justified in the protection of our present institutions and our land and all that they mean to us as Americans. We would be unworthy of our heritage in the enjoyment of the liberties which to us have become commonplace if we had not leaped to the defense of our country when attacked or when threatened with attack. We could not have justified our indifference or cowardice to ourselves for our own sakes alone. We could not have justified such conduct to posterity which would have been in danger of enslavement except for our willingness to fight now for ourselves and for them.

We discuss the question of peace and its enforcement on the assumption that we shall at the conclusion of the war, be able to make the kind of peace for which the people of the world today are yearning.

First, it must be a peace made after the established enemies of peace shall have been unconditionally defeated. Not only must they have been defeated; but they must know that they have been defeated. They must not be left in a situation where they can entertain or exploit the mental attitude that they have not been defeated. This was one of the serious mistakes and handicaps which faced the world at the end of the last war.

In the second place, it must be a just and honorable peace, in which the whole world can join and which the whole world can obligate itself to preserve and enforce.

In the third place, it must not be allowed to degenerate into a contest between political parties, either in the United States or in the United Nations singly or as a whole. This is not a partisan war. It was not begun and is not being continued in this country or in any country for the benefit or for the advantage of any partisan political organization so far as the United Nations are concerned. It must not be allowed to take such a course either before it ends or after it is won.

It may be a long time after the last shot is fired before a formal peace is presented to the people of the world. It may be wise not to rush into a hasty peace merely for the sake of a treaty. The war in which we are engaged is a world war in the true and global sense of the word. The fighting is

in all continents, all seas, all islands, and all skies. The peace must be a global peace. In making that sort of peace, something more fundamental than the mere physical delineation of boundaries must be encompassed. There will be moral and economic, intellectual and spiritual, racial and political and social problems that will lie at the very basis of any endurable and enforcible peace. It may be wise to allow the hot lava of war passions and uprooted ideals to settle and cool for a period before attempting to use them as a permanent foundation for the structure of world order for which we fight and hope and which we are determined to achieve.

It serves no purpose now to revive the controversies aroused by the fight over the League of Nations a quarter of a century ago, except as it may help us to avoid the mistakes we made then. It makes little difference what name may be given the world organization about which we are talking tonight. In 1919 and 1920 those who opposed the League professed they were in favor of some kind of world association, or some other sort of organized society among the nations to keep the peace. We are not interested in a name. We are interested in the forces of civilized society placing their power, experience, intellect, and moral determination at the disposal of a great world need—the need for a deep rest from the burdens and anxieties of conflict and conquest—a need for the healing processes of trade and accommodation—the need for the development of the resources with which God has blessed mankind in great abundance—the need for freedom from fear of political and economic suppression by stronger nations against weaker peoples—the need for peace that will bring relief to the masses of men and women throughout the world who seek only the opportunity to live their lives and work out their destinies in freedom and security.

We cannot here or now write down on the page of a book or parchment the details of such an international arrangement. We can avoid some of the mistakes we have made in the past. We have learned that the mere signing and ratification of peace treaties will not preserve world peace. More peace treaties and disarmament treaties were signed in the two decades between the last two wars than were ever signed in any similar period. But they did not prevent the world's greatest war. Pious resolutions will not preserve peace. Sanctions alone will not do it. While sanctions are desirable and helpful, they did not prevent the attack of Italy on Ethiopia or Japan on Manchuria. It will require the organized determination and power of the nations which are capable of enforcing peace to prevent another outbreak in the future which may plunge civilization deeper into the chasm from which it may never recover.

If we consider this question from the standpoint of economic welfare alone—laying aside all the moral, ethical, and intellectual equations that are inseparable from it—we owe it to ourselves and to posterity to make the effort and to join that effort as a nation.

What would be the result in advancement in the standards of life all over the world if the money expended on warfare had been expended in education and in the development of the world's great resources for the enjoyment of mankind?

We are expending ourselves as a people eighty to ninety billion dollars per annum in the effort to defeat our enemies and preserve our Nation and the civilization of the world. We are taxing our people at the rate of more than $40,000,000,000 per annum and are passing on to ourselves and our children a national debt which may reach the incredible figure of two hundred and fifty or three hundred billion dollars.

How much cheaper would it have been during the past 25 years for us to have made our proportionate contribution to the maintenance of an effective world organization to keep the peace by suppressing brutal and aggressor nations? Such a burden by comparison would have been inconsequential. Yet men objected to it then and object to it now because they say it will involve our Nation in an expensive cooperative undertaking.

The sentiment of the American people, regardless of race, religion, politics, or color, is overwhelmingly in favor of our Nation accepting its share of this responsibility. They know we cannot conceal ourselves in a storm cellar when international clouds gather upon the horizon. They know we are a part of the world, a part of mankind, a part of the great movement of peoples toward a higher goal, happier life, a more secure and dependable fate for themselves and their children and all the children of men.

In September 1939, or I should say, just prior to the outbreak of the present war in September 1939, in response to the question "Would you like to see the United States join in a movement to establish an international police force to maintain world peace?" Forty-six percent answered "Yes," 40 percent answered "No," and 14 percent did not know.

In June of 1942 a poll taken by Fortune showed 50.5 percent for, 37 percent against, and 18 percent did not know.

A year later, in June 1943, Fortune in a similar poll again showed a majority of 56 percent in favor of this Nation taking "an active part in some sort of international organization with a court and police force strong enough to enforce its decisions."

In September 1943, Dr. Gallup in response to this question "Taking into account the arguments for and those against, how do you yourself stand—are you for or against an international police force?" found 75 percent for, 17 percent against, and 8 percent did not know.

As already suggested, I cannot here dogmatically determine, even for myself, the form which such an international arrangement shall take. But I feel very strongly that it must come about, and that the harassed and overburdened people of the world will demand it, and that statesmanship will be bankrupt unless it can respond without fear and without self-seeking quibbles and technicalities.

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD JOIN A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

(By Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT)

What is the ultimate purpose of American foreign policy? Until that question is clearly thought out and fixed in our minds, it is impossible to explain our past policy in time of peace, the reasons why we should go to war, or the purpose of an organization of nations after the war. To me it is clear that the purpose of foreign policy is to insure freedom for the people of the United States, and prevent invasion of this country and foreign wars which might bring destruction to our people and prevent their working out here at home the destiny of the American Republic.

The ultimate purpose of our foreign policy is not to benefit other nations by spreading democracy or the "four freedoms" throughout the world or otherwise. We desire to be good neighbors with the world. We are anxious to help other peoples, but only to the extent that this can be done without involving us in unnecessary wars, or endangering the future welfare of our own people. We did not enter the present war in order to crusade throughout the world for the Atlantic Charter or the "four freedoms." There is no intention on our part to insist on the freedom of India or, apparently, even the freedom of the Baltic states or eastern Poland. We are not fighting for democracy except for our own. As a matter of fact, if we admit that a military crusade for an ideal, or a way of life, or a form of government is justified against other nations, the world would be involved in perpetual turmoil. We pursued a warlike course against Germany because our people were convinced, whether rightly or wrongly, that a German victory would threaten the peace and security of the United States. Our interest in the British Empire is not in maintaining the Empire, but because we feel that war between us is inconceivable, and the existence of Britain as a great sea power is a strong element in preventing any attack on this country across the seas. The good-neighbor policy and assistance to other nations throughout the world are sufficiently justified by the desirability of creating a friendly feeling for the United States among other peoples, and preventing the development of hostile alliances which, if stimulated by poverty and hardship, may lead to the development of aggressive military dictators.

Our commentators and columnists are constantly belaboring a supposed policy of isolationism, which they picture to the people as the desire of someone to withdraw entirely from any interest in world affairs. There has never been such a policy under any administration. The traditional policy of the United States has always interested itself in international affairs—witness the Monroe Doctrine, the disarmament treaties, the Kellogg-Briand Treaty. It is true that we have always refused to commit ourselves in advance to any nation, as an ally or otherwise, to make war under any specified circumstances. Our past policy has insisted on maintaining a free hand to deal with each international emergency as it might arise. We refused to interfere with other peoples, and particularly with their internal affairs, on the very correct ground that this was more likely to produce war than to prevent it. The refusal to enter the League of Nations was based on the theory that our association with the quarrels of Europe would be more likely to produce war than to prevent it. I never agreed that such an argument justified a refusal to join in an attempt to outlaw war.

The question we have to face today is whether conditions in the world have so changed, or may so change during the next decade, that the policy of the free hand is no longer the best method of preventing aggression against the United States. In my opinion the conditions which we face after the war are substantially different, and do require a departure from our traditional policy. I, myself, believe that those conditions had changed 25 years ago. It had become apparent then that any major war between great nations was likely to involve the rest of the world, and grow into a war which might threaten the peace and freedom of the United States. We had, therefore, acquired an interest in preventing the development of a major war. If by agreeing to join with other nations in preventing aggression we could discourage the beginning of war, or if by joining in a minor war we could prevent a world conflagration, I always thought we should have been prepared to make definite commitments in advance.

It may be pointed out that this was not the question with which we were faced in 1940 and 1941. By that time there was no way in which a world war could be prevented. We had in no way promoted or been responsible for the beginning of that war. We were asked to participate at once in the very kind of war the prevention of which is the whole purpose of a league of nations. The only question we had to face was whether a German victory or an inconclusive peace would bring about a successful attack on the United States. I myself thought that it would not, certainly not after Hitler attacked Russia. The country and the Senate were

kept in ignorance of the real situation in Japan, so that I always felt that the policy of bluff which the administration pursued in the Pacific might be successful in preventing war in that part of the world.

However, after this war the necessity of preventing the development of future wars is even more manifest. The development of air power creates two definite threats. In the first place, a sudden air attack may be made with such surprise that it conceivably may be successful as an invasion. In the second place, even if we can still defend this country successfully against invasion, air power is becoming so destructive, and will become so much more destructive, that all our cities and public works may be wiped out even while we defend a blackened land. In the third place, modern war is so expensive as to threaten our economic structure and way of life, and destroy within the freedom for which we battle throughout the world. We should not hesitate to assume any international obligations, even to use military force against aggressors, to prevent the result.

However, there have been plenty of plans in the past for preventing war, and none has been successful. It is not the will to establish perpetual peace which has been lacking. It has been the inability to devise an effective method. The attempt to impose restrictions on other peoples creates new reasons for disputes between nations and new causes for war. The form of organization must be such as to minimize these causes and make the attempt to preserve peace hopeful of success. I am convinced that the effort to set up a single world state is utterly impractical, that it would destroy in America the very freedom which is the purpose of our foreign policy. I am further convinced that a military alliance with England, or with England and Russia, would inevitably produce a counteralliance which in the end would make war more likely. In effect it would destroy freedom throughout the rest of the world, and we could not destroy that freedom without in the end threatening that of the people of the United States. I do believe that a league of sovereign nations, agreeing upon a rule of law and order throughout the world, has today a real chance of success. The utter destruction produced by modern war is so obvious to every people that the determination to keep the peace will be overwhelming if it can be properly organized.

The first step in any league is to write an international law by which the nations shall agree to be governed. It should prohibit any nation from making war without international sanction. It should provide a set of laws dealing with relations between nations, and provide for the submission of all disputes involving such laws to a world court. It should provide for the submission of other disputes to arbitration. The nations should agree to abide by the decisions rendered.

Most of the argument of the theorists has been on the method by which this international law shall be enforced, but the first step is to determine what the law shall be, and with what international relations it shall deal. It must be written clearly, and in accord with principles generally accepted by civilized peoples. Force will never succeed unless it is backed up by the public opinion of the world, and it is only possible to mobilize that opinion behind a law or court decision which is clear and obviously just. In the case of the prohibition amendment we saw that even within a nation laws may be so unpopular or so incapable of enforcement as to bring about violence and lawbreaking.

If we attempt to prescribe laws dealing with the internal affairs of the member nations or others, I believe it is more likely to cause wars than to prevent them. Furthermore, we must not impose on any nation obligations which seem unreasonable to those people, or obligations which we ourselves are unwilling to assume, nor should we force them to take part in disputes where they cannot see any interest whatsoever.

I suggest, therefore, that the permanent law which we write deal only with the action of nations outside of their territorial boundaries, with one exception as to limitation of armament. Temporary internal restraints may have to be imposed upon the Axis nations, but it should be understood that the time will come when they will be removed. I would prefer to build the association on the old League of Nations, although the covenant will require such extensive revisions that it may be simpler as an administrative matter to begin over again. There should be subordinate organizations, such as a council of Europe, a council of America, and a council of the Far East, with courts to consider the questions which involve those areas alone. Special laws may be written, applicable to any given area, but not applicable throughout the world. When the law has been defined, I believe all nations should enter into an obligation to join, and use economic sanctions and force if necessary, to prevent law violation which is defined as aggression and found to be aggression by an international council.

This is the respect in which we are asked to depart from our traditional policy. We will no longer have a free hand because we will have agreed to make war under circumstances found to exist by an international body in which we do not have a majority voice. I see no infringement of sovereignty in undertaking that obligation. However, I think the obligation should be carefully defined. The types of law violation constituting aggression should be clear and definite, and the method of finding the action of any nation to be aggression should be equally clear. I do not believe a nation in one area should be called upon to furnish forces to prevent aggression in another area until the nations of that area have made every effort to settle their own problems. We certainly should not go into Europe unless we are invited to do so by a substantial majority of the people of that continent, who have shown their willingness to cooperate with us when we do so. Otherwise we will not only make ourselves exceedingly unpopular, but we shall probably fail in our objective.

Under the regional plan, our forces could be compared to a suburban fire department, called in only on a three-alarm fire. It would be necessary for us to maintain an army, navy, and air force specially trained for operations in all parts of the world. I believe such a force need not be extraordinarily large or expensive, probably no greater than the American people will insist on maintaining in any event after the war. It will require no conscription. If adequate pay is given the men, it should be an attractive profession.

I would be inclined to oppose an international police force. If such a force were large enough to overcome the forces of every other nation, it would subject the entire world to the rule of some international body, and would have the same dangers as an international state. Someone would have to be chief of police, and the executive or council which directed him, or he himself, would rule the world. If the force were a small one, merely designed to interfere with small nations, it would still be controlled predominantly by one or two powerful nations, and would always be a threat to the freedom of all smaller nations.

It would be necessary to prescribe a definite limitation of armaments for each nation, and the covenants between them must provide that they shall not exceed this limitation, and must permit inspection by the council to determine from time to time whether they are complying with their covenant. A violation of this convenant would be defined as aggression. In this one field of arms limitation it seems to me necessary for the league to interfere with action going on within the boundaries of individual nations, for I see no other way in which to prevent the competitive growth of armaments, which would certainly destroy the hope of peace.

Can such an organization as I have described succeed? Frankly, no one can be certain. Every detail must be worked out to eliminate as much friction as possible. The machinery must operate smoothly without offense to the reasonable desire of all peoples to be free and determine their own future. A league is not likely to succeed if it contains in its basic law, or in the structure of nations on which it is built, any fundamental wrong. It is not likely to succeed if peoples earnestly desiring freedom are subjected to the arbitrary rule of other nations. It is not likely to succeed unless economic arrangements are made so that every nation shall have means available to obtain necessary raw materials and pay for them.

There has been too much emphasis on the question whether we are willing to agree to use force, and too little on the basic nature of the league and the law which it is attempting to impose upon the world. There should be no rushing into a new organization. Plenty of time ought to be taken after hostilities cease to build up the foundations of peace before we attempt to place upon them a permanent structure. If we finally complete a league of nations 3 years after the end of the war, there will be more chance of success than if we rush into it the day after the armistice under the pressure of some emotional propaganda.

No peace organization will be a success unless the people of this country, including the men who have served abroad, are persuaded in their hearts that the organization is necessary and appropriate to maintain future freedom and peace. Those who try to force the people into an organization now, on the theory that later they may not be so agreeable to the idea, endanger the success of the whole project. I am confident that the people can be permanently persuaded. I am determined that some such effort as I have outlined shall be made.

SPEECH OF SENATOR HARRY S. TRUMAN, UNITED NATIONS FORUM, CONSTITUTION HALL, JANUARY 17, 1944

As we march forward toward certain victory, we must make the plan for a lasting and just peace. To win a military victory alone would be futile unless we lay a foundation in our post-war world that will secure for all men everywhere their basic human rights. Our President has proclaimed our war objectives as outlined in the "four freedoms." We are fighting now that the "four freedoms" shall be not only freedoms for the United Nations but a heritage for all the peoples of the world. History has bestowed on us a solemn responsibility. We shall, we must, be a mighty force at the peace conference. We failed before to give a genuine peace—we dare not fail this time.

The pattern of post-war action directly affects the lives of every American citizen and will continue to affect the very existence of generations of Americans yet unborn. There have been occasions in the past where we were out-maneuvered. Our counsel, while then appearing well-advised, has now been shown to have been hasty and ill-conceived. We must not repeat the blunders of the past. It will be no easy thing to formulate the good peace. We must evaluate carefully every factor, every possible approach to the problems of post-war living. As each separate

problem comes before that peace conference, we should be prepared to meet it intelligently.

The economic and social problems of the past 15 years, as well as the exigencies of the war, have required a tremendous expansion in the tasks assumed by the Federal Government. It is important, in view of this expansion, that we keep before us the truth that in America the Government is us. There has been in some quarters a tendency to think of the Government doing this and the Government doing that without realizing who the Government is. In some places it is said, "In view of present conditions, our problems are too big for us to handle alone. We must, therefore, ask Washington to do the job."

This abdication from responsibility, though natural under pressure of war conditions, can only lead to confusion and break-down. We can see the result in Europe. The heart of the democratic process is the voluntary initiative of the individual citizen and his government. When communities grip their responsibilities and resolutely face their problems at the source there comes a new self-respect and a new ability to participate to the full in the destiny of the Nation.

Many Americans today are being led down false paths and enticed by negative un-American brands of thought to fight each other over secondary issues. We need to emblazon across the life of this country the cardinal truths of nationhood—that the real issue is not between group and group within our own country who seem to have conflicting interests. The real issue today is whether we are going to sacrifice personal and group selfishness for the sake of the Nation, or whether we are going to sacrifice our Nation for the sake of our selfishness. The issue also is whether we are going to sacrifice our national selfishness for the sake of the world or insure World War No. 3 by sacrificing the world for the sake of our national selfishness.

Americans must fight on the real issues. The real issue is whether we as a Nation of strong-minded men and women are going to have the courage to sink our differences which arise out of selfish interests and pour everything we have into the Nation's interest. This is crucial if the great lessons of this war are to be mobilized for the building of a united America and a new world.

It has been well said that what we fight for is a pattern of democracy designed by God and worked by everyone. If a rebirth of our American faith is a necessity for total victory in war as our top militarists believe, it will be even more essential when the guns are silent and statesmen take up the task of putting the world together again. The emergence then of America's fighting faith into full maturity and power is an inescapable must for the future. Without it even the most brilliant military success in Europe and Asia will be of small consequence. Indeed, it will only add to our problems and the world's. It is one thing to occupy a people's territory. It is quite another to occupy their minds and hearts so that the evil we fight can never again be willed by any man or nation.

It has been the history of all nations that their growth and expansion are patterned and shaped by the international struggle for power. The foreign policy of a state has always been determined by the rules of power politics as applied to that state's existing economy. So far, in the world's history, there has been no adequate substitute for power politics. Even if the majority of the nations were to renounce war, it would be merely an idle pretense. As long as there exists one single nation that may make a sovereign choice of war, all other nations must be prepared to do likewise. It is this fundamental international situation—realistic power politics—which confronts our world leaders now, and will be the major problem to overcome in building the foundation for a decent and sane post-war world.

The only logical basis for erecting a lasting peace and reconstructing a war-torn world must be in a new improved league of nations made up of the United Nations, and controlled by Britain, China, Russia, and the United States, in the name of all and for the welfare of all. We must see to it that there is no post-war scramble for the spoils of war, for more power at the expense of other nations. Lasting peace can be attained only through a new system of collective defense. The world of nations must adopt some adequate substitute for power politics. We must outlaw war by creating a new machine of peace, more powerful than any machine of war. The means of enforcement is a powerful international police force. The question is, Do we really want international law and order and peace, or are we merely talking nice generalities but determined to go back to the old system of international chaos and recurring wars? No government at any level, local, state, or federal, however limited its functions, ever functioned successfully without having somewhere the force necessary to enforce its rules and punish violations.

The League of Nations created after World War No. 1 outlawed aggression but depended on individual nations to supply the force to make it stick. That did not work. Individual nations will not go to war or risk war simply to save the peace of the world, even though it is now clear that their own peace is involved sooner or later. They will go to war, and this is particularly true of democracies which are devoted to peace, only when their own security is threatened vitally. States will never live in peace among themselves if international law, decency, order, and respect for human life and property are not enforced by armed power wisely wielded by the nations of the world who have pledged themselves to the winning of the war and the accomplishment of a just and lasting peace.

HOW TO PRESERVE WORLD PEACE

(By Hon. JOSEPH H. BALL at United Nations Forum, January 17, 1944)

At Moscow the Governments of the United States, Russia, Britain, and China formally recognized their primary common interest in maintaining peace and stability in the post-war world and agreed in very general terms on the type of machinery to accomplish that objective. The question facing us and our allies now is how we should move forward to implement that agreement and achieve this common objective without permitting the difficulties and differences that undoubtedly will arise to split us apart.

There are many international problems the solution of which in some instances is essential to permanent peace and stability in the world and in other cases will contribute tremendously to it. One is the voluntary working out by nations of trade and commerce policies which will give to all nations and all peoples access to raw materials and markets vital to their economic survival. Another closely related to trade is stabilization of currency. An even more difficult long-range problem is the development of a satisfactory solution of the minority and boundary problems in Europe. Still another is the development of common policies to prevent exploitation of dependent and backward peoples. Important as these and other problems are, some solution of the basic problem of security with justice is fundamental and must be solved first before we can begin to work out satisfactory answers to these other issues. Imagine, for instance, attempting to work out cooperatively trade and commerce policies which will contribute to peace and stability in a world atmosphere where every nation had to be on guard constantly against possible aggressors—where there was no security except the strength of its national arms. Inevitably, in such circumstances, many nations would embark on a program aimed at economic self-sufficiency which in a modern industrial economy inevitably leads to aggression or imperialism and war. I start from the premise, therefore, that we can hope to solve these other international problems only in an atmosphere containing the largest possible degree of collective security, with machinery to preserve the peace in which the great majority of the nations have confidence and which they support. These other special problems in the international field will take generations to solve satisfactorily, and they must be peaceful generations.

So our first and basic step in the United Nations should be to agree on the machinery to implement our common objective of a peaceful, stable world in which justice rather than force prevails. That means that as soon as possible the United Nations should agree on a few common rules of conduct among nations, including the requirement that all international disputes that threaten war be settled by peaceful means and that future attempts at military aggression be stopped by the collective force of the world community. Senator TAFT has developed more fully the concept of international law and peaceful settlement of disputes so I will not dwell on it except to state that I believe all of us recognize that peaceful means for settling disputes, in the justice and fairness of which all nations have confidence, must go hand in hand with the use of military force to stop and punish future attempts at aggression. Otherwise, the use of force would be all too likely to degenerate into the type of oppression against which we are now fighting.

There is, I believe, general agreement in the United States now that if we hope to have a world in which law and order and peace rather than chaos and war prevail, there must be somewhere in the picture military force available to stop and punish violations of the international code of conduct. The question is where that force should reside and how it should be called into action. There are two main schools of thought. One envisions the so-called Big Three—Russia, Britain, and the United States—as the trustees of world peace and proposes that these three nations use their national forces, perhaps in their respective spheres of influence, perhaps operating through some development of the Joint Chiefs of Staff machinery, to preserve the peace of the world. The other school of thought believes that the force must be called into play to stop future aggressions by a general international organization of nations potentially open to all peace-loving nations and that all nations should contribute their proportionate quotas of the force and have some voice in the decision to use it. In addition, I think there is a middle-ground position that the international organization in which all nations have a voice should decide when the force is to be used, but that the force should consist only of the armed forces of the Big Three and they should exclusively do the international policing job.

The first solution, of course, would depend on a close military alliance, either written or unwritten, between the Big Three. I believe that violates one of the basic democratic concepts for which we are fighting, namely, that all government should be based upon the consent of the governed and their participation. We are in effect setting up a very limited governmental agency on a world-wide basis. If we really believe in the democratic concept, I think the United States must insist that the maintenance of peace in the world through this limited international

agency must be open to participation by all peace-loving nations, large and small. All nations should have a voice and all nations should contribute their quotas to the international force. That, it seems to me, is the best safeguard we can have against the possible perversion of such a force to aggressive rather than peaceful ends.

The League of Nations Covenant obligated all member nations to use their national forces to go to the defense of any nation found to be attacked by an aggressor by the League Assembly. In actual practice, the nations did not fulfill that obligation. Even after the terrible lesson of this war, it is likely that nations will hesitate to go to war unless they themselves are attacked or their security threatened so vitally that there is no controversy as to the necessity for fighting. That is particularly true in a democracy where the people have a voice in the decision. And yet, I think we recognize now that military aggression anywhere in the world, no matter how remote, does constitute a threat to the peace of the world and therefore a threat to the peace of every nation in the world. There is probably less danger now than there was after the last war of individual nations welching on their obligations to act against an aggressor but I think the danger is still there. I believe that danger can be lessened tremendously if our international organization has at its command a relatively small international military force, probably consisting primarily of air force. Such a force should be raised on a quota basis by volunteers of all the member nations and supported financially on the same basis. Then, when the organization found aggression to be apparent there would be no long interval between such a finding and action to stop that aggression. In other words, speedy justice would be meted out to aggressors. In addition, the international force would, in stopping aggression, act as the agent of the world community. In effect it would do a policing job against an outlaw nation, whereas if individual nations must act against aggressors then individual nations must go to war against the aggressor. It is far better in the long run to have the world community do a policing job than to force individual nations to go to war. Of course, in the event of a major aggression, individual national forces undoubtedly would be needed to support the international force. I think they would be much more likely to fulfill that obligation if they had already been in a sense committed by the international force.

Finally, I would like to say a word about one valuable function that economic sanctions can perform in preserving the peace. The great danger of machinery to preserve the peace is that it will become machinery simply to preserve the status quo. If that happens, it will fail, because we live in a changing world and any machinery we set up must provide for peaceful change or no force can possibly prevent the explosion of such needs for change into war.

The machinery to provide for such peaceful change would be the same as that for the settlement of disputes. Where the settlement involved no change in any existing national policy or boundary, the decision will be easy to enforce. But it will be more difficult to enforce decisions which require some nation to change its position or national policy on a boundary, say, or administration of a colonial possession. I don't think that military force should be used in such a case to force the nation to make the change which the international agency decided was needed in the interests of justice. But I do believe that economic sanctions could and should be used in such a case and I think they would be effective in a great majority of cases.

I think we might in this way develop world machinery which not only would stop outlawed aggression but would provide for the essential need for change in the world through peaceful means.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE A. A. BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS FORUM, CONSTITUTION HALL, JANUARY 17, 1944

For more than a century great wars have led to great hopes for a system of permanent peace. So it was when Napoleon's empire was overthrown in 1815; so again in the last World War, when President Wilson proposed, and the rest of the world assented to, the plan of the League of Nations. And so it is today; even before the victory is won, plain people everywhere search for the hope that the peace when it comes may be just and lasting.

It has now been realized that permanent peace is not to be had for the wishing.

Apparently, no nation by itself can maintain peace for itself—let alone for the rest of the world—by any course of conduct carried on by itself alone. If peaceful intentions and law-abiding behavior could bring permanent peace to any nation, many countries in the five continents would not be at war now. Ambassador Litvinov remarked that peace is indivisible; and Secretary Hull observed only recently that all of the United Nations have a common interest in national security, in world order under law, in peace; and he added: "The future of these indispensable common interests depends absolutely upon international cooperation. Hence, each nation's own primary interest requires it to cooperate with the others."

The Government of the United States from the outset of this war has recognized that a system of permanent peace must be a major objective; and has maintained continually and forcefully that this must be accomplished through arrangements of general international cooperation. Slowly but soundly the foundations of that system are being laid.

A first step was taken on the deck of a warship in the North Atlantic. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, in August 1941, declared for the United States and for Great Britain as one of the "common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world" that after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny they hoped to see established a peace which would afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which would afford assurance that all the men in all the lands might live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

This was a pledge of cooperation between the United States and Great Britain that the high purpose of cooperation toward a system of peace would be jointly undertaken.

On January 1, 1942, the company of the United Nations pledged themselves to a joint effort, "having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles" embodied in the Atlantic Charter. In the same spirit other nations have associated themselves with the cause of the defense of civilization. Today all save the lawbreakers and aggressors whose defeat is daily growing nearer, have declared as a major war aim the construction of a cooperative system for assuring peace.

After nearly 2 years' study, by authority of the President, Secretary Hull proposed at Moscow that the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China should take a new step toward giving form and substance to plans for the preservation of peace. These Four Great Powers jointly declared:

"That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security. * * *

"That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"That for the purposes of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations."

These clauses of the declaration of Moscow outline the framework of the structure which is being built by history. For, besides reaffirming the principle, and the pledge of united action toward it, this declaration is specific.

It declares for a general international organization—as against a system of spheres of influence, or of alliances, or of balance of power, or of the other shifts and makeshifts which through the centuries have been tried and have failed.

The membership of this international organization is to be open to all peace-loving states, large and small, on a basis of the sovereign equality of each.

Because the building of such an organization is long and difficult, a method is set up to handle questions arising before its completion. This is the understanding that the Four Powers, with others as occasion requires, will consult with one another with a view to joint action for the purpose of maintaining peace. Such consultation is not an empty phrase. We have seen it succeed many times in the great community of the American republics.

The way is thus cleared for a later step still to be taken: the construction of a general international organization.

Even that has begun to shape itself in some respects. The United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture and the signing by 44 nations of an agreement creating the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration both developed organizations dealing with important economic phases of universal interest. We must expect that other vitally necessary areas of common action will be dealt with so that the conditions can be created in which peace can subsist, and so that the strength which is necessary to assure justice and restrain lawlessness will be available to this community of nations whose formation has begun.

Gladly we note that this pledge by the United States and three of its principal allies to form an international organization at the earliest practicable time has received substantially unanimous approval by the Congress of the United States. This was accomplished by the Senate approval of the declaration of Moscow, which thus not only approved the arrangements made at that historic conference but likewise approved the understanding that a permanent international organization would be built. Authority has thus been given by Congress and overwhelmingly ratified by public opinion to proceed further on this huge task. In doing this both Congress and the American public made it plain that they saw in this development the brightest light which now shines through the murk of war. Safety, cooperation, the possibility of international justice, the dawn of freedom from fear—these are in the minds of the millions of Americans in and out of uniform who see the policy of working soberly and carefully and with all safeguards for our national rights and interests toward a healthy international life.

The problems—and they are vast, in carrying this policy forward—are known to you all.

The men who have most experience with international affairs are least likely to lay the blueprints, or to forecast all the answers to all the questions. The methods of representation by which a great community of nations, each sovereign and equal, will be represented present one problem. The possibility of revitalizing international law and providing means of international justice is another; the method by which nations can cooperate in dealing with threatened breach of peace is still another. In the field of economics it is clear that there must be international monetary arrangements, that ways must be cleared for commerce; that international transport and communications by land and sea, air or ether, must be a matter of arrangement. The specific problems of labor, long recognized through the participation of this Government in the international labor office, find place in the picture.

It has been the policy of this administration to search for sound, kindly solutions for these manifold problems—solutions which can and will be supported by our people as being in their own interest and in the interest of all nations.

But this is not a partisan task. Men of all parties, and of all groups within parties, like our guests here tonight, have worked unceasingly and disinterestedly. In this huge struggle to assure that victory shall also mean hope, there are no parties; there are Americans who seek for our people and for all peoples to go forward on the road of civilization.

Floods Are Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to read an important article entitled "Floods Are Unnecessary," by Elmer T. Peterson:

Last May I journeyed through a region which had just suffered one of the worst floods in the history of this country. If you watched the telegraphic news at that time, you know that a flood which caused not less than $127,000,000 worth of damage swept through the lower valley of the Arkansas River in the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas. It was the most disastrous in Weather Bureau annals for that area. Despite warnings, 19 lives were lost.

In the path of these floodwaters—in some places 10 miles wide—were thousands of acres of things you eat—potatoes, cabbages, tomatoes, peas, and other vegetables. Some of our richest bottom lands were catastrophe's victim. The flood washed out and covered with smothering silt the third largest spinach-growing area in the United States. Far greater acreages of alfalfa and other valuable crops were killed, with grave damage to milk, poultry, and meat production. Whether you live in the country or on Park Avenue, this was a serious blow to you, considering the wartime state of our national food supply.

A part of this area was around Muldrow and Sallisaw, both in Oklahoma, in the Grapes of Wrath country, and a local observer estimates that 3,000 farmers are now leaving that sector in a migration more ominous than that of the mythical Joads. Their once-fertile acres are covered sometimes to a depth of 6 feet, with a desolation of sand that will grow no crop. Already land valuations have dropped sharply.

My companions on the trip through this flood-wasted land were Hugh H. Bennett and several of his associates. Dr. Bennett, a tall, genial southerner, is chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service. He is the man who has been leading an inspiring battle against soil erosion in this country—one of our most threatening agricultural menaces. For a good many years his was almost a lone voice, crying out that through bad farming we were letting the winds and the rains destroy our most precious resource. But now, and for some years past, he has had behind him the might of the Federal Government and a working force composed of skilled engineers and agricultural scientists. He has won converts to conservation farming by the hundreds of thousands, and in many regions the tide of the battle is beginning to turn—to turn in favor of all of us who have to eat.

As we drove and walked through the devastated lower valley of the Arkansas, Dr. Bennett summed up his thoughts in five startling words, "This was all so unnecessary."

But before I tell you why Hugh Bennett contends that the Arkansas River flood and all other superfloods are unnecessary, perhaps I should say that this article is not to be a discussion, primarily, of downstream dams, levees, and other huge engineering works. On our trip we inspected the lower Grand River Valley of Oklahoma—called Neosho in Kansas—and we saw with our own eyes that the $25,000,000 Pensacola Dam, on that river, obviously had not prevented or even retarded the flood. Newspapers throughout the region were sizzling with editorial comments on the failure of that expensive dam to do what it was supposed to do.

Dr. Bennett's sword is two-edged. He maintains—and there is much concrete evidence to support his contention—that the universal adoption of soil-conservation practices in this country would increase our food production by at least 20 percent. He also insists—again with the evidence on his side—that such practices could virtually wipe out the menace of disastrous floods.

The story of the increased yields which may be had through conservation has already been told in the Saturday Evening Post by Dr. Bennett himself, in an article, Acres Are Aces—February 27, 1943—and in another article, the Dust Bowl Can Be Saved—December 18, 1937, written by the present editor of the Post.

Happily, the same farming practices which check erosion and hold precious moisture where it is needed also control floods. The blade has two edges, but it is all one sword. All you have to do to end erosion, supply our fields and pastures with life-giving moisture, and prevent the annual catastrophe of accelerated floods is to stop the water where it falls.

The strategy is to build countless little dams for little waters. These dams may be from 1 to several feet high, in the form of dirt terraces 30 to 50 feet apart that follow given levels around the face of a slope—in fields and pastures. They may be a few inches high, in the form of more numerous furrows of contour farming—which means simply that the farmer plows and plants and cultivates around the slope at the same level, instead of up and down the incline. The dams may take the form of thick-growing vegetation in strips of crops—strip cropping—which follow the same contour, always at right angles to the slope.

Or they may comprise solid fields of farm crops planted in rotation, or pasture, or forest, that erect billions of tiny, often microscopic, dams made of roots, stalks, and leaves. The latter is nature's own way, so effective that it works even at Sierra Leone, Africa, where the annual rainfall is 13 feet, with occasional spells of weather that bring 20 to 30 inches within a few hours.

This Arkansas Valley flood was strictly a man-made idea, as Dr. Bennett tells it. In a few days tens of millions of tons of soil were wrenched from the uplands, churned up, and spread on lowlands. The real fertility of these millions of tons was washed into the sea. Most of the light humus, diminutive soil particles, and soluble minerals are gone. Often little but the dead stone dust stayed—the heavy particles of sand.

Against the roadway, in a ditch beside the highway from Muskogee to the Camp Gruber military establishment, in one of the richest farm areas in the Nation, we saw a frame farmhouse beached at a crazy angle. Through an open door we could see a muffin pan hanging on the wall. Table and chairs were tumbled about and everything was covered with inches of stinking mud. A smashed barn disclosed bales of muddy, moldy hay. Banners of weeds hung on roadside telephone wires, sadly signaling the height of the flood. A dead hog lay in a field. A bull calf was bellowing lonesomely, hunting for home. A 500-acre farm had had 300 acres chopped off and washed away into the river.

"Let's stop here," Dr. Bennett said later, on high land along Highway 64, north of Muskogee. It was a field of baby cotton, mauled by the storm. He walked out to a gully wash on a gentle slope and stood on bedrock.

"This tells the story," he said. "This field was plowed and cultivated, with no terracing or contour farming, crop rotation or other conservation practice. There was nothing to hold the water where it fell, so it rushed off, carrying the topsoil with it."

The soil of the entire field was about 75 percent gone and probably would be abandoned within 5 years because it would quit producing enough to make it worth while. Applying this nationally, Dr. Bennett told us there are about 200,000,000 well-developed gullies in the United States that weren't there before the plow barged in. Each one is a new tributary to the simpler drainage system of Nature. They are man-made new streams—waterways that rush rainfall off into the streams, carrying the soil with it. Muddy water in motion is a scandal anywhere. That gully where Dr. Bennett stood was where some of the water came from that flooded the Arkansas River bottoms, just a few miles away. Proper treatment would have held the valuable rainfall right there, to say nothing of the soil itself—still more valuable.

For what scientists call a control, we didn't have far to go. It was on the Rollo Fewel farm of 1,200 acres on the same highway. He is a cooperator in the soil-conservation program, and there was no sign of high water along the traversing creek. Cultivated fields were terraced and contour-farmed. Small draws were dammed, forming ponds. One large pasture, terraced, contained fat Herefords contentedly grazing, building your steaks. A bluestem pasture without terracing was lush. No run-off at all there. No sign of damage anywhere, though this farm received as heavy rainfall as any. The only trouble thus far is that there are too few Fewels.

"Why is that pasture across the road weedy?" somebody asked. The answer was ready. It had been regularly burned off each winter. Another thing to avoid. Burning destroys billions of little dams in the vegetable sponge and stunts the grass.

We drove to a shallow valley where there was a big drainage ditch, clogged with silt, with high levee banks on either side, broken in many places—a miniature version of old man river himself. Tenant farmer W. L. Cotner was working in the mud, repairing with

brush, rocks, and posts the breaches in the levee.

"I had a hundred acres of cotton and other stuff completely ruined," he said. "A 2-acre field of peas, ready for market, washed out. Have to plant everything all over again."

"Ditches can't take a load like that," said Dr. Bennett, straddling a barbwire fence. "The real trouble was that the watershed wasn't properly treated."

Next on the road was a farmstead near the Arkansas River—a chaos of silt, gullies, deserted houses and outbuildings, some overturned. A pathetic planting of potatoes and onions that had grown luxuriantly up to a few days before, now utterly ruined. The water that did this damage came from that very spot where Dr. Bennett had stood half an hour before, and thousands of others like it.

From Roy Kinnard, soil-conservation surveyor, we learned statistics. This flood broke all records since the Weather Bureau first made observations at Fort Smith, Ark., in 1833. Flood stage is 27 feet above low-water mark. In November 1941, the river reached 36 feet at the highway bridge east of Muskogee. On May 11, 1943, it broke this record, making 38 feet. On May 21, 1943, it rose to 47.48 feet.

WHERE IRVING FOUND MEADOWS

Modern floods, repeated Dr. Bennett, as he sadly surveyed the debacle, are a product of man's interference with nature's ways. They come from gully tributaries that have cut through topsoil into sterile subsoil. The vast tonnage of material—soil and subsoil—dumped into the rivers is quickly assorted into fine and coarse substances. The coarse, heavy particles are easily deposited where they do the most harm. These destructive modern floods are unlike the famous Nile floods which gently and lightly cover the bottoms with humus, lime, and other fertile materials from the Blue Nile in the Ethiopia country and the rich central African marshes.

It was in 1832 that Washington Irving visited this Oklahoma spot, traveling west from Fort Gibson, near which the Grand and Verdigris empty into the Arkansas, and his description of lush meadows and wildlife in A Tour of the Prairies is mouth watering. Something has happened since then. Man is guilty.

The rain around here ranged from 17 to 22 inches in 3 weeks—a heavy fall—but Louis P. Merrill, regional conservator of the Soil Conservation Service at Fort Worth, who was one of the party, had this to say, with characteristic conservatism of scientific men: "We don't say conditions are the same, but on a 4,000-acre tract near San Angelo, Tex., a few years ago, 25 inches fell in 60 hours. Terraces stopped all of it. The soil is porous. But at Green Creek, also in Texas, where the soil is tighter, a comparable result was observed."

The south fork of the Palouse River at Pullman, Wash., was cited by Dr. Bennett as a good example of how man can reverse his program of destruction if he will. The valley had been flooding every year, because of plowing. The river had no fish and dried up in summer. Conservation treatment was adopted, featuring grasses and legumes to weave a protective vegetable mat over the exposed plowland. Less than half the farmers cooperated, but that was enough to make a great change. Now, for 4 consecutive years there have been no floods. For the first time in 25 years, trout have come back. Old dead springs have come to life. The streams are clear. The same story is told at Coon Creek, near La Crosse, Wis., and in Wild Horse Creek Valley, near Oklahoma City.

THE ANNUAL EROSION LOSS

The chief, as Dr. Hugh Bennett is affectionately called by his associates, was coming back home in visiting Oklahoma, for his first soil-conservation station was established in the Red Plains region near Guthrie in 1929. This was one of the first of 10 stations established in the United States. One of his first midwestern assignments, as a young man, was on a soils job a short distance northwest of Muskogee.

It happened that I had watched a demonstration at Red Plains just 3 days before, which conclusively proved, by plots of variously treated sloping soils, exactly how rainfall behaves when it hits the ground or vegetation. Since this is no technical agricultural theme, I shall say only that the scientific measurements here, as well as at the University of Nebraska, the University of Arkansas, Iowa State College, and other experiment stations, conclusively prove Dr. Bennett's contentions. For instance, at Fayetteville, Ark., which verges on the headwaters of the Illinois, one of the tributaries of the Arkansas River, 9.1 inches fell within 3 days. A plot of oats showed a four-tenth-inch runoff and Bermuda sod showed practically no run-off at all, whereas a corn plot showed 3.3 inches and the run-off well overflowed, so the observers lost track. This was especially interesting to me, for I am operating a little farm on one of the Illinois tributaries near Fayetteville, raising potatoes, tomatoes, sweet corn, alfalfa, lespedeza, and various fruits, doing all I can with my own hands at odd times, and I have terraced and contour-farmed the place. The terraces held through this exceptionally heavy downpour.

One ominous thing, as testified in Government reports, is that erosion and leaching whisk away nearly 117,000,000 tons of nitrogen, phosphorus, potash, magnesium, calcium, and sulfur, compared with about 19,500,000 tons a year taken off by crops and grazing. These fertilizing agents are enormously important.

"In terms of bulk, we lose 3,000,000,000 tons of soil a year," said Hugh Bennett. "In 4 years we have taken 64,000,000 cubic yards of soil out of drainage ditches alone. I've seen such soil sell as high as $15 a ton. As a matter of fact, soil is priceless. It's the only source of our food. Men fight and die for it. In Venezuela I've seen farmers struggling pitifully on thin-soiled mountainsides to raise meager crops. Oh, they have plenty of money in Venezuela, plenty of petroleum, but you can't eat money or petroleum. Rich, fertile soil is the real prize in the global war we are now fighting."

He had just come from the international food conference at Hot Springs, Va., where he had told the delegates that we Americans have increased crops by 20 percent in areas where we have established soil-conservation programs.

Going along the road, he warmly commended the Oklahoma State Bankers Association, which, he said, was doing an educational job that the schools ought to be doing. This association teaches soil conservation and offers plaques for achievement.

Back in Oklahoma City, Eugene Gum, secretary of this association, had told me that farmers cooperating in this program had increased their crops an average of 40 percent.

Oklahoma, Arkansas, and a few other States have authorized the teaching of soil conservation in public schools, but very few of the schools have done anything about it. "Atlanta is doing a swell job, though," said Dr. Bennett. "But just to show how slowly we've moved, there was no book on soil erosion written before 1936."

At Fort Gibson, whence Washington Irving made his Tour of the Prairies in 1832, the party of inspection saw the confluence of the Grand, Verdigris, and Arkansas Rivers. The awful evidence of the flood prompted me to ask why the $25,000,000 Pensacola Dam on the Grand, which had been promoted as a combined flood-control and power project, had failed so completely in controlling this flood.

Government men, particularly in the technical departments, are cagey about making statements that might get them into controversies with other departments. The Federal Power Commission and the Norris element in Congress were eager to have Pensacola as a hydroelectric project. I had to get the story from chambers of commerce, nonpartisan engineers, and plain statistics. The Oklahoma newspapers were full of the subject. A congressional investigation was demanded. Popular reaction was bitter because the dam hadn't even made the flood hesitate.

POWER OR PROTECTION

It was unquestionably true that the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas had been told that the dam would go far toward controlling floods, especially if several others were built, as in T. V. A. But the facts, as brought out by such spokesmen as N. R. Graham, of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, chairman of a special committee to consider the subject, quoted Government statistics to show that the Grand River furnished half of the 670,000 second-feet flood crest at Muskogee because, when the flood hit its Pensacola Dam, the reservoir was practically full and there was virtually no capacity to take up the excess flow of water.

In its simplest form, the controversy boiled down to the proposition that it takes a full reservoir to produce power, whereas it takes an empty reservoir to protect the lower valley from floods. The Federal managers of the dam wanted it kept full, so it could produce power, which their opponents claim is not a scarce commodity in this area. When the flood came it was necessary to open the gates immediately, and the raging Grand River produced a flood in its lower valley and in the Arkansas River as if there had been no dam at all.

The argument seemed one-sided, because the disastrous results were so apparent that no amount of academic argument would change them. Perhaps the best commentary was the quotation of the inscription on each dam of the Miami Conservancy District of Ohio, which reads:

"The dams of the Miami Conservancy district are for flood-prevention purposes. Their use for power development or for storage would be a menace to the cities below."

These dams, which apparently have prevented recurrence of the floods that once devastated Dayton and other localities on the Miami River, are emptied as quickly as possible after each flood.

A new technique is being tried out at the Brighton Dam, near Baltimore, Md., using methods based on the work of the Soil Conservation Service collaborating with the California Institute of Technology—employing large openings near the base of the dam to discharge layerlike accumulations of muddy water coming at floodtimes. In the case of either Miami or Brighton, however, the fine topsoil gets away, Dr. Bennett reminds us with a wry smile. There are other cases where a special bypassing channel is built to take away muddy flood waters with a minimum of settling, filling reservoirs by letting in water only when it is reasonably clear.

Substantial differences in terrain also furnish an important modifying factor in determining whether a large downstream dam can be used for both flood control and power generation. Obviously, a watershed consisting mainly of rocky or porous soil, or a mixture, or one with a heavy growth of timber or pasture, provides a more favorable laboratory for a combination of flood control and power generation than the Arkansas River watershed. In the various publications of T. V. A. it is claimed that, judging from previous experience, the big floods in its watershed of approximately 25,000,000 acres

have been reduced by from 2.9 feet to 5 feet, as the eight major dams and several smaller ones are manipulated in succession to absorb the greatest possible flow.

Nevertheless, there is obvious apprehension on the part of even the warmest advocates of T. V. A. lest siltation impair or possibly destroy the usefulness of the project, even though 52 percent of the watershed is composed of forest and another large percentage is devoted to pasture, both of which retard run-off. Thus far, only a small fraction of the nonforest land is terraced, but the T. V. A. organization, recognizing the danger, heavily emphasizes the need of all the various types of soil-conservation treatment. Hence, we come right back to the original premise, which is that erosion control—keeping the water where it falls—is the basic way to control floods. In the long run, this technique is also the only way of guaranteeing a hydroelectric project a long life.

THE TROUBLE WITH DAMS

"It doesn't make a lot of difference whether a dam is constructed primarily for power or flood control," said Dr. Bennett, diplomatically bypassing the glaring failure of the Pensacola Dam. "It will fill up with silt anyhow—in anywhere from 25 to 50 years in many instances—unless its watershed is adequately protected. Even Boulder Dam will face this siltation problem someday. There are 2,000 reservoirs in the United States already filled up with sediment. I remember one in Kansas that filled up during one rainstorm. In the remaining 8,000 major reservoirs of the country the rate of sedimentation is so great that about a third of them will fill up in 50 years."

One clincher to this phase of the discussion was furnished a few years ago by Dr. N. E. Winters, outstanding soil conservationist then connected with Oklahoma A. & M. College, who commented on the Denison Dam, on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas. This dam now under construction will cost more than $50,000,000, and its reservoir will receive a silt-laden output of the Red, Washita, and other rivers, which looks like thick red barn paint, its solid content sometimes reaching 15 percent or more. Some engineers predict that it will fill up within 25 years.

"I could take half the cost of this dam, and, by spending it on watershed treatment, completely stop floods on the Red River," said Dr. Winters in a public address. As a matter of fact, he could point to a small lake near Guthrie which has dried up because the watershed has been terraced and contour-farmed.

All of which should give us taxpayers something to chew on.

Address by Associate Justice Louis Le Baron, of the Hawaiian Supreme Court, on I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered in Honolulu, Hawaii, by Hon. Louis Le Baron, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, at the celebration of I Am An American Day, on May 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor and a privilege to welcome you all as Americans—especially you, who so recently, in the presence of Almighty God, have taken the solemn oath as a citizen of the United States of America. Whenever the words "I am an American" are spoken, whether spoken by right of birth or adoption, they are fighting words of an exceedingly deep significance.

It is a fearful obligation to be an American—one fraught with grave responsibilities. Never before in the brief history of this Nation has there been a greater challenge in becoming an American than today. The forces of evil have already struck with a premeditated plan of destroying our people as a nation so that this world may be enslaved. Allegiance to the Nation, therefore, has an outstanding significance.

Today America is at open war with the principalities of this world which would destroy the human soul, and your American citizenship alines you on the side of the forces which are fighting to establish forever the divine right of the people to govern themselves in liberty and in justice. For this purpose the Constitution of the United States of America was framed in 1787 at Philadelphia.

The authors of our Constitution were determined to preserve the gains which the freedom-loving peoples of the world had won by hundreds of years of bitter struggle. They, therefore, were inspired to form a government where justice would be accorded to all men and the blessings of liberty would be secured to themselves and their posterity. The Constitution thus established a government which would safeguard the liberties of the people, distributing the powers of government among 3 distinct and independent departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—devising, as nearly as could be foreseen, a perfect system of checks and balances. The Constitution also recognized that the tyranny of the many may be just as oppressive as the despotism of the few. Consequently the Bill of Rights was written into the Constitution as the first 10 amendments for the protection of the people in their inalienable rights as free individuals, fixing the boundaries beyond which the people themselves might not go in transgressing the freedom of others.

The clear purpose of government as expressed throughout the Constitution and its amendments is for the benefit of the people as individuals. It emphatically repudiates the Old World conception which regards people as slaves of the state, and lays down a gantlet which you have so gallantly taken up.

You newly adopted Americans have solemnly sworn to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, but every American, whether in uniform or not, has this responsibility in common. It does not mean merely to be law abiding, which is important, nor to bear arms against the foe, which is very important and deserving of the highest honor, but, in my opinion, it means something a great deal more. In a larger sense it means that Americans must be steeled against evil, wherever it may be found, for evil directly demolishes freedom, and with it our way of life, and saps the potency of our fighting faith. Satanic forces, through the instrumentality of certain foreign nations, are determined to plunge the world into another darkened age where greed, murder, and filth will hold sway, and where might will prevail over right. But America is fighting with the faith and zeal of her fathers to smash those malignant cohorts back into the dust of history where they belong, and, with the guidance and help of God, will triumph.

As an American you individually have become a vital part of America's destiny to help redeem the people from the pollution by which our enemies hope to rule the world.

Therefore, whether by birthright or adoption, "I am an American" are truly fighting words of an exceedingly deep significance.

Mabel T. Boardman

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that a brief tribute should be paid to Miss Mabel Boardman, who retires from active duty in the American Red Cross after 43 years of wonderful service to humanity, just before this veterans' legislation is taken up for final action. Miss Mabel Boardman is greatly beloved for her splendid character and for her accomplishments. Yesterday over 1,000 people paid tribute at a luncheon given in her honor. Hundreds more tried to attend. Her friends and coworkers all over the country were there in spirit and I know the legions of service men and women were paying, although they were many miles away, invisible grateful tribute to the work she has steadily done for them, so completely and so thoroughly. I hope that this great gentlewoman, this great humanitarian, will take some rest now. But knowing her as I do, her labors will not cease for the American Red Cross and for the world.

REMARKS OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN IN HONOR OF MISS MABEL BOARDMAN, AT THE HOTEL STATLER, IN WASHINGTON, JANUARY 18, 1944

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we are gathered here to pay our tribute to a gallant lady and to honor an ideal of public service, the ideal to which she has devoted the best years of a long and useful life. It is an ideal which she has cherished, nurtured, and brought to its fruition, until it has found its true expression in the vital and beneficent spirit of the American Red Cross as we know it today.

There is little I could say about Miss Boardman which would not inescapably be in praise of the Red Cross. In the 20 years since I came to know and admire her, it would have been difficult for me to think of Miss Boardman without thinking of the Red Cross, or to think of it without instantly bringing to mind her tireless devotion to its service. In fact, her life has been so closely associated and interwoven with this great humanitarian movement that she and the Red Cross have become one and inseparable in our thoughts. It has been said here in Washington before today, but it is a truth worthy of repetition in this presence, that Mabel Thorp Boardman is the Red Cross.

It was in 1900 Miss Boardman became interested in the Red Cross, then a small group, quite inadequate to the demands which in the course of events were to be made upon

it. In that year the association was reorganized with Miss Boardman as one of its original incorporators. From the first she saw in this infant society the potential instrument for the relief of human suffering in times of disaster and emergency, and for the alleviation of the wastage and misery which modern war inflicts on all mankind. From that moment the realization of her vision, through the Red Cross organization, became the dominating aim of her life. And her life has been literally dedicated to a single great purpose—the development of the Red Cross until it should be what it has become, the most powerful and efficient weapon against human misfortune which the world has known.

The terrible realities of war were not then new to Miss Boardman. She enlisted in the service of the Red Cross while the memory was still fresh of our conflict with Spain. During the Russo-Japanese War in 1904–5, she was on the spot in Manchuria, arranging for Red Cross relief. The First World War brought a new and more formidable challenge to her ingenuity and organizing ability. She met that challenge by mobilizing millions of American women under the Red Cross banner. In the face of the doubts and head shakings of those of her coworkers who were just mere men, she put this army of volunteers into uniforms of her own design. By the force of her personality and example she gave to these volunteers an esprit de corps which has proved to be one of the most dependable supports of the American Red Cross, and one which has steadily gained in strength through the years. Miss Boardman knew instinctively what it takes to fire the enthusiasm of womankind, and she supplied it.

The monumental buildings of the American National Red Cross headquarters, and of the District of Columbia Chapter in Washington, stand as permanent reminders that Miss Boardman foresaw their need and possessed the energy and resourcefulness to fill it. For it was largely through her unlagging efforts that funds were raised for their construction by private subscription and congressional appropriations for their construction.

Self-discipline has ruled Miss Boardman's life and her high standards have become those of the American Red Cross. She has been tireless in her services to the Red Cross whenever and wherever they were most needed in its work of education, of relief, and in fighting suffering and disease. Her work has taken forms as numerous and as variable as the demands which time and changing conditions have brought. Hers has been a selfless devotion, covering a span of 44 years, to aims which have been motivated as much by a deep sense of patriotism as by woman's true understanding of human needs. Her unfailing zeal in carrying on this great work has made Miss Boardman in her own right a great and altogether admirable personality.

Few women have been so showered with honors as has this gracious lady. She has been decorated by many governments and Red Cross societies. She has received honorary degrees from numerous colleges and universities. She has been secretary of the American National Red Cross since 1919, a member of its central committee, and chairman of its voluntary services. But far more significant to her and to us than any of these well-deserved honors are the shattered lives that have been rebuilt because of her efforts, the pain and suffering that have been made easier to bear because this woman saw so clearly what the Red Cross might become and has loyally helped it to fulfill its great possibilities.

Now, in the Nation's hour of greatest need, her grand conception is bearing its finest fruits. In collecting lifesaving blood plasma, in making millions of garments and surgical dressings, in bringing renewed courage to our servicemen on every shell-torn battlefield of the world, the Red Cross has truly reached the pinnacle of its service. It is little wonder that so many of these men and their relatives and friends at home are saying: "Thank God there is an American Red Cross."

It is the fate of most men and women to give their lives to hopes and aspirations whose realization they are not permitted to witness. It is the rare good fortune of Miss Boardman, in which we rejoice, to have the high privilege of seeing her vision take on the shape of reality. What reward could be greater or so fitting? And now that she has sought and received release from formal responsibilities to the Red Cross, a freedom which I suspect, knowing Miss Boardman as I do, that she will exercise very sparingly, we wish for her the enjoyment of those durable satisfactions which come from the contemplation of a noble service, nobly performed, and from a leisure well earned and well employed.

And now a word to you who are members of the District of Columbia Chapter. You may well be proud that such a woman is the founder of your organization. Proud, yes. But you should be humble also when you look upon the example which she has set. She has given to you and to all Americans a heritage that is to be treasured above earthly possessions. She has shown us the true worth of that genuine philanthropy which knows no bonds of friendship or enmity or of wealth or poverty. She has implanted in us a new conception of human understanding, of brotherly love, of compassion, and of humanitarian service. That, my friends and fellow members of the Red Cross, is Mabel Thorp Boardman—and that is the American Red Cross.

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 3 (a), as amended, of the Social Security Act. This bill provides that the Federal Government pay each State one-half of the total sum expended for the purpose of administering the provision of the law for old-age assistance. The reason that I have introduced this bill is because under the present system those States which are better able to pay, or the wealthier States, receive a higher percentage of administrative cost, whereas the States which are not able to pay so much receive a smaller percentage. This is clearly a discrimination against the States which are most in need.

During the last fiscal year the State of Florida paid an average of $14.50 to 40,000 people who were recipients under the Social Security Act. By the addition of a cigarette tax in the State of Florida and the curtailing of excess expenditures for administration purposes in the amount of $166,000 Florida is now able to pay $18.50, which is an increase of $4. This is commendable. However, it falls far short of the national average of $25 per recipient. The State of Florida naturally has some pride in the matter and, in addition to that, our welfare board understands all too clearly that even $25 is much less than these people should receive. The State has made every effort to increase this amount, and if this bill is adopted it will increase the amount and sooner or later we shall be able to equal the national average of $25 per month.

I sincerely hope that the committee to which this is referred will give the bill its serious consideration.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member in this House, regardless of party affiliation, who is not anxious to give full justice and recognition to every member of our armed forces. The distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and many of the most able Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, have given invaluable assistance and have worked diligently to bring out legislation to assist discharged veterans.

We are fortunate in having a most able man in General Hines as the head of our Veterans' Administration. An excellent program for vocational training and rehabilitation is being set up. One of my closest friends, Capt. E. N. May, a veteran of World War No. 1, who has been for years with the Veterans' Administration and who has had years of experience in vocational training and rehabilitation, took charge of the vocational training and rehabilitation program in a large hospital in Massachusetts on January 8. This is only indicative of the work being done along these lines throughout the country.

There are nearly 200 Members of this body who served in World War No. 1 and nearly 150 who have sons and daughters in this war. Naturally we are most interested in seeing proper legislation enacted to protect the discharged veterans. Do you remember when you were discharged from the last war? I do. My greatest concern was to get back to my old position and continue working my way through law school. Without any difficulty whatever I secured my old job, continued my schooling, and graduated with my class in 1919. Will this not be the greatest concern of our discharged veterans of the present war? In my opinion, their greatest desire is to get back to work in their accustomed trades and callings. In this connection let me call your attention to a program proposed by the Timken Roller Bearing Co., of Canton, Ohio, in my congressional district:

THEY OFFER THEIR ALL—CAN WE OFFER TOO MUCH?—THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING COMPANY PROPOSES SENIORITY RIGHTS TO EVERY EMPLOYEE FOR DOUBLE THE TIME SPENT IN MILITARY SERVICE

We talk of the sacrifices made by our men and women in service—but most of us merely talk. Few of us take any action to show that these sacrifices are appreciated as they should be.

They have had to give up their homes—their loved ones—their jobs—take 2, 3, maybe more years of the most important period of their lives—and offer them as a sacrifice on the national altar—that we here safe in America can continue the best way of life ever discovered on this earth.

Many of them will never return—and for this there can be no payment—but the tears and heartfelt gratitude of a nation for whom they gave their all.

But for those who will come back—and pray God there will be millions of them—we can do something real—to show that we are not unmindful of what they have done for us.

The way of life that they have helped to preserve can make easier their own way to a living in free America.

For our part, the Timken Roller Bearing Co. has a very definite plan which it proposes to the bargaining agent for its employees. This plan will prove to former Timken employees now in service, that while others have stayed here safely at home, making the highest wages they have ever received, our Timken men and women in service will not have to reenter our employ at a disadvantage because of their absence.

Rather, they will have a very distinct and very certain gain—a gain that they have offered their lives to merit.

We will not pin any decorations on their breasts. We will not give them enscrolled parchments extolling their valor and their exploits.

Our proposed plan will give them instead something much more tangible and usable—something that is commercially valuable in the workaday world to which they will return.

This plan for our employees in service is this: For every year, for every month, for every day spent in service an employee of the Timken Roller Bearing Co. will be granted double such time in seniority standing on the employment rolls of our company.

Is this too much to give our former employees for a sacrifice for which there is no way to reckon payment?

Most of these men and women now get from Uncle Sam—with their lives as possible forfeit—the sum of $50 a month. On call and subject to service 24 hours a day, this figures out to 7 cents an hour. No overtime, no double time; just plain 7 cents an hour.

Surely there can be no objection from those of us whose sacrifices by comparison have been negligible or nonexistent to this humane and reasonable treatment of our returning heroes.

This will be some slight compensation for the fact that they have had to forego the high wages paid to fellow employees able to stay on the job and at home in the bosom of their families. It will be no compensation at all for the hardships, the wounds, and the terrors of war that they have had to endure.

To demonstrate how this system would work: An employee of this company with 5 years of seniority at the time of induction returns after 2 years in the armed services. He or she will have the original 5 years of seniority plus double the time spent with Uncle Sam, or a total of 9 years of seniority.

We believe every industrial concern in America should give this Timken Roller Bearing Co. plan their best thought and attention, with a view to rewarding their men and women in service in some measure.

The Congress of the United States should see that such a plan is put into effect on a Nation-wide basis, giving this economic security to those now doing so much for all of us.

They offer their all. Is a little additional seniority too much to give in return? Can anyone validly maintain that this is preferential treatment that these men and women have not earned, with their blood, with their sweat, and with their toil?

THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.,
Canton, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, this great company should be commended for this plan, and it is my hope that other industrial concerns will give this program their earnest consideration. This will mean more to our veterans than decorations.

I am in favor of granting cash payments to all veterans upon discharge. These veterans do not want to be forced into the ranks of Government unemployment, and they do not want to be regarded as recipients of an unemployment dole. They want something substantial, something tangible. What could be more tangible and usable and of more value commercially than reestablishing them in their accustomed trades and callings? They want economic security and the right to again reenter their normal way of life, which they have fought so nobly to preserve. We want to give them every possible assistance, commensurate with the sacrifices they have made. I am confident that Congress will do its duty toward the veterans.

Our Aging Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article published sometime ago which I hope our Executive, especially our Department of State, will read carefully. In their present reorganization, I hope that Department will endeavor to procure some new and vigorous men, as did George Washington 150 years ago.

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
OUR AGING GOVERNMENT

As Mr. Roosevelt begins his tenth year in the White House, there can be no more practical way of giving him support than to wish that he will recognize, and will not resent and reject the mounting demand of the people for a stronger administration. The heart of the matter is, as he himself once wrote, "a subject of delicacy and yet one which requires frank discussion." It is that he is attempting to conduct the war through men who are no longer in their "full mental and physical vigor"—many of them "unable to perceive their own infirmities" who yet "seem to be tenacious of the appearance of adequacy."

For it is, to say the least, astonishing to discover that Mr. Roosevelt, who wrote these words about judges, about men who can live sedentary lives of study and reflection, now has a Cabinet to conduct the war which is on the average substantially older than the Supreme Court. The average age of the Roosevelt Cabinet today is 62 years; of the Supreme Court it is a little under 57 years. In the Cabinet there is only one man under 50. He is the Secretary of Agriculture. And there are only three more under 60—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Postmaster General. The four men most directly concerned with the conduct of the war itself are at an average age of 70 years. Thus, Mr. Roosevelt begins his tenth year as President and his first year as Commander in Chief of the greatest of all wars with an elderly and rapidly aging administration. It is impossible to believe, and no one can seriously argue, that with all our naval and military chieftains close to 60 or over it, and with this elderly Cabinet, the war is in the hands of men who are in the vigor of their lives.

By any standard of comparison, the Roosevelt administration today is markedly over age. The average age of Washington's first Cabinet was a little less than 39 years. The oldest man in it was Jefferson, who was 46; Hamilton was 32, Henry Knox was 39, and Edmund Randolph was 36. Eight years later, in the last year of Washington's second term, the average age of the Cabinet was, due to changes of personnel, still only 41.

Indeed by present-day standards the men who won the country's independence and organized the Constitution and established the Republic were youths fitted for little more than to be called our boys, and mothered and fussed over as representatives of a youth movement. In the Constitutional Convention, for example, out of 55 delegates, only 12 were over 54 years of age. One of these was Washington himself, aged 55. Of the 10 men who, according to Charles Warren, were chiefly responsible for the form which the Constitution finally took, Madison was 36, Randolph was 34, James Wilson was 45, Gouverneur Morris was 33, King was 32, Rutledge was 48, Pinckney was 29, Ellsworth was 42, Roger Sherman was 66, and Franklin was 81. The old men were there, and played their part, but the burden of the work was done by what we should now consider amazingly young men, almost infant prodigies.

Even if we come down to more recent times for our standard of comparison, the Roosevelt Cabinet is very elderly. The average age of the Wilson Cabinet in 1917 was 54, and really effectively younger than that, if we remember the part played in the actual conduct of the war by F. D. Roosevelt, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who was then 35. In Wilson's Cabinet the Secretary of State was 53, and the Secretary of War was 46.

Or compare this Cabinet with the Theodore Roosevelt Cabinets. On the average they grew younger the longer the first Roosevelt was in office, so that beginning in 1901 he inherited a Cabinet with an average age of 61, and by 1909 he had a Cabinet with an average age of 54. The invigorating quality of T. R.'s administration is surely not unconnected with his willingness to rejuvenate it.

I do not wish to draw any rule of thumb conclusion from these figures—as for example, that older men are useless. Far from it. Men like Mr. Hull and Mr. Stimson are, like Franklin before them, invaluable and indeed indispensable in the council chamber where high policy is determined. Nor will anyone foolishly suppose that any younger man is abler and more vigorous than any older man. There are tired young men who do not know what it is to work hard or to carry responsibilities.

But it is the fact, by and large, that for posts of command during the strain of war, a good man is far better when he is in his thirties and forties than when he is in his fifties and sixties. It is the fact that in times like these, no older man is worth his salt or has attained the wisdom which age is supposed to bring, if his constant concern is not to find his successor and to promote him into his place as soon as he can be found and prepared.

We may even venture to say, I am convinced, that in an age of wars and revolutions, the thing which more than anything else determines the issue of triumph or disaster, is whether the men of the future are brought to power and given the responsibility early enough. Successful wars are fought and are conducted by young men. And revolutions are made by young men when the older men established in their habits and interests, fail to meet the urgent needs of the day by retiring soon enough. Indeed, the main thing that happens in a revolution is not so much the change of institutions but the abrupt rise to power of new men, and the main cause of revolutions is the holding down too long of the fresh energies of the new men, and the main reason why revolutionary armies fight so well is that the new generation arrives at power while its faculties are in their prime. Washington, let us remember, was the leader of the American Revolution which brought a new generation of young men to power.

The moral to be drawn is, I submit, that Mr. Roosevelt's most urgent task is to renovate his administration by rejuvenating it. New organization charts, new blueprints for streamlining this and coordinating that are all very well. But what matters most is to raise up quickly the younger executives, the men in their thirties and forties, who are used to the modern world, can bear the strain upon body and mind, can remain fresh and alert through long grinding days and into the night, are not fatigued and committed by their own past, have not given too many hostages to fortune, and are looking forward to action and to glory, not merely to repose and serenity.

Men of this quality are already in the Government, and many more like them are on the outside waiting to be called in. But those already in the Government do not get the chance to do what they are capable of doing because above them is a layer of elderly men who can no longer think and act as decisively, as quickly, and as freshly as the times require.

There is, so to speak, a kind of blockade at the top which holds back the vital energies which we desperately need. And this holding back produces that sense of frustration, that sense of tangle and of bumble which is breaking the hearts of the ablest men, and is spreading a feeling of discouragement down through the people of the Nation.

Why cannot the President see, and not regard as unfriendly opposition, that this growing insistence upon a new deal in the war administration is evidence of the health and vigor of the people, at long last awakening to their task, at long last preparing to make the war their only business in life, and, therefore, rightly dissatisfied with the inherent conservatism, with the encrusted routine and the elderly obstruction which they see in Washington? And why do not the older men in the wisdom of their age see that their great duty is not to resist this national movement of the people but to welcome it and guide it and encourage it and facilitate it?

What greater thing can an old man do for his country in a time like this than to pass on the torch to the new generation, and then to step down from his post of command and into the council chamber where mature reflection and not the energy to act are required of him?

Address by Frank S. Boice at Annual Meeting of American National Live Stock Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of an address made by the president of the American National Live Stock Association, Frank S. Boice, of New Mexico, at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the association held in Denver, Colo., January 13, 1944. The address contains material of interest to Members of the Senate and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow cattlemen and friends, the year 1943 has passed into history. A review of the events of the year must leave us with feelings which are a mixture of pride and hope, confusion, doubt, and frustration. We are proud of the accomplishments of our fighting forces in all quarters of the globe and proud of the record of our Nation in producing the matériel of war. We are filled with hope because we and our allies are so obviously winning the war. Without question there is much savage fighting ahead and long casualty lists before final victory, but victory is no longer in doubt. Here at home the picture is neither so clear nor so bright. There is confusion everywhere; confusion at the top and confusion among those of us who seek only to play most effectively our part in winning the war. There is doubt everywhere; doubt concerning the wisdom of and the necessity for many of the things that are being done by Government; doubt of the sincerity of many of our leaders both in and out of Government, and doubt concerning the kind of nation we are building for ourselves in the future. And there is a feeling of frustration everywhere; we seem to accomplish so small a part of the things we so earnestly try to do.

This feeling of frustration is very prevalent among cattlemen and with it there is also a feeling of irritation and resentment. We are very conscious of the need for increasing amounts of beef during the war emergency; we know that there is in this country the largest beef production plant in our history, and yet the production of beef has reached its peak and is decreasing. And in addition, our production of beef is being more and more concentrated in the late summer and fall with a corresponding shortage in the spring of the year. Why is this happening? Let us take a look at the record.

There were many who thought—and I was one of them—that with the signing of the order establishing uniform price ceilings on beef at wholesale in December of 1942, the industry would gradually work out of the confusion that had existed during the preceding fall. The events of early 1943 proved us wrong, entirely wrong. Instead of getting better, conditions got worse. Soon after the first of the year the developing black market became an influential factor in determining the price of slaughter cattle. Certain it is that as the season advanced and supplies of slaughter cattle become shorter and shorter the price squeeze on the packer became tighter until many beef-packing plants were forced to close their doors. There can be no doubt that, if O. P. A. had been able to devise a scheme for placing price ceilings on cattle which would work, even in theory, we would have had it at this time. But instead of ceilings we had threats of ceilings alternating with denials that cattle ceilings were being considered and a whole series of statements that the price of cattle was too high and must be brought down by one means or another.

In early June the subsidy roll-back program became effective. Wholesale price ceilings on beef were reduced 2 cents per pound and the subsidy of a dollar and ten cents per hundred live weight which was paid to processors was supposed to insure that the price of slaughter cattle would not be affected by the roll-back. There was, however, a sharp break in cattle prices when the subsidy program went into effect. This subsidy is a consumer food subsidy, announced and operated as such from the beginning and no subsequent statement or directive attempting to class it as a producer subsidy can change the facts in the least. Certainly no producer has ever received any benefit from it.

Next came price ceilings on hogs at a time when there was no valid reason for them as everyone in the industry knew that heavy runs of hogs were only a few weeks away and that hog prices would soon be crowding the support price. And with the announcement of hog ceilings there was also the statement that O. P. A. was not considering price ceilings on cattle because cattle ceilings were a thoroughly impractical method of controlling cattle prices.

Nevertheless, on October 25, the cattle price stabilization directive was signed by the Director of Economic Stabilization. For lawyers and economists this order may not place price ceilings on cattle. But why quibble with words? It does establish prices by grades which are the maximum that a packer's purchases may average for each accounting period. If the maximum prices established in the order are as high as processors should pay under the beef ceilings, then the packer who dares pay more is doubly penalized, for he will have on hand beef that is too high priced, and he will lose from his subsidy payment the exact amount that it is too high priced. The order does provide a very effective price ceiling on slaughter cattle for the legitimate packer. The black market operator, on the other hand, who depends for his money on the extortionate prices charged his victims and not on Government subsidy, is free to pay whatever price necessary to get the cattle. During the period of critically short beef supply which is ahead, this operator will undoubtedly have a field day. And, contrary to official statement, the order does not provide an effective floor under cattle prices. A kind of twilight price zone is created under the minimum of the established prices in which the packer will lose subsidy payments and will benefit to the same extent by having cheaper beef on the rail. Can anyone seriously doubt that packer buyers, trained for years to buy just as cheaply as possible, will continue to do so under this condition, and attempt to force prices down into this twilight zone? And if prices are forced down through this zone, the packer again benefits by having cheaper beef. No, there is no support price for cattle.

Under this order, our free competitive markets where all buyers entered as equals are a thing of the past. The amount of subsidy payment on any purchase depends on the status of the purchaser which is determined by how many cattle he kills, whether or not he has Federal grading of meat and whether he is, as defined by the directive, a nonprocessing slaughterer. In the extreme case a buyer may have a competitive advantage over his less fortunate

rival of $1.40 per hundred in bidding for the same load of cattle. Certainly there is nothing fair or equitable in a situation of this kind. Subsidies, which were originally granted to reduce the price of meat to the consumer, are by this directive to be used also to enforce price ceilings on slaughter cattle and to correct the mistakes of O. P. A.

That is the record of beef price control to date, and those of us in the industry inevitably wonder: What's next? The cattle price-stabilization directive instructs the War Food Administration to "institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders." Does that mean that in the near future we are to have for slaughter cattle permits to ship and perhaps a little later orders to ship? Does it mean for feeder cattle permits or orders to ship at a price? There is uncertainty and confusion everywhere—on the range, among the feedlots, and in the packing plants. Since the beginning of price control of meat, O. P. A. had gradually destroyed the confidence of the industry in the meat policy of the Government. A declining beef production is the result. If we are to produce the beef that our cattle numbers and feed supplies indicate is possible, confidence must be restored. That is the direct responsibility of the Government. It is no easy task for we have traveled too far and for too long a time in the wrong direction. But in the solution of the problem the industry is eager to cooperate.

As early as October 1942 your representatives, working with the Joint Livestock Committee, began the search for a method of controlling meat prices which would allow all segments of the livestock and meat industry to operate on adequate margins and at maximum efficiency, and in early 1943 the American Meat Institute also began an intensive study of the problem. At a meeting in Washington in March it developed that the thinking of these two groups was very close together. In early April the institute plan was presented to representatives of all segments of the livestock industry and, with some modification, was approved by them unanimously.

You are all familiar with the details of this meat management plan for controlling meat prices, but it would not be amiss to restate here what this plan will do. It will through rationing provide our armed forces and Lend-Lease officials with a better method of securing their necessary supplies of meat than is provided by slaughter quotas and set-aside orders; it will through rationing and coordinated Government buying control the price of meat at whatever level of prices is determined to be in line with Government price policy; and it will, by removing arbitrary controls, restore the industry to a normal competitive basis and thereby assure the reestablishment of adequate margins within the industry and the maximum production of meat consistent with our numbers of livestock and supplies of feed. And it is important to remember that the plan does not propose the removal of any of the existing price ceilings on meat until it has been clearly demonstrated that these controls are no longer necessary.

At the April meeting a livestock and meat council was created to present the meat management plan to the proper Government officials and to urge its adoption. It won the approval of Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, of General Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States, and of Prentiss Brown, Administrator of O. P. A. A War Meat Board was set up to administer the plan. And then Chester Davis resigned as War Food Administrator and all progress toward meat management and a sound solution of our wartime meat problem stopped. The War Meat Board has continued to function, but it has no authority and it has never had the cooperation of the men in the Price Section of O. P. A.; men who from the beginning have thought only in terms of the complete control and regimentation of the entire livestock and meat industry. The Board has helped greatly in the rationing program and it has been of material assistance to the Army and to Lend-Lease officials in their efforts to secure adequate meat supplies, but on the more important problems of controlling meat prices without rigid price ceilings and of restoring confidence to the producers of livestock it has been allowed to make no progress. Nevertheless, meat management, carrying as it does the endorsement of all branches of the livestock and meat industry except a small segment of the meat packers, stands today as the only proposal which has been made which will control meat prices and at the same time assure beef production at the level at which it ought to be.

The record will show that in all of the many conferences and discussions of price ceilings and beef production your representatives have always recognized the necessity of controlling inflation and that they have been careful that nothing they did or advocated would in any way make this control more difficult; and it will show that they have from the beginning recognized that some kind of control of meat prices was necessary and that they have insisted that this control could and must be exercised without curtailing the production of beef. In line with these considerations we have never at any time asked that cattle or beef prices be increased.

It would be a brave man indeed, or a foolish one, who would under present conditions attempt to predict the future, and yet, I feel that I should give you my thinking on the subject. You may take it for what it is worth. We must understand first, the primary reason for the cattle price stabilization directive. That reason is not stated in the directive. It was written and signed in unseemly haste in order to win a lawsuit which attacked the validity of the wholesale price ceilings on beef, and if, as a result of the directive, the Government wins the suit as I assume it will, the directive takes on a status very close to that of a court order. As a result, it will be an exceedingly difficult task to have it vacated or modified. It is well to realize also that every move of O. P. A. since the beginning of control has been away from the principles of meat management and in the direction of more and more control. This is inevitable as each ill-conceived or poorly enforced control calls for other controls to make it effective; and so we progress to complete regimentation. It means more and more diversion into black markets of meat or livestock at each new level of control and it means less and less production of beef. But this is the road we have been traveling and I am afraid it is the road we will continue to travel.

There are, however, other possibilities. If consumer subsidies are prohibited or, if in some compromise of the issue meat subsidy is prohibited, the cattle-price-stabilization directive becomes inoperative and the entire beef-price-control program is due for an overhauling. In that event perhaps O. P. A. will be more receptive to suggestions from our industry. We are facing sometime this next spring a severe shortage of beef, when even the Army will be on restricted beef rations and perhaps then an aroused Congress will tell the executive branch of the Government that it is tired of all this bungling and will instruct the O. P. A. in no uncertain terms to sit down with the representatives of the livestock and meat industry and in a spirit of cooperation work out a sound method of control. The industry will gladly cooperate.

When the subsidy roll-back program was announced last May your officers found themselves without specific instruction from the membership on the consumer-subsidy issue. At the time of our last annual convention this issue had not been raised. But at subsequent meetings of cattlemen in local and State conventions and in executive-committee meetings of similar organizations it was shown that cattlemen were in practically unanimous agreement that consumer subsidies should be opposed. Your officers have, therefore, taken an active part in support of the amendment to the commodity-credit bill which would prohibit consumer subsidies.

So much political fog has been thrown around the issue and so many extravagant statements made concerning it that it has become a difficult subject to discuss. And yet, stripped of political fog, the issue is fairly clear. The use of food subsidies is advocated as a means of inflation control and it should be accepted or rejected on that basis. The principal cause of the inflation we are experiencing is also clear. It is caused by the fact that the consuming public has more money to spend than there are things to spend it on at controlled prices. This excess purchasing power, this inflation money is always pressing to force prices up; it creates the black market and makes price ceilings very difficult to hold. It is obvious that if the Government through food subsidies pays a part of the food bill of the consuming public, the amount of this inflation money is increased and with it the pressure for higher prices is increased. This is inflationary. Also, the financing of these subsidy payments must be by increased Government borrowing, and this also is inflationary particularly so as the increased borrowing must be done largely by selling bonds to commercial banks. In an economic sense food subsidies are definitely inflationary at least as much and probably more so than a controlled rise of food prices. Such a rise in food prices absorbs rather than increases the amount of inflation money and it does not require an increase in Government borrowing.

The drive for food subsidies comes from an administration which is seeking to placate organized labor, and organized labor is insisting that food prices be held constant while it seeks and obtains by political pressure increases in wages. In so doing it is attempting to improve the standard of living of its members and thereby shift their just share of the burden of the war onto the shoulders of others. Cattlemen must oppose that kind of scheme.

The truth of the matter is that we are not "holding the line"; we are losing the fight to control inflation. Each day there are increases in wage rates granted under one pretext or another, the amount of inflation money is thereby increased and we draw nearer to uncontrolled inflation. The correct method of controlling inflation is just as obvious as the cause; the amount of inflation money must be reduced and this can be done only by forced savings and increased taxation placed where they will reduce the amount of inflation money. As evidenced by their tax proposals, neither Congress nor the administration is willing to do this. With their eyes on the election this fall, each is dodging responsibility to control inflation and in so doing is completely misjudging the temper and determination of the great mass of the American people. We will endure any hardship and make any sacrifice that is necessary to win this war and preserve our American institutions. We can do neither if inflation gets away.

In making income-tax reports many stockmen who report on the accrual basis have

for years used constant unit values in their livestock inventories. This method had never been specifically authorized by regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but it had, on many occasions, been recommended to stockmen by agents and collectors of the Bureau and its use had been allowed by the Bureau ever since the first income-tax law became effective. During the past 18 months this method of keeping accounts on livestock ranches has been questioned in the Texas district, where the attempt is being made to force stockmen to use one of the specifically authorized methods. It became apparent that if the Texas agents were successful in their efforts the move would spread to all districts of the West, and as the questions involved were of vital importance to many stockmen, it was decided to form a special committee composed of both cattle and wool growers representatives which would handle the question as an industry problem.

This National Livestock Tax Committee was organized last August. Each State cattle and wool growers association, each national breed association and the National Wool Growers Association and the American National Live Stock Association has a representative on the committee. A steering committee of nine men was appointed from the membership of the larger committee to actively handle the problem. It was decided that work of this tax committee would be financed by special subscription. An appeal for funds was made through the State associations and the response has been very gratifying. Our case was prepared and presented to the Bureau at a formal hearing the latter part of October. The Bureau now has the case under advisement. Subsequent conferences with officials of the Bureau make the committee hopeful that it will be successful in having the constant unit cost method of inventorying livestock approved as one of the optional methods of keeping livestock inventories. This National Livestock Tax Committee was organized to handle any livestock tax problem that is of general interest to stockmen. It should perform a service which has long been needed by our livestock organizations.

The old problem presented by the continued increase in numbers of cattle in the country is still with us and in aggravated form. Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that on January 1, 1944, we had over 81,000,000 head of cattle, an increase for the year 1943 of over 3,000,000. That total is 7,000,000 above the highest peak of former cattle cycles. All efforts of the Government through its marketing goal program have been singularly unsuccessful in checking this upward trend; just as unsuccessful, in fact, as have been the efforts of those of us in the industry who have been sounding the alarm and advocating a gradual reduction of cattle numbers. There seems to be nothing that anyone can do that will materially influence the trend. For the past 4 or 5 years we have had generally excellent range conditions, abundant supplies of feed concentrates and the prospect of satisfactory prices. Conditions have been right to accumulate cattle on the ranches and farms and we have done so. But none of these conditions exist today. There is widespread drought on the western ranges which is quite severe in places, feed concentrates are very scarce and high priced, and there is universal uncertainty as to the future of cattle prices.

In the past when these conditions have developed at the same time while cattle numbers were high, the upward trend in cattle numbers has been reversed. Perhaps we are now at the top of the cattle numbers cycle and the year 1944 will see a reduction. Let us hope so, for such a development will result in benefit to the Nation and to our industry.

While it is true that individually we can do little about the national trend of cattle members, we most certainly can do something about the number of cattle on our own ranches. Our ranches all have a certain tolerance as to the number of cattle they will carry. We can risk drought, lower cattle prices, and damage to our ranges by crowding their carrying capacity, or we can play safe by stocking our ranches conservatively. With all the uncertainties that exist today it would seem the part of wisdom to play the game conservatively. The cattleman who goes into the adjustment period after the war with his ranch paid for and conservatively stocked and with a reserve of cash and War bonds in the bank is the man who will survive.

You are undoubtedly concerned, as I am, with the kind of nation which will develop out of this war. We are tired of controls, tired of being pushed around by bureaucrats who seem never to understand and always to be wrong and we are apt to assume that after the war these controls and bureaucrats will disappear. But will they? Will we in this country return to a system of free, private, competitive enterprise with the Government acting as referee, or will we move more and more toward national socialism with Government doing the planning and forcing compliance with its plans? The answer depends to a large extent on the success of American business enterprise in furnishing gainful employment to the returned soldiers and the discharged war workers after the war. If business is successful in preventing excessive unemployment our return to free private enterprise is assured but if we again have large-scale unemployment and boondoggling the road is open to national socialism.

Industry is now planning with courage and wisdom for reconversion of their plants so as to give maximum employment quickly when the war is over. Cattlemen must play their part in the post-war period. They can best do it by deferring until after the war all maintenance and repairs and all new ranch improvements that are not absolutely necessary now. And when the war is over, by using the reserves of cash and War bonds which we should be building up now we can give direct employment to many men by catching up on our maintenance and repairs and by building new improvements and we can give indirect employment to many more by the purchase of materials for this work. I ask that you give serious consideration to some such planning as this for your own outfit.

The year that is past has been a trying one for all of us and particularly so for our secretary and for the men and women under him in the office. Each new problem has called for more study, more travel, and more work. They have given freely of their time and energy. The association is in excellent condition due largely to the untiring energy and loyalty of Mr. Mollin. In these trying times the need for our association has become more and more evident and as a result its support among cattlemen has broadened and deepened. It has a very loyal and broad-minded membership. This being true, the possibilities of accomplishment are almost unlimited.

As for myself, I shall always remember, not the difficulties, the headaches, and the disappointments of the last 2 years but the fact that, in electing me president of the American National Livestock Association, you gave me the opportunity to serve the finest industry in the Nation and the finest and most loyal group of people anywhere; the cattlemen and cattlewomen of the West. It has been a pleasure to serve.

Mr. Stalin's Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What's Pal Joey Up To?", appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. In submitting the editorial for reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to observe that when the Senate was debating the Connally resolution designed for collaboration, and so forth, with the other nations of the world, I then offered an amendment which had as its objective the guaranteeing of the political integrity of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and other countries of the world which had been subjugated by the Axis horde.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S PAL JOEY UP TO?

Josef Stalin's daily Moscow publication, Pravda, day before yesterday printed a rumor from Cairo that "two leading British personalities" had recently discussed possibilities of a separate British-German peace with German Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop. The meeting, said the rumor, took place in Spain or Portugal, and was supposed to have been "not without results."

The London Daily Mail reports that the Pravda rumor was also broadcast from Moscow—presumably so that Russians who couldn't read it could hear it.

Speculation is still superrife in Washington, London, Algiers, Chungking, etc., as to why Pal Joey did such a thing—since, of course, Pravda doesn't print anything except what Our Pal wants printed.

There are three possible reasons: (1) That the story was true—which for our part we don't believe; (2) that Stalin is himself swinging a separate peace deal with Germany, and put out this rumor to give himself the alibi that he had to beat the British to it—which we do not believe, either; or (3) that this is just another of those delicate Russian hints—delicate like a meat ax—to England and the United States to mind their own business as regards the coming fifth partition of Poland.

The third possible explanation listed above looks like the logical explanation to us. It fits into the pattern of numerous recent acts and gestures of Pal Joey's government.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" TAKING PASTING

Stalin has stated repeatedly that he intends to have the eastern half of Poland after the Allies win the war.

He has refused to have anything to do with the Polish exiled government now resident in London; has, indeed, set up a dummy Polish government of his own in Moscow. He became specific on the subject last week when he announced his intention to move west to the Curzon line and stay there after the war. He graciously suggested that Poland be compensated by part or all of East Prussia.

Stalin also has repeatedly stated that he means to have the Baltic states in their entirety—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—because they cut him off from the Baltic Sea except at Leningrad. That was why they were set up by the Allies after World War No. 1. Though you may not sympathize with Stalin, you can understand how he feels. We would feel rather resentful and determined to do something about it someday if Louisiana under Huey Long had declared itself an independent state and cut us off from the mouth of the Mississippi.

Stalin, too, intends to take a part of Finland and the Bessarabian part of Rumania, and is frank about it.

All these plans of the Russian dictator have been an increasing worry to our proponents of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. The Roosevelt idea, given at least lip service by Mr. Churchill, is that small nations after this war should be allowed to pick their own forms of government by free ballots of their peoples.

This Rooseveltian worry about Joey reached a climax Saturday, when Secretary of State Hull made an offer to Moscow to mediate between Russia and Poland. You might as well try to mediate between a big hungry bear and a juicy little lamb. The bear doesn't want mediation; he wants the lamb.

It seems likely that the Pravda rumor publication was, among other things, Stalin's blunt way of answering the Hull offer to mediate, the answer being "No."

Quite a pasting, altogether for the "four freedoms." It will be remembered that Mr. Roosevelt went to great lengths to persuade Stalin to meet him and Mr. Churchill in a conference somewhere. Stalin spurned three or more invitations but finally consented to a meeting at Tehran, in the shadow of Russia. Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill ever since have been letting it be understood that all was sweetness and light at Tehran, though they have been demure about telling their publics what actually took place.

From developments of the last few days, capped by Pravda's publication of that Cairo rumor, it appears that Mr. Roosevelt was neither as potent nor as persuasive at Tehran as he has been in some other parts of the world.

What Kind of Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an interesting contribution entitled "What Kind of Peace?" and written by Clifton E. Hooper, of 7 First Street, Cambridge, Mass., on the far-reaching question of permanent peace, and some of the considerations involved in the establishing of necessary international machinery to assure future peace. Mr. Hooper's article shows deep thought, which is worthy of consideration by those persons and groups who recognize the importance and necessity of providing means for a continuing peace after we have won the war.

WHAT KIND OF PEACE?

The frightfulness in suffering, disorder, bloodshed, and tax burden caused by war, brings to the front a new leadership that seeks a durable peace. A peace that is attended by the "four freedoms" so far as it can be accepted by all mankind—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom of the seas.

The conception of these "four freedoms," its application to individuals, to national ideologies and economic structures and their international relationship, is one that calls not only for agreement at the conference table; in addition it calls for balance. By balance is meant that element which must be incorporated into a workable peace program which will permit settlements which are actuated by a keen desire to adjust differences rather than an adjustment obtained by duress. For, if the objectives must be enforced by might, then the peace will become less durable by reason of the political forces within the enforcement agency.

First, it is well to study some of the courses pursued by the defeated nations in World War No. 1. Three instances suffice to point out that a nation in agreement so far as the peace table is concerned,may not possess sufficient cardinal virtues for peaceful performance but may, in its latent mind as against the one expressed on paper, define the peace-table objectives as merely safety measures to proceed industrially for a later aggression.

One instance of peacetime pursuits being used as a war preparation, was the way which Germany began to build up her peacetime industries solely on the basis of creating resources and easily convertible plants and other commercial assets, for war agencies. Even her manpower, under the guise of physical culture, was regimented and drilled with shovels and hoes and such in place of small arms which were later substituted. Thus, will the peace-table agreement of World War No. 2 give any guaranties that neighboring nations now antagonistic to the aggressors will be recovered politically and even brought under moral subjection through industrial missionary endeavor?

Another instance is the making void of agreed to or imposed obligations as happened by all major nations in World War No. 1. How shall we control the monetary structure of a nation in relation to our own and yet grant that nation the right to recover and re-create its own national political and economic structure and still fulfill its just obligations?

In another instance dwells the avoidance of penalties which should rightfully be imposed upon persons who, as leaders, have been guilty of violent acts against others. A procedure was worked out after World War No. 1, and yet, by sparring for time and compromise, the result was entirely in favor of the accused. A few years of respite brought indifference and remission. Therefore, what shall be the guaranty that the program now being advocated by some for a court of criminal justice shall not, in the deferment of its objectives, become nothing more than a save-face and therefore, should the time thus employed be devoted to helping create new evidences of national security by new international trade agreements?

To anyone who is not given to wishful thinking and who can look ahead to the era of peace which we are fighting for, what will be the situation 3 or 5 years following the setting up of a world congress and court or whatever else such representative bodies may be called. What will remain unsettled as a virulent germ of dissatisfaction? What compromises will have been reluctantly granted? What pre-war efforts will be reconstructed for commercial advantage in foreign countries? Is it possible to change the ideology of a nation such as Japan, or even this new Germany which has been only a generation in building?

Must the incorrigibles who know not defeat, except as a means to make a fresh start, become the Assyrians of old and be utterly conquered? Or, shall the democratic nations try to purchase peace by guaranties of food and other commercial values which are the evidence of brotherhood? Or, shall we try to foster a peace program through cultural missions? Will such policies hold reciprocal values? What shall be the balance to insure durable peace?

The question has been raised, if the United States had become a member of the League of Nations, would we have had the present war. Emery Reves, in his book entitled "A Democratic Manifesto," brings out this point for our own reflection, namely, that the isolationism of the members of the League when Japan seceded and attacked Manchuria; the isolationism of Great Britain in particular when Italy attacked Ethiopia, were direct contributory causes for a later and more widespread aggression against others. Our own isolationism and continuous appeasement policy resorted to with Japan, proved but the encouragement for this fanatical aggressor to attack our own country in a most dastardly manner.

Quoting Mr. Reves, he says: "Peace is law. Law is the justified use of force—a coercive order. Consequently, peace without employment of force is inconceivable."

The President, in his speech to the Seventy-eighth Congress, stated in substance that following the war, the nations who are covetous, such as Germany, Japan, and Italy, "must be disarmed, kept disarmed" and their psychology of life by aggression, must also be destroyed.

One of the silliest arguments advanced by peace-at-any-price proponents is that "you cannot prevent war by waging war." Of course, you cannot obtain the ultimate but you can reduce war to a minimum. For this reason, we put to death criminals to subdue crime and make it too risky to venture upon. War is a scourge and plague, yet, we spend considerable sums and risk lives for preventable measures against other scourges common to man.

The break-down in the League of Nations was that it was a service devoid of substance to make its mission a reality. It was mostly on paper—a zoo of diplomatic endeavor without an agency to enforce its decisions. Our own position is completely outlined by Mr. Reves which needs no further comment: "During the 20 years preceding this war, we wanted nothing but peace. We were prepared to accept any solution of any problem if only the solution kept us out of a shooting war. So we permitted treaties to be regarded as scraps of paper because insistence on their sanctity would have meant war. We allowed ourselves to be cheated, double-crossed and blackmailed—because we wanted to keep our peace."

There can only be formulated in peacetime endeavor, sufficient values for equitable procedure in relation to a future well-being. The only guaranty of the efficacy of such endeavor consists in its enforcement by a might which is all powerful but which has within its own make-up, all the elements of discord, division, and bureaucracy which we strive against. The cycle of wars is the cycle of man's desire to advance his own cause above the others until he succeeds or is defeated. Then comes the period of reparation and adjustment by reason of men's hearts yearning to cease bloodshed. Men will sign agreements because they are tired of war but what will be the balance to keep the peace?

Therefore it must be self-evident, that the "four freedoms" which we, as a Nation, desire for ourselves as well as for others, are in reality, not freedoms so much as limited objectives wherein a tremendous responsibility will be vested in us by reason of a successful conquest—one which should develop in the years to come, an entirely new conception of democracy.

Prohibiition and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the following talk was given over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Sunday, January 16, by Sam Morris, The Voice of Temperance, who broadcasts over WHAS, 840 kilocycles, of Louisville, Ky., every weekday morning at 6:30, central war time:

Thank you, sir.

Howdy neighbors.

We are happy to speak to you over the Columbia network on the subject Prohibition and the War. If you want a free copy of my talk, address your requests to Sam Morris, Box 7, Louisville, Ky.

National prohibition in America was no overnight affair.

The first American temperance society was formed in Saratoga County, N. Y., in 1808. The first national temperance convention was held in Philadelphia in 1833. The National Prohibition Party was formed in 1869. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union was organized in 1874. The American Anti-Saloon League was organized in 1893.

Maine was the first State to adopt Statewide prohibition in 1851. Other States joined the ranks, and by 1916 there were 23 dry States. Four more came in in 1917 and 6 more in 1918, making a total of 33 States under prohibition by State action before national prohibition.

In May 1917 Congress passed a law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to all men in military uniform.

On December 22, 1917, Congress submitted the eighteenth amendment to the States for their ratification. Only 185,000 American soldiers were in Europe at that time.

The necessary two-thirds of the States ratified the eighteenth amendment in 1919, and it went into effect on January 16, 1920, 24 years ago today.

These are indisputable facts of history.

National prohibition was the natural and inevitable result of over a hundred years of temperance education, organization, legislation, and agitation by good men and women, who were sick at the rages of rum.

Yet there are folks who say it was put over by war hysteria while the boys were away.

It would be as intelligent, and as logical, to say that a farmer grows his hogs, cows, chickens, and hay the day he hauls them to market.

RESULTS OF REPEAL

We repealed prohibition in 1933. We have had 10 years of relegalized drink. We know the results.

Dry territory is ruthlessly drenched with Federal sanction.

Beer, wine, and whiskey consumption rises in an ever-increasing flood.

F. B. I. records show that drinking drivers have increased every year since 1935, with nearly twice as many, per 100,000 of our population, in 1942 as in 1932, the last year of prohibition.

They show that arrests for drunkenness have increased every year with approximately two and one-half times as many per 100,000 of the population in 1942 as in 1932.

The percentage of arrests for drunkenness among women was nearly five times as great in 1942 as in 1932, the last year of prohibition.

Arrests of girls under 21 years of age for drunkenness, vagrancy, disorderly conduct, prostitution and other sex crimes increased 89.5 percent during the first 6 months of 1943.

Yet, some folks say prohibition made American women drink.

Twenty-six percent of Federal prisoners were behind bars during prohibition for liquor-law violations; 52 percent of them are there today for that offense.

Today the Department of Justice, and a special Senate committee are both investigating the liquor industry for monopolistic combines, price evasions, ceiling violations, hoarding, black markets, moonshiners, and bootleggers.

Ten years after prohibition.

The leopard has not changed his spots.

He is as wild and vicious as ever.

THE SAME OLD DRINK

They said the old saloon would not come back. So, they changed the name. It is now called a cafe, filling station, drug store, grocery store, night club tavern, hotel bar, cocktail lounge, first chance, last chance, bloody bucket, wagon wheel, tip-top, pea patch, blue moon, silver moon, pale moon, etc.

They changed the name—they didn't change the drink.

The old saloon is not back—the old drink is back.

That's where the trouble lies.

That's what the fight is over.

You may paint a pump handle until you are black in the face, but it won't change the water in the well. You may change a rattlesnake from his hiding place to your rose bed, but it won't change the poison in his fangs.

You may legalize bootleggers and let them come out of their back-alley prohibition hiding places and sell their wares in cafes, filling stations, swanky hotel bars, night clubs, and cocktail lounges—it doesn't change the alcohol they sell the least bit in the world. It is still the same old habit-forming, narcotic, poisonous drug that spawns crime, breeds corruption, begets poverty, fosters vice, wrecks homes, befuddles the brain, weakens the will, and damns the soul.

It is the same old snake.

WARTIME PROHIBITION

We are at war.

War regulations, restrictions, and emergencies make the toleration of this traffic ridiculous in these days of national shortages.

For example: Millions of hardworking people are forced by the change to wartime to get up an hour sooner every morning in order to save electricity, but every night, all over the Nation, multiplied thousands of taverns, night clubs, beer bars, roadhouses, honky-tonks and juke joints, with blazing neon signs and bright lights, operate until the wee hours of the morning.

Take another example—

Millions of sober, loyal, patriotic, bond-buying, taxpaying, blood-donating American citizens can't get automobile tires or gasoline for pleasure driving, but thousands of big motortrucks wear out big tires and burn up unlimited quantities of gasoline to provide beer, wine, and whisky for the pleasure of drinking people.

Take another example—

The War Priority Board has called upon the Nation to gather its scrap iron from hedge rows, fence corners, back alleys, rights-of-way and wreck yards, but at the same time it has permitted thousands of tons of pure steel to be made into whisky barrel hoops and beer-bottle caps, which, by no stretch of an honest imagination, can be called necessary to the war effort.

While patriotic citizens saved tin cans, shaving-cream and toothpaste tubes, and even tinfoil chewing gum wrappers to provide steel for the weapons of war, thousands of beer haulers were collecting the big No. 10 gallon-size heavy cans at cafes, restaurants, and hotels. Half of all they collected went to make caps for beer bottles.

What patriotic mockery.

Take another example—

While millions in India and Europe, on starvation, look to us for food following the war, and while farmers here at home can't get food, supplies for horses, cattle, hogs, and chickens, the breweries go right on wasting millions of tons of vital grain and other food supplies, making beer.

That's what I am talking about.

Look at our transportation congestion. It is one of our biggest bottlenecks. Tank cars, that ought to be transporting gasoline and fuel oil, are employed to haul wine from California around over the Nation to the taverns and cocktail lounges. Hundreds of big freight cars, that ought to be transporting war supplies, are engaged in shipping alcoholic beverages. Thousands of beer trucks, that ought to be hauling the weapons of war, are rumbling up and down our highways, meeting each other, loaded with beer and empty bottles.

Don't talk to me about wild-eyed prohibition fanaticism.

We have a war to win.

Take another thing—

On week ends, pay days and holidays, thousands of war plant employees, that ought to be on the job, are staggering around bleary-eyed, with befuddled brain and with shattered nerves, headaches, and hang overs.

They call it absenteeism.

Newspapers report that one war plant of Detroit, Mich., had to close down for 2 whole shifts on Christmas Day, simply because so many of their 6,000 workers were drunk.

That's what I am talking about.

It is widespread all over this Nation, and everybody knows it. A big Allied leader has been quoted as saying that the recent rail and steel strikes prolonged the war, and will mean the death of additional thousands on the foreign battle fronts.

What about all of this prolific waste, muddled inefficiency, impeded transportation, hindered production, and dissipated energies in the drink shops of this country?

If those threatened strikes comforted our enemies—and they did—this mollycoddled, petted, and pampered drink industry makes them dance with glee.

REJECTION FOR VENEREAL DISEASE

Here is something else.

About 1,000,000 men have been rejected from armed service because of venereal disease. Most of it came from wild escapades and drunken orgies connected with liquor dives, night clubs, roadhouses, honky-tonks, and juke joints.

Millions of other young men, whose praying mothers, church attendance, and Christian ideals kept them sober and healthy, are bleeding and dying on world battle fronts.

That's the contrast between the contributions of the church and the contribution of the repeal liquor industry in producing physically fit manhood to fight in this war.

That's what this fight is all about.

Calling the good church people, who want wartime prohibition, wild-eyed fanatics and blue-nosed reformers, doesn't meet the issue.

Our boys on world battle fronts need weapons of war that beer, wine, whisky, "whoopee" parties, headaches and hangovers, can't produce.

"THE BLOODY MARNE"

July 14 is French Independence Day. In 1918 French soldiers along the Marne River defenses, protecting Paris in World War No. 1, celebrated the day with excessive drinking. American soldiers fighting with them were prohibited from drinking.

A little after midnight the zero hour struck. Three hundred thousand choice German troops of the Royal Prussian Guard, who had been given drinks to increase their

courage and make them "tough," stormed Allied positions in surge after surge to deliver a knock-out blow.

To the right and to the left seasoned French soldiers fell back under the withering attack, leaving the American Third Division exposed on both flanks. Hour after hour, dawn turned into day, day darkened into night, and another night and day of the sickening slaughter followed as those green, inexperienced, but sober, American doughboys, who were outnumbered 10 to 1, fought on until victory came.

They held the line.

They took everything old Kaiser Bill had and littered the battlefield with 60 percent of the Germans left piled in heaps.

It saved the day.

It turned the tide of World War No. 1.

General Pershing decorated them with the inscription "The Rock of the Marne."

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget."

That's what sober soldiers, backed by a sober Nation, did 25 years ago.

Prohibition worked. We did it then. Let's do it again.

Education of Returning Soldiers and Sailors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein, for the information of Members, a letter received from Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and a copy of a letter sent to Governor Saltonstall by Julius H. Warren, commissioner of education for Massachusetts, relative to S. 1509 and any similar bill pending in the House of Representatives:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, January 13, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: At my request, Julius E. Warren, commissioner of education, has examined the contents of Senate bill 1509 which concerns the education of returning soldiers and sailors. He has also conferred with various educational leaders in the commonwealth.

I enclose herewith a report to me that he has prepared on this subject. It includes the points that he believes are essential if the bill is to achieve its objective of being of the most benefit to the returning veterans. He is, I am, and I feel confident that you are also, a firm believer in the principle that adequate and generous provisions should be made for the boys and girls of our armed forces to complete their education which has been interrupted by war service.

At the same time, we here in Massachusetts have always believed that the education of our children is a responsibility for local and State government, and I hope it always will continue as such. It therefore becomes mighty important in order to maintain this principle of government, and at the same time to recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to take care of its war veterans, that the provisions in this bill make it clear that the administration of this act will be left in the hands of the individual States under general policies formulated in Washington. The ninth and tenth paragraphs of Commissioner Warren's letter point to the necessary provisions to carry out this principle of government.

I am taking the liberty of sending you this memorandum on this most important subject for your consideration. I know that the commissioner of education, or any of our State authorities will give you any further information that you may desire.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth.

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boston, January 10, 1944.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth,
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL: At your request I have discussed with leaders of education in this State Senate bill No. 1509, dated as of November 3, and with their help have analyzed the intent and purpose of the proposed law, together with the machinery for putting the program into operation. I am advised that since the bill was introduced it has been written to include some changes which seem essential for efficient and economically sound operation.

Since the purpose of the bill is to provide for all war service persons suitable opportunities to continue or to complete their formal education in approved educational institutions, and thus stop the gap caused by the war interruption of the various kinds of educational experience needed by young men and women who are to participate in the stable and effective operation of a democracy, I would report to you that in my judgment the bill as finally enacted should include the following provisions:

"1. Availability of 1 year of educational experience to any war service person honorably discharged after September 16, 1940, serving for a period of at least 6 months in the armed forces of the United States, in the merchant marine or any of the auxiliaries thereto, who desires to continue or complete his formal education and who is qualified to meet the admission requirements of the educational institution or training agency which he selects and who continues to make in that institution satisfactory educational progress.

"2. Participating educational institutions should include:

"a. Elementary and secondary schools; trade schools; scientific, technical, and vocational training institutions.

"b. Apprentice and in-service training opportunities in business and industrial establishments (which provide State and Federal compensation regulations) and operate under the supervision of the State board of war-service education herein created by this act.

"c. Any institution of higher education including junior colleges approved by the State board of war-service education herein created by this act.

"3. Each war-service person should receive a maintenance payment of $50 a month if single, $75 a month if married, with $10 a month for each dependent child during such time as he may be in full-time attendance in an approved educational institution.

"4. The approved educational institution should be paid from Federal funds the full amount of tuition, laboratory, library, and other fees regularly charged by such institution for each war-service person enrolled and in full-time attendance.

"5. These payments should not be made for any given recipient over a period longer than 1 calendar year, except for certain specially qualified persons within quotas to be established by the national agency, who may receive such payments for a maximum period of 3 additional calendar years. The entire educational experience for each recipient should not extend beyond a period of 6 calendar years from the date of his discharge, with initial enrollment to be effected within a period of 12 months from the date of discharge.

"6. The educational institution which has been approved by the State board of war-service education herein created by this act shall have the right—

"a. To determine qualifications for admission of war-service persons.

"b. To select from the applicants those whom it is willing to admit.

"c. To pass upon satisfactory progress of its war-service students.

"7. Each war service person shall be free to select the educational institution in which he wishes to enroll within or outside his State and choose the course or courses which he desires subject to the approval of the educational institution concerned.

"8. Machinery should be created in connection with the operation of this act which will provide educational and vocational counseling and guidance to the persons eligible for training.

"9. For the Federal administration of this act there should be created an agency within the United States Office of Education whose function should be to formulate policies and procedures necessary to assure the effective operation of the program, to set up State quotas of trainees, etc., and to distribute funds through the appropriate educational agency set up within the individual States.

"10. To carry out the provisions of this proposal within the State, a State should, by legislative enactment, designate any existing State board of education or create a new board to be called the State board for war service education. Pending such action by the legislature, the Governor should designate or create such a board whose functions would essentially be:

"a. Approval of educational institutions of the State.

"b. Setting up and maintaining guidance and counseling services to be available to the ex-service personnel in the State.

"c. Certifying persons who are eligible to receive various types of education and training.

"d. Determining fees to be charged for educational services wherever those fees are in doubt.

"e. Adopting rules and regulations necessary for the effective operation of the program within the State."

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS E. WARREN,
Commissioner of Education
for Massachusetts.

Jobs for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, which was

published in today's New York Herald Tribune:

JOBS FOR SOLDIERS—DISCHARGED SERGEANT PROTESTS PENDING PLAN

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In your issue of January 14 it was reported that all ex-servicemen who applied for discharge to enter private employment were ineligible for benefits under the pending House mustering-out pay bill.

The writer was 1 of 110 men returned to this country in October under the provisions of the discharge act. We were in a combat area of the north African theater when applications were submitted to us. It was explained these men were being released because the Army had found that men more than 38 could not stand up to conditions imposed by combat training and action. While it is true no compulsion was used in our case, we were made to feel the regiment would be better off without these older men. In some cases applications were disapproved by unit commanders, but were approved en masse by the regimental commander.

All these men, in no case in service for less than a year and a half and with at least a year's overseas service, took their chances along with every combat soldier. Their main reason for seeking discharge was to try to get themselves placed in jobs to provide some security against post-war competition for jobs with men under 40. There is absolutely no assurance now of future security in any present-day job. In one case an ex-serviceman could not be rehired by his former employer because of seasonal lay-offs. So, as the soldiers say, "It commences already."

Mr. MAY, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, stated publicly, following passage of the Senate mustering-out pay bill in December, that the House would not go hog wild on this issue, as the Senate had. He further stated that able-bodied men more than 38 would have to await further assisting legislation because one of the conditions of release was the men had to have jobs before discharge. This is definitely not true, as this provision was waived in the entire north African theater, nor do the local draft boards or W. M. C. have any jurisdiction over these discharged men more than 38.

Despite the abundance of jobs today, many ex-servicemen are having a great deal of trouble fitting themselves into jobs other than those they held before entering service. None of these men are looking for a handout, but their period of readjustment back to civilian life is just as difficult as will be that of the men who come later.

With few exceptions, an enlisted man with allotments, insurance, bond payments, personal travel, and other incidentals had little or no chance to save money while in service. Upon transfer and release they had to assume full dependency of families, insurance, purchase of clothing, and resumption of any installment payments suspended during service. There are many cases where men have had to borrow to meet these obligations.

* * * * *

None of the 110 men involved received a full discharge. Each is on Enlisted Reserve, subject to recall in 24 hours. Every one of them is willing to be recalled if the country's interests require it. Such legislation engenders the worst ill will and retaliatory action. Are these men to be penalized for a rule made by the Army and was not of their seeking in the first place?

We believe this bill is discriminatory and is merely postponing the issue for a future session of Congress. Members of Congress have been asked to explain why no public pronouncement of this provision was made until the bill was ready to be voted on, who wrote the measure, and the reason for this provision.

All ex-servicemen in this category are urged to take action, for the end is not yet.

ROBERT H. HENDERSON,
Former Staff Sergeant A. A. A.,
United States Army.

TEANECK, N. J., *January 15, 1944.*

An Inductee Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a young man who had recently entered the military service:

AN INDUCTEE SPEAKS

I have been inducted into the Army.

No, I do not want to go to war. I am a young man just getting a start in life. I have a lovely wife and a wonderful baby. We have been sheltered in a comfortable bungalow. I don't want to go to war because I like to come home at night, put on soft shoes, light up my pipe, and sit peacefully by the fireside with my family.

I don't want to go to war because I'm living a good life, in a good American home. I like to have my evenings free to read the newspaper and listen to the radio. I like to have time to take a drink, if I like, and blow smoke rings. I'd rather get up at the sound of an alarm clock than a bugle.

I don't want to go to war because I like to stand on the corner and argue with my neighbors about whatever my fancy desires. I like to be able to go to church on Sunday or sleep late. I don't have to lock my doors to keep my neighbors out. It's quiet and peaceful out here, and I don't want to go to war.

No, I don't want to go to war. But neither do 10,000,000 other men. And the reasons why I do not want to go to war are the very reasons why it is necessary that I go. This, this wife, this baby—this quiet, peaceful life of freedom—must be saved. (Pvt. Ransom Gurganus, in a letter quoted in Inspection News, Retail Credit Co.)

Justice Now for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, I am not given to frequent and lengthy speeches on the floor of the House. It has been my policy as a first-termer to listen and learn.

However, the urgent need for speed in passing adequate legislation prompts me to express myself in behalf of the amendment to the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, offered by the gentleman from North Dakota, Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, and sponsored by several other Members, including myself. This amendment provides for a minimum of $100 and a maximum of $700 payable to returning veterans, depending upon the length of service.

Some of the arguments and statements in behalf of this amendment have been expressed in letters, telegrams, and articles received from constituents, organizations, and veterans. Excerpts from just a few of these messages follow:

Representing veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 in Minnesota, we ask your support of a bill giving 1 year's pay to all honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2 as they are returned to civilian life. (Legion post-commander.)

There should not be a second's further delay in enactment of law to provide immediate mustering-out pay and 1 year's continuance of pay for all those honorably discharged from the service in World War No. 2. Thousands who have already been discharged are in dire need of immediate cash and the list is growing every day. The Nation is looking to Congress to act right now. (Commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post.)

It is my observation that the veterans of this war are not seeking cash payments simply for the sake of the money, but they do desire a place in the civilian economy and will need help until they so place themselves. And men who have already been out of touch with civilian life feel that they should have sufficient time in which to adjust themselves to post-war conditions. (A private in the Army from Bemidji, Minn.)

The following are extracts from an article which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American recently, and which was mailed to me by a Navy man from Fergus Falls, Minn.:

More than half a million honorably discharged American fighting men have been returned to civil life, most of them disabled by injury or illness, and many of them destitute and incapable of gainful employment.

This disclosure has come as a shock to the American people, and it emphasizes the terrible human cost of wars.

But the American people have had a sickening shock from the further disclosure that the Government of the United States has as yet made no adequate provisions for the care of these men. * * *

Congress should adopt the adequate, honest, and patriotic Lemke bill—or a measure embodying its provisions—and keep faith with the fighting men.

Let the people of the United States protest against the insult that has been offered to the servicemen.

Let the people particularly protest against the shameful neglect and abandonment of the disabled and sick, who have been cast back into civil life to shift for themselves or be the wards of charity. * * *

The 600,000 fighting men already discharged are only the vanguard of those destined to return.

Let us not permit our shameful neglect of them to be the pattern of our treatment of those still to come.

The measure, S. 1543, reported out by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House is entirely inadequate. It is not even as adequate as the measure approved by the Senate. If the House fails to liberalize this bill, S. 1543, I hope the Senate will insist on its more satisfactory provision.

National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is now being seriously proposed to enact a universal service law in this country as a war measure. This is an issue fraught with serious consequences for our Nation and its people.

When we review the history of the slow emergence of man from slavery to civilization, we can appreciate the gravity of this proposal.

The great public-works projects of antiquity were built with slave labor. The Civil War in our own country was fought and won on the issue of the abolishment of involuntary servitude. The greatest example of Irish eloquence is Curran's speech on universal emancipation, which I quote:

I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with, and inseparable from, the British soil—which proclaims, even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery; the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the god sink together in the dust; his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his chains that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation.

When slavery marred our civilization, the immortal Lincoln, in the strife of civil war, issued the Emancipation Proclamation that the world might know that slavery had been banished from our shores:

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Whereas on the 22d day of September A. D. 1862, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

That on the 1st day of January A. D. 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom. * * *

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are and henceforward shall be free, and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that in all cases when allowed they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one in this country today regrets this great forward step in advancing human liberty or would support a law to force people to labor that others may profit.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of legislation providing for mustering-out pay for our service men and women.

On October 26, 1943, I introduced H. R. 3541, which was referred to the Military Affairs Committee. My bill has for its purpose to grant veterans of the present war base pay and family allowances or allowances for quarters for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty. I believe my bill is considerably more liberal with our service men and women than the bill considered today and yesterday; however, I do want to state I am for the provisions of the present bill because this legislation will help; too, it is my understanding our veterans' organizations are for the legislation. This is doubtless evidence the legislation is very constructive. As one who has a brother-in-law in service, as well as 14 first cousins—4 overseas—I have supported all legislation to assist and aid our service men and women. I myself am the author of H. R. 2349, now a law, which is assisting certain warrant officers.

Let the Fighting Man Speak for Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, "Do you want the soldier now fighting your battles on foreign fronts to pay your grocery bill on the home front?" This statement, or one similar to it, has been made many times by the opponents of subsidies. Then, too, the statement has been made that the soldier would not want to cast his vote under the so-called Lucas-Green bill, because, by its denial of States' rights, such action would be unconstitutional.

My soldier mail recently does not coincide with either of these statements. All letters received from men in the fighting service have advocated subsidies and the soldier vote, without any entanglements, such as would be presented by the measure adopted in the Senate. The fighting men in my district who identify themselves by giving their names and addresses are soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men, and flyers, and are those to whom I listen. I will take their word and their suggestion against that of the unnamed fighting men whose words have been so glibly employed on the air, in the press, and from the public platform.

Let the fighting men speak for themselves. Here is what some of them say:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 10, 1943.*
Representative WILLIAM ROWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am about to go in the Army, and I shall be definitely upset if I find the red tape of voting hopelessly difficult.

Please do what you can to get a decent soldier vote through Congress.

Yours truly,

GEORGE A. CRAFT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 10, 1943.*
Congressman ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROWAN: Very seldom do I become sufficiently disturbed to write my Representatives in Congress. However, the recent issue of Federal legislation enabling soldiers to vote without going through the red tape now involved has made a deep impression upon me.

As a member of your constituency I have followed your record enough to know that your voting has been consistently liberal, and that you will undoubtedly do what you can to expedite the soldier vote bill.

I would only like to urge you to do everything within your power to expedite passage of a more useful bill than the one recently passed by the Senate. As a member of the armed forces, I have voted several times in the past year and a half, so I am well aware of the difficulties faced by a soldier wanting to vote. I know that many soldiers urgently desire to exercise the democratic right of the ballot but don't because the cumbersome State requirements discourage them before they start. And we all know that leaving the matter up to the States is no solution at all.

I recently made a trip to a number of Army posts and as I went from place to place I inquired of my friends and others I met about voting. They unanimously agreed that cutting away the red tape and freeing the soldier vote was not only desirable but urgent. Who should have a larger say in determining our national policies in 1944, for instance, than the boys in the lines or in training?

Please do everything you can to help us.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
Second Lieutenant, Infantry.

DEAR SIR: I hope you are not a member of one of those subcommittees of a subcommittee that has to report to the subcommittee of the committee, because I would like

an answer to this question and don't want to wait 6 months to get it.

Shall I tell my brothers on the Salerno front about the unwanted battalion?

That ought to be a great morale builder. It should make them fighting mad to know about political slugs who prefer tangles of red tape to tangles of barbed wire.

Don't you think so?

Cheerfully yours,

BRIAN CATLIN.

DECEMBER 30, 1943.

Hon. W. A. ROWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a lieutenant in the Navy, one of your former constituents, now stationed in Farragut, Idaho. Congratulations on your fight for subsidies.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) JACK "I" STELLERMAN,
Camp Scott 27, Farragut, Idaho.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, legislation to provide mustering-out pay for members of our Nation's armed forces should be enacted promptly. It is the least we can do to assist those now defending us, when they return to civilian life. Of course they cannot be properly recompensed in money for their service and sacrifice, but they should receive all reasonable and possible financial assistance from a grateful Nation. I am heartily in favor of this legislation which calls for the mustering-out pay, just as I favor all other justly deserved and necessary benefits for the protection and welfare of those who serve in the armed forces. Their best interests should be our first interests.

Prisoners of War and the Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Secretary of State Cordell Hull:

The Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CELLER: I have received your letter of December 27, 1943, suggesting the need for the extension of the scope of the international convention which prescribes standards for the treatment of prisoners of war to all civilians who may be interned or detained in time of war.

In September 1939 shortly after the outbreak of war in Europe this Government sent to all belligerent powers a communication stating that, although it recognized that it might be essential to maintain surveillance and some restriction upon the acts of civilian enemy aliens, it hoped that such measures would not be carried to the extreme of mass internment of civilian enemy aliens for the duration of the war, since such treatment meant widespread and seemingly unnecessary suffering to thousands of innocent persons, and that it hoped that the belligerent governments would give thought to the means of avoiding this harshness to civilians perhaps by mutual release for repatriation through neutral countries of adult males under parole not to bear arms, such paroles to be reported to the enemy government or governments through the powers representing their interests in enemy countries.

Upon the outbreak of war between the United States and Germany, the United States Government announced to the German Government its intention to observe the Geneva prisoners of war convention to which it is a party and to apply it to prisoners of war and, so far as its provisions might be adaptable, to civilian internees. The German Government, which had signed and ratified the convention, thereupon notified the United States Government that it would apply the convention to the treatment of American prisoners of war and to the treatment of American civilian internees so far as its provisions might be adaptable to civilian internees. The United States Government and the German Government subsequently agreed that use would not be made of article 27 of the Geneva prisoners of war convention to compel civilian internees to work.

The Geneva Prisoners of War Convention provides a humanitarian standard of treatment for prisoners of war. Specifically, it provides that prisoners of war shall be treated humanely and held in honorable captivity—not imprisoned as criminals. It establishes as the standard for shelter and diet of prisoners of war the corresponding treatment of garrison troops of the detaining power and establishes fundamental rights regarding correspondence, medical care, clothing, pay for labor, satisfaction of intellectual, recreational, and religious needs and the continued enjoyment of full civil rights.

The Department of State is constantly alert to insure the observance of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. Whenever it is learned through the Swiss Government, which represents American interests in Germany and German-occupied territories, through the International Red Cross Committee, or otherwise, that the terms of the convention are not being observed, the United States Government draws the attention of the German Government to that Government's obligations under the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. It may be stated that as a result of such representations, improvements have been reported in the conditions under which prisoners of war and civilian internees are held by the German Government.

The Department is exercising especial vigilance to prevent discrimination by the German authorities against American prisoners of war upon a racial or religious basis, and is happy to report that it has so far obtained no evidence of the existence of such discrimination.

The barbarous treatment accorded by the German authorities to certain categories of civilians under their control indicates the desirability of some international instrument similar to the Geneva Convention to set forth the duties of belligerents in respect of all victims of war and oppression and to provide appropriate neutral and international machinery for their protection and relief.

This and other proposals looking toward the revision of existing international agreements to meet needs brought to light by the present war are being coordinated in the Department with a view to their presentation for discussion and consideration at an appropriate time.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Boston Globe of January 7, 1944, on Votes for Soldiers.

The situation in Massachusetts is similar to that in my own State of Pennsylvania where a law providing for the voting of Pennsylvania soldiers is on the statute books. This bill has proved totally inadequate. The number of soldiers taking advantage of this means to vote has been so small that it has been surprising. Soldiers who have attempted to get ballots and have them returned in time have complained that they were unable to do so.

Certainly it is the obligation of the Congress to facilitate by all possible means the exercise of the suffrage rights of the men and women in the armed services of the United States.

The editorial follows:

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS

It looks more and more as though the service men and women, who are likely to number nearly 12,000,000 by November, will be enabled to cast ballots in the national election. Of course they should, and the doubt of action by Congress to make this possible has cast a severe shadow on American democracy.

Secretaries Stimson and Knox have combined to issue an explicit notice to the Council of State Governments as to the conditions under which War and Navy Departments can cooperate effectively. The Secretaries urge that legislation be uniform to make absentee ballots available to servicemen at least 45 days before the election. They also give notice of various limitations on what can be done by Army and Navy, which are charged, first of all, with pressing the war against the enemy.

If, however, the States take action in time there seems to be a good prospect that the weight of the servicemen will be felt when the results are compiled. Here in Massachusetts there is provision for absentee balloting, but it was not made with a global war in mind. In the last election held by the town of Brookline, ballots were sent to a number of voters in the English theater of war and in other places where our forces were stationed, but it was not until after the election was held that the ballots reached those entitled to vote in England. It is true, however, that one soldier ballot was received from Alaska but that had an airmail stamp on the outside of the envelope. In the last State election very few ballots were received from those in the armed forces and all were from men within the United States.

The technical problem in Massachusetts has been explained by three men entitled to rate as experts in local politics. All are town clerks, Messrs. Shinners, of Brookline; Wellman, of Waterman, and Ryder, of Arlington.

The chief difficulty is that the interim between the time the ballots are printed and the election date is too short to give the opportunity the uniformed voters rightfully deserve. Some help in this matter was offered by the work of the special legislative commission of 1941. It is now possible for men and women in the armed forces to be registered by a kindred person. The filing of applications for absentee ballots has also been arranged. But there is still the vital question of time.

Ballots cannot be printed until nominations are made. The coming primary date is September 19, 1944, and not until after the results of the primaries are determined can people know who are the candidates.

Therefore these town clerks recommend that the date of the primaries be set forward. They suggest the third Thursday in June. Consciousness of the importance of this matter is shown by Governor Saltonstall who is seeking from the supreme court of the Commonwealth an advisory opinion as to whether the war powers conferred upon him by the general court give him the authority to decree this change. If the ruling is adverse he will take up the question of a special session of the legislature to enact whatever legislation is required.

None should doubt that Massachusetts will be fair to the armed forces. If an off-year meeting of the general court is necessary, that will be called. Of course, in taking any action great care should be exercised to make the voting effective by understanding exactly what the Military and Naval Establishments can and cannot do. Messrs. Knox and Stimson have been at pains to be explicit.

In the Senate the bill brought in by Senators GREEN and LUCAS was treated rather roughly, but that was last year and the reaction to such an undemocratic and un-American attitude as disregarding the soldiers' right to vote has been emphatic. As a result there is a prospect of a solution by which a commission will be created to prepare ballots and turn them over to the Army and Navy and then to transmit the marked ballots to the secretaries of the 48 States.

A national election in wartime will be a trying occasion, but it should not be too bad with the servicemen entitled to take full part.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Dedication of Mosquito Creek Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, during the past week end I went to the State of Ohio to the vital industrial center known as the great Mahoning Valley. The steel from this area accompanies our men in the armed services to every quarter of the globe. This modern conflict has been called a war of steel, and the war effort of the valley has been great.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of the Honorable Robert H. Roberts, mayor of Warren, Ohio, delivered at the dedication of the Mosquito Creek Dam, which is located in the district of our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN:

Mr. Hoppe, Congressman KIRWAN, distinguished guests and visitors to the Mahoning Valley, Mr. Purnell, Mr. Flynn, the Army engineers, fellow citizens, and neighbors, this is indeed a happy occasion, one that will never be forgotten, a day which will go down in our history as the greatest contribution to the continuance of this great Mahoning Valley as a vital industrial center.

Today we stand at the source of the lifeblood of this entire area. With the operation of Mosquito Dam we can see in the future the answer to our water-supply problems, which will mean, above all, continuous steel and industrial production, which will assure our people continuous employment.

This project was thought of and planned many years ago. But never was it thought of in terms of helping one particular group or city, but was planned with the thought in mind that it would be of help to the entire Mahoning Valley. We are collectively going to reap a benefit from this storage house of much-needed lifeflood—water.

On behalf of the citizens of Warren, we are very happy to thank the manufacturers and industrialists who have worked in perfect unity in securing this vital and very much-needed project. We also wish to thank the Army engineers for all of the fine work that they have done and the wonderful cooperation they have given to everyone. We also want to thank Senator HAROLD H. BURTON and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT for their efforts in our behalf. Our thanks are also extended to Mr. Kenneth Lloyd, of the Youngstown Manufacturers Association, and Mr. Don Dawson, of the Warren Chamber of Commerce, whose combined efforts, together with each and every one of you, has made all of this possible. Again, on behalf of the citizens of Warren, Ohio, we thank you one and all.

To you, MIKE KIRWAN, our Congressman, we give full credit and honor for this accomplishment. It was under your leadership and through your effort and interest that this project was secured, and it was through your perseverance that it became an actuality and not a vision. Mike, we all know that you are the hardest-working Congressman this Nineteenth District has ever had. You have at all times had the interests of your constituents foremost in your mind. We all appreciate you; we all love you. You have done a wonderful job, and we who know you best always speak of you as a man who can get big things done in a big way—and this project is definitely one of those big things. Thanks, Mike.

Oklahoma Postal Receipts and Bank Deposits Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to take advantage of the Christmas holidays to return to Oklahoma. During my brief stay in my home State, I visited eight of the nine counties of the Sixth Congressional District, which I have the privilege and honor of representing in this Congress.

Despite the fact that the most of our young men in every town, hamlet, and community are in the armed forces, I was somewhat surprised to find that every post office, so far as I have been able to ascertain, from the first-class office down to the smallest fourth-class office in the district shows a decided increase in postal receipts in 1943 over the previous year.

Investigation was also made with reference to bank deposits in Oklahoma and my information is that every bank, large and small, in the Sixth District of Oklahoma has shown a decided increase in bank deposits. I was unable to find any bank in Oklahoma showing a decrease in bank deposits. I am authoritatively advised that practically every bank in Oklahoma and a vast majority of those in the Nation also show marked increases in deposits. These facts speak louder than the carping criticisms of bitter partisan politicians, who continuously talk about business "going to the dogs."

As an example of the present financial and economic situation in Oklahoma, I am submitting as a part of my remarks a very interesting and informative statement found in the Fletcher Herald, one of the substantial weekly newspapers, published at Fletcher, Comanche County, a thriving small town in a splendid agricultural section of southwest Oklahoma. It follows:

BANK DEPOSITS

(By H. P. Wettengel)

A thermometer is used to tell whether the temperature is 100 in the shade or 10 below zero. In a similar way, bank deposits can be used to tell the financial status of any nation.

For a half century the Government has been giving a call for published bank statements as of date of December 31 each year. The deposits shown in these statements indicate the condition that the Nation is in financially.

Newspapers keep files of every paper they publish; hence no one has a better record of facts than a paper publisher. Many people won't believe what they are told unless it is proven by the figures in a newspaper. The memories of many people are very short.

Of late some Republican Congressmen at Washington have been saying that Roosevelt and the Democratic Party will have many things to answer for this year because of what they call the New Deal. But facts and figures will substantiate the New Deal in nearly every instance.

As a starter on these figures, the bank deposits in the First National Bank in Fletcher are here given for December 31 on a number of years. The same figures could be given by me for the Bank of Elgin, and practically every bank in the Nation will show similar figures.

As some will answer and say that the bank was growing, hence should have more deposits in 1941 than in 1932, the deposits for years previous to 1932 are being given also.

Note the deposits of $430,131.45 on December 31, 1927; of $142,839.59 on December 31, 1932; and then $344,156.20 on December 31, 1941, just when the Nation entered the war. This shows the deposits were $287,291.86 more on December 31, 1927, than on December 31, 1932.

Here are the figures:

	Deposits
Dec. 31, 1921	$178,308.09
Dec. 31, 1924	394,157.97
Dec. 31, 1925	353,191.18
Dec. 31, 1926	273,657.74
Dec. 31, 1927	430,131.45
Dec. 31, 1928	325,480.28
(Mar. 4, 1929, Hoover inaugurated.)	
Dec. 31, 1929	334,382.63
Dec. 31, 1930	226,626.57
Dec. 31, 1931	182,990.95
Dec. 31, 1932	142,839.59
(Mar. 4, 1933, Roosevelt inaugurated.)	
Dec. 31, 1933	149,025.50
Dec. 31, 1934	157,745.58
Dec. 31, 1935	201,025.78
Dec. 31, 1936	196,527.93
Dec. 31, 1937	213,236.05
Dec. 31, 1938	223,904.16
Dec. 31, 1939	220,247.48
Dec. 31, 1940	309,712.69
(Dec. 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor—war.)	
Dec. 31, 1941	344,156.20
Dec. 31, 1942	474,170.47
Oct. 18, 1943	570,696.79

Payments of H. O. L. C. Loans in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the good people of Michigan in general and of those in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan in particular, I submit for the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of January 18, 1944, from Commissioner John H. Fahey, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. This letter is a brief record of what Michigan people are doing in the matter of paying for their homes. It gives me great pleasure to know that my Michigan people are using such a portion of their incomes with which to pay off the indebtedness on their homes instead of spending it for something of less value:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. Of this amount, 81,126 loans were closed in Michigan, representing an aggregate amount of $257,819,431.

Citizens of Michigan can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expense and increasing their equities, but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private-debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Michigan, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $103,020,806, equivalent to 59.8 percent. A total of 23,579 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 9,198 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure a total of 7,212 properties. As of September 30, 1943, all but 128 of these have been sold. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of 19,379 loans of the Corporation in Michigan were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 57 percent as of September 30, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record, particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgege payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Excess-Profits Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter received from one of my constituents, Mr. Luty Hawkins, president and active manager of a relatively small business at Mt. Vernon, Ill., where he manufactures poultry brooders which are sold throughout the Nation.

I want to put his letter in the RECORD so that all of the Members of this body may read it. I urge particularly that the Members of the Ways and Means Committee, who are constantly grappling with the tax problem, make it a point to read it because, knowing the writer as I do, I feel certain he speaks for hundreds of thousands of small businessmen throughout the Nation.

HAWKINS MILLION DOLLAR HEN, INC.,
Mt. Vernon, Ill., January 12, 1944.

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: After visiting with you at Rotary in Salem last week, I am inspired to write some important factors regarding the ability of certain manufacturers to operate to full capacity with the present income tax laws working against us.

We feel if manufacturers, large and small, would give you the actual picture as to how this excess-profits tax affects their operations, our lawmakers would be in better position to serve their country. (Please note that I did not say "serve their manufacturers.") Full-time employment is what Congress will most desire in our post-war period. It is up to manufacturers and industry as a whole to see to it that employees are working all the time.

It would seem that some lawmakers have the idea that a corporation is a group of buildings, some machinery and other substances of the material world. If this picture remains in the minds of lawmakers, manufacturing plants will soon be just that. However, a manufacturing plant consists of people—thinking people—people with homes, who are depending upon each other's ability, each other's work through the corporation for gainful occupations.

The executives of every corporation are responsible for the kind of operation of the corporation. We, ourselves, will be unwilling to work our plant full capacity with all the risk involved, when by working our plant only one-half capacity we would show about the same net profit, with less than one-half the risk of loss.

When we sit around the table here discussing post-war plans of our own business, we look out the window and see a space size 100 feet by 300 feet all ready for the erection of a new building where an additional 100 employees can be gainfully employed. We are knocked cold by the fact that we have no chance to gain by risking the capital for such a project. Actually, our new earnings will not be any more on June 30 than they are at this date, because our corporation is small and we are not allowed to make very much money. It might be of further interest for you to know that we are not in war work. We are manufacturing the same product we have always manufactured, and we have not raised our prices.

The man who is brave enough to venture the thought that drastic reductions are necessary in excess-profits taxes may lose a few votes but he will have the satisfaction in his heart of knowing that he has made it possible for the gainful employment of thousands and thousands of people in this country.

I should like for our Congressmen to consider the total amount of money received by the Treasury on the last 25 percent of the excess-profits tax. In other words, let the excess-profits tax run up to 65 percent and get the total. Then run it up to 90 percent and find out just what this sum total amounts to. Here I am sure we can discover the price we will be paying for unemployment in our post-war period that can be avoided.

If Congress is unwilling to lower the excess-profits tax from its high point, which is the picture the public will see, then let the manufacturer keep more of his base money or start the bracket at a lower rate. In other

words, do not charge us so much from the beginning. Let us keep some working capital. We must.

I meet with executives occasionally, and we eventually end up every conversation with "what's the use?"—and it is not good for post-war planning, for men who want to do things, men who are capable of doing things and doing them right, to be prevented from doing so.

I hope the foregoing will assist you in getting the picture as one executive of a small manufacturing plant of this great Nation sees the danger of the excess-profits tax.

Sincerely yours,

LUTY HAWKINS,
President.

The War Against Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are many high ranking officers in our military forces and also many prominent people who believe that at the propitious moment Japan will offer to capitulate and thereby take advantage of time and stolen resources to prepare for another war. Admiral Halsey has recently said that we should accept no terms from Japan until Tokyo has been occupied by our armed forces. I do not know to what extent our Government will be influenced by the people of this Nation in any decision concerning Japan but I do know that from having talked to my constituents and judging from correspondence that I have received that so far as the people of this Nation are concerned they will be satisfied with nothing less than military occupation of Tokyo. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter from my constituents which is a sample of opinion in my State:

PALATKA, FLA., *January 13, 1944.*

Hon. JOE HENDRICKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I have recently read with a great deal of interest the statement of Admiral Halsey that they be permitted to go to Tokyo and blast those yellow devils off the map. His desire is the desire of every red-blooded American, and we, the people back home, are going to depend on you and our entire delegation in Washington to fight the fight of your lives to see that no negotiated peace happens and that no unconditional surrender is accepted from Japan until our armed forces have had the opportunity of blasting the island of Japan and its inhabitants to the hell where they belong.

You and I owe this duty to those boys who are making, and will continue to make, the supreme sacrifice, so pray God let us not forget that duty now and in the future. When the last war ended, as you will well remember, our big business was so anxious to get back to making money that they forgot the boys buried in Flanders Field. Don't let our Nation do this again. Stand up and fight. If necessary, give your lives in this great battle for permanent peace.

I have today written to Admiral William F. Halsey, telling him that he could depend on you and me. Write me and tell me that I am right. I know you will do this. I would like to send your letter to Admiral Halsey.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Your sincere friend,

JULIAN C. CALHOUN.

That Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of January 17, 1944:

THAT BILL OF RIGHTS

In his address to Congress last week President Roosevelt said:

"We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights, under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed. Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

In our long recollection we have never known the people of the United States to be denied those rights, but no government can guarantee them. These so-called rights are all predicated on individual worthiness. Have the lazy, wasteful, and improvident the right to be guaranteed security and prosperity?

This statement is typical of the demagogy which Mr. Roosevelt has employed ever since he entered the White House. It is an appeal to the untutored and benighted masses. It is a play for votes.

This country is utterly incapable of setting up the machinery which would make every individual and every family a matter of the Government's concern. One of the easiest ways to cultivate laziness and irresponsibility is to assure the individual that the Government is his guardian, and that come hell or high water the taxpayers will take care of him and his family.

Like many of Mr. Roosevelt's dreams, this one has no concept of the cost or where the money is to come from. Taxes are now reaching the point of diminishing returns. The wealthy groups are disappearing. This is essentially a country of free enterprise. Presently we will not have the money to engage in enterprise.

Only a few years ago Congress, growing fearful of Mr. Roosevelt's spending, set a limit on the national debt of $45,000,000,000. Soon it was forced to raise this limit to $55,000,000,000. Now Mr. Roosevelt himself says that by the end of the present fiscal year it will be $258,000,000,000.

Much of this can be blamed on the war, but when the war is over the debt will be there. It is not out of reason to suppose that by the end of the war this debt will be three hundred and fifty billions. At the low interest rate of 2½ percent, this will mean an annual charge of nearly $7,250,000,000 annually. If we reduced our debt at the rate of a billion a year, as we did after World War No. 1, it would take 350 years to wipe it out. If we reduced it at the rate of ten billions a year, it would take 35 years. Before Mr. Roosevelt became President we ran the Government on a mere five or six billions a year.

The money that the Government now takes out of our pockets and spends on social security is the money that went into new homes, automobiles, educations for our children, into the cultivation of new markets for our products, into plant extensions, and into educational and medical endowments.

We had our ups and downs under that system just as we are now having war prosperity and in a few years after the war unemployment and deflation on another huge scale. We could take care of the ups and downs in the past because we had the capital to work with, but Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal are destroying this capital as fast as they can.

What the President promises to give us is an era of universal poverty instead of an era of universal bliss. He never gives a thought as to where we will come out. His barrel has no bottom. He is like a child in his play pen with his toys.

Every day two objectives are becoming clearer and clearer if we want to save America. One is to win the war as soon as possible, and the other is to get rid of the Roosevelt philosophy before it can make the ruin of America complete.

Treat All Veterans Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, a number of complaints have been registered with me regarding the price of cigarettes in veterans' hospitals throughout the country. A soldier overseas can buy a pack of cigarettes for 6 cents, being relieved of the payment of any tax. Yet this same veteran home convalescing from wounds received on the field of battle, must pay 16 cents for the same pack of cigarettes while confined at a veterans' hospital here in the United States. These soldiers are sacrificing so much for us, why can't we help them—just a little?

Joseph M. La Rosa, of McKeesport, Pa., one of my most loyal constituents and a great friend of the war veterans, wrote me a letter yesterday on this

timely subject which I am happy to include as part of my remarks:

McKEESPORT, PA., *January 17, 1944.*
Congressman SAMUEL WEISS,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEISS: I have just completed a visit to our gallant servicemen now being hospitalized in our veterans' hospital at Aspinwall, Pa., and many of these men are wounded and suffering the effects of the present war.

They complained to me of discrimination to them in the costs of cigarettes and candies in the veterans' hospital. They maintain that while serving overseas, cigarettes could be purchased without payment of tax—6 cents a pack. While here in a veterans' hospital they are compelled to pay the prevailing civilian price. They further maintain, and rightly, that this is highly unfair and that soldiers should be treated alike everywhere. If any benefits are given, the veterans who have suffered and are hospitalized should certainly receive a fair break.

I am counting on you to get the War Department veterans' facilities and all other governmental agencies to help our incapacitated fighting men and women by treating them the same here as overseas.

Your loyal constituent,

JOS. M. LA ROSA.

War Department Policy Concerning Return of Service Men and Women Having Overseas Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. John W. Martyn, the administrative assistant to the Secretary of War. The letter concerns the policy of the War Department with reference to returning to this country soldiers that have been overseas:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1944.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your communication of recent date addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning the return of soldiers who have been in foreign service for a considerable length of time.

The War Department does not question the desirability of rotating troops who have been in foreign service for a considerable length of time and has had the matter under continuous study since the inception of the war. Until recently, lack of shipping space has been the main obstacle in the return of personnel from overseas duty. This shortage of shipping has now been partially alleviated and the present status of the rotation of personnel on duty outside of the United States is as follows:

Personnel on duty in Alaska and the Caribbean Defense Command should normally be returned to the United States after 2 years' service overseas.

There is now in operation in the north African theater of operations a system which will return monthly a certain number of men with more than 18 months' service overseas.

A policy for the South Pacific and Southwest Pacific theaters is now being prepared and it is hoped that shipping facilities will sufficiently improve by April 1944 to enable the return of a certain number of men from these theaters.

In addition to these categories a limited number of men are being returned as cadres for new units, as instructors and as aircrew trainees. We are also returning certain men who have gained military information that may serve to a useful advantage to the military authorities in the United States and those who require medical attention which cannot be procured in the oversea theaters as well as those whose physical and mental condition indicate the necessity for relief from oversea duty.

Rotation of personnel is also being made in all oversea theaters from combat duty to rest areas and to areas of more favorable climate. Upon arrival at these rest areas every effort is made to provide the maximum facilities for relaxation and recreation.

It must be appreciated that the actual number of men returned to the United States must depend upon the amount of shipping which can be made available. The maintenance of full combat effectiveness of our troops overseas must always receive prior consideration.

You may be assured that the War Department is keenly aware of the problem mentioned in your letter and is making every effort to find the best practical solution possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

The Vacant Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter of Christmas remembrance for a deceased soldier, published in the Washington (D. C.) Post, December 29, 1943, as follows:

SISTER'S TRIBUTE

I am enclosing a letter which is written in memory of my brother, Joseph Paul Kenney, seaman, first class, United States Coast Guard, who was killed in action while on convoy duty in the North Atlantic. His ship, the *Escanaba*, was torpedoed and went down in 10 seconds, carrying with her 101 fighting Coast Guard men:

WASHINGTON, *December 25.*

DEAREST JOE: As I sit here this Christmas morning, my thoughts go back to a Christmas morning a year ago when you, our beloved kid brother, walked in on a surprise visit.

You had joined the Coast Guard in October 1942, and had been home on a few hours' leave one Sunday and then November and December passed with no word from you, as you were then in the cold North Atlantic on patrol duty.

We were praying you'd be home for Christmas. I remember well the many persons who asked, "What do you want for Christmas?" and I would reply, "The nicest Christmas present I could ever wish for would be to have my brother, Joe, home with us."

Our Lord was very kind to us last year, because He sent you home to us for Christmas and we were all together for our last Christmas with you, Joe.

Although you are not here this Christmas, nor will you ever be home again for Christmas, dear Joe, we know and feel that you are and always will be with us in spirit.

There are many more golden stars in the heavens this year, and for us there is one that shines brightest of all.

In the year to come, many more names will be added to that ever-increasing honor roll of America's gallant fighting men.

You will always be an ideal and symbol for me. My steps will not falter as I shall try to be something like you. Your spirit that is always with me is an inspiring source of courage and renewed faith.

May we, as Americans and good Christians, never forget our priceless heritage for which brave men like you believed in and who willingly risked all to make the supreme sacrifice.

I know there are many thousands of mothers, wives, daughters, sweethearts and sisters the world over who are grieved this Christmastide at the loss of dear ones like you, dear Joe, and there is in this grief a common bond among us to work and fight twice as hard so that peace will come again to the world and that more of our boys may come home again.

You are gone from us now, but we have precious memories of a brave, handsome Irish lad who gave so much of himself to make happy those he loved so well.

I know you would say, and as I hear the Christmas chimes this day I seem to hear you say, "Have a very merry Christmas for me."

SISTER.

Soldier Votes or Scraps of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called soldiers vote bill is being used by certain politicians and pressure groups to discredit those who are honestly and sincerely trying to work out a plan whereby our military forces may be enabled to vote free from a fear that their votes may ultimately be challenged. We must write the kind of a soldiers' vote bill that will stick and not one that has "unconstitutional" written all over its face.

Mr. Merlo Pusey, writing in the Washington Post of January 18, 1944, has a most timely article on this subject of soldiers voting. It is entitled "Soldier Votes or Scraps of Paper." Mr. Speaker, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SOLDIER VOTES OR SCRAPS OF PAPER?

It is certainly no credit to our political intelligence that we have permitted ourselves to become embroiled in a row over soldier voting. That row is especially foolish because there is so little to disagree about. Almost everyone insists that the soldiers be given a chance wherever possible. No one is naive enough to suppose that every soldier can be voted any more than every civilian

can be. The best that Congress, the States, the Army, and Navy can possibly do is to get ballots to those who are eligible, or can be made eligible, to cast them.

Now here is a relatively simple, straightforward duty that ought to enlist the cooperation of everyone who can do anything about it. But it has been made unnecessarily complicated by a misguided attempt to tear up the constitutional requirements for voting. Politicians with an eye on votes for themselves are trying to create the impression that voting rights can be created by a fiat where they did not exist before. In doing so they have raised a furor that serves no purpose other than to flimflam the men who are fighting our battles.

Most of the trouble stems from certain unconstitutional provisions of the Green-Lucas bill. There are many commendable features about the bill and its purpose is eminently praiseworthy. But it goes haywire in its presumption to create voting rights that Congress cannot create. The bill presumes to abolish State registration requirements so far as members of the armed forces are concerned. It presumes to relieve soldiers from payment of poll taxes in the poll-tax States. By passing such an act Congress would take unto itself the power to prescribe the qualifications of voters, and of course it has no such power.

In this respect the bill is a snare and a delusion. It pretends to create voting rights in defiance of the Constitution. Occasionally Congress can get away with an unconstitutional act when it cannot be challenged in the courts. But in this case it could not. Ballots cast under the terms of the Green-Lucas bill would be sent to precinct voting units in each State to be counted. Judges of the election would be obliged to throw out the ballots of voters not eligible under State law. If they did not do so, an election won with the aid of such ballots could be challenged in the courts.

The choice of a President, as Senator TYDINGS pointed out the other day, might be thrown into the House by such controversies over the validity of ballots. In that event the House would be obliged to discard the illegal votes under the oaths of its Members to support the Constitution. And the same obligation would hold for the courts.

It is not a question of upholding States' rights. Rather it is a question of what can and cannot be done under the Federal Constitution. That basic law says that electors—voters—entitled to cast ballots for Senators and Representatives "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This can be changed by constitutional amendment, but not by an act of Congress.

When soldiers' and sailors' ballots come to be counted, then the test that must be made is whether those men are eligible to vote for representatives in their own State legislatures. So action on the part of some States, as well as congressional action, is necessary if soldiers are to be given a legal vote and not a deceptive promise which cannot be fulfilled. Fortunately, soldiers away from home can vote in many States without any change in existing law. Other States are hastening to remove such obstacles as registration in person and payment of poll taxes. This is obviously a job that only the States can do as the Constitution now stands.

Once this basic fact is properly weighed Congress should have no difficulty in drafting and passing a satisfactory soldier vote bill. The trouble to date is that a few Members insist in trying to give our defenders something that is beyond the power of Congress to give. What the soldiers want is the vote, not a mere scrap of paper. A scheme giving them votes that would go into the wastebasket might be the greatest boomerang of the post-war era.

Senator TYDINGS has rewritten the Green-Lucas bill with the object of eliminating its unconstitutional features while retaining the proposed war ballot commission to direct the work of getting ballots in the hands of soldiers and of transmitting them to the States. If Congress has the good judgment to accept a measure of this sort and the States do their duty, soldiers will be able to vote almost as freely as they could at home. Otherwise we shall experience either a frustration of democracy or election turmoil. And either might leave tragic consequences.

Issues of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the text of a speech I delivered over the Town Meeting of the Air program on January 6:

HOW CAN THE DEMOCRATS WIN IN 1944

How can the Democrats win in 1944?

I have enough faith in the American people to believe the Democrats will win in 1944 if they deserve to win. The needs of our Nation in this her greatest crisis rather than mere partisan advantage must determine our speech and our action.

The Democratic Party will deserve victory in 1944 if it fearlessly takes responsibility for those hard unpopular measures which are necessary to win this war. Military measures first of course, but also a tax bill, for example, courageous enough to really meet the Nation's needs and curb inflation at its source. No one likes heavy taxes or price control, rent control, wage control, allocation of critical materials, or rules governing manpower. These things are brand new in America's experience. They are war measures and Democrats must make it plain they regard them as such and will end them just as soon as possible. But for the present, it is up to the Democrats to continue fearlessly to be responsible for carrying out the mobilization of our country for total war. The opposition does not need to take responsibility and has been very careful not to do so. I believe the people understand and that Democrats who do not flinch from their obvious duty will gain political strength. For the one primary duty of any political party which is in office in time of war is to risk its own political future whenever by so doing it can in any respect advance its country's cause toward victory.

In the second place, if the Democratic Party is to deserve to win in 1944 it must work to bind together all people, whatever their nationality, race, color, or creed, who are devoted to the cause of human liberty and to the economic and political advancement of the common people of the world. But for the good-neighbor policy, the United States might well have faced dangerous problems in the Western Hemisphere itself when this war broke out. Instead we have the cooperation of our sister American republics with one exception. The Cairo and Teheran Conferences of the President offer hope that policy can be extended around the world.

Many of us would like to believe America could stay at peace in the future by pursuing an isolationist course. But we can't believe that if we are honest, or if we can learn at all from experience, or if Pearl Harbor meant a thing to us. Therefore, the Democratic Party must stand foursquare for the kind of peace men who give their lives expect us above all things to build—a peace that can last a whole lot longer than the last one did, a whole lot longer than a generation. Such a peace requires America's wholehearted participation, not alone with one or two or three other powers, but with every peace-loving and decently governed nation in the world.

The strongest of all the threads of history is the hope of the common people of the world for a better and more secure life in the future than the past has given. Conservative trends of the moment to the contrary notwithstanding this most fundamental of all political forces is perfectly certain to assert itself with ever-increasing strength as the suffering and hardship and losses of the war increase. Furthermore, unless the United States is prepared after the war to maintain economic health, full employment, and full production in our own country, we can neither provide jobs nor do decent justice to 11,000,000 returning veterans, nor can we exert the constructive influence for lasting peace which is our obvious duty. It is, therefore, imperative that the Democratic Party take definite responsibility for a progressive domestic program, part of which must obviously wait until after the war to be carried out, but part of which is so much a part of our wartime needs that it should be undertaken at once.

Among the things that should be done right now is an expansion of the social-security system to include all the population instead of only a little over half of it, to make a genuine national old-age pension its keystone, to make it economically possible for mothers of families without a breadwinner to care for their own children, to protect all disabled and physically handicapped and to start a program of health insurance. By health insurance, I mean health insurance and I do not mean a plan whereby the freedom of anyone to choose his own doctor, hospital, or type of treatment would be in the slightest degree interfered with. Such a broadening of the social-security program could bring approximately $5,000,000,000 per year of revenue into the Treasury, a most important counterinflationary influence at the present time. It would be the best possible means of providing a program of compulsory savings and of giving to our country a backlog of sustained consumer demand for the post-war period.

International cartels and domestic monopolies have been our most difficult barrier to all-out war production. During the war the hold of monopoly upon our country has been strengthened, not weakened. Unless monopoly power is broken and international cartels prevented after the war, full employment, full production, and economic freedom are alike doomed in the United States. Free enterprise means governmental protection of the public interest against monopoly power. The Democratic Party must definitely divorce itself from every monopoly in this country—especially the oil monopoly—and must make it plain that, once this war is won, it will throw all of the strength of government against every special interest which attempts artificially to cause scarcity, increase prices, or deny to others opportunity to engage in any line of business or economic activity. Immediate tasks for the Democratic Party in this antimonopoly drive are: (1) Defeating of pending legislation to exempt

from the operation of the antitrust laws the entire business of insurance, (2) purchase of Standard Oil holdings at Elk Hills in California so field can become in truth a Navy oil reserve and not a further source of Standard Oil power, (3) passage of legislation to require open registration of every present and future cartel agreement and to effectively prevent patents being used as instruments of monopolistic control.

The Democratic Party has to have an answer to the problem of national debt, not just an explanation for it. That debt at war's end will amount to somewhere in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000 with interest in excess of $7,000,000,000 per year. We must not only have a better way to maintain full employment than deficit financing. We must also enable the people of America to earn their way out from under this debt and gradually pay it off through their industry and their production. The way we can do that is set forth in full in my recent book Out of Debt, Out of Danger. As long as the Government compels itself, whenever expanded buying power is required, to give interest-bearing Government bonds to private banks for money newly created on their books and thus to borrow every dime of America's money into circulation at the price of added debt, there can be little hope of dealing with this problem of national debt. It was Thomas Jefferson, himself, the founder of the Democratic Party, who wrote in 1792 and I quote: "The power to issue money should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government to whom it properly belongs." Whenever there is need that additional money be put into circulation to match increasing potential production, it should be government which creates that money without either capital debt or interest charge and the Nation as a whole which derives the economic benefit.

The farmers of America must be guaranteed against another post-war collapse of agricultural prices such as the deliberate deflation of 1920 and 1921 brought upon them. If we can impose price ceilings during the war, we can and must establish floors under farm prices to assure to agriculture its fair share of the national income after victory. No post-war deflation this time, must be a Democratic principle.

If government by congressional action guarantees a full, sustained buying power to our people by effective measures in the monetary and fiscal field, if we have a constructive answer to the problem of national debt, if cheap abundant power from water, coal, and oil can be assured to industries and consumers by yardsticks if necessary, if the income of our farm people is sustained, if the strangle hold of monopoly is broken wherever it exists, then there can be jobs for returning veterans and true economic freedom in America. There will be no need for Government regimentation of competitive private enterprise nor for emergency Government agencies set up outside the framework of congressional law.

This country owes its veterans a debt of gratitude which can never be paid. To every disabled veteran there must be guaranteed not only the hospital care, compensation and benefits which are already on the statute books, but also expeditious methods of determining their entitlements before they are ever discharged. As to all men in the fighting forces, mustering-out pay there must be. But more important is a period of economic security within which they can make their readjustment to civilian life. This means a program of monthly payments to veterans over a period of time and as much effort by public bodies in getting them relocated in civilian life as was exerted in getting them out of civilian life and into the armed forces.

The Democratic Party never wins elections unless it is definitely more progressive and clearly more on the side of the common citizen than the opposing party. The Democratic Party can win in 1944 if it does not forget that fact.

Two Doctors Are Prescribing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun:

TWO DOCTORS ARE PRESCRIBING

In his press conferences President Roosevelt frequently assumes the role of the schoolmaster lecturing to a group of pupils who are not overly bright and who cannot talk back to him. In this vein the President the other day told how Dr. New Deal had been called into administer to the country for internal disorders in 1933, but that on December 7, 1941, the patient was in a bad smash-up and a new physician, Dr. Win-the-War, was called upon to prescribe.

The allegory was entertaining, but the President did not tell the whole story. He concealed the fact that Dr. New Deal was something of a quack who experimented with one kind of medicine after another and never did succeed in getting the patient back on his feet. It was Dr. Win-the-War who finally effected the cure for the internal disorders by administering strong capsules containing billions of dollars in war expenditures.

Moreover, old Dr. New Deal is still fussing around the patient, getting in the way of Dr. Win-the-War and nullifying some of the efforts to treat the patient for the injuries he sustained in the smashup.

For instance, Dr. Win-the-War says we need to produce a great deal more food in order to recover, but Dr. New Deal continued until recently to pay farmers for not planting crops.

Dr. Win-the-War says the patient must avoid inflation, but Dr. New Deal says that elevator operators and employees of a cafeteria in a war plant are engaged in interstate commerce and accordingly must be paid time and a half for all over 40 hours of work a week.

Dr. Win-the-War says the patient must preserve his free enterprise, otherwise he will have no resistance to totalitarian infections, but Dr. New Deal is advocating an operation for the removal of his free enterprise.

Dr. Win-the-War prescribed a mustard plaster of price ceilings to keep down the cost of living, but Dr. New Deal wants to put the plaster on the patient's profits.

Dr. Win-the-War says we must have economic stability, but Dr. New Deal continues to finance the war by the most inflationary methods.

Dr. Win-the-War says that everyone must give a blood transfusion to help the patient recover, but Dr. New Deal says that certain groups, who have great political power, need not contribute any of their plasma.

Dr. Win-the-War says the patient will need large financial reserves in order to get back on his feet when he gets out of the hospital, but Dr. New Deal says the reserves should be given to the Government to pay the hospital bill.

Dr. Win-the-War says the patient needs an extra supply of manpower before he can recover, but Dr. New Deal is hoarding large doses of manpower in his experimental laboratories in Washington and refuses to release any of it except under extreme pressure.

We might go on and on, but this gets over the general idea. How does this allegory strike you, Mr. Schoolmaster?

The Presidential Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, many editorials have been written on the President's recent message to Congress. I have read much of this comment and am particularly impressed with an editorial appearing in the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, which I include in these remarks. This daily is not hostile to the President and, therefore, its appraisal of the message is in no way prejudiced and is worthy of careful consideration. The editorial is as follows:

Mr. Roosevelt, in his annual message to Congress, seems to have aimed at two objectives. One was to win back the support of various dissident groups—the farmers, small businessmen, white collar workers, the unions, and the men in the armed forces—which have given evidence recently of lack of confidence in the administration's handling of the home front situation. The other was to extend to all industry the obligation of workers to support the Government, as in the case of the coal mines and the railroads, as a last resort to prevent strikes.

The President asks Congress to enact a universal service measure. This is not the usual administration course. Most such drastic steps have been taken by Executive authority. In fact, he pointed out that such authority now exists for conscripting capital and property. But in an election year the administration evidently wants Congress to share the responsibility of putting all workers under legal obligation to uphold the Government and refrain from strikes.

Universal service is acknowledged as the only way to accomplish the things the President said it would, but the value of such a measure would have been far greater at the outset of the war. Now, with the armed forces nearly at peak strength, and with industrial requirements for labor beginning to taper off, its value is minimized. Yet if it is the one way the administration has left to prevent strikes and keep production at peak levels, it is probably justified even at this late date.

It will depend largely on the form the measure takes in Congress, and the President has left it entirely up to Congress, how effective universal service can become in the months remaining. And after that the administration of such a law will become a tremendous task. For the Government to say now where each individual should fit into the war picture will require an efficiency and intelligence of administration dwarfing the task confronted by selective service at the beginning.

Now it appears from the remaining portions of the annual message, other than the sections dealing in generalities with foreign policy, that the President left no doubt of his intentions of seeking reelection. These sections dealt specifically with the enactment of Federal legislation facilitating the soldier vote, with an appeal to the white-collar or fixed-income class on the basis of price control, with subsidies to strengthen price control, with advantages to the farmers arising from price control, with the more stringent taxation of war profits, with continuing the present policy of contract negotiation and with an appeal to business to reject any "rightist reaction" or notion of returning to a post-war normalcy.

And in conclusion Mr. Roosevelt extended the basic New Deal philosophy of social security into the post-war realm with a second Bill of Rights that goes further than any previous exposition of this philosophy. In fact, it is hard to fit this latter part of the speech into the rest of his discourse on the state of the Union inasmuch as he dwelt at length on the danger of considering the war a nearly won, and projected this new basis of security and prosperity into the period after this war is won.

Only on the assumption that Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate can these sections of the address to Congress be interpreted.

Universal Impressment of American Citizens Is Peonage—It Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Austin-Wadsworth bill should be defeated by the Congress. It is inconsistent with American ideals and traditions and, in my judgment, contravenes the Constitution of the United States. As long as that Constitution stands, it is ultra vires to the Congress to attempt to inflict upon the American people any form of labor peonage, no matter how beguiling may be the disguising garments in which the measure is clothed.

Uncle Sam is cutting down on his purchases today. Thousands of men are being laid off from their war jobs. We are faced with the ugly shadow of unemployment in the offing. Why, then, the necessity for drafting labor? How can one in logic support drafting labor while failing to draft property and profits at the same time? Since when is a human of less importance to this Nation than property? Where is our vaunted liberty when all citizens are regimented by bureaucrats to the point where they can only work where told?

A form of labor enslavement has been adopted in Canada and Great Britain, but it has been unsuccessful in preventing strikes and is not rigidly enforced. In those countries there are no constitutional barriers.

On what strange constitutional basis can one attempt to justify compelling men to work for a private employer operating for profit? What will be the effect on the morale of the workers employed under such a scheme? The Austin-Wadsworth bill makes no provision for protecting trade-union organization. It makes affiliation with unions purely voluntary. This would absolutely destroy trade unionism.

Why talk about defeating fascism in Europe while adopting its worst features within our own borders? Physician, heal thyself. Let us practice what we preach and exemplify our devotion to democracy rather than stultify ourselves in the eyes of the citizens of the occupied countries of Europe.

Transportation of Race Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning a newspaper photograph showing a Hawaiian-bred race horse that had just arrived in this country to enter the Kentucky Derby. The clipping went on to say that this race horse and four stablemates made the 5,000-mile trip on a Liberty ship.

We are told that transportation and ship's bottoms are at a premium, and there is no available space even for bringing back a soldier who has been granted a furlough and often he has to wait weeks and weeks for some means of transportation to get back home. We wonder how it happens that five race horses can find space in our Liberty ships. Is horse racing really more important?

We are also told that there is a serious scarcity of feed for cattle and horses in our country. Who will furnish the feed for these five extra race horses? Does the bringing of these race horses in a Liberty ship constitute an essential war effort?

WIPPERMAN & MITCHELL, INC.,
Buffalo, N. Y., January 13, 1943.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: We are told that transportation and ship's bottoms are at a premium. With respect to railroad rolling stock we are told that it must all be used to further the war effort.

Is this, the bringing of a bunch of race horses, part of the essential war effort the administration is always preaching about?

Is the Derby so essential to the war effort that five horses have to make the trip from Hawaii by Liberty ship and thence cross country by our overtaxed railroads to Churchill Downs? Furthermore, we are told that there is a scarcity of feed grains for milk cattle. These "very essential horses" are certainly not going to be fed on sawdust.

It does not make logical reasoning to me, a poor layman, that we should be hounded almost to the point where we have to have an AAA priority to breathe, when things like the enclosed photographic reproduction are disclosed. We wonder what priority was required for this?

Don't you think it is about time that Congress took back its full constitutional functions?

Sincerely,

RAY MITCHELL.

Missouri's Record With the Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me as part of my remarks I desire to include a letter received from Hon. John H. Fahey, Commissioner, showing the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Missouri. It seems to me this is an excellent record when it is taken into consideration at the time the loans were advanced the property owners were in debt and many had not paid their taxes for a number of years. The letter follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly $3,500,000,000. Of this amount, 24,535 loans were closed in Missouri, representing an aggregate amount of $84,138,909.

Citizens of Missouri can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expense and increasing their equities but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private-debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Missouri, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $34,315,135, equivalent to 58.6 percent. A total of 5,351 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 2,322 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure a total of 6,876 properties. As of September 30, 1943, all but 104 of these have been sold. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of 6,593 loans

of the Corporation in Missouri were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 57 percent as of September 30, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record, particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY, *Commissioner.*

"Pop" Brown, Leader of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is always worthy of note when a man is inspired to evolve from the fertility of his own brain an idea which is new and which later becomes generally adopted as worth saving and worth following.

And such a new idea may be said to be truly inspired if it results in a conspicuous contribution to human betterment.

Over half a century ago William Bell Brown founded the class which bears his name at the West Somerville (Mass.) Baptist Church.

Affectionately known by countless friends as "Pop" Brown, this inspired leader has passed to his reward at the age of 92, after seeing his plan of a class of men meeting regularly after church service for teaching and discussion, widely adopted in churches of many denominations in other communities throughout the land.

He was a native of Scotland and came to this country when 21 years old.

It is difficult to appraise the multiform influence for good in molding the lives and affecting the thinking of men everywhere which has sprung from the idea of "Pop" Brown for a churchmen's class. He may be truly said to have been a leader of leaders of men.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal:

"POP" BROWN

William Bell Brown, more familiarly known as "Pop" Brown, founder of the West Somerville Baptist Church class for men which bears his name, passed away here this week. Mr. Brown's death leaves a void that will be deeply felt by this community for the work he has accomplished in this city through the medium of the Brown class, has left its imprint and its influence on hundreds upon hundreds of men who found under his inspiring leadership that religion and its obligations imposed no onerous burden but was rather a satisfying and helpful experience.

His was the distinction of founding the oldest men's Bible class in the United States, organized in 1885 with six members. He lived to see the plan of his class adopted by Baptist churches throughout the country. This city was the better for his life among us here and the principles for which he labored will be continued and perpetuated here by the succeeding generations of men who will hold membership in the Brown class.

"* * * and I Often Think of Elm Street"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk and read many articles concerning the thoughts, ideas, and aspirations of our boys who are in the armed forces overseas. The other day I discovered an excerpt from a letter written by one of the boys in our armed forces. It indicates so well the attitude of mind of many of our boys overseas that I felt that it should be given wider publicity. Its sound common sense and its typically American outlook on life impressed me. Here it is:

"* * * I'm a long way from home out here and when I'm alone at night, Dad, I often think of Elm Street with its big trees, its neat houses, the church bells on Sunday morning. It's the peace and freedom and decency of it all that gets under my skin—and it makes me a bit homesick now and then.

"There's nothing like Elm Street over here—and never will be till these folks change their system.

"The trouble lies with the men who rule, and with the people who let them get away with it.

"Over here the wrong men have been running things too long. They have been crazy with power. They gradually took over more and more, and when the people finally woke up it was too late. These folks can't throw out their officials the way we can. They have to have a war to get rid of their so-called new order.

"Thank God we can still put the men we want into office, and throw them out again with ballots instead of bullets.

"This mess is a fine example of what dictatorship and regimentation can do when they really get going. And talk about bureaucrats—you ought to see what the ones over here are doing to what we call the common people. You can't do anything on your own. You just take orders—and like it.

"We ordinary folks at home always had a feeling of independence and self-respect. You and Mom were always looking ahead to better things for yourselves and for us kids. That sort of thing is missing here, Dad, and I think it's the result of years of being pushed around. These folks have been told what to do and when and how to do it for so long that they don't know anything else. They've forgotten how to think for themselves.

"Don't let this system get a toe hold at home, Dad. It's bad stuff. And the trouble is, it sneaks up on you. You don't realize that it's got you till it's almost too late.

"I think most ordinary Americans are just like us—plain, practical, hard working, thrifty people, blessed with a lot of good, common sense. Most of us aren't very strong for fancy political theories. We know by experience that the American way of getting things done, even with its shortcomings, has brought more real happiness, prosperity, progress, education, health, and general good to more people than any other system in the world.

"And that's something to think about. * * *"

Millions of American boys in the armed services are doing a lot of thinking. They are writing home anxiously these days. Many of them are worried—wondering what is happening to America while they are away. They realize now more than ever what real freedom means, and we at home must guard it for them as well as for ourselves.

Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention of the House and the country to an event of particular significance that occurred in my congressional district in Nebraska. Cherry County, the largest in area in Nebraska, exceeded its quota for the Fourth War Loan on January 8, 1944, 10 days before the official opening of the national drive. As far as I can learn, this is the first county in the United States to make such a report. The organization was completed and the work was done before the county knew what their quota might be. The quota was set at $430,000, but on January 11, $480,000 had been subscribed with a number of the precincts still to report.

Cherry County in Nebraska has an area of 5,982 square miles. It is one of the largest counties in the United States. It has a population of only 9,637. The county is almost exactly the size of the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. It is the center of a great ranching country. The people are ranchers and farmers and the kind of people who live in the small towns and countryside of the Midwest. They are the great meat producers of the country. They are the ones who have seen their sons and employees drained off into the armed forces and enticed by high wages into war industries. Their need for farm and ranch equipment has been given little consideration. Their products have been placed under ceilings. I cite this splendid record of buying bonds because we hear so often that the Midwest is not

war-minded. These people have shown their patriotism the best way they know how by oversubscribing their bond quota. This record is worthy of notice and sets a fine example for the rest of the Nation.

The Refugees—An Outstanding 12 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with Eleanor F. Rathbone, member of the House of Commons, who wrote a very illuminating article in the Manchester Guardian Weekly, Friday, December 24, 1943, which I am happy to record.

THE REFUGEES—A DISAPPOINTING 12 MONTHS
(By Eleanor F. Rathbone, M. P.)

A year ago Mr. Eden, on behalf of the United Nations, exposed to Parliament the "bloody cruelties" by which the Nazis were carrying out "Hitler's oft-repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people in Europe" and promised future retribution. In a spontaneous gesture of horror and sympathy the House rose to its feet and stood for a moment in silence.

What has happened since? The terror has continued. Its ghastly methods of deportation, mass execution, starvation, or working to death are not restricted to Jews. The victims include innumerable other Russians, Poles, Czechs. But wholesale massacre on purely racial grounds is reserved for Jews. It is estimated that in Poland alone from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 Jews have already perished.

As soon as they knew the facts the British public began to clamor not for future vengeance but for immediate rescue. Seldom has there been a more widespread, influentially backed agitation irrespective of creed, class, or political party.

What has resulted? In actual rescue, very little. The difficulties were great. The victims were in enemy-controlled lands. The Nazis and their satellites would not let them go. Many thousands escaped into neighboring neutral States. But this was only possible for the robust; seldom for the children and their mothers, the old or delicate. These could only get out by permission of their persecutors. The neutral States were all in some danger of invasion; also, their resources for sheltering and maintaining refugees were limited. The most obvious rescue measures were—

1. To assist these neutrals by drawing off their overflow of refugees where possible, and meantime by help in food, money, permitting imports, etc.

2. To encourage them to negotiate with the enemy to let substantial numbers go, especially of the children, and to help them as before and by promising to take off their hands post-war, if not earlier, definite numbars or proportions of those refugees for whom repatriation or resettlement was unsuitable.

3. Repeatedly to warn the enemy governments of the consequences of continued cruelties and to work on their peoples by similar warnings and by appeals to their religion and humanity.

4. To set an example to all these and to our allies by showing generosity ourselves.

Something has been done or planned in the first three of these directions, but not with the energy that might have been expected in face of so terrible a tragedy and so united a national demand.

Consider the timing of Government action. Four months after the December declaration a conference of the United Kingdom and the United States met at Bermuda. The whole problem of rescue and of post-war settlement was referred to the Inter-Governmental Committee originally set up at Evian in 1938. Some of the principal countries both of refuge and of persecution are not on it. But it functions. Its director, Sir Herbert Emerson, and his two deputies, one Swiss, one American, and the newly appointed Dutch secretary, can be trusted to do their best with the cumbrous machinery.

Many thousands of Jews cannot be expected to return to countries where all their nearest relatives have been murdered, their homes destroyed or expropriated, and where anti-Semitism is deep-rooted. Also there are political refugees for whom repatriation may be impossible. Plainly, the smaller allies cannot be expected to do more than repatriate their own nationals; those who could afford generosity are the United States and the British Commonwealth.

The United States, the statement says, has taken in since 1938 some 195,000 immigrants, mostly refugees. But this is less than a third of the number she might have admitted under her immigration laws. As to ourselves, we have taken in some 60,000 refugees since May 1940, and are still admitting some 800 monthly. But nearly all these latter admissions are believed to be men needed for the armed forces or the merchant service and will be repatriable. It seems, therefore, that with the help of our colonies and the Dominions room could be found for substantial numbers somewhere within the vast spaces under British control. Palestine is pledged under the terms of the White Paper to take in some 34,000 more Jews.

Then might not we, together with the United States, give definite assurances to neutral states that we will take in a definite number or proportion of those to whom they give hospitality? In this matter should not nations which are professedly Christian follow the example of Chaucer's priest of whom it was said:

"But Cristes lore, and his apostles twelve
He taughte, and first he folwed it himselve."

Lend-Lease as Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 19, 1944:

LEND-LEASE AS HERO

To date the United States has put something like $20,000,000,000 worth of food, weapons, material, and munitions into the hands of its allies. No one can claim that this contribution, of itself, is responsible for the victory we see approaching. But it is no overstatement, perhaps, to say that victory would not have been possible without it. The battle which took place in the arena of American opinion over enactment of the lend-lease law during the first months of 1941 was certainly one of the decisive battles of this war. For lend-lease provided not only an essential weapon for victory; it provided also the pattern by which victory was to be achieved—the pattern of the United Nations.

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., until lately Lend-Lease Administrator, was responsible in large measure for the efficiency and effectiveness with which this weapon was wielded. Now he has rounded out that achievement by chronicling it in a notable book—Lend-Lease: Weapon for Victory. The record is one in which Americans can take genuine pride. But Mr. Stettinius' book is something more than a recital of accomplishment. It is an exposition of the meaning and potentialities of lend-lease. "Lend-lease operations, as we know them now," he observes, "will some day draw to a close, but we know already that the principle of mutual aid in mutual self-interest that is embodied in the Lend-Lease Act must live on. Today there is more unity of purpose and of action among freedom-loving peoples than ever before. In that unity we can find the strength to build a peaceful world in which freedom and opportunity will be secure for all."

Mr. Stettinius recalls with candor the dark days when France and Belgium fell and the invasion of Britain seemed inevitable—the days before we recognized that the defense of nations fighting the Axis was vital to our own defense. In the year 1939 we produced 2,100 military planes, most of them trainers. We lacked plant capacity to produce much more. The groundwork for the great expansion necessary to arm the United States was laid by British and French orders—and by British cash on the barrel head until that cash was virtually exhausted. In those days we talked in terms of "aid to Britain." If we had not rendered that aid, we should never have been able to meet our own great emergency when it came upon us.

The darkest hour came immediately after Dunkerque. Most of the modern equipment of the British Army had been lost in the great evacuation. President Roosevelt, with decisive imagination and daring, rounded up all the obsolete World War No. 1 weapons in our arsenals—Enfield rifles, 75-millimeter field guns, an assortment of machine guns—and shipped them with dramatic speed across the Atlantic. "Except for the rifles, which are still used by the Home Guard," says Mr. Stettinius, "the arms we sent in June of 1940 were only a stop-gap. But they went to men who almost literally had no arms at all in the most critical hour of Britain's history since the Spanish Armada sailed into the English Channel." If they saved Britain from defeat, it is worth remembering that they saved also the great island base from which our assault as well as their assault upon Hitler's fortress is now developing.

Production for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Donald M. Nelson at a dinner given in his honor on the occa-

sion of the second anniversary of the War Production Board and of his appointment as Chairman, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 17, 1944. It is a very excellent description of the present condition of the production program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to thank my British, Canadian, and American hosts of the Combined Production and Resources Board, my colleagues of the War Production Board, and the distinguished guests who are assembled here, on two counts: First, because of the warm personal friendliness which you have given to this occasion; and, second, because of the great honor which you have done me in allowing me to come here tonight as a symbol of American war industry. For I can accept the wonderful tribute that this gathering represents only on behalf of American industry. What gives the event importance, I feel, is not so much the second anniversary of the War Production Board, as the fact that today marks 2 years of an all-out industrial war effort—2 years of productive achievement which has staggered the imagination of the world.

But in a larger sense, we are celebrating even more than the tremendous total of nearly $120,000,000,000 of war production and war construction turned out by the Nation during the past 2 years. The real cause for celebration is the virility of the free society which was able so swiftly to transform itself from the world's greatest producer of peacetime goods to the world's most formidable military power.

American production under our free-enterprise system has always been famous for its know-how and flexibility. When to these were added the will to win the war, nothing could stop us. Management and labor both showed what no American ever doubted—their ability to do any job that was put before them, once the job was defined and its urgency made clear.

Fortunately for the country, when the crisis came American industrialists were far from being complete novices in war production. Through the years of peace, the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission had been quietly working with limited funds to develop the tools of war and the necessary industrial background. This foundation of experience was of great help when we went on a war footing. For then, overnight, production had to be enormously speeded up. We needed every bit of the knowledge and experience we had. The problems confronting the country were terrific. Each factory had swiftly to produce its particular product in an amount that would tie in with the production of other related factories. All the elements of American industry had to be linked together and to drive forward together.

Nor was it enough merely to have sound production schedules for finished products and component parts and key materials. Behind these were an infinite number of secondary materials which had to be properly programmed and scheduled—chemicals and textiles and little-known minerals, each of which played a vital, if obscure, part in making some essential weapon or piece of equipment. Moreover, we could not plan production, we could not think about machines and materials, without also having to think about manpower and transportation. The entire economy had to be brought into wartime gear, and kept in gear.

That meant there had to be over-all planning and guidance. Recognizing this need, back in 1940, the President created the National Defense Advisory Commission, which in 1941 evolved into the Office of Production Management, and in 1942, just 2 years ago, reached full growth in the War Production Board.

In some ways, I think, the War Production Board is a unique organization. It represents industrial America as does no other body of men I know. Its personnel is drawn not only from management, but from labor, from science, and from Government. The country will probably never realize how many of these men have voluntarily given up established positions in private life in order to throw their energies into the task of winning the war. Many of them, not only here in Washington but in our regional offices, not only in the top staff but in the second, third, and fourth levels of the organization, remain unknown to the public, while quietly doing jobs of tremendous importance. These men, together with former associates who have made a contribution and gone on to other work, have helped to write a thrilling chapter in American history. For through them, the will of the American people has spoken—the will to play a leading part in shaping the kind of world that free men and women want to live in.

In expressing the will of the American people through industrial action, the great problem has always been the same: to keep the economy in balance, under conditions which are constantly changing, and while moving ahead as fast as possible. I have heard this problem referred to as one of "dynamic balance," which I translate as meaning that we have to speed like anything, but stay on the road.

I don't think the importance of this balancing process is generally realized. Americans, by and large, I suspect, judge the work of the War Production Board entirely in terms of the large figures which appear monthly in the press. Certainly, it gives us all a sense of power and pride when we talk about the nearly 134,000 planes which we have produced in the last 2 years, the 27,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping and more than 3,700,000 displacement tons of naval shipping. We take a grim delight in knowing that we have produced 424,000 pieces of artillery and over 1,160,000,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, that we have turned out over 148,000 tanks and other combat vehicles, and over 1,200,000 military trucks. Yet the real measure of the success of war production is not merely that these figures were attained, but that they were attained without destroying the balance of production.

It is not too much to say that the entire success of our civilian war effort has hinged on the balancing of production. Let me explain that. Production had to be kept in balance, first of all, as between military and civilian requirements. At first, prior to Pearl Harbor, there was great resistance to conversion of factories for war production. But Pearl Harbor changed the temper of the country in a single day. Then it became necessary for the War Production Board to prevent people from going to the other extreme.

I can remember only too well the days when the wholesale conversion of civilian plants for military production was taking place. Sharp criticism was leveled against the War Production Board for not enforcing still more drastic cuts in the civilian economy, and great pressure was exerted on us from many quarters to sweep away virtually all civilian production. The thought behind the pressure, of course, was to drive military output even higher.

The fact was, however, that if this counsel had prevailed, our war production, far from increasing, would have fallen off. If the civilian economy had been forced out of balance, today many of our power plants and transportation systems might be unable to operate because of a lack of repair parts. Millions of civilian homes all over the country might be totally disorganized because people could not get materials with which to maintain their houses, heating systems, and plumbing. War plants everywhere might be forced to cut down operations because workers could not find enough automobile parts to keep their cars running. These and similar misfortunes were prevented only by a careful and firmly defended balance in the planning of production. With our right hand we had to guide industry toward ever-higher production goals, while with our left hand we worked to prevent too great a cut in the output of essential civilian goods.

The principle of balance was also applied in dealing with big business and small business. When we first threw ourselves into an all-out war effort, when a great volume of production had to be obtained in the shortest possible time, it was inevitable that the bulk of war contracts should go to the big mass-production concerns and their subcontractors. There were those, 2 years ago, who wanted to use this state of affairs to alter the whole character of American business. They contended that concerns which could not produce in great volume and at low cost had no place in the war economy, and ought, therefore, to be ruthlessly starved out of existence.

But the Government saw that there was no need to sacrifice small business since under proper guidance, it could make an important contribution to war production; and the great majority of the people shared this view. Accordingly, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was called into being by the President and Congress, and became part of the War Production Board. This Corporation has been instrumental in helping thousands of small concerns to find contracts for war goods or essential civilian supplies, together with materials and manpower to carry out the contracts. Today small business plays a significant part in war production. And looking ahead to the time when the industrial trend will be back to civilian production, the War Production Board is already making plans to meet the special problems which will then confront small business.

A balance had to be struck again in working with management and labor. Patriotism was and is a powerful force in both groups, but it was sure to produce stronger collaboration if backed up by mutual understanding, friendly interchange of views, and a clear definition of the job to be done.

From the first, therefore, representatives of labor participated with representatives of management in the high counsels of war production, where their views were welded into a common policy. At the same time, under the sponsorship of W. P. B., labor-management committees were formed in one war plant after another, until today there are more than 3,000 such committees, working hard and finding many ways of increasing production.

The greatest test of the War Production Board, however, came in striking a balance among the thousands of detailed war-production programs. A great number of different products, many of them new and complicated, had to be mass produced at the same time in the face of serious shortages. First, facilities and materials, and later manpower, had to be rationed among all the separate, urgent production programs—an immensely complicated job.

The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, the Administrators for Rubber, Food, and Petroleum, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Office of Civilian Requirements—all these

claimant agencies of W. P. B. press continuously, as they should, for the things they want. Each of their programs is essential. But often their demands conflict. To prevent these conflicting pressures from pushing war production out of balance, our program makers and bottleneck breakers have to be impartial, alert, and ingenious. Especially since the balance of production keeps changing all the time.

Our troops and technical experts are constantly suggesting improvements in the design and construction of weapons and equipment. You may perfect the production of a certain type of airplane today, but tomorrow changed battle conditions or new research may compel you to redesign that plane or may even make it obsolete. Battle experience may also show that smaller or greater quantities of some product are needed than was first supposed. And, of course, as the fighting moves from one climatic zone to another, and from one type of operation to another, production must move with it.

A year ago we were concentrating on production for the fighting in north Africa. As an example, there was a great demand for tank treads, which are rapidly destroyed by the rocks and burning sands of the desert. Now we are thinking less about deserts and more about the coasts of western Europe. In recent months, emphasis has shifted to landing craft, so that our troops can engage in large-scale amphibious warfare.

To permit rapid shifts in emphasis and improvements in design, the entire war-production program, which adds up to the greatest volume of goods ever turned out by American industry, must be kept flexible at all times. The over-all volume continues to rise, but among the thousands of separate programs there are always a number which are being cut down, and are moving against the stream. This must always be so, if production is to accord with changing demand.

The great flexible instrument of American industry is like an organ; we have pulled out all the stops, and we are striking the ever-changing chords of the victory march. And we must be accurate. A big mistake, such as might come from taking an extreme position on any one program, such as might deprive our armed forces of an essential weapon, or our civilian population of an essential food—a mistake of that kind could be disastrous. Naturally, we have made mistakes, but we have always been able to correct them before the damage was large.

Now we are entering a phase of production where, in many respects, balance will be even harder to achieve than in the past. Reserves of certain types of war matériel are already making it possible to close down some war factories. The workers of those factories in most cases will be able quickly to find employment in other war industries, where they are badly needed. Nevertheless, in certain local situations there may be some manpower available, if only temporarily; there will be facilities available, and there will be materials available. Right now pressure is being felt to permit industrial plants to use available resources in making products that our civilian consumers want.

In time, of course, as victory comes closer and war production levels off, the Government will permit more and more civilian goods to be made. But when should we begin? There is the Nation's morale to consider. Some think it unwise to let civilians buy more goods at this time, while our fighting men are risking their lives in action. Others believe that increased civilian production might improve morale and so strengthen the war effort, by reducing the uncertainties of workers and employers in some areas. Then there is the matter of fairness to industry. Should a few concerns be allowed to enter the civilian market while other concerns in the same line of business are still working on war contracts?

To arrive at a balanced judgment on these questions will not be easy, but I can assure you that plans are being crystallized, and we will be ready to act when the time is ripe for action.

I would go so far as to say that from this point on our responsibility to the people will be even heavier than before. When we were plunging into war production, the public forgave us any mistakes we may have made, because their eyes were on the horizons of the war. Now, however, the situation has changed. Although the Nation is heart and soul in the war effort, people are also thinking about the period that will follow. They are looking more closely at affairs at home. From now on, their confidence, as well as their actual welfare, will be increasingly affected by production decisions. A balanced judgment on the problems of reconversion will be essential to the economic and social health of America in the period ahead.

I have seen the policy of continuous balance work with equal success in another and very important area of the War Production Board's activities—in the international area. I refer to the work of the Combined Production and Resources Board, which has so generously honored me tonight. As you know, the United Kingdom, Canada, and America are represented on this Board and it has been my good fortune, as the American representative, to find myself working closely with the British Minister of Production, Mr. Lyttelton, and the Canadian Minister of Supply and Munitions, Mr. Howe.

To my way of thinking, this and certain other combined boards have set an example for the world in solving troublesome problems in a spirit of energetic cooperation. I shall not pretend that there are no economic points of difference between the United Kingdom, Canada, and America. When three great nations deal in thousands of separate transactions, many of huge size, difficult problems are bound to arise. The point is that none of the three parties has any interest in the tactics of squeeze and grab. On the contrary, all strive for fair play and balanced judgment. Each country recognizes that its own best interests are served by the well-being of the others. The result is that every problem, even the most serious, has proved capable of reasonable solution. The agreements which we make with one another are straightforward statements of practical programs which are fully carried out.

Naturally, it is far easier to resolve problems under the stress of mutual peril than in times of peace. Some people, in fact, tell us that when the war ends, cooperation will end with it. This view is not realistic. It is merely cynical.

Our nations have come a long way in the past 2 years. To be sure, after the war the world is obviously going to face problems of widespread poverty, material destruction, financial dislocation, competitive shipping and aviation, and many others. The nations will undoubtedly have to work hard and to exercise good judgment in order to reach workable economic agreements. But who dares say that we are incapable of hard work and good judgment? The experience of the United Kingdom, Canada, and America in war production has taught us new techniques for working out our joint problems, and, I am convinced, is only the first chapter of the story which the future will write of the economic cooperation of the United Nations in peacetime.

In particular, I am confident that the principles which have made American relations with England and Canada such a good omen for the world can operate successfully between us and the Russians in the days to come. I know from what I saw and heard in Russia that the leaders and the people of that great country are anxious to work with us. They know that only world cooperation and enduring peace can produce the rapid internal development of Russia, which is their main concern.

Like ourselves, and like England, the Russians do not need more living space. What they want and what we want is higher living standards. They are not competitors for world markets. They are interested primarily in the Russian market, and in exchanges of goods which can help to develop that market. In my talks with Marshal Stalin, Mr. Molotov, and other members of the Soviet Government, I found a rugged realism and self-respecting forthrightness which convinced me that we can do business with Russia, to our benefit, to Russia's benefit, and to the lasting benefit of the world.

I do not pretend to have any special insight into the large political issues of our time. But all the evidence I have seen convinces me that once we have destroyed the threat of international fascism, the great powers for the first time in human experience will be in a position to lay the foundations of the protected peace, of the security, and the freedom for which our peoples yearn. Democracy, as practiced in the parliamentary tradition of England and the United States, and in the economy of Soviet Russia, is essentially a peaceful way of life. And since we three great industrial powers combine a preference for peace with a proven superiority in war, we are, I think, on the way to discourage the little Hitlers and Mussolinis who may rise up elsewhere in the churn of future events.

But we must remember that the Hitler psychology is not confined to foreign nations. We run into it, all too often, here at home. And if we are to have peace, both abroad and within our own borders, we must learn to recognize this dangerous state of mind. In my experience, the invariable sign of the Hitler mind is the way it distorts and ignores facts, and shrilly insists on having its own way at any cost to the people.

I am thinking of some men who call themselves Americans, but who in their intolerant hearts hate freedom and democracy and everything America stands for. Like all Fascists, they want to ride roughshod over their opponents. They know that democracy depends on a working balance among many forces, and so they want to destroy that balance, as a first step toward seizing power for themselves and their satellites.

Then there are other men, too many of them, who while not Fascists themselves, yet play into the hands of the would-be Hitlers, by helping to destroy the country's unity and the democratic balance. These are the men who make up our pressure groups, who seek to make big profits out of the war, or who produce our wartime strikes—men in any class who would recklessly gamble with the Nation's future, in order to gain some petty, temporary advantage for themselves.

To my way of thinking the psycopathic Hitler worshipers and the foolish men who give them aid are asking for trouble, and if they persist, will assuredly get it.

By and large, we are a patient people and slow to wrath. But we are also a dangerous people when aroused. And if Americans become aware that small groups of self-seekers are trying to exploit their country and destroy their freedom, a day of heavy reckoning will come for the self-seekers.

I, for one, have had my faith in the fundamental good sense of Americans reinforced by my experience in war production. The great bulk of the people, industrial workers, white-collar workers, professional workers, farmers, employers—in every class, the large majority have been essentially loyal, hard-working, and

cooperative in getting this war won. As the President pointed out in his message to Congress last week, certain sectors of the home front have deteriorated in recent months, notably in Washington, where the pressure groups are most active. But he gave us no reason to think that the attitude of the man-in-the-street has deteriorated. On the contrary, I venture to say that psychologically the plain people of America are getting deeper into the war all the time.

In the first year of the war, I was startled by a public-opinion poll which showed that nearly a third of the people were in favor of a negotiated peace with Germany if the German Army overthrew Hitler. Recently, however, a similar poll revealed that even if Germany got rid of the Nazis and gave up all her conquered lands, three Americans out of four would insist on absolute surrender by the German Army. In my judgment, that shows a great advance in realistic thinking. Surely it is a far cry from any deterioration in popular opinion about the war.

Again, not long ago my attention was called to a poll which showed that 44 percent of the people think that the Government has not gone far enough in asking them to make sacrifices for the war, as against only 8 percent who think that it has gone too far.

No, wherever the home front may have deteriorated, it is not in the minds of the great majority of the people. They have learned that liberty is not just something you inherit, but something you have to fight to keep. And they are willing, anxious to fight for it. The people are becoming steadily better prepared, I believe, for the harsh realities of war. I have yet to talk to an American who does not realize it may well be a considerable time before Germany collapses, and perhaps a matter of years before Japan is crushed. I have yet to find one who is not grimly aware of the pain and tragedy which the war is bound to bring to many an American family.

The people are prepared to work hard and long, and to give up much, in order to win this war. At the same time they are remarkably free from Pollyanna ideas about the future. They know that war disorganizes any society. They know that it promotes certain types of crime and delinquency. They know that the millions of young men in the Army will have a serious problem of readjustment when they return. They know we may be in for a period of acute uneasiness before a healthy post-war society can be firmly established.

But they have faith in their country—the country that Lincoln called "the last, best hope of earth"—and we who share in their Government must have faith in them. We need to remember, all the time, that our airplanes and our tanks, our guns, and our marching men—these are only expressions of the people's will to be strong and free. Although Americans, as a whole, may be sometimes distracted or confused by unforeseen events, in a crisis you will find them where they have almost always been—striding ahead, positive and purposeful, keeping their balance, unwilling to sacrifice big, enduring values for temporary, surface gains.

We men of Washington have the obligation to reflect this historical American attitude in our own work. It is up to us to preserve a calm and steadfast and dispassionate judgment, regardless of the pressures that may be turned against us. Even now, when our hearts are set on a smashing victory in this war, we are able to make the greatest speed by preserving the democratic balance. And I deeply feel that after winning the victory we shall go steadily on, with our democratic spirit stronger than ever, to amaze the world by our achievements in peace.

Address of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, Before National Food and Vegetable Growers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made before the National Food and Vegetable Growers' Association, at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on January 18, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Despite all of the speculation over an early peace and all of the false optimism that has been engendered by the almost unbroken series of Allied victories for the past year, utter and complete concentration on the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment is the most important job that has ever faced America. There should be no discussion of post-war problems that does not make clear the fact that we still have a long, hard road to travel; that does not make clear that post-war planning and post-war thinking must be subordinate to the immediate job at hand. Post-war planning must not detract from the war effort. It must not do anything that will delay the winning of the war.

I do not believe that this point can be overemphasized, for when we take chances on delaying the ultimate victory, we are taking chances with the lives of American boys—the most precious possession we have.

But, with this point properly emphasized and properly borne in mind, I feel that we cannot overemphasize the necessity of a blueprint for a post-war America. I say blueprint because in many cases the planning cannot go past the blueprint stage without interfering with the war effort, but to the extent that they do not interfere with that effort, America's post-war plans should be matured with an absolute minimum of delay. This is true whether the war is to last 1 year or 2 years or 3 years, for the impact upon the American economy of the transition from war to peace will be so severe that if plans have to be matured after the war ends, the consequences will be second only to losing the war.

The transformation of the American economy from peace to war is probably the greatest transformation that was ever accomplished by any people in a space of 2 years. Everything that business and labor and agriculture does today is inextricably tied in with the necessities of war. Production for war has lifted our employment to a level higher than we ever thought possible. It has caused factories that were our greatest source of peacetime employment to completely change their products, with a shifting of machinery that will make reconversion to peacetime production a colossal task. We have put billions of dollars into new plants that employ millions of people. We have accumulated stock piles of materials that equal in value the normal annual income of this country.

This war may and probably will end in two steps—the first, the defeat of Germany, and the second, the defeat of Japan, but this will make our problem differ only in degree—a degree that no one can exactly foresee. It is possible that it may complicate the problem more than it will simplify it, because of the shifting emphasis on the materials needed.

The Army and Navy are now responsible for approximately a million and a half prime and sub contracts that are taking a large part of the production of probably 75,000 factories. Today, as one contract is canceled, another generally takes its place, but some day that vast number of contracts will be canceled and there will be no Government contracts to replace them.

A large percentage of the factories making Government goods have their entire working capital and more tied up in the huge inventories they are having to carry and in their receivables against the Government. Most of them have expanded pay rolls. None of them know or can know when the shifting tides of war may cause the cancelation of their contracts. Most of them do not know what they are going to do with their inventories when that time comes. They do not know what they will do with the machinery that they have had to install. Some of it belongs to them and some of it belongs to the Government. Until they know these things and until they can get the money they have tied up in them, they cannot know what they are going to do with their workers.

Certainly, all of us want the job done so that the American system of private enterprise will retain all of its vigor and all of its ability to go forward and make America greater and greater. All of us want the Government to have as little hand as possible in the support of our economy. Above all, we want to avoid the necessity of made work. Some pseudo-economist made the statement that it would be perfectly simple to employ everyone in America if we put half the people to digging holes and the other half to filling them up, but it is my sincere hope that whatever money the Government spends in the period of transition from war to peace may be spent for permanent improvements that will add to the enduring happiness and prosperity of this country.

Our goal must be the full employment of employable workers on useful jobs. We are employing today some 8,000,000 more people than we have ever employed before. Many of those 8,000,000 people will want to continue in employment. In addition, we have 10,000,000 American soldiers and sailors. Some of them will return to college. Some of them will stay in the service, but most of them must be employed. Our goal is, of necessity, set high.

If we are going to attempt to reach that goal within any period that we can tolerate, the plans for doing so must be started now.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, I have heard related the problems of government, of business, of labor, and of agriculture. We have had before us the leaders of all these branches, who have told us of their problems and their hopes.

Some idea of the magnitude of the problem may be had by a comparison with the problem in World War No. 1. At the end of that war, 32,000 contracts, totaling $6,000,000,000, were canceled. Already the Army has canceled contracts totaling $8,000,000,000, and when the war ends, contracts and subcontracts 50 times the number of those canceled in World War No. 1 will have to be canceled. Their total dollar value will be 10 to 15 times greater. The settlement of the contracts canceled following the last war took years. Surplus materials to be disposed of at the end of the last war were worth $5,000,000,000. Those to be disposed of at the end of this war probably will be worth 15 times that much.

Just as this war is many times more complicated than the last one—just as it takes better planning and better training—so will the adjustment to peace be more complicated and will require better planning and better training for the men that are to handle it.

These problems vary greatly among industries. The aircraft industry has expanded 60 times since the war started. It could make many more peacetime planes than the 9,000 war planes it is now making monthly. It knows that many of its great factories will shut down. It is an industry of small capital resources. It is greatly concerned about getting its canceled contracts settled quickly, so that it will have the money to run those factories it does not shut down. It wants to know what the Government is going to do with those plants that are shut down.

The automobile industry, on the other hand, is most concerned about getting Government-owned machinery and inventories out of its plants, so it can get its own machinery back in and start making automobiles.

Some manufacturers have comparatively small problems of reconversion, but are terribly concerned over the huge stocks of goods they make that are in the Government's hands. They cannot make plans for full employment until they know those goods are not going to be dumped on the market.

The distributing trades cannot make their plans for employment until they know how and when their shelves can be filled with goods.

Local groups concerned with housing cannot make any plans until they know whether the factories located near them are going to operate. Road builders cannot know where roads should be located to best absorb unemployment.

The War and Navy Departments are staggered by the immensity of the mere mechanics of settling canceled contracts. They are all impressed with the absolute necessity of doing this speedily and fairly. They all know that American industry cannot function until it is done. They know that if American industry does not function, the problem of unemployment will be gigantic. They all realize that to dump upon American markets the huge volume of surplus commodities that the Government will own at the end of this war can so disrupt the economy that we might not recover from it in a generation. They all realize that unless goods that are now scarce are gotten into the markets speedily, that we face the threat of disastrous inflation. They realize the necessity of clearing Government inventories and Government machinery from privately owned plants with the absolute minimum of delay. They realize the necessity of getting every Government-built plant that is capable of making commercial goods on an economically sound basis, operating on those goods. They recognize the necessity of a sound public-works program to cushion the inevitable shock of reconversion.

But the realization of these problems is not enough. If we come up to peace with only this realization, we face catastrophe.

In 2 years of war we have not succeeded in getting a complete coordination of our plans under a war economy. We must be prepared to have that coordination under a peace economy immediately upon the end of the war. We cannot get it without combined effort. The groups that have these problems and recognize these problems cannot solve them singly. Some one agency must have the power to bring them together and to get their combined ideas and to lay down the over-all policies under which it shall be determined what inventories are to be stock-piled and where, what Government plants are to continue to operate, what goods are to be sold quickly, and what goods are to be fed slowly into the markets to prevent the shutting down of factories, where public works are to be located to counteract local loss of employment due to the shutting down of Government plants, what goods have no economic use and should be salvaged for scrap, and myriad other questions that have to be tied in together to prevent economic chaos.

This cannot be done by setting up another administrative bureau. Certainly we have enough of those to do the Government's part of the administrative job, whatever that may be. I believe that what we must have is a policy commission, composed of the best brains that this country can produce—a commission that will command the respect of Government and business and labor and agriculture—that concerns itself only with policy and stays far enough away from the administrative problems to be able to see the broad horizons—that can seek and command the unselfish advice of groups intimately familiar with all the problems that will confront it—with policymaking powers so great that it can enforce its judgment and its rules on every other agency of Government to the extent necessary to make them function as a cohesive whole.

Such a commission should be appointed now, for the job it has to do is so important and so difficult that it cannot have too much time to plan it. We all hope and pray that another year may see the end of this terrible war, but we all realize that it may continue far beyond a year. If it should end within a year, the time left for preparing for the transition is altogether too short. No time that it may conceivably last is too long. Just one example. A road-building program probably would do more than any other one thing to take up the slack in employment during the reconversion period. The need for the program for this purpose will be greatest in the first 6 months following the war. But unless projects are determined upon, plans are drawn, rights-of-way are obtained, and contracts are ready to be let, probably not a yard of concrete could be poured for 12 months after the war ends. By the end of that time such a program might be so inflationary that it would be unwise to start it. Certainly it would have failed to help in the reconversion period.

I think I can say to you that the Congress is determined that it shall lay down the broad general principles under which such a commission would function. It has no intention of creating such a group with such vast powers without a congressional chart and compass. It does not intend to impose another superbureau on the American people. But I think I can tell you also that the more thoughtful Members of Congress are terribly disturbed over the possibility of the job not being done in time and the lack of machinery to integrate it, and are determined that we will not come to the end of this war, as we did to the end of the last, without some matured plans for cushioning the shock.

I have so far talked only of our domestic problems. Whether we like it or not, for a while America must contribute much to the rest of a war-torn world. Populations whose fields have been devastated by war must be fed and clothed at least until they can raise their own crops and start their own factories. How this is to be done and how it is to be paid for are subjects that could cover another talk of this length.

It is my understanding that this association handles approximately three-fourths of all the fresh fruits and vegetables that are commercially marketed in America. Naturally, you are vitally interested in what policy is going to be followed with reference to disposal of surpluses of all kinds, but particularly of food surpluses. The Army and Navy will have huge amounts of canned and dehydrated foods when the war ends. These will not have an effect upon the market until demobilization starts and many of them will be used by the Army during the demobilization period. There is no way of knowing at the moment how many of them will have to find their way into other hands but I do not contemplate any serious problem, so far as the domestic economy is concerned, with reference to those goods. Certainly, for one planting season and probably for longer, our allies are going to have to depend on America for food. The same thing will be true of clothing and other necessities of life. There is no better way of obtaining the things that must be sent abroad than to take them from surplus Army stores, wherever they are available in those stores. I am assuming that there will be no surplus of fresh fruits and vegetables in the hands of the Army that will carry past the demobilization period and that the marketing of fresh vegetables will be one of the simpler of our surplus-property problems, provided we can solve the problem of unemployment so that a market will exist for your product. The close tie-in between commercial employment and the farmer and the marketer of the farmer's products as clearly as anything else indicates the imperative necessity of doing this job right and promptly.

I think you will also be interested in what I believe to be the post-war committee's general thinking with reference to the disposal of all surpluses. They realize that the individual problems of the different industries vary so greatly that it is impossible for them to lay down detailed rules under which surpluses shall be marketed, but I believe that they are committed to the philosophy that huge surpluses in the hands of the Government shall not be permitted to disrupt the domestic economy and close down factories that would give much-needed employment. At the same time, they feel that the economic value of these commodities should not be lost, where it is possible to save it, but I think they are committed to the proposition that full employment of every employable worker must be our paramount post-war consideration, and they would not hesitate to recommend the destruction of inventories that would have a sufficiently adverse effect upon employment. In a tentative draft of a report on the subject, made for the committee, the statement is made, "The problem of marketing these inventories so as to secure their greatest economic use and at the same time not disrupt the economy will tax the best minds in America." To that statement I subscribe whole-heartedly and promise you that it will be the aim of the Congress to see that the best minds in America are put to work on the problem at the earliest possible moment.

I have not touched on the future of world aviation and on the disposition of air fields that we have built all over the world. That presents a vast field of thought all its own.

All of our foreign problems are so great that they challenge the thought of the world. Ultimately their settlement will impinge upon our domestic economy to an extent we never before dreamed possible, but they are not so intimately connected with the immediate transition of America from war to peace. That problem cannot wait on the international accords that will be necessary to chart our course in a post-war world. From a long-range view, as distinguished from the transition period, the proper charting of such a course will bear hugely upon the economic destiny of America. I think this war has taught us that we can never again ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" I hope we never will.

I repeat the statement that I made at the beginning of this talk. We are in an all-out war, and nothing must interfere with the winning of it. Thought of post-war plans

and work on post-war plans need not do so. Consideration of them need be no indication of false optimism, and it behooves every organization of business, trade, labor, and agriculture to set up machinery through which they can coordinate their thinking with the policy board of which I spoke, so that the rules that come out of that board may represent the best thought of America.

Yes, my friends, it behooves every organization and every wide-awake American to also be thinking about the kind of a peace that shall be written in the days to come. Under no circumstances must it be a negotiated peace. There must never be any variation from the terms of unconditional surrender. These gigantic problems that we face might have been all avoided had we not turned down the League of Nations 25 years ago. The war is costing us in 1 day enough to have kept our part of the League of Nations going for perhaps 1 to 5 years. When will we learn that if we are going to preserve democracy and our way of life that we must keep a police force on guard over the militaristic nations all of the time? It is cheaper to maintain a constabulary than call out a posse of citizens every time a gang of bandits start terrorizing the community.

Democracies by their very nature move slowly. Dictators always get the jump on the big, kind, orderly, peace-loving democracies. It is time that we place our house in order so that we will not be put in mortal jeopardy every 25 years by power-drunk tyrants.

Cloudy thinkers, reactionary thinkers, I-hate-Roosevelt thinkers, all flutter around like panic-stricken chickens these days cackling about the dangers of international cooperation after the war.

Danger?

What do they think we're in now?

We, as a nation, have tried the game of isolation and it has gotten us into two world wars.

Let us have horse sense this time. Let us use that greatest of modern inventions, the airplane, to outlaw war. Let us join with the democracies of the world and those other nations whose self-interest it is to side with the democracies and set up an air patrol that will stamp out war before it ever starts.

Let us be fair about it. Both political parties had leaders who saw the true destiny of America in 1918—great men who saw the League of Nations was the way toward salvation but they allowed rabble rousers and false prophets to out-talk them. Great leaders in both parties stood by Woodrow Wilson; small leaders in both parties stood against Woodrow Wilson.

Today as we approach another crucial hour when the outbreak of peace will arrive, we must make our program so unified, so fair, so clear-headed, so frank and honest and sensible, that Americans without thought will accept it as the national program of salvation for the future of this country and the world.

Jackson Day Dinner Address of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, a Jackson Day dinner was held by the Democrats of Sangamon County, Ill. People from all over the State of Illinois were present. The crowd was so large that it could not be accommodated. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] delivered a notable address on Andrew Jackson and current political matters. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is not the first time I have been privileged to make an address at your Jackson Day dinner. Indeed, this occasion stirs our memories. I recall that only a short while ago one of Illinois' great and distinguished sons stood here by my side as the champion of honest, efficient, and progressive government. I speak, of course, of the late Gov. Henry Horner, who in death, as in life, belongs to Illinois. Search the history of this or any other State as diligently as we may, and we shall never find trace of a man more devoted, more conscientious, more self-denying in the service of the people than was this great and good man. Would to God that Henry Horner were alive today, leading the onward march in the crucial campaign to come.

Tonight, as I look around this banquet hall, I see leading and influential Democrats from every part of our State, men and women who have in the past represented different political factions in our party, but who today are united and harmonious as we gird our loins for the political battles to come.

If the Democratic Party in Illinois will permit the spirit of Andrew Jackson to dominate its course in the coming campaign, there will be no question about our success. We have harmony. We have unison. What we need do now is to become militant and vocal, presenting honestly and fearlessly to the people of Illinois the records as we find them.

Today America stands at the crossroads, fighting for her very existence against a tyranny and despotism that threatens the entire world. Because of this global war that threatens our very lifeblood, we of the Democratic Party have studiously refrained from indulging in political skirmishes and discussions. Our chief concern has been getting on with the war. Despite the fact that we are faced with a political year, utter and complete concentration on winning the war at the earliest possible moment is the most important job that ever faced America. However, the primary in Illinois will soon be with us. The leaders of the Republican Party have been busy for months. So from this day on it becomes necessary as a matter of political protection for Democrats everywhere to remove their cloak of forbearance and start with a vengeance to organize in every precinct and county, to the end that Democratic men and women shall be in a position to answer the political prejudice and deceptive assaults that will be made upon this administration. Courageous and active service in this political field will bring us a complete victory in Illinois and the Nation in the most crucial and trying period this Nation has ever experienced.

How appropriate, indeed, for men and women of the Democratic and independent faith to come to the city of Springfield, the State capital, the home and burial place of Abraham Lincoln, to remember with reverence the accomplishments and deeds of Andrew Jackson. Andrew Jackson lived in another day, but the issues he faced in domestic and military matters, while solely confined to the Nation, were not wholly unlike the great problems which we face today. You will recall that "Old Hickory" had an uninterrupted course of victory in the face of criticism and attacks. As a soldier, his eclipse and defeat were the constant theme of his enemy. As President, they predicted ruin by his fights against nullification of the Biddle Bank and the admission of Texas to the Union, and a score of other controversies.

Notwithstanding the disunity and the fear of the American people at that hour, Andrew Jackson emerged from all of these selfish and partisan battles as a popular hero, who recognized what was right and patriotic, and was not afraid of the verdict of the public on his unyielding Americanism.

In that desperate political struggle the opposition said they could win with anyone, but the opposition, as usual, had not reckoned with the adversity and seriousness of the times. When the votes were counted it was found that the calm and studied judgment of the American people had prevailed, because Andrew Jackson was reelected.

In the War between the States the people again saw national unity broken asunder. In those critical days Illinois produced the immortal Abraham Lincoln, who after years of bloody war saw his theories and philosophies of government become the policy of the Nation. He, like Andrew Jackson, was bitterly assailed by his opponents. Many in his own party condemned him upon the least provocation. He was called a warmonger, a gorilla, a tyrant, a gawk, an ignorant backwoodsman. He had bungled the war effort. He had misguided the home front. He had ignored the military tacticians. The same charges of dictatorship we hear today were hurled at him as he was compelled in that war emergency to take the necessary and drastic steps in curbing certain activities on the home front.

In the congressional elections of 1862, the Lincoln forces, as a result of his war and domestic policies, lost many Senators and Congressmen. Civil war had disturbed the normal life of the Nation. The people back home were critical. Those opposed to Lincoln said they could win with anyone. However, when 2 years rolled by and the Nation was still at war, the calm, collected, and studied judgment of the people again prevailed. They did not swap horses in the middle of the stream, and Abraham Lincoln, the first and last Republican President that leaders of the Republican Party today point to with pride, was reelected President of these United States.

After Lincoln was assassinated, the Nation floundered. We had lost the man who had been our leader in the bitter and crucible experiences of war. We had lost the man who could, with malice toward none and charity for all, bind up the Nation's wounds.

Vice President Andrew Johnson was a good man, but his total inexperience in national affairs made him a tragic failure as President in carrying out the unconditional terms of surrender agreed upon at Appomattox. He was totally ignorant of the social, military, and economic conditions that faced a Nation which had been at war for 4 years. He was utterly unfit to cope with the great problems that appeared in the post-war era.

Everyone familiar with history knows of the tragic era in the reconstruction period. Everyone knows that when Lincoln died the South and the North lost their best friend. Yes, if the Confederate Army had not been worn to shreds through 4 years of long and bloody war, a second Civil War could not have been avoided under the Presidency of Johnson.

Another crisis is upon us, one that makes the trials of yesterday seem small indeed compared with what we face today. The barbaric Jap and the brutal Nazi seek to enslave the world. Only the unbiased pen of the future historian will tell how close we were to defeat on December 7, 1941. With a little more boldness and daring, Japan could have taken Hawaii. Hitler could have taken England. Had those military plans been carried out, I shudder to think where we might be fighting at this very moment.

Under those conditions, I seriously doubt that there would be any complaint about the rationing of gasoline and sugar. With war on our own soil, there would be no grumblings over wages and price restrictions; no struggle in the Congress of the United States over little things.

My friends, I would be the last one to say that mistakes and blunders have not been made in a global war that staggers the imagination in cost and production. Many complaints that come across my desk are justified. It is through honest complaints and honest criticism made by unselfish patriotic people, regardless of political affiliations, that help solve the gargantuan problems of administration created by this all-out war. This group of great Americans promotes unity with such criticism. This group is shortening the war, but I regret to say there is a noisy minority group in this country who do nothing but gripe and complain over little things for selfish and political reasons.

There are other people in this country, and I have talked with some of them personally, who hate Roosevelt like those who hated Lincoln and Jackson in another day. Regardless of what happens, they don't like it.

This group is powerful. They would stop at nothing to defeat the present administration, regardless of the monumental task presented by the present world crisis. This is the group that would vote for anyone against Roosevelt. They will stop at nothing. They feed upon partisan hate. Then again, the leaders of the Republican Party will continue to talk of trends. They will use every adroit method to exploit politically the farmer, the laborer, the businessman, using the honest mistakes made by this administration to attempt to accomplish that end. Today they are trying to excite and prejudice various racial groups in the face of real embarrassment for some of our allies in this war. They say they will retain General Marshall and Admiral King and other military and naval men, but some of those same leaders have no hesitancy in condemning the way the war is now being waged in the Pacific, the strategy for which is absolutely controlled by General Marshall and Admiral King. The Republican Party at this hour is under the control of little men like Harrison Spangler, chairman of the National Republican Committee, a reactionary and bungler, who is living in the dead limbo of the past. Those leaders have high hopes for a return of government to the good old days of Hoover and Harding.

My friends, the boasts of the leaders of the Republican Party of what they are going to do with us next November do not alarm me. There has not been an election since 1932 that they did not have won—until the votes were counted. In 1932 they had Mr. Hoover reelected on the theory that prosperity was just around the corner. In 1936 they had Governor Landon in the White House, claiming that they would carry every State north of the Ohio River. In 1940 they had Wendell Willkie, barefoot boy of Wall Street, winning by a landslide until the returns came in.

However, I do not underestimate the challenge that is before us. We know of the millions upon millions of dollars that will be thrown into the Republican campaign chest. The villifications, the falsehoods, the political buffoonery that is now and will be leveled at this administration will surpass what happened to Lincoln in his campaign of 1864. But with it all, I have faith in the sanity and the conscience of the American people as we pilot the old Ship of State through the most devastating storm of our national existence. Solid, substantial thinking, independent Americans will give the utmost heed and consideration to the issues of war and peace which by their very nature will overshadow the irritating, domestic issues at home. The American people in this crisis will follow the old adage of the sea, which says "Never drop the pilot in the storm." That means, my friends, the American people will demand the nomination and the election of a man who knows more about this weary old world, who knows more about the leaders of the world, who knows more about how to protect America and her fighting boys now and in the days to come than any single living American. That man is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I do not know, and I do not believe Franklin D. Roosevelt knows, whether or not he will be a candidate for reelection. I appreciate the difficult decision he must make, and if he does become a candidate it will be activated solely by a sense of duty when he balances the scales between shedding the vast burden of responsibility and resting from arduous labors that have been his, or bowing to the ever-increasing obligations to go on with it.

In 1940 he shattered a third-term precedent solely because the majority of the people believed him to be the best man for the job. Is there anyone who believes that the Japs would not have struck us had Wendell Willkie been elected in 1940? Is there anyone who believes that Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy would not have declared war on us if Willkie had been elected in 1940? Do businessmen, farmers, and laborers believe that their conditions would have been any better had Mr. Willkie been elected in 1940? No, my friends, when I see some of the moves made to stop Willkie in the 1944 campaign by many of those who were for him in 1940, I am confident that most of those Republicans are happy in the thought that Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected.

And now in 1944 we are in the midst of the most terrible war in history, with its inevitable sequel of a peace and post-war problems in which is involved not only the future of our country, but the fate of civilization itself. One of the great social and economic problems before us all is adequate legislation and jobs for the returning soldiers, sailors, and marines.

During the next 2 years, eleven million fighting men and women will be returning to their homes. President Roosevelt has repeatedly asked Congress to pass legislation to give those defending liberty a program of hospitalization, mustering-out pay, unemployment insurance, education, employment, home-and-farm aid, all of which is found in the American Legion bill recently introduced in the United States Senate by Senator BENNETT CLARK, myself, and other United States Senators.

The President is also interested in a fundamental principle of representative government involving the right of a soldier to cast a ballot. He stands four-square for the principles inaugurated in the Lucas-Green bill which provides for a uniform Federal ballot for soldiers, sailors and marines wherever they may be training or fighting. That bill, my friends, once defeated by a narrow margin, will ultimately pass the United States Senate. Those who say that the soldiers overseas will have a real opportunity to vote under the 48 different voting procedures by the 48 different States are either totally ignorant of the complicated administrative problems or they are wilfully deceiving the American people.

Some Republican leaders of Illinois and the North throw up their hands in holy horror and with tearful voices they cry, "We are violating the Constitution in attempting to give the soldiers a Federal ballot." My answer to that is—Tell that to the Marines at Tarawa. Tell that to the one-armed soldier in Italy. Tell that to the Illinois boy now convalescing in a hospital in the South Pacific who lost a leg at Guadalcanal. Tell that to the tearful mother as she anxiously awaits her boys' return.

If Congress can declare war, if Congress can conscript men from every State for war, if Uncle Sam can send these boys to every part of the globe, then that same Congress must find a way under the Constitution to give them the right of suffrage. That will happen if the Lucas-Green bill becomes the law.

My friends, the Republican leaders are fooling no one with their legalistic prattles about the Constitution. The American people are far ahead of those who make that smoke-screen argument.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that the Constitution is a continuing instrument of government. It was not written for any special class or political group to use as a cloak to hide their real purpose.

My fellow Americans, the uniform Federal ballot is right; it is just; it is the only ballot that can reach all of our fighting men and women. It must prevail. It will prevail because public opinion is aroused. Public opinion will not rest until this wrong is righted.

And when that Federal ballot of the Illinois soldier is marked and returned, it will come, under the provisions of the Lucas-Green bill, to the secretary of state. Let it be understood that he has nothing to do with the counting or canvassing of the ballots. He merely segregates them and sends them on to the election officers in the county where the soldier resides.

Thank God, we have a secretary of state in Illinois who is a real friend of the soldier. We know he will cooperate with the Federal Government. We know that he will cooperate with the soldier. He will not hide behind the Constitution in doing his duty to the men and women bleeding and dying for the cause of liberty. That man is Edward J. Hughes, the most efficient and popular secretary of state that Illinois ever produced. Ed Hughes will send these ballots immediately to the local election officials, and do not let anyone tell you that these local officials will refuse to count a soldier's ballot because of some political constitutional opinion. If they want to incite a riot, let them refuse to count those ballots.

Let me make my position clear with regard to this legislation. I repeat what I have said before. If a boy can stop a bullet, he ought to have the ballot. The right of franchise is the God-given right of every citizen under the Constitution wherever he may be. That the members of the armed forces have a real opportunity to exercise that right is all I have ever advocated. Regardless of whether the sentiment of the armed forces is Democratic or Republican, I shall never waiver in my devotion to the objective found in the Lucas-Green bill.

I shall not violate Army regulations by asking some of my many officer friends throughout the world to take a poll of the service men and women in their outfits. I shall leave that nefarious practice to Mr. Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Regardless of how these men vote, they must have an opportunity to cast a ballot in the most important Presidential election since Abraham Lincoln was elected in 1864. Whoever is elected this year will mold and fashion the policies of this Nation for the next 50 years to come.

With that as a premise, it is well that we analyze briefly the outstanding Republican candidates as we find them today.

I think it appropriate to mention Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a great soldier and a great commander, but I doubt that anybody except those who figured that the prestige of a war hero might make him an adequate opponent for Roosevelt would believe that General MacArthur would desert his martial

post. His heart's desire is to lead his soldiers back to the Philippines and ultimately lead his men down the streets of Manila and the streets of Tokyo.

Let me repeat what some prominent Republicans have said about the remaining prospective candidates. The papers say Governor Dewey, of New York, who is not a candidate, has the lead. Governor Dewey has made one startling statement, and one only that I can remember, about our foreign policy. He boldly advocates a military alliance with England. Immediately Col. Robert McCormick, owner of the Chicago Tribune and leader of the Republican Party in Illinois, said in an editorial September 7, 1943, entitled "Governor Dewey Goes Anti-American": "The Governor is a tragic example of a man who was not quite big enough to rise above his immediate environment. The voters have no recourse but to repudiate him as a deserter."

Next we find Wendell Willkie, the ex-Democrat who became the Republicans' handpicked candidate in 1940. Col. Robert McCormick has repeatedly read Wendell Willkie out of the party. Willkie will best be remembered by his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, when he made the statement that whatever he said while seeking votes for the highest office within the gift of the American people was merely campaign oratory.

Then there is Governor Bricker, of Ohio, who is geographically available, as was Warren G. Harding in 1920, but whose other qualifications for the big job have not been conspicuous. It was William Allen White, one of the truly great Republicans of this Nation, who said this about Bricker, "Surely the Republican Party cannot be so craven that it would conspire to sneak into victory with no issue but Bricker and a bellyache. Bricker is an honest Harding. Thumbs down."

Then again, there is Alf Landon, defeated Republican candidate for President in 1936. He is busy as a beaver traveling over the country. Some United States Senators say that Landon is the real dark horse. Last week he was described by Republican Governor Wills, of Vermont, as "one of those 4-year political locusts who hates Wendell Willkie, the outstanding Republican of our times."

Let it be remembered that those responsible for dropping these rebellious acorns in the Republican ranks are keymen of the Republican Party. It is obvious that they are as far apart as the poles. All are leading with their chins. None has a defense. You can readily see that the fur is going to fly before anyone is selected as the Republican standard bearer for 1944.

If perchance, Dewey, Willkie, Bricker, or Landon should be elected President of the United States, how long do you think it would take the successful one, as Commander in Chief, to learn all the military and naval strategy of this world-wide war? Will he advocate changes in the battle and naval zones? How long would it take him to trace the happy and harmonious steps that Roosevelt and this administration have taken with Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek in winning the war at the earliest possible time?

Let it be remembered that a change in the party that is administering the war effort would not be confined to just another figure in the White House. Out would go the Cabinet and those others high in authority who have been studying and preparing for the great problems of war and peace. The wheels of progress in this great war effort would stand still. And yet with these naked truths staring the American people in the face, a Republican spokesman in last week's Chicago meeting had the audacity to tell the people of this Nation that a Republican victory in November will speed up the winning of the war and an earlier return of the fighting men to their homes.

That is pure political poppycock, unless the Republican leaders responsible for that statement have in mind a negotiated peace—a peace that would be the harbinger of world war No. 3 within 20 years to come.

My friends, that cannot happen. War must be outlawed. The American people will not be deceived by cloudy thinkers, reactionary thinkers, political thinkers, "I hate Roosevelt" thinkers. These men flutter around like panic-stricken chickens these days, cackling about the dangers of international cooperation after the war.

Danger! What do you think that we are in now?

We have tried isolationism twice, and it has gotten us into two world wars. We can't stand another. Civilization will collapse if the third world war comes.

My fellow Americans, that would be the sentiment of Andrew Jackson if he were alive and active today. He would be crusading for the preservation of the Union through international cooperation. With all his strength and force, with all his power and persuasion, he would ask the American people to stand back of the Commander in Chief in the winning of the war and in the winning of the peace.

Mustering-Out Pay for Servicemen

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House passed the mustering-out-pay bill while I am not satisfied with the small amount and other provisions of the bill. But any mustering-out-pay bill is better than none. I know that the bill, as passed, will not meet with those veterans' approval who were discharged because they were over 38 years of age. You say that they requested the discharge, but that is not entirely accurate. Many of them made the application at the suggestion and urgent request of the Army officers. It was suggested to them that they ask for the discharge in order to help the war effort. To give these veterans the cold shoulder now does not do justice to this Congress.

I am also sorry that the maximum was not raised from $300 to $700 to be paid in monthly installments, the amount depending upon length of service. If Congress prefers to handle this matter by giving crumbs as it is forced to, that, of course, is its privilege. But let me assure you that before we get through with the veterans of World War No. 2 we will find that we will not be able to again treat them in the same manner as we treated the veterans of World War No. 1. This for the reason that there are too many of them and they are going to have something to say about the Government whose armed forces they served.

At the end of this war we will have created a national indebtedness of over $300,000,000,000. It will have cost us over $400,000,000,000. One hundred billion will undoubtedly be taken care of by taxation. Billions of this amount has been recklessly wasted and squandered. The veterans will not share the responsibility of the way that $400,000,000,000 was handled. That was our responsibility. The veterans, however, will ask that the sacrifices they made at home and on foreign battlefields be appreciated by a more equal distribution of the war burden. They will demand that they be given an opportunity to get a new start in life—the life that we interrupted when they were inducted. The stay-at-homers will not again get away with another economy bill.

Let us now get busy and pass a real rehabilitation bill. The time to do that is now. Let us pass a bill that will prevent another unemployment catastrophe. When this war is ended there will be 15,000,000 civilians that will have to seek employment elsewhere than in war and munitions factories. Then there will be 11,000,000 soldiers returning.

That problem challenges our vision, our intelligence and our integrity. We cannot shirk that duty or responsibility. Let us solve that problem now while there is yet plenty of time. If the Government of which you and I are part and proud of is to continue as a Republic then we must solve that problem now. The solution of that problem is with us today and not tomorrow.

Ration Tokens

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 I caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator, of the O. P. A., from Mr. Charles Gordon, managing director of the American Transit Association.

In this letter, the protests of the association relative to the impending issuance of ration tokens was reviewed. The results of experimentation with the tokens in connection with the operation of coin-operated machines was set forth in some detail. The problem that will ultimately arise from the circulation of billions of such tokens that can effectively operate certain types of coin-operated machines clearly demonstrated one of the dangers that must be faced in connection with this problem.

On January 13, 1944, Mr. Bowles directed an answering letter to Mr. Gordon. In order that the record may be complete, I am pleased to incorporate that letter as part of these remarks:

JANUARY 13, 1944.

Mr. CHARLES GORDON,
Managing Director,
American Transit Association,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GORDON: I want to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30 and thank you for it.

The problem of ration tokens proved a difficult one. There never has been any

question in my mind as to the advisability of issuing tokens. They will relieve the food stores of America of an enormous amount of work, much of it done after hours, and of expenses running to approximately $3,000,000 monthly. In the future there will be only one denomination of rationing stamp—a 10-point stamp. No longer will grocers have to sort out and count many denominations of stamps, and the total number of stamps will be reduced over 60 percent. Introduction of tokens will accomplish this result.

Tokens will also save the Government $1,500,000 every time a ration book is issued. It may save the taxpayers $4,500,000 in a year. No one can overlook such savings.

Selection of the type of token to be used presented difficult decisions. Metals are extremely scarce in supply and relatively expensive to use. Furthermore, tokens made of metals would more nearly resemble coins and tokens used by private concerns. Finally, Secretary Morgenthau objected to our use of metals, which finally barred them from consideration. We therefore turned to fiber.

The supply of fiber, however, also proved to be limited, it being used for many military purposes. One of its largest uses is in the manufacture of stop nuts for airplanes. Inset fiber washers prevent the nuts from working loose under severe vibration. Fiberboard is also used in making removable tanks for fighter planes traveling long distances. It is used in safety helmets, in ammunition cases, and other packing cases for the armed forces. It is used also in making helmets for welders, who have played so great a part in our production program. Finally, a considerable supply of fiberboard has been shipped on lend-lease.

Originally, as you state in your letter, we considered using a token 0.900 of an inch in diameter by 0.105 of an inch thick. However, we were advised by the War Production Board that, on account of limited production and large demands, we would be fortunate if we got enough fiberboard for tokens of much smaller size. The 0.900-inch size would require about 3,300,000 more pounds of board than tokens of the size finally agreed upon, and the board could not be made available to meet our time schedule.

When we considered making the tokens thicker, we found that they would have to be three times as thick to bar their use in all turnstiles, and that would take 4,000,000 more pounds of material which was not available to meet the time requirements. So that solution was impracticable.

We were barred also from using tokens in sizes to duplicate coins by the fact that that would have multiplied our difficulties. The result was that after careful consideration of all factors we decided upon tokens 0.050 of an inch thick and 0.642 in diameter, stamped out round. We rejected square tokens for the reason they have been rejected by other token users: There are no machines for counting anything but round tokens. The counting, division, and distribution by banks to 450,000 food stores of 2,000,000,000 tokens not subject to machine count is impracticable.

The tokens decided upon have now been in production for a considerable period. We cannot destroy the Government's investment and in view of the great savings tokens will bring to grocers and meat markets, it seems desirable to put them into use at the earliest practicable time. So, as Colonel Houston advised you by wire, we are going ahead with the program.

It seems to us that the danger of these tokens being used in turnstiles is considerably exaggerated. The truth is that there is a greater supply of money than goods in the country and that by housewives faced with the problem of feeding their families ration tokens are valued as highly as money. A single token, for example, will procure one-sixteenth of a pound of butter. They are not likely, therefore, to be used as a substitute for money. And housewives will hang on to them; few will fall into the hands of children. These reasons would eliminate most of the difficulties you envisage, even if people were not essentially honest.

Since the tokens are red and blue in color and made out of fiber, they have no resemblance to money or to metal tokens.

It is likely, I suppose, that a few tokens here and there will find their way into turnstiles not guarded by operators, but that problematical loss must be balanced against the savings of $3,000,000 each month to food stores of the country and of probably $4,500,000 to the Government, not to mention the greater convenience to the housewives and merchants of the Nation.

We adopted the present program after considerable correspondence and several conferences with the interests you represent and with vending-machine distributors and users. The decision was made after careful consideration of all factors in the problem. I did not personally sit in on the discussions leading up to the decision; but I know that every factor was weighed before a decision was reached. Now that it has been made I do not believe any further controversy over the matter can have any result but to exaggerate the difficulties about which you are worried.

If you are concerned about what will happen when rationing is abandoned and the tokens lose their rationing value, we shall be very glad to discuss that with you at the proper time. I am sure some plan can be worked out that will pull the tokens out of circulation before rationing is abandoned. But as far as the size of the tokens is concerned, that is a closed issue. No amount of controversy will change the decision.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

P. S.—Since this was written an article appearing in the Boston Post on January 5 has come to my attention. It reads as follows:

"Those new tokens, smaller than a dime and red and blue in color, which O. P. A. plans to put into every housewife's handbag by February 27, will not concern the Elevated, although a protest has been made at Washington about them by the American Transit Association.

"They will not work the turnstiles and being bright in color will not fool the men and women who watch the 'hoppers' in rapid transit stations, an 'El' spokesman said last night. He added:

"Furthermore those tokens will be worth something for food, and we do not believe anyone will be tossing them around."

That is exactly my opinion.

The Late Lt. Comdr. Arthur Edward Loeser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address by Capt. Ernest R. Eaton, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve, on the occasion of a posthumous award to the widow of the late Lt. Comdr. Arthur Edward Loeser, United States Navy, by the Greater New York Alumni Association of the University of Rochester at Town Hall Club, New York, at its annual dinner on Monday evening, December 6, 1943.

The cruiser *Atlanta*, named after the capital city of the great sovereign State of Georgia, surviving action against a Japanese fleet she helped to destroy, was so badly crippled that members of her own crew set demolition charges which sent her to a glorious grave. The battle of Guadalcanal lasted 3 days, but that part in which the U. S. S. *Atlanta* so proudly came to the evening of her days, lasted but 17 minutes. The morning following the battle, the gallant ship, mortally hurt, without power, with only two gun turrets operating, and those by manual control, was no longer able to maneuver.

Early that morning, landing barges came from Guadalcanal, and removed the wounded, taking them to base hospitals ashore. All able-bodied survivors remained aboard standing by to salvage the ship, if possible. After several hours of determined effort, it was decided that the damage was beyond repair. Then the survivors were taken ashore in landing barges, except for a small group of officers and men, whose sad duty it was to set charges of powder which later sank the ship they were so well proud of.

The *Atlanta* was a ship of striking personality. She was beautiful to look at, and, her well-poised, steel structure, with its magnificent machinery, was capable of doing great damage to enemy ships. She was a personal ship. It is known that battleships are held in restraint for the final smashing blow, but the cruiser goes ahead sailing back and forth into action, convoying, surveying, rendezvousing, maneuvering, dropping depth charges, and swiftly entering into battle itself.

In the battle of Guadalcanal, with its action and counteractions stretched over a period of 3 days, the *Atlanta* never relaxed. Officers and men alike lived at their battle stations on the alert every minute. At the signal from the bridge, guns bristling from the deck, manned by tense helmeted men, poured out tons of burning steel at enemy planes and ships. Five-inch guns pointed to the sky, and others were directed whereever enemy craft appeared. The *Atlanta*, the polished, gray-painted, light cruiser was alive with action in every sense of the word.

Prior to the Guadalcanal battle, the *Atlanta* had not been idle and had been engaged in four other major actions.

In this ship's command, when she was torpedoed, was Lt. Comdr. Arthur Edward Loeser, killed in action. He was the chief engineer. In the dead of night and during the height of battle, a torpedo from an enemy cruiser bored into the engine room, exploded, instantly killing him and his fearless force of men.

Arthur Edward Loeser, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1927. He served in the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, 1927–29; U. S. S. *Hopkins*, 1929–32 (Canal Zone); U. S. S. *Rochester*, 1932 (China); U. S. S. *Asheville*, 1933; U. S. S. *Chicago*, 1934; U. S. S. *Mississippi*, 1936–38; U. S. S. *Sampson*, 1938–40; U. S. S. *Atlanta*, 1941.

Recently, the United States Navy Department named the Destroyer Escort *Loeser* after the late Lt. Comdr. Arthur Edward Loeser. The sleek 300-foot ship was christened by his wife, and was launched on November 15, 1943, in the presence of his mother, brother, and sister.

His brother, Lt. Comdr. Oscar E. Loeser, United States Navy, is attached to the naval air station, South Weymouth, Mass. The brothers were born of German parentage.

It is interesting to know that in a sense Lieutenant Commander Loeser grew up with

the U. S. S. *Atlanta*. She became part of him, and remained a part of him, during her brief and colorful career. He was one of the first officers assigned to duty while the ship was under construction. In no small measure her remarkable accomplishment was due to his diligence as an engineer during her fitting out and commissioning.

For many years it has been the custom at the annual dinner of the University of Rochester Alumni Association of Greater New York to choose one of its alumni and honor him for an outstanding achievement in a special field or department of human activity and endeavor. This year, assembled at their annual meeting December 6, 1943, at the Town Hall Club, New York, the University of Rochester Alumni Association, in making a posthumous award to his widow, is honoring the late Arthur Edward Loeser, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, killed in action on the U. S. S. *Atlanta* November 13, 1942.

In these United States university men are playing an important and far-reaching part in the biggest business of today—the winning of this war. In this country this is the first time that an alumni association of a great university has honored an alumnus who, in serving in this war, had made the supreme sacrifice. Perhaps for that reason this is the most important of all awards so far made by the University of Rochester Alumni Association or any other university alumni association.

Lieutenant Commander Loeser was a likeable person. Capt. T. F. Cooper, Medical Corps, United States Navy, a friend of his and mine, the senior medical officer on the U. S. S. *Atlanta* during the battle of Guadalcanal, gave me a true insight into the character of Lieutenant Commander Loeser. Everyone liked him. His shipmates felt friendly toward him, and he inspired the younger men with a high degree of loyalty. The men who worked for him quickly carried out his orders, given in softly spoken words. They were usually accompanied with a winsome smile. He had more than an ordinary understanding of human problems. In these bewildering and harrassing years of war that have befallen us, he took time out to give his working crew honest, kindly counsel, and a broad insight into the duties that, as an engineer, he had to perform. He was an unusual combination of efficiency in handling the responsibilities of engineering his ship, and in fulfilling all the human obligations implied, while so doing them. The engine room of a cruiser is a vulnerable spot, and, the men who went below and clamped down the hatches on Friday, the 13th of November 1942, knew this. There was no hesitation upon the part of Lieutenant Commander Loeser or his men when for the last time they all went below to their battle stations. There was no flinching. Well they knew, our ships being greatly outnumbered, that the odds were against them.

Lieutenant Commander Loeser looked upon his men as human beings and dealt with them in simple fashion, not following complicated procedures in the performance of his duties. His soft-spoken voice, his courteous manners, his obvious sincerity won him friends. He liked his work. He was a prodigious worker. Sundays and holidays were all the same to him. This was no part-time war, so far as he was concerned. He did not count time, but made time count. He did not give a minute to his enemy. There was no room in his calendar for absenteeism. Working hours and pay, mean little to men who toil at sea, and they meant less to him. He kept at it, not thinking of compensation, hardship, restraint, lack of comfort, recreation, standards of living or any factors that might swerve others from their purpose in the winning of this war. Self-sacrifice to him, was not self-effacement but self-forgetfulness. Faithfully, he performed his duties while in the service of the Navy, whether anyone rewarded or thanked him, or whether anyone even knew about him.

Ashore and at sea, in the Navy, organization is a necessity and, in the U. S. S. *Atlanta*, the organization was the ship. Lieutenant Commander Loeser believed in coordination in his work aboard ship, he kept his word, and carried out his promises. He read good books and had quite a library of his own. He cultivated high ideals, and was fearful of undue flattery. He followed the precept of the ancient prophet, Micah, "Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God."

Firm in health, honorable in his dealings, having no petty quarrels with his shipmates, not envious of the success of others, he united courtesy with determination and independence. In the sight of men, he so lived that "like Abel being dead, he yet speaks to our hearts." "By his unflagging spirit of patriotism, by his acceptance of high responsibility, his skill, industry, and devotion, he made an enduring contribution, not only to the preservation of our country, but to the immortality of human freedom itself."

In representing the Navy Department in the presentation of this posthumous award from the University of Rochester Alumni Association, I am not unmindful of the deep loss sustained by the bereaved wife, the mother, the brother, and the sister of this officer of the United States Navy. May God bless them, and may time be the great healer of their wounds.

This leads me to say, in closing, that the death of Lieutenant Commander Loeser gave birth to a hero, whose bravery has become a flaming symbol, signifying that no cost in the way of unselfish sacrifice is too great for us to give to our Nation, a people at war.

In its largest sense, the symbol of this man's death, and, all who die as he did, signifies the marching orders of those who serve and sacrifice in this war to crush the militarist criminals of Tokyo and Berlin and help redeem mankind. Its implied truth, self-interest giving way to self-sacrifice, is the greatest moral force at work in the world today.

In making this posthumous award, a fine example of courage has been held aloft. It is hoped that it will fire the human heart and soul of all here present and help make more certain than ever before, the way of that victory, on behalf of freedom and liberty, which will make the world a better place to live in.

Finally, what is the final meaning to us of the laying down of the life of this alumnus of the University of Rochester, Lieutenant Commander Loeser in the U. S. S. *Atlanta*, in the Battle of Guadalcanal? It means America—America for whom we work, and fight, and serve, and sacrifice, and give up our sons in battle, who pass the ammunition until we all are free.

"Glory of warrior, glory of orator, glory of song, paid with a wreath flying by to be lost on endless sea; glory of virtue—to fight, to struggle, to right the wrong—nay, but he aimed not at glory, no lover of glory he—give him the glory of going on and still to be—."

Subsidies Safeguard Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful letter by Mr. Herbert M. Singer, entitled "Subsidies Called Practical Safeguard Against Inflation," written to the editor of the Corpus Christi Caller and appearing in the issue of November 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIES CALLED PRACTICAL SAFEGUARD AGAINST INFLATION

The LOOKOUT: In the interest of public discussion of a subject that is of vital significance to every person in the Nation, I take the privilege of bringing the viewpoint in opposition to that expressed in your vigorous and stimulating column on the subsidy question.

In brief, you oppose subsidies to agriculture because you deem it a governmental gift which places more control over the economy of the Nation in a powerful bureau of government, thus putting up "the freedom which we cherish more than anything else as collateral security for financial profit." You further state that "the money we would save in keeping down price of food, clothing, and other necessities, plus the luxuries, would be multiplied several times in paying increased cost of government."

At the outset, let me point out that our objectives are the same. We both desire to preserve our priceless heritage of freedom. By implication, you appear as convinced as I am that increased production is vitally needed and that such increased production should be achieved, to the greatest extent possible, through the profit motive.

We differ solely on the means to be used in attaining our joint objectives. By implication, you advocate a price rise without the use of subsidy, in other words, a consumers' price rise, whereas I advocate a price rise attained solely through the use of subsidy—what may be called, a producers' price rise. It is my firm opinion that the use of the consumers' price rise, as distinguished from the subsidy method will expose us more quickly and more surely to a destruction of our way of life.

1. If there is one factor that our armed forces rely upon to win this war, it is our industrial and agricultural production. It, therefore, follows that nothing must hinder maximum production. The use of the consumers' price rise method, however, will hinder such production.

Under normal conditions, a shortage of a product will result in a price rise. This price rise will increase the producer's profit and encouraging him to increase production to meet the shortage.

Not so in a war economy where there is a shortage of everything. Because of this shortage, price and wage ceilings become necessities, for among other reasons, it assures producers of certainty as to their costs of production. Without this certainty, producers would be in a quandary in their production program and the profit motive, which is relied upon to induce production, would have less driving power behind it.

The consumers' price rise will force a chain of price rises throughout the whole economy of the Nation, creating uncertainty and confusion to producers generally and frequently resulting in a loss, because of higher production costs, to producers who should, in the national interest, be induced by an additional profit to produce more.

For example, raise the price of corn, and there must be a corresponding increase in the price of dairy products, meats, and corn products (the size of such being governed by the political power of the producers of those products). Accordingly, the cost of living increases and wages must be raised and wages will be raised to the extent of the economic

and political power of the wage earner. Very shortly, the corn producer will find that his costs have increased so that no profit or perhaps a loss has resulted from this initial price rise. And the corn producer will have to fight again for a higher ceiling, his only benefit having been during the period when his costs lagged behind his price increase.

But even this benefit will dissolve with an amazing rapidity. Labor is now girding itself for its battle for higher wages which will begin on a broad scale when, as, and if the subsidy program for agriculture is sabotaged.

The uncertainty of ultimate profit resulting from a price rise may very well destroy all inducement for increased production, and the possibility of ultimate loss may very well jeopardize our present production.

2. If there is one political need which we have at the present time, it is national unity. The consumers' price rise method of increasing production will expose us to catastrophic dissension and destroy our ability as a Nation to think and act clearly on problems of fundamental and long-range importance.

Whenever a price increase is granted to one producer, every other producer will have to battle for a price rise—merely to keep his position. If a producer does not do this, his business may be threatened with destruction. This threat will foster the growth and power of economic blocs whose function will be to bring political pressure on officials to increase ceiling prices. Every character of unholy deal can be expected from these log-rolling blocs, at the expense of our Nation.

There is no necessity of pointing out the disaster of government by economic blocs. The disunity and fall of France speak eloquently enough.

3. A consumers' price rise will place a severe hardship on an important segment of our economic community. Everyone who relies on fixed income or dollar security will be severely hurt. Among them are the widows and children who look to life insurance or pensions, the civil-service workers, the thrifty who have savings accounts, and the patriotic who have purchased War bonds.

This is so because a consumers' price rise is in reality an unseen tax that is imposed on everyone who has or is entitled to a dollar. It is usually invoked when government does not have courage enough to tax openly or when government does not have credit enough to borrow. It is a tax which impoverishes the nation and drains away its wealth even more disastrously than an oppressive tax openly collected, for it is an inequitable and uncertain tax. The chaotic economic conditions resulting from such a tax, which is sometimes called inflation, are so great that people will frequently surrender liberties to obtain some degree of security. Hitler and Mussolini are the answers that people find when life for a large segment of the community becomes too uncertain and bitter.

4. The consumers' price rise method is a horribly expensive way to encourage increased production.

In the main, increased production is obtained by using natural resources or methods of production which are marginal, that is, are operated only in times of stress and not under so-called normal conditions.

Through the use of consumers' price rise method, we are paying a higher price for normal production (which we would get in any event without such price rise) solely for the benefit of tapping marginal production which probably will represent but a small percentage of total production.

5. The consumers' price rise method will make post-war collaboration with other nations infinitely more difficult and will destroy the competitive position of our industries and our agriculture in the world markets.

An increased price structure will make it more difficult for us to trade with the balance of the world. At the present time through the operations of lend-lease, our production costs mean nothing, but in the post-war period our costs will determine whether or not we can sell in the world markets. If we are at a competitive disadvantage, we will not be able to conform to the same rules of trade that the balance of the world uses, and the tendency will then be, as after the last war, to protect ourselves with high tariff walls, thus destroying the possibility of sufficient cooperation among nations to insure peace.

Furthermore, should prices be increased, industry and agriculture in the post-war period, as after the last war, will have to go through the "wringer," in readjusting its high price structure to post-war conditions. None of us would seek a depression like the last; yet that is what inevitably an excessively high price structure will produce.

6. The consumer's price-rise method will not free us from bureaucracy. It will probably generate a greater bureaucracy.

Wartime produces an economy of scarcity. In such an economy, price ceilings as well as rationing are necessary. Otherwise, everybody would bid prices higher and higher until only the wealthy could continue in the bidding. The less wealthy would be left with nothing but the privilege of "tightening their belts."

If, therefore, price ceilings are a necessity, then no price rise can take place without approval of the authorities establishing those ceilings. Accordingly, we will find ourselves trekking down to Washington for every price rise which we need—not only those to stimulate marginal production, but those which will be necessary to preserve our position in the face of rising costs.

Subsidies, on the other hand, do not produce these difficulties.

First, as to production, no change is effected in costs of production through the granting of subsidies. A producer is certain as to what his costs are and will be, and he is in a position to proceed with increased production if the subsidy makes it worth while.

Secondly, as to national unity, subsidies will give negligible impetus to the growth and power of economic blocs. Subsidies will be granted on a basis of the increased production required. This is a less controversial subject and one capable of more scientific approach than the problems attendant upon a consumers' price rise which carries an unpredictable number of consequences to the whole economy of the Nation.

Third, as to bearing the burden of the costs of increased production, a subsidy is far more equitable. Unlike a consumers' price increase which hits those who rely on life insurance, pensions, bank accounts, and War bonds, the costs of subsidy is borne by Government. This means that the cost is spread over the entire economy of the Nation and is as equitably distributed as our tax laws are equitable.

Fourth, as to total costs, a subsidy is ever so much cheaper to the Nation. A subsidy will only be granted to the extent needed to increase production. It need not be granted on production, which would take place regardless of the subsidy. A consumers' price rise is indiscriminate in this respect and gives a subsidy in effect to a producer who does not require it.

Fifth, as to post-war economy, a subsidy will permit us to keep our basic economy in no worse position relative to the balance of the world than it is at the present time. Our industries and agriculture will be more competitive in the world's markets which we have learned are of vital importance to our economy.

Accordingly we will have a better chance of finding the economic equilibrium with the rest of the world which is necessary for lasting peace. Furthermore, the post-war withdrawal of subsidy will permit a quick contraction of production by the marginal producer without affecting the economy of the normally sound producer.

6. As to bureaucracy, we will have less bureaucracy with a subsidy, for there will be an insignificant number of decisions required from Washington on subsidy compared with the never-ending decisions which Washington will be called upon to make on ceiling price rises if the consumers' price rise method is employed.

Finally, subsidies have been with us for some time and have not destroyed the fundamental freedom of our people. The farmers have received subsidies for years. The presently discussed subsidy is merely a change in the nature of that subsidy—from one encouraging smaller production to one encouraging greater production.

Like you, I would like to see an economy free of subsidy. I would also like to see a world free of war. But, we are in a war and the subsidy is the least-evil instrument which can be employed to assist us to increase production and get this war over quicker and with the least cost in terms of our way of life, now and in the future.

It is my hope that this lengthy, yet all too brief, discussion of this all-important question confronting our Nation will throw light on a subject which has too long been in the darkness which you have so aptly called the "tyranny of words."

HERBERT M. SINGER.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Oleomargarine," published in the issue of the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE

Dairy interests which denounce price subsidies as subversively un-American show no such repugnance for subsidies in the form of a protective tariff. The curious thing about the tariff wall which has been built to guard the dairy industry is that it serves to ward off, not foreign competition, but the competition of a thoroughly domestic product, oleomargarine. The sale of margarine in this country is restricted by a variety of taxes imposed not at all for the sake of raising revenue but wholly for the sake of preventing consumers from substituting it for butter. As to the relative merits of butter and margarine we have no strong convictions. But the choice between the two, we believe, should be left to the discretion of the American public.

There is a Federal tax of one-quarter of a cent on every pound of uncolored margarine. If the margarine is artificially colored yellow, as butter is artificially colored throughout the greater part of the year, then the Federal tax on it is 10 cents a pound. Any retailer who handles uncolored margarine must pay an annual tax of $6; if he chooses to handle colored margarine, the tax is $48. Finally,

a license fee of $600 annually is imposed on any manufacturer of margarine. And the interesting catch in this regulation is that any nongovernmental hospital, restaurant, boarding house, or public eating place of any character is called a manufacturer of margarine if it buys the uncolored product and adds coloring to it.

These restrictive taxes were imposed at a time when a number of unpalatable, and sometimes unhealthy, substitutes for butter were on the market. Those who want the taxes continued argue that they are necessary to protect the public against deleterious products and against fraud. But we now have on the statute books a Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to serve precisely this purpose. It prescribes standards of health and nutrition for all food products and requires that their character and contents be clearly stated on their labels. No one can purchase margarine, colored or uncolored, in a grocery store under the misapprehension that it is butter.

Some danger exists, to be sure, that margarine might be substituted for butter in public eating places. A simple regulatory act could control this far more effectively than a discriminatory tax. Restaurants which choose to serve margarine instead of butter should be required to say so on their menus. They might even offer their customers a choice between butter and margarine at different prices. Certainly the opportunity to choose ought not to be denied by congressional prohibition or by taxation which amounts to the same thing.

It is unfortunate that the Maybank bill proposing repeal of the discrimination against colored margarine was debated, and defeated, in an atmosphere of unbridled sectionalism. The 23 Senators who voted for it, with only two exceptions, came from the Southern States producing cotton or soybeans which are used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. They were unfortunately outnumbered by Senators from States in which dairying is an important industry. The distinction is not a sound basis for lawmaking. As Donald Montgomery, consumer counsel of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., put it in his testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, "Margarine legislation * * * is a hang-over from the feudal system under which guilds and masters controlled markets according to the power and prestige they could muster."

American Aviators Over Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the special weekly section of the National Herald, a Greek newspaper of New York, the issue of Sunday, December 26, 1943. The article contains an interview with Lt. Frank D. Buehl, of Memphis, Tenn., giving an account of his experiences after his airplane was shot down by Germans while he was flying over Greece, and the story of how Greek guerillas aided him to escape capture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AVIATORS IN THE HAUNTS OF GREEK GUERRILLAS—THE LIBERATOR BOMBER PILOT WAS SHOT DOWN BY THE NAZIS ON HIS ELEVENTH MISSION OVER GREECE AND WAS RECEIVED WITH OPEN ARMS BY THE ANTARTES, WHO ALSO ARRANGED FOR HIS ESCAPE

(By James J. Kay)

MEMPHIS, TENN.—The amazing story of how an American bomber pilot was shot down in fierce air combat over Nazi-held Greece and saved by fierce guerrillas in a series of dramatic pitched battles with the Germans was told to this correspondent by Lt. Frank D. Buehl, Memphis Liberator bomber pilot, on his return home from Cairo. On his eleventh mission over Greece, he was flying the *Eight Ball* and was really behind the eight ball.

"The Germans were concentrating many airplanes on fields all through Greece, apparently expecting trouble. They sent us to bomb them. On our tenth mission we had found dozens of German planes lined up on a field and smashed them to kingdom come. The next day the Germans must have been mad and waiting for us.

"We had just dropped our bombs on this field near Athens and started for home when about 35 German fighter planes jumped up. We were only a small formation of bombers, so they had things pretty much their own way. The plane to my left went down quickly. The plane on my right got separated from us and that left the *Eight Ball* alone. The Germans swarmed in 6 at a time and just chewed us to pieces with 20 millimeter cannon shells and machine guns. Our No. 1 engine was shot out with her propeller blade feathered and a string of machine-gun bullet holes in a propeller blade; No. 2 had such a big hole in her I could see the insides. It wasn't running. No. 3 engine was afire, the right wing and the bomb bay were afire. My controls were shot to pieces. The bombardier was killed. The right waist gunner had a big hole in his stomach. The top turret gunner had shell splinters in his face. The radio and interphone were out. The whole plane must have had about 500 or 600 holes in her and we could see the bullets splattering around us like hail. We decided it was time to bail out.

"When we finally decided to leave we were at 18,000 feet, and the only way I could control the wrecked ship was to dive her and get some speed, then level off for a few seconds to give the boys a chance to jump. They put a parachute on the wounded waist gunner, put his hands on the ripcord, and threw him out. His chute opened by some miracle. We didn't have much altitude left after the second dive, but we all got out. I was the last one to leave. After my chute opened I got to see the old *Eight Ball* crash and explode right under me. I landed on a rock and was almost knocked out. As soon as I got to my feet 2 bearded men came running out of the woods with rifles shouting, 'Germano, Englezo, Americano?' I answered 'American.'"

THE AMERICANO IS GIVEN A RECEPTION

"Then they came running, put their arms around me and kissed me, talking in Greek. They led me down the mountains to a little village where there were more men with rifles, who hugged and kissed me. They put me in a house and went off. I heard some rifle and machine-gun fire and after awhile a little Greek guerrilla, about 16 years old, came through the door pushing a German soldier ahead of him. A few of the Greeks could talk English and they told me the Germans had sent 15 soldiers after the American flyers. The klephts had intercepted them and killed 14 of them. The fifteenth was the man the boy brought in. The kid had shot the German through the hand and captured him.

"Later that evening my radio operator came walking into the village with some of the Greeks. The guerrillas said they had found the body of the waist gunner we had pushed out. He apparently had died despite his parachute. The Greeks told me they had given him a military funeral and brought me his dog tag.

"I slept that night with the leader of these antartes and the next morning they sent word that more of the flyers were in a little village across the mountains. They put us on some little donkeys and we started out. At this other village we found my copilot and the top turret gunner, who had been wounded, from the other Liberator that went down with us. The rest of our crew had apparently been captured.

"Here we stayed the next night. The next morning we got word that the Nazis had us located and were coming to burn the village to the ground. The Greeks said that the Germans had burned other villages for hiding soldiers. I saw them shell one village. There wasn't anything to do but for the entire population of the village to leave, for they were determined to take care of us and kept telling us how much the Greeks loved the Americans.

"The people took whatever food they had and a few of their belongings and we started out. The people from the village made a procession about 2 miles long. The next night it was cold and raining. We spent the night out in the mountains. My copilot and I spent the night under a little donkey, trying to use his body for warmth and for protection from the rain. We didn't get much sleep that night.

"The Greeks told us they were taking us to klephts' headquarters where arrangements would be made for us to escape Greece. They didn't seem to be sorry that they had sacrificed their village for us. The little food, fruit, and black bread soon gave out and once we went for 30 hours without food or drink.

"The guerrillas were fierce-looking fellows, armed mostly with rifles belonging to many nations—German, Russian, Italian, English, and American—guns they had captured in lightning raids on occupation troops. They had a few machine guns they had captured from the Germans. They had some hand grenades which they gave to us in case of fighting.

"The guerrillas were magnificent fighters because one night their advance scouts reported that the Germans were lying in ambush for us with some armored cars beside a road we had to cross. The guerrillas got ready and went up to intercept the Germans. There was a lot of rifle and machine-gun fire, and soon word came that we could move on. The Greeks mopped up the Germans in a comparatively short time. We were told later by the guerrillas that they didn't need any help, that if the Americans and English would send them enough guns they would throw the Germans out of their beloved country in a week.

"Day after day we went up one mountain and down the next. We walked and walked through impassable mountain trails until our feet got sore. One night, when it was raining and slippery one donkey carrying a kitchen stove slipped and fell. We thought the Germans were near and kept very quiet. We heard the stove bouncing all the way down the mountain making a terrible noise. The donkey had stepped on a child's foot and it began crying. Luck was with us, for the Germans apparently weren't out that night."

AT HEADQUARTERS

"After walking several hundred miles, we finally reached the headquarters of the klephts high in the mountains and word apparently had gone ahead for they swarmed out to see the American flyers. The villagers

crowded around us shaking hands and kissing us. We found it would be several days before we could escape and in the meantime we lived with the Greeks. They were very hospitable and took us into their homes and if they had just a little food they gave it all to us. If there were only a few blankets around they gave them all to us and slept on the bare ground floor themselves.

"The night before we departed they gave a banquet in our honor. It was held in their antartes headquarters with about 40 guests. The menu was excellent. It consisted of tomatoes, onions, beans, black bread, fried lamb entrails, and a single can of sardines for the 40 guests. There was a native liquor called 'oozo' which they drank with great feeling. But it was too fiery for us and almost burnt our stomachs out. The leader of this guerrilla headquarters was a man who lived in New York many years ago. He made a speech about how the Greeks loved the Americans and were helping them to whip the Germans in restoring freedom to the Hellenes.

"The Greeks discussed politics and the form of government by which they wanted to be ruled. To my amazement, almost to a man, the Greeks were against the restoration of King George to the Greek throne. The Greeks were tired of monarchs and wanted a real democratic Greek republican government. I got up and made a speech, too, telling them that I loved the Greeks, and by this time I did love them. They sang the Hymn to Liberty, the Greek national anthem and asked us to sing ours. I was afraid that I didn't know all the words of the Star-Spangled Banner, but when we tried we found out we knew all the words.

"Early the next morning we left. To tell where the Greek guerrilla headquarters is would betray the heroic Greek guerrillas who helped us. From the horrible experience I made the resolution that from now on any Greek that needs any help from me is going to get it. I'd do anything in this world for anything Greek."

The Polish Boundary Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial from the Washington Star of yesterday afternoon, entitled "Polish-Russian Realities," together with an Associated Press dispatch from Baltimore, Md., headed "Monsignor Sheen Views Poland as Moral Test." I should like to have the editorial and the press dispatch printed in the Appendix of the RECORD under one heading.

There being no objection, the editorial and dispatch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH-RUSSIAN REALITIES

The current furor over the dispatch published in Pravda concerning alleged Anglo-German conversations about a separate peace should not distract attention from the Russo-Polish problem.

In considering the Russo-Polish dispute, one should distinguish between the boundary question and the manner in which it is to be settled. Shortly after Russian forces crossed the borders of pre-war Poland a fortnight ago Premier Mikolajczyk stated: "The question of the line is not so important. The greatest problem is to get security for the Polish population." While protesting against unilateral decisions of Moscow, the Polish Government has been conciliatory in its statements and has shown a willingness to negotiate. Stating its sincere desire for a Polish-Soviet agreement on terms which would be just and acceptable to both sides, the Polish Government in exile has suggested that all outstanding questions between Russia and Poland should be taken up at a meeting of the two countries with Great Britain and the United States serving as friendly mediators.

However, Moscow has thus far rebuffed all these overtures, and has refused to rescind its diplomatic break with the Polish Government in exile, which would be the necessary prerequisite to negotiations of any kind. Moscow's answer to the Polish offer was uncompromising in tone. It accused the Polish Government of having "entirely evaded and ignored" Moscow's intimation that the so-called Curzon line should approximate the new Russo-Polish frontier, and then drew the deduction that this constitutes a rejection of the Curzon line as a basis for negotiation. The request for a joint discussion of Russo-Polish issues was not only rejected by Moscow but was also denounced as misleading. As for the suggested Anglo-American mediation, it was pointedly ignored. Simultaneously with this vehement rejection of Polish offers, the Soviet press has been filled with dispatches from abroad, allegedly from Polish individuals or groups, denouncing the government in exile and proposing that it be eliminated and superseded by the Polish Committee of National Liberation formed last year in Moscow, which claims to be the authentic voice of the Polish people.

All this would seem to indicate that Moscow does not intend to deal with the present government in exile. The alternative would seem to be either a revamped Polish Government containing only those compliant to Russian demands or Moscow's formal recognition of the National Liberation Committee. That would raise a diplomatic issue between Moscow and its western Allies, Britain and America, of the utmost gravity.

MONSIGNOR SHEEN VIEWS POLAND AS MORAL TEST

(By the Associated Press)

BALTIMORE, January 19.—Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen of Catholic University believes that Poland's fate after this war will mirror the destiny of our civilization.

"Poland represented the world situation in miniature. Poland is the test of whether moral ideas of the West, on which civilization has been built, shall prevail," he told the Baltimore section of the Holy Name Society last night.

"Unless Poland is restored, unless Russia is told that it cannot settle Poland's case before court actually convenes, unless the democracies are strong enough to enforce the moral principle by which they exist, we shall then have a period of 20 years of barbarism in which Russia shall reach out and gradually assimilate, first, France, Holland, and Belgium and then all of Europe.

"* * * It is not a question of territory so far as Poland is concerned, but whether the Polish question shall be decided unilaterally by one nation or by a group of nations which shall base their decision on moral principles.

"If Russia is not convinced of the danger of such a policy, her assimilation of European nations will continue until she reaches the Channel. England will resist and the doors will be thrown wide open to World War No. 3."

PM Responsible for Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include therein an article from the Washington News of January 19, 1944, by Westbrook Pegler which expresses approximately the same sentiments that I spoke on yesterday in the House of Representatives when I said:

The Republican Members will, I am sure, support a wide-open rule to permit any germane amendments. The talk of a gag rule emanates from the Communists, the Daily Worker, PM, and Walter Winchell—who is doing more than anyone in America to create racial disunity and anti-Semitism—in their consistent efforts to undermine the faith of the American people in our representative and constitutional government. No member of the Rules Committee, nor any Member of the House, has ever advocated a gag rule on the soldiers' vote bill.

The article by Westbrook Pegler is as follows:

NEW YORK, January 19.—I do not profess to know Marshall Field's motives of whooping up and, I think, greatly exaggerating such anti-Semitic activity and feeling as may exist in New York and Boston, but nobody is obliged to believe that he is doing this out of sympathy for victims of persecution or out of honest abhorrence of wrong, and I don't. On the contrary, I insist that Mr. Field, through the medium of his snarling little New York publication, which follows the pattern of certain European papers, is one of the most dangerous anti-Semitic influences in the United States. As far as I know, although Hitler used many avenues of attack on the Jew in Germany, both brutal and subtle, he never hit upon the device of pretending to love them and turning sentiment against them by giving violent offense on their behalf. Mr. Field is fabulously rich and only recently turned to journalism and ostensible good works after a life not particularly distinguished by interest in public affairs, unless horse racing could be so regarded. If he were secretly determined to arouse hatred of the Jews and escape the blame that is laid upon the familiar type of Jew-baiter, with his fortune and his approach he could go far and, whatever his intentions, he already has.

Field's publication, from the very beginning, has contained a cell of reporters, writers and editors who are either Communists or so much like Communists that they could easily pass for comrades, and this championship of the Jews and this exaggeration of petty scraps between kids appearing in a paper with the peculiar editorial slant and the provocative manner of the Field press, irresistibly causes some people to associate communism with Jewishness, which was exactly what Hitler did to make non-Jewish anti-Communists hate all Jews, including the anti-Communists. And, although some of his friends try to excuse him on the ground that he is just an innocent millionaire with a belated yearn to do good, I do not believe he can be so dumb that he does not know that the blackguardism thus committed also tends to becloud reason and arouse resentment against the very people that he purports to defend.

As Joseph Medill Patterson remarked in an editorial in the Daily News, it is fatuous

to pretend that racial and religious prejudices do not exist among the American people; but usually they are kept in the background, and they are still under control in New York and, I have reason to believe, in Boston, too. Detroit has seemed to be the center of the nastiest feeling, for there I have heard a number of smug motor industrialists, including some mouthy bores who don't hold their liquor any too well, make entirely unprovoked cracks against Jews in general. I would attribute this in part to the influence of Henry Ford's old Dearborn Independent and in part to Charles E. Coughlin, although in justice to Mr. Ford I should say that in the course of a visit of several hours a couple of years ago I heard him make several gratuitous remarks which expressed a generous, Christian attitude toward Jews. But in New York, Christian and Jew have managed to rock along very well together up to now and it is no service to the Jews or the community as a whole to cry pogrom every time some Jewish kid gets a poke in the nose in an ordinary schoolyard scrap.

Some of Mr. Field's intimate associates tell me that I have got the guy all wrong and that his Chicago paper—the Sun—and not this New York thing of his, is the true expression of his journalism, the Sun being much different and not given to the violent crusades of his New York voice. That is a pretty serious thing to say about a man with a fortune as large as his who has gone into the publishing business on two fronts. It seems to mean that the power of his fortune is being used by others to create a dangerous division between Christians and Jews in New York who don't want trouble and would get along fine if let alone. At any rate, the responsibility goes straight to Marshall Field, and if he hasn't the intelligence and conscience to refrain from exerting the power of his money to this effect he shouldn't be in the publishing business, although, of course, this is not to suggest that he ought to be suppressed.

If anyone wonders whether I question Mr. Field's motives, the answer is yes, I do. I do not know what his motives are.

Protection for Widows, Orphans, and Estates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter from a distinguished jurist in behalf of my bill, H. R. 3736, as follows:

MAYO, FLA., *January 11, 1944.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I have noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you have introduced H. R. 3736 to allow deduction of life-insurance premiums from income tax. Your bill is a big step in the right direction. I have heretofore addressed letters to our Representatives and Senators, as well as to several others in the Senate and House, urging support of legislation such as this. The principle on which such legislation is based is sound and is justified by every consideration of fairness. People generally take out insurance for protection of themselves or families, and they should be encouraged in doing so. A man who wants to provide for his own in case he should be called away, so they won't be whindlers for some dole or charity, is following the right course. I think the exemption allowed should be for premiums on a fair amount of insurance, with some fair limitation, so that the very wealthy could not buy huge sums of insurance just to get the benefit of premium exemption as well as the protection thereof.

I hope you will be able to push this bill to a vote, and I trust you will call on each of our Florida Members to help you therein. This exemption would be a real help to thousands in your own State as well as in all others.

With regards, I am,
Cordially yours,

HAL W. ADAMS,
Circuit Judge, Third Judicial District, Mayo, Fla.

Report and Question Period for Cabinet Members Has Public Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the proposal embodied in H. R. 327, to make it possible for the heads of departments and agencies to be invited to the floor of the House for a report and question period, has received generous support from the press of the country. More than a hundred leading newspapers have carried favorable editorials on the plan. I include a few of them:

From the New York Times of December 22:

THE CABINET IN CONGRESS

The results of the latest Gallup survey show that 72 percent of the voters questioned favor in principle the proposal of Representative KEFAUVER that Cabinet members appear before Congress, when requested, to answer questions about their departments. Twenty-one percent of those questioned were undecided, but only 7 percent were definitely opposed.

The majority who favored the proposal did so because they believe that it would establish a closer working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government; that it would keep the public better informed, through Congress, of what is going on; and that it would serve as a healthy check on inefficiency and bureaucracy in government. It is clear, in short, that the arrangement is favored by every consideration of common sense.

Colliers of January 1:

H. R. 327—BETTER PASS IT

A proposal that Congress and Capitol Hill let down their hair once in a while and talk things over as man to man has been introduced by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee. The proposal goes by the prosaic title of House Resolution 327, but its content and purposes seem anything but prosaic to us.

H. R. 327 provides for a fairly frequent (once a week or once every 2 weeks) question period in the House of Representatives. At this ceremony members of the President's Cabinet would be asked to appear and to answer questions fired at them by any Congressmen who felt like firing such questions. Some questions would be presented in writing, others orally.

Various safeguards are set up to protect Cabinet members from being asked questions that are frivolous or in bad faith, and to keep the question period from being used to further some faction's or pressure group's private aims. Naturally, a Cabinet member would be entitled to refuse to answer any question that might involve a military secret, or an important facet of foreign policy, or something else against the public interest. Any Cabinet member could even refuse to appear for a question period when invited—though public opinion would most likely make such refusals infrequent.

Representative KEFAUVER, who evidently has given the matter much thought from all angles, insists that the "question period" idea is no new thing in United States Government. It appears that President George Washington and various members of his cabinet used to visit rather frequently with Congress to talk things over face to face. The reason why the custom was discontinued, in President Thomas Jefferson's administration, was that Mr. Jefferson had one very human and very widely distributed weakness: He could not express himself fluently before large crowds of people.

In adopting H. R. 327 then, the House would not be introducing some novelty unheard of outside the British House of Commons—where, incidentally, the "question period" is an ancient and successful institution. The House would merely be reviving an old custom, and, we think, a healthy one.

By this device, the legislative and the executive branches of the Government would have closer contact with each other than they have now. Members of one branch wouldn't have to wait for the morning newspapers or some columnist's keyhole gleanings to find out how members of the other branch felt about some matter important to all of us. A lot of time ought to be saved, a lot of friction short-circuited and a lot of frankness generated.

A good beginning along these lines was made recently when Secretary of State Cordell Hull reported direct to Congress, in a speech which made a profound impression all over the country, the results of his trip to Moscow.

It looks to us as if the House would be uncommonly well advised to adopt H. R. 327, especially at this rather yeasty time in the history of the United States.

The Gallup poll of December 22:

QUIZ PLAN APPLAUDED

(By George Gallup)

CONGRESS CHECK-UP

PRINCETON, N. J., December 21.—Representative ESTES KEFAUVER'S proposal to request Cabinet members and heads of Government agencies to appear before Congress periodically for questioning has widespread support from the American public.

Few proposals in recent years have created as much discussion among political writers and students of government. The Kefauver resolution, sympathetically debated by the House a few weeks ago, has been referred to the Rules Committee for hearings.

The public's reaction to the principle involved in the resolution has been gaged in interviews with voters in all States by poll reporters for the institute. The issue was put to the country as follows:

"A Member of Congress has suggested that heads of Government departments and agencies appear before Congress when requested to answer questions about what their de-

partments are doing. Do you approve or disapprove of this idea?"

The vote is:

	Percent
Approve	72
Disapprove	7
No opinion	21

A high vote of approval was found in all geographical sections. The difference between the section most in favor and the least in favor did not amount to more than a relatively few percentage points.

The idea is popular for three principal reasons, namely, that it would establish a closer working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government; that it would keep the public better informed, through Congress, of what is going on, and that it would serve as a healthy check on inefficiency and bureaucracy in Government.

Voters who oppose the idea, on the other hand, are inclined to feel that a question period might simply be used as a political football, with department heads being questioned by Congressmen not primarily to solicit information but to attempt to embarrass them politically. Representative KEFAUVER'S resolution seeks to get around this difficulty by requiring that each question must first be submitted for approval to the House committee having official jurisdiction over that particular subject.

The institute's survey finds that Republican voters and Democratic voters are in substantial agreement in approving the principle contained in Representative KEFAUVER'S resolution. Of all Republicans questioned, 75 percent were in favor; of all Democrats, 68 percent.

Parliamentary question periods such as the resolution proposes have long been the custom in Britain.

The Atlanta Journal of December 22:

POPULAR PROPOSAL

A resolution has been introduced in Congress providing that members of the Cabinet and other heads of governmental agencies be requested to appear before Congress, periodically, to answer questions relative to their departments. The resolution is now before the House Rules Committee for hearings.

The Gallup poll, recognizing that, if the resolution is approved, it will involve one of the most drastic changes in American governmental methods, has just completed a test of opinion on the subject among the voters in all sections of the country. That the plan is widely popular with the people is evidenced by the fact that 72 percent of those questioned approved the proposal. Only 7 percent opposed it, while the remaining 21 percent answered that they held no opinion on the point.

There can be little doubt but that periodic questioning of Cabinet members at open sessions of the Congress would work to keep the public better informed on the activities and views of the legislative branch of the Government. It would also tend to closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches and would provide a healthy check against inefficiency and excessive bureaucracy.

The only danger apparent is that some Members of Congress might desire to use their opportunity to question Cabinet members for political reasons rather than as a service to the Nation. There is, in the resolution now introduced, a degree of safeguard against this in that each question to be asked must first be submitted to the proper House committee for approval.

If the resolution is adopted, the Congress will not lack a precedent in such questioning. Parliamentary question periods such as now proposed in Washington have been the custom in Britain for a long time. It is at such periods, for instance, that Prime Minister Churchill, or other members of the Government, renders reports on administrative affairs and answers questions from members of Commons.

The system is a good one. It undoubtedly provides a channel through which the general public is better informed on important actions and problems of the day and it keeps the administrative heads of government in direct responsibility to the voters.

Anything which results in greater public information on the affairs of government is desirable. The Kefauver resolution should be approved.

The Knoxville News-Sentinel and all Scripps-Howard papers:

CONGRESS AND CABINET

Secretary of State Hull's address to a joint session of Congress has stimulated public questions as to why the executive and legislative branches of our Government do not work together more closely. Statesmen and students of government have been saying for a long time there is no good reason for the exaggerated barriers which produce inefficiency instead of efficiency, conflict instead of cooperation.

Among proposed reforms one of the simplest, easiest, and more obvious is the Kefauver resolution. It would amend House rules to permit Cabinet officers and agency heads to take the floor periodically to answer written questions. The House would obtain, quickly, authoritative information without which it cannot legislate intelligently. Administrative chiefs would have fuller and more effective legislative contact with expenditure of less time and effort. It would make both parties more responsible in their relations to each other and to the public.

Would this destroy our constitutional system of separation of powers? The separation was never intended to be absolute—the Constitution gives the President joint power with Congress over legislation; it gives Congress certain controls over the courts and the executive, including powers of impeachment; and in scores of ways it intermingles the functions. The Constitution requires the Executive to report to Congress; there are Presidential messages, Cabinet reports, and personal appearances, of department heads before congressional committees. Indeed, the appearance of Cabinet officers before the full House would be but a revival of the custom of the First Congress.

Would this force dangerous revelations of confidential information? The questions would be controlled by the responsible committees, there would be executive sessions when required, and any Cabinet officer could refuse to answer any question.

The Kefauver proposal has been discussed for 80 years. It was unanimously approved by a House committee in 1864 and by a Senate committee in 1881. Similar proposals have been made by such Presidents as Garfield, Taft, and Wilson.

Isn't it a bit farfetched to base our hopes of world peace on cooperation among alien nations if we cannot even achieve a close cooperation between the coordinate branches of our own indivisible Government?

The Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune of December 20:

CABINET QUIZZES

During the First Congress of the United States, President George Washington and Members of his Cabinet appeared before Congress to advise the House of Representatives and the Senate on various proposals that were being considered. They not only gave their views but submitted to questioning. This was in addition to the appearance of President Washington before a joint session of Congress to read his annual messages on the state of the Nation.

The First Congress was composed of many Members who actually drew up the Constitution in the Constitutional Convention. President Washington himself was chairman of that Convention. So it is probable that the founding fathers had the idea in mind of such a frank interchange of views between the President and his department heads and the Members of Congress.

This was brought out recently by Representative KEFAUVER, who has introduced a House resolution amending the rules to provide for a question period during which the heads of Cabinet departments and independent agencies will be asked to answer orally questions asked by Members of the House. This resolution was introduced on October 19 and has created wide interest, especially since Secretary Hull made his appearance before a joint session of Congress to report on the Moscow Conference.

In a recent discussion in Congress many interesting facts were brought out regarding this old-time practice which has been discontinued and which this resolution would reinstate. The practice was stopped in Washington's time because he is said to have been annoyed by some of the questions asked. The appearance of the President in person in reporting to Congress on the state of the Union was discontinued by Thomas Jefferson because he was not a good speaker before a large audience.

The practice of the Presidents appearing in person was revived by President Woodrow Wilson. When this occurred, many persons said he was upsetting a tradition. As Congressman KEFAUVER points out, "He was just bringing back into practice a very useful device given and allowed by the Constitution."

Congressman KEFAUVER also raised one other interesting point by pointing out that the constitution of the Confederate States, which was drawn up on similar lines to the Federal Constitution, provided specifically for the appearance of heads of departments to the floor of the Confederate Congress both in secret and in open session.

Both the British and Canadian Parliamentary systems call for the interrogation of cabinet heads by members of Parliament. As a matter of fact, in our own Supreme Court Cabinet officers have appeared before the Court and have been interrogated regarding the case in point.

As Congressman KEFAUVER pointed out in urging the restoration of this practice:

"It seems to me all that is involved here is a more immediate method of cooperation so that we bypass a lot of circuitous channels and streamline our Government by getting the Executive immediately before those of the legislative branch who have questions involving legislature that the Executive wants. We are, therefore, not violating the Constitution by implementing the proper function between branches of the Government."

Endorsing this practice "as a worthy reform," Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE, from this district, made this important point on the floor of the House:

"I direct attention to the fact that the late Woodrow Wilson, following his graduation from Princeton in 1879, wrote a series of articles in the Gentleman's magazine, then a popular magazine, over several monthly issues, in which he discussed this very point and later incorporated them in his monumental work, Our Congressional Government. He pointed out that that was one of the advantages of the English parliamentary system over the American form of government, in that it brought more closely to the elective representatives of the people the functions of the Cabinet members of Government, as obtained in Great Britain and Canada."

The Kefauver resolution is now before the Judiciary Committee of the House. It is to be hoped that the measure is brought out

and passed and that the Senate concurs. Restoration of this practice would undoubtedly do much to curb the bureaucratic tendency of some departments at the National Capital.

Keep America American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I submit herewith, to be printed in the RECORD, an address by O. Sam Cummings, of Dallas, Tex., past president of Kiwanis International, national chairman of Keep America American organization. This movement originated in Dallas and has spread all over the country. The address is fully explanatory of a very remarkable movement.

The chief concern of every American today is the war effort. The Kiwanis program, Keep America American is essentially a war program, since it concerns the things for which America is fighting.

Civilian as well as soldier morale is essential to winning the war. This morale is based on confidence on the part of civilians and soldiers alike that freedom of opportunity and the American free enterprise system shall be preserved—that freedom of opportunity as well as freedom of worship and speech and freedom from want and fear, will be maintained in post-war America.

That indefinable something we call spirit or morale is necessary to victory. Any force, innocent or malign, which might impair morale, unity of purpose, should be classed as enemy alien. If soldiers and civilians alike know that America will be kept American, a great contribution will be made to maintaining essential morale.

OUR AMERICAN FREEDOMS

In present-day conditions exist challenge after challenge to our democratic way of life, to our democratic form of government, to freedom of opportunity, to our free enterprise system of commerce and industry. American freedom is the touchstone of the remarkable achievements of this Nation. This American freedom of individuals and enterprises is worth fighting to perpetuate.

America is a young Nation. We have only 6 percent of the world's population, yet we own 30 percent of the world's wealth and have 36 percent of the world's income. Back of such achievement for so young a Nation had to be plan and design—a solid foundation, a sturdy framework, an abiding idealism. Other nations had more people, more resources, more experience, centuries of opportunities. What did we have, then, that other nations—other peoples did not have? What was the great fusing agent which accounts for our amazing rise to greatness?

Freedom! Freedom for man and his posterity; freedom guaranteed by our Constitution; freedom to worship; freedom to speak and think and write; freedom to work and earn and spend; freedom of enterprise; freedom to choose and shape our own destinies; freedom to want more than we had; freedom to acquire more to satisfy those wants; freedom to harness our resources and to use our resourcefulness for our own betterment and for the common good.

Freedom to own and support a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"; freedom to earn from our labors and our enterprises the profits with which to support that Government; freedom to keep that Government always within the framework of our Constitution.

Out of this great American freedom—out of the benefits arising from the conduct of the affairs of freemen, out of the profits from the labors and enterprises of this free people, we, the American people, have achieved more than the peoples of any other nation on earth.

Simple, isn't it? Freedom was the touchstone, the fusing agent.

We submit, also, that there are forces fighting to destroy the foundations upon which, and the framework within which, this freedom has so successfully operated.

Yes, incredible as it may seem, these forces are working now—working powerfully, even as our boys fight and die to keep their America American.

America will remain American only so long as we, the people, preserve and perpetuate freedom of men and their enterprises, recognizing these freedoms to be inseparable from our democratic way of life.

IDEA BORN IN DALLAS

As a Dallasite I am proud of the fact that this great patriotic project was conceived in Dallas, Tex., and proud as a Kiwanian that it is the brain child of the Dallas Kiwanis Club.

The Dallas project was adopted on June 15, 1943. To date over $17,000 has been contributed by Kiwanians and their firms to finance the local campaign.

PLAN BECOMES NATIONAL

The response by Dallas Kiwanians to the project was so instantaneous, unanimous and enthusiastic that Kiwanis International Trustee Charles S. Dudley and I decided to offer the project to Kiwanis International for promotion among our 2,200 United States Kiwanis clubs. The board of trustees unanimously and enthusiastically adopted it on June 25, following a personal presentation by Dudley and your speaker at the Kiwanis war conference held in Chicago.

It is almost certain that the Kiwanis clubs, each raising locally their own funds—all to be spent in their own campaigns—will in the aggregate invest over a million dollars in this crusade. Keep his America American will be blazoned on signboards from Maine to California and Canada to the Gulf. Thousands of store windows will display the window cards in large and small cities alike. The mails will carry millions of pamphlets directly into homes, offices, factories, and business establishments. The messages of the spot announcements will reach countless numbers of people over the radio.

This new objective does not conflict with any other Kiwanis activity. It is in addition to other elements of our program. By its very nature it is not a permanent objective.

It should be viewed as a special activity. There should be a new, special committee in each participating club named to conduct the local campaign. The funds necessary to stage the project should be raised especially for that purpose.

As distinguished from conflicting with other Kiwanis activities, the Keep America American project provides several opportunities for cooperation, notably in public affairs, wartime citizenship, public relations, support of churches in their spiritual aims, business standards, and boys' and girls' work in connection with essay projects in the schools. The campaign can be used most effectively in promoting membership increase and maintenance and in establishing new clubs.

Our plan aims at a revival of a passionate love for American freedom. Such a revival will lead every loyal American to resist all who would abridge our freedoms—to resist all who would destroy our free enterprise. And make no mistake, these freedoms are definitely in jeopardy. Because of its lofty objective our campaign will take on the nature of a crusade. We believe that every true American will subscribe wholeheartedly to our objective. We believe that you will share our feeling of urgency in getting such a crusade under way before it is too late.

Many have said that if Kiwanis accomplished nothing more in this crusade than to build a great backfire of patriotic propaganda against subversive propaganda that has poisoned the minds of countless citizens, it would serve an invaluable purpose at this time.

At least a hundred fine, patriotic phrases have, as we all know, been intentionally used by leaders of subversive movements. Even our own appealing slogan, "Keep His America American," with the word "his" omitted, has been thus used.

It is high time that patriotic Americans use such phrases to forcefully present the virtues of our American democracy and way of life—and not let such phrases continue to be distorted and misused by our mortal enemies, and by many to whom subversive propaganda has been nothing but a profitable racket.

Abraham Lincoln said: "If there is anything that the people cannot entrust to anybody but themselves, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their liberty and their institutions."

In time of war it is necessary that government be granted powers that have the effect of partially restricting some of our liberties. But we must be vigilant to see that these restrictions are promptly removed when the war is won, recognizing that it is easier to grant extraordinary powers to government in time of war than it is to secure their return to the people after a war is over.

There is a school of thought in America today that insists that our American system whereby a man becomes a doctor because he wants to and locates wherever he chooses, is out of date. They would give government authority to decide the line of work in which each individual may engage and the place where he may work. They are dissatisfied with our traditional system, which places no limitation upon man's opportunity for achievement in any art, science, business, trade, or profession of his choice.

There are only two kinds of economy, an economy of free enterprise and a government planned and administered economy. In the former the function of government is to enact laws that will preserve and foster freedom of enterprise and provide certain necessary regulation in the public interest. In the latter, government displaces private initiative and management. The idea of government-planned economy is an alien philosophy—a collectivist, a totalitarian philosophy, an un-American philosophy. It is the antithesis of our traditional American system, founded as it is upon freedom of men and their institutions and of competitive capitalism—the system of free, private enterprise.

WINSTON CHURCHILL SAYS:

"We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward, and thrift no privileges."

Millions of Americans do not understand that the free enterprise system and freedom to choose one's occupation in our compensated economy have made this Nation great—the envy of people in every nation on earth. The farmer behind his plow, the engineer behind his throttle, the machinist at his lathe, the stenograper at her typewriter are all beneficiaries of our American system. Convinced of its value to them they will not

surrender it for any other system on earth. They will fight to preserve it.

KEEP HIS AMERICA AMERICAN

Ten million Americans are in the armed forces of our Nation. Into our hands they committed the destiny of the civil affairs of our Nation when they donned khaki and olive drab and blue, just as we committed to them the destiny of our Nation's military affairs when they entered service. It is our solemn duty to insure that the America to which they return is the same kind of an America that they left.

Our boys are not fighting to create a new world order, to impose their religion on the world, to gain glory for themselves. They are fighting to preserve the kind of America in which they lived and worked before they entered service. As someone has so aptly put it, "Save Americans for America, but also save America for Americans."

The emphasis in our crusade is embodied in our slogan, "Keep His America American," upon protecting and maintaining freedom of opportunity and the free-enterprise system for our men in service.

Wholly aside from a consideration of the merits of this plan, we must ask ourselves, "Are we, here at home, ready to stand up and fight to preserve that for which our boys are dying? Are we ready to square off against the forces that would take away our freedom?" We submit that the time for talk has passed; that the time for action is here—now—today.

KIWANIS OBJECT AND OBJECTIVE

The Kiwanis Clubs of the United States find motivation for this great patriotic project in the fourth object of Kiwanis International:

"To develop by precept and example a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship."

They find specific authority for this special emphasis on preserving free enterprise in the objective:

"Perpetuate free enterprise as fundamental to the democratic way of life."

The Keep America American campaign provides a simple, practical, and effective way in which this object and objective may be accomplished—through a message to literally millions of Americans in every walk of life who will read the newspaper ads, billboard posters, window posters, and pamphlets, and listen to the talks over the radio.

KIWANIS IDEAL ORGANIZATION TO CONDUCT SUCH A CAMPAIGN

Kiwanians are typically middle-class businessmen—representatives of little business rather than big business. We have in our membership the proprietors of small stores and shops, executives of medium-sized commercial and industrial establishments, local executives of big businesses, farmers, men from all the professions, including the ministry, employees of social agencies and of local, State, and national Government.

Kiwanis is not identified with controversial ideologies; it is not the spokesman for great corporations, for labor, for farmers, although recognizing the part which they play in our American social and economic life.

"Keep America American" is distinctly an American project. Kiwanis is the ideal instrumentality to carry this American message regarding freedom of opportunity and the free enterprise system to all of the people of the United States.

WHAT IS FREE ENTERPRISE?

Freedom of enterprise conveys one set of ideas to you and, perhaps, a different set to me. Let's first list what freedom of enterprise is not:

1. It is not a freedom to profit at the expense of the welfare of the community.

2. It is not freedom of any man to exploit another.

3. It is not freedom to impede by monopolistic practices the development of new business enterprises.

4. It is not freedom to waste the natural resources of our country.

5. It is not freedom to regard depression as a natural phenomenon as a result of which millions of people must go hungry.

6. It is not a freedom to extract subsidy from Government whenever adversity appears.

Those things are neither the prerogatives nor the preservatives of free enterprise. Such things pull down free enterprise. They would pull down free government on top of them.

Now, on the positive side, what is free enterprise?

1. Free enterprise means freedom for every individual to fully employ his capacities in some useful occupation.

2. It means the right of every worker to choose where he will work and what he will do.

3. It means a system of rewards arrived at through voluntary agreement in competitive markets.

4. It means protection under the law against predatory action, fraud, and violence.

5. It means good sportsmanship on the part of participants, who will try and win by superior efficiency and service, not by racketeering, political favoritism, or monopolistic combinations.

6. It is men and women working out their common destiny, not under the lash of coercive authority, but under the discipline of enlightened self-interest and moral responsibility.

NOT A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

Kiwanis is nonpartisan. Men of every political faith constitute our membership. Those who may think this is a political move are mistaken.

Kiwanis, of course, should not, cannot, and will not support any political party or candidate for office—local, State, or National.

Kiwanis respects the political convictions of all Kiwanians—just as we respect Kiwanians' individual religious views.

There are some Kiwanians who are political officeholders, employees of local, State, and National Government, and active as laymen in party politics who may need assurance that this project is not political. Neither those who would read into it a partisan philosophy which they favor, nor those who would read into it a partisan philosophy they oppose—are right.

Our American freedoms are the common property of all the people. Any campaign designed to implement their preservation commends itself to men of every political faith.

Championship of the American way of life transcends all political considerations. Just as it is imperative that every American buy War bonds to the limit of his resources to help win the war—regardless of what political faith he may profess and what political party may be in power—so must every citizen jealously guard freedom of opportunity and the free-enterprise system, indispensable to winning the peace. Our American system must continue to be the inspiration to freedom loving people everywhere.

To say "Keep America American" is not to imply that we want to go back to the horse-back days, the horse-and-buggy days, the model T days, or even to yesterday. We insist on going forward—going forward to better days than we have ever known. But we also insist that the road we travel must be the old safe road of free, private enterprise. The means of transportation may be as new as tomorrow, but we know the direction to our destination, and that the old road will get us there.

To say "Keep America American" is not to imply that we believe in isolating ourselves from the rest of the world after the war is won. Some method of cooperation between our Nation and our allies, to maintain the peace, is essential, not only to ourselves and our allies, but to the whole civilized world. We must keep America American in order to keep our rendezvous with destiny.

It is not our aim to bring out of this war or out of this crusade, an America which conforms to the concept of any minority group; but rather to preserve our sacred right of free discussion and debate by which, through peaceable means, we may proceed in the future as we have in the past—a free people unmolested by a dictatorial state.

This crusade has no direct action of any nature as its objective, legislative or otherwise. Its sole object is to make the American people vitally conscious of the fundamental part that freedom has had in making our Nation great and to give pointed emphasis to freedom of opportunity and the free-enterprise system. But once convinced that these freedoms must be maintained, every citizen will by his voice and acts—each in his own way—implement their preservation. We are trying in this crusade to make all our people articulate in the defense of their freedoms.

"But I want to do something," you say. "What can I do to further this dynamic patriotic cause?" you ask.

Across your workbench, on your farm, across your desk, at your counter, in your living room—talk about the glorious advantage of American citizenship which freedom of opportunity and the system of free, private enterprise have made available to all our people. In your letters include the phrase keep America American. Secure a supply of our mail inserts and enclose them in your correspondence, in your bills, and statements.

In organizations to which you belong, in advertising by your firms, we urge that you do something along the line we are doing. Many different campaigns devised to accomplish the same purpose—all running simultaneously—will have great cumulative effect.

The combined and coordinated thought and action of thousands of Americans in preaching the gospel of our American freedoms can, to paraphrase a Kiwanis object, "Create and maintain sound public opinion" on this vitally important subject. Let's keep America American.

Soldiers Should Be Allowed To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for people to charge Congressmen with a lack of sincerity for failure to adopt a simple, uniform, fair, nonpartisan voting procedure for the armed services. However, it must be remembered that Congress confronts a very serious constitutional problem, and a degree of patience must be extended while the proper solution is being sought.

Congress must find the solution at an early date and no easy escape is found in inaction. The legal barrier is contained in article I, section 2:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors (voters) in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the

most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That brief innocent sentence is construed by many to mean that each State alone has the power to find the qualification of its voters and that such power is far beyond Federal jurisdiction. Such has been the position for years on the poll-tax situation.

President Roosevelt has called our attention to the fact that surely the framers of the Constitution never anticipated that these words would ever block 11,000,000 citizens in the armed ranks from voting. Yet to ignore the words and invite a court test of a national election would be unthinkable.

Various methods for ending this dilemma have been suggested; one is to have the various States separately adopt a uniform procedure. This is cumbersome, especially since the legislatures of but eight States meet this year.

Another method would have Congress adopt and the armed services distribute uniform ballots covering Federal offices. Ballots would be collected and returned to the States where it would be up to the local authorities to see whether or not they were voted by qualified electors. This would require wholehearted cooperative endeavor by the 48 States, further arrangements would have to be made to facilitate the registering of the great number of soldiers who have not been previously registered because of their age or for other reasons.

This problem can be solved. A means of allowing the servicemen to vote can be found and must be found soon.

Federal Ownership of Real Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH PETERSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Secretary of the Interior:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1943.

Hon. HUGH PETERSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PETERSON: Thank you for your letter of December 16, concerning my letter to the Washington Post, which appeared in the December 16 issue under the heading "Government lands."

The recent public concern over the amount of land owned by the Federal Government may have been caused by numerous purchases of land by the War and Navy Departments. Frequently, these purchases have involved fairly large acreages of valuable lands which formerly made substantial contributions to local tax revenues. So far no provision has been made for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on lands acquired for military purposes. It is significant, also, that these lands have been removed from the tax rolls of many communities simultaneously with the establishment of military or naval encampments or of ordnance plants. Thus, the local governments have suffered some losses in tax revenues and at the same time have been required to expand public services for an increased population. Undoubtedly this process has created some serious local situations and has resulted in undue alarm over Government land ownership in general.

Statements in the press concerning the information set forth in Senate Document No. 130, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "Federal Ownership of Real Estate," reveal considerable misunderstanding with regard to the Federal estate. This misconception of the whole question is due largely to the fact that the report does not make a clear distinction between the original public domain lands and lands which have been acquired by the Federal Government through purchase, condemnation, and donation. There appears to be the general impression, moreover, that the Federal Government has acquired the greater portion of the lands under its jurisdiction during recent years and that it has embarked upon an extensive Federal acquisition program. The fact is, that of the 376,000,000 acres of Federal lands reported in table 2 of Senate Document No. 130, approximately 335,000,000 acres are original public-domain lands which were acquired 90 years or more ago by cession from the Eastern States; by purchase from France and Spain; by treaty from Great Britain; and by annexation, cession, and purchase from Mexico. These lands have never been on the tax rolls of the States or of the local governments, although they have provided them with substantial revenues through the use and development of the resources thereon under authority of various congressional enactments. The lands acquired by the Federal Government through purchase or donation, and thus removed from the tax rolls, make up a relatively small portion of the total Federal holdings.

There is little cause for alarm over the fact that the Federal Government owns one-fifth of the total land area of the continental United States when it is considered that by far the greater portion of this area is unsuited to intensive use and is made up principally of forest and grazing lands well adapted to public ownership and management. The original public domain aggregated approximately 1,500,000,000 acres, or about three-fourths of the total land area of the United States. By various means, including public sale, homestead entry, grants to corporations in aid of transportation, and grants to the States in aid of education, more than 1,000,000,000 acres have been disposed of, and what remains is chiefly the remnants which individuals have not sought to acquire, or which the people, acting through the Congress, have decided should be retained in Federal ownership and under Federal management for conservation and other public purposes.

Even during the period when the 41,000,000 acres, listed in Senate Document No. 130 as acquired from private owners, were being purchased (Federal acquisition of land in substantial quantities began in 1912 with the purchase of forest land under the Weeks Act), more than 150,000,000 acres of public-domain lands were being disposed of. Only during the past decade has the net acreage of Federal land increased. Current Federal land acquisition is largely for war purposes, and much of the land acquired for these purposes will be returned to private ownership following the end of the war emergency.

I agree with you that any sound and lasting solution of the economic and social problems of the country must include a sensible and workable public-land policy. I am pleased with your interest in the efforts of the Department of the Interior in this direction, and I hope that in dealing with land problems, you may find the services of the Department useful.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Tax Law Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

TAX LAW INJUSTICE—CONGRESS SOME DAY MAY DISCOVER HOW NEW DEAL PROTECTS MONOPOLIES

(By David Lawrence)

While the New Deal is busy making headlines by indicting banks and British companies for alleged technical violations of our laws, the same New Deal is busy protecting the big businesses and the monopolies from paying higher tax rates than the smaller-business man.

When the soldiers come home and look for jobs they will discover that as the war boom collapses on the business front, the smaller enterprises—which in the aggregate furnish more employment normally than do the big corporations—will have suffered. The chances to build up post-war capital to go into new lines or to reconvert to old lines will have been materially impaired by the New Deal tax laws.

Thus under the New Deal conception of economic rights—which, incidentally, President Roosevelt completely overlooked in his recent message to Congress—the small corporation with $1,000,000 of invested capital pays just as high a rate of taxes as the $20,000,000 corporation. There is no graduated scale of tax rates which is the very heart of a capacity-to-pay tax system. The 1941 law did provide such a scale for excess-profits taxes but the New Deal insisted on a flat tax which now is to be 95 percent instead of 90 percent as in the present law.

Congress, which is supposed to have achieved some independence of the New Deal on tax matters in recent years, seems to have concerned itself lately with possible tax relief for the $200,000,000 corporations, renegotiation benefit for the big companies, but no suggestions for relief of the smaller corporations has put in its appearance as yet though the revenue measure has gone through the House and is well on its way through the Senate. Under the pending bill, a company which has an invested capital of $1,000,000 and earns $1,000,000 pays a net tax of 72.4 percent, or $724,000 and can retain, therefore, only $276,000. But a company with $20,000,000 invested capital pays only $400,000 out of the first million it earns and hence retains $600,000.

Even on the basis of a 25-percent return or earning on $20,000,000 invested capital, the over-all net tax rate is 72.5, whereas the corporation with $1,000,000 invested capital that earns $1,000,000 pays 72.4 percent in taxes.

This means that the incentive to earn not only is diminished, because very few companies do earn $1,000,000 on a $1,000,000 invested capital—but the situation is correspondingly adverse for companies earning less than $1,000,000.

A business that can keep $276,000 out of an invested capital of $1,000,000 is a small business as corporate affairs are considered nowadays because the gross volume of many large companies runs into billions or big fractions thereof.

The 1941 tax law took care of this problem to some extent by a graduated rate which ran from 35 percent on the first $20,000 of excess profits to 60 percent on the incomes

in excess of $500,000. This was a fair and more equitable means of taxation but the Treasury Department since has insisted on penalizing the smaller businesses by subjecting them to the same rates as the larger enterprises. As for the so-called relief provisions of the excess-profits laws from which so much was promised, it turns out that these are largely "jckers" and that the Treasury is construing the measures narrowly or actually delaying the auditing of these cases so much as to prevent Congress from learning in time to do them any good whether any relief to the smaller businesses actually is being given.

It is doubtful whether there really will be any relief under section 722 which will give smaller businesses any reduction that they do not already get under the broad clause limiting the over-all tax of all corporations to 80 percent.

The net result is to entrench big business still more firmly and to make it difficult for the weaker competitor to strengthen himself sufficiently for the post-war competition. Some day Congress will discover the small-business man and the manner in which the New Deal has protected the monopolies by means of the tax laws. But that discovery as yet appears to be in the dim distance.

Newspaper Pioneer Honored by Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we greet the *American Mariner*, first of the Liberty ships to visit the Nation's Capital, I am pleased that the Maritime Commission has announced that a sister ship of 10,500 tons will soon be constructed and named after the late Edward B. Haines, of Paterson, N. J., pioneer of American journalism, war hero, and civic builder.

The Paterson Morning Call, one of five eastern newspapers founded by Mr. Haines, paid him the following editorial tribute last Tuesday:

NEWSPAPER PIONEER HONORED BY NATION

The announcement of the naming of the latest Liberty ship by the United States Maritime Commission after the late Edward B. Haines, founder of the Paterson Evening News, is the first honor of its kind to be bestowed upon a Paterson citizen of the fourth estate, and heartiest congratulations on receiving this signal honor are the order of the day to his son, Harry B. Haines, the present publisher of the News, who has inherited with justifiable pride this old-established publishing institution and preserved it as a monument to the prodigious labors of this Civil War veteran pioneer of American journalism.

His name will now sail the seven seas on the highways to victory for the United Nations, as a worthy tribute from a united America to an American, who was almost fatally wounded while still in his 'teens in the war to make America united and free for all Americans.

The newspaper life of this amazing human dynamo, of whom the late Dr. William Gourley once said, "Put Haines on a desert island and in 6 months time he'll have a successful newspaper running there," began as a young reporter on the Chicago Times during the feverish era of post-war construction. From Chicago he moved to Kansas City to become city editor of the Daily Journal of Commerce in 1870, and a few months thereafter fate took a hand and made him editor at the age of 22 when his chief was assassinated in the courthouse square during those wild and woolly times.

His first venture as a publisher, imbued with the spirit of making the principles he had fought for on the field of battle living forces in the Government of a reunited democracy, was as head of a weekly newspaper. Then followed the establishment of newspapers in New York and Pennsylvania. In 1880, Mr. Haines became owner of his first Call at Altoona; then in 1885 he established the Harrisburg Call, and in July of that some momentous year was urged by our truly beloved Mayor Nathan Barnert to come to Paterson and found a Paterson Call which he did on October 1, 1885. Then after his sale of the Call on January 1, 1889 to the founders of the Call Printing and Publishing Co., which has carried on the Morning Call ever since under the continuing manangement of the last surviving co-founder, Robert Williams, to whom the new Call Building was dedicated, and his surviving family, Mr. Haines undertook his last successful newspaper venture, the founding of the Paterson Evening News in 1890, which he piloted until his untimely death on May 3, 1911.

That he was a far-seeing prophet, as well as an astute organizing genius, is reflected in the last paragraph of his first Paterson editorial of October 1, 1885, the date of the first issue of the Morning Call, which read: "Paterson needs more and diversified industries. * * * With diversified industries our growth and prosperity are assured."

Surely then this belated honor to the name of Edward B. Haines, American soldier, patriot, and publisher, is truly deserved.

Address of Hon. Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio, Before Ohio Dairy Products Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Ohio Dairy Products Association at Columbus, Ohio, January 17, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I understand that your organization is probably the greatest organization of its kind in the Nation. I was not unmindful of this fact when I accepted your invitation to come to this meeting. From the number of dairymen present in this city and from the heavy program that has been arranged for you, I am sure that this meeting will be one of profit to you and one of benefit to the country. The dairy business in its various ramifications is one of the Nation's greatest industries. The great American cow is an important institution. The value of the food she consumes runs into the millions, and the value of the food she produces runs into additional millions. In other words, she much more than pays her own way and at the same time is one of the human family's greatest benefactors. She deserves consideration and kindness from Congress as well as from her owners.

I shall not attempt any discussion of the dairy products business from a practical standpoint, although I want to assure you that up until I was 20 years of age I probably milked as many cows as any of you. I know something of the dairy products business from its various angles, even to making cheese and going to market and driving a milk wagon. Your distinguished secretary has tactfully suggested that it might be well if I would confine my remarks to the field of national legislation as it applies to the dairy products business.

In this connection let me say that your great industry is well and ably represented in Washington. There are strong milk, butter, cheese, and dairy products associations represented there, and representatives of the American Farm Bureau and of the Grange and other agricultural associations have not forgotten that the dairy industry is probably the greatest branch of agriculture. By way of encouragement, I wish to say that I am very glad that this great industry is so ably represented in Washington.

Frequently the newspapers and other commentators speak slightingly of the lobbyist in Washington. As one who has been in Congress for many years, my experience has been that it is the part of wisdom for an industry to have representatives in Washington to represent its cause. I am always glad to meet these representatives because they are usually sincere and are usually thoroughly advised concerning the matters which they represent. One of the cardinal principles of a republican form of government is that the people should aways have the right to petition those in authority and those who make the laws. A great industry such as a dairy industry that brings to the door of nearly every family in the country a fine, clean, wholesome bottle of milk each morning, is entitled to consideration from those who make the laws as well as those who enforce the laws. There is no item of food so essential and of such wide and general use as that contained in the well-recognized milk bottle. The phrases "bread and butter" and "bread and milk" because of their caloric sufficiency have in our language an all-inclusive meaning.

LEGISLATION

There are two items of legislation that are pending before the Congress of the United States at this time that I should like to discuss with you. One of these is consumer subsidies and another is the legislation seeking to establish the centralization of all food activities under one head.

Before I take up these two subjects let me touch briefly on the food situation in the United States. It is only natural that there should be much agitation concerning food. It is generally conceded that the food problem is next in importance to our problem of winning the war. There are three elements which are absolutely vital to the perpetuation of the human family on the earth. The first in imminent importance is air, which so far is free; the second is water, which is practically free; and the next is food. You have often heard it said that the Army fights on its belly. A soldier must have food and munitions, to win a war.

When the war has been won the problem of munitions ceases to be a problem, but the food problem is present in peace as in war. Food is vital in war and it is also vital in peace. There is no gainsaying the fact that there is a tremendous unrest in the United States by reason of the manner and method of handling food. Before the war it was a well-recognized fact that the policy of the Government toward food production for years had been one of scarcity as against abundance. There has grown up in this country in the last few years a terrifically large and

expensive system of gratuities and subsidies of all kinds and descriptions. These can be measured by the mounting national debt. In other words, the administration, although it collected large sums by the increase of taxes and by borrowing from the people, spent it extravagantly and now has nothing to show for it but the most colossal debt under which any nation ever staggered in the history of the world. Many schemes and plans for public works, for public buildings, for easy loans, and for subsidies have cost us billions of dollars, which now hang over us as a heavy threat. I have never subscribed to the theory of paying money for not producing. That never seemed right to me. In the last 11 years Congress has passed 17 different tax bills and each bill raised the tax rates and broadened the tax base, but in none of these 11 years was there ever enough money taken in to pay the expenses of the Government. The United States being the greatest producer of food of any nation in the world, it is only natural that the food industry was involved in this wild and mad scramble. The trouble with the food situation today is that the policy of scarcity is still being adhered to by those in authority. Even in 1943 much money was paid out by the Government for not raising some commodities.

SUBSIDIES

That brings me logically to a discussion of subsidies. I shall not attempt to discuss subsidies at any great length because most of you are familiar with the arguments on both sides. So that you might know my views I shall be glad to give them to you. I believe that the best policy is to encourage production and if subsidies are necessary they should be confined as nearly as possible to production subsidies. Conditions might also present themselves where the distribution of foods should be encouraged and if so I would not oppose subsidies of that kind because in the production and the distribution of food no special individual is benefited. The general public benefits. The subsidies for production and distribution should not be more than the actual expense necesary to encourage the desired production and distribution of the food sought. In that way the food is started on its course into the market places where all people of all classes have the same advantage. There is no special advantage to any group. Subsidies in the nature of incentive payments are different from the subsidies in the nature of a roll-back. A roll-back subsidy is inserted into the middle of the transaction which brings the food from the producer to the consumer. It is expected to work both ways so as to aid in production and also to keep down the price to the consumer but in most cases the subsidy is largely consumed by the additional expense incident to its imposition and is frequently directed into channels whereby it benefits groups which were never intended to be benefited by such subsidy. Subsidies of this kind usually result in a curtailment of production of the articles to which they apply. Scarcity always means higher prices. The New Deal plan is to produce a scarcity which always raises prices, then to counteract the increased prices by the payment of a subsidy.

SUBSIDY LEGISLATION

The battle of subsidies which has been raging in Washington for the past year or two has been a very spirited one. The New Deal administration has felt that it must defend its policy and must continue its course. As proof of the fact that its course has been an uncertain and unstable one, I need only to cite the many changes that have occurred in the various phases of the administration of the food laws. From Leon Henderson down to the present Price Administrator, Mr. Bowles, many changes of personnel and many shifts of various kinds have been made, but there is still noticeable the same general philosophy.

I shall not tire you with a tedious report of the various parliamentary steps connected with the consideration of the subsidy legislation, but I will say that in the summer of 1943 the House of Representatives, by a large vote, passed a bill which, if it had become a law, would have done away with consumer subsidies commonly known as the roll-back subsidies. The Senate passed the same bill, which the President vetoed. The House was not able to muster a two-thirds vote to override the President's veto, although the vote was close. The House at that time passed legislation extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until December 31, 1943. In the meantime the House considered a bill which is now in the Senate. That bill, too, will outlaw consumer subsidies, but will not molest incentive payments and producer subsidies. This bill was passed by the House by a vote of 278 to 117. Just what the Senate will do with this bill is problematical at this time. Some compromises have been offered, but pending these compromises a joint resolution was passed extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 17th of February 1944. Some definite action must be taken by that time else the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation must cease because of lapse of authority.

It is likely therefore that the Senate and the House will come to some definite conclusion before the 17th of February.

If it should develop that the present law will be continued, the only control then would be through the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. As you know the most powerful influence in a republican form of government should be the people. Our forefathers in setting up our Government provided that the power of the purse should always remain in the people. All legislation for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, which is the legislative branch nearest to the people. The Congress through its taxing powers and through its powers of appropriation may curb the expenditures of the Executive, which it has been doing to a very marked degree in the last year or two. There are many people in the country who feel that the Congress should show still greater solicitude in its control of the purse.

CENTRALIZATION OF CONTROL OVER FOOD ACTIVITIES

There is no gainsaying the fact that government now is more complex than it ever has been. I dare say that there are hundreds more Government activities of various kinds operating in and out of Washington than there were in the First World War. Government by directive and by Executive order now has become much larger in its scope of activity than government by statute or by constitution. This has come through the surrender of power by the Congress to the executive branch and the usurpation of authority by bureaus and other executive agencies. I do not want to be considered as an alarmist but to my mind this situation is positively dangerous. The bureaucrats have more power over the everyday activities of the citizens of the Nation than has the Congress or the courts. These bureaucrats can penalize you if you sell a hog overweight; they can prevent you from selling your product; they can restrict your acreage; they can do many things that no judge in the land can do and that Congress has never assumed to do.

The people have withstood many of these invasions of their liberties without objection because they are patriotic and loyal. When confusing regulations controlling food were voluminously issued the people developed a rebellious spirit. The restrictions and regulations in many cases are so complicated that it is difficult for the average citizen to interpret them. There is no question that in stressful times the Government should have the power to adopt some method of rationing food if that is necessary. Otherwise the strong and the fortunate would get more than their share. However, an administration dedicated to a course of created scarcity as against plenty should revise its philosophy and encourage maximum production of essential foods. The present administration has never yet given a wholesome advocacy to increased production.

When the Government assumes to initiate a program for rationing any specific commodity it should be ready to carry out its part of the program. Coupon holders should always be able to obtain the foodstuffs to which their coupons entitle them. Points but no butter, points but no beef—this has been a common complaint, a chronic situation. It is inexcusable. The food-ration coupons issued by the Government should always be redeemable to maintain confidence in the Government.

When serious shortages of coffee developed soon to be followed by plenty of coffee; when potatoes were so scarce as to be precious, soon to be followed by reports of thousands of bushels spoiling in Government hands; when chickens were so scarce as to be obtainable only through black markets soon to be followed by such a supply as to be practically our only meat diet; when for months steak was considered as a luxury and even today is hardly obtainable, while at the same time we hear reports of millions of pounds of meat spoiling and see the stockyards crowded with more cattle than at any previous time in history; and while the stockyards are crowded with more hogs than at any time in history yet pork is still rationed, there is little wonder that the whole population is rightfully dissatisfied.

REASON FOR CONFUSION

The reason for this confusion is that there are so many different departments and agencies of the Government assuming to control different phases of the food activities. The Food Production Administration (a part of W. F. A.) is supposed to be in charge of all production plans. The Food Distribution Administration issues orders covering every phase of distribution. The C. C. C. pays the subsidies, examines earnings, etc. The Army and Navy decide on their requirements. The Office of Defense Transportation takes a hand in storage as well as transportation problems. O. P. A. fixes the prices and administers the rationing program. The War Production Board allocates containers and machinery. These numerous Government agencies, each jealous to some degree of the others, have a hand in the food picture. None has complete authority. Each has the right and sometimes the inclination to hold up orders to suit its own purposes. But even when they are in entire agreement they must go to the O. E. S. if any agreement affects prices, regardless of mounting costs. Judge Vinson has the veto power that can throw the whole matter back into the "laps of these little gods."

The practical result of all of this confusion has been the general demoralization of the food industry.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE

Because of the muddling of the new dealers in their handling of the food situation, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives, about 9 months ago set up what is known as the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. This unofficial committee is operating without any expense to the Government. This in itself is an innovation worthy of note. This committee consists of 44 members, which have been divided into 9 subcommittees. Each of these subcommittees has been assigned special activities. For instance, one will study

and make recommendations with reference to livestock and meats. Another will study field crops, while another considers dairy and poultry products, and so forth. All of these subcommittees have been very active and have done much constructive work. To this committee must go the credit for focusing the attention of the American people on the necessity for the coordination of all food activities of the Government under one food administrator with full power to act. Upon the direction of this committee, and as general chairman of the committee, I introduced H. R. 2739 on May 18, 1943. This bill was immediately approved by the people of the Nation with phenomenal unanimity. In fact not one single responsible person or organization arose to oppose it. The membership of the House and Senate quite generally approve it.

THE JENKINS BILL

The bill to which I have heretofore alluded is known as the Jenkins bill. This bill provides:

1. It establishes a food administration in the Department of Agriculture and gives the administrator thereof full power over all food activities. This power is broad enough to include the control over prices and all other controls now exercised by any of the many food authorities. It also provides that the administrator may delegate his powers to assistants, but he cannot surrender them.

2. It protects the consumer as well as the producer.

3. The act could be terminated with the termination of the war.

Because this bill assumed to provide controls for prices, and so forth, it was sent to the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration. Later the Agriculture Committee of the House took up the consideration of the matter, with the result that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the chairman of that committee, with my consent, incorporated practically all the principles of my bill into a bill which he introduced, which is known as the Fulmer bill. This bill was recommended for passage by the Agriculture Committee of the House and would have been favorably considered by the House but for the fact that when the President appreciated what Congress was about to do, he forced the resignation of Chester Davis and appointed Marvin Jones. It was generally known that it was the wish of the Republicans and Democrats alike that Davis should be the man to be appointed, whichever of these two bills would have passed. But when the President appointed another man to Davis' position, the ardor of some Members for the passage of that legislation suddenly cooled. They were willing to grant complete authority to Davis or to any other fair-minded man to operate entirely free from any domination, even from the domination of the White House, but they were not willing to give the White House any such authority to be exercised by its appointee by remote control.

It is almost a national calamity that we were thwarted in our attempt to give the American people what they wanted. This determination of the White House to hold all authority and its unwillingness to divide authority with anyone, however competent, is frequently noted.

This legislation is still on the calendar of the House of Representatives and has a fair chance of passage.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee is active and expects to continue its activity. It is constructive in its purposes. It will continue the offer of its cooperation in the solution of food problems.

CONCLUSIONS

Summing up my remarks let me say that to my mind the remedy for the present food chaos is to adopt a policy of increased production of essential food and a sensibly conducted rationing policy where rationing is necessary, and the centralization of all responsibility in all food activities in a single individual who shall have authority to act without dictation.

Record of Servicemen from Marlboro, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from a recent issue of the Marlboro Daily Enterprise, of Marlboro, Mass.:

CITY CAN BE PROUD OF PART SONS PLAY IN FREEDOM'S FIGHT—COONEY AIDS IN KILLING 240 JAPS; DONOVAN HURT AT SALERNO, TURNER AT TARAWA; CONNORS BATTLES NAZIS IN AIR.

MARLBORO.—Dispatches from the fighting fronts overseas more and more are containing the names of Marlboro men covering themselves with glory in action against the enemy, on land, sea and in the air. To date 7 local men have died for their country in action and 8 more have died in the service, 3 in training accidents. The casualty list for Marlboro's sons in killed, died in service, wounded in action, missing in action and prisoners of war now totals 35.

The latest dispatch about a Marlboro boy, cut from a California newspaper by Lt. Charles Gately, United States Marine Corps, of Devens Street, tells of marine action against the Japanese at Bougainville Island in the South Pacific in which a Marlboro marine figured prominently. He is Corp. John J. Cooney, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Cooney, 65 Devens Street. Gately mailed the article to Cooney's parents and it was written by Tech. Sgt Theo C. Link, a combat correspondent. Cooney, in a letter to his parents dated December 30, 1943, following the battle for Bougainville, wrote in part, "I am not having any fun," but said nothing about the fight.

The clipping follows:

"Bougainville, South Pacific.—Two light tanks were given credit for turning the tide of battle on the left flank of this battle front. Smashing blindly against the green jungle walls, unable to see any Japs but acting upon information supplied by marine riflemen, the tank crews poured volley after volley into a foxhole area until all Jap firing was silenced. When the action closed, 240 Jap bodies were counted.

"One of the tanks called the Lady Luck, was manned by Platoon Sgt. Charles H. Kirkham, of Sweetwater, Ala.; Corp. Paul A. Engle, of Lewisburg, Pa.; Corp. John F. Cooney, of Marlboro, Mass., and Pvt. (1st cl.) W. W. Phares, of Porter Hollow, Charleston, W. Va. Corporal Cooney is a tank crew radio operator. He has a brother in the marines, Pvt. Richard W. Cooney, quartermaster, stationed at New River, N. C. Corporal Cooney's picture is published today with his brother's on page 1."

Other dispatches tell about another Marlboro boy, a sailor, Joseph G. Donovan, seaman, second class, son of Mr. and Mrs. William J. Donovan, of 27 State Street, who manned a 20-mm. gun fighting German dive bombers off Salerno until the barrel of his gun depressed and broke his leg. The following account appeared in a Boston newspaper:

"Although he fired hot steel off Palermo and manfully stuck to his 20-millimeter gun when Stuka dive bombers attacked his ship off Salerno, Seaman (2d cl.) Joseph George Donovan, 19, of Marlboro, finally got it himself—but the wound came from his own gun.

"Donovan, now in the Naval Hospital at Charleston, S. C., was trying to blow Nazis out of the sky when the barrel of his gun depressed. He suffered a broken leg, and was sent back to the States to mend.

"He is expected to leave the Charleston hospital shortly. A graduate of Marlboro High School, Donovan has two brothers also in the armed services, Donald and William J., Jr."

A recent dispatch in another Boston newspaper told how Staff Sgt. Edmond R. Connors, ball turret gunner on a United States Flying Fortress, fought German planes for 8 hours 5 miles over Germany. He pumped many rounds of ammunition at attacking planes and aided a crew member who was wounded. The Fortress was badly shot up but managed to get back to its field. It marked the fifteenth mission over Germany for the Marlboro lad, who is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William J. Connors, of Spring Street. His brother is Sgt. James Connors, United States Air Corps, stationed in Italy.

Corp. James H. Turner, United States Marines, son of Mrs. Frances Turner, who arrived home Friday night, his first visit home in 16 months, fractured his right arm in the battle at Tarawa Island in the South Pacific, recalled as the bloodiest battle ever engaged in by the United States marines. Turner lay on the beach for hours before he was picked up and taken to a hospital area for treatment. He has a brother, John F. Turner, aviation cadet at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Republican Trend Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of today with regard to recent Congressional elections, referring to the deep and growing opposition to Democratic political philosophies and practices:

THE REPUBLICAN TREND CONTINUES

Continuance of the Nation-wide swing to the Republican Party is strikingly emphasized by the results of Pennsylvania's two special elections on Tuesday to fill vacancies in Congress.

In both cases the Republican nominees won by impressive margins. In Montgomery County, of course, any other result would have been an amazing upset. But the Republican victory in Philadelphia's Second District has special significance. For 8 years the district had sent a Democrat to Washingon and many of its wards had been counted upon for sturdy Democratic majorities.

The changing trend was manifested when Bernard Samuel carried it in the recent mayorality election by a large figure, and it was well confirmed in Tuesday's special election. Voting rather for Republican representation in the House than for the candidate, enough Republicans turned out to roll up a large plurality.

The effect on Democratic plans in the House during the current session is potentially important. Republican Members now come within eight votes of equalling the dwindling Democratic strength, with five seats vacant. Even more to the point, Democratic votes are one below an absolute majority of the over-all House total.

Demonstrated again is the fact that the people, given the chance to vote in State, local, or congressional elections, are everywhere registering their deep and growing opposition to Democratic political philosophies and practices. This development has been called a Republican trend. It is becoming more than that and conceivably could develop into a tidal wave.

Women of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to compliment the women of the State of Pennsylvania on the fine work they are doing on the home front. As further proof of their work in the war effort, I include statistics from the Indiana Evening Gazette, Indiana, Pa.:

WOMEN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Women of Pennsylvania, 129,125 strong, are contributing their time and their work to the Nation's war effort, according to statistics given Miss Margaret Serene, executive secretary, Indiana County Red Cross Chapter, by Ramone S. Eaton, manager of the eastern area.

These women gave 4,871,107 hours of service in the varied activities of the volunteer special-services program of the American Red Cross during the 3-month period July 1–September 30, 1943. This service was added to the 16,148,362 hours that 182,427 volunteers worked in the fiscal year ending June 30.

"If these statistics for the last 15 months mean anything, it is that the American women in this and in every other State can be depended on to work, and work hard, in the interest of victory," declared Miss Serene. "In the new year there must be no decline in enthusiasm of the effort by which civilian men and women, through the American Red Cross, are responding to the needs of a Nation at war."

Pennsylvania Red Cross production during the months July 1–September 30 maintained the level attained in the preceding fiscal year, Miss Serene pointed out. During the quarter year the State's chapters made 266,459 garments, 481 layettes, and 56,967 miscellaneous articles. Much of this production has gone to aid men in the armed forces and into the Red Cross program of civilian war relief abroad. Pennsylvania chapters made 10,279,155 surgical dressings, which go to the Army and the Navy, and 47,111 kit bags, the kind that go to American fighting men at ports of embarkation.

Also during the 3 months Pennsylvania canteen workers served more than 300,000 meals. Dietitian Aide Corps members served in one hospital and there were 1,379 new cases in home service, through which the Red Cross helps the men of the armed forces and their families. Members of the Hospital and Recreation Corps (Gray Ladies) served in 8 Federal hospitals and 38 civilian institutions.

Pennsylvania has 5,975 volunteer nurses' aides. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 107 chapters awarded 38,356 home nursing certificates This training of volunteer women to serve as skilled laymen in hospitals and of housewives to render primary nursing care in the home is part of Red Cross efforts to compensate for the shortage of doctors and registered nurses at home. During the first 11 months of 1943 Pennsylvania sent 2,255 nurses to the Army and the Navy, recruited by the American Red Cross. The State's 1943 quota was 2,469.

During the last fiscal year, ending June 30, Pennsylvania had 111 chapters, with 214 branches. Nineteen chapters participated in 9 disaster operations, aiding 7,113 persons. Thirty chapters had public health nursing service, with 32,662 cases under care. More than 13,800 nutrition certificates were issued, over 248,900 first-aid certificates, over 4,500 life-saving certificates, and more than 7,100 swimming certificates.

Pennsylvania had 6,348 schools enrolled in Junior Red Cross, representing a total membership of 1,309,439.

More than 625,500 pints of blood were given under the Red Cross plasma program for the armed forces between January 1941 and November 30, 1943. The State has blood donor centers at Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg.

In Pennsylvania 820 volunteers worked at the prisoner-of-war-package center in Philadelphia, packing bundles for distribution to men who have fallen into Axis hands.

Shall We Give the Soldiers a "Bobtailed" Ballot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on January 18, 1944:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen; in the brief time I have on the air tonight, I shall endeavor to clear up some of the confusion that has developed over the question of whether or not the soldiers will have an opportunity to vote in the 1944 elections. I shall evaluate some of the numerous statements that have been made regarding the bill that is now before the House of Representatives. I shall refute some of the completely erroneous statements and claims made in favor of the Federal or "bobtailed" ballot proposal known as the Lucas-Green or Worley bill.

For some reason that has never been clear to me, a terrific drive is being made to compel the passage of the Lucas Federal ballot scheme. Very high-up officials, including the Secretaries of the Army and Navy, have taken part in this drive for a "bobtailed" streamlined ballot for soldiers, and only recently the effort has been endorsed by a statement made by the President himself.

I assure you there is not the slightest controversy over the question of whether or not the soldiers should have the right to vote. In fact, the question does not even exist. Every American citizen, whether he is in the armed forces or not, should have the right to vote in elections. I know of no one in or out of Congress who holds a contrary view.

There is, however, a very sharp difference of opinion as to how the service people may obtain their ballots and as to what kind of a ballot should be provided them, whether they are to have a complete and legal State ballot or a short and legally doubtful Federal ballot.

Let's first consider the so-called Federal ballot plan advocated by Senator LUCAS and Congressman WORLEY. They propose to disregard the plain statement of the Constitution regarding elections. The Constitution definitely states that the qualifications of voters for Federal officials must be determined by the several States. The Lucas-Green-Worley bill sponsors propose to provide a slip of paper which they call a ballot but which contains no names at all. They propose to permit the voters to use this slip of paper to vote only in the election of a President, Vice President, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress. No thought is given to allowing the men and women in the armed forces to vote in State and local elections. If this Federal ballot is used, our soldiers, sailors, and marines will not have a chance to vote for a governor in any one of the 34 States electing governors this year. Even if the Lucas or Worley plan was the only possible way in which the armed forces could vote, it still would be an undesirable and improper piece of legislation to pass, because it is unworkable, deceptive, and, as I have said, unconstitutional.

It is unworkable because it proposes to ask State election officials to accept and count a Federal ballot when it is a fact that there is no State law in any State that will permit election officials to count election ballots that are not specifically provided for under State laws. The language of the Worley bill pretends to meet this situation by leaving to the States the right of acceptance or rejection of the Federal ballots; but its authors must know full well that the States have no legal right to accept Federal ballots unless the Constitution of the United States is amended to permit it.

The Worley bill, in my opinion, is cruelly deceptive, for it is heralded by its sponsors as a bill that would permit the serviceman to vote, when in fact it would do no such thing. If enacted into law, it would permit the men and women in the armed forces to write a ballot for President, Vice President, and Senators and Representatives in Congress, but provides not the slightest assurance that any such ballots would be counted—hence voted.

But there is a simple, workable, and constitutional way of giving the servicemen an opportunity to vote a real ballot that will be counted on election day. This plan is embodied in the amendments to the bill passed by the Senate which have been painstakingly worked out by Congressman CHARLES VURSELL, of Illinois, a member of the committee of the House which has been handling this legislation. The Senate bill as amended and as reported out by the House committee calls upon the appropriate authorities of the various States to cooperate in every possible way to provide absentee ballots for those in the armed forces.

Here is the simple procedure that will be followed under this bill: Post-card applications for State absentee ballots have been already printed under existing law, and are now in the headquarters of the armed forces throughout the world. The soldier merely fills out and signs one of these post cards, and it is sent by air to his State. His local election official, immediately sends him a ballot, also transported by air. The voting procedure is the same under either plan. The soldier marks the ballot in secret, executes his oath before a commissioned officer

or sergeant or other noncommissioned officer of equivalent grade, and it is transported by air immediately back to his State, where it is duly deposited with the proper election official, and where it will be counted on election day.

The Vursell amendments provide that these ballots, postal cards, envelopes, and instructions for voting shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States, and the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration are required to take the necessary steps to affect the delivery of such election materials and to give the transportation of them priority when, in the judgment of military and naval authorities, such priority would not interfere with the prosecution of the war.

The bill reported by the committee also recommends to the various States that, wherever necessary, primary dates be set earlier so that the ballot will be available for mailing at least 45 days prior to the November election. It also calls upon the States to accept post-card applications for, and to waive registration for, all men and women in the military service who may not be registered. It also asks the States to print ballots for the armed forces on light paper and condensed in size as much as possible in order to cut down shipping weight.

Several objections have been raised to the above-outlined procedure.

Let's take them in the order of their seeming importance:

It has been said that ballots cannot be transported to and from the men overseas in time to be counted in the election. I have before me a list furnished by the Army of the overseas locations of our forces, together with a statement showing the average air carriage time to Springfield, Ill., which is about an average point in the United States. The longest distance by the furthest route would require 16 days, thus requiring no more than 35 days for the round trip. Most of our overseas forces can be reached by air within a week. Since the application post cards will be returned to the secretaries of state many weeks in advance, only two trips will be required for actual voting. Only a few States have their primaries so late in the fall as to make the time element a serious question. Most of these States have already signified their intention of moving their primary dates forward so as to permit ample time.

It has been said—in fact, I quote directly from the President's message to Congress—he declares, "The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer 48 different soldier-voting laws." The President has been misinformed. The Army and Navy will be called upon to do no administering of voting laws but will merely be directed to cooperate in the transportation of the ballots. The Army and Navy would have the same identical obligation if the Lucas or Whorley Federal ballot bill becomes law, for the same identical procedure of voting is called for under title II of the Worley bill. Under that title, State absentee voting is provided for. Therefore, in addition to being obligated to carry the absentee ballots of the 48 States, the Army and the Navy would also have to transport the so-called Federal ballots. The Worley bill calls for an Army election day, so the Army and Navy would be required furthermore to suspend the prosecution of the war for 1 day in order to conduct an election. Under the Vursell plan, State ballots are voted individually at no stated time.

It has been said, and again I quote the President, "Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing State laws—and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election." Again I am compelled to say that the President is misinformed. The legislatures of several States have already met and changed their election laws. The Governors of some 15 States have expressed themselves as ready to call special sessions as soon as the Congress has indicated what type of legislation it needed. The State laws will be changed to meet the situation. I have confidence in the States if some of the people have not.

It has been said in the heat of argument that the State voting plan would disenfranchise 11,000,000 people in the armed forces. Let's look at that statement. Military security forbids accurate figures as to the number of men overseas, but I think the figure 5,000,000 by election day is close enough. These men can vote under the Vursell plan, as I have pointed out. What, then, about the 7,000,000 in this country? If they vote the "bobtailed" Federal ballot, they will be disenfranchised so far as State and local elections are concerned. If the proponents of the "trick" Federal ballot plan want to tell you the truth let them tell you that.

Now let us look ahead and suppose the Worley or Lucas scheme becomes law. Suppose the election is a close one. Because of the constitutional problems involved, the election certainly would be contested. It would thereupon take months and possibly years for the results of that election to be determined by the courts.

Meanwhile, under the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, the Congress would have to select a President and Vice President to act until a President and Vice President shall have qualified. In the event the Congress should become deadlocked with one House selecting one candidate and the other House a different candidate, the President and Vice President then in office would doubtless have to continue to serve—although that point has not yet been determined. In any event the situation would be one of chaos. In peacetime that would be bad enough, but in the midst of this war, it would be tragic. And yet, should Congress enact the so-called Federal ballot plan, such a condition of chaos and confusion would likely be the result.

Now let me conclude by asking you people of America some questions: Why are the proponents of the Federal ballot scheme so desperately anxious to have it adopted, when it is not necessary to do it in order to provide a vote for the soldiers?

Why should we tear down our constitutional election procedure when a simple constitutional plan is ready for adoption?

Would the people in the armed forces prefer the Lucas-Worley plan, or would they ask that the complete State ballot be furnished them if given the facts?

How would you answer those questions?

Sunday, here in Washington, D. C., 500 women attending the eighteenth women's patriotic conference here, answered some of these questions by adopting a resolution calling upon the members of the 35 organizations represented to insist in their respective States that measures be taken to assure the soldiers the right to vote. This resolution also specified that particular precaution be taken to see to it that there will be no question as to the legality of the ballots. Those women have spent several days here. They understand the problem and have taken appropriate action.

The soldiers must have the right to vote, but that right must be provided in a legal and orderly way, so that, when they have marked their ballots, they will be counted. That way is provided in the Vursell amendments to the Senate bill, which is now before the House of Representatives. The other proposal is legally doubtful and would provide a ballot without names that would permit no vote for State and local officials.

The Tourist and Resort Industry Is Serving, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in normal peacetime Michigan's second largest money maker is the tourist and resort industry. In the prewar years this industry had an average annual income of some $400,000,000. Most people regard the tourist and resort industry as fundamentally a recreation industry. There are those who feel that recreation has little value to the over-all war effort. Many people in my section have their total life's savings invested in this tourist and resort business. They have suffered untold financial losses because of the necessary wartime reductions of cross-country travel. Many of the resorts have thought it advisable to close up for the duration. Many of the resorts have, of necessity, closed because their owners have entered the armed forces or are participating more directly in the war effort through employment in the huge war-production plants in southern Michigan or elsewhere.

However, northern Michigan, the heart of the tourist and resort industry in Michigan—which I have the honor to represent—is playing its own vital role in our victorious war effort.

At a recent meeting in Grand Rapids, Mich., Mr. W. Stewart Woodfill, president of the Grand Hotel on Mackinac Island—the world's largest resort hotel—delivered the keynote address reflecting the attitude of the various tourist and resort associations in the State of Michigan. In my opinion it was a most admirable speech and one that should be taken to heart, not only by those who have heavily invested in this great industry of our State but, likewise, should be carefully read by some of those of a cynical trend of mind who would even intimate that there is no need—indeed no time—for recreation on the part of anyone during the stress of war. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Under permission to extend my remarks at this point, I include Mr. Woodfill's address:

THE 1944 TOURIST SEASON

Having been asked to talk about the 1944 tourist season, I examined the subject and found, in my opinion, that it largely resolved itself around two general questions, into which the tourist industry might well inquire.

1. Should we aggressively solicit tourist business in 1944? Is it proper? Is it in order? Is it wise?

2. May we hope to work toward a good season in 1944?

Now, I answer the questions in the affirmative and what I shall have to say will be an evaluation of the reasons why I think these questions should be affirmatively considered.

We have passed through two critical tourist years, 1942 and 1943, groping somewhat fearfully at times, and generally quite confused. We have been conscious of a feeling in some quarters that it might be unpatriotic to take vacations in time of war. Some extremists have felt that resort facilities should not even be operated. There has been concern that the tourist trade might utilize labor which otherwise would be employed in war production, and that war workers would leave their benches to patronize resorts. Also, there has been much to do over the possibility that tourists might crowd business travelers from transportation lines. On all these points there has been much confusion.

The difficulty of wartime operation of the essentials of the tourist business, the resorts, is well known to everyone. The problem of staffing resorts with inexperienced older men, women and youngsters, and our concern over the ability or desire of guests to visit resorts, has presented the gravest worries which resorts have ever faced.

But now, after 2 years of war, we find ourselves on solid ground. The key has been set. The picture has become clear. The American people have brought into focus what they think about the place and purpose of resorts during the war. There has been demonstrated a high appreciation of the need of resorts, to sustain health and morale for so many of our people. Actual experience has proved that resorts are needed, that they are helping in the war effort, rather than impeding it.

Let us examine the industry, as it relates to the war economy. In the first place, the number of people now taking vacation trips is far below normal. That can be grasped very quickly when we realize that no longer do automobile tourists crowd the highways. Canadian travel is virtually out for the duration. Ocean cruises and foreign travel no longer exist. Men and women engaged in war work, who do not seriously feel the need of vacation travel, find that high wages, as well as patriotism, hold them to their job. Millions of men and women have been removed from the vacation market because of being on active duty with the military. Millions more are staying home because they find their need for a vacation trip not equal to the difficulty of transportation. We may readily surmise, therefore, that less than 25 percent of those normally taking vacation trips have done so in this year of war.

Yet, by way of paradox, American resorts, which operated this year, have had a very good volume of business, and some may wonder how this can be if general tourist trade has so greatly diminished. The answer is, that the American, seeking rest and recreation, has had to abandon the highway, abandon transcontinental tours, abandon western park trips, abandon Canadian travel, foreign travel and ocean cruises, and abandon many resorts, which have been taken over by the military or closed because of transportation. The result of this abandonment of general tourist travel, has been a concentration of tourists at resorts only, a concentration at American resorts only, a concentration at conveniently located, American resorts only. Small wonder, therefore, that with these limitations resorts at favored locations, such as we have in Michigan, have been in demand and will continue to be in demand in 1944, with increasing pressure if the public know that we are open and know what we have to offer.

Are these resort patrons crowding essential travelers from the railroads? Are the resorts or their patrons disrupting rail traffic? Surveys have shown that considerably less than 5 percent of all rail passengers have been resort travelers, and that is far from traffic disruption.

Have resorts taken manpower from war plants to staff their operations? Hardly. The query answers itself, when you consider the appeal of high wages being paid by the war industries, as compared with modest wages for brief, seasonal employment which resorts offer. No; the resort employee is the unskilled native, too old or too infirm to seek the golden dollar of the war plants, or may be, the older man or woman of that strange itinerant class of resort personnel, whose health requires or whose aptitude desires that they follow the sun or the youngsters too young for war, too immature for heavy work, but who can perform the odd jobs of a resort operation. This is labor at resorts today, such as there is.

Are the resort patrons today the drones and loafers of a war-rich country? Are they playboys seeking gayety and raucous play? No indeed. I can tell you because I know. I have looked upon 75,000 of them this past summer and I can tell you who they are. I can begin with a businesswoman, owner of a business in a southern city. She was distraught with the complexities of her business, the unending problems of a war trade, and she was so enmeshed with her work that she could not think of taking a vacation. One day her doctor told her if she did not take a rest she would soon be beyond the power of meeting any problem, she would be a complete physical and nervous wreck. I saw that woman cry, with hysterics, because a telephone rang in an adjoining room when she first came to my resort this summer. I saw her pace up and down with tenseness, with lines of pressure showing deeply in her face. And in a few weeks I saw this woman changed, changed by rest and quiet from communion with the lakes and forest to a woman who was well and strong again, ready to freshly tackle her problems in a cheerful mood and with assurance of accomplishment. I felt the pride of real service, that I was custodian of a retreat, which had so beautifully healed the mind and body of one so worn.

I can tell you of a famous airplane manufacturer, from an eastern city, who spent some time in my hotel, but who was never identified by anyone, including myself, until the time of his departure, because he was so quiet and was so seldom seen. His time was spent in bed, in looking at the lakes, walking in the woods, getting the cobwebs out of his busy head. He told me, when he departed, that he was returning to his business with fresh ideas, sounder plans, and a renewed vigor to push them through.

I can tell you of an important Chicago businessman, traveled to Mackinac standing in a day coach all the way, not sitting in a day coach, but standing, leaning, or resting on baggage without complaining, so happy and so grateful that he might have a chance to spend a little while at a restful, quiet spot, free from confusion of the city and the fast pace of an office geared for war.

There were no playboys. If anyone has that much pep these days Uncle Sam finds a place for them. There are no loafers. American patriotism and the need of manpower has put all America at work. There was no gayety, and but little drinking. I formerly ran a circus but now I have dubbed myself Dr. Woodfill, for I am only running a sanitorium.

And what my experience has been, so has it been with others of our trade. A sober America, a tired America, has found a safety valve in our resorts. Let no one prostitute with cheap talk, the value of our resorts today, for I am deadly serious in what I have to say. Our service is one of which we can be proud. We are doing our part, that which we know best to do, and it is an important part and America has come to know that it is so. When President Roosevelt came this summer to our neighboring waters of Georgian Bay, he was seeking one of those freedoms which you and I need to remind one and all. He was seeking freedom from strain and pressure, a freedom which resorts alone can best conjure. No voice was raised against his seeking rest and diverting sport, but to the contrary his action was applauded, for everyone knew that he could better serve our Nation by the respite this vacation would afford.

When a major general stayed at my hotel a week this summer, his privacy and the propriety of his visit was completely respected by everyone, for all knew that he should have every minute of peace and quiet that his brief leave might permit.

Winston Churchill, painting a mountain scene outside of Casablanca a year ago might well have found his counterpart in Joe Doakes, sitting on a log at Podunk, Mich., this summer. The purpose was the same.

Yes, our place is fixed and now well accepted for these years of war. We have our part in this struggle. We do not disrupt it. And we have our place not only in this war economy, but also in the normal economy, which must be preserved. These rural places, devoid of industry and agriculture, subsisting on tourist trade only, would become a problem indeed were they shorn of life. My own community, without the tourist dollar, would be starved in a single season to a barren island, a bankrupt city, a stranded community. Take your map and you can find so many places like it. No one can question the wisdom of keeping these jewels of the tourist trade alive and strong to serve the war effort and to preserve the tourist machine which brings into our State, in normal times, the second greatest flood of dollars which our people have.

Our course is clear. Michigan's tourist industry must move forward, aggressively, with pride in the soundness of our place and purpose, with a firm assurance of our value, to the Nation and to the State, preserving and vitalizing that industry which is first within 75 percent of the boundaries of the State.

Surely, we should aggressively solicit business in 1944. Surely, the State of Michigan should cooperate, with renewed and with enlarged interest, in this common effort. Indeed, we should go about our business, with every tool at hand, to keep this trade alive, to keep our tourist wares before the public, with perhaps a broader understanding of the place and purpose of our special service than in the past. This is no time for pussyfooting. This is time for courage and the strengthening of a vital industry. This is no time for half-way measures. We have something this country needs, we have something this State must preserve and encourage. A strong, positive industry, imbued with these concepts, united with a solid front, and, with our goal before us, cannot fail to make 1944 a glorious step in the history of a courageous trade. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, a trade that has learned to walk, but now must prepare itself to run in the days that follow, when this war is done.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, just 1 year from today will be another inaugural in this country—or kingdom.

The Atlantic Charter has lost at least 10 pounds in the last week from Russian flu.

One thing that women workers are admittedly superior in is lining up trucks

and other rolling equipment in a parking field.

The committees on the fourth bond drive out at the curbstones and the crossroads are doing a conscientious and gallant work, General Marshall.

It is getting to be a question whether the soldier vote or the war comes first. The foreign front for November is becoming more important than the second front.

The Grand Army of the Republic will never be excelled in sound and spirit. The Army is just about all gone, and the Republic will be gone if we have four more years of the same.

Ten years ago the State Department was by far the smallest in the Cabinet. Today it has plans, without direct congressional action, to advance to second or third place in size. You should see what all they have outlined.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker spoke to a crowded caucus room in the H. O. B. He personified modesty, sincerity, and comprehension. The Old Rugged Cross never had a more natural extoller in a century, nor the century a greater patriot.

The U. N. R. R. A. is an international herb "Burbanked" out of Atlantic City, where life is half fish and half fowl—the flying horse feeds on it, and posterity will find that it is more difficult to prevent spreading than the bindweed or Johnson grass.

"Our friendship bears not the slightest shade of a mean interest. We have never asked for anything; we have never accepted anything, which we have not fully paid for. The foundations upon which we approach you are solid." What a relief, Mr. President of Venezuela.

Meat inspection has been a division under the Bureau of Animal Husbandry in the Department of Agriculture and has been administered out of one central office here for 38 years. Now it is to have five regional offices. Since the war started, the Army has instituted its own service. Even here one of the oldest set-ups goes the bureaucracy way. Regional and "nudeal" are synonymous.

Aviation Industry Opposes Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) was reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on October 20, as per House Report No. 784. In that report it is stated:

The bill has the support of the National Aeronautics Association, composed of representatives of all phases of the civil aviation industry, of the air-transport industry and the aircraft manufacturers, of air-line labor, both pilots and mechanics, of the training schools, and of the leading association of private flyers, of aviation publicists, and of others.

What are the facts? The National Aeronautic Association passed a resolution on November 13 reading as follows:

It is hereby resolved that the board of directors of the National Aeronautic Association announce that the association has never hitherto taken an official position for or against the bill, H. R. 1012, and subsequent drafts covering the same legislative considerations; and in this connection, that a recent statement appearing in a committee report on the bill to the effect that this association had approved the bill is incorrect; and that copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It was then moved by Mr. Harry K. Coffey, of Portland, Oreg., that the board of directors of the National Aeronautic Association go on record against the bill, H. R. 3420, in its present form and that a committee be appointed by the president of the association to make a detailed study of the bill and to report upon these features of the proposed legislation which, in the judgment of the committee, were either constructive or not constructive.

I quote below from a newspaper release of the National Aviation Trades Association concerning a meeting held in Washington last week:

Following a 3-day meeting called by Col. Roscoe Turner, president of the National Aviation Trades Association, representatives of the leading organizations in the aviation field adopted a resolution opposing the Lea air regulation bill. The meeting was attended by delegates from the National Aeronautics Association, the Air Transport Association, the personal aircraft committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the Aircraft Dealers and Manufacturers Association, and the National Aviation Trades Association. Aeronautical insurance groups were represented by Maj. Reid Chambers.

So that the views of all elements of the aviation industry may henceforth be reflected on Federal legislation it was decided to establish a joint aviation legislative committee. This committee is to be formed by the designation of representatives by each of the groups participating in the meeting. Also, it was decided to request groups that did not participate in this initial meeting to appoint delegates on the same basis. Each participating organization is to appoint a principal and an alternate. The purpose of this joint committee will be "to formulate, push, and promote by every means possible immediate action on Federal legislation relative to aeronautical problems."

The resolution adopted in connection with the Lea bill reads as follows:

"'*Resolved*, That having carefully considered pending House bill (H. R. 3420), and having the interest of aviation as well as the public interest in mind, we hereby declare that our position with reference to such bill is as follows:

"'1. We are definitely in favor of the general regulation of the aviation industry by the Federal Government except as to purely local features which are properly the subjects for State legislation.

"'2. While H. R. 3420 contains some features which are forward steps and improvements over the existing law, nevertheless, in view of the fact that its many undesirable features so outweigh its advantages, any attempt to eliminate its objectionable provisions by amendment would be impracticable, we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to the passing of House bill H. R. 3420 and recommend that the bill do not pass, and further recommend that a new attempt be immediately made to draft and introduce a substitute bill, fair to all aviation interests and beneficial to the public, and that further hearings thereon be held and that all interested parties present their views thereon to the end that such new legislation may be a help rather than a deterrent to the progress of aviation.'"

Mr. Speaker, thus the National Aeronautic Association, composed of representatives of all phases of the civil aviation industry, the Personal Aircraft Committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the Aircraft Dealers and Manufacturers Association, and the National Aviation Trades Association all condemn the Lea bill in its present form, despite the statement in the majority report on this bill.

Although the newspaper release correctly states that the Air Transport Association was represented at this meeting, however, I have received a wire from Col. E. S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America, dated January 14, stating that his association did not vote for the resolution.

This confirms the statement which I made in my speech of December 16, as follows:

The Lea bill is aimed more particularly at the development of existing aviation transportation companies, as evidenced by the advantages it bestows upon existing companies of the Air Transport Association and the additional powers conferred upon a new powerful Federal bureau which it creates. This result is not strange when it is understood that an attorney for the Civil Aeronautics Board and an attorney for the Air Transport Association sat in executive sessions of the subcommittee during the drawing of this legislation, making suggestions and providing language. The bureau got a new and enlarged agency, and the Air Transport Association received many concessions for its member companies.

No one has heard any complaint or objection whatsoever from the Air Transport Association concerning this bill. Of course not. It is drawn in a manner that coincides with its viewpoint. The member companies are getting what they want regardless of the effect on the public interest.

This Gorrell group represents a very small part of the aviation industry. The large part of the aviation industry is pleading to kill the Lea aviation bill in its present form in the interest of the true progress of aviation, as evidenced by the following editorial in the January 1944 issue of Aero Digest:

LET'S STOP THE CIVIL WAR IN AVIATION

It will be a good thing if the Lea bill is put aside to cool. It is beginning to rouse bitter enmities such as never before were seen in the ranks of aviation. We have had our quarrels and our knife throwings, never serious enough to prevent all parties from meeting in friendship between rounds.

But this is getting to be a civil war which is dividing aviation into two hostile camps. When large groups clash, they do not observe the niceties of individual combat.

Our sympathies are 100 percent with the opponents of this bill but even if we were neutral we would be forced to conclude that no powers of persuasion now can halt the opposition from using every possible means to kill the measure in anything resembling its present form.

If this fight is to be stopped, it is the proponents who must yield. They are the aggressors. Only they can cease their aggression. If they fail to do so, they must take the responsibility for a conflict which not only will work serious harm to the cause of aviation but will almost certainly mean the ruin of some of them.

It should now be plain that the Lea bill backers are being outgunned, outmaneuvered, outclassed. Spokesmen for the measure, and those aviation editors who slavishly follow them, have been filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with every possible evidence of support for their views and seeking to make it appear that the opposition is negligible or discreditable. Maybe these tactics help them sell advertising. We prefer to work for the good of the industry.

The most extreme example may be read in a recent editorial in Air Transport which we quote in part, as follows:

"Now that N. A. A. President Gill Robb Wilson endorses the Lea bill, we find there is but one important hold-out against it outside of Congress which significantly is the State railroad and utilities commissions' lobby in Washington. * * * In Air Transport's opinion, anyone who opposes this Lea bill is against the progress of civil aviation." This is just plain hooey, and the gink who wrote it knows it.

It happens that the National Aeronautic Association and its president are in favor but are opposed to the bill as we will later explain. But that is a minor point.

The appalling thing about that editorial is the attitude of infallibility; the state of mind that brands as subversive all those who may be of contrary opinion. There are names for that sort of thing. One of the polite names is bigotry. It is not pretty to see in aviation nor in America. It sounds too much like Hitler or Goebbels chatter.

Let's count noses and see who really is against this bill and who is for it. Let us see who is charged with being against the development of aviation.

One of the main arguments advanced for the Lea bill is that the railroads are said to be against it because they want to have a part in the development of aviation. Since when was that a crime?

Are the railroads less patriotic than the air lines? Have they done less to help win the war than have the air lines?

Of course the railroads have competed stubbornly with aviation. What else could they do? They were arbitrarily ruled out of the air. Now they want to fly. What do we want in this country, the development of aviation or merely of the existing air lines?

The railroads are not primarily interested in the big bill commonly known as the Lea bill (H. R. 1012). This measure omits the question of railroad participation and would leave the rails on the ground as before. Their entry into flying hinges on the shorter bill (H. R. 3420). This is the point of railroad interest, though it is obviously in their welfare that the entire subject of air transport be considered broadly at one time rather than by piecemeal legislation which might close the door to further action.

Why shrink from facing the issue of whether or not the rails and the steamship lines as well should enter commercial air transport here and abroad? If the answer is in their favor, would air-line workers suffer? More lines would mean more jobs and promotions.

Why would it be in the interest of the surface carriers to strangle aviation if they are competing in the business? And how would it make for monopoly to create opportunities for many more air lines than there are today?

These questions cannot be swept aside by the inference that rail opposition to the bill is somehow sinister. The sort of talk and action which is going on is all too likely to cancel out the old label "railroad tactics" which used to stand for high-handed action so that the modern term for it will be "air-line tactics."

But leaving the railroads out of it entirely, a tremendously powerful coalition of forces is now moving against the bill. The private pilots, who would be most entangled in its all-encompassing regulations, are now forming by the tens of thousands and getting angrier by the minute:

It took a long time for them to grasp the point. Most of them were too busy on war jobs to read a 121-page bill which was little publicized and seemed far away from passage. A majority of their old-time leaders are away to war. Even if they knew what was being done behind their backs, they couldn't talk.

The flying fraternity are buzzing like mad hornets. Back of them are the fixed-base operators who now bitterly realize what centralized control can mean, through the crumbling of the civilian pilot-training program. They know that their only chance for survival lies in freedom to develop local businesses. Accordingly, the National Aviation Training Association has firmly gone on record against the bill in its present form.

Insurance companies have tumbled to the fact that there is an insurance clause tucked away in the fine print and they are girding mightily for the fray. Some of the oil companies who want to sell aviation gasoline after the war are by no means asleep.

LOSS OF MUNICIPAL JURISDICTION

City attorneys have read and have become goggle-eyed over the provisions which would strip municipalities of almost any say-so over their own local airports. Congressmen are hearing from home about this in no mild or uncertain terms.

Above all are the sovereign States. Many an aeronautics commission, and in some cases the Governors and legislatures have told off their whole delegations in Congress. Anyone who has paid the least attention to politics of late will have observed the fate of bills with far more voting appeal than the Lea bill, when States rights were at stake.

Supposing the measure were to pass the House; it should be obvious that the controlling States' rights group in the Senate would talk from now until doomsday if it ever came to the floor. And that is not the worst the Senate might do.

Against all these first-class forces, who stands in support? The air lines? Yes; the bigger ones. But if the truth were known, some lines already are shying away from the trap into which the "dumb foxes" who are their spokesmen would lead them.

Such views are not being made public at this stage, lest the appearance of air-line unity be broken. But one who gets around can observe that some of the handy men are preparing escape routes through disclaimers or even by show of opposition so they won't be in the line of fire when the shooting starts. Walk, don't run to exit, my friends.

Who else for the bill? The air-line pilots say they are, mainly because of the independent safety board provisions. The C. A. A. and the C. A. B., of course, are for the measure which concentrates all power in their hands.

Aside from the above, the visible support is spotty and in many cases perfunctory, though air-line emissaries have appeared in many a statehouse and newspaper office spending time and money which might be better used in the war effort.

WHO IS THE DARK HORSE?

Who else now? Who in the background hasn't been counted? Maybe that's the $64 question that only the smartest can answer. But the Senate could find out if they really wanted to know.

If anyone wants an object lesson as to the dangers of tossing this explosive issue about lightly, here is the case of N. A. A. The idea that the National Aeronautic Association favored the bill has been spread by the proponents, but all of a sudden is being denied.

The fact is that N. A. A. held a big "aviation clinic" in Oklahoma City. The first speech was by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, Inc., on the Lea bill. Then a gag rule was imposed on those who wanted to speak against the measure. A vote of the delegates, which certainly would have been adverse, was not allowed.

The N. A. A. board of directors could not be gagged. They passed two resolutions unanimously. First they stated that N. A. A. never had taken a position on the bill pro or con. Then they declared in opposition to the measure in its present form.

Gill Robb Wilson, president of the association, has been elaborately explaining that he never was for the bill.

We do not by any means say that what he says is not so. Unfortunately for him and N. A. A., busy aviation people these days will be as little disposed to analyze what he said or didn't say as they are to wade through 121 pages of Lea bill.

To those backers of the bill who have sown the wind and now stand in the path of the whirlwind, we give this example and add this final thought: Remember the Black committee investigation of 1934, when the air lines were stripped of their contracts. Consider the possibilities for demagoguery in the present situation. Call this thing off while there is still time. We say no more, so as not to give ideas to anyone on Capitol Hill. The time to stop the civil war in aviation is now.

F. A. T.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the above-named organizations and the views expressed in the above editorial evidences the widespread opposition to the Lea bill in its present form. In the interest of good legislation on this important subject there should be further hearings held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at which all interested parties could have an opportunity to be heard. If this is done, I am certain many of the differences now existing could be satisfactorily settled and worthwhile legislation result.

Out of the Shadows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times January 19, 1944:

OUT OF THE SHADOWS

When Winston Churchill suddenly emerged from the shadows behind the Speaker's chair in the House of Commons yesterday, the roar of cheering that went up was echoed throughout the United Nations world. A great man and a great soldier had taken his place again in the line of battle. No one in the House doubted it. No one anywhere need doubt it.

What makes any man great? It is not the infallible correctness of his opinions, for one may think him sometimes wrong and still consider him a great man. It is not consistency, for great men are often great enough to be inconsistent. It is not unvarying success, for great men have their unsuccessful moments. One doesn't know, but somewhere there is a deep mystery of personality. Out of the masses of men these men come when they are needed, out of log-cabins and also out of immemorial mansions.

Winston Churchill is an old Tory. He is an old Liberal. He is a rank imperialist. He is a fervent democrat. But mainly he is one of those men who cannot walk into the House of Commons, or any house or place, without creating something of an electric shock. He does not do this because he is Prime Minister. He is Prime Minister because he can do it.

He is Prime Minister because he has made and projected an image of what the British people wish to be in this war; there he stands and there they stand, in courage so sure that it need never plume itself; in faith as strong as the British earth from which it springs; in cheerfulness that passes smiling into the Dark Valley; in honesty of purpose; in loyalty to even the most misunderstanding of friends.

This is the man who offered an honorable union to France when she was beaten to her knees. This is the man who raised his voice in savage defiance when Britain stood alone, when the wreck of a defeated army was being brought back from Dunkerque, when there were not enough planes, not enough guns, not enough soldiers, nothing but the invincible will to live and die free, between his island race and utter destruction. This is the man who in June 1941 welcomed Russia as an ally.

This man came out of the shadows into the light again yesterday. He came to stand beside President Roosevelt in the only dealings with the common enemy that this country and Britain propose to undertake: dealings with fire and shell, on the basis of unconditional surrender.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address on the subject Full Employment delivered by Vice President WALLACE, before a luncheon meeting of the committee for political action of the C. I. O. at New York City on January 15.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have completed a year of great accomplishment and have begun a year which will be of even greater significance. The President by his daring and his wisdom has set our feet on the road toward complete victory. Cairo and Teheran mean not only the closest cooperation for war but also effective cooperation in the peace to come.

For 2 days you have been discussing the problem of post-war employment. There cannot be in any country full employment for the purpose of full production of peacetime goods except on the basis of an assured world peace. Such a peace is necessary to a large volume of goods flowing between countries. Without a large volume of foreign trade unemployment is certain in the United States and England. Therefore, I say that of all the actions taken in 1943 looking toward full post-war employment, the Cairo and Teheran conferences were probably the most important.

There are those on the home front who have continually tried in one subtle way and another to create discord, especially between the United States and England and the United States and Russia. Ill-timed statements and partial truths have from time to time lessened the hearty will of the American people to cooperate to the utmost every day with our allies in winning the war at the earliest possible moment. Through all of these attacks—and some have been slanderous—the President has kept his eye on just one objective, how best to win an early and complete victory, how best to attain a secure peace.

At this time I want to express my appreciation of the magnificent job the President has done on the home front. To transform 135,000,000 people from an easy-going peace to an overwhelming war effort involves complexities beyond the mind of man to comprehend. The necessarily hasty solution of these complexities has given small men a chance to complain—and I am sorry to say that larger men in their hatred of Roosevelt have forgotten the need of winning the war and have played up the mean, the small, the irrelevant in a way to deceive the public mind as to the real truth. Of course, there are imperfections in a huge task of this sort. Everyone who has built a local union, everyone who has started a great corporation, everyone who has developed a great agricultural cooperative knows the sleepless nights, the heartaches and the mistakes involved. How infinitely greater the task of the President.

And so I say that what we have before us is a prodigious performance which compared with World War No. 1 is almost miraculous. In terms of airplanes, tanks, guns and munitions we have produced in this war from five to a thousand times as much as we did in World War No. 1. In World War No. 1 our expeditionary force used chiefly French guns, planes and ammunition. Compared with the pre-war base, we have in this war stepped up our production both in factories and on the farms much more effectively than we did 25 years ago. We not only have done twice as good a job in stepping up production but we have also done twice as good a job in holding down prices. Since the beginning of the war in Europe the cost of living in the cities has risen by only about a fourth. This is less than half as much as in the same length of time in World War No. 1. In World War No. 1 iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc and tin prices more than doubled. In this war there has been very little rise. Petroleum more than doubled in World War No. 1 but this time it has increased less than a fourth. And so it goes all down the line. Nearly everywhere the advances have been far less than in World War No. 1. The outstanding exception has to do with food, and even here the advance at retail has been less than 50 percent as compared with about 75 percent in World War No. 1. When we take into account that food prices were abnormally low in 1939 and that since then the world-wide demand for food from the United States has been greater than in World War No. 1, it is surprising that such a good food job has been done.

Moreover, we must remember that this war is costing about 10 times as much as World War No. 1 and that the savings in the hands of the people as the result of full employment amount to more than $80,000,000,000. This means there is tremendous monetary pressure on the side of higher prices. Nevertheless, O. P. A. has held the line remarkably well. If it had not done so, if we had had controls only like those in World War No. 1, the consumers in the United States last year would have had their pockets picked by the rising cost of living to the tune of more than $25,000,000,000. Moreover, the debt of the United States because of the greater cost of the war effort resulting from such inflation would have been increased by something like $50,000,000,000. In brief, what I am saying is that the President is entitled to great credit for his leadership in bringing about a truly remarkable expansion of production with the minimum expansion of prices. The great majority in business and in labor is entitled to great credit for their contributions which made his leadership effective.

Many people do not like O. P. A. Some criticize it for being a New Deal agency started by Leon Henderson. Others criticize it for being an Old Deal agency staffed in the North by appointees of Republican Governors. Many criticize it for red tape and bureaucracy. Some of these things may be true. But we have to recognize that so far as the net effect is concerned the job has been a good one. To increase production and hold down prices is like defying the law of gravitation. Just the same, the job has been done and will continue to be done provided the people will stand behind their President and against selfish, greedy, noisy men.

There has been much criticism of the Congress for not setting taxes high enough. Some claim that the corporations have been growing rich out of the war. This may be true in some cases but, even though Congress has not carried out in full the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, the facts are that in this war we have done a much better job in covering back into the Treasury excess profits than we did in World War No. 1. The corporations during the past 2 years made gross profits two and a half times as great as in the 2 years of World War No. 1, but they paid taxes nearly five times as great. Taxes in World War No. 2 have been used twice as effectively to recover excess profits as in World War No. 1.

The President, the Congress, and all the great groups of the Nation are entitled to congratulations for having done a truly remarkable job. In retrospect we can see how many things might have been changed. Certain expenditures have been proved by hindsight to be needless, but the head of a great Nation cannot take chances, and therefore I am thankful that the President tried so vigorously to provide against every contingency, whether it might be in South America, in Alaska, in Africa, Persia, or China. He has done a job in which he and a grateful Nation can take satisfaction.

There are two groups of big businessmen in the United States. In one group are found those who believe in Allied war unity, those who have always hated and distrusted Hitler. In the other group are found those who believe in isolation first. Some of these finance anti-Semitic movements. Some organize hatred of the President and discord in the Democratic Party. Others promote isolationism in the Republican Party. Certain isolationist politicians have been and will be beneficiaries in their campaigns of the money of these big business isolationists. One probable reason why some of these wealthy isolationists so strongly oppose the President and the kind of peace he stands for may trace to the fact that they have had profitable relationships in the past, and hope

to renew them, with the big German trusts. They believe in international corporations or cartels, but they do not believe in any type of international government which would prevent these cartels from preying upon the people of all lands.

Generally speaking, isolationist big businessmen use the tariff as a screen behind which to conduct their monopolistic operations in the various countries. They are not so much interested in a larger volume of international trade as they are in parceling out markets for individual profit. Some of them have been interested in every nation distrusting every other nation so that their armament industries might always have a big market. They do not believe in a long-lasting international peace and will do their best to prevent it by daily hammering the public mind through their agencies of publicity. Unfortunately for the Nation and the world, these men, because of the war, will come into the peace with huge financial reserves and, even more important, with the control of many profitable inventions of great importance to the American public. They control so many new inventions that in the postwar many businesses and certain communities will be able to exist only by grace of their sufferance. Unfortunately, there are businessmen of this sort in every country.

But, fortunately, there are many big businessmen who believe wholeheartedly in Allied unity in just the same way as the President. They believe in unity both for the war and for the peace. They want to see an enduring peace based on a higher standard of living and a growing volume of world trade and therefore believe in the good-neighbor policy not only between the United States and Latin America but also between the United States and the other United Nations in the post-war period. These businessmen do not finance anti-Semitic movements or American Fascists. They believe in clean, aggressive competition in foreign markets. They may fight Roosevelt on his domestic policies but in the main they do it fairly. If the common man has to choose between these two big business groups there is no question as to where his interest lies.

All groups of businessmen, large and small, good and bad, are enormously interested in the Government's policy with regard to reconversion and contract termination. Already 40,000 contracts, amounting to more than $12,000,000,000, have been terminated, and while many contracts have been reinstated there has been enough net change to cause serious unemployment in some localities. When the European war ends there will probably be a $40,000,000,000 curtailment in war production. This could conceivably cost the jobs of more than 10,000,000 men unless plans are made. It is commonly understood that Mr. Baruch will soon submit a report to Justice Byrnes on this subject. No doubt this report will contain in it suggestions as to how the Government may help business finance its reconversion. Many of the businesses which used Government capital to convert when the war started will have to use Government capital in reconversion. When the Government knows it is going to terminate a contract, it should be prepared to do its part in removing promptly its inventory of materials and machines which are not needed by the reconverted plant so that in the shortest time possible men may be at work on production of peacetime goods. Congress may well consider setting up a "reconversion plant corporation" with extensive powers to facilitate the most rapid possible transition from war production to peace production, or it may want to add new and concrete powers to an existing agency.

Businessmen and laborers will face a sharper crisis when contracts are terminated than the Nation faced when war was declared. They have a right to demand that there be some agency in Government which has the power and the courage to speak clearly and decisively on all reconversion problems. There must be public responsibility in the reconversion. Reconversion must not be made a grab bag for monopoly. Small business, the backbone of our Nation, must be protected. The subcontractors as well as the prime contractors must be protected. The prime contractor usually has big cash reserves—the subcontractor almost never.

Labor should back up business in its demands that the problem of reconversion be given prompt and effective consideration. Both labor and business should also join in urging on the Army and Navy a policy of restraint in the too rapid disposal of surplus products. After this war the U. N. R. R. A. may serve as a useful outlet in many cases. It will be remembered that after World War No. 1 certain labor groups in August of 1919 called on President Wilson. At that time it will be remembered that the wages of labor had lagged far behind the cost of living. Labor leaders, calling on President Wilson, said that either their wages had to be advanced or the cost of living had to come down and that on their part they would prefer to see the cost of living come down. Soon thereafter the Army and Navy disposed of large quantities of materials and the Federal Reserve Board adopted a policy of high interest rates. The country had been overinflated but the deflation cure was almost as bad as the inflation disease. The large supplies of stuff put on the market cost many laboring men their jobs. The rapid fall in prices cost many businessmen their businesses. The farmers suffered worst of all. All groups have a right to ask both the Congress and the Army and Navy that this time discretion be used.

Congressional committees have been discussing these problems. Policies are under consideration which during the next year or two will affect the jobs of millions of workers. Labor should prepare to be represented at all hearings of the Truman committee and the various committees which have to do with post-war planning. Just as labor played a prominent part in pushing for the complete conversion which is now doing so much to win the war for us, so labor also should be an equally determining factor in seeing that reconversion gives us full employment. Agriculture, because its prosperity is so dependent on full employment, should play a constructive role in postwar planning.

I do not propose in this talk to say just what the Government ought to do with regard to post-war employment. But I do say that, inasmuch as the Government had to take full responsibility for getting cooperation from all groups to convert our economy from peace to war, it will have to take equal responsibility in converting from war to peace. Those who want to handle the postwar problem merely by turning things loose are asking for anarchy. There are of course certain branches of the economy where all that is necessary is to enforce the antitrust laws. There are other branches where all that is necessary is to make sure that adequate financing is available through the R. F. C. or the Farm Credit Administration. But there are other fields of activity where it will be necessary to engage in specific physical planning. When the contracts are terminated there will be hundreds of thousands of people out of work unless there is detailed advance planning.

This planning must be on a broad basis and not on a little basis. The Federal Government will have the responsibility of paying the interest on more than $200,000,000,000. The only sound way to pay this interest is by the maximum productive use of labor. We have to have full employment and an expanding economy to carry our debt load easily. This means a national income in excess of $130,000,000,000. Some very large businessmen are making their plans on the basis of a national income of only $100,000,000,000. That is not enough to give full employment or to utilize the factory facilities which we shall have available or to carry the national debt load easily. The tendency will be for some businessmen to avoid thinking of the maximum output of the best quality at the lowest price. When the price is held up and the production is held down there is unemployment which produces still greater contraction. We must keep in mind that the profits to be made by monopoly practices are not a net profit for business. All business has to help pay the costs of unemployment.

It seems to me that each business, as it confronts the problem of its responsibility for furnishing that amount of employment which will eliminate unemployment, must be guided in the main by the maximum use of labor and plant facilities. Obviously there are some businesses where production of more than a certain quantity is sheer waste, but in most lines of consumers' goods consumptive power is as great as productive power, provided labor is kept fully employed and the profits and savings are put to work as rapidly as they are acquired. The wise men in labor, business, and government will have to give to the individual small businessman the same assurance of a big market as our Government at war has furnished during the past 2 years. Labor can't do it by itself. Business can't do it by itself. Nor government. All three must recognize their joint responsibility. This country belongs to all of us and we've got to keep it at work to keep it strong.

Of course, we must have a vast stock pile of blueprints for public roads, schools, sewers, reforestation, irrigation dams, and flood-control projects for every State in the Union so that if employment falters for any length of time in any area Government employment may be promptly thrown into the breach. Personally I am hopeful that our taxation system can be modified with such rapidity after the war that the financing for most employment will come from private capital. Incentive taxation by increasing employment and by increasing the national income can increase the Federal revenue. Rates which are too high on rapidly expanding young enterprises will reduce employment and decrease the revenues of Federal taxation. Some place there is a happy medium and it is very important for both business and labor to learn just exactly where that point is—the point which will promptly prevent either inflation or deflation as one or the other tends to develop. Both labor and business might well consider recommending to Congress the delegation of power to some governmental organization to make continuously those slight shifts which are necessary if the national income is to stay on the road of full production, full consumption, and full employment without inflation or deflation.

Labor took the lead after Pearl Harbor in putting real vitality into a complete war effort. To labor goes a very large part of the credit for the production miracle. Labor's hands every day are producing the munitions that are relentlessly destroying the might of Germany and Japan. Labor will not turn back. Our workers will finish what they have started. They will not let our boys down overseas.

During the war labor has come of age and from now on must bear its full share of responsibility for molding public opinion and congressional opinion on behalf of taking those steps which will prevent unemployment in plenty of time. You have shown by your presence here that you are intensely

awake and aware of the rights of the common man, as well as the duties of the common man. You are going home to carry on in 1944 your business as true Americans. You will have your family duties. You will have your days of work. But above all in this great year of 1944 you will have the splendid privilege of seeing and believing and fighting for those things which are to come, for those things which we have been paying for these past few years in that great symbolic phrase—"blood, sweat, and tears."

And now as we look beyond the "blood, sweat, and tears" I see ahead work, happiness, and peace; peace which will come through jobs for all and the full use of the resources of this world for the benefit of the people of this world; work because there is no man of sanity who does not wish to work; happiness because with permanent peace and full employment, man will pursue the usefulness for which he was created.

Let Us Honor Our Heroic Dead by Providing Appropriate National Cemeteries in Their Native States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I again call attention to H. R. 3582, to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in all of our States, Territories, and possessions. This bill has been referred to the Secretary of War for a full report, and I am advised that such report is under preparation for submission to the House Committee on Military Affairs. After a careful study of existing national cemeteries in the United States, I am convinced that it will disclose the urgent necessity for prompt enactment of H. R. 3582.

We have already provided benefits for our service men and women who will survive in this global conflict, and additional benefits for them are now contemplated.

The least we can do, and, in fact, all we can do, for those who must unfortunately and tragically pay the supreme sacrifice in this war, is to provide for each of them a fitting resting place in appropriate surroundings in their home States which will be readily accessible to their relatives and friends.

Burial in a national cemetery is listed among veterans' benefits in Report No. 986 from the House Military Affairs Committee, prepared to accompany S. 1543, the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944. However, when we investigate we find that existing facilities are entirely inadequate to furnish appropriate burial places even as authorized by existing law.

There is an opportunity now to prepare and authorize an over-all plan for national cemeteries, which has not been done heretofore, and which should provide for the veterans of all our wars.

The following will give some facts concerning the existing policies and conditions with respect to national-cemetery facilities in the Nation:

Section 18 of the act of Congress, approved July 17, 1862 (12 Stat. 596), provides "that the President of the United States shall have power, whenever in his opinion it shall be expedient, to purchase cemetery grounds, and cause them to be securely inclosed, to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country."

Public Resolution No. 21, approved April 13, 1866, provides "that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to take immediate measures to preserve from desecration the graves of the soldiers of the United States who fell in battle or died of disease in the field and in hospitals during the War of the Rebellion; to secure suitable burial places in which they may be properly interred, and to have the grounds enclosed, so that the resting places of the honored dead may be kept sacred forever."

The national cemeteries were primarily established to provide burial places for Union soldiers who were killed or died during the Civil War, and 72 of them were completed by the end of 1868. A total of 316,233 interments were recorded, of which number 175,764 were identified and 140,469 unidentified. In addition the remains of 21,336 Confederate prisoners of war were interred and their graves properly marked and maintained.

It can be seen from these basic laws that the location of these cemeteries was determined by the location of battlefields, hospitals, and prisoner-of-war camps and prisons. No thought of subsequent use of these cemeteries for the veterans of future wars existed in the minds of the legislators who enacted the basic laws and the War Department which constructed the cemeteries. Consequently without regard to their accessibility to the future generations, without thought of desirability for interment of unborn legions, and without vision of our country's future progress, growth in population, industrial development, and expansion of our railroads and highways, these national cemeteries were established as and became memorial monuments and shrines to the Union dead of the Civil War.

Subsequent legislation removed restrictions to burials in these national cemeteries. By the act of March 3, 1873, Congress, recognizing the responsibility of the Nation in caring for those who served it in its armed forces, authorized the interment in our national cemeteries of those who had served with the Federal forces and made an honorable discharge therefrom the prerequisite for the privilege of burial.

The restrictions were further curtailed by the provisions of United States Code, title 24, section 281, which in general granted the privilege of interment in a national cemetery to all soldiers, sailors, and marines who served, or may serve, during any war in which the United States has been or may be engaged. Army nurses honorably discharged from their service as such may be buried in any national cemetery.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 886) further includes the men inducted for training and service under this act by extending "the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the land or naval forces to which they are assigned."

It will be noted from the above-cited enactments that the term "privilege of burial in a national cemetery" has been used and in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 death compensation and other benefits are provided. Among other benefits would be included the privilege of burial in a national cemetery, which thus becomes by act of Congress a death benefit.

In order to determine the extent, the recompense, and the value of this privilege and death benefit let us analyze the privilege extended and the benefit granted.

What does it mean to the veteran or his estate in Bangor, Augusta, and Portland, Maine? It means shipment of the remains to a national cemetery, the nearest being Long Island National Cemetery at Farmingdale, Long Island, 45 miles beyond New York City. Total distances of 523, 448, and 387 miles, respectively; the veteran or his estate in Concord, N. H., will have a railroad journey of 345 miles; Burlington, Vt., which is 331 railroad miles from Long Island National Cemetery, and Boston, Mass., where tens of thousands of veterans reside, a distance of 272 miles for final interment; Pittsburgh, Pa., which is 302 miles from the national cemetery at Arlington, Va., and Cleveland, Ohio, which is 433 miles from the same national cemetery. The veterans in Michigan would have the national cemeteries at Rock Island, Ill., and New Albany, Ind., as the nearest national cemeteries in which they have the privilege of burial. Detroit is 459 miles from Rock Island and 355 miles from New Albany. Grand Rapids is 377 miles from the former and 342 miles from the latter national cemetery. The 200,000 and more veterans in Chicago selecting burial in a national cemetery would have 187 miles to Rock Island or 194 miles to Camp Butler, Riverton, Ill., the nearest national cemeteries. Let us go to the far Northwest and examine this privilege and death benefit in that section of our United States. First, there is no national cemetery in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Utah, so let us see what is offered the veterans living in Seattle and Spokane and the cities and towns between. The nearest national cemetery is at San Francisco, 933 miles from Seattle and 1,118 miles from Spokane, while Portland, Oreg., has 748 miles from San Francisco. Helena, Mont., and points north, south, east, and west in the State are offered the choice of 3 national cemeteries—nearly equidistant. San Francisco is 1,239 miles from Helena. The Fort McPherson National Cemetery at Maxwell, Nebr., is 1,134 miles away, and the Fort Snelling National Cemetery near St. Paul, Minn., is 1,210 miles distant. The veterans in Idaho also have impressive distances to consider. Boise is 1,139 miles from San Francisco and 1,025 from the Fort McPherson National Cemetery in Nebraska. Pocatello, Idaho, is 807 miles from the former and 761 miles from the latter national cemetery. Salt Lake City, Utah, is 807 miles from San Francisco and 761 miles from Maxwell, Nebr.

There is no national cemetery in Colorado and Wyoming. Denver has 427,294, and 597 miles to go to reach the national cemeteries at Santa Fe, N. Mex., Fort McPherson, Nebr., and Fort Bliss, El Paso, Tex., respectively. Likewise Cheyenne would be confronted by 533, 400, and 703 miles to reach the same cemeteries. There is no national cemetery in the two Dakotas. The nearest one is located at Fort Snelling, Minn., which is 415 miles from Bismarck, N. Dak., and 416 miles from Pierre, S. Dak. Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is 266 miles from Fort Snelling National Cemetery. Nebraska has the Fort McPherson National Cemetery situated about 4 miles from Maxwell, in Lincoln County. Maxwell is 13 miles east of North Platte on the Union Pacific Railway and U. S. Highway No. 30. Its population is 480. North Platte has a population of approximately 12,500.

California, with its long north and south axis and its large population has three national cemeteries—the San Francisco National Cemetery, Presidio; Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery at San Diego, and a new national cemetery at San Bruno, 8 miles from San Francisco, named Golden Gate National Cemetery. The ones at the Presidio and Fort Rosecrans are about completely occupied, leaving the new Golden Gate National Cemetery available for veterans in the State of California. The veterans of Los Angeles and vicinity are 471 miles from San Francisco.

Texas, the largest State in the Union, presents an interesting situation, when you consider the actual value of the burial benefit offered its veterans of past wars and the veterans of World War No. 2, among whom are those dismounted cavalrymen writing glorious pages of history down in the southwest Pacific. There are three national cemeteries in the Lone Star State—one in San Antonio proper, completely filled and no further grave sites available; one on the military reservation of Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, and one on the military reservation of Fort Bliss, El Paso. The latter two are active national cemeteries. However, their locations are such as to offer only long, expensive express shipments for remains. The Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery is the nearest national cemetery for all points in Texas, except the extreme southwest section. This cemetery is 637 miles from Amarillo, 420 miles from Witchita Falls, 305 miles from Fort Worth, 313 miles from Dallas, 437 miles from Texarkana, 307 miles from Beaumont, and 217 miles from Houston.

The States referred to are not the exceptional situation. Practically each State offers similar conditions. The 79 national cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the War Department are not all representative of national cemeteries as visualized by those of us who have visited the National Cemetery in Arlington at the Nation's Capital. Some of these 79 are completely filled; others have but limited available grave sites; some are at inaccessible locations, and many are so far distant as to preclude all thought of burial therein.

I believe the National Government has by reason of its enactments assumed a moral obligation to provide national cemeteries for our veterans of all wars which offer a death benefit and a privilege becoming our country and worthy of our legions of veterans. It is not a convenient privilege nor can it be called a death benefit to be allowed burial in a national cemetery some three, four, or eight hundred miles away, involving transportation costs of shipment of remains and long train journeys by parents, relatives, and intimate friends of the deceased at more expense—nor would the transshipment of bodies at railway junction points, with long delays in making train connections, add to the solemnity, dignity, and spirituality of a funeral cortege.

Realizing the total inadequacy of our national cemeteries to meet a situation which is now upon us, and with a desire to provide facilities which will give our veterans the opportunity to be buried in a national cemetery within their own native State, near, or within reasonable distance from home and relatives and intimate friends, and within minimum expenses to the estate, I have introduced House resolution 3582. Its enactment will assure to fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters the opportunity to visit the graves of their loved ones on Easter morning and on Memorial Day. It will assure the living veterans that their graves will be maintained and honored in befitting manner as long as this Nation exists.

Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter discussing the constitutionality of a uniform Federal ballot for servicemen in Federal elections, which appeared in the Washington Post of January 20 from Irving Brant, of Gatlinburg, Tenn.

Irving Brant is a distinguished and well-known scholar and is the author of the biography, James Madison, and of Storm Over the Constitution, Peace and the Road to Freedom, and other books.

The letter follows:

SOLDIER VOTE—A COMMUNICATION

The conclusion of the columnist, Merlo Pusey, in the Post for January 18, that Congress lacks the power to establish a simple, uniform Federal ballot, free of the poll tax, for servicemen in Federal elections is based upon two misconceptions. I believe that he has misjudged the constitutional meaning of republican government, and has mistakenly treated one clause of the Constitution as if it stood apart from the rest of the document.

The Constitution requires the Federal Government to maintain republican government in the several States. It has been said: "But a republic is a state in which the sovereign power resides with the electorate without reference to any basis of election." In other words, nine-tenths of the people may be disfranchised, and, if the remaining one-tenth have sovereign power to elect officers, you still have republican government. Such a definition does little more than exclude absolute monarchy. It draws no distinction between a republic and an aristocracy or oligarchy with electoral processes. It was expressly repudiated 156 years ago by the men who wrote our Constitution.

THE WORD "REPUBLIC"

Madison, in No. 39 of the Federalist, remarked that the word "republic" had been applied to Holland, Venice, and other countries, and continued:

"These examples, which are nearly as dissimilar to each other as to a genuine republic, show the extreme inaccuracy with which the term has been used in political disquisitions.

"If we resort for a criterion to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people. * * * It is 'essential' (above word in quotation marks is Madison's) to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it; otherwise a handful of tyrannical nobles, exercising their oppressions by a delegation of their powers, might aspire to the rank of republicans and claim for their government the honorable title of republic."

Madison made the distinction even clearer when he said in the Constitutional Convention:

"A republic may be converted into an aristocracy or oligarchy as well by limiting the number capable of being elected as the number authorized to elect."

If you will accept Madison's definition of a republic, it will necessarily alter the approach to the question of constitutionality, as far as the fundamental principles of our Government are concerned, for it is self-evident that such restrictions as the poll tax tend to produce a government which is not based upon "the great body of the people."

The other point relates to article I, section 2 of the Constitution, which says that the electors of Members of the House of Representatives shall have the same qualifications as the electors of the more numerous branch of the State legislatures. This, it has been contended, prevents Congress from providing a Federal ballot and forbidding the States to set up poll-tax requirements in Federal elections. So it would, if no other constitutional provisions or principles were involved. But it does not stand alone.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT

In addition to the duty of maintaining republican government, Congress is empowered under section 4 of article I to "make or alter" State regulations of the "times, places, and manner" of holding Federal elections—a clause sweepingly interpreted by the courts to give Congress power to prevent corruption and maintain the integrity of congressional elections. Does section 4 restrict section 2? The constitutional argument against a Federal ballot and the anti-poll-tax bill rests almost entirely upon the claim that it does not. The Supreme Court says it does.

Chief Justice Stone wrote in *United States v. Classic*, in 1941, that the States "are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of Article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under Article I, section 8, clause 18" (to make laws "necessary and proper").

With the Supreme Court declaring that the right of the States to prescribe qualifications may be restricted by the right of Congress to regulate elections, how can Mr. Pusey possibly say that the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill "pretends to create voting rights in defiance of the Constitution." Ten prominent law teachers and lawyers recently joined in a public statement upholding the constitutionality of the bill to repeal poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections. Men like Profs. Walton Hamilton and Edwin Borchard, of the Yale Law School, and Dean Lloyd K. Garrison, of the Wisconsin University Law School, are not in favor of "tearing up the constitutional requirements for voting."

Not long ago a poll-tax Congressman tried to persuade me that the Supreme Court was interpreting the powers of Congress under section 4 too broadly. He was utterly dumfounded when I read to him what James Madison, "father of the Constitution," said of its purpose on June 14, 1788:

"Should the people of any State, by any means, be deprived of the right of suffrage, it was judged proper that it be remedied by the General Government."

I submit that Mr. Pusey spoke too hastily on a question of constitutional law, and thereby placed himself in opposition to your often declared principles of right and justice.

IRVING BRANT.

GATLINBURG, TENN.

Unveiling of Portrait of Hon. Carl Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Thursday, January 20, 1944:

PROGRAM

Presiding: Representative WILLIAM E. HESS.

Presentation of portrait: Representative W. STERLING COLE.

Unveiling of portrait: Representative MARGARET C. SMITH.

Introduction of Lawrence A. Powers, artist.

Address: Representative SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Address: The Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy.

Address: The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, Senator from the State of Georgia.

Address: Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations.

Acceptance of portrait: Representative PATRICK H. DREWRY, ranking minority member of committee.

Acceptance of portrait: Representative MELVIN J. MAAS, ranking minority member of committee.

Response of Representative CARL VINSON.

The committee met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., the Honorable WILLIAM E. HESS presiding.

Mr. HESS. The committee will come to order, please.

Distinguished guests, my colleagues, ladies and gentlemen: I feel extremely honored in having been delegated to preside today at this ceremony, honoring the distinguished chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

We who have known him over a period of years and have had the privilege of serving with him on this great committee, have learned to love him.

His has been a busy committee, but through his untiring efforts, his fairness and impartiality, and his unswerving devotion to the Navy, he has guided through the Congress a multitude of measures which have resulted in making our Navy the most powerful in the history of the world.

Mr. VINSON'S leadership has proven beyond question that a democracy can work effectively and efficiently in a crisis such as the one through which we have been passing. He has the respect and admiration of every Member of the House of Representatives, regardless of party affiliation, and is looked upon by the Members as an authority on matters pertaining to the Navy.

Chairman VINSON'S colleagues on his committee, together with some of his many friends, arranged with an artist of renown to paint from life his portrait, which will be presented this morning.

A number of telegrams and letters have been received, but time will not permit the reading of all of them. I will, however, read one at this time. It is from the White House, Washington, D. C., dated January 20, 1944:

"MY DEAR CARL: You have performed many services for our country during your long and successful tenure of office in the House, but I have always felt that your unselfish devotion to the Naval Affairs Committee has been your greatest.

"In your 27 years of service on that committee you have constantly endeavored to strengthen American sea power. Today, you have your desire. We have the strongest Navy in the world.

"You have made many friends for the Navy. No man has more friends in the Navy than yourself.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

[Applause.]

I wish to present to you a member of the Naval Affairs Committee who will make the presentation of the portrait, the Honorable W. STERLING COLE, of New York.

STATEMENT OF HON. W. STERLING COLE, A REPRESENTATVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, distinguished guests, it is an unusual occasion in the annals of the Naval Affairs Committee which brings us together today for a meeting attended by such notables of government as are gathered here at this moment. Our deliberations are not directed to the construction of ships of varying types, airplanes of all sorts and quantities, bases and outposts throughout the world, nor to the complicated structure and requirements of Navy personnel. All that work has been completed and the naval construction program has already passed its zenith. Rather we are met today for the sole purpose of paying honor to one of our number who, beginning as a committee member in the other World War, has contributed more to the development and expansion of the American Navy over the past quarter century than any other individual in the Nation during that period of time.

Three decades ago a young man, then at 30 years of age, but who had already filled offices of public trust, including that of prosecuting attorney, member of the State assembly and speaker, and county judge, was elected by the people of the Tenth Congressional District of the State of Georgia to represent them in the House of Representatives.

During his second term in Congress this young man was assigned to membership on the House Committee on Naval Affairs, a post which he has continuously held from that date in 1917 until the present time. When his party obtained control of the House of Representatives, he became chairman of the committee, and has served as such since 1931—a record not equaled either as to tenure on the committee or as to length of service as chairman by any other person in all our history. It has been under his guidance that all naval legislation of the present war has been enacted; in fact, 10 years ago, he began a program of automatic naval construction which, when Pearl Harbor came, found us much better prepared than we otherwise would have been.

Although when first elected he had no thought of remaining in the Congress for any length of time, two forces united to cause him to be continuously returned to the Congress by his constituency, which later became, and now is, the Sixth District of Georgia. An early interest in his work and principally in matters pertaining to the Navy was coupled with a quick realization by his constituency of the worth and quality of the man they had chosen to represent them, and the honor which we today bestow upon this man must necessarily be shared by his own people for their confidence and trust in him and their loyalty to him.

To signalize this remarkable record of achievement and to serve as an inspiration to those who will follow us, the members of his committee have joined with other admirers of their distinguished chairman to present to the Naval Affairs Committee of this and future years his portrait, as a permanent monument both to his great record and to the constant loyalty of his people. This portrait depicts something more than the likeness of our honored chairman. In addition, it suggests the span of America's nautical history which he helped to shape in a very valuable contributory capacity.

In the distant background may be seen the three-stack, coal-burning battleship, the U. S. S. *Georgia*, now long since decommissioned and junked, but withal the pride of the United States Navy when this young man first came to Congress. In the foreground is a model of the most modern aircraft carrier. Here, forever, is shown the Navy of a generation past and the Navy of today, and standing between the glory of yesterday's Navy and the splendor of the Navy of today is our honored chairman, who has served on this committee during two periods of great national peril and whose influence has had a profound effect upon our Nation's naval history.

In behalf of those who have made this portrait and this occasion possible, it is my high privilege to present to this committee the likeness in oil of our good friend, our distinguished chairman, that genuine American and statesman, the Honorable CARL VINSON, Representative from the State of Georgia.

[Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Mr. COLE.

At this time I am privileged to present another member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable MARGARET C. SMITH, who will unveil the portrait.

[Mrs. SMITH unveiled the portrait.] [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Mrs. SMITH.

I now wish to present to you the young artist who painted the portrait, now an ensign in the United States Naval Reserve, Mr. Lawrence A. Powers.

STATEMENT OF ENSIGN LAWRENCE A. POWERS, U. S. N. R.

Mr. POWERS. I feel highly honored to be permitted this opportunity to express my deep personal satisfaction at having been selected to paint the portrait of the Honorable Mr. VINSON, not only because of the personality of the subject himself but because, as a naval officer, I am aware of how fully deserved is the gratitude of the entire Nation to a man who has been in large part responsible for the maintenance of the Navy through the lean years, the planning for the future, and the great triumphs of the present.

[Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Mr. Powers.

I am sorry to announce at this time that our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, will be unable to be with us today. He has sent a letter, however, which I will read. It is from the Speaker's room, House of Representatives, United States of America, dated January 20, 1944:

"DEAR MR. HESS: I regret exceedingly that it is impossible for me to be with you and other friends of CARL VINSON today to help pay a just and deserved tribute to a great chairman and an outstanding American statesman and citizen.

"CARL VINSON, in the truest sense of the word, measures up to the type and character of men whom we need in these days.

"Please convey to him the sincere regrets of his old friend.

"Sincerely yours,

"SAM RAYBURN."

[Applause.]

Mr. HESS. We had hoped to have the Secretary of the Navy with us today, but we were informed yesterday that he is confined to his quarters with the flu and his physician will not permit him to attend these ceremonies today.

We have with us, however, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Ralph A. Bard, whom we will now hear.

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH A. BARD, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Assistant Secretary BARD. Mr. Chairman, members of the Naval Affairs Committee, and distinguished guests:

I have a message for this occasion from the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, which I would like to read.

"It is a matter of intense personal regret that sickness conspires to keep me from attending today's ceremony.

"Everyone of the Navy delights to do honor to the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. The long period of service he has rendered, and the intense personal sacrifice he has made, covering a period of more than one-quarter of a century, have served to make Chairman VINSON one of the best informed men on naval affairs in the entire Government.

"It is most fortunate that the Navy has the benefit of such a chairman right now, because never before have naval affairs occupied a more important place in our scheme of national defense than they do at this time.

"This war is by all odds the greatest naval war in history and ours is the greatest fleet

participating in that war. Under such circumstances, Chairman VINSON has come to the peak of his effort on behalf of the Navy in the current session of Congress. His profound knowledge of all phases of the Navy has enabled him to guide through Congress, with consummate skill, the authorization of total expenditures for naval purposes of nearly $100,000,000,000. For this happy circumstance the Navy and the entire Nation owe a great debt to Chairman VINSON.

"I wish that I could be with you to join in doing him honor."

And I want to add, Mr. Chairman, on my own behalf, and speaking also for Mr. Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy; Mr. Gates, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, and I am sure for all those officers and men of the Navy who have been fortunate enough to know and work with our esteemed chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee—I want to say it seems to be the unanimous opinion of all of those now on deck who have had to do with shaping the recent destinies of the Navy, that your love of the Navy, Chairman VINSON, your tireless devotion to its interests, and your sound judgments based on your years of Navy association and experience, have contributed most outstandingly to the success the Navy has achieved in building, equipping, and fighting the greatest fleet this world has ever seen.

The unanimity of this feeling of admiration for you and your services to the Navy is a rare tribute in the midst of war and strife, and particularly in this controversial city of Washington.

May you live long and prosper, and as you sit on your Georgia porch and reminisce in days to come it should warm your heart to remember that to the greatest possible degree you merited and won by the vote of all hands of the Navy during this greatest of all wars their highest award and tribute—the Navy's "Well done." [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

I now wish to present a distinguished son of the State of Georgia, the senior Senator from that State, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER F. GEORGE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Senator GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and distinguished guests:

The State of Georgia takes just pride in the recognition given to one of her distinguished sons who, for more than a quarter of a century, has faithfully served the interests of the State and of the Nation in Washington and who, prior to the time he came to Washington, had learned much in the school of politics, much in the art of government in the legislative bodies of his own State.

Born and reared as he was in the old Tenth Congressional District in which have resided through the whole history of the State some of the most brilliant political leaders of the State and of the South and of the Nation, the distinguished chairman of this committee early learned many things about the art of government, many things about the responsibility of public office that are learned only in the school of experience.

Many hard political contests have been the lot and portion of the distinguished chairman, and in the center of his old Tenth Congressional District lived some of the most brilliant political leaders of the last 50 years in the Southeast, some of the most outstanding political sages that have been produced by the Nation, by and large.

So in this hospitable climate, and amongst people who have developed the characteristic of loyalty in the school of political experience, the chairman of this committee learned the things that have enabled him to serve as a worthy Member of the House of Representatives and as the distinguished chairman of this committee in one of the most momentous periods in all of human history.

The State is proud, and I come simply to express gratitude on the part of the State and to pay this unstudied tribute to the sterling virtues and statesmanship of the chairman of your Naval Affairs Committee.

Not only has he served his country well here, but he has the enviable distinction of having participated notably in the greatest war in human history, a war in which the greatest issues are at stake. So he serves not only America in his capacity as chairman of this committee, which he has guided so well since becoming its official head, but he serves all humanity as well. He is serving all just causes everywhere, because our Navy has been, is now, and always will be found fighting on the side of humanity, as well as for those larger issues that make not merely for a happier United States but a happier and better world.

So on behalf of the State, insofar as I am able to speak for the State—and I know that it would speak with one voice—I wish to say that this great honor to our distinguished son, the dean of the Georgia delegation in the Congress of the United States, is profoundly and deeply appreciated. [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Senator GEORGE.

I have the privilege and honor at this time of presenting to you the Commander in Chief of the United States Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Ernest J. King.

STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL ERNEST J. KING, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES FLEET, AND CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Admiral KING. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, ladies, and gentlemen, to be asked to be present is most pleasant. To be called upon to say what the naval services think of the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee is a privilege and an honor. Nothing short of an emergency could have prevented my being here. The views that I shall express are not only my own, but those of every other Navy and Marine Corps officer who knows the chairman, or who has appeared before this committee.

For nearly 30 years the distinguished chairman of this committee has influenced naval policy by his sound judgment, by his perspective, and by his foresight. He has come to know the naval service better than any other Member of Congress, and for that matter, better than a great many people who are in the naval services themselves.

As a legislator in naval matters, he has established a record that is not likely to be equaled. Besides all this, he has a way with him. We have learned that we can approach him with our problems and that they will be given due consideration. In keeping with his understanding of naval officers and their strong points, and their faults, Mr. VINSON seems to have a sixth sense which tells him when to support the proposals made to him and when to give us a sound spanking and send us back to the Navy Department. I strongly suspect that this sixth sense is common sense.

Any individual who knows his job can command the respect of his fellow men. When that individual does his job in such a way as to gain not only their respect but their unquestioned loyalty, it is proof of duty well done and of unfaltering devotion to that duty.

In the case of the gentleman in whose honor we meet today, the high regard in which he is held by his colleagues and all who know him is shared in no uncertain manner by the Navy and the Marine Corps. He believes in us and we believe in him. He has earned for himself the confidence and the esteem of the entire membership of the naval services, and I am happy to have the opportunity to say so publicly.

His portrait in this committee room will be a permanent testimonial to his greatness. It will serve as a constant reminder to us all that courtesy, patience, hard work and, above all, a clear perspective, are invaluable in discharging our responsibilities.

May we have the benefit of his wise counsel for many years to come. [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Admiral King.

I will now present to you the ranking majority member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable PATRICK H. DREWRY, of Virginia, who will accept the portrait.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK H. DREWRY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have the privilege of accepting this portrait of Mr. VINSON, on behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

When I was put on the Naval Affairs Committee 20 years ago Mr. VINSON was the ranking minority member of the committee. So I have had the pleasure of serving under his direction for many agreeable years.

Mr. Butler, of Pennsylvania, a grand old man, was chairman at that time, and, although a Quaker, he was a fighting advocate of a big Navy, the "strongest Navy on earth." He consistently held to the opinion, frequently expressed, that there should be no politics and no partisanship on the Naval Affairs Committee. The work of the committee was based on Americanism, not political maneuvering.

In this view he was supported by the entire committee. When CARL VINSON came to the chairmanship he announced and carried out this policy. The result has been that when legislation has been reported by this committee, the debate on the floor of the House has been confined to the merits of the legislation without reference to political advantage; and the committee, under Mr. VINSON's leadership, has acquired a reputation for well-considered study and patriotic purpose that has been of inestimable benefit to the upbuilding of the Navy and the welfare of the country.

The way has not always been easy. The members of the committee were probably in advance of the thought of the Congress and the country in believing that war clouds were gathering and that the Navy of the United States should be strengthened for any eventuality. Only the united action of the committee following the leadership of Mr. VINSON put the Navy in such condition that it was ready, at least partly so, when the dastardly blow at Pearl Harbor was delivered. I shudder to think what might have been if a weaker man than CARL VINSON in those hard days of preparation had been at the head of this committee.

His good-natured persistence with his committee, his steady and studious and well-informed presentation in the House of the action of his committee, his patient but incessant drive for the enactment of proper legislation, is largely responsible for the beneficial legislation that forearmed our Navy in the pre-war days. It would have been much easier to swing with the tide of pacifism that threatened the country, but CARL VINSON saw the danger, and with fighting courage he led the committee steadily on for the improvement and development of our ships and shore stations at times when it seemed his views and ours were most unpopular.

CARL VINSON deserves the thanks of his country for his service. He was in the forefront of the work for preparedness. This committee knows what he did, and they de-

sired to put in lasting colors on canvas the man as he is. And the committee wanted it hung in this room where his life work has centered, that those who come after him will be reminded of the chairman who had the affection and admiration of the members of his committee and who worked so well for the country which he loves and to which he gives his devoted service.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I repeat I am happy to have the privilege of accepting this portrait on behalf of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Mr. DREWRY.

I now present to you the ranking minority member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable MELVIN J. MAAS of Minnesota.

STATEMENT OF HON. MELVIN J. MAAS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to join in accepting for the committee this very fine and striking portrait of our respected and beloved chairman, CARL VINSON.

No history of the American Congress would be complete without a graphic paragraph about a great congressional leader, CARL VINSON. So, too, no history of the American Navy, rich in tradition, would be complete without a full chapter about a great naval leader, CARL VINSON.

Under his dynamic leadership our Navy has seen its greatest expansion, until today it is not only the largest and most powerful Navy in the world, but the largest and most powerful that the world has ever seen.

The American Navy's greatness, however, is not just its size. It is far more its efficiency and fighting effectiveness. A very great deal of that efficiency and effectiveness is a tribute to the keen, tireless, and effective leadership of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House during the last 13 years.

Mr. VINSON'S far-reaching knowledge of the Navy and his far-sighted vision were translated into legislation that constantly improved our Navy during its expansion.

It is significant that war found our Navy with far and away the largest and most effective naval air arm of any navy in the world at any time. It is perhaps the only military service which along with the Marines was actually ready for war the day war came. Chairman VINSON had drummed into the Congress, the Nation, and, yes, into the Navy itself, day in and day out, the need for a larger and yet larger naval air force. It was almost a fetish with him—more airplanes and aircraft carriers, more carriers and more planes.

Far-reaching changes and improvements in personnel legislation were enacted under his leadership, and usually his sponsorship.

To me it has been a great privilege and a liberal education to serve on this committee under Mr. VINSON'S forceful and imaginative leadership. It has been a particularly happy experience to have been his ranking minority member.

While the general implication is one of opposition leadership between a chairman and the senior minority member, I can assure you that Mr. VINSON and I have worked in the harmony of a partnership. A military analogy might be that CARL is the commanding officer and PAT DREWRY is chief of staff, while I am deputy chief and executive. By "executive" I mean I do a lot of CARL'S hatchet work.

The best description, however, is that the House Naval Affairs Committee is a team with CARL as captain.

Long, long after CARL VINSON is gone—he will never be forgotten—his constructive influence will be felt and appreciated in the American Navy and in naval policies.

A great committee of Congress accepts with deep appreciation this portrait of a grand chairman and great American. [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. Thank you, Mr. MAAS.

It is now my privilege and esteemed honor to present to you the most distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and our honored guest today, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia. [Applause.]

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL VINSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Senator George, Mr. Secretary, Admiral King, distinguished guests, there are times in a man's life when deep feelings cause inability to find suitable and appropriate language to clearly express the emotion of the human heart. To me, today is one of those times.

To correctly ascertain the feelings that surge within me you must look beyond my humble words to understand the gratitude that I have to you and my friends who are responsible for this occasion and for the generous things that have been said.

Full cognizance of my limitations and my many, many friends makes this occasion more appreciated.

The achievements that may have marked my 13 years as chairman of this great committee are not due to any outstanding merit of mine. Credit must be given the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who have wholeheartedly and unfailingly contributed so much to what has been accomplished.

In this committee there is no majority and no minority. It acts as a unit, as one group, with one impulse, inspired by the lofty ambition to serve its country to its greatest ability.

During my 30 years in Congress I have never known a committee that possessed a higher degree of statesmanship or reflected higher credit on the House than the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Your work and accomplishments, and the vision of this committee and the support accorded to it by the Navy Department and the Congress have guaranteed to the Nation in this hour of its greatest peril the road to victory.

For many years before the storm struck which is now engulfing the whole world, you, my committee members, could see in the distant horizon the gathering of the storm clouds, and you had the wisdom and foresight to inaugurate naval programs so that the Navy, the first line of defense of the country, would be in position to combat the storm and lead the Nation to victory and to a lasting peace.

You have the satisfaction of knowing that by your efforts, with the support of the Congress and the Navy Department, the accumulated weight of American naval power provided and made ready in years of peace will bring Germany and Japan to their knees.

By the Constitution, the duty is placed upon the Congress to provide and maintain a Navy. The makers of the Constitution recognized the Navy as a necessary agent of a sovereign state. The House of Representatives has charged this committee with the responsibility of seeing that this mandate of the Constitution is carried out. That responsibility is not a power to be exercised recklessly, extravagantly or vainglorously, but it is a responsibility and a duty to be accomplished soberly and conscientiously.

The manner in which you have discharged that duty has won the confidence and esteem of the House, for time after time your bills establishing naval policies and involving billions upon billions of dollars have been passed by the House by unanimous consent, as the membership of the House knows that you guard that responsibility as a sacred trust, and that trust will never be stained or tarnished.

I mark my words when I say you have a record unequaled by any other committee of the House, for but only once in the past 13 years has the House seen fit to write an amendment in a naval bill over the objection and protest of this honorable committee.

When I first became a Member of Congress on December 2, 1914, I was determined to do everything in my power to further the national defense of our country, and particularly to devote my efforts to developing a Navy befitting what should be the greatest maritime nation on earth.

It seems but yesterday when, on May 27, 1916, I was privileged to address the House on the naval-preparedness program for the First World War. At that time I said:

"I abhor war and detest that spirit which would make military despotism the chief object and purpose of a nation's thought. I deny the validity of the doctrine that would make of the civilian a pawn of a military caste, and assert that a free civil life should be at all times the chief aim of national existence. Neither now nor ever can the specter of militarism of the control of our national life rear its dragon head in this democratic land. Firm as I am in the belief that however numerous are to be the warships which we must now create, these ships ever shall remain as a bulwark of personal liberty."

Those sentiments, expressed over a quarter of a century ago, have ever remained controlling with me.

At the end of the First World War the United States had become the dominant naval power of the world. When the Washington Conference assembled in the fall of 1921 we possessed a naval force which was stronger than that of any other power. This had been created by the Congress in accordance with an announced policy of the Naval Affairs Committee to maintain a navy second to none. Nevertheless, as an altruistic contribution to world peace, we took the unprecedented course of surrendering voluntarily the naval supremacy which we then possessed.

For 11 long years, aside from a small-cruiser program, nothing was done to strengthen the United States Navy. Meanwhile, other nations, Japan and Germany, were secretly and openly preparing for the path of conquest on the lands and oceans of the world. Disarmament by example had proven a dismal failure.

The Naval Affairs Committee, observing the invasion of Manchukuo in Asia and the rise of Hitlerism in Europe and the drift of the tide in a world supposedly at peace, and believing then, as it does now, that the primary duty of government is self-preservation and that no sophistry of logic can justify it in stripping itself of its means of defense and in relying for its preservation upon the mercy, the pity, or the love of other nations, was determined that the American Navy should be strengthened and increased; that the security of the Nation demanded that it be done in the very shortest possible time. Therefore, at the behest of the committee I urged the passage of legislation providing for a shipbuilding program, which was incorporated in the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933.

Again, but 1 year later, in 1934, by direction of this committee and with the wholehearted support of the Navy Department, I introduced a bill which became known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, authorizing construction of ships in keeping with the minimum requirements, considering world affairs at that time.

Again, in 1938, on behalf of the committee, I sponsored a bill, which Congress accepted, authorizing an increase in combatant tonnage over and above that authorized by the act of 1934.

The committee being fully conscious of the steady growth of aviation and the ever-important part it was destined to play in the security of the Nation, on its behalf I sponsored a bill, in 1939, establishing air bases in

the far-flung islands of the Pacific, in Alaska, and in the continental United States.

And then again in 1940, on behalf of this committee, I sponsored 2 bills for further naval expansion, one of which created the 2-ocean Navy and provided for an air force of not less than 15,000 planes.

Therefore, you members of the committee may well take great pride in the fact that you have played an important part in providing for ships and airplanes for the Navy and placing your country in position to combat the enemy in this global war.

In your leadership in sponsoring the shipbuilding and aviation programs, you have shown yourselves to be statesmen with vision.

By the foresight and wisdom of this committee and with the wholehearted support of the Congress and Navy Department, the country was able to withstand the shock of Pearl Harbor.

At the termination of this war we will again be the dominant naval power of the world. We will possess a Navy unsurpassed by that of any other nation or combination of nations.

Let us resolve never again to scrap a single ship, a single airplane, or anything else vital to the defense of our country.

We should have learned our lesson. Security for our country must be based on more than words. We must ever remember that our enemies today are long-range planners. German and Prussian militarism thinks in terms of generation upon generation, and Japan thinks in terms of centuries.

After 2 years of war our Navy has become a mighty menace to our enemies on the seven seas. Our men and our ships are carrying battle to the enemy with such vigor and such success that there can be no doubt as to the ultimate outcome. Imbued with the spirit of "We have just begun to fight," they met the enemy at Coral Sea, Midway, and in the seas of the Solomons and the Aleutians and annihilated them. These and other battles with their glorious deeds will ever live in the hearts of a grateful Nation.

The personnel of the Navy is not excelled in its devotion to duty by any corresponding body of men in the world. Its officers and men, wherever they may be, on the seas, under the seas, or in the air, are living up to the highest naval traditions of the past, and time in its tireless flight cannot forget their daily achievements and glorious deeds of valor in this war.

There are no more courageous or patriotic men than those who serve in the United States Fleet; for them death lurks on every wave and rides in every cloud. Their spirit is never to give up the ship. They are determined that never shall the heel of the aggressor be set upon our shores and that never shall the way of American life perish from this land of liberty.

For those courageous, patriotic, and beloved men who have gone down to the sea never to return, their supreme sacrifice shall not have been made in vain, for there will come forth a lasting peace to bless their children and their children's children yet to be born.

For a continuous period of 30 years a great and generous constituency has commissioned me to represent them in Congress. Twenty-seven of those years I have served on the Naval Affairs Committee, and that association with the men of the Navy has enriched my life.

Members of the committee, for your untiring efforts and cooperation in assisting me as chairman of this committee, I am profoundly grateful. It has been a privilege to serve with each and every one of you and the memories of our association will live with me forever.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. HESS. In closing, permit me, on behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee, to extend our thanks and appreciation to each and every one of you for your participation in the program today.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 17, 1944.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I greatly regret that my absence from Washington will make it impossible for me to be present at the ceremonies on Wednesday in connection with the presentation of your portrait.

The officers of the United States Navy, both ashore and afloat, know even better than I do the great service you have been to the Navy and to the country. Even as a newcomer I have seen at first hand the wisdom, tolerance, and understanding which you have brought to your task as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. I do not believe that the value of those qualities and of your long devotion to the interests of the Navy can ever be fully appraised.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1944.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to tell you how much I regret that I shall not be able to attend the ceremony on January 20 to do honor to you. I am leaving for a trip overseas on January 19.

During the more than 6 years that I have been Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks I have had no associations which I value more highly than those with you and with your committee. I have frequently stated that the Navy and the country can never adequately recognize the value of your services to the Nation. In my humble opinion you have rendered services in this emergency whose value can be matched by few. Some day history will record this fact with appropriate tribute to your devotion.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

BEN MOREELL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE PAYMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HESS: I feel that a pause in the momentous march of national affairs to pay tribute to the Honorable CARL VINSON is most fitting and that this recognition of the fine record of public service of an outstanding leader is well merited.

Since entering the Navy in 1917, the year in which Mr. VINSON, also entered the naval service, I have been keenly aware of his intense interest in and profound knowledge of the problems presented by that establishment. As you no doubt know, I have followed his career with personal pride and satisfaction.

I sincerely regret that a previous appointment in New York prevents me from being present at the ceremonies attending the unveiling and presentation of Mr. VINSON'S portrait on January 20, 1944. Capt. T. Earle Hipp, SC, U. S. N., the Administrative Officer of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, will attend, and looks forward to the privilege.

As soon as I return to the Department I hope to extend my personal compliments.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. YOUNG,
Rear Admiral, SC, United States Navy.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION OF CONGRESSMAN CARL VINSON ADOPTED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MACON, GA., AT THEIR REGULAR MEETING ON JANUARY 18, 1944

It is with sincere interest and approval that we officially note the national recognition to be accorded the Honorable CARL VINSON with the presentation and unveiling of his portrait in the House Naval Affairs Committee Room in Washington, D. C.

As a Member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia, of which our community is a part, Mr. VINSON has served his local constituents capably and with promptness and courtesy, but always in complete consonance with his greater obligations to our Nation as a whole.

First elected to Congress November 3, 1914, and serving continuously since, he was appointed to the House Naval Affairs Committee in 1917, and has been chairman of that committee since 1931.

A genius of common sense in thought and in action, his service has been enriched by experience, and never hindered by fear. Outspoken and forthright in his conception of the needs of our country, his steady wisdom has guided the naval program and has—probably more than any other person outside the active lists of our armed services—contributed greatly to the building of our present two-ocean Navy. He considered this branch of service to be our right arm of defense and intended to hold the sword and not the pen.

We are proud of the many honors bestowed upon him and are firm in our conviction that, as a man and public servant, he is an honor to them all.

It is resolved that these expressions be spread upon the official minutes of this meeting.

It is further resolved that the clerk be, and she is hereby, directed to forward a copy hereof to the Honorable WILLIAM E. HESS with the respectful request that he, as the presiding officer, make these expressions known in the portrait presentation program to be held January 20, 1944.

So resolved and ordered, in public and regular meeting assembled, this 18th day of January 1944.

Approved this 18th day of January 1944.

CHARLES L. BOWDEN,
Mayor.

VIOLA ROSS NAPIER,
Clerk of Council.

CITY OF MILLEDGEVILLE.

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress and Member of
House Naval Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COLE: I thank you for copy of the program your committee has arranged for the purpose of honoring Congressman CARL VINSON.

I believe, sir, that the real people of this Republic will agree that you will be bestowing an honor well earned. And furthermore, sir, I think that each member of the Naval Affairs Committee has won public plaudits because of his active zeal in behalf of our Nation's safety.

I wish, through you, to convey to each my appreciations of the public services rendered.

With the best wishes for our country's welfare, I am,

Very sincerely,

E. A. TIGNER,
Milledgeville, Ga.

REGENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, January 18, 1944.

Congressman W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives, United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COLE: It was indeed kind of you to send me an invitation to the

exercises honoring Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, a loyal friend, an intelligent worker, a patriotic citizen, an able Representative, a statesman who has visions and believes ardently in the American way of life.

For 30 consecutive years he has served his district efficiently and courageously and his State and the Nation through these years in a progressive, determined, brilliant way, particularly in the field of naval affairs, giving to this Nation with the aid and confidence of his associates, the finest navy on the seven seas.

He has been genuinely devoted to every phase of the Navy: Docks, ports, aircraft carriers, training stations, air fields, preflight aviation schools, the WAVES, personnel, and in capable and efficient men and officers to command our ships in peace and war.

We are proud of Congressman VINSON and the fine contributions he has made to our country. He has devoted his efforts largely to Nation-wide problems, problems involving statesmanship rather than self-seeking policies. His whole career has been marked by honesty, fidelity, and loyalty. It is indeed pleasing to his many friends that this deserved honor has been bestowed upon him.

With kindest regards and appreciation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

S. V. SANFORD.

MACON, GA., *January 17, 1944.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COLE: I have received the program of the ceremonies to be held on January 20, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., honoring the Honorable CARL VINSON.

I heard while in Washington last week of this occasion, and had hoped to be present. It now appears that I cannot be. I regret this fact very much.

Next to you gentlemen, who have served with Mr. VINSON through the years, we here in his home district recognize his sterling worth and ability. The Nation has been fortunate, indeed, in the past few trying years to have had him at the helm of the important Naval Affairs Committee.

We who have been his constituents for a generation are even more fortunate.

With high regards, I am,

Most respectfully yours,

CHARLES J. BLOCH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 19, 1944.*

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CARL: The enclosed is a copy of a telegram I tried to send you today, but it was refused by the telegraph company in accordance with war restrictions.

"Please accept my sincere congratulations upon the honor being paid you as the outstanding chairman of the Naval Committee in the history of our Government.

"Your unswerving loyalty to the Navy justifies every compliment which may be paid you."

Am sorry that a severe case of illness prevents my being with you and your friends when you are so signally honored, but will promise to do better next time.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. BRITTEN.

THE GLENN L. MARTIN CO.,
Baltimore, Md., January 17, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House Naval Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESS: I am exceedingly sorry that a previous business commitment prevents my being present at the unveiling of the portrait of the Honorable CARL VINSON on January 20. Will you kindly convey to him personally my regrets.

Congressman CARL VINSON has had a long and distinguished career. He has brought honor to his State and Nation. I am happy that he is being honored by the Naval Affairs Committee, over which he has so ably presided for many years. Extend to him, please, my very best wishes.

Cordially yours,

GLENN L. MARTIN.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and other interested citizens, I submit for the RECORD a letter and statement from J. B. Hutson, president, Commodity Credit Corporation. The letter and statement are clear and deal with the food subsidy:

NOVEMBER 18, 1943.

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: Attached is an outline of three subsidy programs: 1, dry beans; 2, dairy-feed payment; and 3, fluid milk, Baltimore (Md.) milkshed. This is sent in accordance with your telephonic request of November 16.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON, *President.*

ILLUSTRATIONS OF HOW PRICE SUPPORTING PROGRAMS INVOLVING LOSSES TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATE

A. DRY BEANS

Prior to planting time in 1943, the War Food Administration announced that the prices for dry edible beans would be supported at $7.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1, Lima, Baby Lima, Light, Dark, and Western Red Kidney beans, and $6.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1, Pea, Great Northern, Small and Flat Small White, Pink, Pinto, Cranberry, and Small Red beans, cleaned and bagged, in carload lots at shipping point. The support price for No. 2 beans is 15 cents lower. These support prices exceed the existing maximum prices for sales into civilian consumption by the following amounts:

	Per 100 lbs. (cleaned)
$6.50 varieties:	
Pea	$0.70
Great Northern	.70
Small White	.70
Flat Small White	.70
Pinto	.60
Pink	.50
Small Red	.70
Cranberry (western)	.15
Cranberry (other than western)	.60
$7.50 varieties:	
Lima	0
Baby Lima	.80
Light Red Kidney	1.20
Dark Red Kidney	1.20
Western Red Kidney	1.20

In order to implement the support price guaranty, the following actions were taken:

1. Commodity Credit Corporation entered into contracts with country shippers, under which the country shippers agreed to purchase dry beans from producers on the basis of the announced support prices, taking into consideration approved charges for cleaning, bagging, and other services that would have to be performed in order for the beans to be in position for sale at the support price. Under these contracts Commodity Credit Corporation agreed to make a support price payment to country shippers at rates equal to the amount by which the support price exceeded the civilian ceiling price on all beans sold into domestic civilian channels. The Corporation also agreed to buy at the support price any stocks the shippers were unable to sell during the season.

2. Food Distribution Administration, acting as agent for Commodity Credit Corporation, offered to purchase at the support price and dry beans offered, cleaned, and bagged, in carload lots at country shipping points. Such beans will be used for lend-lease, Army, Navy, and other governmental purposes, and no support payment will be made with respect to such beans so used.

3. In order to assist producers in holding their beans until they could be sold, Commodity Credit Corporation offered to make loans to farmers on farm- or warehouse-stored beans which had not been cleaned or bagged, the loan rates being $5.50 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 1, $5.35 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 2, and $5.10 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 3.

4. Commodity Credit Corporation offered to purchase through county A. A. A. committees any thresher-run beans that could not be handled immediately by country shippers if Commodity Credit Corporation bins were available for storing such beans. The purchase price for such beans is the support price less approved cleaning, bagging, and other charges for services yet to be performed in order for such beans to be in position to be sold at the announced support price.

B. DAIRY FEED PAYMENT

In order to assist dairy producers in maintaining production of milk, the War Food Administration announced that from October 1, 1943, to December 1, 1943, inclusive, payments would be made to dairy farmers in an amount approximately equal to the increase in the cost of dairy feed between September 1942 and September 1943, with adjustments for relative changes that have occurred in the price of milk and the proportion of dairy feed purchased in each area. These payments are made as follows:

1. The amount of payment to which a farmer is entitled is measured by the quantity of milk, cream, butter, or butterfat sold by him between October 1 and December 31, 1943.

2. The rate of payment is established by areas and ranges from 30 to 50 cents per hundredweight of milk and 4 to 6 cents per pound of butterfat. The rate on butter is 80 percent of the rate on butterfat since there are approximately 4 pounds of butterfat in 5 pounds of butter, and the rate on cream is about 20 percent of the rate on butterfat since there is approximately 1 pound of butterfat in 5 pounds of cream.

3. Producers became eligible on November 1, 1943, for payment in connection with their October sales of milk, cream, butter, and butterfat, and the first payments were made on that date. The farmer obtains his payment by submitting to the county A. A. A. committee an application for payment and substantiating data showing the quantities of milk, cream, butter, or butterfat sold by him during October. Upon approval of this application the county A. A. A. committee draws a draft on Commodity Credit Corporation and payable to the producer covering the amount to which the producer was entitled in connection with his October sales. The producer takes this draft to his local bank where he obtains cash and the draft is then forwarded to the Federal Reserve bank or branch bank serving that area for payment on behalf of Commodity Credit Corporation. The same procedure will be followed with

respect to sales during November and December 1943.

C. FLUID MILK, BALTIMORE, MD., MILKSHED

In April 1943 milk producers in the Baltimore milkshed were granted an increase of 35 cents per hundredweight in their ceiling prices on Class I milk. No increase was granted, however, in the ceiling prices on Class I milk to consumers. In order to make it possible for the handlers to pay to producers the higher price for milk, Commodity Credit Corporation offered to pay handlers 35 cents per hundredweight of class I milk purchased by them at the new ceiling prices and sold at the ceiling prices applicable to consumer sales. Under this program the farmer gets the increased price at the usual time of settlement with distributors and the distributors in turn apply to Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment to offset the increase in the price of milk to producers.

Speech of Hon. Sam Rayburn Before United States Conference of Mayors on Necessity for Special Congressional Committee on Post-War Fact-Finding and Other Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our highly respected and beloved Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues that it is a speech every public official and all people in all walks of life in America should read and study who appreciate the serious problems of the post-war era that will confront us and which we will have to solve. It is a speech coming from the mind of a man of sound vision and judgment and one who possesses the courage at all times to express his convictions, as well as possessing the determination to put into operation those convictions, which he feels are good, for the best interests of our country. In my opinion it is the speech of a great statesman and one of the outstanding Americans of this generation. It is the bugle call for all Americans to respond to and to follow in the solution of the trying days ahead after this terrible conflict is over. It is a powerful speech delivered at a timely moment. We of the House know Mr. RAYBURN. We know and respect him for his fine qualities and gentleness on the one hand and on the other hand his ability, judgment, and courage, and, when necessary, firmness, in the performance of the duties of the great office he occupies. We know him as our friend.

We know him as an experienced and outstanding legislator; one of the great Speakers of our country's constitutional history. We know him as a great American with an intense love of our country, its institutions, and the noble ideals for which our Government stands.

Several weeks ago our beloved Speaker made a speech on the floor of the House that electrified the country in its simple, plain, blunt, short, and therefore eloquent call for unity in the winning of the war.

His speech at Chicago was the same kind of a speech, talking as SAM RAYBURN does, to the mayors and the American people, on another subject foremost in our minds, the solution of our post-war problems, and guiding the minds of the American people in the sound solution of the post-war problems that will confront us.

The sound judgment, the great ability, and outstanding elements of leadership that you and I, and the numerous friends, and the people of SAM RAYBURN always knew he possessed, are now known to the people of the entire country.

The feeling of respect and confidence of the people throughout the country that the Speaker enjoys, brings credit to the House of Representatives.

We of the House are proud of the respect and confidence that the people repose in him.

The address by Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, at the United States Conference of Mayors, at Chicago, Ill., January 20, 1944, is as follows:

We greet each other today—you, as mayors, and I as a Member of the House of Representatives—with a common bond of understanding. The great majority of us are elected to office by moderately sized communities of peoples. We know most everybody and we hope most everybody knows us. No group of public men in the United States is more intimately concerned with the problems attendant upon the return of industry to peacetime production and useful employment than are you, the mayors of our cities.

This is a heartening meeting. It proves that we do not intend to bring our soldiers back from the agonies of foxholes and plunge them into the heartaches of unemployment. No other group of men, in my opinion, is better qualified to wrestle with these problems because you know your cities. You are familiar with industrial plants in your communities. You know what they make; how many people they employ; how they will be affected by reconversion; what the people think; what they will expect after the war. Large numbers of these men and women are known to you by sight and name. They are not statistics to you; they are not so many dots on a chart to you. They are flesh and blood human beings. They are Americans who want a chance to earn a living, to own a home, to rear their children decently. They are parents who want their fighting sons to come home to a United States of opportunity. If these people are denied, if America fails them, the first men they will turn to will be you—the mayors of our cities.

And it is natural that they should turn to you. You represent and personify local government to them. You are at hand. Your door is open. They know that you know what they are up against. Quite understandably, they expect you to act quickly, act courageously and wisely. That, of course, is why you have been studying the problems of peace and are gathered here today to weigh them.

I consider it fortunate to be here. For the past year I have been turning over in my mind a proposal directly bearing on the post-war problems. I have chosen this conference of mayors for the first public discussion of that proposal because I cannot imagine any successful post-war program without the closest cooperation of all branches of government and most certainly the cooperation of heads of municipal government.

The No. 1 miracle of this awful war has been the amazing transformation of the American economy from a peacetime basis to an unequaled wartime footing. The world, in all its history and in all its wars, has never witnessed anything like it. Consider, for a moment, this astounding accomplishment measured in a few simple terms:

From the ashes of Pearl Harbor, this great Nation of ours rose to build 86,000 airplanes in 1943—a production feat that defies our imagination. Simultaneously the brawn of American labor and the brains of our engineers combined to produce countless military vehicles—everything from jeeps to heavy tanks. For the same period, the arsenals of America supplied our fighting men and those of our allies with 20,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition—more ammunition than this country produced in all its previous wars put together. From the ways of our mighty shipyards came vessels in such vast numbers that today we are transporting 8,000,000 tons by water monthly—a figure 7 times greater than the peak for the last war. While industry and labor wrought these weapons for victory, the American farmer shattered all records. Last year, his production of food was 36 percent greater than in 1929—an amazing achievement.

That is the story to date. Awe-inspiring as it is, half the story is yet to be unfolded. The problem we now face is the job of reversing the process, to return at some future date from a war economy to a peace of plenty.

The problem is all embracing. The American people are now asking:

What is going to happen to jobs?

Businessmen want to know what is going to happen to free enterprise.

Farmers ask if they must go through the post-war wringer once more.

And most important of all—will the American soldier return to find employment at good pay waiting for him, or will thousands of them, still wearing uniforms, again stand on street corners, wanting work but unable to get it?

These are fair questions. But the answers do not come readily. Some people propose that the Federal Government take over everything. Others advocate that the captains of industry be given an unbridled head. Still others want the problem solved by State and local governments.

All three of these are extremist views, impractical views. The answer is not to be found in that kind of thinking.

War means total production. War means totally mobilized manpower. War has always meant centralized government. In the patriotic emotion of making war, the people gladly surrender sacred rights and privileges to build the totalitarian machine with which successful war is now made. But once peace is won, the task is to regain those rights; to dismantle the machinery.

The danger which lies ahead of us will be the absence of that cohesive patriotic emotion with which we took up arms. Unless the American people organize, unless a spirit of true American cooperation is generated, the whole process is liable to disintegrate into chaos and confusion. The challenge is plain. We must look ahead, we must prepare, we must organize.

The greatest weakness in our post-war thinking today is lack of information on which to base our thoughts. The Achilles heel is our post-war planning so far as its woeful lack of coordination. What we need is some plain, practical, and constructive organization. We will dishonor the valiant

dead and the courageous living if we squabble and fight here at home each man seeking his mean and petty advantage.

When the problems of tomorrow are reduced to their simplest terms we find that, after all, we are dealing only with men, materials, and tools. If we can bring these three component parts—men, materials, and tools—together at precisely the right moment in our post-war timetable, the great backlog of civilian needs and public works requirements, together with the gradual reopening of foreign markets, will do the rest. It is at once as simple and as complex as that.

What is to prevent it happening? Businessmen claim they are strangled by a multiplicity of laws, regulations, and taxes. That may or may not be true. Labor says that it will need separation pay to survive the conversion period. That also may or may not be true. Government says that the releasing of materials and the cut-back of production is going to be so complex that many raw materials will not be quickly available. That may or may not be true.

An industrialist asks: "How can I expand without venture capital?" A farmer asks: "How can I continue unless I can get some new farm machinery?" A mayor asks: "When can we go ahead with a new municipal auditorium; when will steel to build it be available?" There are other questions:

"What will come off the production line first in the post-war period? Will it be nails, wire fencing, or structural steel? Will it be fuses, radios, or rubber tires? Refrigerators or metal window frames?"

"How much unemployment will we have? How long will we have it? How fast will the armed forces be demobilized? How many men and women will be kept in service and for how long?"

I don't know the answers, but I do know this: If business, labor, agriculture, and Government do not effectively cooperate, and organize, and discover the answers, the results are going to be disastrous. How, then, to achieve that cooperation?

I have thought about it for a long time. I have talked about it with many people in all walks of endeavor. I have come to the conclusion that the place to start solving this problem is directly with the people. I don't think any superplanning agency, dealing in broad generalities and theories, can do the job. This is a hard-headed practical matter. I do not believe—with Government controls what they are today because of the war—that business or business agencies can provide the answers. Neither do I feel that organized labor nor agriculture with all their laudable and growing expenditures on economic research, can assume the burden.

It is also obvious that under our unique form of government there is no single division of the state which can force other political divisions and subdivisions, or private enterprise, or labor or agriculture to follow an over-all established plan, even if one were tailor-made and ready. But I have an unlimited faith in the spirit of cooperation which abides in the American people, and which, if properly encouraged, can overcome any obstacle. To me, the American way to meet the issue is to perfect a voluntary mobilization of effort, gather the information essential to solving the problem, correlate the facts and make them available to all concerned. From that point forward, reliance on the spirit of American cooperation and American ingenuity is the only recourse.

The essential thing is to get the greatest possible number of public officials, businessmen, agricultural, and labor leaders, attacking the problem simultaneously and in a coordinated manner. Obviously, the 435 elected Representatives in the House constitute a most appropriate agency of the Federal Government from that standpoint. That is equally true of the Governors, mayors, and county agents.

By this time next week it is my hope to announce the names of a group of House Members to sit coequally and nonpartisanly as a Special House Committee on Post-War Fact Finding. It is my desire that this committee will be given sufficient funds with which to do its work and with which to organize its staff.

In addition to its fact-finding function, it will be the task of this committee to recommend policy and to propose legislation to effectuate that policy.

For its consultants this committee will call in officials of the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government for information on demobilization, allocation of materials, plans for production cut-backs, and Federal post-war projects.

For its agents in the field this committee will depend primarily on you, the mayors of this Nation's cities, on Governors, county agents, labor and agricultural organizations, and business groups. It will be your job to help survey conversion speeds in your communities, to measure unemployment impact, and to discover the plans of local business and industry. In short, you will draft the local blueprint.

Depending on you, the mayors, and on other public officials whom I have mentioned, this committee will draw into one common pool information on the following vital post-war factors:

1. Conversion speeds, unemployment, and rate of reemployment.

2. Allocation of materials; selection of categories to which critical materials should go first.

3. Public works, Federal, State, and local.

4. New fields of enterprise, the speed at which they can be put in operation, and their labor-absorbing quotient.

5. Resumption of foreign trade; the possibility of new world markets; coordination with the rehabilitation efforts of the United Nations.

6. The release of surplus war commodities by the Government; the channeling of their sale to minimize the economic impact, while protecting the public interest.

7. Examination of Federal statutes to learn which will retard, and which will aid successful post-war conversion.

The success or failure of this project will depend directly on the energy each public official exerts; on how well you, as mayors, we, as Congressmen, and the Governors, county officials, labor, agriculture, and business can get into one harness and pull together.

We are endowed, by nature and by our capabilities, with everything needful for maintaining a high rate of employment in the United States after this war. There is no reason under the sun why our people should not enjoy more goods and services than they have ever known before. If we can be prosperous in wartime, we can be prosperous in peacetime. If we can employ our people to forge the weapons of war, we can employ them to make the instruments of peace. If our national income can be higher than ever in time of war, it can be high in time of peace. That is what the people will expect of us—you and me.

There is one invaluable lesson that we can learn from this war. We armed for war according to our needs; we can and must arm for peace according to our needs. But we will have to share the responsibility of peace as willingly as we have shared the responsibilities of war.

With our Federal Government rests the primary responsibility that there be no mass unemployment confronting our soldiers when they are mustered out. But this responsibility must be heavily shared by State and local units of government, particularly by the municipalities. Finally, it must be shared by the citizenship as a whole—by business, labor, and agriculture. It should be the goal of the Federal Government, cooperating with State and local units, to make possible the achievement of maximum private employment producing the most useful things in the shortest period of time. Never again should men and women be forced to prove their poverty in order to procure underpaid public jobs.

The public works must receive especial attention. We all know that a public-works program will be necessary to take care of the lag that must occur between the end of war production and resumption of civilian production.

We know that many plans for the reconversion of industry are already being made. So far, little has been said about public works. But we need look no farther than to the street in front of our homes, the highways that reach into our cities, to see that publicly owned property is in great need of repair, that thousands of necessary projects—Federal, State and local—await our most earnest attention once this war is won. Nobody realizes this more than mayors. You not only know what needs to be done, but you also know which tasks will absorb our post-war labor surplus fastest. Your cooperation with the special House committee that I shall name, is going to be of paramount importance. Your counsel and your wisdom will be needed and will be sought.

This job ahead of us can and must be done. If it isn't, then we would be less than wise to consider what may happen. If we bungle the post-war job, if we allow the specter of depression to rise once more, then the people will eventually turn again to a strong centralized government. We might as well face it; that is what they will demand. It may be 5 years from now; it may be 10 years hence; but it will happen.

What then? Will the American people be so fortunate to find another man as great, as democratic-minded, as Franklin D. Roosevelt to lead them through the crisis? Or will the "man on the horse," the "man with the iron fist," seize control?

Sometimes I feel ashamed when some Americans despair the future of America. Who among us during the sorrowful days of Pearl Harbor would have believed that we could do what we have done? Who now will say that there is anything we cannot do? Who believes that there is anything impossible for 135,000,000 people applying their skill to the vast resources of this continent? We are a nation of men—not magicians—but I think we can accomplish almost anything. We shall not be shackled by the past. We shall not be chained by fear. We can create an unparalleled period of prosperity and happiness. The times cry out to us to do it. The men in our armed forces expect it of us. The people will not be satisfied with less. The resources of men and materials are at hand.

History will not record the humiliating fact that the richest and most powerful Nation on earth fell into the trough of despair and defeat just after it had emerged victorious from mankind's greatest war. It will say, on the contrary, that America having become conscious of its spiritual and material strength marched from greatness to greatness.

Think about it:

We are people with a wide range of emotions. We love peace passionately, but we fight wars like demons. We get rich with a gusto, but we get poor with bitter resentment and sullen demands for action. Unemployment and distress galls the soul of America. We don't like it; we hate it.

Now add to that mixture the hard, realistic view of the returning soldier—the man who offered his life so what he, and you, and I love might be preserved. He will have no patience with us at home if, when he returns, he finds a confused, disorganized American scene. Nor should he have any.

Peace begins only after the disillusionment of war. We might as well confront

that fact and confront it courageously. Cool heads, not hot heads, must prevail. Wisdom, not emotion and hate, must rule.

My faith in this great country of ours is without bounds. I believe in the American way of life as I believe in life itself. I feel deep inside of me that we can hew a path after this war that will lead to a new era, not only for us, but for the world. Progress has not stopped; vision is still the gift of man. We can and must act, and act now. For tomorrow will be what we make it.

Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon consider legislation designed to enable members of our military forces to vote. On this floor we will decide whether these men and women will vote in fact or fancy.

Many of them will be too busy winning the war to even think of voting; just as many of us were 25 years ago. Some will want to vote, not only to vote for the President and Members of Congress, but above all to vote for those officials they know best—their Governor, judges, commissioners, sheriffs, those officials of their local government, the bedrock of this Republic.

Under House bill 3876 they cannot do this.

The "bobtail" ballot therein proposed is contrary to the very Constitution they and we took an oath to protect and defend, the Constitution they are fighting to preserve, the Constitution which provides for the election of a President by electors elected as the laws of "each State provides."

House bill 3876 is an abortive attempt to elect a President by direct vote—an attempt to amend or suspend our Constitution by legislative action under guise of war necessity, a precedent of unpredictable danger.

Wars do not set aside or suspend the Constitution nor give us the power or right to do so.

Such illegal and unconstitutional ballots might very easily throw the election of the President and this entire body into a contest creating a state of indescribable confusion and chaos. Do the proponents of this measure deliberately plan to bring about such confusion? I hardly think they do. Do they not want the members of our armed forces to vote for Governor and sheriff?

State laws alone provide legal ballots, laws which will put into soldiers' hands, if they but ask, ballots carrying names of the President, Congress, Governor, sheriff, on down to the bottom of the ballot. This is essential, because many have been gone so long, have so lost contact they do not know who the candidates are. Kansas, I am proud to state, passed this type of law 2 years ago.

Senate bill 1285, in substance, authorizes and directs the Army and Navy to distribute post-card applications for ballots from each State and to deliver and return these ballots.

Prompt, expeditious, efficient distribution will insure ample time for voting. We can depend on the Army and Navy to do this.

Sure, it is a difficult assignment. But so was the invasion of Africa, Italy, and Guadalcanal, but they did a bang-up job there. They will deliver the ballots just as they delivered the bullets—to the right place—on time.

Senate bill 1285, reported out by the committee, will give these men what they want—a legal ballot from top to bottom, to intelligently vote for men of their choice, if they are not—as many will be—too busy fighting.

Senate bill 1285 will avoid duplication of efforts—duplication of asking for and mailing the short "bobtail" and the full ballots.

Senate bill 1285 will eliminate unnecessary handling of ballots.

Senate bill 1285 is legal, constitutional, American.

It is up to you to make your choice.

Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want again to urge the chairman of the Rules Committee and the leadership of the House to report out without further delay the House committee bill 1285 and to urge that the bill be considered on the floor of the House at the earliest possible date.

This House bill has now been blocked by those in opposition to allowing the soldiers to vote by absentee ballot for 50 days. Late in November the committee chairman invoked a point of order preventing the bill from being reported out when an overwhelming majority of the committee were ready to take such action. I appealed to the chairman at different times following this action to convene the committee and give us a chance to report out the bill. Had this bill been reported out at that time a bill to give the soldiers a right to vote could easily have been passed before the Christmas holidays.

Those who have been backing the Federal war ballot commission bill caused this delay in order to give time in which they could build up a propaganda machine with the intent of smearing and browbeating those who are opposed to their "bobtailed" ballot that would sell the soldiers short, with the hope that they could revise the Green-Lucas bill and yet attain the political benefits it would bring to them. They have delayed and blocked the consideration of the House committee bill for this and other purposes.

Opponents of the House bill called upon Sidney Hillman, at the head of the political committee of the C. I. O., who went into action with them in a Nation-wide campaign to intimidate the Congressmen who had the courage to try to work out a bill that would preserve the constitutional rights of this country and would give the soldier a real opportunity to vote.

Joining in this campaign has been every Communist league and all the "reds" and radicals in America.

The action yesterday by the Senate committee in reporting for consideration the revised Green-Lucas bill was the objective they sought. With various States calling a special election in a sincere effort to give the soldier a chance to vote by the absentee-ballot system and other States anxiously waiting for the Congress to take action so they could fit their State laws, so far as possible, to the bill we will pass, the proponents of the Green-Lucas bill were so intent upon foisting the short ballot onto the soldiers that they have continued to delay the enactment of such a bill.

Let the press of the Nation carry the news to the fathers and mothers of the soldiers and to the soldiers in the camps of the continental United States within reach of the press, that the delay in providing legislation to give the soldier an opportunity to vote can be placed squarely on those who have been leading the fight for the Green-Lucas bill—and let the press of the Nation warn them now that the Green-Lucas bill is a political attempt to sell the soldiers short—that the ballot they refer to is only a blank scrap of paper without the name of a candidate on it, and that it disfranchises the soldier of voting for the Governor of his State, other State, district, and county candidates.

This revised war-ballot commission bill is more vicious than the first was so far as the soldiers are concerned. It leads one to question whether or not they are afraid to allow the soldiers to vote. The only change of importance from the original bill that was defeated by an overwhelming majority in the Senate, as I understand, is that it leaves to the States the question as to whether or not the ballots are legal and shall be counted by the various State canvassing boards.

My information is that many of the big States like Illinois cannot, under their laws, count these blank ballots after the soldiers have voted them. What a travesty to put over in the guise of attempting to give the soldiers a chance to vote.

The proponents of the Green-Lucas bill are so intent in taking political advantage, which they believe will help to elect a President and control the Congress, that they insist on regimenting the soldiers for the few minutes they should be given in which to mark their ballots.

Think of an election day being held with the soldier voting under the sharp eye of his commanding officer when the House bill will send him the full and complete absentee ballot which he can open

and vote and then place in an envelope, mailing it back to his home State election official.

We who oppose the Green-Lucas bill believe it is unfair to cheat him out of an opportunity to vote the same kind of a ballot that we vote at home, when we know that under our bill we can give him the ballot in plenty of time for him to vote it and return it to be counted.

We believe he is entitled to 10 or 15 minutes time in which he can exercise this right in a democratic way. We are trying to guarantee to the soldier a fifth freedom—a freedom to cast an untrammeled ballot in a constitutional election, a chance to help to make the democracy work he is fighting to defend.

Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the blessings of democracy are not only advertised by us throughout the world but deemed worthy of the greatest sacrifice of our blood and treasure, it would seem to me to be a great tragedy should we fail to give those in the armed services both ballots and bullets in the name of that same democracy. It has been said that our Constitution provides a framework of government, a division of powers, and a charter of liberties. It is just as essential to preserve that framework—founded on the ballot of a free electorate—as it is to proclaim that liberty throughout the land which has been thus far secured and made secure by our foundation of universal suffrage.

I cannot bring myself to believe that any Member of Congress would desire to deprive any of the members of our armed services of the right to vote in time of war any more than in time of peace.

Neither can I believe that our Constitution is such a strait jacket that it will not admit of such cooperation between the Federal and State sovereignties as will make certain the achievement of the end desired by all. The Constitution solemnly guarantees to every State the blessings of a republican form of government. I use the term "republican" in its wider and not its rarer acceptance. This is not a matter for partisanship but for patriotism—not one for love of party but one for love of country.

In time of war, law is silent. This is true as between belligerents and in a measure true within the walls. A way was found to send the National Guard outside the territorial limits of the United States during even the First World War. An appropriate function can be assigned to the Federal Government and forces, in aid of the States, to the end that those who serve in war may vote. It must be remembered that our forces are under authority. The civil authorities can hardly go into an armed camp and supervise the activities of soldiers. They cannot give orders to officers—and it is the commanding officer who must do much to supervise and certify the casting and transmittal of the vote.

In the matter of the acceptance and counting of the ballots, I think this is a matter for the exclusive action of the States. A great many of the States, including my own State of Nevada by constitutional provision, require that no person in the military service offering a ballot shall be denied either for failure to register or for failure to pay any poll tax. Matters of this sort might well be left to the States because of the emergency without raising other issues or attempting a permanent seizure of jurisdiction by the Federal Government.

It is evident that the ordinary privilege of voting at a primary election or at a general election for county and State officers cannot be exercised during this war by men overseas.

Army and Navy officials have stated that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to administer 48 State election laws among soldiers and sailors scattered all over the globe.

Under the election law of September 16, 1942, only 28,000 votes were cast. That was a very small fraction of those then qualified to vote. With some 12,000,000 qualified votes in 1944, it is to be supposed that a much larger number and proportion will have the opportunity to participate.

We should consider the time element and eliminate preliminary petitions involving the transportation of mails many times over great distances. If uniform, simplified Federal ballots could be sent at an early time to the commanding officers of all service units for distribution everywhere, these might be privately marked and deposited—classified by State and county and forwarded to the proper general or specific election boards for counting. The solemn statement of a service voter that he or she is competent and qualified to vote generally and in the particular district, made to his or her immediate commanding officer, without oath or affidavit, could well be declared sufficient by Federal enactment. In the final course the local election officers might well be left to receive or reject the ballot but only on the ground either of nonresidence or other disqualifying disability.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is and should be no conclusive barrier to collaboration between the general and the local governments in securing to all in the services the right to vote. The Constitution does not stand in the way and as to receiving ballots cast under form on the face fair, if the local election boards should take an attitude prohibitive of the reasonable exercise of the franchise, then this must be considered a domestic political matter beyond the inhibitory or correctional power of the Federal authority. To throw this entire project into the arena of invidious criticism and discrimination here and now will not only deny even more substantial rights to the servicemen but probably will frustrate the entire project. We cannot afford to delay.

It is my hope that my colleagues will substitute the Worley bill, H. R. 3982, for the Senate bill, as amended and reported out by a majority of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. The provisions of the Worley bill will make certain that the men and women in our armed forces will be given the opportunity of casting their votes for national officials in the election in 1944.

The servicemen are chosen to serve under a universal rule. They should be treated with the same universality as respects their votes.

Plight of the Small Farmer in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter from a constituent and also an article and letter appearing in the Hartford Courant of recent date.

The information and facts set forth by an actual small farmer in Bloomfield, Conn., in his letter tells better than can I why he begs of the Office of Price Administration:

MADISON, CONN., *January 19, 1944.*

Mr. RANULF COMPTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am enclosing a piece cut from the Hartford Courant, which I think states the condition of the small farmer as well as anything I have seen.

It is getting more difficult for the farmers all the time. I am losing a man who has been with me for 5 years, as I cannot increase his wages. I have sold 30 head of young stock and a number of acres of my farm so we can continue a short time longer.

It is imperative that we have at least 2 cents increase per quart for our milk.

We are having an open winter and not too severe cold, which I enjoy more than I would if I was in Florida.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD F. KELSEY.

GIVE THE FARMER AT LEAST A BREAK—WITH TRUE PATRIOTISM HE FIGHTS TO CORRECT ONE OF GREATEST ERRORS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

I am sending the accompanying letter to Mr. Chester Bowles, of the O. P. A., and thought you might be interested in it for your People's Forum section.

The farmer, particularly the small one, seldom takes time to express himself, but I feel that his plight is one of serious national interest.

JOSIAH D. SWETT.

BLOOMFIELD.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am just an individual farmer, a New England farmer, slowly being forced to quit farming. I farm a side-hill farm without help other than my wife. My children are too young to help. I have to keep

so many forms of records for the Government that I can't keep records that are able to give me my own costs at a moment's notice. I have heard so many arguments by Government officials and agencies stating the farmers' increased costs and record income and how we are getting 115 percent of parity—whatever that means—and how subsidies are saving the day, that I decided this January Sunday to dig into my records and find out my conditions.

This was prompted by the fact that I work from 5 a. m. to 8 p. m., 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and the only exceptions are when I sit up all night with a sick cow, or broken piece of equipment, or harrow in the spring until midnight or later—my tractor has lights—and I have never been worse off financially. The 100 quarts of milk and the 30 dozen eggs I make a day constitute a small farmer, but there are many of us; and it has been said many little brooks make a big river. I doubt that the large farms turn out as much for each man hired.

Here are the figures I dug up from my records. These are my costs and receipts, and I try to buy as economically as I can and sell as profitably as I can. I am spending my own money, not the Government's, as the war plants are doing. All these figures were taken for the same dates in December 1941, right after war was declared, and December 1943, 2 years later.

The cost as of December 1, 1941, December 1, 1943, approximate increase is as follows:

Feed for laying hens, per 100 pounds, $2.57½, $3.48½, 33 percent; feed for milking cows, per 100 pounds, $2.20, $3.28, poor quality, 50 percent; ordinary farm broom, high quality, $1.15, $1.65, 45 percent; ordinary work gloves, 75 cents, $1, 33 percent; day labor, always obtainable, per day $4, unobtainable, $5, 25 percent.

These are just a few items, but every item I purchase is similar. Many necessary items are unobtainable, not because of scarcity of materials, but because the manufacturer cannot operate profitably under ceiling prices and he therefore takes those materials to manufacture products not under O. P. A. controls.

The Government promise of no tires to retailers forced me to give up a retail egg route early in 1942. I sell my milk and eggs wholesale. Here are my December 1941 and December 1943 prices:

Milk, per quart, December 1941, 8½ cents; December 1943, 8½ cents plus 1 cent subsidy; an increase of less than 10 percent.

Eggs, per dozen, December 1941, 34¾ cents; December 1943, 30⅓ cents; a decrease of approximately 13 percent.

Please bear in mind my poultry feed costs were 33 percent higher, my egg prices 13 percent lower in 1943 than in 1941. My dairy feed costs 50 percent more and milk price is less than 10 percent higher. This subsidy business of less than 10 percent was given out solely to offset increased feed prices. How less than 10 percent of milk cost can offset a 50 percent increase in feed cost is a mystery to me. I am only too well aware that feed cost isn't all there is to producing a quart of milk, but there is no cost that goes into a quart of milk that has not increased. A first-class milking cow in 1941 could be obtained for $125, today it is $200. The salvage on same cow is much less because of meat rationing.

I know these figures are not put together in the right order, and I am well aware that you O. P. A. people can twist figures to say anything, but the old balance sheet in the average farmer's pocket is the real story. I want to win this war, and I like my work and my livestock, and I'll work for nothing more than a poor living; but I can't get my creditors interested in farm bonds with nothing behind them, nor can I build up a national debt. By going into debt I could keep farming another year and then leave my creditors with farm and livestock, but I am not built that way, nor is the average small farmer. We want to do our job and win this war, and we are the people fitted to do it. If the Government thinks it can hire labor and produce the food cheaper than the small general farmer, it had better try it. We are being forced to quit, but believe me, of all the false impressions the present administration is suffering under, to wipe out the small farmer is one of the greatest errors that can be made, especially here in New England and the Northeast generally.

Milk and eggs are two basic foods, and the largest percentage of these two foods used in New England is produced in New England and largely on small farms. Wipe out the small farms, and the millions of war workers in this section will require food shipped in. Inasmuch as we are short of oil, coal, and gasoline because (we are told) of overloaded transportation, how can transportation handle milk and eggs if they could get them?

Let's wake up; it's already too late to save it all, but give the farmers that have stuck it out these 2 years a break. Roll back labor costs. Put a ceiling on them that will cut war-production cost, therefore taxes, also farm costs. Give farmers cost plus 10 percent. At any rate let's see that the farmer gets cost. Ceilings are fine, but if we can't have peak prices to offset losses, let's have floors. It's certainly unfair to restrict our chances of profit and force us to take losses caused by overproduction when we are pleaded into this very overproduction by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I shall await with great interest the reply of Mr. Chester Bowles to Mr. Swett's letter.

Supply of Certain Fabrics for North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
December 21, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McCORMACK: In answer to your request for the detailed information about the supplying of cloth for diapers to French North Africa, I wish to advise you as follows:

In the period following the invasion of north Africa emphasis was placed on providing the minimum quantities of food and clothing necessary to help reestablish the civilian economy in that area for reasons of military necessity.

As a part of this policy, the North African Economic Board, of which General Eisenhower is a member, requested that a supply of diaper cloth be sent to that area.

We sent 450,000 yards of cloth to north Africa in January, February, and March 1943. An additional shipment of 90,000 "squares" was made in the month of May. All of this cloth was sufficient to make 690,000 diapers. The entire consignment of diaper cloth was for children born to European families in north Africa. We are informed that the cloth has, in fact, been used for diapers and other sanitary purposes.

The allocation of cloth for this purpose was approved by the War Production Board. All of the 450,000 yards shipped in the first 3 months of the year were obtained from old W. P. A. stocks.

All of this cloth has now been paid for by the French.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3420, a bill introduced by Mr. LEA, of California, who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which amends the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, will in a short time be considered in the House of Representatives.

Every fair-minded person recognizes that the passage of the civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420, is essential to the future welfare of the United States.

Today aviation is the fastest moving force in the world. Aviation has changed maps, shrunk oceans, and broken down the age-old barriers of mountains, oceans, and deserts.

The legislation for its promotion, and the legislation for its regulation must keep pace with this industry's swift advancement. The present aviation bill is a result of the most intense study for a whole year by the great majority of the present Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Day after day, whether in the hearings, the subcommittee, or in the full committee, since January 1943 many of the members of this committee have devoted their time to the study of the subject. In order that the public could be informed of what was taking place, successive committee prints of the bill were made public and distributed to all interested parties.

The bill reflects the lessons that this country has learned since the last war, and also the lessons from experience under the present Civil Aeronautics Act. The present law has been improved, modernized, and codified. The safety and other necessary regulations under existing laws have been improved in order to meet the present conditions.

The bill recognizes that civil aviation is a bulwark of defense to the country; not only today but in the future.

The bill strengthens our country's efforts to develop all branches of civil aviation and to guard against a post-war deflation in the industry such as set back aviation so disastrously after the last war.

The bill recognizes that private flying must be encouraged through simplifying its regulation and promotion and stimulating broad interest through aviation education and otherwise.

The bill recognizes and provides that their administrative procedures must be streamlined and clarified in the interest of speed and greater protection to the individual.

I could give in detail all of the very admirable and very necessary provisions of the bill which apply to commercial flying, private flying, and other aspects which are necessary for national defense and in the public interest.

There is opposition to this bill from some quarters caused by misinformation or by selfish interests. When the bill comes before the House and when it is thoroughly explained to the House, I am satisfied in my own mind that it will be approved by a large majority because the Members of the House of Representatives will recognize the necessity for the forward steps which have been taken by a majority of the committee who reported this bill favorably.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third in a series of radio talks on our foreign-policy broadcast by me over Wisconsin networks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WILEY. In two previous radio talks, I discussed the pattern of the post-war world which has emerged from the conferences of Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran.

In my first talk, I said the pattern is a hopeful one. It is hopeful because it proposes to build a post-war system of international security around the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, large and small.

In my second talk, I pointed out that any reasonable system of world security must be built on the reasonable security of each member state. And I insisted that each member state has a primary obligation to look first of all to its own reasonable security.

I defined reasonable security as a security which can be achieved without jeopardizing the like security of any other state.

Three observations should be made at this point.

In the first place, the pattern which has emerged from the official declarations of post-war purpose by the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Republic, is, after all, only a pattern, however hopeful. It is a statement of a general principle which it is proposed to apply in the promotion of a general purpose.

Our common sense tells us that it could not be otherwise.

Our common sense tells us that we must undertake to promote world security through the solution of a series of specific problems. Our common sense tells us, too, that we must work out many of the solutions on a trial-and-error basis and in a spirit of give-and-take. We shall attempt, that is, to find solutions along the lines of the broad pattern of principle and purpose already laid down but the solutions must necessarily be a series of reasonable compromises.

We cannot and shall not compromise the fundamental principle that all states shall deal with each other as sovereign equals, but again our common sense tells us that we can deal with each other as equals only because we are confident of our ability to find reasonable compromise or adjustments of our various problems.

The second observation follows logically from the first. In the practical application of our major principle and purpose to specific problems, no individual state will be in position to negotiate as it should in the give-and-take of necessary particular compromise unless it has previously achieved a maximum of reasonable security for itself.

This is particularly true of the three major states which, after this war is won, will have the actual military power to determine the shape and purpose of the post-war world. It is the particular good fortune of the world as it is now constituted that the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union can each achieve a reasonable post-war security without in any way jeopardizing the reasonable security of either of the other two. If I do not include the Chinese Republic among the great powers now holding actual and predominant military power, I am only calling attention to the obvious. China will become one of the great powers with the cordial cooperation of her present major allies, but it will require at least a generation until the Chinese people have developed the necessary industrial base on which all modern military power is built.

In discussing this matter of actual and predominant military power, I think it should be emphasized that the most hopeful feature of the hopeful post-war pattern so far emerged is that it recognizes frankly and honestly that sovereign power can be and must be organized in the interests of international security and international justice. That is the great lesson taught by the decade of appeasement—by the years of the 1930's—when each of the present major military powers of the grand alliance, in turn, appeased the Axis gangsters, while Berlin and Rome and Tokyo organized their own vast military power in the interests of international brigandage.

My third observation quite logically follows from the other two.

Whether we work out a post-war system of world peace and security depends entirely on how reasonably we interpret our own security needs in relation to other and small peace-loving states which we have invited to join with us in setting up the post-war organization.

Quite obviously, these smaller states must look for their own security to the good will and sense of justice of their more powerful neighbors. Their bitter experiences with the Axis gangsters must have convinced them that they can hope to live in reasonable security only when the great powers of the world are sincerely dedicated to a program of world security. These small states, particularly the smaller European and Asiatic states, have learned the bitter truth that no state is entirely sovereign unless it has the power to command respect for its sovereignty.

But the three or four major powers have learned their own bitter lesson from the experience through which they are now passing. They have learned that total security in the sense it has been attempted by Adolf Hitler's Third Reich or Hirohito's Empire is an utter impossibility. Total security can be purchased only at the expense of total loss of all freedom by other states. It can be purchased only at the total disregard of the rights of all other states of all other peoples. And it follows quite indubitably that it can be purchased only at the expense of the total degradation of the states and the peoples making the attempt.

Events have proven that Hitler and Hirohito even though willing to pay this great price of the destruction of all civilized standards didn't have the power to make the purchase stick.

So the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Republic have learned once more what they always knew. They have learned anew that the world cannot be built around the barbarous notion of a herrenvolk. They have learned that their own avowed way of building on cooperation, mutual trust, and good will is the only sound and practical and common-sense way.

They have learned, that is, that an everlasting and solid and very practical realism of the highest sort is final sanction of the idealism they proclaim.

And just as no single state is powerful enough to achieve its own total security, so no single state or group of states can undertake to set up a system of world security without recognizing the reasonable security of the small as well as the great, the weak as well as the strong. Again, this is much more than a matter of mere abstract justice. The smaller states of the world can work harmoniously and confidently with their powerful neighbors or they can sulk in sullen fear. If we are able to convince them that they may all work in harmonious confidence with us, our task will be substantially easier.

Not only that, but we prove our good will and our good intentions toward each other exactly as we prove them toward these smaller and weaker neighbors who should be our helpful friends.

These three observations lead to an inescapable conclusion.

Any durable system of world security can be achieved only if the major powers of the post-war world first of all achieve their own reasonable security. And since reasonable security is by definition a security which is not achieved at the expense of a similar security of others, the post-war world we hope to build will not be a static world. It will not be a return to the status quo ante in the sense that article X of the League of Nations Covenant was finally interpreted by the signatory powers. On the contrary, it will be a dynamic world, a changing world. And it will be a world of durable peace only to the extent that the major powers and the smaller states prove ready constantly to adjust themselves to its changing conditions.

In my second radio talk on this subject, I insisted that in the interests of our own reasonable security the United States has a direct and immediate interest in the post-war disposition of three mid-Pacific island groups—the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas.

I pointed out that on two prior occasions this country neglected or refused outright to concern itself directly with the fate of these islands. At the conclusion of our war with Spain we permitted Spain to sell the islands to Germany. At the conclusion of the First World War we permitted Japan to have a mandate over them.

It is a matter of record, of course, that under its mandate, Japan was strictly forbidden to fortify these islands, but it is equally a matter of record that Japan completely ignored the terms of the mandate.

We are learning now, and at great cost, what it means to have these islands in enemy hands. We are learning that neither the mandate system of Versailles nor the system of localized zones, which we worked out with Japan in the Washington Treaty of 1922, are adequate to our security in the Pacific.

I say this in no particular spirit of criticism either of the Americans who wrote the treaty with Spain in December 1898 or the Americans who devised the mandate system of 1919 or who drafted the Washington Treaty of 1922.

Since those days, the airplane has come into its own in the armaments of the world. What this means for us of the present we are only beginning to understand.

Even with the airplane at its present state of development, no spot on earth is more than 60 hours of actual flying time from your nearest airport. Chungking, China, is only 39 hours from Chicago; that's about the time it takes to travel from Chicago to Reno by train. Brisbane is only 40 hours away, Berlin only 23 hours, London 22 hours, and Moscow only 28 hours.

It takes longer, of course, for an airplane to fly from Chicago or from anywhere in this country to most of these world points because the airplanes of the present cannot fly the entire distance without landing to refuel; but even as we are just beginning to understand what the new air age means to us now, few of us can imagine what the air age of 10 years hence will be like. Some of our leading aerial experts have no hesitation in saying that 10 years from now our great transport planes will fly halfway around the world without refueling.

It well may be that the air age of the future will render relatively unimportant these Pacific islands. But in the air age of the present they are all-important. At one tiny atoll, Tarawa in the British Gilberts, we have already learned to our bitter cost how important they may be.

Now I know there are Americans who hold up their hands in shocked amazement when anyone raises the fundamental question of our own reasonable security. To raise the question, they insist, is an affront to our allies. It is to express our open distrust of their intentions. It is to challenge the sincerity of the pledges made at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran. It is to jeopardize the entire proposed security system of the post-war world.

Of course, it does nothing of the sort.

When we put one of these protesting and amazement-struck Americans on the dissecting table—figuratively speaking of course—and when we pry under the surface of whatever external decorations he may be using, we are more than likely to find that he is not too greatly interested in the United States of America. Often we find that he is not interested enough even to take out citizenship papers.

Or if he has gone through the legal procedure of becoming a citizen or even if he may perhaps be able to lay claim to several generations of American ancestors, we are likely to find if we dig down deeply enough that he is ready to throw all reasonable American security requirements on the scrap pile and to place his trust and hope in some superstate, in the uncertain protection of some world police force.

By way of contrast, when we examine the statements of the recognized leaders of our major allies we find that they very definitely take for granted that each major state shall look first of all to its own security. We find that these leaders, these intelligent statesmen, realize quite clearly that a dynamic world is a changing world. We find that they accept as a matter of ordinary prudence their own duties to look after the prior security of their own states.

And I have too much confidence in the intelligence and understanding of these men to believe for an instant that they would deny the United States, whom they accept as an equal partner, the equal right.

In my next talks I shall discuss quite frankly and sincerely but in no spirit of challenge or criticism, the attitude of these statesmen on this important question.

Overcoming of Group Animosities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very thoughtful and inspiring discussion on the American Forum of the Air entitled "How Can We Overcome Group Animosities?" on January 11, 1944, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, under the chairmanship of Mr. Theodore Granik. The speakers were: Mr. Basil O'Connor, Dr. Frank P. Graham, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, and Dr. Frank Kingdon.

Subsequent to this broadcast, Most Rev. Francis J. Spellman, Catholic Archbishop of New York, addressed a letter to Judge Proskauer, expressing warm approval of the principles of tolerance and Americanism in his broadcast. I ask unanimous consent that Archbishop Spellman's letter be printed immediately following the text of the forum discussion.

I am advised by the Printing Office that the estimate of cost of printing the matter in the RECORD is $120.

There being no objection, the discussion and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman GRANIK. As the zero hour for invasion nears, our military leaders plead for a united front at home to support the battle front.

It seems ironic to be talking about unity—or rather lack of unity—in the United States.

Yet no American can close his eyes to the manifestations of disunity about us. There are continued disagreements between management and labor; between political factions; between religious and national groups; discrimination against certain elements of our populace.

Our armed forces are proving too much for the Nazis, but at home we seem at times ready to surrender to the Nazi weapon of divide and conquer. We thought that war against a common enemy would unite us—would eliminate these group tensions and hatreds. But they persist, and they threaten to become even more dangerous as we approach the post-war era.

How can be head off these threats? What steps should be taken now to stop this horrible business of arraying class against class, faith against faith, race against race, in this land of the free?

This evening the American Forum of the Air has invited three outstanding figures on the American scene, leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, to discuss "How can we overcome group animosities?" They are: Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina and public member of the National War Labor Board; and Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee.

Each has prepared a brief statement. Then, all will join in an extemporaneous roundtable discussion for which we have invited Dr. Frank Kingdon, noted commentator and formerly president of the University of Newark, to act as panel leader.

First, then, Mr. Basil O'Connor.

ADDRESS BY BASIL O'CONNOR

For a good look at the question we're discussing tonight it seems to me that we couldn't have picked a better spot than the city in which we're talking. Where else could you find, in such great numbers, all the elements that make up America? Here we are, seven and a half million of us, white and black and yellow, of every religion and creed, working in every industry, trade, and profession. New York City is more than a cross section of America; it's a little world in itself, a counterpart of the bigger world Hitler and Tojo would like to conquer—if they could.

That's why, long before Pearl Harbor, New York was being used as a proving ground for the Axis strategy of undermining nations from within. By bombarding us with the propaganda of hate they thought they could so divide us that we'd never be able to unite against them. With every trick and slander they could think of, they tried to set black against white, Christian against Jew, native-born against foreign-born, worker against employer. And now that we're in the war, giving it all we have, and beating them on every front, they're still playing their old game, for they know that any friction they can create now may slow down our war effort, stave off defeat for them.

Now they're trying their tactics on our youngsters. Dad is working hard, and giving every spare minute to civilian war activities; mother, too, is often working away from home, adding her bit on the production front. Children without supervision after school want to play, and so become ready victims of any young hoodlum who offers them adventure. We're seeing the results now—in youngsters who wander the streets and beat up the same boys who used to share their games, just because these boys go to a different church. This is the story of recent flare-ups in New York, Boston, Detroit, and other cities.

But all those agitators, haven't been able to stir up much of this sort of trouble, when you realize that we count our numbers in millions. Don't misunderstand me. I'm very much disturbed by the incidents we've had, and I want to see all means used to prevent their recurrence. That's why I'm on this program, but I do want to say that, for all the tremendous effort made to break us up, the results have been mighty small.

I'm proud of that. And I think I know why it's been so. I know what it's like to grow up in a city that is a mighty fusion of peoples, to play with Irish and Italian and Polish and Negro children, to go to school with them, and later work with them, in business, in government, in community enterprises. That's the kind of experience that teaches a man how to get on with people of all sorts, teaches him to respect his neighbors, to respect them even for the things that make them different from one another.

For we are a nation of many cultures, with but one loyalty. There lies our greatest protection against enemies from without or from within. In the bringing of this fact home to every American, in this teaching of the essential character of America, it seems to me we have the best possible basis for combating intergroup tensions of any kind.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. O'Connor. Now, Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, and public member of the National War Labor Board. Dr. Graham.

ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK GRAHAM

There is no magic formula for the conquest of prejudices. The three main ways to overcome group animosities are by (1) education, (2) equality of opportunity, and (3) a spiritual sense of the sacredness of human personality. By education we come to understand the origins of racial, religious, and

social prejudice and, through that understanding, gradually overcome personal prejudice and group animosities. Group prejudices are deep in the psychological inheritance of thousands of years in the development of what anthropologists call consciousness of our kind of human being as opposed to their kind of human being with all the attendant fears of the strange and different, and with all the consequent antipathies toward differences in color, race, religion, culture, and customs. Racial and religious animosities cannot be isolated in time or place. They are as complex as human psychology, older than history, and as wide as the world. History recalls the antipathies and discriminations in the relations of Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Roman and Provincial, Christian and Jew, Catholic and Protestant, white, red, black, and yellow peoples—fearing and too often hating each other because different in color and race, religion, and region. Yet modern science and education reveal that the differences in achievement and civilization are based mainly on differences in environment and opportunity, rather than on differences in race, color, or shape of the head. The difference is more in the opportunity than in the capacity to achieve. The very sincerity and depth of race prejudice is the foundation of its power and its exploitation by demagogues and the dominant group. In our time, master racialism has become not the key to history, is not the basis of a superior civilization, but the instrument of Nazi imperialism in the total war for global domination.

In opposition to master racialism is the American dream, now revived in the American youth giving their lives on all the fronts of freedom. Through this revival of the American dream of human liberty and the equal chance for all people, we can be moved in time to overcome the powers of prejudices and discriminations.

More powerful than even education and the American dream is the spiritual sense of one world, one human family of all men as brothers and sons of God.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Dr. Graham. And now, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee. Judge Proskauer.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH M. PROSKAUER

We are fortunate to be able to discuss this problem in an atmosphere so charged with the spirit of national unity. We know that the war has brought us all together. The boys at the front don't ask whether a man is white or black, foreign or native-born, Protestant, Catholic, or Jew; they wish to know only if he's a good soldier. And on the home front general solidarity of purpose unites us, as individuals and as a nation, in single-hearted devotion to the cause of freedom and democracy.

None the less, the barrage of propaganda from enemy and native anti-Americans has created certain group tensions among us. If this is possible now, what of the post-war period, when economic readjustments, unemployment, and all the conditions that will attend the changing over to peacetime living, will create a more fertile soil for the seeds of dissension? Hitler will be gone, but the rabble rousers who have learned a trick or two from him will still remain, and they may be expected to continue their attempts to stir up hatred for this group or that, in order to gain a following for themselves.

Two things can fortify us against the harm such men might do. Every man, woman, and child in America must learn to understand and recognize the propaganda of "divide and conquer." Whoever preaches suspicion and mistrust of a fellow American on the ground of race, religion, or color, is a messenger of national destruction. This knowledge, plus the warmer understanding of our neighbor that comes from working with him on community projects, can keep us safe.

Chief Justice Hughes once said: "Liberty cannot be conserved by majority rule unless the majority holds sacred individual rights regardless of race or creed, so that along with differences of politics and religion we have a deep and abiding sense of human dignity and worth and hence of our capacity for friendly cooperation in pursuit of common ideals of justice."

This, in the words of the statesman, is what we read in the Ten Commandments and in the Sermon on the Mount. No nation can endure if it gives only lip service to the injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Constitutional guaranties are not enough and cannot be enough. They are but a rope of sand to hold us to our moorings, unless we strengthen the rope with right thinking and individual right conduct.

This lesson we must take to heart in this year of sorrow, when man's inhumanity to man has made the countless millions mourn. In the ancient Greek tradition every physician took the Hippocratic oath, which remains the oath of the physician of today. In this time of war each one of us must be a physician to the cause of humanity and brotherhood, which is the basis of American democracy. In the spirit of this oath, let every true American solemnly resolve:

I will daily deal with every man in business, in social, and in political relations only on the basis of his true individual worth.

I will never try to indict a whole people by reason of the delinquency of any member.

I will spread no rumor and no slander against any sect.

In my daily conduct I will consecrate myself, hour by hour, to the achievement of the highest ideal of the dignity of mankind—human equality, human fellowship, and human brotherhood.

If every one of us shall take that oath and keep it, we shall have gone a long way to overcome group animosities and achieve that accord which is the basis and the vindication of American democracy.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Judge Proskauer. The American Forum of the Air continues with its extemporaneous round-table discussion of "How can we overcome group animosities?"

We have invited Dr. Frank Kingdon, the educator and writer, to lead this discussion.

Dr. Kingdon, do you have a question or comment to address to any of the speakers?

Dr. KINGDON. I am very much interested in this discussion of differences, but I always detect when we get to talking about differences a sort of apology for having a country with differences in it. I am wondering if you gentlemen would be willing to discuss the value of differences. Does a group by keeping its own uniqueness contribute, or does it detract from our total American life? Judge Proskauer, what do you think about that?

Judge PROSKAUER. I think it contributes greatly by maintaining within its proper limits its own individual differences. If you don't have these differences, you have the sameness which results in mediocrity. America is not to be made up of people all alike, all cast in the same mold.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Isn't it difficult to say what the proper limits are? If you take over and maintain your entire historical background, don't you really result in a segregation process which simply accentuates the differences between groups?

Judge PROSKAUER. I think the groups can fairly be accentuated without preying upon one another. The great thing for America is to get what it has always got, the best contribution that can come from the Irish stock, from the Protestant stock, from the Jewish stock, from all those groups which, if united, do make America great.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Isn't the problem really, I mean, to keep those things as a cultural way of life in the groups, but at the same time, fit into a sort of pattern of existence within a sphere?

Dr. GRAHAM. Wouldn't you say, Judge, that economic and political discrimination on account of uniqueness of race and creed is in line with the Nazi program?

Judge PROSKAUER. Exactly.

Dr. GRAHAM. And that America in the days of its infant weakness, the haven of heretics and the oppressed of all races, must not in the days of its power become the stronghold of bigots?

Dr. KINGDON. I don't want Mr. O'Connor to get away too easily with what he said. It seems to me you are dealing with something that really has a creative aspect; that is to say, I am a little inclined to go along with Judge Proskauer and believe that the more the differences are emphasized, in a sense, the more they act creatively upon each other, even though sometimes in terms of irritation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What becomes of your process of assimilation, then?

Dr. KINGDON. That brings us, of course, to the difference between unity and uniformity. That is to say, your progress of assimilation is what Dr. Graham was talking about as the essentially spiritual process. You meet on the basis of a common loyalty, but that doesn't mean that you meet on the basis of acceptance of certain intellectual tenets.

Judge PROSKAUER. This very discussion brings that out clearly. You and I don't agree on this, apparently, and yet I concede that you and your stock have contributed to America some of the greatest elements that have made for its strength. We can contribute from the very diversity of our heritages to a common pot that makes America great, and it does not follow from the variety of those contributions that we have to be mean to each other or cut one another's throats.

Dr. GRAHAM. Or be merely uniform.

Judge PROSKAUER. Or be merely uniform.

Dr. GRAHAM. The world has given America the vigor and variety of its differences. America should protect and enrich its differences for the sake of America and the world.

Judge PROSKAUER. Mr. O'Connor, you yourself referred in your very dramatic opening statement to the different stocks that go to make up America, and you yourself drew the lesson that from the very mingling of those various groups came a great lesson in the fundamentals of American liberty and democracy.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think we all ought to be able to agree on the fact that we can't emphasize our differences and at the same time get along very well together. I think the history of the country proves that these groups, by the process of giving up here and there and the other place, have worked out an assimilation process that has made this country great. I think the tendency has been lately to go the other way and keep the segregated units too much segregated. However, that is a matter of opinion.

Dr. KINGDON. That, however, is part of the social process. That is to say, I don't think that your process of association is going to be one that moves always evenly. There will be times when the differences will be exaggerated, other times perhaps when the process of assimilation moves more rapidly, but it does seem to me that the very thing you are indicating shows how differences do mean ultimately some kind of adjustment, but that adjustment itself, then, presents new aspects of differences that then become reconciled into new assimilation. That is the growing process, the assimilation of the different things into the body politic.

Dr. GRAHAM. Wouldn't you say that understanding religious and racial differences makes for a better understanding of other differences, and for an appreciation of the sacredness of human personality as basic to human freedom?

Dr. KINGDON. I think the whole democratic process is basically a spiritual conception. I would like to ask you a question, Dr.

Graham, because of your experience in the War Labor Board. Do you think that a tripartite board that represents three conflicting interests in America—labor, the employer, and the public—that such a tripartite board decreases or increases industrial tensions?

Dr. GRAHAM. I think it decreases industrial tensions, and I can say that labor and management both have accepted what to them were very objectionable decisions of the War Labor Board because they sat in not merely as advisers but with a vote. They participated in the decision. They hated the decision, but because they participated in it, the three sides—public, labor, and management—they closed ranks and were one solid block for compliance in this critical time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did that all result in the lifting of the Little Steel formula?

Dr. GRAHAM. The Little Steel formula has not been lifted; it is still there solid, in spite of everything you read. Take the United Mine Workers under John Lewis. They did not break the Little Steel formula, in spite of what you read. This tripartite board has held that line, and they got what they got under the terms of their 2-year-old contract and by the right of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That is news, but it is the truth.

Dr. KINGDON. It is good old news, I'd say. Well, you think it has all the more strength because the three groups were represented?

Dr. GRAHAM. Yes; because the three groups were represented.

Dr. KINGDON. Suppose it had been a public board all by itself?

Dr. GRAHAM. I understand the President was advised to scrap the tripartite board and put in a public board without the tensions inside of the board. I think that would have been scrapping the democratic process itself.

Judge PROSKAUER. It is just the same theory, Dr. Kingdon, on which Mr. O'Connor argues a case and loses.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Which is very rare. [Laughter.]

Judge PROSKAUER. I know, because I lost a case once, too. [Laughter.]

Dr. KINGDON. Once or twice, he means.

Judge PROSKAUER. He takes it in good part because he had his hearing.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I take it Dr. Graham has been preaching here that actions speak louder than words.

Dr. GRAHAM. That is right.

Dr. KINGDON. That is so.

Dr. GRAHAM. Before you leave this, I would like to say that the American answer to differences in color and creed is not a concentration camp but cooperation.

Dr. KINGDON. All right. You mentioned color, Dr. Graham. You are from the South. Tell us, what are the southerners in the South actually doing to improve race relations there?

Dr. GRAHAM. The southerners in the South?

Dr. KINGDON. The southerners in the South.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Are there any anywhere else?

Dr. KINGDON. There is one right here now.

Dr. GRAHAM. You know, a lot of them come up here to help run New York City. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRANIK. And Washington.

Dr. GRAHAM. The Negroes met in an exclusive Negro group in Durham to lay out the present minimums for cooperation with their white brethren in the South, and the whites met in Atlanta to lay down a maximum basis for cooperation, and then the two groups got together in Richmond, combining the minimum laid down by the Negroes and the maximum laid down by the whites, and we are organizing now a Southern Council for the Promotion of Interracial Understanding and Good Will and that is what Southerners in the South are doing right now.

Dr. KINGDON. Do you think that that is actually improving the race relations or is it more or less of a sop to a social condition that is not being tackled fundamentally?

Dr. GRAHAM. I think that question has fundamentally got to be solved in the South where it is most tense.

Dr. KINGDON. Do you think it can be solved by this method of meeting and exchange?

Dr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do you think the question is the same everywhere? Do you think it is the same in New York and Chicago and Detroit as it is in the South?

Dr. GRAHAM. It is the function of numbers. With the migration to Detroit and New York, you have the growth in numbers. That is where the numbers are, and we have got to grapple with it in terms of good will and understanding, and use religion and education and the American dream in this tense sector as well as in the other sectors.

A minimum would be right to vote. Abolish the poll tax. Provide that the appropriations go to the Negroes in their just share. That is not true now. Provide that there be equal opportunity to get a job and that there be equal pay for equal work. The War Labor Board, let me tell you, in a very tense case which worked out all right, though, handed down a decision that is going to be far-reaching. There shall be no discrimination in pay on account of color. And that southern management accepted that, and that is going to be a precedent for the future.

Dr. KINGDON. Judge Proskauer, do you feel that these minority groups—the question, let us say, of social conflicts, the labor-employer conflict, the Negro-white conflict, the Jewish-Christian conflict—do you think that they are all essentially the same socially, or is there a difference between them?

Judge PROSKAUER. There is a difference, and yet there is a large part of similarity. The whole question of prejudices seems to me to come from a kind of inferiority complex. It is the desire of every man to show that in some way he is a little better than another man and to get a sense of power. And the way out of it is by education, by religion, by making people realize that they have got to get together.

I always summarize this in my own mind with the objective of Tennyson's great phrase: "One God, one law, one element, and one far-off divinity to which the whole world moves."

Dr. GRAHAM. Let me say that there is no more loyal group in the country than the American Negro, and he is necessary for the winning of the war. At the same time he is a test of the sincerity of the cause for which we are fighting.

Hon. JOSEPH M. PROSKAUER,
President, American Jewish Committee.

DEAR JUDGE PROSKAUER: I heard your statement on the radio tonight and I congratulate you on it. I trust your noble efforts to be helpful in overcoming religious and racial animosities will bear fruit and will promote mutual respect, understanding, and tolerance among all groups of Americans.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN.

Post-war Policy on Corporation Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a paper on post-war policy on corporation taxes which I used as a basis for my part of the discussion at a group meeting of the conference board, January 20 at New York:

Mr. Chairman, I regard it a distinct honor and privilege to meet with you and share in the discussion of post-war policy on corporation taxes. Industrial progress and development in our post-war era will largely determine the general welfare and prosperity of our Nation.

Coming from Kansas as I do, having spent most of my life in very close proximity to the soil and natural life processes, having spent years listening to countless tax ideas and theories as a Member of Congress and the Ways and Means Committee, I incline, when I reflect on the position, toward the views of Josh Billings, who, I am told, once made the sage observation, "It ain't so much what people knows as does the harm, as their knowin' so goldarn much that ain't so."

Having said this, I hasten to add that I imply no omniscience on my part. And I do not intend to imply that I speak as an authority on taxation. I merely say that after listening to all kinds of ideas, theories, and interests for a long time and after having observed the effects of most of the measures that have been taken, I am very much in doubt about most of what has been done as well as most of the measures that are urged. Of course, it would be very nice if we could in one fell swoop, or by some miracle of magic, escape from the limitations of personality and the fundamental responsibility of the individual. I have kept an eye open for something that would promise bringing in the millennium within my lifetime, but I haven't seen anything that looks like it yet.

All of which is preliminary to the observation that there must be a sufficient body of sentiment in the United States that will give consideration to national policies rooted in experience and reason before the prospects of the corporation from the standpoint of taxes in the post-war period can be viewed with optimism.

Then, of course, there is a noteworthy blind spot in much of the opinion of the times with respect to corporations. A vast number of people have been led to believe that a corporation, legally known as an artificial person but actually an aggregation of persons associated together for a stated purpose, is something different from an aggregation of persons not called a corporation. There are many who believe that there is something inherently sinister in a corporation and that corporations can be punished and penalized without limit and with no ultimate adverse effect upon the general well-being. Perhaps I may merely say that there is much to be left to the corporations themselves and to education by way of improving these broader aspects of the surrounding situation.

There is still a large body of sentiment in the Nation which believes that there is some magic in great expenditures by the Federal Government. There are still many who believe that there is a reasonable basis for the assertion, "If industry doesn't do it, the Government will." There are still many who are sufficiently confused to believe that general and continuing well-being can be brought about by use of the taxing power for redistribution of income.

ENTERPRISE

Consideration of post-war policy on corporation taxes involves consideration of national policy with respect to enterprise generally. Although more than three-fourths of the business units of the Nation are subject to Federal taxation on the basis of individual income-tax rates, a very substantial proportion of the total volume of business is done by corporations. However, corporations often start with the effort of an individual. Most corporations have been very small before they have grown very large. And no matter how they have developed, the most

important factor in their development has been enterprise. Much is said about employment in present-day discussion, but little is said about enterprise. Employment is an effect, not a cause. Enterprise is a cause.

For a generation we have pursued policies which increasingly operate with the effect of birth control on enterprise. Now we have reached the point where war production is the dominant factor in our economy and the nature and importance of enterprise have been forgotten. The life process has almost been suspended.

The primary challenge to post-war policy with respect to corporation taxes, therefore, seems to be to reopen opportunity and to keep opportunity open. Enterprise built the American scale of living and America. It will rebuild it if it has the opportunity. We must reopen opportunity and we must have more and better safeguards that we shall keep opportunity open for enterprise.

THE HERITAGE FROM THE PAST

We, of course, take up this subject with a heritage from the past that presents difficulties. Corporation taxes are but one feature of a comprehensive tax structure. This tax structure has been in the course of evolution for more than 30 years. It represents a patchwork that has resulted from a tug-of-war between the ideas of those who would restrict taxing powers to the raising of revenue and the ideas of those who would use the taxing power for the redistribution of income, for the liquidation of the middle class, and for the punitive purposes against the various objects of their pet hates and emotions.

As a result, we begin with the fact of double, triple, and quadruple taxation of the same income when it is derived initially as the product of economic activity through corporations.

One may say there is no reasonable basis for such manifestations of confusion, but that is of little avail. The result is right here in front of us. A lot of people think that it has some fair and reasonable basis.

THE PROBLEM

When hostilities cease our country will be faced with manifold problems of reconversion to normal peacetime production; problems so difficult as to challenge the best brains and ingenuity in both Government and industry; problems of reconversion, cancelation of war contracts, an obsolete industrial machine, unemployment, returning veterans, migration of former defense workers, disabled veterans a $300,000,000,000 war debt, high taxes and an impatient and restless citizenry.

Our answer to these problems will determine whether we are to continue the free competitive enterprise system which has made America great. Their solution will require the patience of a Job and the wisdom of a Solomon.

The cessation of hostilities will bring with it the immediate cancelation of $75,000,000,000 of Government contracts. This will be a tremendous readjustment for industry, with repercussions throughout our whole economy. Industry, labor, and agriculture will come face to face with what portends to be insurmountable problems.

Provision for prompt contract-cancelation payments will to some extent cushion the readjustment and help to assure workers a job during the rehabilitation process.

Limited assistance will also come from the post-war credit under the excess-profits tax.

Unfortunately, the high rates of taxation in effect during the war have not permitted industry to set up adequate reserves of its own, and for this reason financial assistance will have to be made available through Government or private sources, or both.

If the European phase of the war should end before the Pacific phase, as seems likely, a more gradual reconversion will be possible than if hostilities throughout the world should all cease at the same time. This in itself will ease the readjustment necessarily involved in the reconversion process. Furthermore, some war materials have already been made in such quantities that cut-backs are already being put into effect in these lines. This further tends to ease the transition from war to peacetime production.

At best, however, we will be faced with a gigantic task which we cannot afford to be unprepared to meet.

As an end to the European phase of hostilities daily becomes nearer, it should give us grave concern that we are lacking in plans and programs to meet the reconversion problems inherent in the coming of peace. I hope the administration and Congress will lose no time in dealing with these matters.

I am not one of those who feels that we must inevitably have a serious depression following the collapse of the war boom.

It seems to me that the pent-up demand for consumer goods which have not been manufactured during the war period is so great that it should furnish a tremendous post-war market and provide employment for all who seek work.

Of course there will come a time when the demand for these goods will become normal, and it is then we will need new industries to take up the unemployment slack and sustain a high level of national income. Many new industries, such as synthetic rubber, have been born of the war, and if given proper encouragement promise to make substantial contribution to the national economy. Other relatively new industries whose progress was interrupted by the war, such as television, air conditioning, prefabricated low-cost housing, plastics, "flivver" planes, etc., have tremendous post-war possibilities. In order to develop these new industries and expand existing industries, reasonable encouragement must be given to risk capital, primarily through the elimination of excessive taxation.

To my mind, the downward revision of taxes should be at the top of the agenda of post-war measures for assuring a high level of national income through the encouragement of private enterprise. It is as important as the removal of the unwarranted and undesirable governmental restrictions on business. It holds the key to the future greatness of America.

Because of the unprecedented war needs, it has been necessary to impose a level of taxation in this country far beyond that which was levied in World War No. 1. It undoubtedly goes beyond the point of diminishing returns, certainly if extended to peacetime economy. Yet the fact is that during the post-war period we are going to have to maintain a high level of taxation in order to sustain the huge Budget which is in prospect and provide for the orderly retirement of the national debt.

We have been running in the red every year since 1931, and no Government can do this indefinitely without jeopardizing its solvency, upon which the whole economy rests.

To sustain a tax burden of sixteen to eighteen billions, exclusive of social security, it will be necessary to maintain national income at a high level, certainly not less than one hundred and twenty-five billions annually, and preferably much higher. After all, our present taxes yield but eighteen to twenty-three billions more than the apparent post-war requirements on the basis of a national income of one hundred and fifty billions. This shows the necessity of keeping national income at a high level to sustain the necessary tax burden.

In order to have a national income of one hundred and twenty-five billions or more in the post-war period, industrial and agricultural production must be given every possible encouragement, through taxation and otherwise.

THE APPROACH

Turning to consider the specific features of policy that seem worthy of consideration from the standpoint of post-war corporate taxation, I submit the following:

1. Transition from an economy predominantly sustained by war production to one sustained by peacetime pursuits presents a colossal challenge.

2. The need for individual and corporate enterprise to develop and sustain peacetime pursuits on a vast and immediate scale to take the place of the artificial activity represented by most of the war production can be met only if unprecedented opportunities and incentives are held forth.

3. In all taxation, we must emphasize moderate rates and reply on a large, sound, and growing stream of economic activity to produce the necessary revenue.

4. The shortsighted policy which has led us into the errors of double, triple, and quadruple taxation must be recognized and corrected.

PARTICULAR MEASURES

To carry out the general lines of policy thus indicated requires, I think, consideration of measures such as the following:

1. Immediate repeal of the excess-profits tax as of the end of the calendar year in which hostilities in the present war cease.

2. Repeal of the capital stock tax and the related declared value excess-profits tax.

3. Readjustment downward of corporate and individual income taxes so as to produce the greatest possible stimulus to production and employment consistent with the Government's post-war revenue needs.

4. Change of our tax laws so as to offer positive incentive for venture or risk capital.

5. Simplification of the corporate-tax law and returns.

6. Removal of the tax on intercorporate dividends and elimination of the present double taxation of shareholder.

7. No tampering with or strings attached to present post-war credit against excess-profits tax.

8. No restrictions on consolidated returns.

9. Liberalize and make more definite and certain the regulations covering depreciation and depletion.

10. A change in the capital gains and losses section of the code, to eliminate unfairness in disallowing losses while taxing gains.

These ideas, of course, are presented only tentatively. I offer them for consideration. I do believe that on the basis of logic and reason they call for the most earnest study.

We begin with the fact that few corporations have reserves sufficient to enable them to confront a cataclysmic post-war transition with any great feeling of assurance. If the war ended in the near future, there would be no time for them to accumulate such reserves even if it were possible under prevailing national policies and tax measures, which it is not.

Great Britain has a policy with respect to taxation of corporations which is repeatedly pointed to as an example of fairness and reason. The tax is not on the income of the corporation, but a shareholder is allowed the standard rate if paid by the corporation on his share of profits as a credit against his total tax. The corporation as tax collector merely withholds it from the stockholder. And in saying this, of course, I am not referring to the British excess-profits tax.

A channel for the flow of income arising as the product of industry must be reasonably free of obstruction. It is not only an essential of a sound life process but imperative for the well-being of a people so greatly dependent on corporate activity.

The defeatism which assumes that the American people cannot be trusted, that we have a mature economy, that we owe it to ourselves, that the citizen does not know what is good for him and must have some bureaucrat tell him, and that we must not be allowed to make our own mistakes, must be kicked out bag and baggage. But in suggesting this, I, of course, do not imply that means mere transfer of corruption from politics to economics, with license to business or labor or any other group to transgress the public interest. The main point is that the zone of self-control and self-regulation can be greatly enlarged and that we should press forward in that direction toward a dynamic economy.

So I say we must clean up the heritage from the recent past, open every possible incentive to enterprise and give the only agency that can carry through the post-war transition—private enterprise—a reasonable opportunity to do it. In other words, turn on the green light for the same principles and measures that made our country great before and it will do it again.

Financing Small Business After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Financing Small Business After the War," delivered by me at the Boston City Club, Boston, Mass., January 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Boston City Club, it is a pleasure to come to Boston from the pressure and confusion of Washington in wartime to discuss one of the most important of post-war problems. This is certainly an appropriate place to discuss the question because more work has been done on it here than anywhere else in the United States, and Mr. William Leavitt Stoddard, of the New England Industrial Development Corporation, is taking an active part in the preparation of legislation for the present Congress.

The tremendous interest throughout the country in protecting and developing small business is one of the encouraging features when we consider the kind of America we are to live in after the war. It proves that the American people really do want a system of free men and free enterprise, and no socialization of industry. There are plenty of discouraging features which are going to make it hard to attain our real desire. We will be burdened with a debt amounting to approximately $300,000,000,000, with interest charges alone of $6,000,000,000 a year. We will undoubtedly maintain a huge army and navy for many years to come. The necessary expenses of government are, therefore, likely to be sixteen or seventeen billion dollars a year. New projects for public work, social security, foreign trade, veterans' benefits, and countless others, good and bad, would make our Federal Budget more than $50,000,000,000 a year if they were all approved. While we talk glibly of reestablishing free enterprise, we face proposals for Government activity which can only lead to a totalitarian state. The National Resources Planning Board proposes corporations, owned at least half by the Government, to operate power companies, transportation companies, shipbuilding, aviation, aluminum and magnesium. Spending plans would impose on industry such a crushing burden of taxation that there would be no incentive to continue working or to take a chance in any new project. Every man beginning a new industry would start with two strikes against him. We could avoid this burden only by a further increase in the public debt, and that would create an inflation which would destroy the value of all savings and investments. Either course would gradually force a socialization of industry in the United States.

While we talk of free enterprise, and our soldiers battle against the forces of totalitarianism, the whole thinking of the world has turned from the liberalism embodied in our Constitution for a hundred and fifty years to a planning of the lives of other people. Our thinking has turned away from local self-government to the solution of every problem by Federal power and Federal money. If those processes are not restored, we shall find ourselves a totalitarian state, with every detail of our lives planned by a benevolent, but arbitrary and inefficient, bureau in Washington.

There is no doubt that there must be increased Federal activity. The very complications of modern life have forced legislation to preserve the very features of individual and business freedom which maintained themselves when life was more simple. But it becomes all the more important that when we draft legislation of this kind, it be framed so as to preserve individual freedom, and continue the reward the American system has given for initiative, ability, hard work, and genius, instead of suppressing all these qualities by a planned direction from Washington. Many New Deal measures are highly admirable in purpose. Nearly all of them have been used to impose rules and regulations limiting freedom, rather than carrying out the purposes of the legislation.

In small business we have a typical example of a condition necessary to a free-enterprise system, which has been hampered and may be destroyed unless it is protected and assisted in some degree by Federal legislation. But here, also, we must approach the problem of Federal action with the most careful consideration. Whatever we do must foster and stimulate small business, old and new, and must not be diverted to create a new control from Washington either for political purposes or for economic planning. We must not attempt to change the character of little business itself, or cast every man in the same mold.

Small business to a large extent is the basis of our whole free-enterprise system. That system is not free unless men with ability and courage are able to enter into it on their own account. It is not free if every man in the United States is only an employee who cannot rise above that status. Large business units may have many advantages. In some industries, like the utilities and the manufacture of steel, they must be large and require large units of capital. But large business units, like units of Government, tend to settle down into fixed grooves. They adopt methods which cannot be easily changed. There is little incentive among their many employees to develop new ideas or new methods. Our whole system depends on rewards for individual work, individual initiative, genius, and daring. It depends on giving to the men who have those qualities an incentive to provide a better standard of living for their families, a better education for their children, and a better provision for their families after their death. It depends on substantial rewards for such men as against those who take no interest in their work and who have no ability to improve the conditions of their fellow men.

If this country becomes a country of big business, we are not a great deal better off than if we socialize the entire Nation and let the Government run business. As a matter of fact, the easiest road to socialism is through the formation of large business units which can be easily taken over by the Government. The Communist, the Socialist, even the New Dealer, has shown at times a strange friendliness to the biggest units of big business. They do not stand in the way of the so-called reforms, as does a vast group of independent American individuals. Fortunately, we still have such a group who are their own masters and do their own thinking. We have 6,000,000 farmers, every one an independent businessman. We have hundreds of thousands of professional men, lawyers, doctors, engineers, most of whom are independent and develop their own ideas. We have over 2,000,000 small businesses. They must be preserved, if artisans are to have the freedom, after learning the trade, to step out for themselves and be their own masters, if clerks and other employees are to have the same right in the field of retail and wholesale trade.

This number of small businesses, however, has not kept up with the procession in recent years. Reaching a height of 2,213,000 in 1929, 1 to every 55 persons in the population, it fell seriously during the depression, regained some numbers until 1941, but decreased again in 1942 as a result of the war. Small business is bound to suffer under war controls. It is bound to suffer under planned economy. No economic planner would plan a world of small business, because it can't be made to fit into any preconceived category. Rigid price control can be met by large business, but the small businessman who relies on special services and location to obtain a somewhat wider margin is forced into a straitjacket which eliminates any chance to make a living. The small businessman is usually unable to convert to war work, or at least finds it much more difficult.

After the war, therefore, we face the necessity of restoring the health of small business. In part this is a question of encouragement and the stimulation of morale by a new attitude toward business on the part of the Government. A businessman ought to be assumed to be honest until he is proved to be a crook, instead of the opposite assumption now indulged in.

I don't know anything that will help as much as the removal of restrictions on business, not only those of price control, rationing, and supply, but some of the regulations which were in force before the war, particularly those requiring questionnaires and reports. When I used to campaign in Ohio, and go into the stores along the main streets of small towns, the greatest complaint from storekeepers was that their whole time was taken up in filling out Government reports. The large businessman employed more bookkeepers to do the work. The small businessman had to spend his own time, which ought to have been devoted to improving his own business. Certainly the whole system of taxation of business can be substantially simplified. If one policy can help small business more than any other, it is the removal of regulation and Government interference.

In the second place, there should be a clearer definition of unfair competition and a more rigorous enforcement of the laws against that competition. Small business, particularly in the retail field, has always suffered from the practices of large manufacturers and dealers in selling below cost, and otherwise taking unfair advantage of a more integrated business, or one operating over a wide territory. The Federal Trade Commis-

sion ought to concern itself with correcting the unfair treatment of small business.

There are further affirmative policies which can stimulate and encourage small business. There was a time when every man who saved money was a prospective investor in small business. If he had accumulated a substantial fortune of his own, he became the patron and backer of other men who seemed to possess ideas or ability. Undoubtedly many of the new ventures went wrong, but when one did succeed, the investor obtained such advantages as to balance his losses in others. Industries which began with one or two employees were expanded by the investments of a half-dozen friends who had confidence in the enterprise or the enterpriser, until they gave work to hundreds of men, or thousands, or hundreds of thousands. Today that system has disappeared, principally because of the high rates of tax on income. If a man loses, he loses his own money. If he gains, the Government takes from him a large part of his gains, and a large part of the additional income he might otherwise enjoy.

With the burden of taxation which the Nation must meet after the war, there is little chance of a substantial reduction of the rates on income. It would be possible, however, to repeal the capital-gains tax except as against professional speculators and dealers in securities. There is no capital-gains tax in England. If men were encouraged to finance small industries, and knew that they could sell out their interest when the industry was established without paying most of the proceeds to the Government, there would be a great incentive for such action, which might be many times repeated. The capital-gains tax has produced practically no money. The tax has tended to freeze capital and prevent its turn-over in individual hands. If we want capital to go into small industry, or into large industry, the market ought to be just as liquid as possible, and the Government ought to do everything possible to encourage the transfer of property from one person to another, so that capital reaches the hands of those who can make it most useful for production and employment.

The second step to accomplish the same purpose is the relaxation of restrictions on the financing of small industry. The Securities and Exchange Commission has made the business of public financing so expensive and difficult as to be almost impossible in the case of those small manufacturing concerns which have attained their first growth but need additional capital for expansion. Furthermore, these restrictions have hampered the existence of the stock exchanges in the smaller cities. Such stock exchanges should be encouraged and developed. It is hopeless for the small businessman to look to New York for capital. The great exchanges there can only be interested in big business. But with deliberate thought a market for the securities of small concerns can and must be developed in many smaller cities throughout the United States.

Finally, we have the question of Government assistance to provide loans and equity capital for small business. This is the subject of the bill introduced by Senator MEAD, which is now being considered by the Senate Committee on Small Business. Here we reach a field where the very interest of small business itself requires that we move slowly and with careful thought, for once you invite the Government in, it is not unlikely to become a permanent guest. Yet I believe some steps may be safely taken.

Small business divides itself into two groups, one the small manufacturer, the other, and far more numerous, the retail and wholesale dealer. Their problems are substantially different. The encouragement of the manufacturer is more important to the community because he can develop new production, which will create new employment. Retail and wholesale service will undoubtedly be provided by someone without Government assistance. On the other hand, from the standpoint of encouraging independence, freedom, and opportunity, the maintenance of the independent dealer is just as important as that of the independent manufacturer. Retail business does not require as much capital, however, and I believe that the retail problem is more one to be dealt with by protection against unfair competition and removal of regulation than it is by deliberate Government financing.

When we consider the character of assistance to be sought, we find also a variation in the classes of help required. Businesses may require loans for current purposes, they may require capital loans for periods of from 5 to 10 years, or they may require capital either in the form of preferred stock or in the form of common stock. I am inclined to believe that concerns which are adequately capitalized have no great need for current loans. The business of making current loans is the business of the banks. The banking business is also a small business in many communities, and it ought to be conducted by private enterprise just as much as the manufacturing and retail businesses ought to be conducted by private enterprise. Most complaints against the banks for refusing to loan are made by men or companies who are not entitled to loans and who really require equity capital.

When we come to loans for capital purposes, payable in 5 to 10 years, there is a different situation. Banks have not regarded this as their proper function, bank examiners do not regard it as their proper function, and many banks refuse altogether to make such loans. Bank funds for the most part are deposits payable on demand, and bank assets must be liquid. There is no agency in the United States today which makes a business of handling capital loans of this kind. Nor are they saleable to the public in the case of small business.

It may be argued that there should be no capital loans. If business requires capital, it is much better that it be in the form of stock. Loans require the payment of interest in spite of losses. Ordinarily they must be amortized, and so the profits of the business must not only be reasonable but must be of a sufficient size to pay off the loan. A small business, having such a loan, which encounters a depression, is likely to be wiped out. Nevertheless, many small businesses have been financed by loans of this character in the past. Many have borrowed, applied all their earnings to pay off the loan, and borrowed again. Many big businesses, like the railroads, have relied upon bonds to furnish a considerable portion of their capital. There seems no great objection to such a method of providing capital if it is confined to a proper percentage, perhaps a half, of the other capital in the business. My own view would be that in the retail and wholesale business there should be no such loans, but that, if we can, we should provide them for small manufacturing concerns.

The first step in this process would be to enact a clear authority to banks in the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance System to invest in capital loans of manufacturing companies with a maturity of not more than 10 years. Such loans might or might not be secured by mortgages on the permanent assets of the company, but should not be a lien on the inventory and accounts receivable, to the end that current loans might still be obtained.

The legislation before Congress proposes that a small business finance corporation be set up within the Federal Reserve System to make loans to small business. In my opinion, the powers given are much too broad. Such loans should not be made directly by the Government. A Government corporation, however, might guarantee or insure loans made by banks up to 90 percent of their face amount, making a proper charge for that service. This would have the advantage of removing the matter largely from political influence, and leaving the determination of the soundness of the loans largely to persons familiar with local conditions and the record of the applicant. As I have suggested, any loan should be limited to one-third of the net capital after the loan is made.

In my opinion, the provision of equity capital is far more important than loans, but it is also the problem where we meet with real difficulty. I have cited the reasons why the sources of such capital have largely been dried up by our tax system. We have to consider now whether the Government can assist in providing a certain proportion of the equity capital required in small business.

It seems clear to me that the Government should not own stock, either common or preferred, in business concerns. The inevitable result is effective Government control, no matter how small the percentage of stock may be. On the other hand, I believe the Government can assist small business in obtaining capital from investors. I would suggest that we provide for the qualification of private investment companies as an instrumentality in such a plan. Any private investment company which met certain Government requirements would be eligible.

I would suggest a limited guaranty to such a company by the small business finance corporation of capital loans for manufacturing companies, and preferred stock and common stock of manufacturing companies and retail and wholesale concerns. Not to bore you with figures, but to suggest the kind of guaranty I have in mind, we might provide that the corporation guarantee for private investment companies 75 percent of capital loans, 65 percent of preferred-stock issues, and 50 percent of common-stock issues, which they purchase, making a proper charge in each case for the service. The balance of the risk would rest on the private investment company.

Of course the extent of the financing should have some relation to the capital already invested in the business by the owner of the business. For instance, we might provide that in the case of manufacturing companies a preferred-stock issue could not exceed the amount of the capital already in the business, and that the amount of a common-stock issue should not exceed twice the common capital already in the business. In the case of retail concerns, a preferred-stock issue might be limited to one-half the preexisting capital, and common stock to a sum equal to the amount of that capital. Of course these figures are only suggestions, and it would require exhaustive study and perhaps some experiment before they could be correctly fixed. I believe they should be such that a large investment company with wide diversification and experience might afterwhile be able to go on its own and abandon the Government guaranty. The ultimate goal, in any event, would be one of cooperative investment.

In the matter of investment we face a dilemma. The rich man no longer finds it profitable to take a risk. The small investor, for his own good, should not take a dangerous risk. Our effort must be to bring these small savers into the risk investment field. The machinery I suggest is designed to make this possible by diversification of investments and Government guaranty. Undoubtedly these private investment companies would lose money on some of their ventures, but it would not be a complete loss. Some of their small businesses should expand rapidly and prove to be so profitable as to balance the failures. The Government would have a far wider diversification than any investment company, and if a sufficient charge is made for the guaranty, there is hope that there might be no net loss. Even if the activity did cost the

Government something, it should be well worth while.

The proposal I have made sounds radical, but as a matter of fact it is not nearly as radical as the many proposals to put the Government directly into the business of making private loans. It is only more complicated. It is an effort to use our present processes of saving and capital investment. The entrance of the Government into the banking business is threatening to destroy the whole system today, and its extension after the war to the entire loan field would tend to destroy what is left of a free capital market.

I can assure you that the Senate Committee on Small Business is determined to work out a solution of this problem. We shall welcome your advice and assistance.

Adjustment of Railway Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the final adjustment of the railway labor dispute without one moment's stoppage of transportation or production was good news to the Nation.

The full importance of this adjustment cannot be realized without understanding the vast responsibility our transportation agencies are bearing in this war.

The all-important problem of Americans at this time is to win the war.

It is the task of American labor, of American management, of white-collar workers, of men and women in the armed forces, of all of our productive agencies, and men in this Congress.

Our transportation agencies are the vital link between producer, manufacturer and delivery of our civilian supplies, and to our war effort wherever it may be. The responsibility for this transportation is essentially dependent upon the rail system of our country.

This global war, more than any previous one, has emphasized the vital function of the military science of supply—getting an overwhelming volume of supplies to the most effective troops at the place and at the time when most needed. Rail transportation is a vital necessity in the successful operation of the United Nations. Essential raw materials must be carried to the factories, and to civilian populations of all these nations. Finished products must be conveyed to ports for transshipment to our fighting men and their Allies.

Brig. Gen. J. E. Barzynski, commanding general of the Chicago Quartermaster Depot, recently pointed out the tremendous supplies of food alone required for every soldier overseas. He said:

> This means enough butter for 272 days, enough meat for 272 days, enough of everything each soldier eats for 272 days.

The general stated that, in addition, the Army must have on hand 90 days supply of food per soldier stationed at Army camps in America. The American soldier eats approximately five and a quarter pounds of food per day compared to the American civilian's average consumption of a little over 3 pounds.

There are 3,800,000 American soldiers overseas today. Multiply that number by the 272 days supply required per soldier and multiply that astronomical result by 5¼ pounds—the amount consumed each day per soldier—and you will only begin to conceive the tonnage moved by American railroads in wartime. Remember, this tonnage is in the matter of Army food alone. Food for the Navy, the Coast Guard, and civilian consumption is also largely carried by rail.

The American rail system must handle troop movements to an extent never visualized in 1917–18. The intensive, highly specialized training of troops in this war necessitates these movements.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, commander of the United States Army Air Forces, has described the work of only one unit of the Army's Air Transport Command and the supplies needed for it to carry on the supplying of China over the Himalayas, formerly carried over the Burma Road. He said in part:

> It (the U. S. A. A. C.) surpasses in size and is doing a wholesale round-the-globe business greater than any mercantile establishment in the world. It employs 300,000 civilians; its warehouses contain half a million items—five times as many as are listed in the Sears Roebuck catalog—and its storage space in the United States alone equals that of a building 75 feet wide and 100 miles long.

The railroads of this country must move a large part of the freight for the Air Transport Command. Multiply this tonnage moved many times—by the total supplies needed by all our armed services everywhere—and you will grasp some idea of the great magnitude of the job being done by our railroads in wartime.

American railroads have measured up to their responsibility. They have done this under private management and operation of domestic transportation. The recent and temporary control of the American railroads by the United States Army did not discard this basic operational policy. Military control was imposed to prevent, if necessary, rail transport stoppages. Fortunately no stoppages occurred. Today, even this temporary military control has been lifted. During these controls, American railroad management was not changed.

Both American railroad labor and American railroad management are to be commended. They recognized and accepted the wise and understanding conduct of the American railroads under military control, and how well they were administered.

I read two letters received by the President: One from Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; and the other from Mr. J. L. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads. Each of these men deservedly has a well-known place, the one in railway labor and the other in railway management.

In his letter to President Roosevelt, Mr. Harrison says:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am grateful for your assistance in bringing about final disposition of the nonoperating railroad employees' case.
>
> I am confident they will render loyal and patriotic service and back up your program to win the war. There never was any question in this respect. They have always been anxious to do their part.
>
> While there have been some discussions concerning certain phases of the matter, you have found the bases of solving the difficulties, and personally, I appreciate your sympathetic attitude and assistance in this direction.
>
> The railroad workers of the Nation are grateful for your help.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> GEORGE M. HARRISON.

Mr. Pelley says in his letter to the President:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I on behalf of the Nation's railroads express to you as Commander in Chief of the armed forces our appreciation of the efficiency with which the Army took possession, held, and then relinquished possession, of the railroads.
>
> Upon the occasion of the emergency which precipitated the taking over of the railroads, the country was tremendously relieved by reason of the extraordinary facility with which this far-flung and complicated transition was accomplished. The smoothness with which the Army functioned in connection with its possession and operation of the railroads has called forth universal commendation. Even more gratifying is the fact that forthwith upon the settlement of the last wage dispute, you and the Secretary of War took all necessary official action so that within a few hours the Army was prepared to, and actually did, accomplish the complete restoration of the railroads to their owners.
>
> It has been a privilege to work with and under Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell and Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross and their staffs. With all other Americans we find a large measure of comfort in the knowledge that our military fortunes in this time of war are in the hands of leaders of this caliber.
>
> With high esteem, I am,
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> J. J. PELLEY.

The satisfaction expressed by these men of the railway world is shared generally by the public of the country. They, with railway labor and management, express their appreciation of the adjustment brought about by the President, and that governmental control was maintained under private management and operation. The fact that the administration followed that method was also of assurance to the country.

Then, too, the fact that our American railroad system, though undermanned and its equipment undersupplied, is carrying the burden of freight and passenger traffic never before envisioned, gives confidence to the country that it may continue to get supplies and men to the right place at the right time in the important days of the conflict yet remaining.

We may hope that there was never a real danger of the proposed strike going into effect. We can be certain to our satisfaction that the strike, through peaceful means of adjustment, has been settled. It has further assured the United Nations that America is still "the

arsenal of democracy." The President, too, must be recognized as having taken an active, positive, and effective action in the final adjustment of this threat to the impairment of our war effort.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Soldiers In Italy Ask for Right To Vote," from the UE News of January 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLDIERS IN ITALY ASK RIGHT TO VOTE

SOMEWHERE IN ITALY.

EDITOR, UE NEWS:

We, the soldiers who are now in Italy, are 100-percent in favor of the Green-Lucas voting bill. We are a United States Army, fighting for the United States of America, and not for any particular State. We want a United States Federal law to give us a chance to vote the easy way, and not leave us to the individual States with the inadequate laws and delaying difficulties.

The State laws may be O. K. for the people actually living there now, but not for the soldiers overseas.

In our battalion we have soldiers from practically every State in the Union. Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each soldier has to proceed through various methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective States? Some of us didn't vote in the November elections because our ballots reached us when the elections were all over.

This coming Presidential election is very important to us. We have a great man leading us now, and we want to make sure that the proper leadership continues.

Why not let the soldiers vote by V-mail? Don't you trust us? Or are some politicians afraid to let us vote and want to make it tough for us to do so?

Why not ask the soldier? You'll get the answer, and a very definite one, too. The answer is:

"We on the fighting front are determined to use bullets and ballots. Bullets against the Germans and Japanese; ballots against the reactionaries and obstructionists at home. We want a quick victory here and a progressive victory at home."

Pvt. Michael Coleman, of New York; Sgt. Dennis J. Callahan, Virginia; Pvt. James E. Blake, Arkansas; Corp. Julius Kaplan, Nebraska; Sgt. Glenn Buzard, Pennsylvania; Pvt. Haze L. Olsen, Idaho; Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl Ogg, Minnesota; Pvt. Claud Lark, South Carolina; Pvt. Irving Brown, Illinois; Pvt. D. H. Walls, Kentucky; Pvt. Glenn W. Propst, North Carolina; Corp. Peter P. Unas, Connecticut; Pvt. S. P. Haldeman, Jr., Texas; Pvt. (1st cl.) Neil L. Duer, Ohio; Pvt. Alfred L. Block, Iowa; Pvt. (1st cl.) George G. Walker, Florida; Pvt. (1st cl.) Mitchell A. Podbielski, Michigan; Pvt. (1st cl.) John W. Riley, Missouri; Corp. E. G. Anderson, Louisiana; Sgt. James D. Nicol, New Jersey; Pvt. A. C. Moore, Alabama; Pvt. (1st cl.) J. C. Thomas, New Mexico; Pvt. Willard W. Thompson, Oklahoma; Corp. Don M. Fisk, South Dakota; Pvt. Paul Lowder, Arizona; Pvt. Donald J. Henry, Indiana; S/Sgt. Donald E. Gall, Wisconsin; Corp. Dave Howe, Colorado; Pvt. Joseph C. Brady, Rhode Island; Corp. J. R. Tie, Massachusetts; Pvt. Paul Winter, Wyoming; Pvt. Louis Alter, Michigan; Pvt. E. A. Lewis, Georgia; Pvt. Frank H. Sterling, Kansas; Sgt. John F. Stewart, Tennessee; Sgt. C. P. Roberts, Mississipppi; Pvt. (1st cl.) Everett C. Lang, Oregon; Pvt. Carl H. Forsyth, Maryland; Pvt. (1st cl.) John Fitzpatrick, Washington; Sgt. Harold Templeton, New Hampshire; Pvt. Clarence Hamlin, Maine; Corp. W. F. Beard, California; and Corp. Albert M. Hathaway, Vermont.

John R. Steelman, Director, United States Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by John Temple Graves, appearing in the Birmingham Age-Herald of December 8, 1943, relating to the work of Dr. John R. Steelman, director of the United States Conciliation Service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING

(John Temple Graves)

Director John R. Steelman, of the United States Department of Conciliation, called on me the other day. Famously successful at peace-making, this distinguished Alabamian discloses in his talk, without intending to do so, the secret of his success. It is that he has made himself mentally and spiritually a genuine instrument of peace, and done it by seeing the American picture as a whole, as something that includes and must go on including both capital and labor.

This freely enterprising democracy of ours can't breathe indefinitely in the atmosphere surrounding it before Pearl Harbor. There can't be two perpetually hostile camps conducting America's great economic process, as there had come to be before the war. John Steelman represents the hope that there may not be, and the proof that there needn't. He knows that labor has done well in this war effort, and management has done well, and that it is important to point their joint achievement even as they are called on for even greater ones to win the promised victories.

"Amid all the confusion and misunderstanding of the turbulent days in which we live," he vows, "one fact stands out clearly in the minds of all Americans—the major production goals of our war effort are well on the way to successful achievement. In 2 years' time we have tooled up production schedules which ordinarily have required from 6 to 10 years. In airplanes, ships, munitions, and military equipment we have done a superb job. The time has come for a full appreciation of the spirit of cooperation between industry and Government, management and labor, soldiers and civilians who have joined to make victory possible. We are proud of the productive strength of America."

I talked to John Steelman a long time. In all the talk I couldn't make out whether his sympathies were with labor or management, New Dealers or antis, Democrats or Republicans. But I could tell that his sympathies were with the United States of America and with that great principle of liberty and competition under the law for which America stands. In the coming years we who are going to be champions for labor or management, for this side or the other in America's game, will not be expected to be John Steelmans; but we will be expected to appreciate John Steelmans and be reminded through them that there is something above our battles.

Billion-Dollar Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest of September 1943 entitled "Billion-Dollar Watchdog," referring to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLION-DOLLAR WATCHDOG

(By Stanley High)

A member of the President's Cabinet picked up his phone. "I understand," said the voice of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, "that you're planning to allow ——— a million and a half for his interest in the ——— which is being taken over by the Government."

The Cabinet member hemmed and hawed, but finally admitted that such a sum had been considered.

"Well, if that's the case," said TRUMAN, "I think we might have to investigate. The figure's too high."

What ——— eventually got was $175,000.

For, modest and self-effacing though he is, TRUMAN speaks with an authority equaled by few men in Washington. A hint from him that the Senate Committee to Investigate the War Program—of which he is chairman—may launch a probe is frequently enough to get quick and salutary results.

During the past 2 years munitions makers, bureaucrats, dollar-a-year men, and administration officials have been called to explain, under the questionings of this committee, what they are doing with Uncle Sam's money and why. Uncle Sam—thanks to their inquiries—has been saved at least a billion dollars.

What was stirring in him when he proposed such a committee to the Senate was righteous indignation at certain war-production inequities brought to his attention in

numerous letters from his Missouri constituents. But when the committee had followed through to the end some of the hints contained in these letters, the taxpayers had been saved a quarter of a billion dollars in the one field of Army camp construction alone, according to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, head of Services of Supply.

Disclosures by enterprising, fair-playing, average Americans are still the committee's most carefully considered and fruitful leads.

A draftsman in one of the Government's new ordnance plants wrote that most of the 200 men in the drafting department did nothing more useful much of the time than to play checkers, shoot craps, read the papers, and listen to the radio. It took just a week, when the committee laid the facts before the War Department, to clean up that situation.

A carpenter, working on defense housing in New Jersey, found the waste and shoddiness too much for his American ideas of honest work. His official complaint, however, got nowhere. He wrote to the Truman committee. Its investigation uncovered a bona fide housing scandal which led to the indictment of the contractor and brought widespread reforms in the Federal housing procedure.

An employee of a large steel company witnessed a faked inspection of inferior steel shipped to the United States Navy and Maritime Commission. His protest to his superiors was fruitless, but his letter to the Truman committee brought about a wide-open inquiry, the establishment by the Government of double-check inspection, and the indictment of the company and certain of the officials.

The committee discovered that repair rates in west coast shipyards were still based on a peacetime hourly rate. Therefore, under a 24-hour-a-day wartime schedule, profits were enormous. Looking into the files an investigator found a letter from one admiral to another admiral which said, "This matter of divergence of rates will be extremely difficult to explain to the Truman committee." It was, in fact, so difficult that finally a uniform rate schedule was worked out, with savings to the Government of millions of dollars.

Late last February an Illinois housewife wrote the committee, "There seems to be plenty of sugar. If the Government wants us to raise fruit, it must make sugar available for canning. If I can't buy sugar, I'll be buying canned peaches, using my ration points to buy something I can make myself. * * *"

The letter went into the canning-sugar file. By the end of March the file had several hundred letters in it—all to the same effect. Whereupon Senator TRUMAN read a brief statement on the floor of the Senate: "* * * food will be scarcer next year * * * sugar for preserving food in the home should be made available * * * the Office of Price Administration, instead of facilitating home canning, is planning to make it difficult to obtain sugar. * * * I have instructed that a full investigation be made immediately."

Overnight, O. P. A. took second thought, reversed itself and made canning sugar available to the Nation's housewives in greatly increased quantity and without loss of ration allotment.

Army and Navy as well as civilian activities having to do with the war are liberally probed by the committee. Recently a member, talking with Army officials, discovered that camps in Florida were using canned grapefruit juice. Further investigation into Army food supplies caused 30,000,000 cases of canned fruit and vegetables in an overstocked Army reserve to be released for civilian use.

The committee found that the Navy was insisting on building tank-carrying invasion barges designed by its Bureau of Ships, despite the fact that in performance tests those designed by Andrew Jackson Higgins' company in New Orleans had been found notably superior and the Bureau's incapable of the use for which they were intended. Subsequently, not only did the Navy adopt the Higgins' design but the committee disclosures led to a reorganization of the Navy Department's Bureau of Ships.

The committee was authorized on February 10, 1941. Partly, no doubt, because in 5 years TRUMAN had made few demands on its time, none on its patience, the Senate listened considerately to a heavily factual speech, and voted the investigation of national defense he asked for. Pretty sure that nothing much would come of it, they gave him a shoestring $15,000 to get going.

With the shotgun authority of the original resolution the committee has for 2 years dug into all the messy scandals of the greatest spending enterprise in history. And it has done the job on a mere $200,000, doled out by the Senate in driblets. With only 15 investigators and 18 clerks and stenographers, the chairman and the members have made up by their own zeal for the lack of an adequate staff. When the committee's first annual report was issued in January 1942, it had already established itself as the public's most accessible court of appeals and the sharpest goad in the Government.

The committee's most active members are relative newcomers to the Senate. Six of the 10 are freshman Senators and thus singularly free from hat-in-hand responsiveness to pressure from high places. The committee's reports have the wholesome flavor of the grass roots. That is an important reason why the committee has so notably succeeded.

Distinguished only for his honesty and industriousness, TRUMAN came to the Senate in 1934 straight from a county judgeship. After 9 years in the Senate, honesty and industriousness are still his chief distinctions.

From the beginning TRUMAN tried to make sure that his committee was not a one-man show. His colleagues had special skills and talents, and TRUMAN was determined to make use of these. They have worked together—six Democrats and four Republicans—with remarkably little friction. Almost every member of the committee has come to the chairman at one time or another with reports of blunders in the production program. All right, TRUMAN has invariably said, you look into that; if necessary, form a subcommittee and do a thorough job.

Counsel and chief administrator for the committee is Hugh A. Fulton, broad-shouldered, heavy-set ex-assistant to the Attorney General. Fulton made a name for himself in New York City in the investigations which exposed the fleecing operations of Howard Hopson, former head of Associated Gas & Electric. TRUMAN picked him for the committee job because he had an urge for the truth and could hit hard, but had no ideological grudges.

Fulton meets TRUMAN almost every morning, often in "TRUMAN'S Doghouse"—a small room adjoining the Senator's office. Here they go over pertinent letters, newspaper clippings, investigators' reports; here procedure and strategy—subsequently laid before the other committee members—are planned. Hard work accounts for the committee's high average of achievement. That the committee has never given a minority report, TRUMAN attributes to the fact that the investigations are so completely factual they are bound to result in unanimous conclusions.

The committee has power to subpena witnesses but none to enforce action or punish wrongdoing. Its sole weapon is the facts, plus publicity, plus public opinion. Much of the committee's most effective work, however, gets no publicity. To insure quick action on Truman facts, numerous war agencies—among them the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board—have representatives attached, full time, to the committee.

Administration conduct in the last war was the subject of no fewer than 116 congressional investigations—all of them made after the war. This time Congress has not waited. Its numerous investigations are going forward while it is still possible—by bettering and speeding the war effort—to do something about it. Nowhere is so much being done about it with such constructive results as in the Truman committee.

Disposition of Surplus Property

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, at page 19 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, appears a speech by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], with reference to the disposition of surplus property. I think the gentleman from Texas is to be highly commended for bringing these matters to the attention of the House whenever they occur. Unfortunately, however, his criticism of the Navy Department, in this particular instance, was based on erroneous information which he had received from the Navy Department.

I wrote to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy Department and to the Quartermaster General in the War Department in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas. In my letter I said:

I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 10 wherein on page 19 appears a statement with reference to the disposal of surplus property by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas. In the middle of the page he cites a specific example which if correct does not reflect credit on either the Army or the Navy. Will you please advise me as to whether or not the statements made by Congressman PATMAN are substantially as he has stated them?

I have a letter from Admiral Young explaining the situation insofar as the Navy Department is concerned as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reference is made to your letter of January 13, 1944. The remarks of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1944, appear to stem back to a letter written by this Bureau on December 30, 1943 to Mr. Dan W. Eastwood, Chief Investigator, House Committee on Small Business. A copy of this letter is furnished for your information.

Unfortunately, the information contained in this letter is erroneous and it is a matter of great regret that incorrect information was furnished.

Actually, the purchase of plates of which Mr. PATMAN spoke was completed on October 4, 1943, as evidenced by a copy of the contract concerned which is attached hereto. No additional purchases of this item have been made. The purchase was completed

considerably before any information could have been available to this Bureau that existing surpluses were up for disposition by other Government departments.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has an adequate system for determining existing excesses in other Government departments prior to instigating purchases. Barring the element of human error, the Bureau is thoroughly protected against procurement of materials which are excess and available for disposition in other Government departments.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. YOUNG,
Rear Admiral, S. C., United States Navy,
Paymaster General of the Navy.

Distorting History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of today:

DISTORTING HISTORY

The latest Soviet organ to take up the increasingly vehement campaign which the Kremlin is waging against the Polish Government in London is that new enfant terrible of Russian journalism, War and the Working Class. In its latest issue it makes the charge, already voiced officially by the Soviet Government through Tass, that the Polish Government does not really want to establish good neighborly relations with the Soviet Union. It then goes on to argue that before the war the Polish Government was favorable to Hitler even to the point of preparing "to go to war on the side of Hitlerite Germany." That this did not happen, explains the writer in the Soviet magazine, is because "Hitler decided to make a victim of Poland instead of an ally."

Now it happens, of course, that the present Polish Government is a very different government from that which held office in Warsaw in 1939. In fact, in both its personnel and its ideological background it is worlds apart from the Colonel Beck-Smygly-Rydz regime of that day. That, however, is not important. What is important is the disposition on the part of a responsible Russian organ to assume that the world has forgotten the events of 1939 and is prepared to accept a thesis which Russia happens to find convenient at the moment although it is in complete contradiction of the facts.

It is in no unfriendly spirit and with no desire to rake up old ashes that we should like to remind the writer in War and the Working Class that it was not Poland which allied itself to Germany against Russia but Russia which through its deal with Hitler made what was tantamount to an alliance against Poland. But that did not happen until after the Smygly-Rydz government, anti-Soviet though it was, had refused to participate in a German-Polish war on Russia.

Less than a month after the Munich pact Ribbentrop proposed to Poland a "general solution" of all disputed Polish-German questions and a "united German-Polish policy regarding Russia formulated within the framework of an anti-Comintern pact." Indeed, 3½ years earlier Goering, as the Polish White Book reports, urged a joint German-Polish assault on Russia, and suggested that "the Ukraine would become the sphere of influence." This plan Goering repeated in an interview with Marshal Pilsudski. There are many crimes that can be placed at the door of the pre-war Polish Government. But the one crime that it must be absolved from, War and the Working Class to the contrary notwithstanding, is any readiness to join Germany in making war on Russia. No good purpose can be served by such distortion of history.

Dedication of Mosquito Creek Dam and Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an address given by Mr. L. A. Beeghly, president of the Youngstown Chamber of Commerce, made at the dinner in connection with the dedication of Mosquito Creek Reservoir, in Youngstown, Ohio, Saturday, January 15, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, honor guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to publicly express to the congressional delegation here this evening the deep appreciation of all the people of the Mahoning Valley for the completion of the Mosquito Creek Dam and Reservoir.

The Mahoning Valley currently produces 10,000,000 tons of steel annually. This is 11 percent of all the steel produced in the United States. The importance of this tremendous tonnage to the war effort is not fully appreciated unless it is compared to that of other nations. About 15,000,000 tons of steel were produced last year in the British Isles. We know how important their tonnage has been to their war effort.

The British Government would go to any length to protect their steel plants from the ravages of war, and, by the same token, they would provide adequate water and transportation facilities for their efficient operation.

Japan is our cunning and ruthless enemy. Steel has made it powerful on the field of battle. During the year immediately preceding Pearl Harbor it produced 7,000,000 tons of steel. The production in the Mahoning Valley exceeded that of Japan by 3,000,000 tons, or 40 percent. When we think of the destructive results to our country which have come from the effort and money expended by the Japanese people in building their steel industry it is little wonder that the people living in the Mahoning Valley firmly believe that it is in the public interest to ask the Federal Government to help us solve those problems confronting our district which are of national interest, but beyond the ability of State or local governments.

A few years ago when the Congress approved the people's wish that America become the arsenal for democracy, the Mahoning River had a dependable low flow at Youngstown of 80,000,000 gallons of water per day. The Milton Reservoir constituted the only flood or low-flow control works on the river. This reservoir was wholly inadequate to supply the water needs of the valley in periods of drought or to protect it from floods. New war industries and increased production in established plants had skyrocketed the use of water until 1,002,000,000 gallons of water were being pumped into the utilities and industries every day. This meant that each gallon of water was being reused 12½ times in a distance of 25 river miles. It is hard for us to realize just how much water is being used each day in the Mahoning Valley. Perhaps I can help you by saying that it takes 28 tons of water to make a ton of pig iron, 75 tons of water to make a ton of finished steel and 270 tons of water to make a ton of highly finished steel.

The constant reuse of the water caused it to lose its effectiveness for cooling purposes. Actual temperature readings in the Campbell pool of the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. show that the water reached 126° F. The engineers for the United States Geological Survey, in carrying on their work of recording the flows and temperatures in the river, have had to line their rubber boots with heavy wrapping paper to withstand the heat whenever they waded into the river during the summer months.

During the summer of 1941 the war industries were suddenly faced with the realization that their water supply might fail completely. The United States Geological Survey reported that their gage above Milton Reservoir showed on September 30, 1941, that only 3,000,000 gallons of water were flowing into the reservoir each day. The hydraulic engineer of all the industries and utilities using river water had determined that a minimum of 70,000,000 gallons of water must flow through the gage at Leavittsburg to prevent a complete failure of the cooling systems in the plants and utilities. This demand meant that the precious water reserve was being drawn down rapidly. As an emergency precaution 16 stream gages were placed on the uncontrolled streams running into the Mahoning River.

Competent Government hydraulic engineers took advantage of every local thundershower on the uncontrolled drainage area of the river to use it in maintaining the necessary low flow. By these steps 1,200,000,000 gallons of water were saved for future use. Yet, by the end of 1941 only 2,000,000,000 gallons of water remained in the Milton Reservoir, and this was the very narrow margin on which the industrial operations of the valley were dependent.

This condition seriously affected our ability to produce steel and electricity. It was at this point that a delegation went to Washington to ask that the Federal Government provide the Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs. The Congress referred the matter to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. A detailed engineering study was made by General Robins and those associated with him. The report justified the projects as being in the public interest. The Congress has complete faith in the Corps of Engineers because they have demonstrated their integrity and ability time and time again. Authorizations and appropriations came quickly. The reservoirs were to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

General Robins is to be congratulated on having built the Berlin Reservoir within 1 year, and above all he and his associates are to be congratulated for having built the Mosquito Creek Dam within 120 days from the time the contracts were let.

General Robins should find a great deal of satisfaction in knowing that the Berlin Reservoir, although only partially completed, saved tens of thousands of tons of steel for the war effort in December of 1942 when it prevented a very serious flood. He should be equally proud of the steel production record of this district during the fall months of 1943, when he realizes that it was the second driest fall on record.

The ceremony today marks the completion of one phase in the development of this important steel-producing district which contributes so much to our national well-being.

We now have a guaranteed low flow of water at Youngstown of 2110,000,000 gallons of water daily. We will only have to use the water over about five times now. We also receive a high degree of flood protection and the city of Warren receives a much needed domestic water supply. With these minimum basic needs satisfied, the use of additional water to dilute sewage, to increase cooling efficiency and to reduce hardness should be studied by the Corps of Engineers in order to improve the domestic water supplies of those persons living in Pennsylvania and on the Ohio River, as well as those living in the Mahoning Valley. Experience and time may show that the Grand River Reservoir or the Shenango Reservoir are needed by the people on the Beaver and Ohio Rivers to reduce the current pollution in their domestic water supplies.

A low-cost facility for the mass movement of raw materials going into the making of steel is as important to the future prosperity of the Nation as the minerals themselves As we look to the south of the Mahoning Valley we see the Ohio River and the Mississippi River waterway systems extending for a distance of 2,400 miles. The Mahoning Valley is only 35 miles from this great waterway system. Surely the sense of fair play so inherent in the average American would approve the extension of this 2,400 miles of river improvement a distance of 35 miles into this valley.

When we look to the north a distance of 60 miles we see the Great Lakes, with its tremendous volume of lower-lake coal moving from the coal fields of Pennsylvania into Detroit and the Northwest. We also see the New York State Barge Canal joining the Great Lakes to the Hudson River in New York State. The advantages of waterway transportation in this Great Lakes area stands out as an economic factor to be desired by our district. More important than the interests of the Mahoning Valley are those of the Nation. It is a sound national policy to join these great waterway systems, and the Army engineers have found that the connecting link should be by way of the Beaver, Mahoning, and Grand Rivers. We look forward to the post-war period with confidence in the ultimate success of this program.

And, so, we say thank you to each of our honor guests here tonight for the part they played in making this occasion possible. We hope that you have enjoyed your visit to our valley. We know that you have had an opportunity to see a few of our industrial plants and to meet some of the fine workmen who live in this district. We trust that, at some future date when your official duties make it necessary for you to pass judgment on our district, your visit will make it possible for you to be more sympathetic to the problems facing the Mahoning Valley, which also are so important to the economy and security of our Nation in war or in peace.

Joseph Lieb, of South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, quite recently Mr. Robert St. John, a noted commentator, in his broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. gave a just and glowing tribute to a deserving young man, Mr. Joseph Lieb, of South Bend, Ind. This young and very energetic Hoosier has charted a course which leads to better things, and some of his timely suggestions have been of great and lasting benefit to the people, and to the country. This fine and outstanding American after making his contributions to our country, then after making several attempts to enlist in the Army, during this war, finally succeeded and he served in the Army until it was discovered that he was physically disqualified for further service, at which time he was discharged. However, since his discharge from the Army he has continued to wage the fight against those things which appear to him to be wrong. Mr. St. John eulogized this splendid young man in the broadcast he gave over N. B. C. on December 8, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein the broadcast given by Mr. St. John in which he especially eulogized Joseph Lieb.

The broadcast follows:

And now here's a snapshot of a young man who has never received the recognition he deserves. He's Joseph Lieb of South Bend, Ind., who more than 2 years ago started a private crusade against some things he thought were wrong. Before Pearl Harbor he went to the Attorney General with evidence of serious war profiteering and demanded an investigation. He got results. Congressional committees were appointed. They dug up plenty of evidence. As a result, the Government has been saved $3,000,000,000. Then Lieb fought for legislation so that if frauds are discovered after the war the criminals can still be prosecuted. Campaign No. 3 was for higher pay for servicemen. As a result, our men in uniform are the highest paid in the world. Then young Lieb appeared before congressional committees with a demand that the alarming number of service-plane accidents be investigated. Thousands of lives may have been saved by the resulting inquiries. And here's a postscript to the story. Joseph Lieb tried four times to get into the Army. Finally the Army took him. But recently he was discharged, because of a physical disability. He's taken that blow like a soldier, and now he's back in Washington, doing a little more investigating of things he thinks are wrong.

The Late Lt. John P. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which I have just addressed to Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission. Also a poem in honor of the memory of Lt. John P. Washington, chaplain, United States Army, by Martin M. Clifford, of Jersey City, N. J.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1944.

Rear Admiral EMORY S. LAND,
United States Maritime Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL LAND: In behalf of the Federation of Holy Name Societies of Hudson County and as the Representative of the Tenth New Jersey District in the Congress of the United States, I am appealing to you to have one of our great Victory ships named in honor of Lt. John P. Washington.

Lieutenant Washington is the first priest of the Newark Archdiocese to lose his life in the present war. Lieutenant Washington was assistant pastor at St. Stephen's Church, Kearny, N. J., when he enlisted last May. He was chaplain of the Seventy-sixth Division Artillery until assigned to special duty early in the winter of 1942.

He lost his life "due to enemy action" in the sinking of an American ship in the North Atlantic February 3. Survivors of this sinking have related his heroism in sacrificing his life belt to a soldier who had lost his own. He was last seen on his knees in prayer on the deck as the ship went under.

It would seem to me that this would be a most fitting tribute to the memory of Father Washington, who proved himself a true soldier of the cross and an heroic American soldier.

Very sincerely yours.

LT. JOHN P. WASHINGTON, CHAPLAIN, U. S. A.

(Written in tribute to the former assistant pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, Arlington, N. J., who was reported missing on February 3, 1943, as the heroic Army chaplain who gave his life belt to a doughboy aboard a sinking ship in the Atlantic.)

We go into chapel
To kneel down and pray
For Lt. John P. Washington,
Chaplain, U. S. A.

He's been reported "lost at sea,"
As the heroic priest,
Who on board a sinking ship
Cared for himself the least.

He cared, we're told, for his fold
Of American fighting men,
Who faced the sea, courageously,
To reach port again.

Sure, to a lad who felt sad,
And showed how sad he felt,
He said, "Calm down, you won't drown;
Put on my life belt."

And, survivors say, he knelt to pray,
After he had done
The deed to be expected
Of a man named Washington.

Yes; we go into chapel
To show we share the loss
Of the patriot, Father Washington,
True soldier of the Cross.

—*Martin M. Clifford.*

Uncle Sam as Lady Bountiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from Collier's for January 29, 1944:

UNCLE SAM AS LADY BOUNTIFUL

In our estimation, Senator R. OWEN BREWSTER'S, Republican, Maine, recent Collier's article Don't Blame the British—Blame Us! was as salutary an utterance as has appeared in print in any Allied country in many months.

You doubtless remember this report by one of the five globe-girdling Senators—all about

how our oil is being poured out lavishly for the war, while the British and the Russians cagily husband their oil reserves; how we have, to this writing, sewed up no post-war rights in the airfields we have built around the world at an estimated cost of 500 millions; how a good deal of padding of reverse lend-lease figures goes on here and there. It added up to a picture of our national substance being thrown gaily and gladly to the four winds.

The salutary feature of the article, we thought, was Senator BREWSTER's insistence that we should not blame the British or any of our other allies for all this, that we should blame only ourselves.

We have sent out happiness boys all over the Allied and neutral world, to promise our allies and hoped-for allies almost everything under the sun, with discussions of quid pro quo largely ruled out as bordering on the indecent. It gives you a warm feeling of magnanimity at no cost to yourself to be open-handed with other people's money, and our happiness boys evidently have reveled in that pleasure up to their chins.

No wonder our allies and hoped-for allies have taken all this largess with alacrity, and have failed to insist that we get anything in return. Nobody discourages Lady Bountiful from giving her substance away; nobody tells her she is doing it in a foolish manner. People simply take what she hands out, snickering behind her back the while, until she is broke. Then they walk off and leave her busily engaged in finding gratitude in the dictionary.

Out of our Lady Bountiful policy, if we keep it up, we are sure to get ingratitude and general dislike after the eruption of gifts is over—not to mention a serious depletion of a lot of our basic resources, especially petroleum. That's what we're asking for.

It is time to supplant this policy with some common sense and realism, instead of merely denouncing BREWSTER and his four fellow senatorial world travelers as anti-British heavers of monkey wrenches into the Allied war effort. No responsible person denies that we've got to help our allies throughout the war in every way we can. The objection is to our present irresponsible, prodigal, and essentially stupid way of furnishing this help. If we don't reform in that respect, we shall reap a very sour and melancholy harvest of our folly.

What's Ahead for Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I extend my remarks by including therein the following address delivered by me before the seventeenth annual convention and seventh merchandise exposition of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., Hotel New Yorker, New York, Thursday, January 20, 1944, to wit:

I value the privilege of addressing this assembly of business men. There is a charm and a romance about business. Business always appeals to me. The United States was formed and the Constitution was adopted to promote business and commerce among the States. American business has provided higher standards of living in the United States than in any other country in the world and has made the United States the greatest and most powerful of nations.

My father was a country merchant, and as the eldest of his sons I grew up in a general village store. I treasure my experiences in youth as a clerk. They have been most profitable to me in the years that have followed. I am a lawyer and a cotton grower. The savings from my profession are invested in cotton lands in the far-famed Mississippi Delta. I operate stores on my cotton farms, and I have been a stockholder in a wholesale dry-goods company for many years.

Wholesale dry-goods establishments deal largely in textiles and more largely in cotton textiles. As a cotton grower I have my problems and am always interested in textile problems, for cotton growers can only prosper as cotton manufacturers prosper. I have a peculiar pride in the record of the textile industry. As I recall, it was the first of the industries to cooperate with the Office of Price Administration. Many plants have been awarded the Army-Navy E. The textile industry was the first to mobilize for war, and it has a fine record in providing clothing for the armed forces. I grow long staple cotton, and it is a source of satisfaction to me that such cotton is used in the uniforms of the Army and the Navy.

PRODUCTION

Peacetime American industry and manufacturing were quickly converted into war production. While there have been strikes and slow-downs, the greatest war production factories in all history are in the United States. Clothing, shoes, guns, cannon, tanks, ships, airplanes, cruisers, destroyers, and battleships are coming off the lines with unparalleled rapidity and in unparalleled numbers.

STRIKES

The country is in protest against the attitude of selfish and ambitious labor leaders. The administration has made the mistake of coddling labor. Nothing contributes more to disturbing the men in the armed forces and to weakening their morale than strikes in war industries. I have gladly supported legislation to curb and prevent strikes in war, and I maintain that no citizen has a right to strike against the Government or to strike in war industries. It is no excuse to say that strikes are few in number. It is no excuse to say that absenteeism is not general. Production has been slowed down, and production has been delayed by strikes. There was a notable decline in production in the summer of 1943 because of strikes. I have denounced the grasping of organized labor leaders, but labor is not the only group that is to blame. There are other lobbies, and lobbies are out to get what they can. The farm bloc and the labor bloc are not the only sinners. Some manufacturers delayed executing Government war contracts. Production was thus delayed. Some manufacturers have put profits above patriotism.

The reports of the Truman Committee disclosed conspiracies by a few manufacturers to defraud the Government by furnishing defective steel for ships. There were millions of dollars of losses traceable to war frauds. Sometimes employers are just as guilty as employees. Manufacturers were turning out defective steel while the leaders of labor unions were defying the Government. On the home front there was complacency on the one hand and greed on the other. There was an effort to turn the war into a grab-bag. While winning battles abroad, it is possible to lose battles at home. But strikes and defective products are the exception and not the rule. Generally manufacturing and labor have done a marvelous job thus far in war production.

PRICE CONTROL AND PRIORITIES

Price control to prevent inflation and to keep down the costs of living is essential in war. Priorities are imperative. The requirements for the Army and the Navy must be first met. While errors have been made, the costs of living have been kept down, production has been promoted, and inflation has been prevented. The need is to eliminate a repetition of the mistakes and to correct the errors in both price control and priorities. There is selfishness in war just as there is selfishness in peace. Many groups as a result of war are undertaking to better their condition under the guise of price administration. Groups often demand that conditions which obtained in peace be changed in war in order to better the condition of the complaining groups. The human element always enters into the equation in both war and peace; selfishness crops out. The purpose of price control was to stabilize prices and business practices just as they obtained when price control became effective. It was not the intent to change the relative position of groups or methods of doing business under the guise of price administration.

CHAINS AND INDEPENDENTS

Wholesalers are fully aware of the keen competition offered by chains and department stores. They are aware of the advantages of the department stores. While the chains have advantages, there is a definite place for the independents. Personally, I advocate that independents be preserved and protected. They are the backbone of America. I am for big business, but I am also for little business. I believe that little business is just as important as big business, and I assert that the independents are essential in the American economy.

With labor problems, with increases in wages and salaries, the future of the independents is more promising. Neither the labor nor the rent problem with independents will be as acute. I believe that the independent will be able to compete more successfully with the chains in the future than in the past. I know that the independents have their problems. I am aware of the difficulties of little business, but independents must adapt themselves to modern conditions and modern methods. Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, but it is the price of success in little business and in independent business, as well as in big business.

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN

Personally, I oppose the employment of dollar-a-year men in war. There is need for the best executive talent, but the Government is able to pay for the services rendered. I have confidence in American business, but the United States is able to pay adequate compensation for services rendered both in war and peace. The temptation for those who give their services to the Government to perpetuate their views and the policies of their firms or institutions in price administration and in priorities in the prosecution of the war is too great. The dollar-a-year men, while many of them have rendered efficient service, consciously or unconsciously, have contributed to discrimination. I believe in fairness to all groups. I know there will be disruptions in business; I know there will be inconveniences; I know there will be inability to obtain goods, but I believe that patriotic, unselfish American business executives for reasonable compensation will serve their Government in war. Those who occupy high places and formulate policies which may wreck business should, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion.

FREE ENTERPRISE

I believe in the capitalistic system. I believe in the profit motive. I stand for free

enterprise. I believe in the American system. I believe that American business was made for man. I do not believe that man was made for the American business system. I stand for the American system, as I have stated. It has contributed to the progress and advancement of the United States. It must be preserved and perpetuated.

DOUBT AND UNCERTAINTY

I am aware that doubt and uncertainty as to the future of business obtains in many quarters. I am convinced that doubt and uncertainty will yield to constructive business policies and practices. Usually business must play safe, but at the same time business must take risks. As a cotton grower I take risks; I gamble with prices; I gamble on the weather. No group takes greater risks than farmers. There is a place for caution. Doubts and uncertainties arise, but business needs confidence today, and the Government should promote such confidence.

CIVILIAN REQUIREMENTS

We are fighting abroad for freedom. We must not lose freedom at home. We are willing to deny. Our armed forces are willing to die, but we are free men and we are not to be kicked about by bureaucrats, big or little. We know that it is just as important to provide for the civilian population as it is to provide for the armed forces. Food and feed are as imperative for the armed forces as munitions. Food and feed are essential for the civilian populations. We know that supplies and equipment for the Army and the Navy are imperative. We know that manufactures for the armed forces are essential, but we also know that civilian requirements are essential. Civilians have been patient. Workers needing overalls have been more than patient. They have been satisfied to wait, but civilians believe that now with war production at its peak, both the armed forces and civilians can be provided for. They know that there must be reasonable war supplies, but they insist that where civilian inventories have been consumed, civilian requirements may be supplied. Civilians are patriotic; they buy bonds; they support the war. I urge that every effort should be made by all war agencies to supply as fully as possible essential civilian requirements. I shall continue to insist that the Government promote the orderly return of manufacturing from war to peace requirements. Part of the output can be devoted to civilians, while the remainder is devoted to the Army and the Navy. There must be a balanced production. There must be reasonable provision for reconversion to peacetime requirements.

POST-WAR PLANNING

We hear a great deal about post-war planning. No word is more overworked than planning. We heard much about planning during the great depression that followed the crash of 1929. Much of the proposed planning is too theoretical. It is impractical. There are too many professional planners. They cover too much territory so to speak. They embrace too many activities. The result is that there is no definite information for legislation for specific improvements that are urgently demanded and that are entirely practical. Many of the so-called related activities are only remotely connected with the important activities. The result is delay; the result is confusion. The Congress and the country are entitled to better studies and sounder planning. Only tried and true planning should obtain.

PUBLIC WORKS

Total war must be followed by total peace. The immediate task is to win the war, but when the war is won, when war production stops and when our armed forces are demobilized, serious unemployment will arise. The problems of peace will be almost as difficult as the problems of war. Wishful thinking is not sound planning. Careful study, more careful planning, and immediate preparation are essential. Prompt action now is imperative to provide for economic conditions then.

PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION

There is a place for private as well as public construction. Each has a definite field. There are local public works that should be financed and promoted by the State, county, and city. There are other public works that should be provided by the Federal Government. Victory is our first objective, but true patriotism transcends war. It demands adequate planning for peace. Otherwise the sacrifices of our armed forces will be in vain. There is no place for the dole or the work-relief program. They would only add to the economic ills following the war. Public works and private construction contempate long-range planning. They should provide now for construction then.

WAY OF LIFE

We are fighting to preserve our way of life. The profit motive has contributed to our greatness and our success. Private initiative is the capstone of American progress. It must be preserved and encouraged. There must be no conflict between private and public works. Public works therefore must not compete with the works that may properly be provided for through private enterprise. In all public works the benefits should exceed the costs.

POST-WAR BUSINESS

Good business has always followed wars. In fact, booms have always followed wars. There will be good business following this war. I do not believe that all of our material or business frontiers have been explored. Our national frontiers may have been conquered. The deserts and the mountains may have been crossed, but there remain human and social frontiers. There remain frontiers in business to be explored. The field for future business and for future scientific research is unlimited. The appeal to the spirit of adventure will be just as acute following the war as it was in the days of the pioneers.

American business is not done for; it is not washed up. Our country is really sparsely settled. We can support vast increases in population. Inventions are being made and discoveries are coming to light that will revolutionize business in the future. There are always improvements, inventions, and discoveries in war. There is nothing comparable to the medical and surgical improvements in the present war. There is nothing comparable to the mechanical and engineering improvements of the present war. Many improvements have been made in merchandising during the war that will be of benefit to merchandising following the war.

There is no place for the pessimist after the war. Malthus, 140 years ago in England, asserted that the population was increasing so fast that famine was inevitable, and yet there was unparalleled prosperity for England during the 140 years that followed the contention of Malthus. There are those who always enjoy being unhappy. There are some who enjoy being pessimists, but personally I believe in the spirit of adventure, in the spirit of progress, and I maintain that we live in the greatest scientific age in history. Plastics and chemical discoveries are being made. They will multiply. Refrigeration will come into its own. Airplanes will improve more and more. Business may change, but business will endure, and following the war there will be a revival and enlargement of business on a more sound and a more just basis than has occurred following any other war. Business and industry are not dying of old age, but business and industry are strong and they are better prepared than ever before in our history because of our experiences in the greatest of all wars for the days that are ahead.

SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

At the same time many problems will confront business following the war. I know of no more important or pressing question than the orderly disposition of surplus war property. It is conservatively estimated that the United States owns personal property, much of which is overseas, amounting to from fifty to one hundred billion dollars. This property consists of caps, shoes, clothing, underwear, overcoats, automobiles, trucks, tractors, and airplanes. In fact, it consists of property of every kind and character. It includes food, feed, and clothing.

The disposition of surplus war property could easily wreck the economic structure of the United States. I know there are those who advocate the prevention of the return to the United States of manufactured products that are abroad for our armed forces. In the disposition of surplus war property, the American taxpayer and the American public must be considered. The disposition must not favor any group or set of groups. I am glad to report to you that the House of Representatives passed a bill for the disposition of surplus Government property in June 1943. That bill awaits action in the Senate. Immediate consideration is imperative. I shall continue to advocate the orderly disposition of all surplus war property owned by the United States so that business and manufacturing will not be jeopardized. I shall continue to urge prompt, effective, and comprehensive legislation for the fair and orderly disposal of surplus war property. The business and economic structure of the United States following the war must not be wrecked by the failure of Congress to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property.

ON GUARD

Business must be on guard. Monopolies must be eliminated; combinations must be restrained; cartels must be prevented; labor unions must be controlled; and business must take a more helpful and more constructive interest in Government following the war than ever before. There will be increased labor costs. There will be the question of better living conditions and fair wages, but business must be prepared to fight in the future as in the past to prevent confiscation of the profits of business. The selfish tax gatherer and the selfish bureaucrat will hinder business in the future as they have hindered business in the past. The remedy is fair and just taxes and fair and just regulations.

TAXES

War always means taxes. Income and corporation taxes have reached the saturation point. There will be high taxes following the war. Business can aid by insisting that waste and extravagance in government be eliminated and that efficiency be promoted. The best way to promote economy is to make all citizens tax-conscious. The Congress has explored all avenues of taxation. There remains but one form of taxation that has not been adopted. For years I have advocated a national retail-sales tax. I know of no method of taxation that will make the American public more interested in the reduction of high cost of government than a national retail-sales tax. I know of no additional tax that will be fairer to all taxpayers than such a tax.

MORE GOVERNMENT

As I have indicated, there will be more taxes after the war. I now suggest that there will probably be Government restraints after

the war. Rationing will probably continue for some time following the war. Price control to prevent inflation will probably continue for a reasonable period following the war. After all, the greatest enterprise among us is our Government. Business is interested in government as it is interested in no other subject. There must be adjustments. Monopolies must be curbed. Free enterprise and freedom in trade must be promoted. I advocate as little government in business as possible, but frankly while we are still in war, I think business should be now prepared for reasonable governmental control for a period following the war.

PUBLIC DEBT

The mounting public debt is of concern to every thoughtful citizen. Businessmen must give more attention to appropriations by the Government in the future than in the past. Only sound principles and tried policies should be adopted. The public debt must not be increased except to win the war. In the prosecution of the war taxes must be levied to the limit so that the generation responsible for the war may pay as far as possible the cost of the war. Public debt must be reduced, and business must pay taxes for the reduction of the public debt in the prosperous and boom days that follow the war.

PUBLIC SERVICE

I urge businessmen to participate in the public service. They should vote. It is unnecessary for them to hold public office. Those who shape and control public opinion exercise a more potent influence than those who write the laws. Business has been difficult during the war. So has public service. Public service is more difficult in war than in peace. The people are skeptical; they distrust; they grouch; they are selfish; they complain; and they frequently criticize. It has been thus in all wars.

I am from Mississippi, the State of Jefferson Davis. As President of the Confederacy he was denounced as no man was ever denounced. Abraham Lincoln was repeatedly and constantly maligned. If the campaign for his reelection to the second term had occurred 6 months sooner, he would have been defeated. Fairness and justness to the civilian populations in the face of military requirements are always difficult for the President and for the Congress.

VICTORY

While I have spoken of business following the war, I cannot conclude without saying that there is but one thought uppermost in our minds as we meet here today. Our supreme aim is to win the war. We are thinking of victory. In the first months of the war defeat followed defeat. We were licked and we did not know it. In the recent months of the war, as victory follows victory, we are winning the war, and we know it, but there are some dangerous trends. There is too much disunity. There is too much complacency. Many act as though the war were won. I would be less than frank if I did not sound a note of warning. The war is by no means won. The road to victory is hard and difficult. We have just reached the fringes of the Japanese Empire. We have not reached the German frontiers. There are no evidences of internal collapse in Germany. There are no evidences of internal collapse in Japan. There must be an end of the rosy dreams of victory. The war will be prolonged by our belief that we are on the eve of final victory over either Germany or Japan. Notwithstanding reverses and despite losses, Germany still has the largest and best trained army in the world. Although Hitler lost 20 divisions in the defeat at Stalingrad, Germany has requipped 60 divisions since that time and has more fighting men under arms today than at any time during more than 4 years of war. No collapse of Germany can be expected in the near future. In the Pacific and southwest Pacific, after 2 years, we have done but little more than establish supply lanes to Australia in our drive toward Tokyo.

We are engaged in a global and a total war. Many of us know only what we read in the newspaper or hear over the radio about war. It has not been brought home to us. Death has not come to many American homes. Many Americans have not realized the meaning of war. Many of us do not know what sacrifice means. We do not know the meaning of denial. We are eating more; we are wearing better clothes, and we are making more money than ever before. We are thinking more of profits and wages and salaries. Victory will not come until all of us have sacrificed and denied and suffered to the limit. When we contemplate the heroism of the brave boys in the sky, on the sea, and on the land, in the fox holes of the Pacific and in the rugged hills of Italy, when we think of their suffering and of their sacrifice, when we recall their heroism, we realize that we have no conception of what war means, and we realize that we do not know what sacrifice means. I am thinking of a widow in the district I represent. She has four sons in the armed services, one in New Guinea, one in the Navy in the Pacific, one in Africa, and the fourth in Italy. She herself is working in a defense plant. It is easy for us to complain. It is easy for us to find fault. It is easy for us to criticize without cause. It is easy for us to denounce without reason. What do we know about the suffering of fox holes and of submarines? We have ample coffee and sugar, ample food and clothing. We have given up none of the comforts and but few of the luxuries. Selfishness obtains. Groups undertake to improve their condition. Disunity is often encountered. Too many are thinking of profits. Too many are thinking of dollars. Too few are making sacrifices to win the war. Let us rededicate ourselves and our fortunes to the supreme job of winning the war. Victory comes first. The supreme aim of America in fighting the greatest of all wars is not to save the world but to save America. The supreme rehabilitation following victory is not so much the rehabilitation of the world as it is the rehabilitation of America. While advocating the good-neighbor policy, while interested in relieving and alleviating suffering in other countries, the supreme aim of the United States is to feed and clothe America before feeding and clothing the world.

Germany and Japan must be destroyed. The price will be great. The bloodiest battles of the War between the States were fought after Vicksburg and Gettysburg. The bloodiest battles of the war are ahead. The price in blood and treasure will stagger the imagination. No Jap prisoners are being taken. On Tarawa Island, a mile long and one-eighth of a mile wide, there were some 5,000 Japanese soldiers. The attack was made by some 6,000 marines. The casualties of the marines were 1,026 dead and 2,557 wounded. I give you the order of the day when the marines attacked: "The Japanese have been taught that their highest duty is to die for their Emperor. It is up to you to see that no Jap soldier fails in his duty." All 5,000 Japs were killed. There were no prisoners at Tarawa. Nor are there any prisoners in any other battles or engagements with the Japs. But few German prisoners are being taken on the Italian or the Russian front. The Germans are not surrendering. They are fighting to the death. The battle must be to the finish.

We must gird ourselves for the difficult days ahead. We must not repeat the mistakes of the First World War. General Pershing was right when he insisted upon the unconditional surrender of Germany. He insisted that the Americans march down the main street of Berlin. Berlin and Tokyo must be destroyed. There must be no main street left in Berlin. There must be no main street left in Tokyo. Hitler and Tojo must bite the dust.

Complacency and disunity can only delay. They may cost thousands and hundreds of thousands of American lives but the people of the United States as a whole are united for victory, and they are determined to end total war by sinking deep the sword of victory into the heart of murderous Germany and of treacherous Japan.

With victory we plan for a fairer day and a better land. We look forward to the dawn of the day when we can turn from war to peace in a higher and nobler civilization.

Aircraft and the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram received by me from Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America, with reference to the Lea civil-aviation bill, and my answer to his telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 14, 1944.*

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand that Friday you received press release giving impression that the Air Transport Association of America at a recent meeting favored a resolution opposing the Lea aviation bill. Any such statement is incorrect. The Air Transport Association has never voted for such a resolution. The Air Transport Association considers that the Lea civil aviation bill is a forward-looking and carefully considered measure which will greatly strengthen and improve our country's civil aviation law.

EDGAR S. GORRELL,
President,
Air Transport Association of America.

JANUARY 17, 1944.

Col. EDGAR S. GORRELL,
President, Air Transport
Association of America,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLONEL GORRELL: Receipt is acknowledged of your telegram of January 14.

I have received no press release or any other information regarding the action of your association with reference to H. R. 3420, the civil aviation bill. I would be surprised indeed, to hear of your repudiation of this proposed law which freezes the unjust discrimination imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and which has succeeded in placing the American merchant marine in a straitjacket.

No right-minded person would seek to retard the development of American aviation, either domestic or foreign, by reason of what it means to our national security in time of war, as well as to our economy in time of peace. By the same token, this applies equally to our merchant marine, which with aviation, the Army, and the Navy, constitute the four principal links in our chain of national defense, neither of which should be used to destroy the efficiency of the others.

On the contrary, those who have the genuine interest of American aviation at heart will recognize the interdependence of aviation and our merchant marine in trans-

oceanic commerce, in the same manner that aviation interests of friendly foreign maritime nations have, and will encourage the removal of this straitjacket from our merchant marine. When the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was under consideration in the House of Representatives, simultaneously to legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, you personally testified to the interest one should have, when you said to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on March 22, 1938, page 24 of the printed hearings:

"If shipping or any other transportation companies wish to engage in air transportation, there is no reason why they should stand on any different basis from any other person desiring to enter this business."

It was on the basis of your statement, with those made by other representatives of aeronautical interests, that the guardians of the American merchant marine were lulled into a position of false security. Therefore, it is now time when you can aid in remedying that serious situation so detrimental to aviation, our merchant marine and the Nation as a whole, by supporting an amendment to H. R. 3420 to rectify the same.

Friendly maritime nations, I repeat, are sanctioning and encouraging their shipping interests in the development of transoceanic air lines. We must meet that challenge by removing legislative or administrative restrictions that force an impossible condition upon our merchant marine in meeting the competitive situation necessarily facing them in international commerce.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Member of Congress.

Stamp Out Anti-Semitism in America's Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a letter sent by me yesterday to the Secretary of War disclosing details of a flagrant example of anti-Semitism on the part of a commissioned officer of the United States Army. This letter quotes verbatim the anti-Semitic utterances of one Lt. Albert W. Ambs, which brands him, on the basis of his own admissions, as guilty of deliberate persecution of a noncommissioned officer of the Jewish faith placed under his command. I am confident that the Members of the House will join with me in giving stern rebuke to this un-American lieutenant who has wormed his way into our armed forces and is serving the interests, not of the American people, but of Adolf Hitler and his stooges in this country, the domestic Fascists. I am confident that the Secretary of War will promptly take the action I have requested. The letter to which I refer is as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STIMSON: Enclosed are photostatic copies of two letters signed by First Lt. Albert W. Ambs, Army serial No. 484412, now stationed at the station hospital, Florence Internment Camp, Florence, Ariz., and addressed to a Colonel Kirmse. The originals of these letters are now in my possession and I will be pleased to turn them over to you or to a person designated by you upon your request.

The first of the letters written by Lieutenant Ambs to Colonel Kirmse under date of August 8, 1943, contains the following sentences:

"It is the first unit I ever saw that didn't have a bunch of Jewish officers in it, we do not have a one. Thank God for it."

The second of these letters, under date of September 2, 1943, contains the following comment:

"I don't know whether or not I mentioned it in my previous letter, but there isn't a single 'kike' officer in the group and I am happy for it. We have a few enlisted men of Jewish persuasion but they can be handled. In fact my personnel sergeant major is one. I read the riot act to him and then gave him a 14-day furlough in which to think it over. If he comes back unchanged he will simply have to be reassigned and stripped of his stripes. No one likes to work with him, and I have a man whom I believe much more capable of the job. But he was rated and assigned before I came and I will give him every chance in the world to prove to me he can do the work."

Anti-Semitism is at the heart of the international Fascist conspiracy against the security of the Government and the people of the United States. It is, therefore, shocking to find among the officer personnel of the United States Army a man, like Lieutenant Ambs, who gives open expression of an attitude of violent anti-Semitism in letters to his superior officer and who, in one of these letters boasts of his determination to inflict his prejudice upon a noncommissioned officer of the Jewish faith by "reading the riot act to him" and by having him "stripped of his stripes."

The self-revealed attitude and actions of Lieutenant Ambs are repugnant to our democratic tradition and subversive of our American ideals of tolerance and equality. His attitude and actions are dangerous to the morale of our Army. His own signed letters condemn him as being unfit to be a member of the Army of the United States.

Hardly less repugnant is the silent condonation of such conduct on the part of a junior officer by Colonel Kirmse, who received these letters. It is significant that the letters indicate a personal interest of Colonel Kirmse in Lieutenant Ambs. It was the colonel who secured his promotion in grade. For this colonel to remain silent in the face of this anti-Semitic conduct and not to bring Lieutenant Ambs' letters to the attention of proper authorities seriously raises the question of his fitness for the high trust imposed upon him by his rank in the Army of the United States.

The morale of the United States Army is endangered as long as men like Lieutenant Ambs can, for no reason other than a Hitler-like religious and racial prejudice, discriminate against soldiers under their command. The Jewish personnel sergeant major referred to in the letter may by now have been stripped of his stripes, without reason and in an unfair method. Thus the prejudice of Lieutenant Ambs may have gone to such extremes that the organization of our Army into an effective fighting machine may have been impaired by his anti-Semitism.

I need not tell you that the brilliant and patriotic record of Jewish Americans in the present war and in every crisis faced by the American Nation is such as to give the lie to the accursed conduct of Lieutenant Ambs. In the first days of the present struggle there was another Army lieutenant who had a Jewish sergeant assigned to his command. These two together wrote a bright page in the history of our country's fight for freedom. They gave their lives in order that the American tradition of tolerance might survive. We all remember their names: Lt. Colin Kelly and Sgt. Meyer Levin. It is shameful, indeed, to be forced to mention the name of Lieutenant Ambs and to have to describe his conduct toward this nameless Jewish sergeant in the same breath with that of two American heroes such as Kelly and Levin.

I ask you, Mr. Secretary, for prompt and effective action in this case. I ask that the conduct of Lieutenant Ambs and Colonel Kirmse be investigated; that the identity of the Jewish noncommissioned officer be ascertained, his present status determined, and a full investigation made of his treatment in the Army to discover if religious or racial prejudice has been a factor. I ask further that Lieutenant Ambs be court martialed; and that action be taken against Colonel Kirmse consistent with the facts brought out in the investigation. We must stamp anti-Semitism and all other kinds of racial and religious bigotry out of our armed forces. The punishment of Lieutenant Ambs should be made to serve as an example to all others—yet undiscovered—who bring their un-American prejudices into the armed forces.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Maj. Jay Zeamer, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Maj. Jay Zeamer, Jr., Air Corps, United States Army, of 56 Ridge Street, Orange, N. J., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award in World War No. 2.

This soldier, recently discharged from Walter Reed Hospital, established one of the finest records for gallantry and courage. I feel that this should be permanently recorded and the people of our country should be appraised of his outstanding performances in this war. Accordingly, I recite the citations which have made Major Zeamer one of the most decorated men in the country, with the Silver Star, Purple Heart, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, and the Congressional Medal of Honor:

AWARD OF THE SILVER STAR, APRIL 6, 1943

For gallantry in action over Rabaul Harbor, New Britain, on November 20, 1942.

AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS, MAY 8, 1943

For extraordinary achievement while participating in an aerial flight over Rabaul, New Britain, on April 6, 1942. This B-26 type aircraft was one of a formation which participated in the first bombardment mission ever performed in this type airplane. The plane took off in the early morning from an advanced airdrome which was, even under the most favorable conditions, a dangerous field on which to operate a B-26. In darkness and heavy rain, with a low ceiling, the eight aircraft attempted to complete their formation.

Two airplanes turned back, but the remaining six planes proceeded through the treacherous Owen-Stanley Mountain Range. After flying by instruments half way to Rabaul, the weather cleared and the approach to the target was made with good visibility. In the face of an exceedingly heavy anti-aircraft barrage and the danger of attack by three enemy Zeros which were seen taking off in an attempt to intercept the formation, three bombing runs were made on enemy shipping in the harbor. One cargo vessel was sunk and two others were seriously damaged. Two of the planes of the formation were struck by anti-aircraft fire, one of them being forced down in the water on the return trip. The remaining crews dropped life rafts to the stricken crew and then proceeded back to the base, where the B-26's were landed with an average of 10 minutes supply of fuel in their tanks. The ability, courage, and eagerness to carry the attack to the enemy despite great odds, as displayed by these combat members are in keeping with the finest traditions of the service.

GEORGE KENNEY,
Lieutenant General, A. U. S., Commanding.

AWARD OF THE OAK-LEAF CLUSTER (D. F. C.), MAY 26, 1943

For extraordinary achievement while participating in 200 hours of operational flight missions in the southwest Pacific area from April 5, 1942, to January 27, 1943, during which hostile contact was probable and expected. These operations consisted of long-range bombing missions against enemy airdromes, harbors, shipping, and naval forces. Throughout these flights, outstanding ability and devotion to duty were demonstrated.

AWARD OF THE AIR MEDAL, MAY 31, 1943

For meritorious achievement while participating in aerial flight over Rabaul Harbor, New Britain, on January 17, 1943. Lieutenant Zeamer was pilot of a B-17 type aircraft which sank an 8,000-ton merchant vessel in Rabaul Harbor. His bravery and skill, despite heavy antiaircraft fire, are worthy of commendation.

AWARD OF THE OAK-LEAF CLUSTER (SILVER STAR), JUNE 18, 1943

For gallantry in action over the Rabaul area, New Britain, on April 12, 1943.

AWARD OF THE PURPLE HEART, JUNE 24, 1943

For wounds received in action near Bougainville Island on June 16, 1943.

AWARD OF THE OAK-LEAF CLUSTER (AIR MEDAL) JULY 6, 1943

For meritorious achievement while participating in 100 hours of operational flight missions in the southwest Pacific area, from February 1, 1943, to June 17, 1943, during which hostile contact was probable and expected. These operations included long-range bombing missions against enemy airdromes and installations and attacks on hostile naval vessels and shipping. Throughout these operations outstanding ability, courage, and devotion to duty were demonstrated.

MEDICAL OF HONOR, NOVEMBER 27, 1943

Maj. Jay Zeamer, Jr., O-383971 (then captain), Air Corps, United States Army. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty. On June 16, 1943, Major Zeamer volunteered as pilot of a bomber on an important photographic mapping mission covering the formidably defended area in the vicinity of Buka, Solomon Islands. While photographing the Buka airdrome, his crew observed about 20 enemy fighters on the field, many of them taking off. Despite the certainty of a dangerous attack by this strong force, Major Zeamer proceeded with his mapping run, even after the enemy attack began. In the ensuing engagement, Major Zeamer sustained gunshot wounds in both arms and legs, one leg being broken. Despite his injuries, he maneuvered the damaged plane so skillfully that his gunners were able to fight off the enemy during a running fight lasting 40 minutes, and to destroy at least 5 hostile planes, of which Major Zeamer himself shot down one. Although weak from loss of blood, he refused medical aid until the enemy had broken combat. He then turned over the controls but continued to exercise command and, despite lapses into unconsciousness, to direct the flight to a base 580 miles away. In this voluntary action, Major Zeamer, with superb skill, resolution, and courage, accomplished a mission of great value.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 11), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from W. A. Cochel, editor of the weekly Kansas City Star, and three editorials from that paper on the farm situation.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1944.

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: It is difficult to know just where to begin or what comments to make on the subject which we discussed when you were here.

The chief objections to the efforts made to help out the farmer during the depression were: First, that the rules and regulations had a tendency to penalize the efficient farm operator; second, that the rules and regulations were enforced by the assessment of penalties rather than by making awards for conformance; third, the payment of wages to W. P. A. workers then were higher than the prevailing farm wage. Practically everything was based upon the theory of scarcity rather than the one of abundance which, I think, is fundamentally wrong.

It is true, however, that many farmers were kept from bankruptcy, that interest rates have been generally reduced and that farmers have become more conscious of the needs for maintaining fertility of the soil and prevention of erosion. That, I think, fairly well summarizes the efforts up until the beginning of the present war.

We now have two problems. One is keeping up production of foods that are vital with prices that permit farmers to operate with a reasonable hope of profit until the close of the war, and then the big problem of just what readjustments have to be made to prevent a depression such as followed the First World War.

It is extremely unfortunate at the very outset of the present war definite action was not taken to prevent extreme increases in prices and wages. Farmers as a whole feel now that labor has been coddled by the administration and that the inflation which we have at present is almost wholly traceable to excessive wages paid by Government itself, or authorized by Government agencies, especially in our defense industries and to organized labor in old establishments.

There is very bitter criticism of the failure of the O. P. A. to really appreciate the farmers' situation. There is a tendency to point to the relatively large income earned by farmers in the past 3 years, most of which can be attributed to especially good crops and extremely high yields, over which farmers themselves have had little control. Prices for agricultural commodities have been fairly well controlled with only a few commodities getting out of hand. Apparently there are very few, if any, men who have the power of fixing prices or controlling production who have had a successful farm experience back of them.

I frankly believe that if the O. P. A. and W. F. A. and other wartime agencies which have to do with agriculture would select a few men who have not only been engaged in farming as a business, but have been dependent upon it for the major source of their income and have been successful and arrange for them to serve in an advisory capacity, a good many of the criticisms and complaints which we now hear would have been avoided. Too many rules, regulations and directives are issued by Government agents who have no conception of agricultural practices and do not realize the far-reaching effect of their directives.

About 8 months ago those familiar with the situation realized that serious conditions were developing in the production of dairy products as evidenced by the large number of herds that were being dispersed. It was realized by those who are in close contact with the dairy industry that the ceiling prices for milk and its products were not permitted to advance rapidly enough to overcome the increased cost of labor and of feeds. Little effort was made to correct the situation until it had advanced so far that it was impossible. The result was an unnecessarily large curtailment of supplies and increase in price.

A similar condition is now developing in the production of beef. Livestock men of the country, as you know, offered a meat-management plan. Although this had the approval of practically all Government agencies and the livestock industry as a whole, it has never been permitted to function. The result has been a material reduction in the number of cattle on feed, excessive marketing of cattle which should have been fed from 60 to 90 days longer, and a temporary plentitude of beef. This is certain to be followed by increasing scarcity throughout the next 12 months. Ceiling prices were placed on beef more than a year ago, and they have not been increased even though corn has increased at least 40 cents a bushel, hay has almost doubled in value, labor is 25 percent higher and 50 percent less efficient than it was at the time ceilings were announced. Beef cattle are selling today for less than they brought a year ago despite the subsidies to packers.

We have a serious situation in Missouri at the present time due to the recent modification of the corn ceilings in which the new ceilings were announced 9 cents above the old, while farmers' ceiling prices in practically all counties for the State are from 4 to 9 cents below the old ceilings. In Boone County the farmers' ceiling last year was $1.09 a bushel; the new ceiling is $1.04¾. The dealers' ceiling was $1.20. At present the dealers may charge as much as $1.30 a bushel, or 10 cents above his new ceiling, while farmers in the same county are not permitted to sell their corn at more than $1.04¾. There seems to have been a failure to differentiate between areas that were producing a surplus of corn and those that were compelled to import a portion of their needs.

Just at present all central markets are really flooded with hogs. Kansas City, up to the present time, has been able to take care of all receipts. We have no embargoes. This morning, however, my farm foreman called me and said after calling Kansas City

(he and his neighbors had decided to send in a truckload of hogs) had been advised not to do so. Little effort has been made to alleviate this situation. The excessive number of hogs on hand clearly illustrates that farmers will go to almost any limit in producing things from which they hope to get a profit. The Government support to the hog program up to the present moment has encouraged them. In fact, it has been more successful than anyone anticipated. I hope present efforts to curtail production will not overshoot the mark.

There is an opportunity to relieve the situation if all points were removed on the sale of pork. If this were done and should become effective during the month of January the home slaughter of hogs would be increased tremendously. There are very few families who have a sufficient number of points to purchase an entire carcass or even half a carcass. They have the money to do so, and want the meat, and do not want to patronize black markets where they can avoid the Government restrictions. The result is they continue to buy within their ability to furnish points. I have had an opportunity in the last 10 days to dispose of a dozen hogs if I would agree to have them killed on the farm and give delivery of the carcasses there. This is without any solicitation whatever. I believe it would be possible with a little effort to market the entire crop in that way. With the excessive supplies of pork such a procedure would relieve the excessive burden on transportation, the congestion at the markets and in the packing houses, and would also relieve the cold-storage situation. It would also provide a considerable number of families with adequate supplies of meat and lard at a time when both are being produced in excess of demand.

I am enclosing three editorials which have a bearing upon the farm situation. The one, I think, is especially timely because of the fact that it goes into detail in regard to the selection of the 1939 base for regulating farm incomes. The second has to do with the pig-crop report. The third is simply a comment on the relative position of those engaged in agriculture as compared with those in industry.

This letter is the longest I have written in a year. I could probably go on and extend it indefinitely, giving you specific statements, but will not burden you further with this. If you think it worth while I will write a second letter with suggestions as to action which should be taken toward prevention of post-war depression. If there are any questions you want to ask or any information which you would like to receive I will be very glad to try to comply in every possible way.

Yours very truly,

W. A. COCHEL, *Editor.*

MISLEADING DATA UTILIZED

The Office of Price Administration has issued several charts based upon information furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics comparing the farmers' relative position in the two World Wars. These show that prices received by farmers during the first 51 months of each war increased approximately 100 percent. That, on a percentage basis, the net income and purchasing power in this war are relatively higher and prices paid by farmers for production and family maintenance lower than in the first war. Tables accompanying these charts show that the increase in living costs has been only one-half as rapid. These charts and tables are being used as an argument in favor of subsidies, roll-backs, and other proposals for prevention of inflation.

The fundamental error from a farm viewpoint comes from the selection of 1939 as the base for all other calculations. The net income to farm operators increased from $3,900,000,000 in 1914 to $4,500,000,000 in 1939 or 11 percent. The national income increased from $36,400,000,000 in 1914 to $71,000,000,000 in 1939 or an increase of 95 percent.

The average net income of farm operators for 10 years beginning in 1919 was $5,500,000,000 or one billion above the 1939 base. It was also $1,000,000,000 higher on an average from 1935–39 than in the last year of that period. The average for the entire 20 years from 1919 to 1939 was $4,600,000,000 as compared with four and five-tenths billion for 1939 selected as a base date.

In the agricultural situation for November 1943 the ratio of prices received by farmers in 1939 to those paid in the 1909–14 period is given as 74 or 26 percent below normal.

In the last 20 years there were only 7 when the farm income was lower than in 1939 with 12 above that year's estimate of $4,500,000,000.

There are two factors which enter into computation of net income. One is the volume of production, the other is the price of commodities. Exceptional yields during the last 3 years have had more influence than prices received on the net farm income.

Last week prices for beef cattle, sheep, and hogs, which are affected by ceilings and subsidies were all lower than they were a year ago despite the increase in production costs due to increase in the price of feeds.

Farmers feel that open market prices should be permitted to vary enough to overcome production costs and that these prices should be paid by consumers rather than through subsidies. There is nothing in the data assembled by the Bureau of Economics to justify the attitude taken by the O. P. A. in regard to farm prices. The utilization of the 1939 base does not present a true picture of prices in relation to those of other commodities and of labor.

THE PIG-CROP REPORT

The pig-crop report issued by the Bureau of Economics December 23, will receive more than usual study due to the difficulties currently encountered in marketing hogs.

The pigs saved in the fall of 1943, estimated at 48,000,000 head, were 10 percent above the highest previous record. The combined spring and fall crop is estimated at 121,847,000 head, 17 percent above 1942 and 67 percent above the 10-year average. The support given to the price of hogs during the past 3 years has made production profitable. The response of farmers has exceeded expectations. All central markets are flooded with hogs, many forced to restrict shipments. Packers have found it difficult to get labor to handle the large volume and storage space for the product is a problem.

Production in 1944 will decline. The estimated number of sows to farrow next spring is 16 percent lower than in 1943. This may be even lower if a considerable number of sows already bred are shipped because of difficulties now encountered.

Congestion of market and storage facilities, increased prices for corn, difficulty in obtaining high protein feeds, shortage of labor, and lower prices for finished hogs all tend toward decreased production.

The O. P. A. has recognized the need for speeding up consumption of pork by lowering the number of points required from buyers. There is a real opportunity to relieve the situation by a complete removal of points for carcasses from hogs slaughtered on the farm or by local butchers. Very few families have a sufficient number of points to use in buying a carcass that would weigh from 150 to 200 pounds. If the points were removed it would be possible for families living on farms or in small towns and villages to buy a carcass, render out the lard, make sausage and cure the hams, shoulders, and sides. Such a plan could not be utilized by those living in large urban communities. It would reduce transportation requirements, relieve the situation in large packing and storage plants and provide meat in greater abundance for those of low income. The elimination of points should be effective only during the next month when weather conditions for farm slaughter are favorable and while the marketing difficulties will be at their peak.

RAILROADS WILL BE OPERATED

The settlement of the railroad strike is of prime importance to farmers. With the shortage of trucks and limited gasoline rations dependence upon railroad transportation has increased. Although the movement of farm products in midwinter is not as great as in other seasons it is essential that dairy and poultry products be handled promptly.

Livestock ready for market may be held on the farm for a week or two without material loss but the rate of gain is decreased and the cost increased after they are ready to go. Feed shipments can be delayed for a limited period but a real shortage would force premature marketing.

It is extremely unfortunate that a strike should have been called at a time when the railroads were doing a splendid job under most difficult conditions. All but 3 of the 17 unions expressed their willingness to arbitrate. Two of them, the firemen and engineers and the conductors, have merely postponed rather than canceled their strike orders. Until they are canceled it will be necessary for the Government to continue to operate the railroads. The unions blame the President for delay and mishandling the wage dispute.

Agriculture differs from other industries in that production must continue regardless of difficulties or disputes. Farmers have the joint responsibility of both capital and labor. If a farm strike were called they certainly would lose more than by continuing to operate under adverse conditions. Agriculture differs also in that the hours of employment cannot be definitely regulated. Farmers give no thought to a 40-hour week or an 8-hour day. They must adjust their work to conditions over which they have no control. If they were to obtain additional returns for overtime and Sunday work on the same basis as industrial workers the cost of food would be doubled.

Farmers are sympathetic with labor. They realize that those who work in industrial plants encounter higher costs of living, frequently spend a considerable amount of time getting to and from work and lose some of their independence which forces them into organizations to protect their interests. However, they are opposed to strikes, and to any avoidable hardships forced upon those who labor. They are not at all in sympathy with any action which interferes with the effort to win the war. They feel that labor has been coddled by the administration and that protests on account of increased living costs, due to rising prices of food, are not justified.

The settlement of the coal strike followed by Government operation of the railroads with increased wages and other advantages conceded will doubtless result in strengthening the opposition to subsidies on food products.

Income Tax Simplification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 21, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation recognize the necessity for heavy war taxes and are willing

to pay. They properly resent the present difficulty of ascertaining their tax liability. They want a system that is fair and a system that is simple.

There is an urgent need for a simplification of our present personal income-tax system because:

First. The number of income-tax payers has increased in a decade from 2,000,000 to 50,000,000, and many of those new taxpayers do not know how to prepare their own returns.

Second. Millions of work hours that should be devoted to the war effort are now being unnecessarily wasted and lost in the preparation of income returns.

Third. To soften the impact of what now amounts to an increase of 500 percent or more in rates, tax framers have juggled with a complicated system of normal rates, surtax rates, victory tax rates, personal exemptions, earned income credits, and a multitude of special deductions of items not involved in the earning of the reported income.

Fourth. The Congress purported to give to the taxpayer a pay-as-you-go system but largely vitiated the program not only by carrying forward a portion of 1 year's liability to a succeeding year, but by failing to recognize that the average salary earner, as well as all wage earners, do their accounting on the basis of their established pay day, whether it be weekly, semimonthly, or monthly.

Fifth. With the heavy increase in rates certain deductions previously authorized in the name of fairness now become a source of unfairness and inequality since one taxpayer can take advantage of certain deductions from gross income which another taxpayer of similar gross income cannot.

To remedy this situation I propose the following program:

First. Merge the Victory tax, the normal tax and the surtax into one minimum rate to be fully collected at the source from wages and salaries through the medium of withholding by the employer.

Second. Reduce the amount of that rate, and necessarily the amount to be withheld, by computing the minimum rate against a net taxable income to be arrived at by deducting from gross income items of expense incurred in earning the income, plus exemptions and nothing more. That change of course involves the elimination of the earned income credit and the complicated deductions for various items now authorized, although undoubtedly there would still have to be some deviation from the plan to take care of above-average charitable gifts, abnormal medical expenses, alimony payments and certain situations growing out of community property laws.

The result of these proposed changes would be:

First. The elimination of approximately 30,000,000 income-tax returns.

Second. The making fully current of the majority of present taxpayers who owe the basic liability only and who have income of less than $100 from sources other than wages or salaries.

Third. The elimination of labor by the taxpayer and by the Government incommensurate with the results attained; the elimination of an important source of inequity; the distribution more evenly of the tax burden; facilitating full collection of the tax liability while increasing difficulties of evasion.

The essence of the foregoing program I proposed on February 1, 1943, in connection with my pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, and have since on numerous occasions earnestly advocated its adoption. Naturally after a lapse of approximately a year's time, it gratifies me that the proposal has gained favor in numerous quarters. And I welcome the congressional and public support for my slogan of simplicity and certainty—simplicity in administration of the tax laws and certainty in the minds of the taxpaying public of its tax liability under those laws.

The White House Social

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, quite a while ago we were advised from the White House that politics had been adjourned for the duration of the war. Since that assurance was given to the people, we have discovered that the rule, so announced, was largely intended to apply to the people of this country—and not to the Chief Executive, because he has continued to engage in the great game of politics, regardless of war.

The term "New Deal," which was applied to this administration by the President, has become so offensive to the people generally that a change is now sought and an attempt to apply a new name has been suggested by the author of this so-called New Deal. But a leopard does not change its spots, and regardless of the name applied to the present policy of government in this country—with the spending, bungling, domination, and centralization of power—with the theme of one-man government as an outstanding policy—it is the same kind and type of government. The change of name apparently does not change the form of government, because the same plan of regimentation continues, and the same program of playing politics throughout the war effort has not been abated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial which recently appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on the subject of the White House social, which is enlightening, indeed, and which is as follows:

WHITE HOUSE "SOCIAL"

Widespread mistakes are being committed by the Nation's press in carrying an article about a White House "social" in the news columns instead of on the society page. The President has set a glorious example by adjourning politics for the duration, or has he? Anyway, he has tried to liquidate the New Deal as something the voters should forget during the coming campaign. His latest Budget address sounded more like a fourth-term announcement, although that impression may have been nothing more than a bit of ineptitude on the part of the ghost writers.

The coming "social," therefore, must be what its name implies. Some may be surprised that the squire of Hyde Park was acquainted with this term. The grassrooters in the Midwest are familiar with this type of neighborly rally. There are church socials and the plain variety. In either case the women talk, ice cream and cake are served, and then, probably, there is more talk. Maybe there is some knitting. Everybody has a good time.

The President has invited the southern Governors to his White House social. They happen to be gathering in Washington to high pressure a railroad freight rate demand. Mr. Roosevelt thought it would be nice to ask them over for a tidbit or something, maybe to meet the First Lady, if she is in town, and to inspect the mansion.

Once more it should be reiterated that politics is not involved. Some Dixie executives, it is true, have been threatening to rip the solid South wide open over poll taxes, absentee voting, antiracial discrimination, invasion of State rights, and other issues. But all that rancor is purely coincidental. Mr. Roosevelt loves socials and he looks forward to seeing a contented circle of Governors balancing a dish of ice cream on the knee.

Address of Donald M. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Donald M. Nelson at a dinner given in his honor on the occasion of the second anniversary of the War Production Board, and his appointment as Chairman, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 17, 1944:

I should like to thank my British, Canadian, and American hosts of the Combined Production and Resources Board, my colleagues of the War Production Board, and the distinguished guests who are assembled here, on two counts—first, because of the warm personal friendliness which you have given to this occasion, and second, because of the great honor which you have done me in allowing me to come here tonight as a symbol of American war industry. For I can accept the wonderful tribute that this gathering represents only on behalf of American industry. What gives the event importance, I feel, is not so much the second anniversary of the War Production Board, as the fact that today marks 2 years of an all-out industrial war effort—2 years of productive achievement which has staggered the imagination of the world.

But in a larger sense we are celebrating even more than the tremendous total of nearly $120,000,000,000 of war production and war construction turned out by the Nation during the past 2 years. The real cause for celebration is the virility of the free society which was able so swiftly to transform itself from the world's greatest producer of peacetime goods to the world's most formidable military power.

American production under our free enterprise system has always been famous for its know-how and flexibility. When to these were added the will to win the war, nothing could stop us. Management and labor both showed what no American ever doubted—their ability to do any job that was put before them, once the job was defined and its urgency made clear.

Fortunately for the country, when the crisis came American industrialists were far from being complete novices in war production. Through the years of peace, the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission had been quietly working with limited funds to develop the tools of war and the necessary industrial background. This foundation of experience was of great help when we went on a war footing. For then, overnight, production had to be enormously speeded up. We needed every bit of the knowledge and experience we had. The problems confronting the country were terrific. Each factory had swiftly to produce its particular product in an amount that would tie in with the production of other related factories. All the elements of American industry had to be linked together and to drive forward together.

Nor was it enough merely to have sound production schedules for finished products and component parts and key materials. Behind these were an infinite number of secondary materials which had to be properly programmed and scheduled—chemicals and textiles and little known minerals, each of which played a vital, if obscure, part in making some essential weapon or piece of equipment. Moreover, we could not plan production, we could not think about machines and materials, without also having to think about manpower and transportation. The entire economy had to be brought into wartime gear, and kept in gear.

That meant there had to be over-all planning and guidance. Recognizing this need, back in 1940 the President created the National Defense Advisory Commission, which in 1941 evolved into the Office of Production Management, and in 1942, just 2 years ago, reached full growth in the War Production Board.

In some ways, I think, the War Production Board is a unique organization. It represents industrial America as does no other body of men I know. Its personnel is drawn not only from management but from labor, from science, and from government. The country will probably never realize how many of these men have voluntarily given up established positions in private life in order to throw their energies into the task of winning the war. Many of them, not only here in Washington but in our regional office, not only in the top staff but in the second, third, and fourth levels of the organization, remain unknown to the public, while quietly doing jobs of tremendous importance. These men, together with former associates who have made a contribution and gone on to other work, have helped to write a thrilling chapter in American history. For through them the will of the American people has spoken—the will to play a leading part in shaping the kind of world that free men and women want to live in.

In expressing the will of the American people through industrial action the great problem has always been the same: To keep the economy in balance, under conditions which are constantly changing, and while moving ahead as fast as possible. I have heard this problem referred to as one of "dynamic balance," which I translate as meaning that we have to speed like anything, but stay on the road.

I don't think the importance of this balancing process is generally realized. Americans by and large, I suspect, judge the work of the War Production Board entirely in terms of the large figures which appear monthly in the press. Certainly it gives us all a sense of power and pride when we talk about the nearly 134,000 planes which we have produced in the last 2 years, the 27,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping, and more than 3,700,000 displacement tons of naval shipping. We take a grim delight in knowing that we have produced 424,000 pieces of artillery and over 1,160,000,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, that we have turned out over 148,000 tanks and other combat vehicles, and over 1,200,000 military trucks. Yet the real measure of the success of war production is not merely that these figures were attained, but that they were attained without destroying the balance of production.

It is not too much to say that the entire success of our civilian war effort has hinged on the balancing of production. Let me explain that. Production had to be kept in balance, first of all, as between military and civilian requirements. At first, prior to Pearl Harbor, there was great resistance to conversion of factories for war production. But Pearl Harbor changed the temper of the country in a single day. Then it became necessary for the War Production Board to prevent people from going to the other extreme.

I can remember only too well the days when the wholesale conversion of civilian plants for military production was taking place. Sharp criticism was leveled against the War Production Board for not enforcing still more drastic cuts in the civilian economy, and great pressure was exerted on us from many quarters to sweep away virtually all civilian production. The thought behind the pressure, of course, was to drive military output even higher.

The fact was, however, that if this counsel had prevailed, our war production, far from increasing, would have fallen off. If the civilian economy had been forced out of balance, today many of our power plants and transportation systems might be unable to operate because of a lack of repair parts. Millions of civilian homes all over the country might be totally disorganized because people could not get materials with which to maintain their houses, heating systems, and plumbing. War plants everywhere might be forced to cut down operations because workers could not find enough automobile parts to keep their cars running. These and similar misfortunes were prevented only by a careful and firmly defended balance in the planning of production. With our right hand we had to guide industry toward ever-higher production goals, while with our left hand we worked to prevent too great a cut in the output of essential civilian goods.

The principle of balance was also applied in dealing with big business and small business. When we first threw ourselves into an all-out war effort, when a great volume of production had to be obtained in the shortest possible time, it was inevitable that the bulk of war contracts should go to the big mass-production concerns and their subcontractors. There were those 2 years ago who wanted to use this state of affairs to alter the whole character of American business. They contended that concerns which could not produce in great volume and at low cost had no place in the war economy, and ought, therefore, to be ruthlessly starved out of existence.

But the Government saw that there was no need to sacrifice small business, since, under proper guidance, it could make an important contribution to war production; and the great majority of the people shared this view. Accordingly, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was called into being by the President and Congress, and became part of the War Production Board. This Corporation has been instrumental in helping thousands of small concerns to find contracts for war goods or essential civilian supplies, together with materials and manpower to carry out the contracts. Today small business plays a significant part in war production. And looking ahead to the time when the industrial trend will be back to civilian production, the War Production Board is already making plans to meet the special problems which will then confront small business.

A balance had to be struck again in working with management and labor. Patriotism was and is a powerful force in both groups, but it was sure to produce stronger collaboration if backed up by mutual understanding, friendly interchange of views, and a clear definition of the job to be done.

From the first, therefore, representatives of labor participated with representatives of management in the high counsels of war production, where their views were welded into a common policy. At the same time, under the sponsorship of W. P. B., labor-management committees were formed in one war plant after another until today there are more than 3,000 such committees, working hard and finding many ways of increasing production.

The greatest test of the War Production Board, however, came in striking a balance among the thousands of detailed war-production programs. A great number of different products, many of them new and complicated, had to be mass produced at the same time in the face of serious shortages. First, facilities and materials, and later manpower, had to be rationed among all the separate, urgent production programs—an immensely complicated job.

The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, the Administrators for Rubber, Food, and Petroleum, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Office of Civilian Requirements—all these claimant agencies of W. P. B. press continuously, as they should, for the things they want. Each of their programs is essential, but often their demands conflict. To prevent these conflicting pressures from pushing war production out of balance, our program makers and bottleneck breakers have to be impartial, alert, and ingenious, especially since the balance of production keep changing all the time.

Our troops and technical experts are constantly suggesting improvements in the design and construction of weapons and equipment. You may perfect the production of a certain type of airplane today, but tomorrow changed battle conditions or new research may compel you to redesign that plane or may even make it obsolete. Battle experience may also show that smaller or greater quantities of some product are needed than was first supposed. And, of course, as the fighting moves from one climatic zone to another, and from one type of operation to another, production must move with it.

A year ago we were concentrating on production for the fighting in north Africa. As an example, there was a great demand for tank treads, which are rapidly destroyed by the rocks and burning sands of the desert. Now we are thinking less about deserts and more about the coasts of western Europe. In recent months, emphasis has shifted to landing craft, so that our troops can engage in large-scale amphibious warfare.

To permit rapid shifts in emphasis and improvements in design, the entire war-production program, which adds up to the greatest volume of goods ever turned out by American industry, must be kept flexible at all times. The over-all volume continues to rise, but among the thousands of separate programs there are always a number which are being cut down and are moving against the stream. This must always be so, if production is to accord with changing demand.

The great flexible instrument of American industry is like an organ; we have pulled out all the stops, and we are striking the ever-changing chords of the victory march. And we must be accurate. A big mistake, such

as might come from taking an extreme position on any one program, such as might deprive our armed forces of an essential weapon, or our civilian population of an essential food—a mistake of that kind could be disastrous. Naturally, we have made mistakes, but we have always been able to correct them before the damage was large.

Now we are entering a phase of production where, many respects, balance will be even harder to achieve than in the past. Reserves of certain types of war matériel are already making it possible to close down some war factories. The workers of those factories in most cases will be able quickly to find employment in other war industries, where they are badly needed. Nevertheless, in certain local situations there may be some manpower available, if only temporarily; there will be facilities available, and there will be materials available. Right now pressure is being felt to permit industrial plants to use available resources in making products that our civilian consumers want.

In time, of course, as victory comes closer and war production levels off, the Government will permit more and more civilian goods to be made. But when should we begin? There is the Nation's morale to consider. Some think it unwise to let civilians buy more goods at this time, while our fighting men are risking their lives in action. Others believe that increased civilian production might improve the morale and so strengthen the war effort, by reducing the uncertainties of workers and employers in some areas. Then there is the matter of fairness to industry. Should a few concerns be allowed to enter the civilian market while other concerns in the same line of business are still working on war contracts?

To arrive at a balanced judgment on these questions will not be easy, but I can assure you that plans are being crystallized, and we will be ready to act when the time is ripe for action.

I would go so far as to say that from this point on our responsibility to the people will be even heavier than before. When we were plunging into war production, the public forgave us any mistakes we may have made, because their eyes were on the horizons of the war. Now, however, the situation has changed. Although the Nation is heart and soul in the war effort, people are also thinking about the period that will follow. They are looking more closely at affairs at home. From now on, their confidence, as well as their actual welfare, will be increasingly affected by production decisions. A balanced judgment on the problems of reconversion will be essential to the economic and social health of America in the period ahead.

I have seen the policy of continuous balance work with equal success in another and very important area of the War Production Board's activities—in the international area. I refer to the work of the Combined Production and Resources Board, which has so generously honored me tonight. As you know, the United Kingdom, Canada, and America are represented on this Board and it has been my good fortune, as the American representative, to find myself working closely with the British Minister of Production, Mr. Lyttelton, and the Canadian Minister of Supply and Munitions, Mr. Howe.

To my way of thinking, this and certain other combined boards have set an example for the world in solving troublesome problems in a spirit of energetic cooperation. I shall not pretend that there are no economic points of difference between the United Kingdom, Canada, and America. When three great nations deal in thousands of separate transactions, many of huge size, difficult problems are bound to arise. The point is that none of the three parties has any interest in the tactics of squeeze and grab. On the contrary, all strive for fair play and balanced judgment. Each country recognizes that its own best interests are served by the well-being of the others. The result is that every problem, even the most serious, has proved capable of reasonable solution. The agreements which we make with one another are straightforward statements of practical programs which are fully carried out.

Naturally it is far easier to resolve problems under the stress of mutual peril than in times of peace. Some people, in fact, tell us that when the war ends cooperation will end with it. This view is not realistic. It is merely cynical.

Our nations have come a long way in the past 2 years. To be sure, after the war the world is obviously going to face problems of widespread poverty, material destruction, financial dislocation, competitive shipping, and aviation, and many others. The nations will undoubtedly have to work hard and to exercise good judgment in order to reach workable economic agreements. But who dares say that we are incapable of hard work and good judgment? The experience of the United Kingdom, Canada, and America in war production has taught us new techniques for working out our joint problems, and I am convinced, is only the first chapter of the story which the future will write of the economic cooperation of the United Nations in peacetime.

In particular I am confident that the principles which have made American relations with England and Canada such a good omen for the world can operate successfully between us and the Russians in the days to come. I know from what I saw and heard in Russia that the leaders and the people of that great country are anxious to work with us. They know that only world cooperation and enduring peace can produce the rapid internal development of Russia which is their main concern.

Like ourselves, and like England, the Russians do not need more living space. What they want and what we want is higher living standards. They are not competitors for world markets. They are interested primarily in the Russian market, and in exchanges of goods which can help to develop that market. In my talks with Marshal Stalin, Mr. Molotov, and other members of the Soviet Government, I found a rugged realism and self-respecting forthrightness which convinced me that we can do business with Russia to, our benefit, to Russia's benefit, and to the lasting benefit of the world.

I do not pretend to have any special insight into the large political issues of our time. But all the evidence I have seen convinces me that once we have destroyed the threat of international fascism, the great powers for the first time in human experience will be in a position to lay the foundations of the protected peace, of the security and the freedom for which our peoples yearn. Democracy, as practiced in the parliamentary tradition of England and the United States, and in the economy of Soviet Russia, is essentially a peaceful way of life. And since we three great industrial powers combine a preference for peace with a proven superiority in war, we are, I think, on the way to discourage the little Hitlers and Mussolinies who may rise up elsewhere in the churn of future events.

But we must remember that the Hitler psychology is not confined to foreign nations. We run into it, all too often, here at home. And if we are to have peace, both abroad and within our own borders, we must learn to recognize this dangerous state of mind. In my experience, the invariable sign of the Hitler mind is the way it distorts and ignores facts, and shrilly insists on having its own way at any cost to the people.

I am thinking of some men who call themselves Americans, but who in their intolerant hearts hate freedom and democracy and everything America stands for. Like all Fascists, they want to ride roughshod over their opponents. They know that democracy depends on a working balance among many forces, and so they want to destroy that balance, as a first step toward seizing power for themselves and their satellites.

Then there are other men, too many of them, who while not Fascists themselves, yet play into the hands of the would-be Hitlers by helping to destroy the country's unity and the democratic balance. These are the men who make up our pressure groups, who seek to make big profits out of the war, or who produce our wartime strikes—men in any class who would recklessly gamble with the Nation's future in order to gain some petty, temporary advantage for themselves.

To my way of thinking the psychopathic Hitler worshipers and the foolish men who give them aid are asking for trouble, and if they persist, will assuredly get it.

By and large, we are a patient people and slow to wrath. But we are also a dangerous people when aroused. And if Americans become aware that small groups of self-seekers are trying to exploit their country and destroy their freedom, a day of heavy reckoning will come for the self-seekers.

I, for one, have had my faith in the fundamental good sense of Americans reinforced by my experience in war production. The great bulk of the people, industrial workers, white-collar workers, professional workers, farmers, employers—in every class, the large majority have been essentially loyal, hard-working, and cooperative in getting this war won. As the President pointed out in his message to Congress last week, certain sectors of the home front have deteriorated in recent months, notably in Washington, where the pressure groups are most active. But he gave us no reason to think that the attitude of the man in the street has deteriorated. On the contrary, I venture to say that psychologically the plain people of America are getting deeper into the war all the time.

In the first year of the war, I was startled by a public-opinion poll which showed that nearly a third of the people were in favor of a negotiated peace with Germany if the German Army overthrew Hitler. Recently, however, a similar poll revealed that even if Germany got rid of the Nazis and gave up all her conquered lands, three Americans out of four would insist on absolute surrender by the German Army. In my judgment, that shows a great advance in realistic thinking. Surely it is a far cry from any deterioration in popular opinion about the war.

Again, not long ago my attention was called to a poll which showed that 44 percent of the people think that the Government has not gone far enough in asking them to make sacrifices for the war, as against only 8 percent who think that it has gone too far.

No; wherever the home front may have deteriorated, it is not in the minds of the great majority of the people. They have learned that liberty is not just something you inherit, but something you have to fight to keep. And they are willing, anxious to fight for it. The people are becoming steadily better prepared, I believe, for the harsh realities of war. I have yet to talk to an American who does not realize it may well be a considerable time before Germany collapses, and perhaps a matter of years before Japan is crushed. I have yet to find one who is not grimly aware of the pain and tragedy which the war is bound to bring to many an American family.

The people are prepared to work hard and long, and to give up much, in order to win this war. At the same time, they are remarkably free from Pollyanna ideas about the future. They know that war disorganizes any society. They know that it promotes certain types of crime and delinquency. They know that the millions of young men in the Army will have a serious problem of readjustment when they return. They know we may be in for a period of acute uneasiness before a healthy post-war society can be firmly established.

But they have faith in their country—the country that Lincoln called the last, best hope of earth—and we who share in their

Government must have faith in them. We need to remember, all the time, that our airplanes and our tanks, our guns and our marching men—these are only expressions of the people's will to be strong and free. Although Americans, as a whole, may be sometimes distracted or confused by unforeseen events, in a crisis you will find them where they have almost always been—striding ahead, positive and purposeful, keeping their balance, unwilling to sacrifice big, enduring values for temporary, surface gains.

We men of Washington have the obligation to reflect this historical American attitude in our own work. It is up to us to preserve a calm and steadfast and dispassionate judgment, regardless of the pressures that may be turned against us. Even now, when our hearts are set on a smashing victory in this war, we are able to make the greatest speed by preserving the democratic balance. And I deeply feel that after winning the victory we shall go steadily on, with our democratic spirit stronger than ever, to amaze the world by our achievements in peace.

Labor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I present an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Midland Daily News, of Midland, Mich. This editorial discusses a question of the utmost importance to the people of this country. The views expressed are sound; they are based upon facts which have too long existed. The editor puts his finger directly upon the weaknesses of our present administration and their connection with the impossible situation now existing. The editorial is worthy of the consideration of every Member of this body:

LABOR DRAFT

The merits of the President's suggestion for a Universal Service Act which he believes will stop strikes and make for an all-out war effort are now under discussion. We are inclined to doubt the value of such an act, in that we believe it comes too late; that it will not cure the basic ills; that it will simply mean more Government bungling, and may even hinder production.

To draft all labor would be such a colossal job as to make all previous Government efforts seem picayune. To draft only the labor needed for direct industrial war service would dwarf all present efforts. The work alone would take hundreds of thousands of extra Government workers. If this was to be done, and the idea does have some merit, it should have been done earlier. A draft to make the idle work, something similar to the old vagrancy law, might be more practical.

From our observations, it would appear that the Government itself has, through its colossal and far-flung incompetence and its attempt to centralize so much in Washington and leave so much to the President, created the labor strife of which it now complains. To be known as a friend of labor is one thing, but to give in to every whim of labor, or any other group, whether they be farmers, merchants, manufacturers, or professional people, is, from a practical standpoint, untenable. The politicians have continually overpromised and underdelivered, and labor is now awakening to that fact.

A good example of strike making is the present set-up on the War Labor Board. Thousands of cases have come along. Most of them have waited for weeks, some for months, and others never have been settled to anyone's satisfaction. The neglect to have a localized authority with power to act brings no end of trouble and we do not blame labor for many of its complaints. We know of cases which have been pending for 6 months or more and still there is no action and there is little or no disagreement in some of these.

In Michigan in 1943 alone there were some 8,000 cases going to the Wage-Hour Division alone, and over six thousand went to the War Labor Board. Many major cases have had to go to the President. Some have been settled by the Government's taking over, which is a near example of both sides losing and the people holding the bag.

The present Federal system to regulate labor and hold persons to jobs has little value. Few employers wish to hold a person to a job when he is dissatisfied, because he cannot deliver a fair day's work; few employees will stay on a job in spite of regulations if they wish to leave. Thus, to hold them in forced labor would, as we see it, bring on more chaos, greater dissatisfaction, and lessened production.

The President could, under existing power, revamp some of the present Government machinery and see to it that it works. The loose, ineffective, feeble and incompetent methods now set up can be traced to the centralized Washington control. The shilly-shally down there gives anyone who tries to get things done the creeps. That's why hard-bitten labor leaders and hard-driving executives have had to shake out so many bags of chaff to get the wheat and accomplish anything. Let the Chief Executive look at the basic causes of present conditions and apply a remedy.

Views on the Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an editorial appearing in the Washington Star entitled "A Sound Compromise," an article appearing in the Washington Star by A. J. O'Leary entitled "Mailing State Ballots Would Hinder War, Stimson Declares," and an article appearing in the Chicago Times entitled "A. F. of L. Demands 'Foolproof' Soldier Vote Act." The editorial and articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

A SOUND COMPROMISE

The revised Lucas-Green service-vote bill is a vast improvement over the one already passed by the Senate and supported, in a slightly amended form, by the Elections Committee of the House. Its chief virtues are three: First, it would provide for a uniform Federal ballot and thus relieve the Army and Navy of the almost impossible task of administering voting according to the differing laws of the 48 States. Second, it would guarantee the right of election officials in the States to determine the validity of the ballots returned to them and thus resolve all constitutional doubts. And third, with the uniform ballot channeled expeditiously through a Federal commission whose only function would be that of a distributing agent, it would so simplify the whole problem that the bulk of our service personnel would have a genuine chance to express itself next November. On the other hand, by leaving everything to the States, the measure recently adopted by the Senate, and now awaiting action in the House, would have the effect of disfranchising the overwhelming majority of the millions of men and women in the armed forces. Accordingly, to the extent that it would prevent this and at the same time preserve the prerogatives of the States, the new Lucas-Green proposal seems to be an excellent compromise upon which Congress ought to be able to agree. That it has been approved by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is a good and encouraging sign.

[From the Washington Star]

MAILING STATE BALLOTS WOULD HINDER WAR, STIMSON DECLARES

(By J. A. O'Leary)

Secretary of War Stimson told Congress yesterday it would interfere with effective prosecution of the war to give mail priority to State ballots for servicemen for use in primaries extending from February to October, and in the November election.

Unless there is a last-minute change in sentiment, however, the House is expected to pass this week the Senate-approved State-ballot plan, in preference to a simplified uniform Federal ballot confined to voting for President, Senators, and Representatives. The State ballots would cover both national and State tickets.

The Secretary's comment was made in a letter to Chairman WORLEY, of the House Elections Committee, who said, nevertheless, he would offer his bill for a uniform Federal ballot, with permissive use of State ballots, as an amendment to the State ballot bill.

Advocates of the uniform Federal ballot also received a set-back last night, when Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, expressed a fear that use of such a voting procedure in place of the regulation State ballots might throw the whole election into a legal tail-spin growing out of contested returns.

SEES BILL IMPROVED

When the Senate adopted the Eastland-Rankin State-controlled plan December 3, by vote of 42 to 37, Senator TAFT voted with the supporters of the Federal ballot. He said yesterday the House Committee has improved the Senate version, and he now sees no reason why the State-ballot system would not be effective.

The new Green-Lucas bill, which retains the Federal ballots but leaves any question of their validity to local determination, has won over the support of several Senators who were against the earlier version on December 3. But Senator TAFT indicated there may be several switches in the other direction in support of State ballots because, he said, the Federal ballot was the most important question in the bill.

Some supporters of the simplified Federal ballot had hoped to get another vote in the Senate early this week before the House acts, but this seemed unlikely last night. This means that, if the House on Wednesday or Thursday passes the Eastland-Rankin States' rights plan, the last chance for inclusion of the Federal ballot idea will come when the House amendments are brought back to the Senate for submission to conference.

At that point, Senator LUCAS (Democrat) of Illinois, is expected to make a strong effort to have the Senate reverse its action in rejecting the Federal ballot.

STIMSON EXPLAINS STAND

Secretary Stimson's criticism was centered on a provision in the bill giving priority to

mail containing ballots and voting instruction.

He explained that "it would be difficult to give such priority even in connection with the uniform, lightweight, small-sized Federal ballot to be carried by air in bulk in relatively few shipments under title 1 of the bill. But it is a very different matter to require this priority as to many individual mailings of bulky State balloting material over several weeks or months."

He added that if the mail priority provision for all State balloting material is enacted, it might "seriously curtail or entirely shut off" for considerable periods of time the receipt by soldiers overseas and by families in this country of regular mail.

[From the Chicago Times]

A. F. OF L. DEMANDS "FOOLPROOF" SOLDIER VOTE ACT

MIAMI, FLA., January 21.—The A. F. of L. executive council was on record today with an emphatic declaration for congressional enactment of a law assuring every serviceman abroad an opportunity to vote. The Senate-approved measure which leaves the ballot controls to individual States was condemned to "indefensibly restrictive."

"The laws," said a council statement, "which govern the right to vote are, for the most part, designed to protect the citizens of each State in the free exercise of the ballot. But these same laws in the present war emergency now threaten to deprive millions of American citizens of the opportunity to vote in the national elections this year."

ASK SIMPLIFIED LAW

The statement called for a "simplified and uniform soldier-vote law."

Sick of Jergens and Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from Our Sunday Visitor of recent date come the following articles:

ABUSING THE PUBLIC

The tragedy is, Bill, that the majority of today's commentators and editors are pitifully unrealistic about all this. They're fiddling around with half-truths and halfway solutions (a contradiction in terms, because solutions worthy of the name go all the way). Some of these broadcasters and columnists are way off the beam. Of these, the spuming quidnunc, Walter Winchell (gossip, foaming at the mouth) is the example par excellence.

Commander Winchell is making so many Christians sick of himself and of the propaganda he is ceaselessly trying to engineer that, willy-nilly, he—more than many another—is deepening and sharpening the very anti-Semitism of which he yelps and yaps so boisterously in almost every Sunday night's broadcast.

Let something else be thought about—if only for a split second. For the anti-Christian hate line which United States Naval Officer Winchell is trying to pump into Mr. and Mrs. North and South America week after week, the suffering patient public, the fair-minded normal common people who have America's genuine and long-range good at heart ought to take it out on the sponsors who finance this loud-mouthed egomaniac. The sponsors are Jergen's lotion. As one gentleman, writing from the East last week, very simply says, "We don't have to take this stuff standing up."

WIND-UP

I see my time's up, Bill. I've got to get busy on something else. I'll continue next week with the plain proposition that we've got to be truly realistic and have got to fight our outwardly patriotic but insidiously subversive influences—if we mean what we say when we pray "Lord, give us peace."

WINCHELL THE TERMITE

The point I started to make last week about Winchell and which I want to finish here is simply that his week-after-week "line" of vengeful hate, of extermination of the Nazi and the "Sneakanese" is born of and driven by the same unthinking spirit which propels anti-Semitism. Which shows Winchell to be not the great thinker he much too seriously takes himself to be.

What Winchell deals in mainly, looks for, finds, capitalizes on and broadcasts is dirt. But it is unfortunately dirt that will only heighten the mountain between human beings who must be ultimately brought together in justice and charity instead of being hopelessly and hatefully separated. Winchell's trade has been dirt—dug, made mud, and slung now against one group, then against another, and with a deceitful, deceiving unfair emphasis.

I'll explain this. Not only has this man of the "mike" and (is it?) the Mirror made himself the apostle of hate to Mr. and Mrs. North and South America, he has made himself the apostle of the half-truth—and he glories in it. He does that consciously when he too-too-toots a book exposing the Fascist underground in this country but utterly deemphasizing the equally insidious and probably far more effective Communist underground which would slowly termite the structure of our representative republicanism (loosely called our democracy but "democracy" is a much abused, overworked word).

The Income-Tax Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, are receiving much mail from back home complaining rather bitterly about the present income-tax blanks and the fact that the ordinary average citizen cannot intelligently figure out his own return. Frankly, I do not think that I have a single complaint from any individual as to the amount of taxes he is asked to pay, but he very definitely complains about the fact that the system of figuring out his taxes is so complicated and confusing that it leaves him in a bad frame of mind concerning the money he must pay to Uncle Sam.

These taxpayers are justified in the complaints they make, and I want to know why it is that something cannot immediately be done to clarify and simplify these tax returns. It is either the business of the Congress or the Treasury Department to see that this is done. Furthermore, I honestly believe that the Treasury would in the end be the recipient of more money in dollars and cents if Mr. John Q. Public could easily figure out how much he owed the Government rather than to cause him to run around in circles and end up by working through all kinds of figures which he cannot understand.

In this morning's mail I have a letter from a constituent which sets forth an idea, and I present it as the reaction of an average American taxpayer who is willing to pay his taxes and wants to do so in the most workable and understandable way:

DEAR LES: The income-tax muddle is a mess. May I offer a simple solution? Here it is:

Eliminate Victory tax.
Eliminate surtax.
Eliminate earned-income credit.
Use only one income-tax table, as follows:

	Percent
Tax on the first $2,000	20
Tax on the next $2,000	25
Tax on the next $2,000	29
Tax on the next $2,000	33
Tax on the next $2,000	37
Tax on the next $2,000	41

And so on up the scale.

After going through the cross-word puzzles, jigsaw puzzles, red tape, bunk, baloney, and wasting reams of war-needed paper, my 1943 total tax is $3,361.08.

By using one sheet and the above simple schedule, it would be $3,366.42. There is so little difference, but so much time, trouble, expense, and anti-New Deal cussing saved, that I want you to see what you can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope simplification of the income-tax-return forms will quickly be brought about.

The Good-Neighbor Policy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Snagged by the Record" written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNAGGED BY THE RECORD

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There is no more painful accident than that of getting snagged on a fact. Senator HUGH A. BUTLER (Republican of Nebraska) made a tour of Latin America last year and came back with an impression that the New Deal has flopped in its program to develop a good-neighbor relationship in Latin America.

Senator BUTLER said that the New Deal's mistake had been its attempt to carry out a thoroughly good intention in the usual unimaginative New Deal way—by slathering everybody with bagfuls of cash. As a result

Latin America has been by turns amused, insulted, and disillusioned, all at our expense.

The New Deal idea of good neighborliness in Latin America was to put on a glorified W. P. A. program down there, complete with leaf rakers and traveling movie stars. And that, in Latin America, was poor politics, to say the least.

Senator BUTLER estimated the cost of this experiment, noble in purpose but bad in performance, at $6,000,000,000 for 3 years.

Well, the new dealers naturally went off like a crate of skyrockets. Somebody persuaded venerable KENNETH D. MCKELLAR (Democrat of Tennessee) to answer BUTLER.

So Mr. MCKELLAR denounced Mr. BUTLER as 95 percent wrong in his figures, and went o.. to some fancy name calling on generalities, the net effect of his oration being that BUTLER was a boob.

It now appears tha' Senator MCKELLAR didn't have the last word, after all. Senator BUTLER turned his figures over to a firm of certified public accountants here in Washington of long-established credibility and reliability, James A. Councilor & Co.

Yesterday the Senator gave the Senate a report by the auditors of expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit by the New Deal in Latin America during the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944.

The evidence on which the report was made came from Senator BUTLER, and the countries covered included not only the foreign nations to our south but also the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, possessions of the United States. This was natural enough, as those are Latin American countries even though ours.

The certified total of the commitments, loans, and expenditures for all these, reported James A. Councilor & Co., runs to $6,396,760,501.

You may well have read some of all this elsewhere, but consider again one typical passage of BUTLER'S speech:

"In his first reply to my first report to the Senate the Senator from Tennessee said that in return for $78,000,000 we received 30,000 tons of rubber from the Amazon jungle. Shortly afterward the head of the Rubber Development Corporation testified before the Gillette committee that for the sum we got 24,000 tons of rubber. That is a 6,000-ton discrepancy.

"But when the committee counsel put on pressure he developed that before we spent any of that money before the war we already were getting 16,000 tons.

"So that reduces the net return—to use Mr. Allen's figures—to a net of 8,000 tons.

"But it also seems that when we went into the jungle with the $78,000,000 we entered into an agreement with Brazil whereby it gets the first 10,000 tons we take out, with the result that our net return is wiped out and replaced with a deficit.

"For our $78,000,000 it now seems that we are not getting 24,000 tons net gain. We are getting, in fact, 2,000 tons less than we got before we started.

"Is it any wonder that the truth is hard to get at? Is it any wonder that such an effort is made to see that we do not get at the truth?"

Now it will be interesting to see how Senator MCKELLAR gets off the hook. If he does.

When Senator BUTLER first let fly there was rough shushing.

A freshman in the Senate should keep his mouth shut, and anyhow, criticism of the New Deal is just sabotage of the war effort.

But the Senator turns out to be a durable individual who can double check his figures.

And he has directed us toward the essential point in this affair, by his remark on the difficulty of getting the truth out of this administration.

For 11 years Mr. Roosevelt's assistants have had official custody of the records and files of the United States Government. They have played on statistics as on a piano.

Time and again, they have decided what they wanted to prove and then worked up the facts and figures.

But of late the old hand of mastery has been unsteady. It is, of course, still very difficult for the administration spokesmen to restrain themselves from behaving as high and mighty priests in a sacred grove.

Poor old MCKELLAR, when he sounded off, never stopped once to find out whether he was being handed good stuff or bad. It never used to matter, because the opposition was weak and ill-organized.

But times change, Senator, and wise men change with them. From here on in, you'd better be sure you're right before you tackle an administration critic. He may snag you again with a fact, if you don't.

A Canadian Statesman Frankly Warns Americans Concerning World Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable M. J. Coldwell, member of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, is one of the outstanding statesmen of the North American Continent. He is the leader of the relatively new Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada, a progressive political party, which is rapidly attaining great popularity within the Dominion of Canada. His ideas are entitled to respect. I have been asked by many friends to insert a recent speech he delivered here in Washington, D. C., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Coldwell, in this address, gives his reactions to world trends and points out the strange anomaly of the United States appearing to drift to the right, whereas practically all of the other prominent countries of the world are emphatically trending toward greater liberalism.

But let Mr. Coldwell speak for himself. Here is his address:

ADDRESS BY HON. M. J. COLDWELL, M. P. FOR ROSETOWN-BIGGAR, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA, AND PARLIAMENTARY LEADER OF THE COOPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH FEDERATION OF CANADA, AT THE FRIENDS' MEETING HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16, 1944.

I was very glad indeed to accept the invitation from the League for Industrial Democracy, through Dr. Laidler, to come to Washington to address this gathering today.

Canada and the United States are near and good neighbors, sharing the major portion of a great and rich continent. In the main, we speak the same languages and derive our social and political institutions from the same sources, although there are some striking differences between us. In my country, under the parliamentary system of democratic and responsible government, it seems somewhat easier for a new political movement to gain support and achieve nation-wide influence and power than it appears to be in your country. That was demonstrated, too, in Great Britain during the early years of the present century in the rise of the Labor Party, and several times since, in the success of similar parties in Australia and New Zealand, and more recently in Canada in the movement for which I speak. All these political parties are alike in that they are people's movements accepting, as the basis of their philosophies and programs, the fundamental principles of democratic socialism and they maintain contact with each other. In all these countries before the war there wa a trend toward the social ownership and control of the principal economic functions together with a widespread demand for an extension of social-security measures for the people. In the latter respect New Zealand has made the most striking and beneficial advances, its labor government having been elected and reelected to power with substantial majorities and without interruption at three successive general elections. In spite of the almost universal unpopularity of wartime governments, it was reelected again in the autumn of last year. Australia's Labor Government, too, was reelected last August with an overwhelming majority, and but for the unavoidable coalition in Great Britain, it is certain that the Labor Party would have greatly improved its position and perhaps have carried the country. I mention this to show that Canada, free, independent, and self-governing, is demonstrating her adherence to a well-defined British Commonwealth trend through the rise to nation-wide influence of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. While our nearest English-speaking neighbor, the United States, seems as yet little influenced by a similar trend, the trend to which I referred a moment ago as a British Commonwealth trend being, indeed, a world trend. I believe, however, that the success of the C. C. F. in Canada would encourage the organization of a similar effort in your country.

No one who knows anything about the underground movements in the occupied countries of Europe, or the views of, at least, some of those directing affairs in China or th philosophy of Nehru and the younger congress leaders in India, can doubt that the world-wide trend is in the direction of socialism in varying degrees of development. When this war ends, all the oppressed peoples will demand the right to choose their own democratic leaders and to determine their own destinies. We shall be wise if we recognize that now and plan accordingly. Our hope, too, is that the association of Russia with the western democracies in war will make Russia more democratic politically and the western democracies more socialistic economically. If such a synthesis can be realized, orderly, democratic and rapid social and economic advances can be made universally. Much, too, may I add, depends upon the extent to which your great country can find the ways and means of participating in the world-wide trend. For this is no ordinary war fought to maintain empires or to extend commercial domination. It is in very truth a phase, perhaps a final phase, in a world-wide revolution, as profound in its consequences as the great upheaval in Europe which marked the break-down of feudalism and the rise of modern capitalism. No one who fails to understand this truth can appreciate the significance of the world-shaking events in which we are engulfed. It is fitting, therefore, that progressive people should forge the political instruments necessary to give effect to new ideas, new policies, and new programs, to meet the needs of a new social and economic age.

Canada is a young country. As, in the United States, opportunities for the progressive expansion of capitalist enterprise lasted longer than in most European countries. Right up to the First World War and indeed until 1929, our economy responded moderately well to the unplanned methods of a

so-called private enterprise. It was still possible for a few to rise from poverty to comparative wealth. This retarded the growth of progressive movements although there were warning voices crying in the wilderness. The experiences of the great war, giving a demonstration of what might be done through even rough-and-ready planning for a national purpose, caused a substantial growth in the number of Canadians who looked toward various Socialist solutions as means to the achievement of social progress. Our western farmers began to demand publicly controlled marketing organizations and, eventually organized great producers' cooperatives which have met with considerable success and are now being paralleled by substantial consumer cooperative societies. Labor, too, has found that unorganized it was at the mercy of powerful corporations and capitalistic enterprises. Local labor and farmer's political associations came into existence here and there and had temporary successes, but the crash of 1929 found the Nation in every way unprepared to meet it.

Meantime, in Parliament, a small but very able group of western farmers had been cooperating with a smaller labor group. In 1932, under the chairmanship of the late J. S. Woodsworth, M. P., they met to consider ways and means of extending throughout the country the cooperation they had found possible and useful in Parliament.

Thus it was that in August 1932 representatives of a number of labor and farmer political groups met to consider united action, and the C. C. F. was born. The name "Cooperative Commonwealth Federation" was adopted because it accurately portrayed the aims of the movement. The name "Labour Party" seemed too exclusive on account of the dominant role played by the working farmers; "Farmer-Labour" was rejected because it seemed to exclude the small but influential group of middle-class intellectuals and businessmen who were destined to give such valuable aid to the new party. Today the name and the initials "C. C. F." are a distinct asset to us.

At the outset there were unavoidable divisions of opinion. These brought joy to our opponents, but their rejoicing was shortlived for, quite soon, a real core of agreement was reached. The unity which emerged from a recognition of differences at the outset resulted in a real dynamic unity instead of a make-believe purely artificial front. As a consequence, the political program of the C. C. F. was formulated not by doctrinaire theory but out of the needs of the Canadian people. The result was a native democratic people's program and a political movement controlled and financed by the people.

I will not recount the early struggles of the movement, the self-sacrifice and missionary spirit that went into it. On the one hand, we were denounced by a powerful capitalist press as Communists in disguise, while on the other hand the Communist Party loudly denounced us in terms of which they are past masters. But we have veered neither in one direction nor the other. Today the Communists who sought to destroy us because we are democratic and opposed to a totalitarian dictatorship have formed a new party which they call Labor-Progressive and have sought to affiliate with us. But, consistently, our annual conventions, and recently our party gatherings, have unanimously and decisively rejected any and every form of cooperation with them. Between us there is more than one fundamental difference. We believe, therefore, that any attempt to unite groups that differ fundamentally can only bring disaster to democratic movements. That, I think, has been demonstrated many times in countries where Communist Parties have succeeded in boring from within. Their contortions before and during this war have been amazing. The latest statement of Earl Browder at the Madisan Square Garden last Tuesday night is an example of Communist inconsistency. He is reported to have said that the party will abstain from nominating political candidates and will cooperate with the so-called free enterprise system. I believe that much of our success throughout Canada is due to the forthrightness of our statements and the consistency of our attitudes.

During the winter of 1932–33 the provisional council, assisted by leading members of a university group known as the League for Social Reconstruction, drafted a party manifesto based on the provisional program adopted a year earlier. This is known as the Regina manifesto, which was characterized by an outstanding British commonwealth statesman as the finest modern political document in the English language. The document expressed in the clearest terms our aim and purpose. It declared that the C. C. F. is a federation of organizations whose purpose is the establishment in Canada of a cooperative commonwealth in which the principle, regulating production, distribution, and exchange, will be the supplying of human needs and not the making of profit.

Our aim, then, is to replace the present capitalist system with its injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which exploitation of one group by another will be eliminated and in which economic planning for abundance will supersede unregulated private enterprise. The social order which we desire is not one in which individuality will be crushed by regimentation, but one in which the proper collective organization of our economy will make possible a greater opportunity for individual initiative, more leisure, and a richer life for our citizens. We believe firmly that this can be evolved through appropriate political action through the election of a government inspired by these ideals and supported by a majority of the people. We do not believe in change by violence.

In Canada both the old parties, Conservative and Liberal, have been and are merely instruments of capitalist interests which finance their campaigns and control their policies. Their purpose is to divide the people and serve the economic interests that control them. The C. C. F. has not only exposed this unreality but in some Provinces and urban centers has forced them to unite against us. In just over 10 years we have become the major political issue in our country. We are today the official opposition in three of our Provincial legislatures including that of largest Province, Ontario. Here in this industrial Province labor was convinced by bitter experience and by the activities of the C. C. F. parliamentary group that direct political action was essential. Thus, last year, many local labor unions decided to affiliate with us. Then, last September, the Canadian Congress of Labor recommended its local unions to affiliate with us. Unfortunately, inadequate funds prevented our taking full advantage of this favorable situation, and our opponents are amply financed by the corporations, some of which are subsidiaries of parent companies in your country. Significant, too, is the fact that had the civilians voted in Ontario last August in the same proportions as the soldiers who were permitted to vote in Canada, the C. C. F. would have been the government of Ontario. In a recent byelection at Red Deer, Alberta, the three military polls all gave majorities to our candidates. Word reaching me from overseas reports great gains in strength for the C. C. F. among all the armed forces. Perhaps I should say that in our military camps overseas, as in the British Army, discussion of current political and economic matters is widespread.

Many of our men have made up their minds as to what they are fighting for as well as what they are fighting against. Many of them have a firm determination that they will not return again to the chaos and suffering of the pre-war years. Had provision been made for the taking of the soldiers' vote overseas, particularly in Britain, the recent elections held in Canada would have been more conclusively C. C. F. Should a general election for Parliament occur this year, we anticipate a heavy military vote in our favor. Gallup polls have shown our strength throughout the country. While there is a variation of a few points from time to time, a recent poll gave us a larger percentage of the popular following in Canada than any other party. In other words, it is not beyond a possibility, if not a probability, that the general election, due within 15 months at the most, will put us in power in Canada, and what is more we are preparing plans to meet such a national challenge. Editorials in the daily, weekly, and financial press bitterly attacking us, are potent evidence that the vested interests are thoroughly alarmed at the prospect. Because this is so obvious the common man in greater numbers join our ranks. Parties, like individuals, are known the company they keep. Only big business is clamoring for a return to what they are pleased to miscall "free enterprise." We know that planning production for a national purpose, war, has enabled us to treble our national income at a time when hundreds of thousands of our ablest young men and women are in the armed forces and out of actual economic production. Before the war thousands of these young men rode the rods while thousands of Canadians were on relief. Our Government rejected every demand for adequate amelioration on the plea that money was not available. While we all support the huge expenditures for war and destruction, we aver that a properly planned economic structure would enable us to provide opportunities for peacetime production and the distribution of goods and services.

And Canada is a country rich in resources, many of which have been scarcely tapped. True, there has been colossal waste in the exploitation of our forests, our natural gas, and some other resources. The C. C. F. does not intend to allow any corporation, native or foreign, to rob our nation or posterity. Only national planning, however, can safeguard and develop our great heritage. For much of it is already controlled by powerful private and monopolistic corporations. This is particularly true of oil, nickel, chemicals, and aluminum, but public opinion has forced governments to establish publicly owned corporations to operate national air and radio services, although sections of the press and private interests seek constantly to undermine them.

The C. C. F., however, does not believe that everything should be owned and operated by the state. Indeed, we distinguish, clearly, between two kinds of property: that upon which the life and general welfare of the community depends and which ought to be socially owned, and that which ministers to the welfare of the individual and family, and does not interfere with the general economic plan, which ought to be individually owned. Thus we say that banks, investment trusts, Nation-wide monopolistic enterprises like oil, packing plants, transportation, should be nationally owned, while others like telephone, hydroelectric power might be provincially owned. Others again ought to be municipal enterprises, while many industries and distributive services should be cooperatively owned. Thus it is that there are fields where private enterprise could perform a useful function. What these fields should be can, I think, be readily decided. If private business does not exploit the public or is not likely to become a dangerous vested interest, or is being efficiently operated under proper working conditions and will play its part in assisting the national economic plan, there is no reason why its ownership and operation should not continue in private hands. In other words, we do not intend to socialize merely for the sake of socializing, but in order to secure efficiency and the greater satisfaction of social needs. For example,

unlike Britain, land is not a monopoly in our country nor have we developed large-scale corporation farming such as you have in some parts of the Union; hence we believe that our agriculture ought to be carried on on the basis of the personal ownership of the family farm. So we place security of tenure for the farmer in the forefront of our program and intend to legislate to prevent his dispossession and the rise of a tenant farmer problem due to the concentration of lands in the possession of mortgage trusts and financial or other corporations.

As can be readily understood from what I have said, we believe that political democracy must be accompanied by economic democracy if freedom is to be real. Thus we want to see technicians, labor, and so on, adequately represented on all our industrial planning boards with all the accompanying rights to organize collectively and to establish industrial self-government through labor management committees. In addition, there must be a legal code guaranteeing protection against the hazards of illness, old age, and so on. In other words, proper social security for the people.

So far I have dealt with domestic issues. This war more than the last has made Canada conscious of her place and obligations as a member of the community of nations. For reasons I mentioned at the outset of this address, the C. C. F. believes in maintaining close cooperation with the peoples of the British Commonwealth. We are not imperialists. We want to cooperate with progressive people everywhere in ending exploitation and in raising the standards of life throughout the world. We will support every policy which will enable the people of India and the colored races everywhere to attain their rightful places as free men and equal before God and man. This means, of course, that in the community of nations we will lend our aid to the elimination of exploitation everywhere. Only a free and economically secure world can be a peaceful world. No world and no nation can be secure as long as any part of it is denied the right to live in dignity and freedom.

It follows that we are firmly of the opinion that national reconstruction and progress in Canada can only attain its full significance when it becomes a part of world order in which all peoples will have the opportunity for an abundant and creative life. Peace, let us remember, is not only the absence of war. To endure, it must be based on universal security and be rooted in economic, political, and cultural equality. In such a world education must be widespread and free. It should be the privilege of the educated to devise ways and means of making possible the preparation of people everywhere to assume the rights and obligations of full democratic citizenship.

Canada, therefore, desires the closest relationship with the United States and with the nations of the British Commonwealth, for we have a common cultural heritage. But she also desires to assist in the formulation of plans for a new world association of nations. The C. C. F. would like to see our country join the Pan-American Union as one regional organization of nations making for the larger world unity and also because we believe that progressive forces are stirring among large masses of our Latin-American neighbors. Progress like peace is indivisable and we can find mutual assistance in cooperation. We desire, then, to assist in building a world-wide association of nations so that we may achieve international justice and a permanent system of collective security; membership in which would be open to all nations willing to accept its obligations and submit to its authority. We shall not be satisfied, however, with any organization which might be dominated by three or four great powers. As a small nation which has made a substantial contribution to the defeat of the aggressors, Canada on behalf of herself and other smaller powers seeks the recognition that is properly hers and theirs.

I do not propose to outline in any detail what our country has done. True, had we organized thoroughly our economic and other resources when war broke out, had we taken a firm stand against the control of our economy by the representatives of big business, we could have done much better.

The London Economist, in dealing with our huge war budget and high taxation on May 23 last, said, "It is right that due honor should be paid to the realities of steel and muscle behind these monetary figures. If Canada is prevented by the smallness of her population from taking rank with the big powers, she has in the last 3 years made a place for herself in a category all of her own. Relative to her resources, her effort is second to none."

Looking at what our Nation has done in war, Canadians are confident they can do as well in peace, provided that the world moves forward, too. My plea, therefore, to this audience, including as it does, many leaders of progressive thought in this, the Capital City of the richest country in the world, is to find the ways and means to join with and indeed lead the democratic and progressive forces of the world. It seems to me that if you fail in this the United States, perchance North America, may become the lonely, isolated, tariff-barricaded, and last remaining citadel of an outworn economic system, and the world will inevitably drift toward another and a more terrible world war. In 1776 you led the progressive forces of mankind. Because of it you had the sympathy and warm support of many across the seas. From your example then sprang the political revolutions in France, Great Britain, and in many other lands. Now, millions of workers, farmers, peasants, and plain people seek to make real the political democracy we have by achieving the economic democracy we lack, for, unless mankind achieves both, the fight for the "four freedoms" will have been in vain.

Things To Be Avoided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on the editorial page of yesterday's New York Times there appeared a letter dated Washington, January 19, 1944, written by Prof. Herbert Wright, who is professor of international law at Catholic University. The letter, entitled "Things To Be Avoided," deals with a most important subject, and is so factual, informational, and meritorious that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINGS TO BE AVOIDED—PROCEEDINGS OF PARIS CONFERENCE URGED FOR STUDY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In a letter published in the Times of January 16 John B. Elliott makes several inaccurate statements in commenting on an earlier article by Edwin L. James. Because such statements are rather frequently made and not always challenged it may serve some useful purpose to indicate them.

Mr. Elliott says: "Nearly two-thirds of the Senate were for unconditional ratification of the Treaty of Versailles." On November 19, 1919, Senator Underwood offered a resolution of unconditional ratification, which was rejected by 38 yeas to 53 nays. In other words, only 41.8 percent of the 91 Senators who voted were in favor of ratification without reservation, not even a majority, much less "nearly two-thirds." All of the 14 reservations had previously been adopted singly by votes ranging from 54½ to 62½ percent, and what Mr. Elliott probably had in mind was that if the 41 Senators who favored unconditional ratification had joined with the 39 Senators who favored ratification with reservations the Lodge resolution of ratification with reservations previously voted on would have carried 80 to 14, instead of being defeated, 39 to 55.

OBSERVERS IMPORTANT

Mr. Elliott says: "The League, due mainly to the absence of the United States from its membership, was proving a disappointment to its entire membership and verging toward a failure." Of course, this blaming of the United States for the failure of the League is a purely gratuitous assertion, as is also the slurring reason alleged for our Government sending official observers to Geneva to attend sessions of the League—namely, "as a sort of apologetic action for not having accepted membership." The record will show that observers were sent for the purpose of enabling the United States to cooperate with the League in all appropriate matters, not a grudging "recognition that the League and its work were vastly important."

The record will also show that on two very important occasions of vital interest to world peace the United States, by the Stimson note of January 7, 1932, to China and Japan concerning Manchuria, and by President Roosevelt's proclamation of October 5, 1935, laying down an embargo on arms and munitions to Italy and Ethiopia, took stronger action than might have been entailed by membership in the League, only to be left, as it were, out on a limb holding the bag, by the League itself. Is it fair to say, then, that if the United States had been a member "all might well have been different?" It would be fairer if Mr. Elliott could adduce some instance in which the support of the United States for some important activity of the League had been desired and was refused.

NOT A PLAY UPON WORDS

Nor can the inclusion of an association of nations in the national platform of the Republican Party be cavalierly brushed aside as a mere play on words. A general association of nations, based upon the broad principles of justice contained in President Wilson's Fourteen Points of January 8, 1918, is a far cry from the League of Nations actually created by the Covenant. This provided for a closed, armed alliance of the Allied Powers (1) to maintain the status quo of the Paris peace treaties and (2) to further the foreign policies of France and Great Britain.

This is evident from a number of considerations. First, the Central Powers and nations not then on friendly terms with the United States were barred from original membership in the League. Second, a nation not mentioned in the annex to the Covenant was allowed to be admitted to the League only upon (1) the agreement of two-thirds of the assembly, (2) the giving of "effective guaranties of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations," and (3) the acceptance of regulations prescribed by the League for its armaments. No such conditions were exacted of original members.

That this closed alliance was intended to control the world on the basis of the status quo of the peace terms is indicated by article X of the Covenant, which provided for the preservation of the territorial integrity of all members of the League, and by article XI, which provided that "any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of

the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League," the League being empowered to take appropriate action in the contingency.

The objections of the people's representatives in the Senate, therefore, were not so much to a free association of nations as to the particular kind of association they were asked to endorse. This is evident in the vote on the reservations when the Treaty of Versailles was being considered by the Senate for the second time in March 1920.

VOTE ON RESERVATIONS

On reservations 1 (withdrawal from League by concurrent resolution), 2 (exclusive power of Congress to authorize armed forces for guaranty of territorial integrity under article X), 3 (power of Congress to pass on acceptance of mandates), 4 (reservation of decision on domestic questions), 5 (exclusive interpretation of Monroe Doctrine), 6 (nonagreement with provisions concerning Shantung), 7 (approval of Senate required for appointment of American representatives in the League), and 14 (nonagreement with voting power of self-government dominions), the vote was well over two-thirds, ranging from 68 percent on No. 2 to 94 percent on No. 3, while the vote on all of the remaining reservations, except No. 15, ranged from 61 to 65 percent, nearly two-thirds.

No. 15, referring to sympathy for Ireland, did not figure in the first consideration of the treaty and was adopted in the second consideration by the scant majority of 38 to 36.

The resolution of ratification with reservations was put to the vote the second time on March 19, 1920, and received 49 yeas to 35 nays, a 58 percent majority, but not quite two-thirds. Of the 39 Senators who were supposed to favor unconditional ratification, 22 voted in the negative. Had only 7 more of these joined with their 17 colleagues and with the 32 who favored ratification with reservations the resolution of ratification with reservations would have carried by the necessary two-thirds, while if all 22 had switched it would have carried 71 to 13, or 84 percent. To use an expression of Mr. Elliott, "the facts are indisputable."

How far the delegates of the United States to the Paris Conference of 1919 were responsible for some of the ineptitudes, to use a euphemistic expression, of the Paris peace treaties will be evident from a persual of the proceedings of the Paris Peace Conference now being published by the Department of State, four volumes of which have already appeared. A study of these authoritative documents will not only furnish the means for more accurately appraising the blame, if that be considered profitable, but what is far more important, will afford an opportunity for discovering the mistakes to be avoided in the negotiations following the present war.

HERBERT WRIGHT.

WASHINGTON, *January 19, 1944.*

New Slogan, New Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, a correspondent has sent me a copy of a letter addressed to the Portland (Oreg.) Journal entitled "New Slogan, New Name." I ask unanimous consent to have the letter published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SLOGAN, NEW NAME

SILVERTON, *January 11.*

To the EDITOR:

It appears that even the administration has had enough of the New Deal and asks us to bury it, forget it, and find a slogan that better describes present conditions and performance. Inasmuch as the terms, "New Deal" and "Democratic Party" are now synonymous, this same reasoning would call for a new name for the Democratic Party—a name that also fits present performance. I submit for this new party name, "Bureaucratic Party," and the following as an accurate and candid slogan for this Bureaucratic Party: "We preach (before election) the people rule; we practice (after election) the bureaucrats rule."

ALVIN C. DICKOVER.

Necessity for U. N. R. R. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we will be called upon sometime today or tomorrow to determine by our vote whether or not we will participate in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration proposed in the pending bill, House Joint Resolution 192, and thereby cooperate with the United Nations, our allies in this global war, in the relief of the millions of human beings who are, and will be, left in the wake of this tragic war.

The Allied Nations have agreed upon the program now before us, and our action on this measure will make known to them and the other nations of the world our desire and intention to cooperate in a program to preserve the peace of the world in the years to come. We failed to do this at the end of World War No. 1, and in the opinion of many thinking people, this World War No. 2 and our participation in it are the result of our failure to participate in the program for world peace presented to us at that time.

A few months ago this House adopted the Fulbright resolution which announced to the world the policy of this Nation to cooperate in an international program to preserve the peace of the world and prevent future wars. That resolution had the approval of people of this Nation and of our soldiers on every fighting front. This is the first opportunity the House of Representatives will have to take a step to implement that resolution. We cannot afford to pause or take a backward step at this time, but must reveal to our allies in this war our sincere desire to cooperate with them in relieving the misery, suffering, and distress of people who are in many cases the unwilling victims of this war.

The necessity for this program is very tersely stated in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post today, which I have obtained leave to insert herein, and which is as follows:

U. N. R. R. A.

The first practical test of America's willingness to cooperate with other nations in the solution of post-war problems is now before Congress. Both House and Senate have pledged such cooperation in a solemn resolution. The opportunity to implement it with concrete action is now at hand in the form of an authorization to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Our response to this opportunity will signal our intentions to all the world. It is greatly to be hoped that Congress will respond generously and with an impressive majority.

The resolution authorizing American participation in U. N. R. R. A. was endorsed unanimously by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It provides for a contribution of $1,350,000,000 by the United States to be used, along with the contributions of other governments, for relief of the millions of men, women, and children uprooted and impoverished by the war. It is estimated that the total relief job will cost in the neighborhood of $20,000,000,000, 90 percent of which will be paid for by the liberated countries themselves. But the initial expenses are to be met by the 44 members of U. N. R. R. A., about half being allotted to the United States because our national income is now greater than that of all the other member countries combined. The plan is to have each member government eventually contribute approximately 1 percent of its national income.

In negotiating with foreign representatives over the nature of the U. N. R. R. A. arrangement, the State Department kept in constant touch with members of both the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees. The procedure was exemplary for negotiation of international agreements, though, as we said at the time, the Administration would have been better advised to include Congress in the American delegation at Atlantic City. However, this is no treaty. It is therefore clearly not a subject for Senate ratification. It is an Executive agreement, entered into with a continuing knowledge of the proposals on the part of congressional leaders. Congress is now simply asked to endorse an arrangement in the making of which its own representatives have been kept informed. The pattern should be applicable to other international agreements of a similar nature which this country will be obliged to enter into after the war.

Opposition to U. N. R. R. A. can come only from those who oppose any sort of international cooperation. Their objection is not to the means which have been devised, but to the purpose. They should be voted down in an incontrovertible demonstration of this country's will to play its full responsible part in the world society of the future. As the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee summed up the issue, the U. N. R. R. A. is a forward step, carrying toward the peace the teamwork we have achieved in war. We can make progress toward cooperation only by cooperating. It is time for Congress to take real steps in this direction.

The Acoustics of the Senate Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from a Washington resident commenting on the acoustics of the Senate Chamber, which was published in the Washington Star a few days ago.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During a recent visit to the Senate I wondered whether the Members knew what was going on.

Am I the first to notice that the voice of the Senator on the floor is not completely audible, or am I partly deaf?

I was seated in the gallery about 20 feet from a Senator who was speaking. Though I did catch some words I was unable to catch enough of them to complete his ideas.

In order to keep every Senator in the Chamber aware of every word expressed during the sessions, may I suggest that a page boy connect a microphone to the desk of the Senator who is about to speak?

WASHINGTON RESIDENT.

WASHINGTON, *January 14.*

A Roast in Every Pot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, a correspondent has sent me an editorial entitled "A Roast in Every Pot," which appeared in the Portland Oregonian on January 19 last. I ask permission to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A ROAST IN EVERY POT

Mr. Roosevelt, in addressing Congress the past week, asked for appropriations of $100,000,000,000 required for prosecution of the war. This would bring to $400,000,000,000 the military-naval sums set aside by this country since Dunkerque, in 1940.

At the same time, though in more general terms, the President outlined certain social-security objectives designed to achieve, at least for our own people, the freedom from want promised the people of the world by the Atlantic Charter.

There are lucid moments in which one dislikes the paradox of all this. Granted that we will work and fight harder if there is general acceptance of the idea that the war automatically means the dawn of a better day. However, we owe some loyalty to sanity, and we owe some loyalty to the sons and daughters in the services. The fact is that the United States is spending its substance far beyond anything ever conceived in the past, and at the same time our Government is carrying on a propaganda front where the promise is made that both our own people and, ultimately the rest of mankind, will be insured against sickness, poverty, and mischance. The reality is that even in peacetime, and before these terrific expenditures, the United States was in confusion, and under this same administration, over the problem of attaining a system under which those capable of work and willing to work could have jobs, and under which the incompetent and the sick could at least count upon survival.

Now we have stepped out and promised for humanity the permanent solution which we never achieved for ourselves, and at a time when we have been forced to place a debt of approximately $2,000 upon every man, woman, and child in the United States in order to prosecute the war. (One guess is as good as another as to what the debt will be before the conflict is over.)

Personally we are convinced that the approach to this war has been wrong. Today the feeling of the world is that the United States should cast the balance in the fighting, through its manpower but more specifically through its economic power. And that after this is accomplished, the United States still has the duty of rescuing the world from want. That is the conclusion from the Atlantic Charter, which was our baby, and it is the conclusion from the consistent attitude of our Government. The world has accepted it eagerly.

It need not have been this way. We fail to see why the United States should have got itself into a psychological position where it will receive little credit for casting the balance in the war, no matter how deeply it plunges into debt or how recklessly it depletes its resources or how much of its young manhood is sacrificed. The United States itself, through its Government, has encouraged the world to feel that all this will be nothing, and that the real test of our responsibility will come after the fighting stops. Impoverished ourselves to the extent of at least $400,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, we will be expected to save the rest of humanity from poverty. Making up one-fifteenth of the population of the earth, we are expected not only to remove the other fourteen-fifteenths from under the heel of the dictator, but by some magic to provide them with abundance.

No exception is taken here to whatever commitments seem logical, after the war, to the maintenance of world peace. That is a different matter, in large part a political matter. The United States should take its place in whatever world organization is formed, and should be determined to make that organization work. But it is on the economic side more than on this political side that the Roosevelt administration really has made its commitments. And why we cannot understand. Russia has not had to promise mankind freedom from want. It is enough that Russia barred the conquerer with the bloody breasts of her people. Britain did not have to promise mankind an end to poverty, at least until Mr. Roosevelt came along. It was enough that the British people stood dying but unflinching between Nazi Europe and victory. But when the United States entered the conflict, it could not be satisfied with the idea that it was restoring freedom to mankind, and that when the job was done mankind would owe it to the United States not to get itself into that kind of a jam again. We had to promise a rolled roast in every pot. Does that make sense, since we probably cannot deliver?

Ballots for Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, within the new few days the House will consider and take action on several proposals now pending before the Congress the purpose of each of which is to permit those who are now in the service of the United States throughout the world to vote in the 1944 primaries and election. I am sure that every Member of the Congress wants to enact the law that will extend the right of exercising the franchise to the greatest number of our service people. It is just a question of the type of law that will come nearest of accomplishment.

The Rules Committee has specifically provided that the bill recommended by a majority of the Committee on Elections, also that a bill recommended by a minority of the same committee, be given consideration with privilege on the part of the House to carry, defeat, amend, or change either bill in accordance with the views of a majority of the Members. Nothing can be fairer. The House can work its will without let or hindrance and it is to be hoped that emotion, prejudice, and partisanship yield to common sense and reason during the debate and voting in the House.

I am this day in receipt of an editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram which is worthy of consideration because of its approach to this controversial question. The editorial is as follows:

BALLOTS FOR OVERSEAS

The trouble with most of the proposals advanced to enable members of the armed forces to vote in wartime is that the proponents overlook the controlling fact that there is a war on. The successful prosecution of the war has to come first, even ahead of the voting franchise. But the politicians are ignoring this and are loudly proclaiming their intent to see that every soldier can vote. They are trying to do this through the enactment of a Federal law when they know very well that the Constitution gives the Federal Government no authority over voting but reserves that authority to the States.

By doing this they are encouraging the millions of men overseas to believe that every one of them is going to be able to vote. As a practical matter this cannot be done. Only registered voters can vote legally, and State laws control registration. There can be no doubt that large numbers of potential voters among our forces overseas are not legally registered. Some may never have registered at all, and the registrations of others may have lapsed. But the loose talk heard in Washington is leading these servicemen to believe that Congress can and will give every one of them the chance to vote next November. And also that they will be able to vote just as though they were home.

Now, Congress can't do that. But it can provide the means for a very large proportion of the men to vote if it will only simplify matters. And it should display some speed about doing that. The election is next November, not 2 years from now. The ballot blanks will have to be put in the hands of the soldiers and then they must be returned to local election boards within the 48 States for checking and counting by next November 7. Each absent voter's ballot will have to be checked against registration lists in a city or a township, for that is where the registration lists are. There is no such thing as a voters' registration list for an entire State.

And as a practical matter, these overseas ballots will probably have to be confined to choices for President and Congressmen. To include State and county offices would require 48 service ballot blanks, one for each State. To ask the Army and Navy to distribute them, collect them, and mail them back and meanwhile fight a war is asking the impossible. The Army and Navy have

said that they can handle the voting of a simplified ballot but not the voting of 48 State ballots.

Such a simplified ballot could be handled on a V-mail form, making possible and practical the transportation of them to and from overseas by air mail. At the bottom of a perforated strip could be a space for the soldier to sign his name, his home address, and his registration place. This could be torn off by the soldier's home election board or other election official checking the ballot's validity. Tearing it off would assure the secrecy of the ballot.

These ballots could be printed and sent on their way overseas soon after the national conventions. Even then there would not be too much time to assure that they are distributed, voted, and sent back to the proper local election officials in this country.

Substantially, this is the voting procedure contemplated by substitute bills that have been approved by the House and Senate elections committees. It is a ballot on Federal offices. It thus is a restricted ballot, but it is better than none at all. There is no apparent infringement of State rights in the measure; the ballot of every man would have to meet the test of the laws of his State. There seems to be a strong possibility that the legislation will be adopted.

The MacArthur Lock Does Its Part in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1943, the new MacArthur lock was officially opened at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. It was hailed as one of the outstanding construction achievements of all time and will ever stand as a distinct contribution to the drive, the energy and the efficiency of the United States Army Engineer Corps and the construction contractors, the Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Co. That new lock was built in the phenomenally short time of approximately 13 months at a cost of $14,000,000. Concrete was poured and steel was laid in place throughout a most severe winter in which the temperature frequently dropped below 20 below zero, and a winter in which Sault Ste. Marie was hampered by unusually heavy snowfalls.

In accordance with the resolution introduced by myself, this new lock was named after the hero of Bataan and the present hero of the southwest Pacific—himself a former Army engineer officer—Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The president of the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., the principal contractor, and one who was in large measure responsible for this marvelous engineering and construction accomplishment, is a former Chief of the United States Army Engineers, Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Markham.

In the 1943 Great Lakes navigation season, the Soo Locks in general did not break the previous record because of the fact that Great Lakes traffic was hampered by one of the latest openings on record, and the Great Lakes maritime trade was seriously handicapped by an extended stretch of the most diabolical spring weather encountered in many years. There were many very serious accidents in those spring days and many more delays occasioned by foul weather. A full month at least was lost out of the customary 8 months' navigation season.

Nevertheless, tonnage records established through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie during the 1943 navigation season are remarkable in themselves, and it is gratifying to know that the MacArthur Lock played its full part in the achievements of these records. It has been widely proclaimed as a structure worthy of its illustrious name, as proven by the following article from the Sault Evening News of December 31 last:

MAC ARTHUR LOCK GETS OFFICIAL APPROBATION FOR ITS PART IN WAR—LESS ORE HANDLED THAN LAST YEAR BUT IN OTHER RESPECTS SEASON TERMED "MIRACULOUS"; 28 PERCENT MORE WHEAT, 76 PERCENT MORE IN OTHER GRAINS AND 21 PERCENT MORE IN SOFT COAL PASS THROUGH WATERWAY

The great new MacArthur lock, one of America's 1943 production miracles, received official approbation today for its part in feeding the war-vital steel mills to keep arms output at high speed.

In the first formal report on the new lock's contribution to the speeding of iron ore through the Sault canal of the Great Lakes, the United States Army Engineers' office at Detroit emphasized the magnitude of shipments in the face of weather handicaps

The MacArthur lock, named in honor of the American general, was built at a cost of approximately $14,000,000 in 13 months and was acclaimed an engineering masterpiece. It operates in conjunction with four older locks on the canal.

A month shorter than the 1942 season with the weather tying up ships in the spring, the shipping season just completed nevertheless sent only 9 percent less iron ore through the Sault, the Engineers' office reported.

The total was 85,000,000 tons. This, said Lt. Col. Allison Miller, district engineer, was "enough to satisfy Pittsburgh steel mills' winter production." He pointed out that the government also had decided to increase grain shipments at the expense of ore.

Commenting that lake shippers have called the 1943 season "miraculous," Lt. Col. Allison Miller added that the season was "history making." He said 28 percent more wheat, 76 percent more in other grains and 21 percent more soft coal passed through the locks compared to 1942.

Voting by Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith for the RECORD an editorial comment from the Plainfield Courier-News, of Plainfield, N. J., which commends the suggestion of Mr. Roger F. Murray that members of the armed forces be permitted to appoint a proxy to cast their votes in the forthcoming primary and general elections and that the details of forwarding the necessary ballots and powers of attorney be handled by members of the soldiers' families.

To me this seems to be a simple and expedient way of handling the problem. Because of the constant contact which members of their families have with those in the service, Mr. Murray's suggestion has much merit. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the committee in charge of this legislation and Members of the House.

Mr. Murray is an outstanding citizen of Plainfield, N. J. He has had some experience as a legislator, having served two terms in the New Jersey Assembly, and has given much time as a private citizen toward the solution of public questions.

The editorial follows:

VOTING BY PROXY

The plan to let the men and women in our armed forces vote by proxy, advanced by Roger F. Murray, a Plainfielder who served two terms in the New Jersey Assembly, has much which should commend it for serious consideration by those who are trying to decide upon the best way to poll the absentee soldier vote.

Word from Washington is to the effect that Congress may leave the matter in the hands of the several States and that printed ballots of some kind will be favored. The proxy idea eliminates the expense of printing and mailing the sample and official primary and election ballots. It also does away with the work incident to mailing these ballots.

Mr. Murray's idea is to have voting proxy forms printed which may be obtained by members of the immediate family of those in the service. These forms would be mailed by the relatives to the absentee voters who would properly fill them out and mail them back, designating one individual—or possibly an alternate, also—who will have the power to cast a ballot for the person in the armed forces. A separate record of the soldier votes would be kept in each election district and only those having the official proxy forms, properly filled out, would be permitted to vote for the absentee.

There may be some flaws in this plan, but if there are, they have not been brought out as yet. It is doubtful whether any of the absentee soldier voting plans will be perfect. This scheme sounds about as simple and foolproof as possible, and it should not be expensive to put into operation.

Why wouldn't it be a good idea for the Union County delegation in the legislature and our Representatives in Congress to study this plan of Mr. Murray and, if found to be workable, place it before the respective lawmaking bodies for their consideration?

The local resident may have the solution to a problem which has stumped many of the country's best minds.

The Right of Our Soldiers To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country believe that the

men and women in our armed forces should have the right to vote and that it is the duty of this Congress to pass the necessary legislation to give them this right without delay and unnecessary prolonged debate.

This very important matter has already been delayed too long, and if there is further delay these boys may not get the right to vote at the coming election.

We all know that the right of a people to vote, to have a voice in the operation of a government under which they live, is one of the things, if not the most important thing, our boys are fighting for on every battle front in this war. Most of these boys did not volunteer, but were called to serve their country in the hour of peril and great need. In responding to this call to duty they have willingly made many sacrifices even to the point of giving their lives for the safety of our Nation and its people. However, they did not give up all of their rights as citizens because they are now engaged in the highest service they can render their country.

The right to vote is not inconsistent with their military duties and is not a right which they gave up when they responded to their country's call.

Over the Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery, near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, there appears this inscription: "When we assumed the soldier we did not lay aside the citizen." That is the way the people of this country feel about their sons and daughters who are now serving their country, and I feel sure that our men and women in the armed services feel the same way.

I am glad to say that the people in Missouri are deeply interested in seeing that our boys are given the right to vote. In today's mail I received a copy of a resolution adopted by the Constitutional Convention of Missouri now in session at Jefferson City, which is as follows:

Substitute for Resolution 53

Whereas it appears that many of the citizens of this State are in the armed forces of the United States, engaged in a struggle for the preservation of our institutions and of our way of life; and

Whereas by reason of their absence from the State, they will be deprived of the right to vote in the forthcoming elections unless and until adequate and necessary laws are enacted as will provide the means and methods for their exercise of suffrage; and

Whereas, under the present State and Federal laws it is evident that unless adequate provision is made by the State of Missouri and the Federal Government to get ballots in the hands of our qualified electors who are now in the armed forces of our Nation and serving outside of the United States, as well as those within the territorial limits of this country that their rights of suffrage will be denied them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of this constitutional convention, that the Congress of the United States and the Governor of the State of Missouri be petitioned to exert every lawful effort to have adequate laws passed to effectively permit each and every qualified voter in the armed forces of this country, wherever situated, to exercise their full right of suffrage and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from this State and to His Excellency, the Honorable Forrest C. Donnell, Governor of Missouri.

High Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "High Finance" published in the Washington Post of January 22, 1944.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I had intended to ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD but shall not do so, inasmuch as the Senator from Tennessee has asked that it be published in the Appendix. It deals with the figures presented by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] after his recent trip to South America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH FINANCE

Senator BUTLER, the South American explorer, has returned to the fray with an assertion that he was 95.5 percent pure when he told the Senate last November that "our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in or for Latin America during the 3 years, 1942, 1943, and 1944, total more than six billion dollars." In support of his assertion he says that "the documentation of every item and of every amount has been certified and authenticated by the well-known Washington accounting firm of James A. Councilor."

But this is by no means what the well-known Washington accounting firm of James A. Councilor says about it. The well-known Washington accounting firm, in its letter of certification, merely says: "We hereby certify that the source material referred to in these lists has been examined by us and that the amounts shown are correct according to the source information."

This satisfies us completely as to everything except Senator BUTLER'S sources. It means, if it means anything at all, that the Senator added his own figures correctly, even though he may have added the same amounts into the total several different times under several different disguises. Why, this is positively the most convincing audit since McKesson & Robbins saw fit to reorganize. If he succeeds in selling this sort of accounting to his colleagues, Senator BUTLER should find it easy to sell them stock in the Brooklyn Bridge or the Pan-American Highway. We genuflect in admiration.

A Marine Is Back of Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend given by the House, I offer for the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post of January 23, 1944, in Robert Albright's Gallery Glimpses, entitled "A Marine Is Back of Renegotiation." The matter referred to follows:

ROBERT ALBRIGHT'S GALLERY GLIMPSES—A MARINE IS BACK OF RENEGOTIATION

Back in World War No. 1, Marine Pvt. FRANCIS CASE, salary $1 a day, passed a plant where he might have held a job paying $18 a day.

When the war was over, Private CASE did a lot of thinking about it. He studied up on corporation war profits and learned that the war had produced, besides countless casualties, 23,000 millionaires.

Somehow there seemed something quite wrong with a policy that would enable some men to make abnormal profits out of war while other men offered their lives.

He resolved that if war ever came again, and he had anything to say about it, war profiteering would never be repeated.

AN AMENDMENT STICKS

On a day in March nearly 2 years ago, World War No. 1 Private CASE had something to say about the profits in World War No. 2.

He was then—and is now—Representative FRANCIS CASE (Republican), of South Dakota, a baldish, wiry little man on the weather side of 40 who was forever popping up in the House with amendments. No appropriation bill was complete without a Case amendment. More often than not, they were defeated.

But on that 28th day of March 1942, Representative CASE had an amendment that stuck. It was the first legislative provision for renegotiation of war contracts, and its initial target was the $19,000,000,000 sixth supplemental appropriation bill of 1942.

First time up the amendment was knocked out on a point of order: "Under the guise of a limitation the amendment would require executive action."

CASE promptly offered his amendment in another form.

A division vote was demanded. The amendment was adopted, 70 to 8. Renegotiation was born.

ONLY A GERM

It was only the germ notion of the basic renegotiations statute that was later expanded by Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR and the Senate Appropriations Committee. It wasn't much but an idea to start with and the Senate had to do a thorough job of overhauling.

But it said plainly for the first time that none of the money appropriated should be available to make final payment and settle war contracts until the contractor had filed a certificate of costs with a satisfactory renegotiation agreement.

From it was to stem a law that already has saved the Government more than $5,000,000,000 on war contracts.

And out of it was to grow one of the five win-the-war points stressed by the President in his last message on the state of the Union.

Many times since the spring of 1942 the expanded statute has been under attack. On such occasions watchful FRANCIS CASE would generally take the House floor with a warning:

"Be careful what you do to renegotiation."

Last week the law passed its severest crisis in the Senate. When the Finance Committee reconsidered amendments drastically limiting the renegotiation field, Congressman CASE, watching helplessly now on the House sidelines, could afford to relax. Once again he could shake hands with Marine Private CASE.

CASE TELLS HIS STORY

Let Mr. CASE tell how his World War No. 1 dream became a law effectively curbing runaway war profits:

"In February 1941 the Supreme Court had handed down a decision in the old Bethlehem

shipbuilding case, a case that grew out of World War No. 1. The Court said that if a contract was closed and final settlement made, the Government could not recover even though unconscionable profits had been made. The Government lost its suit to recover.

"We were then in the midst of the new preparedness program. Reports of huge profits were coming in.

"The representative of one shipbuilding company was quoted publicly as saying that his company's profits were so large you couldn't handle them with a steam shovel.

"The (House) Naval Affairs Committee and the (Senate) Truman committee were bringing to light case after case of exorbitant profits.

"We were in the midst of the building and arming program. Many projects had to be started with letters of intent. You will remember the fight over the cost-plus idea. You will recall the War and Navy developed the idea of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, but that in spite of it the huge-profit stories kept coming in."

CASE told the House Ways and Means Committee he didn't know whether the renegotiation idea "was constitutional or not." But if Congress could change a contract affecting human lives (Selective Service) he said he thought it could modify a contract affecting property.

"I am not a lawyer," he said. "But it did not seem to me we should pass the sixth supplemental bill adding $19,000,000,000 to the billions already appropriated and not try to do something about that situation. * * *

"We knew that hundreds of contracts were outstanding and that on some of them excessive profits were being made. We knew that funds in the supplemental bill, merged with previously appropriated money, would be used to make final payments on many of those contracts.

"Under the Bethlehem decision, if the contracts were once settled the door would be closed to any price adjustment.

"So I just tried to stick my foot in the door."

Now, CASE is a little guy, but he has a big foot. It's still in the door.

Life Is Real—Even to G. O. P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record, by Samuel Grafton:

LIFE IS REAL—EVEN FOR G. O. P.—IT WAS A SHOCK TO LEARN SOLDIERS STILL WANT TO VOTE

(By Samuel Grafton)

The Republican Party is finding out that life is real, life is earnest.

With what glee did a majority of the party's Senators help kill the Green-Lucas soldier-voting bill, a bare 6 weeks ago. They never seem to have had a moment of doubt about it. Of course, it was proper to kill the bill; wasn't the big issue States' rights? "The big issue," as Mark Sullivan explained, "is States' rights." Colonel McCormick, of Chicago, thought that the big issue was States' rights. Captain Patterson, of the New York Daily News, also added his opinion that the big issue was States' rights.

The big issue, you see, was States' rights. There was something almost touching in the Republicans' absolute faith that their own special and private language, which they have used so long among themselves in attacking the Federal administration, was also the common language of the country.

REPUBLICANS WORRIED

But now the Republicans are worried. For the soldiers don't seem to know what on earth the party leaders are talking about. They want to vote. And over the last week-end, alarmed stories began to sprout in the press to the effect that maybe the party was hurting itself by taking the unpopular side in the soldiers' vote debate.

Something of the same sort has happened on the food-subsidy issue. Here, too, the Republican top leadership acted in the implicit belief that its own special vocabulary was also the plain speech of the people.

So the Republicans voted against subsidies in a body. But now, again, there is a long pause. The rest of the population does not seem to react. I believe the Republicans in Congress are really stunned by the amount of support that has been mobilized on behalf of subsidies. They have been talking their special language to each other so long they have come to believe that everybody speaks a new kind of basic English, made up of 800 words like "bureaucrat," "regimentation," and "States' rights."

The Republicans have been misled, by their own special vocabulary of abuse, into awkward positions on two key issues, soldiers' votes and subsidies. Their eye is too much on Roosevelt.

EVEN IF THERE WERE NO ROOSEVELT

What I mean is that even if President Roosevelt should dry up and blow away tomorrow, the plain people would still want the soldiers to vote, and they would still want low food prices. If there had never been a Roosevelt, the people would still want those things. The Republicans have forgotten that; that is why they are a little stunned to discover today that life is real, life is earnest; that life has intruded into their private game of get that man.

They saw only Roosevelt, wanting a federally protected ballot for servicemen; but they didn't see the serviceman himself, waiting for his vote. They saw only Roosevelt, wanting subsidies; they didn't see the housewife, and her need for low prices. This is a real world, full of millions of people. Roosevelt really isn't the only man in it.

The party is staggering a little, under the impact of these awful discoveries. It is all somewhat overwhelming, like a hermit's first sight of Times Square.

Simplified Income-Tax Return Form Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs of the Government and people of the country today is a simplified form of making up income-tax returns.

Most everybody in business finds it necessary to keep an account of their income and expenses. We find that in every line of business accounting has been reduced to simple principles that save time and annoyance. Most persons with an average education find little difficulty in keeping accurate accounts of their business dealings until it comes to making up their income-tax returns. The forms are growing more complicated instead of being simplified. It is too much to expect that the great mass of income taxpayers must employ income-tax experts to assist them in making out their income-tax returns to insure they have protection from overpayment and at the same time pay their equitable share of taxes. The Government is negligent in failing to simplify the form that must be used by the income taxpayers in the lower brackets, as evinced by the experience of taxpayers throughout the country.

The timely suggestion made in the following letter should receive the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue:

NEW PLYMOUTH, IDAHO, *January 14, 1944.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Today I'm laboring trying to make out my income tax. I don't mind paying an income tax, but the worry and work it takes making out these complicated forms not only takes up valuable time, it is a real headache to a busy farmer who finds the day is not long enough anyway to do what is required of him at the present time. Then after all the worrying I have to go to an income-tax expert and have it done or checked again. This man that helps me is employed by the Government and the time he consumes takes a large portion of the taxes. The Government doesn't get much good out of it, and I still have the worry and have lost valuable time.

It seems to me that a simple form could be devised that a farmer could read and understand. In order to get one you will have to get someone besides a Philadelphia lawyer to make it out.

I would suggest you call in a group of honest-to-goodness farmers to help make it out.

Now I could complain to the income-tax people and it would do no good, because a lot of them would lose their jobs. It is up to you men who represent the people to help us out of this complicated mess.

I would also suggest that the forms not only be made simpler but enclosed would be found a simple and clear-cut table on which one could figure one's tax.

I know that I am expressing the wishes of 99 percent or more of the farmers, and I am sure if something is done along this line it will help get more production and mean more money for the Government.

Hoping you give us some action on this, I am

Very truly yours,

CHAS. J. PRITZL.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in our democracy we hold to the premise that the right to vote is inherent with every citizen. Citizenship as we interpret it is a high estate which privileges those who

are permitted to be elevated to it to choose those who are to govern. The question as to whether citizenship and the consequent right to vote is strictly a State grant, has long been a subject for debate. Unquestionably the States in their zeal to preserve their individual identities as such, and to safeguard against Federal participation in the selection of State officials, attempted to reserve to themselves the right to prescribe under what conditions a citizen of a State might vote.

Congress, however, as recently as 1942 enacted voting legislation which had the effect of preemptorily abolishing the prerequisites prescribed by some States for voting.

In 1872 Congress passed legislation which made it compulsory for all States to hold their elections for national officials on the same day. As far back as 1790 the issue of Federal over State control in national elections became an issue, and almost unanimously those who took sides on the subject—who had participated in framing the Constitution of the United States—expressed the idea that the Federal Government had the right to legislate concerning elections to the exclusion of State legislatures, on all matters where national candidates were involved. They based their opinions on the fact that the Constitution intended to enunciate the principle that our Government was to be a government wherein the will of the majority should prevail. They interpreted the provisions of the Constitution to have placed upon the Federal Government the obligation to see that the republican form of government prevailed regardless of the attitude of any individual State or group of States.

Clearly the will of the majority cannot prevail if at the next national election a substantial proportion of our estimated 11,000,000 men and women in service are foreclosed from voting merely because of the failure or inability of State machinery to provide a ballot for them. Admonitions of the Secretary of War and others who should know the limitations of their abilities to perform should not go unheeded. No amount of industry, or money, or concern with detail, will permit the timely preparation or distribution of ballots by all States, and should any one or more, but not all the States, be able to complete such a task, there would be created preferential status for the soldiers of the States able to complete, to the exclusion of the soldiers of the States which could not. Maine, for instance, might set up a war ballot commission which could provide for the issuance and receipt of every one of its soldier ballots; while California, for possibly 101 reasons, might find itself unable to do likewise. Under such circumstances, who would say that all had equal rights and opportunities in the national election, or that the outcome really expressed the will of the majority. An election which did not give the opportunity for all to participate therein would always leave the outcome the subject of dispute and place in question the moral, if not the legal right, of those selected to hold office.

Certainly it was intended when this Nation was created that there should be no frustration of the privilege of the people to exercise their right to select those who were to govern them. If for any reason the States did not or could not provide means of voting for their citizenry, it becomes the obligation and duty of the Federal Government, insofar as it is humanly possible to do, to provide to the best of its ability for the free exercise of this prerogative.

One who views the present situation dispassionately must readily see that a condition unlike any heretofore experienced in political history confronts us. Distance, lack of adequate facilities, inactivity of some State legislatures, lateness of State primaries, vast dissemination of our military forces, and a multitude of other obstacles preclude the consideration of any kind of a ballot other than a Federal war ballot. It would be impossible to prepare, much less distribute, a ballot which would meet the requirements of any individual State or group of States. In addition to the 48 States to be considered, there are over 400 congressional districts in the United States. Distribution of 48, to say nothing of over 400, different kinds of ballots to men and women all over the world is obviously an impossibility. Conceive for example a situation where 48 men, each from a different State, make up a portion of a company of marines at Tarawa. To meet the proposals of some Members of Congress it would be necessary in a situation of this kind to supply each marine from each of the 48 States a different kind of ballot. Multiply this situation until the rights of 11,000,000 people are provided for, and some idea can be reached as to the magnitude of the job of supplying these people with proper State ballots. Or, much worse, imagine any State with its limited facilities attempting to do that which appears to be difficult even for the Federal authorities to undertake.

The moral responsibility rests upon Congress to supply our soldiers with a ballot. There only remains the need for the adoption of a practical bill that will provide the greatest opportunity for the greatest number to vote.

The so-called Andrews bill makes, so far, the best approach to the problem. Its fault lies in the fact that the ballot proposed under the bill permits election officials at proper polling places to determine whether the voter is a qualified voter prior to opening the ballot. Obviously this cannot be accomplished unless there appears on the back of the ballot when folded sufficient information to apprise the election officials of the voter's legal right to vote. The other objection lies in the ambiguity of subdivision (2), line 22, on page 7, which states that an executed absentee war ballot shall be counted "only if the vote cast for a person who was a duly nominated candidate." It is very possible that the soldier will not know when he is casting his vote whether the person he is voting for is a "duly nominated candidate." The matter is superfluous and unnecessary in view of the permission granted to the voter to write in the name of his party rather than the name of his candidate if he chooses. To avoid confusion subdivision (2) might better be left out of the bill.

Lastly, the duties imposed upon the persons mentioned in the Andrews bill should be more stringently stated to avoid any possibility of misinterpretation of their duties.

Several worthy changes in the Andrews bill may be suggested when it is debated, but in substance the bill has incorporated in it the essentials that are necessary to permit a soldier to express his choice.

If we agree that our soldiers should have a say-so in the very thing they are fighting for, we most certainly should agree on the best method to be adopted to give expression to that choice. The Andrews bill seems to suggest the only feasible method put forward to date.

It might be well to keep in mind while deliberating on this subject, the fact that should our soldiers fail in the mission they are now engaged in, all future discussions as to the right of either the Government, the States, or the soldiers, if indeed the subject could be discussed at all, would be purely academic.

A Victorious New Year to You, America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Manzanar Free Press on January 1, 1944:

A VICTORIOUS NEW YEAR TO YOU, AMERICA!

Greetings to you for a victorious new year, people of America, from your kindred 50,000 citizens inside barbed-wire fences. We send you greetings, we who have been lodged by circumstances of war inside these relocation centers in the deserts of the West.

In 3 months, we will have spent 2 years in these centers. We have had time to rationalize our own predicament. The tragic experiences of evacuation, the untold volume of business losses of the evacuees, the unwarranted hatreds engendered toward us by some people because of our hereditary kinship with the Asiatic foe—these we write off our ledger.

On the other side stands our gratitude to the American people for sanctioning the effort of this Government to look after the welfare of our children, of our aged, and the sick. We realize that in other parts of the world millions of innocent people's lives have been sacrificed in evacuations and by failures of other governments to protect their war-driven civilians. Here in war relocation centers we have found temporary refuge, we have taken stock of our stake in America and now we are preparing in a new spirit to re-establish ourselves.

In seeking to resettle and to re-establish ourselves in our respective trades, businesses, and professions, we realize the unwisdom of trying to force ourselves upon a people who view us with suspicion. We only seek to join in the drive for victory. We are prepared to shoulder our share of further sacrifices demanded of all her citizens by our country. We will not shirk. Indeed, evacuees

who already have left the relocation projects are contributing to our embattled Nation's war effort through their initiative, their resourcefulness, their adaptability, and their talents. In Europe, in the South Pacific, on every front former evacuees are today in uniform fighting beside their brother Americans.

We also believe that our country would achieve something of the meaning of the full use of her available manpower when she encourages the evacuee tradesmen, merchants, farmers, and professional men to reestablish themselves in their own fields of endeavor in the communities of their own choice. We ask you, the American people, to try us on our own merits. We are willing and ready to stand or fall by our records, realizing that it is one of the inherent characteristics of the country we love to appraise its people by the contribution they can make toward the total welfare of the Nation.

It is our belief that our country wants to fulfill the obligation to itself to permit the unhampered restoration of a group of its own people to their natural and rightful niche in the American scheme of life through an orderly process of evacuee resettlement. In the ultimate analysis, the citizen evacuees who are behind these barbed wire fences, through no fault of their own, are not persuaded to resettle by glittering promises of job offers. The important consideration is that they be convinced in their own minds that they are acceptable to American communities as Americans and that in relocation lies their service to their country.

We believe that you are earnestly concerned in the process of revitalizing the American scheme of social structure which recognizes only aristocracy by intellect and by achievement; not through political, religious, or racial differences. We believe that on this conviction, America rests her cause in this war.

Now that our eyes are clear again and our hearts are strong again we look forward as Americans with deepened understanding and firm conviction to this new year when victory shall come to this country that is yours and ours.

Speech of Hon. Sam Rayburn at the Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, at the Jackson Day Dinner, January 22, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I think if Andrew Jackson walked among us today and looked about him at this America that is again fighting for freedom, his eye would be drawn to two great figures, working hand in hand, battling side by side, in the old cause dear to his heart. And at the sight of those two Americans, I think the gallant spirit of Jackson would go its way untroubled; I think he would rest assured that what he fought for more than a century ago is ably defended today.

I have not come here just to name names. I would rather deal in issues than in personalities. But some names, through greatness of spirit, outgrow these limits and become a force in the world. And so it is with these two—these two heroic figures who would bring the light of satisfaction into the eyes of our forefathers. One of these Americans is Franklin D. Roosevelt. The other is Cordell Hull.

Here in our land we have not had to endure the blast from the air nor the atrocities of the Fascist march. We have not had to rebuild our city streets from ruin, nor scorch our fields. Yet, in the war that engulfs us, there is an achievement—an American march to victory—that the historians of this war will set down in shining letters. It is a story marked by greatness of spirit. It is the story of a great Nation inflamed overnight into total war.

Our enemies did not think this could be done. Among ourselves there were some who agreed with our enemies, there were doubters. Our Government, moving to the will of all except that little handful of defeatists, refused to deal with the enemies of free people. And our Government and our people went beyond that. Through our Commander in Chief, we proclaimed a quarantine of the aggressor. And under his leadership we got down to the job of preparing for war on a scale unequaled in all history.

That is the story that is marked by greatness of spirit, that is the job the people of America and their Government tackled 3 short years ago. It is the job they have carried on ahead of schedule.

We still have among us, of course, that small minority who were afflicted with jaundice of the spine in 1940 and enlargement of the spleen in 1943. These hecklers still complain. Our enemies have long since learned to respect the might of this fighting America. Let all Americans do the same!

Well, let us get some of the measure of what has been done. It is so startling as to blind the imagination.

America has produced 183,000 field guns, 64 times the number produced for World War No. 1. We have produced 30,000,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, 9 times our production for World War No. 1. We have produced over 5,000,000,000 pounds of high explosives, 10 times our production for World War No. 1.

We produced more than 85,000 military airplanes in 1943. Even more significant, our rate of production of bombers in December 1943 was twice the rate in January 1943, and in heavy bombers 3 times the rate in January 1943. Each month we have more than tripled the production of a year ago—yes, tripled our ability to transport the heavy bombs which are crippling our enemies' industry.

Those are a few of the tools of war that American capital and American labor, under American leadership, have turned out for American fighting men and for their comrades-in-arms under other flags.

Yes, behind the grumbling and defeatism of the little band of hecklers, labor, industry, and agriculture have delivered the goods.

Some few in our country think these things just happen. They think that great fighting men, generals like Marshall and Eisenhower and MacArthur and admirals like King, Nimitz, and Halsey drop down out of the sky, assignments in hand, reporting for duty. It does not occur to them that the feats of production on the home front would not have been possible without great leadership, or that the genius of generalship we have placed in the field of battle had to be selected, supported, sometimes fought for. It does not dawn on them that the basic strategy under which they have marched or sailed to victory after victory had to be outlined and fitted in with the strategy of a world pattern.

No, these things do not just happen. And may God forbid that we ever take them for granted, for that way lies defeat. We have gone to war under a caliber of leadership that has proved, by actual results, that it was worthy of the high trust we placed in it. That leadership is still proving its worth. May we never make the fatal error of thinking that we can win the peace, under a leadership of any smaller caliber, or under no leadership at all.

I have discussed a few of the things that we have done under the present leadership. It might be a good idea to mention a few of the things that we of the Democratic Party are not going to do.

First, we are not going to meet our debt to the boys who have gone abroad and fought our battles for us by hoping that when those boys get back jobs for them will just happen. We are not going to forget those men and their families when the parades have passed and the bonfires of victory are cold. It is not enough to shower them with torn telephone books. There are no calories in confetti.

Second, we are not going to deprive our people of the right to work. We are not going to leave that right in the lap of chance or tie it to the chart line of a boom-and-slump economy.

We are pledged to preserve for our country its system of free enterprise. We can save that system by making it work; and by that I mean making it work for the well-being of all our people. We cannot save it by giving dollars the inside track over human beings. We cannot save it by going back to an economy of scarcity and trusting to luck that it will provide work and plenty.

We are not going to squeeze that term "free enterprise" down into the narrow meaning that is put upon it by cartels and domestic monopolies. Freedom of enterprise can have its being only in the climate of equal opportunity. It does not mean the freedom of big enterprise to strangle the little. It does not mean the freedom of the few to conspire with foreign interests and to divide up by secret agreement the business that affects the safety of the many.

We are not going to hold out to our people the sorry mirage of isolationism. Sometime ago Tokyo was bombed from the air. The people of Japan heard that those planes had come from the land of Shangri-La. Later they learned that this Shangri-La had engines and a propeller, and that it could move around on the broad Pacific.

Our isolationists, like the Japs, believed there was safety in the expanse of the sea. Had they been given their way a few years ago, our own cities might by this time have learned the terrible lesson of Shangri-La. The millions of our people who live on both oceans of this Nation have reason to thank God for the leadership that refused to let those isolationists have their way.

Nor do we intend to let the isolationists have their way when victory is won. They are as ill-taught in the ways of peace as they are ill-prepared for the dangers of war. On this issue we of the Democratic Party are not vague and mealymouthed. The service we are prepared to render in striving for a workable world security is not lip service. As a party we are not torn apart by conflicting ideas of the foreign policy of our country. Our political closet is not crammed with the skeletons of isolation, and our house is not haunted by some other ghosts.

In Chicago next summer our party will nominate a candidate. But here, tonight, I think we can tell the people of the United States what kind of a candidate we will not nominate.

We will not palm off on the American people an imitation liberal who points a finger at Wall Street but points a gun at the Securities and Exchange Commission. We are not shopping around for symbols, whether they are Main Street or Wall Street.

In the difficult times ahead of us, when nation must meet nation for the common

good, when our Government faces international transactions of great moment and when the peace of our people hangs in the balance, I do not believe the American people will entrust the Presidency of the United States to one who has no proved ability in the field of foreign policy.

Since 1940, the American people have witnessed much courageous trail-blazing in this field of foreign affairs, pioneering that has helped to build a United Nations in time of war and even now is looking to a structure of peace that will withstand any aggression on earth.

We in the Democratic Party offered no doubting Thomas of 1940. We propose to offer no shouting Thomas in 1944.

Now, a few final words on what I think we are going to do. First, of course, we are going to crush America's enemies, no matter how long that may take. We can name the winner now.

With victory, our Nation will be faced with great tasks, great responsibilities, at home and abroad. I touched on the matter of foreign policy when I was discussing candidates, because I felt that there was a peculiar connection there—one that we Americans should keep in mind. But the reconversion here at home will also be a great and exacting task.

Some Americans have a simple picture of that process. All you have to do, they believe, is close down the extra plant capacity you have built for war production, gear your plant to the old-time economy of scarcity and your mind to the philosophy of dog-eat-dog, and then fire the workers you no longer need.

About those American workers and their families, we of the Democratic Party have different ideas. We also have different ideas about the closing of those war plants We have the idea of converting them to the production of peacetime needs of our people—of more production, not less—and of keeping our workers in jobs.

In this effort, I believe the employers of labor will be with us. I believe management in American industry today would be reluctant to gear its thinking and its policies to the economic roller-coaster that landed them in the dumps in 1931.

I wonder if any are homesick for that kind of freedom? The Democratic Party is going to offer an administration and a platform shaped to prevent a return of the ruthlessness of 1929 or the despair of 1931.

No group of Americans suffered more heavily from the effects of that ruthlessness than did our farmers. In ruling it out of the future of this Nation, we have in mind the security of the farmer from the kind of ups and downs that always leave him down and often out. With him we say good-bye to the foreclosures of the 20's and the 30's, good-bye to the 10-percent interest rates.

We do not promise miracles. But we can offer leadership, the calibre of leadership that brought this Nation out of its disarmed state in time to ward off disaster at the hands of international bandits.

We are not going to beat all of our swords into plowshares, but we are going to find the way to internal security with the same foresight, the same determination that we have shown on the way to world security. Those two securities are and will be eternally bound together, and an administration that builds on sand in the one area is also imperiling its foundations in the other.

We of the Democratic Party were first to recognize this principle. The storms of a world in upheaval have forced others to abandon their stand against it. What distinguishes our course in future is that we will act upon that principle. For the fighting men who will come home victorious, for the civilians on the home front who will share in that victory, we will make it work.

I am reminded at this time of the words of our President when, in 1940, he accepted once more the party's nomination. On that occasion he said, I quote: "I do not regret my consistent endeavor to awaken this country of ours to the menace for us and for all we hold dear. I have pursued these efforts in the face of appeaser fifth columnists who charged me with hysteria and war mongering, but I felt it my duty, my simple, plain, inescapable duty, to arouse my countrymen to the danger of the new forces let loose in the world."

Today those forces and their evil outgrowths are still at large in the world. We shall not be chained by fear. Under proper leadership we can create an unequaled period of prosperity and happiness. The men in our armed forces expect it of us. And they expect to exercise their right to vote, and they look to the Democratic Party to enforce that right. Nor shall they look to us in vain. Our party pledges itself to give those men and women an opportunity to vote.

The Democratic Party's faith in this great country of ours is without bounds. We feel deep inside of us that we can hew a path after this war that will lead to a new era, an era of decency not only for us but for all the world. The Democratic Party has always been the party of vision and courage. We have been the advocates, not the rock-ribbed complainers. Of course, we have our complainers about supposed sacrifices. War means sacrifices. In war some make a great sacrifice, others make the supreme sacrifice. I have said it before, I say it now, it appears to me that the ones who are making the greatest sacrifices are complaining the least. When I think of the parents who have given their sons, they are making a sacrifice. When I think of those sons wading in the mud and mire of vermin-infested islands, or scaling mountain peaks where if sickness or disease does not attack them a murderous Jap or a murderous German is behind every stone, every stump, and every tree; when I think of the sacrifices these boys are making, I would despise myself if I complained about my little inconveniences.

In unity there is strength. In disunity there is terrible danger. So, beware of dangerous men who preach disunity. We must have a unity that is uncomplaining

If we meet the challenge of today, if we do our job on this front in unity, God knows and you know that our fighting men will do their part.

All Right, Where's the Catch?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record by Charles Fisher:

ALL RIGHT, WHERE'S THE CATCH?—THIS PAIR OF JAUNDICED EYES NEVER HAS FAR TO LOOK

(By Charles Fisher)

Whenever we come across an especially noticeable parade of somebody's good works, we stand by a little sourly, waiting for the gimmick at the end of it. We have found that the pageant comes first, then the bite.

The method is discernible in a lot of the mail which brightens up the day in a newspaper office. A few years ago a firm with a bill of goods to sell used to come out inartistically with a direct statement of what it was trying to get. The science of public relations has passed 'way beyond that point now, though.

When a propaganda campaign begins, we learn first that the Elysian Eyewash Co. gives picnics to all its employees the second Tuesday in every July. In the weeks following, we are told all manner of details about Elysian, from its workers' health service to its president's theories about the hereafter. It is only after cozy relations have been established that we find the outfit is trying to put the arm on the Government for something, or have a law changed.

A GOOD EXAMPLE

A very pretty example of the system appeared a few months ago when the Lincoln Electric Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, began sending out two or three long releases every week on the efficiency and spirit of camaraderie which prevailed in war work at Lincoln. We weren't alone in our bafflement, for two of our professional associates received the same material. Both of the gentlemen write sports and were, if possible, even less stirred than we by news that Lincoln workers love their Government and their boss.

But the expensive and highly professional hand of a first-rate public-relations counselor was indicated. If we received the stuff, so must many hundreds of other writers. So Mr. Smith, Mr. Dooly, and Mr. Fisher all sat around waiting for the snapper. It came a couple of weeks ago. Lincoln, having proved its good will and love of country, was trying to duck governmental renegotiation of its war contracts.

After a long period of that sort of training, it was not a surprise to find out that the Jack & Heintz Corporation, of Cleveland, is also resisting renegotiation. The firm has evidently been doing an extraordinarily valuable and efficient job in making flying instruments. Its employees are well paid, entertained by music as they work, nourished on free lunches and free coffee, and, in general, treated more as valued friends than as hired hands.

MOST OF US KNOW

Very few Americans have been permitted to remain unaware of those pleasant facts, although it is hard to say what relation they bear to renegotiation—a very sensible system of reclaiming excess profits for the Government after the first wild period when war equipment had to be made and the country didn't have time to bicker about the cost.

Mr. Jack and Mr. Heintz have done quite well as individuals out of their patriotic work. They invested $25,000 each in a new firm 2 years ago. Since then they each have drawn between $75,000 and $150,000 a year in salaries, although the whole firm was established with a total investment of $100,000. The Government built them a $3,000,000 plant and lent them $11,000,000.

The net take on the $100,000 investment has been $2,000,000 in salaries and profits, according to Government reckoning. There was an extra $7,000,000 in the toe of the sock as well, but the Government has reclaimed that. Jack & Heintz protest that the move strips them of all profits for the past year and leaves them without funds to convert to peacetime work and furnish jobs for returned soldiers after the war.

The quarreling over the arithmetic probably will go on for years and unquestionably will reach a point where we won't be able to understand it. It will be interesting then to look back toward this present publicity campaign. For another one will be started at some future date, and the same firms which are insisting that the Government subsidize them for the post-war period will have the press agents at work celebrating free enterprise and protesting against Federal interference. We don't know what Mr. Dooly and Mr. Smith will do then, but we're going to stop reading our mail.

Pass a Genuine and Effective Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of granting the men and women in our armed services, and the members of the merchant marine, the opportunity to vote in the 1944 election, and I appeal to this House to report out legislation that will take away all unnecessary complications and that will simplify the necessary procedure. The bill reported by the committee does not provide an effective method by which the service men and women will be given an opportunity to vote this year, but would prevent many of them from exercising the right of the ballot, which is one of the things for which they are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, on the question of the soldier vote legislation and also a statement showing the action expected to be taken by the various States in this connection, and also a letter and resolution I received from the Cissel-Saxon Post, No. 41, of the American Legion.

ADDRESS OF GOV. HEREERT R. O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND

Because complete information regarding State matters is not obtainable from newspaper accounts, I am opening today a series of radio broadcasts. Through these discussions I will give direct and impartial information on these problems, which has not been given by some newspapers.

Today I will discuss with you the important question of whether the men and women in the Armed Services will be able to vote in the approaching election. It is my firm belief that they must be given the opportunity of voting, no matter in what part of the world they may be. Next, the balloting should be so conducted as to guarantee honest elections. Any hindrances to voting by soldiers and sailors must be removed.

Because the United States Congress reconvenes tomorrow, and will give attention to this question, which has been before its Members for the past 3 months; and, further, because, in my opinion, the entire subject of absentee voting, and of the State's approach to the solution of the problems involved, has not been fairly and adequately presented to the people of Baltimore and the State, it seems desirable that the matter be discussed fully and without bias at this time.

Involved in the State's approach to the matter are several considerations. Frankly, the implications of these phases of the matter do not seem to have been understood entirely by some individuals and other interests who have been pressing for hurried action by the State. The question of State rights has been projected and, by editorial and news stories which covered only one side of the problem, some newspapers have attempted to force the calling of a special session, the results of which could well be undone by congressional action on pending legislation.

Furthermore, as a result of these editorials and news articles, a misconception of the State administration's attitude toward the entire matter might have been created. In the interest of justice to the men and women in the services concerned, as well as to those at home who have been giving the matter the fullest consideration, it would seem that a full, frank statement on the entire question would be desirable.

Every man and woman in the services, and every relative and friend of those absent residents of our State, has a right to be deeply concerned over the question of whether these service men and women, many of them overseas, will be able to vote in the approaching election. It is hardly necessary to declare again that I am strongly of the opinion that every qualified person from Maryland in the services must be given the opportunity of voting, no matter in what part of the world they may be. This involves a similar firm determination that the State administration will do whatever is necessary toward insuring that our absent men and women be enabled to vote.

As the situation stands today, Maryland has on its statute books liberal provisions for absentee soldier voting. In preparation for this emergency, we secured amendments to the election laws, at the last session of the legislature, that compare favorably with those in effect throughout the country. In fact, our voting system is considered superior to that of many of the other States.

However, with so many millions of American soldiers and sailors spread over the entire earth, additional arrangements must be completed because the Army and Navy have made it plain that they cannot be expected to stop waging war in order to transport election ballots. As is, of course, known, all of the armed services are under Federal jurisdiction, and the whereabouts of the soldiers are known only to the Army and Navy. Because the Army and Navy must supervise the balloting, I urged weeks ago that prompt and definite action be taken by Congress to require these services to handle this vitally important matter.

The problems involved are not very complex, and they do not particularly involve any danger to the State's inherent right to regulate voting by its citizens. The cry heard from unofficial sources for the immediate calling of a special session has been raised in disregard of certain facts. I don't believe these people know what has been happening recently in this matter. They are unaware of the great amount of thought and study given to the question in official quarters.

Instead of speculating what might be done by the Army and Navy, as the editorial writers are doing, I have gone to the War Department and secured first-hand information. At the War Department it was suggested to me not to call a special session at once. I am pleased to state that the position I have taken is supported by the great majority of States, because, contrary to newspaper statements, only 2 out of 48 States have taken what they hope will be final action.

Briefly, the new questions raised in a consideration of voting by persons outside the continental limits of the United States are these:

Should a different form of ballot be adopted for overseas voting than could be used for servicemen within the continental limits of the country? Should a simple form of ballot be sent to the servicemen permitting them to vote by one mark for all candidates of certain party designation? Because the Army and Navy have insisted that they cannot undertake to handle this tremendous task unless a uniform system is adopted by the States, should the overseas balloting in the approaching election be limited to votes for the President, Senators, and Congressmen? Should State instructions accompany the ballots to be cast on a special day or should State agents be appointed for the handling of the ballots? All these are questions which can only be answered after it has been decided what the Army and Navy will be required to do under Federal law, which is not yet enacted.

With regard to the demands that have been made for a special session, it is pertinent to point out that, because all the service men and women are under the direct control of the Military and Naval Services, and because only the officials of these services know where these men and women are located, it follows that the handling of the mechanics of the election and the matter of getting application forms and ballots to and from the various posts and stations throughout the world, is one for the service authorities to administer. At the same time, it must be borne definitely in mind that the first objective of these service authorities is to win the war. Every facility at their disposal is severely taxed at the present time and it is not to be expected that it will be possible to dispense with any of these vital services at election time.

The situation boils down to this, therefore, that the capacities of the military and naval services to handle the great number of ballots involved must be the basic determining factor in any regulations that are to be laid down. Only the Congress can authorize the services to perform this function. Until the Congress does pass a law directing the services what to do, and definitely establishing what can be done, it is almost impossible for any State to arrange definitely to conform its election laws to some nebulous idea of what Congress might do.

We have been informed that Congress will take up the matter promptly tomorrow and expects to pass legislation in a short time. However, it must be borne in mind at the same time that Congress has been considering legislation since October 12, and there is no certainty even now what finally will be decided upon.

If the Congress will determine in the very near future just what facilities will be used, there will then be plenty of time to take whatever steps may be required to bring Maryland's voting laws into accord with the necessities of the situation. If a special session is required to permit registration by mail, to bring forward the time limits on filing and withdrawal of candidacies, and to arrange the other details of handling the ballots, this will be a relatively simple task for our legislature. We will be acting then in the face of a known quantity, and not an unknown quantity, as would be the case if the legislature attempted to settle the matter before Congress makes known its decisions.

I urge the citizens of Maryland to take an active interest in this question and to keep in touch with developments starting tomorrow with Congress' reconvening. If you are in touch with relatives or friends in the service, advise them of what is going on and urge them to request the right to vote. Next to winning the war, I do not think there is anything more important than the preservation of our American system of government. This system rests upon the choice by the greatest number of people of their governing officials. Under such a democratic form of government, the greatest good can only be achieved if the largest possible number of voters participate in elections.

In this latter connection I think it unfortunate that the Maryland Constitution makes it impossible for persons under 21 to vote. I personally would prefer to see voting rights extended to all persons in the armed services. If soldiers and sailors, as young as 18, are depended upon by the country to defend the Nation at the risk of their lives, it seems to me that they should be allowed to take part in the elections which constitute a fundamental part of the American system.

However, this right cannot be given by the legislature, as the Maryland Constitution requires that persons must be 21 years to vote.

But we can strive for the most widespread voting, even by persons who are 21 and who have not been able to register. This can be accomplished in a simple manner. First, Congress should decide finally what the Army and Navy will be required to do. Then, with this important pattern established, the States can proceed to set up a uniform system which will be workable and which will enable servicemen throughout the world to vote. By seeking action first by the Federal Government, the various States are not surrendering any of their rights. They merely are securing definite information as to what the armed services can and will do in handling the election machinery for the benefit of servicemen who are under their command and whose whereabouts they alone know.

In urging you to maintain the keenest interest in this question, I assure you that Maryland will do everything necessary. Only the Governor of this State has the right to call a special session, but I will call one in Maryland when and if it is necessary to assure voting by our absent service men and women. Nothing less would be fair and considerate in regard to men and women who have left their homes and are scattered at different points throughout the world, undergoing hardships, so that Americans and America may live and enjoy freedom and liberty in an ordered society.

Other important State matters warrant discussion with the citizens. Such are Maryland's fiscal affairs, which are in excellent condition; post-war planning, in which considerable progress has already been made; road construction; education for returning veterans; conservation and health programs.

In continuing this series of discussions over the radio I will take up matters of present-day interest and give to you facts which would not otherwise be available to you through the newspapers.

Alabama: Does not contemplate calling special session.

Arizona: Special session to convene in February.

Arkansas: Awaiting congressional action.

California: Special session called for January.

Colorado: Special session called for January 28.

Connecticut: Special session called for January.

Delaware: Awaiting congressional action.

Florida: Awaiting reply from Governor.

Georgia: Special session has been held this month.

Idaho: Will call session of legislature if necessary.

Illinois: Special session in January.

Indiana: Special session in January.

Iowa: Extraordinary session on January 26.

Kansas: Has adequate law.

Kentucky: Special session in January.

Louisiana: Regular session legislature, May 1942, provided adequate law.

Maine: No special legislation necessary.

Maryland: Awaiting congressional action.

Massachusetts: Awaiting congressional action.

Michigan: Special session called for January 31, 1944.

Minnesota:——

Mississippi: Has enacted legislation.

Missouri: Considering special session. Will advise later.

Montana: Special session unnecessary.

Nebraska: Awaiting congressional action.

Nevada: Awaiting congressional action.

New Hampshire: Awaiting congressional action.

New York: Legislature in session, and does not contemplate further legislation.

North Carolina: 1943 session of legislature passed appropriate legislation.

North Dakota: Awaiting congressional action.

Ohio: Specia session of legislature after congressional action.

Oklahoma: Awaiting congressional action. Special session will be called if necessary.

Oregon: Last session of legislature passed appropriate legislation.

Pennsylvania: Special session not necessary.

Rhode Island: Legislature in session. Governor has recommended constitutional convention and appropriate legislation.

Tennessee: Awaiting congressional action.

Vermont: Special session will be called if found necessary.

Virginia: Legislature in session. Governor to recommend amendments in absentee voting laws. Federal assistance anticipated.

Washington: Awaiting congressional action.

West Virginia: Legislature convened January 23, 1944. Appropriate legislation considered.

Wisconsin: Legislature convenes January 12, 1944.

Wyoming: Awaiting congressional action.

CISSEL-SAXON POST, No. 41,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Silver Spring, Md., January 20, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: With great respect we invite your attention to the enclosed resolution through which the members of the Cissel-Saxon Post of the Maryland Department of the American Legion ask the Congress of the United States to proceed with the enactment of Federal legislation "which will guarantee to every member of the armed forces the definite presentation of a ballot that can be voted in the 1944 Presidential and congressional general election and which will further guarantee the return of the ballots" to the States.

The Cissel-Saxon Post is the largest American Legion post in Montgomery County, with an active current membership of over 200 veterans of the first World War. At a regular and well-attended meeting held on the evening of Wednesday, January 19, the veterans unanimously adopted the attached resolution by a standing vote of the Cissel-Saxon Post.

We earnestly hope that you will be able to give your support to this fairest and most fundamental question now pending before the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN F. COLLIER,
Commander.
THOMAS B. FOSTER,
Adjutant.

[Enclosure.]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CISSEL-SAXON POST NO. 41, AMERICAN LEGION, SILVER SPRING, MD., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 19, 1944

Whereas we, the members of the Cissel-Saxon Post, No. 41 of the Department of Maryland of the American Legion, observe with increasing concern and amazement the continued failure of the Congress of the United States to provide a method through which the Army and the Navy will be required to offer to every man and woman serving in the armed forces in the present worldwide war a definite opportunity to vote this year for the election of both the President of the United States and the United States Senators and Members of Congress who will be candidates in the respective congressional districts from which these service men and women entered the armed forces; and

Whereas the record establishes that under the absentee voting law for servicemen adopted by the last Congress only 28,000 votes were counted in all the States of the Nation in the 1942 congressional election from the 5,000,000 or more servicemen then bearing arms; and

Whereas it is our further belief that the bill now favorably reported from the House Elections Committee, as represented by a report which, through the votes of three Democratic and four Republican Members of Congress, became a majority report from the Elections Committee to the House, does not provide any more definite or hopeful method through which the service men and women will be guaranteed a chance to vote this year than the method through which they were practically deprived of the right to vote in 1942; and

Whereas we, citizens of the State of Maryland recognize the constitutional right of the duly elected Legislature of the State of Maryland to determine (within the limitations imposed by the Constitution of the United States on the exercise of this power by the government of any State), the qualifications of voters who are qualified to participate in any election of candidates to represent the State of Maryland,

Nevertheless, we, as men who served in the Army or the Navy of the United States in the First World War know that the officials of the State of Maryland are totally unable to find or to deliver ballots to the service men and women from Maryland, or to bring those ballots back to Maryland, and

We further know that only the Federal Government, acting through the chain of communications which serves the other functions of the men and women of the Army and Navy, can act as the postmaster or the collecting agency for these ballots and only representatives of the Army and the Navy can administer the actual process of the voting by the service men and women wherever they may be, and

Whereas we regard any failure to actually make ballots available to those serving in the armed forces as the most damaging possible blow to their devotion to American liberty and governmental institutions, and

Whereas we further regard the actual ability to vote in the coming national election as the most inalienable American right most particularly of those serving in the armed forces who risk their lives and give their toil that America may stay free and that the people of the Nation may again become safe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully but most definitely petition our representatives in the Congress of the United States, as well as the representatives of the other States of the Union, that they promptly proceed with the enactment of Federal legislation which will guarantee to every member of the armed forces the definite presentation of a ballot that can be voted in the 1944 Presidential and congressional general election and which will further guarantee the return of the ballots of each such member of the armed forces to the State of their origin in time to be counted by the officials of that State.

CISSEL-SAXON POST, No. 41,
JOHN F. COLLIER,
Commander.
THOMAS B. FOSTER,
Adjutant.

Attest:
JANUARY 21, 1944.

Labor Loyal in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following radio address of John P. Frey, president of metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

I am in agreement with the splendid address of Mr. Frey and feel that he expresses the sentiment of millions of Americans.

Fellow citizens, I am speaking to you tonight, not as a trade-union official pleading the cause of labor but as an American citizen hopeful of being of assistance in dealing with our wartime labor problems. It so happens that I have spent the greater part of my life in the labor movement, and therefore should know something about my subject.

Two solid fronts are essential to the winning of the war—the fighting front and the home front. The patriotism and the courage of American soldiers in the present war is unexcelled by any previous period of our Nation's history. To maintain this a united and patriotic home front is essential. The morale of the home front definitely influences the morale of our fighting forces.

It has become vitally necessary that we examine this home front, for accumulating evidence indicates that industrially we are drifting toward a dangerous division of viewpoint and purpose. In the industrial field the stage has been reached where groups and individuals differing in their viewpoints are accusing each other of treacherous activity, and where in the heat of accusation and defense men are attacking symptoms instead of bravely facing the facts and dealing with causes. Mere preachings, recriminations, and agitation, charges and countercharges, will not improve the situation. Neither will legislation, for legislation and its administration cannot make men brave, patriotic, or self-sacrificing.

Strikes and threats of strikes during wartime are indefensible, they are intolerable; but also indefensible is profiteering, also indefensible is mismanagement on the part of those placed in responsible Federal positions.

Unquestionably organized labor as a whole is patriotically sound to the very core. Unquestionably organized labor is as deeply interested in the winning of the war as any other group of Americans. The largest number of our fighting forces are from wage earning families. They are the sons, the brothers, and the husbands of those working in our war production plants.

Yet, there are strikes and threats of strikes. Why?

It is not because some labor leaders sit in their ivory towers and call strikes or issue threats for the fun of it. The problem is more than 10,000,000 men and women, not a small group of dictators as some would like to believe. No, indeed, the country's problem is not as simple as that.

I should be remiss of my responsibility if I did not tell you that the morale of our industrial workers has depreciated, and that it is vitally essential that it be restored. Abuse or arbitrary directives will not do it, attempted punishment through legislation will not do it, agitation tending to turn the members of the armed forces against them will not do it.

Some local strikes may have been engineered by saboteurs or those within our borders enjoying our free institutions but who have worked to overthrow them. Some may have been caused by individuals having mixed motives, but the majority of the strikes have resulted from an unnecessary irritation, an irritation operating like a chafing harness which finally makes an open sore.

Workmen pledged not to strike must be protected from those in private management or official position taking advantage of that fact to see how far they can go in imposing upon them.

American labor has been forced to contend with an almost impossible administrative condition in our Government. No adequate national legislation has been enacted which would provide a definite labor policy, and its unprejudiced administration. Instead of one central authority dealing with labor problems, there has developed practically 25 Federal agencies regulating the terms of employment and conditions of labor. In addition there are personally advertised, self-appointed individuals busying themselves advising Government representatives and some labor leaders unfortunately. Both have listened to them with conflicting and harmful results.

These agencies and their directives and decisions have established conflicting policies. Those of us charged with labor responsibility find it difficult to know which way to turn. In my own department my telephone is constantly on the hum from all corners of the country. Problems which should be settled quickly and amicably become enmeshed in the multiplicity of the Government agencies and their conflicting policies and decisions.

There is no central agency to which we can go and arrive at definite understandings. Such an agency is the essential need, and my purpose in talking to you is to urge that we have such an agency created without further delay, in order that the morale of our workers may be restored. It is not my purpose to level criticism, to add to the agitation already taking place. The time is here when we need constructive proposals, and I am making one.

Our Government-labor relationship is the very opposite of that existing in Great Britain, where all labor questions must go through the clearing house of the Minister of Labor. Of course, even in Great Britain strikes occur. Nothing is perfect in this vale of tears and when millions and millions of human beings are involved.

There was within our Government a well established agency, a clearing house through which all final decisions affecting labor were decided. That agency is the Federal Department of Labor, the Department to which labor looked, in the same way and for the same reason that businessmen looked to the Department of Commerce and the farmers looked to the Department of Agriculture.

Most unfortunately for American workmen and the war effort, the Labor Department was not strengthened when war came; instead it was shorn of its most important bureaus, and these were divided among agencies created for wartime purposes. Lacking this central clearing house, labor is now compelled to go from one agency to another seeking the solution of its problems, and not infrequently understandings reached with one agency are thrown out the window by another agency.

In the case of the railway brotherhoods and the railway shopmen there was a well established Federal agency—the Railway Mediation Board. Before this Board railway employees presented their case over a period of 3 months. They were given an award, much less than they believed themselves entitled to, but which the leaders were willing to recommend for acceptance to their membership. After this award had been made, another Feedral agency ruled that the award could not be put into effect. Either the Railway Mediation Board handed down an award which it realized another Federal agency would veto, or there was an inexcusable conflict of authority, the conflict greatly weakening labor confidence in Federal agencies.

If the award was justified, it should not have been vetoed. There should have been within the Department of Labor a clearing house which would have pointed out to the Mediation Board before its decision was made, that such a decision would not be approved, or information conveyed to the higher authority that it must not veto the Mediation Board's decision.

What happened in the railway situation has occurred in many other instances, even where collective bargaining between management, labor, and the Federal procurement agencies had reached an agreement.

In May 1942 the organized shipyard workers, numbering over a million, responding to President Roosevelt's request, accepted a reduction of the wage rate in their shipbuilding agreements which had been approved and guaranteed by the Government a year before. This was done to assist the President in his praiseworthy effort to prevent ruinous inflation.

At that conference the Government pledged itself to a subsequent revision. But the Government's promise was not placed into effect.

What happened was that directives were issued which took the previous authority away from the National Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, which from the beginning had been composed of the Government representatives, management, and labor, and conferred its authority in the matter of wages upon another Federal agency. That agency held that it was not bound by the Government's pledge to the shipyard workers in May 1942.

Men cannot be assured one thing one day and then rapped over the knuckles the next. This confusion and conflict of decisions between Federal agencies causes labor to lose confidence in them. The morale of labor is seriously injured.

I believe a central agency dealing with labor, handing down decisions that will stick and not be vetoed by some other agency, is absolutely essential to restore the confidence of our workers in their Government, which in these times is the over-all employer.

Let me tell you of an experience which I had recently on a train. The conductor, a man 60 years of age, was collecting tickets. A couple of soldiers began chiding him:

"Oh, so you aren't going to strike, after all. We would like to strike."

This particular man has three sons in the armed forces. He said nothing to these boys. What do you have here? You have a contempt of youth toward age. Here was a man who has struggled through life, finally attaining a security and reasonable wage. We may assume he has been a decent family man, no great shot, no man who sought to set the world on fire, no man who aspired to a Mussolini or the President of the United States, or even a leader of men. He was just a man, we will assume, who loved his family and who had struggled hard to give them the essentials of life. You can imagine, then, how it hurt him to have these youngsters questioning his patriotism when he and his kind have been the bulwark of all civilization.

You wonder what sort of an agitation has been spread, and spread by whom that would bring us to the point where there is supposed to be a division between the fathers and mothers on the one hand and their sons on the other.

I do not appreciate this effort, studied, it seems to me, to divide the domestic and the home fronts, to pit them against one another. Relatively, it is an effort to pit the parents against the youngsters.

This conductor of whom I have spoken: Why does he threaten to strike when his sons are in the armed forces? Is he against them? There is an agitation afoot in this country that would make you think this is the case.

No. In the economics of war he is thinking about keeping apace in order that he can be of assistince to those youngsters when they return from the war. He is thinking that he wants to be in a position to finish their education. If they return maimed, this father is thinking that he wants to be in a

position to take care of them. Unless the Communist theory of destroying the family unit is to be accepted, we must assume that this man, in his every endeavor is thinking of that boy on the front. He is continually trying to improve his position in life with that end in view.

We must all realize this plain fact: Life is not static during a war. A war brings a fast-moving economy to a country.

Manifestly, under the circumstances, we can't expect that part of our population known as the wage earners, will stand still. The world moves on.

Let us rid ourselves of this pitting of one segment of our population against the other. From the maturity of my experience, I implore you, not because of any advantage which will accrue to me or any other labor leader, to cease and desist from this agitation which is making for no good in our war effort; which, instead is definitely weakening it.

I firmly believe that on our side, the labor side, if you please, we can move toward a tremendous improvement if labor's problems can be handled in one agency in Washington, preferably the Department of Labor, which was originally set up for that purpose. Labor needs, as do other segments of our population, a getting away from Government by decree and directives, government by discretionary authority. We need, as do all of our people, a return to government by law. Government by whim, inexperience, caprice, and personality is going to lead us into definite trouble—far more so than it has thus far. Sanity in relation to labor must be restored.

I thank you.

Republican Achievements and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] to the Ohio League of Young Republican Clubs, at Toledo, Saturday evening, January 22, 1944:

Mr. President, members of the Young Republican Clubs of Ohio, and guests, I bring to you Republican greetings from New Hampshire. It affords me profound pleasure to be in Toledo this evening to address this large and enthusiastic audience of young Republicans. It is a source of inspiration to look into your earnest determined faces. The subject of my remarks tonight is Republican Achievements and Objectives. An attempt will be made to analyze the blunders of the New Deal, summarize the recent record of the Republican Party in Congress and discern the proper course of action for the future.

In New England we have a brand of Republicanism similar to that in this great State of the Middle West. I assure you that in the election of 1944 New England Republicans will do their full share in defeating the present administration which is seeking to control and order minutely every phase of American life. New England, Ohio, and many other States right across the continent will roll up a tremendous plurality for the Republican Party next November. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico the tide against the New Deal and its iniquities is rising. This meeting here in Toledo today is eloquent testimony to the growing sentiment prevailing throughout the country.

You have conferred upon me a singular honor in inviting me to appear here upon this most important occasion in the history of your club. This conference occurs in a year of victory for our party. I am happy to have the privilege of discussing the events of this crucial period with such a group of able party leaders. Since I am well acquainted with nearly all of the members of the Ohio delegation in the National House of Representatives my delight in visiting Ohio is doubly enhanced. The Republican spirit as manifested by Ohioans is the spirit which will produce success at the polls next fall.

OHIO—MOTHER OF PRESIDENTS

This State, the mother of Presidents, plays a most significant and decisive role in the political affairs of our Republic. Beginning with William Henry Harrison, Ohio has given to the Nation 8 Presidents, including such outstanding Americans as Grant, McKinley, and Taft. This is a pivotal State. This State can well be the determining factor in a Presidential election. It would be folly to predict what may happen at the convention in Chicago 5 months hence but of one thing we may be certain, Ohio with 22 Republican Members to 3 Democrats in the congressional delegation, with an enviable record of economy in State government which is such a marked contrast to the Roosevelt fiscal policies, with a long and eventful history of resplendent republicanism, will contribute immeasurably to the Republican victory of next fall. Ohio, the fourth largest State in the Union, with a population of 6,907,612 will swell the plurality of our victorious candidate for the Presidency. Of all the States Ohio is the most political and the most civic minded. This State, the mother of Presidents, will be in the vanguard of the Republican forces next November.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS

The activity and energy displayed by young Republicans in all sections of the country is most commendable. The young people of today will mold the America of tomorrow. We are on the threshold of a new world. Never has a greater opportunity come to any generation. Out of this horrendous catastrophe, that now holds all of the continents in its fearful grip will, we trust, emerge a peaceful international community. Out of the dislocation caused by the impact of this war will be developed a better state of affairs at home. The democracy that has so admirably weathered the ravages of this international hurricane must and will be preserved. In your hands is the shaping of the future both at home and abroad. A free economy must be guaranteed. The institutions undergirding the greatness of the United States, institutions which have made American life what it is today, must not perish. There is crying need for the finest minds in the affairs of government. The ablest statesmanship is none too good to cope with the problems of this changing world.

It is heartening to see the Young Republicans of Ohio devoting so much thoughtful consideration to public affairs. I hope that your interest and enthusiasm will ever mount and that this organization will constantly wax in strength and vigor. Your ranks include the responsible leaders of tomorrow both in State and in national affairs. The challenge of this day is to keep inviolate the heritage of our fathers and to erect a structure of world unity and peace. I am confident that we will not fail. I am certain that this generation of Americans will meet the present historic occasion with the same spirit of determination and fortitude that has characterized all our forebears and that we will develop a world community which will bring the blessings of peace and prosperity to the countless generations of human beings who will subsequently follow in our footsteps.

THE MODERN AGE

This is a revolutionary age, an age of world-wide upheaval. This is a time of deep and universal changes. The war and the peace which is to follow are parts of the same current global disturbance. Political, economic, and social problems are more complex today than in the past. The reason for this is the impact on the lives of men made by the discoveries in modern science.

The phenomenal development of aviation in the last four decades is symbolic of the present era. On the 17th of last December, we commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the discovery of flying by the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk, N. C. They made the first successful flight with a heavier-than-air machine. Their primitive craft flew 852 feet, staying in the air for 59 seconds. From the plane of the Wright brothers in 1903 to the modern bomber or the present-day transport we find a fascinating and absorbing story that is a monument to the genius of man.

The advent of flying has transformed the thinking and the relations of men. The airplane has brought the continents closer together. The airplane will give the United Nations the decision in the Second World War. The airplane is forcing the powers to accept an international point of view. It is compelling cooperation and collaboration. It will yet be the means of uniting the peoples of this earth in a more tolerant and understanding community. The plane has made imperative the erection of a world organization to prevent wars and to ensure the peace. Recognizing this, the Seventy-eighth Congress has adopted measures favoring the formulation of international machinery designed to avert future conflicts. We live in a modern scientific age. We possess limitless power. We must create a decent world in which this power can be employed for improving the welfare and facilitating the progress of all mankind.

THE WAR

The first and most pressing problem is to win the war. We are making excellent progress in the achievement of this objective. In 1943 notable military and diplomatic victories rewarded the efforts of the United Nations. Today the Nazis are being overwhelmed in Russia, reversed in Italy, and harassed by bombs in Western Europe. Under American fire the Japanese are retreating from their outposts in the Pacific. Momentous conferences, climaxed by the meeting at Teheran have developed unity among the United Nations and have given us clear-cut diplomatic advantages over our enemies. In 1944 we will see the dawn of victory. The collapse of Hitler and his military machine may be only a matter of months and the fall of Japan will doubtless be realized next year. We have every reason to be optimistic. We know that our men and our arms will crush the enemy wherever he may be found. Let us make certain that our statesmanship will win the peace.

THE POLITICAL TREND

As a result of the manner in which domestic affairs have been handled we find the presence of a definite political trend in favor of the Republican Party and opposed to the New Deal. We are at the end of a cycle in American political history. The election of November 1942 and more recent elections in New York, New Jersey, and especially in Kentucky and Philadelphia show that the revolt against the party in power is exceedingly pronounced. From the low ebb of a few years ago the fortunes of the Republicans have

markedly improved. In 1936, there were 17 Republican Senators; in 1943, 37. In 1936, 89 Republican Representatives; in 1943, 208. In 1936, 8 Republican Governors; in 1943, 26. In 1936, 9 Republican Legislatures; in 1943, 27. At the moment there are several vacancies in the National House of Representatives. Since the last congressional election we have gained a few seats making our party only a few short of having as many Members as the opposition.

My colleagues from all sections of the Nation report a growing restlessness and a determination to remove from public office those who have failed to fulfill their trusts. This Nation is becoming more and more dissatisfied, disgusted, and angry with the remiss and negligent management of affairs on the home front. As a Member of Congress I have seen enough to convince me that if many of those who are serving in administrative capacities in the National Capital are not removed from positions of authority the Government of the United States will be gravely imperiled. The people realize this and I am confident that they will so vote in the next election as to make the necessary corrections. Once the Republican Party is returned to power there will be a grand exodus of New Deal lawyers, professors, and impractical theorists from the city of Washington. Such a cleansing of the National Capital will be most salutary and will have a decidedly beneficial effect on the entire country. If this is not brought about I have the gravest fear for the future of free government in the United States.

BUREAUCRACY

The opposition to the present administration is a consequence of the cumbersome, flagrant and irresponsible administrative methods of the party in power. In the last 11 years the New Deal has built up a top-heavy and incompetent Federal bureaucracy staffed, in many instances, by people whose heads have been turned by the authority they possess. The Federal pay rolls have been swelled beyond reason. According to the Byrd report issued on November 22, Federal civilian employees in June 1943 numbered 3,095,463. In September 1943 there were 2,964,405. In a previous report the Byrd committee recommended a reduction of 300,000 persons employed by the Federal Government. This recommendation was not followed. Between June and September 1943, 35 departments and agencies eliminated 166,431, but between June and September, 30 departments increased their personnel by 35,373 making a total reduction of 131,058 Federal employees. One is not surprised that a greater reduction was not made. This administration always tries to circumvent the will of Congress.

The report made on November 22 by the Byrd committee states that should the second request for reduction of Federal employees be not heeded it will be necessary for the committee, "to recommend legislation to the Congress of the United States which will make reductions in Federal civilian employment mandatory." In an additional report by the Byrd committee, published on December 15, are these words, "the committee will continue its investigation of nonessential personnel in the hope of eliminating 400,000 or more nonessential employees from the June 1943 peak of 3,095,463 paid Federal civilian employees." This administration obviously wishes the continuation of a huge Federal bureaucracy. I have often said that if we could only place everybody on the public pay roll we would be in a truly Rooseveltian paradise. In my opinion, if half of the people who are working in the Government offices in Washington were discharged we could then conduct our business much more efficiently than it is now being carried on. We cannot permit this Nation to be strangled by an oppressive bureaucracy.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS

The root of the Federal bureaucracy as practiced by the Chief Executive is government by Executive decree. From Lincoln through Hoover, 6,070 Executive orders were issued. From 1933 to August 1943 the New Deal promulgated 3,296 Executive orders in contrast to 4,400 laws enacted by Congress in the same period. "Government by Executive decree is the New Deal's unconstitutional substitute for Congressional authority." By use of Executive decrees the administration has taken lawmaking into its own hands. The will of the Congress has been flouted and the people have been subjected to government by the White House. Federal bureaucracy through Executive decrees and directives has pushed its tentacles into every community in the United States.

REGULATIONS—CONFUSION—BUNGLING

From the most cumbersome bureaucracy the world has ever seen stream thousands of needless, nonsensical and arbitrary regulations. The backs of the people bend under this increasing load. The multitude of forms to be filled out by those engaged in business enterprises is shocking. From my experience in Congress, from information gained by talking with my colleagues, from observations made in Washington and from contacts with several agencies I am convinced that many of those who are manning the bureaus are trying to control American agriculture, American business, American industry, yes, every activity known to American life. Men with little or no practical business experience are composing the regulations. Ordinary intelligence is not often exercised in writing directives. Businessmen come to Washington pleading for reasonable action only to be turned away by those who are in authority. We readily admit that there must be restrictions to win this war but people from one end of the country to the other bear witness to the fact that much of what the New Deal has done and is doing is not only unnecessary but in many instances most harmful. I have only to refer you to the endless forms to be filled out and the unsound decisions of O. P. A. to establish the point I am making.

Confusion is the order of the day in Washington. Many agencies deal with the same subject. Over a score are involved in the handling of food. There is overlapping and duplication on every hand. Men and bureaus work at cross purposes. The situation is grievously appalling. Unless administrative reform is forthcoming the economy of this country will be so badly mangled that its destruction will be only a matter of time. There should be an immediate reduction and consolidation of Federal agencies. There should be a reduction of the Federal personnel, an elimination of many regulations, a simplification of forms to be filled out and a thorough housecleaning in the Federal Government. The New Dealers are the world's most efficient bunglers. When the final story of this period is written historians will point to the New Deal bureaucracy, its resulting regulations and confusion as the greatest example, in all the annals of history, of what government ought not to be.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE NEW DEAL

I call your attention to a report made public on November 15, 1943, by the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. This House committee devoted its statement entirely to O. P. A. The Office of Price Administration up to September 1, 1943, had issued 3,196 regulations, amendments and orders. "This mass of regulations, orders, amendments, and interpretations," states the committee, "has been largely devised and drafted by obscure officials having little business experience and approved with but cursory review by those having statutory responsibility for the administration of the Act." By way of comparison, during that period of time the Congress passed a total of only 552 public laws. "The committee believes that the facts here presented reveal practices which, if not halted, might conceivably lead to the undermining of our basic constitutional provisions for separate and independent executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government." I measure my words with exceeding care; I speak advisedly when I say that if the philosophy of the present administration is not repudiated it will wreck the American system of government. I have quoted the exhaustive study made by the Smith committee to substantiate this statement. The fearful thing about this administration, in my opinion, is that underlying its activities is a philosophy the goal of which is the complete regimentation of the United States. This means an ultimate stifling of the individual. Such a philosophy is foreign to the heritage of this Nation and I for one will oppose it with all the strength and energy I possess.

ECONOMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

In his annual message to the Congress on Wednesday of last week the President presented what he called an economic bill of rights. He listed the following rights: "The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms, or mines of the Nation; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation; the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living; the right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care, and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; and the right to a good education."

THE RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM THE CURSE OF THE NEW DEAL

With the statement of the President's program I am in full accord. It sounds well. His words and phrases are good, but like many of his promises this program will probably not be translated into action. I agree with his so-called goals and hope that they can be realized. To the economic bill of rights set forth by the President I would add the following which I believe are of equal importance. These are the right to be free from the withering, paralyzing hand of bureaucracy, the right to be free from excessive Government regulations; the right to be free from the confusion of a multiplicity of Federal agencies; the right to be free from the whims of the theorists; the right to be free from the dictates of an oppressive administration; the right to be free from the present practices of the Federal Government detrimental to American economy; the right to be free from Government by directive, and the right to be free from the philosophy of the New Deal and all of its destructiveness.

I propose to fight for the rights I have listed. We must determine whether or not we will walk to the future as free people or as pawns of an all-powerful paternalistic Government which directs our affairs from Washington. I can well imagine that the ultimate objective of those trying to direct so minutely our lives from the Capital of the Nation is to finally prescribe how much air we shall breathe, how much water we shall drink, whom we shall marry, and how many children we shall bring up.

CONGRESS CANNOT DO IT ALL

The President has called upon Congress "to explore the means for implementing" his

economic bill of rights. He said that if a progressive program is not evolved the Nation will be conscious of the fact. From this I conclude that if a program to the President's liking is not produced he is going to blame the Congress. Legislative-Executive cooperation is imperative. I would be the last to advocate a stubborn or a recalcitrant attitude on the part of the Congress on working with the Executive but we must not forget that cooperation should be both ways. Congress cannot do it all. It would help immeasurably if this administration would earnestly strive to comply with the intent of the laws instead of endeavoring to treat with contempt the will of Congress at every possible opportunity. The White House is now unable to control Congress, therefore the attempt to belittle the National Legislature. Let the Executive in good faith try to carry out the laws as the Congress has written them and we will have much better government.

THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The Seventy-eighth Congress, fully aware of the administrative confusion and bungling, has been writing a record of independent action. The only way the people of the United States can secure emancipation from the tyranny of the New Deal is by means of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. Congress fully realizes this and is interpreting correctly the mandate of the people. Congress, the greatest legislative body in the world, is being true to the trust which has been placed in it. Congress is working to end the usurpation of the Federal Government by the Chief Executive.

The National Legislature has discarded its rubber stamp. Congress is regaining the prestige so rapidly lost during the 1930's. Congress is no longer supinely submitting to the dictates of the White House. Congress is striving to save the people's money. Congress is determined to control and curtail the bureaucracy. Congress is telling the bureaucrats instead of asking them. Congress is supplying the leadership that the Nation is so insistently demanding. Congress, I believe, has the confidence of the people, and when the Senate and the House are organized by the Republican Party in January 1945 the bureaucrats will be stripped of their power. The Government of the United States will be purged from the philosophy of regimentation. The people will be freed from the hampering regulations and administrative reforms so necessary and so long overdue will be immediately brought about.

REPUBLICAN RECORD

In the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress the Republicans have established a constructive record of high achievements. They have fought for the recovery of congressional independence, for the restoration of congressional leadership, and for the legislative control of a power-drunk, power-crazed administration. In domestic affairs the Republicans battled for the repeal of the $25,000 salary limitation, the passage of pay-as-you-go tax legislation, the defeat of roll-back subsidies, the liquidation of National Youth Administration and the National Resources Planning Board, all the moves to produce economy and the overriding of the Presidential veto of the Smith-Connally bill. In foreign affairs the Republicans supported the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements, the extension of the lend-lease program and the passage of the Fulbright and Connally resolutions. These, of course, are only a few of our achievements. This is, I submit, a record of which we have a right to be justly proud. The record which we have made and the achievements which will be realized in this session of Congress will augment still further the rising confidence of the people in our party.

OBJECTIVES

The Republicans in Congress will continue unrelentingly their efforts to secure good government and to enact constructive legislation. Many questions of a grave and complex nature must be decided. In every instance paramount consideration will be directed to the welfare of the country and to the continuation of the American form of government and the American democratic system. I call your attention to a few of the major objectives of our party.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Legislation to provide mustering-out pay will soon be completed. A measure was passed by the House on Wednesday, January 19, by a vote of 387 to 0. All those eligible under the House bill are to receive mustering-out payment of $300 for active service of 60 days or more and $100 for active service of less than 60 days. The House and Senate differences will soon be resolved. I was delighted to support this legislation. It is gratifying that such unanimity prevailed. The veterans of World War No. 2—those who have sacrificed so much that our way of life may endure—are to receive proper treatment as they are mustered out of the armed forces.

Our next task is to enact legislation providing the machinery for the servicemen and women to vote. I hope that we shall soon write a law giving a complete ballot to every person in the service. We must make available the opportunity for them to participate in the next election. Certainly those who are fighting that the institutions of democracy may endure should have the privilege of taking part in our elections. Even while we are gathered here tonight lives are being lost and blood is being spilled that freedom may be possible to all men. Those who are fighting for our liberty from one end of this world to the other must have a chance to express themselves in the selection of the leaders of our Government. I shall do everything within my power to obtain an early decision in this matter. I shall strive for quick action on the soldier vote and trust that before another week has come and gone we shall have cared for this most urgent and pressing question.

We must develop a full and integrated plan to properly care for the needs of the veterans of this war. Such a program must include provisions for social security, unemployment benefits, educational benefits, medical care, old-age assistance, Government insurance, reemployment, adequate compensation to the disabled and assistance to the relatives of those who have lost their lives in the service of their country. No matter what aid we extend or how much we give or what we make available, we can never do too much for those who today are carrying this flag to victory on the battlefields of the world. It is the duty of Congress to develop a complete program of relief and rehabilitation. It is the duty of Congress to enact all the legislation necessary to care for those who have borne the brunt of battle that this Nation and all it stands for may not perish.

TAXES

The Republicans have taken a firm stand for the simplification of the tax structure. On Thursday, January 13, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives adopted a resolution demanding that the Treasury take steps to simplify tax returns. They are so complex that much of the taxpayers' time and energy is wasted. The public is demanding a decision on this problem and everything must be done to secure an early solution of this question.

The administration is still holding to its request for $10,500,000,000 in new revenue. On October 6 a statement was issued by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee stating that the administration's program, which calls for $10,500,000,000 in new revenue appeared to go "far beyond what the average person is able to pay." A second statement by Republican Members on October 19 declared against any further increases in income-tax rates and demanded economy in Government in place of the Treasury's proposals. Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of the House, said that an increase in personal or corporation income taxes would "threaten the future solvency of American business and bring about the liquidation of the middle class." The drafting of tax legislation is most difficult. Care must be exercised that in writing tax laws business is not destroyed and the taxpayers' morale undermined. The demand of the administration for a $10,500,000,000 increase in new revenue will not be realized. Such a proposal is too excessive. The tax measure now under consideration provides for only a small part of this amount.

BUSINESS

American industry has done a marvelous and unparalleled job in producing the instruments of war. We can be exceedingly proud of the production record in the United States. As peace approaches, the questions of reconversion, employment, and the termination of war contracts will become prominent issues. Jobs must be provided for our people. This can and should be done through private effort and not through Government control. Republicans stand for free enterprise, individual initiative, and economic freedom. It has been stated by your own Senator TAFT that peacetime production must be either on the basis of individual freedom or on the basis of Government control. Our efforts should be directed toward establishing conditions that will make possible free enterprise and the development of business through private effort.

FISCAL AFFAIRS

In his Budget message the President asked for expenditures totaling $99,769,000,000. It is difficult to comprehend the meaning of a hundred billion dollars. This is a period of astronomical expenditures. The 12 Roosevelt Budget messages, according to the Associated Press, will amount to more than three times the money spent by all of his 30 predecessors. By June 30 of this year the public debt will reach $198,000,000,000 and a year later $258,000,000,000. The total cost of the war is placed at $397,000,000,000. The Budget recommendations of the President must receive close scrutiny. Every dollar necessary to win the war will be appropriated, but we should make certain that public funds are used with the greatest efficiency. Economy must be practiced in spending the taxpayers' money.

WORLD AFFAIRS

The Republican Party, by the declaration at Mackinac and by the voting in Congress for the Fulbright and Connally resolutions, has expressed itself as wholeheartedly approving international cooperation and collaboration. The party will work for the construction of an international organization to preserve the peace. I personally have long been an advocate of an international organization to prevent wars and to promote the general welfare of all the people in the world. On November 5, the date of the passage of the Connally resolution, the United States Senate inaugurated a new departure in world affairs. One of the most needed reforms is now to amend the Constitution so that a simple majority of both Houses of Congress would be able to ratify a treaty. This should be the next step in developing a foreign policy to meet the complexities of this modern scientific era.

We do not intend to proceed as we did at the termination of the last war. With our limitless power has come great responsibility. As the most powerful nation on this earth, our energy must be devoted to constructing a better world for the future. Isolationism is dead. It has been killed by the impact of inventive genius. Whether we like it or not, we are an integral part of the world and must assume a place of leadership commensurate with the power we possess. Ours is a position of leadership both in war and in peace.

Never before has there been such an urgent demand for leadership and statesmanship. The Republican record in the Seventy-eighth Congress speaks eloquently for the party. It is a record opposed to bad administration and the mismanagement of our affairs on the domestic front. It is a record of full and complete cooperation in the war effort. The Republican Party is for free enterprise as against the restrictions of a paternalistic government. The party today is ready to lead in the fight for the construction of a decent international community so that the peace of tomorrow may be preserved and that the victory which our armed forces are winning will not be lost.

Never has a political organization in any country been presented with a finer opportunity. As Republicans, we have a great task to perform. Just as soon as the war is over we must fight to retrieve the extraordinary powers which have been delegated to the Executive branch of the Government. We must make certain that this Nation will have a healthy economic life in the post-war period. We must clean up the administration of domestic affairs and free the Nation from those who are trying to change this system of government. We must strive to implement the Connally resolution and help build that type of an international organization which will become the hope of the future and the hope of those who bleed and die today that the institutions of democracy may continue.

This is a time of unequalled stress and strain. This is a period of dislocation, both at home and abroad. This is an age in which emotions run high and the judgment of men is often clouded by the occurrence of terrific crises on every hand. Out of this turmoil and trouble we hope there will evolve a world free from the pain of poverty and the curse of war. As we move to an unknown and uncharted future, let us be resolved that our party shall be the instrumentality of making this Nation truly free, economically, socially, and politically. Let us be resolved that this party shall be the instrumentality whereby this Republic will assume its rightful place of leadership in the march of humanity toward the goal of world unity. Let us be determined that from the ashes of this globe-encircling conflagration, that from the pain and the blood and the sacrifices of those who are fighting for freedom, there will arise a structure of international understanding and good will that will afford to all nations the richest possible economic development at home and freedom from cruelty and aggression abroad.

Soldiers' Mustering-Out Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I was called to Louisiana last week on account of a death in my family and was absent when the soldiers' mustering-out pay bill was presented to the House. As a result I was absent when the vote was taken on this legislation and was unable to record my approval of the proposal. It is needless to say that, had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill as I have publicly stated on several occasions that I would support legislation providing mustering-out pay for the men and women discharged from the armed services. I have pledged myself to support and vote for all legislation which will assist our discharged veterans and give them the recognition they so richly deserve.

Service Men's and Women's Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to note that the Rules Committee of the House has seen fit to reject a proposal to request a House roll call on a uniform Federal ballot for servicemen. This roll call, if allowed, would have given every Member of the House a chance to be put on record as to whether or not he favors the soldiers voting in the coming election.

I have been listening with a great deal of interest to discussions on the soldiers' vote by Members of this House. Some of my colleagues say it is a matter for the States to attend to; others declare it is the Federal Government's responsibility. Some say it will help the Republican Party; others contend it will help the Democrats. To me it is immaterial which party it will help. No one can or is able to predict the outcome of the servicemen's vote because I feel, in spite of the crystal gazers, that it is an unknown and undeterminable factor.

The important thing is to give to the citizens in our armed services the right to vote and the assurance that their votes will be counted. It is my opinion that, in spite of the many desirable State laws, it will be impossible for the 48 States to handle this matter in an efficient and fair manner. Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of Navy Knox have stated that the only way that any assurance can be given to the service voters would be to have them use a Federal ballot. In view of the fact that only 23,000 of our servicemen voted in 1942 when many States had set up special voting machinery and in line with my own idea that if a man is old enough to fight he is old enough to vote, I am constrained to agree with our Secretaries of War and Navy and to urge that a Federal ballot be used to allow them the franchise which is theirs by right.

I am only sorry that provision is not being made for those between 18 and 21. If they are good service material then they are capable of being good citizens, able to vote intelligently, and certainly worthy of every consideration.

While all our service men and women are fighting for us they should, at the least, be allowed to vote for the individuals and the parties they desire to carry on their Government in their absence. It is the only fair and democratic procedure to follow.

Peace of the World After World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very instructive article entitled "Peace of the World After World War No. 2," which was prepared especially for the Postmasters Gazette of January 1944 by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, National House of Representatives:

PEACE OF THE WORLD AFTER WORLD WAR NO. 2

(By Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, National House of Representatives)

America wants an end of war. America is a Nation of peace. Adherence to the moral law—the word of God—is essential for the future permanent peace of the world. Every decent person in America yearns for peace. Present and future hopes and aspirations of every man, woman, and child will rise from the foundations of the just peace to be constructed at the termination of this war. The attainment of the legitimate ambitions of every American will depend upon the terms of the international treaties to be enacted when the blood-drenched snows have melted and the harvests are again reaped under the smiling skies of national tranquillity.

Words will never bring to a world at war the spirit of peace. The heart of man is the cornerstone of the permanent fulfillment of the desire of all men that life may be carried on in quiet and in honor in a land where the sanctity of the home is appreciated and the nobility of the family revered. The vivifying and regenerating sentiments of a utopian brotherhood of man under God must pervade the universe else all talk of peace on earth is futile, hypocritical in effort, and destructive in result, though the flags of every nation fly high in the heavens of a world, which, tired of strife and dying, has set aside weapons of war. The men and women who have paid the price of the coming victory in coin of suffering and sacrifice are keenly alert to the need of agreements between nations based upon the charity and justice of God. The prayers of their children at the close of each day ask that He make them good boys and girls and make their parents happy. They seek happiness for their parents and goodness for themselves. President, emperor, or king need look no further for their mandate for the future peace of the world.

Permanent peace depends upon universal acknowledgement of the wisdom of innocence—childlike belief and faith in God. Skeptical cynicism and despair of Him spells world chaos.

The signing of an armistice by warring nations will not mean that peace has come to the world. There are sanctions remaining to be paid by the conquered. A child who has

been disobedient is punished by its parent. A man who violates the obligation owed to society must respond in the measure of damage established by law. A nation is but a group of individuals and as a nation must pay for its atrocities in abrogation of international law. Punishment of the enemy powers will be necessary to assure the inviolability of international law.

The virtue of Christian justice must be practiced with zealous tolerance in all post-bellum deliberations if we are to approach the tommorrow after war with confident hope for universal permanent peace. The leaders of the masses responsible for the frightful slaughter of innocent civilian populations and their murderous and rapacious followers must be punished despite any false sentimentalism which may be conceived upon cessation of present hostilities. A failure to bring those tyrannical despots before a tribunal of justice willing to listen to the evidence and punish the wrongdoers will undermine the faith of nations in any high-sounding pronouncement of tract or treaty executed by the responsible leaders of the sovereign states. Militant justice is a necessary condition precedent to permanent international peace. Gentleness born of false charity toward the enemies of civilization is in utter disregard of the virtue of vigorous justice and righteous anger, and if substituted for the rational sanctions for international wrongdoing will leave the citizenry of the world unprotected against the stern realities of world hatreds and oppressions. Just anger and righteous indignation against the frightfulness of the crimes committed in the name of war must be allowed its vindication after the termination of this war as factually and punitively as that inflicted by Christ upon the money changers in the Temple. Vindictive justice and righteous anger without vicious hatred is an international obligation if the peace reborn is to endure.

Idle conjecture and vague generalities of the future authority or organization to be established to assure the wishful hoping of mankind for a durable peace are presently inopportune. America must face the future with the firmest convictions that she can only retain the virtue of her way of life if her leaders know and endeavor to follow the pathway pointed for them by the armed forces of the Nation who have fought and died to make this world a better place to practice tolerant consideration for our fellowman in national as well as international life.

The problem of permanent peace challenges the minds of statesmen, economists, industrialists as well as the masses of the peoples of the world. A just and lasting peace must rest on moral principles. The responsibility for the fulfillment of the hopes of mankind for a durable peace rests primarily upon those who by reason of their position and influence can best assist in the accomplishment of peace but this responsibility extends proportionately to all men of all creeds and races, to make certain that with knowledge of the answers to the questions involved duly elected representatives of the voice of the people apply themselves to the solution of concrete problems of universal peace. International guarantees of the rights of all individuals, the establishment of international law and the recognition of its sanctions, collective control of national armaments, are but a few of the far-reaching thoughts which enter into any discussion of post-war peace. The problems may now be properly discussed but cannot be presently solved by any specific plan devoid of generality.

Many plans are having consideration. Full participation in the councils of nations and the avoidance of all semblance of isolationism with insistence upon world trade policies and the elimination of trade barriers, a world organization for the settlement of international disputes, practical and effective, means to keep peace throughout the world, a league of nations or world association for international collaboration, are among the plans advanced for the solution of the problem by educators, religious leaders, and statesmen.

Educators are learned men who follow the noble profession of teaching the way of life. Out of all of these, some plan of a satisfactory and practical nature must be devised—must be established and put in effective operation to block the road of war mankind is traveling and to substitute therefor the road of peace. Religious leaders reflect the word of God and strive to inculcate His example as a norm of life. Political statesmen attempt to obtain for their own the expedient material blessings which will make possible the attainment of the ideals of the religious and the educators. There is one serious limitation, self-imposed by many of these leaders upon the possibility of a successful termination of a just and lasting peace. The ability of the man in the street to grasp the extent of international problems is both overestimated and underappreciated. Man in authority is prone to speak for publication and literary effect. Philosophical peace treaties of the scholar, abstract sermons on the beauty of peace on earth, and orations which portray the sacrifice of the soldier and sailor and marine and promise impossible benefits and privileges are often because of the language used upsetting to the morale of a nation. The pulse of a nation is a human pulse subject to the same treatment as the heart of man and responds to the feelings, sentiments, and emotions which shade the daily actions of each citizen. People understand simple language. Men prefer the direct approach. The cost of this war is to have a lasting burdensome effect on every living person and fanciful stories of chimerical glories of the land of tomorrow will only bring future trouble and controversy.

Every American knows that world order must be founded on moral principles wherein the rights of the individual must be protected. Oppressed nations must be liberated and the freedom with equality of minorities must be assured. It is too patently a truism to say that international social and economic cooperation must be developed in a world community wherein stability must be maintained by its component states. The average citizen wants added counsel. He wants simple answers to his personal problems.

The peace desired by the man in the street is happiness in his daily family life. He wants an opportunity for self-development with corresponding financial return to the end that he can give to his family—to his children—the little things of life which have been his ambition in his every thought and act. He wants to be told the truth about his future possibility of obtaining the realization of his simple human ideals. He wants to be assured that he can tell his children about Santa Claus and Christmas without the heartsick fear that war may mean for them death and destruction.

The future permanent peace of the world depends upon the sincerity and extent of American effort and contribution. Vast in area, powerful in resources, wealthy beyond the dreams of wealth, the world awaits with dramatic tension the first authoritative signs of the manner in which America will utilize the gifts of God to her as a nation for the great objective that decent mankind seeks—permanent and universal peace. Selfish economic and social isolationism means war after armistice. Dignified self-interest commensurate with but no greater than national obligation to a suffering war-stricken world will be the first blaze in the path toward universal peace. Americans must realize that unless they are willing to exercise internationally the spirit which motivates them in answering community-chest and Red Cross appeals there will never be world peace.

Christ lashed the money changers from the temple. America must drive into a disgraceful oblivion materialistic false leaders who would deny their Maker under the guise of national emergency, forget their spiritual obligations born of the brotherhood they profess, and like giant figures in a Satanas parade attempt to fool America by playing upon American ideals while leading their followers selfishly and with treason-like steps into future war. And there are such men in America who would sell our national honor for the proverbial silver. War profiteering, the foul parent of discord and want, even in necessities of life, is but one example of the depths to which human nature lustful for money will descend. These panderers of misfortune are not all ignorant of their evil for there are many in the lists who enjoy the social environment born of wealth and education. Profiteers are not all petty thieves. The files of the Department of Justice show the extent of the subversive operations and the type of dishonest manipulations now threatening our national structure from within.

America is fighting a war for the "four freedoms." These freedoms are not to be without limits. False and sweetly fallacious argument of demagogues and the false prophets of today that liberty means license untrammeled and unbridled is but another battle America faces between the oceans once proudly claimed as her national protection. Race hatreds within our own State exists today. Intolerance and bigotry are not dead, but unfortunately live in America to a degree which is disturbing. Classism and racism are facts, not figments of the imagination. Irreligion is too prevalent in a land where religious worship is free. These national weaknesses are obvious to the man in the streets who hopes with prayerful heart that the mists of war will not so deprive American leaders of visibility that their Ship of State will be lost on the reefs of cruel raging waters of indifference to reality.

There are certain elementary truths which must be understood and appreciated by all Americans who are sincere in their desire for peace. The existence of God cannot be forgotten and faith in Him expressed through religion must be living and open. A man with religion in his heart is a good man, and peace is only attained through the happiness of goodness. Constituted authority must have the recognition and confident assistance of the masses or peace on earth is but a figure of speech for the utilization of false phophets.

America has grown great among the nations of the world—greatest if comparison will not breed controversy—because every American citizen has been guaranteed by the principles of constitutional government the right to "life, liberty, pursuit of happiness," of equality and freedom under the law. All these rights flow from the recognition in the American way of life of the sovereignty of God—and the obligations of the moral law. American Government traditionally recognizes the inalienable rights of man which the State did not create but which our form of government safeguards and protects. American citizens appreciate the corelative obligations of their inalienable rights and wholeheartedly desire to meet their debt to society according to the proper edicts of established authority. In this relationship between the American State and the individual is implanted seed of international peace for the strength of the relationship lies in its sincere expressed antipathies to all false doctrines and expedient philosophies of the totalitarian, the gentilitarian, and of partial christianity which would destroy civilization. American leadership tends increasingly toward the effectuation of fundamental religious truths and the establishment of that social order necessary for world peace.

Victory in war is relatively simple though fearful in its cost to humanity. Victory in peace is proportionately difficult and equally as destructive to society if based on false idealism. Sons of America are fighting, and dying as instruments of God in the hope of victory in peace. These men of America are men of peace. They are consciously men of heart, sympathetic and fine, hating not their fellow man but righteously angry and demanding just punishment for the most vicious arch criminals in the history of the world. They ask not material gain through glorious treaties. They envision not a world united in peace growing in charity and tolerance before the altars of skepticism built by iconoclasts. They do visualize the future happiness of their homes where in the warmth of God's blessings inspired by His teaching they will gain His reward—eternal peace. And as Americans do not differ except accidentally from other men, in the hopes and aspirations of the ideals of American men and women lies the answer to the Peace of the World after World War No. 2.

Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the two articles by David Lawrence, one entitled "Appeasement Guide" and the other, "All This Is Called Truth," should be read by every Member of the House. If we are fighting to see that the soldier retains his right to vote, certainly we should likewise see that he receives the truth about the home front before voting:

APPEASEMENT GUIDE—WAR DEPARTMENT BOOKLET TELLS OFFICERS HOW TO COLOR MINDS OF TROOPS

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary Stimson, though a Republican, is a loyal member of the President's Cabinet, and there devolves upon him this year a task which, to say the least, is as difficult as any a cabinet member has ever faced. It is within his power to make votes for President Roosevelt's fourth term among the 7,000,000 soldiers who will be overseas this year. It is within his power also to remove any obstacle to letting the soldiers know the truth about the home front and do their own thinking. Mr. Stimson's job is not to give them canned facts, artificially concocted by some of his subordinates in the Pentagon Building.

Unfortunately, Mr. Stimson has gotten off to a bad start. Some of these subordinates have already compromised his position by an official guide which has been distributed to informational officers and those concerned with orientation courses in the Army.

For a moment, as the reader peruses this guide, he wonders whether he is reading a Nazi or Communist booklet used to indoctrinate troops or just an example of official ineptitude or of unconscious imitation. For the War Department guide tells the officers how to color the minds of the troops on current events—and on the very things that will make votes for or against the Roosevelt administration this year.

It isn't the business of the Secretary of War to appease the soldiers and help them get over their own bitterness against the present administration for capitulating to John L. Lewis; and for the President's refusal to allow the Smith-Connally bill to contain penalties against wartime strikes. Yet, Mr. Stimson's "guide" puts the stamp of approval on one kind of news and excludes other news that it feels may be harmful. Thus the guide says:

"Certainly the story that manpower is due to be drafted for war-factory service is information of a type which is calculated to make the average individual in military service more contented with his lot."

Who can assure that to be true if mothers and fathers back home are to be drafted to help manufacturers make more profits? And who will vouch for the accuracy of the foregoing flat statement that "manpower is due to be drafted for war-factory" service? Hasn't all the news of the past week indicated that Congress does not intend to pass such a law? Why shouldn't the War Department speak of the manpower draft as an accomplished thing in a pamphlet to be distributed and used for many months to come?

The guide says, moreover, that "no good purpose is served by plying the soldier with information emphasizing the prevalence of high wages or extraordinary profits."

Isn't there room for a considerable difference of opinion on that point? If wages and profits are high, shouldn't the soldier know about it so that he may express himself in his letters to his home-town newspaper or even to soldier newspapers which reflect soldier opinion? Has the American soldier suddenly lost his right to the freedom of information which President Roosevelt acclaims as one of the four precious freedoms?

There is a simple cure for all this business of trying to make up the minds of American citizens or the soldiers overseas as to what they should think. It is not to hand them Government-made propaganda. It is not to use Government funds, as is now being done, to buy for Army camps specially selected pieces of printed matter that deal with controversial subjects, such as news or news interpretation. It is to let the soldiers do their own thinking by merely making accessible to them American magazines, newspapers, and radio programs by transcription. It is easy enough to make miniature newspapers and magazines. American publishers and radio companies would be glad to make their wares available to the soldiers for a few cents, just as cigarettes or any other commercial articles sold at camp stores are available. This method has some limitations, such as shipping space, but it is much better than to let someone with a master mind in Washington dictate what the soldier should read or should think about what he has read.

The soldiers can take it. The 7,000,000 Americans overseas are not children, but, according to the Army's own claims, the best educated Army in the world. Already the reactions of the soldiers are reaching here in letters to parents and to newspapers and are beginning to affect American public opinion in the good old American way—by the healthy exposure of news to the cool air of the citizens' judgment, unaffected by the Nazi or Communist tricks of indoctrination or by Government order.

ALL THIS IS CALLED TRUTH—WAR DEPARTMENT BOOKLET VIOLATES SOLDIER'S FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

(By David Lawrence)

Millions of letters, many of them containing clippings from American newspapers and magazines, go out daily to the soldiers overseas telling what is happening on the home front, but nevertheless official instructions have been issued to color the news that goes directly to the Army through soldier publications and the word-of-mouth conversation of informational officers.

Strangely enough, all this is called truth. The Associated Press recently performed a public service by drawing attention to the contents of the booklet now being distributed by some bureau in the War Department which tells how the news should be colored for the benefit of the troops.

"The fundamental principle of American information about the war," says the pamphlet, "is that we will speak the truth." But then comes the qualifying instructions and limitations which nullify the foregoing thus:

"A truth need not only be well-rounded, but the utterance of it should take account of the stresses and objectives of the moment. Truth becomes falsehood unless it has the strength of perspective. The presentation of facts is self-justifying only when the facts are developed in their true proportion."

But who is to determine that perspective or true proportion? The booklet goes on to authorize informational officers to allow their own opinions of what's good or bad for the soldiers to prevail. It says:

"In the treatment of all materials pertaining to the state of the Nation, personnel supplying information to the armed forces should be guided not only by the degree of interest of the audience in the subject presented, but, equally, by the probable effect of the presentation upon the audience.

Isn't this the very thing the Nazi and Communist governments do in their propaganda, and can such a practice really be classed under the heading of "truth"? What makes these instructions even more questionable is that if every informational officer in the Army is to be the judge of the "probable effect of the presentation on the audience," can there be any uniformity? And will not the soldier, when he ultimately gets the whole truth from the press back home in the form of clippings or by reading old copies of newspapers and magazines sent to him, wonder why he has been told by his own officers partial truths that can so often be misleading?

The whole subject is pertinent this year because the soldier vote may prove to be the balance of power in the election. If the news which is permitted to get to soldiers through official channels is to be colored by officialdom, can it be said that we are dealing fairly or honestly with the 7,000,000 soldiers estimated recently by Senator LODGE as the number to be overseas this year?

The fact that Secretary Stimson is a Republican does not alter the proposition that the election can be won for the Roosevelt administration by the sending of colored news on current events, and if Mr. Stimson sanctions the kind of booklet that is being distributed as official instructions to informational officers on handling the news of current events for the soldiers, then he is to that extent assisting in the dissemination of misleading propaganda to the Army.

Evidently it is feared that the soldier is not capable of doing his own thinking. He must be treated tenderly with respect to home-front news—which, incidentally, has produced in recent months a distinct antiadministration feeling among the soldiers due to the President's capitulation to Lewis and to the union groups. But the War Department bureau now wants that kind of news soft-pedaled, as witness the following excerpt from its cleverly worded instructions:

"No good purpose is served by plying the soldier with information emphasizing the prevalence of high wages or extraordinary profits or other data tending to show that he is carrying an excessive share of the burden of the war, or that civilian forces on the whole are not cooperating, or that certain economic or social groups are slipping into special favor. The harmfulness of such generalizations is likely to offset whatever truth they may contain."

It will be observed that in the foregoing the writers of the pamphlet evidently thought it was rendered harmless by insertion of the word "emphasizing," but this opens up a wide area of discretion to the informational officer so that he may suppress news dispatches according to his own idea of what is emphasis.

Likewise, there is an adroit reference in the above "civilian forces on the whole." Nobody has ever set up such a straw man before. What has been said often—because it's true—is that certain economic or social groups are slipping into "special favor." But to the Army instructional officer truth of that nature is taboo. To mention it, of course, might do damage to the political fortunes of the Roosevelt administration which has been dispensing such special favors.

Most of the soldiers are over 21 years of age and quite capable of forming their own judgments if they can get the news through customary channels. Yet these same young men are being asked to sacrifice their lives in a war to preserve the "four freedoms," and one of the four, as named by President Roosevelt, is "freedom of information."

Make English a World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from ex-Senator Owen to the Secretary of State:

JANUARY 15, 1944.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Accept my thanks for your letter of January 14 advising me that the President has sent to you my letter to him of January 3, on the subject of making English a world language.

Since writing this letter to the President, I have received Prof. Mario A. Pei's book, Languages for War and Peace, which contains a review of the languages of the world and in specific terms within its cover contains instruction for teaching English-speaking people how to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, and Japanese on a fixed pattern. His other volumes dealing with Chinese, Arabic, Malay, and Dutch are in process of publication.

This book, however, demonstrates the justification of Professor Pei in approving the global alphabet in principle and gives the proof in specific terms that the sounds employed in these languages above enumerated can be written with the global alphabet. The vital fact to which I call your attention is that the sounds employed are covered completely by the symbols used in the global alphabet. For example, every sound of the Russian alphabet of 33 letters is covered by the symbols of the global alphabet so that the global alphabet with its stenographic advantage could be immediately applied to Russian, or to Japanese, as well as to Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian, German. Moreover, my stenographic alphabet can be expanded by phonetic symbols which I have provided to cover any particular sound that might be thought of sufficient importance to justify it.

I request your office to obtain the book, Languages for War and Peace.

I enclose for the information of your office in this connection the book, The Silent Billion Speak, of Frank Laubach, Ph. D., on his experience in abolishing illiteracy in 80 other different languages by the use of various phonetic alphabets devised by him and his associates for these numerous language groups.

He has employed the Roman letters for his various phonetic alphabets but the disadvantage of the various Russian alphabets and of the alphabets employed by Dr. Laubach is that they differ from each other; second, that they employ symbols which in the different languages have different sounds and therefore none of these alphabets can be employed as a world alphabet.

The global alphabet takes this into full account and employs symbols which do not have multiple meanings, which do not have silent letters, and which do not have multiple meanings either in an individual language or, of course, in other languages.

Moreover, my alphabet has been reduced to the simplest forms humanly possible consistent with complete legibility and freedom from confusion with each other. This will enable the people of the world to write the phonetic alphabet as script very much faster than by the use of alphabets using the forms which they now employ.

The great advantage of the global alphabet is that the student who is learning English will have a text in which his own language and the English language are written interlinear with identical meaning. But both languages appearing in the global alphabet enables the foreign student of English to read and pronounce with substantial correctness the English language, as well as his own, leaving him only the necessity for learning the meaning of the English words.

Twelve hundred words of English will suffice to carry on satisfactorily conversation with commercial, social, and general matters of interest, but opening the door to English with 1,200 words of course opens the door to learning many other English words of like sound and shades of meaning. The great advantage of the phonetic alphabet in all these languages is that the individual can learn to read his own language in one day and thus avoid the 10 years of time which it takes a child to learn the archaic spelling employed by literary men in all the modern languages. The phonetic alphabet in all these languages opens the door of knowledge immediately through books printed with the phonetic letters. The Russian people are entitled to the credit of emancipating their world (one-sixth of the globe) from illiteracy and the ignorance and poverty due to illiteracy. The new world established on the basis of the good-neighbor policy, for which we are profoundly indebted to you, will be a new world of literacy and of multiplied production which will enable people now illiterate to increase their output ten-fold through modern processes and make this world a world of superabundance and human brotherhood. This increase of production will enable communities now illiterate to send vast quantities of their surplus production to the United States and to other friendly nations and establish the credits with which to buy the manufactured goods of other nations. The world will create radio receiving sets and will be able to make them. This will enable the voice of the President of the United States to speak to the whole world in English with the speed of light. The prophecy is being rapidly fulfilled were the Master said, "I have many things to say to you which you cannot bear now" but the Comforter (the Spirit of Truth) "shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have spoken to you." Every hour of the day the radio is transmitting the Christian doctrine of brotherhood in some form or other to the ends of the earth.

I venture to suggest, Mr. Secretary, that you might have your experts examine Languages for War and Peace, and Dr. Laubach's book, The Silent Billion Speak, in connection with the material on the global alphabet sent you by the President, together with the book of Williams, The Russians, the book of Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, The Soviet Power, and the book, Mission to Moscow, by Mr. Davies, which gives in detail what Russia has accomplished through the phonetic alphabet and their policy of the intensive education of the people through this advantageous mechanism. Thirty thousand new phonetic books are now being manufactured annually, distributed, and read with avidity by the Russian people. Laubach, in closing his letter to me approving my alphabet said, "Yours for a great cause." No man alive is better qualified than he and he is now working with Nelson A. Rockefeller who is serving so well in advancing the cause of human understanding and the good neighbor policy in connection with our Government.

May I not suggest that you invite President Douglass, of the American University, to examine this matter and make an additional report for the sake of the record?

I do not underestimate the forces of apathy, of preoccupation, of prejudice to the reception of a new way to spell, to write, to read the English language, but I do know the American children of 9 and 10 years of age can learn to read this alphabet with a very few hours of instruction for I am having this demonstrated now in Washington City as proof of the fact, because local proof of 40 children is sometimes more persuasive than the proof furnished afar off by 350 languages, to which I have above referred as evidence.

I cannot close this letter to you without expressing my deep and affectionate appreciation of the colossal services you have rendered as a great public servant in building up the good neighbor policy and in the happy results of the conferences of Moscow, Cairo, and Tehran.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

The U. N. R. R. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from the Minnesota United Nations Committee in favor of U. N. R. R. A.:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 22, 1944.*

Representative WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Congress Building:

The Minnesota United Nations Committee regards the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Conference as one of the most hopeful and necessary steps in world cooperation, if we are to have a basis on which to build world organization, if we are to have markets for our goods and employment for our people, we must realize that the help of all nations is necessary to rehabilitate the devastated nations instead of allowing them to become the prey of disease, anarchy, and revolution. We respectfully urge your favorable vote for the full appropriation for U. N. R. R. A.

DONALD J. COWLING,
Chairman, Minnesota United Nations Committee.

Streamlining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial in the Washington Post of January 23, 1944, entitled "Study of Congress," and am of the opinion that this article will be of interest. The editorial follows:

STUDY OF CONGRESS

Congress has reacted very slowly to the efforts to modernize its machinery and reorient it in our present system of big government. All the outstanding reforms suggested by members and critics of Congress are yet to be accomplished. Yet the American Political Science Association's Committee on Congress believes that changes are on the way. In its third progress report the committee points out that modernization of Congress is now a topic of widespread discussion. There is a growing awareness that Congress will have to improve its methods of operation if it is to remain a great democratic legislature in the complicated post-war era. "Its ability to play its role successfully," as the committee points out, "will depend upon its willingness to appraise and modify not merely its internal machinery, methods, and customs, but the whole question of its place in our scheme of government, including its relations with the Executive on the one hand, and with the people, on the other."

The committee visualizes Congress declining in public esteem and leadership if it attempts to carry its colossal burden of work without modernizing its machinery. That could mean only further shifting of responsibility and power to the President. Even if Congress goes halfway with the reformers, it will have a difficult time arresting the decline of its powers. Mr. George B. Galloway and his fellow explorers in the wilderness of congressional custom, tradition, seniority and habit do not want to stop at the halfway mark. They are urging Congress to reappraise the whole problem of a representative legislature in an era of wide and expanding Federal powers.

What the experts seem to be saying is that Congress will have to modernize its own machinery or surrender more of its policy-making functions to the bureaucrats. Now that is precisely what Congress wishes to avoid. So it should have the greatest possible interest in strengthening its own ability to act in the public interest. A few alert members are working persistently toward this end, among them Representatives DIRKSEN, KEFAUVER, and MONRONEY; Senators LA FOLLETTE, MALONEY, and others. Some of them have proposed admirable specific reforms, such as a question period in the House for the heads of executive departments and the development of congressional research staffs. But by all odds the most hopeful measure on this subject is the Maloney-Monroney resolution to create a joint committee on ways and means of improving the organization and effectiveness of Congress.

In fairness to itself, we believe, Congress should hasten to get this study under way. The country cannot be saved from the extremes of bureaucracy merely by hampering the President. Nor can it substitute positive and constructive policies for the present planless muddling on the domestic front unless Congress itself is organized to function as a modern, responsible policy-making body. We think it is time for Congress to take a long and critical look at itself, and the best possible beginning would be the designation of a handful of its most alert and forward-looking Members to launch such a study.

Let the Soldiers Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the question that confronts us is whether or not we really want those serving in the armed forces to vote for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives in Congress, and to have those votes counted as cast. Everyone will say yes. If that be true, why quibble? Some raise the question of State rights. Let me impress upon you that if our armed forces do not win this war there will be no such thing as State rights.

As for me, I will make it plain between State rights and the right of 10,000,000 men and women in the armed forces to vote in November. I am not going to pay the least attention to dilatory arguments that have been advanced under the guise of State rights. We were not seriously troubled with State rights when we passed the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act which protects members of our armed forces from the sale of their property to satisfy tax assessments, from foreclosure of mortgages on their property, from court action against them during their service, and from the operation of statutes of limitations.

I take the position Congress has the right to enact legislation that will permit those in the armed forces to vote for Federal officials and to make it mandatory their votes be counted.

In the States where registration is required I want to see that waived.

When the War and Navy Departments tell us they just cannot handle this matter and comply with 48 different State laws, then it becomes our duty to pass a law that will govern in every State in the Union.

The majority report holds the so-called Lucas-Worley bill would violate the Constitution. I do not agree with that view but maintain Congress has jurisdiction if it exercises it. Section 4, of artitcle I, reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators.

Therein you find authority for the passage of proper legislation. It specifically provides Congress can by law make or alter State regulations.

No one can deny that under article I, section 4, Congress is given the power at anytime by law to make or alter State regulations relative to elections for Senators and Representatives. There is only one limitation and that is, Congress shall not alter State regulations or laws relating to the "places of chusing Senators."

Amendment 17 amends the Constitution to provide for the election of Senators by popular vote and they are now elected in a manner similar to Representatives instead of by the State legislatures as was originally done. The State legislatures, under the seventeenth amendment, retain some authority or control in the election of Senators, but only in connection with vacancies as it provides that "the legislature of any State may empower the Executive thereof to make temporary appointment until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct." The use of the words "may empower" and "may direct" makes it permissive rather than mandatory for the State legislature to act, and this seems to be entirely in keeping with the original intent of the framers of the Constitution as expressed in article I, section 4, which gives Congress the right to alter State election laws and regulations.

The limitation "except as to the places of chusing Senators" in article I, section 4, is no longer operative because of the amendment providing for the election of Senators by popular vote. At the time that limitation was written it was contemplated to elect Senators by the State legislatures.

Article II, section 1, makes provision for the election of the President and Vice President. That these two officers are likewise representatives of the people no one can deny. The control of the Federal Government over the election of these officers seems to be exclusive. Under this article, "Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress." Here again we find the use of the words "may direct." The action of the State legislatures is simply administrative and directory rather than mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, I have examined the law of my State relative to the casting of ballots of members of the military or naval forces passed in 1943. I say without fear of contradiction if the Missouri law prevails not more than a few of the thousands of men and women in the service who are on duty outside of my State will be able to cast a ballot.

Congress must exercise the powers set out in the Constitution and pass legislation providing a simple method to take care of this question.

The right of the serviceman to vote is the only issue. I say that the Federal Government which took these millions of men and women from their homes has the duty of protecting their right to a voice in the control of the Government. Thousands of our young men have al-

ready died in battle. Other thousands have been wounded or are prisoners. Men who are willing to die for America are certainly fit to vote in America. Unless the Federal Government, which sent these men and women where they are, provides a simple and practical way for them to vote they will not do so.

The obligation to provide a means for our servicemen and servicewomen to vote rests upon us. Let us fulfill that obligation.

Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of this Congress to one of the most perfidious, insidious, and dangerous pieces of propaganda that has yet been given to the public by those who are backing the Green-Lucas soldier-vote bill.

I hold in my hand an expensive ad paid for in the Washington Post by Mrs. J. Borden Harriman and the American Free World Association, one of the idle rich, former Ambassador to Norway, and now Democratic National committeewoman for the District of Columbia. She resides, when in Washington, at one of her palatial homes, Uplands, Foxhall Road.

This false piece of propaganda shows how far those who are trying to take political advantage of the soldiers will go to accomplish their ends. This ad will probably be read by 100,000 soldiers in this district. It is hurting the war effort because it preaches disunity—it gives the soldiers the false idea that the Members of Congress are attempting to withhold from them a vote. This advertisement and such other like statements have been deliberately put out to inflame the minds of the soldiers for political purposes and is definitely hurting the war effort.

It is time that such misrepresentations which are definitely hurting the war effort in this country be stopped.

I have a nephew who was killed at Tarawa. When I was home during the holidays his parents received this terribly sad Christmas present in a telegram stating that their lieutenant son had been killed in action.

I want to say to the Members of this Congress that every father and mother of a soldier with whom I talked while home urged upon me the passage of the House committee bill in order to give the soldiers a free right to vote as provided in our bill.

Again I say, it is time such irresponsible statements that are being made for political purposes which are hurting the war effort be stopped. It is more important to win the war and keep unity in this country than it is to pass the Green-Lucas bill in their attempt to vote the soldier rather than to give the soldier a chance to vote under our bill.

Post-War Disposal of Surpluses and Public Works Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the United States Conference of Mayors at Chicago, Ill., on Friday, January 21, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference of Mayors, I am honored to have the opportunity to address you gentlemen who represent one of our important branches of government and discuss post-war problems that are of vital interest to all of us.

It is imperative that we begin planning now for peace. Some people feel that we should wait until peace comes before we start making plans, but if we wait until that time a catastrophe might follow. Every American knows that we were not prepared to wage war when we were attacked December 7, 1941. Every American knows that after the crippling blow dealt us by the Japs at Pearl Harbor we did not have sufficient strength in trained men and weapons to wage an offensive war. The enormous problem of building our military strength without properly trained military and civilian personnel made the task most expensive. We were called upon overnight to commence the most stupendous building and construction program ever attempted by any nation. As a result of our attitude toward preparedness and as a result of our belief that no enemy would ever attempt to invade our shores, we had few airplanes, few guns, and few tanks on hand December 7, 1941. Although we were temporarily stunned, fortunately, our leadership realized the precarious situation and began moving with the full cooperation of the American people. All of us have criticized at one time or another waste in our preparedness program. Most all of us lose sight of the fact that we were without trained personnel, both civilian and military, to undertake the huge armament program that was laid down for us. We can charge off to inexperience a large part of the waste.

We peace-loving Americans were responsible for not having well-prepared plans and blueprints for waging war. It goes without saying that we must be better prepared for the coming peace or revolution might follow. In 1857, when a world-wide depression was well under way, Friedrich Engels wrote to Karl Marx, his contemporary, stating: "A continuing economic depression could be used by astute revolutionary strategy as a useful weapon for a chronic pressure * * * in order to warm up the people."

The problem of preventing an economic depression after this war is going to require the full cooperation of public officials, labor, and industry in working out a solution. There are those who think the Federal Government should solve the problem. The Federal Government must cooperate, but the final solution must be made by the local communities. Some of the cities you gentlemen represent will not be materially affected by the cancelation of war contracts. Other cities will be faced with ruin unless immediate employment can be given to former war workers. I believe local problems can be solved best by local men. You gentlemen are much better informed on the conditions existing in your respective cities than a representative of some Federal bureau or a Member of Congress in Washington.

We often hear someone criticizing our lawmakers and our State, county, and municipal officers for not being men of exceptional ability. At times we all join in this criticism, and God forbid the day when freemen are prohibited from lifting their voices in criticism of their elected officials. When that day comes we will lose all our freedoms and will be governed by a one-man dictatorship.

What about the caliber of our elected officials? A large majority of them are average Americans, no better or worse than their neighbors. As long as we elect average Americans, we will continue to have a democracy. You can name all the brilliant Presidents on the fingers of one hand and have fingers left over. It is needless for me to remind you that our brilliant officials usually make the poorest executives for they do not respond to the will of the people. Many times public opinion is wrong but in the great majority of instances it is right and our security is much safer when guided by the will of the people than by the whims of a dictator, no matter how benevolent he might be.

A few years ago you occasionally heard a voice in the distance warning against Federal encroachment on States' rights. As the years passed others joined in the cry until today this topic is in the forefront of all political discussions. The encroachment is alarming not only to those of us who are interested in the preservation of our States as autonomous governing bodies but to all who are interested in the preservation of our local governing bodies, for if the State governments are destroyed by Federal encroachment, it follows that all local forms of self-government will be subject to the wishes of the Central Government.

At times I think our schools do not place enough emphasis on the teaching of history: ancient, medieval, and modern. Organized governments from the dawn of civilization have experienced many of the problems that face us today. Many great nations have risen from insignificant states through work, courage, foresight of its leaders, and economic freedom, to a place of leadership in culture, religion, and trade, but most of them have fallen sooner or later. Some have been entirely forgotten. Others, like Persia, Egypt, Greece, to name a few, are now under the protection of newer and more powerful states.

What caused these once powerful nations to fall? A careful study of history will furnish the answer. When a country is rising in importance and international leadership, its people enjoy spiritual, cultural, and economic freedom. Individual ambitions are based on unlimited hope and the knowledge that extra energy and ingenuity will be rewarded with more of the worldly goods to face the rainy day. This can be termed the accumulating era. Then for a period of years groups become selfish, followed by complacency and apathy. The so-called "haves" lose their initiative, and the "have nots" covet their neighbors' belongings. Both groups petition their Government, one for protection, the other for a share in his neighbor's holdings, the result being that both groups become dependent on the Government. History will prove to anyone that when this stage arrives the Nation is either conquered by a stronger state or some tyrant takes control of the Government. History

further shows that all nations controlled by tyrants or dictators do not long endure. History can be used to predict the downfall of any modern nation just as accurately as an astronomer can predict the eclipse of the sun. When the people's demand for economic security at the hands of our Government is met by the Government instead of by individual initiative, you may well prepare for the fall of the system of government you and I love. When this day comes, instead of improving the standard of living of all our people, we will reduce the standard and become a decadent state that will fall easy prey to a more aggressive and virulent people. We are much closer to this fate than we may think. There are strong forces in America today that have enlisted the support of innocent people who are out to destroy our system of government and have the Federal Government guide every thought and action of our lives from the cradle to the grave. Their plans sound plausible at first glance, but with careful scrutiny you will learn in time, I hope, that they will result in disaster. We must not blind ourselves to the dangers ahead but must meet the challenge and preserve our American institutions. If other systems of government are better than our own, why are we today the arsenal of democracy?

Who is responsible for the rapid usurpation of States' rights by the Federal Government? A careful study of the trend will convince you that we are all partially responsible. In the last few years, the Federal Treasury has been used as the prescription counter to cure all our ills. State officials have come to the Federal Government for funds to carry out programs that our founding fathers never dreamed of. County and municipal officials in thousands of instances have come to the Federal Treasury for funds to pave streets and roads, build hospitals, schools, sewage systems, and numerous other projects. We Members of Congress have helped you in every possible way. The food found in the Federal trough seemed to have many more vitamins, and we tried to think it was not costing our local taxpayers anything. We soon awakened to the fact that each of us had to pay for these projects by increased taxation. Some are beginning to see that when Federal funds are spent in a local community, Federal control follows. The same person who pays Federal income tax also pays State, county, and municipal taxes, and there is a limit to the total amount of taxes a person can pay. If we continue to feed at the Federal trough, we must expect an increase in Federal taxation, which means that the burden of the taxpayer will have to be reduced by the States and local political subdivisions, thereby reducing the funds with which our States, counties, and municipalities have to carry out their normal functions. This will, of course, necessitate further Federal assistance and further encroachment and control. It can be truly said that the power of the Federal Government to tax can be used to destroy our States and local governing bodies. You men have a vital interest in the preservation of our local forms of self-government and upon your shoulders and the shoulders of the officials of our States rests the future course of our dual system of government.

How can the trend toward Federal control be halted? The answer to this question, on the surface, might appear to be complex but it is not. The answer is for our States and local political subdivisions to begin solving their own problems now and not expect them to be solved by the Federal Government.

When the war is over our national debt will be $300,000,000,000 or more. We will have to spend $5,000,000,000 yearly for insurance, hospitalization care, and compensation for our veterans and their dependents. We will have to spend $10,000,000,000 or more to maintain our Army and Navy. Our normal Federal expenses, over and above the afore-mentioned items, will be $12,000,000,000, including the interest on our staggering debt but not a dime to retire any bonds. This adds up to $27,000,000,000 in Federal expenditures. We hope the annual national income will be well over $100,000,000,000 but must be prepared for it to be less than $80,000,000,000. Keeping the above figures in mind, do you think the Federal Government will be in a position to launch a large public-works program? We must not kid each other. Of course, some cities who have had an enormous in-migration resulting from war industries will experience great difficulty in the immediate post-war period in finding employment for their residents and some Federal assistance must be given. Most of our States and municipalities are in much better financial position than the Federal Government. I know that you gentlemen have given a lot of time and study to the employment situation when the war contracts are canceled in your cities. Some are hesitant about making blueprints until the amount of Federal participation is known. Knowing the condition of the Federal Treasury and realizing that people will not buy bonds to finance public-works projects with the same patriotic fervor they are now buying War bonds, I warn you not to expect much financial assistance from the Federal Treasury.

The subject I was asked to discuss with you gentlemen is the disposition of our enormous war surpluses, which are a result of the most magnificent production job accomplished by any nation in so short a time. Our military planners, the War Production Board, labor and industry are to be congratulated upon bringing our production to the present astronomic figures. When our production goal was set by the President in his message to Congress soon after Pearl Harbor, the most optimistic had their doubts about the goal ever being reached. Today American ingenuity, American skill and American management have surpassed the goal in many instances. In fact, we have already been able to cut back production on many ordnance contracts. Many new industries have come into existence as a result of our war effort. All of our established heavy industries have been greatly expanded. Today our aircraft capacity is more than 20 times what it was in 1939. The production of high-octane gasoline has increased manyfold in the last 3 years. Chemical production has greatly expanded. Unheard of electrical devices that will be of great value in peacetime have been developed. Our machine tool industry has increased its production until there is great fear in many circles for the future of that industry which is so important to our American system of mass production. It is needless to call your attention to the enormous increases in our refining and processing capacity of aluminum, magnesium, steel and other metals and alloys. Within a few months we will be producing almost twice as much synthetic rubber as we consumed natural rubber in peacetime. The Federal Government has invested almost $20,000,000,000 in the construction of new plants, additions to old plants and loans to private industry to meet the needs of our war production. Many of these plants are equipped with more modern machinery than the plants operated by private industry at the outset of the war.

When the war ends the Federal Government will own 92 percent of the production capacity of magnesium which can be put to many new uses; 50 percent of machine tools; 55 percent of aluminum of which we now have a surplus; 10 percent of steel; 99 percent of synthetic rubber; 50 percent of chemicals and plastics; 90 percent of aircraft; a large percentage of shipyards and many other industries necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. We will produce over $80,000,000,000 worth of war products this year, which is well over our total production for 1939. Most of these plants are operated by private industry under options permitting the operating company to purchase the plants within a specified time. It is generally understood that few of these options will be exercised.

However, industry and the public have a vital interest in how these plants are to be disposed of. Unless we surround their disposal with every safeguard, we can very easily destroy many industries that we hope will be able to absorb American workers in peacetime production. The best available information is that we will have on hand at the end of the war over $50,000,000,000 worth of so-called personal property consisting of machine tools, tractors, jeeps, minerals, strategic metals, and thousands of other commodities. In all probability, we will have on hand over 100,000 surplus airplane motors. One of the greatest threats to the future progress of military and civil aviation will be the dumping of this enormous surplus of airplane motors for an unconscionably low price. It is an established fact that at the end of World War No. 1 we had on hand over 15,000 Liberty airplane motors, a large percentage of which was sold at junk prices. These motors powered boats and aircraft for a period of 10 years or more, being sold at such a low figure that motor producers could not compete in this field and the improvement of the airplane motor was retarded for many years by this unwise practice. After this war is over we hope that it will be possible to continue to increase airplane-motor efficiency by new discoveries and improvements. This cannot be hoped for if we permit the enormous surpluses to hang over the heads of motor producers.

Many people will clamor for the sale of jeeps and trucks to the farmers and to small business concerns. If we were to sell a jeep for $100 to a farmer, it would sound like a bargain, but when we sell that jeep for such a price, we will also have on hand enough canned goods, enough nonperishable foodstuffs, textiles, and other commodities to dump them on the market and beat the price of the farmers' products down to a figure where $100 would be an exorbitant price for the jeep.

It is highly probable that 15,000,000 workers will be thrown out of work when the war ends. We will have 8,000,000 men demobilized from the armed forces. These 23,000,000 Americans will want to work on the farms and in private industry. Our overburdened taxpayers and our enormous debt will not permit a public works program of the magnitude necessary to employ 23,000,000 people. It will be impossible for the automotive industry to employ a large number of the returning soldiers and the unemployed war workers if that industry is forced to compete with the low prices of dumped jeeps, trucks, and tractors.

It might be to the best interests of our country to turn back to the manufacturer as much of the surplus goods as they desire to handle in order that the surplus will be distributed through regular trade channels, in such quantities as the market can absorb without unduly impairing normal peacetime production. It will take the best brains in America to work out a coordinated system of orderly disposition of our surplus. Steps must be taken to prevent scandals. Disposal must, of necessity, be slow. Many plants should be held by the Government as stand-bys for future emergencies. Of course, we all hope that there will never be another war, but we must be practical and prepare ourselves for any eventuality. The next time we might not have 18 months to prepare for an offensive. The next Pearl Harbor might be Seattle, San Francisco, Boston, New York, Norfolk, or Mobile.

It is my understanding that groups are now organized and in the process of being organized with enormous capital resources to purchase these surpluses for the proverbial

song. No person, group, or organization should be permitted to make unconscionable profits out of the surpluses that have been produced by the sweat and blood of the American people. No hastily organized group should be permitted to fleece the taxpayers and destroy American enterprise. In disposing of surpluses that will be resold, the Government should place a maximum retail sales price on each item allowing a fair profit and necessary handling charges to the original purchaser, but at the same time prohibiting exorbitant profits by brokers who purchase Government surpluses.

You gentlemen will be vitally interested in what happens to the many airfields, warehouse facilities, and port installations that have been constructed with Federal funds. I think these airfields, hangars, and other buildings connected with the fields should be leased to the municipalities for a nominal rent, the Federal Government reserving the right to take control immediately in the event of a national emergency. The same procedure, in all probability, should be followed with reference to the port installations. Where the Federal Government owns and operates plants or other facilities in competition with taxpaying organizations, I think the Federal Government should pay a reasonable tax to State, county, and municipal governing bodies. I know of some counties that are having great difficulty in maintaining their school systems due to the increased acquisition of lands by the Federal Government.

It has been suggested that, when declared surplus, certain equipment such as gasoline rollers, bulldozers, motor trucks, lighting plants, hospital equipment, and other materials be turned over to our States, counties, and cities for a nominal sum. There are probably some good arguments for such a program, but I think if we follow this suggestion we will run into many dangerous situations and will defeat the very purpose of an orderly disposition of the surpluses. If we turn over to such political subdivisions the items just referred to for a nominal price, we will be opening the way for all interested groups to receive the same treatment at the hands of the Federal Government. The consuming public will demand for a nominal price the large surplus of canned goods, woolen blankets, shoes, textiles, and other commodities, and if we make an exception in favor of one group we cannot deny the requests of another group. Following such a program would result in the closing down of many plants that give employment and pay taxes to support local institutions.

In many cities the Federal Government has constructed and now owns large factories with an enormous amount of floor space. Some of these factories are now being used in the manufacture of aircraft, aircraft engines, tanks, and other military equipment. It is a foregone conclusion that we will not be making 100,000 planes per year when the war is over. We will be making fewer airplane engines and few, if any, tanks. Existing aviation companies own ample space to manufacture all the planes and parts that will be used in peacetime. These huge Government-owned factories will be idle unless a plan can be worked out to convert them to peacetime production of other commodities. Many of the buildings are too large for one organization to use in normal peacetime production. We hope that the local communities can organize groups to take over these plants and have many small industries under one roof to give employment to local citizens.

I urge upon you when you return home to organize committees and make immediate surveys as to the availability of local capital to purchase these buildings. I hope we can pass legislation authorizing the disposing agency to make outright sales of sections of these huge plants, on long-term credit if necessary, to enable local people to utilize the buildings. We have some plants that 30 or 40 different and fairly large manufacturing industries could be housed in. Of course, an agreement would have to be worked out for sharing heating costs and other items, but if this proposal could be put into effect, I believe that a large part of present government-owned manufacturing space can be profitably converted to peacetime production and result in giving employment to local citizens.

Most all of us remember the financial difficulties in which our cities found themselves during the early thirties when plant after plant throughout the United States was idle. It is human nature for all of us to want to get everything we need for the lowest price possible, but we must take a long-range view of this problem. We cannot afford to permit our own personal desires to kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

I presume your organization is composed of mayors from all the principal manufacturing cities in our Nation. You are all as interested as I am in seeing that every able-bodied citizen in your community is gainfully employed. You are in a position to help make the disposal of these surpluses a success. Any program that is worked out must be based on what is for the best interests of our country in the long run—not what looks best today.

Unfortunately, today the success of mayor and other public officials is too often measured by what Federal funds he can get by persuasion, political pressure, and influence. These words might seem rather harsh but deep down in your hearts as a patriotic American you know it is the truth. When Birmingham secures Federal funds to pave streets, build sewers, and other public works, these projects are cited by citizens of other cities and immediately pressure is brought to bear on the city commission to get their share at the Federal trough.

Unless we all show more political courage during the dark days ahead we will have nothing to pass on to the next generation except worthless bonds and a totalitarian government. Liberty is not like a chattel that can be bought and title remain permanently in the hands of the purchaser. Liberty is bought with sweat, blood, and tears and must be nurtured by initiative, industry, intelligence, and integrity. The foes of liberty are not necessarily enemies from without the borders of a nation. Ofttimes the enemy of liberty is a citizen or group of citizens who appear in sheep's clothing and, before the majority of the citizens learn their true identity they have gnawed in two the columns supporting the temple of liberty. Most nations fall as a result of internal disease and not at the hands of an armed foe. Nothing can be truer than the proverb, "Eternal vigilance is the price of price."

Many suggestions have been made as to the proper procedure in disposing of these surpluses. Several existing Government agencies would like to dispose of them. The fact that an agency is responsible for production does not necessarily mean that that agency is qualified to handle sales and distribution. Congress, being directly responsible to the people, should take the lead in formulating the policy for the disposition of surpluses. The heads of Government departments, under whose control the surpluses will be, should have a voice in the disposition. Each industry that will be affected by the disposal should be consulted before huge surpluses are to be dumped. The American taxpayer, through reputable representatives, should have a voice in this matter. Congress should act without delay for the very existence of our system of private enterprise is at stake.

You gentlemen are leaders in your respective communities and you can lend valuable aid and experience in helping solve this problem. Let's work together and keep America the land of liberty and opportunity.

Poland Held a Focal Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a timely article entitled "Poland Held a Focal Point," by Raymond Leslie Buell, which appeared in the New York Times on January 21, 1944:

POLAND HELD A FOCAL POINT—POST-WAR WORLD STRUCTURE REGARDED AS DEPENDING ON SETTLEMENT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the voluminous discussion of the Russo-Polish boundary question two important points have been for the most part overlooked in this country. First, neither the Paris Peace Conference nor the Conference of Ambassadors ever proposed that the territory east of the Curzon Line be awarded to Russia. A self-appointed Russian political committee in Paris, headed by czarist Russians, such as Prince Lvov, and supported by the Marchese della Torretta, a member of the Polish commission of the peace conference, proposed this solution; but it was not adopted.

No doubt one reason was that the Soviet regime was not yet recognized; but an equal reason was that despite numerous American commentators today to the contrary, eastern Galicia had not belonged to Russia before World War No. 1, but to Austria; and the majority of its people were Ruthenians or Ukrainians. Certainly these people are closely related to the Great Russians; but the culture of the Ruthenians based on Lwów is quite different from the Ukrainians based on Kiev, due in large part to the Uniat Church.

PLEBISCITE NOT ACCEPTABLE

Today it is quite possible that a majority of the people east of the Curzon Line would vote for union with the U. S. S. R., in view of the superb achievements of Russia in the present war. Indeed, Moscow claims such a vote was taken following the military occupation of east Poland in the fall of 1939. Such a plebiscite, however, cannot be accepted by the western world. For the people were allowed to vote for only a single set of candidates, and the plebiscite therefore was just as bogus as the one held by Hitler after seizing Austria in the spring of 1938.

The theoretical solution is to hold an internationally supervised plebiscite in the disputed territory when the war ends, and when Russia returns the million or so Poles—those still living—whom it ruthlessly deported to Siberia and elsewhere after seizing eastern Poland in 1939. In its present mood Moscow does not seem disposed to accept such an idea. If not, then the minimum program the United States can accept is the return to Poland of both Vilna and Lwów—both being east of the Curzon line—since both cities are predominantly Polish in culture and population, including the Jews.

PERMISSIBLE MIGRATION

Likewise we should urge Russia to allow any persons in the disputed territory not wishing to live under the Russian regime to migrate to Poland with at least their personal property. In many respects the Soviet minorities' policy toward the Ukrainians and the White Russians was superior to that of Poland. But the latter Government never indulged in the wholesale liquidation of nationalist leaders of which Soviet Russia was guilty, and the United States can hardly put its imprimatur on any settlement which

extends a system of liquidation and purges to people not liking the Soviet regime.

Whether Poland should be compensated by giving it East Prussia and German Silesia should depend largely on our attitude toward post-war Germany. If we believe that Germany should be divided into six parts and kept economically impotent—thereby increasing the power of Russia on the European Continent—Poland would be entitled to its share of the German loot. If, however, we believe that the right kind of foreign policy will help bring about eventually a democratic and cooperative Germany within the European framework, then certainly the territorial dismemberment of Germany should be opposed.

The second issue, transcending the border question, is whether the new Poland is to become a Moscow satellite or an independent state with a government of its own choosing. Should Poland cede half of its territory to Russia and sign the bilateral alliance proposed by Stalin, it is almost certain that what remains of Poland would become a puppet of Moscow. Possibly Czechoslovakia, which signed a bilateral alliance on December 12, can escape the fate warned against by Machiavelli's Prince when a small country signs an alliance with a great power.

POLISH QUESTION PARAMOUNT

While the fate of Czechoslovakia is doubtful in the absence of a European system, Poland would have much more difficulty in maintaining its independence. First, because of the historical enmity between Russians and Poles, going back to the Middle Ages; second, because of the geographic location of Poland, lying midway between Germany and Russia. The Polish Government, in requesting that America and Britain participate in the negotiations with Soviet Russia on the boundary question, is struggling less for territory than for its independence. It realizes that its fate depends upon the ability of the Big Three to conclude a general guaranty pact or some wider European security system. Upon the Polish question depends the whole structure of the post-war world.

So far the Soviet authorities have roughly brushed aside efforts to find a collective solution for the Polish question. They seem to favor a bilateral sphere of influence solution, which can only lay the foundations for a new imperialism. Soviet sympathizers within the United States support this position by arguing that Russia is merely working out its own Monroe Doctrine—a contention which ignores the fact that United States policy today toward the new government in Bolivia is being determined by inter-American consultation at Montevideo, and that the United States has long since abandoned the interventionist policy in the Western Hemisphere.

The Soviet demand for friendly governments is another doctrine which has distinct limitations. The best way to get such governments is through a foreign policy based on friendship in contrast to domination, and through the creation of a European system guaranteeing the independence as well as defining the obligations of every state. The Soviet doctrine of friendly governments has reached a point, however, where Pravda has already virtually demanded the defeat of Mr. Willkie in 1944, branding him a political adventurer, implying that it wishes a fourth term. Such demands, accompanied by Pravda's publication of the false rumor that the British are negotiating a peace with Germany, do not impress the American public even though the administration remains silent.

This kind of blackmail is the surest means of bringing about a violent reaction against Russia when the war is over.

BREACH HELD POSSIBLE

If Soviet Russia declines to negotiate with America and Britain over the Polish question, it will be the first of the Big Three to violate Moscow's consultative declaration. If it goes further and erects at Warsaw a puppet government dominated by the Union of Polish Patriots, it will create a breach with America and Britain which will make almost impossible agreement on the much more important questions of the future of Germany and the economic if not the political reconstruction of Europe as a whole—unless indeed it is the policy of this administration to acquiesce in all of Russia's demands.

In certain quarters the view is expressed that we should not criticize Russia, no matter what she does, out of fear that Moscow will withdraw from the war. Any such policy is based on a misunderstanding. Russia's participation in this war is due not to American blandishments, but to Russian interests. Naturally we must cooperate with Soviet Russia, but the question is, on what terms. If we constantly retreat, or indulge in uncritical adulation, the Russians undoubtedly will regard it as weakness and simply increase their demands, whereas if we stand up for our ideas of a just peace the Russians undoubtedly will be more moderate than otherwise.

OUR POSITION CRITICIZED

Certainly Russia will need the United States for 10 or 15 years after this war much more than the United States will need Russia. At present, however, we are not playing our cards well. America is strong on industrial and military power but she is weak in creative ideas. The country has been drenched the last year or so with moral universalism coming from the administration, and embodied also in the Mackinac, Fulbright, and Connally resolutions, as well as the pronouncements of church groups.

These pronouncements are well meaning, but in the absence of a realistic foreign policy they will play into the hands of imperialists on the one side and the isolationists on the other. For the present emphasis on universal agreement of all nations and also on the sovereignty of all participating states is likely to make impossible a close-working post-war arrangement between America and Britain, not to mention the democracies of western Europe, and this is undoubtedly just what some of the extremists in Moscow want.

Whether or not a breach occurs with Russia over the Polish question, the war, of course, must be fought until victory is won. But in any case America needs a more realistic foreign policy, taking account of the power-forces and the ideological differences now dividing the world. We can lose no time, for example, in getting a new policy toward Italy, France, and Germany. If we advance some ideas of our own it is not improbable that the Russians will come to terms.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL.

RICHMOND, MASS., *January 19, 1944.*

Dedication of J. William Ditter Memorial Chapel, Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the J. William Ditter Memorial Chapel, recently completed at the Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa., was dedicated on yesterday.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, there follows a copy of the program of the dedicatory ceremonies and of the addresses made by myself and my distinguished colleague, Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont:

DEDICATION DAY, J. WILLIAM DITTER MEMORIAL CHAPEL, 23RD OF JANUARY 1944, NAVAL AIR STATION, WILLOW GROVE, PA.

Rear Admiral M. F. Draemel, U. S. N., commandant; Commander J. M. Rutherfurd, U. S. N. R., commanding officer; Capt. H. R. Lacey (CEC), U. S. N., district public works officer; Capt. E. W. Davis (ChC), U. S. N., district chaplain.

Guests: Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, U. S. N., Chief of Bureau of Naval Personnel; Rear Admiral Ezra D. Allen, U. S. N., Director of Budget and Reports; Rear Admiral W. B. Young, U. S. N., Chief of Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; Rear Admiral L. B. Combs, U. S. N., Assistant Chief of Yards and Docks; Capt. H. G. Hopwood, U. S. N., Aid, Bureau of Naval Personnel; Capt. R. D. Workman (ChC), U. S. N., chief of chaplains; Congressman Harry R. Sheppard; Congressman Charles A. Plumley; Congressman Noble J. Johnson; Congressman Jamie L. Whitten.

J. WILLIAM DITTER MEMORIAL CHAPEL

** A house of prayer*

"Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Dedicated January 23, 1944

The above inscription is found on the plaque at the entrance to the chapel. This chapel is reverently dedicated to the glory of God and in tribute to the memory of the late J. William Ditter, Congressman from the State of Pennsylvania. Mr. Ditter was an ardent supporter of the Naval Air Station and was vitally interested in the construction of the new chapel which we dedicate today. May his memory be blessed among us and may this House of Prayer serve as an inspiration to the spiritual life of all those who worship here.

DIVINE SERVICE

Prelude.

Invocation, the Reverend E. O'Neill.

Hymn: Come, Thou Almighty King, No. 112.

Psalm to be read in unison:

"How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts!

"My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.

"Yea, the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King, and my God.

"Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house; they will be still praising Thee.

"Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee; in whose heart are the ways of them.

"Who passing through the valley of Weeping make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools.

"They go from strength to strength, every one of them in Zion appeareth before God.

"O Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer: give ear, O God of Jacob.

"Behold, O God our shield, and look upon the face of thine anointed.

"For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.

"For the Lord God is a sun and shield: the Lord will give grace and glory: no good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly.

"O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in Thee." (Psalm 84.)

The gloria patri: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen, amen.

The lesson from the Scriptures: I Kings 8: 22–30; Hebrews 10: 19–27.

Solo: The Lord's Prayer.

Presentation of the chapel: Capt. H. R. Lacey (CEC), United States Navy, district public works officer; Commander J. M. Rutherfurd, United States Naval Reserve, commanding officer; Capt. R. D. Workman (ChC), United States Navy, chief of chaplains.

Service of dedication: Chaplain R. D. Workman, United States Navy.

Affirmation of faith:

CHAPLAIN. Good Christian people, I bid your prayers for the dedication of this church. The Lord be with you.

PEOPLE. And with Thy Spirit.

CHAPLAIN. Let us pray. To the glory of God, the eternal Father, whose name is love, whose presence is joy, whose word is truth, whose will is good, whose service is perfect freedom, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life.

PEOPLE. We dedicate this house.

CHAPLAIN. To the glory of God the Son, the Redeemer of the world, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Light.

PEOPLE. We dedicate this house.

CHAPLAIN. To the glory of God the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier of men, Giver of life and light.

PEOPLE. We dedicate this house.

Prayer of dedication: Chaplain E. W. Davis, United States Navy.

Address: Rear Admiral L. B. Combs, United States Navy.

Address: Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD.

Address: Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY.

The lighting of the candles, and the opening of the Holy Bible: As Christ is the Light of the World, and His Word and Sacraments are to be a lamp unto our feet, and a light upon our way, we open His Word and light the candles of our altar—symbolizing the spiritual light that shall proceed from the Eternal Word as it is proclaimed in this house of worship.

The Lord's Prayer.

Hymn of prayer for our shipmates: Eternal Father, Strong to Save, No. 128.

Benediction.

The J. William Ditter Memorial Chapel is of colonial style architecture, designed and planned by the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Construction was started on August 9, 1943, by Townsend, Schroeder & Wood, Inc. The chapel was turned over by the contractor to the station on January 19, 1944.

The chapel has two auditoriums, one with a seating capacity of 200 which will be used for the Protestant services and also for Roman Catholic Mass on special holy days; the smaller auditorium seats 50 people and is set aside for Roman Catholic Mass.

Additional rooms are available for two offices for the chaplain.

The chapel stands as a witness of the spiritual challenge and influence that makes its impact on the lives of the personnel of this station.

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, OF CALIFORNIA

We are met to dedicate this new house of worship, a holy place where men and women of the armed services and their families may assemble in the faiths of their fathers or of their own election, as a free people should have the right to do—a right guaranteed to them by our Constitution, and one of the freedoms for the preservation of which we are now at war.

Every edifice of this kind is a symbol of our faith in God and is proof of our trust in His divine providence. America, I am sure we all agree, has attained its present stature among the nations of the world because its people, from the time of the Pilgrim Fathers, have been possessed of that faith and trust.

It always makes my heart glad to see a chapel when I visit a naval or military station where sailors or soldiers are quartered. It makes me feel that we are not shutting God out. We recognize His fellowship.

How true that is has been manifested in so many ways and so many times to our fliers, to our ground troops, and to our boys on the seas all over the world. The accounts we read of their combats are replete with their frank acknowledgments of divine protection and guidance.

I commend the Navy for naming this chapel the J. William Ditter Memorial Chapel. Mr. Ditter was the prime mover in getting the necessary congressional action. My committee, at his instance, proposed the necessary appropriation. He collaborated with the naval Bureau of Yards and Docks in planning it. He chose the passage from the Psalms that we see inscribed on this plaque that has been placed at the entrance, to which the Navy, as a lasting tribute, has added his name.

Were Mr. Ditter at these exercises today, which he had looked forward to doing, I am sure that he would use as his text in addressing his audience the lines we see here, which he selected:

"Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Friends, the essence of religion dwells in those lines. Is not that therefore a most appropriate prayer he selected that all who pass might read?

It was my honor and privilege to know Mr. Ditter intimately and well because of our membership and close association on the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. That prayer epitomizes his religion.

I was particularly impressed by the tribute paid to Mr. Ditter by Representative EUGENE COX, of Georgia, in the House of Representatives, on the day following Mr. Ditter's untimely death. Let me repeat it:

"As Carlyle said of Sir Walter Scott, 'When he departed he took a man's life with him,'" I say of Bill Ditter that when he departed he took a man's life with him. Nothing but heaven can cover his high fame, no pyramid offset his memory, nothing but the eternal substance of his greatness.

How proud his family, his neighbors, his constituents, and those who are now or later may be attached to this station should be that this House of God should bear the name of such a man.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, OF VERMONT

As senior member of the Naval Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, and as a close personal friend of Congressman J. William Ditter, it is a high privilege for me to be present at this ceremony commemorating the dedication of this beautiful chapel in his name. While he had taken a deep personal interest in all matters pertaining to the Willow Grove Air Station, the initiation of this project was a matter close to his heart and one on which he had spent time and attention in an extraordinary degree. It is fitting that this memorial should commemorate him.

Some men are born to be leaders in whatever profession that they may follow. Their attainments are beyond those of ordinary men. The conspicuous qualities which they demonstrate are apparent to their contemporaries who can admire but not match them.

There was probably no man on the floor of the House whose advice, counsel, and support were more in demand and more frequently sought than were those of the late J. William Ditter. Whenever the going was hard and a fight was on, he was always sought and placed in the breach. I know of no one with such talent for debate, or tenacity of purpose, in the entire membership of the minority party in the House of Representatives.

While it is difficult to realize that we have lost him and that he has gone, and particularly at a time when he was about to reach the pinnacle of his distinguished career in the House, we must appreciate that he gave us the best he had, and he stands as an example which we can attempt to emulate, but not equal, in carrying on the affairs of Government in this and the next Congress and in all those to follow.

We who were close to Bill Ditter on the committee miss his friendship, advice, and support and always will. We knew he had talents beyond the grasp of ordinary men; that his abilities would mark him for higher responsibilities in his party and for his country were he to survive. He had a fine sense of loyalty and willingness for service. He was devoted to the Navy.

Man is but mortal. God in His wisdom has called him home. I know of no finer way to commemorate his name, and symbolize his achievements on the committee, than to dedicate to him this beautiful chapel that he sponsored and fostered. I am sure he is with us in spirit today as we pay tribute to him.

As for me, I admit that this occasion magnifies my sense of great personal loss. In a minor way, as senior member of the minority party, his mantle has fallen on my shoulders. I hope to carry on within my capacities the Bill Ditter tradition in the committee.

"Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a number of editorials dealing with the subject of votes for soldiers, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. The titles of the editorials, together with the names of the papers in which they appeared, are as follows:

"Bullets and Ballots," from the Stars and Stripes of January 8, 1944.

"A Sound Compromise," from the Washington Star of January 23, 1944.

"What New Objections?" from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 6, 1944.

"The Voter in Uniform," from the New York Times of January 22, 1944.

"Stimson, Knox, and the Vote," from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1944.

"Shall Our Soldiers Vote?" from the Springfield (Ill.) Register of January 5, 1944.

"Congressional Duty," from the Washington Post of January 15, 1944.

"Spangler Speaks," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 10, 1944.

"A Nightmare for Senators," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 10, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes of January 8, 1944]

BULLETS AND BALLOTS

When Congress reconvenes in Washington on January 10, it will take up an issue which gives every sign of being close to the hearts and minds of the service men and women of this theater. The issue is overseas voting for uniformed personnel.

If samplings of opinion and letters to the Stars and Stripes are any criterion, the majority of service men and women in this theater hope that Congress will do whatever it legitimately can to ensure the casting and counting of ballots by overseas forces in the 1944 elections.

The nearer service men and women are to the fighting front, the greater appears to be their interest in voting. The Italian edition of the Stars and Stripes, published in Naples, has received more mail on the issue than have the editions of the paper published in North Africa. One letter received by the Italian edition was signed by 42 soldiers from as many States of the Union.

The writers, members of a single battalion representing every section of the Nation, said: "The soldiers on the front want to fight, and they want to vote. * * * We on the front are determined to use bullets and ballots."

And their view was that they would be unable to make proper use of the franchise unless Congress passed some kind of uniform law making it simple for citizen-soldiers to vote. They asked the question: "Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each has to proceed through the various (State) methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective States? The process takes months and we have little time to spare."

The theme of other letters has been that men and women in uniform are under the same obligation to exercise the franchise as civilians. One soldier wrote: "A citizen in a democracy has the added responsibility of preserving democratic processes while he fights."

This letter, it should be noted, was in reply to a soldier who had written: "We have faith in those that we left behind. They know our interests, our problems, and our desires. The electorate at home will do its voting in the good American way and the soldier will not suffer."

That appears to be a minority opinion. The more general view seems to have been represented by a soldier who told a Stars and Stripes reporter: "Each soldier fighting for his country ought to have the right to vote."

This statement was made to a Stars and Stripes reporter who interviewed scores of service men and women in Algiers to find out how uniformed personnel felt about the Congressman who said that denial of second-class mailing privileges to Esquire Magazine and the Varga girl would be "a blow to morale of more concern to the boys abroad than all the hullabaloo over the soldiers' vote."

Just one man among all those interviewed agreed with the Congressman. The consensus was that the Congressman's remark was in bad taste, that the soldier-vote issue was too fundamental to be made the subject of a wisecrack.

Mail received by the Stars and Stripes indicates that service men and women are not unaware of the constitutional difficulties and the political complexities of the issue. One letter pointed out that it would not be easy to give men and women overseas the political information they will need to vote intelligently in this year's elections.

It ought to be emphasized that those service men and women who have expressed an opinion to the Stars and Stripes have not coupled their appeal for a Federal overseas voting law with statements favoring any particular platform or candidate.

Their letters and statements indicate that they are primarily concerned with the right to vote for its own sake and reflect a belief that the members of an American citizen army, even if outside the continental limits of the United States, retain the basic rights and privileges of citizenship. They do not believe they are asking Congress for any special privilege. They feel they are asking a simple right.

They object to the bill passed in the Senate last month, which leaves it to the 48 States to handle soldier voting under their 48 different varieties of laws, on the ground that this method would be cumbersome at best and would inevitably discourage overseas voting, since State laws are not uniform and in some instances make absentee balloting extremely difficult if not impossible.

Some letters to the Stars and Stripes have expressed disappointment that the original Green-Lucas bill was defeated in the Senate, but it seems safe to assume that any measure making it simple and easy for overseas personnel to vote would find favor with the uniformed men and women of this theater.

The over-all view reflected in opinions expressed to the Stars and Stripes is that men and women in uniform overseas have proved that they are good Americans and that good Americans should have a practical voting law.

[From the Washington Star of January 23, 1944]

A SOUND COMPROMISE

The revised Lucas-Green service vote bill is a vast improvement over the one already passed by the Senate and supported, in a slightly amended form, by the Elections Committee of the House. Its chief virtues are three: First, it would provide for a uniform Federal ballot and thus relieve the Army and Navy of the almost impossible task of administering voting according to the differing laws of the 48 States. Second, it would guarantee the right of election officials in the States to determine the validity of the ballots returned to them and thus resolve all constitutional doubts. And third, with the uniform ballot channeled expediously through a Federal commission whose only function would be that of a distributing agent, it would so simplify the whole problem that the bulk of our service personnel would have a genuine chance to express itself next November. On the other hand, by leaving everything to the States, the measure recently adopted by the Senate, and now awaiting action in the House, would have the effect of disfranchising the overwhelming majority of the millions of men and women in the armed forces. Accordingly, to the extent that it would prevent this and at the same time preserve the prerogatives of the States, the new Lucas-Green proposal seems to be an excellent compromise upon which Congress ought to be able to agree. That it has been approved by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is a good and encouraging sign.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of January 6, 1944]

WHAT NEW OBJECTIONS?

"If a man can stop a bullet, he ought to have the opportunity to cast a ballot." It is Senator LUCAS speaking. "There's nothing the States can do that will take away the necessity for a Federal ballot." Again it is Senator LUCAS speaking. No one would dare contest his first statement, while his second statement is so well based on common sense and practicality that it is incontrovertible.

Senator LUCAS' statements were made in support of a new soldier-vote bill which he intends to introduce next Monday. It provides for a Federal ballot commission, as did the original Lucas-Green bill, which was defeated in the Senate, but it answers constitutional objections of States'-rightists by making the commission's duties almost entirely administrative. The commission would prepare and, through the Army and Navy, would distribute the ballots. Then it would turn over the filled-out ballots to the 48 secretaries of state for validating and counting.

So ardent a States' rightist as Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, waved aside the constitutionalists, in their opposition to the original bill, with this statement: "I am in favor of giving our armed forces, away from home in the Federal service, the right to vote in Federal elections for Federal officers, under Federal authority and responsibility. * * * I cannot see that the rights of States are either jeopardized or in any way involved in the present controversy." Still less can he see any jeopardy to States' rights in Lucas' revised bill.

This Nation does not have 48 armies and 48 commanders in chiefs and 48 supply systems and 48 ways of delivering mail. If it attempts to set up 48 voting systems, we may be sure that millions of our armed forces will get no vote next fall, just as less than 30,000 voted in November 1942. Now that Senator LUCAS has more than met the Lucas-Green opponents half way in his revised proposal, what new objection will they make to his plan? Those politicians who contemplate any trickery to deprive our armed forces of a convenient method of voting are playing with TNT and monkeying with the buzz saw.

[From New York Times of January 22, 1944]

THE VOTER IN UNIFORM

It begins to look as though fighting for one's country would not be regarded this year as a reason for taking citizens' votes away. Seemingly decisive action was reported yesterday. The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has voted 12 to 2 to accept the amended Green-Lucas bill for service balloting under Federal supervision. The bill now has the support of a number of Senators who did not approve of it in its original form and its passage in the Senate is predicted. When it reaches the House it will encounter the Eastland-McKellar-McClelland States' rights proposal, approved by the House Elections Committee on a 7-to-5 vote, but there appears to be enough steam up now to head off this feeble measure.

The new Green-Lucas bill ought not to disturb anyone who takes a rational view of States' rights. It would create a four-member bipartisan Federal commission which would distribute and collect applications for ballots and the ballots themselves. State and local election authorities would then pass on the validity of the ballots and count them. A section of the 1942 soldier voting law, providing that State requirements for personal registration and payment of poll taxes be waived, is retained in the new bill, but there is no provision for its enforcement. The States themselves will decide. It will be a test not so much of States' rights as of the inclination of State and local administrations to respect the rights of service men and women.

Anything less than this revised Green-Lucas bill would be a mockery. Secretaries Knox and Stimson have given it as their opinion that any system depending on the initiative of 48 States would be unworkable. Col. Robert Cutler, testifying before the Senate

committee, gave some details to support the opinion. An average of 10,000 troops are now being shifted daily. It would be difficult or impossible to sort these men out by States and see that they got applications and ballots in time. It is comparatively simple, on the other hand, to get the needed documents to all qualified service voters on time and sort them out in this country for sending to the proper addresses.

This matter need not ever have become a subject of heated controversy in Congress. To deny the basic democratic right to those who are fighting in order that democracy may survive would be ironical indeed.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1944]

STIMSON, KNOX, AND THE VOTE

The statement by Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Knox that "the services are unable effectively to administer diverse procedures of 48 States as to 11,000,000 servicemen all over the world in primary, special, and general elections," is expected to go far in forcing Congress to reverse itself on this question when it convenes next week.

Issued in response to a request for information from Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments, the joint declaration of the two Cabinet officers seems to show clearly what many suspected already, namely, that it would not be practical for most persons in the service to thread the maze of 48 different State laws to the ballot box. Furthermore, the chiefs of both the Army and the Navy say that their services could not undertake to make this complicated system work. It seems highly probable, therefore, that the compromise bill, sponsored by Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, and Representative WORLEY, of Texas, will enjoy strong support when the legislators reassemble next Wednesday. An editorial on this page from the arch-Republican New York Herald Tribune makes some pertinent observations.

Under the terms of the compromise bill, a Federal commission would be set up to supervise the distribution and collection by the Army and the Navy of a simple ballot for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. Registration and poll-tax requirements of the States would be waived. The ballots would be counted by the various States.

For a time it appeared that the great majority of men and women in the service would be prevented from voting next year by the failure of Congress to enact suitable legislation. The position taken by Secretaries Stimson and Knox brings a new element into the situation, however, and it now seems likely that those who are offering their lives will be allowed to cast their ballots.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) Register of January 5, 1944]

SHALL OUR SOLDIERS VOTE?

Whatever the outcome of the praiseworthy proposal that legislation be enacted providing ways and means for soldiers to vote in this year's general election, be it said to the honor of the senior Senator from Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS, that he has ably championed such enactment.

Though the Lucas-Green United States Senate bill was defeated by a combination of Republicans and southern Democrats, the fundamental principle involved is still at issue.

Senator LUCAS, who has far-flung support in this struggle, favors a Federal commission of four members, two of whom would be nominated by the Democratic national chairman and the other two by the Republican national chairman. Under the terms of the Lucas-Green bill, this commission would distribute to all members of the armed forces ballots providing votes for President, Senators, and Congressmen.

It is the contention of supporters of the Lucas measure that only through such a Federal agency could ballots be distributed to all service men and women and returned in proper time to the respective States and counties.

A special session of the Illinois General Assembly will meet here Friday of this week at the call of Governor Green to lengthen the time in which absentee ballots may be obtained, set an earlier date for candidates to file petitions, and nullify certain registration restrictions. That is a step in the right direction.

The States' rights issue is being raised by some partisans opposing the principle of the Lucas-Green bill. Senator LUCAS has overcome any valid objection on that ground by revising his Senate measure to provide that the Federal commission would be only a sort of central clearing house, and that ballots would be handled through the offices of the various secretaries of States, and other local election authorities, to insure no infringement of the Federal Government on States' rights.

It seems highly improbable that all of the States acting individually can produce effective collective action to give to the armed forces that voting opportunity which the Green-Lucas Senate bill provides. Motives of none are here questioned, but division on party lines, as now shown among Illinois Congressmen, would indicate that much of the opposition to the Lucas-Green bill is less constructive than partisan.

One Illinois commentator, arguing that action by individual States will only frustrate votes for soldiers, says that several Republican State administrations—that of Illinois among them—are willing to arrange for votes for their own absentee soldiers, but with no regard for the soldiers of other States.

It would be unfortunate, indeed, if the Illinois General Assembly should act otherwise than for the best interests of all of the armed forces. This can be done by complete avoidance of political considerations. Preliminary skirmishes indicate anything but proper approach to a solution of the problem, but action in the open should soon reveal whether the special session is seeking votes for soldiers or merely making goats of soldiers.

[From the Washington Post of January 15, 1944]

CONGRESSIONAL DUTY

The soldier vote issue is now clear, simple and inescapable. As President Roosevelt put it in his message to Congress, "Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing State laws—and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer 48 different soldier voting laws." The question, then, can no longer be discussed in terms of Federal action versus State action to enfranchise service personnel. It must be discussed on the basis of Federal action.

Senators LUCAS and GREEN have revised their bill for Federal action in this sphere to meet the reasonable objections of those who criticized it as unconstitutional. They have pared it down to its bare essentials. Their new bill, introduced on Tuesday, provides for a simple official Federal war ballot and for a United States war ballot commission which will prepare ballots, distribute them through the auspices of the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and transmit them to the several State secretaries of state.

The revised bill specifically provides that votes "shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted and certified." This means that the States retain their constitutional authority to determine the qualifications of voters. State officials, in other words, will decide whether the ballots returned to them were cast by bona fide residents of their States qualified to vote under their State laws.

Under the Lucas-Green bill, however, members of the land and naval forces away from home are released from the customary State procedures for absentee balloting and from the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting. Is there a way of enabling them to vote without waiving these State regulations? Here is the snag. In some States, Kentucky for example, there is a specific prohibition against absentee voting. Perhaps under his wartime powers the President has authority to waive this difficulty. But the uncertainty leaves room for suit by a defeated candidate and the possibility of the invalidation of the entire election.

Congressional action should be supplemented by independent State action to set aside absentee voting requirements for service personnel. But the congressional action is essential. This country could have neither faith nor satisfaction in a national election from which millions of its citizens were barred solely because of their service to the country. We agree with the President that "It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women of our armed forces—and to do it as quickly as possible."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 10, 1944]

SPANGLER SPEAKS

Republican National Committee Chairman Spangler, whose pastime is the production of basement-made political bombshells which most often explode in his own face with an inaudible "Phut!" has managed to make a little more noise than usual in Chicago. A survey of party preference made among troops in England leads him to this conclusion: "I don't think the soldier vote is more Democratic than Republican." He believes, despite contrary opinions held by Democrats in Washington, that the G. I. ballots will follow the civil vote, or, according to his latest figures, show "about 56 percent for the Republican Party."

Spangler has obligingly erased, then, all political reasons for Republican opposition to uniform Federal machinery for soldier voting. Those G. O. P. Senators and Representatives who alined themselves with poll-tax Democrats to kill the Green-Lucas bill can now have no objection to an unimpeded plan for overseas balloting. If Spangler's action does have that effect within the party, none will be so grateful as the soldiers themselves, who are beginning to wonder whether they are mercenaries fighting a war without citizens' rights to help decide who'll run it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 10, 1944]

A NIGHTMARE FOR SENATORS

(Reprinted from the Louisville Courier-Journal)

Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, has mercilessly exposed the root of the hot resentment with which some of his colleagues try to repel the bald truth that they have refused to make any serious effort to facilitate voting by men and women in the armed services. One of these Senators is the rip-roaring neo-Republican, EDWARD H. MOORE, of Oklahoma, and he was simply furious on the floor the other day.

Mr. LUCAS pointed out to the Oklahoman that one day Mr. MOORE might find himself

running against a war veteran who had been denied an opportunity to vote in the Presidential election next year. Mr. LUCAS said bluntly: "Some one-armed man from Italy will be running against you in the next election."

Ay, there's the rub! It may seem smart politics for present purposes to contend that the Constitution leaves Congress helpless in this matter of soldier-voting and that it's up to the States.

Some of the Northern Republicans fear that if Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate next year he might get the major share of that vote. Most of the Southern Senators fear that Federal provision for soldier voting would set a precedent dangerous to their poll-tax oligarchies. But all of them know that the boys are coming back one day and will be in a political position to demand a pretty complete accounting.

The uneasiness of these Senators is rather plain to see. An opposition candidate who left an arm or maybe a leg on a foreign shore but couldn't vote from there haunts their dreams and, with Mr. LUCAS' help, disturbs their waking hours.

Congress Report and Question Plan Widely Endorsed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, heretofore several thoughtful editorials of leading newspapers have been placed in the RECORD endorsing the plan set forth in House Resolution 327 to set up a procedure for inviting Cabinet members and heads of independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the House. I include a few of the many additional editorials that have come to my attention on the subject:

[From the New York Times of November 28, 1943]

THE CABINET IN CONGRESS

Secretary Hull's dramatic appearance before Congress has revived the proposal that Cabinet members be invited regularly to present their recommendations before Congress and to answer questions from the floor regarding them. It is instructive to recall that a measure to this effect was approved by a select Senate committee headed by George H. Pendleton in 1881. The force of the committee's argument as presented in its report has not diminished but, if anything, has greatly increased with the passage of time. Some extracts follow:

"The power of both Houses of Congress, either separately or jointly, to admit persons not Members to their floors, with the privilege of addressing them, cannot be questioned. 'Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings,' is the provision of the Constitution."

As one illustration, the committee cited the practice of allowing Territories to send a Delegate to the House of Representatives with the right of debating but not of voting.

"The act of 1789, organizing the Treasury Department, provided that 'the Secretary of the Treasury shall, from time to time, digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue and for the support of the public credit * * * shall make report and give information to either branch of the legislature, in person or in writing, as may be required, respecting all matters referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives, or which shall appertain to his office.'"

The report goes on to cite further precedents. Two of them follow:

"Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations." (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 51.)

"Saturday, August 22, 1789: The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber, attended by General Knox, Secretary of War, and laid before the Senate the following statement of facts, with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent." (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 66.)

The committee report continues:

"If there is anything perfectly plain in the Constitution and organization of the Government of the United States, it is that the great departments were not intended to be independent and isolated in the strict meaning of these terms; but that, although having a separate existence, they were to cooperate each with the other."

The report goes on to point out that through written reports of Cabinet members and through individual approach or through committees, Congress, in fact, does constantly seek the counsel and advice of Cabinet officials and is to a great extent influenced by them. It argues that the personal appearance of Cabinet members on the floor would supplement and regularize these means of contact, and make them open to the public view.

This would be an appropriate time for another Congressional committee to look into the subject.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of January 6, 1944]

"INFO" FOR CONGRESS, BUT HOW?

Congress must be provided some way to get information necessary for intelligently dealing with the problems and conditions that come before it—but how? The Kefauver resolution, which has been introduced but is still in the air, provides that Cabinet members could be called upon to answer questions with which they are acquainted, but the objection is made that it would enable minority Members of Congress to make things unpleasant for the administration—no matter what administration. And in that case the Cabinet member could refuse to come through with the information wanted, fearing they were being put on a griddle.

The Monroney-Maloney resolution provides that a working staff be set up to provide Congress with facts on all important matters. There is not so much opposition to this resolution as to the former, and yet it is declared in Washington both resolutions are likely to be adopted in some form or other, but with the information matter emphasized.

We do not know about the shyness of Cabinet members before Congress, but it certainly is not asking too much that Congress be given information about matters with which the country is concerned. Not only is Congress entitled to it, but it should be required to delve into matters before taking action. Too much responsibility rests on its shoulders to act when it does not understand.

[From the Philadelphia Record of January 16, 1944]

TIGHTEN UP THE HOME TEAM

Suppose through some Alice-in-Wonderland trick the legislative and executive branches of our Government lost all relationship with each other.

If they had no way of communicating with each other government would be impossible.

So, it would seem, then, that the closer the two bodies be brought together the shorter their lines of communications, the more complete their understanding of each other's plans and purposes.

That adds up to better government for all the people.

Some 72 percent of the country believes that, according to a recent Gallup poll.

They approve the resolution of Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER that Cabinet members and heads of key agencies should appear on request to be questioned by Congress as to Government's business in their hands.

Secretary Hull gave the idea considerable impetus when he appeared before the legislators in November to report on the Moscow Conference. His, of course, was a prepared statement and not strictly in line with the Kefauver question-and-answer concept.

While the idea has considerable opposition within Congress itself, there appears to be no valid objection. Questions could not be hurled willy-nilly, embarrassing the administrative officials. Only questions would be put which first had been passed by a congressional committee.

The personal-appearance idea, one which Roosevelt has popularized though he did not pioneer it, appears to have considerable of the substance of democracy.

[From the San Antonio Evening News of December 24, 1943]

LET CONGRESS SQUARE RESPONSIBILITY WITH AUTHORITY

That the American electorate today far exceeds its previous alertness where national problems and activities are concerned, has emerged sharply in a Gallup poll.

That poll queried selected citizens—constituting a cross section of the population—on their reaction to Representative ESTES KEFAUVER'S proposal that Cabinet members and other heads of Government agencies appear periodically before Congress for questioning concerning their departments' activities.

The approving civic vote given the Tennessee Congressman's suggestion should be eye-opening to the Roosevelt administration. Seven in every 10 persons questioned liked the idea. Only 7 in every 100 disapproved. The high favorable percentage held in all geographical regions.

It is to be hoped that Congress may act upon that virtual mandate and take whatever steps are necessary to effectuate it. By such action it would, at one and the same time, regain its proper sphere of influence in the Government and valuably serve the people it represents, by affording them more information concerning their Government's operations and more direct control over those operations.

What Congress should keep in mind, however, is that in taking such a step it will be assuming a responsibility commensurate with its authority. That responsibility would lie in the duty properly to weigh, and act constructively upon, the facts which would be given it during such questioning. Merely interrogating Federal officials for possible obstructionism—which, it must be admitted, is largely what Congress has indulged in during recent months—would not be sufficient justification for taking up those officials' time.

The people expect more. The fact that they are eager for clearer knowledge and understanding of Washington activities—as evidenced in their approval of the Kefauver proposal—is proof that they would demand more.

[From the Washington Star of November 17, 1943]

A SOUND IDEA

Secretary Hull's decision to appear tomorrow before an informal joint session of Congress sets a new precedent for Cabinet officers and as such may lend impetus to the efforts of many serious-minded Americans to create a better and more effective liaison system between the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

One such effort is that being made by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, to have heads of departments and independent agencies appear before the House, once a week or once every 2 weeks, to answer questions put to them by the Members. To this end, Mr. KEFAUVER has introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House to permit that kind of procedure and to set up certain regulations to govern it. For instance, the question period would be limited to 2 hours and there would be specific committee controls designed to keep it from getting out of hand or running off on nongermane tangents.

Whatever may be the weakness of this proposal, there can be no doubt that it is fundamentally sound and that the objective it seeks to attain is eminently desirable. What it aims at is simply to bridge the gulf that all too often puts the legislative and executive branches at odds when they should be seeing eye to eye or working in a reasonable cooperative manner. It is true, of course, that the Constitution has wisely established these branches, along with the judiciary, as separate organs of the Government, neither of which is to encroach upon the province of the other. But as Mr. KEFAUVER points out, and as many others before him have pointed out, this does not mean that the three are sealed off from each other. For as coordinates, they must work together; otherwise, our Federal system limps and the Nation suffers.

In arguing for his little-publicized proposal, Mr. KEFAUVER emphasizes that the idea behind it is not new, but is in fact almost as old as the Republic. Something like it was advocated in the House in 1864, and in the Senate in 1881, and by President Taft in 1913, and by many others, including President Wilson, since then.

[From the New York Mirror of January 14, 1944]

NEEDED: A REGULAR DAY OF QUESTIONING

The fact that, because of a slight illness, President Roosevelt was not able to appear before Congress to read his annual message, as has been his habit, should not delay consideration of Representative KEFAUVER'S resolution to have regular question days in Congress, in which the chosen representatives of the people may have an accounting from all department heads—and even from the President himself—of all projected orders and legislative ideas.

This get-together works well in Ottawa and London, where members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister, are literally put on the carpet.

Nothing will bring the executive departments of the Government closer to Congress, and also destroy some of the secretive methods of bureaucracy than the adoption of the plan of question days in Congress, as outlined in the Kefauver resolution.

In the Constitution, Congress is the dominant and controlling branch of the Government.

In the last 10 years, however, Congress has sunk to the level of a mere branch of the White House and of the Cabinet departments, and, in fact, of every swivel-chair potentate in the New Deal.

The recent appearance of Secretary of State Hull before Congress has revived the movement, first launched more than 60 years ago, that members of the Cabinet be regularly summoned before the high tribunal of the people—the Congress of the United States—to answer questions from the floor.

The report of a select Senate committee in 1881, headed by Senator Pendleton, contained the following statement, which should be the kernel of the movement today to reassume Congress' primal constitutional position:

"If there is anything perfectly plain in the Constitution and organization of the Government of the United States, it is that the great departments were not intended to be independent and isolated in the strict meaning of these terms, but that, although having a separate existence, they were to cooperate each with the other."

The only cooperation that has existed, in the main, in the last 10 years among the President, his Cabinet, and Congress is the cooperation that exists between dictatorial bosses and cowed servants.

Congress has too often gone down the maw of the bureaucratic Moloch.

No greater authority on the American Constitution has ever lived than Supreme Court Justice Story. More than 100 years ago he saw the lurking dangers to our form of government in bureaucracies not answerable to Congress when he said in a famous paper:

"The Executive is compelled to resort to secret and unseen influences, to private interviews and private arrangements to accomplish its own appropriate purposes, instead of proposing and sustaining its own duties and measures by a bold and manly appeal to the Nation in the face of its representatives. One consequence of this state of things is that there never can be traced home to the Executive any responsibility for the measures which are planned and carried at its suggestions. Another consequence will be (if it has not yet been) that measures will be adopted or defeated by private intrigues, political combinations, irresponsible recommendations and all the blandishments of office and all the deadening weight of silent patronage."

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of November 24, 1943]

SHOULD BE EXTENDED

There is no doubt that the unanimity of Members of both the House and Senate in the invitation to Secretary Hull to address a joint session of Congress on the Moscow Conference was, at least in part, due to the fact that he had served in both the House and Senate before becoming Secretary of State. There is a strong feeling of comradeship between present and former members.

It was mistakenly said that this was the first time a member of the Cabinet had addressed a joint session. It was the practice prior to Jefferson's day, when the Sage of Monticello sent his written message to Congress rather than delivering it in person, as Washington and Adams had done, because he thought the personal appearance of the Chief Executive savored of "a message from the throne." Hull's speaking to Congress was the first time in a century. The way this departure was received by Congress and the country suggests the wisdom of other appearances by Cabinet members.

Woodrow Wilson shocked some sticklers for precedent when he broke a hoary old tradition by going to the Capitol and delivering his message in person. He had in his studies of government set forth in two notable volumes his belief that Cabinet members in this country, as in England, should have a seat in the House and discuss public policies and be subjected to interrogations upon their recommendations.

There is no good reason why, in the absence of constitutional authority, members of the Cabinet should not be requested to report to Congress in person periodically so that every Member would be informed of what each department was doing and subject himself to questions from the legislators. That method has an advantage over the system of hearings before a large number of committees which alone heard the executive requests. It would be a good thing not only for Members of Congress but for the public as well, to follow the English parliamentary custom, at least on important questions such as military affairs, foreign relations, and important matters touching revenue and administration. The Congress claims it is not kept informed when, as a matter of fact, the knowledge is in the keeping of a committee. We have too much government by committees and too little public discussion of national matters in the public forums. As to foreign relations, there has long been too much "hush, hush" and the legislators lack the information to which they are entitled. Except upon matters in war that might give aid and comfort to the enemy, the secrecy that attends foreign policies and military preparedness is more harmful than helpful. The secret sessions of committees are, 9 times out of 10, contrary to the doctrine of public action publicly arrived at. If Congress had known all that Dodd, Grew, Bowers, and other Ambassadors had reported in the half dozen years before the war, it could have been more helpful in warding off the war. Secrecy, censorship, and star chamber sessions are contrary to the spirit of the Republic. Mr. Hull's presentation of matters of the highest importance emphasizes the need of more such unity between the executive and the legislative.

Too much jealousy has existed between the executive officials and Members of Congress. The blame is not one-sided. As an evidence of the wide gulf, there was a day 25 years ago when a big Navy bill was under discussion in the House.

At the suggestion of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee the Secretary of the Navy occupied a seat on the floor, ready, if called on by the chairman, to supply data immediately if it was desired to put the House in possession of information bearing on the largest recommendations for naval strength in the history of any country. The chairman was master of the subject, except as to certain details, which the member of the Cabinet was able to supply as the discussion proceeded. What happened? Certain Members of Congress later voiced severe criticism of the Secretary of the Navy for occupying a seat on the floor while the naval appropriation bill was under consideration. One Member denounced the innovation as "an attempt to coerce Congress."

It would be better for all concerned if, when a measure affecting his department is under consideration the head of that department should be invited to address the body and answer questions. Now that Mr. Hull's appearance has broken the ice, why should not other Cabinet members be invited to discuss matters peculiarly in their knowledge. This would be public business publicly arrived at, which would be good for the country, for the Congress, and the executive departments.

The innovation of last week should become a practice in all matters of great importance. Public affairs should be debated in the open, secret sessions and closed-door meetings should be ended.

The presence in Congress of executive officials for questioning and accounting would be the recapture of early American custom, not the creation of a new precedent. The First Congress utilized such a provision. It was dropped when the need was not so great. It deserves to be renewed now that the need is imperatively greater.

Woodrow Wilson supported the procedure in a magazine article in 1893. President Taft advocated it in his annual message of 1912, and it was later supported by President Harding and Secretary of State Hughes.

Fight United States Fascists Too, Warns Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an article appearing in the Chicago Times entitled "Fight United States Fascists Too, Warns Nelson." Under leave granted me, I insert it, as follows:

FIGHT UNITED STATES FASCISTS TOO, WARNS NELSON

WASHINGTON, January 18.—War Production Chief Donald M. Nelson today had charged that American Fascists—"psychopathic Hitler worshipers"—and pressure groups which play into their hands are seeking to exploit the United States and destroy its freedom.

Speaking at a dinner last night in his honor commemorating the second anniversary of the War Production Board, he said the United States, Britain, and Russia, combining a preference for peace with a proven superiority for war, are well on their way to discouraging Fascism abroad, but "we must remember that the Hitler psychology is not confined to foreign nations."

"I am thinking of some men who call themselves Americans but who in their intolerant hearts hate freedom and democracy and everything America stands for," he continued. "Like all Fascists, they want to ride roughshod over their opponents.

"Then there are other men, too many of them, who while not Fascists themselves, play into the hands of the would-be Hitlers. These are the men who make up our pressure groups, who seek to make big profits out of the war, or who produce our wartime strikes—men in any class who would recklessly gamble with the Nation's future, in order to gain some petty, temporary advantage for themselves."

"To my way of thinking," he said, "the psychopathic Hitler worshipers and the foolish men who give them aid are asking for trouble—and, if they persist, will assuredly get it."

He said the Nation's productive achievements have staggered the imagination of the world and that he deeply believes the United States, after winning victory, will go steadily forward with a democratic spirit even stronger "to amaze the world by our achievements in peace."

Hospitalization and Care by Our Federal Government of Disabled Veterans of All Wars Returning to Civil Life in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the executive committee, department of Massachusetts, of the Disabled American Veterans, on January 8, 1944, at the State House, Boston, Mass.:

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, has as its main objective the hospitalization and care by our Federal Government of the disabled veterans of all wars returned and returning to civil life in Massachusetts; and

Whereas the elected State officers of this organization have since Pearl Harbor been in consultation with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, members of the congressional delegation from Massachusetts, and the manager of the Boston office of the Veterans' Administration, and their associates in connection with the plans now in effect or being put into effect to care for our disabled comrades, which include:

1. Hospitalization for general medical and surgical cases at the new facility about to be opened at West Roxbury, staffed not only by competent full-time doctors but assisted by the most eminent consultants now resident in Boston.

2. The continuation of arrangements for the treatment of general medical and surgical cases, as in the past, at the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass., and at the Marine Hospital, Brighton, Mass.

3. The arrangements made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, by authority of the President, whereby the Veterans' Administration will utilize beds in our Army hospitals for the treatment of general medical and surgical cases when the need arises, which will include utilization of the 2,000-bed Army hospital, soon to be opened at Framingham, and the 800-bed hospital, now under construction at Waltham, Mass., and the hospitals in Fort Devens, Camp Edwards, Fort Standish, Fort Banks, and Westover Field, in addition to the Veterans' Administration facilities already operating at Newington, Conn., White River Junction, Vt., and Togus, Maine.

4. The changing over of the Veterans' Administration facility at Rutland Heights, Mass., because of the impact of returning World War No. 2 veterans from a general medical hospital to a tuberculosis hospital.

5. The plans of the Federal Hospitalization Board for the erection of additional facilities and additions to existing facilities for the care of our mentally sick comrades.

6. The setting up in Boston of a combined facility under one administrative management for the care of the disabled men of Massachusetts, which provides for the allocation of those administrative units which do not come in direct contact with the veterans, such as personnel, finance, legal, supply, utilities, and mail at West Roxbury, Mass., and maintaining in the Federal building the contact unit, which has to do with advising and assisting the veterans in the filing of applications for compensation, insurance and other benefits, the entire Adjudication Division, including the claims and rating boards, before whom the men appear for hearings and awards of compensation and other benefits; the Rehabilitation Division, whose responsibility is the supervision of vocational training, and all necessary records; and to include also the Medical Treatment Division, adequately manned and equipped to render out-patient treatment to disabled veterans who are entitled to such out-patient treatment for service-connected disabilities, and who are residents of metropolitan Boston: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, unanimously endorse these plans in their entirety and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the manager of the Boston Combined Facility and the Members of Congress from Massachusetts.

Approved:

CLARENCE J. HILL,
State Department Commander,
Department of Massachusetts,
Disabled American Veterans.
LEON CHASE WAITE,
Past Department Commander,
Department Adjutant.

Soldier Vote in Texas After World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following soldier-voting law of Texas passed at special session of legislature in May 1919 permitting all honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of World War No. 1 residing in Texas to vote in all elections during 1919 and 1920 without payment or possession of a poll tax:

Senate bill 1—Chapter 3

A bill declaring discharged sailors, soldiers, and marines, who were absent from home in January 1919, to be qualified voters in all elections held in this State during the years 1919 and 1920, without having paid poll taxes

(An act declaring that the war with the Imperial Government of Germany is, within the provisions of section 10, article 8, of the constitution of this State, a great public calamity in all counties, cities, and towns of the State, and declaring that because of said calamity and by reason of the inadequate provisions of the laws of this State the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of this State were prevented from paying their poll taxes, under the provisions of section 2, article 6, of the constitution, and that by reason of these facts and by reason of the fact that section 9, article 16, of the constitution of the State declares that absence on business of the United States shall not forfeit the residence once obtained so as to deprive anyone of the right of suffrage; and, therefore, declaring that said soldiers, sailors, and marines should not and ought not to be compelled to pay their poll taxes due or assessed against them for the years A. D. 1918 and A. D. 1919; declaring that by authority of section 10, article 8, of the constitution said soldiers, sailors, and marines are hereby released from the payment of the poll taxes which may have been or may be levied against them for the years A. D. 1918 and A. D. 1919; providing that it shall not be necessary for said discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, in order to exercise the privilege of suffrage and vote at all elections held within the State of Texas during the years 1919 and 1920, to hold a poll-tax receipt showing any poll tax paid before the 1st day of February next preceding such election, or paid at any time theretofore or thereafter; and providing certain duties for election officers and conferring certain authority upon them with reference thereto; regulating the manner and method of counting the ballots of discharged soldiers,

sailors, and marines; declaring this law cumulative of all other election laws of this State, except where in conflict therewith; making this act apply to all elections in this State, general, special, and primary, and providing that the invalidity of any one section of the act shall not affect the other sections thereof; defining the words "soldiers," "sailors," and "marines" as used in this act; conferring jurisdiction on the various district courts of this State to hear original suits of mandamus brought by anyone within the terms of this act against any election officer or officers who declare that they will decline, or who may decline, to permit any soldier, sailor, or marine to vote hereunder; defining and creating offenses in violation of this act, and prescribing venue, jurisdiction, and punishment therefor; providing for the printing and distributing of 10,000 copies of this act among election officers of the State and making an appropriation therefor; and declaring an emergency.)

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas:

SECTION 1. Whereas the United States has been at war with the Imperial German Government since the 7th day of April A. D. 1917; and whereas said war has called from peaceful pursuits and ordinary avocations more than 174,000 citizens of Texas and taken said citizens from their homes and usual places of abode into military cantonments and foreign countries as soldiers, sailors, and marines and prevented them from exercising the ordinary privileges of citizens of the State; therefore, it is declared that said war is, within the terms and provisions of section 10, article 8, of the constitution of this State, a great public calamity in all the counties, cities, and towns of this State; and whereas the said citizens of this State in the service of the Government of the United States as soldiers, sailors, and marines, in the various departments and divisions of the military service embraced within these terms, have been prevented, by reason of their service and obedience to the laws, rules, and regulations of the military service, and by reason of the inadequate provisions of the laws of this State, from paying their poll taxes under the provisions of section 2, article 6, of the constitution of this State, and, by reason of the great calamity of war as aforesaid, have been so prevented; and whereas it is declared in section 9, article 16, of the Constitution of Texas that absence on business of the United States shall not forfeit a residence once obtained so as to deprive anyone of the right of suffrage; therefore, it is declared that said sailors, soldiers, and marines should not, and ought not, to be compelled to pay their poll taxes, due or assessed against them for the years A. D. 1918 and A. D. 1919; and whereas it is declared in section 3, article 1, of the Constitution of Texas that "All freemen, when they form a social compact, have equal rights and no man or set of men is entitled to exclusive separate public emoluments or privileges, but in consideration of public services"; it is hereby declared by the Legislature of Texas that the services in said war of said soldiers, sailors, and marines were and are "public services" within the meaning of said provision of the Constitution of Texas. And it is here declared that such sailors, soldiers, and marines in consideration of public services are entitled to exclusive separate public emoluments and privileges.

SEC. 2. That, therefore, by authority of section 10, article 8, and section 3, article 1, of the constitution of this State, the legislature of this State, by vote of two-thirds of each house, duly entered and recorded thereon, does hereby release to the said soldiers, sailors, and marines the payment of all poll taxes which may have been or may be levied against them for the years A. D. 1918 and A. D. 1919.

SEC. 3. It is further declared that it shall not be necessary for said discharged sailors, soldiers, and marines, in order to exercise the privilege of suffrage and vote at all elections held within the State of Texas during the years 1919 and 1920, to hold a poll-tax receipt showing any poll tax paid before the 1st day of February next preceding such election, or paid at any time theretofore or thereafter, as provided in article 2942, chapter 4, title 49, of the Revised Civil Statutes of the State of Texas of 1911.

SEC. 4. All such discharged sailors, soldiers, and marines coming within the terms and provisions of this act, when they present themselves at the proper place, which proper place shall be the place of residence of such person at the time of enlistment, or the place of residence acquired since his discharge, and who is otherwise a qualified voter at such place for voting—that is, at the place of their residence at the time of joining the Army, Navy, or marines of the United States—shall exhibit to the election officers their discharge from the military or naval service of the United States, showing their service in the present war, or if such discharge is lost, misplaced, or in the hands of the Federal Government, then they shall make a written affidavit to such fact, stating, in the face of the affidavit, the unit in which they were serving at the time of their discharge, and, as near as may be, the date and place of their discharge and present place of residence. Said affidavit may be made before any officer authorized to administer oaths or by the officers of the election authorized to administer oaths. Upon presentation of such discharge or the making of such affidavit, if the voter is otherwise qualified, except having paid his poll tax, then he shall be qualified to vote and shall be permitted to vote at any election held within the State of Texas. If an affidavit is made, then the affidavit shall be filed with the election officers and shall be preserved in a box or receptacle in the same manner that ballots are preserved. If a voter present his discharge, then a memorandum of the contents of the discharge shall be made by one of the election officers, and shall be filed by him and preserved in the same manner that affidavits are required to be preserved under this act: *Provided*, That the terms and provisions of this act shall apply only to such discharged sailors, soldiers, and marines as may have received honorable discharges from their respective branches of the military service.

SEC. 5. All ballots voted under this act shall be written or stamped on the back thereof by the election officers, or under their direction, and contain the words "discharged soldier's ballot," before said ballot may be voted or may be counted. It shall be filed and be counted as shall be the ballots of other voters.

SEC. 6. This law shall be cumulative of all other election laws of this State, except wherein conflict therewith and where in conflict, this act shall prevail: *Provided further*, That the invalidity of any section of this act shall not affect the constitutionality of any other section.

SEC. 7. This act shall apply to all elections in this State—general, special, and primary.

SEC. 8. It is declared that where the word "soldier" or the word "sailor" or the word "marines" is used in this act, it shall include all enlisted men and officers in the military and naval service of the United States in the present war.

SEC. 9. Anyone who is not in fact a discharged soldier, sailor, or marine as these terms have been defined in this act, who presents himself at any voting place to vote in this State and represents to the election officers that he is a discharged soldier, sailor, or marine, or makes the affidavit herein provided for discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by confinement in the State penitentiary for any period of time not less than 2 years nor more than 5 years. Ten thousand copies of this act shall be printed in bill form, under the supervision of the secretary of state, and a sufficient number of copies of this act shall be, by the secretary of state, delivered to each and every county judge within the State on or before May 16, 1919, and three copies of said act shall be, by the county judge of each county in this State, delivered to the presiding officer of each election precinct within his county, together with all other election supplies to be used at the election to be held on the 24th day of May 1919. And $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, to defray the expenses of printing and distributing said acts as herein provided.

SEC. 10. Should any election officer or election officers declare that they will on any election day refuse to let any discharged soldier, sailor, or marine, or to let discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines, vote in accordance with the terms and provisions of this act, then any such discharged soldier, sailor, or marine shall have authority to bring an original mandamus suit in the district court of the county of his residence, or any court of civil appeals or the supreme court, against any such officer or officers for the purpose of compelling them to permit him to vote in accordance with the provisions of this act; and no appeal shall lie from the decision or judgment of such district judge or appellate court trying such case and no court having jurisdiction to issue the writ of mandamus provided for herein shall upon proper application refuse to issue such writ and hear said cause solely upon the ground that the jurisdiction herein conferred is concurrent in other courts.

SEC. 11. Refusal on the part of any election officer engaged in the conducting of any election in this State to receive or properly count the vote of any discharged soldier, sailor, or marine entitled to vote at any election under the provisions of this act shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed 12 months or by fine not to exceed $1,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine, at the discretion of the jury.

SEC. 12. The fact that there are many thousands of returned soldiers, sailors, and marines, and will continue to be during this and the next succeeding year, who have been, under the law, denied the privilege of paying their poll taxes, and whose avocations and privileges have been denied them by reason of being in the Army or Navy, and the fact that these citizens of the State should not be made to suffer any further than may be by the great calamity of war, and the fact that important elections in this State are soon to be held, create an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the constitutional rule requiring that bills be read on three several days be suspended, and same is hereby suspended; and that this act take effect and be in force from and after its passage; and it is so enacted.

[NOTE: Senate bill No. 1 passed the senate on May 6, 1919, by a two-thirds vote, yeas 26, nays 0; and passed the house of representatives with amendments on May 7, 1919, by a two-thirds vote, yeas 115, nays 0; the senate and house selected conferees on May 8 to adjust the differences, and the conference committee report was adopted by the senate on May 8, 1919, by a two-thirds vote, yeas 28, nays 0; the house adopted the report on the same date by a vote of 109 yeas and 0 nays.]

Approved May 9, 1919.

Became effective May 9, 1919.

Resolutions Adopted at the Seventy-third Annual Meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, January 14, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas State Board of Agriculture recently held its annual meeting in Topeka. The membership of this board is representative of all phases of Kansas agriculture and is composed of some of Kansas' ablest and most progressive farmers. I believe that the board speaks authoritatively for the farmers of Kansas and that the resolutions adopted at its annual meeting represent the views of a great majority of Kansas farmers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit these resolutions herewith:

VICTORY

Together with our fellow countrymen, we grimly realize that our first job is to win the war. We rededicate ourselves to that task. As farmers and stockmen, we pledge our utmost efforts for the maximum production of food and fiber as our primary contribution toward ultimate victory and the establishment of a lasting peace.

COOPERATION

The times call for the close cooperation of all interests, and we urge coordinated action of labor, industry, and agriculture in the prosecution of sound production policies.

COOPERATIVES

We recognize the sound philosophy and underlying principles of cooperative marketing, purchasing, and service organizations and commend the activities of these groups in their contribution to agricultural prosperity and the public welfare.

WAR AND POST-WAR

In the development of all war and post-war national and international policies affecting agricultural production and distribution, we insist that producer representation and expression be fully recognized and that agriculture be adequately represented on all agencies dealing with these all-important problems, as well as at the peace conference.

PARITY

We believe in the principle of true parity for agriculture—a concept which thinking people of all groups of our society commonly recognize as just. We do not seek more than this fair relationship with other interests, either in peace or war, but insist that insofar as possible the parity status be secured and maintained.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The A. A. A. program, including soil conservation and commodity loans, has proven its value to agriculture.

We reaffirm our continued support of the national farm program.

The intent of the law was to bring about parity prices for farm commodities.

We demand that the practice of any Government agency having a tendency to lower farm prices below parity be discontinued.

Funds for Commodity Credit Corporation loans are not definitely assured. We insist that Congress make the necessary appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation to definitely guarantee the continuance of the commodity-loan program, until those crops so benefited shall have reached parity.

We urge that the crop-insurance program be reinstated and funds for its operation be provided.

COST OF LIVING

While living costs have advanced, yet today it requires a smaller percent of the industrial income (22 percent) for the purchase of food than ever before in the history of our Nation. Therefore, the prices received by farmers for food commodities cannot be held accountable for the increased cost of living.

INFLATION

Since inflation is caused by too much buying power in the hands of the people—more money than goods available—its control would seem to require the bringing of supply and demand into balance, by abundant production, together with a tax and saving program to siphon off dangerous dollars. It would appear a helpful policy to use excess income in paying debts, investing in War bonds and subscribing liberally to the various war-chest funds.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

We deplore the use and the proposed extension of subsidies to roll back agricultural prices under the guise of reducing the food costs to consumers. Money for subsidies, interest, and administration can be provided only through taxes or by borrowing. With the national income at the highest in our history, there is no justification for charging these costs to future generations or to the soldiers who are now fighting on the various battle fronts of the world.

FARM CREDIT

We appreciate the benefit to agriculture of the Farm Credit Administration and acknowledge the benefits of a unified system of farm credits, under one management, for mortgage loans and crop and livestock production.

COST OF GOVERNMENT

There is no question that government could be improved and its cost lowered by abolishing many overlapping agencies that are not essential and by consolidations of others to prevent duplication of services. This would save both money and manpower that could be profitably used in the war effort.

FARM MACHINERY

In order that agriculture may meet the goal for food production as set by the Federal Government, insomuch as the present increased allotment is insufficient, an adequate amount of new machinery, trucks, and repair parts must be provided, and we, therefore, respectfully request the War Production Board to immediately allocate and provide additional steel and necessary material for the production of component parts.

PROTEIN FEEDS

Since the War Food Administration has announced that there is about the same amount of protein concentrates per animal unit this feeding season as there was prior to 1940, when there was no trouble in its equitable distribution, we urge the Food Administration to immediately take effective steps to relieve the present intolerable situation by directing that livestock producers receive their fair share of protein in primary form for economical and speedy production. From current information, it appears that large mixed-feed manufacturers have acquired stocks of protein at the expense and in discrimination of farmers and stockmen. We, therefore, recommend prompt reallocation of supplies on the basis of 1940 distribution.

STATES' RIGHTS

During an emergency period such as we are experiencing at the present time, we recognize the necessity of centralized control placed in the hands of the Chief Executive. Normally, however, it is our belief that in order to preserve the full functions of a democratic government and the American way of life, as much decentralization and local control should be left to the States and local units of government as possible.

STATE LAW COMPLIANCE

In the handling, distribution, and sale of feeds, seeds, fertilizers, nursery stock, and similar materials handled by Federal agencies, we strongly urge that the laws and regulations of the various States into which said commodities are moved be complied with.

BUTTER RATION POINTS

We favor the lowering of ration points for butter to the same level as so-called butter substitutes.

OLEOMARGARINE

Manufacturers are again putting forth efforts to repeal Federal taxes on oleomargarine, and we urge our Kansas congressional delegation to retain this ban on an inferior food substitute, as in the interest of public health, the diary industry, and sound policy.

MEAT INSPECTION

There should be no relaxing of meat inspection during this period of emergency. Any relaxation would tend to increase the possibility of introduction and spread of dangerous, contagious, and infectious diseases through importations from foreign countries. We recommend that the inspection of meat, meat products, and byproducts of meat be carefully safeguarded during this period.

QUARANTINE RESTRICTIONS

Owing to the rapid transit of men and materials between various points in the world, extra vigilance must be exercised to guard against the dangers of introducing foreign insect pests and plant diseases, and hence we respectfully urge stringent inspection service in connection with the enforcement of all Federal quarantines.

PORTS OF ENTRY

We want to urge again that the ports of entry be eliminated.

KANSAS-COLORADO CASE

In the 15 decisions heretofore rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States involving the waters of interstate streams, the Court has announced and applied the principle that there must be an equitable division or apportionment of the benefits of an interstate stream as between the States affected. That has been denied by the Court in the recent Arkansas River decision by its action in dismissing the prayers of both States.

We insist that the sovereign State of Kansas rightly is entitled to an equitable part of the waters of the Arkansas River, for irrigation and other purposes. We believe the State should take such steps as may be necessary to protect its interests in this important matter, and that we should diligently press forward to a final solution of this problem.

FILLED MILK

Rather humanly, perhaps, manufacturers of so-called food substitutes are taking advantage of the necessities of war to promote their selfish interests, and we must be diligent in our opposition to these insidious campaigns, to protect the public health and welfare and the agricultural industry. We must be watchful of the Kansas filled milk law which twice has been attacked and for the second time, just recently, upheld by the State's highest court.

FARM LABOR

So long as it appears that we must rely largely upon our own resources, we urge the closest cooperation with State and Federal agencies that are striving to effectuate the most practicable farm labor program for the State, and urge all draft boards to recognize agriculture as an essential industry.

PRICE BASIS FOR WHEAT

As Kansas is the premier wheat State of the Union, normally producing one-fifth of the wheat of the Nation, we protest the discrimination that O. P. A. has placed upon our wheat farmers in setting a full freight differential of 9½ cents per bushel between Chicago and Kansas City in establishing the present price ceiling on wheat at Kansas City, Mo. Normal trade practices in past years and the C. C. C. loan program reflect only about one-half of this freight differential between these two markets. Kansas wheat farmers face the possibility of losing $5,000,000 on the estimated production for 1944 if the present price ceiling of $1.61½, basis Kansas City, Mo., is maintained. We recommend that O. P. A. reconsider the basis for the Kansas City price ceiling on wheat as established January 1, 1944, placing it more in line with the past price differential that has existed between the Chicago and Kansas City markets.

REAL-ESTATE APPRAISAL

For 6 years, a plan of real-estate appraisal, initiated and developed by the county clerk, has been in operation in Trego County and which has to a marked degree removed inequalities in assessments and taxation, which for decades have been a chief complaint in the system generally followed in this State. We commend the Trego County plan as worthy of study.

APPRECIATION

We deeply appreciate the cooperation of those who have assisted in this meeting and its success, and are particularly grateful to the speakers for their excellent addresses, to the press for its generous reports, to the officials of the State of Kansas and city of Topeka for their courtesies, and finally to Secretary Mohler and coworkers for a constructive program and carefully arranged coinvention plans which were well carried out under difficult circumstances.

DR. O. O. WOLF, *Chairman,*
JOHN KEAS, *Atchison County,*
B. M. OTTAWAY, *Franklin County,*
CARLTON HALL, *Montgomery County,*
HERMAN PRAEGER, *Barton County,*
P. B. HARKINS, *Cheyenne County,*
Resolutions Committee.

Robert Bowman, of Kern County, Calif.

REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Tenth Congressional District of California, leading first in producing food and fiber in the United States, now has produced the national president of the Future Farmers of America for 1943 and 1944 in Robert Bowman, of Buttonwillow, Kern County, Calif. The parents of Robert Bowman are to be congratulated on rearing such a fine outstanding son. The people of Kern County are justly proud of his achievements.

Robert Bowman was elected national president of the Future Farmers of America for 1943–44. He is 19 years old and is a Kern County, Calif., rancher. His father is a World War veteran and enlisted in the Navy after Pearl Harbor. Robert manages the home farm, which is located in the San Joaquin Valley. He has one of the outstanding purebred Berkshire swine breeding enterprises in that valley, in addition to alfalfa, cotton, dairy, and other projects. Robert was president of the Kern County Union High School F. F. A. chapter at Bakersfield. He was vice president of the San Joaquin regional F. F. A. organization comprising more than 50 chapters. In April 1942 he was elected president of the California Association of the Future Farmers of America.

He won the California State Future Farmers public-speaking contest in 1942 and placed fourth in the Pacific regional finals. He is a lecturer of the local grange and secretary of the Kern County Pomona Grange. He is also a member of the Farm Bureau in Kern County. While a student in high school, Robert took an active part in school activities, made good grades in his studies, and carried on a large supervised farming program as a part of his vocational agriculture work. He earned a total of more than $2,000 from his farming activities while he was a student in high school. Since being graduated, Robert has devoted his full time to farming. He earned a labor income of $3,824 from his farming program last year. Robert is continuing his farming activities while serving as president of the Future Farmers of America, which is composed of more than 200,000 farm boys who are students of vocational agriculture in the public secondary schools. Robert is typical of the farm youth of today who believe in the future of farming and the ability of farm youth to do their part in building a better way of life on the farm. Last fall at the National F. F. A. convention, he was elected to the American Farmer degree, which is the highest degree attainable in that organization.

Other national officials of the F. F. A., who are visitors today in the Nation's Capital are: O. Beverly Roller, Weyers Cave, Va., first vice president; Ralph Salzman, Ashton, Ill., second vice president; Arthur E. Clifford, Bristol, Vt., third vice president; Robert Barthelmess, Miles City, Mont., fourth vice president; and Byron Freeman, Westboro, Mo., student secretary.

In closing, I would like to compliment Mr. Howard Dickson and his staff for their outstanding accomplishments in the F. F. A. of Kern County. This association is the largest agricultural vocational system in the United States.

I also want to compliment Mr. E. J. Johnson for his fine work. Mr. Johnson is the Federal agent of Agriculture Education representing 11 Western States and Hawaii.

Rescue the Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News:

RESCUE THE REFUGEES

Rarely has the President made a more desirable and popular move than his appointment of the Secretaries of War, State, and Treasury as a War Refugee Board to rescue as many as possible of Hitler's victims.

The fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved unanimously the Gillette-Taft-Baldwin-Rogers proposal for a similar board indicates how far this issue transcends partisan political or racial considerations. The object is purely humanitarian: To save the persecuted minorities who have escaped death but are in peril.

Though all minorities properly are covered by the President's order—political, as well as racial and religious—the largest number are the Jews. They have been singled out by the Nazis for mass extermination. An estimated 2,000,000 European Jews already have been wiped out. Perhaps 4,000,000 remain. They are homeless. Those who are not murdered outright, and who escape destruction by torture, face death by starvation and neglect.

The rescue job is difficult but by no means impossible, because many are still in the satellite countries. Thus when Sweden offered a temporary haven, 6,000 Danish Jews promptly got out. This week about 850 are being taken by ship from Portugal and Spain to Palestine, thus making room for others to come into those transit countries.

But only an active official agency, backed by money and power, can arrange the intricate international facilities to rescue several hundred thousands instead of the few hundreds now escaping. Many can be taken out of France, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria to temporary havens, which the Board can set up in Portugal, Spain, north Africa, Turkey, Switzerland, and Sweden. Palestine probably could care for half a million for the duration of the war if the British Government would permit it.

This new Board must not be allowed to limp along without effective action, like so many earlier efforts, including those of the Bermuda Conference and the Inter-Governmental Refugee Committee. Time is short. The need is desperate.

Prohibition Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, from the pen of Mark K. Edgar, the editorial genius of the Grosse Pointe News, comes a very timely reminder, in view of certain trends today. It is properly captioned "Prohibition threat."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place this article, which first appeared in the Grosse Pointe (Mich.) News of January 20, 1944, in the RECORD:

PROHIBITION THREAT

The public's recollection of the dismal failure of prohibition is still too fresh to permit either the people or their representatives in Congress to give serious heed to the proposal of the Anti-Saloon League to revive the prohibition experiment.

We have had one lesson in the disastrous results that can come out of the attempt to enforce an unenforceable law. However worthy the general thought might have been

in the effort to withdraw alcohol entirely from the country's beverages, the measure was flouted from the moment of its adoption. The people would not have it. It was assailed from every quarter, largely on the score that it opposed the principle of privilege, or personal liberty as it was often called. They insisted on the right of determining their own customs and social habits by voluntary choice and not by legal process.

The attempt to make prohibition a living, workable provision in the legal structure of the land led not only to the break-down of the prohibition law itself but brought in its train the most vicious record of habitual law violations ever known in the history of the Nation. This situation caused many serious-minded persons who had long advocated constitutional prohibition to eventually reverse their position and welcome the repeal of the constitutional amendment which came early in the Roosevelt administration.

The attempt to bring this law back again into the private lives of the people, when they are already harassed by a myriad of restrictions necessarily imposed by the war, would threaten a Nation-wide irritation which might have disastrous effects on the whole war effort.

It would not reduce drinking by a gill. It would introduce another gigantic flood of law violations when the country is already struggling against a tidal wave of lawlessness that threatens to breach every dike an anxious country is trying to build against the peril of inflation.

It is an ill-timed and unwise suggestion and sensible citizens will hope that the proposed measure will meet a quick demise in the congressional pigeonhole, to which it is hopefully reported to be headed.

Let Soldiers Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there are Members in this House who are determined that there shall be some sort of record vote on the question of the Worley bill or the principles embodied in it. These Members feel that the soldiers, sailors, and marines who are on duty in all parts of the world will not have an adequate chance to vote unless there is a simplified and uniform Federal ballot.

The Rules Committee refused the request of the chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the Honorable EUGENE WORLEY of Texas, for a rule which would guarantee a roll-call vote on the Worley bill. It is apparently the hope of certain Members of the House that there will be only a teller vote and that on this teller vote these people will be able to defeat the Worley bill and hence will never have to answer to the soldiers for their actions.

We, on the contrary, feel that if the Worley vote should be defeated in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union there should then be an opportunity for a separate roll call. This usually comes on a motion to recommit by the minority party. It is obvious since the minority party members on the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress are all opposed to the Worley bill that in their motion to recommit they will not make possible the roll call on the Worley bill but will try to avoid any evidence of how they feel on that important issue.

There seems only one way to circumvent that strategy. We can develop a new significance for an earlier vote. It is for that reason that we intend to make the vote on the previous question on the adoption of the rule the test vote as to whether a Member does or does not favor a uniform Federal ballot which can be distributed to the soldiers and insure their participation in the election. On such a vote the Members of the House will have an opportunity to take a stand for or against soldier voting. They will write their own record for the men and women in the armed services to examine when they return from the defense of their country.

Accordingly, those of us who want to give the soldier the best chance to vote have prepared a pledge which sets forth our intentions. It is as follows:

Favoring the principles of the Worley soldier-vote bill, I hereby pledge myself to support a request for the yeas and nays when the previous question is moved in the House of Representatives on the adoption of the rule in the House, and then to vote "nay" on the previous question so that, in the event the previous question is defeated, it may then be in order to move to amend the rule to permit, if necessary, a separate motion to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee in charge immediately to report back to the House as a substitute the provisions of the Worley bill, H. R. 3982, which bill, in our opinion, will insure that the men and women in the American armed forces shall have the greatest possible opportunity to participate in forthcoming elections through the medium of a uniform Federal ballot.

That pledge was signed last night by 27 men who participated in its preparation. They were: Bob Sikes, Michael J. Kirwan, Thad F. Wasielewski, Mike Mansfield, James A. Wright, John J. Sparkman, Daniel K. Hoch, La Vern R. Dilweg, J. H. Folger, Ray J. Madden, Howard McMurray, Chet Holifield, Clair Engle, John R. Murdock, Jerry Voorhis, Emory H. Price, Clinton P. Anderson, John E. Fogarty, Grant Furlong, George Sadowski, A. M. Fernandez, William A. Rowan, Estes Kefauver, Will Rogers, Jr., J. Percy Priest, Brooks Hays, Michael A. Feighan.

Today more than 70 additional Members have signed the agreement. While I want it distinctly understood that these are not all the Members who favor this course, I present their names:

Albert Gore, Mike Monroney, Wirt Courtney, A. L. Bulwinkle, Clarence F. Lea, James M. Curley, Thomas J. Lane, John W. Murphy, Victor Wickersham, James O'Connor, Maurice Sullivan, Herman P. Eberharter, Arthur G. Klein, J. W. Robinson, Herbert C. Bonner, R. E. Thomason, Louis C. Rabaut, John D. Dingell, George D. O'Brien, Samuel Dickstein, Charles C. Buckley, Thomas J. O'Brien, B. M. Vincent, Louis Ludlow, Jennings Randolph, John M. Coffee, Thomas F. Burchill, Ed. V. Izac, Compton I. White, Donald L. O'Toole, Thomas S. Gordon, William L. Dawson, Cecil R. King, Emanuel Celler, Francis V. Walter, James J. Heffernan, Richard F. Harless, Martin J. Kennedy, Augustine B. Kelley, John Lesinski, Vito Marcantonio, Martin Gorski, A. L. Somers, Walter Lynch, Francis J. Myers, Nat Patton, Lindley Beckworth, Lyndon B. Johnson, Lex Green, William B. Barry, James H. Foy, Thomas Scanlon, Matthew J. Merritt, George E. Outland, James M. Fitzpatrick, Pat Cannon, Wright Patman, D. J. Ward, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Lansdale G. Sasscer, Ed Gossett, John Kee, John H. Tolan, Michael J. Bradley, Harold C. Hagen, Usher L. Burdick, John W. Flannagan, Jr., J. W. Fulbright, Orville Zimmerman, Thomas Ford, Jed Johnson, J. Buell Snyder, William T. Byrne, John J. Delaney, Elmer Wene, Edward J. Hart, Joseph L. Pfeifer, and George Mahon.

Call of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 25, 1944:

CALL OF HUMANITY

The President has forestalled certain action in Congress in behalf of the threatened Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe. He has set up a War Refugee Board to attempt the rescue of "the victims of enemy oppression who are in imminent danger of death." This decision follows the initiative of Senator GILLETTE, whose resolution to the same effect had already been reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee, and was on the calendar for Senate debate this week. A similar resolution introduced by Representatives WILL ROGERS and JOSEPH C. BALDWIN was on its way through the House. Passage by an overwhelming majority had been indicated. The industrious spadework done by the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People in Europe had contributed to this prospect, and the committee is likewise entitled to credit for the President's forehanded move. The proponents of the legislative resolutions, who are drawn impartially from both parties in Congress, will no doubt welcome Presidential action without reservation. Perhaps they would have rephrased the title to exclude the word "refugees," for, after all, the congressional aim was that steps should be taken before the Jews become refugees. But the purpose in establishing the new Board embraces the object of the resolutions, and that is the main thing.

The new Board will be composed of Secretaries Hull, Morgenthau, and Stimson. An executive director will be appointed, and this, of course, will be the key post, to be filled, presumably, by a person of both distinction and energy. He is assured in advance of maximum cooperation by the State Department. The Department already has been di-

rected on recommendation of the Board to appoint special attachés with diplomatic status, to be stationed in places where aid could be given to war refugees pending the development of permanent plans. Little can be done, of course, to stop the mass killing, which, according to the Archbishop of Canterbury is going on at the rate of 10,000 Jews a day. But, as Senator GILLETTE has said, the murderer's hand might be stayed if the Big Three were to indicate that their recent statement on atrocities applied equally to the Jew extermination program.

It should have been done immediately after Hitler's New Year declaration that "our whole life, our efforts, and our existence must be directed to only one end: the complete extermination of the Jew all over Europe." The new measure is the other step the Iowan had in mind in that it contemplates rescue and hospitality in special reservation camps in neutral and other territory. When the new agency sets up the centers to which the Jews can escape, there will be that much more encouragement to the Jews to escape Hitler's toils.

We hope the President will also be forehanded in the matter of feeding the starving people of occupied Europe. A resolution calling upon the administration to facilitate this humanitarian measure is going through Congress. It should be speeded up, if the President will not cut short its career by adopting its purpose. There is not the slightest reason any more to bar mercy ships to Europe. The war will be won by military, not economic, means, and when this was realized, the major reason for opposition to this act of charity completely disappeared. We won't say it was wicked to hold out against action. It was simply stupid, an example of how the mind fails to keep pace with the facts. No cost to this country would be involved in authorizing mercy ships to go to the beleaguered countries. The food, the ships, and the personnel will all come from neutral countries. After the experience in Greece, where outside aid has saved thousands of lives, there is no further excuse for a moment's delay in authorizing aid. Now that the President has anticipated congressional action in behalf of the Jews, he should anticipate congressional action in behalf of the children of Europe, for it is the children who would be benefited most. No greater tragedies have been recorded in civilized history than those which are now stirring our Congress.

Installment Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we usually receive letters of criticism of what Congress has done, and also of the various regulations of the governmental departments; therefore, it is indeed a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD a resolution received from George W. Fitch, managing director of the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., whereby the continuance of regulation W without fundamental change under the jurisdiction and administration of the Federal Reserve System is recommended:

Whereas regulation "W" adopted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in order to carry out the President's Executive order of August 9, 1941, and made effective September 1, 1941, to accomplish the objectives of the order, which in part reads: "To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must discourage credit and installment buying and encourage the payment of debts, mortgages, and other obligations, for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying, and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War bonds," has now been in effect for more than 2 years; and

Whereas we of the furniture trade at retail engage in installment selling to a great degree and in doing so have diligently applied all of the provisions of the regulation as originally written and subsequently amended; and

Whereas the members of this State Association of Retail Furniture Dealers, having conscientiously adhered to regulation "W" in the operation of their extensive credit businesses, feel that their experiences with consumer credit control as established in the regulation entitles them to a definite expression as regards the effectiveness of the control on both buyer and seller: So therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive committee, board of directors of the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., regard regulation "W" as being particularly outstanding and effective among hundreds of Government directives for the following reasons:

1. Achievement of objectives to a marked degree.
2. Simplicity and ease of understanding.
3. Businesslike and considerate administration by the Federal Reserve System.
4. Universal popularity among the great numbers of American businessmen and consumers whose selling and buying credit is controlled by it; and be it further

Resolved, That the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., heartily approves the regulation as now written and administered, that we recommend no fundamental changes be made in the directive for the present, especially in the maximum credit period as now allowed, and that we petition the Congress of the United States to continue regulation W, by legislation if required, following the cessation of hostilities under the capable administration of the Federal Reserve System and any contemplated changes in its provisions after the war be left to the judgment of the Federal Reserve System; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C., the Federal Reserve Bank, twelfth district, San Francisco, Calif., and California congressional Representatives at Washington.

RETAIL FURNITURE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
H. F. BARGER,
President.
GEORGE W. FITCH,
Managing Director and Secretary.
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *December 3, 1943.*

Simplified Income-Tax-Return Form Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. O. B. Logan, of Tumbling Shoals, Ark. This letter is typical of many that I have received and expresses better than I can the essence of the complaints against too much red tape. The forms which must be filled out today are especially burdensome to the small businesses and I sincerely hope the Committee on Ways and Means will give particular attention to simplifying the income-tax reports. Likewise, I urge the various bureaus to give attention to this matter.

The letter follows:

TUMBLING SHOALS, ARK.,
January 18, 1944.

Mr. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Congressman of the Third District.

DEAR MR. FULBRIGHT: I appreciate very much you writing me about the matter and it gives me a chance to discuss some of my problems and worries with you. And here are part of them. First, the unfair social-security laws that require a man to have a number before he works and an employer can hire him, then an employer has to put up 4 percent against his 1 percent, and not that as much as the red tape that we employers have to contend with and a bunch of high-paid Government agencies coming around and checking our records and criticizing us and keeping us tore up all the time. And threatening us with heavy fines and making us feel as if we were under direct dictatorship and which we are in a sense. Then comes the withholding tax and all of its red tape. And some higher official checking on it. And then comes our complicated income tax with a million dollars' worth of red tape, and all of it put together makes a real burden on small employers, as well as the large businesses. I have put in since the first of the year my entire time away from my work trying to make out my 1943 report and not started good yet. And I am the kind of person that just wants what is right and do not mind paying taxes but hate to lose one-fourth of my time from my work and do not accomplish myself or the Government either a thing, and it is more than small businessmen can stand up under. So if there is one thing you can do to help relieve the situation it would be very much appreciated. I have written Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. MILLS regarding same, and you will find many people complaining and howling.

Yours truly,

O. B. LOGAN.

Simplify the Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows is not an exception to the rule but aptly represents the majority, in fact, some letters contain unprintable language. This particular gentleman is very unique in his description of the bill and his opinion of the originators. Taking advantage of such situations, we find mushroom growth of alleged tax accountants with no professional recognition preying upon these bewildered taxpayers. I am also inserting a circular letter which is being sent

out by one of these so-called tax advisers. You will note that this is for salary and wages only, and this class of taxpayer should certainly receive advice from Federal officials, rather than fall prey to these fake tax advisers.

I want to emphasize the necessity of some immediate action to simplify the income-tax returns in order that the taxpayer can figure his own taxes due.

The letters I mentioned are as follows:

I have just received the 1943 income-tax form. It is a masterpiece of unintelligible junk, pure unadulterated junk, no one without a legalistic mind should attempt to even try to make a halfway decent return upon such a confusing mess of mumbo jumbo.

As one of your constituents, I urge you to do all you can to prevent a recurrence of this flagrant tax form which, no doubt, is taxing the patience of every taxpaying citizen.

The Treasury officials and even Congress itself possess the acme of optimism in believing that such a tax form could be understood by the average citizen.

It is indeed a sad commentary upon the creative ability of the heads of the Treasury Department. They are asking the people to pay their taxes but seem to try to do everything within their power to prevent them from doing so. They say that the average I. Q. of the average person is that of a 13-year-old child; if this be true, then the tax form should be readily understood by a 13-year-old.

Very truly yours,

DAVID BLOWER,
Los Angeles, Calif.

TAX SERVICE ADVERTISEMENT

JANUARY 7, 1944.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM: You have no doubt received your 1943 income- and Victory-tax return forms from the collector's office and we are now in a position to assist you in preparing same for filing; if you did not receive forms, we have a supply here.

Owing to the changes in the Federal income-tax law the present tax return is far more complex than heretofore and will require more time to prepare. Our previous experience has disclosed that many taxpayers postpone the preparation of their income-tax returns until the approach of the deadline for filing, as a consequence we are obliged to turn away countless persons because of their lateness. To avoid this and to enable us to take care of all our clients, we are offering the following inducements:

Appointments made and kept prior to January 31, 25-percent reduction.

Appointments made and kept prior to February 15, 20-percent reduction.

Appointments made and kept prior to February 29, 10-percent reduction.

Minimum rates prevail on appointments made after February 29.

Our minimum rate for preparing a joint return for income from salary and wages only, including the 1944 declaration of estimated tax and the California State tax return is $20; in the event separate returns are advisable to effect a tax savings, the minimum charge is $25. Where other income is involved, the rate will depend upon the additional time required to prepare the return.

We enclose a list showing information that will be required in the preparation of your tax return to assist you in gathering same.

Your early call for an appointment will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

P. S.—To individuals whose income is under $3,000 and who are eligible for and will obviously benefit from the use of the short form of the tax return, the minimum rate will be $10, subject to the same conditions as above.

Hadassah Youth Aliyah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an address made by the able and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable D. LANE POWERS, before the Hadassah at Trenton, N. J., on Sunday, January 16, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here tonight on the occasion of this dinner tendered by Hadassah, and I consider it a privilege to pay tribute to an organization whose women are engaged in the task of rescuing the victims of Nazi oppression and rebuilding their bodies and souls.

Special mention should be made of the magnificent work carried on under your youth Aliyah program and special praise must go to that grand and noble woman, Miss Henrietta Szold. Ten thousand boys and girls, many of them orphans, have been snatched from gutters, labor camps, ghettos, from a land of torture and murder, and have been transported to safety in a haven of refuge, Palestine. These children have not only looked death in the face, but have seen death dealt out to their parents, their brothers, their sisters. Many of them have come to Palestine suffering from malnutrition, disease, mental shock, and great sorrow of the spirit. In healing them and in caring for them, Hadassah has righly earned the admiration of the civilized world.

But the task of rehabilitating the persecuted members of the Jewish people and of affording them the opportunity to develop as freemen in their own homeland did not begin yesterday. Let us go back in the history of Palestine a mere 25 years. The land was barren and desolate. Where now stands the beautiful modern city of Tel Aviv, there was a shifting sand dune.

In November 1917, England issued the historic Balfour Declaration, which promised that Government's aid in the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The Balfour Declaration was published to the world with full approval of all the Allied Powers then engaged in the First World War, and with the encouragement and support of the United States. The League of Nations conferred the mandate for Palestine upon Great Britain for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that declaration. At that time world leaders, such as Wilson, Lloyd George, Churchill, Smuts, and many others prophesied that when sufficient numbers of Jews had arrived in Palestine through continued immigration, a Jewish commonwealth would arise there.

In 1922, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, by unanimous vote, adopted a joint resolution favoring the establishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine. Two years later, a special treaty between England and the United States gave reinforced American sanction to the mandate for Palestine. I should like to call one clause of that treaty in particular to your attention. It reads: "Nothing in the treaty shall be affected by any modifications which may later be made in the terms of the mandate, unless such modifications shall have first been assented to by the United States."

The United States has never relinquished that right. Every American President, from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt, has reaffirmed the declared and traditional policy of the United States with regard to Palestine—the restoration of the Jewish national homeland.

Because they had faith in the words of the Balfour Declaration, thousands of Jews, especially those from the destitute lands of Europe, immigrated to Palestine. Pioneers, young and old, flocked there to build homes. They drained swamps; they irrigated the dry land; they developed industry and commerce. Hospitals, farms, factories, modern cities appeared overnight out of the blood, sweat, and tears of the thousands of home-seeking Jews. All this in a brief 25 years.

Today the results of this Jewish effort and development are contributing mightily to the success of Allied arms in the Middle East. Palestine, alone, of all the countries in the Middle East, has been the active and loyal ally of the United Nations from the very start of the war. Jewish Palestine has sent 30,000 volunteers into direct action against the aggressors—30,000 out of a total population of slightly over half a million. In the United States, ladies and gentlemen, this would be the equivalent of a voluntary enlistment of over 8,000,000. And despite the fact that Jews constitute but one-third of the total Palestine population, a full 75 percent of the volunteers are Jews.

These Palestinian Jewish troops, attached to the British Eighth Army of General Montgomery, did heroic work in driving Marshal Rommel out of Africa. They have left their dead on every Mediterranean and Middle Eastern battlefield.

Jewish factories, working three shifts a day, are turning out vital war materials for the Allied armies, and since the outbreak of the war the citizens of the Palestine home front have upped their industrial production by 274 percent.

Mr. Churchill has said that a people is entitled to its freedom to the extent that it fights for it. The Jews of Palestine are fighting. They are fighting not only for their own lives and rights, but have joined in the common struggle to protect the rights of all people in all lands.

There is in force today the Chamberlain White Paper—one of the blackest documents ever issued by any democracy—which, if not abrogated very soon, will stop all new Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 31, just 2 months from now. It will freeze the Jews into a permanent minority in their own homeland.

This White Paper was penned by former Prime Minister Chamberlain's Colonial Office in 1939. It was issued to placate those Arabs who had been stirred up against the British and Jews by the Nazis and the Fascists. It climaxed the era of appeasement, and was denounced in the strongest terms by those who later led England through her dark days.

We have been told that the appeasing days are over. But the White Paper remains.

It is inconceivable that a nation which helped to frame the Atlantic Charter, a nation which proclaimed that all men in all lands should live in peace and security, should at the same time admit authorship of the infamous White Paper. It is almost incredible that Palestine, so solemnly pledged to the Jewish people by Great Britain, should be the one place on this earth outside of Axis-dominated countries, where Jews are to be barred simply because they are Jews.

The present leaders of the British Government, although not responsible for the promulgation of the White Paper policy, are responsible for its continuation. Five years ago Winston Churchill rose in Parliament to denounce the White Paper, calling it a "breach and a repudiation of the Balfour declaration." Mr. Churchill now has an opportunity which comes to few fighters against injustice—a chance to implement his words with concrete actions.

We in America have a moral duty and a legal right to demand of our Government that it use its influence to bring about the

abrogation of the White Paper. In this darkest hour of Jewish history, immigration into Palestine is vital to the lives of millions of people. They cannot wait indefinitely. Every American should consider this fight his fight—for it is part of the struggle against injustice everywhere in the world. As for me and my part in that body called the Congress of the United States, you may count in all assurance that I will do what is in my power to prevent such a miscarriage of justice.

Need in Lawrence, Mass., for Branch Office of Veterans' Administration and Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution passed at the regular meeting of Lawrence Post, 15, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, favoring the establishment of a branch office of the Veterans' Administration in the city of Lawrence, and a resolution passed at the regular meeting of Essex County Council, at Lawrence, Mass., favoring the erection of a veterans' hospital in or near the city of Lawrence. Both resolutions were sent me by Mr. Leslie Anderson, executive committeeman, district 8:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE REGULAR MEETING OF ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL, HELD AT LAWRENCE, SUNDAY, JANUARY 16, 1944

Whereas Lawrence Post, 15, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, has been informed that the facilities of the various Veterans' Administration hospitals in Massachusetts are very much crowded; and

Whereas the said post is informed that the soldiers' relief commissioner in the city of Lawrence has been instructed to place sick and disabled veterans in local hospitals; and

Whereas crowded conditions exist in the local hospitals; and

Whereas it is expected that there will be hundreds of men from Lawrence and surrounding cities and towns who will need hospitalization; and

Whereas the city of Lawrence is the largest city nearest to the center of population in the Merrimack Valley: Be it

Resolved, That action be taken by the proper authorities to erect a veterans' hospital in or near the city of Lawrence; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to General Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration; Senators WALSH and LODGE; and Representatives LANE and BATES.

Respectfully submitted.

MAURICE F. O'SHEA,
Chairman.
CLIFFORD C. GREENLAW,
RICHARD O. DOYLE,
Essex County Resolution Committee.
LESLIE ANDERSON,
Executive Committeeman, District 8.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE REGULAR MEETING OF LAWRENCE POST, NO. 15, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMERICAN LEGION, JANUARY 13, 1944

Whereas it has come to the attention of Lawrence Post No. 15, Department of Massachusetts of the American Legion, that a branch office of the Veterans' Administration may be established in some city in the Merrimack Valley; and

Whereas the city of Lawrence is the largest city that is nearest to the center of population of Merrimack Valley; and

Whereas the city of Lawrence once had a branch office of the Veterans' Administration: Be it

Resolved, That the said Lawrence Post, No. 15, go on record as favoring the establishment of a branch office of the Veterans' Administration in the city of Lawrence; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to General Hines, Veterans' Administration Administrator; Senators WALSH and LODGE, and Representatives LANE and BATES.

Respectfully submitted.

MAURICE F. O'SHEA,
Chairman,
CLIFFORD C. GREENLAW,
RICHARD A. DOYLE,
Essex County Resolutions Committee.
LESLIE ANDERSON,
Executive Committeeman, District 8.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House had before it the very important House Resolution 29, dealing with assignment of veterans' legislation to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. As soon as the matter was called up by Chairman RANKIN, right after the House convened, a quorum was called. Having suffered all night the night before with a very painful toothache, I was in a dental chair trying to get relief when the House first met. I arrived on the floor within a few minutes, however, and was present to vote on House Resolution 29, to give the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee jurisdiction of such legislation. I am a member of this important committee and signed the discharge petition soon after it was placed on the Speaker's desk, as the record will show, and I was very much concerned about passage of this resolution and was happy to vote for it in the House yesterday. This is desired by veterans' organizations. Veterans of the First World War and the present war prefer that their legislation be grouped in one committee, and I concur that this procedure seems to be desirable. The House approved House Resolution 29 by an overwhelming vote yesterday, and I was happy to participate in it.

The World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House has just completed hearings on a broad bill to make provision for various benefits for veterans. It is imperative that such be done. Of course, a great deal has been accomplished along that line already, but pending legislation and legislation which the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee may bring out will further complete the very comprehensive program which we have in mind for the welfare of veterans.

With Better Care the New Deal Might Have Washed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following brief editorials from the Saturday Evening Post of January 22, 1944, are worthy of careful consideration by the Members of Congress and the Nation as a whole because they are constructively critical of the administration in two different fields of activity, each of which is quite controversial. The editorials throw light upon the question at issue in each instance and in this particular is helpful in the consideration of the same:

WITH BETTER CARE THE NEW DEAL MIGHT HAVE WASHED

Raymond Clapper, one news commentator with the habit of thinking out what he writes, instead of rushing into print with a half-cooked pot of message, agrees with practically everybody else that President Roosevelt is tired of the term "New Deal" because it has become a political liability. Mr. Clapper also agrees with some millions of other people that "many things which were done in the New Deal period will stay as part of the heritage of America." Among these he lists: "Collective bargaining, social security, regulation of the stock market, which, before Roosevelt, was run as a private club; the principle that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see to it that there are jobs for those who cannot find private employment; the transfer of the real seat of power from Wall Street to Washington."

To which it should be added that whatever deal follows the New Deal will have the following jobs left and bequeathed by the New Deal:

To make collective bargaining really collective and actually a bargain, so that labor-union leaders with unchallenged power may no longer impose upon their clients, with Federal approval, any terms they please and expel union members who object.

Maintenance of social security, but discouragement of the yeastlike growth of a gigantic bureaucracy with power to dictate all activities of life "from the cradle to the grave."

Drastic changes in stock-market regulation, so that the conditions under which the capital market can operate are strengthened and new ventures by private investors are not hedged about with enough paper work to swamp the Ordnance Department of the Army.

Some formula for producing full employment without throwing up the hands à la

W. P. A. and settling for full but useless employment.

Keeping the center of necessary national power in Washington, but restoring not to Wall Street, whose past powers are greatly exaggerated for purposes of boob trapping, but to the American people enough power to enable them to engage in productive effort without benefit of directive.

In conclusion, we have the quaint idea that if the New Deal leaders had paid more attention to such footnotes as these they could still go on calling it the New Deal without risk of being mobbed in the streets.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IS NOT FREEDOM TO UNDERMINE

When Brother Ickes was throwing his weight around a few weeks ago, telling a committee of Congress that he was going to keep Robert Morss Lovett on his job in the Virgin Islands administration, law or no law, our natural impulse was to cheer. Freedom of speech, or even to have your name on fellow-traveler letterheads, is one of the things we are fighting for, isn't it? Therefore, Congress or the Dies committee must be Fascists when they insist that such people shall be kept off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. Lovett, being a high-minded man with a tendency to be a soft touch for the pinks, has our best wishes. He is undoubtedly a valuable public servant. We are also doubtful of the propriety of legislative interference with the executive branch of the Government by stopping payment of the salaries of employees. But it is about time to make a few distinctions about freedom of speech, as well as to make it plain that a Member of Congress who objects to the employment of fellow travelers in the Government is not necessarily either a Fascist or a reactionary. On the contrary, he could be an American with a sense of the fitness of things fully as acute as that of the people who seem to think that freedom of speech includes freedom to bore from within.

If Mr. Stalin discovered in his administration workers who had even attended a cocktail party in behalf of the Republican Party or the American Chamber of Commerce, he would not debate long as to whether or not to keep them on the pay roll. Nor would he permit people to accept public office when it had been proved that their public attitudes were entirely dependent on events in some country other than Russia. The American practice is different. In the most recent plebiscite in New York at least two Communists were elected to the city council. If past experience with Communists means anything, they can be relied on to stick as close to the party line as they can get in view of Stalin's reluctance to let his American suckers know what it is. But because we Americans believe in freedom of speech, we feel that we must make public office available to men whose ideas spring from outside America.

Carried to its logical conclusion, this complacency could result in national suicide. Before that happened, the American people would undoubtedly repudiate freedom of speech and expel the fellow travelers by force and violence. More sensible, to our way of thinking, would be a more precise definition of freedom of speech. For after all, it is one thing to give a crackpot the right to expound his views on a soap box in the park; it is quite another thing to give him a job in an executive department where he may make decisions and rulings which affect the welfare of millions of people. That the two should be lumped together under our constitutional guaranties is nonsense.

Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting radio speech made by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, National House of Representatives, over Station WNAC—Yankee Network—in Boston, January 5, 1944:

Within the next few months—perhaps even within the next few weeks—hundreds of thousands of our boys in Europe and the Mediterranean will leap out of landing barges and begin what we hope will prove the final and victorious campaign against Hitler. We all expect this campaign to be hard and bloody. Many—too many—of our brave heroes will be called upon to give their lives in the cause of freedom. Others will be maimed, and still others will be taken prisoner. All that unfortunately is part of the grim reality of war, part of the price of victory.

As we contemplate this coming campaign, and as we contemplate all the battles and campaigns in which our armed forces have been engaged and will be engaged until complete victory is won over all the Axis nations, we here on the home front are overcome with a sense of humility. What can we do to equal their sacrifice on our behalf? What can we do to reduce the price they are paying for the victory which we will all enjoy?

The tragic fact is that there is such a disproportion between the great sacrifices they are called upon to make and the paltry privations we are called upon to endure that too many of us tend to lose the sense of reality about the war—that we tend to forget that there is a terrible war going on all over the world. As Speaker RAYBURN told us on the floor of Congress, "We in this country would not know that a war was on if we did not read the newspapers, hear the radio, and see the vacant chairs in the homes of the country."

Because the contributions which the Government calls upon us on the home front to make for victory are so small in comparison with their contributions, their sacrifices, we tend to forget that we have any contributions at all to make. We often do not see how our failure to do our small part can possibly affect the course of victory.

That is a terrible illusion. The principal task of the home front is to expand and speed production. Since we all get paid for working and producing, that represents no genuine sacrifice, no real hardship for any of us. The hardship, the discipline, the contribution come in through the fact that in order to maintain production and maintain a sound economic structure in wartime we must all do our part to fight inflation.

The discipline of holding the line against inflation is a pitifully small contribution when weighed in the balance against the stupendous sacrifices made by our boys on the fighting fronts. We are never going to get out of debt to our boys over there even when we do our part loyally, unflinchingly, and without grumbling. But—and here is the rub—if we on the home front don't carry through on our small assignment, we are heaping up obstacles against our armies at the front and against the armies of our fighting allies, prolonging the war and jeopardizing the chances of victory, increasing loss of American lives, and at the same time undermining the economic structure of peace after the war. Our boys over there will never forgive us if through our negligence we allow such things to happen.

The story of the ravages of inflation has been told so many times that the public tends to dismiss it as not only a familiar story, but as a familiar fairy tale. But let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, inflation is not a fairy tale. It has happened before—it is happening right now in China—and it can happen right now to us if we loosen the dikes just a little bit more.

George Washington found himself so weakened by the ravages of inflation in the Revolutionary War that he indignantly exclaimed that he was ready to hang the speculators and the profiteers on a gibbet five times as high as that from which Haman was hanged. During and after the last World War prices rose so high that our price level was more than doubled.

The other day I was reading the story of inflation in present-day China. Since Japan started the war against China, prices in some provinces of China have multiplied 250 times—25,000 percent. Just think of it—25,000 percent.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a fair and practical program for holding the line against the vicious disease of inflation. That program was enacted by Congress in 1942 and entrusted to the executive branch of the Government for administration and enforcement. It calls for holding prices and the cost of living down and keeping wage rates down by limiting wage increases to the terms of the Little Steel formula. That whole scheme of economic stabilization is today threatened with break-down because too many of us, acting through pressure groups, are pushing to lift the ceiling on the particular things we sell while keeping it down on the things the other fellow sells.

All of us have the psychological excuse that some other fellow is being treated, or seems to be treated, more favorably than we are. In some cases, that is undoubtedly true. Given the complexity of the economic system, there is no practical scheme of economic stabilization that could ever be devised which would not have inequities here or there. Let me go further and say that in our whole social organization, in peace as well as in war, no system of rules, no system of laws, can be devised which will be perfectly fair to everyone. But laws are better for everybody than lawlessness, and laws work because everybody recognizes that his loyalty to law, his stake in society, is more important than the minor inequities that are inevitable under any system of laws.

If this attitude prevails in peacetime, how much more should it prevail in wartime? Just think of the stakes which each one of us has in the success of the war effort. Let everyone measure the injustices of which he complains by reference to his paramount stake in victory. Let all the pressure groups—businessmen, the farmers, and labor—ask themselves whether they wish to prolong the war and jeodardize victory by pushing for the rectification of their special grievances and the advancement of their special interests.

Even if we put aside our common stake in the war, even if we assume that the war is safely won, all of us as complainants have to think of the economic effects of breaking the line against inflation. Justice Byrnes has stated—and the truth of his statement is not open to challenge—that while "holding the line may have caused some hardships here and there," yet "by and large there has actually been less economic hardship on the home front during the war than there was

before the war." And it is also true that the chief complainants are not the few groups that have suffered absolute hardship from the war, but people who feel that their relative position has not been maintained—in other words, that their next-door neighbors have benefited more than they have.

Even if this is true—and in many cases the eye of envy distorts the picture—let everybody consider whether wrecking the defenses against inflation will in the long run improve their position. Today people may have their grievances, but they also know where they stand economically. Once things sweep into inflation, nobody knows where he stands. Nobody knows whether he can beat the game of inflation. And past experience shows that it is not the solid, hard-working citizen who usually beats the inflation game—it is not the hard-working farmer, nor the factory worker, nor the industrial producer, nor the salaried white-collar employee—it is none of these, but only the shifty and contemptible speculator who beats the inflation game.

Not only does the average man not gain but lose by inflation when it takes place. He loses a second time in the inevitable aftermath of deflation which ensues when the war ends and normal conditions of supply return. During inflation prices and wages chase one another upward, but during deflation they drive one another down. What is worse is that in the downswing of prices and wages, businesses go bankrupt, farms are foreclosed, and livelihoods are wiped out. Even the moderate inflation which we tolerated during the last war created serious ravages when the price bubble collapsed. We had a very severe industrial recession in 1921. Agriculture was so maimed by the post-war deflation that it did not recover for a decade—in fact it did not really recover until the present administration instituted its parity program for the farmers.

This time the ravages of deflation in the post-war period would be far more serious. Everybody knows that we are going to face a difficult problem in reemploying our soldiers and our demobilized war workers. If at the time of straining all our resources to meet this problem we have to deal with the problems resulting from the crash of inflated prices and wages, we may well find the post-war situation unmanageable. We may find the economy engulfed in the worst depression this country has ever seen—a depression which would make the depression of 1929–32 look like a picnic in comparison.

I have talked about the dangers of inflation without naming names and without apportioning blame among the various groups and lobbies. I have done so because I think all of us have been guilty. I think all of us have been seduced into complacency. We have been seduced into complacency by our success so far in the military conduct of the war and in the economic conduct of the war.

Because we have been successful in military operations and have had, thank God, relatively few casualties so far, we have tended to forget that a war was going on. And because the administration has so far managed the home front that our production has been the envy of the world and hardships to the folks at home have been surprisingly small, most of us think that there is no danger in rocking the economic and political boat.

I believe that this epoch of complacency will come to an end now that we are girding ourselves for a knock-out blow against Hitler and preparing a similar blow for the hosts of Tojo and Hirohito. The American people have had their spree of dissension and bickering on the home front. I cannot believe that they will persist in their bickering in their competition to put private interest ahead of the national interest when our sons and brothers are summoned in great numbers to do or die for freedom. I am sure that we are not going to let them down and we are not going to let our country down.

House Joint Resolution 192

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the pending legislation, under which the Congress would authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, is an attempt to push our Nation, under disguise, further into the field of international bribery.

Under the guise of humanitarian impulses, this proposal will entangle us in the maze of petty political squabbles of every nation in the world. I predict, on the basis of past performance, that within 5 years, or even less, after the launching of this gigantic enterprise, the United States will become the target of the bitterest attacks from all parts of the world. We will suffer execration from peoples and from governments to a degree which has never been known by any nation in the history of the world. The term "Uncle Shylock" will be as a sweet-smelling rose compared to the terms of opprobrium which will be heaped upon us.

With the billion and a quarter dollars which it is proposed to appropriate in this measure, we will buy a bitter broth for our people. The money which we are asked for, in the name of humanity and charity, will buy us distrust and will forfeit the good opinion of those whom we would seek to help.

Let it be clearly understood that this great and detailed organization which is set up under this proposal is a lopsided fraud. There are, or purport to be, 44 nations signatory to the agreement. They include great world powers and tiny governments, as well as some governments which are not in fact governments but merely exiled individuals. On the basis upon which the proposal is here presented, the United States would be one forty-fourth of those participating agencies. But on the basis upon which it is herewith proposed to appropriate, the United States would pay somewhat more than 66 percent of the moneys to be contributed by all of the 44 nations.

The thought necessarily occurs that if the United States is going into the international welfare business or, as the committee report terms it, an international community fund, why does not the United States step out in its own true form as a great government and appropriate and administer its own funds? There can be no valid reason why, if we are to carry 66 percent of the load, we should hide behind 43 other governments and alleged governments.

If it is the will of Congress and of our people to spend money to help those left in distress in the wake of this horrible war, let us stand on our own two feet and do it ourselves. Let us have no subterfuge about it. Let us tell the peoples of the world frankly that we will meet their relief and rehabilitation problems for them, financially, and in supplying them the materials which they need. Then if we fail, and I fear that we are building up to a great failure, the responsibility will be ours, and if we succeed, ours will be the joy of a task well done.

We are told in the report on this measure that signing this agreement is a "milestone in the development of the foreign policy of the United States." It is exactly that, and it is a milestone which we shall regret ever having passed.

We are told that participation in this agency has already strengthened the bond between us and the nations associated with us in the prosecution of this war. If that is true, then our bonds with those nations are weaker even than I have thought them to be, and I have never thought them extremely strong.

Neither we nor any other nation can expect to obtain, or to maintain, the respect of fellow nations on the basis of bribery. That has been proven time and time again in the prosecution of this war, throughout the history of the United States, and throughout the history of nations older than we are.

This is another attempt, by pretty words and by laudable but impracticable methods to obtain deviously what could more satisfactorily be obtained by a forthright manner. Let us junk this and the other disguises which some would make us wear and step forward into the international field unafraid and clothed in our own habiliments.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me add just one more thought in the form of a prediction. That is, that within 1 year this world W. P. A., which is authorized in this bill, will be riddled with waste, inefficiency, and scandal. Mark my words.

The Army is already fitted to carry out the feeding of those nations which our troops will occupy. They have the money and the food to do that now. I cannot vote for an additional appropriation of such an amount as proposed here. After all, I owe my first allegiance to the people whom I represent in Congress who will be called upon to suffer under such squandering.

A Constituent's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

TAFT, CALIF., *January 16, 1944.*

Hon. A. J. ELLIOTT.

Dear SIR: Some time back Fulton Lewis, Jr., said some very nice things about the present Congress. He is close to the picture and should know, but I can't see it. What has been done about the antiquated railroad

laws? Congress is still voting appropriations to pay the salaries of worthless bureaus and an excess pay roll on needed bureaus. But, worst of all, Congress is not writing a tax bill worth the name. What do you expect to do about all these war bills? Wait till the soldiers that fought the battles come home and let them pay the bills?.

The wife and I have bought several thousand dollars' worth of War bonds, and I have a 50-percent pay-roll deduction for the purchase of bonds and was instrumental in making the company for which I work a 100-percent 10-percent organization. If Congress doesn't show signs of passing a ten- to fifteen-billion-dollar tax bill within the next 30 days, I am canceling my pay-roll deduction for bonds and turning all the bonds I have on hand in and start a campaign against bond buying.

It seems so senseless for the Government to be selling bonds at a time like this. There are billions of dollars competing for something to buy, causing the prices to go up. Why should the folks at home have any more than the fellows on the battlefields? They are doing the fighting. Why not those at home foot the bills? You had plenty of nerve at a recent oilmen's meeting in Bakersfield. Do you have the nerve to read this letter on the floor of the House?

Respectfully yours,

Z. H. BISSELL.

Pork Situation Causes Glut on Market

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago farmers and stock raisers were importuned to raise an increased amount of hogs and were assured that a market price floor would be put upon them so that there would be a reasonable profit in this industry. Hog raisers were told that it was their patriotic duty to furnish meat and supplies for the Army and Navy and that this would aid the war effort and protect the lives of the boys who are at the front fighting for our liberty. These farmers accepted this situation and relied upon the statements that were made and the promises that were given and raised a large and unprecedented number of hogs in 1943. It is well that they did so. Their patriotism was splendid, and they felt that they were doing well for their Government and for their flag.

The War Food Administration and C. C. C. kept their promise in regard to the floor price and fixed such price at $13.75 per hundred at Chicago. This was the basic price and farmers proceeded upon the assurance that they would get that basic price and were satisfied with it. But just now a serious complication has arisen concerning hog raisers for they cannot sell their hogs. The packers will not take these hogs because there is a glut in the offering of them. We cannot sell our hogs. It is said that last week there were 11 miles of trucks bringing hogs to the market that were waiting to unload in the hog pens at Omaha. It was impossible for the packers to receive them. Many of these farmers went home with their hogs, but some could not. There is and has been an enormous glut in the market, but those in charge predict that this will not last long and that the most serious part of it will soon be over.

But now an anomalous and strange thing has arisen. We must get permission to sell our hogs. We must apply to the War Food Administration for leave to sell hogs, and at the same time housewives cannot buy pork without paying a large amount of ration coupons in order to do so. It is a strange paradox. Producers cannot sell and consumers cannot buy. It costs money and time and expense for the producer to hold his hogs. When they are ready to go to the market they should go or he loses materially in feeding his animals after they are fit. He cannot keep them without loss and he cannot sell them without a permit. Remember that these are the very hogs he was urged to raise.

And on top of all of this the farmer is penalized 50 cents per pound if the hogs that he brings to the market exceeded 300 in weight. In other words, if the hog weighed 303 pounds instead of the limit—300 pounds—he was penalized and had to pay 50 cents per pound for the extra 3 pounds or $1.50 on that particular hog. So this situation meant that the producer could not sell hogs without penalty if he kept them in addition to the loss that he will sustain in feeding them beyond the time which he ought to feed them. Mr. Speaker, it was a very sad and wicked situation. Members of Congress have been approached from the whole corn-hog area and we have been criticized because of a situation which we Congressmen could not and did not control. So then on last Saturday I secured an interview with the Honorable Marvin Jones of the War Food Administration and then went down to this interview with other representatives of the Iowa delegation including Mr. GWYNNE, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM, but these men represented the whole Iowa delegation, including Mr. LECOMPTE, Mr. TALLE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. HOEVEN. Also accompanying us were Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, and Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois. We asked that relief be given us and our constituents.

We described to them the unfair and wicked conditions now existing in the large pork-producing areas of which our section is the greatest. We urged them to take the points off of pork and to raise the weight support limit to 330 pounds on all hogs farrowed in 1943; and to immediately settle on a program for 1944 in order that hog raisers will know what to expect and plan accordingly for this year's crop of hogs.

Then we suggested that they let the farmer butcher and sell all the pork he could right at the farm. This they will permit, but it will require ration points for all of it.

And we have just now this morning been notified that these officers have raised the weight ceiling which heretofore was 300 pounds, to 330 pounds so that the farmers will not be penalized any longer for selling hogs up to 330 pounds.

This will help and we are thankful for the modification, and hope that the marketing glut will be over in 3 weeks, so that the problem will be satisfied and farmers can market their products without hindrance or loss. Judge Jones and the others seemed to sympathize with us and have now granted the relief above outlined. Farmers will always do their share and may be depended upon to perform their full duty.

When They Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Philip Burke, entitled "When They Come Home," which appeared in the Columbia for January 1944:

WHEN THEY COME HOME

(By Philip Burke)

What a day it will be when the war is won and our boys come home.

Not for all of us certainly, but for most of us, surely, that dream will turn true, that prayer be answered. That day will come, as real as its light at your windows, as milk bottles rattling, as its morning paper with giant headline "Troops arrive."

To a hoarse saluting of whistles a troop ship will move up the harbor, looming huge as it nears. The restless ants that mass her decks will change, while you watch, to men; thousands of faces now looking down, searching the dock. One face blurred through your tears, shouting through the bedlam down to you. Your happiest day; it will come. And it will pass. The next day will come.

What then? When the fighting is over, and the fearing, and the long, long waiting—when you have him at home again, your loved one. What help can you give him? What help will he need, facing the peace and the post-war world?

Now is the time to think about this, lest the demobilization find us as the call to arms did, off guard, ill-prepared, and confused; lest the peace have, too, its Pearl Harbor. For the peace will bring its own dangers, will have its casualties. When the fighting is done and your boy is home safe, he'll be safe from bomb and bullet and shell—not yet safe from the war.

WISDOM IN THE MORNING AFTER

For war is a great sickness, and the peace that ends it will not bring immediate health, but convalescence. Hitler will die, and his henchmen, and the jackal war lords of Japan. The victorious nations will be convalescent; so will be each returning veteran.

After long and grave illness, convalescence brings happiness, release from fear. It brings not health but the hope and promise of health again soon. Convalescence brings, too, the need of wise and patient care. The peace will bring that to each victorious nation; to

each happy home where a boy explains his service ribbons, sits again to his mother's cooking.

The day your boy comes home will take care of itself. The morning after will call for wisdom, for a love that is understanding. That morning you'll need to realize that your boy is tired; under his happy excitement, bone and brain weary, physically and spiritually slack with fatigue.

That fatigue will wear off; time will cure it. But while it lasts, weeks or months, the fatigue will necessarily influence all your boy thinks and feels, and does or does not. Not dangerous in itself, it can lead to danger; not understood and accepted wisely, it can make unhappiness and permanent maladjustments.

Here is the danger. When that fatigue is physical and apparent, when it results from wounds or illness, when it is recorded on faces and service records, it will be recognized and treated. But your son may come home with no wounds, no hospital record, apparently healthy and well. He may seem to himself and to you unchanged by the war. But he won't be. Whether he knows it or not, shows it at first or not, he, too, will be tired, below the level of his consciousness, weary. You, too, though perhaps to a lesser degree, will be tired. And when people are tired their emotions are unstable, their judgments erratic; they make mistakes.

Why is this weariness inevitable, the certain harvest of war? Fighting men, soldiers and sailors, are seldom overworked. Most of the time, for weeks on end, the physical conditions of their life and work are close to ideal. They have the foods we must do without, ample and scientifically prepared meals. They have regular hours and plenty of exercise in the open air. Why then are men in their forties too old for this life?

The battle on sea or land is a comparatively brief period of intensive work. Men work staggering with exhaustion; they work till they fall, and creep to work again. There is no rest for the living until the engagement is broken off. The battles for the South Sea Islands are unlike the battles in Italy, and both are unlike the naval engagements. Yet all are alike in this—they drain the men in action to the last drop of energy. They leave those men weary to the bone.

Civilians are inclined to think of battles as if they were colorful spectacles, as if they were mammoth football games, with generals for head coaches, bombs for footballs, and galloping backs with tommy guns. Civilians are inclined to imagine heroic sprints, bagpipes playing, officers shouting heroic epigrams.

That is one reason, at least, why returned veterans don't like to talk of their battle experiences. They aren't too modest, don't believe it. More often they don't want to disappoint civilian ears. What they remember would sound so flat. Mud and blistered heels, the drip of rain on a fox-hole bed, the empty deadly silence.

And that famous charge? For many a soldier that was a long, tough walk; an endless clumping under battle equipment on a road where nothing happened. Then perhaps an explosion; if you heard it, it missed. You got up and dragged on. Word came back that the foe had dug in on the slope ahead. You fell out by the side of the road. You waited and you grumbled for water. You said hopefully, "Buttsies," to the lucky man with a whole cigarette. Maybe you got out a letter, the last one. The ink had run and smudged, and you knew it by heart, but it brought a moment of home. Shells whined overhead, brown puffs blossomed along the slope. A runner came up with word for the C. O. The sergeants started bawling again. You stuck the letter away and got under your pack. The enemy had moved back again. Victory for the staff; more work for you. You fell in; you clumped on. When you've lived through it, what you remember is hard to explain. It doesn't make good telling to the folks at home who have heard the radio dramas. The G. I. who does the battle work can't compete with Quentin Reynolds.

"Sure, I was there," he'll say, and no more, looking grim and mysterious.

Battles are sometimes exciting. They are always exhausting. But the battles last a few hours or a few days, and they are preceded and followed by weeks of measured activity and waiting. From all physical work, even battle work, young men tend to recover quickly and completely. The fatigue the soldiers bring home with them is deeper, and more dangerous. War means fear. War means anger. And these dark emotions are heavy burdens, tiring bone and spirit of all who bear them.

EVEN HEROES ARE AFRAID

All fighting men, to greater or less degree, are afraid. No sane man can look at the stretchers going back; can watch a sister ship blossom in flame and smoke, and not be afraid. No sane boy can lie deep in the hold of a troopship and listen to the engines, and wonder where he is going, and if he will get there, and not be afraid. The soldier sleeps with his fear and wakes with it, takes it with him to battle. Were I an unbeliever, watching men going into action would convince me at least of the human soul. All animals but men will run from what they fear. Men, in a cold sweat of fear, they very flesh shrinking, will man their guns on a sinking ship, will watch men fall and step over them, walking forward to death.

Even the heroes are afraid. They triumph over their fears. But that triumph is temporary. The fear stays there like the fox under the shirt of the Spartan lad, gnawing in secret and silence. That is why the war tires all of us; all who fear for ourselves, or for loved ones. That is why when the war is over, you must give your son time to get rested, to be himself again. Never again his old self, but a new self, and with God's help, better.

For weariness is but one of the fruits of war. Love can be another. Your son will come home loving his home as he never did before, loving his country, and his God.

One hears talk of the crime wave that must follow the war. With very few exceptions the criminals won't be the returned soldiers. Here at home, our neglected children, our youth, getting used to too much money, to too much hate, from these groups our criminals will come. If you want to see what the boys now on the fighting fronts will be like in the years to come, look around you, examine the Legionnaires of your home town. Graying men, most of them, just neighbors, at their jobs Monday mornings, at church Sunday mornings. Few of us famous, and fewer infamous. No American community has been, or will be, destroyed or endangered by its veterans.

Habits are persistent, and character traits. On Saturday nights, on holidays, your son will look for in Cairo, or Sydney, what he looked for in Boston or Seattle. If he was a good lad at home he'll be a good lad in his platoon. If your son didn't drink to excess at home, he probably won't on another continent. You may reasonably hope that he won't. But don't hope that he won't come home tired. He will.

It's important that you realize this, because the Government and its welfare agencies may not. The Government is making, as it should, plans for returning the servicemen to civilian life and to jobs. It will give them bonuses of one kind or another; it will probably give them educational opportunities. The sick and the wounded and disabled, the Government will care for to the best of its ability. The Government will, as it must, leave to themselves those discharged as physically fit. If your son be one of these, yon can do things for him that no government can.

HE HAS EARNED A VACATION

You must not be distressed nor impatient if the first morning he's home he doesn't get up early and go looking for work; if at first he's reluctant to go back to school; if he seems unambitious. Give him a little time. He's convalescent. When a person who has long been sick gets up, it's just at first for an hour or two. You don't, that first morning he leaves his bed, give him his dinner pail and get him his hat. You urge him to go slowly, not to overdo. You wait wisely till his strength has returned, and with it his urge to be active. Be no less wise with your returned soldier. He'll have plenty of time the rest of his life to work. He's earned a vacation. If he wants it, he needs it. Let him have it with his family's approval.

There is another thing. When your boy returns, he won't be a boy. He'll be a man. He may not be 21 in years, but in some ways he'll be older than you. He will be a part of all that he has seen and experienced. For the years of his service he will have been treated as a man, whatever his age. This is but common sense, inevitable and inescapable; for the Army and the Navy do not deal with children, nor concern themselves with adolescent psychology. For the G. I. of 17 or of 30, the rules are the same and the duties. To bear arms is a man's task. And those who have borne arms will never again bear schoolbooks with schoolboy hearts. The boy who has answered to sergeants and boatswains will be but mildly distressed at teacher's scolding, will stay after school with ill grace.

If your son is one of the many who left high school for the service, he should go back to school, but not automatically and necessarily to his old school. For if he does go back to school, it cannot be as the schoolboy he was; it must be as a man, getting training for pay checks, or wasting his time.

Undoubtedly in some form or other the Government will subsidize veteran education. It will almost certainly offer all those it took from the schools opportunity to resume their interrupted education. Many more will take this proffered training than will take advantage of it. To go blindly back to school just because the schooling is free, has no value. It would be better for a boy to go fishing.

The first thing your son must do, and you must help him do it, is to determine what he wants to do with the peace he has won, and the years. If and when he knows with certainty that he wants to be doctor or steam fitter or farmer, then he will submit to the dsicipline and program of the school that can help him attain his ambition. In a university that had better be nameless, I remember after the First World War, a nonstop crap game, carried on by the veterans who were officially upstairs in the classrooms. Those crap-shooters were being fair neither to themselves nor to the Government. Tired boys and disabled, they were there in school because it was the place of least resistance. They didn't know what they wanted to do, and so they shot crap. If when he comes home your boy has an opportunity to go to school, urge him to think carefully what school, and why. Men can be drafted to fight, but never to study.

In the meantime, your son and millions of men are enduring now for the days to come, for the better world the peace will bring. It is good that they have this vision to light the present darkness. Yet lest they come home to disappointment and disillusionment, they

should know it for what it is, a vision; a horizon that will move before them, a journey's end, not to be reached by armies nor nations.

This better world we are promised must, in the nature of things, remain a phrase, an ideal, until men, the majority of men and their leaders, are willing to live, to think, and to act, by the laws of God. That will not be soon.

No matter what the economists plan, and governments perform; no matter what agreements are sworn in Washington and London and Moscow; if your son is to live in a better world, it must be a world he makes for himself.

No Atlantic Charter can make him personally free. No grateful Congress can vote him happy. He must make his own peace. He in himself must live his own life, with his own hands earn his bread, with his own mind seek and find his own good.

So I come at last to the point of all this, the reason for this I have written.

DO THIS FOR HIM

When your loved one comes home, after the happy excitement, the rejoicing and the feasting; while he is resting and getting readjusted; before he goes back to work—do this for him. No Veterans' Bureau, no law of Congress can do as much. Suggest to him that he start his new life by making a retreat, by spending a week-end with God. Write him now and get him to promise that he will do that, if God brings him home safe. What better way to say thanks, to ask help for the new life ahead? Your son's spirit will be tired; there it will rest. Your son will need guidance; there he will find it. Three days with God can shape 30 years.

Our grateful Government will give the returning soldiers rehabilitation. The United Service Organizations will give the boys comforts and parties. This other thing the Knights could do, and none as well. In their various communities they could sponsor and arrange for these retreats for the new veterans. For Catholic veterans; for non-Catholics, too, of course, if they cared to go, and many would. Many a boy in the field has envied a Catholic buddy his faith, and his chaplain. This would be their chance. They, too, would be welcome.

But some sponsor is needed, someone to make the idea a fact and a date. When your son is home a week, someone is needed to say to him, "How about next week end?" To say, "I'll have the car and I'll bring you home Sunday night." When the Knights have done that much, the priests will do the rest. The boys would be pleased, and their families, and their Father.

Investment in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Highland County, Va., derives its name from the fact that the average altitude of the county is the highest in the State of Virginia. There is no railroad in the county, and no industry of any kind except plants engaged in the processing of logs taken from the mountainside. It is a county of small but rich bottom lands and rolling bluegrass hills. The richness of the people of Highland County consists of their free and independent manner of living, their high ideals, and their unwavering loyalty to democratic institutions.

The enclosed clipping from the county newspaper, the Highland Recorder, indicates the spirit in which the people of Highland approach the responsibility of financing the war effort through the purchase of War bonds:

AS YOU WILL

(By E. Bluegrass)

Fellow Highlander, that gaunt Stockbroker, whom the fearful name Fate and the courageous name Destiny, is calling for more margin. Whether we like it or not, life is a hard-boiled stock exchange in which every man is compelled to play the market. All you have—and all we have—is invested in the stock of one firm—the firm of Democracy, Inc. In 1941 that stock dropped to an all-time low and, though there is a marked uptrend, the market continues deperately bearish. So we must continue to cover. That means margin and more margin, unless we have already decided to throw up the sponge and are waiting the dread notification, "Sold out and account closed."

Back in 1929 a great many of us learned what it meant to be wiped out. When we saw it coming we cashed in on every asset we had and slapped a mortgage on the farm. To protect our financial investments we went the limit. Before we went under, we raised heaven and earth to save ourselves. What we stood to lose was our money. What we stand to lose right now on the floor of the stock exchange of destiny is infinitely more.

We stand to lose the heritage of 200 years of democratic endeavor. We stand to lose the free, vigorous dignity of life we call the American way. We stand to lose all hope of future economic prosperity, and we stand to lose all we have put up to cover democracy's falling market of 1941 and 1942. And what is it we have put up? Passing over our torrent of production (ships, tanks, planes, guns, munitions, fabrics, and foodstuffs), we find ourselves facing the 412 names on the white expanse of the county's honor roll. By now there should be 430. Before long the total will reach Highland's high-water mark of the War between the States—over 500.

We have already put up more than 10 percent of the county's youth. How much of that youth will be expended on the battlefields of Europe and Asia depends on the open-handed promptness with which we meet the old Stockbroker's demands for margin. The more arms, munitions, and supplies we have at the right place at the right time, the more of our boys will come home. The more ships and planes we launch, the more boys will come home. The higher the tempo of production, the more rapid our movement of troops and flow of supplies, the more boys will come home. But that means margin and more margin, a matter of simple arithmetic—the boys or the pocketbook.

Having gone the limit to save our money investments in 1929, what considerations can stop us from going the limit in 1944, when the vastly greater investment of 200 years of national striving is at stake, to say nothing of our gigantic pledge of 10,000,000 American men?

Last Monday night a group of 36 men and women, outstanding representatives of every section of Highland, met in the Monterey High School to devise ways and means of meeting the latest demands of the great Stockbroker. There were bankers, public officials, businessmen, educators, clergy, cattlemen, and farmers. Their problem was to raise $60,000 in 4 weeks, Highland's share in the Fourth Victory Loan.

They were aware that the more well-to-do citizens had carried much of the burden of the great Stockbroker's last demands and that these same men would have to do their bit again, but this time they were glad to discover an opportunity was open for every man, woman, and child who is willing to shoulder his part of the Nation's obligation.

The $60,000 is to be divided as follows: $40,000 in E bonds, $5,000 in corporation bonds, and $15,000 in G bonds. The E bonds are the small-denomination bonds which sell as low as $18.75. They may be turned in 10 years from now for their face value of $25. The corporation bonds are bonds sold only to corporations. The G bonds are interest-bearing bonds, the interest being paid twice a year. They sell, at the lowest, for $100. What especially interested the committee were the E bonds.

There are very few citizens in the county who cannot buy at least one E bond. They can be cashed after 60 days for what you paid for them. If held for 10 years they will yield a profit of $6.25. Each district of the county has been divided into sections and the committee's representatives in your section is going to visit you. Bear in mind that the old Stockholder, who is destiny, is demanding margin to cover your Nation's investments in the American way of life. However humble you may consider yourself, find at least $18.75 to safeguard America's future, and underwrite at least one soldier's chances of a safe return.

Universal Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter by Clayton E. Kline, of Topeka, Kans., a scholarly treatise on the Universal Service Act, as proposed by the President to the present Congress. The communication is directed to Hon. Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, who in a recent address on Town Meeting of the Air, advocated the enactment of the proposal. Mr. Kline, author of the communication, opposing it, is one of the leading lawyers in Topeka, Kans., and a distinguished member of the Kansas bar. I thought others would be interested in following him through.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 21, 1944.

Hon. WARREN H. ATHERTON,
National Commander, American Legion,
Executive Offices,
Indianapolis, Ind.

MY DEAR MR. ATHERTON: I have been a continuous member of the American Legion for 25 years. I listened to your discussion on Town Meeting of the Air last night in opposition to that of a representative of the C. I. O.

Frankly, it was a humiliating experience for me to learn that a representative of this labor union carried a full appreciation of our form of government and a determination to fight to preserve it, no matter what the circumstances, whereas you, as commander of the Legion, were willing to give up all liber-

ties and, apparently, had either forgotten or did not know the meaning of the Constitution of the United States of America.

In the first place, under our Constitution, a universal service act cannot legally be adopted except through amendment of the Constitution for one very simple reason: The thirteenth amendment on slavery, section 1, provides:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

The plain wording of this amendment makes but one exception, namely, punishment for crime. There is no exception in time of war or in any other situation. In this connection, it is well to note the third amendment, which reads:

"No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

One of the most burdensome acts of tyranny, as you may or should recall, had been the quartering of soldiers in private homes, but an exception was made when this tyranny was prohibited, namely, in time of war, soldiers could be quartered in private homes and that could be done today under proper acts of Congress. However, there is no exception under the plain wording of the Constitution to slavery or involuntary servitude. This can only be done as a punishment for crime. Now, without even amending the Constitution or providing an exception, you advocate a direct disregard of the thirteenth amendment and would support a bill, namely, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which would make a potential slave of every American.

You would make every man, woman, and child in the United States a slave to the will, whim, or caprice of some bureau or local committee which could order any citizen of the United States to work any place and for anybody and at any kind of work. The representative of the C. I. O. sensed this, but you did not. For the first time on the radio, this gentleman stated the real and fundamental objection to the passage of a national service act. I have not heard the fundamental constitutional objection so far raised by a Member of Congress.

In the light of the plain and unambiguous wording of the Constitution prohibiting slavery, without an amendment of this Constitution, a universal service act cannot legally be adopted. Certainly, the people, by their vote, have the right to make slaves of themselves if they choose, but Congress has not the right to make slaves of them.

The hysteria of war is no reason for us to give up our form of government. Too many liberties have been sacrificed during the past 12 years, and we are paying heavily for those sacrifices. Think of the thousands of years through which mankind fought and struggled to obtain these liberties. Think that today they exist only in this country, and yet you and others would give them up. Liberties once lost are hard to regain. Perhaps they never can be regained. They are the only thing that we are fighting for now—the preservation of those very liberties. I believe Hitler stated the democracies could not fight a war without changing their form of government. You appear to subscribe to this doctrine.

The President himself says that this war can be won without a universal service act. If the war can be won without making slaves of the American people, then, for God's sake, let's do it. If the war cannot be won without the American people being made into slaves, then let's repeal the thirteenth amendment.

I have witnessed the tyranny of the present administration in peacetimes. I have witnessed the tyranny of its bureaucracies during this war. Under a universal service act, those tyrannies would be multiplied a thousandfold. Such tyranny cannot be attributed solely to the philosophies of the present administration. It would be true of any administration given too much power. It always has been true.

From the standpoint of production, labor and industry have done a magnificent job. This is questioned by no one. True, there have been strikes which all of us deplore, but most of those strikes have been due to bad judgment used in the administration of labor laws. I know of no one in this country who is not doing everything he can to win this war. People are sacrificing far more than they are given credit for and they do not even claim it is a sacrifice. They are constantly abused because they do not sacrifice enough and those making the statement have no conception of how much they are sacrificing. They are bearing ruinous taxes, they are giving their sons, they are working almost beyond their endurance to make both ends meet and still pay their taxes and what do they get from those in authority? Nothing but abuse. They stand for unconscionable waste in government. They stand for the continuation in employment of thousands of unnecessary Federal employees in bureaus that are useless as a fifth wheel on a wagon in time of war and serve no useful purpose in time of peace. They stand for the spending of millions of dollars on theoretical so-called post-war planning and the squandering of millions of man-hours of statisticians and others in this enterprise most of which will necessarily be a complete waste and all of which, no doubt, will have to be changed, as no one today can possibly anticipate where the pawns will lie when this war is ended. We can and will do this job as free and independent people. Making slaves of Americans will never increase our efficiency or speed the termination of this war. I have certainly had my differences with labor unions but those differences have been fought out and settled between free American citizens and, in spite of my differences with these organizations and while they were at their height, I have heretofore made the statement that probably the last defense of American liberty would lie in the hands of organized labor and I thank God that today they have taken the position they have in opposition to a universal service act and, as stated before, I am humiliated by the position taken by the American Legion. The great mass of the people are unorganized and inarticulate. The Legion should take the same position as organized labor.

One other thing: In my opinion, it is an insult to the American soldier to try to place him in the same category as a civilian. I have always considered the wearing of the uniform a peculiar honor, an honor conferred on those who voluntarily enlist and on those who are called to the defense of their country on the battlefield in time of war. For this honor men pay with their lives. The civilian pays with his money, often with his life, but he is denied the honor. The soldier who is injured on the battlefield is usually taken care of by a grateful country for the balance of his life. The civilian injured must take care of himself or must be provided for by his family. The soldier pays no taxes. He is furnished with clothes, food, and, today, generous pay as compared with our armies in the past and other armies fighting in the world. He is provided with cheap insurance, generous pay is given to his dependents, he cannot be sued for debts or taxes. All of these things place him in an entirely different category from the civilian who does the best he can in time of war, working, paying, and often dying without glory or honor for his job and quite often for compensation the net of which is far less than that received by the soldier.

Certainly every man in this country, no matter what his age, and perhaps every woman, is subject to call to defend his country, and that may easily be done by putting them in uniform and putting them in the Army, but when this is done they must then be treated as soldiers, entitled to all the emoluments and privileges that go with serving in the Army, and they cannot be farmed out to work for somebody else. There is no difficulty in securing the manpower to do any job necessary to be done if sufficient pay is offered for the job. The difficulty in the present situation is that, with the regimentation that has taken place and the fixing of wages and salaries that can be paid, it is impossible to attract men to do certain jobs, many of them far removed from the place where these people live. We seem to have money enough for everything else under the sun—to loan to foreign governments, even to buy the products of governments which are opposed to us—but we refuse to pay our own citizens sufficient money to attract them to certain jobs which may need manpower.

The whole job can be done, is being done, and will be done if those with pet schemes and theories will get out of the road and let the American people do this job in the American way. It cannot and will not be done under a universal service act. In my humble opinion, Americans never will be slaves. If they are still Americans, they would refuse to work under a universal service act. If a man is to be a slave, he may just as well be a slave in a penitentiary or concentration camp as to be a slave under a universal service act. In fact, he had better die than be a slave. The American people are willing to die on the battlefield in the uniform of their country, but they are not willing, in my humble opinion, to work in industry under the badge of slavery.

I trust that you will see fit, on behalf of the American Legion, to repudiate your statements made last night over the radio and that you will lead the American Legion to opposition against any national service act.

Yours very truly,

CLAYTON E. KLINE.

Program for Simplification of Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was brought to my attention the program for simplification of tax returns and of tax legislation which is sought by Congressman CARLSON, of Kansas. He seeks to relieve millions of Americans from filing reports where the present laws impose an unnecessary burden upon these citizens. He also seeks to remove the taxes from the shoulders of a large group of persons whose income is so low that they should not be taxed at all. A very important part of his program concerns the simplification of both the short and long forms issued by the Government.

The present forms are so drawn that they have in fact built up a huge business requiring the efforts of many thousands of accountants and specialists. I believe that the ordinary individual should be able to make out his own income-tax

return without endless hours of worry, expense, and trouble. I have been particularly interested in noting that the present forms are so drawn that they do not indicate the rights of citizens to make lawful deductions for their gifts to charity, to churches, and to other designated institutions. In other words, they are so drawn that the provisions of the law concerning exemptions cannot be taken advantage of by the ordinary taxpayer.

It is time that Congress made an earnest study of the outrageously complicated tax structure of the United States with a view to simplification both of the tax program and the form of the returns to be filed by our citizens. Undoubtedly the problem has become much greater due to the heavy increases in the tax burden made necessary by the war, but these very conditions which require the imposition of heavier tax burdens impose an equal duty upon Congress to make collection of the taxes as simple a task as possible.

I have received complaints from individuals in all walks of life and with varying amounts of income. These complaints are directed at the collection of the taxes and at the forms which must be filled out. I was interested in a statement by a leading minister in Springfield, Mass., Dr. H. Hughes Wagner, of Trinity Methodist Church. It states only one of the many complaints which are justly leveled at our present Federal tax system. His statement was contained in the church paper, of which he is the editor, in its issue of January 14, 1944:

A WORD ABOUT THOSE TAX BLANKS

When a traditionally free people can supinely accept with hardly a protest, those monstrosities sent out under the name of the Internal Revenue Department, there is little warrant to be shocked at the blind loyalties of other peoples of the world. The first article in this month's Reader's Digest is an understatement.

The people should know their rights. One of them is the right to give to charity and religious causes an amount up to 15 percent of their incomes. In the so-called short forms no mention is made of this. And the provision for deductions assumes that people give very little indeed. Even in the long forms where such gifts are itemized, so little space is allowed for recording such contributions that the taxpayer is practically bluffed out of putting them down.

This can be said: If you use the short form and you subscribe reasonably (and pay) to the budget of the church and you made a substantial contribution to the Crusade this past year, you have a full right to deductions which the withholding system has not allowed for, and you are due a rebate for 1943.

Dr. Roswell P. Barnes of the Federal Council says that "the new tax law permits no specific advance deductions for religious, educational or charitable contributions. Likewise the short form of the income-tax return now used by many millions of taxpayers makes no mention at all of the fact that a deduction up to 15 percent is permitted for contributions to voluntary agencies."

This last terrible, awful, unforgivable, nightmarish return which has just arrived provides the chance (if you can figure it out, and the Government is daring you to try) for an honest adjustment.

The facts of the above are accurate. The spirit, however, has no official connection at all with Trinity or any church, but is wholly the personal opinion of

YE EDITOR.

A Notable Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City Derrick of January 21, 1944:

A NOTABLE CASE

There is a close affinity between journalism and law. The most important part of the United States Constitution is the first amendment, which guarantees freedom of the press, of speech, of religion, and of assembly. For this reason we would recommend to study in the schools of law and journalism the 10,000-word opinion handed down last October in the case of *The United States* v. *The Associated Press et al.*

The judges who decided this case are members of the second judicial circuit presided over by Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court. Judges Learned Hand and Augustus N. Hand, of New York, decided for the Government. Judge Thomas W. Swan, of New Haven, dissented and filed a 2,000-word opinion which is also worthy of study.

The student of journalism should find himself intrigued by the language of the majority opinion. He will run across such words as "fungible," "plangently," "simpliciter," and "reticulated." It should make excellent skull practice.

There is nothing particularly mystic about the case. One Chicago publisher sought an Associated Press news service and it was refused by a majority vote of the membership. He then complained to the Government, which sued to enjoin the Associated Press as a combination in restraint of trade in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The action had personal instead of public inspiration.

The Government specifically attacked a bylaw governing the admission of members to the Associated Press. Other matters, forbidding members and their employees to communicate news gathered by it to anyone else, the purchase by Associated Press of a news-picture company, and an agreement with the Canadian Press by which each furnishes its news exclusively to the other were attacked.

We differ with the majority opinion without making ourselves amenable to contempt because we feel we can do what one member of the three-judge court did. Certainly the writer of the opinion must have had his own doubts when he closed with these words: "Finally because the interests involved are so important and so large; because the injury done may be so great, if we turn out to be wrong; and because we are not agreed, the whole judgment will be stayed for a period of 60 days after it is entered and subsequently for the pendency of any appeal to the Supreme Court if one is taken within that period." This has the sound of a saving clause, but perhaps we had better not elaborate on that.

Significant is the practical dismissal of all the charges except the bylaw involving the admission of members and this, too, will be dismissed if the Associated Press will adopt a substitute bylaw restricting admission, provided that "members in the same field as the applicant shall not have the power to impose, or dispense with, any conditions upon his admission and that the bylaws shall affirmatively declare that the effect of admission upon the ability of an applicant to compete with members in the same field shall not be taken into consideration in passing upon his application." Fearing that our comment on this would not be complimentary, we refrain from belling the cat.

The Associated Press is the greatest news gathering and distributing agency in the world. It furnishes news to 81 percent of the morning newspapers of America with 96 percent of the total morning circulation, and 59 percent of the evening newspapers, with 77 percent of the total evening circulation. It has 290,000 miles of leased wires connecting 727 cities. Its annual budget is some $12,000,000.

It is a nonprofit organization incorporated in 1900 by a group of publishers for the factual exchange of news and the gathering of it for the members wherever news may be found. The late P. C. Boyle was one of that group and the Derrick has long enjoyed the distinction of being a charter member.

It is an honor and a privilege to belong to the A. P., which has an unimpeachable record for fairness, accuracy, and thoroughness. It has no monopoly of the news or the means of its transmission. There are other press associations which have practically the same membership restrictions. But it considers its members are entitled to the fruits of their membership, earned by years of their devotion to its growth and development and the sums they have paid for its service.

Membership in the A. P. is a property right which this decision might seriously impair or destroy if admission were made possible to applicants in competitive fields. Whether or not this was stressed by the defendant in its pleadings we do not know.

Moreover the action is a flank attack on the constitutional freedom of the press. The Government goes out of its way to regulate its conduct when no misconduct is alleged or involved. We cannot escape the threat.

These matters we leave to the lawyers and the courts but we still think both the opinions in this case would make good reading for students of journalism and all Americans interested in an untrammeled American press. We hope that in its final disposition there will be no allowance made for personal spleen or political prejudice.

[NOTE.—Since this editorial was written, which was nearly 3 weeks ago, the Associated Press has appealed this case to the United States Supreme Court.—Ed. DERRICK.]

Don't Sell the Soldiers Short

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in considering legislation for the purpose of giving the service men and women of our country and those allied services connected with the war effort what we hope to be the fullest opportunity to vote and participate in the coming national election, the Congress is again on trial. In fact, this great body that means so much to the present and future welfare of our country is always on trial in considering major pieces of legislation.

There has been so much misinformation, so many groundless and reckless charges made against the House committee bill we are considering today, so much impugning of the motives of the Members of Congress who favor this bill,

which provides that the States shall continue to control the elections, which right over a century and a half ago was written into our Federal Constitution and which has been reflected in the State constitutions of the various States, and which have been observed and respected in the past, that I hope the debates will put to rout such unfounded charges and bring to the fathers and mothers and friends of the soldiers and to the soldiers, the true facts before the Members of this House and before the bar of public opinion of this great country.

The record of the Congress of the United States since the Civil War has been one of trying to keep faith with the soldiers. The Congress of this country, when other departments of government has failed in the past, has never failed the soldiers and their dependents in the history of this Nation, and, in my judgment, no Congress ever will.

The Members of this, the Seventy-eighth Congress, have 262 sons and daughters serving in this war. No other like number of men and women in any group in the Nation can boast of more service stars in their flag than can the Congress of these United States. Its Members have a deep personal interest in the service men and women. Possibly no other group of men and women feel so keenly their great responsibility to the servicemen of the Nation as do the Members of the Congress. They know it is their responsibility to back the service men and women of this Nation at every turn. They are determined to do it, and they will do it.

I should like for the Members of this body to know that the members of the committee who have held long hearings twice on the Green-Lucas-Worley bill and on the House committee bill have approached their duty without any thought of political advantage and with courage and determination. I think when the false charges and countercharges that have been hurled against the action of this committee, and I am sorry to say by some of the Members of this House, and by one of the most vicious and intimidating Nation-wide barrages of propaganda with the most misleading and prejudicial information that has ever been directed to the attention of this country in years, that history will record and applaud our courage, and the soundness of our position.

We realized that this propaganda would be turned loose against us, but over and above that we realized our duty to the Government, to the institutions of this Government, and to the soldiers, the fathers and mothers and next of kin of the soldiers. We have disregarded any political future and have held fast to our duty as we saw it. Our deliberations have been guided with only two thoughts in mind—that we should bring out a bill that squares with the Constitution, our basic law of the Government, and so far as is possible, with the constitutions and the laws of the various States.

We wanted to write a bill that, if and when it is enacted into law, and the national election has been held under such law, that the election could not be thrown into the Supreme Court or possibly into the Congress for a decision which would delay the announcement of the results for weeks and maybe months, resulting in chaos in this country.

I think most every Member of this Congress knows that there has been made over the past number of years an effort by subversive organizations and by others in this Government to destroy the confidence of the men and women of this Nation in the Congress of the United States.

With greater vigor than usual this practice has been resorted to in opposition to this bill with dangerous and misleading propaganda directed against this Seventy-eighth Congress. The Members of this Congress today should take note of this situation in the discussion of this measure. Certainly the Members of Congress should not become a party to and join with those who are attempting to destroy the reputation and confidence of this body in the minds of the people. For the Congress of this country, the direct representatives of the people, stands as the last bastion in the defense of the liberty and freedom of the people of this country. When the confidence of the people is so shaken in the Congress that the Congress is destroyed, dictatorship will follow and men and women in the future will weep over their misguided folly.

I think it is a safe assumption that the majority of the Members of this House today believe that the committee bill is the most honest and workable approach to this very difficult problem. It is not perfect—no such bill can be drawn and enacted. I know that no group of men in this Congress are more interested in giving the soldiers who desire it, an opportunity to vote than are those who are supporting the committee bill.

Let us see for the moment who have been the most active in the popaganda that has been unleashed against our position. Let us see who has been selected to do the dirty work, to spread the lies and misrepresentations against the members who have supported our line of thought.

All of you know by reading the papers and listening to irresponsible or misinformed radio commentators over the air that in the forefront leading this fight has been the Communist Daily Worker, the newspaper PM, the uptown edition of the communist daily worker, Earl Browder, the radicals, reds and pinks, augmented by the expert smear artists. Recently they have augmented their forces by calling upon Sidney Hillman, in charge of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., who boasts that he will spend $1,500,000 of his organization's money to defeat every Congressman who has refused to bow to his will in legislation during the past year.

Do you think the soldiers who are fighting to preserve America as we have known it and with all of their hopes for the future would be very proud to know that this group of men are trying to hide behind the patriotism of the soldiers—are trying to force and wish themselves in as an ally of the soldiers who are fighting to preserve the institutions of our country, while these communists, reds and pinks over the years have been attempting to destroy it here at home? I absolve the C. I. O. membership in making this charge.

Just how proud are the Members of this Congress to welcome this Communist group of rats and take them to their bosom as an ally in their cause? It raises the question, Should the Congress recede from its position and abdicate on this and other legislation, bow to their will, fade out of the picture, and let them take over? The Members of this Congress know that this issue confronts them more seriously every day we are in session. In these serious times with the fate of the Nation hanging in the balance, with the most colossal impacts of war causing the most tremendous impacts against our financial institutions this country has ever experienced; the future of the millions of the people of this country and its institutions depends upon the Congress exerting its greatest courage, patriotism, and intelligence if we are to preserve, for the men who are fighting, a country rich in opportunities for them to return to in the future. There is a call from the people of this Nation today as never before to the Congress of the United States, to stand fast in its effort to preserve the ideals of America, to preserve law and order, to restrict rather than expand bureaucracy, and that goes for ballot-box bureaucracy.

The people are expecting Congress to acquit itself with intelligence and courage. Congress must measure up to its responsibility on all questions to assure the future of this Republic. Issues must not be measured by political yardsticks. The business at hand is too important.

Taking issue with the President in his message to Congress and with the statement given out by the Army and Navy about the difficulties of handling 48 State elections, may I say that both of these statements are far from the facts, and whether or not so intended are grossly misleading. We do not want the President, or the Army and Navy, through the War Ballot Commission, to handle the election of any one of 48 States. That is what we are trying to get away from. They seem to insist on handling the election. We are adamantly opposed to their handling the election. It would seem if the President is a candidate, and it is assumed he is, he should not want to sit on his own jury.

Now, let me briefly explain what the Senate bill 1285, as amended, provides. The provisions of this bill are very plain and simple.

First, all we want and all we provide for in our bill is for the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to expedite and carry the ballots and to distribute the post-card applications, through their officers, on the various military sectors overseas and in the camps of continental United States, and to transmit the ballots to and from the soldiers. They admit that it will require little effort through their commands to place the post-card application for a ballot in the hands of every soldier overseas not later than August 15 and in the hands of all of the servicemen in continental United States not later than September 15. Placing these applications in the hands of the soldier this

early will give him an opportunity to sign the post-card application which he mails to the secretary of state of his State, which secretary of state mails it to the county clerk of such election official whose duty it is to accept this post-card as an application for his absentee ballot. In order to beat the time element by distributing these cards so early, we will cut off the time necessary for the application to come back to his home-town election official whose duty it is to send him the absentee ballot. This post-card application gives his home-town or rural address and gives his military address, so that the election official knows his military address to which he will mail the absentee ballot.

As soon as the ballot is available, the county clerk or other official whose duty it is to mail out the absentee ballot will mail to him the ballot with an oath attached thereto which he will fill out, stating how long he has lived at his home address, his age, and his qualifications to vote in a certain precinct. Enclosed with the envelope which carries the ballot to him is another envelope addressed back to the official who sends him the ballot. Each of these envelopes have printed on the outside "Official election ballot," which prevents censorship and which gives free air-mail priority by the War and Navy Departments.

Suppose the soldier we are trying to reach is stationed in Australia and we mail him the ballot from Springfield, Ill., in the center of the Nation. The envelope and ballot enclosed would go by air mail to San Francisco which would be picked up there by an Army plane and flown to Australia, delivered to the military or other post office. The soldier would open his envelope, vote the entire ballot, which would have all the names of the candidates on it from coroner to President, sign and swear to the oath attached before an officer, place the ballot in the inner envelope, drop it in the post office there where it would be picked up and flown to Springfield, Ill., to the county clerk, who would place it, on election day, in the hands of the proper precinct election official to be counted.

Does this look like we are asking the Army and Navy to hold the election for 48 States? Why this misleading statement about supervising 48 different State elections? Talk about a simplified ballot. This is the simplified ballot and the only legal ballot that has been recognized in this country. This is what the soldier is entitled to. He is entitled to no less. It is the same kind of a ballot we vote here at home. Are we to deny him this right and foist upon him what is referred to as the bobtailed ballot which would give him an opportunity to vote for only the President, United States Senator, Congressman at Large, and district Congressman, and a ballot without even the names of those candidates on it, a ballot where he will have to write in the names of the men he desires to vote for if he is fortunate enough to know who they are, and, in most instances, he will not know possibly aside from who is running for President the names of any of the other candidates. Shall we cheat him out of a right to vote for his Governor, other State officials, members of the legislature, and for the only men he knows personally in the election, his friends or enemies who are candidates on the county ticket? I have refused, and the majority of the members of our committee have refused, to try to foist such a deception upon the soldier and upon his parents and next of kin who are most interested in him.

Think of the soldier who has been away from home for a year or more when he receives this full and complete ballot. Think how it will encourage and lift his morale. How he will appreciate the fact that the Congress of the United States has not forsaken him. What a boost to his morale this full and complete ballot will be; and then think how with all of the talk that has been made about giving the soldier a ballot, how disgusted and depressed he will be when the election day is called for his battalion and under the sharp eye of the commanding officer he will be handed this War Ballot Commission ballot, this bobtailed ballot, this blank piece of paper that sells him and his interest short. I hope this committee bill in the interest of the soldier and his morale will be approved. I hope we who have made this fight in an effort to keep faith with the soldier will not be placed in a position where if this bill fails we will have no other alternative but to vote for this blank ballot and become a party to breaking faith with the men who have been told that they will receive a ballot—become a party to selling the defenders of this country short.

I assure you it will be the last resort with me and a bitter pill to swallow.

Our bill recommends to the various States that wherever necessary that primary days be set earlier so that the ballot may be available to mail to the soldiers at least 45 days prior to the November election. It calls upon the States to accept post-card applications and to waive registration for all men and women in the military service. It calls upon the States to print absentee ballots on light paper, condensing as much as possible the size of the ballot, size and weight of envelopes in order to cut down weight.

And in this connection may I say many of the States of the Union have been waiting too long now, while our bill has been delayed—waiting to know what pattern of legislation the Congress will lay down so they may call special sessions of their legislatures in an effort to comply with our wishes.

Several States have already called special sessions, and may I say to you Members of Congress that, in my judgment, the Governors and legislatures of the various States are just as patriotic and are more interested in seeing that the men and women from their States have an opportunity to vote as are the Members of this Congress; that they are just as amenable to political pressure as are the Members of this Congress. They want to carry out the wishes of the fathers and mothers and next of kin and the wishes of the soldiers who participate in this election, and they will do it. Those who have delayed the passage of this bill are the ones who must take the responsibility for preventing action by the various States of the Nation where action would be necessary under our bill to get the ballot to the soldier. The people of the Nation more than even before now favor decentralization of government. They are opposed to the setting up of another Federal bureaucracy to invade the election laws and to regiment the soldiers in their opportunity to vote.

Now, I want to put in the RECORD the average time it requires to make a round trip by air to the various military sectors outside of continental United States. These figures allow 2 days for the soldier to vote and 2 days for the election official to handle the vote after it is returned to his voting address. These figures do not take into consideration that the Army is directed under this bill to expedite and shorten this flying time. Here are the figures, and they show plainly that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, if they will exert half the efficiency that the soldiers exert on the battle front, they can get the ballots to the soldiers all over the world and get them back in time to be counted. Let no one deceive you into the idea that the Army and Navy cannot do this once this bill becomes law, and they will do it.

Location of soldier desiring to vote and average air carriage time to Springfield, Ill.—1 round trip

	Days
(a) Alaskan area:	
Nearest	10
Farthest	13
(b) Pacific area:	
Nearest	14
Farthest	26
(c) Canal Zone	7½
(d) Caribbean area:	
Nearest	8
Farthest	12
(e) South Atlantic area:	
Nearest	10
Farthest	12
(f) Middle East area:	
Nearest	14
Farthest	16
(g) Persian Gulf area	18
(h) Far East area:	
Nearest	26
Farthest	32
(i) Mediterranean area:	
Nearest long haul	18
Nearest short haul	13½
Farthest long haul	22
Farthest short haul	17½
(j) North Atlantic area:	
Nearest	9½
Farthest	29½

Mr. Speaker, if you read carefully the the Green-Lucas bill it is obvious, if it means what it says, the Army and Navy will have to transport twice as much tonnage overseas to hold the election as they will under the House bill, and under their plan an election day will have to be called in every sector overseas and in every camp in the United States. It will require the loss of 1 day for 11,000,000 men and women in the services. Under the House committee bill not a single day is lost for anyone in the services.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are trying to rake the chestnuts out of the fire for the man who appointed them, their Commander in Chief. Their position has seemed to be partisan throughout this matter. When

a Member of the other body suggested they were also running for a fourth term he put his finger on the spot.

It is fair to assume Germany will be out of the war before November. We will then have more planes and pilots idle than we know what to do with. Their excuse and claim that they fear it will be impossible to transport by plane ballots to the soldiers cannot be justified on any reasonable premise. It will not require the transmission of over 200 tons of mail by air. We are turning out some 10,000 planes a month. We have 2,500,000 men in the military air service. Their position is in fact clearly untenable.

The authors of the Green-Lucas-Guffey bill, who have bled their hearts so much over the soldiers voting, none of whom have a son in the service, two of whom are bachelors, never have in their bill intended for the soldiers at home or abroad to vote anything but the short ballot. Their title to the bill is so much sugar coating to cover up the real thing. If their bill is passed elections will be held early on the military sectors and after the soldiers have been carefully propagandized they will have this short ballot shoved at them and when they have voted it, of course, few, if any, of them will take a chance on voting twice which they would have to do if they voted the real ballot. They have not been taught to vote twice—in fact, if the Green-Lucas bill passes it is better than an even bet the Army and Navy will make little if any effort to carry the absentee ballots to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Green-Lucas-Worley bills were conceived in politics and every move that the backers of this deception on the soldiers and their relatives has been steeped in politics. Every misrepresentation and the months of delaying and blocking our real effort to give the soldiers a real chance to vote has been timed to political expediency.

This Congress owes it to themselves and to the soldier and his relatives to pass the House committee bill. It is our only chance to keep the soldier from being, in most instances, cheated out of his political rights. It is our chance and obligation to keep faith with the defenders of our country.

Just Anybody

REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my heart's desire always to try to improve my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle and their party. I noticed several weeks ago that the chairman of the Republican National Committee said that, "just anybody," just anybody could win. I wondered what is in the mind of this great party at this time, here in the midst of a war, for the chairman to make a statement like that. I have received an editorial from the Charlotte Observer of Monday, January 24, 1944, which I shall read:

JUST ANYBODY

Republican Chairman Spangler's alleged declaration that his party can sweep the country in the next election "with anybody" at the head of the ticket should become the sort of propaganda that goes into reverse on him and his party.

America is in no situation today to endure the Presidential control of "just anybody."

And we will be deluded as to the good sense of the electorate if it so far forgets itself as to elect any man from either party who fails to measure up to the requirements of being the ablest that can be found for the most difficult leadership of the century that is ahead as well as still present while the war lasts.

Another editorial by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Star of January 25, 1944, is as follows, and my Republican friends should read it and profit by what they read:

G. O. P. REPEATS MISTAKES—LESSON OF LAST TWO ELECTIONS FORGOTTEN—NEGATIVE VOTE WON'T DEFEAT ROOSEVELT

(By David Lawrence)

About this time 4 years ago and 8 years ago the Republican campaign chairmen were confident that they would win the Presidential election. Now—in January—again nearly 10 months before the ballots are counted, the Republicans once more are making confident predictions.

Harrison Spangler, Republican national chairman, says publicly that "any Republican nominated" can be elected. He has been taken to task already by some Republican newspapers for intimating thus that it doesn't make any difference what the qualifications or policies of the forthcoming Republican nominee may be, he is assured of election.

The interesting thing about the Spangler statement is that it really does represent a widespread belief on the part of Republican politicians. It's one reason why the isolationists in the Republican Party, especially in the Middle West, are getting bolder and bolder. For they reason that there is enough antipathy to Roosevelt and the New Deal to sweep into power any nominee, no matter what views he holds on international policy questions.

The assumption being made in 1944 was also made, however, in 1940 and 1936, namely, that the negative or protest vote, made up of those who were discontented with New Deal policies—intensified now by bitterness over the clumsy administration of wartime measures on the home front—would be sufficiently numerous to elect any Republican nominee.

The big question is whether the Republican Party, or any other party, can any longer win an election in America on a program of negatives. There certainly was considerable anti-New Deal sentiment in 1936 and plenty of talk about the billions of dollars spent on "boondoggling" and "pump priming," but evidently the failure of the Republicans to offer a constructive alternative gave President Roosevelt a second term.

By 1940, the country had had 8 years of the New Deal and had been disturbed by the bill to "pack" the Supreme Court and other New Deal mistakes, and there was a powerful precedent against third terms dating from the earliest days of the Nation's history. But again the American people were not persuaded that a negative protest was enough, and they refused to permit a change in administration.

It will be recalled that in May 1940 total war had begun, and in June France had fallen and America was face to face with a crisis of national safety. For if England fell and the British Fleet were captured or surrendered, the United States would face dangers from Germany and particularly would South America be threatened from African bases like Dakar.

In the midst of that international crisis, the Republicans offered a candidate for whom the Republicans worked like beavers. Never did a candidate ever have so many volunteer workers or so much energy in a campaign. But the protest vote against the New Deal wasn't enough. It was felt by many independent voters that Willkie was untried and inexperienced and knew little about world affairs. His campaign strategy was designed so as to minimize that alleged handicap. He adopted virtually the same international position as Roosevelt, but there were skeptics among the independent voters, many of whom said that while they were opposed to the Roosevelt domestic policies they didn't want to risk the Presidency with a man who had such enthusiastic isolationist support as was given Willkie by the isolationist groups in 1940.

As soon as the election was over, Willkie, who never had been an isolationist, started to demonstrate that he would not be influenced by the isolationist wing of the party. He has since spent nearly 4 years endeavoring to overcome that handicap and has succeeded. His supporters think his opposition to the New Deal administration on domestic policies is well known and needs little supplementing.

But if any Republican nominee is chosen, the latter may find that the country is still distrustful of isolationism and will not accept such a nominee especially if he seeks to please the two wings of the party. If he takes a middle-of-the-road position as between the two policies represented, he may forfeit the votes of the 5,000,000 or more independents who really hold the balance of power.

The war will be at its climax in November 1944. History has shown twice now, with Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate, that negative voting is not enough to defeat him and that he has to be confronted not only by the ablest man the Republican Party can select but by the one calculated to win votes of the internationally minded independents who don't want to see another Harding, another repudiation of a world league and another world war to be fought by the sons of the very men who are fighting and dying on our battle fronts today.

Taxing Marshall Field's Estate

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today written a letter to Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, and also one to Hon. Harold N. Graves, Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue, urging them to institute proceedings at once to collect the income or inheritance taxes on the vast fortune that fell into the lap of Marshall Field 3d, in September 1943, and which under

a legal subterfuge has escaped all taxation whatsoever.

The letter referred to reads as follows:

This is to urge you to institute proceedings at once to collect the income or inheritance taxes on the more than $70,000,000 received by Marshall Field 3d, of Chicago, Ill., in September 1943, from the estate of his grandfather, Marshall Field 1st.

During these trying times, when everyone is required to make sacrifices, when our young men are shedding their blood on every battlefield in the world, and when their loved ones at home are denying themselves all but the bare necessities of life, in order to buy bonds, pay taxes, and help to meet the expense of this war, it is simply unthinkable to permit this vast income, or inheritance, received by this man who never earned a dollar of it, to escape taxation entirely.

I know there was an attempt on the part of Marshall Field 1st, 40 years ago, to forestall the collection of these taxes through a will prepared for that purpose by some shrewd lawyers, who imagined that they had found a way to cheat the Government out of any income on this estate by this subterfuge. They saw the income and inheritance tax law coming, and trumped up this scheme whereby they thought they could arrange for the dead hand of Marshall Field 1st to reach down across 40 years until his youngest great-grandchild became 21 years of age, and rob the Government of any revenue from this vast estate, of which, as I said, the present Marshall Field never earned a dollar.

I am appealing to you now, as Attorney General of the United States, and Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to institute proceedings at once to collect what is due the Government on this vast fortune.

I have before me a copy of the will of Marshall Field 1st, and I submit that if we permit this enormous income or inheritance to escape taxation through such loopholes as it provides, it will not only be a blow to the cause of justice, but it will be a shock to the sensibilities of millions of patriotic Americans who are giving their all to sustain our Government during these trying times.

Trusting that you will institute such proceedings at once, and prosecute them to a successful conclusion, I remain

Sincerely yours,

J. E. RANKIN.

Mustering-Out Pay

REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, two proposals for relief and rehabilitation have been considered by Members of the Congress of the United States this week.

One was for the relief and rehabilitation of the nations of the world—people foreign to the United States. And that relief project has gone through with scarcely a murmur.

The second is for our own sons and daughters—the young men and women who are offering the supreme sacrifice that this Nation may remain strong and free and prosperous.

And that proposal, Mr. Speaker, has been chiseled and pared and slashed on every side.

At the very moment this House was beginning its debate on U. N. R. R. A. a group of representatives of the House and Senate were meeting to iron out the muster-out pay bill.

Here on the floor of the House the question was how much we could give to the Europeans—to all the foreigners everywhere. Bitter fights were made made against every effort to reduce the amount we would spend on this global Santa Claus deal, but every effort at economy there was defeated.

I wish I could say the same of the conference to decide how much we would pay our own men in the service. I wish I could say that there, too, the spirit of generosity prevailed.

I wish I could say it, but it would not be true.

The conferees had two bills before them.

One, passed by the House, would give $100 to every veteran with less than 60 days' service; $300 to everyone with more than 60 days.

The other, passed by the Senate, would give mustering-out pay ranging from $200 to $500, depending on length, nature, and place of service, with the top figure payable to those with more than 18 months overseas.

But the House conferees refused to accept the Senate's top of $500.

It would have been logical, then, to expect them to split the difference—to give something more to those with overseas service.

Did the conferees do that?

They did not. They were as parsimonious with the soldiers as our leadership was generous with the rest of the world.

Instead of giving more to those with overseas service, they gave less to those veterans who, through no fault of their own, have served only in the continental United States.

They cut the mustering-out pay for those men to $200.

The conferees agreed to take $100 from the pockets of 11,000,000 soldiers.

There is no rhyme or reason to that. It will meet no real economic need. It is dictated only by a parsimonious, penny-pinching spirit of economy toward the veteran.

The conferees have—actually and literally—agreed to take $1,000,000,000 from our fighting men. One billion dollars which this House had already voted to give them.

It is not a coincidence that this billion is taken from our soldiers at the moment we pass U. N. R. R. A.

Economy was needed somewhere to make this global fantasy possible. Our soldiers are to pay the bill for U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unwilling to make gifts of food or essentials to suffering peoples abroad but I am unwilling to make gifts of billions of dollars to foreign nations, especially when money provided for our fighting forces is to be on a penurious scale.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn this action of the conference as being unjust and not in keeping with the real wishes of the Congress.

The Soldier-Vote Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the soldiers' vote bill will be before this body next week for consideration.

The National Grange has sent out a letter to all Members of Congress which deals with the subject of soldier voting over which there is so much discussion. The letter is of such interest that I am placing it in the RECORD so that all might see and read.

It is extremely interesting to read the decision rendered by Justice David Davis in which he emphasizes that the Constitution need not be nullified or evaded simply because we are at war and that the Constitution is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace.

Mr. Speaker, we can and must give our service men and women an opportunity to vote in a constitutional way. It is just as important and vital that they be given the right to vote for every local, county, and State official as well as for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman.

The letter referred to follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1944.

To Members of Congress:

The National Grange is heartily in favor of giving all qualified voters in the armed services of the country, whether stationed at home or overseas, an opportunity to cast their ballots in the coming Presidential election. Not only should they be permitted to register their choice in the filling of Federal offices, but they should have a chance to vote in such State and local elections as may be held.

We are aware that some of the advocates of a bobtail Federal ballot derisively say that those who want the servicemen to have a chance to vote in State and local affairs are asking that they be given the right to vote for dog catcher. We regard this as a wholly unwarranted and gratuitous slap at the dignity and sovereignty of the States, which is resented by those who believe in our dual system of government.

Any State that has not already acted should without delay take proper steps to facilitate soldier voting. Holding elections is a State and not a Federal function. The Federal Government has no more right to conduct an election than the States have to coin money. Any ballot issued by the Federal Government would, therefore, be spurious and counterfeit. It might invalidate the whole election. However, the Federal Government should cooperate in distributing and collecting the ballots among those who are in the armed forces.

Just because we are at war is no reason why the Constitution should be nullified or evaded in this or any other respect. As Associate Justice David Davis said in handing down the decision of the Supreme Court in the historic Milligan case soon after the close of the Civil War:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that

any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism."

The sound and enduring principles so manfully expounded by Justice Davis in the Milligan case, three-quarters of a century ago, apply with particular force to the questions involved in polling the soldier vote, and and we are persuaded that Congress and the country as a whole would do well to be guided by them.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Payment of Income Taxes

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I gave out an interview in which I had the temerity to condemn Miss Vivien Kellems, of Westport, Conn., for having publicly stated that she had refused to pay her December 15 income-tax installment and, in addition, had urged fellow industrialists to refuse to pay taxes which, under the law, they were obligated to pay to the United States.

In the New York Times of January 21, Mr. David L. Kellems, brother of Vivien Kellems, and her partner in her war plant, expressed disagreement with his sister in that part of her address wherein she advocated the deliberate refusal to pay taxes on the part of citizens of the United States. David Kellems said that those having the necessary money available should pay their taxes promptly.

If some of the employees of the Kellems plant went on a strike, the condemnation would be loud and general. But when management or capital goes on a strike, very little editorial comment is seen in the newspapers. Under the guise of post-war reserves allegedly needed to provide employment, too many industrialists are seeking to secure excessive war profits. Efforts have been made in the Congress to secure changes in the Renegotiation Act, but of late the Senate has changed its views with reference to renegotiation. Regardless of one's feelings as to the merits of features of tax bills now on the statute books, in wartime it is highly dangerous to advocate the deliberate repudiation of the law. I personally voted against the two tax bills which passed the House of Representatives during the year 1943 because of my personal objection to some of the features of such bills which I regarded as inequitable. Nevertheless, the bills went through and became the law of the land. It is my duty, as well as that of all loyal citizens of the United States, to obey that law and adhere to its provisions, while reserving the right to continue to point out the weaknesses of the bills. If one carried the argument of Miss Kellems to its logical conclusion, a citizen might commit a crime and attempt to justify it on the ground that he felt the law to be unjust and invalid; but when in addition to that the criminal advocates that other citizens go out and do likewise, he is coming close to the line of downright subversive conduct.

When men are dying and others are willing to die for our country in this war, there are some few in the United States who contrast sharply with this self-sacrificing patriotism by an amazing determination to save their war profits, all earned through the blood of their fellowmen. Tax racketeers and profiteers should certainly not insult the public by spreading the gospel of disloyalty to the United States. Our country now is fighting for its very existence. We have embarked upon the Fourth War Loan drive. All of the funds which possibly can be raised through taxation are needed. It is not encouraging to note the conduct of such industrialists as Vivien Kellems, because of her disagreement with the provisions of the law, advising her fellow-industrialists to ignore the law entirely. There are patriots and p-a-y-triots. The latter put their purses above their country. I deplore arrogant and contemptuous statements, the effect of which is to undermine the faith of the American citizens in their institutions. Let Miss Kellems concentrate her energies and abilities in the proper channels to crusading to amend the present tax laws in the manner permitted under our system of government. She has the right to work for changes in existing statutes with respect to any provision with which she is dissatisfied. However, when she publicly and contemptuously states that because of her disagreement with the law, she will refuse to comply with it and wants others to do likewise, whether she knows it or not she is, in effect, working to bring about the establishment of fascism within our own borders.

It becomes the solemn duty of all of us to accept gracefully the heavy sacrifices imposed on us by the war and be good sports about it. We should register our protests during the consideration of the bills and then live up to the bills if they became laws, while continuing to agitate for their change in a proper and legal fashion.

Pacific Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am inserting a copy of the radio address made by me on the C. B. S. program "Congress Speaks" on Tuesday, January 25, 1944, from Washington, D. C.:

My fellow Americans, last spring I discussed with you the menace of Japan when it controlled Attu and Kiska at the very doorstep of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. Even though we have driven our enemies out of the Aleutians, I still feel it imperative to call your attention to the gravity of the situation in the Pacific and the dangers yet to be faced there. As recently as January 1, 1944, Premier Hideki Tojo stated, "The real war starts from now."

Since the recent conference at Teheran, the landings near Rome, and as the result of statements emanating from Washington as to our possible losses within the next 3 months, the minds of our people are apt to dwell on the European front as the front of greatest importance. I do not minimize the importance of the European sector nor do I overemphasize the danger in the Pacific area. As one who has spent some years in the Far East and studied its history assiduously, I would like to discuss with you some of the problems which we may expect to face in that war zone. We have learned through defeat, surrender, and victory that the road to Tokyo is going to be our most difficult hurdle in winning this war. We know that the Japanese will not surrender, but will fight to the bitter end, exacting a toll in lives that we cannot as yet even begin to comprehend. On January 7, 1944, Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson stated that only 377 Japanese soldiers had been captured in 25 months of war. Those prisoners were taken on Guadalcanal, Attu, the Gilberts, and in New Guinea. All these actions occurred on the outside edges of Japan's dominions and are only samples of things to come. We have seldom forced a general retreat and the theory of Japan's militarists seems to be that the garrisons on the Pacific rim of the Empire are expendable.

Why does Japan cling to such a military policy? Why does she allow such sacrifices of troops? Why doesn't she send in sufficient aid to relieve her beleaguered garrisons? The reasons seem simple enough and, if correct, indicate that the Japanese are willing to trade space—small amounts of it—for time. In the first place we are now strong enough so that at any given point we choose we can gather more strength than the enemy. But, of all the natural barriers of protection, space or distance is the most important. It offers the possibility of retreat until communications of the invader become too extended to gather force for a knockout blow. Secondly, the Japanese are content to keep the fighting away from its enormously rich conquered territory and scatter it along the southwestern, eastern, and northern Pacific. This allows Japan time, which is a factor in her favor, to consolidate her conquests, develop the resources she needs, and to work on the native populations to build up resistance to a return to old-time imperialism and exploitation.

Much of the support which Japan has received in its conquests of Asiatic lands has been due to dislike and hatreds of many of the yellow and brown peoples toward the whites. They did not like being treated as inferior by the white people and they hated imperialism as it was introduced and practiced. Japan does not push the idea that at the proper time she will take the place of the old imperialists of the Occident. She plays on the slogan "Asia for the Asiatics," and, for the time being at least, it is working. She does not tell the Burmese, the Thailanders, and the others that her greater east Asia policy means, in the end, Asia for the Japanese.

Since November 1942, Japan has made no major offensive moves in the Pacific. Our enemy knows that we have greatly increased our strength in that ocean, that our Navy is now, thanks to the opening of the Mediterranean and the defeat of the sub menace, concentrated there in great force, that our Army is gradually increasing in men and matériel, that the Marine Corps has been selected for almost total operations in that area; and that our Air Forces are gradually,

though slowly, being built up to a scale commensurate with the job before it. This does not mean that even now we have sufficient forces in the Pacific, because the truth of the matter is that we have not.

While much more material than formerly is going to the southwest Pacific, our main area of land operations, it has been admitted by authorities who should know that not much more than 5 percent of American military resources are allocated there. This is a small amount in the over-all picture and certainly not near enough for a theater of operations of such importance. We must, as a people, never lose sight of the fact that the war in the Pacific is our war and that it is just as important and more significant than the war in Europe. America's destiny is going to be settled for decades to come in the outcome of our struggle with Japan.

The issue is not whether we shall concentrate on Japan at the expense of the fronts against Hitler. The question is whether we should send to the Pacific front a larger part of our greatly increased production due to the fact that the danger there is increasing and the resources which the Japanese have are constantly multiplying.

Japan, at the present time, has in her possession all the raw materials to enable her to fight for decades to come. Industrially and economically, Japan is in no danger of collapse. She has concentrated on developing the so-called inner ring of her Empire so that, in trading space in the Pacific for time to consolidate her conquests, she is making herself stronger in the immediate vicinity of Japan itself. As we drive into enemy-held lands from all directions we are shortening Japan's lines of communication, allowing her to concentrate her forces on a smaller arc, and thus progressively she becomes more difficult to defeat.

These considerations which I have pointed out must be faced realistically. The soft days that America has known, and which too many of us still enjoy, are going to belong to the past. We are in the Pacific war all the way, and we must gird ourselves for the tests that lay before us. We must also be cognizant that we have to continue to bear the major burden of the assault and defense of that area. It isn't a matter of what we would like to do; it is a matter of what we will have to do. We cannot go on the assumption that our allies will aid us there immediately the war in Europe is over. Russia and England will be weary and will want to start rebuilding their shattered cities, plants, homes, and farms. They are realistic nations—more so than we—and they are thinking primarily of themselves, as should we. We need only recall the remarks of British Home Secretary Herbert Morrison who, on October 6, 1943, agreed with Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox that the Pacific war held second place in the minds of the British and said, "After all, it was not the Japs who bombed London." This is understandable thinking on the part of Britons because to them Europe—and their enemy of over 4 years—is only 20 miles away. However, it does emphasize the point that the winning of the war in the Pacific will be primarily an American objective and undertaking.

To date we have conquered no Japanese territory. We have taken a small portion of New Guinea, the Gilberts, and the Solomons, we have recaptured Attu and Kiska, but we are still without Wake, Guam, and the Philippines. It will take months to reconquer all these areas, and the longer we delay the stronger those outposts will become and the more difficult to take, because the Japanese have the shrewdness, the ability, and the manpower to stick it out.

In this war the Japanese are nowhere near as hard-pressed for manpower as are the Germans. Japan has a population of 75,000,000 in the homeland plus 400,000,000 subject peoples to support her war machine.

The Japanese still have over 2,000,000 men of military age—between 20 and 39—who have not yet been called to arms because they are not needed. She has, in addition, some 1,000,000 men between the ages of 17 and 19 who are not yet subject to conscription. Since these young men are not actually needed, the Japanese Army has not lowered the age limits to include them so that they might finish their schooling and prepare for the role which they are expected to assume in developing Japan's great empire.

Furthermore, there are 500,000 additional young men available for armed service every year. If Japan was hard pressed—which she is not—she could raise and equip an additional 20 divisions within the next 2 years. This would give her a total of 80 divisions which would approach the number of combat divisions of the American Army planned for service in Europe and Asia. In addition, these divisions would be supplied from bases many thousands of miles nearer the front lines than those in the United States.

These statements are the cold truth. Our people must know—as our military and naval authorities do—the odds which confront us. If we at home are slow to awaken, our boys in the Pacific are not. In the First World War our slogan in France was "Out of the trenches by Christmas." In this war the boys in the Pacific are saying "The Golden Gate in '48." They know, better than many of us in Washington, what the score is and these veterans could guide and advise us far better, in many respects, than we could them.

I believe that the people out home are more aware of this war than are many of our politicians, intellectuals, and commentators. Their sons are scattered all over the world and their grasp of the toughness of our enemies is more realistic than they are generally credited with.

Recent operations against Japan indicate that our holding encounters against her are at an end. Our production in all lines has succeeded beyond our fondest expectations. Added to this is the fact that we have at the present time an Army and Navy in excess of 11,000,000 men scattered on over 50 fronts throughout the world. We have good, competent leadership. We are prepared from top to bottom and we cannot now wait too long.

This is not a moral crusade no matter how much anyone talks about the "four freedoms" or the Atlantic Charter. This war is a fight for existence—for national revenge and security. We are fighting to avenge the disgrace of Pearl Harbor, for our prisoners in the Orient, for our gallant sons who laid down their lives for us, and for a better world where wars will be fewer and, if possible, eliminated altogether.

Many people here think that after the defeat of Hitler Japan will be easily conquered. Nothing could be further from the truth. Japan realizes full well that Hitler will be defeated, but that does not mean that she thinks she will be defeated. She calculates the possibilities of a negotiated peace which, in essence, would be a victory for her and in which would be placed the foundation for a future war. Right now she is counting on our becoming discouraged over the inconveniences which confront us. She thinks we will become a disillusioned people when, in the words of Ambassador Joseph Grew, "we finally realize the immensity of the task which is still ahead of us."

In these days of grimness, we cannot afford to fight each other. We at home haven't made any sacrifices to speak of as far as our ordinary comforts are concerned. Our sons are paying for mistakes which they did not make but which were made by an older generation. They know what they are up against in Japan because they've learned—the hard way.

We are, however, going to have to make great sacrifices—in material things and in men. Our debt—in dollars—will be repaid some day. We will replace many of the things destroyed. But there will still remain the deficit of human lives shattered or lost. This account cannot be balanced but those who remain will have the added responsibility of making a world wherein the mistakes of the past will not be repeated.

The Japanese have no thought of failure and neither must we. Peace in the Pacific is going to be our responsibility but to carry out that obligation and to insure decency and security to future generations we must, first of all, carry on this war to an absolute and complete victory against Japan.

Farmers Ask Only Fair Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from D. D. Dowds, county agricultural agent, Urbana, Ohio:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Urbana, Ohio, January 15, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In Champaign County, Ohio, we have a neighborhood leadership organization through which almost every farmer in the county can speedily be contacted in behalf of war work. This organization is sponsoring the Fourth War Loan drive, and a series of 12 township meetings were just concluded. A total of 158 farm leaders attended these 12 township meetings.

Timely questions affecting agriculture were discussed by these leaders, and, as on previous occasions, I was asked to summarize the thinking and expressed opinions of the leaders and place this information in your hands:

A. Farm subsidies:

Out of the 158 leaders, only 12 expressed themselves as favoring a general farm subsidy program. And these 12 favored farm subsidies largely because they felt it was the only way the farmer could get immediate relief of an inequitable situation. The groups were predominately opposed to farm subsidies because—

1. The farmer is not asking for more than fair exchange or parity prices for farm products and he is justly entitled to such without subsidies.

2. Guaranteed profits to industry and continually increased wages to labor justify a comparable increase in the prices of farm products.

3. Consumers were never in a more favorable position to pay fair prices for farm products.

4. The increase of farm purchasing power through subsidies is a dangerous policy—inducive to lower relative prices in the period of readjustment after the war, when subsidies are not available.

5. Farm subsidies are not sponsored by or wanted by farmers generally. A farm subsidy program is not a farmer's program but sponsored by others. It is a misnomer; it is a consumer program.

6. Farm subsidies are not necessary with price controls and rationing. Equitable adjustments of ceiling and floor prices should

provide ample inflationary controls as well as necessary stimulus to production.

B. Price controls:

1. The expressions from this group of 158 producers were generally very favorable to price controls as a procedure to stimulate necessary production and control inflation.

However, there was definite criticism of ceiling prices which prevent farm commodities from rising to parity or fair exchange prices. The practice of placing ceiling prices on any farm commodity, forcing such commodity to sell at less than parity, and then attempting to stimulate production through use of subsidies, was roundly condemned.

Expressions from the group were bitter in condemning the method and procedure followed in handling price controls on hogs at present, in that the farmer is being unjustly penalized for hogs weighing under 200 and over 300 pounds. The farmer cannot understand why the support price cannot be applied to hogs weighing under 200 or over 300 pounds. Neither can they understand why it is difficult to market hogs weighing between 200 and 300 pounds at support prices, while they can market relatively any number weighing over 300 pounds but at prices considerably under floor prices.

The groups were also very critical of the way poultry and dairy product price controls were being administered.

I have attempted to summarize and condense the thinking and the expressed opinions of these 158 local leaders as they were assembled in 12 different discussions meetings throughout the county. This summary, at their request, is being placed in the hands of you gentlemen who are in position to influence both the formation and administration of policies and programs affecting agriculture.

From my own observation, I might add that I have never sat in on discussion meetings of local farm leaders, over a period of several years, when they were more pessimistic, critical, and almost bitter than I found them at this time.

We trust the above information may prove of some value to you.

Very sincerely yours,

D. D. DOWDS,
County Agricultural Agent.

Federal Regulation of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address delivered by me on Monday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening fellow Oregonians: In a few days a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Immigration will hold hearings on two bills of mine, which I introduced last year at the beginning of this Seventy-eighth Congress.

It seems to me that the subject of Federal regulation of immigration is one which now should receive the serious attention of the American people.

I shall outline to you tonight my present views on immigration and my reasons for them. Then I hope you will communicate to me in Washington your thoughts on the subject.

Federal regulation of immigration is of vital concern to all present and prospective wage earners and, in my opinion, is of the greatest importance to the welfare of our country and to all of its people.

At the very outset of this discussion let me make it clear that I approach this subject in what I believe is a broad spirit of tolerance and humanity, and with a sincere and honest purpose to protect and promote the welfare of all American citizens regardless of race, religion, or country of origin. I want all Americans now citizens of our country to approach unity and as far as possible to become as nearly a homogeneous people as compatibility and natural instincts will permit. By curtailing, or stopping, all immigration now, we may be able to allay some of the forces which tend to augment strife among us; whereas, if we do not curtail, or stop, immigration at least until we have assimilated and harmonized the various groups already here, we may stimulate the causes which separate our people into distinct and contending racial or national groups.

My own father was an immigrant. He came to America as a boy in 1849. That was 95 years ago. Conditions in this country and in the world are entirely different now from what they were then. I have no thoughts or ideas of superiority of race or of national origin. And as for religion, profound grief has convinced me that anyone who has found the road to God's mercy and goodness which satisfies and consoles himself is blessed indeed.

While I grieve for the distressed people throughout the world, whoever and wherever they may be, yet my duty is pledged to the American people, their welfare, and their happiness.

If the interests of the American people is not the first duty of a Senator of the United States, whose duty is it to protect and defend them? Surely Americans are entitled to protection from alien forces, including the immigration of aliens, if such immigration is detrimental to the American interests. If we admit alien immigrants to our country we must live with them in peace. We must not harass or quarrel with them. We must adopt them as of ourselves. Any other course of conduct is cruel indeed. The only honest course to pursue, if we do not want them, is to prohibit their entry to our country.

At present we are engaged in two great wars simultaneously—one against the Nazis in Europe and in the Atlantic, and one against Japan in Asia and in the Pacific. Ten million of our young people have been taken from their normal occupations and have been sent all over the world in the combat forces of our Nation. Some day, after they have won the victory for which they are fighting, the survivors will return to America and those physically and mentally able, will try again to resume their normal lives in domestic employments. Where are they going to find the jobs which they must have, if now, while they are away from home, we allow and encourage aliens to emigrate to America? These aliens who now are entering our country also must have jobs by which they may earn their living. Alien immigrants take American jobs while the Americans in our combat forces are risking their all to recapture for the alien immigrants and their fellow countrymen, the homelands which the adult aliens themselves are abandoning to their enemies.

Should not the adult males of all alien immigrants of combat age remain in Europe and join our, and the Allies' combat forces in defense of their European homeland and in repelling their foes at home, rather than to seek refuge in America and take jobs here while our soldiers, sailors, and marines fight their battles for them?

On account of the two great wars in which we are now engaged and because our country has promised our allies that America shall be the arsenal of democracy, all industries making essential things and producing essential supplies are stimulated beyond their normal capacities and are giving employment to millions of workers more than they will need after the war. When these war plants shut down, or greatly reduce their output, after the war, where are all the workers now employed in them going to find the jobs they must then have, if now we encourage, or permit, to come to our shores all the alien immigrants who seek entrance to America.

Can we find all the necessary jobs for the returned soldiers, sailors, and marines, the unemployed workers from our war industries and for all the alien immigrants from Europe directly, or from South and Central America indirectly, who now are entering our country and whom it is proposed to bring here? Would it not simplify our problems of unemployment after the war if we eliminated the factor of alien immigration workers at this time?

"You take my house, when you do take the prop
That doth sustain my house.
You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

It has been very difficult for me, a member of the Senate Committee for Immigration, to pry any information out of the Federal Bureau of Immigration. The Bureau is very secretive and evasive, which leads one to believe there are facts about immigration which the administration does not want the American people to know at this time. However, last month, Assistant Secretary of State Breckenridge Long testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, according to a news item in the Washington Star, that "we are ready to take all new refugees who come out of France, or out of other occupied territory." It has been further stated, by this same authority, that 580,000 alien immigrants have entered this country since the war in Europe started. There are approximately 6,000,000 aliens in this country today. That is more people than there are Americans of all ages west of the Rocky Mountains, excluding California, or it is about as many people of all kinds as there are in the entire State of California.

Our country no longer has great unoccupied areas. The pioneer period of America is past.

Eighty-five years ago Lord Macaulay observed about America—

"As long as you have boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World. * * * But the time will come when new England will be as thickly populated as old England. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in those Manchesters and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. * * * I seriously apprehend that you will in some season of adversity * * * do things which will prevent prosperity from returning. * * * There will be, I fear, spoilation. The spoilation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoilation. * * * Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and the Vandals came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country. * * *"

Sir James Bryce, one-time British Ambassador to the United States, observed in part in

the 1910 edition of his great work entitled "The American Commonwealth," as follows:

"So America, in her swift onward progress, sees, looming on the horizon and now no longer distant, a time of mists and shadows wherein dangers may lie concealed whose form and magnitude she can scarcely yet conjecture. As she fills up her western regions with inhabitants, she sees the time approach when all the best land, even that which the extension of irrigation has made available, will have been occupied, and when the land now under cultivation will have been so far exhausted as to yield scantier crops, even to more expensive culture. Although transportation may also have become cheaper, the price of food will rise; farms will be less easily obtained and will need more capital to work them with profit; the struggle for existence will become more severe. And while the outlet which the West now provides for the overflow of the great cities will have become less available, the cities will have grown immensely more populous; pauperism, now confined to six or seven of the greatest, may be more widely spread; and even if wages do not sink, work may be less abundant. In fact, the chronic ills and problems of old societies and crowded countries such as we see them today in Europe will have reappeared on the new soil, while the demand of the multitude to have a larger share of the Nation's collective wealth may well have grown insistent. High economic authorities pronounce that the beginnings of this time of pressure lie not more than 20 years ahead (1930). * * * It may be a time of trial for democratic institutions."

That time and those conditions are now upon us and we have been experiencing them for the past 10 years, just as Lord Macaulay and Sir James Bryce predicted 85 and 35 years ago. We must face these facts now, and it seems to me that my duty as your Senator is to protect primarily the interest of all the citizens of the United States of America.

I know there is a great difference of opinion among our own people on this subject of alien immigration, and that is why I ask that you discuss the immigration problem among yourselves and give me and the other Members of the Congress your considered views on it. We must dispose of this question and we must dispose of it constructively.

Most of the immigrants today congregate in various quarters of our great cities and create slum areas and tenement districts there; whereas the immigrants of the colonial period of our Nation and of the first century of the Republic were largely pioneers. They had a land hunger. They were mostly farmers and developers of the virgin lands and their resources. They mixed with and were assimilated by the Americans already here. They were a freedom- and liberty-loving, self-reliant people. From them came no gangsters. Among them were no Al Capones.

These immigrant aliens who retain their national peculiarities after they come to our shores and hold themselves apart as a particular section or separate group, or kind, of Americans, and who vote and act as a bloc, whose civic interests are peculiar to themselves and not common to all other American citizens, add greatly to the difficulties of maintaining the Republic, sustaining the Federal Constitution, and in promoting the general welfare.

The question now is, What, if anything, are we going to do about it? I have my ideas and I have expressed them frankly to you. Do you approve or disapprove of them? I should like to have the benefit of your observations and considered judgments.

Simplified Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the administration and the Ways and Means Committee should be highly commended for their plans to simplify tax returns in order that every citizen may readily understand the requirements and may make his return with the least possible difficulty.

Farm Prices, Farm Income, and Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a letter just received by me from Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, relating to farm prices, farm income, and price controls. I might comment that in view of his figures showing living costs have risen only 25 percent since World War No. 2 started, and the further fact that the national income has doubled in the same period, I canot see why it is necessary to have food subsidies from the Treasury to help out on the family grocery bill. I send the letter to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1944.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We have taken note of the letter from Mrs. G. Sattler, of Americus, Kans., which you entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, in which she complains of the high prices farmers pay for what they buy and the low prices they get. She may be right as to her personal problem, but what she says certainly does not apply to farmers generally.

Farm prices at the farm have risen 124 percent since the war began in Europe. The things they buy have risen only 37 percent. In the last war, after 51 months, farm prices at the farm rose 100 percent. The prices of things they buy rose 70 percent. We have over-all done much better by the farmer than we did in the last war.

Through much hard work farmers have increased food production 21 percent in this war, compared with a 5-percent increase in a like period in the last war. As a result, average farmer income has risen 182 percent since the war began. Total farm income in 1943 reached $14,200,000,000, the highest peak ever reached in the history of American agriculture.

Here and there there may be farmers who have not benefited financially as a result of the war, but the average is all in their favor.

From the peak of World War No. 1 inflation to the bottom of the collapse that followed, food prices dropped as follows:

Corn dropped 78 percent, wheat dropped 65 percent, oats dropped 71 percent, cotton dropped 76 percent, potatoes dropped 85 percent, rice dropped 79 percent, peanuts dropped 73 percent, lambs dropped 61 percent, hogs dropped 66 percent, beef cattle dropped 57 percent, butter dropped 53 percent, milk (wholesale) dropped 32 percent, eggs dropped 73 percent, hens dropped 39 percent, oranges dropped 75 percent.

Average farm income dropped from $1,430 to $554, and in the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosure. I am sure none of us want inflationary prices that will be followed by such a collapse. Stabilization at present levels is in everyone's interest.

Perhaps you will be willing to send this letter to Mrs. Sattler to let her know how much we appreciate letters which tell us how people are thinking. The economic problems presented by war are exceedingly complex. None of us knows all we should know about them. But the over-all results of the stabilization program of this war have been remarkable:

1. Living costs are up only 25.9 percent, after 51 months, compared with a 59.7 percent rise in a like period in the last war.
2. War costs $65,000,000,000 below what they would have been had prices advanced as they did in the last war.
3. Living-cost index held steady for the last 8 months. This, in the face of inflationary pressures far more powerful than they were in the last war.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Red Cross Activities of, and Tributes to, Mabel T. Boardman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 18, more than 1,000 guests assembled at Hotel Statler, Washington, to pay tribute to one of the great women of the world, Miss Mabel T. Boardman, who for more than 40 years has given unselfishly of her time, energy, and money to the great humanitarian work of the Red Cross.

I request that a short sketch of Miss Boardman's activities in the American Red Cross and a brief summary of the tributes paid to her on the occasion referred to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the sketch and tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SKETCH OF RED CROSS ACTIVITIES OF MABEL T. BOARDMAN

The interest of Miss Mabel T. Boardman in the American Red Cross began in 1900, when the organization was chartered by Congress. She was one of its original incorporators. She was instrumental in devising a new charter for the reorganization of the Red Cross, which became a law in 1905. In 1901 Miss Boardman was elected member of the board of directors and the executive committee of the American National Red Cross. In 1905 she was named a member of the central committee. In 1919 she was elected national secretary, a position which she has held for the past 24 years. She has been a delegate to International Red Cross conferences in Washington, London, and Tokyo, and been decorated by many governments and been given honorary degrees by several colleges and universities.

TRIBUTE PAID TO MISS BOARDMAN BY CHIEF JUSTICE HARLAN F. STONE

"There is little I could say about Miss Boardman which would not inescapably be in praise of the Red Cross. In the 20 years since I have come to know and admire her, it would have been difficult for me to think of Miss Boardman without thinking of the Red Cross, or to think of it without instantly bringing to mind her tireless devotion to its cause. Her life has been so closely associated and interwoven with this great humanitarian movement that she and the Red Cross have become one and inseparable in our thoughts. It has been said here in Washington before, and it is a truth worthy of repetition in this presence, that Mabel Thorp Boardman is the Red Cross.

"From the first she saw in this infant society the potential instrument for the relief of human suffering in times of disaster and emergency, and for the alleviation of the wastage and misery which modern war inflicts on all mankind. From that moment the realization of her vision, through the Red Cross organization, became the dominating purpose of her life. And her life has been literally dedicated to a single aim—the development of the Red Cross until it should be what it has become, the greatest and most efficient weapon against human misfortune which the world has known."

In summing up the Chief Justice said: "Few woman have been so showered with honors as has this gracious lady. * * * But far more significant to her and to us than any of these well-deserved honors are the shattered lives that have been rebuilt because of her efforts—the pain and suffering that have been made easier to bear because she has helped the Red Cross to fulfill its great possibilities.

"Now, in the Nation's hour of greatest need, her grand conception is bearing its finest fruits. In collecting life-saving blood plasma, in making millions of garments and surgical dressings, in bringing renewed courage to our servicemen on every shell-torn battlefield of the world, the Red Cross has reached the pinnacle of its service. It is little wonder that so many of those men and their relatives and friends at home are saying, 'Thank God, there is an American Red Cross.'

"She (Miss Boardman) has given to you and all Americans a heritage that is to be treasured above earthly possessions. She has shown us the true significance of that genuine philanthropy which knows no bounds of friendship or enmity, of wealth or poverty. She has implanted in us a new conception of human understanding, of brotherly love of compassion, and of humanitarian service."

TRIBUTE PAID TO MISS BOARDMAN BY LT. GEN. A. A. VANDEGRIFT, COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

I have been constantly amazed by the variety, the scope, and the efficiency of Red Cross activities. Wherever I have gone, I have seen and heard eloquent tributes to the achievements of this association, which are in turn tributes to the profound vision, faith, and industry with which Miss Boardman has done so much to make those successes possible.

I have seen the Red Cross overseas providing cheer, comfort, and recreation; acting as a link between men and their families back home when family emergencies have arisen; helping to relieve suffering, and doing a hundred other things to minister to the welfare of American men in uniform. And I have seen the Red Cross give men—through blood plasma—the gift of life itself.

All of you who have been active in the Red Cross must feel a deep inner sense of satisfaction in the knowledge that you have done so much, and will continue doing so much, to meet the challenges of this war. I know, too, how proud you are of Miss Boardman and her record of world-wide service. I speak for the entire Marine Corps in joining you to pay grateful respects to one of the outstanding women of our time.

In the tradition which she has fostered, a field director on Guadalcanal placed a sign on his tent which read: "The American Red Cross is in this area to assist men of the United States forces in any way possible. Please do not hesitate to call."

I can assure you the men of the armed forces will not hesitate to call wherever they may be.

Text of Resolution Adopted by Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 23, which gives the text of the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and unanimously adopted at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee on Saturday last.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF DEMOCRATS' RESOLUTION

From out of the suffering and hardship of this war, the American people hope to bring two very elemental things—a secure peace and the opportunity to work. They have learned that peace is two-sided; that no nation, however peace-loving and however powerful, can remain at peace in a world where nations bent on war and conquest are allowed free rein. They have learned too, in the great mobilization of this war, that the resources of this Nation when fully utilized provide unlimited opportunities for employment once the determination to produce is put into play.

In war, we have learned to cooperate with the United Nations in order to speed victory.

In war, we have learned to use all the country's manpower and all the country's energies in order to produce the material of victory.

The Democratic Party believes that these lessons of war can be applied to peace; that we will cooperate with other nations to safeguard our victory and prevent future wars; that we will use the wisdom and the strength of this Nation to prevent the return to the misery of the depression and unemployment.

As Democrats we are intensely proud of our President and Commander in Chief. Events themselves rise clearly from the musty fogs of planned political confusion and selfishly inspired controversy to prove the strength of this Nation's war effort, the miracle of its war production, the superb equipment, and the masterful employment of its armed forces, and the wisdom of the world-wide strategy and the world-wide statesmanship of its freely chosen leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

CITES AID TO ALLIES

Our great allies, Britain, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Republic, were sustained in their darkest hours in the knowledge that America, under President Roosevelt's leadership, was as one with them in their fight for the right to live as free peoples in free countries.

Our enemies, the Japanese and the Nazis, have been kept from our shores, our sea lanes, and our skies. We are fighting in the enemy's country; not he attacking us in ours.

Our armies and our fighting men have not been needlessly sacrificed in bloody inconclusive battles. They were not sent into battle until fully trained and equipped. While partisan critics called for offensives on a second front or everywhere at once, or called for offensives against Germany alone, or against Japan alone, or for air attacks alone, our forces, marshaled by the Commander in Chief and deployed in agreement with our allies, have attacked in decisive strength, inflicting maximum injury upon the enemy and minimum loss upon ourselves.

As we moved from the nearness of disaster and the shadow of mortal peril, the voices that were stilled and the tongues that were mute again began their clamor or political attack.

Today those few high-placed Americans, arrogant in wealth or lusting greatly for political power, renew and refresh their bitter hatred for the humanitarian philosophy and the democratic practices of our President and Commander in Chief and, while the war is not yet won, renew the hue and cry of partisan attack upon him and upon the Democratic Party.

Their strategy is to surround their support of the war effort and the making of the peace with reservations; to pick at and rub sore the irritations of life in wartime; to enlarge petty grievances and to diminish great achievements.

APPEAL TO WEAKNESSES

The leaders of the Republican Party are frankly committed to a campaign based upon an appeal to the weaknesses, to the selfishness, to the lack of understanding which they believe are inherent in the American people.

We of the Democratic Party chose rather to trust to the strength, to the patriotism, to the wisdom of America.

We believe that history has drawn our issues. We are ready to set the 12 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt against the preceding 12 years of Republican 'normalcy,' then America retreated into futile isolation, when America sped into wild inflation and made the depression inevitable, when America sank its Navy and corruptly sold its Navy's oil reserves.

We do not believe the American people are ready to take a backward step. Therefore, it is with full confidence in the peoples' intuitive ability to distinguish truth from falsehood, to mark out accomplishment from misrepresentation, that we resolve:

The National Committee of the Democratic Party, representing the millions of sincere and devoted people who have three times elected Franklin D. Roosevelt to be their President, does hereby gladly and proudly express its full and unflinching confidence in and admiration for that leadership both at home and abroad, and it further pledges its every energy and every purpose to the erection of a lasting and enduring peace in which an America free from unemployment and poverty will take its rightful place in a world free of the threat of war; and it does further express its deep conviction that the liberal spirit and far-sighted practical idealism of this Nation, exemplified to the world by Franklin D. Roosevelt, must be imprinted in the peace which follows victory, so that no man who dies in this war shall indeed have died in vain.

We assembled, realizing his world leadership and knowing that our allies are praying with us for the continuation of his services both in war and peace, do now earnestly solicit him to continue as the great world humanitarian leader.

The Service Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "The Service Vote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SERVICE VOTE

When the Senate moved yesterday to reconsider its action of last month killing the Federal service vote bill it was bowing to the force of a popular sentiment which simply will not permit this matter to be shelved in political and parliamentary evasions. No doubt it would be much more comfortable and convenient for everyone if the whole embarrassing business could just be put quietly away somewhere and forgotten; but it cannot be put away because the basic issues involved are too plain and too compelling.

There are three obvious reasons why this question must be faced and settled in a straightforward fashion. The first is the deep popular feeling that a man who is drafted to fight for his country should not thereby be deprived of all his constitutional rights to have a voice in its affairs. The second is the very practical reason that an electoral decision as important as that now impending should not be left open to any possible question on the ground that ten-million-odd citizens were in effect disfranchised. And the third reason is perhaps the most important of all. Whether the servicemen intend to vote in any great numbers or not, there is a good deal of accumulating evidence that they value the right to vote. They are already sufficiently critical of the home front. They are already too much imbued with the notion that politicians, labor magnates, and armchair patriots in general have sent them out to do the dying while themselves conducting business and pleasure as usual at home. The servicemen are beginning to make their right to a vote into a kind of test question.

These are the three chief reasons for political action. If the statesmen had faced up to them more honestly to begin with, they would not have involved themselves in their present difficulties, confusions, and contradictions. But to this newspaper it still does not seem too late for a frank and rational solution. Stripped of its ulterior and legalistic complications, the present issue seems to come down largely to a technical one. According to the Secretary of War, it is not physically possible to transmit all primary, local, and State ballots without interfering with the prosecution of the war. Apparently, it is possible to transmit a simple Federal ballot for Federal offices, while the revised Green-Lucas bill, under which the Federal Government would take such a vote but leave it to State law and State authorities to accept or reject it, offers a clearly constitutional means of doing so. If this is the practical situation the conclusion is inescapable; it is to provide for the Federal ballot, leaving the States as free as they now are to distribute and receive State and local ballots within the normal limits of the military postal services. If it is practical to provide something more than this, Congress should be able quickly to ascertain the fact; if not, this is a reasonable minimum. The one thing which is not allowable is simple obstruction and evasion.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 19, just 1 week ago today your House by a vote of 387 for and none against accepted the committee report of the Military Affairs Committee on the bill to provide mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces. Under the provisions of that House bill, the maximum amount to be paid for those persons eligible would be $300. Senate bill 1543 which was passed by the other body arrived at a maximum to be paid of $500.

Many of the Members of your House were recorded favorably a week ago on the Military Affairs Committee bill, realizing full well that the maximum amount in the committee bill was insufficient and inadequate. The so-called Lemke committee, which consisted of 51 Members of your House, had unanimously approved a maximum of $700 as payment to members of the armed forces upon their mustering out.

The conference committee appointed by you, Mr. Speaker, have reported to your House that they have finally agreed on mustering-out payment for persons eligible, as follows:

First. Three hundred dollars for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or more, having served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Second. Two hundred dollars for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or more, having served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Third. One hundred dollars for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, although the other body arrived at a maximum of $500 and your House voted a maximum of $300, the committee of conference has seen fit to slash this amount to $200 for those members of the armed forces who have served within the continental United States. I for one am very much disappointed with the report of the committee of conference and although I am a firm believer in economy in Government I will never vote to economize at the expense of those men and women in our armed forces who are making heroic sacrifices. I know that the Members of your House must be familiar with the mustering-out provisions of S. 1617 which is the so-called American Legion omnibus bill. Under this bill, the mustering-out or demobilization pay there was a maximum of $500, and also recommended the principle of graduated pay according to the length of service.

With this in mind, I do not intend to vote in favor of the conference report on this mustering-out pay bill. I hope that the entire matter will be recommitted with instructions to increase the amount of payments to an adequate sum.

We Have the Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 23, Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Washington, spoke on the National Vespers program over a national radio network.

Because I believe there is a significant challenge to all thoughtful persons in the message he broadcast, I desire to include here, under leave granted to extend my remarks, the text of Dr. Pruden's broadcast.

It follows:

There may have been times in the past when it would have been excusable for a Christian to think of his faith in personal and provincial terms, but the kind of world in which we are living today requires of us a Christian faith that possesses definite world-wide implications and significance. The terrible events that are taking place all around us remind us that we are world citizens with inescapable interests and responsibilities. We must put into our expression of Christianity that universal note which was sounded by the angel in announcing our Saviour's birth when he said, "Behold, I bring you good

tidings of great joy which shall be to all people"; and the best translations of the song of the heavenly host leave us in no doubt that they sang of a peace that would come to all men of good will, irrespective of race or nationality. Those who became the first disciples of Christ believed that the life and influence of Him who moved among them would one day bring glory to God in heaven and provide a means whereby peace should be realized among men on earth; and we share that belief today.

We need have no doubt as to the ultimate outcome of the age-long struggle between good and evil. The lessons of history, the testimony of our own hearts, and the teachings of Scripture, all contribute to our conviction that one day

"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun,
Doth his successive journeys run."

And that—

"His kingdom shall spread from shore to shore
Till moons shall wax and wane no more."

We have real cause, however, for being tremendously concerned over the extent to which men can delay, thwart, postpone, and sabotage that ultimate triumph of God over all His foes.

Many of those first-century Christians closed their eyes in death in the full expectation that Christ's complete reign in the hearts of men was only a matter of a few generations. Nineteen centuries have passed, however, and much of our world today still resembles the old Roman world in which those first-century Christians lived. I am not at all sure that Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo are any improvement over Judas and Pilate and Nero, and I am not at all convinced that our contemporary pagan gods of wealth, pleasure, and pompous pride are any more to be desired than the idols of wood and stone that lined the streets of Athens when Paul visited that ancient city. The number of Christians has increased, of course, but so has the population of the world, and we have not yet succeeded in making the spirit of Christ the dominant, determining factor in the affairs of men. The fields have been white unto harvest in every generation since our Lord walked among men, but the laborers have been few, and the harvest we have reaped has been only a fractional part of that harvest we might have reaped if we had only carried out the will and purpose of our Lord. As we face the complicated and urgent problems of our own day it is altogether possible that we shall be guilty of three serious mistakes.

First of all, it is possible that we shall be guilty of oversimplification. We are liable to say, "Yes; I know the world is in a tragic condition, but our world leaders have just concluded significant conferences at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran, and the decisions reached there probably determine the destinies of men for a thousand years. The war is hastening to a successful conclusion and if we can only win the war, most of our problems will have been solved. Plans are now on foot to guarantee a more just and abiding peace and in all probability those who represent the nations at the coming peace conference will profit by former mistakes, and we shall have the kind of peace that will make further war an impossibility."

Our problems, however, are not that simple. They cannot be so easily solved. There have been other conferences just as historic and momentous, but they did not provide a solution for the problems that plague us. There was a disarmament conference held here in Washington soon after the close of the last great war, and many probably felt that the decisions reached at that conference would guarantee peace in the world. I was in the city of Paris when the Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed and I stood with thousands of others just outside the French Foreign Office during the momentous ceremony. When the German Foreign Minister appeared we all greeted him with applause, rejoicing that after 10 years the representative of an enemy country had journeyed to Paris to conclude a significant peace treaty. Many of us felt that now that war had been outlawed, we could expect a long era of peace, if not a permanent peace. Several years ago Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister, journeyed to the United States and visited President Hoover at his Rapidan Camp in the mountains of Virginia. The newspapers saw in that conference great possibilities for future peace and international understanding. When the two world leaders sat together on a log one Sunday morning, the world began to wonder if the time had come when the nations of the earth could sit together in peaceful cooperation.

In 1936 a delegation from the United States Congress went out to the Orient, visiting Japan, China, and particularly the Philippines. Bein in Shanghai at the time, I attended a reception given for this delegation and shared the belief with multitudes of others that this group of American officials would probably find some solution to the tense situation existing in the Orient. Today, however, we are painfully aware that no such solution was found. All of these conferences seemed full of promise at the time they were held and appeared to be the crowning effort that might at last give us a peaceful, cooperative world, but in jumping to such conclusions we were guilty of an oversimplification of our problems which practically incapacitated us for discovering a satisfactory solution.

We can make a second serious mistake by transferring our responsibility to others. If we really believe that our world problems will be solved by conferences, or by winning the war, or by the peace conference at the close of the war, then we shall be inclined to sit back and wait to see what our leaders will do. That is what we did after the last war, and you can see where we are today. Our problems will never approach a solution until we begin to realize that they rest as heavily upon us who are average, ordinary citizens as they do upon prominent officials in places of great authority.

We are deeply indebted to our national leaders for their wisdom and insight and the sacrificial efforts they are making to guarantee for the future a just and durable peace, but we have no right to hold them solely responsible for the peace of the world, nor should we expect them to produce a peace settlement for which we are neither spiritually prepared to appreciate nor morally capable of supporting. The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are effective only among those who are capable of appreciating the spiritual ideals contained in them. The statesmanship of our leaders must be implemented by the efforts of the churches to produce the kind of men who will make just treaties workable.

A third mistake of gigantic proportions we may possibly make is the mistake of accepting poor and inadequate substitutes for the only real solution. Agreements made at conferences are usually capable of providing for us temporary relief from war and destruction, but they seem to possess no long-term benefits. When the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, we settled back with a false complacency and felt that all our worries were over. We know now that we were simply given a brief breathing spell between two conflagrations. We made the terrible mistake of accepting a poor substitute for the real thing. Any solution reached at conferences, or made possible by winning wars, simply results in a rearrangement of the same individuals who created and precipitated crises and serious problems in the past, and men can be disarranged just as easily as they can be rearranged. One of our discerning religious leaders has said that "no possible rearrangement of bad eggs can ever make a good omelet," and we know full well that no possible rearrangement of bad individuals will ever make a good society. The only real solution to the world's problems is in the transformation of human beings from greedy, selfish, suspicious, dishonest individuals into men and women of character, integrity, and unselfishness.

We frequently speak of the world's problems as though the matter were plural, when actually the world has but one problem, and all our difficulties flow out of that one—the problem presented by man himself. If we were able to solve the problem contained in man, all the other problems with which man is confronted would be solved automatically. Take the race problem as an example. I was talking the other day to a white minister from the South who told me of a critical situation which arose in the community in which he once served as pastor. A Negro girl had been mistreated by a white boy and the Negro population of the community became so agitated that it looked for a time as though a serious riot might occur. One of the Negro ministers came to this white minister and told him how deeply stirred his people were, and how seriously they were considering drastic action. When the white minister had heard the story of his Negro fellow pastor, he said to him, "I cannot blame you at all for the way you feel. I do not see how you have been as patient as you have been in view of the number of indignities your people have endured. If I had been born of your race, I am afraid I would have done something desperate long ago. I would just like to make one request, and that is, that you begin your vengeance against the white race with me. I am a white man and must confess that I have not done all I could have done to create better relations between the two races. Over in the corner of the room you will find a club with which you may give me a death-dealing blow, and I will offer no resistance. However, before you do that, let us get down on our knees together and ask the Lord Jesus if that is the course he would have us pursue. Let us make sure that that is the method he would approve for the settling of interracial difficulties." The Negro minister, with tears in his eyes, replied in a trembling voice, "I see your point, but there is still a wounded place in my heart." If all the Negro people were like that Negro pastor, and all the white people were like that white pastor, there would be no race problem, for somehow they would discover a solution for their differences in loyalty to a common Saviour.

It is certain that there would be no problem of war if we could solve the problem found in man. In recent years a Japanese ambassador to the United States, Mr. Kensuke Horinouchi, attended the church of which I am pastor. I found him to be a man of profound spiritual insight and an earnest Christian. He was permitted to hold his diplomatic position for only a short time, and I shall always believe that he was called home and replaced by another because he was unable to cooperate with the aggressive policies of his country. He seemed to be a saint in Caesar's household and constantly embarrassed by the incongruity of the situation he faced. If all the Japanese possessed the spirit of this Christian statesman, and all Americans were controlled by the same spirit, there would be no conflict between our Nation and Japan. The same truth would apply in regard to the conflict between capital and labor, to the problem of divorce and broken homes, and to the ever-present problem of intemperance. Mankind's worst enemy is man himself, and decisions reached at conferences and on battlefields will never change him in the least.

It is equally true that the passing of laws will not change him. We tried the prohibition law, but man continued to manufacture and imbibe intoxicating liquors. We tried repeal, and though its proponents promised us that there would be no more saloons or bootleggers, we have both today in great abundance. We are now trying rationing laws, but selfish individuals have discovered ways of hoarding food and other commodities. Laws may provide a certain amount of temporary restraint, but they never provide a permanent solution to human problems.

When you hear world leaders speak of a just and durable peace, of a new and better world, they are simply using other terms for what Jesus called "the kingdom of heaven," a social order in which God is supreme and His will obeyed; and Jesus said, "The kingdom of heaven is within you." The attainment of these worthy goals for mankind is not in wishful thinking or minute planning or in decisive military victories, but is wrapped up within ourselves. It is not clear just what it was that Nicodemus wanted to discuss with Jesus on that historic night when he visited the Master, but we know that both Jesus and Nicodemus lived in a world very similar to the world in which we live today. It is altogether possible that Nicodemus said to Jesus, "Master, this is indeed a tragic world in which we live. The oppression of Rome is apparent everywhere, and the liberties of men are being curtailed on every hand. How can we ever have a better world, confronted as we are by such conditions?" It was probably at that moment that Jesus spoke of the new birth and said, in substance, "Unless men experience a spiritual change from within, they will never see that better world for which you and others like you are hoping and praying." While the world in which he lived was remarkably like our own, Jesus did not speak of a new order or a new world, but of new men. An outward renovation of the world will not suffice. Only by the regeneration of individual men can that better world ever become a reality.

Let it not be thought for a moment that this message is being voiced in criticism of those who have recognized the social implications of the gospel and given them emphasis. Such emphasis was long overdue and deserves from all of us wholehearted and enthusiastic support. It should be recognized, however, that programs for social improvement succeed only to the extent that men are disposed to accept and support them. The spiritual transformation of the individual, then, is emphasized not as a substitute for but as an indispensable preliminary to the creation of that better social order in which all thoughtful men are profoundly interested.

The Great Wall of China cost millions of dollars; it took many years to construct; and it was made as formidable a thing as human ingenuity could make it; but in the first few years after its construction the enemy penetrated it three times. This was not accomplished by knocking holes in it, or climbing over it, but simply by bribing the gate keepers. The Great Wall was no stronger than the character of those who kept the gates. While men are now searching for a way by which the world's problems can be solved, it is the duty and privilege of the Church to say, "We have the solution, and it is in Christ." When the angels sang of that peace which is possible only among men of good will, they were speaking of something far more profound than mere friendly sentiments and charitable impulses; they were referring to a goodness that is ours by virtue of a vital relationship to God through Jesus Christ—a positive goodness that has its roots in the true and living God.

We have the basis for a permanent solution to all our unhappy relationships in Dr. Goodspeed's translation of Ephesians 2:15. Here we read that Christ has "broken down the barrier that kept us apart * * * in order * * * create out of the two parties one new man by uniting them with Himself." When we relate ourselves properly to Christ He dissolves our differences and removes our animosities, and as we become like Him we realize a unity among ourselves that we have never known before. Apart from Christ a new man is impossible, and apart from new men a new and better world is impossible. In the realization of this fact we begin to see to what extent He is indeed the Prince of Peace.

Everett McKinley Dirksen—An Able Spokesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that his colleagues in Congress, irrespective of party, will be interested in reading the following editorial from the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which comments upon an address delivered in South Dakota by EVERETT DIRKSEN, who has announced his candidacy for President on the Republican ticket:

AN ABLE SPOKESMAN

Sioux Falls enjoyed the privilege yesterday of hearing its first speech of this campaign year by a man who is a candidate for the Presidency. He was Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who announced some weeks ago that he is seeking the Republican nomination for the Nation's highest office.

In a community so thoroughly Republican as Sioux Falls is, Representative DIRKSEN found a receptive audience—a group of listeners quite ready to agree with him that the pernicious policies of the New Deal should be halted through a change in the administration.

And DIRKSEN himself made an excellent impression. To say that he speaks well is almost an understatement. Time magazine referred to him recently as the best orator in the House of Representatives. He justified that statement in the brilliancy of his speech here.

But he is much more than just a good speaker. It is obvious that he is a student of government, conscious of the basic value of American principles and the necessity for struggling to preserve them if we are to continue to enjoy the benefits.

It is his impression, fortified by a decade of experience in Washington, that bureaucracy is a genuine evil concerning which the American people should be alarmed. He has observed the development of bureau after bureau, their expansion and the tenacious manner in which they cling to their existence even after the purpose for which they were established had disappeared. Deserving particular emphasis in his opinion was the system that induced a bureau to make every effort to broaden its scope. He deplored as well the attempt on the part of these bureaus to assume to themselves the authority to make the laws and, occasionally, to thwart the expressed will of Congress.

The pressing task, as Representative DIRKSEN explained, is to win the war, but we will be unmindful of our responsibilities and our well-being if we neglect to maintain meanwhile the American way of life.

It was a thoughtful and a pertinent address which the Illinois Member of Congress delivered in Sioux Falls. The comments which he made deserve emphasis. There isn't so much, though that we in South Dakota can do about it that we haven't done already. Our entire representation in Congress is now Republican. Our vote in 1940 was cast in favor of the Republican nominee for the Presidency and against President Roosevelt. The strong probabilities—so strong that little question exists—are that we will continue this record in 1944. Therefore, we have done and are doing as much as our laws permit us to do to advance the philosophy which Representative DIRKSEN so eloquently advanced yesterday.

Labor Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here an article from the Trades and Labor News, of Nashville, Tenn., which sets forth the efforts of the trades and labor council of that city to cooperate with the chamber of commerce in post-war planning.

This is an example of the type of cooperative effort that is destined to bring us real and lasting results in the world after the war.

The article, written by Mr. Ben Faucett, follows:

The Nashville Trades and Labor Council took definite steps for closer cooperation with the Nashville Chamber of Commerce in post-war plans for this city, when President Lee Sanders appointed a cooperation committee to keep in touch with the chamber of commerce for the purpose of exchanging suggestions in the formulation of a Nashville post-war plan that will harmonize more completely with the expectations of local labor, industry, business, and the general public. Motion for the appointment of the aforementioned cooperation committee was made by E. E. Woodward, delegate to the Trades Council from Carpenters' Local Union, No 507. President Sanders named the following delegates to serve on the cooperation committee: C. J. Maunsell, Miss Novella West, John E. Gatlin, and Ben Faucett.

Since the chamber of commerce has already set up a general committee and several special committees on post-war planning for Nashville, with Dr. Philip Davidson, dean of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University, as general chairman, and W. Lipscomb Davis, president of the Davis Cabinet Co., as vice chairman; has spent several months in setting up these committees and the preparation of an extensive booklet explaining the intent, purposes, and scope of post-war planning to be attempted in this locality; and is making various surveys and inquiries throughout Nashville business, industrial, educational, civic, and general public-welfare channels, an excellent opportunity is presented for the chamber of commerce and the Nashville Trades and Labor Council to exchange ideas and get together in formation of specific post-war plans, at least in conditions involving the cooperation of labor and management.

Ye editor of Trades and Labor News was a guest at the luncheon meeting when the

chamber of commerce formally opened its post-war planning for Nashville campaign with a get-together of the general and special committees appointed to plan for beneficial after-the-war conditions here. It proved to be a very enthusiastic and harmonious meeting, so the campaign got under way with plenty of impetus.

After the invocation, John Sloan, president of the chamber of commerce, stated the purposes of the meeting and the various groups expected to take part in post-war planning for Nashville, and he specifically mentioned Nashville organized labor in this respect, after which he introduced Dr. Philip Davidson, general chairman.

"The post-war factors which should afford countless opportunities to business and industry, but for which it is important to prepare now, are as follows," said Dr. Davidson.

"1. The United States will have the greatest productive capacity any country ever had.

"2. The Nation will have the greatest supply of skilled, trained labor in its history.

"3. Americans will have the greatest accumulated purchasing power in history, creating the greatest consumer demand ever experienced.

"4. The release of pent-up demand for the cultural things of life, repressed in the past year, will result in a general return to college and fine arts."

Dr. Davidson declared that "although post-war planning is difficult and is beset with problems, right now we are doing it despite difficulties."

W. Lipscomb Davis, vice chairman, said, in part: "Most people are divided on post-war planning—those who think it is useful and those who argue that nothing definite can come out of such planning now, although I must agree that the main job is now winning the war. We are going to have to work and strive to maintain our fundamental American freedoms—the freedom of private enterprise, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of worship. It is time we, as business people, start planning for the post-war world if the American philosophy of life and the freedoms we cherish are to be preserved."

"We must get the fundamentals and not become confused with an avalanche of details," said Charles Hawkins, city and county planning engineer and secretary of the committee, as he outlined the various steps necessary in forming a post-war program, after which he illustrated his suggestions with a series of large maps showing Nashville's population centers, Davidson County's population centers and other details related to possible conditions here after the war, stressing the point that all post-war planning must be flexible.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of the President on Brotherhood Week:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

The annual observance of Brotherhood Week is a time both of reminder and dedication. It reminds us of the basic religious faith from which democracy has grown—that all men are children of one Father and brothers in the human family. It dedicates us to the practice of understanding and justice through which freedom and equality flourish in human society.

While we are engaged in a mighty struggle to preserve our free institutions and to extend the boundaries of liberty in the earth, it is good for us to pledge renewed devotion to the fundamentals upon which this Nation has been built. Brotherhood must prevail. Our inescapable choice is brotherhood or chaos.

On land and sea and in the air, the sons of the United States fight as one though they come from every racial and cultural strain and though they worship at different altars. They are brothers in arms now; soon, pray God, they shall be brothers in peace. We on the home front must see that history shall not repeat itself in post-war hatred and intolerance. It is for us to make the homeland more nearly a land of brotherhood, worthy of the victory our gallant sons and daughters shall surely win.

I, therefore, heartily join with the National Conference of Christians and Jews and with all forces of good will in our country in urging Nation-wide observance of Brotherhood Week, February 20–26, 1944. I hope that our citizens will meet in church and schoolhouse, in halls and public places to think through the implications of practical brotherhood today, to cement our country's unity during the trying times to come, and to pledge anew allegiance to the flag which is a living symbol of liberty and justice for all.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Fourth War Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, a few nights ago I had the pleasure of attending a dinner of the District of Columbia Building and Loan League at the Mayflower Hotel. This dinner was an initial step of the local Building and Loan League in connection with the Fourth War Bond drive.

A forceful and compelling address was delivered by Mr. John A. Reilly, one of the leading citizens of the District of Columbia, who stands high in the financial circles of our National Capital. Mr. Reilly is president of the Second National Bank of Washington and chairman of the War Finance Committee for the District of Columbia.

Under unanimous consent, I include his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Ladies and gentlemen, normally I would apologize for inflicting a serious note on such a happy occasion. I understand, however, that the meeting was arranged by your officials to stimulate interest in the Fourth War Loan campaign.

The War Finance Committee wishes to take this opportunity to thank and congratulate the Building and Loan League for the splendid contributions it has made to the war-finance program to date.

Your members have purchased heavily for their own portfolios; your officials have served faithfully and well on our important committees; you have acted as issuing agents and contributed money for the administrative expenses of our local office. For all of these things, I thank you in the name of the United States Government.

As we in Washington prepare to do our part in the Fourth War Loan campaign, let us bear in mind that the dollars we raise will accomplish three definite objectives:

1. The successful prosecution of the war, which will enable our boys to return as soon as possible.

2. The maintenance of the economic stability of our country.

3. The attainment of our national and personal post-war aims.

Total global war has disrupted our economy and has left broken hearts and broken homes in its wake. As the shadow of this horrible conflict lengthens, its impact is felt by every household. When our boys reach the age when they would normally enter upon their business or professional careers, they must leave for the battlefields. They are off to save America and our system of free enterprise.

I am going to assume for the purpose of our discussion today that we unanimously want to accomplish the first objective and win the war.

Let us review for a moment the other objectives which are often overlooked.

As intelligent business people, I should like to discuss with you, this evening, the war-finance program and its ability to check inflation.

The word "inflation" is probably the vaguest word in the English language. Experts have written about it—economists have attempted to define it—and newspapers have devoted columns to it—still the public remains hopelessly confused.

The subject of inflation is involved because it involves money and money is a very involved subject. Dollars are the units of our money.

We have faith in that dollar because we know it can be exchanged for the necessities and simple luxuries of life. We also have faith in the credit of the United States and know that if we do not need things now we can save the dollars and use them in the future to purchase things that we may need later.

It is his faith in the stable purchasing power of American dollars that prompts the worker to give the sweat of his brow for them—that encourages the investor to risk his savings in the hope of increasing his net worth in dollars—that prompts the farmer to bring his produce to the city and willingly exchange it for them.

Our money—our dollar's value—is our faith in its stable purchasing power.

The stability of the purchasing power of money depends upon the ratio of the amount of money that is available to the volume of goods and services that may be exchanged for it.

Whenever the amount of available money in circulation increases greatly without a corresponding increase in goods and services, individuals compete for these things with each other. They offer more money and drive the prices up.

Income payments to individuals for the fiscal year 1944 are expected to total $148,000,000,000. Taxes—Federal, State, and local—will absorb approximately twenty-two billions, leaving one hundred and twenty-six billions to be spent or saved.

There will be about ninety billions worth of goods and services available for consumers, leaving about thirty-six billions to be saved or frittered away. This thirty-six billion is economic dynamite and constitutes the inflationary gap that must be closed. The slightest spark will set it off and lead to utter ruin.

If some are inclined to feel that inflation is a myth rather than a reality, may I cite the experience of Germany after the last war.

German inflation of the early 1920's had its origin in a faulty wartime fiscal policy. Instead of taxing heavily, as did Britain and America, Germany financed with planned

deficits; taxes paid only 5 percent of its war cost. So confident of victory were the German leaders that they financed the war with the proceeds of bonds, anticipating that the Allied Nations would pay for their liquidations. The bonds were sold directly to the Reichsbank, which occupied a relationship to the Government of Germany not dissimilar to that of our own Federal Reserve Bank to our Federal Government.

While such a step can be justified in a war emergency, as a policy it carries grave danger, for it is but one step removed from outright paper money. The Government turned the bonds over to a bank whose policies the Government indirectly controlled and this bank printed the money.

At the war's conclusion Germany's indebtedness to the Reichsbank was more than 40,000,000,000 marks. The result was a great increase of currency and the elements of inflation were on the loose.

By the middle of 1922 the international value of the mark had fallen to one one-hundredth of its pre-war rate. There was false prosperity. Demand swallowed everything for sale. Disbanded soldiers had been quickly absorbed by industry busy computing its paper profits. However, each month saw the mark's value sink to a new low. Yet the internal demand for more and more paper continued and history repeated itself. The purchasing value of the mark sank lower and lower as each new wave of paper money fell upon the country. Finally the mark almost ceased to have value; it had fallen to one-trillionth of its original worth. If a comparable fall in the value of American money had taken place, $30,000,000 would have been required to buy a 3-cent newspaper.

Ladies and gentlemen, God forbid that the printing presses will ever start to roll in America for our monetary needs. The most terrible thing that can happen to a civilized nation is to have its legal tender cease to be recognized by its own people.

America, primarily an agricultural Nation, will find the farmers refusing to furnish our towns and cities with food supplies. Perhaps we older ones can take it—but are we doing our duty to God's little ones who are entrusted to our care if we permit th's to happen.

Business units will decline to part with their goods against payment in national currency—thousands will be without clothing and shelter.

What standards can we fix for wages for our 65,000,000 wage earners?

What good will our insurance policies be?

Some may say that this is fantastic and can't happen here. They are mistaken. Once the inflation spiral gains momentum, all power on earth can't stop it. The best insurance against this economic disease at present is the purchase of War bonds.

$95,000,000 seems like a lot of money and it is a lot of money. We should remember, however, that the war is costing $10,000,000 an hour. Before daybreak all that we are expected to raise will have been spent.

May I urge you to again review your assets and invest to the limit in Government bonds during the campaign. Organize your employees and encourage each one to buy an additional $100 bond. Develop sales organizations within your establishments and have your associates canvass their relatives and friends. I can assure you that amazing results will be accomplished. Communicate with your shareholders and clients and suggest that they back the attack. You, executives of the Building and Loan League, have the facilities to ascertain where a good part of the money seeking investment lies. You have a wonderful opportunity to serve your country on the home front and preserve our economy and system of free enterprize.

As we think of the men and women in our country's service, of their sacrifices, their valor and achievements, let us all resolve to strengthen our faith and effort.

Before 1944 comes to a close, thousands of parents will have received official telegrams "I am sorry to inform you." Mothers, who hourly pray for the safety of their sons, will face cruel realities—fathers, who have planned great things for their boys, will see an empty chair at the table—wives and sweethearts will be separated forever.

Each bond that you cause to be sold will hasten the hour of victory. It is a program worthy of your supreme effort.

War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, on December 10:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor and privilege to be invited by the United Commercial Travelers to come here tonight to discuss with you some of the problems that confront us. It has been more than a year since I last spoke in this auditorium to the Democratic State Convention. At that time I was a recently elected candidate, full of confidence. Then I knew practically all the answers. After nearly a year of struggling with some of the most difficult problems ever to face a Nation, few of the answers are as obvious as I had thought. I can assure you that being a Member of Congress will cure anyone's conceit and give him a real sense of humility.

This week our Nation has completed the second year of the Second World War in 25 years. All of us are deeply concerned, not only about the military victory, but also about what kind of world we are going to have when victory is ours. By world, I do not mean only Russia, China and other foreign countries. I mean Arkansas and the United States. On every hand, we hear people talking about post-war planning. This phrase sounds vague and far away, but in fact it is neither. It is simply the common sense effort to lay our plans, and to find solutions as far as possible, for the problems which we know we must solve if we are to preserve our freedom and maintain our prosperity.

I have been asked, "Why is it that you have interested yourself so much in this country's foreign affairs?" Aside from the fact that I was assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have come to the conclusion that unless we can prevent having a world war every 20 years, there is no real hope for any continuing prosperity or happiness in this very State or Nation. While the prevention of war will not, in itself, automatically solve all of our domestic problems, yet unless we do prevent another war in 20 years, I don't think we can solve these other problems at all. On the other hand, if we can have a reasonable assurance of peace, we will then be on the road to a long period of progress.

In considering this question of our foreign policy, we are often misled by the feeling that it is something remote from our daily lives and, in any case, that only the professional diplomats can understand it. I submit to you that it is not remote and its principles are not difficult to understand. Instead of being remote, today our mistake in foreign policy is reaching into every pocketbook in America; it is taking millions of our finest young men, your own sons and brothers, and, on the whole, it is disrupting seriously the life of every man, woman, and child in America. My interest and your interest in foreign policy is not an idle curiosity about an academic matter. On the contrary, it is the paramount reality of our life. It should be analyzed just like you do any personal, civic, or business proposition, applying the same practical reasoning that you do to these problems. Then it does not seem remote.

Needless to say, the loss of our finest young men cannot be evaluated or assessed in concrete terms; and I need not remind you of the suffering and sorrow it brings to everyone. But try to visualize just the material destruction caused by this war. We express it in billions of dollars. This country will probably spend three or four hundred billions in this war. All the countries together will probably spend a thousand billion. If we could realize what this really means in the destruction, the using up of vital, irreplaceable natural resources such as oil, copper, iron, we could much better see what it is worth to all of us to prevent war. You all know how rapidly our high-grade bauxite in this State is being exhausted and how short is our supply of oil. Just imagine what the world would be like if all the materials and energy used in war could be devoted to the building of those things that make for the happiness and the well-being of mankind. Think of the roads, dams, parks, hospitals, homes, airplanes, radios, refrigerators that could be built by the expenditure of only a fraction of the cost of this single war. Or put it this way: Think of all those things we are not going to have because of this war.

It is fairly easy for anyone to appreciate the destructive force of total war while it is in progress. It is much more difficult to recognize the causal effect of war upon many of our economic and social problems, in time of peace. I think few will deny that, in a very real sense, the extreme speculative inflation of the twenties, followed by the worst depression in history, was primarily the result of the economic dislocation caused by the destruction and waste of World War No. 1. A false prosperity, then mass unemployment, soup kitchens, and finally the New Deal itself, all were attributable to the hatreds and economic dislocation caused by destruction of half the world's purchasing power by World War No. 1.

I think that one reason why the depression of the thirties dragged on so long and was so difficult to solve was not only the effect of World War No. 1, but also the effects of the prospective war for which Germany and Japan were preparing. When war is anticipated, each country seeks to become self-sufficient in strategic materials of war. Germany undertook to manufacture her own synthetic rubber, gasoline, and textiles. Tariffs were raised unduly high and, except for certain war materials, world trade languished. You all recall the huge surpluses of some materials in the midst of poverty and suffering and the many experiments which we attempted in an effort to revive prosperity. We, in this country, not realizing the fact that our economy is tied into that of the world, whether we like it or not, tried to solve our problems on a national basis and they would not be solved. In other words, I firmly believe that not only is physical security now a matter of world-wide collective action, but that unless we can create some confidence in the future stability of the world, it will be virtually impossible to make our system of private enterprise flourish. If we must forever prepare for war, then we must have a regimented economy. This means, of course, a contracting economy in which the standard of living will steadily go down. As I see it, the only hope for an expanding economy of free enterprise will be within the framework of a peaceful world.

I think it is inevitable that under the abnormal conditions resulting from total war, the usual economic laws such as supply and demand, are completely upset. When artificial controls are substituted for the natural controls, we get trouble. I do not think it is possible for a free democratic nation to acquire practically overnight the skill or the mental attitude necessary for the proper functioning of a regimented society. The very fact that we normally have, and are accustomed to, free enterprise in this country is the principal reason why we do not understand and cannot efficiently operate a system of regimentation.

I detest bureaucracy. I hate regimentation, just as I loath the destruction of life and property that always must accompany total war. But it does no good simply to hate, to criticize, and to browbeat the bureaucrats. Actually, as individuals, many of the bureaucrats are patriotic, hard-working citizens doing the best they can in an almost impossible situation. The fact is that, by its nature, total war requires an inflated and powerful bureaucracy. We should not forget that in World War No. 1, which was on a much smaller scale than the present one, the Government had many hundreds of bureaus. It even took over the railroads and made quite a mess of it. Government, especially if it is democratic, will always make a mess of such undertakings compared to private management.

It is largely because I am so thoroughly convinced of the superiority of private enterprise, of the principle that opportunity for individual improvement is the most powerful stimulant to constructive action, that I hate bureaucracy and regimentation. And I hate war, not only because it destroys our young men, our families, and our property, but also because it will, sooner or later, destroy our system of free enterprise. War will, inevitably, make all of us slaves of an organized bureaucracy which we call the state, and, furthermore, this is likely to happen even though we win this war and the next war, if we permit a next war. And this will happen regardless of whether the Republicans or the Democrats control the Government.

The reason for this is that the democratic system of free enterprise and individual liberty is not designed for war. It is the best system ever devised by man to promote the prosperity and happiness of the people in peace, but its strength in peace is its weakness in war. The regimentation of every individual and the organization of every resource in the Nation is necessary to wage total war; and this is the very antithesis of the democratic process. Consequently, those nations which develop and perfect the regimentation of all their resources during peace, in anticipation of war, have an enormous initial advantage over the nation which abhors that system. It always takes years for the freedom-loving nations to organize for war. We have just witnessed how very close to defeat the democracies came because of this fact. How fortunate we have been that one of our allies in this war was a regimented nation and was prepared to meet and defeat the savage German. Can one deny that without the heroic and efficient assistance of Russia, a regimented nation, we could scarcely have hoped for victory?

I think that events have conspired to force this Nation to make a choice; either we must decide to become a regimented state, prepared to wage war at all times after the fashion of Germany, or we must take steps, through a system of collective action, with the other nations of the world to see that world wars do not occur. Some influential men have suggested that our best policy is to retain a huge Army, Air Force, and Navy and defend ourselves individually. In the first place, in the long run, this would certainly be futile, as I think the Maginot line and the huge Army of France have demonstrated. Defensive armaments do not win wars any more. Success goes to the one with the initiative. In the second place, to pursue this policy would mean the sacrifice of our basic freedom. It would mean the acceptance of an autocratic bureaucracy as a permanent part of our system, because in no other way can a great nation stay organized and prepared for war. To follow this suggestion would mean giving up voluntarily the principle of free enterprise and liberty of the individual, the very thing we are fighting for.

I am not willing to accept this choice for my part. I think that, if we can marshal our national intelligence and overcome our prejudices, we can prevent wars by cooperative action among the nations. If this can be done, we can thereby preserve the democratic system. We then can deflate our bureaucracy and maintain private enterprise and freedom of opportunity for the individual as the distinction of our Nation.

It is true that no one can guarantee that our efforts to create an effective international system will be successful. But, if we adopt this policy, we shall have a chance to preserve our freedom, whereas, if we rely upon individual defense, we have no chance whatever to avoid the very bureaucratic regimentation we are now fighting.

It was my conviction that this is the only way to preserve our freedom as individuals that prompted me to introduce in the Congress a resolution about which you may have heard. That resolution is designed to change the fundamental policy of this Nation from that of political isolation from the world to a policy of participation with other nations in an effort to control the violent elements which exist in every society. We should not overlook the fact that this war and the last war were both caused primarily by the greedy and violent character of less than 10 percent of the world's population. The peace-loving peoples of the world, composing 90 percent of the population, have the power to impose order upon the violent minority. It is simply a question of organizing that power in some effective manner.

When one considers the causes of wars, after giving due consideration to economic and ideological factors, it seems to me that the really decisive cause of both our World Wars was the conviction by the aggressor that he could win. In the present war, I believe that the Germans arrived at the conclusion that they could win largely because of the isolationist policy of all the non-Axis countries. At Munich the appeasers practically invited Hitler to do as he pleased. Each of the freedom-loving countries thought they could rely on neutrality, or upon their own individual defense, for protection. We in the United States even passed a Neutrality Law, assuring Hitler, positively, that we would not interfere with his plans for the subjugation of Europe and the ultimate domination of the world. When we repealed the law, Hitler probably thought: "Those dirty Americans have double-crossed me!"

When Japan attacked our fleet at Pearl Harbor, they obviously believed that they could defeat us. They thought Hitler was on the verge of victory in Europe, and that the United States would be left alone in a hostile world. In short, they thought they could win. They thought the old system of one-by-one was about to succeed and that they could join in the final blow at Russia and then deal with us alone. The thing that really upset these plans was the amazing resistance of Russia, which has given us time to produce and to organize our strength. Imagine, however, what our situation would be if Russia's resistance had been completely destroyed, and Germany had been free to turn all her power on England, and then consolidate her conquests. Under such conditions, we could not even hope for victory, much less have it almost within our grasp, as we have today.

If it is true that the decisive cause of war is the belief by the aggressor that he can win, then it follows that the most effective way to prevent war is to create a condition in which this lawless minority in the world can never arrive at that belief. The only condition that I can think of where this would be true, would be where the great majority of the peoples of the world agree to act together, instead of individually, to prevent aggression. I think we can agree that if Germany had known, both in 1914 and in 1939, that the peace-loving peoples of the world would finally combine, as they did combine in both instances, she would not have promoted either war. She simply thought that she could destroy these nations one at a time, before they could combine and act collectively to defeat her. Therefore, if the peace-loving United Nations agree, ahead of time, that they will act together and will create some machinery to make this agreement effective, I do not believe the future Hitlers can ever get started. In a very real sense, it is similar to the problem of controlling that small minority of our own citizens who, for one reason or another, refuse to abide by the rules of society. This is exactly the same principle that gives you and me security of person and property here in Arkansas. It is the combined, collective power of all of us, expressed through our police and our courts, that deters the would-be robbers and the murderers. It is true that we have some robberies and some murders, but is there anyone mad enough to suggest that because our system of law and order is not perfect, we should abolish it and trust to the goodness of mankind for security?

It is true that there are those among us who say that the only solution is the development of humility and goodness in the individual. This is practically defeatism, fatalism—that man has no control over his future and can do nothing about improving his lot in the world. Certainly that is not the American way of doing things. We Americans have usually done something about improving this world when we have seen the necessity for it.

All of us have seen businessmen fail, go bankrupt, as the result of following erroneous policies in the conduct of their business. Wouldn't you judge a man crazy if, after such a failure, he should persist in these same policies when he makes a new start? After two wars within 25 years, which in a very real sense may be called the bankruptcy or failure of our foreign policy, it seems to me equally crazy for us and the world to continue the old each-for-himself, isolationist policy in the field of international relations.

Many opponents of collective action to keep the peace seek to confuse the issues by insisting that any such system would be equivalent to an international W. P. A. with Uncle Sam paying the bills. The question of relief and rehabilitation has little to do with the formulation of our foreign policy or the creation of machinery to keep the peace. Relief in the form of food or other articles may have a place in military operations and of course, as a matter of ordinary humanity, we have often assisted the victims of disaster. But a proper foreign policy, together with the machinery to keep the peace, is continuing in its nature; it does not consist of isolated acts of relief. Success in the conduct of our foreign affairs will require the close attention of the best brains of our country. It is a process that will last as long as we are a nation. What the world wants, and is entitled to expect, from us is not gifts of food and clothing, but brains and leadership in the creation of a stable and orderly world.

If we can prevent these total wars for a reasonable length of time, most of the peoples who are now so hard pressed can probably work out their own economic and political salvation.

Another very important consideration is the question of this Nation's relative power and influence in the world. At the end of this war, the United States will be the most powerful Nation in the world. We will be in a position to take the lead in determining the kind and character of the international machinery to keep the peace. On the other hand, if we refuse to accept this responsibility and then drift into another war in 20 years, it is more than likely that some other nation, perhaps Russia, or possibly China, will then emerge as the dominant power. We have only to study the natural resources and manpower of those two nations to see that as they become industrialized, as they are rapidly proceeding to do, they will have much greater prospects than have we. Russia, for example, is more than three times as large as we are with proportionately greater natural resources. Furthermore, her resources are largely undeveloped, whereas we have gone a long way toward exploiting the known deposits of such vital materials as oil, iron, bauxite, and copper. Russia already has a population 50 percent larger than ours and her birthrate is greater. She has astonished the world with the enormous strides she has made in industry within 25 years. It seems clear to me that either we cooperate with Russia and the other nations in a system to preserve peace or we must look forward to the time when, in a chaotic world of warring nations, we may have to compete for survival with an industrialized Russia of 250,000,000 or a China of 450,000,000. It is all very well to be proud of our great achievement and our power, but we must view our strength in its proper relation to the rest of the world and when we do, it is obvious that we are quite a small fraction of that world. I do not think we can possibly depend upon brute strength alone to insure our future. We must use our wits and intelligence if we are to survive.

To all those of little faith, the results of the recent Moscow Conference came as a great shock. While this was but a first small step in the right direction, yet it was a most important one. Only a few short weeks ago the opponents of cooperative action were ridiculing the whole idea as utopian. They insisted that Joseph Stalin and Churchill were great men who were interested first and foremost in the preservation and advancement of their respective nations. The implication of these statements was that they were too smart to enter any kind of collective-security system. As a matter of fact, if these two men are really intelligent, they will eagerly join with us and other nations in our effort to create order in the world. I am hopeful, and I believe that Stalin does see that, purely as a selfish matter, for the promotion of the welfare of Russia he should cooperate. Certainly I think the declaration of the Moscow Conference, recognizing "the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date, a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by such states," gives the lie to those who heretofore insisted that Russia and Britain were too smart to be interested in collective security. The fact is that those countries have suffered from this war so horribly that they know something must be done. We in these United States, not having experienced the grisly horrors of invasion and bombing, have only our feeble reason to fortify us. We still indulge in the luxury of hating the British and the Bolsheviks. It is not necessary to love the British and the Russians in order to cooperate with them. Imagine if you businessmen refused to do business with everyone you didn't love. The truth is that a sound foreign policy rests, not upon love and friendship, but upon an intelligent, long-term conception of national self-interest.

If only we could put half the thought and energy into the effort to create total peace that we are now putting into the prosecution of the war, I have no doubt that we would succeed. We Americans are quick to realize the extent of our power to produce men and machines to make war, but for some strange reason we have a defeatist attitude toward our power to make peace. We do not realize the tremendous power and opportunity for leadership that we now possess in the eyes of the peoples of the world. This opportunity for leadership stems not so much from our physical power as it does from the fact that, at present, all the United Nations, large and small, trust us. They know that we do not seek to enslave them nor to rob them of their land and possessions. They know that the cause of human liberty is right. They feel that our power is a beneficent one. They fear only that, like a sleeping giant, we will refuse to exercise it to help control the lawless and savage organized minority. And let me repeat, by exercise of power I do not mean the giving of alms to destitute people. I mean the giving of brains and leadership in the effort to create order. Just as in your own community, the man who gives his best thought and energy to civic improvement is far more valuable than the indifferent donor who dismisses the whole matter by signing a check.

In conclusion, may I remind you that, during and after World War No. 1, there was a general feeling that efforts looking to the prevention of future wars was a vision and pastime for the dreamers and the idealists. The businessman felt that it was no part of him. He wanted only to return to normalcy. Even the mothers and fathers felt that no effort was better than a possible misstep. Farmers wanted to get on with their plowing and labor felt that international affairs were a pastime for big capital. Now I believe this has changed. In spite of neutrality laws, embargoes, and every kind of appeasement, we found ourselves at war, unprepared, and for a moment in an almost disastrous position. Our faith in isolationism today seems childish, superficial, and stupid.

If capital in America survives this war, it must, for its own preservation, turn to international understanding. If labor hopes to maintain and continue its efforts for more stability in its standard of life, it, too, must interest itself in a more cooperative and peaceful world. Labor in any part of the world cannot maintain, for long, a high protective standard in one spot and have interminable wars keep a billion laborers elsewhere in slavery. The farmers of America can never hope to save, during a few boom years, enough to offset the lean years of discriminatory tariffs and stagnant world trade. Fathers and mothers of America can never feel that their beloved sons can escape international slaughter without a strong cooperative will among nations for peace and the machinery to enforce it.

So today the question of whether we shall have total war or total peace as the prospect for the future is a practical problem of great and personal interest to the small businessman, to the big businessman, to bankers, farmers, doctors, and laborers of Arkansas. Above all, it is a serious, heartbreaking problem to the parents of this generation and to the parents of generations to come the whole world over.

Address of Gov. Dwight H. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the following address given by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, on Monday, January 10, in Chicago, at a meeting of the Republican National Committee:

I feel highly privileged, indeed, to have the opportunity to address such a distinguished and honorable gathering as the Republican National Committee on the occasion of this important meeting here in the great city of Chicago, Ill.

It has truly been inspiring to attend these meetings and to have the opportunity to talk to you who represent every section of this vast country of ours, because in your enthusiasm, your determination, and your confidence in victory for the principles of good government as they are exemplified by the Republican Party, I see a reflection of a mighty ground swell of Republican sentiment, riding the crest of a wave of outraged public opinion—which is going to overwhelm the New Deal in a great tidal wave of ballots in 1944.

As Republicans, our only job now is to insist that the issues of the campaign are presented to the people clearly and uncompromisingly. These issues are:

First, American representative government against New Deal centralization or state socialism.

Second, rededication of America to the civil liberties guaranteed under the Constitution—including freedom of opportunity and enterprise—against Federal bureaucratic regulation of our economic system, which is the first step toward the destruction of all civil liberty.

Third, full participation by the United States in the peace settlement, within the framework of the American Constitution, against various shades of internationalism, isolationism, or other forms of global planning.

The main issue in America today is no longer between what we call the liberal and conservative points of view. The issue is between centralization, totalitarianism, absolutism, state socialism—call it what you will—and free representative American government in which the will of the people is law under their Constitution.

There are men in government today who for more than a decade have been using every means that the power of public office, and the influence that public trust, public funds, national emergency, and political patronage can give them to circumvent the Constitution of the United States and to usurp the traditional rights and powers of the State and local governmental units—and even of the individual citizens themselves.

The argument for centralized government as opposed to free, decentralized representative government is based on the fallacy that this Nation would be a more efficient operating unit if the reins of power were centered in Washington. The power-hungry bureaucrats who conceal the defense of their usurpation behind the cloak of efficiency can no longer deceive the American people, because it is obvious to all of us that such government is not efficient and not representative of the people.

Centralized government is not efficient because the present great national bureaucracy has proven, over and over again, to be the most expensive and the most recklessly extravagant in American history. Never before have the American people seen such red tape, such chaos, and such inconsistency and petty bickering in the seat of their Federal Government.

The New Deal bureaucracy is not representative of the people because it is composed of millions of persons who owe their jobs and their power only to the person who appointed them. They have set up an administrative absolutism, in which their first loyalty is to the boss—not to the people. Their first desire is for more power—not to give greater service. And as a result, never before

have the American people witnessed such repeated and pernicious attacks on their Constitution, and upon every one of the famous "checks and balances" which that Constitution provides to protect them from exploitation by the executive power.

The time has come for the Republican Party to stand for the Republic. It must struggle fearlessly to return the powers of government to the people. Rampant bureaucracy must come to an end.

The argument for government control of business is based on the fallacy that we can place our entire economic system under the rigid control of Federal bureaucracy without losing our civil liberties.

The professional planners and "do-gooders," the false prophets of liberalism, have sprung to the defense of this idea with alacrity and in the past they have succeeded in convincing many sincere and honest American men and women of the truth of this obvious error. But the day of deception is gone.

They are at a loss to answer the fact that this same theory—which carried Hitler into power in Germany, and Mussolini in Italy—has been proven false every time it has been tested. Without exception, the platform of every dictator during the last century has been: To regulate business and protect the civil liberties of the people. And without exception the people who have been deluded into accepting an economic dictator have been forced to accept a political dictator also.

Nor can the apologist for the Federal bureaucracy deny the fact that the effect of this regime of nearly 11 years' duration has been to impoverish the great middle group between the two economic extremes—the merchant and professional man, the clerk and office worker, the farmer and small factory operator—indeed, the people who form the very backbone of America's strength, whose deep convictions are the soul of our freedoms, are being "regulated" out of business by the Federal Government.

The small businessman is in a sad predicament. On his back he bears the burden of his business. On one shoulder he must carry a bureaucrat and on the other shoulder he must carry a lawyer to interpret the bureaucrat's decree.

The parallel with the progress of fascism in foreign countries is too strong to be denied. The freedoms of opportunity and enterprise—significantly omitted from the Atlantic Charter—must be guaranteed to every citizen of this country if America is to survive and remain the greatest nation in the world, for without those freedoms, the famous "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter cannot exist.

Labor loses most of all from government domination. Under free enterprise labor may bargain freely and strike at will. But under governmental controls labor becomes subject to the political theories of those in power. Free enterprise and free labor go hand in hand. Together they result in a free country. To keep them, government must be brought back to its proper place.

On the question of foreign policy, the American people are witnessing the same New Deal effort to circumvent our Constitution and to engage our country in a policy which conforms neither with the clear terms of that deathless document, nor with the spirit of the American people.

While the representatives of every foreign government that is allied with America in this war have repeatedly told us in the clearest, most irrevocable terms, that their first interest at the peace table will be for their own respective countries—yet should any American voice even the mildest expression of the belief that American peace representatives should take proper precautions to safeguard American sovereignty and American interests, they are immediately branded as isolationists, and imperialists, or with some other equally odious term.

The American attitude toward foreign countries has always been one of friendliness, justice, and mutual cooperation—but America could never be charged with imperialism. That American attitude has not changed. Indeed, the people of this country are resolved, now as never before, to take every possible step to prevent a recurrence of war. They insist on the fullest participation in making the peace settlement and in planning the post-war world. But they are determined too, that their sovereignty under the Constitution they are defending on the battlefields today, shall remain safe and unimpaired. And they are determined that, as they have always fought for freedom and justice on the battlefields, they shall not be maneuvered into a position in which their wealth would be used to subsidize, or their unequaled military power used to protect, the evils of injustice, autocracy, or imperialism in other nations.

The American people are looking forward to the day when their sons and daughters—10,000,000 strong—come marching home from war. And the questions in their minds are: What kind of an America will we have for them? What opportunities will reward their heroism?

Will there be respectable, self-supporting jobs awaiting them, or some kind of relief or public dole?

Will America be a productive country, ready to give an ample supply of the comforts of life to the man who is willing to work for them, or shall we still be living in a land of planned scarcity, in which millions of workers who could be contributing to the national wealth are forced to take nonproductive jobs on the public pay rolls?

And lastly, will America be a truly free country—a land of self-respecting freemen—exercising, without hindrance, the freedoms for which we have fought and won, or will it continue to be dominated by heavy-handed bureaucracy which seeks to regulate the public and private life of every citizen?

Those are questions which must be asked and answered in the heart of every American citizen, and every one of us, from the precinct committeemen to the national chairman of our party, can play a vital and indispensable part in dispelling the doubt and exposing the falsehoods that will be used by the partisans of bureaucracy to becloud the issues—a role that is not only the inalienable right but the duty of American citizens—in keeping with the principles of freedom and truth upon which our Constitution is firmly based.

In 1944 the Republican Party will have the opportunity to render the greatest service to the progress and security of America that it has ever had since the day of Abraham Lincoln. Only once before—in 1860—have the issues between the two great political parties been so irreconcilable. In that election the American people rallied to the standard of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate, thereby saving our country from total disaster and establishing perpetual unity and freedom under our beloved Constitution.

In 1944, as in 1860, they must again rally to the standard of Lincoln's party, because the Republican Party is the only major political organization in the United States which is untainted and undominated by that false philosophy of government which threatens to destroy our freedom even as we fight for it. The Republican Party stands alone today as the protector of our constitutional liberties in the hour of gravest danger.

The immediate business before us now is to choose our standard bearer—the man who will lead us to complete and overwhelming victory for liberty, in both foreign and domestic affairs—and as I cast my eye over the ranks of the Republicans of this great Nation, I am happy to report that America is fortunate in that there is such a wealth of superior leadership to be found in the Republican Party. And as you approach the question of naming the convention city in which to make that fateful choice, I am moved to urge that you select the mighty city of Chicago.

May I, as Governor of Illinois, and as a resident of Chicago, extend the cordial invitation of the people of this great State and city to the Republicans of the Nation, to meet in Chicago, and here, in the home State of Abraham Lincoln, choose the man, who like that greatest of all Americans, shall reestablish in Washington the principles of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—the man who will lead the Republican Party to victory in 1944.

America's Oil Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, a letter which he wrote to me in answer to a letter written by Gov. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, addressed to Gov. Earl Snell, of the State of Oregon, dealing with the price of oil. I am now in receipt of a letter under date of January 22, from Russell B. Brown of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, which is a reply to Mr. Bowles' letter to me, and which includes certain other documents all of which contain much factual information on the critical oil situation and which are worthy of consideration by all of the Members of Congress. Pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I include this correspondence and this data in my remarks, as follows:

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1944.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, I have read a letter addressed to you by the Honorable Chester Bowles, Price Administrator. This letter makes reference to previous correspondence from Gov. John J. Dempsey of New Mexico, addressed to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, dealing with the price of oil.

I note that Mr. Bowles wishes to give you the facts in regard to O. P. A.'s position. Throughout the letter a great deal of emphasis is placed upon this theme of facts and true picture. This is rather revealing because the facts as set forth in that letter signed by Mr. Bowles are exactly contrary to many of the facts that that Office has given out on other occasions.

For your information I am enclosing copy of a letter signed by Mr. Bowles, dated December 17, 1943, addressed to Mr. Frank D. Eager, of Lincoln, Nebr., a constituent of Senator WHERRY. With this I enclose copy of my letter to Mr. Eager.

In the letter dated December 17, the Office of Price Administration takes the position: "Furthermore, the intensity with which wildcat drilling is, at present, proceeding bids fair to guarantee that crude oil supplies will be adequate to provide for all foreseeable future needs" and "as is indicated in the

accompanying tables, the net result of our exploratory effort from 1938 through 1942 has been a total addition to reserves almost twice the total withdrawals from underground resources during the same period. Consequently, our total reserves are today the highest on record." In that letter they indicate that all is well.

In the letter of January 5, addressed to you, they state: "However, in view of the great petroleum demand of war, we need to drill more wildcat and other wells than ever before. The Office of Price Administration believes that to get more wells drilled special inducements should be offered." That assertion is a direct contradiction of the position taken in the prior letter.

In the letter of December 17, the Office, referring to the abandonment of stripper wells, said: "A higher level of prices than presently prevails would not, in our opinion, induce any considerable increase in supply. As an industry utilizing depletable natural resources, some abandonments of producing areas must be made from time to time at any price. However, as indicated in table III (enclosed), currently high demands and strong monetary incentives have reduced the number of net abandonments of oil wells to the lowest level in 10 years. At the same time, the fabulously high prices currently being paid for both producing wells and areas have provoked intensified drilling campaigns."

However, in the letter addressed to you, dated January 5, the Office of Price Administration said: "It is also important to keep in operation stripper wells, reaching the end of their productivity. Figures on our abandonments in 1943 are not available, but the 5,422 wells abandoned in 1942 were the fewest abandoned in any year since 1932. However, in view of war needs the Office of Price Administration favors offers of special inducement to keep stripper wells in operation."

It would be helpful if that Office could advise which of these letters contains the facts to which they so freely refer.

The letter to you states, "If the oil industry were losing money under present prices there might be reason for an over-all price increase, but such is not the case." They then cite that 21 big integrated oil companies were making money. Then, "Lest it be thought that these profits came entirely from refining, here are the figures for 26 companies engaged only in crude-oil production." Then they proceed to show profits to these 26 selected companies.

It is interesting to note that the Price Administration has been able to produce 47 companies who are enjoying profits. We have no fault to find with this because we believe it is necessary for companies to make money in order to remain able to do effective work. This same argument might well have been applied to defeat any of the many social-reform programs that have been applied in the United States during recent years.

When the cry that relief for American citizens was needed, it would have been a very easy task to have found 47 citizens of the United States who were doing quite well and that those 47 citizens had possession of much of our wealth; but I do not believe that anyone would have felt that that was a sufficient answer to the need of the great body of our people.

The same situation prevails in the oil industry. Some people are making money but many are not. The determining factor should not be that a few people are making money. I do not understand that it was the function of the Office of Price Administration to control profits. The determining factor should be: Are the producers of crude petroleum getting a sufficient price to enable them to furnish the oil needed?

The Office of Price Administration ignores completely the very obvious fact that every element that goes into the operation of the petroleum producer has become more difficult under wartime conditions and the expense has become very much greater.

Another fact that must be recognized that is not discussed much by the Office of Price Administration is that there is, throughout the United States, a shortage of petroleum products. This shortage is becoming more acute and our rationing is becoming more restrictive.

Those charged with the responsibility of supplying oil for our country's war needs have continuously said that we were facing a shortage that might interfere with the war effort. Certainly, if we continue to meet the increasing demands of the war program, the only source from which we may obtain additional supply will be by taking more and more out of the civilian consumption. This may or may not reach the point where we will be unable to meet all of our military requirements. We sincerely hope it will not but it is certainly a dangerous question to deal with lightly.

A great deal of the space occupied in the letter addressed to you is given to a criticism of the legislative effort to obtain some relief through Congress. Some of this criticism would seem to be justified. Congress should not be forced to legislate specifically for the separate items produced in the United States.

Apparently Congress hoped to avoid this necessity at the time it passed the Price Control law. They defined certain standards. Among the objectives sought to be accomplished as indicated by these standards were establishment of prices that would be generally fair and equitable and establishment of prices to obtain needed production. These standards have, in the case of crude petroleum, been ignored by the Office of Price Administration.

For more than 2 years the producers of petroleum have tried to get a fair hearing on their problem through the Office of Price Administration but to no avail. That office has refused to apply the standards set forth by the Congress of the United States. Except in a few limited areas, the Government has done nothing to correct the domestic production situation during that time.

You must understand that the producers of petroleum, faced with the extreme necessity of continued operations in order to maintain the very greatly needed supply of this important product under the increasing cost conditions, were confronted with some perplexing problems. They must select a course that would provide a remedy. They have exhausted the remedy provided in the Price Control Act and have pursued this course to the highest authority, and failed. The two remaining courses were first, they could strike and refuse to produce until they were given sufficient funds with which to produce. This idea has never occurred to our producers as being a proper course to follow under present conditions. That left them the only remaining course of going back to the legislative authorities as their court of last resort. It is awkward to attempt to legislate for specific industries, but when administrative agencies created by the legislative branch of Government refuse to fulfill the functions for which they are created, there seemed to remain no other course but to go back to the Congress and ask them to provide, in clear and unmistakable language, directions to these agents.

This latter course seems to appeal to the producers of petroleum as the patriotic method of obtaining a full and complete hearing. Certainly, no action can be obtained through Congress without making known the full facts to the legislative body, and the entire public as well. There are not enough of us to form a pressure group if we should so desire. We are left to the resort of reason.

Into the armed forces of the United States we have drawn many millions of the best of our young men. The possibility of the success of our effort, the safety of every man in our armed forces is dependent upon a sufficient supply of petroleum. In fairness to the objectives for which we fight and the safety of our people, we should not postpone our success awaiting our persuasion of an inexperienced few who resort so freely and depend so greatly upon the use of slide rules and slick phrases.

The merits of the case with regard to crude petroleum seem so clear that we have little doubt that the Congress will finally grant the relief requested and in spite of the technical criticism offered by the Office of Price Administration, a remedy will be provided. This seems the only course left to us.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL B. BROWN.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C. December 17, 1943.

Mr. FRANK D. EAGER,
President, the Mid-Continent Co.,
Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR MR. EAGER: Senator WHERRY has transmitted to us for reply your request of November 17, 1943. We cannot too vigorously indicate that the statements and conclusions presented in the pamphlet enclosed with your letter are, to a large extent, contrary to the facts and logic of the situation. Far from being "the correct reasons for the present shortage of gasoline and fuel oil," the data and the conclusions drawn therefrom are such as to distort the over-all picture and mislead those who would impartially examine and independently judge the extent of the crisis.

As is indicated in the accompanying tables, the net result of our exploratory effort from 1938 through 1942 has been a total addition to reserves almost twice the total withdrawals from underground resources during the same period. Consequently, our total reserves are today the highest on record, amounting to well over 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil. The pamphlet, by its omission of these facts, has failed to recognize that, historically and currently, the major contributions to reserves have been and are being made, not by the initial wildcat discovery but rather by revisions and extensions of previously discovered pools. One could hardly measure the reserves underlying an entire field, such as East Texas, by the potential of one wildcat well.

Furthermore, the intensity with which wildcat drilling is at present proceeding, bids fair to guarantee that crude-oil supplies will be adequate to provide for all foreseeable future needs. The rate at which exploratory wells are being drilled is at an all-time peak, and further expansions are restrained only by shortages of exploratory crews and equipment. Similar difficulties are being experienced by producers in areas awaiting further developmental drilling. Proration orders, spacing restrictions, and the curtailment of material use have resulted in a decline in the total number of wells of all types drilled, despite the increasing number of wildcats. This office would favor a relaxation of restrictions on developmental drilling so as to facilitate exploitation of the reserves underlying partially developed areas.

A higher level of prices than recently prevails would not, in our opinion, induce any considerable increases in supply. As in any industry utilizing depletable natural resources, some abandonments of producing areas must be made from time to time at any price. However, as is indicated in table III (enclosed), currently high demands and strong monetary incentives have reduced the number of net abandonments of oil wells to the lowest level in 10 years. At the same time the fabulously high prices currently being paid for both producing wells and areas have provoked intensified drilling campaigns.

Far from accurate is the statement by Mr. Pettengill that "the price of crude oil was

frozen, by action of the Federal Government, at the same depressed level" (as the low prices which had prevailed since 1938). Indeed, an inspection of price trends in virtually all fields over the country indicates that prices were frozen at their highest levels (with the single exception of the peak prices reached in 1937) in 10 years. For example, in the Kansas-Oklahoma area, the October 1941 price of $1.13 per barrel for 34–34.9 degree gravity was considerably in excess of the average price of 98 cents per barrel for similar crudes from 1938 to 1940, inclusive.

To claim, as does the writer of the pamphlet, that an increase in the price of crude oil to the extent recommended by Secretary Ickes would result in an increase of only 1 cent per gallon of gasoline to the final consumer is to totally disregard the subtlety of inflationary forces. A 1-cent increase would increase the total annual consumers' bill by at least $250,000,000, of which 60 percent, or $150,000,000 would represent an increased war cost or subsidy which, in light of the data presented above, could not possibly be accompanied by an increased output of oil. Its effect, apart from the spur to inflation which would occur therefrom, would be to award oil companies with added profits unearned by contributions to the Nation's supply of goods. The disastrous consequences of the increase suggested by Mr. Pettengill was sharply portrayed by Judge Vinson, in his recent statement, a copy of which is attached hereto.

It is stated therein:

"There is not an unnatural disposition to recognize only the necessity of stabilizing the other man's prices or wage. It is generally forgotten that one man's price is another man's cost. If any significant segment of prices or wages are allowed to rise, no control is possible. What must be understood is that the controls on wages and prices are in the nature of a dam restraining natural forces of tremendous power. A single breach may be widened by other pressures until the entire dam is swept away by a flood of price and wage increases. The structure is to be maintained not by yielding here and there, but by resolutely standing firm against the threat of disaster implicit in every request for higher prices and wages."

For this agency to attempt to increase crude-oil prices would be tantamount to a direct violation of the legislative and executive directives under which we operate. It would be contrary to the intent of the hold-the-line order, would violate the directives issued by Judge Vinson, and finally, would directly contravene the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act by (a) encouraging "speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency," and (b) by promoting the dissipation of defense appropriations by an excessive price structure. Finally, we reiterate that it would not bring forth increases in supply commensurate with its inflationary perils.

The information contained herein has contributed to the final formulation of our decision. We trust it provides a suitable answer to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1944.

Mr. FRANK D. EAGER,
President, The Mid-Continent Co.,
Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR MR. EAGER: Mr. Charles Van Vleck of our Tulsa office has forwarded to me your letter to him dated December 22 with which was enclosed a copy of a letter from the Honorable Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, dated December 17 and addressed to you.

This letter signed by Mr. Bowles attacks as "far from accurate is the statement by Mr. Pettengill 'that the price of crude oil was frozen, by action of the Federal Government, at the same depressed level.'" This statement ignores the fact that Mr. Pettengill was quoting the substance of the first report on petroleum of the Office of Price Administration of which Office Mr. Bowles is now Administrator.

This statement, coupled with the many other misleading statements made in the same letter, indicates the difficulty many have experienced with this Office as well as some other officials who are misled by part truths and misstatements of fact. Someone furnished the same type of information to the President of the United States that caused him to state to Congress that we had increased our production of crude petroleum in the United States 66 percent since the beginning of the present war. Fortunately, the President later found out the facts and made correction of the error.

It is unfortunate that we have people working on petroleum problems in the Government that are willing to mislead the President of the United States and Congress, to say nothing of an official so highly placed as Mr. Bowles.

Mr. Bowles' letter is a defensive letter in which is passed on to you in its most plausible aspect an attempted defense of an indefensible action by the Office of Price Administration that is bringing the United States to its knees for petroleum supplies, causing great injury to many people and an action that might very well seriously interfere with our war effort.

Since the independent oil producers first stated their case to the Office of Price Administration, in July 1941, pointing out then and subsequently the consequences which would follow the application of a Chinese boot of price to the business of exploring for, developing, and producing oil, that Office has shifted its ground repeatedly. There was first the assertion that all needs could be met from existing reserves. Next, the theme was that margins above producing costs were large. There followed statements which were characterized by certitude, but not certainty, that imports would be the answer to the deficiency which the O. P. A. finally admitted did exist. Finally, driven from the ability to maintain any of the foregoing positions with any degree of positiveness—although from time to time the confusion is enhanced by restating one or another of them—the last line of their defense in depth was reached with the hold-the-line philosophy. The elephantine trumpetings of the latter reason for denying relief to the harassed and dying independent producing industry still, as I have said, carries the contraharmony of adequacy of reserves, sufficiency of profits, and plentitude of imports.

None has answered the prime question of the civilian consumer: "Where and when will I get enough petroleum products for my essential use?"

The cool, detached complacency of the O. P. A. as to the adequacy of petroleum supply—or, failing adequacy, the sacrifice of civilian requirements—appears not to have been shared by some other agencies of government who occupied a front-line position in the war. Their feeling may be judged by their actions. Attempts, of a costly nature, have been made to find oil supplies in many places outside the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Administration. We need mention but a few: The Canol project, the Bolivian adventure, the drilling by the War Department in New Zealand and Africa, and the Navy's action in opening to production its cherished Elk Hills reserve.

This parched-earth policy which has been forced upon the United States by a few who have misinterpreted the functions of the Office of Price Administration with regard to petroleum is drying up many of the producing areas of the United States. I illustrate by quoting from a release issued by the Petroleum Administration for War dated January 18, 1944, announcing the reduction of production rates in certain areas of the United States, as follows:

"The rates of production certified to the Eastern and Midwestern States (districts 1 and 2) were reduced slightly to conform with declining productive capacity in those areas."

On December 31, we had been engaged in this war 755 days. During that time we have consumed all of the petroleum we could produce in the United States, all the petroleum we could import into the United States, and have been forced to take from the above ground storage of petroleum 89,000,000 barrels of oil. This is an average of approximately 117,000 barrels of oil a day.

You are a resident in what is commonly termed the "bread basket" of America where great agricultural and livestock areas are straining themselves to insure the food supply of the United States and its dependent areas. Only last week some 50 refiners who supply this area were in Washington and advised the Office of Price Administration that they were short of crude petroleum to meet their refinery capacity in an amount more than 200,000 barrels a day, and at the same time constant and increased demands for their product were being made upon them.

The indisputable facts are that there is a shortage of petroleum products in the United States that is now known to every citizen who uses these products and causing great concern to the officials of our Government. Foreign supply has proven inadequate in this emergency, yet we are being told to rely on this source to an ever-increasing extent. The only beneficiaries of this policy are a few petroleum purchasing companies who are also the importing companies. These companies are doing well according to the Office of Price Administration.

This is the story Mr. Pettengill, an American patriot, told so clearly and truthfully as reproduced in the pamphlet under the heading of "What can be cured—need not be endured." The letter Mr. Bowles signs is the reward he gets for his patriotism. There is no need for me to defend Mr. Pettengill. His record is his defense.

The letter that Mr. Bowles signed December 17 tries to support the position taken by the O. P. A. by the statement that, "Furthermore, the intensity with which wildcat drilling is, at present, proceeding bids fair to guarantee that crude oil supplies will be adequate to provide all foreseeable future needs." Mr. Bowles could not believe that statement if he would examine the facts. The papers are full of statements by the Office of Price Administration and by Judge Vinson of plans and proposals to give subsidies or bonus incentives to encourage further discovery or production activities.

On January 5, in a letter signed by Mr. Bowles, addressed to the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Member of Congress from Oregon, it was stated, "However, in view of the great petroleum demands of war, we need to drill more wildcat and other wells than ever before. The Office of Price Administration believes that to get more wells drilled special inducements should be offered."

Large amounts of money have been suggested as being made available for such purpose. Why propose to subsidize an unneeded activity at so great expense? Thus his advisers have Mr. Bowles riding two horses headed in opposite directions at one time.

He says that "exploratory wells are being drilled at an all-time peak." I think that is true. What he did not say was that that was not the whole story. The exploratory work to which he refers is not the bold effort that

has characterized our activities of the past. Stating the number of wells drilled by a few who may be able to invest money obtained through favorable price structures provided for commodities other than crude petroleum ignores the fact that most of our petroleum has been found by those engaged exclusively in the production of petroleum.

He would have you judge the success of a hunting trip by the number of cartridges fired instead of the number of rabbits killed.

The facts are that the total current exploratory and development drilling is only slightly more than half of normal and is at an all-time low in relation to the amount of oil being produced and consumed in this country.

He says that "a higher level of prices than presently prevails would not in our opinion, induce any considerable increase in supply." This statement is unsupported by factual material and is directly contrary to the experience of the petroleum industry throughout its history and in conflict with the laws of economics. Normally, it should not require a very profound study to demonstrate that with more money to spend you should be able to get more of an available product. Again, if more money will avail nothing, why spend a lot on subsidies?

"To claim * * * that an increase in the price of crude oil to the extent recommended by Secretary Ickes would result in an increase of only 1 cent per gallon to the final consumer is to totally disregard the subtlety of inflationary forces," said Mr. Bowles as a part of a concluding paragraph. The Congress had before it for consideration the "subtlety of inflationary forces" at the time of the passage of the act. The Congress directed the consideration of the necessity to establish prices to obtain production and as would be generally fair and equitable. That question has been disposed of by the authority creating the Office of Price Administration and such injunction was not intended to be changed by some arbitrary treatment of the "hold the line" order that is inconsistent with that injunction.

The Office of Price Administration has made a false application of the Price Administration law and the "hold the line" order. I illustrate with the following quotation from a speech by the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, made at Bakersfield, Calif., December 28, 1943:

"The Price Administrator was given authority to recommend prices which, in his judgment, were 'generally fair and equitable.' Later we had the 'hold the line' order which prescribed a different standard. The Administrator was directed 'To authorize no further * * * increases * * * except to the minimum extent required by law.' The Administrator was directed, 'To use all discretionary powers vested in him to prevent further price increases.' The Administrator was further authorized 'to make readjustments provided that such action does not increase the cost of living.'"

In order that you may have for your own study more of the detailed facts on which this letter is based, I am enclosing a memorandum prepared by this Office covering the questions raised by the letter from Mr. Bowles.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL B. BROWN.

[Enclosure]

MEMORANDUM ON CHESTER BOWLES, ADMINISTRATOR, O. P. A., TWO LETTERS ON OIL PRICE AND PETROLEUM SHORTAGE

Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, on December 17, 1943, in response to correspondence with Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, signed a letter addressed to Mr. Frank D. Eager, president of the Mid-Continent Co., Lincoln, Nebr., in which Mr. Bowles accepts authorship for an attempt to refute the conclusions of the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of Congress from Indiana and for 6 years a member of the Petroleum Committee of the House of Representatives, whose conclusions are quoted in a pamphlet entitled "What Can Be Cured Need Not Be Endured"—wherein are given, according to Mr. Pettengill, "the correct reasons for the present shortage of gasoline and fuel oil."

Mr. Bowles signed another letter on January 5, 1944, addressed to Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL, Congressman from Oregon, which letter at the request of Mr. ANGELL, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD January 10, 1944. That letter contains an attempt to disprove statements of Gov. John J. Dempsey of New Mexico addressed to Gov. Earl Snell of Oregon on the subject of petroleum exploration and development.

The author of the two letters signed by Mr. Bowles "vigorously" contends that the statements of Mr. Pettengill and Governor Dempsey are, "to a large extent, contrary to the fact and logic of the situation with regard to the present shortages of petroleum." To support what he claims is "a true picture of the oil-price situation," he resorts to the use of a number of misapplications and omissions of petroleum statistics with which to formulate conclusions which "distort the over-all picture and mislead those who would impartially examine and independently judge the extent of the crisis."

In considering the issues raised in the two letters signed by Mr. Bowles, it becomes necessary to go more fully than was done by the Office of Price Administration into the statistical data relating to the subject matter of those letters. Currently the statistics on petroleum economics show alarming declines in the results of exploratory and development efforts in making available adequate supplies of petroleum for war, essential industrial and civilian requirements, as is indicated in the following table of percentages based on the year 1937, which year is comparable to normal operations in the production of crude petroleum. (See table 1.)

TABLE 1.—*Trends in petroleum exploration and development, stated in percent—using data on each item for 1937 as 100*

[Index or percent—1937=100]

Year	Total exploratory and development wells drilled (oil, gas, dry) [1]	Total productive oil wells drilled [1]	Total new oil reserves found, extensions and revisions applied to year of discovery [2]	Total additions to oil reserves through new discoveries plus extensions and revisions [2]	Rates of new oil wells drilled to total barrels of oil produced each year [1]	Total initial production of new oil wells completed [1]
1937	100	100	100	100	100	100
1938	87	86	113	82	91	81
1939	83	79	39	64	71	63
1940	90	86	66	51	82	68
1941	93	87	43	53	79	68
1942	58	47	16	50	43	26
1943	57	43	16	25	37	17

[1] Source of basic data upon which percentages were calculated: Bureau of Mines. [2] Petroleum Administration for War. [3] American Petroleum Institute.

NOTE.—All 1943 percentage estimated on basis of latest available data from above sources.

Mr. Bowles states:

"Net results of our exploratory effort from 1938 through 1942 has been a total addition to reserves almost twice the total withdrawals from underground resources during the same period. Consequently, our total reserves are today the highest on record, amounting to well over 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil."

The reserves which total the highest on record are not the net result of our exploratory effort from 1938 through 1942, but the net result of exploratory and development effort over a long period of years. There are contained in the figures which O. P. A. claims "amounts to a total addition to reserves almost twice the total withdrawals," amounts in each of the years 1938 through 1942, which are titled "Revisions of previous estimates and extensions to known fields." These revisions and extensions aggregate 9,066,952,000 barrels, the most of which applies to exploratory and development effort carried out before 1938. (See table 2.)

TABLE 2.—*Summary of estimates of petroleum reserves*

[Thousands of barrels]

Year	Additions through—		Additions through new pools discovered during year [2]	Total through new discoveries plus extensions and revisions
	New discoveries plus revisions and extensions reverted back to year of discovery [1]	Revisions of previous estimates and extensions to known fields [2]		
1937	1,864,016	2,792,700	928,742	3,721,532
1938	2,114,469	2,243,571	810,493	3,054,064
1939	732,694	2,058,455	340,667	2,399,122
1940	1,224,091	1,607,012	286,338	1,893,350
1941	796,391	1,538,989	429,974	1,968,963
1942	304,243	1,618,925	260,051	1,878,976
1943 [3]	300,000	(4)	(4)	[5] 939,000

[1] Source: Petroleum Administration for War.
[2] Source: American Petroleum Institute.
[3] Independent Petroleum Association of America estimate.
[4] Not available.
[5] Petroleum Industry War Council estimate of cost and price adjustment committee.

These reserves represent proven reserves and do not represent the amount of reserves which can be produced through existing producing oil wells.

What Mr. Bowles' advisers have failed to understand is that the trends in additions to reserves, whether exploratory reserves or total additions of all reserves, are definitely downward while demands for petroleum are sharply upward. Under these circumstances additional exploratory and development effort is necessary to maintain the industry in a position to meet increasing demands. His advisers also fail to recognize that historically and currently, proven reserves are not reserves which can be produced from existing oil wells.

Proven reserves for the east Texas field according to original estimates made in 1932 were 1,500,000,000 barrels. Up to the end of 1931 approximately 3,500 wells had been drilled. With subsequent "extensions and revisions" added, proven reserves for the field were subsequently set at over 4,000,000,000 barrels. In this field 27,387 wells have been drilled up to the end of 1942, a period of over 10 years. Yet, in 13 years, this field has produced only 1,900,000,000 barrels. It has taken many thousands more wells, over several years to recover only slightly more than the original estimate of proved reserves. It will take many more wells and many more years to recover an amount equal to the "revisions and extensions" which have since been added. All of which is dependent upon many factors, both known and unknown.

In the United States, it has required the drilling of over 1,000,000 wells to recover the first 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil. There are only 400,000 producing oil wells, at the present time. There must be many more thousands of wells drilled to recover the 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil which Mr. Bowles states are today the highest on record. The 400,000 existing oil wells will never produce anywhere near 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

Estimates of reserves in newly discovered oil pools and revisions and extensions of previously made estimates of reserves under-

lying an oil field do not constitute a readily available supply of crude petroleum above ground. To translate these proven underground reserves into usable supplies of aboveground refinable crude oil, many thousands of successful oil wells must be drilled, each thousands of feet down deep into the ground. To maintain an adequate above-ground supply of crude petroleum, to meet an ever-increasing demand for petroleum products, there must be drilled year after year new wells to find additional reserves to replace the old wells which become less productive or are abandoned. During the 10 years from 1932 to 1941, inclusive, the industry drilled 1 new well (oil, gas, or dry) to every 48,000 barrels of oil produced. Since O. P. A. froze the price of crude oil, the industry in 1942 drilled 1 new well (oil, gas, or dry) to 77,000 barrels produced, or 62 percent of the 10-year average; in 1943, 1 well to 83,000 barrels, or 58 percent of the 10-year average.

Oil is produced only from successful oil wells. The record of successful oil wells shows that during the 10-year period 1932 to 1941, the industry drilled 1 successful oil well to every 70,000 barrels of oil produced in that time. In 1942, there was drilled 1 successful oil well to every 134,000 barrels produced, and in 1943, 1 to every 155,000 barrels produced, or a replacement drilling result of only 45 percent of that which prevailed over the 10-year pre-war period.

All new oil wells are not equally productive. An important point which Mr. Bowles' advisers failed to point out is that the trend in initial productive capacity of new wells is sharply downward. In 1937 the average initial production per well in the United States was 485 barrels per day. In 1943 up to September, inclusive, the average initial production per well was 180 barrels per day, only 16 percent of the average initial capacity in 1937. It is the new wells which supply flush production. Eighty-five percent of the current production of crude petroleum comes from flush wells. The decline in the initial capacity and the number of flush wells is serious and should be of considerable concern to everyone in Government and industry.

Mr. Bowles, in arriving at his "highest on record" reserves, calculates additions to reserves by considering all wells, both wildcat and development, plus revisions in estimates made in prior years, but in stating that "the wells are being drilled at an all-time peak" he uses only wildcat wells. The record shows that the industry drilled an average of over 28,000 wells annually during the 5 years 1937 to 1941, inclusive. Under O. P. A. frigidity the industry drilled less than 18,000 wells in each of the years 1942 and 1943, about 10,000 wells less than normal, or 20,000 less wells in 2 years of highly mechanized warfare demanding ever-increasing supplies of petroleum, and, Mr. Bowles contends, "bids fair to guarantee that crude-oil supplies will be adequate to provide all foreseeable future needs."

Mr. Bowles' letters state: "The intensity with which wildcat drilling is at present proceeding bids fair to guarantee that crude-oil supplies will be adequate to provide for all foreseeable future needs. The rate at which exploratory wells are being drilled is at an all-time peak."

Records of wildcat wells do not go back many years. For the few years that statistics are available, 1943 does show the largest number. However, the use of only the number of wildcat wells drilled as a measure of the sufficiency of exploration is an improper application of statistics. No crude oil will ever be produced from the 2,872 dry wildcat wells out of 3,370 drilled in 1943 and no oil will be produced from 10,000 oil wells which were not drilled in 1942, and another 10,000 in 1943, which, without unreasonable price restrictions and with more liberal material and spacing regulations, would have been drilled. (See tables 3 and 4.)

TABLE 3.—*Wildcat wells*

Year	Total drilled	Number of dry holes	Number productive	New fields	New reserves found, average per field
					Barrels
1937 [1]	2,224	2,002	222	177	10,531,000
1938 [1]	2,638	2,344	294	215	9,835,000
1939 [1]	2,589	2,365	224	183	4,004,000
1940 [1]	3,038	2,736	302	222	5,517,000
1941 [1]	3,264	2,761	503	290	2,746,000
1942 [1]	3,225	2,719	504	308	988,000
1943	[2] 3,370	[2] 2,872	[3] 498	[3] 300	[3] 753,000

[1] 1937–42, Petroleum Administration for War.
[2] 1943, The Oil Weekly.
[3] Calculated for year based on 6-month estimate of Petroleum Administration for War.

Mr. Bowles states that: "Currently high demands and strong monetary incentives have reduced the number of net abandonments of oil wells to the lowest level in 10 years."

Table 4 shows total number of exploratory and development wells drilled, productive oil wells completed, and net additional oil wells put in operation during 1942 to be the lowest in 9 years, and it is estimated 1943 results have fallen to the lowest level in 10 years.

TABLE 4.—*Well data, exploratory and development*

Year	Total wells drilled	Classification			Total producing of wells, end of year
		Oil	Gas	Dry	
1934	18,197	12,512	1,373	4,312	333,070
1935	21,420	15,108	1,401	4,911	340,990
1936	25,166	17,800	2,070	5,296	349,450
1937	31,106	22,143	2,543	6,420	363,030
1938	27,149	19,121	1,985	6,043	369,640
1939	25,888	17,485	2,046	6,357	380,390
1940	28,094	19,125	2,352	6,617	389,010
1941	29,070	19,195	2,990	6,885	399,960
1942	17,934	10,302	2,100	5,532	404,840
1943	17,900	9,800	1,850	6,250	403,000

Source: Bureau of Mines, all years except 1943, which is estimated by Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Mr. Bowles states that the "decline in total number of wells, of all types, drilled is the result of proration orders, spacing restrictions and curtailment of material use." This is contrary to fact. Let the records of Pennsylvania and California speak in answer.

In Pennsylvania where the majority of drilling activity is in repressure fields, where no proration, no spacing restrictions, and no curtailment of materials prevail, the number of wells of all types drilled declined from 3,944 in 1941 to 2,530 in 1943, a decline of 36 percent. In this field O. P. A. cut back the price 23 cents per barrel and later restored the cut, plus an increase of 2 cents. The price of heavy crude in California was increased early in 1942. In California where limitations are in force, 651 more wells were drilled in 1943 than in 1942.

Mr. Bowles emphasizes the opinion of his advisers that a higher level of prices than presently prevails would not induce any considerable increase in supply.

Vigorous denials by O. P. A. that any rise in petroleum prices would not increase the volume of drilling or supplies, may be met with review of the facts which historically and currently prove with astounding evidence that increased prices do produce greater drilling activities followed by greater supplies with resulting leveling off and decline in prices (see table 5), while low prices bring decline in drilling activity, reduction in available supplies and resulting higher prices. In 1920, the peak national average price for crude petroleum of $3.07 per barrel resulted in drilling and reopening over 56,000 oil wells with a net increase in the number of producing oil wells of 40,163 all of which are record figures for any one year. Production in 1920 exceeded that of 1916 by 47 percent. Production in 1923 exceeded 1919 by 94 percent. The national average price declined, as production increased, from $2.01 in 1919 and $3.07 in 1920 to $1.34 in 1923.

In 1931 the low average price of 67 cents per barrel brought about abandonment and shutting in more than 22,000 oil wells with a net loss in producing wells during that year of 15,220. Production dropped compared with 1929 approximately 16 percent and by 1932 production had dropped 22 percent. The national average price rose, as production declined, from 65 cents to $1 per barrel by 1934. The tremendous oil reserves found in and productive capacity of east Texas has depressed oil prices ever since 1930. Illinois' unrestricted production further depressed prices.

Currently recent increase in the price of California crude oil has resulted in the increase of drilling activity. One thousand four hundred and seventy-seven wells were drilled in 1943 as against 826 in 1942, and this increased drilling was in spite of "proration orders, spacing restrictions, and the curtailment of material use." Production rose from an average daily production for the year 1941 of 631,000 barrels to an average daily production for the fourth quarter of 1943 of 801,000 barrels, or an increase of 27 percent. These facts do not support Mr. Bowles or his advisers in their conclusion that "a higher level of prices than presently prevails would not induce any considerable increase in supply."

Mr. Bowles' statement that strong monetary incentives have reduced the number of net abandonments of oil wells to the lowest level in 10 years, cannot be supported by the Bureau of Mines' published data, which show by calculation that net abandonments in 1942 were 5,422 while in 1933, 10 years prior, net abandonments were 2,718. No data are yet published on 1943.

Mr. Bowles fails to state that P. A. W. during 1942 and 1943 has ordered that its permission must be obtained before wells are abandoned.

The National Stripper Well Association has by survey found and published the following on abandonments:

1940	9,625
1941	11,738
1942	10,541
1943 (estimated)	12,000

What Mr. Bowles could have said, which he did not, is that the net increase (drilled plus reopened, less abandoned and shut-in wells) in the number of additional producing oil wells in the United States in 1942 (1943 estimated to be still lower) is the lowest in 11 years.

Texas and Oklahoma produced during the years 1937 to 1942, inclusive, 51 percent of the oil produced in the United States. The combined record on productive wells and abandonments for these two States, calculated on the same basis as that used in Mr Bowles' letter, is as follows:

Year	Producing wells, end of year	New productive oil wells completed	Net abandonments	Average daily production, per producing well	
				Texas	Oklahoma
				Barrels	*Barrels*
1937	137,598	12,878	1,338	19.4	11.3
1938	140,000	9,878	3,138	16.0	8.7
1939	144,600	7,728	3,128	15.1	8.0
1940	148,600	7,643	3,643	14.5	7.9
1941	154,250	8,361	2,711	14.2	7.9
1942	152,800	3,593	5,043	13.2	7.2

California, however, in 1942 under the impetus of an expected unward adjustment in its price ceilings, showed a net of reopened wells previously shut in of 1,293 in excess of shut-in and abandoned wells. In that year California produced about 18 percent of the Nation's production. Pennsylvania, temporarily encouraged by the restoration in 1942 of a 23-cent price cut in crude, ordered by O. P. A. in 1941, plus a 2 cents per barrel increase, had 1,800 more wells producing at the end of 1942 than at the beginning of that year; however, this State produces less than 2 percent of the Nation's production.

Related statistics over a period of years show the following with regard to monetary incentives (the price of crude oil) and its results on net abandonments:

TABLE 5.—*Relation of net additional oil wells put in operation to price of crude oil*

Year	Total number of wells drilled	Net number of productive oil wells put in operation	Net number of oil wells abandoned and shut in, less reopened	Average price of crude oil per barrel
1920	34,019	40,163	−15,885	$3.07
1931	12,432	−15,220	22,008	.65
1932	15,040	5,650	4,794	.87
1933	12,312	5,350	2,718	.67
1937	31,106	13,580	8,563	1.18
1938	27,149	6,610	12,511	1.13
1939	25,888	10,750	6,735	1.02
1940	28,094	8,620	10,505	1.02
1941	29,070	10,950	8,245	1.14
1942	17,934	4,880	5,422	1.19
1943	17,900	−1,840	11,640	1.19

Calculations all years based on Bureau of Mines statistics except 1943 which is estimated based on 11 months of published Bureau of Mines statistics.

The fabulously high prices which Mr. Bowles states are currently "being paid for both producing wells and areas" are grossly exaggerated. The sales which he has in mind are principally those in east Texas. In all but north central Texas well completions in 1943 are less than in 1942. In the east Texas field drilling dropped from 397 wells to 255 wells. These purchases have not provoked drilling campaigns; in fact they were made to avoid the necessity of searching for new fields. They were to acquire and to secure an immediate supply of oil to meet war contracts.

On the matter of crude price, Mr. Bowles is careful to confine his comparisons within the 10-year period following discovery of the east Texas field and the prolific production years in Illinois. He avoids any reference to the period prior to the discovery of east Texas. The 10-year national average price 1916–25 was $1.75. (See table 8 attached hereto.) The 10-year national average price 1921–30 was $1.46. In 1926 (the accepted base used by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics) the average price was $1.88, but the east Texas discovery drove the price down to $0.65 per barrel. Subsequent unrestricted production in Illinois has been a substantial contributing factor in depressing the price of crude petroleum. In the last war, to get oil, the average price rose as follows:

1916	$1.10
1917	1.56
1918	1.98

"At the time the defense program was launched, the petroleum industry was depressed. Production of crude oil in Illinois had been unrestricted and the excess supply has resulted in a weakened price structure throughout the mid-continent area." That quotation is from the official publication of the Office of Price Administration, of which office Mr. Bowles is now Administrator. The publication is the First Quarterly Report for the period ended April 30, 1942 and the quotation appears on page 150 therein. Therefore, the statement which Mr. Bowles brands as "far from accurate" is in substance the same as appears in the official records of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. Bowles states in connection with his inflation scare that "1 cent per gallon of gasoline to the final consumer would increase the total annual consumer's bill * * * would represent an increased war cost or subsidy which, in light of the data presented * * * could not possibly be accompanied by an increased output of oil."

It has been previously shown that increased prices brought increased drilling activity and ultimate increased supply, followed by reduced prices, which is fundamental economics in any industry. Mr. Bowles labels the proposed increase "an increased war cost or subsidy," and opposes it. However, in his letter to Congressman ANGELL, he does favor "special inducements * * * to get more wells drilled."

It is difficult to understand how "the disastrous consequences of the increase of a cent a gallon on gasoline can be imagined" when it is admitted by Mr. Bowles that the cost to the public would be about $250,000,000, when that public has already been denied by its Government the right to acquire a supply of gasoline for which the public would normally and promptly pay one and one-half billion dollars. To attach such dire threats of disaster to the accusation that its effect would be to award oil companies added profits, unearned by contributions to the Nation's supply of goods, is a serious misapplication of facts.

The hold the line order has been repeatedly broken through various adjustments to prices of items entering into the cost of living and upward revisions of wages for labor. Ceilings have been removed on aviation gasoline, a product of crude petroleum, but the price of the crude petroleum from which this gasoline is made remains frozen. Other essential war products made from petroleum carry no ceilings, but the crude from which they are made is subject to a ceiling. There is no relation to the cost of living as defined for price control, where these war products are concerned.

As the following table shows, petroleum components have relatively little weight in the total cost-of-living index:

Percent of total cost-of-living index:

Fuel oil	0.2
Kerosene	.1
Gasoline	.9
Motor oil	.1
Total petroleum	1.3

"An increase of 85 cents per gallon in the price of petroleum products (approximately 35 cents per barrel) would increase the petroleum part of the index by 4.43 percent. The total index would be increased by fifty-eight one-thousandths of 1 percent, a rise which could not even be shown by the index at its present level. The total index now (June 1943) stands at 124.8. The increase estimated above to be the result of a higher oil price would raise it to 124.846; the published index would not be changed at all; * * * the line would be held." (Above from Petroleum Industry War Council's Committee on Cost and Price Adjustment.)

In Mr. Bowles' letter to Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL he states "that to get more wells drilled special inducements should be offered" and "The Office of Price Administration favors offers of special inducements to keep 'stripper' wells in operation" and that that office "will not object to any reasonable financial inducement per barrel being paid on the output of new wells or 'stripper wells' if recommended by the Petroleum Administration. All it objects to is extending these inducements to the output of all other wells which already have been drilled and which need no inducement whatever to reach maximum production."

This in the simple language means subsidy. O. P. A. has made these subsidy statements many times over a period of more than 2 years, yet it has presented no plan and does not indicate from what appropriated Federal funds such a subsidy would be paid. If this is a sincere and honest proposal to aid the industry in making available an adequate supply of petroleum for war, industrial, and civilian requirements a plan should have been presented or put into operation over 2 years ago. No explanation for the delay is offered. However, such a proposal requires an inventory of over 400,000 individual producing oil wells in this country and the creation of an immense bureau to administer such subsidies.

The data supplied in the letter of Mr. Bowles to Mr. ANGELL on the earnings of 21 big producing and refining companies and 26 producing companies, are based on the published annual reports to stockholders by these companies. These companies were carefully selected by the Office of Price Administration to prove "all is well" with the petroleum producers. However, the official published data of the United States Treasury Department tell an entirely different story. The published records of the United States Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, show the following with respect to the earnings of corporations (about 5,000 of them) engaged in "crude petroleum and natural gas production":

1941:

2,134 Returns—net income	$177,375,000
2,548 Returns—deficit	36,350,000
4,682 Returns—net income	81,025,000
Total income and excess profits taxes	32,870,000
Net income after income taxes	48,155,000

1940:	
1,992 Returns—net income	$71,140,000
3,022 Returns—deficit	61,169,000
5,014 Returns—net income	9,971,000
Total income and excess profits taxes	14,724,000
Total income and excess profits taxes paid by 5,014 corporations in excess of the net income before taxes of these corporations	(4,753,000)
1939:	
1,892 Returns—net income	69,695,000
3,382 Returns—deficit	57,561,000
5,274 Returns—net income	12,134,000
Total income and excess profits taxes	10,925,000
Net income after income taxes	1,209,000

Large oil companies earned only 6.9 percent on their investment in the first half of 1943, compared with 8.9 percent for manufacturers in general. The amount of large oil company profits are not of a magnitude that would justify a denial of a general price increase of 35 cents per barrel on crude petroleum. In fact, the large companies purchase only about one-half the oil they process, to the extent of the amount of oil they, themselves, produce only a bookkeeping entry would result from an increase in the price of crude oil.

What appears to be increased earnings of crude petroleum producing companies are cited as an indication that the great bulk of the industry does not need an increase in the price of its product.

Net earnings after income taxes for the year 1943 or 1942, when compared with net earnings of 1941 or prior years, are misleading for the reason that intangible expenditures for drilling oil wells in 1942 and 1943 which are proper income-tax deductions are substantially lower than comparable expenditures in 1941 or prior years.

To claim that the oil business is making greater earnings in these abnormal war years in comparison with pre-war normal years, is erroneous, because the industry through wartime restrictions of money, manpower, and material has been unable to drill the usual number of oil wells with which to carry on its business and, therefore, to the extent that it has not been able to drill the necessary number of wells, it has shown added bookkeeping profits for income taxes, but in reality is liquidating its business through failure to replace its stock in trade.

In the 5 years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, oil producers in this country drilled an average of 28,000 wells, while in 1942 and 1943 they averaged 18,000 each year, 10,000 wells each year were not drilled. The total intangible drilling cost of 10,000 wells at an average of $12,000 cash would be $120,000,000, which is not included in each of the years 1942 and 1943 expenses of oil producers.

The $120,000,000 that the industry could not spend in 1942 and 1943 constitutes a substantial part of the reported earnings for those years upon which the industry will be compelled to pay income and excess-profits taxes. These funds being expended in taxes further reduces the ability of the industry to carry out the needed replacement drilling that eventually must be done at increasingly higher costs.

Should a few oil companies have the good fortune to make some additional profits out of an increase in the price ceilings of crude oil and lack the foresight to plow back those profits into their business through additional exploratory and development activities, they will pay the penalty of substantial income and excess-profits taxes. A large part of the money, however, would be used as outlined by the petroleum industry war council cost and price-adjustment committee, as follows:

Possible distribution of the increased income as a result of the 35-cent price increase

Estimated total	$500,000,000
1. Increased geological expense	14,700,000
2. Lease expenses and bonus	23,000,000
3. Exploratory dry holes	45,500,000
4. Development dry holes	10,000,000
5. Higher production operating expenses	51,300,000
6. Higher fixed charges, new development	3,300,000
7. Higher fixed charges, existing development	110,800,000
8. Secondary recovery	35,000,000
9. Stripper rehabilitation	75,000,000
Total	368,600,000
Additional State and severance tax	11,900,000
Additional social-security tax	4,300,000
Royalty payments	65,000,000
Additional Federal income tax	23,800,000
Total	105,000,000
Windfall profits	26,400,000
Grand total	500,000,000

That a shortage of petroleum exists is evidenced by the fact that O. P. A. itself is required to impose rationing of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products for industrial and civilian use. Further evidence exists in the record of withdrawals from petroleum stocks which have been reduced on an average of more than 117,000 barrels for each and every day this Nation has been engaged in this war.

	Barrels
All petroleum stocks, Nov. 30, 1941	567,464,000
All petroleum stocks, Dec. 31, 1943	478,100,000
Reduction in stocks	89,364,000
Average daily withdrawals (761 days)	117,000

Gasoline, kerosene, and fuel-oil stocks are at their lowest levels—lower than last winter when cold weather found many in the Eastern States without adequate supplies to keep their homes warm and many were compelled to convert their heating plants to the use of coal.

TABLE 6.—*Stocks of crude petroleum and products*

[Thousands of barrels]

End of year	Total, all oils	Crude petroleum, including heavy, in California	Natural gasoline	Refined products
1940	564,584	276,615	5,704	282,265
1941	552,328	257,678	4,275	290,375
1942	497,940	245,764	4,632	247,554
1943	478,100	249,200	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

TABLE 7.—*Stocks of principal petroleum products as of Nov. 30—Years 1941–43*

[Dec. 31, 1943, data not yet available]

[Thousands of barrels]

	1941	1942	1943
Gasoline (finished)	87,000	64,224	59,854
Kerosene	10,843	12,630	10,487
Distillate fuel oil	55,673	50,709	44,806
Residual fuel oil	83,730	66,664	53,046
Lubricating oil	7,752	9,336	7,770
Other refined products	47,407	49,150	55,463
Total refined products	291,805	252,713	231,426

The Petroleum Industry War Council recently reported on the oil demand that "No material reduction in over-all requirements for the year should be expected," and that a balancing of United States and United Nations requirements "reveals that on the average approximately 79,000 barrels daily net additional products, mostly gasoline, remain to be covered by United Nations oil-producing and refining countries before present estimates of their 1944 military needs can be satisfied."

Since 79,000 barrels daily is an average for the year 1944, the requirements by the end of 1944 will greatly exceed 79,000 barrels daily, and when it is understood that the above estimate of military needs which cannot be supplied is mostly gasoline and that currently the over-all yield of gasoline per barrel of crude oil is less than 40 percent, the yearly average shortage of crude oil to meet United Nations requirements will be not less than 200,000 barrels daily, mounting to over 400,000 barrels daily by the end of 1944.

It is an undeniable economic fact that an additional price for crude oil will bring increased exploratory and development activity and that, in turn, will result in the production of additional petroleum products to meet war, industrial, and essential civilian requirements, and if any company makes excessive profits from such a price rise, let the Government formulate a plan by which to recover from those few companies any excessive profits rather than spend years trying to figure out how to make a subsidy work for 20,000 oil producers operating 400,000 oil wells.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

JANUARY 22, 1944.

TABLE 8.—*Average price paid per barrel of crude petroleum at the well in the United States by specified States or areas, 1 in each Petroleum Administration for War district and average for United States*

Year	Pennsylvania (district 1)	Oklahoma (district 2)	Texas (Gulf coast)(district 3)	Colorado (district 4)	California (district 5)	Total United States
1916	$2.52	$1.20	$0.76	$1.10	$0.59	$1.10
1917	3.25	1.73	1.07	1.06	.92	1.56
1918	4.00	2.23	1.70	1.32	1.22	1.98
1919	4.15	2.12	1.20	1.51	1.41	2.01
1920	5.97	3.35	2.74	1.79	1.72	3.07
1921	3.33	1.60	1.19	1.22	1.81	1.73
1922	3.21	1.73	1.19	1.18	1.25	1.61
1923	3.33	1.74	1.39	1.19	.92	1.34
1924	3.61	1.57	1.56	1.10	1.20	1.43
1925	3.62	1.97	1.62	1.48	1.42	1.68
Average, 10 years	3.70	1.92	1.44	1.30	1.25	1.75
1921	3.33	1.60	1.19	1.22	1.81	1.73
1922	3.21	1.73	1.19	1.18	1.25	1.61
1923	3.33	1.74	1.39	1.19	.92	1.34
1924	3.61	1.57	1.56	1.10	1.20	1.43
1925	3.62	1.97	1.62	1.48	1.42	1.68
1926	3.56	2.31	1.50	1.84	1.54	1.88
1927	3.06	1.43	1.30	1.20	1.13	1.30
1928	3.27	1.39	1.19	.99	.99	1.17
1929	3.79	1.43	1.21	1.01	1.10	1.27
1930	2.61	1.29	1.04	.89	1.20	1.19
Average, 10 years	3.34	1.65	1.32	1.21	1.26	1.46
1926	3.56	2.31	1.50	1.84	1.54	1.88
1931	1.98	.66	.66	.53	.72	.65
1932	1.89	.90	.81	.77	.81	.87
1933	1.87	.66	.66	.59	.93	.67
1934	2.43	1.02	1.01	.93	.92	1.00
1935	2.14	1.02	1.00	.91	.82	.97
1936	2.43	1.12	1.13	1.01	1.01	1.09
1937	2.57	1.24	1.22	1.12	1.02	1.18
1938	1.88	1.20	1.19	1.09	1.03	1.13
1939	2.08	1.04	1.08	.95	1.02	1.02
1940	2.29	1.04	1.10	.91	.97	1.02
1941	2.54	1.13	1.24	1.07	1.04	1.14
1942	2.94	1.19	1.30	1.11	1.03	1.19
1942 (estimated)	2.95	1.19	1.30	1.11	1.05	1.19

Taxing Individual Initiative Out of Existence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bergen Evening Record of Tuesday, January 25, 1944, and written by John Borg, the publisher:

TAXING INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE OUT OF EXISTENCE

Taxation experts figure the 1944 tax measure now before the Congress will place a ceiling approximating $23,000 on all individual net incomes among the 135,000,000 people whose personal initiative and inventiveness developed the greatest industrial nation in the world. In war matériel it outproduces its combined enemies, and it has the potentialities for outproducing the world.

That achievement by a comparative baby in the family of nations did not result from happenstance. The greatest public educational system in the world laid the foundation of intellectual development primarily to provide the widespread literacy requisite to proper functioning of government of, by, and for the people here. In logical sequence was developed the greatest and most widely attended higher educational system among peoples anywhere. It is graduating more engineers and future technical experts than any other nation. That and the pioneering instinct of a young people willing to take financial risks, impelled by profit motives, created the national industrial colossus which is feared by its foreign enemies and envied by its foreign friends.

But 12 years ago a new political philosophy gained ascendancy. The people were ripe for the change. Under the New Deal, textbook economists operating largely through a Constitution-circumventing system of government by directives instead of by statutory law steadily and inexorably ground our artfully named economic royalty between the upper millstone of capital-consuming taxation and the nether millstone of Government restrictions against individual initiative and enterprise.

The textbook theorists have about completed their job. It could not have been more destructive if Hitler and Hirohito had planned it for them, to destroy the future industrial progress and might of the only nation they really fear now or in a figurative tomorrow. Taxing the rich out of existence (and apparently any citizen who had or still has more than $100,000 is an unsocial, plutocratic crook in current taxation theory) was partisan fun while it lasted; but the political game is now about over, and a tragic economic fact confronts the Nation.

This country's great industries and its vast natural resources were developed by the risk-taking savings of people who from generation to generation have comprised the Nation. Governments neither earn nor save money; they merely spend it. Whatever they spend must sooner or later be extracted by taxation from the pockets of all the taxpayers who live under them. For 11 years the New Deal has been operating with carefree abandon on other people's money. A careless civic majority which received the New Deal's largess deluded itself into believing it was manna dropped from heaven. Now many of them are beginning to realize that they too must somehow someday pay for it. They haven't really felt the taxation pinch yet, but they are coming to know that governmental expenditures cannot be pyramided forever. The law of diminishing returns applies to government taxation as well as in business economics. The foundation of that pyramid no longer rests on the individual initiative and risk-taking enterprise of the citizens. It is now based on governmental power to collect initiative-killing taxes from sources that the high-tax system has slowly but surely strangled.

When Harry Hopkins, President Roosevelt's man Friday, asserted years ago that the New Deal would spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect, he was voicing a prophecy which has since been fulfilled. Handing out public funds to vote-casting majorities is unbeatable politics until they are confronted with the economic aftermath of the greatest and the longest governmental spending spree in human history. Then they too will have painfully recalled to them the historic truism that the power to spend is the power to tax and that the power to tax is the power to destroy a people.

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

Unstable Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure a survey of the world's financial condition will disclose that the value and integrity of money the world over has never been so unstable as it is at this moment—a condition that the war has intensified, but for which the war is not entirely responsible.

The removal of the stable foundation of the precious metals—gold and silver—as money of ultimate redemption from their monetary system by the several governments, including ours, is mainly responsible for the present unstable monetary systems of these governments.

I have embodied my views on this paramount issue in a recent letter which I submit for publication in the RECORD:

JANUARY 26, 1943.

Mr. A. B. RYSTAD,
Brooten, Minn.

DEAR MR. RYSTAD: Your letter of January 20, 1944, opens a big subject and deals with a topic that I have come to find constitutes a blind spot in our educational system—the money subject.

To put this matter to a test, I suggest that you line up the graduates of your local high school and ask them to tell you the three functions of money. I am sure the results would be disappointing. And, as for knowing anything about the fundamental principles of money, that subject is a closed book to the average citizen. The ordinary businessman throughout the country fails to differentiate and distinguish between the elements cash and credit, and by accepting and using a monetary system composed of credit tokens as a money substitute for gold and silver coins, the money of ultimate redemption, our country's business situation is made subject to depressions—when banks lose confidence and fail to supply the money function, as, no doubt, you have learned from experience.

Without entering into a controversy as to the best system of money that may be provided, I will give you my plan to establish a stable national economy and restore permanent business prosperity in this country:

1. Give the American people a sound, workable, adequate money system that will provide the necessary cash with which to transact the Nation's business.

2. And with this system, devise, strengthen, and enforce the laws to protect free enterprise and competitive effort in business that will operate to bring the law of supply and demand into play by eliminating unfair trade practices and unfair competition that production and prices may be automatically adjusted to the Nation's economic needs.

Two simple little things, that could have been done the first week I came down here to take up my duties in Congress in March 1933. Policies that would have placed our country on the high road to business recovery and saved the American people untold loss in tax payments, and the support of unnecessary Government personnel employed to administer Federal relief.

Trusting that I have made my views clear to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

National Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brief on national old-age pensions, which has just been published by Mr. William H. McMasters, chairman of the National Pension Committee. It brings this question right up to the present moment and outlines once more the basic theory of a transaction tax. With the growing demand for more revenue and the apparent exhaustion of sound ways and means of obtaining additional funds, it would seem as though careful consideration should be given to the argument for a universal transaction tax. While I am not personally committed to a tax of that nature, due only to the fact that I have not been able to give it as much consideration as our needs deserve, I am not against the idea. I am open-minded on it, just as I am on all controversial matters. If the idea is sound, as outlined by Mr. McMasters, who has given the whole subject years of intensive study, it might be the final answer to our entire tax problem.

The question of an adequate national pension to be awarded to all American citizens has been before the public, the Congress, and the legislatures of all the States for many years. It is still unsettled. It is still being discussed. This brief is written to set out, once more, my own views on this question. These views have not changed during the years. Rather, they have been strengthened and confirmed as I have come into contact with many public officials who are afraid to say openly that they are opposed to the idea of a national pension, but who have covertly attacked and delayed its adoption. They have done this by introducing objec-

tions to minor points and by questioning the advisability of some small feature or other. This underhanded conduct savors of hypocrisy, but it has been most effectual. These saboteurs of a national pension in any form may have fooled the general public, but they have never fooled me or many others who are familiar with this brand of political trickery.

Either a national pension is right in principle or it is wrong. If it is right, we ought not to waste time in discussing whether or not the age should be 60 years for pensioners. We ought not to be talking for years at a time over the amount to be allotted to each pensioner as though the monthly amount had something to do with the pension principle itself. We could well forget the question of the tax method that would finance the pension proposition. This question of taxation is one that always brings on acrimonious debate. If our Government cannot handle its own tax problems today, without endless debate, when the fate of the Republic is at stake in the present war, surely there is nobody who could satisfy all the Members of the Congress as to a method of taxation that will finance a matter which many of the Members are secretly opposed to. Opponents to any legislative proposal dearly love to see tax ideas introduced for the very practical reason that tax ideas are always debatable. The opponents look very seriously down their noses as though mentally troubled over the sad fate of the old folks of the Nation and then they shake their heads and say to one of their colleagues: "Too bad that the pension advocates cannot get together on a sound and workable tax plan to handle this worthy pension cause in which all of us are so deeply interested. It grieves me. I'm fearfully disturbed over it. I would gladly vote for a suitable pension for our aged citizens if we could only devise some tax plan that wouldn't cost anybody anything. Too bad. Too bad."

My idea of a national pension is this: It should come each month, directly from the United States Treasury. The present old-age assistance laws should be repealed when the new pension becomes effective. These laws are doing more harm to the morale of the American people than any other influence that I know. The pension should become available to every American citizen, on application, at the age of 60 years. It should be enough on which to live, even if the applicant has no other means of support. There should be no investigation of any kind into the financial circumstances of those who apply for this pension. The only restriction I suggest is that the recipient should not receive any other public pension or be a public employee of any kind. As to other kinds of employment, I have never believed that a pensioner should be compelled to retire from active work in order to receive his or her pension. Any provision of that nature is sure to involve trouble. The average man or woman at 60 who feels like doing productive work in the community ought not to be discouraged from working. The prevailing idea of employment is just one of the many strange fallacies that have grown up during recent years. In my opinion, we can never have too many persons employed. But we can have too many folks idle. Workers produce wealth. The more workers, the more wealth. We surely need more wealth in the country. The more wealth that we produce, the more there will be for all.

While that covers the problems so far as I am concerned, there is still the tax question. As to the best method, I feel that our entire tax system is bad in principle.

It is accepted only because there has been no better method tried out. After faithfully working for years for the passage of various Townsend bills, I wrote a simplified bill which is now before the Congress. It carries the number H. R. 1281, and is titled, "National Pension Act." In this bill, I advocate the use of a transaction tax as a proper method to raise funds to carry out the provisions of the act.

My idea of a transaction tax is that it will be assessed equally against every transaction, big or little, that goes to make up the vast economy of the Nation. Every business or professional or salaried transaction, will have just so much deducted in taxes, at the end of each month. This money will be collected by the Internal Revenue Collector. At the present enormous rate of business transactions in the country, the levy of 2 percent would produce about $2,500,000,000 per month. As every transaction will be assessed the same amount, there will be no actual changes in the relative values involved. The retail business will not suffer at the expense of the wholesale; the big man will not be asked to pay more or less than the small man. So far as the economy of the entire Nation might be altered, it would not be changed any more than though the whole business were to lose exactly 2 percent in volume in every part of it. Nobody would know the difference. Any economist who says this system of taxation would be a drain on the economy of the country is merely talking to hear himself talk.

Thirty billions of dollars ($30,000,000,000) per year can thus be taken out of the turnover of our national business today and used to finance our national requirements. If pensioners get a part of it, then it will be serving a most desirable end. Whether pensioners get so much as $1 of it, the principle of a transaction tax is fundamentally sound because it neither favors nor works against any type of business or person, corporation, or industry. Every tax system ever designed up to the present moment has been faulty in one respect. It took revenue from certain sources but failed to take revenue from all available sources. Thus the economic values were changed by the tax system. Relative values were not maintained. A universal transaction tax does not produce this unbalanced result.

Copies of H. R. 1281, National Pension Act, may be had by writing to any Congressman whose name is familiar to you. Any United States Senator will be glad to send you a copy on request. It attracts attention to a bill when Congressmen receive requests for copies of it.

This bill asks for not less than $60 per month for every American citizen on reaching the age of 60 years. There is nothing in the bill about retiring from employment, nothing about the financial status of those who ask for the pension, nothing is said as to whether they have relatives who can support them. There is nothing in the bill about spending the pension during the following month or putting it into the saving bank. If anybody over 60 years of age wishes to live on less than $60 per month, he is not much of a charge on his community, so why worry over him? We have far too many regulations of the habits, lives, and even the thoughts of our American citizens today. I am suggesting that we stop all this regulating and let the men and women who have helped to bring America up to its present state, be allowed to conduct their own lives in their own way. These intelligent, elderly people do not need any regulations. All they need is what everybody else seems to need, enough money to take care of their wants, without privation and stinting.

I could write an entire book on this subject but it would not make my position any clearer. I suggest, once more, that you write to your United States Senator or Congressman and ask to have a few copies of H. R. 1281 mailed to you. There is no charge for these copies and you can send your request on a postal card if you feel like it. This is your country, my friends; the men in the Congress are your servants; you pay their salaries; and the pension bill that I filed is your bill. It's about time to have it enacted into law.

Farmers Choose Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the free farmers of Minnesota adopted the following resolution, which I believe expresses the viewpoint of a large majority of American farmers on the issues of food production, subsidies, and political control, and I am therefore inserting the resolution in the RECORD:

We, the free farmers of Minnesota, believe that price roll-back food subsidies are almost identical to A. A. A. payments to farmers and that the purpose of both is to keep the farmers and food under the political control of a political machine, manned by the same prosperity-through-scarcity men, whose aim and purpose has been and is to socialize farming and control all food.

We know that subsidies are inflationary and that they will increase rather than decrease the cost of food to the consumer.

Therefore, we warn that consumers will be faced this year with huge cuts in livestock and poultry, vegetables and fruits, due to the confusion caused by the New Deal socializers' stupid fumbling (which has already needlessly cost the farmer most of his skilled labor and badly needed machinery, caused the wasting of tons of food through spoilage, ruined the orderly marketing of meat, confused the livestock marketing agencies, caused serious reduction of milk production, and needless gasoline shortages), unless Congress, backed by intelligent consumer understanding, finds some way to bring about a sensible direction of food production (by national or State agencies from which all A. A. A. and subsidy men have been removed), with which farmers can work on a completely voluntary basis, assured of at least cost of production for their products (including cost of labor).

We wish to commend our local and county newspapers for the space they give to farmers' problems, which has at last brought the farmers' predicament to the attention of metropolitan magazines, distinguished radio commentators, authors, and businessmen, stimulating them to devote much space and time to a furtherance of public understanding of the most important and the basic industry of the Nation, agriculture, thereby helping farmers to solve their own problems.

PAUL WARBURTON,
President.

We Salute Captain Floro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that the United States Army Air Forces are superb. We all agree that our gallant young men in the Air Forces together with their young R. A. F. comrades have been doing an unbelievable job of destruction of German industry and military objectives.

One of the persons responsible for the selection of these gallant young aviation cadets has been Capt. Lawrence A. Floro, president of the aviation cadet examining board, Old Post Office, Pittsburgh, Pa. Captain Floro is a veteran of World War No. 1 and as a reserve officer was recalled to active duty over 3 years ago. He was appointed head of the aviation-cadet board and since its inception, and through his system of education, he has made western Pennsylvania Air Forces conscious. His record of recruiting aviation cadets stands first in the Nation, a tribute to Captain Floro. Many of his recruits have been performing heroically in battle everywhere and are receiving honor decorations from their Government. Captain Floro is performing a great service to his country. We salute Captain Floro. I am happy to include as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on January 18, 1944, praising Captain Floro:

RECRUITER WINS PRAISE

Capt. Lawrence A. Floro, president of the aviation-cadet examining board here, has been commended by Lt. Col. Floyd W. Ferree of the Personnel Division of the Army for the fine record made by the recruiting office during the past 15 months.

The Pittsburgh board has been the most productive in the Third Service Command, largely through Captain Floro's efforts, the commendation stated.

Captain Floro expressed his own appreciation to the officers and enlisted personnel of the aviation-cadet boards here and at Greensburg and Erie, and to all members of the Sixth Civil Air Patrol Group.

Preferred Employment of Wounded Veterans Assured by the Kaiser Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of December 1943, while having lunch at the Touchdown Club in Washington, D. C., with Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, and Thomas J. Kehoe, his assistant national service director, as well as with Mrs. Shirley Caples, of Indian Springs, Nev., and Col. John N. Smith, director of the Institute for Crippled and Disabled, New York City—these enthusiasts in the cause of America's disabled defenders briefly outlined their plans for trying to persuade American industry to extend preference of opportunity for suitable employment to the returning wounded and disabled veterans of this war.

Pursuant to such plans, Mr. Kehoe made a trip out to the west coast—and I was glad to be of assistance to him in helping to arrange for his transportation—and while there contacted and aroused the interest of the managers of the Kaiser Shipbuilding Yards at Richmond, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Vancouver, Wash.; and Los Angeles, Calif., as well as officials of the War Manpower Commission, Veterans Employment Service, and others, to the end of having proper arrangements set up for the registration, interviewing, and selective placement of returning handicapped veterans into jobs for which they can become qualified.

As a follow-up to my previous contact with these representatives of the D. A. V.—a congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of America's wounded and disabled—I was happy to note the significant contents of a newspaper release yesterday, concerning this forward-looking policy by the Kaiser company, as follows:

First promise of any major employer in the United States to pledge job priority to wounded servicemen, under plans advocated by the Disabled American Veterans, came today from Henry J. Kaiser.

The great industrialist has promised that special facilities for absorbing almost any type of handicapped veteran into his employ will be permanently set up in at least four of his shipyards.

The four shipyards are at Vancouver, Wash., Portland, Oreg., Richmond, Calif., and Los Angeles, Calif.

The plan, as agreed upon by Kaiser, provides that not only will trained men be assigned to their particular trades, or professions, but that untrained men will be given "in-plant" training. Plans to put physically handicapped men back into a normal life without too long a period for readjustment include the policy of having men with visible disabilities—such as the loss of an arm or leg—to do the hiring.

The Kaiser action came as a result of the D. A. V.'s initial attempt to sound out sentiment in large industry on the role wounded men will play in the future. The D. A. V. hoped, according to Millard W. Rice, the organization's national service director, to have one of the Kaiser plants used as a "guinea pig." Kaiser took to the idea with such enthusiasm, however, as a result of conferences between representatives of his various companies, the War Manpower Commission, and the D. A. V., represented by Thomas J. Kehoe, assistant national service director of the D. A. V., that at least four of his six plants are already preparing to give as many jobs as possible to disabled dischargees.

The War Manpower Commission—which has taken the over-all task of returning millions of soldiers, sailors, coast guardsmen, and marines to civilian life—was represented by W. K. Hopkins, regional director on the west coast.

Heartened by the immediate and enthusiastic response of the Kaiser organization, the D. A. V. is preparing to spread its doctrine of work for the wounded throughout the country by intensifying the aid of the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service, and its Veterans' Employment Service, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States Maritime Commission, the American Red Cross, labor unions, the veteran organizations, and others.

The D. A. V., Rice said, has found in its research that "(1) partially disabled veterans who are placed into suitable employment can and do prove to be just as productive or serviceable as able-bodied persons; (2) generally speaking, they are inclined to be more careful, cautious, reliable, dependable, loyal, and disciplined, and less likely to lose time through illness or injury, than is true as to able-bodied employees; and (3) it is, therefore, a wise policy for employers to extend the opportunity for suitable employment to partially disabled veterans. Wide application of such a policy would be of tremendous direct benefit to the disabled veterans concerned, and to their dependents, as well as to their communities and to our country."

Rice added that a majority of injured men capable of working will require jobs before the actual end of the war. The need for absorbing them into the country's economy will be gradual, he said, with no tremendous influx after the war, as will be the case with able-bodied men. "Now is the time," he said, "to hire the handicapped." Work for the wounded is a current problem, and must be faced by every American business.

Kaiser has already recommended that a survey should be made immediately among all servicemen to discover what they think is needed in post-war employment. This would be one way, he declared recently, of helping to formulate a pattern for the successful rehabilitation of all discharged servicemen.

Michigan's Upper Peninsula Needs a Veterans' Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1943, I introduced H. R. 1259 which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill was identical with a similar bill introduced by me on January 21, 1941, known as H. R. 2488, and identical with one introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress on February 2, 1939, known as H. R. 3644. The purpose of this legislation was to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration facility in or near the city of Gladstone, Mich.; which is ideally and centrally located, both from a geographical as well as from a matter of density of population point of view.

This matter has been under consideration before the committee for many years and has been steadfastly supported not only by my predecessors representing my Eleventh District but also by my colleague from the Twelfth District, Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT, and his predecessor, as well as Senator VANDENBERG and his colleague, Senator FERGUSON, and former colleague, Senator Brown.

Likewise, this matter has long been under consideration by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Heretofore, it has been the opinion of General Hines and his colleagues that there was not a sufficient case load in the Upper Peninsula to justify the construction of such a facility. That condition has been considerably changed since Pearl Harbor. In the post-war world it is going to be not only inadvisable but totally unfair and unjust to expect disabled veterans to travel over 150 miles from their homes to obtain the benefits from the nearest available veterans' facility. At the present time veterans from the Upper Peninsula have to travel 300 miles or more to the nearest veterans' facility either at Milwaukee, Wis., Camp

Custer in Battle Creek, Mich., or at Dearborn, Mich. In the wintertime on frequent occasions the Straits of Mackinac are completely disrupted for many hours at a time because of severe ice conditions at which times, of course, it is impossible for them to reach the Lower Peninsula facility and there have been several occasions when critically disabled veterans en route to a facility by special ambulance have been very seriously delayed by an attempted crossing of the Straits at the wrong time.

It is indeed gratifying to know that the Veterans' Administration is sympathetic to the needs of the Upper Peninsula in the matter of establishing a facility in the Upper Peninsula at the earliest possible time and which matter is now under consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several resolutions and communications pertaining to this subject:

DELTA COUNTY SOCIAL WELFARE BOARD,
Escanaba, Mich., December 27, 1943.

The Honorable FRED BRADLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On December 10, 1943, the Delta County Social Welfare Board adopted a resolution pertinent to the establishment of a veterans' hospital in Delta County to care for disabled veterans of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The resolution has been forwarded to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Administration, and a copy is enclosed for your information. The same is self-explanatory.

We, as a welfare organization, are convinced of the vital necessity of veterans' hospital facilities being made available here. Therefore, we respectfully request your valuable assistance in urging the Veterans' Administration to immediate action with regard thereto.

Yours very truly,
DELTA COUNTY SOCIAL WELFARE BOARD,
A. M. GILBERT, *Director.*

ESCANABA, MICH., *December 23, 1943.*

Mr. FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
The Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINES: The attached resolution and supplement were adopted at a special meeting of the Delta County Welfare Board on December 10, 1943, and are self-explanatory.

Our association with all welfare activities has brought us in close contact with returning veterans and helped us to realize the potential hospital requirements for the Upper Peninsula, following this war.

Pursuant thereto we respectfully urge your immediate and favorable consideration of the subject matter, with a view to establishment of a veterans' hospital in Delta County.

We shall appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,
DELTA COUNTY SOCIAL WELFARE BOARD,
A. M. GILBERT, *Director.*

DELTA COUNTY SOCIAL WELFARE BOARD,
Escanaba, Mich., December 23, 1943.

I hereby certify that the attached is an exact copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Delta County Social Welfare Board at a special meeting held in Escanaba, Mich., on December 10, 1943.

A. M. GILBERT, *Director.*

Whereas public, civic, and private organizations are now engaged in planning post-war work projects for employment of returning able-bodied veterans of World War No. 2; and

Whereas it is inevitable that a number of returning soldiers will not be physically fit but disabled and in need of constant medical and hospital care, and should be given consideration equal to that provided for other discharged veterans; and

Whereas this commission is cognizant of the fact that these facilities are not now conveniently available in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, the nearest veterans' hospital being at Milwaukee, some 300 miles distant; and

Whereas the population of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, according to the 1940 census is 323,544, and best available figures indicate that approximately 9 percent of the 1940 census population has been inducted into the service to date, which means approximately 30,000 from the 15 Upper Peninsula counties, not considering volunteer enlistments; and

Whereas approximately 10,000 veterans of World War No. 1 are still resident in the Upper Peninsula making a total to date of 40,000 inductees and veterans, of both wars, many of whom will be permanent hospital cases, and all of whom will be eligible for medical and hospital services; and

Whereas a few years ago the Veterans' Administration made a survey of Delta County relative to the establishment of a veterans' hospital here, which information is now on file and no doubt shows the central location and excellent transportation facilities available: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in view of the above, the Delta County Social Welfare Board of Escanaba, Mich., respectfully petitions the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., to give careful consideration to the establishment of a veterans' hospital and rehabilitation center in Delta County to care for veterans of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and adjacent territory; and further

Resolved, That we urge immediate and favorable action be taken on the project, to assure proper care for the returning disabled veterans; and further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following: Senator Arthur W. Vandenberg; Senator Homer Ferguson; Congressman Fred Bradley; Congressman John Bennett; Gov. Harry F. Kelly; Walter F. Gries, chairman, State Welfare Commission; O. J. Thorsen, chairman, Delta County Board of Supervisors; Michigan State Headquarters, American Legion; Upper Peninsula Association, American Legion Posts; Delta County American Legion Posts at Escanaba, Gladstone, Bark River, and Rapid River.

SUPPLEMENT TO RESOLUTION, VETERANS' HOSPITAL

The Upper Peninsula of Michigan comprises 15 counties with a combined population of approximately 300,000 persons. At the present rate of inductions it may be anticipated that at least 30,000 young men will have been inducted into the armed services before the war comes to an end. In addition, it is estimated that there are about 10,000 veterans of the First World War now living in this area. It is not unreasonable to believe that a 100-bed hospital represents the minimum need of sick and wounded veterans for the Upper Peninsula.

It is not now possible to estimate how many of the men inducted into the armed services will ultimately return as casualties, wholly or partially disabled and in need of hospitalization. But it is noted that even now, men, seriously in need of hospitalization, are being discharged from the Army and Navy. That this number will greatly increase as the war progresses can be readily foreseen. And it is apparent that present facilities for caring for sick and wounded servicemen are wholly inadequate to meet anticipated needs. Manifestly the care of men disabled while in the service of their country must be the first and primary concern of the Nation.

The Upper Peninsula American Legion Convention held at Menominee in July 1943 unanimously adopted a resolution recommending the establishment of a veterans' hospital at Gladstone, in Delta County. And the Michigan State Department of the American Legion at its annual convention held at Detroit of the same year adopted a similar resolution. This action has been taken in both instances in recognition of the particular conditions that make Delta County a proper location for a veterans' hospital.

Delta County is one of the most heavily populated areas in the district. It has already furnished approximately 3,000 men to the armed services. Menominee County to the west and south is also a populous county and transportation facilities with that area are direct and adequate. There is also a direct line northward to Ishpeming and westward into the copper country. Similarly it is on a railroad that affords direct service to the east end of the Peninsula. The E. & L. S. gives direct connection with a large area in a northwesterly direction. Three out of four main highway arterials of the Upper Peninsula meet in this county.

The west and south sides of the county are highly developed agriculturally, giving assurance of an adequate food supply at the source.

Gladstone is a city of 5,000 population, situated on a peninsula extending into the little Bay de Noquet. A 100-foot bluff to the west and north affords shelter against the most severe of the winter storms and in summer the heat is modified by the proximity of the waters of the Bay de Noquet. The city affords excellent recreational facilities. Its bathing beach is considered one of the most desirable in the entire area. The upper reaches of the Bay de Noquet present excellent fishing, and to the north and east lies the Hiawatha National Forest.

It is believed that any condition or requirement in the way of local facilities or accommodations that may be set forth by the Veterans' Administration will be complied with fully and adequately by the county and the community itself.

It is the view of the sponsors of this petition that:

1. The rehabilitation of the sick or wounded soldier can best be achieved in the native environment and under the climatic conditions to which he is accustomed from childhood, and that the nearness of home and kindred must be considered as a morale factor of the utmost importance to his restoration to health and usefulness.

2. Delta County is the logical area for the location of a veterans' hospital for the Upper Peninsula because of its central location and its transportation and communication facilities.

3. The city of Gladstone offers the most favorable conditions for a veterans' hospital site.

UPPER PENINSULA ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICAN LEGION POSTS,
Stephenson, Mich., January 22, 1944.

Excerpt from minutes of twenty-third annual convention of the Upper Peninsula Association of American Legion Posts held at Menominee, Mich., July 10 and 11, 1943.

"Resolution 2, immediate building of hospital at Gladstone, Mich., was introduced:

" '*Resolved,* That there is increased necessity for the immediate building of a United States veterans' hospital at the site heretofore selected on Little Bay De Noc in Delta County and that we urge the constituted authorities to take the necessary steps to build same, to take care of the disabled veterans of the upper section of the State of Michigan and surrounding territory.'

"Moved by Farley, of Menominee, and supported by Simmer, of Hancock, that resolutions 1 and 2 be adopted—unanimously carried."

I certify that the above is a true and exact copy taken from the official record.

GEORGE W. BEAUDOIN,
Association Adjutant and Welfare Officer.

Mustering-Out Pay Is Only One Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on the roll-call vote today on accepting the conference report on the mustering-out pay bill, I pondered long before voting "yes" on it, for I had hoped for a more liberal provision. However, having been assured at the time the measure was before the House that this was purely a mustering-out pay bill and must in no sense be regarded as including all of such benefit payments or such other benefits as a grateful country should see fit for its defenders, and seeing the impossibility, as well as the unwisdom, of attempting to solve the whole matter of benefits to veterans in a measure which needs to be enacted into law at once, I was one of more than 270 today voting "yea" on this roll call.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that this is a first step in our obligation to the veterans of the present world war, I want definitely to go on record here and now in assuring them that a grateful country should in the proper time take such other steps as gratitude and justice require. In all my thinking on post-war efforts the proper consideration of veterans occupies a large place. I hope and expect private industry to furnish jobs to many, if not most, of the returning members of the armed forces. Our Government must supplement this need as may be required, and I want to work toward that end.

Program of Essex County Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, an Essex County Council of Churches has recently been formed to work in close cooperation with the Mission on Faith and Order of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The purposes underlying the formation of this interfaith group are broadly and more accurately stated in the complete constitution as adopted at the first meeting held at the Second Presbyterian Church in Newark in December 1943. Generally speaking, however, the work will be pointed to developing a better informed concept of responsibility for some of the problems confronting our local and national communities among the members of these churches, with the hope that together they may contribute to the solutions.

On Saturday, January 22, a meeting of the council, held at the Munn Avenue Presbyterian Church in East Orange, was attended by representatives of leading churches from all over Essex County, N. J. The statement of objectives of the commission on community relations was approved at this meeting and a copy of said statement is included herein:

ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL OF CHURCHES—COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES—FROM THE CONSTITUTION

The Commission on Community Relations shall endeavor to enlist the cooperation of educational, social, welfare, and character-building field agencies and shall give special attention to cooperative efforts to reach the unchurched individuals of the county. It shall be responsible for specific activities of the council and its area auxiliaries through the following and other departments of work: Social education and action, race relations, radio, motion pictures, literature, public relations, international good will, publicity, legislation.

During 1944, this commission will endeavor to develop leadership and initiate activities in the departments named, as follows:

I. Social education and action

1. To consider what our churches, individually and unitedly, can do to meet human needs more effectively.

What are these needs? What are the points of tension today?

How can the impact of our Christian ethic be made more effective as we work for human betterment? How can Christian people be made more definitely aware of issues increasingly acute and what can they do to meet and help to solve them?

2. Through the press, radio, and other channels of educational value, as well as directly by sermons, lectures, forums, discussion groups, etc., to make known to the public the problems arising in our communities and their social, moral, and spiritual implications: that the church may speak and act unitedly to develop the moral conscience to the point where needed changes will result.

3. To interpret as we have opportunity the application of the social gospel as an indivisible part of the Gospel of Jesus.

4. To make available to local churches suggestions as to how they can help to build public opinion; how they can successfully work for the solution of some of our acute social problems; what other churches in the county, State, and Nation have done and what we might do here.

5. To cooperate with existing welfare councils, social agencies, etc., seeking from them the facts which through their research departments they have established and endeavored to coordinate activities of all to attain desired ends.

II. Race relations

1. To make explicit the implications of the whole doctrine of the brotherhood of man.

2. As issues arise, to point up clearly the fact that nothing dwarfs individuals and communities like un-Christian prejudices.

3. To place consistent emphasis on the necessary moral attitudes—that is, a common recognition of guilt, which must underlie any political or economic reconstruction.

4. To endeavor to exemplify through varied cooperative enterprises in our communities the religious fellowship and good will of groups striving for social betterment.

5. To place at the disposal of local churches and interested groups resource materials which have been successfully used, and to make known the factors which have developed in the experience of other communities.

6. To initiate and support educational efforts which promote better understanding between racial groups in our county.

III. Radio, motion pictures, literature

1. To stress the positive educational power of these agencies and their far-reaching opportunity for building worthy character, particularly among children and youth, but also influencing the thought and opinion of adults more profoundly than is commonly recognized.

2. To develop the Christian conscience of our communities to the point where individuals and groups will effectively insist upon maintaining in these media standards of good taste and commendable mortal character.

3. To cooperate with local, county, State and National agencies which are at work to eliminate undesirable influences in these fields and to build up support for wholesome entertainment along these lines as it is available.

4. To establish such relationships with local managers of radio and motion-picture houses as shall bring about cooperation toward the desired end.

IV. Public relations and publicity

1. To open up channels for publicity in our communities, through which the distinctive message of the church may be interpreted and the basic importance of vital religion as the foundation of our democracy may be made known to multitudes who now regard the church as negligible and who ignore its appeal.

2. To become alert for news values in the on-going programs of our churches and to organize such a news service as shall enable us to provide attractive articles good enough to command a place in the news.

V. International relations

1. To cause our people to realize the epoch-making advances of these times, which make our whole world one and which demand an outlook broader and deeper than our traditional training has provided.

2. To examine carefully and distribute with care resource materials now available from many international agencies which may help our church people to think through the problems of varied human relationships, discovering the principles which make for durable peace locally, nationally, and internationally, recognizing that in principle these are essentially one.

3. To cultivate leadership in our communities for the study and discussion of international problems and the bearing of Christian principles upon their solution.

VI. Legislation and governmental relations

1. To recognize that a part of our job as religious groups is to keep constantly before the public the reminder that a good citizen fulfills his civic obligations and supports the laws we have, always using his influence for improving of laws where the Christian conscience so directs.

2. To review legislation proposed, local, State, or Federal, and to inform our Representatives where we stand on vital issues.

3. To be ready for action when needed to maintain Christian standards in law and law enforcement.

World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding men of the bench and bar is Judge John J. Parker, of the Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit.

At the annual meeting of the New England Society, on the 22d of December 1943, in Charleston, S. C., Judge Parker delivered a masterpiece on world organization in the post-war world. So profound was the thought and the research demonstrated by this distinguished jurist, I prevailed upon him to permit me to place his fine treatise in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

There is nothing more important in connection with the war that we are fighting than the proper organization of our effort with that of our allies, and there will be nothing more important in the victory than the kind of organization that we and they set up for preserving the fruits of victory and maintaining the peace of the world. I say "the kind of organization" because there can be no question but that some sort of organization must be set up. Unless we are willing to let civilization drift into chaos, somebody must undertake the administration of conquered territory, somebody must help the liberated peoples establish stable government, and somebody must reestablish world commerce and finance. The duty of doing this will, of course, devolve upon the victorious Allied Nations, and they will of necessity set up some sort of international organization for working out the problems involved. We shall be a party to this organization, not only because it will deal with matters affecting our vital interests, but also because we have learned that we cannot safely avoid our responsibilities in a world where any disturbance of the public peace is likely to threaten us with ruin.

It is possible, of course, that this international organization might be set up by the dominant victorious powers, i. e. by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, on the basis of an alliance grounded upon power and self-interest. Such an alliance, however, would be more difficult to form, it seems to me, than an international organization based upon law to which all Allied and Neutral Nations would be admitted to membership; and it would furnish a much less secure basis for international peace. While the three great powers are united now by the common danger which confronts them, this uniting force will be removed when peace comes; and diverse aims and interests will assert themselves. History shows that a coalition of victorious powers is inevitably dissolved as their interests change with the passage of time, as controversies arise and as different members of the coalition seek alliances with the defeated powers to support their aims and ambitions. Any organization to preserve the peace of the world must be based upon something deeper than the transient self-interest of a few nations allied to conduct a war.

In making the peace and in setting up an international organization to restore order, furthermore, the three great powers cannot act alone or look only to their own interests. Twenty-nine other nations are allied or associated with them in carrying on the war, and these must have a voice and their interests must be considered in any peace settlement or in the setting up of any world organization Whatever the great nations might think of imposing terms upon the conquered, they would not attempt to dictate to their allies or to ignore them in the peace settlement. Any post-war organization, therefore, must be set up on a world-wide basis; and it is clear that such an organization would have much greater chances of success if founded upon broad general principles of international cooperation for the purpose of enforcing justice in international affairs, than if based upon transient ideas of the self-interest of the dominant victorious powers. If the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, in any post-war organization for stabilizing international affairs, must take in the 29 Allied Nations with whom they are now cooperating, the organization formed would, in all probability, be of a sort in which neutral nations should be asked to participate. If this is done, what we have is a league of nations for regulating international affairs and preserving peace, whatever it may be called It seems to me, therefore, that we are inevitably back again to the problem of organizing some sort of world government for the preservation of world peace. My thesis is that such government should be based on sound governmental principles for the purpose of enforcing law in international affairs, and not upon transient ideas of self-interest of dominant powers for the purpose of protecting themselves under the outmoded patterns of power politics.

The time has come for us in the United States to face frankly the question of world government and to do something about it. We cannot live to ourselves, and any effort to disassociate ourselves from the problems of the world only gets us into deeper trouble. The fact is that the great improvements in transportation and communication have bound the nations of the world so closely together that the life of each is inextricably intertwined with the lives of the others. Each is dependent upon international trade and communication, if not for its existence, at least for its progress and prosperity. Any part of the world can be reached by air from any other part in a few hours time. Communication is a matter of seconds. A disturbance of the peace in any section disturbs the peace throughout the entire fabric of civilization. Every nation, therefore, has a vital interest in that phase of the world's life which is international in character; and there can be no question but that there has been achieved the necessary unity of ideas and ideals among the Allied and Neutral Nations with respect to the fundamental basis upon which international affairs should be conducted to justify the effort to organize international life.

With the expansion of the life of nations beyond national boundaries, accompanied as it is by a unity of interest in a world order and unity of ideas and ideals upon which a world order can be built, the time has come for us to establish government by law in international affairs. International law we, of course, already have. Law arises out of life. It is the categorical imperative of organized society. International law is implicit in the relationships of international life; and notwithstanding the lack of any adequate organization it has already been developed sufficiently to guarantee the peace of international society if it were adequately declared and enforced. The trouble is not so much lack of law as lack of authority to enforce it, i. e., lack of international government with power to compel obedience to law. Government must rest, as Pascal tells us, upon both reason and force. Force without reason is tyranny, but reason without force is anarchy. And anarchy in international affairs is what we have had; for, while reason expressed in treaties and conventions has declared the just rules of international law, there has been nowhere a government with jurisdiction and power to see that they are obeyed. We have sought to set up government in international affairs by reason and common consent without adequate organized force to support it, with the result that it has broken down into international anarchy. Not having brought force to the support of reason, we are threatened by those who would base government on force alone. There can be no enduring peace, no adequate national security, until international life is organized under some form of international government operating in accordance with law and clothed with power sufficient to compel obedience to law in international affairs.

I see no reason why the international life of the world should not be organized for the protection of the peace and order of society, just as life within nations has been organized. When Dillinger and Touhy started out to plunder and rob, we did not depend upon the individual effort of citizens who were wronged by their violation of law to restrain them. They were dealt with by the force of organized society. When Germany and Italy and Japan, however, started out on a course of international robbery in violation of international law and the common dictates of humanity, they were able to disturb the peace of the entire world because there was no organization of international life with force at hand sufficient to restrain them. This war would never have occurred if such force had been available to restrain Japan when she seized Manchuria, to restrain Germany when she marched into the Rhineland, or to restrain Italy when she invaded Ethiopia. If such force had been available, the probabilities are that there would have been no occasion to use it, for none of these nations would have dared to defy the combined strength of an organized international society.

ORGANIZATION BETTER THAN BALANCE OF POWER

Nations through the last century sought to attain security by maintaining what was called the balance of power. The idea was to form defensive alliances so strong that the members thereof were not likely to be attacked by any combination of nations that might be organized against them. Before the last World War, Great Britain, France, and Russia were parties to one such alliance and Germany, Austria, and Italy were parties to another. The Monroe Doctrine formulated by John Quincy Adams and Canning was an alliance somewhat of the same kind, its purpose being to protect the American continents from the ambitious designs of continental European powers. The theory of the balance of power, however, has broken down. It was based, not primarily on reason and justice, but on force and self-interest. It failed to preserve the peace in 1914; and it is bound to fail so long as nations, actuated by self-interest and self-aggrandizement, are able to persuade themselves that they can succeed against an alliance which they deem it in their interest to attack. A world government established by the civilized peoples of the world and equipped with force adequate to preserve international peace would have all the advantage of the balance of power without its weakness. It would bring to the defense of a nation unjustly attacked sufficient force to protect it, would have no national ambitions in conflict with the interest of any nation and would use the force at its command in accord with the organized sense of justice of peoples so numerous as to render unlikely the mistaken or partisan use of power.

One of the great burdens which will weigh upon mankind after the war is the cost of armaments and the maintenance of great standing armies. If the world is maintained as an armed camp, this burden will be insufferable. The efforts of men will be devoted, not to raising the standards of living or to the spread of learning and culture, but to the manufacture of munitions of war and to training themselves in the profession of arms. If this is to be avoided, some means must be devised for the limitation of national armaments; but none of the great powers will dare to consent to such limitation if the result will be to leave it powerless before those who through greed, envy, or revenge may plot its destruction. Only by raising up and arming an international organization, whose action the nations of the world can control and whose duty it will be to preserve them from attack, can they be assured of the protection which will render it safe for them to limit armaments.

This war will bring the United States to a position of great power and influence in the affairs of nations. Such a power is accompanied by great responsibilities. The free nations of the world will look to us as the leading nation in post-war civilization, and we owe to them as well as to ourselves the duty of exercising that leadership unselfishly and wisely to establish order in international affairs—order based upon law and supported by the organized force of civilized society. The time has passed for such holocausts of death and destruction, precipitated by the selfishness or greed of nations, as we have witnessed now twice within a single generation; but such calamities will be constantly recurring if international life is not organized on the basis of law supported by adequate force—if individual nations dominated by greed or ambition are left free to plunder or enslave the weak when they feel that they have power to do so. International order should be based on justice and right, not on "the good old rule, the simple plan, that they take who have the power and they keep that can"; and no higher responsibility rests upon this great Nation, so singularly blessed by God and by nature, than to use her great power of leadership for the establishment of such a world order.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

In any thinking about world organization, take account of what the League of Nations accomplished. As a matter of fact, it did a very great deal toward unifying world life. It brought together 63 of the 72 nations to discuss in a common forum problems affecting international life. It resulted in fruitful cooperative effort in the solution of many vexing problems of international significance, such as international labor problems, international health problems, problems arising out of the traffic in narcotic drugs, etc. It provided sound government for areas subjected to international control. It brought into being the Permanent Court of International Justice for the settlement of international disputes upon a juridical basis. It unquestionably averted wars in a number of instances. And it could undoubtedly have accomplished a great deal more along this line if the United States had been a member. The League was born of the idealism of this country and was incorporated in the Treaty of Versailles by reason of the insistence of our President. We were the richest and most powerful Nation in the world; and no one can say what would have been the course of the League's development or what it might have accomplished in world affairs, if American statesmen had sat in its councils and helped direct its efforts in the stormy years following the last war. Not only were League efforts crippled by reason of the impossibility of securing unanimous action of nations in the absence of the United States, but this absence resulted in the loss of leadership of the country that naturally should and in all probability would have been the leader of League action.

The fact that the League failed, under such circumstances, to preserve the peace in this world crisis, is no reason why the idea of world organization for collective security should be abandoned. The League's usefulness has been demonstrated and its weaknesses have been pointed out by experience, and we are now in position to build a better organization on the basis of the knowledge thereby acquired. We have learned much from our experience with the League just as our fathers learned much from their attempts to form a confederated government in the early history of this country. Our first attempt to form a government in America, the Confederation, was a failure. Our first efforts under the Constitution itself resulted in the Civil War, the greatest war that had ever been fought in the world up to that time. Not until we had organized the life of the country in a central government with adequate powers was our confederacy of States any more than a rope of sand, and not until we had further strengthened it by the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, was it capable of functioning with assurance and success.

We should remember that the League was formulated by some of the best minds who have ever given thought to international affairs. It brought together in its organization, at one time or another, all of the leading nations of the world except ourselves. Britain and Russia, the two great nations with which we must deal in the future in forming any sort of world organization, were enthusiastic in its support and conceivably would still be willing to cooperate along similar lines. It has accumulated a vast fund of experience and has perfected organizations of great value for dealing with international questions. To me it seems wiser to proceed along the general lines of the League structure, strengthening it where it is weak, adding such powers as experience has demonstrated to be necessary, and making such changes in its organization as seem to be wise, rather than to attempt some entirely new and different plan of organization.

The League was a mere association of sovereign states for the purpose of preserving peace among nations.[1] Its value consisted in the agreement among its members to refrain from warfare as an instrument of national policy, to submit to arbitration or judicial settlement matters of dispute which might arise, to consider in council and to advise with regard to matters which might threaten international peace, and to assist in the defense of a member unjustly attacked. It was given no power, however, to legislate with respect to international affairs and had no independent force of its own which it might use for the preservation of peace between nations. It consisted of a council and an assembly in which the members sat in an ambassadorial capacity and which could not act even in an advisory capacity except by unanimous vote. It created a Permanent Court of International Justice, but the jurisdiction of that Court depended upon the consent of parties and the League was given no adequate power to enforce its decrees.

The weaknesses of the League, which experience has demonstrated, were: (1) It was given no power to legislate with respect to the international phase of world life and thus give organization and stability to international relationships; (2) it was given no power to use organized force for the enforcement of international law or the preservation of world peace, but could only advise action by the member nations; (3) no adequate provision was made for the compulsory adjudication of international disputes or for enforcement of the decrees of the court which it established; (4) unani-

[1] The heart of the League is to be found in articles 10, 11 (1), 12 (1), 13 (1), and 16 (1), (2), and (3), which are as follows:

"X

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

"XI

"1. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the secretary-general shall on the request of any member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council."

"XII

"1. The members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to enquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until 3 months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council."

"XIII

"1. The members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration or judicial settlement."

"XVI

"1. Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the League or not.

"2. It shall be the duty of the Council in such a case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

"3. The members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking state, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the members of the League which are cooperating to protect the covenants of the League."

mous action was required both of its Council and Assembly; and (5) members of the Council and Assembly were under no obligation with respect to the League, but only with respect to the countries that they represented, and voted by countries. In any world organization to be hereafter set up, these weaknesses must be overcome. The Association of Nations and the obligations assumed under the old Covenant must be retained, but to these must be added powers which will enable the League to function adequately in the regulation of international life and to restrain breaches of the public peace. This means that to the League must be given certain governmental powers in international matters. These powers should, of course, be strictly defined and limited, as they would constitute limitations upon the sovereignty of member nations and failure to define and limit them strictly would be a fruitful source of future strife and conflict. It is a mistake, however, to regard the granting of such powers as in any sense a detriment to or a weakening of the nations granting them. New York enjoys a richer and fuller life as a member of the American Union than she would ever be able to attain as an independent sovereignty; and the same result would follow in the case of nations becoming members of an international organization and giving to such organization powers with respect to the international phases of world life. It is a source of weakness and not of strength for nations to be charged with responsibility with respect to matters beyond their jurisdiction and control.

SOVEREIGNTY AND LIMITATION OF POWER

There has been much nonsense talked about sovereignty. "Sovereignty," says Chief Justice Jay in *Chisholm* v. *George* (2 Dall. 419, 472), "is the right to govern." This right is not arbitrary, but arises out of the nature of the relationship to which it is applied. In our American Union the people of the several States possess sovereign power with respect to local affairs, the people of the entire Union with respect to national affairs. The international community, on the same principle, should exercise sovereign power with respect to international affairs. If a matter concerns me and nobody else, I am the one to decide what to do about it. If it concerns the people of North Carolina and nobody else, the people of North Carolina should decide. If it concerns the people of the United States and nobody else, they should decide. If, however, it concerns the international society of the world, that society, properly organized, should make the decision. In exercising sovereign power in matters of national concern, the Federal Government does not encroach upon any powers which the State of North Carolina ought in the nature of things to exercise; and in exercising sovereign power in matters of international concern an international organization would not encroach upon powers which any nation should exercise. A whole should be governed by laws relating to the whole and not by laws relating to a particular part; and only by government having relation to the welfare of the whole can conflict be avoided between conflicting interests of the parts.

As stated above, the powers of any sort of world government which is to be set up must be strictly defined and limited. To give general jurisdiction to legislate with respect to any matter that may threaten international conflict would constitute such an invasion of national sovereignty that no considerable number of nations, I think, would agree to it. Certainly this Nation would not; and it is well to remember that fear that something like this might be involved was an important factor in our refusal to join the old League of Nations. On the other hand, it is essential that power be vested somewhere to control the international phases of world life. Attempts by the several nations individually to control international relations can only result in strife and conflict, and attempts to regulate them by common consent will invariably break down when there is deep-seated disagreement or where national selfishness or ambition come into play.

What are the powers that an international government should have? Without attempting to enumerate them with exactitude, they may be stated generally to be the powers necessary to regulate the international phases of world life—i. e., the power to prescribe general laws regulating international trade, travel, and communication; the power to protect the freedom of the seas and of the air for these purposes; the power to make rules of international law; the power to preserve the peace between nations by the exercise of its own force where necessary; the power to render and enforce binding judgments in international disputes, and powers of this general character. These powers should be definitely and unequivocally stated, and it should be made clear that no power is granted to interfere with the exercise of national sovereignty in other particulars. With respect to the control of international trade and communication, for instance, it should be made clear that the powers granted the international government do not infringe upon the power of nations to regulate their internal affairs by the imposition of tariffs or by restriction of immigration.

For the protection of the powers vested in the international government, definite limitations should be placed on the exercise of national sovereignty. The right to make war except in self-defense should be forbidden to the member nations, certain kinds of treaties and alliances should be forbidden, provision should be made for limitation of armaments capable of being used for offensive warfare, and limitations should be placed upon the right of nations to restrict the use of the air or the seas for travel or communication or to restrict the use of ports or navigable waters.

There has been a widespread notion in this country recently that an international government should be charged with responsibility for guaranteeing freedom and democracy to men everywhere; and some have gone beyond this and have advocated something like a planned economy for the entire world. This, of course, is a dream that can do nothing but hinder our efforts toward world organization. Russia would never be willing to accept our ideas of democratic government for regulation of her internal affairs, and it is certain that we would not accept her system here. The efforts at planned economy have nowhere met with such success as to justify an attempt to apply it on a world scale. We must leave to the nations the regulation of their internal institutions and internal economy, not only because they will be better satisfied with their own institutions than with those provided for them by others, but also because no world organization that could by any possibility be evolved could successfully prescribe local government for widely scattered peoples with widely differing ideas and ideals. There is no more important element in the concept of democracy than the principle of local self-government.

Provision should be made, however, also for setting up commissions to make studies and recommendations as to matters which are important to the development of world life but which are left entirely within the sphere of national control. The most important and fruitful activities of the League of Nations have been in this field, and efforts of this character might well be extended. Studies and recommendations with respect to education, labor questions, currency stabilization, and exchange, agricultural development, production and distribution of food and raw materials, public health and control of disease, regulation of the traffic in narcotic drugs, etc.—these would be of great value to the progress of mankind. I do not mean that the international organization be given power to legislate with respect to these matters, but merely that it set up commissions to make studies and recommendations with regard thereto, to serve as a basis of international agreements or legislation by the member countries.

Among the subjects which should be studied by an international commission is the formulation of an international bill of rights, a declaration of certain fundamental rights of the individual which all nations admitted to membership in the world organization should observe in dealing with their peoples. All men need justice and all men need freedom to express personality and to worship God; and no nation which denies these fundamental rights to its people is entitled to be a member of a community of civilized nations. It is probably not practicable to secure universal adoption of the principles embodied in the American Bill of Rights; but it is not too much to hope that we may eventually secure an agreement among nations not to deny to their peoples freedom of religion, freedom of speech, or the equal protection of the laws. This would solve in large measure the troublesome question of dealing with minorities. If every citizen is given equal justice under law, governmental oppression of minorities cannot arise.

IS THE PROPOSAL PRACTICABLE?

The test of any plan for preserving the peace of the world is not merely whether it is desirable but whether it will work. The question arises, therefore, whether it is practicable to give a world organization of nations the limited power to deal with international matters that I suggest. I believe that it is; and, not as a proposed plan of organization, but merely to point out to doubters who may be driven to isolantionism or to advocacy of power alliances through fear that a plan of organization for government by law in international affairs is not workable, I suggest the following as an illustration of how it is possible to give limited governmental powers in international affairs to an association of nations. Since the days of Aristotle it has been accepted that the necessary functions of government are legislative, executive, and judicial, and the inquiry is whether an organization limited as I have indicated could be set up with these functions and without danger to the constituent states in their respective spheres.

THE LEGISLATIVE POWER

The world organization should have a legislative body with definitely defined legislative powers. All constituent nations should have representation in the body as in the Assembly of the League; but the representatives should be officers of the Assembly bound under oath to support the international organization and not merely ambassadorial representatives of the nations selecting them. They should vote as members of the Assembly and not as representatives of the nation from which they come. Of course, nations should not have an equal number of representatives in the Assembly. Representatives might be apportioned in accordance with population and other factors of world importance, each nation being given not less than one nor more than a maximum number of representatives; and provision should be

made for reapportionment upon a vote of a certain portion of the members of the Assembly and the Council. The requirement of unanimity in action should be abolished. It is manifest that no deliberative assembly can accomplish anything if every member holds the power of veto over its action.

I think that a proper check on inconsiderate action by the Assembly would be requirement of approval by the Council. This is in accord with the provisions of the old League Covenant and with the bicameral system of England, our Federal Government, and all except one of our States. In the Council as in the Assembly, requirement of unanimity should be abolished, except perhaps with respect to a very limited class of questions. No improvement has been found over majority action, with requirement of a majority of two-thirds in certain types of important and delicate questions.

The Council, it seems to me, should be selected by all the nations. The membership should be small, not exceeding the number of 14, which was the number finally fixed by the League. The election of these should be apportioned, 1 each being given to such nations as the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, and the others being apportioned on some equitable basis.

This legislative body of the League should be given real power of legislation with respect to matters within the League's jurisdiction, such matters as raising and equipping an adequate armed force, prescribing general rules governing international trade, travel, and communication, prescribing and modifying the rules of international law, or defining crimes against the laws of nations and providing for their adequate punishment. It should have power, too, to raise the funds necessary to carry on the international government. Our experience with the Confederation shows that no government can live that is dependent upon grants from constituent states. The legislative body should have power to apportion levies upon the states on some equitable basis and be provided with means to enforce payment. Whether it should have power to levy excise taxes by uniform rule on matters subject to its jurisdiction, such as international commerce, shipping, and communication, might be given consideration. No government can live without the power of the purse as well as of the sword; and certainly a world government cannot live as a mendicant.

To those who are apprehensive of granting legislative power to a body which this country cannot control, the answer is that the power will be granted only as to international matters which lie beyond the exclusive jurisdiction of any nation. The fact that the representatives in the International Assembly will come from so wide a territory and represent so many divergent points of view means that problems affecting international life will be fully considered from all angles.

Legislation would be limited by the Covenant to the prescribing of general rules; and all representatives would have an interest that these rules be just and in accord with reason and right. Concurrence by the Council would be a safeguard against legislation representing a combination of small states against the great, and concurrence by the Assembly would be a safeguard against legislation arising out of the selfishness of the great states. But the great safeguard would be that rules affecting the safety and happiness of the international community would be worked out in the open after full and fair debate, and not be the product of secret treaties between nations or secret agreements between ambitious dictators.

THE EXECUTIVE POWER

Such executive power as was possessed by the League of Nations was vested in the Council. While I am a believer in Montesquieu's theory of separation of powers, I am not inclined to think that this provision of the League Covenant need be changed, except that the requirement for unanimity of action should be abolished, frequent meetings of the Council, at least quarterly, should be required, and the Council should elect a president, who should be vested with certain of its powers during recess and charged with the duty of calling it into extraordinary session in emergencies. It should be the duty of the Council, not only to give consideration to matters affecting the peace of the world, but also to see that the laws promulgated by the international body are enforced and the obligations assumed by member nations are observed.

In the hands of the Council should be placed the sword of the international organization. It should be given power not merely to call upon the member nations to perform their obligations in time of international crisis, but it should also have a force at its disposal which it could call into action immediately. This force would necessarily be distributed among the several nations, but it should be subject solely to the command of the international organization. There will be an abundance of the machinery of warfare after this war is ended, and there will be hundreds of thousands of soldiers glad to accept service in an armed force of this character. Whether such force is recruited and paid directly by the international organization or by the countries in which different branches of the force are stationed, the entire force should be subject to immediate call by the international organization to be used anywhere when needed. We find no difficulty in raising millions of men and sending them all over the world for the purposes of war. There should be no difficulty in raising a comparatively small force in each nation by voluntary enlistment for the purposes of peace; and the force required of any nation would be small compared to the army it would have to maintain, even in peacetime, if some form of world government is not established.

I do not mean, of course, that this country or her allies should proceed to disarm at once upon the setting up of the world organization. Limitation of armaments would be a matter to be worked out by consent of nations and over a considerable period of time. We should certainly maintain at first with our present allies sufficient force subject to our command to insure our safety and safeguard our interests. The presence of a force subject to the control of the international organization, however, like an alliance under the old balance-of-power plan, would make it possible for us from the beginning to limit the expenditures that we would otherwise have to make for arms and armament. There is nothing inconsistent, I think, in this. Notwithstanding the adequacy of the city police force, a banker may well provide guards for the protection of the funds entrusted to him, and nations which have recently been so seriously endangered will wish to provide adequately for their own defense notwithstanding their right to rely upon the international organization. But, just as the banker will hire fewer guards if the city is adequately policed, nations will find it necessary to make less preparation for defense when an international police force is available.

THE JUDICIAL POWER

Of prime importance in the preservation of international peace and order is the provision of an adequate judicial system for the adjudication of disputes between nations that might lead to war. The Permanent Court of International Justice has been set up for this purpose pursuant to article 14 of the League Covenant. It consists of 15 judges and sits at The Hague. It has been manned by judges of outstanding character and ability and has done splendid work. It has decided 60 cases of importance and has entered several hundred orders. It is universally recognized as having made a success of its work; and every President of the United States for the past 20 years has urged our adherence to the statute creating it. Mr. John Bassett Moore, Chief Justice Hughes, Secretary Frank B. Kellogg, and Prof. Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard, have served upon its bench.

No criticism can be made of the court, I think, except the lack of sufficient jurisdiction and the fact that there is no adequate provision for the enforcement of its decrees. Its jurisdiction depends upon the consent of parties litigant that it hear cases affecting them,[2] whereas what is needed is jurisdiction over any matter of dispute between nations, to be exercised upon application of any party to the dispute. In addition to this, the international government should be given power to enforce the decrees of the court and be charged with responsibility for doing so. Long experience at the bar and upon the bench has impressed upon me the importance of prompt adjudication and adequate enforcement of decrees as a means of avoiding trouble and conflict between parties. I am sure that this is as true of nations as it is of private individuals. Agitation of grievances in the public forum and through diplomatic exchanges can lead only to friction and conflict, whereas a prompt settlement by recognized authority will soon relegate them to the limbo of forgotten things. Only people who are foolish or insane trouble themselves over a lost lawsuit.

The Permanent Court of International Justice should, of course, be given jurisdiction to hear and determine all disputes between nations involving legal rights, and not merely those with respect to matters lying within the legislative power of the international organization. Analogy is found in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States to hear cases arising between the several States, where the jurisdiction depends upon the character of the parties litigant and not upon the nature of the controversy. Controversies endangering the peace of the world might arise out of a variety of matters as to which legislative power should not be vested in the international organization; and the court should have power to settle these controversies. It would settle them, however, on the basis of law; and there could consequently be no just objection to giving it compulsory jurisdiction over them.

It is true, of course, that controversies might arise between nations with respect to matters of interest, as to which law would not furnish a satisfactory settlement. For these a system of arbitration should be set up, and as the aim is to end warfare as a national policy, it would seem that for such questions compulsory arbitration might well be provided. President Taft was an ardent advocate of arbitration of international disputes. He pushed through a number of arbitration treaties that were mutilated by the Senate. His view was summed up in 1911 when he said: "We now have treaties of arbitration in which we agree to submit all questions that do not affect our national honor and do not affect our vital interest. Well, that seems to me to be an agreement to arbitrate everything that is highly unimportant. We leave out questions which, when they arise, are likely to lead to war. If arbitration is worth anything it is an instrumentality for avoiding war. But, it is asked, would you arbitrate a question of national honor? I am not afraid of that question. Of course I would." Peaceful and law-abiding nations like England and the United States have not hesitated to submit international questions of the most important character to

---

[2] Fifteen nations have given assent to compulsory jurisdiction pursuant to provisions of the Court statute.

arbitration. Other nations should not be permitted to imperil the peace of the world by going to war over such questions.

There is another suggestion with respect to the setting up of judicial power. I believe it would be well to create a system of inferior international courts, to be composed of not less than three judges each, and with appeal to the Permanent Court of International Justice, to hear cases arising between citizens of different countries involving large amounts or delicate international questions, as well as cases arising out of the exercise of power by the international government. One of the fertile sources of international conflict is alleged injustice to nationals, as where contracts are not properly enforced or property is confiscated by unjust decisions. One of the reasons for the establishment of extraterritorial courts has been the fear that justice would not be properly administered by the courts of the countries where they have been established; and we are all familiar with the practice of handling private litigation through diplomatic sources in countries where there is little confidence in the courts. It seems to me that such a system of international courts would command the confidence and respect of those who trade, travel, or invest their money in foreign countries, and would thus do much to extend commerce and unify commercial and business law, as well as avoid some of the most fruitful sources of international conflict. A question may be raised as to the enforcement of judgments of courts of this character, but I see no reason why the countries which are members of the international organization would not be willing to provide that judgments of such courts might be registered with the courts of general jurisdiction of those countries and enforced as though they were judgments of such courts.

The committee of the American Bar Association on post-war international judicial organization, composed of some of the ablest lawyers of America, among others Mr. John W. Davis, Senator George Wharton Pepper, and former Attorney General William D. Mitchell, has recently published a report containing the following recommendations:

"First. That any post-war international settlement should make provision for an international court of justice with compulsory jurisdiction of legal issues and should continue the present Permanent Court with such modification of its statute as may be necessary to adapt it to the new conditions.

"Second. That the relation to be borne by the Court to such central international organization as may ultimately emerge cannot now be determined; but the committee lay heavy emphasis on the principle of an independent judiciary and on the importance of separating the judicial from the policy-making function.

"Third. That the Permanent Court of Arbitration be retained.

"Fourth. That the creation of other permanent international tribunals or the expansion of existing tribunals be studied with a view to encompassing the rapidly increasing number of cases of an international character which until now have been customarily referred to temporary commissions, arbiters, or arbitral tribunals."

I emphasize this judicial settlement of disputes because I think it one of the most important provisions of international organization. What we are seeking to do is to set up for the regulation of international affairs government based on reasons and right, and not merely on force. Adjudication of controversies is settlement on this basis. It will result not only in the peaceful settlement of the controversies presently before the court, but also in the creation of precedents, which will lead to the healthy growth and expansion of international law. Every lawyer knows that the most important developments of the law have come, not from the fiat of a legislature, but from court decision—from the application of reason to the settlement of actual controversies. Even where legislation exists, it must be modified or expanded by that interstitial legislation, as Justice Holmes called it, which arises when the courts apply the legislation to concrete cases.

WORLD GOVERNMENT BY LAW

I have given these suggestions, not as any hard and fast framework of an international organization, but merely as an illustration of how it seems to me that such an organization can be made workable. Many of the things I suggest may not be acceptable to those with whom we must agree in setting up the organization. Other things may be suggested which will work equally well or better. The matter of importance is, not to develop a particular kind of organization or to give it particular powers, but to set up some sort of world structure which can bring to bear the force of organized society in support of government by law.

In this connection, I would suggest that the problem of peace is not the negative one of merely avoiding conflict. Peace is a positive thing. It involves the functioning of life in accordance with the laws of life. Peace in international affairs is dependent upon the functioning of international life in accordance with the proper laws of such life. If we are to have a peaceful world, these laws must be ascertained and declared by reason and a world organization must be devised which will bring to their support the force of organized world society.

A regional organization of nations has been suggested. Such organization would doubtless be of great value for purposes of economic development and otherwise, and is not inconsistent with the world organization for government by law that I have in mind. Customs unions and confederation of small states into national unions, after the pattern of the United States or the Soviet Union or the Cantons of Switzerland, are highly desirable; but such regional organizations would not of themselves fulfill the function of preserving world peace or giving government by law in international affairs. Without a world-wide organization to stabilize international affairs on the basis of law, they might well lead to a revival of power politics with all of its evils.

GREAT AMERICANS HAVE THOUGHT IT PRACTICAL

This concept of an international organization for the preservation of world peace and for giving the world government by law is not the pipe dream of wishful thinking. It has had the support of some of the greatest and most practical statesmen that this country has produced in recent years, as Mr. Russell Davenport has ably pointed out in a recent article.[3] Elihu Root, William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Newton D. Baker, and a host of others have worked to bring it into being. The views of Wilson and Baker are well-nigh universally known. What is not so well remembered is the interest that some of the great Republican statesmen have taken in the movement. I quote from Mr. Davenport's article:

"Theodore Roosevelt * * * in his speech in Christiania in 1910, accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, endorsed the idea of a league to enforce peace 'by force if necessary.' In 1915 he wrote, 'The futility of international agreements in great crises has come from the fact that force was not back of them. What is needed * * * is to create a judge and then to put police power behind the judge.'

"William Howard Taft was no less clear. 'We are not peace-at-any-price men,' he said in a speech at Philadelphia (1915). 'We believe it is still necessary to use a threat of overwhelming force of a great league, with willingness to make the threat good in order to frighten nations into a use of rational and peaceful means.' In the same year Charles Francis Adams wrote to Root that he thought we were 'tending irresistibly to Tennyson's parliament of man and federation of the world.' Root replied, 'I agree with you about the tendency.' But he expressed irritation at the glib and facile pacifists who did not understand international difficulties. He went on to say that in order to have a court (he always thought in terms of a court) whose judgments would be respected, there must be an international police force. Root was cautious in approaching this idea, but later in the same year (1915) he had evidently progressed toward it. 'Laws to be obeyed,' he said, 'must have sanctions behind them * * *. Many states have grown so great that there is no power capable of imposing punishment upon them except the power of collective civilization outside the offending state.'

"That these Republican statesmen had their feet on the ground was shown in the year 1910, when Congress took the utterly unprecedented step of passing a joint resolution, which Taft signed, calling for the creation of a peace commission. The stated object of the commission was to 'consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international police force for the preservation of peace.'"

Mr. Root, one of the most practical of American statesmen, did not dodge the limitation of sovereignty involved in the idea. In a letter to Colonel House of August 16, 1918, he said:

"An international breach of the peace is a matter that concerns every member of the community of nations, a matter in which every nation has a direct interest and to which every nation has a right to object * * *. The Monroe Doctrine asserted a specific interest on the part of the United States in preventing certain gross breaches of the peace on the American Continent, and when President Wilson suggested an enlargement of the Monroe Doctrine to take in the whole world, his proposal carried by necessary implication the change of doctrine which I am discussing * * *. The change involves a limitation of sovereignty, making every sovereign state subject to the superior right of a community of sovereign states to have peace preserved just as individual liberty is limited by being made subject to the superior right of the civil community to have the peace preserved. The acceptance of any such principle would be fatal to the whole Prussian theory of the state and of the government. When you have got this principle accepted openly, expressly, distinctly, unequivocally by the whole civilized world, you will for the first time have a community of nations * * *."

It is important to remember that when the League of Nations Covenant was before the Senate of the United States, at least 75 of the 96 Senators were for the League in some form; that it was defeated by disagreement over details of the plan which now seem insignificant in the light of subsequent developments, and that upon final vote it had an actual majority (49 to 35), only 7 votes short of the required two-thirds.

SHALL THE CONQUERED NATIONS PARTICIPATE?

The setting up of an adequate world organization is not dependent upon the answer to this question; but the question is one which should be considered in connection with the subject. The conquered countries would, I take it, not at first be given representation in the international organization. They will in all probability be subjected to control by an international commission until such time as they are fitted

[3] Fate of Mighty Nations, Fortune Magazine, May 1943.

to take their place in the family of nations. This control, however, is a matter which should properly be undertaken by the international organization; and when the conquered peoples have given evidence of their capacity for self government and of their willingness to live peaceably in the international organization, they should be given a voice therein. It would not be feasible, nor would it be right to condemn them to an inferior status for an unlimited period. The leaders who have instigated and led in the perpetration of the great crime against humanity involved in the present world war should be promptly and adequately punished, and the people who have allowed themselves to be led into the enterprise should be deprived of the power to cause further trouble; but after their life has been purged of the criminal and dangerous tendencies which make them a menace to the peace of mankind, they should be given a place in the council of nations. Outside the world organization they would almost inevitably constitute a rival and hostile organization and would be a constant source of danger when their strength should have recuperated from the effects of war. Within the organization, they would be subject to its restraining influence and their ambitions, like those of other nations, would be directed along lawful and peaceful lines.

CONCLUSION

The forces of science and commerce have brought the world to the position where its life must be given unity. It is unthinkable that the strife and conflict which have attended recent years should be allowed to continue. If unity is not achieved through reason, it will eventually be achieved through force. False nationalism, which exalts a part above the whole, cannot triumph for long. It will surely create, it has already created, conditions which will bring about its destruction. The only hope now of defeating those who would unify the world by force, is for us to rise, as we have risen, above the narrow limitations of nationalism and join hands with men of good will of other nations who believe as we do in the reign of law. If we can do this in time of war and passion for the sake of winning the victory over our enemies, there is no reason why we cannot do it in time of peace for the purpose of preserving the fruits of victory.

It is important that we begin at once to enlist the thought of the American people in this great enterprise and let the world know where we stand. Consideration of many matters affecting the post-war world should be deferred until the victory is won, but our attitude with respect to some form of world organization for preserving peace and establishing government by law is a matter upon which the sooner we declare curselves, the better. Such a declaration would stimulate thought along similar channels in allied countries, would encourage our enemies to lay down their arms and would do much to allay the fear that after the war is won we shall refuse to accept the responsibility that will rest upon us to take part in organizing a peaceful world society. Our allies were members of the League of Nations. Not only was our refusal to join the League taken as an indication of opposition to the idea, but the failure of the League has been blamed in large measure upon our failure to join it and participate in its deliberations. If it is thought that our present attitude is one of opposition, planning for post-war organization will proceed along the old lines of alliances and power politics. A clear declaration that the American people favor an organization of nations for the establishment of government by law in international affairs would give new hope to the world.

Former President Hoover and Ambassador Gibson have ably argued that many of the problems of world reconstruction must be worked out over a long period. I am in accord with this suggestion; but the problem of setting up an international organization for preserving the peace and giving the world government by law is not one of these. The greatest need for such an organization will come in the stormy years immediately following the war; and the organization will provide the best possible machinery for working out the long-time problems. Furthermore, the further we get away from the war, the weaker will be its unifying influence upon our allies. We should strike while the iron is hot. While the minds of men are still alive to the horrors and dangers of war, while our hearts are filled with generous impulses towards our allies with whom we have fought in the common conflict, before jealousies and disputes have arisen and minor alliances have been formed, we should get together with our allies and with such neutral nations as will join us, agree upon a fair plan of world organization, and throw behind it the enthusiastic support of victorious nations determined that the sacrifices made in preserving our civilization shall not have been made in vain.

An International Office for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last Monday I asked and obtained permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An International Office for Education," by Msgr. George Johnson. I am now advised that the article is estimated to make approximately two and a quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that the cost of printing will be $101.25. Under the rule it is necessary for me to renew my request after this announcement. I do renew the request and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTERNATIONAL OFFICE FOR EDUCATION [1]

Recently announcement was made of the organization of an American Association for an International Office for Education. This group, under the chairmanship of Dr. Harlow Shapley of the Harvard Observatory, is presently made up of some 25 persons well known for their activities in various fields of American life such as religion, letters, industry, labor, welfare work, and education. By identifying themselves with the association they have expressed a personal conviction that something in the nature of an international education office is needed, and at the same time they have indicated readiness to lend their influence to the promotion of the project.[2]

The formation of this association and the attendant publicity serve to focus the attention of the American public on something which for the past several years has bulked large on the agenda of every important organization of educators in the United States. More than that, due to the fact that those deeply interested did not feel that existing groups were moving rapidly enough, new educational groups have emerged devoted directly and exclusively to the study of the place of education in post-war reconstruction. For education can and should play a very important role in the making of the peace and its perpetuation and in the healing of the ravages wrought by war. Treaties of peace, political organizations, agreements concerning the distribution of raw materials, measures to take care of the physical needs of peoples, instruments for policing the world and curbing international gangsterism will not be enough. In the long run, the foundations for a true and lasting peace must be laid in the hearts and souls of individual men and women everywhere in the world. Nationals of all countries must come to an understanding of their common humanity and all that it implies. They must learn that artificial boundaries drawn by statesmen and the physical separation from one another caused by distance and the configuration of the surface of the earth do not alter the fact of human brotherhood under the Fatherhood of God. Physically, they may live apart from one another, but, spiritually, they must strive for union. Education is the means that civilization has developed to aid human beings to develop their intellectual and moral powers and to show forth the Divine Image according to which they were made. Through education the peoples of the world can be brought to a fuller realization of the fact that they belong to one another so that, concentrating more and more on their common ideals, hopes, and aspirations, they will be less influenced by the selfish, separatist urges that would rend them asunder.

To play its role in international affairs effectively education must have adequate instrumentalities. Heretofore it has lacked them. Politics, business, finance, have developed devices for international cooperation. Labor, too, has been in a position to make a very respectable contribution to cooperation among the nations through the International Labor Office. Yet, as far as education is concerned, for the mutual exchange of ideas, for the giving and receiving of counsel and assistance, for the identification and solution of common problems on an international scale, there has been no adequate organization. Despite this handicap, effective work has been done by various groups and agencies in certain limited fields, notably that of the exchange of professors and students. There have been international educational conferences and meetings of various types which have had some success in bringing together the educators of the nations. All of this, however, has fallen short of what was not only desired but even necessary, and it is woefully inadequate to meet the tremendous strains on civilization

[1] Address delivered at a regional meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society at Trinity College, Washington, D. C., on January 15, 1944.

[2] Vice chairmen of the association are: James Marshall, New York City Board of Education; and Msgr. George Johnson, Catholic University of America; treasurer, Sylvan L. Joseph, former regional director, O. P. A. Included in the membership are: Owen D. Young, Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Varian Fry, Henry I. Harriman, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Rohde, Dr. Wilfred Parsons, S. J., Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Clinton Golden, Miss Selma M. Borchardt, Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard, A. Philip Randolph, and Dorothy Canfield Fisher.

and culture that the war and its aftermath will develop.

What is usually envisaged in the way of an instrumentality for international educational collaboration is an agency more or less in the form of the International Labor Office. The International Labor Office is the operating instrument of the International Labor Assembly. This latter is made up of representation in agreed proportion of labor, industry, and government. It meets at stated times and is responsible for the plans and problems which the International Labor Office carries out. The Office is financed by the member governments. Though attached to the League of Nations, the International Labor Assembly has not been part of the League and numbers among its members nations like our own which are not signatories.

What with the war and the present confusion of world affairs and the uncertainty as to the future, he would be presumptuous indeed who would attempt to draw up anything like a complete blueprint of an international educational organization. Roughly speaking, it is generally thought of in some such terms as the following: There would be an assembly composed of delegates from the various countries of the world. These delegates would represent not only the government of their country but also its important educational and cultural interests. The wisdom of making provision for representation of such fields of activity as agriculture, labor, management, science and technology, public health, public welfare, and religion is generally recognized since developments in all of these fields vitally affect the schools.

The assembly, however constituted, would operate through a secretariate which is currently thought of as the International Education Office. This would be headed by a director and staffed by persons of demonstrated competence. Financial support would be derived from contributions from the various participating governments.

Obviously, there would have to be much careful and painstaking working out of details, such as those concerned with the conditions of membership, adequate representation of all interests involved, the nature and character of the directing authority, the proper scope and function of the secretariate, to mention just a few. There seems to be general agreement among the groups and persons who have been giving study to the project that voluntary groups must be adequately represented, that, even though governments select the delegates to the assembly, they should do so only after fullest consultation with nongovernmental, educational, and cultural associations so that there will always be a substantial number of persons in the assembly who are not government officials.

Almost everyone who is interested in the creation of an international organization for education has tried his hand at listing its possible functions and activities. The more apocalyptic his vision of its possibilities, the more ambitious will be his blueprint. The list set down by the American Association for an International Office for Education is comparatively modest.

An International Office for Education, the association declares, will be able to serve the following purposes: "(1) It can prepare and recommend minimum standards at all educational levels; (2) it can on request give expert advice on schools and school systems in all parts of the world; (3) it can recommend and supervise the distribution of funds to repair devastated school systems and universities and stimulate new ones if the United Nations determine upon a policy of relief and rehabilitation of schools; (4) it can assume leadership in assisting the nations to meet through adult education the problems of adjusting demobilized armed forces and the people in war industries and in the resettlement of refugees; (5) it can provide a center for the exchange of experiences and techniques in the field of education and cultural relations; (6) it can facilitate the international exchange of students, professors, scientists, and artists; (7) it can set up schools for administrators and teachers, to train personnel for those countries which after the war will be inadequately staffed and which will not at first be able to set up their own schools for administrators and teachers or have the background for such an enterprise; (8) it can create commissions to prepare curriculum materials to bring about better international attitudes and understanding and commissions such as that established by the Scandinavian nations to bring about the elimination from text books of matter causing international ill will or misconceptions by one people of another."

Unfortunately, as far as the public is concerned, any discussion of education and its place in the international picture is identified too easily with the views of certain starry-eyed, emotional, yet fairly noisy, individuals who seem to think that education, and particularly their own brand of education, can make the world over in a very great hurry. Though they claim to be apostles of democracy, what they really stand for is cultural imperialism. Fairly innocent of all things abroad, they pant with impatience to move into the countries of Europe as they are progressively liberated by the armed might of the United Nations. They talk in terms of armies of schoolmasters and schoolma'ams invading not only the Axis countries but other lands as well for the purpose of taking over their school systems. They would flood Europe and Asia with textbooks and teaching materials guaranteed to inoculate the minds of the learners against the virus of fascism and to set them on fire for what they call democracy.

Under the circumstances, it is only natural that the announcement of the organization of the American Association for an International Office for Education should have led the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of Fordham University, to utter a word of warning. He has no quarrel with the principle of an international organization that really concerns itself with education, but he fears that it might become an instrument of propaganda. "If such an office proved to be really international and actually concerned with education," said Father Gannon, "it should be a great step forward. But nothing in our post-war plans is so full of dynamite as the small item of rehabilitating European education. After 50 years of tinkering, with something less than complete success at home, we are threatening now to make our experiments world-wide. We are to have an international office of education. If some educator from a small college in the United States were to be sent abroad to reorganize Leipzig University along democratic and progressive lines, there might be a hitch somewhere; and if this office should become one of propaganda instead of education, God help the next generation."

Of course, there is always the danger that any organization, international or otherwise, might come under the control of the wrong kind of persons or forces and its original purposes be distorted. Because an international education office might possibly be used to propagate foolish and dangerous ideas, it might be argued fairly that it would be much better not to have an international education office at all. The trouble with that argument is that it would apply to almost any organization or institution that human beings have ever set up. One needs to weigh the possible good that could come to the world at large through the proper functioning of an international organization for education, wisely set up, wisely administered, and carefully watched, against the harm that might be done if it were taken over by fools or knaves.

It might help anyone to make up his mind on this point to know that the beginnings of an international educational organization have already been made. Every 2 months there meets in London a group which is known as the Conference of Ministers of Education. This conference was organized by the British Government. The chairman is Mr. R. A. Butler, the British Minister of Education, who has been designated to represent the British Foreign Office. The membership of the conference is made up partly by official representatives of governments and partly by observers. Details with regard to financial support are being worked out, though to date most of the expenses have been borne by the Government of Great Britain. As yet the United States, China, and Russia are not officially represented in the conference, though they have had observers present at meetings. The ultimate intent is that the conference become a United Nations body.

The Conference of Ministers of Education has adopted a six-point program: (1) The reconstruction of national systems of education in the devastated countries through material aid according to policies to be determined by the governments of those countries themselves. (2) A program for the reconstruction and reconstitution of higher institutions of learning, technical institutions, professional schools, etc. (3) The recovery and restitution of cultural objects of various kinds that the Nazis have carried away. (4) A program for putting an end to the indoctrination of youth in the Nazi and Fascist ideology. This is regarded as primarily a political rather than an educational problem. (5) The creation of a permanent agency or agencies for international educational collaboration. (6) The reconstituting of personnel in the devastated countries in the fields of scientific research, welfare activities, and education.

In this Conference of Ministers of Education we have the beginnings of an international educational organization. The very fact that it was organized indicates that the governments that have joined it are convinced that, at least as far as the reconstitution of European education is concerned, action on an international plane is imperative. From the point of view of organization and representation, the conference falls far short of what is generally deemed desirable in the way of an international educational organization. However, on the basis of the beginnings it has made, a more satisfactory instrument could be developed.

There seem to be certain points upon which properly informed persons would agree:

1. Once the countries of Europe are liberated from the control of the enemy, immediate steps must be taken to restore their educational facilities. If it is necessary to feed the bodies of their children and young people, it is at the same time necessary to feed their minds. Education is not a luxury that can be dispensed with in times of dire distress. As a matter of fact, it is precisely in times of dire distress that it is most necessary. Men do not live by bread alone.

2. Since the educational forces in the nations of Europe that have been ground under the Nazi heel have been decimated, steps will have to be taken to prepare new teachers for the tasks that lie ahead. Some of these prospective teachers might be sent abroad to this country or to Great Britain for preparation but they would be very few. Most of the teachers will have to be made ready for their work in their own native land, but help of some kind will have to come from abroad.

3. The agencies that are engaged in arranging for the exchange of professors and students will be called upon to expand and intensify their efforts to a very high degree. If we keep in mind that universities and technical schools have ceased to function wherever the Nazi blight has fallen and in

some cases, notably in Poland, have been completely destroyed and their professors massacred, we will have some idea of the magnitude of the task that faces the civilized world in reconstituting the instruments upon which the maintenance of its civilization depends.

4. Fullest cooperation between governmental and nongovernmental agencies in defining and solving post-war educational problems is indicated. Entirely aside from the nature of the peace that will follow the war and the kind of political organization that will eventuate, it would seem to be imperative that there exist some organized and effective means whereby the peoples of the world can meet together for the purpose of discussing an interest that is as common and vital as education and discover ways and means of illumining with the light of truth every darkened nook and cranny the world over.

In this connection it is of utmost importance to lay strong stress on the fact that education is not primarily a function of government. The rights of government with reference to education are secondary and supplementary to the prior rights of parents. The rights of the church take preeminence over those of the state. Individuals or groups of individuals may set up schools and devote themselves to the noble mission of education, and government has no right to interfere with them or to limit them except inasfar as may be necessary to insure that they are not operating in prejudice to the common good or to the rights of children and young people. Not only is government forbidden by the dictates of right reason and fundamental justice from proscribing or unduly limiting voluntary educational activities, but it is required to foster, protect, and support it.

Education is an activity that belongs to the people and which the people carry on in the State for the purpose of developing better human beings and thus maintaining and progressively raising the intellectual and cultural level of the civilization in which it operates. Education declines in quality and effectiveness in the degree that it becomes subject to political control and is made to subserve political ends.

As a consequence, any projected organization for international collaboration in education is bound to fail of its purpose and become a peril to human welfare if it is nothing more than an association of government functionaries and represents only the interests and the point of view of government. Far from bringing the people of the world closer to one another, it would operate to intensify differences and deepen cleavages. Everything that it stood for would be suspect.

Hence it cannot be too strongly and too frequently insisted upon that the composition of whatever form of group or assembly is contemplated for the purpose of guiding and directing an international educational office must be thoroughly democratic in the sense that it gives full and adequate representation to the people of the various nations and not merely to their governments. Voluntary organizations for educational purposes should be given a voice, as should parents, the teaching profession, and the public at large. It is only then that the assembly would be in a position to approve projects and authorize activities that would enable the office to render real service as an instrument for bringing about some substantial beginnings of international unity and understanding.

In all the discussions of the "education for death" which has been nazidom's frightful creation little attention is paid to the fact that it never could have succeeded in fastening its foul tentacles on the minds and hearts of German youth had it not been for the fact that behind it was the tyrannical might of Hitler's dictatorship. It never could have succeeded had it been forced to compete with free education.

The moment a fanatical minority seized the reins of government and forcibly suppressed all opposition, Nazi education was in a position to impose its will wherever it pleased. Every type of educational activity that existed in the Reich was ordered to conform to the Nazi philosophy. If it refused, it was forcibly proscribed. Parents and teachers who defied the authority of government found themselves in concentration camps or before a firing squad. Hitler was able to succeed so dreadfully in the horrible purpose of nazifying German youth because he monopolized education and made it the tool of his party.

The German experience writes large the warning to the world against the peril that lies in accepting the principle that education is primarily and essentially a function of government and that the right to control it is vested in the state. As long as the people retain control of their schools, education will remain free and will respond not to the ambitions and whims of some party or some class but to the yearnings and aspirations of the souls of men and women and children. An international educational organization which would serve to intensify government control of education in member nations would be a dangerous machinery indeed, for it would contribute to the spiritual enslavement of mankind.

Such is not the character of the organization that is envisaged by those in the United States who favor the establishment of an international educational office; it would contradict all of our accepted traditions and cancel out all that we have learned from happy experience with our own American system. In the words of the National Advisory Committee on Education, our American schools are "the most nearly folkmade in the world." The Constitution of the United States of America does not include the conduct of education in its enumeration of the powers of the Federal Government; hence, according to the implication of the tenth amendment, education is reserved to the States. In actual practice our schools have developed under local initiative and they are conducted under the immediate direction and supervision of boards or committees chosen by the people whose interests they serve.

At the same time the Constitution guarantees the right of parents to determine the kind of education their children are to receive. Parents are not obligated to send their children to tax-supported schools if these schools do not provide the kind of education which squares with their fundamental religious convictions. Other motives—some of them personal, some of them social, some of them intellectual—lead many parents to patronize private schools instead of using the educational facilities that are available under government auspices. Thus it comes about that an important and valuable contribution to our national culture and civilization has been made and is being made on a voluntary basis by a considerable segment of our population.

The principle that by nature education belongs to the family before it belongs to the state must be accepted as basic by any international organization for education. Hence ways and means must be found to secure adequate representation of the interests of parents. Likewise, the interests and rights of religious and private educational activity must be effectively recognized, protected, and fostered. The international educational organization must safeguard itself against becoming the ally of those political forces in every country who regard education as the exclusive function of government. That way lies education, not for a fuller life, but for death; education not for freedom, but for enslavement.

Any form of human association that carries substantial promise of bringing the peoples of the world closer together in mind and in heart is worthy of a trial at this fateful stage in world history, even though certain risks are involved. The survival of the civilization we have known and cherished depends upon the perpetuation and progressive elevation and refinement of the culture upon which it is based. What the preamble to the Northwest Ordinance asserts with regard to our own country has universal validity: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." The truth will make us free if the truth itself is free, free to roam the world unhampered by national or party barriers, free to shine in every darkness, free to penetrate into every open mind, free to confound every power that would darken or distort it and thus keep men and women shuddering with fear in the gloom of mutual hatred and distrust.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

Jackson Day Dinner Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, at the Democratic Jackson Day dinner held in Washington on January 22, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we are all thinking about the young men of America, the best equipped men who ever went to war. We hope and pray that victory will soon be theirs and ours and that our sons will return home safely. All soldiers should be given a genuine and simple ballot that will be counted.

We as Democrats are here tonight because the people, suffering from the Hoover-Mellon-Wall Street collapse, demanded a new deal. The people believed in Roosevelt, the Democratic Party and the New Deal in 1932 because they felt that the New Deal stood for human rights first and property rights second. The people confirmed their faith in Roosevelt and the New Deal in 1936 and 1940.

The New Deal is not dead. If it were dead the Democratic Party would be dead, and well dead. But the Democratic Party is not dead and the New Deal has yet to attain its full strength. The New Deal is as old as the wants of man. The New Deal is Amos proclaiming the needs of the poor in the land of Israel. The New Deal is New England citizens dumping tea in the Boston Harbor. The New Deal is Andrew Jackson marching in the twentieth century. The New Deal is Abraham Lincoln preaching freedom for the oppressed. The New Deal is the "new freedom" of Woodrow Wilson fighting the cartels as they try to establish national and international facism. The New Deal is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the peace to come the freedom of Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt means the economic right of the people to the great

abundance of the America of tomorrow. The freedom of Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt in the peace to come also means that personal liberty must move hand in hand with that abundance. This freedom stands for justice and fair play for all the classes and all the regions in terms of the welfare of the plain folks.

The doorway to this freedom is blocked by the deliberate misrepresentation of the paid hirelings of the special interests. Because of these hirelings the worker on the farm and in the factory has often been condemned without a hearing as a saboteur of the war effort. These paid hirelings try to create dissension between the fighter on the farm, the fighter in the factory, and the fighter at the front. They shall not succeed because all three fighting fronts have the same two objectives, quick victory in war, justice and jobs in peace. Justice and jobs for our workers and servicemen will give prosperity to our farmers and adequate profits for business.

The Democratic Party will always be first in the hearts of the people if it applies to the ever-changing problems of war and peace the resolute courage and patient humanity of the founding fathers of the American New Deal—Jackson and Lincoln.

One man more than any other in all history has given dynamic power and economic expression to the ageless New Deal. That man is Roosevelt. Roosevelt has never denied the principles of the New Deal and he never will. They are a part of his very being. Roosevelt, God willing, will in the future give the New Deal a firmer foundation than it has ever had before. So, on with the New Deal, on with winning the war, and forward march for peace, justice, and jobs.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, how the soldier is to be voted is a bigger battle in the Capitol yet than all the news from the front.

As their Commander in Chief it is widely feared he, F. Dema. Roosevelt, will champion their cause with an order telling them how to vote.

There are so many things demanding final solution in February that the gallant little month will have to produce or expand or be ashamed.

The whole economy program in the House for the next fiscal year is praying for a winter Christian revival in the Bureau of the Budget and in "another body."

We have more sympathy than ever with my four-thin-tire constituents since my 86,000-mile light car blew one out in the mountains January 7. Will write my Senators about it.

Intervention naturally finds its greatest strength east of the Alleghenies and west of the Great Divide. The speeches and the votes show it. From Pittsburgh to Denver it is a different land.

For the first time in 10 years, the big month of January waits till the last day to pass a department appropriation bill. March 1 will find the least done in years along this line.

FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, tall, straight, broad, stern, smart, and vocal, dares any Member to answer him on "Where are you going to get the money?" Mournfully and silently the answer comes, "Only this and nothing more."

The best estimate today on the soldier vote in the House is that 25 Republicans will vote for the President's bill and 60 Democrats will vote against it. Watch and see if they are able to whip a large part of the 60 into line.

JESSIE SUMNER is leaving Congress at the end of this year, so she can go out and find some new thrill doing something else. That is more adventurous and original than many men have been. Too, she promises to speak more plainly from here out.

It was only a few years ago that F. D. R. was bearing down on any Federal aid to roads. Now he is willing to make it all Federal aid. The old 50–50 system is the best. The proposal in the message had smaller chance of coming out of the committee than a national service act.

Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written to the President by the Honorable Thomas L. Blanton, who for approximately 20 years represented the district that I am now trying to represent.

In this letter, Mr. Blanton discusses the labor situation as affecting the people of the United States, as he sees it. I join Mr. Blanton in many of the things he has said in this letter, and believe that labor should clean house and become more interested in doing their part to assist the boys on the battle front than they are in the uncalled for strikes in war plants.

The letter follows:

ALBANY, TEX., *January 7, 1944.*

To HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Practically every home in the United States now has a father, son, husband, or brother daily risking their lives in defense of our Government. The light already has gone out in thousands of homes in the United States, where they have made the supreme sacrifice for country and liberty. I speak for those homes and absent men in our armed forces.

This is no time to quibble with avaricious, responsibility dodging union labor leaders and their traitorous attempts to sabotage the Government and the people. I urge you to ask Congress to at once pass promptly a law fixing the death penalty for any person who engages in a strike during the rest of this war emergency.

Thank God, I am through with public office and can denounce the deadly throttlehold union labor leaders have had around the throat of our Government during the past quarter of a century. Because I actively supported the "work or fight amendment" to the First Draft Act, and tried to stop their control of the Government Printing Office, and refused to obey the unreasonable demands of union labor during World War No. 1, their revengeful leaders tried to have me thrown out of Congress, and continuously during my 20 years' service there, hounded, persecuted, and sought to ruin me politically and otherwise, which method they pursue against every man in public life who dares not to obey their every command.

Every posted person in the United States knows that repeated strikes have retarded our war efforts, and that the strikes recently threatened by the railroad and steel workers not only gave aid and encouragement to our enemies, but also brought discouragement, depression, demoralization, and disgust to our own home people everywhere, and will prolong the war.

Organized labor should be ashamed of its record. During World War No. 1 there were 6,000 strikes against the Government. Woodrow Wilson promptly sensed the intention of the railroad brotherhoods to call a strike and realizing how disastrous it would be both abroad and at home, he took over the operation of all railroads, regardless of cost to the Government, on December 26, 1917, the handling of which required the time, skill, and ability of experienced officers in our military forces, who should have been devoting all of their energies to the conduct of the war. Then through threat of strike, the railroad brotherhoods forced Director General McAdoo to pay them $754,000,000 in increased wages, and to date such raises back 6 months, and later after McAdoo was succeeded by Hines, the railroad brotherhoods forced Director General Hines to pay them an additional $67,000,000 in increased wages. By threat of strike which the railroad brotherhoods then arrogantly proclaimed "would tie up every train in the United States so that not a train could be run" they forced Congress to pass the infamous Esch-Cummings Act giving them the wages, overtime pay, and other things they demanded, and Congressmen and Senators were threatened with defeat if they did not support said measure, and because some dared to support the Webster amendment safeguarding some rights for the people, they were viciously denounced and opposed for reelection. In this way union labor leaders make cowards of men in public life, whose love of office constrains them to seek the path of least resistance and not oppose any demands of union labor.

These railroad conductors work on comfortable trains, under pleasant surroundings, are paid for all overtime, and under an act passed by Congress can retire on adequate pay for life, when still hale and hardy. These pampered, overfed, luxury-loving conductors by much protest cannot deceive the people into believing that they have not given aid and encouragement to the enemy, and their threatened strike and refusal to allow the President to adjust the matter, and the threatened steel strike, have given much aid and encouragement to the enemy, and every posted person knows that such action will prolong the war, and cause the death of thousands of our men in the service. These conductors knew when they forced the President to take over all of the railroads that the time, talents, and energies of numerous colonels and other high officers in the Army would be diverted from war to handling railroads. Yet they put their own personal interest above the welfare of the Government and of the people, who thereby are incensed by righteous indignation.

We all know what would happen if soldiers were to strike for higher pay. They would be shot. We well know what would happen to sailors if they murmured about

conditions. They would be shot. We all well know what would happen to our brave marines, if when half starved they refused to wade through muddy jungles. They would be shot. And highly paid steel and railroad workers who deliberately interfere with our war plans, and selfishly stop the needed production in steel mills, and selfishly tie up transportation, should be shot as traitors to their country.

Criticism by newspapers might cause a tie-up of their plants, industrial employers rather pay all union demands, and pass the increased cost on to the people, than be attacked and have their property destroyed by reckless strikers. Members of Congress prefer to obey than be put out of office. The numerous costly strikes that have already occurred during this war constitute a shameful, ineffaceable disgrace upon union labor, which our returning men in the service shall never forget.

On behalf of the millions of fathers, sons, husbands, and brothers, who are now absent from their homes, daily risking their lives serving in the armed forces of our Government, I respectfully petition that you promptly request Congress to pass a law fixing the death penalty for any person engaging in a strike during the balance of this great war emergency.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Mustering-Out Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who believed it was wrong to exclude from the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act all those over 38 years of age who at the suggestion, almost at the order of the Army, requested their discharge in order to enter private employment. If these men should never have been inducted in the first place, that is the Government's fault, not theirs, why should they be punished for our mistakes?

The appended letter illustrates all too painfully the situation. I dislike telling this veteran that the newspaper reports of the bill's provisions are correct, and that the Uncle Sam he served so faithfully has short-changed him.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 25, 1944.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: I noticed by the morning paper that the muster-out pay bill was ready for passage and that it excluded men that were released from the Army under the 38-year bill. If this is the case it sure isn't a very nice thing for the veterans like myself who have served for nearly 2 years and who have been through campaigns overseas. It seems like a slap in the face as a thank you for honorable service in the Army. There are a great number of us older fellows who, on account of previous military experience and other experiences that were helpful in getting an army going, got into this thing to give the little help we could. Many of us served overseas. In my case I was overseas on December 12, 1942, and went through the African campaign and didn't leave Africa until November 1943, which is about 11 months. We went through this gladly, living in the mud and rain and enduring all the hardships that one encounters in war. We did this gladly because we believe that our country is the best in the world and that it was our duty to give all we could to keep it that way. We went into unbuilt camps in this country and spent the first couple of weeks working and drilling in our own civilian clothes, thus wearing them out because there was a shortage of G. I. clothing. Then to top it all off after nearly 2 years in the Army, we find we are excluded from a mustering-out pay. Please let me know as soon as possible if what I read in the paper is true, as it means a lot to me and the hundreds of other fellows who are in the same boat.

Yours very truly,

STERLING S. OSMUNDSON.

What About Primaries and Soldier Voting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette on January 23, 1944, dealing with a phase of the soldier-voting problem. As pointed out in the editorial any soldier-voting measure which does not provide for voting in primary elections would be entirely worthless in Arkansas and in a substantial number of the other States. The editorial is as follows:

WHAT ABOUT PRIMARIES AND SOLDIER VOTING?

The proposed Federal legislation for soldier voting would do just nothing at all about enabling servicemen to have a voice in the choice of officials in those States, including Arkansas, where the primary is the real election for all offices except President and Vice President.

The pending Senate measure, which provides that the War and Navy Departments shall distribute post-card forms on which soldiers and sailors might apply for absentee ballots, would apply only to the November general election. Moreover, Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, points out, the Federal ballot form itself, as suggested by the Senate Elections Committee, would carry no candidates' names and provide no means for voting in State and local elections. How would voters here at home in Arkansas like to have a ballot handed to them at the polls that did not contain the names of the candidates?

Suppose Arkansas should, as it apparently could, find solutions for such problems as payment of poll taxes and lengthening the time between the first and second primaries. The biggest problem of all would still remain unsolved—the problem of obtaining the service addresses of men and women to whom primary ballots were to be sent.

General Compere, State selective-service director, whose office is compiling the names of all Arkansas in the Army, says the addresses might be obtained from the Adjutant General's Office at Washington—with much red tape and maybe long delay. But General Compere suggests that the families of servicemen might supply addresses to county clerks or notify servicemen that they might apply for absentee ballots.

From the viewpoint of the States where officials are virtually elected in party primaries it is vitally important that any Federal legislation designed to preserve the voting rights of service absentees should include primaries as well as the general election.

Opposition to Lea Civil Aeronautics Bill Grows Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading aviation publications is American Aviation, published in Washington, D. C., by the American Aviation Associates, Inc. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following editorial from that periodical in its January 15, 1944, edition:

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION

The various efforts now being made to reconcile contrasting views on the pending Lea bill (H. R. 3420) are encouraging and it behooves all aviation interests who want to see constructive legislation enacted to cooperate toward that end.

During 1943 the maneuverings on the Lea bill were somewhat a travesty of errors. There are some who will resent this term being applied to their activities, but the truth is that no well-rounded preparation for a needed and important national legislative act had been made. Yet there is so much of value and merit in the Lea measure that every effort should be made to salvage the useful parts.

Early in 1943 the Lea bill was bounced into the aviation arena by the Lea committee primarily as a means of stopping the Nichols movement to create a standing committee on aviation in the House. The bill had been hastily prepared and rushed into motion. Some of its content was vitally needed to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, other parts were needed for clarification. Some new material was added and eventually the bill called for the creation of a new independent Civil Aeronautics Commission.

What resulted was an omnibus bill in which everything but the kitchen sink had been thrown. Instead of merely amending and clarifying the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, it took the form of a brand new major piece of legislation.

Within the past 3 or 4 months the Lea bill has kicked up a terrific storm in the States, and sides were drawn for and against a bill that few had actually read and few could really understand with proper perspective. Most disturbing of all was the appearance of a number of new "champions of freedom who sought to show that private aviation was doomed to a slow death under the Lea measure, but who actually, it is strongly suspected, have disguised some very special interests under a kindly cloak of freedom for the private flyer.

The air lines of the Nation need legislation. It is unfortunate that the necessary amend-

ments were not culled out for immediate action instead of lumping them into an omnibus bill. Generally speaking, the State aviation bodies want to be cooperative, but some of them have been scared out of their wits for fear that they may lose something by the act. Some of the States are sincere. Some others have raised a fighting flag merely because someone said there was a fight against States' rights.

The primary mistakes in the handling of the Lea bill are within aviation itself, and most of the airlines who want to see the legislation enacted are now willing to admit that they did not take the necessary time to work on the bill with other aviation interests, such as private flyers, State aviation commissions, and the like. The efforts to reconcile differences of opinions should have been made long ago. No effort to obtain national legislation should ever be made without the bulk of aviation interests solidly behind it—at the start.

Most aviation opponents of the Lea bill are opposed only to a few sections. Few aviation opponents want to hold up a piece of legislation that is largely beneficial to all. It is unfortunate that certain aviation groups find themselves on the same side of the fence as the railroads and other interests who would be expected to oppose any measure fostering aviation. Had Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association, sought the advice, counsel, and support of all aviation groups at the outset, and tempered the bill to meet the desires of a majority, there would not be this unfortunate conflict within the aviation fraternity itself.

Meantime there should be freedom of discussion among all aviation groups and the differences ironed out to the greatest degree possible. The charlatans, the phonies, the johnny-come-latelys, who have barged into an internal aviation fight for special disguised interests, can be eliminated through constructive discussions by real aviation representatives. What is desired by all is uniform, healthy Federal legislation with a retention by States of their rightful prerogatives, with protection for common carriers and freedom for the private flyer.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have inserted a resolution approved by the Conference of Mayors of the United States at a meeting in Chicago, Ill., January 19–20, 1944, showing they are opposed to this legislation:

AIRPORT ZONING

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress a bill, known as the Lea bill, which proposes to empower the Federal Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to establish safety areas around airports and to require cities, at their own expense, to remove all approach obstructions and to prevent all new obstructions by zoning the height of all structures or trees; and

Whereas this bill provides that if cities do not remove or prevent all such obstructions the Administrator may close our city-owned airports without notice and send notice of such closing, not to the mayor of the city owning the airport but to the Governor of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference disapproves the above provision of the Lea bill and recommends to the Congress that it not be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition to the Lea civil aviation bill grows daily. More light is needed on this subject before we attempt to pass on this legislation.

National Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at one place, that is, under one heading, two speeches; one by the distinguished Representative from New York, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, and the other by me. Both advocate the passage of Senate bill 666, the national war-service bill of which Mr. WADSWORTH and I are coauthors.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN, OF VERMONT

THE WILL TO FIGHT AND WIN THE WAR

This Nation entrusted the powers of the purse and the sword to Congress. The exercise of these powers for the common defense transcends all other powers. As John Quincy Adams described it, the power of the Nation to defend its life is "tremendous; it is strictly constitutional; but it breaks down every barrier so anxiously erected, for the protection of property and life."

Congress, moved by the will of the people, promptly reacted to invasion by the enemy with a declaration recognizing the war and pledging all the resources of the country to bring the conflict to a successful conclusion.

That declaration of war and pledge can constitutionally be implemented by any statute such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill would create. Passage of that particular national service bill would provide necessary factors of warfare for our armed forces, and for our civilian army.

Consider morale, and uninterrupted supply: The confidence of our fighting forces in us at home has been shaken by the disposition of groups of individuals to flout the pledge in the declaration of war. They do their part. They're being shot at and killed. How can we answer to ourselves or to them if we fail?

We, at home, have been shocked by the irresponsibility evidenced by interference with production and interruption of transportation. Every hour's delay in the prosecution of the war costs lives of our sons and daughters on the front.

The presentation of this national war service bill, initiated by the American Legion and a committee of citizens, nonpartisan in character, is a positive act of warfare. It's consideration focuses attention upon the encouragement to our enemies by acts such as lock-outs, strikes, and slow-downs in production.

If there should be the popular demand for this legislation which the necessities of war suggest Congress would not fail to pass it and the Executive would have little difficulty carrying it into effect. Its spirit must be faith—by the people in government, by government in the American people, by employees in employers, by employers in workers.

The bill is framed in such faith, and all elements of American society are fairly and justly treated in its provisions. Trade-unionism is not attacked.

The adoption of this proposal by Congress is what is needed to tone up morale on all fronts. It would, by its equal liability provisions make vital interests of the Nation paramount over interests of any group. It would answer the anxious questions of our fighting men: Who governs? Who runs the war? Passage of the Austin-Wadsworth bill would assure those who fight and those who serve in noncombatant duties that we will not let them down.

Other reasons for passing this bill are included in one broad fighting word—mobilization.

The laws we have passed authorizing the taking over of factories and management, the requisitioning of machines, tools, and other property, conscripting wealth by renegotiation of contracts, and by price fixing and taxation, have served but only imperfectly. They comprehend only one side of the industrial structure. In many cases the remedy for desertion of war production has punished the willing worker in order to cause the unwilling worker to serve.

Those laws, however, did afford the necessary war power to take over plants and industries to restore continuous production. The exercise of those laws did prevent more prolonged and more fatal interruptions. Few Americans now believe that those laws are not necessary.

Such laws are self-imposed restraints. They represent the will of the people. They are limited to the duration of the war. Such laws do not destroy freedom. They regulate the use of freedom for the duration of our struggle to preserve it. They thus express the noblest quality of self-government.

By Executive order we have tried to mobilize manpower. The coercion applied through indirect sanctions has been successful to only a limited degree.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill is needed to tone up and give authority to existing contract referral systems and other manpower regulations.

But the bill meets an imperative in the required registration of women, classification of both men and women, testing and training, selection and assignment, or continuing in place, for which it provides. Without such a law we have not been able to, and cannot in the future, tap the pool where additional manpower can be found. Notwithstanding cut-backs and releases of employees, additional manpower must be found if we are to meet the extraordinary demands which confront us.

This pool may be described as having four elements:

(1) Those not in the labor force, namely: women not now employed, students, part-time workers, retired workers, the handicapped, those in institutions, and those who will be released from time to time upon termination of contracts; many have been released already;

(2) Those already in the labor force who are employed and those who are employed part time, negroes, aliens, and other minority groups who have suffered from discrimination;

(3) Those already in the labor force who are employed at the top of their skills but who are not working in essential industry;

(4) Those already in the labor force who are engaged in essential industry, but who are not employed at the top of their skills—an invisible host.

There is no room for debate about the need. In 1943 we failed, by 10 percent to 15 percent, to attain our objective in production of certain items. This failure was due to the inability to get workers needed for the particular places, at the particular time when needed. This factor will be worse in 1944, unless flexibility of mobilization is

authorized by law. We contemplate the greatest exertion of the Nation's power in 1944. More than ever before we need definition by law of equality of liability to serve. This is important for morale, but it is an imperative for over-all direction of willing workers who, if left to their own knowledge and will alone, would not find the places where they could serve best their country in its hour of greatest need.

Discriminations would occur but they would be based on the reasonable grounds stated in the law—undue hardship would be one ground, for example.

On passage, all mobile persons, whether now employed in war production or to be so employed in the future, would be volunteers.

The direct effect of the act on them would be unification under government with benefits as well as liabilities, all based upon the exigencies of winning the war.

Those in place would, if assigned there by their local boards, be liable to continue in place. Turn-over would virtually end. In 24 hours a pool of manpower would thus be created.

Those hoarded would, if assigned to places where there is a shortage, be liable to move from relative idleness to productive service. Then, another pool would be created.

Those employers and employees who depend in part on pirating would be liable to conform to assignments by local boards for new help and new jobs. Thus a disruptive practice would be ended. All could retain the attitude of volunteers if they have the will to do so. No one need put himself in an attitude where he must be drafted.

But, even if drafted he would not be "enslaved." His status would be quite different from the soldier upon his induction, for his status would continue to be civil and not military. All his rights and claims would be protected in civil sanctuaries by due process of law. Four tribunals would be open to every volunteer, as well as to every person who refused to volunteer:

First. The local board.
Second. The appeal board.
Third. The President on appeal.
Fourth. The courts.

The will to fight and to hasten the end of the war, to save lives, to bring our men and women home could be—just note the moderation—could be, implemented through such legislation as this. That great statesman and soldier, Secretary Stimson, has admirably stated the unanswerable conclusion flowing from that moderate premise:

"No variety of twisted thinking will deny the right of millions of American men in uniform to every chance of living through this conflict. Their lives have already been placed in jeopardy by the Nation in summoning them to arms. It would be an act of the most cruel and despicable indifference if we avoided any course which would give them their chance to come through this war with their lives."

Americans who are determined to make all the effort and endure all the sacrifice that is necessary to win the war in the shortest time and with the least expenditure of human life, can do much by writing their Senators their views regarding the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, OF NEW YORK

I have taken it upon myself tonight to discuss in some detail the provisions of our bill, now pending in the two Houses of the Congress. I do this because I am well aware there is much of misunderstanding and misapprehension about it and because a truthful and accurate description of its provisions will go far toward clearing the atmosphere.

Let us start at the beginning. In its first section there is set forth a declaration of the fundamental principle upon which the bill rests, the principle being that every adult civilian, otherwise competent and with appropriate exceptions, owes it as a duty to serve in a civilian capacity in support of our soldiers and sailors, who are striving to win this war in order that our liberties may be preserved. No one can doubt the soundness of that principle. Most assuredly manpower is the most important of our resources, but thus far we have not mobilized it for civilian duty under any act of the Congress. We have mobilized men for military duty, for service on the battlefield. And we admit, in fact we boast, that in that law is found the very essence of democracy.

Who of our civil population are to be included in the obligations set forth in this bill? They are all civilian men between the ages of 18 and 65 and all women between the ages of 18 and 50, except that any woman who has living with her and under her care a child, or children, under 18 years of age is exempt from the obligation. Likewise, a woman who has dependent upon her other persons who, on account of illness or advanced age, need her personal care. Thus it will be noted that the bill protects the home. A mother cannot be taken away from her children, nor for that matter the children from the mother; nor can she be taken away from her aged parents, who, without her care, would suffer. It so happens that all the men in this country between the ages of 18 and 65 are already registered as a result of the operation of the selective service law. In that registration is found a statement setting forth the registrant's education, his experience in business or employments, his aptitudes and his potential aptitudes for different sorts of work. That is already a matter of record. Women between 18 years and 50 years of age would be called upon to register, and in doing so provide similar information. Thus we would possess an inventory of the whole available civilian man and woman power—a thing which we do not possess today and without which it is impossible to mobilize in orderly fashion.

Now let us get into the practical aspects of this measure. It provides, first, that the Director of National Service, an office created by the bill, shall keep advised of the number and qualifications of workers needed in any war industry, or in agriculture, or in any other essential occupation, and to keep that information up to date. Then if it is found that there is an acute need for additional workers in any one of those essential occupations the President, or the Director of National Service, may issue a proclamation specifying the number of workers needed, the kind of work which they would have to do, and calling for volunteers to fill the jobs. When the volunteers come forward their aptitudes and potential aptitudes are studied, and those of them who appear able to be useful are to be assigned to work; and those whose potential aptitudes run in the direction of the work to be done and who need additional training are to be given short training courses at the expense of the Government. When finally assigned to work these volunteers will receive the full pay or wages that go with the job. In other words, they are to be treated exactly like the men and women who are already working in their respective jobs. It is only when volunteers fail to come forward in sufficient number that resort will be had to the process of selection, or the employment, if you please, of the element of compulsion. If we do not get enough volunteers then the presently existing Selective Service System will be instructed to find the people to fill the gap. The local draft boards will do it through a process of selection just as they have been doing in connection with the recruiting of our armed forces. And the selectees, when assigned to work, will get the full pay or wage that goes with the job. However, it is well to remember at this point that the registered person may appeal from the decision of his own draft board, contending that his being assigned to the job would impose undue hardship upon him, and his appeal will be heard and decided by the already existing appeal machinery of the Selective Service System. In this connection some other provisions of the bill should be cited. For example, it states that when a person is assigned, either as volunteer or selectee, to work at a place other than his home town his traveling expenses incurred in reaching his new place of employment shall be paid by the Government; when he returns from that job at the conclusion of the war his traveling expenses back home shall likewise be paid by the Government. Again, the bill states that in assigning workers to jobs due regard should be given to the wisdom or advantage of assigning them to work near their own homes, and that whenever they are assigned to work away from their homes suitable housing facilities shall be found for them. Even more, if it should be decided that an especially skilled married man is needed in a certain job and that he can't very well go to that place without his family, then he may take his family and his household goods with him and the Government will pay the expense of transportation—both ways.

Again referring to workers, the bill provides that those persons now employed, at the time of the passage of the act, in essential occupations may be retained on their jobs unless such continued retention inflicts an undue hardship upon them, in which case they may appeal to the local draft board for release. Finally, when a worker, either volunteer or selectee, is assigned to a job by the Government, the manager of the plant or undertaking in which he is to work must accept his services, unless he can demonstrate on appeal to the draft board that the assignment would be injurious to the war effort.

Thus you will see that this measure, starting out with a declaration of sound and democratic principle—the obligation to serve—proceeds, first, to afford ample protection to the home itself by preventing it from being broken up, and ample protection to all those who, having volunteered or having been selected, are put to work. I am sure it will be conceded that these protections are not only adequate but generous, and that they will reduce the inconveniences resulting from national service to a minimum.

But the most important thing of all from the practical standpoint is that this bill treats everyone alike, rich or poor, in offices, in factories, and on farms. Today we may appeal to John Smith to go out and take a certain job. Smith says that he is willing to do it, but inquires immediately, "Why doesn't Bill Jones go, too?" And Bill Jones, when approached, makes the same observation about his neighbor Robinson. Each man will tell you that he is perfectly willing to go if all the other eligible fellows go. And today we have no law which treats everybody alike. Put such a law upon the statute books and the public response would be instant and overwhelming, for, believe me, ladies and gentlemen, with this sound principle stated in the law, the great American people will come forward, willing—yes, anxious—to show a full measure of devotion.

We Hope Congress Won't Be Stampeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted and as a part of this extension

of remarks, I include the following editorial from the January 20, 1944, issue of the Hardin County Index, published at Eldora, Iowa:

It is to be hoped that Congress will stand pat on its refusal to permit the Federal Government to supervise and conduct the voting by persons in the armed forces.

We see no reason to change our view, expressed in a previous issue, that those in Government service should have a chance to vote, but that this should be done under State supervision.

There are two important reasons for this stand.

One is that the soldiers should have opportunity to vote not only for Federal positions but also for State and local offices. No action by the Federal Government can in itself provide a complete ballot, it would seem.

Second. The plan of having States conduct elections is one of the safeguards to freedom which the founders of this Nation wisely established. No would-be dictator could easily get control under such a system. He could do so much more readily under a Federal system of holding elections, as has been demonstrated in other countries. We don't want to even start along that line.

There is no State that cannot arrange to provide adequate opportunity for soldiers to vote, provided the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard organizations will give needed cooperation. If Mr. Roosevelt desires, he, as Commander in Chief, is in position to issue instructions which will provide such cooperation.

Congress should recommend to the several States that they provide every facility for voting by the soldiers, and Congress also should request the Commander in Chief to direct that the armed forces aid in the movement insofar as it will not interfere with prosecution of the war.

If this is done, any State that fails or neglects to take the needed steps will likely be called to account by its service people when they get home from overseas. Iowa won't be one of these.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, some of us have for years been trying to protect the jobs for American service men and women and other American workers, and it is interesting in that connection to note a resolution passed by the Eighteenth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held in Washington, January 16, 1944. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas millions of members of the armed forces of the United States will be returned to civilian life at the close of the present war; and

Whereas readjustment from military to civilian life inevitably presents economic difficulties; and

Whereas for many successive years the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense has adopted resolutions calling for the restriction of immigration in the interest of the national employment situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Eighteenth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense counsel their representatives in Congress for a moderation in the matter of immigration that the Government will in no way injure the opportunities of the returning service men and women, whether or not his or her service has been within or outside the borders of continental United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each member of the Committees on Immigration in the Senate and the House, and to the national defense chairman of each organization participating in this conference.

Condition of the Jewish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before Zionist District of the Five Towns and Far Rockaway at Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Long Island, N. Y., on January 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The honor which you have conferred on me this evening is one to which I can respond only with the deepest humility. I know that Palestine is the source of eternal truths of religion and morality on which our future civilization must rest. I know too that the bond between Palestine and the Jewish people is one of history's most persistent and most inspiring facts. By your generous action tonight, you have linked one who pursues so temporary a business as politics with so eternal a phenomenon as the Holy Land. That is something which must make the most arrogant of us humble. It is in that spirit of humility that I express to you my profound appreciation.

I am certain that historians will see the story of the past 20 years as a series of amazing paradoxes, of remarkable contradictions between the things we said and the things we did. We recognized the need for unity and teamwork among nations, yet we encouraged disunity by embracing isolationism. We spoke eloquently of peace, yet we did little to stop the drift to war. We talked loudly of international social progress, but we continually gave comfort to forces of reaction. Indeed, in this war itself, the United Nations have proclaimed generous ideals, yet we frequently shrink from putting them into practice.

But I doubt whether any paradox will seem more striking than our policy with regard to the Jewish national homeland in Palestine. And let me make one thing clear at the outset, because I want no one to misinterpret my words—I say our policy on Palestine. By that I mean precisely what I say. I mean British policy; I mean American policy; I mean United Nations policy. However, there has been far too great a tendency, I believe, to regard the things that are happening in Palestine as exclusively the result of British policy. But we have, fortunately, reached a stage in this war when our major policies are common policies. No important decision affecting the United Nations can now be taken unless there is a considerable measure of agreement among its major members. If policy on Palestine today is what it is, then you and I and all the people in the United States must shoulder our share of the responsibility. Had we made our own attitude clear and categorical, had we protested as vigorously as justice, decency, and our own solemn declarations demanded, then I am convinced that the somber shadow of the British White Paper would not be lengthening today over Palestine and the fate of the Jewish people.

I said a few moments ago that present policy on Palestine is one of the most striking of contemporary paradoxes. Few ventures in history have commanded such eloquent verbal support as the restoration of the Jewish national homeland. The Balfour Declaration was endorsed by over 50 nations at San Remo. Its principle was unanimously endorsed by our own Congress in 1922. Every American President since that date has reaffirmed that principle. Our present Chief Executive has made his position crystal clear. I doubt whether there is a single important statesman in any of the democratic countries who has not expressed unbounded admiration and support of the achievements of the Jewish people in Palestine.

But I also doubt whether any project so warmly endorsed in words was ever so consistently discouraged in practice. Every new policy announced with regard to Palestine since 1922 has represented another violation of the letter and spirit of the original Balfour Declaration. The development of the Jewish national homeland should have been encouraged and facilitated. Instead, it has been retarded and frustrated. And today, we have actually reached the stage where, in a matter of weeks, no Jew will be able to enter Palestine because he is a Jew. No Jew will be able to buy land in Palestine because he is a Jew. If the British White Paper is enforced, the promise of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine will be transformed into the reality of a national ghetto. And there will be set up in Palestine, in the Holy Land, legal discriminations against Jews which would not be permitted in any free country in the world.

How can we explain this amazing fact? Why have we so denied by our acts the ideals we professed with our words?

Is it because the Jewish people no longer want Palestine? Surely no man with an ounce of respect for the truth will make such a claim. Surely the blood and the sweat and toil with which the Jewish people have fertilized the soil of Palestine should cast that lie back in the teeth of those who utter it. Surely the tens of thousands of Jews who have been kept alive only by the hope of reaching its borders desperately want their homeland. I know that a few Jews do not support Zionism. Some people therefore argue that the Jewish people do not want Palestine. That is as valid as claiming that the American people want Hitler over here because a few American citizens have been indicted for acting as his agents.

Is it because the Jewish people of Europe no longer need Palestine? That argument might conceivably make some sense if the other countries had kept open their doors to the helpless victims of hatred who cried for compassion. But the millions of Jews who have been murdered in Europe are millions of answers to those who suggest that the Jews do not need Palestine. These people have been oppressed as Jews, tortured as Jews, killed as Jews. Surely, then, the Jewish people urgently need their homeland where they can regain their dignity as Jews, build creatively as Jews, breathe freely as Jews, live proudly as Jews.

Is it because the Jewish people have proved incapable of building their homeland? I challenge anyone who makes that claim to take one look at some of the things I saw in

Palestine a few short months ago. During the past few years, the world saw painfully few examples of creative statesmanship. But I doubt if many examples of constructive effort in all history exceed that of the Jewish people in Palestine. While the rest of the world was plunging headlong into the abyss of depression and war, Jewish Palestine was building and expanding. A tiny settlement of some tens of thousands was growing into a modern nation of more than a half million. Where other nations were devoting their energies to destructive purposes, the Jews of Palestine were uniting in creative enterprise. Where aggressor armies were ravaging whole countries, the Jews were transforming a wasteland. Where others brought death, the Jewish national homeland brought life.

Is it because we were uncertain of the loyalty of the Jews of Palestine to the ideals for which we of the United Nations are fighting? To that I can say only this: One need but set foot in Palestine, to feel the depth of its dedication to the democratic ideal, to social progress, to human freedom. And let me remind those, whose memories are short, of one simple fact. The most important conference of this war, possibly of all history, was held in the Middle East. But it was not so very long ago that Jewish Palestine was the single oasis of democracy in a vast middle eastern desert of indifference and lukewarmness to democracy's fate. And it was not so long ago either that the Jews of Palestine had to wring from the United Nations the opportunity to give all they had in the fight against our common enemies.

The Jewish people, I therefore say, passionately want Palestine. The Jewish people desperately need Palestine. The Jewish people have supremely proved their ability to rebuild Palestine. The Jewish people have overwhelmingly demonstrated that they will build a genuinely democratic Palestine.

Then why do we of the United Nations persist in our determination to liquidate the Jewish national homeland? Why do we continue to thwart one of history's noblest and most inspiring adventures? Why do we make Palestine the scene of one of the most tragic injustices of this generation?

I can think of only one possible answer—expediency. We of the United Nations are playing a game. We are sacrificing certain loyalties of some people for the doubtful loyalties of others. We know that the Jewish people, come what may, will never abandon their fight against fascism. Do we think that by sacrificing the Jewish national homeland we can win the allegiance or the neutrality of others whose love for democracy may prove to be a doubtful affair?

That, I say, is the kind of expediency that persuaded the democracies to shut their eyes to the aggressive military plans of the dictators. That is the kind of expediency that led straight to Munich. That is the kind of expediency that plunged the world into war.

But is it expediency to shatter the greatest hope of the Jewish people in the hour of their greatest need?

Is it expediency to toy like a pawn with the fate of a people?

Is it expediency to hamstring one of the world's most creative developments when so much that is good is being destroyed?

Is it, expediency to announce to millions who have rallied to our cause that they can place no faith in our promises, no trust in our humanity, no hope in our justice?

May I suggest to you this evening my own conception of expediency?

Throughout Europe there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who have been driven from their homes and uprooted from their lands. Some few have escaped to neutral soil. The rest await the fanatical fury of fascism which is certain to be unleashed against them in the final agony of defeat. Many of these people can be helped to escape—if there is somewhere they can escape to. I say that it is expedient to throw wide open the gates of Palestine to every Jew who can be brought out of Europe to its shores.

Throughout Europe, there are millions of people who are risking their lives because they have faith in our pledges. I say that it is expedient to maintain that faith by honoring our commitment to the Jewish people.

Throughout Asia, there has been in many sections, an encouraging surge of democratic feeling. That is of vital importance for lasting peace and progress. I say that it is expedient to foster that movement by strengthening the most powerful advance base of the democratic ideal in Asia—Jewish Palestine.

Throughout Asia, standards of living will have to be raised and industrialization extended if democracy is to grow and flourish. I say that it is expedient to encourage that development by strengthening the most fertile source of creative inspiration in the Middle East—Jewish Palestine.

Humanity, justice, honor, expediency, therefore, all demand from us not that we shut the doors of Palestine but that we open them: Not that the development of Jewish Palestine be frustrated but that it be encouraged; not that the British White Paper be enforced but that it be ripped to shreds; not that the Jews of Palestine be reduced to the status of a minority but that they be given through the formation of a Jewish commonwealth the opportunity to take their place in dignity and honor among the world family of peoples.

We of the United Nations have shown that when we want to, we can rise to great heights not only on the battlefield but in the conference chamber as well. We rose to great heights at Moscow. We rose to great heights at Cairo. We rose to great heights at Tehran. Here in Palestine is another great conference opportunity for the United Nations. Let us liquidate every injustice at the conference table and give the lie to our enemies. I say it is another opportunity for the United Nations, because the fate of the Jewish people is not the exclusive responsibility of any single country—it is the concern of all mankind. Let us of the United Nations therefore have the greatness and the nobility to seize that opportunity and to seize it now. Let us scrap the white paper and destroy our last link with appeasement. Let us open the doors of Palestine and give new hope to millions. Let us affirm the right of the Jewish people to a commonwealth in Palestine and end their fears that it is to become a ghetto. And let us, by showing such greatness, restore the Holy Land to the world as a symbol of truth and justice: Of truth because we shall be honoring our solemn commitment, of justice, because we shall be ending one of history's gravest injustices.

While the military forces of the United Nations are fighting to preserve our right to life, liberty, and happiness, let us, through the instrumentality of the conference table, insure that right to the Jews of Palestine and to all the oppressed everywhere in the world.

Britain, Russia, Japan, and America's Role in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Britain, Russia, Japan, and America's Role in Asia," delivered by Harry Paxton Howard before the Community Church Forum in New York City on Sunday night, January 9, 1944.

The speech is of greater length than is allowed under the rule to be printed in the RECORD without an estimate having been made. I have had made an estimate of the cost, which is $247.50.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN, RUSSIA, JAPAN, AND AMERICA'S ROLE IN ASIA

(Speech delivered by Harry Paxton Howard before the Community Church Forum in New York City on Sunday night, January 9)

(The publication Who's Who In America, in its monthly supplement for June 1943, tells us that Harry Paxton Howard went to Japan in 1917, was associated with American and British newspapers there, and was deported by the Japanese Government in 1922 because of his association with Japanese labor men and other democratic elements, and the publication of his book, the Socialist and Labor Movement in Japan. Following his deportation from Japan he went to China, where he lived for 19 years, engaged in newspaper editing, magazine, and research work, and teaching in universities. He was Hitler's first American victim, as the Nazis brought powerful pressure to secure his dismissal from the China Press at Shanghai following his outspoken editorials on the Reichstag fire and the other criminal means used by the Nazis to seize power in Germany in 1933. He left Shanghai in May 1941, after 24 years in the Far East, because of Japanese threats of violence owing to some of his writings. His book on America's Role in Asia, published by Howell, Soskin, appeared last year.)

When we think of Asia, we should think of a vast continent far greater than North and South America taken together, with a population greater than all the rest of the world taken together. The continent of Asia, with its great fringing islands and archipelagoes, is the home of some 1,300,000,000 persons—10 times the population of the United States, an actual majority of the population of the earth. They are not of one race, but of many races. They are not of one civilization or religion, but of several civilizations and religions.

Almost one-third of this great continent is a part of the Soviet Union, ruled from Moscow. Great Britain, however, is the western power that came closest to establishing ascendancy over the Asiatic continent. This was during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, when Britain's vast empire included 430,000,000 Asiatic subjects, and was for generations the leading power in China—with a population estimated as high as 500,000,000. Britain still possesses most of this great empire, of which the brightest jewel is India with its population now approaching 400,000,000. Britain has now lost—for the time being, at least—the areas lying east of India, such as Burma and Malaya, Singapore, and Hongkong, and various other islands and parts of islands. It has also lost its ascendancy in China. But Britain has during the past 2 years made great gains farther west, and now possesses a more extensive and more integrated empire than at the beginning of the present war.

This is vital to the British Empire in Asia. For its real center of power is farther west. Britain rules India, and its other Asiatic and African domains, from Britain itself. Its power in southern and southwestern Asia is dependent mainly upon its military and industrial power in Britain itself, its shrewd diplomacy, and its communications. Its

communications with Asia have been greatly strengthened during the past 2 years. With our effective and decisive assistance, the British succeeded in obtaining ascendancy throughout north Africa and the Mediterranean. They expanded their power in the Middle East during the previous World War, by picking up some of the pieces of the old Turkish Empire. They have now strengthened this position further, giving friendly cooperation to the Lebanese and Syrians to get rid of their French overlords. From the Mediterranean through southern Persia to India there is now but one great power in the ascendant—Great Britain. Never before has this been the case.

Some of you may remember that 15 months ago, when our shrewd diplomacy with France enabled us to land in French North Africa with a minimum of French resistance, Premier Churchill announced triumphantly: "I did not become His Majesty's Prime Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." His triumph was understandable. For the landing in northwest Africa was made as an alternative to the second front in western Europe that Moscow was demanding, and which some high American officials favored as the most effective blow at Hitler's Europe—the blow direct. It was not merely a matter of strategy, but a matter of politics—this landing in North Africa.

For what it meant, in British imperial terms, was the ultimate ascendancy of Britain over all north Africa, and over the Mediterranean as well, including the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, and the southern part of Italy. Britain now, for the first time in her history, dominates the entire continent of Africa, with no single empire in a position to challenge this domination. She also possesses exclusive domination of the Mediterranean. For more than a year, while the struggle was under way, United States General Eisenhower was in supreme command. But some of you have noted the changes in command that took place 2 weeks ago.

General Eisenhower has become "European" supreme commander, with headquarters in Britain. The Mediterranean supreme command is separate from this, and is no longer in his hands. The supreme commander in that great and vital area is Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson. There are still American forces in the Mediterranean—plenty of them—but their officers are under this supreme British command. The Mediterranean has been made safe for British domination, and the British have the situation well in hand. What they have gained in north Africa and the Mediterranean is far greater and more important, in every respect, than what they have lost east of India. They now have a more powerful and more integrated empire, with better and more secure communications, than ever before. If the war were to stop tomorrow—which it will not—Britain would be one of the great victors.

It is quite understandable that the New York Daily News—a paper with which I do not claim to see eye to eye—suggested recently that a proper slogan for President Roosevelt would be: "I did not become President of the United States in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

Some of you may have read General Smuts' recent statement regarding the necessity of Britain's establishing herself on the European continent itself, as a counterbalance to the Russian colossus in eastern Europe. Some British imperialists envisage the bringing of Belgium, Holland, and perhaps other western European states into the British orbit even more closely than Portugal. The British may reassert their claim to Hanover—which was separated from England only a century ago—or other German territories. As you all know, the British, 3½ years ago, made an offer of complete union with France—and they certainly would like to see France brought together with Britain under the British Crown today.

So it is possible that the policy envisaged by General Smuts will be realized—that Britain may actually reestablish itself on the European continent. The growing strength of Soviet Russia in eastern Europe calls for some such balance—as it is seen in the eyes of British imperial leaders who think only in terms of balance of power. It will require, of course, an invasion of western Europe. The British, we may note, are no longer opposed to such an invasion. It is likely to be terribly costly, but if it is successful the British gains will be enormous.

There can be little doubt that most of the forces engaged in the invasion will be American. This was clearly implied by the statement from Washington—an official statement—which pointed out that our population is three times that of Great Britain. It seems likely that the proportion of 73 percent American to 27 percent British, as stated by Senator JOHNSON of the Military Affairs Committee, is correct. The official explanation about our population being three times that of Britain was evidently intended as an excuse for a similar disproportion in the number of fighting forces.

It happens, however, that our population is not 3 times that of the British Commonwealth of Nations, or 3 times that of the British Empire. The population of the British Empire, in fact, is some 500,000,000—almost 4 times the population of the United States. The population of the British Commonwealth of Nations, including the great dominions but not counting India and other colonies, totals some 75,000,000, which is not one-third but almost three-fifths the population of the United States. But the entire British Empire should be taken as basis, since it is the British Empire that has been at stake in this war.

So Britain, with firm footholds in western and southern Europe, with complete ascendancy in the Mediterranean, the entire African Continent, and the Near East, will have a firmer hold on her Asiatic Empire than previously, so far as contact and communications are concerned. It is already understood that with British ascendancy established in the eastern Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and other areas we will withdraw. This was made wholly clear in the speech by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, addressing the English-Speaking Union of Chicago on December 6, a few days after the Teheran Conference, in which he spoke of the actual division of the world between American and British naval forces under the intended international police force.

Secretary Knox's statement must be regarded as an official one. Furthermore, the New York Times' Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock, ascertained that Secretary Knox's statement was cleared by higher authority—i. e., by President Roosevelt. Colonel Knox, it will be remembered, described the wartime working arrangement of the United States and British Navies as "the backbone of our post-war naval police force, already organized and functioning." So specific was the program set forth by the Secretary of the Navy that it could safely be concluded that it had been reviewed and approved by both President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill—and their Cabinets.

The program, in the words of Secretary Knox, "assigns to the British Fleets control of the Eastern Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean, while the United States guards the western Atlantic and the entire Pacific. When the ships of either nation pass into the control areas of the other they pass into the command of the controlling Navy."

This British control of the eastern Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean is already being established. This, indeed, was the first task of the war. The second task, now well under way, has been the reestablishment of Moscow's domination over eastern Europe—the position that Stalin first achieved during his partnership with Hitler and which he is able to establish more firmly thanks to his assistance from us.

The British naval controls now being established will mean the continued domination of southern Asia at least as far east as India, Britain's exclusive ascendancy in southwestern Asia, British domination of the entire African continent, exclusive control of the Mediterranean and the eastern Atlantic, and domination of as much of southern and western Europe as is possible and practicable. If and when this is achieved, the United States can devote itself more fully to the job of dominating the entire Pacific. We have quite a way to go yet. Admiral King has suggested that the year 1949 might be our year of victory, and he made it clear that he was not being pessimistic.

In the meantime the British are emerging as probable victors in the war. Even in the Pacific, with American military and naval leadership, our main tasks so far have been the recovery of British New Guinea, the Gilbert Islands, etc., for the British Empire. As soon as our marines, at the cost of 3,000 American casualties, established themselves firmly on the blood-drenched shore of Tarawa the British resident landed, raised the Union Jack, and resumed civilian administration. No British armed forces whatever participated in this landing.

Will the "international police force" envisaged by Secretary Knox, with domination of the seas of the world divided between the cooperating American and British Navies, mean permanent peace? Secretary Knox does not think so. He was creditably frank in a press conference in London on September 24 when he said:

"I am not one of those foolish enough to believe that we can banish war. But I believe we can banish it for a while."

It is evident that he would not refer to his Chief, President Roosevelt, as foolish, so it would appear that the President shares his feelings on the subject. The President, however, has, fortunately, spoken for himself. In his press conference on December 17 he told the press, according to the New York Times:

"The Allied conferees were motivated by the general thought that they did not want another war in the lifetime of the present generation."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch quoted him as follows:

"The President had expressed the hope that after this war there would be no war for at least the lifetime of this generation. He was asked whether Stalin shared this view. He replied that Stalin did, very definitely."

I should like to quote the comment of that outstanding magazine of Christian thought, the Christian Century, upon this, in its issue of January 5:

"There was a time when the President talked of a lasting peace, a peace which would mean that never again would the sacrifices of war be required. Now, if this report is correct, in the informal intimacy of his press conference he says that what he and Stalin hope for is peace that will last a generation. We do not believe that such a peace will satisfy the men who are doing the fighting, or those at home who pray for them day and night. Peace for a generation is just another long armistice. Mankind demands something better than that."

We need not speculate, at this moment, who our enemies will be in the next war, a generation hence. If Germany and Japan are defeated and disarmed there will be only three great powers left in the world—or four, if China is built up to the position of a great power. The next war, therefore, will evidently be between some powers which are now allies. The only hope we have is that

Roosevelt and Stalin agreed that there would be no war for a generation. And then?

In the present war, however, Russia is our ally. For many generations Asia has been the great center of Anglo-Russian rivalry, though we now see this rivalry extending into Europe. Moscow today dominates far more of Asia, in terms of square miles, than Britain does. But British territory in Asia is far more populous, and much of it more fertile, lying farther south. So far, Britain has successfully checked—usually with the aid of allies—every attempt of the Russians to expand southward into warmer territories and to warm-water ports. They are still blocking such expansion, so far as possible. They agreed to supply Stalin's man, Broz, in Yugoslavia, but they insisted on keeping southern Persia—Iran—for themselves. And they have no desire to see Russia replace Japan in Manchuria.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the British gained the support of the French against Russia in the Crimean war. For generations, they propped up the evil and vicious Turkish Empire—the "unspeakable Turk"—against the Russians. They are still—now very cautiously, for obvious reasons—keeping what is left of Turkey as a buffer against Russia.

The Russians, blocked by British and French naval power, expanded southward by land—into Central Asia. The British had already established their position in India, and expanded farther to the east. They defeated China in the Opium War and forced the Chinese to accept the drug, took Hong Kong from the Chinese, and gained domination of the China Seas. The Russians obtained the great maritime province, where Vladivostok is now located, from the Chinese. The British strengthened their position in China itself by intervention in the Chinese civil wars of the mid-nineteenth century; they gained control of the Chinese maritime customs, one of the most important revenues of the Chinese Government in later years. They invaded and conquered Burma, which had long been a self-governing dominion of the Chinese-Manchu Empire.

The Russians built their great Trans-Siberian railway, running clear across Asia to Vladivostok. This was something the British could not ignore. Rapid communications would give the Russian colossus a most powerful position in the Far East, and threaten seriously the ascendancy Britain had secured in China by the Opium War and other aggressions. In fact the Russians in 1896 concluded a secret treaty of alliance with China, and extended their railway across Manchuria and southward to Port Arthur. British ascendancy in China was mortally threatened, and the British could not possibly stop the Russians themselves. Some Far Eastern people had to be brought into the conflict against Russia in eastern Asia, as the French and Turks had effectively aided the British at the southwestern extremity of Asia.

Now we come to Japan, for this is where Japan was brought into the picture of empire in Asia. Japan, as you may know, was one of the most isolationist countries in the world. For centuries the Japanese had lived to themselves, deliberately shutting out the wars and rivalries for empire elsewhere in the Far East. Japan was not a free country; it was a feudal despotism, under the control of various feudal lords. The family that bore the lofty title of "Sovereign of Heaven"—that we now call Emperor—had no political power whatever. And Japan at least had peace. For two centuries, before the events that followed the coming of Commodore Perry to Japan and the forcible opening of the country, Japan was at peace both at home and abroad.

The record of its relations with China is a most remarkable one. Japan first sent envoys to China in the fifth century A. D.—some 1,500 years ago. In that entire long history, it is an amazing fact that the relations between China and Japan were disturbed by only three wars. There are no two European countries neighboring on one another that have a record in any way comparable to this. There is not a century during which the soil of Europe has not been drenched with blood again and again. But there is the historic record of China and Japan: Three wars in 15 centuries of contact between these neighboring Asiatic peoples.

There is one very important thing to be remembered in connection with this. Some of you may have seen a statement by the American State Department, on December 4, 1943, describing the Japanese Emperor as a seeker of peace. Our former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, made a speech at Chicago on December 28 in which he declared that the cult of the god-Emperor in Japan could become a real and valuable asset. Frederick Kuh, in a dispatch to PM from London, December 24, reported that most British authorities apparently favored the Japanese imperial system. He quoted one British Far Eastern expert as saying that "any British Government would normally dislike as radical a disturbance of the status quo as the substitution of an unstable republic for the present throne in Japan."

Now it is important to keep these statements firmly in mind, for they do not represent a new policy but an old policy. That the British should support the monarchial system in Japan is understandable, from a viewpoint of their own dynastic interests. It is understandable, also, that the British should support the Italian monarchy, however much the democratic elements in Italy may detest their little king, the patron of Mussolini and of fascism in Italy. And everyone familiar with the situation in Italy knows that the American Government has seen eye to eye with the British on the subject, and is no more friendly to an Italian republic than the British Government is. The same thing is true in Japan.

But why is this so? Is it because the Japanese Emperor is really a lover of peace? Is King Victor Emmanuel of Italy a lover of peace and a friend of freedom? We know that the latter is not true. And those of us who know Japan and its history know that the role of the monarch in Japan has not been that of a peace lover or peacemaker. The fact is that the high position of the imperial dynasty in Japan, which dates only from the restoration in 1867, has meant giving a center of national unity to the Japanese, who were formerly divided into their feudal clans and feudal loyalties. This imperial system, which was largely based upon grand monarchy in Europe, was the center of the new growth of Japanese militarism, imperialism, and aggressive expansion. And this was deliberately fostered and promoted by the British and American Governments, for imperial purposes.

I have sometimes found Americans amazed and incredulous when they have heard of such things. I hope that with the recent statements by the American State Department, by our former Ambassador to Japan, and by the British authorities quoted by Frederick Kuh, the facts of the matter will have become clearer. Their statements are directly in line with the attitude taken by the American—and, of course, the British—Government 50 years ago, when there was a severe political crisis in Japan, with the recently formed Japanese Parliament asserting itself so emphatically that the whole imperial system was in danger. Parliament was demanding full control of Japanese political life.

I have referred to this in my book, America's Role in Asia, from which I quote:

"The American Minister had long since reported the grave political crisis in Japan and informed Washington that unless the Japanese Government were permitted to divert popular hostility from themselves to foreign enemies the whole imperial order was threatened. The throne itself, he had emphasized, was in danger, and its collapse would be a calamity. The administration at Washington in this situation, sympathized wholly with the throne and the bureaucracy against Parliament, and agreed that the militarists must have a free hand."

The free hand in question was in China. The Japanese militarists were permitted to invade China in order to rally patriotic feeling to the support of themselves and the throne. And they did invade China. But what is behind all this—this American as well as British support and patronage of the Japanese imperial system—a system of absolute despotism supported by a state religion of Emperor worship, with the Emperor a living god, like Alexander and others of ancient days? Why should our Government, even today, when we are actually at war with Japan, patronize and support this evil and vicious form of government, resting not only upon the physical but the mental enslavement of its subjects? It is a far cry from the days of Thomas Jefferson, who was the sanest and wisest adviser of the French revolutionists who overthrew their imperial absolutism in 1789, and who fostered and favored the Monroe Doctrine as a declaration against the evil and despotic principles of the Holy Alliance, and in favor of the development of free government on the American Continent. How can we have traveled such a road, from being the friends of free government and human liberty to being the friends and patrons of absolutism, reaction, and the vicious and degrading creed of Emperor worship?

The reason for our attitude in the Far East is not a mystery. Some Americans in the Far East were seeking special privileges and were prepared to cooperate with the British or anyone else in gaining such privileges. Most of Asia had already been reduced to colonial subjection by the latter part of the nineteenth century, but China was too great to be conquered outright by western powers. It is a country greater than the United States in territory, and almost four times as great as ourselves in population. Britain and other powers seized some of the outer territories of China and established themselves along the China coast, but they could not conquer China outright. For this it was necessary to get help from some Asiatic allies, offering them a share in the plunder. But Japan and China were friendly neighbors, and had been throughout most of their long history. Their last war was at the end of the sixteenth century.

The British Minister to Japan, Sir Ernest Satow, was the actual promoter of the Imperial Restoration in Japan in 1867. He had carefully worked to promote conflict between the feudal clans of Japan, and when this struggle had been brought to a height, with foreign intervention and supplies of foreign munitions, he suggested the establishment of the monarchical system in Japan as a center of unity. In the civil war of 1867 and 1868 the British actively intervened on the side of the monarchists, and we followed suit. We gave actual and active support to the monarchists when they moved north to crush the "Republic of Hokkaido" which had been set up by Japanese on that northerly island.

Why was this done? Because the British—and those Americans who follow similar ideas—wanted to see the dynastic principle advanced, and also because they saw a developing Japanese militarism as an offset to China. The modern period of Japanese-Chinese relations started in 1873, when we

embarked upon what our then Minister in Tokyo, Mr. de Long, termed "the true policy of the representatives of the western powers to encourage Japan in a course of conduct thoroughly committing its Government against" an alliance with China, "and by estranging its court from those of China and Korea make it an ally of the western powers."

Now, this estrangement policy has been the most fundamental and permanent of all western policies in the Far East, starting with organizing, building up, encouraging, instigating, financing, and supplying Japanese militarism and imperialism against the Chinese. For this, the estrangement of the courts was central, for the assertion of the power and position of the sovereign created open rivalry. The mutual-assistance pact between China and Japan in 1872 did not even mention the two sovereigns. It was an agreement between governments, not between sovereigns.

So Japanese militarism and imperialism were built up, first, as a weapon against China, in the hope of estranging and instigating Japanese militarists against the Chinese. There were democratic and antimilitarist elements in Japan which opposed this policy, and opposed the imperial oligarchy as well. But when political crisis came in 1893, the militarists were able to deflect popular feeling by the appeal to patriotism. They invaded China and Korea, and gained special privileges not only for themselves but also for the British—and for some Americans—in China. The Chinese were forced to pay a big indemnity to Japan, but they had to borrow the money abroad, and the Japanese did not actually see very much of the money. The British induced the Japanese to take a good bit of it in the form of naval armaments and other munitions. Japan was taken into partnership with Britain and other powers in the exploitation of China.

There is one thing about this that should especially interest us at the present time. Down to 1894 Britain and the United States—and other powers—possessed the same extraterritorial privileges in Japan that we possessed in China down to a year ago. But in that year, when the Japanese militarists invaded Korea and China, the British and American Governments agreed to relinquish our special privileges in Japan and treat the Japanese on a basis of equality. It is worth while to remember the parallel to the present day. Now we are building up Chinese militarism to fight Japan, and we are starting to relinquish our special privileges in China and treat the Chinese on a basis of equality. There is not the slightest evidence that the building up of Chinese militarism will assure peace in the Far East, any more than the building up of Japanese militarism assured peace. But our Government, it must be remembered, does not even hope for permanent peace. All it is working for is "peace for a generation." By that time, perhaps, Chinese militarists will be much more powerful than Japanese militarists. It is too early to figure which one we will fight in the next war. Perhaps the Japanese will be our allies again—as they were in the last war.

In 1898, when we got into the Philippines, the British encouraged us most strongly to hang onto them, and not to let them go. So they obtained us as an ally in the Far East, and we have remained their allies until this day. Then, in 1900, when the Chinese Boxers rebelled against the partitioning of their country by western powers, the British and American Governments begged the Japanese to join us in the military expedition against Peking—to which they finally agreed. Then, in 1902, the British concluded a formal alliance with Japan, with the specific purpose of encouraging the Japanese to make war against Russia. The Japanese treacherously attacked the Russians in 1904, and treacherously invaded little Korea. They had both financial and diplomatic support from both Britain and the United States. Without this British and American support, they would have been disastrously defeated. They would not, indeed, have dared to make war. But as it was, they gained a firm foothold on the mainland of Asia, dominating both Korea and south Manchuria. It is this foothold that they have so effectively expanded during the past 13 years.

So Japan emerged as a third power in Asia. She was built up—this little feudal country of isolationism and peace was centralized and organized and militarized and built up under an imperial oligarchy and with a newly invented state religion of Emperor-worship—by Britain and the United States, in order to serve the purposes of imperial ambitions and balance-of-power politics first against China, then against Russia. Russia and Britain remained the two principal antagonists for domination of Asia. But the Japanese had now been brought into the picture, as allies of the British. And we had come into the picture also, as supporters and backers of the British and Japanese against the Russians and Chinese. We must remember that the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, concluded in 1902, was the actual fulfilment of American Minister de Long's dream of 1873, to estrange the court of Japan from those of China and Korea, and "make it an ally of the western powers."

I have told you of Japan's amazingly peaceful record down to the Imperial Restoration—as it was called—of 1867. What has been Japan's record under the rule of the new Imperial oligarchy, under the Emperors that our State Department alleges are "seekers of peace." Japan went to war in 1873, in 1894–95, in 1900, in 1904–5, in 1914–19, in 1931–32, in 1937, and in 1941. The record speaks for itself. And those highly placed Americans who are so friendly to the Japanese Monarchy, who were responsible for the specific instructions to American airmen in 1942 not to bomb anywhere near the Imperial Palace in Tokyo, who are responsible for the O. W. I.'s instructions to say nothing offensive against the Japanese Emperor, who are responsible for the present propaganda for Hirohito as a "seeker of peace" and Emperor-worship as a "fine constructive force"—such Americans are not seeking peace. They are seeking new wars, and preparing for new wars. For the Japanese Monarchy represents war. And when these highly placed Americans refer to the Japanese Emperor as a "seeker of peace," they do not mean peace with China, or peace with Korea, or peace with Russia. They mean peace with us—the old evil partnership which some of us thought was broken forever. Peace with the Japanese Monarchy with its monstrous record of war and aggression. Peace for a generation, perhaps, to prepare for the next war—on an even greater scale. Some men make enormous fortunes out of war. Some politicians may make remarkable careers out of war. Our boys at the front risk their lives, day after day. Our politicians risk only their careers.

You all know, I think, of the manner in which the United States supplied the Japanese militarists, under their "peace seeking" Emperor, with war materials for use against the Chinese, right down to 1941. Our exporters supplied them not only with a sufficiency for their war of aggression against China, but with a considerable surplus for use against us. It is well to remember that the Japanese planes that bombed Pearl Harbor flew there on American fuel oil.

Now this was not a new American policy. It was an old policy. For more than half a century we have been supplying the Japanese militarists for wars of imperial aggression. Some of our exporters and bankers have made out excellently from this business. But now that war is on, it is the common people of this country who are paying the bill—paying it in "blood and sweat and tears." The exporters and bankers are not suffering. They are making more than ever before. The same elements that made tens of millions by supplying the Japanese militarists for their wars of aggression are making billions by supplying the present war against the militarists. It's an ideal business for these people, profiteers in war and in peace: Heads they win, tails we lose.

How does it happen that we are now at war with Japan, instead of continuing to finance and supply them in their war against China? To most Americans, the reason is simply: Pearl Harbor. But every American who read the Roberts Commission's report on Pearl Harbor knows that the Japanese attack there did not come as a surprise to Washington. For the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Military Intelligence had all notified their subordinates at Hawaii, on November 27, that negotiations with Japan had ended, and that an attack was to be expected at any time, but that we must not make the first overt act. But how were these negotiations ended and why? And what was the background of this remarkable development which led directly to our involvement in war?

Time does not allow of any extended survey of the situation, so I will briefly recall some central developments with which you are all, I believe, familiar. Stalin concluded a pact of nonaggression with Hitler in August 1939, which was in effect a pact of nonaggression against one another but aggression against smaller nations. They divided eastern Europe between themselves. Then, with his eastern front secure, thanks to Stalin's friendly neutrality, Hitler was able to strike westward at Denmark and Norway, at Holland, Belgium, and France. These things are matters of history.

In the spring of 1941, Stalin concluded a pact of nonaggression with Japan. The pact with Hitler was the prelude to the partition of Poland, and later of other parts of eastern Europe. The pact with Tokyo was the prelude to the partition of China. In fact, it partitioned vast areas between Russia and Japan. The Russians recognized Japan's domination of Manchuria through Japan's puppet regime there, known as Manchukuo. The Japanese recognized Moscow's domination of outer Mongolia through Stalin's puppet regime there, known as the Mongolian People's Republic. This was only the beginning. But before they could extend their partition farther south—as Hitler and Stalin extended their partitioning of eastern Europe between 1939 and 1941—the Germans treacherously struck at Russia, and Stalin had to concentrate all his forces in Europe to meet the attack.

Now there is one very important point to remember about this: It was the friendly neutrality and nonaggression pact between Moscow and Berlin which enabled Hitler to strike westward into Scandinavia, the Low Countries, and France in 1940. In the same way, it was the friendly neutrality and nonaggression pact between Moscow and Tokyo in 1941 that enabled the Japanese to strike southward against the United States, the British, and the Dutch. Hitler's rear was safe and secure in 1940. Japan's rear was safe and secure in 1941. Russia and Japan have remained friendly neutrals in the Far East. There is no reason to expect them to alter this policy. Neither the Soviet Government nor the Japanese Government has ever violated any agreement which it was to their interests to observe.

So the Japanese were able to concentrate all their forces on the southward drive. Now just why did they make this treacherous attack upon the United States, which had built up and patronized Japanese militarism and

the Japanese Imperial despotism from the very beginning of its modern development, some 75 years ago? Our Government, in fact, had in May approached the Japanese with the offer of a deal against Germany, as we now know from the State Department's official publications.

This offer to Japan was connected with a very important event, of which we learned something from a British official statement last October. This event was the landing of a Nazi envoy, Hess, in Britain on May 10, 1941. According to the official British statement of last October, Hess declared that Hitler "does not want to defeat England and wants to stop fighting" [England]. "He gave his word of honor that the Fuehrer had never entertained any designs against the British Empire, nor had he ever aspired to world domination. The Fueher would sincerely regret the collapse of the British Empire. Hitler had declared to him as recently as May 3 that he had no oppressive demands to make on England."

The German proposals were, in brief, "that Germany should be given a free hand in Europe," and England "a free hand in the British Empire, except that former German colonies should return to Germany." Also, "the British should evacuate Iraq." Germany "had certain demands to make of Russia which would have to be satisfied either by negotiation or as a result of war."

There can be no doubt that what all this added up to was an offer of peace with Britain, and support of the British Empire in Asia and elsewhere, on the basis of German demands on Russia and probably war. Now it is important to realize that the American Government knew immediately what Hess had come to England for, though this information was kept from the public, as completely as possible, for more than 2 years. If we read the State Department's White Paper, we may note the remarkable event that immediately followed Hess' landing in England.

He landed in England on May 10. The following day was Sunday, which I always thought was a holiday at Washington as elsewhere. Yet on that Sunday, as we know from the State Department's paper, Secretary Hull approached Japanese Ambassador Nomura with a new and significant proposal: "Secretary Hull told Ambassador Nomura that if Japan really desired a settlement of the Pacific situation on a basis of peace and friendliness, there should be no serious difficulty * * *. We were profoundly convinced that Hitlerism * * * would be applied to Japan herself just as quickly as it had been applied to countries in Europe which had trusted Hitler * * *.

"Unless the civilization of the world was to run the great risk of being destroyed by Hitler, the united efforts of nations like Japan, the United States and Great Britain would be required to shape the course of the world in a different direction. * * * We proposed to resist when and where such resistance would be most effective, whether within our own boundaries, on the high seas, or in aid of such countries as Great Britain."

The Japanese Ambassador, we are informed by the State Department, responded eagerly and promptly, and the following day "handed to the Secretary of State, as under instruction from his Government, a proposal for a general settlement between the United States and Japan." Negotiations started and were continued, simultaneously with the discussions proceeding in England of the German proposals. These talks were secret, in both capitals. Neither Congress nor Parliament was informed.

The Germans invaded Russia. The Japanese remained neutral, declining to respond to Hitler's appeals that they strike Russia in the rear. Our negotiations with Japan continued, and the Japanese Government—according to the official statement of our State Department—made the definite decision to reach a friendly settlement with the United States. Permit me to quote verbatim from the story given out by the State Department at Washington on December 4, 1943, as it appeared in the New York Times on December 5:

"Emperor Hirohito, when the present Japanese Government of General Hideki Tojo took office on October 18, 1941, had taken the unprecedented step of directing the Government heads to avoid war with the United States. Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan, reported this as reliable information from an unidentified informant on October 25, 1941.

"Just before the fall of the preceding cabinet, Mr. Grew reported, the Emperor, in a conference with the leading members of the privy council and of the armed forces, inquired 'if they were prepared to pursue a policy which would guarantee that there would be no war with the United States.'

"The army and navy representatives did not reply to the question, so the Emperor, 'with a reference to the progressive policy pursued by the Emperor Meiji, his grandfather, in an unprecedented action ordered the armed forces to obey his wishes.' "

The new Japanese Cabinet dispatched the special envoy Kurusu to Washington, to negotiate here. He arrived in November, evidently with instructions to reach an agreement on a basis previously discussed and tentatively agreed to by representatives of the two Governments, and with specific orders "to pursue a policy which would guarantee that there would be no war with the United States."

On November 26, as we know from the State Department's official statement, the American Government presented the Japanese with wholly new demands. Instead of the previous appeal, and I quote, for "the united efforts of Nations like Japan, the United States, and Great Britain" against Hitlerism, the American Government called upon the Japanese to "withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and from Indo-China," and "not support, militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China, with capital temporarily at Chungking." Japanese assets in the United States had already been "frozen," and an increasingly tight embargo was already being enforced against Japan. Our note of November 26 made it clear that only by yielding to our demands would the Japanese be able to obtain the resumption of peaceful economic relations with the United States.

Secretary Hull, it is important to realize, did not expect these new demands would be accepted. According to the New York Times correspondent, Arthur Krock, under date of December 17, 1941, Secretary Hull "felt sure that the reply of Tokyo to the proposals of November 26 would be an expansion of the war somewhere in the Pacific area at the first moment that appeared to be propitious and who issued a private warning to his associates to look for it at any time."

That these warnings were actually issued we know from the Roberts Commission's report of January 23, 1942. On November 27, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Army Chief of Staff, and the Chief of Military Intelligence at Washington all sent most remarkable and significant messages to their chief officers at Hawaii and elsewhere, stating specifically that negotiations with Japan "had ended"; that hostilities were "momentarily possible"; but that "this Nation should not commit the first overt act."

On December 7, the Japanese attacked. Secretary Hull's expectations were fulfilled. And Congress, which had shown such bitter resistance to repeal of the Neutrality Act in November, was brought by this overt act to virtually 100-percent support of the war. There seems to have been very little consideration of the fact that our Government had on November 26 presented a virtual ultimatum to the Japanese, in the full expectation that the Japanese reply would be war. We had been attacked, and we rallied in defense.

What caused the administration to effect its radical change in policy toward Japan in November? Perhaps it was the great difficulty it had in obtaining repeal of the Neutrality Act. As is clear from the State Department's published papers, Hitlerism was seen as the main enemy, and for months our Government sought Japan's cooperation against Hitler. The Japanese Government, according to our State Department, was determined to avoid war with the United States, and welcomed our earlier proposals.

But the administration faced enormous difficulties in obtaining repeal of the Neutrality Act in November 1941. It succeeded in getting what it aimed at, but against very strong opposition. It was out of the question to get a declaration of war from Congress, unless we were actually attacked. So the administration finally decided to withdraw its former offer of a friendly understanding with Japan against Germany, and present the ultimatum of November 26. So it got its declaration of war—overwhelmingly, and with only one dissenting vote.

So we were gotten into the war via the Pacific. But we did not concentrate our forces in the Pacific. We concentrated our forces and our supplies farther west, supporting the countries which were fighting Germany. So the British Empire has not only been saved, but has been made more powerful than ever before. The Soviet regime has not only been saved, but is now expanding its domination in the areas of eastern Europe which it formerly got hold of by its deals with Hitler. But Japan has expanded to the dimensions of a vast empire, one of the greatest in the world. So far we have done no more than push into the farthest periphery of this empire, at two points. As General Edson of the United States Marine Corps said, on January 3, summing up the situation, the Japanese had "lost practically nothing" except some shipping, their casualties had been light in comparison with their total strength, and "they have in their possession at the moment everything that they started this war for." And he warned that Tarawa, for which we paid so heavily, was "easier" than some points nearer Japan will be. "The information which we had on tides at Tarawa was sketchy at the best," he said. "As we get farther and farther toward Japan we will have even less information than we had this time."

I believe that most of the American people want the persons responsible for the treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor brought to book. And if we are fighting for permanent peace, and for the freedom and democracy which are the basis of enduring peace in the Far East, the war is worth while. Freedom and democracy and enduring peace are worth fighting for, in order that our children may be free from the fear of slavery and from the fear of war.

I shall not again quote what President Roosevelt has said on this subject—"peace for a generation"—or what Secretary Knox and others have said. I shall ask, instead, whether we are fighting to help the peoples of eastern Asia to attain their freedom, or for something else. Are the peoples of China and Burma and Malaya and the East Indies and Korea and other countries to have the right to govern themselves? Or is it the purpose of our Government to reestablish British and Dutch and French and other white rulers over Asiatic peoples who do not want them, and to keep the Japanese imperial oligarchy in existence and bargain with it

over the territorial division of the Far East, hoping to have the Japanese militarists as our allies in the next war?

If this last is the purpose, it is probable that President Roosevelt will see his expectations of another war a generation hence fulfilled. For no permanent peace can be based on the subjection of Asia.

Cooperation and not empire, democracy and not domination, peace and not war and military alliance, must be the binding ties of a free world. Western domination of Asia is passing before our eyes. And western empire must not give way to Asiatic empire. Both must give way to an organized world. This may seem a foolish idea to Secretary Knox, but it is not new to Americans familiar with America's great democratic traditions. For we ourselves, when we ended the power of the British Empire over these colonies, formed our own union of States. Union and cooperation is the alternative to empire, everywhere in the world. It is the one alternative that freemen seek, and that freemen can accept.

Is it Utopian to hope that stronger nations should use their strength as a trust to help weaker nations? Not merely to help them to fight, but to help them in the ways of peace? Such a policy is in fact the deepest and greatest tradition of our foreign policy, long before some ambitious politicians brought us into the selfish and unprincipled game of imperial aggressions and power politics and the financing of militarists and gangsters to provide markets and protect the paltry interests of a handful of privileged Americans. The earlier policy, the policy I now refer to, is the doctrine laid down by President James Monroe 120 years ago, when the Spanish and Portuguese empires had been expelled from this continent and were preparing to move back.

Our policy at that time was to warn those powers off, not merely as representing European empire but also as representing a political system in fundamental conflict with our own. The Monroe Doctrine was based upon the deepest and most fundamental interest of the American people—the preservation of democracy.

The world has dwindled since that time. Modern communications and other developments have brought the 1,300,000,000 of Asia much closer to us than the peoples of South America were a hundred and twenty years ago. And whether Asiatic peoples are to be free, and our friendly neighbors as part of a free and organized world, or to be the human base and cannon fodder of tremendous empires outnumbering us 5 or 10 to 1, is the gravest problem we have to face today. For the world can no longer survive nine-tenths slave and one-tenth free.

The basic policy of our Republic is not that of empire; our political system is not based upon concepts of absolute rule over subject peoples. And in this we differ from the British Empire, despite Britain's well-developed democracy in relation to domestic affairs, both at home and in the Dominions. Britain in Asia is an empire, not a democracy. And our political system is not that of Soviet Russia; neither can we favor the Communist methods of controlling the destinies of peoples outside the Soviet Union. We have our own political system, still imperfect but wholly sound, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. The preservation of this system is our primary interest, besides which all else fades into insignificance. And in order to preserve this system it must apply not only to domestic but to foreign affairs. We must follow foreign policies determined not by the interests of economic or political adventurers and careerists but by our fundamental national interests of peace and democracy.

The old order in Asia with its domination by western empires, is broken. We are free to declare our own American policy—a policy of freedom and justice for Asia. We must state it now, today, while we are carrying on the war that must forever end the brutal domination of the Japanese Army over eastern Asia. We must state it now, today, before our balance-of-power Machiavellians conclude some new deal with their beloved imperial absolutism of Japan. We must state it now, today, to show the peoples of Asia that we are their friends and not their enemies, and are not seeking either to salvage broken European empires, or to impose our own imperial domination.

We must formally and openly renounce any intention of subjecting any Asiatic country to our own imperial rule, or of seeking imperial privileges in Asiatic countries.

We must approach all our allies claiming territories in Asia for cooperation in a joint statement of specific renunciation of imperial ambitions in Asia. If we can obtain such agreement, it is far better than any other way. But if it is difficult, we must make it a unilateral doctrine like the doctrine of Monroe. It must be a clear, frank, and unambiguous statement of this most fundamental of American foreign policies. We must apply it to Asia. We need seek no new words or phrases. We can apply to Asia, and to the present situation, the historic words and phrases of the Monroe Doctrine.

"It is by rendering justice to other nations that we may expect it of them. It is by our ability to resent injuries and redress wrongs that we may avoid them.

"It is a proper occasion for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the Asiatic Continent and its fringing islands, by the free and independent condition which much of it will assume and maintain with the withdrawal of Japanese forces, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European or Asiatic power.

"The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Pacific. The political system of the European powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to reextend their system to any part of Asia or its fringing islands as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments which have declared their independence of foreign powers, with or without outside military aid or other support, and which are able to carry on their effective internal authority when outside support is withdrawn, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

If freedom is to live, this must be America's role in Asia. Our deepest rights and interests lie in the encouragement and advancement of the democratic way of life, everywhere that it lies within our power. And this, also, is the only lasting and worthwhile basis of peace. Not peace "for a generation," while preparing for a greater war a generation hence. But peace with freedom, the enduring peace of good neighbors in a free world.

We are not to expect or require Utopia from Asiatic peoples. We have not yet reached Utopia on this continent. We have not yet reached it here in the United States. It lies forever beyond the hills. But freedom is the light that brings us ever nearer to it. And if freedom is to live, Asia must be free.

Palestine

REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a signal honor as well as a moral duty to be the joint author and sponsor of House Resolution 419, simultaneously introduced by the Honorable JAMES A. WRIGHT, Member from Pennsylvania on the majority side of the House. This is a subject that has been near my heart for many years and as I have indicated I am most happy to be privileged as a Member of Congress to take some action looking toward the abrogation of the British White Paper which attempts to hold the Jewish people as a permanent minority in Palestine and which precludes the relief to the suffering Jew so long and so vividly presented to us in Europe. It is hoped that this joint action by the Congress will give the State Department encouragement to take active steps to bring about favorable action in Europe. It is also my hope that this concerted joint action, with the engendered sympathetic public opinion reawakened by these resolutions, will spur the administration to pursue an aggressive policy toward that end.

Let no one say this is not our business to interfere with Great Britain in this matter. Decidedly it is our affair. Great Britain formally initiated the project in 1918 and wanted our approval and encouragement which we and the other allies of World War No. 1 gave at that time. Subsequently, Great Britain became the trustee—mark you, the trustee—for 52 nations of the League of Nations in establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine. We must not forget that in 1922 a joint congressional resolution favoring the establishment of a Jewish home for the Jewish people in Palestine was adopted unanimously, and we must not forget that in 1924 a special treaty between England and the United States gave special significance and sanction to the mandate for Palestine. It is worthy of note that the treaty specifically set forth that any changes must be with our assent. This is ample reason, if there were no humanitarian ones, for us to actively and energetically insist that Great Britain abrogate the British White Paper which was enunciated without our assent or approval.

Every humanitarian impulse is toward opening wide the doors of Palestine to our suffering brothers of the Jewish faith. Let me say in conclusion that literally thousands of my constituents in Connecticut, both Jew and gentile, have urged me to lend assistance to any action that might speed the day when Palestine would once more be a haven for the Jew.

Answering those thousands and acting on behalf of the sympathetic members of the minority, I have taken this action today. It is my earnest hope that the House will give unanimous approval to the adoption of the resolution.

Address by Senator Tunnell Before the Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] before the Democratic National Committee, in session at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on January 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every majority party must defend itself against criticism of its record. In politics, the record of a political party is its certificate to the world as to its policy. I should say nothing at this time were it not for the fact that I believe the Democratic Party of the Nation has an opportunity such as parties seldom have. I believe that there is in connection with this opportunity a duty.

The present World War was foreseen by the leader of the Democratic Party who was then President of the United States before the war broke out in Europe in 1939. The President, realizing the dangerous position in which America would be placed, attempted to get the Congress of the United States in the position in which it would realize the danger that our Nation was likely to be hurled into a great war. His suggestions were ignored by many of his critics. Many of them said that he was looking for a third term in the Presidential chair. Others said he was just a warmonger with love of power. There were no war clouds in the skies according to these critics. In our form of government there are few whose duty it is to plan for the whole Nation. There are times when it appears that no one beside the President has that duty. At least few beside him seem to be greatly concerned about the country's interest. Many of us are concerned as to the problems of our various localities or States. The President must have an over-all picture of the Nation's position. At the close of the First World War the Republican Party which had been enlarged by accretions of the dissatisfied from the Democratic Party and from every other element of the American people blocked every attempt at placing the world in a position to prevent another World War. From the close of the First World War to Pearl Harbor, the Republican Party had been consistently isolationist. During the 8 years that I have been in the Senate I have observed the hostility which the Republican Party, through its representatives in the Senate, has exhibited to any steps which would be considered as a preparation for the war which our President told us was coming. Many sincere Republicans arrayed themselves on each side of this great question, but the majority of the minority party was clearly isolationist in its leanings.

Is it strange that under these conditions the Republican Party would prefer that there be no argument as to the foreign policy? Our opponents desire to point to their record in the vote on appropriations. They don't want us to point to their votes on lend-lease, on the selective service, on arming our merchant ships, and the various questions which arose when the President of the United States was pointing out the danger which our country then faced. The opposition party has voted for appropriations to conduct the war. It has consistently criticized the conduct of the war. A short time ago we were told that some of our allies were fighting the war at our expense in a manner that was entirely unfair. They told us that American gasoline was being used when the gasoline of other countries should be used. We were told that large numbers of American trucks were being taken to Europe or to the Pacific which should have been left in the United States. We were told that the lives of a million men could be saved if certain steps suggested by them should be taken. We were told that there should be an entirely different strategy in the war effort. I listened to two prominent Republicans a few nights ago over the radio. The implication of their speeches was clearly that there was no disagreement between the two parties on foreign policy. A question was then read to one as to what particular domestic law would be repealed if his party had the power to do so. We were told that in foreign policies there was no disagreement. In domestic policies there was no law which his party would pledge itself to repeal. Just what must the American people expect if this Government shall be turned over to the Republican Party? Will the social security laws be repealed? Will there be antilabor legislation? Will there be antifarm legislation? Will the old reactionary element of the Republican Party be able to dominate legislation? What is the policy of the Republican Party? The principal plank in the platform of the Republican Party at Chicago, if it properly portrays the sentiment of its leaders, will be an anti-Roosevelt declaration. The Republican Party believes that whatever is endorsed by President Roosevelt should be opposed, whether his proposals are good or bad. Again, for selfish reasons, these people must eliminate Franklin Roosevelt. They can't dominate him. Is such an elimination in the interest of the American people at this time?

What is the policy of the Republican Party? Up until the Mackinac Island Conference, its policy was isolationism. Is there a person within the sound of my voice who believes that any possible solution of world conditions would be sooner arrived at if the President should be displaced by some Republican? If such a move is to be made, who is there in whom the country has such confidence as to place that man in the position of Franklin Roosevelt? Is it Wendell Willkie? In what does his foreign policy differ from the policy of Franklin Roosevelt? What percentage of the American people would prefer to trust his judgment in foreign affairs to that of the President of the United States? Perhaps it is Governor Dewey with his proposed alliance? Are we going back to the days of alliances such as preceded the First World War? Are we to take the views of Governor Dewey on international affairs when that seems to be his only platform? Where are those who shouted so loudly against the President's policy of lend-lease? Where are those who called him a war monger? Where are those who told us that there was no danger of America being attacked by air? Who saw this war in advance? Who said there would be no war? Who realized the situation in which the United States was to be placed? Our Republican friends sneeringly refer to the slogan, "Win the War." They tell us that the war is in the hands of certain generals and admirals. They tell us that even a Republican could safely be trusted to sit in the White House. They tell us that the war is simply a matter of appropriating money for certain generals and certain admirals to spend. Can we beat Hitler without a head to the American Government? Just what do our political opponents want in this war? On Tuesday evening of this week I listened to a broadcast by a Republican leader. His whole theme was the failure of the American Government. He told us that during the First World War the maintenance of the cost of living was the result of a cooperative effort. He told us that the cost of living rose 100 percent during that war. He told us that the administration had bungled the whole domestic policy, and that the cost of living had risen only 25 percent during the present World War. He did not tell his radio audience that the income of the United States had risen from $39,912,000,000 in 1932 to $119,800,000,000 in 1942. He did not tell the audience that the taxes in the United States at this time to be paid in 1944 are greater than the total income of the Nation in 1932. He did not tell us that during this time the country has been placed in a state of defense and offense. He did not tell us that 45 percent of the cost of the war was being financed by taxation, practically all of which comes out of the profits and wages of the American people.

He did not tell us that our farms are turning out feed more rapidly than it was ever turned out before by the United States in wartime. He did not tell us of the tremendous amount of aid that we had given to our allies. He did not tell us of the numbers of airplanes, tanks, trucks, munitions that were being manufactured by the American people. He did not tell us that we have trained and equipped the greatest Army in the Nation's history. According to his story, everything is confusion and futility. By these methods the Republican leaders hope to change a minority to a majority during the absence of 10,000,000 men in this war. They hope, by adding to their numbers the dissatisfied from every element of American life, to make of their party a majority instead of a minority. They hope to add to their numbers every person who is dissatisfied with gasoline rationing. They hope to add to their numbers every man who is complaining about scarcity of automobiles. They hope to add to their number every person who objects to taxation in time of war. In other words, the whole appeal of the Republican Party at this time is to the dissatisfied. There is a duty upon the Democratic Party to take the offensive in this political war. There is a duty to save America from a repetition of the peace disasters after the First World War. Can we do this with the isolation Republican Party of the United States? Will this party be aided by the antiwar element which it has protected? The Democratic Party has the organizations in every State in the Union to save democracy. It has the conscientious, determined, law-abiding, patriotic Americans who want to win the war, who believe that it would be a case of lost motion to change the management of our country in the midst of a

world grapple for existence. The Democratic Party has, above all else, the Commander in Chief best fitted to command the ship during this world storm. The Democratic Party has today the duty to present its claims to the American voter. This is a duty not alone to the American people generally. It is a duty to each man in the armed service. It is a duty to each woman as she sits at home and waits the return of her husband in the world struggle. It is a duty that we owe each infant as it grows without the guidance and training of a father who is in the armed service, whether at home or in a foreign land. But there is a duty even stronger than that I have described. There is the duty to oncoming generations yet unborn that they may be saved from a struggle such as we have twice seen. It is a duty not alone to America and its generatons born and unborn. It is a duty to mankind. It is a duty to a suffering world. Can we again fail to measure up to our opportunties, our duties? Is the American electorate going to permit the Republican Party to have sufficient power to again block an effort on the part of the struggling nations of the world to prevent a future war? Are we to have again a fight against world progress such as was led by Henry Cabot Lodge after the First World War? Are purely partisan, political victories to be preferred to victories for mankind on the world front? Are we to throw aside with contempt the fruits of the struggle that is costing the lifeblood of millions? Is this a struggle for the freedom of mankind, or simply one for a victory for the Republican Party in the United States of America? Are these sacrifices of money, blood, and youth to be in vain? Can you combine the dissatisfied elements of this Nation, those who are dissatisfied with rations, with taxes, with war restrictions, into an organization dedicated to the preservation of our liberties and the elevation of our posterity?

The Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, interest in the Worley or Green-Lucas soldier vote bill continues to mount. Those of us who associated ourselves together a few evenings ago to devise a method by which a record roll-call vote could be obtained on the Worley bill or the principles embodied in it, have been greatly encouraged by promises of support from both sides of the aisle in the last few hours.

It is my conviction that when the previous question is moved on the rule for the soldier vote bill, plenty of Members will stand up to insist that there be a yea-and-nay vote. We have 118 signed to a pledge to do that and we have assurances from a great many more Members that they will be on hand.

These assurances have not come from only one side of the aisle and it is that fact which gives us reason to believe that the rule will be voted down and an opportunity given to so amend the rules as to insure a separate roll-call vote on the Worley bill.

We desire to show that the signers of this agreement, which gives a special significance for this early roll call on the previous question and thereby gives to the returning veteran in future years a clear index as to those who favored a uniform Federal ballot, were not confined to any section of the country. There were a dozen signers from California and a dozen from Pennsylvania. There were a half-dozen from Texas and a half-dozen from North Carolina. They came from Arkansas and Illinois, from Michigan and Missouri, from Florida and Washington, from Tennessee and Oklahoma. They were all over the map and that fact brings comfort and confidence to the supporters of the Worley bill. I list the signers to the petition for a clear-cut vote on the principles of a uniform Federal ballot for all men and women in the armed forces of the United States, and I list them here by the States which they represent:

Alabama: JOHN J. SPARKMAN.

Arizona: JOHN R. MURDOCK, RICHARD F. HARLESS.

Arkansas: BROOKS HAYS, J. W. FULBRIGHT.

California: CHET HOLIFIELD, CLAIR ENGLE, JERRY VOORHIS, WILL ROGERS, JR., ED. V. IZAC, CECIL R. KING, GEORGE E. OUTLAND, JOHN H. TOLAN, THOMAS FORD, CLARENCE F. LEA, ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, HARRY SHEPPARD.

Florida: ROBERT L. F. SIKES, EMORY H. PRICE, LEX GREEN, PAT CANNON.

Idaho: COMPTON I. WHITE.

Illinois: WILLIAM A. ROWAN, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, THOMAS S. GORDON, WILLIAM L. DAWSON, MARTIN GORSKI.

Indiana: RAY J. MADDEN, LOUIS LUDLOW.

Kentucky: B. M. VINCENT.

Maryland: D. J. WARD, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., LANSDALE G. SASSCER.

Massachusetts: JAMES M. CURLEY, THOMAS J. LANE.

Michigan: GEORGE SADOWSKI, LOUIS C. RABAUT, JOHN D. DINGELL, GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, JOHN LESINSKI.

Minnesota: HAROLD C. HAGEN.

Missouri: ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, CLARENCE CANNON, JOHN J. COCHRAN.

Montana: MIKE MANSFIELD, JAMES O'CONNOR.

Nevada: MAURICE SULLIVAN.

New Jersey: ELMER WENE, EDWARD J. HART.

New Mexico: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, A. M. FERNANDEZ.

New York: ARTHUR G. KLEIN, SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, CHARLES C. BUCKLEY, THOMAS F. BURCHILL, DONALD L. O'TOOLE, EMANUEL CELLER, JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, MARTIN J. KENNEDY, VITO MARCANTONIO, A. L. SOMERS, WALTER LYNCH, WILLIAM B. BARRY, JAMES H. FAY, LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI, THOMAS H. CULLEN, SOL BLOOM, JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, JOHN J. DELANEY, MATTHEW J. MERRITT, JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, WILLIAM T. BYRNE.

North Carolina: J. H. FOLGER, A. L. BULWINKLE, HERBERT C. BONNER, W. O. BURGIN, ZEBULON WEAVER, CARL T. DURHAM.

North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK.

Ohio: MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

Oklahoma: MIKE MONRONEY, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, JED JOHNSON, LYLE H. BOREN.

Pennsylvania: JAMES A. WRIGHT, DANIEL K. HOCH, GRANT FURLONG, JOHN W. MURPHY, HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, FRANCIS V. WALTER, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, FRANCIS J. MYERS, THOMAS SCANLON, MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, J. BUELL SNYDER, SAMUEL A. WEISS.

Rhode Island: JOHN E. FOGARTY, A. J. FORAND.

Tennessee: ESTES KEFAUVER, J. PERCY PRIEST, ALBERT GORE, WIRT COURTNEY.

Texas: R. E. THOMASON, NAT PATTON, LINDLEY BECKWORTH, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, WRIGHT PATMAN, ED GOSSETT, GEORGE MAHON.

Utah: J. W. ROBINSON, WALTER K. GRANGER.

Virginia: JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

Washington: JOHN M. COFFEE.

West Virginia: JENNINGS RANDOLPH, JOHN KEE.

Wisconsin: THAD F. WASIELEWSKI, LA VERN R. DILWEG, HOWARD MCMURRAY.

Farm Conditions and Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. E. C. Brookens, an attorney of Westmoreland, Kans., who is very familiar with farm conditions. He makes some suggestions in regard to individual income-tax returns that seem to me to have considerable merit.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTMORELAND, KANS., *January 18, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From time to time I have noticed statements in the newspaper concerning an effort to be made to simplify income-tax returns.

As you know, we are located in a rural community and I have had the occasion to assist many farmers in making their tax estimate.

The complaint most of them had was that after making the December estimate shortly thereafter they would be required to make and file a complete statement for the entire year.

It occurs to me, since each farmer is required to make a December estimate, that it would be well to change the fiscal year for them from December 1 to December 1 and then let them make a final return for the year at any time during the month of December; or if it is necessary that the fiscal year be from January 1 to January 1 then let them make and file a return during the month of January. In this way they would have to make but one return.

I found a number of cases where farmers had cattle or hogs on feed but could not tell whether they would be able to get them to market on account of the roads and also because trucks are hard to get at times.

Another matter that should be adjusted is the $624 exemption in estimating the Victory tax. Many farms are owned by the wife and husband jointly and the wife under recent conditions works about 50–50 in operating the farm; but we are told that unless the wife has a separate income from some other enterprise, even though she attends to the chickens and helps with the milking, she has no separate income that can be deducted even though the sale of the cream and eggs amount to more more than the $1,248.

It is not difficult to tell if a man and woman are married but it seems almost impossible to determine just what each of them earn in a joint enterprise, so why not eliminate that 40 percent post-war credit and give a man and wife $1,248 exemption or better still do away with the exemption entirely.

This present blank is a tremendously difficult piece of literature to understand. You must remember that many of the farmers have only an eighth-grade education and they know practically nothing about bookkeeping.

In helping make out the December 15 estimate, I recall one farmer who came to our office and he had with him a statement of the whole family's expenses, even including his chewing tobacco and it took a long time to check through a vast number of pages of items to check out the ones that could not be used in the December estimate.

If you fellows who passed this pay-as-you-go-tax law could spend about 2 weeks in a country law office helping make out these tax returns, I am sure you would then realize what the average farmer is up against. I have found that a large majority of the farmers are absolutely honest in their efforts to meet the requirements, but they are completely bewildered.

Very truly yours,

BROOKENS & BROOKENS,
By E. C. BROOKENS.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to a subject in which we are all vitally interested, and particularly the 43,500,000 taxpayers who will be called upon to file income-tax returns this year, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler, who writes a column under the headline "Fair Enough." The article is an extremely interesting one, and adds to what has been already said and written upon this all-important subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, January 21.—Henry Morgenthau thinks Miss Vivien Kellems' exhortation to her fellow citizens to refuse to pay their income taxes smacks of disloyalty. He exaggerates.

Miss Kellems is guilty of exasperation and foolishness, no worse. Her exasperation may do some good but she will surely pay for her foolishness because the Treasury has the right and power to sell her out on the courthouse steps like an Iowa farmer in the days of the panic and would have to do it to maintain the authority of government and law should this energetic and emotional manufacturer of a small but highly important war contraption persist in her refusal to pay on the ground that she needs the money for a stake to resume normal business after the war.

She has given shrill and penetrating voice to a cry of protest and despair on behalf of many other entirely loyal citizens who find themselves actually broke today, stripped of their savings and compelled to go to the loan sharks for money to hand over to Mr. Morgenthau. There are among these good Americans some with children in the services who have suffered sudden total loss of their normal employment or business and must now pay to the Treasury money which they had put by for that rainy day without the slightest hope that they will be able to pay the rent and keep their homes together. They will pay with a feeling that there is something wrong about a government which would reduce them to poverty and use part of their money to buy unaccustomed comforts for the peoples of foreign lands and to pipe streams of cash into the treasuries of corrupt unions at home. The family is the basic unit of American society and the Nation, but the income-tax rates now hold that the head of a family is entitled to only a miserably insufficient allowance for their support and must take care of strangers, including foreigners, first.

These are some of the thoughts of Americans no less patriotic than Mr. Morgenthau, who agree with Miss Kellems up to the point where she asks them to engage in a mass protest or tax strike.

Mr. Morgenthau said further that taxes are levied by Congress, representing the people, and that "we in the Treasury are charged by law with collecting those taxes."

That is correct, except that the Treasury has tried to tell Congress how much to charge and has insisted on ruinous rates. Paradoxically, the Treasury and the New Deal have squeezed and squeezed toward financial extinction the one class of income taxpayers who yield by far the most important return. There has been in this program evidence of animus against an economic and social class of Americans who are as patriotic as any of the rest and much more loyal than some ideologists in Washington.

Miss Kellems' reference to "fantastic, ridiculous, and distorted tax laws of this country which no one can understand" was not an exaggeration. These laws are unfair, retroactive in some respects, and so complicated that it has been necessary to hold classes for the instruction of agents of the Internal Revenue, who will admit, privately, that they still do not understand. The taxpayer himself is lost in the tangle of language and references, and he has a feeling that a tax originally intended to raise money to run his Government has now been turned into a device to take away his home, his savings, his insurance, and the money which he had hoped to leave his wife when he died. There has been a suggestion in the Treasury's taxing program for years that there was something morally wrong about saving and accumulating from the earnings of hard work and ability, and a parallel suggestion that the State should take over this and care for all alike and on charity rations.

Mr. Morgenthau expresses a political bias when he said of Miss Kellems' remarks, "Such an attitude is especially unworthy of persons profiting from war contracts."

Why is it especially unworthy? War contractors, on the whole, have given this Nation service at least as great and noble as his own. These contracts were no favor to these manufacturers. They were made in good faith between citizens and the Government, but he suggests that war contractors somehow forfeit their freedom of speech.

Return to Civilian Use of Palm Beach Hotel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in PM on January 23, 1944, entitled "Palm Beach Hotel Men Happy; Wounded Ordered Out."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALM BEACH HOTEL MEN HAPPY; WOUNDED ORDERED OUT—GENERAL SOMERVELL ORDERS BREAKERS, NOW ARMY HOSPITAL, RETURNED

(By I. F. Stone)

Real-estate interests of Palm Beach, Fla., have succeeded in a long campaign to throw wounded American soldiers out of that famous resort.

The famous Breakers Hotel, taken over by the Army in December 1942, and converted at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars into a modern hospital, will be vacated on March 31, put back into shape at the cost of several hundred thousand dollars more and handed back to the Florida East Coast Hotel Co.

The War Department's sudden decision was made as those in charge of the hospital, in expectation of an increased flow of casualties from the projected second front, were preparing to ask permission to expand their facilities. These were planned especially for neuropsychiatric and facial surgery cases in the belief that the all-year-round sunshine of Palm Beach made it an ideal place to rehabilitate battle-broken minds and bodies.

SOMERVELL SIGNS

Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding officer, Army Service Forces, signed the order to abandon the Breakers as a hospital on January 10 without discussing it with the Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk. He said he did so because there was "no use paying high rentals when space was available elsewhere." The General said "we owe that to the taxpayers."

There are almost 800 patients, many of them battle casualties, in the Breakers now and most of them are to be moved to Camp Atterbury, Ind.

Although local Palm Beach real-estate interests and their spokesmen in Washington have sought to make it appear that the town is unanimous in wanting to get rid of the hospital, Mrs. George Emerson, mother of Alfred Gwynne Vanderbilt and one of the social leaders of the fashionable colony, told this correspondent by long-distance telephone that she thought the decision "outrageous" and that it was deeply resented by many persons there.

CHANCES FOR THE RICH

"Many of my friends are up in arms about it," Mrs. Emerson said. "This is a wonderful

place for the boys and there is talk of getting up a petition. Charles Alexander felt so badly about it that he sent a telegram of protest to the President.

"This was a chance for Palm Beach to show that the so-called rich people are back of the war effort and we feel very intensely about it. It must have cost several hundred thousand dollars to put the place in shape for a hospital and now it looks like money thrown out the window. The boys in the hospital feel very bad about it and we all wish something could be done to get Washington to reverse its decision."

Mrs. Emerson has been working in the hospital as chairman of the Gray Ladies, but asked that it be made clear that she was speaking for herself and not for that organization.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida) declared that he and Mrs. Pepper had visited the hospital recently and had intended speaking with War Department officials about plans to enlarge it. He said he was very much impressed with the hospital and surprised by the sudden decision to hand it back for operation as a hotel.

FIFTY DOLLARS A DAY

The Breakers, largest hotel in West Palm Beach, is one of the most fashionable hotels on the east coast of Florida. It had 500 rooms, and a tourist agency in New York said that while the rates used to run from $24 to $40 a day American plan, it would rent when reopened at from $30 to $50 a day. This agency said it would not be ready for occupancy this season.

The hotel is one of many built by the late Henry M. Flagler, who was an associate of the elder Rockefeller, and also built the Florida East Coast Railway. The hotel is owned by the Florida East Coast Hotel Co. Its counsel is Scott Loftin, former United States Senator, a Jacksonville corporation lawyer long associated with the Flagler estate and receiver for the Florida East Coast Railway.

The hotel was taken over by the Army Air Forces as a rest and rehabilitation center for evacuated wounded and turned over on September 10 last to the Surgeon General, who put it in shape to handle neuropsychiatric surgery, ophthalmic surgery, and maxillo-facial plastic surgery. In lay terms this means surgery for injury to brain, spine, and nerves, surgery of the eyes and facial surgery in head and jaw wounds.

ROUTINE MATTER

A War Department source said $299,402 had been spent in equipping the hotel for use as a hospital and that the first rental payment was at a rate of $250,000 a year. The cost of restoring the hotel is estimated at from half to two-thirds the amount spent in equipping it, probably two-thirds, according to this same official source. Engineers are now working on the details. This would put the cost of restoration at from $150,000 to $200,000.

According to this source, General Somervell signed the order for the release of the hotel as a routine matter, along with many similar orders. The officer responsible for real estate matters is Col. John O'Brien, head of the Real Estate Division in the Army Service Forces, formerly in the Lands Division of the Department of Justice.

The owners of the hotel have been running an undercover pressure campaign for its release almost ever since the day the Army took it over, according to informed real estate sources, but promised the Surgeon General at a private conference last November that they would give it up since he thought the hospital necessary.

General Somervell vigorously denied a report that he had signed the release over the objections of the Surgeon General. He sent PM word that he had signed it without discussion with the Surgeon General but phoned the Surgeon General at once when he heard PM's report. Somervell said the Surgeon General expressed himself as in agreement with his decision. The Surgeon General could not be reached for comment.

Two Members of Congress, Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS of Florida, and Representative PAT CANNON, who represents the district in which Palm Beach is situated, have been sending the War Department letters from constituents and real-estate interests back home asking for the release of the Breakers.

SOCIAL HANDICAP

Restoration of the Breakers as a hotel would increase tourist and railroad business on the east coast. A Palm Beach newspaperman explained that use of the Breakers as a hospital interfered with the resort's social activities because that hotel had formerly been the center of West Palm Beach social life.

Judging from Mrs. Emerson's reaction, many members of the fashionable social colony seem prepared to make that sacrifice. Apparently business interests in West Palm Beach, headed by Mayor James M. Owen, feel differently.

I was unable to reach Senator ANDREWS but did succeed in speaking with Representative CANNON. This is the conversation which took place:

"We understand you were the leader of a campaign to get the hospital moved out of Palm Beach."

"Not that I know of," Representative CANNON said. "My files don't show it. If anything was done by my office, it was done orally."

"Well, didn't Palm Beach people ask you to help get rid of the hospital?"

TRANSMITTED REQUEST

"I did transmit a request of Mayor James M. Owen to the War Department just like I'd transmit any request by my constituents," was the answer.

"Don't you investigate requests before you pass them on?"

"I do when I want to," CANNON replied. "What's your interest in this, anyway?"

"Well, we understand there are close to 800 battle casualties there."

"They're not going to be thrown in the gutter," was the Congressman's comment.

I said I understood the Surgeon General was opposed to releasing the hotel. I asked the Congressman whether he had discussed the matter with the Surgeon General.

"Why don't you call the War Department?" Representative CANNON said. "General Somervell knows all about it."

Somervell said no member of the Florida delegation had been in touch with him about the hotel. Recent large-scale releases of hotels may be linked with the fact that the Truman committee has begun an investigation into the amounts paid as rental.

American Federation of Labor Urges Congress to Create an Agency on Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an Associated Press report from Miami, Fla., dated January 27, 1944, showing that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor has endorsed the creation of a commission by Congress on reconstruction somewhat similar to the action taken by the House yesterday when it approved unanimously a resolution to set up a Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, consisting of 18 Members.

The following committee was appointed by the Speaker:

WILLIAM M. COLMER, Mississippi, chairman; JERE COOPER, Tennessee; R. EWING THOMASON, Texas; FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania; ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Missouri; JERRY VOORHIS, California; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona; WALTER A. LYNCH, New York; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; HAMILTON FISH, New York; CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Massachusetts; B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee; RICHARD J. WELCH, California; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, New Jersey; CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; CHARLES S. DEWEY, Illinois.

This committee has practically the same objectives as suggested by the American Federation of Labor, of trying to provide post-war employment for American wage earners and to stabilize American industry and our entire economic system.

The Associated Press report referred to follows:

MIAMI, FLA., January 27.—The American Federation of Labor's approach to post-war problems is a reconstruction commission created by and responsible to Congress, with authority to make the over-all policy on reconversion, contract cancelation, disposal of Government property, and utilization of demobilized manpower.

The policy would be made by representatives of employers, labor, and agriculture, with a chairman appointed by the President. Quarterly reports to Congress would be required.

The A. F. L. executive council yesterday heard these recommendations by its post-war committee, headed by Matthew Woll, and adopted them as its own. The council's winter meeting was expected to end today.

CONFERENCE SLATED

The council also announced it would sponsor a conference of employers, labor, and agriculture in the near future to consider these problems. The conference will be financed by a $10,000 contribution from the Carnegie Foundation. Mr. Woll, answering news conference questions, intimated that the labor representation at the conference would be limited to the A. F. L. He said the Carnegie contribution was made "without strings."

Legislation creating a reconstruction commission also would provide for continued price control and rationing of scarce commodities until stability is attained.

Mail Service for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of Congress I receive

hundreds of letters relative to the delivery of mail to those in the armed forces. The great majority of them commend the service, but now and then, naturally, there is a complaint due to the fact that the relatives or friends have received letters, especially from abroad, which indicated that recent communications they had written had not reached the person to whom they were addressed.

I realized the great undertaking in handling the soldiers' and sailors' mail and therefore I decided to secure a statement from the Post Office Department relative to this activity, as nothing is better for the morale of the service than expediting the delivery of mail from home. This morning I received from the Postmaster General a very interesting statement upon this subject, and under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

For some time before the beginning of hostilities the possibility of war was realized and as early as 1939 preparations were started and plans made to provide the best possible mail service for the armed forces in the event of an emergency. An agreement was entered into between the Post Office and War Departments in March 1940, defining the responsibility of each in the handling of Army mail. This was followed by a similar agreement between the Post Office and Navy Departments in September 1942, which covered mail for personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Effective January 1, 1943, under an agreement by the Post Office Department, the War Shipping Administration, the War Department, and the Navy Department, mail service was extended to the members of the crews of United States merchant vessels and vessels of the Army Transport Service.

While the War and Navy Departments assume responsibility for handling mail after it is turned over to them by the Post Office Department, experience has shown that in the event of a break-down in the handling of the mail, the Post Office Department is held responsible in the eyes of the public. For this reason the Post Office Department has a fundamental interest in the treatment accorded mail for the armed forces, whether in the custody of the civilian or military postal services. Post office inspectors were accordingly assigned to make periodic visits to the various camps and installations to give expert advice and assistance in the handling of the military mails. More than 220 inspectors are so assigned, including an average of about 15 at overseas points or theaters. In addition the War and Navy Departments have commissioned numerous experienced postal employees for assignment as postal officers and to a great extent has assigned inducted men and women with postal experience to mail-handling activities. Over 32,000 postal employees have entered military service.

The transportation and delivery of mail at camps and other installations within the United States have been fairly well standardized and present no momentous problems. The task of getting mail to the armed forces overseas, however, is fraught with seemingly insurmountable difficulties. From the best estimates obtainable, about 2,000,000 letters and 250,000 parcels and prints are transported every day to the Army alone. During the period set aside for mailing Christmas parcels in 1943, almost 20,000,000 parcels were sent to the men overseas, and reports indicate that only a small proportion remained undelivered on Christmas Day. In addition to the mail-handling activities, facilities are provided in overseas theaters for issuance and payment of money orders. The need for this service is indicated by the fact that about 600,000 money orders are issued to Army personnel each month in the amount of approximately $30,000,000.

Under present arrangements, mail addressed to soldiers, sailors, marines, armed guards on vessels, and members of the Coast Guard is transported by the Post Office Department to post offices convenient to camps, posts, and stations in this country and to ports of embarkation when addressed for delivery to persons overseas. At these post offices the mail is turned over to authorities of the Army or Navy, who assume responsibility from that point on until the mail is actually delivered to the individual addresses, and the Post Office Department has no further jurisdiction over such mail. All questions of onward transportation, routing, speed, and safety from that point on until the mail is delivered are decided by the Army or Navy, as the case may be.

Mail from soldiers, sailors, marines, armed guards, and Coast Guard members who are overseas does not come under the control of the United States Post Office Department until it reaches this country and is received by a domestic United States post office. Mail from our forces in camps and posts in the United States enters the United States Postal Service when it is turned over to a post office or branch, generally located at or near the camp. Prior to the time the mail is actually received in a United States post office it is under the complete control of the Army or Navy, and the Post Office Department has no part in its handling.

Directory files and locator cards are made up by the Army and Navy and are maintained under their complete supervision. When soldiers, sailors, marines, and members of the Coast Guard have been transferred, mail for them is given directory service, readdressed, and forwarded to the addressees at their new locations by the Army and Navy and not by the Post Office Department. Directory service of this nature requires time and retards the delivery of the mail. Such service must also be given insufficiently and incorrectly addressed mail, and this, too, causes delay.

Reports indicate that mail for our fighting forces is flowing smoothly from the Postal Service to the custody of the military and naval authorities, who have assumed the tremendous task of transporting the mail to the individual soldiers, sailors, marines, and armed guards, and Coast Guard members wherever they may be.

Many contingencies have arisen during the present hostilities which hinder the Army and Navy in the delivery of the mails for our fighting forces at overseas destinations. Loss by enemy action is always a possibility, but unavoidable delays constitute the major problem. Mail is apportioned to all available vessels and other means of transportation with a view to keeping losses at a minimum in the event of sinkings or other disaster as the result of enemy action, but some complaints concerning mail service to and from the armed forces have been received because of the sinking of vessels.

The war has denied us the use of foreign shipping, we have lost many ships of our own, and yet we have more Americans all over the world than ever before, with the attendant supply problem. The transportation of mail by the Army and Navy must be considered with the movement of military and naval personnel and war materials; and, as the most pressing needs must be served first, delay in the transmission of the mails may result. Although the Army and Navy take advantage of every opportunity to dispatch the mails, at times the overburdened facilities at their command cannot accommodate all the mail, and it must be concentrated at points of embarkation until space is available. During all of this time the mail is held under the complete control of the Army and Navy. In the interest of safety, ships must travel in convoys, which cannot depart until the last boat is loaded and then cannot proceed faster than the slowest vessel. Sudden and secret movements of the troops for whom the mail is intended are responsible for certain delays. Similar difficulties must be confronted in the delivery of mail by the Navy to sailors, marines, and armed guards stationed aboard ships, as tactical movements frequently occasion additional delays in contacting these vessels. The censoring of mail by the national censorship or military authorities may account for some delay, but this is kept at a minimum.

Briefly, the diversion of ships to many areas, the need for cargo space and the lack of aircraft to carry mail, unexpected transfer of personnel to secret bases, sudden ship movements, and the consideration of the transportation of war materials and personnel, make it evident that the frequency and success with which mail can be delivered to overseas destinations and theaters of war must be determined by military and naval officials, so that the requirements of our fighting forces may be met.

The fact that the Army and Navy are successfully meeting their responsibilities is indicated by numerous reports from the inspectors who have been assigned to observe conditions and offer advice, that mail is being received and delivered at overseas destinations in the shortest possible time. If delays occur in delivery of mail to the individual addresses it is due almost invariably to conditions in a local combat area or theater which prevent immediate contact with the addressees. Even where local conditions are unfavorable, mail is being delivered to the men in fox holes and in the front lines of battle. Many complimentary letters are received from the relatives and friends of service men and women in overseas service and from the addressees themselves attesting to the efficient mail service being given.

Many comments have been made regarding the rapid and regular service provided mail moving from our armed forces overseas to this country as contrasted to the occasional irregularity and delay accompanying the delivery of mail overseas. This condition is due to various reasons, the three most important being that less mail comes in from the armed forces than goes out to them, ships and planes on their return trips have more room for the mail, and the location of correspondents in the United States is permanent, while that of our fighting forces is not.

Letters received by the Post Office Department from the public have, at times, questioned the service being given mail from members of our overseas armed forces because the date of postmarking and the date of receipt indicate the passage of a considerable period of time. It is evident these correspondents do not understand where the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department begins and ends and believe this mail has been postmarked at post offices at points of debarkation through which mail from our armed forces abroad is routed. This is not the case as Army and Navy post offices travel with the organizations for which they have been established and mail placed in their custody for transmission to this country is postmarked at the overseas location. The time required for the transmission of such mail to the addressees is, therefore, in most cases not excessive. Army post offices are branches of the post office to which they are attached. For instance, A. P. O., 887, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y., is a branch of the New York post office but is operated entirely by Army personnel and money orders and other papers issued and stamped by that branch bear the designation A. P. O., New York, N. Y. This has led many people to believe the location of all A. P. O.'s is that of

the post office at the city of which they have been made branches.

The V-mail service was inaugurated to expedite the delivery of Army and Navy mail. In some overseas areas, however, stations have not yet been set up for the reproduction of V-mail. In such cases, if it will facilitate delivery, the V-mail is dispatched to a neighboring V-mail station to be reproduced and forwarded to the addressees from there by the most expeditious means available; otherwise it is transported from the United States to its destination in its original form. V-mail letters, whether filmed or in their original form, are given priority by the Army and Navy over ordinary air mail or ordinary letters, and are transmitted by aircraft if that is possible. Over three-quarters of a million V-mail letters are filmed and dispatched daily.

V-mail letter sheets should be used only when corresponding with members of our American armed forces on duty overseas. They should not be used in corresponding with persons in the service of other countries, even though they may be citizens of the United States, as such correspondence would pass through the international mails. Under existing arrangements between the Post Office and the War and Navy Departments, mail for personnel of the various service branches overseas is transported to its destination as domestic mail.

The Post Office Department has numerous requests from the public for the addresses and locations of soldiers, sailors, and marines. We are, of course, wholly unable to furnish the information requested, as no records of military or naval personnel are maintained by the Post Office Department. Reference of these requests must, therefore, be made to the War or Navy Departments which entails additional clerical work and delay in the receipt of the information requested. It is urged that persons finding it necessary to be furnished with the addresses of soldiers write to The Adjutant General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C., for such information instead of to the Post Office Department. The addresses of naval and marine personnel may be obtained by requesting such data from the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, and Marine Corps Headquarters, Navy Department Building, as the case may be, each of these offices being located in Washington 25, D. C.

The Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have only been in Congress a little over 9 years. During that time I have heard and read many Presidential messages, but the message the President sent up here on yesterday was the most unfair, most unjust, and misleading statement that I have as yet heard. In his message it seemed to me that the President went out of his way to insult Congress. The President has been asking for unity from all, while, as evidenced by this speech, he thrusts a dagger at Congress for his own political gain. Never have I heard a statement wherein the President labored so hard in an effort to try to convince the soldier boys that he is their friend and that those in Congress who do not agree with him on everything he says or does are the soldiers' enemies. I want the soldier to have a vote, a ballot to be voted which carries the names of all the candidates for whom the soldier desires to vote. Not just a few names, such as President, Senator, or Congressman, but for all individuals qualified to have their names on the ballot. Under the Constitution they have as much right to have a vote cast for them as the President has.

In Illinois the legislature in special session has already made provision for all servicemen to vote in the fall election. The only obstacle lies in the statement that the Army and Navy say they cannot get the ballot to them in time. I still believe that where there is a will there is a way. We have a big job on our hands in licking Germany and Japan but it is not insurmountable and we are going to do it. So it would seem we could get a few million ballots scattered throughout the world and back again.

The President says we should be willing to stand up and be counted. For myself, I will say I will be glad to stand up any time to be counted on this bill and any other legislation that may come before us. I am wondering if the President has himself been willing to always be counted on vital questions. I could mention a few instances where he failed to take a position when it might well have proven beneficial to the country had he done so.

It has been suggested that "politics stop at the water's edge." After the political speech on the part of the President on yesterday, I do not see how he will ever again even dare suggest we forget politics during war. That speech was the most direct appeal for votes that he has ever made to the soldiers and the voting public.

It so happens that the Democrats in the House are precluding us from voting on the soldiers' vote bill as reported out by the committee. A rule was granted as far back as last Friday, January 21, but has not as yet been reported to the House by the chairman of the Rules Committee because the leadership in the House does not want us to vote until they finish consideration of the soldiers' voting bill in the Senate. By dilatory tactics they feel they can pressure certain individuals to support the so-called bobtailed Federal ballot.

Russian News and Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Sullivan County Republican, Monticello, N. Y., of January 14, 1944, owned and published by David A. Kyle. This is an old and influential newspaper in Sullivan County, and its editorials carry weight throughout the county.

This editorial on Soviet relations and Wendell Willkie should be of interest to the people, not only of my district, but throughout the Nation:

RUSSIAN NEWS

Now that the Russian press, which always speaks for the Russian Government, has boxed Wendell Willkie's ears and told him to mind his own business, it is just as well for us that Mr. Willkie is only a private citizen and that his chances of ever becoming more than a private citizen in American Government are becoming more and more remote.

Mr. Willkie honored the Democrats by belonging to their party for years, the Republicans honored him by permitting him to be their standard bearer in an important Presidential election and allowing him full swing to indulge in "campaign oratory," and the administration honored him by furnishing him a bomber to satisfy him that the world is round and that there is only one world. Even though the honors are very much in favor of Mr. Willkie, let us consider that the account is balanced, but if there remains any doubt in anyone's mind that the account is not balanced, why, then, let us forgive the debt in whomsoever's favor.

We will forget the former mayor of Akron and the Harry Hopkins letter as "much ado about nothing." We do know that these two potential candidates for the 1944 Presidential candidacies, Roosevelt and Willkie, have much in common in their respective careers. They were both members of the Democratic Party for years. They both take great pleasure in riding in bombers. They both seem to have an unstinted determination to establish a glorified W. P. A. over the whole world. They each have the further magnified ego to place themselves, as not only the respective simple leader of the two major political parties of the Nation, but also as the sole platform makers for those parties, without any help of other political leaders and with complete disregard of the taxpayers and voters.

Many political leaders of the Democratic Party do not believe that their leader, the President, is doing their party a favor by turning thumbs down on Thomas Jefferson's doctrine of States' rights, and some of the Democratic Senators tell what they think about it on the floor of the Senate. By the same token the Willkieites who claim to belong to the Republican Party are doing no favor to their party by undertaking to convince the American people that many of the foremost leaders of the party, including Members of Congress, are isolationists, without defining an isolationist.

Before the war, New Dealers accused and claimed everyone to be an isolationist who thought there might be some way of preventing our boys from being sent to the four corners of the world to be killed. Since the war started for us we have not heard any American complaining of doing his full part—every American so far as we can see is in the war one way or another—and no individual or party can appropriate for himself or itself exclusively the "Win the war" slogan. The word "isolationist," has in the past been used as a smear word, and certainly with us all trying and doing our utmost to win the war and all in the war up to our necks and praying for the safe return of fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters and sweethearts, who are scattered over the whole face of the earth, it is now always used as a smear word and it can have no other meaning.

We admire Wendell Willkie as one of our great citizens. We do not begrudge him the support we gave him when he was a Republican candidate for President. We do not censure him generally for his common traits with the New Dealers, because every

citizen is entitled to his own beliefs, likes, and dislikes; but we do wish to make an observation relative to a common trait of the two potential presidential candidates of the major parties; both candidates, in their attitude to their respective parties, have no consideration or respect for the party that has conferred its highest honor on them, and their attitude toward the party that "Papa knows best" and if you don't agree with papa you should be smeared. Also both disregard the doctrines of great Americans, one disregards the doctrine of State rights advanced by the great Democrat Thomas Jefferson and the other disregards the doctrine of Washington to keep our nose out of the business of foreign countries, as we will expect and do expect them to keep theirs out of ours.

European Power Politics—Casualties in Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this week's Newsgram in which it is stated, "This country has fought two wars in 25 years to prevent German domination in Europe," from the columns of the United States News, a periodical published weekly in Washington. The Newsgram is a review of world affairs insofar as power politics in Europe is concerned. The article is an extremely interesting one.

In connection therewith I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD under the same heading an article from the Washington Star entitled "United States casualties 142,289, including 32,662 dead."

There being no objection, the Newsgram and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News]

These are things that you can expect in the period just ahead:

1. German peace soundings will grow in urgency; will reflect frantic effort by important interests in Germany to find a way out short of destruction.

2. Russia will be immune to peace overtures. Russians stand to gain more by victory and an imposed peace than by any possible negotiated peace.

3. United States-Britain will be played upon hardest by the Germans; will be given the most tempting offers. Ruling groups in Germany would prefer far more to let in United States-British forces than to take a chance on occupation by Russia.

4. No German peace offer will spark prior to invasion from the west and the defeat of German forces in that part of Europe. It still is probable that the Germans will be forced to surrender unconditionally, that they can't deal.

Further: Germany will not weaken her forces facing Russia on any planned basis. She fears the Russians, and what they might do, more than anything else.

Russia herself reflects two fears: (1) Fear that United States-Britain will make a deal with Germany that leaves Russia out; (2) fear that a bloc of nations will be organized in eastern Europe to serve as a buffer against Russia. The Russian agreement with Czechoslovakia, her insistence on a pro-Russian government in any future Poland, her firm attitude toward Finland, all grow from these fears.

Keep in mind the fact that the months ahead, while they're to be the months of hardest fighting, also are to be the months of constant peace maneuvers by the Germans. The only hope Germany now has is in some kind of deal.

Americans, who now are deeply involved in world politics, need to know what it is that is to govern the moves that will be made to affect Europe's future.

As matters stand and have stood—

On the Russian side: Russia opposes a strongly organized Europe. She fears that its strength might be directed at her. She also strongly opposes a Balkan federation for the same reason. Russia's diplomacy is directed at assuring that neighbors are under Russian influence, that other nations aren't organized on a basis that might threaten her security or her growing power in Europe.

On the British side: Britain opposes dominance of Europe by any one power. She has fought Germany twice to prevent her dominance. She has been interested in a Balkan federation to stand between Russia and western Europe. She may be forced in post-war to try to form a friendly bloc in western Europe, including a revived France, or else to find a basis for friendship with post-war Germany.

On the United States side: United States has regarded itself as unconcerned by the balance of power in Europe. But this country has fought two wars in 25 years to prevent German domination in Europe, to block a European set-up that would cast covetous glances toward Latin America and its undeveloped resources. United States, after this war, again will find its interests closely alined with those of Britain; will seek to prevent any single-nation dominance on the Continent of Europe.

The question of power will underlie post-war arrangements. Alternatives are these: (1) an effort by Britain with United States backing, to offset Russian efforts to extend Russia's power through Europe, or (2) some new international machinery that can take the place of balances of power and national rivalries for power.

It still is uncertain which alternative finally will be taken.

United States-Britain aren't doing so well in their first maneuvers with Russia. They appear not to be succeeding in their effort to restore something like the pre-war status quo in France, Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, etc.

To show what is happening through much of Europe—

In France: De Gaulle, opposed by United States-Britain, befriended by Russia, is the temporary winner. He's a nationalist, not for too close United States-British ties.

In Czechoslovakia: The Czech Government in exile is alining with Russia.

In Italy: United States-British efforts to bolster the monarchy, to pump life into Italy's pre-war economic organization, is not yielding many real results.

In Yugoslavia: United States-British-backed King Peter is playing second fiddle to Russian-backed Tito. United States-Britain are having to change horses.

In Greece: British-backed King George seems to be losing out.

In Poland: Russia appears to be in line to win her territorial demands. She also is likely to force a Polish government she regards as friendly.

All of this suggests that the post-war drift in Europe is to be leftward.

In the war itself, it is more and more apparent that too much optimism in United States has been built around air power, that results from bombing are not to be so decisive as the air enthusiasts had promised.

There was the promise that German supply lines in Italy could be destroyed by bombing. Five months later those lines seem still to be functioning.

German aircraft production was to be cut drastically by bombs. Yet the British air force testifies that Germans are making more planes than before.

Absolute air domination of the French coast was to result in destruction of German gun emplacement. Still British guns firing at a German convoy in the channel instantly bring salvos from big German guns in return.

This isn't to discount the importance of air power. It is a first essential to any victory in modern war. However, the concept of air power as the decisive power appears to be undergoing a very great strain. Next few months will tell.

[From the Washington Star]

UNITED STATES CASUALTIES 142,289, INCLUDING 32,662 DEAD

Latest available figures on American war casualties total 142,289, including 32,662 killed.

The Office of War Information announced the figures today. They cover Navy casualties through January 22 and Army losses through December 31.

Navy casualties were listed as 35,572, including 15,520 dead, 7,206 wounded, 8,562 missing, and 4,284 prisoners. (These figures include Marine Corps and Coast Guard casualties.)

Army casualties to the end of December totaled 106,717, with 17,142 killed, 39,917 wounded, 24,137 missing, and 25,521 prisoners.

The Mustering-Out Payment Act—Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the conference report on the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 because I believe the compromise agreed upon by the conferees is a half-baked and inadequate piece of legislation which fails to do justice to the veterans of this war.

When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] challenged the chairman of the House conferees to prove the justification of the conference agreement, the following dialog occurred:

Mr. MAY. The justification is that the Senate would not agree to anything but that, and the conferees on the part of the House had to yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman feel that this is the best compromise that could be had?

Mr. MAY. This is the only one we could get.

Under the circumstances it was my judgment that the best thing to do in the interest of common ordinary fairness and justice was to reject the conference report and start again from taw in an effort

to get a bill that would really deal justly with the veterans.

This bill is supposed to tide the veterans over from the time they are mustered out until they become fully reoriented in civil employment. Costs of living have risen enormously and they are likely to be still higher when most of these boys are mustered out.

With everything they have to buy for themselves and their families gone skyhigh in price, how far do you think the sum of $100 or a like amount will go in tiding the veteran over from the time of his discharge while he looks around for employment? The rates in this conference agreement range from $100 where the soldier has been in service less than 60 days to a maximum of $300 for oversea service.

As a stickler for economy, I yield to no one, but I believe in justice even more than I believe in whittling every dollar off the Government's expense account. These boys had no option about going to war. In my judgment the Nation has no option about making reasonable provision to enable them to get back into private life. The Government should make the transition as easy as possible. This does not mean an extravagant allowance or the appropriation of one dollar more than is necessary, but it does mean a more satisfactory arrangement than is provided for in this conference report. I think a better arrangement than the one proposed would be to provide monthly payments to the veterans over the period necessary to enable them to readjust themselves to civil life. Even the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. MAY, has indicated by inference that the report is not satisfactory to him. A few days ago we authorized an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 to rehabilitate foreign peoples after the war. I think that we should be helpful to the world, but in doing so let us not overlook our obligation to be good to our veterans, too. They are making possible a better world of tomorrow.

In conclusion, I wish to present for the RECORD a telegram I have received from the national commander of the American Legion, with which I heartily agree:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1944.*
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion suggests provisions muster-out bill as agreed upon by Senate-House conference committee yesterday are inequitable. True muster-out pay recognizes no difference between foreign and domestic service. Legion has case of World War No. 2 dischargee with 4 years' service in continental United States discharged for injuries incurred in training resulting in loss of both hands and one eye. According to conference report he would be entitled to $200 muster-out pay, whereas one with few weeks' service overseas would get maximum $300. We recommend the principle of graduated pay according to length of service embodied in the Legion's omnibus bill, S. 1617.

WARREN H. ATHERTON,
National Commander,
ROBERT W. SISSON,
Chairman,
National Rehabilitation Committee,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director,
National Legislative Committee.

The Needs of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following facts and recommendations made by the executive committee of the Bergen County Board of Agriculture, Hackensack, N. J.:

A SUMMARY OF FACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BERGEN COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

PRICE CEILINGS

In most cases price ceilings are unfair in the present set-up. They are not consistent with increased costs of production and they do not enable the farmer to recover from losses he has to take when prices are far below the ceiling price. Dairymen's production costs have doubled since 1941 and the milk subsidy does not nearly effect dairymen's increased cost of labor, replacements, and hay.

Recommendations: Eliminate all price ceilings, or place carefully prepared ceilings on everything, including all (industrial and agricultural) labor. If price ceilings must be maintained we recommend:

1. Give farmers fair representation on committees which determine price ceilings.
2. Establish a floor price and require A. M. A. or some other agency to arrange for purchase of surpluses when prices fall below the floor price.
3. Notify producers of ceilings before planting time or before suitable times for breeding livestock and poultry.
4. Place responsibility for ceilings with the W. F. A. rather than the O. P. A.

FEED FOR LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY

This area is a heavy consuming area of grain and processed feed purchased from the Middle West. Very little corn, which is essential to livestock and poultry feeding, is coming into this area and farmers are faced with decreased production of eggs, milk, and meat.

Recommendation: Require O. P. A. to remove or raise the ceiling price on corn to enable competitive buying from this area. Follow all reasonable measures to bring needed feed to this area.

LABOR

Skilled and unskilled labor will be harder to get in 1944 than in 1943. Most of the crops in this area require laborers of both types.

Recommendations:

1. Continue responsibility of recruiting and placement of farm labor in the hands of the Agricultural Extension Service and provide adequate appropriations for same.
2. Provide a suitable insignia or uniform for regular farm workers.
3. Tap all sources of available farm labor, such as arrangement for release of men not needed in the armed forces who have skill in agricultural work.

FARM MACHINERY

Local farmers did not suffer greatly because of curtailment in the manufacture of farm machinery and materials, such as insecticides, during the past year. Parts for repair were hard to get. Conditions will be much more difficult for 1944. Depreciation on farm machinery is rapid in spite of best care.

Recommendation: Increase the amount of farm machinery and repair parts to be distributed through the usual channels of trade and simplify the method for obtaining equipment under quota.

AGRICULTURE CREDIT

Credit needs were well met but there are too many agencies extending credit to farmers which results in overlapping and confusion on the part of farmers.

Recommendation: All credit agencies should be coordinated under one head. We suggest the Production Credit Association.

REGULATIONS

Federal regulations are a never-ending and ever-changing source of irritation to farmers. They require entirely too much of the farmers' time which must be taken away from productive activities. We believe that most of these regulations are unnecessary and farmers are called upon to spend too much time in filing applications, making reports, keeping records, filling out questionnaires, making surveys and running from one place to another in order to secure equipment, materials, and other things needed in their farm business.

Recommendations:

1. Place farmers on advisory committees of all bureaus having authority to set up regulations which affect farmers. Require that farmers' suggestions be given due consideration relative to plans of operation, forms, price ceilings, rationing, priorities, gasoline allotments, and farm machinery allotments.
2. Simplification of all necessary forms and the elimination of all unnecessary forms.
3. Federal agencies should prepare and issue necessary regulations in good, plain English and avoid all legal terminology.

COORDINATION ON THE COUNTY LEVEL

It is recommended that all agricultural matters clear through one agency in the county. County Agricultural Extension Service is set up and is well known to farmers of this county. We recommend that Extension Service be asked to continue to coordinate on the county level the many agencies whose regulations affect the production of foodstuffs.

It is further suggested that appropriations for extension be increased to enable securing necessary personnel to carry on these many activities.

Rear Admiral H. G. Bowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent address of Rear Admiral H. G. Bowen, United States Navy. Generally acknowledged as one of the foremost advocates of new and improved types of propulsion machinery for our naval vessels, Admiral Bowen was recently presented with a gold wrist watch by the Advertising Club of New York. The watch bears the following inscription:

To Rear Admiral H. G. Bowen, United States Navy, from Advertising Club of New York for distinguished service 1903 to 1944.

Particularly in the field of high-pressure, high-temperature steam equipment

Admiral Bowen's efforts have been rewarded by the highly efficient propulsion machinery which drives our fighting ships today. His accomplishments have been recognized by organizations outside the Government. It is high time the Navy Department and the United States Government accorded him the official recognition to which he is justly entitled.

The address referred to above is as follows:

Gentlemen, there is no need for me to tell you how deeply I appreciate your inviting me to be here with you today, or how honored I am to know the spirit behind the invitation. Actually, I feel a close kinship with you who have been selling America on the necessities and the luxuries that make life as pleasant as it is in this country under peacetime conditions. For a good many years I've had to act as a salesman myself, an advertising man, if you will, and goodness knows I've sometimes had to use methods as high pressured as you sometimes are accused of resorting to. Certainly I know the value of high pressure—whether of salesmanship in direct appeal, or steam.

Many of you have had a close and intimate relationship with engineering and industry as a whole in the role of advertising counselman and public relations advisers to manufacturers and distributors. Therefore, I want to tell you today something of that high-pressure campaign some of us in the Navy have had to engage in when we were trying to get away from engineering practices and theories that practically had been frozen by time and usage.

Several years ago the late Admiral Moffett said that a second-best Navy is no better than a second-best poker hand. Most of us have worked on the theory that the efficiency of a navy is a measure of the engineering efficiency of the country to which it belongs. We realize today more than ever before, that the most essential element of national safety is scientific progress, not only in the realm of land and sea defenses but also in defenses against attacks from the skies.

We must not forget in this industrial age that a major essential of victory is scientific progress while we are at war, and that we must have the ingredients of scientific progress within us even before war comes. If we as a Nation are to be victorious, the martial benefits of research and development must be a part of our pattern of military effort. Many who did not realize it before Pearl Harbor are thoroughly aware of the fact today. I hope that the lessons we have learned during the past two years will remain with us during the years after victory is ours. However, I keep warning myself and my associates, and I warn you too, that we should not relax our efforts toward supersalesmanship of new ideas if we are to continue to hold the gains in scientific progress we fortunately have made over our enemies.

We in the Navy, and particularly in the Navys engineering division, have had long and sometimes bitter experience with the problems of scientific progress. It costs money to carry on experiments and research—not great sums of money, as wartime expenditures go, but amounts that appear large when war seems remote and researchers sometimes are classed as impractical scientists with their heads in clouds. At times it has been very difficult to get that money.

But it is in peacetime that major research must be done, and I hope that, as a result of recent victories that have been to a surprising extent based on pre-war research, we shall not have the difficult time we once had of convincing the authorities who control research funds that such advance work must be continued if progress and superiority over our enemies is to be maintained.

Two major American scientific developments, I could well say naval discoveries, have confounded our enemies and saved thousands of American lives. One of them is an important phase in electronics which I cannot discuss here today.

The other "weapon" I can talk about here with safety. This is the development we made in the highly complex and technical problem of propulsion machinery. I won't burden you with technical and obscure details concerning progress in this field; suffice it to say that, as a result of the American Navy's experiments and research, we have developed in our warships the ability to go farther and hit harder, with less fuel and lighter, more efficient machinery, than the ships of any other nation in the world by at least 25 percent.

The machinery in our new ships, and in most of our older, reconverted warships, is known by the awkward name of "high-pressure, high-temperature steam equipment." Actually this was no new thing in steam plants ashore, but naval engineers the world over thought that such a development was impossible on ships at sea. The story of how the Navy broke with tradition is a long one, filled with both drama and controversy. We had to fight long-established shipyards to do it; we had to battle with manufacturers of ship machinery. Finally, we had a good rousing fight inside our own naval family before the break could be made.

High-pressure, high-temperature steam is simply a means of generating steam and superheating it in order to obtain more pounds of energy from each ton of coal or oil consumed. We first attempted this in the *Porter* class of destroyers contracted for back in 1932. But the attempt was made to use higher pressures and temperatures without designing machinery adequate to employ them. Machinery we were using then chiefly was of British design, similar to that used in the British Navy. The attempt was only partially successful.

In 1933 we started building a new fleet. At that time we decided definitely to break with tradition to get what we wanted in new ships. Previously shipyards had been building our ships and all their parts. They were not too anxious to accept new machinery designs, for that involved retooling and completely redesigning their production facilities. But we were determined to have machinery on ships as efficient as any on land. To do this, we placed orders for new-type turbines, gears, and other complicated machinery with companies sometimes far inland, and called on them for their best workmanship. I can say today that we got it. Thereafter, shipyards became shipbuilding yards and assembly points for the machinery that went into the hulls. Only through this change in procedure were we able to build our present Navy and merchant marine. At the same time, we became independent of any foreign design or construction. From that time on, the power of American warships was limited only by the resources of American scientific knowledge and industrial abilities.

Specifically, high-pressure, high-temperature steam development resulted in heavier armament on our ships; weight formerly carried in machinery was lessened to make way for more protective covering. At the same time it allowed us to increase the weight and number of guns carried, so that today our battleships have 100 times the antiaircraft fire power that they had at the beginning of this fleet conversion.

My own part in the introduction of modern propulsion equipment has led me to the conclusion that the more slowly and logically such development can be carried on in times of peace, the more effectively it can be presented to the men who must ultimately use it in battle. Navy Secretary Charles Edison, under whom I served as Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, was in thorough agreement with me on this, and it largely was due to his insistence, his influence, along with that of a corps of young, imaginative officers who realized the necessity for superiority in propulsion machinery for our fleet, that we were able to inaugurate the changes that are being felt so much today. Also I received valuable help from William F. Gibbs, who developed the ideas of the pioneers and created support in its early development.

My years as chief engineering officer of the Navy were filled with controversy centering around these conversions. I had to put across ideas which today might be called commonplace, but the actual fights at times bordered on the spectacular. In contrast, the years I spent at the Naval Research Laboratory on the banks of the Potomac were quiet, so far as the public was concerned, but I feel that they were fruitful in great measures in far-reaching results—even if we cannot discuss them here.

During those years I mainly was concerned with securing equipment and in finding laboratory space and getting money to pay for it. In this matter I found Congress most helpful. The brilliant support and farsighted achievement of the Naval Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives, and in particular the chairman of the committee, namely the Senator from Nevada, the Honorable James E. Scrugham, and also the late William F. Ditter of Pennsylvania, and Representative C. A. Plumley from Vermont, who also aided in this great development proved most effectivev. As to our scientists at the Naval Research Laboratory, I cannot give too much praise for besides bringing to light and developing these new and original ideas, they were called on to indoctrinate and instruct scientists and production men in commercial life as well as develop schools for the training of thousands of future operators. However, you can believe me when I tell you I had to use some good advertising methods and some superheated salesmanship to make it possible for our scientists to keep at their work.

You, in your field are closely working hand in hand with the leading industries and manufacturers of this country. I want to call your attention to the position of commercial research in this modern industrial nation. The rise of commercial laboratories since the last war has been phenomenal. They have wielded tremendous influence in the scientific, the commercial, and the economic field. The commercial research laboratory represents an art that is self-supporting. Since World War days the Navy has maintained the closest contacts with them. As a matter of fact, we have worked hand in hand with them in the development of practically all new ideas in radio, in the engineering field, and in metallurgy.

But, no matter how fine the cooperation between commercial laboratories and Government scientists, there will always be a great need for such institutions as the Naval Research Laboratory. No matter how great outside developments may be, they must be adapted to Navy needs. Industry is not in a position to carry on the unrelenting search for new improvements, new instruments, that a first-class Navy must constantly be developing to keep its fleet superior. I need only hint at a fact you already know to prove my point: Where would we be today if our research in electronics and radio had not been carried on down on the Potomac long before commercial laboratories became interested in the possibilities?

Consider this fact alone: One of that laboratory's inventions brought about an industry that had a greater output, measured in dollars, this past year than one of our largest industries.

There have been times, many times, when we were working on lots of faith but little money. Some of the worst skeptics of 10 years ago now admit that if a small group of officers and scientists in the Navy Department had not persevered in their work in the

face of official inertia, compounded in many instances by scoffing disbelief, the United States might have lost this war 10 or 12 years before it began.

However the case may be, I hope you will pardon me if I tell you a little story about the skipper of a warship who was having difficulties hearing his orders repeated at the other end of a bridge speaking tube. In exasperation he turned to his executive officer standing by him on the bridge.

"Some damn fool is on the end of this tube." he said, and everyone could hear the young ensign's quick retort from below: "Not on this end, sir!"

I feel that your kind invitation to be with you today, and this honor that you are conferring upon me, is ample proof that you do not believe me to have been on the wrong end of such a tube. For my part, I accept this honor on behalf of all the young, energetic officers and the devoted men of science who have labored to put across what to many seemed impossible ideas.

To move the world, Archimedes asked only for a sufficiently long lever, and a place to put it. For my part, I shall continue asking that our men of science, inside the Navy and out, be given the opportunity, the place, and the funds to carry on their experiments, for only through their work can we maintain the greatest, the most powerful Navy in the world, but an Air Force as well.

Relief and Rehabilitation of Devastated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, from the pen of Mr. Constantine Brown, who has written an article published in the Washington Star on January 25, 1944, concerning the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 yesterday by the House of Representatives, under the title of "U. N. R. R. A." The article discusses the question of the utilization of the $1,350,000,000 in the pursuance of power politics in Europe.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

If a section of the United States were hit by a major tragedy and funds for its relief and rehabilitation had to be obtained by private contribution in which, say, Thomas Lamont, was the principal contributor, no one would be surprised if his representative were given a decisive voice in the distribution of the funds.

It appears, however, that what seems logical in regard to domestic affairs is not logical in a large-scale international undertaking.

Congress has been asked to appropriate $1,350,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated and hungry areas of the war-stricken world.

The people of the United States never have been stingy in assisting other nations when they were in distress. Americans contributed hundreds of millions after the World War to feed not only our former associates, but they sent aid into Russia, which at that time was ostracized by our Government, and into Armenia to save millions of people from starvation.

The relief and rehabilitation of Europe, the United Nations governments have decided among themselves, must no longer be based on charity. All parties concerned must do their bit to raise a large fund to help the starved peoples of Europe and Asia soon after their liberation from the Axis yoke. Industries and public utilities which have suffered so much from the "torch" policy of the Germans and the Japanese and from aerial warfare, will have to be restored to permit quick economic rehabilitation. The devastated areas comprise practically the whole of Europe—with the exception of the few remaining neutral countries—and the major portion of China.

For this purpose the United States, which has the largest national income of the world, probably will be assessed an amount equal to 1 percent of its 1943 income.

It is immaterial whether or not the 1943 figure represents the real income of the United States or is an inflated amount due to war conditions. It is argued in some quarters that American industry will remain very busy long after the war, since it will be forced to produce for the whole civilized world everything from hairpins to machine tools and planes.

But what appears important to many legislators—even though they are going to vote for the required appropriations—is that while the American taxpayer is the heaviest contributor to this undertaking, the United States has only a 25-percent voice in the handling of both relief and rehabilitation.

A committee of four forms the directing council of the U. N. R. R. A., in which Britain, Russia, China, and the United States are represented with equal voice, although there is a most unequal contribution of funds.

Nations which are to receive assistance are to be consulted whenever their own countries are involved, but do not participate in the framing of the U. N. R. R. A.'s general policies.

The United States Government was careful to see there was no hitch in this United Nations attempt to present a solid front to the world. The whole matter was presented to the country as the first endeavor of the associated powers to work in complete harmony and on the surface the project does not seem to involve any controversial political problem. But it appears that with the best will in the world politics cannot be kept out of the organization.

Definite trends and a race for jockeying for political domination are only too obvious in Europe today.

The Russians are in the midst of an offensive in old Poland. In Yugoslavia there is a bitter fight between the representatives of King Peter and those of Moscow. A similar situation is said to exist in Greece. In Italy these seems to be an ill-concealed struggle between the supporters and nonsupporters of the House of Savoy. In France several factions are preparing for a fight for power after the Nazis have been eliminated and General Charles de Gaulle hopes he will be the man who will guide his country's destinies. There are many who still oppose him.

Feeding the starved people of all these countries will be a strong trump card for the would-be leaders. Food in a starved country is far more important than gold, and the organization which has the key to the larder in its pocket can impose itself on that country.

If the council of four were composed of representatives of countries not involved in the game of power politics we could look on it as an adequate directorate to insure a fair distribution of the materials purchased largely with the American taxpayers' money. But unfortunately both Britain and Russia are involved in that game and their representatives might be tempted into some sort of "patronage" which would help their proteges obtain political supremacy, for a while at least.

The fact that America has no decisive vote in the U. N. R. R. A. is likely to get this country involved in the game of power politics when we favor unwittingly the formation of this or that puppet government in Europe.

Disposition of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 21 I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Navy Department with reference to the speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on January 10. This letter came to me in reply to my written inquiry which read, in part, as follows:

Will you please advise me as to whether or not the statements made by Congressman PATMAN are substantially as he stated them.

On the same day that I wrote to the Navy Department, I also directed a similar inquiry to the War Department calling attention to the fact that the information given to the House by Mr. PATMAN, if correct, did not reflect credit on either branch of the service. A reply has just been received from the Quartermaster General, and I include it with my remarks:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
Washington, January 25, 1944.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representaitves,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reference is made to your inquiry regarding a statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1944, in connection with the sale of soup plates.

You are informed that the surplus of soup plates was not caused by the Quartermaster Corps purchasing quantities in excess of original requirements at time of purchase. They became surplus because in the summer of 1941, a general-use bowl was adopted to replace soup plates. The general-use bowl was considered more satisfactory than soup plates, as it could be used for foods other than soups, such as cereals and fruits, and is better adapted for use in cafeteria-type messes, particularly where the six compartment mess tray is used.

This office instructed the Quartermaster and Army Service Forces depots, where the soup plates in question were located, which were not desired by any other War Department activity, to report that property to the regional property officer of the Treasury Department, who has jurisdiction over the disposition of surplus property items.

The records of this office indicate that proper action was taken by the Quartermaster Corps under existing rules and regulations.

Very truly yours,
E. B. GREGORY,
Major General,
The Quartermaster General.

California's Solution of Soldier Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, California is today holding a special session of its legislature. The purpose of this session is to amend its election laws so that every soldier or sailor, no matter where located, no matter whether he ever voted or registered to vote before, may have his chance to vote. In order that my colleagues may know what is proposed and to determine whether the proposed amendments of the California Legislature will be effective, and I think they will, I am including in these remarks a digest of the law proposed, which was prepared by the legislative counsel of California. The committee which drafted the bill consisted of the attorney general, the legislative counsel, the secretary of state, a representative of the county clerk's association, and a member of the legislative committee on elections.

Following is a digest of the bill:

TENTATIVE DRAFT WAR VOTERS' BALLOT BILL

DIGEST OF BILL

Applies only to Presidential primary, direct primary, and general elections to be held in 1944.

Extends maximum period for absent voting process from 26 to 56 days, by changing first day for mailing absent voter's ballot from twentieth to fortieth day prior to election and the last day for receipt of such ballot from sixth to sixteenth day after election.

In general, moves forward by 20 days the time or period before election for circulating, signing, filing, examining, and certifying election papers and doing other acts relating to placing names on ballots. Changes time for completing canvass from sixteenth to twenty-first day after election and extends by 10 days the time for certifying election results and issuing certificates of election.

Advances date of direct primary from the last to the second Tuesday in August (August 29 to August 8), and adjusts times for party conventions to conform.

Defines "war voter" to include members of armed forces and their auxiliaries, and also persons serving outside of the United States as (1) employees of the United States, (2) employees of the American Red Cross, and (3) officers and members of crew of merchant vessels.

Provides that application for absent voter's ballot by war voter is application as to all subsequent elections. Provides that application under Federal law is to be treated as though made under State law.

Makes special provision for unregistered war voters by treating request for absent voter's ballot as being also application for affidavit of registration.

For the presidential primary, unregistered war voter is to receive affidavit of registration and special "war ballot" covering all parties. He may register, then vote for the proper party, and return both the affidavit and the ballot at the same time.

For the direct primary, unregistered war voter is to receive affidavit of registration but unless he has indicated his party preference he receives no party ballot.

For the general election, unregistered war voter is to receive the affidavit of registration and the ordinary ballot.

An act to add sections 26.5, 48, 49, 50, 51, 132.5, 132.6, 951.5, 2050.5, 2053.5, 2792.5, 2799.5, 2807.5, 2839.5, 2842.5, 2843.5, 2892.5, 5901.6, 5901.7, 5902.6, 5904.5, and 7964.5 to, and to amend sections 293.5, 296.5, 5901.5, and 5931.5 of, and to repeal section 132.5 of, the Elections Code, relating to elections, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

The People of the State of California Do Enact as Follows:

SECTION 1. The sections of the Elections Code, added or amended by this act shall remain in effect until the ninety-first day after final adjournment of the fifty-sixth regular session of the legislature or until the 1st day of January following the cessation of hostilities in all wars in which the United States is now engaged, whichever first occurs. While these sections are in effect they shall supersede any existing provisions of law which are in conflict with them, but such provisions are not repealed by them and after these sections are no longer effective shall have the same force as though these sections had not been enacted.

Nothing contained in the sections above referred to shall affect any municipal, district, or local election, it being the intent of these sections to apply only to the Presidential primary, direct primary, and general election.

SEC. 2. Section 26.5 is added to the Elections Code to read:

"26.5. 'Direct primary' is the primary election held on the second Tuesday in August in each even numbered year to nominate candidates to be voted for at the ensuing general election or to elect members of a party central committee."

SEC. 3. Section 48 is added to said code to read:

"48. 'War voter' refers to an elector who comes within one of the following categories:

"(a) Member of the armed forces of the United States or any auxiliary branch thereof.

"(b) Employed by the United States and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States.

"(c) Employed by the American Red Cross and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States.

"(d) Employed as an officer or member of the crew of a merchant vessel documented under the laws of the United States and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States."

SEC. 4. Section 49 is added to said code to read:

"49. 'Territorial limits of the United States' means the 48 States of the United States and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 5. Section 50 is added to said code to read:

"50. Whenever by any statute of the United States, provision is made for absentee voting, an application for an absent voter's ballot made under the provisions of that law may be given the same effect as an application for an absent voter's ballot made under this code.

"If, by any Federal statute, provision is made for the transmission of applications for absent voter's ballots to the secretary of state, he shall transmit such applications to the clerk of the county in which the applicant claims residence.

SEC. 6. Section 51 is added to said code to read:

"51. Whenever by the provisions of any law of this State relating to the Presidential primary, the direct primary, or the general election, any act in relation to the circulation, signing or filing of any document or paper, the examination thereof or certifying thereto, the certification, posting, or publication of names of the candidates, or the doing of any act toward the placing of the name of a candidate upon the ballot for any such election, or the application for or delivery of an absent voter's ballot for any such election, is required to be done on or before a specified time or date, or within a specified time prior to any such election, the time for doing such act shall be deemed to be a date or period of time 20 days prior to the time or date specified in such provision of law; and whenever by any provision of law of this State relating to such elections any act relating to the receiving, counting or canvassing of absent voter's ballots, the issuance of certificates of nomination or election, or the certifying as to the results of any such election, is required to be done on or before a specified time or date, or within a specified time after any such election, the time for the doing of such act shall be deemed to be a date or period of time 10 days after the time or date specified in such provision of law. Absent voter's ballots may, however, be applied for and delivered not later than 5 days prior to the election.

SEC. 7. Section 132.5 of said code as added by chapter 865, statutes of 1943, is repealed.

SEC. 8. Section 132.5 is added to said code to read:

"132.5. A war voter may obtain from the county clerk of his home county the required blank affidavit of registration in duplicate. He may then appear before any commissioned officer of the armed forces or any minister, consul or vice consul of the United States, and make an affidavit. The affidavit shall specify the street and number or post-office address of his residence with sufficient particularity to identify it and determine affiant's voting precinct, and that he will be necessarily and unavoidably absent from the county of his residence on all the days allowed by law for general registration of electors. The affidavit shall set forth all the matters required by the provisions of this chapter relating to the contents of an affidavit of registration. The affidavit shall be forwarded, in duplicate, duly authenticated as above, enclosed in an envelope addressed to the county clerk of the county in which he claims to be an elector. The county clerk of any county, on request made in writing, shall furnish the necessary blank forms of affidavit of registration, in duplicate, to all electors so applying who are or will be temporarily absent from their home precinct. Upon receipt of the affidavit by the county clerk within the time allowed by law for registration, the affidavit shall be entered and bound by the county clerk in the proper register. Section 132 does not apply to a war voter."

SEC. 9 Section 132.6 is added to said code to read:

"132.6. Whenever any person not a registered elector shall apply in writing to the clerk for an absent voter's ballot for the presidential primary, the direct primary or the general election, and the application shows that he is a war voter, that his place of residence is in the county, and that the applicant is absent from the county in which he claims residence, the clerk shall mail, to the applicant, with the absent voter's ballot, two blank forms of registration affidavits to be executed in duplicate by the applicant. The affidavit shall be in the form prescribed by section 230.

"If the applicant desires to vote at the election he shall, on or before the day of the election and before marking the absent voter's ballot, execute the affidavit of registration in accordance with section 132.5 and return the same, together with the absent voter's ballot, to the clerk from whom the same were received.

"Upon receipt thereof within the time required by law for the return of absent voter's ballots, the clerk shall examine the affidavit of registration and if it appears therefrom that the affidavit of registration is properly executed and that the facts stated therein are such as would have entitled the applicant to register and vote at the election, if the affidavit had been executed in this State and within the time required by law, then the affiant shall be deemed a duly registered elector for said election as of the date of the affidavits to the same extent and with the same effect as though he had registered in proper time before the clerk.

"If the affiant executes but one of the duplicates and the same is found by the clerk to be in proper form and sufficient as to the facts therein stated to entitle the affiant to vate at the election, the clerk shall make a duplicate of the affidavit which duplicate shall be used as are other duplicate affidavits of registration.

"Upon determining that the affidavit of registration so received by him is sufficient the clerk shall deal with the absent voter's ballot returned in the same manner as other absent voter's ballots are required to be dealt with by law. If he determines that the affidavit of registration is insufficient he shall write thereon the word 'rejected' with the date of rejection and the reason therefor and shall likewise write upon the absent voter's ballot the word 'rejected,' the date and the words 'not registered'; provided that if it appears from the affidavit of registration that the affiant is entitled to register and vote at the election in some other county or city and county in this State then the clerk shall immediately mail such affidavit of registration and absent voter's ballot to the clerk of such other county or city and county who upon receipt thereof shall deal with them as though application therefor had been originally made to him and he had received the affidavit and ballot from the affiant."

SEC. 10. Section 293.5 of said code is amended to read:

"293.5. The county clerk shall cancel the registration of any person registered who has voted at neither the preceding direct primary nor at the preceding general election unless, prior to the time he has canceled the registration, he has had written notice from the voter, or the sworn affidavit of a friend of the voter, that the voter is a war voter, in which case he shall not cancel the registration, but it shall remain permanent unless canceled for any other cause enumerated in section 293. If the county clerk has already canceled the affidavit of registration, then upon receipt of the proper information within 60 days after mailing the notice provided for in section 296.5, he shall restore the affidavit of registration to the files."

SEC. 11. Section 296.5 of said code is amended to read:

"296.5. When the county clerk cancels the registration of any person for failure to vote, he shall mail a notice to that person at the address given on the registration or upon the last application for transfer of registration, stating that 'your registration has been canceled this day because you did not vote at either the last direct primary or general election and you will be required to register as provided by law before you shall again be entitled to vote, unless you are a member of the armed forces of the United States or any auxiliary branch thereof or employed by the United States and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States, or employed by the American Red Cross and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States, or employed as an officer or member of the crew of a merchant vessel documented under the laws of the United States and serving outside the territorial limits of the United States, and you or a friend by affidavit has notified the county clerk of that fact within 60 days after the date of mailing of this notice, in which case your affidavit of registration shall be restored to the file and shall remain permanent unless canceled for any other cause'."

SEC. 12. Section 951.5 is added to said code to read:

"951.5. For the nomination of all candidates to be voted for at the general election, a direct primary shall be held at the legally designated polling places in each precinct on the second Tuesday in the immediately preceding August."

SEC. 13. Section 2050.5 is added to said code to read:

"2050.5. The chairman of the State central committee of each of the political parties qualified to participate in the presidential primary shall notify the secretary of state on or before the 9th day of February immediately preceding the Presidential primary as to the number of delegates to represent the State in the next national convention of his party."

SEC. 14. Section 2053.5 is added to said code to read:

"2053.5. The secretary of state shall, on or before the 19th day of February of the year of the Presidential primary, certify to the county clerk of each county the number of delegates to be elected by each of the political parties qualified to participate in the election."

SEC. 15. Section 2792.5 is added to said code to read:

"2792.5. The State convention of each political party shall meet at Sacramento at 10 o'clock of the morning of the first Thursday in September next following the date upon which the primary election preliminary to the general election is held and shall be composed of the following delegates:

"(a) Each officer named in this article who was nominated and elected as a candidate of the party and whose term of office extends beyond the 8th day of January next following the primary election, or the appointee or successor to fill a vacancy in the office of any such officer. These delegates are 'hold-over delegates.'

(b) Each candidate of the party in whose behalf nomination papers were filed and who was nominated at the primary election by that party. These delegates are 'nominee delegates.'

"(c) One delegate appointed for each of the officers herein named, not represented by a 'hold-over delegate' nor by a 'nominee delegate' of such party. These delegates shall be chosen and appointed in the manner provided in this article for filling vacancies in the State convention. These delegates are 'appointive delegates.'"

SEC. 16. Section 2799.5 is added to said code to read:

"2799.5. As soon as practicable after the primary election the Secretary of State shall prepare a list of the names of all delegates to the convention qualified under the provisions of this article. He shall thereupon send a notice by mail to each delegate which shall inform the delegate that:

"(a) He is a delegate to the State convention.

"(b) The convention meets at Sacramento on the first Thursday in September of the then current year.

"(c) The delegate shall appoint three voters to be members of the State central committee.

"(d) The appointment of three members of the State central committee shall be made in writing in the form hereinafter prescribed, signed, and acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized to administer oaths in this State and shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State not later than 5 o'clock of the afternoon of the Tuesday immediately preceding the Thursday on which the convention is to convene.

"(e) The delegate shall send a notice by mail to each of the three appointees, which shall inform him that:

"(1) He is a member of the committee.

"(2) The committee will meet at Sacramento on the day following the first Thursday in September.

"(3) The meeting may be attended either in person or by proxy.

"(4) Every proxy shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State not later than 5 o'clock of the afternoon of the day preceding the meeting of the committee.

"(5) The proxy shall be in writing signed and acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized to administer oaths.

"(f) Four forms of proxy are enclosed, one of which he may use himself, and one of each of the others he shall send with each of the notices of appointment to the State central committee."

SEC. 17. Section 2807.5 is added to said code to read:

"2807.5. The convention shall be called to order at 10 o'clock of the morning of the first Thursday in September by the retiring chairman of the State central committee. It shall at once proceed to the election of a temporary chairman by roll call read from the alphabetical roll submitted by the secretary of state. The convention shall elect such other temporary officers as the convention may determine."

SEC. 18. Section 2839.5 is added to said code to read:

"2839.5. The county clerk shall, between the first Monday and the second Monday of May next preceding the direct primary compute the number of members of the county central committee allotted to each assembly district or supervisor district, as the case may be, pursuant to this article."

SEC. 19. Section 2842.5 is added to said code to read:

"2842.5. Each county central committee in a county containing 20 or more assembly districts shall meet in the courthouse at its county seat on the third Tuesday in May following the Presidential primary in May 1944 and on the third Tuesday in May every 2 years thereafter, and shall organize by selecting a chairman, a secretary, and such other officers and committees as it deems necessary for carrying on the campaign of the party. Every other county central committee shall meet in the courthouse at its county seat on the last Tuesday in August following the direct primary, and shall organize by selecting a chairman, a secretary, and such other officers and committees as it deems necessary for carrying on the campaign of the party."

SEC. 20. Section 2843.5 is added to said code to read:

"2843.5. Not later than 10 days after the third Tuesday in May following the Presidential primary, the county clerk shall mail or otherwise deliver to the Secretary of State a certificate showing the chairman of each county central committee in each county containing 20 or more assembly districts.

"The county clerk shall within 10 days after the last Tuesday in August following the direct primary, ascertain who is the newly elected chairman of each county central committee in all other counties and shall mail a certificate to that effect to the secretary of state."

SEC. 21. Section 2892.5 is added to said code to read:

"2892.5. When, as a result of any primary election, a person has received a nomination to any office without first having filed a declaration certificate, and having his name printed on the primary election ballot, he may, at least 60 days before the day of election, cause his name to be withdrawn from nomination by filing in the office where

he would have filed his declaration certificate had he been a candidate for nomination, his request therefor in writing, signed and acknowledged by him. When this section has been complied with, the name of the candidate shall not be printed on the election ballot for the ensuing general election as a candidate for that office."

SEC. 22. Section 5901.5 of said code is amended to read:

"5901.5. If the voter is serving in the armed forces of the United States, or any auxiliary branch thereof, he may make his application for an absent voter's ballot at any time after being notified that he is about to leave the State or to be confined to camp, and no later than 5 days before the election."

SEC. 23. Section 5901.6 is added to said code to read:

"5901.6. If the voter is employed by the United States or is employed by the American Red Cross or is employed as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel documented under the laws of the United States, he may make his application for an absent voter's ballot at any time after being notified that he is to be required to serve his employer at a place outside the territorial limits of the United States, and no later than 5 days before the election."

SEC. 24. Section 5901.7 is added to said code to read:

"5901.7. Whenever an application for absent voter's ballot is made by a war voter, the application shall be deemed an application for an absent voter's ballot for the Presidential primary, direct primary, and general election, or such of them as may be required to be held subsequent to the date of the application, and shall be deemed an application for registration under the provisions of section 132.5 of this code.

SEC. 25. Section 5902.6 is added to said code to read:

"5902.6. Where the applicant is not registered and is entitled to receive both a ballot and affidavit of registration under section 132.6, the clerk shall, in the case of the direct primary, deliver to the applicant the official ballot for the political party with which the applicant has indicated his affiliation. In the case of the Presidential primary, the clerk shall forward to the applicant a 'war ballot.'

"The 'war ballot' shall be in the form prescribe by the Secretary of State. It shall bear the names of the persons preferred for President by each group of candidates of each political party qualified to participate in the Presidential primary and shall bear a notice that the voter shall vote only for one group of the political party with which he has expressed his intent to affiliate in his affidavit of registration. In other respects, the Secretary of State shall be guided by and shall conform as nearly as possible to the form prescribed in article 2 of chapter 2 of division 6 of this code.

"If it appears, upon the opening of the absent voter's ballots, that any voter has voted for the candidates of more than one political party, or for the candidates of a party with which he is not registered, or that the voter has failed to state his party affiliation in the affidavit of registration the ballot voted by him shall be void."

SEC. 26. Section 5904.5 is added to said code to read:

"5904.5. Whenever the clerk is required to mail an absent voter's ballot to any elector and the address to which said ballot is to be mailed is a point outside the territorial limits of the United States, he may mail the absent voter's ballot to the elector by air mail, and, if by any law of the United States official election ballots may be mailed without the payment of postage, he shall do so."

SEC. 27. Section 5931.5 of said code is amended to read:

"5931.5. If a voter is a war voter, he may appear, either within or without the territorial limits of the United States, to mark his absent voter's ballot before any commissioned officer of the armed forces of the United States, or before any minister, consul or vice consul of the United States, if he is unable, by reason of his service, to go to his polling place or to go before the clerk of the county, municipality or district in which he resides."

SEC. 28. Section 7964.5 is added to said code to read:

"7964.5. When begun the canvass shall be continued until completed, which shall not be later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of the twenty-first day following the primary election."

SEC. 29. This act is hereby declared to be an urgency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety within the meaning of section 1 of article IV of the Constitution of the State of California, and as such shall take effect immediately. The facts constituting such necessity are as follows:

"Many thousands of citizens and electors of this State are outside the State and in foreign countries serving as members of the armed forces of the United States, as employees of the United States, as employees of the American Red Cross, and as officers and members of the crews of merchant vessels of the United States. Their services are essential in the waging of victorious war, and are such that they may be away from this State and in foreign countries at the time elections are held in this State. If present in this State, these electors would be entitled to vote at the coming elections and they are not now entitled to absent voter's ballots. Under the existing election laws of this State, it is impossible for many of these electors to cast a ballot and in most cases it will be impossible for them to obtain and return an absent voter's ballot in time for that ballot to be counted. It is essential to the public welfare of the United States and of this State and to the public peace, health, and safety that all electors be given the right to freely express their choice at the polls and to effectively exercise their voting rights. The time required prior to the elections to be held in the year 1944 within which to prepare for such elections and to inform the electors of their rights and privileges in relation thereto is such that it is necessary that this statute shall take effect immediately."

Soviet-Polish Boundary Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Mr. Cedric Foster, radio commentator, delivered over the Mutual network through Station WNAC on Sunday, January 16, 1944:

On the field of battle today on all major fronts the United Nations continue to advance—slowly but relentlessly. Tonight I want to leave these war fronts to point out that in the last few weeks, actually since the day that the "red" armies crossed the 1939 eastern frontier of Poland, the Soviet-Polish boundary dispute has received considerable attention. The position of the Russian Government has been stated quite clearly—one might even say dogmatically so, regarding Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Moscow declares that these Baltic states are integral units of the Soviet Union—that they are occupied territory and as such they will be freed. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, according to Moscow, are part of Russia because they voted themselves into the Soviet in plebiscites. Therefore, the matter is closed. Bluntly does Russia say she will not negotiate their frontiers.

Poland, however, is not in quite the same category. Entry of Russian troops into prewar Poland, as the advance of General Vatutin's armies of the Ukraine continued to force the Germans to the westward, precipitated the problem. Poland asked whether the Russians were coming as liberators or conquerors. Since that time the relationship between the Kremlin and the Polish Government in exile, and these two governments do not enjoy diplomatic intercourse, this relationship has been more strained than ever. From Moscow comes word that the Russians would consider the so-called Curzon line as the future eastern boundary of Poland. This Curzon line was suggested as a possible boundary in the year 1919. It is well, at this point, that the Curzon line be understood. This line commences just north of Grodno on the Polish-Lithuanian frontier. It runs south through Grodno to Brest-Litovsk on the Bug River, that is the Polish Bug River and not to be confused with the Russian Bug River which is many miles away to the southeast in the Ukraine, south from Brest-Litovsk following the Bug to a point just north of Lwów. Then south to Lwów—to anchor itself eventually in the Carpathians on the old Austrian border. It should be stressed that this was a suggested line, drawn up by Britain's foreign minister, Viscount Lord Curzon. The line was accepted by neither disputant. Poland and Russia continued to struggle on the field of battle despite the Curzon proposal. The only weight that the Curzon line ever held lies in the fact that Curzon believed this line came the closest to what Woodrow Wilson believed should be Poland's eastern frontier.

Russia is willing to talk today in terms of the Curzon line. The Polish Government, and very wisely so, has not allowed itself to be drawn into public and open discussion over the merits of any line. Poland has simply asked the United States and Great Britain to mediate the dispute with her Russian neighbor and ally, in the war against Germany. As matters now stand the request is under consideration in Washington, London, and Moscow.

There are two sides to this Russian-Polish boundary question. If there were only one side there would be no controversy. There will be those people in this country who will throw up their hands in horror at the mere presentation of the Polish side of this discussion. These people will point out that to argue the matter now will be to retard the progress of the war. They might even go so far as to say it will give aid and comfort to the enemy. Definitely they will say the question should not come to the fore at this moment.

Yet were it possible to sit in on a meeting of the Polish Cabinet of the Government in Exile that Cabinet would tell us that the issues which are at stake between Russia and Poland are the fundamental, basic issues over which the entire world struggle is being fought. The Poles will tell you that the principles of the Atlantic Charter undeniable are interwoven into the tapestry of this controversy. And the Poles will say something else, too. They will point out—or rather they will ask the question—is the peace which is to follow this war going to be underwritten as the war itself moves along? More important than that, is any one nation, and it makes not the slightest difference which nation is meant, is any one nation going to dictate frontiers and boundaries without all

participants in the struggle against tyranny having the right to discuss these frontiers in round-table debate? Poland would then ask, in conclusion—is the future world going to be one in which collective security is going to the anchor to the windward—or is power politics to have full sway, as it has in the past? If collective security is to be the motivating influence in the treaties which will bind the wounds at the end of this war—then there must be consultation between all interested parties—there can be no unilateral decisions. But if power politics is to be the leitmotif—then we might just as well say so right now. Why bother around with pretty phrases—why mouth idealistic words—why speak and think in terms of the Atlantic Charter—or any other charters. Why not state, honestly and openly that the theory on which we'll all adhere is the one of "fifty million Franchmen can't be wrong"—it's the theory that God has always been—and God always will be—on the side of the most battalions.

When we consider Poland's side in the discussion with Russia, we know that Poland before the war was not without its faults. No government is. Not even our own. None holds up the Polish Government of 1939 as a Utopian state of affairs. But Poland's history has been long, and as honorable as any European state. Its culture, which stems from the ninth century, has left its imprint on central Europe. Poland essentially belongs to the West. Its religion comes from Rome. As part of the West it desires to remain.

For 120 years Poland did not exist as a state. It was partitioned three times by Austria and by Russia and by Prussia in 1772, 1793, and 1795. In that year the last remnants of Poland were flung into chains.

At the conclusion of the First World War Poland set out to regain her boundaries of 1772. In the ups and downs of that struggle, Russia at one time stood within the shadows of Warsaw. Then came for Poland the miracle of the Vistula. Polish armies hurled back the Russians to Minsk. The treaty of Riga was signed on March 18, 1921. In that treaty was established Poland's eastern boundary which was to remain accepted by all and inviolate until the early days of September 1939. Riga gave to the Poles a boundary about the same as the second partition of 1793. In 1923 the powers of the world, including America * * * recognized this boundary and in 1932 its validity was reaffirmed by a Soviet-Polish nonaggression agreement * * * an agreement which was renewed in 1934 for a period of 10 years.

If you were to sit in on a Polish Cabinet meeting tonight, that Cabinet would tell you that through all the years following Riga, Poland had every reason to believe that her relations with Russia were getting progressively better. Then the Germans attacked. The tanks and the planes and the infantry of the Hun swept across the Polish frontier. Seventeen days later, Russia announced that Poland had ceased to exist as a state, this despite the fact that Warsaw had not yet capitulated, and, as such, all agreements signed by Poland in the past were null and void. Moscow said the Ukrainians and the White Russians living in eastern Poland could not be left to their fate. So she moved in and absorbed the country.

Then Russia sat down at a table with Germany. Molotoff and Ribbentrop established a line to which their names have been given. Germany took everything west of that line and Russia took everything east. Poland disappeared. This Molotoff-Ribbentrop line was west of the so-called Curzon line. It gave to Russia the city of Lwów, Polish for countless centuries. And also eastern Galicia, which never, in all history, had been Russian. Russia's claim to Galicia was vested in the fact that Galicia had Ukrainians among its population and the Ukraine was a part of the Soviet Union.

Then came the invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany. Poland had established a government in exile and Russia now found herself fighting a common foe. On July 30 of 1941 Russia signed in London a treaty which abrogated her agreement with Von Ribbentrop, which outlawed the Ribbentrop-Molotoff line. Thus did Poland revert to her prewar status of the Riga boundary, established in 1921. And one should point out that when Russia took this step German armies were streaming into the Soviet Union, through White Russia, and the Ukraine. German power was nearing its crest. Now the situation has turned about as the Soviet drives the Hun from Russian soil. Now the Soviet says it will discuss the Curzon line, which is not very much different from the Molotoff-Ribbentrop line. Ethnologically, says Russia, eastern Poland belongs to us, a statement which the Poles deny. From a security point of view, we must have it, says Russia. To which Poland answers, "If you need it for security now and in the future, why didn't you need it in 1941 when you renounced your partition of Poland with Germany, a renunciation to which Anthony Eden and Sumner Welles gave hearty approval."

That is the outline of the record which has been written into the books between Poland and Russia. You may ask the question, "What's to be done about it?" The answer is that we can't afford to underwrite any peace or boundary which is drawn from the white-hot crucible of war. While the war goes on we can take cognizance of claims and counter-claims, but to commit ourselves is another matter. Our State Department has never recognized absorption of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union. If Russia insists upon taking eastern Poland as she drives the Germans to the west, we can always keep the record straight. When the time comes for final settlement the world then will know where we stand * * * where we've always stood. As we fight side by side with Russia against the Germans we can remember that a strong Poland, erect on its own feet, a Poland which is not dependent politically or economically on any state * * * is the best insurance for future peace. That is stark realism, to say nothing of the Pole's desire for such a state.

As long as we remember this we'll be on firm ground in the peace conference. In the meanwhile we can lend our best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to resolve the issues between Poland and the Soviet.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of 10 letters published in the Stars and Stripes under date of January 11. Of the 10 letters, 8 in strong language, demand the right of the servicemen to vote in the next election.

I should also like to have printed on the same subject, a letter which appeared in the Stars and Stripes in an earlier edition, under the headline "Want action on voting."

I have in my hand a letter published in Yank from Sgt. L. C. Stoumen, who has served in Puerto Rico, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes of January 11, 1944]

MAJORITY OF SOLDIERS' LETTERS REVEALS STRONG DESIRE TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER—A DIGEST OF MAIL RECEIVED RECENTLY BY THE STARS AND STRIPES OF ITALY ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ABSENTEE SOLDIER VOTE PROPOSALS NOW BEFORE CONGRESS

SUGGESTS FEDERAL BALLOT

DEAR EDITOR: I wish to most emphatically endorse the sentiments of those who demand action on the voting question. A very definite reactionary trend has been developing in American affairs during the past year which can largely be attributed to the withdrawal of million of clear-thinking, progressive-minded youths from participation in the functioning of our electoral system. It is clearly obvious that certain interests are well pleased with this turn of events and are not particularly anxious that their present advantage achieved through the dislocations of war be upset. But it cannot be denied that there are constitutional and administrative obstacles involved in this issue and it might be well for us to consider them. However, I believe a solution can be found if the majority of our lawmakers are made to realize that soldiers are awake to the gross injustice of denying those making the greatest sacrifices to preserve "the American way" a voice in determining their Government's policy during the 4 vital years following the next national elections. Under our system the States have always been accorded the responsibility of conducting our elections, and there seems some doubt that the Constitution intended the individual States to determine the qualifications of their voters.

The best plan therefore, appears to be to permit each soldier over 20 to vote by Federal ballot. The voter will mark his name and address on his ballot in a manner to preserve its secrecy and it shall be forwarded to his local election board. Each board shall be required to count his votes for Members of Congress, if the local draft board certifies as to his residence. Acceptance of Presidential votes shall be optional, but each board shall be required to inform those submitting ballots as to its disposition. I believe most ballots will be accepted (many States no doubt will adopt enabling legislation) and those denied will know where to place the blame, if any. Admittedly, this will develop some confusion, controversies, and inequalities, but such a law is in my opinion better than none at all. All this reveals a serious defect in our method of election and a permanent solution should be secured by a constitutional amendment, if necessary.

Corp. CHARLES MURPHY.

WOULD VOTE, IF—

DEAR EDITOR: I wish to add a bit to this subject of overseas voting. To be short and plain, why should so much be said about men in service voting? There are many things that we men would like to write to our Representatives if we were civilians. But what is the point of voting for a man to whom we as soldiers may not write to express our reactions to different policies while he is in office? In other words, if a man elected to office is not going to be guided by our wishes and dislikes, why vote at all? I want to be free to write to my Representative after I

vote for him. I say let's get these blasted Germans whipped and get back home.

Pvt. CHARLES A. MCABEE.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

DEAR EDITOR: I read with interest the article which said that many soldiers thought that the President would remain in office until the war was over. It was gratifying to have your explanation of our constitutional rights. Now, if some one would explain the same thing to the Congress at home perhaps we would get some action on the Green-Lucas bill. The soldiers want the vote.

Pvt. E. H.

DECISION IS AN OMEN

DEAR EDITOR: It was with satisfaction that we read that Congress will again consider the issue of the soldier vote in its forthcoming session. This Presidential election is without doubt one of the most important in the history of the United States. The leaders selected at the polls in this election will have much to say about the kind of peace which will follow this war. The soldier in this war is interested in winning the peace as much as he is in winning the war.

If Congress can solve this problem it will be a favorable sign that the post-war world will not follow the pattern of debacle which ensued after the First World War.

Pvt. WILMER GAYDOS.

FEUDALISM BLOCKS BILL

DEAR EDITOR: I have just read about the status of the G. I. voting legislation in the United States Senate. I appreciate your good journalism whereby you give both sides of the story—quoting the authors of the deceased bill as well as the "Democrats" who killed this democratic bit of legislation.

I feel, however, that this matter is important enough for all soldiers to call for action on this bill. This occasion calls for an editorial and a mass response from us to show the Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, that we are here to fight for freedom—freedom to vote, too. We will not let a matter of antiquated feudalism like the poll tax stymie the desire of most G. I.'s to vote in the next election. Let us take measures to correct this while time remains. If we wait longer, we will be without representation in the affairs at home.

Corp. LOUIS HEIT.

SOLDIERS ARE NOT INDIFFERENT TO VOTING

DEAR EDITOR: The indifference of people to the affairs of government is in many ways responsible for the present war. In the future we all shall want to participate more actively in all post-war policies. It is this sincere desire of the members of the armed forces to be effective citizens which prompts us to ask for favorable action on the Green-Lucas bill. Let us begin now—not later—to be active voting citizens.

Sgt. KEN GARVEY.

DOESN'T WANT TO VOTE

DEAR EDITOR: Instead of sending us ballots and advertisements about the coming Presidential elections, send us bullets and ammunition so that we can get this war over.

The folks at home can take care of the election as they have done on a number of other occasions. We know and feel that they will vote for the right man, who will help to get us all home soon.

Let's use all of our machinery to win the war.

Pvt. M. J. WALSH.

NO POLL-TAX STRINGS

DEAR EDITOR: Your short article in today's issue of the Stars and Stripes on the soldier-vote bill leaves out the essential feature of the new bill sponsored by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN. Absence of editorial comment on a development which so deeply affects soldiers' rights was a very unfortunate omission.

The revised bill can have only one purpose. By subjecting the soldiers to State voting qualifications, it perpetuates the poll-tax restrictions which have excluded large sections of the population of eight Southern States from privileges granted them under the Constitution. In brief, it says to those soldiers who have not been able to meet their poll-tax obligations, "You may fight and die for your country, but you may not vote for her representatives."

I do not wish to raise a controversial issue here, but I think it important that we should know what the issue is, and how the men who represent us voted on it.

Pvt. C. WEINSTOCK.

WANTS AN AGGRESSIVE STAND

DEAR EDITOR: I can think of nothing more bitterly ironical than the prospect of a democratic army deprived of its rights to vote at the height of battle.

Let none of us be deceived. The defeat of the Green-Lucas bill means the disenfranchisement of the armed forces overseas in the 1944 elections. The enemies of the Green-Lucas bill have employed the old dodge of States' rights to rob us of our vote. The individual States cannot possibly create the means for handling the huge service vote. (My own State ballot reached me 40 days after the prescribed deadline.) Only a Federal agency working in conjunction with the War Department can intelligently cope with the problem of the service vote.

I urge the Stars and Stripes to take an aggressive stand on this issue which for us is no more controversial than the principles for which we fight.

Pvt. (1st cl.) W. E. W.

MERITS OF GREEN-LUCAS BILL

DEAR EDITOR: The news concerning the defeat of the Green-Lucas bill was disheartening. It was the one piece of legislation which would have provided Nation-wide, uniform ballot and would have waived poll-tax requirements for the men overseas. Once again certain Congressmen have seen fit to stifle the voice of a large portion of the population.

They argue "States' rights" as if to say, we are not one Nation geared to one job, with one object—to win the war. To that paramount objective another phrase must be added "to win the peace that follows." As citizens of a democratic country, it is our right and our duty to choose our leaders freely. If never before, it is of the utmost importance at this time and during the coming years that we choose our leaders by careful thought and by the fullest participation of all the people. Our Government policies in national and international affairs are far too serious a nature not to be understood and actively supported by the majority of men and women in the precarious post-war world ahead. This election will influence that period greatly.

One might say, nevertheless, the servicemen overseas can vote, his State giving him the procedure to follow. Upon examination one finds wide differences in voting requirements—many States making it impossible for a valid ballot to be cast, owing to the lack of time; and most voting laws involve too much red tape for one to cope with. The soldier-vote bill would have obviated all this by substituting a standard voting procedure for all.

To what purpose are these men driving when they deny to men and women in service a simplified direct method of voting? It gives rise to the thought that they are afraid of the voice of the people which connotes fear of the democratic processes. Perhaps their records in Congress are such that they do not have the support of those they supposedly represent and this action is merely another instance of playing politics.

I am firmly convinced that the American serviceman overseas has learned to cherish his country and its high standards. I wonder just what he will do when he realizes his rights are being stepped on at home. Can The Stars and Stripes give the answer?

Sgt. HENRY HIRSCH.

[From the Stars and Stripes, Italy, of December 30, 1943]

MAIL CALL

WANT ACTION ON VOTING

DEAR EDITOR: We, the soldiers who are now in Italy, are 100 percent in favor of the Green-Lucas bill. We are a United States Army, fighting for the United States of America and not for any particular State. We want a Federal law to give us a chance to vote the easy way, and not leave us to the individual States with their inadequate laws and delaying difficulties.

The State laws may be all right for the people living there now, but not for the soldier.

In our battalion, we have soldiers from practically every State in the Union. Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each soldier has to proceed through the various methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective States? The process takes months and we have little time to spare. Some of us did not vote in the November elections because the ballots reached us after the elections were held.

This coming Presidential election is very important to us. We have to be sure that the proper leaders are elected.

Why not let the soldiers vote by V-mail? Don't they trust us or are some politicians afraid to let us vote? The soldiers on the front want to fight, and they want to vote. They say in effect: "We on the front are determined to use bullets and ballots. Bullets against the Germans and Japs; ballots against the reactionaries and obstructionists at home. We want a quick victory here and a progressive victory at home."

Pvt. Michael Coleman, New York; Sgt. Dennis J. Callahan, Virginia; Sgt. Glenn Buzard, Pennsylvania; Pvt. Claud Lark, South Carolina; Pvt. Glenn W. Propst, North Carolina; Pvt. (1st cl.) Neil L. Duer, Ohio; Pvt. (1st cl.) Mitchel A. Podbielski, Michigan; Sgt. James D. Nicol, New Jersey; Pvt. Willard W. Thompson, Oklahoma; Pvt. Donald J. Henry, Indiana; Pvt. Joseph C. Brady, Rhode Island; Pvt. Louis Alter, Michigan; Sgt. John F. Stewart, Tennessee; Pvt. Carl H. Forsyth, Maryland; Pvt. Clarence Hamlin, Maine; Pvt. James E. Blake, Arkansas; Pvt. Haze L. Olsen, Idaho; Pvt. Irving Brown, Illinois; Corp. Peter P. Unas, Connecticut; Pvt. Alfred L. Block, Iowa; Pvt. (1st cl.) John W. Riley, Missouri; Pvt. A. C. Moore, Alabama; Corp. Don M. Fisk, South Dakota; Sgt. Donald E. Gall, Wisconsin; Corp. J. R. Tie, Massachusetts; Pvt. E. A. Lewis, Georgia; Sgt. C. P. Roberts, Mississippi; Pvt. (1st cl.) John Fitzpatrick, Washington; Corp. W. F. Beard, California; Corp. Julius Kaplan, Nebraska; Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl Ogg, Minnesota; Pvt. D. H. Walls, Kentucky; Pvt. S. D. Haldeman, Jr., Texas; Pvt. (1st cl.) George G. Walker, Florida; Corp. E. G. Anderson, Louisiana; Pvt. (1st cl.) J. C. Thomas, New Mexico; Pvt. Paul Lowder, Arizona; Corp. Dave Howe, Colorado; Pvt. Paul Winter, Wyoming; Pvt. Frank H. Sterling, Kansas; Pvt. (1st cl.) Everett C. Lang, Oregon; Sgt. Harold Templeton, New Hampshire; Corp. Albert M. Hathaway, Vermont.

[From Yank, the Army weekly]

NEW YORK CITY,
December 24, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Senator from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: A few days ago I was in San Juan, P. R. There, I and a few other men from Pennsylvania, were pleased and proud to read your name and Representative WALTER'S name in the list of the 27 Congressmen (published in our local paper) who signed the statement advocating votes for servicemen as provided for in the Scott-Lucas bill. We were also happy to read of your speeches in Congress. Unlike many soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard men from the South, from New England, and other parts of the country, who are deeply disturbed about the actions of their Representatives in Congress, we are happy to feel that we are well represented in Washington.
that we are well represented in Washington.

I want you to know that I, for one, appreciate your work and shan't forget it.

Perhaps you'd be interested in a little report on the political thinking of men serving in the islands of the Caribbean, so here goes: I've been in Puerto Rico, Haiti, Jamaica, Virgin Islands, and Cuba for the past 3 years, and am now home on furlough before leaving for another foreign assignment. I've talked to many men in all the services, and believe I know what they think.

First of all, and unfortunately for the Chicago Tribune and the poll-tax Senators, at least 7 out of 10 enlisted men are Roosevelt Democrats. They'll vote right down the party line, especially in the President runs again. My personal choice for Vice President (or President, if F. D. R. doesn't run again) is WALLACE; no question about it. The officers are split maybe 50–50, with perhaps a slight Democratic edge. The junior officers are more Democratic than the colonels. * * * But don't misunderstand me. I am not interested in getting the right to vote overseas because I know my party will benefit thereby. It's more basic than that. We fought a war once over taxation without representation. That's property rights. But how about conscription without representation? How about dying without representation? That's human rights, and no phony smoke screen about the constitutional rights of the States can hide the issue or must be allowed to interfere with just legislative action. The vote's got to be under Federal control.

A lot has been written about the supposed hatred among servicemen for organized labor. Well, some of this is true. Some of it is the result of phony news stories such as the widely reprinted Chicago Tribune story about the merchant seamen who are supposed to have refused to work on Sunday at some South Pacific port, thus forcing wounded and ill soldiers to unload the badly needed supplies. This particular story has, of course, been exploded, but one yellow section of our press continues to spread disruptive poison, and many servicemen overseas are sick of it. Hardly anybody in the service has any use for John L. Lewis. * * * There is another reason for soldier resentment against labor, probably the basic one.

Servicemen resent that war workers and businessmen are earning fancy money while living in the comfort of their homes and not risking their lives. Aside from the too radical plan of conscripting capital and labor, as well as servicemen (which would well solve the problem but which hardly anybody wants), there are measures of control which I believe most servicemen approve. First, we don't want strikes and we want the wage and price lines held. We're not economists, but we know enough to be scared of inflation. The President's subsidy plan seems sense to us, and we want you and your colleagues to fight for it. We want all pressure groups resisted. The demands of steel, rail, and other labor for more wages seem to us a little beside the point. But we recognize that as long as Congress refuses to pass a really tough tax bill as requested by the Treasury, to skim off all possible excess profits from industry, and to give proper power to O. P. A. to control the cost of living—as long as these conditions obtain, labor has a talking point for more wages.

We want you to fight for subsidies, for O. P. A. power, for a tremendous tax bill which will hit the highest brackets and industry hardest, for renegotiation of contracts, for any measure which will keep war profits way down. * * * My home is in Bethlehem, Pa. While there I heard a lot of talk I didn't like about the way Bethlehem Steel Co. hoards labor, wastes material, builds itself facilities for post-war use, and generally wastes Federal money through selfish interpretation of its cost-plus contract. Couldn't this be looked into?

A final word on labor. Don't forget that most servicemen come from poor working families, that many of them and their fathers were and are good union members.

MacArthur for President? Few servicemen would vote for him. We don't like his dramatics. We don't like the way he argues grand strategy in the papers. We're afraid he'd be another General Grant. What got us maddest was the trial of the Selfridge Field colonel for shooting a Negro private. Patton's light punishment disappointed many of us, but the Selfridge mess was disgusting. The colonel was drunk. He shot a soldier because he was a Negro. And the court martial, composed of colonels, let him off with reduction to captain. Is there one justice for enlisted men and one for officers? Let Patton stay. He's a good soldier. But I join with every other serviceman I spoke to in demanding that each member of the Selfridge court-martial board be himself investigated and court-martialed. Never to our knowledge has there been a greater miscarriage of justice in the American Army. There can hardly ever have been one more disruptive to service morale. If the private, under the most violent of provocation, had shot the colonel he would rot in Federal prison for 50 years. Please see what you can do about this. And if any further punishment can be handed the colonel give him all you can.

My thanks, respects, and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sgt. L. C. STOUMEN.

A Senator Remembers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Senator Remembers," by Jacob Simpson Payton, concerning the respected and esteemed senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. The article is published in the Christian Advocate of January 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR REMEMBERS

(By Jacob Simpson Payton)

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, is the dean of the United States Senate. For more than 34 years he has survived alike the election hurricanes and the stream of time that have swept from Capitol Hill the last of his early colleagues among whom were Senators Joseph Weldon Bailey, Albert J. Beveridge, William E. Borah, John W. Daniel, Chauncey M. Depew, Jonathan P. Dolliver, Robert M. La Follette, Henry Cabot Lodge, Elihu Root.

"Senator, I hope I have caught you in a reminiscent mood this afternoon," I said as I entered his office, "for I have come to hear your recollections of Methodism during your youth." He smiled, looked a trifle disturbed that anybody should doubt his ability to converse on that subject and, leaning forward in his chair, said: "Why shouldn't I have memories about Methodism? Yes, siree, bob, I was brought up on it. Why, my father was a Methodist preacher. My oldest sister married James W. Koder, a Methodist missionary who died in Brazil. Another sister was the wife of a Methodist preacher, John A. Rice, a member of the South Carolina Conference. One of my brothers, Charles Betts Smith, was named for one of the saintliest Methodist ministers of his day, and he himself spent his life in the Methodist ministry. And my brother, Alex Coke Smith, was a Methodist bishop. And here you come asking me if I know anything about Methodism."

The mere mention of certain South Carolina Methodist worthies of his youth unlocked the floodgates of the Senator's memory, and for an hour there flowed forth a stream of anecdotes over which he chuckled, and of incidents during the recital of which he seemed to catch the glow of far-off years when he listened to sermons delivered with demonstration of the Spirit and with power. "Did you ever hear of Dr. A. M. Creitzberg?" I ventured. "Did I ever hear of Creitzberg? Why, he baptized my brother, Charles Betts. Yes, siree, bob! There was an able man. Why only last Sunday afternoon when Dr. Harris, of Foundry Church, christened my grandson, I told about a funny thing the old nurse said about my brother when he was handed to her following the baptism." And there followed the story, replete with humor.

When I asked him what was the greatest sermon he ever heard, he instantly replied: "Oh, yes, and I can tell you that, too. It was the sermon preached by Charles B. Galloway on the morning of my graduation from Wofford College. I shall never forget that sermon. Why, under the appealing eloquence of the bishop, the very air seemed vibrant with voices from the unseen." And he recited passages of the sermon which he had heard more than half a century ago with amazing exactness and impressiveness. Senator SMITH said that he believed that the second greatest sermon he ever heard was delivered on the evening of that same day by Dr. Warren A. Candler, later a bishop. He described how after the congregation had concluded a hymn, a stanza of which begins, "Other refuge have I none," the young preacher related numerous conditions under which he had heard it sung. He had listened to it in English cathedrals and from choir lofts in city churches.

The Senator then quoted the future bishop's description of how once at midnight in a parishioner's lowly cabin a dying saint had sung the hymn in a manner which, for beauty and meaning, had surpassed all the other renditions he had ever heard. All the political oratory to which Senator SMITH had listened across the years had not effaced the words of the speaker, which he reproduced verbatim.

It was when I inquired about the faculty of Wofford College during his student days that the Senator entered upon a series of eulogies. "President James H. Carlisle possessed the greatest mentality I ever knew. He was not only absorbed by religious convictions, but he lived them. He considered Prof. James A. Gamewell most remarkable, not only from the standpoint of longevity, but

from that of character and scholarship. He referred affectionately to other instructors but seemed to reserve a higher niche for Professor Dupre of the science department, whom he described as "the purest man I ever knew." And as if not wishing to give the impression that all the piety and intellect had perished with the past, he added: "There is nothing fuzzy either about the thinking of Dr. Henry N. Snyder. His thoughts are like steel-jacketed bullets that hit the mark."

It was revealing to observe that the vitiating and corroding influences of three and one-half decades on Capitol Hill had left undimmed the glory of the traditions of South Carolina Methodism, in which the veteran Senator is steeped. Never once during a rather prolonged recital of his memories of both humble and distinguished preachers did he lapse into the slightest criticism of them. To him the old itinerants remain a glorious company. Their impassioned eloquence still rings in his ears, and I could not escape the belief that he places infinitely more value on the evangel which he heard proclaimed during his youth, than upon all the panaceas prescribed by politicians.

My interview was primarily to obtain some recollections of an elderly statesman who hails from the State in which the Wesleys once preached and in which some of the most intrepid pioneers of American Methodism demonstrated with joy and pride that in the warfare against evil they were expendable. Senator SMITH heard from his father, Rev. William H. Smith, who entered the South Carolina Conference in 1842, countless incidents of the heroic perseverance and spiritual conquests by these heralds of the faith. And he bears proud witness to members of his own family who followed in their steps.

Before our visit was concluded we had yielded to the irresistible inclination of Capitol Hill to talk politics. On this subject the Senator's comments were sizzling hot. He would disclaim with regret that he has always kept the Methodist faith, but never that he has failed to keep the faith of his political party in its original and undiluted form. He almost gives one the impression that he considers himself the last surviving simon-pure Democrats.

Long ago he was given the sobriquet, "COTTON ED," because of his devotion to the product that each recurring autumn blankets the southern fields with fleecy whiteness. Whoever will may choose the gardenia which was named for a Charleston preacher whose pulpit John Wesley occasionally occupied, or the poinsettia which bears the name of a former Secretary of War from South Carolina, or the camellia which first bloomed in the soil of that State, but for Senator SMITH the emblem of beauty, honesty, and prosperity is a fluffy cotton boll. "Yes, siree, Bob," says COTTON ED, "that is the flower for me."

He considers the interpretation of the Constitution by Joseph Weldon Bailey, of Texas, the most remarkable intellectual effort ever heard on the floor of Congress; the erudition of Senator John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, the most amazing ever contained in one lawmaker's head, and a stalk of cotton the grandest thing that ever popped through the earth. And like the Senator, they all belong to the South.

If, however, one were to inquire where he had seen character transformed into completest beauty, and the Christian life displayed at its best and the gospel proclaimed with most searching and redeeming power, there is little doubt that Senator SMITH would turn back to the scenes of his childhood in South Carolina.

National-Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Capt. Herman Hirsh, of the Marine Corps, addressed to the Senators from Pennsylvania, regarding the enactment of a national-service law, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY-SEVENTH EVACUATION HOSPITAL,
A. P. O. 230, care of Postmaster, New York,
January 12, 1944.

Honorable SENATORS FROM PENNSYLVANIA,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is a simple expression of my wholehearted approval of the President's recommendations in his recent message to Congress. I am a Pennsylvanian and want you to know how I, and many of my fellow soldiers, feel about the President's message.

First. We are all for a national-service law.

Second. We are 100 percent for much higher income taxes.

Third. Keep wages from rising.

Fourth. Inflation in our country will be a terrific blow to our morale and we expect you to prevent it.

Fifth. We don't want to see our children and grandchildren paying for this war.

Don't let us down.

HERMAN HIRSH,
Captain, Marine Corps.

Local No. 490, U. A. W.-C. I. O., Supports Six-Point Peace Program, Sponsored by the Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic Religious Denominations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the members of Local No. 490, U. A. W.-C. I. O., Highland Park, Mich., at their regular monthly meeting, held in January 1944:

Whereas it is essential to the welfare of labor that a peace be arranged after this war which will recognize the rights of all nations and of all groups within our own Nation; and

Whereas leaders of the three great organized religious denominations, Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic, have united in a common six-point program for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas organized labor should welcome and support this joint manifestation of moral leadership in building a just peace and should do all in its power to promote a lasting world order: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse the six-point interfaith statement of America's religious leaders as to the moral foundations of peace, to wit:

1. The moral law must govern world order. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organizations. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law, (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary, (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be communicated to our Representatives in Congress, and that copies be sent to the C. I. O. convention, to the international executive board, and to U. A. W. locals in this area.

Senator Butler Cites Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of January 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S THE PROOF—SENATOR BUTLER CITES FIGURES

Some weeks ago Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, following a tour of 22 Latin-American republics, charged that the Roosevelt administration had spent approximately $6,000,000,000 in furtherance of the so-called good-neighbor policy in Mexico, Central and South America, a high percentage of which had been wasteful and unnecessary and some of which was outright boondoggling of the most patently political variety.

He expressed the further conviction that a considerable amount of the spending not only had been unproductive of good will, but had been negative in its effect, since it served only to make the benefiting nations regard the United States as a soft touch.

The reaction to these assertions was immediate and violent. Vice President HENRY WALLACE broke out in a fine frenzy of excited denial and indignant name calling. Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, came loyally to bat for the administration with loud affirmations that Senator BUTLER was 95 percent wrong and that the total outlay in fiscal adventures south of the border was less than $2,000,000,000, all of which had been well spent.

Now Senator BUTLER, after a period spent in gathering precise information, comes to bat with proof of his charges. He has submitted to the Senate independently audited figures showing a total of $5,733,953,543 in spending, commitments, and extensions of credit during the past 3 years only. He freely admits that this is a trifle short of the round six billion figure, but adds that he is only 4.5 percent wrong by cold figures which, he comments, "is as near right as any mortal could hope to be in checking New Deal expenditures," an option with which it is unlikely that many who have observed the New Deal in action will be inclined to disagree.

Moreover, he hints that the actual total may be considerably higher, since he has included only items that can be documented and certified, and, as he points out, the Washington spenders have developed to a high degree the art of concealment and of financial "double talk."

This revelation comes opportunely for two reasons. First, it disposes of the attempted smear designed to show that because Senator BUTLER is a Republican and this is a campaign year, he had made loose and extravagant charges which were without foundation.

Secondly it coincides neatly with the upheaval in Bolivia and the rumors of Nazi domination in Argentina—both beneficiaries of the New Deal's largesse—to demonstrate how futile has been the lavish outpouring of American taxpayers' money in countries where the Roosevelt administration thought that the money alone would purchase favors and good will.

Senator BUTLER's observations on this point in his report to the Senate are well taken:

"In Latin America, we have already found out what we are beginning to find out in other parts of the world; namely, that money will not buy good will and that the Treasury of the United States cannot successfully be the agent for building our post-war world.

"It is time that we called a halt and took an inventory as the first step necessary in the direction of developing a policy that will be sound good neighbor."

J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1944, the Republicans of the House of Representatives held a conference at which a committee on resolutions, composed of Representatives HALLECK, of Indiana, chairman; KINZER, of Pennsylvania; MUNDT, of South Dakota; PLUMLEY, of Vermont; and STANLEY, of New York, prepared the following resolution on the death of our friend and colleague, Representative J. William Ditter. Copy of the resolution was forwarded to Mrs. Ditter:

Be it resolved, That we, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States, desire to pay joint tribute to the memory of our friend and colleague the Honorable J. William Ditter, of Pennsylvania.

The announcement of the tragic death of our associate on the afternoon of November 21, last, shocked all of us once more into a realizing sense of the fact that we are "too full of sleep to understand how far the unknown transcends the what we know"; taught us again to recognize the truth that in the midst of life we are in death; brought home to us anew the value of the friendships we make to lose too soon.

We shall sorely miss our friend, his wise counsel, his cheery smile, and his comradeship for all the word implies.

"Somewhere he wings his way
Where the immortals keep, where Homer now
Has back his sight, David his little lad;
Where all those are we dully call the dead,
Who have gone greatly on some shining quest.
He takes his way. That which he quested for,
That larger freedom of a larger birth,
Captains him, flying into fields of dawn."

Aggressive antagonist, fearless fighter, suaviter in modo, fortiter in re, he died as he lived, a knight sans peur et sans reproche.

Measured in days and years, his life was too short, but in accomplishment, long. He lived so long as to set his mark high on the scroll of honor of his day and generation, leaving there indelibly carved a record of which his family, his country, and we, his friends, may well be and are justly proud. This shall be his living monument.

To our friend J. William Ditter:

"* * * better than martial woe, and the pageant of civic sorrow;
Better than praise of today, or the statue we build tomorrow;
Better than honor and glory, and history's iron pen
Was the thought of duty done, and the love of his fellow men."

In retrospect we can see him on that tragic night, facing the inevitable fearlessly. Swept by storm and fate, he passed from life to death with the stern challenge of his courage on his lips. He can almost be heard to say:

"Fear death? to feel the fog on my throat,
The mist in my face,
When the snows begin, and the blasts denote
I am nearing the place,
The power of the night, the press of the storm,
The post of the foe;
Where he stands, the Arch Fear in a visible form,
Yet the strong man must go;
For the journey is done and the summit attained
And the barriers fall.
Though a battle's to fight ere the guerdon be gained
The reward of it all.
I was ever a fighter, so—one fight more,
The best and the last."

In the words of Douglas Malloch, in conclusion let us say of our friend:

"Time brings not death, it brings but changes;
I know he rides, but rides afar,
Today some other planet ranges
And camps tonight upon a star
Where all his other comrades are.

* * * * *

"Time breaks no circle such as this,
For this I swear, because believing;
However hurt, however grieving,
However much a friend we miss
Between the worlds is no abyss.

* * * * *

"Whatever vales we yet may wander,
What sorrow come, what tempest blow,
We have a friend, a friend out yonder,
To greet us when we have to go—
Out yonder someone that we know.

"To all eternity he binds us;
He links the planet and the star;
He rides ahead, the trail he finds us
And where he is and where we are
Will never seem again so far."

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased and be spread upon our records.

Group Work in Tomorrow's Community Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Dr. McGowan in Washington on January 15, 1944:

From every quarter a persistent effort to plan for post-war days is under way. It is based, of course, on the positive assumption that the war will be won and that the determination of the peace will be ours. With so much yet to be done, we seem to be "jumping the gun" a bit. One of our Fortress pilots, presently stationed in England, said recently, "Looks like there's two wars on, one here we're just starting, and one the folks at home have got already won. Kinda wish they'd get in the same war we're in."

Perhaps this situation grows out of the fact that here at home we've surprised ourselves at the tremendous revolution that has taken place with comparatively little friction

in changing from a peace to a war economy. This change has made it possible for us to produce guns and ammunition, ships, tanks, planes, and all the implements of war in such colossal quantities as to confound our enemies, and to make the ultimate outcome of the conflict a rather sure thing in our home-front minds.

We can't be blamed for this attitude. Neither will we be criticized by thinking folks for meeting here today with the purpose we have in mind. One thing is certain, whether pedagogues, long-haired or otherwise, give thought to the subject or not, the quantitative thinking of the demagogues will go on and on.

Since we have so developed our mechanical processes that there is no predictable limit to the quantity, quality, and variety of our production, we can rest secure that the field of mechanical engineering is safe. Sociologists, however, are wondering how we can also make the field of human engineering equally productive and safe. Certainly the fields for our effort and the possibilities for constructive change are literally boundless. Our job is to catch up with the mechanical engineers, to take up the slack, to make increasingly narrow the lag that distinguishes our present positions.

Our road is not going to be easy. Someone said, it may have been Monsignor Ryan, "If I come along with a mechanical gadget that will increase production, or add to our abilities to do things, I am straightway hailed as a great contributor to science. But if I think through a philosophy of industrial relations, or government, or social welfare, I'm invariably considered a visionary and theorist, and, if I press it hard enough, a veritable crackpot." At least such a pioneer may take some comfort in what Mr. Churchill said at Harvard: "The empires of the future are the empires of the mind." And no doubt the processes of the mind will continue to be expressed in words.

Community organization of tomorrow is not to be a repetition of pre-war standards. We must have in mind a constant upping of those standards by way of making possible an increase in the general happiness and well-being of people. It goes without saying, our present standards of production will make possible a decrease in the number of hours worked. We will be constantly applying more efficient and better means to our productive effort, and, as in the past, there is every reason to expect newer inventions will make possible even greater leisure. In short, an increasingly greater proportion of work will be done by machine and a smaller and smaller proportion done by human labor. New inventions will shock the imagination. We are told the possibilities in the field of electronics and plastics have just been scratched. Without doubt, post-war years will give undreamed-of developments along these lines. The Henry Kaiser shipbuilding technique will be applied to hundreds of other fields. And just as methods of production are revolutionized, increasing efficiency will bring staggering production.

In the light of all this, the sociologist is constantly bothering with the question: "How can society improve its economic organization so as to make full use of the possibilities held out by the march of science, invention, and engineering skill without victimizing many of its workers and without incurring such general disaster as the recent depression?"

Sociologists are well aware that the increase in scientific discoveries has brought problems of morals, of education, of unemployment, and above all, of leisure time. Of course, as we increase our leisure time, there is a very rapid increase in the incidental problems involved. Social institutions are not easily adjusted to change. The family has not yet fully adapted itself to the factory. The law was slow in adjusting to dangerous machinery. School curricula were slow in adjusting to the new occupations which machines created. On all sides we find this lag. There is in our social organizations an institutional inertia, and in our social philosophies a tradition of rigidity. Unless there is a speeding up of social invention, or a slowing down of mechanical invention, grave maladjustments will continue to increase.

As we think of the group work potentialities in the whole social structure we see their growing importance in the light, not only in the possibility of technological unemployment, but in the possibility of an establishment of a 6-hour day and a 5-day week. Yes; in the establishment of a workweek of even still fewer hours. Man is not a machine, we say; his nature is not adapted to too much work at repetitive tasks; recreation is a physiological need as much as food; if wisely chosen it is good for both mind and body.

It is conceivable that here again we may have another labor-management problem. The advantages which flow to both out of leisure time constructively spent need no amplification. Today progressive industrialists constantly seek to keep the health of workers at a high level in order to promote efficiency in production. Medical care by doctors and nurses is a regular charge on industry. By the same token, the general morale and mental health of future workers may be looked after and guarded by a plant personnel department which will devote much of its energies and thinking to workers and their leisure time.

Interestingly enough, in some large munition plants today organized entertainment for workers is regularly offered to break the monotony of the intensive production drive. One large shipyard in Pennsylvania stages what is called Lunchtime Follies. This calls for three performances in 24 hours so as to make sure that workers of each of the three 8-hour shifts will be entertained. The shows go on while the worker-audience sits around munching sandwiches, dunking doughnuts, or drinking milk. This is found to pay dividends in more and better work. Already it is prophetic of post-war group work in new roles. In short, the group worker of tomorrow will find he is a requisite in industry. Yet, a very definite requisite in much the same way that the medico finds necessary place today. His organizing powers, skills, and techniques will be constantly challenged by the increasing number of leisure hours flowing to the lot of the workingman.

By virtue of commercialization, the problem of leisure is bound up with purchasing. Not only automobiles, radios, and theater tickets, but also many objects of household decoration or personal adornment are bought to make leisure hours more enjoyable. Business with its advertising and high-pressure salesmanship can exert powerful stimuli on the responding human organism. Here is the challenge. Tomorrow's group worker must tackle this problem as never before. Working with churches, libraries, schools, museums, park societies, labor organizations, and adult-education groups, his job will be to create new and untouched wellsprings of interest. He, too, will have to advertise. It will have to be intensive to compete effectively. Albeit, this charge, in great measure, must be part of the taxpayer's burden. Federal, municipal, and State governments must join forces with him in a common crusade.

Of course, government participation in furthering leisure-time interests is not new. During the trying years of the depression the New Deal subsidized a great deal of artistic development to provide employment. Group work in communities throughout the United States was fostered as never before. This deliberate cultivation of community activities by W. P. A. group-work leaders contributed notably to the popularization of art, music, handcrafts, and many other forms of recreation.

Indeed, the great contribution of the Federal W. P. A. during depression years represents a national foundation on which tomorrow's group workers will build for the future. Literally thousands of recreation facilities, such as camps, picnicking grounds, trails, swimming pools, recreation buildings, athletic fields, playgrounds, and parks were built.

It must be remembered, too, this revolutionary increase in recreational facilities gradually developed a more dynamic philosophy with respect to play and recreation. For tomorrow's group-worker it will mean a shift of interest from mere play itself to an even greater consideration of the effects of play upon participants.

In a particular sense will this consideration have to flow in favor of the millions of our soldiers who will in due course be mustered out. Returning to cities, towns, and villages all over the country, most of them, in all probability, will face a period of unadjustment, or unemployment, and, many of them, unfortunately, will be unemployable. Theirs will be a primary claim on group-work services everywhere. In a very special way will many of our returned men stand in need of personalized service beyond that commonly accorded members of a group. In this respect, tomorrow's group-worker must be prepared to make wider use of mental hygiene in supplementing his regular activities. How far he can go, or should go, in this field will depend on many factors, chief among which will be his ability to judge wisely the value and effect of his time so used.

It is hoped the dearth of group-workers all over the country will be relieved by the enlistment, in private and public agencies, of many who are now serving in N. C. C. S. and general U. S. O. services. Those with capabilities who have been properly disposed in this work will have picked up invaluable experience. They will be needed on the home front in post-war action that will have tremendous social significance.

Broadening group work in the future is bound to do much to break down race prejudice. This is one of the most obvious antipathies which has afflicted our Nation from the beginning. It perhaps is due in part to the automatic perception of physical differences. On the other hand, however, much of our traditional prejudice against certain minority groups finds sanctuary among economic and other interests which are best served by the continuous subjugation of these groups. The outbursts of racial resentment throughout the country last summer indicate the very critical nature of this whole problem. But post-war America must give us an adaptation that is mutual if the varied strains are to be knit into a productive and peaceful social order.

It goes without saying one of the biggest challenges that will confront the trained group worker of tomorrow will be the breaking down of social discrimination and inequality of opportunity for play and recreation that now hinders and retards the growth of mutual respect and understanding among whites and Negroes. In this respect already significant beginnings are encouraging, such as, for instance, the growth of joint conferences on the subject, the improved community-playground attitudes, the development of housing and recreation projects for the combined use of whites and Negroes, and the wholesome acceptance of the competing Negro athlete. These are specific tools of the group worker. May they be multiplied manyfold, for "Jim Crowism" and its attendant evils cannot remain a blight on our democracy.

Group work of tomorrow will have to be more concerned with youth in its early stages. There will have to be a more definite link between group work, grammar school, and preschool children. Preschool play groups are now generally accepted. This program has much to offer.

It is interesting to note that our birth rate has risen rapidly; 3,200,000 babies were born in the United States last year. This is slightly in excess of 200,000 more than in 1942, and nearly 1,000,000 more than the depression year 1933. Someone said, "If building gun carriages wiped out the last depression, building baby carriages may prevent another."

Be that as it may, out-of-step youth today is in the spotlight as never before. One thing is sure, whether waves of juvenile crime happen or not, we are bound to get waves of juvenile crime news. I suppose during a war we are easily aroused and prone to get hysterical over anything. It seems to me the war has revealed what has been happening to youth for a long time. And if we are going to do anything about it, it's time for us to lift our sights from the electric chair and fix them on the high chair. Certainly, any case or group worker who has ever worked with a child referred by the police, court, or protective agency, has always regretted that the opportunity for constructive service came as late as it did.

Of course, it is the group worker's job whenever possible to buttress the ennobling influence of parental guidance in the child's life. The home must remain the citadel for character development. Just last Sunday in our churches we had read to us, in the gospel of the day, the beautiful and intimately revealing story of Christ's childhood. We heard "And He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject to them." Here we see sublime acceptance of parental authority by divinity itself. Here is the perfect pattern for the family.

But every group worker is well aware that all too many parents in the United States are only half-time parents. He is well aware that too many parents tie up their dogs at night yet allow their boys and girls to run at will. He is well aware, too, that respect for parental authority has decreased in about the same proportion as parental supervision has decreased. And, I suppose, the decrease in parental supervision is about in keeping with the acceptance of employment opportunities by mothers in industry and in the general war effort. In short, the social radicalism promoted by modern industry has developed a philosophy antagonistic to constructive family life.

What of tomorrow? It is unlikely that more tranquility will mark the home life of the Nation. It is also unlikely that many women presently earning high wages will want to quit industry in favor of closer home ties. All of which is another evidence of the willingness of the modern home to shift its responsibilities to outside agencies. And tomorrow's group worker will be faced with the job of joining forces more closely with the church, the school, and the community in taking up additional slack left behind by parents, who seek even wider separation from their God-given responsibilities.

The extension of private and public group work in cooperation with the general school program offers limitless possibilities. It is in this field, perhaps, that greatest headway will be made in the years to come. Of course, the school-group-work program will have to become more closely knit than at present. The group worker of tomorrow must definitely assume more responsibility for the leisure-time of out-of-school youth. The teacher, too, must assume active responsibility for bringing to the attention of the group worker those most in need of his constructive help.

Obviously the teacher is in a key position to note variation on the part of the pupil from accepted school and social norms. The child who is a disturbing individualist, and who does not get along well with his fellows, the bellicose type, the class trickster and general nuisance, these, and other children with problems, should early be brought to the attention of the group-work department of the school or the neighborhood center. The group worker, cooperating with the teacher, will then be in a position to help think through ways and means of begetting satisfactory social adjustments.

After all, every child, in order to lead a normal existence, has to feel cooperatively accountable to someone for his behavior and conduct. Without this accountability he is all sail and no rudder. And, if we admit that many parents never demand an accounting, then this gap must be filled somehow. Working closely together the combined efforts of the teacher and group worker will help relieve the situation. Working together they will be in a position not only to assist in shaping the behavior pattern of the child, but, as they envision their larger program, theirs will be the ever-increasing job of regearing parents with home responsibilities.

There is a close relationship between sound temporal and spiritual allegiances. Properly fostered they rest on the same foundation. They have a common blood stream. A force that makes one strong, buttresses the other. A disintegrating force attacks them both. The properly disposed group worker knows this. He is aware that the paganism of tomorrow will be a more aggressive, though perhaps more subtle, paganism than that of today. Because of this, the larger social aspects of his job will invariably impinge upon spiritual relationships. It will be necessary for him to work closely with the church. He will have to bring to his aid religion in the greatest challenge he has ever faced.

A Ballot for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, because I am one of the signers of the pledge favoring and supporting a bill which "will insure that the men and women in the American armed forces shall have the greatest possible opportunity to participate in forthcoming elections through the medium of a uniform Federal ballot," I think it is particularly appropriate that I have asked for the privilege of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this resolution which urges that Congress adopt such a measure:

Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to provide an effective ballot for the armed forces of the United States

(By Councilman Sweeny)

Whereas 11,000,000 men and women are now in uniforms of the United States of America, and many of them are fighting and dying on the fields of battle to protect their country and preserve its republican form of government and democratic institutions;

Whereas the right to an unconditional universal and secret ballot is fundamental to the republican form of government and a living democracy; and

Whereas nearly all of the millions of Americans in the armed services of their country are so located that they cannot exercise their rights as citizen-soldiers to cast their ballots in the approaching national elections unless the Government of the United States makes effective arrangements therefor; and

Whereas any plan to leave the arrangements for the casting of the ballots of the Americans in the armed forces to the separate States and Territories may result in confusion, inefficiency, interference, and partial disfranchisement; and

Whereas the failure to provide an effective means for the Americans in the armed forces of their country to readily cast their ballots in the approaching national elections will furnish the enemies of democracy with much material for propaganda to the detriment of the republican form of government and democracy and tend to depreciate the morale of our armed forces: Now, therefore, the Common Council of the City of Detroit

Resolves, That the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Vice President thereof be, and they are hereby respectfully requested, to forthwith provide appropriate election machinery for the free, secret, and universal balloting by the Americans in our armed forces wherever they may be situated, in the approaching national elections, the ballots to include national, State, and local candidates as fully as though the soldier-citizens casting the same were voting at their respective residences, with the provision that no election of persons to Federal office shall be valid unless the votes of the soldier-citizens cast therefor have been fully and fairly counted.

Resolution Opposing Loans of National Farm Loan Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the St. Louis County Bankers Association, held December 16, 1943:

Whereas the St. Louis County Bankers Association has been advised and informed that the National Farm Loan Associations servicing St. Louis County and adjoining counties are soliciting loans in improved suburban property, that such loans are available to part-time farmers or suburban residents whose principal income is derived from sources other than farming, and that the security acceptable may be located in a community where the source of such outside income is available to any subsequent owners of the property; and

Whereas it is obvious that urban or suburban property owners may qualify to receive the benefits of the 3½ percent interest rates offered by said National Farm Loan Associations on long-term loans; and

Whereas such activity on the part of said National Farm Associations constitutes a further encroachment by Government-sponsored lending agencies into the field of chartered bank lending; such encroachment thereby narrowing the field of legitimate

business opportunity for chartered bank-lending institution, which said field of business opportunity has been heretofore narrowed to the point of endangering the survival of chartered lending agencies without the assistance of profits derived from account-service charges and otherwise surtaxing their clientele for various services rendered; and

Whereas the banks of St. Louis County and adjacent counties have now on hand an excess of reserves available for loans on real estate at reasonable and fair rates of interest, but have not been able to place such excess reserves in a fair proportion of real estate loans because of the complete invasion and appropriation of that field of business by instrumentalities of the United States Government, which have and are now offering to lend Government funds at lower rates of interest than legitimate business agencies in a competing field can meet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, 1. That the St. Louis County Bankers Association view with alarm, deplore, and express their unalterable opposition to the action of the National Farm Loan Associations in further broadening their lending services in making Land Bank Commissioner loans to part-time farmers and suburban residents whose principal income is derived from sources other than farming and on small improved suburban tracts of several acres or more, for the reason that such action constitutes a further encroachment by governmental sponsored lending agencies in the field of chartered bank lending; and

Resolved, 2. That the president and secretary of the St. Louis County Bankers Association be and they are hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, president of the Federal land bank, St. Louis, Mo., president of American Bankers Association, president of Missouri Bankers Association, president of Independent Bankers Association, the two United States Senators from Missouri, the United States Representatives from Missouri, and such other persons as the executive committee of the St. Louis County Bankers Association may hereafter designate.

Exclusion of Japanese Is Essential for Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance and excellence in composition, a truly great editorial expression, I ask that the editorial which appeared in the Fresno Bee on January 22, 1944, under the caption of "Exclusion of Japanese is essential for safety," an editorial which also appeared in the Sacramento Bee and the Modesto Bee, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The editorial referred to follows:

EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE IS ESSENTIAL FOR SAFETY

Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, the top military leader on the Pacific coast during the Japanese evacuation in 1942, has filed a report with the War Department which should cause those urging the return of the Nipponese to the west coast to think twice before advocating such a policy.

The general said that prior to the evacuation substantially every ship leaving Pacific ports was attacked by enemy submarines, indicating conclusively the operation of some method of shore-to-ship communication. Signal lights and short-wave radio transmitters were found. Japanese flanked almost every military field and utility installation. It was more than a coincidence, he remarks, that where no military installations existed, no Japanese were to be found.

General DeWitt, now attached to the War College, flatly asserts that the security of the Pacific coast requires the continued exclusion of the Japanese from this area.

Every citizen of the west coast who has the welfare of his country and home at heart should agree unqualifiedly with General DeWitt.

Surprising, however, there are some persons, many of them merely misguided, who favor the immediate return of the Japanese to the coast.

They have introduced such extraneous elements as race hatred, constitutional rights, and discrimination, when they must know they are not and have not been a factor in the evacuation. These are dragged in merely to befog the issue.

Only one consideration is involved here, and that is military security. And the man most qualified to speak on the subject declares continued exclusion is a requirement for security.

Some who shed crocodile tears for the plight of the Japanese say they never have encountered a disloyal one. By the same token they would dispute that Antarctica is cold because they have not been there.

If these people want to talk about constitutional rights, they might have a word to say for the 130,000,000 Americans who have the constitutional right to see that their homes and security are protected.

Those who would bring back the loyal and continue exclusion of the disloyal would do well to reveal their formula for separating the white sheep from the black.

The simple fact of the case is, there is none.

It cannot be done on the basis of citizenship. In his report, General DeWitt points out that "thousands of American-born Japanese had gone to Japan to receive their education and indoctrination there and had become rabidly pro-Japanese."

Under the circumstances, the sensible policy to maintain on the west coast is to keep them out.

Waste-Basket Fodder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who heard or have read the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] on November 19, 1943, were probably not as surprised as the Director of the Office of War Information professed to be to learn that Uncle Sam is the No. 1 publisher in the United States. We all have waste baskets, and I will venture to say that the bulk of the material which fills each of them every day consists of assorted varieties of claptrap which come to our offices daily, unsolicited, from dozens of Federal agencies.

It was rather surprising, nevertheless, to learn that these Government agencies used 40 percent more paper during the last fiscal year than they did in the previous fiscal year. This in spite of the fact that the private publishers have taken a 23-percent cut in paper supply and the Nation is busily engaged in another scrap-paper salvage campaign.

However, Members of Congress are not the only ones who continually receive a superabundant supply of waste-basket fodder. The daily, biweekly, and weekly newspapers in the United States are receiving more than their share. Out in California, in my congressional district, these newspaper publishers are getting fed up. One of them who believes in saying what he thinks wrote me recently as follows:

FRIEND JACK: I enclose package of news releases from O. P. A., etc., for the month of December—a short month, because the boys and gals had holidays to entertain them and they didn't have to bend their energies too much to releases. In fact, we got about as much in the whole month of December as we have already in January.

My point is not that the releases are not news and valuable to the public. The point is that whenever any news emanates from C. P. A. it is released in Washington to United Press, Associated Press, International News Service, and radio, and transmitted pronto to the dear public through the press and over the air. Then, that being the case, whynell does every stooge all along the line feel it one of his bounden duties to rewrite it and send it along to his underlings and to the press? The duplication is terrific, costly, wasteful of man and woman power, and raises general havoc with editorial minds and dispositions.

The O. W. I.—a misnomer, it should be Office to Ward Off Information—should be curbed and plenty. Its handling of the remarks credited, wrongly or rightly, to General Marshall, anent the labor leaders, should cure the O. W. I. of any more funds. If they can't do any better than that they'd better quit and if it were in my power they'd quit or work for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the package of news releases to which this friend of mine refers consisted of 34, count them, 34 news releases from the regional O. P. A. office in San Francisco, 4 news releases from the Tenth Regional War Labor Board, 2 releases from the regional office of O. D. T., and 1 each from the Treasury Department and the Navy, all in the month of December. Highly significant is the fact that his paper did not publish a single one of the articles. Most of those he forwarded to me were appropriately marked in his own firm handwriting "More fertilizer."

Frankly, I doubt that any of the 45 or 50 newspapers in my district used more than 2 or 3 of the canned news releases. What does this indicate? Waste, extravagance, duplication and lost manpower. What is the remedy? Drastic reductions in the funds that are appropriated to our Government agencies for the printing and mailing of so-called news releases that are dead and buried before they are born.

The Children Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, no letters impress me more than communications from children. I received in this morning's mail some letters written by members of the freshman class of the Roosevelt High School, in St. Louis. The subject discussed in each of the letters is the condition of the unfortunate children in occupied countries abroad. They constitute an appeal for help for the little ones who are suffering abroad. Some of them endorse the United Nations Relief Rehabilitation legislation. The letters were sent to me by Miss Charity Grace, a teacher whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for many, many years. The children are her pupils.

In their appeal the children are alarmed over what might happen in the future. Unless they are properly fed, they fear twisted minds and bodies. They speak of having heard arguments on both sides of the question, especially the one that food might fall in the enemy's hands. They pray that some way can be found to send the needed food and medical supplies to the children of Poland, Holland, Belgium, and other occupied countries.

The pupils who have written me are Lydia Saunders, Tom Bryant, Eunice Muhler, Robert Kraft, Charlotte Kasten, Betty Rose Zeis, Patsy Starkey, Herbert Richtter, Marilyn Pope, Lois Hughes, Ruth Hofmann, Patricia Gerber, Winnie Franklin, Delores Colbert, and Juanita Brown.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, hope that the day is not far distant when these children in the Nazi-occupied countries will receive the relief that they need so much at the moment.

Sports Hall of Fame for Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the world looks with hope to Washington, D. C., the busy Capital of the United States—sometimes looked upon as the Capital of the world. Yet, even in this hustling, bustling citadel, proper facilities for various undertakings are lacking. I refer particularly to an appropriate athletic stadium. In the nearby Baltimore Municipal Stadium, exhibition games can accommodate 60,000 spectators while the maximum capacity for championship events here in the Redskin city is 36,000.

Vincent X. Flaherty, redheaded, top-notch sports writer for the Times-Herald comes forth with a natural. He advocates the creation of a sports hall of fame for Washington to accommodate everything from football to darts. I urge Bob Simmons, popular president of the Touchdown Club, to get his influential and virile organization behind this movement. I urge the Congress to support it, and I feel certain that the American public that loves clean sports will endorse this splendid undertaking.

In sppport of Mr. Flaherty's suggestion, I am happy to include as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the January 26, 1944, issue of the Washington Times-Herald entitled "Sports Hall of Fame for Washington":

SPORTS HALL OF FAME FOR WASHINGTON

Already the talk about war memorials is hotting up. Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, has crashed through with a proposal for postwar project No. 1 for Manhattan. It would cost between $88,700,000 and $126,800,000 and contain a fashion center, opera house, convention hall, music and industrial arts headquarters, plus the usual helicopter landing field on the roof and auto park in the basement.

All this, as a memorial to the war dead. There are imperfections in such a layout, but it is at least in the right mood, in that it emphasizes life and activity, not death and stillness.

No doubt some busy brain among the Federal planners is sketching out plans to build the usual marble mammoth in Washington as a memorial to the war dead of the Nation and city. We hope not.

With all due respect for the World War No. 1 thought and sentiment that resulted in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery, we think one such memorial as that is enough.

On January 11, Vincent X. Flaherty proposed in his sports column for this paper that there be established in Washington a sports hall of fame and an attached stadium designed to accommodate everything from football to darts.

MR. FLAHERTY EXPLAINS

Mr. Flaherty has explained his idea as follows:

"There is a lot of hullabaloo about physical fitness in peace as well as during war. You get it in the schools and in factories. It's a big thing—big enough, I think, to rate recognition here in the Capital City of the United States.

"After the war, millions of tourists will visit the Nation's Capital. A must stop on their tour would be the sports hall of fame—a place where the fellow from Keokuk, and Miles City, might pause and browse around and absorb the lore and legend of America's great sports—baseball and football and golf and tennis and racing and boxing and all the rest.

"The hall could be a place where great championships could be contested for, and it could also house the headquarters of all sports. Professional sports could hold their annual meetings in it. This is the legislative city. The Nation is managed here in Washington. It's the place where all sports should have their administrative headquarters."

It just so happens that there is this very day an excellent occasion for official consideration of Mr. Flaherty's proposition. The Office of Physical Fitness of the Federal Security Administration is holding a general national meeting here to discuss ways and means of improving the American physique.

John B. Kelly, of Philadelphia, is general chairman. Mr. Kelly, world's champion sculler and all-time American oarsman, says the idea is to develop national interest in sports to such a pitch that everybody will follow some kind of sports or athletic contest, and take part in at least one sport, personally. Mr. Kelly is worried because Secretary of the Navy Knox recently said that 50 percent of America's young men are unfit for military service.

While we think the Secretary was putting his figures mighty high, we do believe it is important for the O. P. F. of the F. S. A. to do its part in promoting better health.

GET TOUCHDOWN CLUB AFTER IT

One good way to do the job, we think, is to get such outfits as the Touchdown Club of Washington, D. C., behind the campaign. Robert C. Simmons, president of the club, is a first-rate organizer of mass interest in such matters.

Mr. Simmons knows sports, and he knows the importance of a national sports program, including a sports hall of fame, stadium, and general heading up of sports interest in Washington.

We hope the Office of Physical Fitness calls him into its sessions and gives consideration to our Mr. Flaherty's thought.

But whether it does or not, we certainly do think the board of trade and other purely local interests should get behind the thing. If the Federal Government won't do anything, we suggest bonds be offered to the general public of this city. The money would be forthcoming in short order and, what is more, the fans' flocking to the stadium would pay the whole thing out in a very few years.

The H. O. L. C. Record in the State of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John H. Fahey, dated January 24, 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. Of this amount, 24,524 loans were closed in Massachusetts, representing an aggregate amount of $132,289,104.

Citizens of Massachusetts can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown

a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expense and increasing their equities, but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Massachusetts, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $67,599,425, equivalent to 48.9 percent. A total of 3,620 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 1,245 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure a total of 10,142 properties. As of December 31, 1943, all but 1,659 of these have been sold. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of 10,153 loans of the Corporation in Massachusetts were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 58.9 percent as of December 31, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record, particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

A Farewell Message From an American Merchant Marine Officer to His Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Fulton E. Yewell to Mr. and Mrs. William Norris Busick. This officer lost his life in the Mediterranean war theater. The letter was discovered in his safe deposit box with instructions "To be opened only in the event of my death." It was handed to me by his uncle, Capt. John S. Delano.

The letter follows:

S. S. ———, *October 18, 1943.*

MOTHER AND DAD: This is kinda hard to write. There are so many things that I want to say and don't know how. All that I can say is to thank both of you for all that you have done for me through all these years. You, Mom, have been the kind of mother that any boy would have been proud of. Sometimes I may not have seemed grateful for all the things that you have done for me but that doesn't mean that I wasn't aware of them. I know how you have sacrificed for me more times than I could ever remember. I know the heartaches and tears that I have caused you so many times. But they are just the things that make a man and his Mom so close. If you ever read this you will at least know that I made the last voyage with a smile, I have no regrets. My life has been full and happier than the majority of people. If I must go at least it will be worthwhile regardless of what some may say. What more can one ask than to die for all the things that he loves and holds dear—my home, my family, my country, and just to be able to live the way that I have. All these things make any sacrifice a pleasure. Just to know that you and Dad, and others like you, will have a place to live like good old God's country. I don't mean that as flag waving, but just as I feel in my heart. Maybe the little that I can leave behind me will make things easier for you in the future; that is the only worry I have, that you two won't have all the things that you deserve and that I want you to have.

To you, Dad, what can I say? You took me and raised me, far better than any blood father could have ever done. You have been everything to me that I lacked. What little I have made of myself I owe entirely to you too. It has always been the little things that you have done, the way you understood when something was wrong, and the way you worried about me and always forced me to make something of myself even when I lost faith and became discouraged.

So to both of you all that I can say is please don't let this affect your lives too much. Don't give up hope, either. It takes a lot to make me cash in. Just think of me as away. Remember that poem that hangs in the bedroom—He is not dead, he is just away, with a wave of the hand and a cheery smile—read that and think of me once in awhile.

Always take care of each other for me—that is the only request that I have to make. I love you both so damn much. Well, I better close before I get sentimental. Give my love to Aunty, Carl, Captain John, Aunt Helen, and Ida, as well as all the rest. But most of all I leave all my love and happiness to the best parents a boy ever had.

So long for a while.

Your son,

JACK.

Heat But No Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 27, 1944:

HEAT BUT NO LIGHT

Mr. Roosevelt's vehement message to Congress about the soldiers' vote mixup does not help the members of that body solve the complex problem with which they are wrestling. Mr. Roosevelt makes assertions and impugns motives. But assertions and impugnings serve only to raise the blood pressure of the harassed Congressmen and make it more difficult for them to keep their heads clear.

Regardless of the fast-flying charges of politics which are now being made, nothing is more certain than that most of our representatives in Congress are trying their best to find a way out of the difficulties in which they find themselves. There may be a few who are short-sighted enough to think it good business to keep the soldiers from voting. The stupidity of such an attitude will be disclosed the first time the soldiers get a chance to mark ballots on which the names of such obstructionists appear. The others are at least as high-minded about it as the President himself.

Since the good faith of the great majority is not to be denied, Mr. Roosevelt serves the cause but ill by suggesting that their motives are fraudulent. He would do much better to call in a few representatives of both parties and calmly listen to them state their problem. He may not think that the constitutional issue is an important one—concern for the Constitution has never been one of Mr. Roosevelt's outstanding worries. But it is important, nevertheless, to a good many Congressmen. Their State laws also are important to them, if for no other reason than the certainty that an unconstitutional bill dealing with the soldiers' vote would be challenged in half a dozen States. One overturn by one high court might well invalidate the whole election and thus lead to who knows what disruptions.

As a matter of fact, the Congress has so far shown considerable understanding in its effort to handle this issue. If we may judge by Mr. Thomas D'Alesandro's useful poll of the States, most of the latter, also, are ready to act promptly as soon as the procedure to be followed is set forth in Federal enactment.

What is needed at this moment, above everything else, is the detachment in which, alone, clear thinking is possible. Mr. Roosevelt's outburst has made that cool detachment more difficult to achieve.

Resolution of Warren F. Hoyle Post, Department of North Carolina, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas millions of the young men and women of America are engaging in the fighting forces of our country, devoting their profound and loyal effort toward the prosecution of a war in the interest of international humanity, with great sacrifice both to themselves and to their families, particularly of a material and monetary nature; and

Whereas the American Legion membership has likewise experienced these hardships and sacrifices, and it is the unquestionable obligation and duty of every American citizen to contribute every effort humanly possible and to make sacrifices commensurate to those sacrifices of the men and women of our fighting forces; and

Whereas there are certain citizens engaged in the war effort at various defense plants,

in the coal fields, and factories, and elsewhere, who have caused disturbances and unrest, and who have been so un-American as to strike and to make demands for exorbitant wages and other things in the interest of selfish gain, and who have retarded production for the needs of our men and women in service, and for the home front: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Warren F. Hoyle Post, American Legion, Department of North Carolina, in the city of Shelby, assert itself against these un-American activities, which have become so repugnant and obnoxious, and that this post go on record as proclaiming to all the Nation its belief and opinion that such participants are un-American and traitors to common decency and to American idealism; and that drastic steps should be taken by our Government to stop once and for all these activities; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator and Congressman, to the National and State commanders of the American Legion, and that a copy be recorded in the minutes of this American Legion post.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. COOKE,
Commander.
J. REID MISENHEIMER,
Adjutant.
A. WILLIS MCMURRY,
Vice Commander.
J. LOUIS MCDOWELL,
Vice Commander.
VICTOR J. SIMMONS,
Vice Commander.
GRIFFIN P. SMITH,
Service Officer.

Just What Does Mr. Harl Owe United States?—Seven Answers So Far—What Is Yours?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Philadelphia Record of January 27, 1944:

JUST WHAT DOES MR. HARL OWE UNITED STATES?—SEVEN ANSWERS SO FAR—WHAT IS YOURS?

If you're having difficulty with your income-tax return—and who isn't?—perhaps you can get some consolation out of the case of John G. Harl, a carpenter, of 5412 Florence Avenue.

Harl wanted to be certain his return was accurate.

"Uncle Sam," he said, "is entitled to every cent I owe."

On the other hand, he didn't want to pay too much, figuring Uncle Sam doesn't want more than he asks for.

TRIES TO MAKE SURE

His first rough figuring indicated he owes about $40.

Wanting to be sure, he went to the internal revenue office at Fifty-second and Market Streets. The man there figured it at $60.47, including the payment not due until May 15, 1945.

One day Harl happened to be in midcity, so he dropped by the main office at Ninth and Market Streets to make doubly sure.

The first man he saw did some figuring and got $222.38.

Harl knew that couldn't be right unless everything he had read in the papers was wrong.

He told the man at the counter, who "took the papers into an inner office and told me to come back after lunch."

After lunch, he got a revised return, showing the Government owes him $30.16.

Having exhausted all the other expert advice in sight, Harl told his story to newspaper reporters.

REPORTER TRIES HIS HAND

In between writing a story about the O. P. A. and one about the W. L. B., a reporter took Harl's figures and calculated his tax at $45.02.

The city editor, with characteristic skepticism of reportorial arithmetic, tackled the problem next and arrived at $11.48.

The assistant managing editor, who is reputed to have won a mathematics prize in college, figured Harl's indebtedness at $12.90.

Now, here, reader, are the facts about Harl's 1943 income:

He took in $3,710.05 in the carpentry business. His expenses were: materials, $1,923.40; truck operation, including taxes, $247.11; truck depreciation, $120; entertainment, $50.

He made $560.90 in one stock transaction and lost $127.10 in another. The stocks were held less than 30 days.

He made contributions of $270 to church and charity.

His 1942 tax was $71.12. He paid all of it, but made no "declaration" payment.

He is married, lives with his wife, and has no other dependents.

NOW YOU TRY IT

Experts among the Record's readers—of whom there are doubtless thousands—are invited to try their hand at figuring out what Harl owes the Government, or what the Government owes him.

Any reader submitting the correct answer will be awarded a prize of one brand new copy of the Individual Income and Victory Tax Return, 1943 model.

JUST COULDN'T HAPPEN

The Record today will submit the figures to Collector Walter J. Rothensies for a final experting—and an official correct answer.

Yesterday the collector said it "just couldn't happen that everybody wouldn't get the same results if he uses the same figures and does his arithmetic correctly."

Another War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, copy of a letter written by the able and brilliant war correspondent of Time magazine, Robert Sherrod, to a friend and constituent of mine, Mrs. Jane Hawkins, of El Paso, Tex. Her son, First Lt. William Deane Hawkins, of the marines, was killed on Tarawa. Bob Sherrod was with my fine young friend, Deane, in that tragic battle, and gives some of the details in this letter.

Deane Hawkins was loved and admired by his friends in El Paso, just as he was by his comrades. Future historians will record him as one of the great heroes of this war.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 12, 1944.*

Mrs. C. JANE HAWKINS,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MRS. HAWKINS: By a coincidence, I had started to write you last night concerning the death of your son, First Lt. William Deane Hawkins, on Tarawa. Then I received your letter this morning.

I was deeply moved by your letter, in which you said: "He was my whole world, all I had, so from now on there will be only the past for me, where he is concerned."

He lived as he died, always on the peak of excellence. As one who saw him during the height of the battle, a few hours before he died, I can testify to the utter truth of that statement. It is difficult for me to find words to tell you how magnificent your son was. One after another, high-ranking officers told me: "Hawkins was the difference between victory and defeat. The inspiration he furnished to all the men on the island by his courage cannot even be estimated." The men of his platoon, of his regiment, and of other regiments who fought on the island were all in agreement: "If a man ever deserved the title of 'hero,' it was Hawk."

At the end of the battle Maj. Gen. Julian Smith named the airfield Hawkins Field in tribute to your son. It was a rare honor—airfields are usually named for flyers. But General Smith commented: "It is such a small thing to do for a man like that."

You say "he was a wonderful son, always cheerful, confident, sweet, kind, and thoughtful of others." I saw your son frequently on the transport we shared on the way to Tarawa. He was very popular with his fellow officers and with the enlisted men, from whose ranks he had risen because he was a born leader. I remember standing at the rail of the transport with "Hawk" late one afternoon, watching the miracle of the equatorial sunset—gold and green and slate grey and flaming red. He was talking about his scout and sniper platoon, the highly-trained, specialized outfit which other marines called Hawkins' Raiders. He said: "You know, I've got only 34 men, but I honestly believe they can lick any 200-man company in the world." The confidence which his men placed in him was reciprocated in his attitude toward them.

He spoke of the plan of the battle: "We are going in first. It's our job to knock out the snipers who will be on and under that pier. They've got to be killed before the landing can be made. Sure it's a dangerous job. But I'll tell you a story about this platoon. We had to leave one man behind to take care of supplies. I asked for a volunteer, but nobody would volunteer. They all wanted to stick together in danger."

The next time I saw Lieutenant Hawkins was on the afternoon of the first day. Ever since they had landed, after cleaning out the pier, the scout and sniper platoon had been inland silencing Jap machine guns which had been killing our men in the later waves. We held only a perilous 20-foot beachhead at the time, and we did not know whether our assault on Tarawa would succeed, or whether we would all be overwhelmed by the Japs, who not only outnumbered us at the time but also controlled the rest of the island excepting our small beachhead. But "Hawk" was just as confident then as he had been when I talked to him on the transport. He was standing up straight, with bullets whizzing all around his head—he could have ducked down behind the seawall but he didn't. He simply said, "Aw, these Japs can't

shoot. They can't hit anything." The only reason he had come back was that he had run out of ammunition. Then he headed back over the seawall to kill more of the enemy that was killing our men. And he knew that any man who climbed that seawall stood at least a 50 percent chance of becoming a casualty very quickly.

That was the last time I saw him. I heard during the afternoon of the second day that he had been wounded, quite seriously this time, but that the doctors might save him if they got him safely aboard a ship and administered a lot of blood plasma.

The rest of the story I got from one of his men. It varies in some slight respects from other accounts I have heard since then, but not very much.

That is what the scout-sniper told me: "Hawk was slightly wounded when we landed, but he didn't even pay any attention to the wound. We stayed out there all the first day, shooting Japs as fast as we could find them under their camouflaged dugouts. It looked pretty bad at the end of that first day, as you know, and nobody knew whether we would make it. That is, nobody but Lieutenant Hawkins. He never doubted it a minute. He was wounded again the second morning, when so many of our men were being killed in the water as they waded in. This time it was more serious, a bullet through his shoulder. He bled quite a lot, but he refused to be evacuated. 'I came here to kill Japs. I didn't come here to be evacuated,' he said.

"All that morning Hawk rode around in a halftrack, riding up on the Japs and shooting them in their machine-gun nests. I'll never forget the picture of him and some other men from the platoon. He just stood up and kept firing, with a million bullets a minute singing by his ears. Hawk knocked out six machine-gun nests that morning. Each of them had two to six Japs in it. I never saw such a man.

"Sometime after noon Hawk got another bullet, this time through the other shoulder and lower down. He bled a lot before we could get him back to the beach. The doctors did everything they could for him, and we thought he might live. But they were afraid to move him. He died on the beach during the night. I am sure that he would have lived if it hadn't been for his losing so much blood from that second wound, when he refused to be evacuated."

I heard the story later—I do not know whether it is true—that the doctors ran out of blood plasma while they were administering to Lieutenant Hawkins. As I say, I do not know whether that is true, but I know that the demands for plasma were very great, and had been for 2 days. If it is true, it should serve as a reminder to those giddy people who feel that the war is won, that an all-out effort by everybody is no longer necessary, and we do not really need blood donations any more.

It is a coincidence that Hawk should have received his fatal wound just about the time the tide of the battle turned in our favor. Sometime between noon and 1 o'clock of the second day we began to realize that we were winning, that the issue was no longer in doubt. It was as if some higher power had said to Lieutenant Hawkins: "You have done your duty, my boy. The job is finished."

Lieutenant Hawkins was buried in the graveyard just back of what was the regimental command post during the battle, with about 300 of his comrades, only a few hundred feet from the airfield that is named in his memory.

I do not know what else I can say. What can one say about a man who died so nobly in the service of his country? If Lieutenant Hawkins had seen a hundred years he could not have lived a fuller life. He could not have achieved more. Hawk knew what the war was about. He knew that we must crush the Japanese utterly, so that our sons will not have this war to fight again 20 or 30 years hence. His example of devotion and unselfishness will surely serve to sustain other millions of young men who must finish the job. His name will live always in the brightest pages of those men who are proud to call themselves United States Marines.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT SHERROD.

The Hall Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,
Binghamton, N. Y., January 26, 1944.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: The Lieutenant Colonel John Lloyd Broome Detachment of the Marine Corps League has gone on record by unanimous approval of the Hall bill known as H. R. 1504.

Most of our members here at home are middle-aged, sober-minded, and thinking men of experience and service who served in World War No. 1. We would most certainly have appreciated the privilege of free transportation as provided in the Hall bill in the last war, and we would feel unfaithful if we did not now raise our voice in its favor.

Whether the service man or woman is married or single we favor the Hall bill. Is it not just as gratifying for a mother to see her son come home on furlough as it is for a father to come home to his wife and children? We think so. One thing is certain. The opportunity to see their loved ones at home will be afforded to many who might not otherwise be in a position financially to make their journey.

Inasmuch as the essence of the Hall bill is its speedy enactment by the Congress, we are of the opinion that the House Military Affairs Committee should report on H. R. 1504 in the very near future. We would be pleased if you would convey this message to that distinguished committee.

We most sincerely hope you will make every effort, and the influence of your high office, to see that this bill is passed by the Congress.

Semper fidelis,

DONALD M. BOSTWICK,
Adjutant.

The Poll Tax and the Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from one of the good publishers of the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, Mr. L. F. Reid, of the Renville Star Farmer, Renville, Minn.:

RENVILLE STAR FARMER,
Renville, Minn., December 10, 1943.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: I have read with a great deal of interest the various arguments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pro and con, on the anti-poll-tax measure.

Enclosed you will find a copy of an editorial of mine on that subject, which appeared in the November 25 issue of the Renville Star Farmer.

As you know, I am definitely opposed to a poll tax as a prerequisite for the right to cast a ballot. As a believer in democratic principles, I do not believe it fair to require the payment of a poll tax or any other form of tax to obtain the right to vote, and I am equally opposed to anything akin to a property qualification for the same purpose.

We are engaged in a great war. One of our expressed objects in this gigantic world conflict, in which practically all of the nations of the world are either embattled or are at least vitally interested in the outcome, is whether the forces of aggression are to prevail or are those democratic peoples who believe in the American way of life and government to have their say as to the status of the post-war world.

When the struggle is over and representatives of the nations meet around the little green table to lay plans for a better and a more democratic world, I am sure, we who want the other fellows to accept our way of life and government to a large extent should of necessity come to the conference with clean hands. We cannot do this, however, while there is a law on the statute books of any State in the Union which inhibits any citizen, white or colored, rich or poor, of his right of franchise.

Sincerely yours,

L. F. REID.

Editorial by Mr. Reid in the Renville Star Farmer, November 25, 1943:

To make assurance doubly sure of peace and justice to all the peoples of the world, there should be a clause in the post-war peace settlement stating in unequivocal terms, that nowhere on earth shall there be a poll tax or any other kind of a tax imposed as a qualification for voting. In other words, every citizen must be allowed to express his or her opinion at the polls, regardless of his or her standing financially, in the blue book or elsewhere. To do less than this would make a farce of democracy.

Congressman Wants God at the Peace Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Baltimore Catholic Review of January 14, 1944:

CONGRESSMAN WANTS GOD AT THE PEACE TABLE

In his address at the annual communion breakfast at the St. John the Baptist Holy Name Society, Baltimore, last Sunday, Congressman THOMAS D'ALESANDRO said that if we wish the peace conference which will follow this war, to be successful, "God must be at the peace table."

"God was barred from the peace table at Versailles," said Representative D'ALESANDRO, "and see what things turned out to be. How can you have peace if you bar the Prince of Peace from the peace table? How can you expect to have a lasting peace if a conference is to be held without thought of God, without begging God prayerfully to guide the deliberations? You cannot rebuild peace on the foundations of hatred and atheism.

MANY MEN IN THE SERVICE

"There are many men absent from this communion breakfast this morning," said Representative D'ALESANDRO, "who have attended your communion breakfasts in the past. They would be here today but they are far from home—the very flower of the youth of St. John the Baptist Parish. Boys of Italian blood are fighting our battles all over the world. They are here in spirit. On this table in front of Father Iannone are between 40 and 50 letters from the young men of your society, who are facing danger and death to win victory and achieve a real and lasting peace. They know and all of us know that if the mistakes of the past are repeated, if God be barred from the peace table where God, above everybody else, has a right to be, this war too will fail to end all wars."

The letters to which Congressman D'ALESANDRO referred were received by Father Henry J. Iannone, P. S. M., pastor of St. John the Baptist Parish, from St. John's boys in the services in all parts of the world—Africa, India, Italy, the southwest Pacific, England, and other places.

WILL FOLLY BE REPEATED?

Mr. Fitzpatrick, taking up Congressman D'ALESANDRO'S remarks said:

"If the peacemakers at the coming conference intend to repeat the folly of those who barred God from Versailles, they can be assured that they will be repaid in the coin which a godless apostate from the Catholic Church paid the world when he unloosed the most terrible war in history. If the framers of peace at the coming conference bar God from their gatherings, if they refuse to see that the only way to peace is the way that the Prince of Peace walks, then all the evils of hell will sweep the world again as they have been sweeping the world from 1939 to 1944."

The Great Harl Tax Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Philadelphia Record of January 28, 1944:

GREAT HARL TAX MYSTERY; UNITED STATES OFFICIAL TOTAL, $23; UNITED STATES SUPER-OFFICIAL, $44

Synopsis: At 12:01 a. m. yesterday John G. Harl, carpenter, didn't know how much income tax he owed. He had been trying to find out and had got six different figures.

Three of them were from three officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as follows: $60.47, $222.38, and a credit (owed him by the Government) of $30.16. The other three, submitted by helpful members of the Record staff, were: $45.02, $11.48, $12.90.

The Record announced a contest for amateur and professional experts, offering one brand new Individual Income and Victory Tax Return, Model 1943, to any reader who could get the right answer. Now go on with the story:

The game of What Does Mr. Harl Owe the Government? quickly caught the public fancy.

It was not so much the substantial prize offered by the Record as the challenge to one's knowledge of elementary mathematics and of income-tax returns. Hundreds started figuring out Harl's personal problem.

During the morning some of the bolder contestants began telephoning the Record with a variety of answers. It was impossible to tell them whether they were right because Collector of Internal Revenue Walter J. Rothensies, named as official umpire, wasn't interested in the Harl game.

"It is," he said, "contrary to law to publicize or publish the tax return of an individual. I have no comment to make on this matter."

WOMAN'S ANSWER

In midafternoon a young woman telephoned the contest editor and said:

"This is the office of the accounting firm of ——, —— & ——. Everybody's been working on that income tax all morning, and our two best experts got the same answer. It was $23.16. Is that right?"

"Could be," she was told. "What was the name of that firm? I didn't get it."

"Oh, my goodness," she said. "Don't print that. We don't want the boss to know all the rest of us were playing the game, too."

With the two accountants in agreement, it looked as if $23.16 would be a good bet.

The odds on $23.16 increased a few minutes later when a third accountant called in with the figure.

Walter Camenisch, chief of the city's income-tax bureau and teacher of Federal taxation at the Peirce School, offered to try his hand. After 25 minutes, he announced his answer—$23.16.

Two other accountants, working independently, came to the same conclusion.

ROTHENSIES ADAMANT

But Collector Rothensies wouldn't confirm or deny the figure.

"We won't give out any information about an individual's tax," he repeated.

If a newspaper submitted a hypothetical case, he said, he could give an answer as "guidance" for the public.

The Record thereupon sent the collector a letter by messenger. It outlined a hypothetical case in which the figures were exactly the same as those given by Harl. But Rothensies wouldn't be out-foxed.

"I know those figures," he said, "and I know who the taxpayer is. I'm not going to become involved in this. I shall advise the Department of the publicity given this case and be guided by what I am told."

A NEW ANGLE

Whereupon the Record copied off the figures again and gave them to a reporter, who went to the income tax counter at Ninth and Market Streets.

"I'm an electrician," he said, "and here are my income figures for last year. What's my tax?"

He happened to get a clerk who didn't know the Harl figures. After 5 minutes of figuring, the clerk announced the result:

"Thirty-six dollars and eleven cents."

That reduced—only slightly, if it must be said—the odds on $23.16.

OFFERS A COMPROMISE

Collector Rothensies (who was unaware of his clerk's calculation) now offered a compromise. If Harl would come into his office, he said, he would figure out the tax and then Harl—if he wished—could announce the result.

A reporter rushed to the Harl home in a taxicab and induced the taxpayer—now somewhat embarrassed by the whole affair—to accompany him. They arrived at Rothensies' office at 5:20 p. m.

"I am pleased to meet you, Mr. Harl," said the collector in a hearty tone.

He then presented Harry Unger, chief of the income tax division, who was standing by with two assistants. The five men sat down at a table.

COLLECTOR'S QUESTION

"Do you want us just to compute your tax or to make out a return?" asked the collector.

"I just want to find out how much I owe," said Harl.

He then repeated all the figures which had been the basis of the previous calculations. When he came to $270 contributions to church and charities, the collector informed him that the item likely would be questioned.

"I have canceled checks and other proof of even more contributions," said Harl. "I made it $270 because that is 15 percent of my income."

(The income—line 9—was calculated at $1,803.34.)

The experts thereupon agreed to make the deduction, subject to later check.

READY TO REPORT

At 5:35 p. m. Unger announced he was ready to report. He and the collector then held a brief conference in the corner of the room.

The collector then handed Harl a small piece of paper. The reporter snatched it and ran to a telephone. He dialed The Record's number and got the city desk.

"United States official," he shouted into the mouthpiece.

"Twenty-three dollars and sixteen cents."

The city editor went to dinner. He was ready to pay off on $23.16.

NEWS FROM WASHINGTON

An hour later he returned. On his desk was a dispatch from The Record's Washington bureau. It said:

"The Chief Income-Tax Statistician of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and his staff have spent a fair part of the day working on the Harl return. No two of the experts arrived at the same conclusion until the Chief, Mr. G., started coordinating and announced the official figure.

"It is $44.05."

The city editor called the Washington bureau by telephone.

HIS REASONS

The bureau, in turn, called Mr. G. Said Mr. G. (who, it was explained, likes to remain anonymous, like all "revenooers"):

"When I first figured it, I got $23.16, too. But, checking back, I decided I was wrong. Under strict interpretation of the regulations, I figure he is entitled to only $108.20 for contributions instead of the whole $270.

"However, I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll work on it again tonight and let you know in the morning. It could be I was wrong."

We repeat: How much does Mr. Harl owe the Government?

See if you can find out by using the following figures and the chart published in another column:

HARL'S FIGURES

Harl took in $3,710.05 in the carpentry business. His expenses were: Materials, $1,923.40; truck operation, including taxes,

$247.11; truck depreciation, $120; entertainment, $50.

He made $560.90 in one stock transaction and lost $127.10 in another. The stocks were held less than 30 days.

He made contributions of $270 to church and charity.

His 1942 tax was $71.12. He paid all of it.

He is married, lives with his wife, and has no other dependents.

Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants Urges Simplification of Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants, of Detroit, Mich., offering a constructive suggestion to Congress on the problem of taxation, and urging that Congress appoint a nonpartisan commission to write a simplified law covering taxation:

Whereas since the enactment of the original income-tax law in 1913 there have been 20 statutes making revisions thereof passed respectively in 1916, 1917 (two), 1918, 1921, 1924, 1926, 1928, 1932, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940 (two), 1941, 1942, and 1943; and the members of the Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants believe that such annual revisions of the tax laws have resulted in the creation of a very complex tax structure which is highly detrimental to the prosperity of the country, and

Whereas they believe that the permanent establishment of sound principles of taxation is urgently required to give taxpayers the necessary confidence to face the future: Be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants urges that Congress establish as soon as possible a qualified nonpartisan commission composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the Treasury Department, and independent lawyers, accountants, and economists to write a simple revenue law which will express a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation.

War Damage Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Government agencies which was established because of war conditions is the War Damage Corporation. The main purpose of this Corporation was to issue policies of insurance which would protect American citizens against losses incurred by enemy action, by bombing from the air, shelling by naval units, or by direct action by ground forces. It is my understanding that our leading military and naval officers are in agreement that such damage is unlikely, due to the change in conditions throughout the world. For that reason I believe that Congress should take steps whereby the home owners of America should be relieved of the burden of premiums on war-damage policies. Owners of properties on which there are mortgages are practically forced to pay premiums on these policies in order to protect the interests of the mortgagees, even though the home owners feel that there is little, if any, likelihood of damage to the properties. I have already spoken to the House on the subject, suggesting that either the policies now issued remain in effect for the remainder of the war without further premiums, or that the business of the corporation be wound up at the earliest possible date and any funds or surplus on hand be distributed among those who paid premiums.

I wish at this point to bring to the attention of the House an editorial on the subject which was contained in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of January 22, 1944. The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO CANCEL IT

The danger of a bombing raid, on our East coast at least, is past. Even the most pessimistic, including Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, admit this. The air-raid-warning system has been dismantled and raid tests practically have been abandoned.

Isn't it about time that war-risk insurance policies were canceled, and property owners were at least partly reimbursed for the premiums they have paid in on protection insisted upon by the mortgage holders? The War Damage Corporation was established when it appeared probable that continental United States might be invaded or bombed. War-risk insurance was instituted to pay for the damage done during an invasion or bombing. Banks, and other mortgage holders, as a general rule, compelled mortgagees to take out the insurance, in order to protect their equities in the mortgaged properties. War-risk policies are written, as homes and other property change hands, even though the possibility of attack is so remote as to warrant virtual abandonment of defense machinery.

When the time came around for renewal of these policies last year, there was much opposition to the plan, since not a single claim had been paid on any policy under the terms of the insurance, and many of the insured balked at paying the charges. However, the insurance was continued, and no one officially admitted that the danger of invasion or bombing no longer existed. It is now apparent to all that the danger is over.

Since this obviously is so, the cost of war-risk insurance should be eliminated for taxpayers already staggering under the mounting burden of Federal and other taxes. Existing policies should be canceled and premiums refunded for that part of the year during which the coverage will have ceased.

The Renegotiation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the tax bill is soon to be before the Congress. The renegotiation problem will be dealt with in the conference report. Therefore, pursuant to permission granted me, I am including an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot which is well worth reading.

The editorial is as follows:

THE RENEGOTIATION PROBLEM

The issue of renegotiation of war contracts, which Congress has been considering, is one of those things which seems calculated to bring out more prejudice and passion than intelligent consideration.

On the one hand are those—let us hope they are few—war industries which want to make a profiteer's field day of the national emergency, building up sky-high profits out of the blood of fighting men and the sweat of taxpayers.

On the other are the left-wingers who, under the guise of controlling profits, actually want to hamstring private industry.

Renegotiation is simply the Government's method of asking for revision downward of prices on war products, for which contracts were made hastily with the thought that production was more important than cost. Many industries have accepted renegotiation gracefully, only to find that they were victimized and had their contracts cut unreasonably. Some manufacturers even voluntarily returned large profits, and yet were penalized to an extent which they deemed unjust. On the other hand some concerns, which have waxed fat during the war, have fought against every move in this particular fat salvage effort.

The trouble, as always, is that law must deal with the patriots and the profiteers and that in its execution the process of renegotiation may be distorted by the mental quirks or political slants of the negotiators.

The claim made by some industrialists that they should be permitted to retain certain profits as surplus from which to finance reconversion costs after the war, or at the termination of their contracts, is sound on its face. But there are all kinds of companies. For some the process of reconversion will be comparatively simple. Some are sheer war babies, for whom no peacetime field is assured. In between are the bulk of the munitions makers who have given up building automobiles or washing machines to make airplanes, tanks, or guns.

It seems clear that, if taxpayers are to be protected and profiteering adequately controlled, there must be some sort of Government check on whatever reserves renegotiation is to recognize. It wouldn't do merely to let a company enjoy special profits with the expectation that they would be used to provide post-war jobs and products only to find that when the time comes something else happens to the money.

One thing the Senate bill proposes to accomplish. It will permit war contractors to appeal decisions of the war price adjustment board to the court of claims. That is simple justice. The present-day theory that a Government bureau shall have power to make

major decisions without recourse to the courts is basically unsound and un-American.

But, as we have said, this question is deeply involved in selfishness and politics. We can only hope that the Senate and House will agree on a measure which, while protecting the Government from the gouge of greedy manufacturers, will not condemn honest industry to post-war handicaps and potential bankruptcy.

Hon. David J. Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Crisfield (Md.) Times of January 21, 1944, concerning our colleague, Hon. DAVID J. WARD, of the First District of Maryland.

I should like to pay a personal tribute to Mr. WARD, who is a very useful member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of which I have the honor to be chairman. He is painstaking, capable, and thorough in his work and has rendered valuable service to the committee in handling postal legislation. I have found him to be faithful, dependable, and industrious and his service on the committee and in the House is of an outstanding character.

The article referred to is as follows:

WHAT DOES A CONGRESSMAN DO BESIDES MAKING SPEECHES?

Congressmen are valuable in many ways besides making speeches in Washington. Too often, perhaps, the Congressman who talks the most does the least.

Still, a great many people who vote for a Congressman time after time don't know a great deal about what their Congressman does, unless they see his name in print, telling of something he has accomplished.

The Congressman from this district is a Democrat, Hon. DAVID J. WARD, whose home is in Salisbury. He has been, in turn, a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, of the Maryland Senate, and for several years now a Member of the lower house of Congress.

So what has Congressman WARD done for the people of his district since he has been in Congress?

Very important in the past, and to be very important in the future, has been his help to war veterans in securing compensation and hospitalization. Not many people, outside the veteran's own family circle, know about this work, yet its importance cannot be overestimated.

Last summer farmers in this county and on the Shore generally were helped very much by the importing of farm labor, which was handled in farm-labor camps. Somerset had one of them, and Congressman WARD helped very materially to get it. This coming season there will be as great or greater demand for farm labor, and Congressman WARD will again help the farmers here by assisting in obtaining imported labor for them.

Congressman WARD was the man who introduced the bill for free postage for servicemen. That bill was incorporated in the Second War Manpower Act, and as a result, soldiers, sailors, marines, and all service men and women can send their letters to their families, their loved ones back home, free.

Channel markers for Smiths Island, digging a channel from the Little Annamessex River to Pocomoke Sound that is used by many watermen and those watermen say it is one of the greatest improvements to the local waterways that could have been made, having lights and markers placed in other rivers and harbors in the county and on the Shore, all can be credited to Congressman WARD.

In subsequent issues of the Times there will be other matters brought to the attention of the people concerning their Congressman, who he is, and what he does.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Bill Hilts lives at 3737 West Harrison Street, Chicago, Ill. He is in the Army now, approaching the age of 22, and says in no uncertain words that, next to winning the war he wants to vote for Roosevelt for President in 1944. Bill Hilts evidently has the impression that somebody is trying to prevent him from exercising his right of franchise while he is fighting for his country. In a letter received recently Pvt. Bill Hilts gives vent to his feelings on the subject in this manner:

UNCLE BILL: I certainly don't envy you. Many of the men in Congress aren't going to be there too long if they don't allow the servicemen to vote. The fellows say they would vote for Roosevelt if they had the chance. They also are determined to vote against anyone who blocks their voting. It is a funny freedom when a citizen is told he can't vote for the country he is fighting for. Sometimes it is awfully discouraging. I hope the soldiers get together and put everyone in prison after this war who attempts to take away what they fought for and their buddies died for. Too much darn politics.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the growth of the mining industry has been a major factor in the up-building of our country. The strength and power of the United States must be credited in a large measure to the development of our second greatest industry—mining.

It is my privilege to present for printing in the RECORD an address of Carl J. Trauerman, of the Montana Mining Association:

ADDRESS OF CARL J. TRAUERMAN, MINING ENGINEER, MANAGER, MINING ASSOCIATION OF MONTANA, AND PRESIDENT RUBY GULCH MINING CO., BUTTE, ON SILVER, AT AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS CONVENTION, SHIRLY-SAVOY HOTEL, DENVER, COLO., JANUARY 28, 1944

I have been asked to give a short talk on silver, and I state right now that, especially since the days of William Jennings Bryan, there is no such thing as a short talk on silver. I could quote a lot of figures that speak, I could go into the mining of silver and tell how necessary it is that we have silver in the ores to make the mining of base metals profitable, and vice versa. However, in the limited time that I have, I think I had better paraphrase the introduction that a Rotary Club member gave to a prominent mining man who was to address the club. The master of ceremonies introduced him as a man who knew the mining business "from the ground up." Therefore, I am going to talk about silver from the ground up.

I know we are all interested in maintaining the present status of silver in industry and in the money structure of the world, but we should try to augment both uses and also try to get a better price for the white metal. I propose practical procedures to accomplish these objectives.

First, continue present research and carry on additional research to find more commercial uses for silver. Before the present war Dr. Goetz and other famous research specialists were doing very good work along these lines. We all know the many industrial uses to which silver has been put during this war. The Wall Street Journal on January 17 quotes Handy and Harmon as stating that 125,000,000 ounces of silver were used in industry in the United States in 1943, or about four times the average amount used in the 5 years prior to 1941. This is about twice the average annual United States production of the white metal. While we cannot expect any such industrial use after the war, there may come a day, I hope, if we have the proper kind of research, when I will have to retract that statement. In the early 30's I submitted written testimony to the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which Congressman ANDREW L. SOMERS of New York was chairman. In the testimony, which afterward was printed and widely distributed, I showed in great detail that sterling silver could be popularized and sold in much larger quantities than in the past and at a profit if the price were reduced somewhere in line with the cost of silver-plated ware, plus the extra amount of silver needed to make sterling. I think my testimony would make good reading for that coterie of writers who about 15 months ago used the pages of the Saturday Evening Post, the Reader's Digest, and other well-known magazines to print such articles as The Silver Scandal, The Silver Bloc, etc. Did I say the writers of those articles? I meant to say the sponsors of the writers of those articles.

My second main suggestion might seem facetious, but I mean it in all seriousness. We should carry on research to get more votes for silver in the United States Congress. I don't mean by logrolling or questionable lobbying.

While the silver question is considered a western question, the status of silver is a matter that concerns the entire United States and the entire world. We have able silver champions such as Senators MCCARRAN and SCRUGHAM of Nevada; Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma; Francis Brownell, chairman of the American Smelting & Refining Co.; Congressman COMPTON WHITE of Idaho; James A. White, Washington, D. C., statistician, and

others, and in the past we have had the ablest of them all, he who always regarded everything, even the heavens wherein he now rests, with a silver lining, the late great Key Pittman.

These men have done and are doing a splendid job in trying to educate the Members of Congress from the East, South, and Middle West on the importance of silver as money. However, we have done very little to educate the constituents of the middle western, eastern, and southern Members of Congress, and something ought to be done about that.

The people in the East, South, and Middle West believe that silver producers are now getting a gift of about 30 cents per ounce for their silver. The real fact is that the Government is coining the silver on a basis of $1.29 an ounce, and the producer actually is getting 58 cents per ounce less than he should. People east of the Mississippi have the same idea about the public-land question. They think that in getting the agricultural homesteading and mineral land by location that we in the West receive a huge gift. They don't realize the work, time, and money it takes to develop the mineral and agricultural land to profitable production. And just where would the war effort have been today without the production of farm and forest products and minerals that were produced in the West from land, a great deal of which was taken up by location and homesteading?

My suggestion is that we enroll a group of high-class, honest speakers who know their subject and send them to address gatherings of civic clubs, commercial clubs, and other civilian clubs in the East, South, and Middle West, and educate the people to see the light on subjects such as silver, public-land location, and other subjects; to show these people that when the silver mines and the western farmers are prosperous that the East, South, and Middle West also are prosperous. We in the West produce from the natural resources, while the East, South, and Middle West produce the supplies and machinery for the western industries and also produce a great many of the necessities of life used by the employees in the western industries.

We have heard a lot about reciprocal foreign-trade agreements and the foreign good-neighbor policy. Gentlemen, charity begins at home. I use that phrase in a figurative sense only.

There seem to be many trade and industry inequalities among the States of the Union. Objectives of one State or group of States (such as the West's silver and public-land objectives and the South's fight for more equitable freight rates), are misunderstood by other States. Let us try to eliminate these misunderstandings by instituting domestic reciprocal-trade agreements and the good-neighbor policy between the 48 States of the Union, Alaska, and our island possessions.

The Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the statements made upon the floor of the House recently that the 1942 soldier-vote bill was a failure for the reason that only 28,000 servicemen voted under the law in the various States. The same sentiment has been expressed by very high officials and the same reason has been given for the conclusion reached.

As I occupied the office of secretary of state in one of the States during the fall of 1942 and thus had charge of the administration of the Federal law that was approved on September 16, 1942, I am inclined to question the reason which has been given for the so-called failure of the 1942 war-ballot law. It will be noted that only about 1½ months elapsed between the approval of the act and the election date in November. Also, it will be noted from the examination of the law that postal-card applications for absentee ballots were to be made available in the various Army camps and used by the soldiers to apply for ballots. We received applications for ballots by letter and when the time element made correspondence possible, we replied that for his own protection and to insure a legal ballot the soldier should make his application upon the official postal card to be provided him. In a number of instances we received replies from the soldiers to the effect that such postal-card applications were not available in their camps and stations, and that their officers did not know about the Federal law or about the postal-card applications.

We received a number of such replies and were compelled to reach the conclusion that due to the short time between the enactment of the law and the date of the election that there was not a general understanding among the servicemen of the provisions of the law.

While in our State only 196 applications for ballots were received prior to November 3, 1942, in the same State some 350 applications for ballots were received by the secretary of state during 1943 when no election was held. This indicates that knowledge of the 1942 law had become more widespread among the various branches of the service.

My experience with the 1942 act leads me to believe that at least one reason for the small number of effective ballots cast in the various States was due to the fact that its provisions were not widely understood by the persons concerned and the time between the approval of the law and election day was too short to permit a general understanding of it.

There is also another feature of the 1942 law which might be considered. That is that the ballots in the various States are to be printed under the supervision of the secretary of state and that such ballots contain the names and addresses of the candidates for electors, United States Senators, and Members of the Federal House of Representatives. This provision is in sharp contrast to the proposal to supply a blank ballot to be used by those who undoubtedly in very many cases will not know the names of the various candidates who have been nominated for these offices. As is true among the civilian population, there will undoubtedly be many service people who will desire to vote for particular candidates rather than to vote a straight party ballot. Such persons will be deprived of an opportunity to vote for particular individuals of their choice under the plan proposed to send out a blank ballot with absolutely no names of candidates thereon.

Japanese Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, that the despicable nature of our Japanese foes may be the better known, I ask that an Associated Press report which appeared in the columns of numerous newspapers last fall may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May that day of reckoning be not long delayed.

The article referred to is the following:

JAP DIARY DESCRIBES BEHEADING OF YANK

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS IN THE SOUTHWEST PACIFIC, Tuesday, October 5.—The Japanese beheading of a captured American airman was disclosed in all its stark details today as General MacArthur's headquarters made public a diary captured from a Japanese soldier at Salamaua, New Guinea.

The execution, carried out according to the Samurai code of the Japanese, occurred last March.

Verbatim translations of extracts of the diary, dated March 29, said:

"We all assembled at headquarters where one of the crew of a Douglas shot down by antiaircraft March 18 was brought under guard.

"Tai Commander (sub-lieutenant first class) Komai told us it had been decided to execute him, and he was to be accorded a Samurai's death.

"We were assembled to witness the execution. The prisoner was given a drink of water outside the guardhouse. The chief surgeon, Lieutenant Komai and a platoon commander bearing a sword came from the officers' mess.

"The time has come. The prisoner of war totters forward with his arms tied. His hair is cut close.

SEEMS TO SUSPECT WHAT'S AFOOT

"I feel he suspects what is afoot, but he is more composed than I thought he would be. Without more ado he is put on a truck and taken to the place of execution.

"The prisoner sits beside the chief surgeon and about 10 guards accompany him. The noise of the engine echoes along the road in the hush of twilight. The sun has set and columns of clouds rise before us.

"I glance at the prisoner and he seems prepared. He gazes at the grass, now at the mountains and sea.

"At the execution ground, Lieutenant Komai faces the prisoner and said: 'You are to die. I am going to kill you with this Japanese sword according to the Samurai code.'

"The commander's face is stern. Now the time has come. The prisoner is made to sit on the edge of a water-filled bomb crater. The precaution is taken to surround him with guards.

"When I put myself in his place the hate engendered by this daily bombing yields to ordinary human feelings.

"The Tai commander draws his favorite sword, the famous Osamune. The sight of the glittering blade sends cold shivers down the spine. First he touches prisoner's neck lightly with sword.

PRISONER CLOSES HIS EYES, IT'S ALL OVER

"Then he raises it overhead. His arm muscles bulge. Prisoner closes his eyes for a second, and at once the sword sweeps down.

"Swish—it sounds at first like noise of cutting, but is actually made by blood spurting

from arteries. The body falls forward. Everybody steps forward as head rolls on the ground.

"The dark blood gushed from trunk. All is over. There lies the head like a white doll.

"I realize that the emotion I felt just now was not personal pity but manifestation of magnanimity that becomes a chivalrous Samurai.

"A superior seaman from the medical unit received the sword from the surgeon. He rolls the body on back.

" 'Here's something for the other day—take that,' he says, and with one sweep lays open the abdomen.

" 'These thick-headed, white bastards are thick-bellied, too,' he remarks. There's not a drop of blood left in man's body. The seaman gives him a kick then buries it.

"The wind blows mournfully and the scene prints itself on my mind. Darkness descends.

"In front of headquarters we got off truck. If ever I get back alive this will make good story to tell. That's why I write it down.

" 'The prisoner killed today was airforce 'Tai' (captain or flight lieutenant) from Moresby. He young man aged 23, an instructor in Army Transport Command at Moresby."

That ended the entry in the diary. But at the end of the press release, appearing as though headquarters wanted to remember for future reference, was the footnote that said the officer who committed the atrocity was Sublieutenant First Class Komai and the next senior officer responsible was Lieutenant Commander Tsukioka.

The execution described above was the first reported since President Roosevelt announced in April that Japan had executed several United States fliers captured after the raid on Tokyo and other Japanese cities April 18, 1942.

The Japanese radio in telling of the execution went on to say that other airmen taken prisoner after raids on Japanese territory would be executed. Killing of captive soldiers is contrary to international law as proclaimed under the Geneva convention, to which Japan is a party.

Walter Lippmann on Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the failure of our Government to recognize the revolutionary government of Bolivia has caused some discussion, and there appeared in the Washington Post yesterday an article by the well-known columnist and authority on foreign affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Bolivian Affair," which, under unanimous consent granted, I wish to submit herewith. It is a clear and forceful presentation of the matter.

THE BOLIVIAN AFFAIR

It may be true, as Senor Iturralde at the Bolivian Embassy in Washington says, that the revolutionary regime in his country has some popular support. The living conditions of the workers in the tin mines are known to be at a very low level indeed. But that does not alter the fact that the new regime was established by a conspiracy, outside and inside Bolivia, and that it was engineered by Fascists, or more exactly by Nazis, whose connections run back to Berlin. Naturally the conspirators exploit the popular grievances, that is exactly what Mussolini, Hitler, and all their imitators have always done in their rise to power. The Nazis, when talking to the masses, have always worn a demagogic mask; the name "Nazi" is an abbreviation for national socialism.

We may be perfectly sure that this conspiracy was not organized because in Berlin and Buenos Aires the conspirators' hearts were bleeding for the Bolivian proletariat in the tin mines. They have been playing for other stakes; they are out to destroy the union of the American republics, and to establish a bloc of nations around and south of the River Plate into which the Nazis and Fascists, who know they are defeated in Europe, can retreat, and there recuperate and reorganize for a return to power. In Argentina and Bolivia they have been preparing one of the places from which to try it all again.

Secretary Hull refused to recognize the Bolivian Government on the ground that the rebellion was "but one act committed by a general subversive movement having for its purpose steadily expanding activities on the continent." We may be sure that he would make no such grave accusation if the evidence had not been conclusive, and the action of the Argentine Government in breaking diplomatic relations with the Axis is proof conclusive that he knew what he was talking about and what he was doing.

We must hope, of course, that the reaction in the Argentine means that this conspiracy will now be completely unmasked and wholly destroyed. But it is much too early to feel sure, and we shall need to be shown, and clearly shown, by the Argentine Government. The plain truth of the matter is that the Fascist character of the Argentine Government is so patent that acts to appease the United Nations by making concessions long overdue cannot be accepted easily. The inherent character of the regime is such that it is impossible for the United Nations to trust it, even when it comes bringing gifts. As long as it denies to the Argentine people the elementary liberties of this hemisphere, every concession must be suspect as a maneuver, a strategic retreat, and none can be accepted as the sign of a genuine change.

The refusal to recognize the Bolivian Government, which was the spearhead of a great diplomatic action, is a recognition of the truth that neighbors cannot be good neighbors if their governments are composed of men who conspire against the peace and the common defense of the neighborhood. The rule of noninterference does not extend to governments like the Bolivian, be they Nazi, Fascist, or Communist of the supra-national revolutionary and aggressive kind. Such governments will interfere violently and dangerously among their neighbors if they are not interfered with first.

Thus, it is possible to live on good terms with Salazar, of Portugal, because, though his regime is Fascist, it is not supra-national and has no part in any plan of world conquest. It was even possible to live with, though never to trust, Mussolini's Italy until about 1935 or thereabout it became mortgaged to and involved with Hitlerism. It is possible, we believe with increasing confidence, to live with and even cooperate with contemporary Stalinist Russia—something which could not have been said when Moscow was, in fact, the capital of international bolshevism.

Our reaction to what is happening in South America will have long consequences, for we have here the first stages of a return to that conception of international order which was lost to sight in the anarchy of the twentieth century. This is the view that national sovereignty is not absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional, but that it is a right within the framework of public law and of a universal moral order. A state cannot, therefore, do anything its rulers happen to wish to do; unless it conforms to the accepted principles of the civilization to which it belongs, it is a rebel and an outlaw. The principles of civilization are not unchanging. They develop. But such as they are in any epoch, they cannot be defied by any state without danger to its neighbors.

This conception of what modern men call sovereignty has been traditional in the western world for some 20 centuries. Our Declaration of Independence was written by men who would not have known how to think in any other tradition. When many of those same men later recognized the independence of the Latin-American republics, and then backed their recognition by proclaiming the Monroe Doctrine, they assumed as a matter of course that this whole hemisphere would acknowledge the same universal principles of public law and public morals.

It is not, then, a new departure but a return to ancient principles which have been grievously flouted and neglected in our time, when we say to Bolivia that she cannot secede from the community of which she is a member. As long as Bolivia tolerates a government which is affiliated with the enemies of this community, or contains leading men who are in rebellion against its basic principles, we are compelled to act and, as seems most effective, we shall act. We shall not have finished with this war until we have eradicated all the elements of any conspiracy capable anywhere in the world of renewing this war.

No doubt the central place to eradicate them is in Germany. Not much can be done around the River Plate if the German defeat is conclusive. But around the River Plate the German defeat might be made inconclusive, and fortunately perhaps, the conspirators have shown their hands early enough to put us on guard.

This may be because they could wait no longer; the Nazis are desperate and doomed men in Europe and they must make ready a place of refuge. But in fact it may also be due to the feeling which has long existed in the Argentine, even before it fell into the hands of the Fascists, that the United States is a good-natured and morally lazy democracy which will not act in its own vital interest until someone, as at Pearl Harbor, has kicked it in the face and knocked it down.

Cynically frank Argentinians have been heard to explain the neutrality of their government on the ground that if Hitler won the war he would take revenge, whereas if we won the war we would forget before we even remembered to forgive.

Perhaps this time we may be proving that we are made of sterner stuff.

The Fathers of Men in the Armed Forces Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, no one should know the minds of those in the armed forces better than the parents of the men and women who are on duty. Of course, they are constantly in correspondence with one another. I therefore feel that the expressions of American War Dads are typical of the feeling of the men and women in camps in this

country and on duty abroad. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks, resolutions adopted by the Anheuser-Busch Chapter of the American War Dads assembled at a meeting in St. Louis. The resolutions follow:

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that there will be from time to time attempts made to pass legislation that will take away from the members of the armed forces the rights that were theirs under our Constitution before they entered such branches of the armed forces; and

Whereas our boys are now fighting on 32 fronts to restore at least a semblance of liberty and freedom to all classes of people in every section of the globe: Therefore be it

Resolved by us the members of the Anheuser-Busch Chapter of the American War Dads, assembled and meeting in St. Louis, notify the Congressmen and Senators, representing us in this district, That we are commanding them to watch carefully the rights of our sons who are in the service and to see to it that if any legislation is presented that would deprive these boys of any right that was theirs when they entered the service, that such legislation be deferred until such time that every man in the armed forces of this Government can have an opportunity to express his opinion upon it and thereby insure our sons that they will not lose at home the precious heritages that have carried them into the raging conflict in order that they might extend the same rights to others; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Council of the American War Dads in Kansas City, requesting that they notify all chapters of the American War Dads to take similar action.

Whereas there are now millions of our boys away from their homes, many of them outside of the continental limits of the United States of America, fighting and dying in order that America might live; and

Whereas such boys, were it not for the crises in which their Government now finds itself, would be at home exercising their right of suffrage as citizens of this country at the ballot box; and

Whereas it is now, under the laws existing, impossible for them to exercise such rights which in effect, deprive them of the ballot and force them to accept elected officials who may or may not be contrary to their idea of the type and kind of official who should represent them; and

Whereas, by being deprived of the use of the ballot, certain ideas and changes in government may or may not be made that are contrary to their belief as citizens of this Government; and

Whereas these millions of our men have offered themselves as a sacrifice upon the altar of liberty in order that justice and freedom might be relieved of its shackles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the American War Dads of the Anheuser-Busch Chapter, in meeting assembled in St. Louis, unanimously command our representatives in both Congress and Senate to see that such changes in laws and regulations are made that will enable our boys to cast their ballots and not be disfranchised even temporarily; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the national headquarters of the American War Dads, with instructions that it be forwarded to every chapter of the American War Dads, that they might issue the same command to their representatives in Congress and Senate.

We, the Anheuser-Busch Chapter of the American War Dads, having been advised of the cold, thoughtless, and disinterested method that this Government uses in the notification of parents of the death of their boys in service by telegram, and further having this matter brought to our attention by the fact that one Mr. and Mrs. George Gannett, of this city, received such notification by telegram and such telegram was shoved under the door and no attempt made to personally deliver it.

Whereas this Government of ours is now spending billions of dollars for the conduct of this war and hundreds of millions of dollars in radio, newspaper, and any and all kinds and types of publicity to build morale not only among the troops but among the civilian population as well, we, the American War Dads, believe that this great Government of ours should show its sympathy to the families of boys who have been either killed or are missing in action in a way that would express to the parents the gratitude that is in the hearts of the American public for the great sacrifice that this boy and his family have made in order that others might live and that by so doing they could create and build a greater morale among the troops and the civilian population than much of the useless propaganda building today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senators and the Congressmen representing St. Louis and St. Louis County be sent a copy of this resolution along with a letter, and furthermore, that they be instructed that it is the command of the American War Dads that necessary steps be taken at once to have either the Army or Navy personnel, as a special representative of the President of the United States, personally deliver to the family the news of either the death or the report of missing in action of the son, and that at the same time this personal representative express the sympathy of the President of these United States and the American public to the bereaved family or the nearest of kin. And if no Government official is available, that the American War Dads or similar organization be delegated as the official representative of the President to convey such message; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American War Dads national headquarters in Kansas City requesting that they notify every chapter of the American War Dads to take similar action to this.

Protest Contemplated Partition of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America is one of the largest organizations of people of Polish lineage anywhere in the world. At the plenary meetings of its executive council and directorate on the 11th day of January, 1944, in Chicago, Ill., all of the national officers being in attendance, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the American press has published, under today's date line, a news item from London to the effect that the Government of Soviet Russia has formally announced that it will annex the eastern section of Poland, embracing in area approximately one-half of the territory of Poland; and

Whereas the Government of Soviet Russia asserts that the Polish Government in exile now located in London, does not represent the will of the Polish nation, and further charges the Polish Government with incompetency, because of the alleged failure to organize active resistance to the Nazi invader; and

Whereas the Government of Soviet Russia forcibly and illegally seizes Polish lands, without the consent of the population residing therein, thus undermining the foundation of the future growth and existence of Poland, and thereby assuming a stand, contrary to all principles of democracy and liberty, for which the present war is being fought; and

Whereas the charges leveled by the Soviet Government against the present Polish Government are untrue, as the Polish Government in London is the sole and constitutional exponent of the will of the Polish nation, and said Government has taken all steps possible, to combat our common foe: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, convened at its plenary meeting in Chicago, Ill., on January 11, 1944, solemnly protests, in the name of its membership composed of Americans of Polish extraction, against the contemplated partition of Poland by Soviet Russia, and supports the stand taken by the Polish Government in London, which is allied with the Government of the United States.

We place implicit trust in our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and express the firm conviction that he will not permit the Government of Soviet Russia to despoil the Polish nation, now so terribly tortured and ravaged by the Nazi barbarians.

JAN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President,
STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General,
ANTHONY J. KOZUBAL,
Treasurer,
For the executive council and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

Gov. Earl Warren, of California

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my most famous constituent is Gov. Earl Warren, of California. It is doubtful if any man in public life today has so captivated the imagination and good will of those who are familiar with his record and personality.

He has what it takes to make a great public official, as well as the capacity to get votes. The registration in California in 1942 was overwhelmingly Democratic in the ratio of about 16 to 10, yet he won the governorship over the incumbent Democratic Governor by over 300,000 votes. This political giant from the West has courage, energy, ability, tolerance, balance, and an uncanny knack of inspiring and holding public confidence. That is the natural result of his integrity and friendly personality.

His domestic life is a model of happiness and harmony. His family consists of a charming wife and six lovely children.

Governor Warren is a big enough man to handle any political job in the Nation—and I mean exactly that.

Time magazine, in its issue of January 31, 1944, will have an interesting article on Governor Warren which I am, by unanimous consent, including as part of my remarks. The article follows:

MAN OF THE WEST

On the pediment of the neoclassic State office building at Sacramento is inscribed a line from a poem by the late Sam Walter Foss: "Bring me men to match my mountains." Visitors to the Governor's office frequently wonder if Earl Warren, California's thirtieth Governor and favorite son for the Republican Presidential nomination, is not such a man.

Big, blond, blue-eyed Governor Warren seems to radiate goodness and warmth. Impressed by his relaxed good nature, his evident simplicity, the eager "yes, yes" and "uh-huh, uh-huh" with which he indicates earnest interest in everything they have to say, his visitors often begin to fit him into a scheme of history. They see him not merely as a perfect political candidate but as the forerunner in United States politics of a new era of friendly men to succeed the recent era of angry men—the era of the Burt Wheelers, the Fiorello LaGuardias, the Huey Longs, the Harold Ickeses, and the Culbert Olsons.

LENGTHENING SHADOWS

Examination of Earl Warren's 25-year record in public office fails to reveal much promise that he is a potential giant in United States history. The Warren utterances and speeches have never risen above the level of safe, dull political prose. He has rarely tried anything which had not been tried before. A calm man of Swedish descent, slow to anger, he has stuck close to the middle of the road. But the record does reveal an able, hard-working, personally attractive public servant who, with the westering sun of California behind him, is casting a longer and longer shadow across the land.

At the meeting of Republican National and State committeemen in Chicago last fortnight, Earl Warren was the name most mentioned for second place on the Presidential ticket. As leader of a 50-vote delegation, the Governor of the great, growing, and no longer so screwy State of California is sure to be a power at the G. O. P. convention. Warren is in the front rank of the group of up-and-coming Republican Governors, who are, in considerable degree, the life of the party. And he is also nationally significant as the most active political leader of a West which, enormously altered by war, is both worried and greatly hopeful about its future, and is resolved to fight for that future on both economic and political fronts.

This year California has a strong and active Willkie faction. But the bulk of the State's Republican leaders, including those for whom Willkie is too liberal, is waiting to see how the bandwagons roll. Thus far they are less interested in nominating any particular candidate than in electing some candidate, and primarily interested in the political concessions which California and the other Western States can exact by their convention bargaining. So intent is Governor Warren on retaining this bargaining power that, though denying he is either a candidate or anti-Willkie, he told a Time correspondent last week that if Willkie should enter the California primary, "I would indeed exert all my influence and all my effort against him." A few days later Mr. Willkie (who not long ago called Warren one of the Nation's great Governors) announced that in view of the Governor's assurances of neutrality he had decided not to enter the California contest.

TOM AND EARL?

Governor Warren's disclaimers of candidacy sound more wholehearted than Governor Dewey's because he declares that he not only intends to finish out his present gubernatorial term, but "God and the people willing, I hope to be Governor for a second 4 years." Unlike Dewey, who felt that he was ripe for the Presidency at 38 Earl Warren at 52 modestly asserts that he is not yet experienced enough for the Nation's No. 1 job. But when convention time comes Earl Warren may think differently.

The political appeal of a Dewey-Warren ticket is obvious, two young Governors from opposite ends of the country, from politically strategic States, two ex-district attorneys, two family men with impeccable private backgrounds.

Tom Dewey and Earl Warren have other similarities. Dewey was a flashy racket-buster who fastened on cases with national interest and made the most of the attendant publicity. Earl Warren's work as district attorney of Alameda County (Oakland, Alameda, and Berkeley) was less spectacular. But in a State where most gang-busting is done on movie lots, he sent droves of bootleggers, con men, grafters, and corrupt city officials packing off to jail.

Both Dewey and Warren have been charged with being somewhat insensitive to the means which they have employed in pursuit of their righteous ends. In 1930, when Warren set out to indict some Oakland city officials for graft, he well knew that if the indictment did not come off, he would be charged with engineering a whitewash. Accordingly, he released daily transcripts of the grand-jury testimony to the press—a clear law violation—to show that he was doing his utmost. Happily for him, the indictment and convictions followed.

The episode of Earl Warren's past, remembered most unfavorably on the west coast, is his handling of the celebrated *Point Lobos* case. In 1936, at the height of west coast labor strife, the chief engineer of the freighter *Point Lobos* was stabbed and beaten to death in his cabin, while the ship lay at an Alameda dock. The chief engineer had been known to unioneers as a fink. Some 5 months later, District Attorney Earl Warren got three union officials indicted and convicted on a charge of conspiracy to murder the engineer. The trial had some curious aspects: the judge was an old friend of Warren's, the deputy district attorney who tried the case became heavily indebted to one of the jurors. Labor and many liberals cried "frame-up." Labor unions surrounded the courthouse daily with 1,000 pickets. The 3 unioneers were subsequently pardoned by Gov. Culbert Olson. Labor has never completely forgiven Earl Warren.

Warren, though personally warmer and more ingratiating than Dewey, has even fewer intimates. Both are politically cautious. But both have proved excellent governors, with a talent for leadership, for organization, and for picking able assistants.

UP FROM WAKING UP

The house on Los Angeles' dingy Turner Street where Earl Warren was born in 1891 is now occupied by a Chinese family. Earl Warren's father was a master car builder for the Southern Pacific, who lost his job in 1894 when he went out on strike. The family moved 110 miles north to Bakersfield, then still something of a frontier town. Governor Warren recalls the day as a child when he was riding his donkey down the main street and ran spang into the running gun battle in which Deputy Sheriff William E. Tibbett, father of baritone Lawrence Tibbett, was killed by an outlaw. (Thirty-five years later, Earl Warren's father, who had branched out into real estate, was found murdered in his Bakersfield home. The crime is still unsolved.)

Young Earl Warren started his working life as a call boy, waking up railroadmen on time. Then he was a newsboy and cub reporter for the Bakersfield Californian. He played the clarinet in the Kern County High School Band, later joining the musicians' union. At the University of California, Warren was a steady but not brilliant student. He flunked second-year Greek, he failed to make the baseball team as a pitcher because he was too wild. After law school, he practiced for 3 years in Oakland, then was drafted for World War No. 1. He ended up as an infantry first lieutenant, but did not get overseas.

His political career began after the war when he landed a job as a clerk to a legislative committee in Sacramento. Thenceforth his rise was cautious and well planned; he did not try for a new job unless he was reasonably certain he could get it. His first important job, as assistant district attorney, was assured him by the friendly legislative committee for which he had worked. As district attorney, he guided through the legislature a bill vastly increasing the powers of the State attorney general, and raising the pay from $6,000 to $11,000 a year. His next step up was to the attorney generalship.

Warren says that what finally determined him to try for the governorship was his utter inability to get along with Democratic Gov. Culbert Olson. Many other Californians could not stomach New Dealing Governor Olson either, and Earl Warren shrewdly capitalized on this feeling. Running as a nonpartisan (he came surprisingly close to getting the Democratic nomination as well as the Republican), he stumped the length (1,000 miles) and breadth (200 miles) of the State, probably shook the hands of more Californians than has any other man alive.

FAMILY MAN

When the Warrens moved to Sacramento, the Governor's Mansion (once the boyhood home of the late great muckraking journalist Lincoln Steffens) was an ugly, gray, 70-year-old frame relic. Part of the roof had toppled off, the rococo porches had rotted, plaster had fallen from the ceilings. One Governor after another had boarded off sections of the 20-room house.

The Warrens changed the mansion into a gleaming monument to the gingerbread era in American architecture, filled its spacious, high-ceilinged rooms with rollicking laughter which had not been heard there for decades. The Warren family is self-sufficient. The Governor and his wife (the former Mrs. Nina Palmquist Meyers, a widow, whom he married in 1925) have never entertained much. Mrs. Warren explains: "I had five children in 6 years, and you can't do much entertaining then."

When Governor Warren gets home from his office, he is greeted by his bouncing children as though he had been away for months. At bedtime Papa Warren makes the rounds of all bedrooms for a good night, or if he has turned in early to read in bed, the children troop in to him. The Governor has a study on the third floor, but he rarely uses it. Home, he feels, is for relaxing. He reads a lot of nonfiction.

THE GOVERNOR

Earl Warren brought as much life to California's government as his family did to the mansion. Californians, looking at his first-year record, had to go back to the turbulent first year of HIRAM JOHNSON's administration (1911–17) to find a yardstick by which to measure their new Governor. Warren has yet to equal JOHNSON, but he has chalked up some solid accomplishments.

The 1943 legislative session, his first, was the shortest in California since 1907, and the most businesslike. In 71 days Governor Warren pushed through:

Reduction of the State sales tax from 3 to 2½ percent; raising of personal exemptions in the income tax. (Said Warren: "It didn't mean much to the average individual taxpayer, but it did turn the tax indicator downward for the first time in history.")

Upping of the old-age pension from $40 to $50 a month.

Streamlining of the State guard.

A food and fiber act which provided State aid in the harvesting of crops.

Earmarking of $43,000,000 in State funds for post-war development and $25,000,000 for a war-catastrophe fund.

Establishment of a post-war reconstruction and reemployment commission.

Total number of bills signed, 1,137 out of 1,291 passed.

This week, when the legislature meets in special session, another record seems sure to be set. Governor Warren has asked the legislature for but three meaures: (1) Prison reform, (2) soldiers' vote bill, (3) authorization of a constitutional amendment permitting the State to tax Federal lands. (The Governor will dodge the touchy issue of California's relocated Japanese citizens.) Legislative leaders expect the session to last just 3 days. Reason for the speed is Earl Warren's established practice of thoroughly thrashing out bills in citizens' committees and informal groups of legislators before they are even submitted to the legislature.

WARREN AND THE WEST

Earl Warren enjoys being Governor of California. But to him one of the best parts of the job is the chance it gives him to take the lead in safeguarding and building the future of the West. California used to snoot its smaller western neighbors. But Governor Warren called the first conference of the Governors of the 11 Western States at Salt Lake City last May. A third meeting will be held soon.

The problems which the Governors have to discuss appear at their biggest in Governor Warren's State. Although California has lost a half million workers to the armed services (plus 40,000 working Japanese), its total employed population nonetheless grew from 2,482,000 in April 1940 to 3,375,000 in June 1943, and is still growing. More significant than the growth in numbers of California workers is the change in the type of work they do. In 1939, 55 percent of its industrial workers were employed in manufacturing nondurable goods like food, textiles, oil products. Today 80 percent of them are manufacturing durable goods; more than half of that 80 percent are employed in the 2 industries of aircraft and shipbuilding. And most of California's new industrial plants have been built with Federal money.

So California now has three great worries. It fears a terrific employment slump when the demand for its airplanes, ships, and other war products stops. It is afraid that its federally owned factories may be nationalized or dismantled. It is afraid that when the war with Germany ends, the war with Japan will keep it absorbed for another couple of years, while the East gets the jump on it in reconverting to peace. Oregon and Washington have had similar booms—now have similar worries. And the industrial fates of the hinterland Western States, as suppliers of metals and other raw materials, are closely linked with those of the coast.

So the West, itself once a frontier, now has frontiers of its own, on the Yangtze and on the Potomac. It does not aspire to displace the East industrially. What it wants is to develop a great home market for its industries and to trade greatly with British Columbia, Alaska, and the Orient, especially with new China. To banish its post-war nightmares, to achieve its post-war dreams, it feels that it must continue its fight for States' rights under Warren and other Governors, but must also have far more representation in Washington, D. C., than it has ever had before.

California's acting Republican national committeeman, William Reichel, explains the immediate hopes of California Republicans simply and bluntly. "I'm pro-Warren and pro-California," he says. "We want something to bargain with for California. We're not "anti" anyone. Our program is sound. It's got logic. We have 50 convention delegates. We are big and strong and important, and we're going to get something. At the convention our votes will get us a western Cabinet member, a western Supreme Court Justice, and a western man on every high policy-making body in the Government. That's what Warren will be bargaining for. We'll get them or they won't get our votes."

Pressing Issues of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a very able and eloquent address, on some of the pressing issues of the day, delivered before the Consolidated Clubs of Holdenville, Okla., on January 28, by the Honorable Charles E. Dierker, United States district attorney for the western district of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to come here to give you the views of an ordinary everyday American citizen on some of the pressing issues of the day.

On the 5th day of November the United States Senate in adopting the Connally resolution, took probably the most important step in American foreign relations that ever happened in all our national history. By a nonpartisan 85 to 5, almost unanimity, the Senate cut loose from 167 years of provincial isolationism and the United States took her place in the ranks of the nations of the world. To my mind entirely too little emphasis on, or notice of, this momentous step has been had by our people. Men who saw into the future 25 years ago realized that we could not shut ourselves off from the rest of the world, nor by crawling under the bed save ourselves when our house might be burning down. How tragic that another blood bath was necessary before we awoke to the fact that not only is an association of nations necessary, but that we must go further still and put teeth and force and power into such an organization to maintain the peace of the world, as circumstances may from time to time require, if we do not want to see our very civilization destroyed before the present century has run its course.

Perhaps the main consideration that is solidifying our people into a realization of the necessity for keeping the peace in the future is that we are at last beginning to understand that the forces of evil aggression have never been completely obliterated. Like a smoldering fire inside a bale of cotton, they have simmered along ready to break forth and start a tremendous conflagration when the right moment arrives. Exactly such a situation has existed for a long time as concerns what we now know as the German Reich. To my mind the historian of the future will rank Hitler with Nero and Attila as three of the greatest scourges ever visited upon mankind. However, just as Nero and Attila could not have perpetrated their terrible atrocities without willing and able lieutenants, so is the case with Hitler. I am not historian enough to know the underlying philosophies that actuated the terrible butcheries of Nero and Attila, but I think I do know something of the philosophies that actuate Hitler and his people.

Back through the centuries the philosophy of the Hun has been that he is a superman; that all of his neighbors are inferior to him and should pay tribute to him. In modern times this spirit has been largely crystallized into the word "Prussianism." The State of Prussia has been for centuries the breeding place and the spawning ground for a race of warriors. Their philosophy has permeated the remaining States that make up the Reich until today, in my opinion, there is little to choose between the Saxons, the Bavarians, the Wurttembergers, and the Prussians. All are strongly imbued with their superiority complex and also thoroughly believe that their race is destined from on high to rule the world. Hitler has given emphasis to this philosophy, and its arrogance and butcheries have in the past few years reached an all-time high.

I have stated that this philosophy of superiority is ingrained and deep-seated. Let me read you what the German writers and leaders themselves have said. Early in this century the German philosopher Fichte said:

"The German race is a race of supermen. The Germans are the chosen people. Beyond us are barbarians."

In 1911 the writer Tannenberg, in his book Gross Deutschland, said:

"We must leave nothing to the vanquished but their eyes to weep with."

Also, in 1911, General Von Bernhardi, in his book Germany and the Next War, said:

"We must follow the policies of Prince Bismarck and Frederick the Great. None of the wars which they fought were forced upon them. None did they postpone as long as possible. They were always determined to be the aggressor, to anticipate their opponents, and thus to secure for themselves favorable prospects of success."

In 1940 Dr. Goebbels said:

"Hitler gave to the soul of the German people the possibility to express itself."

In his famous book, Mein Kampf, Hitler says:

"The bases of my program are blood and fire. * * * I hate all that is spirit and humanity."

In 1937 in his book Heroism and World Fear, J. Janoff, said:

"Only he who is hard enough, who knows the joy of cruelty, can be historically effective today."

This characteristic has been diagnosed by Dr. Richard M. Bricker in his book, Is Germany Curable, as a pronounced form of paranoia. Dr. Bricker says that paranoids have delusions of grandeur and persecution, combined with an overpowering urge to dominate others. Just before the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia in 1938, Hitler delivered one of his screaming speeches in which he attacked the Czechs viciously. All this, as was apparent at the time, was just a smoke screen and a pretext. We heard Hitler say that day over the radio that when the Sudeten issue was settled, he had no further territorial demands in Europe. That cunning, lying speech was just a step on the road to world domination and I believe we can all now agree, though most of us did not realize it then, that after England and France the Western Hemisphere was next on the victim list.

Hitler's German American Bund, his secret agents, and the German press in this country, were not idle. As far back as 1935 the New York Deutsche Zeitung said:

"Here in the United States we, 32,000,000 Germans, have nothing to say about our own language. We are forced to pay with our

taxes—which we pay on every cigarette, on every drink of milk or wine—for schools and teachers, who do not even know our language. * * * If united Germandom in the United States succeeds in obtaining permission to run its own schools with its own taxes, then something so colossal will have been accomplished that * * * nothing greater is attainable. That must be our goal. Now let us start to fight for it."

In the New York Staatszeitung of February 8, 1940, the editor, Dr. Ridder, urged, I quote:

"Every German living here should become an American citizen as quickly as possible, since that gives protection, at least to a great extent, against excesses of the patriotic mob in case the United States should again be drawn into the war."

Shortly before Pearl Harbor a reader of the Staatszeitung inquired why the paper had not continued to stand by its pro-German policy. The Staatszeitung answered:

"Do you know what we would risk? Do you know that we have to give consideration to political currents, if we do not want to jeopardize our existence?"

On the very day of Pearl Harbor this paper said:

"If they (our racial brothers) are wise, they will refrain from any discussion of the war, in order to avoid all misunderstandings."

In other words, German-Americans were exhorted to refrain from any discussions of the war and, in effect, to hide and cover up their inner feelings so that they could parade under false colors, and their neighbors would not know that they were traitors to America and false to their obligations of citizenship.

Even yet I hear friends of mine almost daily saying, "If the German people would get rid of Hitler they would be all right," or again, "Hitler got the German people into this mess," or again, "The German people are good people and are being forced to march to the music of Hitler and the warmongers."

People who make these statements are, to my mind, only fooling themselves. I think I am qualified to speak on this subject because every drop of blood in my veins is of German origin, and only one generation removed. I think I know something of the German mentality. I have been in Germany twice, first as an American soldier and 10 years later as a visitor. In 1927 it was clearly apparent to me that the German people were merely living for the day and exerting all of their energy toward the time when they could strike again. I am very much afraid they will do this very thing once more. To date it is conservatively estimated that they have robbed their neighbors of more than $36,000,000,000 in money and personal property, to say nothing of the millions engaged in forced labor. So far the war has been a profitable undertaking for them and to my mind they are firmly convinced that if worse comes to worse they can do once more what they did in 1918, and that the sob sisters in this country and our allies will again have their way so that the German nation will emerge just as strong as ever and ready at the first opportunity to strike again. The last time German soil was untouched, while France and Belgium were paralyzed. This time the Germans were happy and filled with glee when the people of England were being bombed into mincemeat, but today when the tables have been turned and the horrors they are the author of are being perpetrated upon their own soil, the English and American bombers are castigated as barbarians. They are beginning to understand that retribution is a terrible thing, but their education is still far from complete and their attitude of racial superiority and desire for warfare of aggression must be knocked out of their heads by the butt of a rifle if necessary, but it must come out before there can be any permanent peace.

There is one thing that the German leaders do not seem to be able to get through their thick skulls and that is that their Prussianism does not survive in a free soil. A vast majority of the German citizens who come to the United States become almost immediately true and faithful citizens. Witness General Kreuger, MacArthur's chief of staff, who was born in Germany; your own Nimitz and Eisenhower, who are all of pure German stock. It is unfortunate, however, that a small percentage of Germans prove untrue and some of them even traitorous. It was not an accident that Lieutenant Krug went to Max Stephan in Detroit. There are other Max Stephans in the United States and the sooner a rope is put around their treacherous necks and they are all swung from the scaffold, the better off America will be.

There is one thing in connection with this matter, however, of which I think we can be a little proud. Three years ago Congress appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation $16,000,000 to be used in combating subversive activities in this country. Probably no money that Congress has ever appropriated has been spent to better purpose. Every alien had been required by law to register. Those of the Axis Nations who were likely to become our enemies were closely checked. Within 24 hours of the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor, over 11,000 alien enemies were taken into custody. All of these aliens have been accorded hearings, about one-third of them have been released or paroled, and the other two-thirds have been interned. We have had a number of these cases in my district and it has been my recommendation to the hearing board that all doubts be resolved against the suspect. We cannot afford to take any chances with a man who may be ready at any opportune moment to spring upon us and help to crush out our national life.

Due mainly to the thorough job your officials have performed, there has not been in this country one clearly established case of sabotage in this war. This is a most remarkable record considering our free and easy-going way of doing things. This has no doubt been a great shock to the German office on subversive activities and in desperation they were forced to send their saboteurs here by submarine. These men found the sitting here rather uncomfortable, however, when the electric current was turned on at Washington. Word of the very tragic end of these would-be saboteurs was quickly flashed to nazi-land and I think one may be sure such a bold, arrogant attempt against us will not be repeated. In fact, in the Duquesne case in New York, a group of would-be saboteurs were successfully prosecuted and imagine the chagrin of the squareheads when they learned from the witness stand that one of their supposed members who was in charge of their clandestinely operated radio station, was an agent of the F. B. I.

In all of this there is, and must be, much food for thought for each and every one of us. If we Americans wish to retain our liberty, we must not again gamble with it as we have done in the past 5 or 10 years. With a world about us being consumed in the flames of war, we went blithely along our way. We slept until the house almost burned down. The next time we may not awaken in time if we again sink into so profound a slumber.

The outcome of the present conflict is, to my mind, no longer a matter of doubt, but whether it lasts several years or is concluded in shorter time we are going to have to be on our guard. It is an easy thing to get people to believe what they want to believe. It was easy until Pearl Harbor to get a great many of our people to believe that we were in no danger. Nobody had any designs on us; all we needed to do was to go along our peaceful way and everything would be all right. A lot of people believed this because they wanted to believe it, and our mistake could well have proven fatal.

Yes; I can see them when the war is won. The isolationists and what-have-yous will be running up and down the country telling us that there will be no more war; that Germany and Japan cannot rise again for a hundred years in order to strike us; we should be kind to our former enemies and all that sort of rot. Nations cannot live in the past any more than individuals can. France depended on the Maginot line because it would have provided sufficient protection in 1914. Today, but for her friends, her case would be hopeless. England neglected air power and depended on her Navy, as she always had, and the error was almost fatal. Russia did not trust to her compact of 1939 with Hitler but redoubled her preparations for war, and by this action on her part probably saved civilization.

Washington advised against entangling alliances. He was a wise man, but he lived in the day of the stagecoach and the sailing vessel. It is unfair to Washington to quote what he said 150 years ago as authority for that sort of a policy today because, naturally, his advice was only meant to cover world conditions as he knew them. Were he living today, I am sure he would be a leader in advocating a league to keep the peace.

Washington was not so much of an isolationist but what he was shrewd enough to court, and glad enough to receive, the very vital aid of France. And on December 7, just 2 years ago, how comforting it was to know that we did not stand alone, but that Russia and England and China and the others stood shoulder to shoulder with us, ready through mutual suffering and sorrow and anguish of soul, to see this Gethsemane through.

Thomas Jefferson was our first interventionist. When the Bey of Tunis undertook to levy tribute on our commerce, he sent Stephen Decatur over there. We licked the hell out of the Bey and we have not had any trouble with his people since.

There can be no question but what we are living in the most crucial period in modern history. This is a war for keeps, and yet, at a moment when our very existence is in jeopardy, we have every reason to be ashamed that we are not exerting our full national effort. Why? There was never an issue that had all virtue and right on its side. So, too, there are always two sides to any controversy, but this much can be said. When his country is threatened, no man has a right to refuse to work. No workman has any more right in wartime to lay down his tools than the soldier upon the battlefield would have to lay down his rifle. Any workman who, because of any real or fancied grievance, walks off the job, is unworthy of American citizenship and is entitled to be ostracized.

A lot of the rest of us, too, have little cause to stick out our chests. We have performed and are performing a modern industrial miracle. We have turned our production almost overnight from a peacetime to a wartime basis. Eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven war planes in November, over 24,000,000 tons of shipping in 2 years, both records never even approached by any nation at any time, to cite only two examples. Of course mistakes have been made and toes have been pinched, but let's look at the overall picture and take it with a smile.

But you say, "It's costing a lot of money." Yes; it has cost a lot of money and it's going to cost a lot more. A lot of money has been wasted and a lot more will be wasted. But if it costs a million dollars to build a tank that will make just one American boy's life more secure, then I am in favor of spending that million dollars. We can make some more money, but when one of our own flesh and blood has lost his life we have forfeited

a treasure that cannot be measured in terms of gold and silver.

So let's take up another notch in our belt and come out of our corner swinging. Did you ever hear of a fighter winning a championship by letting down on his punches when he had his opponent bleeding and groggy? No. That's just the time to put in that extra pound of effort to make the knockout certain.

America is very much worth fighting and sacrificing for and while no doubt there has been some bungling and there will be a lot more, American citizenship is still the biggest bargain and the most prized possession in all the world.

If one were ever an agnostic, events of the last few years certainly should have bolstered his faith. The forces of evil were straining at the leash ready to sink their poisonous fangs into the very heart of all that is noble and worth while in life. That they have been definitely thwarted is, to my mind, only because the Great Ruler of the universe had decreed it so. With abiding faith in the justice of our cause, relying on the God of our fathers to give strength to our hands and courage to our hearts, we shall pass through the fires of this trying day and emerge once more into the glorious sunlight of peace and justice and liberty for all.

Japanese Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morris Harris:

JAP ATROCITIES NOT NEW, BUT NOW WE'RE VICTIMS

(By Morris Harris)

The atrocities on the defenders of Bataan shock and horrify Americans, but to the Japanese they are old stuff.

They have been doing this sort of thing for centuries under the harsh code of the Samurai warrior.

If we are shocked, it is because we haven't learned our Japanese.

We heard about these things happening to the Chinese and the Koreans and the Manchurians. Some of us saw some of them and reported them, but the general reaction seemed to be: "It will never happen to us."

But it has, and it may happen in even greater degree than so far revealed before this war in the Pacific ends.

My experience with the Japanese military is that they are a band of thieves and killers run amok.

The veneer of western science and machine knowledge they have added to their arsenal of weapons does not include the essence of real civilization. Like all Americans who have lived long in the Orient, I have had Japanese friends, but I have also seen some of them turn into Japanese militarists.

BARBARITY THE SAME

The traditional methods by which the Japanese military have been expanding their empire for generations are not far different from those they used in the Philippines. Their conquests have flowed and infrequently ebbed, but the barbarity of their methods always has been about as they stand revealed today.

It has been America's fate to be the principal obstacle in the way of Japanese military expansion, and for this Japanese militarists hate us.

Since a century ago, when we first became interested in the Orient, this country has stood for the open door and equality of opportunity for all nations in the great markets of the East, and for the independence of China and all oriental nations.

This ran directly counter to Japanese military ambitions. Always we were the stumbling block.

From 1931, when the Japanese grabbed Manchuria, these policy clashes came thick and fast, and the growing hatred of the Japanese Army for us flamed to a height which even today few of us realize.

So these military minds of Japan thought they saw in the European war the chance to do what they had long dreamed of doing—drive the white man from the East.

WE BLOCKED THEM

Again we stood in their way. They thought if they eliminated us the way would be open. They tried and failed.

We proved them wrong in two important ways.

They thought we would make a deal. We didn't.

They thought our men were soft. Our men, and our Filipino comrades on Bataan and Corregidor, proved how wrong they were on that score.

Those men were the first to fall—after a fight—into the hands of these conquest-crazed killers.

The story of what happened to them is an expression of the feeling that Japanese war lords have cultivated toward us.

It also exposes the actual nature of "bushido," the so-called code of the Samurai which allegedly guarantees gallant treatment for gallant fighters. Actually, the harder an enemy fights the Japanese, the more he may be exposed to cruelty and torture when he is a prisoner.

WAS USED BEFORE

I have seen this work out in China, long before Pearl Harbor.

The Japanese burned thousands of the Chinese defenders of Nanking alive. In north China they smothered captured Chinese troops in boxcars in the summer, let them freeze to death in the winter. As a matter of course, they worked them to death in labor gangs.

And, of course, there is the classic example of history when centuries ago a Japanese invader of Korea brought back thousands of pickled human ears as trophies of the luckless Korean people and preserved them in a Japanese temple.

When Japan hit Pearl Harbor I was in Shanghai and soon afterward was a prisoner of the Japanese gendarmerie. I rotted in their filthy jail for nearly 3 months.

With other Americans, British and Chinese, I lived in semidarkness, in silence, and in utter filth.

We would have died of malnutrition if we had not been able to get food sent in by friends. Japanese officers kicked and shoved me around with swords in an effort to make me confess trumped-up charges that I was a spy and threatened court martial.

I was one of the lucky ones they did not beat.

What they have done to Americans and Filipinos, they have been doing for years to the Chinese.

This is the Japanese enemy.

Retail Institute of America Urges Credit Restrictions Be Lifted—Discharged Servicemen's Credit Should Not Be Frozen by Regulation W of the Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by the letter that I received today from the Retail Credit Institute of America, and the arguments that have been propounded in favor of exempting discharged servicemen from the wartime restrictions of regulation W of the Federal Reserve System, so as to permit these servicemen to rehabilitate themselves and their families as quickly as possible. These men are returning to homes that were broken up as a result of their service in the armed forces. They are entitled to reestablish their home life with their families as quickly as possible. Where the restrictions on the purchase of household and other goods require one-fifth to one-third down payment, and that full payment for goods purchased be made within 1 year, may be all right for those civilians who have been enjoying wartime high wages, and, as a result, have been able to accumulate a large savings. This situation, obviously, does not apply to the returning soldier or sailor. We should not deny him the right to purchase necessary household goods because of the fact that he does not have sufficient cash on hand to pay for them. Every effort should be made to aid him, and to liberalize his credit, so that he will be able to enjoy those conveniences and necessities that his neighbors enjoy who have not been called into the armed services of their country.

I feel that the suggestions made by the Retail Credit Institute of America should be given immediate favorable consideration, and that they should be complimented for having brought this subject to the attention of the country. I feel confident that every Member of Congress will join in demanding that regulation W of the Federal Reserve System be lifted in its application against the credit of our discharged servicemen.

I am herewith including a copy of the letter that was sent by the Retail Credit Institute of America to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System:

The BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
The Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: The Retail Credit Institute of America has been considering the problem of merchants properly accommodating the soldiers, sailors, marines, and others, men and women, who are being returned to civilian life each month.

The President of the United States in his budget message to the Congress on January 10, 1944, spoke of over 1,000,000 men and women who have been discharged from the services since January 1, 1942, for reasons of age, physical and mental disabilities, and other reasons. He referred to the responsibility of the Nation with respect to the rehabilitation of these people into civilian life. The President said, "Special measures are needed to increase the opportunities for the employment of ex-servicemen, particularly those disabled in war service." Second only to the Nation's responsibility to find jobs for these people is its further responsibility to speedily return them to normal living advantages.

Except for private resources enjoyed by very few of them, these men and women are entering civilian occupation without accumulated pre-war economic security and they with their families face problems of rehabilitation which are a national responsibility.

Those who contracted debt prior to their induction into the services are protected by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act with respect to repayment, but the existence of this debt is a deterrent upon their ability to get back on their feet economically and become self-supporting, independent people again.

The combined benefits of the Soliders' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act and exemptions in current regulation W do not open the way for resumption of current purchasing to meet living requirements when these people are discharged from service. Even if they are prepared to meet the down payment and time stretch requirements of regulation W, they are required to make new purchases in stores where they have no existing overdue accounts. This seems an unnecessary, forced shift of their business for a technical rather than a logical reason.

It is a dual responsibility of private enterprise and the Government to go further then to provide a buffer against the effects of pre-war indebtedness. These returning men and women must have an opportunity to establish home units and to integrate themselves in civilian life. Many of the families represented in this group are new and have no pre-war home establishment to which to return. Contrasted with a majority of other American families whose primary needs are for replacements through individual purchases, many of the people about whom we are concerned need complete ensemble equipment for homes or apartments and the entire wherewithal to commence housekeeping and normal living.

Naturally, the ability of private credit grantors to serve is dependent upon the purchaser's possession of fairly substantial employment, but once the employment problem is solved, merchants who sell on credit are in a position to assist vitally in this rehabilitation process. It is impossible to suppose that the necessary purchases for the reestablishment of civilian life or the establishment of new home and living units can be accomplished under the present terms of regulation W which admittedly is written to coincide with war-flushed incomes which the soldiers, sailors, marines, and others in the armed services have not shared and in which they are less and less likely to share as time goes on even after their discharge.

The Retail Credit Institute of America and its members petition you to amend regulation W in section VIII by the addition of the following paragraph to the exemptions already inaugurated therein:

"Any extension of credit to a person discharged from active service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, as the term 'active service of the United States' is defined under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1942, as amended, and to the wives, children, parents, or members of the immediate household of such persons living in the same domicile with them."

Section 10, "Renewals, revisions and addition of installment credit," does not ameliorate the situation, for (1) it only permits extensions or renewals of existing credit without unfreezing the debtor's account to enable new purchasing, and (2) it applies only to members of the armed services of the United States and not to those who have been discharged from the services. Other similar provisions with respect to service people found in existing regulation W similarly fail to care for those discharged, the group which was the special concern of the President in his message of January 10.

It might be argued that it is enough to amend regulation W to provide for the unfreezing of overdue accounts of service people if contracted subsequent to the effective date of regulation W and applicable to those discharged from the services since Pearl Harbor. True, this would permit current credit purchasing, but only under the down payment and time restrictions of the regulation. These constitute to the returning soldier an even greater hardship.

It seems to us the patriotic duty of both the administration and the merchants of the country to deal with these men and women with considerable understanding and to help them get back on their feet and into a status of comfortable living as rapidly as possible. Oftentimes this can be accomplished through the service of individual consumer credit and quite frequently the down-payment requirements of regulation W will prove unnecessarily harsh and the restriction on the length of contracts unnecessarily difficult to meet.

We do not believe merchants will be overanxious to extend long terms and low payments except where a returned soldier has a substantial job or where in every respect the credit risk is reasonable. We do believe, however, that it is wise to remove unnecessary barriers which act to prevent the quickest possible return to normal living of these people who have served the Nation.

The inflationary aspect of such an easing of credit restrictions would be slight, indeed, and, in fact, to the extent that the proper extension of credit may ease the demand for immediate sizable monetary payments out of the Public Treasury for rehabilitation purposes; the step we suggest would be definitely deflationary.

The amendment we propose does not eliminate past indebtedness—a fact which, reasonably considered, will serve as a check against unnecessary heavy purchasing on new accounts. Merchants as well as customers will recognize this when negotiating new purchase contracts.

We believe that you will give this very earnest thought and feel that in offering the suggestion we are opening the way for a patriotic service that can extend in a minute way in every city and hamlet of the United States to thousands of people who broke up their established living arrangements and standards to serve the Nation.

Since this subject is so fundamental to Americans and because it is vitally important to use the resources of private enterprise to reestablish homes and living standards, the institute assumes that its publication of this petition shortly will meet with the approval of the Board of Governors.

Very truly yours,

RETAIL CREDIT INSTITUTE OF AMERICA, INC.

Resolution of Associated General Contractors of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, twenty-fifth anniversary founders' meeting, Minneapolis, Minn., January 14, 1944:

Whereas in normal times the construction industry, next to agriculture, is the largest employer in the United States—employing at the site of construction one out of every seven workers in the country, and including those in related work off the site of construction, one out of every three and one-half workers in the country; and

Whereas since October 1941, normal construction has been virtually eliminated from the national economy and will continue to be virtually eliminated until the cessation of hostilities, and during this period there has accumulated and pyramided an immense amount of both public and private construction needs which now constitutes a vast reservoir of worthy and needful projects deferred until the post-war period; and

Whereas this association is specific in its policy of advocating that all construction undertaken after the war be undertaken because of its utility or general cultural value and believes that there is so much needed, necessary, and worth-while work to be undertaken, with both public and private funds, that there is no reason for wasting money and manpower on needless work; and

Whereas to effectually utilize this reservoir of needed construction and to take care of additional current construction requirements efficiently and economically, and to meet post-war employment needs as they arise, will require a clear definition of policy by the Federal Government affecting those activities and will primarily require careful advanced planning prior to the post-war period by both private industry and Government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the twenty-fifth anniversary founders meeting of the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota assembled this 14th day of January 1944 at Minneapolis, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation necessary to effectuate the following:

1. The declaration of a policy by the Congress that the Federal Government does not intend to engage in public works which directly or indirectly compete with the proper functions of private enterprise, or the proper functions of State and local governments.

2. That financial participation by the Federal Government in local public works, excepting on projects of an interstate or national character such as highways and airports, be limited to assistance in the planning of post-war public work, with such aid distributed through the proper State agencies.

3. The revision of Federal tax laws so that industries and businesses which prepare plans now for post-war construction will be allowed to account for those costs as current business expenses.

4. The proviso in all future appropriations for construction financed in whole or in part by Federal funds that such construction be

performed by private enterprise through the contract system; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota Members of the Congress of the United States and to our national association, the Associated General Contractors of America.

The President's Room in the National Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE PRESIDENT'S ROOM IN THE NATIONAL CAPITOL

The gifted Italian Brumidi stands high
As master of durable art—
He's gone, but those pictures of his occupy
A place in America's heart,
Symbolic of all that's majestic and grand
In our Nation's Capitol, where,
In artistic excellence, with his own hand,
He's written his epitaph there.

The President's room, in the Capitol, is
A monument that has endeared
Brumidi to us, thru those paintings of his,
Which always will make him revered.
The ceiling and walls of this historic room
Here picture America's past,
'Mid rainbows of promises, bursting in bloom,
Whose fragrance is destined to last.

Intelligence, purity, power, and charm,
With faith, hope, and charity, speak
A noble significance, sweet as a psalm,
From faces inspiringly meek,
Creating more hope in America's heart,
Supported by justice and truth,
Suggesting that wisely, through picturesque art,
She cherish the days of her youth.

The President's room is a choice beauty-spot,
Much prized for its jewels of art
Whose marvels of int'rest are never forgot,
But live, like love's vow, in the heart—
And every American that's ever come
To visit his Capitol, who
Has seen this inspiring, historical room,
Feels Washington's dream coming true.

While manhood and womanhood are pictured there,
Childhood justly predominates,
And Nature's first-fruits, as an answer to prayer,
Which she in abundance creates,
Add multiplied beauty and charm to the scene,
That could not by words be expressed,
Inciting emotions, as calm and serene
As hope for the heart that's at rest.

Those wonderful pictures were aptly designed
In every detail in the heart
Of this master-craftsman, who's really enshrined
Himself in his treasures of art.
He lives in his pictures, on Memory's walls,
Which proudly the Nation reveres,
And will, till the curtain of destiny falls
Upon the last vanishing years.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Dangers of Post-War Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me for the St. Louis Star-Times relating to the dangers of post-war alliances.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WHEELER CITES DANGERS OF POST-WAR ALLIANCES

(By Senator BURTON K. WHEELER)

About a year ago the head of one of the large investment-banking houses in New York came into my office and I asked him to sit down. He said, "I do not agree with you, and so I do not want to get into an argument with you." I said, "You do not agree with what I think about the post-war problem." He replied, "That is correct."

I said, "Will you tell me what I think about post-war problems because I do not know now what my views may be on this subject when the war is over. If you will tell me what part Russia is going to play and what part England is going to play, then I will tell you what my views are; but I cannot, nor can anyone else, have any workable post-war views without that knowledge."

The fact is, it is impracticable for anyone to say what his views are on the post-war situation without knowing the part that the realist Stalin is going to play or what England is going to do. This is not only a fluid war, but the international situation is admittedly fluid.

It is now generally understood that Russia has been isolationist, but in the future may embark on a program of imperialism. Also the desires of England have been more openly avowed and better understood.

Today then, the situation may have sufficiently clarified to make it possible for us to define and for this Nation to pursue in cooperation with others of like interests, a definite practical post-war policy. With this hope in mind and an appreciation of the present urgent need for a definitive program, this article is written.

Leagues of nations are as old as ancient Greece. They have invariably failed to prevent war and, all too often, have proved to be the downfall of those nations which have relied upon them for defense. The Athens of yesterday and the France of today stand witness to these truths. The fact is it is always better to rely on one's own strength than on others. Nor does the system of alliances hold out greater hope. Hitler and Stalin had a nonaggression security alliance (August, 1939) through which Russia got half of Poland and furnished Germany with material—but only 22 months later they were at war (June, 1941). The Anglo-Japanese alliance (1902–22) is not too old to be forgotten—yet Britain and Japan are at war. Poland had an alliance with Britain and France at the outset of the war, a pact which pledged both to protect Poland. History is strewn with more black pages than white on the subject of alliances, running all the way back to the Holy Alliance of 1815 and even the Triple Alliance of 1688, and yet the world periodically came to war.

The fact is every military alliance is a provisional measure against a common foe. When that foe has been overthrown the alliance may continue for a while until the danger has passed. Once the danger is gone, the alliance loses its meaning and usually its existence.

Neither leagues of nations nor alliances, then, have been in the past—nor are they likely to prove in the future—any real basis for lasting peace.

In war the common purpose—the defeat of the enemy—overrides every other. To the extent then that the Anglo-American-Soviet coalition for war against Hitler calls for common, effective, impartial and united military action, it is all to the good. It does not, however, follow that this coalition can or will result in a constructive alliance for peace. Nor does it follow that profound difference between the Allies do not still exist.

A resolute foreign policy, a firmness in upholding national interests against foreign aspirations that are prejudicial to them, even if these aspirations are those of Allied Powers, is as necessary today as it always was and always will be.

Yet we are advised in high quarters not to think about these differences. Unfortunately these advisers are wholly mistaken. As the London economist recently stated: "What is done while hostilities are terminating, in Italy, in the Balkans, in Poland, in Germany, will determine the shape of the peace. The problems—political and economic—of the settlement in Europe cannot be left for vague agreement in an unspecified future. Either the new system of international cooperation can come to agreed solutions or there will be no international cooperation."

The war has reached a stage where it is no longer possible to postpone the making of fundamental, political decisions concerning the future of Europe. In fact with the so-called second front in the offing this may well prove to be our last opportunity to secure from our allies political agreement on concrete decisions which will assure to the nations of Europe security from future domination by this or that power and the economic basis, which together are essential if there is to be any lasting peace. For without peace and security in Europe there can be no assurances of peace anywhere, as the last two wars have shown.

Yet, neither the Moscow nor the Teheran Conferences attempted, so far as we know, any solution of the fundamental problems of Europe. There was no declaration about Germany. They did not hint at any plans for the economic integration of Europe. They made no statement on regional groupings nor did they propose any other workable cooperative framework for Europe. If any agreements were reached it is inexcusable that the American people have not been so informed. Mr. Roosevelt has stated that there were no secret agreements and Mr. Wilson denounced secret agreements. Yet without policies on these points it is difficult to see how Europe's future can be decided on any but false and dangerous principles of power, with Europe degenerating into a third war. Overwhelming power never has solved the problems of Europe and it would be folly, in defeating Hitler, to accept the premise on which he worked.

But to participate soundly and effectively in such negotiations we must have a foreign policy of our own based on facts—not propaganda.

For several years now it has been the basic assumption of our propagandists that people are like children who must be soothed by fairy tales about the world in which they live. The result has been such confusion of thought that even today millions of Ameri-

cans are uncertain about our war aims, puzzled by the contradictions that confront us daily in our newspapers, sometimes on the same page, befuddled by the half truths of many of our commentators and columnists who are our self-constituted instructors, speaking with questionable authority over our radios and in our press. We have only to recall the atmosphere of make-believe and distortion of the facts by our propagandists prior to the declaration of war by Congress.

"By October 1941," as Demaree Bess recently wrote in the Saturday Evening Post, "everyone in Europe knew that the United States was already deeply involved in the European war, having committed a whole series of warlike actions against Germany.

"Nevertheless, our administration refused to concede that we were at war against Germany, and our people were so confused about the whole situation that, up to the very hour of the attack on Pearl Harbor, we were still continuing to conduct fierce debates about whether we should keep out of the war."

In more recent times Americans have again been plunged by their propagandists into a new atmosphere of make-believe. This time the question is the kind of peace. Fortunately people are now getting tired of being told what things mean. They want to know what the things are. They will then determine the meaning for themselves. A people can remain free only by maintaining open minds and free discussion of the facts. Without knowledge of the facts in turn and general discussion by all sides it is impossible to arrive at sound conclusions.

First of all, then, in examining this question of peace, we must rid our minds of much of past and current one-sided propaganda. The notion that future peace lies in the creation of a triparty power alliance with Russia and England is wholly mistaken. "Even after Hitler has been eliminated," as the New York Times recently editorialized, "there will still be some 350,000,000 people in non-Russian Europe who have not lost the capacity or the energy for trying to organize their own life in their own way. Yet most of the projected post-war plans, especially those based on alliances between the Big Three who conferred in Tehran, tend to treat that non-Russian Europe as something of a vacuum, or an area occupied by only small nations which can be bartered away, or neutralized, or divided into spheres of influence dominated by the Big Powers. To attempt such a settlement would be to erect a house of cards which must fall at the first wind."

Nor does the answer lie in general disarmament or any system of collective security for as E. A. Voigt, a leading Englishman, recently correctly stated, "Any measure of general disarmament will, in effect, rearm the Germans, seeing that armaments are always relative, not absolute. While any system of collective security will, by imposing upon the victorious powers the obligations of quelling aggression all over the world—and so deflecting foreign policy from its legitimate purpose of promoting national interests—afford a patient, vigilant, and resolute Germany the chance of recovering what she has lost."

But Voigt adds, "It is a dangerous error to assume that the German problem exhausts the European problem, and that the European problem will have been solved when Germany has been reduced to permanent impotence." The fact is that the German problem is only a part of the whole European problem and the whole European problem must be solved if we are to assure lasting peace between Germany and the rest of Europe.

To solve this problem, two definite steps are necessary: First, the maintenance of the countries of eastern Europe between the Baltic and the Aegean as independent communities and their integration as an organic whole; second, the further restricting of German influence in Europe—by a federal organization of western Europe, and the integration of Germany into this new European order, such federation to be based on human liberty and national equality after the pattern of Switzerland.

For generations prior to the last war the political entity of Austria-Hungary, despite its conflicting racial elements, was a prosperous region of free and uninterrupted trade. At the same time it served as a political bulwark against German aggression. Its modern equivalent would be the creation of a confederacy of eastern Europe. Such an eastern zone has the making of a vast prosperous, industrial, as well as agrarian community. Its population numbers almost 100,000,000 people and is being drawn together by a common danger. Its cohesion through confederation would create a power at least equal to Germany and in time superior. Such a confederation would give Russia security along her western border and add to the security of France and the Lowlands along their eastern borders, thus making practical the second step—the formation of a united states of western Europe.

This idea of a united states of Europe is not a new idea with me. I advanced it as long ago as 1923. I was not a Member of Congress when the League fight was on, but was for the League very strongly at the time. However, in 1923 I visited Europe and spent 5 months there. That was when I changed my mind about the League and came to the conclusion that the only answer for Europe was a united states of Europe. Briand in France had this conception and worked for it. So did Stresemann in Germany. But their work was swept away by Blum and Hitler.

Mr. Churchill, writing in the Saturday Evening Post in 1930 on this same question had this to say, "The conception of a united states of Europe is right. Every step taken to that end * * * is good in itself—good for them and good for all. It may even prove to be the surest means of lifting the mind of European nations out of the ruck of old feuds and ghastly revenges. It may be the surest of all the guarantees against the renewal of great wars."

The truth is, if we begin our efforts to secure peace by re-creating the balance of power in Europe or by making maps to suit nationalist ambitions of certain great nations, or entrust our future welfare to a triparty power trust or the revival of a political league of nations, we will find at every step we are running across the path of great economic forces which sooner or later will destroy the entire structure. We cannot erect political order on economic chaos.

In Europe, then, economic necessity precludes a return to pre-war economic conditions. Economic grouping of nations must ensue if Europe is to be saved from future wars.

However well, then, any Anglo-American-Russian agreement might function—the complete restoration of peace on stable and sure foundations postulates the establishment of economic peace between the various nations of Europe.

The argument that Germany, situated in the middle of Europe, in control of its central industrial region might attempt to dominate this federation can be discounted. In the first place when Hitler is defeated she will not be allowed to retain undivided control of Rhenish-Westphalian industry. In the second place she will form only a minority of the total population of a new integrated—rather than divided—Europe, whose population, four times as great as Germany's, for some time will be united by anti-German sentiment, ready to smash any German attempt to achieve predominance. This means that Germany, as long as it follows a policy of peaceful collaboration, will find its neighbors cooperative. But as soon as it attempts any step toward hegemony, it would find itself hopelessly encircled by the great majority of other Europeans.

America, because of her importance as a world power—economically and politically—can and should help to bring this about through a firm foreign policy and by close collaboration with others of like mind who have the same vital interests. But cooperation, like other good things, may be overdone and the kind of cooperation which would involve this Nation in a peacetime power trust composed of Russia, England, and the United States might easily prove prejudicial to any lasting peace.

Furthermore, the existing conflicts of interest between our chief allies contain the stuff of all Anglo-Russian tension for the last 100 years, while possible grounds for disagreements exist between England and China.

Without alliances we might arbitrate and help maintain the peace. With alliances our hands will be tied.

The general situation always will be changing with the ever-changing interplay of political and economic forces, with the rise of some nations, the decline of others, and the making and unmaking of alliances. In the light of this, as Voigt says, "England has no one permanent foe in Europe. As her foe varies, so her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow." This is the natural corollary of the balance-of-power theory on which British policy rests. But for us in America, the policy laid down by George Washington of "just and amicable feelings toward all" should prevail.

Nothing in the revealed plans laid down at Moscow or Teheran foreshadows a more cooperative and unified Europe. In fact, the fundamental problems of a post-war Europe, starving and disintegrating, was the one question all seemed intent to forget. Yet without a settlement of these problems there can be no real peace.

It is, however, not too late to plan for a constructive, ordered, cooperative Europe in which the beaten and the victorious may one day live and work harmoniously, but it is as the London Economist says, "the eleventh hour." It is, then, an immediate cooperative and resolute American foreign policy that will promote, on the one hand, the union of the countries between the Baltic and the Aegean and, on the other hand, a united states of western Europe, which holds out the best hope for a sound solution of the whole European problem. It provides the only hope that the progressive disintegration of Europe may be arrested and that there will be a long period of peace and prosperity following this war. It may be the only hope that civilization—as we know it—will survive.

We are in this war and we must win it. But we are not fighting for the transitory emergence of a political figure or two to govern the destinies of mankind. We are not fighting to enrich the British Empire or even to sustain it. We are not fighting to secure for Mr. Stalin the domination of Europe. Nor are we fighting to establish one-man government in this Nation—call it what you may—communism, fascism, or new dealism. We are fighting to save our civilization for our children.

Unless these matters are thoroughly understood—and understood now—I can see little hope for peace in the post-war world. On the other hand, their early recognition by the administration and our allies would expedite victory and make for an early return of our boys to their homes.

Publication of American Newspapers and Magazines Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Under Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 25, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. McCORMACK: I have your letter of January 11, inquiring about the publication of American newspapers and magazines abroad.

I am sure you appreciate our difficulties in getting news and other reading matter to the troops overseas because of shortage of transport which has often been responsible for long delays in delivering shipments of periodicals. This is by no means a problem in all areas where our troops are stationed. For example, our reports indicate that sufficient reading material is arriving in the European theater to meet minimum needs. However, commanders of certain other theaters, particularly those in somewhat isolated areas, have felt keenly the desirability of getting fresh reading matter in familiar form to their troops as expeditiously as possible.

To meet this need, several publishers offered to make plastic plates of their publications, or parts of them, which were rearranged for this purpose without advertising. Theater commanders, in turn, arranged for air priority by which these plates could be quickly transported to the theater and assisted in finding arrangements for printing.

Overseas editions of Time, Newsweek, and weekly editions of the New York Times, and the Chicago Tribune are being printed in this manner in certain theaters. These projects have received assistance from the theater commanders in varying degree, depending on local conditions.

The first of these special overseas editions for the troops was printed in the late summer of 1943. Since that time, other publishers have become interested in similar projects, so that the War Department has found it necessary, because of lack of facilities, and in order to guard against possible charges of discrimination, to issue an over-all policy within which theater commanders could render such assistance to publishers interested in printing in their theaters as was felt desirable from the point of view of the troops.

The policy leaves in the hands of the theater commander the decision as to whether he desires such publications to be established at all. If his judgment is that such publications are unnecessary, he is under no compulsion to accept them. If, however, he feels them to be desirable, the policy indicates that he shall accept them in the order requests are received to the limit of available facilities.

The War Department cannot properly secure paper for these ventures, since supervision of paper allotment is vested in the War Production Board. Publishers, therefore, must arrange for their own supply of paper. If, however, they secure sufficient paper stock, theater commanders desiring them to print will arrange priorities for water shipment of the paper and air priorities for shipment of plastic plates or mats.

In addition to the editions produced solely for the troops, certain magazines, such as the Reader's Digest, have established regular editions in foreign countries through private arrangement for public sale in those countries and without reference to the Army.

Details concerning the establishment of an overseas edition by a publisher are being handled in the War Department by the Special Services Division, but final arrangements must be completed between the publisher and the theater commander. If your correspondent desires additional details, I am sure the Special Services Division will gladly provide them upon request.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

Address of Hon. Charles A. Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, January 29, there occurred in Topeka, Kans., the fifty-third annual meeting of the Kansas Day Club. Our distinguished colleague, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, was the principal speaker. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address which Mr. HALLECK delivered on that occasion:

I am honored at the invitation which brings me here today—honored and immensely pleased. Because this day marks the anniversary of two great events in American history. One is the anniversary of the admission of Kansas to the Union. The other—somewhat less epochal—is the ninth anniversary of my election to Congress.

That was back in 1935, when New Deal congressional rubber-stamping had brought that otherwise great legislative body to about its lowest ebb in the estimation of the people. Since that time, we Republicans constantly have been increasing our numbers. With that increase, and because of it, Congress has been gradually reestablishing itself in the confidence of the people.

In that process, your splendid Kansas delegation has been most effective. Senators CAPPER and REED, and Representatives LAMBERTSON, SCRIVNER, WINTER, REES, HOPE, and CARLSON are able, patriotic, and trustworthy statesmen. Kansas and the Nation can well be proud of them.

And as a Hoosier representative, I can also add that Republican administration of your State government here in Kansas, presently headed by your distinguished Governor Schoeppel, is clear evidence of the sort of good government the Nation can expect after next November when we again go into power.

Perhaps I may suggest that this is almost the first general gathering of importance in the campaign which is about to open for the control of this Government during the next 4 years. There is a peculiar fitness in having this meeting in Kansas and upon this very anniversary. The struggle of Kansas for statehood and the goings on in this State in the fifties—the sanguinary battles between free-State and slave-State settlers—was the episode that provoked the organization of the Republican Party. Out of that dramatic struggle to determine whether Kansas should enter the sisterhood of States as a slave State or a free State came the election of Lincoln. I think I am not mistaken in my history—and you Kansans will know it better than I do—when I say that the split in the Democratic Party in 1860 was caused by the position that Stephen A. Douglas took in opposition to the Kansas proslave constitution. The Southern Democrats refused to support him because of that act; they bolted the party and nominated Breckinridge. And that split made possible the election of the first Republican President. Where else, upon what spot of ground in this wide land, could the Republican Party, which led in the great battle to keep this country united, begin the struggle which lies ahead of it to keep this country free?

You have been introduced recently to a new character in our politics. He calls himself "Dr. Win-the-War." But a lot of us have been for concentrating on winning the war for a long time. We need no conversion. Anyway, this character advertises himself as the legitimate successor of "Dr. New Deal." Good old "Dr. New Deal," it seems, has taken down his shingle and is retiring from practice. But if you will look more closely at this "Dr. Win-the-War," you will see that he is the same old "Doc," with the same old hangers-on, only with a brand new set of whiskers. He calls himself "Dr. Win-the-War." But the circumstances of the change of name may indicate that "Dr. Win-the-Election" is in it, too.

Now we do not need in this country any "Dr. Win-the-War." This war is not going to be won by advertising doctors. There is no issue among the people of this country on the question of winning the war. If there is one thing under heaven on which the whole people are a unit, it is the winning of this war. And the politician who tries to make you believe that he alone has the necessary intelligence and patriotism to do that, is insulting the intelligence and patriotism of the American people.

This is the most highly professional war ever fought in history. Our Revolution was won chiefly by amateur generals, leading simple farmers and artisans, who knew how to hold a rifle and shoot it straight. But by the time our Civil War was waged the instrumentalities of war had changed. It had become a scientific adventure for the professional soldier. Our people did not realize it, and so regiments were raised, headed often by men who had never worn a uniform. We had some generals who were doctors, lawyers, and even poets and preachers, when the war began. Probably most of the trouble Lincoln had on the military front came from these freshman generals. Abraham Lincoln told Grant that he had to confess his own ignorance of military matters and that he never interfered with his generals save with the greatest reluctance, and then only on nonmilitary matters. He insisted on one thing only—that they fight. In the end the war was won by two great professional soldiers.

This war is a vast enterprise, enormously technical and calling for the services of the professional soldier and engineer upon an unparalleled scale. What would Lincoln say today of his military ignorance in the presence of the airplane, the tank, the mysteries and miracles of modern ordnance? This war will be won by our great commanders, Marshall and Eisenhower, MacArthur and Arnold; by our great admirals, King and Nimitz, Ingersoll and Halsey; by our brave soldiers and sailors out on the battle front; by our magnificent producing organization at home, developed under our system of free enterprise; and by the unconquerable will of the American people. The Republican Party will draw a line around these generals and admirals and hang up a sign reading, "Politicians, keep out."

But if there is no issue between us about winning the war, there is most certainly an

issue between us about the kind of life we shall have in America when this war ends. Here in what was called Bleeding Kansas was spilled in the historic border wars the first blood in the great irrepressible conflict that we fought to save the Union. Now we are in another great struggle to determine whether or not the people of this country shall continue to live in a system of free enterprise under the flag of a free Republic.

The great experiment in government launched on our soil set up for the first time in modern history a society in which the tyrant state was subdued. For centuries men had to live under what we now call totalitarian governments—governments that had no limits upon their powers. Our fathers made sure that such a government would not flourish here. They divided the powers of sovereignty among the States and the Federal Government and reserved a large part of them to the people. They would have no all-powerful monarch, as in France, and no all-powerful parliament, as it exists now in England; no all-powerful executive or all-powerful Congress or all-powerful central government. They created not a democracy but a representative republic on this model. And that experiment has lasted for 161 years. Under it has grown the most powerful and freest people on God's green earth and the most prosperous people in human history. I say it has been a successful experiment. It has been more. It became a shining light for the peoples of the world, and everywhere other nations began to take, in whole or in part, the forms of representative constitutional government which had been created here.

But the last war changed all that in Europe. Despite all our high hopes, most of the nations of Europe that had been moving toward freer parliamentary forms began to get rid slowly of their hard-won liberties. The war smashed victor and vanquished alike. The people of Europe, torn by age-old wars, by feuds, by deep racial divisions, by other social and economic diseases, grew weary of their poverty and frustration. Their distress made the perfect soil for the demagogic crusader. Everywhere—in Italy, Germany, Turkey, Spain, Greece, in all the Balkan countries—the demagogs vied with each other in promising safety, security, abundance, and freedom to these depression-ridden people. Listen to Mr. Hitler talking to his people:

"We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. There must be cheap automobiles for the workers to ride in and wide public highways for the automobiles. National socialism is the revolution of the common man. Rooted in a fuller life for every German from childhood to old age, national socialism means a new day of abundance at home and a better world order abroad."

Hitler was promising the people of Germany a new deal if only they would sacrifice a little of their freedom, if only they would streamline their Government a little, provide him with adequate power and a strong centralized state. This was happening all over Europe. And the wretched population, broken and enervated by war and continuing depressions, listened to this siren song. Little by little we saw one nation after another throw itself into the arms of these demagogic and totalitarian governments, throwing their free governments upon the scrap heap of history, throwing away their own liberties for the empty promises of security.

Now, I ask you—Is America going to follow that path? Do you not hear everywhere these glamorous promises of abundance? The highest national income ever known in this country was in 1929 when it reached the eighty-two billions under a Republican administration. But now we are told by some of our New Deal promisers that when the war ends we shall have a national income of one hundred and twenty billions. Some of our frenzied financiers infected with New Deal theory assure us it can be one hundred and eighty billions. Vice President HENRY WALLACE, who is not going to let anybody top him when it comes to promising, said the other day that it may well be two hundred billions.

But now, my fellow Americans, are we not entitled to ask—How are they going to do all that? They couldn't do it in the 8 years they were in power before the European war. The highest they could hoist the national income was seventy-one billions. But now they say they can push it, according to the latest bulletin from the prophet, HENRY, to two hundred billions. I want to know what they have found out since the war began that they didn't know before? What is the secret of this new world of blessed billions which they have discovered? Perhaps you think that HENRY WALLACE is talking through his hat. But remember, HENRY thinks he knows how to do this. And what is his secret weapon for abundance?

You do not have to guess. Just read their speeches, their books, their pamphlets, and their official reports. Actually you need not read all this stuff. They sum it all up this way: "Look at the giant production that is going on in America during this war. Every man and woman and many of the children are at work. We have full-blast production. We already had last year an income of one hundred and twenty billions. We will have an income of one hundred and fifty billions this year. We can do it because we have done it. We have shown in this war how a nation's income can be expanded. If we can do it in war, producing war goods, we can do it in peace producing peace goods." And now you can figure it all out for yourselves. How are we creating full-blast production in this war? How have we pushed up the national income to one hundred and twenty billions? By making the Government into a great centralized totalitarian giant, by Government borrowings of incomprehensible billions of dollars, and by turning the Nation into a great army of regimented and controlled producers and taxpayers and lenders. Our people submit to that now because they are told it is necessary to win this war. But does any man in his senses believe they will submit to it when the war ends?

This Government proposes to spend a hundred billion dollars this year on the war alone. It proposes to borrow the greater part of that, some from the people, most of it from the banks, thus creating a huge volume of bank money. It proposes to impose the most confiscatory taxes upon everybody. Of course, we submit because our boys are facing resolute and ruthless enemies all over the world and we are prepared to make any sacrifices to back them. To operate an economy like this the Government creates a multitude of bureaus which have taken over the law-making functions of Congress. They multiply so fast that Washington is no longer big enough to house them; and if we continue, the District of Columbia will have to annex large sections of Maryland and Virginia to hold the bureaucrats. They literally regulate everything from the cradle to the grave. They begin with safety pins, baby nipples, and diapers. They touch, investigate, supervise, questionnaire, and regulate every phase of every life through the seven ages of man. They wind up at the funeral parlor, where the undertaker, in addition to burying you, will, as the agent of the O. P. A., pick up your unused ration points for the Government.

Now we submit to all this, as we do to the vast piling up of the national debt, to the grinding taxes, and to this comprehensive regimentation because we are at war, and we are in no mood to grudge what we give and sacrifice for victory. But if I know anything about the American people I know that they will not submit to this 1 minute longer than is absolutely essential when the war is over. And yet this New Deal, I assure you, has no other plan for keeping this Nation afloat and producing all this abundance they sing about than this. Billions and bureaus. This is the cure for all the Nation's ills. "Old Doc New Deal" has only these two sovereign remedies in his little black satchel. No matter what is the matter with you, he says, "If a billion won't cure it, a bureau will."

But do not be misled. This new system did not begin with the war. The New Dealers have always liked it. Many recent programs on the home front are merely an extension and development of what was already in progress before under the New Deal. The Constitution and its Bill of Rights began to irk them. In fact, Vice President WALLACE has told us that we "put too much emphasis on the Bill of Rights democracy," and compared us with Russia, where they put the emphasis on economic democracy. He called what they have in Russia "economic democracy," and suggested that it would be a blessed thing if we could mix our Bill of Rights democracy and Russia's economic democracy.

Yes, the New Dealers are still on the job in Washington. And giving them a new name has not changed their views in philosophies one whit. Nor has it endowed them with any new or different capacity or competence.

If the administration really wanted to get on with winning the war, it would immediately move out some of the incompetents and replace them with men of action and practicality. That would provide full and complete home-front support of the valiant boys at the fighting fronts.

I refer particularly to those whom everyone knows are the real Cabinet in Washington—those men headed by Harry Hopkins, who actually issue orders to members of the Cabinet. This group has come to be known as the palace guard. This "palace guard" has outlined the New Deal's post-war plans for America. When the war ends, we will owe at least $300,000,000,000, a sum beyond human comprehension. How this will be dealt with disturbs the minds of every serious-minded citizen. But the "palace guard" is not worried about that. They say government debt is a good thing; that it is not a burden because we owe it to ourselves; that it is by government debt and more government debt we can make ourselves rich and happy and that instead of worrying how we can pay that three hundred billions and the immense interest on it when the war ends, we should just go right on borrowing forever and spending the money. Every sane American knows in his heart that that course can lead only to disaster and ruin. The challenge to sane Americans is—reverse that course. That they will do next November.

New Dealers say we cannot operate under our present form of government. We must streamline it. Streamlining it means that more power must be brought to Washington—that power must be centralized—and that the powers in Washington must be lodged more and more in the person of the President. Congress is too slow, too unwieldy, too unmanageable for them. It must hand over most of its powers by legislative abdication to the President and become a mere debating society and an organ to register the decrees of the President. This is the new order that is being prepared for us. This is the brave new world of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Wallace and Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Frankfurter.

Of one thing you may be sure, the Republican Party does not believe in this so-called new order. On the contrary, the Republican Party pledges that as soon as possible powers

over the lives of our people which have been concentrated in Washington shall be returned to the people where they belong.

After all, this so-called new order is no such thing at all. It is only a pale copy of the vampire economy of Germany and Italy. It is based upon the theory that our system—the system of free enterprise—is all washed up. But what of the Democratic Party? Does it swallow this preposterous dose? Why, the Democratic Party no longer has a choice about what it will swallow. For nearly a century the Republicans and Democrats fought each other at the polls and in our National and State Legislatures over the problems of making our great Republic work. They differed endlessly. They argued and debated. Leaders on both sides struggled to correct the abuses and weaknesses in our system. They proceeded upon the theory that our republican government of checks and balances and our system of free enterprise was here to stay. We called each other hard names sometimes. But we respected each other as good Americans devoted to our institutions and traditions. Now for the first time a group of men is in power which seems to have come to the conclusion that our traditional system is outmoded, that it is all washed up and that we must change it—that we must adopt a new order in which the Government will be the great producer and borrower and banker and farm manager and industrial director because American business is no longer capable of either financing or managing itself. What is this group? It is the New Deal elite, and make no mistake about it, they are still on the job. It is a crowd of doctrinaires and parlor pinks who couldn't get elected deputy assistant dog catcher in any American village, who have captured the mechanisms, the political apparatus, of the Democratic Party.

I know in my heart that the great majority of the men who sit in the House of Representatives and in the Senate do not believe in these mad philosophies. I am sure that they look with scorn on most of it. But they are powerless. Many of them are able and patriotic men. But the machinery of their party has been taken out of their hands by the new system of government spending which they have created. They are the prisoners of their terrible blunders. They will never recover their independence and redeem the freedom and dignity of the great party they have unwittingly betrayed until they rise in their self-respect and oust the "palace guard" that rules their party from the White House.

Meantime the struggle now is not about tariffs or the money question or any of those other detailed matters of government about which our parties differed in the past. It is not about what we should do to make our system of free enterprise work. It is a struggle about whether we shall abandon that system or retain it. It is a great debate we begin, a great struggle we enter, in which the Republican Party will urge measures to cure the defects of our system and make it more effective, while the opposition party, unless it repudiates its present leadership, will be fighting to maintain their false doctrines which I say endanger our republican institutions and our free way of life.

The great problem before us is to maintain and create the conditions under which our free economy can work. No party that does not believe in that system ought to be entrusted with the difficult task. Instead of plans to make free enterprise work so that we will have real security, we hear of nothing but plans for what is called security. The poor, the unemployed, the youth, the aged, are told they will be given security from the cradle to the grave. Of course, no party or faction in America is opposed to social security. The Republican Party in Congress in 1934 and 1935 prodded Mr. Roosevelt to act on this when he held back and said "the time was not ripe." Few remember that fact. But it is a fact. We will preserve and strengthen the whole structure of social security.

But here is a point I want to emphasize on this subject. There are two kinds of people who want security. There are those who are not too young nor too old to work, who are neither sick nor indigent. They are the producing masses of the Nation—the employers and workers, the men and women who own and organize and manage our factories, our mines, our utilities, our farms, and the millions of skilled and unskilled men and women who work in them; those who build and produce and create all our income and our wealth. They will be secure only if a climate and a soil is created within which these groups—employers and workers—can find good returns and sound wages in keeping their factories and shops and stores and mines and farms and utilities working. If they do not produce, there will be nothing either for them or for the poor and helpless among us. The Government produces nothing. It only collects the taxes with which benefits for the needy are paid from those who labor and produce.

We must, with all possible fullness and tenderness, care for the weak and unfortunate among our people, but we must also be sure that the strong shall be kept active. Let us provide for the weak; but let us keep the strong strong. The strength of the Nation lies in the united strength of her strong men and women who constitute 80 percent of the population. Let us provide for the 20 percent who need help. But let us not cripple the 80 percent who must provide for them.

The way to make free enterprise work is to free it, not hobble it. The free-enterprise system is a system of private ownership operated for fair return under fair regulation. And any party that deliberately sets out to destroy fair return will kill this system. It must be profitable for men to operate factories, to own and manage stores, to operate mines and farms. If it is not profitable, they will not operate them. They will close them down, and there will be neither profit for the owner, wages for the worker, nor security for the aged.

We all know that productive enterprise has on occasion been harried, penalized, taxed, and regimented almost to death. The Republican Party knows this. It knows that all of us must share some part of the guilt. Businessmen who are too greedy and want to exploit their employees or swallow their competition must be stopped. Labor unions which overstep the boundaries of their legitimate functions must be stopped. Above all, the Government of the United States must go out of the business of running everybody's business. The tyranny of the bureaucrat must be stopped. We must search out every brake and every constricting force which slows down the enterprise and energy of our people and remove it. I repeat, the Nation will be strong only as it is made up of a population of strong men and women—men and women who want the fine things of life but who know these are not handed to a people by a philanthropic government but must be worked for and sweated for and paid for.

America is the product of the strength of a hardy people. They did not build this great Republic and its free commonwealths with kid gloves. Here, into and through Kansas, poured that heroic stream of frontiersmen in the old covered wagons, which were the symbol of their daring journey, with their undaunted mothers of this strong race, their children, and their small belongings. They were not accompanied by any professional bureaucrats with maps and charts and supervision. There were no luxurious comfort stations nor glass-walled neon-lighted hot-dog stands or cozy tourist camps along the road. They faced the risks of the wilderness seeking their security in an unknown world. They bored into the mountains for that fabulous mineral wealth which made us rich. They cleared and cultivated on the prairies those millions of acres which are now called the bread basket of the world. They built towns and cities and great commonwealths richer than those from which they came. Of course, I know some cynics will say it would have been better if the experts and the theorists had been along to make the going easier. I do not think so. For these people were developing not merely the land—they were building a people, a race of strong men.

Man is made to dream—but also to grow; and only by work and struggle does he grow. It is by exercise and labor the body is made strong. It is by effort and struggle that peoples are made strong. There is no stronger race of men in the world than is to be found here upon these Kansas prairies.

This State and this people were created by its dreams and its labors. It was born as a State in the midst of difficulties such as few other new States encountered. It had to fight for every inch of its soil and for its place in the Union. So much was this true that when Kansas was finally admitted and had to adopt a State seal, John J. Ingalls suggested as the State's motto the Latin maxim, Ad Astra per Aspera, which means, as you Kansans know so well "To the stars through difficulties."

Before us, in America, as a result of the long depression and this tragic war, lies a road of difficulty and danger. It leads over the hills. But beyond the hills and above them are the stars. Our love of that precious heritage of freedom and struggle which has come down to us from our fathers will strengthen our hearts and harden our courage as we march on over the hills of difficulty and sacrifice toward the green pastures and the eternal stars.

The Next Step Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Next Step, which I gave before the executive committee of the Inter-American Bar Association and the international and comparative law section of the American Bar Association, at Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nineteen hundred and forty-four is the critical year for our generation everywhere. With united, well-directed, world-wide hard work, I believe it can become a year of great progress on the road toward a just, a lasting, and a living peace. It is time to take the next step on that road.

ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION

Let us estimate our situation. Decisive military victories are the first essential. Whatever we say or do about plans for peace must be so said and done as to help win

such victories. It must be so said and done as to add strength and unity to the efforts of the United Nations to win the war as quickly and completely as possible in both hemispheres. Failure to make tangible progress with plans for the peace while the war is going on would be as serious a failure in our wartime duties as if our generals failed to plan their next military campaigns while fighting the battles of today. Timing and preparation are as important in peace as in war.

By a living peace, I mean a peace that can grow and adapt itself to the changing needs of humanity. A peace worthy of the infinite price being paid for it must be filled with a vigorous positive force based upon and dedicated to the common interests of humanity.

Today we are assembled under the auspices of the Inter-American Bar Association and of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. It is appropriate, therefore, as a part of our wartime assignment, that we consider as lawyers the premises that already have been widely recognized and to some extent officially approved for the peace we seek.

At least four such statements require such a review. These are the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, certain resolutions of the ministers of foreign affairs of the American Republics released at Rio de Janeiro February 2, 1943, and Senate Resolution 192 adopted by the Senate of the United States of America November 5, 1943, incorporating a part of the Moscow Agreement of October 30, 1943.

In these statements I urge your attention to the specially emphasized portions of them. In those specially emphasized portions I further urge your attention to the unequivocal emphasis upon the three things: (1) The need for unity of action among all the United Nations, large and small; (2) the need for action that will create a living organization capable of meeting the changing needs of the future; and (3) as the statements approach the present, an increasing recognition of the need for early action along these lines.

ATLANTIC CHARTER

First. While the Atlantic Charter purports to be a joint declaration of only the personal points of view of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and has not been incorporated in a treaty, it has received such formal and informal world-wide recognition that any step departing from it would call for a justification of such departure. Its full text is as follows, and I emphasize its sixth paragraph:

"The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

"Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

"Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

"Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

"Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

"Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

"Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments."

DECLARATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Second. On January 1, 1942, 26 nations joined in the declaration by the United Nations. Since then 8 more have adhered to it. This total of 34 United Nations includes 14 of the 21 American republics. The full text of this declaration is as follows, and I emphasize its first paragraph:

"The Governments signatory hereto—

"Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter,

"Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, declare:

"1. Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

"2. Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

"The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism."

RESOLUTION OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Third. Of the many resolutions adopted at the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 21 American republics, at Rio de Janeiro, and released February 2, 1943, Resolutions XXV and XXXV are especially illuminating for our present purposes. Their full text is as follows, and in them I emphasize the first two "resolves" of Resolution XXV, together with the entire single paragraph of Resolution XXXV.

"Resolution XXV

"Post-war problems

"Whereas

"1. World peace must be based on the principles of respect for law, of justice, and of cooperation which inspire the Nations of America and which have been expressed at inter-American meetings held from 1889 to date;

"2. A new order of peace must be supported by economic principles which will insure equitable and lasting international trade with equal opportunities for all nations;

"3. Collective security must be founded not only on political institutions but also on just, effective, and liberal economic systems;

"4. It is indispensable to undertake the immediate study of the bases for this new economic and political order; and

"5. It is an imperative necessity for the countries of America to increase their productive capacity; to secure, from their international trade, returns which will permit them adequately to remunerate labor and improve the standard of living of workers; to protect and preserve the health of their peoples and develop their civilization and culture,

"The third meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics

"Resolves:

"1. To request the governing board of the Pan American Union to convoke an inter-American technical economic conference charged with the study of present and post-war economic problems.

"2. To entrust the Inter-American Juridical Committee with the formulation of specific recommendations relative to the international organization in the juridical and political fields, and in the field of international security.

"3. To entrust the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee with a similar function in the economic field, to make the necessary preparations for the Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, referred to in the first paragraph of this resolution.

"4. To request the Pan American Union to appoint an executive committee to receive such projects as the American nations may present, and to submit said projects, respectively, to the Inter-American Juridical Committee and to the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee.

"5. To request the Pan American Union to direct this executive committee to submit the recommendations of the Inter-American Juridical Committee to the governments of the American republics so that the conclusions reached may be adopted at a subsequent meeting of ministers of foreign affairs.

"6. To request the Pan American Union to determine, in agreement with the governments of the American republics, the date and place of meeting of the Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, referred to in the first paragraph of this resolution."

"Resolution XXXV

"Support and adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter

"The third meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the American republics

"Resolves:

"To take note of the contents of the Atlantic Charter and to express to the President of the United States of America its satisfaction with the inclusion in that document of principles which constitute a part of the juridical heritage of America in accordance with the Convention on Rights and Duties of States approved at the Seventh International Conference of American States, held at Montevideo in 1933."

Pursuant to these resolutions, the respective committees have been proceeding with the assignments made to them. This is a clear recognition of the immediateness of the need for consideration of the subjects outlined a year ago.

In this connection it also will be appropriate to emphasize the recognition which

the American republics have given to the relationship of their American problems to those of the world. This was well stated in the joint declaration by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of these republics in 1939. This statement is as follows—and I emphasize its third, fourth, and fifth sentences:

"The inter-American system is not founded on any spirit of isolation, nor is it in any sense antagonistic to any other section of the world or to any other international organization. The American republics feel that they have a set of problems peculiar to themselves, and that these can best be solved by cooperative action among the several states. At the same time, they recognize the interdependence of the world as a whole, and the inevitable necessity of every state and region maintaining contact with and being influenced by developments in every other state or region. The American republics have, therefore, adopted a series of rules and principles to govern their relations with noncontinental states and regions. These rules and principles are free from any selfish purpose of isolation, but are inspired by a deep sense of universal cooperation."

UNITED STATES SENATE RESOLUTION 192

It remained for the representatives of the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China to crystallize the growing appreciation of the need for early international organization of the United and Associated Nations. They did so in the fourth paragraph of their Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943.

When this paragraph was released to the world on November 1, it was seized upon at once by the Senate of the United States of America and incorporated, word for word, as the fourth paragraph of Senate Resolution 192, which, at that moment, was pending on the floor of the Senate. On November 5 this resolution was adopted by a vote of 85 to 5. It constitutes the one current declaration by the Senate of the United States of America as to its future international policy. Its full text is as follows—and I emphasize its fourth paragraph:

"*Resolved*, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

"That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

"That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

In the light of all these governmental statements it is appropriate to quote here the recent declarations of the American Bar Association and of the Inter-American Bar Association in this field. The house of delegates of the American Bar Association at Chicago, March 30, 1943, adopted the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association endorses, as one of the primary war and peace objectives of the United Nations, agreement among such nations for the complete establishment and maintenance at the earliest possible moment of an effective international order among all nations based on law and the orderly administration of justice."

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

The Inter-American Bar Association at its Rio de Janeiro conference on August 14, 1943, adopted the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That the Inter-American Bar Association endorses as a primary peace objective the establishment and maintenance, at the earliest possible moment, of a uniform international system, with judicial, legislative, and executive functions, based on moral and juridical principles and on the internal experience of all nations, and adapted to the requirements and limitations of international cooperation."

If we are now to translate these fine words into deeds there must be established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization open to membership by at least all of the United Nations, large and small, and flexible enough to meet the changing needs of the future in maintaining international peace and security.

ESTABLISHED UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

To this end, let us consider what, if anything, the world now has in the nature of such an international organization which directly affects the United States of America and then let us consider by whom, where, and when the next step should be taken toward the perfection of such an organization to meet the needs of the future. Outstanding among the international organizations of the world there are the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice. With them go the physical facilities including the palace of the League at Geneva and also a wealth of experience gained by the world and particularly by the many men and women who have taken part in the last 24 years in the work of the Secretariat and of the many related activities of the League. While it is true that the United States of America has not served as a member of the League, it has taken part through observers or otherwise in many of the League's activities, has developed a staff familiar with the work of the League, and recognizes that experience of great value to the world is available as a result of the work of the League. This does not mean that the League necessarily must be revived as such, but it does mean that the assets derived from the League are bound to be helpful.

Apart from the League of Nations, the United States of America has entered into hundreds of international treaties and is an active participant in scores of international undertakings. If the United States is to retain the benefits of the civilization of today, it is inescapable that the United States must work with other nations of the world. I shall mention some 40 examples of international activities to illustrate these relationships. As a result of modern conditions, as evidenced by these accepted relationships and otherwise, the question no longer is whether or not the United States shall enter into international relationships with the other nations, but it is rather, How can the United States maintain international relationship with the world to its own best advantage and how can the United States, in so doing, be of the most help in establishing and maintaining peace and security in the world? A partial list of our established international relationships is as follows:

Of general scope: Pan American Union—Dealing with great numbers of international interests among the 21 American republics.

Legal questions: International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, Permanent Committee of Jurists on Civil and Commercial Laws, Committee of Experts on the Codification of Private International Law, Inter-American Juridical Committee, Permanent Committee of Habana on Comparative Legislation and the Unification of Legislation, Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission, Inter-American Trade-Mark Bureau.

Labor questions: International Labor Organization.

Agricultural, industrial, and financial questions: International Institute of Agriculture, International Sugar Council, International Wheat Advisory Committee, International Coffee Board, International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, United Nations Commission on Food and Agriculture.

Questions of communication: International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union, Bureau of the International Telecommunications Union, International Radio Consulting Committee, Inter-American Radio Office, International Hydrographic Bureau, Permanent American Aeronautical Commssion.

Health and social questions: International Office of Public Health, Permanent Central Opium Board, Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees, American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Standards and statistics: International Bureau of Weights and Measures, International Statistical Bureau.

Art, science, and education: International Commission on Historic Monuments, Bureau of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, International Council of Scientific Unions.

Military boards: Combined Chiefs of Staff, Combined Munitions Assignments Board, Combined Raw Materials Board, Combined Production and Resources Board, Combined Food Board, Combined Shipping Adjustment Board.

The foregoing are evidence that the day of strict isolation of the United States has passed. There can be no question that the United States wishes to take full advantage of the scientific, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and cultural developments of modern civilization. As an isolated nation we cannot do this any more than a hermit, living alone, can keep up with the opportunities and standards of living of the modern world. The foregoing examples identify but a few of the problems of infinitely varying degrees of formality that naturally arise from the world-wide human relationships of today and from our standards of living that are dependent upon carefully adjusted scientific programs.

NEED FOR FOUNDATION FOR PEACE AND SECURITY

In spite of these friendly organizations, the whole structure of society has been so threatened by the uncompromising attack of Germany, Italy, and Japan that civilization was, and still is, threatened with destruction. Our primary obligation, therefore, is to look to the foundations of our peace and security. While recognizing the existence of the interesting superstructure of our world-wide international legal, economic, social, and cultural progress, we must look first to the foundation stones of the peace and security of the world. Having founded the temple on a rock, we can then make good use of the plans and blueprints for upper stories. Our first problem is that of security, and nothing must be allowed to divert us from its solution. The holocaust of today is but the penalty for our failure to build our present temple of peace upon sufficiently broad, deep,

and strong foundations. It is fundamental that we wish our civilization to be founded upon the consent and support of the individual men and women of the world so that they may enjoy what the United States of America has identified as their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. For over 150 years this has been our faith. We are dedicated to the cause of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery—to be attained as circumstances shall permit. This eliminates from the plans of the United States any Pax Romana based upon conquering and enslaving the world by the aggression of any one or more of the United Nations. Similarly, the United States sees all too clearly that the inevitable failure to keep forever in balance the power of the peace-loving and that of the war-loving nations has led to this greatest of all wars.

It is for this reason that every declaration of policy which has been read has emphasized the need for the formation this time of an international organization open at least to all of the United Nations, large or small, to establish and maintain peace and security in the world. The United Nations, by their victory in the war, will have demonstrated that as long as they remain united there is substantial military assurance of peace and security. On the other hand, if this championship team shall be permitted to disintegrate in any degree, there enters immediately a corresponding degree of uncertainty as to the future. Regardless of the reason which leads any nation, large or small, to withdraw from the United Nations, such withdrawal will produce at once a need on the part of every nation to offset that uncertainty. This soon leads to alliances and counteralliances until the pattern of the next war again is written in them.

NEED FOR EARLY ACTION

More important then, than any other national or international policy of this or any other nation is the simple need for continued unity among the United Nations. Such unity exists now in time of war. The primary obligation of every peace-loving nation is to see to it that it continues in time of peace. It is important, therefore, that there be no period of uncertainty following the release of the force of common danger from the enemy that holds us together with the urge of self-preservation in the face of murderous attack. This makes it important that agreements for peacetime unity receive substantial and widespread approval before the coming of the peace. Only in unity is there reasonable promise of peace. The chances of reaching such understandings in time of war are better than they will be in time of peace. Each of the United Nations is now under pressure for continued unity with the others so as to win the war. This pressure will not come with equal force after the war for then disagreements will be much easier because of no immediate danger of military disaster as the penalty for failure to agree.

Appreciation of this importance is reflected clearly in the Moscow Agreement and in the resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States on November 5, 1943. The fact of the situation is, however, that, as yet representatives of only the four principal allies among the United Nations have met and made this declaration, or apparently have discussed its implications.

THE SMALLER UNITED NATIONS

Each of the other 30 United Nations is important to the conduct of the war in a varying but vital degree. Their unity in peace is vital to the continuance of that peace. The interests of each of these nations are entitled to the same fairness, firmness, and kindness as are those of each other such nations. This is the meaning of their "sovereign equality"—this their inalienable right. It is essential that each shall receive fair treatment, regardless of its size, if our ideals are to be translated into practice and if there is to be a just, a lasting, and a living peace in the world.

The time is ripe for the United Nations to meet this fundamental problem of their unity. It must not be left to improvisation. It can be solved successfully only through the kind of frank and fair consultation that must mark future dealings among these nations in time of peace, if peace is to be the rule of the future. In that peace every man, woman, and child, the world over, has a stake of life and death.

THE NEXT STEP

The next step, therefore, should be meetings of representatives of all of the United Nations, large or small, for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations in the interest of establishing and maintaining peace and security in the world. The time for such a step is now. The place for the meeting is here in view of our comparative safety from hostile attack and our geographical availability to the nations concerned. Including Canada, 15 of the 34 United Nations are in the Americas, and the call of such a meeting might well bring forth the adherence of some or all of the remaining 7 American republics.

While such a step toward carrying out the program of the Moscow Declaration might well be sponsored by all four of the participants in that declaration, it is highly appropriate, in view of the incorporation of this policy into the resolution of the United States Senate of November 5, and in view of the dedication of the United States throughout its history to a policy of disinterested helpfulness, for the United States of America to take the lead at once in urging upon all of its allies the importance of this step. Such meetings, under the pressure of war, can contribute much to the firmer unity of the participants in the conduct of the war as well as to their greater faith in the program of the peace.

It was this procedure that was in the minds of the four Senators of the United States who on March 16 introduced Senate Resolution 114, calling for the initiation of meetings of this kind. Senate Resolution 192, as adopted on November 5, covered much of the substance of the earlier resolution, but omitted all reference to procedure.

Lapse of time has rendered the action more, rather than less, appropriate. The need for it has increased rather than decreased. Not many decades ago the United States of America was one of the smaller nations of the world seeking the same freedoms for itself that it supports now for all the peace-making nations of the world, large or small. If the United States is to live up to its present responsibilities for its own peace and security and to its ultimate ideals for the individual man, the next step toward the establishment and maintenance of the peace and security of the world is for the United States of America to invite its co-sponsors of the Moscow Agreement and all of the other United Nations to meet here in the interests of furthering the establishment at the earliest practicable date of a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

This expresses the spirit of the American republics. This is a step on the road to lasting peace.

Some Criminologists and Free Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am placing in the RECORD an article by the Reverend John Edward Coogan, S. J., which appeared in the latest issue of Federal Probation, a publication of the administrative office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice.

Father Coogan is the director of the department of sociology at the University of Detroit.

The article follows:

SOME CRIMINOLOGISTS AND FREE WILL

(By John Edward Coogan, S. J., director, department of sociology, University of Detroit)

During the past few years American students of criminology have witnessed something of a crescendo in the deterministic attack upon the free-will explanation of human conduct. Dr. Edwin Sutherland may be cited as a mild beginning. He declares that during the past 50 years the explanation of human conduct based on doctrines of free will and individual responsibility has been attacked with such apparent success that the whole superstructure of punishment has been overturned.[1] Dr. Wood, professor of sociology, University of Michigan, goes further; he summarily disposes of the mens rea description of the criminal as an unscientific survival of theological notions of sin.[2] Dr. Taft, too, professor of sociology, University of Illinois, although acknowledging that determinism is still a mere hypothesis, claims for it a high pragmatic value, and feels that it is obviously verified in the best life histories of criminals.[3]

It is in Dr. Barnes, however, that determinism finds its most forthright champion. It has already been many years since he flatly declared that the scientifically minded person can only approach the free-will explanation of criminal conduct in an attitude of mingled amusement and impatience.[4] In his most recent work he explains all human conduct as determined by heredity and environment; thus disposing, he thinks, of the old bugaboo of freedom or perverse will.[5] Several writers, too, in recent issues of Federal Probation have come out ringingly for determinism. Thus Dr. J. P. Shalloo of the department of sociology, University of Pennsylvania: "The theoretical explanations of the Middle Ages stemming from and ending in theological, metaphysical, and philosophical speculations about the nature of the will and its relation to sin probably set back our understanding of human conduct at least 500 years * * *."[6] And the psychiatrist,

[1] Principles of Criminology, 1942, p. 366f.

[2] Arthur Evans Wood and John Barker Waite, Crime and Its Treatment, 1941, pp. 480, 484.

[3] Donald R. Taft, Criminology, 1942, pp. 290–295.

[4] Current History Magazine, June 1926.

[5] Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology, 1943, p. 173f.

[6] Trends in Criminological Research, October-December 1942, p. 21.

Dr. A. A. Brill: "In brief, all our acts are definitely determined by our congenital constitution (inheritance) and our cultural environment (fate)." [7] (It seems worth noting that the arguments such determinists commonly urge against human free will are urged just as forcibly against the free will of God Himself. And as a matter of fact deterministic criminologists are usually contemptuous of or at least indifferent to religion as a reformative influence. However, we here confine our attention to the matter of human free will.)

POPULAR BELIEF IN THE FREE WILL

Many thoughtful readers must be puzzled by the self-confident repudiation by professional criminologists of the whole structure and framework of the common sense explanation of human behavior. The arguments for free will have had the respectful attention of the world of philosophy for nearly 2,500 years. Many of the best minds of the ages have been and are today libertarian; among these being William James, probably the outstanding figure in the history of American psychology. Popularly the conviction of free will is as taken-for-granted as is the air we breathe. It was taught in the colleges and universities from which came the founding fathers of our country. It was the inspiration of the frontiersmen who from a wilderness carved out an empire. Today it remains the presupposition of our laws, our law courts; it is the assumption of our convicts and their custodians alike.

The most reasonable explanation of the nonchalance with which some of these criminologists scorn free will would seem to be perhaps their unfamiliarity with the respect shown it in its proper field of philosophy and psychology. But, granted this unfamiliarity, there still stands clearly before us the adherence of the mass mind to free will; it would, then, seem that a democratic appreciation of the judgment of the common man should counsel something of diffidence in its rejection by the professional criminologist. The criminologist may be one man in a thousand, but he isn't a thousand times a man. Moreover, the pathway of criminological theory is so strewn with the dry bones of discarded theories, the certitudes of yesteryear, that a proper humility—even a saving sense of humor—should suggest to the criminologist caution lest he but add to the calcium deposit. This the more especially since—a most important reminder—the adjudication of the claims of free will versus determinism is the function of psychology, not of criminology. Hence, in attempting the adjudication the criminologist, as such, is quite outside his field.

THE NEED FOR DEFINING THE TERM

Few, if any, of the criminologists who so confidently scorn the free-will explanation of human conduct take the trouble to show just what that explanation is. And those who do take the trouble rarely succeed in describing the free will in such terms that its fondest adherents would recognize it. Thus Dr. Taft thinks deterministic the finding that "the criminal is a product." Of course, he is a product; every effect is a product. But is he always and everywhere the product only of forces over which he had no control? Dr. Sutherland, too, surprises us when he declares that voluntarists assume that the naked will, unaffected by previous experiences or attendant circumstance, is the explanation of behavior.[8] What representative spokesman of the free-will camp makes such assumptions he does not say. Certainly the assumptions would already have seemed puerile to the great medieval philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas, the champion of free will. Dr. Wood, too, might reasonably be asked to supply proof for his dictum that laws exempting from criminal responsibility, wholly or in part (as in the case of children, feeble-minded, and insane), are, of course, contrary to the assumption of free will.[9] As a matter of fact, the medieval explanation of free will already made such concessions axiomatic.

And Dr. Barnes' confident assertion that to anyone who is familiar with the activities of criminals it is evident that punishment for the sake of deterrence cannot be squared with the doctrine of the free moral agent. If, says Dr. Barnes, a man in deciding his course if not affected by his previous experiences, punishment will not deter him from crime.[10] Where does Dr. Barnes find voluntarists contending that man is not affected by his previous experiences? The contrary was already taught by the arch voluntarist Aquinas nearly 700 years ago. Dr. Barnes here sends Prof. Willard Waller into the lists for him; and yet the latter admits that there are but a few who hold to the absolute freedom of the will "in its logical completeness." [11] That is to say, there are few (are there any at all?) who hold the concept of free will that Professor Waller thinks they ought to hold. He acknowledges to his disgust that the voluntarists themselves put many limitations on the concept of free will. Since this is so, why are these limitations so commonly ignored in these determinists' explanations of and attacks upon the free-will system? But complaints against determinists on this score are an old story. More than 50 years ago William James wrote: "Caricatures of the kind of supposition which free will demands abound in deterministic literature." [12]

VOLITION AND SELF-DETERMINATION

In order, then, that readers may have a clear idea of the meaning of the unfairly assailed free-will concept, I offer this brief outline, altogether inadequate though it must necessarily be. The free will is conceived of as that personal power by virtue of which a man determines his own volitions; his volitions are not made for him by circumstance, as rivers run and rain falls; but are the consequence of his own active determination. Thus the movement of his will need not be the resultant of a "parallelogram of force"; neither is he "a graven image, pushed from behind." He can actively refuse to be a soft touch for any least desire, or even for "lust incandescent in the flesh." In the determination of his course of willing he can cast the decisive vote. In order that he may thus freely choose his own course it is obviously necessary that he perceive that there is at least a twofold choice; and for the alternate courses he must perceive proportionate motives. We are not defending even the possibility of motiveless willing. For a course of action involving serious consequences, the proportionate motives will, of course, be serious; they need not, however, be equal. The obviously less rational or less attractive choice may be made by the agent's active interposition of the ego; the agent decides after the manner of an arbitrator which of the conflicting motives is to prevail.[13]

Champions of the free will are altogether falsely charged with conceiving of it as operating in a vacuum, remote from all human circumstance and play of passion. These champions, however, call it most obvious that whatever obscures the mind in its perception of motive impairs the freedom of the will. And passion may be so violent as to rob the mind entirely of the perception that there is a twofold choice; will-action at such a time would not be free.[14] Habit, too, for example that of following the crowd, can give such a bias to the will that the dictates of reason are little noted; hence freedom of action is often thus seriously impaired.

EVIDENCE OF FREEDOM OF THE WILL

As to proof for the freedom of the will, this paper would be intolerably long if we gave more than a suggestion: It is then a fact of universal experience that we perceive ourselves freely choosing; for example, each time we resist a strong temptation. Note therefore, we are not deducing free will as a consequence of some dogma; we are pointing to immediate evidence. We are as immediately conscious of the very act of choice as we are conscious of an act of sight or hearing. It is determinism that must contradict this immediate evidence, and the reason for that contradiction is the determinist dogma that the law of necessity found in physics and chemistry must be verified in every field. But "facts are stubborn things," and the massed millions remain as convinced of the fact of their perception of freedom-in-action as if the determinists of twenty-five hundred years had never lived. If the immediate perception of the mass of mankind were so absolutely and invincibly erroneous, then any judgment might be erroneous; and there would follow universal skepticism, a mental state both self-contradictory in theory and never found in practice.[15]

Further evidence for the freedom of the will is had from the essential discrimination which all of us make between two types of action: Before one type we hesitate, deliberate, consult, predict, promise; whereas before the other type we would think such conduct absurd. What sufficient reason can we offer for such essentially different modes of conduct unless experience has shown us that the one set of actions depends on our free choice, the other does not. This testimony to the fact of free will is further confirmed by the essentially different mental states had after acting. After some acts we feel not mere disappointment at the evil consequences; we feel positive remorse, we continue even for years to blame ourselves. After other acts which may have had a much worse effect, we feel nothing more than regret. "There is a plain difference between the sorrow of a murderer and the sorrow of a man who has accidentally killed his friend." Again we ask, what sufficient reason is there for this abiding difference of consequent mental state unless in the one case there is a perceived guilty responsibility? [16]

THE OUTLOOK FROM THE TWO POINTS OF VIEW

Before closing let us briefly compare the promise for criminology of the two contending explanations of human conduct. If man has a free will, then no matter what the threat or what the attraction, provided only he clearly perceives the fact of a twofold choice with proportionate motives, his choice is in his own hands, he can still stand firm. Be his heredity what it may, his environment never so defective; be he the illegitimate son of Blue Beard and the Witch of Endor; nevertheless, given that perception of the twofold choice, he can still proclaim:

"I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

On the other hand, according to determinist theory, let him be the son and heir

[7] Is Punishment a Deterrent? January–March 1943, p. 19.
[8] Op. cit., p. 366.
[9] Op. cit., p. 484.
[10] New Horizons in Criminology, p. 394.
[11] Ibid., p. 393.
[12] Principles of Psychology, Holt & Co., 1890, vol. II, p. 577n.
[13] Hubert Gruender, S. J., Problems of Psychology, Bruce, 1937, p. 70f.
[14] Richard R. Baker, The Thomistic Theory of the Passions and Their Influence Upon the Will, Notre Dame, 1941, p. 120ff.
[15] Gruender, Experimental Psychology, Bruce, 1932, p. 433f.
[16] Gruender, Problems of Psychology, p. 84f.

of a professor of criminology and a policewoman, let his environment be air-conditioned and sterilized, let him be raised on one cow's milk and let no metal touch him; let him have the courage of a Daniel Boone and the intelligence of an Einstein, nevertheless, some obscure defect, say, of the "glands of destiny," may disgrace him. If conduct is absolutely determined by heredity an environment, then since all our family strains have likely suffered some impairment during the unnumbered centuries, and the environment of all of us is somewhat defective, there can be no assurance in life's major crises that the preponderance of force is not toward evil; a preponderance which, in the supposition of determinism, we have no power to resist. Thus one may ambition to serve his country, "be a hero in the strife," but by force of evil circumstance to his own wide-eyed horror find himself irresistibly carried on to treason.

This matter of the relative promise for criminology of the two systems under discussion has elicited an interesting rejoinder from Dr. Barnes: Free will, he says, offers no basis for reform; it allows that even a eugenic babe, raised remote from all evil influence, may go wrong. Determinism, on the other hand, would, he says, give assurance that such a lad would not be likely to go wrong.[17] Even accepting Dr. Barnes' description of the possibilities under the two systems, it is not obvious that eugenic babes would fare better under determinism; confessedly they might go wrong under either system. Moreover, since eugenic babes are not too common, and some defects of both heredity and environment are, as we have said, always to be feared, the determinists' description of the critical importance, the all-importance of those elements, would lead us to conclude that determinism denies to any child the positive assurance that he even can go straight, no matter what the temptation.

Arguing also in favor of the social utility of determinism, Professor Taft asks, if man's will is free, why study the causes of crime at all? If the will is free, he adds, crime cannot be prevented.[18] From what we have already said it should be quite apparent that since both bad heredity and bad environment can give a powerful bias to the will, research and prevention are matters altogether worth while. The professor's charge, too, that the free-will concept requires that we hate the criminal[19] need not long detain us: We hate the sin, but not the sinner. Christianity, which so emphasizes free will, is at least as emphatic in its mandate of universal love and brotherhood: "Judge not, lest ye be judged," "He that hateth his brother is a murderer," "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," such as these are of the very marrow of Christianity, perfectly compatible with the free-will concept.

Gladly, therefore, do we concur in the traditional mass judgment of America asserting free will. With the democratic masses we repudiate the fatalistic creed that "there is not the slightest iota of choice allowed to any individual from birth to the grave."[20] Ours rather is the vitalistic conviction of William James that "the whole feeling of reality, the whole sting and excitement of our voluntary life depends on our sense that in it things are really being decided from one moment to another, and that it is not the dull rattling off of a chain that was forged innumerable ages ago."[21]

[17] Society in Transition, Prentice-Hall, 1939, p. 57.
[18] Op. cit., p. 291.
[19] Ibid., p. 292f.
[20] Barnes, Current History Magazine, June 1926.
[21] Op. cit., vol. I, p. 453.

Lessons From a Historic Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Lessons From a Historic Debate," written by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and published in the New York Times magazine of January 30, 1944.

In his article the Senator from Massachusetts states:

We should not revive the old controversy over the League, but use it as a guide for our future policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS FROM A HISTORIC DEBATE—SENATOR LODGE SAYS WE SHOULD NOT REVIVE THE OLD CONTROVERSY OVER THE LEAGUE, BUT USE IT AS A GUIDE FOR OUR FUTURE POLICY

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Senator from Massachusetts)

Almost 24 years ago—on March 19, 1920, to be exact—the Treaty of Versailles, containing the Covenant of the League of Nations and the reservations adopted by the Senate, came to its final vote. The vote was 49 in the affirmative, 35 votes being cast against it. Inasmuch as a two-thirds vote was required, the treaty was not ratified. Twenty-four Democrats and 14 Republicans voted or were paired against ratification. Twenty-three Democrats voted or were paired in favor of ratification. From that day to this the Versailles Treaty has been officially dead.

It was, I suppose, only natural that this controversy should have given rise to much strong feeling and the verbal excesses which such feeling entails. At that particular time an America which was war-weary and disillusioned by its contacts with foreign nations resorted to a vilification of the President and cast aspersions on his motives which every lover of truth and fair play must deplore. This particular variety of "tumult and shouting" has happily died down. But, just as unfortunately, the pendulum of public opinion has now swung to the other extreme, and today it is becoming fashionable in some quarters to vilify and impugn the motives of those who differed with President Wilson.

It is not to defend any individuals, however, that I am writing these lines. Rather is it because of my conviction that there are very valuable lessons to be learned from the League of Nations which can be of great usefulness to the American people today. We therefore owe it to ourselves to learn these lessons instead of reviving and indulging in the personalities and epithets which are now almost 25 years old. What are some of these valuable lessons?

First is the fact that the League of Nations Covenant was tied to the Versailles Treaty and therefore never had a chance to be considered on its own merits. It had to suffer continuously from the imperfections of the treaty, which were conceded by practically everyone.

Second was the fact that the League Covenant was a full-blown panacea for the ills of the world, instead of being an extension of the very effective international organization which had just concluded a victorious war. Unlike the recent agreements at Moscow and Teheran, it did not seek to build on a proved and working foundation.

In the Covenant itself there were five principal bones of contention, which, out of many other topics in dispute, became the problems which above all others could not be solved:

First of these was the insistence of the Senate that the United States should retain the right to determine what are and are not domestic issues.

Second was the desire of many Senators that China, instead of Japan, obtain the former German rights in China.

The third problem arose from the insistence of the Senate that the United States should reserve the right to interpret the Monroe Doctrine.

The fourth disagreement occurred on the question of the United States having equality of voting with the other nations who were members of the league.

The fifth—and perhaps the most insoluble of them all—was raised by article X, which committed the United States to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of members of the League. To this article the Senate added the reservation that military action taken in conformity with the article should be by act or joint resolution of Congress. In other words, it was not contended that the United States should never seek to preserve the territorial integrity of another country. This reservation merely stated that in any particular case which might arise Congress would have to act.

As one ponders these obstacles today, one has the right to feel optimistic about the future. The Mackinac declarations, the Vandenberg-White resolution, and the Connally resolution, together with the debates in the House and Senate, make it abundantly clear that no responsible body of opinion either here or abroad suggests depriving the United States or any other country of its right to determine what is or is not a domestic question. There is certainly no disposition anywhere to confer any rights on Japan.

It seems fanciful to suggest that our right to interpret the Monroe Doctrine or to promote our very successful policy with Latin America will be questioned. Implicit in the recent gatherings in Moscow and Teheran is the realization that no international arrangement will work unless the great military powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China—are the core of such an arrangement, and no one therefore seriously entertains the thought that these great nations will put themselves in a position where minor nationalities through unequal voting will be able to control their destiny.

The fact of the matter is—and it is a most encouraging fact—that the steps which have been taken so far with regard to the aftermath of World War No. 2 specifically and categorically reserve the principle of national sovereignty and the principle of constitutional process. One of the greatest, most far-reaching, and most fundamental constitutional processes is the power of Congress to declare war. No responsible man suggests today that Congress should be deprived of that power. Yet—strange to relate—it was the simple insistence on that power which caused so much disagreement in connection with article X.

At the time of the League of Nations debate three schools of thought developed. There were the so-called irreconcilables who

wanted no form of international arrangement, and many of whom took the view that disputes which arose in other parts of the world were none of our business. This view, I think, is just as out of date today as the view that the United States should submit its domestic questions to the control of a few small nations.

The second school of thought was represented by those who favored ratifying the treaty exactly as it was submitted.

The third school of thought was represented by those who favored ratification of the treaty with reservations covering the points which I have summarized. It was to this group that my grandfather, the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, belonged. The irreconsiliables wanted nothing to be ratified. The advocates of the League as presented also wanted nothing unless they could have the original draft. The advocates of the treaty with reservations opposed the treaty in its original draft. What they wanted was the treaty with reservations—and they wanted it so badly that after the vote of November 19, 1919, they sought and brought to pass a second vote on March 19, 1920. Any reader of the debates will see that the partisans of all three schools of thought were earnest and in good faith.

It is perhaps human nature to seek to dramatize a conflict with a hero on one side and a villain on the other. Life and history would indeed be simple if it could be stated in terms of black and white. If you think of the League of Nations debate in terms of heroes and villains or of angels and devils, you may give yourself an exciting time but you will miss the central truth. If you seek to personalize the blame for the United States not becoming a member of the League, you will have to overlook the record. You will have to overlook the fact that on March 19, 1920, 24 of the President's followers voted against ratification of the treaty with reservations. If they had voted for ratification, we would have become members of the League.

Whether or not our membership in the League would have altered the course of events is a matter of conjecture. If we had remained in the grip of that strong aversion to military preparedness which characterized our policy after World War No. 1, our period of membership in the League would not have been very effective. Indeed, it might have involved us in war even sooner. Be that as it may, the situation was well stated by Dorothy Thompson in an article under date of October 18, 1943, wherein she said:

"Our participation in the League of Nations foundered on the fact that the President insisted on the whole treaty and Covenant being accepted in toto, without a single modification. Now, the interesting thing about the whole controversy is that the modifications demanded by the Senate, chief among which were those applying to sanctions, were not unacceptable to the Allied Powers. Actually, in operation, the interpretation of the Covenant desired by the Senators was internationally accepted, and was probably the sense of the questionable paragraph from the beginning. The President, who wished to force his will upon the Senate rather than take nine-tenths of a loaf, got, in the end, no loaf at all."

Yet while one must not place the responsibility for our not joining the League upon the Senate, neither should one place it on the President. It was both a personal and a national tragedy that he should have lost his health at such a decisive moment in history. One is certainly justified in believing that a man of his intelligence, with his experience in government, both as Governor and as President, would have shown those gifts of mediation which are the essence of democratic government—if he had kept his health. Neither he nor anyone else can be blamed for the cruel physical blow which fell upon him and without which a true meeting of minds would probably have taken place.

The great events which sway the lives of millions of people and shape their destinies in the future are the products of joint effort by the dreamers on the one hand and the men of practical action on the other. The world needs dreamers because without them nothing new would ever be attained. The world needs men of practical action because without them nothing that the dreamers proposed would be workable. The failure of the League of Nations can, I submit, be traced to the fact that the dreamers and the men of practical action did not get together. That they did not do so is not their fault but is rather due to nature—which struck down the health of the President.

In the years which followed, the misfortune was not ended. It is needless to say that the policies pursued in the twenties and thirties would not have met with the approval of President Wilson. But it should also be set down that our failure to arm and our consequent inability to take effective action in foreign affairs would have incurred the equally strong disapproval of many of those who opposed the President.

May we not draw from this page of history lessons which will enable us to avoid the misfortunes of the past—lessons which will enable us to achieve that "procedure of cooperation with other nations likewise intent upon security" whereby, as Secretary Hull told the Congress upon his return from Moscow, "we can and will remain masters of our own fate."

Memorandum Referred to in Speech of Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland in Congressional Record of Friday, January 28, 1944, Answering Charges Made by the Honorable Robert F. Jones on October 26, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] obtained leave for me to insert in my remarks certain materials obtained from the Maritime Commission in answer to charges made by the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, on the floor on October 26, 1943, when he introduced his resolution to investigate operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. These were omitted from the RECORD on Friday, and I ask leave to insert them now in the Appendix as an addition to my remarks made on Friday last:

We have made an examination of all of the eight different charges made by Representative ROBERT F. JONES, on October 26, 1943, when he introduced a resolution to investigate operations of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

We have also investigated the various articles along the same lines written by Willard Edwards in the Washington Times-Herald and those made by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont.

Charge one: "Twelve subsidized shipping concerns have $200,000,000 of earnings and profits in their reserve funds—tax free."

This charge appears to be a reiteration in oversimplified form of statements made by Senator AIKEN on the floor of the Senate on March 19, 1943, and fully answered by the Commission in a communication printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1943 (pp. 2354 to 2356). The charge is not only factually erroneous, but on its face raises no question of improper administration by the Commission, and the question it does raise is solely as to the wisdom of the policy enacted into law by Congress.

The statement as to the amount of moneys held in the reserve fund is wide of the mark by almost $120,000,000, based upon the latest available figures. As of October 31, 1943, the amount in the capital-reserve fund was $26,772,106.83, and the amount held in the special reserve fund was $54,072,796.02. Of the $54,072,796.02 held in the special reserve fund, at least $28,000,000 represents obligations in favor of the Commission on account of recapturable subsidy which fall due at the end of each 10-year accounting period provided for in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Assuming that the figures of $200,000,000 is intended to refer to cumulative gross deposits in the reserve fund, substantial deductions are to be made on account of deposits made of depreciation on subsidized vessels and deposits of amounts representing book values of vessels sold or lost in order to arrive at the proportion of profits which may be considered tax free. As pointed out in the communication referred to above, of the $174,000,000 deposits mentioned by Senator AIKEN, at least $33,000,000 were not, in any sense, deposits of taxable income.

Apart from any question of the accuracy of the figures, the establishment of the reserve fund and the making of withdrawals therefrom are based upon statutory requirements. The capital-reserve fund was primarily set up for the purposes of acquiring new vessels for operation in the subsidized services and for the reduction of mortgage indebtedness on vessels employed in such services. The special reserve fund was established (1) to protect the interests of the United States in recapturable subsidy; (2) to provide a reserve against years of operating losses, normally to be expected in the light of shipping experience; and (3) to the extent it is prudent to do so, to provide a supplemental source through which replacement tonnage may be financed. (See section 607 (a) (b) (c) and (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.)

Since the subject matter of the charge involves only questions of congressional policy, it seems unnecessary that the Commission make any more than the foregoing brief comment thereon. The Commission is convinced of the soundness of this policy and has consistently administered the reserve provisions of the act in conformity with its letter and spirit.

Charge 2: "Insurance was placed on the steamship *Coolidge* for $7,000,000, more than twice the book value of the ship."

The facts on which this charge is based are not materially in dispute. The net book value of the *Coolidge* as of December 31, 1941, when it was delivered under charter to the Government, was $3,978,217.61, computed in accordance with General Order No. 24 of the Commission, which is used in determining invested capital for subsidy purposes, and was not and is not intended to be an estimate of value for sale, insurance, or other purposes. The book value of the *Coolidge* for income-tax purposes as of the same date was

$5,307,544.50. The charge is directed against the propriety of using commercial value for insurance purposes, as distinguished from book value.

The possibility that the Commission might have to provide insurance for vessels of high commercial value, where the insurance could not be taken care of in the American commercial market, the capacity of which was $4,000,000 for any one risk, led to the enactment of legislation granting such authority in October 1940. In connection with this legislation, appropriations obtained from Congress in the amount of $40,000,000 provided a revolving fund for the insurance activities authorized by that act. The House Appropriations Committee was supplied with specific information covering 1940 insurance values then contemplated for 15 large vessels, including the *Coolidge*, and we stated the estimated insurance value of the *Coolidge* at $7,500,000. The report of the House Appropriations Committee (Rept. No. 2743, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) gives among the reasons for the enactment of the legislation and the provision of an insurance fund, the following:

"* * * Under existing war conditions American commerce may be jeopardized by inability to secure from the usual sources insurance against marine perils and marine war risks. It is also doubtful whether the private insurance market has sufficient capacity adequately to protest the high values which may be exposed to war perils even in the case of neutral merchant fleets. * * *

"* * * In addition to the safeguarding of our commerce against such a contingency, there are about 15 vessels under the American flag of such high value that they cannot be insured to their full value by the American insurance market."

The Commission has consistently exercised its insurance powers in accordance with commercial practice and has furnished marine and war-risk insurance in accordance with the law. Insurance valuations of the *Coolidge* in the commercial market for the policy years beginning October 1, 1938, to October 1, 1941, inclusive, ranged between $7,230,000 and $7,510,000.

In the light of the foregoing legislative history and the statutes which the Commission is charged with administering, there was no justification for using book value in determining the valuation of the *Coolidge* for insurance purposes. The figure of $7,000,000, which is $500,000 less than that furnished to the Appropriations Committee, was a fair and reasonable value for insurance purposes.

Charge 3: "Six American Export Line ships valued at $232,350 made six trips for $1,724,918 in charter hire, of which $1,574,144 was profit."

The six American Export Line ships referred to were each either 21 or 22 years old, and had a depreciated aggregate value of $232,350.07. That value and their age had no relation, however, to their earning capacity, except as to their ability to deliver cargo at its destination.

The total revenue earned by these six vessels on their trips to the Red Sea and return was $3,023,897.46, which included the $1,724,918.64 charter hire paid for the outward trip for the British Ministry of War Transport.

The direct voyage expense was $1,668,695.99 and the direct voyage profit for the round trip was $1,355,201.47. No taxes, and no overhead expenses were included in the voyage expenses.

The Maritime Commission considered the amount of the charter hire paid for the outward voyage to be excessive in the light of the actual hazards, and suggested a voluntary adjustment downward. This suggestion was not acted upon by the American Export Line, and the case has been referred to the Price Adjustment Board of the Commission for renegotiation.

Charge 4: "80 vessels made 90 trips to the Red Sea in the spring of 1941, collected $31,364,880 in charter hire, of which $26,000,000 represented profit."

Eighty-one vessels were used to make the 90 trips to the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf during 1941, under space charter arrangements made between the shipowners or agents and the British Ministry of War Transport.

The charter was for the outward voyage only and $31,756,618.47 was the charter hire paid for the use of the vessels on the outward trip, for the British Ministry of War Transport. The direct voyage profit of $25,978,933.11 was based upon the round trip total revenue of $51,437,083.08, less $25,458,149.97 direct voyage expense, not on the outward voyage alone. These figures include the round-trip revenue and direct voyage profit of the six American Export Line ships referred to in answering Charge 3:

These charters were not sought by the owners but were the result of a call for ships urgently needed to move vital war material to a critical area. The owners, in chartering their vessels for this service were undertaking voyages into dangerous waters, had to depend upon their own efforts to obtain return pay cargoes, and were taking their vessels from far less hazardous trades where higher earnings were probable.

They were old vessels, all except one, a Norwegian which made one out-bound trip only. They were all, however, capable of carrying the cargo that was so urgently needed in north Africa, and owners of more modern vessels did not choose to risk their vessels in this service.

When the space charter rates for these voyages were agreed upon the Maritime Commission considered they were fair and equitable, in view of the existing charter market rates which were higher than those agreed upon. They were also considered fair and equitable because it meant the entrance of American-flag vessels into a heretofore forbidden and active war area where losses could be expected, and the question of obtaining return cargoes was in doubt.

After a review of the preliminary reports on the first voyages, the Maritime Commission brought about a reduction in the rate. When further figures became available, the Commission decided the actual returns to the owners represented excessive profits under the space charter agreements.

The Commission called the situation to the attention of the Comptroller General, asking for any suggestions that he might have to offer in respect to the possible recovery of these excessive profits.

In the meantime further check of the voyage returns confirmed the belief of the Commission that the rates were too high and on November 19, 1942, at the invitation of the Commission, a number of the owners who had taken part in the Red Sea venture met with the Commission to consider the subject.

Three suggestions were presented to the owners at the time, any one of which is adopted would have resulted in a reduction in the charter rate, and a voluntary refund on the charter hire collected.

The owner's response to this proposal being unsatisfactory, the Chairman of the Commission brought the matter to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. Extensive hearings were held before a special subcommittee on charter rates early in the year, but so far no report has been made.

Two operators have made voluntary refunds through the Commission, aggregating $310,803.90. Upon failure of the remaining operators to respond to the suggestion of the Maritime Commission to make voluntary adjustments on the amounts collected, the Commission referred these contracts to its Price Adjustment Board for renegotiation, pursuant to the terms of Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended.

Charge 5: "Ship operators, according to public records have received $280,000,000 in subsidies."

Operating-differential subsidy accruals under both temporary and long-range operating-differential subsidy agreements, from inception of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to date, total $51,129,437.93 a long cry from $280,000,000.

These accruals cover all 17 of the temporary operating-differential subsidy contracts, and all 12 of the long-term agreements. No operating-differential subsidies have been paid or accrued since the latter part of 1942.

Charge 6: "A concrete-ship program of $150,000,000 was folded up by the Maritime Commission under mysterious circumstances."

There was nothing mysterious in the action of the Commission in canceling a portion of the concrete-barge program last August. It was a matter of business judgment in the light of results obtained on the existing contracts. Adequate press releases were sent out by the Maritime Commission outlining the action taken and the reasons therefor.

This program was only entered into in 1941 as insurance of providing every possible vessel that could be obtained, when there was a call for more facilities for moving oil and other bulk commodities along the coast, and there was a scarcity of critical steel for the construction of normal type of vessels. A separate available supply of labor was utilized.

The program did not progress as fast as expected, and the cost of each vessel was much higher than had been estimated. When the tanker situation improved and steel was made available in sufficient quantity to enable us to build more adaptable vessels the concrete program was revised accordingly.

As of December 1, 1943, one self-propelled and 22 non-self-propelled concrete barges have been delivered to the Maritime Commission. A number of these are in use as oil storage tanks in the Southwest Pacific area, and others are in use in carrying coastal bulk cargoes.

Twenty-three additional concrete barges have been launched, and are expected to be ready for service soon. Eight of these are of the self-propelled type.

The total amount involved in this readjusted concrete-ship program is $115,546,213, including facilities.

Just recently at the request of the War Department the Maritime Commission placed a contract for the construction of 25 concrete lighters.

Charge 7: "Insurance of $727,050 was paid by the Commission on an obsolete ship, the steamship *Effingham*, which was bought for $48,470. The operator made a profit of 3,000 percent on this insurance and on charter hire before this vessel was sunk."

The payment of $727,050 made by the War Shipping Administration in settlement of the total loss claim on the *Effingham* was in accordance with the provisions of the charter party under which it was operating at time of loss.

This payment had no relationship to the book value, but was the agreed contract valuation based upon the market value determined in accordance with standards generally adopted under W. S. A. General Order 9, dated May 14, 1942, for the valuation of dry-cargo vessels constructed prior to 1935.

The report of the Advisory Board on Just Compensation in rule 5 states that the enhancement clause of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended,

has no application to the valuation of chartered vessels for the purpose of insurance.

The charter-hire earnings of a vessel, as long as they are not out of line with the going rates in the trade in which it is operating are not censorable just because the vessel is old. The age of a vessel does not fix its earning capacity, especially in times when the sole consideration is the vessel's ability to deliver the cargo at its destination in a satisfactory condition. Charter hire at the time of loss was $3.35 per deadweight ton predicated on time basis, a most reasonable figure.

Charge 8: "A report to the Comptroller General, never forwarded to Congress, disclosing bewildering financial maneuvers involving $60,000,000 of taxpayers' money in connection with the American President Lines."

It would be premature and well-nigh impossible for the Commission to comment on charges based on an alleged report, a copy of which has not been furnished to it presumably because it is an interoffice communication of the General Accounting Office which is still being reviewed by that agency.

The Commission's activities in connection with the restoration of the important trans-Pacific and round-the-world services were the subject of two lengthy reports of the Commission to Congress—Financial Readjustment of Dollar Steamship Lines, Inc., Ltd., dated February 17, 1938, and Reorganization of American President Lines, Ltd., dated April 10, 1939. The net results, in addition to the reestablishment of the services and the purchase by the company of six new combination cargo and passenger vessels of the C–3–P type, which are valuable units of our war effort, are as follows:

(a) Loans by the Commission and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, made in 1938, aggregating $4,500,000, have been repaid in full, with interest.

(b) The mortgage indebtedness on the old vessels, which in 1937 was about $14,000,000, has been repaid in full.

(c) There has accrued to the American President Lines, Ltd., in operating subsidies a total of $10,015,105.83, $7,525,871.54 of which is subject to recapture by the Government, according to audit of December 31, 1942.

(d) The common-stock interest which the Commission acquired from the Dollar interests in consideration of releasing them from certain obligations on notes, and amounting to about 80 percent of the common-stock equity, has a book value of approximately $4,558,927.45.

The Assistant Comptroller General testified on December 14, 1943, before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Appropriations Committee (hearings, p. 815) in response to the question, "Is there a report pending on the American President Lines?" as follows:

"A report of an investigation has been made by the investigators. It has been before the Comptroller General, and he had determined thus far that there is nothing in it to justify reporting it to Congress. He has taken the position that before reporting similar matters to the Congress, he should find either illegality or obvious waste worth while calling to the attention of the Congress."

The Commission does not pretend to be infallible. Matters of detail relating to the transactions involved in these charges may deserve criticism and in some cases require correction. From a larger point of view, these transactions were undertaken and carried out with a view to the best interests of the United States and the fulfillment of the objectives of the statutes which the Commission and the War Shipping Administration administer. Most of them were successful. In the case of those which later events indicated were no longer necessary or desirable, the programs were subsequently abandoned or modified.

Liberty and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a scholarly and brilliant sermon entitled "Liberty and the Law," delivered by the Reverend Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., professor of political science at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., at the Red Mass, under the auspices of the Law School, on Sunday, January 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is one of the tragedies of this tragic era that the men who are called upon to defend the rights of man against those who deny and destroy those rights are themselves afflicted with a profound scepticism as to the very meaning and value of right itself. It is as if you sent a helmsman to guide a ship through a stormy sea and told him that the line between his helm and the rudder might break at any minute. It is as if you sent an army of soldiers against the enemy and told them that the powder in their guns may be mere incombustible sand and so will propel no bullet. It is a tragic thing that men should think, or at least suspect, that the cause for which they fight is no cause at all, but the mere image of a human longing that has no origin, no reality, no value.

Human rights and human liberties have been the object of attack and of defense for many thousand years. Many statesmen and many soldiers have defended those rights and liberties, and many tyrants and many dictators have destroyed them. But always the defenders of those rights and liberties knew that what they fought for had a real existence and that they were worth the lives which were sacrificed for them. It is reserved for our age that the defenders of rights and liberties have their own mind corroded by the awful fear, sprung from disbelief, that the enemy may after all be right and we may be wrong, when he says that there are no rights which the state or the race is bound to respect.

And that is not all. In the whole western tradition, for many hundreds of years, authority was the complement of liberty—authority existed so that liberty might be preserved. It is almost 200 years now since Jean-Jacques Rousseau first questioned this assumption of the western mind. For him authority was not the complement of liberty, but its antithesis. The two were enemies to each other, and if liberty is a sacred thing, then authority is a sacrilege. In the whole western tradition, for many hundreds of years, authority preserved human liberty by means of the written law, which was defined as a finding of human reason promulgated for the common good. When the sacred nature of authority was questioned, and it became instead a mere creature of human convention, then law became, not a finding of reason, but an act of the will, and therefore a kind of violence, an offense against the common good. In the whole western tradition, for many hundreds of years, authority in the community was the authority of the community itself, and law was the expression of the ruler's subjection to the interests of the members of the community. The community had this right because it was based on the natural law, which is the law of God as found by human reason in human nature. When the very existence of this natural law was denied, then the community itself fell from the high estate with which the law of God had endowed it, and the way was opened at long last to make of it an instrument of tyranny, and not a blessed channel of human comfort and human progress.

It was Pope St. Gregory the Great who in the sixth century wrote from Rome these striking words to the usurping Emperor Phocas at Constantinople: "This is the difference between the kings of the gentiles and the emperors of the Roman Commonwealth, that the kings of the gentiles are lords of slaves and the emperors of the Commonwealth are rulers of freemen" (Epistola, XXX). It was this same Pope Gregory who over and over again insisted that "by nature all men are equal" (cf. Moralia, XXI, 22). Upon these twin concepts of liberty and equality, secured through justice, the medieval civilization was finally built, and it is to us today a striking thing that when the founders of our republic preached these concepts they were only striving, however unwittingly, to reestablish in the world the teaching of a Pope and father of the church.

It was Cassiodorus who, writing for the Emperor Theodoric in Rome, impressed this ideal of justice upon the administrators of the Western Empire, just as it was he who, later, as a monk, introduced into the monasteries of Europe that studium which was to preserve ancient human wisdom for succeeding generations. It was a great bishop, St. Isidore of Seville, who helping to legislate in the seventh century for the Visigothic Kingdom in Spain, formulated these great ideals of liberty and equality when he thus described the law: "Every law should be honest, just, possible, according to nature, according to the custom of the country, necessary, useful, clear also, lest in obscurity there lurk an ambush, and written for no private interest, but for the common utility of all the citizens" (Etymologies, II, x, 6.)

It was from these sources that the Middle Ages learned that government is the servant of the community, and that the ruler loses his right to rule when he deserts the principal duty of his rule. In the time of Charlemagne and his successors in the ninth century, at least 18 writers, monks or bishops, or both, reminded their rulers of these truths: that the ruler is the servant of his community, that the instrument of his rule is the written law, and that the ruler is himself subject to that law. It can, I think, at least be argued, with much truth, that when popes like St. Gregory VII, Innocent III, or Boniface VIII struggled with the great rulers of their times, they were not so much striving to assert the temporal predominance of the Holy See as they were attempting to establish in succeeding generations the great principle that the purpose of government is to serve the community and that the law must be the channel of this service.

Now it is one of the brighter signs of our times that men are more and more beginning to perceive that after all theology lies at the bottom of the science and art of government. It was Our Lord Himself who in the Gospel decreed the distinction of the spiritual and temporal powers, of God and of Caesar, into two separate and autonomous spheres. It was St. Paul who in his Epistle to the Romans elevated the temporal power to a sacred position when he taught that all political power is God's power and enjoined upon us to obey it as we obey God himself. It was the Church, therefore, which brought about that first great emancipation of the human race, the emancipation of the soul, when it took from the state the right to intervene between the creature and his Creator. But it was also the Church which worked the second great

emancipation of mankind, the emancipation of the body, and therefore of the whole man, when it taught that it was the plan of God Himself that man should live in society and that this community of men was the providential instrument by which the dignity and integrity of man's personality would be protected and advanced. For if this is true, then it is an emancipation, indeed, for no longer shall a mere man have the right to dispose of his subjects as he pleases at the motion and whim of his will. Both the citizen and the ruler are subject to the rule of human reason as expressed by written law. Liberty then becomes the right of the members of the community to be governed in their own interests and equality becomes the right of all the citizens to participate in the benefits of this rule. And both liberty and equality are not mere human prerogatives. They are sacred gifts of God endowed by Him upon His creatures. And it is only then that they cannot be abridged or destroyed, for only then have you placed them at the spot where they cannot be touched, outside this world in the hands of God. Put them in the hands of man, society, state, race, class, or what you will, give them a purely human origin, and state, race, or class can take them away. There is no liberty or equality except upon a theological basis.

Now this equality in liberty was safe enough as long as it was based on the ruler's own belief that it was God's law that he rule the community in its own interest and as long as the ruler's conscience was in accord with that belief, and that usually meant as long as there were churchmen to remind the ruler of his duty and rulers to listen to the churchmen. But on those conditions this equality in liberty was at best a passive equality—the subject participated in the benefits of government, indeed, but in doing so he was at the mercy of the benevolent dispositions of his rulers. It was a passive equality, not an active one, and hence precarious, and contingent upon the uncertain good will of a hereditary ruler.

It is one of the glories of the great St. Thomas Aquinas that, centuries before his time, he saw that in order to secure this passive equality, the participation of all the members of the community in the benefits of government, there must also be an active equality, the association of all the members of the community in the process of government. It was thus he laid down the principle that, as he said, "all should take some share in the government." (Summa, I–II, 105, 1 in C.) For him the community was the supreme concern, for it is nothing more than a body of men seeking a common good by joint action, and all should have a share in this common good, since the joint action is the action of all. It was this he meant when he laid down this other principle, that "the directing of anything to the end concerns the one to whom the end belongs." (Summa, I–II, 90, iii in c.)

It is not surprising, then, when we heard St. Thomas tell his generation that the sovereign "has not the power to frame laws except as representing the people" (Summa, I–II, 97, iii ad 3), or when he tells us that law itself is nothing else than "a species of contract between the people and its ruler" (Expositio in Ep. ad Romanos XIII, lectio 1). For any ruler in the Christian dispensation, he tells us, echoing St. Gregory the Great, is the ruler of a free people. For him, therefore, law is not a purely coercive thing, as it was to the ancients; it is primarily directive. It is a pattern of conduct, presented first to the intellect of men, and then an obligation, presented to their free wills, binding them in conscience to work out this pattern in their actions (Summa, I, 96, iv in c; Summa, I–II, 90, i in c). It is because man is a person, not an individual atom, impersonal in an impersonal society, that government owes to him the right of disposing of himself as a free agent; but it is also because all other members of his society are also persons that as a member of their community he is subject to their collective needs and collective demands. This, I take it, was the supreme contribution made by the Church in the Middle Ages to the great cause of human liberty.

That high point of the human intellect in quest of justice and order did not long survive St. Thomas Aquinas. Not more than a generation after his death, writers like Giles of Rome (Aegidius Colonna) were telling their readers that a community regime (regimen politicum) like that espoused by St. Thomas, might have been all right if man had not sinned, but because man was sinful, prone to error and crime, it was necessary to govern man by strong and masterful rulership that proceeded not from the community but from a single governing head (regimen regale). It was the Fuehrer Prinzip of our own times raising its serpent head in the midst of the medieval theological paradise. It was to have disastrous consequences. From then on we can discern a straight line down to the Hitler of our own day.

There was one gallant effort to stem the tide of absolutism by which the right of the community and the person of man were being submerged. It started in Spain in that great revival of scholastic teaching initiated by the Spanish Dominicans and carried on by their disciples, the Spanish Jesuits. St. Robert Bellarmine in Italy, in conflict with James I of England, self-anointed prophet of the divine right of kings, and Bellarmine's defender, the Spanish Suarez, once more invoked the great name of Aquinas, whom the rise of the national states had caused to be forgotten in man's thinking about the political power. Once again it was the Catholic Church which became the champion of the community and the common good. Once again men were recalled by its theologians to the truths that liberty and equality are rights which man has received as an inheritance from God. Once again it was preached that authority in the community is the authority of the community itself and that law is the expression of the ruler's subjection to the interests of the members of the community. And in the reassertion of these truths the theologians of the church found unexpected allies in Great Britain, among those old Whigs who were combating the new absolutism on the English throne, and who were not ashamed to go to the continent, to the writings of the scholastics there, to find the arguments with which to carry on their struggle. And we in our day, in this country of ours, must not forget that it was from these old Whigs that the founders of our Republic received their training in the lessons of political philosophy. So it was, by a strange turn of the wheel, that the ancient European tradition of human rights and human liberties, the tradition of the Catholic Church for many centuries, was transplanted to the New World and became in turn, through revolution, the tradition of the United States of America.

Meanwhile a new and menacing movement was arising on the continent of Europe which was to destroy not only the newer absolutisms but also the older European tradition itself, and it was to find its realization in a revolution in France which was a very different one from that which had been made in America in 1776. This European revolution denied that the natural law was the law of God as discerned in man's nature by man's reason. It set the individual up against the community, and it made government not the instrument of God's will toward men but a purely human and conventional force which fundamentally must be the antagonist of human freedom. Where once the church had taught that authority is the complement of liberty, government became the antithesis of liberty. The state itself became something hateful, something to diminish and to weaken as far as possible, and law is an invasion, a necessary invasion, but a hateful one, of the independence of the individual. So a Herbert Spencer in Britain came with his slogan, "Man versus the state," and an Albert Jay Nock in the United States with his even sharper slogan, "Man's enemy the state." For a Karl Marx, that state is merely the instrument of exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. It must inevitably and eventually wither away. For a Mussolini and a Hitler, the state is no less an instrument of oppression than it is for the others, but for that reason something to be cherished and strengthened. For the liberal who takes his thought from Rousseau or Spencer, the state and its government must be the same: it must be either hated or cherished beyond bounds, according as you wish to escape from it or use it as a weapon of sheer force for the exaltation of race or class.

It is truly, as I have said, one of the tragedies of this tragic era that the defenders of liberty against its destroyers must be afflicted with an incurable scepticism as to the foundations of liberty. Striving to place it upon an unassailable foundation of human reason, they have only succeeded in taking away from it the only foundation which it could possibly have, the theological foundation of that law of God which we call the natural law.

Here, then, is the dilemma of the modern man. He must return to the traditional European concept of the community and the ruler, of true liberty and true equality, and that means ultimately that he must return to God. Or he must obstinately persist in a purely humanistic concept of authority, and that means that he will be disarmed in the defense of liberty in the face of those who are more ruthless in their logic than he is. The man of the West who loves liberty loves it because of the ancient tradition that is his. But his love and his logic, his will and his mind, are at odds with each other. And when a man's love is divorced from his logic, his love becomes sentimentalism and his logic becomes a broken staff. It is our present task to bring our love of liberty once more in accord with our true traditions, in order to rescue it from scepticism and despair.

All these things I have described as happening through the centuries in man's pursuit of liberty are enshrined in our American institutions, our legal traditions, our jurisprudence. Not only Catholics, of course, but many other Christians, have preserved them in their theology, But where they have preserved them, it has been where they have been consciously in union with the great universal stream of Christian thought. When they have departed from them, it has been when they allied themselves with those who exalt man against God, the individual against the community, force against reason, and violence against law. We shall have cured our scepticism, and armed ourselves invincibly, when we put our human liberties under God, the community, reason, and the law.

To an Anxious Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial for which William Allen White was awarded the Pulitzer Prize. It appeared

in the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, July 27, 1922:

TO AN ANXIOUS FRIEND

You tell me that law is above freedom of utterance. And I reply that you can have no wise laws nor free enforcement of wise laws unless there is free expression of the wisdom of the people—and, alas, their folly with it. But, if there is freedom, folly will die of its own poison, and the wisdom will survive. That is the history of the race. It is the proof of man's kinship with God.

You say that freedom of utterance is not for time of stress, and I reply with the sad truth that only in time of stress is freedom of utterance in danger. No one questions it in calm days, because it is not needed. And the reverse is true also; only when free utterance is suppressed is it needed, and when it is needed it is most vital to justice. Peace is good. But if you are interested in peace through force and without free discussion, that is to say, free utterance decently and in order—your interest in justice is slight. And peace without justice is tyranny, no matter how you may sugar-coat it with expediency. This State today is in more danger from suppression than from violence, because in the end suppression leads to violence; violence, indeed, is the child of suppression. Whoever pleads for justice helps to keep the peace; and whoever tramples upon the plea for justice, temperately made in the name of peace, only outrages peace and kills something fine in the heart of man which God put there when we got our manhood. When that is killed, brute meets brute on each side of the line.

So, dear friend, put fear out of your heart. This Nation will survive, this State will prosper, the orderly business of life will go forward if only men can speak in whatever way given them to utter what their hearts hold—by voice, by posted card, by letter, or by press. Reason never has failed men. Only force and repression have made the wrecks in the world.

An Idea—Whose Time Has Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "An Idea—Whose Time Has Come," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, on January 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall not attempt to describe my grateful appreciation for this new evidence of your friendship, esteem, and confidence.

I will do my uttermost to continue in this good favor and to merit it as a badge of highest honor when I go into retirement next year.

George Bernard Shaw, when a guest of honor at a luncheon in London some time ago, was asked by the master of ceremonies, "Mr. Shaw, won't you tell this club, in your own inimitable manner, just where you think we are going?" "I don't know where the world is going," replied the wit, "but I do know this club is always going to lunch."

Too many people who are acquainted with service clubs, such as Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis only from the outside have the idea that all we do is eat.

Now, mind you, we do eat—and I would like to recommend our food to any gourmet prospective member who might be hesitating to join us on that score—it is equal to the best the world has to offer—as I was saying, now mind you, we do eat, but that is not all we do. It is not our primary interest. It is not even our secondary interest.

You ask, What is our primary interest? Perhaps I can best answer that by giving you my definition of a service club: "A service club is a company of men of different professions and occupations, of diverse religious creeds, and various political affiliations, who have achieved and seek to maintain a high degree of respectable success in their chosen fields of endeavor, who have freely and unitedly assumed social responsibilities commensurate with their wealth, success, and influence."

It may seem to some of you that this definition of a service club is too idyllic and complimentary. To be sure I am partial, and you know it. But we do not have to turn to our partisans for compliments, for even our enemies do us the extraordinary honor of paying us compliments.

It is always a first-rate compliment to be disliked by certain people. In our day it is the superlative compliment—next to being hated by the devil—to be the direct object of the avowed enmity of Herr Adolf Hitler.

The service clubs have been paid that superlative compliment.

One of the first acts of this modern Nero was to disband and dissolve the Rotary Clubs of Germany.

We regard this categorical compliment with inestimable pride.

Victor Hugo, on the eve of his death, wrote in his diary, "No army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come." In a reflection on that brilliant observation by the noted French novelist, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick writes, "Repeatedly in history that truth has been vindicated. As though its hour has struck, a new idea emerged. The special men and women who happened to represent it were often not remarkable in themselves," Dr. Fosdick continues. "Only this was their distinction: They were the implements and instrumentalities of an "idea whose time has come.'"

This is one of the momentous centuries of history. Because in this century there has emerged an "idea whose time has come." One claims that idea is the common man. He has called this the century of the common man. For another, the idea is America. He nominated this the American century. Both men are sensitive to the fact that something notable is happening. But the emerging "idea whose time has come" is not the idea of the common man nor the idea of America. History will record that "the idea whose time has come" in this century is the idea of freedom for all people of good will—freedom for the uncommon man as well as the common man. And with the emergence of this idea of freedom—as if it were attesting to the health of human instinct—there is the resurgence of an idea whose time was at the dawn of time. It is that men forever stand in the need of God. Now, we know there is more than pretty sentiment in the beautiful spiritual, Standin' in the Need of God.

There is a rising tide of consciousness of this need of God throughout the world. Since Pearl Harbor Americans everywhere have turned to Him, as never before, for courage, comfort, and guidance. In Russia, whose people have been historically deeply religious, but since the Bolshevik Revolution, have been instructed against the tenets of their ancient faith, leaders and people alike are turning in conscious need to that ancient faith for help. Premier Stalin, who was for years the world's chief antagonist of religion, recently raised his glass in a toast to the President of the United States and exclaimed: "May God help him in his task." And even Hitler, from his fast deteriorating position, for the first time since his rise to power, in the last paragraph of his New Year's proclamation, injected the religious note.

Today the Allies stand before the future—as it is framed in this year of our Lord 1944, with a clear conception of all it entails in sacrifice and death, but with confidence in our certain victory. A large measure of this optimism comes as a reasoned judgment on the weight of might we possess in men and material. But much of our optimism is grounded in our religious faith. Joe Louis put it in homely and striking words: "We will win because we are on God's side."

The Kiwanians of America are conscious of being, and sincerely desire to become, more perfect implements and instruments of those "ideas whose time has come." It is our avowed purpose by word and deed, by individual and united effort, to deepen our own and our fellows' faith in God; to proclaim and to live by the highest American ideals of freedom; to practice in every walk of life the loftiest moral and ethical principles we know; and last, but not least, to reach out with the strength of love to the underprivileged, to lift them up, and to help them lift themselves, to places of just redress, and full opportunities to satisfy their natural abilities and their honorable ambitions.

One step in the direction of achieving our avowed purpose was taken several months ago by our national organization. A program has been undertaken on a Nation-wide basis to publicize facts about our economic history that are apparently so obvious that most of us, or at least dangerously many of us, have become blind to them. Kiwanis, with this program, will do its part to make every American aware of the material and spiritual rewards that are his with our American system of free enterprise. We want every man, woman, and child in America to take inventory, to know their comparative position in the world-wide scheme of things, then to judge and pass their own verdict on where they are and the system by which they arrived there.

As members of this service club, a cross-section of the business and professional men of this country, we know that the only road to genuine good times is now, as always, and ever will be, free production and exchange of goods and services for a profit. This is the American free enterprise system of both business and labor. We are well aware that this so-called profit system has become the victim of scorn and sneers. Why this system, which has earned us individually and collectively as a nation the envy and fear of our enemies and the admiration of our friends as the richest and mightiest people on the face of the earth, should be the butt of ridicule is simply beyond my poor ability to comprehend.

We in Kiwanis have solemnly decided that we will not sit back and without a struggle allow its enemies to destroy that system which has rewarded so many with so much.

If there should be fear in the hearts of some, that taking this step we now stand with those who desire to save this system merely as a means of securing themselves and their posterity forever whatever they have, regardless of the system's accumulation of imperfections which retards progress in the direction of higher standards of living for more and more people, let me say this, some of our minds have not yet jelled in that mold. When in the clear white light of experience, reason, and God's own revelation, the imperfections are apparent, we stand with those who would remove them, and, if need be, radically by surgery, so long as it does not impair the life of the patient, whom we would rather have, even with some imperfections, than not at all.

In fact, I contend that regular, judicious pruning of the economic tree is as productive

of better and more abundant fruit, as it is to a healthy apple tree.

The Kiwanians of America are not trying to save this great economic system for ourselves alone. Of course, we want it for ourselves, but we want it for our country, for our children and grandchildren, too. We want to save it for you, Mr. and Mrs. America, whoever you are and wherever you are, and your children and grandchildren. We want to save it for our sons and your sons in service: for the 5,000,000 who will be overseas by next July, for a sure hope to those who return, and a living monument of genuine opportunities for the families of those who will never return.

We must not fail in this home-front struggle. We will not fail if we seek the guidance of Almighty God, and live by that guidance in all our endeavors.

In closing I repeat, Kiwanians of America are conscious of being, and sincerely desire to become more perfect implements and instruments of those "ideas—whose time has come."

Unnecessary Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1942, now more than a year ago, before the Executives Club in Chicago, among other things I said this:

A lot of this unnecessary censorship must be done away with. This war now belongs to the people. Certainly they did not want it, but it is now theirs. It has been thrust upon us. The few may have brought it about but the few can never win it. Now that the people are engaged in a life and death struggle, it is the people—all of the people—who are now paying for it. They are doing the fighting and they are doing the dying and they ought to be let in on it.

Don't think I am foolish. I know in war you cannot reveal the secret movement of troops. I know you cannot disclose information that would give aid and comfort to the enemy. I know that a certain amount of censorship is not only desirable but absolutely necessary, but I do say that it is supreme folly to withhold from the American people for weeks and even months, the information that the enemy already possesses.

These men who want to cover up must have something to hide. Honest men, able men, and sincere men don't have anything to hide. They welcome constructive criticism and they have no fear of the other kind.

Mr. Speaker, in my hand I hold a clipping which I cut from yesterday's issue of the Washington Sunday Star. It is an Associated Press dispatch and reads as follows:

PASTOR SEES POLITICS IN ATROCITIES "TIMING"

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., January 29.—The Reverend R. E. Day, pastor of Port Arthur's First Baptist Church and father of a son who is a Japanese captive in the Philippines, today charged that the Government "is making propaganda and politics out of the torture of our soldiers and the broken hearts of their families."

"Why was the truth about the Japanese barbarism so long suppressed?" he asked during an interview.

"It looks to me that our Government is resorting to most reprehensible tactics in holding up these facts and then springing them on us as an election year opens and for the purpose apparently of propagandizing the fourth war loan."

The pastor's son, Capt. Morris E. Day, was an Army chaplain on Bataan and has been a prisoner of the Japanese since its fall.

"The administration," said the Reverend Mr. Day, "should give us the facts as they develop for informational purposes and should not juggle its releases with an eye on politics and propaganda. We Americans can take it."

Mr. Speaker, at no time have I expected the new dealers to follow me. We do not think the same thoughts, nor do we speak the same language. Our political philosophies are antithetical, but if the new dealers possess one grain of good sense and fair play—which, of course, I seriously doubt—they will heed the timely warning of this Texas preacher, who is pastor of Port Arthur's First Baptist Church, and whose son is a captain in the United States Army, now in Japanese hands.

The President pleads for unity among our people when he does not have it in his own official family. The wrangling and bickering between Elmer Davis and Robert Sherwood should end. The Office of War Information should be abolished or at least merged with the Office of Censorship under a single responsible head, who will assume sole responsibility and who will stop at once playing politics with the suffering of our soldiers and cease dishing out propaganda for life tenure of office. This is only one of innumerable examples of the overlapping and duplication of alphabetical agencies. These agencies daily issue contradictory orders that produce much confusion and uncertainty among our people, and which with all their extravagance and waste are making this war cost the taxpayers twice as much as it should. We can have unity if those in power are willing to give as well as take. We will soon win the war if responsible authorities think first of winning the war instead of winning the election.

East Texas Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter concerning damage to east Texas timber and work which is being instituted to minimize as much as possible the loss recently sustained there:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 29, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your communication of January 23 concerning the damage to timber stands in east Texas caused by the recent sleet storm, and your request that we investigate the matter to determine how the forest products involved may best be salvaged.

Our representative in east Texas, Mr. Miller, held a meeting of landowners, pulpwood, and lumber operators, and State officials last Thursday to determine how the salvaging of the down timber on both private and public land in the storm area might be accomplished most effectively.

As you may know, the Forest Service, at the request of the War Production Board, is administering the timber production war project to stimulate the production of lumber and pulpwood needed for our war effort. Our chief of that project, Mr. Shaw, in our regional office at Atlanta, Ga., at the request of Regional Forester Kircher, has gone to the storm area to obtain first-hand information concerning the situation and to determine how our project might help the private landowners in salvaging their merchantable timber. Special attention is being given to the best use of prisoners of war in the needed salvage work. We will attempt to provide such assistance as is possible to the private forest landowners and operators in salvaging their timber products, and will take direct action to salvage down timber on our national forest areas. Every effort will be made to expedite this work.

Sincerely,

LYLE F. WATTS, *Chief.*
By C. M. GRANGER.

The Drys Are at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WABC, New York, over the Columbia network, Sunday, January 23, 1944:

THE DRY MOLLY MAGUIRES AND CARRIE NATIONS OF HATCHET FAME ARE ON THE RAMPAGE AGAIN

While some 10,000,000 of our youth are in uniform, both here and abroad, the camel seeks to get his nose in under the tent. The professional "drys" are again creeping upon the Nation to make it a Sahara.

The "drys" conveniently forget the last prohibition "drink storm" and holocaust. It was an "ignoble experiment" with its "ginger jake," "needled beer," "rotgut," "home brew," "bathtub gin," all of which took a terrific toll of life. The hip-pocket flask became the badge of "flaming youth." The speakeasy, the honky-tonk, the clip joint, and the blind pig were the rendezvous of the socialites and the guttersnipes. Hijackers, poachers, and rum runners attained the wealth of Croesus. The Al Capones, Waxey Gordons, and Legs Diamonds became the "glamour boys." They drove the "coach and six through the statute."

Justice lay prostrate. Crime mounted. The Nation was helpless.

The "drys" call such a cost of prohibition trifling. Any revival of the mischief is unthinkable. Yet last week before one of the subcommittees of the House Judiciary Committee was enacted a farce comedy—a hearing on the Bryson bill, which seeks to

goosestep the Nation into dryness and disgrace.

Note the haste of the "drys" to get through with their sordid business before the boys come home. Our absentee soldiers are concerned lest the comedy become a bitter tragedy. As recently as last October American servicemen abroad were asked this question by the British Institute of Public Opinion: "If the question of national prohibition in the United States should come up again, would you vote 'wet' or 'dry'?" The poll showed that 85 percent were "wet," 9 percent "dry," and 6 percent undecided.

An even more powerful warning of how servicemen feel on this issue was contained in an editorial in the Stars and Stripes, daily newspaper of the United States armed forces in the European theater of operations, which declared: "* * * We know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control."

We must indeed listen a thousand times more to the voice of wisdom of the absent servicemen rather than to the siren voice of the professional dry.

Apparently the drys are working like beavers. They are pressing and pushing in all directions. Their strength should not be minimized. They have been making the Nation arid by local option, i. e., through the back door by sneak attacks. The creeping paralysis of prohibition through local option has affected already 18.9 percent of the population of the Nation. Of the 3,070 counties in the United States, 904, or 30 percent, are already dry. While urban and industrial areas have been unmindful of lurking danger, the drys have been feeding prohibition to the rural areas by the spoonsful, administered by that quack Dr. Bluenose Pecksniff.

The Nation must be aroused out of its apathy. Nothing should be taken for granted. The drys are powerful financially. They are very good organizers. I have been checking votes. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may be evenly divided. When there is an even split, it is customory for the subcommittee to refer the bill without recommendation to the entire membership of the Judiciary Committee. As to the Judiciary Committee in its entirety, there seems to be no preponderating sentiment either way. A member has a perfect right to refrain from voting.

Thus, unless the right-thinking people of the Nation bestir themselves and make their influence felt, it is possible for the Judiciary Committee to vote this bill out.

They are now using a new shibboleth. During the last war, prohibition was introduced to save the boys. This time in addition it is to prevent absenteeism. That issue is as false as a theatrical storm. But the drys are making headway with it and are grinning like Cheshire cats. Before it is too late, the Nation must be galvanized into action against these drys. We need many Paul Reveres to warn the Nation against its latest enemies.

Remember, the trick worked in the First World War, and we allowed ourselves to be bunkoed into wartime prohibition. That was the entering wedge for the eighteenth amendment and its handmaiden of iniquity, the Volstead Act.

Now, again, we must save our boys for the duration and, besides, stretch the working men and women of the Nation across a dry procrustean bed.

Once bitten, twice shy.

Wake up, John Q. Public. Be on guard:

It would be outrageous to try to iron and barlock our soldiers into soberness. What an insult. Why? A lad ready to go through the valley of the shadow in Tunisia, at Salerno, or at Tarawa must shun a harmless glass of beer.

A mechanic at the aircraft plant, a welder in a shipyard; yes, even a farmer at his plow, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker—none can quench their thirst with whatever they will, highball, cocktail.

Es ist verboten. Hitler could not do much worse.

As for saving our boys from liquor, the Office of War Information, after a careful coast-to-coast survey, points out that there is no "excessive drinking among our troops" and that "drinking does not constitute any serious problem," and that "no American Army in all history has been so orderly," and lastly, "the sale of beer in the post exchanges in training camps is a positive factor in Army sobriety."

Secretary of the Navy Knox says, "We are convinced that this approach (educational and recreational) is more enlightening and effective than rigid prohibition with all its attendant and familiar evils."

Secretary of War Stimson says, "Prohibit * * * and those who desire such beverages will inevitably resort to the speakeasy and bootlegger outside the military reservation. * * * I urge that it not be imposed on us by Congress."

The report of the Office of War Information goes on to say, "Wartime is the honeymoon of rumor. The uprooting of settled people, the necessary censorships which conceal the movements of troops, all the excitements and insecurities inevitable in a nation at war, create a ready audience for tall stories and sensational gossip. The uniform is conspicuous. One unruly delinquent in a G. I. blouse, a half-dozen prankish privates tipsy with a few drinks and furlough freedom, can start stories which, pyramided in telling, give the impression to the honestly gullible that service carousals are hampering our training for war.

"There is drinking in the Army; there will continue to be drinking in the Army. The approach of the military authorities to the problem is not prohibition but control."

To the dry quibblers and humbugs I say:

"The American soldier needs neither curtain lectures nor apology. He behaves well, he trains well, and in the far-flung places of the earth he is fighting well. * * * His commanding officers believe in him, his chaplains are proud of him, and we glory in him."

Reading One World, I find that at every stop Willkie made in Russia, whether he dined at the Kremlin or breakfasted in a Siberian outpost, vodka was served. Here is a virile, rejuvenated nation, perfectly proud of its liquor. The Russians drink annually millions of gallons of vodka—far more than we per capita. Yet Willkie proclaims the Russians "one of the healthiest peoples of the world." Their stirring victories on the eastern front highlight an amazing fortitude.

The courage and boldness to be gotten from a bit of rum or wine now and then is invaluable. The rank and file for centuries know this secret. Byron put it another way. He said, "There is naught, no doubt, so much the spirit cheers as rum and true religion." You can no more deny people by any kind of prohibition the cheer of rum than you can deny them the solace of true religion.

Finally, all else failing, the drys, looking for a scapegoat, blame so-called absenteeism on drink. That charge is scurrilous, implying that large numbers of decent, God-fearing workmen and workwomen are irresponsible sots, who care more for liquor than they do for patriotism. It is a damnable lie. Every important survey clearly shows that drinking is a negligible factor causing absenteeism. No, indeed, we shall never allow absenteeism and our absent soldiers to become a fulcrum with which to lift prohibition again onto the backs of the people, for even the duration.

Listening to the testimony of some of the sophists before the Judiciary Subcommittee, one got the impression that all laboring men and women on Saturday night went on a binge from which they could not recover until Tuesday or Wednesday of the following week.

The causes of absenteeism are complicated. They may exist, not only in the community where the plant is located, but in the plant itself. Epidemics and sickness are the major causes. The common cold and grippe is the greatest single factor. The testimony of Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Secretary of Labor Perkins, and the United States Public Health Service, attribute absenteeism, in addition to sickness, to shortage of housing, lack of transportation facilities, car-sharing difficulties, acute lack of doctors and dentists which in many areas is most acute, working wives compelled to take time off to care for infant children, material shortages in plants which slow up production, job shopping, job piracy, lack of understanding by an employee of the importance of his job, lack of supervision, and the accumulation of output lying around in plants leading an employee to believe his work is not urgent, increased earnings from overtime and higher wages enabling the worker to lay off without decreasing his standards of living and the temptation to spend money on entertainment and recreation as consumer goods become scarcer and scarcer.

Thus the professional drys very glibly speak of absenteeism with more emotion than sense. Indeed there is little culpable absenteeism and only a minutia of it is due to drink. Absenteeism is not a simple problem. There is no single cure-all. The professional drys advancing excessive drink as a major cause, if not the principal cause, is dangerous business. It obscures the problem and makes more difficult a badly needed solution. But over and beyond that, it is our duty to point out the utter fallacy of the charge. Otherwise, our dry friends will have what they so earnestly covet—a perfect stealthy and backdoor approach to the return of prohibition.

I say to the drys, desiring the return to prohibition, seek out Chapter 26 of Proverbs, verse 11, which reads as follows: "As a dog returneth to his vomit so a fool returneth to his folly."

It is axiomatic that water never rises above its source. No law, therefore, can be enforced if not backed by public sentiment. The source of all law is public sentiment. If a statute is unwanted, it will be disregarded. No amount of palaver by the professional drys can alter this fact. The eighteenth amendment was torn to shreds because it offended the wisdom and common sense of the Nation. It rebelled. Repeal resulted.

The drys fail to recognize that drink, in itself, is not an evil. It is the abuse of drinking that spells doom for the offender. Because of that abuse, the drys would abolish whisky, wine, and beer for all. That would be like trying to hold out the Atlantic Ocean with a groan. It cannot be done. Only moral suasion can curb the abuse of that which is inherently sound.

If you say, "Would there were no wine," because of the drunkards, then you must say, going on by degrees: "Would there were no steel," because of the murderers. "Would there were no night," because of the thieves. "Would there were no light," because of the informers, and "Would there were no women," because of adultery.

Montaigne said, "To forbid us anything is to make us have a mind for it." Abraham Lincoln said, "Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. It is a species of intemperance within itself, for it goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation, and makes a crime out of things that are not crimes. A prohibition law strikes a

blow at the very principles upon which our Government was founded."

Mark Twain said, "Prohibition only drives drunkenness behind doors and into dark places, and does not cure it or even diminish it."

There are none so blind as those who will not see.

The drys deliberately would bypass the bribery, corruption, chicanery, and deceit which were the byproducts of prohibition. They are like horses with blinders. They only see one thing—another eighteenth amendment, regardless. By design they blot out the fact that for the first time in our history between 1919 and 1933 crime became organized into a great industry. Let us assume that prohibition did keep drink from a few timid souls. But the prohibitionists fail to realize the terrible cost, the terrible toll. They assume it was still worth while. That is like the story that comes out of Aesop's Fables, where the well-intentioned bear kills the fly on the forehead of his master who is sleeping, by dropping a heavy rock on his forehead.

The sad commentary of prohibition was that it did not prohibit. People still drank. Remember that the eighteenth amendment, and even the present Bryson bill, does not make the purchase of liquor an offense. Only the seller is guilty. Why should not the purchaser be deemed an offender? Prohibitionists very significantly leave that gap so that many of them can still buy and have their liquor.

Even today in the dry States of Kansas, Mississippi, and Oklahoma the drys apparently get all the liquor they want. In Mississippi the Federal Government issued 3,117 liquor licenses. In Oklahoma 3,415 liquor licenses were issued, and in Kansas 3,933 liquor licenses were issued.

What are these dealers doing with all these licenses? They are selling beer, wines, and liquors in vast volume in these dry States. The mere possession of such a license should be prima facie evidence of a violation of State laws. Are these possessors punished? Of course not. That would deprive royalist drys of their liquor. I say to the drys, especially of these States, before you try to dry up the Nation, clean up your own back yard. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye but considereth not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

I listened attentively to a professional dry over this network last Sunday whose argument I am supposed to answer today. Frankly, his seems to me the tale of one enthusiastically misguided, "all sound and fury but signifying nothing."

The same speaker said that the liquor industry is being mollycoddled and pampered. That certainly gives one a laugh. The liquor industry is actually held in a vise to such an extent that in 1942, the Federal revenue from alcohol amounted to about $1,215,174,000 and the State tax amounted to about $350,000,000.

In addition, it is very significant that the drys say nothing about the important role of the alcohol industry in the present war. No potable whisky or brandy is being manufactured. All distilleries have been commandeered for the manufacture of alcohol as a basic ingredient for the making of smokeless powder, chemical warfare materials, medical supplies, and synthetic rubber, and lend-lease materials. When the distilleries were converted from producing potable liquor to war alcohol, practically no critical steel, copper, or bronze, or other strategic metal was required. Today, all distilleries are devoted 100 percent to the war effort. Nor will the use of grain by distillers for vital war materials deplete in any sense. of the word the stores needed for food.

It is 10 years since we buried Dr. Bluenose Prohibition. Let him stay buried, with his umbrella, his sleazy plug hat, and his oozing piety.

Democratic Leadership and the Solid South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democratic Leadership and the Solid South," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP AND THE SOLID SOUTH

The South received little consideration at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee in Washington last week, just as it usually has had little consideration in the party's recent national conventions or from its national administrations after supplying the foundation to elect them to office.

The Roosevelt-New Deal administration would have had a hard row from the beginning but for the South. In Congress southern Representatives make up more than half of the Democratic-New Deal majority in the House and almost half of the majority in the Senate is from the South. In actual figures, the South supplies 53 percent of the Democrats in the House and 44 percent of those in the Senate Yet, in national Democratic conventions it has only 25 percent of the delegates and when the national committee meets to plan a coming convention and campaign the South is offered little more than crumbs from the political banquet table.

The sum and substance of consideration for the South at the Washington national committee meeting was: First, that the South should, of course, supply the votes on national election day to cast its more than one-fourth of the electoral college tally in behalf of whatever candidates the eastern, western, middle western, et cetera, delegates to the national convention had selected. With the South guaranteeing over 25 percent of the electoral college, it is necessary for the rest of the Nation to provide only less than one-fourth of the total electoral college vote in order to elect the chosen candidates. Second, the Washington meeting policy was to vaguely dangle before the South the possibility—but only the possibility—that a Vice Presidential candidate from its States might be selected for the coming campaign.

However, there was no definite promise even on this single political crumb. In 1940 the South thought it had some chance of getting the Vice Presidential nominee when it mustered 224 convention votes behind BANKHEAD, but President Roosevelt named and nominated WALLACE.

Even though the Vice Presidential post is simply secondary and intended to quiet grumbles about not having the Presidential nominee, the South has had the second place post only twice since the Civil War—Robinson of Arkansas in 1928 and Garner in 1932. Garner was shelved in 1940 in favor of WALLACE, who always has been anathema to the South. And, Robinson did not come until 60 years after the Civil War had ended.

On the Presidential side the South has not been given the Democratic nominee since before the Civil War. Prior to the Civil War five of the seven Democratic Presidential nominees came from the South—since then, none. Woodrow Wilson was born in Virginia but he was southern only by geographical coincidence of birth. By rearing, environment, education, and adult activity he was an eastern educator.

The chief modern-day reason for failure of the South to receive consideration in the high councils of the party of which it always has been the foundation is failure of its own political leaders to do anything whatever about the situation. In fact, they have helped make it easier for the party chieftains to disregard the South, particularly by their action in making possible, in 1936, the end of the party convention rule requiring a two-thirds majority for nominations. Under the two-thirds rule the South had at least a veto power in nominations. Under the majority rule established at the 1936 Philadelphia convention, both the third term and the Wallace Vice Presidential nomination over the southerner, Bankhead, later became possible. Bankhead had ample votes to block WALLACE in 1940 if the two-thirds rule had existed.

As things stand now, a group made up chiefly of nonsouthern new dealers have been able to hold the national Democratic whip hand largely because of the South's own political lethargy within the party which it founded and built to national power.

International Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is one question on which we are all agreed, I think without exception. Every person in the United States would like to see come out of this conflict some form, some method of a just and enduring peace. The former Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, has been making various speeches throughout the country at different times and writing articles on this all-important subject. He is a man who knows the subject and has given it probably as much study as anyone else in the world. Whether we agree with what Mr. Welles says or not, nevertheless I am sure that the views he expresses are entitled to consideration. Recently in the Washington Post there appeared an article by Mr. Welles entitled "International Agency." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AGENCY

(By Sumner Welles)

BASED ON REGIONAL SYSTEMS

III

If the preliminary world organization is to be based upon regional systems similar to the present inter-American system the composition and powers of the executive council of the international organization under whose general authority and supervision these regional systems would function are of prime importance.

In the original Council of the League of Nations the five principal Allied Powers were

given permanent representatives, and four other members were elected by the League Assembly from among the smaller powers. Subsequently the number of members of each category was increased. Action on all basic questions required unanimity in voting.

Experience has demonstrated that certain features of these arrangements caused serious difficulties. While the Assembly usually attempted to provide for regional distribution in electing representatives of the smaller powers to the Council, the election of individual governments rather than of representatives of regional groups of states resulted in a situation where the representation within the Council of the general interests of the other smaller states, or of policies of broad regional advantage, was rarely undertaken.

Moreover, the method of selecting representatives of the smaller states by the entire assembly resulted in continued lobbying on the part of the former in order to secure election to the Council. Not infrequently the vital interests of smaller nations were prostituted for this purpose.

The requirement of unanimity in the voting of the members of the Council of the League often blocked necessary or desirable action.

The executive council which the United Nations should immediately create so that they may all participate in the political decisions now being made might advantageously be constituted, so far as present conditions permit, in such a manner as to enable it to become the embryo of the executive council of the future provisional international organization. Much valuable time and experience could thus be gained.

To be effective the executive council of the world organization must be small in number.

Permanent individual representation must be accorded to the four major powers—the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States—and, subsequently, to any other major power equally willing and able to participate, through the employment of its armed force, in the maintenance of peace throughout the world. Additional representation should be given to the inter-American system; to a European organization—whether that comprises a single regional system or several systems; to a system of the Near East and to one of the Far East. Furthermore, representation on the executive council should be accorded the British Commonwealth of Nations, since, while it is not a regional system, it comprises an association of autonomous states constituting one of the most powerful factors contributory to world order and stability. By reason of the geographic location of its component parts it is directly concerned in the maintenance of peace in each region of the world.

The precise number of representatives on the council to be elected by each system would necessarily be contingent upon the manner in which the European system is composed. The representation of the inter-American system should in any event be no less than that granted directly, or indirectly, to the states of Europe, whether they comprise one or several systems.

The four major powers must, of course, continue as members of their respective regional systems, and would participate in the election of regional representatives.

The powers to be granted by the United Nations to the executive council of the incipient world organization should be as broad as those entrusted to the Council of the League of Nations, namely, authority to deal with any matter "affecting the peace of the world," together with jurisdiction over all international agencies to be set up by common agreement between the United Nations.

No action should be taken by the executive council except upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of its members, including within such two-thirds majority the votes of all four of the permanent representatives of the major powers.

In the transition period many of the matters to be dealt with by the executive council will involve the utilization of the armed forces of the major powers. It is therefore essential that in all decisions involving the use of their police powers, each should be in accord with the action to be taken.

As its agency in the carrying out of all decisions involving the use of police powers the executive council should appoint a security commission, consisting of military, naval, and air experts designated by the major powers.

In the selection of representatives of regional systems on the executive council, resort might be made to one of two alternative methods. The first method would provide for the representatives of each regional system to be designated yearly by rotation from among the states comprised within the regional system. The second method would envisage the election by the regional states of individuals, nationals of any state within the region, and chosen from lists of nominees proposed by all of the governments involved.

Agreement by the United Nations upon the designation of an executive council to represent all of them, both large and small, is a matter of urgent need. At the present time the great majority of the nations joined together in the common struggle for liberty have no voice in decisions which are being reached, and which must inevitably affect the future lives of all freedom-loving men and women. The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated more clearly than ever before how greatly this representative agency is needed—how gravely the possibility of successfully constituting a future world organization has been jeopardized by the long-protracted delay in its creation.

Agreements between the major powers, or bilateral pacts between some of the members of the United Nations, may be useful preliminary steps. They are not substitutes for an organization representative of all of the United Nations.

Editorial Comment on Votes for Soldiers' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a number of editorials from Ohio newspapers urging the enactment of the pending measure which I think should be included in the RECORD. The first is an editorial entitled "A Compromise," from the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 24.

There is also an editorial entitled "Second Class Citizens," from the Beacon Journal of Akron, Ohio, the issue of January 18.

Another is an editorial entitled "Not a Partisan Matter," which appeared in the Plain Dealer, of Cleveland, Ohio, on January 11.

I have another editorial entitled "Apropos of What Soldiers Think," from the Times, of Portsmouth, Ohio.

Another editorial on the same subject is entitled "The Soldier's Right to Vote," from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 15.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also hold in my hand some 20 others editorials, all favoring the enactment of the soldiers' vote bill, which have been published in daily newspapers in the State of Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 24, 1944]

A COMPROMISE

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has emerged with a revised soldiers' vote bill which seems to be an acceptable compromise. Under the terms of the measure a Federal balloting system would be established, but "duly constituted" local election officials would be given the right to decide upon the validity of individual ballots.

This arrangement evidently answers the demands of both camps in the controversy over soldier voting. It will provide the uniformity and speed of voting which only a Federal balloting system could provide among the men distributed around the world in the American armed forces. At the same time it gives due regard to State rights in determining the qualifications of voters. One of the chief bones of contention in the proposed strictly Federal voting plan, of course, was the matter of indirect repeal of poll taxes and certain registration requirements. We do not argue here the justice of such objections. As a cold matter of fact, however, they threatened to block the entire Federal soldier-vote program.

It is probable that the respecting of State authority over vote qualifications will lead to some disfranchisement of servicemen. This is to be regretted. But the compromise becomes acceptable in the light of the fact that otherwise the bulk of the millions of the men in uniform would effectively be disfranchised. Several of the States have made gestures toward providing easy means for their citizens in uniform to vote, but the wide diversity of State registration and voting requirements would have bogged down helplessly any effort to poll the soldiers under 48 different election laws. After all, we are at war, and these men are fighting it. Any arrangement which extends them the right of franchise must be simple, uniform, and shorn of all confusion and red tape.

If there must be quibbling over registration and eligibility, let's have it back home, among the State election commissions, and not up front where the guns are roaring.

[From the Beacon Journal, Akron, Ohio, of January 18, 1944]

SECOND CLASS CITIZENS?

The issue in the soldiers' vote bill is not one of States' rights, as some Members of Congress would have the public believe.

The question is simply whether the right of franchise is going to be protected for more than 10,000,000 service men and women who will be away from home on election day.

CARTER GLASS, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a State which has always jealously protected its rights, is among the authorities who maintain that the Federal Government has the responsibility of seeing to it that the fighters have the opportunity to vote.

It is perfectly obvious to everyone, including the opponents of a practical soldiers' vote bill, that if the States are left to take care of the voting themselves, the great majority of the uniformed absentees won't have the chance to cast a ballot.

Regardless of who stands to reap the most votes—and there is sharp difference of opinion on that score—both parties ought to be equally anxious to see the right to vote protected for a group that is certain to be a powerful political influence in the Nation for years to come.

With the northern and southern Democrats sharply split, this is a splendid opportunity for the Republicans to show some constructive leadership. If they can provide the push in Congress to get a suitable bill passed, the soldiers and the Nation as a whole will be more inclined to listen favorably to the G. O. P.'s plea that its men be placed in charge of the Government.

Some Senators are reported to have changed their minds since voting several weeks ago for a meaningless measure that passes the buck to the States. If the House adopts a bill that really makes it possible for the soldiers to vote, the Senate almost certainly will go along.

It's up to the House to decide whether the men and women who are risking their lives to preserve democracy are going to be given something better than second-class citizenship.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of January 11, 1944]

NOT A PARTISAN MATTER

Efforts of political leaders of both parties to find out how service men and women are going to vote in the Presidential election before the necessary machinery has been set up to make such voting possible are distinctly out of order. They arouse the strong suspicion that neither party is going to support soldier-vote legislation until and unless it is fairly certain a majority of that vote is going its way.

If this should happen, it would be a repetition of the disgraceful conduct of the two parties in the 1864 election when the Republicans favored and the Democrats opposed letting the soldiers vote because both suspected that the result would favor the Republicans.

Only slightly less reprehensible would be withholding the vote from our fighting men on the ground, suggested by Congresswoman BOLTON, that they don't know what is going on in the United States and therefore could not cast their ballots intelligently. Unless all the information coming back from the fighting fronts is inaccurate, most of our soldiers and sailors are thinking more about the affairs of government than they ever have before, and are pretty well informed on what is going on at home. But even if they were not, this would be a poor time to start denying the franchise to every citizen who could not take an oath that he had listened to all the campaign speeches.

The only pertinent consideration in the soldier-vote issue is whether it is mechanically possible to deliver the ballots to all eligible service men and women and have them counted in time, and whether it can be done in a constitutional manner so that there will be no danger of the election results being the subject of litigation.

With the proper cooperation of the States, this should be possible. Both the Army and Navy have indicated their willingness to set up the necessary machinery if the States and Congress act early enough. It is up to Congress to act first so that the general pattern for whatever State legislation is needed may be set before the legislatures are called into session. That means Congress must act quickly.

[From Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of January 17, 1944]

APROPOS OF WHAT SOLDIERS THINK

Congressional concern has been expressed over what United States service voters will think if ballots for the Presidential election in 1944 do not reach them in whatever form the speaker happens to favor.

Apropos of what service people are going to think, perhaps the best guess is that they don't give two whoops and a holler about the hair splitting that is preoccupying Congress on the score of soldier voting. If they hear about it in some of the hot cold spots and cold hot spots they are holding down, it must make them wish they could spare the time to argue endlessly about something that should have been settled months ago.

What service voters have a right to think is that if Congress gets so preoccupied with partisan politics and ballot greed that it can't muster the collective intelligence to figure out a way to get ballots into their hands constitutionally there is something wrong with Congress.

Judged by the things being said in debate, it's time for the debaters to quit worrying about themselves and begin worrying about the men overseas who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of whatever plan is devised to distribute ballots among the military forces.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 15, 1944]

THE SOLDIER'S RIGHT TO VOTE

Before the Christmas recess the Senate adopted and sent to the House a soldier-vote bill which would entrust the problem to the 48 States. This was in accordance with the Federal Constitution, which clearly gives the States control over the machinery of voting.

Objections to the bill have come from Members of Congress and the President, who argue that the States cannot act in time, and from Army and Navy officers, who say they would be unable to administer the voting under 48 different State laws. Various compromises have been offered in the two Houses at Washington. On Friday the House Elections Committee, through a bipartisan majority, rejected all of them and approved a modified form of the Senate bill, thereby leaving the problem up to the States.

The argument for a uniform Federal ballot, to be distributed and collected under Federal auspices, is that it would be simpler than soldier voting under State laws. The sufficient argument against it is that it would be unconstitutional. In any event, it would permit the soldier to vote only for Federal offices and not for State and local. Thus, only part of his right to vote would be preserved, even in theory.

Why cannot the Congress approve a uniform type of ballot for Federal, State, and local offices, to be distributed and collected by the Army and Navy, and suggest to the several States that this type of ballot be adopted by all? If such a uniform ballot were offered to the States, we believe they would adopt it. We do not agree with the President that there is "no likelihood" the States will act. Try them and see.

Of course, a suggestion from Congress would be only a suggestion and could not become law until the States had made it such. But they would be under the pressure, if pressure were needed, of implementing the sacred right of franchise for men and women who are risking their lives for this Republic of 48 States.

The question of soldier voting has become pretty complicated in Washington. But one fact is as obvious as Mount Shasta. The men and women in the armed services, at home or abroad, have the right to vote and must be permitted to vote in time to have their ballots counted for all Federal, State, and local offices next November.

Roosevelt Moves on Behalf of Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Associated Press:

ROOSEVELT MOVES ON BEHALF OF JEWS—UNITED STATES DEPARTMENTS TOLD TO EXTEND REFUGEE HELP

President Roosevelt created a War Refugee Board last night and directed it to attempt the rescue of "the victims of enemy oppression who are in imminent danger of death."

The Board consists of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and War, who are empowered to appoint a full-time executive director to administer the refugee assistance program.

A White House statement said the President's action was designed to bring about immediate rescue from the Nazis of as many as possible of the persecuted minorities of Europe—racial, religious, or political—all civilian victims of enemy savagery.

The White House said that Mr. Roosevelt stressed that it was urgent for action to be taken at once to forestall the plan of the Nazis to exterminate all the Jews and other persecuted minorities in Europe.

Decision as to how the goal could be accomplished was left to the Board. It could, perhaps, make use of the International Red Cross, neutral diplomatic missions, or even underground movements in occupied lands.

Mr. Roosevelt stated, the White House said, that he expected to get the cooperation of all the United Nations and other foreign governments in the program.

The State Department was directed to appoint special attaches with diplomatic status, on recommendation of the Board, to be stationed at spots where help might be rendered to war refugees.

The Board will be charged not only with developing plans for the rescue of oppressed peoples but also with working out measures for their transportation, maintenance, and relief and for setting up havens of temporary refuge.

Amendment of Iowa Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message to the special session of Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa by Gov. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, January 26, 1944:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, the honorable members of the general assembly, on December 28, 1943, I issued a proclamation convening your honorable body in extraordinary session on this date, and you have convened in response thereto. The constitution and the laws of the State of Iowa provide that there shall be a regular session of the

legislature each 2 years beginning in January following the general election in November, but provision is made for special meetings when emergency matters of vital interest and necessity occur. Our laws further provide that when such special or emergency sessions are deemed necessary by the executive, he shall state to the legislature, when it is assembled, the purpose for which the call was issued. I do that now and state to you that the purpose for which this extraordinary or special session of the fiftieth general assembly was convened by me is the necessity, in my opinion, of altering our election laws so that our citizens who are qualified voters in the armed forces of our country may be given every reasonable opportunity to vote in the primary and in the general election of 1944; and for the enactment of such necessary legislation as will accomplish this purpose and make any reasonably necessary or proper changes in our laws regarding elections as may facilitate or contribute to the accomplishment of this purpose.

Under existing law, with respect to absent voters and the casting of their ballots, there is but a 20-day period prior to any election, during which the absent voter must request an application for ballot, receive such application, return it to the county auditor, receive a ballot from the auditor, vote and return it to the auditor. Heretofore this time has been found sufficient for ordinary use by absent voters within the territorial limits of the 48 States and is still ample within this country. Manifestly, however, with thousands of our citizens in remote parts of the world, this length of time is not sufficient for them to vote from overseas by absent voter's ballot.

There is no question involved as to the right of the voter in the armed forces to vote regardless of where he may be, but the question involved is one of opportunity and time within which he may exercise this right. Any legislation touching this right should be extended to all persons in the armed forces without any attempt to differentiate between those within the United States and those in foreign lands; because, with the rapidity of movement and uncertainty of location, there is no assurance that any of such voters may remain for any length of time either within or without our territorial limits.

There has been much discussion in recent weeks concerning action by the National Congress in connection with such voting. At no time in such discussion has there appeared any serious or feasible program under which the absent voter in the armed forces could be provided with any opportunity to vote for other than Presidential and Vice Presidential electors and for Members of the Congress. No feasible or practical suggestion has been offered in connection with such national action that would in any way offer any opportunity for those who are defending their homes, their States as well as their Nation, to register any opinion or cast any ballot with reference to the local county or State offices in their home counties and home States.

The Constitution of the United States places the power and the duty of providing for and regulating elections for national and State office primarily and in some instances exclusively with the legislatures of the respective States.

The first paragraph of section 4, of article 1 of the Federal Constitution, provides as follows:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

The first two paragraphs of section 1 of article 2 of the Federal Constitution with respect to the President and Vice President and their election are as follows:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector."

These two sections of the Federal Constitution provide the basis for the very serious doubt that exists as to the ability or the right of the National Congress to enact such legislation. By the same provisions, however, it does clearly and affirmatively appear that the responsibility and the obligation does rest upon the legislatures of the various States to provide for and protect the franchise of its citizens. It is because of this responsibility and obligation and under the existing circumstances in which our laws, adequate for normal peacetime service, are not adequate under these wartime conditions for the exercise of the franchise by members of our armed forces, especially in foreign lands, that I believe it to be the duty of the legislature to meet these responsibilities fully and promptly. May I add that, through letters and personal conversation with most of you heretofore, and especially since the date of the call for this session, I am convinced that you are unanimously of the opinion that this is a duty and an obligation to be met and performed.

With regard to the method of voting and the necessary steps to be taken, I have of course given some thought, and I have asked the Attorney General's office to do some research. Whatever help or benefit may derive therefrom is available to you, not with the idea that any conclusions reached are final, but rather from the standpoint of impartial research and opinion as to certain probable requirements in legislation to accomplish this purpose generally.

Based upon this thought and research, there are several factors that should be taken into consideration in connection with any legislation that may be enacted.

The right to vote being a fundamental principle of our system, the opportunity to vote at both the primary and the general election should be preserved to the greatest reasonable extent. It certainly is fundamental, under our party system of government, that the citizen shall have a right to choose his party and have a voice in the selection of his party candidates for office, as well as the right to exercise his personal opinion in voting for officeholders in the general election.

In order that absent voters in remote places can have an opportunity to receive and return their ballots, it will be necessary to lengthen the time prior to each election during which such ballots may be forwarded and received. The newspapers indicate that it is the opinion of the War and Navy Departments that a minimum of 45 days is required, and I recommend that this time be increased by at least 10 more days. Such lengthening of time will necessitate an earlier filing date for filing nomination papers by candidates and suggests that it will be necessary that primary candidates file their required nomination papers for county offices approximately 70 days prior to the primaries and for State and National offices at approximately 80 days prior to the primaries. This should occasion no hardship under the circumstances.

Care should be exercised so that technicalities of registration of absent voters in the armed forces be eliminated as far as possible, to facilitate voting.

The request for ballot on the part of the voter in the armed forces should be simplified, and, while I believe that the voter himself should make the request for ballot in the primaries because of the necessity for declaration of party affiliation, however, in the general election, adult members of his family should also be permitted to make application in his behalf if they or he so desire.

It also seems desirable that a voting or ballot commission be established for the purposes of the elections this year, and I recommend that such commission be established. It should have adequate, proper, and uncontrolled representation from each of the two major parties in the State and such commission should have discretionary authority with respect to establishing uniformity in size, weight, and other matters in connection with the ballot. It should be authorized to make reasonable adjustments and provisions in connection with the transmittal of ballots, in keeping with any future regulations of the Federal Government, that may be helpful in connection with such absent voting.

There are, of course, many other items to be considered, but they are, largely, incidental, necessary alterations having to do with the mechanics of tne legislation rather than the principle.

I recommend that the legislation herein contemplated be of a temporary nature, so far as this extraordinary session is concerned. It may be desirable, later, to make more permanent provision with respect to future elections, but any such permanent changes should be considered maturely by a regular session of the legislature, benefiting, no doubt, from the experience gained from temporary enactments.

An extraordinary session of the general assembly is, of necessity, an emergency session. It is hastily called because of emergency demands. As a rule no comprehensive planning has been made for its action, other than the needs of the particular emergency justifying its call. Such a session should, therefore, be most cautious with respect to considering or enacting permanent alterations or changes in established and operating statutes.

I know that you are busy people, and that you each have a multitude of duties in your own businesses and occupations, increased many times by the war effort, shortage of help, and plans for greater individual and community effort for this year. I realize fully that you had little opportunity to make plans to come here and that it is a distinct effort on the part of each of you and a serious hardship for many. However, again may I say, and I am certain you agree, the importance of providing and protecting the opportunity of voting for our armed forces is one of the fundamental obligations of our State and of our citizens. Liberty has been preserved through the protection of the ballot—it is the bulwark of self-determination and our defense against autocracy. No more potent duty is placed upon public officials than to maintain that right to its greatest extent.

Your sons, your brothers, your loved ones are today fighting the greatest battle for the survival and future of freedom that the world has ever known. Your sisters and daughters are taking their parts. We, likewise, must meet the duties of home and society in this battle of freedom.

The State of Iowa is assuming its full share of responsibility in this war effort. With over 250,000 of our citizens in the armed forces, we are well above the national average in this field of the war. Our leadership in the purchase of bonds, in the production of food, in contribution to the various services, indicates that there is a deep appreciation of our responsibilities and a willingness to discharge them fully. The State legislature is the only body that can give the members of our armed forces the full opportunity to exercise all of their major rights of franchise, and we, as a State, would be derelict

in our duty if we did not assume and discharge this responsibility, placed upon us by the Federal Constitution and gladly accepted by us. Our sons and daughters are citizens of our State as well as of the United States, and any voting opportunities that limit them to voting only for national officials would be a piecemeal approach to the discharge of the obligations we owe them and but partial recognition of the rights for which they are fighting.

Our citizens have a vital interest in their county officers and county government and in their State officers and State government as well as in national offices and National Government. To limit their voting opportunities to national offices only would be to assume that there are no offices and there is no government worthy of consideration other than national. I do not agree with such an assumption or such philosophy.

May I assure you of my full confidence in your judgment in connection with the enactment of proper legislation on this subject and I offer every cooperation in connection with the action of this legislature to accomplish this purpose.

There's But One Answer to Soldier Vote Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Members of Congress will have an opportunity to express themselves on the all-important subject of soldier-vote legislation in the very near future, it occurs to me that a very interesting and informative article by Ernest Lindley on the subject is well worth reading and considering. It presents food for thought. Therefore, under the leave granted me, I am including as part of my remarks the article by this well-known columnist as follows:

The outcries of outraged innocence from Congress at the President's description of the "States' rights" service vote bill as a "fraud" have evoked sympathetic comments from certain sections of the press. However, the New York Herald Tribune, a staunch Republican organ, declared bluntly that the President's ugly word was entirely justified by fact.

The editorial, published in the Herald Tribune on January 28, said:

"The so-called States' rights bill was a fraud, and all Senator TAFT's protestations of insulted innocence and shrieks of 'politics' are unlikely to convince the servicemen otherwise.

"When Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon, can let slip the admission that 'the difference over this bill centers around the fact that the Commander in Chief is himself a candidate; if he would eliminate himself from that disadvantageous and unfair position, I think debate on the bill would come to an end,' the men on the fighting lines may well ask whether the honorable gentlemen have any interest in their franchise at all or are merely concerned in a battle for selfish partisan advantage."

BELATED ADMISSION

This goes to the heart of the matter. The evidence is not limited to Senator HOLMAN's politically indiscreet candor or to Senator TAFT's floundering explanations. It can be found also in the new justification produced by some who voted for the States' rights bill in the Senate in December and by others in their behalf.

This is that only by so voting could they register their objections to certain features in the original Lucas-Green bill which they considered unconstitutional. They claim the credit for bringing about modifications in this bill which now overcome, at least in part, their original misgivings.

This belated explanation is in itself an admission that the bill for which they voted in December was exactly what the President called it: A fraud.

Further evidence can be found in the composition of the alliance against a Federal ballot for the men and women in the armed service and in the private talk of Members. If the political opponents of the President did not fear that he would receive a majority of the service vote, they would not maneuver to keep the men and the women in the services from being effectively enfranchised.

But for this fear, a bill providing for a Federal ballot would have been passed before this. Likewise, the belief of the President and his supporters that a majority of the service vote would be cast for him probably does give added drive to their efforts to obtain a bill which will permit this vote to be cast and counted.

NOT ISOLATED

Whether this appraisal of the distribution of the service vote is correct is debatable. Both the President's opponents and his supporters believe it to be correct. It is true that the opposing candidate will have difficulty in reaching all the men in the services with a full statement of his case against the administration. It is true that Roosevelt's name is known and that he is the Commander in Chief.

But if he were a bad Commander in Chief, if the war were not being well conducted, the men and women in the services surely would know it.

Their verdict is all the more entitled to full weight because it is less likely than part of the vote on the home front to be alloyed with such base considerations as obtaining private economic or political advantage.

Moreover, the men and women in the services are not completely isolated from knowledge of home affairs. Most of them get letters from relatives and friends. Most of them get reading matter, including independently edited American news magazines.

The notion that they cannot form an intelligent opinion without reading or hearing all the speeches of the politicians and all the propaganda which will pour out of the Republican and Democratic national committees is thoroughly absurd.

JUST ONE ANSWER

The deep fear of the Roosevelt opposition—and especially of many of the Republicans in the Senate and House—that the service vote will go, in a substantial majority, for the President and against them, is more directly traceable to the fact that during the last 2 years this opposition had devoted itself chiefly to trying to win political favor by catering to the pressure groups.

The administation's record in respect to the pressure groups is by no means perfect. But, on the whole, the executive branch of the Government has stood its ground in the face of terrific pressures, backed by a majority of Congress. At any rate, it is willing to submit its record to the judgment of the men and women in the service whereas the opposition very clearly wishes to avoid this test.

There are constitutional and mechanical difficulties about taking the service vote. They are simple compared to difficulties of other types which have been surmounted during the war.

The central question is whether the people who are making the greatest sacrifices for the preservation of the democratic way are to be enabled to vote or whether they are to be left effectively disenfranchised.

Roosevelt Pledges That United States Will Share Oil With World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

ROOSEVELT PLEDGES THAT UNITED STATES WILL SHARE OIL WITH WORLD—GAS SHORTAGE TO CONTINUE, PRESIDENT SAYS; REVEALS LEND-LEASE HAS COST 18.6 BILLIONS

(By Willard Edwards)

Any hopes entertained by civilians for increased gasoline rations were blasted yesterday by President Roosevelt as he transmitted to Congress the thirteenth report on lend-lease operations.

Disclosing that a total of 18.6 billions in munitions, food, machinery, and services had been furnished the United Nations as of last November 30, the report carried a special section on the shipment of petroleum which stressed that war needs will take all available supplies during 1944.

TO "SHARE" AFTER WAR, TOO

Moreover, after the war, the United States will have to share any surplus oil with nations which have insufficient reserves, the report asserted.

"Master lend-lease agreements" have made provision for a division of petroleum production on a basis of need, Congress was informed.

Legislators greeted this revelation with mixed amazement and indignation and repercussions are expected when Congress reconvenes next Monday.

NEW SUPPLIES WON'T HELP

"The over-all petroleum war needs of the United Nations in 1944 will rise above what they are now," the report stated. "The increasing number of planes, ships, and tanks which we are now producing and putting into action against the enemy require increasing quantities of gasoline, oil, and lubricants.

"Additional supplies of petroleum products from other areas will not therefore result in reducing the demands on our own petroleum resources. All available supplies of petroleum products will be required for a speedy and complete victory of the United Nations over the enemy.

"After the war the nations of the world, including the United States, will require petroleum to maintain their industrialized economies. Discoveries of new oil fields will undoubtedly be made to supplement known oil reserves and, as in the past, the steady development of technological improvements in oil production will make it possible to draw on oil reserves which cannot now be tapped.

"Nevertheless, as in the case of other natural resources, some nations will have insufficient oil reserves to meet their petroleum requirements. Others will have a surplus.

"FAIR AND EQUAL ACCESS"

"Agreed actions by nations of the world, as provided for in the master lend-lease

agreements, for the expansion of production, the elimination of discriminatory treatment in commerce, and the reduction of trade barriers, will assure to the United States and other nations fair and equal access to the petroleum produced in all parts of the world."

Lend-lease supplies of petroleum products totaled approximately 132,000,000 barrels, or about 9 percent of United States production in 1943, according to the report. This figure is exclusive of the vast amounts shipped abroad for our own forces.

The report insisted that all petroleum refining facilities in the Middle East operated by the British are being "utilized to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient use of tankers and the maximum output of products, such as aviation and other high-octane gasoline." This statement conflicted with the report of the world-touring Senators.

Other highlights of the report:

Lend-lease shipments to the Soviet Union through October 31, 1943, totaled $3,550,443,000, more than one-fourth of lend-lease exports to all countries. Shipments in the first 10 months of 1943 were 63 percent higher than in the entire year of 1942.

Food shipments to Russia totaled 1,790,000, including 343,000 tons of wheat and flour, 277,000 tons of sugar, 324,000 tons of canned meat, 441,000 tons of edible fats and oils, 136,000 tons of dried fruits and vegetables, 38,000 tons of dried eggs, and 33,500 tons of butter.

Fighting weapons sent to Russia included 7,000 planes, 3,500 tanks, and 195,000 motor vehicles, including trucks, jeeps, and motorcycles.

Shipments to Great Britain totaled $5,980,379,000 through October 31, 1943. Food shipments totaled 10 percent of Britain's total food requirements.

Supplies to Africa, the Middle East, and Mediterranean area totaled $2,168,299,000 in value.

Exports to China, India, Australia, and New Zealand totaled $1,603,346,000.

Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been making an intensive study for the past several months of the problems incident to the disposition of surplus government-owned property—problems which are already with us but which will be manifoldly multiplied as the war production program is gradually terminated. Unless some sound program for the orderly disposition of these huge surpluses is adopted, it is inevitable that a repetition of the errors made after the last war will occur.

As a result of our study of these problems, I introduced on December 18, last, H. R. 3873, a bill which carries the unanimous endorsement of the members of the House Small Business Committee. It is a bill which has received enthusiastic support from many industry groups as evidenced by hearings before the Small Business Committee and currently before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Excerpts from Guaranty Survey, published by the Guaranty Trust Co., New York City, were brought to my attention yesterday through an article appearing in the New York Times (Tuesday, January 25, 1944); these excerpts from the study of this great bank's research staff give additional evidence of the seriousness of the problem and how it should be approached to make the best possible utilization of these surpluses with the least effect on our economy.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD these excerpts as appearing in the Times as follows:

In its present stage, the problem is mainly one of redistributing raw material and productive equipment in such a way as best to promote the effective prosecution of the war. Contract terminations and cut-backs in certain items, combined with unexpectedly favorable production records, are making supplies available for the use of producers of other items.

As the war goes on, the disposal problem will increase both in magnitude and in scope. Materials and equipment, instead of being rechanneled into new branches of war industry, will become available for civilian use. Actual military and naval supplies in the possession of the armed services will become surplus. And finally there will remain the most difficult and important problem of all—that of disposing of the huge industrial plants built and owned by the Government.

Only a rough idea of the size of the task and the strength of the economic forces, good or evil, that will be created in disposing of surplus war materials can be gained from estimates of the total money value of the property involved.

While it is apparently impossible to arrive at a close approximation, the amount of goods of all kinds that will eventually have to be disposed of has been placed by some authorities as high as $65,000,000,000, a sum not far below the entire national income in a fairly prosperous year before the war. The Government's investment in war plants and facilities alone includes about 2,600 establishments valued at approximately $15,000,000,000, and these totals will be even larger before the war is over.

Preliminary steps in the adoption of some such program should be taken without delay. Government agencies should immediately establish records of their war property, and any such property becoming surplus should be promptly placed under the control of the disposal authority. The whole plan should be administered with a view to the rapid stimulation of post-war employment, the effects on existing enterprise, and the interests of the taxpayers.

Equipment and supplies should be made available, as far as practicable, in quantities permitting acquisition by small as well as large concerns—an objective that can be attained only in part, since many of the facilities consist of extremely large units. No class of property should be disposed of, or terms fixed, except after consultation with committees representing the industry or industries most directly affected. Property should be disposed of, as far as possible, through regular trade channels by the industries that originally produced it.

While sale is preferable to lease, there is no vital objection to the latter in cases where property cannot be promptly sold to advantage. Whether the property is sold or leased, however, the Government should not accept equity securities in payment. Surpluses held abroad, competitive with products of the United States, should be disposed of abroad when possible; and the disposal authority should have power to distribute property for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of devastated areas. When property is disposed of abroad it should be debarred from subsequent reimport into the United States, if such reimport would tend to have an adverse influence on domestic economy.

Fourth Loan Drive at Lovilia, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the success of the Fourth War Loan drive depends largely on the patriotism and zeal of every loyal American desiring to bring this war to a successful and speedy conclusion.

The laissez faire attitude of some of the communities contributes to the slowness with which quotas are subscribed, but in my district the town of Lovilia, Iowa, has a will to win so sincere that its quota was oversubscribed the first day. This is characteristic of Iowa, where the Treasury Department reports that for September and October 1943 Iowa citizens purchased more War bonds in the third drive than any other State, computed on a per capita basis. Our average was $47.73 per person, while the national average was $27.29.

Lovilia is made up of as fine, industrious, and patriotic citizens as may be found any place in the United States. Their attitude is that it is a privilege to live in our great country and to accept a full share of the burdens of war. Long before the Fourth War Loan drive was launched, preparations were made under the direction of Ed Agans for a whirlwind sale of bonds and, as in the previous drives, the quota set for Lovilia was oversubscribed before the first day was over.

I am proud of the record made by Lovilia folks and the State of Iowa as a whole, and under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the Monroe County News of Albia, Iowa, of January 24, 1944, commenting on the outstanding achievement of this small community:

LOVILIA AGAIN IS FIRST

The Lovilia community has achieved a most enviable habit, one that every community in the Nation can well emulate. By some means or another, Lovilia anticipates and oversubscribes war finance quotas the very first day of such drives.

Ed Agans and his efficient corps of patriots get ready far in advance for that which they know will be asked and expected. Mr. Agans declares that success in the Lovilia community is nothing more or less than education and organization. Agans insists that when the community knows the full details of what is expected, then the whole matter boils down into apportioning the responsibility.

In Lovilia the people have no attitude of "Let George do it." They have no ultrarich people. They have no few people or few concerns to stand the brunt of War bond drives and other community campaigns. They realize that it takes teamwork by everybody. Acting on such common-sense philosophy,

they "get there fustest with the mostest." So the job is done, and they stand ready for the next requirement.

Lovilia is an inspiration to not only Monroe County, but to Iowa and the Nation. Lovilia is an evidence that the small town is still essential. Lovilia demonstrates a patriotic devotion, without which all of us would be poorer.

In the days of reconstruction the Lovilias of the Nation will be empowered to accept their shares in rehabilitation. The misery of depression will fall on such communities lightly. They will have tucked away the bonds with which to carry on. They are demonstrating their faith in the America of tomorrow. This newspaper is proud to acclaim the great devotion of our sister town, and we do want to give praise where praise is due.

Government-Check Racket Keeps Secret Service Busy in New Protective Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a very interesting article in the Washington Star of Sunday, January 30, written by Mr. Joseph H. Baird, that tells of the activities of the United States Secret Service, which is headed by Mr. Frank J. Wilson. It not only pictures the extent of the work that must be done by the Secret Service, but offers some excellent suggestions which, if followed out, will certainly prevent forgeries. It seems to me that this information should be given wide publicity, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the article as part of my remarks. It follows:

Before the end of the Government's fiscal year next June, more than 300,000,000 checks will have been issued during the preceding 12 months on the richest institution in the world—the United States Treasury. That will be nearly twice the number drawn in 1943 and a record for volume in American financial history.

Millions of these checks are being received by people who never before have handled one of Uncle Sam's vouchers. They—and the merchants and banks that cash them—know that these light blue safety-paper checks are as good as gold.

But what they may not know is that this flood of paper wealth into the United States mails have opened a new and lucrative field of operation for the Nation's crooks. A new class of sharpers—mail-box thieves—are preying upon the families of Government employees and servicemen. And merchants throughout the Nation who have not been cautious enough in determining the identity of those for whom they cash Treasury checks, are finding to their sorrow and financial loss that these imposing vouchers are good as gold only if indorsed by the person to whom they are rightfully issued.

SECRET SERVICE IN A NEW ROLE

All of which has imposed a new job upon the United States Secret Service, which is supplementing its Sherlock Holmes role with that of an educator and guardian.

In a large office on the first floor of the Treasury Department sits a middle-aged, stockily built man whose orders and policies radiate out to 54 field offices through the United States, where highly trained operatives work to protect the public from counterfeiters and check artists. His name is Frank J. Wilson, and he heads that much-glamourized but actually little-known organization, the United States Secret Service.

Mr. Wilson is giving much thought these days to the problem of protecting the new millions of Government check-receivers, as well as the country's businessmen, from loss through fraud. He sums up his formula for protection of the latter in a terse phrase:

"KNOW YOUR ENDORSERS"

That slogan is going out today to the American public in many forms. It is being printed on millions of checks, both governmental and private. It is being taught through booklets in 15,000 high schools and colleges. And its lesson, in graphic form, soon will be incorporated into a moving picture, "Know Your Money," which the Secret Service has used effectively to cut down losses from counterfeiting from $1,000,000 to $22,000 per year.

Before telling this writer recently of the Government's new check problem and what the Secret Service is doing to solve it, Chief Wilson expounded his ideas on the educational role his office is playing.

BEFORE THE CRIME

"It's our conviction," he said, "that the prevention of crime is far more effective than the investigation of it. For prevention precludes the creation of criminals and saves their victims. Investigation after the crime involves both the criminal and the victim in tragic consequences. For the criminal there is the penitentiary. For the victim there is loss of money, embarrassment, and the disgust with self for having been played for a sucker.

"I feel that it is the duty of the Secret Service to protect the public from being made suckers. And we haven't done our full duty unless we use every possible method to prevent citizens from being victimized.

"Of course, our role as detectives is much more melodramatic. When an agent makes a big haul it often means a lot of favorable publicity for the Secret Service. But we have an equally important duty to perform in educating the public for its own protection."

MEAT FOR MAIL-BOX THIEVES

In Chief Wilson's files are thousands of documents showing both the immensity of the current check problem and the methods used by crooks to mulct the rightful payee on Government checks.

During the current fiscal year, it is estimated, the Army will send out, mostly by mail, 6,500,000 dependency benefit checks each month. The Navy will issue approximately 2,000,000. The Newark Office of Dependency Benefits is paying out $2,250,000,000 yearly. Most of these vouchers will go to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of American soldiers and sailors, few of whom ever have received Government checks before.

Each one of these millions of checks is "meat" for the mail-box thief, a new type of crook spawned by the war.

These operatives, knowing that dependency checks are mailed out on a hard-and-fast schedule, which results in their being delivered on the same day each month, pry open the mail boxes of known relatives of servicemen, steal the vouchers, as well as other mail which might be useful in providing identification, and cash the checks in the stores of unsuspecting merchants.

The cashing of such checks is easier than one might think. And the gullibility shown by businessmen who honor them is amazing.

Here are a few cases from the files of the Secret Service.

GANG ROUNDED UP

In Detroit recently the Secret Service rounded up a gang of 26 persons who were operating a systematic racket in the theft and cashing of dependency checks. They divided the town into districts, so that the greatest possible haul might be made on the days when checks were due to arrive.

The gang, wise in the ways of its craft, always stole other mail along with the checks to furnish identification in cashing them. Two well-dressed women in the mob specialized in forging endorsements and cashing the checks, while one of the male gangsters, a Pole, passed those made out to Polish beneficiaries.

Here in Washington recently a woman had accumulated five Government checks, which she had folded away in a small coin purse in her handbag. She went into the office of a local utility corporation to pay her bill and later discovered that her small purse was missing. She immediately reported the loss to the Treasury.

Soon all five checks, bearing a forgery of the woman's endorsement, were cleared by Washington banks and finally reached the Treasury, where a Secret Service operative was assigned to the case. His successful apprehension of the thief and forger provides an interesting study in Secret Service technique.

Starting with virtually no clues, the agent went to the utility office and obtained the names of five persons who had paid their bills immediately after the woman who lost the checks. Obviously they were standing in line behind her.

Of course, the agent knew, too, the names of the suburban stores where the checks had been cashed, and learned that they were presented by a young woman, who was known by sight but not by name to the merchants who took them.

The agent, after some investigation, eliminated four of his five names, and suspicion narrowed down to the one young woman. He learned that she had been seeking a Government job. Going to the Civil Service Commission, where she had filled out papers, he obtained a sample of her handwriting. It corresponded with the forged endorsements.

Confronted with this evidence, the woman admitted her guilt. She now faces grand jury indictment as a thief and forger.

Another Washington case:

PAIR WORKED IN TEAM HERE

Secret Service agents here recently discovered that a man and woman, working in cooperation, had stolen and forged the endorsements on 18 Government checks. When caught the woman had in her handbag a tack-hammer and beer-can opener which she used to jimmy mail boxes.

More astounding, the pair had social-security cards made out in the names of each payee of the 18 checks. Which leads up to the Secret Service's advice to merchants:

"Don't take social-security cards as identification."

These can be obtained by anyone merely on application.

While the Secret Service will not guarantee any form of identification, its best advice to check-cashiers is: Require, in the case of a man, a selective-service registration card; in the case of a woman, a ration book bearing her signature. Such things as lodge cards and drivers' licenses are considered virtually worthless as identification.

Although the honest person may at times find it difficult to cash a check, the Secret Service can cite cases showing the amazing gullibility of some merchants.

There is the epic of the deserter from the Army who traveled all over the United States, long eluding operatives, on money extracted from unsuspecting merchants. This man's technique was to buy from a 5-and-10 store a book of perfectly blank checks. In the

space where the name of the bank was to be written, he inscribed "Quartermaster's Bank of the U. S. Army" (an institution that never existed). He would make the checks payable to any name that might occur to his fertile mind and sign them with the imposing signature of "General" or "Colonel" So-and-So.

Incredible as it may seem, he cashed these checks in many parts of the country.

CHECK-PASSER TRAPPED

Finally, he was trapped in a peculiar way. The Secret Service learned that the man had tuberculosis and might seek medical help. Hospitals were warned to watch for him and a notice about him was placed in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

In time, the man appeared at the office of a midwestern doctor who had read the notice in the Journal. After treatment, he offered the physician one of his "quartermaster's bank" checks. The Kansas City office of the Secret Service was notified and apprehended the forger.

"Why didn't you vary your technique?" the agent asked.

"Why should I?" the crook answered. "I didn't have any trouble with these checks. The public is a bunch of dopes."

To which Chief Wilson adds emphatically:

"All criminals are looking for a sucker—and it is our duty to try to prevent the public from being made suckers.

"We are in a somewhat different position from most law-enforcement agencies. They must wait for crimes, and then try to solve them. But we, dealing with money and checks, can start out by trying to prevent crime before it happens, proceeding through a program of education.

"For instance, in the years before we started our 'Know Your Money' campaign to teach people not to accept counterfeit bills, we sent between one thousand and two thousand persons to prison annually for counterfeiting. Last year we jailed only 68.

"Now we are carrying out the second phase of our campaign with the slogan 'Know Your Endorser.' That is working, too. And the same procedure can work in curbing all crimes where finances are involved. Naturally, we can't apply this theory to crimes of passion such as murder, which are often motivated on the spur of the moment."

With America in the midst of the greatest war it ever fought, Chief Wilson is concerned with the psychological and sociological effects of the Treasury's effort to protect Government checks.

Obviously, he observed, a soldier abroad is going to worry when he learns that the dependency check upon which his family lives has been stolen, and his ability as a fighting man will be lessened.

With this in mind, the Secret Service had the Office of Dependency Benefits mail out with original checks a stuffer advising the payees how to protect them. Similar warnings were printed in service magazines, such as Yank and Leatherneck. Soldiers frequently clip these and mail them to their families.

The Secret Service also is spreading its check-protection campaign to private business. To date some 2,647 firms, including large ones like Du Pont and Dravo (shipbuilders) are printing on their checks: Know Your Endorser. Local police departments, newspapers, radio stations, and schools are cooperating.

Chief Wilson sets great store by publicity, explaining:

"If there is enough information spread by the newspapers and radio the public can be saved from being victimized by financial sharpers. I can point to the analogy of a magician. Unless you know his tricks, he can fool you, but once you see behind his magic you can no longer be deceived."

And how can the rightful owner of a Government check and the merchant who is asked to cash it protect themselves?

Chief Wilson has a four-point answer for each.

To those who receive Government checks:

"1. Have some member of the family at home when the checks are due to be delivered.

"2. Be sure your name is printed clearly on the mail box.

"3. Try to cash your chceks in the same place each month. This will make identification easier. Merchants are being cautioned to ask identification.

"4. Do not endorse your check until you are in the presence of the person you will ask to cash it."

And to the merchant:

"1. When a stranger asks you to cash a check, insist that he properly identify himself as the rightful payee of that check.

"2. Before you accept any check, ask yourself this question: If this check is returned because of a forged endorsement, can I locate the forger and recover my loss?

"3. If a check is already endorsed when it is presented to you, insist that it be endorsed again in your presence and compare the handwriting.

"4. Have each check initiated by the employee who pays out money for it."

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this evening I want to discuss briefly the question of providing a method by which the soldiers can vote in the coming national election. May I say in the beginning that every Member of Congress is anxious to extend to the soldier the fullest possible opportunity to vote, the disagreement being only as to the method which the Congress should adopt.

The question of which party the soldier may favor was not considered in the drafting of our committee bill. The purpose of our bill is to give him a chance to vote secretly, legally, free from coercion, a ballot like he would vote if he were home, a ballot that will be counted in his election precinct.

Contrary to the many false and misleading statements that have been hurled against us who are supporting the committee bill, and of which I am one of the authors, it is a well-known fact that no Member of Congress has any desire to prevent our soldiers from voting.

The record of the Congress of the United States since the Civil War has been one of trying to keep faith with the soldiers. The Congress of this country, when other departments of government have failed in the past, has never failed the soldiers and their dependents in the history of this Nation.

The Members of this, the Seventy-eighth Congress, have 262 sons and daughters serving in this war. They know it is their responsibility to back the service men and women of this Nation at every turn. They are determined to do it, and they will do it.

I should like for you to know that the members of the committee, who have held long hearings twice on the Green-Lucas-Worley bill and on the House committee bill, have approached their duty without any thought of political advantage and with courage and determination.

Our deliberations have been guided with only two thoughts in mind—that we should bring out a bill that squares with the Constitution, our basic law of government, and, so far as is possible, with the constitutions and the laws of the various States.

We wanted to write a bill that, if and when it is enacted into law and the national election has been held under such law, that the election could not be thrown into the Supreme Court, or possibly into the Congress, for a decision which would delay the announcements of the results for weeks and maybe months, resulting in chaos in this country.

Now, let me explain House committee bill 1285. I think I can best explain the provisions of the House committee bill by taking a voter who is in the armed service in Australia whose home is in Springfield, Ill. Our bill directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to place into the hands of every soldier overseas a post-card application for an absentee ballot not later than August 15. All the soldier has to do is to write in the blank space his home address, and in another blank space his present military address, and sign this printed application for an absentee ballot. On the reverse side of the card, which is addressed to the secretary of his State, he shall write in the State from which he hails, and this card goes direct to the secretary of state, in this instance, it would be Springfield, Ill. The secretary of state forwards it at once to the county clerk of his home county, who files it of record. As soon as the ballots are printed the county clerk mails the ballot to him at his military address, the same ballot he would vote if he were at home, a ballot with all of the names of the candidates on it from coroner to President. It would go by air from Springfield, Ill., to Los Angeles and from there all ballots going to the southwest Pacific and to Australia would be picked up by Army planes, and the ballots delivered to the military post offices.

The soldier would get his ballot like a letter from home; would open it, vote it, and place it in an inner envelope, which envelope is addressed back to his county clerk.

Ballots would then be picked up by Army planes, flown back to Los Angeles, and would be carried by regular air mail from Los Angeles to the voter's home address.

Our process is just this easy of administration. The same process would apply to soldiers in the various camps in the United States only that the officials of the Army and Navy would cause to be distributed the same postal-card application a month later, on September 15, with post-card applications and ballots carried by commercial airways instead of Army planes.

Practically all of the States in the Nation are anxious to cooperate with such a Federal plan, and, where necessary their Governors have indicated their willingness to call special sessions of the legislature in order to provide a longer time between the primaries and the printing of the ballots and the November election.

Think of the soldier who has been away from home for a year or more when he receives this full and complete ballot. Think how it will encourage and lift his morale. How he will appreciate the fact that the Congress of the United States has not forgotten him. What a boost to his morale this full and complete ballot will be; and then think how with all of the talk that has been made about giving the soldier a ballot, how disgusted and depressed he will be if the Green-Lucas bill is enacted. For when election day is called for his battalion, under the sharp eye of the commanding officer he will be handed a blank ballot, with no names of candidates on it, this blank piece of paper that sells him and his interest short.

Now, I want to give you the average time it requires to make a round trip by air to the various military sectors outside of continental United States. These figures allow 2 days for the soldier to vote and 2 days for the election official to handle the vote after it is returned to his voting address. They do not take into consideration that the Army is directed under this bill to expedite and shorten the flying time. Certainly they will greatly reduce this time. Here are the figures, and they show plainly that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, if they will exert half the efficiency that the soldiers exert on the battle front, they can get the ballots to the soldiers all over the world and get them back in time to be counted. Let no one deceive you into the idea that the Army and Navy cannot do this, once this bill becomes law, and they will do it.

These figures give the days required, as I have explained, for the ballot to make the round trip from the voter's home and return.

To the Alaskan area, 10 days; the Pacific area, 14 days; the Canal Zone, 7 days; the Caribbean area, 8 days; the South Atlantic area, 10 days; the Middle East area, 14 days; the Persian Gulf area, 18 days; the Mediterranean area, 18 days; the North Atlantic area, 10 days.

This time table proves conclusively that the States will have ample time between primaries and the election to get the ballot to the soldier and back. In fact, most States will have twice the time that is necessary.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, both appointed by the President, and serving under him, have made statements pointing out some great difficulties in transporting by air these ballots overseas.

I think the best answer to their objections is to point out that these same gentlemen just recently boasted that in addition to Christmas mail they carried to the soldiers overseas nearly 3,000,000 Christmas packages. One must wonder if their position is not to a considerable extent influenced by the President who opposes our plan.

It is fair to assume Germany will be out of the war before November. We will then have more planes and pilots idle than we know what to do with. Their excuse and claim that they fear it will be impossible to transport by plane ballots to the soldiers cannot be justified on any reasonable premise. It will not require the transmission of over 200 tons of mail by air. We are turning out some 10,000 planes a month.

Now let me explain the Green-Lucas bill. This bill provides for a short blank piece of paper without any names on it on which the soldier would be able to vote only for President, United States Senator, and his Congressmen. He could not vote for them unless he knew the names of the candidates and, would have to write them in the blank spaces provided.

Election days would be called under this bill at various times for the various military sectors all over the world and in all of the camps in the United States. The men would be called upon and handed this short ballot. These ballots would be voted, placed in envelopes and sent back to the War Ballot Commission and then distributed throughout the United States to the various States and precincts. After they have been returned many States, under our laws, will not be able to count them. Then the soldiers will find out too late that he has not been able to have a voice in the political affairs of the country he is fighting to defend.

If the national election is close we might find several States contesting the election in the Supreme Court. Such a condition would bring chaos to the Nation and would doubtless continue the President in power until a decision was rendered by the high court of the land.

I ask you in all fairness does this not refute completely the charge that we who are supporting the committee bill are attempting to prevent the soldiers from voting? Our bill is the only bill that is attempting to get to the soldier the whole ballot like we vote at home. We feel he is entitled to no less.

I think it is fair to say that the Green-Lucas bill does give a sort of a left-handed endorsement in title 2 to the provisions of our bill providing for the full and complete absentee ballot to be sent to the soldiers but the proponents of the bill argue that it can not be done and that it is impractical. The plain facts are that the proponents of the Green-Lucas bill have never intended for the soldiers to have anything but the short ballot and if their bill is enacted this short ballot will be placed into the hands of the soldiers early when they hold their different elections in the military sectors and they will be cheated out of an opportunity to vote the whole and complete ballot.

There does seem to be a sinister reason, which is obvious to most of the Members of Congress, why they insist on this short ballot.

Now let me refer briefly to the President's message as delivered to the Congress on soldier vote legislation this week. Most of the Members were astounded and thought his action was most regrettable. It was out of place, intemperate, unfair, and misleading. He referred to the committee bill as a deception and a fraud against the soldiers and the people. This is an unwarranted and a most serious charge to bring against the Members of Congress, the direct representatives of the people, of one of the great coordinate branches of our Government. It tends to cause disunity and could tend to cause the lack of confidence of the people of this country, and the men and women in the armed services, in the Congress of the United States.

Will it help the morale of the soldier to read that the President accuses Members of Congress of attempting to withhold from them the ballot? Of course, the facts are the very opposite.

Then again he says, "Several States have their primaries too late for the ballots to be gotten to the soldiers." He did not refer to the fact that the Governors of many States, where necessary, have called and are willing and anxious to call special sessions of their legislatures to make their laws conform with national pattern of law the Congress will enact.

He says, "An absentee ballot law will not work now because the Ramsey absentee ballot law failed in 1942." He did not tell the people this law was enacted only a few weeks prior to the election in 1942 and never had a chance to be administered.

Again, he said, "Some people, I am sure, with their tongues in their cheeks, say that the solution of this problem is that the respective States improve their absentee-ballot procedures." This trite remark against Members of Congress, implying by innuendo, insincerity, is uncalled for, and should be below the dignity of the Chief Executive. It again tends to lessen the confidence of the people in representative government.

Again he says, "Our millions of fighting men do not have any lobby or pressure group on Capitol Hill to see that justice is done them." The best answer to this statement is the many laws passed for the soldiers and their dependents during the past year, and the liberal mustering-out pay voted overwhelmingly by the Congress this last week of over three billions of dollars proves again that the soldiers do not need a lobby to insure that the Congress will look after their interest and do them justice. The record of Congress for the past 10 years shows far greater support for the servicemen than does the record of the Chief Executive.

Then he charges the Congress with delaying the passage of legislation on the soldier-vote bill. His leaders on Capitol Hill in the Senate and in the House have blocked and delayed consideration on our committee bill 1285 for the past 50 days. Had they allowed this legislation to come before the House it would have been passed before Christmas.

We who have contended for holding the election within the States have insisted upon our position because we believed it is an honest and workable plan that will do justice to the soldiers and will insure an election that will be accepted as final with no chance for legal technicalities to be raised.

Let me close with this serious thought. The information we have from several States is that even though the election officials of the States would be anxious to count the short Federal ballot provided under the Green-Lucas bill, they will be prevented under their State laws from so doing. In this situation the soldier would not only lose his vote but if they were so counted it might throw the entire election into the courts. In this instance we might find the electoral college could not decide, nor would the Congress be able to decide, who was elected. We cannot afford to take a chance on such a dangerous situation.

Reports to Committee of Forty-eight Interested in Food Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Forty-eight Interested in Food Production, composed of one Representative from each State, of which Congressman LEMKE is chairman and I am secretary, met again last Friday for the purpose of further study of the farm machinery situation. Most of the Representatitves were present. Reports were given by various Government agencies and numerous implement manufacturers.

Mr. Dave Meeker, Chief, Farm Machinery Supplies Branch, War Food Administration, reported that in the past steel, copper, and certain other metals were the limiting factor, but that that was not true today. He stated that the problem was that of components. He reported the following favorable steel allocations:

Tons allocated to farm-machinery production	
Fourth quarter, 1942	87,000
First quarter, 1943	187,434
Second quarter, 1943	246,753
Third quarter, 1943	314,420
Fourth quarter, 1943	317,117
First quarter, 1944	362,169

Authorization for 1944: 1,153,000 tons (over-all allocation) to farm-machinery production in 1944. He mentioned the fact that with steel easing up that there might be further allocations.

Mr. Meeker cautioned the group not to be too optimistic, because there was still a shortage of tires, carburetors, magnetos, bearings, tractors, engine-powered combines, engine-powered spraying equipment, engine-powered hay balers, because these were in direct competition with landing-craft programs, the Army's

truck program, and the airplane-tire needs.

He reported the following tractor production, which indicates quite an increase during the last year, although yet inadequate to meet the demands of farm production:

Tractors produced:	
December, 1942	4,200
First quarter, 1943	15,550
Second quarter, 1943	18,133
Third quarter, 1943	32,939
Fourth quarter, 1943	56,573

The December 1943 production was more than 20,000.

Mr. Meeker pointed out the fact that manufacturers started the 1944 production as early as July 1943 in many instances; in other cases the factories got off to a late start; however, the first half of the production was rather good, although not as favorable as he had hoped, although it is accelerating at a rapid rate. He made the forecast that production would be out in time for seasonal use.

Mr. Meeker stressed the fact that steel billets were no problem, yet steel plates were very difficult to get fabricated because of ship and landing barge construction.

Mr. Meeker mentioned the fact that steel sheets were hard to secure because mills had previously changed over to plate production.

In answer to a query from one of the western Congressmen, Mr. Meeker indicated that he did not anticipate any difficulty in securing sufficient power take-off combines, but indicated a shortage of the need of the other types.

LEMKE REPORTS

WILLIAM LEMKE, Representative from North Dakota, reported that he had written 50 implement companies and had received reports from several of them to the effect that they did not have sufficient allocation of necessary materials, others indicated that they were not up to schedule and still others indicated a labor shortage. He stated that the congressional group was not only interested in allocations, but production as well. He mentioned the fact that some firms were short of lumber, gears, malleables, chains, and so forth. One company reported to him that it believed too much emphasis was being placed on production of large implements leaving the one-horse farms without sufficient equipment.

ROLAND D. DOANE, REPRESENTATIVE OF INGERSOLL STEEL, REPORTS

Mr. Roland D. Doane, representative of Ingersoll Steel, which makes disks and other products indicated that their requirements had been doubled and that they were not up to schedule because of labor shortages in West Pullman, Ill. He indicated that the steel supply had been insufficient at times. He said his plant there was running 900 men short and that one-third of the employees operating the furnaces were colored women. He said his firm had turned down a number of Government contracts.

Mr. W. H. Losch, manager of Losch Farm Machinery Supply Co., Jersey Shore, Pa., implement distributors, reported that only 12 combines, 49 tractors were allocated to the 8 counties served by his company. He said only 464 ensilage cutters were allocated to the 67 Pennsylvania counties and that the need was much greater. In the State of Pennsylvania the corn binder situation would be tragic; his area is allotted 6 ensilage cutters, whereas the need is for 40. Only 274 potato planters, 428 diggers, and 6 potato graders were allocated to the State, which was entirely inadequate to meet the minimum requirements.

T. A. Dicus, representing Ferguson Co., tractor and implement manufacturers and distributors, reported that the farmers could use more implements than they could get. His firm will meet its allocation quotas. He said under L-257 that 18,000 tractors would be turned out. Orders would far exceed that. He indicated a definite improvement in Government red-tape requirements. He voiced the opinion that the manpower situation was not too serious. His firm makes very little for the armed forces.

Mr. R. E. Van Norstrand, representative of Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co., said their tractors were moving faster than the paint dried on them and that none of their equipment was collecting any dust.

The general opinion of the members of the Forty-eight Interested in Food Production was that the War Food Administration should requisition and the War Production Board should grant further allocations sufficient to meet the needs of the food-production program without delay, providing that it did not interfere with the prosecution of the war. The group stressed the importance of food in the war program.

The War Food Administration officials stated that the activities of the Committee of Forty-eight Interested in Food Production had materially aided the W. F. A. and that the efforts of the group had proved worth while and very valuable to the food program and the war effort.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, the discussions on the soldier vote in the Congress has warned the States that it may be necessary to work in conjunction with the Federal Government to make sure that our uniformed forces have the opportunity to vote for both the Federal and State candidates in the coming November elections.

I am proud to call to your attention this morning the fact that the State of Connecticut has promptly acted on that warning and has further liberalized its voting laws to give every possible chance to every elector in the service an opportunity to exercise his franchise. The Connecticut General Assembly which had been in session all of last week passed a carefully considered soldier-vote law to meet every condition it may be called upon to make to cooperate with the Federal Government in giving the soldier a vote. The telegram to me from Governor Baldwin of my State on Saturday morning confirms this action:

RANULF COMPTON,
Congressman from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.:

Connecticut General Assembly just passed soldiers' vote law making it possible to be made voters although absent from the State, to vote a straight, split, or individual candidate ticket with liberal provisions concerning application for absentee ballots either in person before leaving country, by informal written request, or by request of relative or friend directed to registrar of voters. Ballot simplified as to form and reduced as to size and weight. Provisions made for using Federal facilities if provided for distribution of absentee ballot forms without application.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor of Connecticut.

This action on the part of the State of Connecticut may offer an example and a method which may prove useful to those States which have not been able to give the soldier-vote question full consideration.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the problem of making provision for the members of our armed forces in the service to cast their votes in the coming elections has become an absorbing issue. Texas is in an attitude somewhat different from that of other States. Under the constitution of Texas the payment of a poll tax is required as a condition precedent for voting and this provision being in the constitution cannot be repealed or suspended by an act of the legislature. The legislature can submit a resolution for that purpose to be voted upon by the legal voters, but such a resolution can only be submitted at a regular session of the legislature. There can be no regular session of the Texas legislature until January 1945 which will be after the next general election.

In these circumstances, it is plain to see that the Governor of Texas, the Honorable Coke Stevenson, is entirely correct in saying that the Legislature of Texas cannot legally pass any act to waive the constitutional requirement for the payment of the poll tax to be effective in the next election. Unless Congress has that authority, there is no way by which it can be done. Of course, the State legislature may provide a way for those to vote who have paid their poll tax, but those who have failed to pay the poll tax

cannot legally be given this privilege by State action.

The war powers of Congress in the Constitution, in part, are as follows: To declare war; to raise and supply armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution those powers.

Under those provisions which have generally been liberally construed by the courts, there is little doubt in my mind that Congress has the authority to pass laws authorizing those in the armed service to vote in elections to take place while they are so engaged in war, and to relieve them of the payment of the poll tax to that end. Unless Congress does have this authority, it is plain to see that all persons from Texas engaged in our armed forces who failed to pay their poll tax will be completely disfranchised, as the State cannot possibly amend its constitution before the next general election.

The Worley bill, in my opinion, is the only practical proposal before us to authorize the soldiers from Texas to cast their votes in the next general election. And, believing as I do that it is not in violation of the war powers of the Constitution and that it does not involve the question of States' rights, I shall give it my support unless a more practical solution can be devised.

Need for Simplification of Income-Tax Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received concerning a request I made to the authorities of the Treasury Department to try to simplify income-tax forms:

GENERAL COUNSEL,
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: You have brought to my attention criticism voiced by many of your constituents concerning the complexity of the present income-tax forms.

This is a subject which has had very considerable attention from the Treasury Department for some time. You will remember that it was this Department which as far back as 1941 proposed the law making possible the simplified return form available to the great majority of taxpayers. In addition this Department has recommended since 1942 that the earned income credit be repealed for the sake of simplifying tax returns. The inclusion of this proposal in both the House and Senate versions of the current revenue bill is another step in the right direction. Likewise this Department opposed the Victory tax, in part, because of the complexity which it adds to the taxpayer's job of computing his taxes. We have repeatedly advocated the repeal of the tax, pointing to the complications which it presents. In addition we have urged the amalgamation of the normal tax and surtax so that the taxpayer may have but one computation to make in place of the involved procedure he must now follow.

Of course, this year much of the complexity in the tax forms is attributable to the forgiveness provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act. When the transition from the old system of collecting taxes to the current collection method is completed these problems will cease to complicate the return forms.

This illustrates, however, the reason for complexity of the forms. Special tax treatment for different kinds of income, deductions which are limited to a percentage of income, provisions for carrying over or carrying back losses from one year to another year, all require special handling.

To enable the taxpayer to cope with these problems, the present income-tax forms have been arranged in such a way that the taxpayer, by following the forms and accompanying instructions, can be sure that each item is given the treatment required by the law. Since it would be necessary for him to go through these calculations in arriving at a statement of his income tax, it is better that they appear where they can be examined and checked. I am not trying to justify the host of special devices in the law. They have been enacted from time to time in response to the urging of first this group and then of that group. I am merely trying to indicate that so long as they are part of the law they must be taken into account by the taxpayer to accurately state his taxable income and, therefore, he may as well show the Government the computations by which he arrives at his tax.

You may have noted that a tax bill to follow the current bill has been talked of as a tax simplification bill. I am in hope that in the present climate of opinion much can be accomplished to clear up the law and thus to simplify the forms. We have been preparing for it by asking men with practical experience in the field to review the whole subject and make their recommendations and our staff is working diligently on the subject. We shall therefore be prepared to add to the suggestions for simplification which we have already made.

Sincerely yours,

RANDOLPH E. PAUL,
General Counsel.

Jap Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, few things have happened in this war which so shocked the American people as the Jap atrocities on the heroic defenders of Bataan. Actual accounts of the mass murder of thousands of American and Filipino troops after the surrender were brought back by American officers who escaped to tell the awful truth. Deliberate murder of helpless captives by starving, torture, and neglect; the fiendish glee of Jap ghouls who harrowed their prisoners to their deaths, all seem too terrible for belief. But these things are true.

In this country there is a mighty surge of indignation. Our sympathy goes out to all the families of the victims who fought and suffered and died for us. We are choked by wrath against the bestial criminals.

But our anger will not help the dead, will not hurt the guilty Japs. Emotion is not enough. We must do something about it, more than swear or weep.

Here at home we may feel there is nothing much we can do. But there is. Nothing very dramatic and nothing heroic, certainly. But we can help win the war. The fighting front does depend on the home front. And we are the home front—all of us little people, doing little jobs, which add up to such a vastly important total.

We make the home morale, which sustains or undermines the spirit of our fighting men at sea and in the skies and in the fox holes and in the prison camps. We can strengthen that morale. We can be ashamed to think, much less speak, of our own petty inconveniences and minor sacrifices compared with the real sacrifices. We can refrain from the partisan bickering that wears away national unity.

We can put an end to strikes and slowdowns that hold back production. We can stop the profiteering and selfish maneuvering for business advantage. We can speed up the flow of planes and munitions and ships, without which our Army and Navy cannot avenge the victims of prison camps in the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, with silent supplication for the strength with which to destroy this foul foe and all his works, we can steel ourselves for the long wait until the death blow can be delivered. What a blessed relief it would be if we could turn on those Jap fiends who have starved and tortured and murdered our men in the prison camps and wipe them out tomorrow. But blind anger will not finish the job. It may only delay the final destruction of the enemy. Our task is long and hard. There is no quick way. The steady way is the sure way.

The Fate of Purges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following timely editorial from the Chicago Tribune of January 27, 1944:

THE FATE OF PURGES

The political action committee of the C. I. O. which has been meeting in Chicago under the chairmanship of Sidney Hillman has decided to postpone the issuance of its list of the Senators and Representatives whom it wishes driven from public life. There were intimations that the subject will be given

further study and that eventually the purge list will be issued from New York or Washington. Meanwhile, Mr. Hillman contented himself with an attack on Senator TAFT.

It doesn't make much difference when or whether Mr. Hillman publishes his list. By this time it ought to be pretty apparent to anyone that the American voters do not obey instructions to purge officeholders who have earned somebody's displeasure by thwarting his greed for power. The Antisaloon League had some success with its purges years ago; the experience may well have served as a warning to the voters never again to pay attention to such self-appointed monitors.

President Wilson, in the hour of victory in the last war, sought to purge Congress of the Republican opposition and for his pains saw the election of a Republican majority. President Roosevelt sought to purge Congress of the men who had opposed his Court-packing venture and he, too, suffered a sharp set-back. Mr. Willkie tried to purge the Republican Party of its honest Republicans and got less than nowhere.

Mr. Hillman seems to think that what these men couldn't accomplish he can do with the $5,000,000 slush fund that the C. I. O. is supposed to be raising. That's a lot of money, but the Congressmen don't seem to be worried and they have no reason to be. The fact is, whether Mr. Hillman knows it or not, that the C. I. O. will have the greatest difficulty delivering its own members for Mr. Roosevelt and his rubber stamps. The members were Americans before they joined the C. I. O., many of them against their wills, and they are not accustomed to taking orders on how they shall vote. As the realization grows that the stakes in this campaign are the independence of the United States and the preservation of its prosperity and its liberties, Mr. Hillman is going to have to talk fast to hold even his dues payers in line with their own money.

At the same time it is obvious that the C. I. O.'s political support is, in the vast majority of the congressional districts, a liability rather than an asset. The farmers fear it; the urban middle classes distrust it; railroad workers, coal miners, and a substantial group in the A. F. of L. hate it. The more strident Mr. Hillman's political actionists become in the campaign the more damage they are likely to do their cause.

The people of this country don't like purges and don't like the kind of self-anointed prophets who run them. Evidently the C. I. O. is going to have to learn this lesson the hard way.

Voting by Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Frank R. Kent regarding the pending legislation relating to voting privileges for the personnel of our armed forces, which appeared in the January 28, 1944, edition of the Washington Evening Star:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(Frank R. Kent)

The vigor and enthusiasm with which the administration is pressing the bill by which it is proposed to have our soldiers and sailors vote this fall for Federal officials only and under Federal supervision, is greater than it has exhibited for any other legislative proposal since we entered the war.

The President has put his full personal strength behind it, as witness his violent and denunciatory message to Congress. If he would do half as much for his national service recommendation, which is far more vital, it might easily go through. Stimulated from the White House, members of his Cabinet are actively urging his particular soldier vote bill. But more significant is the eagerness of the White House political aides and fourth-term strategists. As a result, the Roosevelt House and Senate leaders, who have been lukewarm to other Presidentially recommended measures, are right "up in the collar" on this one.

It would be pleasant to record that all this administration concentration is inspired by the lofty desire that the men in the armed services should not be deprived of their right to vote while fighting for their country, and that there is no political purpose to be served in the Green-Lucas program. But one has to be gullible, indeed, to believe that. Privately, the New Deal politicians make no secret of their expectations from the sort of bill they are pushing. Some of them think that the President's message is the best campaign speech he will make this year. Senator TAFT has sound grounds for his comment on it.

Once his bill is through, the New Dealers argue, there need be no worry about the success of the fourth-term effort. The soldier vote will put it in the bag. That is their belief and it must be admitted there is considerable ground upon which to base it. One extraordinary pro-Roosevelt advantage is obvious. Clearly the appeal, "Stand by the Commander in Chief," upon which the fourth termers are seeking to justify their attempt, will be much stronger with the men in uniform than with others.

There are two reasons. One is that between the Army special service and the O. W. I. Foreign Service there is no way to get any political information to the armed forces abroad which the administration thinks undesirable for them to have. The whole business is bottled up and no amount of breast-beating protests of how pure the hearts of the administration's propagandists and how nonpartisan they intend to be alters that situation. It is a set-up that precludes anything like an effective presentation of facts unfavorable to a fourth-term candidacy—and there is no use pretending it is not.

There is also the consideration that the Army and Navy are always concerned in keeping up morale. From their standpoint, it would seem an evidence of poor morale for the troops to vote against the Commander in Chief while the war is on. There would be a natural disinclination to do that anyhow. Furthermore, it is contended, the high military and naval authorities prefer to have no change and this feeling is certain to seep down through the subordinate officers to the ranks. In brief, an election conducted among the uniformed men, as it is proposed to conduct this one, is a one-sided affair and there is no way to make it otherwise, which is why the fourth termers chortle over the situation. In their view the message was a superb political stroke.

Fully aware of all this, the Republicans and anti-fourth-term Democrats are suffering a good deal of pain. They dislike intensely having the other side put them in the position of opposing the vote for uniformed men. Everybody wants the uniformed men to vote, but that does not make it less distasteful to the Roosevelt opposition to know that wholesale delivery of the uniformed vote to Mr. Roosevelt is being planned.

Conceding the handicaps under which the bill would put them, the Republicans have been trying to effect a compromise by which, to some degree, these can be nullified. But, whatever the bill's final form, there is no way wholly to offset: (1) The advantage of the Roosevelt position as Commander in Chief; (2) the inability to get to the soldiers with an effective presentation of the failure of Mr. Roosevelt's management of the war on the home front, and the disastrous effects of his lack of a labor policy on the whole war picture. However, these things do not justify refusing the soldiers the vote and, in the end, a bill will be passed. About all the Republicans can do, then, is to make the best of it, though there just will be no way for the Republican candidate to get his case fully before the troops.

With Mr. Roosevelt, of course, there is no necessity to advertise his personality and, if the other side is unable to campaign, his friends think the Commander in Chief argument is about all he needs, and that hardly has to be made. That is the way they reason. Of course, a considerable number of soldiers are not yet of voting age; a considerable number will not bother to vote, and a considerable number will vote against Mr. Roosevelt. But allowing for all that, the advantage still will be with the President. It may not elect him, but it certainly will help him.

There Is No Middle Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the most startling Capital news of the week was the special message from the President on the soldier-vote question. I say it was startling in that he had covered this same subject in his state of the Union address read to Congress by clerks in both Houses and delivered over the radio to the Nation. He criticized the constitutional State method of voting as contained in the Eastland-McClellan-McKellar bill as fraud on the servicemen. He had every right in the world to send his message to Congress. He has the privilege to state his views on legislation like any citizen.

Irrespective of what was intended, the whole bold truth is that the proposed legislation for a Federal ballot violates both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of the United States, which every public official has sworn to uphold and defend. There is no middle ground. There is no compromise with policies which would destroy the foundation of the Nation by abrogating the supreme law of the land.

Regardless of the fact that the White House statement may have contributed to the endorsement of the Federal ballot by many people, it is my judgment that they are not fully cognizant of the irreparable injury that may be inflicted by the imposition of this ballot upon the States. All Southerners abhor the treatment to which the South was subjected by carpetbaggers and destructive influences following the War between the States and are determined that there shall be no repetition. Advocates

of the Federal ballot bill would supplant State rights and constitutional processes with a central Government ballot commission, a bureaucratic agency, whose swarms of hired hands would attempt to dictate to the people of the sovereign States on matters which are reserved to them and to the people themselves.

To vote for the Federal ballot bill would be just as destructive to the Constitution of the United States as to support legislation which would say that it is unlawful to worship God in accordance with one's own conscience. If Congress could break down one constitutional provision, it could enact a law that the Government can acquire the land of the citizen without compensating such owner. If election qualifications can be written by the Congress, would it not be just as reasonable for Congress to say that those sections of the Constitution providing freedom of speech and of the press, and the right of the people to peaceably assemble can also be taken away?

It may be politically unpopular to oppose the administration on this issue, but the political future of any person has no place in the determination of so vital a question.

The State plan is far superior to the bob-tail Federal ballot since the servicemen can vote for every office from constable to President, instead of for only Federal offices. The men and women in the armed forces are fighting to uphold our Constitution and the American way of life. I am not going to be a party to break it down while they fight.

Iowa Absent Voters' Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram received from Hon. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, the Governor of Iowa, advising me of the action taken by the special session of the Iowa General Assembly in the matter of amendment of the Iowa voters' law:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *January 29, 1944.*
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Iowa absent-voters' law, as amended by the special session just concluded, provides ample time for Iowa voters in the armed forces at home and abroad to vote at the primary election and for national, State, and county officers at the general election in 1944. All other Iowa voters in this country also have ample time. Other States have made, and I am sure most of the remainder will make, such provision.

Certainly the armed forces have a right to know the names of all of those who are candidates for office, and have a right to full participation in the nomination of those candidates as well as to participate in their election.

Any Federal law providing only a blank ballot for President and Members of the Congress without the names of the respective candidates and providing for write-in voting only, would not only deny voters the opportunity to vote for State and county officials, but would be in total disregard and probably violation of the Federal Constitution as well as the constitutions and laws of all the States. Surely nothing could be more of a fraud on the members of the armed forces and the basic American rights of franchise than this.

Any Federal legislation should aid the States to give full voting opportunity to servicemen rather than to restrict these opportunities.

In any case there can be no sound, impartial reason for a Federal ballot except for use by servicemen from States which do not provide adequate opportunity for absent voting.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Governor of Iowa.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein editorials in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of December 12, 1943, the Chicago Daily Tribune, December 4, 1943, the Bangor Daily News, Bangor, Maine, January 4, 1944, and the Philadelphia Inquirer, January 5, 1944, all relative to one of our governmental agencies, the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the newspapers of the country are taking cognizance of the actions of this governmental department, and I think it is time that the Congress begin to take cognizance of some of its actions and take the necessary steps to stop their high-handed methods.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of December 12, 1943]

THE OUTWORN F. C. C.

The Federal Communications Commission was described at a recent session of a House investigating committee in Washington as a haven for draft dodgers.

One employee reported that it took all of his persuasive power to keep the Commission from obtaining a draft deferment for him, despite the fact that he was a IV–F, judged unfit for military service because of physical defects.

This employee told also how the F. C. C. engaged in needless duplication of radio intelligence work already done by the Coast Guard. He said that he was told the Commission wanted its employees to appear busy so that it might secure larger appropriations from Congress and so that the employees would not have to go into the Army.

As far as made-work is concerned, there is little difference between F. C. C. and the defunct W. P. A. except in the size of the projects. From its legitimate task of policing of the airplanes, F. C. C. has turned to censorship, political activities, radio spy work, regimentation of broadcasters, and sociological readjustment of the ownership of radio stations and communications facilities.

None of these jobs was delegated to it by Congress, and all of them were undertaken as the result of New Deal conniving. When the F. C. C. asks for more money, it is to pursue these New Deal objectives and not to keep order in the broadcasting industry.

In fact, whatever need there may have been for the F. C. C. is disappearing. The radio industry, one of the most progressive in America, is cutting the ground from under the Commission. Frequency modulation was in operation before the war, and when peace comes and the industry is able to resume frequency modulation development, Congress will be able to junk the F. C. C. and end its expensive political and sociological experiments.

F. C. C. came into being because there are only a limited number of transmission channels available to regular broadcasters, and to communications stations, and they must be made to share them without interference. When frequency modulation comes into its own, the number of broadcasting channels will be almost unlimited and the possibility of interference between stations will be remote. Licensing will not be needed. A frequency-modulation broadcaster can have a full property right, not only to his physical properties but to his channel as well, and there will be more than enough of the latter to go around.

The FM broadcasters can be regulated as far as their programs and operating technique are concerned by the same laws that govern the publication of newspapers and magazines. It costs much less to build and operate a frequency-modulation station than it does to build and maintain a similar station of the type now in general use. The fidelity of the broadcasting is so much greater that frequency modulation appears certain to supplant the regular broadcasting of today in most parts of the country.

The few commercial transmission systems that retain their original broadcasting equipment for distance-covering purposes can be regulated adequately by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has a much more savory reputation for impartiality and efficiency than the F. C. C., and is too busy maintaining that reputation to embark on New Deal social reforms.

With its only excuse for existence erased by the progress of the industry it was set up to regulate, the F. C. C. can sink back into oblivion alongside its New Deal counterpart, the W. P. A.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of December 4, 1943]

F. C. C. AND THE PUBLIC GOOD

Eugene Garey, counsel for the House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission, has charged that James L. Fly, chairman of the F. C. C., interfered with attempts of the Navy to halt Japanese broadcasts from Hawaii before the attack on Pearl Harbor. At another session of the same Committee, T. A. M. Craven, an F. C. C. commissioner, testified that a Navy officer had been "practically cashiered and put on the retired list" for opposing Fly.

Testimony did not link the two incidents, but Garey said that Rear Admiral Stanford C. Hooper, retired, reported that Fly "blasted" the Navy for going beyond its authority in attempting to halt the Japanese broadcasts. Hooper was sent to inactive duty soon after Pearl Harbor.

The F. C. C. is a bureau set up by Congress to regulate the radio broadcasting industry. Its primary duty is to allocate frequencies and power permits to broadcasting stations so that each broadcaster may be heard and chaos will not result. Soon after the New Deal embarked on its social reforms, the

F. C. C. picked the phrase "for the public good" somewhere out of its congressional charter and set off on a program of totalitarian conduct with that as its excuse.

The F. C. C. interfered with the establishment of American communication systems in north Africa, which resulted in what amounts to a British monopoly on the news Americans receive from the southern European war front. Even in peacetime it began a censorship of radio programs that Congress certainly had not delegated to it.

Through the method of issuing short-term broadcasting licenses, good only for a period of months, it intimidates broadcasters. Mr. Garey has also charged that the F. C. C. interfered with the selection of personnel in some radio stations. F. C. C. said that it did all these things "for the public good."

It will be interesting to see whether that same explanation is offered when F. C. C. answers the charge that it championed the cause of Japanese broadcasting in Hawaii.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of January 4, 1944]

FLY AND FLY-BY-NIGHT

No; the scene is not Berlin. Nor Tokyo. The scene is largely Washington and wholly American. Yet here and now a high Navy official—that's as near as the press is permitted to identify him—stands publicly accused of having practically cashiered out of the Navy, an officer of that Navy because—get this—he dared to oppose the will of James Lawrence Fly, Federal Communications Commission Chairman. And there's nothing to be done about it. Congress, representing the public, cannot inquire into the matter because Army and Navy officials have been forbidden by Executive order to appear before the investigating committee.

What was it the late Huey Long, an expert on fascism, is supposed to have told an associate? "When fascism comes to America, it will come in the guise of antifascism." Huey had his faults—grave ones—but he knew a thing or two about dictatorship; he was a dictator himself.

P. S.—It took Federal Communications Commission agents a year to locate an illegal fly-by-night broadcasting station, in a little North Carolina mountain town, which was on the air for an hour every day. And the operator held an F. C. C. amateur's license.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 5, 1944]

HIGH-RIDING F. C. C. CAN GO TOO FAR

Reports that the dictatorial Federal Communications Commission may vote to oppose, as a matter of general policy, further expansion by newspapers in the field of broadcasting and radio station ownership, are definitely disturbing.

It does not readily appear why newspapers should be thus unfairly discriminated against, nor is it clear that the F. C. C. has authority under the law to rule our newspapers from radio station ownership in the future.

It seems to us that if a newspaper wants to broadcast news or opinion it has as much right to license as an individual or group of individuals that has the same objective in view.

To bar a newspaper from the radio field just because it is a newspaper, whether or not on the ridiculous basis that newspaper broadcasting might sometime lead to a "monopoly," would be an invasion of fundamental American rights.

The F. C. C., under the chairmanship of James Lawrence Fly, has distinguished itself by its arrogant, domineering attitude in virtually all phases of radio, including licenses and programs.

If it attempts to discriminate against newspapers in station ownership Congress should move quickly to nullify such high-riding tactics.

In Righteous Wrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux City Journal of January 29, 1944:

IN RIGHTEOUS WRATH

When, with Nazi Germany made impotent in unconditional surrender, the full power of British-American might is hurled against the uncivilized Japanese, let no one anywhere protest, for whatever is done to destroy this foul enemy will be justified. The wrath of the British and ourselves will be a righteous one, and it will be expressed to the fullest extent of the offensive power of these great nations, whose nationals, held as prisoners of war, have been treated with such brutality by their captors.

Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, speaking solemnly in London before the House of Commons, declared thousands of British troops had died as prisoners of the Japanese after being brutally mistreated. He uttered this stern warning: "Let the Japanese Government reflect that in time to come the record of their military authorities in this war will not be forgotten."

What attitude our own Government in Washington will take is for the authorities to say. It would be, however, unnatural if they did not feel, with the shocking story of enemy barbarities told and verified, as do the British, if they, too, did not promise this nation and people that they would not forget these inhumanities and make the Japanese pay for what they have done. And nothing in the way of punishment of which we and the British as civilized people could approve and bring ourselves to inflict upon this enemy would be, or could be, too severe.

There can be no doubt as to the truth of the atrocity stories that have been told. Dozens, scores of American and British civilians and soldiers have reported the acts of the brutal Japanese. Men of high military rank and private soldiers have told what the Japanese did, how they humiliated and tortured helpless prisoners in their power, starving and beating and degrading them until they must have welcomed death and the relief it would bring.

That is the kind of enemy we face in the Pacific theater of war, a beast in human form that is utterly without honor, or mercy, or the decency that comes with civilization. This ruthless foe, whose own nationals that have fallen into British and American hands have been treated in a kindly manner, who have suffered no imposition, has taken keen delight in the torture of our men and women they captured. The revolting story of what happened to the gallant defenders of Bataan and Corregidor only increases the wrath of our Nation and people provoked by the foul attack on Pearl Harbor. Let that wrath continue and when the time comes to strike more powerful blows at this enemy, let no one anywhere plead for him, for he deserves no mercy. He has invited his own destruction.

Americans, reading the horror story of the unbelievable cruelties practiced by the Japanese, will let their thoughts go back to Cairo and the conference held there, with President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek solemnly agreeing that the Japanese must and shall be herded back to their own islands, giving up all their conquests and accepting a place as a demoted world power. By all means there should be no abandonment of that policy. Let it crush and grind and torture if it will the nation and its people who have done these things to gallant, decent, civilized American and British fighting men who became captives.

Americans who feel this way about it might as well be prepared, however, for the development of a sentiment here in favor of less harsh treatment of this enemy. Already almost one can hear the suggestion "But there must be some good Japanese. Let us be merciful to them." Good Japanese. Yes; perhaps there are some good ones somewhere. Our fighting men have given a good account of themselves when the odds were not overwhelmingly against them, and every dead Japanese was transformed into a good one. Real Americans, aflame with the revolting truth of enemy atrocities, will go no farther than that.

Overall Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter concerning a shortage of overalls in certain areas:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. BECKWORTH: Mr. Nelson has asked me to acknowledge your letter of January 12, in connection with the shortages you have recently found to exist in overalls in certain areas in your State.

The overall situation has been a major problem for our office for some time, and we are still seeking an adequate solution.

The essential problem arises from a greatly reduced supply of material at the grey goods level because of the burden of military needs. This problem is further complicated by the fact that the work-clothes industry is normally a low-wage industry and under present conditions, the resulting labor turn-over is exceptionally high.

The overall industry is now studying methods for increasing the flow of work clothing under a maximum production program, and it is our intention to pursue this study to a proper conclusion upon receipt and analysis of the industry's recommendations.

We are further planning to provide every assistance in securing material and necessary manpower as soon as the resulting program is determined. Price action where required, will also be requested from O. P. A.

I appreciate your calling this matter to our attention and wish to assure you that we are doing everything which can be done to provide an adequate solution as promptly as possible.

I hope you will call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. WHITESIDE,
Vice Chairman for Civilian Requirements.

South Carolina and the New Year, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Olin D. Johnston, Governor of South Carolina:

SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE NEW YEAR, 1944

(By Olin D. Johnston, Governor of South Carolina)

We feel that South Carolina is emerging as a great industrial and agricultural leader in the Nation. We look forward to the post-war period, confident that we shall progress in a definite way which will be helpful to our Nation. Our State is rich in its history and tradition, holding a unique distinction as being one of the Thirteen Original States, and along with our historical background, we are planning for a post-war program that will give greater opportunity to the young men and women who are now serving in the armed forces of their country and who we hope soon will return from a victorious war to take their rightful places in our State and Nation.

The present war finds South Carolina doing its full share at home and on every far-flung battlefield. Our industries and factories have geared themselves to a maximum war production which today is furnishing the necessary equipment and food to help our armed forces in this great struggle. Many of our factories and industries have won the high award of the Army and Navy E and have in other ways been honored for the efforts which they have put forward in this war crisis.

I am happy to report that in our State there has been no serious trouble to impede our war effort. Capital and labor have worked together in full cooperation and each has put first the winning of this war.

In South Carolina the legislature has set up a Preparedness for Peace Commission. This commission has made plans to prepare for the return of our armed forces to civilian life. It is also engaged in investigating and recommending solutions to the tax problem of our State. In South Carolina there is today no State tax on real estate. While thousands of our sons and daughters are engaged in this great war, our farmers have been fighting the battle on the home front and have been producing the necessary food, not only to feed the armed forces at home and abroad but also the people at home have lived in prosperity and happiness. The sons and daughters of our laboring people, like the sons and daughters of our farmers, have taken their places on land, on sea, and in the air to combat the enemies of democracy, and while these sons and daughters are carrying the battle to the enemy, the fathers and mothers of these boys and girls are working in mills and in the fields to produce what is necessary to win an all-out victory.

The people of our State in every bond drive and in every war-fund request have willingly met and even surpassed the quota assigned to them. The State of South Carolina is in the best financial condition since the beginning of its history. We have not only met all of our outstanding obligations and debts but have in our sinking fund a large surplus.

Our State highway system is one of the best in the Nation and during the post-war period, with the surplus we have created, we expect to build up a better system, and with the full cooperation of the legislature, the Governor and the highway department, we will move on to assure our people of the finest system of transportation for highways in our country.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a news item appearing in a recent issue of the Stars and Stripes:

LEST THEY FORGET, BACK HOME—E. T. O. SOLDIER WANTS TO VOTE, WITH NO SNAFU ABOUT IT, EITHER

(By Earl Mazo)

The average American soldier in the E. T. O. wants to vote in the forthcoming Presidential elections. And he would like it well understood at home that he wants no political manipulations to prevent that vote.

Perhaps the best expression of the general feeling on this subject, gathered in conversations with officers and men of all services in the last 2 weeks, was made by Capt. Carl P. Geis, of Salem, Oreg., a fighter pilot who was decorated with the D. S. C. for action against the Japs in the Philippines.

"I can't see the difference between being a citizen at home or over here," he said. "If anything, I feel I have more right to vote now than ever before."

Sgt. Jack Goldner, of Brooklyn, who is in the engineers, added, "* * * and the politicians trying to block that vote had better watch themselves. A lot of us will be coming out of this war, and we won't easily forget those sly maneuvers on the part of some people to take our voting privileges from us."

INFORMATION PLEASE, TOO

Capt. Charles Shaw, of Cody, Wyo., a Fortress navigator, pointed out that with the vote the American forces overseas should be given full information on all points of the campaign and all the arguments on both sides of every issue discussed.

And Second Lt. Hugh Cuttell, a Fortress bombardier, added another twist: "I'm just 21 and this will be my first chance to vote. If I'm still overseas, I surely don't want to miss that chance."

A soldier from Georgia said, "I figure if I'm good enough to fight for my country, I'm good enough to vote for the people who will be put up to run it." And a WAC private first-class added that she couldn't see "what the argument is about. We're citizens, and that is that."

Master Sgt. Richard D. Williams, of Tampa, Fla., a Liberator crew chief, said he personally didn't want to vote in local elections until the war was won, "but the national elections are different. We all are a part of that."

To the average soldier the question of whether the States or Federal Government controlled the voting was unimportant. "All that the fellows I know are interested in is voting, and doing it right without any red tape and mixups to kil' our votes," said Staff Sgt. Roger Palmer, Grand Island, Nebr., Fortress tail gunner.

Second Lt. Edward R. Ryan, of Los Angeles, a Mustang pilot, said, "I guess many millions of the best men in the country would be put on the shelf, so to speak, if we aren't allowed to vote. After all we're going to have to live in the United States of America after this thing is over, and I for one want something to say about whom we live under."

Master Sgt. Oliver T. McNiell, Jr., of Foxboro, Mass., an instrument specialist at a bomber station, went further when he said: "I don't want to go home and have to fight all over again there for the things we're battling about over here. That's why I want to be sure to register what I have on my mind in the elections."

Corp. Eugene E. Pierre, of Seattle, Wash., asked, "Who should be more concerned with the future of America than we young people in the Army? And how can we better express what we want than through our vote? I definitely want to vote just like I always have. They say it is complicated and mixed up, when it really isn't. The people at home owe it to us to make our voting as simple as possible, but most of all they ought to realize that we have as much right to vote as they do."

Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN J. MAAS
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am in favor of the soldiers voting. Who has a better right to vote than the men fighting for their country? That is not the question involved. What is involved is whether we are to aid the soldiers in their voting, or whether we are to set up a new bureaucratic control over their votes. Whether intended or not, a federally operated and controlled voting system, outside of the constitutional framework set up for elections, will have the effect of coercing and intimidating the voters in uniform.

What the Federal Government should and must do is to be of assistance to those in service who desire to vote, but not supervise their voting. The United States must facilitate the distribution of State ballots to all those in the service who are eligible to vote, no matter where such soldiers, sailors, or marines are, and then collect and return those ballots to the various States to be counted under State supervision. That is all that the soldiers want done.

As a matter of fact, I have been impressed from the letters I receive from soldiers with their lack of any intense desire for the vote beyond the rights they now have.

We in Congress are far more excited about this matter than the soldiers are. Most of them with whom I have talked, as well as those from whom I have heard by letter, are opposed to setting up any

new Federal election system. They feel that if they want to vote, most of them can through the regular absentee system in their States.

Many express a fear of the effect of a drive for soldier votes as likely to create political campaigns within their camps and on board ships, with consequent heated arguments, dissention, and grouping of cliques by political factions.

If this happens, it will be most unfortunate, if not tragic. If there is any place that there should not be party politics, it is in the military services.

Yet, how can this be avoided if we set up a federally supervised and controlled election system?

Most of the men who have written to me from overseas say that they are too busy fighting to study campaign issues and also they are not sure that they are getting impartially both sides of all the questions involved.

The danger of pressure from officious superiors and also attempts to curry favor by vigorously campaigning for the candidates favored by superiors have been called to my attention by soldiers themselves.

I wish to quote from a letter to me by a soldier on this subject. For obvious reasons, I am omitting his name:

JANUARY 5, 1944.

Hon. MELVIN MAAS,
Representative, State of Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I can't conceive of any reason for the great controversy in Congress regarding the voting of soldiers. The problem seems to resolve itself into just two conditions: First, that the Constitution does set forth the age requirement—21 years; second, the Constitution prescribes the method—by State electorate.

In the first case, those who have voted in previous elections can merely indicate their last voting address and the legality can be quickly determined by the respective ward of the voter.

Those individuals who were too young to vote before induction but who since have reached 21 can have their age verified at their immediate headquarters and the vote legalized by the commanding officer. In addition, their vote could be sent to their draft board instead of their ward for legalizing residence, and age, and counting.

As to the second condition, that should leave no argument. The Constitution sets forth the exact manner of electing the President of the United States, and that manner is one which can only be handled by each State of the Union.

The electorate vote will be especially important this year and there should be no interference with its proper function, especially as to how it is obtained.

As to how the States can handle the voting of or by the soldiers, that is something which can be corrected by special State sessions. They have been held before for much less important things. As to poll tax, that again is a State function so far, and in those States the soldiers who choose to vote can merely enclose a remittance with their ballots. We send money orders for a great variety of things.

As to mailing costs, if the Federal Government is anxious to have the soldiers cast votes, why not grant the States free mailing rights for the occasion. Soldiers have free mailing privileges now for the return votes. Regular mail could be used for the continental United States, Canada, Alaska, South America, and even Great Britain. They could leave off a few bales of Scotch woolens or some English china for one trip this way. The farther places can be handled by V-mail with a little Yankee ingenuity and courage.

I'm a soldier, but I'm writing this as a citizen, which I believe I still am. Anyway, I've always exercised my right to vote and I can see no exception now, and so, God willing that I am still alive, you can be sure I will vote as a citizen of the State of Minnesota and not as a ward of the Federal Government, even if I have to take a leave to do so.

Yours truly,

_____,
Sergeant, United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this soldier pretty well expresses the general view of those in uniform. There is no need for a federally sponsored, supervised, controlled, and influenced election system.

Millions in the Service Facing Enemy Bullets Should Not Be Denied a Federal Voting Ballot

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are taking up the bill to amend the Soldier Vote Act of 1942, and I feel if the membership could peruse but one-twentieth of the telegrams, letters, petitions, and resolutions which have been addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Rules, urging my support of the Lucas-Green or Worley bills, I am sure a vast majority would cast their vote for either of the bills and, at the same time, would vote to amend the rule to permit a record vote on the measure.

Mr. Speaker, the President has been criticized for his message to the Congress urging the consideration and passage of legislation which will afford to those in our armed service their constitutional privilege to exercise their right to cast their vote in an election for President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. Those critics have not been fair in questioning the right of the President in this respect, because the Constitution provides for that very thing, and I quote article II, section 3, thereof, which reads as follows:

He (the President) shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The President has the interest and welfare of the service men and women at heart, and these unjustified attacks, in the face of this constitutional provision, shows to what extent those opposed to his policies and administration will go in attempting to discredit him in the eyes of the brave members of our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, the thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received come from every section of the country, from every State, and from practically every city and are signed by civic, commercial, labor, farmer, and social organizations, by former and present servicemen, and many communications have been received from the fathers and mothers of service men and women who, in no uncertain terms, declare that no one in our armed forces should be denied the privilege of casting their vote in the next Presidential election. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall urge tomorrow the amending of the rule to provide for two motions to recommit, as has been done before according to precedent established, or will move to vote down the previous question so that the rule can then be amended which, if passed, will insure a record vote on the Worley bill, H. R. 3982, or the original Lucas-Green bill. The passage of either of these bills will be assurance to those who are good enough to face enemy bullets that they are worthy of receiving a Federal voting ballot.

Mr. Speaker, not desiring to unnecessarily encumber the RECORD, I insert, as I have stated, a very small number of letters which I have received, advocating the enactment of legislation providing for a Federal short-form ballot, as follows:

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *January 21, 1944.*
ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

I have talked with many of our men in the fighting areas and I know their folks at home want them to have their vote in 1944. This can be done only by a Federal ballot.

BOB HOPE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 18, 1944.*
CHAIRMAN,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Committee must permit open debate and amendment on soldiers' vote bill with absolutely no gag rule. We urge utmost speed for creating Federal machinery for vote.

METROPOLITAN CHAPTER NO. 31, FEDERATION OF ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, CHEMISTS, AND TECHNICIANS, C. I. O.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *January 17, 1944.*
Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building:

Urge full opportunity to debate and amend soldiers' vote bill.

A. S. COOLIDGE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 17, 1944.*
Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Sixty members of East Flatbush Victory Club urge you don't impose gag rule on soldiers' vote issue. Federal ballots only assurance servicemen's vote will count.

FLATBUSH VICTORY CLUB,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 20, 1944.*
Chairman ADOLPH SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that the committee permit continuance of debate and not allow the Eastland States Rights bill to pass but rather to vote

for the Green-Lucas bill. We urge this as a nonpolitical organization interested only in the morale of our armed forces and feel that if we send them to the foxholes we should send them to the polls.

NATIONAL STAFF OF THE WOMEN'S AMBULANCE AND DEFENSE CORPS OF AMERICA.

WASHINGTON, *D. C., January 15, 1944.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you reject any proposal which would stifle adequate discussion of soldier vote legislation. Opportunity for amendments from the floor should be granted. The citizenship rights of 11,000,000 Americans are at stake. Urge you grant an open rule on this bill.

NATIONAL FEDERATION FOR CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTIES.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *January 16, 1944.*

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please make fight of your life to block rule favoring Eastland soldiers' vote bill. We must have a bill to insure that all men and women in our armed forces, wherever they may be, shall have opportunity to cast ballots that will be counted in the coming election. Any bill insisting on 48 State ballots is tantamount to disfranchising millions of our most precious citizens, rendering them voiceless in the affairs of the Nation for which they are giving their lives.

MRS. LESTER MONKS,
Brookline, Mass.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 20, 1944.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman of the House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you do all you can to continue hearings on the Eastland bill. The people want the soldiers' vote administered by the Federal Government.

WESLEY HAYNES.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *January 18, 1944.*

Representative SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of millions of southern soldiers who want Federal guaranties of their right to vote, urge that you adopt rule on soldiers' vote bill permitting freedom of action including right to amend. A gag rule on such vital legislation is indefensible.

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE,
DR. CLARK FOREMAN, *President.*

WILLIMANTIC, CONN., *January 19, 1944.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building:

Continue vigorous support soldier vote measure similar to original Green-Lucas bill.

DR. WILLIAM CHASE.

DENVER, COLO., *January 22, 1944.*

Chairman SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of democracy guarantee simple basic rights of freedom to those fighting for free world. We want provisions of original Green-Lucas bill.

DENVER COMMITTEE FOR THE RIGHT TO VOTE,
E. V. DUNKLEE, *Chairman.*

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *January 19, 1944.*

ADOLPH SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would strongly urge that Green-Lucas bill be brought out for prompt action. Imperative our soldiers everywhere should be able to vote.

PAUL TRIVERS.

BROOKFIELD, ILL.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The membership of Electromotive Diesel Workers' Local 719 U. A. W.-C. I. O. at a recent meeting expressed pleasure and appreciation for the fight you are putting up for the federally administered soldiers' vote bill. We stand 100 percent behind you in your fight for a ruling to permit floor amendments to present bill. Our political action committee is working hard to obtain the soldiers' vote for our fellow Americans in the armed forces and will publicize your stand and actions on the bill. Contact us with instructions for further action.

TERRY KANDAL,
Chairman, Education Committee,
Local 719, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 20, 1944.*

Congressman ADOLPH SABATH,
Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolutions taken at a mass meeting at Pythian Temple, New York City, sponsored by the Citizens' Committee of the Upper West Side;

Whereas the soldier vote bill recently reported out of committee is based entirely on the narrow partisan individual State laws and does not extend the free right to vote to our fighting men and women; and

Whereas certain reactionary Congressmen have entered into an alliance to impose a gag rule limiting debate on this bill in order to pass it without change: We hereby

Resolved, That this body protest and petition the House Rules Committee to defeat the gag rule maneuver in order that a free debate may expose the inadequate spurious nature of the aforementioned bill, that through such debate the bill may be amended to create an impartial Federal control ballot system whereby our soldier citizens may vote without qualifications under the law.

STELLA HOLT,
Executive Secretary, The Citizens' Committee of the Upper West Side.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 20, 1944.

Chairman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of justice and democracy, please rule against shutting off debate on Eastland States' rights bill so that we can express our disapproval of this bill.

GEORGE CARTER.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 16, 1944.*

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly oppose gag rule on amendment to present inadequate soldier vote bill.

Rev. STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN,
Mrs. MARTHA FLETCHER,
American Unitarian Youth,
Boston.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 26, 1944.*

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, 48 members of the business girls department of the St. Louis Y. W. C. A., urge House Rules Committee to report out the soldier vote bill for open debate and full right to amend on record vote. (Signed by 48 members.)

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 16, 1944.*

Representative A. SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that your committee grant rule to make it possible to amend the soldiers' vote bill just reported out by the House Election Committee in order that our fighting men will be assured of a vote.

FANNIE W. ROBERT,
Secretary-Treasurer, State Municipal Workers of America, Local 197, C. I. O.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *January 19, 1944.*

ADOLPH SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am extremely anxious that Green-Lucas soldier-vote bill should be brought out on the floor.

RICHARD COLLINS.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 17, 1944.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman of Senate Rules Committe,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to use your influence in seeing that the Green-Lucas bill reaches the floor of the House in its original state, and that you use your influence to see that it is passed as such.

MRS. FANNIE LONON,
President, Board Directors, Harriet Tubman House, Inc.

CLEVELAND, OHIO., *January 22, 1944.*

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: At our regular meeting of January 17, 1944, I was instructed to write you the unanimous opinion of our membership. Whereas our Navy Department has announced that more than a thousand marines gave their lives at Tarawa for you and me so we at home can enjoy democracy. The right to select by ballot those who govern the people in peace, as well as in war, is the cornerstone of democracy. Surely the signers of the Constitution did not intend a document which, even in wartime, would be construed to take away the franchise of any of these who are fighting to preserve the Constitution itself. Therefore, we believe it is our sacred duty on the home front to guard jealously those democratic rights for which they are giving their lives. We, therefore, expect that you, who represent both of us at home and 10,000,000 American citizens in the armed services, wherever they may be, will permit no partisan selfish interest or legalistic arguments to stand in the way of guaranteeing that through the passage of some Federal legislation so every man and woman in our armed forces may, without delay, be given both the right and the opportunity to vote in 1944.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH RYMAS,
Financial Secretary, Painters' Local Union, 867.

THE SOLDIERS MUST BE GIVEN THE VOTE BY FEDERAL LAW

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 19, 1944.

Mr. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Certainly every loyal citizen is outraged by the fact that there is even any

doubt in Washington that soldiers be permitted to vote. Everyone with whom I have discussed this matter feels vehemently that it is especially those citizens who are fighting a bloody war who deserve the privilege of the ballot.

I trust you will do your utmost to get the boys the ballot.

Sincerely,

MRS. JACQUES LESLIE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *January 18, 1944.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABATH: I just want to ask you to keep fighting for the Federal soldiers' ballot. All my friends in the Army are behind you and we're not forgetting the opposition.

I'm proud that you're a Representative from my State. It helps to offset some of the other things that go on there and some of the other Congressmen.

You know, of course, that the country is for it, and that it is the only democratic thing to do. Do your best to keep it from getting stymied in the Rules Committee.

RANKIN has shown his colors and the whole thing needs a good airing.

Sincerely yours,

E. R.,
A. S. T. U., Columbus, Ohio.

FRATERNAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO CHURCHES IN AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1944.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to call your attention to the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill now before the House Elections Committee. When the Senate on December 3 tabled this bill in favor of the Eastland (Miss.) States' rights substitute bill 12,000,000 fighting men were brazenly disfranchised.

The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, representing 11 denominations and serving to make vocal the expressed desires of the 13,000,000 Negro Americans, recognize that such a flagrant compromise of justice is not representative of democratic America. We condemn the action taken by the United States Senate and call upon you to reverse this decision in the House of Representatives.

Nothing is more essential to the functioning of our democracy than the free use of the ballot without restrictions. Our men are paying a dear price for these basic civil rights. Their blood runs warm in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia.

May we depend on you to represent the Christian spirit of America by voting uncompromisingly for the original Green-Lucas bill as it stands and defeat the States' rights amendment?

Very respectfully yours,

W. H. JERNAGIN, *Director.*

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., January 19, 1944.

To All Members of the House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This Nation has enrolled 11,000,000 men in the armed forces to fight for freedom and democracy.

Many of these men are now scattered on the world-wide battle fronts. Their lives, their blood are being given to preserve the principles of this Nation. One of those principles is that citizens shall have a free choice in the election of their public officers.

The Army and Navy have said without any equivocation that only a Federal ballot can make the vote of soldiers and sailors possible in November 1944. We urge you to maintain the honor and justice of this Nation, its people, its Congress, and its Constitution by supporting a Federal soldiers' vote ballot administered by a Federal ballot commission and certified by that commission.

We ask that the House reject the Rankin-Eastland measure to disfranchise our servicemen. We ask that the House recommit this disgraceful bill to committee or amend it to provide for a Federal ballot administered and certified by a Federal ballot commission.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY HILLMAN, *Chairman.*

THE MICHIGAN DAILY,
Ann Arbor, Mich., January 23, 1944.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: On behalf of the students and military personnel at the University of Michigan, may I urge your cooperation in securing immediate passage of the Green-Lucas bill, assuring the vote to our 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces.

You may be interested in the results of a recent poll on campus in which 1,732 civilians, soldiers, and members of the Navy V-12 program overwhelmingly expressed their desire for the passage of this bill, as compared to only 95 opposing it. The poll, I am sure, represents the opinions of the entire campus.

A break-down of the figures showed: Army, 707 for, 49 against; V-12, 343 for, 19 against; civilians, 682 for, 27 against.

I am sure that the soldiers and sailors and marines who voted in this poll will be not at all satisfied in any compromise measure which allows State discrimination in the voting procedure. I am also sure that their receiving the ballot is as important to morale as a letter from home.

We feel that this opinion should be regarded seriously because it is indicative of youth's sentiments all over the Nation.

Very sincerely,

MARION FORD,
Managing Editor.

AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION,
CHICAGO, ILL., *January 25, 1944.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our membership wishes to express their deepest gratitude to you on your firm stand against the morale-breaking, phony, politics-as-usual Rankin bill.

It is hard for us to believe that any of our Congressmen would put politics before the lives of our brothers and sisters in the armed forces of our country. But seeing is believing—and it's a terrible shock to all Americans, which we sincerely hope will be reflected at the polls in 1944.

We also wish to commend you on your position for a uniform Federal ballot that will really give our men and women, both in the armed forces and the merchant marine, an opportunity to vote.

Please keep up the fight to defeat the Rankin bill and push for passage of a bill providing the uniform Federal ballot—with no strings attached.

Yours in victory,

D. C. CARDAMONE,
Chairman, American Communications Association, Local 34.

BAER FIELD,
Fort Wayne, Ind., January 25, 1944.

Representative A. J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee.

HONORABLE SIR: Many of us soldiers feel outraged at the insults that many Congressmen have thrown our way. Nobody in the Army is telling us how to vote nor are we ignorant of what's going on. * * * I have yet to meet a soldier who doesn't believe we should have the vote, and most of us realize it must be under Federal supervision. This is not a question of States' rights, but the American rights. Many of us are fighting and some are dying in this war; that's O. K., it must be that way, but we also want our say in it.

I'm sure you will do your best for the passage of this.

Yours truly,

Pvt. G. O.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *January 17, 1944.*

Representative SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABATH: * * * There is overwhelming evidence that popular sentiment demands a workable Federal soldier vote bill, knowing that State ballots, though preferable, are simply not feasible due to the mechanical problems involved.

I am quite sure that the substitute bill reported out by the House Elections Committee does not meet the requirements which most people in Iowa have in mind, and to invoke Representative RANKIN'S proposal would be nothing less than gag rule to prevent improvement of the bill by open debate in the House.

I trust that you will communicate these sentiments to other members of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES PADDOCK.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE-AIRCRAFT-AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.),
Detroit, Mich., January 24, 1944.

To All Congressmen of the United States:

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The one and a quarter million members of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O., and the 350,000 in the armed forces, urge that you vote in favor of the Lucas-Green compromise soldiers' vote bill now pending before the Senate.

Simple justice demands that the men and women who are most directly engaged in the struggle to defend the free peoples of the world should have an opportunity to exercise the most fundamental of free people's rights, the right to vote. As soldiers and individuals, they are no less deserving of that right than are we as civilians. As a group, they constitute so large a part of the Nation that no election in which they did not participate could be called representative of the will of the people.

The antidemocratic minority in the House and Senate who would create a second-class citizenship for those who are prepared to lay down their lives in the defense of their country must not be allowed to take refuge behind the now somewhat threadbare cloak of unconstitutionality. Nor must they be allowed to conceal themselves by the devious device of refusing to have their votes recorded on the Worley bill and the spurious Rankin bill. Congressman MARTIN DIES' statement that "under a record vote members of the House might be afraid" to vote against the Worley bill is the direct antithesis of the democratic conception of Government of, by, and for the people. The people of this country and the men and women of the armed forces, through their newspaper, Stars and Stripes have demanded in no uncertain terms favorable action and a record vote on this bill. For the Congress of the United States to deny them that would be an admission that it is no longer responsive or responsible to the wishes of the American people.

We are confident, however, that the patriotic majority in Congress will not permit the narrow partisanship of a wilful minority to override legislation which so intimately affects the lives and fortunes of the people of our country.

We would appreciate it very much if you would express to us your opinion regarding the Lucas-Green bill.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. THOMAS,
President,
RICHARD T. FRANKENSTEEN,
Vice President and Director Legislative Department.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *January 11, 1944.*

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH.

DEAR SIR: Our soldiers are fighting for this country, and they deserve the right to help choose their Government. Whether or not you think most of them will vote for you has nothing to do with the case. The Congress has made mistakes before; don't you help it make another—let the soldiers vote.

Yours truly,

FREDERICK THURSTON.

WINDSOR, CONN., *January 19, 1944.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: People connected with the Connecticut Conference on Social Legislation whom I meet from many parts of the State are very eager to see Federal legislation providing for the soldiers' vote under conditions in the main like those provided in the original Green-Lucas bill.

We sincerely hope you will do your utmost to bring about the passage of this much-desired legislation so that the voting may be done under Federal supervision, which we believe to be the only practical method of handling the situation.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL HOWARD,
Chairman of the Connecticut Conference on Social Legislation.

THE BRONX BOARD OF TRADE,
New York City, January 26, 1944.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
House Office Building,
Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: At the regular monthly meeting of the board of directors of the Bronx Board of Trade, held on Monday afternoon, January 24, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That this Board records its approval of the new soldiers' vote bill, as introduced in Congress providing for the issuance of a short Federal ballot to permit all eligible voters in the military services to participate in the November elections for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, all such ballots to be circulated among eligible voters by the War and Navy Departments, and thereafter, when returned to this country, to be transmitted to the several States for appropriate action by each such State; and be it further

* * * * *

We urge that you do your utmost to secure the passage of this proposed legislation.

Yours very truly,

ADOLPH J. CHESLEY,
President.

OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, C. I. O.,
PORT NECHES LOCAL NO. 228,
Port Neches, Tex., January 24, 1944.

HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We urge that your committee permit open debate and amendment on any compromise bill dealing with Federal control of soldier-vote issue. We also urge that no gag rule be applied. It is our belief that a vast majority of the common people desire that our servicemen be given an opportunity to participate in Government, and it is also felt that any machinery through which qualifications will be set up by the States would fall far short of the desired objective.

Very truly yours,

L. L. CRANE,
President, Local No. 228.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 16, 1944.*

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read that you are committed to voting for a real soldier-vote bill. I hope that as a member of the House Rules Committee you will use your influence against the proposed gag rule on the House which would prevent debate on a real Federal ballot for our servicemen and women. The attempt to prevent such a ballot indicates an obscene fear of the service vote. If anyone deserves the right of franchise our fighting men and women do. Let's make sure that they get it.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL TWIGGS.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Mobile Register, Mobile, Ala., of Tuesday, January 25, 1944, and an editorial from the Mobile Press, Mobile, Ala., of Wednesday, January 26, 1944, in connection with the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway project:

[From the Mobile Register of January 25, 1944]

THE TENN-TOM CANAL WOULD BECOME AN ASSET OF LASTING NATIONAL VALUE

"For almost a century far-seeing men have visualized and urged construction of a navigation canal connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers."

That statement is not of current or even recent origin. It is a quotation from United States District Judge John McDuffie when he was in Congress and a member of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Yet it retains every ounce of its significance, for the reason that it still bears witness to the long-argued merits of a project which continues to plead for congressional authority to serve the national economic welfare.

Lately this proposed improvement has received strong support, notably in the testimony of Col. P. A. Feringa, resident member in Washington of the board of Army engineers for rivers and harbors, and in the presentations of such enthusiastic congressional backers as Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, and Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, of the First Alabama District.

When all factors are appraised the surprise is that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal is not today an accomplished fact rather than an advocated improvement of the country's river system. It commends itself as a logical additional route for water-borne transportation between a rich and broad hinterland and the Gulf of Mexico. It combines, aside from the other benefits it might have, the threefold advantage of saving distance, time, and cost as an all-year route for traffic moving to and from the Gulf and a territory extending from the Middle West across the north central States to the Pittsburgh steel district.

Facts placed before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee at the most recent hearing on this project show convincingly that the savings to be gained would be enormous on the handling of large annual tonnages such as could be expected to move over the route.

In comparison to the permanent great value it would have to the country, the construction cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal is by no means stupendous. The canal would have a length of 39 miles, a depth of 12 feet and a width of 115 feet. Its construction, with certain auxiliary improvements on the Tombigbee, is estimated to cost only $66,000,000.

If this short canal were established its effect would be not simply to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers but to accomplish navigable coordination of inland waterways in the middle United States, vastly increasing their usefulness in the transportation of a wide and important assortment of commodities. It has been emphasized that the project would connect by an all-water route the rich producing and consuming regions of the Tombigbee, Warrior, Alabama, and Mobile River Valleys and the Tennessee, Cumberland, Ohio, Mississippi, Missouri, and Illinois River Valleys. When these facts are weighed, a convincing conception is obtained of the economic importance and need of this improvement.

Congress is not asked to approve this highly deserving Tennessee-Tombigbee project for construction now. It is asked to authorize the canal for post-war construction. The declared policy of Mobile, the Gulf terminus of this water route, is to refrain from pressing for the war-time construction of Federal projects not related to the war effort.

When the war ends, one of the problems calling for solution will be that of adequate employment in the transition to peacetime economy. It has been estimated that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project would provide jobs for 5,000 to 6,000 workers. Thus as a post-war project it would help solve employment needs while taking shape as a waterway development of vast and lasting economic benefit to the Nation. Congress is, therefore, in position to render an outstanding double service to the country and its people by authorizing this needed improvement for post-war construction.

[From the Mobile Press of January 26, 1944]

TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY AS A MAJOR POST-WAR DEVELOPMENT—CONGRESS SHOULD GIVE CONSIDERATION TO A PROJECT FROM WHICH MORE THAN A DOZEN STATES WOULD BENEFIT

The opening of the Erie Canal in 1825 linked the Hudson River with Lake Erie and proved one of the greatest single factors in the remarkable development and prosperity of the State and city of New York in the nineteenth century.

What the Erie Canal meant to the State and port of New York, the proposed Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway would in some degree mean to the State of Alabama and its seaport, Mobile. The waterway would connect this port with some of the greatest industrial and agricultural States in the Nation and would have an incalculably stimulating effect upon Mobile's trade and commerce.

Naturally Alabamians and Mobilians are all for the Tombigbee-Tennessee project, but it is by no means a narrow, selfish interest that inspires us to urge Congress to give favorable consideration to it.

The proposal has so many indisputable advantages beneficial to the economies of more than a dozen States from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes that it is difficult to see how any opposition can block it as a most desirable post-war project.

It would be a national asset, supplementing present navigable waterways. It would give States in the interior a new, cheaper, and shorter water route to the Gulf of Mexico. The cost of the project, compared with some of the immense public improvements undertaken in the national interest, is so nominal that it is a wonder that it has not been constructed long ago. The $66,000,000 expenditure for a 39-mile cut to join the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers by a 12-foot navigable canal would be a very modest outlay considering all the benefits that would accrue to the States that would be affected.

A United States Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in 1941 submitted a report estimating that the Tombigbee-Tennessee project would result in a savings of $2,168,000 annually to shippers on freight moving between the Gulf and points on the Ohio River and upper Mississippi Valley. Slack-water features of the proposed waterway, eliminating the necessity of bucking strong downstream currents on upstream hauls, it was estimated would bring a saving of about $1,000,00 to barge-line shippers.

At the time these estimates were submitted it was pointed out they were conservative. The prospects of an increased volume of trade and commerce after the war would seem to indicate that the savings to the public might be far greater than originally anticipated.

Then of course, too, there are many intangible values that would result from the construction of the waterway, such as the development of recreational areas and enhancement of land values.

Congress would do well to put its stamp of approval on the Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway as a post-war project.

Address by Senator Truman at Launching of Battleship "Missouri"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] at the launching of the battleship *Missouri* on last Saturday, January 29, at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The launching of the battleship *Missouri* is an event of great national significance. I am deeply conscious of the high honor conferred upon the State I serve in the United States Senate in naming this mighty arm of American naval strength the *Missouri*.

The *Missouri* and her three sister ships, the *Iowa*, *New Jersey*, and *Wisconsin*, will be the largest and finest warships in the world, and the armament to be installed in the *Missouri* will make her the most formidable craft afloat.

The christening and launching of this greatest warship of all time illustrates the decisive answer which the democracies of the world are making to the challenge of the aggressor nations.

The *Missouri* will be commissioned 9 months ahead of schedule. It is such records as this which enabled the Navy to commission 3,500 new vessels in 1943—a total greater than all the ships possessed by the Navy at the beginning of that year. This not only replaces all our losses, but vastly increases the fighting strength of our Navy and makes it beyond question master of the seas.

At the same time our enemies have suffered disastrous losses in sea power. Germany's vaunted submarine warfare has met its match. Our convoys are getting through—our ships are delivering the goods. Our own submarines and surface craft are striking ever increasing blows at the Japanese. A third of the Japanese merchant fleet is now on the bottom of the Pacific. So are many of Japan's finest war craft. Japan is straining every effort to replace her losses, but we know, and Japan knows, that in the race of production she is hopelessly outclassed.

Whether the strategic demands of the war carry the battleship *Missouri* to Atlantic or Pacific waters, we can confidently expect her to be fighting the enemies of this Nation with honor and glory. The time is surely coming when the people of Missouri can thrill with pride as the *Missouri* and her sister ships, with batteries blazing, sail into Tokyo Bay.

Missouri is the "show me" State. The battleship *Missouri* will show all Americans—indeed all the world—her innate seaworthiness, her valiant fighting spirit, and the invincible power of the United States Navy. The motto of the State of Missouri is, Salus populi suprema lex esto—Let the welfare of the people be the highest law. I know that will be the motto of the officers and men of the *Missouri*. So, today, Missouri joins hands with her sister States throughout the Union in asking the blessings of divine providence upon this magnificent battleship and upon her valiant men.

May this grand ship and gallant crew add to the splendid tradition of our Navy and do their part toward a speedy victory.

May this great "show me" ship, named for the "show me" State, be an avenger to the barbarians who wantonly slaughtered the heroes of Bataan, and may the battleship *Missouri* and all the other ships of our Navy do their full share on behalf of the people of the United States to maintain the peace which will follow our total victory.

Our Latin-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of our Latin-American relations, written by Helen Essary, and appearing in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

South America is deeply worried over the disordered thoughts on Latin-American relations now somersaulting across the Rio Grande. A South American diplomat told me this anxiously yesterday evening over a second truth-provoking glass of Chilean champagne.

It is, indeed, important to the United States that she keep the friendship of Latin America, my diplomatic friend continued. But it is even more important to the Latin-American countries that they keep the friendship of the United States.

Now, this year, this month, this very day is a critical hour in the relationship of North and South America, I was told. The feeling between us is not good.

"Tell me," I urged my friend, "tell me honestly—what do you think is at the root of these continued misunderstandings between people who really want to be friends—who must be friends if we are to pull through this frightful dog-eat-dog war?"

"May I be permitted to tell the truth?" I was asked.

"Good. Then I shall do so. I hope I shall not hurt your sensibilities and add to the already too bad confusion. The trouble is"—and he paused for another sip of champagne—"the trouble is that you in your big rich country continue to treat us as—I think the best phrase is your own—as poor relations. We are proud, we Latins. Very proud. We are not happy when you put us on a sort of dole.

"Yes; it is a sort of dole," he continued. "We feel that you are not really making us your friends because of friendship. You used to look down your noses at us. Everybody knew that. Then—again I ask permission for your patience—then when you saw that you were losing out on the Far East, that Japan was definitely your enemy, you began cultivating us in a showy way.

"You hadn't thought us worth your while before. Had you? But you began to think we might be useful when you found danger from the Orient closing in."

Naturally, South America needs the friendship of the United States. For after its own fashion, Germany is closing in on the Latin states. These things are indeed true, as my South American friend emphasized at the beginning of our conversation.

"But," and he added: "And this is a big but—you can't expect us to trust your friendship. We cannot get it out of our heads that you only cultivate us when your more powerful friends let you down. Certainly we are suspicious of your sincerity. Why wouldn't we be suspicious? You've got to prove your good faith before we can be cooperative with you."

Latin pride now came again into the conversation. "You are a mighty blustery lot, you North Americans. I hope you will not be insulted—sometimes you are not too sensitive.

"You think, because it makes for you pleasure to give in your kind of way, that it pleases us to receive in the way you want us to receive. You give us no choice. You make us like your kindness.

"We don't want kindness—not between nations. If you would arrange to buy raw materials from us and help our trade otherwise, then we'd have a chance to get on our feet. The education you have undertaken—this business of making our people know each other better—is, of course, important. Before you started on this campaign we knew Europe better than the United States. Few South Americans ever went to North America.

"They went to London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna to be educated, to shop, to make holiday. You should do more of your educating—very, very soon."

The conversation now turned to the difference in the attitude of Europe and South America toward the United States. Europe, we decided—certainly England—is like parents who, having lost their money and their power, feel it the duty of their offspring to support them. The offspring is the United States.

Not only do the old folks in the British Isles expect to be supported by us, they expect to be supported in the grand manner. Likewise, they wish us to straighten out their quarrels with the old folks next door to them and be mighty bright and happy while so doing.

South America, on the other hand, doesn't feel that North America owes her anything. Since the United States is handing things around on a silver platter, she wants her share of the grab bag. But she regards herself as a lusty youngster who has had the advantage of a civilization in many cases far older than that of the United States. And she just won't be patronized.

It was fascinating to listen to Latin-American relations as viewed by a Latin. It was also encouraging to hear said, at the end of our talk, with the sound of honesty:

"Do not, I pray, be troubled too much about Argentina. Argentinians do not hate North Americans. They have been worked on by the Axis. Who hasn't? But they prefer, for reasons of their own, to stick to North America."

Absentee Soldier Voting in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following act of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin and also a joint resolution with regard to absentee soldier voting in time of war:

Assembly Act 696

An act to create section 11.90 of the statutes, relating to adjustments in the election laws of this State to facilitate voting by Wisconsin electors serving in the armed forces of the United States at the primary and general elections of 1944, and making an appropriation

The people of the State of Wisconsin represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

11.90. Electors in armed forces; adjustments in laws to facilitate voting in 1944 primary and general elections. (1) Legislative purpose. In recognition of the State's responsibility to enact appropriate legislation to facilitate so far as practicable the voting by its qualified electors who are serving in the armed forces of the United States, at elections held within the State, the legislature by this enactment makes necessary adjustments in the absent voting law and in the election statutes to provide adequate time for the preparation and transmission of ballots to such electors within and without the United States and for the return of such ballots in due time to be recorded at such elections. All county and local clerks and all election officials throughout the State are directed to cooperate to the fullest possible extent in order to effectively carry out the purpose and intent of this section.

(2) Application of section: This section applies only to citizens of this State who are absent from their respective voting residences because of service in the armed forces of the United States and applies only to the November general election held in 1944 and the primary election preceding such general election.

(3) Election laws to govern except as modified: Except as modified by this section, the provisions of sections 11.54 to 11.68, chapters 5 and 6, and other statutes relating to elections shall so far as applicable apply to voting under this section.

(4) Local register of electors in armed forces: The clerk of each city, village, and town shall compile and maintain an up-to-date list or register of electors therein who are serving in the armed forces. Such register shall contain the name of the elector and his latest known residence and mail addresses. It shall include all such electors who will become 21 years of age on or before November 7, 1944, with a notation as to any who will reach that age after August 15, 1944, put on or prior to November 7, 1944. The clerk shall make a diligent effort to make such register complete and up to date at all times and to that end he may request the assistance of the local draft board, newspapers, and the citizens generally. He may publish appropriate advertisements in any one or more newspapers having circulation in the municipality requesting parents, wives, or husbands, relatives and friends of such absent members of the armed forces to furnish their names and latest addresses. Such clerk shall exercise reasonable care to avoid duplication of names and to avoid including any person who is for any reason not qualified to vote at such election. He shall distribute to each polling place in his municipality a copy of such register for use on election day.

(5) Mailing of ballots: The local clerk shall, as promptly as possible, mail an official ballot or ballots if more than one are to be voted at the election, as provided in sections 11.57 and 11.58, to every absent member of the armed forces whose name appears on the register. The return envelope shall be substantially in the form prescribed by section 11.58 except that the affidavit thereon shall also contain the date of birth of the absent voter and shall state that the voter has not returned another ballot to any voting precinct. Such ballots shall be mailed, postage prepaid, to the address shown on the register as the latest known address, and shall be mailed by air mail when the destination is more than 500 miles. Priority in mailing shall be given first, to ballots to be sent outside the United States, then to ballots to be sent 500 or more miles within the United States, then to all other ballots. If, after a ballot has been mailed to an absent member of the armed forces, the clerk is advised as to a new address, he may mail another to such person at the new address, marking it in such manner as to indicate that it is a duplicate and to prevent more than one ballot being counted. No registration other than that specified in subsection (4) and no request for a ballot shall be required to entitle an absent member of the armed forces to vote the ballot mailed to him. If the Federal authorities require or recommend any type of mail service for mailing ballots which is different than that provided in this subsection, the secretary of state shall notify the city, village, and town clerks as to such changes and specify the method or methods of mail service required or recommended.

(6) Form of ballot: The ballots used under this section shall conform to the requirements in sections 11.54 to 11.68 and chapters 5 and 6 except that if a modification of the size of ballot or envelope or weight of paper is necessary to conform to mailing requirements of the Federal authorities, the secretary of state shall notify the respective county clerks specifying the changes, and the clerks shall cause such modifications to be made. No envelope, return envelope, or explanatory note shall contain the name of any person who is a candidate at the election to which the enclosed ballot pertains.

(7) Balloting instructions enclosed: An explanatory note shall be enclosed with each ballot giving instructions as to the marking of the ballot and the return thereof, and any other pertinent information. The form of such explanatory note shall be prescribed by the secretary of state.

(8) Marking and return of ballot: The ballot shall be marked and returned as provided by sections 11.54 to 11.68 except that the affidavit on the reverse side of the return envelope may be executed before a commissioned officer, warrant officer, or noncommissioned officer not lower in grade than sergeant or its equivalent Navy rating.

(9) Delivery and counting of ballot: Upon receipt of the returned ballot the clerk shall check the elector's name with his register to insure that the ballot is from a voter entitled to vote and that he has not already returned another ballot. Any discrepancy or disqualifying fact appearing shall be noted by the clerk on the envelope. In other respects the provisions of sections 11.54 to 11.68 as to delivery, deposit, counting, and challenging of such ballot shall apply, except that in the primary election the failure to return unused ballots shall not invalidate the marked ballot, which shall be counted. All ballots received by the clerk before the closing hour of the polls shall be delivered by him to the proper polling place. No separate count of ballots of absent members of the armed forces shall be made or kept.

(10) Time limitations in absent voting law suspended: The limitations of time for filing or receiving applications under section 11.55 or for delivery of ballots under section 11.57 shall not apply to electors absent by reason of serving in the armed forces. Any such elector may in one application request a ballot for the primary election and the succeeding general election. All applications by such electors shall be sent directly to the clerk of the town, village, or city wherein they have a voting residence. All applications received by the secretary of state or any county clerk shall be promptly forwarded to the proper local clerk.

(11) Date of primary election advanced: The date of the primary election preceding the general election in 1944 shall be August 15, 1944. The dates for the performance of acts in preparation for such primary election are changed as follows:

1944

May 6 (not earlier): First day for circulating nomination papers.

June 6 (not later): Last day for filing nomination papers.

June 21 (not later): Secretary of state to certify names of candidates to county clerks.

June 23 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of printers.

July 10 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of county clerks.

July 12 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of local clerks.

August 15: Date of primary election.

August 16 (not later): Local inspectors report returns to county clerk.

August 17: County board of canvassers meet.

August 21: Primary election returns reported to secretary of state. Petitions for recount proceedings must be made within 3 days after the last regular meeting of the board of county canvassers.

August 22: Canvass by State board of canvassers begins.

August 25: First day for filing independent nomination papers for general election.

August 28: Canvass by State board of canvassers completed.

August 29: Platform conventions meet (12 o'clock noon).

(12) Dates in preparation for general election advanced: The dates for the performance of acts in preparation for the general election in 1944 are changed as follows:

1944

September 1 (not later): Declination by nominees must be filed.

September 2 (Saturday noon): Last day for filing independent nomination papers for general election.

September 4 (not later): Vacancies in nomination must be filled.

September 6 (not later): Secretary of state to certify names of candidates to county clerks.

September 8 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of printers.

September 18 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of county clerks.

September 20 (not later): Ballots to be in hands of local clerks.

November 7: Date of general election.

All other dates or time for the performance of acts in preparation for the primary election or general election are advanced proportionately when necessary to conform to the changes in dates made in subsection (11) and this subsection. The secretary of state shall determine what advancements of such dates or time are necessary and give such notice thereof as he may deem advisable.

(13) Appropriation: There is appropriated from the general fund to the secretary of state a sum sufficient for the execution of his functions under this section, including the printing and distribution of such information as the secretary of state deems advisable to indicate the change in the date of the primary election and changes in dates or time for the performance of acts in connection with the elections to which this section applies.

(14) Expiration of section: This section shall expire after the completion of the general election in 1944.

Assembly: Ayes 91; noes 0.

Senate: Ayes 30; noes 0.

STATE OF WISCONSIN—IN SENATE

Senate Joint Resolution 83

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States as to the responsibilities and prerogatives of the States and the Federal Government in providing for absentee soldier voting in time of war

Whereas the Federal Government enjoys limited grants of powers under the Constitution of the United States to regulate elections, such grants being in article I, section 4, relating to election of Senators and Representatives and in article II, section 1, relating to the time of choosing electors; and

Whereas the only prohibitions against the States on the subject of electors or elections are contained in articles XV and XIX of the amendments which provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex; and

Whereas the reservation to the States of all powers not delegated by the Constitution to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States includes the reservation of power in the State to prescribe the qualifications of its electors and the time, place, and manner of holding its elections; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin, in recognition and fulfillment of its responsibility to provide voting opportunities for all of its electors has enacted a law facilitating voting in the 1944 elections by electors who are absent by reason of serving in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Wisconsin enactment has simplified its absent voting procedure as far as possible, avoiding the necessity of making applications for ballots, requiring local clerks to compile and maintain an up-to-date list of absent electors in their respective localities who are serving in the armed forces, with their latest known military addresses, and requiring such clerks to forward ballots to all electors on such list, and advancing all dates to conform to the minimum mailing requirements announced by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; and

Whereas the effectiveness of the law of this or any other State is dependent upon the prompt transportation of ballots to and from absent electors serving in the armed forces, particularly those serving outside of the United States; and

Whereas the transportation of ballots through the mails is exclusively the responsibility of the Federal Government which can and should be implemented by appropriate legislation by the Congress; and

Whereas the several bills now pending in the Congress on the subject of absentee soldier voting clearly invade the constitutional responsibility and jurisdiction of the States and should be limited in scope to the constitutional authority of the Federal Government to provide only for the transportation of ballots and applications therefor furnished under State-enacted legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States: (1) to refrain from enacting legislation on the subject of absentee soldier voting which invades the exclusive jurisdiction of the States under the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and (2) to take positive action under its exclusive constitutional authority by enacting legislation providing for the prompt and speedy transportation of ballots and applications to and from members of the armed forces, furnished under and pursuant to State legislation; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Tribute to James A. Farley by Nelson Dunstan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute paid to James A. Farley by Nelson Dunstan in his column published in the New York Morning Telegraph of November 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Have you ever heard Jim Farley speak? There, my friend, is a real honest-to-God American. No $4 words—just a fine fellow, who, in words, pours out what he has in his heart and mind. Knowing nothing of politics and hating the very word, we drank his beautiful compliment to Joseph E. Widener and to Colonel Winn and voted him one of the most natural speakers we had ever listened to in our annual rounds of luncheons and dinners. God give us more politicians who think in terms of this country. It was really a swell speech, at least to us, for we admire plain speaking and plain writing.

Voting by Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of the Governor of Colorado to the members of the thirty-fourth general assembly in extraordinary session convened January 28, 1944:

You are being called together today in solemn assembly to exercise one of the fundamental precepts of State government, namely, the extension of the right of suffrage to the first citizens of this State, the men and women serving outside the continental limits of the United States in the military service of our country.

Those valiant sons and daughters of Colorado who are offering their lives and their all on the altar of freedom in order that we may maintain the American way of individual initiative and enterprise in this State and Nation, are entitled even more than anyone else, if possible, to the right to cast their ballots for those who are to represent them in public office upon their return. The determination of the qualifications of these electors is purely and exclusively a State prerogative. We must do the full job in this regard, save and except the mechanics of placing the ballots in the hands of the veterans and getting them back. This is the Government's responsibility.

They have the right to insist that upon their discharge from military service they shall, if they desire, have the privilege and opportunity of again taking up life where they left off, even to being placed in the identical job, industry, or profession. We must insure to the man who closed his barber shop, garage, or grocery on Main Street, that he will be welcome at the same old stand after he has exchanged the khaki for the mufti. We must guarantee to him that he will be able to assume the same status in civilian life as existed when he went away to fight our wars, as nearly as it is possible to do so.

To assure to him and to her the things they hold dear, to guarantee that those of us on the home front shall assist our soldiers, sailors, and marines in refitting themselves for the obligations of citizenship and of absorbing them into our social and economic life, they, themselves must not be denied the inalienable right to exercise the most precious of State rights, that of expressing themselves at the polls.

And so, it was deemed fundamental in preserving the rights of these men and women, that the members of the thirty-fourth general assembly be convened in special session to the end that our election laws may be amended, repealed, rewritten, or revised in ample time to make it possible for those in the armed services wherever dispersed to cast their votes in time for their return from beyond the borders of this State to be counted at the general election next November or when the official or other count is made, as in the opinion of the general assembly may be most feasible.

There were those who felt that the call for the extraordinary session should have been delayed until the Congress had by overt act made manifestation of its intention in providing the ways and means of getting the ballots to and from the soldiers so entitled

to vote. Time being of the essence of the situation, however, and because we did not care to take the chance of waiting too long, perhaps, it was deemed expedient to make provision for the ballots to reach the most distant soldier elector in ample time to assure the marking of his ballot and its return to the proper election officials. It is unthinkable that the Congress will not set in motion without delay the necessary machinery to bring this about.

Singularly enough, there are two members of the senate and one of the house who are in the armed service and who will, perhaps more than the average soldier, appreciate the time and attention you ladies and gentlemen will have given to the matter when you shall have made it possible for your fellow compatriots, as well as others similarly situated, to exercise their rights of suffrage.

It is with justifiable pride that we salute the members of the senate and house who were with us at the regular session a year ago and who are now serving in the uniform of our country: Senators Wayne A. Aspinall and Sam T. Taylor, and Wayne W. Hill of the house.

I know I voice the sentiment of this joint assembly when I say that we hope and fervently pray for their safe return to our midst, as well as all of the more than 80,000 who are serving with them from Colorado in the various theaters of war.

This session was called for the express purpose outlined above. It was not intended that any other legislation be taken up, discussed, introduced, or passed. This is no time nor is the occasion propitious for you to concern yourselves with laws which can well await the next general assembly. Certainly it is not the moment to embroil yourselves or your constituency in controversial subjects.

The measure you have been asked to consider is emergency legislation. It must be done now. All other acts or amendments to existing laws which have been suggested for discussion at this time are not of such pressing importance but what they can await the thirty-fifth general assembly in January.

Article 9 of section 4 of the Constitution of Colorado expressly provides:

"The Governor may, on extraordinary occasions, convene the general assembly by proclamation, stating therein the purpose for which it is to assemble; but at such session, no business shall be transacted other than that specially named in the proclamation."

The only legislation "specially named" in the proclamation aforesaid is the amendment of our election laws to make it possible for the overseas veteran electors of this State, and those similarly situated, to vote in the 1944 elections. It was limited to that subject and that alone. Consequently, it would be contrary to the constitutional provision aforesaid if any attempt were made to consider any other legislation at this session. It was not intended that you do so when the call was issued. Any such effort would take unfair advantage of a situation which was not contemplated.

It is earnestly requested, therefore, that you limit your deliberations and your actions to the legal purpose of the call, do it as speedily and expeditiously as possible and to return to your homes.

The proclamation was issued, considering the time element, so that you might introduce the proposed amendment today or Saturday and pass it not later than Friday or Saturday of next week. This can easily be accomplished if you will speedily agree upon a proper bill, and see that no parliamentary or other unnecessary delays hamper its progress.

It was planned you could be homeward bound not later than the end of next week. You have it within your control to do this. It is hoped and urged that you will make every effort to adhere to this program.

Let me express to you and each of you the thanks and appreciation of the executive office as well as the citizens of Colorado generally for the patriotic sacrifice you are making in leaving your jobs, businesses, and professions to participate in this special session. The people will laud you if you will confine your labors to 10 days and your deliberations to the one subject. We are economy-minded. So are the taxpayers. We do not want to put the State to any unnecessary or uncalled for expense incident to this session. I know you are in full agreement with this statement.

Soldiers' Opportunity To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRANT FURLONG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, believing as I do that World War No. 2 is a war between nations and not between States of the United States, but one for the freedom of all oppressed people of the world, no matter what that individual's religion, color, or ancestors' nationality may be, and the fact that our Federal Government has called the members of our armed forces to fight that battle for democracy, it is then our duty as a nation to see to it that the soldiers and all other members of our armed forces get that one opportunity of a democracy, which is to vote; if they fight they must have the privilege to vote.

I support the Worley bill because I know that is the one way they will secure the opportunity to vote; the States' rights bill will give them the right, but, due to time lost and the difficulties in the individual States to get the ballot to the soldier, he seldom will get the opportunity.

I wish to bring to your attention the following article which appeared in the Stars and Stripes of December 30, 1943, signed by 45 men from many States of the Union:

We, the soldiers who are now in Italy, are a United States Army, fighting for the United States of America, and not for any particular State. We want a Federal law to give us a chance to vote the easy way and not leave us to the individual States, with their inadequate laws and delaying difficulties.

The State laws may be all right for the people living there now, but not for the soldier.

In our battalion we have soldiers from practically every State in the Union. Can you imagine what percentage will actually vote if each soldier has to proceed through the various methods, most of them not even knowing the requirements of their respective States? The process takes months, and we have little time to spare. Some of us did not vote in the November election because the ballots reached us after the elections were held.

This coming Presidential election is very important to us. We have to be sure that the proper leaders are elected.

Why not let the soldiers vote? Don't they trust us or are some politicians afraid to let us vote? The soldiers on the front want to fight and they want to vote. They say in effect: "We on the front are determined to use bullets and ballots. Bullets against the Germans and Japs, ballots against the reactionaries and obstructionists at home. We want a quick victory here and a progressive victory at home."

The Polish Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JERSEY CITY, *January 18, 1944.*

NOWY SWIAT,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. YOLLES: Tears grip my heart as I listen to the voices reaching us from Poland, over which Russia is spreading her red fangs in order to crush her and open the way to other nations and the whole world. The Polish situation is very difficult. The blackest of clouds are overhanging her, and here we are asking ourselves what the allies will do and whether the Atlantic Charter is going to become a scrap of paper and the sacred pledges given to Poland broken again.

I am a mother who made her greatest sacrifice on the altars of America and Poland as well as all the martyred nations, so that brutal power will not rule the world. My boy, who volunteered in the Navy of the United States on the second day after the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor, when he left home he said: "Mother, I shall fight for America and Poland; although I never knew the country, I love it with all my heart just as you do." My boy died on his post in the Pacific action on the 13th of November 1942. He gave his young life for a better world—for America and for Poland. My second son has been now fighting on the Italian front for the past 7 months. He also believes and fights for the same ideals. My third boy is still on American soil, but I do not know for how long and where fate will place him, but also he believes that he will fight for a better world.

I appeal to you in face of this great danger that you help us to raise our voice to which we have a moral right and a duty. Our boys are fighting and perishing not in order to replace one aggressor with another for the sake of ruling over the world. Let us rise in full consciousness of our duty and raise a powerful voice stating that we American mothers of Polish origin demand justice for Poland. Let our voices be heard in Berlin and Moscow to temper their appetites to grab Poland.

I am,

Very truly yours,

WANDA LIPOWSKA.

Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Sun of January 27, 1944:

SABOTAGE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

I finally got around to reading the book Sabotage! The Secret War Against America, by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn. There are two editions of this book, and when I saw that the original version as published by Harpers did not contain an acknowledgment to the Dies committee for material taken from its reports, I looked at the reprint, which also failed to give the Dies committee credit for material which could only be made available by the committee.

I don't suppose that most readers care very much where the evidence comes from so long as it is accurate and reliable, but in this instance I should have imagined that the authors would be proud to acknowledge that one of their principal sources was a committee of the Congress of the United States. There is a page of acknowledgments at the end of the book, but MARTIN DIES is not among those present.

For instance, on page 163 of Sabotage are photographs of correspondence between Lawrence Dennis and Dr. Friedrich Auhagen. These same photographs appear on pages 1308 and 1309 of the Dies report, appendix, part II, dealing with the report on Nazi organizations. Those documents are in the Dies committee files, having been, as I learned, obtained by subpena by the committee. There is only one place where any one could get them; that is the Dies committee or its reports. Sabotage was first published in 1942; these particular Dies committee reports appeared from 1939 to 1941.

There is no question as to the authenticity of the documents as they appear in Sabotage, but what roused my curiosity as to these and other citations was that in both the old and new editions Sabotage attacks Representative MARTIN DIES; yet both editions use material taken from his reports without acknowledging the source.

For instance, on page 64 of the old edition of Sabotage is a story involving a Japanese-American, Kiyoshi P. Okura. I find that story on page 1782 of the Dies report. I could not find it in the reprint of Sabotage.

Of course I have not made a line-by-line comparison of Sabotage and the Dies reports and therefore I cannot say how much material in total the book got from the committee. Looking here and there, I have found 11 citations in the Harper edition of data, including photographs of supenaed documents, actually taken from Dies material, most of which could not be found elsewhere as the committee has physical possession of the documents in question.

I should make no complaint about this if DIES had been given credit. After all, congressional committee reports make dull reading. They are printed on poor paper, the type is hard on the eyes, and when the volumes are thick they fall apart. The popularizer of congressional committee reports does a beneficial job in placing before the American people valuable data. I recall, for instance, Prof. Charles Beard describing how he got the material for some of his early books by using a vacuum cleaner on musty and forgotten Government documents.

The authors of Sabotage were at liberty to quote from the Dies reports, which are public property, but they should have given MARTIN DIES and his investigators credit for their work. Certainly it is bad grace to use the product of their efforts and then to attack them in the very book that is illustrated by documents which they uncovered. That is not playing the game—not the American way.

And what is the charge that these authors, who use the product of his work, make against MARTIN DIES? It is that when he says that our Government offices are full of Communists the Axis radio repeats his charges without unfavorable comment. The implication is that an American should not say what he believes to be true because Goebbels might repeat it without unfavorable comment. In other words, if MARTIN DIES believed from information available to him that Communists are employed in the Government, he ought to say that everybody employed by the Government is a Democrat in order that Goebbels might be misled. Maybe the authors of Sabotage are right about that.

The Jewish Problem in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to House Resolution 419, now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That resolution states:

> That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine be opened for the free entry of the Jews * * * and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker is worthy of the support of the entire Congress—support that will not end with the mere passage of the resolution, but rather support that will make the contents of the resolution an actuality. In these days when we are deeply concerned with the problem of relieving oppression, we should not overlook the plight of the Jewish people who have suffered oppression throughout the ages.

Without equivocation this country should state its position on the Jewish problem in Europe, as suggested by House Resolution 419. A just solution of that problem will go far toward the establishment of harmony among all mankind, a step necessary if we are to maintain permanent peace throughout the world.

H. R. 3886

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 3886) to grant to the home owners of this country one of the income-tax benefits now denied them but permitted for the operation of any business, large or small. This bill would permit a home owner to make a deduction from his gross income when computing his Federal income tax for depreciation on his home.

There is never any argument about the desirability of home ownership in this country. We pride ourselves because of the wide home ownership the American people have achieved. We know that it is the basis for the best citizenship. We know that we build strong communities when people own their own homes, and yet we do very little in connection with Federal tax laws to encourage this desirable state. In fact, we actually penalize home ownership.

Home owners, a little study will show, are made to suffer the injuries of multiple taxation. They have not complained in the past, but today's high Federal income-tax rates are causing them serious problems. If their plight is not recognized, we face severe loss in morale and good citizenship. The underlying fault is this: The Federal Government, in levying its taxes upon net income, fails to recognize, except in a minor way, that real-estate income, unlike other income, already has paid its share of governmental costs. This is because real property has been, and continues to be, the traditional source of local taxation. Moreover, Members of this body realize that real property in their home communities carries a disproportionate share of local costs. But on top of these local taxes, the Federal Government likewise places a high tax on real estate through income taxes on the earnings of property. First, the property is assessed locally, and then its earnings are taxed federally. Clearly, that is double taxation.

Today's tax laws differentiate between business real estate and personally owned real estate. Rents received from business real estate are taxed after first deducting the expenses incurred, including repairs, maintenance, interest, labor, depreciation, and taxes. If the property is sold, the difference between the selling price and the cost, less depreciation, is taxed as a profit or allowed as a loss. When we apply that principle to residential property, observe what happens. We provide for depreciation on houses where they are used for income-producing purposes. If a man owns a house, which he rents to a tenant, we allow that owner to write off depreciation when computing his tax. But if he owns the

house in which he lives and raises his family, we do not allow him similar treatment. Why, no one has ever figured out. It is obviously unfair to grant depreciation on residential properties when used for income-producing purposes and to deny it when it is used for a home—a much higher purpose. Yet we do exactly that. This is the anomaly which this bill seeks to correct.

The total reduction in revenue to the Federal Government which would be affected by the proposed bill would be small but to the individual taxpayer it would be of substantial meaning. More than that it would represent some encouragement to our home owners.

We hear a great deal today about the complexity of our income-tax laws. The Members of this House who have seen the new income-tax blank will readily agree that it takes a mathematical Houdini to figure it out. The proposed amendment would be a small step toward straightening out the mess. At the very least it would be handling depreciation on residential property on a consistent basis.

There are several million families in the United States who own their own homes. These people provide a major part of local revenue for our towns and cities. Justice demands that they be treated fairly as far as Federal income taxes are concerned. Our present practice is not to assist them but place heavy burdens on their shoulders by unequal treatment of Federal income-tax laws. It is high time that we treat them fairly. If it is justice to allow depreciation on houses used for rent it is certainly just to allow the same depreciation used by their owners for homes. That is what this bill would accomplish. It should be passed.

Soldier Vote in 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD a brief article written by C. Richmond Carpenter, reviewing the Rhode Island soldier vote in 1918. The article follows:

SOLDIER VOTE IN LAST WAR—THREE-MAN RHODE ISLAND BOARD IN 1918 PUT OUT 5,000 BALLOTS AND GOT RETURNS ON 1,800

(By G. Richmond Carpenter)

Five to six thousand ballots sent out; nearly 1,800 returned. The vote: 61 percent Republican.

In brief, those were the results of the soldiers' vote act of 1918 when Rhode Island had 28,000 men in the services.

Today, 26 years later, the best brains in both political parties are concentrated on devising a method under which as many as possible of the more than 75,000 Rhode Island men and women in the services may exercise their franchise in the November elections.

The situation today and that of 26 years ago are similar in some respects; different in others.

Now, as then, a Democratic President is in the White House. Now, as then, an apparent Republican trend has set in across the Nation. Now, as then, the United States is in the midst of a World War.

SOME DIFFERENCES, TOO

Nineteen eighteen, however, was not a Presidential election year as is 1944. It was before the period of universal suffrage. It antedated dropping of the property qualification for voting for certain offices.

Rhode Island government 26 years ago was completely in Republican hands—executive and legislative. Today the Democratic party rules the executive arm of government and controls one branch of the general assembly.

Consequently, efforts are being made to agree on soldiers' vote procedure to which both parties can subscribe. Pending another meeting on Tuesday of leaders of the two parties, introduction in the general assembly of proposed legislation has been held up.

When legislation to facilitate participation of Rhode Island men and women under arms in next November's balloting is introduced in the general assembly, it will be a matter new to all but two of the present members.

Twenty-eight senators and representatives, according to their biographies, are veterans of the last war. Including them, 142 legislators will have their first decisions to make on soldiers' vote legislation at this session.

Two others, Democratic Floor Leader William G. Troy, in the senate and Democratic Floor Leader James H. Kiernan in the house, were members of those same branches in 1918 when the general assembly during its waning hours of April 19 enacted the soldiers' vote bill which Governor R. Livingston Beeckman promptly signed.

Passed by the legislature at the same time and signed by the Governor was a companion measure allowing party caucuses to be held 3 weeks in advance of the usual dates.

THREE-MAN COMMISSION SET UP

The soldiers' vote bill set up a three-man commission consisting of the secretary of state, a member nominated by the Democratic State committee. The act charged the commission with preparing suitable ballots containing the titles of the several offices for which an elector absent from the State in the military service of the United States, was entitled to vote, and so far as possible the names of nominees for such offices.

Soldiers and sailors whose names appeared on voting lists under the act, could vote for United States Senator, Representative in Congress, and general officers of the State.

The act instructed the commission to conform as far as possible with provisions of general law regarding the form of the ballots but allowed latitude to modify the form to meet special conditions.

A requirement was that the commission should endeavor to distribute ballots in ample time so that all ballots voted might be returned to the secretary of state not later than December 10 if they were to be counted in the final results.

Ernest L. Sprague, in 1918 a deputy secretary of state, recalls the task as a tremendous one. However, it is his recollection that between five and six thousand ballots actually went out to soldiers whose names appeared on the voting lists. The ballots went, he says, to men overseas as well as to Rhode Islanders stationed in various parts of the United States. The ballots were sent out with a return envelope on the back of which was a certificate to be signed by a commissioned officer of the soldier-voter.

All ballots were to be returned to the secretary of state on or before noon of December 10 and he was required to turn them over to the State returning board for tabulation within 2 days.

By noon of that date, 1,685 official soldier ballots and 97 unofficial ones had been returned to the secretary of state. In addition there were between 700 and 800 postcard ballots sent in.

DAY TO COUNT VOTES

On December 12 the returning board prepared to count the votes. A 3-hour hearing preceded opening of the ballots. This was climaxed by a ruling from Attorney General Herbert A. Rice that only ballots, official and unofficial, cast by a qualified elector and certified to under the law, could be counted. Out went the post-card ballots.

The ruling and the consequent action of the board so infuriated Col. Patrick H. Quinn, the Democratic Party's official representative, that he charged "an outrageous, infamous libel" had been perpetrated on the soldiers of the State who cast the post-card ballots.

The count was completed, 1,595 soldiers' votes being added to the election day totals, 187 being rejected for various reasons. The Republicans, already victorious, received 61 percent of them.

Today the State faces a far more imposing problem of permitting many thousands more not only to vote for the offices included on the 1918 ballot, but also for general assembly and local candidates. And there is the added problem of qualifying the servicemen to vote beforehand.

The consensus is that a constitutional amendment is mandatory if an approach to the objectives is to be achieved.

What the United Nations Relief Program Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a pamphlet issued by Food for Freedom, Inc., of which organization Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow is chairman:

The agreement for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, signed on November 9, 1943, may well be called a declaration of interdependence. The event is memorable for its acceptance of joint responsibilities for their mutual welfare by the representatives of 44 nations. Beneath the ashes of the legal language of the agreement are the sparks from which life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness may be rekindled in a war-wrecked world.

The essence of this declaration of interdependence is that these nations agree that peace depends on sharing. Every one of the signatory nations recognizes that it must contribute assistance of one kind or another to achieve both peace and economic security.

Hunger as well as the enemy must be driven out before a bridgehead for peace can be firmly established. The common aim of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U. N. R. R. A.) is to help heal the wounds of war. After the first stage of preventing famine and pestilence, U. N. R. R. A. will assist on a pay-as-you-can basis the people in the lands that are to be liberated. They want a chance to get back to their homes, to live and to work again as free men and to pay for what they receive. Until their farms and factories are back in

production they will need aid. Their own efforts will shorten the relief period as well as reduce the cost. They will again become good customers and speed world-wide economic recovery.

Americans will want to know the return to be expected on this investment, and to be certain that it will promote the maintenance of their own standards of living in the postwar period. They will want to be sure that they are not being imposed upon and singled out to provide a disproportionate amount on the costs leading to bickering and bitter debate such as prevailed after the last World War. If Americans face this problem realistically, they will see that their national self-interest coincides with the desirability of an international plan to assist the victims of the war.

The following 20 questions are among those Americans will be asking. The U. N. R. R. A. agreement answers some of them, others are supplied by the decisions of the U. N. R. R A. Council made at the first Council session. The final answers, however, will depend in large measure upon the attitude of the citizens of the 44 nations. If they understand the practical advantages of this joint undertaking and the spirit in which it is initiated, they will demand that their nation's share be quickly and adequately furnished. Then 44 bridgeheads will have been secured.

The Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, appointed as Director General, recently said: "It is given to us, twice within the span of a lifetime, to attempt to devise a peace in which all men can live in freedom from fear and want. We failed last time. We dare not fail again."

TWENTY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE U. N. R. R. A. PROGRAM

1. What is the U. N. R. R. A. agreement?

It is an agreement by the United Nations and other nations associated with them in this war to pool their efforts and available resources to meet the emergency needs created by the war in areas from which the enemy is driven.

2. What is U. N. R. R. A.?

It is an international body formed by 44 nations to carry out this agreement. Additional nations will be invited to join later. U. N. R. R. A. consists of a council, a central committee, a committee on supplies, a committee on financial control, regional committees for Europe and for the Far East, standing technical committees, and an administrative staff under a Director General.

3. What is its main purpose?

It is to help the peoples in liberated areas get on their feet and so end the need for relief. The U. N. R. R. A. program includes the provision of food, clothing, temporary shelter, and medical aid; arrangements for the return of prisoners of war, exiles, and other displaced persons to their homes; aid in restoring urgently needed agriculture and those industries essential to relief; and aid in repairing public utilities, such as water, light and power, transportation, sanitation, and communications, for immediate restoration of essential services. By the nature of this war, some of the nations now least able to help themselves have made the largest relative contribution toward the common victory.

4. Where will the foods and other supplies come from?

They will come from many different countries. Wheat has already been promised under the International Wheat Agreement from the United States, Canada, Argentina, Australia, and the United Kingdom. Vegetable oils will come from Africa, sugar from the Caribbean, fish from Newfoundland, rice and coffee from Brazil, tea from India and Ceylon, beans from Chile and Mexico, evaporated milk from New Zealand. Each country will be a source of the foods and other supplies it is in the best position to supply. The United States with its varied products and with its location on one of the shorter shipping routes to Europe will be in a position to supply assorted relief commodities when the needs are most urgent and transportation difficulties most pressing. During that period Americans may face shortages from time to time in certain types of food or other articles. Countries such as North Africa, receiving relief assistance immediately after their liberation, will themselves become contributors of supplies when these are needed for other areas that are liberated later.

5. How much will it cost? Who pays the bill?

This being a joint enterprise in action, it is also a joint enterprise in finance. The Council has proposed as a fair basis for contributions by all the noninvaded nations 1 percent of their annual income for 1 year (the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943), but where this would prove too heavy a burden, adjustment should be made. The invaded countries will make such contributions as they can. Although for years to come several countries will have to use most of their resources for rehabilitation and reconstruction, they have nevertheless strongly expressed a desire to pay for the goods they receive. Thus a larger part of U. N. R. R. A. supplies will be sold locally. Free local distribution is planned for those who cannot afford to pay so that they will receive equal share. The sum which the United Nations have decided as necessary to carry out this program is $2,500,000,000. Of this sum for the relief of Europe and the Far East the share of the United States on a 1-percent basis would be not over $1,500,000,000. This is much less than the $2,250,000,000 we spent on relief in Europe during and after the last war. It is only the cost of 5½ days of war.

6. What return will we get for this contribution?

The U. N. R. R. A. program is more than part of the war liquidation process. It is a recognition that these imperative emergency needs must be met to insure victory. Practical and limited in scope it is not a world-wide W. P. A. program. Ninety percent of our contribution will be spent for United States products. Furthermore, reestablishing conditions favorable to profitable world trade is not charity. It is an investment in peace.

7. Which nations will receive aid? What about enemy countries?

Aid is to go to the victims of war in territories now held by the enemy as rapidly as the peoples come under the administration of the various United Nations. Victims of actual warfare in other Allied countries will also receive aid. The share of each area will be decided by the central organization of U. N. R. R. A. on the basis of need, limited only by the resources available (determined by the Combined Food Board) and the equally urgent needs of other countries. Whenever necessary, U. N. R. R. A. will operate in enemy or ex-enemy countries, but it is stipulated that expenses for such operations should be paid for by the enemy or ex-enemy country.

8. Who will run it?

The Director General, appointed by the U. N. R. R. A. Council and answerable to that council, will be responsible for all operations. He has entire authority to choose his own staff and it is anticipated that it will be composed of expert and experienced administrators of many nationalities. Distribution in each country will be the responsibility of the recognized government or authority of that area, unless assistance is asked.

9. Will relief be used as a means to political ends?

The chief safeguard against the use of the organization for political purposes is the fact that it is constituted of many governments of many views and that the policies will be determined by the group as a whole with the Director General being responsible to that group. The signatory nations have agreed that these supplies and services will "at no time be used as a political weapon." The clear intent is to bring relief where most needed (whether that nation or that individual can pay for this service or not), regardless of race, creed, or political belief.

10. Will peoples receiving assistance know from whom it has come?

There will undoubtedly be more enthusiastic support in the United States for this relief undertaking if the peoples being aided are clearly informed as to our share in this joint United Nations task. The U. N. R. R. A. Council has requested member governments to provide opportunities to U. N. R. R. A. to publicize its operations and to permit the use of labels on supplies furnished by it. The peoples receiving aid should therefore know how large a share the United States contributes.

11. How long will relief be under military control?

Relief will be under military control only as long as hostilities or other military necessities in any area require such control. The decision as to military necessity rests with the military command.

12. Will this program help shorten the war and bring the members of the armies of occupation home sooner?

In establishing and maintaining ordered conditions behind Allied lines, military efficiency is increased and victory is hastened. Because acute needs are to be met and rehabilitation is to restore the vitality of areas depleted by the war, the sooner the population will obtain tolerable living conditions, the more rapidly can the armies of occupation be reduced, and the sooner occupation can end.

13. Will continued and stricter rationing be necessary to carry out our share of this program?

The answer is a qualified "Yes." Rationing will probably have to be continued for a time after the war but not primarily because of this program. The quantities of food and other supplies which we will send to the liberated areas, although vitally important to the people who receive them, will constitute a very small percentage of the total we consume ourselves. Withdrawing these quantities from our markets would not in itself create a need for rationing though rationing will appreciably help accumulate or control these supplies. Many of the commodities needed for relief will be things not rationed in this country—some of them not even used by consumers here. In the planning of production expansion, both in the United States and elsewhere, the anticipation of relief requirements has been one of the factors taken into account.

14. How long will United Nations relief need to continue?

This is an emergency organization devised to bring its own activities to an end through rehabilitation. In some areas it may not continue after the harvest of the first crop. In others, where ruin and depletion are greater, the rehabilitation will need time to become effective. The U. N. R. R. A. program is expected to terminate about 2 years after the close of the war.

15. Will agricultural rehabilitation in foreign lands hurt American farmers?

No; it will not. With full employment in our own country, it has been demonstrated that the farmers in the United States have customers here at home who need all they can produce of most types of farm products. The rehabilitation of agriculture in the liberated countries will be advantageous to us as well as to them. This may call for some new emphasis in agricultural production in

occasional instances. The nations of the world are interdependent with respect to economic matters. The people of one country gain, not from the misery but from the prosperity of others. The liberated areas must be restored to positions of economic stability and given the assistance they need to bring their resources back into production. What the farmers of this country have real cause to fear are the consequences of a disastrous post-war depression which is likely to follow if U. N. R. R. A. fails to do this rehabilitation, and to do it well.

16. How will U. N. R. R. A. affect the jobs of American industrial workers?

Certain commodities produced in America, such as shoes and clothing will be needed on an emergency basis for foreign relief. This will be one of the factors which will assist American industry to see itself through the period of conversion immediately after the war. This relief demand will not create large-scale employment nor will it be a substitute for a domestic program of full production but it will help through a crucial period. Long-range benefits will be gained by American workers through the rehabilitation of these foreign lands whereby these impoverished people rebuild their economies sufficiently to purchase American products.

17. How will it affect private relief agencies, national or religious?

U. N. R. R. A. will welcome the help of private relief agencies with special competence and will permit them to operate wherever possible in areas of their own choice. Complete cooperation and integration of functions are assured voluntary relief agencies provided they obtain consent and are subject to the regulation of the Director General.

18. What is the relation of U. N. R. R. A. to the Hot Springs Food Conference?

The food and agriculture plan discussed by the United Nations at Hot Springs is worldwide. Its purpose is eventually to stabilize the world food supply. U. N. R. R. A. is restricted to certain areas and to emergency problems of food supplies during and immediately following the war. There will be certain times when methods to increase food production for emergency use may conflict with plans for long-range production. Consultations have been agreed upon to keep to a minimum any such conflict of purposes.

19. Will joining U. N. R. R. A. involve the United States in "entangling alliances"?

U. N. R. R. A. is not in any sense a superstate or an over-all economic organization. Individual countries make their own decisions as to their part in the operation of this plan. It will encourage the United States to agree to a membership in some form of world government only if our citizens become convinced that it is to our national interest to join with other nations in the common solution of world problems other than relief and rehabilitation. No commitment of such action is made by the participation of the United States in U. N. R. R. A.

20. What can the individual United States citizen do about it?

Every American citizen will be asked to make his contribution to this work. He will do it by accepting a temporary continuation of the rationing of certain supplies essential to relieve emergency wants and to stimulate quick recovery in war-stricken countries. He will be asked to pay his share of the American contribution, which will be appropriated by Congress. Both contributions require his full understanding that this work, while fulfilling the humane desire to bring mercy to the suffering, is dictated as well by the desire to shorten the war, to save American lives, to reduce the dangers of post-war depression, and to hasten the return to a stable and prosperous peace.

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON.
RAYMOND GRAM SWING.

Is It a Conspiracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the tenth anniversary of the first contract of the Tennessee Valley Authority extending its light and power rates to the people within its distribution radius, we are saddened by the fact that these blessings have not been extended to the people of the entire Nation.

This morning I had a letter from a friend of mine, whose home is in my district, but who is now in Arizona with her husband who is in the Army. She comments on the great reduction in light and power rates in the T. V. A. area, and the measureless benefits these reductions have brought to the ultimate consumers, and deplores the fact that such benefits have not reached the people of Arizona.

I call attention to the fact that Arizona is within the distribution radius of Boulder Dam, and that her people are entitled to their pro rata share of Boulder Dam power.

If the same policy had been applied to the distribution of Boulder Dam power, and to the distribution of other power produced by public projects in Arizona, that have been applied in the T. V. A. area, the people of Arizona would today be getting their power at less than one-half the rates they are now paying.

Nothing that I can think of would be of greater economic value to the people of that State.

This lady enclosed an editorial from Dunbar's Weekly, a paper published at Phoenix, Ariz., the date of Monday, January 17, 1944, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The matter referred to follows:

IS IT A CONSPIRACY?—ARE WE ON OUR WAY BACK TO THE SLIMY DEBAUCHING INSULL DECADE?

Has the Reclamation Bureau become an implement of the power monopoly and holding-company barons of Wall Street? Are the benefits of the great hydro power plants of this country, built at public expense, to be turned over to these leeches who so bitterly and unscrupulously opposed their building? Must American electric users forever pay tribute to these foreign parasites?

Shall electric consumers circuitously, through utility operating cost and rate-base juggling, be obliged also to pay for the gigantic sales and self-eulogizing advertising spreads now being run by 142 electric light and power companies in the magazine Time and other costly advertising mediums, and for the sophomoric radio program Report to the Nation, nightly imposed on radio listeners—all for the glorification of this type of proven gangster and blue-sky purveyors of the booming twenties?

That's the way it looks, Mr. Power User—and the bitterest pill of all, the Reclamation Bureau, which for so many decades has been the recipient of public appropriations of millions and millions, seems to have adopted a policy of placing as many barriers as possible between the ultimate electric user and electric power developed at public cost.

That we may not condemn unjustly, let us "look at the agency record" in Arizona. Here the Reclamation Bureau has functioned principally through mechanism of the Salt River V~"~y Water Users' Association. This purely private and profit motive corporation claims an investment of about $30,000,000 and operates a "project" of about 230,000 acres of land.

It is the largest producer and distributor of electric power in Arizona—substantially all on public money as its capital. It denies and repudiates jurisdiction of any State regulatory body, pays no property tax, and for more than three decades has followed a rate policy of charging all the traffic will bear.

Available to Arizonians is 17.63 percent of the firm power of Boulder Dam now producing about 4,155,000,000 kilowatt-hours firm hydroelectric power. This vast supply becomes available to Arizona on the establishment of a State agency to administer the same and for 15 years the citizens of Arizona have been seeking to secure the establishment of a power and water authority act essential under the Boulder Dam Adjustment Act.

In addition to Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, we have Parker Dam producing 120,000 kilowatts, one-half of which belongs to Arizona, and there will be produced at Davis Dam on the same river, still uncompleted, 180,000 kilowatts of which a substantial part belongs to the State.

With this vast quantity of electric power available, Arizona has the third highest electric rate of any State in the Union. In 1942 the electric users of Arizona paid the utility companies $6,790,061 more than they could have purchased the same electric energy for under the Tennessee Valley Authority rates.

Notwithstanding that we have had several damaging power shortages within a very recent period, every attempt of the citizens of Arizona to bring public power from the Colorado River dams into the consuming and marketing areas of the State has been defeated by the Arizona Power Trust—spearheaded by this Reclamation Bureau project because it fears any power control by the people.

Although Arizona has over 25 public power and irrigation districts, some 8 municipalities and 6 nonprofit cooperatives distributing or ready to distribute electric power on a nonprofit basis, not one of these public bodies has been able to obtain a single kilowatt of public power except by buying it from private utilities operating on a high profit basis. Such Colorado River power as comes into the State is by selection of the Reclamation Service distributed through private concerns in spite of the fact that our nonprofit public units have been seeking this power for many years.

In this new State of sparse population, we are afflicted with 11 foreign holding companies. Two of the leaders—Central Arizona Light & Power Co., of Phoenix, and the Tucson Gas, Electric Light and Power Co., of Tucson are owned by the American Power & Light Co. and Cities Service Co., respectively. These and the Salt River Valley Water Users Association operating the Salt River Reclamation Project, are the three private power concerns now receiving power from the Colorado River and imposing an unconscionable profit on electric consumers of Arizona.

As required by the Boulder Dam Adjustment Act, the people of this State are seeking to establish an essential State agency in the form of a power and water authority to receive and to bring into the consuming and marketing areas of the State Boulder Dam power on a nonprofit basis and to establish publicly owned utility plants for retail distribution.

Several cities and towns have already declared their respective intentions to adopt public ownership as a municipal practice, and we have in the city of Mesa one of the most

successful public-owned municipalities in the United States—thanks to the foresight of believers in public power who were obliged to wage a 25-year fight against the power trust for its establishment. Not one of these public units has been able to obtain power under the Reclamation Bureau policy except through private utilities and at an exorbitant cost.

Every movement for municipal ownership has been unscrupulously fought by the Arizona Power Trust and the fight is still on. Recently Cities Service Co. has been ordered by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to dispose of its isolated plant at Tucson under the National Holding Act; and the city is seeking to purchase the plant. Cities Service Co., and that includes the Power Trust, is fighting the movement with all the abandon and extravagance of debauching campaigns usually indulged in such cases. It is presently seeking to force a reconsideration of the S. E. C. action and apparently has the cooperation of the United States Reclamation Bureau. The situation is best explained by an editorial by Editor William R. Mathews, appearing in the Arizona Daily Star of that city last December 30:

"A BUREAUCRAT'S RECORD AND ARIZONA

"When a bureaucrat back in Washington calmly plans to dispose of Colorado River power to southern New Mexico, the State of Arizona should become interested. When a mere hired hand plans to dispose of something belonging to Arizona, the State of Arizona should have something to say about it.

"When this same bureaucrat announces this plan at a time that could easily mislead another Government bureau like the S. E. C. on a matter of policy, that bureaucrat's chief, in this case Secretary Ickes, should know what is going on in his department. In view of Mr. Ickes' record it is hard to believe that he knows that one of his bureau chiefs is making a public record on a subject at a time that fits in with the desires of a private public utility attempting to escape the holding Company Act of 1935.

"Mr. H. W. Bashore, commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation of Mr. Ickes' Department of the Interior, wrote a letter to Representative ANDERSON of New Mexico about the possibilities of connecting Elephant Butte Dam power in southern New Mexico with Colorado River power. The gist of Mr. Bashore's letter amounts to warm approval of such an idea, although it specifically states that the power allocated to New Mexico from Elephant Butte 'is not being used in that State and therefore Texas has been obtaining and using more than its allotted share.'

"After giving a brief description of future power developments on the Colorado River and the transmission line now extending from Parker to Tucson, Mr. Bashore approves the plan of connecting the Tucson end of this line with Deming and Elephant Butte power. Then he says, 'Thus the connection from Tucson to Deming would link existing lines and permit Colorado River power to flow into southern New Mexico. It would augment the supply of power available to communities in New Mexico and Texas now served by the Elephant Butte system.'

"There is an example of typical bureaucratic thinking and planning. Colorado River power belonging to Arizona and California is going to be sold to New Mexico, which Mr. Bashore admits cannot even use its share of Elephant Butte power, and Texas. That should be news to the people of Arizona. A bureaucrat back in Washington proposes to dispose of something belonging to Arizona without even consulting the owners.

"That much is bad enough. But the bureaucrat does something that can hardly have the approval of the chief, Mr. Ickes. He proposes this plan, and thus gives Government authority to it, at a time that fits in exactly with the plans of a New York public utility holding company to do the same thing as a means of escaping the full effect of the Holding Company Act of 1935. He does it when the matter is up for decision before the S. E. C. He thus, in effect, tells the S. E. C. that plans of the holding company to integrate New Mexico utilities with the Tucson utility, fit in with plans of the Reclamation Pureau. He omits entirely from his letter any information about the ownership of Colorado River power and the limitations that his Bureau or a private company faces in disposing of it.

"Because this matter is now before the S. E. C. for decision, Governor Osborn should let the S. E. C. know of Arizona's attitude on such a question. Secretary Ickes should at least correct this record that one of his subordinate bureau chiefs has made so conveniently for a holding company which is attempting to escape the full effects of the Holding Company Act of 1935."

No one in Arizona ever heard of Mr. Bashore's proposal until it was suddenly sprung at a time most beneficial to the holding company and most detrimental to the city of Tucson and public ownership in Arizona.

Elephant Butte reclamation project dam on the Rio Grande in New Mexico produces less than 25,000 kilowatts hydroelectric power. In that State a large proportion of the consumed electric energy is produced by steam, Diesel, and gas plants. That public power should be brought from this small reclamation unit in a State where power is or will be scarce into a State like Arizona where power is or will be plentiful seems an absurdity. A connection between Colorado River projects and the Rio Grande projects is understandable, but since Boulder power can be used only in Arizona and since there is not or ultimately will not be any surplus power in New Mexico, why has Mr. Bashore stepped into the picture at this time and under these circumstances?

The Reclamation Bureau has been functioning in Arizona for more than 30 years—why at some time in this 30 years was an announcement not made of any contemplated connection from New Mexico? Why come forward now with such a proposal—devastating as it is to the movement for public power in a State so sorely afflicted by the most vicious Power Trust of any State in the Union?

The people of Arizona have credited Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes, in whose department the Reclamation Bureau functions, with full sincerity and earnest desire to make available public power to the people of Arizona and other States at the lowest possible price. We still have confidence in his sincerity and purpose; but if his subordinates of the Reclamation Bureau control the power policies of that agency as in the past, then the public may as well abandon any hope of benefiting by the great Federal power works of the past 10 years. If Director Bashore has any satisfactory explanation for his ill-advised and ill-timed announcement, we would like to hear it; and we trust that Secretary Ickes will see that the explanation is forthcoming.

Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of January 29, 1944:

WHY?

The American people are entitled to all the facts—now—regarding the barbarous, wholesale murders of American and Filipino prisoners of war by the Japanese.

The American people are entitled to answers—now—to these questions:

Why have we not been told the truth?

Why was the story of Bataan kept secret for 2 years?

Why has one former employee of the O. W. I. been allowed to sell the most horrible tale in all American history to one magazine?

Why has the report of Lieutenant Colonel Dyess, which should be made in the most solemn and official form to all the people, been sold in the market place like a piece of merchandise?

Why isn't the whole truth being told? The White House has admitted that it isn't.

Why has this news, the most momentous since Pearl Harbor, been made to coincide with a War bond drive?

Why are the American people steadily treated as children?

We are entitled to all the facts—now.

We have the right to the full story of Bataan. We can take it, no matter what it is.

President Roosevelt should see now that all the American people are given all the facts.

It is his responsibility.

It is our right.

Willkie's Obvious Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

WILLKIE'S OBVIOUS DECLINE

Almost a phenomenon in American politics has been the career of Wendell Willkie. Virtually out of a clear sky he shot upon the scene in May 1940. He stormed the Republican Convention in Philadelphia in June of that year and, to the amazement of seasoned political observers, got the party's nomination. Then followed a vigorous and colorful campaign. He was defeated by President Roosevelt in November but it was generally conceded that he had made an excellent showing.

But what has happened since then? As Willkie's rise was precipitate, so, it appears, is the current tendency for his fall.

In a recent editorial we pointed out that he is dropping far behind Gov. Tom Dewey, of New York, in tabulations of the Gallup poll.

The Argus-Leader's poll in South Dakota reveals similar trend with Dewey getting 43 percent of the votes and Willkie 23 percent. There has been no campaign for Dewey in South Dakota and no campaign against Willkie. The change in sentiment has taken place without organized influence.

The Omaha World-Herald conducted a poll in Nebraska on a plan somewhat similar to that of the Argus-Leader in South Dakota. It gave Dewey 40 percent of the votes and Willkie 19 percent. And this was the result without a campaign on either side. Evi-

dently the expression in Nebraska was quite voluntarily as it was in South Dakota.

In all of this, of course, there is a deep significance to the party leaders. Though some may deny outwardly any particular faith in the polls, yet they appreciate their importance. The influence of the polls was felt, in fact, in Chicago early last week at the meeting of the Republican National Committee. Observers there saw a tendency on the part of the primary Willkie promoters to turn toward some other candidate in the realization that their favorite of 1940 was not the man for 1944.

Many Republicans continue to be vigorous supporters of Willkie but the polls show a sentiment that they cannot ignore.

Willkie is a resourceful man. But even his ingenuity is hardly sufficient to rescue himself from the oblivion into which he is falling at a critical stage in the development of the 1944 campaign.

Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution No. 13, adopted by Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, twenty-fifth anniversary founders' meeting, Minneapolis, Minn., January 14, 1944:

Whereas the war is approaching its most intense phase, which makes it necessary that all citizens do everything possible to aid the armed forces; and

Whereas anything any of us do or fail to do which might hamper the armed forces at this time may result in prolonging the war with consequent greater loss of of life; and

Whereas governmental orders, directives, and interpretations thereof have limited the freedom of action on the part of industry to handle labor problems in an efficient manner; and

Whereas both labor and industry are confused by the vacillating and inconsistent attitude and actions of the multiplicity of bureaus and boards established both in peacetime and during the emergency to deal with the labor problem, with conflicting jurisdictions and superimposition of one on the other; and

Whereas under these conditions labor as a whole does not have a clear understanding of its rights nor of its duties in relation to the greater service to all of the citizens and, therefore, is sometimes misled by selfish or uninformed labor leaders into calling strikes or threatening to strike which injures the Nation's war effort; and

Whereas both labor and management must realize that their first duty is to the armed forces at the fronts and that their own interests will be best served by allowing nothing to interfere with maximum production of war goods, and that any temporary injustice or sacrifice which labor or management may endure is trivial as compared to the heroic sacrifices which are being and will be made by our fighting forces and by citizens in occupied territories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the twenty-fifth anniversary founders' meeting of the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota assembled this 14th day of January 1944 at Minneapolis, Minn., That we believe the duty of organized labor is to refrain from all stoppage of war work and in industry essential to the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That we request that the administration in Washington formulate a labor policy that is fair and workable, and to put it in the hands of men who are competent to administer this critical job and to delegate adequate powers to them.

Soldiers' Votes and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as the soldier-vote bill will soon be before the House for debate and decision, I believe the Members will be interested in the opinion of some of the folks back home. Today I submit to you a splendid editorial on this subject from the Parkersburg News, one of the great papers of my State:

SOLDIERS' VOTES AND POLITICS

President Roosevelt's message has done nothing to remove the political angle from the soldier ballot controversy, or to pour oil on the troubled congressional waters. Indeed, if the deliberate purpose of the message had been to widen the breach and to emphasize politics in the less desirable meaning of the term, we can think of nothing better calculated to accomplish this than the President's denunciation of the State ballot plan as a fraud, and his demand that every Member of Congress stand up and be counted on the issue.

If there is any fraud involved, we think it can be demonstrated that it is more likely to be found on the Federal ballot side. As for making the record, we have seen no evidence of a disposition on the part of any Member of Congress to hide his position. Yet, Mr. Roosevelt's demand for a counting of noses has the same effect, and we think deliberately so, of asking a man when he had stopped beating his wife.

Let's examine the two propositions a minute. Let's examine them from the standpoint of the soldiers and the standpoint of election honesty, waiving constitutional considerations which are nonetheless serious and of far-reaching potentiality.

Mr. Roosevelt and those supporting the Federal ballot plan profess concern only with giving men and women in the armed services an opportunity to vote.

Very well. If they are to be given this opportunity, it should be a real opportunity. But what is proposed? It is proposed to distribute a uniform blank ballot among those in the service, on which votes could be cast for President and Vice President, United States Senator, and Members of Congress. These ballots would be distributed and handled under direction of a ballot commission, and returned to the respective States of the voting soldiers. The burden of ascertaining whether or not these ballots were legal would then fall on the States. This of itself would impose an almost impossible burden, would in all probability hold up vote counting for weeks if not months, and inject hopeless confusion and contention into determination of the election results.

But there is a great deal more that is objectionable involved. Obviously, the soldiers would be required to write in the names of the candidates they wanted to vote for. We venture to say that not 1 soldier in 50 would know the names of the candidates for United States Senator running in his State. And not one in a hundred, to make it conservative, would know the names of the candidates for Congress in his district. But most of them would know the candidates for President, certainly all of them would know one candidate if it happens that Mr. Roosevelt seeks a fourth term. Moreover, the opportunity for fraud in the distribution and use of ballots, "by the basketful," as Senator REVERCOMB put it, and the exercise of improper influence under such a system would be great and obvious.

Another thought: If it is so important that the soldier be given an opportunity to vote, why isn't it important that he be given the opportunity to vote a full ballot? The President isn't the only officer to be elected. The seats of Senators and Congressmen are not the only ones to be filled. There are Governors and other State officers and countless local officials to be named. Why isn't it the soldier's right to have a crack at these candidates as well as one of those at the top?

It isn't important if the purpose is something other than to permit service men and women to exercise the right of franchise.

Contrast this situation with that posed by the use of State ballots. The State of West Virginia has enacted a special law providing for the dispatch to interested voters in the service of regular absentee ballots. What's the matter with that? Did the members of the West Virginia Legislature perpetrate a fraud when they made a special trip to Charleston to work out this ballot? Did the Governor of West Virginia, who happens to be a Roosevelt Democrat, by the way, intend practicing the kind of fraud the President is afraid of when he convened the legislature in extraordinary session for the express purpose of making provision for a soldier ballot? And what's to be done with these ballots of West Virginia and other States if the President has his way? Incidentally, while on the subject of fraud, what does it sound like when the Secretaries of War and Navy warn that delivery of State ballots couldn't be guaranteed, in the face of the fact that the Government is regularly delivering ordinary mail from every corner of the country to American soldiers all over the world? If a State ballot can't be delivered, how can a Federal one make the grade, or how does a letter to a soldier reach its destination now?

There can be, of course, no quarrel with the principle of implementing the soldier's right of franchise. And nobody that we know has quarreled with it. But it is, in our judgment, one of those situations where the principle is sound but the available methods of applying it largely impracticable. We are very sure that the thing has stirred up controversy and set in motion forces which may lead to public ills far outweighing the benefits to anybody likely to flow from the attempt to make it possible for soldiers to vote.

We do not believe that there was, at the time the thing was started, any great demand for a ballot among men under arms. We doubt if 1 soldier in 20 had given the matter any thought at all or would have been the least bit disturbed had the issue never been raised and had no attempt to provide soldiers' ballots been made. We are very sure that the soldiers and the country would have been much better off had those who agitated the idea in the first place possessed the good sense to let sleeping dogs lie. However, now that the thing has been set in motion, we think it highly important, not only for the sake of the forthcoming election but for the sake of future control of the American system that the States send their own ballots to their own men. We feel very strongly with Senator GEORGE that the moment Congress invades the field it is proposed to enter with the Federal ballot, "we have opened the way for Federal control of elections in every precinct in America."

The Soldier-Vote Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merlo Pusey, from today's Washington Post:

WARTIME WASHINGTON
(By Merlo Pusey)
MORE ON DOUBLE-CROSS BALLOTS

One reason why the soldier-vote issue has gotten into such a tangle is the persistent confusion of legal and mechanical questions. Actually there are two controversies rather than one. The first centers upon who is entitled to vote, and the second upon the best way of getting ballots into the hands of qualified voters and back again to election precincts. The problem is simplified, I believe, when we consider these issues separately.

The grave weakness of the position taken by President Roosevelt and other supporters of the Green-Lucas bill is their assumption that all men and women in the armed services have the right to vote, or, if they do not, that Congress can give it to them. That, of course, is a false premise. Congress does not have power to say who shall vote and who shall not. The courts have so often made this plain that it is rather amazing to have the settled law on the subject blandly ignored by responsible officials.

The fact is that some men and women in the armed forces would not have the right to vote if they had remained at home. They don't automatically acquire that right by reason of being in uniform. Nor can Congress give it to them.

In upholding a Maryland law requiring citizens moving into that State to declare their intention of becoming citizens of Maryland before voting, the Supreme Court had this to say: "The privilege to vote in any State is not given by the Federal Constitution or by any of its amendments. It is not a privilege springing from citizenship of the United States * * * It may not be refusal on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, but it does not follow from mere citizenship of the United States." In other words, the privilege to vote in a State is within the jurisdiction of the State itself, to be exercised as the State may direct, and upon such terms as it may seem proper, provided, of course, no discrimination is made between individuals in violation of the Federal Constitution.

Before passage of the nineteenth amendment the courts consistently upheld the right of the States to deny the vote to their female citizens. "Certainly," said the unanimous Supreme Court opinion in *Minor* v. *Happersett*, "if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage." As recently as 4 years ago the court upheld the Georgia poll-tax laws on the ground that the privilege of voting is conferred by the State and is not derived from the United States.

In the face of these and many similar decisions and the express language of the Constitution stating the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress, sponsors of the Green-Lucas bill persist in their attempt to create new voting rights by congressional action. To be sure, the bill would leave the States free to throw out invalid ballots cast by soldiers and sailors ineligible to vote under State law. But this means only that the bill is a fraud insofar as it pretends to sweep away State voting qualifications.

Certainly then, the first step should be to strip the Green-Lucas bill of its unconstitutional provisions. This should be accompanied by a vigorous drive to induce the States to enfranchise men and women in the armed services who do not now have the vote. President Roosevelt poured scorn upon the idea of State action in his message the other day. But if the States themselves adopt this defeatist attitude, it will mean that thousands of soldiers will be double-crossed. They will be given what purports to be a ballot but which will be only a scrap of paper for the waste basket when it gets to the precincts where votes are counted.

If this legal problem were disposed of by the simple method of following the Constitution, it would be much easier to work out a compromise on the mechanical issue of getting ballots to the men in uniform and back to voting precincts. The objective here, it seems to me, should be the same as in the removal of voting restrictions; that is, to secure maximum participation of our defenders in the elections. Obviously, then, State ballots should be given preference to the "bobtail Federal ballot" wherever that is feasible. State ballots containing the names of both Federal and local candidates could certainly be used in most instances so far as soldiers within the United States are concerned. Short Federal ballots may be the only feasible means of reaching men on distant battle fronts. But here again it appears that many of the States will have to legalize the use of such ballots. For the Constitution specifically gives the States full control (except as to the time of selection) over the choice of electors who carry out the will of the people in designating the President and Vice President.

The greatest danger of all would be disregard of these constitutional directions. For that would taint the election and might easily involve this country in a political brawl such as that which followed the Hayes-Tilden contest. What a foolish mockery it would be to flout our Constitution under the pretense of extending the voting privilege when, by a little extra effort, the men in uniform can be given genuine ballots that will actually help to elect the candidates of their choice!

Lend-Lease and Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of January 15, 1944:

LEND-LEASE AND VICTORY

The balance between victory and disaster in World War No. 2 has been so close so many times that relatively minor factors may be said to have affected the final result, but there can be no question that lend-lease was decisive. Without it, we would today be looking forward to a quite different world and one far less hopeful for international cooperation. It has cost us only one-seventh of our total war expenditures, and we never got more for our money.

The debate on H. R. 1776, the lend-lease bill, in the winter of 1940–41 was national in an unusual sense. Landon and Hoover were among those opposing it. The measure was passed in March by 260 to 165 in the House and 60 to 31 in the Senate. Yet after the policy had had a chance to prove itself, there was no question of the Nation's indorsement, and it is significant that the votes on renewal in 1943 were 407 to 6 and 82 to 0.

Lend-lease was a "natural" in this war. We could not send our soldiers in time to defend our principles and our country, so we sent instead our guns, our planes, and our food to fight for us. To have demanded cash for our supplies or to have exacted loans would have simply wrecked the whole program or dislocated post-war adjustments. Yet obvious as was the necessity, the actual creation of the program was a stroke of genius. Former Administrator Stettinius in his report recalls that the President indicated in the summer of 1940 that his mind was working along the lines of lending ships to Britain, but the final idea was born in the Treasury Department, which discovered an 1892 law permitting the lease of Army property under certain circumstances.

Oddly enough, lend-lease may help to win the peace as well. The principle of mutual aid in mutual self-interest must live on, says Stettinius. "In that unity we can find the strength to build a peaceful world in which freedom and opportunity will be secure for all."

Heroic Rescue by Miss Talmadge Gwaltney, of Cradock, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINDER R. HARRIS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish herewith to insert a newspaper account—from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot—of the heroic rescue of two persons from impending death by little Miss Talmadge Gwaltney, 10 years old, of Cradock, Norfolk County, Va., which is in my congressional district. This young girl is deserving of recognition and credit in the form of a Carnegie hero medal, and I earnestly trust that such an award shall be made to her. I am submitting the case to the body which passes on these awards.

The news story from the Virginian-Pilot follows:

GIRL, 10, RESCUES CHILD AND MAID FROM GAS-FILLED HOUSE—PORTSMOUTH MISS SHUTS OFF JET, REMOVES BABY, SUMMONS FIREMEN

Through the presence of mind and quick action of Talmadge Gwaltney, 10-year-old girl of 64 Cushing Street, Cradock, a 4-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. G. B. Porter, of 41 Prospect Parkway, and a Negro maid employed by the Porters were saved from asphyxiation by gas shortly before 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon in the Porter residence.

The maid, Doris Terry, 25, was revived after a pulmotor squad from the Cradock fire department and assistants gave artificial respiration for about an hour and 15 minutes. The child, Judie Ann Porter, did not require respiratory treatment, having been moved

from the house to the front porch of the residence by Talmadge Gwaltney.

According to information obtained by Assistant Chief L. B. Boynton, of the Cradock fire department, the Porter child and the maid were alone in the house. Boynton said he was informed that the accident occurred when the child is believed to have turned on a jet in the gas stove while the maid was engaged in ironing.

Shortly after this, Boynton said, Talmadge Gwaltney went to the residence to visit the Porter child. Entering the home, she discovered the maid and the child on the floor. She hastily took the child to the front porch after turning off the gas jet, and ran next door and informed neighbors what had occurred and the fire department was summoned. The child quickly revived in the outside air.

Respiratory treatment was given the maid by Assistant Chief Boynton and Firemen Charles Winn and John Winn, and by Mrs. Mabel Dorson, of the Norfolk County Motor Corps, and an employee of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINDER R. HARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important tasks which will confront this Nation in the post-war period is the perfecting of a definite and workable plan for the conservation and efficient use of our great American merchant marine. We are spending, under appropriations by Congress, many billions of dollars to build merchant ships. These vessels now are contributing vitally to the successful prosecution of the war. They are being wisely and intelligently handled under the direction and jurisdiction of the War Shipping Administration, headed by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land.

By the time the war ends in victory for our arms, we probably will have 20,000,000 tons of shipping. That shipping is going to be perhaps our strongest weapon in the making of an enduring peace and the rehabilitation of the United States and the other nations of the world. This great American merchant marine—by far the largest cargo fleet ever constructed in any country at any time in the history of the world—must be handled in the interest, first, of this Nation and its people; if directed and guided in that direction, it inevitably will render invaluable service to the other people and other countries of the world.

I was delighted to note in the Washington Post today an account of the formation of an organization designed to promote an adequate privately owned American merchant marine. This is a worthy and patriotic objective. I trust it shall receive the active interest and support of every Member of Congress.

The news article from the Washington Post follows:

SHIP LINES FORM FEDERATION TO PROMOTE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

Formation of the National Federation of American Shipping, comprising virtually all oceangoing shipping of the country, was announced yesterday to promote an adequate privately owned American merchant marine.

Similar in scope to the General Council of British Shipping and the Association of American Railways, spearhead of the Nation's railroads, the federation elected Almon E. Roth, of San Francisco, west coast shipping executive, as president.

The federation, formed by five existing shipping associations, outlined a three-point program:

1. Disposition of the tonnage which the Government will own at the end of the war, estimated at forty to fifty million tons, on a basis that will be fair to all concerned and yet enable American private industry to compete with foreign shipping.

2. Development of coastwise, intercoastal, and foreign commerce.

3. Construction and acquisition of modern and speedy vessels.

"The development of a national program for the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine involves many delicate relations with foreign governments and foreign shipping services," the federation said in a statement.

The federation will provide an authoritative voice for American shipping interests in connection with the solution of these international problems.

WILL QUIT W. L. B. POST

Roth, who will take a leave of absence as president of the San Francisco Employers Council and resign as an industry member of the National War Labor Board to accept the new post, said so far there has been no common agreement on the probable size of the Nation's peacetime merchant marine, or other factors involved.

Roth, a former president of Rotary International, will be succeeded as president of the San Francisco Employers Council by George O. Bahrs.

DIRECTORS NAMED

Named directors of the shipping federation were:

R. R. Adams, of Grace Lines, New York City; J. J. Halloran, Sprague Steamship Co., Boston; Basil Harris, United States Lines, New York; B. B. Howard, Standard Oil of New Jersey, New York; Joseph T. Lykes, Lykes Bros., New Orleans, La.; H. Harris Robson, United Fruit Co., New York; H. W. Warley, Calmar Steamship Corporation, New York; Henry F. Grady, American Presidents Line, San Francisco; Frazier Bailey, Matson Navigation Co., San Francisco; Charles L. Wheeler, McCormick Steamship Co., San Francisco; A. O. Wall, General Petroleum Corporation, Los Angeles; E. P. Farley, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., New York; E. Myron Bull, A. H. Bull & Co., New York City; Edward A. Roberts, Waterman Steamship Corporation, Mobile, Ala.; and Roth.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a letter received from a soldier from my district who is now serving with the Fortieth Engineers Regiment in Italy. I believe it expresses concisely the twofold mandate which most of the men in the armed forces are issuing in unmistakable terms to us, their Representatives in Congress.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are depending on you to keep the guns and planes arolling to our front.

We are also placing our faith in your hands to make sure the peace structure to be erected on the foundation of an unconditional surrender will be one that will guarantee a permanent peace no matter what the cost in dollars and cents may be.

Best wishes,

Pvt. (1st cl.) FRED E. WEBBER.

Home Front Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, wherever there is a strike in some essential war industry or whenever an unauthorized stoppage of work delays the production of some urgently needed war item the country hears about it in short order—through the press or over the radio. However, when a particularly outstanding production job is accomplished somewhere on the home front it is too often overlooked or neglected.

One such job was recently done, at the Joshua Hendy Iron Works in Santa Clara County, Calif. I consider it worthy of special mention. As the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian editorialized:

One of the most heart-warming stories of the war recently came to light. It didn't take place in a fox hole under enemy fire. It is not a story of air heroes or of great bravery on the sea. It is just a story from our own production front right here in California. But what a story.

The Navy Department relates it as follows:

This month at the Joshua Hendy Iron Works, Sunnyvale, Calif., 310 more men lived up to the production slogan "Difficult things we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer." On a Thursday, officials of the company received a call from the Navy Department in Washington. The Navy, in substance said, "We need 250 (restricted) in a hurry. We need 2 of them next Wednesday for test at our proving grounds. We need the rest by Friday. This is important."

The company said, "O. K."

That particular job needed 310 men with a particular welding skill. They were not available at the Joshua Hendy works. No blueprints were at hand. Fifty tons of certain material were needed and the company didn't have it.

Nevertheless, on Saturday the job was under way. Three hundred and ten men were gathered from various industrial plants in the San Francisco Bay area. The Navy flew in models and prints of the equipment. Neighboring factories furnished the needed supplies and materials. Time clocks and

cards were pitched out of the window and for the next 150 hours these men put on a demonstration of what the home front can really do. They established a record of which Americans everywhere can be proud.

These men couldn't be told either the purpose or use of the equipment. Most of them owed no allegiance to this plant. They didn't know the boss and they weren't in the Navy. But they absorbed the idea that the chips were down and that the Navy needed the equipment on time.

Sometimes the welding fumes would get a man and he would have to go somewhere until his stomach straightened up. But the work didn't stop. A foreman would take up the welding torch. If a man got groggy he would lie down on a nearby cot and one of the inspectors took over. The boss, in overalls, did the same. The wives of the men somehow caught on to the spirit of the production battle and brought food, coffee, clean clothing and shaving material from home.

On time the test equipment was completed and rushed to the Proving Ground. Production didn't wait on results. The men kept right on. They were pretty sure the stuff was right because the Navy inspectors made preliminary tests right on the assembly line. If there was the slightest question on quality the men themselves tossed it aside.

By 2 p. m. on Friday, 7 days after getting under way, the job was done and the last crate of equipment was in the hands of the Navy en route to the job at hand.

Better that one, Mr. Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, it is such outstanding accomplishments as the one related above, repeated over and over again, from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida, that not only prove that the United States is indeed the arsenal of democracy but that also furnish conclusive proof that the days of Hitler and Hirohito are numbered. The men and women who do these jobs merit the Navy's highest praise: "Well done."

Legislation To Help Western Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mining Record, Denver, Colo., of January 27, 1944:

LEGISLATION TO HELP WESTERN MINING INDUSTRY

The outstanding legislation so far as the mining industry is concerned, proposed in Washington during 1943, was the bill of Congressman MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, representing the State of Nevada, which, if passed by Congress, will remove mining and oil financing from the provision of the Federal securities law. This legislation would bring the mining States of the West back to life and end the expenditure of millions of dollars by the Federal Government now being taken from the United States Treasury in an effort to develop prospects into mines. Congressman SULLIVAN'S bill, in our opinion, is the most vital legislation that has been proposed in recent years to end the present stagnation in many western mining districts.

The Federal securities law, as interpreted by the S. E. C., is so severe that practically all mining and oil financing has been ended. The Federal law is designed to prevent fraud in the sale of these securities. But there are plenty of State and Federal laws to prevent fraud. The progress of an entire industry should not be stopped because a few racketeers once moved in on the mining business. There are rackets in most lines of business, but the progress of industries isn't stopped by them. These racketeers are singled out and prosecuted, leaving industry in which they operated in better position than before.

The mining and oil industries can be made to afford positions for returning soldiers after the war. But if the present stagnation in opening new mines and drilling new oil wells is allowed to continue, there will be few positions in this mining development for the men returning.

The Government will undoubtedly stop financing mine development from the United States Treasury when the need for metals for war purposes comes to an end. The West should prepare for this by backing the Sullivan bill. Greater supplies of oil are needed for the war. One way to get this oil would be to allow the financing of wildcat drilling operations as was in effect when the present great producing oil fields were being developed. Fortunes can be made with the present price of oil; developers would finance and drill if given the chance.

Mustering-Out Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recently passed the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944. This is a bill which affects millions of people in and out of our armed services. I want to set out briefly its main provisions in simple, nonlegalistic language so that every service man and woman will be able to tell at a glance just what his or her rights are in respect to this legislation. If there is anything which is not clear, my suggestion would be that you consult your veterans' post or write to your Congressman. Meanwhile, keep this for reference.

WHO GETS IT?

All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard honorably discharged on or after December 7, 1941.

EXCEPT

1. Those eligible for retirement;
2. Those receiving a higher base pay rate than the base pay of officers of the third period ($2,400);
3. Those discharged on their own initiative to accept other employment (except for the period served out of the United States or in Alaska);
4. Air Corps Reserve officers, not selected for a commission, entitled to receive a lump-sum payment ($500 for each year of active duty);
5. Those whose total service was as students under a service-training program;
6. Those discharged to enter either the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies, or those whose total service was as a cadet of one of the academies; and
7. Any commissioned officer not discharged within 3 years of termination of the war.

WHAT DO YOU GET?

1. You would get $300 if you have served 60 days or more outside the continental United States or in Alaska.
2. Two hundred dollars if you have served 60 days or more, but have not been sent outside this country.
3. One hundred dollars if you have less than 60 days of active service.
4. If you have more than one honorable discharge, you get mustering-out pay on only one of them.
5. You are entitled to these payments whether you were mustered out before or after the passage of this act.

HOW ARE THE PAYMENTS MADE?

Payments are made in monthly installments of $100 each. If you are entitled to $300, you get $100 when you leave the service and $100 in each of the following 2 months. If you are entitled to only $100, you naturally receive that amount in one lump sum.

HOW DO THOSE ALREADY MUSTERED OUT GET THE MONEY?

Those already mustered out must make special application for the pay within 2 years to the War or Navy Department. You are to receive $100 within 1 month after your application is approved. Additional payments will be made each 30 days until the entire sum is paid.

MISCELLANEOUS

First. This money is exempt from taxation.

Second. It cannot be claimed by creditors or be subject to attachment by court procedure.

Third. Under other existing laws the serviceman gets his transportation home in addition to this mustering-out pay.

Peace for All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century Mr. Jacques Back has been a leader in civic and religious movements not only in Nashville, Tenn., but in the South. In that time he has unselfishly contributed of his thought, energies and efforts to every worthy cause in the interest of the public good.

Mr. Back published an editorial in the Observer, of January 28, 1944, dealing with a subject that currently is receiving a great deal of attention. Because I believe this editorial to have been inspired by the highest motives of patriotism and

an intense desire to promote the establishment of a just peace, I desire to insert it here under leave granted to extend my remarks.

The editorial follows:

SHALL THEY BE HELD SLAVES BY MEN?

(By Jacques Back)

It is natural that men and women everywhere should speculate as to how and when the war will end; that nations should draw blueprints now for a new world structure; that mankind should envision a peace that will give real and lasting security to all. This global conflict shall not, we vow, end in futile compromise in the appeasement of aggressor forces; not in an armistice that is but the interim period for scheming and trading; not in a victory that is mere illusion.

There is much to sway our emotions and to fashion our minds, once the terror of actual warfare begins to subside in the hour of victory it is so easy to preach and to grant forgiveness. Yes; even to forget, save perhaps in poetry that tugs at our heartstrings. the millions who lie buried beneath the earth. Especially we, in this land—the America that is noted for its material wealth, and, no less, for its sublime idealism—we, who had to be shocked into consciousness by treachery, driven into action by brutish aggression, we who surprised the world by a heroism and fortitude, both of spirit and heart, unmatched in the annals of history—we are still the apostles of mercy, the dispensers of justice all too frequently misdirected by compassion.

I pray that Americans may always retain that balance of character. For, from it springs our Nation's greatness, its marvelous development. Because of it, this western land is respected and, by some, hated; at times feared and envied. For it men have fought and suffered hardships and died. It is both its glory and its strength. But I pray, also, that Americans will insist that this shall be, indeed, the war to end war; that the prophetic vision expressed in the Atlantic Charter shall become the touchstone of international morality, the taproot of a new social order based not on might, but on justice; not on racial distinctions, but on ethics of equality and decency; not on arrogance or covetousness but on mutual appreciation. That there be no barriers to human progress, no separate gates, marked for Christian or Jew, or for any one of numberless sects and creeds through which man may hope to enter into the kingdom; no "verboten" signs on the highway that leads to the land of promise, to tranquillity, to peace.

I pray also—lest I must hold without value all professions of humane concern—that Americans will prize, beyond challenge, the integrity of the pledged word. For, if national honor is sacrificed to suit expediencies, if solemn treaties are scrapped to appease groups and individuals clamoring for privilege—then the spectres of fear and want will remain to harass society, to again threaten civilization.

It may seem trite to restate Adolf Hitler's sinster boast that he would drive the Jews out of Germany— from out of every land on the face of the earth. Such was the theme song of his Mein Kampf—the fanatical rambling, which the world laughed away as the meaningless explosion of a cramped mentality. It was his tempting promise to the disgruntled cliques in the Reich—the monarchists, who had been robbed of their throne; the socialists, whose political platform seemed so much like an importation from the Osten; the little kings and princes, and the vested members of the general staff, who had feverishly searched for something to lean upon, to guide them, to give them "face," during the humiliating post World War No. 1 years. It was, perhaps, only a chance shot, but it found its mark. It touched the festering wound in the political anatomy of the nation which was down in the mouth, and down at the heels—a nation which had been beaten in the game for high stakes, and now—hungry and desperate—was ready to make an art of petty larceny.

The Herrenvolk—the super race—accepted Adolf Hitler's sporting proposition. To beat up a few old Jews, to smash a few Jew shop windows, would be a diversion. It would break public inertia, provide a new topic for bierstuben conversation, bring back a sense of power. Here was a sure thing, just a few hundred thousand Jews to cope with. The French, and the hated English, and the Americans, complacently hugging their money bags—they surely wouldn't mind. As a matter of fact they might think it a clever political play, and even be led to imitate it. So the Jew was made the scape goat—destined for capital punishment, but, as a feeble concession to international law (what mockery), charged with all the crimes contained in the German lexicon of defeat. He started the war, Germans were told—he shunned the fight—he formulated the peace terms. Barred almost entirely from participation in the Government's affairs, he, nevertheless, misdirected its policies. He controlled wealth and prostituted science and art; half capitalist and half Communist, this freak creature, with diabolical cunning, stood, feet firmly planted, upon the prostrate forms of 60,000,000 Aryan blue bloods. Why wonder that, in its hour of deep humilitation and resentment, the German people should rise to punish and drive out or kill this alien sect? Heil, Hitler!

What seemed a sport at first, soon became stark, terrifying reality. German youths, trained to be gangsters, became supergangsters. They robbed and stoned, and killed "by orders of, and protected by, the law of the Reich"; they gorged themselves, their insatiable appetites matched only by their astounding capacity to stomach the bitter fare; it didn't disturb their digestion, their gastric juices functioned quite normally. The blood and the tears, the ghastly figures of bludgeoned Jews—the grim drama in which they played stellar roles—left them untouched; it gave them, if anything, a sense of new power. They were (who dared deny it?) the conquering race.

History will record it as the tragic sin of all governments that they failed to stop this orgy of rape and murder. It proved to be Germany's first step in a well-formulated plan to invade and annex neighboring states; to defy and subjugate and rule the Continent; to challenge and fight and enslave the world. The German General Staff would never have thought of liquidating the Reich's Jews, but Hitler and his motley cohorts were, after all, furnishing a "diversion" and what matter if the Jews were made to feel the first shock of the onmarching hordes? Let the Austrian clown have his fun, the generals argued, and, for the time being, the glory (or the blame), whilst we place the cannons and train the human fodder and mass for the brilliant venture. And so Adolf Hitler had his way, first with the Jews in Germany, and then with those of Austria. Country after country as each came within the sphere of German domination, resorted to the same method of "diversion"; torture camps sprang up here and there; extermination centers, brothels, and death vans, and sealed cattle trains. More than one Lidice shall, for generations to come, be mute testimony to this age and time, when Christian Germany, with laughter and scorn, crucified its sacred heritage, reversed the Decalog.

We, who gain our information from reports and comments liberally sprinkled with propaganda, cannot always attest the accuracy of figures. When we calculate the extent of Hitler's war on the Jews we can only take the facts as they are presented to us. Some claim that 2,000,000 Jews have been wantonly slaughtered; others place the total at nearly three million. Hundreds of thousands, it is known, have been evacuated—the young and strong to forced menial labor; the aged carted off and brutally murdered. Masses of them linger in concentration camps—ill, cold, starved, hopeless. Some escaped. A few by a queer whim of fate are harbored by friends, by Christian friends, waiting for the day when they may manage to elude the hangman's clutches.

For these few there is still a haven. With all doors closed, with nations ceremoniously maintaining immigration quotas and bureaucratic rules, there still is Palestine. There still is the homeland. There still is that crystal-clear declaration of sympathy which Lord Balfour transmitted on November 2, 1917—during the fateful days of World War No. 1:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object."

There—at long last—loomed the realization of a people's dream, the answer to an age-old prayer. "A national home"—for the persecuted, the banished, the despairing underlings of society; for the human flotsam vainly seeking anchorage; for a weary, heartsick, wandering race. It was a legal document; a luminous beacon—that pointed the way, charted the course. Fifty-two other governments including our own, endorsed it. Great Britain's trusteeship, accordingly became a corporate responsibility, a matter of individual and collective interest, and the Jews of the world were justified in their belief that the text and purpose of the Balfour Declaration would be respected and honorably observed.

The extent of that confidence and the measure of reliance on Great Britain's pledged word were unrestrained. Jews poured their wealth into Palestine; they reclaimed vast areas of swamp land; erected towering edifices; harnessed natural resources; built modern communities. The people of the land were coming back to the soil. The drawers of water gathered at the wells—the shepherds on the hills—the builders high atop mountainsides. A new chapter in the life of the race was slowly beginning to evolve—a bright romance that had the undertone of joy and peace—of security.

Can you sense the profound gratitude of these hearts? How they must have invoked God's blessing upon the defenders of humanity, upon Great Britain, upon America, upon the righteous among the nations. Hitler swore that he would drive the Jews out of every land, and from the face of the earth. Can they reach Palestine?

History again steps in. "For each of the next 5 years—(so reads the British White Paper, issued on May 17, 1939)—a quota of 10,000 Jewish immigrants will be allowed, on the understanding that a shortage in any one year may be added to the quotas of subsequent years within the 5-year period if economic absorptive capacity permits." And "after the period of 5 years no further Jewish immigration will be permitted unless the Arabs are prepared to acquiesce in it." And then: 'His Majesty's Government is satisfied that when the immigration over the 5 years which is now contemplated has taken place, they will not be justified in facilitating the further development of the Jewish National Home by immigration, regardless of the wishes of the Arab population."

Proud England! Champion of honor among nations! How can Great Britain

speak in terms of disdain and charge this or that nation with the violation of solemn treaties, when she thus flagrantly dishonors her own pledged word? Nay, more: when she betrays the trust imposed in her by 52 sister-nations? The British White Paper is the black stain on her national coat-of-arms; it is, in design, a replica of the Munich Pact; it is selling the Jews down the river. Part of the political assets left by the late Chamberlain government, it stands to menace the world's hope of peace. Winston Churchill fought it bitterly, if ineffectively, when it was promulgated. Is it not strange then, that Mr. Churchill, now wielding greater power than has any statesman in Great Britain's long history, should fail to restate his solemn conviction—that Jews may come to their Jewish homeland "as a right, not of sufferance." It is hard to understand how the world's humanitarians—President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister, having formulated the Atlantic Charter, the code of ethics that shall govern international relations, how men so well informed of what's going on in the German mind—how they can hesitate for one moment to proclaim that freedom from want and freedom from fear, and the right to live in peace shall not be guaranteed merely to some whilst denied to others; that the Jews shall be co-sharers in these precious liberties.

The enforcement of the British White Paper would be as a death sentence pronounced upon Jewish hopes. Like a court's decree, which, after a brief respite, sets the day of execution, Hitler—more than any other man—will welcome that day. He will accept it as the go-ahead signal, as Great Britain's tacit permission to have him deal as he pleases with the rest of the homeless Jews in his still firmly held fortress of Europe.

There are some who counsel that this is not the time to create a furore about a few million Jews. I plead, dispassionately, yet with all the earnestness of my being, that this is the time. I hold it is the essence of patriotism. I count it an indissoluble part of the ethics and the creed that are basic of our democratic way of life, that America should speak out now. Two million fiendish murders are worth talking about. The millions who are held slaves are worth thinking about. The anguished cries for deliverance from death cells, from the hell of the torture halls, from prison tombs—they weigh as an agonizing burden on the conscience of humanity. We cannot lift that burden, even whilst we liberate the Greeks and the Serbs, the Poles and the French. It will be with us at the very hour when the enemy is on his knees and submits in unconditional surrender. The world will not be free unless we level the barriers, until we efface the ghettos and open the gates.

If this is not the time for any one thing, it is not the time for playing power politics, for diplomatic gambling. It is not the time for evasive silence. Indeed, it is not the time for Great Britain to forfeit the good will of the people of America. I want Great Britain to revoke the White Paper. I want Great Britain to redeclare the principles of the Balfour Declaration. I want to be able to stand up proudly—withal, humbly—and count myself one of the free Americans whose faith in British honor cannot be shaken. Too, I want it written into the history of this age that America helped mightily to cut the shackles that have held a whole people to the cross for 20 centuries. I want redemption for the Jew from his suffering; for the Christain from his sin of omission; for humanity from its mortal weaknesses, from war, from greed, from the spirit of hate. I want peace for all mankind.

Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for Tuesday, February 1:

SOLDIER VOTE

Across no subject have more red herrings been drawn than across the soldier vote bill. But the parliamentary tangle in which the bill had been lost is now being straightened out. The second Lucas-Green bill—the so-called Federal ballot bill—has been revised in committee. In its present form it meets valid objections which had been advanced against its parent. Those objections were weighty. They persuaded this newspaper that second thoughts were necessary on a bill which was tantamount to a fraud almost equally with the State ballot bill which was so denounced by the President. In one section the bill waived State law in giving the vote to all servicemen. In another section the determination of the validity of the filled-out ballot was left to State officials. In other words, the right to vote was not ipso facto granted under the Lucas-Green bill. Those who rent the air in behalf of this measure as it stood prior to revision were confused themselves and were confusing others. However, Senators LUCAS and GREEN now have deleted the section waiving State law. So that those who want to see that the servicemen who are entitled to vote shall vote, but who, at the same time, want to keep within the framework of constitutional government, can now support this revised Federal ballot measure with a clear conscience.

At the same time an effort should be made to clear the atmosphere of the misunderstandings that have darkened it. In this respect the President did not help matters in his intervention in the debate when he spoke about the Ramsey Act of 1942. Referring to it as a "Federal absentee-balloting statute," he said it provided for "a Federal ballot prepared by the States." In point of fact, it provided for nothing of the sort. It provided for the validation of a State ballot for all servicemen. What made consideration of a Federal ballot necessary was the insuperable difficulty of getting State ballots to the battle fronts for our millions of fighting men to fill out. The weight of a State ballot plus the envelope is 3 ounces, or the equivalent of 12,000 V-mail letters. Multiply 12,000 V-mail letters by 5,000,000, and you have some notion of the burden that would be put upon the administrative authority. Accordingly the argument for a Federal ballot for the election of Federal officials is, it seems to us, irresistible. What bedeviled the debate on the Federal ballot was the attempt to give the power to the Federal Government to repeal State law and qualify all servicemen for the vote.

This was the intent of the first Lucas-Green bill. Then, in the second version of the bill, occurred the two provisions which, as we have said, canceled each other out. Perhaps a hope remained that the States would count the votes as received as a result of a combination of public and Federal Government pressure. We doubt the success of such a maneuver. The right to determine the qualifications of voters belongs to the States. It is a fundamental power, and the States would struggle up to the courts to retain it. Of course, it is fervently to be hoped that the States themselves will take action at the earliest possible time to extend the suffrage to all the men who are fighting. Every Member of Congress with any sense of responsibility must do all he can to promote that end. But enfranchisement is a matter for the States of residence, not for the Federal Government. "The United States," as the Supreme Court has said, "has no votes in the States of its own creation." If this issue were properly presented to the servicemen, it is our conviction that they would take their stand in behalf of the proper way of giving them the opportunity to vote. Never was there a time when we need to be so scrupulous about constitutional government. This is what our boys are fighting for, and they know it. The demagogic appeals for the repeal of State laws by the Federal Government would, if successful, cause endless confusion and bitter recriminations, and be a real danger to the American system.

My Attitude Toward a Record Vote on the Worley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, at least twice recently I have expressed myself on the floor of this House as favoring the Worley bill as the most feasible and satisfactory proposal to date to permit the members of our armed forces scattered throughout the world on many battle fronts to vote in the coming elections. I have all along pointed out that to accomplish this huge task in a constitutional yet practical way, without interfering with the war effort, will require a high degree of cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. The revised Worley bill, in my judgment, will best accomplish that objective.

I would like to be counted in a record vote as supporting the Worley bill, as I understand it, and I was very anxious to make it possible to have a roll call vote on that measure as distinguished from any other bills purporting to extend the privilege in a constitutional way to all members of the armed forces. It was for that reason that I voted "No" today on the ordering of the previous question. Of course—if and when the Worley bill is rejected—I shall vote for any proposal, even if less effective, which may yet evolve if it purports in a constitutional way to enable our Nation's defenders to vote. I think it unfortunate that the rule under which this measure is brought to the House will make it possible to thwart so wholesome a measure as the Worley bill without a recorded vote for the whole world to see how Members stood on it.

Certainly I recognize that duly constituted authority over elections rests largely with the States and that Congress has, under the Constitution, only limited authority with reference to the election of Members of Congress. The Worley bill, as I understand it, encourages the voting of the full ballot by cooperation between the States and the Federal Government to as great a degree as it is possible to obtain. This would mean that the States would need to change their election procedure in the direction of uniform action, which is what the State of Arizona, as well as several others, is now planning to do. Also, it would mean that the Army and the Navy, acting for the Federal Government, would conduct, not 49 elections, but one or, at the most, two. It would further mean that the Worley ballot would be applicable only to those officials whose election is under the influence of Congress, and the ballot would be used by voters of those States which did not cooperate by suitable changes in their election laws.

Form Filling Is the Bane of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of many Members of Congress, form filling continues to be the bane of business. The income-tax monstrosity is the latest nightmare, and it, I want to stress, is no child of Congress regardless of recent intimations from high sources to that effect.

There are a few bureaucrats—far removed from the plain, common-sense realities of business and farm and from the hard facts of war—who are still busily engaged in regimenting this country and in leftish experimentation. Unfortunately, some of them are high in the Nation's councils.

These world order advocates are destroying the good name of the many thousands of Government workers who are sincere, conscientious, and hard-working in their devotion to a free America whose Government belongs to the people. They will in time destroy the good name of the Democratic Party under whose coattails they sneaked into power.

The warning is plain. Our boys are not fighting for a perpetuation of regimentation by bureaucracy. I call for a purge of pinks from Government rolls, and with them the impractical theorists who write useless forms and all the others who see Government as the master and not the servant of the people.

We in Congress have asked time and again for a simplification of regulations, for less form filling, for a Government that confidently leads its people through sound principles and sensible economies. I would be the last to reflect upon this Nation's great wartime achievements. But I seek also a successful home front. This is not impossible of accomplishment even in wartime. It is time to take the steps that will insure it.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extract from a radio speech dealing with the soldiers' vote made by Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, from his office in New York on January 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Talking about soldiers, there is a great deal of discussion these days about the soldiers' vote. I think it is just about time that somebody told the truth about it. There is a great deal of sparring going on in Washington about the soldiers' vote. Some say they are for it and others say that they are for it but are against it. There is only one way to be for the soldiers' vote, and that is to be for it, honestly, completely, anl realistically. There is no other way.

I can tell you, from my own experience as a legislator—14 years in Congress—that there are many ways of defeating a bill that you may be opposed to and voting for it. Those who insist upon the perfection in the law to permit the soldiers to vote, perhaps really do not want the soldiers to vote. Now, come on, let us be perfectly frank about it. You and I can talk about this. There is nothing difficult about it, if you really want the soldiers to vote.

Anyone who suggests that each State should prepare the ballot and send it to the soldiers so that they may vote is absolutely either insincere, or is hopelessly ignorant of the laws of his own State that any such position simply does not make sense. Do you know that soldiers, as a whole, will not be able to vote for their own Congressmen, let alone have a separate State ballot?

We must have separate ballots for the men to vote so that the ballots may be counted in the vote for that State. There is no other way for a soldier to vote for the Presidential candidates, because the President and Vice President are not elected by popular vote. They are elected by electors who are elected in each State. Therefore a boy from Oklahoma who is in Africa will have to vote a ballot that will be counted in the total vote of Oklahoma, and a boy from New York who is out in the Pacific will have to vote for his choice for President on a ballot that will be counted among the votes cast in the State of New York. The same may apply for any candidate running as such on a State-wide ticket.

It is humanly and physically impossible to vote for local candidates. And I will prove it to you. In order to arrange for the boys to vote for Congressmen—and let us forget local candidates—it will be necessary to have 435 sets of ballots and 435 sets of maps and many thousands of lists of election precincts. If there were only 1 place where all the soldiers could vote, then it might be properly argued that it is quite all right to have 435 different ballots. But if you stop to consider that our soldiers and sailors and marines are stationed in at least 1,000 different places throughout the United States and the world and you started to distribute 435 different ballots to each place where any soldier may be stationed and 435 maps to determine which ballot an individual would vote, you can see that it would be an impossible task. Now, let us try it: I will dare anybody to go to Madison Square Garden, say on a Friday when they have a boxing match, or go to the Metropolitan Opera House any evening and try to get the audience, with maps of congressional districts, to determine which district they live in. It just cannot be done. We would have to have at least five or six thousand men and women to distribute the ballots, to assort the ballots, to identify the proper congressional district for each soldier to vote, and it just cannot be done.

These men and women are entitled to vote. Let us cut out the sham. Let us be frank and honest about it. Let us provide a ballot, 48 different ballots, one for each State, in time to get the ballots to the men, and permit the men from that State to vote for President, Vice President, United States Senator and any Congressman-at-large, taking in the entire State. For instance, take New York State. We could not possibly get a ballot before September, if it is to be a ballot containing all of the congressional candidates. The 1944 primary will be held on August 15. On August 16 we will know the congressional candidates of the major parties. But then, in normal times, October 16 is the last day for filling vacancies caused by declination of an independent nomination. If the law is changed it can be brought up to Setpember 11. So if the soldiers were to receive a complete ballot for the State of New York, it could not possibly be prepared until September 12 and manifestly you could not get that ballot to all of the soldiers of the State of New York in the various places where they are on duty.

I repeat, let us give the soldier a vote. Let them vote for President and Vice President and for State-wide offices. But this ballot should be ready not later than August 16, and on its way. Every place in the world where soldiers are stationed will then have to have 48 different ballots, even if they vote only for President and Vice President. They still will have to have 48 different kinds of ballots or the ballots marked in accordance with the State of residence of the individual soldier. Let us hope that the Congress will act intelligently and practically in this very important matter. There will be 11,000,000, nearly 12,000,000 men, in the service by election day.

Contribution of Italian-Americans to the War Effort

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, during the early days of this war, and for a considerable period thereafter, no group of

our citizenry were more unfairly maligned or more unjustly treated than those of Italian blood and Italian extraction. For some unknown reason, they were deprived of employment and positions of trust. Our own Navy Department at one time refused to take men of Italian ancestry into its Intelligence Division unless these applicants could prove that they were four generations removed from Italy.

Any American who knows the history of his country cannot help but wonder at the reason behind such treatment. The Italian people were among the first to reach the shores of this western world. Early in the history of the Colonies they had taken their places as mechanics and artisans in Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Savannah, and Charleston. Many of them fought with distinction and valor through the hard, dark, drab, and dreary days of the Revolution. Their loyalty and patriotism were appreciated on more than one occasion by General Washington.

In the War between the States in 1861 to 1865 there were three regiments composed entirely of men of Italian birth and ancestry fighting under the banner of Grant and Sherman. Three men of Italian blood achieved the rank of brigadier general in that war. In the final victory parade that was held on Pennsylvania Avenue here in the Nation's Capital in May of 1865, there were no more distinctive groups than the so-called Garibaldi volunteers. Historians of that period quoted with amazement their orderly appearances, their strict discipline and the great number of silver rings on their battle flags which noted the number of engagements in which they had participated.

In the First World War which is within the memory of every man and woman in this House of Representatives, no people came forward more eagerly to serve the adopted country than those of Italian blood. We can all remember the enthusiasm with which they gave their time and efforts and money and their blood that these United States might achieve victory. In those years between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 we all know of the remarkable strides made by the Italian-American in the fields of art, medicine, literature, civics, and every other feature of American life. We have seen them build and support magnificent homes for the poor and the aged, hospitals for the unfortunate sick, and institutions for those of their youth who have been left orphans. They have taken part in every feature of our civic and national life.

When World War No. 2 broke out we found them to be one of the most important national segments of our population. Immediately they responded to their adopted country's call. Immediately, they were willing to struggle, to suffer, to die if need be, that America and its cause might live. Wherever the Italian had settled, there we found intense enthusiasm in the raising of funds for the U. S. O., War bonds, Red Cross, and for anything else that might contribute to the destruction of our foreign enemies. In my own city, before recruiting was stopped, young men of Italian blood thronged by the thousands to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps recruiting offices to join up in defense of America. We first realized how many of these men had responded to their country's call when the invasion of Sicily began. It was here that the Italian-American soldier not only showed his valor, but also proved his worth to our country. When the first American forces reached Sicily and later the mainland of Italy, there were far more Italians in their ranks in proportion to their population in our country than any other group. Through their knowledge of the Italian language, customs, and psychology, they were soon able to make friends with the Italian populace and in many cases with the members of the Italian Army. The Italian people soon recognized their American friends and were willing to sue for peace. It is my honest opinion that it was the invasion of Italy by such a strong force of Italian-Americans that brought about the speedy abdication of Mussolini and in turn saved thousands and thousands of American lives.

Today, in every corner of the earth, upon every sea, in the sky above and beneath the seas, these splendid young Americans are making history and will bring great glory to the people of their race. If one but looks at the daily casualty lists he will find the Magrinos, the Del Vachios, the Spinellis, the Del Isolas, and hundreds of others with similar names making the supreme sacrifice.

It is my sincere hope that never again will the citizens of this Republic doubt the loyalty and devotion that our Italian-American brothers have for these United States. They have proven their worth as men and as Americans, and as such we pay honor due.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in entire agreement with President Roosevelt in supporting a Federal ballot, for no matter how the opposition dresses up their arguments, the plain fact is that a uniform Federal ballot is the only method by which the men in the service can be reached in time to have a voice in the elections this year. We voted to send men to fight so that our democratic form of government shall be continued, and we are now saying, in effect, you are good enough to fight for America but you are not intelligent enough to vote right.

Under the Worley bill men in the service are assured of a vote for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen. Under the so-called States' rights vote plan some States will send out ballots; many will not. The Army and Navy have opposed State ballots on the ground they would be impossible to administer. They certainly know what is possible. The President is right in saying "a States' rights plan is a fraud upon the American people." I believe it to be a greater fraud upon the men in the service, who are suffering and dying to preserve democratic government, while they themselves are denied the right of a voice in the selection of the men and women responsible for governing. The Members of Congress who refuse to be recorded on this issue will have some difficulty in explaining why. If we break faith with the men who are fighting and dying for us, God help America.

[From the Jersey Journal of January 31, 1944]

GIVE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS SOME VOTE—AT LEAST ON WHO'S TO BE PRESIDENT

It's time for Congress to stop bickering about States' rights, Federal rights, or any other right, save the serviceman's right to vote.

He didn't drop his citizenship when he picked up a gun to defend his homeland.

If Congress will keep in mind first of all the idea of protecting the serviceman against loss of his right to vote, many difficulties can be overcome. The problem of giving soldiers and sailors a chance to vote is much more complicated than President Roosevelt pretended in his message to Congress. But it is not so tough that Congress can't solve it.

There's no reason to suppose that a soldier in Australia, for example, wouldn't understand why he couldn't have the opportunity to vote for the mayor of his home town back in the United States of America, or the sheriff, or other local items. Anyone can see how ridiculous it is to propose that the Army and Navy try to put the right local ballot from the old home town in the hand of each serviceman.

But there's plenty of reason to suppose the average serviceman would like to vote on candidates for President, Vice President, Senator, and Governor.

It does seem as if a serviceman's short ballot form could be used, and as if the few States where this might require special legislation or even State constitutional amendments ought to be willing to do whatever is necessary to make such a plan practicable.

President Roosevelt let Congress have it with both barrels when he labeled a State's rights vote plan "a fraud upon the American people." He demanded Congress provide adequate Federal machinery for fighting soldiers and sailors to vote next fall.

Congress, which has been bickering for weeks over the issue of whether the States shall handle the balloting of the men and women in the armed forces, or whether it shall be handled by the Federal Government, was in no mood to take the President's censure lying down. This was evident when the Clerk had finished reading the President's message to the House. The Republican side guffawed loudly even during the reading and again when it was finished.

In the Senate Republican Senator TAFT, of Ohio, said he "resented the designation of the State-voting proposal as a fraud."

Despite the evident amusement the President's message caused, he hit the nail on the head many times in his pungent statements, and Senators and Representatives better get wise and do something about soldier voting before it is too late. True, the election won't roll around until November, but the national conventions will take place in the early sum-

mer and the machinery for the election should be set up long before then.

There are 11,000,000 in the armed forces and most of them are of voting age and have a direct interest in the byplay now going on in Washington. As the President pointed out, they cannot understand why the fact that they are fighting should disqualify them from voting. He cited an important fact in the 1942 general elections. He said out of 5,700,000 men in the armed forces at the time, only 28,000 servicemen's votes were counted under the Federal statute (a 1942 law). Certainly that is not representative of the number of men in service.

The President made an impressive plea for Federal control of the balloting. "What is needed," he said, "is a complete change of machinery for absentee balloting which will give the members of our armed forces and merchant marine all over the world an opporunity to cast their ballots without time-consuming correspondence and without waiting for each separate State to hold its primary, print its ballots, and send them out for voting."

Congress can laugh now, if it wants to, but it won't be a laughing matter if those millions in service do not get their chance to vote. They have no pressure groups to fight for them, for all their pressure is being brought to bear on the enemy.

Mustering-Out Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of the record, I desire to reiterate my position on the mustering-out pay bill recently enacted by the House, and also set forth the reasons for my vote in favor of adopting the conference report.

When the measure was pending in the House, because I did not believe that the provisions of the bill submitted by the Military Affairs Committee were generous enough, I voted for the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], which would grant a maximum mustering-out pay of $700, depending upon the length and character of service.

I also voted for the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], extending the benefits of this measure to those over 38 who had been discharged to take up essential industrial occupations, since many of these men had seen long and arduous service and, in my opinion, were entitled to the benefits of this bill.

From the start I have energetically and wholeheartedly collaborated with every effort made to expedite consideration and action upon this measure. I did this because I felt many of our discharged disabled veterans were in dire need and that boys discharged in the future ought to be provided with means to bridge over the gap between discharge and employment. I believed this legislation ought to be enacted with dispatch and promptitude.

Of course, I was not satisfied by any means with the result of the conference report which reduced the amounts provided by the House bill. In the light of my previous vote for much higher amounts ranging up to $700 I regarded these reductions as most undesirable. Nevertheless that was the best compromise that could be obtained in the conference. To oppose the adoption of the conference report would simply prolong the intolerable delay that has characterized some phases of the history of this legislation and, therefore, I voted to adopt the conference report so that the mustering-out pay bill might take effect immediately.

Congress will have many opportunities in the future to remove inequities, inequalities, and discriminations contained in this measure by considering and enacting an appropriate adjusted-compensation measure which will take into account all essential factors of service and give our veterans generous recompense for the sacrifices and hardships which they will have undergone to preserve our democratic institutions.

While I deeply respect the attitude of those who opposed this conference report, I think to have rejected it would simply have brought further unnecessary delay, without any discoverable possibility of changing the result.

I stand now as I have stood from the beginning, and as I always will stand, on principle and in practice, for unstinting and most generous provisions and benefits for all our veterans. I am prepared to give fullest expression to these convictions both with my voice and vote.

The Soldiers' Vote Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, from the newspaper editorials in my section it is evident that the people are not being deceived by the effort of the administration to force through the Congress the Lucas-Green bill, which in fact will disfranchise most of the men in the service. The West Virginia absentee voting law, as recently amended, makes it possible for any West Virginia serviceman stationed any place in the world to vote the complete ballot just the same as the folks at home. I submit to you an editorial from the Point Pleasant Register which indicates the people are thinking straight on this subject:

NOT AS AN INTERESTED CITIZEN

On January 26, when President Roosevelt asked the Congress for a roll-call vote on the controversial soldiers' vote issue now before Congress, he said he realized that he had nothing to do with making or enforcing congressional rules, but that he thought there were times "when the President can speak as an interested citizen."

Fair enough. However, the President is more than an interested citizen. He is President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of our armed forces. He does not speak as an interested citizen but as the one individual who possesses more power than any one other single individual in the entire world.

Mr. Roosevelt's uttered opinions are not on the same plane as those of a private citizen but assume the form and power of dicta which is practically a command to be followed. When uttered by an official of a high court it almost becomes equal to a part of a decision and is followed by inferior judges in forming opinions and decisions.

Any utterance by President Roosevelt, either written or spoken, will assume the same importance to at least a large number of the Members of the Congress as an order. If not followed it may bring down the wrath of the administration on that individual's head and remove him from public life forever, just as other courageous statesmen have been purged from public life. Notably in the Supreme Court packing case.

And it is the honest opinion of millions of patriotic Americans that the same effort will be made to purge from public life anyone who has the courage to oppose the administration of the soldier-vote bill.

As to making and enforcing congressional rules, it is the opinion of this writer that the President has demanded as "must legislation" more rules than all the Presidents who occupied office before him.

As to his statement about making and enforcing congressional rules, we cannot agree with the President. We think that he has made more rules and regulations, by "must legislation" than all Presidents who have preceded him and enforced less of them, or else perverted them to cover situations they were never intended to cover, than all the Presidents who have preceded him. Note the House committee's report on the W. L. B. January 26.

The President said, "Our millions of fighting men do not have any lobby or pressure group on Capitol Hill to see that justice is done for them. They are not ordinarily permitted to write their Congressmen on pending legislation; nor do they put ads in the paper to stimulate editorial writers or columnists to make special appeals for them."

We cannot agree with Mr. Roosevelt on this pronouncement. Every publisher and editorial writer in the United States has backed up the armed forces with every inch of type, every ounce of their energy and their entire equipment to see that our sons and fathers and husbands and daughters and wives had a fair deal and if anyone is to blame it is not the Congress or the citizens, but the President and Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

If American soldiers cannot write their Congressman it is due to the fact that the United States Army is still using the antiquated and barbarous rules of Frederick the Great which Baron von Steuben copied in a manual of arms for our Army and we're pretty sure the Commander in Chief could have them simplified, if he thought they infringed on the personal liberty of a volunteer or drafted army. It seems a late date to bring that matter up when it could have been disposed of by the Commander in Chief several years ago.

As for buying space in papers to curtail or infringe on the rights of soldiers, it is all poppycock. Editors and publishers are a strange breed. They work long hours for little pay, but I would like to go along with President Roosevelt and watch him or anyone else try and buy the average editor or

publisher to belittle or deprive an American soldier of his rights. That would be the great battle of all time. It can't be done, Mr. President. If your contact with the American newspaper world has not taught you this simple lesson, it is useless for a country editor to try and do so.

"As their Commander in Chief, I am sure I can express their wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discriminations which are being practiced against them."

The above statement by President Roosevelt was either a burst of pure rhetoric or a confession of his own inability to correct a wrong he has known that existed. If it is rhetoric, it can be forgiven—forgiven and put down as one of the many meaningless outbursts which has marked the President's long years in office.

If it is spoken from actual knowledge, the Congress should ask him why he has not laid that situation before the Congress and required an investigation in order to place the blame and relieve our armed forces of any unjust rules, regulations, or persecutions. We consider that to be one of the main functions of a commander in chief of any armed force and especially when that armed force is engaged in war.

Mr. Roosevelt said, "The American people cannot believe that the Congress will permit those who are fighting for political freedom to be deprived of a voice in choosing the personnel of their own Federal Government."

It would seem that the President is distrustful of the 48 different States, when in reality millions of the inhabitants of the 48 States are distrustful of the President's motives.

Seaman Basil Izzi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation of the United States Navy Department in the case of Seaman Basil Izzi, of Barre, Mass.:

Survivor of 83 days on a life raft, Basil Dominic Izzi, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve, has been awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal for the gallantry and ingenuity he displayed during the prolonged ordeal.

Izzi, 21, is the son of Dominic Izzi, 1 Power Mill Corner, Barre, Mass.

The award was authorized by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, acting in the name of the President. The citation on which it is based reads:

"For heroic conduct as member of the United States Navy armed guard on occasion of the sinking of a Dutch merchantman by an enemy submarine in the Atlantic Ocean on November 2, 1942. When two torpedoes struck the ship and exploded in rapid succession, Izzi, upon abandonment of the flooding vessel, clung frantically to a bamboo mat until four shipmates adrift on a life raft, finally hauled him out of the sea. From then on, although two of the men succumbed, he and the others gallantly fought off delirium and death for 2,200 miles, ingeniously subsisting on fish, birds, and rain water long after their provisions had been exhausted. Although tortured repeatedly by vain hopes of rescue and painfully weak from prolonged exposure, Izzi bravely disregarded his own plight in a resolute desire to uphold the morale of his companions. His unselfish devotion, fervent optimism, and persistent faith undoubtedly alleviated their suffering and sustained their will to live until a passing ship spotted them 83 days later."

A Soldier's Visit to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is more than a simple pleasure to introduce and doff my hat to a Washington visitor to my home and office, a constituent of my district, and one of America's No. 1 citizens, Sgt. Harry M. Dennis, now of Uncle Sam's Army, formerly of Pekin, Ind. Sergeant Dennis seemed to be so impressed with his Nation's Capitol that I asked him to favor us with a soldier's reaction to Washington as seen on a 72-hour leave:

A G. I. SEES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Sgt. Harry M. Dennis, U. S. Army)

Yesterday Washington, D. C., was just another city on my "must see" list, but thanks to the kindness of Mrs. Earl Wilson who acted as my guide on a tour of the Capital City today it is a vibrant, living personality. I have been emotionally stirred by Washington's historical beauty, as moved as I have been when the full tide of some lovely voice has washed over my soul singing Ave Maria or The Lord's Prayer, as touched as I have been when in the fields on our Indiana farm I have been favored by a meadow lark's vocal greeting to the morn.

To see our legislative department in action is, I believe, the ambition of every citizen of the United States. It was certainly mine. Sitting in the gallery of the House of Representatives listening to the discussion on the bill relative to the muster-out pay for men and women of the armed services I must confess, if I'm to be honest with myself, that I found it very difficult to keep my mind on the subject under discussion. Later I believe I found the reason for my disinterest in that particular bill.

I stood in the benign presence of Lincoln in that so humanly exact marble shrine in memory of him, and the thought of money paled. I stood before Jefferson in the memorial to that great American, and gold lost its glitter. I stood before the copy of the Constitution in the Library of Congress with all the signatures of those courageous authors of our liberty and I wondered—would they from a personal financial standpoint have given this issue a single thought?

In the presence of those honored dead who sleep the eternal sleep at Arlington, a voice within me questioned, "Was it for a personal financial gain that these men gave their last full measure of devotion?" I thought of my home and my family, those ties that this war has severed, and the question of muster-out pay was to me as nothing compared to my desire to get our job finished and take up again that way of life which these men had so valiantly defended. I felt the presence of the spirits of these men. I felt so small and yet so humbly proud that even I was a part of this glorious heritage and suddenly it did not matter if the future should demand my life on some battlefield. Certainly, I want to live. Of course, I dream of the day when I can again be with those I love, but so did they. Their example of devotion to all mankind gave me greater courage to face any eventuality which might befall. I couldn't help but feel that if the Congress, labor, and management could take a few moments out to dwell on our heritage that it would bring them to a more rapid meeting of minds. Perhaps it would bring them to a compromise which would give us, not a utopia, but provide for coming generations a society in which the dignity of the individual man would be preserved—not preserved for our Nation alone, but for all men.

My experiences in Washington have given me a stronger desire to be a part of this glorious future. I want to express my own convictions in my local, State, and National Governments. I'm firmly convinced that Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Hamilton, or any of the great leaders, would have found a way to grant us this privilege in a manner which would have guaranteed the exercise of our liberties without fear that the sanctity of the ballot would be violated. Having inherited this wealth of governmental procedure from our great men of the past, our present leaders with their own devotion to our cause, certainly will not fail us.

Burning an Empire

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a book which is said to be the first comprehensive account of American forest fires. It is called Burning an Empire, and it was written by Stewart Holbrook, whose articles and other books about our forests and lumberjacks have made him widely known.

It is a well-named book, and I hope that every Member of Congress can take occasion to read it. It is not dull reading. In fact, it reads like a thriller. It is a thriller, but it is a true one. For, in fact, we have burned an empire, and, if the truth were known, we are still burning it.

Mr. Holbrook tells the stories of some great fires, which have wiped out whole communities as well as millions of acres of forests. We burned about 36,000,000 acres a year from 1933 to 1937, and most of this tremendous loss was man-caused. Mr. Holbrook tells of one fire alone that burned 270,000 acres of some of our finest forest lands in 20 hours. That was in Oregon in 1933, and it gives one some idea how rapidly this menace can wipe out the results of the best efforts of forest operators and public agencies to conserve this resource and provide trees for tomorrow.

This is a matter of interest and concern to those in States without large forest resources, as well as to those who come from forest regions. We have heard much about depletion of our natural resources, how petroleum is running out, how important mineral de-

posits are nearing exhaustion. Timber, almost alone among natural resources, grows. When harvested, it can be grown again. It is being grown again, and again, under scientific management. This is important to the future of the country, of the entire country. But in some areas, where forests once grew, repeated fires have made the land unsuitable for new crops of trees, or have destroyed sources of seed that would naturally produce new forests. That is a greater loss than the destruction of the original trees themselves. And most of it was caused by carelessness.

Mr. Holbrook's book gives one a better understanding of the causes of these fires and how best to combat them. It is a most helpful contribution to the cause of real conservation. We have made some improvement, but the problem is not solved. It is a continuing problem, of which we should be constantly aware.

Votes for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 2, 1944:

VOTES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Congress is still discussing, heatedly, the question of the armed forces' votes in the 1944 Presidential election.

GREEN-LUCAS ADVENTURE

The administration first tried to push over the original Green-Lucas bill, which would have enabled the President to name a five-man commission to supervise the entire voting procedure throughout the services. This was somewhat too rich for the Senate's blood, and it killed the measure, substituting a resolution calling on the States to make arrangements to collect ballots from their own fighting citizens.

Mr. Roosevelt bounced back recently with a special and hotly worded message to Congress, demanding passage of a modified Green-Lucas bill. Evidently the President believes, like many other New Dealers, that he will get a majority of the service vote as a fourth-term candidate. If he didn't believe that, his message would hardly have been as fervent as it was.

The armed forces should have the opportunity to vote. We don't see how anybody can in logic or fairness dispute that proposition.

BYPASSING CONSTITUTION

But the trouble with the modified Green-Lucas bill is that it calls for a procedure whose constitutionality can probably be attacked successfully in the courts. Under the Constitution, the members of the electoral college are elected by the voters of the several States. They then proceed to cast their States' electoral vote as instructed by the voters. It may be an archaic system, as many say it is, but it hasn't been repealed, and in all likelihood won't be before next November 7.

Under the Green-Lucas bill, this system would be bypassed in the case of the service votes. A so-called Federal ballot would be dealt around to the services by the War, Navy, and Post Office Departments—all controlled by the New Deal, though Secretaries Stimson and Knox call themselves Republicans. Only Federal candidates would be voted on.

It is easy to see how some shrewd constitutional lawyers could attack this set-up. The election could be contested; it might wind up in the House of Representatives or the Supreme Court; its outcome might hinge on one or two doubtful States. A situation as ugly and as dangerous to the Nation as the Hayes-Tilden shindig of 1876 could easily develop.

Mr. Roosevelt, being the masterful soul he is, might then feel called on to seize some sort of autocratic control of the country, pleading war necessity.

NEW DEAL PRESSURE

We are inclined to think with the New Dealers that Mr. Roosevelt as a fourth-term candidate would get a majority of the service votes.

These young men were tapped on the shoulder by Uncle Sam at age 18, 19, or thereabouts, and hustled off to a regimented existence. They wear the same types of clothes, go to bed and get up at the same hours to the call of a bugle, eat the same food, study the same things, and are discouraged from thinking for themselves except when it comes to using individual initiative in battle.

"Stand by your Commander in Chief" propaganda, we expect, will be circulated industriously among them, and direct or indirect pressure will be brought to bear on them to vote for Roosevelt. We'd expect this pressure to succeed in many cases, though doubtless some of the boys will insist on voting as their fathers did before them.

MAKE IT LAWFUL

For all that, the servicemen should have their votes. By the same token, we think the American people would be foolish to reelect Mr. Roosevelt, but if they want him for a fourth term they should have him. That's democracy, even if Roosevelt in a fourth term proceeds to kill off democracy.

But Congress should not let itself be stampeded into ordaining a service vote procedure which can wreck the 1944 election because it is unconstitutional. The services should have their vote, but Congress owes it to them as well as to the rest of us that it shall be a lawful and valid vote.

There is plenty of time for the State legislatures to attend to the matter. Each State, incidentally, should decide (as the Constitution intends) whether its citizens in the services are to vote only for major State and Federal candidates or for all candidates from dog catcher on up.

This is the democratic, constitutional way to go about it. We have yet to hear, despite the flag waving and the breast beating of the New Dealers, of any other democratic, constitutional way to go about it.

Canadian Labor Forced To Idle in Sight of Vital United States Pulp Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Stratton from the Boston Herald of February 1, 1944:

CANADIAN LABOR FORCED TO IDLE IN SIGHT OF VITAL UNITED STATES PULP JOBS

(By Arthur Stratton)

ST. COME, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, January 31.—In this French-Canadian town and in dozens of others nearby today there may be seen hundreds of able-bodied young men loafing on the streets, in garages, and in stores, while a few miles away over the American border manpower is so scarce that wood, vitally needed for munitions and pulp, can't be cut and taken to the mills.

These men are not permitted by Canadian authorities to go the few miles to American soil and cut wood. They want to do so desperately. They would be paid handsomely. But Canada will not give them the necessary permission to cross the boundary.

Those who have pleaded in vain with Canadian authorities for permission to work charge they are being forced on relief rolls of this Province. Others assert they are among several thousand discharged from an aluminum company, reducing its war production.

That this great reservoir of manpower exists alongside an area pleading for labor is verified by a dozen or more mayors of French-Canadian communities in this area. The mayors of 4 communities alone, St. Zacharie, Aubert-Gallion, St. Prosper, and St. Come say nearly 1,700 men in these places have sought unsuccessfully to get over the border and go to work.

Canada has set up a quota of men it will allow over the boundary so ridiculously low that it is impossible for America to make use of this substantial manpower source. Only 3,600 Canadian men are permitted to go into the entire northeastern section of the United States and cut wood for American companies desperately in need of this raw material for pulp and the many vital products allied with it.

NOT TRUE QUOTA

Actually the 3,600 figure is not a true quota. This is the top which Canada says it will permit to work in the forests of adjoining Maine and other areas in all of the northeastern United States. Because of a maze of restrictions and time limits virtually impossible for a Canadian worker or an American company to untangle, the quota really is in the vicinity of 2,000 men.

It isn't because Canada wants the men for military service that she will not permit them to be used by America for a few months in the winter wood-cutting season. The thousands of men hanging around in this section of Canada today either have been rejected for service or told that they will not be called in the immediate future.

Across the boundary into Maine, only a few miles from here, are hundreds of thousands of acres of pulpwood ready for cutting. There is no shortage of standing wood. Transportation to the mills is not a factor here because virtually all of it is water-borne in the spring.

There is some indication that Canada thinks the men are paid too well for their work. The few that are permitted under the quota to cut in Maine average between $8 and $10 a day for a 54-hour week. When they are paid off by a firm such as the Great Northern Paper Co., which owns one-tenth of the State of Maine, they receive their wages in American money. When they come across the border to their homes here they turn the American money into Canadian currency. Right here they realize another 10 percent increase because of the difference in exchange.

AMAZING SITUATION

That there is a great source of available manpower here can't be disputed. Young people are loitering around everywhere. To one accustomed to complaints of manpower

shortages in the States the situation is amazing.

"In my town alone, the town of St. Come," said Mayor Joseph Toulouse, "I consider there are at least 250 strong, experienced woodsmen trying every day to go to work over the border. I refer to them as being available now, when their farm work here permits them.

"This number of men cannot leave their farms to work far away for the Canadian companies because the change would be too expensive while the Maine forests are but a few miles from our farms. There are at least 250 who are trying to get work across the line and I would say perhaps about 460 were at the disposal of the American companies altogether."

Mayor L. E. Larochelle, of St. Prosper in Dorchester County, Province of Quebec, only a few miles from here, estimated his community had 500 men. He has petitioned the Canadian authorities in Ottawa in vain for permission to get these men work.

Mayor Achille Thibodeau, of Aubert-Gallion, St. Georges, located in Beauce County, in the Province of Quebec, estimated there are 650 men available in his community.

QUOTA RESTRICTED

Mayor Edouard Grouleau, of St. Zacharie, reported 350 available in his township. "It would be greatly appreciated if the Canadian authorities would submit to my request," he added, with respect to his efforts to get these men working in Maine.

The men are kept within this Province by a regulation requiring that they have a so-called labor exit permit before starting across the boundary line into the United States. Up to last Friday night only 3,600 such permits could be issued under the quota restrictions. At one time there were no restrictions and a single company often employed as many as 2,000 men.

Once a permit is issued to a man it cannot be replaced, even if he should decide to go home after working only a few weeks. Thus in a few weeks it is estimated that there will not be 3,600 Canadians in the American woods but only about 2,000. There can be no replacements until Canadian authorities designate another recruiting period.

The men eligible to obtain these permits, aside from the quota restrictions, are comparatively few because of the Government requirements. None of the military-age group from 18½ to 40 can even be considered for a permit, with the possible exception of fathers married before 1940. A youth younger than 18 is not permitted in the woods under another regulation.

Thus to a considerable extent American companies are restricted to Canadian labor 18 to 18½ or over 40. A man rejected for military duty under the selective-service laws of Canada can't obtain a permit to work in Maine. He is of military age, and that's the end of it.

MANY LAID OFF

The man who issues the exit permits in this area is Hilaire Gregoire, who bears the title of national elective-service officer. He is sympathetic with the men, but is forced to point out that he must obey the regulations and not issue permits above the quota and to anyone of military age.

Gregoire is the first to agree that Canadian men can be located easily when they are given permits to work for American companies in the woods just across the border. This is no barrier, he agrees. The companies must furnish a bond for the safe return of every Canadian taken over into the woods, and the fine is $500 per man in the event one strays.

A total of 315 men in St. Come signed a petition urging the Canadian Government to give them a chance to go to work in the Maine woods, but it did no good. The young men with time on their hands here today include many laid off a few weeks ago from an aluminum company farther north. Emilien Drolet, 20, of St. Zacharie, said he was one of 600 laid off by the company, and added that he had been told the company's force was to be reduced from 11,000 to 7,000 hands.

Freya M. Stark, Agent Provocateur, and the British White Paper

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, two resolutions have been introduced in this House and two in the opposite Chamber demanding the abrogation of the British White Paper which bans the entrance of Jewish refugees into Palestine after April 1 next.

There has come into this country one, Miss Freya M. Stark, a British agent to the Arabs. She is scheduled to go on a lecture tour to uphold this cruel White Paper, contrary to the wording of the resolutions offered in this House, and is to do so at a time when sentiment is at a fever pitch against this white paper.

Lord Halifax deserves condign criticism for allowing this lecture tour and permitting this agent provocateur to come into this country to speak in favor of maintaining the damnable white paper—rather a scarlet paper steeped in blood of thousands slain and who might otherwise have been rescued from Hitler's hangmen if the gates of Palestine had been properly opened.

The lectures of this woman will seek to influence action of our Congress upon the aforesaid resolutions. How dare Lord Halifax allow such a thing.

Is the British Embassy paying the cost of her tour?

Is the British Embassy or the British Information Service—the British propaganda service—defraying her expenses?

Is any oil company with Arabian or Near East oil concessions supporting her efforts?

I respectfully ask Lord Halifax to answer these questions.

This agent provocateur has been in the employ of the British Foreign Office since 1939. She was supposed to aid in helping hold the Arab world to the Allied cause. Her success in this regard was nil.

While Palestinian Jews fought and died and worked and produced for the Allied cause, the Arabs would not even give as much as a donkey or camel to aid the Allied soldiers. Let us emphasize to Miss Freya Stark and the British Colonial Office of the open hostility of the Arabs.

Let us remind the British Colonial Office of the treachery of the grand mufti of Jerusalem and the revolt in Iraq against the British and Allied Nations. What was this remarkable woman, Freya Stark, doing in the meanwhile with her Arabphile and her Judeaphobe. We had to beat Iraq into submission. King Ibn Saud waited until the tide turned to call himself friend. King Farouk of Egypt and Abdullah of Transjordania were openly pro-Axis, and were caught redhanded, betraying British military secrets to Axis headquarters in Tobruk. The grand mufti is even now a Nazi gauleiter in Berlin.

This Stark woman wants us to reward the Arabs for their treachery and castigate the Jews for their loyalty.

We want none of her and her kind in this country.

Finally, delenda est carta blanca—the white paper must be destroyed.

The Soldier Vote Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that even at this late date we have before us for consideration legislation which will give those in military units the privilege of voting with the minimum of red tape. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate, both pro and con, and I am glad to take the floor and fight for the rights of those who are wearing the uniform of our country. I will say unequivocally that I want our armed forces to vote, but I do not want them to be penalized or discriminated against because they are wearing the uniform. They are being discriminated against in a shameful manner by the President's proposal of a Federal bobtail ballot, which would give them only the right to vote for the President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman. This bobtail ballot means that they would be deprived from voting for local and State officials, whom they know, and who would fill the offices which would most intimately affect their everyday affairs when they return after the war.

Mr. Speaker, I know of specific instances in my district where the fathers of men and women in uniform are candidates for State and local offices, and this Federal bobtail ballot would prohibit them from voting for their parents. Is this fair? Is this not discrimination? Are they not being penalized because they wear the uniform? The bobtail ballot robs them of their chance to vote on an equal basis with the people who are holding down their old jobs. It robs them of a voice in all matters concerning the home front, and, Mr. Speaker, those in uniform have very definite opinions about some of the things going on on the home front this year. Our men and women in our military units are entitled to better treatment than this. They certainly are entitled to the same ballot that you and I

have. They are American citizens giving their lives that you and I might live and vote for all those we want in public office. Let us give them that same privilege.

Absentee Voting by Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD an editorial written by Judge Harlan Palmer, editor and publisher of the Hollywood Citizen News, Hollywood, Calif. Here is one editorial which definitely hits the nail on the head. In other words, if we want to be a politician, we should vote for the Federal ballot. If we wish to be a statesman, we will vote for a method, which will also give the soldiers an opportunity to have their votes counted.

POPULAR

The President takes a popular step when he demands that Congress pass legislation that will permit servicemen to vote wherever they may be.

But many Congressmen declare that the President's demands are impossible to meet. They declare that it is unconstitutional to take away from the respective States of the Union the right to provide for the exercise of the franchise by their citizens.

There is no occasion for the laymen to endeavor to determine whether such enactments as the President demands can be met in a constitutional manner.

Only the members of the Supreme Court of the United States who have the last guess can determine the constitutionality of the law. And even the President's efforts to fill the court with men who would express the same thoughts as he entertains have not been completely successful.

In making his demands, the President, master politician that he is, knows that he is playing smart politics regardless of whether or not his proposals can be enacted into a constitutional law. He has asked for something that most people would like to see granted and most people have no idea about the constitutionality of the proposal.

If Congressmen were as smart politically as is the President and were not looking into the future they could gain popularity by granting the President's demands though the legislative enactment be unconstitutional.

But some Congressmen are asking what the situation will be in the event the question of the constitutionality of the Presidential election goes into the courts. They are seeking to secure the maximum of voting privileges for the servicemen by methods that will leave no question as to their constitutionality.

Governor Warren has asked the California legislators to make changes in State laws that will make possible the casting of ballots in all California elections by California servicemen everywhere.

Other States will perfect their machinery for absentee voting. Congressmen urge all States to make it possible for the servicemen to vote. Some States will not act.

But even though all the President's demands were legally met, there would be many servicemen who would find it impossible to vote.

Whatever is the final outcome, the President has protected himself politically. And if an election should be declared illegal after months of litigation, the President would be holding his job in the meantime.

Statesmanship might require a different course than that followed by the President, but there is no question that good politics call for the exact course that the President has taken.

Proposed National Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, how do our actions on the home front affect the morale of the boys at the fighting front? That is the question uppermost in the minds of most of our people today. Every loyal American wants to help these boys who are offering their lives, their limbs, and their minds, that our people may continue to enjoy the freedoms of Americanism. We not only want to furnish them with food, clothing, planes, tanks, guns, and ships to defeat the enemy at the earliest possible date, but we want to encourage them mentally, and have them feel that we are backing them up to the limit.

Many of our people sincerely believe that a national-service act, whereby civilian labor would be conscripted for war industries, would improve the morale of our brave boys at the front, and we are concerned about just how they do feel regarding actions of this kind. A friend of mine recently received a letter from a young chap at the fighting front, wherein he discusses very intelligently this question and in a very clear and concise manner advises just how he feels regarding the conscription of civilian labor, and how he believes many of his fellow soldiers feel about this matter.

This letter is very informative on this subject and I believe it should be read by every Member of Congress and every citizen of this Nation. The letter reads as follows:

AFRICA, *January 15, 1944.*

DEAR MAC: Am in receipt of another of your letters and believe me they are most welcome. I haven't many correspondents for I believe that social correspondence should be restricted to a very close circle of friends and not include outsiders or members of these all but anonymous organizations which well-meaningly enough band themselves together and write to soldiers. Since I have been in the service I have received no correspondence or package from any club, association, society, or corporation; nor have I missed anything, although my volume of mail has been slight for having missed all this. Nevertheless I sincerely hope my small circle of friends will continue to write.

By this time you will have been assured that we have fared well during the holidays which you incorporated as your sincere hope in your letter of December 24. It was gratifying to learn from the same paragraph of this same letter that prices have not been unbearably increased nor that there is any dearth of good food. This type of news is reassuring to those of us who feel a constant concern over the well-being of our loved ones and friends back home. You are well aware of the controversy which persistently fills the newspapers along these lines, and much of the furore reaches us. We have no way of determining the degree of reliability in these reports due to factional business and political considerations which often tend to distort or becloud these issues.

We here in this sector have been informed as to the contents of President Roosevelt's recent message to Congress. Many of us view it with deepest interest, and I on one point therein, with deepest concern—that is, the labor-conscription proposal.

It is true that I can't get a complete cross-sectional canvass on the attitude of my fellow soldiers. And it may be true that some of them feel that if a man can be tapped on the shoulder and ordered to fight for $50 per month then it is fitting that all men be compelled to serve in a civilian capacity wherever and however the "powers that be" arbitrarily direct. I myself have never felt this way about this matter. It is true that national military conscription is essential and no right-minded man objects to it although he knows that he can no longer enjoy those personal liberties which Americans hold so precious; that military service is decidedly nondemocratic but rather authoritarian throughout, and rightly so, that it might best perform the function of successfully waging war. However, these rights which the fewest necessary number of us must relinquish, is so done that the rest of us might continue to enjoy and perpetuate this precious thing for which we allegedly fight—personal liberty. And it is the cherished hope of right-minded servicemen, if they really love their families and their country and those things of priceless value which comprise America's richest heritage, that our fellow Americans be allowed to continue to enjoy to the fullest possible degree consistent with the successful progress of the war effort these precious liberties including the minimum governmental interference in their personal lives; which privileges we in the service needs must continue to forfeit until victory is won.

This implication is purely conjectural and of necessity will always remain so. Are our production schedules in arrears? Are our supply lines not functioning properly? Are people not generally bearing up under their tax burdens? And above all, in what way would our armed forces be benefited by such a measure?

If our dead could speak they could not deny the heartache borne by their loved ones; neither will the maimed nor those in prison camps deep in enemy territory. We know that millions at home are anxious over our welfare over here and are not given up to crass indifference nor riotous living, neither are exempt from, to some degree, the self-denial that war brings in its ghastly wake.

True, there are those who maintain and profit by the black market; there are those in industry and agriculture and other fields of endeavor who are waxing fat on blood, and sweat, and tears; and there are those in the realm of government who seek preferment and intrench themselves more ruthlessly and tenaciously in the name of public interest and the winning of the war. But these reprehensible creatures are in the minority, and these are the ones whose unhallowed activities would be least affected should this regimentation proposal become law, so as a curb on the callousness of those who graft and profiteer, and nurture their overwhelming ambition, the national labor conscription proposal would be useless.

Nor have I ever discovered any evidence to make me believe that the arbitrary judgment of government was as capable of judging a man's qualifications for essential civilian war service as the man's individual preference, or foreknowledge of his own experience and capabilities motivated by a normal degree of patriotism blended with a natural self-interest.

And then, again, what a sadistic inhuman attitude is further implied. Because some of us for tactical reasons must sleep in muddy, rain-filled fox holes, will it help us if you for no reason whatsoever be compelled to burn your mattresses, and be compelled to sleep in the street? Because some of us in the performance of our duties suffer physical discomfort do you feel that we want you to flagellate your flesh? Because some of us die or are torn and maimed would we enjoy hearing of an epidemic of self-mutilation sweeping over the States? And because some of you raise a chicken or two in your backyards and have an occasional treat which you would gladly share with us if you could, must we hope and pray that you strangle on the bones?

Must you be afflicted with inspections and work details and top sergeants, must you be subjected to a civilian version of the tender offices tendered us by the military police, just because such things are necessary and proper to our way of life?

When the politicians in certain quarters have axes to grind, it's amazing how they shed alligator tears and break forth with an epidemic of wracking sobs over our sad plight and feel impelled to assuage us by afflicting our loved ones.

What sort of contemptible rotten rats do some of our so-called solons make us out to be if their actions are purported to be guided by our desires?

The above diatribe expresses exactly my attitude and undoubtedly that of countless others among my fellow soldiers on this and kindred proposals, feeling that this is indeed a step toward dictatorship. Old Adolf's probably smirking up his sleeve—the skunk!

Feel free to express my opinion on this matter among our political acquaintances, MAC, if you feel as I do. I wish the majority of the Congress will feel likewise.

Kindest wishes, from

EDDIE.

Our Duty Is To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a paper in my district written by Mr. H. A. Lawson, of the Eagle Rock Sentinel, which I find is reflecting the views of the great majority of people:

OUR DUTY IS TO SERVE

Service from citizens is more often than not something on which there is no price. It can be had voluntarily, but is hard to force. That's because it is American. That is why we so often refer to the American way. Americans have seen so much of the forced system in European countries that they want none of it here, or at least just as little as possible. The American people are not inclined to favor any proposed laws that will further infringe upon their freedoms and their liberties. They realize that constant curtailment is nothing more nor less than giving more and more power into the hands of the few. And that is one of the very things they are today fighting against in a world war.

The process of elimination was the price European peoples paid and made dictators possible in this world, and brought on us all the war and its accompanying miseries. It all started with gradual curtailments of the people's rights and liberties. First went the right of peaceful assembly. There followed the forfeiture of religious freedoms. It was not long before a free press disappeared. Without voice the people soon became helpless, easy victims to the Gestapo and the other agents of vengeance whose activities developed into wholesale murders of innocent peoples. All semblance of democratic government was burned at the stake.

It is not possible for such things to happen here. The people will not permit them to, because they are jealously guarding their rights, their liberties, and their freedoms. Already forfeiture of some of them is building up a bureaucratic form of government—a form of government as obnoxious as it is unconstitutional. They recognize a military draft to be necessary to muster out manpower to fight a war. But it is not at all likely they are going to accept a draft-labor program, as is proposed by the President. They feel the Nation's Chief Executive, if he wishes to curb strikers, does not need so drastic a measure when he can get results through antistrike legislation. The free people of America are not in favor of being shuttled from pillar to post, and thus become powerless and impotent, and left to the whim of bureaucrats. The American people want the American way preserved to them—the volunteer-for-service way.

The Little Men Who Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 1, 1944:

THE LITTLE MEN WHO COUNT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Few of us have ever bothered to learn the mechanism of a Presidential election, and that is why so few understand the fine points of the battle now going on between the professional politicians as to the way the soldier vote in the election this fall shall be counted.

Like the mechanism of anything that goes well, the election mechanism is just taken for granted.

That policy may be O. K. as to an automobile or a radio as long as there are plenty of hired wrench twisters around who will set things right for pay.

In the matter of election mechanism, ignorance is an invitation to disaster any time. This election mechanism is established to protect freedom and liberty in our own particular case, but it can continue to do so only so long as we individually see that it works as specified, as in a Presidential election.

A President, friends, is never elected by the direct vote of the people.

When our country was founded, we didn't have Nation-wide competition between two major political parties, no radio-flashed campaign talk from Washington to the remotest hamlets with the speed of light.

The founding fathers saw the possibility of all sorts of "riggery" and confusion ahead.

So they decided that in each State a number of prominent citizens should conclave to vote for the whole populace on the Presidency under the watchful eyes of trained officials.

That is why the Constitution provides (art. II, sec. 1, par. 2) that—

"Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector."

It was authorized that Congress could fix the day for "chusing" the electors, and it has, but note that the method was left to the individual States.

The electors, meeting in their respective States, were to vote by ballot for two persons, at least one of whom had to be a citizen of some other State besides their own, and after voting on the various candidates for President they were to sign and certify the results, which were to be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate (who is Vice President of the United States).

The President of the Senate, in the presence of the House of Representatives and Senate, was to count the ballots of the electors for a majority, and a second place, President and Vice President.

That was what the Constitution provided in the beginning and that is the rule today, though nobody ever bothers to notice its operation any more.

But suppose there should be some kind of ball-up as to the validity of some of the votes by the electors?

Nowadays, as distinguished from the early years of the Republic, electors are voted into office strictly along party lines, and are bound by custom or law in various States to vote for whichever Presidential candidate a popular majority in their individual States directs them.

Suppose there came a doubt as to which party holds a majority of the votes in some State this fall—say an important one like New York?

And don't think votes of electors can't be brought into wonder and doubt.

In 1800, for instance, Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received exactly the same number of votes in the electoral conclave and, as the Constitution provided, the issue had to be settled by the House of Representatives.

A disgusting and sordid intrigue followed, and not until after 36 ballotings and all kinds of horse trading did Jefferson get into the White House.

An amendment was rushed through to the Constitution immediately, intended to prevent any such thing again.

But an almost identical happening occurred again in 1876 as between Rutherford B. Hayes, the Republican, and Samuel Tilden, Democratic Presidential nominee. By then we had the telegraph, the railroad, and the daily newspaper.

None of those mattered as to the main and critical point. The Hayes-Tilden election was, to put it mildly, close. Some Republicans first conceded the election to Tilden.

To squash a long and exciting election story into a few paragraphs, the end product of some "fummadiddles" brought the votes of four States—Oregon, Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina—into doubt.

Again a Presidential election had to be settled by Congress, amid terrific uproar.

Some historians claim we went right to the verge of a second civil war before Hayes was held the winner.

And to this day there are gaffers and historians who claim Tilden was robbed.

And, of course, after the event, there was another reform wave. But there are still loopholes. A straggling soldier vote this fall could drag us through another such loophole into another terrible mess.

That is why so much care must be taken in Congress to work out a system of counting these soldier votes from all over the world to insure that the 1944 election shall not wind up in disgrace, after the manner of the elections of 1800 and 1876.

So don't think it is all so simple as Mr. Roosevelt, Senator LUCAS and company make it seem.

How to handle the soldier vote is very vital to the Nation's internal security.

Overseas Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of the Los Angeles Examiner dated January 4, 1944, and an editorial of the Los Angeles Times dated January 11, 1944:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of January 4, 1944]

OVERSEAS AIR LINES

Because of a curious conflict between two Government departments, which can only be adjusted by Congress, modern development of the American merchant marine after the war is jeopardized.

The issue is whether or not American steamship companies may operate overseas air lines supplementing their sea-borne trade.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority, by a tortuous interpretation of an old law, has ruled that such ship operators may not operate air lines along their steamship routes.

The Maritime Commission, coming to the aid of the shipping industry, has urged an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act which will permit such operation. The Commission has appealed to Representative LEA, of California, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to remove the discrimination.

The issue was presented recently in a speech before the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club by William K. Jackson, vice president and general counsel of the United Fruit Co., a company with vast shipping interests.

As Mr. Jackson showed, the great American shipping companies are qualified to develop foreign commerce, and the airplane will be a dominant factor in foreign commerce after the war.

With close Government control over shipping, aviation, and foreign commerce, the public would be protected against any imposition arising from affiliation of ship lines and air lines.

America faces a stiff job in developing its shipping lines. Before the war 70 percent of our foreign commerce was carried in foreign ships. To reduce that adverse ratio, American shipping must have all the rights enjoyed by foreign lines, consistent with American standards of ship operation. No legislation restricting those legitimate rights should be imposed.

Congress should act quickly to clear the air of the legalistic clouds which would hinder the development both of shipping and overseas aviation.

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 11, 1944]

THE OPERATION OF OVERSEAS AIR LINES AFTER THE WAR

Now the cause for much behind-the-scenes maneuvering in Washington, the plea of American steamship lines for the unchallenged right to operate overseas air lines between the United States and its Territories and possessions is plainly one of those matters which should be handled from the standpoint of fundamental public interest.

Conceding the logic of arguments by established air-transportation companies that their work of pioneering overseas air passenger and cargo lines should be fully appreciated and afforded protection against unfair competition, there seems to be no legitimate reason for concluding that operation of air lines by established steamship organizations would fall into such a category.

The shipping industry has a long and splendid record of pioneering to its own credit. It has converted its equipment from sail to steam and to the Diesel engine and electrical propulsion. Addition of an air arm to augment established routes will serve the public more adequately and in addition will constitute a form of competition which in the post-war world should prove both an incentive to all air operators and an added inducement to public use of this means of travel.

Under legal interpretations by the Civil Aeronautics Authority the shipping lines have been denied franchises for overseas air lines, and efforts are now being made to have Congress enact legislation specifically granting such right.

The Maritime Commission, approving in principle the contention of shipping interests that the public welfare will be best served by a combination of surface and air transportation operated by steamship companies has endorsed a proposal that the Aeronautics Act be amended to remove the discriminatory regulation.

The Times believes the law should be amended and that every encouragement should be given both to the steamship companies and to the regular air line organizations to make full preparation for the expansion in air transportation which will follow a return to peace.

Excerpt From Article by Samuel Grafton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excerpt from a column by Samuel Grafton. It explains in pithy phrase some of the reasons for the different attitudes toward European governments as taken by Russia and ourselves:

One of the real reasons why the Russians may mistrust us a trifle, even now, is that we have no real plans for the future of Europe. We want to go home. We are in favor of whatever will enable us to win quickly and go home fast. That is why we are able to get along better with the Polish Government in exile than the Russians are. The Polish Government in exile is merely our temporary companion on a brief adventure. But the Russians have to think of the same Polish Government in terms of a permanent neighbor, separated only by a party fence. We are aching for the moment when we can say, "Good-bye, Europe, good-bye! May all your children be Democrats!" But the Russians have to stay in the old neighborhood.

Mr. Arkwright on Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of Labor for January 28, 1944:

MR. ARKWRIGHT ON PLANNING

Among those who are profitably and wisely engaged in the business of post-war planning no one is doing so with more solid foresight than Preston Arkwright, president of the Georgia Power Co. There are some who think in terms of profitable investments; others of us may be thinking in terms of building bigger cities and having a larger pay roll; still others may be interested in how many workers will be employed and what each will receive. Beyond these there will be a few who will think of the economic, social, and political significance of developments that definitely change the ways of living of a large number of people.

It remains for Mr. Arkwright to give consideration to all of these. He is planning for his own company. He wants the Georgia Power Co. to be ready with plans and with the cash. To that end he is making the plans and accumulating the cash. This he is doing with a social vision that matches his industrial vision. He sees not only new power plants in operation, new dynamos whirring, and new light and power lines carrying electricity to the remotest hamlet as well as the largest factory, but he sees men, women, and children working, living, and playing. He sees them going to school as well as going to work. He sees them in their homes and churches as well as in the mill.

And seeing them thus he is concerned with their problems, their hopes, and their desires for a better life. In this respect he comes very close to the vision and plans of the leaders of the union movement. Mr. Arkwright has long been known as a friend of labor. We think, too, that union labor has been known as his friend.

A recent article of his appearing in the Journal of Commerce of New York carries a splendid recital of his vision of post-war planning and of the place of the South and southern industry in post-war planning. While the entire article is worth careful study by every worker, and for that reason it is published in full in this issue of the Journal of Labor, we would like to call particular attention to certain statements of his of special interest to labor. Take, for instance, this statement:

"I want to say right to begin with that I do not believe in cheap labor. I believe in paying workers as much as possible, not as

little as possible. In my opinion, no manufacturer should be encouraged to come to Georgia who is simply looking for cheap labor or trying to run away from labor unions."

Such a statement as this should be a part of any program to develop industry in the South. Any and every city or chamber of commerce seeking new mills and factories should adopt this as a cardinal principle. The people ought to be satisfied with no advertising that fails to carry this specific plank in its platform. Cheap labor will not develop industry; it will not develop the South.

Take another statement: "I have been dealing with unions for a quarter of a century, and I believe they are an asset to my company and to the men themselves."

Note, please, that these are the expressions of the head of one of the largest corporations in the Nation and one of the largest employers of labor. It is the expression and opinion of a man who has had experience with organized and unorganized labor. Certainly his experience commands respect. And who can challenge the courage as well as the sincerity with which he speaks?

President Arkwright proposes to put in his post-war platform these two fundamental planks. First, he believes in a fair wage, and, second, he knows that good business management comes with good relations with his employees and these good relations are best had under union conditions. We commend Mr. Arkwright for his leadership in this field. May his leadership have that recognition it deserves by all those who are sincerely interested in developing in the South an industry that will actually promote wealth without promoting poverty, increase the standard of living without developing a poor third who are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed.

The Nation's Wage Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid analysis entitled "Our Wobbling Wage Policy," by the very able columnist, Mr. Merlo Pusey, writing in the Washington Post of January 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WOBBLING WAGE POLICY

(By Merlo Pusey)

National service is encountering very rough sledding in Congress. The public reaction, too, has been decidedly lacking in enthusiasm. There are many indications that a majority of the people have favored national service ever since Pearl Harbor. Now that the President has come around to it, however, some have changed their minds.

Offhand this appears to be a rather perverse attitude. Certainly any proposal from the Commander in Chief designed to hasten victory ought to bring a sympathetic response. Congress has seldom hesitated to approve any measure that could be definitely called win-the-war legislation. How, then, can the lukewarm reaction to the President's request for a national service act on the ev^ of our great offensive against the Nazis be explained?

First, there is a widespread feeling that the remedy does not fit th^ disease. In asking for a national service law the President appeared to be interested chiefly in getting a new weapon against strikes. But national service is not the best means of preventing work stoppages. Great Britain found that strikes continue in spite of legal work requirements. Certainly that would be the case here if national service were not administered better than the Stabilization Act and the so-called antistrike law have been.

National service would not stop the demands of powerful unions for higher wages, and it is these demands that are causing most of the interruption of war industry. If the administration had met this problem effectively, the question of national service would probably not have arisen at this time. A crisis developed largely because Washington officials invented one escape clause after another instead of stabilizing wages. That critical situation would not suddenly evaporate with enactment of the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

The stark truth is that official Washington is still in the business of encouraging strikes. It surrendered to the coal miners and gave them what they wanted after they struck three times. For months it refused to permit peaceful settlement of the railway wage dispute on the basis of 8-cent-an-hour increases. Then after the strike threat arose it gave the nonoperating employees raises of 9 to 11 cents an hour and the operating employees 9 cents. The final settlements effected by the President himself give railway employees $63,000,000 more than they would have gotten from the 8-cent compromise worked out under the orderly procedure of the Railway Labor Act. The fact that the larger increases were wrapped in a phony label of overtime compensation will not alter in the minds of other labor groups the basic fact that the railway workers obtained more than their minimum demands by strike threats.

Other unions are thus encouraged to believe that if they create enough disturbance the administration will find a way to meet their demands, at least in part. That is probably the most disruptive influence in the whole labor picture. It is an influence which only the President can eliminate and there is no indication yet that he intends to do so.

Most of the present difficulty arises, therefore, from the lack of a consistent labor policy that is clearly understood by the rank and file and rigorously enforced by the Government. Now this lack of policy would not be overcome by a national service law. Such a law could be used only to implement a fair and reasonable set of rules governing wage adjustments and working conditions in wartime. It is not surprising that Congressmen hesitate to put the coercion of a national service law behind the muddled lack of policy that now prevails.

In other words, many Congressmen feel that the President started in the wrong place to redress the home front. The lack of a real labor and wage policy to date has brought us face to face with five dangers: (1) Inflation, (2) confusion of workers as well as the public, (3) loss of confidence in Government, (4) encouragement of strikes, and (5) deterioration of morale on the fighting front because of laxity of wartime disciplines at home. National service is not a big enough blanket to smother out all of these grave national risks.

The country would undoubtedly like to make a new start toward mobilizing our total strength to hasten the end of the war. But there is not much interest in giving the Administration another grant of power to throw into a caldron already bubbling with confusion. That is the nub of the issue. The quickest way to turn the scales in favor of national service would be a demonstration of backbone on the part of the executive branch in the enforcement of a well-defined and reasonable wage policy.

Statement by Senator Thomas of Oklahoma to the People of His State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in the nature of a report to the people of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This statement is in the nature of a report to my employer—the people of the State of Oklahoma.

The second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress convened on January 10.

For 5 years the Congress has been in almost constant session and will remain in session until this war is won and peace is restored again to the troubled peoples of the world.

THE WAR

If this war does not serve to end war, then another such a war will destroy what is left of civilization and force the peoples of the earth into a period of debt, distrust, and dark ages that may last for hundreds of years to come.

Hence, we have before us the all-out issue: Win the war at the earliest possible moment.

The results of the war might be so terrible that we do not dare to hesitate, to slow down, or to compromise.

The world knows that we did not start this war, but being in we want the world to know that we will see it through to victory.

Any other course would mean only a temporary peace during which time the outlaw and bandit nations would redouble their preparations for another war in their continuing efforts to conquer and to rule the world.

The United States is not a militaristic nation.

This may be proven by a single sentence: Were we a warlike people, when this war started, instead of having an army of less than 200,000 men with obsolete equipment, we would have had a well-trained army of millions, with the most modern guns and planes that science and inventive genius could devise and, in addition, we would have had a two-ocean navy—the most powerful in the world.

WHY WE WERE NOT PREPARED

The following question continually arises: Why were we not prepared for war?

The answer is simple:

First, we had fought World War No. 1 and, winning, we thought we had ended war.

Second, our people have felt secure behind the protection of thousands of miles of water; hence, we felt that vast war expenses were unnecessary.

Third, our people have believed that should trouble come again we would adjust and settle our differences and misunderstandings around a conference table rather than upon the fields of battle.

How far we were wrong in our assumed security was demonstrated on that Sunday morning, what at the exact time that Secretary Hull and the Japanese Ambassador and their staffs were seated around a conference table at Washington, Japan attacked at Pearl Harbor and stabbed America in the back.

WE MUST WIN OR LOSE EVERYTHING

Thus, this terrible war started and now that the war is on we must either destroy our enemies or they will destroy us.

Should Germany and Japan, or either, win the war, they will do to us exactly what they have already done to the other nations they have conquered.

These are some of the steps they certainly will take should they win:

They will disarm our people and then they will confiscate our property.

They will keep the Philippines and take over Puerto Rico, Panama, and Hawaii.

They will confiscate our $25,000,000,000 of gold and silver and take over our banks and financial system.

They will take all profits from industry and collect all taxes and use the money to rebuild their destroyed cities and to rehabilitate their peoples.

SHOULD WE LOSE UNITED STATES MAY BE DIVIDED

Should the Axis Powers win, it is rumored that plans are made to divide the United States and Canada—Germany to have the eastern half and Japan to have Alaska and the western half of Canada and the United States.

Should this happen, let me remind you that Oklahoma is located exactly midway between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Should the Mississippi River not be selected as the dividing line, then our State might be divided—the eastern half going to Germany and the western half going to Japan.

Should we lose this war our people will be reduced to economic slavery through the generations and ages to come.

Some may contend that such statements are fantastic and that such things could not possibly happen—but reflect a moment.

What has already happened to Korea, a portion of China, the Philippines, France, and the other nations of Asia and Europe?

When Korea was conquered by Japan the people were disarmed and the only weapon left was one kitchen knife to each three families.

ALLIED DEMANDS ON AXIS COUNTRIES

Again, what are we at this moment demanding of Germany and Japan?

First, we are demanding that they surrender or be annihilated.

Second, we are demanding that they be disarmed and then kept disarmed.

Third, we are demanding that their conquered peoples be liberated and that their confiscated lands be restored to former status.

Fourth, we have pledged that we will join our allies in the development of an international military force strong enough to restore and maintain peace throughout the world.

With such issues joined, and with the possible consequences so horrifying, it must be clear to all that this war must be fought until victory is achieved.

Should we lose, all will be lost.

When we win, whatever we have left of money and property will be just that much saved.

PRODUCTION OF WAR EQUIPMENT

In our efforts to win this war our people have performed near miracles.

Today we have a well-trained and well-equipped army and navy of more than 10,000,0000 fighting men.

Our other millions of patriotic men and women are on the farms, in the factories, and on the home front producing and supplying the equipment for war.

Today we are building war planes at the rate of over 100,000 per year.

We are launching new ships at the rate of 5 per day, or almost 2,000 per year.

Planes, ships, guns, ammunition, and war necessities of every kind are reaching peak production.

Today, our soldiers and sailors, your boys and mine, have the best housing, the best food, the best clothing, and the best war equipment that American genius and skill can produce.

Our armed forces have the best of everything that will give them the best chance to win the war and come home alive.

Because of this war our people have suffered and are suffering embarrassments, hardships, and losses, and it is natural that there should be complaints.

However, I am proud to report that in Oklahoma and throughout the Nation, our people are solidly and enthusiastically supporting the military leadership in this war.

WE HAVE GREAT LEADERS

President Roosevelt as Commander in Chief; General Marshall as Chief of Staff; General Eisenhower, commanding our forces in the east; and General MacArthur, commanding our forces in the west, are receiving national and world-wide acclaim for their brilliant accomplishments.

Already our leaders and our armies, cooperating with the great leaders and armies of our allies, have won victory after victory and to date we have just been preparing to fight.

OKLAHOMA IN THE WAR

In this war, Oklahoma and Oklahomans have played major roles.

According to population our State is a leader in volunteer enlistments.

Our brave soldiers, sailors, and officers have won world acclaim in every engagement on every battle front.

Our farm, factory, and home fronts are producing to capacity.

Already Oklahoma's place in the history of this war is assured.

NEW ISSUES ARISING

In connection with the war effort let me refer briefly to some issues which have arisen and which must be solved.

We now have almost 200,000 Oklahoma men and women in uniform.

The vast majority are now, or soon will be, outside the State.

Unless some provision for voting is provided, these men and women will be disfranchised in the election to be held this year.

A practical and workable plan should and must be developed making it possible for every Oklahoma man and woman in the armed forces to vote.

SOLDIERS MUST HAVE CHANCE TO VOTE

To make it possible for our soldiers to vote the States and the Federal Government must cooperate.

Through such cooperation the problem may be solved.

In order for us to show good faith we must not only make it possible, but we must make it convenient and easy for our absent men and women to vote.

To do otherwise will subject our responsible authorities to criticism which has been current for a quarter of a century because the soldiers in the last war were not permitted to vote.

I am supporting legislation which will give each qualified member of our armed forces the opportunity of voting in the coming election.

Recently, President Roosevelt, in a message to the Congress, said:

"The American people are very much concerned over the fact that the vast majority of the 11,000,000 members of the armed forces of the United States are going to be deprived of their right to vote in the important national election this fall, unless the Congress promptly enacts adequate legislation. The men and women who are in the armed forces are rightfully indignant about it. They have left their homes and jobs and schools to meet and defeat the enemies who would destroy all our democratic institutions including our right to vote. Our men cannot understand why the fact that they are fighting should disqualify them from voting.

* * * * *

"The need for new legislation is evident if we are really sincere—and not merely rendering lip service to our soldiers and sailors.

* * * * *

"What is needed is a complete change of machinery for absentee balloting, which will give the members of our armed forces and merchant marine all over the world an opportunity to cast their ballots without time-consuming correspondence and without waiting for each separate State to hold its primary, print its ballots, and send them out for voting.

* * * * *

"These bills propose that blank ballots on special paper suitable for air delivery be sent by the War and Navy Departments to all the fronts and camps and stations out in the field, well in advance of election day. Immediately after primary elections are held, the names of the various candidates would be radioed or wired to the various military, naval and merchant-marine units throughout the world—on the high seas, on every front and at every training station. The lists of candidates would then be made available to the voters, and the ballots would be distributed for marking in secrecy.

* * * * *

"The voting date would be fixed in each area in sufficient time to get the ballots back home before election day, even if the actual names of the candidites had not been received in that particular area. The ballots would be collected and transmitted back to the United States by the quickest method of delivery, for forwarding to the appropriate State election officials.

* * * * *

"Each State, under these bills, would determine for itself whether or not the voter is qualified to vote under the laws of his State. Each State would count the ballots in the same way in which it counts the other ballots that are cast in the State."

That is all-important and must be acted upon in time to permit each member of our fighting forces to vote.

MUSTER-OUT PAY FOR ARMED FORCES

Another issue of vital interest to our soldiers has been acted on by the Congress.

In the last war when our soldiers were discharged they were given a flat sum of $60.

The Congress has just passed Senate bill 1543, which provides for the following amounts as mustering-out pay:

1. Three hundred dollars for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, to be paid one-third at time of discharge, one-third at end of 1 month, and balance at end of 2 months after final discharge.

2. Two hundred dollars for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, to be paid one-half at time of discharge and balance at end of 1 month.

3. One hundred dollars for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days, to be paid at the time of discharge.

(a) The term "member of the armed forces" means any member of the Army or Navy of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components, and any member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, who was discharged under honorable conditions on account of disability.

Save in special instances, all persons in the armed forces with rank below that of captain, shall be entitled to receive the pay as provided in the law.

The law is retroactive and those already discharged from service will be paid the amounts provided by the law.

WAR IS COSTLY

My mail brings complaints that this war is costing too much money.

There can be do doubt that this war is wasteful—but we must remember that all war is waste.

Also, we must remember that before either Germany or Japan fired a hostile shot they each had spent well over $100,000,000,000 in a program of preparedness.

The United States has done in 2 years what it took our enemies a generation to accomplish.

Again we must remember that this war covers the earth and in order to win we have had to equip not only our own fighting men but in addition we have assisted in equipping the armies of our allies.

Our Government has proceeded on the conviction that it would be less expensive and more efficient to equip our Allied soldiers to fight on their home soil than to have to equip, maintain and transport all of our soldiers across thousands of miles of submarine-infested waters to fight in foreign climates and on foreign battlefields.

Under present plans, through the lend-lease program, we are furnishing surplus equipment to China, Australia, France, and Russia, and because of this arrangement we hope it will not be necessary to have at any one time more than 5,000,000 men outside the United States.

In support of this program of cooperation, Marshal Stalin recently is reported to have said: "Without American production the United Nations could never have won the war."

HOW MEET WAR BILLS?

In order to meet war bills we must have money, and there are but three ways for the Government to secure money.

First, we secure funds through taxation;

Second, through the sale of stamps and bonds; and

Third, through the creation of new credit.

This latter plan requires the printing of bonds and the deposit of such bonds in the banks against which checks are drawn to meet our expenses.

This latter plan is highly inflationary so that we are raising all the money we can through taxes and the sale of bonds.

A new tax bill has just been enacted by the Congress and now our existing laws will raise annually Federal taxes in the amount of over $43,500,000,000.

When we add the State, county, city, and district taxes to Federal taxes, we find that our total tax bill will be far more than the total income in some of the years of the depression.

The Congress is convinced that very soon we will be raising all the taxes that the people can pay.

STATUS OF INFLATION

In the public press we see and over the radio we hear reports that we are now in a dangerous spiral of inflation.

These reports are based, first, on the fact that we now have over $20,000,000,000 of paper money in circulation, and, second, that we have over $100,000,000,000 of credit money on deposits in our banks.

This vast sum of buying power, of course, is inflationary.

War always causes increased activity, and increased activity requires an increased supply of money and an expansion of credit.

The Congress early foresaw what was certain to happen, and in order to secure a just and equitable distribution of such supplies as we have and may produce, and in order to control prices and prevent inflation, the rationing and price-control law was passed.

Measured by the increase in the general level of prices, the law has been a success.

The law of supply and demand has not and cannot be repealed; hence, scarce articles always tend to increase in price while the prices of those in abundance either remain stationary or tend to fall.

Using general wholesale prices as a base, official records show that during the year 1943 wholesale prices on the average increased exactly 1.7 percent.

The figures are as follows:

One year ago the wholesale price level, or index number, was 101.2 percent, and on December 25 the index number, or general wholesale price level, was 102.9 percent.

When we compare the prices of today with those of World War No. 1, we must admit that we have little inflation now.

INCONVENIENCES OF WAR

Well do I know that our people do not like to be rationed and resent being told what they may and may not do.

This rationing—price-control program—is one of the inconveniences and embarrassments made necessary by war.

Were it not for the rationing program the energetic, strong, and powerful would secure the bulk of the supplies and the timid and the weak would either have to do without or pay monopolistic prices for the necessities of life.

SUBSIDIES

The Congress has another question to solve immediately—the question of subsidies.

Subsidies mean gifts, gratuities, and donations.

Our citizens, save in distress, do not want public charity.

This is the reason that farmers, livestock producers, and dairymen are opposed to these Federal hand-outs.

In order to pay subsidies the Government must secure the money.

As just stated, we cannot raise enough money to meet our war bills through both taxation and the sale of bonds; hence, we must resort to the creation of additional credit through a further increase in the public debt.

The subsidy program will require a vast expansion of credit and such expansion is admittedly inflationary.

The subsidy program works as follows:

Take beef cattle for example:

The ceiling price may be fixed at 15 cents per pound; hence, the market price is rolled back 5 cents and the packer pays the cattle producer 10 cents per pound. The additional 5 cents—to make up the 15 cents—is to be paid out of the Federal Treasury as a subsidy.

The subsidy payment is made by the Government to the packer or processor of the animal and the packer or processor is supposed to pass the amount of the subsidy on to the producer of the livestock to be slaughtered.

Unless the producer sells direct to the packer he never sees the subsidy. Farmers, stockmen, and dairymen are neither asking for subsidies nor for any other form of Government dole or gratuity.

Farmers and producers are asking only for fair prices in the market places.

FARM PARITY FORMULA SHOULD INCLUDE LABOR COSTS

In order for producers of food products to secure fair and just prices the parity formula must be amended to include the cost of farm labor.

No form of business employing labor can possibly survive unless the cost of such labor is taken into consideration in determining the cost of the goods produced.

ALL CONTROL OVER FARMING RELINQUISHED BY GOVERNMENT

To our farmers let me say that this year there will be no control over acreage to be planted to any crop so that you are free to plan your crops as you wish.

We have tried controlled production and now we will go back to the free and unrestricted plan and then we shall be able to compare the results of the two systems.

OKLAHOMA AN OIL STATE

Oklahoma, in addition to being one of the leading farm States, ranks third in the production of oil.

This being true, the price of oil is of major importance to our State treasury, to the counties producing oil, and to our people generally.

The present gross production tax on oil is 5 percent of the selling price; hence, the higher the price per barrel the more tax that will be collected to help meet the expenses of our State government.

Notwithstanding the fact that labor costs are higher and the cost of operation generally have increased, there has been no advance in the price of oil for over 5 years.

The records show that the present price of oil is less than 60 percent of parity.

The standard gravity of oil in Oklahoma now sells for $1.17 per barrel, and if the price should be increased to parity with other commodities, the standard grade of oil would sell for slightly less than $2 per barrel.

With the present low price of oil the 5 percent gross production tax brought to our State treasury during the last fiscal year the sum of $8,381,000.

If the price should be raised to full parity the oil industry would pay to the State the sum of some $14,000,000.

Not only would the State profit by an increase in the price of oil, but farmers, landowners, Indians, and royalty owners likewise would be benefited.

The question of an increase in the price of oil is now pending before the Congress and an effort will be made to secure favorable action at an early date.

OKLAHOMA GREATEST INDIAN STATE

Let me speak a word to the Indian citizens of Oklahoma.

You have important problems pending at Washington.

One problem of interest to the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations is the proposed sale of your coal and asphalt deposits.

The bill authorizing the sale has already passed the Senate and should pass the House early in the new session of the Congress.

The members of all the several tribes are interested in having the schools and hospitals maintained and expanded, if necessary, to provide ample facilities to take care of the largest Indian population of any State.

I am chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee and assure you that there will be no change, with my consent, in the Indian program for Oklahoma save to make such program better and more efficient.

BUREAUCRACY

Bureaucracy means a system of carrying on the business of government by means of departments and bureaus.

I have many complaints that we have created too many bureaus and that too much power has been concentrated in the executive branch of the Government.

There is but one answer to the complaint, and that is that during the depression we had to provide relief for every group of our people.

The first relief bill passed was the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (R. F. C.) to make Federal credit available to the banks, the railways, and the insurance companies of the country.

Then we had to create boards and bureaus to help the home owners, the building and loan companies, the farmers, the youth of the country, and the unemployed.

Then World War No. 2 came upon us and found us unprepared.

In every war the fighting people concentrate their power in the hands of their leaders.

In all our wars our people have followed such a program.

In the War for Independence General Washington spoke for the Colonies, and his word was law.

In the War between the States the Congress gave President Lincoln the laws he asked—even the power to print non-interest-bearing paper money with which to pay war bills.

In the Spanish-American War President McKinley was given lump-sum appropriations to carry on the fight against Spain.

In World War No. 1 all power required was given to President Wilson to wage war against the Central Powers.

History records that after each war the powers conferred were returned to the people and the Congress.

In this war we see 80 percent of the human race fighting for their property and their lives.

Our enemies have all power concentrated in their leaders, and they can act on a moment's notice.

To meet such concentrated power successfully, we likewise had to concentrate power in the Executive, as the Commander in Chief of our fighting forces.

Today Hitler acts and speaks for Germany.

During Mussolini's inglorious military career he spoke and acted for Italy.

Today the Emperor and the war lords speak for Japan.

In order to be able to cooperate with our allies and to meet concentrated power with power, the Congress has acted in the public interest.

When the war is over, as after all wars, the special powers granted to the Commander in Chief will be returned to the people and the Congress.

BUREAUS AND BOARDS ABOLISHED

Already the purely depression bureaus, boards, and departments have been closed or are in the process of liquidation.

The N. R. A., the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., the C. M. A. and the C. C. C. have already been liquidated.

The Disaster Loan Corporation (D. L. C.), the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (H. O. L. C.), the Food Distribution Administration (F. D. A.), the Federal Housing Administration (F. H. A.), the Federal Security Agency (F. S. A.), and the Federal Works Agency (F W. A.), are now in process of liquidation.

The following war boards and bureaus will be closed just as soon as the war is over: The Combined Food Board (C. F. B.), the Defense Plant Corporation (D. P. C.), the Metals Reserve Company (M. R. C.), the Office of Civilian Defense (O. C. D.), the Office of Defense Transportation (O. D. T.), the Office of Price Administration (O. P. A.), the Office of Rubber Director (O. R. D.), the Office of War Information (O. W. I.), the Petroleum Administration for War (P. A. W.), the Smaller War Plants Corporation (S. W. P. C.), the War Food Administration (W. F. A.), the War Labor Board (W. L. B.), the War Manpower Commission (W. M. C.), the War Production Board (W. P. B.), and the War Shipping Administration (W. S. A.).

While the Congress authorized, as war measures, the creation of these boards and bureaus, yet all know that because of their complexity the Congress could not either personally or directly administer such departments.

BUREAS AND BOARDS TO BE RETAINED

The following departments will probably be retained after the war is over: The Civil Aeronautics Board (C. A. B.), to supervise commercial aviation; the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F. B. I.), to investigate and suppress crime; the Federal Communications Commission (F. C. C.), to supervise telephone, telegraph, and radio activities; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (F. D. I. C.), to insure bank deposits; the Federal Power Commission (F. P. C.), to supervise the development and distribution of public power; the Rural Electrification Administration (R. E. A.), to supervise the distribution of electricity to farms and farmers; the Securities and Exchange Commission (S. E. C.), to supervise the issuance of stocks and bonds and to protect the public against fraud in the sale and distribution of worthless securities; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (R. F. C.), to make available Federal credit to the larger institutions of the country.

The complaint against bureaucracy is justified when unecessary departments are created or when the temporary work is completed and the bureau is retained.

When we realize the vast debt we are sure to face when the war is over all must agree that every useless board, commission, and bureau must be closed at the earliest possible date.

OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM

The old-age pension system is another bureau that not only should not be abolished but should be retained and liberalized. Pending a complete revision of the law which I favor the following amendments should be provided:

(a) The system should be made wholly Federal so that our senior citizens residing in the poorer States shall receive the same amounts per month as those who live in the richer States.

(b) Last year I was able to amend the law so that those receiving assistance may work in the production of food and feed and receive pay therefor without having such sums deducted from their monthly pension checks. The law should be amended to provide that those receiving pensions may perform any kind of work and receive pay therefor without having such sums deducted from their monthly checks.

(c) If the law is not amended as provided above then it is obvious that because of the increased cost of living the amounts of the monthly checks should be substantially increased.

PROGRAM FOR OKLAHOMA

In considering the post-war world, we should bring the issue down to Oklahoma.

While we are rehabilitating other States and other peoples, we should insist that Oklahoma be included in the program.

To make any progress we must have a plan and such a plan must be developed to improve our land, help our towns and cities, and to serve the best interests of our people generally.

While today we have minerals and metals, such as oil, gas, lead, zinc, and coal, yet the time will come when these metals and minerals will be depleted and then our people must fall back upon the soil for their livelihood.

For the present we should develop all our natural resources, including our metals and minerals and, at the same time, we must not only protect but improve the fertility of our soil.

To protect and improve the soil different plans should be developed for different sections.

Modern plans for soil conservation should be adopted and carried out everywhere.

On the western side of Oklahoma irrigation should have a trial to see if the placing of water on the land at the proper time will materially increase the production of food and feed.

If the experiment proves successful, then it is possible to convert western Oklahoma into a vast irrigation area.

On the east side of Oklahoma we have millions of acres of fertile bottom lands which are being damaged and destroyed by ever recurring floods.

If these lands are to be preserved and improved, flood-control projects must be constructed to keep water off the lands.

All agree that much of the most productive land in other States is either under irrigation or protected by efficient flood-control works.

It is obvious that in Oklahoma our towns and cities live off the land and resources near such municipalities; hence, the more prosperous the lands, the more prosperous will be our towns and cities.

Along with the development of our lands, we must not overlook the opportunity for the development of manufacturing institutions.

Increased food and feed production should lead to the location and operation of numerous processing and dehydration plants, as well as canning and food-freezing factories.

Oklahoma has the opportunity of becoming one of the most active and prosperous sections; first, through irrigation and flood control, thereby increasing food and feed production; and, second, through the processing and distribution of such food and feed products to the less productive sections of the country.

In conclusion, no one can foretell when the war will end.

We hope it will be soon.

When it is over we will have to take care of our returning soldiers.

Plans have been and are now being made to provide work for those who may need employment.

It now seems certain that Oklahoma and Oklahomans will be busy for years after this war is over.

Until the war is won the task of all of us is to carry on as best we can the work in which we are now engaged.

May God speed the hour when this terrible war will end; when our sons and daughters may come safely home, and when peace may be restored and extended to all peoples throughout the world.

Garret A. Hobart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and distinguished Members of the House is our colleague, Hon. DONALD H. MCLEAN, of my home State of New Jersey. While he lives in Elizabeth and has represented the Sixth New Jersey District in our body for six terms, Mr. MCLEAN was born in my home city of Paterson. It is interesting to note that he knew Capitol Hill before the turn of the century, because in 1897 Vice President Garret A. Hobart, of Paterson, had him named a page boy in the Senate.

Whenever my colleague and I take visitors through the Capitol we always show them with pride the white bust of Mr. Hobart in the corridor near the entrance to the Senate Chamber.

I present an interesting article about Mr. Hobart appearing in last Monday's Paterson Evening News:

As Congress recently observed the birthday anniversary of President William McKinley, New Jersey Members recalled that it was the eminent Patersonian, Garret A. Hobart, who served as Vice President during the first term of the man who was assassinated during his second term.

Hobart, who rode to victory with McKinley for his first term as twenty-fourth President of the United States, presided over the Senate only 2 years before he was forced to retire because of ill health.

The New Jersey statesman was born at Long Branch, N. J., in June 1844, the son of Addison Willard and Sophia Hobart. He entered Rutgers College at 16 and was graduated with honors in mathematics.

After graduation he taught school for a short while and then went to Paterson to enter the law firm of Socrates Tuttle, later marrying Jennie Tuttle.

He was elected to the New Jersey Assembly and was chosen speaker at the age of 30. He moved from the assembly to the State senate and in 188[illegible]-82 was its president.

During his 2 years of presiding over the Senate he showed such ability Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, grandfather of the present Senator from that State, remarked on the Senate floor that Hobart has "restored the Vice Presidency to its proper position."

Hobart's health broke in the spring of 1899, and he went to Long Branch to recuperate. He failed to rally and returned to his home in Paterson, where he died November 21, 1899. President McKinley and other notables attended his funeral, and he was buried in Cedar Lawn Cemetery.

In 1903 the citizens of Paterson erected a bronze statue of Hobart next to that of Alexander Hamilton on the plaza of the city hall. In addition to this memorial there is a white marble bust of Hobart just outside of the Senate Chamber in the Capitol here. It shows him with his full-flowing moustache, high forehead, stiff, stand-up collar, and loosely knotted necktie.

The Palestine Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me relative to the Palestine resolution:

After the victory of the United Nations which is inevitable and which I hope will come soon, the world will be confronted with a gigantic task of rehabilitation for millions of uprooted and homeless human beings. Among these the plight of the Jews who will have survived the Nazi program of extermination, will be indeed tragic. It will be imperative to find a solution for this pressing problem.

Palestine represents the most practical available opportunity for Jews to rebuild their broken lives, and to become self-sustaining and self-respecting human beings. This is so because of the remarkable achievements of the present Jewish community of 600,000 in Palestine, which during the last quarter of a century has laid a magnificent and solid foundation for the Jewish Homeland as the result of the opportunity afforded it by the nations of the world, including the United States, after the last war.

This resolution expresses the policy of our country in the light of the stern realities of the present hour, and voices the desire of the American people that the Jews who were the first victims of Nazi terror shall be given the chance to enter their national homeland, to settle and work there on farm and in factory and to join with those Jews who have preceded them to continue to build a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

All decent men will wish them well and all Americans of goodwill will join their voices to this manifestation of encouragement and hope.

It Doesn't Hook Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just how can a fellow vote for all the appropriations requested—yes, often demanded—and give heed to the protests against additional taxes on this, that, and the other?

Vigorous protests against (a) a sales tax; (b) additional income taxes; (c) a tax on amusements, including admissions to motion-picture theaters; (d) additional taxes on profits which will prevent railroads and other corporations accumulating any surplus to replace worn-out equipment; and, in fact, (e) additional taxes of any kind, are heaped on my desk.

Yet a greater number of letters and wires demand that I vote for additional appropriations to increase—

(a) Annuities to Federal employees;

(b) Salaries of Federal employees;

(c) Give compensation to those who helped construct the Panama Canal;

(d) Old-age and unemployment payments;

(e) Funds for the Army and Navy;

(f) Funds for Federal housing;

(g) Funds for farm loans;

(h) Funds for rural electrification;

(i) Funds for subsidies;

(j) Pension payments to all veterans and their dependents of, first, Spanish-American War; second, First World War; third, present World War; and

(k) Perhaps 50 or more other purposes, including—last but not least—a billion and a half as the contribution of the United States to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Just how can appropriations be increased—taxes lowered?

NEXT YEAR

On the 13th the President asked Congress for $100,000,000,000 for the 1945 Budget, ninety billions of which was for the prosecution of the war. That would bring our national debt to $258,000,000,000. The two hundred and fifty-eight billions will not cover the sums which must be paid to the servicemen, nor for their rehabilitation, nor to their dependents.

Each man, woman, and child, including those in jails, asylums, and hospitals, will owe $1,984, with an interest charge of $39 per year. If your neighbor, the little child, or the inmate of jail, asylum, or hospital does not pay each his $39, you will have to assume your share of that.

The war must be carried on; the soldiers paid; their dependents cared for. And millions—yes, billions—must and will be spent for hospitals, nurses, medicines, physician's care, for those who return disabled from the war.

From the American Association of University Women in various communities in Michigan come requests to vote for the billion-and-a-half-dollar appropriation requested by the President, to be spent in feeding and in rehabilitating people all over the world who have been ruined by the war. Rehabilitation means the return to and the rebuilding of homes and businesses of the people of the Old World who have been dispossessed and ruined by the war.

I hope I have as much charity for, as deep a desire to aid, the unfortunate, the hungry, and the starving, throughout the world as anyone. Unfortunately, with my desire to help everyone is the responsibility for the spending of the funds which are available and, as long as there are returning veterans or servicemen abroad who must have our dollars and our pennies, it will be my purpose to first consider their needs.

Altogether too many of those who write urging me to vote for a specific appropriation apparently overlook the fact that there are other requests for appropriations; that the amount available is limited. All too many who insist upon additional appropriations—some of them running into billions of dollars—at the same time vigorously protest against additional taxation.

I am glad to have requests urging me to support all worthy projects, but I wish that every individual so requesting would also point out a source from which the additional revenue can be obtained without curtailing some necessary Government activity.

Monsignor Sheen Charges That Soviet Russia Spreads Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 2, 1944, by Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen, of Catholic University, noted orator and conductor of the Radio Catholic

Hour, which should be interesting and instructive to all Americans who are confused by the maze of political propaganda from Communist sources both from within and without the United States and the constant barrage of "smear" attacks impugning the patriotism of all Americans who dare to question the motives of Joseph Stalin and the Communists in America.

RUSSIANS SPREAD FASCISM IS ANSWER OF MONSIGNOR SHEEN

No country in the world has contributed as much to fascism as Russia. For it was only through the Soviets giving the Nazis the green light in the treaty of 1939 that the Nazis were able to extend their form of fascism all over Europe.

Furthermore, now Stalin has already declared himself in favor of fascism, for in 1939 the American press carried a picture of Stalin shaking hands with Von Ribbentrop and the words which Moscow cabled to the United States were "Fascism is a matter of taste. Our friendship is cemented with blood."

Russia's condemnation of the Vatican on the grounds of being fascist is quite excusable and pardonable. Russia is the only nation in the world outside of Germany that does not permit freedom of the press and freedom of religion. It, therefore, never permitted to be circulated within its borders any of the Vatican's statements condemning fascism and nazi-ism. Having never heard of them through its rigorous censorship it can therefore be excused of being ignorant of them.

FASCISM CONDEMNED

Every other nation on the face of the earth knows that the Vatican condemned fascism in an encyclical written in Italian, nazi-ism in an encyclical written in German, and communism in an encyclical written in Latin. To the land therefore that allows no infiltration of religion we should apply the words of the Saviour on the cross, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do." Their condemnation is born of ignorance.

The Soviet accuse the Vatican of fascism because the Vatican was silent when Italy attacked France. Why does not Russia accuse the Vatican of being Communist because it was silent when Russia attacked Poland?

RUSSIANS ACCUSED

The term "fascism" is extremely vague. The Communists use it to mean anything that is anti-Communist. As a matter of fact fascism is really communism in its dotage. Communism is the Asiatic form of fascism and fascism is the European form of communism. There is no essential difference in ideology between the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Communists; all absorb the individual into the collectivity. There is as little difference between communism and fascism as there is between burglary and larceny.

The Soviet condemnation of the Vatican is merely an item in a pattern which Russia is skillfully working out. It is of one piece with the recent Soviet condemnation of the British for their alleged attempt to make a separate peace with Germany. It thus prepared for its own infidelity by accusing a spouse of infidelity. Having accused the political order of connivance with the enemy it now accuses religion. Thus does Russia prepare both politically and religiously for alienating itself from the Allies and making a separate peace with Germany.

Within the last 2 years there can be found no record of Russia's condemning nazi-ism. Not even in the Moscow or Tehran declarations. Stalin does not hate nazi-ism or the German Army. He hates only Hitler. He made that statement to Harry Hopkins in December 1941. He repeated it in another form in February 1942.

In November 1942 he said, "The destruction of all German military force is inadvisable from the point of view of the victor." In July 1943 he permitted the free German committee to broadcast asking Germany to "recall the German troops to the Reich's frontiers and embark upon peace negotiations."

Every day Russia is feeding Germany with broadcasts saying, "Save your armies. It is the foundation and security of your survival."

SEPARATE PEACE

It is therefore not at all unlikely that once Hitler is overthrown from within that Stalin will make separate peace with the German military staff. Perhaps that is why the words "unconditional surrender" were left out of the Teheran declaration.

On the whole these false condemnations by Russia of Great Britain and the Vatican may produce much good. They may arouse the American people to a realization that Stalin is not a cross between George Washington and Sir Galahad. Furthermore, they may convince us that no nation which denies freedom of speech and religion to its own citizens can be counted on to give to other nations those rights which its own people do not enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, some radio commentators, admittedly of radical inclination, have even charged that any person who criticizes communism at home or abroad, or infers that the Communists will dominate Europe after the war and set up another dictatorial and totalitarian system, thereby depriving the European people of the freedom for which the war is being fought, is a pro-Fascist. Monsignor Sheen has performed a courageous and timely act in exposing the fallacies of this pro-Communist conspiracy and should be commended for defending the Vatican and the Catholic Church from the unfair, false, and malicious charges made by the Izvestia, official Soviet newspaper, for what it termed the Vatican's pro-Fascist attitude.

We in America know that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is not pro-Fascist, pro-Nazi, or pro-Communist, but pro-American. There is no more loyal or patriotic group of American citizens than the Catholics, whose sons are fighting and dying in our armed forces all over the world. Many of their sons have received the highest military and naval decorations for gallantry in action. The Catholic Church has a right to be proud of the heroism of her sons fighting against fascism and nazi-ism.

I quote from a radio speech I made on June 30, 1941, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network:

I wonder where the great Catholic Church will stand when the issue becomes clear? I wonder whether it will want to help build up communism, world revolution, and atheism, not only in Russia but throughout the world.

It is abundantly clear from Monsignor Sheen's statement that there is no compromise between the Catholic Church and communism than there can be between Americanism and communism or its twin sisters of the right—nazi-ism and fascism. Now that we have surrounded the Nazis and Japs, America must be on guard against our enemies from within and against helping to set up a Communist dictatorship in Europe.

Neither the Vatican nor the Catholics of America need any defense from the vicious, dishonest, and untruthful accusations of Izvestia, but, nevertheless, Monsignor Sheen's reply should be read by all loyal Americans regardless of race, color, or creed. We need hundreds of Father Sheens today to go forth through the Nation and arouse the American people against the activities of communistic groups who seek to destroy our free institutions and erect a government based on foreign ideologies and dictatorships.

I stated in a Saint Patrick's birthday speech at Boston on March 18, 1943, that:

False foreign ideologies have sprung up in our country that seriously threaten the very existence of our American form of government, religion, and our way of life. St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland; I wish we could produce another St. Patrick to run the snakes, or modern termites, who are gnawing at the foundations of the Republic, out of America.

If I have incurred the enmity of the Communists or those who maintain foreign ideologies in this country, I could ask for no better testimonial of my love for American institutions. If they were to speak well of me, I should be compelled to exclaim like one of old: "What bad thing have I done, that such men praise me?" If I had my way, I would provide free transportation for all alien Nazis, Fascists, and Communists to return to their native lands, and remain there and not plague us with their attacks upon our free institutions and our representative and constitutional form of government.

A Man Who Can Do the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last night on the subject A Man Who Can Do the Job, the address being broadcast over the Columbia network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Next November we will select a President of the United States for the next 4 years. That President will face the toughest job in our history. We must win a global war and fulfill our great responsibility in helping to prevent future wars by solving a multitude of grave aud complicated international problems. On the domestic side, we must develop conversion, labor, tax, farm, and fiscal policies and administer them so as to avoid either a postwar inflation or deflation and maintain full employment within the framework of our American political and economic system.

In the accomplishment of these tremendous tasks our next President will be a key factor. He not only shares with Congress the responsibility for developing the policies and in many instances must initiate them, but he also is responsible for their administration,

and efficient administration is as important as sound policy.

The selection of that next President is a very solemn obligation of all of us who enjoy the freedoms of America, beginning with the first precinct caucuses, through State primaries, and the two party conventions next June up to the November election. There is no place in that process for bitterness and name calling, or for movements based wholly on an "anti" or "stop" philosophy.

America needs desperately a positive, constructive approach to the great issues facing us. The freedoms, perhaps the very lives, of future generations depend on our decisions in this year of crisis.

What are the qualifications America needs and should demand in our next President?

First, we need a President who has thought through the basic problems facing us in the domestic and foreign fields and has a clear program for America to solve them in accordance with the principles of our system.

Our next President must recognize that the development of international machinery to maintain the peace and to assure justice to all peoples is the major task facing the civilized world today. Our way of life will not survive another great war. That simple fact outweighs all the nationalistic prejudices, the old enmities between peoples and the minor and even major incidents that may arise and tend to split the United Nations apart. It is not enough that our next President state generally that he favors international collaboration. Peace after the last war was sabotaged by leaders subscribing to that general proposition, here and abroad. We need a President whose record on this issue is clear beyond a doubt, who is willing to tell the American people flatly that we must stay in this world picture and help prevent a recurrence of war, and that whatever sovereign powers it is necessary to delegate to an international organization to prevent future aggression and settle disputes peacefully must be so delegated.

In the domestic field, we need a President who presents to us a clear program to solve the problems of distribution and consumption, of full employment, of reconversion within the pattern of the American enterprise system. It must be a program based solidly on the facts and forces which govern that system, not on unworkable theories, wishful thinking, or easy-to-take panaceas. Generalizations about the American way of life, about economy in government, are not enough. We should demand that our next President state clearly to us the kind of labor relations policy, the kind of tax program, and the other policies he believes necessary to stimulate venture capital, new production, and employment. He should tell us clearly the role which social security properly should play in our enterprise economy and give us forthright leadership in other fields. The right policies may not be easy ones and they certainly will mean hard work for all of us. There is no soft, easy way out of this world-wide mess. Let us beware of anyone who tries to fool us into believing there is.

The second qualification we should demand in our next President is administrative ability. The mushrooming jungle of Federal bureaus and agencies in Washington is one of our greatest post-war problems. The confusion, the overlapping, the lack of clear-cut responsibility is resulting in a kind of paralysis, of which the Foreign Economic Administration set up last summer is a perfect example. For 6 critical months it has been marking time because no one in it seems to be sure just what his responsibility and authority is.

The third qualification we should demand in our next President is clear and courageous leadership in the American tradition. The only way the people of America can have a real voice in determining governmental policies is to know the facts and be given an opportunity to support programs based on the facts. Public opinion in a democracy does not just happen. It is developed by leaders—leaders of business, labor, agriculture, the press, and professions, and leaders of government. The President has a tremendous responsibility in this respect because he can reach more people than any other public official. The President can play it politically safe and wait for public opinion to be developed by leaders of various groups and then go along with it, giving the appearance of leadership. Or he can be a true leader and get out in front himself, helping to build public opinion for necessary programs. We need desperately the latter kind of leadership in America today.

The fourth major qualification we should demand in our next President is political understanding, the capacity and the will to work with Congress as a team in developing national policies. More effective teamwork, a better liaison betwee Congress and the Executive is one of our most urgent needs in Washington today. Efforts of the present administration to hammer Congress into subserviency to the Executive will not work, and strike at the very heart of our democratic system. We need as President a man who knows politics and how to work with politicians and who recognizes that he has no monopoly on wisdom.

It is our task as citizens to find and elect a President who has these qualifications. Those of us who have observed the abilities and accomplishments of former Governor Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota at first hand for 10 years propose him for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Why? Because we are convinced that he is the man who can do the best job for America as President. Let's measure him against our four qualifications.

First on program:

Harold Stassen's record on the issues of today is clear beyond a doubt. Long before Pearl Harbor, though he could have dodged the then-controversial foreign-policy issue on the grounds it was not a State affair, he repeatedly warned Minnesota and the Nation of the peril of unchecked aggression. Before he went into the Navy nearly a year ago he advanced as a basis for discussion a concept of the kind of international organization needed to assure peace and justice in the world.

In the domestic field Stassen has developed the broad outlines of a national program in articles and speeches and has put much of it into practice at the State level in Minnesota. Under his leadership, Minnesota's Legislature in 1939 passed a labor-relations act aimed at ending a period of severe labor disturbances in the State. The act, administered with fairness to both management and labor, has kept work stoppages in Minnesota to a small fraction of the national average. Minnesota's fiscal and tax policies, under Stassen's administration, stimulated enterprise and new industries, changed a State deficit to a surplus and at the same time increased State services.

Stassen has advocated the same kind of fair labor policy for the Nation, providing clear and speedy procedures for settling disputes and writing into law a code of conduct for both management and unions. Social security, he believes, should be expanded to cover all economic casualties, but he sees its role as providing a floor below which we do not permit individuals' living standards to fall, rather than a bed in which the national economy goes to sleep. The basic aim must be productive jobs for all, not a dole. Stassen sees clearly that to expect private enterprise to provide full employment without a drastic change in present tax policies, without reversing the continual harassment of management, without a fair and workable labor-relations code and without compensating for the trend toward monopoly during the war would be futile and would merely accelerate our present drift toward state socialism. He has advocated a shifting of taxes from production to consumption, tax incentives to venture capital, and stricter monopoly controls.

Stassen's record in efficient administration, our second requirement, is superlative. Elected Governor of Minnesota in 1938, in 4½ years he turned State deficits of $10,000,000 into balances of $35,000,000, reduced the number of State employees from nearly 17,000 to 10,000, cut the State debt $31,000,000, and at the same time increased and improved State services, built more highways and increased State school aids by $1,500,000. He did it simply by applying recognized principles of good administration. With the legislature he worked out a reorganization of executive departments, replacing boards and commissions with single executives and placing a State business manager in charge of purely business functions such as purchases and budgeting. Stassen made the reorganization produce results by picking able executives because of their qualifications for the job rather than political connections, giving them complete authority to do their jobs and then holding them responsible for results.

In the Federal field, Stassen would establish clear lines of authority, heading up to Cabinet officers and not heads of emergency agencies. Executives would have clear authority to do the jobs assigned to them and would be held strictly responsible for results. It seems strange that such simple, common sense facts about administration should need emphasis, but anyone who has been in Washington knows that they must be emphasized.

On leadership, which is merely another name for political courage, Stassen ranks at the top. Typical was his early, out-in-front leadership on foreign policy in a State considered isolationist. He scorns the safety of political expediency when the welfare of the State or Nation is at stake. As Governor, his door was always open to any interested group on any issue. He listened to all, but his decisions always placed the public interest first. He carried to the people in his first campaign for Governor the clear outlines of every major policy which his administration subsequently adopted, even though many of them, like his labor-relations program, were regarded as political dynamite, best left alone. We gain some idea of how he would operate at the Federal level from the fact that 6 months before the War Manpower Commission in Washington got around to it, Stassen recognized in 1942 the critical farm-labor problem and had in operation a State program to solve it.

How about our final requirement—political understanding and a capacity and desire for teamwork?

Harold Stassen was in public life and politics for 14 years. He knows government from the county and State levels up, and the three legislative sessions with which he worked were the most productive of constructive results in Minnesota's history. Harold Stassen believes in democracy, he has faith both in the people and the democratic institutions through which they govern themselves. We need that faith and the ability to translate it into action.

Harold Stassen has the qualifications we need in our next President. He is a man who can do the job.

Today he is a lieutenant commander in the Navy serving in the Pacific area. He cannot participate in any campaign for the Republican nomination. Therefore, we who believe he can do the best job for America must, in stark reality, draft him for a greater and higher service to his country.

All of us have both a right and a responsibility to take an active part in the selection of our next President—it is a responsibility doubly heavy today because we owe it to our

fighting men to do our share, each individually, to help select as President a man who will preserve and consolidate for democracy the victory which they are buying with their lives.

Take the Chains off Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the current issue of Collier's:

TAKE THE CHAINS OFF RADIO

We're in favor of the program of Niles Trammell, president of the National Broadcasting Co., for the bringing of radio in the United States within the Bill of Rights' guaranty of freedom of speech. Radio does not now enjoy that freedom, yet radio is one of our great media of speech and communication.

At the present time, the Communications Act of 1934, a vague and loosely worded statute, is administered by the Federal Communications Commission, better known as the F C. C. The F. C. C.'s chairman, James L. Fly, is a veteran business-baiter. Accordingly, he is forever trying to extend the F. C. C.'s power to coerce the 900 to 1,000 broadcasting agencies in the United States into singing only such songs as this Government agency wants sung.

The Supreme Court recently held that Fly's grab for power, even to the power to oversee choice of programs, were legitimate under the 1934 law; that it is Congress' job to clarify that law and thus limit the F. C. C.'s powers. These include the life-and-death power to revoke a station's license if the station fails to please the F. C. C.

Mr. Trammell proposes that Congress write the following points into the law regarding the United States radio industry:

A declaration that radio broadcasters have full freedom under amendment I of the Constitution (the freedom-of-speech clause of the Bill of Rights).

A flat order forbidding the F. C. C. to exercise any kind of program control.

Long-term or permanent licenses, revocable only for specified causes.

Licenses to be revocable only after jury trial and conviction in the Federal court for the district where the accused station is located.

F. C. C. to be forbidden to administer antitrust laws against radio; these laws to be enforced against radio in the same manner as against any other industry.

Government to be ordered to issue experimental licenses and encourage development of new radio services.

Discrimination to be forbidden on basis of occupation or business in granting licenses.

Procedural parts of the 1934 Communications Act to be revised to conform with recommendations of the Federal Communications Bar Association and the National Association of Broadcasters.

All these improvements look good to us. Some of them are embodied in the White-Wheeler bill, a measure pending at this writing, to clarify the 1934 law. We think all the Trammell recommendations ought to be written into this bill, after which Congress should pass the bill. It is time to knock the bureaucratic chains off the American radio industry, for the benefit of the listening public and the industry, and out of a decent respect for the Constitution of the United States.

The Fourth Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Fourth Imperative," delivered by me over the Wisconsin radio stations on January 29, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

More than 2 months ago, I declared in a radio talk that five imperatives demand the close attention of the American people in the explosive times in which we live.

The first imperative, I said, was the need of appreciating the enormous task confronting us before this war is won.

Our slow progress in Italy, stubborn German resistance in White Russia and west of the Dnieper, the bitter loss imposed on our marines at Tarawa, and the painfully slow progress of our gallant and well-led soldiers in the Solomons and on New Guinea all should convince us beyond question of the extraordinary difficulties which we must surmount before final victory is won.

Appreciation of the vital importance of this first imperative is of primary necessity. It is the measure of our will to fight, of our will to make every effort to support our combat forces on the 27 battle fronts of the world, on all the oceans of the world, and in all the skies above. It is a measure which each and every one of us must apply each to our own conduct, to our own effort, to our own readiness to serve and sacrifice. It is a measure of our total will to total victory.

The second imperative, as I pointed it out then, has happily been largely realized in the series of conferences recently held between the leaders of the four major powers. This imperative, I said then, was the need of working out complete accord among the United Nations in the war effort. As a result of the three conferences mentioned, we are now assured that the armies of the major Allies will be coordinated in major compaigns to smash the Axis tyranny, to crush Hitler's Reich first, and then to deal with Japan. We can all look forward to the intensive demands which will be made upon us with greater confidence because these conferences have been held.

The third and fourth imperatives I mentioned dealt with the post-war world. The fifth deals with our domestic problems.

The third imperative I defined as the need of working out, now, a complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period.

As a result of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences, as I have pointed out in more recent radio talks, the broad pattern of a hopeful post-war security system has now emerged. It is a hopeful system because it is proposed to build it around the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states. But as I also pointed out in recent radio talks, the pattern is stil broad and general. Many specific problems remain to be solved within its framework.

But as I pointed out further in recent talks, the major powers who must give shape and direction and security to the post-war world can approach their difficult task only if each is first assured of a reasonable security for itself.

And that brings me to the fourth imperative which I defined in my earlier radio talks.

That is the need of America receiving title in perpetuity to the strategic air and sea bases in the Western Hemisphere which we have occupied and improved and the use of vital sea and air bases throughout the globe.

We should, I said, work out reciprocal use of commercial bases throughout the earth.

In my more recent talks, I have emphasized how reasonable American security must assert a paramount interest in three western mid-Pacific island groups which on two previous historic occasions we thrust away from us. These groups, the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas, will be taken from Japan according to the pledge of the Cairo Conference.

But the conference is silent on their ultimate fate. I submit to you that the people of the United States should make it clear beyond all doubt that we are intensely concerned about their ultimate fate.

More than 2 years ago and before this country was yet involved in war, in a speech in the Senate of the United States, I called attention to the importance of the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands in the eastern mid-Atlantic from the standpoint of the security of this country and the entire Western Hemisphere.

In short, American security demands that the United States shall have a clear and decisive voice in the ultimate disposition of all these sentinel islands of the Atlantic and Pacific. Properly fortified, they could well become our outposts of defense. Neglected, they might well become, as they did become in the Pacific, attempted stepping stones of invasion.

I pointed out, too, in my recent radio talks, that an intelligent concern for our own reasonable security in no way challenges the sincerity or questions the motives of our present allies. I pointed out that such intelligent concern is only reasonable prudence.

And I point out that in exercising common prudence, we are doing no more than our major allies are doing. Moreover, we are doing no more than we have agreed they should do, particularly in the Far East.

I refer, of course, to the pledge that came out of the Cairo Conference, the pledge to strip Japan of all her loot of the last half century.

I shall attempt to point out in more detail in still a later radio talk that not only in the Pacific, about which the Cairo Conference was chiefly concerned, but also in Europe, our allies have taken or are taking what they believe are reasonable steps to assure their own reasonable security.

Let me emphasize again that we should not criticize them for doing this. We should question them only, as I have said, when they undertake to achieve their own security at the expense of the equal security of others, but we should recognize their primary right to look to their own first interests first, exactly as I am confident they are willing to recognize ours.

In discussing what has taken place at the Cairo Conference, we cannot, of course, go behind the official declarations which were made public at its close.

We can only accept the declaration as it was made public and note not only what was said in it but what was not said in it.

The three powers of the Cairo Conference, the United States, Great Britain, and the Chinese Republic, definitely disclaim any gains for themselves, any thought of territorial expansion.

The conference pledged not only that Japan will be stripped of all her loot of the last half century, it specifically provides that Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be returned to China and that Korea shall in due time become a free and independent state.

A close study of the declaration will reveal that the powers involved showed a most encouraging readiness to deal with the definite problems mentioned in an intelligent give-and-take manner.

China is to be commended for readiness to join in guaranteeing the ultimate independence of Korea. This large peninsula, dropping southward from Manchuria and across the Yellow Sea from the densely populated and rich Chinese province of Shantung was once a Chinese protectorate. China might readily have claimed it again not only on historic ground but as a matter of security. That she did not speaks highly of the statesmanship of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

And it speaks equally well for Chinese statesmanship and patience that China made no protest of record against the retention of Hong Kong by Great Britain.

Quite obviously Britain has retained Hong Kong not as a measure of military security but as a matter of imperial security. From the broader needs of British imperial commercial security, retention of Hong Kong is from the British viewpoint, a matter of reasonable insistence. For the time being, at least, China has recognized that interest.

Britain, in turn, has apparently yielded at another point where her leaders could have pleaded reasonable security needs. That is in the matter of Siam or Thailand, as this small kingdom is now known.

It is true that no specific mention is made of Thailand in the Cairo declaration. But its future would seem to be assured under the general pledge that the three major powers covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion.

Yet the Japanese have proven rather conclusively in this war that Thailand can be used as a base from which to attack Burma, the Malay States, and Singapore. It is true that Thailand is not likely to be of great value as a base unless whoever holds it also holds Indochina. And Indochina seems destined under the terms of the Cairo declaration to be returned to France. The French Committee of Liberation obviously takes this for granted, since the committee just recently has publicly pledged an improvement of the one-time lamentable French colonial government in southeastern Asia.

Yet, les us give credit where credit is due. However much we may question the justice—and the wisdom—of the British attitude in regard to Hong Kong, her attitude toward Thailand is commendable.

Again in regard to the relations between Russia and China—we may be sure that the Cairo declaration was submitted to and approved by Moscow before it was made public.

By the terms of the declaration, all Manchuria is returned to China. Apparently this means that Russia is waiving any interests she once held around the shore of the Gulf of Dairen. She is waiving any claim of a return of Port Arthur which she lost to the Japanese in 1904. And she is waiving, apparently, any title she once held to the Chinese Eastern Railway which cuts directly across Manchuria to the great Siberian port of Vladivostok.

Moreover, Russia seems to be accepting the physical fact that Manchuria thrusts northward in a great arc which almost isolates Vladivostok and the Maritime Provinces from more recent Soviet industrial developments in central Siberia. In so doing, Russia is to be commended for recognizing the prior historical, economic, and cultural claim of China in a matter so directly involving the security of the only great Russian port on the Pacific.

But again, the Cairo declaration is significant for what it does not say. Exactly as no mention was made of the return of Hong Kong to China by Great Britain, so no mention was made of Outer Mongolia and Sinkian, in latter years avowedly special spheres of Soviet influence.

Quite obviously, the loot to be returned is only the loot which we propose to take from Japan. Only the United States emerges from the Cairo atmosphere with a pledge to return American loot. And we do not propose to return the Philippines to Spain, we propose to return the islands to their own people. Nor was this a pledge made at Cairo. It is a pledge we made directly to our gallant allies of Bataan and Corregidor. It is a pledge which we propose to keep.

In view of the dispositions taken at Cairo, dispositions announced and implied, in view of the post-war pattern which has emerged from Cairo, a pattern announced and implied, the United States would be making no unwarranted or unprecedented demands in avowing her direct interest in three mid-Pacific island groups which events have proven to be of major importance to American security.

These island groups, each tiny islet occupied by almost primitive peoples, can have no hope for independent post-war status. Neither as groups nor as separate islands have they the political, cultural, or economic development necessary to independent statehood. Nor can they because of the very nature of the modern air age return to the status of independent barbarism and inter-island looting raids which they enjoyed in all the centuries before Spain brought some semblance of order there some three centuries ago.

Stretching as they do for some 2,500 miles across the western Pacific just northward of the equator, they are necessary and important land bases for the vast air-borne and perhaps sea-borne commerce which will follow any era of enduring peace in these regions. They should definitely be incorporated in the American defense system, with due regard of course for the reasonable security and commercial requirements of Australia, China, and the Philippines.

They should be incorporated definitely in the American system not only because our own immediate security demands it but because our major responsibilities as one of the major world powers which undertakes to guarantee world security demands it.

Densely populated southeastern Asia and the great islands which lie between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans, many of them also densely populated, are the key to the arch of any security system in the southwestern Pacific. As the only one of the four major powers whose continental borders lie eastward across the Pacific from these lands, the United States has a particular responsibility in this vast region.

In a post-war world which will be frankly built around the principle of power organized for peace and security, the United States has a double interest and a double responsibility in this area. It must be in position to exercise its power in the interests of the responsibility involved.

What Price Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Sunday Sun of January 30, 1944, entitled "What Price Gratitude":

WHAT PRICE GRATITUDE

There are few things cheaper than the practice of so-called economy where open-hearted generosity is in order. An example of this is found in the picayune quibbling of Congress over the payment of discharge financial tokens to our fighting men.

Why Congress, which, in the past, has been so blandly magnanimous in handing out billions of dollars on practically each and every presented idea for the public weal, should run into its shell and work up a lather of debate over giving a few hundred dollars to discharged or demobilized veterans of this war, is beyond the ken of most of us.

We don't think it necessary to review what our boys have been through in the hell of this war for the past 2 years and more. Even those people who do not have relatives in the service obtain a graphic picture of the suffering endured by our soldiers and sailors through only superficial reading of the press accounts.

A million men have been honorably discharged from the armed forces for various reasons. Many of them have obtained work. Many of them are in poor physical condition as the result of their service. All of them need a little money to help plant their feet firmly into civilian life again.

The number of discharges increases daily. Is the Government which these men fought and suffered to maintain going to elbow them aside as undeserving of a little show of gratitude? Is this condition of antipathy to be the official attitude of the Government toward these deserving servicemen?

Let's start saving money where the economy is needed—and not at the expense of common decency and national honor.

Chaplain Louis Werfel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Yeshiva memorial services for Chaplain Louis Werfel:

We Americans pick up our newspapers every morning and read about death and suffering on so large a scale that we are unable to understand them. Words cannot express for us the meaning of total war. We get a hint of the freeman's ability to fight and, if need be, to die for his ideals. We get an impact, a vague stirring of righteous anger at the enemy, and that is all. Mass slaughter, brutality such as has just horrified us all in the news from Bataan, the concentration camp, the battle of Stalingrad, starvation, air raids, atrocities, are incomprehensile to those of us who are fortunate enough never to have experienced these things.

But there are other things we can understand. There are stories which can bring tears into our eyes. There are incidents which reach our hearts because they are simple enough for us to comprehend them.

All of us can thoroughly understand the tragic and untimely death of a young man.

All of us can grieve over such a loss. It hits home.

It is about such a man that I speak today.

Chaplain Louis Werfel was 27 years old when he lost his life, a month ago, in a plane crash in Algeria. On December 24, last, he was on his way to conduct a religious service for the Jewish religious holiday of Hanukkah at a north African base.

News of Chaplain Werfel's impending visit reached American men of Jewish faith stationed at a base near that one on December 27—3 days after his plane had crashed.

These men had fought through the north African campaign. All of them knew Chaplain Werfel, the young "flying rabbi" whose burning belief in God and in American ideals motivated him to leave the security of his home and congregation in Birmingham to apply for the chaplaincy and later to fly on a thousand-mile tour of north Africa in order to serve the men in uniform. These soldiers considered him as a personal friend.

Every Jewish boy at that base—and there were many of them—was eager to attend Chaplain Werfel's Hanukkah service, to commemorate a struggle for freedom which these soldiers in north Africa, together with their comrades of all faiths, in every branch of service, have taken up again in our time. They were eager to attend that significant service, and they were anxious to see their young friend and adviser Chaplain Werfel once again.

At 6 o'clock that evening the men piled into a truck and rode over to the other base to meet Chaplain Werfel. But he was not there. They waited.

A Catholic chaplain came over to the group and told them he could not understand the delay, but that it would be best to go on and have the service. Chaplain Werfel had been inexplicably detained. They all thought it was the weather.

One of the men volunteered to officiate; prayer books were distributed and the men, confident that their chaplain would arrive eventually, held a simple holiday service.

When it was over several of the men went into the chaplain's office to return the books. Another chaplain, a friend of Chaplain Werfel, told them the sad news.

The men were shocked. A corporal gathered them together and they said Kaddish, the Hebrew memorial prayer, for the soul of the young religious leader they had all known and loved.

All of us can understand this simple story and be moved, as I was moved, when I heard it.

Chaplain Werfel did not meet death melodramatically. He died in the line of duty, on his way to fulfill a religious mission which meant more to him than security, more than his personal safety and comfort, more, in a way, in a very significant way, than his own life here on earth. And so, from the standard by which these matters are judged among all decent men, I think we can well call him a hero of this war.

Chaplain Werfel was born in my own congressional district. He burned with enthusiasm and religious fire. He desired to serve in the rabbinate. His ambitions were modest. He wanted only to inspire a religious congregation and preach the word of God.

He was by no means an introverted man, an ascetic, who would shut himself off with his books to commune alone with the Lord. He was interested in the welfare of the people around him, he had many friends, he was well-informed, he took part in the life of the community around him and, when he served with the Mount Kisco Congregation up-State. When he served as rabbi of the Knesseth Israel Synagogue down in Birmingham, he knew his congregants and was well loved by them.

When war came Louis Werfel applied for the chaplaincy, because he considered it his duty as a rabbi to save what was more precious to him than life itself.

The Army had no difficulty in finding a place for this well set up, inspired young man who was so eager to join the Chaplains Corps. He was endorsed by the committee on Army and Navy religious activities of the Jewish Welfare Board, was promptly accepted, and, upon completing his studies at the Harvard chaplains' school, he was assigned to the Air Force training school at Boca Raton Field, Fla. His popularity there was a fitting tribute to his character. He lived close to his men and shared their problems. When he held services the chapel was crowded. His lectures and group discussions needed no advertisement. He had quickly adjusted himself to Army life, and the men all loved and respected him.

Nevertheless, although he was exempt from overseas duty because of minor physical disabilities, Chaplain Werfel requested war-theater duty repeatedly. In his application for service overseas, he wrote that he was "motivated by a recognition of what I consider to be my duty as a rabbi in Israel."

Finally, last June he was sent to north Africa with the Twelfth Air Force.

We learn that on one occasion, when he was scheduled to conduct high holy-day services for soldiers in the town of Constantine, he refused to be hospitalized, despite a rather serious illness, before he had conducted all services for both days of Rosh Hashana, the Hebrew New Year. And his main anxiety while in the hospital was that he recuperate in time to conduct Day of Atonement services at the Constantine Synagogue. He was cured just in time, and, in describing those services, he wrote that "we had to have a notice read in every local civilian synagogue reminding the community that the Allied soldiers were conducting their own services and requesting them to wait outside our hall until our service was completed, and then, as the soldiers emerged from our service, to invite the men to their homes. When our service ended the mass of civilians standing outside our door was so great that we found difficulty in leaving the synagogue. People fought with each other for the chance to invite a soldier home."

Every instance he found of such humanity moved and gratified Louis Werfel.

Chaplain Werfel's north African assignment was to visit all the areas covered by the Twelfth Air Force Service Command and serve the Jewish men there by organizing services for them and training enlisted men to conduct them, or to arrange for them to have access to Jewish services in nearby towns. Wherever he went on that tour he himself conducted services for the units he visited.

In his last letter to the Jewish Welfare Board, Chaplain Werfel wrote that he had been standing on an airfield waving farewell to the crews of Flying Fortresses and Liberator bombers which were on their way to bomb European targets. "As those lumbering yet graceful planes taxied past me," he wrote, "I waved to the crews. One of their bombardiers was a Jewish boy from Louisville, Ky., already the possessor of a handful of Oak Leaf Clusters to his Air Medal. I stood there, waving them on, wishing them luck, praying that every one of them would get back safely * * * and through my mind there ran the words of the Talmudic dictum: 'Those who are sent on missions of religious duty suffer no harm.' At least, that day, all planes returned."

Chaplain Werfel's last request, addressed to the Jewish Welfare Board, was for 10,000 Jewish prayer books for men serving with the Free French forces, whose own chaplains could not arrange for the printing of such items in north Africa.

On the day before his death, Louis Werfel wrote that, because of bad weather, he had been grounded while on his tour of duty, just as he was preparing to conduct a series of services for Jewish men in his command. But apparently he decided, with characteristic earnestness of purpose and disregard of his own safety, to proceed the next morning. His plane crashed into a mountainside later in the day.

Chaplain Werfel lived fully, nobly, thoroughly. The choices he made will redound forever in his honor. He was one of the army of chaplains in our armed forces, numbering more than 200 Jewish chaplains among them, who have chosen to live this way and are ready, if need be, to die for inalienable American rights.

Chaplain Werfel left his congregation and his home because he had made his choice—to serve his country in this war, which he looked upon as a holy cause. It is a choice which all of us have been called upon to make and we, like him, must face the inescapable realities before us. We must derive strength and inspiration from his story, and give of ourselves without stint to see to it that he and others like him will not have died in vain, that there will be more freedom and justice in this world because of his sacrifice.

We are touched by his loss, for we can understand it. But we cannot let it go at that. We must make good the promise for which he gave his life.

Jap Cruelty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, June 27, 1943, I received a letter written June 27, 1942, just a year before, from Harold Pinkney, a home-town boy, who when the letter was written was held in a Japanese camp located in occupied China.

The letter was evidently written to give the impression that he was in good health, was well treated, and had plenty of food to eat. Reading between the lines, it was apparent that all was not well; that Pinkney was not getting the food he should have; that he needed soap and other supplies.

Immediately I sought ways to get food and small articles he needed to him through the Red Cross, but was advised that the Japs were not letting Red Cross supplies go through. That, mark you, was in June of 1942.

When the three American officers escaped from the Japanese prison camp in the Philippines, one of them, Lt. Col. William E. Dyess of the Air Corps, who later lost his life in a plane crash in this country, gave an account of the Jap atrocities to a writer of the Chicago Tribune. For 5 months the Tribune and others have had the story of the Japs' cruelty and inhuman treatment of our men.

It was not until January 28 that the Army and Navy gave permission to the press to make known the facts. Undoubtedly, the authorities concealed the facts in the hope that the Japs might be prevailed upon to treat the remaining prisoners in accordance with the rules of war.

That hope having faded, on the eve of the Fourth War Bond drive the facts are given to the public. Beyond question, the disclosure will aid in that campaign. Expressions of indignation as well as of horror and of demands for revenge are natural.

Condemnation of what has happened, threats of what we intend to do, are futile, unless we, without any further delay, quit fooling around here in Washington with inconsequential issues and throughout the country as individuals spend every waking moment, every ounce of reserve strength, in the effort to carry the war with ever-redoubling intensity to the Japs.

The stories which have been told, which will continue to be told, of savagery practiced upon American prisoners should cause us now without any further delay to see that MacArthur gets the munitions of war and the men he needs. No one can longer ignore the war in the Pacific. When the Japs took Hong Kong and Singapore, we learned what they were doing to the Chinese and to the British. We had no reason to think they would do otherwise to us.

Perhaps MacArthur's knowledge of what his former comrades were suffering in the Philippines was one of the reasons for his intense desire to go back and to rescue them.

The war in Europe is of vital importance, but we sent our men into the Pacific, and we cannot do less than support them to the limit. Instead of cussing out the Japs, telling what we are going to do, it is long past time, and I am speaking about myself as well as you, that all of us redouble our efforts in every conceivable way, so that the more quickly will come the day when every American who still remains alive in Jap hands will be rescued, when no longer there will be a Japanese Empire.

Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave that Members may extend their remarks in regard to the soldiers' vote bill, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, La., under date of January 30, 1944, as follows:

PRESIDENT VERSUS CONGRESS

President Roosevelt's blunt demand for the passage of the Lucas-Green national vote law for servicemen and the merchant marine probably won't narrow the apparent breach between the administration and Congress. The message may turn some votes for the bill, but its attempt to put Congressmen on the spot by demanding that they answer roll call on the measure, and his insistence that the recommendation-to-States bill already passed by the Senate is a fraud, will hardly make Capitol Hill feel any friendlier toward the President.

There is fundamental disagreement in Congress not merely over the wisdom of passing Federal vote legislation, but over the constitutional power of Congress to override State rights in this field. From the President's message, one might suppose that Members of Congress have some hidden purpose to keep the servicemen from voting and do not wish their names identified with their offense. What is nearer the truth is that the majority want to maintain the rights reserved to the States by the Constitution, but fear a roll call because they would be accused by politicians of hostility to servicemen.

The Lucas-Green bill provides that blank ballots shall be sent out to the services to be filled in later when the names of candidates are telegraphed or radioed by the Government. The ballots then would be returned to State officials who would decide which ballots were legal under the State laws, but could not exclude ballots of voters who had failed to register or pay poll taxes by reason of their absence in the service. The bill originally passed by the Senate, which the President calls a fraud, recommended that the States pass laws to facilitate soldier voting.

While the President seems to have no doubt of the right of Congress to tell the States what to do about servicemen's voting, many Congressmen completely disagree with him. Also, the President seems to think the servicemen have a deep and special interest in national candidates, but not so much in State candidates, for whom they would not vote on the ballots distributed by the Government. But the fact may be to the contrary, since the record seems to show that a bigger vote comes out when local candidates are in the race than when a President is elected.

Mr. Roosevelt belittles the effect of the efforts many States are now making to facilitate soldier-sailor voting. But whatever success they have will at least apply equally to balloting for both State and Federal offices. The States do not agree with the President that the soldier vote on Federal candidates is any more necessary to preserve our sacred democratic institutions than the vote on State and local candidates. His emphasis on the soldiers' special interest in the Federal election inspires the charge by his opponents that he is campaigning for the soldier vote. At the same time some Democratic Members of Congress might find it opportune to remind the White House that a good many of our fighting men are as much interested in preserving the political freedom inherent in State rights and the noninterference of the Federal Government with the election machinery as they are in any other of our democratic institutions.

A Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clipping from the Enquirer-Gazette, a weekly newspaper published at Upper Marlboro, Md. This clipping is well-expressed message of sympathy and spiritual consolation to those who have lost loved ones in the war. It was written by T. Van Clagett, former judge of the circuit court and one of the most highly respected citizens of our county. It follows:

A MESSAGE

Mr. EDITOR: I have been thinking of this war and of the casualties of this war.

What can one possibly say to a mother who has lost her son?

It is no consolation to her that we shall win this war. It is no consolation to her that our enemies will be fittingly punished.

"He maketh wars to cease in all the world; He breaketh the bow, and snappeth the spear in sunder, and burneth the chariots in the fire."

Finally she will be consoled.

"Until the day break and the shadows flee away."

"He doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men."

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

T. VAN CLAGETT.

Program for the Post-War Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me an outline of a program for the post-war era that I ask to have inserted in the RECORD in the hope that it may contribute to the great task that lies before us. It was prepared by Newton L. Glover, of Pillager, Minn.:

AMENDED PLAN FOR THE PROBLEM OF POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

(By Newton L. Glover, Pittager, Minn.)

"Necessities and luxuries, two things that we may name,
One we must have that we may live, the other's but a game."

To consider this plan for furnishing employment for returning soldiers, we must first go into mental bankruptcy to get rid of false, established, and cherished economic ideas accepted as facts. Admit that every person considers himself a little world around which all others are mere satellites; also that human nature has not been changed by education and civilization and never will be. Let modern warfare be conclusive proof.

It is self-evident that to furnish us bare necessities of life, under modern methods of production, would require only a small fraction of our time and effort. Equally true that luxuries and quasi luxuries are craved by all as much as food, and if enjoyed by all, instead of the few, the demand therefor would ipso facto furnish a home market and employment for all.

Every unbiased reasoner knows that ways and means must be found to make the earning capacity and leisure of all the people sufficient to buy and enjoy luxuries that they produce, instead of limiting these luxuries to the law-favored few; otherwise there will be unemployment, panic, strikes, that may end in civil war. There is no dodging this issue. Returning soldiers will not only demand it, but force it. They will go through party lines, press, and radio propaganda as they did through German opposition. They will not turn back from Washington, as in the First World War. They will organize, rule, or ruin.

As a post-war plan to rehabilitate pre-war prosperity or more we suggest:

1. Congress must penalize all waste and wanton destruction of all surplus war supplies or property and return all that is overseas, to be repaired and reconditioned by the Army, for home market. It must then be available at retail only and such as is useful for the farmer, at Government cost, or below. This preference is warranted, because organized labor may expedite their capricious demands by strikes, but agriculture is forced to hotchpotch their grievances; depend on legislation that is generally adverse; accept the least leisure and luxuries of any other industry and the lowest standard of living. A contrast that is flabbergasting to the truly informed.

2. All proceeds from the sale of Government property mentioned should be used to finance unemployment insurance.

3. The Government should recommend:

(a) All property now exempt from execution in the several States to be exempt from all taxation—local, State, or Federal—and no poll tax.

The Government can withhold financial assistance from obdurate States to force their cooperation.

As a means of recoupment or compensation for the lost taxes mentioned:

(b) Because modern transportation has annihilated distance, all counties should be consolidated in the several States according to population and distance from county seat and all elective officers therein to file with their candidacy the salary or remuneration they are willing to accept.

(c) Country schools should be consolidated where school bus service would be more economical.

4. Congress should appoint a standing committee to investigate the utility, use, service, and avail of all State- and Federal-tax-supported bureaus or offices and publish their findings; also source of price setting.

5. The maximum net salary, bonus, or gift or remuneration for services performed in any State or in the Nation should not exceed $25,000 per year to any individual and the minimum salary not less than $150 per month.

6. Except for those engaged in agriculture, the maximum employment should not exceed 30 hours per week with 2 holidays each week and no overtime.

7. Federal old-age pension to all natural-born citizens or other citizens resident for more than 40 years, upon reaching the age of 65 to be $50 per month and $10 increase each year thereafter until the age of 75.

8. Federal loans at 3 percent to be made to any honorably discharged soldier engaged in farming.

9. No soldier to be discharged until, through furlough, he can find permanent employment at reasonable wages, or employ himself as well.

10. Federal laws that loans or forbearance of money over 8 percent constitutes usury and forfeiture of amount loaned.

11. Excess-profits tax should limit net profits of all corporations or individuals employing 10 or more people to 8 percent.

12. Radio should give to citizens of all States every word spoken in Congress, including open hearings of committees.

13. Electric high lines should be promoted at minimum rates of service to encourage back-to-the-farm movement and lessen hardships thereat and make rural life more attractive.

14. Land, being the poor man's friend, if he is granted the opportunity to cultivate it, repays him in proportion to his opportunity. It is the foundation of food, wealth, and life. Why is it inaccessible to the man who needs it the most? Minnesota and many other States have only a fraction of their lands under cultivation, generally because the tax forfeited and cut-over land is rendered valueless through the pernicious and illegal methods of taxing it. The statute says: "It shall be assessed at the true and full value." The State has many thousand acres forfeited for taxes. Good, fertile, virgin soil, some covered with stumps and second growth timber, worthless even for pasture. The State cannot sell it; it has no value while there is no timber of value on it. If bought, a fictitious value is put on it to make the purchaser pay taxes, and if this kind of land happens to be within the boundaries of a farm containing a plot of cultivated land, the whole is assessed at fictitious values and upheld by the court, because taxes must be forthcoming to pay salaries and support offices of political origin and benefits. When the timber grows enough to tempt someone to buy the land to cut the timber off, he pays a small tax, gets the timber and lets the land go back. Just a legal way of robbing Peter to pay Paul and keep the land inaccessible to settlers.

The Federal Government should sequester all this land and hold it free from taxation thereby for a term of years, divide it into 80-acre farms, apportion it to returning soldiers unable to find more suitable employment, have the Army bulldozers prepare a major portion for cultivation with temporary or modest buildings, in lieu of having the Public Works Administration construct new highways, etc. Upon residing and cooperation, the applicant to receive title within 5 years.

CONCLUSION

At war the results of our labor are being destroyed and burned in order to conquer our enemies and the people are prospering financially. If, as much pre-war effort is made producing luxuries that we are permitted to enjoy, consume and destroy, would not we continue to prosper financially?

Fostoria, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement of the Fostoria Review-Times, concerning the post-war situation of Fostoria, Ohio:

FOSTORIA'S WEEKLY PAY ROLL NOW IS $291,154, WITH LARGEST EMPLOYMENT IN CITY'S HISTORY—SURVEY MADE BY REVIEW-TIMES OF INDUSTRY, RAILROADS, BUSINESS HOUSES, ETC., AUGURS WELL FOR BOTH THE PRESENT AND FUTURE; OWNERS OF FARMS SURROUNDING FOSTORIA REPORT PROFIT

In direct contrast to fears expressed in some sections of the United States that a sudden end of World War No. 2 will bring chaotic industrial and business conditions, the city of Fostoria and its wide trading area which the Review-Times covers with its 5,679 subscribers, is looking forward to the post-war period in anticipation of its greatest era of prosperity.

Surveys conducted by the Fostoria Review-Times in recent weeks have shown the city of Fostoria is at the present time enjoying its most prosperous era and checks made with findings of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the War Production Board, and other Federal agencies indicate that, so far as Fostoria is concerned, the end of the war will not have a detrimental effect upon conditions, but to the contrary, will bring an improvement.

PRIME TRUTHS

Several prime factors, when considered over a long-time basis, bear out these findings for Fostoria. One is that Fostoria business and industry are on sound footings at the present time; second, its citizens have millions of dammed-up purchasing power which will be released after the war; and third, so far as industry is concerned, Fostoria has no war-born factories which will become "graveyards" at the end of hostilities.

In other words, competent Fostoria industrial leaders and businessmen, in making plans for the post-war period, believe that the 2,500 Yanks from the Fostoria area will come home to a place much better than that which they left during the last 3½ years.

FINANCIAL FACTS

Considering the above-mentioned prime factors, here are facts which shed light upon what may be expected in the post-war era in Fostoria.

No one can dispute the statement that Fostoria business and industry are on sound footings at the present time. A recent announcement by the United States Employment Service office showed that unemployment benefits paid out in Fostoria during 1943 totaled only slightly more than $5,000. Compare this insignificant sum with the somewhat startling figure that Fostoria business and industry pay out $291,154 each week in wages and salaries.

Fostoria industrial firms' weekly pay rolls total $231,500, four trunk-line railroads pay their Fostoria employees $19,654 each week, and small business concerns pay their employees $30,000 per week. Fostoria is employing its greatest number in its history.

In 1940, prior to the beginning of the war boom, Fostoria's weekly pay-roll total was $150,000, or about half of the 1944 figure.

AGRICULTURE BENEFITS

Rural residents of the Fostoria area likewise are receiving large amounts of cash for their efforts. In just one of their markets, that for soybeans at the Swift & Co. plant, they received $79,352.65 for their product between October 23, 1943, and January 1, 1944, and it is estimated that by April 1, 1944, they will receive an equal amount, or a grand total of nearly $160,000 in a 5-months period. Pile on top of that the income from wheat and other grains, produce and livestock, and it is apparent that Fostoria agriculture also is on a sound footing.

Likewise, no one can dispute the statement that citizens of Fostoria have millions of dollars of dammed-up purchasing power which will be released after the war. Even a cursory glance at Fostoria financial figures bears out the statement.

HIGH DEPOSITS

Reports of the condition of Fostoria's two Federal Reserve banks, the First National Bank and the Commercial Bank & Savings Co., showed that at the close of business December 31, 1943, demand deposits of individuals, partnerships, and corporations totaled $2,677,294.87, and the total of all deposits in the two financial institutions was $7,719,224.46. A comparison with figures in the reports of December 31, 1942, show that Fostoria bank deposits have nearly doubled in that 1-year period.

The potential buying power of Fostoria-held War bonds is equally emphatic. Fostoria bought $864,298 in bonds during the First War Loan, $1,870,584.21 in the Second War Loan, $1,364,664 in the Third War Loan, and soon will be called upon to buy at least $1,089,000 in the Fourth War Loan. In other words, by March 1, 1944, Fostoria industry,

business, and individuals will hold approximately $5,200,000 in Government War bond securities which will be reconverted into cash during the post-war period.

These figures, however, are dwarfed by the prospect of what industry can do for the city of Fostoria after the war, and there is every reason to believe that such will be the case.

Fostoria's industries should not suffer tremendously from reconversion to peacetime production, and even if industry, business, and railroad pay rolls continue at a rate of only 75 percent of the present war-boom level, citizens of Fostoria will receive more than $10,000,000 per year in wages and salaries, or an average of approximately $2,250 per family, a figure equal to that established by the committee on economic development in its plans for an economy of plenty under a system of free enterprise during the post-war period.

Practically all of Fostoria's industries are working all-out in war production, but happily most of these industries are operating with facilities established before the war and which can and will be used after the war. The National Carbon Co., the Electric Auto-Lite spark-plug division, the Fostoria Screw Co., and the Atlas Crankshaft, Inc., are good examples. Practically all of the carbon products being manufactured here at the present time will have a ready market in peacetime business; millions of automobile spark plugs and aircraft ignition materials will be needed after the war; the demands for munitions will not be cut off abruptly because America never again will be unprepared; and crankshafts for Navy boats, trucks, and automobiles will be needed.

On the other side of the picture is the fact that several Fostoria firms have been operating under curtailed schedules but will enter a period of greatly increased activity after the war when civilian demands for their products must be filled. Likewise, the building firms anticipate great activity.

A survey made by the United States Chamber of Commerce shows that 4.4 percent of all American families intend to build or buy a new home within 6 months after the war is over. Transcribed to Fostoria's population of 4,000 families, this means that at least 175 new homes will be built in Fostoria immediately after the war. However, because of a definite housing shortage in Fostoria over a period of many years, Fostoria building tradesmen believe new-home construction in this city will be much greater than the national over-all average.

FOSTORIANS WILL BENEFIT

Fostoria is primarily an industrial and railroad city and its business and personal economy is established directly upon the precepts of big business. So-called big business in the United States is making definite plans for tremendous production of civilian goods after the war. These plans are based on anticipated types of purchases, revival of time-payment plans, and a stimulation of advertising and merchandising activities.

Vast new markets, not only for consumer goods, but in replacement of war-worn plants and machinery are foreseen. Demands for millions of household appliances, automobiles, and new homes, and for urban and rural improvements, point to almost unlimited possibilities for America after the war—and Fostoria industry and business, long based on an efficient competitive economy, will do its share and its individual citizens will benefit not only in the field of economic security but also in the satisfaction of personal contribution to the desire to make Fostoria exactly what the servicemen think it is—the best little city in the world.

Address by Senator Truman Before Traffic Club of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, night before last I had the pleasure of hearing the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] deliver to the members of the Traffic Club of Baltimore a very illuminating, informative, and timely address on the subject of transportation. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Traffic Club of Baltimore, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to you on the subject of transportation. I have long been interested in this subject. As many of you know, I have been a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate since 1935. In a sense, therefore, I feel that I am one of you because, like you, an important part of my interests and responsibilities as a Senator are concerned with transportation.

Associations such as yours perform a very real and useful service, not only in establishing and maintaining contacts among users and operators of transportation systems which facilitate the handling of day-to-day operations, but also in furnishing a medium for the interchange of ideas and information, thus improving knowledge and leading to the rendering of better service.

In my remarks to you tonight, I would like to address myself to two general subjects: First, transportation under wartime conditions, and second, plans for transportation in the post-war period. I shall make no attempt to cover either of these subjects, but will make only a few observations and comments which will serve to indicate my own personal views and philosophy.

As you know, the special committee investigating the national defense program, of which I am the chairman, has devoted considerable attention to the study of transportation and filed a report on this subject about the middle of December. In this study, of course, the committee was not concerned with fundamental changes in the structure of our transportation systems, but only in assuring that our railroads, busses, trucks, barges, pipe lines, and air lines would be adequate to meet the heavy demands placed upon them by war production and other war needs.

The committee found that the essential soundness and vigor of our transportation systems and the wholehearted cooperation of shippers, operators, and employees had permitted the performance of an almost miraculous job of handling an unforeseen transportation burden and the overcoming of serious obstacles which had not been anticipated. Still, the committee was convinced that prompt action should be taken by the appropriate agencies to permit replenishment of equipment and relieve the strain so that the war effort would not be hampered or delayed by a break-down or diminution in transportation service.

We believed that concentrating our attention upon military activities and bending our efforts to the production of military supplies had resulted in neglecting adequate maintenance of transport facilities and feared that such neglect might prove costly to the success of the entire war program.

I am glad to be able to report to you that the situation today is much more encouraging than it was 6 months ago. During the progress of the committee's investigation, many steps were taken by the Government agencies concerned which should go a long way toward solving the problem. Beyond those steps already announced, the committee was assured that additional corrective measures would be taken.

The committee's activities in the field of transportation did not cease upon the filing of the report. I, personally, the other members of the committee, and the staff are continuing to follow the progress that is being made. The importance of continual watchfulness against any influence that might impair the usefulness of our transportation systems cannot be overemphasized.

If there is one single thing which has impressed me more than any other about the history of transportation in World War No. 2, it is the fact that the marvelous record of achievement of an important and difficult task on a Nation-wide scale was accomplished through community diligence, initiative, and sacrifice in the American way.

The Special Committee Investigating the War Program has directed its attention to a great variety of undertakings and subjects. In many, the committee has exposed serious mistakes in judgment, miscalculations, poor logic, improvidence, waste of taxpayers' funds, and an emphasis on self-interest to the derogation of the public good. In instances where the committee has had clear evidence that such factors were interfering with the defense program, it has not hesitated to issue public condemnation. As long as I am able to exert any influence, the committee will not hesitate to condemn action, or inaction, clearly inconsistent with the most vigorous prosecution of the war of which this country is capable. There is, and must be, no room for considerations of political effect or personal consequences, either to those whom we may have to condemn or to ourselves.

It is, therefore, refreshing to one who has been forced to witness so many mistakes, and the results thereof, to find a war activity where it can be said to those directly involved: "This job has been well done." Moreover I do not think it is pure coincidence that this showing of excellent performance has been accomplished largely through the efforts of the men and women who make their livelihoods in performing prosaic, but necessary, day-to-day tasks that go to make up the operation of our transportation systems. The longer hours, the harder work, the stretching to make ends meet, the speeding up of traffic, the concessions, the cooperation, the adjustment to difficult conditions with patience and the willingness to forego peacetime standards of service—these things do not make headlines but they have been the factors through which the record has been compiled.

Now, as to post-war transportation, I realize that anyone, especially a Senator, who makes a categorical statement on this subject at this time, far in advance of the occasion when actual decisions will be made, is sticking his neck out. Yet, I am one who believes that planning should be done now before the arrival of the crisis which will confront us immediately upon the cessation of hostilities. I think that planning should be done through public and private discussion and

debate of all possible alternative proposals. I think this discussion should be candid, but should be entered into with an open mind, with a readiness to be persuaded and to modify positions taken, as errors may be exposed or alternative views may be shown to be wiser.

It is in this light, therefore, that I advance my own individual thoughts about the future of transportation in America. I sincerely hope that they will be of sufficient interest to you, whose livelihoods depend in one form or another upon transportation, to provoke comment. I have a profound conviction that a Senator, or any other legislator, can do his job better by being receptive to the views and arguments of his constituents generally and particularly the representations of those individuals who have a direct concern with the legislation, or lack of it, upon which your legislative representatives are required to make decisions.

A great variety of proposals for modifying the structure of our transportation systems in the post-war period have been and will be made. There are those who advocate complete nationalization of all forms of transportation, and there are others who propose integration under private control. Then, there are others who advocate continuance under the present system with minor adjustments and modifications, most of which have to do with greater or less regulation by the Government.

I do not propose to discuss these plans, or any one of them, in detail, but will content myself with stating what I conceive to be the basic principles of a sound American program in this field. I might say these principles are so broad that they are equally applicable to all other realms of industrial activity.

Merely for the purpose of stating these principles realistically, rather than in a vacuum, I will apply them to one specific plan for the post-war transportation structure which has been advanced. That plan is the so-called integration of modes of transport as proposed by the Transportation Association of America. This plan has been widely publicized by a well-organized group which recommends:

"The organization, over a reasonable period of time, of a limited number of competitive transportation systems, each authorized to develop and furnish all types of facilities and services (or combinations thereof) which are most adaptable for the efficient, economical, and orderly transportation of persons and property."

This recommendation is based upon the following conclusions arrived at by the Transportation Association of America:

"Common-carrier transportation is a public service and its essential facilities cannot be discontinued at will. They must be maintained either under private ownership with public regulation, or under Government ownership. When private ownership continues to be unprofitable for too long a period, Government ownership is inevitable.

"The benefits flowing from the Government's development of the waterways, highways, and airways should be made available on impartial terms to the entire common-carrier industry, as well as to private transportation.

"Fair and equitable regulation of the common-carrier transportation industry, as it is now physically and financially constituted, is not possible under the present policy of enforcing the principle of competition between modes of transport."

The recommendation and the conclusions, at first consideration, strike one as being extremely plausible. Yet, the implication and philosophy of this proposal are in irreconcilable variance with my own views of our American society.

When we speak of integration, I think we should be clear about exactly what that means. Integration of operation or coordination between various modes of transport, through such relatively undeveloped methods as standardized and unit packaging and mechanical transshipment, is one thing, but integration of ownership is another. Because improved integration and coordination of modes of transport will result in improved service and reduced cost to the shipper and is, therefore, desirable, it does not follow that such integration can be achieved only through integrated ownership. Our entire history runs contrary to such a proposition.

Standardization and cooperative action in operation would obviously be easier of achievement if it could be ordered by a dictator of a transportation empire rather than through the agreement and cooperation of a multitude of independent enterprises. Yet what assurance have we that the dictator of our industrial empire would ever issue such an order? Our industrial history teaches us rather that once an industrial empire has been created there is a strong tendency for its management to seek to maintain the status quo by fair means or foul rather than to embark upon new, untried, and speculative undertakings, which, after all, is the only sure means through which progress can be made.

There are over 750 separate operating railroad corporations in the United States. There has long been cooperative action between them in the interchange of equipment and in through rates and through service. Cooperative action is, therefore, proved to be workable without integrated ownership. Such coordination can be extended and improved as to the railroads and it can likewise be extended so as to include coordination between various modes of transport. It is true that in the establishment of joint rates there are many problems which are both important and difficult, but they are not insoluble. Establishment of such joint rates and regulations for operating under fuller coordination between the modes of transport must be worked out cooperatively, but with the central control and plan of a Government agency such as the Interstate Commerce Commission. The reason there must be centralized control by a public agency is that unlimited competition in the establishment of joint service between modes of transport might result in actually defeating the purpose of achieving better service at lower cost through competition because of the establishment of duplicating and unnecessary facilities beyond the point where the volume of business could support them.

As I see it, the mechanical means through which progress in transportation will be made, aside from general modernization in equipment and improvement in administrative organization and techniques, center around devices peculiarly adaptable to the coordinated service I have said was desirable. Among these devices are unit packaging, standardization of packaging and handling procedures, the widespread use of mechanical materials handling equipment such as fork lift trucks, tractors, trailers, and cranes, mechanical means of transshipment between highway, rail, and water-borne equipment, such as demountable truck bodies and ferrying operations—and many other means, some of which have not yet even been conceived. The problems involved are not alone mechanical nor financial but include the relationships between the many and varied elements of the transportation machine and the fundamental structure of our system and are, therefore, to a large degree, governmental. It seems to me that, difficult as these problems are of solution, they present an intriguing challenge to anyone whose heart is in the transportation business. The goal of a strengthened and more plentiful national existence that will inevitably result from an improved transportation service should spur us on.

We want integration of operation, but we certainly do not want that type of integration of ownership which we have witnessed in the past of which the Van Sweringen railroad empire was an outstanding example. To add trucks, busses, barges, and air lines to such an integrated system would only multiply abuses and increase the damage to the public welfare.

Another word used in the recommendation of the Transportation Association of America ought to be clarified. That word is "limited."

The question is, How limited should the number of these so-called competitive transportation systems be?

If we limit the number to one, we have a glorified cartel beyond the wildest dreams of the most rabid advocates of monopoly in history. It probably would be only a temporary transition to complete nationalization. If we limit the number to say four national systems or one system for each railroad territory, or two, or three for each territory—we still have cartel-monopolies only differing in size.

Even if we limit the number to the present number of class I railroads—137—still, we would be freezing a status quo and departing from a fundamental American freedom—the freedom of opportunity. This does not mean that there should be no limit upon engaging in the business of furnishing a public transportation service. We went through that period of development where the lack of limits and the abundant enterprise of our forefathers created more facilities than the volume of business required and we actually got poorer service. We solved this problem by regulation and the device of issuing franchises on the basis of public convenience and necessity.

I certainly do not advocate doing away with this kind of limitation. But this is neither a numerical, nor a static limitation, but, in theory, at least, is sufficiently flexible so as to assure competition and freedom of opportunity but to prevent the chaos, confusion, deterioration of quality of service and even financial losses that attend uncontrolled springing up of enterprises offering a public transportation service.

I think there is a very serious question as to whether or not such limits have not already become too rigid and whether we do not need more transportation enterprises, rather than less. Congress has delegated a very sweeping power to the Interstate Commerce Commission without a detailed definition of standards. I simply suggest that possibly the Interstate Commerce Commission may have gone farther than necessary in discouraging the entry of new blood into the body of our transportation system. I can say, however, that we must not permit anyone to get the idea that a franchise is simply an annuity donated by the public, permitting a life of ease and indolence regardless of the service rendered the public. A certificate of convenience and necessity is rather a privilege to perform a public service for gain—a two-way proposition. When the desire to serve the public ceases—the privilege of receiving the reward should likewise cease.

I am one of those who believe that man's progress toward a higher level of civilization depends upon man's ability to learn and utilize the laws of nature. I have little patience with those who concoct fancy and plausible schemes out of thin air, ignoring the lessons and experiences of the past, and who, because they are convinced that existing methods and systems are imperfect, conclude

that any change, no matter how ill-conceived or ill-founded, would be an improvement.

I hold that one of the fundamental laws of nature is that every living creature is endowed with the will to exist, and that this impulse, in an endless variety of manifestations, is the motive power for all human activity. If this be true, it seems to be clear that the course of wisdom is to conduct ourselves in such fashion that that power is harnessed and utilized to the greatest advantage of all. For, efforts to stifle it or legislate it out of existence will prove futile in any event and probably only serve to cause distortion and suffering.

The reason that I differ with the proposed "integration" of transportation systems, therefore, is that I believe that that proposal is fundamentally based upon the concept that a permanent level or pattern of transportation has been achieved, and it is now simply a question of organizing its structure and distributing its fruits. To me the proposal implies the adoption of the cartel theory which in essence expounds the view that those who at one time, either themselves or more often their predecessors, made signal contributions to the advancement of civilization are, by reason of that fact, entitled to an existence in perpetuity at the expense of society in general without making any further contributions.

This proposition I hold to be fundamentally unsound and unattainable, no matter how desirable it might appear to be. Perfection is always sought, but perfection is never actually attained. It seems to be the fate of humankind always to be looking toward new horizons.

Transportation, like communication, is a basic activity in modern society. Reaching new and higher levels of comfort and happiness through other human activities depends in a very real sense upon progress in transportation. One of the obstacles man has forever been forced to overcome during the course of his development is the obstacle of distance. Like the force of gravity, distance has limited man's activity.

In 1800 if a man took a trip from New York City to New Orleans via stagecoach and horseback, it took him 84 days. In 1944, by regular schedules, that same trip can be made by rail in 32½ hours and by air in slightly over 7½ hours.

In one sense the difference between the traveling time consumed in 1800 and the present represents an extension of living time and permits greater enjoyment and happiness to that extent if we likewise assume that we have sufficient intelligence to take advantage of the extra time achieved.

My question is, How did this come about? Was it because in 1800 someone decided that all we needed to do was organize and equitably distribute what then existed, or was it because the will to exist down through the years induced those persons concerned with transportation to seek to furnish a better service at a lower cost? I say that our country has grown great because it has not stifled the profit motive, but because it has encouraged enterprise and has protected freedom of opportunity.

This should not lead anyone to suppose that I am an advocate of unbridled license. The contraction of our society requires that more and more limits and controls be placed upon this motive power of which I have spoken and these limits and controls are fundamentally the responsibility of our highest unit of organized cooperation, the Government. Many of you are familiar with the investigation of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate, of which I had the honor to be vice chairman, and you will recall that shocking disregard of the public interest was exhibited on the part of many financial interests who essentially controlled the railroad system. Many of you are also aware of efforts directed at competitors, not through furnishing a better service at a lower cost, but to seek by artificial means to destroy the competitor or render him impotent.

I say that these manifestations of the will to exist are a perversion of liberty and that all of us, and especially the Government, must redouble our vigilance, our courage, and our action to overcome them wherever they may be found.

We have not reached perfection in transportation. Great fields for the full play of inventions and ingenuity lie ahead. Many problems remain to the solved. The improved service which can be achieved through improved coordination of modes of transport and elimination of archaic methods staggers the imagination. America is not ready to retire. The goal of security and ease is illusory. Our policy must be to encourage initiative, not to exclude it. The Government's function should be, not to direct and operate transportation systems either itself or through cartels, but rather to police and curb manifestations of self-interest which are harmful to growth and progress.

Dark days still lie before us. Confusion and disorder surround us. Yet, I have faith, even at a time when appearances are all to the contrary, that mankind will come to learn, observe, and utilize the laws of nature and thus achieve a level of happiness and well-being not now possible of conception.

I thank you.

The American Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The American Spirit, delivered by me before the annual merchandising school and sales show of the Wisco Hardware Co., Crystal Ballroom, Hotel Loraine, Madison, Wis., January 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two years ago, in January of 1942, it was my privilege to address this group. At that time we had been at war for less than 2 months. Since that meeting 2 years ago world history has been written. Many lives have been lost. Much blood has been shed. But we are on the road to eventual victory.

We've cleared Africa. We've knocked Mussolini out of the war. We're pounding Hitler's fortress of Europe from the skies with the mightiest air armada ever assembled.

We're pushing mightily against the southern door of Hitler's fortress and Russia is doing to Hitler what she did to Napoleon. Hitler can only turn inland. From the Finland Gulf to the Sea of Azov the Russian regiments are hurling him backward to the shambles of air-devastated Berlin.

In an arc across Italy, from England and around to Iraq and Iran, Britain and the United States draw closer and closer in a ring of steel and fire.

Nimitz, MacArthur, Mountbatten, and Chiang Kai-shek are likewise drawing a steel noose closer around Tojo. The spectacular raids of our Navy and our marines and our Army in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands is evidence of remarkable progress.

We've come a long way since our last meeting 2 years ago, but we still have a long, hard trip ahead. On the Japanese front, for example, it is possible that our present advances may not reach their climax until the summer of 1945, when real pressure could be applied against the Japanese mainland from all sides. It might take all of 1944 and a good share of 1945 to get adequate bases for supply and offensive operations in the far Pacific.

You will recall incidentally that the Navy recently announced the construction of some 45,000-ton aircraft carriers. That indicates that the men who make plans for the American Navy aren't taking any chances. We will have a powerful super-aircraft-carrier fleet ready for the final attack against Japan in 1945.

We've been at war with Japan for 2 years and it has taken all that time to get a foothold in strategic bases. We know, of course, that the campaign against Japan will be stepped up just as soon as Hitler is defeated. This will mean that most of the units of the British Navy will be available to help in the Burma campaign which has been developing in the Bay of Bengal. This year we know that Mountbatten will do substantial damage to the enemy communications, but it is unlikely that he will achieve his objectives until the winter of 1944–45.

If we can whip Japan by the summer of 1945 or even by 1946, it will be the most remarkable feat in the history of naval warfare. It will mean that we will have successfully fought an enemy, 7,000 to 10,000 miles away.

The German battle won't be finished overnight either. It isn't just a matter of reducing Berlin to ashes. Not so long ago, Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Assistant Chief of Staff and Chief of Military Intelligence, sent every Member of Congress a report on the strength of the Axis. That report contained some sobering information. It pointed out that the Nazis lost 20 divisions at Stalingrad and 8 in north Africa, but nevertheless managed to raise more than 60 new divisions in 1943, each with 600 machine guns and 300 heavier weapons. In other words, German war industry is still producing despite bombings.

The Nazi manpower situation isn't as bad as we hoped. According to the Strong report, in June 1939 there were 23,000,000 war workers. In November of 1943 it was estimated that there were 35,000,000 including some 7,000,000 foreign civilian workers and prisoners of war. In addition to this impressive total, there is a vassal slave population of 325,000,000 persons.

Despite bombings, the Nazi production schedule is still high. In 1942 Germany and her satellites produced 42,000,000 tons of steel as against 25,000,000 in 1939. Her coal production was 186,000,000 tons and Axis Europe produced almost twice that amount.

The German harvest for 1943 surpassed any crop output since the war. All of these facts mean that we must not be overconfident. We have every reason to believe that we will be victorious but we also have every reason to believe that there is still a long, hard battle ahead.

Now the Wisco organization—today as 2 years ago—is exceptionally foresighted in planning to meet every contingency. I have every confidence that throughout the war and in the post-war period, you will continue to make an outstanding contribution on the home front.

That won't always be easy. It hasn't been easy at any time during the past 2 years. Our military record has been unbelievably

splendid but our domestic record has been marred by grave shortcomings.

These shortcomings transcend party politics—and I do not refer to them in any narrow partisan sense. I can say to this group here today, however, that I would be gravely remiss in my obligation to small business if I did not point out that small business faces annihilation—along with many of our cherished ideals—if we do not arrest the dangerous erosion of certain very fundamental and integral parts of the American pattern of life.

It is perfectly obvious to every schoolboy in the land that our entire national life had to be sharply altered during the war. Rules and regulations are a natural part of war. Many of them were poorly conceived and almost all of them were badly administered—but at least they were born in the legitimate wedlock of wartime supply and demand.

I say to you today that if your business and the so-called American system is to survive, it is vital now for every one of us to carefully establish—now—our post-war objectives—after which we can adopt our post-war plans.

It isn't enough for a group such as this one to plan merely for its own business. This group must also continue to manifest an active interest in the affairs and policies of government. Our businesses and our lives will have to fit into a governmental framework, and it's up to us to insist on getting the kind of a framework we want.

We are fighting the totalitarian lands. We don't like their way of life and we don't like their kind of government, so I suppose we will not want that kind of a government in post-war America.

Let's analyze our objections to totalitarian governments:

First of all—every totalitarian land is characterized by a certain type of defeatism. It is the kind of defeatism which throttles all individual thinking. It is the kind of defeatism which says that it is useless to protest any governmental trend, such trends are inevitable. It is the kind of defeatism which says that there must be more and more socialization. It is the kind of defeatism which says that individual initiative and free enterprise are dying and can never be revived. It is the kind of defeatism which says that individuals and businesses must come hat-in-hand to government for help if they are to survive with any degree of security.

That brings us to the second most obvious characteristic of totalitarian lands. In every one of these countries there is a complete dependence of the people on government. Government isn't dependent on the people, in the manner conceived by Jefferson. Instead the people are dependent on government. That isn't a brilliant or startling observation, and yet it is something which doesn't seem to alarm us sufficiently.

It is well for us to remember every day of our lives that for every scrap of food or clothing or money for which we are dependent on government, we surrender a portion of our independence, a portion of our freedom. Sometimes that is necessary. When poverty or famine or disaster stalk our land, when there is pestilence or plague we naturally turn to the Government of our country.

My point is that we cannot start on the defeatist idea that there is always famine or disaster or plague in all of our land. There is a place for a national medical and health program, for example; but when that program automatically takes over all of your personal health problems, when it automatically takes over all physicians, then it becomes socialism. I might add, incidentally, that, in connection with post-war planning a number of socialized health programs have been discussed, some of them sounding suspiciously like the German system.

Dependence on Government usually has its origin in a financial dependence. If businessmen can't establish a little nest egg for the post-war period of conversion back to a civilian economy, they may have to come to Government hat in hand asking for help, and then turning over their plants to college-boy theorists and long-haired investigators with questionnaires.

If Government hangs on to its federally owned war plants, then Government itself will be in business, and on a tax-free basis at that. I believe in the principle of establishing adequate conversion reserves for industry, and I also believe that Government must make and announce its decision now with respect to the sale of federally owned war plants.

With reference to another phase of dependence, I might add that no thinking person wants to see the veteran permanently dependent on Government. Help for the veteran? Financial help, medical help, yes, any and every help. Everyone wants to help to the greatest possible degree. But we don't want that help to become a political football. We don't want that veteran to become so hopelessly dependent on Government that he becomes a serf. We want him to have every conceivable assistance but we also want him to have every conceivable opportunity—opportunity for rehabilitation, opportunity to earn a decent livelihood for himself and his family.

A third characteristic of dictator governments is the obliteration of local-government units. I am opposed to the elimination of local-government units. I regret keenly that in the past few years there has been a definite encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of State government. For example, the Federal Government (or at least the present administration) has attempted consistently to federalize the unemployment-compensation systems. In Wisconsin that would probably mean the destruction of one of the finest unemployment systems ever devised, and I might add that I have opposed any such unwarranted federalization.

A fourth characteristic of government under the dictators is obviously a strong centralization of government. That might mean the Federal administration of education, with little regard for localized problems. That could mean the administration of a program of price control or rationing or regulation, strictly on a national basis from a national headquarters and by national administrators, in war and peace, whether needed or not.

I do not hesitate to say that the entire O. P. A. program would have been infinitely stronger if the national policy had been, first, clearly conceived and clearly expressed; and secondly, administered by a decentralized system conscious of local problems.

. fifth factor in the growth of any totalitarian government has been the creation of an enormous public debt—which meant in effect that government took over all of the nation and its resources.

I'd like to linger on this point for just a few moments because I feel that it is extremely important. First of all, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, let me say that as the son of thrifty, hard-working Norwegian immigrant parents, I still can't understand how you can become prosperous by accumulating debts you can't pay.

Price controls alone can't prevent inflation. If our Nation spends recklessly we will have inflation regardless of any price control. Some of the brain trusters in Washington think that you can have a public debt of two or three times our national income. I don't know how long a retail-hardware business in southern Wisconsin could survive on that basis—and I don't know how a government can survive unscathed.

We can't compare our debt with the debt of Great Britain or France before the war. It is true for example that France had the highest per capita debt in the world—but it was in terms of long-term bonds and so was Britain's.

Only one-eighth of the British debt ran for 2 years or less and the rest had long-term maturities. We know that a debtor can carry a big load if his creditors can't demand payment for 25 or 50 years.

In the United States, however, half of our debt of $190,000,000,000 is payable within 2 years—and half of that can be cashed by the holder in a period of days or months.

Now I don't pretend to know how much of a debt this country can and should carry. A number of executives have said that we can carry a $300,000,000,000 war debt if we don't add to the debt after the war ends. That last part begins to make sense. It was estimated that in 1943 the "inflationary gap" caused by excess spending was around fifty billion. Now, that gap must be closed. That will probably mean a combination of taxes—and reduced spending, and production of more civilian goods.

While I'm on the subject of taxes and the public debt—it might be well to comment briefly on social-security pay-roll levies.

This group is familiar with the fact that the old-age benefit tax originally was scheduled to increase from 1 percent to 2 percent on January 1, 1943, and then Congress postponed this increase until January of 1944. Personally, I have felt that reserves are amply for current liabilities and I have opposed increases in the rate—particularly if the increased revenue were diverted to other purposes.

A sixth characteristic of strongly centralized governments has been a strong desire to foist its ideas on the rest of the world. Once in a great while that is excellent, but sometimes it means perpetuating certain domestic blunders on a large international scale.

Our congressional committees have been considering a proposal for a $10,000,000,000 United Nations bank. We are advised that this bank is to assist in the reconstruction and development of member countries. That's a commendable objective, but it is just barely possible that the bank may really be the mechanism for international pump priming. If so, there isn't much assurance that it will be any more successful on an international scale than it has been on a domestic scale.

Some time ago we heard a great deal about a world-wide triple A and a world-wide commodity credit corporation. Neither one of these programs succeeded on a domestic scale and here again there is nothing to convince any reasonable person that they will succeed on an international scale.

Please don't misinterpret these statements as being in any manner in opposition to international collaboration. I do believe in such collaboration, and for that very reason I am reluctant to subscribe to an international program which exactly duplicates some of our domestic blunders. I don't want to see the kind of international dependency which we create on a national scale—because I believe that dependency of this type offers grave dangers to free government and free peoples.

Now everything I've said thus far sounds as though I didn't have confidence in the future. As a matter of fact, along with most Americans I have every faith in the future of America. In order to realize our hopes and our faith in this future, it is necessary, however, for us to be aware of certain dangers in the world-wide trend toward socialization.

I am confident that we will emerge from this war with a toughened moral fiber—and that we will reject any witch-doctor attempts to sell us easy cures. The war is teaching us that only by sweat and blood can we win a victory. That will be equally true in the post-war period. You can't win a war by

legislation and we won't be able to whip our post-war problems by legislation alone.

There will be a tremendous desire to swing back to our free-enterprise system after the war. The war has demonstrated what industry and business can do in supplying the sinews of war. After the war there will be a tremendous volume of foreign reconstruction needs. There will be an accumulated domestic demand for consumers' durable goods. Many industries will need new machinery and equipment. Individuals and corporations will have accumulated some savings (if we adopt intelligent tax laws). There will be a boom in residential construction.

All of these factors will make for a prosperous era—if we do not discard certain fundamentals.

At the outset of this discussion we reviewed the past 24 months. We went back to the days when a good share of our fleet was lying in Pearl Harbor and Japan was sweeping over the Philippines, Hong Kong, Singapore, the Dutch East Indies, Burma, and the perimeter of islands flanking Australia.

Today, when our fleet is twice the size it was at Pearl Harbor, today when our air force is the largest in the world, we realize that we have effected the most remarkable progress in all military history.

When we met some 2 years ago, better than 90 percent of our economy was a civilian economy. Despite that civilian economy we armed the British. We sent them bombers hot off the assembly line. We built ships and sent them out loaded faster than the U-boats could sink them. We sent new weapons and food to the Russians—sent them through the hazards off the Norwegian coast. We took on that kind of a job at a time when we were raising and training our own Army and our own Navy and our own Air Force. At the same time we were building our 2-ocean Navy and our merchant fleet of 30,000,000 tons, and our air fleet of more than 100,000 planes.

American initiative and American industry and American business did that job. Our system of free enterprise formed the basis for our production miracles.

That freedom of enterprise must be preserved for our fighting men. Your job is to see that it is preserved. Your job is "to merchandise" this product. It's part of the goods you hold in trust for your children and those who come after in America. Don't succumb to the doctrine that a continued expansion of government is inevitable or that the state is the master.

We will win this war, and we will win a worth-while post-war era of peace, but we will do so only if we are alert and vigilant. Pearl Harbor taught this Nation for all time to come this lesson, that it must remain constantly on guard on the international front. Likewise we must on the home front remain alert and vigilant lest we lose our birthright.

Inflation and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the subject of inflation and subsidies, written by the Honorable Peter Zimmerman, of Yamhill, Oreg., and published in the Sunday, January 30, 1944, issue of the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION, SUBSIDIES

To the EDITOR:

There are only three ways of stopping higher prices or inflation.

First. Lower incomes for people. Pay cuts.

Second. Taxes which take more of people's income.

Third. Increased production.

Any plan to combat inflation not based on one or more of these methods is a fake.

No. 1 is impractical.

No. 2 is difficult.

No. 3, Increased production, is the solution to this problem that is both possible and practical.

Every disastrous inflation in history has resulted from large-scale deficit financing by the Government over an extended period. The cause of inflation is huge Government expenditures, inflated profits and salaries and wages, coupled with a scarcity of food, labor, and goods. Government is pouring out more than it is collecting in taxes. Subsidies are part of the outflow that feeds the purse of inflation.

According to this administration's reports the excessive buying power in the hands of the public in 1943 was $36,000,000,000, and it is predicted it will be $47,000,000,000 in 1944. The effect of subsidies is to put more buying power in the hands of the public, when the need now is either reduce that buying power or increase production. From this unquestioned fact we may draw the conclusion that subsidies should be used sparingly and then only when the good done is far greater than the harm. The real harm in subsidies is when they boost buying power more than they stabilize prices.

Under the pressure of organized groups the administration rolled back prices to agriculture and at the same time increased profits and salaries and wages, repealed income taxes under a pretense of pay-as-you-go. Here is a clear case of the administration rolling money out of the treasury to add it to the inflationary tide without compensating advantages. Handing more money to people who as a group already have more money than they can spend is a direct stimulus to inflation. A stand against subsidies is a direct fight against inflation. Sponsors of the roll-back idea advance two arguments.

First, they claim it will help income classes whose salaries have not kept pace with war salaries. But the subsidies are not confined to this class, they go to everybody.

A food stamp plan would serve this purpose much better and with less than one-fifth the cost.

Second, they claim it will aid the President in holding the line against wage increases. In other words, subsidies are needed to appease labor. The facts are that average hourly wages have advanced much faster than the cost of living. Since the roll-back of farm prices by the administration last spring wages have advanced from 8 to 20 percent by consent of the administration. Yet farm prices have been rolled back until the farmer is being rolled off of his farm, and farm production is on the decline. This again means less food and fiber, while the people have more money in their pockets. This can only fan the flames of inflation. A cost of production to agriculture as to industry will stimulate production, eliminate scarcities and drain off some of the surplus buying power now looking for the food to nourish healthy families.

PETER ZIMMERMAN,
Yamhill, Oreg.

The Soldier Vote Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress who hears me and every person who has reached the age of understanding knows that those Members of Congress who took a position as recorded by their vote on the previous question had made up their minds as to how they would vote on proposed amendments and on the soldier vote bill as it shall come to the roll call.

Although for the last 2 days we have enjoyed the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution, not a vote has been made for or against the bill despite all the oratory and arguments. So the sooner we get down to brass tacks and send the bill along to the other branch for confirmation or rejection, the quicker we will get back to what was once called normalcy, which was not such a bad word though that status was not what it was anticipated it would be.

But before I take my own suggestions too seriously, let me call your attention to an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning:

STAB IN THE DARK

The Worley bill is to be killed, apparently, and it is to be killed covertly, in camera. The killing of it may be good or bad as you prefer. No matter; that is not the issue here. The issue is a starkly simple one: How is the democratic process to survive if it is carried on in darkness, when our Representatives decline to stand up and be counted. These men in Congress are our Representatives; not our rulers. If they do not represent us, it is the basic theory of our governmental system that we may replace them.

When the vote for concealment is analyzed, it is hard to deny the contention of those who see a heavy dose of politics in the entire controversy. With 11 honorable exceptions, the entire Republican membership of the House—180 strong—recorded themselves against a record vote. Fifty-two Democrats joined these Republicans. And it is noteworthy that all of the 52, with only one exception, hailed from the South. Perhaps this is shrewd politics. We think that the American people will not so regard it.

The decision of Congress in respect to soldier voting is no routine, trivial affair. It may determine the outcome of a national election. It will vitally affect millions of American citizens. Why are the gentlemen of the House afraid? The fear they have displayed will stigmatize whatever action they may take. For it will indelibly mark that action as the choice of men who were ashamed to acknowledge what they wished to do. And it will stamp it as the work of men who do not care enough about democracy to act in its traditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not jealous of the aura of glory placed on the brow of the invincible 11, but I do insist that while they stood up to vote "no," I stood up to vote that there should be no violation of the Constitution of the United States or of the established rules of the

House in order to permit the recognition of such a proposition as that for which they contended. I stood up and was counted for that in which I believed as will again be evidenced when I vote against certain proposals and for the bill eventually—and the sooner the better.

The Post editorial is so clearly and evidently written under a misapprehension and misunderstanding of the situation, or with deliberate attempt to misrepresent it, that no other comment need be made.

My attention has been called to an editorial by the publisher of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times which, generally speaking, pretty well covers my sentiments; so I am inserting it here and now:

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS OATH

(By Basil Brewer, publisher, the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times)

The President is engaged in the most powerful vote drive of his career.

He and his advisers have decided the votes of 11,000,000 men in service are all-important in the coming fourth-term election.

He believes the servicemen will vote largely for himself, the Commander in Chief, as in past American history.

Says the President:

"Our millions of fighting men do not have any lobby or pressure group on Capitol Hill to see that justice is done for them."

But by the President's decision, the servicemen now have the most powerful political force of our times lobbying and pressing for them—the President himself.

Says the President:

"As their Commander in Chief I am sure I can express their (the servicemen's) wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discrimination which is being practiced against them."

The truth is the resentment of the servicemen against wartime voting difficulties, if it exists at all, is a result of a "build-up" by just such statements as that of the President on January 26, from which the above is quoted.

Equally brought about by "build-up" is resentment, if any, of the people generally.

In 150 years of the country's history, including five previous wars, resentment by servicemen and the people against voting difficulties in war has been largely nonexistent.

It largely is nonexistent today—on the part of the real fighting men.

Says the President:

"The American people cannot believe that the Congress will permit those who are fighting for political freedom to be deprived of a voice in choosing the personnel of their own Federal Government."

Significantly, it is thus revealed the voting arrangements for the servicemen which the President demands do not include voting in their State primaries, where State and Federal candidates are to be nominated.

The relief which the President demands does not include arrangements to vote for candidates for Governor or other State or local offices.

Says the President:

"Congress has not the same 'authority'" here, "nor would it be practical to do so."

Thus the President's indignation and demand ignore both State primaries and State elections, two out of three of the voting rights of servicemen.

"Deeply aroused," the President demands action to permit the servicemen to vote—only for Federal candidates.

It is, of course, a foregone conclusion the President will be one of these Federal candidates.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution provides no iota of authority to Congress or the President to interfere in State or Federal elections in peace or war.

By amendment 10, adopted at the time the Constitution was adopted, all "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In 150 years of the country's history, the right of the States to determine who shall vote in State and Federal elections was not challenged—by the Federal Government, or otherwise.

By constitutional amendments, the States themselves have limited their voting rights as follows:

Section I, amendment 15—

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Amendment 17—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Amendment 19—

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Only one reference exists in the Constitution to rights of Congress in elections, article I, section 4:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations."

Congress is given here the right only to "alter regulations" concerning the "time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives" only.

There is no power here to alter either the time, place, or manner of holding elections for President or Vice President.

There is no power here to take from the States the right to determine exclusively the qualifications of voters.

Yet, on the slender and illegal ground of article I, section 4, Congress passed, and the President signed, Public Law 712, the present Federal absentee balloting law.

Law 712 took from the States, and of course unconstitutionally, the right of the States to require registration or poll tax as a requisite for voting by servicemen.

In his message to Congress of January 26, the President said significantly, in advocating the Green-Lucas bill:

"Certainly it (the Green-Lucas bill) does not violate States' rights any more than Public Law 712, which was passed by a substantial majority of the Congress in September 1942."

Thus is the President indicted in his own utterance.

Public Law 712 was, as the President says, passed by Congress, and was, as he did not say, signed by the President.

It is of course, as said, unconstitutional.

Public Law 712 now becomes justification for further invasions of the Constitution by the Green-Lucas bill.

WASHINGTON

It is, of course, impractical, and may be wrong in principle, to make poll-tax payment a condition for voting for servicemen.

Of course, it is impossible for most of the servicemen to register in their States in order to vote.

But the Constitution leaves this power to the States; the remedy, if any, likewise lies there.

Far more serious than the injustices which may prevent many servicemen from voting—

Is the invasion of the Constitution, for which the soldiers and all fight—

By attempted federalization, or a step toward federalization, of elections.

With divine inspiration Washington foresaw and warned, in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.

"But let there be no change by usurpation: For though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

"The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

Let each Member of Congress prayerfully consider these words of Washington as he strives to remedy the alleged injustices of soldier voting.

And let each Member of Senate and House, and the President, look to his oath of office in connection therewith.

LINCOLN AND ROOSEVELT

The problem of servicemen's voting in war is not new.

It has existed in all five previous wars of this country, since the Constitution was adopted and the Government organized.

Never before has there been a pressure drive to arouse the servicemen and emphasize their voting problems.

Never before has there been a demand, from a candidate or otherwise, to nullify State law, or evade it.

In the dark days of 1864, Lincoln was greatly worried as to the results of his coming election.

The North was winning great battles, but McClellan threatened to defeat Lincoln and dictate the peace.

"Unconditional surrender" of the South was the issue of Lincoln's campaign against McClellan.

More than 1,000,000 voters were in the armed services of the North, mostly absent from their States.

It was suspected then by Lincoln and his supporters, as it is now by the President, the soldiers and sailors were for "the Commander in Chief."

The soldier vote, when finally counted, showed almost 5 to 1 for Lincoln.

Yet only 150,000 of the total of more than 1,000,000 soldiers voted.

Carl Sandburg says "hundreds of thousands of soldiers whose ballots would have been given to the President (Lincoln) had no chance to vote, either because of required marching and fighting, or because their home State legislatures had refused them the right of voting in the field."

Yet at no time was there the slightest suggestion that methods of election be changed—made to order for and by "the Commander in Chief."

At no time was there even the suggestion of violating States' rights, as established by the Constitution.

The history of 1864 does not disclose the slightest resentment from the soldiers whose fighting prevented their voting.

Indiana, where the legislature was "Copperhead," was a doubtful State.

The draft law was bitterly resented there as elsewhere.

Governor Morton suggested the draft be relaxed until after Indiana's October election.

Lincoln responded, "It is better we both should be beaten, than that the forces at the front be weakened and perhaps defeated."

The Democratic electors in Tennessee objected to the voting instructions fixed by the Governor.

Lincoln replied, "I can have nothing to do with the matter. By the Constitution and the laws the President is charged with no duty in a Presidential election in any State."

Lincoln received 55 percent of the total vote, as against 80 percent of the soldier vote.

THE ELECTION OF 1918

In November 1918, elections for House and Senate were held.

America and her allies were winning the First World War; the armistice came just 7 days after the election.

Woodrow Wilson, concerned with the problems of the peace, made the great political mistake of his career.

He demanded that the people elect Democratic Members of Congress to cooperate with the President in concluding the war and the peace.

The people responded by electing a Republican Congress; the League of Nations was defeated.

Wilson broke his health and life in the resultant struggle.

But not once was there the suggestion from Wilson or elsewhere that Federal Government proscribe or limit the rights of the States to declare who should vote, whether soldiers in service or otherwise.

POST CARDS VERSUS PIN-UPS

On January 20, before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Col. Robert Cutler, representing the Army, expressed doubt that "the men in action would be interested in February in an election in November."

This, from the Army headquarters, did not indicate the servicemen were "burned up" on the subject of November voting.

Yet, on January 26, 6 days later, the President said:

"As their Commander in Chief I am sure I can express their (the soldiers') wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discrimination which is being practiced against them."

The President's plan provides recommendations, as stated, only for servicemen's voting for Federal candidates, including President and Vice President.

It declares it is impractical to provide servicemen the means for voting in State primaries or in State elections.

This is borne out by statements of the Secretaries of Navy and War, who declare unqualifiedly the military forces cannot transmit State primary or general election ballots.

Yet in his same message of January 26 the President says to the servicemen:

"In fact, since they (the ballot laws he urges) provide for a post-card system to implement the State laws, each voter is given at least as great an opportunity to vote for State and local candidates as he would have under any legislation."

"As great an opportunity to vote for State and local candidates as any other plan" is, of course, just no opportunity at all.

Thus with verbiage the President tries to camouflage the fact that what he is pleading for and demanding is the right of the serviceman to vote for Federal candidates only, including himself.

Colonel Cutler, representing the Army, says the men in action are not interested in February "in the November elections."

That undoubtedly is the correct appraisal.

And if they learn in the far-off fighting fronts of the President's "deep anxiety"—not for their voting rights but for their votes—this also will leave them cold.

Almost any serviceman would then trade 12 of these Presidential post cards for 1 real fascinating pin-up.

TRANSPORTATION ONLY

Clearly we do not fight for the right of any man or group to manipulate the voting provisions of the law or Constitution to favor any group or candidate in time of war or peace.

Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, has well pointed out the menace of tampering with the constitutional election provisions.

Said the eminent Senator on the floor of the Senate on January 14:

"If our servicemen are fighting in far-off places to destroy the Constitution of the United States and all that it holds for them, there is not one of them who knows it. Yet, while they are fighting in far-off places for America, for its Constitution, and for all that it means, there are those who are seeking to set aside our democratic and constitutional processes and erect instead a government on a Hitlerian model by denying to our servicemen the Constitution for which they are contending.

"Therefore, while all of us want all the men and women in the armed forces to have the right to vote, we must legislate to achieve that result within the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States, for it is the same Constitution in time of war that it is in time of peace. If we do not legislate in this fashion the law will be illegal. More than that—it can be challenged in every precinct, election district, and State in the Union. In hundreds of precincts the votes of the soldiers will be thrown out and not counted. That is the possibility which overzealous advocates of fly-by-night legislation are seeking to put over on the gallant men and women of our armed forces. We must not let such a debacle at the ballot boxes take place. We must nip this deception in its budding. We must give the soldiers the right to vote and we must do it in such fashion that no legal question about the validity of that law can be raised or sustained. To do less than this is to embrace treachery to men who are dying in far-off battlefields even as I speak."

The only truly valid and legal thing which Congress can do to facilitate the voting of servicemen is to provide transportation—transportation of State and Federal primary and general election ballots, wherever possible, to all those qualified by State laws, to vote in their respective States.

It insults the suffrage rights and intelligence of servicemen to demand for them only the right to vote for Federal officers.

The right of the serviceman to vote in State and Federal elections cannot be halved or divided.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

There is confusion in all our minds, including servicemen, as to what we are fighting for.

A few facts, however, are crystal clear.

Clearly we fight to destroy Hitler and Hirohito—their plans of world domination would destroy America.

We fight for the preservation of our liberty—for the right to rule ourselves, in our chosen way.

Our Government in America, its virtues, its very sins shall forever be our own.

All this of course also is crystal clear.

But unless, while winning, we yet would lose, it must be equally clear—

We are fighting to preserve our Constitution, even in its shortcomings and errors, if these exist—

Until those errors are remedied by amendment, as provided in the Constitution.

The Constitution must not be changed by evasion, deception, or decree.

If the Constitution gives Georgia or Alabama, or any other State, the right to make payment of poll tax a requisite for voting—

We must defend that right—as well as all other rights—with our lives.

Only thus can we defend our constitutional form of government—from which spring all our liberties—all that makes the lives of freemen worth living.

For the greatest of all freedoms is the freedom to err, within the Constitution and the law.

When there is no freedom to err, within the law, there no longer will be freedom to do right—nor any right nor wrong nor freedom whatsoever.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my State has written me as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Montpelier, January 29, 1944.

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLES: Yesterday I received a wire from STYLES BRIDGES concerning the soldiers' ballot now under consideration by the Congress. So that you will be informed of the message sent to me and my reply, I set them forth below.

The message from the Senator was as follows: "Will you and your State be able to provide the necessary State voting machinery so that our armed forces have full opportunity to vote if the Federal Government will give complete cooperation in handling ballots? Please wire."

My reply was: "Re your tel, yes."

With regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WILLS.

Verbum sat sapienti, except to say that I shall vote for a bill which I believe to be constitutional and one which affords the soldiers and sailors, and others entitled to act under its provisions, the right to cast a legal vote, not to throw a piece of worthless paper into a box or away.

I am determined that, insofar as my vote can help, each and all of those in the armed forces shall have as nearly as may be the same privileges and opportunities of and for voting wherever they are as they would have were they at home.

This is what all of us are fighting for.

The White-Collared Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems in the American scene today is the plight of the fixed-salaried and white-collar employee. These two groups are among the largest classifications of our wage earners. Included in these categories are Federal, State, municipal, and county employees. Also, those employed by banks, public-

utility corporations, stores, brokerage concerns, and almost every other field not engaged in manufacture or construction.

These people for the major part are attempting to live on salaries that were established in the final days of the depression. It is true that that some of these people have received slight increases, but for the major part their salaries have not been raised during the past 2 years. They are a class of people whom we who represent the large cities consider an essential part of the background of our metropolitan communities. They are the people in the forty-to-seventy-five-dollar-a-week category. The great majority of them are married and have families plus other responsibilities. Many of them are home owners with large mortgages on their homesteads. Many of them were striving desperately in normal times to give their children collegiate or professional education. Today, these people do not know where to turn. They have seen rent, clothing, food, and all of the other necessities of life rise in cost by leaps and bounds.

Their own incomes are stabilized, but during the last 2 years they have seen the cost of living advance almost 40 percent. It has been necessary for these people to reduce their standards of living. They have had to give up many of the small pleasures that we Americans considered our just due. Not only have they been greatly affected by the increased cost of living, but they have been dealt another terrific blow by reason of the 20-percent withholding tax. Then many of them are expected to contribute 10 percent of the balance of their greatly reduced salaries for War bonds and other drives connected with the war effort. These people are gradually approaching poverty. In many instances they have found it necessary to sell at great personal sacrifice, both financially and sentimentally, the homes for which they saved for many years. Others have been forced to give up the hope of education and professional training for their children for they can no longer afford that burden.

Their reduced spending power is in turn felt by the local butcher, baker, shoemaker, movie-theater operator, and every other businessman with whom they formerly left part of their income. This has created a vicious and depressing cycle. It has created a new class of poor.

No one in this Congress is more opposed to inflation than I. No one has less desire to see a wild spree of spending than I. But I do feel that some means must be found to give this great group of our people not so much increased spending power, but sufficient wages and salaries that will permit them to live and maintain the standard of living that was theirs and which contributed so much to the material well-being of our cities and large towns.

It is my opinion that either the President of the United States or this Congress should appoint a commission to study this problem together with experts of the Treasury Department. In a war, the morale of our armed forces will always be a reflection of the morale of the home front. If the morale of the great mass of our people at home is allowed to drop, you may rest assured that victory will be delayed with the consequent cost of hundreds of thousands of additional lives and billions of dollars.

Gentlemen, this matter must be studied and an answer must be found.

Address of the Honorable Louis E. Miller, of Missouri, Before the St. Louis Medical Society on the Wagner-Murray Bill and Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable LOUIS E. MILLER, before the St. Louis Medical Society, St. Louis, Mo., on January 7, 1944.

The address follows:

Mr. President and members of the medical profession, I feel not only highly honored, but deeply grateful to be present and point out some of the vicious implications of the pending Wagner-Murray bill, insofar as it affects the practice of medicine in America. However, I cannot proceed to a discussion of this bill, without first pausing to pay to your profession public acknowledgment of the great service which you are rendering to mankind at home and abroad under most difficult conditions. The war has made unexpected and unusual demands upon your time and talents. A vast number of your associates have given up profitable private practice to minister to the needs of the men and women in the armed forces. The great advances of the last decade or two in medicine and surgery have brought to an anxious America the comforting assurance that fewer casualties will be permanently incapacitated than obtained in the last war. The triumphs achieved by medical science will mean that many who would have died will live and become useful citizens. Those of you whose lot it has been to remain at home are rendering a great service in protecting the health of the civic population and the soldiers of production behind the lines.

These things you have been able to do because your profession has been free—free to follow the paths of research without official interference; free to try and to triumph without dependence upon political favor; free to progress and to practice subject only to such limits as your personal ability, training, and initiative might prescribe. You have a right to expect some measure of material reward for the years of education and study which you have devoted to preparing yourselves for your profession.

Notwithstanding all this there is a school of thought presently ensconced in public office, as powerful as it is ruthless, which favors complete Federal control of the practice of medicine. While the Nation fights a global war to rid the world of foreign dictators the starry-eyed planners and disciples of the discredited and almost defunct New Deal plot to foist a domestic dictator in Washington upon your profession. They have tried to destroy the confidence of the people in their own instrument of control over their Government, the Congress. In their subtle campaign to undermine the American system they have ridiculed the founding fathers as mercenary malefactors and selfish schemers. They picture the pioneers who helped make this country the greatest industrial empire in the world, as a group of brazen buccaneers gorged with greed and actuated by avarice. The purpose of these plotters is plain. They attempt to tear down American institutions as well as our form of government and substitute instead the master plan of State socialism. Shall we allow them to succeed? Shall we win the war but in doing so lose our constitutional form of government? Shall we sacrifice priceless American lives and treasure in destroying foreign dictatorships and the evils which they have inflicted upon the world only to set up a subtle scheme for a domestic dictatorship here? The answer is an emphatic "No." They cannot succeed if the American people are aroused to a full realization of their foul purposes.

It is an age-old trick of the demagog to cloak his scheme under the specious pretext of protecting the poor or giving security and aid to the unfortunate.

Let's proceed to an examination of the Wagner-Murray bill. Let us submit it to the sunlight of a searching inquiry. If there is evil in it, then the evil should be exposed. While on the other hand, if it be filled with good and be a blessing to mankind, as its proponents claim, then the more it is subjected to the light of a genial inquiry the more illuminating must its shining greatness appear.

The plan of administration is set up in the following language: "The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is hereby authorized and directed to take all necessary and practical steps to arrange for the availability of the benefits provided under this title." In order to give the plan a semblance of respectability, section 904 provides for a national advisory medical and hospital council of 16 members. However, there is no requirement that the membership must be chosen from the medical profession. The entire personnel of the council is chosen by the Surgeon General; it is without authority and its functions are purely advisory since all authority and power are lodged in the Surgeon General. The bill provides profligately for its administration and maintenance.

A trust fund is established to be known as a Federal social-insurance trust fund, and all social-security taxes are to go into this fund. The fund is to be created from the following sources and by levying upon (sec. 960) every employer a tax of 6 percent on all wages he pays up to $3,000 per year and by levying upon (sec. 961) every employee a tax of 6 percent to be deducted from all wages on earned income up to $3,000. In addition (sec. 963) every self-employed person shall pay a tax of 7 percent on the market value of his services up to $3,000 per year and under section 962 all Federal, State, and municipal employees (under certain conditions) shall pay a tax of 3.5 percent and the respective governments, by which they are employed, a corresponding tax of an equal amount. In short, this would create a total tax or levy of 26 percent. From these figures it would follow that the total annual revenue paid into the Federal social-insurance trust fund would be approximately $12,000,000,000.

Under section 913 of the bill it is proposed to establish a separate account within the

trust fund to be known as the Medical Care and Hospitalization Act. This act would consume about 25 percent of the total trust fund or $3,000,000,000.

The plan goes further than the mere socialization of medicine, in that it is provided after 2 years of operation, the time required apparently to subdue all doctors, acquire all hospital facilities and take over all medical schools, the Surgeon General shall then make reports as to the most effective methods of providing dental and nursing services together with the approximate cost and recommendations for the necessary legislation. In short, the Surgeon General is directed to evolve another plan whereby nursing service and dental care are provided for the 110,000,000 citizens who vote, but are not considered capable of earning the funds for necessary care. The bill merely provides that any physician qualified to practice medicine may furnish medical service under such rules and conditions as are prescribed by one man, the Surgeon General. Every one of the 110,000,000 beneficiaries of this bill may select his own physician provided his physician agrees to work under the rules and conditions prescribed by one man, the Surgeon General. The names of all the doctors who may be available to render services shall be determined by one man, the Surgeon General. The services of a specialist are to be considered specialist services when so directed by one man, the Surgeon General. The schedule of fees to be paid shall be fixed and approved by one man, the Surgeon General. The maximum number of persons any physician may serve shall be determined by one man, the Surgeon General. The lists of hospitals to which a patient may be sent for treatment shall be fixed by one man, the Surgeon General. Only those physicians may teach in medical schools who are approved by one man, the Surgeon General. The subject matter taught in the medical schools must be approved by one man, the Surgeon General. The medical care as well as the hospital services of 110,000,000 shall become and remain the sole responsibility of one man, the Surgeon General.

In order to obtain an idea of just what $3,000,000,000 would do, I will cite you to some situations that are interesting by comparison. It would mean an extra pay-roll tax each year of $120 for each family in the United States. The total revenue of the Federal Government from 1924 to 1933 averaged only $3,500,000,000. The public expenditures of the French Government in 1936 amounted to only $3,000,000,000. Three billion dollars is twice as much money as the Japanese Empire spent in 1940 when preparing for war. Three billion dollars also represents the equivalent of the annual income of the German Government between the years of 1930 and 1935.

Just what would the Surgeon General be able to do with $3,000,000,000? First he could hire 120,000 effective physicians in the United States at an average of $5,000 per year for a total of $600,000,000. The Surgeon General could also pay for every available bed in every non-Government-owned hospital, 365 days a year at $5 a day for the sum of $671,000,000. He could also pay $2.50 per day for every available Government-owned bed, 365 days in the year for the sum of approximately $960,000,000. He could still spend for medicines and drugs over $168,000,000 and in addition he would have available for administration expense the sum of $600,000,000. Out of this staggering sum the Surgeon General could assume and pay the total costs of the 66 class A medical schools in the United States amounting to about $21,500,000. He can subsidize every one of the 22,000 medical students in the country at $700 each per year, by the payment of $15,400,000 and he would still have on hand the tidy sum of $11,000,000 in order to build a bigger bureaucracy in Washington and throughout the Nation.

It staggers the imagination when you try to comprehend the enormity of such a sum. What does $3,000,000,000 mean? It means more money than any human being ever had to spend in 1 year. What would $3,000,000,000 do? It would permit one man to make political pawns of a profession; forfeit its self-respect and insure its inevitable decline.

What has been the effect of government regulation and regimentation of medicine in Europe? Prior to the turn of the present century, it was customary for those seeking specialization and postgraduate training to make a pilgrimage to the teaching centers of medicine in Europe, but with the advent of government control of medical service and education, such as was inaugurated by Bismarck in Germany and Lloyd George in England, the decline and decay of medical education set in in those centers. Doctors became political pawns instead of research scientists and independent practitioners in a free profession.

The amazing growth and advances made by American medicine in the last few decades attests to the prudence and wisdom of the American way in medical education and practice. In 1905 there were 162 medical colleges in the United States; many of these being privately owned and dependent solely upon tuition fees for their maintenance.

About 40 years ago the American Medical Association created a council on medical education and as a result of its activity and influence the number of medical schools was reduced from 162 in 1905 to 76 in 1943, and their standards of admission, curriculae, faculties, and equipment have been consistently raised until today they outrank the rest of the world. The medical schools of this country are graduating about 22,000 well-trained men and women each year; 95 percent of these graduates take postgraduate training as internes in splendidly equipped hospitals; competent examining boards pass on the fitness of those who desire to enter the various specialties. Impressive institutions have been erected where research work may be conducted by those especially trained to do research. The phenomenal part of this progress has been accomplished in less than half a century by the medical profession, unhampered by governmental interference and unaided by Federal funds. The question immediately arises as to why the Government should take this sudden interest in medical training and practice. What need is there to a complete renaissance in medicine? Why a Wagner bill which would turn back the clock of progress a half century and restore a dictator's dream of 1-man control over the education and training of the personnel and facilities connected with the practice of medicine? What would result should the bloated and bungling bureaucracy of Washington take over?

May I remind you that now every boy or girl has an equal opportunity to study medicine. Under a system of Government control the method of selecting students might make it necessary to resort to political pull to assure admission to schools and the service of internships in hospitals.

Although the fiscal aspects of the proposed social insurance scheme are staggering, yet it must be realized that the cost will not be wholly economic. There are the social ramifications to be considered in such a colossal scheme of governmental control.

Is it not too obvious for argument that it would seriously affect the initiative and character of the next generation? When the Government undertakes to pay the cost of a nation's birth, recreation, education, medical service, hospital care, old-age disability, and even goes so far as to guarantee a job for all, can these factors fail to dull the edge of the average person's initiative or dampen the ardor of his enthusiasm for personal success? If the next generation is completely emancipated from all anxiety concerning its needs and welfare, where then can be found the incentive to improvement and progress in life? From what fields would ambition beckon to better one's self since the fun of striving to reach a goal is half the joy of realization.

Shall we deaden and later inter the spirit that cleared the forest, built the factories, erected the railroads, created homes, banks, and hospitals, and gave life to an independent, fearless and free press? For after all, private enterprise means a free business, free press, free religion, and free medicine. It is the body and spirit of the priceless thing we call liberty. It expresses and sustains all that is noble and lordly in the human soul in ambition, initiative, enterprise, personal resourcefulness, self-respect, self-reliance, it is after all the ideal, it is America as the fathers founded it and as conceived and administered in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The work of the human race since creation has been accomplished by individuals and progress has been greatest where men have been freest. The march of science and the progress of the professions which have dignified humanity; the intellectual triumphs which have elevated it; the heroism and self-sacrifice which have consecrated it, are all the result of individual effort. Socialism in any form is the final refuge of those who have failed in the struggle of life. It is the prescription of the intellectual laggards and of those who were born lazy. It means the survival of the unfit and the inevitable would-be degeneration. It would deprive ambition of all incentive, industry of its stimulus, and character of its just reward. We must not forget the fundamental fact that civilization is the immeasurable value of the individual soul. Individualism lifts all to the level of the highest. Socialism drags all down to the level of the lowest. Individualism is progress and life. Socialism is stagnation, decay, and death.

The Wagner bill insofar as it attempts to create a system of socialized medicine is nothing more than a political opiate intended to dull all senses and make easier the final conquest of state socialism.

Upon a Government simple but strong in its construction has been engrafted a system of bureaucracy which appalls with the amazing speed of its development. It is a creature of the New Deal and its left-wing planners.

Under the benediction of the present administration it has grown to its present size and activity with more than 3,000,000 persons on its pay roll. One agency of this New Deal octopus, the O. P. A., boasts a proud pay roll listing over 2,700 lawyers. While a similar organization in England, after which the Washington plan was largely copied, gets along with only 10 attorneys. The great State of Pennsylvania conducts its business with 44,000 State employees, while at the same time the bloated bureaucracy of Washington maintains 215,000 Federal employees on its pay roll for that State; the State of Wyoming transacts its business with fewer than 1,000 employees, but the Federal Government maintains over 6,000 on its pay roll to handle the Federal business of this sparsely settled State. The Federal bureaucracy has been termed a Frankenstein monster but what can be said of the monstrosity known as the Wagner-Murray bill?

There are more than 30,000 persons now employed by the Social Security Agency and more than 13,000 by the Social Security Board.

The work of these agencies has consisted in administering the old-age and survivorship insurance; it paid $110,000,000 last year. Under the Wagner-Murray bill with $15,000,000,000 to spend annually, think of the vast horde of employees of the Social Security Board who would tramp into every home and hamlet in the country with its 1,000,000 or more employees. The philosophy of this bill, like most of the New Deal proposals, has been to create bigger and better bureaus and more and more taxes. There is not a decent thinking American who does not deplore the fact that there are people in this, the world's wealthiest nation, who do not have sufficient sustaining comforts.

If you inquire whether or not I believe in social security my answer is an emphatic "Yes;" but I want to see it achieved by the efforts of the individual created and sustained by his own initiative.

You inquire if the Government should not assist in the achieving of social security. My answer is an emphatic "Yes," but we must prevent mass unemployment by removing the cause of unemployment; we must help keep people well by finding out and remedying the cause of illness and disability; we must provide for the uncertain as well as the expected contingencies of life by a system of education, industry, and savings. In short, by every possible means, but we must not have it at the price of an unbearable compulsory social-insurance program, which would make one-half the population the keeper of the other half and be administered by the constantly growing and bungling bureaucracy.

What are the fiscal aspects of the Wagner-Murray plan? It is possible that if we want social security sorely enough we can have it provided we do not want or need anything else more. Merely wishing will not be sufficient.

It should be pointed out that the passage of this bill would accumulate, at least for the present, deductions from workers' wages of 20 percent for income tax, 10 to 25 percent for War bonds, 12 percent for social security, and such other deductions as are already made in many individual plants. In accordance with these figures there would be a minimum deduction of 42 percent and a maximum deduction of 57 percent of the workers' wages.

What is the post-war picture with respect to finances and taxes? It is estimated that when the war is over we shall have a national debt of around $300,000,000,000. If we are obliged to pay interest at a rate of only 2 percent upon bonds maturing in 50 years, this means that we must first raise through taxation more than $9,500,000,000 annually for interest payments alone. It must be borne in mind that representatives of this Nation have boasted that we will virtually finance the rehabilitation of the world after the war.

We have repeatedly promised food and clothing for millions of the subjugated people of the earth. How can the staggering cost of this burden be met if we impose an additional $15,000,000,000 tax upon the earnings of those who work, produce, and save, to be redistributed in turn to those who will not work, produce, or save?

This Nation has gained its pre-eminent place in medical education and care by methods that have been tested in the tough crucibles of time and economic hardship. Under this bill it is proposed to abolish these institutions and methods and to substitute others whose experience in many countries has failed to produce conditions of health equal to those existing here. This bill would abolish volunteer control and individual initiative that have brought medical education, hospital management, drug purity, research, and medical service to the door of all. It must be remembered that no provision is made in the present bill for the care and treatment of the indigent and needy. Only those who are willing to be taxed and can pay from $120 to approximately $180 a year for the support of a system of state medicine would be eligible to participate in its alleged benefits. As a substitute the people are offered a system controlled by salaried political bureaucrats.

We must remain steadfast to the American system, American medicine, and American doctors who have developed the most effective and widely distributed medical care that has ever been provided for any people in the world.

Under this system the average life of the average person has been nearly doubled in 150 years. An infant born in 1942 is expected to live 12 years longer than a child born in 1900. Since the beginning of this century the death rate per 100,000 people has been reduced from 1,755 to only 1,060. During this same period smallpox has been subdued; typhoid fever has almost disappeared; diphtheria has practically been conquered; pernicious anemia, tuberculosis, diabetes, and many of the lesser ailments are being brought under control. The United States has the highest general level of health and the lowest death rate ever known for a like number of people under similar conditions.

With nearly 55,000 physicians in the armed forces and with a prospect that 20,000 of these will have gone from a more or less abbreviated internship or residency directly into military service, it is estimated that at least one-third of this number will remain in the services after the war, because military needs will be great and life comparatively comfortable. It will be manifestly unfair to these men and women to foist upon them a system of socialized medicine and political peonage, while they are working and dying to rid the world of the cruel yoke of regimentation as practiced upon other people of the earth.

The American Bar Association at its annual meeting in Chicago in August last year condemned Federal control of the practice of medicine. Impartial newspapers throughout the land have pointed out the vicious implications of this bill particularly insofar as it relates to the practice of medicine. We have a duty to perform to those at home and abroad to see to it that American medicine is kept free from the taint of politics and the deadening hand of bureaucratic control.

Let us all become true sentinels in the watchtowers of a free and untrammeled America. Let us see to it that the flag of personal initiative shall not be dragged down from the mast of private enterprise by the dirty hands of the disciples of Karl Marx, and in its stead run up the red rag of socialized medicine and State socialism.

Prophet With Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 3, 1944:

PROPHET WITH HONOR

Just 20 years ago Woodrow Wilson's life came to an end. The spirit which animated him and the principles to which he gave his full devotion were not extinguished with him. They survived and matured, as he knew they would, in the slow, composite, democratic mind of this Nation. And now, perhaps, as he prophesied, they are about to triumph.

It was the core of his belief that nations, like men, cannot live unto themselves. He saw the earth round and integrated. He saw its freedom and security as indivisible. When he first set out to preach this doctrine to the American people, he said in a speech at Indianapolis in September 1919: "For, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes."

Woodrow Wilson evoked in the American people a national exaltation never equaled. In that spirit, a spirit of immolation, he led us into war. But with victory the exaltation faded. We failed to carry forward the high purposes he had avowed. For that default we are paying today the terrible penalty he foresaw. His words have fresh force and meaning for us now. We may differ again, as we did a quarter century ago, over the letter of his formula for the future. But the spirit of that formula must not again go unheeded. The direction and the goal are clear.

In the Nation—More Light on the Separation of Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the article appearing in the New York Times entitled "In the Nation" under date of February 3, 1944, written by Arthur Krock presents some pertinent facts relating to the soldier-vote bill. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my observation:

IN THE NATION—MORE LIGHT ON THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—In the last 24 hours there have been three important developments in the congressional struggle over methods to poll the armed forces in this year's elections. These illuminate, particularly for the citizens of New York State, the difficulties in working out a device that is both effective and legal. If they could be explained to the members of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the merchant sea-service, they might assure better comprehension of the reality of the issue by those in the armed services who have said they are fighting to maintain institutions at home.

The first development was a telegram from Governor Dewey to Senator BRIDGES in answer to a request for his counsel. After saying that "every citizen of New York can and must have an opportunity to vote," and pointing

out that the State constitution forbids denial of voting rights because of military service, the Governor offered another fact about the State constitution.

"Any ballot authorized by Congress," he telegraphed, "which would not list State, county, and other local offices would be incomplete and not in accordance with the provisions" (of the State charter). "Therefore it would be incumbent upon the New York Legislature," concluded the Governor, "to make available to every citizen in the armed forces from the State of New York a full and complete State ballot."

Since no administration measure meets this requirement, the implicit question is whether New York citizens, in and out of the services, want Congress to attempt to supervene their Constitution by statute in a category specifically reserved to New York by the Federal Constitution.

The second development was dramatic and came in a speech by Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, many-times wounded and decorated veteran of World War No. 1. "Senators say they want the soldier to vote," he exclaimed. "What soldier do they want to vote? All soldiers? Oh, no, they do not. That is not what they are providing in this Federal ballot. There are at least 2,000,000 young men in this Army [and Navy] not yet 21 years of age. They would not get a vote."

TO THOSE UNDER 21

Then warming to his theme he said:

"Will they say to me, 'We cannot do so under the Constitution?' Neither can we give the others the right to vote under the Constitution. If we are to violate the Constitution, let us go the whole way, and let us give all the boys a chance to vote. * * *

"I heard it suggested the other day that we tell the boys who fought at Tarawa, the marines with arms or legs off, that the Constitution denies them a vote. Yes, I say, tell it to them, for most of them were under 21. * * * But let us not tell the fathers and mothers of America that the Congress is trying to give the soldiers a vote when we deny it to at least 2,000,000 of the cream of this Nation's young manhood."

For, just as it is a fact that regulation of voting is a right reserved to the States by the Constitution, so it is a fact that nearly every State requires that a voter shall have attained the age of 21. If Congress by statute can supervene the first, it can surely supervene the second.

Another enlightening development was the announcement by Senator BYRD on the floor today of steps being taken by Virginia to poll its uniformed citizens and yet maintain its legal right to manage that function. He informed the Senate that Governor Darden has asked the general assembly at Richmond to waive poll-tax payment and registration as voting requirements, to provide that State members of the armed forces shall vote in the primary elections (something no administration bill does, although primary results in a number of States are tantamount to election results), and to accept applications for a ballot (to be sent to those in uniform) by any friend or relative at home.

TIME FOR STATE ACTION

Thus, 9 months before general election day, one State already is arranging for all the voting easements which advocates of the Federal ballot prophesied would not be forthcoming. All States have ample time to do as much, and telegrams to Senator BYRD from the governors of most of them pledge similar action.

These were developments which help to explain the renewed hope which prevailed today that it will not be necessary to demolish a basic section of the Constitution, a cornerstone of the system of the separation of powers, in order to collect and count the votes of those in the armed services who are citizens of the several States. Numerous governors who replied to Mr. BYRD's inquiry replied that they merely await the action of Congress to bring their voting machinery into conformity, provided this action does not include an attempt to take away by statute their rights under the Federal Constitution or a direction that they violate their own State charters.

The hope of adjustment centered round a proposal that the United States ballot commission be empowered, when a majority found that State arrangements were inadequate, to send Federal ballots to uniformed citizens of such States, to be returned to the States for counting. That course would hold within narrow limits the supervention of States' rights, and it would be founded on wartime acts which permit certain legal relaxations if they are found essential to the most effective prosecution of the war. It would be constitutional infraction, but the minimum.

Tribute to Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which was published in the Washington Post of February 3, 1944:

TRIBUTE TO WILSON—A COMMUNICATION

On the death of Woodrow Wilson, February 3, 1923, the nations of the world paid tribute, all nations except Germany. It remained silent. It is interesting, too, to note that the Republic of France addressed "to the House of Representatives of the United States the homage of its sentiments of profound sorrow." Perhaps in eliminating all reference to the Senate all the people of that Republic some 20 years ago realized that because of the action of a minority of that body another and crushing war was bound to result.

When Woodrow Wilson set forth on his fateful tour in September 1919 to deliver 30 scheduled speeches he was warned that "his life might be the forfeit of his enterprise." He replied, "I would forfeit my life to attain the end I seek."

The fame of Woodrow Wilson, said Dr. Edwin A. Alderman, "depends upon an unconquerable idea, so greatly conceived and set forth that it must continue to grow and is now growing into new and finer form, and his fame must grow with it into whatever bright renown it may contain."

SERVICE TO MANKIND

In speaking once to youth, Wilson said, "We die but once, and we die without distinction if we are not willing to die the death of sacrifice. Honor and distinction come only as rewards for service to mankind."

Wilson tried desperately to warn our country of the coming of the Second World War. At Omaha, Nebr., he said "Stop for a moment to think about the next war. For I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it. What shall I call it? The final war? It might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents; she is not exhausted at all. America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the industries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew.

EUROPE'S DEPLETED RESOURCES

"The next war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The Nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the Nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe. It is not likely that, with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war, just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and day of her birth. The next time will come; it will come while this generation is living, and the children will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war."

It has come and those children are now men and are fighting.

Wilson faced a tremendous campaign of opposition. Simultaneously billboards and newspapers blazed forth with advertisements similar to the following: Shall we bind ourselves to the war-breeding Covenant? It impairs American sovereignty, surrenders the Monroe Doctrine, flouts Washington's warning, entangles us in European and Asiatic intrigues, sends our boys to fight throughout the world by order of a league, the evil thing with a holy name, League for the Preservation of American Independence.

Little wonder, therefore, that at St. Louis in September 1919, Woodrow Wilson made this prophetic statement, "I feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight, together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say, 'Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get. And the glory of the armies and the navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came, and there will come some time, in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world.'"

On Armistice Sunday, 1923, he spoke his last public words, "I am not one of those that have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist Providence before and I have seen their destruction, as will come upon these again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns!"

MELVIN D. HILDRETH,
Chairman, Washington Committee,
League of Nations Association.
WASHINGTON, *February 1.*

Tax Information for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the confusion that exists in the Federal tax system over regulations relating to tax liability of farmers, Mr. A. J. Glover, editor of Hoard's Dairyman, requested me to submit a number of pertinent questions on the subject to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This was done, and I am, therefore, asking leave to print the Commissioner's reply to Mr. Glover as a part of these remarks:

JANUARY 22, 1944.

Mr. A. J. GLOVER,
Hoard's Dairyman, Fort Atkinson, Wis.

DEAR MR. GLOVER: Your letter of December 8, 1943, to Hon. A. H. ANDRESEN, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., together with the list of questions enclosed therewith, has been referred to this office for consideration and reply.

The enclosure mentioned presents a number of questions on the use of the capital gain-and-loss provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as they apply to the sale of farm property. You express a desire to supply the readers of Hoard's Dairyman with reliable information on this subject and ask that the answers be furnished in time for publication in the issue of February 26, 1944.

Your questions indicate that they were inspired by the provisions of section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by section 151 of the Revenue Act of 1942, relating to gains and losses from involuntary conversion and from the sale or exchange of certain property used in the trade or business. This provision of the law reads as follows:

"(1) Definition of property used in the trade or business: For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'property used in the trade or business' means property used in the trade or business, of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (1), held for more than 6 months, and real property used in the trade or business, held for more than 6 months, which is not (A) property of a kind which would properly be includible in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, or (B) property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.

"(2) General rule: If, during the taxable year, the recognized gains upon sales or exchanges of property used in the trade or business, plus the recognized gains from the compulsory or involuntary conversion (as a result of destruction in whole or in part, theft or seizure, or an exercise of the power of requisition or condemnation, or the threat or imminence thereof) of property used in the trade or business and capital assets held for more than 6 months into other property or money, exceed the recognized losses from such sales, exchanges, and conversions, such gains and losses shall be considered as gains and losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months. If such gains do not exceed such losses, such gains and losses shall not be considered as gains and losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets. For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) In determining under this paragraph whether gains exceed losses, the gains and losses described therein shall be included only if and to the extent taken into account in computing net income, except that subsections (b) and (d) shall not apply.

"(B) Losses upon the destruction, in whole or in part, theft or seizure, or requisition or condemnation of property used in the trade or business or capital assets held for more than 6 months shall be considered losses from a compulsory or involuntary conversion."

The questions which you submit read as follows:

"A. For tax returns made on the cash basis is only 50 percent of the profit taxable and is the entire loss, if any, deductible in the following cases:

1. (a) When the farm itself is sold?

(b) Also, if the farmer has not taken depreciation in previous tax returns on improvements, must he compute it for the years held and deduct same from the original cost before computing his profit or loss?

2. (a) When a piece of farm machinery is sold?

(b) Also, if the farmer has not taken depreciation in previous tax returns, must he compute it for the years held and deduct it from the original cost?

3. (a) When breeding or work stock is sold that the farmer has purchased?

(b) Also, if the farmer has not taken depreciation in previous tax returns, must he compute it for the years held and deduct it from the original cost?

4. (a) When breeding or work stock is sold that has been raised on the farm?

(b) Also, if the farmer has not taken depreciation in previous tax returns, must he compute it for the years held and deduct it from the original cost?

"B. For tax returns made on the accrual basis is only 50 percent of the profit taxable, and is the entire loss, if any, deductible in each of the cases cited above under 'A'?

"C. We have recommended in the past that a farmer keep his inventory of breeding cattle on a standard basis of, say, $150 for purebred cows without regard to age or length of time in herd, with heifers under 1 year at half this, and with calves at one-quarter. This same method has been suggested for grain and hay raised on the farm, carrying them at the same rate per bushel or per ton from year to year. In this way the inventory would show the condition of the farm from year to year, and actual sale when made would show the profit or loss.

"Would this method of inventory be accepted for rendering income-tax returns, it being assumed that the same method is followed year after year?"

It is to be observed that the portion of the law quoted above is but 1 of the 10 subsections composing section 117 relating to capital gains and losses and that it does not purport to prescribe rules for the determination of the taxable profit or deductible loss with respect to the sale or exchange of any particular property. In substance, subsection (j) merely provides a modification of the subsection (a) definition of "capital assets" so as to require properties expressly excluded by that definition to be treated as capital assets held for more than 6 months under the particular circumstances described by such modification. The tax consequences of sales or exchanges of capital assets are controlled by subsections (b) to (i), inclusive.

For the purpose of illustrating the operation of section 117 (j), assume that on January 1, 1943, an individual was the owner of a fully equipped farm consisting of farm land, farm residence, farm improvements, and farm machinery. He was also the owner of various corporate stocks and bonds. All of such property had been held for more than 6 months. During the year he operates the farm and also sells the corporate stocks and bonds, realizing gains on all stock sales and losses on all bond sales. Also during the year a farm tractor is struck by lightning and completely destroyed. The insurance received exceeds the depreciated base of the tractor thus reflecting a gain realized from the involuntary conversion of property used in the trade or business held for more than 6 months. In December he sells the farm land, farm residence, farm improvements, farm machinery, and all crops raised during the year, realizing gains on the farm land, farm residence, and crops, and losses on the farm improvements and farm machinery.

In filing his income and Victory tax return for 1943, such a taxpayer would treat these transactions as follows:

(a) Crops: The total receipts would be reported in Form 1040F, schedule of farm income, or in schedule C (2) on page 2 of Form 1040. In either case, the net profit or loss from the operation of the farm business would be reflected in item 8 on page 1 of the return Form 1040.

(b) Corporation stocks, corporate bonds, and farm residence: All of these items constitute capital assets as that term is defined in section 117 (a). Accordingly, the gains and losses realized upon their sale would be reported as long-term capital gains and losses in schedule B (Form 1040) and, since the taxpayer in this illustration is an individual, only 50 percent of such gains and losses would be taken into account in computing net capital gain, or net capital loss, and net income.

(c) Farm land, farm improvements, farm machinery, and farm tractor.

1. The farm land here clearly constitutes real property used in the trade or business, held for more than 6 months, which is not (A) property of a kind which would properly be includible in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, or (B) property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business, and, likewise,

2. The farm improvements, farm machinery and farm tractor here constitute property used in the trade or business, of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (1), held for more than 6 months, within the meaning of the definition of property used in the trade or business as contained in section 117 (j) (1).

If the gain realized on the sale of the farm land plus the gain realized from the involuntary conversion of the farm tractor exceeds the aggregate of the losses sustained on the sale of the farm improvements and farm machinery, all of this property would be treated the same as capital assets held for more than 6 months and the gain realized and losses sustained would be reported on schedule B (Form 1040) with the sales of corporate stock, corporate bonds, and farm residence as long-term capital gains and losses, only 50 percent of such gains and losses being taken into account. If the summary of capital gains and losses shown on schedule B (Form 1040) reflects a net long-term capital gain, the amount thereof would be entered as item 6 (a) on page 1 of Form 1040; since there are no short-term capital gains or losses in this illustration, the net long-term capital gain would also represent the net capital gain. If, however, such summary reflects a net capital loss, the amount of such loss to be entered as item 6 (a) on page 1 of Form 1040 would be limited to (1) the net amount of such loss or (2) the net income, computed without regard to capital gains or losses, or (3) $1,000, whichever is smallest.

If on the other hand, the losses sustained on the sale of the farm improvements and farm machinery aggregate an amount which exceeds the gain realized on the sale of the

farm land plus the gain realized from the involuntary conversion of the farm tractor, none of this property would be treated as a capital asset and 100 percent of the gain realized and losses sustained would be reported at the bottom of schedule B (Form 1040) as resulting from the sale or exchange of property other than capital assets. The net result shown by this part of the schedule as a total net gain or loss would be entered as item 6 (b) on page 1 of Form 1040.

The above illustration is equally applicable to the case of a corporation, or an estate, or a trust, insofar as it demonstrates the proper application of the provisions of section 117 (j) of the code. However, the tax consequences under the other subsections of section 117 would be materially different in the case of a corporation since a corporation must at all times take into account 100 percent of the capital gains and losses and may deduct the losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets only to the extent of the gains from such sales or exchanges.

The illustration is limited to cases in which the seller at the time of the sale is (1) the owner and operator of the farm or (2) the owner and lessor of the farm and improvements, provided, the leasing and management of leased properties occupies the time and attention of the owner sufficiently to constitute such leasing and management as his trade or business. Farm lands and improvements not used in the owner's trade or business would constitute capital assets within the meaning of section 117 (a) of the code.

In every case where the gain realized or loss sustained is recognized for income-tax purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code, the computations of such gains or losses must comply with the requirements of section 113 of such code. Section 113 (b) (1) provides, among other things, that "Proper adjustment in respect of the property shall in all cases be made— * * * (B) in respect of any period since February 28, 1913, for exhaustion, wear and tear [depreciation], obsolescence, amortization, and depletion, to the extent allowed (but not less than the amount allowable) under this chapter or prior income tax laws * * *." It follows that in computing the amount of the gain or loss to be recognized under section 117, the cost or other basis of the property must be decreased by the total amount of depreciation which has been allowed, or which should have been allowed, for all prior years. (See sec. 29.113 (b) (I)-1 of Regulations 111.)

The fact that the taxpayer files his income-tax returns on the cash receipts and disbursements basis instead of the accrual basis would have no bearing upon either the computation of capital gains or losses or upon their treatment for income-tax purposes. The gross income of a taxpayer reporting on the cash receipts and disbursements basis consists of—

(a) all amounts received or constructively received in connection with the operation of a business or profession, the ownership (not sale or exchange) of property, and the performance of personal services; plus

(b) the net gains or profits realized on the sale or exchange of property not coming within the ordinary course of his trade or business; less

(c) the net losses sustained on the sale or exchange of property not coming within the ordinary course of his trade or business.

From such gross income he may deduct—

(a) All amounts actually disbursed for business expense, salaries and wages, interest, taxes, etc.; and

(b) depreciation and depletion of business property; and

(c) the net amounts of casualty losses.

He may not deduct, among other things, amounts paid for increasing the capital value or for making good the depreciation of property, since such amounts enter into the computation of the gain or loss realized on a subsequent sale or exchange of such property. See section 29.24-2 of Regulations 111.

Though the provisions of section 117 of the Code are unaffected by the question of whether the return is filed on the cash receipts and disbursements basis or on the accrual basis, it may become necessary in some cases to consider the basis of the return in order to determine whether, under one of the various elections granted, particularly to farmers, the taxpayer has treated some particular type of property as capital assets or as property held for sale in the ordinary course of the taxpayer's business. Livestock acquired for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes is property of this type.

A farmer may elect to file his income-tax returns on either the cash receipts and disbursements basis or on the accrual basis, and he has the right of electing to include in his inventories livestock acquired for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes which would otherwise be treated as capital assets subject to depreciation.

Were it not for the above-described privileges or rights of election, the farmer, livestock raiser, or dairyman would be required to make his income-tax returns on the accrual basis and on this basis he would be required to treat as capital assets subject to depreciation all livestock acquired or raised and retained for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, and not for sale. This method enjoys the advantage of being simple, direct, and sound from the economic standpoint, particularly where raising livestock for sale or dairying is the principal business activity. Recognizing the difficulty of ascertaining the actual cost of raising livestock and other farm products, the income-tax regulations provide an optional inventory method, the "farm-price method," which provides for the valuation of inventories at market price less direct cost of disposition. When adopted, the "farm price method" serves a dual purpose. It furnishes the inventory value of livestock raised for sale and the capital value of livestock raised and retained for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, and not for sale since the cost or other basis of livestock retained for capital purposes would be its inventory value on the date of its conversion to such purposes. The bookkeeping mechanics are simple since it is only necessary that the inventory value of the livestock converted to capital purposes and set up in a capital account subject to depreciation be excluded from the opening inventory of the year of such conversion.

A farmer, livestock raiser, or dairyman who has filed his income-tax returns on the accrual basis as described above should experience no difficulty in applying the provisions of section 117 (j) of the code to a sale of livestock. If the livestock, whether purchased or raised and retained for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, has been capitalized properly, it would constitute property used in the trade or business of a character subject to depreciation and as such it would be accorded the same treatment as the farm machinery. If, however, the livestock was purchased or raised for sale, it would be an inventoriable item and as such would not be a capital asset within the purview of either subsection (a) or subsection (j) of section 117.

The farmer, livestock raiser, or dairyman who is filing his income-tax returns on the accrual basis has the right under section 29.22 (a)-7 of regulations 111 of electing to include in his inventory of livestock raised or purchased for sale all livestock acquired for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes and not for sale, instead of treating the livestock acquired for such latter purposes as capital assets subject to depreciation. Such a taxpayer is treating all of his livestock exactly as if it had all been raised or purchased for sale, and therefore includible in his inventories, and consequently he may not treat such livestock for the purposes of section 117 (j) of the code as being property used in the trade or business of a character subject to depreciation.

The farmer, livestock raiser, or dairyman who is filing his income-tax returns on the cash receipts and disbursements basis may not for the purposes of section 117 (j) of the code treat any of the livestock which he has raised as property used in the trade or business. Such a taxpayer, by his method of accounting, will have charged against income the entire cost of raising such livestock, thus leaving any of such livestock which may have been retained for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in exactly the same position as the livestock raised for sale. Any livestock purchased for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, which has actually been capitalized and subjected to depreciation, will constitute property used in the trade or business within the purview of section 117 (j). However, if such livestock is treated in the same manner as livestock purchased for sale, it would lose its character as a capital asset for all purposes.

From the foregoing it is to be observed that the sole question to be determined is whether as a fact the taxpayer, in his books of account and for income-tax purposes, has treated the livestock acquired for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes as capital assets subject to depreciation or in the same manner as he treats livestock acquired for sale.

The answer to your question (C) is "No." Section 29.22 (c)-2 of Regulations 111 and the corresponding provisions of all prior regulations prohibit the use of the so-called constant-price method of valuing inventories. These regulations have been approved in a long line of court decisions. For an early case see *Lucas* v. *Kansas City Structural Steel Co.* (231 U. S. 264), disapproving inventories valued on the so-called base-stock method, a variation of the constant-price method which is even less objectionable since it applies the constant prices only to what is deemed to be the normal quantity or base stock. As to this method the Supreme Court stated in part as follows:

"It is not contested that if inventories are necessary in order to determine the company's income, the base-stock method does not fulfill the desiderata. The Federal income-tax system is based upon an annual accounting period. This requires that gains or losses be accounted for in the year in which they are realized. The purpose of the inventories is to assign to each period its profits and losses. In years of rising prices the base-stock method causes an understatement of income; for it disregards the gains actually realized through liquidation of low-price stock on a high-price market. In times of falling prices it causes an overstatement of income; for it ignores the losses which result from the consumption of high-price stock. This method may, like many reserves which businessmen set up on their books for their own purposes, serve to equalize the results of operations during a series of years. But it is inconsistent with the annual accounting required by Congress for income-tax purposes. It results in offsetting an inventory gain of 1 year against an inventory loss of another, obscures the true gain or loss of the tax year, and, thus, misrepresents the facts. It does not conform with the general or best accounting methods and is apparently obsolete. The company disclaims any defense of the base-stock method; and the lower court disapproved it."

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Commissioner.

Article by Rt. Rev. Fulton Sheen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following article by the Right Reverend Fulton Sheen, which appeared in the local press recently:

No country in the world has contributed as much to fascism as Russia. For it was only through the Soviets giving the Nazis the green light in the pact of 1939 that the Nazis were able to extend their form of fascism all over Europe.

Furthermore, Stalin has already declared himself in favor of fascism. In a telegram to Hitler he said, "Our friendship is sealed with blood." Molotov told Von Ribbentrop, "Fascism is only a matter of taste."

Russia's condemnation of the Vatican on the grounds of being Fascist is quite excusable and pardonable. Russia is the only nation in the world outside of Germany that does not permit freedom of press and freedom of religion. It, therefore, never permitted to be circulated within its borders any of the Vatican's statements condemning fascism and nazi-ism. Having never heard of them through its rigorous censorship, it can therefore be excused of being ignorant of them.

Every other nation on the face of the earth knows that the Vatican condemned fascism in an encyclical written in Italian, nazi-ism in an encyclical written in German, and communism in an encyclical written in Latin. To the land, therefore, that allows no infiltration of religion we should apply the word of the Saviour on the cross, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do." Their condemnation is born of ignorance.

The argument of the Soviets is rather puerile. They accuse the Vatican of fascism because it "maintained silence when Italy attacked France in June 1940." Does that make the Vatican Communist because the Vatican was silent when Russia invaded Finland and Poland? And, incidentally, what was Russia doing for France in 1940, particularly since it was bound to France by a treaty?

The Soviets next accuse the Vatican of endorsing the Italian conquest of Abyssinia. This is just as untrue as to say that the Vatican has endorsed the Soviet conquest of the Baltics. The facts are: (1) When Mussolini ordered the illumination of Rome to celebrate the Abyssinian victory, the only dark spot in Rome was the Vatican; (2) when Mussolini ordered all bells in Italy to ring at 3:15 p. m. the date of the conquest, the Vatican bells were silent; (3) Pius XI rebuked the Fascist press for distorting his address to the nurses on August 22, 1935, to make it appear that he favored the conquest; (4) when Mussolini used strong efforts to have Pius XI crown Victor Emmanuel as Emperor of Abyssinia, the Holy Father refused.

The Soviets further charged the Vatican with complicity with fascism in Spain. The facts are: (1) The Vatican attitude toward Spain was dictated not by political but by religious considerations. If the Communist-Republican group had supported religion or was indifferent to it instead of destroying 20,000 religious buildings, while the nationalists persecuted it, the Vatican would have favored the Republicans; (2) had the Republicans maintained neutrality toward religion as did the popular front in France the Vatican would have remained neutral; (3) if tomorrow the Falangists persecuted religion and burned churches and a new party defended religion, the Vatican would condemn the Falangists and, let it be repeated, solely on religious grounds and not on political grounds; (4) the Holy Father refused to join Italy and Germany in recognizing the insurgent leaders as the legitimate government of Spain; (5) when the refugees of Spanish persecution did come to Rome he blessed them for defending religion, reminding them that their politics were bad, warning that intentions less pure, selfish interests, and mere party feeling may easily enter into, cloud, and change the morality of what is being done.

It does little good however to discuss fascism. The term once had a very definite connotation; namely, the absorption of the individual into the state as communism is the absorption of the individual into the class and nazi-ism is the absorption of the individual into the race. There is therefore no essential difference in ideology between the three. In the hands of the Communists, however, the term "fascism" is now one of abuse to cover all who are anti-Communist.

As a matter of fact fascism is really communism in its dotage. Communism is the Asiatic form of fascism and fascism is the European form of communism. There is as little difference between communism and fascism as there is between burglary and larceny.

The Soviets use words very cleverly. As they massacred Jews under the name Trotskyite, so they label all anti-Communists as Fascists. In this sense of the term the church is Fascist, but by the same distorted language it is Communist because it is anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist. The Vatican within the last 6 months has been called Communist by the Nazis, Fascist by the Communists, and anti-Fascist by the Fascists. They all mean the same thing—namely, the Vatican is opposed to antireligious ideology. When the Vatican condemned the attempt of Germany to nazify Europe, the Soviets were silent because religion played into their hands at that time. But now when Russia is about to barbarize Europe it condemns the Vatican, for the Vatican is the only moral force left standing between Europe and barbarism.

The Soviet condemnation of the Vatican is merely an item in a pattern which Russia is skillfully working out. It is of one piece with the recent Soviet condemnation of the British for their alleged attempt to make a separate peace with Germany. It thus prepared for its own infidelity by accusing a spouse of infidelity. Having accused the political order of connivance with the enemy, it now accuses religion. Thus does Russia prepare both politically and religiously for alienating itself from the Allies and making a separate peace with Germany.

The charge against the Vatican is no great surprise. Everyone who knows Russia knew it was coming. What was unexpected, however, was its timing. The fact that it should come now rather than a month later proves how confident Russia really is in its ability to control Europe. As Russia already served notice that America and Great Britain may not interfere in the question of Poland, so now it serves notice on religion that it may not interfere in the question of Europe. Lenin once boasted, "The next country we will make Communist will be Spain. Then we will burn Europe from both ends." The firebrands of the house of European Christian civilization are lighted by the article in Izvestia.

Within the last 2 years there can be found no record of Russia's condemning Nazis. Not even in the Moscow or Tehran declarations, Stalin does not hate nazi-ism or the German Army.

He hates only Hitler. Harry Hopkins quoted him to that effect in November 1941.

In November 1942 Stalin said: "The destruction of all German military force is inadvisable from the point of view of the victor." In July 1943 he permitted the free German committee to broadcast asking Germany to "recall the German troops to the Reich's frontiers and embark upon peace negotiations."

Every day Russia is feeding Germany with broadcasts saying, "Save your army. It is the foundation and security of your survival."

It is therefore not at all unlikely that once Hitler is overthrown from within Stalin will make separate peace with the German military staff. Perhaps that is why the words "unconditional surrender" were left out of the Tehran declaration.

The danger facing Europe is not bolshevism as Hitler says. It is "communazi-ism," the union of Pilate and Herod for condemning Christ to death.

On the whole, these false condemnations by Russia of Great Britain and the Vatican may produce much good. They may arouse the American people to a realization that Stalin is not a cross between George Washington and Sir Galahad. Furthermore, they may convince us that no nation which denies freedom of speech and religion to its own citizens can be counted on to give to other nations those rights which its own people do not enjoy.

Stalin is very clever. One of his cleverest tricks was to tell the President at Tehran that there was a plot against his life. Churchill refused to fall for the idea but the President took up residence with Stalin. One cannot help but recall the time when Russia was fooled by that same plot trick when Alexander came to France after the Napoleonic defeat to impose peace on defeated France. Talleyrand of France said to him: "There is a plot against your life. Do not stay with your own people. Come and stay with me." And Talleyrand got what he wanted in the treaty.

The time is now 5 minutes to 12. America must be prepared for Russia's defection from the common cause and for the de-Christianization of Europe. The time is not far distant when the press of America will take from its files the stirring words of the President of the United States: "The Soviet Union is a dictatorship as cruel and as absolute as any other dictatorship on the face of the earth."

Mustering-Out Pay for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have always stood for generous provision and realistic benefits for our servicemen. I shall always stand for generous provision for the members of our armed forces.

Because of the niggardly provision made for our servicemen in the conference report on the recent mustering-out-pay bill, I registered my protest by voting against the conference report. However, I voted for the mustering-out-pay bill as amended when it originally came before the House.

In connection therewith I am pleased to set forth a letter just received from Mr. T. C. Radde, editor of the Sparta Herald and publisher of the Monroe

County Democrat, of Sparta, Wis., who sets forth the feeling of the people back home on this question:

MONROE COUNTY PUBLISHERS, INC.,
Sparta, Wis., January 31, 1944.
Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I note with satisfaction your vote against the $300 mustering-out pay for servicemen. To me that was just a mere hand-out as a mustering-out sop to honorably discharged war veterans, including the sick and disabled. The policy of the present administration toward the servicemen has always been very niggardly, as you will note by the veto of the first bonus bill for World War No. 1 vets. When they can boondoggle away billions in South America for rehabilitation, and send billions more to the occupied countries, why is it only the veterans and always the veterans who must bear the brunt of the New Deal administration's sole economy? While the man going overseas probably does more than the man who stays in this country, why should the stay-at-home be discriminated against? It isn't his choosing that he stayed here. Believe you me, BILL, I have talked to a good many men here at McCoy, who get terribly tired of the continuous training grind and would do almost anything to get where the action is.

It is my honest and sincere opinion that every discharged serviceman should stay on the pay roll at least a year after he is discharged. Don't give him the money in a lump sum either, because I have seen too much of what happens when that is done. Can you feature a man coming back from overseas and discharged at New York, let's say, handed his $300 and told to go home? Nine times out of 10 he'll blow that money and come home broke. It is my opinion that as long as the Government is taking these men away from their families, jobs, and surroundings, they should not be abandoned when they come back, but should be given every assistance possible to reestablish themselves as good citizens. They have it coming.

Sincerely,

T. C. RADDE.

Preservation of the Salmon in the Sacramento River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article by Ned Cronin which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News of December 29, 1943. I might at this point state that the very justifiable complaint made by Mr. Cronin has been remedied in such a manner as to not only conserve the electrical power for our war effort but to conserve our fish as well for the same effort.

As Mr. Cronin so aptly states:

This is no situation in which a stalemate exists; where there will be either electrical power and no salmon, or vice versa. There can be both with a little judicious administration.

According to reports the matter has been worked out so that there can be both electrical power and salmon. We of California are thankful for the exercise of judicious administration.

California sportsmen, commercial fishermen, and just plain civic-minded citizens who are concerned with the preservation of our natural resources a· up in arms over a War Production Board ruling that threatens to exterminate the entire salmon run in the Sacramento River.

These individuals, representing thousands of people within the State, have passed the viewing-with-alarm stage. Now they are sizzling around the neckband, and not without good reason, since this arbitrary decision emanating from the W. P. B. office will destroy a cherished natural resource that has been cultivated through years of hard work and careful planning.

The bone of contention upon which the people are gnawing is a ruling which came through the office of Ralph Lowery, construction engineer of the Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River.

He has notified the Fish and Game Commission that the flow of water in the river will be restricted to 500 feet per second beginning January 1. That figure may not have a great deal of significance to the person who has come to regard liquids as arriving only in pints, fifths, or quarts, but when mention is made of the fact that the normal flow of the river at this time of the year is 4,000 feet per second, it provides a means of comparison. That's like taking a robust, two-quart man and holding him down to one smell per day.

Of course, a man can survive under those conditions albeit it might cramp his style a bit, but with a fish it's different. To cut off his supply of water is just as sure a means of extermination as is the exclusion of air to a homo sapiens, or is this getting a little too primary for the intellect of the good readers?

LOTS OF EGGS

The point is that the fish and game commission estimates there are approximately 56,000,000 salmon eggs imbedded in the gravel below the Shasta dam. That is a lot of eggs any way you want to stack them.

Ordinarily about 50 percent of the eggs would fail to hatch because of natural reasons, too numerous to mention here. However, that still leaves 28,000,000 eggs having a reasonably good chance of maturing into one of the greatest game fish western waters have ever known.

Those eggs enjoying a mathematically certain chance of survival would never be able to make the grade should the water suddenly be cut to 500 feet per second on January 1, as ordered. And with those precious seeds destroyed, the move amounts to wanton destruction of a priceless California product.

It is only fair to state that the situation is not a case of somebody on the W. P. B. waking up one fine morning with nothing better to do than issue an order turning off the faucet on the Sacramento River. We have been informed that the water is being impounded through the W. P. B.'s zeal to cook up an added amount of electricity for use next year.

That in itself is a worth-while ambition, but the fact still remains that victory in war is brought about through the coordination of many resources, and not the gaining of one at the expense of another. There can be nothing baffling about that.

Make no mistake about the annual salmon run from the Sacramento River playing an important part in the war effort. Electrical energy may produce instruments of warfare, but they all have to be handled by men. Unless food is available there will be some pretty miserable trigger pulling and in that respect the yearly salmon pack is a godsend.

This is no situation in which a stalemate exists; where there will either be electrical power and no salmon or vice versa. There can be both with a little judicious administration.

The ichthyology experts have a counter-proposal to make that would seem to merit the serious consideration of every government official involved in the ruling. They urge that a flow of at least 4,000 feet per second be maintained until February 1, and that from that date a gradual reduction of not more than 200 second-feet per day be made until the minimum of 500 feet per second is reached no earlier than February 20.

That would give the precious eggs an opportunity to develop into sorely needed food fish and at the same time would impound some water for the production of electrical power.

This would seem to be the wisest move, and unless it is followed the Sacramento River salmon run is doomed and irreparable damage will have been done.

Responsibility of Bureaucracy to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me January 22, 1944, at the Hotel Statler in Washington at a joint meeting of the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Society for Public Administration:

In the early days of this Nation we had a simple governmental establishment with only a few employees. As the population grew our structure of government has kept pace.

In recent years the Federal Government has extended its activities in many directions, and this has also brought about an expansion of personnel.

In the early days I doubt if anyone used the term "bureaucracy" in referring to our system of government, or the term "bureaucrat" in speaking of its personnel.

Today we hear both terms used frequently, and I suspect that those using the terms do so almost wholly with intent to convey the impression that such things should be abolished.

Our Government, for many years after the adoption of the Constitution, had little effect upon the average citizen. They dealt only with local or State governments. To them the Federal Government was a thing with which only the politicians were concerned. It did not bother them, so they paid little attention to its make-up or its personnel.

In fact, except for the Postal Service, the average citizen had little reason for concern with the Federal Government until about 50 years ago. Of course, there are some exceptions to this statement, but for the purposes of this discussion I think we need not discuss the exceptions.

As the United States progressed from an agricultural country into one largely devoted to industry, trade, and commerce, not only between and among the several States, but with other nations of the world, it became necessary that the Congress provide the machinery for the regulation of commerce.

Thus more than 50 years ago the Interstate Commerce Commission was created. Its duty

was to regulate interstate traffic on the railroads. Today it also deals with bus and truck operations and also waterway traffic.

This Commission was the forerunner of other agencies combining within their powers, to a limited extent, both legislative and executive authority.

Today we have many such agencies. Their impact upon the lives of the people is far-reaching. In many respects they control the activities of business, commerce, and industry. Their existence has brought the Federal Government into the life of practically every citizen.

In addition to these agencies of government having both legislative and executive authority, we have now divided the regular departments in the executive branch of the Government into numerous bureaus.

Therefore, in this the year 1944, it is correct to say that we are governed, in the Federal field, by bureaus. Thus in the proper sense, we have a Federal bureaucracy—but I do not agree that to abolish this type of government would in any way contribute to the welfare of the people.

It would be necessary for us to replace these agencies—yes, these very bureaus—with other agencies having the same functions. The change would be in name only.

Every large private corporation or business is divided into departments. These departments in private business life correspond to the division of Government agencies into what we call bureaus.

The departmentalized set-up of private business, where it is a large operation, are very similar to the bureau type of organization we have in the Federal Government.

Today's critics of bureaucracy seem to forget that local and State governments have their corresponding divisions of government. The only difference is that the Federal Government is much larger.

Webster's dictionary says that a bureau, among other things, is "a business office." It also describes a bureau as "a government department or office, or one of its subdivisions, for the transaction of business."

"Bureaucracy" is described by Webster as "a system of carrying on the business of government by means of bureaus, each controlled by a chief; also, a system of government by bureau heads and their superior administrative officers."

I can find nothing in these definitions that should be objectionable to the people. The objection, I am sure, applies primarily to the methods used by the bureau heads.

It is true that in recent times the people, or some of them, have said that Congress has delegated too much authority to the agencies of government.

I must admit that the Congress has delegated great authority to the agencies of government. I suspect, however, that the criticism arises from the methods in which this authority is being exercised.

In my opinion, it has been necessary that the Congress delegate power. How else could the complex duties now exercised over the expanded commerce and industry of our Nation be handled?

Certainly no one would expect the Congress to pass upon freight rates. We have all seen the difficulty Congress has faced in trying to write tariff laws. We know that the Congress could not regulate fair-trade practices; could not decide who shall be licensed in the radio field.

The legislative branch of the Government is composed of the House, with 435 Members, and the Senate, with 96 Members. These bodies can set up the machinery of government along broad lines. The Congress can, should, and does decide the policies to be followed by the agencies and departments in the Government. However, in my opinion, the legislative branch cannot spell out the details of the operation of these agencies. They must be given discretion—they must have the power to make rules and regulations.

Many of them also must be given power which is of a semijudicial nature. Congress cannot, and should not, undertake the exercise of any judicial power.

Thus we see that in the years since the inception of our Government, our civilization has grown complex. We are no longer a simple people engaged primarily in tilling the soil.

It therefore became necessary that our machine for governing this complex type of living be expanded, that its powers and flexibility should match the new mode of living.

Thus we have expanded the regular departments of Government and organized them into bureaus for the better administration of the new and expanded duties given to them.

We have also added the newer type of agency, the commission, into which have been combined to a limited degree executive power and legislative authority.

Of course, the added power and authority makes more important the type of personnel. It also adds importance to the methods used by this personnel.

It is in this latter field that I think just criticism can be directed. Let us examine this subject.

We have made progress in the selection of personnel. We now have most of the positions, except those of a policy-making nature, under the merit system. They are selected by civil-service procedure. Most of them have the opportunity of making a career of serving the public.

Their working conditions, their salaries, and their security have been improved. A liberal retirement system is provided for their old age.

I would be the last to claim that we have reached perfection in the methods of selection of personnel. I am not at all satisfied that we have found the best methods of testing the qualifications of applicants for governmental positions. But we have made noted progress in recent years.

There remains vast room for improvement in the civil service. We should continue every effort for the improvement of the public service. We can and should have better administration, better supervision of employees, better opportunities for advancement for those who show talent.

We must find the substitute for the profit motive of private business so that public employees will strive to do their best—so that public service will equal that received by the same public from corporations and private companies.

It seems to me that it is the duty of bureaucracy to never forget that it is working for the public. Each of us, whether elected or appointed, is a servant of the people.

Under our system of government the people are the masters—we are the servants. This should never be forgotten.

That is the first duty of bureaucracy.

Then the public servant should strive to exercise the authority of his office in a manner pleasing to the people. That cannot always be done, I know, but there is a vast difference in the way some agencies treat the public, as compared with the treatment received from other agencies.

As an example, I cite the Postal Department. In my opinion, it is the most satisfactory agency we have—both to the public and to the Congress. Those working in the Post Office Department are trained to be courteous. They are trained to be accurate. They must always be considerate. Persons who make themselves objectionable to the public rarely stay in the Postal Service.

It is interesting to note in passing that most of the key officials of the Postal Service are promoted from the ranks. They are men with many years of faithful and satisfactory service.

It is also interesting that this Department is nearer 100 percent civil service than any other agency we have.

The other agencies of Government might well study the Postal Service to find out why it is so well liked by the public.

One of the failures of bureaucracy arises from the desire of some bureaucrats to stretch the laws passed by the Congress—from their efforts to make the laws do things Congress never intended them to do. This has been particularly true in recent years.

This one fact alone is largely responsible for the outcry against the bureaucrat.

Therefore I say that it is the duty of the bureaucracy to confine its exercise of authority to the limits intended by the legislative branch. If they are in doubt, they should consult the Congress and seek legislation to clarify the meaning of the act being administered.

Another failing of bureaucracy in its duty to the public lies in the attitude of some toward the Senators and Congressmen. Some have a tendency to thumb their collective noses at the legislative branch. They resent the effort of the legislator to assist his constituent.

This attitude is responsible for the effort for confirmation by the Senate of all important positions. I do not feel that this is the remedy for the difficulty, but I can understand the motive of those who resent the wrongful attitude of some bureau officials toward the representatives of the people.

Every Government official, no matter what his position, should show proper consideration to those in the legislative branch of the Government. They should remember that they, too, are servants of the people—that both the bureau official and the legislative representative are working toward the same end—that they are being paid by the taxes of the people—that those who pay the fiddler have a right to call the tune.

Bureaucracy should also remember that the positions in the Government belong to the people. They are not the personal patronage of anyone. Relatives, former college mates or associates in business should not receive the positions under any official unless they can demonstrate that they are the best fitted persons available. Even then, it is my opinion that such appointments are bad policy and that every effort should be made to avoid them.

It is also the duty of the bureaucracy to give prompt attention to the business of the public. Needless delays, unnecessary red tape, the requirement of complex forms, all tend to bring down upon the head of the Government official the displeasure of those having to deal with him. Every effort should be made to simplify the procedures and to insure prompt action. That is especially true at the present time—and it is equally true that some agencies have been very lax in this respect.

In the selection of personnel it should be remembered that the position being filled is a public service. Persons selected should be temperamentally qualified to deal with the public. They should not be objectionable to the public for any reason. They should be well balanced, able to adjust themselves to serving the public, not crusaders or agitators.

If we are to maintain a career system in the Government those engaged therein must be willing to forego some of the privileges of private life.

The presence of any person on the public pay roll, whose employment is objectionable to a majority of the people, in my opinion is a mistake. I am not thinking of political party objections in this connection, but rather to those who identify themselves with causes or activities to which a majority of our people object. Membership in a subversive organization or similarly objectionable activity is what I have in mind.

To sum up the duties of bureaucracy to the public, it is my opinion:

That it should carry on the public business efficiently, effectively, with as little red tape and delay as is possible.

It should deal courteously with the people, show consideration to every citizen; have respect for the elected representatives of the people.

It should always remember that it is the servant of the public. It should never strive to become the master of the people.

It should always strive to ascertain the intent of the law, administer it wisely and humanely. It should never try to stretch the coverage of an act, but when in doubt, ask for legislative action to clarify such intent.

It should select with care its personnel, always remembering that the positions belong to the public, that those selected should be the ones most likely to please the public and those qualified best in all respects to fill the position to the satisfaction of the people.

Remembering that taxes are always burdensome, it should practice economy in spending its appropriations. It should not retain on its rolls a single unnecessary employee.

Those in the career service should give the utmost loyalty to the administration in power, regardless of personal opinions or political affiliations—only in this way will it be possible to maintain the career system.

Public service is a public trust. Therefore it is the duty of the bureaucracy to constantly guard its ranks against the idler, the loafer, the misfit, the malcontent, the discourteous and any who fail to understand the duties of the public servant to the public they serve.

Above all it is the duty of the bureaucracy to give to the people the best possible government. It should be always remembered that a dissatisfied people will demand a change. When they become sufficiently dissatisfied they vote for change without always being sure what the results may be. Dictators often ride to power amid the ruins of a government in which bureaucracy sought to be the master rather than the servant of the people.

Therefore it is a most important duty of the bureaucracy to constantly inform itself of the public state of mind and to correct its errors promptly.

It is the duty of all of us to do our full share in winning the war. No more important duty faces the bureau officials of our Government. The effectiveness with which they administer their duties will in large measure contribute to the early victory we all so desire or will delay that result and increase the cost.

In this grave hour of our country's peril much power has been delegated to the Commander in Chief. This power must, of necessity, be administered by others, under his leadership.

The war powers thus necessarily granted should be used wisely, with great discretion, with the sole objective of winning the war. They should not be used for any other purpose, certainly not to advance the greedy desires of any privileged group, nor to advance the crusade of any minority favoring a cause not essential to victory.

Above all, the bureaucracy should remember that it is the trustee only of a sacred trust, that trust being the sovereign power of a great liberty-loving people. As trustees they temporarily exercise this power—not for themselves nor for any special group—but only in the interest of the general welfare of all of the people.

They should never abuse the trust reposed in them. They should keep the faith we have in them and in that way preserve the freedom our forefathers won with their lives.

The Waterman Steamship Corporation Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter from Admiral E. S. Land, chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, to Hon. S. O. BLAND, chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, dated January 17, 1944; copy of letter from Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, to Admiral Land, dated December 16, 1943, in which letter the Comptroller General states, "The charges originally raised against the Waterman Steamship Corporation may be regarded as having been eliminated by subsequent development"; copy of letter from Mr. Frank L. Yates, Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, dated August 12, 1943:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, January 17, 1944.

Hon. S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: In view of your committee's interest in the charges raised by the General Accounting Office in connection with certain transactions between the Maritime Commission and the Waterman Steamship Corporation involving the purchase and sale of certain vessels, I believe you would be interested in the following letter from the Comptroller General, in which he states that "the charges originally raised against the Waterman Steamship Corporation may be regarded as having been eliminated by subsequent developments."

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

[Enclosure]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 16, 1943.

ADMINISTRATOR,
WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Office for Emergency Management, Executive Office of the President.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL LAND: I have your letter of October 13, 1943, as follows:

"On April 26, 1943, you requested me, as War Shipping Administrator, to withhold payments to the Waterman Steamship Corporation until such time as the amount withheld shall be sufficient to cover the charges raised by you against Waterman in your report to Congress, dated August 8, 1942, relating to certain transactions between the United States Maritime Commission and the Waterman Steamship Corporation.

"The charges, in the amount of $1,995,602.68, represent the difference between what the Commission paid Waterman for five ships which it bought from the corporation in December 1941 and the amount the Commission would have paid if, instead, it had, required Waterman to return to the Commission five other ships which were sold by it to Waterman in June 1940.

"Two of the five ships so sold to Waterman have been lost while under charter to the War Shipping Administration. The charters provided for indemnity in case of loss on the basis of the values specified in the sales agreement of June 8, 1940.

"The three ships still in operation have been returned to the War Shipping Administration, also in conformity with the values specified in the sales agreement of June 8, 1940.

"The acquisition of these ships, together with the indemnity for the two that were lost, appears to remove from consideration the question of whether the United States should have acquired one group of five ships as against acquiring the other group. The United States needed, and has acquired, both groups.

"It is my understanding that you agree that these developments eliminate the charges raised against Waterman Steamship Corporation. May I have confirmation that my understanding is correct?"

As you are aware, the matter of indebtedness of Waterman Steamship Corporation to the United States in the amount of $1,995,602.68, by reason of the facts and circumstances described in office report of August 8, 1942, to the Congress (House Document No. 840, 77th Cong.), was referred to the Attorney General for the institution of collection proceedings. Subsequently, by letter dated June 15, 1943, the Attorney General forwarded to this office copies of certain communications which, he stated, had been received from the War Shipping Administration. By letter dated August 12, 1943, the Attorney General was advised that in view of the facts disclosed by such correspondence—substantially the same facts set out in your letter above quoted—further action to collect the amount of such indebtedness was not required.

The sole basis for the charges originally raised by this office against Waterman Steamship Corporation in respect of the involved transaction stemmed from the failure of the United States Maritime Commission to exercise the option contained in the sales agreement of June 8, 1940, by which the vessels covered thereby could have been reacquired at their sale price, plus improvements, less depreciation. Of course, it is clear that by reason of the subsequent developments described in your letter the United States now has realized fully the financial advantages of said contract option; and to that extent there is removed from consideration the question of whether the United States should have acquired one group of five ships as against acquiring the other group.

Accordingly you are advised that your understanding—that the charges originally raised against Waterman Steamship Corporation may be regarded as having been eliminated by subsequent developments—is correct.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 12, 1943.

Re indebtedness of Waterman Steamship Corporation, $1,995,602.68.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL.

MY DEAR MR. BIDDLE: I have your letters of June 4 and 15, 1943, FMS: HS 77-3-35, with enclosures, regarding this matter which originally was referred to you by the Comptroller General's letter of August 21, 1942, transmitting a copy of an investigative report dated August 8, 1942, submitted by this Office to the Congress, relative to the sale by the United States Maritime Commission under sales agreement No. MCc-874, dated June 8, 1940, of five vessels from the Commission's laid-up fleet to the Waterman Steamship Corporation for the aggregate price of $596,000 (43,316

dead-weight tons), with an option to the Commission to repurchase the same vessels at said aggregate price, plus the value of improvements made thereto by the corporation, less reasonable depreciation, and to the subsequent purchase by the Commission from the said corporation of five other and older vessels at an aggregate price of $3,374,700 (43,965 dead-weight tons), instead of exercising the option to repurchase the vessels sold under the said agreement of June 8, 1940. (See H. Doc. No. 840, 77th Cong.) Subsequently, by letter of March 5, 1943, there was transmitted to you, for use in effecting collection, a transcript from the books and proceedings of the General Accounting Office showing, by settlemen No. US-10194-MC, dated January 7, 1943, the certified indebtedness to the United States of the Waterman Steamship Corporation, thirteenth floor, Merchants Bank Building, Mobile, Ala., in the amount of $1,995,602.68, representing excess payments made to the debtor by the United States Maritime Commission by reason of the said Commission's failure to exercise its right of option under the aforesaid agreement of June 8, 1940.

Now, it is noted from a copy of a letter dated June 2, 1943, of the general counsel, War Shipping Administration, to you, which copy was enclosed with your said letter of June 15, that "all of the vessels sold to Waterman with certain repurchase rights in favor of the Government have, by mutual agreement, been repurchased by the Government in conformity with the original sales contract. Two of the vessels have been sunk, and insurance paid by the Government has also been limited to the amounts payable under the original sales contract" and that "the vessels will be delivered immediately upon their return from voyages pending on May 19." The two vessels referred to as having been sunk—*La Salle* and *Andrew Jackson*—are stated in your said letter of June 15 as having been "compensated for under war-risk policies written by War Shipping Administration at amounts corresponding to the option prices" specified under article 7 of the sales agreement of June 8, 1940, by which agreement the United States Maritime Commission sold to the Waterman Steamship Corporation, with certain repurchase rights, five vessels named *Bayou Chico, Ponce de Leon* (ex *City of Weatherford*), *La Salle* (ex *George Peirce*), *Andrew Jackson* (ex *Salaam*), and *Beauregard* (ex *Yapalaga*).

In view of the above representations, further action looking toward collection of the amount certified to be due by Waterman Steamship Corporation under certificate of settlement No. US-10194-MC, dated January 7, 1943, as aforesaid, would appear at this time to be not required. It is expected, of course, that upon delivery of each of the three aforesaid vessels, payment vouchers covering the purchase price thereof will be verified before any payment is made to the Waterman Steamship Corporation. (See the letter dated May 29, 1943, from T. M. Torrey, Director of Large Vessels Procurement, War Shipping Administration, to E. A. Roberts, president, Waterman Steamship Corporation, a copy of which said letter was transmitted here by your letter of June 15 aforesaid.)

There remains for consideration the question of whether the prices paid by the United States Maritime Commission to the Waterman Steamship Corporation for the five vessels, *City of Alma, Raphael Semmes, Jean Lafitte, Iberville,* and *Ipswich,* were excessive in view of the provisions of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1242). If such prices were excessive you may desire to give consideration to the filing of a counterclaim for such excess in the pending proceeding brought by the Waterman Steamship Corporation in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama to recover from the United States the sum of $1,145,277.80, plus interest and costs, by reason of the alleged loss at sea, by enemy action on July 1, 1942, of the steamship *Warrior.* The views of this office on the question of whether payments for the five vessels were excessive will be the subject of further report to you at an early date.

Respectfully,

FRANK L. YATES,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today all that was mortal of Woodrow Wilson died, but the spirit of this great American did not die on that day. It still lives and in the hearts of a grateful people, and grows brighter with each passing year. Only the fullness of time can and will fully evaluate the depth of his patriotism, the clearness of his vision, the high order of his public service, and his unswerving devotion to duty in his service to humanity. Truly, it may well be said of him that he literally gave his life for his country during one of the most critical periods in its history.

Twenty years after his death we find ourselves engaged in a life-and-death struggle in a world war to preserve democracy for ourselves and the other liberty-loving nations of the world and to preserve the future peace of the world. To win this war, as we surely will, we will be compelled to spend billions of dollars, make many sacrifices and suffer the loss of thousands of the flower of our young manhood. Woodrow Wilson lived through such a tragic, trying era, and knew from bitter experience the devastating impact of such a war upon civilization. I am one of those who believe that if our Nation had followed the vision and leadership of Woodrow Wilson at the end of World War No. 1, we would not be engaged in this tragic struggle today.

Mr. Speaker, the deep concern of the people of our country and especially the concern of the fathers and mothers, who have given their sons to serve their country, is assurance from the leadership of our Nation that we will not again make the same mistake, tragic as it was, that we made at the end of World War No. 1, when we refused to cooperate with other freedom-loving nations in a program, championed by Woodrow Wilson, to prevent future world wars and to preserve world peace. Mr. Speaker, we must not make this mistake again if civilization is to live. That is the task that lies ahead of us and posterity will judge how well we meet the issue and do the job.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial today entitled "Prophet With Honor," which I ask to insert herein, and which is as follows:

PROPHET WITH HONOR

Just 20 years ago Woodrow Wilson's life came to an end. The spirit which animated him and the principles to which he gave his full devotion were not extinguished with him. They survived and matured, as he knew they would, in the slow, composite, democratic mind of this Nation. And now, perhaps, as he prophesied, they are about to triumph.

It was the core of his belief that nations, like men, cannot live unto themselves. He saw the earth round and integrated. He saw its freedom and security as indivisible. When he first set out to preach this doctrine to the American people, he said in a speech at Indianapolis in September 1919: "For, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty, and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes."

Woodrow Wilson evoked in the American people a national exaltation never equaled. In that spirit, a spirit of immolation, he led us into war. But with victory the exaltation faded. We failed to carry forward the high purposes he had avowed. For that default we are paying today the terrible penalty he foresaw. His words have fresh force and meaning for us now. We may differ again, as we did a quarter century ago, over the letter of his formula for the future. But the spirit of that formula must not again go unheeded. The direction and the goal are clear.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate of this question of the soldiers' vote, I have heard it said, time and time again, that it is no political issue; and I now say that it certainly should not be political. On both sides of the aisle we agree that the soldiers should be able to vote and we are all desirous of fixing up legislation to enable them to do so. None in this body is naive enough to honestly believe that a law will be perfected whereby every soldier will be able to vote, any more than in peacetime every citizen qualified is able to vote. At every election there are thousands of legal voters who are unable to cast their votes for one reason or another. Such must be inevitable. We cannot pass any law that will provide for every contingency and no matter how good a law we pass there are bound to be some soldiers who will be unable to cast their votes just the same as there will be some citizens right here at home who for some reason or other will be unable to vote.

The problem we have here is not on the substance, but rather the method,

and in the absence of bad faith, and I don't accuse any of my colleagues of bad faith, we shall all work to the end of procuring the best method possible. It is not complimentary to this body that we have been working for months, with the poor result thus far obtained. What is wrong? I think the trouble is Congress is disorganized. I learned way back in the intermediate grade in school that there are three branches of our Government working, or supposed to be working, entirely independent of each other, and that each branch has an exclusive and distinctive function. Now, the trouble seems to be that for about the last decade the administrative branch of the Government has taken over all three different branches of the Government, and by reason of this, up until very recently, Congress has been in very ill repute and was called a rubber stamp Congress. Many Members of Congress who were willing to forego their constitutional duties and surrender their legislative judgment to the administrative branch were involuntarily retired, and the complexion of this legislative body was somewhat improved, but must I say there is still room for improvement? I, personally, think we could do a much better job if we were left to our legislative duties and were not visited by either "Dr. Must" or "Dr. Pressure."

I have the utmost respect for all Members of Congress; I know none whom I would say do not mean to be fair, serious, and conscientious in their desire to do what they think is best for their country and constituents. But we must learn something from experience, and we must live down the reputation that we are a joint and several "rubber stamp."

Maybe I am saying too much. Maybe I am too fresh, even for a freshman. I would, however, even at the expense of possibly being called too fresh, call attention to a mistake we made at the last session as a precedent for what I am fearful we are again about to fall into.

You all remember how our earnest and hard-working committee worked on a tax bill. They were, legislatively, doing a very good job in working out a rather simple "pay as you go" tax bill, when, what happened? You all know—I dislike to dig up this putrid body—the administrative branch came along and said "No." The Treasury Department, instead of confining itself to its administrative duties after enactment of a tax law, thought that it must also do the legislating. You know the result—we got a monstrosity—and what do we now say to our constituents? What can we say? We have to admit parentage of this awful offspring. How many of us are proud of that legislation? Maybe there has been a worse and more complicated tax law enacted since the beginning of the world, but if there has, I do not believe anyone at present living has ever heard of it. All on account of the pressure of the administrative branch of our Government.

Are we now going to make the same mistake? The same administrative branch of our Government is again telling us how to legislate. Are we going to be deaf, dumb, and blind and permit the pressure groups to drive us into producing another monstrosity? This time we have been visited by "Dr. Pressure" himself, flanked by the support of the Cabinet members purporting to be speaking for the Army and Navy. I cannot believe, and I hope it is not true, that "Dr. Pressure" is prescribing for the Army and Navy, they are doing too well. Our Army and Navy are the best in the world, but I simply refuse to believe that the Army and Navy know as much about legislating as Congress. I think that most all the mistakes of Congress in the past has been due entirely to outside interference and if the administrative branch would leave us alone, we will be able to do pretty good jobs.

There is one thing that "burns me up" more than anything that has happened to me in my life, and I also was in World War No. 1, as were nearly all, if not all, the members of the committee who have worked on this bill, which I hope will go through, and that is when I receive a letter or telegram—and I receive many of them—urging me to vote for legislation permitting the soldiers to vote. Where does this propaganda come from that gives the impression that the legislative branch is trying to deprive the soldiers from voting. Who is it that is spreading this smearing and slurring? We, as legislators, have the responsibility of drafting a law that will be workable and constitutional. We are sworn to do that, and we are sworn to support the Constitution. We are not all sick and we do not need any quack medicine prescribed by Dr. "Pressure." We do not need any expert testimony to convince us how much a ballot weighs, or how long it will take for a ballot to reach a soldier on the several battle fronts, when we are writing our sons on those fronts and are receiving replies every day.

I cannot state too strongly how anxious I am of giving the soldiers a chance to vote and every Representative I know is just as anxious as I am. But these boys want the privilege of voting the same as you and I and the same as they have voted in the past. Let the vote be constitutional—make it a valid vote—and not one that can be knocked out by the Court as unconstitutional.

I am against the bobtail ballot. It is silly and unnecessary. The Governors of the respective States have expressed their willingness and desire to cooperate to the fullest extent. We do not have to do any guessing as to what will happen to all bobtail ballots that are voted by voters of New York State, the State where I vote. Governor Dewey is one of the outstanding Governors of the States. No one will deny he is a learned and painstaking lawyer. And what does he say about the bobtail ballot, that the pressure groups are trying to stampede us into enacting into an unconstitutional law; this is what he says:

> Any ballot authorized by Congress which would not list State, county, and other local offices would be incomplete and not in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New York. Therefore, it would be incumbent upon the New York Legislature to make available to every citizen in the armed forces from the State of New York a full and complete State ballot.

These who are fighting our battles are entitled to a real honest to goodness ballot which includes all the names of candidates. That sacred right is in our hands and we must not fail them. The Army and Navy of which they are a part, will do their part. It will be child's play for them to transport, distribute, and return the ballots, if necessary, in half the time any of us would think it possible. Our committee has done an excellent job. The members have exercised good judgment and care in preparing a bill that meets all the requirements and it is constitutional. It behooves every Member of Congress to support the committee bill.

This committee bill is the best that is in us all. It represents the legislative ability of many of you members who are the best legislators in the world. Let us all vote for the committee bill and thereby show that we will not tolerate pressure groups who are throwing an insult into our faces by telling us that our judgment is so poor and we know so little about legislating that we must be told what to do and how to do it by pressure groups knowing nothing about the subject.

Let us make it unanimous. Let us discourage pressure groups trifling with the rights of our boys who are giving their lives for us.

The Chaplains Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem reprinted from the New York Sun of January 12, 1944:

THE CHAPLAINS CORPS

(By H. I. Phillips in the Sun Dial)

(Rabbi Louis Werfel, known as The Flying Rabbi, was killed in an airplane crash in Algeria, on his way to resume duties as a chaplain with the armed forces.—News item.)

I

The Flying Rabbi! Little was he known
To those of us who fight the war by ear,
Yet, dead, he serves again to prove so false
The bigots' ways, wherever they appear;
Dead, speeding to the side of Jewish boys,
He kept the faith with all the fighting breed
Enshrining high again this gallant crew—
The Chaplains Corps, of every faith and creed.

II

As Christian padres serve on far-flung fronts
And bring the boys "the strength that passeth all,"
So did this rabbi and those of his faith
Go through the muck and torture to the call;
There is no Jew, no Gentile in that time
When bugles blow and duty points the way,
And, knowing this, the chaplains do their stuff
As they would do it on the Judgment Day.

III

The Catholic, the Protestant, the Jew,
As one they give the all sustaining grace
To those who die to keep our way of life,
Without regard to color, faith, or race;
Theirs is the symbol of a nation strong,
The force that makes a country's shield so bright;
The Chaplains Corps of gallant, quiet men,
Who blaze a way with the Eternal Light.

IV

The priest who puts the wafer on dry lips,
The rector leading tired men in prayer—
The rabbi with the word of Abraham—
Each doing quietly his holy share. . . .
These are the men who ease the weary path,
Who soothe the heart and heal the harassed soul—
Who keep the vision of the boyhood day,
Preserving things learned at a mother's knee.

V

The Roman collar and the vestments of
The Protestant and Rabbi seem as one
When all is stripped of shallowness and dross,
And only solemn duty's to be done;
So out there on a thousand battlefields
The soldiers shout with one hot breath,
"You lie!"
To lesser souls in comfort's easy lap
Who walk the slimy path of bigotry.

Aid for Private Flyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board has just proposed a step of great significance to the future of private flying. Indeed, American Aviation, the leading aviation publication, describes this step as "the most important thing that has happened on the regulatory side of aviation since the passage of the Aeronautics Act of 1926."

The C. A. B.'s proposal is for a drastic simplification of the rules affecting private flying. Whereas those rules today take up 20 closely printed pages, the proposed revision would come to only 7 pages, with whole sections of the existing regulations entirely deleted.

The theory behind the proposed revision is that regulation by Government, in the private flying field, should be primarily for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of the public rather than of protecting the individual private flyer from his own carelessness. In this respect the proposed revision approaches the theory of regulation generally adopted in the case of the private automobile, marks a fundamental departure in the approach toward the regulation of private flying, and recognizes that in the post-war period proper development of private flying depends upon intelligent and liberal Government regulation just as much as upon technological progress.

These proposed revisions have been under consideration by the C. A. B. for a long period of time, and have been very carefully worked out. The revisions have been circulated to all interested parties and comments and criticisms have been invited before they are to be placed in final form.

There has been some criticism of the Lea civil-aviation bill coming from aviation circles. Most of this critfcism, however, has been based on the unfounded assertion that the provisions of that bill would make the regulation of private flying more complex. It has been evident that those voicing such criticisms either failed to study the bill or, in their analyses, failed to make a distinction between the basic provisions of law and the administrative regulations adopted thereunder. Thus we have heard criticisms of the bill couched in terms of the horrible complexity of the private flying regulations which have come out of Washington.

Actually the Lea bill has simply codified and clarified the provisions of existing law affecting the regulation of private flying, and there is nothing whatsoever in the bill which makes that regulation any more complicated or severe. On the contrary, in important respects the Lea bill affords greater protection to the private flyer and a greater opportunity to him for the free employment of the right of flight. Furthermore, the bill includes a specific mandate to the effect that in the Government regulations there must be a sharp distinction drawn between the regulations affecting commercial transportation by air and those dealing with ordinary private and miscellaneous flying.

There is no doubt but that the regulations affecting private flying heretofore have been complicated. In a number of respects these regulations have been aptly described as considered by many to be a Chinese puzzle.

But this complexity has not been the fault of the C. A. B. The C. A. B. inherited these regulations, has repeatedly invited private-flying groups and others in aviation to suggest simplification, and has itself been critical of the regulations, and has for some time past been studying means of simplifying them.

The existing regulations were put into effect by the old Bureau of Air Commerce prior to the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in 1938. The drafting of these much maligned regulations was not only influenced but was actually accomplished by representatives of some of the very groups which recently have been most vociferous in criticizing the Lea bill because of the complexity of the administrative regulations affecting private flying.

In any case it has remained for the Federal administrative agency to take the lead in bringing about reform. Those who have whipped themselves into a frenzy of criticism of the Lea bill because of the fallacious reasoning that Federal regulation is likely to be more complex than State regulation, and who have shouted from the housetops of the need to preserve States' rights in the aviation field in order to save private flying from being shackled by the restrictive action of a remote Federal bureau, are now confounded. Not only have those critics come from the very groups who were responsible for the complexity of the regulations which the C. A. B. inherited, but those groups have themselves failed, and failed dismally, to make constructive suggestions for improvement. It has been left to the C. A. B. to take the leadership, and the C. A. B. has done so. There could be no clearer demonstration of the absolute impossibility of attempting to handle the regulation of flying on any basis other than the Federal basis as set forth in the Lea civil aviation bill.

The Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of February 2, 1944, by Frank R. Kent, which should be of particular interest to my colleagues:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

A pro-Roosevelt columnist, now in the South Pacific, reports that most soldiers with whom he talks favor Mr. Roosevelt's re-election, but are deeply resentful over the strikes at home and toward labor bosses generally.

There is no question as to the accuracy of this report. But it does not make sense. It does not make sense to be for Mr. Roosevelt and be angry about strikes at the same time.

And it is an absurdity to be against labor bosses and favor 4 more years of the Roosevelt regime. One might as well say that he likes motor cars, but hates gasoline. The only way to account for this paradoxical feeling among the soldiers is that they have not been able to get the facts. It would be surprising if they had got them. Certainly, on this subject, they would never get the straight stuff from the foreign branch of the New Deal-dominated O. W. I.

Yet there was never a clearer record than that which links Mr. Roosevelt to the labor bosses and places primary responsibility for the strikes on his shoulders. Wholly aside from the close political alliance that has existed between him and them for 9 years before we got into the war, during which period extraordinary White House favors built union labor into the country's most favored class, the story since Pearl Harbor is a revealing one. The outstanding facts are these:

First. Resisting all appeals for a single-headed War Production Board, Mr. Roosevelt's original set-up was a dual-headed affair with a labor politician—Sidney Hillman—holding coequal power with Mr. Knudsen. Eventually, this arrangement broke down, as it was bound to do, but it was 18 months before Mr. Roosevelt got around to the single head which the last war had proven essential.

Second. Almost from the date of the Pearl Harbor disaster, the war has been used by the labor bosses to grab more power and more money, and an epidemic of strikes, retarding munition production, has afflicted the country.

Instead of condemning these strikes (more than 5,000 in 2 years) Mr. Roosevelt has consistently minimized them, and, supposedly inspired by him, his Under Secretary of War, Mr. Robert Patterson, has sent glowing letters to labor bosses commending them for labor's magnificent work, at a time when many millions of man-days were being lost through strikes and billions of dollars of War Department contracts were being held up. So far as there has been an administration labor policy, it has been a policy of bribing the labor bosses with wage increases and closed-shop gains.

Third. From the start the President has stood in the way of antistrike legislation. Twice, through his personal influence, antistrike bills which had passed the House were killed in the Senate. Finally, he vetoed the feeble Connally antistrike bill and it was then passed over his veto.

Fourth. In every instance where a strike has threatened to bring production to a standstill, in the end the labor bosses have gotten nearly all they asked and often more than they expected. In no case has he made a firm stand against labor demands—even against those of the unfriendly John L. Lewis. The chief difference between Mr. Lewis and the other labor bosses, who, as political allies of the President, are demanding a fourth term for him, is that Mr. Lewis is less hypocritical.

Fifth. Last month after General Marshall had denounced the railroad strike threat as a "damnable crime" against the Nation, the President, under heavy Army and Navy pressure, recommended a national service act. But he crippled its chances by insisting that unless four other measures were enacted with it he would not be for it.

From that day neither the labor bosses nor Members of Congress have taken its passage seriously. Though it has been strongly urged by Secretary Stimson the proposal is considered dead and no move to restore it to life and vigor has been made by the President.

There are other facts in the record, such as the President's acceptance of the phony "no-strike" pledge, but these are the big ones—and they cannot be disputed. They show that Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the labor bosses is the chief reason for the strikes, that he has at no time stood up against them, that he has made concessions to them that should not have been made and permitted them to kick holes through his own anti-inflation program. They are still doing it.

And now we are told that the soliders, while angry over the strikes, favor Mr. Roosevelt. It must be because they do not know the record, and it is easy to see why. Clearly, it has not reached them, and quite as clearly it isn't going to reach them in the coming program—surely not through the O. W. I. or the Army's special service. If they fully knew the record, the reported stand of the soldiers could hardly be possible.

Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted January 25, 1944, by the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., requesting the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to give the members of our armed forces the right to vote:

Whereas it appears that large numbers of those in the service of our country are deprived of their right to vote by reason of their forced absence from their domiciles, and are, therefore, disfranchised of one of their paramount rights of American citizenship, and it further appears that no provision has been made by legislation to insure said members of the armed forces of their right and privilege to cast their vote in elections pending: Wherefore be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Lynn, in meeting assembled, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America by immediate action to provide adequate legislation to allow and permit the members now serving in the armed forces to cast their ballot in all elections pending; and be it further

Ordered, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council, forward to each Member of the House of Representatives representing Massachusetts and to the Senators representing said State, a copy of this resolution.

Conference of Cooperative League on International Cooperative Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because of its world-wide significance and thoroughly constructive program for meeting the problems of the people both now and in the post-war period, I am asking consent to include with my remarks the January 27 issue of Cooperative League News Service which outlines the cooperative conference held in this city on January 19 and 20, of this year:

ROOSEVELT LOOKS TO COOPERATIVES TO PLAY IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE PEACE THAT LIES AHEAD—REPRESENTATIVES FROM 22 COUNTRIES LAY SPECIFIC PLANS FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

WASHINGTON, D. C.—President Franklin D. Roosevelt told representatives of 22 nations, in conference here January 19 and 20, that "the cooperative movement, which belongs to no one nation but has its roots in the traditions of all democratic peoples, is one of the appropriate instruments to be used in any effective handling of the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of Axis aggression."

More than 30,000,000 of the world's hundred million co-op members were represented by the 60 delegates from 22 nations present at the conference. A crowd of 500 filled Washington's United States Chamber of Commerce auditorium for the evening session January 19.

In a letter addressed to Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, sponsors of the 2-day conference on international cooperative reconstruction, the President said:

"It is fitting that the centennial of the establishment of the truly democratic Rochdale principles is being celebrated by a conference of the Committee on International Cooperative Reconstruction.

"The weavers of Rochdale, who founded modern cooperative enterprise, balanced independence with interdependence, self-interest with good will, and action with foresight. Any effective handling of the problem of the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of Axis aggression must be based upon these same considerations. The cooperative movement, which belongs to no one nation but has the roots in the traditions of all democratic peoples, is therefore one of the appropriate instruments to be used in this task.

"I look forward to the success of your conference and to the contribution that the cooperative organizations throughout the world will make to the years of peace that lie ahead.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

Sir Arthur Salter, recently named senior deputy director general of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, told the delegate Wednesday night that the spirit, tradition, and outlook of cooperatives is in complete harmony with United Nations plans of post-war recovery.

U. N. R. R. A. TO MAKE USE OF COOPERATIVES

Sir Arthur said that "true democracy cannot be built on purely political foundations," but "must be broader, based in social and economic structure."

"In the distressed countries," Sir Arthur Salter said, "those who relieve will rebuild. Those who rebuild will help to make the pattern of government. Cooperaives must be again, as they were before, part of this pattern.

"We need to tap the reservoir of good will and active benevolence which is to be found both in cooperatives and in many other great nongovernmental associations throughout the world. True democracy is made by active and equal participation of citizens not only in the polling booth and governmental office but in education, in economic enterprise, and in social effort."

Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, and member of the American delegation to the United Nations Food Conference, warned that "the minds of men throughout the world are marching" and that a "guaranty of at least a minimum protection against the hazards of health, accidents, insecurity, and other needs must be made available to the average man in accordance with his capacity for productive effort."

LINCOLN POINTS TO RESPONSIBILITY TO ABOLISH WANT

"It seems to me that the world faces some stark realities," said Lincoln. "Either we are going back to our old exploitation, imperialistic profit-motivated economy of scarcity, or we by trial and error will work out the blueprints of a new world based on an economy of abundance. We must find the answer to the maintenance of relatively high production, full employment, high purchasing power with maximum use of human and material resources. We must stop wasting human and material resources. We must overcome this paradox of want and hunger amidst potential plenty.

"However wisely we may plan to make a world of peace permanent, one freedom stands fundamentally beyond all others—freedom from want. Those of us who believe in cooperatives believe we have a contribution to make. And the cooperatives must not fail."

E. R. Bowen, general secretary of the Cooperative League, addressing the conference earlier the same day, told about the widespread development of cooperatives in America and declared that "cooperatives have beer proven by a century of experience to be a dependable program for freedom from want,

a democratic road to economic freedom, the economic foundation for world peace. The common man has found a common cause as a consumer and is on the way to produce and distribute plenty for all."

Preceding Mr. Bowen, Dr. Joseph G. Knapp, of the Cooperative Research and Service Division of the Farm Credit Administration, reported that at least 3 farmers in every 5 are participants in some form of cooperative activity. A total of 10,450 marketing and purchasing cooperatives with combined membership of 3,850,000 handle $3,780,000,000 business a year.

NETWORK OF COOPERATIVES AROUND THE WORLD

Dr. James P. Warbasse, president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the United States of America and member of the Central Committee of the International Cooperative Alliance, outlined the world-wide growth of cooperatives and reported that before the war the I. C. A. had a membership of 124,000 cooperative societies with 100,000,000 members in 39 countries.

"When it comes to world reconstruction the choice must be made between three agencies," Dr. Warbasse said, "private profit business, the political state, and the cooperatives. If the people of the distressed countries are to be saved, the best results will accrue from their having as much of a hand as possible in saving themselves. If self-help is better than philanthropic or autocratic help, then the plain man as a user and consumer of things must control the production and distribution that serves him. If abundance is better than scarcity, the plain man who needs things must be allowed to produce and distribute the things he needs. The world-wide cooperative movement points the way."

APPROVE FORMATION OF WORLD-WIDE TRADING ORGANIZATION

Opening the final day's session, Howard A. Cowden, president of the Consumers Cooperative Association and chairman of the Committee for International Cooperative Reconstruction, presented for the consideration of the delegates from the 22 countries represented, the formation of an international cooperative trading and manufacturing association. The new agency was approved by unanimous vote of the directors of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. 2 days earlier. It was approved in principle by the delegates and is to be presented to cooperative organizations in various parts of the world for specific action.

The world-wide cooperative would serve primarily in the fields of food, petroleum products, and agricultural supplies. It would have its own oil wells, refineries, and tanker fleets, its own processing and manufacturing plants. The capitalization required would be $12,000,000 with cooperative organizations throughout the world participating in the capitalization, operation, and benefits of the association. "It can be of immense service to cooperative members in all lands," Mr. Cowden declared. "It can return important savings, and it can provide a measure of competition for the oil cartels which undoubtedly regard the war merely as an interlude to the resumption of 'business as usual'."

CONFERENCE ADOPTS A PROGRAM FOR RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

The Conference on International Cooperative Reconstruction voted unanimously to approve in principle a concrete program for the use of cooperative facilities and methods in reshaping the post-war world and building the peace. The program calls for establishment of an international cooperative trading and manufacturing association; and an international cooperative bank; recommends the creation of a cooperative division of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U. N. R. R. A.); launching of a freedom fund financed through popular subscription to help prehabilitate co-ops in victim countries; removal of barriers to free movement of people, goods, and currencies between all countries; additional curbs on cartels and monopolies; and close collaboration between consumer-purchasing and producer-marketing cooperatives to help raise the standards of living of all peoples.

A joint meeting of the boards of directors of National Cooperatives, Inc., and the Cooperative League of the United States of America immediately following the conference took steps to implement the decisions of the conference, to transmit the recommendations to appropriate organizations throughout the world, and authorized the Committee on International Cooperative Reconstruction to send a man abroad to work with cooperative organizations in other countries in connection with the conference recommendations.

Nations represented at the conference, either through their cooperative associations or through representatives of the governments interested in cooperatives, included Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, England, Greece, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Palestine, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Canada, New Zealand, Jamaica, China, the Philippine Commonwealth, and the United States. Observers from the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and several of the executive departments, as well as national educational, religious, labor, farm, and professional organizations participated in the conference. Peak attendance at the sessions was between five and six hundred.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RECONSTRUCTION

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Here are a few of the highlight statements made during plenary sessions Wednesday and Thursday, and at the Press Club luncheon Wednesday:

Rudolph Molin, of Sweden, said that 40 percent of Sweden's population participate in cooperative activities and that this large group is willing to aid in rebuilding Europe's war-torn economy.

George Radin, of Yugoslavia, who had been a delegate to both the United Nations Food Conference and the U. N. R. R. A. conference, emphasized that the great need of his countrymen was not relief but reconstruction. It is this field, he said, that cooperatives in other countries working with cooperatives in his own country could be of greatest aid.

Prof. Shih-Chi Hu, general secretary of the Cooperative League of China said China's 60,000,000 cooperative members and their families offer his country's best hope for post-war rehabilitation.

Dr. V. Myslovic, representative of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Agriculture in London, pointed to the successful growth of cooperation between producer and consumer organizations in his country before the war as one of the essentials of sound economic development for post-war Europe.

Anders Fjeldstad, agricultural attaché of the Norwegian Embassy, pointed out how self-governing boards composed of consumers, producers, and government representatives working with cooperative organizations had lowered the prices to the consumers substantially and at the same time increased the return to the farmers.

Prof. Stephen du Ropp, director of the office of research and publication of the Polish Government's information center, urged that the favorable moment that exists at the end of the war be grasped to use cooperatives for decentralized production as a method of speeding rehabilitation through self-help.

Israel Mereminski, of the General Cooperative Association of Jewish Labor in Palestine, described how cooperatives are the essence of the Palestinian development, with 65 percent of the people connected with one or more cooperative organizations.

Dr. Maurice Columbain, of the cooperative section of the International Labor Office, brought to the conference a special report on Cooperatives and Post-War Reconstruction, which has just been published, outlining how the cooperatives throughout the world can be used in post-war relief distribution, thereby eliminating inefficiency and saving time, money, and heartaches in post-war relief.

Msgr. Donald McLean, of the Catholic University of America, urged that the cooperatives look to the huge job of world reconstruction as well as relief and rehabilitation.

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, declared, "We must gather up the forces of humanity to offset the inordinate concentration of power. There must be another answer except power and paternalism. The cooperative movement must grow faster. It is the only 100-percent constructive program on the horizon today. We are in a world-wide struggle between private and governmental concentration of power on one hand and a people's program on the other. Monopolies and cartels forced the world into an economy of scarcity, which is the main reason for the current war situation. Cooperatives can combat these monopolies and help rebuild the world after the war."

The Past 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith insert statement of Mr. J. M. Wyatt, whose illuminating statements on wines and liquors frequently appear in the public prints under the pseudonym "Mark Merit":

THE PAST 10 YEARS

Just 10 years ago an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was repealed. A free and an articulate people had spoken its piece. And so that "ignoble" experiment of a democratic people was written off, as an accountant would say, "with a loss." For we did lose something. We lost, temporarily, that most precious of all things that civilized man has striven for since long before the Magna Carta * * * respect for the sacred rights of the individual; respect for constitutional authority. Just turn back to the chapter in our history that deals with the prohibition period. See the "scars" that illustrate its pages. Not long ago they were still livid; now they are paled by the healing influence of time. But they are still vivid in the memory of those of us who lived, perhaps precariously, through that period. Not a pleasant picture, in retrospect.

Now we are again at war. Now we really are fighting with every ounce of our resources and our manhood and womanhood—to continue our way of life—our right to think and talk and worship as we please—our right as individuals. So that it can't happen again, let us visit, mentally, the chamber of horrors of the prohibition period. Let us compare that period with the last 10 years.

And, let us who are forced by various circumstances to stay at home while our sons are absent fighting for us, let us guard the home front against all manner of schemes that could wreck us from within. And, in

passing, may we remind those who just can't think of all things these days: 10 years ago the alcoholic beverage industry began providing much needed revenue for our Government which reached a point where its total was second only to the national income tax. Ten years ago the alcoholic beverage industry began providing work for thousands in its own industry and in related industries, when there were twelve to fifteen million jobless in America, willing and anxious to work.

Ten years ago the alcoholic beverage industry began providing a market for millions of bushels of surplus grain for which there was no market; when crops were being plowed under, and when farmers were paid for not raising instead of raising normally revenue-producing foodstuffs. And, 10 years ago, the alcoholic beverage industry began the construction of new plants and the rehabilitation of old ones which were literally converted "overnight" to the making of precious alcohol for wartime purposes when the emergency arose. Not a drop of whisky is being made today by any legal American distillery. The whisky which is now being voluntarily rationed to the trade, and in many places by the trade to the consumer, was made in peacetime. The past 10 years. Think of the preceding 10 years, years of prohibition which did not prohibit.

Politics With Service Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester (Pa.) Times of February 2, 1944:

POLITICS WITH SERVICE VOTES

It is fairly obvious, according to observers of the Washington scene, that the to-do about votes for servicemen is five-sixths political. The President and some of the Senators and Congressmen who face election this year see in it an issue which they can twist to their own interests by making it appear that a vote is being denied to servicemen. Actually, this is not so. Practically all States have provisions for soldier voting. The process is cumbersome, but it involves question of States' rights and constitutional procedures which the servicemen are now fighting to maintain. Congressmen are fighting at home to maintain those principles.

One of the grave dangers to Constitutional government comes from the fact that millions of the servicemen have never known any other President but Mr. Roosevelt. For many of them it will be the first time they have ever voted. Service men and women now under 25 years of age were under voting age at the last Presidential election. It is pointed out that the White House political gang expects a good majority of those servicemen to vote for the Commander in Chief, just as they counted on the votes of persons on W. P. A. projects, during the 1930's.

It makes a sordid picture, and Senators and Congressmen who are sincerely anxious to make service voting less difficult are said to be deeply concerned about the way the President has maneuvered to make it appear as though they are opposed to having the servicemen vote at all. The controversy between Congress and the President on the soldier vote problem has served to highlight the adroit methods that are used by men bent on perpetuating themselves in power.

Resolution of the Ottumwa Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution on international air policy adopted on January 25, 1944, by the Ottumwa (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce.

The city of Ottumwa 2 years ago presented, without cost to the Government, 1,440 acres of some of the best farming land in the State of Iowa for the construction of a large naval air base, where some 800 students are in training at all times. I mention this to show that Ottumwa is an air-minded community and has at all times shown an unusual interest in the development of aviation.

The chamber of commerce, in the following resolution, has further demonstrated its interest in aviation and its future and expresses the conviction that Congress should make plans now for the establishment of a world system of air transportation:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make its declarations of policy operative and that the appropriate governmental agencies incorporate in their planning of foreign air transportation to be operated by United States flag air carriers, the following basic policies to be established in the world system of air transportation thereunder created:

1. Free and open world-wide competition, subject to reasonable regulation by the appropriate governmental agencies.

2. Private ownership and management of air lines engaged in domestic and foreign operation.

3. Fostering and encouragement by the Government of the United States of a sound world-wide air transportation system.

4. World-wide freedom of transit in peaceful flight.

5. Acquisition of civil and commercial outlets required in the public interest; be it further

Resolved, That a world-wide system of air transportation should be developed in which open and free competition, reasonably regulated; be given full play. The air lines of the United States be permitted to forge ahead under the stimulus of world competition. Their growth should not be restricted in any way by the withering effect of monopoly. Private ownership, with its encouragement of initiative and creativeness, and its attendant rewards for accomplishment should be our undeviating policy; be it further

Resolved, That there should be no delay in the development of world system air transportation policies and the consummation of negotiated arrangements to make them operative; be it further

Resolved, That facilities constructed and now under control of the armed forces of the United States be made available insofar as possible for privately owned and operated air lines.

H. F. DARBYSHIRE,
President.
H. A. BROWN,
Chairman, Committee on Aviation.
LOUIS G. BEIN,
Secretary.
OTTUMWA (IOWA) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Votes for Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the men and women in the armed services have just as much right to vote as any other qualified citizen. I want to see them vote and I expect to do everything in my power to that end. I have talked to quite a number of service men and women, and they tell me that they expect the right to vote even though they may not be in a position because of their war service, to exercise that right and cast a lawful vote. Nevertheless, I think they are entitled to that right. I also understand and respect their statements concerning the casting of a legal vote.

These boys and girls want the right to vote, and they are entitled to that right to vote. They should have it. But, in desiring the right to cast a ballot they want also to be sure that the America they are now defending will be preserved. They do not believe that a group of foreigners who have recently found a haven in these United States should be so bold and so lacking in gratitude or good judgment that they would try to take over and completely rebuild the social and political concepts of the Nation that sheltered them and gave them peace, prosperity, and the very political freedom that they would destroy by overriding our constitutional government. They do not believe that these people understand or have tried to inform themselves as to just what the United States of America stands for and what it is—a democratic republic with a constitutional government.

These boys and girls in the service, these youngsters from the South and Midwest, along with their mothers and fathers and the folks back home believe in constitutional government.

They are opposed to communism and fascism. They are rightly indignant when pressure groups composed largely of Negroes, Communists, and foreigners, who have never voted and have never taken the trouble to qualify to vote, do attempt to curry the favor of men and women in the service, men and women whose very lives are now in jeopardy on the altar of patriotism, by suddenly de-

manding an "unconditional Federal ballot for the armed forces." Our service men and women, believe in white supremacy and are not being fooled by Communists and Negroes and foreign-pressure groups who are attempting to take advantage of the war and the patriotic fervor of our people to drive an entering wedge into our body politic that would destroy the very thing our soldiers and sailors believe they are fighting to preserve. The members of our armed forces do not want a blank ballot. They want to know for whom they are voting and why. They remember quite well that the chaos in Europe today is the result of an unconditional "Yes" or "No" ballot. They want no such thing to happen in America. They are fighting to see that it does not happen. The mockery of an unconditional ballot that may or may not be counted according to the whims of the moment does not appeal to them. They want to return to the America they left behind when they answered the clarions of war. They want to return to the same home town, the same main street, the old relatives and friends—solid Americans whose self-denial, energy, thrift and strong religious and political concepts have made America great. That is what they are fighting for. That is what it is the duty of this Congress to preserve.

The men and women in the service do not want to be made a political football. They do not like demagogy; they want facts and fair treatment. Let us see that they get it.

Power Trust Menaces Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, entitled "Power Trust Menaces Labor," by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], which was published in the International Teamster for February 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER TRUST MENACES LABOR—ELECTRICITY CARTEL WOULD GRAB PUBLIC PLANTS

(By United States Senator HOMER T. BONE)

The post-war period will present what may well be a terrifying picture to the entire United States, but the problem is particularly grave in two or three of the big industrial States of the East, and in many of the far-west and central-western States. This problem is unemployment due to post-war demobilization.

Reliable estimates by the Department of Labor indicate that in the State of Oregon the number of unemployed when the war ends will represent over 33 percent of the total number employed in that State in 1940.

The figure in the State of Washington is even more gloomy, for the number of post-war unemployed will be equal to over 45 percent of the total number employed in 1940. California also presents a dismal picture of unemployment. The grim necessity for planning ahead to meet such a frightful shock is all too apparent. Only two States in the Union show greater possibilities for post-war unemployment than the State of Washington, and therefore it is of tremendous importance to that State to try to set its house in order to cushion itself against the shock.

The greatest asset in the way of natural resources in the entire United States is possessed by the State of Washington. That is the matchless water-power resources of the State, which constitute 20 percent of all hydraulic power in the United States. Probably the greatest advance we can hope to make in the field of industry is in the realm of plastics, light metals, and in the electrochemical industry.

These developments offer the brightest hope for the future, and particularly for the future of the State of Washington. Such developments call for vast floods of cheap electrical energy, and Washington is today singularly blessed in possessing the huge pools of power made available by the presence of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville power plants.

These enormous power developments came into being at a time when they were able to make their maximum contribution to our war effort, and without them the Pacific Northwest could not have played its vital part in the defense of the Nation.

The contributions of these plants to the war effort have been so valuable that they may have provided the turning point in the war. Thousands of fighting planes that fill the air in the battle zones are the children of Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

So valuable is this contribution that if it has shortened the war and helped to insure a more speedy victory we could write these plants off at the end of the war as a total loss and still have found in them one of the most important assets the Nation possessed in its hour of peril.

Happily, we do not have to write them off, and they will continue to minister to the needs of the people of that section. They will provide the most important element in the new industrial development I have mentioned. They constitute the backbone of the great public-power movement of the State of Washington which has been foremost in the country in that field.

Today we are bluntly told by the head of one of the largest of the private power monopolies in the country that Uncle Sam should turn these magnificent plants over to the private-power monopolies. Such a proposal is outrageous, and yet it may be well within the realm of possibility if the people are not careful.

Organized labor has a great stake in the political and economic operations that lie just ahead, and it is going to see a wild scramble on the part of the big business interests for economic domination as this war draws to a close. There can be little or no doubt that the giant monopolies of America, which are in many instances tied in with world cartel operations, will be very ruthless in their attitude toward small business, which seeks to compete.

It requires a fantastic stretch of imagination to assume that when this sort of a clash occurs labor will not be an unfortunate goat in such a controversy.

One need only be reasonably familiar with developments in the national capital to become aware of a growing volume of bitterness toward organized labor, and thoughtful men are well aware that this feeling will violently flare up in the post-war period. Well-informed men in the capital make no bones about this problem in discussing post-war operations, but at the moment most of this discussion is behind closed doors.

The big private electrical combines are a part and parcel of big business, and organized labor is lending itself to a dangerous operation if it fights public power by becoming an ally of the private power monopoly, which is one of the most cold-blooded and hard-boiled private monopolies in this country.

Certainly, if any group under the flag should stand against private monopoly it is organized labor. As a group it should be the first to support every effort to smash cartel combines and private monopolies. Certainly this should be its position if it believes in free enterprise and a free competitive system in America.

One of the things that helped to bring the disease of fascism to Europe was the presence of giant cartel monopolies which provided a degrading form of economic slavery for the people.

Our businessmen out West are now beginning to be painfully aware of what the big combines and cartel groups are able to do to their hopes and aspirations for the preservation of certain war industries in that section. The Government turned to Alcoa to either build their own or operate Government-owned aluminum plants. Now Alcoa is getting ready to shut down these western operations.

The businessmen of my State are deeply concerned but I have previously given them repeated warnings that this is what would happen to us as soon as the war tension eased. Unless there is a revamping of our business set-up many of the fine and flowery phrases employed now will become worse than worthless promises.

Cartel operations are an exemplification of the rule of "scarcity." Businessmen damned the administration for "plowing under" pigs and otherwise trying to aid the farmers who were struggling with (then) huge surpluses of wheat and other commodities.

The cartel-monopoly operation is an economy of scarcities and controlled production, and it certainly presents a weird picture for men who benefit by the operations of the cartel system to censure the administration's effort to do something to help when a great surplus of commodities appear to be glutting the market and, for the time being, ruining the producer.

The inconsistencies in this picture are apparent to any thinking man. Some day some bold soul will write the history of this period in language that sizzles.

The rivers and lakes and water-power resources of America belong to the people. If organized labor helps to destroy public power development it thereby plays directly into the hands of private monopolies. To persist in such a terrible operation would be to bring down upon the heads of our children the most disastrous economic consequences. Let no one tell members of organized labor that they cannot get a square deal from the public. If they cannot, then parliamentary government is eternally doomed in this country.

One of the challenges now laid by big business against the administration is that it has been "too friendly" to organized labor. It is worthy to note that this administration has also been friendly with public power development.

There never has been, and there never can be, a more weird combination of inconsistent and antipathetic interests than a combination between private power monopoly and the labor movement of America. If organized labor is ever induced to aline itself with big business, such a combination would probably spell doom for small business and the destruction of public power development.

In the development of public power over recent years, we have seen the working out of employer-employee relations in which every reasonable effort is being made to preserve the decent and desirable things in human relations. Organized labor now stands at the crossroads, and it faces a very crucial hour. God forbid it should make a terrific mistake by joining hands with forces that are instinctively hostile to all of the just aspirations of labor.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, to the other 47 States in 1944, watch our smoke and Eisenhower's.

"Life was an exuberant adventure for William Allen White," as Henry J. Haskell said. This is a worth-while philosophy for anyone to acquire.

"The crusade for a new world order" asking us in the Capitol to lay aside our petty political differences, comes from one church denomination, acting alone.

CHARLEY HALLECK, our Kansas Day speaker, who threw punches with both fists and invoked admiration with his melodious words, dangles a Phi Beta Kappa key.

Bill White's power of expression in writing was his abiding genius and will always remain the righteous envy of millions. One of the great things about his life, to other native sons and daughters, was that he stayed in Kansas.

As Adams and Jefferson died on the same 4th of July, so White's death came on the birthdays of Kansas and McKinley. The author's famous editorial, What's the Matter With Kansas? was written in the 1896 campaign. He loved his native land.

Gomer T. Davies, 89, of Concordia, as usual, missed nothing on Kansas Day. Let me recommend his life and psychology as a pattern for growing old graciously. For 60 years he has been a newspaper editor, yet, as a youth, he mined coal in Iowa, with John Lewis' father and saw this younger leader of workers grow up.

Another rare character in Kansas is Justice W. E. Hutchison, who voluntarily retired from the Supreme Court. He came to the western part of the State in 1887, lived through the rough and tumble of climate and men, and never lost one iota of his cultural manhood or his moral fiber. His white tie was immaculate last Saturday, his mind as keen as a razor blade, and his voice as soft as a rose.

"I realize that the Executive as such has nothing to do with the making or the enforcement of these (House) rules. Nevertheless, there are times, I think, when the President can speak as an interested citizen." When, pray tell me, did ever before only an interested citizen have a message carried on the floor of Congress by a White House clerk and read by the reading clerk under direction of the Speaker?

Territory of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the annual report of the Department of the Interior:

The fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, saw the Territory of Hawaii make great advances in fortifying the civilian population against every possible consequence of the war.

Hawaii is in the Pacific theater of World War No. 2; it is the most important United States outpost in this area. As such it must expand and enlarge its facilities to accommodate the thousands of armed personnel and defense workers that have come here; it must take steps to educate and protect the resident population against enemy activities, both from within and without; it must cooperate with military, naval, and other agencies to make Hawaii impregnable and secure against every emergency. All these, and more, Hawaii has contributed and accomplished during the past 19 months.

Every man, woman, and child is aware of the importance of Hawaii as a base for our forces; everyone has willingly gotten behind the war effort and has made it possible, in such a short period of time, to put our area in readiness for the great offensive against Japan.

Under the direction and supervision of the Office of Civilian Defense, the whole Territory is now honeycombed with bomb shelters and all vital civilian installations have been protected against damage by splinter and bombproof shelters. Emergency hospitals and auxiliary first-aid stations, manned by hundreds of volunteer nurses and aides, have been constructed throughout the Territory. Emergency evacuation camps, kitchens, and food storage places have likewise been erected in areas removed from military objectives.

The civilian population has been immunized, fingerprinted, and furnished gas masks, and has been trained for fire fighting, first aid, gas defense, block patrolling, etc. The populated areas of Hawaii have been supplied with air-raid sirens, the water supply has been chlorinated against bacterial contamination; utility installations are under constant guard; emergency police and fire reserves supplement the regulars.

The production of food has been increased to make Hawaii more nearly self-sustaining. The sugar and pineapple plantations have turned over thousands of acres of land for production of food for local consumption. This has relieved shipping space for other essential commodities and supplies. Hawaii, prior to the war, did not produce sufficient fresh vegetables to supply local needs. A monthly production of about 4,000,000 pounds before the war has been increased to approximately 8,000,000 pounds. Poultry, pork, and beef-cattle production, though handicapped by shortage of feed, has nevertheless been able to hold its own through local feed production.

Mass influx of workers, overcrowding, black-out restrictions, and general inability to live normally under present conditions have created numerous problems of housing, hospitalization, sanitation and garbage disposal, disease control, juvenile delinquency, crime prevention, etc. The Territory is making every attempt to handle and alleviate these conditions.

Evacuation camps have been opened to homeless and distressed families. Approval for construction of some additional 1,000 housing units has been obtained but unless lumber and other essential materials are made available this project will fail.

During the past year four diseases—mumps, whooping cough, poliomyelitis, and influenza—became epidemic. These were quickly controlled and the casualty rate was low. Venereal diseases have also been satisfactorily controlled, the rate dropping to an unprecedented low of 4.5. Tuberculosis, however, due to living conditions, is on the increase with over 2,000 cases for the past year as against an average of 1,500 for prior years.

The Territory is on guard against the outbreak of tropical diseases. This is a constant threat on account of contact with armed personnel passing through from other Pacific areas.

Business has had a prosperous year. This is reflected in an increase of tax revenues, both Territorial and Federal. Defense jobs and the presence of thousands of armed personnel have accounted for increased purchasing power. Inflation, however, has been kept down by price fixing and rationing under the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Civilian Defense.

There has been an acute shortage of labor in Hawaii. Defense activities, with higher level of wages, attracted labor from local industries. Hawaii was designated a "critical labor area" with a net shortage of 14,000 workers, the bulk being required for agriculture and for Army and Navy agencies.

All governmental agencies of the Territory devoted their resources and personnel to aid and cooperate with military, naval, and Federal agencies. This will continue until victory is achieved.

The restoration of civil affairs to civil authorities on March 10, 1943, has had a healthy reaction on the community. It has relieved military personnel for military duties; it has returned to civilians the responsibility of administering their own affairs. Hawaii can well be proud of its record of accomplishments. It is eager to demonstrate that its people are capable of carrying their share of any responsibility and of performing any task necessary to assure the fullest safety of the islands.

Twenty Years After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

TWENTY YEARS AFTER

Twenty years ago today Woodrow Wilson died. He died broken by the bitter knowledge

that the cause for which he led the Nation into war, the cause for which American boys fought and died on the fields of France, had been lost in victory. A great war President, he died defeated, not by the enemy but by his own people when they failed to support the one aim that in his mind justified the waste and agony of a conflict that up to that time had no parallel in history. He was repudiated as an idealist, and we returned to "normalcy"; but if he could come back to the earth today, who could refuse him the title of the supreme realist of his generation?

With terrible clarity the dying author of the Covenant of Nations saw that the war we thought we had won was not over. He died in the "absolute conviction," as he said in his last speech as President, that "within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it." America had a greater interest in preventing it than other nations because, he warned, "the next war would have to be paid for in American blood and money."

He died, too, in the absolute conviction that this country would have to accept the vision of reality that blind men called a dream. "I would rather fail in a cause that some day will triumph," he said, "than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail." Twenty years after, the vindication of Woodrow Wilson is cruelly complete. It is to be hoped that the education of the American people is also complete, for if we fail again there will be no peace, neither in our time nor for generations to come.

Federal Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Philadelphia Record of February 3, 1944:

SIXTEEN OF TWENTY FEDERAL EXPERTS GIVE WRONG ANSWERS TO SAME INCOME TAX RETURN—NEW RULING VOIDS CITY WAGE TAX DEDUCTION IN COMPUTING VICTORY TAX NET INCOME

John G. Harl's experience with his income tax return—getting a total of eight answers to the same problem from Government experts—is no isolated case.

Instead, a Record survey disclosed yesterday, Harl's case is typical of what is happening to four-fifths of United States taxpayers.

The Record submitted identical income figures to 20 internal revenue offices in 7 States.

Sixteen Government experts or 80 percent gave wrong answers.

ONE SOLICITS $5 FEE

Four, or 20 percent, figured the return correctly. One, in Newark did so only after he solicited and received a $5 gratuity for working on the Government's time.

The three other correct answers were calculated in Pittsburgh, Lancaster, and Indianapolis.

Two offices in the Philadelphia area—at 4333 Frankford avenue, and at Chester—made no errors in arithmetic. But both misinterpreted the law, according to a ruling issued officially in Washington only yesterday.

WAGE TAX DEDUCTION UPSET

The new ruling held the city wage tax may not be deducted in computing the Victory tax net income.

The unanimous opinion of accountants here had been that the deduction could be made. Collector Walter J. Rothensies had proceeded on the assumption that the tax is a "necessary expense" of working in Philadelphia, and all his offices allowed the deduction.

The belated ruling thus affects every return in which the wage tax was an item prepared to date by internal revenue men and private accountants. All these thousands of returns are now incorrect, regardless of the accuracy of other items.

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT MAY BE WRONG

With the Record's survey showing 80 percent of the Government's own experts making out incorrect returns, the imagination is staggered at the thought of how many errors must be made by taxpayers who do their own figuring.

It would be surprising if more than 5 percent of all returns filed this year should turn out to be correct.

The Record's problem as presented to the 20 offices posed a relatively simple set of figures. Income was from (1) wages, (2) one rental property, and (3) two stock transactions. There were normal deductions for taxes, interest, and contributions.

TWENTY-NINE PROBLEMS IN RETURN

The return, in effect, submits an arithmetical examination of 29 problems. But with this big difference: In an examination, a pupil getting 28 right answers out of 29 would receive the high grade of 96 percent; in making out the tax return, one error throws the whole result out.

The 14 Government experts who made mistakes in arithmetic, or in copying figures onto the form, got results differing from the true answer all the way from 2 cents to $25.45.

The correct answer, under the new ruling, was $79.17 gross, including $5.60 which can be deferred until March 15, 1945. Answers given by clerks ranged from $67.33 to $105.62.

RULING ADDS 91 CENTS

The correct answer arithmetically, when the wage tax is improperly deducted in Victory tax calculations, was $78.26.

Thus the new ruling added 91 cents to the tax liability. That was for a married man, living with wife and one child, whose wage tax was $31.20.

The 16 clerks who got the wrong answer divided evenly in "favoring" the taxpayer and the Government. Eight figured the taxpayer's liability a total of $33.37 too low, and eight gave the Government $96.06 too much—a net taxation-by-error of $42.69.

The clerks, with the exception of the fee-grabber in Newark, were patient and courteous to Record representatives, who presented themselves as bona fide taxpayers and asked no special service.

ALL TRY TO BE HELPFUL

All clerks tried to be helpful, though several questioned the claim for certain deductions, particularly one for depreciation of the rented house. Their mistakes in arithmetic and copying were the sort of errors to be expected when one tries to take a long, complicated mathematics examination under pressure.

In most offices reporters and correspondents had to stand in line for periods ranging up to 2 hours. At same places, notably Bethlehem, Allentown, and Detroit, correspondents failed to get to the desk at all after waiting for hours.

At Trenton, a reporter found, a moratorium on making out returns was ordered last Monday, to continue until February 8. The reason: All clerks were ordered to attend a special school for further instructions.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The problem submitted by The Record consisted of figures showing the following income: $3,120 from wages, $65 from stock transactions, $260.75 from rent. Deductions added up to $55 contributions, $159.40 interest, $243.20 taxes (including wages tax in Philadelphia). The 1942 tax was given as $61.20, of which half was paid. The total withheld by employer was $236.60. The taxpayer was stated to be married, living with his wife and one young child.

The figures were submitted to four offices in Philadelphia, three in New York City, and one each in the following places: Chester, West Chester, Norristown, Bryn Mawr, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Lancaster, Camden, Newark, Wilmington, Washington, Baltimore, and Indianapolis.

HOW MISTAKES WERE MADE

Some of the mistakes in arithmetic, detected by checking returns obtained at the offices with a correct return, were:

Ninth and Market Streets: Added $65 stock profit in computing Victory tax net income; made three mistakes in multiplication: 1 cent in favor of taxpayer, 5 cents and 1 cent in favor of Government.

Germantown and Chelten Avenues: Made $10 mistake in addition in computing income from rentals; error favored Government.

Fifty-second and Market streets: Added stock profit in computing Victory tax net income; picked up 40 cents on same item for unknown reasons.

West Chester: Made $10 error in addition on rentals; computed 13 percent of $1,147.65 as $198.19 instead of $188.19. Both errors favored Government.

Norristown: Forgave $45.90 instead of $50; made 2-cent error in computing earned income credit.

Bryn Mawr: Added interest wrong; $144.40 plus $15 gave $169.40. Added tax credits wrong; $236.60 plus $30.60 gave $277.20. Both favored taxpayer.

Camden: Failed to add depreciation when figuring rental income; included stock profit in Victory tax income; errors would cost taxpayer $25.

Scranton: Figured Victory tax wrong, failing to get right answer when taking 5 percent of $2,756.75; error favored Government.

The Newark man with the itching palm was found at a desk on the fourth floor of the post-office building during a quiet hour when no one was standing in line.

OFFERS AID FOR $5

He told the reporter his return was "too complicated" and that he should see an accountant. "We only handle short ones," he said.

The reporter left. As he was waiting for an elevator in the hall, the clerk came out, said he was an accountant and offered to do the job at home that evening.

This offer was refused, and the clerk finally offered to do it immediately for $5. He and the reporter went back to the desk and made out the form.

DOUBLES EXEMPTION

The clerk-accountant tried to induce the reporter to increase his exemptions for various items and, despite the reporter's protest, did double the estimated expenditures for amusement taxes.

The carefully computed return required 31 minutes of the clerk's time.

TAX ANSWERS OBTAINED BY RECORD'S REPORTERS

Here are the answers obtained in 17 internal revenue offices by Record reporters to

an income-tax problem for which the correct tax is $79.17:

Philadelphia:	
9th and Market Sts	$80.19
4333 Frankford Ave	[1] 78.26
52d and Market Sts	70.25
Germantown and Chelten Aves	80.29
Chester	[1] 78.26
West Chester	91.30
Norristown	84.02
Bryn Mawr	67.33
Scranton	84.97
Lancaster	[2] 79.17
Pittsburgh	[2] 79.17
Camden	104.20
Wilmington	80.03
New York customhouse	75.06
New York, East 45th St	79.06
New York, West 4th St	105.62
Indianapolis	[2] 79.17

[1] Arithmetic correct, but law misinterpreted as to city wage tax.

[2] Correct answers.

Slightly different figures were presented, through a misunderstanding, at Baltimore and Washington. The correct answer there was $67.92. The clerks figured:

Washington	$67.90
Baltimore	64.37

At Newark, the clerk, for a $5 fee, made one change in a deduction. He then obtained a correct answer, for his figures, of $78.20.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from two of my constituents:

AMERICAN LABOR PARTY,
New York, N. Y., January 31, 1944.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: The American Labor Party urges you to do your utmost to assure the right to vote for millions serving their country on battle fronts, at sea, and in training centers.

The objective, for which it is your duty to work and fight, is a simple one: The passage of a law providing for a simple, uniform Federal ballot, distributed promptly and without red tape, which gives service men and women and the merchant marine the opportunity to vote.

A sound legal formula for reaching this objective can easily be devised if Congress would stop political juggling for partisan advantage.

Anything less than the Green-Lucas bill would be a mockery. The conclusion is inescapable that leaving the matter to a jumble of absentee voting laws would prevent millions of service men and women from voting for Federal officials this year.

It would be a grave affront, destroying morale of men at the front and on ships who are discharging the highest duties of citizenship, if several hundred citizens in Congress, playing politics as usual, were to deprive 10,000,000 or more citizens of their right to vote in this year's election. Too many in Congress trust the armed forces to handle guns but not ballots because they fear the effect of the soldiers' vote.

Too many in Congress want the record of 1942 and 1943 repeated when only a handful of Americans in the armed forces were able to vote. This year American democracy must be made at least as effective as that of Australia, where proper machinery enabled 90 percent of Australian servicemen to vote.

Few opponents to a workable system of voting have the courage to take an outright stand against the soldiers' right to vote. Instead they devise crippling amendments which would emasculate any bill designed to make that right effective.

An aroused public opinion calls on Congress to act swiftly and effectively to prevent robbing millions in uniform of their franchise.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE S. COUNTS,
State Chairman.
ALEX ROSE,
State Secretary.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to S. 1285, as reported to the House: Page 9, line 17, after the word "waterways", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the word "and", and after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

(3) The term "State" includes the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have presented would extend the privileges of this legislation to the Territories by adding to the bill as it now stands a simple statement that the term "State" as used in this bill should be defined to include the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Those members of the committee to whom this amendment has been presented have expressed themselves to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] and myself as favoring its adoption.

The net result of the amendment would be to cover the Territories into the provisions of this bill on the same basis as the States. It would recommend to the Governors of the Territories that steps be taken under the laws of the Territories to extend to the men in the services from the Territories the privilege of voting in the election this fall on the same basis as the citizens at home.

It would, in addition, guarantee to the Territories the same facilities and cooperation of the War and Navy Departments as are provided the States to carry out the purpose of this legislation.

It does not extend to the men in the services from the Territories any voting privileges beyond that which they normally enjoy as private citizens of a Territory.

The extent to which the people of the Territories participate in the selection of Federal officials is extremely limited. Although the Territories are incorporated parts of the country, the Federal Government still reserves complete control over the executive and judicial branches. The Governors and secretaries of the Territories are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the United States Senate. The members of the judiciary, including the members of the Supreme Court and the Territorial circuit courts, are likewise appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate.

The people of a Territory choose their own legislature on much the same basis as most States, but the laws passed by the territorial legislature are subject to veto by Congress. In the cases of both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, Congress has never found it necessary to exercise this right.

The people of the Territories do not participate in the election of the President, the Vice President, or any Members of the United States Senate, as they are not represented in the Senate. Their participation in the election of Federal officials is confined exclusiyely to the choice of their Delegate to Congress who sits in the House and carries the responsibility for representing the Territory in Congress, without the privilege of voting. This is the only official in the Territory of Hawaii who is elected at large and by a vote of all the people of the Territory.

For the very reason that the participation of the people of Hawaii in election of Federal officials is restricted to just this office, the election of the Delegate assumes a measure of importance probably quite beyond what might otherwise be the case under different circumstances.

Under the ballot customarily used in Hawaii, this office is the first on the legislative ballot. The other names on this ballot include the members of the Territorial Senate and the House. A second ballot is used to cover the election of the officials of the city and county of Honolulu or the officials of the other three counties of the Territory, this depending, of course, on the counties in which the election is held.

The record of Hawaii shows that an extraordinarily high percentage of those eligible to vote exercises that right. As one of the basic privileges of American citizenship, this right is cherished with unusual care and thoughtfulness.

The exercise of this right as citizens has developed in the voting people of the Territory a strong sense of their responsibility as American citizens. This has been increasingly evidenced since the annexation of the islands more than 45 years ago, and accounts in no small measure for the extraordinarily fine record made with and since the outbreak of war.

The officials of the War and Navy Departments, as well as the men in immediate command of that vital area, have been unanimous in their praise of this record, and testify that the cooperation of the civilian population has been invaluable in meeting the extremely serious problems that have confronted these islands during the period of the last 2 years, and still faces them.

The performance of Hawaii's people in this crisis is the natural outgrowth of the Federal Government's policy of extending to the people of the Territory a

large measure of local self-government. This policy has developed a sense of individual responsibility and loyalty that has been attended with results that are characteristically American and enormously valuable to our common country.

I believe, therefore, that in perpetuation of this policy it is important that the soldiers from the Territories receive their ballots also when the time comes this fall to vote. I think it would be most unfortunate if the men from Alaska and Hawaii who are wearing the uniform of the United States should be made to feel that they will have no part in the election while everyone else about them is receiving his ballot.

I believe that the knowledge that they too will participate in the election, even though within the limitations customary to a Territory, will be a valuable contribution to their morale.

Archbishop Curley States Russian Press Creates Disunity Among Allied Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, in answer to the attack of Izvestia, official Soviet newspaper, on the Vatican:

My answer to Mr. Stalin and his official paper is, that is a lie.

Let me be frank. The statement made by the Russian paper Izvestia is absolutely and unqualifiedly false. It is in line with Pravda's statement about British attempts to make a separate peace and about many other things in the past.

The purpose of the Russian press would seem to be to create disunity not only among the Allied Nations but everywhere the world over. In the meantime, Russia is preparing to take eastern Poland and the Baltic states, regardless of what the British and American governments may think about it.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor merely to express agreement with my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN, who some time ago on the floor of the House facetiously stated that Wendell Willkie was the administration's secret weapon against the Republicans. After having read Mr. Willkie's statement concerning taxes, which was not qualified by an accompanying statement relative to reduction in unnecessary expenditures, I am forced to agree with my illustrious colleague.

Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

UNITED FARM EQUIPMENT AND
METAL WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 31, 1944.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear SIR: I am writing you these few lines to urge you to support the Worley bill or the Green-Lucas bill and vote down the Eastland-McClellan substitute, and do everything else in your power to pass legislation which will provide a uniform Federal ballot for soldiers. We all know, of course, that everyone wants the soldiers to vote, but the important thing now is to pass the law before it is too late.

Enclosed find a copy of a resolution passed at a recent district conference of our union. The resolution is self-explanatory. I would appreciate it very much if you would insert this letter and the enclosed resolution in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN MESSNER,
Educational and Publicity Director.

Whereas the first essential of democracy is the right to vote; and

Whereas the men and women in our armed forces are risking their lives in the defense of democracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this district conference of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America demand that Congress pass Federal legislation enabling soldiers to vote as the only effective method; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn all partisan maneuvers such as tend to set up 48 separate State systems as unworkable, undemocratic and un-American.

No Necessity for a National Service Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the request by the President for legislation to draft every working man and woman in this country is not only presently unnecessary but it is contrary to every concept of a free democracy. The enactment of such legislation would represent the substitution of a form of totalitarianism for our democratic processes. The thing we are trying to do in this war is to preserve and protect our own form of government. For it would be tragic indeed to win the war if at the same time we sacrifice our own freedom at home.

If there was ever any justification for taking a radical step of this kind, it was at the beginning of the war before war production was under way at full speed, but there is no excuse for it now with production levels at their present high scale. Basically this legislation is thoroughly wrong. It would draft men to serve in private industry which is operating at a private profit. There is a vast difference between drafting a man to serve his country in the armed forces as against drafting men to serve a private employer. It would permit further regimentation of free labor by Federal bureaucrats who would be able to force the laboring man to take any job in any part of the country. Men and women could be taken from their homes and families and moved to remote parts of the country at the whim of a new Federal agency. If war production demanded it, I would not oppose it. But not even its sponsors claim it has anything to do with war production. It is plainly and simply a move to destroy free labor under the guise of war necessity.

It is said this law will prevent strikes. But it will not do so. The experience of Great Britain proves that. There is a national service law in that country and it has not prevented strikes because in 1942 the number of strikes in Great Britain were greater proportionately than there were in the United States. We do not want to do in this country the very thing that we have accused our enemies of doing, namely, of punishing innocent people along with the guilty. This is a vicious practice which a free government could never condone. Yet, if a national service law were passed the millions of workers who have never gone on strike during the war emergency, those who have served faithfully in war production throughout the Nation, would all be punished by conscription and placed in involuntary servitude merely because a small percentage of their number had engaged in unauthorized and illegal strikes.

In northern Michigan, where I come from, Mr. Speaker, are three basic industries—iron mining, copper mining, and lumbering, each vitally connected with the war effort. To my knowledge, there has not been one single strike in that area to interfere with this important production. The many thousands of our workers engaged in these totally vital industries have worked faithfully and continuously without interruption. Would it not be grossly unfair to punish loyal and patriotic workmen of this type simply because a small minority of workmen elsewhere in the country had gone on strike? Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation places a stigma upon every honest workingman in the country. It will not increase war production, nor will it prevent strikes, and I am unalterably opposed to its passage.

United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks on the independent offices appropriation bill appearing on page 828 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, January 27, 1944, I took occasion to refer to financial aspects of the work of both the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. I referred particularly to purchases, charter-hire, insurance, trade-in valuations, agency fees, repair costs, accounting control and findings by the General Accounting Office indicating, in the absence of explanation, gross waste and extravagance, running perhaps into hundreds of millions of dollars.

In this connection I inserted a series of tables, including a few typical figures compiled for me from data furnished by the Maritime Commission and other official sources.

In order to give a more complete picture of the data supplied me by the Maritime Commission, I desire to supplement my previous remarks by the following brief over-all summary prepared for me from the data referred to.

VESSELS PURCHASED JULY 1, 1941–DECEMBER 31, 1942

The data furnished by the Maritime Commission indicates that 69 vessels, 20 years or more of age, were purchased by the Commission during the period in question at a total cost of $26,353,835, or an average of about $382,000 per vessel. This average is between seven and eight times the average General Accounting Office book value for these vessels. The return to owners, however, would appear to be less than that in respect to similar ships from charter hire and war-risk insurance.

VESSELS CHARTERED JULY 1, 1941–DECEMBER 31, 1942

The data furnished by the Commission indicates the charter of approximately 1,200 vessels during the period in question—758 of these vessels being 20 years or more of age and having a total General Accounting Office book value of about $37,900,000. The estimated charter earnings for the 758 vessels referred to for the 18-month period, according to the Commission, aggregate $199,767,162, or an average of over $263,500 per vessel.

VESSELS INSURED JULY 1, 1941–DECEMBER 31, 1942

The data furnished by the Commission indicates war-risk insurance placed during the period in question on 690 vessels, 20 years of age or more, in the amount of $477,337,985, or an average approaching $692,000 per vessel. This compares with a General Accounting Office book value of about $34,500,000, which is about 7 percent of the insurance placed.

It is understood that insurance paid is deposited in tax-free statutory reserves or construction funds.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as the Members of the House appreciate, has been charged with the duty of investigating work of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Just what concrete results have been accomplished, just what progress has been realized, I do not know. I am impressed, however, by the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], chairman of that committee, on the floor of the House on Friday, January 28, in which he emphasizes the tremendous field of work under the jurisdiction of his committee.

He states that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has jurisdiction not only over the merchant marine and fisheries but also the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, navigation aids, such as lighthouses and buoys, merchant marine hospitals and the Panama Canal. He further states that he himself has felt sometimes that waste has existed and that his committee has been confronted in this field with some very troublesome problems. "Some of those problems" he adds, "have almost killed me and I reckon some members of my committee."

The statement, Mr. Speaker, would seem to raise squarely the question of whether or not the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is in a position to conduct effectively the investigation which would appear to be of major importance from the standpoint of the taxpayers of the Nation. There is already pending before the Rules Committee, I understand, a resolution providing for a select committee to conduct this investigation. If the standing committee is too busy to do a prompt and thorough job in this connection, it seems clear to me that the situation calls for the appointment of a select committee.

No one, Mr. Speaker, least of all those responsible for the work of the two agencies, wants to see a repetition of the extravagance or scandals in the field of shipping which shocked us all at the conclusion of the last war. Existing legislation was designed to prevent just that.

Informing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article written by Mr. Ernest Lindley which was carried in the Washington Post of February 2, 1944:

KEFAUVER PLAN WORTH A TRIAL

A few weeks ago there was a flurry of interest in the press and in Congress over the proposal that members of the Cabinet and the heads of other executive agencies regularly submit to questioning of Congress. Secretary Hull's personal report to Congress on the Moscow conference was widely applauded as a step in this direction. Although Mr. Hull was not questioned from the floor, his address anticipated and answered many of the questions in the minds of the Members and of the public.

Representative ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee has introduced a bill providing for regular question periods in the House. At these, department heads and agencies would appear on invitation from the House and answer questions. A Gallup poll indicated that 72 percent of the electorate favors the substance of the Kefauver plan, while only 7 percent disapproves it, the remaining 21 percent having expressed no opinion. Many individual members of the House are in favor of it—some keenly so.

It is important that the Kefauver bill should not be sidetracked and forgotten, because it is both constructive and entirely feasible. It involves no radical revision of the machinery of Congress. It displaces none of the present machinery. It is an addition. If, after adequate trial, it were found to be unsuccessful or of only limited value it could be dropped.

Most Members of the House are poorly informed about many of the great questions on which they are required to pass judgment. Some, it is true, probably do not wish to be well informed. Some prefer to ignore the facts when they know them. It is not always possible to determine from a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when a distortion is deliberate and when it is due to simple ignorance.

But a great majority of the Members, even those who do not allow facts to be their guide, must be credited with a desire to be accurately informed. Many are accurately informed, and in extreme detail, about the particular matters which come before the committees on which they serve. The committee system is essential and its abandonment or modification is not proposed. Congress can cover thoroughly the whole range of governmental affairs only by dividing up the work through committees. As a result the conscientious Member tends to become a specialist in a few things while he does not learn enough of other things to make an intelligent judgment.

The Kefauver plan would serve as a counterbalance to overspecialization. It would help to keep the House as a whole informed about the most important events and problems. It would help to keep it informed on matters which do not require immediate legislative action but which are of such importance the other legislative problems should be weighed in reference to them. It would also serve, probably, to keep the heads of executive departments and agencies on their toes.

There have been many schemes during the last 80 years for providing better liaison between Congress and the Executive. Several times it has been proposed that members of the Cabinet sit in Congress and take part in the discussions, although they would not be allowed to vote. This proposal has foundered on numerous misgivings and objections—the fear of Congress that the executive branch would thus acquire too much influence, the fear of committee chairmen that they would be short-circuited, and the fear of the White House that its influence would be weakened by such intimate contact between Cabinet members and legislators.

The Kefauver plan avoids all of these old objections. Cabinet officers would not sit in Congress or take part in the debates. They would appear at stated intervals on invitation of the House to answer questions for fixed periods. These questions would be filtered through the appropriate committees, to eliminate foolish or unimportant ones and to combine and rephrase those going to the heart of important matters. The Cabinet officers or heads of other agencies would not

be required to appear—although they would undoubtedly do so as long as the question period was competently managed by the House. They could decline to answer particular questions, with or without explanation.

The Kefauver plan is so sensible and so thoroughly safeguarded that it is hard to see how any Member of Congress could object to it or how most of them could fail actively to favor it. At least, it is worth a trial. Neither its adoption nor its abandonment if it should not prove fruitful would disturb the existing machinery of Congress.

The Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 days the House has had under consideration the so-called soldiers' vote legislation, and it has given serious consideration to two different measures.

One of these bills was reported by the committee and the other bill was known as the Worley Federal bill, which conformed to the Lucas-Green bill in the Senate. I supported the Worley Federal bill through until it was finally defeated by a record vote of 168 for to 224 against, on a motion to recommit and substitute it for the committee bill. This left only the committee bill to be considered by the House. Rather than oppose any legislation designed to be of assistance in aiding our servicemen and servicewomen in the armed forces to vote, I voted for the committee bill. This legislation will be largely reshaped in conference between the House and Senate. I sincerely hope that the more liberal Worley Federal bill, which in my judgment assures a better opportunity for the members of our armed services to vote, will be finally written into the bill when it will receive my full support.

Greed Our Greatest Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, there came to my office the other day through the mails from Mr. Hubert M. Harrison, of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, an article by himself entitled "Greed, Our Greatest Enemy." Having read this article and agreeing with the things discussed by Mr. Harrison, I feel that this article is worth while, and that everyone in the United States should read it; and it is for that reason that I am herewith enclosing it with my remarks, hoping and trusting that every citizen in our great country will read it, and if we all do so, I know it will be of help to us.

The article follows:

GREED, OUR GREATEST ENEMY

There is only one power on earth that can defeat America and her allies in this fight for human liberties and that is our own selfish greed. While the men of our armed forces are facing death on battle fronts around the world, there are those who call themselves Americans who take advantage of the country's dire emergency to try to win some selfish advantage at the risk of our national life.

The time has come for sober thinking and plain words about men and women, in whatever group, who put selfishness above their country's welfare. The striking union-labor employee who stops war industry, prolongs the war, and causes the death of additional American boys; the manufacturer with a Government cost-plus contract who pads pay rolls with unnecessary employees and winks at increased labor costs or turns out inferior goods at huge profits; the politician who thinks more of staying in office than of doing his courageous duty in war problems; the aimless, thoughtless, self-centered man or woman who wastes money and vital material and who complains at slight inconveniences and does absolutely nothing useful to help win the war, are all unworthy of the privileges they enjoy.

Our national leaders may well plead for unity among the people. America has not yet put its whole heart and soul into this war. We have invested some money in War bonds, we have contributed to war-aid agencies, some have rendered services great or small at home, and others have made the supreme sacrifice. But too many are thinking: What can I get out of this war? Rather than: What can I put into this war to help win it?

Perhaps when many more homes have received that ominous telegram from the War Department or the Navy Department beginning: "We regret to inform you—" then maybe public opinion will become aroused and traitors and slackers will be ostracized in the community.

Thank God there have always been enough Americans who were willing to fight for their country to preserve it—even for slackers and grafters and profiteers and traitors.

Favoritism in Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there is printed herewith a newspaper article from the Newark Evening News of Tuesday, February 1, which tells of outrageous favoritism in the issuance of gasration coupons, which may to some degree account for the shortage of that precious commodity, and a letter from Philip S. Clarke, a member of the Manasquan Rationing Board who has three boys in uniform, is most enlightening.

I have referred this matter to Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, with the request that a prompt investigation be made to the end that those who are guilty of such unfair practices may be promptly and properly attended to.

The article and letter follows:

O. P. A. EXECUTIVE GETS GAS AS COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN—BOOTH WINS IN APPEAL TO WOOLLEY FROM MANASQUAN BOARD'S DENIAL

MANASQUAN.—Some of the grizzled fishermen here, as well as the unpaid members of the Manasquan ration board, are having difficulty understanding why a certain high-ranking O. P. A. executive is entitled to gas rations as a commercial fisherman.

Regional Administrator Woolley overruling the local board from his Empire State offices in New York says Lance E. Booth, his regional food-rationing officer, rates the rations.

Fishermen who say they watched Booth's white-flanneled form last summer on his mahogany and white, chrome-plated 40-foot cruiser, are bitter.

TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED GALLONS APPROVED

Booth, who lives at 801 Park Avenue, Spring Lake Heights, received rations of 1,200 gallons of gasoline in July 1943 on the basis of an application in which he stated that the "principal occupation of the principal user" of his boat, *Mike II*, was "commercial fishing." Complaints began to come to the local board, which started an investigation just before Booth applied for and received 900 more gallons, again for "commercial fishing."

Five days later, October 6, the board appealed to Ralph W. Hackett, district O. P. A. director at Trenton, saying the *Mike II* appeared to be "purely a pleasure boat owned by a high O. P. A. official."

Records showed the *Mike II* was built in 1937 and has provisions for installation of two swivel fishing chairs and rod holders. The hold is 2 feet deep, and fish storage space is 5 feet by 1.

TO PAY UPKEEP

Booth was summoned to a hearing before the local board November 2 to prove his professional piscatorial standing. Booth testified he had at one time left O. P. A. to serve in the Coast Guard with his boat, but returned to the agency in December 1942 when he was discharged for medical reasons. He said he had been unable to sell the boat and so decided to try to pay the upkeep by fishing.

Coast Guard records show he spent only 15 days fishing from July to September 1943, and that of these 11 were working days at O. P. A. Booth explained he arranged with O. P. A. to take off the 11 days as part of his annual leave.

"VERY STUPID MISTAKE"

Booth explained further he had meant that he was a commercial fisherman only when he was actually on the boat. He conceded he had made "a very stupid mistake in failing to understand the O. P. A. regulations," which state that a mere fishing license or sale of the catch does not make a commercial fisherman.

"It should also appear," the rule sets forth, "that the applicant is regularly engaged in fishing as his business."

Booth told the local board he had made a mistake which he would correct in any way the board desired, and he agreed to and did return the 900 gallons.

CHANGE OF HEART

But Booth apparently had a change of heart about the case. He informed the board November 17 he had decided to appeal the matter to Chester Adams, regional mileage director. Adams got an opinion from Kimball Prince, regional rationing attorney, that a boat operated on an average of once a week to catch and sell fish could be deemed to be operating "regularly," and that upon

the facts stated by Booth "I would say he is engaged in commercial fishing as a business."

The board thereupon again wrote Hackett, reiterating its stand that "in point of time consumed" fishing did not appear to be Booth's principal occupation.

Hackett affirmed the board's action November 24. Booth thereupon again appealed to the regional office, and December 9 Woolley overruled both the board and Hackett.

Woolley opined that while Booth's gross fishing revenue for the 3 months was only $400, "by operating the boat during better fishing months and more frequently it is possible to gross in the neighborhood of $6,000 a year. Upon all the facts, I find the applicant is operating a commercial fishing boat and a ration should be issued to him."

A week after that ruling Booth notified the board he was putting his boat up for the winter, but that he would resume operations late in March and would then file a new application.

OCCUPATION EXECUTIVE

There is one more phase of this intricate picture. In applying for supplemental gas for his car January 8, Booth wrote that his principal occupation is that of an O. P. A. executive. He explained the injury suffered in the Coast Guard makes it impossible for him to walk a mile to the railroad station.

Booth said today everything was done openly and above board in his boat case, and that he feels his work with O. P. A. should not deprive him of the same rights as any other citizen; that since the boat is used exclusively for fishing he rates the gas.

A LITTLE CONFUSED

He conceded he was a little confused at first about the gasoline regulations but points out his job is food rationing and that actually he knew no more about the complicated gas rules than any other citizen. He also stressed there never was any intent to deceive the ration board about any phase of the case, for the board knew as well as anybody that his full-time job was with O. P. A. Booth says he was thinking of the boat, rather than himself, when he answered the principal occupation question.

MANASQUAN, N. J., *February 3, 1944.*

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Please read the enclosed article from the Newark Evening News of February 1. I think you ought to know about it because several people have already expressed their indignation to me and stated that they were going to write to you about it.

I have served as a volunteer on the Manasquan rationing board for a year and a half—4 days and 2 nights a week. The present case tops anything we have been up against, and people coming to the board have been bitter in their comments.

You see, a ration board cannot appeal from a decision against it. We are supposed to keep quiet and avoid criticism of O. P. A. or resign. I don't want to resign. I have three boys in uniform, and I want to do what I can to help.

After our own board said this man was not entitled to a gasoline ration to run his sports cruiser and the Trenton office upheld us on appeal, the regional office where the applicant works overruled us both and said that Mr. Booth was entitled to the 2,100 gallons of gasoline he got last summer and fall to run his boat, mostly on week ends, on 15 fishing trips. This was during the time when an A-book holder was allowed only 8 gallons a month.

An old man and his wife came into the ration board day before yesterday and asked for enough gasoline to drive to Baltimore with their daughter-in-law and her baby to visit their son, a wounded soldier in a hospital there. We had to tell him that O. P. A. rules forbade any ration for this purpose; he would have to go by train. He replied that he couldn't afford the railroad fare for three people to Baltimore and back. His appearance supported his statement. He only wanted 25 gallons. What do you think he thinks about Mr. Booth's 2,100 gallons?

I think you ought to ask Mr. Bowles to investigate this incident and correct it so that people will not think there is one rule for O. P. A. officials and another for taxpayers who furnish the money for their salaries. Won't you give this matter attention, please.

Cordially yours,

PHILIP S. CLARKE.

Soldier Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the recent discussions before the House upon the proposition of making it easier for our men and women in service to vote. From the inception of the presentation to Congress of the various bills pertaining to soldiers voting, I have felt that our men and women in service should be given a full and complete ballot in order that they might express as American citizens their opinion as to the various candidates for public office that they favor. I have not been in favor of the Green-Lucas bill, nor the Worley bill because of their infringement upon constitutional rights. I do not believe in throwing aside any phase of the Constitution by a wave of the hand. Our Constitution, adopted in 1787, went into effect in 1789, and for more than 150 years has been the guiding genius of this great Nation of ours. I am not in sympathy with those who think because we are at war that the provisions of the Constitution can be ruthlessly thrust aside. Therefore, I have favored giving to the men and women in service a complete ballot, predicated upon the old historic rights of the States to regulate voting.

Nobody questions the right of our men and women in service to vote; it already exists. The controversy, however, rests upon the proposition as to whether the Federal Government or the States should provide the machinery for the election in which our service men and women are earnestly urged to vote.

In the history of the American Government, the States have always possessed and exercised the right of voting. That is a prerogative which is given them under the Constitution; it is a right that has never been trespassed upon by the Federal Government. The attempt to pass a second Green-Lucas bill, or the Worley bill in the House, is the first time an attempt has been made to usurp the prerogatives of the States with reference to elections.

Let us consider for a moment the Federal ballot bill, known in the Senate as the Green-Lucas bill, known in the House as the Worley bill. Under the terms of this bill, the soldier boy gets a bobtailed ballot with no names of candidates placed thereon. The name of the Democratic Party is printed on the ballot with the place where the soldier boy puts his cross; likewise with the Republican Party. Not a name appears on the ballot. He does not know who the candidate for President or Vice President is on either party so far as the ballot is concerned; he does not know the name of the candidate for Senator or the candidate for Representative in his own congressional district so far as the ballot is concerned.

Many of these servicemen across seas, now numbering 4,000,000, by election time probably numbering 5,000,000, will be from representative districts that have been changed since they entered the service. They will not know the names of the Congressmen from their districts; neither will they know the numbers of their districts, because the ballot will not tell them. The only way they would know, would be that they had been able to keep up with the information from home, which in hundreds of thousands of cases would be impossible. So the proponents of the Federal ballot would give to a serviceman a piece of paper with party names on it only, not a single candidate's name being printed thereon; and the soldier boy would be asked to vote this type of ballot. Under the Federal ballot, he could not vote for State officers; he could not vote for county officers.

In addition to the utter silliness of the form of the Federal ballot is also the proposition of its unconstitutionality. Several States of the Union, including the great State of New York, through their law-enforcing officers, have stated that such a ballot could not be counted in those States. You would have the peculiar spectacle, then, of giving a soldier boy a ballot, which in some States could be counted, and in others could not be counted. The danger of such an election is too great for this Nation to risk.

Under the terms of the House bill, the men and women in service can vote by ballot for Federal, State, and county officers. They can vote a straight ticket if they desire; they can split their ticket if they desire, because their ballot contains, just as your ballot and mine does, the names of the particular candidates for office on the respective party tickets. Already most of the States of the Union have called their legislatures into session to advance the date of the elections in their respective States in order to give the soldier boy a longer time to vote.

I am heartily in favor of every service man and woman voting, should they desire. But I want them to vote a ballot that is fair on its face; that has the names of the candidates on it; that gives them the right to vote on all officers as we do at home; namely, Federal, State, and county. Many a soldier boy is more interested in voting for some friend of his on the county ticket than he is in voting for a State or Federal officer.

He should have this right. He cannot do it under the Federal bill; he can do it under the bill which continues the right of the States to regulate elections.

Some argument has been made by those who favor the bobtailed, or Federal ballot, that the ballot would be too heavy and could not be transported. This is not true. The full and complete ballot would weigh from six-tenths of an ounce to an ounce. Assuming there are 12,000,000 men and women then in service, that would represent 500 tons of ballots to be mailed. Let us cut out hundreds of tons of needless propaganda now being sent to the soldier boy, which he does not want and which costs the taxpayer thousands of dollars, and in its place give to our service men and women a bona fide ballot, which is their prerogative as American citizens.

After several days of intensive study and debate, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 328 yeas to 69 nays, reaffirmed their faith in the right of the States to control elections. This was a great victory for constitutional government. It showed the Nation clearly and definitely that so far as the great majority of the Members of the House of Representatives is concerned, they stand upon the principles of our great Constitution, which is looked upon by experts of government the world over as the greatest political document ever penned by man.

New Jersey and the Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Joint Resolution 2, State of New Jersey, approved January 25, 1944, and which reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 2

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation, expeditiously, which will leave to the States the responsibility of providing the form of absentee ballots and all provisions for tabulation of the vote and which will provide for Federal action only in the delivery, collection, and return of the ballots

Whereas Congress is considering soldier vote legislation; and

Whereas the Constitution of the State of New Jersey provides that no elector in the actual military service of the United States shall be deprived of his vote by reason of his absence from his election district, and places the duty upon our legislature to provide by law for the effectuation of this guarantee; and

Whereas the New Jersey Legislature is now in session and desires to make all further changes in our laws which will improve the opportunity of our servicemen and servicewomen to vote; and

Whereas New Jersey servicemen and servicewomen will be assured of their right to vote for all Federal, State and county candidates and also on public questions if Congress will provide merely for full and speedy cooperation in the delivering, collecting, and returning of the ballots: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to adopt legislation, expeditiously, which will leave to the States the responsibility of providing the form of absentee ballots and all provisions for tabulation of the vote and which will provide for Federal action only in the delivery, collection and return of the ballots.

2. That the secretary of state be and is hereby directed to transmit, immediately following the passage of this joint resolution, a copy thereof, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

Approved January 25, 1944.

Some Fights We've Missed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, of the Washington Times-Herald, February 2, 1944:

SOME FIGHTS WE'VE MISSED

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It is routine these days for orators and politicians to claim that the world is smaller, on which account the United States of America must get into war inevitably, if war there is.

Just why this smallness makes our part in every war inevitable they never explain very clearly.

It is true there are more powerful weapons in the world today than ever before and more people to use them. World population and world powers of destruction have both enlarged steadily for the past 500 years.

But it is not true that every increase in population and every invention of new weapons have automatically spread the scope of war.

It is only true that some wars have been local and some have not and that in two recent instances war has become entirely general for reasons not yet entirely explained to the satisfaction of all.

Since the founding of this Republic we have had many opportunities to get into both localized and generalized wars. Once we resisted temptation very well.

There came to hand yesterday an interesting compilation of such wars since 1800, which we reprint herewith for your reflection and study. Note which nations in this quietly dramatic serial account have spent their force on wars in many directions, and ponder what has happened to them since:

1801: The old German Empire breaks up, and all territory on the left bank of the Rhine is ceded to France.

1802: French aggressions in Holland, Italy, and Switzerland.

1805: England declares war on Spain; France fights Austria.

1806: Napoleon enters Berlin.

1807: Napoleon defeats Russia.

1808: Napoleon invades Spain.

1810: France annexes Holland. Turks driven out of Balkans.

1812: War starts between United States and England.

1814: France invaded from all sides. Napoleon to Elba, British seize and burn Washington.

1815: Napoleon leaves Elba, is defeated by British and Germans at Waterloo, then sent to St. Helena for life.

1816: Holland annexes Belgium.

1817: British wars in India.

1822: Greeks and Turks at war. Civil war in Spain.

1823: French Army enters Spain.

1824: British battle for Burma.

1825: Russia wars on Turkey.

1826: Russia invades Persia.

1827: Turks driven from Greece.

1828: Russia overruns Rumania.

1829: England and Austria intervene against Russia.

1830: Revolution in Poland and France. Belgium revolts from Holland.

1831: Prussia and Austria aid Russia against Poland.

1832: Egypt revolts against Turkey.

1838: French bombard Mexican ports. Debt collection, old style.

1839: Britain wars on China.

1846: War between the United States and Mexico.

1848: Schleswig-Holstein fights Danish annexation.

1849: Danish-Russian War.

1850: Britain blockades Greece. Prussia and Austria war.

1834: France and England war against Russia.

1856: British war on China and Persia.

1861. Civil War in United States. British blockade runners supply South.

1864: Germans defeat Danes.

1866: War between several German states. Austria wars on Italy.

1868: Britain invades Abyssinia. Spanish revolution.

1870: Franco-German war.

1871: Alsace-Lorraine goes to Germany. Back to France in 1918 and back to Germany in 1940.

1874: Spanish civil war.

1876: Balkan wars.

1877: Civil war in Japan. Russia wars on Turks.

1879: British war on Zulus.

1880: Boers and British battle.

1881: France wars on Tunis.

1882: Britain wars on Egypt.

1884: Japan wars on Korea.

1885: Russia wars on Afghanistan.

1887: Balkan wars. Italy wars on Abyssinia.

1894: Japan wars on China.

1895: Belgium seizes Congo State.

1898: Spanish-American War.

1899: British wars on Boers.

1900: Boxer war in China, United States returns Boxer indemnities.

1904: Russo-Japanese war.

1910: Japan takes Korea.

1912: Balkan wars.

1914–1918: Russia, France, Britain, Italy, United States, Japan, Rumania, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Portugal, and Montenegro (12 nations), battle Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria.

1917–18: The United States of America participated in the World War.

1931: Japan seizes Manchukuo.

1932–33: Europe repudiates all World War debts to United States ($12,000,000,000).

1934: Italy takes Abyssinia.

1937: Japan develops an incident in China.

1938–39: Germany takes Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. France and England declare war on Germany.

1940: Russia takes part of Finland. Germany seizes Denmark and defeats Norway,

Holland, Belgium, and France. Italy joins war against England.

1941: Germany and England at war. Russia, Italy, Rumania, and Japan, against Germany in 1914, like the figures of the year, have reversed their position and are with her in 1941 until midsummer, when Germany attacks Russia.

December 7, 1941: Pearl Harbor attacked; United States at war with Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites.

1943: Germany repelled by Russia; Italy out of war. United States rising as attacking power in Atlantic and Pacific waters.

Japan's Lack of a Moral Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article recently published in the newspapers served by the International News Service. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is the author of the article, which is entitled "BONE Reviews Japan's Lack of Moral Code."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONE REVIEWS JAPAN'S LACK OF MORAL CODE

(By Homer T. Bone)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—The somber picture of what happened to American troops on Bataan should be a constant reminder to us that the most savage tribes on earth could be no more ferocious and sadistic than those who have been blessed with the arts and sciences of so-called modern civilization, once these emotional barriers have been broken down.

Most Americans believed the humanizing influence of western civilization had developed in the Japanese mind some degree of respect for the common decencies of life.

PLANS FOR CONQUEST

That viewpoint has been widely shattered by the tragic story of Bataan. Our military and naval leaders will now have to shape the specific war policies necessary to the complete conquest of our enemy in the Pacific.

Once that is achieved, we should set about with vigor and intelligence to end forever the Japanese menace. Certainly we possess enough intelligence to accomplish that desirable end.

Upon innumerable occasions I have called public attention to the fact that our own nationals once busily engaged in arming Hitler and Hirohito, and I was as bitter in condemnation of this practice as the amenities would permit. Along with millions of Americans, I viewed with consternation and with feelings of deepest concern the shipment to Hirohito of millions of tons of the finest scrap steel that could be accumulated in this country—enough steel to build much of the vast armament of Japan.

Some men defended this trade as a necessary adjunct of modern trade. Their voices were sufficiently loud to drown the voice of protest. Perhaps the supreme tragedy of Bataan will forcibly remind us of our folly in arming our potential enemies, and stand as a constant reminder of our frightful blunder in not only supplying them with materials but also with the finest technological information from the scientific laboratories of America.

WE TAUGHT JAPAN

The great international cartels did not overlook Japan in the scope of their operations. So Japan became a beneficiary sharing in the great pools of scientific knowledge developed in the laboratories of the countries now her sworn enemies. These harsh and cold facts must be remembered if this war is to bring home to us a very grim and necessary lesson.

It will avail us little if we crush militarism in Japan only to help revive it later by our economic, industrial, and technological process. If this be deemed an indictment of certain business practices, we need only to consider that indictment in the light of the fact that our past operations are coming back to us now in blood, sweat, and tears and in the broken and battered bodies of our boys. The steel and munitions of war we shipped to Japan are coming back to us in the form of "Bundles for America."

The pieces of shrapnel taken from the maimed bodies of American soldiers came from scrap piles in our beloved America. Whatever else may be said about this wretched business, it is high time that we develop some new moral codes in business, which plays so important a part in international relations.

JAPAN HAS NO CODE

The fact that Japan is guilty of crimes charged against her seems to be convincing evidence of her determination to wage ruthless and relentless warfare against the Allies. The American people will have to accommodate themselves to the thought that they are in for a struggle with a power as completely indifferent to standards of common decencies as were the Asiatic hordes that once nearly overran the whole civilized world.

Certainly the logic of events calls for a program which will forever end the possibility of recurrence of such outrages in a world which calls itself civilized. We are going to have to learn the grim lesson that the matchless achievements of science can be used to destroy civilization as well as to advance its culture. If this lesson is lost upon humanity, the future is ominous indeed.

One of the most peculiar manifestations one witnesses in the National Capital is the continued use of Tojo as the principal devil in the Japanese drama.

Little or nothing is said about Hirohito, the spiritual as well as the political head of Japan. If reliable authorities are to be believed, the Japanese Nation draws from the Son of Heaven. If that be true, every consideration of international policy calls for a proper handling of that particular problem.

If idolatrous worship of the Emperor of Japan leads the Japanese soldiers to the commission of atrocities, the description of which is almost too shocking to be told, it is time that this fountainhead of inspiration to such sadism be dried up.

If this is not done, the world will again face an embattled Japan as soon as she can rearm. Unless we are exceedingly cautious and remain on guard we may again witness the terrifying spectacle of some of our own people rearming a new and revitalized Japan—all in the sacred name of trade. All we can do at this moment is to highly resolve to end this menace to world peace. It is a sad and bitter contemplation but one that must be faced realistically. It is the supreme tragedy of this generation.

The Draft Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita Kans., entitled "The Draft Boards." I believe the suggestion in this editorial is a timely one and entitled to the consideration of this Congress. It reads as follows:

THE DRAFT BOARDS

Members of local draft boards, who have been working without pay since 1940, may receive tokens of gratitude from their Government. Recognition of their services will be in the form of honors such as honorary commissions in either the Army or Navy. A House bill, if enacted by the National Congress, provides Army recognition starting with lieutenant and ending with lieutenant colonel after 5 years of draft-board service. The commissions do not call for any allowances, pensions, mustering-out pay or service remuneration of any kind. At the end of the war all would be given a month of active status, thus making them eligible to become members of veterans' organizations.

In Wichita many of the draft-board members are veterans of the First World War. They have given many days of precious time to war work and with a minimum of criticism from anyone. They have remained as anonymous as any individuals who ever served their country. Very few persons know even members of the draft board in their district. Patriotic service certainly is worthy of recognition.

Freedom-Loving Americans Should Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of February 3, 1944, carried a news article that is most shocking. It has been well known for some time that State socialism, parading under the guise of the New Deal, had many things in common with communism. It has also been well known that prominent and influential Communists held high positions in the New Deal administration. Now, however, the Communists make an open and public drive to elect candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt to a fourth term.

Thus the Communists wage a political battle side by side with the political machines of our great cities, such as the Kelly-Nash machine of Chicago, the Pendergast machine, and the Mayor Hague machine. What is going to be-

come of the American way of life if these forces prevail? What will become of free enterprise in America if the plan of the Communists for a fourth term becomes a reality? What hope is there for the world if the great United States, a product of individual liberty and private enterprise, goes to the peace table with the leadership of the Communists and their coworkers, who openly espouse many of the principles of State socialism? These are the philosophies that are distressing the world. The world is not distressed because we have too much Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including the news article referred to:

FOURTH TERM URGED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND COMMUNISTS

A fourth term for President Roosevelt is favored by the Communist Party for Maryland and the District of Columbia, according to announcement in Baltimore today by Al Lannon, executive secretary of the party.

Fulfillment of aims of the Teheran Conference, described by Mr. Lannon as "the greatest turning point in world history," necessitate national unity behind the President, he said.

"We Communists," Mr. Lannon said, "formulate all of our policies with the single aim of active collaboration with the democratic and progressive majority in the Nation."

Every effort should be made to defeat the forces of "profascism" and aggressive imperialism within the United States, and these cannot be defeated without maximum national unity, he said.

Raymond Clapper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very moving editorial in today's Washington Post, on the death of Raymond Clapper. I have known and admired Ray Clapper for many years. He died as he had lived—a true soldier of democracy, in the front line of the battles, in peace as in war, for decency and justice. In every story he covered, in all the stirring events that passed under his scrutiny, he sought and found the truth that made men free.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAY CLAPPER

Ray Clapper went out at the top.

That he had to die at this time is heart-searing news But American planes are plunging to earth every day in all parts of this flaming world. This one was carrying a soldier of the press, an ace of aces.

Ray Clapper was always a front-line reporter, in peace or in war.

He was in the front line in every battle for truth and justice in the past two decades. He was always the reporter, searching out the fact.

He served his apprenticeship in the enlisted ranks here in Washington. And he advanced by ability, honesty, and integrity alone. First, in his heart, was the dignity and the responsibility of his profession. He never forgot that his job was to tell America the facts so the people would know.

The Washington Post is proud that he started his career as a columnist on this newspaper. But even as a columnist Ray Clapper was always the great reporter. Let others pontificate. Ray depended on his legs, his eyes, his ears, his inquiring mind, in a never ending, patient search for facts.

This war found him an admired, respected, successful captain in his profession. It would have been so easy for him to have concluded to rest on his laurels.

But not Clapper. He thought only of a reporter's duty. He saw Great Britain in its dark days; he soared over the Himalayas into Chungking; he flew over Rome on the first raid; he stood with the troops in Sicily. And destiny found him in the South Pacific catching the spirit of the boys in the jungle, writing the finest copy of his career. He died a full general in the eyes of every newspaperman in America—at the top.

It is a cruel blow to family and friends.

But we know—as Ray knew facts—that his spirit cannot die. He stood for everything that was fine in Americanism, in journalism.

Somehow, in thinking of Ray Clapper, the recent story by Ernie Pyle of the death of a beloved American captain in Italy keeps coming to mind. Pyle told how the captain's men shyly paid rough tribute. They cursed reverently. They surreptitiously held his cold hand, straightened his collar, smoothed his coat; and silently dedicated themselves to fiercer opposition to oppression.

We believe that everywhere in our great country today, newspapermen are figuratively straightening Ray Clapper's collar, cursing reverently; and dedicating themselves to carry on his fight—that the people may know and democratic America may not die.

The National Service Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not Tell Fighting Men the Truth?" printed in the January 29 issue of Labor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT TELL FIGHTING MEN THE TRUTH?

LABOR OUTLINES A PLAN BY WHICH THE PRESIDENT, OR SECRETARY STIMSON, OR BOTH, MAY STRENGTHEN SOLDIER MORALE

In pleading with the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to approve President Roosevelt's plan to draft American workers for private profit, Secretary of War Stimson argued that the measure would have a good effect on the morale of our soldiers on the fighting fronts.

Many of them believe, he stressed, that there has been a let-down on the home front and that American workers are failing to do their part in this great emergency.

Undoubtedly our soldier boys have been misled by the antilabor propaganda with which newspapers and magazines and radio commentators have flooded them. Labor agrees with Secretary Stimson that this has produced an unfortunate and perhaps a dangerous situation.

Labor submits, however, that the remedy is not to penalize American workers, but to give our soldiers the truth about what is happening on the farms, on the railroads, and in the war plants in this country.

We respectfully submit that the time is here when Mr. Stimson and the President himself, who is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, should address themselves to this important task.

A few days before Mr. Stimson testified before the Senate committee, his chief assistant, Under Secretary of War Patterson, proclaimed with apparent satisfaction that the record made by "industry and labor" was "unparalleled."

Official reports fully sustain Mr. Patterson. Never in all the history of the world have men and women produced the instruments of war in such volume and with such skill and speed as have American workers since this war began.

We have literally overwhelmed the enemy. We have piled up immense reserves. Our soldiers, sailors, marines, and gallant airmen are the best equipped, the best housed, the best clothed, the best fed among all the soldiers of the world.

These results have been accomplished without compulsion. They constitute an amazing and altogether gratifying triumph for the kind of American democracy our brave soldiers are dying to preserve.

American workers have accomplished these things, as President Roosevelt and Mr. Stimson well know, under the most distressing conditions. In too many instances they have done their job despite wretched housing, inadequate transportation, insufficient food, and other appalling handicaps.

Furthermore, and for this we have the testimony of high Government officials, machines in American war factories operated under wartime conditions are deadlier than the enemy's bullets on foreign battlefields.

Paul V. McNutt, Chief of the President's Manpower Commission, says industrial safety is "a major war problem" and the Office of War Information, an agency very close to the White House, tells us that since Pearl Harbor accidents have killed 37,600 men and women workers, or 5,000 more than the announced combat losses of the armed forces.

In addition, 4,710,000, or 60 times the number of fighting men wounded or missing in action, have suffered from accidents. Of those injured, at least 210,000 were permanently disabled.

All this represents a loss of 270,000,000 man-days a year, says the O. W. I., or the equivalent of withdrawing 900,000 workers from production lines for a full year.

These are facts which should cause thinking men to cease worrying about the comparatively minor effect of such strikes as have occurred—most of them the result of the provocative attitude of anti-union employers.

Instead of urging Congress to draft American workers for private profit, why wouldn't it be a good idea for Mr. Stimson—and better still, the Commander in Chief himself—to go on the air, from time to time, and relate to our soldiers in foreign fields the facts we have stated, and many more which may easily be gathered from official records?

Coming from the President or from Mr. Stimson, labor is convinced our soldiers would

find these facts most convincing. They would no longer speculate about what is happening on the home front, because they would be in possession of the truth.

They would know that American labor has not let them down, but, on the contrary, has done as good a job on the home front as our defenders have done on the battle fronts.

The Voice of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article from the January 26 issue of the Nebraska Union Farmer. The managing editor of this paper, Mr. Chris Milius, is the president of the Nebraska Farmers Union, and the editor is Mr. L. S. Herron.

I commend this article to the Congress as coming from those who know.

FAIRNESS IS ALL FARMERS NEED

Some people are fussing about Congress not appropriating as huge sums as have been proposed for hand-outs, subsidies, and baits for farmers. They try to make a war-food issue of it by arguing that the slashing of appropriations for agriculture will reduce production of farm products.

Farmers do not till, plant, cultivate, and harvest with dollar bills, but with labor, equipment, and supplies. Most farmers capable of adding to the national food supply have the means to buy the equipment and supplies, and hire the labor they need, if the equipment, supplies, and labor were available. It is not a question of congressional appropriations, but of arranging priorities to allow farmers the things they need with which to produce.

As for incentives, farmers would not ask for any more than they are getting if the incomes of other groups were held down in proportion. But if incentives are needed, they can best be provided not by subsidies and hand-outs, and unpredictable interferences with natural laws, but by permitting farmers to have a larger part of what natural prices would be.

Strikes in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Striking Britons," published in the Washington Post of February 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STRIKING BRITONS

Some Americans will be surprised to learn that the number of strikes occurring in Great Britain in 1943 reached an all-time high for the twentieth century. Although more than half these strikes were so-called "quickies"—that is, unauthorized work stoppages that lasted 2 days or less—the amount of time lost from all strikes added up to 1,800,000 man-days for the year, the worst record since 1937. And that despite the fact that the British worker is subject to compulsory national service laws.

The British strike figures clearly indicate that national service legislation—whatever its other merits, and these, it seems to us, are decisive—is not a sure-fire panacea for the strike evil, as many Americans seem to believe. The British Government's extraordinary powers to deal with strikes, coupled with the support of organized labor, have prevented serious work stoppages in essential war industries such as have occurred here. But the British have not discovered any cure for the occasional strikes that are spontaneous explosions of pent-up irritation generated by the stress and strain of war. Strikes of this kind provide a means of blowing off steam and relieving pressures that, given no outlet, would constitute a more dangerous threat to the war production program.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, January 24), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Soldier Vote," written by the late Raymond Clapper and published in the Chicago Times of Wednesday, December 22, 1943. This is a legacy, Mr. President, which every Senator and every Member of the House ought to read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIER VOTE

(By Raymond Clapper)

The soldier-vote question cannot be left where the Senate has attempted to leave it. In effect the Senate has said that the Constitution prevents the United States Government from insuring that its soldiers have the opportunity to vote.

How does it come that the distinguished constitutional lawyers of the Senate have so suddenly lost their ingenuity that no way can be found by which American soldiers can be guaranteed an opportunity to vote?

Ways have been found by which the Government of the United States fixes rents on your shelter, fixes the price of your groceries and tells you how often you can buy a pair of shoes.

Ways have been found under the Constitution by which the United States Government has spent $15,000,000,000 to build war plants operated by American industry.

Ways have been found by which the Government of the United States can take your 18-year-old son and either put him through college or fix him up with a nice fox hole out on some jungle island in the South Pacific.

Ways have been found by which the Government of the United States can do just about anything that it is necessary for the Government to do.

It is odd that these constitutional lawyers in the Senate simply can't find a way to insure a vote for the soldiers who are drafted and sent out to defend Iceland or to fight in Italian mud.

Will the servicemen accept any such excuse? As one distinguished veteran of the last war, Col. E. Brooke Lee, says in an editorial in the Maryland News, there has been no talk, even in the United States Senate, that this is a States' war. Everything that has or will happen to those young Americans in this war, he says, has been voted by this Congress to be a completely Federal and national responsibility and function. This war is a complete national effort. To work at all, Colonel Lee adds, the method through which the servicemen are to vote must flow along the same channels.

His point, which many servicemen are making, is that no real opportunity to vote will be allowed those serving the fighting forces if the States are "requested" by Congress to set up machinery for conduct of the voting. The reason is that the Army and Navy are far removed from the sphere of State government. Men in the Army and Navy are not allocated to services, divisions, or ships with any regard for their States or voting residences.

As Colonel Lee says, the 48 States as individual agencies of local government can no more conduct an election among members of the armed forces of the United States than they can conduct the supply system, the hospital system, the rail system, or any other of the services that affect all these men. The States will not even be able to find out where their soldiers and sailors are for months after the next Presidential election.

Only the Army and Navy know where these men are, and only the Army and Navy can distribute or collect their mail, their food, their ammunition, their clothing, their weapons, or their wounded, Colonel Lee says. Congress has set up this method for all the tools of war. Why change it for the distribution of the great weapon and privilege of the free citizen—the ballot?

Does any distinguished constitutional lawyer in the Senate think the matter can be disposed of on the Senate floor by explaining that the Constitution of this Republic will not permit its defenders to be protected in the privilege of voting?

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, criticism and correction of mistakes of bureaus and departments are proper functions of the Congress; but our efforts along that line are being used by some people and some groups as an excuse to attack and undo everything that has been done in the past 11 years, whether good or bad, with the result that much beneficial legislation is being threatened. A case in point is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I am very proud that I was a Member of the Congress which in 1933 passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote; and the people of this country should be equally proud of the manner in which this Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been administered. This legislation in 1933 was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. It displaced despair with hope in the hearts of millions, and kept many a building and loan company out of receivership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower in the dark days of the depression when his loan was refinanced was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home. We replaced those delinquent loans with the longest term amortized mortgage—at the most reasonable interest rate—on properties that as a class were the poorest risks. This great humanitarian act was fully justified if we had lost a billion dollars, but the remarkable thing about it is that the taxpayers have never lost one single dollar because of the H. O. L. C., and will not lose a single dollar, unless—and bear this point in mind—unless the Congress votes for immediate liquidation of this corporation, in which event the taxpayers will lose $400,000,000 and many of those so insistently urging this liquidation would profit that amount at the taxpayers' expense.

Why this sudden urge for immediate liquidation? The H. O. L. C. is already being liquidated in an orderly manner. Since 1936 when they ceased making loans they have reduced their investment from approximately $3,500,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, and under existing laws, must complete liquidating by 1952.

Immediate liquidation can have but three results—all of them bad—as far as the people and taxpayers are concerned. First, a loss of something like $400,000,000; second, expense and inconvenience to present borrowers who will have to refinance through private companies; third, it will contribute to inflation. Let me give you an example of how it will work. An original $6,000 loan has been reduced to $2,000. It would be a gilt-edge risk at $4,000, and since the borrower is being put to the expense of making a new loan, he will be tempted—probably encouraged—to make it for $4,000, thereby pouring 2,000 more dollars into a market which already has more dollars to spend than there are consumer goods to buy. Multiply that example a few thousand times and you will have what we fear—inflation.

You all know the powerful campaign being waged to cause this liquidation—the prairie fire method. It has brought a deluge of letters to my desk from the building and loan companies of my State. You know the kind of letters I mean because you are receiving them, too. I do not know the sort of replies you are making, but I want to place in the RECORD, for the information of my fellow Members of Congress, a copy of one of my replies, and trust that my position will be emulated by many of my colleagues in whom I have every confidence.

JANUARY 24, 1944.

Mr. J. B. DOLLARD,
President, First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Capitol Securities Building, Boise, Idaho.

DEAR MR. DOLLARD: This is to acknowledge your letter of January 18 enclosing copy of a letter from Congressman DIRKSEN relative to the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I am not at all sure that an immediate liquidation of the H. O. L. C. would be beneficial to the taxpayers of the United States, and I will tell you why. The chief argument for liquidation is that the H. O. L. C. is in competition with private business, but since it has not made any loans since 1936 that argument is not valid.

H. O. L. C. should not be confused with other emergency housing projects. It was set up in 1933 with a capital of $200,000,000, which is still intact, and has never cost the taxpayers $1 additional; while it did save the homes of something like 1,000,000 families, and incidentally bailed out some rather shaky building and loan companies by taking over their least desirable loans. Most of H. O. L. C.'s losses were occasioned by its assistance to these private loan companies.

The great majority of the loans made by the H. O. L. C. (approximately two-thirds of all the money loaned by them) are not only worth par, but a considerable premium above par, and, if the H. O. L. C. were forced to liquidate them at par now, as suggested by Congressman DIRKSEN, the taxpayers would lose approximately $400,000,000. Its liquidation would only result in the sale of these choice premium loans, and the H. O. L. C. would be left to use their far-flung organization to service only the poorer loans referred to above.

If the H. O. L. C. is allowed to continue in operation for the time anticipated by the Congress—until 1952—they will not only be able to return to the Public Treasury their original $200,000,000 capital, but a nice profit on their operation. Since they are not in competition with private business, I can see no particular advantage in liquidating them at this time.

On the other hand, I can see a distinct disadvantage to present borrowers by forcing them to go to the expense of refinancing their loans with private companies, while private purchasers of the choicest of the H. O. L. C. loans at par would make a very considerable profit at the expense of the taxpayers.

I have very recently taken occasion to look into the affairs of the H. O. L. C., and the above statements are my honest convictions on the subject. However, if you can furnish me any additional information or show me where I have erred in my conclusions, I will appreciate it very much.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly two million applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. Of this amount, 4,692 loans were closed in Idaho, representing an aggregate amount of $8,875,603.

Citizens of Idaho can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expense and increasing their equities, but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Idaho, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $3,090,040, equivalent to 64.8 percent. A total of 1,651 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 309 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure a total of 427 properties. As of September 30, 1943, all but 15 of these have been sold. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of 500 loans of the Corporation in Idaho were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 57 percent as of September 30, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

A Cup of Kindness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's weekly magazine:

"A CUP OF KINDNESS

"And we'll tak a cup o' kindness yet,
For auld lang syne."

—*Robert Burns.*

From Dr. Lin Yutang's new book, The Wisdom of Confucius (Modern Library, New

York, 1943, 265 pp., 26 illustrations by Jeanyee Wong, 1 map, $1.50), we've just found out what Confucius' central piece of wisdom really was. The great Chinese thinker lived 551–478 B. C.

Solely and simply, Confucius' controlling idea was this: That if everybody in a country would do his or her best to be kind, generous, and decent to everybody else, the sum total of this kindness, generosity, and decency would produce in that country a kind, decent, and generous social system, under which the largest possible number of people could feel that life was worth living.

On this central proposition is hung the entire philosophy of Confucius—who incidentally was no stuffed-shirt or pompous jackass, and who had a sort of Mark Twain sense of humor.

Maybe there's something in it. There is at least this much in it: The individual, 999 times out of 1,000, cannot exert much direct effect on the great tides of force awash in his own time; but he or she can at least be personally kind, generous, and decent in private life. It is no easy job. One of its hardest aspects is the matter of deciding what is the really kind thing to do in certain situations. But it can be achieved, and practice makes something approaching perfect.

Perhaps—who knows?—if the majority of us in the twentieth-century United States were to try out Confucius' approximately 2,450-year-old idea and stick to it for a few years, miracles would appear in our national life.

Make F. E. P. C. Permanent—Support Scanlon Bill, H. R. 3986

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, our fighting men are about to face a supreme test—the like of which, we who are secure can hardly imagine. I speak of cracking the western front. We have the stupendous example behind us of the raging land battles of our allies. It is our turn now—to take on the full massed army of the enemy, in attack. We shall break him with all the physical being, technical skill, and material power which we have brought together and developed in the past years. We have been warned in advance by those conducting this campaign that our personal loss will be dreadful. It will mount into the hundreds of thousands. No battle of ours until now compares with what lies ahead for us. It is our turn now.

In the face of this impending sacrifice, let us examine with the honesty of a surgeon's scalpel what we have contributed to real democracy to compensate for this bitter loss. How much is there undone? What of the unfinished democracy here in the republic?

In losing the best of a generation to the Nazi brute are we attacking discrimination with boldness and righteous scorn befitting our soldier-liberators?

In honest truth, we can say that in these days the Bill of Rights and the "four freedoms" are being excoriated by some in America, who have never caught the real meaning of democracy. We know from recent debate in this chamber that the reactionary is prepared to rob the working rights of the Mexican, Jew, Negro, Catholic, or persons of foreign birth, as the case may be. If we do not turn the tide of this force our fighting men will return to find the choking vines of discrimination obliterating the American worker for whose very existence he is fighting abroad—and who has sustained him with arms as he made the fight.

The men who are about to attack are one—to the enemy. The enemy will know the power of his fire—not his race, creed, or the origin of his forebears.

F. E. P. C., the one practical Federal agency which has met the minority question with a real answer—jobs, not words—is itself under salvo here in the Congress, its real function being diverted by the age-common game of might-is-right politics. This should not and cannot be the case in a free Nation. The question concerns the working existence of our own citizens. This question concerns three-quarters of the peoples of the earth's globe who look to us for judicious leadership and revitalization of the meaning of popular government.

Ben Franklin was succinct with respect to who we are and what we mean to the peoples of the world about us. Let us hear him again:

> The eyes of Christendom are upon us, and our honor as a people is become a matter of the utmost consequence to be taken care of. If we give up our rights in this contest, a century to come will not restore to us the opinion of the world; we shall be stamped with the character of poltroons and fools.

The F. E. P. C. is war government. The Executive order by which it was established is an expression of equity and cold-blooded reality, war marked by the constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief.

Our Constitution is minorities. The stature of our moral leadership grew immeasurably through the statesmanship and vigorous equalitarian stand of the President when he issued this order. The order as amended in May 1943 reads in part:

> It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders.

This order has provided equal opportunity for all Americans to participate in the production of battle weapons. To fight a war and tyranny as was organized by our enemies, we must call all hands on deck or go under. Previous discrimination as we had known it had to go by the board for reasons of survival and by the very nature of our democratic doctrines. We could not cut back the right of some 30,000,000 of minorities to share in the flood of work growing out of our war effort because of his or her particular custom or color of skin. Total war demanded total mobilization of manpower.

Because of our gigantic effort, hitherto untapped natural resources had to be forced out of our continent. To date the income of this Nation amounts to $160,000,000,000 dollars per annum compared to forty billion per annum of a decade ago. This new wealth made ruthless demands on every available pair of hands. The threat of distinction made no fine line of difference—youngsters and the aged; Irish, Polish, Negro, Scot; and even the infirm—we needed them all desperately. To have deliberately denied any person work and promotion would have been to sabotage ourselves as a whole.

Apart from the reality of plain work to be done let us never underestimate the morale of the minority in relation to war.

Thirty millions of people subject to discrimination is a vast number. It is 20 to 25 percent of the Nation. Disillusionment and frustration among neglected people was the cause in great part of the collapse in Western Europe. The Fascist mind resorted to endless invention and finally abducted the spirit of millions who had been discriminated against—economically or otherwise.

As to ourselves—how could our professions to democracy square with our induction of minorities into the armed services while at the same time deny them right to produce weapons of war to protect their sons, our kin and neighbors.

It is only logical that once the need for labor was established, any person occupied in war work should receive pay on an equal basis with his coworkers. This is the labor standard of the land.

This is the meaning of economic democracy and proper in a nation abounding in wealth such as ours.

F. E. P. C. has the support of progressive labor leaders whose main preoccupation and task is to guide the practical and political affairs of the American workers. On the other hand, there are those labor leaders who would pull their own house down rather than admit a dark-skinned coworker to the full privileges of a federation for workingmen.

I quote from the statement of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at their sixty-third convention held in October 1943:

> The direct and whole-hearted participation of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor in the work of the Fair Employment Practice Committee has been based on the recognition of the fact that race discrimination in war employment is inconsistent with the Nation's foremost objectives in war for the survival of democracy. Such discrimination is not only contrary to individual human rights affirmed by our Constitution and basic to our institutions, but is also a threat to national unity during and after the war. Differential treatment of minority groups, and especially Negroes, at the time of maximum employment induced by the war, is bound to establish and perpetuate basic differentials in the Nation's wage structure solely because of race. When employment is curtailed after the war, the creation of a reservoir of cheap labor among Negro workers can only serve to destroy the established wage standards for all labor and result in racial strife. Insistent need for elimination of race discrimination in employment and wage standards is thus dictated, not only by the Democratic principle to which the labor movement is pledged, but also by the need to assure economic stabilization.

The labor movement will crumble and crash if any segment of organized labor allows the resolutions and pledges taken in convention assembled to become a mere scrap of paper and allow words issued in convention to become a mere pap.

Railroad workers who have been discriminated against are wondering whether they shall see their case fitfully settled by the special committee appointed by the President. I am wondering with them. I shall watch developments with interest.

If responsible labor leaders have gone down the line in support of F. E. P. C. it is because of reason and a desire for healthy economics. Democratic principle is their pump-primer. A wise labor organization is not dry rot in the land, but a live organism. It cannot help but recognize the minority workers. These millions have and will work into the labor system and in turn become the consumers of the goods it fabricates.

I wish to quote at this point from President Philip Murray's report to the sixth constitutional convention of the C. I. O. held on November 1, 1943. In endorsing F. E. P. C., he has said:

> Two years of practical experience in dealing with problems of discrimination in employment on grounds of race, creed, color, and national origin by the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice prove that these undemocratic and socially destructive practices can be controlled if approached with vigor and honesty—there is much ground yet to be covered, of course, for deep-seated habits and prejudices cannot be changed overnight. But a basic orientation has been achieved and we have a general understanding now of the policies which must be followed in the long pull—from the time of the establishment of the first committee, C. I. O. has given strong support to this work. It was instrumental in obtaining the issuance of Executive Order 8802. It pressed for vigorous enforcement without fear or favor. It has urged full and prompt investigations and hearings in all situations where discriminatory practices have taken place.

The idea of an American minority sounds strange to most of us. Who is he? It is hard to think that we are anything but plain Americans—all of us. But there are those who have been standing on the fringe of equal opportunity for generations, or who have been discriminated against for fear of aiding the enemy. There are the million refugees who have fled the Axis combine to seek freedom and work within our shores. There is the American Indian, who receives only a minimum share in our industrial system—but whose inherent craft skill no one questions. Some twenty millions of our people are immigrant or first- or second-generation Germans, Italians, Jews, Finns, and French-Canadians. There are in America approximately 7,000,000 or more persons of Polish descent immediate or remote.

One person in 10 in the United States is a Negro. There are 13,000,000 people in this largest minority group.

A major portion of 3,000,000 Spanish-Americans are located in the Southwestern States. These people's forebears helped settle New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, and southern California. New Mexico bore the highest loss of the 9,000 men who went to Bataan in April 1941. The Two Hundredth and Five Hundred and Fifteenth Coast Artillery of New Mexico was made up of Spanish-speaking men in ace antiaircraft units. Many are Japanese prisoners now.

The F. E. P. C. is a fair yardstick to measure minority percentages by. Of the 3,000 complaints filed with the committee last year, 81 percent alleged discrimination because of race or color, 9 percent because of religion, 5½ percent because of alienage, and 4½ percent because of national origin.

The F. E. P. C. is not trying to impair the traditional employee-employer relationship of 30,000,000 persons in the United States but by adjusting complaints it is setting patterns for a greater slice of democracy than they ever received before.

As matters stand today a member of a minority group has one-eighth as good a chance of getting placed in skilled or semiskilled occupations as a member of a majority group.

F. E. P. C. has a big job cut out ahead. This Congress has a big job cut out ahead and the duty of making America a place of equal job opportunity for the men and women who are now returning or who are still overseas. The men and women in the fighting services are not a majority—they are everybody. They are the "four freedoms" in living, acting, fighting reality. They will want to see democracy work because they are fighting those who have discriminated against freedom.

Discrimination against a fellow citizen is unethical. Labor leaders and legislators have aided in protecting the minority against economic exploitation to some extent—they have improved his general welfare, but for long centuries he carried his grief to the churches and synagogues. If he had a poor chance elsewhere he took comfort in religion. Today religious leaders are increasingly concerned with the practical measures to attain the ideal of the brotherhood of man. On November 13, 1943, the Administrative Board of the Catholic Welfare Conference at the direction of the archbishops and bishops who attended the annual meeting of the hierarchy in Washington issued an important statement on the essentials of a just peace. While the statement was concerned with international relations it significantly enough singled out the problem of extending equal justice to all groups of American citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. I quote the hierarchy:

> It would be inconsistent to promote a world reconstruction in which all nations great and small, powerful and weak, would enjoy their rights in the family of nations, unless in our own national life we recognize an equality of opportunity for all our citizens and willing to extend to them the full benefits of our democratic institutions.

This statement was quoted in the January issue of Catholic Action and went on to say:

> In the providence of God there are among us millions of fellow citizens of the Negro race. We owe to these fellow citizens, who have contributed so largely to the development of our country, and for whose welfare history imposes on us a special obligation of justice, to see that they have in fact the rights which are given them in our Constitution. This means not only political equality but also fair economic and educational opportunities, a just share in public welfare projects, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for the social advancement of their race.

Mr. Speaker, the thinking and desire for action in this instance has underlined the lot of the American Negro. The same applies to the Spanish-speaking population—it applies to the Jew who is discriminated against—to the Polish-American who carries his accent to the graveyard shift—to the Seventh-Day Adventist who worships on Saturday.

The kind of thinking I have just quoted is based on tolerance and love for the dignity of man. This is the foundation of our civilization. It is not original, but is being further implemented today by men of good will who know that the destiny of the world is democracy.

I should like to dwell on the subject of the Negro at this point—there is much said about him which only partly reveals his position in our war economy.

Out of a total of 14,000,000 war workers in the plants and factories reporting to the War Manpower Commission the actual number of Negroes making the necessities of war as of last July was a little more than one million.

This figure carries a good deal of significance. It is no mere abstract term for war workers punching time clocks. There is a history of evolution and redoubled effort of a loyal citizenry to receive their just due in real jobs.

During the last war when the Nation stepped up its production—thousands of Negroes proved their adaptability to industrial working conditions—although historically their source of livelihood stemmed from the land. During the last war they were the last hired and the first fired. When the war boom spiraled down into a depression—the Negro went down with it. What he had gained in higher standard of living, was short lived. He retained the new dignity but lost the proper standard of living. Later, during the world-wide depression of the thirties the members of his race weighted the relief rolls in what seemed to abnormal extent. But what private jobs there were went to others—consequently the public supported him on relief. In this war his race has come forward again in an attempt to hold down bona fide jobs, earn regular pay according to standard conditions set down for all who work in war. The Government policy of nondiscrimination has supported this urge to come forward to work.

With the aid of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, 1,000,000 are contributing directly to the production of war essentials. Without discrimination approximately one-half million more could produce goods for the armed forces. This would be within the 10 percent ratio which the Negro bears to the whole population and which could save management, Government and the whole war effort from the present exasperating search for adequate labor.

Discrimination has a strong foothold here on the home front and if F. E. P. C. for reasons of myopia among special groups is discouraged from doing its proper job, we shall lose critical numbers of willing and able workers now in war and for the reconstruction job which lies ahead.

Some still question the Negroes' capacity for industrial-type work. As far back as November 1942 the American Management Association discussed the Negro worker in a special research report. Enlightened personnel officers concluded these following points:

First. Negro workers have great potentialities; they have responded to training for industrial employment.

Second. Regardless of race, creed, color, where accepted, good personnel procedures are employed, workers respond, and satisfactory production may be expected.

Negro workers in war industries are still, for the most part, employed below their maximum or potential skills, but in many instances restrictions have been lifted to the benefit of production. Skilled Negroes have been recruited in a shipyard in Brunswick, Ga. In the area of Hampton Roads, Va., 4 Government establishments and the largest private contractor employed 2,000 skilled and 7,000 semiskilled Negroes. Shipyards in Mobile, Ala., recruited Negro welders, traditionally one of the highest skills. In Baltimore a leading shipyard has employed some 10,000 Negroes. Of these over 2,000 were skilled men in a wide variety of occupations. Two years prior to this only a few had been employed, and they had been restricted to unskilled work. In the summer of 1943 over 65,000 Negro men and women had found employment in the aircraft industry. Thousands were in production jobs. From the fall of 1941 to January 1943, Western Electric increased its Negro employees from none to over 1,200. A large proportion of these were women, and Negro workers were employed in technical, clerical, skilled, and semiskilled capacities.

This is something of the record where the barriers of discrimination were let down to the benefit of the whole country. Discrimination would have chalked the loss of these workers to the "too little and too late" side of the war ledger.

Our railroads in the southeastern States are being confronted with the tragic loss of human life, not to speak of vital materials. This has been traced to the lack of trained manpower. Skilled railroad hands are ready and available to operate on the runs but discrimination prevents Negroes from resuming jobs which have been traditionally held by them. The toll of train wrecks mounts like a dirge.

The F. E. P. C. hearing held in September in this city divulged that there are 16 southern roads and terminals where Negroes have been firemen for half a century but where in recent years these colored workers have been discriminated against to the extent of rightful promotion being blocked and of frequently losing their jobs outright. It was disclosed that on one line several Negro workers were murdered in order to eliminate them from their jobs.

The cause of displacing near to a thousand trained workers is not a racial issue. White southern engineers have been working in harmonious relationship with Negro firemen since the turn of the century. The railroad industry was one of the first to hire Negro workers in this country.

This question is in a sense "technological unemployment" and has been frozen into a racial issue through the 1941 Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement—where limitations were put on the numbers and privileges of firemen of the Negro race. The real center of conflict behind this trend is a technological development and a consequent economic Gordian knot which the F. E. P. C. desires to untangle to the total benefit of the country.

The old type steam-driven locomotive has been gradually replaced with the automatic stoker and diesel-powered engine. The coal fireman's hazardous and physically tough job has evolved into a comparatively attractive one for which one group is attempting to replace the other.

In the final analysis the roads are losing irreplacable workers.

Very recently a nationally known newspaper writer reported on conditions which caused 72 persons to lose their lives in the Atlantic Coast Line wreck. It has become clear that the southbound train was handled by an inexperienced crew. The man responsible for a train of 15 cars and 500 passengers was a conductor only 30 years old. The fireman whose business it was to warn the oncoming northbound train had had only 3 years of experience.

Nevertheless the pool of trained railway workers remains. Many of them testified before the F. E. P. C. railroad hearings in September, the extent to which there is restraint from rightful jobs. Speaking of young and inexperienced white workers who had been hurdled ahead of older and more experienced hands one witness put it very simply. He said:

> Had he (the personnel officer) put those (colored) men to work instead of those five or six young white boys that they had put to work—and, three of them got their arms and legs cut off and the other got cut half in two. Those young Negroes had some experience (they had been car leaders for 7 or 8 years). They knew how to stay away from under the wheels, but those young boys didn't—even if they had been black boys at that age. I am not trying to cover up nothing. A spade is a spade with me. But if he had allowed those experienced semiskilled men to take the job they would not have been killed possibly. But they would not let them take the job.

This is a quotation from the F. E. P. C. railroad hearing transcript for September 18, 1943, page 734.

In conclusion, describing the meaning of discrimination in one war industry alone, I should like to quote from the recent report from the Subcommittee on Investigation of Congested Areas of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. The Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia is chairman of this committee. The report reads in part:

> Certainly the transportation system of this country is so vitally an integral part of our war machine, its proper maintenance contributes more to the final victory than will a few planes or tanks * * * the status of transportation throughout the Nation is alarming.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to point out the positive and negative sides of the question of discrimination. I believe that a long run national program for combatting discrimination must dig down to the basic causes. One of the most important of these is economic. It stems from the fear of job insecurity and competition. We know for example from studying the causes of the Detroit riots that in instances where white and Negro workers were engaged in essential and well-paid jobs—working side by side—there was no alarm and physical antagonism. In fact, there were numerous instances of rescue by white men of Negro coworkers.

The problem of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, will finally be settled in an American way, by American methods—as we have settled many diverse and angry problems before in our history. We are still a great and united Nation because in the final decisions all which is healthy and of integrity of the majority decides for the general welfare.

History and the evil abroad is challenging us to make our decision. We will accept that challenge by passing the Scanlon bill (H. R. 3986)—a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry.

We must take care of this problem. Is the Bill or Rights at home to be an all-encompassing doctrine—broad as our continent is broad, deep as the spirit of the good-neighbor policy and universal as the agreements of Cairo, Moscow, and Teheran—or shall we deliberately and cynically intend to keep 30,000,000 of our own people limping at our side? The answer is that the country is already responding. This is America, the land and principles upon which is founded democracy, the guiding light of freedom and peace.

America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk delivered by me on February 2, before the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at Milwaukee, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be present with you in Milwaukee to discuss this challenging subject—America's Future.

What will the future of America be? The answer is, of course, that it will be just what we, the people, make it. If the answer is correct, then it is very clear that we cannot be asleep to our personal responsibility in the matter.

If I attempt to draw aside the curtain between the present and the future, I can see great days ahead for our country, provided we, the people, who shape that future, are great in our plans, and great in the execution of them.

America's future, of course, includes America's place in the world—her relations with other nations, her foreign trade. It also includes her domestic problems, her ability to rebuild America economically, politically, and socially, after the strair of these war years. It includes above everything else, her ability to put into operation a great coalescing force in the affairs of mankind, breaking down the barriers which have kept men apart. To this end, there must be equality of opportunity in trade—and fair trade it must be. The day of the international buccaneer is over. Fair trade means giving value received in return. When we work out between different peoples mutually beneficial economic, social, and political relations, we are laying the foundations of peace.

What of the year immediately ahead? What can we expect? I am no oracle, but I have my opinion. Both wars will take a violent turn by spring, and there will be little question as to why we have built a 7,700,000-man army. It is that army of American boys who will deliver the knock-out blow in Europe. We know that actual defeat of the German Army from the west will provide the ending of the war with Germany. That victory may come by late summer or fall.

It is unfortunate that the months ahead will see Europe a greater shambles even than now. Unless the German morale should break, we are going to increase our tremendous impact upon her and her satellites from the skies, and if her people cannot take it, then we may see an earlier peace. But if we keep on having strikes and threats of strikes in our country, enabling Hitler and Goebbels to tell the German people that we are cracking as indicated by strikes and disorders, it simply means that we shall be prolonging the war and sacrificing thousands of our boys because the Germans will then think there is still a chance to win, and will refuse to give up their war effort. We know what the German press has had to say about our labor crises.

As to the war in the Far East, it is anticipated that Japan will begin to break down by the end of the year. We have reason to believe she will be cut off from her new empire by autumn, her lines of communication in the South Pacific severed by the continued attacks of the armed forces of the United States.

Perhaps we are not too optimistic in predicting that the bombing of Japan proper by land-based United States bombers will be on the way by late 1944 or early 1945.

Here at home, it is expected that the cost of living will rise from 3 to 5 percent, but not much beyond that; there will not be a runaway price inflation in the year ahead. Price control, wage control, and rationing will continue to keep inflationary pressure within bounds so long as the war lasts.

And to you who are interested in merchandise, I say there is evidence that the Government in Washington is waking up to the imperative need of following suggestions made 6 or 8 months ago by your Senator, that there be more consumer goods manufactured. This will not only help business, but will operate as a safety valve against inflation.

For the average person, living will be little, if any, more complicated in 1944. Your automobiles will be a little more worn, gasoline will be as tight or tighter, tires will be scarce; but the fuel-oil situation should be much better by next fall.

We can expect that the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration will have seen fit to release more abundant meat supplies by spring. Food generally will be more abundant with new crops, as our stock pile for European relief grows greater and takes care of that tremendous task.

By the end of the year, I believe we shall be looking cheerfully into the future. We shall probably be arguing about who is to get first call on the new cars to be produced in 1945; about who is to build the new home they have been planning so long, and who is to get first chance at the thousand and one new articles that have been produced by the ingenuity of our engineers. The public will be surprised to learn that post-war cars, houses, in fact all commodities, may remain at a higher cost level than in pre-war days, because it will be the effort of Government to maintain a higher standard of living than has ever obtained in our history.

Instead of drafting for the armed forces, demobilization will be the concern of the country; for once Germany is defeated, the Army will begin to cut back rapidly. Fathers, among the last to go into the Army, will be the first to come out; the men who have been on combat duty the longest will be the first to return to their homes and civilian life. We shall by that time, if my efforts are of any avail, be prepared to put those men back into a civilian life far better than that from which they were wrested by the onslaught of war. They will have a tremendous part to play in the reconversion of our war economy to a peacetime economy.

But what of the more distant future—those years of peace which will follow the adjustment period immediately after the war? They, too, will bring their problems and perplexities, but they will be problems of reconstruction, rehabilitation, and rebuilding—nationally and internationally. The capitals of Europe will have been destroyed, its transportation systems wrecked, its great commercial centers demolished, and the morale of its people shattered. The spiritual and physical reconstruction of that vast area is a tremendous challenge to the people of our day and of our country; but it is not one before which the spirit of America will quail. It is from the great moral and spiritual reservoirs of America that the rest of the world must draw its strength for the rehabilitation of its people, and for its material reconstruction. In meeting this great demand upon us, we do so not as a Santa Claus, but as a helpful brother—a Samaritan making the sick and wounded capable to take care of themselves. However, let America remember what the Apostle Paul said: "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than the infidel." Our own birthright we shall preserve, and aid other people to preserve their's also—bearing in mind what Henry Ward Beecher said: "We should so live and labor in our time that what came to us as seed may go to the next generation as blossom, and what came to us as blossom may go to them as fruit. That is what we mean by progress."

Though the war will be over, we shall still be operating on a global scale. It will be America's merchant ships, her great fleet which will take the materials of peace to the farthest corners of the earth. It will be America's steel mills, America's factories and industries, which will produce the materials of reconstruction. And our returning soldiers, each of them trained in some particular field, will have a strong hand in refashioning the world of tomorrow.

It is during those reconstruction days that we must be particularly on our guard; for those will be days of prosperity, and if there is not a proper balance when we have assisted the rest of the world to its feet industrially, and established other centers of production to compete with ours—unless we are on guard we may again find ourselves on the brink of economic depression—an economic Pearl Harbor.

It is during those first years of peace that we must adjust our economic structure for the future—not just for the moment by a policy of day-to-day expediency. Perhaps, out of the travail through which America is passing and has passed during the past 3 years, and during the depression years before that, she will come forth cleansed and purified of many loose ideas and false philosophies, and find the highway that will lead to closer cooperation between the various segments of her own society, and between herself and the other nations of the world. That is my faith. But a purifying process is required. The dross must be separated from the gold by fire; and that fire means clearer thinking, higher moral standards individually and nationally, coupled with industry, thrift, and constructive building.

What a job for our homes, our churches, our schools, and each of us individually.

"Isn't it strange that princes and kings
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings
And humble folk like you and me
Are building for eternity?
To each is given a kit of tools
A shapeless mass and a Book of rules
And each must fashion, ere life is done
A stumbling block or a stepping stone."

Yes, the world of the future will be what we, its citizens of the present, make it—just as we today are what the past has made us.

For us, there are three great lights to guide us on our way—the light of experience and history, the light of reason, and the light of God. Let us consider some of our problems in these three lights.

From the light of history we should learn much. Let us look back upon ancient Greece, in the days of Pericles, when the city of Athens was master of that region of the world. Pericles made Athens the most beautiful city, artistically, that the world had ever seen—literally an artist's dream crystalized in marble. But Athens had more than physical beauty. It was the home of philosophers, poets, historians; the arts and letters flourished there. It was the seat of learning—so much so, that to this day any great center of learning is spoken of as the "Athens" of that vicinity. Yet Athens fell into ruin and decay. Why? Because it lacked something; that vital quality absolutely necessary for individuals and nations, if they are to live with others, and survive. Athens lacked it because the Greeks themselves lacked it. They wanted to be masters of others—they wanted to enslave their fellow human beings to their own selfish uses, and as a result, the Greeks never learned the lesson of cooperating with others. There was no unity between the cities of ancient Greece—each stood alone—and consequently, they eventually fell. They didn't learn the lesson of working together. They didn't learn to treat others as they would be treated. That one fact led to their destruction. Truly, we can learn much from the light of history.

This is an important lesson, which we must apply both on the home front that we may have unity within our borders, and in our international life that we may have unity between the nations. The world has become

so contracted that we are not over 24 hours away from any other point on earth, and possibly in a few months will not be over 10 or 12 hours distant. In the light of experience, and in the light of reason, we can readily understand how important it is that the nations learn the necessity for cooperating with each other, so we won't be at each other's throats a generation from now.

In the light of history we can take a lesson from that fine little country, Switzerland. That is a country composed of three nationalities, with three different languages and various religious beliefs—yet they have held together politically, they have worked and lived together, in peace and harmony, both within their own borders, and with the rest of the world. In the light of experience we can take a lesson from our own country. We are 48 States and territories, each with its own State's rights—yet we are one people. We have proved that in this fight in which Hitler and Hirohito tried to "take us for a ride." Russia, too, shines, as a great "light." Before this war there were between 80 and 100 different tongues spoken in Russia, but those people have united as one man fighting for the fatherland.

During this past century, the British Empire has taught the whole world a lesson in unity. Her whelps came to her rescue when she was attacked. And why was that? Was it not because Britain's whelps were as free as the lioness herself, that they exercised every right that the mother did? There was not only commercial and economic unity in that great Commonwealth of Nations; there was also spiritual unity and political unity between Britain and her dominions.

Still another historical experience comes to my mind, and it comes from Japan itself. You will remember that almost a century ago, Commander Perry went into Japan and opened it up to western civilization. Why is it that in all the passing years Japan has not learned to work harmoniously with the other nations of the earth? The Japanese came to this country and learned much. They copied everything we had except the lesson taught by the Book of Books: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. That they did not learn. That light from God, which we possessed, they never had. When Perry went into Japan, Japan was a nation living in the Middle Ages. Since that time she has acquired much of our technical knowledge. She learned to manufacture her own planes, her own great munitions of war, her battle wagons. She became industrialized, and she has conquered a great deal of territory. But what will it gain her, if she has lost her own soul? Possessed as she is of the arts and sciences but lacking love of her fellow man, will she not, like ancient Athens, fall to her doom? Is she not at this very moment on the verge of that? In the light of history I would say that she is. She, like Athens, had the master complex; all other nations were to be her slaves. That also was the idea of Hitler.

Now let me ask, What will be the situation after we have won the war in Europe and have knocked out Japan? What will be the situation in the Far East? What of China and Russia? China has a population of 450,000,000. Consider what a power she will be when she has accomplished the same things within her boundaries which Japan has accomplished, when she has become industrialized, modernized, and organized. What will be her attitude toward us? What will be the attitude of America, of the white race, toward the yellow race? Those are problems which we must consider now, because what we do today will shape our future world.

We must never forget the lesson of Pearl Harbor. We must teach that to our children's children, so that through all time, America will be alert and on guard—have her eyes open to see the many social and political currents flowing through the world. She must recognize the great changes going on about her, and she must keep constantly prepared to meet any emergency.

In the light of history, in the light of reason, and in the light of God, should we not begin on our own home front, in every village, hamlet, and city, to practice the golden rule in our home life and in our national life? Then will follow the practice of that golden rule in our international affairs; and as a result, the yellow, the brown, and the black races will not only learn how to manufacture arms, build ships, and fight. They and we will learn the higher imperative—how to live together in harmony in a contracting world, irrespective of color, creed, or breed.

Economic, political and social lights are not enough. The greatest lights are those spiritual lights, those great precepts which live through the ages. as taught by the saviours, the prophets, the sages of all history. If we and other peoples apply them in our daily living, in business relations, social relations and political relations, we will not have war. If we rely on the law of economics alone, war will follow.

We have had many plans, many suggestions in the United States. We have seen people go almost daffy about this or that plan. While the plan may be important, it is still more important to know the character and the soulstuff of the planners, whether they are morally responsible, whether they will carry through, whether they have faith, whether they have honesty and integrity, whether they will make good on the pledged word, whether they are growing souls, or those simply living in the muck of human existence.

I do not believe that the millennium is just around the corner; nor do I believe the millennium is going to materialize out of this mess the world is in. But, as I view the present, I do believe that the world has turned a corner, that this is one of the pivotal ages of humanity. It is probably comparable to that age of political revolution in which this country received the stimulus which resulted in her freedom—when all the world stepped forward out of the past. It is probably also comparable to the age of industrial revolution when all the world felt a new impetus, and we saw great groups of people take a step forward. Or perhaps it may be comparable to that period when the world reached out into the field of discovery—not only of new continents on this earth but great spheres of the heavens, when we chartered the heavens and the earth anew, and the minds of men were impelled toward greater heights.

I have mentioned the fact that China will play a great part in the not-too-distant future. How important, how vital it is for us to demonstrate to her 450,000,000 people, by our deeds, that we live not simply after the law of economics but also by the law of the Spirit, as taught by Him whom we call Master. It is for us, by our acts, by our living, by our international contacts, to revitalize the important truth that by unity and cooperation, by helping one another, we can build a peaceful world. If the nations do not demonstrate this ability now and in the future, then it is possible that 50 or 100 years from now some country may have the same impulse Japan and Germany had, and we may be called upon to face a great nation, fully equipped and industrialized, in another world conflict.

So, when we think of America's future, when we think of the world of tomorrow, let us think about the responsibilities confronting us in the world today, and endeavor to so build now as to preclude the probability of war in the future.

Farming—Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy and former Ambassador to Mexico. The address is entitled "Farming—Then and Now," and was delivered to the North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, at Raleigh, N. C., on February 2, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Raleigh is proud to welcome the men who feed us to their city. Some city dwellers have forgotten and sometimes despised the source from which Anteus gained his strength—a source upon which as never before civilians and men in the armed forces depend. We need to recall the truth that was emphasized to city dwellers when eloquently and succinctly expressed in Bryan's speech that captured the presidential nomination in 1896:

"The great cities rest upon our broad and fertile farms; burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

I have no key to let you open the door of your own house. This is a peculiar city. It did not grow into a capital city as in most other States. Like Washington, it was born the seat of government. Outside of small and provincial Wake Courthouse this was a privately owned farm with magnificent oak forests to fame unknown (the property of Joel Lane) until—

Until tired of a roving capital, a State house on wheels, so to speak, the State bought the land to establish a permanent capital with no roving instincts. And so in 1792 the commissioners appointed paid Joel Lane $2,756 for 1,000 acres. It was State-owned every foot of it, laid off not unlike the city of Washington for a permanent seat of government. The State capitol building—one of the three most perfect architectural structures in America. It is the light kindled, not by people living here, but by the whole people of what was once Sir Walter Raleigh's proprietary colonial hope chest.

And so you are in your own house when you are in Raleigh. Your taxes, whether you opened your eyes in the delightful atmosphere that surrounded Virginia Dare's birthplace or first drew your breath on the heights where you inhaled invigorating mountain air, made this city possible. You own it. Here you and your forebears have made the laws and shaped the policies of the Commonwealth since it donned the robes of statehood.

Peculiarly, Raleigh is the dynamic center of the agricultural life of Tarheeldom. From your Agricultural Department, from the Agricultural College, from State and cooperating Federal agencies flow the scientific and practical policies which in the past—and now more than ever—have made agriculture a profession as well as the chief foundation stone upon which the prosperity of today and the better order of tomorrow rests.

You are gathered by your own fireside to take counsel of the ways and means to conserve the soil, to increase production, to solve the yet unsolved problem of distribution so that the farmer will receive his just share of the dollar the consumer pays for the food and raiment and other crops grown in sweat and toil. If I dared to say what is the chief goal that had eluded farmers and statesmen in all the years I'd say it is to close the chasm—sometimes deep and yawning—between the price paid by the consumer and the price paid to the farmer.

The past 2 years have witnessed more marked achievement in everything touching agriculture in the fair adjustment and division of what the ultimate consumer pays for what the farmer produces. A few weeks before Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated I asked him what he regarded as the chief problem which his administration should undertake to solve for the common weal. With a sort of Yankee spirit—he had lived in Connecticut and knew something of the fabled wooden nutmeg belt—he asked: "What do you think?" I answered by relating this incident:

"During the campaign of 1912, I was invited to lunch by Mitchell Palmer, afterwards Attorney General, at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. He ordered one-half a cantaloupe for each of us. While we were eating, the waiter brought Mr. Palmer's mail. He opened it and said: 'Look here, I have a letter from the manager of my farm. I raise cantaloupes. He reports that he had received 85 cents for a crate of cantaloupes shipped to New York. And now we are paying 80 cents for one cantaloupe at the hotel.' I told the newly elected President 'there was something wrong in a situation where a consumer in New York paid 80 cents for one cantaloupe and the grower received only 85 cents for the whole crate. The country cannot prosper unless farmers receive fair prices for their crops,' I said, 'and therefore, the man who can do most to secure prosperity, a practical agriculturist, should be Secretary of Agriculture, a man who can reduce the cost between producer and consumer. He is your key man.' "

That incident, of course, is an extreme case, bu: it is a striking commentary that while under the new freedom and the New Deal—both in Washington and in Raleigh—more has been done to improve the status of the farmer than in any other era the fact still remains that the lion in the path is too great disparity between the price the consumer pays and the farmer receives. That is the next hurdle to be surmounted. You farmers must quit petitioning. You must evolve a plan—just alike to producer, merchant, and consumer—and insist that the present antiquated hit-and-miss practice come to an end.

Everything is comparative. The farmer, like the mariner if he is to arrive at a safe harbor, must take reckoning of his course and avoid all of the shoals that may mean shipwreck. Today as you plan for a better voyage, let us pause and contrast the situation of the farmer in 1931 with his condition in 1941 (the years in which statistics are available). Let us first see what the farmers in all the United States received for their crops in 1931, 2 years before there was any New Deal, and in 1941.

The total money the farmers in all the 48 States received for their crops in 1931 was $4,122,850,000, and in 1941 was $7,739,013,000—an increase of $3,616,163,000.

The value of some of the chief crops in the United States was as follows:

	1931	1941
Livestock	$4, 859, 759, 000	$5, 320, 000, 000
Cotton, lint	483, 639, 000	903, 257, 000
Tobacco	128, 582, 000	903, 257, 000
Peanuts	17, 144, 000	68, 752, 000

The total money the farmers in North Carolina received for their crops in 1931 was: $136,496,000. In 1941: $304,746,000—an increase of $168,250,000. The value of the chief crops in North Carolina was as follows:

	1931	1941
Livestock	$74, 564, 000	$91, 455, 000
Cotton	22, 456, 000	48, 880, 000
Tobacco	42, 488, 000	134, 384, 000
Peanuts	4, 400, 000	14, 345, 000

These figures speak trumpet-tongued for the industry of the men who till the soil, plus the introduction of better methods and the aid and cooperation of a Government possessing a heart as well as a cash register to record the collection of taxes.

We hear much about the mistakes that have been made by Government—and there have been too many, and there should be no soft-pedaling in demanding their correction—but some people have short memories. In magnifying the errors they are apt to forget the pit from which they digged when the New Deal plan was invoked. Not a great while before he died, Dr. Wallace Riddick, president of the College of Agriculture and Engineering, who was also a practical farmer from his youth, was asked by a skeptic what he thought of the New Deal as related to agriculture. He spoke a parable when he said:

"I am like the blind man in the Scripture who received his sight from the Great Physician, recorded in the ninth chapter of John. When asked by those who said Jesus was a sinner, how he was healed, the blind man answered: 'Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see.' "

Dr. Riddick added that prior to 1933 he lost money on his farm and feared he was headed for bankruptcy, whereas since 1933 he had made money and was comparatively on easy street. "Whereas I was blind, I now see."

The chief stimulus after the war of the sixties to general improvement in agriculture was the establishment of State College. The pioneer advocate of agricultural education was Col. L. L. Polk. He ridiculed the theoretical instruction in agriculture at the University of North Carolina, the only place where any attempt was made to teach agriculture. He said: "I have been to Chapel Hill and there wasn't a plow, a harrow, a rake, or anything that looked like agriculture except some spectacled professor now and then discussing agriculture as practiced in Egypt centuries ago." Contrast the one-crop system and frustration of agriculture in the early 90's before the college and the Agricultural Department, working together, got into their stride. That college has taught students to be better farmers and to learn how to make farming more successful for others so that those who live on the land may enjoy a richer, fuller, and more satisfying existence. The Extension Service has largely revolutioned farming through the intelligent zeal of young crusaders sent out from that institution, cooperating with forward-looking women and older farmers who added experience to the scientific knowledge of the college graduates. Recently more than 3,000 neighborhood leaders have shouldered the responsibility of aiding the Extension Service by informing their neighbors as to important facts which should be known by all.

Among the Federal agencies which have been set up to work with rural people since the present national administration came into power, none has been more effective than the Soil Conservation Service, brought into being through the enthusiasm and persistence of Hugh H. Bennett, a native North Carolinian and an apostle of erosion control. Seventeen soil-conservation districts have been organized in North Carolina since 1935, covering 61 of the 100 counties and teaching the principles of saving vital top soil to owners of 190,935 farms. More than a million acres of land are farmed under definite plans drawn up through a cooperative agreement with the Soil Conservation Service and the owners of the acres. This has done much to stop erosion in the State.

Production credit associations also have been of great aid to farmers in providing credit more suitable to farm needs and at reasonable interest rates. These production credit associations have been a valuable adjunct to the original Farm Credit Administration as established under the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

The Rural Electrification Authority also has brought the blessing of electrical power to 151,532 country homes as compared with only 11,558 farms having this power back in 1935.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, working in the western part of the State, is aiding farmers in establishing pasture sods and in using other water-holding methods to be a boon to the people of that section. The T. V. A. cooperates closely with the Extension Service in promoting the use of better farm management and the application of limestone and phosphate to the steep hillside fields of that section, thus encouraging the growth of clovers and other forage crops. It is significant that floods along the Mississippi last spring occurred on the western side of the river and not on the eastern side, where the T. V. A. has built its great power and reservoir dams.

From the standpoint of funds involved and its widespread influence on nearly every farm home, perhaps the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is the governmental organization which is of most interest to all farmers.

Back in 1932 farmers of North Carolina were facing a critical economic situation. Their principal money crop—flue-cured tobacco—was selling at levels far below cost of production; their farm lands were depleted from years of cultivation which took more from the soil than was added. Farmers of every other State were in the same comparable position.

A little less than 11 years ago—in March of 1933—President Roosevelt summoned representative leaders of the Nation's farmers to Washington to assist in formulating a national program for agriculture. One of the results of this meeting was the creation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which has as its primary objective adjustment of production of the Nation's basic crops to meet existing demand and, at the same time, to maintain productivity of our soil for future use.

During the 10 years the triple A has been in operation in this State, our soil has been given the kind of care and protection which is paying good dividends now that we need every pound of food we can get from every acre of land. We need not fear that the labor, machinery, and materials devoted to this land will be wasted.

Some seem to forget that when the triple A first came into being, farmers were struggling with unmarketable surpluses which threatened to drive them into bankruptcy; so that the first job was to bring production of crops in line with the limited demand in order to allow the farmer a fair and just return for his work and use of his land, materials, and machinery.

That situation is now reversed, and farmers are asked to produce as much as possible of those crops the Nation must have to prosecute the war. Except in the case of tobacco, the producer who formerly had an acreage allotment which represented his fair share of the Nation's market, now has a production goal which calls for maximum amounts of soybeans, peanuts, corn, Irish potatoes, small grains, and other food, feed, and fiber crops.

Thus within the comparatively short span of a single decade, we have seen the triple A adjust production of our basic crops both upward and downward in order to meet existing demands of the Nation. One big reason why North Carolina farmers have been able to accomplish the task of producing their share of the tremendous amounts of food, fiber, and feed crops is the way in which conservation farming promoted by the triple A has increased per-acre yields of our principal crops.

In our eastern flue-cured belt, farmers last year harvested an average of 965 pounds of tobacco per acre as compared with 900 pounds per acre in the 10-year period, 1932–41. As you know, last year was a drought year and production was below normal. This is noted in the fact that the 1942 average yield was 1,110 pounds per acre. In our old flue-cured belt, per-acre yields increased from 797 pound per acre in the 10-year period, 1932–41, to 950 pounds per acre in 1942. Last year's production—in face of the drought—declined to 895 pounds per acre, which still is almost 100 pounds above the 10-year average.

Other crops show similar increases. The average production of corn, for example, increased from 18.9 bushels per acre in the period 1932–41 to 22 bushels per acre in 1943; wheat increased from 10.2 to 11.5 bushels per acre, and tame hays increased from 87–100 tons to 93–100 tons.

Perhaps our most important immediate contribution to the war effort has been the production of oil-bearing crops, peanuts, soybeans, and cottonseed. In these, too, we find present per-acre yields higher than those in days before conservation farming was practiced on its present wide scale. The yield of peanuts, for example, increased from 1,122 in 1932 to 1,230 pounds per acre in 1942, and soybean yields increased from 11.1 to 13 bushels per acre in the same period. Production of lint cotton has increased from 307 pounds per acre in 1932–41 to 337 pounds per acre last year. In the previous year, 1942, this figure reached 412 pounds per acre. Per-acre yields of Irish potatoes have grown from 98 bushels in the 10-year period, 1932–41, to 111 bushels last year, and sweetpotato yields have increased from 97 bushels in the 10-year period to 115 bushels per acre in 1942. Production last year dropped to 97 bushels per acre because of unfavorable weather conditions.

At the same time, we note that acreage of these crops has been steadily increased as demand grew. Production of peanuts picked and threshed last year was 302,000 acres as compared with 235,000 acres in the period, 1932–41, and 270,000 acres in 1942. Similarly, production of soybeans for beans increased from 140,000 acres in the 10-year period, 1932–41, to 268,000 acres in 1942. Last year's acreage for beans dropped to 257,000 acres because weather conditions made it more practical to cut a large portion of the crop for hay, rather than to harvest it for beans.

The triple A today has marketing quotas on only two crops grown in North Carolina—flue-cured and burley tobacco—marketing quotas having been approved on both by an overwhelming majority in referendums held last year. It was announced several months ago that individual marketing quotas for both burley and flue-cured in 1944 will be 20 percent higher than in 1943.

Primary concern of triple A's conservation program at present is to effect immediate yields in necessary crops and at the same time maintain our soil in a high state of productivity. None of us knows when this war will end, and we must keep our farm plants in shape to produce to the limit as long as it is necessary. Records in the State triple A office here show that the percentage of North Carolina's crop land participating in the program has increased from 61.9 percent in 1936 to 93.5 percent in 1942.

To protect our soil from the ravages of erosion and to add fertility, the triple A has advocated seeding of winter legumes and grasses, and turning them under the following spring.

Along with these conservation practices, farmers of North Carolina constructed about 15,000,000 feet of terraces in 1940 and again in 1941, as compared with 9,849,000 feet in 1936.

Perhaps the legislation under which sharecroppers and tenants are helped to own the land they till, known as the Farm Security Administration, promises more to the men too long forgotten than any other progressive step. At a low rate of interest, 3 percent payable in a long term of years, 33,559 tillers of the soil in the United States have borrowed $191,487,000 to purchase small farms. In North Carolina 2,827 loans have been made, aggregating $10,417,368. And, wonderful and gratifying, the borrowers in the country as a whole have met their payments promptly. As another proof of the wisdom of this new aid to those who lacked land, the statistics show that they have led in the production of all food crops.

And what has been done is but an earnest of the large benefaction we shall see now that Frank Hancock, of North Carolina, is the directing head of this agency that will make this a Nation where every farmer as an owner may have the blessing and dignity of a calling upon which the greatness of America chiefly depends.

District of Columbia Servicemen Have No Right to Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to a leading editorial in the Washington Post on Friday, February 4, headed "Speaking of the vote." This editorial chided the Congress for entirely overlooking the fact that the District of Columbia also has a few soldiers, sailors, and marines fighting and dying for their country in the far-flung battlefields of the world. It is regrettable, to say the least, that these men and women were overlooked, although our soldiers from our outpost Territories of Alaska, and Hawaii were given the same consideration as were other members of the armed forces. This is really a pertinent question raised by the editor and should, and probably will, have the effect of focusing attention on our disfranchised citizens of the District of Columbia, as well as their fighting men.

After all the good speeches made by the Members of the Congress about the flag, the Constitution, State rights, heroism of our fighting men, both in the past and present, and after the bitterness the debate caused, the parading back and forth up and down the center aisles to be counted, so far as any effective, statutory law is concerned, the fighting men from the District of Columbia can take consolation in knowing that the opportunity for the soldiers to vote remains substantially status quo. I repeat again so far as any direct, effective legislation affecting the voting of the soldiers was concerned, there was none. There was, however, a recommendation to the States that they, where it was necessary, amend their election laws to permit the soldiers to vote, and a most sincere wish upon the part of the Congress that in some way our soldiers on the fighting fronts would receive a ballot that they might exercise their priceless inherent right of suffrage.

A great deal has been said about the word "fraud" in connection with this legislation, and while I do not say the legislation passed is a fraud, yet I am bold enough to say that if our soldiers beyond the continental limits of the United States are led to believe that they will have an opportunity to vote under this legislation passed by the House, they are due for a great disappointment. There are some forty-odd different election laws governing absentee voting, some States in fact by constitutional provision prohibit absentee voting, so that there will be no uniform method whereby all members of our armed forces will be able to vote for any candidate, whether it be the President of the United States or precinct constable. If the action of the House becomes law and perchance a ballot falls into the hands of some soldiers and not others, it will be because of a lack of uniformity in the method of voting as prescribed by the laws of the 48 States.

The so-called Worley amendment, championed by the gentleman from Texas that was defeated, provided for a uniform ballot to all members of our armed forces, making it possible for all servicemen to vote for President, Vice President, United States Senator, and Congressmen, and also allowed them, where possible, to vote for their State, county, and precinct officers.

If our soldiers should ever have the opportunity of reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House proceedings when it considered the Worley amendment, they will know it was defeated primarily upon the ground that such a method as this amendment prescribed would be unconstitutional. Those of us who believed that the only practical, as well as constitutional, way of allowing the soldiers to vote was the adoption of the Worley proposal, did everything we could to have that proposal become law. Having failed in this endeavor, there was no other alternative for us except to vote against any proposal or to support the so-called Rankin bill, so, many of the advocates of the Worley amendment decided that some benefit might be had by the soldiers through the Rankin bill, thinking it might be better than no bill at all, and voted for it on its final passage. Some, however, chose to vote against it rather than to compromise on a meaningless gesture.

It is to be hoped that some compromise may be worked out between the Senate and House conferees that will liberalize the provisions of the House bill. If this is not done, all the shouting that was heard, all the bitterness that was caused, all the fine Fourth of July flag waving and constitutional speeches that were made will have been made in vain.

What Price the Final Hour?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by John Gilbreath of Chattanooga, Tenn., which was printed in the Chattanooga Times on Wednesday, February 2, in the column of Alfred Mynders, Next to the News.

The article is as follows:

WHAT PRICE THE FINAL HOUR?

What strategy can the Japs devise?

They have a strategy. Last week Premier Hideki Tojo voiced an appeal to his people. He called for a strengthening of their will. * * * He said that Japan must fight to prolong the war * * * Tojo's strategy * * * the hope that the people of the United States * * * will tire, somewhere along the way. (Time, January 31.)

What follows is written in the regretful knowledge that, if it gains the prestige of print, it's likely to lift the blood pressure of some elderly gentlemen in whose regard Franklin Roosevelt is outranked by the devil himself. However, these possible losses by apoplexy here at home are not to be weighed against the fortunes of young Americans facing even more unpleasant death in, over, and beyond the seven seas. It is for them and their lives that this humble message is written.

The national election year 1944 will bring to millions of men and women of this country a soul-searching test.

We shall be moved, as never before, individually to question our motives, predilections, prejudices, as we approach the ballot box. We shall hope to banish, from whatever thinking equipment we have, the pride of our own opinions and certainly all thought of domestic political advantage of the moment. We shall seek honestly to see, beyond domestic issues, the thing vastly more important now: How quickly the war can end in complete victory, regardless of what domestic policies our leaders advocate. Many of us will have to make a choice between what seems to be the lesser or greater error.

We shall be impelled to think and act with great care now because most of us now have the lives of our own sons or near relatives at risk. Many others will face the Nation's claims upon their boys still in school, just reaching the age of military service.

Can we realize that literally life or death for some of these from our own families may depend upon how we at home meet these tests this fateful year?

We know we are in a fight to the finish against conscienceless, cruel, savage, determined foes. We know we must win totally if we are long to survive. We now have reason to believe we shall win, unconditionally.

But we also know, or should know, that each unnecessary hour the war must last means the death of some young Americans who if the war had ended an hour earlier would have returned to live out long and happy lives in the grateful country they helped to save.

Perhaps that final hour may mean life or death to your boy—yes; you who are reading this—or the flaming destruction of that nephew of mine who is piloting a bomber, or of that other nephew—the pair of them my fishing partners back in those blessed days of peace—who may encounter the deadlier game of tin fish out there on his ship in the Pacific.

We should know by this time that every evidence of disunity, domestic and political strife we reveal, is exaggerated by our enemies; broadcast among their peoples and among the millions of their slaves in subjugated countries. Who doubts the word of General Marshall that strikes already have had an effect that will prolong the war? Will an extra month, week, day, hour it takes to crush our foes mean the death of your boy or mine?

Whatever we may think of Roosevelt and a fourth term, it's time for millions of us to reflect upon what Tojo and Goebbels would do with a news flash that the people of the United States had revolted, kicked out their war leaders. Kicked them out with the help and rejoicing of traitors both in and out of jail, with the aid of every bundist, fronter, peace-now lunatic; of every Nazi and Jap spy and saboteur in the country.

Enemy propaganda based on such action in America would be worth more to Japan and Germany in prolonging the war, even that little extra time, than an Axis battlefield victory. In that extra time, how many of our men shall die? And whose?

"He said that Japan must prolong the war."

How can one escape the searing apprehension that to contribute by his vote or word or deed to the encouragement and comfort of our enemies by giving them what would be their greatest single propaganda weapon of the war, would mean unnecessary death to some American boys—perhaps yours or mine—in that final, tragic day or hour before the delayed unconditional surrender quiets the guns?

Demands Tax Revision and Simplification

REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I condemn and bitterly oppose the continuation of a tax policy which is rapidly liquidating millions of Americans in the middle-class and lower-income brackets, who are living on fixed or lower incomes and do not receive any benefits from war expenditures. This large group consists mainly of men and women in various professions, teaching, small business, labor, agriculture, and persons in the fixed-income groups. They are willing to buy bonds and pay their just share of the taxes, but their morale is not given any lift whatsoever, when they learn of tremendous waste and extravagance in government, and now find additional tax burdens placed upon them in the new tax bill. These Americans are now making real sacrifices in the interests of the war effort. They do not have a lobby in Washington and must therefore depend upon their Representatives to protect their welfare. It is up to Congress to stop this liquidation.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that the time is overripe for a revision of our Federal taxing system, and that the greatest tax burden should be borne by those who make excessive war incomes and profits and are best able to pay.

Federal taxes on incomes of individuals have risen from $1,000,000,000 in 1939 to an estimated $18,800,000,000 in this fiscal year, and the largest part of this tax burden has been placed on the middle and lower income groups.

SIMPLIFICATION OF INCOME-TAX BLANKS AND FORMS

Mr. Speaker, 50,000,000 taxpayers are mad, confused, and disgusted over the complicated income-tax blanks mailed from the Treasury for 1943 returns. I do not blame them, as I feel the same way. There is little hope that the Treasury will simplify the tax blanks so the average taxpayer can understand them. It is up to Congress to bring about a revision of tax laws and to force the Treasury to issue tax-return forms that do not require the assistance of a staff of Philadelphia lawyers and certified public accountants to fill them out.

The 1943 tax blanks have aroused a storm of protest from the people. They are willing to pay taxes, but how, in the name of common sense, can they be expected to understand and fill out the returns when many experts from the Treasury are not able to do it? I am informed that 600 Boston lawyers, mostly Harvard and Yale graduates, took a 2 weeks' Treasury school course to find out how to fill out the 1943 returns. If Boston lawyers must go to a Government school for this purpose, what about the rest of the taxpayers? It is up to the Ways and Means Committee to force the Treasury to provide a simplified and understandable tax form for 1944. In addition, the committee should promptly report legislation to eliminate the guessing contest as to estimated future income, and repeal penalties for failure to make the proper estimate.

Letter of J. E. Carroll, of the Association of Washington Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my request for permission to insert my remarks in the Appendix, I include herewith a copy of a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. E. Carroll, chairman, executive committee, Association of Washington Cities, and my reply thereto:

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES,
Seattle, Wash., January 10, 1944.

Hon. E. V. IZAC,
United States Representative from California,
Chairman, Subcommittee, House Naval Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN IZAC: I was surprised to read the press report of your committee findings, charging that the State of Washington had been shunning its responsibility to aid

municipalities in meeting their emergency and wartime problems. While it is true that for a number of years cities of this State were in acute financial distress, the large amount of aid now given by the State has brought about a very different situation.

The State of Washington is in the front ranks of those which share funds with their local units of government. In fact, as far as we have been able to determine, no State has shown more concern for the solution of municipal problems, nor has any made a greater per capita contribution to relieve the financial difficulties of its cities.

I wonder if your subcommittee had information on the actual amount of assistance cities in this State receive. If not, you will be interested to know that municipalities have allocations or shares from five State funds, and in addition occupy one complete field of taxation vacated by the State in favor of cities. This assistance may be broken down as follows with the per capita amount cities are expected to receive in 1944 from these funds.

A. All cities

	Official estimates for 1944 per capita
15 percent of State gasoline tax	$1.89
52 percent of State liquor profits	2.84
50 percent of new 10-percent war liquor tax	1.23
15 percent of motor-vehicle excise tax	.30
War emergency appropriation	.47
Admission taxes up to $1 (field vacated by State)	1.00
Total	7.73

B. Certain cities

Cities below 1,500—value of State maintenance of primary highways, per capita	$0.58
Cities with war industries—a special allocation is made to mushrooming cities which have boomed because of war industries. $500,000 is allocated per year for the present biennium in direct proportion the individual increase in local population bears to the total increase on a per capita basis. A check is made by a special census board every 6 months to allow for shifts in population. The probable allocation per capita based on population increase since 1940 will be	1.85

I wonder if you can mention any other State which has gone further to assist its cities and towns? If not, do you think it fair to single out the State of Washington for special attack stating that its responsibilities had been shunned?

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. CARROLL,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

FEBRUARY 3, 1944.

Mr. J. E. CARROLL,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Association of Washington Cities,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. CARROLL: I have delayed replying to your letter of January 10, 1944, in the hope that I would be able to forward you a copy of the printed hearings of the Congested Areas Subcommittee on the Puget Sound, Wash., area. Unfortunately, the Government Printing Office has not completed the printing of this hearing due to the backlog of other congressional printing requirements. As soon as the hearings have been printed, I shall forward a copy to you and I invite your close scrutiny of the testimony of mayors, or their proxies, of this area before the subcommittee. I believe that you will find that they not only failed to take issue with the clearly expressed observations of the subcommittee members during the hearing on the adequacy of sharing of the State sales tax revenue by the State with congested war production municipalities, but stated that State assistance in some of the specific revenue media that you mention, such as percentage of the State gasoline tax and the State liquor tax, was inadequate.

I am sure the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of all of the States, will agree with the following contentions of our subcommittee: First, that this war is primarily the problem of the Federal Government. In order to prosecute the war it must necessarily avail itself of the geography of the various States and the manpower and facilities of towns and cities in all parts of the Nation. There are certain favored localities, which, because of strategic location, are of especial importance in the prosecution of the war. On the west coast I might mention San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. Into these favorable areas went billions of dollars in war contracts and the Federal Government actively recruited millions of people from all parts of the United States to go to these localities in order to expand the war production effort to our maximum capabilities. When these people came into these areas the money they received for their labor came from the Federal Government. However, when they spent that money in order to live, a share of it was retained by the States in the form of taxes. Therefore, the upturn in the economic life (shall we call it prosperity) was reflected in an unprecedented rise in the sales-tax revenues of those States which levy such a tax. In the meantime the tremendous increase of population in these war production cities and the augmented war activity greatly strained the limited municipal facilities and compelled such cities to quickly expand their facilities. This required money and in most cases it was a financial burden greater than they could carry. Whereupon Congress set up a fund with which to aid them. So it can be seen from the foregoing that the Federal Government and the local communities both are shouldering an overwhelming load while the States, in most instances, are giving back very little in the form of relief to the municipalities. In other words, only a small percentage of the additional moneys and revenues some States obtain as a result of the expanded war effort is being returned to the towns and cities. The result of all this is very disturbing to this committee. We are expected to do everything possible to eliminate whatever hinders the war effort. We have recommended and are requiring the best cooperation on the part of Government agencies with the local communities. But there is an increasing sentiment in Congress against the Federal Government carrying the whole load; and this was strikingly evidenced recently when the Appropriations Committee rejected an appropriation of $50,000,000 to augment the now depleted Lanham Act fund.

The substance of testimony and information presented to the subcommittee was that the revenue realized by the State of Washington from the State sales tax increased from the pre-war 1940 figure of $30,709,029.76 to $59,314,695.54 in 1942. As compared to this increase of almost $29,000,000, practically doubled in the 2-year shift from peacetime to wartime economy, we were told that the State granted to the municipalities $2,000,000 through percentage participation in certain State tax revenues (excluding that of the sales tax) and the amusement-tax revenues. This did not appear to be sharing revenues in proportion to the war burdens carried by the municipalities, whose heavily increased war populations accounted for the doubling of State revenue from the sales tax.

You ask if I can mention any other State which has gone further to assist its cities and towns. Statistics on this point are clear. May I call your attention to the published studies of the Division of State and Local Government of the Census Bureau of the United States Department of Commerce, (1) State Finances, 1942 and (2) State Finances, 1943. They conclusively present the inadequacy of Washington's State aid to local governments at the same time that Washington had the greatest percentage revenue increase of all States and the greatest percentage of aid from other governments (practically all from the Federal Government) increase of all States. The first paragraph of volume 1, No. 4, of State Finances, 1942 in the individual State report on Washington succinctly summarizes the situation in stating:

"Washington's revenue of $139,000,000 in 1942 was 42 percent larger than that received in the previous year. Despite a marked increase in expenditure, total income exceeded expenditure by $21,000,000. In 1941, revenue and expenditure were about equal, at $97,000,000. Although revenue of State governments increased generally in 1942 over 1941, Washington's expansion is outstanding. Increased economic activity in a State of large defense industries might be expected to inflate revenue, but that trend was accentuated in Washington by new taxes and a higher rate in the general sales tax."

Other pertinent excerpts of that report quoted for your information are:

"Washington's revenue system depends largely upon sales taxes. The general sales tax produced $40,000,000 in 1942, nearly half of the tax revenue, exclusive of unemployment compensation taxes of $16,000,000.

* * * * *

"Of the rise of $41,000,000 in total revenue, the 65-percent increase in the general sales tax contributed $16,000,000, partly because of an increase in the rate from 2 to 3 percent, effective for all but the first month of the fiscal year. * * *

* * * * *

"Federal grants, principally for public welfare services, were 84-percent higher than in 1941, and provided 17 percent of total State revenue. * * *

* * * * *

"Of the State's total expenditure of $117,000,000, $35,000,000 was transferred to trust funds, more than half to school trust funds, and most of the remainder to the unemployment compensation fund. * * *

* * * * *

"Almost half of the expenditure for State aid from general funds was for highway purposes. * * *"

Statistics compiled in these reports reveal (1) that in the comparison of 1942—the first full year of the war—revenue with the 1941 revenue, the State of Washington has the greatest percentage increase of all States—that of 42.5 percent; (2) that in the comparison of the 1942 aid received from other governments with the 1941 aid received from other governments, again the State of Washington has the greatest percentage increase of all States—that of 84.1 percent (from the standpoint of Federal aid to the State of Washington. Members of Congress in passing on appropriations should be particularly interested in this figure since all of the aid to the State of Washington was from the Federal Government with the sole exception of less than one-twentieth of 1 percent coming from local governments to the State of Washington); (3) that in 1942 the State of Washington had the second greatest per capita revenue of all States—that of $79.90, being exceeded only by the $93.48 of Nevada; (4) that the State of Washington ranked fortieth of the 48 States in the percentage of State aid to local governments compared to total State revenue in 1942; (5) that the State of Washington ranked thirty-eighth of the 48 States in the percentage of State aid to local governments compared to total State expenditure in 1942; and (6) that of the 16 States for which 1943 statistics have been compiled to this date, the State of Washington ranged fifteenth, or next to lowest, in both the percentage of per capita State aid to

local governments compared to per capita revenue and expenditure of States. In these statistics local shares of State-collected locally shared revenues are classified as revenue of the State, on the income side, and as payments for State aid to local governments, on the expenditure side. The 1943 statistics are given below:

	(A)	(B)	(C)				
	Revenue per capita	Expenditure per capita	State aid to local governments per capita	(C) ÷ (A)	Rank of State	(C) ÷ (B)	Rank of State
				Pct.		Pct.	
Alabama	$34.04	$30.93	$10.62	31.20	5	34.33	7
Arizona	63.58	56.87	19.60	30.83	6	34.46	6
Idaho	53.00	52.87	7.86	14.83	14	14.87	14
Indiana	45.23	41.22	17.03	37.65	1	41.31	1
Kansas	44.47	34.71	14.06	31.62	4	40.51	2
Maryland	43.09	39.00	10.66	24.74	10	27.33	10
Minnesota	53.87	47.58	17.24	32.00	3	36.23	5
Missouri	36.42	34.80	6.62	18.18	12	19.02	13
Nebraska	33.41	31.02	12.00	35.92	2	38.68	3
North Carolina	42.27	33.46	12.33	29.17	7	36.85	4
North Dakota	46.22	36.66	7.24	15.66	13	19.75	12
South Dakota	40.58	34.19	4.00	9.86	16	11.70	16
Texas	35.71	36.35	10.13	28.37	8	27.87	9
Washington	82.18	72.38	10.71	13.03	15	14.80	15
West Virginia	50.33	49.40	11.73	23.31	11	23.74	11
Wyoming	60.16	56.88	15.87	26.38	9	27.90	8

You then ask if I cannot affirmatively answer the first question, if I think it fair to single out the State of Washington for special attack stating that its responsibilities have been shunned? While I believe statistics obviate the necessity of an answer to this second question, I will answer the question because I want the record to be clear. As I clearly stated during the hearings in Seattle, the Congested Areas Subcommittee has made this criticism wherever it was of this opinion. The State of Washington has not been singled out for we have made the same observation and criticism of my own State, California, and the State of Maine.

However, statistics would support any focus on the State of Washington for at the very time when it was (1) benefiting from the highest percentage increases in revenue and Federal aid of all States, (2) increasing its sales-tax rate from 2 to 3 percent greatly at the expense of imported Federal war workers, and (3) thus building up its surplus and trust funds, its aid to local governments was among the lowest of all the 48 States.

I am surprised at the tone of your letter for it indicates complete indifference to the subcommittee's praise of the valiant efforts of municipal authorities and recommendations to the Federal Government, as well as the State, to give specific aid to the municipalities.

Very truly yours,

ED. V. IZAC,
Chairman, House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas.

Consumer Subsidies

REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, more than 8 months ago this Congress expressed its disapproval of the use of the roll-back consumer's subsidy. On July 2, 1943, this House voted, 228 to 154, to override the President's veto of legislation specifically prohibiting the use of this device. There never has been any direct legislative authority for its use. In the absence of other action, the Congress continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for 6 months, with still no reference to consumer subsidies. On November 23, 1943, this House passed another bill expressly prohibiting the use of this type of subsidy. Unfortunately, the other body took no action.

On December 17, 1943, I spoke on this floor and called attention to the need for prompt action. At that time I pointed out that although it was the clearly expressed wish of each House of this Congress that no more consumer subsidies be paid, and although no outright legislative authority for the payment of such subsidies was ever granted by this Congress, the whole matter had remained in a state of indecision for a full 6 months. During this time payments were allowed to go on simply because a minority of this House had been unwilling to specifically prohibit this unfair and inflationary use of public funds.

I urged then that it was of vital importance to the farmers of Texas and the South to know at the earliest possible moment just what policy would be followed. I urged that the Congress act one way or the other before Christmas. No action was taken. Instead, this House agreed with the other body to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until February 17, 1944. I opposed this delay. I voted against it. I pointed out that it was calculated to simply further postpone a final decision. Other Members assured the House that immediately after the first of the year this question would receive attention and that the whole question would be settled long before February 17. That date is now only 10 days away. There is absolutely no prospect that this question will be settled by February 17.

On the contrary, I now hear that the proponents of consumer subsidies expect to just go on without authority and pay and pay, tax and tax, and spend and spend on the theory that so long as Congress does not stop them, no one else will, and that Congress cannot stop them because the President will veto any act of Congress which specifically prohibits this expenditure, which no act of Congress ever affirmatively authorized. While I have always believed and still believe that public money cannot be legally spent except in conformity to a direct authorization by Congress, I must confess that the experience of the past would indicate that there are agencies in this Government that are in nowise troubled about legislative authorization so long as they can expect to receive the protection of the Executive. That the Executive expects to protect them from the will of the overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress is clear from the veto of the act of Congress last July 2. I am, therefore, reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the advocates of consumer subsidies are not concerned over the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Nor are they concerned over the unhappy situation of 2,000,000 Southern farmers who should know now what the farm program is to be.

I am concerned with the problems of these farmers. They clothe America and they provide much of the food consumed in northern cities and by Allied armies on battle fronts around the world. These farmers are entitled to know how the price of their products is to be controlled.

Last year, they saw roll-back subsidies imposed on their meat, and the price of their cattle and their hogs crumbled. Many of these farmers cannot afford a repetition of the losses they took in 1943. I believe that they would have a better chance of getting a fair price in a free market place than they will at the hands of a Government bureau that says that the cost of farm labor should not be considered in determining a fair price for farm products. I believe that these farmers could and would produce more food and fiber if given assurance of a price that will pay a fair return to the farmer over and above the farmers' expenses. I, therefore, believe that the Nation would be better served by paying the farmer enough in the market place to encourage food production than by refusing to recognize the legitimate costs of production and by subsidizing consumers after discouraging production.

But, Mr. Speaker, if this Congress should hold a contrary view, it is our duty to express it without further delay. Whatever decision is to be made, it should be made at once. It would probably be better to make a wrong decision now than to make a correct decision next summer. Delay is absolutely certain to be wrong and harmful. Why not act on the subsidy question now—once and for all?

H. R. 4103

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Immigration Committee is going to ask for unanimous consent to take up H. R. 4103. This is a bill sponsored by the Attorney General which provides a plan for denationalizing American-born citizens during the war.

I feel impelled to offer an objection. The bill will, I am sure, prove entirely ineffectual. I and several of my colleagues had bills to handle this problem in a more practical and effective manner. These bills have apparently been abandoned in favor of the new bill presented by the Attorney General. We had an opportunity to explain our bills, but no opportunity to present witnesses to explain their object and how they would work. Bringing them up by unanimous consent will not permit adequate time to draft the amendments which I propose to offer. It will not permit time

to debate this important matter, so the Members of the House may be properly informed on this legislation.

This statement is made to explain my position. A rule should be obtained in this case so we all may be heard and be prepared with the amendments that I feel are imperative if this legislation is to be something more than a futile gesture. I have a mandate from my people to present this matter to the House. The Legislature of California this past week supported my bill in principle and also the resolution providing for an expression of Congress that all denationalized citizens should be deported by virtue of a provision in our treaty following the termination of the war.

The following is a copy of the resolution of the California Legislature adopted on January 31, 1944:

Senate Joint Resolution 9

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to provide for the deportation of alien and inimical Japanese at the conclusion of the present war

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, House Concurrent Resolution 29, which proposes the adoption of a policy of deporting at the conclusion of the present war all Japanese nationals in territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, all persons of Japanese descent in such territory who are determined by due process to have given aid or comfort to the enemy in the present war or to have advocated the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or who, being persons owing allegiance to the United States, have avowed allegiance to a foreign state; and

Whereas Hon. LEROY JOHNSON has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill known as H. R. 3012 providing for a creation of a commission to carry out and effectuate the above defined policy and conferring upon such commission judicial powers of examination and determination, amply protecting the rights of persons charged with the commission of any of the acts, defaults, or conduct above described, and providing for a full hearing and for preview of the decision of such commission by an established judicial tribunal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of California heartily approves of the principle of the above cited resolution and bill now pending before the Congress and memorializes Congress to adopt adequate measures to carry out the purposes thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California.

The Korean Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain addresses made in the city of Ashland, Ohio, during the recent pageant and celebration relative to the Korean movement. I regret that I was unable to be there in person to participate in this splendid program, but I appreciate this opportunity that the world may have a clearer picture of the Korean movement, a movement that justifies the serious consideration of all who believe that "justice and righteousness are the aim of all mankind."

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS OF MRS. GUY C. MYERS

Ladies and gentlemen present here and those who make up the vast listening audience of the Mutual Network, our city of Ashland presents an unusual appearance today.

The American flag is everywhere in evidence. There are welcome banners across our streets. And another flag also is in evidence. It is the oldest flag in the world—the flag of the people of Korea.

Along our main streets, in our churches and civic clubs, in our high-school auditorium, and in our homes, the people of Ashland, yesterday and today, are hosts of the Korean-American Council, an organization of American citizens who have long sought to assist the Korean people in their heroic struggle against the Japanese.

There are many Koreans with us here. Korean ladies, in their dainty and picturesque costumes; Korean gentlemen who are content to appear in the conventional attire of the male American.

Now, you people on the radio particularly may be asking yourselves, "What in the world has Ashland to do with Korea, a distant land in far-off Asia?"

I am very happy to answer that question.

The Koreans represent "the forgotten nation."

We, in Ashland, are, I presume, the first American community to learn all about them. Last fall we had a flaming crusader for liberty in our midst. He is a Korean. From him we heard the Korean story. We learned of the great struggle led by Dr. Syngman Rhee, first President of the Korean Republic, to end Japanese domination of his countrymen.

And as one page after another of Korean heroism unfolded before us, we asked ourselves:

"Why isn't something done about this? Why are not the Koreans given help in the form of arms and ammunition? How can a nation of nearly 30,000,000 people be blotted out of the world's consciousness?"

So we decided to do something about it.

We, of Ashland—typical small mid-western city—proud of our town, proud of its homes, churches, and industries, grateful for the peace and security of our own lovely countryside, and proud of our contribution, in men and money to the war, reached a decision.

We decided to adopt Korea, the forgotten nation.

We felt that in doing this, we might be able to focus the attention of the rest of the people of the United States on Korea and the help she can be to us in licking the Japs.

Well, then along came the Cairo Conference.

President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at the Cairo Conference pledged independence to the Korean people.

I don't want you to infer they acted in this fashion because they learned Ashland, Ohio, was planning its own adoption ceremony, but their great action, applauded by all lovers of freedom, necessitated a slight change in our plans.

The Cairo pledge says Korea will be made independent "in due course."

We, the people of Ashland, are hosts to the Korean Recognition Conference because we believe liberty is not a bait. We believe if some help, in the form of arms and ammunition, reaches the Koreans, they'll know we are in earnest.

The Koreans are fighters. They hate the Japanese. But you can't fight a man with a gun with your bare hands. Let us help these fine people help us beat the Japs!

I thank you.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H. KING

It is an honor to be associated with the people of Ashland in their most worthy effort to win immediate recognition of the Korean Provisional Government by the Government of the United States.

Korea once was a member of the family of nations. We, the American people, persuaded her to relinquish a self-imposed isolation and enter the modern world. Trustingly, Korea accepted our guidance. Trustingly, Korea entered into treaty relations with us. Imagine, therefore, the bewilderment and sorrow of the Koreans when we, with no dissent, but implied assent—indeed, official approval—were the first nation to recognize Japanese annexation by closing our legation, packing our diplomats' bags, and recalling our representatives.

How quick we were to recognize the Japanese. Yet today, more than 2 years after Pearl Harbor, we fail to recognize the Korean Provisional Government, a government conceived in revolution against the Japanese, a government founded on the principles of democracy, a government which, with the slightest assistance from us, can utilize the vast manpower and resources of the Korean people and help shorten the war in the Far East.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is no east and there is no west when principles of morality and decency are concerned. Honor is not an exclusive possession of the Occident any more than it is an exclusive possession of the Orient.

We can cleanse a page of our country's diplomatic history now—now—now by recognizing the Korean Government. Let us right the wrong of nearly 40 years ago. The people of Ashland know the Korean story. They want the wrong righted. They hope and pray our entire Nation may know the story of Korea. The people of Ashland are certain that if the American people do know the entire story of Korea they will communicate their desire to Washington, and the wrong will be righted.

I thank you.

ADDRESS OF DR. JAMES SHINN

It is with deep gratitude I address the people of Ashland, who have made this conference possible, and the listening audience beyond this microphone.

I am a Korean. Last fall, I came to Ashland. I wanted to help our beloved leader, Dr. Syngman Rhee, in his half-century struggle to regain freedom for the Korean people.

I could have started in New York and Chicago, but I was terrified by their bigness. What could one small voice do in the canyons made by towering buildings? How could it be heard midst the roar of traffic?

So I chose Ashland, a typical American community. Its people, engaged in agriculture as well as industry, are not too far removed from the good earth so they cannot hear the whisper of nature. Yes; the voice of God.

I was received here with open-handed hospitality. The ministerial association opened the churches, the civic clubs gave me an opportunity to tell the story of the Korean people, the American Legion helped me. Schools and the Ashland College gave me time for talks. The leading citizens took a deep and sincere interest in my efforts.

Soon everyone responded with offers to help, and they did help. It is difficult for me to describe to you the elation that filled my soul. Justice and righteousness are the cause of all mankind and justice and righteousness must rule in the case of Korea.

The people of Ashland believe the Koreans should be recognized. Gladly they add their voices to mine. Hopefully they believe all America may thus come to know the case of Korea.

I, too, believe that it shall. With infinite humility and gratitude, I repeat: I, a Korean, born in Korea, saw and suffered Japanese atrocities. I came to Ashland and I found the heart of America. I thank you.

ADDRESS OF DR. PAUL DOUGLASS

I deem it a great honor to be here in Ashland today and to be a witness of the kindly and friendly efforts of the people of this charming city to right a wrong of nearly half a century ago. I refer to the manner in which the United States, as well as the rest of the world, turned the other way when the Japanese swarmed into Korea and killed the independent life of that nation * * * an independent life of 4,200 years. And the United States had a binding treaty with Korea, a solemn promise to assist a sister nation. Our Government now has a chance to erase that blot of national dishonor.

While the world little heeded Japan's first step in her march of conquest, the Korean people then and now refuse to accept Japanese domination. The Korean people love liberty. They have been willing to die for it in the past and they are willing to die for it now. They are capable of guerrilla warfare, terrorist activities, and sabotage * * * if we help them with arms and munitions. And every Korean who is armed and fighting the Japanese means one less American boy needed over there.

In man's struggle for freedom there are always stanch souls willing to accept the responsibilities and obligations imposed by leadership. The Koreans possess many such men and women and we are fortunate today in having one who, for more than half a century, has labored incessantly for them. He has suffered all kinds of torture, both mental and physical, for the cause of freedom and liberty. And when we consider his record, his perseverance—the fact that all these years he has never given up hope, we know in our hearts that divine providence will never permit failure to be written at the conclusion of his efforts.

It is my very great privilege to present to the people of Ashland and this great radio audience, Dr. Syngman Rhee, first president of the Republic of Korea, and now its envoy to Washington. Should the United States officially recognize his government, and it is unbelievable that our great country should not do so, especially since the Cairo declaration, Dr. Rhee will be his reborn nation's first ambassador to the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Rhee.

ADDRESS OF DR. SYNGMAN RHEE

Thank you, Dr. Douglass. My friends in this great radio audience, I wish to tell you how thrilled I am to address you from Ashland, Ohio, where the good citizens of this typical Midwest town have invited me to participate in the Korean Recognition Conference.

During the 49 years of my fight for Korea's freedom—even in the darkest days, when there was not a ray of sunshine—I never lost sight of a hope that some day the great people of America would come to know the truth about Korea and then they would see that justice was done to my people. The voluntary demonstration by the people of Ashland and elsewhere of their belief in the justice of the Korean cause is the proof that my cherished dream of nearly a half century has at last come true.

Here in America, some years back, there was much talk of "the forgotten man." That pitiable human being—the first victim of unemployment—was tossed and buffeted about by the fury of the storm of your great depression. The waves of the ocean of despair seemed on the point of engulfing him. Then something happened. A light pierced the darkness and picked out the struggling figure. The captain of a great ship gave orders. The vessel altered its course and soon was alongside. "The forgotten man" was saved.

Now, I will tell you why that was. In time of crisis this great Nation has always found its soul. You, the people, were the ship of state, and your captain was worthy of your choice. And when a people seeks and still can find, deep within itself, the qualities of compassion, of justice, and of decency, then that people walks hand in hand with the Almighty. There are no "forgotten men" with God.

I wish today to tell you something of my country and the long struggle of my people for liberty. I wish to talk about Korea—"the forgotten nation."

Since the Cairo declaration, pledging the independence of Korea, we no longer are a forgotten nation. The Koreans everywhere rejoiced that the way was at last opened. We are deeply grateful to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. It is the extension of the Atlantic Charter to Asia. Your noble President had promised it sometime ago, and this is the fulfillment of his promise.

The life of the Korean people extends far, far back into history, more than 4,200 years. And Korea can lay rightful claim to many splendid contributions to civilization.

Scholars throughout the Orient came hundreds of years ago to the first of all solar observatories, and the structure still stands in Korea. Your own Library of Congress has in its possession the 112 volumes of the first encyclopedia. This was published in Korea before America was discovered. And the Natural History Museum in New York holds another of Korea's contributions—53 pieces of metal movable type, invented in Korea in A. D. 1406—50 years in advance of their invention in Europe by Gutenberg.

You may well ask: "Why don't we know about these things?" The reason you do not know is because for nearly 40 years now you have only read what Japan has permitted you to read about Korea. And that is not all. Japanese agents have ransacked American libraries of books about Korea—books published before the darkness of night descended upon my unhappy country when the Japanese swarmed over it and enslaved the Korean people.

Since then the one unchanging effort of the Japanese has been to make Korea a forgotten nation. They have very nearly succeeded in blacking out from the rest of the world the existence of a once free and independent country of nearly 30,000,000 human beings. Think of it! The life, the culture, the civilization of 30,000,000 persons erased from the annals of the world.

The Japanese changed the name of Korea.

The Japanese forbade the teaching of the Korean language.

The Japanese forced the Koreans to give up—outwardly and in public, at least—their Korean names and to adopt Japanese names.

The Japanese, through power and force, have changed every single thing in Korea but one. They have not changed the liberty-loving spirit of the Korean people. That spirit has flamed in revolt before and it will flame in revolt again. You see, Japan has never known the moral power of justice. All she knows is the force of the sword. The sword, however mighty, can never win the heart of a liberty-loving people.

The people of Korea stand ready to help you. The 30,000,000 enemies of Japan, right at her doorstep, are your potential allies if you will only use them. Remember, 3,000 of your countrymen lie dead, the victims of Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbor. And thousands more since then. Well, we Koreans have our dead, too. Their cries of anguish, as they were crucified by the Japanese—yes, crucified—still come to us. Their voices from beyond do not tell us to appease the Japanese. The voices of the dead that we hear demand the utter destruction of the militaristic Empire of Japan. They demand death to the Japanese militarists. And I believe that the voices of your dead do likewise. We must heed those voices, for, unless we do, the coming generations will have to lay down their lives to pay for the mistakes we are making.

Is it not a strange situation that Korea, the one nation which has whipped Japan, has so far been denied an opportunity to join with those nations which must defeat Japan if civilization is to be saved?

Is it not unusual that we Koreans should be beseeching you to let us join you?

I contend there is a moral duty for you to give us the chance we ask, and I shall tell you why.

Situated as Korea is between the great Chinese Empire to the west, Manchuria, Mongolia, and Russia to the north, and the warlike tribes of Japan to the east, my country has been the battleground of her warring neighbors for all the bygone centuries.

But the Koreans managed to protect and maintain their existence as an independent nation for more than 42 centuries. As time goes, that is a considerable period, don't you think? In fact, we enjoyed our freedom until the white man of the west came and gave to the warrior race of Japan the superior weapons of war.

To our peaceful land came Americans some 62 years ago. The Americans said, in effect: "Come, join the outside world. Open your ports for trade. Let your people enjoy the blessings of progress. We will take you by the hand. We will guide you. We will protect you."

So it came to pass, in 1882, that the people of Korea entered into the solemn treaty relations with the people of the United States. You know, that very same treaty is still on your books. It has never been repealed. Its beautiful language remains unchanged. And, without exception, those Americans who know the true story of the diplomatic relations between my country and their own have spoken out courageously and have demanded that justice be done. I appeal to you to add your voices to theirs.

Suffice it to say, Japan with weapons from the white man of the west swarmed over Korea in 1905, and the enslavement of my people then began. This was the first step in Japan's new order in Asia. We were the first victims.

Don't you agree with me when I ask again why the millions of Koreans are not given an opportunity to join forces with you? Because, of all mankind, the greatest enemies of the Japanese are the Korean people. We rose in revolt against them in 1919. We are ready to rise again.

At the time of our 1919 revolt, 33 patriots representing every section of our country, met secretly in Seoul, our capital, and published a declaration of independence. Their fate was imprisonment, torture, and death. But this awful fate did not prevent the holding of secret elections throughout the land and the naming of a congress. This congress convened, formed a government, and declared to the world its formation. This government, now 25 years old, has fought Japan so long and so alone. But men who battle for democracy do not quit. And this government, ever since December 7, 1941, has been asking the United Nations for recognition.

Our American friends formed the Korean-American Council, and they, too, have asked

the United Nations for an immediate action, but as yet no action has been taken.

Please remember that recognition of the Korean Government by the United States Government does not mean independence for my people. We shall have to fight for that ourselves, and we are prepared to fight for it. Recognition would mean, however, that some of the planes and guns and munitions you are turning out of your arsenal of democracy would not be denied us, as they are now. We offer you our tremendous manpower in the hope that you will accept it for the common cause. Remember, too, that every Jap engaged in fighting Koreans is one less Jap to fight an American soldier.

I have faith that ultimate victory will be won by the United Nations, because I believe in the power of justice. But I do not want this war to last for 10 or 15 years. If the statesmen of the western world could understand the psychology of the Asiatic peoples, they soon would realize how little actual fighting your soldiers would have to do in the Orient if we had sufficient arms and ammunitions, bombs and planes. We'll take care of the Japs.

One last thought: I did not term Korea a "forgotten nation" to excite your pity, for we are a people proud of our 4,200 years of life as a nation. No; we shall not let the world forget us. But I did use the analogy for a purpose. You remember I said that in times of crisis America has always found her soul. I can sense a spirit of purification; yes, regeneration, in this blessed land since the war began. Misfortune and disaster have had a like effect on my own countrymen. We look to you as the leader of the moral thought and justice in the world. Once, long years ago, you extended us a helping hand, and led us into the company of nations. Please do not deny us that self-same hand now, when ours is outstretched toward yours.

The Challenge Accepted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President, charging that Congress was perpetrating a fraud by refusing to adopt his bobtailed ballot, which denied servicemen the right to vote for State and county candidates, challenged it to "stand up and be counted."

A coalition of Republicans and Democrats promptly accepted that challenge, ordered a roll call on the Worley bill, stood up and were counted, and the administration went down to defeat by a vote of 224 to 168. Immediately thereafter, the so-called States' rights bill, vigorously opposed by the administration, was adopted, 328 to 69. In the meantime, the Senate had passed a modified Federal bobtailed States' rights bill, and the final procedure for voting by servicemen will be determined in conference between the 2 bodies.

So many charges of attempting to deprive the soldiers of voting have been hurled by the administration at those who opposed the Federal ballot, a little explanation may be in order.

The administration's plan is to put control of the election machinery in a Commission appointed by the President, who is a candidate for a fourth term. The President wanted a ballot which would deprive the servicemen of the opportunity to vote for all State and county officers, but let them vote for President, Senator, and Congressman. Below is a copy of the ballot he wanted:

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT, FOR USE IN GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19__

Instructions: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office or write in the name of his political party—Democratic, Republican, Progressive, Farmer-Labor, American Labor, or other.

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President or the name of his party_____.

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator or the name of his party_____.

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district or the name of his party_____.

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR STATE

(Only in the States entitled thereto)

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large or the name of his party_____.

(Vote for one or two, as the case may be)

Mr. Speaker, if the soldier did not know or could not or did not spell correctly the name written in, the vote would not be counted under many State laws. And do you know of any reason why soldiers should be deprived of the right to vote for Governor, sheriff, or any county officer? I do not.

Under the plan adopted by the House, every individual, women as well as men, in the service, qualified to vote under State law, will be furnished a ballot if he or she can be reached by the Army, Navy, or United States Postal Service. That ballot will be marked in secret and returned to the States for canvassing.

That is the kind of a ballot the servicemen should have—not the bobtailed ballot set forth above.

Voting by Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of voting by soldiers, delivered last Friday night by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] over the Blue Network, Inc.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Considerable heat has been generated in Washington in recent weeks over the issue of soldier voting. There is little evidence that there is as much concern in the country or among the soldiers since communications to Washington seem to have been largely inspired by one propaganda agency.

However, for any of those who have been disturbed by the current agitation it is possible to assure them that there need be no difficulty about anyone in the armed services anywhere in the world casting a ballot this fall for the officials of his choice under the terms of existing law—outside of two or three States where constitutional provisions prevent.

You may well ask then—why all the fuss—and thereby hangs a most interesting tale.

Two years ago on September 12 the Congress passed and the President signed a law providing that post-card applications for absentee voting ballots should be made available to all members of the armed services anywhere in the world and similarly thereafter on February 1 in any election year.

Much has been made of the fact that only 28,000 of these post cards were used in 1942. This might indicate that the men in the service were not particularly interested in voting. Overseas this was especially apt to be the case because of their preoccupation with the task in hand and lack of information as to the issues and the candidates. In 1942 also it was not possible to prepare the post cards and accomplish their distribution in time to be of service since only 52 days elapsed between the passage of the law and the date of the election.

Certainly the experience at that time is insufficient to draw any definite conclusions as to the effectiveness of the law.

Meanwhile, this past fall, there developed considerable agitation that the absentee-voting laws of the various States were not well adapted to take care of the servicemen and legislation was proposed under administration auspices looking to a so-called Federal ballot which should be made available to servicemen everywhere on a balloting day to be determined by their commanding officer prior to the November election, when the men would be given an opportunity to make completely blank ballots with simply the words Republican or Democratic at the head of the column and the ballot would be counted for candidates for Federal office, whoever they might be.

It was very strongly represented that this was the only practical and effective way for the man in the service to have a ballot: First, because of the difficulty of securing a State ballot; and second, because of the difficulty in transmission to the various theaters of operation.

The so-called bobtailed Federal ballot has never been defended by anyone as desirable except on the basis that no other could be made available.

Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, sponsor of the so-called Federal ballot legislation, in reporting the bill stated as follows: "It should be said at the start that every effort is made to further the use of State absentee balloting procedures."

Very careful and thorough investigation has disclosed no reason why it is not perfectly feasible for State absentee voting procedure to be followed and to be effective in practically all cases. The Governors of 43 States have advised the Senate that effective State absentee voting procedures have been adopted in their States or that they are prepared to see that such procedure is adopted as soon as the Congress makes up its mind.

Here another curious situation developed when it was discovered that the present law had been on the statute books for over 2 years and that 12,000,000 post cards had been printed to comply with this law. Yet only 1 card had been as yet sent overseas for every 4 men in the service, although the law stipulated that they should be available on February 1 "or as soon thereafter as practicable."

Certainly after 2 years it should be practicable to have these post cards available overseas on February 1. Inquiries, however, were answered with the bland assurance that there was no particular hurry about the post cards in spite of the plain mandate of the law. As a matter of fact there is plenty of time. The curious fact is that the proponents have been urging haste and denouncing delay.

Air-mail transit to the most remote theater of operation requires only 16 days. All the theaters where the bulk of American troops are stationed can be reached in from 6 to 13 days.

The post-card applications for absentee ballots on which the soldier simply writes his name and military address and home residence can be sent at any time. State election authorities have indicated the greatest readiness to cooperate in taking care of the vote of absent servicemen. These cards need simply to be filed in the proper precinct as allocated by the secretary of the State concerned and the ballots are then forwarded at the proper time.

Forty-five days has been allowed as a proper time for transit of the ballots out to the servicemen and back by air mail and in most instances this could easily be accomplished by surface ship as well.

Even this allows 12 days for the soldier to handle his ballot after it reaches his post and for any delays in transit.

However, it was claimed air mail could not be used because of the weight of State ballots and the interference with home mail.

States are prepared to accept 1.2 ounces as the unit of weight for a ballot with the necessary envelope and instructions. On this basis the interference with the ordinary mail would be negligible.

A great deal was made of the fact that transporting the State ballots by air mail would interfere with home mail. It was alleged that the soldier did not desire this.

Here are the facts as to interference.

During this war over 1,000,000,000 pieces of mail have been transported overseas. During the last Christmas season, in the same period of time required for handling the State ballots, more than 2,000,000 pounds of air mail alone were taken to our servicemen overseas. This would be sufficient to care for more than 25,000,000 State ballots. How many would be required?

If we shall eliminate those who are not old enough to vote and allow the same percentage of those eligible desiring to vote as in our national elections, we shall find that there might be required a maximum of 3,000,000 ballots for servicemen.

This would mean approximately 10 percent of the air-mail space available during a comparable period this past year. It seems safe to assume that during the Christmas period there was far more than a 10-percent increase in the mail to the boys overseas. If this is correct, then it would mean that the absentee-ballot service for the boys overseas could be accomplished during the fall election period without any appreciable interference with home mail.

This is all based upon the assumption that the boys overseas will desire to vote in approximately the same proportion as people at home, although there is much to indicate that this is not the case.

The boys overseas are very much preoccupied with matters more immediately in hand and are also increasingly handicapped in voting by their long absence from the country, with very limited means of information as to what is going on.

This necessarily affects their interest in a ballot.

A post-card application leaves each individual serviceman free to determine for himself whether or not he wishes to vote, in which event the Government can and should use air-mail facilities to get his application home and his ballot back and forth.

There is much to indicate that the considerable agitation in this matter in certain quarters is motivated not by a desire for the soldier to vote but by a desire to vote the soldier.

The marshalling of soldiers to the polls is not in accordance with the American tradition. However cunningly the matter may be devised, the fact remains that commanding officers in the various theaters of operation must issue orders regarding the day of voting and the failure of any particular unit to turn out a substantial vote might well mean a question as to its efficiency. The top sergeant is likely to see that the men vote.

Serious questions are presented as to the constitutionality of the so-called Federal ballot and as to the possibility of serious complications in the election as a result of its use. The Senate many weeks ago enacted a measure making additional provision for assisting State balloting procedure and the House has just enacted a similar provision by an overwhelming majority of 328 to 69.

Proposals to supply a Federal ballot in the case of any State not providing adequate procedure for soldier voting have been rejected by the administration forces in spite of their insistence this is all that they desire.

We may as well realize that this is an election year and prepare for the most determined use of all the agencies of modern propaganda to influence the result. Our sons overseas are extremely limited in the information which they can receive regarding current problems. It may well be advisable in the interest of sustaining their morale not to inform them more completely regarding many of our problems here at home but certainly this is a poor preparation for their casting of a ballot.

Three of the most important executives in the London branch of the Office of War Information have recently resigned in disgust over the administration of its policies. Three of the major executives in the New York office controlling the dissemination of all news to our men overseas are being retained in office in spite of the demand of the Director of the Office of War Information for their removal for failure to carry out proper policies.

It would be well that our sons overseas should be advised of some of these things that are going on back here at home. They will then perhaps be better able to understand and appraise the information which they receive during the next few months through the medium of the Office of War Information.

An administration that desired the confidence of the people in their integrity would invite representatives of the major political parties to participate in the determination of the news that shall be sent overseas to our sons during the next few critical months. Such a course would command confidence in their purpose instead of the distrust that must necessarily be occasioned by the existing controversy between the Director and the Deputy Director over a question that involves either the intelligence or the integrity of the administration.

This is assuredly a time for Americans everywhere to be upon their guard.

The so-called Federal ballot was to make no provision whatsoever for any State or local officers nor was it to be available for any primary election, although so far as many Southern States are concerned, the primary is the only thing that counts. While it may have been thought that elimination of soldier voting from the primary elections would appease Senators and Representatives from the South, this did not prove to be the case as they recognized very clearly the fundamental problems of State rights and State sovereignty in the ballot that was involved and took their stand firmly for a continuance of State sovereignty in the suffrage.

While there has been much misleading propaganda put into circulation as to the issues, the situation is gradually becoming clarified. The decisive vote in the House yesterday reflects the considered conclusion of its membership that any soldier anywhere desiring to vote will be entirely able to do so under the provisions of the bill as passed by the House and previously adopted by the Senate supplementing the legislation of 2 years ago.

It will be interesting to learn how soon the post-card applications for State absentee ballots will be made available. Parents everywhere may well inquire of their sons and daughters as to whether they have been afforded an opportunity to secure these post-card applications.

Address by G. Seals Aiken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, one of the outstanding citizens of the Commonwealth of Georgia is the Honorable G. Seals Aiken, a practicing attorney of the capital city of Atlanta. He is grand chancelor of the Knights of Pythias of that State. I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from a very able and patriotic address he recently delivered to members of that body in convention assembled.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have conferred upon me the highest honor within your power and have entrusted me with the destiny during the ensuing year of our great order. You have thus exhibited to me your complete confidence. I am deeply grateful to you for this high honor, your loyal friendship, your confidence, your esteem, and your good will.

If I were dependent upon myself alone, I would utterly fail in the great task before me, but with your loyal support and cooperation and the unlimited wisdom and power of our Lord and Master, we can attain together a victory and righteousness and fraternity far greater than our highest anticipations. First, we must proceed with prayer and supplication and free from all vainglory and selfishness. Our order was born during the dark and dreary days of war. It grew, flourished, and spread and ennobled and uplifted men who followed its banner of brotherly love and patriotism. The times of strike, hate, greed, and despotism which confront us now should inspire us to maintain and perpetuate with increased diligence and devotion the eternal principles upon which our order is based. We were not born in wealth nor have we ever prospered by reason of this material substance. Our progress has always been in accordance with the richness of our spirits and our willingness to serve mankind. There is no less need for these qualities now. On the contrary, the need is greater than ever before.

We must uphold, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies—foreign and domestic. We should always remember the ever truthful and undying words of the United States Supreme Court uttered many years ago, that

the Constitution is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and in all emergencies, and that no more iniquitous doctrine was ever conceived by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended at any time.

We should remember that the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by our forefathers to preserve and perpetuate for the protection of Americans in future years the God-given and inalienable rights of freemen as expressed in the immortal Declaration of Independence.

We should never forget this wise and soul-stirring paragraph in the noted decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Lee:*

"No man in this country is so high he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All officers of the Government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the authority which it gives."

The Government of the United States is one of law and not of persons. The flag which plays such an important part in our lodge ceremonies symbolizes the liberty, justice, and security protected by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. We must use the flag in that manner and teach Pythians that the reverence due and shown the flag is by reason of the great principles of liberty, justice, and security in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence which it symbolizes.

Alexander H. Stephens truly said: "No system of representative government can be long maintained by any people who have not the intelligence to understand it, the patriotism to approve it and the virtue to maintain inviolate both its form and principles as established."

Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill rightly said, "Who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved do bless him. Who lets his country die, lets all things die, dies himself ignobly, and all things dying curse him."

In my opinion the Knights of Pythias affords the greatest opportunity of any organization today to teach, practice and exemplify in a genuine American manner the principles of patriotism, brotherly love, charity, peace and good will toward all men. The presence today of greed, hate, antagonisms, strife and bloodshed should be a challenge to us as true Pythians to carry forward to victory our banner of liberty, fraternity, justice and true security. I earnestly seek your full, continued and whole-hearted support in this great work of Pythianism. I promise you my utmost, unselfish and active devotion to its sacred cause. I assure you it is a real pleasure for me to be your servant in so great an undertaking. I cannot adopt a wiser or surer course than that contained in our inspiring ritual, which is based upon the teachings of the greatest of all teachers. That shall be my guide, my law and my creed in serving you, and the proof of my loyalty to the cause.

The battle cry of France at the institution of its great Republic, following the reign of terror and centuries of tyranny by autocratic kings, was "liberty, equality, and fraternity." They had caught the democratic and independent American spirit of '76. Our patriots of '76 were great fraternity men, such as George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Tom Paine, Samuel Adams, and countless others. Fraternal love creates an insatiable desire to help one's fellow man. It is the motive power which causes all true progress in the world. It is the successful antidote for pessimism, hate, selfishness, and war. It is indestructible and utterly invincible. It costs nothing, carries no penalty, but confers benefits and rewards upon those who practice it, beyond the price of gold or the finest jewels. It is the one thing the sick world so badly needs and which would restore it to exuberant health, happiness, prosperity, peace, and good will. It is the priceless jewel we Pythians desire to give all worthy men who are willing to practice its virtue and extend its marvelous benefits. May I have your unbounded and enthusiastic support in dispensing this ennobling, enriching, peaceful, and character-building treasure?

Interview With Louis Bromfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with the well-known writer, Louis Bromfield, at Pittsburgh last week in a bond-selling drive, which is informative as to his position, and following the interview I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Philadelphia Record reminding the country that This Is Starvation Month, or Have You Forgotten It, referring to a prediction made by Mr. Bromfield about 18 months ago.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROMFIELD ASSAILS ADMINISTRATION, RAPS WILLKIE ON BOND RALLY VISIT—CHANGE OF HORSES IN MIDSTREAM O. K., AUTHOR DECLARES

Changing Presidents this year would not affect our war effort, Author Louis Bromfield said today.

Here to participate in an all-day drive by Pittsburgh district women to sell $6,000,000 in War bonds, Bromfield told reporters:

"That idea about changing horses in the middle of the stream is rubbish. Changing horses was the best thing England ever did after they entered the war."

(He referred to the election which replaced Prime Minister Chamberlain with Churchill.)

"We have the finest set of generals in the world. They would still be running the war no matter who is elected President in November."

HOME-FRONT CHANGE

"The only change would be on the home front and that could only be for the better."

Bromfield was one of four noted authors who came here to speak at four rallies. The others were Fannie Hurst, Clifton Fadiman, and Col. Carlos P. Romulo, aide-de-camp to General MacArthur and the last man off Bataan.

Bromfield predicted Dewey would be President Roosevelt's Republican opponent in the election, with Wendell Willkie probably as Dewey's closest contender for the nomination.

HE'LL TAKE DEWEY

Bromfield added:

"The trouble with Willkie is he tries to be both Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt. I'll take Dewey.

"Willkie would lose a lot of Democratic votes which another Republican probably could get."

Bromfield said buying War bonds was like investing in your own business, adding:

"If America is to remain a going corporation, we've got to back it up with money."

The well-known Ohio "farmer" said our biggest problem today was keeping the United States united and promoting better understanding. He declared:

"The present administration is trying to divide the country. They try to split everybody into a labor vote or a Negro vote or a soldier vote, etc."

ASKS FOR UNITY

"This idea of the politician's trying to divide us is bad. We must have more unity."

He said he thought a Federal ballot for soldiers would be unconstitutional, adding that soldiers must be allowed to vote but under the supervision of the States.

Fannie Hurst declared that the Nation was "at a zenith of bond buying" and "we are here to help Pittsburgh continue to do its usual good job."

[From the Philadelphia Record of February 7, 1944]

THIS IS STARVATION MONTH, OR HAD YOU FORGOTTEN IT?

Did you have enough to eat yesterday? Do you think you and your family will be able to avoid starvation the rest of this month?

For this is February 1944. This is Famine Month.

Don't you remember? In the August 1943 issue of Reader's Digest was a very important article, with this heading: "We Aren't Going To Have Enough to Eat." The subcaption was: "What Muddling in Washington Has Done to Our Food Supply." It was written by Louis Bromfield, the famous author-farmer of Ohio. He is also noted as a Roosevelt-hater.

The Digest had an editor's note extolling Mr. Bromfield's knowledge of agriculture and added: "He has spent months investigating the food crisis."

The article said, in part:

"The (food) situation will grow worse this fall and reach its most desperate stage this winter, especially from February on. 'February,' Herbert Hoover points out from his experience, 'is always the black month—the month to be feared the most.' If it were possible, I would rather not think about next February. By then most of our people will be living on a diet well below the nutrition level.

"How could such a state of affairs have come about? There is but one answer—the President and the men about him * * * did nothing whatever about the desperate food situation until April of this year. Then it was too late—and too little was done."

So here we are, well into February, the "black month." Is your diet "well below the nutrition level"?

No, it is not. You have been eating very well, indeed. The rationing regulations are not quite as strict as they were last August when Mr. Bromfield, with the aid of Mr. Hoover's experience, foresaw near-starvation in February 1944.

The American people are eating far more and far better food than they had in the last year of Mr. Hoover's administration. Then, in 1932, our granaries were bulging with 8-cent corn and the stockyards were squealing with 3-cent hogs. Yet millions of Americans didn't have enough money to buy hominy grits and sow belly.

Every so often it is necessary to call our prophets of doom to account for their haywire predictions, just to keep the record straight.

Next time a crisis is predicted, remember the Bromfield-Digest famine month hoax. There will be plenty of crises in the next few months; for this is a Presidential election year.

Consider Mr. Bromfield, the New Deal hater, and Reader's Digest, dispenser of dour, anti-

Roosevelt propaganda, combining to smear the administration with foggy thinking, inaccurate statistics, political bias, and a frightfully shocking forecast. Several million Digest readers must have believed it. It was reprinted in many daily newspapers of wide circulation.

Perhaps we judge Mr. Bromfield and the Reader's Digest too harshly. They might have been perfectly sincere in their prophecy of starvation. If they were sincere, here is a simple way for them to prove it:

In the next issue of Reader's Digest, let Mr. Bromfield write another article, admitting he was dreadfully wrong. Let the Digest apologize, in an editor's note, for giving wide circulation to so shocking and discouraging a prediction, which surely did harm to our national morale.

Copies of this editorial are being mailed to Mr. Bromfield and the editor of Reader's Digest.

War Production Board and the Development of Irrigation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the McCook (Nebr.) Daily Gazette under date of February 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Another fine example of an utter lack of cooperation and coordination and overlapping of authority between the many bureaus and departments of government in Washington today is contained in the decision handed down Monday by the War Production Board of which Donald Nelson is chairman. The decision had to do with irrigation projects in the Middle West which might be developed within a reasonable length of time and facilitate the wartime problems of food and fiber production, included in which were two Nebraska projects—Mirage Flats and the Cambridge project.

The Cambridge project had been approved by the War Manpower Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, Army engineers, the War Food Administration, and the Farm Security Administration; months and months have been taken up in hearings, investigations, conferences, surveys, and checking and double checking. The War Food Administration continues to make a plea to farmers to grow more food and the world is warned daily of a serious shortage which is certain to come, if not during the war, then immediately following. A plea is made by the War Manpower Commission for projects, to employ both prisoners of war and the millions of soldiers and defense workers who will seek employment when the shooting is over; vast sums of money have been spent by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers for plans which will place additional acres of land under water, double crop production, and at the same time save millions upon millions of dollars from devastating floods. After all this, another bottleneck is found!

The W. P. B., which has held such projects up previously because of a lack of steel and other essential materials needed for war purposes. Now with materials on hand and prison labor available and idle, W. P. B. finds that the Cambridge project is undesirable at this time, while at the same time the W. P. B. reverses itself by placing its O. K. on Mirage Flats. How come? Who's right and who's wrong? And how long will it take to find out? Must we wait until the war is over and the world is starving before these departments of government can get together and make up their minds? Or will an investigation tell us the truth as to whether we actually need greater food production? This is the sort of red tape the people are getting sick and tried of. It is the sort of dilly-dallying that ofttimes brings about the change of heads of departments and administrations. It is the kind of politics that bankrupts nations.

In one breath the W. P. B. says the Mirage Flats project is sound and sensible and in the next breath it says an equally, or even superior project is not; "because of present wartime costs, because of the length of time it will take to construct the project, because of the uncertainty of prisoners of war labor, because of the uncertainty and delay attending the initiation of production on newly irrigated lands is insufficient assurance that the benefits which would accrue to the war effort would be worthy of the expenditure required"; and a number of other "becauses." These are the "becauses" Donald Nelson gave the Senators from eight States Monday, together with a number of other representatives.

And each one of these excuses has been studied and passed upon and answered favorably by departments of government set up for their particular parts of the work. The War Food Administration said. "We need the food; the projects can be completed in time for early production" (Cambridge, for instance, half completed and in production in 1945). War Manpower said, "We have the labor; thousands of prisoners of war who are idle and dissatisfied" (for instance, 2,000 or more housed within a stone's throw of the Cambridge proposed reservoir). The Bureau of Reclamation said, "The projects are feasible" (for instance, they label the Cambridge project as tops of the list). Each and every one of the arguments on which Donald Nelson made his decision, or the decision for the Facilities Review Committee, has already been answered and approved.

Yet here is one of those bottlenecks where, regardless of facts, regardless of needs, thumbs are turned down with a lot of "becauses" that simply don't hold water. Of course, Donald Nelson may change his mind—we hope so—not selfishly because this territory has a project in the program but because we have come to believe that there is a demand, and is going to be a greater demand, for food production; because we do believe that the War Manpower Commission knows what it is talking about when that Commission says they have the labor available; because we have confidence in the ability, demonstrated over a period of many years, of the Bureau of Reclamation; and because Donald Nelson himself has said that there is now a sufficient amount of materials, such as steel, on hand to justify releases for civilian and industrial purposes. The decision handed down Monday by W. P. B. is another fine example of overlapping of authority down at Washington more than it is a lack of coordination. Really, in this case there was coordination and a meeting of minds of those departments which had to do with the problem—all but one, the Facilities Review Committee of the War Production Board.

We of the Republican River Valley and the State of Nebraska have never once asked for one pound of any material needed for the winning of this war, and, I am certain, never will. But if foodstuffs are going to be needed, if production on the farms must be stepped up, and if the materials are available, then we are going to continue to believe and hope that Donald Nelson and his committee will reconsider that decision.

The Attitude of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of a recent issue entitled "Moscow Sleigh Ride."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW SLEIGH RIDE

It becomes more and more fascinating to try to figure out what that dear Russia is up to.

The Teheran Conference of Messrs. Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin was supposed to have birthed nothing but sweetness and light. But its melodious echoes were still batting loudly around the world when Stalin slipped into his Moscow newspaper, Pravda, that rumor that the British were dickering with Germany for a separate peace. This followed close on the heels of the Russian rebuke to Wendell Willkie, a slavish admirer of everything about Russia, for not being quite slavish enough.

Now, Izvestia, another of Stalin's newspapers, accuses the Pope of dickering for a separate peace with Spain, or something like that. Stalin's government mouthpieces haven't got around as yet to accusing Roosevelt of dickering for a separate peace with Japan, but who knows what may happen next.

The most striking of these Russian moves to date, though, is the announcement that Russia is now not one country, but 16 republics. Some of these republics are still in possession of the Germans, Rumanians, or Finlanders; but that, the world is assured, will be taken care of after the Allies win the war. It is evident from its recent cavortings around that Russia is confident its part of the war is virtually won.

Each of these 16 Russian republics is to be autonomous, meaning it is to have its own army, its own foreign policy, and its own diplomatic representatives in other countries.

The peace conference possibilities flowing from this arrangement are intriguing. At the peace parleys after World War No. 1, the British were about to round up six votes, because of separate British dominions around the world, to our one. Had we joined the League of Nations, we'd have been outvoted in much the same way.

Stalin, a shark at international poker, is apparently getting set to outplay the British at that game, with 16 votes at the peace parleys—and presumably with 16 votes to cast for Russia if he lets Russia be lured into any sort of revived League of Nations.

Of course, there is a counterplay available to us if our rulers have the gall or the imagination to play it. The United States has 48 States. Each of these has an army, in the form of its militia or National Guard, and each has a secretary of state. Why not have these State secretaries of state start writing diplomatic notes to Ethiopia, Estonia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, etc., so that we can say each State has its own foreign policy? Having rigged up these false fronts and stage props, we can claim 48 votes at the peace parleys, and 48 in any League of Nations we may be razzle-dazzled into joining. That will hold Joe Stalin and everybody else for a while.

Everybody is entitled to his or her own guess as to what that dear Russia is up to.

Our guess is that Stalin is up to nothing more than getting ready to draw Russia's post-war western boundaries exactly where he wants to draw them, with protests or interference from the western allies ruled out.

This, of course, will make the Atlantic Charter look pretty sick. Under this document, inspired by Mr. Roosevelt and subscribed to by Mr. Churchill (with tongue in cheek, we imagine) the Allies were not going to do such things as Mr. Stalin is doing. There was to be no territorial aggrandizement, and small nations were to choose by plebiscite their own forms of government.

So Stalin now moves to aggrandize Russia territorially, and to gobble up a variety of small nations and pieces of small nations in the process. This not only rocks the Atlantic Charter back on its heels, but hangs an unlovely shiner on the "four freedoms" as well.

We are thus coming to see the effectiveness of the Rosevelt foreign policies. These policies are, in plain English, being slapped all around the map by Stalin—and the episode is made all the more painful in view of the billions' worth of lend-lease goods we have shipped to Russia, and for which we are apparently not going to be paid even in Russian lip service to the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

It looks like Pal Joey has taken a certain party for a nice long sleigh ride on the snowy steppes of Muscovy

Human Rights and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] at the Metropolitan Opera intermission last Saturday afternoon over the Blue network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL

A great American, one of our founding fathers, is credited with an anecdote.

It seems that on the afternoon of July 4, 1776, in the city of Philadelphia, a swarm of horseflies were gathered in a livery stable.

They would as soon bite through the silk stocking of a continental congressman as the bare leg of a street urchin.

Near the stable was a hall where, on that sultry afternoon, men were arguing.

Three long days, they had been arguing.

In a corner sat a young writer, squirming in his chair.

The debate concerned a document he had composed.

The great majority of the delegates were wholly in agreement but as too frequently happens on such occasions a few were attempting to find a little formal flaws.

They were picking at it, questioning this word and that phrase, wanting to cross out here and put in there.

The author was afraid these fault-finders would pick it to pieces, or, worse yet, talk and talk and never get down to a vote.

Suddenly the horseflies rose from the livery stable and came roaring in through the open windows.

The dignified gathering put up a defense with lace handkerchiefs and fans.

The few dissenters tried to talk on.

But the attack was too fierce.

Their convictions were no stronger than their stockings; in great haste they joined the great majority in their approval of the young man's work.

That young man's name was Thomas Jefferson.

The document approved that afternoon was the Declaration of Independence.

And the story of how it came to be accepted without further ado is Jefferson's own.

The proof of the soundness of his great ideals and the realization of his vision of the future are the strength of the United States of America today.

Out of the war that is being fought today, out of the coming victory over fascism, other declaratory words, words of great moment to all humanity, will be written.

They will be submitted for the approval of the successor body to that gathering in Philadelphia on the Fourth of July 1776.

They, too—we hope—will be words wisely chosen and brave in meaning.

These new words—we hope—will carry their meaning beyond the borders of our own land and ring the earth with the fire that burned in Thomas Jefferson's soul when he wrote the truth self-evident that "all men are created equal."

We hope that truth will free peoples by the hundreds of millions who have never known the meaning of equality.

For in the accession of these new millions to the estate of freemen, in their great gain, will lie our own saving from great loss, in their liberation today will rest the hope that the liberties of our children and our children's children will be secure forever.

The starting point of all wars of major size has been in the inability of some nations to equalize the rights of their own people.

In societies where the caste system prevails there can be no equality of rights, no mutuality of understanding, no lasting peace.

Their downtrodden masses can see improvement in their plight only by making other peoples subservient through conquest.

We expect, too, that to any such world declaration there will be objections, criticism, opposition.

Some will be honest and sincere, some will be carping and full of trickery.

Well, livery stables are no more.

But if and when that declaration of the equality of all the peoples on earth is discussed in the Halls of Congress, it is my own secret hope that somehow, somewhere in the vicinity, we can have ready a squadron of the descendants of those horseflies that, according to Thomas Jefferson's story, attacked so effectively in 1776.

If there are no horseflies here and at the peace tables of the world, let us hope that the gadflies of conscience, at least, will be present.

Those words—"All men are created equal"—were the hope of the world in 1776.

They are the hope of the world in 1944.

Their negation of yesteryear took the form of tyranny in such matters as taxation without representation, or the impressment of seamen, or absentee rule over the land.

Their negation today, under the sign of the swastika and the rising sun, takes yet darker forms, more barbaric cruelties.

It has taken planes, not horseflies, to force the die-hard from his position against the equality of men.

That there may be no negation tomorrow, it is well that we repeat those simple words, those five small words with their world-shaking meaning—"all men are created equal"—that we say them over and over—yes, that we sing them and celebrate them and shout them from the housetops, and if need be, let the thunder of our guns and ships and planes roar them out to the farthest corner of the earth where Fascist negation may take refuge.

It is well also that we know what they mean.

Jefferson knew.

When he declared men equal, there was in his mind no clouding of issues, no denial of the recognition that is the just due of individual genius, of personal excellence.

"Whatever be the degree of talent," said Jefferson, "it is no measure of right because Sir Isaac Newton was superior to others in understanding, he was not therefore lord of the person or property of others."

Equal, then, in right, in opportunity.

The Fascist ideology reverses this, limiting right or opportunity to the few and denying all talent, negating the very existence of genius, among the many.

We, too, have had among us those who would keep opportunity limited to the few. But we have had others who better understood the tenet to which our forefathers pledged their lives and fortunes.

Abraham Lincoln understood.

Said he, "Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of the equal rights of men; ours began by affirming these rights.

"They said, some men are too ignorant and vicious to share in government.

"Possibly so, said we; and, by your system, you would always keep them ignorant and vicious.

"We proposed to give all a chance; and we expected the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser, and all better and happier together.

"We made that experiment, and the fruit is before us.

"Look at it.

"Think of it."

And we may say the same today.

Since Lincoln's time, look at the progress we have made—think of it.

It is in the nature of democracy, it is in the essence of the experiment, that the nation which espouses it is, and must be, ever in quest of an equality above the aggregate estate of its citizens.

The nation that aims at the democratic goal in life must keep its sights set high.

The opportunity that is equalized in our way of life is the opportunity to advance, to rise, to contribute to the common betterment.

It is a leveling up, not a grading down.

It is necessary for us to understand this if we of this generation are to do our part in fulfilling the destiny of our Nation.

It is not enough now to parcel out a limited number of jobs among some of our citizens and let others remain unemployed.

It is not enough now to protect now the small businessman against the hold-up or the fellow who may want to hurl a brick through his shop window, and yet allow big business to strangle him with the devices of monopoly.

It is not enough now to open the laboratory to the scientist and let him create a new and finer material world of tomorrow and then see the things of that world withheld from our people for the greater profit of entrepreneurs.

It is not enough now to fight an aggressor who is backed by fascist capital, yet tolerate private scheming and the resumption after the war of renewed international collusion by some segments of business.

It is not enough now to send our young men to war without making provision for them to carry on the education that they have interrupted, when that war shall have

been won, or without giving them the full measure of security for themselves and their families, the right to work, the freedom from want, and the freedom from fear that they have risked their lives to hold safe for us all.

These are a few of the advances we must make if we are to keep up our task of equalizing opportunities, if we are to succeed in pacing our democracy with a fast-moving world.

And keep it up we must.

America, being forever committed to the principle that all men are created equal, and forever committed to the sacred task of safeguarding the inherent rights of all groups, whether they be majorities or minorities, is as deeply, as solemnly bound to the proposition that this equality which is our goal is an equality in progress, not a leveling off in reaction.

This is the progress of a nation, not the preferment of a minority, the betterment of the estate of a people, not the advantage of a few.

The America that Jefferson's imagination created, the America that has lived gloriously for 150 years, the America that the soldiers left and the America to which they hope to return, is the ideal Government for the world's example. This means that the nations of the world must recognize that there are no supermen or superior race groups and that men will not live under the heel of other men.

Therein has arisen the strength that ensures to us victory in war.

Therein, too, is pointed the way to victory in peace.

And in that victory the America that we love will be beloved of all the world, for she will have fulfilled her destiny.

That destiny—the destiny of people who have learned to share freedom—I can best put before you in the mighty song of an American who saw it far beyond the horizon of dark and troubled times.

The better part of a century ago Walt Whitman wrote:

Fresh come to a new world indeed, yet long prepared
I see the genius of the modern, child of the real and ideal,
Clearing the ground for broad humanity, the true America, heir of the past so grand,
To build a grander future.

Pennsylvania in the War of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following report giving details as to what has been accomplished by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency in 1943 in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is proud of her record in the production of food for the armed forces, and I believe that this report reflects great credit on the A. A. A. administration:

PENNSYLVANIA IN THE WAR OF 1944

One million in arms, including Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, Berks County; Gen. H. H. Arnold, Montgomery County; Gen. George C. Marshall, Fayette County; 3,500,000 industrial workers, including 1,362,000 in service trades, 486,000 steel workers, 333,000 textile workers, 245,000 coal miners; 10,000,000 people to feed and 120,000 farms to do it.

Challenged by the hard necessities of war, American farmers in 1943 ignored the ordinary limits of human ability and set their sights beyond the range of reasonable endurance. They faced the inevitable wartime shortages of skilled men, supplies, and equipment. They endured the vexatious delays from wet weather and floods in 1943 and outstripped their own marvelous records for 1942 by 5 percent and the 5-year average food-production record by 32 percent.

In Pennsylvania the total production of our field and fruit crops was raised from $184,562,000 in value in 1942 to $224,104,000 in 1943, an increase of 21 percent. Most important is the increase in acreage planted to crops required for human consumption—the crops and products carrying special incentives from the War Food Administration so that farmers might combine patriotism and profit in their contribution to winning the war.

Here's the record:

Snap beans (for processing):	*Acres*
1937–41	2,560
1942	4,600
1943	5,400
Sweet corn (for processing):	
1937–41	11,240
1942	14,700
1943	16,700
Soy beans (for beans):	
1937–41	10,000
1942	30,000
1943	45,000
Milk:	
1937–41	$115,506,000
1942	157,083,000
1943	184,575,000
Green peas (for processing):	*Acres*
1937–41	7,200
1942	15,300
1943	18,000
Tomatoes (for processing):	
1937–41	17,820
1942	28,500
1943	28,600
Potatoes:	
1937–41	176,000
1942	167,000
1943	180,000
Eggs:	
1937–41	$42,056,000
1942	66,665,000
1943	90,950,000

A FEDERAL RESERVE SOIL BANK

The disastrous floods of the Ohio and Mississippi are caused by soil-clogged streams and valleys, much of that soil from Pennsylvania farms.

In 1936 Congress provided funds to hold our soil to the hillsides—in Pennsylvania as in the rest of the country. It was the purpose of this money to prevent floods, preserve our soils, and provide reserves of fertility as a national resource.

Investments in the bank of fertility called for lime, superphosphate, and legumes as a foundation for a system of permanent soil improvement; contour farming, strip cropping, and diversion ditches to prevent soil erosion on Pennsylvania hillsides; forest seedlings to protect steep slopes and build forest resources for the future.

We need 2,000,000 tons of lime a year for Pennsylvania farms, experts say.

Prior to 1935 farmers used about 250,000 tons a year, but by 1943 the A. A. A. program had increased this amount to 1,000,000 tons.

WHY?

When Congress provided funds to conserve soil for Pennsylvania farmers, commercial producers of highway stone and flux-stone for steel mills saw an opportunity for the use of screenings. They installed giant pulverizers and went into mass production of agricultural lime. Then A. A. A. committees provided lime for farmers, stone producers utilized a waste product, steel manufacturers reduced costs of manufacture, the Government was able to purchase cheaper steel, farmers produced bigger and better crops, and more food was produced on fewer acres.

Milk and meat are produced most economically on improved grazing land. Soil conservation is best accomplished by the protective covering of a thick turf of grass crops.

Both summer and winter forage crops require liberal applications of lime and superphosphate. In addition to 1,000,000 tons of lime applied to Pennsylvania farms in 1943 through the assistance of A. A. A. committeemen, more than 34,000 tons of superphosphate were applied to crops through A. A. A. funds.

Legume seeds, forest seedlings, and other erosion-control practices were also furnished through Government conservation funds.

A COUNTY A. A. A. COMMITTEE MANAGES A BUSY INSTITUTION

The 67 county office nerve centers of wartime agriculture are headquarters of 2,600 community committeemen. They are in close and frequent contact with the 106,000 farms that have cooperated in the conservation program.

It is most natural that these institutions become the centers of gravity for a war farm program. They are controlled by practical farmers elected in open and free farm elections every year. These men and women were trained by service during the years of acute farm adversity. They know the ins and outs of farm problems.

These are the men and women who were able to assist farmers to secure from the limited supply of critical war materials 88,526 pounds of copper wire for 3,050 farms so that more milk and eggs might be produced by artificial aids; 82,000 allocations of gasoline for farm equipment and 379 new farm trucks to haul war crops to market centers; 9,624 units of new farm equipment, including 3,950 milking machines, 2,424 farm tractors, 1,193 tractor cultivators, 726 hay loaders, 678 side delivery rakes, 522 corn planters, 309 combines, 302 potato diggers, 274 ensilage cutters, 234 pick-up balers, 214 corn pickers, 165 potato planters, 130 corn binders; 986 construction permits for farm buildings to provide facilities for greater food production.

These are the men and women who prepared from official records and personal investigations 16,000 reports to draft boards in support of deferment of thousands of essential and skilled farm workers, and referred 782 cases to the State A. A. A. headquarters for review by the State Selective Service office at Harrisburg.

These are the men and women who aided farmers to find ways to repair worn farm equipment either in their farm shop or in the shop of a vocational school so that our allies might have tanks to drive Rommel out of Egypt.

These are the men and women who developed plans to stretch the national stockpile of rubber on farms until a new synthetic industry might be built.

These are the men and women who sold the soybean idea to farmers when the Japs captured our Philippine oil supply. And above all they organized production so that Britain got milk and eggs, Russia got butter and pork, Mediterranean countries got wheat and flour, and at home we supported the best fed fighters and nation on earth.

In 1944 we face a greater and graver task. Even if Germany is defeated this year and the need for the implements of war tapers off, the need for food will increase.

Men and women at the fighting front; men and women at work; women and children in our homes; men, women and children cringing under the heel of Hitler—call

for food from all the resources of our land, all the vigor of our health and all our faith in all-wise providence.

We must meet these goals: 200,000 acres of potatoes, an increase from 180,000 acres in 1943; 100,000 acres of soybeans, an increase from 60,000 acres planted in 1943; 240,000 acres of buckwheat, an increase from 140,000 acres in 1943; 1,414,000 acres of corn, an increase from 1,360,000 acres in 1943; 846,000 acres of wheat, an increase from 812,000 acres in 1943.

We must hold the increases we have made in milk and eggs;

We must adjust our pork and beef production to our supplies of grain;

We must produce all the commercial vegetables our processors can handle and all the fresh vegetables possible.

Challenged again, the task of A. A. A. committeemen is greater than ever before.

Getting the fullest possible use of every possible acre of land in every community is a difficult assignment of responsibility, but it is the job every A. A. A. committeeman faces. The invasion of the Continent calls for more men and more landing craft. Farm labor will not be more plentiful and steel will go to the Army first. Once again our job will be to: Mobilize food production among our neighbors; help them secure feed, machinery and supplies; place conservation materials where they will produce more; encourage soil conservation and improvement practices; get every idle acre into practical production.

Declaration of First Principles of Any Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement prepared by Msgr. F. S. Legowski, of Toledo, Ohio, in his capacity as a member of the readjustment planning commission, Department of Ohio, American Legion:

PRINCIPLES, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF OHIO, READJUSTMENT PLANNING COMMISSION

The job of readjustment of our post-war world to the shape that it ought to have is more difficult than the job of an artist in painting upon canvas the image he has in his mind. It is the job of seeing the future.

We do, however, have certain guides. Tried and proven principles, existing and operating institutions, practical methods of procedure, venerable documents expressing the noble ideals of our national aims and purposes all point to the kind of world we must strive to achieve.

The first and most fundamental guide to the kind of world we should strive to achieve is religion, specifically the Christian religion. Christian principles gave origin to our form of government, permeated its every institution, are the spirit of its literature, the core of its culture, the force of all its social sanctions, and the heritage of our traditions.

Our imperishable political documents are blueprints not only of our past but also of our future. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights are signposts pointing out the road to our national and world future. Here we have not merely an ideal but a workable model of the religious, political, economic, social, educational, and cultural conditions under which we desire to live, with our returned victors and all the world. Today our soldiers are fighting against deadly enemies; we on the home front must fight to win the peace.

To win the peace we must first know what is peace. Centuries ago Augustine defined peace as "the harmony or tranquility of order." Order is the correct relation of all parts to the whole. It is like a jig-saw puzzle. When disassembled and disjointed the various pieces give the impression of confusion, but put into their proper place and relationship to each other, they create a perfect whole.

Proper order begins with God; next comes man, then things. God is the beginning and ultimate end of all good order. He is the only Absolute Being. The Creator of all things, and the Ruler of the Universe through the operation of the laws of nature. He is the foundation upon which the superstructure of peace may be built.

The individual, the social group, the nation, and groups of nations can have permanent peace only if they accept God as its foundation.

Next in the proper ordering of peace is man. Every man by virtue of his nature is an image of God. He is a person, an individual, endowed with reason and free will. Because of his origin, nature, and destiny he is clothed with immortality. Regardless of his color or stature, race or country, creed or country club, vocation or trade, political party or financial standing, he is fundamentally equal to all other men. He has the same fundamental rights and duties.

The third place in the jig-saw puzzle of correct order is occupied by things. They belong to man. His to use and enjoy. Never must they master or rule him.

When all these three elements are properly related and coordinated we have harmony and tranquility—which is peace. Peace for the individual, peace for the Nation, peace for the world. Peace between God and men. Peace between man and man. Peace between men and things.

Peace between God and men means freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom to teach and receive religious instructions without political interference, freedom to establish and maintain benevolent institutions for the material, mental and spiritual welfare of our fellow human beings, freedom to hold and use property to effect these purposes, freedom of the individual and society to oppose any movement to destroy these rights and responsibilities.

Man is composed of body and soul, a material and a spiritual element. Therefore he has social, economic, political, and cultural rights and duties. Our Declaration of Independence proclaims these truths to be self-evident, "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Every man, therefore, has a right to acquire and possess food, clothing, and shelter sufficient for a decent human living. He has the right and duty to work for a decent living. In the event that private enterprise fails in this regard, society or Government has the right and duty to provide such opportunities. He has the right to security against sickness, disability, old age, or unemployment by means of group or organization insurance; in the event of its failure, to Government assistance. He has the right to private property guaranteeing such security. He has the right to choose his vocation, profession, trade, or state of life. He has the right to form associations with his fellow workers or members of any vocational group to secure through group bargaining an adequate family wage, reasonable hours of work, and decent working conditions.

As a political entity, we, the people, have the right and duty to determine the kind of Government under which we shall live. That government must protect our language, our race, our religion, and our cultural traditions from the tyranny of the majority. It must assure to all equality before the law.

All the provisions of our National Bill of Rights flow from the nature, dignity, and destiny of our manhood.

These are the principles of our national peaceful existence. Such must be the fundamental principles of an international peace.

These principles are so fundamental that unless they become the framework of international relations there will be no peace. Our own Nation and the United Nations, both internally and internationally, must make these principles the foundation of the future structure of the post-war world.

A mutual acceptance and understanding of the principles and philosophy of our Declaration of Independence, of our Constitution, and of our Bill of Rights are an indispensable prerequisite for the building of a decent future world.

Cutting Off Their Noses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I predict the Rankin bill—which does not give the soldiers a vote—will prove a boomerang back to haunt many Congressmen. The editorial from the February 3, 1944, issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, which follows, will give the answer:

CUTTING OFF THEIR NOSES

By a record vote the House of Representatives decided not to put its Members on record when they vote on the soldier vote bill. Now wasn't that a fine way to deceive the soldiers, kid the people, get even with President Roosevelt, and enhance the dwindling prestige of our Congress?

Apparently, the men we send to Washington to represent us prefer to deplore the way the legislative branch of our Government has lost its constitutional and traditional powers to a bureaucratic administration than do anything about it.

As we pointed out in these columns recently, and as nearly everybody realized, Mr. Roosevelt out-smarted Congress when he came out squarely for a Federal ballot to give our soldiers a chance to vote. Maybe he didn't have any right to meddle in legislative affairs, but somebody had to do something to shake our solons out of a parliamentary stalemate. Now for the representatives of the people to refuse to stand up and be counted on the soldier voting bill because the President said it was the fair thing to do is a most absurd example of cutting off one's nose to spite his face.

Why don't they record their votes if they aren't ashamed of the way they vote. Why shouldn't the citizens who send them to Washington know what they do there? What is going to become of representative government unless we replace these mice with some men and women big enough to think for themselves and courageous enough to say what they think?

Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House have a great regard for Ernie Pyle, soldier correspondent, who has spent more time with our combat soldiers than any other newspaper correspondent. He says the soldiers want to vote. They do not want complicated forms, affidavits, questionnaires, and various State regulations as will be required by the Rankin bill, but they want a simple short form ballot such as will be provided by the Worley-Green-Lucas bill.

I wish to include in my remarks Ernie Pyle's column which appeared in the newspapers on February 3, 1944. Conference committee please take notice!

SOLDIERS WANT TO VOTE

(By Ernie Pyle)

IN ITALY, February 3.—The British Army recently announced a new system of wound and foreign-service stripes, similar to ours of the last war. I've wondered for a long time when we would get around to doing it ourselves, and if you ask me the sooner the better.

The new British wound insignia is to be a straight up-and-down gold stripe an inch and a half long on the left forearm. There will be one for each wound. Similar stripes of red will be granted for each year of service in the war.

Ours of the last war was a golden V on the right sleeve for each wound, and the same on the left sleeve for each 6 months of service abroad.

A little thing like a stripe can do wonders for morale. And certainly it's pointless to wait till everybody gets home, for the average soldier will get into civies the moment he gets his discharge. Over here and right now is when wound and service stripes would give a guy a chance to get a little kick out of wearing his record on his sleeve.

In fact I wouldn't mind parading a few stripes myself. Very shortly I'll have a total of 2 years overseas since World War No. 2 began, and since I'm now at the age where hardening of the arteries may whisk me off at any moment, I'd like somebody to see my stripes before it's too late.

A thing I've always feared in war zones has at last happened—my typewriter has broken down.

A certain metal bracket has crashed right in two, and you can no longer turn the cylinder and make a new line by hitting the little lever on the side.

Still, all in all, the break-down could be much worse, and I don't know that a broken typewriter makes so much difference anyhow to a correspondent who is unable to think of anything better than his broken typewriter to write about.

A few weeks ago I mentioned that the boys in a certain artillery battery were betting on whether Schlitz beer ever came in green bottles or not.

Well, R. Ray Parsons, of Indianapolis, writes that the Schlitz bottle was brown for many years, but that because of the wartime bottle shortage it is now often put in green bottles. That settles the argument, but the best part is yet to come.

Mr. Parsons was a private in the A. E. F. in the last war and he is a Schlitz salesman. He has now been so carried away with his own war memories, and his enthusiasm for the ripe quality of his own suds, that he offers to buy the two artillerymen all the beer they can drink in a week after they get back to America. If they'll write him, he'll make the date.

That would be fine but, Mr. Parsons, what the artillerymen and everybody else want is beer over here right now. Everybody but me, of course.

All America seems to be worrying about whether the soldiers are going to get to vote.

Well, if you'll let me have the platform a moment, I think I can tell you how it is. I can't answer for the Army which is either in training or in behind-the-lines routine jobs, but I think I can answer for the front-line combat soldier, and the answer is this:

Sure he wants to vote. If you ask him he'll say yes. But he actually thinks little about it, and if there's going to be any red tape about it he'll say nuts to it.

The average combat soldier is so consumed with the job of merely keeping alive, and with contributing what bare little he can to his own miserable existence, that he has little room in him for thinking about the ballot. If you offered him his choice betwee voting in November and finding a dirty cow shed to lie down in out of the rain tonight, the cow shed would win.

If the Army could set up the machinery and some day all of a sudden tell every soldier in the combat zone to step up and mark his X if he wanted to, then 99 percent of the front-line troops would vote.

But if soldiers have to fill out long questionnaires from their home States, sign affidavits, and fuss around with reading and writing out complicated lists, then I think 99 percent of those same front-line troops would say:

"To hell with it, we'd rather have a cigar ration at suppertime instead."

Foreign-Trade Zones on Great-Circle Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of my esteemed friend and distinguished public servant, Hon. Thomas E. Lyons, as same appears in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, issue of January 29, last. It shows the great possibilities of free ports under the so-called Celler Foreign-Trade Zone Act.

FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES ON GREAT-CIRCLE ROUTES

(By Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board [1])

In the war now racking the world, opposing forces are employing every available resource and energy in mutual destruction. With peace it will be possible for these resources and energies to be used in the creation of a unity without which there can be no lasting peace. And just as air transport is playing a vital role in this war so can it play an important part in securing that unity and lasting peace. The future of the world—politically, economically, and socially—is inseparably bound up with that of aviation.

On the other hand, the future and potentialities of air transport itself have been and are being immeasurably advanced by the war. For example, until 1939, when the trans-Atlantic clipper service was inaugurated, only 11 out of 88 attempts to cross the Atlantic had succeeded. Since January 1, 1943, American transport planes have maintained an average of 500 trans-Atlantic flights per week. Landfall to landfall time for such flights has been reduced to just over 6 hours.

IMMEASURABLE POTENTIAL

While warring governments are utilizing airplanes to transport troops, munitions, and supplies to every front in this global war (see Imports by Air, in the January 15 Foreign Commerce Weekly), the problems and achievements of today are but harbingers of the problems and possibilities of the future. The future of air transport stands as a vast, immeasurable potential.

But even on the basis of present achievements it is possible to think of all of Europe, all of Africa, all of North and South America, and parts of Asia as being within 24 hours flying distance of the United States. Not only does the airplane travel faster, it travels the shortest distance between two points on the earth's surface. For example, the straightest route from the Panama Canal to Tokio is not directly across the Pacific. Roughly it passes over the Gulf of Mexico, Houston, Denver, Seattle, and the Aleutians.

The sea route from Seattle to Calcutta is 12,000 miles, the air distance is only 7,225 miles. From Chicago to Murmansk is 6,150 miles by the shortest surface carriers, 3,500 miles by air. In terms of elapsed time, of course, the difference is even more striking. A cargo plane can make 25 trips while a freighter is making one.

The speed of the airplane flying great-circle courses and shrinking the world in size to a matter of hours, will enable us for the first time to show with competitive promptness the merits of our products in the most remote markets of the world. Think of an Orient a scant 100 hours away by air, instead of 50 days by surface transportation. Consider the increased value of a European market less than 24 hours distant.

INLAND CENTERS AS PORTS

Commercial relationships in the world at large have been maintained, heretofore, through ports with access to the seas and oceans. But, in the air-ocean of the future, inland trade centers will be as much ports of the world trade lanes as seaports are today. It is neither visionary nor impractical to foresee the day when ice-free harbors will no longer be the exclusive lifeline of a nation's oversea commerce. The airplane knows no boundaries, being able to traverse sea, desert, and mountain without interruption. Bad weather, as the only obstacle, is rapidly being overcome. Thus, the port of tomorrow can just as easily be located 1,000 or 2,000 miles inland, depending upon the industry and the economic importance of the region surrounding it.

While this conclusion may appear paradoxical and even visionary, it has the support of many harbor officials. The American Association of Port Authorities meeting in New Orleans in October, after discussing the desirability of closer relations with inland airport operators, decided to hold the question under active consideration. It is expected that affirmative action will be taken

[1] This article has as its basis a recent address by Mr. Lyons before a joint meeting of the Miami Propeller Club and the Greater Miami Port Authority.

at the next meeting. Today we have 49 airports (37 permanent and 12 temporary) of entry designated by the Treasury Department. Some of these airports of entry, while in border States, are a considerable distance inland from the sea and frontier.

Undoubtdly, the development of air cargo will make inland points important foreign-trade centers. Cities and towns such as Chicago, Cincinnati, Detroit, Wichita, St. Louis, and Fairbanks, Alaska, can become foreign-trade centers as vital as seaports are today.

Nor need air cargo be developed solely at the expense of existing surface facilities. While some classes of cargo now carried by other forms of transportation will be a source of business for air cargo, we should not concern ourselves too much with this diversion. First, it will extend over a period of time sufficient for adjustments to be made. Second, long years ahead of what would have been possible otherwise, air transportation and air cargo will bring into the channels of trade many of the products and the resources of the hitherto undeveloped regions of the earth.

STRIKING EXAMPLES

Already there is extensive carriage of cargo by air in Central America and New Guinea—to take but two examples. In both places surface transport facilities are poor. In New Guinea, a trip which by the only other available means of transportation would have required 1 week took 25 minutes by air. T. A. C. A. in Central America, supporting itself largely by the carriage of more than 20,000 pounds of freight a year (much of it the chewing-gum base, chicle), has received world-wide attention. These developments in Central America and New Guinea illustrate not only the speed but also the unique mobility of the airplane and its disregard of topography. From similarly isolated areas of central and northern Asia, furs, bristles, silk, rugs, tea, herbs and drugs, tungsten, and precious stones could be obtained; resources of untouched areas in Africa likewise will reach world markets.

NEW GOODS, NEW MARKETS

Conversely, air cargo will open new markets, and, in integrated transportation systems, these new commodities and the goods for these new markets will move on and benefit all types of carriers. Moreover, air cargo will create new articles of commerce. Perishables that never before could find a distant market in even a refrigerator car will flow along the trade routes of the Nation and the world. Others will come to our tables full-ripened and full-flavored. Exotics, heretofore almost unknown, will become commonplace.

Too often we have considered the airplane merely as a unit capable of carrying a small group of passengers and a few hundred pounds of mail and express. But cargo planes now rolling off the production lines for military purposes and the commercial planes planned for the post-war era are a different story. For example, one of the largest railroads owns 80,000 freight cars. On the basis of actual ton-miles carried in a recent year, only 1,150 airplanes of a type being built today could carry an equivalent amount of freight in 1 year.

FACTOR OF RATES

Present air-cargo rates are between 80 and 90 cents a ton-mile—several times rail express rates, which are next above those of less-than-carload freight. Despite this, and in the face of the most modern, efficient, diversified, and economical surface-transportation system in the world, United States air lines are approaching the carriage of 15,000,000 ton-miles of air cargo a year. What will happen when air-cargo rates are halved and halved again? Consider the value of time and speed in transportation. Think of the savings for business when the speed of air transportation has reduced the necessity for large stock inventories of expensive merchandise.

While there are few articles of commerce which have not at some time or some place been moved by air, it would be foolish to think that even in the distant future the airplane will displace the world's railways, trucks, water carriers, and pipe lines in the carriage of freight. Even though speed is often an important factor, in the case of many commodities the flow of supply can be adjusted so as to offset such an advantage.

Although air-cargo rates, and passenger rates, too, will in time be substantially reduced, relative cost factors will favor surface forms of transport. While we cannot now visualize air commerce depriving surface carriers of any large proportion of foreign and domestic commerce, we nevertheless can expect substantial increases in the carriage of high-value goods and passengers by air.

SHUN COMPLACENCY—AND PLAN

Unquestionably air cargo has a future. That future should be planned. We must begin planning today, doing those things necessary to facilitate the handling of world air commerce. Already new air centers are beginning to emerge: Wichita, Chicago, Fairbanks, New York, Minneapolis, Dallas, and Miami are examples. These cities have a variety of natural advantages but because of legal formalities necessary for conducting foreign trade, such naturally favored municipalities should begin considering their future as possible foreign-trade centers. Moreover, as the New York Port Authority recently warned, it is urgent today that established trade centers guard against complacency. All such centers must do everything possible to facilitate the handling of foreign trade.

FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES' ROLE

Among the legal formalities, compliance with which is necessary in carrying on foreign trade in the United States, are the customs regulations. Much of the merchandise that will figure in international air cargo in the future will either not be ready for or intended to enter domestic distribution channels. Foreign-trade zones and customs bonded warehouses are both designed to facilitate foreign commerce in these two categories of goods.

The basic difference between these two facilities is that foreign-trade zones are segregated terminal areas designed to minimize formalities and expense incident to the landing and holding of foreign merchandise, while, ordinarily, only a section of a commercial warehouse is set aside for customs-bonded purposes. Further, foreign goods may remain indefinitely in a foreign-trade zone, but when brought into customs territory such goods are subject to all tariff laws affecting imports. Foreign merchandise in a foreign-trade zone is not under customs control and occupies the same status as if it were still outside the territory of the United States.

Bonded warehouses operate under the tariff laws which define their functions and place their administration directly under customs authorities. Only foreign dutiable merchandise that has been entered for warehousing can be stored in a bonded warehouse where it may remain only for a period of 3 years after which the duties must be paid or the goods reexported.

Further, under the laws and customs regulations governing the bonded-warehouse system, importers and prospective buyers are permitted to examine, sample and, for safety or preservation only, repack or transfer merchandise in a bonded warehouse. The examination and sampling must be done under the supervision of the storekeeper, and after an application on Customs Form 3499 has been approved by the collector. Samples may be taken out of bonded warehouse after making an entry at the customhouse and upon the payment of proper duties. On certain commodities such as liquors, samples may be taken out and appropriate duties collected when the remainder of the package or lot is later withdrawn. Examination and sampling are restricted to regular working hours.

SIGNIFICANT ADVANTAGES

On the other hand, under the foreign-trade zone system an importer may take a prospective customer or group of customers into the zone for examination and inspection of his merchandise at any time without the supervision of a storekeeper. The importer may even arrange an auction of his wares at the zone, as illustrated by the auctions held at the Tobacco Frascati at the New York zone. Bona fide customers, upon proper identification, may enter the zone unaccompanied and be directed to the importer's place of business provided someone is there to receive them. Examination and sampling of merchandise in a foreign-trade zone is done under the freedom of customary trade practices, such as in the Tobacco Frascati's specially lighted rooms for the sampling and inspection of East Indian tobacco.

How can these privileges available in a foreign-trade zone be of aid to commerce in air cargo?

FUR-TRADE POSSIBILITIES

A glance at the accompanying map immediately suggests the commercial potentialities of the far northern centers. And, while it is to be hoped that established commercial centers will not be too adversely affected, the possibility of shifts must not be ignored, nor should the loss of important commercial enterprise to other countries, for want of vision and understanding on the part of established interests, be permitted.

For example, with the development of air cargo it is quite possible that the world fur trade will shift or be forced to migrate from its presently established centers to other points or a single more geographically favored market. While established interests in the United States might reasonably try, through offering necessary facilities, to attract this world trade, they should understand that, even for those interests themselves, a shift to a United States center such as Nome or Fairbanks, Alaska, would be vastly preferable to the location of the trade at an equally favored foreign center.

And this very example is by no means fantastic. Consider the fact that not only most of the present fur-producing areas of the world but also vast, heretofore untouched, areas have no established surface carriers. Until today this merchandise reached established carriers and the world markets only by way of the most primitive forms of transport—the dog sledge and the human pack. With the development of air cargo, planes will land on frozen tundras and forest-bound lakes and from these areas they will bring the furs to a center where without customs duties or excessive surcharges the pelts may be shown and where auctions may be held, where buyers from the world over may gather to examine and buy.

Think of Fairbanks, or Nome, Alaska, as such a market, with not only all of Alaska, but all of Canada, all of continental United States, all of northern Asia, including Siberia, Manchuria, Tibet, and other regions, and all of northern Europe, as its hinterland. Here, in a foreign-trade zone, the pelt of the Russian sable, the Canadian beaver, or the Alaskan seal could be shown and auctioned; here English, Russian, German, Canadian, Argentine, Australian, South African, and American buyers, buyers from every consuming market of the world, could gather and bid, and United States customs duty would be paid only on those pelts purchased for United States consumption. Moreover, the planes bringing the pelts from the trappers would carry foods and manufactures to these potential consumers, open-

ing new markets and opportunities for American enterprise.

Another occasion where foreign-trade zones will serve international air transport concerns the transfer of in-transit cargo from one type of carrier to another. For instance, from plane to ocean vessel and vice versa. These zones will provide customs-free areas where bulk cargoes can be broken, thus allowing air cargo to be repacked economically to withstand specific transportation hazards.

HIGH IN HOPE AND WORK

And these are but a few among a myriad of possible examples. As was previously stated, the determinants of the harbor of tomorrow will be the industry and economic importance of the region surrounding it. Dazzling as is the prospective future of certain northerly centers, the prospects of many inland United States cities as air-cargo foreign-trade centers is incomparably brighter.

In considering such a commercial theme as this, one feels that we should all keep steadily in mind the words of Daniel Hudson Burnham: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us."

Bless 'Em All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Bless 'Em All, a tribute to its ballplayers in the armed forces, was sung by the entire audience at the dinner of the New York chapter of the Baseball Writers' Association of America, held in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Sunday evening, February 6, 1944. It is a splendid tribute to its baseball heroes.

BLESS 'EM ALL[1]

We're warm and well fed and we're havin' a time,
We've done it all before;
Fun and good spirits are seldom a crime,
You can't ask for anything more;
But now give a thought to the hope of the world;
Kids who in battle may fall;
Lift voices and prayers for stout-hearted players
Who honor our game. Bless 'em all!

CHORUS

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
The players who answered the call;
Start with Mulcahy, the first to go in,
Yell, "Captain Greenberg!" and set up a din,
For we're singin' good luck to 'em all,
And pray they'll be back to play ball—
The Powells and Fellers, the Rowells and Kellers—
Unbutton your lips! Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
The humble, the short and the tall,
Arnovich, Mulligan, Pesky and Klein,
Reiser, Krakauskas and young Gantenbein;
Make your pray'rs echo out in the hall,
They'll need 'em with backs to the wall,
For Pytlaks, Sylvestris, the Dusaks, Majeskis,
Let's whoop it aloud! Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
Our homage they'll always enthrall—
Dickey, Bonura, Dejan, Posedel,
Gehringer, Lyons, McCoy and Blackwell,
Padgett, Schumacher, Marshall and Mize,
Di Maggios, Campbells and Fryes,
Sib Sisti and Graham, and Crespi and Nahem—
They're bringin' us fame. Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
Rizzuto, a hero one fall,
Beazley and Martin, now John Vander Meer,
Williams, and Wakefield, the kid of the year!
For they're saying' goodbye to us all,
And some of 'em beyond recall;
Just think of the futures, the shell shock and sutures,
And lost boyhood dreams! Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
Let's put our best stuff on the ball;
You had a tough break in losin' Gene Stack—
Our Jackie Singer will never be back;
It's good-bye to a few, but not all,
And some days the list will appall,
But don't pull the blunder of stoppin' to wonder,
Keep doin' your best. Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
Our boys who are winning the brawl;
Face 'em in darkness and ask your Divine:
"Safeguard his future; he's prolongin' mine!"
And then vow not to grumble or squall,
As into warm blankets you crawl;
Just liken your ease to his jungles and fleas, to
The horror he sees! Bless 'em all!

Bless 'em all! Bless 'em all!
Our heroes who used to play ball,
Lyin' in foxholes, in mud and the rain,
Fight for the right to play baseball again;
Oh, you can't let 'em down, not at all,
You'll play out the schedule till fall—
Status quo ipso facto, a goal to come back to
When victory's won! Bless 'em all!

[1] Meaning every player, official, and executive of organized baseball now serving his country.

Raymond Clapper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials on the passing of Raymond Clapper, who, in the words of the Washington Evening Star, "wrote for one of the largest audiences in America." His many readers will miss his keen and factual reporting, and his host of friends throughout the country and, indeed, throughout the world, will mourn his passing as a deep and personal loss.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of February 4, 1944]

RAYMOND CLAPPER

Raymond Clapper wrote for one of the largest audiences in America. He held that audience by the carefulness of his factual reporting and the earnest sincerity with which he expressed his honest opinions on current events. He influenced people's thinking, and his influence was good. For he was a clean and high-minded journalist, as self-respecting in his integrity of purpose as he was respectful of the public for whom he wrote. His death is a loss to his countrymen and a deeply personal sorrow to his friends.

The phrase that so often is heard among those who are left behind, a suggestion that Ray Clapper would have preferred to die as he did—hard at work on a great story, full of the old zest and excitement that no real reporter on the trail of news ever looses—passed the lips of many of his brethren in Washington yesterday, as the word spread. But there is inadequate comfort in the thought, for he met his death still short of the powers inherent in a brilliant mind, a balanced sense of ethical values and a noteworthy talent for straightforward expression. He had come far, but he would have gone further, and while the news of these dark days tends to accustom us to the repeated shock of tragedy, this one touches very close to home in those who value the things in newspaper work for which Ray Clapper stood. He found and filled a place in American public affairs that will not be readily filled again.

[From the Washington Post of February 4, 1944]

RAY CLAPPER

Ray Clapper went out at the top.

That he had to die at this time is heartsearing news. But American planes are plunging to earth every day in all parts of this flaming world. This one was carrying a soldier of the press, an ace of aces.

Ray Clapper was always a front-line reporter, in peace or in war.

He was in the front line in every battle for truth and justice in the past two decades. He was always the reporter, searching out the facts.

He served his apprenticeship in the enlisted ranks here in Washington. And he advanced by ability, honesty, and integrity alone. First, in his heart, was the dignity and the responsibility of his profession. He never forgot that his job was to tell America the facts so the people would know.

The Washington Post is proud that he started his career as a columnist on this newspaper. But even as a columnist Ray Clapper was always the great reporter. Let others pontificate. Ray depended on his legs, his eyes, his ears, his inquiring mind, in a never-ending, patient search for facts.

This war found him an admired, respected, successful captain in his profession. It would have been so easy for him to have concluded to rest on his laurels.

But not Clapper. He thought only of a reporter's duty. He saw Great Britain in its dark days; he soared over the Himalayas into Chungking; he flew over Rome on the first raid; he stood with the troops in Sicily. And destiny found him in the South Pacific, catching the spirit of the boys in the jungle, writing the finest copy of his career. He died a full general in the eyes of every newspaperman in America—at the top.

It is a cruel blow to family and friends.

But we know—as Ray knew facts—that his spirit cannot die. He stood for everything that was fine in Americanism, in journalism.

Somehow, in thinking of Ray Clapper, the recent story by Ernie Pyle of the death of a beloved American captain in Italy keeps coming to mind. Pyle told how the captain's men shyly paid rough tribute. They cursed reverently. They surreptitiously held his cold hand, straightened his collar, smoothed his coat; and silently dedicated themselves to fiercer opposition to oppression.

We believe that everywhere in our great country today, newspapermen are figuratively

straightening Ray Clapper's collar, cursing reverently; and dedicating themselves to carry on his fight—that the people may know and democratic America may not die.

[From the New World-Telegram of February 4, 1944]

RAY CLAPPER

From north Africa last July Raymond Clapper began a dispatch with this sentence:

"What appalls me about war is the unbelievable waste of life and effort and nature's riches."

To us, who were Ray Clapper's coworkers for so many years, who knew so well his warmth and decency, his unsparing search for truth, his tolerance of others' honest opinions, his intolerance of demagoguery, stupidity, and greed—to us, Ray's death in action brings home, more than anything else that has happened, the awful human waste of war. For he was not a man to be spared in a world so much in need of common sense, plain-language reporting, so much in need of statesmanlike journalism.

We think that—because we were so proud of Ray, so fond of him. But we know Ray wouldn't agree. He would write one of his famous dissenting opinions—keen and fair. For he didn't value his life over that of other and younger Americans. He asked only the reporter's privilege to share their privations and perils—asked only to be with them where, as he wrote in his dispatch published today—

"You live only minute by minute through the routine that carries you smoothly, as if drifting down a river, toward the day of battle."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 5, 1944]

HE HAD TO GO

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Ray Clapper's strong, clear Kansas mind and his good heart will be missed in Washington. Millions of people throughout America knew Clapper's voice on the radio and his writing in the newspapers.

In Washington, a generation of newspaper men and women who grew up with Ray Clapper knew him as a figure of the best that the newspaper career can offer.

The youngster who wants to know what kind of life he can lead in journalism may take a look at Clapper's for a guide.

Clapper was a relentless reporter, all his newspaper days.

The last time this writer saw him on the streets of Washington his shoulders were hunched forward and he was splitting the wind with his nose, on the way somewhere in a hurry.

Years and dignity showed in his weather-beaten face, but in his walk there was the eternal reporter—spring, bounce, and drive for the story.

He was the model of what we all would like to be in the business of the news, and as a man he was decent.

No wonder so many people loved and respected him.

Clapper's fundamental determination to do his duty, is best told in his own words as he set out for his last trip:

"Very frankly, I would rather go back to Europe for the big cross-channel show than be starting out into this somewhat neglected war in the God-forsaken wastes of the Pacific, which is being fought over islands that no American will ever want to see again.

"But some people in Washington feel that there is not sufficient awareness at home of how much our men are doing and in what a living hell they must sometimes do it.

"So somebody says why don't I go out and get a taste of it, and so here I go, dragging these aging bones, when it would be much nicer to be in London living at the Savoy or the Dorchester and having a quiet, luxurious week end occasionally with the Tony Biddles in the country."

He knew where the untold story of the war is hiding and his dispatches were unfolding it when he plunged to death in a fighting airplane.

I have been reading over some of the tributes paid Clapper by the great in public life who knew him and appreciated his worth.

The sum of them all, it seems to me, was stated by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army:

"I have been shocked and distressed. During the past 4 years I had come to feel a sincere friendship for him and great respect for his integrity.

"He had seen much of the war on many fronts where he displayed the courage and adventurous spirit of a true soldier."

That he did. His very last dispatches came from an aircraft carrier somewhere en route to the battle now raging around the Marshall Islands.

Of all the columns Clapper ever wrote, none had more poignancy than that of January 26, dated "Somewhere in New Guinea," in which his reporter's sensitiveness to surroundings developed the following:

"During our night mission I talked with some of the crew, and discovered a strong religious tendency among them. Ensign T. J. Lovvorn, Stamford, Tex., told about being attacked December 27 by 25 or 30 Jap dive-bombers. The PT's shot down 4 of them. We suffered 4 wounded, but all the PT's got back. One had 59 strafing holes, but no one aboard her was hurt.

" 'That makes you believe in God,' said Lovvorn.

"Others, who never attended church at home, go to services here. A regular Navy man, long in the service, said:

" 'Only the hand of Almighty God saves us sometimes.'

"The same thing was said in almost identical words when I saw Lieut. Gen. Walter Krueger, commanding the Sixth Army. Krueger was born in Germany. He rose from buck private to senior lieutenant general. He has commanded everything from a rookie squad to an army. His men say he is a precisionist, a strict soldier.

"General Krueger said you can have the most perfect organization, your supplies and everything else can be ready, and you can have an advantage over the enemy in everything, but still the time comes when you have to fight, and that is the test. He said sometimes he knows Almighty God has laid his protecting hand over his men and brought them through.

"Almost every individual has some little religious charm or other good-luck token. Many wear a little image of Saint Christopher, the patron saint of travelers. Often these are gifts. One man, a non-Catholic, wears one given him by his wife, who is a Catholic.

"I'm not a religious man, but I find myself frequently taking out a tiny brown bear which my daughter gave me as I was leaving last year for the European theater. Over here seven war correspondents have been killed, mostly in the last few months, and I never get in a plane any more without checking in with the little brown bear."

Seven newspapermen dead in the South Pacific alone—now make it read "eight."

Sometimes, as Ray Clapper reported, the hand of God stretches out to save a man from his fate.

Sometimes, God holds His hand—and then the man goes forth to find out what else there is to the story of life.

For a newspaperman or any other, there could have been no nobler death than Clapper's.

And that little brown bear—surely it's going on with him in his further adventures.

Food Subsidies—A Pot of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by F. A. Pearson and W. I. Myers:

FOOD SUBSIDIES—A POT OF GOLD—DO NOT SOLVE ECONOMIC INEQUITIES BUT CREATE MORE AND ARE DIRECTLY INFLATIONARY

(By F. A. Pearson and W. I. Myers)

Food subsidies are economic, social, and political problems; they are highly controversial and produce plenty of heat in our frozen economy. Food subsidies affect the purchasing power of everyone, but in different ways and by widely divergent amounts.

Subsidies are not new. During the early thirties the Nation used subsidies, in the form of payments for restricting production, to raise prices at a time when practically every other force, national and world-wide, was driving prices down. Now the Nation contemplates using subsidies to keep prices down at a time when the major forces in the United States and in the world are forcing prices upward. Subsidies did not overcome deflation during the early thirties and will prove unsuccessful in preventing inflation during the early forties. The power of the Government's price-raising activities of the thirties and the power of its present ceiling food prices and controls are greatly overrated. The power of the market on prices for food then was and now is greatly underrated. It is almost as difficult for the uninformed to become conscious of that power as it is to explain it or to control it. The Nation had better weigh carefully the end it hopes to attain and the methods of attaining the objective before it attempts to check the rising trend of prices.

There are several important arguments for food subsidies: To stimulate production, to protect the consumer, to eliminate inequities, and to prevent general inflation.

PRODUCERS

There is little question but that subsidies would stimulate production of the this or that food, but whether the total supply would be materially augmented is a question. The only important justifications of subsidies to food producers is to shift production or to get food that otherwise would not be produced. At present prices most farmers are operating near capacity and the problem is to subsidize those who could expand production still further. To locate these particular producers and determine the exact amount of subsidies required would be expensive and time consuming.

It has been stated that subsidizing high-cost copper producers has saved $28 for every dollar the Government has spent. In the absence of convincing evidence the magnitude of this saving may be questioned. But even if true for copper, it does not follow that such subsidies could be used in agriculture. It is one problem to find the high-cost producers among the small number of copper mines, but it is quite another problem to find the high- and low-cost operators among the millions of food producers, food processors, and food distributors. Agriculture has a wide range of costs and it would be difficult to determine costs for these millions of producers. Presumably, then, the subsidies must be scattered about

among the high-cost and low-cost producers on the basis of production. Most of the benefactions fall into the hands of low-cost producers who produce the bulk of the food and are already operating near capacity, insofar as this is true, the subsidies are a benefaction and ineffective for the purposes intended.

CONSUMERS

Although many persons favor subsidies because they think they will increase production, the vast majority favor them because they help hold down consumer food prices. Leaders of labor and other consumer groups sponsor subsidies on the assumption that they will keep down food prices and thereby maintain or increase the purchasing power of the incomes of the groups they represent. Since the cost of living and weekly earnings have risen about 25 percent and 75 percent, respectively, from August 1939, to October 1943, the organized laborer's case has lost some of its force. The interest in subsidies, however, has not waned. The white-collar workers have not had commensurate increases and have become the forgotten men that should be brought under the protective wing of the Government. How to get them there and protect them is of course a conundrum. By the use of subsidies the Government could temporarily depress the food prices for the white-collar consumers and thereby could increase temporarily their purchasing power. While the Government was subsidizing white-collar worker's food, it would also be subsidizing many organized laborers who do not need assistance. Therefore, the Government would be pouring additional purchasing power on the "just and unjust." It would pass into the hands of a few that need it and many who do not. Subsidized purchasing power in the hands of those who do not need it is a price-raising force and affords little protection to that part of the so-called white-collar group who really need it. If equality were to be attained, it would also be necessary to distinguish between those who need it and those who want it. Since everyone wants more income, many persons erroneously conclude they need it. There is a much greater difference between those that need it and those that want it than is generally realized.

INEQUITIES

Wartime subsidies are one of the defensive weapons used in the retreat of a regimented price economy. The first step was to attack with general price-fixing orders. Since these proved ineffective because they created many inequities, the strategy was shifted from attack to defense. The first defense weapon was rationing, which in turn was only partially effective because it did not eliminate previous inequities and in fact produced still more. To hold the retreating line, subsidies were called for. The demand for subsidies was an admission that low ceiling prices impeded the production of this or that commodity and had not protected the consumer nor eliminated inequities as it was assumed they would.

Where subsidies fail to hold the weakening line, there is no new surprise weapon of defense. Therefore, it is necessary to use more and more subsidies. This was well illustrated by Government legislation and W. L. B. administration which subsidized union labor. It now appears to some that it is necessary to subsidize the white-collar classes to give them equality with other more favored groups.

There is another excellent illustration of the cumulative inequities and the necessity for more subsidies once the first step is taken. The Government subsidized hog production with high prices for pork and low prices for corn. To correct one of the errors, milk production was subsidized with cheap wheat and later with direct dollar payments. If continued, it will be necessary to subsidize the civilian consumers of wheat and corn to protect them against the subsidized cow which was subsidized to protect it against the subsidized hog. When the Nation starts to use subsidies, inequities follow and there is no end except more and more subsidies to correct the mounting inequities.

It has been pointed out that subsidies cannot hold the line unless accompanied by rigid price controls, inflexible wage controls, firm savings programs, and vigorous tax measures. If that Utopia were attained, there would be no inequities, and the necessity for subsidies would be nil. Since imperfect legislators and imperfect administrators have not given us rigid price and wage controls and have not siphoned off excess purchasing power by vigorous fiscal and savings programs, it follows that huge amounts of imperfect subsidies would be required in the attempt to eliminate the subsidized inequities for the 125,000,000 imperfect civilians.

INFLATION

Subsidies are no protection against inflation. In fact, subsidies are inflationary. They increase the purchasing power of consumers which is antisocial in times of war. If the increased purchasing power is spent, it causes immediate inflation through rising prices, and if not spent it will probably cause postponed inflation through the so-called inflationary gap. In addition, subsidies add to the Government's fiscal expenditures, which is also antisocial in time of war. The problem is to keep down the Government's nonwar expenditures and to reduce civilian purchasing power to the bone. Food subsidies, therefore, are not a war measure as some contend. They are just as much a political measure now as they were in the early thirties.

Subsidies and taxes are as opposite as the poles in their effect on inflation. Taxes reduce the purchasing power of consumers and transfer that purchasing power to the Government. Subsidies increase the purchasing power of the consumer and decrease the purchasing power of the Government. Shifting purchasing power to civilians from the Government results in immediate or delayed inflation, which is ultimately a tax on consumers. The bigger the wartime subsidies, the greater the inflationary force. Ultimately, despite rigid controls, inflation will operate as a tax to partially offset the maladjustments created by mounting subsidies. Wartime inflation is a flat tax and is no respecter of persons.

Food subsidies do not increase materially total food production; they do not syphon off excess consumer income; they do not eliminate the so-called inflationary gap; they do not decrease the Government debt; they do not eliminate inequities; and they do not prevent inflation. Subsidies are just as attractive and just as elusive as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Honor the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and expressive poem by the famous English satirical writer, poet, and member of the House of Commons, A. P. Herbert, published in the weekly Truth of January 28, entitled "Honor the Poles."

HONOR THE POLES

Honor the Poles. They fought the bully first.
When some said die, they shouted "Do your worst."
They fought him well, they gave him blow for blow,
While bigger men made treaties with the foe.
They yielded only to the front attack,
When someone snugly stabbed them in the back.
They fight him still; he cannot quench the flame:
There is no Quisling with a Polish name.
They fight beside us, and it seems too soon
To kill a comrade with a low cartoon.
A little "sensitive"? Are we surprised?
Four times partitioned, murdered, robbed, despised.
A hundred miles or so; why all the fuss?
Those hundred miles did not belong to us.
We can of course, be cooler, calmer men;
We're not partitioned every now and then.
No man has taken Oxford from us yet.
No man says, "Give us Scotland, and forget!"
But if he did, I fancy we should strike
The same proud poses that you so dislike.
Indeed, I wonder so severely tried,
Should we ally such patience with our pride?
It may be hard to help these loyal souls,
But let us not insult them. Honor the Poles!

This poem refers to the London Evening Standard cartoonist, David Low, who a few days previously drew a cartoon ridiculing the Polish attitude in the present crisis.

Mr. Herbert's poem will serve as an answer to the ungrateful remarks of Mr. Low and his insidious reflections upon the Poles.

It was the Polish warrior of the gallant, the daring R. A. F. to whom Mr. Churchill referred when he said after Dunkerque "Never did so many (meaning English) owe so much to so few."

Take the Gag Off Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., of January 26, 1944:

TAKE THE GAG OFF HIM

The House Lea committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission seems to be making a great deal more progress and producing an infinitely higher type of witness than it did under the former leadership of Georgia's Representative Cox. The other day it succeeded in getting J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, into the witness stand.

Director Hoover did not tell all he knows, for a presidential directive forbids him, he testified, discussing security matters, regardless of who it is does the inquiring. Mr. Hoover did, however, make one revelation which doesn't show the Federal Communications Commission in a light any too good.

On January 2, 1942, less than a month after Pearl Harbor, Attorney General Francis Biddle, of whose department the F. B. I. is a part, sent a letter to James L. Fly, chairman of F. C. C., requesting the Commission's files of merchant marine radio operators. In that letter Attorney General Biddle warned Fly that there was strong evidence indicating that information has been "surreptitiously transmitted to our enemy and that military attacks may have been furthered by these radio messages." This letter was read into the Lea committee's hearing record.

The request of the Attorney General represented a natural, logical security step. By Presidential directive of September 1939, the F. B. I. was specifically charged with the duty of controlling espionage, sabotage, and subversion. It needed the merchant marine radio operator fingerprint files to check against those in its own master files, that being one of the primary methods of identifying enemy agents.

The written request, it will be noted again, was made on January 2, 1942.

"We received our first fingerprints on June 2, of that year," Mr. Hoover testified, or more than 6 months after they were requested.

When one agency of government is guilty of such a flagrant lack of cooperation with the chief security agency of the same government, and especially at a period when the fortunes of this country and its allies were at such low ebb, it calls for convincing explanation, to say the least. Maybe Mr. Fly can explain that one with the same glibness he has explained other F. C. C. activities. It remains to be seen.

In reply to a question by a committee member, Mr. Hoover said he had "his own opinion" about the delay in getting the fingerprints. The people will have theirs, too, and there's not apt to be any great divergence between the two.

The F. B. I.'s director is to reappear before the committee for further examination. It would be a great and revealing thing if the White House would take the gag off him and let him lay a few facts on the line. If he hasn't got the facts, nobody has—and we think he has them.

Detroit as a Host Would Not Be Surpassed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present in the Mayflower Hotel at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee on January 22, 1944, and to hear four stalwarts from the Fourteenth Congressional District of Michigan, the district which I represent in the Congress of the United States, extend an invitation to the committee to hold its 1944 convention in Detroit.

Detroit, the City of the Straits, founded by Cadillac in 1701, and located on the banks of the river which bears its name, a name that is known in every land of the world where progress has found its way, would be unsurpassed as a host. Detroit has been called "the city where life is worth living." She has welcomed the folks from every clime, and truly the blood of the world flows in the veins of this thriving metropolis. The production from her war effort is first in rank of the cities of the world. Truly, she holds her head high in her defense of proper ideals.

How natural, therefore, was it for Mrs. Howell Van Auken, the Democratic national committeewoman from Michigan; Mr. Otto Wendell, Jr., of the teamsters' union; Mr. Robert Seibert, a production soldier flashing his factory badge; and Mr. Frank Schwartz, of the rank and file, to bring to the attention of the committee the invitation of the people of Detroit to hold the 1944 Democratic national convention in their city.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the addresses made on that occasion:

Mrs. CLARA D. VAN AUKEN. Mr. Chairman and national committeemen and women of the Democratic Party, I have been asked by a committee of Detroit people, where I reside, to present to you an invitation to come to Detroit for the national convention this year. As you know, Detroit has been named the "arsenal of democracy." Detroit is located in Wayne County. We have 700,000 war workers, almost all of them members of recognized labor unions. We have turned out 13 percent of the war production of the United States in Wayne County. We feel that, since this party is the "win the war" party, it would be very logical for you to come to the "arsenal of democracy" for your convention.

I will not say anything more except that Detroit is a better place to live in, Wayne County is a better place to live in, and Michigan is a better place to live in because of this administration and because of the Democratic Party. Our workers have freedom now which they never had before. They have a living wage. They have a decent place to live. Their children have education. The businessmen are better off. Our banks are better off. Everybody is better off because of this administration. So there would be a great deal of appreciation on the part of all the Michigan people if you could come to us for the convention. We can provide you with the comforts and with the entertainment. We have been assured of that by our tourist bureau.

I take great pleasure in introducing Mr. Otto Wendel, of the Teamster's Union, also one of our very active young Democrats. [Applause.]

Mr. OTTO E. WENDEL, Jr. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Democratic National Committee, ladies and gentlemen: A movement was started by the rank and file in Detroit and Wayne County, of the Fourteenth Congressional District of Michigan, Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT's district, spread through the entire State, through all other congressional districts, to bring, and to ask you people to hold, your convention in Detroit, for various reasons. The Fourteenth Congressional District presented a resolution to the mayor of the city of Detroit, which was joined in by all the teamsters locals in the State of Michigan affiliated with Joint Council No. 43 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The rank and file in the State of Michigan of the Democratic Party have gone out and by themselves, aided by people who have worked for the party, put themselves in a position to send this committee down here to pledge to you that with the money that the rank and file have already gotten together through a finance chairman, we can guarantee to underwrite all of the expenses of your convention. Our Federal judge, Frank Picard, who is vice chairman of the tourists and convention bureau, was asked to explain the facilities, which the tourists and convention bureau have assured the mayor of Detroit that Detroit could furnish to handle your convention.

The reason we feel that you should have your convention in our city is that labor is located and is compact in the city of Detroit. The working people of the city of Detroit and in other industrial cities have benefited through this administration, through the Democratic administration, and through the leadership of our Commander in Chief. It is to bring this convention to the people who go into the booths and vote, who have received the C. C. C., the F. H. A., for whom it has been made possible to buy homes with 10 percent down. These people want you to bring your convention to Detroit.

Those people back in Detroit have migrated from every section of the United States—from the South, from the East, from the West—to take their places as production soldiers in the lines of production. You delegates to the convention will be able to see people from your States at work as soldiers of production.

The Commander in Chief has designated that it would not be termed the New Deal Party in the future, but the Win the War Party. Detroit has been known as the "arsenal of democracy," manufacturing tools for victory, and it is the "win the war" city. In what better place could you hold your convention for the Win the War Party than in the win the war city?

As a member of this committee, I am able to guarantee that, through the rank and file, with the money that has already been turned in through our finance chairman, we will be able to meet and handle and underwrite the expenses of your convention.

I should like at this time to yield to Mr. Robert Seibert, a member of this committee, who will cover it in further detail. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERT SEIBERT. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am here as one of those production soldiers that the previous speaker has spoken about. I am here to offer to you, in behalf of that great mass of production soldiers in the win the war city, the official invitation, not of business, not of industry, not of labor, but of all the people of the State of Michigan to bring your convention and the birth of the Win the War Party to the win the war city, the city of Detroit.

The rank and file members of labor, the rank and file members of the Democratic Party, in the State of Michigan are sitting by today praying that the Democratic Party will break precedent by holding the first national convention of either political party in the city of Detroit. We feel that this plea and the work accomplished by this rank and file organization have revitalized the Democratic Party in the State of Michigan. Those of us in the rank and file feel and know that we can do the same as Chicago has asked that you consider here today. Not one single penny of the money that has been raised to this hour has come from industry or big business or labor. Every dollar has come from the rank and file supporters of the rank and file on this committee, because we went out and contacted the rank and file of the people.

If the Democratic Party wants to start the birth of the new name, the Win the War Party, there can be no other city that has the same complex as Detroit as a rank and file city. No other city in America, no other city in the world, has that complex. What greater momentum could be added to our great Commander in Chief's suggestion that we are the Win the War Party than to bring it to the production, who are today sending to every city of win-the-war workers, the soldiers of battlefront in the world the materials which they build with their hands and with their brains? We ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to bring to Michigan and Detroit the Democratic convention of 1944.

At this time I should like to yield the balance of the time to Mr. Frank Schwartz, a member of this committee.

Mr. FRANK SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the national committee from all over America, I cannot add much to what has been said by my colleagues of the rank and file of Michigan and especially of Detroit, but I will tell you that when you come to Detroit, you will actually see how industry is moving. It is one of the best known cities in the world. It is Detroit that is going to help in a large measure and has helped in a large measure in winning this war. We have every nationality in the world in Detroit. It is a melting pot. They do not know distinction there. They are ordinary, plain people.

As one of my colleagues stated, we have never had a convention in Detroit, even though we are so finely located geographically. Other cities have had it, but we have not. Would this not be the psychological time, my friends, to bring this convention to the city that a lot of people throughout America would like to visit?

There will not be as many delegates to this convention as there have been in the past on account of the facilities and railroads, and so forth, it being wartime, people being so busy, but there will be perhaps about half that number—although we are in a position to take care of as many as 25,000 people. We have the Olympia there that seats in the neighborhood of 18,000 people, centrally located in the middle of our city. We have all the other facilities, including boats on our beautiful lakes and our river, where we can accommodate a lot of people. We have railroads there out of the New York Central, and as a last resort, we could take care of it by Pullman trains. But that has been covered by our tourist and convention bureau chairman, who said that he could take care of the situation.

I speak to people from all over the Nation, and I believe, as one of my colleagues has said, that we have something like 700,000 to 900,000 workers in Detroit alone (that is including, of course, Wayne County), and we have something like 300,000 or 400,000 fine men and women from the South who are working up there and making a fine wage, thanks to our fine Democratic Party and our beloved President. They have that liberal touch out there. They are fine, ordinary, midwestern people.

From the political angle, let us be astute; let us use strategy. Michigan is normally a Republican State, but in the last 10 or 12 years we have had two Democratic Governors, and in the last national election we lost the national vote by just a few votes. By taking the national convention to Detroit, there is an opportunity from the psychologic effect it will have upon Michigan, to bring Michigan back to the Democratic field, not only for the Nation but for the State. That is important, my friends. It is more important than showing off some city. If you are looking at it from the Democratic standpoint, so that we may retain and carry on that fine type of government that the Democratic Party has given us and all of us, that liberal touch of democracy so that all people can have equal opportunities in this wonderful Nation of ours, and if you want to carry those 38 electoral votes of Michigan, which may be very important (and they are always important from a political standpoint), we bespeak you and beseech you, my friends, to give this very serious consideration in your vote.

Come to Detroit, and you will be welcomed like the sunshine on a cold day, and we will certainly appreciate it. We may say once that you have made history in bringing that convention to one of the finest, greatest cities in the world, our Detroit, and you will love it when you come there. Go along with us and put this thing over and let Detroit have it this time. From every standpoint it will be for our benefit and it will be for the benefit of all the people of this Nation. Thank you. [Applause.]

Polish Professors in America About Poland and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article appearing in the Polish Falcon, published in Pittsburgh, Pa., January 27, 1944.

One of the most disturbing situations confronting the statesmen of the Allied cause in the post-war period is what disposition will be made of the Polish question.

Down through the centuries Poland has suffered unmercifully as the result of invading hordes from all sides of the Polish Nation. This country from time to time has been partitioned off and divided by these conquering forces. When Poland was reconstructed as a free nation after World War No. 1, it was believed that, insofar as the freedom of her people was concerned, her problems had been solved.

It is hoped that the Allied statesmen who are sworn to uphold the four freedoms enunciated in the Atlantic Charter will see to it at the peace table that Poland will not suffer again from a partition that will separate its people from the nation they love, and deprive them of the rights of a sovereign nation to govern themselves as a free people.

POLISH PROFESSORS IN AMERICA ABOUT POLAND AND RUSSIA

The American Press reported recently of a new Polish organization, the Kosciuszko League, founded in Detroit with the purpose of spreading among the Polish population the idea of an acquiescent attitude toward Soviet Russia. One of two principal speakers at the organizatory meeting was Dr. Oscar Lange, professor of political economy at the University of Chicago.

Dr. Oscar Lange emerged as an ardent follower of Russian claims to eastern Poland on April 29, 1943 (a few days after the rupture by the Soviets of diplomatic relations with Poland), publishing a provocative letter in the New York Herald Tribune, in which Poland's determination to maintain the integrity of her territory was called by him "national hysteria." His suggestions were identical with propositions from the Russian Foreign Office.

Dr. Lange's opinion is being given widest publicity as that of a Polish scholar and a former member of Kraków University, thus creating a false impression that he reflects the opinion of the Polish scholars. Therefore we, professors and lecturers of the Polish universities, declare that we take most vigorous exception to both his views and his tactics. It is an easy but by no means convincing method—simply to accuse people holding other opinions of being Fascists and reactionaries, in order to discredit them in public opinion. But we expect a more impartial and scholarly approach on the part of Dr. Lange, who as a lecturer had been associated for a short time with Kraków University.

This university had always represented the highest Polish spiritual values, and in the present war nearly all of its members had been deported to the Nazi concentration camps, where many died in consequence of inhuman treatment. We also expected more fairness on Professor Lange's part in dealing with the government of an Allied Nation of which he was a citizen until a short time ago.

We all are in favor of cooperation between an independent and democratic Poland and the Soviet Union, and we think that Poland gave ample proof of this being her desire. But to achieve such a cooperation the territorial claims of Soviet Russia must be withdrawn. The Polish-Russian frontier of 1921 had been a frontier of compromise and as such it had never been questioned by Russia. The Poles are the most numerous there, and except for the time of partitions there territories belonged to Poland for many centuries not only historically but yet culturally. Large cities in this territory, Lwów (which had never belonged to Russia) and Wilno, are inhabited by an overwhelming majority of pure Poles and are among the main centers of Polish culture. Many great leaders in Poland's history and a number of great poets came from eastern Poland.

Poland was first to fight against Nazi domination and has continued this struggle ever since with appalling sacrifices on the home front and abroad. Russia, it should be remembered, joined the United Nations only after being attacked by Germany and after 22 months of collaboration with the Nazis. It would be a great injustice and disaccord with international morality, should Poland be deprived of any part of her territory in favor of Russia. Political, historical, and cultural reasons speak against it as strongly as the moral principles for which we are fighting this war.

Dr. Henry Arctowski, Lwow University, Observatory of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Gustaw Bychowski, Warsaw University; Dr. Wladyslaw Gorzynski, Director, Central Meteorological Institute, Warsaw; Dr. Oscar Halecki, Warsaw University; Dr. Jerzy Kaulbersz, Krakow University, Wayne University; Dr. Andrzej Krzesinski, Krakow University, University of Montreal; Dr. Michal Laskowski, Warsaw Agricultural College, University of Arkansas; Dr. Gustaw A. Mokrzycki, Warsaw Institute of Technology, University of Montreal; Dr. Stanislaw Mrozowski, Warsaw University, Chicago University; Dr. Jozef Pawlikowski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal; Dr. Jan H. Rosen, Lwow Institute of Technology, Catholic University of America; Dr. Stanislaw Sniezko, Krakow University, University of Maine; Dr. Wojciech Swietoslawski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Mellon Institute for Industrial Research; Dr. Jozef Sulkowski, Poznan University; Dr. Boleslaw Szczeniowski, Warsaw Institute of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal; Dr. Aleksander Turyn, Warsaw University; Dr. Florian Znamiecki, Poznan University, University of Illinois.

Dr. Israel Schapiro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Murray Frank on the retiring chief of the Semitic Division of the Library of Congress, Dr. Israel Schapiro, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 6, 1944. Dr. Schapiro is now retiring after nearly 31 years of outstanding service, during which time he supervised the growth of the Semitic Division into the important cultural source it has become for modern students of theology, philosophy, history, natural sciences, archaeology, and other branches of learning:

DR. SCHAPIRO RETIRES AFTER 31 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE WITH THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

(By Murray Frank)

While Nazi Germany has been destroying and burning books and libraries in Europe, the United States has been collecting and replacing much of this cultural treasure for posterity and for civilization at large. Future historians will emphasize that deed as a great contribution.

The cultural pride of this Nation is the Library of Congress, here in Washington, which has succeeded in collecting and preserving many valuable manuscripts and books of European nations and peoples. Among the first to be burned by the Nazis were Jewish books and books written by Jews. But human thought cannot be eradicated merely by building bonfires in Berlin.

The fact is, many precious documents and books eventually found their way to this country and were deposited in the Library of Congress.

It was due chiefly to the efforts of Dr. Israel Schapiro, chief of the Semitic Division, that much of the cultural heritage of Jews has been preserved in the Library of Congress.

He has been with the Library for nearly 31 years—a period of service that has become one long, continuous accomplishment for American culture. Now, in his sixty-second year, he is about to close a significant and highly interesting chapter in his life. He is retiring this month.

STUDIED IN BERLIN

Born in Sejny, northwestern Russia, in 1882, Israel Schapiro attended Russian and private Hebrew schools. At 18, he came to the University of Berlin and later studied at the University of Strassburg, where at the age of 24 he received the degree of doctor of philosophy. In 1907 he went to Jerusalem as professor of Hebrew literature in the Teachers' Seminary.

Dr. Schapiro remained in Jerusalem for 3 years, during which time he perfected his knowledge of Arabic, Aramaic, Syriac, and related languages. He arrived in the United States in 1911 and served as co-editor of the Hebrew weekly Haderor (Liberty) until 1912 when he resigned to become chief of the Semitic division at the Library of Congress.

The Semitic division was started in 1912 chiefly through the efforts of the philanthropist Jacob H. Schiff. Mr. Schiff bought the famous 14,000-volume Deinard collection of Jewish learning and thought, which he presented to the Library of Congress as a gift to the American people. Six months later Congress created the Semitic division.

FORTY THOUSAND VOLUMES

Mr. Schiff stipulated that the Library should appoint "a specially qualified person, not a mere cataloguer but a real Hebrew scholar and bibliographer who would in his person as well as through the collection worthily represent Jewish scholarship on the staff of the Library of Congress."

The man selected to fill the position was Dr. Israel Schapiro, at the time only 30 years old.

The Hebraica alone now totals more than 40,000 volumes, including many incunabula and rare editions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Semitic division also has thousands of volumes in other Semitic languages.

Dr. Schapiro has written several learned works on Hebrew literature and numerous bibliographical studies in English and Hebrew. He possesses traditional learning and worldly education of a high caliber. In discussing the wholesale destruction of his coreligionists in Europe, Dr. Schapiro expressed to the writer the following thought:

"It was not political ideas which made possible the uninterrupted existence of the Jewish people for nearly 4,000 years, but our religious and cultural attainments and contributions to civilization. Continued cultural development of our people will mean inevitable survival after the present holocaust."

In addition to his duties at the Library, Dr. Schapiro was professor of Hebrew literature and history at George Washington University from 1916 to 1927. He has engaged in journalistic activities in five languages.

ENRICHED CULTURE

The Semitic division became, under Dr. Schapiro, a rich cultural source for modern students of theology, philosophy, history, natural sciences, archaeology, and other branches of learning. In recent days, due to the revival of religious persecution abroad, the Semitic division is constantly asked to provide pertient information for Congress, the Federal agencies, and others.

Consequently, while Nazi Germany was destroying culture, the Semitic division has proved by its continued growth that in a democracy the pen is mightier and more enduring than the sword.

This country will doubly appreciate the accomplishments of Dr. Schapiro. It will appreciate his zeal and untiring efforts in collecting the literary treasures and cultural heritage of an ancient people, and it will appreciate the fact that he was instrumental in enriching American culture and civilization.

Farmers Reject Subsidy Bribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a very recent meeting of the Rock County Farm Bureau Federation that organization objected strenuously to bribes of any kind, and unanimously resolved that all subsidies should be abolished. More than 550 members present at the meeting were in complete agreement on this subject.

It was pointed out that subsidies are inflationary to large groups of consumers which ultimately leads to inflationary spirals. The Government's practice of paying subsidies on milk was roundly condemned. Mr. Henry Wieland, president, asserted that the farmer today is a very prosperous individual and he needs no special assistance from the Government to produce. He criticized this form of subsidy as a bribe to keep the retail price of milk down.

Another resolution, called the creed of the American farmer, stated:

> We will not strike, we will not slow up production, we will not follow selfish, grasping power-loving leaders. As farmers we will continue to support only programs and policies based on the welfare of the Nation and its people.

Mr. Speaker what a relief it is to have real American farmers speak out in this fashion. They ask for nothing except the right to produce as best they can. They want no money "hand-outs;" they only want fair prices in the market places. The loyal and patriotic farmer can and will produce without Government interference. We have his promise Mr. Speaker, that the welfare of his country is foremost and we can rely on it.

The Rock County Farm Bureau Federation is entitled to our commendation, Mr. Speaker, for its frank and fearless statement. Under this kind of leadership, the American way of life is secure.

The Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 4, 1944

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, the House has had under consideration for several days two measures to provide voting facilities for our armed forces.

One of the bills, the so-called State rights bill, was reported by the committee, and the other was known as the Worley Federal bill, which conformed to the Lucas-Green bill in the Senate. I voted for the Federal bill, which was defeated by a record vote of 168 for, and 224 against, on a motion to recommit and substitute it for the committee bill. Rather than oppose any measure to provide voting facilities for our armed forces, I voted for passage of the State rights bill, the only bill then left to be considered by the House.

The Federal ballot substitute would have made it possible for our servicemen and servicewomen to receive a much more simplified ballot, with much less time and expense to the Army and Navy in getting the ballots to and from our armed forces overseas, and with greater assurance that all the members of the armed forces would be reached.

Foremost in my thought is the winning of the war and having our boys returned home as quickly and in as

nearly perfect condition as possible. However, while they are in the service of their country, they must not be deprived of the right to have a voice in their Government, and my desire is that they may be permitted to vote in our elections by as direct and simplified a method as possible.

I sincerely trust that the conferees of the House and the Senate will so modify the legislation as to write into the bill provisions for a Federal ballot, or some more simplified method of voting than that provided in the State rights bill.

I also trust that when the members of the Maryland Legislature are called into session to amend the Maryland State law to conform to the Federal law, they will have in mind continuation of the legislation for some time after the war ends, in order to provide voting facilities for those servicemen and servicewomen who may be retained in the armed forces in the States or overseas, as complete mustering-out of our armed forces will, in all probability, not be accomplished for some time after the end of the war.

Whence These Powers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, last week the House, by a substantial majority, passed the Rankin-Eastland bill to facilitate, so far as possible under the Constitution and the laws of the States, the voting by our members of the armed forces. There is considerable agitation in the country over this question. There are two schools of thought. The proponents of one of these contend that the right of franchise of these boys absent from their respective homes is so paramount that they should be permitted to cast their votes under a Federal ballot, notwithstanding certain fundamental, constitutional provisions. The opponents of that view believe that the right to exercise the franchise is so sacred that it must be safeguarded from even this expediency. But paramount over everything else is the fact that the Congress does not have the right to override the Constitution.

We have always believed that a grateful American people desire to see that our boys who are making the sacrifices in this war should have preferred treatment at the hands of the American people, including the right of franchise. We desire to facilitate their opportunity to vote as much as is constitutionally possible. But we also believe that it is the politicians and not the soldiers who are so much exercised about this matter. Our thought is that if the Congress were to consult the soldiers about what they desire above everything else, the answer would be to stop these strikes and unwarranted interferences with our war production on the home front and thus hasten the end of the war and the happy day when they may return to their homes.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial written by the Honorable George P. Money, editor of the Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald, and himself the son of a former United States Senator from Mississippi. The editorial follows:

WHENCE THESE POWERS?

It seems that proponents of the bill pending in Congress to conceive, consider, draw up, and pass a Federal law to allow absent soldiers to vote, are saying that Congress has the power to confer the right to vote. That is something new, and while nobody wants deliberately to deprive of a vote any soldier, qualified under the law of his State to vote, it is a strange sight to see men representing their States make a law (vote for a law) which they could not make in their own States. Representatives cannot confer constitutional jurisdiction on Congress. It is not a matter of what they "want" to do, nor how "right and just" it may appear. Who made the National Government? Who made it a government of limited powers? Who made the Constitution? Who or what made power can amend it?

The opponents of the bill are concerned about and believe in the rights, power, and sovereignty of the States. Apparently the advocates of the bill—some, at least—are interested only in the vote for President and care not a whit about the State offices, or whether a soldier is qualified under the law of his parent State, or not. All that matters is to get the soldiers' vote, though if some of those soldiers were now in their States they would not be qualified to vote at all.

There is another motive, but we shall not discuss it, for it is highly sectional—and you know the President several times has said that there should be no politics during the war. Remember?

Whence come these franchise powers of Congress?

A vastly important structural, fundamental principle is involved here—but some shut their eyes to it.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF, on February 5, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, it is with pleasure and satisfaction that I return to the air and am able once more to address you in this manner. I am especially grateful to my charming sponsors; the officers and members of the Hall Furlough Clubs, for making this time available to me.

I want to take this occasion to assure them and the thousands of wives, parents, and relatives of the fighting heroes of the Southern Tier, that I will continue to the best of my ability to look after their welfare in the Nation's Capital. In these broadcasts, I will endeavor each week to bring to you folks back home as accurate a picture as possible of the fast-moving Washington scenes.

A few days ago, the country heard with profound shock the amazing stories of Japanese atrocities. All over America, our people received this news with extreme horror.

I have this to say of such abominable treatment of our beloved sons. I have the greatest faith that a just God will mete out swift punishment to those Jap barbarians as did the Lord of Israel to the enemies of His people.

"Vengeance is mine,' saith the Lord."

At this moment, there are being printed in pamphlet form accurate accounts of Japanese outrages upon our captured soldiers in the Philippines. If any of you listeners would like copies of this complete account of the atrocities, write me in Washington and I will be glad to send them to you as soon as they are ready.

Not long ago, spurred to action by letters from both soldiers and civilians I introduced in the House the following resolution:

Whereas the men and women in our armed forces are being charged unreasonably high rates for food on railroad trains while traveling; and

Whereas these patriotic soldiers, sailors, and marines cannot afford to pay high prices for their meals; and

Whereas special consideration should be made by the railroads for these men and women who are sacrificing so much for their country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress request the railroads of our Nation to lower food rates in their dining cars to service men and women and reestablish these existing rates at popular restaurant prices.

The mail from home is pouring into my Washington office. I am frank to say I cannot answer it as fast as it comes in. This does not mean I don't welcome your letters. I am always glad to hear from you. I am always glad to serve you especially if you request information about your boys or want to obtain your allotments. Remember, I like to have your reactions because they are helpful to me in these troublous days.

According to my information, the Hall Furlough Clubs are growing. This is pleasing to me. I hope these clubs will be formed in every city ward and district in Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott. Their efforts and objectives are most commendable. We should have these clubs on the home front to boost morale.

Members of the Hall Furlough Clubs, I salute you.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond A. Fitzgerald, of Cambridge, Mass.:

The complete Massachusetts delegation in Congress should strenuously oppose the Green-Lucas bill now before Congress or any similar bill which seeks to erect a Federal voting structure in plain contravention of the United States Constitution, as well as certain State constitutions, and which at best permits Mr. Soldier to vote only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.

However, they should be prepared with an immediate plan which is feasible, simple, constitutional, and which gives Mr. Soldier a

right to exercise his complete franchise from President down to keeper of the pound.

The FitzGerald plan (if you will) proposes voting by proxy, which Massachusetts already permits in the case of blindness or other physical disability, pursuant to general laws, chapter 54, section 79, which provides that anyone by reason of "blindness or other physical disability, he is unable to prepare his ballot or register his vote upon a voting machine shall be assisted in such marking or registering by any qualified voter whom he may designate," an absolutely clear-cut example of voting by proxy because it is perfectly obvious that the blind man does not mark his ballot nor does he operate the voting machine (same for physical disability).

It is perfectly clear from the above that Massachusetts permits someone other than the voter to actually mark the ballot or operate the voting machine and this, mind you, with the imprimatur of the legislature through the general laws, which is tantamount to saying that such a legislative mandate does no violence to the Massachusetts Constitution. No doubt each of the 47 other States has similar provisions for the blind and physically disabled.

It follows: The general court in 5 minutes can expand the above general laws, chapter 54, section 79, after the words "blindness or other physical disability" by the addition of the words "absent by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States"; and by adding at the end of said section the words, "*Provided, however,* That the person designated by a voter who is absent by reason of service in the armed forces shall present an approved proxy signed by said absent voter to the election officer at the voting precinct in which the absentee soldier is registered on election day."

The above is so simple, direct, feasible, possible, logical, and constitutional that objections, in my opinion, can only be the same which were shot at the Ruml plan by Morgenthau and others:

1. The objectors did not originate the plan;

2. Its sheer simplicity baffles certain persons who will believe that it lacks merit because of the absence of complicated technicalities.

The United States Constitution provides specifically that the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress are to be elected by the people of the several States and, of course, it is perfectly clear that the numerous State officers from Governor down are chosen by the votes of the people of the several States.

When the President requests and urges Members of Congress to "stand up and be counted" on a bill such as the Green-Lucas bill, he cannot really believe that their refusal indicates indifference to the soldiers' chances of voting. It is much more likely that their refusal is motivated by constitutional qualms and the knowledge that Mr. Soldier can exercise his complete franchise if he (Mr. President) and they (Congress) will get down to business and do the right thing. It may well be that Members of Congress believe that if this audacious usurpation is permitted, thereby robbing the States and the voters therein (including the soldiers) of their constitutional right to have their votes cast for all candidates we may see the day (and not far distant) that the States may be forced to stage a terrific battle to recover the rights secured by our founding fathers when they adopted the United States Constitution.

Therefore, I suggest that if the President and Congress are in dead earnest in their desire that Mr. Soldier exercises his complete right next November, they can do so by immediately preparing, printing, and distributing 11,000,000 official proxies (small size for insertion in ordinary envelopes) to the 64 fighting fronts and camps. Immediately thereafter, the 48 State legislatures could meet to validate the use of said proxies.

Mr. Soldier can then obtain a proxy from his commanding officer on application by signing his name and correct voting address thereon in the presence of the commanding officer who then stamps or countersigns the same. Mr. Soldier then mails the same to his father, mother, wife, brother, sister, or trusted friend at home. Certainly he can depend that such proxy will be voted by them as accurately and as honestly as in the case of the blind man who, in many cases, enlists the aid of an unknown precinct officer.

In the extraordinary case that the soldier has no one to delegate back home, he may state that he wishes the actual ballot and provision can be made for the same, as now contemplated in the pending bills. However, such cases may not amount to 1 or 2 percent and, in any event, Mr. Soldier can exercise his complete franchise by his election to (1) use the proxy; or, (2) he may receive the actual ballot.

The above plan obviates the necessity of any change of voting dates—the primaries and elections in the 48 States are conducted as usual—the machinery is simple—there is no extra burden on the mails—there is no tampering with the Constitution—there is no erection of a brand new Federal voting structure or Federal ballot commission—and, most important, Mr. Soldier can vote himself in full or have his complete vote cast by the holder of the proxy in whom he has implicit trust.

Finally, if the powers in Washington insist upon jamming through improper legislation, I believe that the State of Massachusetts should announce to the rest of the country, "You do as you please. We in Massachusetts have the legislative machinery, backed by the Constitution, to provide soldier votes by proxy. We are going to do just that if we have to distribute our proxies to the fighting fronts. If you insist on forcing an improper Federal structure, which, at best, denies Mr. Soldier a tremendous portion of his voting right, we intend to conduct our election, as we always have, under our constitution and our general laws."

Mr. Christopher I. FitzGerald, of Milton, Mass., collaborated and concurs with me on the above; hence, the title "FitzGerald Plan."

Peace Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me at Temple Rodelph-Sholem, New York City, February 6, 1944:

When the war drum beats, the Bill of Rights somewhat retreats. Granting the necessity, most of us agree that it is essential that public opinion remain free and untrammeled, but only to whatever degree may be compatible with national safety. No patriotic American would be willing to give aid and comfort to our enemies, directly or indirectly. Freedom of expression, in press and book, from pulpit and platform, over the radio, in the theater and the cinema—is ever the vanguard of freedom—even during war. The torch of this freedom may not burn so brightly during the perilous days of war, but burn it must. It is our duty to maintain the flame at all times. There should be no blinders upon our eyes, no plugs in our ears. Recognizing our rights, we must likewise though realize that in times of crisis and decision, such rights carry grave responsibilities. Thomas Paine has said, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

The late Justice Holmes, an ardent advocate of individual rights, has counseled that no one, in the name of free speech, should be entitled to cry, "Fire! Fire!" in a crowded auditorium. No one should be permitted the liberty of creating such panic, with its attendant death and destruction.

This freedom of speech, which we so zealously guard, has presented us with a very serious problem. We are now confronted with a group of self-appointed so-called peace arbitrators.

Permit me the liberty of a confession. At the risk of being considered calloused and impatient, I must admit that I find it very difficult, at times, to suffer fools gladly. I am infuriated by the irresponsible muddling of the "Peace Now" movement.

These shoddy remnants of the lunatic fringe are seeking to lead the world into an abyss of anarchy and self-destruction. They apparently would not shudder if we were sucked into the whirlpool of political and moral suicide. They seem utterly devoid of any semblance of historical perspective. Their's is a revival of medieval fanaticism. Their outrageous plans are well laid. These backstairs busybodies have come around to the front door. What lies behind their maneuvers?

If fools, bunglers, and lunatics were the only adherents of peace now, I would not be too greatly perturbed.

But there are cunning and skillful leaders that make the movement so dangerous. Meanwhile, Goebbels and Goering laugh like Cheshire cats.

They have selected as their chairman and chief strategist Dr. George W. Hartmann, visiting professor of Psychology at Harvard and a frequent candidate for public office on the Socialist ticket.

The managing executive is acknowledged to be one Bessie Simon, a former Government employee and Washington office manager of the supposedly defunct America First Committee. She is credited with wide social and political contacts.

Bundists, the America First alumni, the Coughlinites, isolationist public-office holders, the disgruntled and variegated crackpots, withering with hate of their fellow man, have sought to hop on the band wagon of "peace now." Many of the names can be found in Under Cover. Collectively, they are anti-Roosevelt—but to excess. Reports indicate that they are hopeful of backing a Republican Presidential candidate, if they cannot gain enough strength to put a ticket of their own in the field. They have sought the aid of influential men and women. A veritable network of agents has been established by them in most of the principal cities in the country. The prospects have been canvassed and the program determined. Large numbers of Federal employees were classified as to their interest and the nature of their possible contribution. The time has come when our camplacency must end. A righteous indignation demands acts of repression and suppression against these sappers and defilers of our democracy.

They not only lack restraint but even discrimination. There is evidence of a communication to a Nazi held on Ellis Island. Same was intercepted and read, in part, as follows: "We do not know how long you will be in Ellis Island or whether you are free to come and go from there, but if you are free, we should like to have you come to our meeting on December 30."

In a spell-binding speech at Carnegie Hall last December 30, Hartmann stated: "The 'peace now' movement holds that the Germans and Japanese are no better but also

no worse than the British and the Americans." "One of our main jobs is to show Americans that they can have either victory or peace—they cannot have both." "We are here to create doubt in the minds of those who would keep on fighting." "To win the war is the surest way to lose the peace." These words border upon sedition, if not on worse.

Their audacity is so monstrous, they would hang democracy on a gibbet. They rear defiantly in these historical moments of decision We must not be deceived. These people are not working for peace. They would surrender this country to a triumph of Nazism and Fascism in all their multifarious forms.

Have they forgotten that Mein Kampf, that devil's blue print for the world of tomorrow, has, by government fiat, supplanted the Bible in the home of every German today? That the Star of David has been relegated to a symbol of public degradation and opprobium? That the distortions of the swastika have replaced the rugged simplicity of the cross? Yes; these Hartmanns and Simons—agents provocateurs—would have us bend knee to the responsible jackal.

Oliver Wendell Holmes frequently indulged his penchant for paradox and he intended to amuse us with this one. "Give us the luxuries of life and we will dispense with the necessities," said he. However, an egg is still an egg. "Peace Now" would have us exchange the soft circumstance of a cessation of hostilities for the bedrock of fundamental freedoms.

Now, the immediate problem is—what rein shall we give these malefactors? How far shall we let them abuse freedom of speech, freedom of press. and the right of peaceful assemblage?

They demand these liberties. When we check-rein their excesses, they yell like stuck pigs. They invoke the very freedom they would destroy.

One is reminded of the old caution—"They will enlarge this hole in the wall of liberty until they have brought the whole structure down, crashing to the earth, and the army of the despot will march in through the breach and storm the last citadel of liberty."

From their activities to date, one is led to the conclusion that "Peace Now" seeks to serve as a magnet for mobs. There is a rational goal—which they would irrationally achieve.

Fortunately, experience has taught us the lack of wisdom predominating in these dissident groups. They would have us believe the salt of the earth no longer gives taste to the substance with which it is mixed.

With intense and misplaced emphasis, they would persuade us that they are elaborately lucid. However, we know that conclusions are true only if premises are true. They have blundered in their deductions. But America will not be deceived. America must turn out these rascals. "Peace Now" is "Defeat Now."

There is no compromise between right and wrong. Either we are right or Hitler is. A negotiated peace now involves compromise. "Peace Now" means compromise. The lines are clearly drawn. This is a war between fascism and democracy. Democracy is government by reason and persuasion. Fascism is the very antithesis. It is government by force. If democracy has outlived its usefulness, then slavery is the only alternative. Any compromise between the two ideologies would produce some bastard form of government, and to many of us unthinkable, if not unpredictable. Yet "Peace Now" means just that. This is not only unwise; it is dangerous. It is tragic.

"Peace Now" means acceptance in some form of Hitler's racial theory, at least in part. Hitler has announced that all Germans, Nordics, and Aryans are the herrenvolk (masters) and all others the sklavenvolk (slaves). Can anyone in his right mind, with our tradition, accept such a notion? Can we picture ourselves even as part slave to a part German or part Nordic or part Aryan master?

This agument may seem superficial, yet if we carefully analyze the "Peace Now" movement, it adds up to meeting Hitler at least halfway.

Then we run our eye down the long list of differences between us—social, political, religious, racial, military, economic. If we are to have Peace Now, we must resolve them. What principles and theories on Hitler's list must we accept and what reject? If there is to be no military victory, Peace Now to be successful must contain so much give and so much take. Shall we accept the Nazi's racial ideas and reject his religious tenets? Shall Hitler be permitted to remain dictator? Shall Himmler still pillage and plunder and graft with his Gestapo? Shall Goering continue to possess and enjoy the art treasures stolen out of Rome, Paris, and The Hague?

Peace Now means appeasement of the Reich and Fascists everywhere—a policy that has failed us so far wherever we tried it—in Japan, Vichy France. In common parlance, it would catch us with our hair down. Fascists are still in power in the Argentine, in Bolivia, notoriously in Spain. We have Victor Emmanuel and Badoglio in Italy. Otto von Hapsburg (who knows where) drooling in anticipation of a return to Austria. Carol of Romania does his daily dozen of political handsprings to distract us from our contemplation of his immediate past. We have not disposed of these papier mâché monarchs. In a negotiated peace, they would be the glamor boys of Europe. There would be plenty of empty thrones and a plethora of grasping aspirants. We might have no choice but to place Otto on some sort of Austro-Hungarian dais. Carol might be reinstated in the Romanian citadel. Don Juan might be rushed from seclusion in Austria to the Spanish throne, with El Caudillo attempting to act out the role of a modern Bismarck. Shall Hitler force us to allow these guttersnipes to drive a coach-and-six through statutes and rules of decency and honor?

Peace Now would have us cringe like cowards and tremble. It is raising the white flag of surrender. Such appeasement is always interpreted as fear of the one appeased. We would earn only disrespect and scorn for our pains. There is an old saying in the Far East, "Appease a rascal as you will, he was and is a rascal still."

This inner menace of reaction would have us think the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are the bunk. With the twists and turns of evasive falsehoods, they portray us as saps and dupes and that Roosevelt and the Congress have succumbed to war phobia. We are suckers to support the war any longer. Why pay any income tax? Let us stage a sit-down strike against Trading With the Enemy Act, the U. N. R. R. A., the Economic Warfare Administration. Let us debunk the O. P. A. and tear up our ration coupons. Let's deal in the black market by way of reprisal against the war mongers. We must do all in our power to increase the spiral of inflation, encourage strikes, sow discord, create panic, bring the Government crashing down on our heads. The strong man on horseback, the new Schicklegruber, will be inevitable. He will gladly bring order out of chaos.

That will be the end of the journey if we follow the path of the Peace Nowers. These are the way stations along the fatal road.

Peace Now revives memories of the infamous Cliveden set who sought to persuade Hitler and Chamberlain to come to terms. We recall Chamberlain's triumphant return to London, his waving aloft at the welcoming throng the Munich Pact. "Peace in our time," he assured us. He lived to see the results of his sorry mission prove to be the foulest compromise of them all. Neville's umbrella gave him protection from the elements, but the Munich Pact did not protect either him, Lord Halifax, or Lady Astor, supposedly secure at Cliveden, from the airborne wrath of Hitler's luftwaffe. "Peace in our time" brought the tragic climax of death and destruction to every inhabitant of England's tight little isle.

Such a genuine fiasco, so recent in the minds of all of us, should silence these grim organ grinders of insipid and senseless tunes. It is a discordant jangle that tears at our nerves and makes us "edgy."

Naturally they make no reference whatsoever to the extreme plight of the Jews in Europe. What would be their fate as a result of "Peace Now"? They are not as yet liberated. They are still scattered, homeless, and suffering. In any negotiated peace now, Hitler would certainly have more than a little to say. His extreme venom against the Jews would force him to demand a continuance of his vengence. Will he be permitted to continue to make Europe "Judenrein"? What about Jews bereft of home, hearth, jobs, property, business, possession—will they be repatriated? When the unlawful possessors of their properties return their spoils, will there be new festering sores of antisemitism? These problems, unsolved, bristle with difficulties. What of the thousands of Jews held in concentration camps such as Dachau, Transmistara, and Oranienburg? Must they remain there? What of similar camps in Bulgaria, Poland, France, Spain, Italy, etc.?

Peace Now? Will England join with Hitler and stoutly insist upon the maintenance of the cruel White Paper, barring the Jews from their cherished homeland and confounding their problems a thousandfold?

Palestine is the only place on earth where the Jew is not unwanted.

Hitler would stamp in rage against Palestine as a national homeland for Jews. It would have to be sold down the river. He would screech insanely if reminded of a Balfour declaration. The Grand Mufti at Jerusalem, now the Arab intelligence center for the Axis in Berlin, would doubtless become the Gauleiter of Jerusalem. He would be aided and abetted by another Judea phobe, King Ibn Saud of Arabia. Both are endowed with the moral scruples of a tiger. Between them the whole Near East and Middle East would become Judenrein.

Yes, Peace Now would mean surrender of Jewry to der Fuehrer in all respects.

The whole world—America and the British Dominions—all are not without guilt for the failure to give havens of rescue to the Jew. Peace Now would keep that guilt at the sticking point. There could be no change of heart.

Many interesting suggestions have been made that the oppressed Jews be colonized in various parts of the world including British Dominions, like New Zealand, Australia, Canada. How fruitful were these suggestions is revealed by the attitude tersely explained by the statement of the Australian representative at the Evian Conference for Refugees, "Gentlemen, we in Australia have no racial problem, Thank God, and we do not intend to have one started." That summation is brilliant in its brevity, finality, and tragedy. It foretells what would happen at any peace conference if the Peace Now-ers have their way. What answer would be given to the hands of the driven Jew, knocking at closed doors? Only anti-Semites would give the answer.

If Peace Now-ers prevailed, the President's War Refugee Board—now holding out at long last at least a vision of mercy and rescue for the race of the prophets—would be imperilled. Hitler would have none of it. He would, at the peace table of the Peace

Now-ers say to the Jews seeking haven anywhere—"Let the Jews go elsewhere"—in mocking parallel to "Let them eat cake." Hitler would let loose all his bestial wrath upon the 4,000,000 Jews remaining in Festung Europa.

Thus, we Jews have much at stake. We must especially do all in our power to detect, to scotch and destroy these nests of sedition and intrigue built by those of the Peace Now movement.

At any peace table now—before the decisive defeat of Hitler on the field of battle—the many pressing Jewish problems would not only be unsolved, they would be even more aggravated. Despite the maledications of many statesmen in their animadversions against Hitler, upon the excuse of the necessity for assuming a realistic and pragmatic attitude, they would make concessions to Hitler. The Jew, as a race, is the most enfeebled in Europe. Their strength has been maliciously sapped. They cannot retaliate. It would be the work of a moment to toss them to Hitler's waiting wolves. Unconditional surrender is the only acceptable answer.

Further, can one imagine what Stalin says of Peace Now?

The avowed purpose of Peace Now is to discourage Americans from continuing the struggle. They deprecate our war aims. They try to smother the spirit of patriotism and lessen the ardor of those united in their work for victory. They seek to sabotage the desire in the heart of each one of us to crush Hitler and Hirohito. They are relentless and perverse in their efforts to undermine the morale of the Nation, hoping to entice into their deplorable movement all people everywhere. Letters have been written to political prisoners now in concentration camps in the United States. We are already having great trouble with many of these renegades behind stockades. Hartmann's letters do much to preserve the tendency to riot and disturbance.

As far as I am concerned, they have gone entirely too far by merely organizing. Their insinuations create a lack of confidence in our Commander in Chief, in General Marshall, in General MacArthur, in General Eisenhower, in any military and naval commander anywhere. I am firmly of the conviction that the Department of Justice and F. B. I. can and should act. If they persist the military authorities should dog them and clamp down hard on them.

Think what they must do to the minds and hearts of the mothers and wives of our men on the many fighting fronts. They approach them like confidence men, give them so much and the rest will be easy. They are incapable of the honest disclosure that there is no easy solution for a world in complete upheaval.

If this were not enough, they seek to drive a wedge between ourselves and our allies. They dig into their hatful of hateful and fictitious ideas and solemnly declare that the Germans and the Japs are not better but also no worse than the British and Americans. What effrontery to our honored dead. One is struck dumb by such insolence, particularly now, when our ears still ring and our hearts are deep in grief over the recent disclosures of the barbaric treatment accorded British and Americans by the Japs.

Dr. Richard Brickner has referred to the collection of symptoms extant in Germany today as a definite form of paranoia. Every Asiatic authority has agreed that the modern Japanese are equally sadistic and deranged.

Episodes like that in Kiev stick in the throat. There, as revealed by the New York Times and U. P. correspondents, the Germans machine-gunned some fifty to eighty thousand of Kiev's Jewish men, women, and children in late September 1941. Two years later, when Kiev's recapture by the Red Army seemed imminent, the Germans forced their Russian prisoners of war to burn the unburied bodies, completely destroying all evidences of crime.

At the concentration camp in Tremblinka in Poland death houses were set up for Jewish victims. They were stripped of all their clothes and were forced through the bitter cold to enter the portals of the death chamber. The floors were deliberately made slippery and smeared with chlorine that burned the flesh that touched it. When the huge chamber was piled high with humans, still more were hurled in on top of the first victims and the chamber was then sealed. From the walls poured forth live steam of tremendous intensity of heat and force and the Jews were literally boiled to death. Witnesses speak of intense pain and suffering. Nor did horror end there. When the doors were opened the bodies were found to be practically melted together into a solid mass. Blunt instruments had to be used to pry them apart. Jews were given this task, while other Jews were ordered to dig graves for the martyred.

Yes, these "Peace-at-Any-Price-ers" would reward the barbarians responsible for these enormities. These peace-mongers would give Hitler and Hirohito that which they so ardently crave in order to recoup their staggering losses on the field of battle. Perhaps they are so deluded as to think our enemies will leap into strait-jackets, alone and unaided. They piously claim that the war was forced upon Germany and Japan. Don't they remember Pearl Harbor? Who made a bloody policy of lebensraum? What of Rotterdam, Coventry, Warsaw, Lidice, and all the other cities and towns visited with sudden death and wanton destruction? Are we to forgive and forget?

The subhuman Hitler knows no law but the law of force. Only fire and sword will subdue him and his henchmen. Only triple reprisals now will prevent his carrying out the plans sponsored by Dr. Alfred Rosenberg and other brutes—to make the world "Judenrein," establish the "Herrenvolk," who will inhabit plenty of "lebensraum."

We were softies before. We removed the shackles from the first Reich too soon. The Prussian Junkers and military caste emerged in Germany and used Hitler as a fulcrum to climb to power. Hence the new 30 years' war. The present war is but a continuation of the last one. Only this time we must crush Nazidom and obliterate all trace of its fascism.

Nazi Germany must be dismembered, disarmed, and dismantled—and we must see to it that it remains dismembered, disarmed, and dismantled—for at least a generation. Otherwise, like Phoenix of old, Germany will arise a third time from her ashes.

In times of acute national peril, there is immediate and constant danger. The Nazis and the Nipponese need not have planes soaring over our heads nor their artillery rattling at us from beachheads. But we can be imperiled by their agents, secretly working from within. There is a vigorous and active fifth column that extends from Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. Axis propaganda pours into the country from all sides. Lord Haw Haw and other Benedict Arnold broadcasters reach into every home, via the radio. We hear from the Falange that permeates South America, due to our wretched policy of appeasement.

This, combined with the Peace Now movement, beyond a doubt, gives aid and comfort to our enemies. The propaganda emanating from the combination is identical in many instances. Goebbels must love it and I am sure it gives Hirohito cozy dreams.

I believe our statutes are broad enough to cover their crimes but if there are no specific statutes, certainly the President has sweeping powers under the Second War Powers Act. He could readily empower the military authorities to clap these malefactors into military prison. Let's get rid of them, bag and baggage. Let's have done with this incredible spectacle.

As a further warning, Sigrid Schultz, in her new book, Germany Will Try It Again, gives many details of the story of how the German secret general staff during the period of the Weimar Republic deceived both the republican government and the outside world and maintained a skeleton military organization that was capable of rapid expansion after Hitler came into power.

She also reports a soliloquy which, she says, she overhead Hitler deliver at an automobile show which he was inspecting:

"Strange that these machines and all the thousands of other machines in our factories should be changing the human character. But they are. The man who drives his car at top speed has developed a totally new set of reflexes. He does not think any more before he makes a move—there is no time to think. For his own safety he must react with lightninglike speed. Therefore, he must act automatically, almost like a machine. A good part of his energy goes into automatic reflexes instead of into thought. That is why in our day and age the number of people who think for themselves is dwindling."

This is a neat trap but one which I am confident that our loyal, red-blooded and intelligent Americans will very neatly sidestep.

Information poured out of Europe from all sides concerning the atrocities committed by Germany in the many invaded countries. If one were inside Germany during these eastern campaigns all one had to do would be to go to one of the railroad stations and lounge around in the waiting rooms. The Black Guards, arriving from or leaving for the front, described with undisguised joy how they had locked Poles and Jews into cellars. They further highlighted these stories by describing how windows and doors were left open, only for the purpose of throwing through them the demolishing hand grenades.

However, these Black Guards were not the only Germans rejoicing at the suffering of Poles, both Jew and Gentile. There were, of course, previews of the first official news reels of the war arranged at the Propaganda Ministry for the benefit of foreign correspondents and others. The squeals and shouts of delight from high-ranking German officials at the sight of these anguished Polish prisoners was really unbelievable. Later, there news reels were shown in the public theaters. The same images of unhappy Jews and Poles were flashed on the screen, poor, hapless humans, terrified at their fate. The response was immediate—shrieks of laughter and other evidences of great amusement. Apparently, it occurred to none of the onlookers to ponder how he would look if confronted with similar horror.

Shall all our protests against the sadism of the Nipponese and the Nazis be for nought?

Shall our clamoring to high heaven for punishment and retribution take on the aspects of the tale of an idiot, all sound and fury and signifying nothing?

Indeed, our shibboleth and final answer shall remain "Unconditional surrender." Then, and only then, can the world live in Rodeph Sholom—house of peace.

Peace Now would have us live in an atmosphere of distrust and pessimism, typical of the counterirritant. They would have us believe that they are as pragmatic as William James, yet we know they are as pessimistic as Schopenhauer.

Our task may be difficult, but it is obvious. We must continue to generate a solid and colossal conviction in the integrity of our struggle. We must not permit disguised isolationists, rabble rousers, racial and religious bigots to sap the vitality of our effort and loose the hurricane of doom upon us.

To them we can and must say, "Truly, a generation of vipers."

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent commentary on governmental waste and extravagance is contained in the following editorial in the January 19, 1944, issue of the Bremer County Independent, of Waverly, Iowa:

GOOD OLD FEDERAL AID—WE GET $100 A MONTH FOR FREE

Wartime's no time to gripe; wartime's no time to find fault. * * *

But when the Federal Government shoves $100 in 1 month into the prosperous town of Waverly to pay for free milk which isn't needed, it's time to take notice.

A check for $100.20 was deposited by the Waverly schools in a Waverly bank Monday, that check representing the Federal aid on the local milk program for a single month. There are very few children who are unable to pay for the milk they drink at school here, and those few have always been cared for, and amply, by local organizations. They still could be.

Yet the Federal Government came in last fall and said, "This program is ready. You are paying for it whether you use it or not. You better take it." And the local schools took it * * * for, after all, they had no chance to say whether or not the project was needed or whether it was even worthy. The whole thing was handled as a blanket affair.

It's very possible that there are some areas where Federal aid for milk for children might be needed. But certainly that isn't the case in most of the rural Midwest. The cost of such folly must be tremendous—multiply $100 by 4 or 5 months, and then multiply that by the number of schools who don't need it, and you'd have enough for several people to retire on.

Using Federal money to buy unneeded milk here is as silly as dipping into Uncle Sam's pocketbook to buy lime for the alfalfa fields in downtown New York.

Mr. Speaker, the $100.20 check referred to in the editorial is from a $50,000,000 appropriation made by the Congress. Of course, this is all borrowed money. This appropriation will add another $50,000,000 to the rapidly growing public debt which will be the legacy of the next generation. Assuming that the school board receives a payment of $100.20 each month, it will receive in the 9 months' school year about $900. Based on population as compared to the national total the citizens of Waverly will find added to their Federal debt burden $1,520. It is not a profitable deal any way you look at it.

However, that is not all of the story. Waverly is a thrifty and prosperous community in the heart of the best dairy district in America. The average wealth and general welfare is much higher than that of the country generally. Therefore its share of the $50,000,000 debt will probably be considerably higher than $1,520.

During the depression the Federal Government built up a vast organization to look after relief. Now the emergency is over. The Nation finds itself in a great war which needs all of its resources and energy. Nevertheless, much of the Federal relief organization is being maintained. Such is the staying power of a bureau. The whole situation calls for congressional action, and that soon.

Bellona Gets Mr. Lodge—Mr. Treadway Suggested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the most beloved man in political life in western Massachusetts today is Congressman ALLEN TOWNER TREADWAY, dean of the Massachusetts congressional delegation and ranking member of the great Ways and Means Committee. By his ability and sincerity of purpose displayed through a lifelong public career, he has gained the universal respect of the people of his State and Nation. Former President Calvin Coolidge followed Mr. TREADWAY as president of the senate in the General Court of Massachusetts. At that time President Coolidge expressed the hope that he could perform the duties of that high office as well as Mr. TREADWAY had performed them. In Congress Mr. TREADWAY has won the confidence of all his colleagues. One of the great newspapers of our State, the Springfield Republican, has suggested that our Governor appoint Mr. TREADWAY to the seat in the Senate made vacant by the resignation of our junior Senator, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. Its editorial pays a well-deserved tribute to our colleague, ALLEN TREADWAY, as well as to Senator Lodge. I am delighted to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a permanent record:

BELLONA GETS MR. LODGE—MR. TREADWAY SUGGESTED

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge has finally yielded to his martial instincts in resigning his seat in the United States Senate in order to devote himself wholly to military service during the remaining period of the war. For at least a year he must have experienced an inward conflict over this question, especially since the President's ruling that Members of Congress must choose between legislative and military service. They could not do both.

The Senator's motives will be applauded. To give up a seat in the United States Senate, with 5 years to serve in his present term, is a rare sacrifice. In considering Mr. Lodge's chances of ultimately scoring a comeback in public life, the great risk he is facing of never coming back cannot be ignored. It is true that a combat military career such as Mr. Lodge now seeks might prove in the postwar period a valuable political asset. But the present fact is that Mr. Lodge is sacrificing one of the most valuable prizes in public life for a gamble that could easily turn against him. Everyone will join in wishing for him the complete gratification of his military desires, rooted as they must be in his patriotism, and then a long career of usefulness whether in public or private life.

The Senator's service in the upper branch of Congress has been too short to win much distinction or acclaim. But he has been laying the foundation for future influence and leadership by familiarizing himself with the business and parliamentary procedure of that body. If the war should be ended by the summer of 1946, Mr. Lodge might be in a strong position to become the Republican candidate for the seat now held by Senator WALSH, who might not seek reelection at the age he would then have reached.

The immediate function of Governor Saltonstall is to name a successor to Senator Lodge, to serve the rest of this year, or until the voters of the Commonwealth in November next car fill the office with someone of their own choice. It may be said that Mr. Lodge's sudden resignation precipitates a political crisis for the Republicans of Massachusetts. The coming State campaign is much involved in the Governor's solution of the problem. The next Republican State ticket's composition depends on the Governor's course. The Governor's own future is conspicuous in the picture.

Inevitably, it is suggested that the Governor could resign his present office and, through a prearrangement with Lieutenant Governor Cahill, obtain for himself the appointment as Mr. Lodge's successor to serve the year out. Then Mr. Saltonstall, having possession of the office by appointment from Governor Cahill, could be nominated by his party in the primary and seek a popular election to the Senate in November.

This plan is tempting, but in a sordid way. Its execution would give Mr. Saltonstall an apparent certainty in the Senate in place of a dubious prospect at the Chicago convention as a Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate. Besides, it would enable him to escape being a candidate for Governor a fourth time, while other Republicans are waiting patiently for their chance to rise on the escalator. He could thus keep in the political swim and remove the possibility of a retirement into private life, for a brief period, in case he should run for neither a State nor National office in the autumn.

The most practical objection to a resignation by the Governor for the sake of security from his successor an appointment to the United States Senate, by an arrangement with Mr. Cahill, who would also be a beneficiary, is that this sort of a game always leaves a bad taste for the public to live with. It is a game that has been played in some other States, yet never with conspicuously successful results. Our own belief is that Governor Saltonstall is not the man to promote his own political career by resorting to methods sure to arouse justified criticism.

The appointment of Congressman TREADWAY to serve the balance of this year as Mr. Lodge's successor in the Senate seems to the Republican an appropriate and simple solution of the Governor's problem. True, Mr. TREADWAY has announced that he would not seek renomination in the First District. But his reason for that step toward retirement would likewise remove him as a candidate to succeed himself in the Senate. He is now serving out his term as a Representative at Washington; he could serve in the Senate the balance of this year as well as in the House.

Mr. TREADWAY has served in Congress some 30 years, being now the dean of the Massachusetts delegation. To crown his career with a term in the Senate, however brief, would be a gracious act of the party he has served so long and faithfully. His appointment would not seriously embarrass the Republican minority in the House, in view of the fact that one vote would not matter much one way or the other. And his appointment would gratify western Massachusetts, especially Berkshire County, while leaving the succession at the November election a Republican free-for-all, with Mr. Saltonstall very much in the lead.

Give Youth a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which I wrote in September 1939, entitled "Give Youth a Chance." This article was published in a national magazine.

As chairman of the subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that my views about the problem of juvenile delinquency are the same today as they were in 1939, only more serious, as the study of the subcommittee has shown.

The future of America depends on the youth of today and it is therefore our duty to see to it that they are given the opportunity to become the kind of citizens we want them to be.

What are you, as Members of the House of Representatives, doing to help our subcommittee solve this problem?

The article referred to follows:

What of America's youth? In this day of commercial upheaval, with the people of the world apparently in a state of flux and eager to leap at each other's throats, it is no wonder our young people are dazed and distrustful, uneasy as to what is in store for them. Just what, they ask themselves, has the world to offer them?

Countless thousands of them finish schools only to find themselves with nothing to do, with no place in the commercial world. They are idle, have nothing worth while to motivate their daily existence; and an idle mind breeds mischief.

In a distressingly short span of time these juveniles commit some seemingly small, unlawful act engendered by their idleness. This proves to be the starting point for careers that may end as habitual criminals. But there is a remedy for juvenile delinquency, a remedy that might almost be termed a specific.

That remedy is supervised activities.

Playgrounds, yes, but carry the plan much further than that. There is no reason why this supervised activity plan could not embrace far more than playground sports. There are many juveniles who haven't the knack of participation in specialized sports such as baseball, football, tennis, and other strenuous physical activities. They might be interested in quieter pursuits, such as stamp collecting, carpentry, weaving, or kindred hobbies.

These activities of mind and body should certain be supervised by paid experts. A set plan should be worked out and put into effect, improved upon by the trial and error method until it is standardized. These activities may well bridge the gap between idleness and the final finding of a life career on the part of the youth. There will be no need of worry about the development of secondary leadership. Even mass treatment such as this will bring out individual initiative, each case proving to the others what an opportunity can do.

This work of reclaiming idle youth must be started early. The youth of America must realize that we care, that we freely submit they will be the bulwark of the Nation a score of years from now. Juveniles must be weaned away from back alleys, water fronts, and corner gangs. They must be shown that they are wanted in the scheme of things.

With regulated youth activity, the moral stamina for which America is justly proud inevitably will come. A vast improvement in national health and proper youth thinking will be its priced byproducts.

Naturally, there will be cases of the incorrigible youth. The juvenile court should have complete and sympathetic jurisdiction up to 18 years of age, perhaps longer. But regardless of the offense, the youth should be handled as an equal, with perhaps a general discussion with the juvenile's planned activity supervisor present. He should be asked for opinions, requested to pass on his own case and suggest individual treatment. In this manner he soon will consider himself as being vitally concerned with his own welfare and gain confidence in what is being attempted in his behalf.

If actual arrest is necessary because of incorrigibility, no youth should be thrown into contact with a habitual criminal. When this is done the youth is branded with the stigma of association with the experienced lawbreaker and soon becomes hardened and contemptuous of all effort to help him. When a youth is jailed along with habitual criminals he almost invariably becomes one of them. Every effort should be made to separate him from the experienced criminal so that the latter may not influence him.

Give youth a chance. Give the boys and girls an opportunity to play and work and plan under proper supervision. Those having special qualifications should be encouraged to improve them.

Meet youth all the way so the stigma of being sent to a penal institution shall not be against them.

During the first quarter of 1939 the Federal Bureau of Investigation inspected 139,423 fingerprint arrest records. Nearly 20 percent of the arrests represented persons less than 21 years of age. At least 95 percent of these 27,000-odd young criminals could have been saved if a practicable and standardized method of planned activity had been in effect when they were in their more formative ages.

And, remember, the figures above are only those which came under the scrutiny of the F. B. I. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, long has recognized that the youth of America must be dealt with in a sympathetic and understanding manner so as to lead them away from vicious criminal influences.

Youth is naturally of an inquiring turn of mind. We should feel it is our privilege to see that these eager and fresh young minds are pointed toward the right things. It is a solemn duty, a sacred trust on the part of all adults to help lead toward those goals which make for a solid citizenship.

Supervised activities will help save the youth of America from crime and wrongdoing. Overflowing with a boundless energy our youth must be led into activities which mean future happiness. We cannot sit aloof and take the attitude of "let someone else do it." We must put our shoulders to the wheel and lend of our strength and experience.

How should we start?

First of all, we should ask local authorities what is being done in our town to keep idle youth busy. We should meet together with civic leaders and insist that a comprehensive youth program be fostered. There are many national organizations to whom we may turn for plans and guidance. Write the National Youth Administration, Washington, D. C., for workable plans and the knowledge gained by their experts. At first there may be many instances of lost motion and misguided effort, but a real and abiding sincerity will win out in the end.

Are these thousands of juveniles worth saving? The answer is in your heart. Read it right and now.

America's great human problem, now and in the future, is her teeming thousands of youngsters, all eager to be led to a worthwhile future.

Give them a chance.

Rescue of Jews From Nazi Terror—A British View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I went to Britain to see what steps could be taken to rescue the surviving Jewish people of Europe. In Britain, I found that one of the most active, aggressive humanitarians was Miss Eleanor Rathbone, a Member of the British Parliament, and chairman of the Committee to Rescue Jews From Nazi Terror. This committee, rather popularly called the Rathbone committee, has done excellent work. It has achieved unity of rescue organizations which we have not been able yet to obtain in this country.

I want to call the attention of this whole House to this excellent speech of Miss Rathbone, made before the House of Commons on December 14, 1943, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert her talk in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Precisely a year ago this Friday there was the memorable scene in the House when the Foreign Secretary disclosed the horrible truths about the cruelties being perpetrated on innumerable Jewish victims on no other ground than that of their Jewish race. Spontaneously members of the House rose to their feet and for a moment stood in silent tribute of pity and horror for the victims. Ever since then the atrocities have continued, and they are continuing day by day. The number of victims has risen from hundreds of thousands to millions, and they are not confined to the Jewish race.

With its usual keen sense of the practical, British public opinion fastened, immediately after the statement of a year ago, upon the question "What can be done for rescue before it is too late?" Last Saturday a press statement was issued by the Foreign Secretary, and simultaneously in the United States. It told us that the whole subject, both of the immediate rescue and of the post-war settlement of refugees, had been referred to the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees which was originally set up at Evian.

There is one point to which I would like to call attention because it seems extremely important. It concerns the help which might be given or promised to neutral States in order to encourage them to take in more refugees. The importance of that is that until we have successfully invaded the occupied territories where all those persecutions are taking place, the one chance of large-scale rescue depends upon the action of the neutral states. I shall be told that some neutrals have tried to approach the enemy on this subject and that their offers have been refused. But is that not ignoring the

changing war situation? Can we doubt that as our victory draws near, the Nazis, and still more the satellite nations, are becoming increasingly aware of the danger of further outraging world opinion, and may yield to pressure where formerly they had hardened their hearts?

Two things we can do to influence the result. We can convince the enemy that this is a matter about which we care passionately, so much so that if they continue with their massacres and cruelties it may affect their future position and our treatment after victory of their peoples. Secondly, we must make it possible for neutral states to offer large-scale hospitality. Are we doing that? There appears in the published statement a point which arouses some anxiety. It foreshadows the help which is to be given or promised to neutral states for maintaining their refugees until they could be repatriated. But it says nothing about those who can never be repatriated. There must be large numbers to whom repatriation will be practically an impossibility, who can never be asked or forced to return to countries where all their nearest relatives were murdered, where their homes are in ruins, or have been expropriated, where anti-Semitism is so deeply rooted that it will take a generation to root it out, or where political difficulties are such as to make return an impossibility. What is to be done about those people?

The two countries who can do something are we, with the help of the British Commonwealth of Nations; and the United States. Cannot we promise to take responsibility for a proportion of refugees accepted by the neutral states, possibly after some given date, and so make it possible for the neutral states to offer to take in further large numbers? Some have been very generous already. What is the difficulty?

As for the United States, the press statement said that since 1933 they had taken in 195,000 foreign immigrants, most of them refugees. That number is less than one-third of the number whom the United States might have admitted in those 5 years under their existing yearly immigration quotas. Surely, therefore, they can afford to promise a fairly substantial measure of post-war generosity?

As to ourselves, the same statement said that we have taken since May 1940 some 600,000 refugees and that we are still admitting them at the rate of about 800 a month. Let us be honest about that. The recent admissions were made on a strictly utilitarian basis. Nearly all were admitted because they were wanted for the armed forces or the merchant navy of ourselves or our allies. Nearly all of them are people who will be repatriated after the war. So we, like the United States, can afford to take more responsibility for those in neutral states who can be repatriated.

We can find room for some of them in this country; for larger numbers in Palestine, because even under the meager White Paper quotas arranged before the war there are still certificates for 34,000 more Jews. We can also find room in our colonies, and try and persuade the dominions to take their share. We have already got a special responsibility in this matter of refugees because of our relation to Palestine. If it had not been for the restrictions placed on immigration to Palestine in pre-war years, even before the Palestine White Paper, imposed partly for economic reasons and partly to appease the Arabs, tens of thousands of men, women, and children who now lie in bloody graves would long ago have been among their kindred in Palestine. That is something I will never forget, and I hope the House will never forget it either.

As to more recent policy, I am going to speak plainly. I claim to know as much on this subject as anyone in the House outside official circles, and I perhaps know as much as anyone in England. But there are many other, who, like myself, think of this terrible question day and night. It is on their consciences all the time. They are not satisfied that the utmost has been done for rescue. They do not belittle the difficulties, which have been enormous. But more might have been saved if more courage, resource, and imagination had been put into the task. Shipping has been grudged, though it has been found often for less vital services. Visas are most grudgingly and sparingly given. They are always given on utilitarian grounds. The test is not is this man or women in danger but do we want them for our own purposes.. Neither we nor the United States has shown a shining example to the world in this matter.

At first reading the published statement sounded all right. It promised some action, but it failed to deal with the crucial question of what is to happen to the refugees who cannot be repatriated, and what we are going to do to make it easier for the neutral states to offer them hospitality. I beseech Mr. Eden, and through him the Cabinet, to give all their thought to this matter. Let them say plainly what we are prepared to do. If the Government does that, it will have the support of every section of opinion in the country worth consideration. Do not let them be deterred by the mean jealousies and selfish fears of a mere handful of people who have been influenced by anti-Semitic, or by antiforeigner propaganda.

The F. C. C. and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of January 20, 1944:

THE F. C. C. AND LIBERTY

The Federal Communications Commission has again put its hand to law writing. Its latest edict is that while it will not deny radio-station ownership to newspapers, it will make sure that there is diversification of ownership.

It has served notice that when only one wave band is available in a particular city, and two applicants equally well qualified, one newspaper and one nonnewspaper, seek the frequency, the F. C. C. will, in the public interest, be inclined to favor the nonnewspaper applicant.

The F. C. C. maintains that it has reached this decision after long investigation of newspaper-radio ownership. But as far as available records show, it has published no report to support its conclusion, nor has it ever submitted the question to public hearings.

The business of the F. C. C. is to police radio in the interest of traffic orderliness. When it steps beyond this function to rule on the content of broadcasts or to deny or favor one kind of ownership, it is betraying a kinship with the tyrants of today and yesterday who made the ownership of a printing press conditional on their approval of what was printed upon it.

The mystery still is why Congress does not take an afternoon to boot the F. C. C. into the climate of American freedom.

Some of the Things I Dislike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 4, 1944, which is entitled "Some of the Things I Dislike":

SOME OF THE THINGS I DISLIKE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Elsa Maxwell recounts:

"With a silent sinking of the heart I found myself sitting next to George Sokolsky. 'George,' I said, 'I'm going to move to another seat. I don't want you to spoil a wonderful evening, because I have a feeling this is going to be a wonderful film.'

"George looked at me sharply. 'What makes you think I'm not going to like this picture?' he asked.

" 'Well,' I answered, 'for the simple reason that you don't like anything much.' "

Well, I happened to like what Elsa and I saw that night. It was "The Song of Bernadette," and I like Elsa whose heart is of the purest gold. But admittedly there is much to dislike in this world of ours—much of the fake and bluff and fraud that passes for sound currency because glamorous names are attached to it.

1. For instance, I dislike lies—particularly when designed by those in high places to confuse the people and to gain power for themselves. Certainly in a democracy, the Government is accountable to the people, and those who hold public office are servants of the people paid out of their taxes. They have no business telling untruths, half truths, or absolute falsehoods. And when they do, they should be called.

2. I dislike slogans. "Votes for soldiers," for instance, is a slogan designed to create the impression that some are opposed to permitting soldiers to vote, when the fact is that the discussion is about how to conduct this difficult and special type of election without destroying our traditional constitutional government. I dislike similar attempts to substitute slogans for facts and knowledge and wisdom.

3. I dislike smears. When a man is called a Fascist because he believes in constitutional government, that is a smear. When a man is called an anti-Semite because he preferred Franco to the Communists in Spain, that is a smear. When a man is called an isolationist because he prefers that the United States and Great Britain have a voice in the Polish boundary settlement rather than to leave it to Russia alone, that is a smear. The smear results from associating words which have become unpopular with opinions about which patriotic Americans may differ.

4. I dislike politicians who love power and who sacrifice the traditions of this country to perpetuate themselves in power. I dislike anyone who seeks power for power's sake. I still believe that the third term is an evil. I believe that limited tenure of office is the keystone of the American system and that its lapse will result in a despotism by officialdom. No country can ever be stronger than the roots of its traditions.

5. I dislike politicians who speak one way in private and another in public.

6. I dislike men of high office and of high public esteem who permit their speeches and state papers to be prepared for them

by scriveners who are in no way responsible for the thoughts they get the great names to express. Any dope can give the impression of being a philosopher, if he can get a philosopher to ghost for him.

7. I dislike men and women who favor Communism but have not the courage to announce their conversion to the Marxist conception of life.

8. I abhor the American who regards his own country as second to some world order or to some foreign land and who is always working on schemes and plans to subordinate American interests and concerns to those of any country in Europe or Asia or all of them put together. An American ought to be for America all the time—or he ought to renounce his American citizenship and join up with the people he prefers.

9. I dislike those who have so twisted our school system that our children grow up without a knowledge of and love for their own country. If that is progress—it still is no good.

10. Why go further? It all comes down to a preference for the square deal to the New Deal. Maybe the truth is old-fashioned and maybe love of country is horse-and-buggy stuff. But I don't believe it—and I mean to say so, Elsa dear!

Navigation on the Tennessee River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, to indicate the importance of navigation in the T. V. A. program, I include two news items, one a recent press release from T. V. A. and the other an article from the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of February 3, 1943, telling of the first shipment through the new public-use terminal at Decatur. These items follow:

NEW TONNAGE RECORD MADE—FINE INCREASE SHOWN IN FREIGHT MOVED ON TENNESSEE

All records for ton-mileage were broken by Tennessee river freight traffic during 1943, according to estimated figures announced today by T. V. A.

Freight traffic for 1943 exceeded that for 1942 both in tons and ton-miles. Estimated tonnage for 1943 was 3,088,635, as against an actual 1942 tonnage of 2,836,605, an increase of 8.9 percent. Estimated ton-mileage (number of tons times number of miles hauled) for 1943 was 224,290,264, exceeding the previous all-time high of 161,469,400 established in 1942 by 38.9 percent.

Excluding sand, gravel, and stone, relatively low value freight moving usually over very short distances, the tonnage increase over 1942 amounted to 49.7 percent and the ton-mileage increased 46.2 percent.

The increase in 1943 is a continuation of the trend established in 1939, the year a commercially usable channel was extended to Chattanooga, 464 miles above the mouth of the river. Beginning with that year, a new ton-mile record has been established in each succeeding year. During the 5-year period ton-mileage has increased about 300 percent and tonnage about 200 percent. Excluding short hauls of sand, gravel, and stone, ton-mileage has increased more than 330 percent, tonnage more than 260 percent.

Major increases for 1943 were in the long-haul movement of grain, coal, coke, new vessels, pig iron, motor vehicles, fertilizer, limestone, and steel products. Clay, forest products, and petroleum products lagged behind 1942.

The completion of Kentucky dam near the mouth of the river and of dredging below Fort Loudon and Watts Bar dams between Chattanooga and Knoxville are expected to make a minimum channel depth of 9 feet available throughout the river for a large part of 1944.

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of February 3, 1944]

TERMINAL HAS FIRST SHIPMENT

The port of Decatur today received the first shipment, 500 tons of pigiron from Sloss-Sheffield, Birmingham, consigned to the East.

The pig iron arrived by railroad from Birmingham, requiring about 10 rail cars and will be placed on one barge of the Central Barge Lines.

Loading into the barge started this morning about 7 o'clock and will require about 2 days. The downstream tow will arrive here on Monday and the barge will start toward destination.

E. K. Morhead is terminal manager at Decatur and Guntersville. The two terminals are operated by Tennessee Valley Authority.

Montana's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation reported out favorably the bill to authorize the Hungry Horse project in northwestern Montana. Because of the clear cut analysis and clear vision shown by Mr. Donald Treloar, of Kalispell, Mont., in an address before the Montana Reclamation Association, I am, under unanimous consent, inserting in the RECORD a copy of his talk. It is one of the best expositions on our State and its possibilities that I have ever read and I want to assure the House that a careful reading of its contents will be worth the time spent. We, of Montana, see our problems from the same viewpoint and, while we recognize the needs of our neighbors, we insist that our resources, especially in water, shall be used primarily for the benefit of our people and our State. We are trying to look to our future so that we may become a more valued member in our family of States because in so doing not only will we benefit but the Nation as a whole will also benefit.

Mr. Treloar's address follows:

PROBLEMS OF A DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR WESTERN MONTANA

I consider the privilege of addressing this group a distinct honor. And I would be negligent if I did not extend my personal thanks and the thanks of my community to those responsible for the invitation extended to me to address you this afternoon. The subject as printed on your programs suggests something specific, something tangible, something at hand, as well as those ideas which to some might sound visionary: "A program of development for western Montana." I would not presume to present such a program to a group of this nature without a great deal more study than it has been my opportunity to give it. There are men among you here who have had the position, the responsibility, the informational facts at hand, and the time to make such a study. So I will deal with a phase of development for western Montana which I hope will prove helpful—suggested in good faith, and one which, if it were not for the limitations of time in the preparation, might well be the crux of any program of development at any time which this organization might undertake. In the correspondence with your Mr. Monson I agreed to talk upon the subject Problems of a Developmental Program for western Montana, which I believe are more complex and more of a hindrance than the lack or abundance of projects to be accomplished.

First of all, I should like to say that anything which is going to benefit Montana, western or eastern, must be economic. And let's be sure we are together on that word before I proceed. To clarify my position I might say that I prefer the purer definition of management of a household, or State, to any other. And we might broaden that for this discussion to mean the management of the productive resources of western Montana as they relate to the means of living. You will please note that I am using the relationship of the resources of Montana as a means of contributing to or improving the life of the people of Montana. Production of resources of any area without contributing to the life of that area in major portion means depletion and eventually exhaustion, and unless such production without adequate return is modified, the area holding the resource becomes poor, and eventually is left barren.

Now, the science of economics does not investigate or try to explain how any particular individual can get a living; it investigates how all of the people together get a living, and how they divide up what all of them together produce from the earth, or trade with throughout the world. So that when we speak of productive resources today we mean production of resources for use, with the idea of using those resources to the best advantage of Montana, and particularly in this talk, as the use of these resources applies to western Montana.

I shall deal with public and private property today. I will give you some thoughts that have occurred to me in connection with our part of the State. And at the outset I would like to remind you that there are only two ways of getting a living, whose foundation political economy borrows from the science of law, and those two ways of getting a living are, taxation, and bargaining, or in the sense with which I shall speak today, public and private enterprise.

In an analysis of Montana one thing stands out in my mind, and that is that there is a wide difference between western and eastern Montana, not in the people, but physically. Western Montana consists mainly of a few fertile valleys, hemmed in by high and rugged forested mountains. Eastern Montana has broad plains with few mountains and only small amounts of forest land. It is a striking difference, but in spite of that physical difference both areas have been blessed richly with resources that class in both the metallic and nonmetallic groups. Certain sections of Montana differ vastly from certain other sections of Montana. In the Flathead, water resources and irrigable land as well as a wealth of minerals prevail. In the Bitterroot Valley water resources are not as great, irrigable land is there, some minerals, but not yet on a known scale comparable with northwestern Montana. Just across the Continental Divide from the great scenic and water resources of the Flathead lie oil pools of great vastness.

On the summit of the Continental Divide in the central portion of western Montana lies the richest hill on earth. Eastern Montana has its Missouri River Valley, with many possibilities for irrigation, the Yellowstone Valley with its chrome, coal, as well as farm land. Western Montana holds vast potentials for lumber, pulp, and power. Eastern Montana knows vast range lands, some power, vistas of wheat, and other grain land. Montana has scenery, from the stretches of the Beartooth Mountains to the Skalkaho, the Clearwater, the Lolo, the Kootenai, the Cabinet, the Flathead, the Missions, the South Fork, the Gates of the Mountains, Glacier National Park, Yellowstone Park, vast intriguing caves, not yet fully explored. And represented within the State are five great railroads. The mineral resources of our State run a wide gamut, from coal and chrome, to copper, lead, zinc, silver, gold, manganese, zonolite, and others, as well as clays for pottery and clays for aluminum. And I say we are richly blessed indeed in Montana with potential water resources. In the back door of western Montana lies the potential for a Grand Coulee of its own. In the north fork of the Flathead lies one of the few remaining stands of pulp timber in the world of sufficient size to provide constant operation with proper reforestation to support a permanent paper industry for the State. Resources? Yes, tremendous, but Montana today, ranking high in productive resources, is fortieth in population with about half a million people within its bounds. Montana, with all of its innate wealth contributes richly to a few whose principal interests lie outside of our State. A very small proportion of this wealth remains in Montana. And so as an economic unit Montana contributes niggardly to the Nation's wealth and to its people. The people of Montana who have so loyally fought through lean years, borne the bug-a-boo of unemployment will not be able to share in the heritage which it should be theirs to enjoy, unless, when this war is over, Montana can form a basic policy of creating permanent jobs for many and turn the resources of this State to productive use to support the status of all of its citizens. We must determine that Montana shall exist as a sovereign State in fact and not just in name.

Our diversified natural resources are capable of providing an industry which would likewise be diverse—a stable industry providing jobs for hundreds where one job is provided now. Montana can support such a variety of different enterprises that unemployment would become a rarity. New jobs, new pay rolls, new and extensive building programs, new schools and institutions, new industrials, providing more new jobs for more new pay rolls, more markets for more produce from more intensive farming; more use for Montana built goods, to give more jobs to others, in railroads, air lines, taxis, and shoe shines. And once that circle starts, just as a stone tossed into a still pool, it will widen and form other circles which will extend out until Montana will truly become the State it is capable of being.

Montana not only has lost and forfeited industrial opportunities, especially during the past 10 years, but Montana has further depleted her population during the past 3 years, by giving up approximately 70,000 of her people for military demands and productive efforts, not in Montana but elsewhere. Some day, we hope soon, many, if not all, of these tradesmen and youth will return to Montana. There will be increasing thousands of laborers and their families returning to the Dakotas, to Minnesota, to the East and Middle East whose course will bring them through our fair State. Some of them will want to stay. Where are we to find the jobs for these prodigal sons, and how are they to secure a living?

The solution to these dislocations lies in our ability to plan for what we know will surely come as the sun follows the night. Only by intelligent planning, planning embracing all of the people, can we in Montana meet these dislocations which will follow this war, and succeed in holding the population which we have now, and need increased so badly.

Any post-war planning which Montana does must of necessity and for sound economic reasons be of a permanent nature. No transitory passing dole will suffice this time for Montana people. The program must be based upon production from our vast resources, of course. But that program for production must be predicated upon production within Montana for as wide a use as possible within Montana. It must be predicated upon the knowledge that centralized industry has learned a bitter lesson—in labor, in housing, in mass absenteeism, in poor distribution of capital, in panicky marketing, in inflationary spirals. And it must provide for the opportunities needed by private enterprise to give needed jobs, to turn out the needed goods, to be put to use within our own homes as well as the homes of those who need those products elsewhere. It must not be predicated solely upon production for use outside of our State. As I said earlier in this talk, any such program will merely deplete, and not build up, our ability to permanently contribute to our peoples' welfare, as well as to the increased wealth of our Nation. Any post-war program must not only provide jobs to the men and women returning from the services and from war industry, but must also provide for the rehabilitation of those unfortunates who are already beginning to come back from this present conflict, blasted and broken in body and mind.

Any post-war program must include increased and wiser use of the farm lands of the State, wisely cultivated with the use of water in the light of their ability to be farmed in a diversified manner. Some soils of our State do not fit into a program of ditch irrigation, but do much better with spray irrigation. In the western part of Montana our soil is not the kind where you can bulldoze the tops of knolls in a leveling process and still leave plenty of soil. Many places in eastern Montana permit of this. The texture of our soil in western Montana is such that the nourishing elements of that soil could quickly be washed away with careless ditch or flood type irrigating.

Any post-war program for western Montana must include further field work and surveys in our forest areas. According to a recent publication of the United States Department of Agriculture only about one-fourth of western Montana's forest area shows field work of a research nature completed. The northwestern part of the State is included in this area where work has been completed. This completed area lies west of a line extending from the point where the Continental Divide intersects the Canadian boundary to the Idaho line southwest of Missoula. The balance of this forest land in western Montana did not have field work started at the date of this publication, which was April 1941, and the most recent one available to me. It is reasonable to assume that due to the outbreak of war the status of that forest survey is the same now as it was then. E. H. Clapp, recent Acting Chief of the United States Forest Service, makes this concise and true remark: "Much of our rural poverty is within forest regions with large areas of poor soils. Here vanishing forest resources and forest industries leave farm people and rural communities stranded, minus the employment in the forest and income from the forest, so much needed to supplement the meager returns from their cultivated crops. Wretched living conditions mean abject people. If forests and their products should vanish, rain would muddy our waters, fill reservoirs with debris, ruin hydroelectric plants, and bring flood damage the like of which we never saw before. Between rains you would wonder what had become of the water supply."

We have been moving for some time in the direction of forest conservation, but dangerously slow. The trend at the outbreak of the war was that we were draining our virgin forests in the United States at the rate of 2,200,000,000 cubic feet a year. The annual growth was estimated to be 11,300,000,000 cubic feet, while the drain was known to be 13,500,000,000 cubic feet. To meet the expanded requirements of the Nation for forest products in the post-war period, as well as to make up for the great swath cut by war production, it will be necessary for the Nation to nearly double the rate of growth, to allow for requirements now in sight, with a margin for safety, and allowing for some small amount of export. We, in Montana, must be conscious of this trend. I would urge every agency dealing with the care of our forests to be cognizant of the value of our evergreens not only for timber but for watershed protection, grazing, recreation, and wild life. A proper post-war forest program will insure employment in Montana in our forest industries for all time, will develop from our forests new uses, new industries, new jobs, new services to mankind. It will make them produce abundantly and perpetually. Unemployment and low standards of living for vast numbers of people * * * demand our attention in times of economic distress. The forests present a real sound opportunity to alleviate distress, to strengthen morale and to build for permanency.

In connection with our forest resources, we should immediately protect roadside strips of trees along our highways wherever they run through forest land.

Any post-war program for Montana must, too, consider the coming problems and opportunities of air travel and transport. There is much to be done if Montana is to provide suitable facilities within the State to induce private enterprise in air express and passenger travel to give Montana full consideration.

Any post-war program for Montana must include not only wider agricultural opportunities, but, as I have said, it must provide wide stimuli to private enterprise. And that leads me to another and a most important consideration.

Private initiative and private enterprise can only get the opportunities to develop production for use in Montana by a program which will include participation by the Federal Government. Any program which is not based upon plans to include the constructive agencies of our Government such as we have represented at this meeting is doomed to failure—will wash away as the sands. We have a dam site in western Montana, the Hungry Horse, which can be developed for use within Montana at a cost of from $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 in the immediate post-war period. It is impossible for Montana as a State to finance such a venture itself. Any such attempt would lead our State quickly into bankruptcy, for there are other post-war projects within Montana which are ready to go. I understand that Montana, through our highway commission and in collaboration with the Governor, has plans for a program of highway construction within the State which will be announced soon. A program of progressive needed highway improvement to take some sections of our State out of the mud. What chance has Montana to do this work alone? What good would any benefits do the people of Montana if we were bankrupt before we had a chance to put these benefits to work for us? You know that big contracting is the finest form of private enterprise. You know that contracting, whether for reclamation projects or power dams, or highways gives the greatest opportunity for employment. The whole spectrum of labor,

from skilled technical engineers to the lowest bookkeeper's clerk and ditch digger are used. Machinery is needed of the type that provides many jobs for countless numbers of people in other areas. This contracting must include projects which will provide not adequate but surplus low-cost power at rate bases comparable to rates in neighboring States.

An incentive and an opportunity will then be presented private enterprise to locate mills and fabricating plants in our State to provide jobs and resulting pay rolls. Such projects are, in the main, huge undertakings. Who is capable of financing such programs but the Federal Government? The answer can only be no one. We are not sufficient unto ourselves in this regard. And the opportunities presented cannot be fully realized without Federal help from the constructive agencies of our Government. Now let us not forget the original definition of economic in my talk today. I do want to stress it here again. Economic * * * management of a State * * * and that term management used here implies all that goes with efficiency * * * all that goes with careful expenditure and wise frugality. It does not mean the taxing of private enterprise to provide a dole, not in this post-war sense, although there may be times in a nation's history when such a program can assist in the economy of that nation. But in a post-war period I do not believe it has a place. Therefore we must in Montana distinguish between the progressive constructive, building agencies of our Federal Government who will give private enterprise opportunities that they badly need today, we must distinguish between these agencies and other Federal agencies created only through passing, transient conditions of politics or dislocations of industry. Of the constructive group may I just mention some of those represented here today—the Army engineers, the Reclamation Service, and the Bonneville Administration.

In a program of development through the use of constructive agencies such as these, we are assisting private enterprise by opening the doors to development. Huge sums of capital required in industry to build, tool up, and get the wheels moving cannot be expected in Montana unless we provide conditions which are at least as attractive as those in other sections of the Nation. And while Montana today is rich in the raw materials for private enterprise to use, she is poor indeed in creating the opportunities for that private enterprise to set up in our State. Low-cost power together with elimination of discriminatory freight rates are two prime factors in creating opportunities for private enterprise. Industry will improve Montana's rate structure.

We in western Montana are indeed conscious of our position, politically, geographically, and industrially. Perhaps our only major difference is geographic. We in western Montana watch the water go by to the Pacific by way of the great Columbia River drainage. In eastern Montana you are part of another great system, the Missouri-Mississippi. The problems of developing the water resources of western Montana are not in any way comparable with the problems of developing the Missouri in eastern Montana. We are perhaps more fortunate. We have plenty of water for ourselves, and plenty of storage basins along the way to take care of all downstream needs. The plan for the Columbia Basin is sound * * * briefly a controlled flow of the river with multiple use of that water in all of the States through which it flows to the sea. In eastern Montana we are battling for recognition of rights which seem at times to have been denied us, because there doesn't seem to be enough water, nor sufficient storage, for multiple use along the way, and still leave downstream developments undamaged. But that doesn't mean that we in western Montana are not sympathetic with your problems in eastern Montana, and vice versa. It doesn't in the least detract from our desire to cooperate in every way with you in eastern Montana. And we are anticipating that same spirit on your part. We in western Montana are happy and pleased to be a part of the Montana Reclamation Association. It may that as an association, with a quite definite plan, blending our minds harmoniously together, we may be able to strike the chords of development within our great State that will bring Montana and its people into the light of true achievement. We in western Montana are highly grateful and thoughtful of the unity of support given us recently to preserve Montana's rights to the use of the waters in our area. In the light of passing time that spirit of unity, that tie between us, established in haste, but effective nevertheless, may prove to be the unity which will weld our minds and hearts on a program which will subjugate all selfish interests, and bring forward an economy based not upon profits for the few, but rather upon jobs and security for the many, with profit for all.

I would caution against any delay in pushing forward any plans which are sound at this time. What is post-war? We have already entered this period. I would urge those Federal agencies who will be charged with the actual work of building to appreciate Montana's position, to preserve what should be preserved, to sustain us with their help, and to maintain with us our dream of accomplishment. They can make or break Montana's future. We stand together at the threshold of a new era, an era which presents to us a real challenge. Let us accept that challenge and create not sectionalism but unity; not contempt, but pride; not jealousy, but trust; not a tavern, but a temple.

We in Montana must realize that others have left us far behind. We must face the truth and grasp the fact that if developments needed and wanted in eastern Montana along the Missouri and otherwise are to be realized, they will be realized only with the help of others who have gone ahead of us. We must face the reality that in western Montana development must bear fruit if we are to rise to our rightful place in the Northwest.

The State of Montana finds itself a part of two major drainages, the Missouri drainage area and the Columbia drainage area. It is all right to cry States' rights; we should have those rights. We are all willing to fight for those rights. In the five Northwest States Washington and Oregon have shown tremendous growth, beginning some years before the war began. The war provided a tremendous stimulus to their industrial expansion. Already we can see the permanency and also the increase of this industry after the war is over. Montana is in no position to compete with those two States at present. We missed the boat somewhere along the line. But perhaps it's not too late to catch up. We can only expect to safeguard our State rights if we show a willingness to become a part of a great western and northwestern program of development during the period which lies ahead. And we must start now. The development of our water resources gives us the key.

The extensiveness of the post-war plans of the Department of the Interior may best be realized by some facts recently published by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, himself, in which he says:

"It is in the vast region of wide open spaces that we are planning our new empire. Department engineers tell me that water can be made available to transform nearly 20,000,000 additional acres of arid land into prosperous farms. This would permit the West to double its present population.

"The plans of the Department of the Interior to convert through irrigation these great tracts of sagebrush and cactus into fertile fields and farms are neither newly-hatched nor half-baked. For several years now the Bureau of Reclamation has been getting ready to meet just such a situation as will face the country when peace comes. The plans for the vast enterprise are more than half completed right now, and any time that Messrs. Hitler and Hirohito decide that they've had enough, the Bureau will be ready to translate these plans into action and take an enormous bite out of the post-war employment problem.

"By far the major part of the investment would be returned to the Federal Treasury directly from irrigation and power revenues. Indirectly the gain in the national wealth through increased taxable values and purchasing power would pay big dividends.

"With Congress willing and supplying the necessary funds, work would start immediately on programs interrupted by the war in the Columbia Basin in Washington, in the Central Valley of California, at the Gila project in Arizona, and elsewhere. At the same time, other new programs would be begun on both sides of the Continental Divide—in the Great Plains along the upper reaches of the Missouri, and in the lands drained by the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, the Colorado, and many other rivers. Dams, reservoirs, and power plants would be built, and thousands of miles of new canals and irrigation ditches constructed to carry water where it is needed most.

"This enormous building job would put 480,000 men directly to work for 3 years—225,000 of them at construction sites and 255,000 in the plants and factories that would provide materials for the developments. This army of nearly half a million men would transform by irrigation 6,000,000 additional acres of desert and sagebrush to productive farm land. This would be a substantial start toward the reclamation of the nearly 20,000,000 acres that I have mentioned as susceptible of irrigation with available water supplies. The program would also provide supplemental irrigation of another 10,000,000 or more acres that are not getting enough water to produce maximum crops to support the present population of the areas.

"The irrigation of the 6,000,000 new acres would provide ample farms for 125,000 men and their families. The supplemental irrigation would make available 40,000 more farms, because, with an adequate water supply, great tracts now inadequately irrigated could be cultivated more intensively than at present. The supplemental service would also give greater security to more than 100,000 families on established irrigated farms.

"But putting 480,000 men to work at construction, and locating another 165,000 men and their families on farms where they could become self-sustaining, is only the beginning. For every family that would take up land, one additional family would find a livelihood in the villages and towns that would spring up in the wake of development, and a third family, elsewhere in the Nation, would gain a living by providing the farm implements, automobiles, clothing, etc., which residents of the new communities would require.

"Here, then, we have one answer to the gloom-mongers who maintain that America will have nothing to offer its ex-fighting men and war workers—the greatest reclamation development in history—new fields, towns, factories, offering opportunities that challenge the wildest imaginings.

"At this time, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is counting on the probability that Uncle Sam will retain 2,500,000 men in the armed forces in peacetime. That means approximately 8,500,000 demobilized. Directly and indirectly, the Bureau of Reclamation alone is preparing to take care of approximately a million of them. Which means the 4,000,000 men, women and children would be assured of the necessities and com-

forts of life as the result of one Government program.

"Speaking of water power, there are rivers waiting to be harnessed everywhere. We have been getting along on about one-fourth of our potential capacity. And more than two-thirds of our undeveloped water power is in the West. I offer this morsel of information to those who say that the end of the war will find the Nation barren of opportunities.

"In discussing the coming development of the West, I have not been indulging in wishful thinking. Expert engineers and technologists of my department have been making field investigations and formulating definite plans for many years. We know what we are talking about. We are ready to start digging as soon as Congress gives us the 'Go' sign.

"Yet, great as this reclamation and power plan is, I cannot emphasize too strongly that it is only one of many which are being blueprinted by the Government to assure postwar employment. An enormous amount of work needs to be done in reforestation, in soil conservation, in improving rivers, harbors, and highways, in eliminating slums and rebuilding cities, in creating national parks and recreational facilities. On every side, big jobs are beckoning—not only for the immediate post-war period but for many years to come."

Personally, I would like to see Montana's farms, wherever they may lie, have water within their reach to make this State bloom; I would like to see the tremendous reservoir of power in Montana contributing in fullest measure to private enterprise within our State, processing, as well as producing, the raw materials of our State. I would like to see every home provided with electrical servants to lighten the burdens of Montana's women, whether on the farm or in the city. I would like to see the fruits of the labors of Montana people justly rewarded. I would like to see Montana become a State rich in rewards for private initiative, with jobs, good wages, improved living conditions for all. It can be done with a sound program, with continual good guidance and leadership, with an industrial system producing a multiplicity of opportunity. I would like to live until travelers through Montana will not hasten away, but will abide with us, until our farmers and laborers will match the sweat of their toil with the whir of the machine and the planning of our leaders, all facing happily and hopefully toward a fuller life in the great treasure State, our Montana.

Our Post-War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful sincere people in planning for the future have their eyes on the National Capital, and are placing their dependence on their Representative in Congress to embody the humanitarian principles in our post-war program that is being promised us by the leaders in the national administration. Let us see to it that these promises are fulfilled.

I submit for publication in the RECORD a letter expressing the views and aspirations of an earnest and thoughtful citizen of the district I have the responsibility to represent.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *January 30, 1944.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In memory, I can see you just as you looked in our City Park, and as you spoke to us—before election. Seven of us are voters in this family. Seven of us want to know just how you are going to represent us at this critical time. Our boy wrote from the Southern Pacific lately—"Those men are for themselves. They hide behind words." This boy has been away from home a long time—November, 1941.

I do not like for him to feel that way, nor to say it. But those boys get their heads together, and they form their own conclusions; and after all haven't they the right to watch Washington? And you men that we sent to Washington are being watched more closely than any time before. There never was a time when simple home people—honest, respectable and Christian people—are thinking in terms of world affairs. We know that never again can we live just for ourselves. We must not disregard other peoples and we cannot if we would. So, Mr. WHITE, we are asking you to remember us—the common people at home.

We want peace—honorable and righteous peace.

We want the Atlantic Charter lived up to in fact.

We do not want any more "hiding behind words."

You know the old saying, "What you are speaks so loud I can't hear what you say!" Now, of course, that remark does not refer to you personally; but you must admit there has been a lot of camouflage right there in Washington.

We are not smart. You are smart enough to be where you are. You are smart enough to see that Christian people are coming to the front and asking for Christian proceedings in the capital of our country; and maybe we will be heard at last.

Yours truly,

MRS. FRANK WEEKS.

Justice for Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of shock that I read the report of the recent Japanese atrocities against our American and Filipino comrades of Bataan and Corregidor. These heroes suffered tortures that we, as civilized human beings, find it hard to comprehend.

We must recognize the fact that in the Japanese we face a fiendish and a fanatical enemy. There can be only one outcome to this struggle in which we are engaged and that is we either win or lose. The latter alternative is alien to us as Americans and we are determined to win—all the way—and to avenge our prisoners held by Japan and to exact payment for every torture and agony heaped upon our gallant comrades.

We are determined, no matter what the cost, to carry this war to Japan and to place her in a position where she can never again do any harm against any people in the world. This is a solemn obligation on our part and we must steel our hearts for the task which lies ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter just received from the Montana Bataan Relief Organization of Missoula, Mont., and signed by Mrs. Opal Barthclf and Mr. Joe Gamache, Sr. I understand full well how these people feel because their sons were on Bataan, and I want the House to know that their efforts in behalf of the men of Bataan and Corregidor have been ceaseless. They have not forgotten and neither must we.

In conclusion, I want to state that I am in wholehearted accord with the communication from the Montana Bataan Relief Organization.

The letter follows:

MONTANA BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
Missoula, Mont., January 31, 1944.
To Our Congressmen and Senators.

GENTLEMEN: We the people of Montana who have relatives in the Philippine Islands, or in any Japanese prison camp in the Pacific or anywhere on the mainland of Asia proper, our friends, and sympathizers, who now are many, of the misfortunate men of the Philippines, do now petition you as Congressmen and Senators (with our hope and our power now in you vested) to present House bill 1374 properly to your respective legislative bodies. Yes, we can furnish thousands of signatures of citizens of Montana if you deem it necessary. We all now as Americans do plead for your support and untiring efforts. We do hope that you will do all in your power to support our laudable undertaking.

Further we wish you all to go on record officially presenting an ultimatum to the Japanese Government (using the utmost care that it shall come to the attention of the proper authorities in Japan) whereby they shall be duly notified that the peace terms of the United States, when granted to Japan, shall be predicated upon the kind of treatment given prisoners of war held by them; that retribution will be exacted of the military and civil authorities; that we the people of the United States shall not exempt the Emperor, his heirs, or any of his subordinates.

Mrs. OPAL I. BARTHOLF, *Chairman.*
JOE GAMACHE, Sr., *Secretary.*

The Worley Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the Worley bill with clarifications and some modifications and strengthening. In studying and appraising this whole situation, I have endeavored to put myself in the place of the soldier. I know that if he wants to vote there will be a deep conviction and intense desire on his part. Therefore, I believe that every possible opportunity should be given to

the men and women of the armed services to exercise their franchise.

If we will only be tolerant in this matter and are willing to attempt to reconcile our differences of opinion, I believe a study of an amendment that I intend to offer today will be helpful toward that end. My amendment attempts to achieve the same purpose as one now being given consideration in the other body which was introduced by the junior Senator of my State. The purpose is twofold, to confine the use of the Federal or short ballot to members of the armed forces overseas unless by August 1 of this year the State has not provided an absentee ballot. There are a few such States today. Now, I have suggested the use of this Federal ballot overseas because of a statement made by the Army and Navy that they will not be able to transport the State ballots. The fact that I question this is beside the point.

We must take the statement of the Army and Navy at its face value, at least at the present time. If the soldier cannot get a State ballot; if the State ballot does not reach him, or if he does not want to use the State ballot, then the Federal ballot will be available to all soldiers overseas. This should satisfy all of those who have contended that they fear the State ballot cannot be delivered abroad. However, there can be no possible excuse for using this Federal ballot here at home. There is no transportation problem and, therefore, those who favor the Federal ballot must concede that its use at home cannot logically be urged. As a matter of fact there appears to have been no real difference of opinion on the question of the State ballot. It is conceded by even the most ardent advocates of the Federal ballot that the State ballot should be available and used by every voter who can possibly use it. The only excuse, as has been said so often, for the Federal ballot is the fear that it cannot be delivered to the soldier's hand.

Now, of course, there may be two or three States that cannot or will not provide for an absentee ballot for their soldiers. If this has not been done by August 1 then those who advocate the Federal ballot are perfectly logical in asking that the Federal ballot be made available to those in the armed services both at home and abroad. I am informed that 40 States have acted or will act through their legislatures to cooperate in every way possible to send the State ballot to the men and women in service everywhere.

My own State of Connecticut has been most foresighted and progressive to that end. The special session of the legislature which closed last Friday, January 28, provided a State ballot on which the soldier may vote a straight ticket, a split ticket, or write in the names of individual candidates. The application for this State ballot is now made very easy. The soldier may use the blank Federal post-card application or even an informal written request to secure one. Simpler still, the soldier may have an absentee ballot sent him upon the request to the registrar of voters by a relative or friend. The absentee ballot has been simplified in form and reduced in weight and size to conform to the recommendations of the Army and Navy. In other words, the State of Connecticut has accepted the use of all Federal facilities in order that the soldier in the field both at home and abroad may vote for every office from President of the United States to selectmen of his town.

Now as for these post cards; in accordance with Public Law No. 712, the Army and Navy have already had printed some eleven or twelve million blank post cards, at least so I am told. Also in accordance with this law these blank post cards should be distributed or the Army and Navy should begin to distribute them on February 1 and therefore these post-card applications for the absentee ballot will be available to the soldiers everywhere within a short time. I would just like to point out that there can be very little congestion of the transportation facilities in taking care of the absentee ballot as provided by the State of Connecticut. These post-card applications will be dribbling in to the State for months to come. When our candidates have been nominated and the ballots can be printed they will be sent to the soldiers wherever they may be. As the nominations for the State of Connecticut are not necessarily made at the same time as those in other States it follows that the process of furnishing absentee ballots will proceed from the 48 States in somewhat of a piecemeal manner. It seems obvious that they will return to their respective States in the same way. Not all at once but in the regular course of mail service. This being so the assistance and labors of the War and Navy Departments will be materially reduced.

Whatever Federal ballots are provided can go overseas by boat and the comparatively few that need to be used can come back by plane without taxing or interfering with the military transportation. Also I have provided that there be printed on the Federal ballot notice to the soldier before he votes it that this Federal ballot may be used only for voting for Federal offices, and that if he wants to vote for the State and local offices he should use the post-card application blank to send for and use his State ballot.

It seems to me that my amendment to the Worley amendment to S. 1285 should be acceptable to us all. Every problem can be solved if we try to solve it on a middle ground. In this case we have the unusual situation of each side to this question gaining something from the other. Both those who advocate the State absentee ballot and those who favor the Federal ballot will have their case strengthened and will have the use of their respective ballots more easily attained. The Worley bill, amended as I suggest, will give the members of the armed services every possible opportunity to vote. That, I am sure, is the honest wish of every Member of this House.

Why I Am Opposed to This Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposing the adoption of the conference report on the pending tax bill as it is presented to us today by the House conferees. Although the time was extended for debate on it, I did not have time to ask Chairman DOUGHTON several questions which I wished to ask, nor did we have time enough to hear from the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] all of the reasons why he is opposing the bill. I think he has some compelling reasons. Another gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has indicated a number of reasons why this measure is inadequate, and I have somewhat the same feeling as he expressed.

Chairman DOUGHTON did indicate that certain experts testified that the Social Security tax might be frozen at the present rate for the remainder of this year without endangering the soundness of the program. I'm indeed glad to hear that and I hope it is a mathematical truth. However, I have heard that some actuaries explain that the soundness of this insurance program depends upon a certain increase in the premium payments, which may or may not be the increases as originally provided by law. This leads me to question the wisdom of tampering very much with the premium payments as first planned, unless the desire is to weaken the whole plan. I hope it is true that the payments may be kept temporarily from increasing according to the original plan without endangering the financial soundness of the system in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied in my own mind with the provisions contained in this measure concerning renegotiation. I, for one, had hoped to take the profits out of war. I have worked consistently toward that end. I fear that this measure will leave loopholes for enormous profits. Some say such profits can be caught by taxation. I do not believe that any scheme of taxation we could devise would recapture much of the profits which our carelessness in regard to these war contracts would make possible.

Of course I do not want to bleed white those who are providing us with the implements and materials of this war. My observation leads me to believe that those who are filling war needs are not only doing a wonderfully fine job in producing what we need but they are not doing so badly by themselves and for the stockholders. I do not believe that we can leave the gate wide open for war contractors to make all the profits they can get and hope that we can get the large part of it away from them and back into the Treasury in taxes. They would like

for us to permit them to make enormous profits and they will take care of seeing to it that Uncle Sam does not get too much of those profits away from them in a revenue bill.

I fear that our conferees have yielded too much to the Senate conferees in this matter, especially on renegotiation, and I cannot bring myself to vote to accept this report.

The Soldier's Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the the following editorial from the New York Times of February 5, 1944.

THE SOLDIER'S VOTE

During the long and frequently bitter debate in the House of Representatives on the question of legislation to facilitate the soldier's vote, a great deal was said on all sides about the attitude of the southern Representatives on such matters as States' rights, the poll tax and (in the words of one southern Member of Congress) the question of white supremacy.

In the light of all this it is interesting to examine Thursday's roll call in the House. The question came on a vote of recommittal which amounted to a choice between a Federal plan for the soldier's vote, as desired by the President, and a States' rights plan, as desired by his opponents. On this question 131 votes were cast by Representatives from the Southern States (including the border States as part of the South). The record shows that 69 of these votes were cast in favor of the Federal plan and 62 in favor of the States' rights plan. On the basis of these figures it therefore becomes impossible to hold the South responsible for the defeat of the program favored by the President. For if the decision in the House had been left entirely to the southern Representatives the President's program would have been adopted, 69 to 62.

The real reason for the defeat of the President's program was partisan, rather than sectional. The Federal plan was defeated not because of southern votes, a majority of which would have approved it, but because of Republican votes. Of a total of 193 Republicans voting on the question, only 18 supported the Federal plan and 175 supported the States' rights plan, which is something of a novelty in the long history of the Republican position. When any party casts so nearly solid a vote as this (practically 10 to 1), it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that political considerations played a part. Clearly, for many Republicans, the decisive factor in the whole affair was their fear that a majority of the soldiers' vote would go to the President in case he is a candidate for re-election.

This is not a good enough reason for opposing legislation which tries to give the soldier in the field more adequate assurance of his ability to exercise a fundamental right to which he is entitled. Congress will have to do better than this, before it is through with the issue, or answer to an indignant public which is tired of seeing the soldier's interests made a subject of politics.

The Republican Party and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the Republican Party and Labor, delivered by me at the Lincoln Day banquet at Detroit, Mich., on February 5, 1944:

This evening we celebrate the birthday and honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln was one of the real founders of the Republican Party and was the first Republican President elected to office. He placed the Republican Party in such an outstanding position that no other party was able to challenge its leadership successfully for a quarter of a century.

I want to talk tonight about Abraham Lincoln and the common man. I want to talk about Lincoln and the attitude of the Republican Party toward labor. The Republican Party was organized as the poor man's party and to better the conditions of the common man and of the slave. By labor I mean the millions of workers organized and unorganized who are employed in factories, in the mines, on the farms, on the railroads, and in every corner of this great country of ours; I mean the hundreds of thousands of Government employees, whether State or Federal; I mean the millions of workers in white-collar jobs, the school teachers and office workers—in a word, I mean the millions of workers who make up our peacetime and wartime working force.

LINCOLN BELIEVED IN HUMAN RIGHTS AND IN PROPERTY RIGHTS

Abraham Lincoln once said, "God must have loved the poor because he made so many of them." This was Abraham Lincoln's way of saying that he sympathized with the poor. No man was more understanding toward the great masses and their problems than was Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln believed in our constitutional system of government. He believed in human rights and he believed in property rights, always placing human rights above property rights. He also believed that human rights depend in a large measure upon property rights. The right to own property to him was sacred. His philosophy was expressed in a little paragraph which reads as follows:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world; that some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let him not who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Thus Abraham Lincoln set forth distinctly and without equivocation his belief in human rights and the rights of labor as well as his belief in the right to own property. He believed that these rights were guaranteed to every American by the Constitution. The Republican Party must believe in human rights and in property rights; that human rights come first; that human rights and property rights are interdependent, each depending on the other.

I believe in property rights whether those property rights exist in the form of a contract that a worker has whereby he sells his labor, the only product he has to sell, to an employer for a definite amount for a definite period of time, or whether it exists in the property right of the owner of the factory in which the worker is employed. You cannot destroy the one without destroying the other. So long as that worker is willing to fight for the right that he has in that contract whereby he sells his labor to his employer, he will fight for every type of a property right, including the property right which the employer has in the factory in which he is employed.

The New Deal party has been charged repeatedly, and not without cause with trying to change our form of Government. Anyone who examines the Republican, Democratic, and Socialistic platforms of 1932 will be forced to the conclusion that the New Deal party has been following the Socialistic platform of 1932 rather than the Democratic platform since that time. The hands may have been the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The endorsement and support that the New Deal administration has been receiving from Communist Browder and men of his belief during the past 11 years is some indication that those policies have been in some respects so pink that Communists saw red. The Socialists and Communists have given their unqualified support to the New Deal.

THIS NATION CANNOT EXIST HALF SOCIALISTIC OR COMMUNISTIC AND HALF CAPITALISTIC

The Republican Party believes in the capitalistic form of a Government as provided for by the Constitution. We believe in the profits system. We are opposed to socialism and communism.

During the years preceding the great political campaign of 1860, this Nation was at the crossroads—one way pointing toward slavery and the other towards the abolition of slavery. During the debates of that period, Abraham Lincoln repeatedly said that "This Nation cannot exist half slave and half free."

Today this Nation is again at the crossroads—one way pointing towards the capitalistic form of a government as provided for by our Constitution and the other towards socialism, if not communism. This Nation cannot exist half communistic or socialistic and half capitalistic. Whichever way we go, we must go all the way. There is no halfway stopping place. We must either continue the profit system or abolish it. Whether we like it or not this is and should be the great issue of the coming campaign. The people should have an opportunity to express themselves at the polls. No one can criticize an American for advocating any principle in which he believes so long as that principle is not actually immoral and so long as he advocates bringing about the change by the ballot box. No one has a right to lead the people down a blind alley towards socialism or communism, while promising them constitutional government.

These issues should be presented to our people squarely. If this Nation is going to abolish our capitalistic form of government and the profit system, let us do it in a constitutional way with our eyes open and by ballot.

THE MASSES WILL DETERMINE WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE

There are 54,000,000 peacetime workers of all types in America. While they place human rights above property rights, they own real and personal property and believe in property rights. They have been taught in the schools, churches, and in the homes to respect property rights. They have been taught that the right to own property is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. These 54,000,000 workers constitute the bone and sinew of this Republic. They are American. It is because of the fact that these workers and those who preceded them through 150 years of our constitutional

history have believed in constitutional rights that we have constitutional rights. It is because they have believed in and still believe in property rights that we have property rights. They are in the majority. In the final analysis, they will determine the kind of government we are going to have. Once you shake the faith of the millions of workers in these principles constitutional government, including the right to own property, is a thing of the past. Injustices are quickly noted and resented by the average American and the worker is an average American.

MR. ROOSEVELT AND THE NEW DEAL PARTY CRUCIFY LABOR

While labor owes much to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party, Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party owe more to labor. Without the support of labor, Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party could not have been successful. For 11 years labor has befriended Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party. Today we find Mr. Roosevelt and his New Dealers crucifying great masses in the ranks of labor, organized and unorganized.

MILLIONS OF WORKERS FROZEN AT PRE-WAR LIVING WAGES

Millions of workers are frozen at pre-war or nearly pre-war wages while others are frozen at wages far in excess of pre-war wages all by the same Executive order and all have the same increase in the living costs. Millions of workers today find themselves with 20 to 25 percent wartime deductions from a pre-war or nearly pre-war living wage to meet an increase in the cost of living of from 20 to 30 percent while millions of unskilled workers are receiving outrageously high wages to which they are not entitled and while some corporations are taking large excess profits and squawking when we try to make them refund those excess profits. I have taken the position repeatedly that to the extent to which an industry is engaged in war production, to that extent their pay rolls are Government pay rolls and their excess profits are taken out of the United States Treasury.

WORKERS ARE ENTITLED TO A DECENT WAGE

I have always strongly supported a decent wage policy for both skilled and unskilled labor. Skilled labor should be well paid and paid in proportion to the skill. From my office window, I can see the new Mellon Art Gallery. Month after month I watched workmen erecting that beautiful structure. Day after day I was amazed at the skill with which craftsmen built that beautiful dome. The architect drew the plans. The workmen erected the building. The one was as important as the other. The trowel was as necessary as the architect's pen. However, you and I can agree that the workmen who with broom and shovel sweep away the broken stones and debris at the foot of that building should not be paid the wages of the skilled craftsmen who fashioned that beautiful dome.

THE UNSKILLED WORKER HAS NO RIGHT TC DEMAND THE WAGES OF A SKILLED WORKER

In making my study of war costs which took me through 47 defense plants and the reports of which I made to Congress on June 29 and July 2, 1943, I was impressed by two outstanding facts. I found workers with little or no skill being paid as much, or more than the skilled workers who had been years learning their trade, and I found corporations operating on Government funds making large excess profits to which they were not entitled.

I found 18-year-old girls leaving the ribbon counters of dime stores and after a few weeks of training being paid $65 a week. Farmers' boys, gas station attendants, grocery-store clerks, automobile salesmen with little or no skill, being paid from $120 to $220 every 2 weeks. A superintendent of a Government arsenal being paid $6,500 a year after 38 years of service told me a defense plant offered his $4,000-a-year assistant $11,500 a year, including $5,000 bonus. Tank welders, after 4 to 6 weeks of training, are paid $67 a week or the same wages expert welders were paid. Girls after 2 and 3 weeks of training are being paid $269 a month for a 48-hour week. Girls assembling oil pumps receive $146 every 2 weeks.

In one factory I found machine-gun assemblers were paid in 1942 from $4,774 to $8,741 a year. The United States Employment Service advertises for laborers to go into northeastern Canada at $300 a month plus room, board, clothing, and overtime; for welders at $214 a month while learning and after a few weeks of training $270 a month, plus bonuses; for dish washers, kitchenmen, and waiters at $250 a month and bonuses.

All unskilled labor and labor requiring very little skill were paid excessive wages, adding excessive costs to the war production program which must be paid by the millions of workers in the low-income brackets. The dime store girl who is not so fortunate is still working for $18 a week and paying income taxes to raise the money to pay the other dime store girl in the factory $65 a week.

EXCESS PROFITS

In my report to Congress on July 2, 1943, I gave the results of a rather extensive study on excess profits by corporations giving numerous illustrations. I found corporations with little or no capital operating on Government funds and making tremendous profits. One corporation with $65,000 capital stock and surplus and $6,696,000 Defense Plant capital took 60 percent net profit before taxes on $50,771,000 worth of machine-gun sales to the Government after paying themselves $3,000,000 management and engineering fees through another corporation owned by them. After paying back $23,000,000 under renegotiation, including half the fee, and paying $4,800,000 in taxes, this little corporation had a net profit in 1942, after renegotiation and after taxes of $1,880,918, in addition to a $1,500,000 engineering fee, on a paid-in capital and surplus of $65,000.

Another corporation showed a net profit before taxes of $18,000,000 or 37½ percent on gross sales to the Government of $48,000,000. After refunding more than $6,500,000 under renegotiation, paying $8,500,000 in taxes, this corporation had $3,200,000 profit left after taxes and after renegotiation, or nearly 16 percent on the invested capital and earned surplus.

Another corporation took a net profit, before taxes, of $125,00C,000 or 28 percent on the gross sale of $450,000,000. After refunding $65,000,000 under renegotiation and paying $45,000,000 in taxes, this corporation had $13,600,000 left on an invested capital and earned surplus of $47,000,000. This corporation increased its surplus more than $8,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

Another corporation took a net profit, before taxes, of $35,000,000 or approximately 27½ percent on gross sales of $127,000,000. In addition approximately $10,000,000 was earned on cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, making a total net profit before taxes of $45,000,000. After refunding $14,000,000 under renegotiation and paying $24,000,000 in taxes, this company had left approximately $7,000,000 profit, after renegotiation and taxes, or approximately 37 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus of $20,000,000.

JACK & HEINTZ

One of the corporations which has taken the greatest profit on the smallest capital is Jack & Heintz. I would not mention this corporation by name but for the fact that they have been flooding the desk of every Congressman with charges that the Government has been unfair. Let us examine the real facts. This company was organized in November 1940 with a capital stock structure consisting of 100 shares no-par-value stock for which the three Jacks and Heintz paid in the sum of $500 or $125 each. They also paid in $99,500 in surplus which was not in cash but in assets and patent rights of an old corporation. Thus we have a corporation of four individual stockholders who show a paid up capital stock and surplus of $100,000.

My records show that this company obtained Government funds through the Defense Plant Corporation up to August 31, 1943, the following sums: First commitment approved, $396,021; second commitment approved, $3,046,292.34; third commitment approved, $1,613,346.25; fourth commitment approved, $5,137,650.29.

In other words the taxpayers furnished $10,193,309.88 of their cash capital and Jack & Heintz, according to these figures, furnished $500 actual cash and $99,500 in property and patent rights. Of course, they can operate cheaply when they have no depreciation to charge off, no capital invested, but let us see what the real picture is.

Earnings, for the calendar year of 1941, before taxes were $932,024 and after taxes $289,089. Earnings for the year 1942 before taxes were $7,740,829. The earnings before taxes were 7,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus and after taxes 1,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus.

Thus in 1942, after setting aside $173,680 for depreciation and obsolescence; after paying the three top officers $116,645 each; after giving a Christmas bonus of $944,300 (I am told one secretary was given a bonus of $39,000); after paying wages that, according to their statement averaged an annual rate of $5,172 per employee, as shown in my statement to the House on June 29, 1943, and after paying $6,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes, this company showed a total 1942 earnings of $1,740,839 on an invested capital and paid-in surplus of $100,000. The total pay roll for 1942 was $8,886,000 while the annual sales for the year were $23,661,000. This company has an exceptionally good production and low-cost record.

Jack & Heintz forget to mention in their statement that the two Jacks and Mr. Heintz paid themselves in 1942 $116,645 each in salaries; that they had paid $944,000 in Christmas bonuses, including $39,000 to one secretary; that the Defense Plant Corporation furnished them with defense plant facilities, equipment, etc. in the amount of $10,193,309 and that they themselves only contributed $100,000 in actual cash, property, and patent rights. Of course the Government would not allow the $944,000 in bonuses to employees who were being paid the wage scale that Jack & Heintz were paying. Of course they would not allow a $39,000 bonus to a secretary. Of course they would not allow $116,000 salary for two of the Jacks and Mr. Heintz when those funds come out of the United States Treasury. These people are being paid with Government funds because their factory pay rolls are being met with Government funds. They are just as much a Government employee insofar as being paid out of the Treasury is concerned as is the $1,260 or $1,440 Government clerk under Civil Service.

EXCESS PROFITS WILLINGLY REFUNDED

Hundreds of corporations have found themselves with excess profits and are cheerfully and gladly refunding them. Ninety percent of the corporations are in this classification and the other 10 percent must be compelled to refund their excess war profits.

WHO PAYS FOR THESE LABOR COSTS AND EXCESS PROFITS?

A part of the money wasted, including moneys paid in excess wages and excess corporation profits, is being paid out of current taxation and the remainder is being paid by borrowing and issuing bonds.

According to Mr. Roosevelt's message to Congress, the public debt will aggregate $258,000,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for which we are ap-

propriating now. We are told that this debt will reach the tremendous sum of $300,000,000,000, or twice the assessed valuation of every piece of property—real and personal, tangible or intangible on the assessment rolls of the various assessing units of the 48 States. The principal and interest of this debt will have to be earned and paid for in a large part by the worker, including the exserviceman.

But let us be more specific and see just who is paying and will pay for this tremendous waste which will aggregate billions of dollars in our war effort. The Treasury Department records show that in 1944, 67,300,000 people will receive in incomes $157,000,000,000 and pay $22,000,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

A break-down shows that 21,600,000 individuals, including heads of families, will receive this year $19,200,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or less, or an average income of approximately $890 a year per person and will pay $500,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

Twenty-four million, four hundred thousand more individuals, including heads of families, will receive this coming year, $42,400,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 to $2,000 and pay $4,100,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

Twelve million two hundred thousand more individuals will receive $34,600,000,000 in incomes of $2,000 to $3,000 a year and will pay $3,400,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes. Sixty percent of the income this year is going to people with incomes under $3,000 and 80 percent of the income is going to those with annual incomes of $5,000 a year or less. These are the people who will pay the heavy taxes. It is their money that the President is using to meet the factory pay rolls, including machine-gun assemblers who are receiving as high as $8,700 a year and 18-year-old girls who receive as high as $65 to $75 a week.

Oh, but the President says we will limit incomes to $25,000 a year. Let us see what the record shows. The Treasury report shows that 110,000 individuals will receive $7,400,000,000 in incomes of $25,000 and over and pay $4,400,000,000 in taxes. If you take the entire income of every person in the United States who will receive in 1944 an income of $25,000 or more you would only add $3,000,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. Incidentally, may I say that I will go along with anyone in taxing incomes down to a minimum. I will not go along with a policy limiting incomes paid in competitive business. So when we are wasting money it is the money of the low-income group and wage earner which we are throwing down a rat hole.

SMALL BUSINESS PAYS

While we are making millionaires in industry through excess profits and while excess profits are being taken by both labor and corporations, thousands of small businessmen are being forced to the wall financially because of business conditions and are forced out of business due to inability to obtain peacetime material or help. These people are paying heavy taxes. Thousands of other small businessmen are making small profits or no profits and are paying heavy taxes which go to make up both excess labor and excess corporate profits.

WHO PAYS?

Who pays for all this waste of public funds, extravagance, and inefficiency? The railroad worker, the day laborer, the low-paid factory worker, the skilled worker who has spent years learning his trade, the miner, the school teacher, the farmer, the white-collar worker, the businessman—these and millions of others will pay for this waste, extravagance, and inefficiency. They will pay for excessive costs and excessive profits. It has been estimated that it will take a tax levy of six billion annually to pay for and amortize a $300,000,000,000 debt in 50 years. The returning serviceman, who has won the war, will have to work and toil and sweat and pay a tax the rest of his life to pay for this waste. His children, and perhaps his children's children, will pay. Every citizen, rich or poor, big and small, will pay and pay and pay. There is no easy way out.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S SO-CALLED BILL OF RIGHTS

In 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt first came into office he stated, and properly so, that one-third of the people in America were ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. At that time the total income of the Nation reached a low point of forty-six billion. By income payments I mean the total income of the country, wages and salaries, farm incomes, rents, dividends, etc. It is this income against which taxes are levied Only recently Mr. Roosevelt in a message to Congress set forth what he called a second bill of rights in which he stated that every family had: 1. The right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation. 2. The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a rate which would give him and his family a decent living. 3. The right of every family to a decent home. 4. The right to a good education. 5. The right to adequate protection through old-age security, accident, and unemployment insurance, etc. He made the statement, "Necessitous men are not free men." Again, "People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff out of which dictators are made." To all this we Republicans agree. Hungry men and women brought about the French Revolution. However, a man can be just as hungry if he has a job and isn't earning enough to care for himself and family as he is without a job or with a job on Work Projects Administration. After 11 years of the New Deal, Mr. Roosevelt speaks of these rights which the people should have but do not have. All of these things were promised the people 11 years ago and promised repeatedly since then. To the extent that we have these things, they were brought about in a large part by war or prewar emergency conditions and not through Mr. Roosevelt's efforts.

AFTER 11 YEARS OF THE NEW DEAL, ONE-THIRD OF THE PEOPLE ARE STILL ILL-FED, ILL-CLOTHED, AND ILL-HOUSED

Let us see just what the situation is today after 11 years of New Deal promises. Let us see just what constitutes a decent living. In 1937 the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia set forth a minimum budget for a single woman and in 1943 the Labor Department brought that budget up to date. That budget is as follows:

Estimated November 1943 cost of a weekly budget for a single woman, approved Nov. 2, 1937, by the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia [1]

Item	November 1937 cost	Estimated November 1943 cost
Room and board	$10.00	$12.70
Clothing and upkeep	3.50	4.59
Sundries (priced)	2.52	2.81
Personal care	.57	.76
Health	.57	.63
Recreation	.33	.38
Transportation	1.05	1.04
All items priced	16.02	20.10
Other sundries included in this budget	.98	1.23
Total cost	17.00	21.33

[1] This budget was prepared by the Minimum Wage Board in 1937. It has been brought up to date by using cost-of-living indexes prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I do not believe that this budget is excessive. Congress increased wages of the lower income group because it was considered too low. However, let us take the budget as it is:

This budget would require an annual pay check of $1,191 a year to maintain what the Minimum Wage Board calls a minimum requirement in the District of Columbia for a single person. While this may be high in some areas, it may be low in others but we can use it as a yardstick.

TWELVE MILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND SINGLE PERSONS WILL HAVE 1944 INCOMES OF $1,000 OR LESS

According to the Internal Revenue Department estimates for 1944 and breaking down the 21,600,000 incomes of individuals of $1,000 or less into single persons and heads of families, we find that 12,250,000 single persons will receive in 1944 incomes of $1,000 a year or less with an average of $897 out of which they have to pay their income and other taxes. This would be $300 a year, plus taxes, less than the budget provided for by the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia. Can all of these people be said to be well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed? If not, then they must be ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed.

THIRTY-SEVEN MILLION FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND AMERICANS LIVING ON AVERAGE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF $880

The Labor Department describes the typical and average family as consisting of 4 people—a man, his wife, a boy age 13 and a girl age 8. They have made up what they call a minimum wage budget as found by the Work Projects Administration in 33 of the largest cities on June 1, 1943. This budget runs from $1,541 a year as high as $1,809 a year with an average of approximately $1,700 a year for a family of 4. The Detroit, Mich., budget is set at $1,798 a year. Going back to the income-tax records, we find that 9,370,000 married persons, and heads of families, will receive in 1944 incomes of $1,000 or less with an average income of $880 per year. This means that after 11 years of the New Deal 4 times 9,370,000 Americans, or 37,480,000 Americans, are living on an average income of $880 per year per family of 4. This is approximately one-half the average amount the Labor Department says a family of four requires for a decent living in the 33 largest cities. Surely these 37,480,000 Americans do not come under Mr. Roosevelt's definition of having a decent living.

TWENTY-NINE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND MORE AMERICANS LIVING ON AN ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF FROM $1,000 TO $1,500

United States Treasury records show that 7,450,000 married persons or heads of families will receive incomes this year of from $1,000 to $1,500. Multiplying this number by 4 for the average family, we find that these 29,800,000 more Americans live on incomes of $1,000 to $1,500 per year per family of 4. In this group we find millions of white collar workers, section men on the railroads, school teachers, miners and in fact we find people from every walk of life. Mr. Roosevelt is taking the taxes that these people are paying into the Treasury and turning it over to machine gun assemblers who are getting more money per year in some cases than a lieutenant general in the Army. Soldiers, sailors, and marines have to learn to assemble machine guns and take them down again blindfolded in fox holes, gun turrets, etc., for as little as $50 a month.

SIXTY-SEVEN MILLION TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND AMERICANS LIVE ON ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF $1,500 OR LESS

Summarizing these two last groups alone and not including the 12,250,000 single persons with incomes of $1,000 or less, we have

16,820,000 heads of families supporting, or trying to support, 67,820,000 Americans on incomes of $1,500 or less.

When the New Deal Party in the coming campaign points with pride to the $157,000,000,000 wartime income produced by issuance of bonds and taxes let them point to these 67,000,000 Americans who are in this low-income group.

Let us proceed again. There are 2,151,640 persons who are being paid an average of $26.46 per person per month old-age assistance. Can these people be said to be well fed, well clothed, and well housed? We have 134,804 men on railroad retirement who receive an average of $66.25 per month to support themselves and dependents. In view of wartime costs can these people be said to be well-housed, well-clothed, and well-fed?

We find approximately 75,000 Government employees including postal employees on retirement who are receiving an average of $966 a year to support themselves and families. Two and one-half billion dollars of the income in 1944 will be paid out to several million people in old-age pensions, retirements of various kinds in small sums. Many of these people who have paid their hard-earned money into a fund find they are being paid in a dollar which purchases 50 percent of what the dollar they paid in purchased. Surely no one will contend that these people are well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed. We are taking money from them in taxes that they should have to buy bread and milk and clothes and food for children and turning that money over in profits to corporations and in excess wages to people who are not and cannot earn the money they are being paid. In view of these facts, can we say that we are now properly feeding, clothing, and housing that third of the people which Mr. Roosevelt said 11 years ago were ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, or are they still ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed?

SECTION MAN PAID $23.80 A WEEK

In making a study of labor costs, I stopped a railroad section man in a little town of a thousand people. I knew him personally. He has a wife and five children, and lived in a tarpaper shack. I asked him to show me the tear sheet of his last pay check. The tear sheet shows the amount he earned and the amount of deductions for various purposes. He had $23.80 left as take-home pay after deductions for a 48-hour week to support himself, the wife and five children. He was working 48 hours a week and they could work him 56 hours a week, including Sundays, without overtime. So long as they did not work him more than 8 hours in 1 day, he drew no overtime. He saw factory workers getting time and a half for Saturday, double time for Sunday, incentive bonuses, night bonuses, vacation bonuses and other bonuses. He saw the Government taking his tax money, small though it may be but money he needed desperately to support that little family, putting it into the Treasury and then paying it out in excess labor costs to people who were not earning it.

I am not condoning strikes. No one can condone or justify wartime strikes but I can appreciate the position of a man like this—walking home with a little check to his family in the face of those conditions.

I have a letter from a responsible party who wrote me of 3 railroad engineers who have worked 30 years each on an engine. They were married men. Their wives went into a defense plant and after a few weeks of training were making more money than their husbands were making after 30 years of experience and hard work. Are you surprised there is dissatisfaction?

On my way home to Michigan recently, I picked up a marine in the city of Washington. I took him on all the way to Uniontown, Pa.—some 200 miles. He had worked in a coal mine since he was 14 years old and his father was still working in a coal mine. He did not know who I was. I asked him to tell me the kind of a contract they had, the one they were trying to change, and just what his father did from the time he left the house until he got back. He told me that his father left the house for a shift, walked 2 miles, rode 10 miles in the car to the mouth of the mine, went down the shaft, walked 3½ miles underground, picked up the pick and shovel and it was then that his pay started. He worked 7 hours, not including 30 minutes for lunch, laid down his pick and shovel and his pay stopped. He walked 3½ miles underground, rode up the shaft, rode 10 more miles and then walked the 2 more to his home. There was charged against his check blasting powder, caps, fuses, tool breakage—he furnishing his own tools—tool repair, oil for his lamp in addition to his withholding tax, social security and other deductions.

The base pay of a miner was $1 an hour. That is the contract they were trying to get away from. I am not justifying strikes but one can readily see how the miner feels when he sees 18-year-old girls getting $65 to $75 a week paid for out of his tax money. I am not justifying strikes but I do want to give you some of the reasons behind this labor trouble we are having. When we are having labor trouble, it is often a case of Mr. Roosevelt's chickens coming home to roost.

The New Deal administration has been calling some of these low-paid workers disloyal and inflationists because they dared to ask for that decent living which was promised them. They have been crucified because they ask for enough money to buy food to fill the stomachs of little children and to keep their bodies covered with decent clothing.

WHAT IS NOT INFLATION

Let me lay down here and now a fundamental principle as to what is not inflation. Paying an individual or the head of a family enough money whether in wages or other income to support himself and family in common decency is not and can never be inflationary. Money spent for the necessities of life to keep body and soul together will never bring about inflation. Taking money we call taxes away from the low-income groups which should be spent for bread, butter, milk, and food to fill the stomachs of hungry children will not avert inflation. Such a policy can only bring about suffering, crime, immorality, and poor citizenship.

CONCLUSION—MILLIONS OF AMERICANS ARE LOOKING TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FOR LEADERSHIP

Millions of Americans are today looking to the Republican Party for real leadership. Millions of workers have been bitterly disappointed by Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal. They have been disillusioned and are now learning by bitter experience that most of the things which Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal were supposed to give them have not been given them or have to be paid for and paid for dearly. Many of them feel that Mr. Roosevelt has misled, misinformed, misrepresented, if not betrayed them. These and millions of Americans of all political parties are convinced that Mr. Roosevelt has led them from democratic ideals and principles into fields of radicalism. They can no longer follow him. These millions from all walks of life are looking to the Republican Party for leadership. They have no other place to go. They still have faith in America. If Socialism or Communism obtains a foothold in this Nation, it will be because these masses have lost faith. God help the Nation if the Republican Party fails them.

Abraham Lincoln was a great leader. Great leaders are always humble. He was greatest in his love for, faith, and belief in the common people. He had faith in the masses and they had faith in him. He believed in them and they believed in him. Nothing could shake the faith of the common people in that great leader and nothing could shake his faith in the common people. It was because he had faith in them and they in him that he was able to carry this Nation successfully through a great national crisis in history. What this Nation needs today is real leadership—someone who can bring about the solution of these great and intricate problems which confront this Nation, a great leader, a humble leader who can sit on a plow beam beside a farmer and talk over his problems; who can sit on a railroad tie and talk to the sectionman about his problems; who can sit in an engine cab and talk to the engineer, fireman, and conductor; one who can stand beside a lathe in a factory and talk over the problems of the factory worker; who, if need be, can go into the bowels of the earth and talk over the problems of the miner; one who in his desire to serve will find time to talk with the humblest citizen of the land and discuss his problems with him.

What America needs today is a great leader; one who, like Abraham Lincoln, has faith in the masses and in whom the masses have faith; one who believes in the common people and in whom the common people believe; a courageous, God-fearing leader; one who, if need be, can say "No" to any group whether in the ranks of labor or industry; one who will protect the low-income groups from unjust demands, whether by labor or industry, and protect the common masses from unjust demands of both labor and industry.

What the Nation needs is a great leader who can lead with a confident knowledge that the masses are following him and who need not look back to see whether they are in fact following him. Give the Nation that leader and the great masses will turn to him and bury their betrayers beneath an avalanche of ballots. Give the masses that leadership and they will be a pillar of strength to him who dares to do the right as God gives him to see that right.

Our constitutional Government and all the rights guaranteed under it depend as never before upon that leadership. Without it, I fear such Government may be lost to us forever. The great masses look to the Republican Party hopefully and almost prayerfully. The Republican Party must be prepared to furnish that leadership. It cannot, it dare not, and I am confident it will not, fail.

Hannegan's Political Gall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Waterbury Republican of February 5, 1944:

HANNEGAN'S POLITICAL GALL

One has to be a bred-in-the-bones politician to have the gall to deliver an address like that of the new Democratic National chairman, Robert E. Hannegan, read for him in Birmingham, Ala., Thursday night because he had missed his plane and could not be there. The Republicans are accused of causing inflation and Franklin D. Roosevelt is lauded as having saved us from this dire evil.

Labor unions point to Government cost of living statistics as phony, complaining that

costs have become so oppressive as to justify their demand for pay increases. We doubt that anyone can be found who will testify that inflation has been held so beautifully in control as Chairman Hannegan would have us think.

But it takes Hannegan to tell us that the Republicans, not the administration in power, are responsible for economic or any other troubles the people may find themselves confronted by. Blandly he will next ask us to believe that the public debt which rose from a total of about $20,000,000,000 when Roosevelt took over to almost seventy-three billions by the time we came into this war—eliminating the astronomical climbing of the war period—is something put upon the Nation by Republicans who were not in power, and not by Roosevelt.

Blandly he will tell us that it was the Republicans and not the New Deal administrators who put 3,000,000 civil employees upon the public pay roll. Blandly he will tell us that the fiscal policies that put this Nation in a deficit without exception every year of the entire period of Roosevelt's administration are due to the Republicans. Blandly he will place upon Republicans the responsibility for the fact that our Federal Government expenditures jumped from about four and a half billions in the year preceding the advent of Roosevelt to over twelve and a half billion the year before we entered this war—again we eliminate the war-period expenditures.

This effort to unload upon the Republicans the responsibility for what happened while the Roosevelt New Deal administration was in power must mean that the New Deal leaders themselves are smelling the odor. They haven't the nerve to state that it does not exist and so shift to the campaign technique of trying to put the blame for it all upon Republicans who were the minority all these years. We thus get an example of the sort of campaign oratory we are going to be subjected to this year.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, with great reluctance I shall vote against the conference report on the tax bill (H. R. 3687). I realize that the conferees have worked faithfully on the job and many provisions of the bill as reported by the conferees have my heartiest approbation.

I particularly approve the provisions of the report in reference to the renegotiation of contracts. I am glad at the amendment eliminating the increase made in the House bill of the rate of postage on third-class mail.

But I have consistently advocated a sales or spending tax with substantial cost-of-living exemptions as the most effective antidote for inflation, and I think the bill should have made some provision of this sort, instead of making the provisions which it makes for various excise taxes on luxuries or presumed luxuries. I agree with the view that we should pay currently for as much of the war as we can and I am satisfied that there is still a good deal of current high earnings going into goods and commodities far from indispensable. I think that we need the deterrent effect of such a spending tax.

I am greatly disturbed at the inflationary dangers which beset us, the constantly mounting national debt, the unprecedented sums of money in circulation. It is true that prices have thus far been held in line on the whole remarkably well; on many items they are well below those of the last war. But I do not think that we should on this account deceive ourselves as to the existing dangers. The inflationary implications of our present debt structure are far greater than any which existed in 1917 or 1918.

I am satisfied that the present administration has no anti-inflation program of any value. I do not think that borrowing money to pay consumer or rollback subsidies will curb inflation. On the contrary, I regard those subsidies as being in the nature of pensions paid indiscriminately, regardless of the means of the recipients, most of whom can pay their bills from day to day.

Neither do I see any merit in the Treasury's tax proposals. I do not think any material amount of revenue can be obtained from taxes in the higher income brackets. They are too few in number. Corporate taxation must leave the corporations with enough capital and surplus to meet the shocks of conversion to a peacetime economy and to maintain employment.

The vast majority of incomes in this country are under $5,000. Some of these incomes could stand more taxation without undue hardship. Others whose incomes have not benefited from the war would accommodate themselves to higher taxes only with great difficulty. A sales or spending tax with cost-of-living exemptions would automatically reach the incomes with surplus spending power, as evidenced by actual spending.

The insincerity of the administration's efforts to curb inflation were illustrated in December when the majority leader went out of his way—RECORD, page 10706—to commend a bill increasing the pensions of Spanish War Veterans, though it came to the House with a report from the Veterans' Administration which refused to recommend passage of the bill and described it as contrary to the President's program.

If we are really out, as I think we should be, to fight inflation, I think we should be bolder and more honest than the administration is at the present time. It is for this purpose that I vote against the conference report, notwithstanding its meritorious features.

Strike-Free Record in War Industries at Yonkers, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include two articles which appeared in the Yonkers Home News, one on January 25, 1944, and one on February 1, 1944, setting forth the fact that Yonkers, N. Y., has established a very important record in having no industrial disturbances or strikes since Pearl Harbor and before.

The Yonkers Home News is a weekly paper sponsored by the Alexander Smith Memorial Foundation, Inc., and is sent free to 10,000 servicemen from Yonkers all over the world.

I wish to compliment the city of Yonkers, together with the employers and employees of all these plants on the great contribution they have made toward winning the war by avoiding strikes.

I believe it would be advisable for the United States Government to give to any city in the country some award of honor or recognition for a record such as the city of Yonkers has set in connection with the war effort.

[From the Yonkers (N. Y.) Home News of January 25, 1944]

NO STRIKES HERE IN WAR—YONKERS HAS BEEN FREE OF LABOR LOCKOUTS ON DEFENSE WORK DURING DURATION — MAY BE NATIONAL RECORD

Yonkers may be setting a national record for cities of its size in the Nation. One thing is certain, it cannot be excelled in the avoidance of labor strikes in war work. The fact is that the Terrace City in the Hudson Valley has not had a single strike in war production work since Pearl Harbor. And long before that, while the Nation was beginning to arm, there was no lockout to mar this record.

These are the glad tidings the Home News is able to convey to the thousands of Yonkers men and women in the armed service scattered as they are all over the globe.

At the present time there are 17 industrial enterprises in this city producing what is required for the war effort in about as many different lines, every one of which has been performing 60 minutes of every working hour without interruption of any kind caused by labor disputes.

It is estimated that the number of men and women engaged in these tasks ranges as high as 15,000 and that about every one of them has a relative or close friend in the service.

In addition to the 17 leading employers there are a number of smaller producers which have been called upon from time to time to do war work, and their record is as free from industrial disturbances as the larger ones.

This city whose population was recorded at 142,000 in the Federal census of 1940 can match any other city in the Union in this respect and is surpassed by none because its rating stands at 100 percent today.

SOME MAY CROSS FINGERS

These interesting facts now beginning to dawn on all concerned may be discussed with a crossing of the fingers or with the customary knocking on wood. But it is comforting to realize that both employers and employees have proceeded thus far on a principle that has made for peace, and that gives good promise of its continuance.

A FINE EXAMPLE

The leaders of the city's chief industries have set an example of cooperating with their workers, and have employed every means within their power to stimulate the production that the war effort has required. This has been met with a like attitude upon the employees and their leaders, stirred by patriotic fervor, and a determination to reach every goal that has been set. The code they

have both embraced is best explained in the words, "Come let us reason together."

VICTORY PERFORMANCE

Until the last war order has been filled here, with victory and peace proclaimed, the performance to date gives every promise of a continuance.

It may be that this city will be one, or one with other patriotic communities, which will have earned national if not international recognition for having kept the faith of "No strikes during the war."

PRODUCERS FOR THE WAR

The industrial centers where employers and employees have stood out conspicuously in the record Yonkers has made and is making follow:

Alexander Smith & Sons Carpet Co.

Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corporation, Habirshaw Division.

Otis Elevator Co.

Poirier & McLane Corporation.

American Sinteel Corporation, 320 Yonkers Avenue.

American Dietaids Co., 176 S. Broadway, diet aids.

Beccpa Glove Mills, 4 Warburton Avenue, knit gloves.

Arthur G. Blair, Inc., 145 Alexander Street, equipping boats.

Cameo Curtains, Inc., 45 John Street, curtains.

Campbell & Sons Manufacturing Co., 117 Stanley Avenue, hats.

Havranek Bros., 196 Ashburton Avenue, meat products.

Hipwell Manufacturing Co., 252 Hawthorne Avenue, instrument cases.

Ludlow Spring & Welding Co., 217 Riverdale Avenue, ship funnels.

New York Engineering Co., 80 Babcock Place.

Nye Machine Co., 70 McLean Avenue, machine shop.

Pyridium Chemical Co., Nepera Park, chemicals.

Riverdale Glove Co., 95 Riverdale Avenue, knit gloves.

Refined Syrups & Sugars Co., Vark Street, sugar products.

Saunders Tool & Machine Co., Inc., 31 Atherton Avenue.

United States Shipbuilding Corporation, Ludlow Field, ships.

U. S. Industrial Chemical Corporation, Vark Street.

White Swan Uniforms, Inc., 21 St. Casimir Avenue.

Yonkers Woodworking Co., 157 Tibbetts Road.

[From the Yonkers (N. Y.) Home News of February 1, 1944]

PRESS AND RADIO HAIL NO-STRIKE RECORD HERE—100 N. B. C. STATIONS BROADCAST SALUTE TO YONKERS

The no-strike record in War Production established by this city has already been widely advertised. The newspapers of the State and country through dispatches issued by the Associated Press and by the National Broadcasting Co. have made known to millions of Americans at home and abroad the enviable achievement, following a news story appearing in the New York Times detailing the performance.

ONE HUNDRED BROADCASTS THROUGHOUT THE NATION

"Hat's off to the city of Yonkers! That Hudson River city has had no strikes in any of its industries engaged in war production since or before Pearl Harbor. The Yonkers Home News disclosed this fact today. The city's men in uniform all over the world will read of it when this week's issue reaches them."

These were the comments of Morgan Beatty, the well-known commentator of the National Broadcasting Co., over Station WEAF, Wednesday evening, in his broadcast of Associated Press news of the day, from Washington, D. C. It was a Red Network presentation over a coast-to-coast hock-up of 100 stations. The National Broadcasting Co. told the Home News on Thursday that millions of listeners are guaranteed the Alka-Seltzer Co., which sponsors the program.

BATON ROUGE FIRST TO FALL IN LINE

Other cities awakened by Yonkers' leadership in setting forth its claim have begun to survey their own conditions. The first of these to fall in line is Baton Rouge, La. There the publisher of the Daily Advocate, which is also issuing a Home News for that city's servicemen, Mr. K. H. Knox, tells of the Yonkers achievement under the headline, Yonkers Sets Record for Labor Harmony, following which he places his city on the Honor Roll of Patriotism with this declaration:

"You can be proud of the way war industry in Baton Rouge is backing you up—there are none here who will 'stab you in the back' to gain a few cents an hour of wage increase.

"The writer has personally talked to the heads of the following larger companies and each has assured him that since Pearl Harbor there has never been the slightest delay in the production of war material due to any labor dispute or trouble, and that all of his company's employees stand 100 percent in every way behind you and in the determination to win the war."

Then follows a list of the leading industries in Baton Rouge.

TALK OF NATIONAL AWARD TO YONKERS

Here in Yonkers the chamber of commerce and the Yonkers Real Estate Board have added their acclaim to the record the city has made. Of the 92 municipalities in the United States having a population in excess of 100,000, Yonkers rated sixty-first in the Federal Census of 1940 with 142,598 inhabitants.

Already there is talk of Government recognition of the 100-percent performance, of this and other cities that can match it, which possibly might take the form of an award of honor from Army and Navy or through congressional action.

Post-War Priorities for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would provide for the sale of surplus war materials in small units after the present war, and grant veterans preferential rights to purchase such materials. I quote from the provisions of the bill:

That (a) in the sale of surplus war materials owned by the United States or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States after the termination of the present war, the stock of each type of surplus war materials proposed to be sold shall be divided into small units, according to cost price, in order to assure a fair and equitable distribution of such materials among prospective purchasers thereof.

(b) Preferential rights to purchase such materials shall be granted to persons who have served during the present war in the land and naval forces of the United States and have been separated from such service under honorable conditions or released from active duty.

(c) War bonds presented as the purchasing medium for any such materials by any veteran exercising his preferential purchase rights shall be accepted in payment for such materials at their maturity value.

This bill is sound in principle since it gives the service men and women the opportunity that they did not have at the close of the last war. The war materials were disposed of in large lots to individuals and firms with large capital. The soldiers and sailors are buying war bonds and saving a part of their earnings in the hope that they can go in business for themselves when they return to civilian life. Under the bill the soldier farmer is given an opportunity to buy a jeep which he can use on the farm. Men in the air service have been trained in all phases of aviation and radio.

These men would be given preference in the purchase of aviation and radio equipment so that they may put into practical effect the training received in the service of their country in wartime. Many other items could be put to use by our fighting men if they could purchase them in small quantities.

Every effort is being made to obtain the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations in the passage of this legislation. It is believed that these groups not only will be favorable to the enactment of the bill but will get behind it actively.

Our servicemen are entitled to mustering-out pay to get them established in civilian pursuits, but they are more interested in the enactment of laws so that they can help themselves in earning a livelihood for themselves and their families.

Bureaucracy—Causes and Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, having been granted unanimous consent by the House of Representatives, I extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech delivered February 6, 1944, by our distinguished colleague, Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois. This speech was broadcast over radio stations KGBX and KWTO at Springfield, Mo., and over KDRO at Sedalia, Mo. It is a thoughtful statement worthy of the careful attention of Members of Congress and the public. Mr. DIRKSEN by reason of his abilities and long honorable service in this House, speaks with authority on matters of public policy and his observations are of Nation-wide interest.

In this time of distress and bewilderment, when government seems to have departed from the true purposes for which it has been ordained, it might be well to survey the problems which confront the Congress and the country in the hope of getting a better estimate of what our true and basic problem really is. Today, as never before, the purposes of government must be clearly and

energetically restated. We must travel back to the main highway of government and start from there. We need a simple and clearly understood road map to provide direction for the future.

When the Seventy-eighth Congress reconvened, it was beset with a host of problems, most of which have not yet been disposed of. It must deal with foreign relations and lend-lease, with food and relief for those areas which have been conquered and occupied so that order might be preserved. It must deal with taxes and appropriations, with muster-out pay and votes for soldiers. It must deal with the disposal of surplus war goods to prevent a damaging impact upon our economy and with the question of the renegotiation of war contracts. It must deal with contract terminations in order to expedite the transition from war to peace so that jobs might become immediately available for those who are demobilized from our armed services and our war plants.

Later on will come other problems such as the size of the Army and Navy that will be maintained in the post-war period, the question of post-war controls over our own economy, the size and kind of a public-works program which will be initiated, if any, and many others which will spring out of the transition period.

As we survey this list of problems and policies with particular relation to the home front, it might be well at the very outset to take into account the observation which was made nearly 100 years ago by the philosopher, Thoreau. It was he who observed that for every person hacking at the roots of evil there are 100 hacking at the branches.

It may be that most of the confusion with which we are confronted today as we ponder the activities of government, springs from the fact that we have not probed deep enough for fundamental and underlying causes. It may be that we have been hacking at the branches rather than the roots. It may be that we have concerned ourselves too much with the results of policies and activities rather than with causes. Know-why is quite as important as the know-how. Today we witness attacks upon bureaucracy and conflicting Federal programs. We hear much of burdensome restrictions upon industry and business and of multitudinous reports which are required. We hear of and know about vexing controls and irritating restrictions. We see evidences of waste and extravagance. We note the inefficiency and lack of economy in Federal activities, and they all provoke a storm of protest and discussion. Yet all these are but results rather than causes, and the real issues before us are deeper and more basic. If we can isolate the basic causes, we shall see more clearly the real problem which lies before the country and the Congress.

This is a good time to determine where we are, how we got there, and what must be done to get back to the main road.

Let us go back to 1932, when economic collapse brought Nation-wide distress. Every group in the land was clamoring for action and they got action. The programs which were instituted more than a decade ago were called "action" programs and bear that designation even today. There was a widespread belief that our difficulties were only temporary and would soon pass away. That belief did much to reconcile people everywhere to the policies which were instituted even though in the judgment of careful students of government, many of them were a departure from the purposes and objectives of government. There was a certain willingness to endure controls and deficit spending since the difficulties were only temporary. States and local divisions of government who had difficulty in meeting relief problems because of debt limits came to Washington and freely threw their responsibilities upon the Federal Government. People were not too tax-conscious in those days and it was reasonably easy to secure public support for most any type of a program which had to do with relief. It was a time when it was easy to persuade many people that our distress stemmed from the failure of our economic machine, and that we needed a new machine or that we must do a lot of tinkering upon the economic system which had carried us along for nearly 150 years. Thus it was that action programs of all kinds were invoked. Now, let us examine briefly how these policies were carried into effect and how the pattern which developed an amazing expansion of the functions of the Federal Government, finally developed the problems at which we are hacking today.

One can select any activity of government in order to demonstrate this thesis of cause and effect. Consider an agency like the W. P. A., which was created to make work.

When the W. P. A. was authorized, it, of course, required personnel to make it operative. There must be administrators and assistant administrators. There must be clerical and fiscal and professional employees. There must be regional and district offices staffed with personnel of all classifications. There must be State and local offices adequately staffed. And there you encounter at once the question of bureaucracy. Multiply that agency by the many agencies of government and you can readily understand how the Federal pay roll grew from about 500,000 in 1932 to the 3,000,000 who are on the rolls today. Bureaucracy is the result; the cause is found in the activities which have been undertaken and expanded by government.

When such an agency is created and staffed, it needs funds with which to meet pay rolls and purchase supplies. In addition, there must be funds to pay for the projects which such an agency undertakes. It quickly runs into hundreds of millions and billions, and there you encounter the whole problem of the expenditure of funds which finally shows up in the form of taxes, borrowings, and debt. Once more you see cause and effect. An increasing national debt, heavier expenditures, higher taxes, are but the fruit of action programs.

It has been customary for such agencies of Government and especially those that deal with emergency programs to insist on broad and flexible powers if in their own judgment they are to operate effectively. They do not want to be restricted in their activities by provisions of law which are too rigid. They want authority to make broad rules and regulations to carry out their responsibilities. They want power to make rules which also carry penalties. Nor do they want those rules and regulations to be reviewed in the courts. It was this period of emergency activity which gave birth to that seemingly harmless phrase in many pieces of legislation which reads, "the administrator shall have power to make all necessary rules and regulations to carry such act into effect." The result can be seen in the form of a vast body of administrative law under which the Nation operates today and under which the people may be penalized. It has resulted in administrative management of the Nation rather than by law and if that trend continues, it will finally mean a nation that is completely managed and controlled by officers of Government who were not elected to office and who are not directly responsive to nor responsible to the people. Once again, you have cause and effect.

When an agency of Government is vested with this power to make rules and regulations, it must be delegated and redelegated to subordinate personnel. The responsibility for the power which is so redelegated from the top to the bottom becomes remote as it reaches that place where it is applied to the affairs of people at the grass-root level and accounts for the fact that abuses, discriminations, and the invasion of the civil liberties of the people so often develops. Here then we find cause and effect as we seek to find a remedy for those irritating and vexing applications of Federal power as it is applied to the daily living of our people. It should be apparent, therefore, as we consider bureaucracy, high taxes, a heavy debt, the growth of administrative management of the affairs of the people and the annoying restrictions which are placed upon their behavior and conduct that these are but results which spring from the expansion of the activities of the Federal Government and the delegation of broad powers to administrative officials who are not responsible to the people and who cannot be reached at the ballot box.

It is interesting to observe what has happened over the last few years when the people's elected representatives in Congress have undertaken to either abolish some of the agencies whose continued existence was unjustified or to curtail their appropriations or to restrict some of their more indefensible activities. Administrative agencies have directly or indirectly undertaken to apply pressure for the purpose of influencing Congress and diminishing popular confidence in that body.

Wherever the courts have stood in the way of the exercise of arbitrary power by a Federal agency and there was a likelihood that the courts might restrict executive operations, an effort was made to prevent a review of administrative orders and decisions by the courts as happened when such a provision was written into the Price Control Act. Public opinion was managed by means of endless press releases. In many cases the Federal pay roll was used as a kind of lobby organization to send letters and telegrams to Members of the Congress and the Senate protesting any action that might be contemplated in the direction of economy and efficiency to give the taxpayers of the country a fair deal. Finally many of these emergency functions were cloaked in a kind of moral doctrine in order to give them appeal to the country and to make it appear that any action by the Congress to abolish or restrict such activities was a definite blow at the general welfare and the common good. It is possible, therefore, to summarize the basic end result of this program and the objective toward which it has been moving. It has been essentially based upon the submergence and the subjugation of the individual and the development of a mass collective philosophy which is diametrically opposed to individual freedom. The emphasis has invariably been upon the collective good at the expense of the freedom of the individual and if this trend continues, true individual freedom and the dignity of human personality will be in genuine peril. Freedom and the collective philosophy have not and cannot live together in the same country. One or the other must eventually triumph and that will become the basic issue in America. In 6,000 years of history there is no record that a controlled and managed economy has ever succeeded. Yet today, we move in that direction.

Now there must be a remedy for this situation. Is it in a better administration of this same philosophic concept of government? That would be like calling for more efficient administration of the wrong thing and is not the answer. The answer lies in the maintenance of individual liberty, and in a preservation of a balanced form of government.

The prestige and functions of the Congress must be recaptured. The power of the courts must be restored and maintained. It is far better to endure the abuses and inconveniences which may ensue from court decisions which restrict administrative orders and regulations than to risk the destruction of the powers of the judiciary and to gradually starve the appetite for freedom and the safeguards with which that freedom was surrounded in the Bill of Rights

All this we must do but we must do more. We need to develop an unshakable determination to preserve the climate in which freedom and the free-enterprise system can flourish.

Why have we come so far compared with other nations? Is it because we possess superior skill, greater resources, and better techniques than other nations? These do not supply the answer. We have come further because ingenuity and initiative could come to full flower under the American system. I believe history will support that assertion. We can only hope to meet the problems which lie ahead in a turbulent postwar period and improve the standards of every person in America by the preservation of that atmosphere which is so conducive to a full expression of our energies. Shall we now surrender to the collective philosophy and to a system of government under which the affairs of the people are administratively managed by individuals who become the stewards of our individual behavior or shall we militantly cling to that which made us a great nation and which alone gives promise of undreamed of progress in the future?

Surrounded by soldier graves, a great and humble man spoke to his compatriots at Gettysburg in the autumn of 1863. There he expressed a hope. How appropriate it is today. "That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom." It must be reborn in hearts and minds throughout the land.

Iowa Labor Protests Unfair Little Steel Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted unanimously by the Des Moines Trades and Labor Assembly, January 16, 1944:

Whereas it is self-evident to any thinking man that the net wage of the average workman to apply on living costs are inadequate; and

Whereas statistics and figures likewise prove that net earnings of wage workers are below the amount necessary to afford a reasonable standard of living; and

Whereas through the necessities of war, government and machinery have been set up to control and regulate wage increases; and

Whereas labor, in order to cooperate in the war effort, has pledged itself to refrain from the use of the strike as a method of obtaining economic justice; and

Whereas the National War Labor Board and its Regional Boards, in the conduct of inquiries and hearings as to the proper wage increases to be granted to labor, has found itself bound in its opinion by the so-called Little Steel formula and other restrictive policy rules; and

Whereas by reason of said Little Steel formula so-called area wage brackets and other diabolical and senseless rules, merited increases for wage workers have been refused and denied; and

Whereas by reason of such decisions of the War Labor Board, great groups of working people have been kept at a wage level inadequate to meet normal needs of even ordinary diet; and

Whereas records undeniably disclose that corporate net profits after taxes of all types and kinds are paid, will, for the year 1943, reach an all time staggering total high of $8,000,000,000; and

Whereas the high taxes necessary to win the war must come out of the worker's income and thus leave greatly reduced amounts for living costs, while high taxes for corporations, after operating expenses, still leave corporations with greater income than ever before; and

Whereas it is necessary that a concerted drive be made against the rules, regulations, and limitations which prevent decisions of wage increases to be made on the merits of a case, primarily on the cost of living and the inadequacy of the pay; and

Whereas this can be accomplished only by the elimination of the Little Steel formula, and other incomprehensible rules and regulations of the War Labor Board: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Des Moines Trades and Labor Assembly in meeting assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, this 16th day of January 1944, That the said Des Moines Trades and Labor Assembly go on record unanimously in its own behalf and in behalf of members of organized labor of the American Federation of Labor in Des Moines, Iowa, that it protests most vigorously the unfair, discriminatory and vicious practices necessitated by the Little Steel formula and other rules, which prevent the granting of adequate wage increases to wage workers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Des Moines Trades and Labor Assembly call upon, by letter or otherwise, each affiliated local within its jurisdiction to the end that the members thereof may be appraised and advised of the need for the cancelation, alteration, and change of the Little Steel formula, other rules and regulations which have and are preventing fair dealing with the great mass of workers of the United States who are winning the war on the production front, and whose sons and daughters, in the main, are fighting and winning the war upon the battle fronts; and be it further

Resolved, That concerted action be taken by the labor organizations of Des Moines to demand that the shackles be released so that fair, impartial treatment can be given labor on the merits of its demands, and labor can continue to support the war effort in every possible manner without the exercise of its inherent right to strike, which it has yielded gladly in the common interests of our country during this war crisis.

Adopted unanimously this 16th day of January 1944, at Des Moines, Iowa.

DES MOINES TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
By J. W. SOUTTER, *Secretary.*

Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, at Conference of Council of American O. R. T. Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered at the conference of the Council of the American O. R. T. Federation, New York City, December 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indeed happy to be presented to you by your distinguished chairman, Commissioner Fertig. He is an old friend of mine and a former colleague of mine in the New York State Assembly. I recall, too, in what high esteem he was held by our two most distinguished former Governors—Roosevelt and Lehman, for whom he was counsel.

His leadership in the work of O. R. T. is entirely in keeping with a selflessly rich and long public career, devoted to governmental and community efforts. His talents and achievements have given him a deservedly high place in the esteem of the people of this city and State. I congratulate you and him both.

I think it is highly significant that this conference of the O. R. T. Council should take place shortly after the United Nations met in Atlantic City to formulate their plans for post-war relief and rehabilitation. I say that because I am convinced that in those tasks we shall have to lean heavily on the experiences of organizations such as your own which have long been pioneers in that work. From O. R. T., particularly, we shall have a great deal to learn about one of the greatest rehabilitation problems of all. I refer to the rehabilitation of the Jews of Europe.

There is one inescapable fact which we must face. When this war is over there will be three or four million Jews left alive in Europe who will desperately and urgently require assistance. Many of them, we hope, will be able to go to Palestine, there to build a new life for themselves, and a homeland for their fellow Jews. And the United Nations, in decency and justice, must spare no effort to make that possible. Others, we hope, will find welcome elsewhere. But for the great portion of them there will be no alternative but to remain on the soil of Europe. There they will be—dispersed in many lands, uprooted from their homes, released from ghettos, and liberated from concentration camps. They may have been freed from the yoke of Nazi tyranny, but they will still be ground under the crushing tyranny of poverty and disease, of homelessness and hopelessness. To these Jews, the United Nations shall have to bring immediate and extensive assistance.

But there has been too much of a tendency, I believe, to think of rehabilitation in too narrow terms. When we speak of rehabilitation, we generally think only of food and shelter, of clothing and medical supplies. Certainly, those items are of fundamental and overwhelming importance. But they by no means exhaust our tasks of rehabilitation—and we shall forget that fact only at our gravest peril. Rehabilitation, if it is to be effective, must include a major offensive against the legacy of hatred and prejudice that years of intensive anti-Semitic propaganda are certain to leave throughout Europe. And rehabilitation must include as well a program to restore to those who have been ground into the dust, the self-respect and human dignity of which they have been so cruelly robbed. Failing these things, our efforts may serve for a time to relieve hunger. But they will not achieve complete rehabilitation.

The problems of physical relief are widely understood. And I think we can rest assured that the groundwork is being laid for that program. Little attention has been given, however, to the broader aspects of relief of which I have spoken. Still less attention is being given to the problem in which you are so vitally interested—that of Jewish rehabilitation.

During this war, the Jews of Europe have been the victims of one of the amazing conspiracies of history—a technique of silence. We have heard a great deal—and rightfully

so—about the magnificent contributions of our heroic European allies: The Poles and the Czechs and the Norwegians and our other comrades in freedom's common battle. We have heard, too, of the heroic and epic struggles of the Greek guerrillas and the Yugoslav partisans and the French underground. But we have heard remarkably little about the Jews of Europe. We become aware of their existence only after they have ceased to exist, only after some unbelievable mass murder like that of Warsaw and Kiev. But of the magnificent contribution the Jews of Europe have made to victory we have been told little. We seldom hear about their role in the fighting forces of the United Nations; in the underground movements of the conquered lands; of the heroic resistance of the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto; in Greece and Crete and north Africa; in Palestine, that bastion of the Near East. And let me tell you that I can testify from personal experience in north Africa and Palestine to the magnificence of these contributions.

I do not pretend to understand the reasons for this technique of silence. I do not understand why, when we recount the blows struck on democracy's behalf, we should so discriminate against those who in their dedication to democracy's cause have proved themselves second to none in the world. I do not know why, when we tell of the fight against fascism, we should so scrupulously and studiously avoid any mention of those who were fascism's first and foremost victims.

But I do know this: By so doing, we of the United Nations have thrown away one of our most effective techniques of rehabilitation. For years, fascism's favorite strategy was the strategy of hatred. It sought to sow by its anti-Semitic propaganda the seeds of discord and social disunity among its enemies. At home, it sought to foster national unity by promoting a common fear of the Jew. Through persistence and cunning, fascism succeeded in foisting on its own people, and among many in other parts of the world, a fantastic and utterly false conception of the Jew. That conception it will take years of patient education to eradicate. And it is certain to prove a major barrier to the reintegration of peoples and the reconstruction of social life in Europe after the war.

What a wonderful opportunity we have thrown away by our technique of silence. If we had only challenged the Fascist offensive of lies with our own counteroffensive of truth, we could have begun the process of reeducation by hammering away at the fantastic Fascist conception of the Jews. If only the United Nations had told the world the true story of Jewish participation in the war. If we had told of the overwhelming response of Jews the world over to the call of freedom and civilization. If we had told the inspiring tale of the Jews in occupied lands who are braving the starkest horror to organize resistance against the enemy. If we had told the soul-filling saga of the Jewish community of Palestine which has already given in such measure of itself and its resources and is clamoring for the opportunity to give more. If we had done these things, we would already have made a major contribution to the rehabilitation of the Jews of Europe. Instead, we have, by our silence, given support to Fascist fulminations.

But our silence has embraced not only the war and the contribution of the Jews to it. It has extended to the peace and the prospects of the Jews of Europe in the peace. The Atlantic and Pacific charters, the conferences of recent weeks, the various declarations of the United Nations have given inspiration and hope to the peoples of the world. We have promised to restore the homeless to their homes. We have pledged ourselves to redeem the lands that have been plunged into slavery. We have even promised to restore monarchs to their thrones. But in all of these pledges and commitments, we have been silent about one group of people who, more than any other, need a word of hope, a note of encouragement, an act of inspiration. I refer to the Jews of Europe. In the hour of their darkest distress, we of the United Nations have spoken to them not one direct word of cheer. Where we have specifically committed ourselves to other peoples, we have sought to answer the anguish of the Jews with glittering generalities, with pious platitudes.

I spoke earlier of the fact that one of the major tasks of rehabilitation will be to restore to those who have been reduced to such distress their self-respect and human dignity, to give them the feeling that they are once more human beings in a family of peoples, equals in a world of equals. What a contribution we could already have made to that job of rehabilitation if we had spoken forthrightly and courageously. If we had said to the Jews of Europe: You who were fascism's first victims. You, against whom fascism first launched its World War precisely because you were Jews. You, who in so many lands have been robbed of every semblance of human rights and human dignity. To you, we of the United Nations say: We are determined to restore to you those rights of which you have been so arbitrarily deprived. We are determined to give you those opportunities which you have for so long been denied. We are determined to recognize those claims you have so rightfully been urging. We are determined that you shall, as individuals wherever you are, enjoy equal rights with all other individuals.

We shall make certain that your rights as a minority group are respected, wherever you establish such rights. And we promise that we shall respect your rights to Palestine which we and the entire civilized world recognized after the last war. If we had said these things, what hope and inspiration we would have given to the downtrodden Jews of Europe. With what respect and hope they would have been able to carry themselves even in the depths of this misery. What strides we should already have made in that particular job of rehabilitation.

If the United Nations, therefore, are finally and seriously and earnestly talking about rehabilitation, then it is high time this technique of silence about the Jews of Europe was brought to an end. It is high time we told the world the story of the Jewish contribution to democracy's struggle. It is high time we gave to the Jews of Europe some faith and hope in their postwar prospects.

Under any circumstances, the work of O. R. T. would deserve the highest commendation and support. Because of the failure of the United Nations to take advantage of their opportunities, your work becomes of even greater importance today.

Your experience of 63 years in the tasks of rehabilitation, your flexibility and resourcefulness born out of the need of meeting ever-changing conditions throughout the European continent have marvelously equipped you for the problems of rehabilitation we shall face when final victory is won.

The schools for training you have established and which today are carrying on in Switzerland, in north Africa, in North and South America are already helping to train thousands of Jews for practical and constructive pursuits in the post-war period.

Even in Fascist-dominated Europe, the vast training system you of O. R. T. had succeeded in establishing, the force of expert teachers and leaders whose work has been interrupted by the war, will be waiting to play their important role once again when peace will permit a resumption of your operations.

More important than anything else, however, is the fundamental philosophy you have developed and which has been the basis of all your activities. That philosophy, I might add, has influenced the work of organizations far removed from your own. And I hope that for the future of democracy, it will profoundly influence all our efforts at rehabilitation. For, basically, the philosophy of O. R. T. has been that sound social life, constructive democratic organization, the harmonious integration of people of diverse cultural and religious affiliations must rest on the provision to all people of practical, useful, creative work. Where an entire population is dedicated to creative, constructive pursuits, there we can hope to find social harmony and social progress. Where certain sections of the population are denied that opportunity, where they are restricted to economic ghettos, there the entire society must ultimately fall into decay and degeneracy and chaos.

For years O. R. T. has been attempting to integrate European Jewry into the economic structure of that continent by doing these two things—by challenging all the oppressive measures which sought to confine Jews to social and economic ghettos, and by training Jewish men and women in constructive industrial and agricultural pursuits. If that program of liquidating all discriminatory measures and practices and of providing everyone with the opportunity for practical, constructive work is applied to the Jews of Europe and extended over the entire field of reconstruction, then we can look forward with hope to the final success of all our rehabilitation efforts.

The Japanese Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important questions facing our country is, How are we to conduct ourselves as a Christian nation in the treatment of the Japanese? Those who have been born in this country claim citizenship, those who have immigrated to our country and have never become citizens, and the problem relating to the final location of those Japanese moved from the west coast because of military necessity. This is no easy task and requires the services of men who are fully acquainted with this problem and with years of experience in the question of Japanese affairs.

Two broadcasts have come to my attention recently—one by Upton Close, January 30, 1944, in which he analyzes the handling of our Japanese and Philippine relations, both as to radio and newspaper publicity. The other article by Lothrop Stoddard, January 30, 1944, over a national radio broadcast in which he details to a considerable extent the entire background and history of this race of inhuman, treacherous, uncivilized sadists of the Orient. This broadcast is worthy of careful study. From this article we should be able to plan a definite program as to the proper treatment of the Japanese question. I insert this article as part of the permanent record of this Congress:

For us Americans all other aspects of the world picture this week have been eclipsed by the horrible revelation officially released last Wednesday evening by the War and Navy Departments—the story of the martyrdom

of some 50,000 American and Filipino soldiers made prisoners nearly 2 years ago by the Japanese when they conquered the Philippines. The very next day, Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, related a similar tale of horror to the House of Commons regarding the fate of an equal number of British, Dominion, and East Indian troops captured by the Japanese when they overran Malaya, Burma, and Hong Kong. Those twin accounts, reluctantly published by the American and British Governments only after they were convinced that nothing could be done to alleviate the sufferings of the survivors and that the disclosure could not notably intensify a fate already worse than death, reveal a pattern of deliberate brutality, sadistic cruelty, and almost scientific savagery hitherto associated only with a few of the most ferocious and degraded breeds of men.

Fortunately it is not my task to summarize those grisly tales, which have undoubtedly been read and pondered by nearly all my radio audience. But it is very much my task to analyze their meaning and deduce the lessons to be drawn from them, because for more than a quarter of a century I have been observing Japan and the Japanese. This coming March it will be 24 years since the publication of my best-known book the Rising Tide of Color, wherein I warned against the menace of Japan militant to our world in general and to America in particular. I was by no means the first to do so. Almost a generation before my book, Homer Lea and others had uttered similar warnings of the wrath to come out of the East. Unhappily, ours were Cassandra voices, ridiculed or condemned by so-called liberals, pacifists, humanitarians, and the whole "uplifter" tribe which had the ear of American public opinion right down to Pearl Harbor and which kept this Nation stupefied by the opium of its Pollyanna twaddle. Now, in the stark light of those grim revelations, let me repeat a few of the things I and others have been saying, lo these many years, about Japan and the Japanese; this time, perchance, with a better prospect of being listened to and believed.

Briefly, here is the situation: Japan presents a problem for the future of our Nation and our civilization infinitely more stubborn and deep-rooted than does our European enemy. Understand, I do not minimize the threat of Nazi Germany nor the task of overthrowing it. Yet it is only 11 years ago today that Hitler and his Nazis came to power and began the systematic fanaticizing and brutalizing of the German people, while even if one traces the roots of nazi-ism back to Bismarck or Frederick the Great, the entire cycle is less than two centuries. In Japan, however, we find the whole system which we now call "totalitarianism" molding the thoughts and practices of its people for at least 1,500 years. This is recognized and bragged about by the Japanese themselves. Early in the present war a Japanese statesman referred peevishly to Nazi and Fascist compliments on Japanese similarities to their alleged creations. "The Germans and Italians," he complained, "say that we Japanese have imitated them. On the contrary, they have imitated us!" That is the liberal truth. The totalitarian mold of Japanese national life was fixed with the establishment of military feudalism in the seventh century A. D. Thenceforth, the soldier was the Japanese ideal, to which all else was sacrificed. And this militaristic ideal was coupled with the belief of a master race divinely predestined to world-dominion. From the very dawn of their history the Japanese have felt themselves to be the elect of mankind. Their islands are the land of the gods. Their native religion, Shinto, which means "the way of the gods," has no moral or ethical code or covenant, but is a glorification of their native heroes and of themselves. Every Japanese believes implicitly that the first Japanese Emperor, Jimmu Tenno, who is supposed to have ascended the throne more than 2,500 years ago, was the lineal descendant of the sun goddess, Amaterasu Omikami; that from his loins has sprung a dynasty of god-emperors, eternal through the ages; that the divine effulgence pervades the entire Japanese people, which is the Yamato race, literally seed of the sun, destined eventually to dominate the entire earth under the mystical doctrine of Hakko Ichiu, the 8 corners of the earth under the one imperial roof. I say, all this is believed today just as intensely as it was more than 1,000 years before Hitler and Mussolini were born. Compare that age-old arrogance and lust for world conquest with the half-baked ambitions of Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy—the latter already collapsed like the plaster-cast of the Roman Empire which it proved to be.

Japanese history has been one of chronic predatory warfare, either against their neighbors or against each other. The politico-social pattern has always been the despotic rule of a master caste over the docile and obedient masses of the Heimin, or common people. And this despotic regime has been maintained not only by Gestapo-like police methods but even more by a system of education, going back to the earliest times, which deliberately suppressed mental originality and imposed complete thought control. That process was taken over and streamlined by the small group of master minds who created modern Japan when it emerged from its isolation some 90 years ago. More than ever before, Japan's educational system aims not to develop exceptional ability and character but to create a general level of attainment and provide a supply of well-trained instruments of national policy. Japanese education proceeds on the assumption that every man, woman, and child is first of all a member of the state, and that the state has rightful and absolute power over them, body and soul. Each child must therefore at the earliest possible moment be fitted into the system. He is not to find his own place but to occupy the one assigned him. The master minds behind modern Japan buttressed their system by intensified psychological sanctions. Emperor worship and the inherently nationalistic cult of Shinto were put on an efficiency basis, while the military code of Bushido, hitherto confined to the warrior caste of Samurai, was indoctrinated into the whole people, which eventually became a solid block of fanatics eager to make any sacrifice for their god Emperor and the divine destiny of the Yamato race, membership in which is almost as impersonal as that of bees in a hive. Modern Japan was thus being spiritually as well as materially prepared for that course of limitless aggression which has always been in the minds of its leaders and which permeates the whole people. There is no other and better Japan, no exiles for conscience's sake, no concentration camps for liberal dissenters, as in Germany and Italy. Japan is a monolithic block in its attitude and policies toward the outer world.

Such is Japan militant, which must be destroyed as an aggressive power if we and our world are to know future peace and security. The task is a prodigious one. Japan's fighting men will have to be killed literally by the millions in a fight to a finish wherein they will sacrifice themselves as unhesitatingly as bees or wasps in defense of their hives. The Japanese home islands must be invaded and subdued as part of the job. That will take a prodigious toll of blood and treasure, of which a large part will undoubtedly be American. We must steel ourselves to that realization and pay the price, no matter how heavy it proves to be. Revelations of Japanese savagery and bestiality can thus serve a useful purpose. Our martyred dead will thus not have died in vain.

Yet defeat and occupation will not suffice to exercise the demoniac spirit inculcated into the Japanese for the past 1,500 years. Neither will promiscuous slaughter of the population, which now numbers some 75,000,000, increasing at the rate of nearly 1,000,000 per year. We must approach the problem of Japan, not in a mood of blind vengeance but in an attitude of scientific surgery. Our objective should be to cut out a deep-seated cancer which threatens our national life and our civilization. This does not involve the massacre of the whole Japanese people, which is practically unthinkable. But it does necessitate selective killing, and killing on a large scale. Japan's whole history is the domination and indoctrination of a docile, collective-minded mass by a masterful ruling caste. That ruling caste must be literally wiped out if what may be termed the apostolic succession of diabolism is to be permanently broken.

The conquest of Japan should, therefore, be the signal for the elimination of certain categories of the population. First and foremost must be the entire officers' corps of both the Army and Navy, including those on the retired list. They are responsible for the fanaticizing and brutalizing of the simple-minded and rather stupid peasant boys taken into the armed services. The entire officers' corps, numbering roughly between 200,000 and 250,000, should, therefore, be adjudged individually and collectively guilty of war crimes and summarily executed. It is probable that a large proportion of them will have anticipated the firing squad by committing hara-kiri, or ceremonial suicide, when Japan's defeat has been accomplished. With them should be slated the leaders of the jingoistic and terroristic nationalist secret societies like that of the Black Dragon, presided over by that bearded old ruffian, Mitsuru Toyama. Also, the more sinister figures in journalism, finance, and other upper circles should be ferreted out and disposed of. The grand total to be eliminated may run as high as 500,000. That is an appalling prospect for so humanitarian-minded a people as ourselves and our British allies. Yet, in my humble opinion, nothing less will suffice. Only thus will the Japanese masses be freed to learn and accept a new and better system of ideas and practices. I repeat, the cancer must be cut out.

Meanwhile, the disillusionment of the Japanese masses may best be begun by two military operations. The first of these might well be another air raid on Tokyo, this time with the specific objective of bombing the imperial Palace. In my opinion, the avoidance of that target by the famous Doolittle raid was a great mistake. The Japanese people inevitably jumped to the conclusion that our airmen were overawed by the Imperial presence. Next time, Hirohito should be placed in personal jeopardy. But even more important, to my mind, would be a bombing of the great shrine at Ise, the earthly abode of the sun goddess Amaterasu. To this supremely venerated spot go habitually Cabinet ministers, generals, admirals, the Emperor himself, there to confer with Japan's divine patroness and to obtain her inspiring counsel. To the protection of the sun goddess the Japanese ascribe their freedom from foreign invasion during the entire course of their history. The shattering of that legend by a good bombing of Ise would be worth the loss of a group of planes in a suicide raid. Beneath their stoic exteriors the Japanese are a volcanically emotional people. Loss of faith and loss of face could demoralize them far faster and far more surely than mere loss of life, which with them is a negligible matter. Our aim must be preeminently to break the Japanese spirit—that "Yamato damashii"—soul and spirit of Japan, which is the ultimate dynamic with which we are faced.

To that ultimate objective let us dedicate ourselves, not in the hot anger of revelation at Japanese atrocities on our helpless sol-

diers, but with a stern and inflexible resolution which knows no cooling. No reprisals upon Japanese prisoners or civilians within our power. That would be to degrade ourselves to the level of our savage antagonists. I repeat, this is a matter, not of blind vengeance, but of cold surgery.

Purchase of Baja California Proposed

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on my own responsibility, I have just now introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) calling upon our Government to institute negotiations with the Government of the United States of Mexico looking toward the purchase from our neighbor to the south of her sovereign rights in and to the peninsula of Lower California, known by them as Baja California.

Baja California is joined to Mexico proper, on the map, by a strip of delta land of the Colorado River, and at the same time it is physically separated from Mexico proper by the broad estuary of the Colorado River and by the blue waters of the Gulf of California.

The peninsula—Lower California—is a strip of land about 800 miles long, having an average width of about 50 miles. It is a rugged, mountainous country with relatively little population, approximately 95,000 inhabitants. It has no rivers or streams of any importance, although it does embrace the mouth of the Colorado River.

However, Lower California has a number of deep-water bays, the principal one among them being Magdalena Bay. We have heard often of Magdalena Bay. It has the characteristics that lend it to great usefulness as a fleet and submarine and naval air-patrol base. Jap Naval Reserve fishermen have frequented it for years, as is well known.

It will no doubt always be the duty of the United States Fleet and Air Force to stand as the protector of the Americas in the Pacific. With Magdalena Bay properly developed, our task in that respect would be materially aided.

I do not know that our Navy has recently expressed any interest in Magdalena Bay, but everyone knows the concern that was felt for that bay at the time of Pearl Harbor, and its occupancy has been a matter of great concern since the earliest days of the Panama Canal. Strategically there is value to Mexico in protection by us of our good neighbor to the south by the establishment of a base on Magdalena Bay, 600 miles south of San Diego.

Lower California commences but a few miles south of San Diego where is located one of our great fleet bases. The border is but a short shot away. Lower California cannot be adequately defended by Mexico as there is no land connection or bridge to the mainland of Mexico south of the border. The rail connection, the Southern Pacific Railroad, begins at Nogales in Arizona, thence via Tucson, Ariz., across the Colorado River at Yuma, thence across the Imperial Valley over the Sierras inside the Mexican border into the coastal area at San Diego. It is a long, arduous trip, but shortly after Pearl Harbor Mexico did move a number of her splendid troops to Baja California via that route. To supply such troops from Mexico sent in adequate numbers for defense would be a difficult task indeed. They would almost of necessity have to be supplied by us.

Of course, the Gulf of California can be crossed by boat, but harbor facilities are meager at best, and roads over and through the mountains from the Gulf to the Pacific side are mostly primitive trails.

Although American tourists frequent the Mexican resorts near the border, and some revenue is derived from that trade, it is doubtful that Mexico receives enough revenue from the fishing and agriculture of the peninsula to support much of a government in Baja California and certainly not enough to support adequate defenses. At the same time, the defense of Baja California is vital to the defense of the Americas.

If Baja California were to become a territory of the United States, all land and other rights of its inhabitants would be protected and no doubt material benefits would come to the present owners of its lands through the investment of our capital and the development of its agriculture, industry, and resort facilities.

It is easy to visualize the extension of broad highways down its length, not only for strategic purposes but for tourist travel, post-war, and the development of its shores as resort places. The town of Ensenada, 65 miles south of the border, now a famous resort, should experience a real boom. And, as the present highway from San Diego would be further extended, other delightful spots would be opened for settlement.

No doubt proper port facilities would be established opposite Guaymas in Mexico and a ferry service for automobiles established that would provide easier access to the Inter-American Highway travel than presently exists. Such a service would bring much business to Guaymas and Mazatlán, Guadalajara, and other places en route to Mexico City.

I believe truly that Mexico itself would benefit greatly from such a transaction. The present Government of Mexico is engaged in a great internal development program. With credits established in our country arising from this proposed transaction, the Government of Mexico could purchase from us quantities of supplies and material for development of her agriculture and mines and railroads. Mexico can make important use of these things in the improvement of the internal affairs of her people.

Mr. Speaker, I think, in my humble way, that the sale of the sovereign rights to Baja California by the United States of Mexico to the United States of America would be a profitable deal to all parties, including the present inhabitants and parties in fee interest. This suggestion is made in the spirit of utmost friendliness toward our neighbors.

Cooperation, Not Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over radio station WIBA of Madison, Wis., on February 5, 1944:

The House of Representatives took an historic step in the direction of international cooperation on Tuesday, January 25. On that day it passed an authorization "to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." The supporters of this resolution felt that it was a concerted effort by 44 nations of the world to unite in a common enterprise to relieve human suffering and establish international good will among nations.

The world is weary of incessant wars. Every generation hopes for peace and yet every generation, somewhere at sometime, is engaged in fighting wars. It is a strange paradox that people everywhere want peace and yet people everywhere are fighting wars. For several thousands of years man has struggled to avert the calamity of war and has not yet solved this problem. The present generation and the preceding generation have seen two world wars within 25 years. What action can we take to prevent a third world war?

This is the question that is disturbing the minds and the hearts of earnest men and women everywhere, and one fact, it seems to me, has been established beyond a reasonable doubt. That fact is that the highly competitive method of international trade must be supplanted by some system of international cooperation. For unless western civilization can solve the irritations and differences that arise from highly competitive commercial exchange, and thereby remove the constant friction that results from this exchange, there will be wars and more wars, and tired humanity will have no surcease from its blood, sweat, and tears. Hence, it must be apparent to people not only of our own Nation but to every other nation that this highly competitive system must be discarded and some other method arrived at if we are to have any degree of lasting peace.

The age old slogans of "to the victor belongs the spoils" and "trade follows the flag" and a host of others will have to be scrapped. For centuries it was a common practice of man to get what he wanted by peaceful means if possible, by brute force, and violence, if necessary. Time and again so-called dominant peoples have established a trade footing among weaker nations and followed this with financial penetration and succeeded that by military intervention. Most of the wars that have been fought have had the underlying cause of commercial supremacy. To continue this pattern for the future is unthinkable. It would seem that we must work out a plan of international cooperation.

All of the United Nations have a common interest in national security which can be achieved only through a condition of peaceful world order. It is certainly to the common interests of all the United Nations to bring about permanent peace through law abiding behavior. As Secretary of State Hull recently observed:

"The future of these indispensable common interests depends absolutely upon international cooperation. Hence each nation's own primary interest requires it to cooperate with the others."

It seems to me that all of us in this country can wholeheartedly endorse Secretary Hull's statement, and no doubt similar sentiments are entertained by leading diplomats and government officials.

The success of this relief and rehabilitation organization can be a forerunner for successful international cooperation among nations of good will in the future. Therefore men and women earnestly seeking a method of peace, look with hope upon this enterprise and will pray for it's success. Enthusiastic supporters of this movement hail it as the bringer of everlasting peace, while the opponents condemn it as the creation of a world-wide W. P. A. Somewhere between these extreme views lies the truth. Those who sponsor this movement, and who have analyzed it carefully and thoroughly, and have discussed it with representatives of the other leading nations, look upon it as a prologue to the real movement for international cooperation for law and order which is the ground work of world peace.

What is this organization? In simple terms it is a community chest of 44 nations of the world to relieve human suffering. "The characteristic elements are these; each membership contribution is voluntary, yet through this organization the human needs are analyzed, the means to meet the needs are allocated, and the value of each contribution is thus enhanced."

No doubt the four leading nations among the United Nations—Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China—will be the dominant figures in this organization. Yet the smaller nations are also members and are given full faith and credit in the entire proceeding and are stockholders in this international company with representation and voice in all deliberations. Many of these smaller nations have been the most woeful sufferers of invasion by the aggressor nations. Such countries as Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and the Low Countries will need help, and this help will be furnished as far as lies in the power of the United Nations when the aggressors are driven out.

Whatever moneys are contributed by the United States will be appropriated by installments and only after very careful scrutiny and analysis by the Bureau of the Budget, both Houses of Congress and the President. Let no one feel that money will be wasted or will be spent foolishly for needless purposes, as there are capable men on both the House and the Senate Finance Committees who are determined that not a dollar shall be spent on this momentous proposal unless it is to relieve human suffering and want in those areas where our soldiers are operating. After all, is it better to save money or save human lives?

And this brings me to another phase of the discussion; namely the actual military value of this operation, for it is felt by those of us who voted for the passage of this resolution that it will create international good will, will establish a warm place for us in the hearts of the people who have been subject to oppression by the aggressor, thus securing every possible kind of cooperation from them and even benefiting through military aid. We believe it will save the lives of thousands of our boys and will help to shorten the war. Certainly no one can say that it will contribute to the destruction of any lives on our side of this fight nor will it prolong the war.

Let us say that the House of Representatives had rejected this proposal. What plan of international cooperation would the opponents have to offer to take its place? You can scan the hearings thoroughly and examine them in every single detail, and you will find nowhere a counterproposal offered by those who were against the passage of this resolution. None was offered on the floor of the House nor in the debates which lasted 4 days. Therefore are we not justified in the conclusion that a rejection of this proposal would mean an endorsement of the old order, and if the old order is continued, what hope can there be for suffering mankind to look to the future for relief from the burdens of war. I know of none and therefore felt that we should not regard this proposal lightly but should accept it as a try-out to see whether or not it is possible for civilized nations to work in harmony for the common good.

There are those who feel that we should get out of Europe as speedily as possible; there are those whose skepticism ridicules all efforts through international cooperation; there are those who want to wash their hands of the whole bloody business. To them I would say, "Oh, ye of little faith. Is it for this that an entire generation is making the supreme sacrifice?" No, my friends, we are in this war and we must stay in until it is finished. And when hostilities cease we must do our utmost to achieve some lasting plan for world order so that it will not happen again. To the mothers and fathers of sons in service, to the relatives and friends of our boys, to the men and women everywhere, let me say that the decision is in your hands. For no movement can long endure which is not supported by public opinion. Yours is the final decision. The issue rests with you.

The men at the front who are making the great sacrifices, and those at home who are about to go to the front, are all looking to us to devise some means to prevent a recurrence of these world-wide catastrophes every 25 or 30 years. To them and to their loved ones, let me say that this is the beginning of what we hope may develop into a better understanding, a kindlier feeling, and a deeper appreciation of the brotherhood of man. Without it we have no hope for the future, with it we have the sustaining hope and the abiding faith that men and women of good will everywhere in the world can join hands for a common purpose, that that common purpose should be international law and order and security through a lasting peace for the future generations.

Christmas 1944—Somewhere in the South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Lt. Charles F. Nolan, United States Marine Corps:

CHRISTMAS 1944—SOMEWHERE IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

The castor-bean is not the fir
And coral isn't snow;
The weather's not a bit like that
Of Christmases I know.

No children's laughter fills the air
As stockings are explored;
No families to rally around
And share the festive board.

There's really little to suggest
The holidays of long ago,
And if we let it get us down,
We're likely to feel low.

Yet Christmas is a state of mind
And Christmas is a prayer;
And Christmas is the breath of love
From someone waiting there.

Love travels faster than the wind,
Ignoring time and space;
And memory is a picture frame
And every thought a face.

So, though the surf beats on the reef
And loved ones far apart,
It's Christmas on this lonely isle
With Christmas in the heart.

—Lt. Charles F. Nolan,
United States Marine Corps.

The Income-Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Hon. Guy U. Hardy, of Canon City, Colo., who served in this body from 1919 to 1933, representing the Third District, which I now have the honor of serving, in which he calls attention to the indignation that is being expressed on every hand about our complicated tax laws, and particularly the forms that the taxpayers must make out this year. I was happy to hear the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. DOUGHTON, advise the House yesterday that his committee intends to begin a study of this situation immediately. Let us hope the remedy will soon be found and appropriate relief given to our suffering taxpayers.

Mr. Hardy included an editorial on this subject from the Rocky Mountain News in Denver, as follows:

HOW DID THE TAX GET THIS WAY?

If there's a slump in war production between now and March 15, you can blame a large share of it on the income-tax return.

More man-hours will be wasted on the Internal Revenue Bureau's form 1040 and form 1040 (A) than were ever lost by strikes, lockout, and sit-downs.

Any man who can assemble all the data, read all the regulations, make all the arithmetical calculations, and fill in all the blank spaces in form 1040 in less than 8 or 10 hours of steady work must be a mathematical wizard and a shark at law and accounting. And even such an expert is likely to spend sleepless hours worrying about having made some mistake that may cause the tax collector to move in on him 2 or 3 years hence

with threats of penalty fines and jail sentences. Form 1040 (A)—which may be used by persons having incomes of less than $3,000 derived wholly from salary, wages, dividends, interest, or annuities—is less complicated. But even that is enough of a headache to boom the aspirin market.

And it is all so unnecessary.

The income tax got this way because in the last three decades the Treasury and Congress have been jerry-building the tax laws. Year after year they have piled new tax measures on top of the others, have scrambled new tax philosophies into those already on the statute books, have devised newer and crazier formulas of computation without eliminating the old. And it will continue to get worse until taxpayers get angry enough to compel the Treasury and Congress to wipe the slate clean and start fresh with a simple law.

After all, the theory of the income tax is simple—the theory being that citizens should contribute to the support of their Government, each according to his ability to pay. Annual net income is used as the logical measure of ability to pay.

It should be possible to write a simple law which taxpayers can understand, and to provide taxpayers with a simple form on which they can make their returns. The form could be printed on one page—instead of the four pages now used in 1040. The taxpayer need be required to answer only a few simple questions, such as the amount and sources of his income, his family status, his allowable deductions. Having answered those questions, the taxpayer could then mail in his return. The Revenue Bureau could compute the tax, notify the taxpayer's employer how much to deduct from his wages and send the taxpayer a bill for whatever additional tax is due.

Experts of the Treasury and Congress, who seem to take a sadistic delight in torturing taxpayers, will probably cry out that it can't be done that way. * * * That's the way England collects income taxes.

Jewish Colonization of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 10:30 o'clock the Committee on Foreign Affairs began public hearings on House Resolutions 418 and 419, introduced jointly by myself and my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. These resolutions call upon the United States to use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country; that full opportunity for colonization be afforded so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. Last week two distinguished Senators, Mr. TAFT and Mr. WAGNER, introduced Palestine resolutions, identical to ours, before the Senate.

The problems of the Jews are well known to most of us. Some of the great minds of this century have discussed these problems and put forth methods of relief. Committees have been formed, mass meetings held, and resolutions passed. Nothing done to date has been effective.

I do not rise today for the purpose of heaping praise upon the Jews even though their record in Palestine is one of which they can well be proud. They know their virtues and they are practical enough to acknowledge their faults. I would prefer that my actions be the gage of my intent—that my tribute to their courage and ability be shown by my determination to lessen their suffering. Let us, then, be practical today.

It is the wish of most Americans and a great majority of the British public that the so-called White Paper promulgated by the Chamberlain government in 1939 be abrogated. It may well be that the present British Government will be receptive to the type o pressure which the Government of the United States can exert toward abrogation of this document. We have the right to interfere and, more important, it is our sacred duty to mankind to interfere with the action of any nation which adversely affects a national policy in which we have a vital and human interest.

Adoption of our resolutions by this Congress will be notice to the British Government and to the world that the cooperative spirit we are anxious to extend toward the solution of international problems must be accorded equal importance in the solution of purely human, racial problems.

I do not want to take up your time discussing in detail the history of the Jewish problems in Europe and Palestine or the cause and effect of the British White Paper of 1939. I will remind you only that the Balfour Declaration of 1918, which we were asked to approve, resulted in this Government, by its approval, specifically being accorded the right to review any action of the British which affected the future of Palestine. Now is the time to exert that right.

We are concerned here with a problem of human suffering. Much of this suffering can be alleviated by opening the doors of Palestine to the havenless Jew. But while we hesitate, the suffering continues on so fantastic a scale that it is impossible to contemplate in our everyday thoughts or explain in everyday language. It is like a childish nightmare that is impossible of description; a frightening dream that seems unreal. And because we cannot describe it; because our everyday thoughts cannot grasp the horror, it has become commonplace; it passes lightly from our thoughts or perhaps we speak appropriate words of regret for the condition or condemnation for those responsible.

Yet if one out of the myriad of these horrible experiences occurred within our sight we would be sick at heart and aroused to immediate and positive action. The bird that strikes our windshield; the dog beaten or hurt in our presence; the story of a child burned in a building fire or crushed by a car; the news of a lost or wounded soldier being mistreated or mutilated by the enemy—each brings shock and personal pain and the will for action.

Why, then, should we pass off with platitudinous complacency, the acts, abuses, and tortures multiplied a thousandfold against our fellow man, they who have joined us as brothers in arms; flesh and blood like our own; begat as we were begat; beholden to the same ideals of humanity; bedamned by the same intolerance that has swept the earth with the greatest scourge of all time.

We should not.

I come before you humbly and with a great feeling of futility as I remember the great men who have espoused this cause. Without your support I am as helpless as the persecuted and tortured Jew. With your aid I and, more important, the hopeless suffering Jews of Europe have a weapon to defend their right to a free homeland—a weapon provided by an expression of strong public opinion from the greatest, the strongest, the most humane, the most tolerant nation on earth.

Some of us here today are Republicans, some are Democrats and a few represent other political parties. Almost daily we unite, in whole or in part, for some fine purpose that raises us above our politics. So it is and so it must be with the Jews, the Christians and the representative of any other faith. We may be divided in our belief, but we must be united in our aim—peace and good will on earth.

Mr. Speaker, when House Resolutions 418 and 419 come before this Chamber with the favorable recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as I know they will, let a loud and unanimous "Aye" symbolize that we are all tolerant and just Americans—even though in our more selfish moments we may be political partisans and separated in our religious beliefs.

I ask for your support and hope that the resolutions will prevail.

In Case of Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the Evening Star of Washington an article by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "In Case of Attack." As a member of the resolutions committee of the last Democratic convention I have a very distinct recollection of those words "in case of attack," as does the present Presiding Officer, Mr. PEPPER, who was also a member of the resolutions committee. Mr. Lawrence's article is so clear cut and illuminating I think it

should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be so printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"IN CASE OF ATTACK"—ISOLATIONISTS LOP OFF LAST PHRASE IN QUOTING ROOSEVELT'S 1940 PLEDGE

(By David Lawrence)

Irrespective of the merits of the political parties or their candidates in the comihg Presidential contest, there is one piece of misrepresentation, still being circulated by isolationists, which ought to be eliminated from the campaign. It is the assertion that President Roosevelt, although promising "to keep our boys out of foreign wars," did nevertheless send them abroad to fight, in fact to many stations overseas.

There is no justification for quoting that part of the President's 1940 pledge without quoting the rest of it. In every campaign speech in which Mr. Roosevelt mentioned the possibility of war, he quoted or referred to the language of the Democratic national platform of 1940, which heads exactly as follows:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

The phrase that is customarily eliminated by the isolationists is "except in case of attack."

The record, of course, shows that on December 7, 1941, Japan did attack us at Pearl Harbor, declaring war on the United States at the same time. Whereupon Germany and Italy also declared war on the United States. In each case the initiative was taken by Japan, Germany, and Italy, respectively, and in each case the Congress of the United States ratified by resolution the existence of "a state of war."

While there was discussion during the 1940 campaign of the possibility that the United States might become involved in war, both candidates pledged themselves to do their utmost to keep the war from reaching our shores. Mr. Willkie in his speeches intimated that Mr. Roosevelt might not be any more careful in keeping that pledge than he had been in keeping 1932 pledges on domestic policies, but the Republican nominee sometime after the campaign publicly acknowledged his mistake in expressing that doubt. This is to his credit. As a matter of fact, those who say there was not much difference between the two nominees in 1940 forget that Mr. Willkie's campaign maneuver was to take the side of the argument which intimated he would be much more likely to keep the peace than would Mr. Roosevelt. This in turn forced answers in late October from Mr. Roosevelt in which he reiterated his desire not to send our boys overseas except in case of attack.

But neither candidate counted on the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor as likely to make their speeches academic and seem just campaign oratory. It was the Hitler tactics to involve Japan in a war with the United States in the hope that a substantial part, if not all, of America's war production would be diverted to the Pacific. To a certain extent that strategy has succeeded, for there can be little doubt that if Japan had remained at peace the downfall of Hitler would have been accelerated.

There are some Americans who charge that the sending of our virtual ultimatum of November 26, 1941, to Tokyo was provocative and caused Japan to declare war. Until the publication of the Department of State's documents the text of the November 26 note stood alone and may have given rise to such an inference. But with the official revelation of what went on for several weeks before November 26 ever since Tojo came into power it is plain that Japan was trifling with the United States Government and was engaged in a process of double dealing which makes our November 26 note a marvel of patience and forbearance.

In no war in modern times is the record so plain. The evidence is irrefutable that Japan and Germany and Italy each engaged in aggressive war. So far as President Roosevelt is concerned, there is plenty of basis for criticism of his domestic policies, but the contention that he violated his pledges when he sent American boys overseas is a plain misrepresentation. Its reiteration does no credit to the cause of the isolationists or their spokesmen.

Small Business Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Small Business Necessary," published in the Buffalo Evening News of February 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS NECESSARY

This is a critical time for small and medium-sized business. When war production got under way, many were left without Government contracts, and with no materials for civilian business. Later, as the drive for more and more production engulfed the whole economy, they found their place as war producers, and a useful one it was. Many of the largest manufacturers have said that without the subcontracting they did to hundreds of small companies they never could have reached their armament-output goals. Now military production requirements are shifting. Many old contracts are running out or are being cut back. A number of small companies are beginning to find themselves without business.

As it plans for this period, the Government must remember that small, medium, and large businesses are all essential to the American economy. The military attitude is that it is dangerous to allow much conversion now to peacetime goods. That is undoubtedly wise, because the war is far from won. But they will be of little use if the plants kept as stand-by facilities are bankrupt and run down because their owners could not survive a business-less period. Large companies run little such dangers. But the small and medium-sized manufacturer has no such bargaining power as the big industry. He is in danger of being caught in the middle between war production and peace.

The Government can and should help him, by making his tax problems simpler, for instance. And it should insist that a fair proportion of what civilian business is allowed goes to small concerns. But probably the greatest boon to the small businessman can be big business itself by extending its system of subcontracting absolutely as far as possible. Big business itself will be the gainer, because the economic vitality of this country lies in myriad small businesses. We need big business, to be sure, for mass production and some types of mass services. But where would their markets be if little business collapsed? Then, too, the big industries should remember that healthy small businesses are good insurance of the continuation of the private-enterprise system. It would be a lot easier for the Government to take over a relatively few far-flung corporations than thousands of small independent companies.

There will be more cases after the war, too, in which the Government should see to it that small business is protected. An important example is what disposition is made of war-emergency plants, convertible to civilian production, which now are owned by the Government. These should not be handed to big business on a silver platter. Congress should prohibit their lease or sale to companies which would thereby gain monopolistic positions. Or it might insist that such plants be offered on more favorable terms to small than large companies. It is worth the country's trouble to save its small manufacturers, for they are the backbone of most communities. Witness the fate of one-industry towns in hard times for proof.

A Guidepost for America's Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Guidepost for America's Tomorrow," written by Stuart Chase and appearing in the February 7 issue of the Progressive.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GUIDEPOST FOR AMERICA'S TOMORROW

(By Stuart Chase)

I have been down to the T. V. A. again to refresh my spirit, depressed by the casualty lists and the dreadful bombing of European civilians. I needed something to remind me that mankind could build as well as pulverize. Also I was tired of crossing myself every time free enterprise was mentioned. After a few hours in Knoxville I was ready to believe in the future again.

Not that Knoxville is any Utopia. The city is just another example of how a beautiful natural setting on a fine river can be wrecked by land speculation. It has its slums, blighted areas, festering waterfront, all complete. T. V. A. headquarters are in a dreary office building facing Roxy's 10-cent movie house.

Where does the lift come from? From the spirit of the men who work for the T. V. A., the mighty dams which stand back of them, and a feeling that the valley is getting back its strength again.

There is a curious thing about the men. They are not so much smarter or wiser than the rest of us, but they seem to have got hold of something they believe in. How many Americans in normal times are doing things they only half believe in, or mistrust altogether?

Think of the dismal reaches of high-pressure selling alone. Yet I doubt if most people want to spend their lives pursuing customers who prefer to be left alone, or buttering up the National Widget Corporation. They want to build things, make something

they can be proud of. It was in this spirit that the craftsmen of New England built houses, churches, and clipper ships. It was in this spirit that the Republic itself was founded.

WHAT AMERICA MIGHT BE

You feel it coming to life again in the men of the T. V. A. As they talk to you and show you their work, you begin to see what America might be if people really believed in what they were doing. A door opens somewhere deep within your mind and for a second you catch a vision which almost blinds you.

A commercial civilization throws on the scrap heap the most constructive element in human nature, the instinct to cooperate with one's fellows in building up the community. The biological fact that man is a social animal is neglected, and a great storehouse of energy and enthusiasm wasted.

Back of the integrity of the men of the T. V. A. stands the integrity of the engineering. These works may be the major art form of the power age, cathedrals for the twentieth century. Sometimes I think the strength of the dams enters into the men who build them. A mighty river in floodtime is not something you can stop by making a speech, or by sending out a posse from the Dies committee. If Congressmen, editors, and columnists had to face the Tennessee in flood, we might hear less nonsense out of them.

There are 29 dams now, and they control every drop of water which flows in the valley. Nothing like this has ever happened to any other river in the world. It takes quiet, hard-thinking men, versed in geology, physics, and mathematics, to design a dam which will shoulder its way into the rock of the hills and stand there as long as the hills stand. It takes sure-handed, disciplined men to build what has been designed.

DOWN BUT UP AGAIN

On a crisp November day I went to Fontana, the largest of the storage dams in the headwaters. It lies in a wooded gulch where the Little Tennessee comes roaring out of the Great Smokies. It is now about half completed. Just below one of the diversion tunnels a whole section of mountain was about to come down in the greatest quarry shot ever fired.

You could see the drilling machines on the crest of the cliff against the blue sky, their walking beams clanking up and down. They were sinking holes 300 feet deep to be packed with a new type of explosive, strong as TNT but safer to handle.

Berlin, Hamburg, London never received such a shock as this mountain will receive. The "aggregate" will come down by the tens of thousands of tons. Then, unlike the rubble left by blockbusters, it will go up again. It will go up across the river on that big conveyor belt into the crushing mill, and along that higher conveyor to the mixing plant on the side of the mountain.

With cement and water added, it will be poured on the top of the dam by that T crane, big as a skyscraper, until the face of the dam stands more than 500 feet above the river and reaches to the scarred line under the pines. The mountain comes down, yes, but only to be reshaped and rise again in a massive shining wall, holding back tens of thousands of kilowatts of energy. The workmen look like ants, crawling and climbing around their huge machines, set against the huger mountain.

MONEY SAVERS, ALL

After watching the earth movers in action, I went to see where they lived. The new town of Fontana, population 3,000, seemed to be designed as carefully as the dam itself. Workmen on commercial projects usually have to live in tar-paper shacks, but not in the T. V. A. We found comely white buildings with schools, playgrounds, stores, a theater, a hospital, a fine cafeteria, and a village of 200 trim prefabricated demountable houses, which can be trucked from one engineering job to another. By the time the T. V. A. architects get through developing these houses, they may have found the answer to decent, low-cost shelter for sharecroppers.

This town is so designed that it will not automatically become a ghost town when the dam is finished. It will shrink gracefully to the smaller permanent town needed by the maintenance men and their families. It can expand again if it becomes a mountain resort and recreation center. Why not? The scenery is grand and wild; the equipment offers all the comforts of home tastefully assembled.

I do not advise practical men to pull long faces about the cost of making living conditions tolerable, and even pleasant, for people who tear down mountains and build dams. The morale and energy conserved, plus the low accident, sickness, and turn-over rates, all are money savers. Practical men will find the final costs, per cubic yard of concrete poured, as low as they come. When they learn further that the T. V. A. earned $15,000,000 last year, with power rates as low as they come, they can stop worrying about either consumer or taxpayers.

Now, let's go down the river a piece. Guntersville in Alabama was an old town and the county seat. When the big main-stream dam threatened to engulf a large part of the town, the city fathers petitioned the Tennessee Valley Authority to buy out the rest of the place and end its existence. The Tennessee Valley Authority people did not say "Yes" and they did not say "No," but they displayed a map, some sketches, and a rough plan.

The sketches showed a new town on a peninsula, with water on three sides. It could still be a county seat, aided by the new navigation terminal. It could become a big fishing, boating, and recreation center and one of the prettiest, best situated towns in all the South.

The Tennessee Valley Authority men laid the papers down in front of the city fathers and walked away. They were not going to tell them what to do; they were just going to open a window and let the city fathers look out of it.

The city fathers looked, and decided to continue the corporate existence of Guntersville. The section which was going under water was the other side of the tracks anyway. The fathers organized a local planning board to cooperate with the Tennessee Valley Authority in developing the new town. The whole population became interested and excited. Guntersville was going places, and the local folks pitched in and went to work.

There she stands today, pretty as a picture, queen of a great inland sea. Last August a series of motorboat races was held in Guntersville, and provision was made for 10,000 spectators. When the great day arrived, 50,000 showed up. They ate up everything in the town by noon.

INSPIRING OTHERS TO BUILD

This story illustrates a very important point. Unless the people of the valley are behind the T. V. A., it becomes just another big power outfit, operated by remote control. Unless the people think it is their agency, working for them, it has no permanent function. On the other hand, the valley people are not very enterprising. They have been living for generations in a corn or cotton culture which has narrowed their horizon, dried up their imaginations. Their children have got out to the big cities of the North at the first opportunity. So it is hard for the people to see what their valley might be; easy for them to resent any change in their accustomed ways.

The T. V. A. men can see the future. Here is energy running like water. Here is a lake 600 miles long, ready to provide a new and happier pattern of living. Here is diversified farming, with new phosphate fertilizers to replace the one-crop mining of the soil. Here is a chance to plan with Nature and go forward, not backward. So the problem is to light the imagination of the people and then let them go forward under their own steam, as in Guntersville.

Any dictator with a competent technical staff can enforce progress, can threaten to shoot the burghers of Guntersville if they leave the town. But such progress costs too much. It makes people so angry that they would rather go back to living in caves. The only progress that sticks is the kind that the people themselves help to make.

Again and again the T. V. A. men have seen clearly what to do, and have had the legal power to do it. But they have waited—fuming sometimes—until the local people have caught the idea and started to do it themselves. This is democratic planning in action. This is one of the things that draw students from all over the world, to get jobs in the T. V. A. and learn its techniques.

The power age demands a good deal of careful planning, if communities are to survive. Yet if the planning is all enforced from the top, people will ultimately revolt. Here in the Tennessee Valley is being evolved a way to reconcile planning with people.

ALL COMES BACK TO THE MEN

The same idea has been followed in the T. V. A.'s post-war program. Already a million man-years of useful, exciting work has been blueprinted, but most of it in cooperation with local planning boards, chambers of commerce, school boards, highway commissions, public health authorities, farmers' organizations, housing groups.

It is not work which the T. V. A wants to impose on the valley, but work which the people want done. I went over some of the plans in detail, and I suspect that the whole project is the most intelligent and practicable piece of post-war planning in the county today.

It all comes back to the men who work for the T. V. A. They believe in what they are doing. They want their work to last. But they know that it will last longer if people believe in it too, and help to develop it.

Everywhere you go in the valley you will see these mighty works, the cathedrals of the age of energy. Inscribed on each of them, in plain, fine letters of metal you will find the words:

"Built for the people of the United States."

Furloughs for Men and Women in Service Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following resolution sent me by Florence Newman, legislative department, board of aldermen, city of Chelsea, Mass., adopted January 10, 1944, by the city government of Chelsea:

Whereas there will be submitted for the consideration of Congress legislation relative to furloughs to be granted to the men and women in the service on foreign soil who have served periods ranging from 1 to 2 years; and

Whereas the city government of Chelsea, Mass., feel that this is a humane measure: Now, therefore,

They earnestly urge immediate favorable consideration of any pending legislation to effectuate these measures.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, Senators DAVID I. WALSH and HENRY CABOT JODGE, Jr., and Congressman THOMAS J. LANE.

FLORENCE NEWMAN.

In board of aldermen, January 10, 1944, adopted.

Approved, January 12, 1944.

BERNARD L. SULLIVAN, *Mayor.*

Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL, *City Clerk.*

Mustering-Out Payments to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the War and Navy Departments have agreed on a plan for making mustering-out payments to eligible veterans of the war who have been discharged or released from active duty under honorable conditions since December 6, 1941. The following brief summary of the material parts is taken directly from their official release:

WHAT YOU MUST DO

1. A person who becomes eligible for mustering-out payment subsequent to approval of the law providing for such payment will receive such payment from the proper department without the necessity of an application.

2. A veteran who has been discharged or relieved from active duty prior to approval of the law providing for mustering-out pay must follow the following procedure:

(a) Submit a certificate of discharge or service. To assure the return of this certificate, the veteran is cautioned to write his present address on the certificate.

(b) Submit an informal type of certified application on which is stated his name and address, service number, serial number or file number; that he was not discharged or released from active duty to accept employment without service outside of the United States; that he is not now serving on active duty; that he has not and will not make any other application for the mustering-out payment; the State of which he was a resident at the time of induction or enlistment, and whether he has had foreign service.

WHERE DO YOU APPLY?

1. Commissioned officers of all services will be required to furnish evidence of length and termination of service to their respective departments. Officers discharged from the Navy will make application to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.; officers discharged from the Coast Guard, to United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, D. C.; officers discharged from the Marine Corps, to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.; officers discharged from the Army, to one of the finance offices, United States Army, listed below.

2. Navy and Coast Guard enlisted veterans will be required to file their applications with the Field Branch, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Cleveland, Ohio.

3. Enlisted veterans of the Marine Corps will file their applications with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.

4. Pennsylvania veterans of the Army, both discharged officers and enlisted personnel, will file their applications with the finance officer, United States Army, located at the Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

WHO RECEIVES PAYMENT WHEN VETERAN HAS DIED?

1. In the case of any veteran discharged under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, and who died after leaving the service and before receiving any portion or the full amount of mustering-out payment to which entitled, payment of the amount due may be made to a surviving wife or husband, or if there is no wife or husband, in equal shares to his child or children, if any.

2. If the veteran leaves no surviving wife, husband, or child, payment may be made in equal shares to the surviving parents.

3. In these cases, application should be submitted by letter addressed as follows:

(a) If the veteran served in the Navy, to the Chief of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

(b) If the veteran served in the Coast Guard, to U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

(c) If the veteran served in the Marine Corps, to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.

(d) If the veteran served in the Army, to the Fiscal Director, the Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

NOTE.—Penalties are provided by law for making false claims for mustering-out pay.

Soldiers' Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Manchester Herald of February 5, 1944.

This editorial not only expresses my own views on the question of absentee voting for service personnel, but I understand it also expresses the views of many Members of the House who, while desirous of getting a complete State ballot into the hands of every service man and woman, realize that it would be a physical impossibility.

Until I am convinced that the War and Navy Departments are playing partisan politics, I will continue to accept their testimony and advice on military matters and on other problems that relate to transportation of supplies, ballots, or anything else going to the battle fronts.

CONNECTICUT SOLDIER VOTES

Without reference to the votes of its representatives at Washington—several of whom seem part of a mad scheme to give American armed forces the impression that this country is quite capable of refusing them a right to vote—the Connecticut position on the soldier vote is sound, healthy, and admirable.

The absentee-voting law adopted by the special session of the general assembly is as liberal as any State could devise. Assured reasonable facilities of transmission for our State ballots, there is little reason why all Connecticut men in the services should not have their vote next fall.

By passing this law, Connecticut demonstrated that it was not interested in keeping the vote from anyone because of the racial prejudice which controls the policy of the South.

By passing this law, the Connecticut Republican administration gave clean demonstration of the fact that it didn't consider it American to try to obstruct anyone's vote because of any assumption that it might be cast one way or the other.

All this is a matter for Connecticut pride. There are no clouds over our relations with our men in the service. We have, in this matter, given them the best we know how to give them. And if every other one of the 48 States would do as we have done, and if Federal cooperation merely as to transportation would be forthcoming where needed, there would be no need for any Federal ballot or any Federal regulations as to the methods of soldier voting.

The fact that they have Connecticut's fine individual effort behind them might possibly excuse Connecticut's Representatives from any further consideration of the problem, were not the function of the Congress national in scope. But it is thus national in scope, and there is poor chance that all the other 48 States will follow Connecticut's example, and there is even a chance that some of them will refuse to do anything at all, at least in time to affect 1944 soldier voting. In this situation there is room and need for a Federal ballot, which could be cast when no State ballot was obtainable. And there is, in any event, need for Federal transportation facilities.

If Connecticut's Representatives in Washington are true to the spirit of Connecticut action back home, they will be part of no obstruction tactics, no matter what other States or what other political strategies may choose to do. The Connecticut policy, as expressed by the general assembly's action, was to do everything possible to give soldiers the vote. We don't think Connecticut's Representatives at Washington can find a better policy.

We are pleased to note that Congressmen MILLER and COMPTON, on Thursday, voted in favor of substituting a Federal ballot bill for the States' rights measure in the House and that Congressman MILLER refused to vote for the States' rights measure which was finally adopted in the House. It is further to be noted that both Senators DANAHER and MALONEY cast their votes against what might have been a final defeat of all Federal vote plans in the Senate yesterday.

Strikes in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, again we read where the leaders of great labor organizations issue strong no-strike appeals, calling upon union men to "give all we've got for production of war materials." Outstanding among these statements were those by President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and President Murray, of the C. I. O. Addressing the convention of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Green said:

No matter how unjust conditions may become, no matter how sharp the aggravation may be, the members of the American Federation of Labor should realize that they must stay on the job and keep production to the limit of their ability until final victory is won.

When the lives of our sons and brothers and loved ones are at stake, when victory in this war against hatred and tyranny hangs in the balance, there cannot be any justification or excuse for any strike or stoppage of work.

Despite these appeals the same paper that carried these statements called attention to several strikes that are now going on in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk an outstanding editorial this morning from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 4. Under the leave granted me, I include that editorial as part of my remarks.

STRIKES IN WARTIME

The problem of strikes in time of war, which persists despite the no-strike pledge voluntarily made by union labor leaders after Pearl Harbor, disturbs, perplexes, and grieves American citizens from coast to coast, while reports from the armed forces show a mounting wave of indignation that work stoppages should occur while they are facing death at the hands of the enemy. In a statement made January 26, Secretary of War Stimson said:

"In the week ending last night, there were no less than 22 strikes in war plants producing such vitally needed fighting material as airplane and tank parts, machine tools and jeeps, aviation gasoline, cable and wire, of which we are critically short, head nets and mosquito bars which protect our soldiers in the Southwest Pacific against malaria."

It is true, of course, that behind each strike is a separate set of facts and circumstances, and that, while some may occur because of extreme provocation by labor-hating employers, others are completely irresponsible and unjustified. There is, for example, a vast difference between last year's coal strikes, provoked by the power-mad egomaniac, John L. Lewis, and a walkout in steel plants as a protest against the closing down of open-hearth furnaces—or, essentially, against the kind of poor government planning which would create unemployment when the Nation's steel furnaces should be working full blast at all times.

MACHINERY SHOULD BE USED

Yes, there are differences among strikes, but labor must consider that the general public at home and the armed forces abroad are prone to regard a strike as a strike, without studying too keenly the merits of each case. The no-strike pledge of December 1941 did not say that some strikes were justified and some were not. It pledged no strikes.

Again, no matter how strong the provocation to strike, the fact remains that the Government has set up machinery for the settlement of industrial disputes of all kinds. This machinery has at times worked badly; at most times it has worked very well. The general feeling is that this machinery must be used when trouble arises, by employers and employes alike; that they should be patient when it works badly; and that neither strikes nor lockouts should be resorted to while the machinery exists.

A statement by Wayne L. Morse, who has just resigned as a public member of the War Labor Board and whose sympathy with legitimate labor aspirations is unquestioned, put this thought very well. In denouncing a particular strike, Mr. Morse said that, although American labor "has made a glorious production record since Pearl Harbor which is of almost miracle proportions," it should not lose sight of the fact that the men in the armed forces have the right to expect uninterrupted production of war materials at home. Mr. Morse continued:

"No combination of words, no rationalized alibis, no pleas of provocation and extenuating circumstances can be, will be, or should be accepted by our fighting forces as justifying work stoppages."

Those are strong and unequivocal words, and to them Mr. Morse adds: "It is precisely when provocation exists that the pledge to refrain from work stoppages is tested. It is only then that the pledge not to strike has any real significance."

MR. TOBIN'S REMARKS

An even stronger denunciation of strikes in wartime comes from none other than Dan Tobin, head of the A. F. of L. Teamsters' Union. Writing in the International Teamster, Mr. Tobin said that work stoppages are a sign of overconfidence which might lead to loss of the war. Pointing out the intimate relationship between the production of war materials and the saving of lives on the front, and saying that we will be lucky if not more than a million American men are killed in this war, Mr. Tobin asked:

"How, then, can you on the trucks, or in the fields, or in the factories, or in the mines, stop work for 1 day and thereby prolong the war perhaps 6 months or a year longer than it should last?"

Mr. Tobin urged workers to tell those who advocated strikes "that the blood of those young men across the seas fighting a fight for our freedom will not be on your hands or on your conscience. Don't stop work. Bear your troubles, if you have any. Your troubles are insignificant compared to the sufferings and hardships of our men over there."

Recently the New York World-Telegram printed an editorial tribute to war workers who have not gone on strike and to the fact that labor as a whole "has broken all records for production, war or nonwar." It is a well-deserved compliment to those who have kept the no-strike pledge. Unfortunately for these loyal citizens, many of whom stayed at work despite provocations and injustices, the strikes of a substantial minority have prejudiced great segments of public opinion against the innocent as well as the guilty.

We say "the strikes of a substantial minority" because, in the aggregate, it is disconcertingly large. There are various statistical approaches to the incidence of strikes, such as the seemingly innocuous figure of the Bureau of Labor Statistics that they produced a loss in man-hours of less than 1 percent in the past year. A very impressive figure is that, of some 14,000,000 of trade-union members, 2,137,000 individuals went on strike during 1943. (Some 400,000 coal miners went on strike 4 times, but they are counted only once in this figure.) Thus, approximately 15 percent of all organized labor violated the no-strike pledge. We submit this figure is too large.

ERRORS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

In criticizing wartime strikes, we are not overlooking the errors the administration has made in its approach to labor disputes. In the case of the threatened railroad strike, for example, we can see why labor leaders should be confused and irritated when one Government agency—the National Mediation Board—approved certain wage requests, while another agency, speaking through Mr. Vinson, overruled the board.

We know that it adds to the confusion when some unions, appealing over the heads of other Government officials, get the ear of the President, who sometimes interferes by making a decision of his own. We can understand how the War Labor Board, which has adopted a policy of refusing to consider a labor dispute while the workers are out on strike, was resentful of the action of Mr. Ickes in dealing with John L. Lewis, while the coal miners were on strike.

There should be, we believe, an overhauling of the whole Government machinery for handling wage disputes and perhaps the establishment of some over-all authority over the subject, as suggested by Donald Richberg, one-time head of N. R. A. In such an overhauling, the conflict among the various boards and departments now operating should be eliminated and overlapping functions corrected.

Moreover, there should be more speed in handling wage disputes. Some strikes have been provoked because many months have elapsed in deciding questions of wages and working conditions. While the War Labor Board has done good work, it has literally been swamped with cases demanding decisions, and long delays have resulted. It should be possible to expand facilities to avoid such delays.

Another source of understandable irritation is the rising cost of living, which many union leaders point to as justification for strikes and strike threats, and for attacks on the Little Steel Formula. Here is a very real issue, and it is one that taxes the patience of union men as well as the statesmanship of their leaders. For it is a question in which labor leaders should exercise statesmanship.

For some time W. L. B., at the request of the President, has been studying living cost increases. Until that study is complete, labor leaders, whose following has a deep stake in the anti-inflation fight, should refrain from premature demands. The granting of those demands would only accelerate price increases and thus give impetus to that deadly spiral which, in the end, means national disaster.

GOOD ADVICE FOR LABOR, TOO

If labor does not, in times like these, adhere to a broad no-strike, anti-inflation policy, it may find that its behavior will rise to plague it in the future. Speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers recently about the lack of national unity, and the forming of cliques and blocs which are seeking to advance their own special interests, Charles E Wilson, W. P. B. executive vice chairman and former head of General Electric, said:

"I do not want to be an alarmist—perhaps I exaggerate, since I spend so much time in Washington, where politics is always exaggerated—but I tell you frankly that I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it."

Mr. Wilson was speaking as a broad-gaged leader of industry to other leaders of industry. He was urging them to "exercise temperate judgment, to practice the arts of compromise, to avoid the temptation of sacrificing enduring values for temporary gains, and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity." This same advice might be accepted by union leaders, for if a right-wing reaction should come, it will be aided and abetted by the high feeling aroused by strikes and intemperate labor demands. Again, if a right-wing reaction should come, labor will suffer most from it.

TO SUM UP

Granting fully that war profiteering should be completely obliterated; granting fully that some employers are still trying to prevent formation of unions and to break up unions already formed; granting fully that the Government's labor machinery has not always operated efficiently; granting fully that the President has bungled in interfering with the decisions of his own agencies; granting fully that there have been increases in the cost of living that sometimes outstrip wage increases—granting all these points, it is nevertheless true that, if strikes continue, labor will be creating an unhappy future for itself.

In the long run, patience and restraint will do more for labor than temporary gains won by strikes in time of war.

Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as an expression of my own opinion on the soldier-vote controversy, but stated much more effectively than I could state it, I extend the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Pettengill, on the question of the soldier vote:

SOLDIER VOTE

A piece of a ballot with only three candidates on it, all Federal, gives the soldier his right to vote. A complete ballot to vote for every candidate denies them the right to vote. The latter is a fraud on the soldier and sailor. This is the logic of one of the three Federal candidates.

Mr. Roosevelt says: "I have been informed that it would be possible, under the rules of Congress, for a soldiers' vote bill to be rejected or passed without any roll call, thus making it impossible for the voters of the country—military or civilian—to be able to determine just how their own Representative or Senator had voted on such a bill."

Mr. Roosevelt knows better than this. He knows that the Constitution of the United States provides that "the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered in the Journal."

Being in the Constitution, no rule of either House or Senate could prevent a roll-call vote on the rejection or passage of any bill, if 20 percent of the Members demand it. Congress has not yet repealed the Constitution, whatever may be said of the bureaucrats—big or little.

The procedure is as follows: The Speaker says, "The question is on the passage of the bill." At this point any Member may rise and say, "Mr. Speaker, on that question I demand the yeas and nays."

The Speaker then says, "The yeas and nays are demanded. All those who demand the yeas and nays will rise." If one-fifth of the Members rise, the Speaker says, "One-fifth having demanded the yeas and nays, the Clerk will call the roll." The Clerk then calls each Member by name. As his name is called, each Member votes yea or nay, and his vote is recorded in the Journal, as a permanent and public record. If the bill is an important one, within half an hour the newspapers across the Nation will be setting those names and votes in type for the people back home to read.

A similar practice prevails in every State legislature. Mr. Roosevelt served in the New York Legislature and has witnessed this process scores of times. In short, a minority of 20 percent can compel Congress to face the music on a roll-call vote. It was the men who wrote the Constitution, and not Mr. Roosevelt, who should be given credit in this matter. No rule of either House could prevent it. There is no such rule. Mr. Roosevelt knows this.

It is true that both Houses of Congress have rules to expedite business and to prevent senseless delays of filibustering. For example, only one motion to recommit a bill is allowed. But a roll-call vote may be had on the motion to recommit. If Congress permitted a dozen or a hundred Members to offer separate motions to recommit, each airing his personal substitute for the bill before the House, Mr. Roosevelt would then complain that Congress was talking the country to death. What Mr. Roosevelt wanted was a special and extraordinary rule not on the books, to permit a third roll call on a particular substitute which he favored.

The fact remains that no bill can be passed by either House without a roll call, if one-fifth demand it. And it is the bill itself that is the important thing as to which the people want to know how their Congressman voted.

If Congress is to be charged with political cowardice when it acts strictly in accordance with constitutional provisions, what shall we say of a President who permits bills to become law without his signature, as he can and does, doing nothing for 10 days?

Bureaucracy and Labor Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press article referring to a recent statement by Mr. John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor:

UNION CHIEF BLAMES F. D. FOR STRIKES—SAYS LABOR IS IRKED BY TOO MANY AGENCIES

(By Philip Warden)

John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor and special lecturer on economics at the University of Chicago, yesterday placed the blame for the strikes that have plagued American war industries directly on the shoulders of President Roosevelt.

Speaking on the A. F. L.'s Labor for Victory radio program, Frey said if the administration had adopted a national labor policy when it entered the war, and had set up 1 instead of 25 Federal agencies for deciding labor questions there would have been no ruptures in labor's no-strikes pledge.

SHOULD STUDY CASES

Declaring that "it is worse than folly" to look for legislation to improve the labor situation, Frey asserted that the time has come, not only for labor but for the American people, to give "more careful consideration" to the conditions that are causing strikes and slow-downs in war production.

"The problem is not as simple as some would lead you to believe," Frey said. "It is not a few labor leaders calling strikes or issuing threats for the fun of it. The problem arises through millions of workers, men and women, in the war industries whose justified complaints at times have received no prompt or adequate consideration.

"Some local strikes may have been caused by individuals having mixed ambitions, industrial and perhaps even political. But the majority of strikes have resulted from an unnecessary irritation, an irritation which like a chafing harness has finally created an open sore.

IMPOSSIBLE CONDITIONS

"American labor has been forced to contend with an almost impossible administrative condition in our Government. There is, in fact, no national labor policy to which labor can look for definite guidance. Instead of a national labor policy, administered by one central authority, governing labor problems, there has developed more than 25 Federal agencies which issue regulations and decisions affecting terms of employment and conditions of labor."

Frey asserted that the "almost fatal confusion and conflict" between Federal agencies affecting labor is illustrated by two fairly recent examples.

One, he said, was the case of the railway brotherhoods and the railway shopmen who, in their efforts to obtain wage increases, went to the well-established Railway Mediation Board, and spent some 3 months in presenting their case.

CONFLICT AMONG AGENCIES

He said the Board made its decision and the unions were ready to accept it, even though the award was much less than they believed they were entitled to, when another Government agency stepped into the picture and said the increase would not be allowed.

Another example, he said, was the case of the organized shipyard workers who in May 1942 responding to President Roosevelt's request, accepted a reduction in the Government approved wage rates as their part in the war against inflation. The administration pledged that if the cost of living was not stabilized, the old rates would be reinstated.

"What the Nation now needs is efficient Federal organization in the field of labor instead of the disorganization which now exists," Frey concluded.

Absentee Soldier Voting in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Worley bill contains three titles.

Title I relates to the so-called bobtailed ballot, which makes provision for a soldier to vote for President and Vice President, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress only.

Title II provides for voting under State law for State as well as Federal officers.

The administration has told us that ballots under State absentee ballot procedure cannot be carried to the men in our armed forces for two reasons. One is that the States would not get around to making proper arrangements and the other that the ballot would be too bulky and heavy. This is but another way of saying that the administration does not want this kind of a vote, because neither argument is a sound one.

So far, therefore, as title II of the Worley bill is concerned, it was offered to the House only because it would attract some votes, because, if this Worley bill is passed, the administration will direct its attention to the so-called bobtailed ballot provided for in article I.

Everybody in this country wants the soldier, sailor, and marine to vote if he desires to do so. And the exercise of the privilege of voting should carry with it the right to vote not alone for President and Vice President, but also for United States Senators, Representatives in Congress, Governors, candidates for the State legislatures and all State officers. The proposal of the administration would permit the serviceman to cast a vote only for President and Vice Presi-

dent, so far as the State of Maine is concerned, because the Worley bill and the Green-Lucas bill contemplate one election only, namely the November election. The State of Maine holds its election for United States Senator and Representatives in Congress and State officers in September.

The proposed Federal ballot would prevent every member of the armed forces from the State of Maine from voting for any officer except President and Vice President and under the provisions of either of these Federal bills they would not be voting for President and Vice President legally.

So far, then, as the State of Maine is concerned, if I vote for this Worley bill, I am voting to disenfranchise the service men and women of my State as to their right and privilege to vote for United States Senators and Representatives. For me to vote for the Worley bill is to vote away the right and privilege of a soldier to vote against me if he sees fit to do so. This is a position I do not care to take.

According to Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, who made a statement with reference to September Maine elections:

Maine servicemen will not vote in the September election under title I procedure provided by the Green-Lucas Act. That procedure is possible of accomplishment for overseas voting because it provides for one uniform election (as well as for small size, lightweight ballots, and bulk carriage over and back). The administration in wartime of voting under title I cannot be extended to more than one election.

Further:

Title I of the Green-Lucas bill is intended to apply to the general elections on November 7 in the several States.

Therefore, if the Worley bill is passed and becomes a law, the members of our armed forces from the State of Maine will not be able to vote for any office except that of President and Vice President—assuming this could be legally done in the manner provided.

The following is a press release from Gov. Sumner Sewall, of the State of Maine:

AUGUSTA, MAINE.—In view of much public discussion and many inquiries coming into his office on Maine's position in the matter of servicemen's voting, Gov. Sumner Sewall, after extended conferences with Harold I. Goss, the secretary of state, and Frank I. Cowan, the attorney general, today issued the following statement:

"A careful study of Maine law and existing voting machinery indicates that our soldiers and sailors will have an opportunity wherever they may be, to vote in the regular State and national elections, if:

"1. The Federal Government can handle round-trip mailing of ballots in 45 days;

"2. Parents or friends will supply city and town clerks with military addresses of those in service.

"An executive order will be necessary to permit absentee registration of servicemen in cities of more than 3,000 population as it is now permitted in smaller communities. Also, parents and friends must be granted the right to request that soldier absentee ballots be sent to registered servicemen. These provisions I can and am willing to make by appropriate executive order.

"Due to the delay caused by recounts, soldier votes will not be counted for candidates not placed on the ballot by the official canvass of the Governor and council of returns filed by municipal clerks.

"The weight of our customary ballot, directions for voting, referenda questions and envelopes is about one and one-half ounces. If reasonable weight restrictions are imposed by the Congress or by the War and Navy Departments, we are confident that we can meet them. If necessary, I am prepared to incorporate in any executive orders that may be required provision for printing of ballots on lighter paper.

"I realize, of course, that many questions may arise and that unforeseen circumstances may appear. However, this is the best approach to the problem as we now see it. Unless and until the Congress takes specific action to provide otherwise, we shall go ahead with plans along these lines."

Congress and the Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Loren E. Souers, from the Canton (Ohio) Repository of February 3, 1944:

CONGRESS AND THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

(By Loren E. Souers)

(Canton lawyer and member of the board of education, Mr. Souers is widely recognized as an authority on the Federal Constitution. Concerned over what appears to be a determined effort in Washington to take over control and supervision of the Presidential and congressional election as a Federal function, usurping the constitutional authority of the States, Mr. Souers made the accompanying analysis for the Repository. "The potential consequences are far reaching," says Mr. Souers. "But it has been easy to build up a flag-waving pretense of doing right by the soldiers to blind them and the people generally to what is afoot. The people ought at least be given the chance to know the true nature of this scheme.")

The controversy which has been raging in and out of Congress as to voting by men of the armed services in the election next fall, has reached a stage during the past week which presents the gravest threat to our system of constitutional government since the Civil War.

A determination is apparent, on the part of advocates of Federal conduct of the election in the Army and Navy, under the insidious guise of enabling the servicemen to vote, to effect a revolution in our political system of the most far-reaching consequences, involving a deliberate disregard of constitutional limitations of the power of the Federal Government and the virtual destruction of the States as sovereign political units within their proper sphere.

If, upon the pretense of an emergency, the Constitution of the United States, which distributes the powers of government between the Union and the States, can be ignored or suspended by Congress and the President at will, on one occasion, then there can no longer be any limit beyond which they cannot go; and if an emergency is thought to be needed as an excuse, no one can doubt that one can always be found.

Undoubtedly the great majority of our people are entirely confused about the issue involved in this controversy, which is not at all whether the men of the armed services shall be given the best practicable opportunity to vote, but whether the Federal Government shall be made completely supreme over the States, so that all rights, liberties, and activities of the people of every part of the Union shall be subjected to the policies, whims, and even tyrannies of a central government.

The very purpose of preserving the States under the Constitution when it was adopted, and reserving to them powers denied to the Federal Union, was to keep government as close as possible to the people, to give the people of each State the means of expressing their own will as to questions particularly affecting them, and to prevent sectional domination of the whole Nation, so far as could be done.

Necessarily, this required independence of the States in the matter of the selection of their Senators and Representatives in Congress, and in the exertion of their proportionate influence in the election of a President. This independent power of the States would be nullified in principle and fact by any control of the national election by the Federal Government; which, as to the election of the President is entirely forbidden by the Constitution, while the power of Congress to control the processes of election of Senators and Representatives is very limited, though not wholly prohibited.

Everyone wishes the soldiers and sailors to vote, so far as is possible without unreasonably delaying and complicating the election process. I wish my own sons to vote; and in the elections of 1942 and 1943 they both did vote, though absent with the Army. Indeed, in 1943 one of them voted from Africa, proving that the great majority of our boys, if they and their friends at home are sufficiently anxious for them to do so, can vote even under present State laws; though I admit diligence and careful timing contributed to the arrival of my son's vote in time last fall, and under present regulations many would not be able, or sufficiently informed, to accomplish a like result. Reasonable remedies for that condition I will suggest later.

But, important as it is that soldiers and sailors have a full opportunity to vote in this coming election, even that is not important enough to justify the nullification of the Constitution, which is the charter of the liberties of these same boys, for which they are fighting. Voting in one election cannot be worth that price—especially when it is clearly unnecessary to pay such a price.

It is assumed by most people that the right to vote derives from the Federal Government. In fact the right to vote is not and never was given by the Federal Government, but by the States. The only control which the Federal Government constitutionally exercises over the right of the citizen to vote is negative; the States are forbidden by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments to deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex. Subject to those negative limitations, the power of each State to determine which of its citizens may vote is absolute, so long as no arbitrary discrimination is made by the laws of the State, as between citizens similarly situated.

This principle of State power to decide who may vote is so firmly and clearly established that it required a great civil war and four amendments of the Constitution (the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth) to take away the power of States even to deny the vote to Negroes and to women.

What, then, are the powers of Congress as to the election of the President and of Senators and Representatives in Congress? They are very limited. Congress may not determine who is eligible to vote, nor impose or remove any limitations or conditions of the right to vote adopted by the several States,

except that any attempt to deny the right to vote to colored citizens or women is void.

The provisions of the Constitution as to election of the President and of Senators and Representatives, are very different, and as to the former the Congress has almost no power at all. Clearly the President, the Senators, and the Representatives, since their offices are created by the Constitution can only be elected in the manner prescribed by that instrument. Let us see what are these provisions.

First, as to the President:

1. He is to be chosen by electors, who are to be selected by each State in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct. Clearly Congress has no authority whatever to decide who may vote for Presidential electors, or in what manner, or by what form of ballot, or by whom the ballots shall be received or counted, since the whole choice of the manner of election is left to the State.

2. The Congress "may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes," which day is to be the same throughout the United States. This is the only power concerning the election of the President which Congress possesses. Therefore any attempt by Congress to prescribe any regulations or conditions for the election of the President would be sheer usurpation and a flagrant subversion of the Constitution.

As to Senators and Representatives:

1. They are to be elected by the people of the States.

2. Those who may vote for Senators and Representatives must be the same persons who are qualified to vote for members of "the most numerous branch of the State legislature." That is to say, those citizens of this State who may vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress must be those qualified, by the State constitution and laws, to vote for representatives to the General Assembly of Ohio. Since the election of the State representatives must necessarily be by electors qualified under State law, it follows that qualification to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress (e. g. citizenship, place and length of residence, registration, etc.) must also be determined by the State. Otherwise, the Congress could determine who may elect representatives to the State legislature, and all existence of the States as governmental sovereignties would be at an end, and the States become merely large counties, completely dominated by the Federal Government. All of the people of the Nation would become subjects of a central authoritarian government, no longer bound even by its own Constitution, nor by the Bill of Rights.

3. Congress may make or alter regulations as to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives to Congress; but only as to times and manner (not places) of electing Senators of the United States. Even these regulations, which relate only to election procedure are ordinarily to be prescribed by the States.

4. Each House of Congress is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members. Thus, after the election, each House may determine whether the election of any Member has been honestly and legally conducted, whether the result has been truly returned, and whether the person elected is fit and qualified to be a Member of that House. This relates only to action that may be taken after an election, not before or in the process of election.

The foregoing are all of the powers which the Constitution grants to Congress concerning the election of the President and of Senators and Representatives. As to the President, the Congress has the solitary power of fixing the time of election, and no other power whatever. As to the election of Senators and Representatives, the powers of Congress are considerably greater, but do not include the power to say who may vote or upon what qualifying conditions; and such powers as are granted must necessarily be exercised with great caution, to avoid intolerable confusion and opportunities for coercion or fraud—and the greater the emergency the greater the danger to be apprehended from such confusion, coercion, and fraud.

Therefore, any such action by Congress as is proposed, setting up Federal machinery to formulate, print, distribute, and collect ballots, especially for Presidential electors, to be voted under military supervision, with no possible adequate means of determining whether any particular soldier or sailor is a qualified voter or to preserve the secrecy of his ballot, and wholly disregarding State constitutions and laws, would be a flagrant abuse of power by the Congress, involving a wanton flouting and nullification of the Constitution.

It would be no kindness to our boys thus to subvert the system of constitutional government for which they are fighting without their even suspecting that such a revolution is being perpetrated in their names. I repeat that, much as I desire my own sons to exercise the sacred franchise of citizenship they have been taught to cherish, I do not desire it at such a price, nor will they.

Nevertheless, it does not follow that nothing can be done. Undoubtedly, present State laws present obstacles which will make it difficult for soldiers and sailors to vote, because of too late printing and distribution of absent voters' ballots, too rigid and complicated registration rules and other regulations, and difficulties of transportation, distribution, and return. Some of these difficulties the States must remove, but the power and obligation are theirs and theirs only. In other matters, Congress can, without any violation of the Constitution, render great assistance.

I suggest the following remedial measures:

1. Let the States:

(a) Advance the time for printing the ballots and issuing absent voters' supplies;

(b) Advance the time for filing applications for absent voters' supplies, and permit an application to be filed by either the soldier or sailor or a member of his family or duly authorized agent, with proper precautions against duplication, thus eliminating the necessity of two round trips—first of the application, and then of the ballot—which was one of the difficulties I had to overcome for my son overseas, but by diligence did overcome;

(c) Suspend, as to voters in military service the provision of law under which registration as a voter lapses if the person has not voted within a fixed period, since this must already have caused the lapsing of registration of many men who have been absent in service for 2 or 3 years; and

(d) Suspend any requirement that the precinct of the voter be designated on his application, so long as his home residence is stated.

2. Let Congress:

Provide for expediting the transportation, delivery, and return of the ballots issued by the State authorities and for affording to each voter an adequate and easily accessible means of secretly preparing his ballot and having it duly attested and forwarded.

If such measures are adopted, it is safe to predict that at least as many votes will be effectively cast as under the unconstitutional plan now so violently advocated in high Federal places. Endless confusion, uncertainty, and fraud will be avoided; no violation of the constitutional prerogatives of the States will be committed; and the soldiers' and sailors' right to vote will be assured to the greatest possible measure and yet the Federal Union of the States under the Constitution will be preserved, and the obligation of the Federal Government to obey the organic law, ordained by the people of the United States, by which that Government exists, will be vindicated.

Deepening Channel of Missouri River

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, considerable confusion has developed in the Northwest as is evidenced by telegrams and letters that are being received about the effect of a clause in a bill reported by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors relating to the Missouri River below Sioux City. The fear is expressed that a proposed 9-foot channel there would interfere with storing water above that point for irrigation and other uses.

The confusion occurs, partly, because there is now pending a report by the Army engineers on flood control on the Missouri River, and it is expected that hearings will be held on that report very shortly. Many people mistakenly think that the rivers and harbors bill embodies action on that report. It does not, but it could be that downstream development would preempt water against upstream development.

To get a clear understanding of just what is proposed, I went down to the office of the Chief of Engineers last Saturday and discussed the matter.

The engineers advise me that the channel work proposed below Sioux City will not create any additional water demand above that which is now authorized. I asked for a written statement on the subject which was given in a letter received by me today, which, with the permission of the House, I place in the RECORD at this point:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington February 7, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your visit to this office on February 5, 1944, during which time you referred to the proposed 9-foot channel project for the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth and its effect on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin.

House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress, outlines the proposed work in detail. There is enclosed a copy thereof for your convenient reference, and it will be noted that it states specifically that the 9-foot channel is now available for at least four-fifths of the mileage and that the improvement of the obstructive stretches will be by means of minor extensions of existing contraction systems, by bank revetment, cutoffs, closing of channels, removing of snags, and dredging.

The proposed 9-foot channel will be obtained in a manner similar to that used for the Mississippi River, the contraction works serving generally to confine the wide shallow

portions of the river to narrow and deeper sections. It will not be attained by any additional demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that presently authorized.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

Soldier Voting During the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Ann Arbor News of February 1, 1944, showing the forms which were used during the Civil War in a State ballot; also a copy of chapter 253 of the laws of the State of New York, passed April 21, 1864, under which these forms were used. The reason for offering these for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD is that I am sure it is the desire of the Congress that the States enact the best possible laws to permit State voting in the coming election. I believe that these documents point out some means of doing so.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1944, entitled "Ballots and Bullets," written by Danton Walker, and setting forth a letter from Lt. Gen. U. S. Grant.

There being no objection, the documents referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ann Arbor News of February 1, 1944]

HOW SOLDIERS VOTED DURING CIVIL WAR

Voting privileges for soldiers is not just a new idea thought up by Democrats to plague Republicans in the coming election, according to documents now in the possession of the Clements library of the university.

Documents have recently been purchased by the library showing that one William Bennett, of the Seventh Regiment, Heavy Artillery, was permitted to cast a vote through a proxy in Troy, N. Y., while serving with the Union Army outside Petersburg, Va., during the Presidential election of 1864.

ACQUIRED BY LIBRARY

The documents, which have only recently come into the possession of the Clements library, through the interest of Forest H. Sweet, of Battle Creek, consist of a power of attorney and an affidavit attesting that William Bennett—or Bennitt, as he sometimes signed his name—was a member of Company H, of the Seventh Regiment, Heavy Artillery, stationed in the State of Virginia near Petersburg, and that he was a resident of Troy in Rensselaer County of the State of New York. The power of attorney, signed by Bennett, witnessed by Monroe W. Riker, and attested to by H. E. Jones, captain, authorizes and empowers one John D. Miles, of Troy, to cast a "vote or ballot at the general election to be held on November 8, 1864," in the name of the absent soldier.

The power of attorney is headed with the legal phrase:

"In pursuance of an act of the legislature of the State of New York entitled 'An act to enable the qualified electors of this State, absent therefrom in the military services of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, to vote' passed April 21, 1864."

In the affidavit which accompanies the power of attorney, William Bennett states that he has been a citizen of the United States for 10 days and is 21 years old or older. He has been an inhabitant of the State of New York for 1 year preceding the election, and has lived for 4 months in Rensselaer County.

OPPOSED BY M'CLELLAN

The election of 1864 was the one in which Lincoln was opposed by the Democratic candidate, Gen. G. B. McClellan, at a time when the Northern troops were fighting not far from Appomattox. The power of attorney was signed by Mr. Bennett on October 27, 1864, and the election was held on November 8, of the same year. The problem of carrying mail from Petersburg in Virginia through the war-torn countryside safely to New York would be almost as difficult as that of flying mail from England or the South Pacific.

The papers came into the possession of the Clements library at a particularly appropriate time, Dr. Randolph Adams, director of the library, pointed out, when the country at large is concerned over the problem of soldiers voting in the 1944 election. These documents show that soldiers have voted during the country's history and under conditions no less difficult than the present. The historical interest of the papers make them valuable in themselves, he said, but the appropriateness of their discovery at this time enhances their value, both to the library and to the country.

Affidavit Assisted in Soldier Vote of 1864: Among the papers filled out by William Bennett, who voted in his home State of New York in the election of 1864, while fighting in Virginia with the Union Army, was an affidavit, signed by his captain, stating his age and place of residence. The document is one of two recently purchased by the Clements library of the university.

"§ 3. The said absent elector shall make and subscribe the following affidavit:

"I, William Bennett, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have been a citizen of the United States for ten days, am now of the age of twenty-one years, that I have been or shall have been an inhabitant of the State of New York for one year next preceding the election to be held on the 8th day of November 1864, for the last four months a resident of the County of Rensselaer, for thirty days next preceding said election a resident of the city of Troy, and that I am now, and until said election, intend to be a resident thereof; that I have not made any bet or wager and am not directly or indirectly interested in any bet or wager depending upon the result of said election, and I do further swear, that I am in the actual military service of the United States, that I am now a member of Company H of the 7th regiment of Heavy Artillery, N. Y. S. V., now at or near Petersburgh, in the State of Virginia.

"WM. BENNETT.

"Sworn to and subscribed this 27th day of October 1864, before me.

"H. E. JONES,
"Captain, One Hundred and Forty-first New York Volunteers."

"SOLDIER'S POWER OF ATTORNEY

"In pursuance of an act of the Legislature of the State of New York entitled 'An act to enable the qualified electors of this State, absent therefrom in the military services of the United States in the Army or Navy thereof to vote,' passed April 21, 1864:

"I, William Bennett, a member of Company H of the Seventh Regiment Heavy Artillery, New York State Volunteers, now at or near Petersburgh, in the State of Virginia (of the city of Troy), in the county of Rensselaer, do hereby authorize and empower John D. Miles (of the city of Troy), in the county of Rensselaer, to cast for me and in my name and stead, in pursuance of Section 2 of said Act, my vote or ballot, the same as if I was personally present at the General election to be held on the 8th day of November 1864.

"WM. BENNETT.

"Witness:

"MONROE W. RIKER.

"On this 27th day of October 1864 before me personally came William Bennett, to me known to be the same person described in the foregoing instrument, who being by me duly sworn, deposes and says that he executed the foregoing instrument for the uses and purposes herein mentioned. And at the same time appeared before me Monroe W. Riker, who being by me duly sworn, deposes and says that he saw the said William Bennett sign and execute said instrument in his presence, whereupon the said Monroe W. Riker became the subscribing witness thereto.

"H. E. JONES,
"Captain, One Hundred and Forty-first New York Volunteers."

Papers show soldier voted in 1864: An affidavit and a power of attorney, pictured above, are two recently purchased documents in the Clements library of the university, showing that soldiers of the Union Army were permitted to vote during the Presidential election of 1864. The above power of attorney was made out by William Bennett, fighting at Petersburg, Va., and names a proxy to cast a vote for him in Troy, N. Y.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 7, 1944]

BROADWAY

(By Danton Walker)

BALLOTS AND BULLETS

Think there's anything new about the problem of soldiers voting? Read these excerpts from General Porter's Campaigning With Grant:

"The Presidential election was now approaching, and provisions were being carried out for receiving the ballots of the soldiers who came from those States which had passed laws authorizing their soldiers in the field to cast their votes. General Grant had been consulted in regard to the propriety and practicability of permitting the soldiers to vote, and he had written a letter which contains such broad principles of statesmanship, and exhibits so much foresight as to the checks and restraints with which the matter should be guarded, and produced so profound an impression at the time. that it is given in full:

"CITY POINT, VA., *September 27, 1864.*

"The Hon. E. M. STANTON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

"The exercise of the right of suffrage by the officers and soldiers of armies in the field is a novel thing. It has, I believe, generally been considered dangerous to constitutional liberty and subversive of military discipline. But our circumstances are novel and exceptional. A very large proportion of the legal voters of the United States are now either under arms in the field, or in hospitals, or otherwise engaged in the military service.

"Most of these men are not regular soldiers in the strict sense of that term, still less are they mercenaries, who give their services to the Government simply for its pay, having little understanding of political questions, or feeling little or no interest in them. On the contrary, they are American citizens, having still their homes and social and political ties binding them to the States and districts from

which they come and to which they expect to return.

"They have left their homes temporarily, to sustain the cause of their country in the hour of its trial. In performing this sacred duty, they should not be deprived of a most precious privilege. They have as much right to demand that their votes shall be counted in the choice of their rulers as those citizens who remain at home—nay, more; for they have sacrificed more for their country.

"I state these reasons in full, for the unusual thing of allowing armies in the field to vote, that I may urge, on the other hand, that nothing more than the fullest exercise of this right should be allowed; for anything not absolutely necessary to this exercise cannot but be dangerous to the liberties of the country.

"The officers and soldiers have every means of understanding the questions before the country. The newspapers are freely circulated, and so, I believe, are the documents prepared by both parties to set forth the merits and claims of their candidates.

"Beyond this, nothing whatever should be allowed—no political meetings, no harangues from soldiers or citizens and no canvassing of camps or regiments for votes.

"I see not why a single individual not belonging to the armies should be admitted into their lines to deliver tickets (ballots). In my opinion, the ticket should be furnished by the chief provost marshal of each army, by them to the provost marshal (or some other appointed officer) of each brigade or regiment, who shall, on the day of election, deliver tickets, irrespective of party, to whoever may call for them. If, however, it shall be deemed expedient to admit citizens to deliver tickets, then it should be most positively prohibited that such citizens should electioneer, harangue, or canvass the regiments in any way. * * *

"In the cases of those States whose soldiers vote by proxy, proper State authority could be given to officers belonging to regiments so voting to receive and forward votes.

"As it is intended that all soldiers entitled to vote shall exercise that privilege according to their own convictions of right, unmolested and unrestricted, there will be no objection to each party sending to armies easy of access a number of respectable gentlemen to see that these views are fully carried out.

"U. S. GRANT,
"Lieutenant General.

"General Grant (the history continues) felt that he was simply a soldier and he took no active part in the political campaign, although he never failed to let it be known that he ardently desired the triumph of the party which was in favor of vigorously prosecuting the war to a successful termination. * * * On the 8th of November the Presidential election took place. The voting passed off very quietly in the camps. Every soldier was allowed absolute freedom in the choice of candidates, and perhaps no election had ever been conducted with greater fairness. General Grant had a marked aversion to interfering in any matters which pertained to the civil administration of the Government."

[From laws of the State of New York, 1864]

Chapter 253

An act to enable the qualified electors of this State, absent therefrom in the military service of the United State, in the Army or Navy thereof, to vote

Passed April 21, 1864; three-fifths being present.

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. In time of war, every elector of the State of New York in the actual military service of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, who shall be absent from the State of New York on the day of election, shall be entitled to vote at any general or special election held in this State, in the manner and form following:

SEC. 2. Such absent elector shall, by an instrument executed by him not more than 60 days previous to any general or special election to be held in this State, authorize and empower any elector of the town or city where the said absent elector shall reside, on the day of said election, to cast for him his vote or ballot, in the manner prescribed by this act; for all officers for whom he would have a right to vote if he were present at such election; said instrument shall be signed by such absent elector, attested by a subscribing witness, and sworn to before any field officer, captain, adjutant, or commandant of any company or detachment on detached service, in the service of the United States, and commissioned as officers in the volunteer force of the State of New York, or the captain or commandant of any vessel in the naval service of the United States, to which the said absent elector may belong or be attached; and such officers are hereby duly authorized to administer oaths for the purposes specified in this act, and they shall attach to their signatures their official designations.

SEC. 3. The said absent elector shall make and subscribe the following affidavit: "I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have been a citizen of the United States for 10 days, am now of the age of 21 years, that I have been or shall have been an inhabitant of the State of New York for 1 year next preceding the election to be held on the _____ day of _____ 186__, for the last 4 months a resident of the county of _____, for 30 days next preceding said election a resident of the town (or city) of _____, and that I am now and until said election intend to be a resident thereof; that I have not made any bet or wager, and am not directly or indirectly interested in any bet or wager depending upon the result of said election, and I do further swear that I am in the actual military (or naval) service of the United States, that I am now a member of company _____ of the _____ regiment (describing the organization to which he belongs), now at or near _____, in the State (or Territory) of _____ (or attached to the United States vessel _____).

Sworn to and subscribed this _____ day of _____ 186 __, before me.

SEC. 4. The said absent elector in the service as aforesaid, shall prepare and fold the ballot or ballots he designs to cast at such election, and enclose the same, together with the instrument described in the second section of this act, in an envelope duly sealed, having on the outside thereof, either written or printed, the affidavit prescribed in the third section of this act, sworn to and subscribed as therein required. The said envelope, prepared as aforesaid, shall be enclosed by him in another envelope, marked "soldier's vote," sealed and directed to the elector empowered by the instrument described in the second section of this act, to cast the ballot of said absent elector; and the said absent elector may then transmit the same to the person to whom it is directed, by mail or otherwise.

SEC. 5. Such elector, upon receiving such letter from such absent elector, may open the outer envelope thereof, but he shall not open the inner envelope thereof. On the day of such election, and between the opening and close of the polls thereof, he shall deliver such inner envelope to the inspectors of elections of the proper election district, and at the polls thereof; and if the name of the person signing the affidavit, on the outside of said envelope, shall be found entered upon the register of electors of such election district as a duly qualified voter therein, said envelope shall be by said inspectors publicly opened, and the votes or ballots therein contained shall be duly deposited in the appropriate boxes prepared to receive the ballots of voters, and the name of such absent elector shall be entered upon the poll lists, together with the name of the person delivering the ballot at the polls. If such name shall not be found entered upon the register of electors of such such district where such person claims to reside, such envelope shall not be opened unless an affidavit be made by a householder of the district, to the effect that he knows that said person whose vote is so offered is a resident of said district. If such affidavit be made and delivered to the inspectors, they shall open said envelope and deposit the votes or ballots therein contained as aforesaid, and the name of the person so voting shall be entered upon the poll lists, together with the name of the person delivering the ballot at the polls. The ballots contained in any such inner envelope, which shall have been opened or unsealed before the same shall have been laid before the board of inspectors of election, shall not be deposited in any ballot box at such election, but shall be rejected.

SEC. 6. The affidavits and instruments described in the second and third sections of this act, and all envelopes containing "soldiers' votes," not opened at such election, shall be kept and filed by the inspectors of election in the same manner and place as the poll lists of such election are required by law to be kept and filed.

SEC. 7. Every person who shall be entitled to receive any letter or envelope marked as herein provided, before he shall take away the same, shall sign and deliver to the postmaster or his deputy or clerk, a receipt therefor, which receipt shall specify how many such letters or envelopes he has received, and otherwise, as far as may be, specify the particulars of the description thereof. And any willful omission to comply with the provisions of this section shall be adjudged a misdemeanor, and any person convicted thereof shall be furnished accordingly.

SEC. 8. Any inspector of election and any elector to whom said ballot shall be sent who shall willfully neglect or refuse to perform any of the duties required of him by this act, or in any manner willfully violate or abuse any trust or duty hereby imposed on him, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by fine not less than $250, and by imprisonment in the county jail not less than 4 months.

SEC. 9. Every person who shall be guilty of willful and corrupt false swearing or affirming in taking any oath or affirmation prescribed by this act, shall be adjudged guilty of willful and corrupt perjury; and every person who shall make or sign a false certificate to any instrument or affidavit authorized by this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

SEC. 10. Every person who shall deliver or present to the inspectors of elections under this act, any forged, altered, or changed ballot, envelope, or instrument required or provided for by this act, knowing the same to be so forged, altered, or changed, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine not less than $250, and by imprisonment in the county jail not less than 4 months.

SEC. 11. All provisions of the laws of this State relative to general or special elections not inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act, shall apply thereto.

SEC. 12. The secretary of state is hereby authorized and required to prepare and have printed the necessary blank forms and envelopes required to carry out the provisions of this act, and shall cause the affidavits required by the third section of this act to be printed in blank upon proper envelopes, to contain the instrument required by the second section of this act, and shall, at least

2 months previous to any general or special election, cause such blank forms, envelopes, and copies of this act to be forwarded to the several regiments from this State in the service of the United States in the field, and to the several hospitals, posts, and naval stations in sufficient quantity to furnish one copy of each blank, form, envelope, and copy of this act to each person in the actual military service of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, from this State, and absent therefrom. The sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the expenses authorized by this section.

SEC. 13. Any officer of this State, or of the United States, or any other person, who shall, directly or indirectly, control or attempt to control any such enlisted elector in the exercise of any of his rights under this act, by menace, bribery, fear of punishment, hope of reward, or any other corrupt or arbitrary measure or resort whatever, or to annoy, injure, or otherwise punish any such officer or man, for the manner in which he may have exercised any such right, shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the sovereignty of this State, which shall be punished as a misdemeanor, and for which he may be indicted and tried at any future time, when he may be found within the limits of this State; and upon conviction, he shall be imprisoned for a term not exceeding 1 year, and fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000, and he shall also thenceforth be ineligible, after conviction thereof, to hold any office in this State.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication received from the New England council under date of February 4, 1944:

C. E. D. RECOMMENDATIONS ON WAR CONTRACTS APPROVED

A sample check of New England manufacturers conducted by the council's industrial committee indicates that the four recommendations as to termination of war contracts made by the Research Division of the Committee for Economic Development, are approved by the managements of war industries in New England. Of the 184 manufacturers responding to an inquiry from Nathan Tufts, chairman of the industrial committee, 163 signified their approval of the C. E. D. recommendations.

The findings of the research division of C. E. D., first published in full in New England in the Council's War Bulletin, concentrated upon four major proposals, as follows:

1. CONTRACT SETTLEMENT BOARD

We recommend the creation by the Congress of a governmental board with broad powers to establish uniform and simplified policies for the guidance of the several war agencies in the settlement of terminated contracts.

2. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

We recommend the delegation of clear-cut authority to the contracting agencies to make final settlements with contractors within the framework of policies and procedures established by the contract settlement board.

3. EXPANSION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S LEGAL MACHINERY

We recommend that the Congress enact legislation which will establish a clear and simple avenue to the courts for all contractors and provide adequate legal machinery for expeditious handling of such disputes.

4. MANDATORY LOANS TO CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS

We recommend that every contractor and subcontractor be granted the right to obtain mandatory loans from the Government in amounts equal to a substantial proportion of proper settlement claims.

To Robert D. Aitcheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, the war is bringing its griefs and sorrows to many homes and friends. One of the touching tributes to a lost friend appeared last week in the Prince Georges County Post, of Hyattsville, Md., as follows:

TO ROBERT D. AITCHESON

As lovers of horses will,
Bob and I have ridden together;
Never again will I hear his laughter
As we canter over the hill.
If they have horses in heaven, Bob,
Pray for me in between;
I am not riding with you there, Bob;
I'm riding with you here, in my dreams.

Your saddle pal,
CHARLES M. ATTICK.

These two friends were the owners of fine horses and rode the roundabout hills at Berwyn together for years. I offer this just to show how the hearts of friends, bound together in a common way, suffer in a common way.

The Truth About the Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking address on the subject The Truth About the Soldier Vote, delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System on February 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we approach Lincoln's birthday, when the Nation does tribute to that great American, it is appropriate to recall some of the things he has said in the past. Delivering a message to Congress at that momentous special session in 1861, Lincoln said:

"Our adversaries have adopted some declarations of independence in which, unlike the good old one, penned by Jefferson, they omit the words, 'all men are created equal.' Why? They have adopted a temporary national constitution, in the preamble of which, unlike our good old one, signed by Washington, they omit, 'We, the people,' and substitute, 'We, the deputies of the sovereign and independent States.' Why? Why this deliberate pressing out of view the rights of men and the authority of the people?

"This is essentially a people's contest."

Lincoln was speaking of slavery at the time, but he may with equal justice have been speaking of the soldier vote. The same principles are involved and the same claim of violation of State rights is being used to becloud the issue. It is being used with a background of political motives, and it is being used most by the members of that political party who in a few days will stand up at Lincoln Day dinners and pay lip service to Abraham Lincoln, the greatest member of the Republican Party.

The soldiers' vote issue has been so befogged that the people are led to believe there is an honest choice between a Federal ballot and a State ballot. No politician has dared admit that the issue is whether or not the men and women in uniform and the men of the merchant marine shall or shall not vote. No politician has dared to stand up and say that he is afraid of who the armed forces will vote for. Yet that is the truth of this issue—if there is a Federal ballot the soldiers will vote—if there are only State ballots the great majority of soldiers will not vote.

The soldiers themselves sense that this is true. The soldier in his fox hole on Kwajalein Island, or on the beaches before Cisterna, or in the mountains around Cassino, has a right to wonder, if he is deprived of his vote, whether he is in fact fighting a war for democracy and against fascism. His fighting spirit will be divided as he wages a war for his country if the politicians in the leather-padded fox holes of Washington deprive him of his constitutional right to choose those who will govern him. The soldier knows that any American election which disfranchises 10,000,000 voters is not electing a truly representative, a truly democratic government.

Furthermore, the soldier-vote question extends beyond the single issue of the franchise. The man in uniform reasons that if he is meanly treated in his absence he may be given the same sort of treatment when he returns. He justifiably wonders if he will, as promised, be given back his job when he is released from service. He justifiably wonders if he will come back to a depression and find no jobs in the country of freedom and opportunity for which he has been fighting. The soldier has his own forceful G. I. language to express his feelings about the way politicians have handled the vote question, and if it goes against him he will come back determined to seek an accounting of the Members of Congress who have treated him so badly. Further resentments may be kindled which will have more far-reaching results than those of an election overturn. No one can clearly foretell all the consequences; this is not a question to be considered in a vacuum.

In spite of the definite opinions expressed by men and women in uniform on this measure, in spite of statements by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy that handling State ballots is impracticable, in spite of an appeal by the President to Congress to permit soldiers to vote, the deputies

of the sovereign and independent States have insisted that there be a compromise to permit State handling of ballots. This is pure subterfuge, camouflage, and smoke screen. Here are some of the reasons why:

The proposal to have soldiers write home for ballots and have them sent is impracticable if for no other reason than the constant shifting of troops. A West Virginia soldier stationed in California might write home for a ballot, but before it reaches him he may have been transferred to Oregon, to Chicago, to the East, or sent overseas. One soldier has written his father about the soldier vote to say: "You can't fool us on the States' right vote. I tried to vote in 1942, and I finally got the ballot 3 weeks after the election was over." The boy's father sent the letter to his Senator, a so-called States' rights proponent, for an answer.

If the so-called States' rights bill were passed and a conscientious effort were made to get local ballots to every citizen in the armed forces, it would be necessary to ship to each regiment and naval vessel a full supply of various type ballots from all over the country. If, as in the Civil War, troops were organized by States, this would be a less complicated matter. In this war it is vastly more complicated, because residents of many areas, by military policy, are included in every detachment of troops.

Two soldiers from the same State may not necessarily use the same ballot. In my home State of West Virginia there are 350 magisterial districts, each with a different ballot. Rhode Island, the smallest State, has more than 100 different ballots. Illinois has 12,000 different elections and ballots. Probably 50,000,000,000 local ballots would have to be distributed in order to reach as many as 95 percent of the servicemen with the proper local ballots.

This seems on the face of it too absurd to be real. But it is real. It is the inevitable result that would follow if a serious attempt were made to carry out the provisions of the Eastland-Rankin bill. The vote of every member of the armed forces could not otherwise be insured under this measure.

An attempt was made in 1942 to vote by a States' rights system. It did not work. In my own State, the number of ballots sent out was 744; the number returned was 290. In Rhode Island the number of ballots sent out was 632, the number of votes cast 316, or just half. For the country as a whole, 136,686 out of 5,000,000 servicemen applied for ballots, and 28,051 voted. That is only 1 out of every 300.

Besides, no question of States' rights actually arises in connection with the Federal ballot. State ballots would be counted in every case where servicemen can obtain them and return them in time.

No, as James Russell Lowell wrote in his notable "Election in November," the issue "has compelled our politicians into that first fatal compromise with their moral instincts and hereditary principals which makes all consequent ones easy; it has accustomed us to makeshifts instead of statemanship, to subterfuge instead of policy, to party platforms for opinions, and to a defiance of the public sentiment * * * for patriotism."

But, when States' rights do not seem to befog the issue enough, the partisan politician takes shameful refuge behind the skirts of the Constitution. As a lawyer and as a former judge I have studied the Constitution on this question and I find the Constitution simple and clear. It says, article I, section 4: "The times, places, and the manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislatures thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulation." This is a direct, straightforward grant of constitutional power to the Congress. Providing a simple uniform Federal ballot for the soldiers is squarely within the area reserved by the Constitution for the exercise of power by Congress. No Member of Congress, no politician in or out of Congress, should seek to deprive the legislative branch of this clearly constitutional authority.

No applicable question of constitutionality has arisen in regard to the soldier-vote law passed a year and a half ago. This measure, Public Law 712, relieved servicemen of the necessity of registering for elections or of paying poll taxes in order to vote. The States may determine, under the Constitution, the qualifications of voters. State courts have held that registration is not a qualification, nor does the payment of a poll tax fit or qualify a citizen to vote. Yet there are poll taxers and recently converted States' righters who are using the Constitution to muddy the waters on the soldiers' vote.

This cry of "unconstitutionality" reminds me of the story about Horace Greeley's bad handwriting. It was so atrocious that he had a special compositor to set type for his editorials. Practical jokers in the composing room filled two pages with the tracks of a sparrow and shuffled them into the copy. The typesetter did not pause as he went through the first page of the sparrow tracks, but he came to a full stop in the middle of the second. Going up to the boss, he said, "Mr. Greeley, I can't seem to make out this word right here." Greeley brusquely took the page from him and looked. "For heavens sake, man, can't you read? That word is 'unconstitutionality.' "

All the soldiers cannot vote unless there is a simple Federal ballot which can be shipped in bulk to all the fronts and outposts and cantonments and camps. No other way is practicable. And the soldier has the right to vote.

That right is the right of the American citizen to choose those who will govern him. I maintain, as did Abraham Lincoln at Peoria, "that no man is good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent." I say this is the leading principle, the sheet-anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times relative to the soldiers' vote:

THE SOLDIER'S VOTE

Elsewhere on this page this morning there is a V-mail letter from an American corporal, somewhere in Britain, strongly urging the enactment of a Federal voting plan and expressing the fear that the adoption of the alternative so-called States' rights plan would breed resentment and distrust among the armed forces. There can't be much doubt that this is the typical attitude of the American soldier and sailor overseas. All the evidence points that way. Stars and Stripes, which ordinarily does not run editorials, printed one recently expressing the opposition of the armed forces to the plan which leaves it to the 48 States to handle soldier voting under their 48 different varieties of law, on the ground that this method would be cumbersome at best and would inevitably discourage overseas voting. From Algiers the United Press has brought a report of an apparently unanimous opinion in favor of a Federal law to give us a chance to vote the easy way and not leave us to the individual States with their inadequate laws and delaying difficulties. There is a wealth of similar evidence from other quarters.

These are the men who are taking the risks and doing the fighting and the dying, and their strong preference in this fundamental matter ought to be respected and, we believe, can be respected, under the Constitution. As a substitute for the wholly inadequate bill adopted last week by the House of Representatives—a bill which simply makes a pious and empty recommendation to the States that they cooperate with the Federal Government—the Senate yesterday approved two bills that bring the situation to a state of renewed confusion. What is needed is a bill which provides for the Federal distribution and collection of soldiers' ballots, which is the only way the matter can be handled with any real assurance that the men and women of the Army and Navy will be able to vote for Federal officials in this year's election. But the bill should also respect the constitutional provision of States' rights by leaving it to the States to determine the qualifications for voting. The States would get the ballots and the States would do the counting.

That is a practical plan and, constitutionally, a proper plan. We believe that the great majority of Americans at home, as well as their sons and daughters overseas, tired of politics in Congress, want action on it.

Muzzled Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., entitled "Muzzled Witnesses." This editorial directs the attention of the public to an extremely important matter. It seems to me this is a situation that ought to be carefully examined so that all of the facts may be determined:

MUZZLED WITNESSES

An order ostensibly issued to prevent civil and military officials of the lesser grades from talking too much had an immediate and disagreeable reaction. J. Edgar Hoover, called before a House committee with regard to complaints against the Federal Communications Commission, repeatedly refused to answer questions because there was a Presidential order affecting such questions as those

asked by the committee. Whether the order had special application to the investigation of the F. C. C. or whether it was intended to be a blanket order covering all investigations of Federal operations is not certain. But the total effect is to raise a very serious question: Is the Government going to muzzle all witnesses in investigations? This would indeed be a drastic limitation of free speech and a gross outrage upon the people.

Specifically, the committee wanted to know the details about Hoover's charge that a great deal of information, including fingerprints, radio talks, and various documents had been withheld from the F. B. I. by the F. C. C. This was a pre-Pearl Harbor affair and presumably the suppressed records dealt very acutely with national safety.

It seems to us that suppression of facts, or the prevention of their disclosure by responsible officials, is serious tampering with the processes of justice and a national safety. If the President can, by a sweeping order, prevent J. Edgar Hoover from testifying in a vital affair, any other witness can be muzzled and any sort of complaint can be smothered and any sort of scandal covered up.

The country is rather suspicious of Chairman Fly and the F. C. C. Unquestionably, there are symptoms of dictation and concealment with regard to radio. The Chairman has been free with his bans. It is requisite that the country understand what one of its principal commissions is doing and what its purposes are. The business of communications is to be informative and not secretive. The United States Government should not be prostituted to suppressions and oppressions in the name of an appointive commission. The President has no right to remove this Commission from the power of Congress or to protect it from the criticisms of the public. The muzzling of Mr. Hoover, who is one of our national reliances, seems to have a sinister meaning.

Independence for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday night, January 26, in the city of Washington, D. C., a huge mass meeting was held for the purpose of discussing independence for India. The occasion was India's Independence Day. I served as chairman of the meeting. As such chairman, I made a few remarks, which I am inserting herewith:

I am in favor of the freedom of India first of all because I am an American, and national freedom is the tradition of all Americans; secondly, because we, together with the rest of the United Nations, including India, are in the midst of a global struggle, entailing enormous sacrifices, chiefly for the defense and vindication of human freedom, and it does not make sense that the 400,000,000 of the people of India should be denied or deprived of their own birthright of freedom. Then, again, India has a most eminent past in terms of culture and art, philosophy and religion, and free India may be expected to make a contribution to world civilization of the future worthy of her great past.

I believe that the freedom of India is necessary for India, for Great Britain, and for the world at large. It is not easy to conceive of a post-war pattern of an enduring world peace, or of stability and contentment in Asia, without a free India. The problem of India is the key problem of imperialism, and if it is not solved amicably the whole of Asia will continue to be in a state of ferment, an arena of tension and intrigue, of unending feud between nationalism and imperialism, and, indeed, between rival imperialisms. I believe that India's cause is a just cause, and the statesmanship of the United Nations should be equal to finding an honorable settlement of the issue.

It is sometimes suggested that discussion of this problem of India at this juncture might embarrass our ally, Great Britain. I, for one, repudiate this suggestion. I refuse to believe that frank, honest discussion, even if it involves a little friendly criticism of a problem that vitally concerns the future for all of us, can in any way embarrass Great Britain. On the contrary, I submit that the misgivings in the minds of India's millions about the purpose of this war is a matter of great embarrassment to all of us.

Not only from the viewpoint of the future but also for the effective prosecution of the war, particularly against Japan, I think we must have the wholehearted support of the people of India and to end the present unfortunate deadlock between her and Great Britain. That support we can get only by assuring them of their own freedom.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Franklin, Ohio, population 5,000, a paper-mill town, is doing something practical about juvenile delinquency. Sponsored by the local Lions Club, a large, vacant garage has been converted into a community center for boys and girls from the seventh grade to high-school seniors.

The name of the center, selected by the members themselves, is the Kats Kavern, probably because the high-school football and basketball teams are known as the Wildcats.

Boys eligible to membership, under direction of members of the Lions Club, did all the work of cleaning out the junk in the garage, painting the walls, laying a dance floor and converting the dingy spot into a most attractive place of assembly. The old garage office has been changed to a pleasant lounging room, with upholstered furniture, handsome floor lamps, reading and game tables. A milk bar, where soft drinks and refreshments are served, was installed in this lounge. The big repair shop and storage room now has a dance floor, ping-pong tables, shuffleboard courts, and other equipment.

Membership dues are $1 per year and the youngsters feed the nickels to the juke box which furnishes music for dancing, except on Saturday nights when the high-school orchestra plays.

The Kats Kavern now has 215 paid members, and the average attendance is around 85 with the Friday and Saturday night gatherings reaching 150.

Franklin has the usual delinquency problems faced by all towns where mischievous boys find little to occupy them in the long winter evenings. The Lions Club which sponsors this venture has 42 members. They spent $4,000 remodeling, decorating, and furnishing the old garage. The operating overhead is about $200 per month, one-half of which is realized from profits from the milk bar and the juke box take. The community will be canvassed soon for a white-elephant auction sale when homes will be solicited for unused furniture, clothing, and various white elephants which will be sold to the highest bidders at a big community auction sale. In view of the cause and the spirit of competition in the bidding a large sum will no doubt be raised in this manner. A minstrel show put on by the Lions and other home talent performances are given at intervals to raise funds.

The Kats Kavern is properly chaperoned and supervised. When the new furnishings were turned over to the youngsters they were told: "All these things are yours. If you abuse, mar, or mutilate them you will be destroying your own property and it will not be replaced." So far it has worked. Three high-school boys who had left their classes returned to their studies because the membership is limited to boys and girls attending school.

At a recent conference of the Ohio Council of Defense held in Cincinnati the delegates were told by speakers from the Ohio Department of Education that the Kats Kavern was one of the outstanding programs presented to date in the Ohio area by any community the size of Franklin.

The Polish-Russian Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a distinguished Polish-American patriot, Rev. John L. Mieczkowski:

ASSUMPTION B. V. M. CHURCH,
Oil City, Pa., January 23, 1944.

The Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With heartfelt thanks I am returning the enclosed herewith resolution and timely editorials, bearing on the very important Polish-Russian controversy. I am in complete accord with the sentiments contained therein, and every true Pole, the world over, is of the same mind and heart.

As you are aware, the intended grab and subsequent attack of Germany on Poland

brought England, France, and our own country to Poland's side. Why, then, should Poland, after 5 years of bleeding, surrender now about one-half of her land and citizens to Russia? And would it be proper for the United States to sanction such infamous robbery with the spilled blood of our many soldiers, sweat and tears of our countless citizens, and the hundred billion dollars of our hard-earned wealth? Why wage war on Germany, when she did not demand as much as Russia? Soviets have been sending one ultimatum after another to Poland, and her allies are standing stupefied! The emigre-government of Poland is truly representative of the Polish people and has been accepted as such by England and the United States. Yet, Russia has the audacity to slander and insist that it be changed according to her dictates—she desires a government in Poland of her own choice, and our knee-weak Government is silent, perhaps acquiescing? What has become of the Atlantic Charter and the other far-fetched slogans? What has become of the "four freedoms" for Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Rumania, and the other small nations? My boys of this parish, numbering about 285, are gallantly fighting not only for Uncle Sam, but also for the land of their fathers. The spirit of liberty and justice for big and small alike is leading these heroes on to victory—and should we betray them? God save us, if we do!

To compensate Poland for her despoliation, Russia is graciously offering her integral parts of Germany. Hence, already scheming for a better opportunity, when again with Germany she expects to divide the rest of Poland. Why does not she take Germany and leave Poland alone? How can peace prevail with such a sinister neighbor? Yet some of our gullible officials are bowing to all Russian whims. It is better for all to oppose her now than to fight later. You also know the Soviets do not accept the governments of Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia—because they are not enough Bolshevik We are told that the Tehran meeting has settled all differences in the most amicable spirit and manner—obviously it did not. Perhaps if our leaders had a little more backbone Russia would not get away with all her bluffing and bulldozing. Please remember, too, England is not surrendering any of her former territory—why should Poland? It is this injustice that is causing a great deal of unrest in the world and in our country likewise. People are getting very suspicious and tired of fighting for Russia. And after this war are we to police Europe, to see that the aforesaid robberies are not amended? We have some splendid leaders in Congress and Senate, like your colleagues, Mr. SHAFER, Senators BRIDGES, WHEELER, commentators such as Simms, George Sokolsky, and others, but our executives are not assertive enough. They know how to give everything to Russia, but do not know how to gain respect for this great land of ours. Russia does not accept even the intervention of our Government, nor that of England, and we call her democracy. You remember what Willkie got from Russia for praising her?

In 1920 the late Secretary of State Bainbridge V. Colby said: "This Government believes in a united, free, and autonomous Polish state, and the people of the United States are earnestly solicitous for the maintenance of Poland's political independence and territorial integrity. From this attitude we will not depart, and the policy of this Government will be directed to the employment of all available means to render it effective." Such statesmen we need today, and I am glad you are one of them.

Let us pray and hope that God send good will and brotherly love into this forlorn world of ours.

Cordially yours,

Rev. JOHN L. MIECZKOWSKI.

Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the United States public in general knows very little about the country's conscientious objectors, who they are, what happens to them, or how they are treated.

Often they are lumped together in the public mind with draft dodgers, slackers, and evaders. This, however, is not the case. Selective Service, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Government agencies which have most to do with the subject, all carefully differentiate between the man who is trying to evade service and the objector who quite openly refuses to serve because of his religious convictions.

Congress made definite provisions in the Selective Service Act for sincere, religious conscientious objectors by setting up for them work of national importance under civilian direction. In doing this it was guided by the American heritage of protecting the freedom of belief and worship even of those unpopular minorities whose ideas seem to most people to run directly counter to the safety and best interests of the Nation.

I would like to report briefly on what has happened since that time.

A number of men have felt unable to serve in combat units where they would be asked to kill, but have accepted service in the medical corps and other noncombatant divisions. The Army has recently announced that this arrangement is working out satisfactorily with only a relatively few cases reported where men were causing them any trouble.

Another 9,000 or more men have refused any type of military service with the armed forces and have been sent to civilian public-service camps. An additional 3,000 objectors have been sent to prison, either because they failed to receive a C. O. classification and still refused to enter the Army, or because they were unwilling to go either to the army or C. P. S. A large number of the latter are Jehovah's Witnesses who generally claim ministerial exemption.

Since the Selective Service Act was made law, however, Congress has not followed up its original intent to grant freedom of conscience to those religiously opposed to war. It has failed to provide for the basic needs of men in civilian public service despite the fact that this was established as a legal and recognized alternative to military service.

It is, of course, a public question how much attention should be given the conscientious objector in time of war. It might be interesting however, to consider the following little-known facts:

First. Men in civilian public service have at no time been paid for their work for a period of almost 3 years, despite the fact that payment, not to exceed Army rates, is legislatively provided for.

Second. The Government does not provide maintenance, beyond loaning the men vacant C. C. C. camps and setting up their work programs which are rigidly enforced. Food, clothing, and incidentals are supplied in the main by three historic peace churches. Mennonites, Brethren, and Friends—Quakers. Now, after 2 years, about 40 percent of the men are working for mental hospitals or other public institutions which provide maintenance, but still at no cost to the Government. Since the civilian public service program started the various religious groups concerned have raised and expended $3,000,000.

Third. C. P. S. men do not receive accident compensation and must pay themselves or refer to their churches medical bills, even when hurt while working for the Government. Selective service has twice tried to include C. O.'s in the Employee Compensation Act—benefits to be based on imaginary earnings of $42 a month—but Congress has so far not permitted this. Two such bills are now pending—one on the Senate Calendar, since last April; the other in the House Military Affairs Committee, since last February.

Fourth. Neither are C. P. S. men included in any of the dependency legislation for servicemen, despite the fact that the draft of fathers affects both groups equally and their rates of dependency are about the same. This throws the support of their dependents back on the same church groups whose resources are already taxed with the support of the men themselves. The problem is relatively new but it is beginning to assume major proportions.

A House Military Affairs Subcommittee recently took an interest in this situation and is now—since last October—considering a measure which would devote to the men's dependency needs the money which they themselves earn but are not allowed to keep. There is now about $200,000 of this money in a special fund of the United States Treasury.

The National Service Board for Religious Objectors, the central office for the church groups involved, has organized a Dependency Council to meet the more immediate, pressing needs, but is forced to look to Congress for any permanent or over-all relief. The Council has a working budget of $2,000 to meet the dependency claims of 6,700 C. P. S. men, in addition to the needs of close to 3,000 conscientious objectors in Federal prisons.

Both the Selective Service System and the conscientious objectors themselves agree that the situation is being handled far better in this war than in the last. The discrepancies enumerated above, however, and the fact that about 3,000 conscientious objectors have been sent to prison so far, would suggest that perhaps we have not as yet found the complete solution to the problem.

As the matter now stands, a conscientious objector is granted legal standing by the Selective Service Act, but at the same time is fined, in effect, for his views.

The Role of the Dental Profession in the Health of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and, because of the illness of Senator PEPPER, read by another at the annual winter educational meeting of the Massachusetts Dental Society, at the Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass., January 26, 1944. The address contains very valuable discussion of the role played by the dental profession in the health of the Nation, and is very interesting.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish at the outset to assure the gentlemen of this distinguished audience that I, as a lawyer, know my place. That place, in the field of dentistry, is in the chair at which is probably the less pleasing end of the drill. In the matter of dental care there have been times when I felt inclined to agree that it must be more blessed to give than to receive, but I have remained a layman and accordingly, before such an audience as I have tonight, I approach the subject with a keen consciousness of my own limits.

I shall stay within those limits. I hope when I open my mouth to be able to say something more than "ah," but I shall not try to use words like "odontothanatosis" or pretend to know what they mean. And I shall try to remain sensible of the fact that while it is the duty of men in my profession to put teeth in our people's laws, we in the Congress are not charged with an equal responsibility to put law in our people's teeth.

As a layman and a lawmaker I am here, not with instructions or advice, not with pontifical edicts, but with a plea, an earnest, heartfelt summons to action—such action as you yourself may see fit to take—on behalf of the people of the United States.

I have been told that in discussing dental care I am entering upon controversial ground. By some of my own well-meaning colleagues I have been warned to walk before you as one walks on eggs. But I have also talked with a good many leaders of your profession, some of whom are in attendance at this gathering, and from them I think I have received better advice. From them I have gained a confidence in the dentists of this country which enables me to speak out frankly, feeling that this segment of a forward-looking, public-spirited profession will accept whatever I may have to say in the spirit in which it is offered. There are times you know when better political advice comes from those who pull teeth than from those who can only pull punches.

Let me assure you that I am not indulging in overstatement when I say that the Nation was shocked, profoundly, and in all its walks of life, when the results of our selective service examinations early in this war emergency were made known. Some of you will recall those figures. As of March 1941, 43 percent of all men examined were at that time being declared unfit for military service.

Since then many of the older standards have been relaxed. It was a matter of changing standards, and particularly dental standards, or going into war without an army. Therefore, men have since been taken into the Army who were originally rejected. Today, the fellow with a I-A card is told, "If you can chew butter, you're in."

But changing the requirements, on paper, does not change the men nor the condition in which our Army found them a couple of years ago. We do not sweep away the need for medical and dental rehabilitation which those young men bring with them when they put on the uniform, simply by rewriting selective-service rules; and of course our Army—and less directly our civilian population as well—is now engaged in footing the bill in catching up with the neglect of years.

It is a big bill. While the Army replaced with dentures and bridges 29 percent of the teeth it pulled out of its men during the year 1942, figures for the early part of 1943 give some idea of the effect of the subsequent relaxation of standards; for the replacements in January of last year were 58 percent, in February 72 percent, and in March 81 percent. In the Army Dental Bulletin for July 1943, you will find incomplete figures for the month of March, showing that 562,546 teeth had been extracted, and that 458,753 of these were replaced.

These Army dentists are working on 94,000 patients a day, each of whom requires a minimum of one and one-half fillings. They are restoring 2,250,000 teeth every month. Since Pearl Harbor, they have put 23,000,000 fillings in the teeth of our soldiers. Overseas the Army has one dentist to every 850 soldiers.

This is work that has to be done. We have the order of Major General Mills that no man goes overseas unless his teeth are up to standard. That is a military order, given for very good military reasons. The Army knows its own manpower problem is not solved by railroading the unfit to the battle front. It must first make them fit, or risk losing the battle. And we may as well state the fact, and face it frankly, that the Army Dental Corps is now doing what amounts to a public health job on these millions of Americans—a job that needs to be done if we are to remain a strong people and a great Nation in time of peace as well as war, a job that must be done on Americans whether they are 6 or 26 or 46, whether they are in our armed forces and our war plants or in our homes and schools.

We are finding out how big that job is. We are given a vivid, indeed a shocking, realization of its magnitude in the field of dentistry alone when selective service made known its findings in 1940. We learned that defective teeth were disqualifying for general military service 8.3 percent of all our young men who were subject to the draft.

Now, it seems to me worth calling attention to the fact that in 1918, when Army standards were the same as in 1940, bad teeth were not the biggest disqualifying factor. Only 1.3 percent of those boys were below the dental standard. Defects in the musculoskeletal system, cardiovascular troubles, foot disease and several other causes were ahead of bad teeth. In 1940, selective service found these causes standing in about the same order as in 1918—with the single marked exception of teeth. Bad teeth were now not only first, but first by a wide margin over any other disability, and proportionately more than four times as serious, in numbers of men affected, as in 1918.

Why this change? What has been happening since 1918? George Perrott, writing in the Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, says—I quote—"It should not be concluded that this necessarily indicates an increase in the prevalence of dental disease since 1918. It may indicate that young men today have had less dental care during childhood and adolescence than those of 1918, due perhaps to the effect of the depression." End quote.

We no longer have that depression with us. But we still have bad teeth, and we are still falling behind in our long losing race against the great enemy, dental caries. That enemy has a secret weapon. Except for the possibility that fluorine in our drinking water may help, we have as yet no true preventive of caries. We can—if we have the services available and if we make full use of those services—prevent to a large degree the loss of teeth eventuating from caries.

This we are not doing. We are not keeping up with the annual incidence of defect. And that incidence of defect embraces not just one stratum of our society, but all of us. Many of you may be familiar with studies undertaken in New Jersey and elsewhere, showing that tooth decay is no respecter of persons or pocketbooks. It attacks impartially, on both sides of the railroad tracks. In our warnings and fears of the great ogre of socialized dentistry, it may be well for us to remember that we already have with us socialized decay.

What the Army Dental Corps is doing for our fighting men may reasonably be taken as a yardstick of the need of our people as a whole, if we are to keep our traditional place in the vanguard of all peoples. Call it theoretical, if you will. Call the objective an ideal. Yet in the United States Army it has already become a very solid piece of theory, a very real ideal, with a good sound bite to it, able to withstand the rigors of the K ration or anything else the war may bring. A hint of the condition of our civilian war workers is given in a report of the United States Public Health Service:

"Reports from several factories have indicated that more time is lost on account of the lack of dental care than for any other reason. In certain areas workers sit in dental offices hoping that some person having an appointment will not keep it."

We may lay the dental condition of our young men in the Army to the depression or to any of the assorted causes that suits the analyst's fancy. It does not very much matter—not nearly so much as the sad fact of that condition, not so much as the fact that among our school children of today, when there is no depression, we still have that condition in the making. We still have the enemy hammering away at our future citizens with the secret weapon. And we still have not found, or at any rate applied, the answer.

I have studied a report which is doubtless familiar to many of the distinguished members of this audience, showing the results of a study of the progress of dental caries among school children of the city of Hagerstown, Md. With the thought that it may be of some interest to men in the profession, who are very close to the problem to take a couple of steps back and away from it and hear briefly the points in that report that impress a lay mind, I am taking the liberty of going over those items that struck me most forcefully.

As you may recall, Hagerstown at the time this study was undertaken—in 1937—was considered a typical small American city, of some 30,000 persons. The study was made among the town's 4,416 school children who were given complete dental examinations in the spring of that year. The report explains that the examinations were made with "number 3 plain mirrors and fine pointed pig-tail explorers under favorable lighting conditions," but those are the kind of details that I shall skip henceforth, on a plea of ignorance. In my school days the only "pig-tail explorers" I knew wore short pants, and I could recognize one of them by looking into a mirror—No. 3, or any other number.

At any rate, this study showed that in this typical community dental caries had attacked one or more permanent teeth in 19.9 percent of the 6-year-old girls and in 12.3 percent of

the boys of the same age. It showed that as age increased caries in the permanent teeth became more prevalent until 14 or 15. At that age 95 percent of the children had one or more decayed, missing, or filled teeth.

More than half of those children—53 percent, to be exact—had one or more unfilled carious deciduous teeth, and nearly 60 percent required one or more fillings in permanent teeth. In all, the examinations showed about 10,000 deciduous and 8,000 permanent teeth with unfilled cavities, and the defects in these teeth were affecting 21,000 deciduous and 12,000 permanent tooth surfaces.

In summation, I quote a few sentences from the report:

"Carious defects in permanent teeth are treated fairly adequately in one-fifth and are entirely neglected in one-half of the 4,416 grade-school children. * * * The filling of permanent tooth surfaces is being accomplished at a rate which is about one-sixth of the rate at which the defects are accruing. * * * If such an accumulation of untreated defects in the permanent teeth is to be avoided in the future some provision should be made to give elementary school children (in the form of filling alone) approximately 6 times the amount of service they now receive."

"Six times the amount of service they now receive." Well, that was as of May 1938. At the time of the survey there were practicing in Hagerstown 32 dentists. Today I am informed that there are 10 fewer. Six have gone into the armed forces, 1 died, 1 retired, and 2 have been incapacitated by illness. In the meantime, Hagerstown's population has grown to about 42,000.

It is true that our country is too vast, too diverse in its climate, its economics, and its people, to permit of many safe generalizations based on the findings in a single town. Yet there is other evidence that what has happened in Hagerstown is happening in America's myriad of other towns.

On April 1, 1940, we had in the United States 70,417 active dentists. Taking into account the changes since then—additions from the dental schools and subtractions for deaths and retirements, and further subtracting the men of 65 years or more, those in the armed forces, and those serving in administrative duties, the number of effective dentists whose services were available in private practice at the beginning of this year is estimated at about 35,000.

Of that number more than half are between the ages of 45 and 65. These men are faced with the job of caring for the teeth of our civilian population in a ratio of 1 dentist for each 3,500 persons, whereas when we had a ratio of 1 to 1,800 our school children were getting something like one-sixth of the care they needed. And here, as with our doctors, we find the available dentists bunching in the larger cities, so that for our great rural areas even that ratio of 1 to 3,500 is knocked into a cocked hat.

The distribution of dentists is unfortunate not only by way of geography but also economically and racially. Recently I went down to Pascagoula, Miss., to chair an investigation of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education. There I was told that the State of Mississippi has a ratio of 1 dentist to each 5,800 of the population, which compares with 1 to 4,800 pre-war.

As compared with the rest of America, that did not seem too far out of line, economics and other things in Mississippi considered. But then, somewhat as an afterthought, I was reminded by the local witness that more than half of Mississippi's 2,000,000 population were Negroes, and that for these one-million-plus of the Negro people there were, in all, just 35 dentists.

The ratio then becomes 1 dentist for each 28,500 people. You will find, therefore, ratios in many parts of Mississippi like that for instance, of De Soto County, of 1 to 27,000, or Tunica County, with 1 to 22,000. And some counties have no dentist at all.

Before the war, this witness in Pascagoula said, 30 percent of the people of Mississippi had some sort of dental treatment. Seventy percent had none. When I asked him if he thought the number of dentists there was adequate to take care of the people, he said "Yes," he thought it was. And Pascagoula, Miss., like Hagerstown, Md., enjoys the distinction of being a part of the United States of America.

But disregarding for the moment bad distribution, if we now have, throughout the country, a ratio of 1 dentist to 3,500 civilians—and that compares with a ratio of 1 to 1,800 regarded by the Journal of the American Dental Association as "necessary and desirable"—what about replacements? Are we gaining back any of the ground lost through the war, with new graduates from the dental schools, or are we losing further?

The dental profession has estimated that in time of peace at least 2,250 graduates are needed annually to replace the men who die or retire and to meet the needs of a growing population. Many in the profession believe this number should be higher.

In time of war, the Army has estimated its own need of replacements at 825 dentists every 9 months; the Navy at 400. About 16 percent of the boys who go to school fail for one reason or another to be graduated. Taking this into the account, the Army figured it would need 982 members of each new class, the Navy 475. This makes a total of 1,427. As the number admitted in 1942 was 2,702, it was thus calculated that the armed forces would take 53 percent of these new men, leaving the civilian population 47 percent, or 1,375 men—a little more than half the minimum number regarded as needful for civilian replacement.

So much for theoretical pencil pushing. How has it worked out? The latest figures I have been able to get show that in November of last year there were, in our 40 schools of dentistry, a total of 8,871 students enrolled. Of these, 6,310 were going to school under the direct jurisdiction of the Army—earmarked, as it were, for duty there—and 1,914 for the Navy. This left exactly 647 men studying dentistry presumably with the idea that when they get out of school they will be available in civilian practice—647 dentists out of these 8,871 students. As compared with the 47 percent which had been figured on paper, actually the figure is a little better than 7 percent. For civilian needs, we are getting a little better than one-fourth of the minimum necessary replacements.

The experience of our Army was painfully convincing evidence of the way the need for dental care can pile up through the years. We have been given other figures to show that. We know that the white adult population is getting less than one-third of the fillings it needs, less than a third of the crowns and bridges, and about one-seventh of the prophylaxes. We know, too, that our children are getting only about one-fifth of the fillings they need.

To fill up this gap—assuming that we were to find ways of paying for the service—we would need just about twice the number of dentists we normally have in practice during peacetime. This, of course, does not take into account the job it would be to catch up on the past—that is, bring population up to a state of reasonably good dental health to start out afresh.

I shall not go on with statistics. I have been in the United States Senate long enough to know that a statistician is a person who can help you win an argument if you let him know where to stop. If you don't, he might go on until he wins for the other side. I know there are other aspects of this dental problem. I know there is a need of public education. I know that the year-in, year-out income of a large part of our population is not great enough to cover dental costs, along with the ordinary expenses of living, even if we had dentists available for all our people.

But is the answer to these problems to sit back and let nature take its course? I do not think there is a person in this gathering who would agree with that. The dignity of the profession of dentistry, like that of medicine, will not countenance a narrow, astigmatic disregard of the broad needs that exist beyond the limits of individual practice. The American dentist fails neither his patient nor his people. And this is a time when the people, facing dire need, are looking to the profession for leadership, for the finding of a way. "Our concern," says your own Journal of the American Dental Association editorially, "is that the dental needs of all our people at home and on the firing line shall be met and that we shall not find ourselves at the end of the war with a disastrous shortage of dentists."

I have inflicted upon you a good many figures bearing out my belief that unless we do something about it—and that "we" is most earnestly meant to embrace the leadership and initiative of the dentists themselves—we do indeed face a situation bordering upon disaster, a ruinous shortage, with the resultant irreparable damage to our Nation and to our children who will constitute the Nation to be.

The dentists and doctors of this country long ago learned—contrary to an old popular notion—that a healthy people means a healthy profession. We do not apply directly the Chinese system of paying the doctor only when we are well, and going free until he cures us. But in a broader sense, that principle does hold good in our country. For if our people become unhealthy, no profession, no business, is immune to the effects of that ill health.

The leaders of these professions are aware of this. It is at the base of their concern over the shortage of dentists and doctors. And it is also at the base of my own confidence that in coming before you with a plea that something be done, I am not bespeaking an alien or hostile viewpoint, I am not talking a foreign language.

To the question, What to do about it? A number of schemes and plans have been proposed. A number of general principles have been laid down. The principles, I believe, assay a higher content of good common sense to the ton than the plans for carrying them out. But decaying teeth have an unfortunate way of failing to respond to a statement of principles. They go right on with their decay until those fine principles are translated into filling up the holes.

For myself, I claim the distinction—rare in our times—of not knowing the answer. To the members of this audience, and the other thousands of your profession, I give my most earnest assurance that I have not worked out a lawyer's solution to a dentist's problem. There is no Pepper plan. By unfortunate misinterpretation, my name is from time to time linked up with the presentation of various plans. It has been subscribed to none. I have as yet pledged my support to and identified myself with none of them.

The only Pepper plan that I do not disclaim at this time—indeed that I have actively espoused and now insist upon—is that we now find a way of moving from word to deed, that we shift from principle to action. And that way should be found by those who are most directly concerned, who should and do accept the responsibility.

In dentistry, the reference is as direct as I can make it to the dentists. You are re-

sponsible. If you do nothing, the condition that endangers the well-being of your people will continue, for that attack is always with us. If your leadership merely restates fine principles but opposes any attempt to act upon them, new inroads will continue to be made upon that well-being. And to Americans, dentists, lawmakers, and laymen alike, this prospect is intolerable. We cannot let it go on.

This does not mean that the shortage of dentists, the insufficiency of low-bracket income to meet the price of dental care, and all our related ills are going to be laid on the doorstep of the profession for it to take care of unassisted. I have not embarked on a campaign to soak the dentists.

I am inclined to agree that we can find ways to carry out in action certain of the principles that have been set forth, without soaking the dentist. One of these principles that seems to me sound and grounded in hard fact is the often suggested shift in application of our available manpower from concentration on dental care for adults, where the accent is now, to at least some enlargement of the energies spent on dental care of children. That, in the light of what we know of the nature of dental decay, seems to me good economy. With adults getting less than a third of the fillings they need, and children getting only a fifth or a sixth of what they need, there seems to be little question as to the direction our new efforts should take.

Under wartime conditions we cannot expect to go as far in this direction as we might in time of peace. But we should be preparing now to provide prophylactic and corrective services for our entire school population as a post-war project, and we should be doing as much of the actual work now as our curtailed manpower can carry. Whether some sort of compulsory program of dental health education is necessary in connection with this work is one of many of the questions on which I am at present keeping an open mind, and on which I am seeking the assistance of the profession in forming a judgment.

I am also reserving opinion, subject to proposals that may come from the dentists themselves, on the means, the machinery, to be set up for accomplishing this end. Shall we extend the usual school service programs and hereafter include in them high-school pupils as well? Shall we have State free health services for children and adults who are unable to pay, or national health insurance? Shall we set up procurement agencies to assign dental service to work on school children if such service can be obtained in no other way? And shall such agencies also undertake to supply dentists in areas where the need for them is now maximum and the inducement minimum, by adding to this inducement from local, State, or Federal resources?

What about working out ways to make greater use of subprofessional personnel? What about the so-called belt-line plan, which I have been accused of flirting with, marrying, and all but fathering and mothering, though I have never given my approval or disapproval, either orally or in writing?

What about group practice and the pooling of highly refined mechanical appliances which cannot be replaced while the war lasts and only at large expense in time of peace? What about looking into the question whether monopolistic or collusive trade practices have existed in the manufacture and sale of dental equipment, to see whether there is any effect of needlessly raising the cost to the public of dental care? What about the cost to the student of dentistry of such equipment as he must have while in school? And what about social security for dentists and better compensation and status for teachers of dentistry?

These and other questions of direct concern to the dental profession are—so long as the problem of under-serving exists—also of concern to the public and those who are entrusted with public leadership. The way to solve that problem of under-servicing must be pointed, and if the profession itself fails to do so, fails to do any more than state principles without subscribing to and insisting upon and initiating action, then from sources less qualified, that leadership, that initiative will have to come.

When the people of this Nation are in need, whether of goods or services, and when that need is essential to their strength and well-being, it becomes the responsibility of their elected representation in Government to see that such need is fulfilled. But it is also a responsibility of their Government to seek out the advice and the leadership of specialists best equipped, best qualified, to provide those goods or services.

In addressing this appeal for action to the dentists of America, I feel that I am fulfilling that part of my own responsibility. I feel that the job has been left to good hands.

What I have said about the Nation's need of dentistry would also, I think, apply in the main to the general problem of medical care. I recognize the fact that these two needs are closely related. In both cause and effect they frequently overlap.

Our doctors, too, were in for a shock when those figures on selective-service rejections came out. They learned that of the physical defects of all the hundreds of thousands of Army and Navy rejects, some 20 percent or more were remediable. Of those curables, around a fourth were victims of hernia alone—nearly twice as many men as were turned down for remediable defects of the mouth and teeth.

Our doctors know, too, that more than 40,000 of their number are now in the armed forces, that between six and seven thousand are still wanted, and that death and retirement take 11,400 physicians each year. They know that there will be only 3,700 graduates of medical schools in the next 3 years to replace the 34,000 whom we will have lost from the civilian population in the same period.

So you see, there are broad parallels. Unless something is done to make the most of our available sources of dental and medical care, these trends will confront our people and our Nation with danger over the years ahead. Even a hungry people, as we have seen in this world welter of blood and tears, can fight for their freedom. A sick people, a disabled people, would be left without fight, without hope.

But here again, in the matter of devising a plan, I am anxious to advertise my own disqualification—namely, the fact that I am not a doctor, that I believe it is up to the doctors themselves to take the lead in forming ways and means to bring greater well-being to our people. I have told my friends in the medical profession that there is no "Pepper plan" for socialized, organized, synthesized, or ostracized medicine, and that I am waiting to give my approval and support to such improvements as the great majority of doctors in this country themselves approve and advance.

I take this stand in the confidence that our medical profession, like you dentists, have the good of the people at heart and recognize that good as one of the essentials of their own self-interest. With that confidence, I do not believe the doctors are going to sit back and do nothing.

Our Nation, determined at all costs to keep its health in war and in peace, now turns to the responsible profession and says: "Physician, heal thyself."

Veterans' Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, conditions on the home front for veterans who are suffering in health through disease or wounds are not satisfactory in the United States. The failure of the Veterans' Administration to attend properly and promptly to the needs of these veterans of the present war, outside of the relatively few cities in which there are district offices of the Veterans' Administration or Veterans' facilities, is causing grave concern to the families and friends of thousands of veterans. There is no sufficient reason apparent for the delay in establishing a large number of subdistrict offices throughout the country as was done following the First World War. The office space, the physicians, and the various personnel are available at Springfield, Mass., and undoubtedly are available in countless other centers of population in the various States. I believe that the committee of Congress having to do with such matters should immediately investigate the failure of the Veterans' Administration to handle this problem in an efficient manner. Their failure is causing needless expense and suffering to thousands of veterans.

I believe the situation is set forth fairly in the following newspaper article from the Springfield Union of February 5, 1944:

TWO HUNDRED WAR VETS NEED MEDICAL AID, IS CLAIM—OPENING OF BUREAU OFFICE IN CITY NEEDED, SECRETARY OF LEGION SAYS

Two hundred discharged servicemen, some of them sent home from far-flung battlefields, are walking the streets of Springfield, critically in need of medical attention, while official red tape in Washington prevents the establishment of a Veterans' Administration office in Springfield, where the men could receive quick attention, Earle H. Bliss, executive secretary of the Springfield post, American Legion, revealed today. The post met last night and the subject was discussed at length.

NEAREST OFFICE BOSTON

The Legion does not place the responsibility for the delay in reopening an office which had existed in Springfield until 1933, and for which there is already plenty of need, with the certainty that at the close of the war many thousands of men and women now serving in all parts of the world will rely on for physical advice and assistance, as well as held on insurance problems and the securing of vocational training. A rating board should hold meetings in Springfield once a month in the opinion of Legionnaires.

"It's far more important to provide physical care for the disabled in this war than it is to vote," in the opinion of Mr. Bliss, who points out that many of the 200 now in the area because of physical discharges have to go out and secure and pay out of their own pockets for physical care and medicines. If there was a Springfield office of the Administration these veterans could go there and they would be sent to a physician who would

be paid for by Federal funds. The nearest office is now in Boston, and long delays in adjudicating claims or giving the care needed immediately is likely to be encountered.

From 1917 to 1933 the Veterans' Administration Office was open in Springfield, which served the entire area, and most of the doctors who gave assistance to men referred by the medical officer are still in the city and the system could be put into operation within a few hours if someone in Washington would give the word.

Representative CHARLES R. CLASON has been working to have the office reestablished, and Coleman C. Curran, department adjutant for the District of Massachusetts, American Legion, has been to conference in Washington, trying to get some immediate relief for veterans who have to rely on the family physician for help until such time as the Administration can establish an office here or clear the cases through Boston.

NEED SIX OFFICES

All that is needed for an office in Springfield is a suite of about six offices, where a director, a vocational training officer, a medical staff officer, and two or three clerks could serve the returning servicemen. A few desks, chairs, typewriters, and filing cabinets are all the equipment necessary at the start. One of the rooms would have to be set aside for a physical examination room for men and another for women in the service. There are several Federal agencies in Springfield which have equipment which could be released to the Veterans' Administration.

In the meantime the men can continue to pay for their medical advice and medicines, and until such an office is established they will have to rely on the American Legion, American Red Cross, Soldiers' Relief, and the Army and Navy emergency relief agencies for assistance that will all be available at one headquarters when and if an office is opened in Springfield.

The Springfield office could serve the entire western Massachusetts area as it did after the First World War in the opinion of Legionnaires.

"Dr. New Deal" and "Dr. My Deal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a recent editorial from the Port Jervis Union-Gazette, Port Jervis, N. Y., one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my district. The owner and editor, Mr. Fred D. Salmon, is a leading citizen of Orange County, and his editorial policy reflects the sentiment of the people of that section of the State.

This editorial is well worth reading, as it contains political observations that should be seriously considered by the American people as we approach the Presidential primaries.

The editorial follows:

"DR. NEW DEAL" AND "DR. MY DEAL"

There doesn't seem to be much left for the American citizen to do about primary and election this year—or anytime, maybe. With "Dr. New Deal" (would-be "Dr. Win-the-War") already boomed and boosted and demanding a fourth term, and the one-man party of "Dr. My Deal" Willkie carpetbagging the country for votes for the nomination of what was the Republican Party, we fail to see any reason for anyone really going to the primary this year.

If Willkie has his way he will again get the nomination for "Dr. New Deal—Win-the-War's" office, and Willkie seems determined to win or ruin everything for the others. Willkie's only claim over "Dr. New Deal—Win-the-War" so far is that he has no wife to gallivant around the country boosting or hindering her husband's work. That ought to amount to something now. That is about the only thing that is different between the two candidates.

So with "Dr. N. D." determined to head his ticket, and W. W. determined to head his ticket, there goes the Democratic and Republican contest and 50,000,000 voters have no need to go to any polls.

As to the two candidates—what is the difference between them, if any? Willkie was Roosevelt's stooge last election. Now it is the same, or letting the stooge take over. A fine pass we have to consider, for a free country.

All we need is another freedom added to the four—freedom from Roosevelt and Willkie.

Treatment of Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication received from James DeArmond Golliday Post, No. 6, the American Legion, Kokomo, Ind., of which post I have the honor to be a member; also a clipping transmitted with the letter relating to the Army's menu for Japanese prisoners held in camps in the United States.

I can readily understand why patriotic, red-blooded American citizens seethe in anger at recent disclosures of the atrocities of the Japanese in starving, brutally beating, and killing our sons and brothers in Japanese prison camps when they read of the treatment civilized America accords Japanese prisoners. Of course, we shall never be guilty of the crimes of these barbarous people, and it will not help our men to retaliate against Japanese prisoners. We feel honor bound to comply with the Geneva Conference, and, I apprehend, will continue to treat the Japanese prisoners in accordance with international law. However, I sincerely hope the time is near at hand when we can mete out adequate and just punishment to the officials of Japan who are responsible for these inhuman acts. While the American people are rationed and in many instances deprived of the normal or customary menu in American homes, we naturally resent the sumptuous menus placed before these traitorous barbarians. The answer to the Japs is not by way of retaliation against prisoners of war but by pursuing relentlessly these despicable enemies until they are completely subjected and adequately punished for their crimes.

KOKOMO, IND., *February 4, 1944.*

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMRADE: Attached to this letter you will find a clipping of a United Press news dispatch of January 28. This news report was released the day after the horrible revelation of the treatment accorded war prisoners by the Japanese Government.

Under the circumstances we hold that the treatment of Japanese, held prisoner by our Army, as outlined in the news story, is beyond all reason, far beyond the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and certainly can serve no military purpose. We do not advocate brutality in the treatment of prisoners, but now that we know what has happened to the heroes of Bataan, we shudder to read the menu our Army sets before our enemies. It is apparent that during the year that the news was withheld from us many of our defenders died of brutality and starvation, while are enemies grew fat on sumptuous viands furnished them by the comrades of the men who died.

We wish further to call your attention to the fact that in the attached menu there are such items as bacon, butter, sirup, coffee, beef, and canned tomatoes—all of which are rationed. In other words, American citizens are being asked for these food items from their own tables in order to feed enemy Japs. These same Americans are also buying War bonds, and have a horrible fear that some of this money is being spent on fresh grapefruit, fresh milk, apple pie, oysters, jelly roll, and the like, while our Americans (14 from Kokomo) are starving in Jap hands.

Recently, right here in this district, we are reliably informed that some German prisoners worked in a canning factory. The officials in charge tried to hire a bus to transport these prisoners a distance of 1 mile.

As an American citizen we feel sure that you will resent these things. As a fellow member of this American Legion post we feel that you will understand our feelings in the matter; and as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the national House of Representatives, we feel certain you will do something about it.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES DEARMOND GOLLIDAY POST, No. 6,
THE AMERICAN LEGION.

UNITED STATES PRISON CAMPS GIVE JAPS CHOICE FROM THIS MENU

WASHINGTON, January 28.—The Army's master menu for today, typical of the quantity of food available to Japanese prisoners in United States camps, follows:

Breakfast: Fresh grapefruit, whole wheat cereal, fresh milk, hot cakes, bacon, toast, butter, sirup, coffee.

Dinner: Beef stew, leafy greens, carrot-raisin salad, biscuits, butter, apple pie, coffee.

Supper: Corn chowder, scalloped oysters or fried fish, oven-brown potatoes, tomatoes, bread, butter, jelly roll, coffee.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]:

Since I am going to talk about food subsidies and their use in keeping down the high cost of living, perhaps I had better explain just what subsidies are.

Due to the war, farmers have been burdened with increasing costs and hardships in producing foods. There has been a shortage of farm machinery. Farm labor has been drawn to the war plants in the nearby cities and what has remained on the farm commands higher wages. At the same time it has been necessary, in spite of these adverse conditions, to produce more food than ever before—to take care of our armed forces who consume more than civilians, for lend-lease to our allies and for our own civilian consumption. The farmers of the country have met this challenge—in 1943 our farm production was 7 percent greater than ever before in our history and 21 percent higher than at the start of the war. It was the Government's policy to stimulate this production by financial incentive to the farmer.

In order to achieve this result, the Government has guaranteed the farmer an adequate price for his crops. This is called a support price. At the same time, by means of the Price Control Act, Congress directed the President to stabilize prices and wages. If the unusually high costs of producing foods were passed on to the consumer, at a time of scarcity of food for civilian consumption, prices could not be held down. They would rise constantly as indeed they did in the last war. The cost of living would steadily increase. At this point, in order to control prices, the Government again stepped in and in certain necessary commodities paid to the farmers a portion of this increased cost of food production. These payments, commonly called subsidies, are paid at the source. They are paid to the farmer in most cases. Consequently, by the time the product reaches the table of the consumer after having passed through the hands of various distributors and middlemen who have added their mark-up, much more money is actually saved than the amount of subsidy which is paid. This program has been in effect for some time. Its enemies now wish to discontinue it.

Let us see what would happen if the use of subsidies were forbidden by Congress. If prices increase, demands for increased wages will follow immediately. Wages are tied to prices—one cannot rise without the other. If food prices increase and an increase in wages be refused, production of essential war equipment will be impaired. An increase in wages will in turn cause a further increase in prices and the dizzy spiral of inflation begins. Obviously we cannot discontinue support prices to the farmer and still produce the food we need. But unless subsidies are used the consumer must pay the bill.

If prices and wages increase the value of the dollar shrinks. The War bonds in the hands of the public will be paid off in depreciated dollars The cost of the war, and remember the Government is the biggest customer today, will increase by billions of dollars. The allotments to soldiers' dependents, the value of insurance policies and annuities will steadily depreciate in purchasing power.

It is well to remember that the war prosperity felt by many people is not equally spread throughout our entire population. Approximately 25,000,000 workers have less purchasing power, less real wages, than they had 4 years ago. These include those known as white-collar workers and among others certain service, Government, and public utility employees. In addition to this is that group of people of fixed income numbering over 8,000,000 and including those receiving public assistance allotments, railroad retirement, veterans' and civil-service pensions. There are in all, then, 33,000,000 people who are less able to meet living expenses than in August 1939. An increase in the living costs of this group would be unfair and, in many cases, unbearable.

This problem should not be treated by the public as a political issue. The recent division in the House of Representatives approximately along party lines when the program was last voted upon has, I believe, given the public a misleading impression. Noted columnists, including such students as Walter Lippmann and Raymond Clapper, whose tragic death so recently shocked us, and who are in no sense politicians, have endorsed the use of subsidies. Neither is the subsidy program for the exclusive benefit of members of the labor unions as has been charged. The prevention of inflation is the job of unorganized workers as well, of businessmen, of farmers, of all Americans. Several of the farm groups have been short-sighted in their opposition. I would like to remind them that in the deflation which followed the last war some farm prices dropped 80 percent and all farm prices seriously declined. The same thing will undoubtedly occur after this war if inflation is not checked.

What are the arguments against subsidies if their continuation appears to be so imperative? I believe that much of it can be ascribed to the hostility of certain groups to labor organizations. Organized labor has fought vigorously for subsidies and perhaps some people wish to spite them by resisting their demands, but these people are short-sighted, for in attempting to strike at labor they are hurting their own economic position. Again, some point to the greatly increased national income, stating that people are making sufficient money to pay their own food bill. I have pointed out that this increase in income, although great, is not evenly spread. Some people are now less able to pay their food bill. Also that inflation cannot be checked once it is permitted to occur. With plentiful dollars and scarce food one price increase will follow another. Some of the opposition to subsidies may be political. With no desire to criticize the motives of my colleagues, I recognize that it is the natural tendency of a minority political party to be suspicious of the motives and the programs of the majority. This tendency is responsible for the partisanship shown, not only in the present Congress but commonly throughout our national history.

Then, also, I am afraid there are some people in the country who would not mind seeing a little inflation because they feel that they would gain an immediate profit. I remind these people that the price of this immediate profit may well be the wrecking of our economy and their own future hardship, together with that of all the rest of us.

It is charged that subsidies are un-American—that they are a step in a growing tendency toward state socialism and government participation in business. We are too prone to condemn as un-American anything which for one reason or another we happen to dislike. But this again is no new tendency. The followers of Jefferson and Hamilton had widely divergent ideas about what was American and un-American and expressed themselves with a forcefulness and even a rancor which would surprise many critics of our present political scene. But are food subsidies un-American and contrary to our tradition? Subsidies have been employed for various purposes ever since our Government existed. One of the first measures passed by the First Congress under the Constitution was a bill to protect infant manufactures. When the railroads were being projected across our wide plains and the West was being built up, the Government as well as the States subsidized them extravagantly. We are paying subsidies for petroleum for the people of New England due to the destruction of our coastwise trade by submarines. We are paying subsidies for the production of copper. Our war plants, constructed with Government money which will certainly be written off in part, amount to subsidies. No one objects to these, they are necessary for the winning of the war. But, the critics continue, these last are producer subsidies. We do not oppose producer subsidies, which increase production but we object to subsidizing the consumer. Let us examine this argument. To the extent that the Government pays a portion of the abnormal costs of agriculture which result from the war, to the extent that it asks the farmer to plant soybeans and peanuts where formerly he had planted cotton or tobacco, to the extent that it asks him to utilize his marginal land which is more expensive to farm, to this extent certainly subsidies of which we speak are producer's subsidies—they aid in production, and there is no more reason why the consumer should be asked to pay these unusually expensive food prices than there is why the home owner of New England should be asked to pay the high cost of fuel-oil transportation across the continent. But there is another argument which I believe is even more cogent. Is it not a worthy objective to maintain price ceilings in order that the Government can avoid the payment of higher wages which go into the ultimate cost of the war material produced in industrial plants? Is it not a valid objective to maintain the value in purchasing power of the American dollar? If subsidies can be used to protect manufacturers, to encourage the construction of railways and for other completely worthy objectives, why is it so immoral to employ them as a weapon against inflation?

Now for the bogeyman of state socialism which is so often brought up to terrify us. I personally do not believe in Government participation in business to any greater extent than is necessary to accomplish a result which could not be accomplished otherwise, and a result which is of prime importance to the health of our economy. Public works, if necessary to relieve widespread distress, Government direction of industry if necessary in total war, yes; but private initiative should be the rule and control the exception particularly in normal times. Our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, said the other day that we should not talk so much about state socialism. He said we can never have state socialism in this country unless the voters so decide at the polls, and I for one do not know many Americans who want any part of state socialism.

Just a few figures before I close. Steel prices rose in the last war 695 percent; in this war not one dollar. Pig iron 304 percent—only 14 percent in this war; coal 695 percent—21.5 percent in this war. And to the housewives living costs, the price of your food, shelter, and clothing rose 59.7 percent in 51 months of the last war where in this war, after a like period, they have risen only 25.5 percent. In the last war we had no price control, and we cannot have price control without food subsidies unless the difference is taken away from the farmer.

This is a matter of great national importance to the farmers, workers, employers, consumers, to Democrats and Republicans alike. I hope that we are not so foolhardy as to tear down the only dike that holds back the flood of inflation.

Colored Troops in Combat Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include herewith a letter, dated February 1, 1944, to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in regard to the use of colored troops in combat units on the battlefields of Europe and of Asia, and an acknowledgment from John W. Martin, administrative assistant, to the effect that the Secretary of War has directed that a comprehensive report on this subject be made to him and that the information requested will be submitted to me at that time. In view of the fact that both these letters are self-explanatory, I am inserting them in the RECORD without further comment.

When I have all the data I will submit it to the Congress with my own comments and observations.

As one who served with colored combat troops in the last war, I am vitally interested in knowing the exact situation in regard to the use of colored soldiers in combat units. In the last war the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Colored Infantry, formerly the Fifteenth New York National Guard, in which I served as an officer, was on front-line combat duty within a year after war was declared.

I am also particularly interested to know whether my amendment to the Selective Service Act, providing that there should be no discrimination in the training of colored soldiers in all branches of the service, including Air, Tank, Cavalry, Infantry, Artillery, and all combat units, has been adhered to by the War Department.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am informed that several Negro tank destroyer units, which underwent training for several months at Camp Hood, Tex., have been broken up and the enlisted personnel transferred to quartermaster truck companies. May I be advised whether this information is correct?

If this were the first report of this kind which had come to my attention I would not burden you with this inquiry. But there have been others. I have also been informed that a large number of enlisted men, who were members of the Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery at Camp Forrest, Tenn., were transferred to quartermaster service organizations under orders dated August 26, 1943, and signed by the commanding general, Army Ground Forces. Originally this organization was the Eighth Illinois National Guard Regiment. It fought in France in World War No. 1 as the Three Hundred and Seventieth Infantry. After it was brought back into the Federal service it was redesignated the One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery and later reorganized as the Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery. More recently the Negro press carried an article sent from an advance Pacific base by Fletcher P. Martin, an accredited war correspondent for the Negro Publishers' Association, in which he stated as follows:

"The crack Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, fully equipped and prepared for any eventuality, is performing service duties at docks and supply dumps while awaiting possible assignment to combat. * * * Twenty-one months have passed since this outfit embarked from California for the south Pacific * * *."

To say the least, the training of Negro personnel as combat units for months and the breaking up of those units and the transferring of that personnel to service units is demoralizing to Negro soldiers and to Negro people generally and a waste of taxpayers' money.

I am aware of the fact that military necessity must control the assignment of personnel in the Army, but if the planning of the General Staff were adequate such actions would not be necessary. In the circumstances, however, I am still wondering whether there is not a deliberate plan to keep Negro soldiers out of actual combat. As far as I am informed, the only Negro units which have actually engaged in combat in this war are the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and a few antiaircraft units. The record of Negro troops in all of the wars in which this country has engaged (and in which they have participated as fighting soldiers) does not justify their being relegated now to the ranks of labor battalions only.

Finally, may I invite your attention to the amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which I offered and which the Congress approved. That amendment provides:

"That in the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

That amendment contemplated that Negro inductees would receive the same training and perform the same services as all other inductees. If Negro soldiers are being trained as combat troops but denied service as such, such discrimination appears to be a violation of my amendment.

May I be fully advised of the facts respecting the breaking up of Negro combat organizations and the transfer of their personnel to service units?

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

FEBRUARY 5, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISH: As an acknowledgment of your letter of February 1 inquiring as to the Army's plan for the use of Negro troops, the Secretary of War has asked me to advise you that he has directed a careful study of the matter and has requested that a comprehensive report on the subject be made to him. At that time, Mr. Stimson plans to communicate with you further.

Your interest in the matter is appreciated, and I assure you that a further reply will be made at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Pipe Line in Mediterranean Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Ibn Saud Expected to O. K. Oil Line," dated Cairo, February 7, 1944, with reference to the pipe line in the Mediterranean area to which reference has been made in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IBN SAUD EXPECTED TO O. K. OIL LINE—OFFICIALS AT CAIRO BELIEVE RULER FAVORS DEAL WITH UNITED STATES

CAIRO, February 7.—Strong indications that Ibn Saud, ruler of Saudi Arabia, will approve the proposal to lay an oil pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the eastern Mediterranean, came from Saudi Arabian officials in Cairo today.

A member of that country's legation said the King had been aware of negotiations in the United States for several months, and probably would give his consent, provided suitable returns were made in the form of goods for development of the country.

1,250-MILE LINE PLANNED

A legation official said the deal, if consummated, would make Saudi Arabia one of the biggest oil-producing countries in the world.

(Secretary Ickes has announced that the Petroleum Reserves Corporation plans to build a 1,250-mile pipe line in Arabia under an agreement with the Arabian-American Oil Co. and the Gulf Exploration Co. to reach Arabian and Kuwait oil reserves. The cost is estimated at from $130,000,000 to $165,000,000. Senator MOORE (Republican, Oklahoma) declared Monday the construction plan was a treaty which needs approval of Congress.)

Both officials and oil men in the Middle East professed a lack of knowledge of details of the proposal, including size of the pipe line or location of its Mediterranean outlet, which presumably would be Alexandria.

SIX-MONTH JOB, VIEW

Expert opinion was expressed that the line could be completed in 6 months if it were the subject of an all-out effort. This would require a big quantity of special desert equipment as the line would cross an area seldom traversed by man. Most of the route is covered by soft, shifting sand, requiring special vehicles with huge soft tires.

Only one oil field now is working in eastern Arabia, but drilling has been done at another, and a third discovered. The three fields are hundreds of miles apart along the Persian Gulf.

Lack of transportation is the present difficulty, but a pipe line would place Saudi Arabian oil on an excellent competitive basis in post-war Europe.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting herewith a transcript of the remarks of Mr. Joe C. Jackson before the Bristow Round Table. Mr. Jackson is an outstanding citizen and a man of unusual ability, as his commentary on this subject reflects.

Mr. Speaker, the Bristow Round Table is a community club organized for the purpose of holding forum discussions on issues of current public importance. It is a splendid organization and is carrying on a program that any town in America would do well to adopt. The Bristow Round Table is a splendid thing. It is good for Bristow and its citizens, and it is an asset to the Nation.

The address follows:

Gentlemen, the question for discussion is: "Resolved, that the Government should subsidize the production of basic articles of food for the purpose of controlling prices."

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, there are one or two terms that we of the affirmative would like to define. By the term "subsidy," we mean a direct cash payment to the producers of food high enough to stimulate the production of food and at the same time enabling us to maintain ceiling prices, thus correcting a dangerous trend toward inflation and protecting millions of consumers who cannot afford to pay more for the food they consume.

By the term "price control," we simply mean to prevent the retail prices of food from increasing by means of adequate ceiling prices.

We are not debating this evening as to whether subsidies are good or bad in general or in theory. Just as a physician does not debate as to whether narcotics are good or bad in general or in theory. He merely decides as to whether to give narcotics to a particular patient, at a particular time, for a particular reason. And so it is relative to the discussion of subsidies this evening.

This is not a question of what we should have done 2 or 3 years ago. It's not a question of whether wage increases to labor were justified or not. It's not a question of whether subsidies are un-American or not. It's not a question of whether subsidies set a dangerous precedent or not. And it is not a question of whether price controls have been effective or not. Such arguments are immaterial, and, when used, serve only to becloud the main issue before us.

The question before us is simply this: What is the best program to meet the emergency as we face it now?

Speculation and debate as to the errors and mistakes that got us into this emergency may tend to keep us out of future predicaments, but such speculation and debate will not solve the problem we face now.

The situation is like a man in a rowboat, in a swift stream headed for a waterfall, when all he has to counter the drift are his oars. He cannot refuse to oar because he made a mistake in not bringing along an outboard motor. He cannot refuse to oar because it's against his principles to oar, or because it might set a dangerous precedent to oar. No; if he takes such attitudes, he is going over the waterfall.

Today, we are in a stream—a stream made swift by war. Our whole economic system is out of time. War has loosed the floodwaters upon us. The laws of supply and demand are out of balance. All we have to counter the drift—to balance the laws of supply and demand—are our oars, or subsidies. It behooves us to make the best possible use of them. Circumstances alter cases. The program of peace—or a program of following the laws of supply and demand—will not necessarily work during times of war. Sometimes it is necessary to use the only tools at hand, whether we like them or not.

For a few minutes, let us lay our prejudices aside. Let us forget whether grandfather was a Democrat or a Republican. Let us approach the problem with an open mind. Let us state the facts in the case. Let us substantiate the facts. And let us draw the best, most logical conclusions possible from them.

According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, America today faces a drastic food shortage in 21 basic articles of food. We are told that unless we increase the supply of these foods immediately, or in the near future, we are not going to have enough for our civilian population and our armed forces, much less for our allies whom we are supplying through lend-lease. This contention is substantiated by the National Farmers Union, the National Consumers' League, and various other sources of facts.

According to certain dairy publications, dairy herds are being slaughtered. Hundreds of dairymen are going out of business. The same thing can be said of ranches, poultrymen, and other such producers.

Yes; we face a threatened food shortage, occasioned largely by the fact that thousands of farmers have left the farm and have gone into defense industries. This is a fact. It is not a scare argument. As a fact, the only thing debatable about it are the conclusions we might draw from it.

Along with the problem of increasing the supply of food, there is the attendant problem of preventing retail prices of food from increasing. This problem is posed because there are millions of consumers who cannot afford to pay more for the food they consume.

According to the United States Chamber of Commerce, general living costs have increased during the past 3 or 4 years more than 23 percent. This contention is substantiated by the National Consumers' League and the National Farmers' Union. It is also substantiated by common knowledge. These same sources tell us that the prices of many foods during this same period have increased more than 50 percent.

According to reliable sources, there are between 11,000,000 and 15,000,000 heads of families in America, with more than 23,000,000 dependents, whose money income has increased little since 1939; 85 percent of the workers in America, after taxes are paid, receive far less than this. Only 18,500,000 of our 44,000,000 or 45,000,000 workers are any better off today, financially, than they were in 1939. Four million of our 14,000,000 or 13,000,000 industrial workers receive a weekly wage of $30 or less. For proof of this, consult any book of facts such as the Statistical Abstract or the World Almanac.

Thus, the conclusion is clear. Living costs have increased drastically. The money income of millions of consumers has increased little since 1939.

Therefore, the real income of millions of consumers is far less than it was in 1939. These people cannot afford to pay more for the food they consume. A general increase in prices, to them, would be disastrous.

In this group we have our nondefense workers, our retail clerks, our school teachers, civil-service workers, college professors, old-age pensioners, people living off savings accounts, dependents of service men and women, and so on. These people are tied down. They do not rise and fall with the economy.

There are only two ways to increase the supply of food. We can say to the farmer that we are removing ceiling prices. We can direct him to go to the market and get his increase there. We can direct the dairy farmer to charge a higher price for milk, butter, and other dairy products. In a short while, we will have an ample supply of dairy products. The same conclusions can be reached relative to the other foods where there is a shortage. But such a program will drastically increase the retail price to the consumer.

According to Time magazine, the production price of food, the price the farmer gets, represents only 7 percent of the retail price. Thus, if we give the farmer an increase on the market high enough to stimulate production, think of what will happen to the retail price by the time that increase is pyramided all the way through the price structure. According to reliable sources, if you give the farmer $1 on the market, it will represent an increase of more than $5 in the over-all cost of living.

The facts before us clearly show, clearly indicate, that the consumer cannot afford to pay more for the food he consumes.

However, for sake of argument, let us assume he could afford to pay more. For sake of argument, let us suppose the consumer does have more money today than he has ever had before.

It would still be undesirable to increase the cost of food because such would lead to a dangerous inflation of the economy. An increase to the farmer high enough to stimulate added production will ultimately increase living costs by more than $15,000,000. An increase of 7 percent to the farmer now will jump living costs almost immediately by $5,500,000,000.

These figures are from the O. P. A. but they are also substantiated by other reliable sources.

If living costs go up, labor will demand wage increases. If labor demands and receives wage increases, such will necessitate further increases in price, which mean further increases in the cost of living, and so on around the vicious cycle of inflation. It would not be long until the whole country would be flooded with baloney dollars, and you know that as well as I do.

What would inflation mean? It would mean that the War bonds we have purchased would be worthless. It would mean insurance policies would be ruined. It would mean millions of consumers on stable incomes would be wiped out. And it would mean that those who might benefit from it temporarily would be destroyed by the deflation that always follows. No right-thinking man can uphold inflation. To speak of controlling it is wishful thinking, for it's just like an avalanche. Once it is loosed, there is no stopping it.

Price increases would not only be disastrous to the general consumer but they would also be disastrous to the American farmer, whom such increases are designed to aid, because he is also a consumer. The American farmer purchases annually more than $2,500,000,000 worth of processed foods. Since the production price represents only 7 percent of the retail price, any increase the farmer might get on the market would be more than counterbalanced by an increase in the retail price of foods and other things he must purchase, thus necessitating higher and higher prices and adding to the inflation spiral. James G. Pattin, president of the National Farmers' Union, says that 2,000,000 small-farm operators will be wiped out if inflation comes by the deflation that always follows.

Then, how are we to increase the supply of food? The only answer is by a judicious use of subsidies. Let us say to the American farmer that we are retaining ceiling prices but we are paying him a cash subsidy to support prices high enough to stimulate the production of food. In this manner we can increase the supply of food. We can prevent the retail prices of food from increasing.

In no other way can the problem be met. We challenge our friends of the negative to show us any other program that will meet the need—any other program that will enable us to stimulate production and maintain retail ceiling prices.

But, you say, what will this program cost and who pays for it? According to the O. P. A., it can be done for $800,000,000. Other sources say it will cost $1,500,000,000. By taking this sum and giving it directly to the producers of food, we can stimulate production and maintain ceiling prices.

Of course, this sum will have to be paid out of tax funds. But compare $1,500,000,000, plus stability of prices, plus inflation checked, with a $15,000,000,000 increase in the cost of living, plus unstable prices, plus an ever increasing avalanche of inflation.

Isn't it better to increase taxes or go in debt $1 by way of subsidies than to increase general living costs more than $10 by way of increased prices and then have to go in debt or increase taxes one or two dollars anyway in order to meet the increased national expenditures occasioned by the rise in prices?

Isn't it better to put the grease on the axle than it is to pour it all over the vehicle? Isn't it better, by a judicious use of subsidies, to stimulate the production of certain articles of food than it is to increase all prices just to stimulate the production of those same articles of food? Do we have to loose the floodgates just to get a few buckets of water?

We must increase production. We must prevent retail prices from increasing. The only way to meet the problem is by a program of subsidies. We cannot depend on the laws of supply and demand. We cannot trust to the drift of the current in a flooded stream.

Looking Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me which appeared in American Highways for January 1944:

LOOKING FORWARD

(By Hon. J. W. ROBINSON, Utah, chairman, House Committee on Roads, U. S. Congress)

For the past 2 years, the world has been in a life-and-death struggle that will determine what nations and what ideologies shall survive. All industries as well as all human relationships have suffered a severe shock. Many industries have been completely destroyed, and most of those which were not have been forced to undergo drastic and severe changes.

Our highway system, fortunately, has not been completely put out of commission, because by its very nature it could not be. But it has been forced to withstand a severe shock. Largely due, however, to the hard work, courage, foresight, determination, and cooperation of the highway officials, our American highway system has withstood the war shock.

After 2 years of war, you as highway planners and builders are completing your plans to attack with determination the highway problems of tomorrow, and to do even bigger and better things in the development of the highways of the future than has been done for the highways of the past.

As chairman of the Public Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, I wish to compliment this organization on the results that it has achieved during the trying days since Japan's dastardly attack on us at Pearl Harbor.

Although ordinary construction and maintenance work on public roads has been suspended during the war, the strategic war roads have not been neglected. More than 7,000 miles of access roads and other wartime highways have been completed at a total cost of $270,000,000, including $190,000,000 of Federal funds. Another 6,000 miles have been improved and a considerable mileage now is under construction at an estimated total cost of $317,000,000, of which $265,000,000 are Federal funds. This emergency construction covers a number of special projects outside of the United States, such as the Alaskan Highway.

I think all Members of Congress fully appreciate the tremendous handicaps that you have been under in carrying out your war construction program—handicaps made heavier by the interference of bureaus. And I know you all feel, as I do, that a great deal of the interference and red tape by the Federal Government was wholly unnecessary; and that it did a great deal to impede the progress of your road program. But I want to particularly compliment the officials of the Public Roads Administration, for their untiring efforts and cooperation in seeking to overcome these difficulties and to relieve the bottlenecks which were created by these bureaus. However, you have not been discouraged. You, like the rest of us, fully appreciate the fact that we are in a desperate war and that everything must yield to the pressure of the war effort. You know, as I know, that the problem before you, as well as the rest of the American people, is the winning of the war, and this must be done at all costs and with all speed. Therefore, where the road program has not contributed directly to this end, it should be, as it has been, delayed until after the termination of the conflict.

Besides the construction work that you have carried on, it has been your responsibility to look into the future and to visualize accurately conditions as they actually exist when the war is won and this country is at peace.

If you look carefully at that picture, you will conclude that your part in the post-war program is possibly the most important part that is to be played in the great drama of reconstruction after the war. If you men see the picture as I see it, you will appreciate fully that the responsibility of putting 1,000,000 men to work, immediately at the close of this war, is on your shoulders. There is no other organization that I know of that can do this job in the public works field. This responsibility is yours, and by saying "immediately after war," I want that term "immediately" technically and legally interpreted by you. No group of highway officials in the history of this Nation has ever had such an outstanding opportunity to perform a service to humanity as you men will have at the termination of this war; and no group of highway officials since the beginning of this Nation has had so great a responsibility as you now have.

The problem of having 1,000,000 men put to work on our highway system, to help provide useful employment for soldiers who will be released immediately after the war, and to lessen the shock that our industrial economy will suffer at that time—that problem is your problem.

But when you do this, you have not then rendered to your State and your country the complete service that is demanded of you in your official capacity as highway builders. It is your duty and your responsibility to see to it that all the highways that you construct are properly located. It is also your duty to see to it that every highway that is built by you is constructed according to the most modern and up-to-date plan of highway construction. And your State and your National Government, future demands, and it is your duty and your responsibility to see to it that not one dollar of this money is wasted; that the taxpayer receives 100 cents worth of value out of every dollar which you spend.

You men are now charged with great and grave war responsibilities, but the future demands even greater service. With that demand will come to you the satisfaction that in this war effort and in the peace to come, you will have done a job that is just as important, just as necessary, as the work of our soldiers in the first line of defense.

At the present time it is estimated that we are expending $100,000,000 annually on highway construction. In prewar years, our highest annual expenditure was approximately $670,000,000 for the maintenance of both roads and city streets. Legislation before Congress now contemplates the expenditure by the Federal Government alone of a billion dollars a year for construction in each of the 3 years beginning immediately after the war. If the required maintenance and the contributions called for by the States is added to this figure, we have a minimum of $2,000,000,000 to be expended annually, of which one and a third billion is for construction, and the rest for maintenance. Bear in mind that during the first year after the war, it will be necessary, if plans outlined by Congress are carried out, for you men in this great organization here today to plan and actually carry out for 3 years after the immediate termination of this war, four times as much highway construction each year as has ever been accomplished in any one year in our history. This is a tremendous problem, but I am confident it will be attacked in the same spirit, with the same determination, with the same cooperation, as this organization has faced other problems, and that the same fine job will be done.

With your aid and your recommendation, Congress provided $10,000,000 in the Defense Highway Act of 1941 for advance engineering for plans and surveys for the development of the strategic military highway network and for by-passes and extensions in municipal areas; and also, at your suggestion and with your help, Congress made available $50,000,000 for unobligated balances from previous appropriations for Federal highways. This $50,000,000 was set aside last July and was to be used for planning of general highway projects. It was my understanding and the understanding of Congress that those appropriations, plus the money which was to be paid by the States to this special fund, would be adequate to provide complete construction plans, to write specifications, and to prepare cost estimates, on construction contracts totaling at least $2,500,000,000.

You men who have the responsibility for expending this vast sum of money, and who have the responsibility for putting 1,000,000 men to work immediately after this war; and who have the responsibility for helping the Nation meet the first shock effect that the end of the war will cause our economic system to suffer—you men know that in order to accomplish this result, you must have prepared detailed plans and specifications for highway construction in your various States that can be used the day the armistice is declared. And you also know that the maximum amount of these construction contracts that should be ready to be let immediately should be in the aggregate approximately $2,500,000,000.

Have you these plans, specifications, and construction contracts ready?

According to the September 30 tabulations of the Public Roads Administration, only slightly over half of the 1941 planning appropriation has reached a programming stage, and hardly more than a third of it has been allotted to definite projects. How far these projects have progressed in field surveys, construction drawings and the other necessary preliminaries to completion, is now being checked. But my guess is that if the war were to end before the next construction season, hardly a third of the construction potential would be in shape to begin.

I earnestly hope this pessimistic view is incorrect. But every available bit of evidence, based on Public Roads Administration studies and tabulations of progress from other sources, indicates that planning and blueprints under the 1941 program is moving very slowly. And completed programs are what will count when the war ends.

Under the July authorization of $50,000,000—an act, mind you, which makes no restrictions on type of Federal-aid projects eligible under it—only 16 States have even received approval for planning as of October 30, and only $7,700,000 in Federal funds had been obligated.

Thus, for the two Congressional programs, only something less than $700,000,000 in proj-

ects have been approved for planning, or hardly more than a quarter of the potential total possible under the 1941 and 1943 authorization by Congress.

These figures were so discouraging that I asked the Public Roads Administration to try to estimate for me, from its field reports, what the over-all picture is at the moment on progress of all types of State highway planning, including non-Federal-aid projects.

Their report shows that about $100,000,000 in projects have been postponed by the war, and are ready for actual construction the moment war restrictions end. And the Public Roads Administration estimate is that a total of another $400,000,000 in projects is ready for construction bids at this moment.

The Public Roads Administration also believes that if all goes well, this $500,000,000 combined total will rise to $800,000,000 by next spring—assuming that the State highway department can find engineers and field survey parties to overcome the present planning personnel shortage.

Gentlemen, a half-billion-dollar construction program ready at this moment is dangerously low. An $800,000,000 program ready next spring is not enough. Each of you knows as much as I do about how soon this war will end, or how soon we may see the defeat of Germany alone, with the resultant possibility that partial conversion to peace may be desirable in this country.

While I have no intention of hinting that such conditions may come about soon—because I have no basis for such a hint—common sense tells us that we should endeavor to be ready in case the war should suddenly end, or Germany should suddenly collapse, within the next 60 days. Such development, you know as well as I, is not outside the realm of possibility, even though it may not now seem probable.

When the day comes for this Nation to begin canceling some or all of its war contracts, and for some or a large portion of the men in the armed forces to be released, we shall be face to face with an enormous unemployment problem.

Now, I am not an alarmist. Indeed, I firmly believe this Nation will enter a period of prosperity as soon as we have reconverted to peace. The war has created a vast pent-up buying power, a vast deferred demand for peacetime goods, and a vast technological and fabrication progress that will, if properly brought together, make the post-war era one that we will welcome for many reasons. And in no other field will the boom be felt so soon and to such an extent as in the field of highway transportation.

But we shall go through a period of adjustment, before this boom begins. New automobiles will be rolling out of the factories within 90 days after the war ends—but many other industries will not be so fortunate, and will require longer reconversion periods. The critical period will be the first post-war year, before private industry hits its stride and makes heavy demands on labor, equipment, and materials.

The hard fact is, gentlemen, that except in the highway field, there is no such thing in America today as a public-works program ready to go. And I regret to state my fear that the highway program is not as far advanced as it should be, in view of the special need for timing construction to start quickly after the war.

You well know that planning progress has been slow, except in a few States. That is one reason why you are urging immediate action by Congress on the pending legislation, so that you can plot your course with more assurance and greater speed.

I for one will do my utmost for early action on H. R. 2426. We in the Roads Committee know and sympathize with the acute wartime personnel problem that many States are suffering. We know that at least in one State, women are being used for field survey parties, and in the drafting rooms. We know of at least one other State where highway engineering work is being farmed out to private firms on a large scale.

We earnestly hope that such measures will become more common, if that is the only way to overcome personnel shortage. Post-war projects must be completed during the war, if work is to start immediately after the war. How to do it is a tough problem in many States, but we are depending on you to find a way. The slow engineering progress now in evidence is a critical matter.

Certainly there is ample and useful needed highway work available for planning—so much, indeed, that the post-war problem becomes one of selecting only a small portion of the total needs, on a basis of giving priority to the most urgent.

On our main highways, the war is building up the greatest backlog of construction and maintenance work in history. This association itself lists construction needs at over $7,000,000,000 on main highways alone. On these main roads, the job will be to make up lost time.

But we also have something else to do. We must overcome comparative neglect of the two ends of our highway system—the city end and the secondary roads that directly serve farms, mines, timberlands, and other natural resources.

The pending bill in Congress attempts, on your recommendation, to cope with these two needs. The problems vary among the States, of course—a fact which the pending bill seeks to recognize.

We have 2,960,000 miles of rural roads. In recent years a 10-percent Federal-aid secondary system has been established. Under provisions of H. R. 2426, the permissible Federal-aid secondary mileage can be doubled, making it a 20-percent system. The pending bill would authorize about $300,000,000 a year in Federal aid for secondary roads—the largest local road program in history.

Adding this 20-percent secondary system to the 12-percent primary system, we find 32 percent of all rural roads would be covered by the proposed State-Federal program, or a total of nearly a million miles of rural roads. Because of the sheer mileage involved, this rural program probably will continue to receive the larger share of total highway expenditures for many years to come.

All this leads to the question of how to pay for these roads. As we all know, the main source of highway revenue is the highway user himself, who according to authoritative Federal surveys, has more than paid for his proper share of the costs of highways in years past, in the form of gasoline and license fees, and other excise taxes, local, State, and national.

From this we come to the clear conclusion, backed by exhaustive data from our own highway planning surveys, that it is the heavy-traffic routes which alone show a net tax-revenue profit. It is the heavy-traffic routes which make it possible to build the other needed roads that carry lesser traffic.

In one major particular, therefore, the post-war planning program should mark a definite change in American highway progress. From your own monumental highway planning surveys of recent years, you have shown the Nation that highway needs are changing somewhat, from those of providing all-weather communicating lines to those of providing transportation lines capable of handling large volume of traffic safely and efficiently.

The change is in itself a tribute to the job you have done in the earlier stages of highway development. The American highway transportation system is maturing, is firmly established, and well patronized.

But the change also clearly indicates that the road-building policies which were practical in earlier years are not always practical engineering methods today. The "stage construction" program is more and more reaching a point where future attention must be concentrated heavily on design and location of roads more nearly representing ultimate standards of highway utility.

To put aside some of the routine that has been well learned, and to give increasing attention to transpotration problems as they lead into the heart of our cities—those are not easy things to do. And while there remains ample unfinished business in our routine fields, we naturally dislike to trod the troublesome and uncharted paths that lead into the new fields.

Perhaps that is partly the reason why only a third of the 1941 planning fund has been allotted to definite projects. It is, however, very refreshing to note that well over 1,000 miles of limited-access highways have been programmed by the States under this 1941 act. Unquestionably, momentum will pick up in this field of ultimate design, and especially the urban phase, in the coming months.

I think you will agree with me that transcontinental traffic in the sense of vehicles starting from one ocean and going to the other or even starting from Canada and going to Mexico is negligible; that most of our traffic is shuttle service for 100 or 200 miles in and around the cities scattered throughout the country; that for practical purposes the end of pavement has been reversed in the past 20 years. At the close of the last war, the pavement usually ended with the city limits, whereas, at the present time incoming traffic meets inadequate facilities at the city limits. The pace for traffic movements in most cities is now intolerably slow. These bottlenecks must be broken in the post-war period.

In the urban highway picture, ripples are now appearing on municipal waters that have long been undisturbed. Some have become sizeable little waves, with State highway departments showing a refreshing attitude of cooperation.

I have a feeling that those waves will grow larger in the coming months, that whitecaps will appear in municipalities all over America. Many cities have had a breathing spell, during the war, from the chaos of decentralization and street and parking congestion that has come about since our highway transportation system grew into a giant. But now they are awakening to the urgency for planning for the day when automobiles again will increase in number. Municipal officials will come to you, asking your cooperation in their traffic problems.

I know you will do what must be done. You have lived and worked to serve highway transportation, and you will not change your habits now, no matter what the difficulties may be. You will go where traffic problems lead you, as you have for the last quarter of a century. To your past record of erecting the backbone of a highway system which now contains half of all the world's improved roads, you will add a new chapter of helping to unscramble the urban traffic congestion problem.

You will respect the city's rights to control its streets, just as the Public Roads Administration has respected the State's rights to designate the Federal-aid highway system. But, working hand-in-hand with the Public Roads Administration, you will, as the Public Roads Administration does on a national scale, exercise proper supervision over the local program, to preserve the integrated network of major traffic arteries when the new urban links are welded.

The urban job must be done. If you did not cooperate in the doing of it, our cities would find ways of by-passing you, and doing the job some other way. I firmly believe that would bring about grave problems, and that the emphasis on a nationally integrated highway system which you have struggled to maintain would be destroyed.

Before we had State highway departments, we had roads. But they were unrelated to each other, built to the weird ideas of miscellaneous local units of governments. They did not serve traffic, because traffic knows no State or city or county boundary, and must be able to roll on without interruption over political subdivision lines.

It was this need for crossing the boundaries of local political subdivisions with a State-wide road system which brought about the creation of State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration over a quarter of a century ago. Largely because you did your job well, the automobile has become an integral part of the average American's daily life.

But simply because it is now a part of our daily life, the automobile has become primarily a short-trip vehicle, and congestion has developed in areas of population concentration. The airplane tomorrow inevitably will emphasize and intensify the short-range character of highway travel, and post-war motor traffic will double in volume, according to every indication, within a decade after the war.

Only by solving the muddle of traffic congestion can you guarantee that the motorist, who pays in special taxes the cost of our highways, will continue to find our highways of increasing value and service to him.

I realize well the difficulties which you gentlemen share with us in the Congress, and also with the several agencies, municipal and county, within your States, in meeting this post-war challenge.

The job is complex and tough. Not only must we bring our secondary and primary road systems up to the standards required, but we must also manage somehow to eliminate the traffic bottlenecks blocking the Nation's highway circulatory system and strangling the life out of our cities.

Tough as this assignment is, the opportunity it gives all of us for public service is correspondingly larger. We have, as a foundation for our effort, the wealth of factual data which you men yourselves, in cooperation with the Public Roads Administration, have assembled through the highway planning surveys.

The job, then, as I see it, is to use these facts, and to apply intelligently and thoroughly in highway planning those techniques of modern engineering which have proved their effectiveness in solving congestion and accident problems. This means designing and building new facilities, or modernizing existing ones, to make them capable of carrying our motor transport efficiently and safely.

Large expenditures will, of course, be involved. Here again as public officials we face heavy responsibilities. These expenditures can be made investments that will return important dividends to the people of the country, by the reduction in losses through delay and accident, and by ending wasteful and uneconomic spending of funds for piecemeal improvements that fail to get results. Certainly we must see to it that funds are expended wisely, with utmost efficiency, and consonant with the need for prudence and economy which the future most certainly will bring with it.

The future of highway transportation will be secure under such methods of keeping pace with motoring needs. And now, of all times, is the time to strike a mighty blow at diversion of highway revenues to nonhighway purposes. General State taxes are bringing in surplus revenues, whereas the war has struck hard at highway revenue sources. It is pleasing to note that the battle against diversion has progressed well this year, and it is to be hoped that the fight will continue with increasing success in 1944.

I can assure you that you have sympathetic and loyal friends in the Congress of the United States, who look to you to help tremendously in restoring the Nation to a sound economic course after the painful days of war give way to a victorious and hard-won peace.

When the war is over, the time for post-war planning will be over, and the time for action will be upon us. The Congress can help you chart your course by making decisions quickly on the form the Federal-aid highway program will take, when it is resumed after this wartime interruption. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will be able to make those decisions quickly, and that they will be in general agreement with the progressive attitude of this Association.

But you, and you alone, can acquire the land, speed up the making of local and State fiscal agreements to supplement the Federal funds—and get the program completed on the largest scale in highway history.

Get those projects ready for construction bids; use every possible device to overcome the personnel shortage, and to overcome whatever other obstacles stand in your way. Work out joint arrangements with cities and counties to use their engineering staffs on projects of mutual concern. If you cannot get enough engineers for your own staff, farm some of the work out to private consultants. Call on the State and local engineering societies to help mobilize their members.

Completed projects, and road designs that approach ultimate standards—this is the stuff out of which post-war progress will be made.

We do not have them in sufficient volume yet, and the time left to prepare them may be shorter than we dare hope. The situation is serious. I am sure you recognize its gravity, and will do your utmost in the coming weeks to make post-war plannng, in the highway field at least, a phrase that has meaning in it, and progress in it, and useful employment, and an expanding future of public service for our State highway departments.

Mecca Killing Stirs Arab Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, apropos of the discussion concerning pipe lines, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a United Press dispatch from Cairo under date of February 6, 1944. I do so to call attention to the stability or lack of stability of governments of countries through which the pipe line in question may be constructed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MECCA KILLING STIRS ARAB ROW

CAIRO, February 6.—The Iranian Government has threatened to break off diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia because of the recent beheading of an Iranian pilgrim to Mecca, Moslem holy city, for assertedly fouling a sacred carpet in a mosque, a reliable source said today.

Iran was said to have notified King Ibn Saud it would sever relations unless adequate reparations were made for the summary execution of the pilgrim.

The beheading, which occurred about a month ago, has developed into a major sensation in the Middle East, and the ill feeling has been fanned by spectacular reports in the Arabic press.

The pilgrim, an aged man, became ill in the midst of a religious ceremony in a hot and overcrowded mosque after his arduous trip to Mecca. Rather than defile the sacred premises, he regurgitated into his robes, Iranians said.

The Symbolic Battle for Monte Cassino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an admirer of the Anne O'Hare McCormick type of journalism which, in my opinion, is one of the features of the New York Times. Again, today, on the editorial page of that newspaper we find an article written in her usual excellent style. Because I consider the Symbolic Battle for Monte Cassino a masterpiece of descriptive writing, logical reasoning, and wholesome philosophy, I recommend it to the consideration of the membership of the Congress. The article follows:

ABROAD—THE SYMBOLIC BATTLE FOR MONTE CASSINO

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

If there are no neutrals in this war, neither are there any sanctuaries or places of refuge. The struggle of states like Sweden and Switzerland, Turkey and Spain to maintain a precarious and unnatural balance against pressures from both sides demonstrates again and again how impossible it is for any nation to be at peace while the combat goes on. The so-called neutrals are merely fighting another kind of battle to keep out, and the only reason they are left teetering on the brink is that they are off the main track or so small that they could not throw enough weight into the scale to change the result.

The belligerents, on their side, are waging another kind of warfare over the neutrals; sometimes it is effective, sometimes not, but it is war, and considering the heavy strain and cost of military operations, as they develop in Italy, for instance, one might expect more satisfaction, less clamor behind the lines for "stronger action," when, as in Spain and Argentina, we win rounds in bloodless battles.

Under no circumstances could any great power escape a conflict of this magnitude. To say that Russia and the United States were dragged in because they were attacked is a superficial explanation. At some point they were bound to be attacked not only because in one way or another they were in from the beginning but because this is preeminently a contest of great powers, and the most skillful maneuvers for time or immunity could not save nations with a supreme stake in the world from intervening in a struggle for the domination of the world.

WAR FOR EVERYONE

Nor is there any escape for the individual, wherever he lives and whatever he does. What makes this war different from all the wars of history is that nobody on the earth can find refuge from it. Perhaps there are places in South America where the battle

seems far away; if so, they are unique, and even on that continent the economic effects are felt everywhere and existence moves to the incessant accompaniment of news from the war fronts.

Nowhere else is there even relative immunity. Despite the easy charges of "complacency," the United States is in a state of high nervous tension from end to end. No town is so remote that it can get away from it. No citizen is so uninvolved personally that he does not live with a weight upon his mind and heart. Americans are not in the front lines as the Russians and the British are. They cannot be expected to feel terrors that have to be experienced before they can even be imagined.

But in the desert, on the mountains, and in the wide plains they are as immersed in war as in the industrial cities, perhaps more so, because there are fewer distractions. It was in one of the loneliest of ranches, without a human habitation in sight, that an old man described himself as "hounded by this business. My boys and my men gone, the radio talking all day long about the fights they're in, bombers circling overhead, a wreck on the range, the stock sacrified. You can't run away from this one."

You can't run away anywhere. The battle on the slopes of Monte Cassino proves it. In pre-war days the searcher for peace thought of a coral island in the South Seas or an ancient monastery on an Italian hilltop as the ideal place of refuge from the turmoil of the world. If he had ever been to the great abbey of Mount Cassino, he thought first of that, partly because it seemed so safe and strong in its own inner peace, a citadel that no conqueror would covet, and partly because it had always been such a refuge.

In the darkest period of history, in those dim centuries after the Roman Empire fell and there was no new civilization to take its place, when Europe was a place of war and chaos such as it may be again unless it is quickly and wisely reorganized, Monte Cassino was the most famous of the monasteries which kept the torch of learning burning. Founded by St. Benedict in 529, it was a renowned sanctuary for scholars at a time when there were no schools except in the monastic enclosures where the monks spent their lives transcribing the books that would otherwise have been lost to the world. The library and archives are packed with the fruits of their labors—incunabula, manuscripts and documents of an interest and a value beyond computation.

DESTRUCTION OR PEACE

This war has reached out to the dream atolls of the South Seas. And Monte Cassino, spared through all the warring centuries, has not been spared in this conflict. It is strange to think that American boys are fighting what the reporters describe as the bitterest battle they have fought in the Mediterranean in the streets of the little town of Cassino, at the foot of the hill, and on the winding road that so many pilgrims have mounted to seek peace in one of the world's havens of peace.

The Americans have strict orders not to shell the monastery, which is Vatican territory, but the Germans are established on the hill and apparently they pay no more attention to the signs warning that it is neutral ground than to the Red Cross signs marking the hospital tents they bombed yesterday at Anzio.

This is the kind of war it is. What the Dark Ages saved, this fire consumes and there can be no sanctuary, no island of peace or safety for anyone until it is put out. For the first time man is confronted with the final alternative: He can destroy his world or he can fight against all obstacles and discouragements for a peace system that will save it.

Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Seminole, Okla., January 7, 1944:

I rise to voice a word of tribute for the soldiers of Bataan. I wish that my thoughts could go out to touch the breast of sorrow and caress the heart of grief. I wish I had words of magic to place in the darkness a sunbeam, to plant in the garden a flower. For we know that there are mothers in "the room with an empty chair." We know that there are fathers whose courage is cloaked in prayers—and hearthstones unfired and desolate, left dark by the shadow of death. We can feel this moment their nearness, those men and their loved ones, too. We can hear the muted music and read the pages of their souls. We can see at this moment a mother, alone in a child's room. A room unchanged since daddy went away—the prints of baby fingers on the papered wall—toys scattered on the floor. The lullaby is hushed.

They do not rest in Flanders Field where poppies grow but here in our hearts are planted those poppies that never can die, like the beautiful flowers of evening that blossom out there in the sky.

My friends, I salute the men of Bataan. It has been 1 year, 8 months, 28 days, and 10 hours since the bravest army of the world staggered and fell with broken sword and shattered shield on that dark day when the flag of hope and glory went down in blood and tears.

The men of Bataan fought from tree to tree from hill to hill. We know and feel the true accounts of ready valor and grim courage. If one could gather up the tales of bayonets crossing, hand to hand combat in the bogs and swamps, men who marched into cannon's mouth scorning bombs and machine guns' hell, what vivid and terrible volumes they would make. If the ether's magic could yield up the whispered hopes, the muttered prayers—or if one could touch the unshed tears held back by the grim courage that masked haggard faces he would then truly know that around their broken shards are spun the greatest events of history.

The angry ocean lashes a Bataan that is changed. The jungle sounds, the leap of the rabbit, the start of the deer, are there no more—only reptiles, the insects, and the enemy.

It has been 1 year, 9 months, and 3 days since Corregidor scarred and broken, crumbled in exhaustion and changed from a fort to a tomb. Its decimated army too exhausted from ceaseless battle, too weak from starvation to rally another attack, lay wounded in the caves beneath the battered crumbling walls and stacked their arms in the anguish of defeat. (Ah, it is a sacred temple. Every crumbled stone is a consecrated part of freedom's shrine.) There was the tattered remnant, stung by the lash of torture, battered by the storms of death they held on. Hearts sick with the horror of war clung stubbornly to a cause that held no hope but death. The Christians in the catacombs were no more resolute than they. Facing cruelties that chill the heart and make it cold, they too knelt in quiet prayer. There were no atheists on Corregidor. Valiant youth, suffering unspeakable privations, performing deeds of matchless valor, they stood firm. Their example steeled the nerve of millions. They were martyrs, yes—who never knew the fear of death.

Shot through the heart by a cowardly enemy, Corregidor died as a fort but valiant blood marked her stones and corridors and sanctified her with glory. From that death Corregidor will be resurrected and the glory of her yester eve will live in the splendor of her morrow.

Corregidor saw not only the stout hearts of men but also the quiet courage of the American woman. The nurse was there. She touched the brow of agony and held the hand of pain. When the first rays of sunlight kissed the waking world they touched not the dew of the morning but the tears in her angelic eyes. Wher the drapes of twilight clothed parts of the world in rest she was at her task. And the moon moving in mystic majesty across the parapet of the sky in royal robes of stardust saw her kneeling by the wounded. The nurse was there, her ears attuned to hear the slightest whisper of pain as though it were the voice of a trumpet, her gentle hands working in neverending haste, her woman's heart breaking in silent courage admitted only in her quiet tears—God bless the nurse and let angels and archangels prepare a royal robe for her.

Today the remaining few of the army of courage are imprisoned amongst the ruins of battle that stand as monuments to their eternal glory—wounded and scarred the fearless soldier of that dauntless band awaits the triumph of the cause he served and defended.

Where once were men at arms stand now the camps of prisoners. What joy will herald the day when they can return to the peaceful walks of our way of life. Home will be their paradise. Do you have a loved one there? God speed the day that answers my prayer that he will return home safe to you.

The bestial treatment, the torment, the torture these brave men have endured as prisoners will wrack the heart and blanch the face of all mankind when the truth is known. The word Jap will be a synonym for hate in the mind of all the world—when their atrocities are exposed. Their cruelties are a stench to the nostrils of civilization. No word of mine could describe the bestial, cursed, hateful acts of these despicable, evil, arrogant beings. No civilized mind could invent punishment severe enough to atone their vile deeds.

Can you for a moment feel yourself amid the silent men holding back their unshed tears as they watched the man who faced the strafing guns with them on Bataan's field of glory go to organize a return in force?

Some day that general will return and that some day is so near that reasonable hope can sight it now. He will face the Jap again and this time see the terror in their eyes and hear the mirth die out of their laughter.

Write the word Bataan in your hearts. It holds deeds that shine like stars above our shrines. I salute the men of Bataan and Corregidor. Their leaders were great men but so were the rank and file.

Anxious hope stands on the horizon of Philippine desolation. The ear of hope hears what might be the strike of lightning, the jolt of earthquake, and the clap of thunder, but it is more. It is the thunderclap of the blockbuster borne on the wings of vengeance.

The Philippines have never been conquered. The men of Bataan, American and Philippine, brother soldiers, the unconquerables, can now hear the drone of motors, motors that tow 10,000 wings, winged hope—winged assurance.

Today's Italy is but suggestive of tomorrow's Germany and Japan. Democracy will care for its own.

As I stand here in these beloved walls I can see a distant shore where radiant joy darkened into the midnight of grief, where homes once bright with mirth and music hold only echoes and are dark with shadows. Where hearts once felt warm sunshine and feet touched flowers are hearts that are stilled forever, to miss the sunbeams and the flowers; a land where young lads still and lifeless lie, wrapped in the folds of our flag; a land in the far Pacific where lay a thousand shattered rainbows 'way out at the rainbow's end.

The thrilling and pathetic saga of the vanquished has touched a soft, sad note to the melodies of the southern seas. Never again will the roses of the isles bloom and share their fragrance with the breeze until the crushed power of that heroic people is unchained and free. That day will come, and muted music shall burst into song. The land will teem with happy workmen singing the old-time melodies as they rebuild what vandal hands have wantonly destroyed.

Among the cemeteries of the isles our heroes sleep. Their blood is the red stain of honor in the flag of the great Republic. It is ours to keep fresh and new the great tradition of their deeds. It is ours to enshrine the courage that beckoned the bravest of our brave into the opening grave.

Remember that the men of Bataan grappled with the peril and halted its advance. Their fearless discharge of duty wrote into history a glorious record of service to our country. They rewrote their song of hope and made it a song of courage. If my heartstrings were harp strings I'd play their song for them.

Ballots or Bullets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Ballots or Bullets," which appeared in the Boston Post under date of February 7, 1944:

BALLOTS OR BULLETS

The House and Senate will resume this week their efforts to extricate themselves from an untenable position on the question of soldiers' votes, which was the result of an amorphous fear that budding ambitions of politically expedient statesmen would do or say something to offend a potential block of 10,000,000 service votes.

There are three bills, all the products of expedient thinking, before the Congress; the Worley bill, which provides Federal machinery for collecting votes to be counted by State officials; the Eastland-Rankin bill, which would leave 48 separate voting laws the job of getting in the soldier vote, and the Green-Lucas bill, which would limit the Federal ballot to States which had not liberalized their voting laws.

What seems to have been ignored entirely is the bald fact that service men and women at the fighting fronts need ballots about as much as they need two heads. What the fighting forces do need is ammunition. By the time elections roll around in September primaries there will be approximately 5,000,000 persons of voting age overseas. To provide all those who are eligible to vote with a ballot, which will be counted in the next national election, is a staggering problem of transportation under even the most simplified plan. Perhaps the troops on the fighting fronts will be overjoyed to have the privilege of throwing a handful of ballots into the faces of Germans and Japs when their ammunition runs out because the shipping space which should have brought bullets brings ballots instead.

Politicians have a horror of laying up hostility for themselves by doing the wrong thing to potential voters, and the much-discussed veterans' vote of the post-war years has reduced them to a common state of anxiety neurosis. They have visions of wrathful veterans coming back when the war is over and throwing them out of cushy jobs, neck and crop. They see goblins behind every legislative tree. They see the goblin of millions of disenfranchised voters in the Southern States gaining a voice in the affairs of State and Nation. They see the service vote reelecting President Roosevelt for a fourth term. The frightful possibility that the soldier vote will fail to perceive their merits from afar and that they will be unhorsed in mid-career keep them awake nights.

Actually, the service people at the fighting fronts are not rampaging around demanding an intermission in battle so that they can vote. They will hold the Congress and all the elected leaders of State and Nation responsible for their acts when the war is over. But, what they want now is an uninterrupted flow of supplies and equipment to enable them to finish up the job and to get home.

If Members of Congress were aware of how little esteemed they are by men at the fronts they would be even more alarmed. The few Members of Congress who have shown themselves at the fighting fronts got no cheers and no plaudits. They did get a cold and fishy stare, which bodes no good for them.

With the home folks, the Members of Congress can go back to the grass roots and sound out sentiment. But the service vote can't be sounded out. It's the great unknown quantity—and it's driving the Congress crazy.

Here in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in its current issue, the Saturday Evening Post carries an editorial, Where Is All This "Chaos"? Read it.

And the answer is, right here in Washington, with headquarters in the White House:

WHERE IS ALL THIS "CHAOS"?

Apparently the New Deal public-relations artists have done a pretty good job selling us on the notion that the country is guilty of chaos and confusion. Wherever you turn, you hear people talking about lobbyists, special interests, blocs, and pressure groups which are supposed to have got things in such a mess that even the calm and clear-eyed New Dealers are momentarily bothered. In his message to Congress, Mr. Roosevelt mentioned "disunity at home, bickerings, self-seeking partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation, business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual." The implication, of course, was that the New Deal would have to change all that.

So we ask, "Where is all this chaos?" There have been strikes and threats of strikes, largely brought about by the insistence of the administration upon messing up the labor problem and sabotaging every effort of Congress to resolve it. But what about the rest of the chaos—farm bloc, manufacturers, and so on? Some people have hammered the table and talked pretty loud about their rights, as if they had forgotten the issues being decided by human courage on a score of battle fronts. But a good many times the shouters have a case. The farmers have done their best to make it plain that they could not operate without labor and machinery, and that, if wages were not controlled, farmers would have to get higher prices. They have also held out against the type of subsidy which would put them in the New Deal's pocket without having any material effect on the cost of living. Maybe they have pushed their case pretty far, but we venture to state that, when and if a subsidy law is passed, the farmers will accept and obey it. Is it chaos to point out defects in New Deal proposals, which have not been invariably above criticism?

If it is, then manufacturers are doubtless contributing to chaos when they go to Washington to explain that a tax policy which denies them the right to accomulate a reserve for post-war expansion will retard the ability of the war economy to change over to peacetime requirements. They are supposed to be pests swarming through the lobbies of the Congress if they seek to make the point that some bugs in the renegotiation law stifle rather than stimulate industrial production. But is it chaos when the men who are supposed to be performing this industrial miracle explain that certain administrative practices have effects contrary to those expected of the law? Is it chaos to point out that an O. P. A. ruling makes for unneeded scarcity in one product and an unexpected glut in another? In short, is it chaos whenever the people who are expected to make the bricks complain that they lack the necessary straw?

It has been our observation that, quite contrary to the implications in the chaos theory now so popular, the American home front is doing pretty well. It puts up an argument, but, on the rare occasions when the leaders settle something, all parties accept the result with good grace. Chuckleheaded and arbitrary orders and directives are obeyed with very little complaint, and admonitions to the effect that nobody is really fighting the war but the New Deal jobholders are laughed off with surprising good nature. In short, if there is anything to worry about, it is not the outbreak of chaos, but the willingness of the customers to trust mother even when she flutters about like a decapitated hen. Most of the chaos is just democracy at work.

Mr. Speaker, as noted above, in his message to Congress, the President mentioned "disunity at home, bickerings, self-seeking partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation, business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual." The President ought to know, for right here in Washington, centering in the White House, he will find the very things he criticizes.

His theory and the theory of the palace guard is that all those who disagree with him are wrong. Apparently, he thinks the Executive Mansion is the fount of all intelligence, all patriotism. Never was a man more mistaken.

Establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution sent me by Mr. A. Pearlstein, secretary-treasurer of the Local Union, No. 259, Newspaper Chauffeurs, Distributors and Helpers, Boston, Mass., urging the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine:

Whereas newspaper dispatches from Europe and the documented reports of the State Department tell a horrible story of the atrocities to which the conquered peoples of Europe have been subjected; and

Whereas it has been reserved for the Jewish population of occupied Europe to be marked for mass extermination, and the world has seen more than 3,000,000 Jews in occupied Europe starved, hunted, gassed, clubbed, and machine gunned; and

Whereas humanity owes it to its own conscience to undo, so far as can be undone, the inhuman plans of the Nazis and save those who still can be saved; and

Whereas to this end, the Newspaper Distributors' Union, A. F. of L., calls upon the United Nations to take immediate steps to rescue the remaining Jews of occupied Europe. We call upon the United Nations and our own country to provide for them temporary havens. We urge that where immigration restrictions impede the work of rescue they be temporarily lifted, and that in our own country quotas be enlarged where necessary so that those Jews who can be saved may have a temporary resting place; and

Whereas the Newspaper Distributors' Union has observed with admiration the reconstruction of the Jewish homeland since the Balfour declaration recognized the special claim of the Jewish people to the soil of Palestine, and has watched with pride the great role played in the upbuilding of Palestine by the forces of organized labor there: Be it

Resolved, That our Government and the Government of Great Britain are urged by the Newspaper Distributors' Union to implement fully the Balfour declaration, to reaffirm the right of the Jewish people to a national home in Palestine, and to aid and encourage in every way the settlement upon their ancient soil of the victims of Nazi persecution.

Roosevelt's Spirit a Lesson to Wounded Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Roosevelt's Spirit Hailed—His Overcoming of Physical Handicap Should Be Lesson to Wounded Soldiers," published in the Washington Star of December 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT'S SPIRIT HAILED—HIS OVERCOMING OF PHYSICAL HANDICAP SHOULD BE LESSON TO WOUNDED SOLDIERS

(By David Lawrence)

Just about 20 years ago a young man lay in bed wondering whether the ravages of infantile paralysis would wreck his life. He could no longer walk as his fellow men did. He could no longer move about among his friends and travel as he pleased—he was destined to a lifetime of circumscribed activity.

There will be other young men coming back from the war soon. They may be disheartened over their physical handicap—they may think their activities will be circumscribed. But they need only look today at the example of a man who braved the handicap and traveled nearly half way around the world on a hazardous mission, on planes, on ships and in automobiles near the fighting zone. He had much to risk—a position of great responsibility, namely, the President of the United States—but he knew how to meet that risk.

Today President Roosevelt is back in the United States. The story of how he traveled and where he went will soon be told. For 5 weeks he has been absent. It has been announced that he visited Teheran in Iran, and Cairo, and that he went to Italy near the battle fronts. The Nazis tried hard to ascertain his route. They even went to the desperate lengths of issuing a fake report of the capture of one of the President's sons, believing that maybe the President would be questioned or informed by radio, and that his whereabouts would then be detected.

But the scheme failed. The Nazis are not to know at this time anyway just how the President went to Europe and the Near East. But the American people can know that it was a hazardous journey in more senses than one. They can know that Mr. Roosevelt was warned about the dangers but felt that it was his duty to make a supreme effort to meet with Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill to accomplish the military coordination that must bring victory.

No such trip in the midst of war was made in 1917 or 1918 and no such journey by the Commander in Chief has been made in all our history. It was much more a journey by the head of our military and naval forces than by the head of our Government because the objectives were so predominantly military.

Those who knew in advance about the trip have been genuinely worried. That he would be absent from the United States more than a month at a critical time in domestic as well as foreign affairs was in itself an argument offered by some advisers against the making of the journey. There were risks also at the places where the President stopped.

But Mr. Roosevelt does not lack personal courage and determination. Whatever differences of opinion there are among us with respect to the qualities of Mr. Roosevelt's administration at home or the controversies that have surrounded him in public office, it cannot be said that Mr. Roosevelt sought to hold so tightly to his office as to decline to risk his life on a long journey by sea and by air and by land near the war zones.

The measures taken to protect the President were far reaching. There was no doubt airplane escort if he went aboard a warship to transact business such as signing bills, for the deck of a warship is American territory, and there also was protection whenever the air transport took him across thousands of miles in the Mediterranean or the Near East. But if anything had happened while the President was aboard a ship, if a torpedo from a plane or submarine had made an effective attack, Franklin Roosevelt couldn't jump into a lifeboat or do those simple things for himself in an emergency that a man in full physical vigor can do. For him the risk of a catastrophe was greater because he was already disabled.

But though he cannot stand or walk except with support, Mr. Roosevelt has never yet allowed that fact to impair his determination to get about just the same and to carry out in the midst of war the responsibilities of his position as Commander in Chief. Those of us who knew him as a young man in the 1920's have never forgotten the spirit of his fight against his handicap. Somehow today as he comes back from overseas, his whole trip seems a heroic manifestation of that same spirit and resolution plus a readiness to make the supreme sacrifice for an objective so closely related to the shortening of the war.

Tribute to Woodrow Wilson by Martin Agronsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the twentieth anniversary of the death of Woodrow Wilson, February 5, Mr. Martin Agronsky, a radio commentator, paid an eloquent tribute to the life and character of that great man. What Mr. Agronsky said in his radio talk might well be read by every Senator concerning the problems of peace with which Woodrow Wilson labored and for which he died.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Agronsky's remarks be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Woodrow Wilson, our President in the last war, died 20 years ago today. When he died in 1924, 4 years after leaving the White House, not only his name but his ideals were already in eclipse in this country. It was already fashionable to refer with contempt, in his last 2 years in office—from 1918 to 1920—to Wilsonian idealism. Powerful and immovable opponents in the post-war Congress of that time fought Wilson on the floor of the Senate and the House in his attempts to bring this country to a realization and full share in her international responsibilities. Men like Senator Henry Cabot Lodge—a more honest and learned prototype of our present-day isolationists—proved better and more powerful politicians than President Wilson. They negated all his efforts to bring the United States to the Council table of the League of Nations. The United States then had had a bellyful of both the war and of Europe. Only a small minority in the country recognized with Wilson that winning the war was not even half the battle—that winning the peace was the important thing. Wilson was a voice in the wilderness. When, despite failing health, which those who knew him believed came as much from sickness of the heart as from any physical ailment,

he addressed one public warning after another to his countrymen, no one paid him heed. The League of Nations, which owed its birth as much to Wilson as to any other man of the time, came into being as a result of his efforts, but his own countrymen would have no part of their President's creation. The creation of the League—even though he could not lead his own country to join—may have compensated Wilson to some extent for the disappointments he suffered at home. But history shows him as being too great and too farsighted a man to have held the belief that the League could succeed without the active participation of the United States. In Wilson's personal papers and public speeches, both as President and ex-President when the war ended, anyone can see today that Wilson believed deeply that the isolationists of his time were betraying the soldiers of the last war and their unborn sons when they led this country to adopt a policy of isolation. In believing this, Wilson showed himself a prophet. Like many other prophets, he was then without honor in his own country. After Wilson's death, the United States truly turned its gaze inward. There were many public scandals in which the unsavory records of scores of war profiteers, who had been fattening themselves at the public's expense were unmasked. Many brilliant and not so brilliant books were written in the last post-war years which endeavored to show that all the talk of idealism and honor and right which had led this country with such high moral spirit into World War No. 1, were just so much baloney. The novelists and many of the historians tried to make it crystal clear that the war had actually been fought for the munitions makers, international cartels, big business, and imperialistic ideals. The slogan "Make the world safe for democracy" was held up by many as a laughing stock. Many writers worked hard at convincing the American people that they had swallowed Allied propaganda hook, line, and sinker; that they had been thoroughly bamboozled and that this country had had no business to enter the last war on any side. In short, the last war was thoroughly debunked. Naturally, the average American, remembering the long casualty lists, and the broken homes of the last war turned away sickened from these revelations. Isolationism became popular. When Hitler filled the Kaiser's abandoned boots, it was pretty tough to convince the American people that what happened in Europe, or anywhere outside the United States, was our busines this time.

The isolationist trend that Wilson had foreseen, along with the failure of the League he had done so much to create, brought this country and the world to the terrible war tragedy of today—that Wilson had also foreseen. Today, even in the midst of the war that proved the wisdom of President Wilson's ideas, there are many who still view with suspicion the part that America is destined to play in the world. There are many more who still reject Wilson's belief that lasting peace can only come through whole-hearted international collaboration. Today, on the twentieth anniversary of Wilson's death, Americans might like to remember that though Wilson died with his great hopes unfulfilled, he did not die disillusioned. Raymond Clapper, the great columnist whose tragic death is reported today, last Armistice Day wrote a moving word picture of that Armistice Day in 1923 when Wilson, a dying man, came to the door of his home to speak his last public words to some loyal friends. Though it is still the fashion to be cynical, those last words of Wilson still have undying meaning. Wilson said: "I have not the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist providence before, and I have seen their utter destruction, as will come upon these again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

The Moscow Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star of February 10 by Constantine Brown relating to the agreements reached at Moscow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(Constantine Brown)

Some of the agreements reached at Moscow between the American and Soviet Governments appear to have been shoved into the background.

At a press conference held soon after his return from the conference, Secretary of State Hull said emphatically that the Free Germany Committee established at Moscow last August was dead. Mr. Hull added that its influence—if it had any—came to an end when Foreign Commissar Molotov signed the Four Nations declaration.

There is no question that Mr. Hull was convinced that what he was telling the American people was absolutely correct.

Those who read the newspapers and listen to foreign broadcasts, however, hear that the Free Germany Committee, far from being dead, is stronger and healthier than ever. It has grown in size and is more active than when it was created 6 months ago.

The Soviet Government continues to offer it all the necessary facilities for broadcasting at least once and sometimes twice a day to the peoples in the Reich. Its speakers, ranging from generals to civilians, urge the German people to overthrow Hitler and not to fear any revengeful attitude on the part of Russia.

They inform Germany that the Soviet has agreed that the old Hohenzollern colors of red, black, and white should be reestablished and the life they are leading in Russia has convinced them that there can be a reorganization of the German Empire as a nationalist-socialist state.

One of the speakers, a former officer in the German Army, has painted an ideal picture of the pleasant life Germany might have if she agreed to side with the U. S. S. R. Generals, privates, ministers, artisans, intellectuals, unskilled laborers who are among the prisoners captured by the Russians live as one big happy family in the various Soviet prison camps and there is no reason to doubt, the broadcaster said, the same kind of life is possible in Germany after the present regime is overthrown and peace is signed.

The speakers of the Free Germany Committee add that Germany's old-established policy since the days of the Iron Chancelor Bismarck was to live in full harmony and friendship with her eastern neighbor, Russia. This policy was sadly mismanaged under Kaiser Wilhelm and brought disastrous consequences to the German people under the Hitler regime. There is no thought in the minds of the present Russian rulers, these broadcasters say, to demand the unconditional surrender of the Wehrmacht nor to dismember the fatherland. Russia needs Germany, the committee speakers say, and Germany needs Russia if she wants to survive.

From the viewpoint of psychological warfare these broadcasts would appear useful. They certainly can affect the German morale by creating hope among the people more than the threats that German militarism must be crushed and peace can be obtained only by unconditional surrender.

The question which arises in the minds of many American observers, however, is why Mr. Hull has stated so emphatically that the committee is dead. The American people have been given the texts of the agreements reached at Moscow. They also have been told—and there is no reason to believe that this was not correct—that there have been no secret agreements and covenants. But the negotiations which preceded the final formulation of the agreements are, of course, a matter which is never given out to the public.

There must have been some strong opposition by the Americans and possibly the British to the presence of a Free Germany Committee in Russia, and as a result of the objections raised by Mr. Hull and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, Foreign Commissar Molotov must have given some positive assurances that since the German Committee was distasteful to the other Allies, it would be abolished.

Mr. Hull makes no rash promises. When he pledges his word he does everything within his power to keep it. It stands to reason that he took the word of his Russian colleague to be as reliable as his own, and on his return to Washington he informed the American people on November 15. that the Free Germany Committee was dead.

Whether Commissar Molotov's decision was reversed later by higher quarters because of military or propaganda expediency is not known. But the whole situation throws a queer light on the Moscow agreements.

Restoration of Jewish Homeland in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a communication from a prominent, substantial, and patriotic citizen of Oregon, for whom I have the greatest respect and friendship. Not only because of my admiration for this exemplary American citizen, Mr. Abe G. Gilbert, but also because of my profound sympathy for the distressed and harassed Jews in Europe, who plead for the restoration of their ancient and historic homeland in Palestine and whose cause is sponsored by Mr. Gilbert, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the benefit of every Member of the Congress, two editorials from the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal, which he has sent me on that subject.

I take this opportunity to record my approval and to pledge my active support of Senate Resolution 247 and all other similar measures intended to accomplish the same purpose.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of January 18, 1944]

THE FORSAKEN PEOPLE

(By Samuel B. Weinstein, chairman, Committee for the Abrogation of the Palestine White Paper)

In these trying and tragic times thoughtful men and women have been looking ahead to the day when our armed forces come home victorious and peace reigns triumphant over a better world. Principles have been laid down, and discussions are going forward to feed the hungry, and to assure freedom of worship, free institutions, and economic security to freemen everywhere on this earth.

For the conquered peoples of Europe and Asia, in the darkness of their suffering and sorrow, these plans offer at least a continuing hope of a better day to come. But for the helpless Jews in conquered Europe, Hitler is doing the planning. He is deciding their future by a ruthless campaign of unlimited murder. The minority is simply being wiped out—now.

The millions who yet remain have maintained their physical existence in the hope that an opportunity will be given them to emigrate to Palestine, a place where they are wanted and welcomed by their own brethren, but this last avenue of escape from the Nazi terror is to be shut off by an act of one of the United Nations.

Twenty-six years ago the Balfour Declaration guaranteed the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people who may wish to settle in Palestine. Since that time the Jews have built their homeland into one of the greatest colonization achievements of our time. But that effort is now threatened with destruction. On March 31, under the terms of the Palestine White Paper of 1939, the doors of Palestine are to be closed forever to Jews. This infamous white paper was the climax of the appeasement policy pursued by the Chamberlain government in 1939, at a time when the forces of democracy were in retreat. It was the Munich policy over again, applied to Palestine. It was legally, morally, and humanely indefensible.

Today, as democracy takes the offensive and victory is assured, appeasement must be ended. The illegal and immoral white paper must be swept aside. The doors of Palestine must not close.

The Balfour Declaration was justly hailed throughout the world as an act of historic reparation and as a charter of freedom for the Jewish people. It was designed to open the gates of Palestine to homeless and harassed multitudes of Europe's persecuted men and women of the Jewish faith. The reasons which 25 years ago led the American people and the Government of the United States to favor the cause of Jewish national restoration in Palestine are still valid today. In fact, the case for a Jewish Palestine is overwhelmingly stronger and the need more urgent now than ever before. I am confident that America will answer this call for a hand of friendship and sympathy. It will act, and act now, to avert another blow to millions of human beings. Justice, liberty, fair play, and regard for the dignity of the human personality are not yet entirely forsaken.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of January 20, 1944]

PALESTINE SHOULD BE NO WAILING WALL

Closure of Palestine to further development as a national home for Jews of all nations threatens at a time when freedom and civil rights are being fought for on battle fronts throughout the world. That the rights of Jews in the Holy Land should be denied is now particularly serious, in view of the need of refugee homes for Jews able to escape Nazi persecution.

To trace the issue, it is necessary to go back to the Balfour Declaration of 1917, when Arthur James Balfour, British Foreign Affairs Secretary, wrote that "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities."

The declaration was too vague. It created the term "a national home for Jews," but failed to define the degree of civil authority, rights, and privileges. It therefore launched years of controversy, which Winston Churchill once tried to settle, while Colonial Secretary, with the statement that Jewish people are in Palestine by right, not by sufferance, and that Jews were entitled to further development of their community, which could be considered a state or national home.

But in 1939 the British Government, pursuing the appeasement policies of Chamberlain in the Near East as well as in Europe, issued a white paper which gave such new interpretation to Arab authority as to threaten the entire Jewish national home movement. American and British Jews seek abrogation of this paper and determination of a policy in line with the accepted intent of the Balfour Declaration. Aid of the American Government and public is sought. At this hour, when the issue is so vital, it should be settled, and further development of the community should be made possible on a permanent basis Peace in Palestine is feasible if a policy is clearly established.

Income-Tax Returns

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are angry. They are vehement in their protest over the intricate, difficult, and confusing Internal Revenue income-tax returns for 1943. The complexity of these tax forms can have but deleterious effects as regards the entire income reporting structure. Its immediate simplification to the point where it can be readily understood and completed by the average American is most urgently requested. Many taxpayers will be required to waste valuable man-hours filling out these cumbersome returns. Many will be required to engage lawyers and auditors—who themselves are in a quandary—to complete returns. In fact, collectors and agents throughout the country are in a state of turmoil and no two agents can agree on a return.

Congress can aid the American taxpayer, who is willing to pay his share of the terrific cost of this global war, by providing a simplified income-tax return form. To accomplish this simple objective, I am preparing an amendment to the existing law. This Congress has already enacted legislation to help Allied peoples throughout the world. Now let us evince a little concern for our own 40,000,000 American taxpayers by providing a simple form to file in order to pay their share of the cost of this relief. It can be done and it must be done.

A splendid editorial in the February 2, 1944, issue of the Pittsburgh Press is quite timely, and I include it as a part of my speech.

HOW TO GET A SIMPLE TAX

Getting a simple income-tax law is a simple matter—on paper.

It is relatively easy to get a Member of Congress to say he is in complete sympathy or in hearty accord with a simplified tax measure—and hence, a simplified tax return.

But if so many of them are in such complete sympathy or such hearty accord with the idea of an understandable tax law, why is it so hard to get such a law?

This is such a popular side of the issue, it concerns so many people, it makes so much sense that it is difficult to see why there is so little action.

It cannot be because of indifference. Congressmen themselves must fill out income-tax returns and pay taxes. It is they who struggle with these bewildering and intricate laws, spending many months at the job every year. And they have heard plenty on this issue from the folks back home.

It cannot be laziness, because in the long run a simple tax law would involve less work, less legislation, less controversy.

It cannot be inability, because in Congress there are many learned men, and especially many who are learned in the law.

Perhaps it is because Congress gets in a rut, because its archaic committee machinery is too high a hurdle, because adherence to tradition, the party line, and the seniority system is too deeply implanted, or because tax committees are too overcome by the befuddled experts from the Treasury.

However it is, there always is one way to get action, sometimes later than soon, but ultimately sure-fire action.

That is for the people to speak.

The North Side Chamber of Commerce, for instance, sent to the two Pennsylvania Senators and four local Congressmen vigorous protests against the present tax forms. The chamber received polite replies from each, all agreeing to the complaint.

No doubt these legislators are earnest about it.

But what counts is action, action which will produce a simplified tax law. And to that end, the North Side Chamber of Commerce offers an unbeatable suggestion—let organizations and individuals all over the country besiege Congress in the same vein.

Matthew Smith

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it seems Harry Bridges, of San Francisco, is not the only alien "thorn in the flesh" of the war-production efforts in this country. It has come to my attention today that there is one of the

same ilk by the name of Matthew Smith, executive head of the Mechanics' Educational Society, which organization has been on strike in a number of war plants for some time.

From what is said about this alien in an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of February 7, he is a radical labor agitator of the worst type who came to this country in 1928, has refused even to apply for American citizenship, and ridicules the very idea of such citizenship, boasting the fact he is a "citizen of the world." I think every Member of this House will agree with me that any alien who comes to this country for any reason and who, after living here for years, refuses citizenship, certainly should not be permitted to hold great power of any sort whatsoever. This man should not only be stripped of the power he has in labor circles but should be returned to the country from which he came and forbidden to reenter the United States. It is high time that the Congress provided laws under which aliens of this character, or those who come to this country and refuse citizenship, can be returned to their native lands. Certainly the activities of such men as I am discussing should not be permitted in war production at a time when this country is facing its greatest emergency.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial referred to:

WE FIGHT THREE WARS—WILL WE LOSE ON HOME FRONT?

Can the United States fight three wars at the same time with any chance of winning?

That is the question before the people.

Millions of American men will face death this summer for the conquest of Europe in what, it is predicted, will be the bloodiest struggle in the history of warfare.

Millions of others at the same time will be offering their lives in the Pacific against the most brutal foe civilization has ever known.

Many of these valiant Americans on both fronts will face starvation and horrible death by torture.

They die that America may live.

But, the third war is on the home front.

The first two cannot be won if we lose the third.

Yet, because the master mind of one labor union is in a row with another union over which one is to collect union dues, war production, the turning out of the fighting equipment necessary to give our lads a chance, is paralyzed.

No; this blow for Hitler and Hirohito has not been struck by an American, thank God.

This strike against the Government of the United States has been called by a foreigner.

Matthew Smith, executive head of the Mechanics' Educational Society, is a radical labor agitator who came to this country from England in 1928 because he was starving over 'ome.

Smith has refused even to apply for American citizenship and jeers at the very idea. He will have you know that he is a citizen of the world.

Americans can die and the Nazis and the Japs can triumph as far as he is concerned. His union dues come first and the war effort must stop because he says the C. I. O. is getting members away from him.

The National War Labor Board?

"We are not interested in what the War Labor Board says," answers Smith.

When the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. went on record through their national officers that there would be no authorized strikes during the war, Smith thought that very stupid of them. He refused to make any such pledge. "Such action," he said at the time, "would prevent us from exploiting labor in wartime."

In 1942 Czar Smith struck his first blow against war production by calling a general strike in the plants he controls, until he got what he wanted. The Free Press then said editorially:

"This alien will not be punished for his insolent crippling of our war effort. He will be supported and soothed and sustained by the administration at Washington which has held to one consistent tenet—that a labor union can do no wrong—not even when headed by men whose only investment in America is a one-way ticket to arrive here."

Smith was not punished. He made the Government of the United States knuckle to him. On such meat has his arrogance grown. This is no controversy over wages or hours or working conditions. It is not a strike against the hated capitalists. It is a strike against the United States!

The eyes and limbs and lives of American youth is the price we will have to pay.

In our book there is just one word to describe this refusal to give our boys the weapons they need.

How will Washington meet this challenge?

Dies Goes the Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

Mr. Speaker, may I add one preface to this editorial. The Dies committee has already spent more money than any other select committee in the entire history of the United States.

DIES GOES THE LIMIT

The association of American citizens for the furtherance of their mutual political interests is not new, and there is nothing inherently sinister in the idea. The Republican and Democratic Parties, the League of Women Voters, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the various veterans' societies are examples of such associations.

But Representative MARTIN DIES draws the line against organized political action by labor. He announced that $75,000 recently given him by the House will be used in part to finance an investigation of the C. I. O. political action committee, headed by Sidney Hillman. Since one purpose of the C. I. O. committee is inspection of Congressmen's records, the appropriation amounts to the use of public money by reactionary Congressmen to protect their political skins.

DIES' intention is in accord with the charge made by the biased Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, that the C. I. O. political action fund violates the Smith-Connally Act, which prohibits political contributions by unions. Violations of this law are properly the jurisdiction of the Attorney General and the Federal grand juries. By no stretch of the imagination are they within the province of the Dies committee, which was created to investigate "un-American" activities, but which has demonstrated a woeful incapacity to define the term.

The Dies committee long and notoriously has misused taxpayers' money to further the political viewpoint of its chairman, whose ambitions are no secret. Two years ago he unsuccessfully sought promotion to the Senate. In view of his background, his determination to pass judgment on the organized political activity of others reaches the limit of insolence.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Sammy boy has ambitions to be Vice President some day, his mama says.

Last year Congressmen distributed 9,000,000 farmers' bulletins, covering 600 subjects.

Out West they speak of the "palace guard" or the "kitchen cabinet," composed of Harry Hopkins and others, as the "floundering sons of the founding fathers."

Tonight we go to the Mayflower to banquet with Governor Bricker in memory of Abraham Lincoln, who "held the ridge-pole up and spiked again the rafters of the house."

At the Central Church of Chicago last Sunday was discussed What Price Delinquency? Those who care should shudder at the F. B. I. percentage of increases among youth since war.

Every soldier should be permitted to vote under the Constitution, but if half the energy and expense of that effort were given to getting out the home vote it would be more productive.

The soldier vote bill finally goes to conference; subsidies, after 75 days, gets from the House to the Senate floor, while national conscription sleeps peacefully beneath the Dome, and nobody seems to care much.

It was refreshing to hear practical men, not on the Federal pay roll, talk about post-war planning at Topeka last week. The Industrial Council of the State Chamber of Commerce called it Tomorrow's Opportunities for Your Town. They got their teeth into things, and it wasn't W. P. A.

The one-man government is evidencing itself more every day. No department head or bureaucrat dares to differ with the Commander in Chief. Committee hearings reveal this. Only the Chief Executive and his six little presidents, with their regiments, are needed—and there is really not much need of the six.

A House Member, who was once a Senator and who was 12 years chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, with oustanding military background in his family, and a distinguished soldier himself of the Spanish-American War in the Philippines, was never more than a private.

Establishment of Jewish Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., on February 7, 1944, to establish a permanent and independent Jewish home in Palestine:

Whereas the Nazi program of extermination of the Jewish people, a barbarous program of mass murder unequaled in the history of the world, continues unabated; and

Whereas the United Nations engaged in war upon the forces of Axis militarism have frequently given a pledge to restore religious tolerance and racial security to all peoples of the earth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., calls upon our National Government and the governments of our allies, particularly Great Britain, to give all possible effect to the following program:

1. Prompt, effective, and positive action by the governments of the United Nations to rescue as many of the helpless victims of Nazi-ism as possible and to establish havens for those Jewish people who can still be saved and extricated from Nazi-dominated countries.

2. Immediate abrogation by the Government of Great Britain of the Chamberlain White Paper of 1939 under which Jewish immigration into Palestine is restricted and under which this Jewish national homeland will be closed to Jews forever starting April 1944, as discriminatory, unfair, unjust, and a hindrance to the war effort.

3. That the Government of Great Britain, which has a special responsibility in the matter, fully implement the Balfour Declaration that the right of the Jewish people to a national home in Palestine be reaffirmed, and that every aid and encouragement be given to enable the victims of Nazi persecution to settle upon their ancient soil and make it bloom once more as it did in the days of the prophets; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to the State Department of the United States Government with a request that it be forwarded to the foreign office of Great Britain.

Federal Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and editorial from the Cleveland Press of January 31, 1944:

FIVE UNITED STATES EXPERTS FIGURE TAX—FOUR (OR FIVE) WRONG

The income-tax law under which the public is now filling out returns and making payments is so complicated that even Government tax experts can't agree on the amount a person should pay.

The Press today had five reporters go to the internal revenue office in the Midland Bank Building where thousands of Clevelanders are getting their returns made out—free of charge—by deputy internal-revenue collectors.

The five reporters, unknown to the collectors, presented five different deputies identical statements of their last year's incomes and tax payments and claimed deductions.

The answers, obviously, should have been identical.

Here are the answers:

Reporter J. Howard Absalom owes the Government $12.55.

Reporter Eugene Segal is entitled to a refund of $13.88.

Reporter Stanley Anderson owes the Government $246.10.

Reporter Dan Williams is entitled to a refund of $9.21.

Reporter Joseph Collier is entitled to a refund of $8.23.

The five Government experts thus came up with answers as much at variance as five corner-store experts who were tested by the Press last week.

So there you are, taxpayer. Sweat on.

A JOB FOR CONGRESS—THE INCOME-TAX SYSTEM MUST BE SIMPLIFIED

No more convincing argument could possibly be offered for a simplified income-tax system than the experience recounted elsewhere on this page of the five Press reporters who visited income-tax headquarters this morning.

Obviously, the complicated nature of the income-tax forms this year has confounded everybody, including, as it now turns out, the men trained by the Government.

We are not surprised at this. No one should be. We have urged upon Congress and the administration at Washington to simplify the return. People just cannot understand it.

These income-tax men are doing the very best they can with a problem saddled upon them by Congress. We think that, all things considered, they are doing an excellent job, under the leadership of Tom Carey, the internal revenue collector, who has been trying hard to serve the public. It is ironical that this complicated mess should develop the first year he is in office.

But this complicated tax form must be simplified, and the only way to get it simplified is to point out its absurdities in actual practice so that Congress will finally do something about it.

However, one thing must be borne in mind by all of us. We must pay our taxes. We must do the best we possibly can to figure them out, and do as honest a job as we can, either by ourselves or with the help of the Government officials or others upon whom we rely.

Pay our taxes, we must, and pay them promptly, and honestly. Without our taxes the Government, especially in wartime, cannot function.

So, no matter how headachy the form, no matter who makes the errors, no matter how absurdly complicated the tax forms—

Pay your taxes, and pay them as quickly as you can!

Program of Interregional Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the issuance of the report of the National Interregional Highway Committee in January of this year, after an exhaustive 3-year study by a group of technicians, under the chairmanship of Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, constitutes the most significant factual survey of roads needs—particularly those in the larger metropolitan areas, which have been recognized as the most pressing—ever to be published in this country.

The report which has been warmly commended to the Congress by the President of the United States provides today the necessary facts on which to develop a sound program of interregional highways and the related feeders within the several States.

Moreover, the publication of this report focuses public attention on those areas where unemployment is likely to develop during the period of conversion from a war to a peacetime economy. The report notes the close parallelism between the location of the Nation's most urgent road needs and the locations where there has been the greatest development of wartime industrial activity. Projects to relieve congestion in these cities will provide, at one and the same time, employment in the precise places where the need of employment will be greatest. In the words of Chairman MacDonald's letter of transmittal to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the construction of a national system of interregional highways "if begun with the termination of the war emergency will permit the productive utilization of much of the manpower and industrial capacity then likely to be available."

Now the report does not deal with the effect on the highway systems of the several States due to the limitations and wartime conflictions and the lack of proper maintenance, it is manifest that any sound road program for the Nation must include not only provisions for interregional highways but also for the normal needs of other parts of the highway system. Hence appropriation should be flexible and the amounts to be used on different parts of the Federal-aid and local roads and street system should be the proper responsibility of the State highway departments. The needs and requirements of the different States vary widely from one another. Such diverse needs and requirements cannot be accomplished by a single formula or plan of apportionment. To meet the road needs, not only of such an interregional system, but also of the State and local

needs within the several States, it is proposed that there be a three-way apportionment of the capital sum of $1,000,000,000. The apportionment would be as follows:

Sixty percent of the original amount to be allocated for the interregional system and to be apportioned according to the road needs of the system, which as indicated in the report, are conveniently and accurately measurable by the numbers of persons to be demobilized in each of the several States, since there is close parallelism between road needs and the recent level of industrial activity, the conversion of which will accompany demobilization from industry and the armed forces. For the needs of that part of the Federal-aid highway system that is placed within the interregional system, there is provided an apportionment for Federal-aid in keeping with the apportionment of past years and an allocation of this fund to the States in accordance with past practices. This part of the total sum amounts to 20 percent of the total, or $200,000,000 a year, which is somewhat in excess of past Federal-highway aid appropriations. The remaining 20 percent of the fund, or $200,000,000, is apportioned to the various States according to the respective use of their highway systems as approximately measured by motor vehicle registration of the several States.

This bill, which represents the combined thoughts of representatives of a number of different States is presented by me at their suggestion to focus attention on what amounts to clearly delineated highway needs on an equitable basis in which Federal funds could be expected to meet those needs. It contains the very important provision that in order to qualify for the receipt of Federal funds, each State—or its subdivisions—must be willing to appropriate an equal amount of matching funds.

The Russian Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "The Nation's Politics" by Paul Mallon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S POLITICS

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The story is told among United Nations diplomats that the Vatican summoned the American chargé a few weeks ago to tell him it looked with perturbation upon the possibility of a Communist controlled or influenced government being established in Italy. The story could be true, and is accepted as such. Authorities here naturally will neither confirm nor deny.

But the Anglo-Russo-American agreement specifically provides for representation of minorities in the new Italian Government (Communists being the main one), although it does not even call for an election. The Pope could well be disturbed.

LEAKED TO STALIN

At any rate, the story leaked to Stalin, and immediately thereafter, the Pope was mysteriously attacked as a "Fascist" without explanation by one of Stalin's so-called journalists in one of Moscow's so-called newspapers, Izvestia.

Similarly, Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, made a Toronto speech calling for a closer knit post-war British Empire in order to keep Britain from being minimized by the giants like the United States, Russia, and China. Immediately thereafter, Stalin's Supreme Soviet (Parliament) unanimously got and adopted the idea of dividing Russia into 16 individual republics for international purposes only.

AGAINST CABINET

This action was the Moscow counter-pressure move, not particularly against the Halifax speech, but against its obviously authentic presentation of the current British official cabinet position (Halifax is a member of the war cabinet). That is the least—the very least, it was. That is the most optimistic construction which can be placed upon it.

There was no natural reason why Russia should break into 16 states. The breakage is purely superficial. Moscow will continue to control, as always. Autonomy was always theoretically provided in the Russian Constitution, and denied in fact.

Not even the domestic Communists have offered any justification for this new move other than the apparent diplomatic intention of Russia to take in Poland, the Baltics, Finland, even the Balkans, and perhaps Germany itself as an individual Communist republic, empowered to deal individually in foreign affairs and entitled to the delusion of maintaining its own inferior army.

The time has come to speak frankly, although our officials naturally cannot. They regard the Russian split, plus the attack on the Pope, the separate treaty with Czechoslovakia, the attack on Britain (suggesting she would make a separate peace), the attack on Willkie—all as the greatest single development since the declaration of war.

FEELS HER POWER

While the polite published interpretations are the least of Russian intentions, the plain, unavoidable deduction must be that Russia, realizing her strength, intends to employ it to the fullest in post-war Europe, Asia and the whole world.

Obviously, she does not believe her socio-collectivist way of life is the democratic way, and she intends to promote her way and her self-interest in her customary diplomatic pressure vein against the wishes of friends (Britain, Willkie, et al.) as well as foes.

If Moscow is reaching the state of mind where a Democrat or non-Communist is a Fascist, she is alining herself against the rest of the world, combating Britain, the Vatican, Willkie and us. She is certainly taking a lot of it. The most that this could mean will be evident to everyone without being specifically stated.

NOT COOPERATIVE

This alarming interpretation seems unavoidable in view of the fact that she has so soon abandoned the conference table and negotiation, for the field of pressure politics and empire building of her own.

These very diplomatic acts she has already committed, violate the spirit of Tehran, the spirit of negotiation and friendly agreement, in favor of antagonistic conflict for self-interest.

Moscow must either change her tune, or she will soon hear a new tune from Washington as well as London.

Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poor Substitute," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of February 8, 1944, dealing with the food-stamp plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR SUBSTITUTE

Issue of food stamps to low-income families under a modified version of the Aiken-La Follette bill to resurrect a Federal relief program is one of the substitutes now offered for the $1,500,000,000 food subsidy legislation. The plan is to kill the subsidies which are being used on a selective basis to maintain floor prices under certain crops and to encourage production of some specially needed foodstuffs. With the subsidies cut off, food prices would have to be allowed to advance to a point where even high-cost producers would be justified in maintaining their production. To offset the serious situation created by such an advance in food, the framers of the legislation would authorize the issuance of free food stamps to families with incomes of less than about $1,600 a year.

Elimination of the subsidies would, it is claimed, save the $1,500,000,000 a year being used for that purpose. But the outlay of American consumers in buying higher priced food would be several times that amount, and, in addition, an appropriation of $500,000,000 would be made to redeem the free stamps from the merchants.

Thus the antisubsidy group in Congress proposes to impose on consumers a cost much greater than they are now paying for the subsidies, and their plan has other objectionable aspects. One of these is that it would crash the anti-inflation line and the breach would not be limited to foods. If foods go up, the O P. A. will not be able to hold present ceilings on many manufactured products, the cost of which is related directly or indirectly to foods. Unquestionably it would bring more complaints about the cost of living and inspire another drive for higher wages.

The Senators might well consider also whether the price hiking they propose would do more injury to the low-income families they propose to help with free food stamps than the food stamps would relieve. Essentials of low-income families are not limited to food, and it is probable that the price inflation which would follow in other goods would more than cancel the value of a few stamps.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the choice of $1,600 as an income level under which a family would need free food

stamps does not take into consideration the wide fluctuation in living conditions, costs, and habits in various areas and among different segments of the population. It is equally obvious, also, that any return of the Government to the relief business under present conditions of full employment and a shortage of manpower would be a confession of the inept management of our wartime economy.

A Vote for the Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I believe there were literally hundreds of speeches delivered by Members of Congress on the so-called soldiers' vote bill during the past few weeks. During the weeks ahead, before this question is finally resolved, there probably will be several hundred more speeches on the same subject.

It might be well for all of us to keep in mind the difficulties attached to the job of getting ballots to the four corners of the world, preserving the purity of the ballot, collecting the ballots after the armed forces have voted, and returning these voted ballots intact to the home election district of the soldier.

I am in favor of doing everything possible, consistent with military regulations and exigencies, to place a ballot at the disposal of every person in military uniform who is eligible and wishes to vote. And to that end I shall support legislation which will accomplish this result.

I would like every Member of Congress to read the following letter written by President Woodrow Wilson during the last war on this topic.

The letter follows:

I have conferred with the Secretary of War on the subject of the soldier vote in France, and he has pointed out to me the difficulties which seem inherent in the problem but which do not lie on the surface so that they can be appreciated generally without a statement of them. The laws of many of the States make no provision for taking the vote of absent soldiers, so that any facilities extended by the Army could be taken advantage of only by those States which have in some way made provision for such an emergency. In some States the soldier vote is authorized to be taken by mail, but the guaranty of the secret ballot stands in the way, because uncensored correspondence cannot be permitted for military reasons. In some States commissioners are authorized to be appointed to visit the soldiers and take their votes, and the Secretary of War tells me that the military authorities will cooperate with such commissioners as far as possible, but he points out the danger of allowing any sort of responsibility for the purity of the ballot or of the thoroughness of the opportunity to vote being allowed to rest on the military authorities, as disappointed expectations on the part of candidates would undoubtedly lead to accusations of unfairness among military men in whom the public confidence ought not to be shaken by such charges.

Soldier Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the plan to be embodied in legislation to give the citizens of this country in the armed forces the right to and provide the means of casting their vote. The State of Idaho will cooperate in a full measure with the departments of the Federal Government by enacting the necessary laws to implement this voting program as stated in the letter presented herewith for printing in the RECORD:

STATE OF IDAHO,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Boise, January 27, 1944.

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: I have just read in this morning's Statesman where the President scourges Congress, concerning the soldier vote bills now pending. How a President can take the position of insisting upon the passage of patently unconstitutional legislation and still maintain his self-respect is beyond my comprehension. I sincerely hope that Congress, the only remaining representative of the people, will not intentionally violate their oaths as the Chief Executive has so consistently done.

I am particularly interested in this matter inasmuch as I have been assisting in the drafting of legislation to facilitate the soldier vote for consideration of the Idaho Legislature at special session. I am the only attorney in the house of representatives in this session, and I think that I can say that that branch of the legislature at least, will not ratify a constitutional amendment, and insofar as I am able to have any influence, will not pay any attention to a Federal ballot for the reason that the same is unconstitutional and in direct violation of every precept of our representative government. I have examined the Worley bill and the Green-Lucas bill, and find that neither of them would be satisfactory as presented to me. I have, on the other hand, read a letter and attached provisions, from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the Council of State Governments dated December 30, 1943, and find that the requirements set forth on page 2 of the letter of the Secretaries may be adequately provided for by State legislation.

It is my opinion now that when the Idaho Legislature is called in special session (the date being tentatively set for February 28, 1944) we shall provide for a State ballot for State and Federal officers, and that insofar as the State of Idaho is concerned, that ballot only will be counted by election judges. I think that is safe to assume that should the so-called war ballot, as presented in the Worley bill, be presented for counting and certification to the officers of the State of Idaho, an injunction suit will be brought immediately to enjoin the counting of such ballots, and I think it is equally safe to assume that such would be the case in virtually every State in the Union. A school boy with rudimentary knowledge of the Constitution could anticipate the outcome of such suits, and they will be in State courts.

It is high time that someone call the President's attention to his oath respecting the observance of the Constitution, although I doubt that he would remember it.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIS C. MOFFATT.

Tax Simplification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the question of tax simplification is at this time uppermost in the minds of every taxpaying individual. In fact, the growing complication of our tax laws and the resulting complications of all income-tax returns, have become such that few of our people without the help of tax experts can hope accurately to complete their returns.

One of the members of our Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has introduced a bill embodying the features of a very promising plan originated by him, which is discussed in the Washington Post of February 9, 1944, by John R. Beal under the heading of Tax Simplification.

Inasmuch as this is a most interesting article, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks I may be permitted to insert it in the RECORD:

TAX SIMPLIFICATION

(By John R. Beal)

DIRECT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Some 50,000,000 persons are facing the task of filling out the most complicated tax returns in history by March 15. It's safe to assume we don't need a Dr. Gallup to figure out whether these taxpayers are in favor of simplifying the job. Congress has undertaken serious consideration of it. What are the prospects?

With respect to the March 15 returns, of course, no relief is in sight. They are on 1943 income, to be checked against estimates and payments made last year. They are extra-complicated because we are still in the process of transition to pay-as-you-go. It's expected that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will do what it can to ease the burden by postponing for a month the requirement of filing an estimate of 1944 income.

There are three main divisions to the job of tax simplification. The first involves making the arithmetic easier for individuals; the second, clearing up complexities for corporations; the third, simplification of estate and gift taxes. If Congress gets down to business and doesn't become too preoccupied with politics, it can quickly accomplish much on the first portion of the task.

The new tax bill, in eliminating the earned income credit for individuals, takes a forward step. By using the same base against which to assess normal taxes and surtaxes, it permits use of a form on which most persons will have one less tax calculation to make.

For the future, Representative FRANK CARLSON of Kansas, original legislative sponsor of the Ruml pay-as-you-go principle, has pointed the way with a bill based mainly on what the Treasury recommended last year.

CARLSON'S sponsorship of the administration program represents constructive tax statesmanship, and there is evidence that some reversal of sentiment has occurred since the program was rejected in connection with the new revenue bill.

CARLSON'S bill embodies five features:

1. It provides one tax on personal incomes, with a single base and a single set of rates and exemptions. This means repealing the Victory tax, eliminating an estimated 9,000,000 taxpayers from the roll of those contributing to the Government during wartime. But the group which pays nothing but the Victory tax contributes only 1.76 percent of the total revenue. That loss—$300,000,000—could be made up by reducing the exemption for married persons from $1,200 to $1,100 and adjusting surtax rates upward about 3 points. The question is: Are the remaining 41,000,000 taxpayers willing to pay this added cost for easier tax computations?

2. The bill eliminates the requirement of returns for those whose liability is substantially covered by withholding. The Treasury probably would oppose this provision, on the ground that returns would be needed as a check.

3. It extends to taxpayers with incomes up to $5,000 the privilege of using the relatively simple short return, now limited to the bracket up to $3,000.

4. It simplifies both the short and long form of returns for individuals. It is in the forms, and not the law's language, where complications beset the individual.

5. Finally, the bill permits taxpayers to revise their income estimates on January 15 after the close of the taxable year, thus eliminating all possibility of penalty for underestimating income.

Simplification is a matter of degree. Graduated withholding, keeping the great mass of taxpayers substantially current in their obligations to the Government would extend the process still further and go about as far as is practical. Simplification in the highest brackets would affect relatively few individuals and might create many inequities.

Untangling corporation tax complexities is a totally different problem, and estate and gift taxes pose equal difficulties. One obvious first step on corporations would be to eliminate the capital stock and declared value excess-profits tax. Corporations can hope for little substantial relief during the existence of the separate wartime excess-profits tax.

Simplifying levies like the corporation taxes and those on capital gains probably require spadework study by a commission of experts. But individual tax computations can be made easier now by direct congressional action.

We Want an Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, it seems that Philadelphia has received another brush-off by the Government in reference to the completion of the northeast airfield.

The city has had no commercial air service for several weeks, through no fault of its own, the Government claiming there are no funds available for this field.

It does not seem fair that the third largest city in the United States should be without commercial air service.

The following are editorials on the subject:

[From the Northeast Chamber of Commerce, Philadelphia, Pa.]

UP IN THE AIR

Philadelphia was without any airport service for practically 3 weeks due to incompetency on the part of the Federal Government, in our opinion.

Two years ago the Federal Government demanded an airport be immediately established in northeast Philadelphia for the protection of the city and vicinity. Homes and farms were demolished and the municipality was compelled to pay $500,000 for the site so this airport could be completed in 60 days.

The city did its part in acquiring the land for the Government project. The Government did not do its part as a year and a half later even the lighting on a Government contract had not been completed and planes could not safely use the field when an emergency arose.

If it was necessary to have an airport in the northeastern part of Philadelphia for the city's protection, it was necessary to have a completed one. The Government fiasco would have been no protection if there had been real danger, only luck saved the day despite $500,000 spent, as a partly completed field is valueless and no planes could safely use it.

Furthermore, if the Federal Government had completed work at the northeast Philadelphia field as the occasion called for, it could have easily completed any extra needs so that when it closed the Municipal Airport at the southern end of the city it could have authorized emergency use at the Northeast Philadelphia Airport without any delay.

Philadelphia is one of the most important war production centers; officials use air transportation; war correspondence is important; tons of air mail were received and sent from Philadelphia every week; even production parts were shipped by air mail. This was all eliminated because a situation arose at the municipal airport that the Government officials knew about for some time, yet no attempt to complete the work at the Northeast Philadelphia airport was apparent, either to relieve this situation or actually protect the city and surrounding area.

In view of war conditions this is no time for incompetent air handling in what is one of the most important production centers in the world, and in an area where at least 3,000,000 people are affected.

The Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce sent the following resolution to the mayor on January 4:

"Whereas after the expenditure of thousands of dollars by the city of Philadelphia in acquiring and establishing a municipal airport on Hog Island site with the endorsement of the United States Government, the airport is now entirely closed by the National Government on account of danger due to certain use of Government property in the vicinity, which may be utilized for this purpose for considerable time due to world conditions, and

"Whereas an unfinished airport has been established in Northeast Philadelphia at considerable expense to the municipality at the direct demand of the United States Government: Be it

Resolved, That the municipal authorities be requested to demand that the United States Government complete the present northeast airport immediately so it can adequately and safely provide facilities for the city of Philadelphia and its industries in their important war work, and thus eliminate continuation of unnecessary deprivation of facilities as now exists."

One of Philadelphia's airports should be made and kept safe and efficient for routine and emergency use.

The above editorial was written on January 18 and copy of it forwarded to Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 9, 1944]

UNFAIR TREATMENT FOR AIRPORT

What bears the earmarks of a complete run-around has been given Philadelphia by the Government in the matter of completing the Northeast Airfield.

This city has been cut off from commercial air service for 7 weeks, this through no fault of its own, but only because the Municipal Airport was closed down for military reasons. Now we are informed that no military necessity exists for Government action to put the Northeast field into usable condition and that no funds are available for the purpose.

The Government, in other words, chooses to close one airport, but refuses to do anything to open up a substitute field. Philadelphia is caught in the middle.

There might, fairly, be some question about the amount of money required to finish the Northeast Airport. Perhaps the $2,000,000 requested by the city can be shaved down. But there surely is no excuse for Washington to brush Philadelphia off completely and to say, in effect, that if we want an airfield we shall have to provide it ourselves.

In taking such a position, the Government agencies concerned are forgetting that this city spent a considerable sum on the Municipal Airport and is now unable to utilize the facilities there—by Government orders.

If there are no funds at hand in any agency that could be tapped for the Northeast Airport requirements, then a simple solution would be a specific appropriation by Congress for that purpose. Philadelphia's Representatives should see to this.

The cessation of commercial air service has already caused this city great inconvenience. By some means Philadelphia must get back on the air map without delay.

Why Meat Is Scarce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Eaton (Ohio) Register-Herald of January 26, 1944:

WHY MEAT IS SCARCE

No clearer or more succinct analysis of the meat situation in the Nation has yet been made by anyone than that of Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE of Kansas when he said: "They have gone at it in Washington from the wrong end."

In his remarks before the recent livestock and feed conference in Kansas City, Mr. HOPE also pointed out that the Government went to the producers of tanks, airplanes, and

guns, fixed a price that would make them a profit, approved any necessary wage scale, allotted them materials, provided them with machinery, even built plants, helped them find workers and aided them in other ways. No one can properly criticize this procedure of the Government to aid a war industry.

But food production also is a war industry. Without food we die. Mr. HOPE pointed out that in food production the Government started to solve the problem by first deciding what the consumer should pay, thus going at it from the opposite end from that which they approached munitions production. What Mr. HOPE did not also say but very well might have said is that the Washington pretzel benders who have tried to make their words the farmers' law should not be wholly blamed for approaching the food problem from the wrong end. This is the case because, as college-bred theorists, they have never yet learned one end of an animal from another.

Their ignorance of the simple facts of farm life coupled with the certainty of their conviction that they know all about the intricate economic facts of socialized existence have served to deprive the people of a meat-eating nation of the food allowed them under their ration points.

All of this is bad enough. What is even worse is that Washington officially "dumb" continues its mistaken course even after having discovered that the practical realities of food and meat production cannot be forced to fit college theories.

The issue before the Nation is not as they loudly insist "Subsidies or inflation." Instead it is "Production and more production, or hunger."

Our fighting forces, our people and those of our allies can be adequately fed if Washington bunglers will stop pestering the farmers with food regulations.

Conference Report on Title VII, Revenue Act of 1943—Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1943, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee yielded 5 minutes to me which I used to discuss the renegotiation features of the conference report. One of the amendments to the Renegotiation Act which was reported by the conference committee and which I criticized was that provision which would exempt from renegotiation contractors whose business with the six departments which are within the law—the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and the R. F. C.—does not exceed $500,000 a year. I referred to the case of a contractor whose governmental business was under $500,000 a year and who, after charging up $90,000 in salary as costs, still made $200,000 in profits. I pointed out that under the amendment which had been reported out such a contractor could not be renegotiated.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] requested that I place in the record the name of that contractor "so that the proper officials uptown may take cognizance of it." When I made my statement on the floor I based it upon the testimony given before the Committee on Naval Affairs by Mr. Kenneth H. Rockey, Chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board. In response to a question from Mr. Robert E. Kline, Jr., the committee's able general counsel, as to the existence of cases where, on sales of less than $500,000, unconscionable profits were made, Mr. Rockey stated the case to which I made reference in my remarks. In his testimony, which appears on page 515 of the committee's record, Mr. Rockey did not identify the company by name, and I did not know its name when the gentleman from Minnesota requested that I insert it in the record. I have learned since, however, that the company to which Mr. Rockey referred was Pausin Manufacturing Co., of Newark, N. J. I have also been informed that my colleague from Minnesota need have no concern about the failure of the Price Adjustment Board to act. I am advised that the Navy Department Price Adjustment Board has already renegotiated this company and recovered its excessive profits. Had the law contained the amendment which was included in the conference report, such renegotiation would not have been possible, however. The facts in the case of this company may be of interest to the House.

Pausin Manufacturing Co. had business in 1942 amounting to $327,052. It paid out officers' salaries, $90,000, or 27.5 percent of such sales. The Price Adjustment Board very properly disallowed $40,000 of such salaries as an item of cost. The company's profits, before taxes, amounted to $133,929 on business of $327,052, or 41 percent. It is particularly interesting to note that the company's net worth in this period, and before the accrual of these earnings, was $53,377. Its profits before taxes amounted to 250.9 percent of its net worth. Even after the payment of excess-profits taxes the earnings left to the company amounted to 70.1 percent of its net worth. The Price Adjustment Board recovered $90,000 in excessive profits from this company, leaving it a profit return of 82.3 percent on its net worth before taxes, and 23 percent after taxes.

The case of this contractor is not isolated. There are many instances of companies receiving war business in amounts less than $500,000 a year on which they have made excessive profits. For example, the East Liberty Electroplating & Refinishing Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1942 had business of $257,734. Before renegotiation, this proprietorship had profits of $165,874, or 64.4 percent of the amount of its sales. In renegotiation, the Navy Price Adjustment Board recovered excessive profits of $80,000 from the company. As the tax bill now stands, no longer is such recovery possible.

Another company, the Kar Engineering Co., of Great Barrington, Mass., had renegotiable business in 1942 amounting to $421,992, on which it had profits before renegotiation of $205,568, or 48.71 percent of such sales. In relation to its net worth of $119,000, such profits amounted to 173 percent. The Navy Price Adjustment Board recovered from this contractor $162,500, something which it could not do under the amendment approved in conference.

Still another such company is Agawam Aircraft Products, Inc., of Sag Harbor, N. Y. For the year ending August 31, 1942, this company had sales amounting to $311,572. On these sales it realized a profit of $134,693, or 43.32 percent. Its profits after taxes amounted to 75 percent of its net worth. The Navy Price Adjustment Board recovered $100,000 in excessive profits from this contractor. This, of course, could not be done under the amendment approved in conference.

Similar instances have been common in connection with War Department contractors. The following table, prepared by the War Department Price Adjustment Board, demonstrates the excessive profits made by Army contractors which would have been left intact had the amendment been included in the original law:

Selected list illustrating companies which would have made larger dollar profits on $500,000 volume, without renegotiation, than on greater volume with renegotiation

Unadjusted renegotiable sales	Unadjusted renegotiable profit	Percent	Salary		Recovery	Adjusted renegotiable profit	Margin of profit on renegotiable sales after adjustment
			1940	1942			
$513	$248	48.3	$8	$30	$205	$43	14.0
$562	243	43.1	21	47	200	43	11.8
$599	263	44.0	12	36	215	48	12.5
$620	280	45.0	23	24	230	50	12.7
$527	197	37.3	(1)	45	179	18	5.1
$1,839	885	48.1	(1)	100	805	80	7.8
$644	293	45.5	36	51	230	63	15.3
$924	380	41.2	43	62	325	55	9.2
$1,536	765	49.8	(1)	(1)	665	100	11.5
$570	217	38.1	(1)	30	172	45	11.4
$977	432	44.2	(1)	(1)	355	77	12.5
$798	328	41.1	(1)	28	267	61	11.5
$802	346	43.1	61	106	280	66	12.6
$646	275	42.5	11	27	200	75	16.7
$1,114	470	42.2	21	96	395	75	10.4
$1,284	586	45.6	(1)	23	500	86	11.0
$965	416	43.1	(1)	70	330	86	13.5
$570	179	30.2	39	66	154	25	6.0
$634	223	35.2	13	24	175	48	10.5
$635	216	34.0	28	79	165	51	10.9
$634	216	34.2	(1)	20	161	55	11.8
$571	198	34.7	(1)	(1)	145	53	12.5
$2,213	1,232	55.7	25	47	1,075	157	13.8
$749	277	37.0	(1)	(1)	210	67	12.4
$538	181	33.6	28	72	130	51	12.5
$845	322	38.2	(1)	40	242	80	13.4
$1,245	482	38.7	22	48	400	82	9.7
$550	180	32.7	45	41	128	52	12.3
$1,020	368	36.1	(1)	62	297	71	9.8
$670	214	32.0	(1)	(1)	163	51	10.1
$852	295	34.6	(1)	24	225	70	11.2
$806	289	35.9	36	45	220	69	11.8

[1] Not shown.

NOTE.—Dollar amounts stated in thousands.

Selected list illustrating companies which made large profits on renegotiable sales of less than $500,000 before renegotiation

Unadjusted renegotiable sales	Unadjusted renegotiable profit	Percent	Salary 1940	Salary 1942	Recovery	Adjusted renegotiable profit	Margin of profit on renegotiable sales after adjustment
$476	$193	40.6	----	$40	$158	$35	11.0
$389	154	39.5	----	25	128	26	10.1
$428	175	40.9	----	50	150	25	9.1
$424	202	47.6	----	50	165	37	14.2
$451	167	37.0	----	45	138	29	9.3
$484	201	41.5	$16	32	160	41	12.7
$419	250	59.6	35	53	230	20	10.3
$451	167	37.0	----	45	138	29	9.3
$226	133	58.7	----	----	123	10	9.9
$310	191	61.6	----	[1]18	180	11	[2]8.5
$454	247	54.4	----	----	225	22	9.6
$403	137	33.8	----	[1]24	106	32	[2]10.6
$397	192	48.5	----	----	157	35	14.6
$465	155	33.3	----	----	120	35	10.1

[1] Paid but disallowed.
[2] Allowance for renegotiation purposes.

NOTE.—Dollar amounts are stated in thousands.

While the amendment exempting business not exceeding $500,000 from renegotiation was originally proposed by the Under Secretary of War, it was not approved by all of the procurement agencies. Particularly Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, forcefully opposed such an exemption. In a letter sent by him to the Director of the Budget under date of March 17, 1943, Admiral Land said with respect to this amendment:

It appears that there are two principal purposes of the proposed amendment * * *.

2. To exempt from renegotiation contractors whose aggregate volume of contracts with the three Departments and the Commission does not exceed $500,000. This suggested change in the law raises the present exemption amount from $100,000 to $500,000.

The proposed explanatory letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives submits that the proposed amendment "will substantially reduce the number of contractors and subcontractors with whom renegotiation is required. This will greatly facilitate renegotiation with the larger contractors and subcontractors without seriously affecting the principal objectives of the section."

The Commission is in accord with the view of the War and Navy Departments that the administrative burden of renegotiation will be lightened by reducing the number of contractors to be renegotiated. Representatives on behalf of the Commission have testified before committees of the Congress that its principal fear as to doing adequately the job of renegotiation was its possible inability to assemble within reasonable time limits the administrative machinery to cover the entire field of industry subject to renegotiation. It is in sympathy with any practicable and, from the standpoint of policy, sound plans to meet and solve this administrative problem.

The Commission, frankly, does not know by how much in terms of percentages the proposed amendment, through raising the exemption amount, will reduce the volume of renegotiation work. It, of course, has made a tentative survey of its own contractors to seek an answer to this question, and while it finds that the number of contractors per se will be reduced, it cannot determine by how much that reduction will reduce the actual volume of renegotiations to be conducted, because it does not know, for instance, how much dovetailing of contracts there may be between the agencies concerned, or the extent to which the volume of subcontracts will increase the volume of the prime contractor.

Assuming, however, that the effect of the amendment will be to reduce the size of the field to be renegotiated, and thereby to make the task of administration less difficult, the Commission cannot express itself as being in agreement with the last clause of the quoted section of the proposed explanatory letter of transmittal without seriously affecting the principal objectives of the section, or, phrased in different language, it cannot agree that the principal objectives will be served by the amendment. It feels obligated to point out in the following numbered paragraphs certain reasons why the amendment may affect adversely those objectives:

1. Objective, to reduce contract prices thereby effecting savings to the Government, and, more remotely, to establish a control over inflation: Renegotiation enables the Government to supervise costs of production and through the lowering of those costs to bring about price reductions. The amendment not only takes away such supervision over the contractors exempted but also permits the possible excessive costs of the exempted group to influence upward the costs of the nonexempted group.

2. Objective, to increase the total volume of war production. The exempted group represents an appreciable part, both actual and potential, of the Nation's productive capacity. The effect of the amendment may be to curtail production in that the exempted contractors may be tempted to hold their volume within the exempted amount and not to increase their potential volume to its maximum. (This same effect is not felt in any like degree where the limitation is $100,000.) A company, for instance, may be able, from the standpoint of facilities, to handle a volume many times larger than $500,000, and yet, because of its desire to retain excessive profits, will confine the volume to the exempted amount and thereby secure a larger profit than it would on the larger volume which is subject to renegotiation.

3. Objective, equality of treatment: The effect of the amendment will be to discriminate unfairly and inequitably between members of the same industry by exempting a portion thereof from renegotiation; and to permit contractors with war contracts to profit unfairly and inequitably as against other industry without war contracts and who have become war victims.

4. Another objective of the section, although it may be more remote, is to maintain general morale: The exempted companies generally occupy positions of prominence within their own communities. If such companies are permitted to retain excessive profits the effect of the amendment may be to impair the morale of the other groups, whose grass roots are in such communities—such as labor, agriculture, and the home folks of men in active military service.

It might well be that, by reason of these considerations of policy with regard to the amendment, the present limitation of $100,000 should be retained upon the understanding that the price-adjustment boards of each agency voluntarily will set up some form of scheduling whereby contractors will be renegotiated in order of dollar volume, and the contractors with the smaller volume, at the bottom of the list, will be renegotiated on the then basis of administrative capacity.

The matter involved is one of legislative policy. The Maritime Commission does not object to the submission of the amendment to the Congress for its consideration. We feel, however, that the committees having the proposal under consideration may desire to consider the possible adverse effects of the amendment on the objectives of the renegotiation statute.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of the discussion in the House relating to the conference report insofar as it dealt with renegotiation, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs asked that I substantiate the statement which I had made that the effect of this amendment would be a refusal on the part of contractors to accept business beyond the amount of the exemption. This thought was perhaps more clearly expressed by the capable ranking minority member of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. MAAS, when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to testify as to the conclusions which he had reached after having actively participated in the investigation of the Naval Affairs Committee and after hearing all of the testimony received by our committee. When he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MAAS said:

But you said this law had not done a swell job. Of course, you will defeat your own purpose if you raise this to $500,000, because you will have many corporations that will limit their production to $500,000. You will defeat the purpose of the whole thing.

Mr. LYNCH. I feel sorry for the boys in the camps and in the field if the corporations are going to limit their production to $500,000 so as to make sure they will get all they can.

Mr. MAAS. That is already being done. A great many factories are limiting their production to $100,000 so as to escape renegotiation now.

I have discussed this matter with representatives of the War and Navy Departments, who informed me that this is actually the case and is happening right now. Renegotiation is so effective that a manufacturer can make as much profit out of $500,000 of business which is not subject to renegotiation as he can out of $3,000,000 of business which is subject to renegotiation. I am told by representatives of the War Department that contractors are actually resorting to the device of setting up separate partnerships and separate corporations to handle their war contracting business, no one of which will be permitted to go beyond the $500,000 exemption. If this occurs, a scandalous situation will have arisen. Vigorous steps should be taken by the Departments to prevent such use of the corporate fiction.

Naturally many contractors who are not willing to accept business beyond the renegotiable limit do not broadcast their lack of patriotism to the world nor commit it to the written record. There are many instances, however, where they have done so. Thus the Hinkle-Klauss Co., of Fremont, Ohio, wrote Mr. Robert E. Kline, Jr., general counsel of the Naval Affairs Committee, on May 17, 1943, as follows:

We have at various times been requested by the Government to manufacture items differing from our regular production. We have been afraid to venture into any of these new fields as the risk of renegotiation, etc., has been too great compared with the possible small net result to the stockholders.

The Frost Veneer & Plywood Co., of Sheboygan, Wis., wrote Mr. Kline on May 15, 1943:

In regard to business which we have on file, both here at Sheboygan and at Antigo as well, would advise that we are not holding any direct contracts with United States Government agencies. Further we have not accepted or booked any subcontracts for cus-

tomers who are holding direct contracts with the Government agencies. All the orders which we have on file, both at Sheboygan and at Antigo as well, are orders which we have booked on the basis of our costs, and on the basis of our estimated costs, and none of these orders has been booked on the basis of renegotiation. The reason we have booked orders in this way is entirely due to the fact that we are not in position to have Government representatives several months or several years from now advise us that the prices charged on these particular orders are too high, with the result that this business which we are now getting out, and which will show a small profit, will definitely, after renegotiation, mean a loss to us.

It isn't only this question of loss which is serious, but it is the question of these Government orders being subject to renegotiation which is disturbing manufacturers all over the United States today, and especially small manufacturers like ourselves, who are operating on a close margin and just can't afford to have selling prices drastically reduced by renegotiation years after orders have been filled and accounts paid.

The Empire Manufacturing Co., of Winder, Ga., wrote the commanding officer of the Philadelphia quartermaster depot complaining of renegotiation and saying:

In view of the uncertainty and delay caused by renegotiation, it is our purpose to hold our operations within the limit of the nonrenegotiable figure, which we understand is now $100,000 in any calendar year. This will mean that for next year we can only produce for the Government about 33⅓ percent of this year's production.

A more patriotic attitude was taken by the Beach Lumber Co., of Rome, N. Y., which in a letter to Senator DAVID I. WALSH relating to renegotiation said:

Almost on the heels of the Signal Corps investigator came an inquiry from a wire company on a large quantity of the same reels for use with Signal Corps wire. Our immediate reaction was to pass up this business, partly because of the difficulty of obtaining the material, the uncertainty of our ability to retain help, and the diminishing profit factor, plus the implied threat of having our reserves dipped into as a result of renegotiation. This current order is to run for several months and if our fighting forces continue at the present rate and the war terminates before this contract is completed, we may be very considerably damaged from cancelations. Passing up this business probably would have been the best thing from the standpoint of our stockholders but we have accepted it because we know that our wire company customers have no other place to turn for this quantity of reels and our allies, to whom this material is being shipped, might seriously suffer.

Other small industries may not take such a view under similar circumstances.

In the course of my remarks on the floor I referred to that feature of the present renegotiation law which permits certain contractors whose original contracts with foreign governments were taken over by the United States and paid for with public funds of the United States. I made particular reference to such contracts of Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc. That company, for example, had a contract with the British Purchasing Commission for the manufacture of airframes calling for the payment of $31,577,283. The company's costs under this contract were $16,709,689. Advance payments of $12,300,000 were furnished by the British Government and $4,744,000 by the French Government to assist the company in the performance of the contract. Before taxes, Douglas Aircraft made a profit of $14,867,594 on this contract, or 88.99 percent of its cost. Even after the payment of all taxes the company still had profits on this contract alone of $7,345,212, or 43.96 percent of costs. Although a substantial portion of this contract was taken over by the United States and financed with public funds of the United States under the so-called Arnold-Portal agreement, none of the profits on this contract may be recovered under renegotiation, although other contracts between Douglas and the United States are subject to renegotiation.

Another Douglas contract entered into with the British Purchasing Commission and in connection with which the British Purchasing Commission advanced $14,400,000 called for a total contract price of $42,882,206. The costs of Douglas under this contract amounted to $25,393,744, leaving a profit before taxes of $17,488,462, or a profit of 68.97 percent in relation to sales. Even after the payment of taxes, the company still had a profit of $8,602,842, or 33.92 percent in relation to cost. Although a substantial portion of this contract was also taken over by the United States and paid for with United States funds, it, too, is apparently not subject to renegotiation. I do not cite this example with the intention of criticizing the Douglas Aircraft Co. Without question they have supplied our Army and our Navy with superb aircraft, which are immeasurably lightening the burden of the war. I do not believe that they desired to make excessive or undue profits. That they have made them shows inevitably the inability of anyone to tell at the time that these contracts were made what a fair price was.

Douglas Aircraft is not alone in this situation. Empire Ordnance Corporation, a company formed for the express purpose of manufacturing armaments in this war by the notorious Frank Cohen, who has been described by an assistant attorney general of the United States as someone alongside of whom "Get-rich-quick" Wallingford was a piker, realized a profit of 105 percent in relation to cost on contracts for recoil mechanisms originally entered into with the British Government and then taken over by the United States. Bell Aircraft Corporation entered into a contract with the British Purchasing Commission calling for a total contract price of $14,645,980.19. Its costs under this contract alone were $9,473,419.15, leaving a profit before taxes of $5,172,561.04, or 54.60 percent. Even after the payment of taxes on this contract alone, the company realized a profit of $1,109,942.60, or 11.72 percent. On another contract originally entered into with the British Purchasing Commission and subsequently taken over by the United States, Bell Aircraft Corporation received payments of $9,647,163.43. Its profits before taxes on this contract amounted to $3,389,634.60, or 54.17 percent. Even after the payment of taxes, the company had a profit on this contract alone of $910,622.20, or 14.55 percent. Although both of these contracts were taken over in substantial part by the United States, and paid for with public funds, they apparently are not subject to renegotiation.

Still another instance of this is the Remington Arms Co., which received a contract for cartridges from the British Purchasing Commission in the amount of $26,520,182. On this contract the company had profits of $9,380,098, or 54.73 percent of cost before taxes. Although this contract was also a take-over agreement by the United States and the British Purchasing Commission, the excessive profits realized on it are not subject to renegotiation.

I cite these examples, Mr. Speaker, not for the purpose of pointing the finger of criticism at these contractors or with the intention of labeling them as profiteers, but solely for the purpose of demonstrating that the mere fact that there is something called a renegotiation law on the statute books is no guaranty that excessive profits are not being made out of this war. It is not enough that a law be labeled a law to control war profits. Unless that law is sufficiently broad in its scope as to cover all war contracts, whether made with the War Department or any other department of the Government, whether made in the first 3 years of the war or the last 3 years of the war, and unless that law contains sufficient power and authority to recover all such excessive profits, it is a delusion to think or to say that we have done all that we can to eliminate war profiteering. We have a responsibility in this House, Mr. Speaker, to see that a real war-profits control measure is adopted. We have an obligation to the public and to those now serving in our armed forces, who will return to pay the debts which we have incurred in their name and to settle the contracts on which these wild profits have been realized, to see that every possible precaution is taken to prevent such profiteering. I recognize that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, and I propose to submit to the House in the near future legislation designed to accomplish such a purpose.

In the meantime, rather than liberalizing the present law which this bill now does, and in fact making loopholes through which billions of exorbitant profits will probably flow, we should be broadening the provisions of renegotiation so that no excessive profits may accrue to anyone out of this war. To that end I bespeak the serious consideration of the facts I have disclosed by the President and by the Congress.

The Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD,

I include the following letter from an Army private currently stationed at a prisoner of war camp in Nebraska. This letter is typical of hundreds that I have received and I feel sure that it represents the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the members of the armed forces.

The past week has seen the defeat of the soldier-vote bill by the House of Representatives by a majority which is hard to fathom. Perhaps we who are here at this camp are more conscious of the importance of that measure than are the average group of soldiers because we are in daily contact with men who have lost their freedom, their rights as freemen. Too, most of us are men who have had some form of higher education, have worked at jobs which have brought us close to administration of the democratic principle. There are few of us who do not appreciate our right to vote.

But I shall never forget the solemnity with which our group received the news that we, soldiers in the Army of the United States, have received our first telling defeat at the hands of the Government for which we fight and serve. It is so difficult for us to understand what objection there is that keeps us from voting as do the folks back home. Only hazy reference to party lines and undesirable backing of the measure are proffered as reasons for rejection.

I do not know if you will have another chance to vote upon this measure, but if you should, you may know there are 11,000,000 men behind you to echo your "aye."

Sincerely yours,

Private A. A. T.,
P. O. W. Camp, Nebraska.

British Interest in American Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the great interest on the part of the leaders of the British Empire in the political affairs of our Nation. I am of the opinion we are capable of handling our own political affairs without any recommendations from the British Isles. I feel they have plenty to do to look after their own affairs and resent their interference in our affairs. I recommend the reading of the comments of John O'Donnell and Frank C. Waldrop which should prove interesting to the Members of this body.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

INDISPENSABLE TO WHOM?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A British newspaper, the Yorkshire Post, has just come out editorially with the news that Mr. Roosevelt is "an irreplaceable national leader." This is of more than passing interest because the Post is controlled by Anthony Eden, Britain's Minister for Foreign Affairs and potential successor of Mr. Churchill as Prime Minister.

The Post explains to its readers that the indispensable Mr. Roosevelt is "handicapped by the Constitution" in his vital work, but infers that when we have lost enough lives in this war we will relax as to that and let him have his way. Evidently, the Post is not a very close student of Mr. Roosevelt's administration to date.

It seems not to know that the Constitution is a relic of horse and buggy days to Mr. Roosevelt. He has even gone so far as to instruct Congress, in one publicly known instance, to pass a law he wanted, regardless of doubts as to its constitutionality.

That was the occasion of his search for Federal control of the coal-mining industry.

The perfumed junior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOE GUFFEY, introduced the Coal Regulation Act for the President and in time it turned out that, sure enough, the law was no good.

That, for the information of the Yorkshire Post, was neither the first nor the last evidence of Mr. Roosevelt's contempt for the restraints the Constitution puts upon him.

But here is some more of the Post's lesson on American doctrine to its readers:

"The founding fathers saw tyranny as a great danger to be guarded against and they equipped the Constitution with an elaborate system of checks and balances designed to insure that no one organ of the Government should have too much power."

You can bet they saw tyranny as a great danger. And were they right? What, Americans, do you think today about the founding fathers' wisdom? They were the enemies of tyranny in government. And what is more, they wanted the Government of the United States to stay a republic, free of Europe's meddling.

Never in history has there been a man more interested in the welfare of humanity than was Thomas Jefferson, one of our ablest founding fathers.

Jefferson was widely traveled, widely and deeply read, and he lived on the grand scale. There was no selfishness or narrowness in Jefferson's soul.

But Jefferson knew that as a public officer of the United States he was not the owner of the public's welfare. He was just a trustee, honored by the Nation when it hired him to administer public office.

He considered himself neither infallible, nor indispensable. Nor did he ever forget that as a public servant, even in the Presidency, he was dealing with other people's lives and property.

He recognized the duty to govern according to law and in the interest of America first.

In the matter of the Presidency, he had some sharp words to say which only now begin to have strong significance to easy-going citizens of this country. He put those words in a letter (December 20, 1787) to James Madison:

"A Galloman or an Angloman (pro-French or pro-English President) will be supported by the Nation he befriends. If once elected, and at a second or third election outvoted by one or two votes, he will pretend false votes, foul play, hold possession of the reins of government * * *

"The election of a President of America some years hence will be much more interesting by certain nations of Europe than ever the election of a King of Poland was." (Jefferson had in mind how Russia and Sweden fought to see which would influence the elections of Poland's kings—in the end Poland was ruined.)

And then he remarked that, in order to disinterest European nations in our affairs, we should change Presidents constantly, so that "no foreign power, nor domestic party, will waste their blood and money to elect a person who must go out at the end of a short period."

Jefferson was able to see ahead. He gave us fair warning, and here today is the danger he foresaw, focused for plain view, in the Yorkshire Post.

Incidentally, Jefferson said some things of interest concerning good neighborly relations with Latin America in a letter (August 4, 1820) to William Short:

"I hope [to see] a cordial fraternization among all the American nations, and * * * their coalescing in an American system of policy totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe.

"The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other. * * *

"I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe.

"I wish to see this coalition begun. * * * I should rejoice to see the fleets of Brazil and the United States riding together as brethren of the same family, and pursuing the same object."

Same object being, of course, as he stated it above, a policy "totally independent of and unconnected with Europe."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 7, 1944]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Our worthy statesmen and distinguished students of international affairs are a befuddled and goggle-eyed band these days, as they grope around trying to figure out what good old Pal Joey has concealed up his Soviet sleeve.

There is something touching and poignant in their childlike feeling of hurt surprise. After all, here was good old Uncle Stalin, the jolly old pipe-smoking host, always willing to throw a vodka and caviar party at the drop of a lend-lease hat, tipping over the parlor table and giving the trusting innocents a boot in the pants—accusing the British of conniving with Hitler for a separate peace, giving a hot foot to Pal Wendell Willkie, pulling 16 republics and 16 ambassadors and 16 foreign policies out of the Russian puzzle box, and then taking a rousing slap at the Vatican. And all this to the great embarrassment of the butts of his Slavic humor, those two ever-trusting colleagues, Brothers Roosevel and Churchill, whom Pal Stalin has made into a couple of diplomatic cuckolds and thereby providing the comic relief and belly laughs in this greatest of global tra_edies.

But if the Russians have bewildered and bedeviled the master minds of the New Deal international thinking, pause for a moment and meditate on the utter confusion into which Britain has thrown the New Deal's political strategists on the home front, in particular the palace guard running F. D. R.'s fourth-term campaign.

If there was one thing that the Roosevelt clique most emphatically did not want at this stage of the reelection campaign, it was the demand from the foreign press of Britain that the citizens of this Republic reelect Franklin Delano Roosevelt next November 7.

Such soothing flattery would be most welcome if expressed privately in the bosom of the family, but to roar it out in authoritative English publications puts the New Dealers in a dither. In fact some of the Roosevelt boys are hinting that there is a sinister plot behind it all and that the plot wasn't planned by any friends of F. D. R. and perhaps, they whisper, the frost really is on the pumpkin of Roosevelt-Churchill friendship, that some of those yarns of a Roosevelt-Churchill disagreement at Cairo and Tehran may have definite basis of fact.

Well, what's happened in the last 10 days? First of all, out comes Anthony Eden's Yorkshire Post with the declaration that F. D. R. is an "irreplaceable national leader" and be-

moans the fact that in this United States Presidential campaign they note in Yorkshire a "rising tide of selfish partisanship and acrimonious political controversy."

Hard on the heels of these bold declarations from the paper controlled by Britain's foreign secretary comes the fourth-term endorsement of F. D. R. from the influential, authoritative, government-supported organ of the established Church of England, the Church of England Newspaper.

This mouthpiece of the government-supported religious group goes even farther than Eden's Yorkshire Post. It not only calls for the reelection of F. D. R. but by name singles out New York's Republican Governor Dewey for direct attack and blasts him as "a statesman whose belief in international solidarity is a grudging concession to the pressure of events."

Now this is what the New Deal political thinkers most emphatically did not want from Britain at this time. They think that it will hurt the fourth-term drive and has placed ammunition in the hands of F. D. R.'s political opponents. The attack on Governor Dewey they think unfortunate and also this paragraph from the editor of the Church of England newspaper:

"The old American isolationism is dead. History has killed it, but history has not killed the desire and the will of isolation which in the post-war situation will take the form of narrow, unimaginative, reluctant concessions to new demands. Governor Dewey, who is tipped for the Republican nomination, is such a man."

We've heard two ingenious explanations of this sudden and unprecedented entry by authoritative organs of Britain's Government into the United States 1944 Presidential campaign. One cancels the other out, but that's the way things go here in the Capital. We submit both for consideration and draw no conclusions:

The first, from an angrily puzzled fourth-term strategist, is based on the proposition that Churchill's conservative government through their controlled newspapers are now giving F. D. R. the old "kiss of death."

The assumption in this case is that the British master minds that ordered the F. D. R. fourth-term endorsement, well realized that their act would set up political repercussions adverse to F. D. R. in the United States. They "planned it that way" to quote an old New Deal campaign slogan.

And the reason for this, according to theory 1, is that Churchill and F. D. R., since Teheran, no longer agree on policies with respect to Russia's immediate ever-expanding territorial demands in Europe—and the still-to-be-disclosed demands in the direction of Norway and the Persian Gulf, and toward gateways to India. Conservative Imperialist Churchill still quotes Kipling and the bear that walked like a man is still the bear of yesteryear, even if he now waves a hammer and sickle.

The other explanation applies only to Anthony Eden's Yorkshire Post endorsement of the fourth-term candidate. In this case, we were told the British Foreign Minister was merely trying to repay a political debt, owed since back in '38.

Eden had then quit the Chamberlain cabinet and Europe was a year from the outbreak of war. According to this yarn, a big-shot executive of the National Manufacturers Association was invited to the White House and F. D. R. was supposed to have suddenly popped the question:

"Now, why don't you fellows do something for me? I think it would be a perfectly fine idea if your organization would invite young Anthony Eden to come over here and make a speech."

This was at the time when the groundwork was being laid for the visit, 6 months later, of Britain's King and Queen.

The President's request was carried back by the White House visitor and there was a loud uproar. Eden of course was then hellbent for intervention on the Continent and there was a powerful group in the American organization that didn't want him to come to this country under their auspices and to use their organization as a sounding board.

But an invitation went to Eden. He accepted. Then came another uproar in the N. M. A. and the word was passed around that the invitation was unauthorized, but had been sent in a routine way by an employee who never thought Eden would accept. But Eden did accept.

Eden also accepted £2,000 for expenses and when his ship reached quarantine in New York Harbor he was confronted with some N. M. A. representatives who read his prepared speech, and promptly went up in the air because of its interventionist belligerency. The Eden speech was watered down and the call to arms (United States) considerably muted.

Anthony Eden spent the night at the White House and his American reception, planned by F. D. R., gave him tremendous political power and prestige back in England, which he promptly cashed in on. Hence, the return favor of indorsing F. D. R.'s fourth-term drive in the Yorkshire Post.

You hear so many unbelievable things in this Capital—and practically all of them are true.

Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 11, marks the birthday of one of America's really great men, Thomas Alva Edison. This Congress and the President have honored this great American by issuing a proclamation designating February 11, 1944, as Thomas Alva Edison Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

Thomas Alva Edison, through his more than 1,100 inventions, is helping the United States and our allies to win this war. Not through mere inspiration but in the very real sense of extra fire power and faster speed on the fighting front and more and better production at home.

Mr. Edison has been called, and rightly, the father of American industry, and surely none of us doubt that it is American production which is now turning the tide toward certain victory.

It is not enough to refer to Mr. Edison merely as an inventor, the greatest one in history. It is not enough merely to associate him with the electric light, or the phonograph, or the motion-picture camera, or the storage battery.

True, all of these and hundreds more are the products of his ingenious mind. But to fully appreciate the influence of Edison on America's gigantic war effort today, we must look beyond any recitation of his inventions and look to their effect in industrial use.

Wherever you go, along our enormous production front, you will find Thomas A. Edison—be it far below ground in a mine, aboard a fast freight train, on a ship ploughing the seas, or in any war plant you would choose to name.

To give here a detailed list of Edison's contributions to each individual industry would be an almost endless, but amazing recital. It is a fact that Edison's inventions, placed at the disposal of other men, actually created some of our most war-vital industries.

It would be difficult to name any industry that is not more efficient and more productive because of Thomas Alva Edison.

What is true in industry, is likewise true on our fighting fronts. Every American plane, ship, or tank is a better, tougher piece of fighting equipment because of Thomas Alva Edison.

Merely because his birthday occurs in the month with two other American heroes, the life and deeds of Thomas Alva Edison should not be forgotten nor consigned to obscurity. Accordingly, I intend to initiate legislation to establish February 11 permanently as a national day of celebration in honor of his birth.

Southern Forest Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a paper presented to the Southern Forestry Conference in Atlanta, Ga., on January 20, by Mr. J. H. Allen, who is one of the great industrialists of my State. He is an authority of national standing on timber and pulpwood matters. He has insisted that such legislation as he has recommended in his paper is absolutely necessary if we are to continue to make progress in southern forest development. Here is an important field for post-war planning now.

Let us realize that by spending only 10 cents per acre in timber farm management and protection we can produce on the 100,000,000 available acres of land in the South fiber-weight equivalent to 100,000,000 bales of cotton. With all our power and all our intelligence today we are utilizing only about 6,000,000 cords of wood in the paper industry. It is possible to raise this amount to 10,000,000 cords more, and find a market for it right here in the United States. If we finish this cordwood into paper products in the South, it is possible that we might spend in labor in the South, in the production of wood, pulp, and paper, and converted products, some $15 a cord or $150,000,000 more than we are now spending. We cannot let this

question go by without seriously considering the suggested plan for action:

WHAT LEGISLATION WE NEED FOR FORESTRY IN THE SOUTH

I want to make it clear and definite in the beginning that this paper is being read for the purpose of making my own personal suggestions as to legislation, but not with an intent of criticizing the Federal, State, or industrial management of forest problems. I fully realize that, if we are to make progress, we must place Federal cooperative responsibility where it belongs, State responsibility where it belongs, as well as industrial and individual ownership responsibility where it belongs, with the purpose in view of coordinating the forces to the end that we go forward all together with the firm determination to have better timber crops in the South, and to have these crops continuous, generation in and generation out.

In the term "legislation" I want it understood that I consider not only Congress and the State legislatures as legislative bodies, but also any Federal agency that has the right to issue directives. A directive now is synonymous with an act of Congress.

FORESTRY IS A PART OF AGRICULTURE

I consider the most important legislation to be passed is the defining by Congress, or, let us say, the classifying by Congress, of forestry as agriculture. Raising trees as continuous crops needs more protection now than does any grain crop we are planting, for if the raising of trees is not classified as tree farming, or if new crops are not raised, we shall simply cut off the present stand of timber in the United States and in a century or so we shall have a Sahara Desert out of our now present forest areas. This is unthinkable, but it, too, is unbelievable that there are some forces in Congress who have neglected giving to the tree farmer the same legal rights as to the marketing of trees and the curtailment of harvesting trees that has been given to the grain farmers. The naval stores crowd has brought about the classification of their industry in a satisfactory manner. It has been helpful to them, but it will be even more helpful to the pulpwood producer and the log producer. This legislation should be passed.

NATION-WIDE FOREST-FIRE PROTECTION

I think Congress should put up the money to protect all of our woodland area of the United States against fire. I think that, if the Federal Government fails to do this, each Southern State should agree to State-wide fire protection over its forest areas. If the State fails to do this, I believe it should be the obligation of every tree-raising county in the South to have county-wide fire protection. If the county should fail to do this, I think we should have forest-improvement districts whereby the landowners would go in together and arrange the funds to protect their own improvement area.

We have all driven down the highways in the South, and have seen hundreds of fires in our time, and have driven by without notifying anyone or, in fact, without having anyone to notify that the fire was spreading wildly and should be put out. There are no fire departments to whom you can send this message. Millions of dollars of valuable timber has been burned up in the South in the past 20 years on account of this lack of fire protection. This constitutes a legislative neglect that will stand as a monument to the ignorance of those in charge of protective legislation. The Pacific Northwest has done a grand job of protecting their woodland areas, because they have large timber to protect, whilst we in the South have more trees than they, but they are not so visible, nor the value is not so apparent; therefore we have slumbered through the fires and have let the wealth waste. This, of course, should be stopped.

CEILING PRICES

I think that the O. P. A. should have the same ceiling price on 128 cubic feet of fine pine wood at any southern shipping point as is the ceiling price for a cord of black pine or jack pine or spruce timber at Watertown, N. Y., or at any other point in the North. We certainly should not have a lower ceiling price for wood in the South than is paid in Canada for wood delivered into the United States. This is certainly true as long as wood is such a critical material and is so badly needed in the war effort.

PAYMENT OF TAXES

I would recommend to the Southern States that a law be passed whereby a landowner could set aside acreage for a term of years for the purpose of raising timber with the privilege of not paying taxes on these lands until the contract time is up or until the timber is cut, and the taxes accrued could be paid out of a severance tax as the timber was cut and removed. I think that this law should also provide that, if a concern wanted to borrow 10 cents an acre per year on these lands, the money to be used for fire protection and forest management expense during the time the land was set aside without income, he should be permitted to do it through some agency with the understanding that this 10 cents per acre per year loan could also be repaid simultaneously with the payment of taxes out of the severance tax, at the time of the marketing of the timber taken out of said land.

THE GENERAL CURTAILMENT OF HARVESTING TIMBER SHOULD BE PERMISSIBLE UNDER LAW

The timber farmer is, in a large measure, dependent upon the industry that buys the logs, wood, poles, ties, or forest products. If these industries operate at a loss through overproduction, very little can be paid for stumpage. Stumpage will be affected. There should be legislation enacted that would permit those producing wood to curtail their production jointly in order that, in the case of pulpwood, no more pulpwood was cut in any given year than was necessary to fill the profitable demands for pulp, paper, or other forest timber products. The paper mills themselves should be permitted to sit in a curtailment agreement with the wood producers, with their State conservation departments, and with some Federal agency, to the end that no more young timber should be cut during any one given year than could be sold at a fair replacement value of the timber cut and sold.

If, after the war, there is a tremendous overproduction of pulp and paper without some protection, we shall, here in the South, produce six or seven million cords of wood yearly and in competition with each other, sell that wood into the markets of the United States and the world at a loss. Then, in that event, we shall have practiced forestry in vain.

ANTIDUMPING

I feel that no treaty should be made with any foreign nation that will permit them to ship wood, pulp, and paper or any other forest product into the United States in competition with our own industries who fail to pay their own foreign employees the same scale of wages we pay our labor. I don't think that any other nation should enjoy free access to our markets which have been built around an economic structure that gives to our labor enough money to live on a high plane, without protecting this high plane of living by a very high tariff against the offending foreign nation.

Russia and the Scandinavian countries, and Canada itself can keep our paper market and our forest products and our labor broke for the next half century, unless we protect ourselves against their oppressive inroads. They must adopt our plane of living in those foreign countries and pay their men accordingly or not dominate our own trade which constitutes our own highway of commerce over which we should always maintain, let us say, police control.

COOPERATION

In closing, let me say that the pulp and paper mills of the South and the lumber plants of the South, the naval stores industry, are as a rule managed by fine, capable men who live close with those of us who are raising trees for sale. Our interests are identical. The sugar refiner is interested in the farmer who is raising beets. My company happens to be in both lines of this business. We raise trees and we harvest the trees and sell the products. We see both sides of this question, and we have no criticism to make of either. The purpose of writing this letter is to deposit with you suggestions in the general pool of forest thinking, hoping that some thought expressed here may lead to some form of betterment in timber supply for the immediate war effort, and for the future needs of the pulpwood and paper consumer of the United States and the men who want to make a living in the labor ranks of the paper industry, and to the bankers security who wants to make money out of the forest, who hires his money out to the paper companies who are harvesting and processing our forest areas.

Forestry, as I have often stated, is a great commercial ocean whose waves touch all the shores of commerce. Therefore, we are all interested in the constructive handling of this development, and, if we will resolve to be cooperative in our efforts, the South will soon have a recurring fiber crop that will be much greater in weight, shortly, than the cotton crop, and the cotton made will, too, be greater.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 4, 1944:

DON'T LIQUIDATE THE H. O. L. C.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was formed at the bottom of the depression to prevent wholesale foreclosure of mortgaged homes. It was eminently successful. Private lenders, with defaulted mortgages on their hands and faced with a disorganized real-estate market on which they could not sell foreclosed properties except at a great loss, were more than glad to be bailed out by the Government's H. O. L. C.

Thousands of home owners were helped through the crisis, and thousands of lenders were relieved of defaulting mortgages. Most of the lenders took some loss. It was also expected that the H. O. L. C. would lose money, that the taxpayers would have to assume the deficit from sour loans, perhaps up to a billion dollars. H. O. L. C. was not formed to take over the safest loans; it was formed to take over the shaky ones. Despite this, the H. O. L. C. is now operating at a profit, is absorbing losses on the sale of foreclosed houses, and there is reason to believe that the accumulated net loss of $65,242,431 may be turned into a profit by June 3, 1952—

a profit instead of an expected billion-dollar loss.

Since 1936 no new loans have been made. The H. O. L. C. has been in the process of gradual liquidation. It has reduced its original $3,484,000,000 investment to $1,632,000,000; its outstanding bonds from $3,489,453,550 to $1,729,481,800; reduced its personnel by 81.7 percent (from 20,811 to 3,810), its annual administrative expenses by 72 percent; it is still further reducing these items now. Of the nearly 200,000 properties acquired, 92.2 percent have been sold. The accumulated loss on these to June 30, 1943, was $255,080,636, but income from loans and rentals reduced the loss to $65,242,431.

Under the original law creating it, the H. O. L. C. has 8 more years to run. John H. Fahey, Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner and head of the H. O. L. C., insists that the H. O. L. C. must be allowed to continue for the next 8 years, if it is to liquidate in an orderly manner with minimum loss to the taxpayer.

Some private lending institutions, however, have been urging Congress to force immediate liquidation. Conditions are far better than in 1933. Building is restricted. Homes are in demand in many war-boomed communities. Rentals are no problem, and sales, if houses are foreclosed, are quick and may be profitable. Many a private lender who was glad to have the Government bail him out from 1933 to 1936 would like now to get back some of the business he willingly dumped in the H. O. L. C.'s lap in the period of financial foul weather.

There are lenders who would like to buy up the best H. O. L. C. loans, but let the Government keep the bad ones—thus letting the taxpayers take the maximum beating. The majority of lending institutions are not like this, Mr. Fahey tells us; they do not want to profit at public expense.

The H. O. L. C. makes a strong argument in its report to Congress. It contends that, if private lending institutions are allowed to buy the sound mortgages, from which the H. O. L. C. derives its income, the H. O. L. C. will have to continue its organization all over the country to service its remaining unprofitable business. Or it will have to sell the bad loans at a great discount. Either way, the taxpayer would be gouged so that some private lending institutions might make money.

The Journal has opposed, and still opposes, hasty liquidation of the H. O. L. C. It would mean leaving the public holding the bag.

It is the way of all Government agencies to hang on as long as possible. Agencies mean jobs. The H. O. L. C., doubtless, could operate with fewer persons and lower expenses, but its record is pretty good—especially good compared to some of the other depression-born Federal agencies.

Congress should not force the H. O. L. C. to liquidate now for the benefit of a small pressure group.

Expansion of Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting, instructive, and able address by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] before the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action. The speech was delivered in New York on January 14 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I am glad to be here this evening to discuss the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, S. 1161, proposing an expansion of our present Social Security System.

I am sorry that my esteemed friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, could not be with us on this occasion. I am merely substituting for him. No man in the United States deserves more credit than the distinguished Senator from New York for his contributions to our social progress and for his fine record of progressive labor legislation during the past 20 years. In this field, he is by all standards without a peer, and we are always glad of an opportunity to acknowledge his leadership and to express our appreciation of his great work. What I will have to say here tonight will be in complete accord with his views, I am sure.

Many great changes in our economic life have taken place during the past half century. During that short span of years, our country has been transformed from an agricultural economy into the richest and most powerful industrial nation in the world. These changes have created serious economic and social problems and hazards for our people which could not have been foreseen in the formative period of our national life. Because of defects which have developed in the operation of our economic system, we have had alternating periods of great prosperity and periods of widespread unemployment.

Even in prosperous times, large sections of our population are unable to enjoy a decent scale of living. So, we have with us in good times and in bad times constant problems of unemployment and want. In the depression of the early thirties, we set up temporary programs of relief and reemployment, and later in 1935 we enacted a limited system of social security. That limited system has more than justified its worth so we are today considering its expansion. The great majority in this country have come to feel that a broader and more comprehensive social-security system is not only a needed protection for our people and the improvement of our society, but will have a balancing influence in the operation of our whole economic system.

Earlier this week, in his message to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Roosevelt said:

"The one supreme objective for the future * * * can be summed up in one word: 'Security.'

"And that means not only physical security * * *. It means also economic security, social security, moral security. * * *

"Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want."

The President has expressed thoughts that lie uppermost in the minds of all Americans. The sacrifice we are making in lives and treasure is conclusive proof that our people are determined to realize both of these freedoms now, for themselves and for their children.

Our people have refused to succumb to the blandishments of Hitler and his brand of fascism. Just as surely, their demands for real improvement in our society will not be put off by vague promises of action in the distant future. Some way must be found to make an economy work so as to give the average man and woman some measure of security. A system which permits a third of the people to suffer long periods of destitution and want cannot be justified. The most profound analysts of the causes of the war are in general agreement upon one fundamental point—political freedom, won in many lands after the last war was not actually accompanied by safeguards to assure economic freedom. Men were seduced into the doctrines of the Fascists and the Nazis by the desperation of their economic slavery.

This is the real significance of the President's call for an economic bill of rights to parallel the political Bill of Rights which we have had for a long time. Note that in the President's economic bill of rights, economic security—social security—is prominent among the essentials.

Our country, as I have pointed out, has already been experiencing a more or less restricted system of social security. Of necessity, in launching that program in 1935, it was considered wise to make a cautious beginning. The administrative problems of such a new program were serious, and we lacked the requisite experience. The actual operation of our Social Security Act during the past 8 years, however, has demonstrated both the necessity and feasibility of a broader social-security program.

That is what we are now seeking to accomplish through the legislation pending in the Senate and the House. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, proposes to expand our present limited system into a broad insurance coverage, giving the American family protection throughout life against the common economic hazards occasioned by the loss of income through unemployment, temporary or permanent disability, death of the breadwinner, or old age, or resulting from the high costs of medical services.

This bill, sponsored by Senator WAGNER and myself in the Senate and a like bill by Congressman DINGELL in the House, extends the benefits of the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to about 15,000,000 citizens now excluded, such as farmers, farm workers, small businessmen, domestic servants, professionals, and employees of nonprofit institutions. It expands the present limited system into a truly national social-insurance system. It increases the old-age benefit allowances for workers and their families. It provides substantially the same benefits for those who must retire because of permanent disability as for those who must retire for old age. It liberalizes the benefits for the unemployed and provides the same benefits for those who lose their wages because of temporary disability or because of maternity. It welds the employment offices into a national system, equipped to serve the needs of unemployment insurance and of the labor market. It protects those who are in the armed forces, by giving them wage credits for the period of their national service. It provides the best medical care and hospitalization our Nation has to offer, and at the same time, protects the free selection of physician and hospital by the patient, as well as the free choice of patients by the doctor and hospital. Finally, it provides for an improved system of public assistance for all needy persons.

Of course, neither Senator WAGNER nor I started with any assumption that our bill is perfect—the last word. On the contrary, we said at the outset that we submit it for discussion, criticism, and improvement. No doubt it can and will be improved. We welcome all constructive criticism.

This is not the occasion, however, to examine the bill in detail or to debate its technical features. Nor do I need to exhort you in order to win your support for action to strengthen social security for America. Our interest here is to consider what needs to be done, in a practical way, to win public support, and to defeat those who are obstructing progress. We will be in a position to make progress, I believe, if we gain a clear understanding of these forces of opposition—who they are and how they may be met.

First, let me dismiss those who identify social security measures with the present administration, and oppose it out of blind, partisan, political opposition. Such people stoop to any means, fair or foul—they simply must be fought on whatever ground they choose. They and their methods can and must be ruthlessly exposed.

Then there are those ultraconservatives who fear and oppose any change, especially such change as would improve the stability and economic freedom of the common man and make him and his family more secure. We know from our own recent history that these reactionaries fought against the establishment of old-age pensions; they fought against income taxes; public utility regulation, antimonopoly laws; child-labor laws, etc. Collective bargaining was to them plain socialism and communism, and it still is. They opposed legislation for the protection of widows and orphans. When 16,000,000 workers were tramping the streets in search of work in the late depression, they considered Federal protection and relief for them as unconstitutional. They could think of no better remedy than heavy loans to the bankers at the top and soup kitchens and apple-vending licenses for those at the bottom. They are the same element who fought the workmen's compensation laws and contested every attempt to alleviate the plight of the oppressed and the exploited in every period of our history.

This reactionary opposition is asserting that the proposed legislation is socialistic, and that it is revolutionary. These are devastating terms. In the minds of innocent people, they are likely to create great apprehension. The fact of the matter is that this bill is revolutionary only in the same sense that all progressive legislation when first proposed is revolutionary. Each provision of the Bill of Rights was revolutionary when adopted. So were many of the great advances in thought, in science, and in industry through which man has advanced to his present high stage of civilization.

The real question, of course, is not whether this proposal is revolutionary. Rather, the question is: Is it sound legislation, will it act as a stabilizing force in meeting the serious hazards and emergencies of our economy, and will it contribute to the national security and welfare?

These are the questions which we, as sponsors of the legislation, asked ourselves before we introduced the bill. It would never have been brought to light in the Congress of the United States if the answer to these questions had been in the negative.

We also have those who oppose social security because their only concern is the momentary cost which social insurance may place on them. They do not look ahead; they do not think in long-view terms; they do not see that the financial interests and success of every citizen is interlocked with the wealth, vigor, and security of the entire Nation. They do not see that such a program will act as a cushion or stabilizing force in our economy. All they see is that the first impact of social security is a tax or a contribution exacted from them or their business. They fail to see the ultimate benefit they gain through the stabilizing effect on the Nation.

Then there are others who rarely raise their voices against social security as such. Their opposition takes another form. They get the State legislatures to enact "experience rating" provisions. Then, having gotten the employer financially interested in reducing benefit payments—because his tax rate is reduced if the benefits are reduced for his former employees—they bring about the restriction of the workers' benefits in many ways. As a result, the employer's contribution rate goes down and unemployed workers fail to get benefits. At the same time, through experience rating, contributions fall off in good times—precisely when the trust funds ought to be building up against the great needs of bad times.

Another subtle way of sabotaging unemployment insurance is to keep the system on a State-by-State basis. Many employers consequently fight nationalization of the system, although they know that this is essential if it is to be really effective. They argue, of course, in terms of "States' rights," "preserving the Federal form of government," and they rail against "regimentation," "Federal bureaucracy," etc. They give every reason except the real one—namely, that through the State legislatures they can control the contributions. The State-rights doctrine has permitted corporations in many States to block proper legislation protecting workers from silicosis or other industrial diseases and from recognizing such diseases as industrial hazards justifying compensation.

A side issue, but a very important one, concerns the identity of the front men in this opposition campaign. Some of them are administrators of State unemployment agencies and are more concerned with their own personal jobs than with the public benefit or advantage to be secured by the systems they administer. Some of them appear to be largely responsible for having induced chambers of commerce, associated industries, business institutes and similar organizations to support experience rating, and to oppose nationalization of unemployment insurance.

A parallel to this particular attack against social security is to be seen in the move to continue freezing the pay-roll tax for old-age and survivors insurance. The technical arguments that are used are different; but the underlying motivations are the same. Take note of the fact that the same people, the same names, the same lobbying organizations come up in the freeze-the-old-age-tax campaign that you meet in the battle against a stronger system of unemployment insurance.

There is also another class opposing social security because they have vested interests which they fear would be encroached upon by a comprehensive national system. There are many examples of such groups. One of the loudest and most active is the so-called Insurance Economics Society of America, a lobbying organization created by certain accident and health insurance companies. They are opposed to providing disability protection for the wage earners of America. It might limit their field of operations. And they, who, according to their own reports, operate for the most part at a 33–50 percent overhead cost, argue against social insurance on the ground that it would be inefficiently and expensively administered by the Federal Government.

Finally, there are those who oppose our proposals for medical care benefits through social insurance. They have precipitated a campaign of opposition which, for its size and vigor and lack of scruple, wins all the prizes. It deserves special attention because the subject is new to many people and the issues have been confused.

Gallup and other polls taken throughout the country have proven that our people are for health insurance; the principal labor organizations have endorsed it. Hundreds of able, socially minded physicians, who have taken the time to familiarize themselves with the proposed legislation, see in it at least an outline of a sound and practical solution for the serious problem of medical care confronting the Nation for many years. They discern in it potential benefits not only for the welfare of the Nation and the millions of our citizens, but for the medical profession as well.

Take, for example, the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc. It is composed of leading practitioners and distinguished members of the medical faculties of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and other leading medical schools throughout the Nation. This committee endorsed the medical features of our bill last summer and recently issued a report of constructive criticisms obviously the result of long and painstaking study.

Or take another example. In a radio address on September 21, 1943, Dr. Ernst P. Boas, chairman of the executive committee of the Physicians Forum for the Study of Medical Care, a leading practitioner of New York and assistant professor of clinical medicine at Columbia University, likewise endorsed the bill, saying:

"In this country at this time a compulsory insurance plan seems to me to be most suitable. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill forms a good groundwork on which to plan a better system of medical care."

A few weeks ago the Physicians Forum issued its full report, opening with the statement that at a meeting on October 18, 1943, the Physicians Forum approved the general features of the medical section of S. 1161. They continued, saying, and I quote:

"A number of changes in the bill are necessary to assure that the medical benefits will provide the best quality of medical service."

And they proceeded to suggest some real improvements.

These and other groups have spoken in unmistakable language against the deficiencies in our present system of medical care distribution. The fact that numerous kindhearted physicians render services to poor patients free of charge is indeed a great credit to them, but it is no credit to a state of society that makes it necessary for self-supporting people to accept charity. It is also unfair to the doctors. The present system of buying medical care according to mere individual ability to pay is wholly repugnant to the American way of life.

Since voluntary methods heretofore employed in the United States have proven unavailing, the logical solution is a system of compulsory social insurance. In this connection, it might be worth mentioning that 10 years ago, the committee on the costs of medical care, whose minority report was adopted by the American Medical Association, pointed out that if insurance is adopted, it had better be compulsory.

It is therefore quite astounding that a powerful group has now been organized to combat this effort to improve the distribution of medical care. The spearhead of the movement is the national physicians' committee for the extension of medical service, located in Chicago, Ill. It is flooding the country with pamphlets, leaflets, and press releases filled with misinterpretations, deliberate falsifications and vilifications of the bill. The committee seems to be well financed. It is stated on good authority that pharmaceutical firms are contributing liberally to its funds. The reason is clear. A national system of medical care and hospitalization insurance would increase the number who go to a doctor instead of merely buying patent medicines. Uninformed, well-intentioned doctors are also being induced to contribute to the fund to carry on this campaign to defeat the bill.

Time will not permit me to lay before you even a fraction of the unjust, unfair, and false assertions made by the national physicians' committee in its literature dealing with our bill. A medical-care insurance system, paid for by the insured and their employers, they label as "free medicine," "state medicine," or "socialized medicine." They tell us that our bill would usher in "totalitarian state control"; that it would "place in the hands of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, the power and authority to hire doctors and establish rates of pay for doctors," all of which, of course, is pure fabrication, as a careful reading of the bill will show. They also charge that the Surgeon General would "determine arbitrarily what hospitals or

clinics may provide service to patients." And to cap the climax, here is another gem among these falsehoods. I quote:

"An individual will be forced to accept the physician assigned to him subject to the Surgeon General's selection or disposition, whether the physician is to the patient's liking or not."

These distortions and falsifications are the handiwork of the same leaders of organized medicine who attacked in similar fashion the findings of the committee on the costs of medical care in 1932. These findings so viciously attacked were the work of a committee headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, a past president of the American Medical Association, and one time Secretary of the Interior in President Hoover's Cabinet, hardly the kind of a man who would lead our country into communism.

I will not take the time to review the obvious answers to these attacks on S. 1161. I want to emphasize that though many of the ablest men in medicine support our proposals, a considerable part of the rank and file in the profession is blindly following the lead of this group known as the National Physicians' Committee, organized for the express purpose of defeating the bill. However, signs are not wanting to prove that the rank and file of physicians in this country are worried about the dangerous road being pursued by these reactionary leaders in the profession.

Conservative and reactionary stands are not strange in any profession. All down through history, we have witnessed struggles like this to preserve the status quo. In the medical profession, those in control have fought nearly every great medical pioneer just as they are today fighting health insurance. What matters even more to this discussion today is the kind of a battle these opponents of progress are fighting.

Organized medicine is not fighting alone. It has linked itself with the leading opponents of social security. It has tied up with certain vested interests (like the Insurance Economics Society, mouthpiece of certain accident and health insurance companies); with certain professional, commercial, and industrial organizations which are flooding the country with dishonest and vicious literature designed to deceive the public and defeat the bill. Indeed, it might almost be said that the shoe has gotten on to the other foot. Those older opponents of social security who have been with us a long time are now using the horror stories of the National Physicians' Committee to spearhead their own attacks on social security as a whole and are holding up the charges of "political medicine," "socialism," "communism," and the like as grounds for public opposition to the entire social-security program. This is an important reason why a realistic political action program should take hold of the situation and ruthlessly expose the chicanery in this controversy over the medical-service features of this bill.

As part of the general program of public education, it is tremendously important for the public to know that social security under a broad insurance system can be had at a price which is within the means of everyone. It is important for the public to know that their medical care needs can be met with the fullest and most modern methods. And, they should be told how the stand-patters are not only opposing health insurance but are misrepresenting the facts and using deliberate distortions to oppose the whole social-security program so essential to the national welfare.

The day has come for the public to organize its forces for this fight and spare no effort in achieving the goal of real social security for all. The public must be aroused and enlightened. Thus far, only the voices of reactionary elements in the medical profession and in industry have been heard. We must not let these partisan attacks shut from our eyes the true needs of our country.

The time to enact this legislation is now, while our millions of men and women are earning good wages and while wage deductions constitute no hardship.

We do not know what lies ahead of us in the immediate future. We know that great danger may develop. We must be ready in that uncertain post-war period with this expanded and extended social-security system to take care of all possible eventualities. We were caught unprepared for war in 1941, and we know what that has cost us. Let us not find ourselves unprepared for peace. It might be even more disastrous. S. 1161 offers a rallying point for concerted progressive political action by our citizens in all walks of life.

"It is our duty now," said President Roosevelt in his message to Congress, "to begin to lay the plans * * * for the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content * * * if some fraction of our people is ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and insecure."

The President has asked the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights.

"Many of these problems," he said, "are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation."

Our social-security bill, S. 1161, is one of these. The great need now is that groups, like the Committee for Political Action, should bring home to the American people in all walks of life, the importance of raising their voices and using their ballots in demanding congressional action for real and comprehensive social security in our time.

Louis Bromfield's Prediction of a Famine in February

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the York Gazette and Daily dealing with the month of hunger predicted by Louis Bromfield last August. The article is very interesting and instructive.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND FANCY

We don't think Louis Bromfield, novelist and Roosevelt-hater, is particularly hungry at this time, but we think it is a very good idea that he should be subjected to a little forced-feeding. The press of the country should hold the spoon. And the diet should be words—his own.

We think also that the Fascist editors of the Reader's Digest should be made to sit by and eat the pages of that lousy little magazine while Bromfield eats his words.

What's this all about? Well, draw your belts tighter, children, and we'll tell you all about it.

And before you go any further, you might suggest to the good wife cooking your breakfast that she can afford to put an extra egg in the pan because you'll be a bit hungry by the time you finish this. Eggs are only 35 cents a dozen.

This is the month of the big famine—Louis Bromfield's February. It was about this big famine to come in this month of February that Louis Bromfield wrote in the Reader's Digest last August.

This is a sample of what Bromfield wrote then:

"The situation will grow worse this fall and reach its most desperate stage this winter, especially from February on. 'February,' Herbert Hoover points out from his experience, 'is always the black month—the month to be feared the most.' If it were possible, I would rather not think about next February. By then most of our people will be living on a diet well below the nutrition level."

Faker, pardon us, Farmer Bromfield also warned us last August, "before we have finished, this tragic food situation will go down as one of the most senseless scandals in American history."

The Reader's Digest headed up Mr. Bromfield's story thus: "We aren't going to have enough to eat." Subtitle: "What muddling in Washington has done to our food supply."

The Digest also explained "Mr. Bromfield has spent months investigating the food crisis."

How hungry are you this morning?

Do you feel as if your diet is below the nutrition level? How much weight have you lost in the last week because you couldn't buy enough food to keep you going? Isn't it true that, like the rest of us, you're just a wee bit overstuffed?

Perhaps you didn't notice it, but the full-sized famine arrived on Monday. A propagandist for the Livestock Producers Association released a statement that within the next 60 days there would be a beef famine, followed later by a pork famine. But it was only several weeks ago that meat packers were claiming that they were having to dispose of large stocks of edible meats because we didn't have enough refrigerator space to keep the backed-up supplies. And it was suggested at that time that pork be removed from the ration list.

And Monday, the day the famine arrived, 9,000 head of hogs remained unsold in the cattle market at Chicago. We hope you can stand the shock of this famine by tightening your belts.

Now, let's become a bit elementary for a moment.

Bromfield has been proved a faker by the mere passing of time. The Reader's Digest has been proved a propaganda medium, carrying propaganda designed to promote disunity and demoralization among our people in wartime.

"What muddling in Washington has done to our food supply," says the Digest. Since our food supply is still quite ample, one might conclude that the food situation wasn't muddled by Washington at all, and that each one of us has the Washington administration to thank because we still have more than enough to eat. Isn't it grand that we can still pick and choose our food? And it wouldn't be too bad if we had to line up for chow just as the soldiers have to line up.

Since Bromfield said this tragic food situation, such as we have in his black February, wil go down as one of the most senseless scandals in American history, the people of the United States of America, it seems to us, have every justification for pinning the longest ears in American history upon Louis Bromfield. We could also suggest an iron cross for the publisher of the Reader's Digest. Either they are stupid fools, or they deliberately sought to mislead the American people

to create disunity and low morale, even at the expense of aiding our enemies.

It was the New Republic which reminded us that this is the month of the big famine predicted by Louis Bromfield in the Reader's Digest. We think the press of this country should devote its efforts to making Bromfield eat his words even if they aren't nourishing.

Voice of Salerno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a composition entitled "Voice of Salerno," by E. Beeson Michel, reprinted from the magazine Exchangite

There being no objection, the composition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF SALERNO

(By E. Beeson Michel)

I am the soul of a man. Not long ago I walked down city streets and country roads, and moved among my fellow men. I felt warm sun and cooling rain. The touch of things was good—the cold, wet muzzle of my dog; my little son's small, tender hand; my wife's gentle kiss. I saw the beauty of a distant hill of moonlight on the water, my mother's face. I laughed and worked and loved, the same as you. And now I am dead.

I never gave much thought to death, until I got into this business of war. Carpentering was my trade. When I was called, I knew I didn't want to die, but I didn't have much choice. Like others, I had a job to do. I watched men fall, saw blood spurt, and the writhing, agonizing flesh. I heard brave men weep, and murmur beloved names. I learned that death at war is not gentle or benevolent. It is a slobbering, ravening beast.

When my turn came, I tried to be strong. But, through the numbness, I kept thinking, "What will she and the kids do? What will happen to my kids?" Then a great, rushing, sweeping current carried me away, and here I am, dead.

I'm still worrying about my wife and kids. I won't be arcund when they get sick, or hungry, or lonely, or in trouble. I can't help them, now. But you can. How can you refuse?

Treatment of Wounded Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hands Gone, Blind, Deaf, Boy Left to Shift for Himself by Army" from the editorial page of the Los Angeles Examiner of January 25 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDS GONE, BLIND, DEAF, BOY LEFT TO SHIFT FOR HIMSELF BY ARMY

(By William McCullam)

NEW YORK, January 24.—An ultimate horror of war—Government neglect of its own disabled ex-servicemen—struggled with human hope in room 1806 of the Hotel Lexington here today. Hunched in his chair was a 20-year-old boy, his one good eye fixed on a man before him with stainless steel claws instead of hands.

"But I can still feel my fingers," the boy said. "It still feels like I have my fingers and can move them. How long will it take before I can get used to clamps like yours?"

As he spoke, Lawrence Edward Mahoney lifted his own two arms. One sleeve was empty, the other held a block of wood encased in a glove.

"How long?" he repeated. "And who will teach me when I get them?"

Lawrence Edward Mahoney, at 20, is a discharged veteran of World War No. 2 who lives today entirely dependent on the support of his parents at 217-21 One Hundred and Tenth Avenue, Queens Village, N. Y., together with eight other children.

His value to the Army came to a sudden end at Camp Hood, Tex., last July 9, when a defective grenade blew off his hands, destroyed his left eye, and ruptured both ear drums.

Left to shift for himself, with only railroad fare home, he had come to room 1806 seeking the assistance of Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, and the advice of the man with the steel clamps.

The latter was Charles C. McGonegal, the Legion's national field secretary, who lost his hands in France during the last World War. His subsequent mastery of a pair of lobsterlike claws has been an inspiration to thousands similarly injured.

As the boy continued his questions, his face moving with an eagerness which gleamed through dark cobwebs of pain, Commander Atherton outlined the case briefly in an adjoining room.

"This is the kind of thing the veterans' organizations are fighting to clean up," he said. "I don't see how people in Government service can eat or sleep while bewildered and helpless boys like that are still uncared for.

"There he is, 100 percent disabled and unemployable, entitled to full compensation and help, yet he not only hasn't received a cent since his discharge, but is in need of immediate medical care.

"He cannot get either yet because red tape is holding up the release of his medical records to authorities here.

"In addition nobody has seen that he has even the makeshift use of artificial hands.

"The wooden block they gave him for the left arm doesn't even fit."

Meeting Lawrence Edward Mahoney, a former crack swimmer and basketball player who attended Andrew Jackson High School, is not an easy thing to do. He seems to have a deep distrust of strangers.

Introduced by his father, Daniel, an auditor and World War veteran, the dark-haired youth stands with head bowed and seems surprised when you stretch out your hand to shake his wooden block.

"Not much to say," he mumbles. "I can't tell you much. Nothing unusual—" his voice trails off.

Bit by bit questioning reveals the facts that he entered the Army when Company K, Fourteenth Infantry, New York National Guard, was mobilized in January 1940.

"I joined the National Guard," he explains in answer to a question, "because—well—just because I thought it was a good thing to do. I thought maybe it would help, I guess. That was a long time ago."

More questions. Answers—Camp Shelby, first; then Camp Sutton; promotions; master sergeant after 2 years at Camp Hood, assignment to instructor in demolitions.

Then the day: "I was showing the operation of an offensive grenade. It must have had a defective fuse. It went off in my hands.

"No; it did not knock me unconscious. It blinded me. I got to my feet. Then I sat down again.

"I could hear them shouting something about tourniquets, then the ambulance and some kind of a shot in the leg. I passed out at the hospital."

After 5 weeks at the Camp Hood Hospital where his left eye was removed, his stumps sawed clean, his ears treated, and numerous lacerations of face and body repaired, Lawrence was taken 35 miles away to McCloskey General Hospital at Temple, Tex., for 4 months until last December 20. He there underwent additional treatment, was fitted for the wooden blocks known as temporary appliances, and was supposed to recuperate.

Lawrence Edward Mahoney comes closest to showing anger when he tells about his 4 months at Camp McCloskey.

"It was pretty grim," he says. "Nobody came in to help you, to tell you how to use your new hands. You just lay in bed all day.

"Sometimes, because the blocks hurt and I'd have them off, an orderly would come through, take them off the window sill and throw them on the bed. 'Put your hands on,' he'd say. So I'd put them on."

Finally, on December 20, the man with no hands was discharged with a total of $132 in back pay and railroad fare for his return home.

He made the entire trip in a day coach.

"There were 57 of us," he recalls. "We lined up in the finance officer's office about 1 o'clock in the afternoon and it took us until after 5 o'clock to get our money and papers.

"Corporal Joe Mangan, a fellow about 22 who got both legs shot off in foreign service and who was going back to New Bristol, Conn., took my money for me. He could just barely walk on crutches, but we got home together to our families all right."

What did the Army tell him about his rights? What did they tell him he could do to rehabilitate himself, to make a living?

"The Army didn't do anything," he says. "The Red Cross said they filed a pension claim for me, but nothing's happened yet in 9 weeks.

"As far as the Army is concerned, all we got was the discharge paper, the money, and a lecture.

"We were told to report to our draft boards in 10 days or the F. B. I. would be after us. Also, that as long as we were in military uniforms we were subject to military discipline. Stuff like that; that's all."

Nothing else?

"No," he says. "Nothing else. Nothing. Nothing about how to comb my hair again, how to get dressed. Nothing.

"Today is the first time I even knew I might get some kind of hands that will really work. Today is the first time I felt like something might be done to help me.

"I don't like to ask for help. In the hospital I refused to plead with the orderly to help me. But I've got to have it."

Commander Atherton, stating that the case was typical of the neglect against which his organization and the Hearst newspapers have been campaigning for months, said that

he had sought Federal action in the matter 10 days ago.

At that time, he said, he had wired details to Secretary of War Stimson, asking that release of the boy's medical papers be effected at once to Veterans' Administration officials here.

When no reply was forthcoming, the commander added, he issued instructions to his aides to contact Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Until the release of the boy's medical papers, Atherton pointed out, he is ineligible for adjudication of his pension rights, for further treatment and to obtain the appliances he needs.

"This boy," the Legion official said, "was in the hospital for months before his discharge. What reason, in the name of common sense, can be given for not having the records of such a man up to date?

"Why was he discharged if his records were not in order and immediately available for transfer?

"The entire case is appalling."

It is because of the experiences of thousands of neglected veterans like Lawrence Edward Mahoney, many of them in even more desperate circumstances, that the Hearst newspapers are waging their current campaign for justice.

Sought as a fundamental in relieving their suffering is a year's discharge pay, with readers urged to take part in the crusade by wiring their Congressmen immediately.

Elsewhere in this edition is a coupon expressing such demands.

Send it in now.

Settlement of Terminated War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very scholarly address delivered by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the annual meeting of the National Screw Machine Products Industry at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, January 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to come here this afternoon to discuss with you a proposed legislative program for the prompt and equitable settlement of terminated war contracts. This is a problem of vital concern to American business and to our Government. Its intelligent solution is a condition precedent to any orderly reconversion of industry to a peace economy.

American industry has more than met the highest expectations of the Nation. Indeed, it has accomplished a record of production little short of miraculous. Now, however, as the war has turned in our favor, we have reached a point where we are witnessing heavy cut-backs in production. In some instances there has been a complete stoppage in production of specified war matériel involving the cancelation of contracts representing billions of dollars. This creates new problems more serious and threatening to American business than our original problems of war production. To meet these new problems, we must have the closest cooperation between the Congress and American industry.

I am therefore particularly happy to discuss these matters with representatives of your important industry which has played a vital role in the war production program. Your contribution to that great program, though not so spectacular as that of the major industries turning out ships, planes, and tanks, has, nevertheless, been a vital underlying factor in the great record our country has accomplished in war production—a record which has astonished our allies and confounded our enemies.

These new problems now confronting your industry and every industry demand prompt and careful study and planning, if we are to avoid confusion and disaster when the war ends. Already, as I have pointed out, cutbacks and contract terminations have created some very serious problems not alone for the concerns directly affected but for the Nation.

Here are a few of the serious questions to be answered:

How rapidly should the procurement agencies undertake to cancel war contracts and return contractors to civilian production?

As war contracts are terminated, what policies can be established to bring about quick and equitable settlements essential to avoid delay in reconversion?

What kind of financial program and tax structure will be needed in the reconversion period to provide business, especially small business, with proper access to long-term capital?

As reconversion progresses, how can we best combat the trend toward monopoly and centralization of business and infuse more competitive vigor into the bloodstream of our economy?

How can we meet the demand for an economy of high production and full employment in the post-war period?

Following Pearl Harbor, because of our lack of plans for the prosecution of total war, we found it necessary to make decisions almost overnight on the basis of Executive orders and administrative directives. The war agencies called in the large industrial plants and launched a gigantic program of war production. There was, of course, much dissatisfaction and serious dislocations in our economy—small business was penalized—but we finally got things going. We won the battle of production and we are now approaching the inevitable period of peace. It is imperative that we now prepare our basis for an orderly return to a peacetime economy. It is my conviction that all the basic reconversion and post-war questions, such as those I have mentioned, must be answered by Congress. Congress must lay out the total reconversion program. Any other procedure would not have the full support and confidence of the American people. It is impossible for a small group of men, however able and patriotic they may be, to sit behind closed doors and draw up final post-war programs having far-reaching effects on American industry and business. Only through the legislative process—with public hearings on proposed plans and with full debate on the floors of the Senate and the House—can we develop acceptable plans for the reestablishment of a truly competitive economy in the post-war period—one that will have the confidence of the people and preserve a genuine system of free enterprise.

For a long time the Congress has been aware of the necessity for carefully studied plans to return American industry to a peace economy. Many committees of Congress, both in the Senate and in the House, have been busily at work holding hearings and drafting legislation to accomplish this purpose. Business has long recognized the need for comprehensive legislation as the keystone for demobilization and reconversion. In recent months representatives of industry have been of invaluable assistance in helping the Members of the Congress to understand the practical problems involved. Among the executive agencies of the Government, there is also a growing realization that no administrator can hope to do an effective job on demobilization and reconversion unless his program is firmly backed by a clear mandate from the elected representatives of the American people.

Within the past few months considerable progress has been made in developing a legislative approach to our post-war problems. As chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have had an unusually good opportunity to view the healthy effect of congressional initiative upon our governmental processes—particularly with regard to contract termination.

A year ago the various war agencies felt that contract termination presented no legislative problems whatsoever. Everything could be settled, they thought, through directives and regulations. The war agencies made the contracts and they could end them it was contended. Seven or eight months ago the only bill on the subject was a rider attached to the pending War Department appropriations bill. This rider did nothing more than enable one of the several procurement agencies to make advance payments and termination loans. This, of course, was far from a satisfactory approach to the full problem. It was only the wisdom and foresight of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable ANDREW MAY, chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, that held up this rider and prevented it from being reported out of the House committee, where it was pending. We have since learned much about the magnitude of this problem.

Today the legislative program on contract termination is no longer limited to a rider that relates only to one contracting agency and covers only a fraction of the problem. Congressional investigation by Senator GEORGE'S Committee on Post-War Planning, as well as the Military Affairs subcommittee, has uncovered a great variety of questions that can be met only by legislative action. As a result, business, labor, Congress, and most of the officials in the contracting agencies now realize that what is required is a broad statute covering contract termination as a whole.

A few months ago, when the Military Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, began its studies on contract termination, we found a bewildering variety of termination clauses being used by the various contracting agencies. A uniform termination clause was recently promulgated through the Office of War Mobilization. This new uniform clause is substantially the same as the standard termination clause previously used by the Army, to which the Navy's 6-percent-profit limitation has been added. It is unquestionably a step in the right direction. However, it is for use only in prime contracts, and is of no help in the contract-settlement problems of the subcontractor and the supplier.

Both Government and business, moreover are now agreed that the new uniform clause does not modify in any way the need for comprehensive legislation. It does not deal with interim financing, defective contracts, appeals, or with questions of fraud or other important questions. At present, the war-contracting agencies do not possess an unqualified power to negotiate final settlements. The Baruch uniform termination clause therefore does not solve the problem of speedy settlements of terminated contracts.

Senator GEORGE'S Post-War Planning Committee and the Military Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, are now working together on an omnibus contract-termination

bill that will undertake to meet all these basic questions which I have indicated. It will provide a comprehensive plan for prompt and equitable settlement of all claims arising from terminated war contracts as well as adequate financing during the period between termination and final settlement. Although the draft bill is yet being studied and perfected through consultation with business and with the officials of the war agencies, I can now outline its general provisions.

First of all, it creates a Director of Contract Termination Settlement to coordinate the operations of all the Government contracting agencies insofar as they relate to the subject. The Director is given the responsibility of promoting company settlements, decentralized administration, simple record keeping and reporting forms, and the training of appropriate personnel by the departments, and by industrial and banking institutions. He is directed to assist the Smaller War Plants Corporation in protecting the interests of smaller contractors. It provides for adequate advance notice before termination and for consultation with war contractors through advisory committees and such other policies as the Director may determine. The Director is required to submit quarterly reports to the Congress on the operations of his office and of the contracting agencies under the act.

Second. The relations between the contracting agencies and the General Accounting Office are completely clarified. The contracting agencies are given the power to negotiate final settlements in accordance with the policies laid down by the Director. The present functions of the General Accounting Office are maintained; namely, to examine settlement records to determine if payments are made in accordance with the settlement agreements and to uncover any evidence of fraud. Whenever the General Accounting Office finds or suspects that a settlement is tainted by fraud, it is directed to report the facts to the appropriate executive agencies, including the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice must then institute such legal proceedings as it may deem necessary to protect the Government. Severe penalties are provided for any misrepresentation of facts or any attempt to defraud the Government. These provisions will effectively accelerate settlements while at the same time protect the Government from fraud.

Third. The bill clearly recognizes the need for continuous surveillance by Congress of the operations of the executive agencies under the act. It explicitly sets forth that such surveillance shall be conducted by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Fourth. The bill provides for adequate interim financing through partial payments and loans. Mandatory advance payments are provided for not to exceed 90 percent of the amount claimed. The contracting agencies, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are authorized to make or guarantee termination loans directly or to guarantee loans made by private banks.

Fifth. The bill provides a firm legislative basis for making quick and equitable settlements with subcontractors and suppliers. While I am not prepared to embark upon a complete discussion of this point at this time, I should like to list some of the provisions that will be of particular help to subcontractors and suppliers:

The bill will provide that—

(a) The contracting agencies are specifically authorized to compute payment on the basis of the percentage of completion wherever such a method is practicable. This provision was proposed by your association and will be of great advantage in simplifying settlements.

(b) Fullest advance notice before termination is called for. In many cases, this should provide the 30-day advance notice that your association has recommended. They will be expected to follow this provision in good faith.

(c) The legal barriers to company settlements are swept aside and the agencies are directed to develop formulas and carry out company settlements to the fullest extent feasible. This is important in getting prompt settlements.

(d) The contracting agencies are directed to exercise such control over payments to prime contractors as will guarantee receipt by subcontractors of the money due them.

(e) Subcontractors are allowed to appeal to the contracting agencies against the findings or decisions of prime contractors.

(f) Protection is provided for the subcontractor whose prime contractor is bankrupt or whose prime contractor had his contract canceled because of default.

(g) Provision is made for authorizing prime contractors to make final settlements with subcontractors without the delays involved in waiting for detailed audits by the Government.

(h) Provision is made for the contracting agencies to settle directly with the subcontractor, where necessary. In some cases, this will call for purchase of the subcontractor's claim.

Confidential copies of the draft bill have been made available to the many war contracting industries interested in these problems, and my committee will welcome the fullest criticism of the proposed measure before it is officially introduced.

This legislation is of vital importance. Contract terminations present the most serious of all our post-war problems. We are seeking to provide a prompt and practicable method of transition from a war economy to a peace economy. This measure is designed not merely in the interest of aiding war industries in securing prompt settlements, but is in the interest of avoiding chaotic business conditions which would result from the piling up of unsettled war contracts representing billions of dollars and creating unemployment and confusion in the post-war period.

Without a law of this kind, thousands of business and industrial concerns—especially smaller subcontractors and suppliers—with their capital tied up in unsettled contracts—may be financially crippled or rendered insolvent while waiting for the slow process of settlement under existing laws.

With such a comprehensive contract termination statute on the lawbooks, and with administrators who will intelligently and honestly discharge their responsibilities, we shall be able to look forward to the day of final victory without fear that delayed settlements will bring on an economic collapse blocking our chances of providing jobs for demobilized soldiers and war workers. We shall be able to assure the thousands of small manufacturers who have their meager capital tied up in war contracts that their Government will give them a fair deal. Our decks will be swept clear for action. Under such a law, we will be able to concentrate our attention on essential post-war plans for the attainment of full production, expanding employment, and the reestablishment of our traditional system of free enterprise on a sound basis.

If we solve these problems involved in the termination of contracts and provide a safe and practicable plan for prompt settlements, we will have taken a great step forward in the transition to peacetime production. There will still remain, however, another problem of vital importance to every businessman and to the American people as a whole. That is the problem of preserving our system of free, competitive enterprise against the gradual monopoly of industry and commerce. This is problem No. 1 for the businessmen of the country.

We must prepare our plans now if the serious blows inflicted on small business by the failure to plan for war mobilization are not to be repeated during the period of demobilization.

This proposed contract termination bill constitutes one phase of this planning. It is one part of the plan we are developing to see that our American system of free enterprise survives. The free enterprise system depends for its existence upon healthy and flourishing small independent businesses. In the manufacturing field, such small businesses, if they are to thrive, must have a technical base of modern, up-to-date equipment capable of turning out goods at low cost. During the war, our Government has acquired over $15,500,000,000 of the newest and most modern facilities. We must see that this vast reservoir of plants, facilities, and tools is utilized in such a way as to stimulate and expand free enterprise and not to foster monopoly by going exclusively to the large corporations, already overexpanded and which have held the bulk of the prime contracts. To that end, I have introduced a bill for the utilization of surplus machine tools, S. 1609, which provides a favored position for small business in the acquisition of these tools. This bill is by no means the final word but is intended to aid in assuring the continuance of those small plants typical of your industry by providing them with the opportunity to have the first option to purchase or lease the new and highly productive tools and machines provided during the war years.

I am mindful that your industry is a parts industry, supplying the large corporations which produce automobiles and other consumers' durable goods. During the war, these large corporations which formerly had few screw machines of their own have now acquired thousands and are in a position to be independent of the services which you have rendered in the past. The Senate Small Business Committee will work to see that your industry has the opportunity and the access to finances necessary to acquire Government-owned machines. Through such measures as these we are seeking to preserve small industry and arrest the trend toward collectivism which threatens the existence of all business large and small.

During the past 50 years, our country has seen a steady march toward the monopolization of industry and commerce. Little business has been up against a constant struggle for survival. We are all familiar with the effects of this trend in some foreign countries.

In Germany, for example, the government took the lead in the cartelization of business and industry. With the aid of the German industrial monopolists, Hitler and his fellow-criminals came into power. The present world catastrophe which has set the clock of civilization back many generations, is directly traceable to the influence and machinations of these economic monopolists.

In America, the mortality of small business has been steadily mounting. These small concerns, however, continue to struggle for survival with characteristic American tenacity, hoping that something will happen to improve their opportunities for survival. Far-sighted statesmen, economists, and businessmen have begun to look with apprehension upon this trend toward the concentration of economic power in our country.

Since the beginning of the present war, the tendency of big economic units to grow bigger and the small ones to grow smaller or be eliminated entirely has continued. Representatives of the bigger corporations were in Washington when the shower of large ordnance orders began to pour down upon us. They got the lion's share of the orders and small business was largely forgotten. Mammoth new industrial units began to arise. Tremendous expansions of already overgrown industries have been made.

Now, with victory in sight, it is quite clear that small business is approaching a crisis. At the conclusion of the war, which is already discernible, we will find the big corporations more powerful, with greatly expanded facilities, with well worked out plans for conversion to peacetime needs, with markets surveyed and sales plans fully matured. The smaller firms will not occupy such an advantageous position. They will need protection and direction in that period. Small business therefore must bestir itself now.

Now is the time to lay a solid foundation upon which our system of free competitive enterprise will be able to stand firmly and lastingly. Thus we may be able to preserve and expand our system of free enterprise through which we have attained our present high position of power and influence in the world.

Lack of Gratitude of Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of January 30, 1944, relating to ungratefulness of republics.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Republics are proverbially ungrateful.

But this great and once rich Republic is peculiarly and especially ungrateful.

It fights its wars with children mainly—in violation of its solemn pledges—and then when it has mutilated them or blinded them refuses to care for them adequately or even to try properly to rehabilitate them and make their lives more endurable and useful.

Our great and once rich Republic can hand out a billion dollars to South American friends and a billion dollars to very dubious and very questionable Russian friends and billions of dollars in Europe, Asia, and Africa to rehabilitate alien peoples, but it hesitates and haggles and quibbles and complains and cuts appropriations when it is asked to compensate in something near a fair manner the youth of our own country who have sacrificed their ambitions and opportunities, their sight, their hearing, their limbs, their health, and oftentimes their sanity to keep the rest of us safe and free, and to give us the opportunities which have forever vanished from their young lives.

The phrase which says "republics are ungrateful" really means that the people who run republics are ungrateful.

And it does not mean merely that politicians are ungrateful but that the people who elect the politicians are ungrateful.

Yes, friends, the politicians are your politicians.

They would not be in office if you did not put them there.

They would not stay in office if you did not keep them there.

They would not evince neglect of our defenders if you did not condone it.

Republics would not be indifferent and ungrateful if we, the citizenry, were not indifferent and ungrateful.

The Congress—our Congress—has just cut down the rehabilitation payment for honorably discharged soldiers at the threat of the President's disapproval and his habitual veto of disabled soldier relief.

A cowed and cowardly Congress trembles at the crack of the administration whip.

But it does not fear the lash of your displeasure—your disapproval, fellow citizens.

The Congressmen dread the loss of Presidential patronage, but they do not dread any loss of public support.

They think the people will forget or will not care.

They think republics are ungrateful.

Are they?

Are you?

If you are not ungrateful, do not merely be content to say that you are sympathetic with the brave children who have sacrificed their health and chances of happiness so you may be healthy and happy and whole.

You have the power to direct your Congress and your country.

Are you neglectful of your power or unworthy of it?

You have a voice.

You have a vote.

Use them for honor and for justice.

A Poetic Version of the Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, this being an appropriate time for discussion of Abraham Lincoln, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an original poem entitled "A Poetic Version of the Gettysburg Address," by Horace C. Carlisle, of the Architect's Office of the Capitol.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POETIC VERSION OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Four score and seven years ago
Our fathers, on this continent,
Brought forth a Nation that might know
The blessings of a government
Conceived in liberty, one to
The proposition wisely bound,
That all men are—no matter who—
Designed to stand on equal ground.

We're now engaged in civil war—
Our Nation's being tested now—
The Union that we've battled for
Now wears upon her bleeding brow
A cruel crown of piercing thorns,
As she bewails her heavy loss—
God grant that she, 'mid buffs and scorns,
May not die on Secession's cross.

Upon a famous battlefield
Of this field as a resting place
For these, dear to the Nation's heart,
Who slumber here in death's embrace—
We know we cannot dedicate,
Altho our love may have no bound—
We know we cannot consecrate
This hallowed and most sacred ground.

But, in a larger, purer sense,
Than in the living can be found,
These that died here, in our defense,
Are they that hallowed make this ground—
Yea, these brave men who struggled here,
And fought, unfeared and unafraid,
Are they whom we today revere,
Alike, the living and the dead.

The world may little note, nor long
Remember what we may say here,
But they, in story and in song,
Will greater grow, from year to year—
We that are living should renew,
Upon our knees, our prayers and ask
That we be dedicated to
Their noble, but unfinished task.

It's rather, yea, for us to be
Here dedicated to the great
Remaining task, for God knows we
Need this to save our ship of state.
May from these honored dead we take
Increased devotion to the cause,
And may we, for their mem'ry's sake,
Prove faithful to the Stripes and Stars.

May we here highly be resolved,
Whatever be our loss or gain,
That—matters not what is involved—
These dead shall not have died in vain.
Soon time shall wipe away all tears,
And, when war's heartless hates shall cease,
The North and South, down through the years,
Will, in the Union, dwell in peace.

Though punished by His chast'ning rod,
Because of evils that were done,
Shall our bruised Nation, under God,
Be reunited into one,
That North and South, when ends the war,
May be blessed with new freedom's birth,
Lest government of, by, and for
The people perish from the earth.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The War With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Britons Oppose All-Out Jap War," published in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 11, 1944]

BRITONS OPPOSE ALL-OUT JAP WAR—LIBERALS URGE USE OF ONLY VOLUNTEERS

LONDON, February 10.—Demobilization of British forces at the end of the war in Europe and recruitment of a volunteer army to fight Japan were recommended by a Liberal Party committee in a report published today.

The committee suggested, however, that if volunteers were too few, the new army be supplemented by young conscripts 18 to 22 years old.

The report, sent to Prime Minister Churchill and other Ministers, rejected Minister of Labor Ernest Bevin's "first in first out" demobilization plan. Instead, the committee urged an "all out at once" program. It expressed conviction that a large demand for

labor immediately after the war would provide sufficient jobs to absorb all men available.

The committee urged that civil defense services be demobilized on the same basis as the armed forces.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "I Refuse," from the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I REFUSE

Any soldier vote bill that comes out of conference committee without provision for a Federal ballot would be an advertisement to servicemen everywhere that their Congress is not prepared to turn a finger in enabling them to participate in this year's great decision. We would hesitate to be so accused if we were a Member of Congress. It would be compounding this neglect with hypocrisy to assert that a State ballot will give the servicemen the same voting opportunity as a Federal ballot. The President declared that this would be practicing a fraud upon the serviceman. He didn't put too harsh a word upon it. Consider the State of New York. The list of candidates in New York State prepared by the State War Ballot Commission is a book of 900 printed pages. Clearly this cannot be carried by air mail. It would go by ordinary mail. So would the other State ballots. Thus, with the dates of most primaries falling in late summer and early fall, there would be no chance at all for the servicemen, who are now scattered over the earth's surface, and who are subject to constant change of duty station, receiving State ballots in time to fill out and return by election day. Merely a recommendation to the States to expedite and facilitate voting procedures would be tantamount to a denial of the voting privilege. Let that be clearly understood.

Voting under Federal auspices is the only feasible method of soldier voting. All that the conferees are asked to do is to set up Federal machinery. They are no longer asked to repeal State law, as they would have been under the original Lucas-Green-Worley measures. All that is now entailed is that the Federal Government would prepare and distribute by air mail a simplified uniform ballot for Federal offices, collect the executed ballots, and provide for their distribution to the election officials of the voter's State. All persons qualified under State law to vote would then be assured that their votes would be counted. No constitutional right of the State would be infringed by this Federal act of helpfulness. The inclusion of a Federal ballot—of servicemen voting under Federal auspices—is the irreducible minimum of what Congress should do. The conferees, conscious of their obligation to the servicemen, will, we hope, repeat with Representative WORLEY:

"I refuse to say to the men and women in the armed forces that Congress will do nothing to protect their franchise where State procedures fail. I refuse to say to the soldiers and sailors overseas that the Constitution of the United States, which is strong enough to put them in uniform and place them under the fire of the enemy, which enables us to remove them from the civil courts and subject them to military law, is too weak to empower the Congress of the United States to protect our fighting men against the loss of their right to vote."

Brazilian Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article appearing in the Omaha World-Herald of February 9 last entitled "United States Pact on Rubber 'Failure.'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PACT ON RUBBER "FAILURE"—NEW CONTRACT REVEALS FLOP OF BOONDOGGLE; BRAZIL TAKES OVER

(By Russ Symontowne)

NEW YORK.—For the rest of the war, Brazil, not the United States, will get the rubber out of the Amazon jungles and will sell it to this country at 60 cents a pound, which is probably less than half what we have been paying.

With the official announcement of a supplemental agreement, the complete failure of the $80,000,000 boondoggle was acknowledged Tuesday.

All the hordes of American managers, experts, and do-gooders who clutter up the Amazon cities will be withdrawn. Brazil was so glad to get rid of them she actually paid a bonus of $500,000 to be used to "aid the rubber program."

Valentin Boucas, economic adviser of Brazil and rubber czar, made the announcement.

Boucas and Douglas Allen, president of the Rubber Development Corporation, long fought against the 60-cent rubber price which Brazilians and Americans have been urging ever since it became apparent that our Amazon program was a failure.

Boucas assured newspapermen Brazil had already done away with the long list of alphabet agencies, set up at the demand of the United States to carry out its program of equipping rubber workers.

Two years ago when the Amazon adventure started, Brazil was expected to produce 50,000 tons of rubber in 1943. Last November, when I was in the Amazon, Allen said about 30,000 tons would be shipped. Fewer than 24,000 tons reached this country. Tuesday, Boucas estimated that by going back to the primitive methods used 40 years ago during the rubber boom, Brazil might send us 25,000 tons this year.

Although the 60-cent rubber price is a 15-cent increase over the established price, Allen testified before the Gillette committee in December that the actual price was $1.12. Lowest estimates of experts put the price at more than $1.50.

The Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter relative to the cabaret tax, I have received from Edward Flore, general president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOTEL AND RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES' INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE AND BARTENDERS' INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1944.

HON. JAMES MEAD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of 250,000 members of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America we protest the enactment of the 30 percent so-called cabaret tax which has been agreed to by the Senate and House conferees on H. R. 3687. We feel that this tax is so unreasonably high it will not only fail to fulfill its purpose, but will seriously affect the employment of the members of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America.

The Secretary of the Treasury requested Congress to provide for the raising of $60,000,000 through this particular tax. Last year a similar tax of 5 percent accounted for $30,000,000 in revenue. It would seem, therefore, that a 10 or 15 percent tax on the check of guests in restaurants, etc., where entertainment is furnished with food and beverages would fulfill the purpose of the tax. To raise the tax to 30 percent would make the cost of dining in restaurants where entertainment is furnished prohibitive and deprive persons of modest means of this form of entertainment. In depriving the great majority of the American people of this form of entertainment through making its cost prohibitive through a 30 percent tax, the Government would dry up to a large extent this source of revenue, with the result that instead of increasing to $60,000,000 the revenue to be derived from this tax, the actual revenue would be little greater and in fact might be even less

But not only would a 30 percent tax fail to raise the $60,000,000 requested by the Secretary of the Treasury but persons who formerly dined out in places where they might find entertainment will no longer do so with the natural result that employees in the catering industry will be deprived of their livelihood to an extent which we feel would be disastrous to many. Many waiters, bartenders, cooks, etc., have engaged in their particular line of endeavor for many years and it will be difficult for them to readjust themselves in other occupations.

We do not desire that this protest be misconstrued as a protest against any tax of this nature. We feel that a reasonable tax would be perfectly proper and perhaps even to double the tax to 10 percent would not be

unreasonable for we feel that people seeking entertainment while dining should contribute something to the cost of Government for the privilege of being allowed to so enjoy themselves. However, to increase the present tax sixfold can only result in many people who formerly sought entertainment while dining to remain home; for restaurants and hotels which formerly furnished entertainment during dinner to dispense with entertainment with the result that revenue will not be forthcoming to the Government but employees in a large industry will be detrimentally affected in their employment and those persons of modest means will be deprived of a source of entertainment.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD FLORE,
General President.
HUGO ERNST,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. C. FREDERICK PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of approximately 200 letters from residents of the district that I represent expressing serious concern over the lack of anthracite with which to heat their homes. Many of them are people who, but 1 short year ago, were induced by governmental agencies to convert their heating units from oil to anthracite.

It is especially distressing to these people when they realize that within not more than 100 miles of their homes are 500 acres of the best and finest anthracite land in the world.

This is comparable to the present temporary shortage of coffee in Brazil, which normally exports to this country the majority of our national consumption of coffee.

Let us hope that the anthracite shortage will soon be ended and our citizens be able to obtain the necessary fuel for comfortable, healthful living.

Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, having been one of the Members of Congress from the oil-producing States who has been asking relief for the small independent oil producers of this country, and arguing the plight of this important industry, I wish to call to your attention, to the attention of the governmental officials concerned, and to the attention of the Members of Congress, an article by Mr. Drew Pearson, of the Washington Merry-Go-Round, published in this morning's Washington Post, which further succintly confirms my arguments for a reasonable price increase for this industry, and especially the small independent oil producers.

The article, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, is included in my remarks, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)

If you scratch beneath the surface of Wichita Falls, Tex., one of the liveliest little towns in America, you will find proof of two tragic things which are happening under the Roosevelt administration.

One is something for which you can't blame the Government—namely, that the time is not too far off when present wartime rationing of gasoline may be a normal peacetime necessity. In other words, our oil reserves are running disastrously low.

The other is something which the Roosevelt administration could definitely prevent—that is, the manner in which little business is being swallowed up by big business.

In the industrial East it is the little manufacturer who is going out of business while six big companies have waxed fat on more than 50 percent of all the war contracts. Out here it is the little independent oil man who is gradually being put out of business by the low price of crude oil and the strangling process of the major oil companies.

Every week or so in Wichita Falls, center of a once-thriving Texas oil field, an independent sells out to the majors and retires from the game. The same is true in Tulsa, Okla., and every other oil field except such rich bonanzas as east Texas, where oil still gushes instead of being pumped.

What most people don't realize is that about one-half the Nation's oil is produced not by the big companies which splurge out the filling-station advertising, but by the little independents. In fact, it is the independents who have pioneered most of the Nation's wells, after which the majors buy them up.

BIG COMPANIES FOR LOW PRICE

Since the majors have to buy most of their crude oil, they are the last ones to want an increase in its price. They already have the price of gasoline fixed with a comfortable margin and the lower the price of crude, the better for them.

That is why, secretly, they have been rooting behind their hands for the O. P. A. and Economic Stabilizer Vinson, who have opposed a price increase in crude oil. Howard Pew, of Sun Oil, testifying at a hearing in Washington, frankly admitted: "I am very keen on getting the cost of crude oil down as low as possible."

This price-depressing position of the majors, plus their advantage of owning the pipe lines, has made the oil industry one of the least profitable in the country as far as the independent is concerned.

Ironic part of the whole thing is that, before the war, the big companies were blocking a higher price for crude oil, but since the war the O. P. A. does the blocking for them.

Another fact that most people don't realize is that out of the 400,000 oil wells in this country, 300,000 are stripper wells. In other words, they are old wells which pump off 1 to 3 barrels daily. These are the wells now being closed down. And once closed, with the pump and casing pulled, they are lost permanently to the Nation. Never can they be reclaimed without prohibitive cost.

Nevertheless, Washington still unwittingly plays into the hands of big business.

NOTE.—Judge Vinson would be glad to give the stripper oil wells subsidies, but to date they have fought subsidies just as vigorously as they have fought for a price increase.

They're in It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 7, 1944:

THEY'RE IN IT
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The British Government's intention to interfere in the Presidential campaign of the United States this year is now official, open, and on the record. The plan has been curling out in numerous unofficial and semiofficial ways, as in the editorials of the Yorkshire Post, a newspaper controlled by Britain's Foreign Minister Anthony Eden. But now we're getting it straight and unvarnished from a newspaper operated by a Government establishment.

This publication is called the Church of England Newspaper. A dispatch from London yesterday reported that it has just declared that "to pretend that the election this year is the concern only of the American people is just stupid."

Think that over, friends. If we pretend our Presidential election this year is our own business, we are "just stupid."

The Church of England Newspaper goes on to call Mr. Roosevelt's third term "an untold blessing and benefit to humanity," and in reference to the fourth term it says:

"The decision is fraught with incalculable significance for all mankind, not only for the peoples of the British Empire and Commonwealth, and while we recognize fully that it is the American people—130,000,000 of them—who will decide this most important of all political questions, we nevertheless affirm our right to be interested in the result."

It then shows its interest not only by saying Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected but by taking a poke at the strongest potential candidate against him, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York. Thus:

"It is going to make a difference of life or death for future generations of the world whether next November the American people elect a statesman who feels in his very bones the necessity for international comity and cooperation, or a statesman whose belief in international solidarity is a grudging concession to the pressure of events.

"The old American isolationism is dead. History has killed it, but history has not killed the desire and the will to isolation which in the post-war situation will take the form of narrow, unimaginative, reluctant concessions to new demands. Governor Dewey, who is tipped for the Republican nomination, is just such a man.

"The world will need men who can at least keep pace with history, who can spell out the meaning of events as they happen. This is precisely what President Roosevelt has proved himself capable of doing.

"In this war, Providence has retrieved the muddles of democracy. That should be a warning, both to America and ourselves, not to tempt Providence again."

That's electioneering in these United States. And by a church. By a foreign church. By a foreign church that is a part of a foreign government. The only thing bolder would be the arrival here of boys with black bags for the back rooms.

It may surprise you to read the statement here that the Church of England is a part of the Government of the United Kingdom, but it is a fact.

Our Constitution, founded in blood and drafted after long study of the eternal habits of governments, carries a specific clause forbidding our Government the power to run any religious system.

Some of the bitterest experiences of mankind have resulted from governmental management of religion. And the men who organized these United States for us wanted to save America from such tragic episodes.

In separating church and state our founding fathers did something unique. The people of England, after many centuries of religious wars and struggles, have never been able to work it.

King Henry VIII, in his quarrel with the Pope about divorce and other matters, seized the religious system of England outright in 1534 and proclaimed himself "supreme head in earth of the Church of England."

Not all Englishmen accepted the idea of a governmentally established church, and out of the religious wars that followed dissenting Puritans, Catholics, and later Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and other Christian sects of English, Scotch, and Irish fled to North America and gave this Nation its course in history to date.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of North America, which has many parallel doctrines to that of the Established Church in England, was first the Church of England's colonial establishment in North America.

Since the Revolution of 1776 it has grown into a sect of purely American organization.

But in England, though there were religious wars and dissenters from the establishment fled here, still the Crown persisted in control.

At this very moment, George VI of England is titular head of the Established Church.

The bishops of the Established Church are officers of the government and sit in the House of Lords.

The Established Church is maintained not only by voluntary offerings of people who profess its doctrines as their faith, but by national taxation.

Thus, when the Church of England speaks that is the government of the British people speaking.

And in one of its oldest, richest, and ablest voices.

The same, naturally, is true of the Church of England Newspaper.

There is no use looking embarrassed, citizens, and trying to say it ain't so. Our British friends are moving in on us and they have their plans as to what we must do.

Full Employment in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, at the Plankinton Hall Civic Auditorium, Milwaukee, Wis., at 8 p. m. on the evening of Friday, February 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We all want full production and full employment in the post-war world. Our people will not again tolerate the economic waste of unemployed men and unused resources. If we succeed in putting all of our abilities into full use, our national prosperity will in itself make a very great contribution to world prosperity, and in addition our success will cause others to go and do likewise. An employed neighbor is a good neighbor. Abiding peace demands that labor, both in the United States and in other nations be fully employed.

The miracle of war production is the direct result of clearly defined objectives recognized by everyone. Not only have our production objectives in war been clearly defined, but we have ruthlessly cut through most of the red tape and selfish interests which stood in the way. If in peace we clearly define our objectives and push ahead with united effort and a hard-boiled attitude concerning red tape, we can have a miracle of peacetime production which will be even more remarkable than the war production of the past year.

The perils of failure are great. We know full well the devastation caused by the Hoover-Mellon-Wall Street depression. Idle minds, unused muscles, hoarded money, and vacant plants gave rise to thousands upon thousands of men who are now physically or psychologically unfit for the armed forces. Disease and illiteracy, monstrous forms of social prejudice, and multicolored shirt movements still haunt our all-out war effort. The vermin press and the Fascist-minded groups who supported appeasement, who now demand a negotiated peace, and who have atempted in every manner to sabotage our war effort are products of that same depression. These remnants of that economic nightmare have been largely dissipated by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal. The most die-hard reactionaries have been compelled to concede the value and necessity of social security, rural electrification, crop loan, bank-deposit insurance, and the other economic safeguards which led us out of the wilderness.

We live today in critical times, and we must recognize that the crisis of the peace to come will bring with it once again the challenge of idle factories and idle men. We must take hold of the economic realities of peace as courageously as we faced the realities of war.

Real prosperity for the people of the United States will require a production at least 40 percent greater than in 1939. Our vast output of war goods during the past year has proved that it is technologically possible to produce much more than this. With our servicemen working in peacetime pursuits, it should be possible to produce at least 70 percent more than we did in 1939. Americans, therefore, will be impatient with any failure to translate our enormous potential wealth into the enjoyment and security which comes from full employment and higher living standards. In the peace to come, our free private enterprise system must create a broad material basis for full employment and the common welfare.

In order that the free enterprise system may continue, it is essential to make certain changes which will encourage business to seek its profits by expanding output rather than by reducing it. New industries must be encouraged. New light metals like magnesium and beryllium, new plastics, new developments in housing, medicine, transportation, new ways of utilizing our enormous resources of wood will result in new avenues of investment for little business, increased opportunities for employment, and a greater national wealth. We must always be on our guard against the forces which would prevent the achievement of these goals. We have already seen in the recent past how the aluminum monopoly protected its own position by throttling the development of magnesium; how the production of plastics was limited by an international cartel; how prefabricated houses were held up by various groups seeking special privilege; how the introduction of new medicines was blocked by entrenched greed; all of these things did their part in visiting depression upon us in the early thirties, and keeping us in the grip of unemployment.

In the peace to come, millions of our boys will return. For them, as for all, the avenues of opportunity must be kept open. This can be done by maintaining the full production we have achieved in wartime and by encouraging new production. To be sure of accomplishing this objective, our tax laws must be studied and revised to encourage venture capital. Every time businessmen invest in progressive, new industries, employment increases correspondingly.

The present enormous plant capacity which is now turning out the weapons of war must be used to the fullest to produce the commodities of peace. It will be worth while considering the possibility of lend-leasing to businessmen those plants which can be effectively used in preventing monopoly. By this means the principle of free enterprise will be strengthened, the national wealth increased, and opportunities for full employment maintained.

The development of new industries which offer the greatest opportunities to free enterprise should be encouraged by Government-sponsored research available to all businessmen. The patent system must be made to fulfill the constitutional mandate to promote the general welfare and must no longer be used as a device to frustrate free enterprise by fencing whole areas of our technology into feudal preserves for the benefit of the few. It must be made a vehicle for the encouragement of small business and the inventor rather than a weapon of oppression by monopoly groups.

Monopoly, by its price control, its use of patents and trade-marks, and its limitations on production, has fostered depression in peace and delayed all-out production in war. Monopoly has attempted to discredit American labor. But the fact is that labor has done a magnificent job in this war. Labor has been on the job 99.86 percent of the time ever since the war started. Can business say more?

The restrictive practices of monopoly groups prior to Pearl Harbor left us without optical goods, aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber, plastics, high-octane gasoline, tungsten carbide, and a score of other critical materials. All these things have been brought to light in recent years by vigorous Senate committees headed by TRUMAN, of Missouri, BONE, of Washington, and KILGORE, of West Virginia.

We must see to it that the dead hand of monopoly does not hamper our efforts at post-war reconstruction. Full employment and full utilization of our resources cannot live with monopoly and entrenched greed.

The achievement of these goals requires a positive program of action by Government, businessmen, labor, farmers, and consumers. Government must make provisions now for demobilizing industry as well as the men in the armed forces and the war factories. While this problem is complex and intricate, there are, nevertheless, certain constructive measures which can be set in motion now—tomorrow will be too late.

Small business is the vehicle which carries forward the spirit of free enterprise. But small business faces ruination in the reconversion period unless adequate means are provided to guarantee that the necessary credit and raw materials are available. The large monopolies have enormous reserves set aside to tide themselves over the critical stages of this period. This is not true of small business. What then must be done?

We must have a liberal credit and fiscal policy in the immediate post-war period, in order to keep small business operating. This we must have to enable small business to bear the burdens of contract termination and reconversion.

At the same time our tax structure must be made more realistic and consistent with the problems of industry. Monopoly profits, financial manipulation, and Wall Street speculation must receive no encouragement in our tax policy. On the other hand, investment in genuinely productive activity and new industries should receive every incentive and consideration possible from our tax laws. It is upon increased production and new industry that we must depend to build that sturdy and progressive economy which will and must mean jobs for all.

The achievements of our war effort have opened up vast new frontiers for business enterprise. The march of science and technology have given us a glimpse into the future. Business and Government alike must have the courage to pursue the promise. Civil aviation will open up investment and job opportunities. Chemistry, electronics, and medicine beckon to the venturesome. If the Government keeps the channels of opportunity open and business, labor, and agriculture assume their respective responsibilities, America can lead the way into the kind of a world we are fighting for.

New industries and investment possibilities, in addition to new avenues of employment, can be created by Government research. Charles Wilson of the General Electric Co. and the War Production Board has already pointed out the necessity for Government's undertaking this function. Little business cannot afford the expensive laboratories necessary for modern research. Government research should be open to all for full, competitive development. The farmer has already seen what cooperative research effort between the agricultural community and Government can do. A similar service to industry would benefit every area of business activity.

More important than anything else in our drive toward post-war prosperity is raising our sights as to what the American people can have. When we study the post-war market expectations and employment plans of businessmen, we find that they do not add up to sufficient jobs for all the returning soldiers and discharged war workers. Today, just as in 1940 and 1941, we are not looking at the future in big, realistic terms. Most people before the war failed to see the danger that threatened. They failed to realize our tremendous capacity to produce. Once Roosevelt set our sights and Government had obtained the enthusiastic cooperation of labor, business, and agriculture, the impossible became the possible and we got the job done. Peace is just as important as war and demands an equal effort and an equal raising of the sights. We aimed for full employment, decent wages, and 100 percent production in war. We must do the same in peace.

Full employment involves governmental cooperation, whether it be in war or peace. When I speak of governmental cooperation producing additional jobs, I am referring to the free enterprise job opportunities which flow from the creation of such national assets as airfields, housing projects, schools, hospitals, T. V. A.'s, good roads, and other public works. No single firm, no local government, no single group can provide activities of this sort in sufficient volume to save us from joblessness. Only by democratic, cooperative planning between government and the various groups and regions can there be provided sufficient activity to create for private business the additional jobs which are needed to save our free enterprise system. Free enterprise and joblessness cannot long exist side by side in the same nation.

It is the function of Congress to create the necessary machinery for democratic, cooperative job planning. We must act at once to close the stable door before the full employment horse is stolen. To avoid loss of both private and governmental money, to avoid human misery and strife, we must put forth every effort to convert full wartime employment into full peacetime employment. We dare not let ourselves sink into the mire of a vast post-war unemployment. Those who tried to lift the country out of the 1933 jobless morass know how difficult it is to get the business machine rolling again once it has slowed down.

Fortunately much work is now going on in Congress and in the administrative branches of the Government having to do with the problems of contract termination, disposal of war plants, credit policies for small business, etc. This is fine, but it is not enough. In addition, there should be a jobs authority or jobs council made up of the very best minds in government, business, and labor. The President had the right to draft our boys to win the war. To win the peace he should have the right to draft the best brains to serve on a jobs authority or jobs council. As to whether there should be a jobs authority or jobs council depends on the attitude of the public. A jobs authority would have the responsibility and power, subject only to the President and the Congress, to get full employment of resources and skills. A jobs council would not have authority but would merely advise the Congress, the President, and the public with regard to several alternative types of action which Congress, the President, or business might use to prevent unemployment before it actually takes place. War production became our No. 1 economic job the moment Pearl Harbor hit us. Therefore we set up the War Production Board at once. Jobs will be our No. 1 economic problem the moment peace comes. Therefore we should have some sort of organization that can get at least as prompt action on behalf of jobs as the War Production Board got on behalf of fighting material. Those who want immediate action will favor a jobs authority. Others may feel that a jobs authority would have too much power and therefore would favor a jobs council. Matters of this sort can be evaded for a time, but not for too long. We must act with speed even before the fighting stops. If we act promptly, individual private enterprise will be saved and eventually will find opening up to it markets and job opportunities beyond the range of the most ambitious businessman.

Post-war private enterprise will move with great efficiency if it has confidence that the men on a jobs authority or council are continually dealing with the basic factors influencing national income, national production, consumer purchasing power, and volume of employment. Today the Government is furnishing a wartime market for about $90,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. When the fighting stops, we must find a peacetime market for $95,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. The jobs authority or council would have to plan for expanding the purchasing power of farmers for industrial products and the purchasing power of low-income groups for food and shelter. The authority or council would have to concern itself with the effect of interest rates and taxes on production and consumption. It should be prepared to make effective recommendations as to marketing or storing temporary surpluses.

If the public decides that the problem of winning the peace in terms of full employment is just as serious as the problem of winning the war, the public will demand some type of jobs set-up which will give positive assurance of postwar jobs for all. There must be neither idle poor nor idle rich. The jobs set-up would make its number one concern the provision of jobs for returning service men and women. Its number two concern would be the provision of jobs for those who formerly worked in war plants. Its over-all concern would be to make sure that the total business activity of the country is so great that jobs can be found for these servicemen and displaced war workers without creating unemployment for those who have been engaged in peacetime activities all the while. A jobs authority, if it had full responsibility for getting jobs for everyone, would also have to have power, subject only to the President and the Congress, to coordinate the various agencies whose activities determine markets and the speed of the business machine. Such power is so great that it could not be trusted lightly to any except those of the highest character. That is why I have said the President should have the privilege to draft brains in time of peace just as he has the right of drafting bodies in time of war.

After previous great wars there has been a period of judgment destroying inflation followed by a ruinous deflation. A jobs authority can prevent this. A jobs council could suggest ways of prevention.

I am convinced that the returning soldiers will insist on our putting as much effort into winning the peace as we have into winning the war. If we adopt some such mechanism as a jobs authority and put full energy behind it, we should be able to resume, with a minimum of dislocation, the age-old march of man toward abundance and the pursuit of happiness with the maximum of free enterprise. The prophets of old cried out for the wants of man, the great scientists of yesterday and today have revealed that there need be no physical poverty anywhere if exploitation of human beings can once for all be wiped out. Our great statesmen have led the way—Lincoln preaching freedom for the oppressed, Wilson fighting for the freedoms that were being swallowed up by cartels and international fascism, and Roosevelt expressing the ageless new deal in terms of greater economic security and hope for the forgotten, the common man. We have now become as one people with one mind and heart and effort to win the war at the earliest moment. We must remain as one people with one mind and heart and effort to establish firmly for us all the promise of peace, plenty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Restless Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I append a comprehensive and constructive statement by Mr. H. E. Klinefelter, editor of the Missouri Farmer, the official organ of the Missouri Farmers' Association, on flood control, with particular reference to the control of floodwaters in the valley of the Missouri River. Mr. Klinefelter is an outstanding representative of the agricultural press and has a lifetime acquaintance with the engineering and

agricultural problems attending the annual overflows of the Missouri and its tributaries, and is in a position to speak with authority on the subject. In response to a request from members of the Missouri delegation, Mr. Klinefelter has submitted the following analysis of the situation, embodying conclusions reached in an extended conference with officials of the Missouri Farmers' Association, as follows:

DEAR MR. CANNON: * * * Presumably any flood-control plan will embrace the Missouri River Basin, and will include parts of Missouri, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Arkansas, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and perhaps Wyoming, which area covers 15 percent of the United States, and wherein 17,000,000 people live. This will necessarily be so if we admit the fallacy of dealing with floods after the surplus waters have already swept down into the lower valley, as we have been doing in the past, and if we admit that floods must be dealt with at their source, which is on the uplands.

Before considering flood-control measures, it is important to agree upon a few points:

1. Flood control and soil conservation are inseparable—they are one and the same thing—although in the past they have been dealt with separately.

2. It is too late to attempt flood control after the waters have swept down into the valleys by means of big dams and higher levees, and to do so is to deal with effects rather than causes.

3. Floods begin on the uplands where the rain falls, and if water can be slowed down, captured, and held and utilized on the uplands by means of soil-conservation measures and good farming practices, most of it will never reach the lower valleys to cause devastating floods.

4. We may as well admit that floods can never be absolutely prevented. The worst flood in the memory of white men occurred in 1844 when most of our State was covered with forests. However, S. C. S. has proven in a northwest Missouri watershed area that we can more nearly control floods by proper soil-conservation practices than was possible naturally back in the days of boundless forests. Because floods cannot be controlled absolutely, there is justification for some levees and perhaps a few big dams to protect lowlands when there is an extra 7-inch rain, for example, at a time when rainfall is unusually abundant.

5. Flood control must be attacked on many fronts because it is a far-reaching problem caused by deforestation, melting snow water, excessive rainfall, soil erosion caused by improper land use, etc. That's why no one can say that mere dams and levees, or mere reforestation, or any one or two measures will suffice. Any flood-control plan must be far-reaching and all-embracing, and it is with this thought in mind that we of the M. F. A. suggest the following points:

Soil conservation should be given the greatest emphasis in any flood-control plan. Over a period of time, soil-erosion losses are four times greater than flood losses, anyhow. By means of pastures, ponds, terracing, contour farming, reforestation, and the promotion of good farm practices generally, we can slow up the run-off, utilize the surplus water—intercept the flood water and hold it back so that most of it will never reach the lower valleys. Such measures will not constitute a dead expense merely to hold back floods, as is true of big dams and levees, but will constitute an investment which will enhance the wealth of State and Nation and all that this implies.

Farm ponds of one-fourth acre to 5 acres in size, from 8 to 12 feet deep, are an effective means of capturing the surplus rainfall and utilizing it on the uplands. Dr. W. C. Etheridge has sent you reference material on the value of farm ponds, and therefore we shall not repeat it here. We completely endorse all he has said, except that in addition we point to the enormous cost of farmers hauling water for livestock each year, for which no estimate is available, and which an adequate number of farm ponds would save.

Irrigation is an important factor in the Northwest, and there is some point to impounding water in the dry sections for this purpose, particularly because melting snow water each spring contributes to the volume of water which causes floods in the lower valley. Any talk of irrigation elsewhere in the basin is, of course, ridiculous.

Big dams in the main streams, except perhaps in isolated cases, are impractical. In the first place, big dams without adequate soil-conservation measures on the uplands would soon be ruined through silting. Secondly, the impounded water behind them would create a permanent flood on our best agricultural lands. And, thirdly, it is more economical and effective to build thousands of farm ponds than a few big lakes.

Levees are probably necessary, but it is futile to build them higher and higher without doing anything about soil conservation on the uplands. Unless we deal with floods at their source, a time will come when the Missouri River will become so silted that it will flow between two walls, as is true of the Yellow River in China, and as is the case in lower Louisiana. Levees will serve a purpose in holding back an unusually heavy rain at a time when the soil is soaked throughout the basin.

Retention dams, which are big dams used for power, irrigation, and transportation by means of which a large volume of water is impounded and later allowed to subside after flood dangers have passed, are highly unpopular in Missouri. They create big permanent floods, and ruin our best farm lands. As the water is allowed to escape, a frog pond and mosquito source is created.

Detention dams, small ones constructed on the upper sources of creeks which detain the surplus rainfall for a few hours or days—merely serving to slow down the floods—are practicable. They should be built mostly on wastelands, along creeks, for example, where there is little bottom land. Any land the Government must purchase in order to build such dams should be reforested so that the covering can help absorb dashing rains.

Electric power in the Missouri River watershed will be greatly needed in the future. Cheap power made available in this heartland of America would soon make it a great industrial empire as well as greatly promote agriculture. If any big dams are built in the basin, attention should be given to power. And it should be a Government-owned project. Power is one field the Government, either State, National, or municipal, should take over, since it reaches right back into every man's kitchen refrigerator. For long enough, the power barons have held back the Nation's progress through exorbitant rates and other costs.

Recreation has a place in any flood-control plan, particularly in north Missouri. In some parts of north Missouri families have to travel many miles to reach a body of water to fish in and near which to hold family picnics. A few small lakes, say 5 miles in length, scattered throughout north Missouri, would provide needed recreational facilities for fishing, boating, picnicking, etc., and at the same time impound large volumes of water which contribute to floods. Such areas should be reforested and stocked with game and fish.

Reforestation is closely related to flood control. Denudation has greatly contributed to floods—timberlands, covered with leaf mold and other debris, absorb water like a blotter, and waste lands should be acquired by the Government for reforestation, with the better kinds of timber propagated. The areas would serve as oases for wildlife. The Nation's timber supply is being greatly depleted. We have not the figures available, but sooner or later Uncle Sam must do something about it. It is a problem that individuals cannot handle, because it takes a lifetime to develop a lumber crop and individuals cannot carry such a long-time investment—people don't live long enough to realize on it.

Administration of any flood-control plan should be channeled through two authorities. Levees and big dams should doubtless be handled by the Army. Soil-conservation measures should be channeled through some State agricultural authority such as the State soil districts commission personnel, composed of agricultural leadership. This is not to suggest, however, that soil districts should handle the work, since most of the work would have to be done outside soil districts. An organization combining, for instance, the extension forces, the farm-organization forces, soil-conservation service, civic groups, and others, would of necessity have to get behind such a program so that entire communities can be prepared ahead of time. It should be a people's movement.

We contemplate a sort of assembly line job. Leaders would sign up farmers in each community on a farm management plan looking to proper land use which would slow down and hold back surplus rainfall. Engineers would visit each farm, for example, and lay out farm ponds, fence rows, terrace lines, etc. Then crews of men would follow up, going from farm to farm, throwing up terraces and building ponds and fences to fit the needs. Machinery such as tractors, graders, and bulldozers no longer needed by the Army, should be utilized for these purposes. This program would employ thousands of ex-soldiers near their homes, instead of congregating them temporarily in large numbers on some monumental construction job such as road building and big dams.

And the program should not be a Santa Claus visitation. The Government should simply help farmers to do the job, it being recognized that all the people have a stake in the Nation's soil whether they own it individually or not, but farmers should be reminded of their primary responsibilities and be required to contribute toward the project—such as with labor, fencing, and other materials, and a pledge to manage their farms in conformity with what is proven to be good, sound practices. Where municipalities or counties are to be benefited by recreation facilities, they should contribute in some measure.

We reiterate—soil erosion losses over a long period are four times more costly to the Nation than floods. Adequate soil conservation measures will do more than anything else to prevent floods. Thousands of farm ponds properly located are more economical and more effective than big dams in our main streams for controlling floods. A post-war program of soil conservation and flood control can be a progressive means of helping the Nation to adjust to peacetime normalcy, and it will be a national investment that will bring good returns.

H. E. KLINEFELTER,
Editor.

Approved by Missouri Farmers Association State legislative committee.

Home Folks Aren't Fooled All the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a man and his wife living near my home

town, farmers both, with a son in the service—who rose from the ranks and is now a major, cited for distinguished service in the African campaign—comes the following letter, which is proof enough that the home folks are not fooled all of the time.

I happen to know that this letter is written by the mother, although signed by both. I know, too, that both grew up in the country, are typical average Michigan farmers.

So let the politicians in Washington read and remember, if they will, that the folks back home—at least in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan—have rather definite ideas about what the politicians in Washington are up to:

ALLEGAN, MICH., *February 9, 1944.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Long time since I have written and we sure hope and trust that the Senate and Congress will do something besides jangling to get this war to an end and stop the brutality. Our sons haven't asked or bargained for this horrible war. There will always be wars in those countries. The "four freedoms" won't stop them. They can't agree in Washington; how can we expect every Nation to do as we do? Can't be done; not even England will do as we do when this thing is over. First, it seems to me we must pick out someone besides Willkie for a Republican. Then the Senate and Congress should vote never over two terms for a President. The people back home are fed up, and do a lot of thinking instead of writing. Wherever the Roosevelts have traveled one or two sons pop up to see them. Yes, even Christmas two were home.

We haven't seen our son in 2 years and over next month; is almost 2 years overseas. Seems some of the overseas men should be released and new ones sent over. It sure is no benefit to their morale to keep them there too long. Will admit there are some things we don't understand. It looks, no matter at what expense, the war will not end until after election.

Yes, even in England they tell us for whom we should vote. Are we turning America over to England? Also see where the post office is out of the red. It ought to be, with all the stamps that are sold air mail, then go by slow boats. They are complaining of no letters; we send three, yes four sometimes, every week. Still, on January 14, our son wrote his wife he hadn't had any letters from us since November. I sent all of them air mail. We haven't had one from him since December 22. Am sure he has written.

Also put an end to them ever-popping-up strikes. Our boys work, go hungry, yes, swim rivers, have clothes frozen on them—not 8 hours but 24 to 60 hours and they can't strike.

Also the subsidy—give them a fair price; let farmers raise what they can do the best.

Then last but not least; we were asked to raise chickens, chickens, and more chickens. Everyone that had a back yard raised a few chicks. Results right now are too many chickens and eggs down; market feed is going up 5 cents a 100 pounds, about every week.

In the last war Melvin and I lost, or went in the red, on chickens about $600, wheat was $3 a bushel and so on; eggs down to nothing. There sure must be a remedy for this or very few chickens will be raised. Also there has been plenty of meat; guess some spoiled now. They tell us there will be a famine in meat in 60 days.

Also here is a problem. I have always baked and everything. Mel doesn't like baker's bread nor anything baked in a bakery. Well, we get from January 15 to March 31, 10 pounds of sugar. Anyone knows that is not enough; need some in bread and whatever I bake. This sugar business sure helps the big monopoly. Krogers do a big business in baker goods right here in Allegan and so does every other bakery.

Also don't make a mistake and have prohibition again. There were so many bootleggers. See where the prohibition officers will spend $1,000,000 to get it dry. Why don't they buy $1,000,000 of war bonds to help get this war over; then let our sons and husbands decide whether they want prohibition. They are doing the fighting.

Also hope that our men overseas can vote States' ballots, not controlled by the President; also they must be constitutional so they won't throw them out, for they will try many tricks to keep some in the dark but I really believe we been fooled long enough.

Also, I would like Senator PEPPER to get in the war. He wanted war so bad, am surprised that he is still in Washington. He should be in Japan.

Am a poor speller and writer; hope you can read it.

Yours sincerely.

Having read the foregoing, have you any doubt but that these people know what is happening? Do you think they are not aware of the drives by pressure groups? They live near enough to war industries to know what is happening in some of those plants and to know what wages are paid therein.

Let us not labor under the delusion that the folks back home are being fooled. They have been, perhaps they are, about some things, but not about everything.

What Did You Do Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem from the Las Vegas Evening Review Journal, of Las Vegas, Nev., of February 9, 1944:

WHAT DID YOU DO TODAY?

(John W. McGoodwin, H. A. first class, stationed in Pensacola, Fla., and a member of the U. S. Naval Hospital staff there, sent the following poem to his mother, Mrs. J. W. Jones, in Henderson, Nev., after he had received it from England with the following comment: "Lt. Dean Shatlain, tank commander, amputated his own foot with a jackknife and thought he was dying as he wrote the poem. He was rescued later by Americans after 2 hours of hiding and is now recuperating in a hospital in England." The poem was written in Africa.)

What did you do today, my friend,
From morning 'til the nite?
How many times did you complain
That rationing is too tight?
When are you going to start to do
All of the things you say?
A soldier would like to know, my friend,
What did you do today?

We met the enemy today
And took the town by storm—
Happy reading it will make
For you tomorrow morn.
You'll read with satisfaction
The brief communiqué—
We fought—but are you fighting—
What did you do today?

My gunner died in my arms today—
I feel his warm blood yet;
Your neighbor's dying boy gave out
A scream I'll never forget.
On my right a tank was hit—
A flash and then a fire—
The stench of burning flesh
Still rises from the pyre.

What did you do today, my friend,
To help us with the task?
Did you work harder and longer for less,
Or is that too much to ask?
What right have I to ask you this?
You will probably say—
Maybe now you'll understand—
You see—I died today.

The Tax Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a letter received today from a constituent relative to the tax muddle that we are now in. It strikes me that my constituent has made a good point, and it deserves consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Bureau of Internal Revenue:

JANESVILLE, WIS., *February 11, 1944.*

DEAR MR. SMITH: You probably get many letters complaining about the present income- and Victory-tax forms, and there is one specific thing that I cannot understand about the 1943 form. On page 3 of the instructions for form 1040, the following is said about the specific exemption from Victory tax:

"An exemption of $1,248 is allowed a husband and wife filing a joint return unless the Victory-tax net income of one spouse is less than $624, in which case the total exemption is limited to $624 plus the Victory-tax net income of such spouse."

Why is it that a joint return, where the wife has a job outside the home, is entitled to twice as much exemption as the joint return, where the wife has a family, and she stays home to look after the family? I understand that it is patriotic for women to work in war plants, but are we going to discourage families and family life?

According to the ruling of the Internal Revenue Department on the above quotation, a farmer's wife, who helps her husband on the farm, cannot claim a Victory-tax exemption, and an independent grocer's wife, who helps her husband at the grocery store, cannot claim an exemption.

It seems odd that a tax could be called a Victory tax which discourages a farmer's wife to help her husband on the farm, and which discourages a grocer's wife to help her husband at the grocery. I thought that it was bringing victory nearer and quicker when a wife would step in and help her husband do chores on the farm, or a wife would step in and help her husband run his grocery store.

I would appreciate to hear of your attitude toward this part of the Victory tax.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND SCOTT.

Address of Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis at Crispus Attucks High School Flag Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 21, 1944, very impressive ceremonies were conducted at the Crispus Attucks High School, in Indianapolis when a service flag was dedicated to the young men and women of that school who have gone forth to serve their country in uniform.

Crispus Attucks High School is one of the largest and most important of the Negro high schools of the United States. In many respects it tops all others. Indianapolis is proud of it and of its principal, Russell A. Lane, who has demonstrated high qualities of leadership in educational work and civic enterprise.

The promoters of the celebration were fortunate in securing a speaker worthy of the occasion, Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, who told from first-hand knowledge how the war is progressing and cited the brave and patriotic conduct of Negroes in the various theaters of operation.

I appreciate the courtesy of the House in granting my request for unanimous consent permitting General Davis' speech to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He spoke as follows:

This should be a very proud occasion in the life of your community. I am honored to have a part in it. We are met here tonight to dedicate a service flag to the boys and girls who were students of Crispus Attucks High School and are now men and women, serving their Nation in uniform through its time of greatest crisis.

You are the parents, the relatives, the friends of these brave young people. The ties are very close. But you do more than honor them tonight. You are drawn together now in an expression of your pride that this community has assumed its appropriate share in the defense of ideals of liberty which have particular significance for our race and people.

These young people are your dearest possessions. You have given them freely. I know that each star in the flag which hangs here represents anxiety and heartache and sacrifice to some Indianapolis family. Yet it is only these stars, and the many others on similar flags in auditoriums such as this throughout the country, which guarantee that the 48 stars on the blue field of our Nation's flag may still shine forth in freedom.

This is total war. It has reached from foreign lands across both our protecting oceans to touch every phase of American life. No town has been too small to feel its influence. We do not need to have our cities devastated by attack from the sky to realize how urgent has been its threat to our entire civilization.

Colored men have gone out from our ports to man the lifelines of defense and attack in distant places which were hardly names to us when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. New Guinea and Guadalcanal, Pantelleria and Gela on the shore of Sicily—these have become words which live in glory because Americans, colored as well as white, spent their blood there in defense of their country.

Last August 31—and no later figures have been announced—153,800 colored soldiers were serving overseas, which represents more than one quarter of the total number of colored soldiers in the Army.

On that same date, the War Department announced that the total number of colored persons in the Army, including officers, enlisted men, nurses, warrant officers, hospital dietitians, physical therapy aides, and members of the Women's Army Corps, was 582,861.

Of this colored personnel, 57,323 were in the infantry, 58,328 in the coast and field artillery, 92,171 were in the engineers, and 9,750 were in the cavalry. The remaining 360,000 were in the other arms and services—Army Air Forces, Chemical Warfare Service, Quartermaster Corps, Armored Command, which is tanks, tank-destroyer command, and medical corps.

There were 4,386 colored commissioned officers. Of that number, 395 were medical corps officers, 67 were dental corps officers, 158 were chaplains, and there were 202 nurses.

I mention these figures, because I believe that on such an occasion as this it is fitting to examine the great contribution which colored people are making to the powerful army we have created to meet the challenge of the Nazi and the Jap. And I hope that in this process I may contribute to your understanding of the many-sided army in which so many of our men and women are serving and fighting.

I have been a soldier all my life, and the Army is my life. I take pride in it and I like to see others filled with that same sense of pride. There has been plenty of reason for enormous pride in the exploits of our young men during the past 2 years of battle. Colored soldiers were among the first to go out, both across the Pacific and across the Atlantic. There is not a major expeditionary force overseas today which does not contain colored troops.

Let me tell you about some of them. Over in New Guinea last spring, Brig. Gen. Hanford C. MacNider paraded the troops on the occasion of the first anniversary of the landing of American soldiers on that embattled island. A colored general service engineer regiment which had seen service under fire had the distinction of leading the parade, because it had been the first American unit to arrive in the spring of 1942.

Speaking to the assembled officers, noncoms, and enlisted men of the unit, General MacNider said, and I quote, "Fellow soldiers, a year ago today when you stepped ashore as the first American troop unit in New Guinea you were making history. You've been making it ever since. You've had a part in the building and upkeep of all our airfields, and thus you've helped make possible the destruction of the convoy in the Bismarck Sea, the flying of the infantry over the mountains, a hundred enemy actions.

"You've contributed your share to every crack we've taken at the Japs," General MacNider continued. "You've built the causeways and the docks, even unloaded the ships so we could eat and fight. You've built roads and the mains which bring us water and the lines which give us our light and power. Some of you have been to war with the tanks. You know all about bombs, from hanging them on planes to having them hung on you."

And when General MacNider gave these men his highest praise. He said, "You're one of the workingest outfits in this man's army. All of us over here are proud of you. All Americans will be proud of you when your record gets into the histories."

Yes, all Americans are proud of an outfit which calls forth such a commendation as that.

Or let me tell you about the four colored soldiers—infantrymen, these were—who were awarded the Legion of Merit, our country's newest decoration, for acts of heroism they performed in Guadalcanal last March 27. The citation tells the story, and I should like to read it to you:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services on March 27, 1943, at Guadalcanal, by leaving the comparative safety afforded by a slit trench and advancing some 250 yards over open terrain, exposed to bombing from an enemy air raid, in order to assist in evacuating casualties. This undertaking was accomplished although enemy action continued, causing impenetrable dust, and confusion prevailed. Exceptional coolness and efficiency during exposure to danger were displayed while evacuating the wounded."

Let me high-light the picture just a little for you. Here are four enlisted men, one a private first class and the others privates, lying in a slit trench where they had sought shelter when the alarm was given. As the citation says, they were comparatively safe there. Except for a direct hit—when no one can protect himself—these men did not need to expose themselves. But there were other soldiers nearby who were not so fortunate. The bombs that missed the slit trench where these four lay caught some of their comrades. Then, disregarding the danger to themselves, the private first class and his three companions left their shelter. I have no doubt that some of the wounded men they helped to evacuate owe their lives to the courage and unselfish action of these four men.

Not long ago the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Antiaircraft Artillery Automatic Weapons Battalion had the honor of being cited by the commanding general of the Fifth Army in Italy, Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, for outstanding performance of duty.

This battalion was the first American colored combat force to land on European soil, and it had been the first American colored combat force to land in north Africa.

The action which drew forth General Clark's praise happened in the harbor of Naples, even before the unit had gone ashore. The troops were still aboard their ships when German bombers began a night attack on the American craft massed in the bay.

On board one vessel the soldiers had been selected to man 40-millimeter weapons that were part of the ship's armament. Because of the position of the hostile aircraft, the main antiaircraft defenses of the ship could not be maneuvered to produce effective fire. But the men of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth could. An enemy bomber was picked up by searchlights and the American crew began pumping shells at this target. Three hits were observed and the third seemed to tear off the right wing of the Nazi plane. The bomber crashed into the sea.

During this same action, on a nearby ship that was carrying part of the men and equipment of this battalion, Master Sgt. Johnson Clark, of Detroit, jumped into a truck which was lashed to the deck and opened fire at a second bomber with a .50-caliber machine gun mounted on the cab. The Nazi, struck by Clark's shots and by other fire being put up from the ship, crashed into the sea.

That is the type of quick thinking and quick shooting which warms the hearts of Americans. The bravery and accuracy of fire demonstrated by those colored troops definitely weakened the enemy's raid on important harbor shipping.

General Clark left no question of his own high opinion of these troops. In commending them he said, and I quote, "I am proud of the outstanding performance of duty of these soldiers in this baptism of fire. Their conduct was excellent and reflects the training and discipline of their unit. The Fifth Army welcomes such soldiers."

But the Four Hundred and Fiftieth was just beginning its exploits that night in Naples Harbor. Not long afterward we heard more about its men from a post somewhere in the front lines, and it was the same gun section that had accounted for the two bombers.

Another Detroit man, Sgt. Herbert C. Tyler, is its section chief. One afternoon an excited Italian farmer came running up to him, waving his arms wildly and pointing to a culvert about 800 yards from the position occupied by the section's guns. I don't believe Sergeant Tyler had much of any idea what the Italian said, but it didn't take him long to realize what he meant—trouble.

He picked up his tommy gun, ordered three of his men to follow with their rifles, and led the group to the culvert. Before long, they were back with four German prisoners, who had surrendered without a struggle. But hidden in the culvert with them, these fellows had assembled a vast stock of mines, grenades, carbines, and TNT. Later it was brought out that they were sent on a mission of sabotaging Army material. By quick and fearless action these four enlisted men of the Four Hundred and Fiftieth had neatly upset their plans.

I am a little reluctant to speak of the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron—not, I hasten to say, because I do not take great pride in its achievements, but because during its operations from north African bases and later from bases established in Sicily last summer my son, Lt. Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., had the honor of being its commanding officer.

But in this case I feel that modesty should be overruled in favor of a word about the service of this squadron, which first saw action during the early days of June in dive-bombing attacks on the Italian island of Pantelleria. This was after the capitulation of the Germans and Italians in north Africa, you remember, but previous to the landings on Sicily.

It was on June 18 that a flight of 6 planes from the Ninety-ninth first encountered enemy planes. Over Pantelleria they met a force of 12 German FW-190's protecting bombers bent on raiding Allied garrisons which, by that date, had taken over the island. Ten more German fighters hovered upstairs, flying over. In this baptism of fire, the Ninety-ninth gave a praiseworthy account of itself. The American colored pilots parried the Nazi thrust and caused the other planes to retreat with 2 of the Germans damaged. The Ninety-ninth suffered no losses.

During a bomber escort mission to Sciacca, Italy, the squadron accounted for its first enemy plane. On that date, the Ninety-ninth was flying close escort for our bombers, absorbing all of the attack of more than 20 ME-109's, Macchi 202's, and FW-190's. The Americans lost 2 of their planes, but Capt. Charles B Hall, of Brazil, Ind., downed the first plane credited to a colored pilot. After the ships returned, General Eisenhower himself visited the airfield where the squadron was based and personally congratulated Captain Hall on his victory.

These few episodes, taken from the Army's records, are in the pattern of service which colored troops are performing on every American battle front. But the Army is not all fighting. And before ever a man gets into combat there are many long—sometimes weary—months of training before he has accomplished that necessary transition from civilian to soldier.

That transition means far more than the exterior change of putting on a uniform. The uniform is his outward evidence of the new life to which he has dedicated himself, but his real dedication is a matter of the spirit.

To many men who pass through the processes of selective service and are sent to their first camp, I am afraid the Army may seem for a time to offer a strange and sometimes unreasonable life. This is as true of the white man as of the colored man, but I have often felt that there are prejudices and resentments, grown out of old experience, which make the colored man somewhat more apprehensive of what is in store for him when he enters Army life.

Without comment on the merits of these prejudices, I should like to point out some of the distortions and anxieties which they may create in the minds of parents back home when they are sifted through the letters which the new trainee may write.

The most important attribute of the soldier is a strong, healthy body. It must be trained to such a fiber of toughness as few civilians ever acquire. A healthy body is the soldier's first shield and resource. Without it, he can never surmount the hardships of enemy action in difficult terrain. The calisthenics, the drilling, the gradually stiffening marches and bivouacs under the open sky are not designed by the Army for the purpose of making him uncomfortable. Some day, on some far field, he may bless them, for they are the source of his strength to endure.

War is not a soft thing. Even in such mechanized warfare as this, in the last analysis it is the soldier's strength which wins the battle. He may ride to battle in a truck, but he will fight on his feet, and his feet had better be good.

There are many complaints in letters back home during the first weeks of training. Do not take them too seriously. These men are just beginning to find aching muscles which they had never known existed before. They are beginning to know fatigue, but they have not yet mastered it. They are learning instant obedience to orders, but they have not yet discovered that this, again, is not some unreasonable compliance which the Army demands but is the basis of success in battle.

Battles move swiftly, relentlessly. There is no time to question, to argue a little, to consider whether you will obey when a commanding officer issues an order. He who hesitates may well have lost his life before he makes up his mind, and the disciplined soldier learns that instant obedience is both necessary and wise.

Gradually the spirit of the soldier is born during these months of training. A man acquires pride in himself, pride in his outfit, pride in the Army, pride in his country which this Army represents.

Many men will return to civilian life far better equipped to serve useful lives for what they have learned in the Army. The Army has need for many skills, and there are not enough who possess them to fill the need. So the Army has instituted its many technical schools at which trades and skills are taught which will be as useful in civilian life later on as they are now in combat.

Many men, too, are learning for the first time through their Army experience how to read and write and count money and approach the ordinary experiences of life with confidence. Illiterates who pass certain tests are inducted and then incorporated into special training units where these rudiments of education are taught. A large number of colored men are now undergoing this type of training, many from the agricultural regions of the South where they have never before had opportunities for schooling. To these lives the Army will have added incomparably. Upon the basis of learning which they are acquiring, they may move forward to knowledge which was beyond their reach before.

Army experience is also cutting the rate of venereal disease. Although initially the Army would not accept a man with venereal disease, the regulation was changed some time ago so that men were accepted first with uncomplicated cases of gonorrhea and more recently with uncomplicated cases of syphilis. Inductees infected with venereal disease are sent to hospitals at the reception centers where they undergo treatment. From these centers they are assigned to various units of the Army in the same manner as other soldiers.

These facts should convince you that the Army experience, on the whole, is not a life to be looked upon with apprehension. It is hard, it is tough sometimes. It must be, to prepare us for these grim months we are facing. No weaklings will come through them easily. But before he has finished his Army career, a man acquires a new respect for himself.

Colored soldiers are honored members of the Army. Guarding them—and all soldiers—against local prejudice, Army justice operates to protect their interests when they may have been led astray in civilian communities.

I do not know that it is generally known, but the commanding officer of a soldier arrested in a civilian community is directed to ask the civilian authorities to surrender him for trial.

Not all such requests are honored, for a soldier, as well as a civilian, is under civil jurisdiction when he leaves the boundaries of his Army post. But in those instances where civilian authorities do not comply, the refusal is transmitted to the War Department. Additional requests are made. The result is often—though not always—the surrender of the soldier to the custody of his commanding officer, to face the unprejudiced justice of military law.

I have said that I feel honored to be here tonight. I want to repeat it. To the relatives and friends, I should like to offer my congratulations on the young men and women to whom you are dedicating this service flag. In such evidence of our single-minded devotion to one great cause lies the strength of this Nation. Victory will be ours. We cannot fail. You may read it in these stars.

Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am including the Lincoln Day speech delivered by Justice Francis E. Rivers, of the city court of the city of New York, last Thursday evening at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., before the annual Lincoln banquet by the Republican Members of the United States Senate, House of Representatives, and the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia. Justice Rivers is one of the most brilliant of the colored race in America. We from Kansas are particularly proud of him because he is a

native of our State. I am sure that many will be glad of this opportunity to read the very able address he gave on Abraham Lincoln:

Fellow Americans, we are fortunate in these desperate times to be able to repair to an over-soul for inspired leadership. I would pay tribute tonight to the noblest of the many great properties of this transcendent figure.

On September 22, 1862, Abraham Lincoln achieved his last step in putting in proper perspective the intricate mass of problems involved in the relationship of slavery and union. It was the conclusion that abolition of slavery was morally right and that what was morally right was the best aid to preserving the Union.

He had reached this decision through serious reflection—through prayer on bended knees—and through the most tortuous soul-searing years ever endured by any American.

He was not aided by the pride in moral exaltation and the sureness of conviction of a Sumner or a Garrison. In fact such was his distaste for ascribing to himself moral virtue that he asserted military necessity as the sole ground for his decision favoring freedom.

But in 1862, just as today, the embittered prejudice which would deny any advance to the Negro, made it so that moral courage had to be the first requisite of any American leader who dared to do an act calculated to improve fundamentally the lot of the colored man in these United States.

Mere intellectual depth or shrewd intuitive statesmanship or political smartness or military astuteness could never have served a man to brave the storm which engulfed Lincoln when on September 22, 1862, and again on January 1, 1863, he signed and made effective the emancipation proclamation.

How aptly this Biblical verse fits Lincoln: "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

Suffering was the main element perfecting Lincoln, the captain of America's salvation in its darkest days. And in this process of growing through pain, so deep had become his faith in America and so understanding his knowledge of America that his mind was America.

He knew then that when he had suffered till his mind recognized abolition of slavery as morally right, that the controlling public opinion of America would likewise feel that all Americans must be free because it was right. And being so thoroughly American he had faith, despite any storm of abuse and prejudice, that the majority of Americans were fundamentally fair and would favor what was decent.

Lincoln gave the example of a great national leader who made prevail the aspirations of the enlightened majority rather than the cynicism and blind prejudices of the few. His was a brilliant grasp of public relations and timing which sprang from his deep-seated convictions which were part of the inmost soul of America.

The faith that America is at heart decent, the moral courage and practical insight to give the inspired leadership needed to encourage fair men to persist in their course, without regard to consequences—this is what Lincoln means today to every sincere American citizen no matter what his race, color, or creed.

All Negroes, in common with other loyal Americans, are grateful to this martyred leader for having extirpated the blot of slavery from our national life. However, it is a challenging standard of the leadership which America deserves today, rather than because of appreciation of past acts, that the American citizen cherishes and reveres the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

We would have this challenge continually held before us—continually given present-day application and not exist merely as a subject for tribute on special occasions.

Today, as in 1862, America needs the zeal and intelligent effort of all its citizens. The recent revelations showing that our foes combine an incredible savagery with their fighting skills make us realize that a new reserve of national strength must be tapped to insure the speedy crushing of these inhuman enemies. Such reserves of human spirit exist in our democracy, but without moral leadership they cannot be evoked.

During the past decade we have witnessed in our leadership an alarming indifference to moral principle. A national administration has presented as its chief concern the "forgotten man." At the same time it has abandoned the Negro citizen to the mercies of local bigots.

Such betrayal of the Negro, it has attempted to justify upon the craven ground that anti-Negro forces must be always appeased, lest they wreck a New Deal program or cause our defeat by sabotage of the war effort.

Such a national leadership is without moral courage and wrong in its American instincts since it assumes that the majority of Americans would rather endure defeat than see fairness accorded the Negro.

Contrast with such unmoral conduct the brave action of Lincoln: he risked loss of the disloyal Americans who laid down their arms and deserted because of the Emancipation Proclamation. He knew that this courageous blow for freedom would inspire the great majority of Americans to fight that much harder.

In these anxious days there occur frequent instances of the American uniform failing to protect the Negro citizen against the mistreatment of discrimination, segregation, assault, and even homicide perpetrated upon him by disloyal Americans in America.

A national leadership misreads the temper of the people in not recognizing that this outrageous condition constitutes the burning moral issue facing America today.

The present administration having thus failed, new national leadership must be found soon to face and meet successfully this inescapable issue. Continued default in the duty of courage will compel at an early date the disappearance of moral fiber in all American leadership.

Here then is the Republican Party's opportunity to regenerate American life by infusing it again with moral principle. To grasp this opportunity its leadership must successfully measure up to the challenge of Abraham Lincoln.

The Republican Party would fail to meet this challenge if it avoided taking a position on this serious moral issue, in the hope that by not antagonizing powerful forces, it would become the beneficiary of various discontents and hates. This party will be recreant if it copies the present leadership and allies itself with anti-Negro forces as the easy way to win control. It will have lost its soul—and the election.

The Republican Party's career nationally and locally has shown that it achieves its most victorious estate when it intelligently infuses moral principles into its leadership. The American electorate signally rewarded the courage of Lincoln and the Republican Party in the 1864 elections. It was when the Republican Party was forging the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments with fires of moral courage and enthusiasm that it won the approval of the American Nation in election after election.

History proves that adherence to the ideals of Lincoln by the Republican Party is the only way in which America will be made to face bravely this burning moral issue, the continued evasion of which imperils our national character.

But in emulating Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party does more than render justice to the Negro; it makes America the strong and spiritual Nation it was meant to be.

What does Lincoln mean to the Negro? To the Negro the great-souled leadership of Lincoln contains the fundamental impulses of American democracy. In fact, Lincoln's soul not only is America; it also embodies the America that is to be; an America in which the practiced way of life will square with the professed ideals of our Nation.

To achieve such a Nation requires that great moral leadership shall again arise.

The Negro wants to recapture today his traditional part in helping the Republican Party develop this moral leadership necessary to make live in deeds the true meaning of Abraham Lincoln.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, so many articles appearing in the press in regard to the soldier vote have been ill-informed and in many instances grossly misleading that I am particularly pleased to note in one of the papers in my district a letter which discusses the whole subject with remarkable lucidity and analytical power. Particularly noteworthy is the writer's treatment of the lessons to be drawn from the Hayes-Tilden controversy.

This letter, writen by Charles C. Chase, appeared in the Kennebunk Star of Friday, February 4, 1944, and reads as follows:

PROPOSED PLAN FOR SERVICE VOTING COURTS BITTER CONTEST OVER RETURNS

KENNEBUNK, *February 1.*

EDITOR OF STAR:

The more one reads about the proposed conduct of service voting, the clearer it becomes that its advocates are either stupid or desire a ballot limited to voting for the President and Vice President and, in either case, are courting a bitter and lengthy contest over the November election returns.

Their failure to be realistic about the fact that, mechanically, it would be an impossible job for the Federal Government unless the service ballot was confined to voting for the President and Vice President only, and their utter disregard of the right to vote for State candidates by the service citizens, leads only to the conclusion that it is a purely partisan measure of sinister intent.

Nor is there anything in the forced compromise to date to alter that view.

California, for example, conducts an election in November not only for the purpose of voting for the President and Vice President, but for Representatives from each of 23 Congressional Districts, with a necessarily different ballot for each.

The State has 80 assembly and 20 State senatorial districts each of which require a different ballot, 100 in all.

Moreover, counties and cities will have matters, as well as candidates, which will have to be approved or disapproved by the voters in the same election in November all

of which adds up, in ballots, to hundreds of thousands in number and many in variety.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

Our own State provides another example. In mid-June a State-wide primary election is held in which the political parties ballot on their respective candidates for Governor, for Congress, and in the 16 counties for county officers; in all, 16 different ballots. Three months later the State election is held at which another 16 ballots are required, followed in November by the Presidential election.

These are the requirements of only two States.

Multiply these by 24, with more added to account for other elections in several States and the difficulty of it all—and the intent—is clear.

The job of handling an election is tremendous even for the States, with their established voting machinery. Surely a government said to be suffering from a labor shortage is going to find it almost impossible. One need only turn to the 1944 income-tax return for a current example of Government bungling.

The States elect a President through electors selected in a manner provided by their legislatures. All Congress may do is decide the date when the electors shall be chosen and the date of meeting to cast their vote. State boards deliver certificates of election to the electors who thereafter meet in their respective States, cast, certify, and seal their ballots and send them to the President of the United States Senate.

Article XII, section 1, of the amendments to the Constitution provides "the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all these certificates, and the votes shall then be counted * * *." Sounds perfectly simple, but who is to do the counting?

NATION NEARLY DISRUPTED 67 YEARS AGO

That question nearly disrupted the Nation 67 years ago. The country had not emerged from the bitterness of the Civil War. Not only did Federal troops remain in the South but many northerners held State offices in Southern capitals. Old angers and hates were renewed, causing prudent men in both sections to urge unity and peace for the safety of the Republic. The New York Democrat, Tilden, on the morning following the election, seemed to have 184 electoral votes, 1 short of a majority. The Democrats' hopes of carrying the election had been high, since they had gained largely in the recent elections for Congress and were in control of most of the Southern States. The Republican expectations of emerging with a victory out of this unhappy mess lay in Oregon and California, which seemed certain, and in South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, where there were troops and carpetbaggers from the North. Altogether the Hayes forces believed they could count on 185 votes, which was enough.

EACH PARTY CLAIMED VICTORY

As a result of the disputes and desperate partisan practices in the three Southern States both the Republicans and the Democrats sent returns to Congress, each claiming victory. In Congress the House of Representatives was Democratic and the Senate was Republican In due course the President of the Senate was presented with two certified sets of returns from each of the three Southern States and from Oregon, which the Republicans had counted in their victory column on the morning after the election. The President of the Senate, who was a Republican, was to open the ballots. But who was to count them? Hayes was elected if the President of the Senate was to do the counting; Tilden, if a joint convention of both Houses did so. A deadlock and no election was to be the result if the two bodies acted separately.

The inauguration date was March 4, fortunately 3 months after the December 6 meeting date of the electors. Compromise was indeed necessary to avert disaster. The compromise was an appointment by Congress of an electoral commission, consisting of five Members of the House, five Members of the Senate, and five Justices of the Supreme Court. Of this commission, eight were Republicans and seven were Democrats.

After investigation and many arbitrary decisions, the commission, by a majority of one vote (cast by a Republican), declared the Republicans had won in each State where there was a dispute. Congress then announced that Hayes had been elected President for the next 4 years. He was inaugurated March 4, 1877.

The country had survived a near crisis. The essential continuity of Government had been preserved by a perilously narrow margin, caused by questionable and conflicting authority in certifying the returns on the vote for electors.

ANGER NOW EXCEEDS THAT OF 1876

In this 1944 election, as in 1876, the States must issue the certificates of the electors—their authority for casting their votes for President. Suppose a Federal voting commission should certify votes which were unacceptable to State election boards, the latter claiming they did not conform to the laws of their States (several Southern States now contend they will refuse to tolerate such an infringement), might there not again arise the contesting blocks of votes which would peril the succession?

The danger now would exceed that of 1876, however. The Congress convenes on January 3. Several days might elapse before getting down to business. By January 20 the new President must have been declared elected if the succession is to be continuous. This is a dangerously short time in which to settle the contest.

Surely in a close election partisan feeling would be great and the issue between some of the States and the Federal commission might become as acute as in 1876. If the Federal commission were determined to have its way or several of its necessarily partisan members were resolute men, a repetition of 1876 is possible. Is such a risk necessary in time of war?

SERVICEMEN MAY VOTE UNDER PRESENT LAW

Nobody is trying to disenfranchise anybody. Obviously any person in the service, regardless of where located, can vote if legally entitled to do so and will take the time to write a letter to his secretary of state. That he will find these officials cooperative there need be no doubt.

All the Federal Government needs to do is to continue as a first-class mail carrier. There are enough interested and vigilant politicians of both parties left at home in all States to see to it that absent citizens have a chance to vote.

As to citizens of Maine, they can be certain of their chance as our absentee voting statutes are simple, easily complied with and the State officials alert to their duty.

CHARLES C. CHASE.

Jews in Palestine

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, it is very evident the time is at hand when we cannot go any further without raising our voice in protest over the continued unwillingness of Great Britain to relax her stringent rule regarding the immigration of Jews to Palestine.

The humiliation and atrocities to which they have been subjected, particularly on the European Continent, surpasses anything that has come to the attention of the civilized world.

Their position is insecure. In the countries where they are not persecuted, they feel a gratitude tempered by fear lest this may not endure. This constant atmosphere of fear is no good for any individual or group of individuals in the free exercise and development of mind and body. Anti-Semitism is always lurking around the corner, a danger not only to the Jews but to the moral and mental balance of their gentile neighbors.

What can we do to relieve this situation? We can either take them into our fold or help to secure for them a place where they may gather and develop into a nation and a country of their own. A national existence of their own seems to be the consensus of opinion. But where? Each nation seems to shirk the responsibility. Several areas have been mentioned but have proven to be a fiasco. Jewish tradition, religious and national, knows only one promised land, and that is Palestine. It is the rightful home of the Jewish people. This territory which has been assigned for the Jewish national home, through the Balfour declaration to the Jews, on November 2, 1917, is only 10,000 miles square, a very small portion of the vast Arabian territory which is about 1,500,000 square miles.

This is the same Palestine which the Bible has described as a land flowing with milk and honey, and the historians tell us that it supported a population of 4,000,000 in the Roman and Grecian era.

During the centuries that followed, misrule has been so evident that neglect of this holy place soon converted it into a desolated area. Sand dunes replaced vegetation and cities dwindled.

Now, let us see what has been done to this holy land, which is about the size of Belgium or Sicily, since the Jews began their development in 1920. They have not only doubled its population, but through their determination to rebuild the ancient homeland of the Jewish people, they have converted this rapidly disintegrating area into a semi-industrial and agricultural country.

They not only had to acquire land but had to reclaim it, drain it, reforest it, fertilize it, irrigate it, electrify it, and industrialize it with new industries which today number textile, chemical, electrical, building, and clothing. A credit to any nation. Its agricultural population of 800,000 will be trebled in the near future due to irrigation possibilities. Its cities now, which at one time were deserted, are well inhabited and electrified. Tel-Aviv is now a city of 200,000, where only 30 years ago was merely sand dunes, and Haifa rapidly growing into a city of 500,000.

This growth of the Jewish national home and its achievements in many fields commands the admiration of the world

and certainly a source of pride to the Jewish people.

Palestine in general has become a new world. The large increase of Jewish population, which is about 1,500,000 today, has not displaced any of the native population. In fact, we are informed that it has caused an increase in the Arab population. This has been confirmed by Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, secretary for the colonies in the Chamberlain government, when he stated in the House of Commons on November 24, 1938:

The Arabs cannot say that the Jews are driving them out of their country. If not a single Jew had come to Palestine after 1918, I believe that the Arab population of Palestine today would still have been around the 600,000 figure, instead of over 1,000,000 as at present, at which it had been stable under the Turkish rule. It is because the Jews who have come to Palestine bring modern health services and other advantages, that the Arab men and women who would have been dead are alive today, that Arab children who would never have drawn breath have been born and grow strong.

The assurance by the English Government of a Jewish national home in Palestine, initiated over a quarter of a century ago, was mainly responsible for the country's mighty advance. The persecutions of the minorities during the World War No. 1 was the seed for the development of this home, with the hope that such atrocities would never again occur. But, before and during the present World War, the atrocities became more and more brutal. Millions of Jews were slaughtered. Every attempt was made to stop these atrocities, but to no avail. His Holiness Pope Pius XI, cognizant of these brutalities, interceded on several occasions and offered his services to guarantee safe passage, whenever possible, for the transportation of the oppressed minorities to their homeland in Palestine. But unfortunately this did not materialize. His pleas and the increased atrocities have stirred the entire civilized world to act with greater urgency toward making it a reality. Palestine for the Jews. A homeland of their own. But what have we accomplished, and how does the situation stand today?

At a time when millions of European Jews have been massacred by the Nazis, we face a possibility of closure of the only door of escape for the 2,000,000 Jews who still survive the tortures and who are imploring the civilized world to provide them with means of escape from the Nazi murderers through the white paper of May 17, 1939, issued by the British Government, which closes Palestine to all Jewish immigration on March 31, 1944, and to which I protested at the time of issuance of this white paper and asked President Franklin D. Roosevelt to do all in his power to have Great Britain rescind that order and to remind His Britannic Majesty of the mandate for Palestine adopted by the Council of the League of Nations on July 24, 1922. This treaty specifically stated that any changes must be with our assent.

Mr. Winston Churchill informs us that—

His Majesty's Government have no intentions of repudiating the obligations into which they have entered toward the Jewish people.

And also stated:

The position is that His Majesty's Government are bound by a pledge which is antecedent to the Covenant of the League of Nations * * * and regrets very much that the pledge of the Balfour Declaration, endorsed as it has been by successive Governments, and the conditions under which we obtained the mandate, have both been violated by the Governments' proposals. There is much in this white paper which is alien to the spirit of the Balfour Declaration.

Is it fair then for the democratic world to be standing idly by and permit this white paper to go into effect? I, for one, do not believe so. This pledge of a home for refuge should not be closed to the still wandering persecuted scattered Jews throughout Europe, numbering about 2,000,000, whose eyes are focused on Palestine.

Should the doors of Palestine be closed to them through the action of the white paper, we ought, then, bow our heads in shame, for through this act of closure we would encourage the Nazi's regime to continue their brutalities and exterminate the remaining Jews. It would be a signal for Hitler to continue his atrocities until his aim has been accomplished.

We, as a democratic people, cannot and will not tolerate such brutalities. The Congress of the United States should, and undoubtedly will, approve unanimously any resolution that offers protection of the persecuted minorities.

You all recall the statement of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, 20 years ago, when he said:

A great responsibility will rest upon the Zionists, who, before long, will be proceeding, with joy in their hearts, to the ancient seat of their people. Theirs will be the task to build up a new prosperity and a new civilization in old Palestine, so long neglected and misruled.

Now, let us look over the record of the Jewish people since occupying Palestine. What do we find? We find that the Jewish people have lived up to their responsibility and have made Palestine what it is today. I agree with Prime Minister Churchill, referring to the Chamberlain statement, when he said:

Well, they have answered his call. They have fulfilled his hopes. How can he find it in his heart to strike them this mortal blow?

The Jewish people of Palestine have not only shown interest in their homeland but have done much to aid the Allied cause. The Jewish troops now number over 30,000 volunteers and have contributed much toward winning the war. Many of the Jewish youth of Palestine have already paid the supreme sacrifice in the line of battle and their loved ones at home aid our allied armies by operating war plants and in the transportation of vital implements of war.

The Jewish troops are not only fighting to save their Jewish brethren of Europe but are fighting to help save the lives of our boys as well. They are a part of our integrate forces. They are fighting to help save the democratic way of life, to which they have already contributed much.

Mr. Churchill, the dynamic force that he is, respected by all, even by the Axis nations though they care not to admit, has the opportunity now to enforce his words by concrete action. He should persuade His Britannic Majesty to abrogate this white paper, and together with the Allied nations, particularly with the United States through its War Refugee Board, create now a haven for these Jews. Get them out of the Nazi-controlled countries. Give them temporary shelter with the hope that Palestine will keep its doors open forever to welcome them.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, hearings are now being held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs concerning the welfare of the persecuted minorities. I know a resolution will be adopted by that committee by a unanimous vote and I hope this House will adopt it likewise.

Views of a Capable Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most interesting and thought stimulating letter from Lt. Col. Alfred G. Karger, a very capable officer of the Chemical Warfare Service, written somewhere in Europe. Lieutenant Colonel Karger has a host of friends in Washington and Cincinnati and, indeed throughout the country. His father, the late Gus Karger, Sr., was an outstanding newspaper correspondent and an intimate friend of President Taft. I esteem it a privilege to request unanimous consent for the printing of Lieutenant Colonel Karger's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTH INFANTRY
DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE DIVISION
CHEMICAL OFFICER, A. P. O
No. 8, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y., January 21, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIS: Well, here's one of the letters that I promised you I'd write when I got overseas. It has to do with that pet theme of mine that I hammered on so desperately and with such futility during the pre-war period when lethargy and romantic pacifism had a strangle hold on the smug and complacent citizenry.

Now we are beginning to hear echoes of such talk as disarmament, small standing army, and the same general interest being aroused as before in matters of national defense and preparedness. If these people who are starting their propaganda machines turning out this sort of bunk could just go through the 3 years that I have spent watching our Nation struggle to establish a military machine—could see the terrific expenditures made necessary by the exigencies of the emergency—conditions which could have been so

easily remedied by a little foresight and understanding—they would stop selling this poisonous doctrine of isolationism. We know that the world is a small one now and that we cannot shut ourselves off from reality and be safe.

No nation can consider geographic conditions as bringing them safety. We were not bombed in the States but that does not mean that we could not have been. It was only due to the fact that our enemies were kept busy in another hemisphere while we were granted that all-important factor of time to equip ourselves and incidentally to furnish our future (at that time) and our present allies with the weapons of war to protect us from any form of invasion.

Now we are preparing to invade. Many things have prevented this action earlier and certainly one of those conditions was a lack of the wherewithal to invade. Weapons, ammunition, trained men, transportation, and many other considerations of invasion potentiality had to be gotten from scratch and have helped to prolong this war at the horrible cost of lives, limbs, and property. Before anyone acts upon ill advice regarding reduction of our Military Establishment and equipment to any bare minimum let those who are sincerely interested (not just politically minded sinners against the commonweal) await the return of those of us who have seen some of the damage that their earlier indoctrination has produced and from us secure a picture that may change the mind of the unknowing pacifist to that of a realist.

I hope that you are well and that your duties are not so heavy that you are injuring your health. Your conscientiousness and attention to your job have always been a subject of my admiration. Fond regards and best wishes to you and yours. As ever your friend,

GUS.

Three Hundred and Fourteenth Troop-Carrier Group Contribution to Infantile-Paralysis Fund

REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure this morning at the request of Maj. William H. Hodges to present to the President of the United States in behalf of the Three Hundred and Fourteenth Troop-Carrier Group, now serving abroad, a check in the amount of $1,668, which was their contribution to the fund for infantile-paralysis sufferers. Mr. Speaker, this certainly is one of the most commendable things that has come to my attention since our young men have been abroad.

Major Hodges, I am proud to say, comes from my home town, Washington, N. C., and entered the Army sometime before Pearl Harbor, a private. My home town and State are proud of his record and the part he has taken in raising this fund, which will enable unfortunate children to enjoy life and grow to strong manhood and womanhood.

I insert Major Hodges' letter to me and Colonel Stiles' letter to the President:

HEADQUARTERS, THREE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH TROOP CARRIER GROUP, A. A. F.,
New York, N. Y., February 4, 1944.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HERBERT: I am calling on you again for a special favor. On the last trip that our President made in this theater, our organization was fortunate in being honored by having him to visit us. We gave a review for him, and were host to him for luncheon.

The President's visit here inspired the men to do something for the infantile paralysis fund. The check and plaque I am forwarding to you, requesting that you arrange to make this presentation to the President for us.

In our group we have men from most of the 48 States. In presenting this token of appreciation, the members of our group consider it a distinct pleasure to contribute to the infantile paralysis fund.

With kindest personal regards to both you and Eva, I remain,

Sincerely,

BILL.

(Maj. Wm. M. Hodges, O559934).

HEADQUARTERS, THREE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH TROOP CARRIER GROUP, A. A. F.,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1944.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your visit to the Castelvetrano Army Air Base last December 8 inspired the enclosed "Mile of Dimes" contribution to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

The plaque is being sent to you by the personnel of this group as a personal memento of your visit.

On behalf of myself, my fellow officers, and the enlisted men, I wish you a very happy birthday.

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON STILES,
Lieutenant Colonel, Air Corps,
Commanding.

Strikes and Work Stoppages

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives on two occasions has passed legislation which deprives labor unions during the war of the benefits derived from the National Labor Relations Act, and other legislation, should strikes or slow-downs in wartime occur. The Senate did not concur in this provision. On January 13, 1944, the gentleman from Virginia, Representative SMITH, again offered this same proposal in his bill, H. R. 3962, which was referred to the Labor Committee of the House. No action has been taken on this bill, despite the mounting number of walk-outs and stoppages of work in war plants. On February 10 I wrote the chairman of the Labor Committee, urging immediate action on the Smith bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the letter I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Labor, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

Hon. MARY T. NORTON, *Chairman,*
Committee on Labor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NORTON: I am writing with reference to House Resolution 3962, by Mr. SMITH of Virginia, a bill to prohibit strikes and other interruptions of production during the present war.

I am hopeful that by this time you have set dates for hearings in which all interested parties may be given an opportunity to appear before your committee to consider this proposal. I know of nothing that would add to the morale of our service men and women more than the enactment of H. R. 3962.

With due deference to the expressed intention of labor unions to abide by their "no strike" agreement made some 2 years ago, strikes continue to mount in war industries. It is the responsibility and duty of the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to the end that walk-outs, lock-outs, and labor stoppages be prohibited during the existence of the present global war.

Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, speaking in Kansas City this week before the convention of the International Boilermakers' Union, urged labor to stay on the job and keep producing to the limit of their ability until final victory is won. On this same day that Mr. Green made this appeal 2,000 American Federation of Labor foundry workers voted to remain on strike in Chicago. This is just one example of the mounting and increasing number of man-days lost as the war goes well into its third year.

The Smith bill, H. R. 3962, is strictly a war measure, and under its provisions the proposals of the bill would cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following termination of hostilities in the present war. The people of America are fed up with the dilly-dallying tactics which have been followed consistently in the past and demand action on the part of the administration and the Congress in preventing the loss of even 1 production hour that would provide necessary implements of war to our fighting forces.

I hope that you will call your committee together at an early date for the consideration of this meritorious proposal, and I shall appreciate your notifying me the dates the hearings will be held.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. C. GATHINGS,
Member of Congress,
First District, Arkansas.

Converting Coal Into Gasoline and Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to refer to the bill H. R. 3209, which would authorize the construction and

operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

From the hearings on this bill it can be concluded that there are two main processes for converting coal into gasoline and oil. The first is the Berguis hydrogenation process, in which hydrogen gas is used at high temperatures, and the second process, the Fischer-Tropsch process, where the coal is first converted to water gas, which is a mixture of carbon monoxide and hydrogen.

In considering the location of the demonstration plants provided for in this bill, which I regard as of great national value, it must be recognized that there are two general factors of utmost importance. The first of which is the supply of raw materials such as coal, power, and water, and the second the consuming market for the liquid fuel.

In considering these two vital factors Pennsylvania is outstanding as a logical and practical location for these demonstration plants. We have an abundant supply of coal, ample power and water supplies, and we are in the heart of that part of our Nation that is in need of additional supplies of motor fuel.

The coal resources of Pennsylvania range from anthracite to all grades of bituminous coal. We are told, for instance, that three types of fuel are available for the Fischer-Tropsch process—anthracite, bituminous coal, and coke—all produced in Pennsylvania and near the consuming market.

The Federal Anthracite Coal Commission, of which I was a member, created by Public Law 355 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, was authorized by the Congress to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite region. The Congress concurred in the recommendation of the Commission by authorizing in Public Law No. 812, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the establishment of an anthracite research laboratory.

Anthracite coal is recognized as a highly desirable fuel for generation of water gas which can be used as the basis of certain chemical industries of which the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis of motor fuel is an example.

In this connection I would like to quote from the Report of the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission, House Document No. 709, Seventy-seventh Congress, page 11:

> By suitable operation of the generation and subsequent treatment of the water gas it is possible to produce hydrogen to be used in ammonia synthesis. The location of synthetic-ammonia plants in the region would be desirable since they would utilize directly some of the unemployed labor, would consume anthracite as fuel for water-gas generation, and would eliminate the necessity for building expensive coke-oven plants with their heavy demand for steel and other materials. Within or near the anthracite region is the only location at which synthetic-ammonia plants could be operated economically without coke ovens when solid fuels are to be used.

The technical experts advise me that what is true of ammonia is equally true of the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, in which high-grade Diesel engine oil is produced.

As of 1938, Germany was reported to have 14 plants manufacturing synthetic gasoline by the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, the combined capacity of which was slightly over 7,000,000 barrels. Japan is believed to have in operation two plants of this type with a capacity of 215,000 barrels per year.

Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania anthracite region, situated within 125 miles of the metropolitan area of New York and Philadelphia, with an abundance of raw material supplies and with a large amount of basic information on the generation of carbon monoxide and hydrogen from anthracite coal, offers an unparalleled location for a demonstration plant on the Fischer-Tropsch process for producing oil from coal.

I would therefore like to urge the Bureau of Mines to give favorable consideration to the establishment of one of their demonstration plants in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania to produce synthetic liquid fuel from anthracite coal.

Canned Vegetables Are Important

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the canning industry is one of the leading industries of our country. It is not only important from the standpoint of preserving food, but also because it is directly needed by our armed forces.

The canners have experienced much difficulty in their effort to carry on their operations.

Last season the industry was faced with the dilatory tactics of the O. P. A. and other administrative agencies. Later the commitments of some of these agencies were not too well fulfilled. In spite of all the unnecessary handicaps the industry faced last year, the canners went out and did a splendid job. While the total pack was not a national record, it was recognized as a most excellent achievement when the obstacles placed in their pathway were taken into consideration.

Here it is the middle of February and we are without a program for 1944. The time for action is now. High Government officials are now advising the public that less canned goods will be available in 1945. This, no doubt, will be true unless there is a different approach in solving the problem than has been exhibited up to this time.

Everyone realizes that the Nation enjoyed most favorable food production weather in 1944.

The pack of 1944 has a direct bearing to the war effort, and if this pack is not the maximum it will be the result of dilatory and confusing tactics of Federal agencies and the blame will be placed squarely on their doorsteps.

I am including an article from the Wisconsin Medical Society, volume 41, No. 6, which should be of interest to everyone who wishes to obtain first-hand information about canned vegetables. Please particularly note that in modern canning practices canned vegetables are substantially as efficient sources of vitamins as the original fresh foods.

It appears that too many people are taking too many sips from the New Deal fountain of philosophy to carry on a real constructive agricultural food program. The article follows:

VEGETABLES ARE VITAL

(By May Reynolds, University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Vegetables do the task. In times like these, when America's future depends in a great part on our physical health, vegetables come into prominence as body builders, protectors, and regulators. Vegetables are not a cure-all. They do not supply all the requirements of the human body. But they have a place to fill, and they fill it well. They minister to certain wants which cannot be filled by such other foods as meats, sweets, and cereals. They supply an ample share of man's dietary needs.

What are the dietary needs for a healthy body?

First of all, a healthy body must be built upon a healthy framework. That demands quantities of minerals, particularly calcium and phosphorus.

We get most of our calcium from dairy products, and phosphorus usually offers no particular problem, since a good normal diet supplies sufficient phosphorus. But offering some added calcium are such vegetables as cauliflower, lettuce, turnips, carrots, and dried beans, and these same vegetables also offer a fair supply of phosphorus.

The body must have materials from which to produce well-formed muscles and organs, and foods rich in proteins are body builders. Here vegetables are weaker than many other foods, but dried peas and beans are a good source of protein, and other vegetables carry small quantities. It must be noted that the protein in these vegetables is not complete, and independently cannot support life and growth, but with other foods they make a good contribution toward filling the protein needs.

MINERALS KEEP UP BODY MORALE

For healthy bodily organs and for a normal blood stream, minerals are again important. Phosphorus, mentioned earlier, is certainly a necessary nutrient in this respect, and when any deficiency in phosphorus occurs, an increase in the share of vegetables in the diet ordinarily will correct the fault.

Iron is equally vital and may be supplied by that old stand-by, spinach. The dinner-table motto, "Eat your spinach and get your iron," is not so far wrong as some people believe. Other green vegetables, too, are good sources, and while probably less than half of the iron in most vegetables is available for the body, still they furnish substantial amounts.

Another important mineral, copper, is found in small but significant amounts in most garden vegetables.

Vegetables are much weaker in the field of supplying energy to the body than are sugars, fats, oils, and meats, which adequately meet this need. But, the importance of vegetables to health is not measured by the energy they give (the exception to this rule is potatoes, which are important for fuel).

THE BODY NEEDS REGULATORS

The construction and maintenance of the body testifies that it is a well-planned machine, and as a machine we must recognize that it has certain functioning needs. It must, of course, have fuel to burn and to convert into energy. But it must also have lubricants and regulators. It must have proper timing and treatment to work at top efficiency.

Vegetables, supplying vitamins and minerals, solve these problems of regulation. Just as vitamins and minerals stabilize and encourage normal growth, and just as they help produce a healthy body, so they help to regulate the functioning of that body.

Minerals, for instance, help control digestion. They constitute a safety valve, too, which keeps an alkaline reserve in the blood stream to help neutralize excess acidity. Vegetables are important in supplying the minerals vital to the digestive process and in furnishing bulk and roughage, also important in digestion.

Many things enter into the question of healthy nerves. But an adequate mineral supply is one factor which helps regulate the functioning of the sensitive nervous system.

Vitamins have a regulatory function, too, and appetite, digestion, and the proper functioning of the nervous system are all partially dependent on adequate vitamins. Again vegetables are an important source of supply.

THOSE VITAL VITAMINS

Let's step over to that vitamin classification to see just what vegetables have to offer.

All green leaves and green vegetables such as spinach, lettuce, and chard, and most yellow foods such as carrots, squash, and sweetpotatoes, contain carotene, which can be converted to vitamin A in the liver. Vegetables supplement the dairy foods, therefore, in supplying the first vitamin, A.

Next on the list is thiamin, also spoken of as vitamin B_1. Thiamin is the vitamin of morale, one of the B-complex vitamins which is important to nervous stability. Its chief sources are lean meats, particularly pork, along with whole-grain products, whole-wheat flour, and whole-wheat cereals. But fresh peas and lima beans are excellent sources, and cabbage, carrots, spinach, and lettuce are good sources of thiamin.

Riboflavin, another B-complex vitamin which affects nervous balance and the digestive process, is found to some extent in peas and beans, in leafy vegetables, and in lesser amounts in corn. Vegetables are not the best source of this vitamin, which can be obtained more efficiently from milk, lean meat, and liver, but they are helpful in insuring the riboflavin supply.

Nicotinic acid is less plentiful in vegetables than in meats and meat products. Peas and beans are fair sources of that antipellagra factor, but other vegetables carry very small amounts.

Vitamin C is also important to nutrition, and here another vegetable comes into the picture. Tomatoes are one of the best economical sources of vitamin C, and their appearance in the diet is a guarantee of vigor and of resistance to infection. Cabbage is very high in vitamin C content, and spinach, lettuce, turnips, and peas are good sources.

In supplying the sunshine vitamin, D, fish oils are important, and exposure to sunlight is also a factor. Vegetables are of small consequence in that regard, although the leafy vegetables contain a very little vitamin D.

PROTECTIVE FOODS ARE NEEDED

If any major mineral or vitamin elements are missing, then the body falls into disrepair, for it cannot function smoothly and efficiently without these body lubricants and regulators. That is why E. V. McCollum, who isolated vitamin A when he worked at the University of Wisconsin almost 30 years ago, later designated the foods which supply mineral and vitamins as "protective" foods, essential to the health of the body.

McCollum's earliest protective foods were milk and green vegetables. Now the concept has been expanded to include fruit and eggs as well, and modern biochemistry recognizes that all these foods are protective and efficiency-promoting. But vegetables are still near the top of the list.

VEGETABLES ARE NOT FUEL FOODS

All classes of foods have certain characteristics. Sugars and fats, for instance, supply heat and energy. Meats are generally rich in proteins and in some of the B-complex vitamins. Breadstuffs, if milled from whole grain, supply thiamin and are also rich in protein and energy. But vegetables have their role in nutrition elsewhere, a role as important as that of any other class of foods.

Vegetables do not have their greatest worth as a food for fuel. Their important function is that of a food for protection and for the greatest degree of health.

One other factor has not been considered in this study of the nutritional value of vegetables. Vegetables are low in calories, high in roughage. In other words, they can supplement a concentrated diet high in protein and calories, supplying vitamins and some of the bulk which is important to digestion.

They can also be used to advantage in a diet designed to reduce the caloric intake. For the reducing diet, lettuce, cabbage, and spinach are very valuable, because they give a good supply of certain much-needed nutrients; they offer bulk and yet they are low in calories and are nonfattening. While the leafy vegetables are outstanding in this respect, most vegetables have some value.

THE FOOD PLAN IS A YEAR-ROUND JOB

Another important point to consider in measuring the nutrient value of vegetables in the diet is that they are available all year round at reasonably low cost. Root crops keep well in cellar storage, and other vegetables can be prepared by drying, canning, or bottling.

That brings us to a question which housewives frequently ask. What effect does canning have on food value?

IS CANNING HARMFUL?

Canning is a process of preserving foods by heating them to a sterilization point and then sealing them in air-tight containers. It is a fairly simple process, and yet, in times past, its very simplicity brought it under suspicion. "If foods can be preserved that easily," people once said, "canning must harm them some way."

That doubt seemed to be confirmed by the occasional spoilage of cans or bottles of foods, and not until 1895, when H. L. Russell, of the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station first applied bacteriology to canning, did most people admit that canned foods might be perfectly wholesome.

Then, with the advent of the vitamin, suspicion arose again, and people began to wonder what effect heat had on the vitamin content of foods in the canning process. The first tests, made when the B-complex vitamins were still classed as a single vitamin B, indicated that canned vegetables lost much of that vitamin during the cooking process. The tests indicated that vitamin C, too, was largely lost, and cast a shade of doubt around the nutritive value of canned foods. But soon came further studies which revealed that almost all of the vitamin content of food is retained in canning. The original mistake came about in this way:

The component parts of vitamin B, which was later broken down to include thiamin, riboflavin, and nicotinic acid as well as other minor vitamins, are soluble in water. That means that in the cooking process the vitamins are dissolved in the vegetable juices. Consequently, when analyses were made of the vegetables themselves, without the vegetable juices being studied, the cooked product was weak in the B-complex vitamins.

Later, when more complete tests were made, they revealed that thiamin, though it disintegrates when subjected to prolonged heat, can survive short cooking easily. Nicotinic acid, which is less important in most vegetables but available in fair amounts in peas and beans, is hardly affected at all by heat. But in both cases the vitamin dissolves in the juice, and appears more readily there than in the vegetable itself. The accessory food substance which was first called vitamin G, later classified as a B-complex vitamin and called B, and finally given the proper name of riboflavin, also dissolves in water and so appears in the juices of cooked vegetables more than in the solid food.

As for vitamin C, succeeding studies showed that cooking in the presence of air destroys that vitamin. So canners got around the problem by first sealing and then cooking tomatoes, cabbage, and other vegetables rich in vitamin C

CAUTIOUS CANNING RETAINS FOOD VALUES

In the final balance, then, canned vegetables are substantially as efficient sources of vitamins as the original fresh foods; however, two cautions must be remembered. The juice of cooked vegetables should always be served with the vegetables themselves or saved to be used in vegetable soups, to retain B-complex vitamins. Tomatoes and the other vitamin C vegetables should be served cold when possible, because reheating of canned foods of this class has a destructive effect on vitamin content. The addition of soda in cooking vegetables should be avoided, because vitamin C deteriorates more rapidly in an alkaline solution.

But fresh or canned, vegetables are tremendously important in the diet. They deserve a place alongside such stand-bys as milk, butter, cheese, fruits, eggs, and meats.

MENU PLANNING

The final word in menu planning, in light of these facts, is this:

Everyone should get at least a serving a day of leafy green or yellow vegetables, a daily helping of potatoes, and a serving of tomatoes, cabbage, or other source of vitamin C.

Any well-balanced diet must recognize the importance of vegetables, for they have their place on every menu.

THERE'S A USE FOR EVERY VEGETABLE AND A VEGETABLE FOR EVERY USE

Potatoes and other starchy vegetables are a source of carbohydrates for energy.

Green, leafy vegetables—lettuce, spinach, and others—yield iron, calcium, copper, and other much-needed minerals.

Yellow vegetables, such as sweetpotatoes and carrots, offer carotene, from which the body can produce vitamin A.

Tomatoes and cabbage are rich in vitamin C.

The legume vegetables, beans and peas, yield such B-complex vitamins as thiamin, riboflavin, and nicotinic acid.

All vegetables are good sources of most vitamins, and they are all substantially rich in minerals.

Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of this date, entitled "Law of the Land." The editorial calls attention to the deliberate and repeated consideration of the renegotiation statute and very properly speaks of "the final result as a testimonial to the legislative process of study, discussion, and compromise."

The editorial follows:

LAW OF THE LAND

Few congressional acts have had such painstaking consideration and review as the war contract renegotiation statute. Originally enacted after careful committee study in April 1942, the law was revised and repassed in its essential features a week ago. It now awaits the President's signature as a part of the Revenue Act of 1943. In evaluating it, Congress has had the benefit of hindsight as well as foresight—the advantage of 18 months' experience with actual operations.

Businessmen, in the main, have accepted the law with good grace. Many of them, in fact, have welcomed it as an effective device for clearing them of any stigma of wartime profiteering. But a rather powerful minority has balked at the law since its inception and has sought by every lobbying device at its disposal to have it expunged from the statute books. The complaints of this group have been listened to attentively and have received thorough examination.

As long ago as January 1943, the Truman committee, through a subgroup headed by Senator HATCH, undertook a study of the law's effect on war production. A report was issued on March 30. In June the House Naval Affairs Committee held public hearings for 3 weeks, giving aggrieved contractors full opportunity to testify. Its findings were published in a 1,300-page report on October 7 of last year. The House Ways and Means Committee took up the problem in September, holding public hearings for a fortnight and compressing its conclusions into 1,100 pages. During December the Senate Finance Committee, as a part of its study of the tax bill, threshed out the renegotiation issue once again. After all this research had been completed, House and Senate conferees reviewed all the evidence and finally reached a satisfactory agreement.

The renegotiation law as it now stands is doubtless imperfect. The Post itself has been critical of certain features of it. But the final result is a testimonial to the legislative process of study, discussion, and compromise. It is a sound, workable law, acceptable to the executive agencies which must administer it and responsive to the rights of the contractors who must submit to it.

Now it is time for all sides to quit debating it and squawking about it. The issue is now settled. Renegotiation must be regarded as an established procedure of our wartime economy. Those who don't like it would be well advised to lump it. If they continue to resist it, as for so long some of them resisted the Wagner Act and the wage-hour law, they can aggravate the difficulties of wartime administration and clog the courts with useless litigation. But the public will scarcely credit them with any high degree of patriotism. Relentless publicity should be the best means of dealing with them. We have no time nowadays for obstructionism.

They're in It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

THEY'RE IN IT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The British Government's intention to interfere in the Presidential campaign of the United States this year is now official, open, and on the record. The plan has been curling out in numerous unofficial and semiofficial ways, as in the editorials of the Yorkshire Post, a newspaper controlled by Britain's Foreign Minister Anthony Eden.

But now we're getting it straight and unvarnished from a newspaper operated by a Government establishment.

This publication is called The Church of England Newspaper. A dispatch from London yesterday reported that it has just declared that "to pretend that the election this year is the concern only of the American people is just stupid."

Think that over, friends. If we pretend our Presidential election this year is our own business, we are "just stupid."

The Church of England Newspaper goes on to call Mr. Roosevelt's third term "an untold blessing and benefit to humanity," and in reference to the fourth term it says:

"The decision is fraught with incalculable significance for all mankind, not only for the peoples of the British Empire and Commonwealth, and while we recognize fully that it is the American people—130,000,000 of them—who will decide this most important of all political questions, we nevertheless affirm our right to be interested in the result."

It then shows its interest not only by saying Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected but by taking a poke at the strongest potential candidate against him, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York Thus:

"It is going to make a difference of life or death for future generations of the world whether next November the American people elect a statesman who feels in his very bones the necessity for international community and cooperation, or a statesman whose belief in international solidarity is a grudging concession to the pressure of events.

"The old American isolationism is dead. History has killed it, but history has not killed the desire and the will to isolation which in the post-war situation will take the form of narrow, unimaginative, reluctant concessions to new demands. Governor Dewey, who is tipped for the Republican nomination, is just such a man.

"The world will need men who can at least keep pace with history, who can spell out the meaning of events as they happen. This is precisely what President Roosevelt has proved himself capable of doing.

"In this war providence has retrieved the muddles of democracy. That should be a warning, both to America and ourselves, not to tempt providence again."

That's electioneering in these United States. And by a church. By a foreign church. By a foreign church that is a part of a foreign government. The only thing bolder would be the arrival here of boys with black bags for the back rooms.

It may surprise you to read the statement here that the Church of England is a part of the Government of the United Kingdom, but it is a fact.

Our Constitution, founded in blood and drafted after long study of the eternal habits of governments, carries a specific clause forbidding our Government the power to run any religious system.

Some of the bitterest experiences of mankind have resulted from governmental management of religion. And the men who organized these United States for us wanted to save America from such tragic episodes.

In separating church and state our founding fathers did something unique. The people of England, after many centuries of religious war and struggles, have never been able to work it.

King Henry VIII, in his quarrel with the Pope about divorce and other matters, seized the religious system of England outright in 1534 and proclaimed himself "supreme head in earth of the Church of England."

Not all Englishmen accepted the idea of a governmentally established church, and out of the religious wars that followed, dissenting Puritans, Catholics, and, later, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and other Christian sects of English, Scotch, and Irish, fled to North America and gave this Nation its course in history to date.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of North America, which has many parallel doctrines to that of the established church in England was first the Church of England's colonial establishment in North America.

Since the Revolution of 1776 it has grown into a sect of purely American organization.

But in England, though there were religious wars and dissenters from the establishment fled here, still the Crown persisted in control.

At this very moment George VI of England is titular head of the established church.

The bishops of the established church are officers of the Government and sit in the House of Lords.

The established church is maintained not only by voluntary offerings of people who profess its doctrines as their faith, but by taxation.

Thus, when the Church of England speaks, that is the Government of the British people speaking.

And in one of its oldest, richest, and ablest voices.

The same, naturally, is true of the Church of England newspaper.

There is no use looking embarrassed, citizens, and trying to say it ain't so. Our British friends are moving in on us and they have their plans as to what we must do.

Women Can Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by CLARE BOOTHE LUCE in the February issue

of Chatelaine, a Canadian woman's magazine:

WOMEN CAN WIN THE PEACE

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE)

In darkest Europe, where the Germans vainly seek to dominate the people body, mind, and soul, many anonymous heroines are playing tag with death in the underground. They are printing and distributing clandestine newspapers, spreading Allied propaganda, committing those acts of sabotage which, though usually minor, have done incalculable damage to the morale of the Germans.

Naturally, we get very little precise information on the work of these women of the underground, but we respect and honor them in absentia next only to the men who are fighting our battles in Europe and the Pacific.

Their tales of heroism are tales to be told by the post-war hearthside. Today we praise the woman war workers of the overground—the overall girls.

Today in the United States the women war worker, with her wrinkled slacks and her grease-smudged face, is the heroine of the hour. She is glorified in movies, in comic strips, in current fiction; she has replaced the glamour girl and the movie star on magazine covers.

If she had not taken her place on the production line, our side would still be fighting a war of too little and too late. Hers is the fist, if not the face, that has launched a thousand ships, hers the skill that built the planes that are blasting the Germans in Europe and the Japs in the Pacific.

In Canada, where fewer women normally accept private employment than in most of the other western democracies, nearly 2,000,000 women are now at work, as against 900,000 in 1940. In the United States there were 17,400,000 women workers in August 1943—5,200,000 of them married and living with their husbands. Both countries are striving to add women to their labor force, and in America the goal is 18,000,000 women workers by July of this year.

When peace comes, millions of these American women and thousands of the Canadian women will form a labor surplus. The United States Department of Labor has estimated that there will be 12,000,000 unemployed in my country during the first 6 months after the war unless there is a vast public works program, and even with such a program unemployment in the transition period of industry from war to peace is expected to be near the 7,000,000 mark.

Canada, according to a Gallup poll, has definitely decided the course it will take with regard to women workers. Seventy-five percent of the Canadian men who were polled and a remarkable 68 percent of the women said that men should be given the first chance in any competition for post-war jobs.

A Gallup poll in the United States revealed an entirely different viewpoint. Here 50 percent of our women war workers announced that they planned to stay on at their jobs after the war and another 13 percent said they were undecided. Thirty-five percent of the married women expressed either a desire—or determination—to continue to work.

Further evidence of the mood of American women workers is this declaration issued by the Women's Advisory Committee of the United States War Manpower Commission on May 17, 1943: "The Government and industry must not assume that all women can be treated as the reserve group during war only, nor should those who wish to stay in the labor market be accused of taking men's jobs. The right of the individual woman to work must be recognized and provided for, just as the right of the individual man to work."

No one can question the legality of this statement, but morally it may be as wrong as the legal foreclosure of a mortgage on a poor widow. To be sure, before the war there were 2,500,000 women in America who were already the heads of families, with one or more persons depending upon them for support. When the war is over there will be millions of others who must support themselves and, in many cases, contribute toward the support of someone else—a wounded soldier-husband or their war-orphaned children. These women must work and they have every right to their jobs.

Nevertheless, there are other women workers who, tomorrow as today, will chiefly use their salaries to purchase luxuries. These are the women who work for "cake" and, if they continue to work in time of depression, they can keep male heads of families from earning even their families' daily bread.

However logical or rational it may be theoretically, practically it will not hold water to tell an unemployed veteran of Salerno or Guadalcanal or Manila or El Alamein or Dunkirk that these women have as much "right" to work as any man.

If there is any post-war scramble for the available jobs between war veterans and well-dressed, well-fed, well-situated lady veterans of the assembly plant, I fear that the women will either fall or be pushed with scant chivalry from the lofty pedestal of popularity on which they are now standing.

Of course this does not refer to those women who must work to maintain themselves or their dependents, nor to the career or professional woman who works out of sheer love of the task. The talented and skilled professional woman is always needed because, whatever the economic situation, no country ever has enough good artists, good doctors, good teachers, good lawyers, or good persons in any of the skilled professions.

But those women who do not have to work and who were introduced to jobs by the war should accept gracefully a post-war honorable discharge at the factory or the office and go back to the job which is still uniquely theirs, homemaking. This they must do unless the demand on our factories and fields by the nations that must be rehabilitated is great enough to keep both them and their returned menfolk all prosperously working. In my own opinion this could easily happen, but it is not the view held by most economists.

If there is a depression or period of unemployment, it will be no argument to say that women do not want to be considered a wartime labor reserve. All the able-bodied men of America are always considered a wartime military reserve, subject to call when their country is in danger and to dismissal when the war has ended. Such service is a patriotic obligation to the male citizens and few dare even to protest it, though its wages are often death. Why should women feel that they are not bound by similar laws, even though their war service has thus far not been compulsory, has never involved great physical risk, and has been, on the whole, profitable?

But saying that millions of American women should return to their homes and thousands of Canadian women should return to theirs after the war does not mean that from then on the lives of these demobilized and honorably discharged women war workers should be emotionally and intellectually bounded by the gas stove and the kitchen sink—or even the cradle. Just because they go "home," their horizons need not be delimited by getting the Sunday dinner and balancing the household budget.

There is a definite post-war job for the American housewife and the Canadian housewife—a job that has not been filled, though every headline in the newspapers for the last decade should have read like a help-wanted ad directed to our housewives. The housewife is, in a sense, a member of a great semi-leisure class, a class that has some leisure to do the things that must be done if we are to have a better world—the things that women best can do. That is to help bring the Nation to a true political awareness of the problems of war and peace by taking a greater part than ever before in the political life and thought stream of their country.

Unfortunately, it must be said that women have not lived up to the high hopes that were held for them in this capacity when they were granted the right to vote in the United States and Canada. They have not reformed politics with their gentle presence, though because of them politicians today have better manners than they once had. Women have never fully exercised their franchise nor informed themselves on current issues. Too often even those who have gone to the trouble to become informed citizens have confined themselves to complaining privately to one another that the men were making an awful mess of things. But, with notable exceptions, the great masses of American and Canadian women did nothing constructive to untangle the mess before it was too late.

Too often their most energetic efforts on behalf of peace consisted of occasionally picketing Government buildings when the forces of war were already in motion and could not be stopped. Most women from 1932 to 1939 said, if not in words, in effect: "Oh, dear, we're going to have another war," and then carefully looked the other way and tried to concentrate on the day's wash or the newest fashion, so this upsetting prophecy would not spoil the day for them.

Many women, publishers' polls showed, stopped reading the papers entirely when the news, after Munich, became too troubling. This intellectual boycott of bad news, this escapism and fact-evading made many women insensibly Hitler's allies. Many women did not like to think a war was coming, so many husbands made an effort not to discuss it with them, and the net of it all was—families were not emotionally prepared for it—and the war came anyway.

If, instead of privately bemoaning the trend of the time or looking the other way, the masses of women of America and Canada had dipped into that store of magnificent realism which all women possess, though some conceal it cleverly, and had used their voting power, their voices, and their influence to prepare our countries for war, World War No. 2 might never have come off—and they would not have lost so many sons and husbands on the battlefields.

But it is idle now to speculate on what might have happened if American women had realistically insisted that their Government employ their jobless menfolk in the construction of ships and planes and tools of war, instead of having them raking leaves and boondoggling. It is futile to wish that the women of America, instead of thinking we could have peace simply by not preparing for war, had demanded that their Government take a definite, positive, unequivocal stand beside Britain and France, and, at an early date, Russia—against the then somewhat timid and tentative forces of Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo. The biggest mistakes in the decade of blunders were made by men, but they were endorsed by the overwhelming silence of the women.

The last war convinced women that they had the right to vote, and there is some reason to hope that this war will move them to exercise that right and the other rights of citizenship with the wisdom, the energy, and the sometimes very annoying (to men) tenacity that is peculiar to them.

If women of a town or a province or state, of a nation and of the world are divided on many issues, at least they share—the Canadian women with the women of Germany, the American women with those of Japan—a realistic desire for peace and for the social betterment of their communities and their countries. If the women should ever decide to work together for these goals, they would

succeed. They will not be dogged and discredited by the centuries of failure which handicap the efforts of all men, because men have a way of redoubling their efforts as they lose sight of their goals, or abandoning their goals for personal and often selfish objectives.

Yes, this semi-leisure class of tomorrow's housewives will not be a class of bridge players, of tea sippers, of gossip mongers. It will consist of women whose experience and knowledge has been enriched by a war record on a production line or driving a bus or typing in an office, and it will be a class with no petty aims or selfish goals. It will be a class whose work will be seen and felt everywhere, on every street, in every town and village and in the central government offices of every country.

As a example of the work women can do, there is one matter which is close to them and to their children—a knowledge of their country's history. Several months ago the New York Times conducted among college freshmen a survey on American history which revealed such ignorance as would be ludicrous if it were not deplorable.

More than 150 of the freshmen taking this test listed Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederacy, as the President of the United States during the Civil War. Students attributed to Thomas Jefferson the discovery of electricity and a career as a Salvation Army worker. Thirty percent of the students, a total of 2,077, could not name correctly the President of the United States during World War No. 1, and only 6 percent could name the Thirteen Original States. Half of the students confused William James, the psychologist, with Jesse James, the bandit. (I feel particularly sensitive about this poll, since one of the questions asked was: "Name a prominent figure, not now living, connected with the movement for women's rights." My name led all the others.)

Later a number of learned professors and college presidents gave their profound opinions on the cause of this failure in the history curriculum of American schools, but, like most profound observations, these answered no questions and contributed no solution.

Why shouldn't the mothers of high school youngsters conduct a private probe of the method of teaching history in the schools and investigate until they can point out the source of the failure and the way to correct it? In the United States the Parent-Teacher Association exists primarily for this purpose, and if the advantages of parent-teacher contact which this organization affords were used by all mothers, we should witness a tremendous advance in education.

Better still, why shouldn't post-war mothers set out themselves to study history and the causes of war and the causes of peace—so they may teach their children? It is an old saying that men drink wisdom and philosophy and patriotism from the breasts of their mothers.

One job which women in the United States and Canada can do and should do is to support actively the political party whose aims best match their views of what is right—whether that party is Liberal, Conservative, or Canadian Commonwealth Federation in Canada or Republican or Democratic in the United States, or one of the smaller parties. The party system is the root of democracy and energetic, competitive parties stimulate good government.

There is another organization which has accomplished much in the United States, and that is the nonpartisan League of Women Voters. The members of this league receive what amounts to a liberal education in world affairs and legislation pending before their local, State, and National Governments—something our schools do not provide. Each member of the League of Women Voters then carries this knowledge to every member of her community she can reach. And then, when she has made a bloc of voters on any given issue, she takes care to notify candidates for office in her town or city, her Congressman and Senators exactly how her bloc feels on this issue.

Many a Congressman and Senator in Washington is haunted by the feeling that the league is looking over his shoulder and watching every move he makes, which, in itself, is enough to make most legislators tread lightly and carefully and think before they vote.

These are but a few examples. There are any number of women's organizations in the United States and Canada which accomplish a great deal now but could accomplish far more if they were supported and actively aided by greater numbers of their sex.

The trouble is that many women's clubs which are formed for high purposes quickly degenerate into pleasure groups. Too many women would still rather enter a bridge tournament than risk being accused of jousting with the ideological windmills of politics and foreign affairs.

For women's organizations are frequently the victims of male ridicule and female skepticism, which is quick to propagandize the impression that women's clubs and associations accomplish no purpose but gab. I have studied many women's organizations in the past years, and I have seen few which have failed to obtain their objective, when that objective was a practical and worthy one.

Think of the great good that the various war relief societies, which are run almost exclusively by women, have done. Why couldn't women work just as hard and just as effectively in peacetime to relieve suffering and injustices not caused by bombs? To this there is no answer except that women, alas, like men. grow lazy in peacetime.

There is, for example, a big and immediate task for women of leisure who want to aid the victims of a maladjusted and prejudiced peacetime employment system. Why can't housewives fight the injustices which confront on every side their privately employed sisters? Particularly, why can't they fight in the coming battle, now in the skirmish stage, for equal pay for equal work? In the United States many women workers with skill and experience are receiving less than the starting pay of unskilled men in the same company.

To cite one instance of this—a survey of department stores conducted by the United States Department of Labor before the war revealed that more than seven-tenths of the women, most of whom were employed as salesgirls, were paid less than 30 cents an hour. In the same stores almost one-third of the boys and men, who worked as packers, cleaners, and at other types of unskilled manual labor, received more than 30 cents an hour.

Even in some war plants, at a time when women workers are desperately needed, their wage scale is far below that of the men employees. On the whole, men seem perfectly satisfied with this situation, not realizing that during the depression one survey of large American cities revealed that 26.2 percent of the men were unemployed, while only 18.9 percent of the women in the labor force were jobless—simply because women were working for such low wages that it was profitable to keep them and discharge the higher paid men.

Fortunately for you, a Gallup poll in Canada indicated that at least 73 percent of the men were fully convinced that women who replace men in industry should be paid equal wages. The 20 percent of the men polled who were undecided and the 7 percent who opposed equal pay should reflect about the difficulties of competing against a rival of recognized worth but cheaper price.

The problem of inequitable wages for women cannot be solved in the United States by minimum wage laws—even in the 26 States which have adopted such legislation—for a minimum wage may be far below a fair wage for the work done. Only an intensive campaign conducted by women can win fair and decent wages for women, and thus keep up the wage scale of the whole labor market.

In the United States many women feel we cannot have any class of workers whose low wage scale undermines our high standard of living. We cannot afford cheap oriental labor, cheap immigrant labor, or cheap female labor.

So here are a few aspects of the problems which men have not solved—the problems of building a sane world in which peace will have at least a chance to thrive, the construction of a sound economy which offers the same wage opportunities to all who must work, the education of the citizenry for intelligent participation in their Government, which we must have if the democratic system is to survive.

The housewives of Canada and the United States have everything at stake in our post-war world—their future, the future of their children, the future of their country. As an ever better organized and informed phalanx of public opinion, they will be heard and they will have their way if theirs is the right, the unselfish, the progressive way.

We women must renounce for all time the tradition that it is unseemly for a woman to mix in politics or world affairs, just as we have broken the traditions that woman's place can never be in factory or office. The women of Europe accepted that outworn tradition too long, and that is why many of them today are trying to derail Nazi troop trains, blow up Nazi factories or cut the throats of Nazi sentries. Those women are now concerned only with the destruction of the Nazi system in the hope that some day they will get another chance actively to aid in constructing a democratic one of their own. Under the German occupation a great many women have probably changed their opinion that politics is beyond their domain, their intelligence or their ability.

Canadian and American women will share many of the same post-war problems. By exchanging their views and their experiences in meeting these problems, the women of our two countries can set a fine example for the women of other countries. They can set such an example of cooperation and understanding as our two neighbor nations, in more than a century of unbroken friendship and mutual trust, have already set for the entire world.

There are 143,000,000 people in Canada and the United States. Seventy million of them are women. That is an awful lot of women. If they were ever to make up their minds that they were going to take a hand in things—"do something about it"—they'd do it.

Don't Change Horses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 8, 1944.

EDITOR, NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: On the editorial page of your issue of Tuesday, February 8, 1944, you have a cartoon of President Roosevelt emiting that old bromide, "Don't Change Horses," etc., etc.

"Let's look at the record," as one of our greatest of all statesmen—Gov. Alfred E. Smith—would say.

In a speech made at St. Paul, Minn., April 18, 1932, our first multimillionaire candidate for President said:

"There will be many in this Nation during the coming months who will implore you not to swap horses crossing a stream; there will be others who will laughingly tell you that the appeal should have been worded, 'Do not swap toboggans while you are sliding down hill.' But it seems to me that the more truthful, the more accurate plea to the people of the Nation should be this: 'If the old car, in spite of frequent emergency repairs, has been bumping along downhill on only 2 cylinders for 3 long years, it is time to get another car that will start uphill on all 4'." (Strike out "3" and insert "12.")

The above quotation, and more of the same stuff, will be found at page 638, etc., of volume I of "Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt," complete sets of which are now to be found on all the basement bargain book counters at greatly reduced prices.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. O'CONNOR,
Former Congressman.

Remarks by the President on the Occasion of the Transfer of the Destroyer Escort "Senegalais" to the French People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by the President of the United States at the Washington Navy Yard on the occasion of the transfer of the destroyer escort *Senegalais* to the French people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the American people I transfer to the Navy of France this warship—built by American hands in an American navy yard. This is one of a long line of events symbolizing the ancient friendship between France and the United States. It emphasizes the determination of this Nation, and of all the United Nations, to drive from the soil of France the Nazi invaders who today swagger down the Champs Elysees in Paris. This one transfer under the Lend-Lease law is typical of the thousands of transfers of American-made weapons of war which have been made to our fighting Allies. They are bringing closer the day of inevitable victory over our enemies on all the fronts all over the world.

No day could be more appropriate for this ceremony than the aniversary we now celebrate of the birth of that illustrious American who, in his time, struck such mighty blows for the liberty and dignity of the human race—Abraham Lincoln.

In 1940 the Nazi invaders overran France. Although we were still on the side lines, we in the United States realized the horror of that catastrophe—and the grave menace it carried to all the civilized world.

The land of France fell to the enemy, but not so the ships of France. Today her fleet still proudly flies the tricolor in battle against our common enemy. At Nettuno and Anzio, French ships were among those which bombarded the German coastal installations. In a strategic sector of the Allied line now pushing toward Rome are French troops. The Nazis on the Italian front know only too well that France is not out of this war.

And the time will soon come when the Nazis in France will learn from millions of brave Frenchmen—now underground—that the people of France, also, are not all out of this war.

In a sense this transaction today can be regarded not only as lend-lease—it might even be regarded as reverse lend-lease. For in the early days of our national history this situation was reversed. At that time, instead of France receiving an American-made ship, the young Nation of the United States was glad to receive a ship made in France by Frenchmen—the *Bon Homme Richard*—a ship made illustrious under the command of John Paul Jones, in the days of our Navy's infancy. And it is well to remember that that ship was named in honor of our Minister to France, Benjamin Franklin—that wise old philosopher who was the father of close friendship between France and the United States.

This vessel, which today we are turning over to the people of France, will somewhere, sometime, engage the enemy. She is a part of the growing strength of the French Navy. She is a new class—a destroyer escort—speedy and dangerous. I want to tell you something else about her—there are more where she came from. Under our lend-lease agreement, she is not the only ship you will receive from us—we are building others for your sailors to man.

I hope that the Nazis and the Japs are listening today as we make this transfer. For it will help them better to understand the spirit and determination which binds together all of the fighting fleets and armies of the United Nations on the road to ultimate victory.

Vice Admiral Fenard, you are the senior officer of the French Navy here, and you are the chief of the French naval mission. It has been your duty to work with us in outfitting your fleet. My years of friendship with officers of the French Navy make this a particularly memorable occasion to me, personally. To you, we turn over this ship—the *Senegalais*. We recall with pleasure that it was a French ship which fired the first salute ever rendered to the Stars and Stripes flying from a United States man-of-war. We remember that salute today—and symbolically return it.

Good luck, *Senegalais*—and good hunting.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of veterans' legislation, which I delivered on February 11 last, and which was broadcast from station WRC over the network of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, every thoughtful person—in and out of public office, in the armed forces or civilian life—is looking ahead to the time when our service men and women are welcomed home by a grateful Nation, to the security and peace of their own firesides. Everyone is agreed on the main objective—to deal justly and equitably with the demobilized veteran, to provide for the disabled and their families, to care for the survivors of those who gave their lives at the call of their country. The President has recommended a broad program of legislation to Congress. The veteran organizations have brought to bear their long experience and background, in the task of devising proper measures. Congress is moving promptly, and I think effectively, to bring into practical terms the best thinking in the country, in a field of legislation that transcends any party or class of our people.

As a United States Senator, and as one of millions of fathers throughout the country with boys in the armed forces, I have given special attention to the many letters which come to me from service men and women, and to suggestions that come through personal contacts with them. When all is said and done the chief aspirations of our boys can be summed up in these simple terms: They want, above all, an opportunity for a useful, gainful job under the free-enterprise system which they are fighting to defend. Such a job is beyond price; there is no real substitute for it. And the veterans expect the sympathetic help of the Nation in locating those jobs. Second, they want an opportunity to better themselves, through education, training, and retraining. And third, they want mustering-out pay and social insurance protection—as a matter of right, not charity—to safeguard the insurance rights they have already attained, and to provide adequate unemployment allowances until they can find steady jobs at steady, decent pay.

Our main reliance, for the full employment of returning veterans, rests with the initiative and capacity of the American businessman. Every encouragement and aid has and will be given by the people as a whole, through their Federal, State, and local governments. At the heart of the Federal help to the veteran in finding a job, is a vitally effective veteran employment service. This morning, I discussed with the Senate Finance Committee an important proposal I have just introduced, with the approval and fine cooperation of the American Legion. More than 10 years ago I was privileged to sponsor the law creating the present United States Employment Service, which provides for a veteran employment service. The new plan I have just introduced would create a Veteran Service Placement Board within the United States Employment Service. This Board would consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as Chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the administrative head of the United States Employment Service. This Board would determine and have full responsibility for all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service. In this way the policies of the Veterans' Employment Service are closely coordinated with the policies of the Veterans' Administration. At the same time all the job-finding facilities of the entire United States Employment Service are made available to every veteran throughout the land. By this new plan, we would place the full weight of the National Government behind a revitalized Veterans' Employment Service, under a single chain of command, to help place veterans in private employment in any part of the country.

Our fighting men and women are not stand-patters, satisfied with returning to the status quo before the war. Most of them—like the pioneers in industry, agriculture, and the useful arts who built this country—aspire to improve their lot. They hope to have a chance for the education that was denied them before the war, or to resume the education which was stopped by their induction into the service. Many will want refresher courses in mechanical training or the professions from which they came. Many will want to utilize the new skills—professional or mechanical—which they have attained in the armed forces.

We owe these men and women every possible assistance and opportunity for attaining these goals. Furthermore, this educational aid will be of enormous value to the country as a whole, which is incurring a serious deficit in the number of technicians and trained professional persons. The longer the war lasts the greater will be this deficit. I am confident that Congress will enact suitable legislation along these lines to help train the leaders of the country in the years ahead. Such measures will give an opportunity for the best that democracy has to offer to those who were ready to fight and die for a land of opportunity.

After the veteran has exhausted his mustering-out pay or educational allowance and has utilized the veterans' placement service he may find himself without a job for a period of weeks or months. Such unemployment occurs for some men in some localities for varying periods, even in good times. The immediate period of post-war adjustment will not be normal. Industry will be converting to peacetime products. Thirty million veterans and civilian war workers—perhaps half the regular working forces of the country—will have to find their place again in peacetime production. The veteran, of course, has a qualified guaranty that he will get back his old job, but the guaranty will be ineffective for many, and many more will go in search of new and better jobs.

Only half the returning veterans are likely to have any rights or coverage under existing unemployment-insurance laws in the 48 States. Those who are covered are likely to find the benefits too small and the period of coverage inadequate. In my testimony this morning before the Senate Finance Committee I discussed remedial legislation on this question. The bill introduced last November by Senator GEORGE, Senator CLARK, and myself would provide a uniform national system of unemployment allowances for former members of the armed forces. The allowances would be $15 a week for a single man and as high as $25 a week for a married man with dependents. The allowances would be paid for as much as 52 weeks of unemployment, if the veteran requires that length of time to find a proper job suitable to his skill and temperament and the need of his family and locality. I believe this maximum of 52 weeks should be available for the entire 2-year period following mustering-out pay, as provided in the bill sponsored by the American Legion.

The legislation I have introduced contains the usual and proper safeguards against abuse, arbitrary quitting of work, and refusal to accept suitable work when offered. This is bona fide unemployment insurance; it is not a feather bed for the indolent.

In my judgment, this plan should operate without red tape or delay. The veteran would present his discharge certificate and claim to any one of the 1,500 full-time local offices of the United States Employment Service, or 1 of the additional 2,000 part-time offices. The administration would be so simplified that this local office could determine the amount of the benefits on the spot, without the necessity of sending papers for approval to other State, regional, or Federal offices.

The veterans' social-insurance legislation I have introduced also provides a paid-up credit in the old-age insurance fund of the Social Security Act for every month of military service. The amount of the payment would be on a uniform wage basis of $160 a month. This is necessary to protect the benefit rights of millions in the armed forces who are already covered by the Social Security Act. Indeed, in many cases already on record, the widow and survivors of a man killed in action have lost the right to benefit claims under the old-age and survivors insurance system now in effect. The bill would make good these lost claims for the survivors and put the veteran covered by the act in the same position as when he left his civilian job to put on the uniform of the Army, Navy, or Marines. The bill also provides the same paid-up benefit rights for millions of other servicemen who have never had this social-security coverage. This is done in order not to discriminate against them, and in the hope that, by future amendment of the law, they can be brought under its permanent protection.

There is not time tonight for me to discuss in detail other proper benefits being devised in congressional legislation—mustering-out pay; unemployment insurance for the merchant marine; increased allowances for the disabled and their dependents; better provisions for hospitals, training and retraining centers; Federal help toward home or farm ownership. All this and more is part of the cost of war. It is a cost which democracy perhaps bears more gladly than the cost of shot and shell. We pay it not out of gratitude alone, although our gratitude is unbounded. We pay it because this is a cost of building up rather than tearing down, a cost that looks to a better, happier future for the service men and women, and a more secure land in which all of us can fulfill our highest hopes.

Lincoln Day Address by Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, delivered by me over Wisconsin radio stations, February 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Yesterday I saw Lincoln.
I stood reverently before him
Within the lighted walls in Washington.
There he sat, like one who would speak to the Nation.
With deep, all-seeing eyes, soft and friendly,
Full of the warmth of human kindness.
His spirit of tolerance, of liberation,
Of love of the Republic
Filled that shrine
And reached out, calling all of us
To unity, to sacrifice, and brotherhood.
Surely his life defines the American way—
The ways of freedom, liberty of conscience,
Press, and speech.

—*A. W.*

As long as men cherish freedom, the name of Abraham Lincoln will be loved and revered. It is, therefore, peculiarly fitting that in this day, when the freedom of men all over the world is threatened, we should turn to Lincoln for guidance.

Lincoln's administration came at a decisive time in the life of the Nation, even as this hour in which we live is a decisive period in the life of the Republic, and of the world.

The national ideals for which Lincoln fought are now being ravaged internationally. The battle for freedom and freemen is not yet won. Human liberty is at stake. Lincoln's idea was to save the Union and to enshrine freedom. Ours is to preserve the Union and procure freedom for men all over the world. His was a sacred task. Ours is a sacred task.

We are today fighting slavery in a very real sense. On the battle fronts, we fight against enslavement of ourselves and others by the Axis. On the home front, we are fighting for freedom from economic slavery, from loss of local government control, from government competition in business, from excessive taxation profligately spent, from an ever-mounting public debt. It is argued that we can place our entire economic system under the rigid control of Federal bureaucracy without losing our civil liberties. The sad experience of every country which has tried it, proves the fallacy of such an idea.

As we face the future in a world greatly contracted by modern invention—a world, in other words, in which all nations will have to live much closer together—I believe we as a nation can derive sure guidance and direction from the precepts of this great American. There is much loose thinking in our country today; in the midst of a maze of seductive propaganda, let us consider a few basic truths expressed by Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln said, "Property as the fruit of labor, is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when he builds it." This bit of wisdom answers all the seduction of plausible socialistic talk with which we are surrounded today.

Lincoln didn't believe in wasting the people's money. He said, "It is an old maxim and a very sound one that he that dances should always pay the fiddler. Now, sir, if any gentleman * * * choose to lead off a dance, I am decidedly opposed to the people's money being used to pay the fiddler."

But perhaps the strongest principle along these lines to which he ever gave expression, was that in which he said, "If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

In other words, he did not believe in a government clothed in paternalistic functions. Paternalism, no matter how benevolent, implies that those under its care are incapable of taking care of themselves. It is my own belief, as it was Lincoln's, that "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves, the government ought not to interfere."

I sometimes wonder if our people realize that right here in America we are already being led along the paths which may broaden into a veritable highway toward socialism. Many of the post-war plans now under discussion sound suspiciously like the German system. If the Government hangs on to its federally-owned war plants, then Government itself will be in business—and on a tax-free basis. Washington officials have tried to federalize the unemployment system. The enormous public debt has the earmark of totalitarianism. Take the social-security program—an excellent program in many respects. There is a place in our land for a

national-health program, but when that program automatically takes over all your personal health problems, then it becomes socialism.

There has been definite encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of State government, and bureaucracy is firmly entrenched in Washington. There are those who argue for centralized government as opposed to decentralized, representative government on the fallacious statement that a centralized government would be a more efficient operating unit. Surely, after 3 years of such government it is obvious to all of us that such government is neither efficient nor representative of the people. On the contrary, our great national bureaucracy has proven to be the most recklessly extravagant Government in all American history. Never before have the American people witnessed such inconsistency and chaos in the Federal Government. And it is certainly not representative, for it is made up of millions of people who owe their jobs and their loyalty to the boss—not to the people.

Lincoln made a very clear statement as to the limiting of Federal activities, the functioning of local government, and the personal rights of the individual when he said, and I quote: "I am for the people of the whole Nation doing just as they please in all matters which concern the whole Nation; for those of each part doing just as they choose in all matters which concern no other part; and for each individual doing just as he chooses in all matters which concern nobody else." That, my friends, is a definition of true democracy.

If we are now headed, as I hope we are, toward a new emancipation period, it will be well for us to keep these precepts of Lincoln firmly in mind, lest we lose those rights and privileges which have been so dearly bought by the blood of our forebears, and of our contemporaries. Merely reducing Berlin to ashes will not preserve these prerogatives. If we permit the present trend within our country to continue, we can lose, more easily than most of us realize, all those precious rights about which I have been talking.

Of course, we know that the war necessitated the granting of vastly increased powers to the Executive; but it was just such gradual increase of power in the hands of the leaders in Europe which led eventually to loss of all rights of the people. I fear this trend does not sufficiently alarm ou people. There have been grave shortcomings in the executive branch of our Government—shortcomings which have not helped matters. Your Congress, the legislative branch of Government, enacted an anti-strike law. It was up to the executive branch of Government to see that that law was carried out. No law, no matter how good it is, can be effective unless it is adequately administered.

Whether an ordered world is to be established and maintained when the war is over, will depend in large measure upon the wisdom, the common sense, and the policy of the leadership and the people of the United States. I feel sincerely that we must not fail this critical and challenging hour in the world's history. We know that when this war is over, the world will not be cleansed of those evil forces which make for war. There will be no opportunity to put into effect many of the visionary schemes which have been advanced. No matter what kind of a post-war world we find ourselves in, America must see to it that she is adequately fortified against any emergency that may arise—physically fortified, and, equally important, fortified morally by adherence to those fundamental republican principles, some of which I have enumerated.

Lincoln would face this situation fearlessly. Remember his words to Congress in 1862; they have an equal significance to us today. He said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." Is that not a perfect direction for us today, when we too, find ourselves faced with new problems?

Lincoln stood for union within the Nation. When the war is over, there will again be a great need for the people of this country to stand united in their efforts to recover from government those rights and powers which belong in the hands of the people. Lincoln said, "To give the victory to the right, not bloody bullets but peaceful ballots only are necessary. Thanks to our good old Constitution, and organization under it, these alone are necessary. It only needs that every right-thinking man shall go to the polls, and without fear or prejudice vote as he thinks."

There, my friends, Lincoln gives us the remedy to the whole situation. If our people think rightly, and then vote according to their beliefs, this Government will indeed be a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Let us then go forward dedicated to national unity in war and in peace, making sure there shall never be again another Pearl Harbor in our history.

This is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, signing off, saying thank you.

Dewey's Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's address before the fifty-eighth annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club at the Waldorf-Astoria on February 12, 1944, reprinted from the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, 1944:

It is good that we return, at least once each year, to the wisdom and the character of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln was a man for the ages; because, throughout all ages, as long as human nature remains the same, the example of his life and conduct will remain a lesson and an inspiration. He was a plain man. Although he towers above his contemporaries he was very much like his fellow men. Better than anyone he knew that he was not perfect, not all-wise, not given the ability to solve the problems he faced in easy strokes of brilliance. He would have been the last to call himself indispensable. But he had one quality that made him big enough to save the United States of America in its hour of need—he had integrity of character.

When Lincoln came to the Presidency the Nation was torn by bitterness and dissension. His clear, calm vision pierced through the turgid mass of public controversy to see the essential issues. He saw one thing as fundamental—the preservation of our constitutional system.

He knew very well that our founders had devised a Constitution which could bring ordered freedom to expanding and diverse groups. They had the genius to see that sovereignty was not indivisible, but rather the total of all governmental rights.

Some of these rights could best be conferred upon those having broad responsibility to the people as a whole. Others could best be left with those having a localized responsibility. By our Constitution a principle of balance was struck. It enabled and required the people to work together through Federal agencies on matters which were genuinely of national import. All other matters were to be dealt with by the States.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

In the earlier nations there was of necessity a similar division of powers and duties. But always before the ruler kept such powers as he pleased, leaving local affairs for local administration as a matter of grace or as suited his personal convenience. The new, inspiring concept of America was that all government was solely by consent of the governed, that all powers resided in the people. That is the true, inner meaning of constitutional government under law.

Lincoln perceived that unless our people remained under that system they would inevitably fall into discord and disintegrate into jealous and disorderly groups. It was his great decision that our constitutional system must be preserved at any price. Many paid that price. They fought and died to make that great decision a reality. That reality is one which can be preserved only by the unwavering diligence of each succeeding generation.

In the last decade we have fallen upon times which carried a menace to our constitutional system as grave as that of Lincoln's day. The menace Lincoln faced was violent; ours was subtle. But one, as much as the other, carried a mortal threat. He faced secession by the States. In our time we have seen abdication by the States.

It remained for us to see the day when States and their subdivisions abdicated their responsibilities in favor of a single, national ruler. As dangerous as secession, abdication has also shown how the institutions of freedom are undermined. For free government must always work from the bottom up, not from the top down.

This was the great principle laid down by Thomas Jefferson. He declared:

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories."

It is in local units that men and women can most fully sense and practice the responsibilities of citizenship. Once we have ceased to do that, once we concern ourselves merely with a 4-year choice between one or another ruler, then we will be a ruled people.

AN AMERICAN AUTOCRACY

On March 4, 1933, the first attempt to establish an American autocracy took place as the result of the election of what used to be known as the Democratic Party. It asked and was given almost absolute powers. In that year the Governors of 40 States were also members of the Democratic Party. Many of these Governors were accidents. The majority were so untrained in the principles of free government, so willing to surrender them, so satisfied just to be in office, that the title alone was enough. They were willing to become provincial satraps under the rule of Washington.

I well realize that no detailed and permanent division can be made between the powers of Federal and State governments. Increasing economic interdependence requires increasing Federal duties. Particularly must Federal power be enlarged when, as now, our Nation faces the stupendous tasks of war. We give to that effort our unlimited support. We accept without reserve the wartime leadership which devolves upon our President under the Constitution.

Having done so, does this mean that all of the basic responsibilities placed upon the

States and every citizen by the Constitution are to be abandoned? Does this mean that the 120,000,000 Americans maintaining the home front should assume that our free system and all of the rest of the Constitution have been terminated or suspended? Surely, if it did, the suspension would become permanent and the war for freedom would be lost at home before it was won abroad.

The amazing thing about the American people is that even before the war they themselves sensed that the abandonment of local government was surrender to autocracy. Even before the war they were moving to recapture their freedom and the basic right of local self-government. They sensed that the Democratic Party was no longer the party of the people. Both nationally and through its Governors it had become definitely and finally the New Deal party, irrevocably committed to absolutism at the seat of the National Government.

The people had no Lincoln to tell them in simple words what the trouble was. Their own instinct guided them. They sensed that they themselves must bring back to State government competent, experienced men who would do the job of local government. They sensed that there was a vacuum in State government into which inevitably the Federal Government was moving.

DIVISION OF POWERS

Only the Constitution, with its division of powers and strong State governments, has made America a place in which minorities could live. Only the Constitution with the support of the people kept this country united in Lincoln's day and will keep it from autocracy in our time. The ultimate truth is that no man or group of men have ever been wise enough to substitute themselves for the institutions by which freedom is preserved.

So, as in Lincoln's day, our people found once again that the Republican Party alone could preserve their constitutional system of freedom. In one State after another the Republican Party has been restored to power until today instead of 8 there are Republican Governors in 26 of the States, embracing three-fifths of the people of the Nation.

All of you here were familiar with the consequences of the abdication by the New Deal Party in the State of New York of the State's duties and right to the National Government. It had been long obvious that the people of our State had not been given a full share in the war effort of the Nation. The State administration had simply left everything to Washington. Civilian defense had fallen into chaos. Food production was taken for granted while, in fact, its problems cried out for vigorous handling and leadership. The tax structures, State and local, were driving business and employment from our State while war contracts and employment were going elsewhere.

The spirit of the remedies applied by the Republican administration of New York State was to bring the people back to the practice of self-government, of relying upon ourselves. The strength of a nation is the strength of the people. The strength of the people is where they live—in the cities, villages and farms of America. Without them, as some seem to have forgotten, there would be no Federal Government. By revitalizing the State of New York we have greatly strengthened the National Government for war and for the peace to come.

In all this our State has not been alone. Twenty-five other States, from Massachusetts to California, have been doing the same, strengthening our system, preparing to do their part in saving both the system and the Nation in the days soon to come.

RESTORING STATE GOVERNMENT

Why have the people of the United States been so busily engaged in restoring competent, honest government in their States? Is it a mere trend against the party in power? Is it merely petty irritation at war-born sacrifices? Is it merely rebellion against the autocratic rule of a swarm of bureaucrats rivaling in numbers and in tyranny those by which our enemies live? I think not. The reason lies at the very root of our form of government and in the nature of the crisis through which we are passing.

We are living in mighty and moving times. We who are alive in the year 1944 are taking part in the greatest struggle of all history. Of this our people are deeply aware.

Within the next year or two we shall bravely win the greatest of all wars for individual freedom or we shall tragically lose it.

There is no American who has the slightest doubt that we shall win it and that we should win before too long. By the same token there are few thinking Americans who wish to risk the peacetime chaos of continued New Deal government. And there are few Americans who do not fear what that government might fail to do in the building of a just and lasting peace.

Anyone who gratuitously raises so much as a doubt as to the unswerving determination of our party to build a great peace trifles with the truth and with his country's future. I was present at Mackinac Island when the Republican Governors and Republican leaders in the Senate and the House of Congress deliberated upon the principles which must guide us in bringing about a lasting peace. There was not one person present who was not moved by the tremendous opportunity to state the principles by which it was to be approached and inspired by the vision of what lies ahead of us as a Nation.

It was that group of Republicans who drew the Mackinac Charter which was translated into action by our distinguished Secretary of State at Moscow. It was that result which was embodied in the Connally resolution adopted by a bipartisan majority of the Senate. Here was the first concrete, constructive achievement in our foreign policy of the future, and its framework was advanced by the Republican Party at Mackinac Island.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The people of the United States were turning to the Republican Party even before the war broke out. They have been turning to it at an accelerated pace since we entered the war because they are so desperately anxious that we shall build well and strongly in international cooperation after the war.

The people know that the Republican Party has been devoted since the day of its birth to responsible constitutional government. They know that they cannot hope for world peace unless that peace is built upon the firm rock of truly representative government. They know that, with a self-willed Executive who wars at every turn with the Congress, they will have a repetition of the same catastrophe which happened in 1919.

The American people themselves are beginning to shape our thinking on things to come. In the the last few years they have shown that they want a government which is once more close to the people. It seems manifest that they want to make their own decisions as robust, clear-thinking free men. They have had enough of the abdication of their rights to a select few in the National Capital.

The people realize that the only hope of America for world peace is that it be won by an administration which they know is not seeking power for the sake of power. If the national Government is one which our people can trust to serve them alone, to be their servant and not their master, they will trust it to do its full share in the world.

In the face of today's complex problems we are likely to think that the difficulties which face the world are beyond the ability of ordinary men to conquer. We are apt to conclude that they can be solved only by extraordinary men—men whose intellectual attainments transcend the range of normal minds. If this were indeed so we should have to despair of the outlook for humanity, for as we look about us, it can hardly be said that the world is crowded with such intellectual giants. But the truth is that our problems, by reason of their complexity, will not lend themselves to single, brilliant solutions. They will be solved in the end in the way all difficult tasks are solved, the way a man builds a house, brick by brick, by tackling one difficulty after another in accordance with tried and tested principles.

ONE OF THE PEOPLE

The strength of our system is that it makes it possible for all the people to receive the benefit of the thought and the productive effort which society produces. Neither power nor opportunity is confined to the selected few.

The wisdom and strength of Lincoln lay in the fact that, however high he rose in our nationa. life, he remained at all times one of the people. He did not seek to impose upon them ideas which were alien to their thoughts and traditions. Rather he gave expression to the aspirations which existed in their own hearts and minds. So it was when he spoke, he spoke with the voice of the American people.

Lincoln loved and respected the American people. There was nothing in his soul of the paternalistic contempt for their intelligence and their character which has become the prevailing attitude of our present national administration. Government, for Lincoln, could never be merely government of the people or even government for the people. It had also to be government by the people.

Because the peace of the world cries out for it, it is this government we must regain. It is this government we must preserve. It is this government which shall not perish from the earth.

Speeches by Senator Mead and Senator Brewster Regarding Tour of Battle Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that addresses by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], regarding the trip made by them as members of the delegation of five Senators who last summer visited the battle fronts, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The addresses were made on December 1, 1943, at a meeting of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator TRUMAN. Members of the committee and staff and their wives and husbands, I am happy to have you present here this evening.

If this special committee of ours has been successful (and some people claim that it has been rather successful) it has been due

to the fact that it has nine able and distinguished Senators on it who spend their time telling the chairman what he ought to do, and he does just as they tell him.

That committee would not be able to function unless it had a capable and efficient staff. We feel that we do have a capable and an efficient staff. We never have had you all together before so we could tell you that, but I think I speak for the members of the committee when I say that we are satisfied with the efficient way in which you do your work and if we have been successful it has been due to the fact that you have been efficient and your efficiency, I think, has paid us in results.

The other day I was reading a preview tear sheet of Newsweek that is coming out in which all the newspaper people in Washington and the editors of the leading daily papers of the United States had voted on the people who had accomplished things for this present war effort. Of course, General Marshall and the President headed the list; and other distinguished people were mentioned with a great many votes; and then the legislative people came in for consideration, and those legislative people mentioned were this special committee of ours first and the B2H2 committee second—the only legislative committees mentioned. Three members of the B2H2 committee are members of this committee.

If we have been successful, it has been because we have an objective and that objective is to make a contribution that will help win the war more efficiently and more quickly, and that has not been a political matter. We kid each other about being Republicans and Democrats, and we are Republicans and Democrats, but first we are putting forth the best we can in this effort—every member of the committee. We have been at it 3 years now, and there never has been a minority report, because our objectives are exactly the same: to help win the war efficiently and quickly so as to save as many young men as possible; also, incidentally, some of the taxpayers' money, too.

This special committee was authorized to appoint two members on this around-the-world trip, and those two members appointed by the chairman of the committee were Senator MEAD and Senator BREWSTER who are going to tell you now about the trip.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, Mr. Chairman, and friends, if I use the map I may be able to give you a better idea of the scope of our trip. There were two Democratic Members representing the Truman committee, if I were to speak correctly and if I had in mind the social side of our lives. I might add we were two Jeffersonian Democrats—that is, I was a Jeffersonian Democrat away back when I went to school, and Ralph was one when he saw Walter Hampden in the play called The Patriots. He was a good colleague to travel with. He was as considerate as a mother would be of her child. As an illustration of his deep interest in me he would allow me to go to sleep ahead of him, because if he didn't, I might not go to sleep. If that pun is too deep for you, you ought to hear Ralph asleep sometime.

Well, we left Washington on the 25th of July. We reached Washington again 66 days afterward. Figuring the time we spent in our C–87 and in the planes we picked up here and there and hitchhiked in, we were about 188 hours in the air. Some wag said that was no new experience for a Senator. That is, he is either up in the air or at sea, figuratively speaking. We traveled about 50,000 miles. Thirty-eight thousand of those miles were in our big four-motored transport ship, and four or five thousand more in ships in which we hitchhiked; one, I remember, in which we traveled through the New Hebrides was called Hitler's Hearse. Four or five thousand additional miles were made in jeeps, trucks, half-tracks, tanks, trains and ships, and other forms of transportation. Altogether we traveled nearly 50,000 miles, a strenuous task in any man's life at any age when it is completed within 66 days. We were 53 full days on the ground and that gave us opportunity to observe life in the various countries through which we traveled.

There were 13 in our crew, 5 Members of the Senate, 5 members of the crew, and 3 Army officers. We began to count the number in our party, but no one seemed to finish the count, at least they didn't mention it; they were rather secretive about the number. After we left the airport the pilot pulled a fingernail off; the doctor rushed up and there was considerable agitation. It looked as though we might have to return, but we didn't. Then we had a little difficulty in Iceland. Ralph and I had to hitchhike from there to Scotland; the plane, we were told, wouldn't work. One motor was bad. Then in London when we prepared to leave the weather was bad, so we had to go back to our hotels and wait. Next we took off from Land's End and flew down the Atlantic on the west coast of France, also on the German radar, and when we landed in Africa everybody was very happy. Then we all began telling how 13 was the luckiest number in their lives. Dick Russell was one of a family of 13. I was first elected in '13. Ralph couldn't think of a number 13 that fitted in very well except that he hoped to be elected 13 times to the Senate. At any rate, it suddenly developed that everybody knew that there were 13 of us and that 13 was our lucky number.

The trip was not altogether a joy ride. Some people may have had that erroneous impression. We slept in pup tents, in bamboo barracks, in huts; we slept in hotels that were not very attractive. In a forward area up in northern Australia, somebody who evidently was too considerate of us sent a telegram notifying the commanding officer that we would prefer to live in hotels to barracks, so when we got there and landed in the middle of the woods, they asked us if we would prefer the Shoreham or the Mayflower. When we made our choices known they took us to two Army tents that had big signs on them, one "the Mayflower" and the other "the Shoreham." Well, we enjoyed this roughing it, as it were, for it brought us close to the boys and the way they lived.

The trip over the northern Atlantic, over the ice cap of Greenland was a bit awesome and appalling. We could well realize that crashes over that land were in most cases fatal. To look down upon the great ice plateau of Greenland is at once a great sight and one filled with anxiety. The night flight from Land's End in England down to north Africa was one of the worst of the trip. We were equipped with Mae West life preservers, and I am glad that Mae West never had a chance to save my life. When in flight over the water we had to put on these life preservers and sleep with them and in addition we had to have our parachutes ready for a jump at any time.

The flight over the hump in China was another difficult operation. Some 50 ships were lost there in a few months preceding our arrival. Eric Severeid and a party of 17 were walking out of the Himalaya country when we were going over. We met them in Chabua in northern India after we had made the trip to China and had flown back. The trip over the Indian Ocean was another difficult one. We traveled nearly 3,200 miles in approximately 16 hours, leaving Ceylon late in the afternoon and arriving in Australia early the next morning.

The trip through the Solomons and the New Hebrides where, by the way, we had some fighter protection, where bombing was being indulged in by both sides, where alerts were frequent, was a very interesting and thrilling task.

There were also some unpleasantnesses that accompanied us. For instance, the food in the United Kingdom was monotonous. Every morning we would order fresh fruit and coffee, toast and eggs and sometimes bacon, or ham, but we never got what we ordered. They usually gave us sausage for bacon that was 98 percent cereal, and mushrooms for eggs. They gave us coffee just once, and after that we ordered tea. I couldn't imagine how anybody could spoil coffee as easily and as completely as they do over in England. When we got tired of eating in the best hotel in London we would eat with the American soldiers at their mess and there we really got something substantial to eat. The English people are really sacrificing, and when we gripe about restrictions, we should remember that this country would be a paradise for the average Englishman.

The mosquitoes that we met in Africa chased us all the way to Hawaii. I thought the same mosquitoes were after me every night. They made it necessary for us to carry netting along to sleep under so that we might not become victims of dengue fever, malaria, elephantiasis, and the other diseases carried by those cute little insects.

Then for real comfort, there was the hot weather in Basra. The day we were there it was about 150 at the airport in the sun; a little less than that under cover, of course. There our boys worked in the morning and again late in the afternoon.

There were mosquitoes in the South Sea Islands, where the breed is a little different and the diseases a little more severe. Usually, at the table, wherever we were, we found along with our pepper and salt an array of pills—pills for the heat, pills for the fever, pills for this, and pills for that. We took atabrine pills and salt tablets at each meal. So it wasn't just a joy ride.

I wanted to talk to you about our travels, and so I will leave the more fundamental problems to my colleague.

After leaving the Capital on the 25th of July, our first landing was at Presque Isle, in Maine, in Senator BREWSTER'S home State and in the heart, I am told, of the greatest potato country in the world. They have just produced 70,000,000 barrels of potatoes this season, and I would suggest that you all get in your winter potatoes now. At Presque Isle the north wing of the American Transport Command has its jumping-off station. I was told that more people had visited Presque Isle since they established that station than had visited Presque Isle in all of its prior history. Presque Isle is coming into its own.

Next day we flew from Presque Isle over to Gandar in Newfoundland, where we have an air base. We also have a Navy base at Argentia and another one at Stephensville, called Harmon Field. We spent the night at Gander and then the next day we flew up to an air base in Labrador called Goose. You probably are beginning to imagine that stopping here in the land of the icebergs we were putting on our fur coats and our earlaps. Why, RALPH BREWSTER went swimming the day we were in Labrador. Being from Maine, of course, that wasn't as much of a trick as if Senator RUSSELL from Georgia had done it, but it was really warm the day we were there. We have a beautiful base there.

I don't know why this base is Gander and that one is Goose, or why the goose is so far from the gander, but we have two or three little bases farther up north. They are called Crystal Nos. 1 and 2—they are probably the goslings. Over here [pointing] on the west coast of Greenland we have some air bases, where Col. Bernt Balchen, the noted Arctic flyer, is in charge. He is doing a great job there. Recently he made a miraculous rescue of some men who were lost up here on the ice cap. He flew a seaplane up there, located a little gully that had some water formed in it by the warmth of the noonday sun, and landed in it, and by circling the ship around in that little pool of water and ice he was able to pull one of these boys in at a time. They were so weak they couldn't help themselves, and so he kept his ship moving, and with great skill and his physical power he

pulled all the boys aboard and flew them back to safety. Probably only once in a hundred times could that feat be accomplished.

When we left Goose we flew over the ice cap of Greenland to Reykjavik Field, in Iceland. Iceland is a much more favored land than either Labrador or Greenland. In Labrador the natives, who came originally from the British Isles, have lost about 3 inches in stature through the years because of malnutrition and an inadequate or deficient diet. They haven't heard of vitamins up there as yet. They are emaciated looking, all are thin, many are dull. A Canadian railway, looking for 10,000 employees, began the task of recruitment up there, but gave it up as a bad job. We have employed some on our military projects. The first few days, I was told, they usually eat themselves sick and have to be hospitalized. They are not used to our substantial food. After they learn that it is going to be found at every mess they exercise better control, and eventually prove to be steady, though not good workers. It would take three of them to equal one worker from the United States. If those poor people had been properly nourished they would now be in position to help us immensely in this war effort, but unfortunately they are neither helpful to Canada nor to the United States because of their poor physical condition. The same is true of Newfoundland, except for St. John's and one or two other cities of the south coast.

To give you an idea of their backwardness, our boys put on a moving picture show at Wesleyville in Newfoundland. The performance started at 8 o'clock in the evening. It was the first some of the natives had ever seen, and they had to continue the show until 4 o'clock in the morning to satisfy the local audience.

They certainly need leadership and help.

Of course, Greenland for the most part is green only in name. Why they called it Greenland and this country [pointing] which is more favored and more green than Iceland is a mystery except that it was explained that the explorer who discovered these two places, a real estate man, thought that in order to attract population he would have to call this Greenland and that one Iceland.

In Iceland, where the Scandinavian people make up the majority of the population, they are fairly prosperous. They are naturally limited in their economy. Fishing is the greatest industry. They do have some wool; they raise some sheep; they do some gardening, and some little manufacturing. They talk about haying up there. There haying is just about like cutting our front lawn. They stack up a little grass in piles and save it to feed the goats and the sheep during the winter.

There is one natural advantage that they have there over any other of these cold countries, and that is that out of the mountain springs near Reykjavik they are able to get a good supply of boiling hot water. The temperature of the water is about 160 when it reaches Reykjavik. So they have some advantages up there. They get their ice cubes in the shape of icebergs from Greenland and their hot water for hot slings out of the mountain; so you can have either ice cubes with your Scotch or hot water with your rye.

During the summertime they have little darkness up there. You have to put the blinds down to keep the light out in order to go to sleep. It is daylight at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. Anybody who is in the habit of getting up at daybreak wouldn't have any sleep up there in July. Somebody asked HAPPY CHANDLER how long we were in Iceland and he said, "I think we were there about 4 days and 1 night."

One afternoon RALPH BREWSTER and I hitch-hiked a ride on a cargo plane to Scotland in order to get there a little ahead of schedule so we might be on with our Truman committee duties. We landed in Scotland at a place called Prestwick and while there we were housed in a railroad train that had been taken over by the United States Army and stationed on a siding at the rear of the station. I was right at home in that railroad train because I was more or less brought up in one. The next morning we drove over to the Firth of Clyde. On the way we were given a lesson in history and Scotch folklore as we passed the rivers, lakes, and villages that Harry Lauder made famous the world over. At the Firth of Clyde we motored around the harbor and saw the two majestic queens, the *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*, discharging 25,000 troops that arrived from the United States that day. While there we went aboard the United States cruiser *Augusta* and enjoyed lunch at the table at which the Prime Minister and the President drew up the Atlantic Charter while the ship was out here some place in the middle of the Atlantic.

At noon we went back to Prestwick and flew over to Londonderry in Ireland to look over our facilities there and then in the evening we returned and joined our colleagues who had come over from Ireland. During the night the train pulled out for Paddington Station in London where we arrived the morning of the first Sunday after leaving Washington. At Paddington Station there was a great array of distinguished guests to welcome us. Some of them looked like Senators and some were better dressed. I heard somebody say that our Ambassador and London's Lord Mayor and other notables were there to welcome us. The best dressed of all was a man at the end of the line, a big, tall man dressed more formally than any man I ever saw in my life. He had a big silk hat, a long-tailed coat, and bright colored battle decorations all over his manly breast. I walked up to him after shaking hands with the Ambassador and said, "Good morning, Lord Mayor," and he replied, "I'm not the Lord Mayor. I'm only the station agent here at Paddington." As an old railroad man, I wish I could bring that custom to the United States. What an improvement it would be if in the Union Station in Washington we had a man like that standing around to welcome us when we came to the Capital. It's a cure for inferior complexitis.

We spent 5 days at the Dorchester Hotel in London and we took in all the sights around town and all of the American military facilities. The most thrilling sight of all was seeing the young fellows pouring into the briefing room preparatory to their trip over the Reich; to watch these youngsters take their seats just as they would in a college classroom; to see them as they went up to the board, the captain of the flight, the intelligence officer, the ordnance officer, the signal officer, all the other officers, to discuss how best to negotiate the flight, how to avoid the danger spots, that corner where flak was very dangerous, where to rendezvous, how to fool the enemy, etc., etc. The route back home and where to meet your fighter protection, and if you have to bail out to be sure to signal for a war rescue ship and to keep your radio going. At the end of all this they would ask, "Are there any questions?" The boys would ask some questions, and I remember on one occasion the man speaking said, "And Captain So-and-so, you will be at the bottom of the lower squadron, there being three squadrons, one above, one in the middle, and one at the bottom, and you will protect the belly of the other ships."

The captain said, "That's fine! Who'll protect my belly?" In that spirit of lightheartedness they would jump out of their seats, put on their caps, and away they would go into their planes for a trip over the Reich which might be the last one. At the bomber briefing each one of us was assigned a boy from our home State. My boy was from Buffalo. His name was Captain Spitznagel, and during the briefing I was thrilled when they said, "Captain Spitznagel, you lead the first squadron into the Reich this morning." That was his twenty-third flight. I watched the papers every day because if he made his 25 trips safely he then would be given a furlough, and I am happy to say to you that he is now in Buffalo with his family. He made his 25 flights and more and he is safe and sound.

We saw a fighter group being briefed. They do this quicker than they do the more formal briefing for a great bomber raid. The fighters get up quick, they go over fast, they strike rapidly, and back they come. So the kids assemble fast, and after they are briefed, it's "Any questions?" The questions over, they jump out of their seats and into the sky they go. I was much interested in a Buffalo boy in this outfit, and I watched the newspapers the next day where I read this heading: "Buffalo Gal, piloted by Lieutenant Smith of Buffalo, N. Y., comes back safely with 50 flak holes in his ship and the ship's tail on fire." That is how they bring back many of these ships and that is no doubt where they got the inspiration for that song, Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer. That kid came back with a wreck of a ship, but that is the spirit that wins. I don't know how long they will be able to take it and I don't want to prognosticate the end of the war, but it occurs to me that air power will be increasingly prominent in any consideration of any future wars.

We were getting ready on the fifth day to leave London's Dorchester Hotel for Plymouth. This will be a little difficult for Captain Leo to listen to, but it indicates how welcome distinguished visitors are in all parts of the world. Captain Leo, will you stand up? [Applause.]

By the way, there is another excellent custom that ought to be introduced in this country. Over there we were assigned rooms close together on the same floor and we had serving us two maids, two waiters, two valets; one on each shift, of course, not assigned to us alone but assigned to the floor. The service was fairly good, even though the food wasn't. We were ready to leave and we said to the waiter, dressed very gaudily as he was just like a man about to be married or inaugurated, in real formal clothes, "Well, we have enjoyed our stay here and we have had a very lively time, and we would now like to ask you one question."

He said, "What is it, sir?"

We said, "Have you been tipped sufficiently?"

He then straightened himself up, clicked his heels together, and in the most serious vein in which a man ever answered a question (and I knew it pained him to answer it) he said, "Now that you have asked me I want to say to you—and I discussed it with my colleague [that is what he called the other waiter]—I was disgusted."

On investigation we were told by Captain Leo, our finance officer, that they all got the regulation military tip, but word had gone around that we were Senators, not members of the military, and so a hasty consultation brought about the decision that we would double the tip, and in that way senatorial dignity was saved. So we left London without the worry of an international incident.

We next went down to Plymouth, and there at Plymouth we visited the tablet at the water front from which the Pilgrims left England for America. Of course, with some exceptions, we got down on our knees and kissed the tablet because the most prominent name on the tablet was that of a man

named Brewster, one of RALPH'S ancestors. I asked the guide, becoming more interested, when they left England and he said at midnight. Their departure was a dark secret.

I said, "Why honor them with a tablet?"

He said, "That only came a hundred or more years after they left." At any rate, they did a good job and they were real Pilgrims in the building of a remarkable Nation.

Next we looked over the havoc of Plymouth and the surrounding communities, and you could not imagine the devastation that took place in Plymouth. You could stand in the heart of Plymouth and look as far as the eye would carry and you would find nothing but devastation that looked like the ruins of ancient Rome or some other medieval place; blocks, blocks, blocks for miles were destroyed, and yet those people came out of the debris every morning and with characteristic courage, courage that has carried them on to the assurance of victory, and sang, "There'll always be an England." If we had any misgivings about the sacrifices of the people of England, when we got there and saw what happened we had nothing but the highest admiration and respect for them.

After visiting south England, we flew down the Atlantic coast to Morocco and at Marrakesh we were welcomed by a delegation of military and naval officers, some of whom made the trip through north Africa, which included Morocco, Algiers, and Tunis, with our committee. Ralph knows a great deal more about our travels through north Africa, because he has a wonderful boy over there, his son, Charles, who, as the aide of General Wilson, took care of us and he did a remarkable job all the way from Marrakesh in Morocco until we bade him good-bye at Cairo. We were not only in good hands, but we enjoyed the supervision and the service that was superb. In other places it was all that we expected, it was good, but in that theater it was really superb.

From north Africa we went over to Cairo (I am purposely skipping across north Africa quickly) and we stayed at Shepheard's Hotel, a very famous hostelry, written up in many of the travelers' tales of the world. Naturally, while we were there we visited the Sphinx and the Pyramids. As Ralph was looking up at one of the Pyramids he said, "Well, I am encouraged as a Republican, because I notice that every one of these dynasties came to an end."

I looked, and noting that the dynasty ran through two or three centuries, I said, "Well, as a New Dealer, I will settle for that. We only had three terms, but that ruler and his children must have had a political monopoly."

While in the Middle East we took a short trip over to Palestine and saw the development over there. I want to tell you that the development there in Palestine and in Tel Aviv, fostered and financed by the Zionist movement, principally in the United States, is a most remarkable one. It looks more like California or Florida than any place you would find in that whole area. If they would expand and encourage that development the chances are they wouldn't need very much food from the United States, particularly the type of food they could produce over there. All this north Africa-Middle East territory is more or less desert except the littoral along the Mediterranean. The Italians, we were informed, were doing a good job in rehabilitating a great deal of the land in north Africa. They are great settlers, great farmers, but unfortunately Mussolini forced them into war. The Turks, they told us (and I am not sure about this) were not good soil builders in Africa because they cut down the trees for the lumber and that permitted the desert to encroach upon what was fertile land.

While Ralph and I were over in Palestine we met a seer or a soothsayer. I told him that I knew that Hitler was coming to an end and I wondered if he would tell me when Hitler would die. He said, meditating a moment, that Hitler would die on a Jewish holiday. I said, "How do you know?"

He said, "That's easy; no matter when he dies it will be a Jewish holiday."

I must tell you that all through these Arabian countries, in north Africa and in Arabia, Iran, Iraq, the men and women wear dresses made like sheets. They probably could dress a whole community if they had the table covers that we have here in this room. In fact, some of them that are not so well off would do well on a napkin or two. I saw a few children with nothing on but a string but I never saw anybody who was so poor that he didn't have at least a string; there are, unfortunately, too many of them in that category.

There has been some tolerable or benevolent sabotage over there according to tales that we heard and by some of our own boys. But they were not in the Army or Navy, they were probably employed on some merchant ships. The natives, so the story goes, would pay fifteen or twenty dollars for a good table cover; a sheet on a double bed probably would bring ten or twelve dollars. They say that one merchant ship left the Mediterranean without a sheet on any of its beds. They had all been sold to the natives, and I presume the boys who had to sleep without sheets were amply repaid, and many an Arab was all dolled up. I don't know whether that is so or not, but it makes a good story.

This is a story that relates to the conduct of the Army, and it probably ought to be investigated by the Truman committee. There are certain off-limit districts all through here, and there are also curfew hours. All the Arab ladies wear white veils so you can't see their faces; in fact, you are lucky if you see one eye. Now, of course, no military policeman would take the veil off a lady's face. Some of our own soldiers, so I was told, short of stature, would dress like an Arab, put on a sheet, take off their shoes and stockings, and toddle by one of our M. P.'s into restricted zones and after curfew hours, and one M. P. said to me, "I knew right well that that was one of our boys but I was afraid to take the veil off his head because we might start a war with the Arabs if I ever made a mistake." That also makes a good story.

Another very interesting tale I came upon because of my interest in railroading. Up at Basra in the Persian Gulf Command we have a railroad and a highway running up through Iran to Tehran and then on up to the Russian border. Most of the railroaders are natives. They have railroads of narrow gage and they don't run all the way up, they connect up with other railroads on the way. We have stepped them up considerably. They used to haul about 600 tons a day, they probably haul 6,000 now. Everybody, they tell me, in that part of the country raises the marihuana weed. They have little Victory gardens of it all over the place. Even the gendarmerie, the local police, have one in the front yard of the police station. All the engineers on the railroad enjoy it and sometimes they go to sleep and run through the switch and our cargo of lend-lease is lost before it reaches the Russian border; it is then "lend-loss" rather than lend-lease, but there isn't anything you can do about it because smoking I am told is a national pastime and we are not over there to convert or reform the natives—we are over there trying to deliver the goods up to the Russians.

From Basra we flew to Karachi in India and from Karachi we flew to India's Capital—New Delhi. At Karachi Senator BREWSTER and I stayed at the American Minister's home. The American Minister, whose name is Macy, is in the Brewster family. I am not sure about the connections but RALPH knows because he spent half the night talking about the family tree. We flew from Karachi as I said to New Delhi, and this is the sixth Delhi, that is why they call it New Delhi—they destroyed the first five. I don't know how long this one will last but it is a beautiful capital.

India, you know, is not just one united country: India is made up of about a hundred separate countries. They have independent states all over India. Some have nothing to do with the Indian Congress that holds forth at New Delhi. They are under the rule of princes or maharajas. Therefore, there is division in India, governmental division, class division, political division. In addition to that they have a Moslem population of about 75,000,000 or 80,000,000; they have a Hindu population of about 275,000,000. I may be careless with my millions but if they have good times the population will go up 50,000,000 in the course of 2 or 3 years and if they have a famine it will come down again. About 10 years ago they had some prosperity and they increased the population by 50,000,000. They have several different governments that do not get along very well with each other. I think they have about a hundred in all. They are very jealous and very envious of each other. Then they have these two great national groups, the Moslem and the Hindu. The Moslem is a meat-eater and he is a man who goes hunting and enjoys shooting; he makes a good soldier and he is aligned with the Arabic world; he has a great following to the West. The Hindu, the follower of Mahatma Gandhi, is an appeaser, a pacifist; he is not a fighter; he resists by forming a great crowd, probably of ten, fifty, or a hundred thousand (it is not hard to get a hundred thousand together over there), and parading to the center of a town and blocking trade, traffic, and everything. They bring in the cavalry and the mounted police and beat them into insensibility, knock them down unconscious, and they get up as soon as they come to and take their places in line and in that passively resistant, militant method they show their opposition to the government.

There is a problem. If freedom came to India what would happen between those two great people? They are very envious of each other and no doubt some difficulties would result.

In the Hindu world they have a great many temples and many of the temples are entirely cool to one another. There is envy again, opposition again. They deify everything from the vicious cobra, the snake, to the wild bull of the Hindus Mountains. We were at several of the temples and witnessed their form of devotion. Those differences of opinion, those grave political, national, and religious differences, make India a great problem for England.

Down here in Bengal Province where we spent some time in Calcutta, there are probably a hundred thousand people living on the street, lying on the sidewalks like the sidewalks right out in front of the Capitol. If this were part of India there would probably be two or three hundred Indians lying around Woodward & Lothrop's store; they would be in the doorways; they would be on the sidewalks, out in the street. They would have malaria, they would have dengue fever, and we saw them with leprosy. A whole village would come into town looking for food, there not being any in the village—men, women, and children, all the way from babes in arms to men of venerable old age, and they would lie around, and they would look for millet or some form of vegetation. They won't eat any meat; their religious principles prescribe against it. Although they have about 200,000 sacred cows, nobody dares to kill them, and so by reason of the fact that the Japs have taken over a great deal of the country around there, the rice supply has been reduced about 10 percent in Bengal Province, and the other provinces will not supply them with rice.

A great many of those who have rice hoard it for higher prices or for their own safety, with the result that probably every minute of the day, at least every few minutes of the day, somebody passes out on the street from starvation and they cover him up and the next morning the garbage wagons or the ash wagons or some other wagons pick up the dead and take them out to the crematories and their ashes are distributed on the sacred rivers of India without undue delay. The Hindus cremate their dead. The Moslems bury their dead on a good day. They have to wait for a good day. They were holding one fellow there 6 weeks waiting for a good day while we were there. You can imagine your difficulty if you were one of the visiting relatives waiting to take in the funeral.

From Assam Province in India we flew up over the mountains into China; we flew over the Himalayas. We were about 22,000 feet above sea level, and in addition to our parachutes we wore our oxygen masks. We looked like men from Mars; we had big snouts, and they were inflated and deflated as we drew in our breath or exhaled it. We went into Kunming and there we met General Chennault, a great general. He is keeping the Japs at bay with a small but very efficient air force.

We went from there up to Chungking where we spent several days with General Stilwell; and one night on Yellow Hill, which is the name of the homestead of the general and the "Missimo," we enjoyed the evening there. They had a table a little larger than the head table here, and General Chiang Kai-shek sat at the head of the table and Ralph sat over there, Senator RUSSELL sat over there. Ralph doesn't talk very good Chinese and the general talks no English, so there were two languages at least they couldn't use. The "Missimo" sat down at the other end of the table, which, in my judgment, made it the head of the table, and I sat at her right side. During the course of the evening I enjoyed flirting with these fellows in deaf language. They realized my superb position down there, they were envious of me. After a while we got to talking about it. Finally Ralph said, "Aw, it's the luck of the Irish," and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, of course very truthfully said, "It is not. It is his charming personality." I am not sure whether she was kidding me or not, but she is a very delightful personality and we had a great night on Yellow Hill. She served us not a Chinese meal but a meal that you could get any place in the United States; all the spices and oils and every bit of the ingredients necessary in the cooking could be bought here in Washington or in New York City or in any American city, so she really went out of her way to make it enjoyable for us.

We left Chungking for Kunming and there we met General Chennault again, and from there we went down into India and spent some time at Calcutta and then we went down to Ceylon and spent some time at Ceylon. Then we got ready for the most famous trip of all, the longest trip of all, from Ceylon to Australia over the Indian Ocean, just off of Sumatra and other islands held by the Japanese.

We were to be the first land plane ever to make that trip. It would require about 16 hours. We couldn't get all of the weather and radio information because the enemy would pick it up, so we had to leave in a sort of blind flying atmosphere, hoping that we would have a tail wind and that we wouldn't have to land, because if we did we would have to land in our rubber boats. We finally got to Australia about 8 o'clock in the morning and landed at Carnarvon in Australia. After spending 24 very pleasant hours there, being again in the land of steaks and chops for the first time since we left the United States, and we did enjoy steak and eggs for breakfast and could have all we wanted, we went up to Darwin, which is a forward area, from which they were bombing the islands.

There is a very interesting story about kangaroos, but I won't tell you that story. I will tell you another one. An Irish boy was sent down there to Australia from Ireland, and he had never seen a kangaroo. The first glimpse of one was very interesting. He tried to describe it to one of his associates, and he asked, "What kind of an animal is it and what's the name of it?"

This fellow was out of patience with him and he said, "It is a kangaroo."

"A what?"

"I said it is a kangaroo."

"What did you say it was?"

"I said it was a kangaroo, a native of Australia."

"A native of Australia! For the love of God! My sister married one of them."

We spent a delightful night with the boys up there and we saw another briefing party and I met some boys from home. We got up in the morning and saw them off. Ralph will tell you about that. We went from there over to Townsville. From Townsville we went up to Port Moresby and spent about 3 days with General MacArthur at his headquarters. We flew over the Owen Stanley Mountains to Oro Bay and Buna and Dobodura and many of the places where a number of great battles were fought. We went back to Port Moresby and were preparing to fly down to Brisbane. The night before our flight, DICK RUSSELL, who had been visiting in some other direction, came home and told me that I had missed a regiment of Buffalonians over at Dobodura. I couldn't think of missing them and yet I didn't see how I could get over the Owen Stanley Mountains because you have to rise to a high altitude and you have to get back before noon because the gap fills in with cumulus clouds and they have lost a great many ships because of the difficulty in negotiating those mountains through that gap due to the turbulence on the wings. I was able to borrow a ship and to fly over to Dobodura. Our ship left the next morning and landed that afternoon at Brisbane. I spent the morning with the boys. Then I flew back to Port Moresby. I flew from there around to Milne Bay with Senator Lodge, and then I left him with Lieutenant General Krueger and I went back to Townsville and about 10 o'clock at night after the flying freight car was repaired I got on a ship that was filled with boxes, military equipment, and one wounded bombardier. It was flown by a Dutch crew and from 10 o'clock in the morning until about one-thirty or two I was 10,000 feet high, the windows of the ship were wide open and I came nearer freezing to death than I did at any other time in my life. I had to stand up on the floor and dance like an Indian to keep warm. The poor bombardier had all the blankets and of course he was entitled to them. He had been hit the day before by shrapnel and both arms and his chest and head were completely bandaged. He had lost one eye and they were rushing him to a hospital to save the other eye.

The next day I had a very nice talk with him and he was very cheerful. I am in hopes that I will hear from him and that he will have saved his eye. His only worry was that he thought something would happen to him and he wouldn't be able to get back with the boys.

At 2 o'clock in the morning I got into Brisbane and the next morning we started out to see the sights there and went down to Sydney and from there we went down to Melbourne. A strange thing about Australia that I could never understand is that there the trees give off their bark rather than their leaves; the leaves never give off. There people drive the wrong way on the street; I could never understand that. And they walk the wrong way on the sidewalk. There you go south to enjoy the cold weather, whereas we go north in our country. Everything seems to be an opposite from what it is in the United States, and that is why they call that the place "Down Under." They are amused at an American motorcade and whenever we go through the streets with motorcycle men at the head of a big long parade of automobiles, men, women and children rush out of the house and are thrilled to death at this American "show," as they call it. It is becoming very popular there but it was never practiced by the people of Australia until the arrival of the American troops. I think Ralph can tell you how nicely they treat us there because his boy served there and I think he has many fast friends over there still.

We went back from Melbourne to Sydney to Brisbane and from there we went over to New Caledonia and landed at Noumea. That is a French colony and one of the richest islands in the world. They shovel nickel off the hills there. Three of us, Ralph and Senator LODGE and I, flew then with Admiral Halsey up to the New Hebrides and to the Solomons and we spent some time at Guadalcanal and surrounding islands, Espiritu Santo and others, and we saw the boys pretty close to action. We were warned during the day that we could expect bombing at night. At night we only had an alert, but for 5 or 6 nights after we left there the Japs bombed the place, as they did Port Hedland the day after we were there, as they did Chungking for the first time in 2 years the day before we arrived. (They were following us around but their intelligence wasn't accurate enough except in Bizerte where we were aroused at 4:30 in the morning and rushed out to the porch overlooking the Mediterranean. We didn't see any of the excitement. We saw the explosions of the ack-ack guns up over us and heard the drone of the German motors rushing away.)

Don't let anybody tell you that the Japs are not putting up great resistance all through that area. This talk about our fleet meeting the Japanese fleet and finishing the war in 24 hours is a myth, we know now, but it was a favorite passage of orators in days gone by. It is illustrated by a story they tell of General Chennault's volunteer fliers who were flying P-40's for the Chinese Government as volunteers long before we got in the war. Two of them were up in the air. They had gone over, as was their habit, to a Japanese air base and stung them good and hard. Because of their inferior numbers they used to have to race back quickly to their own base. They didn't have enough to meet the Zeros that came in tremendous numbers, and fight them a fight of attrition because they would lose, so they were hustling back, jumping from cloud to cloud because the sky was black with Japanese ships. They had a shortwave broadcast coming from the States, and some orator was saying that "if we go to war with Japan" (it was imminent, although Pearl Harbor had not taken place) "the war won't last over 2 weeks." He was trying to give the audience some encouragement. He said, "It will take us 1 week to find them and 1 week to smash them out of the war."

One of these pilots, looking up at the blackness of the Zeros in the sky, said to the other, "Did you hear that?"

"Yes; I heard it."

"Well, why don't we tell them where they are and save them a week?"

A Japanese prisoner who was captured out there (and this is their idea of how our fellows fight) said, "We fight for the Mikado. The German he fights for Hitler. The British he fights for the British flag. But American, he fight for souvenirs and for the hell of it."

Of course, the souvenirs are Jap scalps, and they are bringing in a great many of them.

We left Australia for Noumea and then for the Hebrides and the Solomons, and went

back then to the Fijis and met our boys, and then went from the Fijis to the Samoans and from the Samoans to Hawaii.

A strange thing happened. We went across the date line. It was Sunday in Espiritu Santo, and I remember that I went to church. I usually kept track of Sundays that way, although with Harold Stassen, the Governor of Minnesota, as our naval aide, Ralph and Harold and I argued one Friday as to what day it was. I thought it was Friday, Ralph thought it was Saturday, and Harold Stassen vouched that it was Sunday, so I jumped in my jeep and went to church. We found one, and really it was Sunday, but that is how you lose the dates on a trip like that.

Having Sunday in mind and flying from Espiritu Santo to the Fijis and arriving there on Sunday afternoon and then leaving there Monday morning for the Samoans and arriving in the Samoans Sunday again had me baffled. Then getting up the next morning and finding that that was the second Monday in 2 days was very disturbing. We were allowed only $7 a day, and we were wondering whether we had lost 2 days or gained 1. We tried to tell ourselves that while we had 2 Sundays and 2 Mondays, the numbers went right along progressively, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, but they didn't. We were told afterward that we had two 20's and two 21's, and therefore we lost a complete day. We were arguing about it as we were flying from Samoa to Christmas Island, and the sergeant came rushing in from the cockpit and said, "We are only an hour and 40 minutes from Christmas."

Somebody said, "Well, isn't that strange. We just had 2 Sundays and 2 Mondays, and now we are only an hour and 40 minutes from Christmas. That's better than the New Deal did, because they only gave us 2 Thanksgivings."

We enjoyed our stay in Hawaii, and from Hawaii we flew to Los Angeles. That was another overnight trip over the ocean with our life preservers and our parachutes and all the rest of our equipment with us.

I have got to let you in on a secret, though. We were flying from India over to Australia, and we were at a very high altitude to keep away from any possible attacks by surface ships, and although we went over the Equator, as we approached Australia it became severely cold. I was sleeping in the lower berth, and Ralph was sleeping in the upper berth, and I began to dream about icicles and ice caps and ice cubes and everything like that, and suddenly I woke, and I was freezing. Ralph was also up. I said to him, "Ralph, I've got to make a deal with you. Why wouldn't it be all right for us to pool all our clothes and sleep together here in the lower berth?"

He said, "Well, it would be all right if we sleep back to back." So we had my blankets and his blankets and his mattress on top of us and all of that kept us fairly warm until we drifted down to a lower altitude early the next morning and then it was really warm. That is about as close as we got together and that is about as close as a Republican and a Democrat can get together. We were certainly paired together for our own insulation that time.

We flew back to Los Angeles and I made a mistake. I was telling an audience that we flew from Hawaii to Los Angeles and spent a very, very pleasant 24 hours there, and then I said, "The next morning we left Los Angeles for the United States." That was at an Ohio State society. If it had been at a California State society you wouldn't be hearing this very valuable lecture from me tonight.

I must tell you one thing about a message I received from the boys: That if I ever went home and made a speech I would be sure to ask my audience to do all the letter writing they could. I saw boys rush up to jeeps and trucks for the mail and if you could see the anxious look on their faces as they rushed up and then the smiles on those that got a letter, everything would be all right if you didn't have to look at that fellow who was disappointed. I think it would be worth a million dollars to put a smile on his face. I think it was the most tragic and the most pathetic face that I ever looked at—the face of the boy who was forgotten back home. If you have anybody in the service, if I were you I would write a letter tonight.

I have a project that we put on occasionally that entails writing letters to everybody we know in the service. We have a long list. Sometimes we make one letter cover them all, but we keep them advised and we keep letters going out to them, because it doesn't make much difference whom they get a letter from if they don't have to go back without anything. I have heard a lot of stories about it. One boy said, "I promised my dad I would write every day but it is an awfully hard job." Believe me, it is hard. If you could see those boys training for street fighting, training for beach landing, doing invasion training, crawling around on their stomachs for distances of half a mile, with screaming machine-gun bullets going right over their heads all the time, if you could see those boys when evening comes you would realize that this fellow really had a right to write his father as he did. He said in his letter, "Dear Pop," and then there wasn't anything else except "Your loving son, Jim." Then P. S., "Oh, boy, am I tired!"

Then there was a story about a young fellow who wrote his girl and he had a clever subterfuge. He wrote "Dear Susie," or whatever her name was, and then he just canceled it all out, marked it "Censored" and wrote nothing, and then he just signed his name, and she boastfully, so I am told, showed it around to all her friends and said, "Gee, that must have been hot stuff. The censor canceled it all."

There are a million things that could be said of greater interest but I have at least taken you around the world. There are many, many problems that ought to be brought to your attention, problems that I hope will be brought to your attention by my colleague. I want to say to you, however, that I didn't come back an America Firster, as some newspapers indicated, and I take advantage of every opportunity to clear that up. I am for America first, second, third, and on and on until you get into the fractions, but I am not a member of that organization. As a result of my trip around the world I really believe that we ought to lead in an effort to outlaw wars, to eliminate the festering sore spots that aggravate wars, to bring a better and a more wholesome condition to the peoples of the world that are neglected and that are enduring intense suffering tonight.

I believe that we can do that without an international W. P. A. or dole; we can do that by the great moral leadership which I believe we possess, and I hope that when this war is over the resolution sponsored by the four men which was an incentive and a sparkplug for the later resolution that was adopted by the Senate will be implemented and supplemented by legislation which will bring America into the family of nations to outlaw the tragic, horrible situation that we witnessed as we made our trip around the world.

I want to pay my respects and my compliments to the chairman of the committee because while my education was limited as a boy, I enjoyed a very broad education as a result of his appointing me to membership on this global committee that enjoyed the trip around the world.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. RALPH O. BREWSTER. I have to correct a few little inaccuracies in which Jim indulged. First, about that getting down in the bunk story. I could say that was the bunk, but as a matter of fact what actually happened was this: We were flying over the Equator at about 10,000 feet and I, being a Republican (he didn't mention that), was assigned to the upper berth. In a couple of years on the next trip I expect Jim to sleep in the upper bunk. Along about 2 o'clock in the morning I was sleeping very peacefully when I heard this plaintive voice from down below and it was Jim who said, "Ralph, would you please come down here and get me warm?"

That is what I proceeded to do to the best of my ability, to show how charitable a Republican really can be.

There is one story that he omitted which he has told on every previous appearance. I have heard about it, as I have been checking up on him. I have fifth columnists in almost every party he has attended, and I notice he omitted it tonight when I was present. This concerns the famous hop over the hump of the Himalayas. He told you about that but he didn't tell you the story he has been telling, which is that as you go over that 750 miles at about 20,000 feet you are over the gorges of the Salween and the different rivers. It is pretty rugged country, filled with head-hunters. Jim's story is that, as he flew over there and contemplated the possibilities of a descent such as Eric Severeid had, he looked at me who was opposite and as he contemplated my profile and my visage he thought to himself: "Well, if we ever get with those head-hunters my head will be the first to go." Mrs. Brewster heard him tell that one night and when she told me about it she said, "You know, Ralph, you really aren't so very handsome."

He omitted the kangaroo story which we had a little trouble over down there because the military aide released the story, whether to embarrass us or not we never discovered. We went out to see the boys off on this bomber raid from Darwin in Australia, going up over New Guinea for a 750-mile drive. We went out very early in the morning after we left our "Hotel Mayflower" at which we were staying, in the woods, and we found those boys a pretty sober lot, I can tell you that. There isn't any of the thrill of combat in the cold gray dawn when they are taking off on a trip that for most of the distance of some 750 miles they were over Japanese islands and Japanese territory. They were going to bomb a spot right in here. I remember Jim asked one of the boys how he was feeling and I remember his answer (it made a very deep impression on me), for all he said was: "Kinda low." They realized that a good many of them might not come back.

As they came down the runway that morning a kangaroo hopped out across the runway square in front of the third plane down, and the propeller struck the kangaroo, which was about 5 feet high, and knocked it out to the side of the runway, killing it. Here was where the spirit of the American boys showed. The day before, that had happened and killed 10 boys in the plane, throwing it off its balance. These boys kept right on. They were entering a formation of 48 planes to go on this cruise and it was very essential that they all keep their place in the formation. We expected that plane would come back, as it would have been entirely justified in doing, to see whether or not there was any injury to the plane, but they refused to delay the flight, though they had another plane in reserve which they could have taken, but it would have meant a considerable delay and the use of a lot of gasoline. They kept on that trip, made a 1,500-mile flight and returned safely that night. It may have been poor judgment on the part of the pilot of that plane, but it was certainly a spirit and a fortitude that demonstrates the character of those boys.

As we went back to the camp we saw these kangaroos in the woods, so we stepped along the road and the kangaroos seemed to enter into the spirit of the occasion and undertook to race with the jeep. We clocked them up to

30 miles an hour and finally, just to show their contempt for us, they not only kept alongside but they finally hopped square across the road in front of us, believe it or not, to show their utter lack of regard for any human-made jeeps or other things. The only story that appeared in the Australian papers the next morning was that Jim and I were out racing with the kangaroos, which wasn't calculated to make much of a hit with the people down in Australia. We were ready to shoot the particular military informant who let that out.

He spoke about the situation in Iran and Iraq, where it is very hot; he said 150 degrees; it was 162 as I remember it. Perhaps I was more susceptible. I got the only air-conditioned room there was, which may have explained my sense of the heat.

He spoke about the mosquitoes that followed him around from Africa to Honolulu, forgetting the fact that, as I call Captain Leo to testify, the temperature in Arabia and Basra in Persia, where it averages around 160 degrees all the time—112 in the shade but there isn't any shade—is so hot that neither a fly nor a mosquito can survive. That was something I never knew before. That is the only compensation for living in that country. There the mosquitoes and the flies completely disappeared. They are the only things that disappeared, however, because it is the most filthy, unsanitary, unwholesome atmosphere that it is humanly possible to conceive of. I wouldn't begin to tell, after the very delicious meal we have enjoyed here, what the sanitary conditions are in that area, and how the people ever survive is beyond human comprehension, without pure water of any kind or any pretense at sanitation.

I met an Englishman there who had a sense of humor. After he had sized us up a little and found out that Jim was an Irishman, he said, "Well, you know, I had a very funny wire from London this morning. I got a cable from London instructing me to show every courtesy and attention to the sanitorial committee." I think if you could have seen our journeys through the Middle East, Africa, India, and China, you would have appreciated that perhaps it would be a good idea if we should send out a sanitorial committee to follow up this senatorial committee.

We had only one real collision on the trip, and that was down in Australia when we actually had a member of one of our civilian agencies defy the committee. That is the first time that has ever happened and it was the only time it happened on the trip and that gave us a great feeling of our importance. Every evening in our journeys we would assemble all of the civilian agencies and Jim and I as members of the Truman committee would give them the once-over to find out what conflicts there were (and there are always plenty of them) and what degree of collaboration had been established, what their activities were in the area, and the cooperation with the military. This particular fellow, I think, was lend-lease and apparently he didn't like our looks. It happened that we had Senator RUSSELL, and, I think, one or two of the other Senators with us, and after a couple of questions this young gentleman said, "Well, who are you fellows, anyway? What right have you got to ask us questions?"

Poor DICK RUSSELL, who was chairman of the committee and happened to be presiding, was floored by that, and it suddenly dawned on him that he had no senatorial resolution directing this trip or authorizing any investigation. There was where the Truman committee came galloping to aid. Dick simply turned and said, "I will let you talk to Senator MEAD." Jim immediately threw out his chest and pulled all the stops on the Truman committee and their resolution which authorized the investigation, everything under the heavens. By the time Jim got through telling him off there was a very humble and a very obedient man. That was the only difficulty of that kind that we had throughout the trip.

Jim spoke about the rescue squads on the Eighth Air Force over the North Sea, and that was one of the things that impressed me most and was most reassuring. The day before we were there something over two hundred boys were shot down on the raid over Germany and 150 of them were rescued from the North Sea by this very amazing rescue service that they have established. That was certainly a tremendous reassurance to the boys in getting around.

I am not going to undertake to compete with Jim in a travelog, as he certainly is the lecturer par excellence on that, so in a brief summary of our studies on the trip I want to give you the picture of what we saw as our conclusion, recognizing that the Truman committee had now extended its domain throughout the world.

Senator TRUMAN has always been as a chairman very modest, attributing credit to everyone else but himself, but I think we all recognize that it has been his wise guidance that has steered us successfully past the rocks and shoals on which so many other committees have foundered during the decades of our legislative history. He is apt to turn it aside, as other modest men, and say, "They are thanking the wrong man."

I am reminded of the fellow who was converting the patch of very bad weeds into a very delightful garden, and the parson came along and said, "You and God have done quite a job on this patch of weeds."

The man who had been sweating his head off out there over the patch of weeds, getting the flowers to grow, said, "Well, you ought to have seen it when God had it all alone."

I think there is an application here because I think these things do not just happen—nor by divine inspiration other than by the sincerity of purpose that has animated certainly the chairman and I trust all the rest of the members of the committee and I know the staff into very unusual labors. I think whatever reputation we have achieved for intelligence and integrity may be attributed in equal portions to the chairman who has inspired the staff to carry on in the way that they have. The rest of us committee members are sort of supernumeraries who are happy to get around and serve as the eyes and ears and question marks to some extent when necessary, but it has certainly been to this team of scrubs, as they like to call us among some of the older and I almost might say balder heads, that we owe the privilege of playing on this particular team.

I think the chairman's getting us together tonight to develop a little more of that esprit de corps for which we may well become famous was a very happy idea and I don't want to be impolite in suggesting to our host that possibly from time to time we might repeat this happy occasion.

As you know, we did have a very serious purpose, and while Jim has given you a great deal of the lighter side, and we tried to get that as we got along, because if we hadn't had it we never would have been able to survive and we tried to enjoy and profit by the marvelous opportunity that had been given us by our designation by the chairman to go on this trip, at the same time we realized that we were using 45,000 gallons of gasoline—I don't know whether you ought to put that down or not; we were reminded of it by our gasoline-starved constituents along the Atlantic seaboard who thought that unless we could show that this trip was going to show dividends we had perhaps better not come back at all.

I can testify to the work that we did under the direction of JIM MEAD, whom I recognized as my boss for the purposes of the trip in the absence of his boss, whom we saw here tonight, and we kept steadily at it, not so much on the military-naval fronts, because we recognized that those were, as we believed, in very competent hands. We found out how the boys are supplied with things, and never in any war has any army been so well supplied. I have to add a little prohibition testimonial, because I have to say also that never has there been so much fighting on so little liquor as in the Army that is now in the field—maybe not entirely a result of choice but perhaps somewhat a result of the necessities of transportation. When boys are going in those bombers—10 of them—with their lives all dependent on every other one, they are certainly interested in clear heads, and the condition of those boys is in startling contrast to the airmen of the other war, when, as some of you will remember, going up in the crates of those days a man had to be out of his head in order to go up—he had no parachute, he had very little protection of any kind, and it was 99 chances out of a hundred he would never come down. Today it is entirely different. It is a mechanized war to the last degree and clear heads are very requisite. That is reassuring to many of the mothers who wonder how their boys are getting on in all these outlandish spots to which they have been shipped around the world.

We directed our attention to the civilian front, as you know and as many of you have learned in the inquiries which we have been conducting since our return. I think I speak the conclusions of all the members of the committee—I know I do of Senator MEAD and of myself and of the consideration which is being given by the Truman committee, which will ultimately develop a report covering these points in our explorations—that we have a tremendous challenge before us. There is no doubt that we are going to win the war. That, I think, admits of no possible doubt. We hope it will be soon, but we know that it is certain. The irresistible might of America is being mobilized everywhere around the world. We saw evidences of it throughout the Pacific that were impressive in the extreme.

All the naval and air power and military might that is being mustered down there is beyond human comprehension, and the Japanese are going to feel it in full force in the next few months. So we are going to win the war. Whether we are going to be able to win the peace that is to follow is another and a very serious question. In the not distant future, 10,000,000 boys are going to come marching back and they are going to ask us some very serious questions as to what we have done with the talents which were entrusted to our care and what provision we have made to see that they come to the kind of country that offers the rewards that they desire.

I think we are fully persuaded that we have a terrific job on our hands, first in restoring our domestic economy, to which a great deal of attention is being given by various committees, the reconversion of industry and all of those things that are involved. But as we see it from our global trip, a very much broader responsibility rests upon us. In two great wars we have learned that we cannot ignore the world outside. It is being brought home to all of us in America, as we have found ourselves without provocation upon our part plunged twice into these great holocausts, that it is necessary that we take very serious thought.

Senator MEAD spoke of our association with the nations and our determination that this shall not recur. With that I think the overwhelming majority of Americans are in full accord. But we must move on to the very much more practical application of the ways in which this hoped-for millennium may be brought to pass, and I think that out of our

observation of conditions around the world we became very much more realistic and we realized that much of what has happened in recent centuries has not happened by accident but has happened because of the conflict of mighty forces among the nations that were determined some to have and others to take away, and we could see the growing evidences of a similar conflict of forces in the years that are to come.

There are not lacking indications that around the world there are other gaps and chasms which may well be ultimate in war, and it is our thought that America cannot turn its eyes in again, but must go out and have a part in the affairs of this whole world.

Russia, a great white space on the map, is the greatest self-contained country in the world with the greatest resources, beyond any doubt. It probably has between 40 and 45 percent of all the petroleum resources of the earth, which is the *sine qua non* of modern war.

Britain, which has built this great empire—out of the 45,000 miles of our travel, 35,000 miles were in the British Empire; the battle-front extends around it, whether we travel in Africa, in India, in China, in Australia, or up through the southwest Pacific where practically all of those islands are under British mandate or control—has tremendous resources. Britain has around 25 percent of the petroleum of the world, which is the source of power. Churchill has made it clear that his primary objective is to preserve the Empire. He feels that that is his mission as an Englishman and I think we must recognize his sincerity of purpose and his patriotic devotion to that ideal.

Stalin is devoted to continuing and establishing the Russians as one of the great, if not the greatest, powers in the world.

We over here in the United States have been dedicated for a century to developing our country. Compared with the rest of the earth, we are not so terrific in extent, but we have amazing resources. We have about 20 percent of the petroleum within our own boundaries and 10 or 15 percent more around the Caribbean. We have done an amazing job in a hundred years, but we have been preoccupied with things here at home. I think we all realize now that we have got to look out beyond the seas. We think of it in a rather idealistic way, that we will join a concert of the nations and that we will lend our voice in the cause of peace and that everything will work out all right from now on with the United States, Britain, Russia, and China, after the great conference that is now going on in Tehran, in Iran, up here above the Persian Gulf, according to rumors and reports.

I think the thing we have got to bring home to ourselves is that it does not happen quite that way. Peace still is associated with power, and the United States cannot by continuing its continental isolation so far as trade is concerned ever expect to be a part of this whole world. The British Empire has been built on a constant extension of its interests among countries everywhere through control of communications, through control of transportation, in former years by the merchant marine and in more recent years as it has built up its great system of Imperial Airways, and trade is going to follow the flag. I, for one, am completely persuaded, and I think Senator MEAD is in accord, that the United States without undertaking to break up any other country, without seeking in any envy to destroy the Empire of the British or the great country of the Russians, must more and more have a hand in the affairs of all this world. That means by trade.

That means that in the post-war world, in my judgment, we must have an international system of airways that will go completely around the world. We have built all these airports, as you know, worth around $500,000,000, in all these different spots and we have no rights of access 6 months after the war ends. We think that is very wrong. We believe that the least that can be expected, the least that we can ask of the world when at the end of the war it is anticipated that we will have given to the rest of the world $25,000,000,000 worth of goods and will have received back about $4,000,000,000, a net balance of twenty-one billion, is to let us fly around the world and use our enormous airplane building resources that are being used now to win the war to develop a great system of airways that shall service the world, remembering that that will be the key to peace. If we could envision an America with an airways system entirely around the earth, operating to all these airports, based on the great production facilities of our factories that are to be continued, based on all the personnel and facilities at all these ports around the world, no other nation would ever be able to start a war and that would certainly be the key to peace.

I do not anticipate that America can have such a monopoly, but I do anticipate that in cooperation with our British and Russian friends we may envisage such a system and it is to that that I am earnestly devoted, believing that in such a division of aerial transport we shall have the basis upon which we may erect an enduring peace.

We have 40,000,000 tons of merchant shipping which we must see continues to service the traffic in the world; yet that means trade, that means that more and more of our surplus productive capacity built to unprecedented heights for the purpose of serving as an arsenal to win the war will now be devoted to the cause of peace, and that in return for all the things we can give the rest of the world they will give us some of their raw materials because America cannot continue indefinitely to be Santa Claus to all the world.

We are furnishing 80 percent of all the petroleum used by the United Nations. The British Empire with petroleum reserves almost equal to ours is furnishing about 8 percent. Ten times the amount of petroleum is coming from our country. That cannot indefinitely go on. It is a result of the fact that we have the refining facilities and we have the transportation facilities to reach the seats of war, so it has been an accident of the war that we were compelled to do this, but as rapidly as we are able to tap the petroleum reserves in the Persian Gulf, where there are estimated to be around 40,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum in this little area, that situation can be relieved. I have been learning a good deal about this petroleum business. It seems it locates between the continents, so we find our great petroleum reserves in this Caribbean area and Mexico and Texas, between the two continents; we find the greatest petroleum reserves of the world between the three continents of Africa, Europe, and Asia, right in this Middle East area. That is the greatest source of power known to man at the present time. Right up above are the Russian reserves which they claim are 40,000,000,000 barrels also; in other words, around 75,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum right within this area.

There are a few other reserves down in Sumatra and Java between Asia and Australia, the other continental area. Whether or not there are great reserves in the Arctic North remains to be determined. The geologists are speculating about it. (They have not found too much in Canol thus far.) We have some petroleum reserves up here in the north of Alaska and it is possible that between North America and Asia and Europe in the north they may find petroleum.

We must take, as I observe it, a more realistic view and see to it that American foreign policy shall move to protect our interest in these petroleum reserves outside our area, and to that we are giving a great deal of attention. I hope that within the next few weeks the Truman committee may be able to make an authoritative report on this petroleum situation which Jim and I were instructed by the chairman before we left to investigate along wih several other things, that will be of real value in determining the policy on this score, because not only our country and our oil companies and our Government but other countries as well are all waiting and watching anxiously to see what we shall do and by the contribution we may make in this report I think we may measurably advance the cause of permanent peace to which I think our boys are all devoted.

It is not going to be sufficient to have the airways, which are the seat of military as well as commercial power, or the merchant marine which backs up the Navy, or the petroleum reserves which are also essential because without them no ship or tank or plane can move; but it is also going to be essential to have a world-wide system of trade built on diplomatic and trade representation that shall extend around the world, and it is that vision which I hope we can present in proper measure to the Members of the Congress as we conclude our studies and offer to our people and to the world some degree of assurance that America is going to be a functioning part of this whole plan.

This does not mean that the British or the Russians will have to take any back seats. There is plenty of room for all of us in the world; there is plenty of room for trade. The English will certainly not go down to the position we saw our good friends in in India in any period that we can contemplate, but it does mean that America will find scope for the energy and the intelligence and the organizing genius which have made America in the last century the example and the envy of the world, and we go out not seeking to erect an empire, not to extend an ideology, but seeking simply to share with other countries something of the achievements we have here. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

That is the picture of the America that I see: Without quarreling with what England has done in the way she has extended her empire, without quarreling with the Soviet conceptions of how they may extend their views, the genius of America is to go forward with an example, freedom, enterprise, that has accomplished so much in this past century.

Do we realize that the entire war effort of today, the only prospect of our success, rests Atlaslike upon the productive capacity of America and particularly upon our petroleum industry which has been able to furnish the vital essentials for our airplanes, for our ships, for our tanks, and for all the functioning of modern war; that Russia, with more petroleum than we, that Britain with more petroleum than we, have been utterly unable to do that because they did not have the refining or the transportation capacity to do the job? That is all a tribute to what private enterprise has done here in the United States. We may be proud and grateful that we were able to contribute in this way, but we must be concerned and cautious that in the decades ahead, with the realization that our petroleum resources will not last at the present rate over 15 to 20 years, that, as Secretary Ickes said the other day, we could not possibly oil another war, we must begin to take very serious thought and show to our Congress, to our country, and particularly to the 10,000,000 boys who are moving toward the fighting fronts all around the world, that we have been conscious of the responsibility entrusted to our care. I think as we do that job we shall acquire the richest compensation of living in the thought that we, like all these 10 generations that have preceded us upon these shores since my old ancestor landed there at Plymouth Rock, have made our little contribution to the building not only of a better America but to the building of a better world. [Applause.]

Aviation Problems and Possibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the banquet meeting of the National Aviation Trades Association at St. Louis, Mo., on December 3, 1943:

Toastmaster Shaffer, ladies and gentlemen in the field of aviation, I feel that you have a heavy burden on your shoulders. Down in West Virginia one day a lanky mountaineer walked through a cemetery and looked at a tombstone. He was feeling good on that particular trip. I remember he had had a little sustenance under the belt—of the floating variety rather the solid type. He looked at the marker and read:

"Here lies the body of Mary Ann Brown.
When on earth she weighed four hundred pound.
Now she has gone to her sweet rest
Safe from harm, on Abraham's breast."

My friend took some chalk and wrote beneath—

"It may be sweet for Mary Ann,
But it's a darn heavy load for Abraham."

But that is all in jest. You meet here tonight and there are heavy burdens, not only in the thinking processes of your minds individually and collectively, but there are burdens in reality which are upon the shoulders of those who represent, as you do, a most important segment or segments in this great aviation industry.

I have listened, as you have listened, to the thought-provoking and searching comments of the national commander of the American Legion. The latter part of his talk impressed me greatly as he spoke of these men who are returning from the fighting fronts.

I should like to supplement something he said on that score by telling you that there are 2,000 tired and broken soldiers who are returning to civilian life each and every week of the year. Where they shall go, what we can do to contribute to their rebuilding is a problem not only for the administration at Washington, D. C., but for these men and women who, in community activities all over America, are thinking very definitely of discharging their solemn duty to the veterans of this global conflict in which we are engaged.

This is not the first time I have spoken from exactly this spot. Several years ago in the heyday of democracy in this country, I came to St. Louis to speak at the Jefferson Day banquet. There are the ever-increasing ranks of those who fly, of those who live in the world in which airpower will win the ultimate victory over the ruthless and relentless and well-equipped foes that we fight on scores of fronts tonight. Those individuals will give rebirth to civil and commercial aviation when the final hour of victory has been won.

Yes, the boastful, strutting Mussolini has been bombed into oblivion. The jaundiced Jap, taught to face defeat rather than run from the enemy, flees fog-bound Kiska before we understand he has departed. Tonight over the occupied countries of Europe, over the heart of Germany and the capital of nazi-ism itself, there continues to pour down on the madman and his satellites the power of the air forces of America and the Allied Nations.

It is not especially of this phase of aviation that I speak tonight, but I think it is well for us to realize, those of us who have believed in this instrument, that it is the major factor in the winning of this war. Let's not be afraid to preach that doctrine. Those of you who have flown, those who are now flying, and those who will undertake it in the future, must continue to lay emphasis, a deserved emphasis, not only on the prosecution of this war through air power, but the planning and the keeping of the peace through the power of wings which will rise from America and stretch over all the world.

What happened when America became fully awakened to what it could do in the air? There are those in the high command who realize that they overcame certain obstacles when Great Britain and America welded themselves together. Tonight we can realize that the Allied Nations haven't given seventy-five hundred tons of bombs to Berlin; they have doubled the poundage In how long? In 11 days! Think of it. Eleven days! In these concentrated bombings the Allied air forces have given back to Berlin twice what Berlin gave London. Fifteen thousand tons of ammunition, more than 30,000,000 pounds, have been dropped from the skies over Berlin. That is not counting the other sectors on the fighting fronts.

I think that is the reason two of our air forces boys wrote this verse, which I clipped from an evening newspaper. They were talking about the round-the-clock bombing of the enemy, and this is what they penned:

"Herr Hitler said to Goebbels,
'Do you think it can be spite?
The U. S. A. by day,
And the R. A. F. by night!'

"Herr Himmler said to Goering,
'Why don't your Luftwaffe fight
The U. S. A. by day,
And the R. A. F. by night?'

"That Churchill has us on the run,
That Roosevelt is a meany.
They paid us ten bombs to one,
And gave us Mussolini!"

These pilots are serving gallantly in the Air Forces of the United States, bringing a speedier conclusion to this terrible catastrophe and saving the lives of millions of men who are today in the uniforms of the Allied Nations. They are carrying the actual fight to those dictators and regimes who would tear civilization apart, make of Christianity a mockery, and attempt to give a dictatorship to the world.

But this evening we are thinking of another world, a world in which peace will prevail. Into that world you will fit this industry of domestic aviation, this private flying, this charter and commercial type of air service of the future.

When I came from Chicago to St. Louis this evening, I traveled that distance in 1 hour and 30 minutes. It took me one-half that time, or 45 minutes, to drive from your St. Louis Airport to the Jefferson Hotel. I am not a carping critic. I threw out the challenge, not alone to St. Louis but to you men and women who represent two or three hundred communities, that in your planning for aviation in the future bring airports closer to the heart of business, and make it rub elbows with those whose support you must have if you will build it, not only for yourselves but for America.

St. Louis has this airport. You plan another airport. But on the fringe of this great metropolis of the Middle West there should be other supplementary fields. In the tomorrows we'll have those airports as near the city as possible, but we shall also know that it is necessary to lay out high-speed express roads from the air facilities to the heart of the city. If you fail to do that in your planning, if you think you can set your airport 15, 20, or 30 miles from the city, you will hold back the development of transportation which is so vital to a continuance of the air-transport progress of America.

It won't be possible for every community to treat the problem in exactly the same manner. In Pittsburgh, as they build an airport, they build a $2,000,000 highway. When they laid out the future pattern, they realized that the two arteries of travel must go together. Instead of taking 35 or 40 minutes to go from the Allegheny Airport to the heart of that industrial city, they will have cut the time in half. In other words, there will be only 18 minutes of travel time between the airport and the heart of the Steel City.

What are they doing in New York City, Mr. Tichenor?

I want to tell you that Frank Tichenor made a campaign speech for me in 1942. I never knew about it until tonight. He made it down in the eastern part of West Virginia. When I tell you that I just squeezed through by 259 votes, you will understand that it was the courage and the persuasion of this grand old man of aviation which aided my reentrance into the Halls of Congress.

When LaGuardia Field was built in New York, the "Little Flower" could come to Washington and say, "Look what has blossomed here." He may be short and rotund, but he is thinking in terms of tomorrow. Why is he doing it? Because he has been a flyer himself. He understands the importance of aviation and what it will do for the city that plans, and plans correctly, for the future.

That is why Idlewild Airport is being built now. Idlewild Airport is going ahead. Its cost dwarfs the expenditure on LaGuardia Airport.

As they build this great air terminal they are thinking also in terms of a shorter travel time between the airport and Times Square. Are they going to lick the problem? They are shortening the drive by at least 15 minutes. All over America large cities with great populations and with funds now available are thinking in terms of doing the job properly for the years ahead.

I have said that I flew here. Chicago has two schools of thought at this moment on its new airport construction. One believes that the airport which is now located 45 minutes by car from the Loop should be used in the future, but that the highway should be greatly improved between those two points. There are others who believe that an airport should literally be carved out of Lake Michigan, and that the 10 minutes driving time from such a landing field to the Loop is the answer of those who look ahead. Of course, it may be an excessive cost to bring that about, but what was done at Washington, D. C., on the shore of the wide waters of the Potomac can and likely should be done at Chicago, because there as well as New York and St. Louis and all these other large cities must ultimately come to the realization that airport facilities must be brought close to the people whom we are to serve.

That is enough about these big air terminals, these huge airports, because they are just one factor in this "community aviation development," which, by the way, was the subject C. R. Mooney plucked out of the hat for me. I'm not talking to it, but all around it.

We need to provide this type of airport for the commercial air lines of tomorrow. I pay tribute to the far-visioned men who run the air-line industry, but I say to them that the great boom in aviation in America, when this war is over, will not be so much in the increase of air-transport business as it will be in the great upsurge of private flying.

The time is ripe when you, who are the pulse beat of the great aviation industry of America, remember to stop talking about flying merely on the street corner of your home town. Talk about it in terms so that the men on Capitol Hill and the White House in

Washington will hear, not one voice crying in the wilderness, but they will be aroused by a cooperative spirit which should be a part of any planned program for American aviation in the future. Where better could it be headed up than here in 1943 at this convention of N. A. T. A. in St. Louis? Do you have the nerve to do it? Do you have the spirit to do it? If you do, the job can and will be done.

Charles Stanton, the Administrator of C. A. A., says that by 1950 we'll have, not 24,000 aircraft which were used as of Pearl Harbor day, but we'll have 300,000 civilian planes which will be operated. Whether those figures are correct, it matters not tonight, but it shows that leaders are thinking in terms of a great expansion of private flying in the readjustment period immediately after the war.

I would like to make a prophecy. Within 2 years after the war is completed we'll have 1,000,000 men and women who will be flying aircraft in the United States.

If they are to do that, they must have now proper thinking on the part of individuals and groups like those who are represented here tonight, who are ready to move forward constructively, and not attempt to cry down the opposition, but to give impetus to air expansion.

I speak of that because we shall shortly consider in the Congress of the United States the so-called Lea bill. Don't get the idea that Congressman LEA is not a good man. He is from California. He has had a long and distinguished record as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. He hasn't preached aviation in just the last 2 years; he has preached it for 20 years. He has laid down some of the foundation stones which you gentlemen have carried into your communities through the years. Don't give a blast at LEA because his name happens to be on a bill that you can't agree with in all its parts. Get together and write in clarifying language amendments to the measure. Debate on the House floor will clear up many matters. Changes can be made and will be made. Let them know the thinking of men and women like yourselves who believe that you have a job to do and you want it done in the right way. If you will do that, there will be some men in Washington, D. C., who will carry the fight for you, who will stand by you in the writing of legislation which will finally be enacted.

In 1938 the Civil Aeronautics Act was a subject of long and conflicting debate. On the motion to recommit the bill to committee the roll call vote was 119 for and 214 against. You see that strong opposition, when a policy had to be set down for the Government. Thinking in terms of that act, if it were to come before the same individuals today, the number voting against it would be much less. The value has been proven.

One year later came the Civilian Pilot Training Act. I stand here and look into the face of the individual who, more than anyone else, fostered the initiation of that program. You know I am referring to Bob Hinckley. Within his head were those thoughts that molded together this pilot-training program, and yet there were those in Congress who fought vigorously against the enactment of such legislation.

I shall be practical with you. I have mentioned these acts of 1938 and 1939, and the act possibily of 1944, for only one reason. Let those who represent you in Washington know how you feel. I want to throw out this challenge. Get your own Member of Congress and take him into the air. Do you realize that of the 433 men and women in the House of Representatives, and the 96 in the Senate, even today when the whole world is attuned to air power and its importance, that only approximately 200 of that number have flown? You can't sell a person on an idea when he has never been introduced to it properly.

You know in your community the Member of Congress who represents your district. It doesn't matter whether he is 35, 45, 55, or 65. Remember that about 60 percent of those in the Congress of the United States are more than 50 years of age. Remember that they grew into manhood at a time when aviation was in swaddling clothes. But even if they are advanced in years, invite them to get into the seat beside you in your little Piper Cub or Tailorcraft or Aeronca, or Ercoupe. If you can get them into the skies, you will be able to talk to them and they will understand your problems because they have been introduced to this problem which is yours, and which they want to correctly solve. If they won't listen to you, you can always drop them out.

In looking over the agenda of your meeting here, I realize that you are at this convention to do a job, to sit down and go through these problems and set a satisfactory conclusion containing the consensus of those present. I hope you are ready and willing to do just that.

All over the country there are those persons who are talking about the great future of aviation. They have a right to talk about it because it will come to pass, but let's break it down, let's tear it apart and be realistic as we go ahead with the job.

Today we are spending each month $8,000,000,000 on the production of war materials with which we fight our enemies. Think of it! Approximately $100,000,000,000 a year. We can't keep it up, of course. The timetable of victory may be wrong, but for discussion we might think in terms of Germany being defeated in the summer or fall of 1944, and Japan in the summer of 1945, we'll realize that the $8,000,000,000 being spent each month will gradually taper off. There will come a reconversion from the manufacture of fighting materials to peacetime production. Therefore, next year it is possible that will taper off to $5,000,000,000 a month, and ultimately, if this timetable operates as we trust it will, we will run only $3,500,000,000 a month in wartime expenditures.

When that day comes will we be ready to understand the part aviation will play? Will the aircraft factories on the west coast and other sections close their doors and shut down forever? No. They will balance the heavy plane production with light plane production. Men and women by the hundreds of thousands have gone out there from all walks of life. Some of them will stay, but many of them will go back to peacetime pursuits.

Let's realize that this is coming. If we wait until the hour is here, we'll never be prepared to meet it. That is the reason I ask you tonight to think constructively in terms of reconverting a wartime America to a peacetime world.

I said at the Oklahoma City meeting—and alert Wayne Parrish can bear me out—that these billions of dollars of war contracts cannot be terminated overnight without bringing a tragic unemployment problem to this country. Not only Washington, but the main streets of America everywhere, must realize that this job must be done, and done sanely.

Take the company with a $350,000 contract. It was held up, I am told, by the Government, and he wasn't paid for 8 months. Why? Because there were items totaling $10,000 which were in dispute. Is that the way to treat a man who turns out the materials with which we fight? No. It's wrong. It will be stopped in the administration of our affairs if you will become one concerted voice in groups like this all over the country. This man, an aircraft parts manufacturer, will desire only what is correct and right.

One other thought. Let's think soberly about the fact, ladies and gentlemen, that the planning and the developing of aviation in this country tomorrow is to be done not by novices, not by theorists, not by little cliques in Washington, D. C.; it is to be done by those hundreds of thousands of hard-bitten airmen like yourselves who realize the problems which you have had to fight through in your own little niche in aviation. The same courage must be applied to the bigger picture.

We have in the National Capital too many of those "Johnny come latelys" on the scene of aviation. They come forward with their misplaced ideas on global aviation as well as the settling of problems in domestic aviation. Don't allow them to give our progress away. Don't allow American initiative and courage to be junked.

The Congress of the United States is a cross-section of America. We make mistakes. However, realize that Members are your elected representatives. They stand before the ballot box and are judged. When they were elected they also had the specter of defeat staring them in the face, because in your franchise you not only have the right to elect them, but you also have the responsibility to reelect them or reject them.

However, there are in Washington tonight far too many agency individuals who in reality are writing the laws of America. They are not doing it on Capitol Hill by introducing a bill and after it has had committee hearings putting it through the procedure of bringing it on the floor for debate and final vote. They are drafting the laws of America because certain directives and regulations set forth have the intent of law. These persons never stood for election, never went back to their people to give their story, never fell or rose because of what they had done. No accounting of their stewardship to citizens back home was required.

Without making any charges against the Executive power, without stating any unfounded remarks against certain bureaus which have been built up almost overnight, which are nebulous, with nothing substantial behind them, I must say that at your National Capital there are those irresponsible individuals who are attempting to dictate not only the aviation policy of America for tomorrow, but many of the policies by which this Nation will either rise or fall in its contacts with the world at large.

Don't allow that to happen, men and women of this convention. We have been given us hundreds of directives which are not from law but simply from stern regulations. As Commander Atherton, of the American Legion, said earlier this evening, those powers must be returned to the people of the United States. Be more than aviators. Be more than those who are interested in flying. Become citizens of this Republic in reality.

I wonder how many of you could raise your hands if I asked who voted in the Presidential election of 1940, or 1936? You would be surprised how many hands would never go up. Why? Because the figures bear me out that in the Presidential election of 1940, out of every 100 eligible voters, 33 never cast their ballots. For one reason or another they did not exercise their franchise. Let's say 25 out of 100 were derelict to their duty and therefore did not discharge their obligation as citizens of the United States. That doesn't speak too well for a working democracy where all are expected to participate.

When some of these moves are made which are wrong, and you criticize, remember that you are part of America, and you should use your right by analyzing the men who stand before you as candidates, and also those platforms upon which a party is molded.

Before I sit down I want to say this to you ladies and gentlemen: Are we going to think only of aviation, or are we going to consider all the parts which compose this air-automotive age in which we are living? If you are big, you are going to take the over-all picture and be ready to meet the challenge.

The other day I had the opportunity of flying with a gentleman who tonight is in this

banquet room. His name is Arthur Hyde, a good pilot. We flew 175 miles in a plane over the mountains, from Morgantown, W. Va., to Washington, D. C. It wasn't ordinary air travel. It was flying a plane—the first in America—to be fueled with gasoline made from coal.

As we go into the air automotive age of tomorrow it won't do us any good to have the finest planes in the world, or the finest pilots, or the greatest desire to make aviation go forward if we do not realize that the fuels of the future cannot come alone from the petroleum pools of America.

An analysis by men who know tells us that, due to our serving the world on our many fronts in this war, in 15 years we may be on the bottom of the petroleum barrel of the United States unless vast new reserves are found. Here in the Middle West there are agricultural products that could be used for the making of fuel oils and aviation gasoline.

In the Rocky Mountain region in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah lie the great deposits of shale. Eighty-five percent is in that area. In America there is enough coal so that we can produce not only for present uses but all the aviation gasoline and liquid fuels we need for the next 1,000 years.

From oil shale we can get 35 gallons of aviation gasoline per ton; from coal we can get as high as 130 gallons per ton.

In this flying business you can appreciate the idea that America must not lay aside her wings 15 years from now for lack of fuel. You will be wanting to go forward then. Private business must be ready for the challenge that is going to come in slightly more than a decade.

These different problems project themselves into our thinking. Be ready to embrace them and understand their importance. Give your ideas voice not individually but collectively, as N. A. T. A.

Commander Atherton told you about a chap from Guadalcanal, and because of that I cannot fail to tell you of a Washington, D. C., boy. He was a private 21 years of age. He sat to my left a few weeks ago. Had I desired to touch his right leg with my left, it would have been impossible because he had lost it in Pacific fighting for you and for me. His personal physical loss was lessened somewhat by the philosophy of this American boy, who said, "Let's never allow war to cover mankind again."

What he said has been echoed by other American youth, including Joe Foss, that gangling 27-year-old farm boy from South Dakota, who said, in essence, "Let's see that when this war is won we are never again put into war, because if we do, civilization will fall."

One hundred and three years ago Tennyson closed a prophetic poem with these words after he had given us a picture of the airplane 100 years in advance of his time:

"Till the war drums throbbed no longer,
and the battle flags were furled,
In the Parliament of man, the Federation
of the World."

Oh, if we could catch a little of the spirit of that man as we think of our obligation to America and to the world in the years that are just ahead. I believe we'll do it. I believe we'll do it because we want to do it, because we must do it. May we have the spirit of the Wright brothers who just 40 years ago took a frail craft and literally tossed it into the sky, never thinking of it as a death-dealing device, but only as a means of giving rebirth to the peoples of the world.

As the plane of wartime America writes not the twilight of the gods, but the twilight of madmen, let's give to that plane the force of the future, a future in which this land of yours and mine can still remain the citadel of courage and Christianity, the fortress of freedom, the land of liberty—America, the Nation we love.

Liberalization of Service Pension Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] with reference to House bill 2350, increasing the pensions of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to make the following statement in support of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

This bill, which I am sure the Senate will be happy to approve, was passed by the House of Representatives on December 15, 1943, and was reported by the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, with amendment, on January 31, 1944.

H. R. 2350 amends existing law and the purpose of it is to increase the rates of service pension payable to certain veterans and the widows of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition to correspond with the rates of pension payable to veterans and the widows of veterans of the Civil War. The bill also provides that the marriage limitation date be extended from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938.

Section 1 of this bill would increase the rate of service pension payable to a veteran who has reached the age of 65 or one who is totally disabled from $60 to $75 per month. Existing law provides for the payment of $60 to the veteran if he has reached 65 or, regardless of age, if he is totally disabled. The average age of these veterans is now 69 years. The increase provided in this bill will correspond with the service pension of $75 per month which was granted to Civil War veterans regardless of age by the act of June 9, 1930. Under present law, both Civil War and Spanish-American War veterans now receive $100 per month if their physical condition is such as to require the aid and attendance of another person.

Section 2 of H. R. 2350 would fix the marriage date for widows of deceased veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition at any time prior to January 1, 1938. This would amend existing law (the act of May 1, 1926) which defines the marriage date as September 1, 1922, and thus extend that date to January 1, 1938. Under the provision of this bill the new marriage date of January 1, 1938, 40 years after the beginning of the Spanish-American War will more closely correspond to the Civil War widows' delimiting date which is June 27, 1905, 44 years after the beginning of the Civil War and 40 years after the end of that war.

Section 3 of H. R. 2350 would increase the monthly pension payable to widows and former widows to $40 at the age of 65 and would provide a pension of $50 per month to a widow or former widow who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service. Under existing law the widows and former widows of such veterans receive a service pension of $30 per month regardless of age. Civil War widows receive a service pension of $30 per month which is increased to $40 at the age of 70 and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the veteran during his Civil War services receives $50 per month.

Section 4 of the proposed bill, which is the amendment added by your committee, would bar the payment of pension or increase in pension to the widow who deserted the veteran. This provision would require continuous cohabitation from the date of marriage to the date of death of the veteran except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow. This requirement would be similar to existing law applicable to widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian War, and World War but pensions granted prior to the enactment of this act would not be discontinued.

The estimated cost for the first year, as furnished by the Veterans' Administration and appearing in the House report, is as follows:

Sec. 1. $75 per month for age 65 or total disability affecting 85,140 veterans	$15,286,000
Sec. 2. Marriage date change to Jan. 1, 1938, affecting 4,000 widows ($1,642,000). If ½ apply the first year	821,000
Sec. 3. $40 monthly rate for widows age 65; $50 monthly rate for widows if married to veteran during war, affecting 42,000 widows	8,242,000
Total estimated cost for first year	24,349,000

I strongly urge passage of H. R. 2350 without delay. As has been previously stated, the purpose of the bill is to amend existing law and increase the rates of service pension payable to certain veterans and the widows of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition to correspond with the rates of pension payable to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War. It is true that the period elapsing between the ending of the Civil War and the date such benefits were granted to Civil War veterans and their widows is greater than the period which has elapsed since the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition. However, your committee feels that the present high cost of living justifies extending the benefits provided for in this bill in advance of the time such benefits were granted to the Civil War group.

In my opinion, the passage of H. R. 2350 would be a simple act of justice toward this group of our veterans and their widows. These are veterans who gloriously served beneath Old Glory, who fought our Nation's battles and defended our cause on foreign soil. And when they won the victory of 1898, the United States of America emerged unchallenged as a great world power.

Today, when the people of the United States are engaged in a great global war and our sons are fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world, is it not fitting and proper that we stop and remember those men who fought for this Nation in the years gone by? The least we can do is to see that these men, who are now advanced in years, are adequately cared for. Let us do what we can for these veterans and for the widows of those who have passed to the Great Beyond. It was for us and for this Nation that these gallant men so proudly served and fought. The years have not dimmed our memories; we shall not forget.

Will We Keep the Faith?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Will We Keep the Faith," delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at Knoxville, Tenn., February 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have not come to Tennessee to speak of the prejudices of yesteryear. I am not speaking tonight as a Republican, of course not as a Democrat, but as an American citizen speaking to American citizens. I am fully conscious that I speak in the State which has given three of its greatest sons to our country: Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson. In JOHN JENNINGS and CARROLL B. REECE she has two National Representatives who never knew a political philosophy except fighting for their country, for its preferment; always for its best interests.

There are two great, absorbing thoughts present in the minds of every American: A quick, victorious ending of the war, followed by peace and prosperity.

As the flames of the World War reflect a red glow in the heavens, life at home goes on as best it can. Among other civilian activities, we continue holding elections. That is only as it should be. To vote—to choose our civilian leaders—that is one of the real objectives for which we are fighting. All of us are dedicated to the principle that free government of free men must endure.

Clock-like, the mainsprings of liberty are kept wound by the ceaseless activities of us all. As furrows are turned and harvests reaped, factory chimneys smoke, wheels turn, and assembly lines move, we hear the tick-tock of democracy in action. To abandon an election, even in wartime, is unthinkable. Free elections are the symbol of a free government; of a free people. It is a precious part of the heritage for which we fight. So, while our heroic armed men prevail against the foe on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, those of us here at home must and will carry on the unceasing fight for liberty and freedom and everything that goes to make up their and our concept of American democracy.

As patriots, then, we meet tonight. Not as narrow partisans, but in a larger sense as Americans. Times like these demand a patriotism that transcends political expediency. The trivial must not be magnified. Neither should we gloss over mistakes that cost us dear. Error must be meticulously avoided. Only free debate and factual discussion can insure the utmost of governmental efficiency.

Many vital and complex issues will be decided at the next election. In the main, they all can be summed up in one: Will our country continue to move toward the national socialistic state which is the objective of the New Dealers or will we keep the faith, the faith of our fathers, the faith of our sons and daughters who fight the war? That, fellow Americans, is the larger issue of the coming campaign and election.

The President recently suggested the necessity of absolute Federal control of manpower. If he means the same sort of control of manpower which he has given labor, little business, and the farmers, I am against it. The New Dealers openly advocate that "the greater the mortality is among the little fellows, the better it will be." They believe what they term the inefficient producer has no place in the planned economy of mass production managed by the totalitarian state which they hope to make of the free America our fathers fashioned for us.

Authoritarianism stalks our land today like a grim, grisly ghost which seemingly cannot be laid. It has shrouded itself in the hallowed robes of the honored Democratic Party. It has covered its deceitful face with the mask of a forthright and sincere party which never, by word of platform, subscribed to the stealthy assassination of the American system of free enterprise.

From its inception, the Democratic Party has stood for States' rights—for rights reserved to the people. The New Dealers—those sham Democrats—have been gradually taking rights away from the common man and from the States.

As their tremendous power in Washington becomes greater, the power and rights and liberties of the individual become lesser. We are fast becoming an "owned" people. As the New Dealers openly put it in their discussion, "The little fellow has no place in a planned economy." And what else is the New Deal except a "planned economy"—no matter how bad that planning may be.

Today, disguised in the robes of democracy, there are 57 different varieties of political medicine men who have done their best to turn true Democrats into "Sham-o-crats."

The palace guard's strategy is first to hide their ultimate intentions from the American people and, second, to undermine the Democratic Party. In Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, Mr. Roosevelt "worked" with independent groups instead of the regular party organizations. As a result, there is no Democratic Party worthy of the name in those States. In Illinois, he "worked" with the Kelly machine which, of course, did not want a strong Democratic Party down State. In New Jersey, the life-term candidate Roosevelt worked with the Boss Hague, who did not want a strong Democratic Party in the State which might challenge his Jersey City machine. Then there was the infamous purge attempt in 1938. When the purge failed, the only way out for the New Dealers was to destroy the Democratic Party—keeping only a shell alive behind which they could carry out their masquerade. And that is exactly what they have done in most of the Northern and Western States.

Because of all this, the honest, sincere and patriotic Democrat is confronted with but two choices in this election: Either vote against his real convictions when he votes for sham Democrats like the New Dealers, or, the strange anomaly of saving his own party by temporarily voting the Republican ticket.

The New Deal—the "Sham-o-crats"—philosophy of the national socialistic state is simply not the philosophy of the Republican Party. Neither is it the philosophy of the real Democratic Party.

The philosophy of the Republican Party is opposed to the concentration of political power just as it is opposed to the concentration of economic power.

In that latter connection, let me say that I realize the importance to you of remedying the unjust freight rates which discriminate against the South just the same way as Kansas is discriminated against.

But, important as the question is, what difference will it make what freight rates are to be, if all of us are to be regimented into a national socialistic state?

We must settle that issue first. Either by defeating Candidate Roosevelt for renomination or by electing a Republican President in his stead.

Those are the only two ways the overpowering issue of this campaign can be settled. And, if the antitotalitarian Democrats can't get the job done in their own party, they then should make sure of their future and their country's future by helping the Republicans do it.

We are witnessing here in America the same trend of events the world witnessed in Russia, in Italy, and in Germany.

In those countries a minority grabbed power, under one guise or another, and then gradually gained control of the country by carefully making certain the majority opposition was divided—and stayed divided—until it was too late.

In 1944 we must make certain of the preservation of the Republic and all the elements of American life in which the majority, regardless of party preferment, have always believed and always will believe.

I am sure the country—knowing the facts and understanding the issue—will reject the national socialistic state which Mr. Roosevelt has so carefully woven on the loom of the magnificent vision of the first New Deal, just as today the world rejects the same forms in Hitler's Nazi Germany.

But, you say, the New Deal does not display the same brutality and inhumanity as do the Nazis. That's correct. It does not. But it is playing with the same fires of intolerance and hate. Furthermore what always happens when you have a government pattern that can only be trusted to a few? We have learned by bitter experience that centralization of political power creates of itself more centralization. We know intolerance breeds more intolerance; arbitrary bureaucracy always breeds more master bureaucrats. After you have taken away a man's rights, his hopes of a decent livelihood of his own choosing, his right to manage his business or his farm, or work as he pleases, what difference does it then make if you forego lashing his body, and, instead, put him to work on the paltry pay of the W. P. A. so he can barely manage to keep himself and his family in food and is forced to go to the relief office for his clothing and his medicine? Let us not wait until the fateful handwriting appears on our walls. Let us read what has been written on the walls of other nations which drank in the opiate of indispensability and trusted in one man too long—and too far.

The patriotic and conscientious Democrat who is sick all over at the spectacle of what was once the elevating and inspiring original New Deal degenerating into the Fascist, bureaucratic later version—yet who is sick at the thought of voting for a Republican—that voter must do some hard, common sense thinking in terms of realities and not of ancient issues.

The political consequences of the next election will be quick and immeasurable. We are winning in battle. But we must exercise the keenest of political wisdom if we are to win the ceaseless battle at home to keep America American.

I shall cling to my political faith and so shall you—in normal times. But this fall, let us, as Republicans and Democrats, join in common union to clean house in Washington. It is painfully evident to an increasing number of real Democrats that they must turn their back temporarily on the political party of their fathers in order to keep American faith with their sons and daughters.

Yes, fascism is here in America and its name is the New Deal. Already the big and the petty bureaucrats of Washington are developing all the facets of an arbitrary régimé. And that is fascism—no matter by what name it is called by its genial and hypnotic ringmaster.

Mind you, that's not simply my conclusion. I call to witness thousands of businessmen, farmers, and laboring men, who are experiencing for the first time in their lives the

arbitrary and arrogant mishandling of a bureaucracy. A bureaucracy that not only believes itself to be permanent, but also considers its judgments to be completely superior to those of men who have spent years learning the multitudinous details of their businesses and their livelihoods. Like the ancient laws of the Medes and Persians, the bureaucrats dicta, once delivered, cannot be changed. Cannot be changed, that is except by popular revolt. And here, in America, we must accomplish that revolt in the American way—in the voting booth.

The claim of one man that one party has a monopoly on the slogan Win the War, is the cheapest and sleaziest kind of politics.

The President's attempt to substitute "Win the War" for the "New Deal," as a campaign slogan, is an insult to every member of our fighting forces. It is an insult to every man and woman who is sacrificing and working to win the war. We are not fighting this war as Democrats or Republicans, nor as New Dealers, but as Americans.

But since the President started the discussion and his spokesmen are continuing it, let's look briefly at the record.

We Republicans have gone so far in our cooperation as even to yield to the administration's desire to dodge a full military inquiry into Pearl Harbor, the greatest national defeat and disaster in our history.

Here is the spectacle of an administration in power for 10 continuous years. It was sending belligerent notes to Japan. Yet so poorly coordinated was the Roosevelt administration that we were surprised at Pearl Harbor and suffered a defeat unparalleled in our history. The effects of that terrible disaster reached far beyond the immediate loss there.

Those effects have prolonged the war in every area at a fearful cost of blood and money. Prime Minister Churchill, addressing the British Parliament, said in effect that the loss of Singapore and the Malay States had come about because Great Britain had relied upon the Pacific fleet of the United States to protect those vitally important bastions. But that shield had been thrown down and temporarily broken. The Roosevelt administration has plainly avoided an inquiry into the pitiful mismanagements that permitted the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. Why not go into it—since the President has started the discussion?

One of the great soldiers of our history has noted with some disapproval the amount of Presidential interference being evidenced. Gen. Peyton C. March, Chief of Staff in the First World War, said a few weeks ago that General Marshall has to take more military direction from Mr. Roosevelt than he, himself, did from President Wilson.

In addition to this well-founded suspicion that the national administration is interfering with our military and naval experts, we are also conscious of the fact that fourth-term politics here at home has prolonged the war.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the President and even Harry Hopkins have held important conversations with foreign representatives if not actually making agreements without the knowledge of our Secretary of State. When the State Department should be running the whole show the "Palace Guard" has repeatedly interfered with Cordell Hull's management.

It is a matter of common knowledge that there are entirely too many agencies studying problems, arguing abstract issues, bickering among themselves and interfering with the miracle of production by farmers, labor, and business.

The observant citizen is well aware of Candidate Roosevelt's "slick" ways of dodging—pushing aside—all unpleasant and tough problems which he figures will cost him votes whichever way he goes—if he goes. So he passes the buck.

The one unchangeable slogan to which Mr. Roosevelt has stuck through 12 years is: "Win the Votes." Win them one way or win them another but always—win the votes.

And now, Mr. Roosevelt announces he has quit the New Deal—that the country needs a change of doctors. Of course, he discovered that only after the returns began to come in from Kentucky and other States. It seems to me the voters beat him to it.

But until he takes steps to clean out the fellow travelers that infest every Government department, he is in the position of the man who has buried the hatchet but left the handle sticking out.

But what are we going to do after Candidate Roosevelt and his horde of carpetbagging bureaucrats are swept out of office?

To sum up the answer to that, let me say the Republican Party realizes there must be some controls, even after the war. But we intend to reduce those controls to a level of common sense and repeal as many of them as we can in line with the safety of our country. The New Deal "shamocracy" intends more control and bigger control and permanent control. We don't.

I believe the Republican administration must carefully maintain a delicate balance between the guaranties of individual freedom and the grant of governmental powers adequate to social well-being.

The New Dealers won't agree with me in that. They believe that what they call social well-being makes it necessary for the two-party system to be liquidated and the individual to be regimented. The independent labor unions, the strong farm organizations, all business, and in short, our beloved national traditions of the American way, must be dumped in the ash can. We Republicans don't intend to let them get away with that. And we need every citizen's help to stop them—regardless of his party.

Labor is waking up to what is going on. It is beginning to realize that regimentation will eliminate its independent bargaining power. We will see to it that labor's inalienable rights are protected—just as the rights of every American and American group will be protected. And let's remember that the words of the employer weigh a ton compared to the words of the unorganized employee.

The New Dealers are also turning on the farmers.

Let me read you a perfect example of the bare-faced and brazen attitude a spokesman for "Sham-o-crats" takes towards the man who tills the soil and reaps the harvest:

"The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtues and all knowledge. He has voted against progress, against civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of Main Street. He has exhausted our soil and he will exhaust our Treasury if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later, we shall discover, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered, that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the Kulak, is simply so much mud on the path of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.

"The problem of farm relief will become not how shall we relieve the farmer, but who shall relieve us of the farmer."

In view of that ardent New Dealer's words need anyone any longer doubt the bureaucrats' desire to do away with the little man—the small producer?

We must refashion an America where the little man has an opportunity. We have got to rearrange things so that our boys returning from the war will have a chance to improve their civilian lot. Sure, we must have laws governing banks and credit, but we must somehow get back to the day when character was good for reasonable bank loans.

When this war is over, our young men and women won't have security listed on the stock exchanges. But they'll have character and determination to succeed—if we give them a chance.

Another prime measure which we must encourage is to get prompt price reductions whenever they can be made possible by technological and organizational progress. Prosperity as a result of that must be passed on promptly to the general public. The "Sham-o-crats" have ignored that necessity.

Every wise statesman in every period of history has sought the widest possible distribution of the natonal income. The intelligent use of income, inheritance taxes, and price reductions to affect that distribution is in the public interest. Call that "share the wealth," if you want to. But it is actually a wise and settled policy of good government. We're for it.

Our present tax structure is a tremendous aggregation of patches. It's got more patches than original cloth. In no sense does it represent a careful, thinking, analysis of the problem and the development of a logical integrated tax program. All taxation must be planned from the point of view of encouraging individual enterprise and activity as well as sharing the wealth. Taxation is the most important single problem concerning us on the domestic front from a long-range point of view.

It is sensible taxation that will make it possible for us to get an acceleration of private investment private business, and consequent widespread employment following the war.

And right here and now let me point out that the Republican Party's long record of liberal treatment of the Nation's soldiers and sailors means that we will repay as best America can their sacrifices in the Nation's behalf. We can never pay our debt to them. That is impossible. Money, encouragement of opportunity in civilian life—neither can compensate them for what they have been through. But we can play fair with them. And we will. We will have something better than a glorified W. P. A. waiting for them when they get back.

The great difference between Republican and New Deal thinking is that we believe in restoring private jobs and small business, while the New Dealers think only in terms of public works. We'll have public works, too—such as are necessary. But we don't intend to put the cart before the horse. We will do everything we can to encourage private enterprise and then close the employment gap with public works.

Let's not forget the record. Let's not forget that in his first 7 years Candidate Roosevelt was unable to solve the unemployment problem. He inherited a bad one. But it grew worse under his administration. At the end of the 7 years Roosevelt's unemployment reached its peak. Only the war and the draft temporarily solved it for him. Left to him and his "Sham-o-crats" it won't be solved after the war either.

How quickly we get into production after the war depends on whether the problems are properly tackled, such as the uniform and speedy conversion of war contracts, the sound funding of our national debt and taxation. I believe the present tax structure is a national menace, and under it post-war conversion is difficult and a depression eminent. I repeat again and again that fully 25 percent of the expense of nonmilitary activities can be saved by a frugal and efficient administration. But beyond that, I propose a complete revision and simplification of our archaic tax system from the bottom up so as to unshackle American business and enterprise for the all-important task of providing jobs for our returning soldiers.

The President's recent message to Congress suggested the necessity of an anti-inflation program. But his Treasury Department has never yet proposed a tax bill carrying out even the generalizations of the President's message.

The answer as to whether Candidate Roosevelt's message was a genuine state document or merely a campaign text will come when we see whether he puts up a stiff fight for specifications to fit its general recommendations.

We need Abraham Lincoln's kind of thinking today even more badly than it was needed in the days when the very bonds of national union were about to break asunder. We need courage and foresight like his, as we carry on the gigantic task of winning the war and planning and working out the reconstruction and reconsecration which must follow.

We need Lincoln's kind of patience, his self-denial, his tolerance, his determination, his high purpose. For all of these must be very much in evidence in the White House if we are to persevere in this war and in the days to come.

And we won't get Lincoln's kind of patience, tolerance, high ideals, and understanding of the common man from these New Deal carpetbaggers who had descended not only on the South but all the rest of the Nation as well, telling us how to run our businesses, our farms, and our jobs.

No loyal, sincere, and true Democrat need hesitate to vote for Republican candidates in the next election. He need never fear the taunt that he has deserted his party. His party—for only the present I hope—has been enslaved in a present-day Babylon by slave masters whose ways are not his, whose motives are repugnant to him, and whose mastery must be broken for the good of all.

The true Democrat can save his party and his country by choosing the Republican over the "Sham-o-crat." I have no doubt of his decision.

Win the war? I'll say we will win the war. We will win it in Europe. We will win it in the South Pacific. And we will win it at home, too. And that's what this coming election is about.

Jewish Immigration Into Palestine—The British White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very enlightening editorial appearing in the New York Times, Saturday, February 12, which urges American intervention to obtain abrogation of the British white paper which limits the Jewish immigration into Palestine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE PAPER

According to the original provisions of the white paper issued by the British Government on May 17, 1939, Jewish immigration into Palestine was limited to 75,000 for a 5-year period and was due to be stopped completely on March 31, 1944. Even that small quota was not filled because of war conditions, and the terms were modified last November to permit the entry of immigrants who were unable to reach the country before the deadline. But a mere extension of the time limit is not enough. As the end of the 5-year period draws near it is clearer than it was in 1939 that the ban imposed by the British after years of disorder and the failure of the abortive round table conference was a stop-gap rather than a solution of a complex and burning problem.

The case for American intervention in this question is stronger than it was 5 years ago. The presence of our troops and supply depots in the Near East and our vital concern in peace and order in this strategic area give us a greater right to urge that the white paper should now be abrogated. At the time it was published this newspaper opposed the rigid limitation on the flow of immigrants into Palestine as unjust and unacceptable, and everything that has happened since confirms and strengthens that opinion. The increasingly desperate state of those of Jewish faith in Europe has made it more than ever evident that in these tragic years the doors of any place of refuge, instead of being closed to a crack, should have been opened wider.

On the future political status of Palestine there is room for wide and deep divergences of view. This question remains, and promises to remain for a long time to come, one of the most complex and highly charged problems for post-war statesmanship. But it is significant that Jews and non-Jews, no matter how much they differ on this point, stand solidly in support of that part of the current Congressional resolution that advocates American initiative in seeking to obtain the resumption of immigration. The hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee reveal general agreement on the justice and necessity of removing the white paper ban. This is a fair reflection of public opinion in this country. The final settlement of the Palestine problem fits into the framework of the general peace. It depends on the code of justice and security the victors are able to establish. Meantime, there can be no question that humanity and a sense of reality demand that the arbitrary ban should be lifted and immigration should be permitted on the most generous terms possible.

Polish Government in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Star based on a radio address delivered by the former Ambassador to Russia and France, the Honorable William C. Bullitt, who relates that the Polish Government in London is the voice of the people:

BULLITT SAYS POLISH GOVERNMENT IN LONDON IS VOICE OF PEOPLE

William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia and France, declared last night that if there is to be peace after this war, "the case of Poland must be decided not on the basis of force but on the basis of justice and fair play."

"Poland cannot be wiped out of the hearts of the Poles," he said. "Poland cannot be wiped out of the mind of the world. He who attempts to enslave Poland prepares only war."

Observing the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko, American-Polish hero, Mr. Bullitt spoke over the Mutual Broadcasting System under auspices of Polish-American organizations.

He praised General Kosciusko's service to the American Army in the Revolutionary War and his leadership in the Polish war against Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Polish hero, he said, became a symbol of man's struggle for freedom.

Despite the partitioning of Poland by Russia and Germany, Mr. Bullitt asserted, Poland has not ceased to exist. The Polish Government in London, he remarked, "represents truly the Polish people."

"The Moscow agreements signed last October aroused and justified the hope that, in the interest of lasting peace at the end of the present war, all major problems which might affect the peace of the world would be taken up by the United Nations acting together and not decided by any one of the United Nations acting alone and by force," he said.

"There will be no peace in the world if that hope is disappointed. We know, therefore, that if there is to be peace after this war the case of Poland must be decided not on the basis of force but on the basis of justice and fair play—the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

"We do not want this war to be the preface of World War No. 3. Therefore, we are vitally interested in the resurrection of Poland as a genuinely free and independent power, neither engulfed by any other nation nor dominated by a Quisling government imposed by any other power."

Governor Bricker's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bricker Gives Fair Warning," published in last Saturday's Chicago Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER GIVES FAIR WARNING

Honest John Bricker—there he stands! The Governor of Ohio has left the sphinx role to be played by Tom Dewey, and come out foursquare for * * * for * * *

Well, it's hard to tell what Honest John is for. But at any rate he's no enigma. In his "Me and Lincoln" speech in Washington Thursday night he gave the Republican Party a clear and unobstructed view of his character and mind. He's against taxes (cheers). Against subsidies (hurray!). Against a Federal ballot for soldiers, world supergovernment, the New Deal. And against Roosevelt (deafening applause).

Nobody can say the Republicans haven't had fair warning. If they take Governor Bricker they know what they are getting. Do they want a cozy and comfortable man, a safe, sane and cool man, whose answer to the

problem of full employment is unflinching sympathy for the millions of workers who want to work? Do they want a standpat, back-to-normalcy, full-dinner-pail man, an honest Harding, a postdated McKinley, a transmogrified Coolidge? Do they want a nominee who meets the issues of 1944 with the ringing challenges of 1896, and swims in the sea of foreign policy clutching the driftwood of the Mackinac declaration?

If so, Governor Bricker is their man. No doubt remains that the ideal leader of a horse-and-buggy Republican Party is Honest John.

Lincoln Day Address of Gov. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a speech by Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Members of Congress:

We meet tonight in memory of the immortal Lincoln, founder of the Republican Party. He personified the great common man. He glorified American opportunity. His spirit still lives and we take inspiration from his life and service. He had a deep and abiding faith in his fellowman. He believed that our constitutional principles were adequate in times of great crisis. He proved that representative government could wage war and emerge free. Lincoln defined the function of government in these terms: "To lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the face of life."

CLEAVAGE EXISTS

Today, a cleavage exists in our country which is fraught with more serious consequences to our national future than at any time since Lincoln's day. The cleavage cuts across our political, economic, and social life. The question confronting every citizen and every legislative leader may be simply stated. Shall government direct the lives of our people, or shall it create conditions which will enable them, individually and hopefully, to find their own way? Shall we continue our march toward absolutism, or shall we preserve the free atmosphere which our people have breathed since our country was founded?

In Lincoln's day the question was, Shall America remain a nation. In our day the question is, Shall the Nation remain American.

From the days of the ill-starred N. R. A., our people have been bewildered and oppressed by the edicts and decrees of a power-seeking government, determined to become their master. The Republican Party in the coming campaign will take its stand on a platform, "To afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life."

The Republican Party is the liberal party in America. The New Deal is reactionary. It reaches back for centuries to Old World devices for extending its power and depriving people of their rights. The New Deal is the American counterpart of the sweep of absolutism which has destroyed so much liberty around the world. It lacks faith in our people. It assumes that people cannot take care of themselves, but must be taken care of by a paternalistic government. So it has built up a dominating bureaucracy, and used it for selfish political purposes. Bureaucracies begin in benevolence and end in despotism.

SERVILE MAJORITY

The New Deal philosophy has extended into every branch of government. It assumed in the very beginning that the executive branch of the Government is paramount. The Congress was relegated to an inferior position. Legislation was drafted by representatives of the Executive. A Congress dominated by a servile New Deal majority submitted. Often the power of patronage was used. Every conceivable political device was employed to build the power of the Executive.

Congress surrendered the purse strings to the Executive through lump-sum appropriations. As a result Congressmen were placed at the mercy of the Executive. Then came the attack upon the Supreme Court. An attempt was made to relegate it to a position of subservience to the Executive. The program included an unceasing suppression of State and local governments. You will recall that in the early days of the New Deal legislation was sent to the governors of our State with a "must" attached to it. It came directly from the executive branch of the Federal Government.

I live with the people who feel the impact of this expanding system of government in their daily lives, and I know their reactions to it. I believe that the safest program for our country lies not in fitful movements of reform and reaction but to steady progress through adherence to our representative system of government.

The time has now come to take the policy-making power of government out of the hands of the arrogant bureaucrats and return it to the hands of the elected representatives of the people.

The material accomplishments of our people under self-government are unmatched. With only one-sixteenth of the world's population, we have produced more automobiles than all the rest of the world, one-third of all the radio sets, one-half the telephones, and one-third of the railroad mileage of the world. This was not due to our great natural resources alone, because other countries have had them. In our free political atmosphere we have made better use of our resources and more people have enjoyed a higher standard of living than in any other country of the world.

STRIKE MENACE

Our war accomplishments prove the soundness of our traditional system. In spite of the manifold discouragements of our industry at the hands of the New Deal during pre-war years, it magnificently has met the challenge of war. This achievement of management and workers constitutes one of the brightest pages of our history.

This has been accomplished in spite of the weakness of the New Deal in handling labor relations. It could never have been accomplished except for the loyal support of labor in this country. But I want to say to you as members of my party in Congress that, in time of war when men and women are dying to preserve free government, including the right of labor itself to organize, no group or no union should be permitted to strike. I do not care whether that strike is against management or government, the consequences are the same. Some life is endangered by every idle hour. Every strike delays victory.

But this is not all. Labor is irreparably injured in the eyes of the public and these strikes will cause our soldiers to return from the battle fronts with a distorted opinion of the loyalty of labor in this country. I do not care whether the strike is induced by selfish labor leaders or unthinking members of the union, the result is the same. This is a problem of Government. If we can wage a war on every battle front of the world, we can certainly keep the wheels of industry turning. A law should be enacted by this Congress laying down fundamental principles for the administration and adjudication of labor disputes and the prohibition of strikes in the time of war. The recently suggested National Service Act is no answer to this problem at this late date. The strike problem can be solved by fair legislation and by just enforcement of the law.

The boys at the battle front are demanding such action. The fathers and mothers of those boys are demanding it, and that demand will be expressed in the election this year. Such action, instead of destroying rights of labor, will preserve them. The time has come to support the millions of workers who want to work and to quit coddling selfish labor leaders for the sake of the votes which they say they can deliver in an election. If politics and votes had been forgotten by this administration, we never would have had the distressing confusion which has confronted us in this field.

MOVE RESENTED

The genius of our Government rests upon faith in the worth of the individual citizen and respect for the dignity of the human personality. Upon this faith we shall stand and wage the campaign ahead.

I am proud to be a member of the Republican Party. I deem it a high privilege to address my fellow Republicans in Congress. You have revitalized the Congress and given valiant aid to the war program.

Winning the war is not a partisan opportunity. It is an American responsibility. All of us resent the effort of any political leader to make "win the war" a political slogan. That became the watchword of every patriotic American on December 7, 1941, and will remain so until the day of victory.

It is a matter of deep satisfaction to all of us that the people of this Nation saw fit to reward our party in recent congressional elections for its demonstrated alertness and high sense of responsibility. The Republican Party has never been willing, when entrusted with power, to sell the day in order to serve the hour. In serving one generation, it has also given thought to coming generations. Our party is justly proud of its past and it is exceedingly sure of its future because of its consistent purpose.

I come to you tonight confident of victory for the Republican Party and say to you with the deepest of sincerity that I am more interested in winning the coming election for the Republican Party and in defeating the New Deal philosophy of government than I am in being President of the United States.

One of the many striking differences between the Republican Party and the New Deal is in leadership. There are many leaders in our party who would make excellent candidates for the Presidency and whom I would be proud to support and who, if elected, would do the job that must be done to save the priceless heritage of this Republic. The New Deal has only one candidate.

DUTY OF PARTY

It is the duty of the Republican Party to present to the American people the issues which endanger their traditional freedoms. There is danger in the size and in the power of the Federal establishment itself, with 3,500,000 civilian employees. In Ohio alone there are 5 Federal employees for every State employee. There is danger in bureaucratic restrictions so arbitrary, intricate, and difficult as to smother the spirit of initiative and enterprise of our citizens. There is danger in the ruthless and reckless aim to destroy our system of checks and balances. There is danger in the heedless grasp for power that led to the departure from the salutary limitation by tradition of

a President's tenure. The aggregate effect of these dangers is staggering.

I am of the opinion that our paramount task at war's end is to restore order and sanity in our fiscal affairs and our system of taxation. Let us now consider some of the aspects of this problem.

The many fiscal experiments of the New Deal have created a confused program of spend, waste, borrow, and tax. Too often this program has been inspired by political opportunism. In time of war great expenditures are necessary. War means taxing until it hurts. It means lending every dollar possible to our Government. But in war it is our duty to insist that our Government be as single-minded toward the war effort and as frugal in the ordinary activities of government as it asks us to be.

The question with which we are confronted is whether these New Deal pre-war fiscal policies are to continue after victory.

DEBT BEFORE WAR

On June 30, 1939, 2 months before the Germans began their drive into Poland, the Federal debt stood at forty and a half billion dollars. This was almost exactly $18,000,000,000 more than the amount of the debt on June 30, 1933, some 4 months after the New Deal administration took office. Even more startling is the fact that the debt in 1939 was $14,000,000,000 greater than it was on August 31, 1919, which was then the all-time high and resulted from World War No. 1. We have been told in high-sounding phrases by New Deal fiscal magicians: "Think nothing of our national debt. Just borrow more. Public debt has no similarity to private debt because we owe it to ourselves." There might be some sense in such a statement if we all had equal incomes, equal bond holdings and paid equal taxes. The truth is that under our economy it makes no difference to the individual taxpayer whether the debt is held internally or externally.

The necessary increase in the public debt caused by war, plus reckless nonwar government spending, plus the cost of the tremendous New Deal political organization present a problem fraught with a great danger if the New Deal pre-war fiscal policies are continued in the post-war era. It is high time that every citizen knows where the New Deal fiscal policy of spend, waste, borrow and tax is continued will lead our country.

LOSS OF AUTONOMY

The first result will be the loss of autonomy of the State governments. This will occur when financial independence of State and local governments ends. The farther we follow the course of expanding our Federal expenditures and deficit financing, the less will be the resources available for State and local governments. There is a limit to the aggregate tax burden our economy can carry. This trend has led local governments to depend more and more upon State aid and Washington contributions.

In 1932 when the New Deal came into power, the Federal Government collected 22 percent of our total taxes. In 1939 the Federal portion had jumped to 38 percent. Even with the increased tax income, the Federal Government spent more than it collected and continued deficit financing. Much of this came about because the Federal Government entered more and more into functions that before had been locally administered.

Changes in economic and social conditions do require from time to time the reallocation of governmental functions. But some New Dealers have expressed the opinion that the Federal Government should use substantially the entire taxing power and dole out to the States and local governments what Washington wants them to have. This would make State and local governments a mere sham and pretense. When the States and local governments become financially dependent upon Washington the whole Federal structure will have been destroyed.

SECOND RESULT

The second result of continuing New Deal fiscal policies will be the loss of representative government and free enterprise. Since the submission of the 1945 budget it is estimated that by June 30, 1945, we shall have a national debt in excess of $250,000,000,000. This may well require a post-war interest charge of five to seven billion dollars. This, with the other cost of Government, must be paid primarily by those who create the income of the Nation.

As long as the Government does not allow its debt to go beyond where it can be serviced without entrenching upon our system of private enterprise our economy is not in danger. But with such a debt we realize immediately that the interest alone becomes a serious burden upon production.

In the post-war period the annual operating expense of the Federal Government has been estimated at about $15,000,000,000. Taxes can rise so high that they will ultimately become unbearable, paralyzing production by taking so much of the profit that no incentive remains to take a chance.

If we pursue deficit financing in the post-war period we shall inevitably reach the point where, barring wholesale inflation, private enterprise will be unable to keep labor fully employed, making it necessary for the Government to borrow more and more in the attempt to relieve unemployment. But in that event those from whom the Government must borrow will either be out of business or already taxed to such an extent that they will have no money to lend. Government credit will then be impaired. This happened in modern Italy and also in modern Germany. These Loreleized songs are invitations to ultimate national bankruptcy. This will mean an end to representative government and free enterprise in America.

ULTIMATE DEFAULT

This necessarily follows because of the post-war era constantly mounting Federal taxes increase the equity of the Government in our income which is our wealth. This means the steady transfer of ownership of our wealth, which includes our industries, from private persons to the Government. We would have lent our wealth to the Government on the "owe it to ourselves" theory until, with any marked decline in our national income, we would owe so much to ourselves that we would be unable to pay ourselves the interest, much less anything on the principal. This means ultimate default. The wealth of the Nation would be held by the Government or in other words owned in common. This is socialism, if not communism.

Make no mistake about it, the most effective way to overthrow our republican form of Government is to continue to follow the New Deal fiscal policies in the post-war period.

The post-war financial problems can be solved and our American way of life can be protected. But they cannot be solved until we have an administration in Washington which throws out the bureaucrats, theorists, spenders and borrowers, and adopts and adheres to policies of economy, common sense, and sound business methods. A balanced Federal budget at the earliest possible time after the war is won will create more jobs than all the projects Government can devise.

Nothing would encourage the American people more, nothing would enhance the war effort to a greater degree than to send back into productive industry or to the Army or Navy the hundreds of thousands of unnecessary Federal employees.

END CONFUSION

The first essential looking to sound fiscal policy is a responsible cabinet Government in Washington. This means the elimination of many boards, bureaus, and commissions, and holding the department heads responsible. If a Cabinet member is unable to handle his problems, get one who can instead of substituting a bureau. The overlapping of boards, bureaus, and commissions, the superimposing of czars upon departments, the cross-checking of one authority upon another, result in costly confusion, endless bickering and public distrust.

A third result of continuing New Deal fiscal policies would be the adverse effect on our participation of post-war international affairs.

Time and again I have said that the United States should take her place in a cooperative organization among sovereign nations after this war. We want no supergovernment, no central world authority over us. An international cooperative organization whatever precise form it may take can solve the problems which lead to war and fulfill the hopes of our people for a peaceful and better world.

But if the New Deal fiscal policies are continued our participation in international reconstruction and cooperation is doomed to failure. A nation which builds its own financial house upon the shifting sands will be too weak to help build an international house upon a solid rock.

TAX POLICY

In summary I believe that a sound constructive post-war tax policy must be based upon the following principles:

1. Simplification of tax laws and regulations including reports and returns. It is time to end a system of taxation in which five governmental tax experts can compute an income-tax return with identical figures and get five different answers. This happened in Cleveland last week.

2. Stability in tax laws and regulations to enable business to map out constructive future programs without constant fear of changes and new theories being adopted.

3. Adherence to the principle that the taxing power exists primarily for the purpose of raising necessary revenue and does not exist to be used as an undercover method of effecting social changes.

4. Adoption of tax measures which will leave adequate sources of revenue available to States and local governments to enable them to maintain their financial independence.

5. Strict adherence to fiscal and tax policies which will stimulate and encourage venture capital and private enterprise to provide jobs in private employment.

6. A reduction in Federal taxes as soon as possible after victory. I offer to you no Utopian picture of ease with abundant money for all raised by borrowing from ourselves. The task confronting us is a difficult one but courage, hard work, and a great faith will carry us through.

At the darkest hour of the civil war a group of men called upon Abraham Lincoln. They suggested that the cause of the Union was lost and that he should give up. He answered them in these words:

"When I was a young man in Illinois I boarded for a time with a deacon of the Presbyterian Church. One night I was aroused from my sleep by a rap at my door and I heard the deacon's voice exclaiming, 'Arise, Abraham, the day of judgment has come!' I sprang out of my bed and rushed to the window, and there I saw the stars falling in a shower. But I looked beyond these falling stars and far back in the heavens I saw, fixed and immovable, the grand old constellations with which I was so well acquainted. No, gentlemen, the world did not come to an end then, nor will the Union now."

Hitler, Himmler, and Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that is not rationed or censored in Germany today and that is hate. This fact is emphasized in an editorial published in the Chicago Times, on Sunday, February 13, which follows:

INTOLERANCE

Is there a remedy for the social disease of intolerance? Can scapegoating of minority groups, which is synonymous with intolerance, be cured?

Cynics will say no. To them hatred, envy, and greed are uncontrollable drives in human beings.

THE NAZIS DENY BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Some cynics, like Hitler, go further. They say that hatred, envy, and greed ought not be controlled. They say it is unnatural to control these traits. They argue for full expression of them. From this view comes nazi-ism. Nazi-ism is the denial of human brotherhood. (Else what would happen to the "master race" theory?) Nazi-ism is oppositeness to the doctrine of love thy neighbor. (It preaches hate, hate, hate.) Obviously nazi-ism is an inexorable enemy of democracy. (It advocates inferiority and superiority among men and subservience to a leader.)

People with faith in mankind feel that curing intolerance is possible.

One cure for intolerance is the practice of Christianity. As if composed to reform modern scapegoaters—those who blame and hate minority groups for their own troubles and shortcomings—the Sermon on the Mount says:

"Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

As if in warning against modern demagogs, the cunning men who capitalize for their own power the human instinct for scapegoating, the Sermon on the Mount also says:

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

Intolerance is a corrupt tree. Its fruits are disunity, hate, heartbreak, and violence—all "grapes of thorns" or "figs of thistles."

Another cure for intolerance is education. However it is the kind of education, rather than the amount that counts, as is pointed out in the pamphlet A B C's of Scapegoating, obtainable from Central Y. M. C. A. of Chicago. On education for tolerance, this pamphlet, prepared by a group of Harvard psychologists, gives first place to education for insight.

WHY SCAPEGOATS GET THE BLAME

Insight means self-knowledge—the seeing into one's own self, even into one's unconscious—the seeing of why each of us tends to pick on scapegoats—the seeing of why we find it perversely satisfying to blame scapegoats for conditions we do not like, although the scapegoat has nothing to do with creating such conditions. Education for insight, say the Harvard psychologists, would explain why people avoid recognizing their own faults. It would emphasize how intolerant thinking gives help and encouragement to our enemies, the Nazis and the Japs, who want to see Americans divided along racial and religious lines.

It would be of help if our public schools emphasized such education, and in the very low grades, too. The churches and parents ought to do likewise.

A third cure for intolerance is economic security. People who feel secure in their jobs, in their homes, in their opportunity for decent lives, do not fall prey to false prophets who come to them in sheep's clothing, no matter if they wear the politician's smile or the clergyman's garb. In America, the disappearance, in prosperous times, of the Know Nothing movement, the A. P. A., and the Ku Klux Klan, is proof of a relation between intolerance and economics. So is the rise of nazi-ism in Germany.

In A B C's of Scapegoating, this program is presented:

"A. Raising the standard of living of all, thus eliminating the need for competition among marginal groups. (For example, in Chicago, if Negroes were better housed and faced less discrimination in jobs, there would be less danger of racial tension.)

"B. Establishment of social and educational security for the individual, thus enhancing his feelings of status, and lessening feelings of inferiority and apprehension.

"C. Proper vocational adjustment to help prevent feelings of inadequacy and jealousy."

Abraham Lincoln, whose one hundred and thirty-fifth birthday was celebrated yesterday, summed up the cures for intolerance in phrases immortally identified with him: "With malice toward none; with charity for all" (Christianity). "A house divided against itself cannot stand" (insight). "Government, of the people, by the people, and for the people" (democracy and economic security).

If America is to restrain the rising tide of intolerance that responsible leaders have detected lately, conferences, speeches, and editorials will not be enough. The principles of Christianity must be practiced 7 days a week. There must be an effective, long-term program of education for tolerance that reaches all Americans. Above all, there must be assurance of economic security to the masses who, without economic security, tend to turn in distress to false prophets.

Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, I was stunned, to read the following news item in the Washington Post of Monday, February 14, 1944. I never dreamed that such things could be possible. How can anyone be a party to encouraging white girls into the arms of Negro soldiers at a canteen dance while singing Let Me Call You Sweetheart?

But let me quote the article from the Post:

MRS. ROOSEVELT GUEST AS LABOR CANTEEN OPENS

The Washington Labor Canteen, 1212 Eighteenth Street NW., to be operated for all service men and women by the Washington C. I. O. Industrial Union Council, was formally opened last night with the informal appearance of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

The First Lady mingled among the 200 servicemen and hostesses and stood behind a refreshment bar passing out sandwiches. She was introduced to the representatives of various labor unions who attended and shook hands with all the servicemen present. She joined in group singing of "Dancing Around Hitler's Grave," "Waltzin' Matilda," and "Let Me Call You Sweetheart."

The Labor Canteen is the only service center in Washington which invites both white and Negro servicemen and has both white and Negro hostesses. There was about an equal number of both at the opening last night, and supervisors of the canteen said the plan was proving successful.

The canteen will be open each Sunday night. Invitations for next Sunday have been sent to Vice President WALLACE and Secretary of the Interior Ickes.

In a 2-minute talk in the recreation room, Mrs. Roosevelt congratulated the union council on establishment of the canteen and said she hoped it would be one place where servicemen's overseas service bars would be recognized. She said she was distressed by the general failure of the public to identify service bars.

I wonder if such things as are quoted above are true. I wonder if the sponsors really believe in the commingling of the races and the resulting evil of cohabitation. Have these people no regard for the traditions of the South or the culture of the white race? Do these people honestly believe that the white people of this Nation have reached such a low point of moral and social decadence that they do not have pride in race or family and are willing to accept all comers? Don't these people understand that such activities do not contribute anything to the uplift or culture of the Negro race but do tend to mongrelize the white race? Are these things malicious or merely misguided benevolence? Whatever the motive, God knows such goings-on are destructive to both the Negro and the white man and no good can come of it—not even political. So, why this dishonor to American womanhood?

Mr. Speaker, I deplore and condemn with all the intensity of my soul the promotion of such activities.

Oregon Dairymen's Association Adopts Resolution on Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a telegram from Oscar Hagg, president of the Oregon Dairymen's Association, setting forth a copy of a resolution adopted by the association at its fiftieth annual session held on February 11, at Eugene, Oreg., bearing on price control of the dairy industry. Pursuant to consent granted, I include a copy of this telegram and the resolution as a

part of these remarks so that all persons interested in the protection of this great industry so essential to the successful prosecution of the war and the feeding of the civilian population may read them. The telegram follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *February 11, 1944.*

Hon. HOMER ANGELL,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Oregon Dairymen's Association in fiftieth annual session at Eugene today approved unanimously the report of its committee on price control:

"Dairy products constitute one of the vital needs of this war. Dairy producers have continued to carry on under handicaps largely because of full appreciation of those needs. They will continue as long as the relationship between income and expense makes production possible. They ask only for conditions that make it possible to do the job.

"Despite the playing with statistics by agencies in control, featuring maintenance or increase of cow members, the dairy industry is losing ground in the face of increasing war needs. People are fed by dairy production, not by dairy cow members, and production continues downward.

"This lack of adequate dairy production is caused both by price returns which do not cover even direct production costs, and the fact that other war-needed farm products offer greater returns for land, equipment, and labor.

"No part of the American public is more sensitive to the dangers of inflation than are producers of dairy products. This association takes the position that the inflation pressure today arises primarily from sharply increased net incomes of workers and from any swollen war profits. It believes the subsidizing of the food costs of such many millions of people in the guise of payments to producers to be unsound, not in the public interest, and damaging to the war effort. Such subsidies add to the funds already seeking something to buy. Far better to assist low-income families directly.

"We make two recommendations relating to control of dairy products prices:

"1. That one and only one governmental agency control. Joint responsibility gives control to the least or lesser informed.

"2. That dairy products prices be permitted to rise to such levels as will get the necessary production, limited by ceilings, and coupled with floor prices."

OSCAR HAGG, *President,*
Reedville, Oreg.

Address of Hon. E. E. Patton, Mayor of Knoxville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 11, Mr. Roy N. Lotspeich, publisher of the Knoxville Journal, and Mr. Guy L. Smith, editor, gave a luncheon to 200 prominent citizens of east Tennessee in honor of former Governor Alf M. Landon, who delivered the Lincoln Day address to an audience of more than seven hundred at the Lincoln Day banquet sponsored by the Knox County Young Republican Club. Governor Landon and the guests at the luncheon were welcomed to Knoxville by its distinguished mayor, former State Senator E. E. Patton. This address is so good and contains so much Tennessee history with which the average reader is not familiar I feel it should be inserted in the RECORD for the information of all.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Landon, distinguished guests, fighting Republicans of east Tennessee, and repentant Democrats, it is a rare privilege, a great pleasure and a high honor to welcome to Knoxville and East Tennessee a distinguished former Governor of Kansas and a nominee of the Republican Party for the office of President.

Governor Landon, to us east Tennesseeans this is sacred ground, hallowed ground, from a civic standpoint. Fifty feet to my right was erected the capitol of the first National Territory to be carved into a State and admitted to the Union as such.

This capitol was 22 feet square, built of logs and was a skyscraper for that date; it was actually two stories high. The State senate met on the ground floor and the assembly held its sessions on the second floor. This is the only instance in the history of America where the "upper house" was the "lower house."

In January 1796 the Constitutional Convention held its sessions in the Capitol Building and there formulated the constitution of Tennessee, pronounced by Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, as the most democratic constitution in America. You will recall that Jefferson said that if we had to be told from Washington what to plant and when to plant it, we would all go hungry. [Applause.]

Just across the street from the capitol stands the home of William Blount, the first Governor of a national territory appointed by the President of the United States, and that President George Washington. This is the first house built of sawed lumber west of the Allegheny Mountains. One mile to the west of us stands the University of Tennessee, the first institution of higher learning in the world to admit women on an equality with men.

In this county of Knox was born David G. Farragut, America's first Admiral. He entered the United States Navy at the age of nine, and this shows that the youngsters of this section are most precocious.

I hope your stay among us will be pleasant, that you will carry away with you happy memories and tender recollections of our hospitality, that you will again soon come to see us, that if the wind gets too strong in Kansas, you will come and make your home here in this Republican section. Governor, if you will do that, you will live to be 150 years old.

Again, I bid you a most hearty and cordial welcome to our city and section.

How a Correspondent Was Converted Into a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Goldfish Bowl, organ of the National Press Club, which pays deserved tribute to our able colleague, LOUIS LUDLOW:

The article is as follows:

LOUIS LUDLOW DEVELOPED STATESMAN'S TECHNIQUE AS HEAD OF PRESS CLUB

(By Homer Dodge)

In the brave new world of post-war planning it may be that the careers of our citizens will be plotted long in advance as the career of a royal personage used to be but, assuredly, in the past the turnings in the pathway of a man have been frequently a matter of pure chance.

It seems to this observer that the distinguished congressional career of LOUIS LUDLOW fell out on an unforseeable turn in events. That is not to say that LOUIS LUDLOW's career would not have been distinguished had he never entered the House; indeed it already had gained much distinction. But it might have been other than a political career.

It fell out in this manner. Alfred Kirkhofer had been elected president of the National Press Club and LOUIS LUDLOW vice president. That was before the days of the establishment of the royal succession when vice presidents automatically moved in. To be sure there is no assurance that LOUIS LUDLOW would not have been elected president in good time anyway. On the other hand there is no assurance that he would.

SUCCEEDED KIRKHOFER

Alfred Kirkhofer had been in office only some 3 months when he was called to Buffalo to assume the chair of managing editor of the Buffalo Evening News, the paper for which he had been correspondent here. That was some 16 years ago. LOUIS LUDLOW, as vice president, succeeded. A farewell dinner was tendered to Mr. Kirkhofer which, inevitably, took on something of the nature of an inauguration for LOUIS.

Mr. LUDLOW, up to that time, had been one of the most reticent and retiring individuals who ever lived. It is not certain but there is a reasonable doubt as to his ever since schools days, perhaps, having made a public address. On this occasion he drew from his pocket what appeared to be a length of wall paper and read an address which some hearers say lasted 4 hours. In those days Mr. LUDLOW's addresses were perhaps something like Edmund Burke's in that they read better than they sounded.

N. P. C. POLITICS HELPED

At any rate that public address gave every appearance of having given the Indiana correspondent a taste of public life. It was during his administration as president that Charles Lindbergh came to Washington after flying to Paris and it was LOUIS LUDLOW who made the address of welcome.

There may long have been lurking in the back of LOUIS LUDLOW's mind the idea of going to Congress, but surface indications here strongly intimated that it was his somewhat sudden precipitation into the pool of press-club politics and public life that determined that new direction of his career. Certain it is that he stood for the seat as a Democrat in what was considered a Republican district and a Republican year and was elected to the Seventy-first Congress. He has been in Congress ever since, constantly mounting in the estimation of his constituency and of his colleagues. Today and for a considerable time past, LOUIS LUDLOW has been a power in the House, the only man ever to go direct from the press galleries to the floor.

We said that his career already had gained distinction. It had. LOUIS LUDLOW went to Indianapolis from the farm at the age of 18 and got a job as reporter on the Sun. He came to Washington as a correspondent in 1901. He represented Indiana papers and from 1913, the Columbus Dispatch. He is the author of several books, notably From

Cornfield to Press Gallery and Senator Solomon Spiffledink. The latter is a satire on political practices, which showed that, when he entered politics, it was not with blind faith but with peculiarly enlightened awareness.

NO ITEM TOO SMALL

Now what seems of special interest concerning this notable career is this. LOUIS LUDLOW was known to his newspaper colleagues as one of the most indefatigable pursuers of the item. His papers included small and large ones but no paper was too small, no query too trifling, no bit of happening too obscure to escape this man whose ubiquitousness had long since passed into a proverb. He worked probably 14 hours a day.

This writer on a time was sitting in a distinguished company composed chiefly of Members of Congress. The talk fell on Washington correspondents and their relative merits.

Senator Joseph B. Foraker, of Ohio, one of the big men of the Senate in that period of big men, was heard to express the opinon that LOUIS LUDLOW was far and away the best correspondent in Washington. And that was in the days of Richard Oulihan and Gus Karger. It seems that it needs not to say more.

Regulation Over the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Judge Joe G. Montague, general attorney for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, before the Central Cooperative Association, at St. Paul, Minn., on February 8, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Thye, ladies, and gentlemen, the privilege accorded me in allowing me to speak to you tonight is one that I count as a distinct honor. All of my life has been spent in the range country of the Southwest and my activities have been largely identified with that type of agriculture—range growing of livestock. Only through the close association that developed during the past few years have we of the Southwest come to know and appreciate you people of the North and Northwest. During comparatively recent years the large movement of feeder cattle from our area to your section of the country has brought about a widening acquaintanceship and a broadened viewpoint. Through this business association we have learned something about your problems and you have learned of ours. This has been beneficial to all of us and to the Nation as a whole, for each of us has, consciously or unconsciously, developed under the influence of the other.

But it took the emergency growing out of this terrible war to really make us appreciate each other. We have had the same problems confronting us. We have been forced into many battles on the home front, in most of which I have had the doubtful honor of being an active belligerent, and in every one of those conflicts we have been encouraged in our efforts to do and have done the right thing by the self-evident fact that all of agriculture, whether from the South or the North, the East or the West, the Southwest or the Northwest—regardless of sectional lines or geographical location—has presented a solid front and has been unswerving in its adherence to fundamental principles and in its universal willingness to make sacrifices for the good of our warring Nation. It has been my pleasure on numerous occasions to work side by side with your general manager, Mr. Norris Cairnes, and I give testimony that he has both great fighting qualities and high intelligence. He has been not only an ally but a leader, and I know he will continue to occupy that position. Your commissioner of agriculture, Mr. Trovatten, has also stood out prominently in the fight that has been forced on agriculture and he has, by logic and forceful argument, so acquitted himself that his opponents are always wary of him. I count these associations with these gentlemen—your spokesmen—as memorable moments in my life.

There has been one malicious and wholly ungrounded attack made on agriculture, and I want, at the outset, to refute it with all the strength of my being. Agriculture has been accused of opposing, or at least not supporting, the war effort of this country. Some speakers, writers, and commentators, inspired by influences that will not themselves bear the light of impartial investigation, have accused agriculture of impeding the war effort and even of going on a sit-down strike just because agriculture has not accepted the purposely confusing and evilly conceived domination and rule of people who not only know nothing about agriculture but whose only interest in the subject is to control the industry and all those engaged in it. We would have indeed been poor specimens of the genus American if we had failed to protest and oppose this sinister purpose and obvious intent of those who now attack us. Thank God that all agriculture, from all over the Nation, was large enough and unselfish enough to lay aside sectional thought an the particular interests of segments of the industry and present a solid front in opposition to the assault made upon this industry and, more important still, upon the American system of government under principles of democracy.

Agriculture not only opposed all these attacks, and they have been many and deadly in their intensity, but, in spite of all these difficulties, our industry has responded to the national demands with unprecedented production in all branches of the industry. This record is all the more impressive when you realize that, on top of such obstacles as manpower shortage, transportation difficulties, equipment depletion, and actual shortage, we have had to work under an ever-increasing handicap of confusion and confusing regulations, decrees, directives, and generally misdirected governmental control.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that no agriculturist should, out of self-respect, allow anyone to say or even intimate that the farmers and ranchmen of America have failed in the discharge of their duties as Americans. No industry has contributed more. This is literally true whether you speak of contribution of products or of that greatest of all contributions, fighting men. There never were and there never will be finer fighting men than your sons now winning glorious victories on every continent, on and under the surface of every ocean, and in the skies over the whole globe. Too many—far too many—farm and ranch homes are displaying that last tribute to a loved one who has paid the supreme sacrifice for us, the gold star. I say we have a right from every standpoint to resent the insults that have been handed us and to denounce the insulters. I feel this so strongly, Governor Thye, that I believe you could, with propriety, recommend to your legislature that they make the killing of an individual guilty of accusing agriculture of lack of patriotic sentiment an act justifiable, even commendable, under the law.

It is a strange and an unhappy situation that warrants the expression of such sentiments. As you have been told, I have the honor of being the representative of the cattle industry in Texas and the Southwest. In that capacity it has been my duty to participate in many of the episodes that are called hearings before various governmental agencies and before committees of the Congress. This experience has been most enlightening to me. At the outset I approached this work with the enthusiasm and fervor of a neophyte and with reverence and respect for those who had authority to speak for my Government. I sincerely and truly wanted to help. I still do, but that reverence and respect which I formerly accorded the bureaucrats has long since faded away and has been replaced by fear and positive apprehension. There was a time not so long ago when I would accept any statement made by an agency of the Government as gospel. I naively believed in the sanctity of the oath that must be taken by any Federal official obligating him to support the Constitution and the laws of the United States. I have learned to my sorrow that this sacred and time-honored oath means less than nothing to many people in high positions. This is a terrible statement to make, but it is warranted by positive acts that are matters of record.

To illustrate what I mean I cite you to the circumstances surrounding the issuance of the directive of October 25, 1943, by Judge Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization. In making this statement I am but quoting from testimony given by four high officials from the Office of Price Administration before the House Committee on Agriculture. There these officials, each of whom had sworn he would uphold and support the Constitution and laws of the United States, testified that they knew they did not have authority under the law to issue this order through the Office of Price Administration. They testified that they knew the law forbade any such order unless approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary as well as the War Food Administrator had refused to approve this order. Yet they boastfully admitted that they had, by long and hard persuasion, prevailed on the Director of Economic Stabilization to issue that directive, thus not only circumventing the express will of the Congress but actually violating it. And their only justification for this act was the fact that they knew that previous orders issued by them would be held void by the court. This is just one illustration to prove to you that our hired hands in Washington, and that is all that these officials are, take very lightly their obligations under their oaths. The illustration might be multiplied to a point of nausea.

Psychologists tell us that physical surroundings have tremendous influences on our mental reactions. If you will look at a map of the city of Washington you will be impressed with the similarity the confusing plan of that city bears to a spider web. Perhaps residence in this spider-web Capital City may account for the acquisitive development of the Federal Government and the insatiable appetite for power possessed by Federal officials. It may be that we citizens who are about to have the last remaining vestige of personal liberty snared in this central spider web should either break up the web or change spiders. The entrancing invitation of the Washington spider to step into his parlor has been too often proved to be a lure into entangling meshes from which, once caught, escape is difficult.

Most Americans are perfectly willing and ready to excuse a conscientious mistake. We realize that we all make some mistakes and hope that ours will be looked upon by our fellow men with the charity we give to the other fellow. I sometimes think that this good-natured attitude of the American public may be blamed for a lot of the confusion and chaos existing on our home front today. At least this complacency has been imposed on and, through it, advantage taken by those who are consciously and deliberately trying

to overthrow our American ideals and our form of government. While we were peacefully pursuing our respective occupations a powerful group of un-American people began locating themselves within our own Government. Undoubtedly, this movement had started before the beginning of this war. Then, in the excitement and absolute chaos that developed when we were brought into the conflict, many more of these people inserted themselves into strategic positions and the power and influence of those already entrenched was magnified.

We have seen an absolute revolution in our civil government. It has been bloodless but nonetheless real. Who would have ever dreamed, in times past, that the American people, acting through their duly elected Congress, would have so freely handed out to any agency the power to write regulations that have the full force and effect of laws—yea, even in some instances supersede laws? Yet that is what we have done in literally hundreds of instances. Who would have believed that we, the American people, born and bred in traditions of purest democracy, would have allowed a Government agency such power that it can write a regulation having the full force and effect of a law, vitally affecting the very freedom of ourselves, and, at the same time, empower that same agency to act as the judge, prosecutor, and the jury in trying a citizen for an alleged violation of that regulation? Yet that is exactly what we have done. Even worse than that, we have allowed some of these bureaus to write regulations that supersede the law, and, although under such regulations the citizen's property may be taken from him and he may be imprisoned, yet he has no right of appeal to a duly constituted civil court. If this is democracy, then I do not know what democracy is.

It has always been my belief that a democracy operated through three distinct divisions of government. The legislative department, chosen by the people, enacted the laws. The executive department enforced and administered the law in the exact sense and spirit with which it was enacted. And the judicial department construed the law and passed upon such questions as were regularly submitted to it affecting the meaning of the law and the propriety of the method of administration. At least that is the type of government that I have always believed our forefathers set up by the Constitution they adopted over 160 years ago. And in this belief I am justified by the rule of life and the precedents that we have inherited from our clear-thinking earlier Americans. And, equally important, under our conception of democracy—under the American concept—the individual citizen was sacred and respected. His liberty and his right to own property and call it his own was not only protected, but it was guaranteed to him. The Nation was set up as a Union of Sovereign States, and within the States sovereignty was vested in the citizens. Such was the United States as originally established. In that country I believed, and this ideal I always have been and always will be ready to defend.

But do we have that kind of government centralized and operating in and out of Washington today? Emphatically we do not. Today the Federal Government has usurped most of the reserved States' rights and, in mass thinking the individual has been forgotten, although it is still true that democracy must always rest its case upon and derive its strength from the individual and from the service and protection that it gives to individuals.

Instead of having a union of sovereign States we have a centralized Federal Government that, like the octopus, constantly reaches out and absorbs more and more of the functions of the respective States. This is so true that today almost every act of everyone's life is controlled more directly and more intimately by the Federal laws and especially by Federal regulations than they are by State or even local municipal governments. And that is not the American concept; it is not the constitutional democracy provided for by our ancestors when they founded this Republic.

Even worse than this, we daily and even momentarily see innumerable instances of this colossus of a Federal Government assuming new powers and controls. The attitude of this creature of ours towards the individual citizen has become so paternalistic that the spirit of initiative has largely disappeared in this country. At least it has been subdued. This Federal Government has moved into our daily lives and assumed the right and the responsibility of telling us how to live, how to work and how to die. You farmers know the truth of this statement better than anyone. You have seen the Federal influence on your work, your crop plans, your planting, harvesting, and marketing more distinctly and completely than any other industry.

It matters but little to say that this influence of the Federal Government has been developed by its desire to be of assistance to the individual. Such assistance is bought at an exhorbitant price if individual liberty and freedom of thought and action are the price.

Of course, those who view this situation from the bureaucratic angle—those who would justify this revolution in ideals and in governmental functions—say that great good has developed from all of this. They point out the production records and the farm income to prove this statement, thus justifying the means by the end. But, in like manner, Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo could point to roads, canals, public works, and power developments of vast magnitude accomplished during their era of domination, but do you not know that the farmers, the butchers, the bakers, and the candlestick makers of their countries now curse the day on which they surrendered personal liberty for temporary improvements and gains? We are in just such a position as were the peoples of these other countries 15 years ago. Let us not be blinded by the gilded cover on the box of gifts this ever power-hungry and bureaucratic-ridden Federal Government offers us. We are the political children of our respective States; we are joined with the political children of the other States in a common effort, the result of which is the Federal Government. That institution is our creature. Let us not allow that creature of ours to assume paternalistic prerogatives and powers.

I have spoken to you about the situation that exists within our Government bureaus wherein we have numerous instances of administrative agencies usurping the powers, rights, and prerogatives of both the legislative and the judicial branches of the Government. While these bureaus and the individuals in them may be most blameworthy for their own acts so violative of American concepts, yet they have high precedent to cite as their justification. At the risk of being repetitious, allow me to again state our American fundamental concept of democracy and the functions of government. Our laws are enacted by our legislative department of government, the Congress. These laws are administered by the executive branch just exactly as they are enacted. The judicial branch functions as the interpreter of the law. These functions and prerogatives are separate and distinct. Neither branch has the right to encroach on the activities of the other. Now the high precedent and example to which erring bureaus may cite us as being the pattern they are following when they usurp the functions of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government is the conduct of the President of the United States in dealing with consumer roll-backs and subsidies.

It is not my purpose to discuss the subsidy question tonight, though, in passing, I may say that a Federal subsidy is, in my judgment, the cheapest kind of bribery, for it steals from all to give gratuities to a few, and its purpose is to buy the support of one element of the people at the cost of the liberty of the others, and the price paid in money is just the value of a loaf of bread, thus making Judas Iscariot a profiteer. But the question I am discussing with you is bigger by far than just the subsidy proposition; it is far bigger than agriculture or any other industry or combination of industries. It is: Shall we have fascism in this country?

Fascism, when boiled down to its essentials, simply means a government by decree as contradistinguished from a government by duly enacted laws. It also means that the individual is subservient in mind and body to the state and the state is the dictator who issues the decrees. You say, "We will never have that system in this country. We would not stand for it." But have we not already had it? Are we not perilously close to having more of it now? Consider this Presidential precedent that I referred to a moment ago. It is manifest in his handling of the subsidy problem. Last summer, by large majorities, the Congress of the United States—our duly elected legislative department—declared these subsidies to be undesirable and banned them. This displeased the President and he vetoed the act prohibiting the payment of these subsidies. Although the majority of the Congress still opposed subsidies, sufficient votes, that is two-thirds of each House, were not available to override the veto, and the will of one man, the President, prevailed in a legislative function over the will of a majority of the Congress, the proper legislative agency. Now we again face this selfsame situation. By a vote of more than two to one the House again prohibited subsidies. The majority of the Senate likewise is opposed to subsidies, but if the President again vetoes this prohibition—and he probably will—we will again have an example of the will of one man, the Executive, overruling the majority of the legislative branch. In plain words, we will have rule by decree or regulation or Executive order rather than by law, and that will be fascism in its truest form—the thing you say we will never have but which actually we have had for a long time and which we are on the verge of continuing.

It is clear that the problem we are facing is one involving principle—not just policy. Too often we become confused in our thinking and careless in our speaking when we refer to a matter of policy as being one of principle. Principles are constant, immutable, but the policies under those principles may be varied by special circumstances just so long as the inviolability of the principle is preserved. Our immediate issue is definitely one of principle. It is the fundamental concept of democracy and the question to be answered is: "Shall the people of this country rule themselves by laws they enact through their chosen Representatives in the Congress or shall we submit to rule by the decree, regulation, or Executive order of one man, whoever he may be?

Mr. Chairman and friends, I repeat, the question for us tonight is not just one peculiar to our own industry of agriculture. It is not limited to any industry or group. It is so fundamental that I personally consider it to be the most serious decision that Americans have ever been called upon to make. We must decide whether or not we are to be ruled by individuals who either never subscribed to American ideals, or, if they once did, have now thrown them overboard, or shall we rule ourselves under our American concepts which guarantee to us our personal liberties of mind and effort.

There can be but one answer to this question. The American concept must prevail regardless of cost. We would be a miserable lot, indeed, if we did not fight with all of our strength and with all the intelligence we have and with our franchise to preserve for

our sons, who are fighting all over the world for the very thing I am talking about, this American way of life. We have the sacred obligation of preserving for them the kind of government they believe they own and that obligation we cannot—and God willing—we shall not shirk.

Liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in Hawaii.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly $3,500,000,000. Of this amount, 481 loans were closed in Hawaii, representing an aggregate amount of $1,296,322.

Citizens of Hawaii can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expenses and increasing their equities but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private-debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the corporation in Hawaii, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $327,827, equivalent to 74.7 percent. A total of 191 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 63 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. It has not been necessary for the Corporation to take over any properties through foreclosure in Hawaii. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of two loans of the Corporation in Hawaii were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 57 percent as of September 30, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record, particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Lincoln Day Address of Gov. Walter E. Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address made by Gov. Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey, on the occasion of the fifty-eighth annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club at the Hotel Waldorf, in New York City. There were three principal speakers at this dinner, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, Rev. Paul Wolfe, pastor of the Brick Church, in New York City, and Governor Edge. Each of them made a well-thought-out and carefully written address and were enthusiastically received by the 1,700 people present. It was a memorable occasion, with thoughtful Americans meeting in reverent memory of our martyred President in an atmosphere of determined patriotism. Governor Edge's remarks on the violation of States' rights by the bureaucratic New Deal government were temperate, true, and timely and I hope will be widely read and taken to heart by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

My role tonight seems to be more or less in the nature of a pinch-hitter. I accepted with great pleasure the invitation of your committee to be a guest at this historic affair with the assurance that I could enjoy the evening listening to two old friends, Senator LODGE and Governor Dewey, and that I would be fancy free and have a night off as it were.

As a matter of fact, when opportunity affords, we Jerseymen greatly enjoy a run over to New York, which we consider our most alluring suburb. Of course, we must also admit being under some obligation to the metropolis as thousands of the loyal residents of New Jersey, quite a few represented here tonight, make their daily contribution to the business and professional activities of this great city. However, when their business day concludes they indicate their fine sense of discrimination and judgment by returning to enjoy the environs as well as the civic virtues of New Jersey.

In celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln one's mind naturally goes back to the turbulent days during which he pleaded for unity. While for the time being he failed because of the assassin's bullet, nevertheless his counsel, his tolerance, and his real Americanism triumphed in the end. May the realization of his example and sacrifice and the sacred legacy he left to posterity serve and influence us in the troubled days ahead.

Mr. Chairman, in considering a message tonight, I fully recognize my inability to represent the former distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who, all praise to him, is now on his way to the fighting front. However, may I indulge in a few observations on a subject I am sure Governor Dewey will agree to be one of the outstanding responsibilities of an executive. It applies not only to New York and New Jersey, but to every one of the 48 sovereign States.

We have witnessed in the past few weeks, and especially the past few days, an exhibition in Washington that justifies, nay, demands, direct protest from the States.

I refer to the comedy that has and is still taking place over the passage of an absentee soldier's voting bill. If the measure does finally emerge from its present complicated situation, even with some semblance of the recognition of the responsibility of the States, it won't be because the administration wanted it that way. It is quite evident its estimate of the ability of the States to provide proper facilities for their citizens to exercise an uninfluenced opportunity to vote is indeed pretty low.

We recognize that Washington has in the last 10 years made much headway in the determination of the administration to annex practically every responsibility of the States, with the exception of our contributions to the United States Treasury.

We cheerfully respond to every call and anticipate many, so far as it relates to the prosecution of the war, but we do protest when this well-planned activity in departmental and administrative circles in Washington goes so far as to trespass upon our State constitutions.

The Constitutions of the States of New Jersey and New York and, so far as I am informed, of every other State of the Union, provides that it shall be the fundamental duty of the States to prepare a method for members of the armed forces to have the sacred opportunity to exercise their right of franchise.

What has Washington to do with that responsibility beyond providing the necessary method of distribution and collection of the soldiers' ballots? Why, the citizens of Washington, rightly or wrongly, don't even have the right to vote, and the Representatives of the States of the Union in Congress themselves must return to their home States to vote, or in some manner, if provided, cast an absentee ballot. Yet we are told by the administration in Washington that it is fraudulent for the States to endeavor to carry out the mandates of their own constitutions.

So far as New Jersey is concerned, we already have a legal method for soldiers' absentee voting, but, recognizing under present conditions the difficulty of registration and other normal protections of the ballot, we are preparing to pass, and will pass in a very few days, a soldiers' absentee ballot which, if distributed to New Jersey's half-million-odd service men and women, will at least enable them—and without any local pressure—to register their desires.

Whenever I discuss the subject of States' rights, I am afraid I become so indignant that I might be accused of lack of respect. Nevertheless, it is a topic those of us charged with State responsibility cannot, and should not, evade.

I feel most deeply the necessity for a return to the States of many of the responsibilities that have been absorbed in recent years through Federal centralization. I recognize large service fields that are vested with a national scope and interest and in which initiation, administration, and finance must lean heavily upon Federal policy and Federal resources. But I strenuously oppose the reduction of the States to Federal administrative provinces.

I object specifically to the exclusive Federal control of unemployment compensation funds contributed by employers and workers of the State; I object to the studied and consistent policies of the Federal Government to bypass the States in Federal contacts with the State's own local subdivisions; I object to the disproportionate amount of tax money taken and lavished on projects of doubtful value in other parts of the country; I object to the strong element of coercion that carelessly invades our civil rights and refuses to recognize the strength and eagerness of voluntary action; and I object to the manipulation of Federal benefits at timely moments, to the detriment of free State elections.

The right of the States to function as sovereign bodies must be restored. The systematic destruction of this sovereignty, which has patterned almost every major act of the present administration both before and since the war, is the greatest threat to American democracy since the eighteenth century.

It is far more than a redistribution of authority as between the States and the National Government. It means the ultimate abandonment of private enterprise, the disruption of organized labor, the abolition of local education, and the elimination of fundamental democratic controls, the ideals we are supposed to be fighting to maintain.

This issue affects the lives of every one of us. It affects the pocketbooks of every one of us. It raises the question as to whether the citizens of the American States are to govern or be governed.

Under a long series of catchwords, such as "economic planning," "new nationalism," "socialized industry," "consumption economy," and "public investment programs," the present administration has issued Executive order after Executive order, each one trespassing on the rights of the sovereign States.

My friends, these are great lessons in unpopular government and we must be self-sufficient in our own responsibilities and vocal in the fight for a return to American federalism.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for possibly exceeding my time, but I must admit when I discuss States' rights as viewed from Washington, I see red.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on the theory that the Lucas-Green-Worley bill is unconstitutional and in violation of States' rights, has opposed its passage. Among the many communications which I have received bearing on the constitutional and States' rights contention is one which I have received from the National Lawyers Guild. It carries the opinion of some of the most outstanding constitutional lawyers in the United States which clearly sets forth the facts and the claim of the gentleman from Mississippi, as to the constitutionality is erroneous.

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD,
New York, N. Y., February 2, 1944.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the attacks on the constitutionality of the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill, the National Lawyers Guild has made a study of this question, and wishes to present to you its considered opinion that the bill meets a test of constitutionality.

The War Department has stated it will be physically impossible to deliver, distribute, and return to each of the States, prior to the November election, individual State ballots to the tens and hundreds of thousands of citizens of each State who are dispersed throughout our world-wide battle fronts. The structure of our armies is not based upon State lines. This being so, we must either adopt a uniform Federal ballot or deprive our armed forces of their right as citizens to vote for the candidates listed under their respective States.

The need for a uniform Federal ballot is apparent. The question still remains whether it is within the war powers of Congress to provide for voting by such a ballot. If, in the exercise of its war powers under article I, section 8, of our Constitution, Congress should destroy or interfere with a citizen's civil or political right, it has the complete and unqualified authority to restore or repair that right in the interest of the war effort. The draft law of 1917 interfered with the right of those who were called to fight in World War No. 1, to defend themselves in civil suits. To remedy this wrong, Congress passed the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1918 which suspended all civil proceedings, in State and Federal courts, against members of the armed forces. In peacetime, this would have been an unconstitutional invasion of the jurisdiction of each State over its courts and over its citizens' rights and obligations before those courts. In wartime, however, it was declared to be a valid exercise of the war powers of Congress. (*Morse* v. *Stober*, 9 A. L. R. 81; 130 A. L. R. 774; 137 A. L. R. 451; 146 A. L. R. 1450.)

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 bars not only civil suits against members of the armed forces, but foreclosures, repossessions and the collection of income and real-estate taxes. It also suspends all statutes of limitation. Although it interferes with States' rights, this law also has been upheld as valid under the war powers of Congress.

Civil rights depend upon the free exercise of our political rights. This truism Congress recognized by the passage in 1942 of Public Law 712, which gave to members of our armed forces the right to vote in national elections without payment of the poll tax. This law was not attacked in relation to the November 1942 election as an unconstitutional invasion of States' rights. In fact, its constitutionality has been upheld in an opinion by the attorney general of the State of Virginia, a poll-tax State.

In *Konkil* v. *State* (166 Wis. 335), it was held that as the "power to maintain an Army or Navy necessarily implies the power to prescribe the conditions under which the persons in the military service of the United States shall be subject to the process of the courts, whether State or Federal," it also, "implies the power to prescribe the conditions under which persons in the military service" shall exercise the right of suffrage.

In *Pierrard* v. *Hock* (97 Oreg. 79), Congress' right to stay State court proceedings was upheld as necessary to maintain the morale of the Army.

In *United States* v. *Gettysburg Electric R. Co.* (160 U. S. 668, 681 (1896)), an act of Congress authorizing condemnation of land for monuments on the Gettysburg battlefield was upheld as a proper exercise of the war powers of Congress, especially since it tended to enhance a citizen's love of his country and quicken his motives to defend it.

Surely the members of the armed forces, of whose morale we must be solicitous and upon whom we depend for our safety from the Fascist savages of Germany and Japan, will not be consoled over the loss of their political rights, by their realization that Congress puts States' rights above human rights. Such a realization is hardly conducive to the maintenance of morale or to love of country. We know that it will be impossible for the millions of our soldiers in Europe, Asia, Australia, the Pacific Islands, and elsewhere to vote in the November 1944 elections unless Public Law 712 is implemented by the Green-Lucas bill. Our soldiers, sailors, and marines, fighting to defend our national existence, cannot be expected to understand why they are deprived of their political rights. Nor should they be expected to understand the inexplicable.

We may ask ourselves why it is that Congress, having exercised its power to protect the political rights of our fighting men, by passage of Public Law 712 (1942), now hesitates to give practical effect to that law. That law removed the poll tax as a voting prerequisite, but it provided no central Federal voting machinery. Experience provides the answer. Under it, only some 28,000 votes were cast in the November 1942 elections despite the fact that at that time most of our Army was in this country.

It is the considered opinion of the National Lawyers' Guild that the Green-Lucas bill is constitutional as a measure designed to restore to the members of our armed forces the political right to vote, which is now denied them because of their services in their country's behalf.

We urge that you vote for and exercise your influence for the passage of the Green-Lucas bill.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT W. KENNY,
President.

Is He More Indispensable Than Jefferson?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, February 13, 1944. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include that editorial. It is my hope that all may read this well-written editorial, which follows:

IS HE MORE INDISPENSABLE THAN JEFFERSON?

We know that the above caption is not written in perfect English, but we think you get the idea.

Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) was our third President, and our second two-term President. He served as President 1801–9; and looked at from any angle he was quite some man.

Born at Shadwell, Va., in what was then frontier country, Jefferson went to William and Mary College. He was admitted to the bar in 1767. He made good money as a lawyer, but quit the bar after 7 years to go into politics, feeling that lawyers were persons "whose trade it is to question everything, yield nothing, and talk by the hour."

The year 1775 saw him a Member of the Continental Congress. In 1774, Jefferson had written a pamphlet called A Summary View of the Rights of America, in which he stated the colonists' chief grievances against the British King George III in scorching language. The Declaration of Independence, which Jefferson wrote in 1776, was largely a polished rewrite of this 1774 pamphlet of his.

As a Virginia legislator and then as Governor of that State, he caused revision of

many of its laws so as to provide more and more rights for ordinary people.

This concern for the everyday citizen's welfare and happiness was one ruling passion of Jefferson's entire adult life. The other was a belief that the people could be and must in this country be trusted to run themselves.

Alexander Hamilton felt the opposite—"Your 'people,' sir, is a great beast"—and from these two early American geniuses flowed two opposing streams of thought which are still running through American life. They went into President Washington's first Cabinet together; Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury and Jefferson as Secretary of State. Their disputes were so many and so uproarious that Jefferson finally resigned, to keep the peace.

In 1796, Jefferson was elected Vice President and John Adams, President. Adams was of Hamilton's Federalist Party; Jefferson belonged to the Republican Party, which later became the Democratic Party.

In 1800, it fell to the House of Representatives to choose between Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr for the Presidency; and it fell to Hamilton to swing the deciding weight to Jefferson, the solid man, over the flashy Burr.

Jefferson's two administrations were characterized by his simplicity as a man; he much disliked, for example, to be called excellency, honorable, or even mister. The great stroke of his first term was the Louisiana Purchase, whereby for about $27,000,000 Jefferson bought from Napoleon Bonaparte what are now the States of Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, and most of Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana.

Laws were liberalized during both of Jefferson's terms, especially laws regarding voting qualifications, decent treatment of the Indians, and distribution of public lands.

Jefferson could probably have had a third term. He chose instead to reinforce the no-third-term precedent set up by George Washington. There were those who considered Jefferson indispensable, but he was not one of them.

His views on the subject:

"My opinion originally was that the President of the United States should have been elected for 7 years, and forever ineligible, afterward. I have since become sensible that 7 years is too long to be irremovable, and that there should be a peaceable way of withdrawing a man in midway who is doing wrong. The service for 8 years, with a power to remove at the end of the first 4, comes nearly to my principle as corrected by experience; and it is in adherence to that, that I determine to withdraw at the end of my second term. The danger is that the indulgence and attachments of the people will keep a man in the chair after he becomes a dotard, that reelection through life shall become habitual, and election for life follow that. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years. I shall follow it."

It should be noted, too, that Jefferson kept his promise.

He was succeeded by James Madison and James Monroe, each Secretary of State under his predecessor, each a member of Jefferson's party, and each a two-term President who might have had a third term had he cared to flout the George Washington example.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt is a different kind of Democrat from Thomas Jefferson. Having broken the no-third-term tradition via the "again, and again, and again" promise not to send our boys into any foreign war, he is now being offered as the indispensable man to lead us through the war. If Roosevelt gets a fourth term, this country will be on its way to becoming a monarchy, instead of the republic which Jefferson hoped it always would be.

Destiny of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Louis Le Baron, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii:

DESTINY OF A NATION

"THERE IS DISCERNIBLE A DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE RAISING UP OF AMERICA IN A NEW LAND * * * TO MEET THE PRESENT WORLD CRISIS"

(By Louis Le Baron, associate justice, Supreme Court of Hawaii)

America, for the first time in her brief history, is in a position to gain a proper perspective of her mission on earth as a nation. She has progressed to a point where she is commencing to envision the tremendous responsibilities which will be hers after the citidels of unrighteousness have been smashed. She is beginning to evaluate her heritage and to shake off the shackles which have been retarding her in her ever-accelerating march forward to meet her God-given destiny to lead the world in the pursuits of righteousness and justice. She is taking stock of herself and her sinews of war are toughening. This global war will be won, but that is not enough. An even greater task for America lies ahead when evil gradually will have become dislodged from the hearts of men.

This war is not merely an international or interracial strife. It is a great deal more fundamental. It is not a question of whether the world shall be free or slave, although that issue is involved. It is rather, in the last analysis, whether God's word shall remain and continue to stand inviolate, together with the light of righteousness and justice it sheds. No force has yet been able to smother its radiance or ever will. When that issue comes to the fore, victory is assured all along the way and America will recognize her place in God's over-all plan for the redemption of the world.

Today the greatest and most powerful embodiments of evil ever gatehered together or the face of this earth since its creation have manifested themselves. Satanic forces through the instrumentality of certain nations are attempting to overrun civilization and enslave the free peoples of the world. Such evil powers, so emphatically alined against Christianity, are warring with a demoniacal fury against Christ in all the implications which such an onslaught entails. It is therefore natural that they are clashing with America and that America is challenging their malignant threat.

In such a conflict to the death America stands fortified as a Christian nation. Her very foundations rest upon the laws of God through the common law of England which permeates the laws of the land and gives vitality to her institutions and form of government. Her ideals of righteousness, justice, fair play, liberty, freedom, and her conception of the way of life breathe the spirit of the word. The President of the United States of America as well as all high executive and judicial officers of the country throughout its history are sworn into their responsibilities upon the Holy Book. The reading and study of this Book has been the unfailing source of strength to America's leaders and people. It is the inspiration and mainspring of the Nation. The Congress of the United States of America and the legislatures of the various States have ever been convened by prayer to the Lord God Almighty. Each member of the armed forces swears allegiance before God. It is not to be wondered that America's light in this stricken world is a beacon which the forces of darkness have reason to know will eventually lead them to their destruction. Consequently, in the hope of averting their doom they have launched their last desperate attempt to extinguish it.

In 1776 America fought to be free from the political fetters of a tyrannical king but held steadfast to the faith which had brought her forefathers to the wilderness of her then bleak shores. The forming of the United States of America was a veritable modern-day miracle, an example of divine guidance through the prayers and thoughts of her God-fearing founders. It is to her undying credit that America has never repudiated the God of her youth. Her heritage, therefore, includes the divine covenants to Abraham and the laws of God. The Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States are but recent waymarks along the same road of righteousness toward the ultimate goal in the kingdom of God on earth. Thus is discernible the Divine purpose in the raising up of America in a new land to meet the present-day world crisis.

America became restive to be on her way to fulfill her national destiny before the Old World was barely aware of her existence and almost as soon as she had taken her place in the family of nations. In 1801 she boldly swept the Mediterranean Sea of its Saracen pirates by destroying their nests along the Barbary coast at a time when the other maritime powers of the world were abjectly paying them tribute. A few years later, in 1823, America forestalled the aggression of the Old World against the New by invoking the Monroe Doctrine and thereby assuming guardianship of the Western Hemisphere. Following the same deep urge, she freed Mexico from the grasp of Maximilian, broke the chains which Spain had forged upon Cuba and the Philippines, and halted the barbarian hordes of the Kaiser. Today she is fighting to rout the forces of evil in its final bid for world dominion. She is now engaged in the culminative stage of her more than a century old military operations against those forces. It is, however, not by her might alone that America has heretofore prevailed, nor will it be so now. It is by the spirit of God that she has confounded her enemies and by it they will be forever vanquished. Such is her most powerful secret weapon against which her enemies are helpless, for that same spirit which has guided and protected her along the way in the past will be her shield and sword in the future. America has never put her trust in any one man or group of men, but in the Divine Creator and His word. Therein lies her strength and assurance of the fulfillment of her destiny.

The corroding influences of ungodliness, selfishness, graft, corrupt politics, stock-market speculation, exploitation of the underprivileged, racial prejudice, labor strikes, and a multitude of other shortcomings, which have from time to time beset some of the American people, are deplorable, but are merely passing phases. They may temporarily confuse and blind a few of her leaders into spiritual apathy, thereby creating indecision in the halls of Washington, but America will shake off such lethargy just as surely as she did the rotting influences of slavery in 1861 in order to continue on her way to fulfill the mission which was destined to be hers before she was conceived as a nation. The attempt of America's enemies to destroy the Word of God and sweep into oblivion the fruits of its works by their concerted efforts to enslave the world will result in the sacred flame burning so fiercely that it will consume not only them and their evil designs in its

intensity, but the dross within America as well.

After 1776 America could not rest complacently on a mere military victory, nor will she be able to do so when the principalities of evil have been finally sacked and destroyed. As America comes into a fuller realization of her identity with His word, she will approach the fulfillment of her national destiny when man attains his true estate in the image of God. It will be through that Book that America will prosper, find her salvation, and be forever established.

The soul of America marches on.

Physicians Left in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATF OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relative to physicians left in Louisiana. The statement was forwarded to me by Dr. C. Grenes Cole, who is State medical chairman of the Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission, at New Orleans, La. His purpose in sending the list to me was because some time ago I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of all physicians in the United States, and he wished to have the list for Louisiana brought up to date as of February 1, 1944.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Physicians left in Louisiana, Feb. 1, 1944

Acadia	24
Allen	7
Ascension	11
Assumption	10
Avoyelles	13
Beauregard	6
Bienville	9
Bossier	7
Caddo	145
Calcasieu	36
Caldwell	5
Cameron	3
Catahoula	3
Claiborne	13
Concordia	6
De Soto	10
East Baton Rouge	90
East Carroll	4
East Feliciana	14
Evangeline	8
Franklin	13
Grant	5
Iberia	19
Iberville	16
Jackson	8
Jefferson	10
Jefferson Davis	8
Lafayette	24
Lafourche	16
La Salle	9
Lincoln	13
Livingston	7
Madison	7
Morehouse	12
Natchitoches	17
Orleans	606
Ouachita	45
Plaquemines	6
Pointe Coupee	5
Rapides	59
Red River	6
Richland	12
Sabine	11
St. Bernard	1
St. Charles	5
St. Helena	2
St. James	7
St. John the Baptist	7
St. Landry	23
St. Martin	5
St. Mary	14
St. Tammany	15
Tangipahoa	19
Tensas	3
Terrebonne	13
Union	7
Vermilion	13
Vernon	11
Washington	16
Webster	20
West Baton Rouge	4
West Carroll	10
West Feliciana	6
Winn	4
Total	1,563

This report does not include hospital interns and residents, as interns and residents are not included in our quota.

The Soldiers' Vote Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the annual banquet, Republican Editorial Association, on Friday, February 11, 1944, Hotel Continental, Kansas City, Mo.:

On the eve of the birthday anniversary of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, we Americans approach a crisis in our history. To hope for another Lincoln may be one way to indulge in forgetfulness of the many lessons of this wondrous, though simple, American life. Abraham Lincoln understood the application of simple honesty and plain common sense. America, today, needs the courage to apply common sense to the test of leaders and to demand ordinary integrity as the fundamental motive in the acts of our leaders.

The American crisis today is twofold—military and civil. It intensifies as we approach election day in November of this year. This very critical time in our history is made all the more crucial because of the selfish and avaricious ambition of a group of would-be monarchists operating in our Federal Government. These people have as their symbol and as their head Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the Presidency of the United States. They are more concerned in his perpetuity of power than they are in any degree of America's future. They leave no stones unturned—no paths untrod—in their revolution to destroy freedom in America and to set up in its place a post-war monarchy. To them America is not a democratic nation of 135,000,000 people, or a nation of 48 sovereign States. To them the strength of our Government is not derived from the practiced ability of the people's right to govern themselves successfully. They are the enemies of local self-government. They are the enemies of the sovereignty of the several States. They are guided by the principle that the power of the State stems from the control of the State by the few—instead of the traditional American premise, which has clearly demonstrated that the power and strength of the State should stem from the people. To them America is a mass of robots, divided into controllable or uncontrollable classes, or a mass of voting puppets, divided into controllable or uncontrollable groups of votes. They never think of the voters as individual Americans thinking for themselves and constantly striving to provide good government. They think of the voters of the Nation only as stepping stones to satisfy their greater appetite for individual power.

This monarchistic group is known as the New Deal. They are a cancer within a great political party known as the Democratic Party. They have become a cancer within the democracy. They have rotted the very foundation of our Nation by defiance of the peoples' representative government and by repeated attacks upon the peoples' Constitution. They have been guilty of stealing elections—of buying elections—and now have added to their many other crimes a desperate attempt to manipulate an entire Federal election by vitiating constitutional provisions. This attempt is known as the Green-Lucas Federal Ballot for the members of the armed forces. They have raised a great issue which may well decide the fate of the Nation. The issue is this: Shall the members of the armed forces be regimented and crowded into the voting of a blank, nameless ballot, on the crest of a wave of biased, partisan New Deal propaganda—or shall the members of the armed services be permitted in the same fashion as every other citizen to vote under a program, which would take to them as individual citizens their regular constitutional ballot? In order to foist this issue on the public, the New Deal has marshalled all of their propaganda forces of the Nation. These forces are dedicated to the eventual overthrow of the Republic. With these forces have been enlisted many loyal innocents who in good faith, and with every sincere intention, have trusted the people in high positions in the Federal Government to be incapable of fraud. These leaders of the New Deal are not only capable of fraud, but have a record of fraudulent conventions and elections.

After the return of the President from the Teheran Conference, the New Deal managers started in dead earnest to work on the fourth-term drive. The first public move was a carefully timed political feint on the part of the President. This cute maneuver was made during a press conference when the President related the allegory concerning Dr. New Deal and Dr. Win-the-War. The President said that the New Deal was dead. With the existence of a Congress as strong as the present one—or one even stronger (such as most Americans anticipate next year) the New Deal is dead. While the New Deal totters around the edge of the grave, it will never be considered safely dead as long as New Dealers live in places of political power. But, the public is genuinely sick and tired of the New Deal and its repeated failures. The net result of the New Deal, after these past 11 years, has been a back-breaking mortgage on the future.

Elections of 1940 and of 1942 and of 1943, and special elections, have been ample evidence to the White House managers that the people have caught up with them. Accordingly, the first political move must be a feint to make the people believe that these New Deal theorists have given up—that the administration is moving over to the path of sanity. Nothing is further from the truth.

After this first move it became necessary to make a positive gesture which would win back certain blocs of votes. The largest

bloc of votes today is the members of the armed services—more than 10,000,000. These servicemen had largely lost confidence in the management of the home front because of the reported strikes and general confusion in domestic management. The administration had been guilty of mothering these strikes and smiling upon their continuance. The administration had been guilty of yielding in its own rules which is designed to "hold the line" in the fight against inflation. The administration had been guilty of following a line of no labor policy which was the cause of labor strikes, labor shortages, and labor unrest and distrust. Despite censorship control these items of news had reached the troops who resent the situation. For years the administration had played labor along for the votes they could get by so doing. Now, some of their bad children had come home to plague them. This situation was divorcing them from the soldier vote and from the mass of voters here at home. Their mismanagement of labor was splitting their labor-vote ranks. The labor leaders, who were stooges for the administration, were having trouble holding their thinking members in bondage. Well-managed unions were discouraged by Presidential preferences.

In January, at the opening of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Presidential message called for a National Service Act or a draft of all the people. It, of course, did not mention constant Presidential opposition to all sincere attempts on the part of the Congress to stop strikes. This move was designed to soften any opposition growing in the votes of the armed forces.

The next move was to follow up on February the first with one of the most dishonest of all state papers—the Presidential message on the soldiers' vote issue. In this message the President represented himself as sort of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He used his Presidential privilege to send a direct White House message to the Congress to represent himself as a private citizen making an appeal. He used the same privilege to assume the role of a lobbyist for civil rights because he is the Commander in Chief of the armed services. With all of these self-assumed titles he proceeded to indulge in the greatest of American falsehoods by accusing the Congress of the United States of perpetrating a fraud against the men and women in the military services. He accused the Congress of attempting to keep the men from voting. American history does not record any occupant of the White House, committing such a desperate political move. This message constitutes a new low in national politics.

The President failed to tell the people and the armed services that his own vote plan was an unconstitutional move to regiment their votes and count them with a New Deal board of five. He failed to state that this move was a conspiracy to usurp the constitutional rights of the States. He failed to tell them that the ballot they were to vote was not a legal ballot but, instead, a blank and a dud. He failed to tell them that under his plan their votes would probably be illegal and uncounted. He failed to tell them that they would not be able to vote the "Federal ballot" for their State and local officers. He failed to tell them that this was a purely political move to destroy the sovereignty of the States—26 of which are Republican, and a political menace to his fourth-term desires. All of these things he failed to tell them. Instead, he posed a monstrous political hypocrisy. His message got through to the troops. Opposition messages by the majority of the Congress will find little chance of filtering through the lines of censorship.

He demanded that the Congress stand up and be counted. He tried to distort the rules of the House. Throughout the land New Deal mouthpieces howled his partisan propaganda. These voices, heard on the radio and in the stultified press, are behaving like so many stooges. The program was so crude that the great Democratic Party, which enjoys the control of the Congress, split wide open on the issue. Stanch and true Democrats refused to go along with a plot which was designed to reelect them by unconstitutional means. Added to this has been weeks of New Deal congressional filibuster. These are days which demand strong hearts and great moral courage to face the attacks designed to destroy the Republic. Thank God such men are to be found in both political parties in the Congress.

In Missouri we had the spectacle of having the servile New Deal press acting the usual role of a Charlie McCarthy. In St. Louis the New Deal Star-Times was found in the embarrassing position of having mimicked weasel words on Wednesday, February 2, only to have to swallow their political Adam's apple on Friday, February 4.

Stand up and be counted was the false howl. Well, the House of Representatives at the proper time, and without consulting the New Deal, stood up and was counted. I am proud to say the eight Republican Members of Missouri stood firm for the preservation of the American Constitution. Now let the proponents of this election plot stand up and be counted. Let them tell the truth to the men in the Army and Navy. I'll enumerate a few of these proponents for you. They were and are: New Deal political managers; Members of the Congress, who go along with whatever the White House whip demands; Communist organizations; Communist-front organizations; C. I. O. political action committee, headed by White House stooge Hillman, and organized to promote a fourth term; New Deal subsidized columnists; New Deal subsidized radio commentators; New Deal-controlled newspapers, such as the "pink" New York PM; the Chicago Sun; the Daily Worker, a Communist journal; New Masses, a Communist journal; the "stoogey" St. Louis Star-Times, and others who were pathetically misled despite their sincerity. Among the sincere were those in all groups who fail to understand that the roots of democracy are grown in the soil of local self-government. These good people fail to understand that the strength of our Republic stems from the people, their counties, and States, and not from the Federal Government.

Any public administration which spends more time finding ways of keeping its perpetual power than it spends in doing good for the future of the Nation bodes ill and bad weather for the future of the Nation.

Next election day can be the blackest in the history of the Nation or the brightest in many a future day to come. Because of such dangerous attacks against the Republic, we are a people half determined, half confused. We are determined that we shall have a change on the muddled home front. We are confused in the question of changing the Commander in Chief. We people must realize that any change for the better is always a good change to make. Any opportunity to obtain sound Executive leadership will be an enormous improvement over the bungling political Executive leadership of today. Any patriotic leadership will retain our good military leadership of today without interference. Any patriotic leadership with competent Executive qualities will lend aid to the military which will be of tremendous new aid to the battle fronts. If we have faith in the future of our Republic—if we want a future for our Republic—we will have the simple and plain courage to make this change for improvement in the constitutional manner this year. To ignore the impulse of this simple courage is to yield our Government to a one-man rule. Revival of the New Deal spells American monarchy. I fear the Republic cannot withstand another 4 years of the present New Deal administration. Failure on our part to carry this message to our troops abroad or to our fellow citizens at home will allow a betrayal of our fighting forces. The accursed forces which propagate destructive propaganda here at home and abroad are America's greatest enemies of tomorrow—they are enemies of the boys who fight—the enemies of their children and ours.

How could anyone believe such a monstrous incongruity as to believe that the same Washington managers could manage so badly at home and yet do so well on the battlefronts? The plain truth is that military successes come from a different management, not the President. The division of that management came back in the middle of 1942 as history will some day reveal. Since then we have gone forward militarily, while domestically we have bungled our present and undermined our future.

Issues for Consideration in the 1944 Presidential Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of William L. Hutcheson, general president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. The statement has been approved by the general executive board of the brotherhood.

Every so often a single year flares out historically as a turning point in human progress. Nineteen hundred and forty-four seems destined to be such a year. Vast social and economic issues are coming to a focus. Long evaded realities must be faced. Just as this is the "year of decision" of our great and uncompleted war task, so the choice which the American people will make in the 1944 Presidential election will determine the shape and direction of our national economy for at least a generation.

As producer, as consumer, as citizen, the American wage earner feels the impact of every throb of our national viewpoint. His viewpoint is that of the whole American economy. Labor speaks as the voice not of a faction but of the national interest as a whole.

To American labor the issues of 1944 are crucial. Labor wants a change.

In voicing such insistence labor makes it clear that the time is past when our economy can permit the extravagance of watertight compartments of mutually exclusive group interests. American well-being is indivisible. Any national program, however packaged to win labor's approval, which injures the national economy, inevitably injures the wage earner. The American labor movement, while continuously striving for the betterment of labor's status, rejects the Marxian concept that a single group can benefit while the general economy suffers.

It is my conviction that the New Deal administration has shown itself incapable; that its methods and policies have, themselves, created new threats to our national economy more disquieting than those which we have been attempting to escape; that wage earners

have been victims of a cruel political deception in that our economy has been entrusted to visionaries. When war ends the 12,000,000 men and women in the armed forces want to return to honest-to-God jobs. While they are away it is the duty of all men and women of good will to oppose unsparingly the national policies and leaders who have revealed an incapacity, or an unwillingness to make our American free enterprise system work. They must make their opposition effective in the approaching Presidential contest.

Labor demands of both national political parties that the candidates shall have the ability and their platforms the assurance of a progressive leadership to the end that the Nation shall have—

1. The preservation of free enterprise.
2. The abatement of bureaucracy.
3. The halt of paternalism.
4. The creation of post-war jobs through private industry.
5. The maintenance of labor's social gains.
6. The protection of our national interest.

(1) The preservation of free enterprise. In many respects, our accepted American free-enterprise system has been in sad and constant retreat throughout the 11 years of New Deal rule. Under the guise, first of combatting the depression, and later of waging World War No. 2, many of those in high places in this administration waged a continuous war of attrition against the psychological and economic supports of our free-enterprise economy. They have pursued Government policies which have dangerously weakened the incentives which make a free economy workable. They have confused the public mind with their jargon of an inevitable after-war mixed economy.

Labor recognizes that a free economy is the only soil in which a free State and a free-labor movement can exist. The American Federation of Labor has repeatedly declared itself unqualifiedly for the preservation of free enterprise. Its post-war policy is postulated upon the continuance of such an economy in this Nation. It looks with deep distrust upon those who propose the two-headed nonsuch of a mixed economy for America's future.

We insist that the two major parties offer us candidates in 1944 with a proven record of practical understanding and faith in our free-enterprise economy.

(2) The abatement of bureaucracy: A corollary is the necessity of an immediate program to halt the weed-like growth of bureaucracy which is choking our democratic institutions. Our national economy is enmeshed in an intricate networth of Government controls and regulations.

While admittedly there are areas in our economy where Government rule-making and enforcement are dictated by the national interest, what we are now witnessing is bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy. For the man with a practical job to do, Washington today has become a labyrinth of duplicating agencies, of conflicting authorities, of time-wasting futilities of buck-passing, of form-filling, and of executive face-saving. Naturally, in such an atmosphere of confusion, abuses multiply and injustices become rank.

For labor, bureaucracy creates a truly poisonous political atmosphere. In the war between conflicting boards and authorities, labor's problems and interests become the football of political careerists. The projective labor laws which the people have succeeded in placing upon the Federal statute books through long and patient effort, are only too frequently vitiated or weakened by the incompetent maladministration of the bureaucratic agencies to which they have been entrusted for enforcement. Labor has looked with increasing apprehension upon the unconscionable blunders which bureaucracy has committed in recent months in such nationally urgent situations as the N. L. R. B. handling of the Kaiser case, the coal-mine negotiations of 1943, and the railway wage case. It cannot safely entrust its future to the architects of such a governmental system.

In the 1944 election, it asks for nominees who will have the courage and the vision to draw the true line of demarcation between functions which properly belong to government, and those which should be left in the keeping of a free people.

(3) The halt of paternalism: Nothing is more disquieting to labor than the steady march of the Nation, under the New Deal, toward an over-all paternalism. The substitution of government by men for government of laws, against which Jefferson warned the Nation, has proceeded apace. Vast discretionary authority has been conferred upon appointive boards and commissions whose decisions affect the life of every citizen.

Such paternalism is a stealthy threat to the continued freedom of organized labor. It lulls labor misgivings by offering temporary aid in specific situations. It deceives the trade unionist into the belief that only through government has he won long overdue social gains which would have been achieved inevitably through his own trade union action. In the end, it enfeebles the labor movement by habituating union officers to an uncertain dependence upon the favor of opportunist politicians.

Samuel Gompers taught the American labor movement to look upon all progress as insecure which was not achieved through the rigor of union self-reliance. The favors which the politicians confer are too often the bait for the hidden and barbed hook of Government control. Under such a system trade union leadership becomes the rubber stamp of a political regime.

The present Administration, in its conduct of such agencies as the National Labor Relations Board and the War Labor Board has revealed many of the worst vices of a paternalistic State. It has stripped to virtual impotence the Department of Labor through which labor should have a cabinet voice in the conduct of the National Government. It has played a mischievous game of politics in the internal organizational life of the unions. It has pursued policies which have prolonged division between national labor bodies. It has had its labor union palace favorites, who have enjoyed advantageous breaks from New Deal agencies. On the other hand, it has attempted to visit veiled reprisals upon other trade union executives who have refused to toe the Administration line.

Inevitably, such attitudes have led to a capriciousness and vacillation in Government labor policies which have frequently operated to hurt the trade union movement. The advantages of New Deal friendship have too often been overweighed by its long-term threat to union self-reliance. It raises the serious question in labor's mind whether, on balance, labor has not been the final loser. Labor asks of the political parties that they nominate candidates in 1944, who, while sympathetic with trade union needs and objectives, will recognize and respect the necessary line between Government compulsion and our voluntary structure of free trade unionism.

(4) The creation of post-war jobs through private industry: No question is more hauntingly existent in labor's mind than how unemployment can be avoided in the post-war period. Recent Department of Labor studies have indicated the possibility of an unemployment of 12,000,000 within 6 months after the close of hostilities. Faulty and ill-planned Government policies could easily snowball this figure up to the largest unemployment total in American history. America will not and cannot accept the consequences of such a social breakdown.

The jobs for post-war labor must be created by private industry. Government can and should assist during the reconversion period by an extensive public-works program of nationally useful, self-liquidating projects. But Government's greatest contribution should be the maintenance of an economic atmosphere favorable to the kind of capital invested and risk-taking which will encourage the development of new industries and resultant new jobs. The channel of enterprise must not be choked by Government controls or punitive tax policies on one hand or by self-defeating monopolistic or cartel policies by industry on the other hand. Business within recognized socially desirable limits must enjoy the incentive of adequate profit-making opportunities. Unless the hazardous problems of the post-war period are approached in this spirit, we run the risk of seeing the expansive impulse in our economy inhibited or dwarfed.

In the light of the dismal failure of the New Deal to solve the unemployment problem during the 8½ years before Pearl Harbor, labor cannot intrust to the New Deal the unprecedentedly difficult employment task which will follow the war. The call is for practical, and not visionary, national leadership. The administration which is to be selected in 1944 must have the capacity to win the broadest measure of confidence and cooperation from capital, labor, and agriculture. The New Deal has conspicuously failed to win such confidence through three administrations of opportunity.

(5) The maintenance of labor's social gains. It is imperatively important that the next administration be guided by an intelligent and sympathetic understanding of the increasingly constructive role of organized labor in our present economy. The last 12 years have seen the American labor movement coming of age. Collective bargaining is no longer a debated cause; it is an accepted national policy. The duty of industrial statesmanship today is to direct the vast social energy of organized labor, once dissipated in the struggle for union survival, into collaborative productive functions. Labor is ready and eager for such a creative future.

Obviously the rich contribution which organized labor can bring to our economy will not be achieved in an atmosphere of distrust or Government hostility. It cannot develop under an administration which blows hot and cold on labor policies.

It is urgent that the political parties present candidates whose past records give assurance that labor's social gains of the last generation will be confirmed and extended during the coming years. Only thus can we be certain that the teamwork which has lifted American production to such superlative heights during the war crisis will be a permanent part of the American future.

(6) The protection of our national interest: The close of the World War will confront America anew with the problem of our future relations with the world. We recognize the pitfalls which confront statesmanship in grappling with this intricate problem. Already important voices are being raised in our midst urging the Nation to make commitments which would bind us to post-war responsibilities of such incalculable costliness as to bankrupt our home economy. Such commitments would also dangerously increase the possibility of American involvement in future foreign conflicts.

Certainly, America must do its after-war part in alleviating human suffering. As in all previous emergencies, we will give generously to the relief of the destitute in the war-ravaged lands. But we must make certain that such benefactions shall be in the form of terminable gifts, rather than continuing obligations. We cannot embark upon any ruinous policy of raising the standard of life of other peoples at the cost of lowering the living standards of our own population. The

American interest must be paramount in our minds at all times. Labor insists that the candidates in 1944 clarify their positions unmistakably upon this issue.

The maintenance and elevation of the American standard of living is inextricably woven in the foregoing fundamentals. Our American economy is geared to the sustained purchasing power of our wage and salary earners. Only by the preservation of our traditional policies can we avoid a short-sighted post-war assault upon the American wage structure, as was experienced following World War No. 1. As the American people face the unprecedentedly difficult task of after-war reconstruction, the call is for close-ranked unity of all for the general good. We offer this statement of principles as an integrating point for all who will work together for a fearlessly constructive American decision in the 1944 elections.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Hungry Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a statement on the Hungry Horse project delivered by Mr. William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House of Representatives on February 5, 1944. It is my hope that every Member will read this because it sets out in detail the promise which the Hungry Horse holds for us in Montana and also shows how it will be a self-liquidating as well as a worth-while project.

I am appearing today in response to an invitation extended to Commissioner Bashore by the chairman of your committee and Representative MANSFIELD, of Montana, to the Bureau of Reclamation to discuss H. R. 3570. This bill, as you know, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake, as an emergency war project, the construction of the initial stage of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in Flathead County, Mont. The Flathead River is a tributary of the Clark Fork of the Columbia River.

I am not in a position to advise the committee with respect to the views of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, or the Bureau of the Budget in connection with H. R. 3570. Those views are now in process of formulation.

I am glad, however, to give the committee such factual information as the Bureau of Reclamation possesses in regard to the Hungry Horse project.

The Hungry Horse project, sometimes known as the Kalispell project, is one of those which the Bureau of Reclamation has placed on its tentative list of post-war projects. That is not to say that it should not be built now for the purpose of increasing power output in downstream hydroelectric plants for war and other purposes.

The Bureau of Reclamation is interested in the Hungry Horse Dam as a feature of a larger, more comprehensive plan now in preparation for the development by irrigation of the lands in the so-called Kalispell area; for power production for use in Montana; and for flood control and related benefits.

The low dam contemplated in the bill now before you would regulate releases of stored water that would materially increase the firm power capacity at the Grand Coulee Dam and other Columbia River plants. The Bonneville Power Administration, which has charge of the distribution of power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dam will doubtless give you full details of the power needs for war in the Pacific Northwest.

The Hungry Horse Dam would fit in well with an over-all long-range program for the development of the Columbia River Basin. A dam at the Hungry Horse site would provide storage for irrigation of some 80,000 to 100,000 acres of land in the Kalispell area, to which I have referred and which lies just north of Flathead Lake. Therefore, if a dam is to be authorized the committee might wish to consider including authorization for construction of the required irrigation works and systems as well.

Under normal conditions approximately 7 months would be required to purchase the right-of-way, complete field investigations, prepare plans and specifications, let a contract for and begin the construction of a dam such as the Hungry Horse. With the project authorized, ample funds provided, and a high priority given on manpower and materials, this period probably could be shortened. Similarly, under emergency conditions, the construction period to bring the dam to a point where storage would be effective for increasing the firm power supply for war purposes at downstream plants would be materially reduced from the pre-war estimate of 3 to 4 years.

Our engineers believe that a suitable dam at the site would be a concrete structure. They estimate that it would cost about $20,000,000.

The proposed Hungry Horse Dam and reservoir was, I believe, first studied a score of years ago by the United States Geological Survey, which, like the Bureau of Reclamation, is an Interior Department agency. These studies included geological exploration of the dam site and reservoir area, foundation exploration by core drilling of the dam site, and field surveys related to stream flow and the capacities and areas of the reservoir.

The Bureau of Reclamation initiated field surveys in the vicinity of Kalispell, Mont., in the fall of 1940. Water supply studies showed that the natural stream flow of the Flathead River below the junction of the South Fork is adequate for irrigation of the lands in the Kalispell area without storage, and our preliminary plans contemplated a diversion dam in Bad Rock Canyon. Bad Rock Canyon is immediately below the confluence of the South Fork and the main stem of the Flathead River just east of the town of Columbia Falls. This plan would not have required a storage dam. The first examination by geophysical methods, of the diversion site in Bad Rock Canyon indicated that suitable foundation would be found at a depth of about 75 feet below stream bed. Recent core drilling at the best site, topographically, has shown that satisfactory foundation material will not be found within a depth of 300 feet. This leads to the conclusion that a diversion dam raising water to any material height is not practicable at the most favorable site in Bad Rock Canyon. Drilling was undertaken at another and less favorable site, but there is small hope now that it will prove satisfactory.

The tentative opinion of the Bureau engineers at this time, therefore, is that a dam on the main stem of the Flathead River in Bad Rock Canyon is physically infeasible and we, therefore, necessarily must revise our original plan of development for the Kalispell area. One solution for the problem that the failure to find a usable site in Bad Rock Canyon has introduced would be diversion of water from the South Fork a few miles below the Hungry Horse Dam site. This now seems the best. The South Forks natural flows will not provide an adequate water supply without storage and regulation throughout the irrigation season for the irrigation of the acreage of arable but semiarid land that is available in the Kalispell tract. A storage reservoir, therefore, would be needed to make the flow of the South Fork adequate. A reservoir at the Hungry Horse site would serve this purpose and solve the problem of how to get the water that will be required. The Hungry Horse reservoir, in addition, could provide flood protection in the Kalispell Valley, where flood control is greatly needed. It would also make it possible to develop power at the site for use in Montana, and, in addition, it would provide, as has been noted, stream-flow regulation that would be reflected in the increased production of power downstream at all existing plants, at least potentially, and at all power sites that may be developed later on the lower rivers.

The preliminary studies of the Bureau of Reclamation show that the initial development of the Hungry Horse project should include a concrete dam to provide approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet of live or usable storage. This dam would permit the installation of 80,000 kilowatts of power capacity at the site. The ultimate development contemplates a dam to store 1,500,000 acre-feet and permit a total power installation at the site of 142,000 kilowatts.

The power plants downstream that would benefit are the Polson (Kerr) plant of the Montana Power Co.; the Thompson Falls plant, also of the Montana Power Co.; the Grand Coulee plant of the Bureau of Reclamation; the Rock Island plant of the Puget Sound Power Co., and the Bonneville plant of the Corps of Engineers. When the increase in the firm power capacities of the power plants likely to be installed downstream on the Columbia is taken into account, the total firm power capacity directly attributable to the Hungry Horse project would be a very material amount.

Storage at the Hungry Horse dam would permit the installation of another generating unit at the Polson (Kerr) Dam. When constructing the power plant at Polson (Kerr), provision was made by the Montana Power Co. for the future installation of an additional 56,000-kilowatt unit. There are places for additional generators at the Grand Coulee and the Rock Island plants, as well. The Thompson Falls and Bonneville plants do not have provision for installation of additional generators. The benefits to these two plants would be full and immediate for that reason. The Hungry Horse Dam, as has been stated, is important as a unit in the multiple-purpose development of the Columbia River Basin. For some years past it has been urged by the Bonneville Advisory Board, the Corps of Engineers, and more recently, by the newly organized Northwest States Development Association. It has also been considered by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Hungry Horse development is one of the major features of the over-all plan as it bears on the Clark Fork.

Further, the Hungry Horse Dam is a part of the basic program recommended by the State of Montana. It has support throughout the State. Any basic program for water and land development would be seriously weakened by omission of a project of its key character in the drainage basin scheme and in the State and regional economy.

The Hungry Horse Reservoir area is virtually uninhabited. Most of it has been burned over and the second growth is small. There would be relatively little of value lost in submerging the area. Lands that have been developed or that are potentially irrigable in the Flathead watershed lie below the reservoir site.

In addition to providing supplemental storage to increase the firm output of power at downstream plants, the Hungry Horse Dam would make possible, as I indicated earlier, a power plant at the site to serve a potentially important market in Montana. This would encourage the development of mineral resources in this region including silver, lead, copper, and aluminous clays. There are stands of pulp timber sufficient, so our preliminary information indicates, to provide continual operation, with reforestation, a 200-ton paper mill. There would also be a substantial demand for power in connection with the irrigation of lands which would be served from storage in the Hungry Horse Reservoir. Water will have to be lifted from gravity canals by pumps to water more than a third of the lands that are in need of irrigation.

Topographic surveys of approximately 107,000 acres in the Flathead Valley immediately north of Flathead Lake have been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation and it is roughly estimated that from 80,000 to 100,000 acres are irrigable. Most of the land could be served by gravity from the diversion to be made just below Hungry Horse Dam. About 35,000 acres of the total, however, would be served by pumping with 50-foot lifts from the gravity canals. The Hungry Horse power plant would produce, over and above the needs of irrigation pumping, about 370,000,000 kilowatt hours of firm power and 120,000,000 kilowatt hours of secondary energy annually. That means that these amounts would be available for commercial use after the irrigation requirements had been served.

Most of the potentially irrigable area is now dry farmed, and of this approximately 30 percent is devoted to the production of wheat and other small grains. The rainfall, about 7½ inches during the crop-growing season, is inadequate to produce the pasture and forage that is needed for the livestock industry of the area. Such hay crops as are produced are usually limited to one cutting per year. Some potatoes and peas are grown under dry farming methods on these lands but the yields are very low.

With irrigation, the production of potatoes, dairy products, and peas will be substantially increased in the areas now dry-farmed. The present livestock industry would be materially benefited and stabilized as well through the increase in assured forage crops.

Areas presently irrigated below Flathead Lake produce per acre on the average approximately 180 bushels of potatoes, 25 bushels of dried field peas, 35 bushels of wheat (spring and winter), 50 bushels of barley, 85 bushels of oats, 25 bushels of rye, and 3 to 3.5 tons of alfalfa hay. These figures forecast what can be done with irrigation on the Kalispell area. Similar or higher production may be expected in the area north of the lake when irrigation water is available from the Hungry Horse Reservoir. Preliminary information indicates that with irrigation the lands in the Kalispell area will bring about the creation of food and new wealth to the extent of about $2,000,000 annually over and above the present production of these lands.

Studies by the Bureau of Reclamation of flood control and of beneficial effects of such control by the Hungry Horse Dam and Reservoir have been only preliminary and somewhat superficial in nature.

Control of high water flows at Hungry Horse Dam would make it possible to profitably and economically bring about 8,000 or 8,500 acres of marginal lands along the main stem of the Flathead River into sustained production. These lands, because of flooding and threat of flooding, are now used only to produce wild hay. Flood control also would accrue benefit to additional lands and areas in the valley.

The following is a summarization of data extracted from volume II, House Document No. 103, Seventy-third Congress, first session (War Department Report Columbia River and minor tributaries).

The maximum elevation of record on Flathead Lake occurred in 1894, the next highest in 1928, and third highest in 1916.

With 279,000 acre-feet of storage available in the Hungry Horse Reservoir for flood control at the time of the 1894 flood, the elevation on Flathead Lake would have been reduced 3.28 feet, i. e., to approximately elevation 2896.7, and on Pend Oreille by 2.32 feet, i. e., to approximately elevation 2073.8.

Studies of the 1928 flood show that if 135,000 acre-feet of storage had been available in the Hungry Horse Reservoir for flood control, the maximum elevation of Flathead Lake during 1928 would have been reduced from elevation 2896 to 2893 or 3 feet, and that the corresponding reduction in elevations on Pend Oreille would have been from 2068.7 to 2065.8, or 2.90 feet. The 1928 flood studies did not take into account any possible channel storage between Flathead and Pend Oreille Lakes which would have further reduced the computed flood height on Pend Oreille.

With greater amounts of flood storage capacity available than given above, the flood crest heights on both Flathead and Pend Oreille Lakes would be further reduced.

The areas which would benefit from flood control at the Hungry Horse Reservoir are the delta of the Flathead River at the northern end of Flathead Lake and the lands marginal thereto; the lands marginal to Pend Oreille Lake and the city of Sand Point.

If the Hungry Horse Dam is to be authorized at this time, the Bureau of Reclamation feels that the authorization might well include the development of the lands in the Kalispell area by irrigation. These lands could be served by a canal system tentatively estimated to cost $12,000,000. This irrigation development, of course, should await the end of the war.

The Bureau of Reclamation has not completed its engineering report on the Kalispell or Hungry Horse project, and therefore the information I have given is but tentative at this time. Present indications are that a multiple-purpose development, including Hungry Horse Dam and power plant and transmission lines, and the irrigation system, would cost about $40,000,000. The benefits would exceed the cost materially, and have been roughly calculated as follows:

	Annually
Irrigation benefits	$2,000,000
Local power benefits	650,000
Downstream power benefits	300,000
Flood control	100,000

Bricker in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

BRICKER IN WASHINGTON

(By Mark Sullivan)

CANDID CANDIDATE

Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, came to Washington last week, delivered a Lincoln birthday address, met and answered questions of upward of 50 newsmen at a press conference; made an impromptu address, and answered a volley of questions at a luncheon of the National Press Club. It was this luncheon perhaps that gave the best opportunity to get an impression of Mr. Bricker. In an impromptu address he is more himself than in prepared speeches. Contrary to the custom of speakers at the Press Club, he did not ask that what he said be "off the record." And he answered every question asked. He seemed to practice this candor, not in any spirit of self-conscious virtue, nor with any faintest innuendo of invidious comparison with men in politics who prefer to speak off the record, but in simple naturalness.

What brought a large audience of keenly observant newsmen to listen to Mr. Bricker—indeed, what brought him to Washington—was his candidacy for the Republican Presidential nomination. As to that, the newsmen know that at this stage Mr. Bricker ranks third, possibly lower—that is far behind Governor Dewey, of New York, and Mr. Wendell Willkie. But regardless of what fortune may attend Mr. Bricker's present race, he is, as a new figure emerging on the national scene, a real addition to the ranks of public men competent for national leadership.

He made a definite impression—definiteness is a trait in him, a marked one. His intelligence is extremely high—but utterly without subtlety. Acting or pose is foreign to him. He is direct and concrete, rarely speaks in abstractions, is most at home when dealing with facts and conditions. One gathers that most of what now composes his excellent mind came to him more from experience than from words he read or heard—he has learned the art of government through the check of experience upon theory. Though he has spent much of his life in politics, he is completely without the oversuavity that is part of the art of some public men. About Mr. Bricker there is no art nor artfulness, nor adroitness nor indirection. Yet decidedly he is not artless, in the sense of being naive. On the contrary he is shrewd and penetrating.

In what he said one thing stood out—concern for safeguarding the individual against exactions and compulsions by government. To this end, he distrusts bureaucracy. To the same end he distrusts centralized government at Washington—prefers local government as being nearer to the people, hence less likely to oppress the people, and more easy for the people to change. He showed a trace of vehemence when he said that the State government of Ohio is carried on by 20,600 employees—while there are in the State 111,000 agents of government who derive their authority from distant Washington. In so large a bureaucracy—with its double tendency to perpetuate itself and to expand—Mr. Bricker sees not merely waste, and not merely danger to the liberty of the citizen. He sees political danger—danger to free elections, danger to democracy.

The inevitable question was asked him—supposed by defenders of bureaucracy to be a "killer" question: "Just how would you reduce the number of Government agencies and employees?" Mr. Bricker, without pretending to be detailed in a 1-minute answer to an offhand question, mentioned two broad principles. At the end of the war he would demobilize all wartime agencies and return to Congress the powers under which they operate. And he would decentralize to the States much of the work now done at Washington, or by Federal employees sent out from Washington. He spoke almost with indignation of Federal employees coming to State capitals and county seats—to duplicate, or overlap, or supplant work already being done by employees of local government.

Some of the pointed questions thrust at Mr. Bricker assumed that it was in the field of internationalism that he would be least at home, most likely to show inadequacy. And in answering these questions he did have the careful deliberateness of a man who is

exploring a new field and is careful to go sure-footedly. In saying there must be a cooperative association of nations, he was prompt and forthright. He said there must be an association of nations, not only for preserving peace, but for purposes of expanding international trade. But one felt that if Mr. Bricker were given responsibility for erecting an international structure, in a field new to him and to everybody else, he would subject each step to the test of practicality—but would build an institution that would work and endure.

Parsons in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the New York Times of Sunday, February 13, entitled "Parsons in Uniform." This editorial is remarkable, not only in the eloquent and beautiful language in which it is couched but it pays a worthy tribute to a class of our soldiers not mentioned enough, namely, those great men who unselfishly devote their lives to the saving of the souls of human beings.

PARSONS IN UNIFORM

An American military chaplain is killed while ministering to the dying on an Italian battlefield. Another is decorated for valor on a shell-torn beachhead in the Solomons. Continually the news columns testify to the gallant service of the "parsons in uniform." Come to think, wasn't it one of these men whose Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition gave us our first song of this war?

Thousands of them have left the security of church and manse to descend into the hell of war with our Nation's youth. They keep alive the spiritual values in the hundreds of chapels in the camps and posts of this land, but they do not stop there. They go wherever the troops march, the ships sail, the warplanes fly. Ready to preach or to die, they save bodies and minds and souls.

They mark the graves of the fallen. They write letters of comfort to the home folks of the wounded. They solace the sick. They give hope to men despairing of life in the field hospitals. And they listen to the troubles that burden the soldier's heart—troubles the soldier will confide to no one but "the padre."

Scores of tales of the devotion of their calling come back from the fighting fronts. One chaplain is nicknamed The Lord's Postman. One constructs a portable sanctuary, airborne, for men on lonely jungle outposts. One makes a worthy communion chalice out of fragments of a wrecked plane. A Negro chaplain does his bit for Army morale as pastor of a labor battalion engaged in the dull, glamourless drudgery of a supply line far behind the battle zone.

Characteristic of them all is one chaplain who wins the Silver Star, yet won't talk of his exploit. A modern St. Paul, he says, "I could tell of narrow escapes, of strafings, bombings, digging for my life, hunger and thirst, and many other things which are mere incidents along the way." But he prefers to tell of the courage and the patient endurance of the men of his outfit, which to him are a sign of "lovely and imperishable things in each soldier's heart and memory."

The Oil Shortage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WHN, Mutual Broadcasting System, February 14, 1944:

I will assert at the outset that the shortage of petroleum we are now experiencing could have been greatly minimized and perhaps prevented had there been as much attention given to the job in the United States by official Washington as is being given to oil development plans thousands of miles from home.

We were given official notice on February 3 that the oil situation is going to get much worse. It was then said by the Petroleum Administrator in a press release that civilian consumers of the Eastern States are entering a critical 90-day period when it will be "touch and go whether civilian demand can be supplied." The rationed demand has been met partly from the inventories on hand but these have been so reduced that they can no longer be counted upon.

There is no relief in sight, for nothing is being done—no plan is being proposed except continued and undoubtedly more severe rationing. In the event that anyone has reached the happy conclusion that the recently announced pipe-line project in Arabia will help us at home, I will perform the sad duty of removing that impression. That affair, if it comes to anything at all, belongs in the post-war era. It can have no possible bearing on our situation for it will require 2 years to finish it after it has once been started. It will not even contribute anything to our military operations, unless the European phase of the war drags out far longer than the military spokesmen expect it to.

We are wholly on our own in this country for an oil supply to win this war and to provide the essential petroleum needs of the civilian and industrial users. The demands for the military program increase steadily and the civilian shortage grows more acute.

The tragic pity of it is that something could have been done. The oil producers—the independent oil producers—began 2½ years ago to warn that unless they were put into position where they could increase their efforts a shortage would come. Abiding fully by the wartime emergency controls that were established, they went to the agencies to whom control had been given and told their story. Day after day and week after week they tried to get the professors and the economists to understand that they had to drill for oil and that drilling costs money. If drilling is stopped, the oil supply will fail.

All the predictions have come to pass. The consumer who nurses along his meager allowance, the householder who cannot get enough oil to warm his home, the farmer who spends precious hours away from his work to prove that he needs gasoline to do his farming—all these know there is a shortage. Not all of them know that it could have been avoided.

A few simple figures will tell the story eloquently. In 1941, 29,000 wells were drilled. Last year the number was 17,800. Last year the oil fields of the United States yielded about one and one-half billion barrels of crude oil and that was one billion and a quarter more barrels than were found in the new fields discovered. The bank account is being drawn upon at a rate more than seven times as great as the deposits are being made in the form of new discoveries.

Nor did that meet the demand. It was necessary to draw out of the storage tanks of the Nation an average of 54,000 barrels a day during 1943 and the withdrawals are getting greater, for in January of this year—the month just passed—about 350,000 barrels was the average daily draft upon the above-ground stocks.

The oil producers' case is simply this: His costs have gone up, like all other costs in all other industries, and the price freeze on crude oil has left him standing helplessly by watching the gap between costs and income narrow to the point where he can no longer do business. A mere break-even basis permits of no expansion. For many producers owning thousands of oil wells it is no longer that good; it is an out-of-pocket loss.

With a regularity that has become monotonous, oil producers are selling their properties to the large companies and retiring from the business. Such transactions add nothing to the oil supply. They remove from the business the genius and the skill of the men who know how to find and to produce oil, and the trend is toward a monopoly of ownership—a monopoly that is being fostered by Government policy.

Producing costs have gone up greatly since 1941. The cost of finding new oil by the drilling of wildcats, as the industry calls exploratory wells, has advanced fourfold since 1938.

The assertion is made by men who know that every barrel of oil produced in the United States today is selling for less than the cost of replacing it.

What has happened to price? Well, in 1941, at the time crude-oil prices were frozen, the national average was $1.17 per barrel, and it has now gotten to $1.20. The Office of Price Administration has doled out a few raises, 3 cents here, 5 cents there, 12 cents in another place, and in one burst of recklessness, 25 cents, affecting a few thousand barrels a day of a heavy fuel grade of oil in California—after the Navy had demanded that something be done to get some more fuel oil for the ships. These sporadic advances, widely scattered, served in more than 2 years' time to bring up the national average only 3 cents a barrel.

That could bring no results, and it brought none. Three cents will not offset over 60 cents average increase in costs. Such puny raises as were made were on small quantities of oil, and the greater portion of the Nation's production was not affected at all. In one State, for example, where more than a quarter million barrels daily are produced, the only price raise was 10 cents per barrel in 1 field that produces 200 barrels.

The result is being witnessed in another vital way. The abandonment of oil wells is on the increase. The owners cannot pay out more money than they take in, so they call the salvage dealer and sell the equipment from the small wells. In 1942 there were more than 10,000 producing wells abandoned, and last year there were more than 13,000 of these economic casualties. This is happening when the Nation needs every barrel and every gallon of oil that can be produced.

There are more than 400,000 oil wells in the United States. Their production ranges from a fraction of a barrel per day to several hundred barrels. Three-fourths of the total number are of the class known in the industry as stripper wells. They produce 15 to 20 percent of the national total. It is, of course, this class of wells whose equipment can be sold for scrap steel for more than the owners can realize in several years from the sale of oil.

Nearly every one of these 300,000 stripper wells could be stimulated in its daily production. The operators know many methods by which they can make the wells yield more. In my district there was originated the principal method of getting more out of the old fields after the natural pressure was gone.

Water is put into the producing sand and oil is thereby forced into adjacent oil wells. The method has also been used with success in other States in recent years. The results are notable, but the costs are high. Today, little new work is being done of this kind. Under price conditions that would have enabled the producers to apply this or other suitable methods, our oil production could be much higher.

The same economic vise has been applied to wildcatting. The Petroleum Administrator early in 1943 urged the industry to drill a minimum of 4,500 wells of the exploratory type—the wells which might find new fields. The response of the industry, trying as hard as it could, was a thousand wells less than the number Mr. Ickes pleaded for.

The obvious safeguards to our oil supply were disregarded. Instead, we were given the Canol project—$135,000,000 worth. It consists of a macaroni-size pipe line and a tea kettle refinery up near the Arctic Circle and all on Canadian soil. It may, if it ever gets into operation—it has been nearly 2 years in the making—it may deliver 3,000 barrels of crude oil a day to be distributed along the Alaska highway, which highway, incidentally, no longer is relied upon to deliver much freight to Alaska. Compare this 3,000 barrels with the daily production of four and one-half million barrels in the United States.

Now we are threatened with a pipe-line project across the sands of Arabia, to cost from $130,000,000 to $165,000,000, and nothing of this kind ever costs as little as the first estimates call for; Canol started out to be a $25,000,000 project and went up $110,000,000. Add Canol and Arabia together and there is nearly $300,000,000 of the taxpayers' money—all outside this country and neither doing anything to help the oil supply that is of concern to you and me—the oil to win this war and to take a little strain off that A coupon.

It seems to be out of date in some circles to display a concern for the people of the United States, but I am old-fashioned. I want to see something done about the oil supply here, not in the far north or the Middle East. I share the faith of the thousands of oil producers and oil geologists that there are vast treasures of oil to be found here in our own country. I believe, with the oil producers, that the new fields can be found and the old ones given new life, and that the total of the effort expended in that direction will amount to many billion barrels of oil right here at home. We have 20 States with their hundreds of communities where the production of oil is a vital part of the economy, yielding taxes for the maintenance of local and State government, the support of schools, and the lifeblood of the business of such communities. Labor has a stake in this matter. There are many thousands who work in the oil industry. Shall they seek new occupations, or go to Arabia?

The sole argument against doing something here at home is that it would cost the consumer. Well, I have yet to see the owner of an automobile who would not be glad to spend 3 or 4 cents a week and get more gasoline thereby. In another form, taxes, it is now planned to use the consumers' money on foreign ventures—with Government getting into the oil business as a proprietor.

The House of Representatives has taken affirmative action on this oil-shortage problem. It passed a bill in December which would compel the O. P. A. to raise the price of crude oil and let the producers get to work. The bill is now in a Senate committee. Our oil discovery and producing effort has been running down for more than 2 years. Our action in the House was for the purpose of correcting the shortage of a most essential resource.

President Roosevelt Acts To Reopen Mail Facilities Between the United States and Occupied Areas of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Maj. Gen. Edwin M. Watson, secretary to President Roosevelt, and also a letter from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, addressed to the President. The letters relate to the reopening of mail facilities between the United States and occupied areas of Italy.

I feel certain that Americans of Italian origin throughout America will hail the action of President Roosevelt in making possible the exchange of personal letters between their relatives in those sections of Italy now occupied by our troops and themselves. This action will also serve to strengthen the ties of genuine friendship between the Italian people and our American boys in Italy.

The letters follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 12, 1944.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of January 31. The matter about which you write was promptly taken up with the Secretary of War, and there is enclosed herewith for your information copy of his communication addressed to the President on the 1st. It is self-explanatory.

Very sincerely yours,
EDWIN M. WATKINS,
Major General, United States Army,
Secretary to the President.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1944.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have your memorandum concerning mail service in Sicily and southern Italy. Limited internal service now exists in portions of the occupied areas which accounts for the Italian stamps mentioned in your memorandum. However, no regular international postal service for these areas is presently available.

Every effort is being made to resume postal communications between Allied and neutral countries and those portions of Italian territory now controlled by Allied troops. Before resumption can be effected, internal postal facilities in occupied areas must be fully restored, adequate provisions made for military security and censorship, and necessary arrangements made for transportation. It is also necessary to establish complete agreement on limitations and procedures with the United Kingdom.

At present it is expected that resumption of service for mail of a personal character will be permitted on or about February 15, 1944, for Sicily, Sardinia, and the 10 Provinces of Bari, Brindisi, Catanzaro, Sosenza, Lecce, Matera, Potenza, Reggio di Calabria, Salerno, and Taranto, and occupied Italian territories in Africa. A press notice is now in process of preparation and will be released prior to resumption of service.

As additional Provinces are occupied, service will be resumed as rapidly as practicable. Commercial, business, or financial correspondence will be resumed at a later date upon completion of agreements now under discussion between the United Kingdom and interested Government agencies of the United States.

Postage for correspondence addressed to Italy will be in accordance with appropriate foreign-mail rates at present in operation. Both Italian Government and Allied Military Government postage will be available in Italy.

Respectfully yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON.

To Boys in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in submitting herewith a copy of a letter to the boys in the service, printed in the February 3, 1944, issue of my home-town paper, the Shamrock Texan.

This letter is one of a series written by my good friend, Bob Douglas, and enjoyed by Shamrock and Wheeler County boys wherever they might be stationed in all parts of the world.

Now, Bob would be embarrassed if he knew I was placing this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I did want him to know these letters are most appreciated, not only by our boys in the armed service of the Nation but also by those of us back here at home:

To the Boys in Service:

We here at home have not yet begun to make the sacrifice that you boys have, and although we complain at times about rationing and other Government regulations that are placed upon us, I do not think that we have begun to do our very best, but I am telling you that I do think that we have begun to realize some of the things that we must do before this thing is over, and I am telling you that you can depend on the Panhandle and Wheeler County folks to come through in a big way.

This last week I had a boy to come into the store and start a conversation with me, and I sure hated to ask him his name, in fact, I did not, but I finally found out who he was by asking his father, and he was the Gunter boy from Allison who is now stationed at Las Vegas, N. Mex., and he said that he was doing fine but sure would like to get going from where he was stationed as he felt that he had served his time there.

Charlie Vanpool came up the street very early one morning and was sure stepping and the very first thing that he said to me was that I did not know him, but I told him that I did, and he seemed mighty happy to be home for a few days, and said that there were some things that he had rather do than be in the service, but as this was his line of work for the present he was going to make the most of it and at the same time make the very best soldier that he knew how.

Dorothy Reynolds was in this past week and said that she and Burford were here for a few days, and that they were doing

fine, and that she hoped that this affair would be over soon that they may, with the rest of the boys, be back home again for keeps.

Orvil Cooper was also in here this past week, and I am telling you that he has grown, not too much in height, but in width he has taken up plenty of space, and really looks good.

N. D.—Blue was also in to see me and I would never have recognized him, but he told me about me helping him on one occasion and that this help really was worth a lot to him and that it had meant much to him in the service and that the only thing that concerned him now was just how soon this would be over and he could get back home. Each of you should see Jack Sims. I can't say that he has spread out any but he has surely taken on more altitude, but at the same time has that kid look on his face. I really enjoyed talking to him and have another chat or two coming up with him.

I wish that each of you could see a picture sent to me by Aubrey Caudell this past week. It shows six servicemen with two big bears, one weighing 1,400 pounds, and the other 850 pounds, and he told me that it was the only thing that any group had shown him that he could not think of something bigger and better in Texas.

I had a very interesting letter from Bud Sims this past week and he wanted to know the address of any of the boys from here that was near him. Said that he felt that he could get off a few hours and pay them a visit and if it was at all possible to send him their names that he would sure appreciate it.

I may have received a lot more of some types of food than I received this past week but to tell you the truth, J. H. Jackson brought me two of the nicest venison steaks that I have ever had and on top of that Dennis and Bert Betenbough brought me some of the very choicest mountain oysters or calf fries that I have ever had and I am telling you that they were really fine and if there is anything that I like better it is more of these.

Do not forget to write the home folks each day, be good sports, cheer some lonesome buddy each day and go to church often.

Your friend,

BOB DOUGLAS.

Portrait of a School Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, outside of the home, the school teacher has the greatest influence in building the life and character of a child. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the teachers of this country, who have done and are doing a great work in preparing our boys and girls to be the citizens of tomorrow. Typical has been the fine work of Miss Eva Moore, of Arkadelphia, Ark. After 39 years of teaching in the schools of that city, she has resigned. She has influenced the lives of many of our citizens, many of whom are outstanding in their vocations. A deserving tribute was given to her in a news article appearing in the Siftings Herald, Arkadelphia, Ark., on February 9, 1944, as follows:

MISS EVA MOORE RESIGNS AFTER 39 YEARS OF TEACHING

Miss Eva Moore resigned her position as teacher in the Arkadelphia Elementary School last month. During her 39 years of employment in this district she has served as principal of the elementary school, as critic supervisor of practice teachers who were enrolled at Ouachita and Henderson State Teachers College, and as grade teacher.

At the time of her resignation she was teaching the fifth grade, which meets in the Methodist Church during the reconstruction of the elementary-school building. Friends will be glad to know that Miss Eva is recovering from illness that necessitated her resignation.

Teachers and pupils with whom she came in contact regret the absence of such a master teacher.

The poem which follows describes a master teacher:

THE TWO TEMPLES

A builder builded a temple,
He wrought with care and skill,
Pillars and groins and arches
Were fashioned to meet his will.
And men said, when they saw its beauty,
"It shall never know decay,
Great is thy skill, O builder,
Thy fame shall endure for aye."

A teacher builded a temple,
She wrought with skill and care,
Forming each pillar with patience,
Laying each stone with care.
None saw the unceasing effort;
None knew of the marvelous plan;
For the temple the teacher builded
Was unseen by the eyes of man.

Gone is the builder's temple,
Crumbled into the dust,
Pillars and groins and arches
Food for consuming rust.
But the temple the teacher builded
Shall endure while the ages roll;
For that beautiful unseen temple
Was a child's immortal soul.

—*Author unknown.*

The Income Tax Forms Must Be Simplified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the income-tax forms must be simplified. There is no justification for the procedures our citizens are forced to go through in order to pay their taxes to their Government. They are not complaining about the payments due but they are protesting the methods used. The present tax form is a complicated crazy quilt that no one can readily understand. The fertile brains that thought it up have rendered a distinct disservice to the American people and to the Nation as a whole.

I have been informed that the tax form is the product of the congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and Mr. Randolph Paul's division in the Treasury Department. I would like to suggest to the House that the Bureau of Internal Revenue which is responsible for the collection of taxes should also be made responsible for making out the income-tax forms. The collectors and agents of the Internal Revenue Bureau work with taxes, know the taxpayers' feelings, know the mistakes in the law, and consequently are in a position to recommend a form that would be most reasonable to all.

If we want to know something about military affairs, we go to the Army; if we want naval information we go to the Navy; therefore, I think it is only proper to go to the Internal Revenue Bureau for assistance in simplifying tax forms. Let us forget the lawyers and go to those who know this particular business and get their advice. They are the closest to the people who pay the taxes and they are the ones who will know the answers. Mr. Speaker, the income-tax forms must be simplified.

Speedy Remedy by the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 28 in extending my remarks under the title "Waste Basket Fodder," I included a letter from one of my good friends in the newspaper business in California. This letter and my own statement criticized the Office of Price Administration and other Government agencies for the large number of news releases that are sent out by regional offices to daily and weekly newspapers all over the country. Most of this news, I tried to point out, has already been released from Washington through the various press services and is bound to be pretty old and cold when it is rehashed and published a second or third time.

Well, believe it or not, the spark struck tinder. A few days after my remarks appeared in the RECORD I received a letter from an old friend of mine who is now in charge of the Office of Congressional Information in the O. P. A. His communication reads, in part, as follows:

I am in Washington with O. P. A., in charge of its Office of Congressional Information, and noticed the letter you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28 from a friend criticizing the number of O. P. A. releases to newspapers.

Having once run the business end of the New York Evening Post, I don't think I entirely agree with him. Our releases are mostly about individual regulations covering various products. Many of them get no general news releases and are of interest only to certain localities, but in those localities the interest in them is intense. A regulation covering lettuce and sugar beets, for example, would not be general news, but it would be vital to the people of Salinas, or Gonzales, or King City. It would pay the papers there to get and review all our releases for the sake of those of special local interest.

But why argue? An order has gone out to all our regional offices to analyze all releases, eliminate any needless ones, and to

circularize all newspapers receiving releases asking if they want to continue to receive them. A return post card will be enclosed. Further, even if a paper returns the card but makes no use of our releases, it is to be cut off the list. I imagine your friend will very soon be relieved of receipt of the unwelcome O. P. A. releases, at least if he means what he says.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call particular attention to one sentence quoted above. "An order has gone out to all our regional offices to analyze all releases, eliminate needless ones, and to circularize all newspapers receiving releases asking if they want to continue to receive them." This attitude is gratifying indeed and the O. P. A. is to be commended for the attempt it is making to reduce nonessential expenditures.

What a fine thing it would be if all other Federal agencies would follow the example set by the Office of Price Administration. What savings in paper, manpower, and taxpayer's money could be made. I don't know, but I hope, I hope.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which was taken from the Elkins (W. Va.) Intermountain:

WASHINGTON DEADWOOD

Congressman ANDERSON of California has recommended that the House of Representatives order drastic reduction of funds allowed Government information agencies for the printing of so-called news, which, he argued, is stale before it reaches the press. In support of his proposal he pointed out that although private publishers have had their paper supplies cut almost a fourth, Federal agencies have increased their use of paper by 40 percent.

Here is a proposal which merits more attention than it is likely to receive. There are few things in this life more useless, as any newspaperman can testify, than the press hand-outs of governmental agencies. Yet they clutter up every mail delivery to every newspaper office in the land.

Here is a relatively small but, we suspect, characteristic bit of evidence of the extravagance of our Federal Government. It reflects that expansiveness of the bureaucratic mind responsible for the lavish use of money which, according to Senator BYRD, is making the war cost twice as much as it should cost.

Eliminate the Red Tape—Let Us Trust to the Honesty of Those in the Armed Forces and Let Them Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read where the War Food Administration proposes to distribute amongst the farmers of this country $290,000,000 in connection with the soil-conservation program. This, of course, is for the purpose of increasing the output of needed crops. I have no complaint in reference to this program. I do desire, however, to point out that the War Food Administration has come to the conclusion that it is going to trust to the honesty of the farmers in connection with the distribution of this money, as it proposes to let the farmers make their own reports as to whether or not they complied with the agreements. In other words, as I take it, if a farmer states he has complied, he will receive his check. I am willing to trust to the honesty of the farmer in connection with this program.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, if we can trust the farmers of this country where money is involved we can likewise trust to the honesty of those in the armed forces to cast their votes in the election in November. Those who wear the uniform of their country and who are willing to lay down their lives for their country should not be denied an opportunity, with all red tape eliminated, to vote in the November election. In calling this to the attention of the House I hope that the conferees will bring back a bill that will provide for a Federal ballot and will not require those in the armed forces to have their applications and their ballots sworn to before a superior officer. Yes, let us trust to the honesty of the men and women who are in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an editorial published in the Washington Post entitled "I Refuse" and also a letter to the Washington Star from a member of the Navy, who has just returned from serving 18 months in the South Pacific, on this subject.

[From the Washington Star]

FEDERAL BALLOT PREFERRED BY ADVOCATE OF SOLDIERS VOTING

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Having returned from an 18-month stay in the South Pacific, it has occurred to me that I might be able to present the view of an overseas veteran concerning the issue of veterans voting, now pending before Congress.

My company of a naval construction battalion was separated from the other companies by hundreds of miles; in fact, for more than a year, no two companies were together for more than a few weeks at a time, although the battalion still remained the administrative unit. In my company were men representing 39 States. The battalion included men from all the States. In order for those men to have an opportunity to vote this fall, under existing State laws, it will be necessary for each man to write to his home and request to be registered; therefore, to obtain from home a formal application for an absentee voters' ballot, fill it out and send it to the proper official at his home; then, within the time limits set by law, the clerk will mail the requested ballot; when the soldier receives it (if ever) he may mark it and start it back. Unless it arrives so many days before the election day it will not be counted.

Ordinary mail from the east coast reached me in the southwest Pacific in an average of 3 weeks after mailing date; V-mail in about half that time; second-class mail in 2 months (if I were fortunate).

It readily will be seen that the statutory time limits will not permit an overseas serviceman to vote his own regular State ballot. The question of advancing dates by emergency legislation still will not dispose of many technical difficulties until a uniform law for all States is adopted—registration, poll taxes, printing ballots, holding up the time for counting, etc., requiring a uniform treatment. If that is not done millions will be deprived of their constitutional right of voting.

If uniform ballots are made legal, then large consignments can be sent to each base and each man, regardless of his home State, may send his ballot home to be counted. If the two Presidential candidates' names appear, then he can vote a straight ballot just as a voter at home. Anyone in the States who votes for the head of the ticket and nowhere else is presumed to vote for everyone on that ticket. Why should a different rule be adopted for a soldier, sailor, or marine? Does anyone really question the ability of one of them to vote for his choice, or is it simply the desire of Congressmen to prevent their voting because they believe they know how the majority of servicemen will vote?

They all profess to be determined that every "vet" will get to vote. Then why not leave out the technical discussions of constitutionality (which applies to peacetime elections) and remove all obstacles in the way of every veteran's legal vote?

Who in the United States has a better right to help select his Governors than the man or the woman who is giving his or her life for it?

I. R. MURPHY,
Carpenter's Mate (1st cl.), United States Naval Reserve.

[From the Washington Post]

"I REFUSE"

Any soldier vote bill that comes out of conference committee without provision for a Federal ballot would be an advertisement to servicemen everywhere that their Congress is not prepared to turn a finger in enabling them to participate in this year's great decision. We would hesitate to be so accused if we were a Member of Congress. It would be compounding this neglect with hypocrisy to assert that a State ballot will give the servicemen the same voting opportunity as a Federal ballot. The President declared that this would be practicing a fraud upon the serviceman. He didn't put too harsh a word upon it. Consider the State of New York. The list of candidates in New York State prepared by the State war ballot commission is a book of 900 printed pages. Clearly this cannot be carried by air mail. It would go by ordinary mail. So would the other State ballots. Thus, with the dates of most primaries falling in late summer and early fall, there would be no chance at all of the servicemen, who are now scattered over the earth's surface, and who are subject to constant change-of-duty station, receiving State ballots in time to fill out and return by election day. Merely a recommendation to the States to expedite and facilitate voting procedures would be tantamount to a denial of the voting privilege. Let that be clearly understood.

Voting under Federal auspices is the only feasible method of soldier voting. All that the conferees are asked to do is to set up Federal machinery. They are no longer asked to repeal State law, as they would have been under the original Lucas-Green-Worley measures. All that is now entailed is that the Federal Government would prepare and distribute by air mail a simplified uniform ballot for Federal offices, collect the executed ballots, and provide for their distribution to the election officials of the voter's State. All persons qualified under State law to vote would then be assured that their votes would be counted. No constitutional right of the State would be infringed by this Federal act of helpfulness. The inclusion of a Federal ballot—of servicemen voting under Federal auspices—is the irreducible minimum of what Congress should do. The conferees, conscious of their obligation to the servicemen, will, we hope, repeat with Representative WORLEY:

"I refuse to say to the men and women in the armed forces that Congress will do nothing to protect their franchise where State procedures fail. I refuse to say to the soldiers and sailors overseas that the Constitution of

the United States, which is strong enough to put them in uniform and place them under the fire of the enemy, which enables us to remove them from the civil courts and subject them to military law, is too weak to empower the Congress of the United States to protect our fighting men against the loss of their right to vote.

Global Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting to the Congress a recent letter by Hon. Robert L. Owen, one of Oklahoma's most distinguished sons and former Senator, with further explanation of his global alphabet. Senator Owen, who for so many years in the United States Senate crusaded for many reforms, is now battling for world literacy through the adoption of a global alphabet, based on phonetic characters that are capable of representing in a written form all of the sounds of the languages of the world.

The letter printed herein further explains this great work:

JANUARY 19, 1944.

NEW HAVEN JOURNAL-COURIER,
New Haven, Conn.

GENTLEMEN: The New Haven Journal-Courier's excellent commentary on the global alphabet was received. It is right in referring to the 47 sounds of the English language but this has been fully covered by the global alphabet which uses 33 letters of immutable sounds, which in combination make every sound referred to.

The global alphabet does not contemplate standardizing any language. It only proposes to make visible to the eye the spoken sounds as employed in conversation, which it can do and does do effectively, thereby enabling books of instruction to put the spoken words of any foreign language interlinear with English of identical meaning, thereby enabling any very cheap book costing probably not exceeding 10 cents as a book of instruction for the Englishman to quickly learn the words and pronunciation of any foreign language and to enable anyone speaking a foreign language to immediately read and pronounce the English equivalent to the words of his own language. This is precisely what is done in a very inadequate manner now used by the Army and Navy in teaching American soldiers and sailors to speak a foreign language but they are compelled to use English letters which have multiple meanings and their method requires instruction by an individual teacher using his voice and records recording the sounds of the voice in English. The global alphabet avoids this pitfall and the need for records or the human voice of the instructor.

You say with truth that the present English spelling is a "hodgepodge of the sort that makes the language a nightmare to adult students learning it for the first time." This valid objection is completely met by the global alphabet. The President referred the petition on the global alphabet to the United States Senate, Senate Document 133, to the State Department, which is now studying the matter with a view to determining its claims of perfect efficiency.

Eleven books are now available prepared under the direction of Prof. Mario A. Pei, of Columbia University, and 60 linguists cooperating with him for teaching the principal languages of the world to English students. His book, Languages for War and Peace contain 7 of these books. It is published by S. F. Vanni, of New York. These books could be printed in the global alphabet, which is not only phonetic but stenographic, enabling the people of the world with the pen to write their own language with great speed and ease.

The global alphabet is a revolution and can be employed to abolish illiteracy throughout the world by enabling the world to write every sound of any human language stenographically.

The illiteracy of Russia has been abolished by the phonetic alphabets employed in Russian and in over 200 of its dialects. Illiteracy is being rapidly abolished by the work of Dr. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., and his associates operating with the cooperation of over 120 foreign missionary societies in over 80 different nations using the special phonetic alphabets devised by Dr. Laubach. Their production should be increased in like manner.

I send you under separate cover the proof of the truth of these statements. I thank you for your excellent editorial and I agree that my chief obstacle in persuading the world is the apathy, indifference, and possible opposition of literary men who are content with the hodgepodge spelling to which you refer. Our obligation to literary men justifies our thanks to them for what they have done, but they cannot stand in the way of the mechanism already employed by over 350 nationalities wich are now spelling and printing books with the phonetic alphabet, alphabets which can be learned in 1 day and in which hundreds of thousands of new books in the phonetic alphabet are now being printed. In Russia this alphabet and the intensive education of the people with it has regenerated Russia and already has increased its production over 400 percent. When all nations adopt the phonetic system, the production of the world will be correspondingly increased, creating a world of abundance which will result in other nations sending their surplus to America for credits with which to buy the products of New Haven and of America and of other friendly nations.

Prof. Pei's instruction books in teaching foreign languages conversationally employ only about 1,200 words which are sufficient for conversation dealing with social and commercial matters, but this opens the door to all other words required. It must be remembered in phonetic printing the symbols employed are not supposed to be microscopic, but only sufficient to bring to the mind by the symbols and the context the spoken word. This has been proved to be sufficient. Moses wrote Genesis with 22 phonetic letters. It sufficed.

Yours very respectfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Eternal Vigilance—The Price of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day celebration in Wheeling, W. Va., on Saturday evening, February 12, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow citizens, it is a special privilege for me to come to West Virginia to join with you in the observance of the birthday of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, a distinguished son of your neighboring State of Kentucky. It is a special pleasure because your State of West Virginia was one of the chief supporters of Abraham Lincoln's policies. West Virginia, as I happen to know, is especially proud of her war Governor, that great statesman and courageous leader, Francis H. Pierpont. As I recall history, it was Governor Pierpont who became the first Governor of the commonwealth of West Virginia after the meeting of county delegates at Wheeling on May 13, 1861, had arranged for delegates from the 25 western counties of what is now known as West Virginia, to organize the new State, to support Lincoln and the Union. It was then, as I recall history, that the distinguished and courageous Francis H. Pierpont was elected Governor, and it was under his leadership that the State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union in 1863.

Your State chose Governor Pierpont as its most distinguished son when it placed the life-size statue of him in Statuary Hall in the House wing of the Capitol. I pass that statue of West Virginia's war Governor many times a day in going to and fro between my office just off the Statuary Hall and the House floor. The heavily bearded face always awakens in me an admiration for those sturdy statesmen of that other day.

Abraham Lincoln and Francis H. Pierpont were both men who were convinced that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Your Republicans in Congress have been trying to exercise that eternal vigilance because it is through your Congress and through your Congress alone that you can implement your eternal vigilance and so protect your liberty.

I want to express to you my appreciation of the fact that you have chosen to send to the House of Representatives three men outstanding for their efforts to preserve our constitutional form of government. One of them, ANDREW SCHIFFLER, my good friend of many years, is your Representative from Wheeling. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH is your able Representative from Glenville, and HUBERT SUMMERS ELLIS, of Huntington, is the third. These men are powerful advocates of free government and are commanding attention by reason of their able and energetic services in the House of Representatives. The election of CHAPMAN REVERCOMB to the Senate added another able and powerful advocate of constitutional government.

These three representatives and Senator REVERCOMB have been identified with the struggle which is going on in the Congress to preserve our constitutional form of Government, to restore sanity in the spending of the people's money, and to prevent a ruthless, arrogant, power-lustful bureaucracy from fastening its clutches permanently upon the people.

This fight for free government is not a new one. It is not a development of the last few years. It is as old as civilization itself. It will continue to be a struggle just so long as free government exists because as Abraham Lincoln said in response to a serenade in 1864, "Human nature will not change. In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this (day) we shall have as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as good and as bad."

We have today those who, under cover of the perils and struggles of this world war, would overturn our constitutional governmental system, our free-enterprise system, our free-social system, and set up a powerful centralized Federal Government as the

paternalistic protector and director of all the peoples lives and activities. That would be the very definition of tyranny, and yet to these misguided people who want to accomplish it, it seems like the easiest way. In all ages there are people who prefer to have their government care for and support them rather than to support themselves and their government, and we have those people with us today. That was what Lincoln meant when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacity. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

The maintenance of free government is not an easy way, it is a hard way. The American people want freedom—freedom to follow or freedom to lead; freedom to work as little as possible to get along, or hard enough to buy the big house on the hill.

Those who would overturn our free government and establish a Federal paternalism under a political monopoly, have a peculiar blind spot—they have an idea, apparently, that such a paternalistic government, either as a semi-dictatorship or as a complete dictatorship, would in some way find a method by which to support the people. Anyone who for a moment considers any dictatorship, ancient or modern, must realize that under any dictatorship the people not only have to support the government, but they have to do it the hard way, the wasteful way, the most unpleasant way.

Those who fight against the encroachment of a political bureaucracy on the people's freedom do not have an easy task. Powerful bureaucracies have no trouble enlisting in their aid powerful individuals, powerful radio interests, and powerful newspaper propagandists.

Those men and women who stand determinedly for the preservation of the people's freedom often find it to be a thankless and misunderstood task. No luscious patronage, and no fat contracts, no special favors, and no free junkets come to those who fight bureaucracy. Their sole compensation is usually that sense of satisfaction which must come to every man and woman who helps to preserve the freedom of a people—that liberty of the individual which is as precious as life itself.

When one man possesses almost absolute domination of this country for 12 years and shows not the slightest indication of asking to be relieved from that domination, it is crystal clear that there is reason for the people to be disturbed about the future of their Government and their Bill of Rights.

The people are disturbed; they have become alarmed over the trend which has persisted for more than a decade and which continues toward a centralized Government at Washington under the autocracy of a political monopoly. Because of these fears, the people of America are rapidly swinging into the struggle to set up a strong opposition to this drift toward a rigid regimentation and State fascism. This opposition is not confined to those whose political doctrine is of the Republican faith. If that were the case, there would be no hope for success. The opposition includes, beside Republicans, a legion of men and women who proudly boast of their loyalty to Jeffersonian ideals. A multitude of independents who hold the balance of power in this country and swing from one party to the other as their judgment dictates, are also in this fight to free the United States of America from the strangling clutch of a selfish and self-centered political bureaucracy. It was these people who helped to swell the vote for the Republican Presidential candidate to 22,000,000 votes in 1940. The support of this group enabled Republican congressional candidates all over the country to poll a million more votes in 1942 than did those who sought election on the Democratic ticket. Those who still profess to believe that the Nation is overwhelmingly in favor of the New Deal ideology might do well to ponder those figures. It will be the support of these groups, together with the new, progressive, militant Republican Party which will elect a President next fall and wrest control of Congress from the so-called New Dealers.

One of the danger signs everywhere visible today is the scant respect some men and women high in public life have for the Constitution. These deluded men and women are ready, when they desire to achieve some immediate objective, to brush aside the Constitution. In doing so, they are helping to bring about the destruction of their own liberties along with the freedom of their fellow citizens. If one group can set aside some part of that great charter of liberty upon which all our people must depend for security and protection, then it will not be long before other groups will attempt to do likewise. Under such a trend the great bulwark of liberty with its precious Bill of Rights would soon be reduced to a mere written document without life or force. Abraham Lincoln saw this danger very clearly when he said in his first inaugural address on March 4, 1861:

"A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. * * * The rule of a minority as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible. So that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left."

It is a fortunate fact that in every crisis the American people rally to the defense of the Constitution. A few years ago we had a striking example of this deep reverence and devotion which the people have for their great charter of liberty. The New Deal, arrogant and confident in the popular support it had mustered by scores of grand political promises, decided to sweep aside an obstacle in its path as it sought to march toward the goal of absolute power. The administration proposed to pack the Supreme Court by legislative action. It was confident that it could persuade the people to consent to this dangerous procedure and the shock of its disillusionment went to the very roots of the New Deal. The people were aroused by this attempt of the Executive Department to dominate both the Judicial and Legislative branches of the Government and they made known their opposition in a positive way. It was through no fault of the people or the Congress that the objective was achieved later through the process of time and the frailties of human life. Today, with such an overwhelming control by the Government of one group, the preservation of the Constitution is more imperative than ever. Even a justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Roberts, has taken occasion within the last few days to point out in a dissenting opinion that the tendency of the Court "to disregard precedent has become so strong in this Court of late as * * * to shake confidence in the consistency of decisions and leave the courts below on an uncharted sea of doubt and difficulty, without any confidence that what was said yesterday will hold good tomorrow."

This condition against which Mr. Justice Roberts warns confirms completely that wisdom which Abraham Lincoln believed was inherent in the people when they are given the truth and the facts, and which was inherent in the people when they rose up to oppose the packing of the Supreme Court.

It is that wisdom inherent in the people which has always caused them to rally to the support of the Constitution when attempts have been made to set it aside or ignore its provisions. It is a fact which cannot be forgotten that if and when it becomes necessary, in order to keep pace with changing conditions and the march of progress, to change the Constitution so it may be more closely adapted to the needs, those changes can easily be achieved. Those wise men who framed the Constitution foresaw that there would be need for changes. They provided the way. The Constitution was not an organic law established by the Government for the control of the people; it was an organic law established by the people for the control of their Government and their governors. In keeping with that fundamental fact the framers of the Constitution provided that it could be amended by the people and only by the people. The process of amending the Constitution, contrary to the continued complaints of the New Dealers who wish to set its provisions aside on occasion, is not difficult and is not slow. When the people are convinced that an amendment to the Constitution is necessary, that amendment can be brought about with ample speed. You can rest assured that when a few New Deal politicians desire to change the Constitution by evasion, by manipulation, by strained and distorted constructions of the constitutional language, or by judicial decision, they want to bring about that change for purposes which they are convinced the people would not approve. Otherwise they would come out in the open light of day and let the people know what they propose to do. and submit their policies to the people for approval or rejection.

The nonchalant way in which it was proposed to set aside the Constitution in providing the vote to the service men and women was shocking. First, let me state definitely and without reservation, there is no one I know of opposed to giving the service men and women the fullest possible opportunity to exercise rights of citizenship. Our service people are entitled to participate in the fall elections and it is our job to see that they have a full opportunity.

The service men and women are entitled to just as good a ballot as you and I, who remain here at home. They are entitled to vote not only for President and Members of Congress, but for State and County offices as well. It may hurt the vanity of some of us, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that many of these servicemen and women are much more interested in their own representatives to the State Legislatures, the local judges, or the prosecuting attorneys than they are in their Representatives in Congress.

Naturally, the Army and Navy, upon whom would rest the job of transporting the ballots, favor the way which would make their task easiest. But this should not be the determining factor. A ballot just as good as is given the civilians can be carried to the fighting men and we should do the job uncomplainingly. It is asking very little. It is sheer nonsense to sit back and complacently say it cannot be done. It can be done—and it must be done.

To give the soldier the complete ballot and a legal ballot, it will be necessary for the civilian voter to make some readjustments. He is ready to do this. The telegrams from the Governors showed this. The States are ready and anxious to get the full ballot to the fighting forces. Let there be the same zeal on the part of the Federal Government to provide the transportation. If half of the time spent in trying to avoid the job were devoted to solving the problem of transportation, the plans would already be complete. It would be an indictment of the efficiency of the Army and Navy to say they cannot do the job of transportation.

There were two sinister features connected with the soldiers' ballot plan proposed by the administration. First was the original suggestion which was a bold attempt completely to dominate the election by a non-secret ballot, and with the control resting in a commission to be appointed by one of the men whom everyone expects to be a candidate. Certainly an enormous amount of credit must go to the opposition for exposing this original bill, which might well have made the coming election a development of grave danger to the unity of the Nation. The opposition developed in growing numbers and the original bill vanished before the shafts of criticism. It was withdrawn but left grave suspicions in the Congress.

The States for more than 150 years have controlled elections and their right to that control has been unchallenged. This is no time to challenge that right in the midst of a great war.

For 10 years there has been a vast accumulation of power in the Executive department in Washington. Frankly, there is grave concern among our people over this constant demand on the part of the Executive branch for more and more power. Of course, we realize the little bureaucrats believe they know what is best for us but there are some who prefer a little more freedom and there are some who believe the little bureaucrats do not have all the correct answers.

I wish to emphasize the fact that people are concerned over the way things are drifting. This is not the time to increase these fears. The service people can have their vote without breaking down the Constitution. Let's give it to them the legal way, and if we do it in the legal way, the votes will surely be counted; that is vital, too. A vote not counted is no vote for a soldier.

The so-called bobtail-ballot proposal, clearly unconstitutional, would leave it to the States to determine whether or not it shall be counted. Without containing names it could not be legally counted in many States. Then what a riot of confusion would result.

The services of more lawyers would be required than are at present on the staffs of the New Deal bureaucrats, and that is quite a statement. No one could predict the path to which the confusion might lead.

Let's give the service men and women a ballot—one over which there will be no question about its being counted. No one should want to work fraud upon the men and women willing to die for our country and its institutions.

To save the Army and Navy some extra work and extra management is not a sufficient reason to violate the Constitution and give the Federal Government control of elections. There certainly is no lack of personnel to supervise the job.

We will need a completely united effort to hasten the winning of the war, to bring about victory in the shortest possible time. That must be our chief objective until it is accomplished.

We need all the statesmanship we can summon from whatever party it may come to solve these gigantic problems ahead. The task is not as easy as some believe. Even the little group of "palace guards" can learn some things.

We Republicans in Congress have a definite chart; a definite goal which we ever keep our eyes on. These are our objectives:

1. We will give our full effort to the winning of the war. To us it is the paramount objective, and we have always cooperated to the fullest extent to bring about an early victory and to get our boys and girls back home.

2. We will defend the Constitution from assaults by subversive organizations as well as from the unthinking who would destroy it for selfish advantage.

3. We will fight to eliminate waste and extravagance in our expenditures. The cost of Government is a heavy burden which is borne willingly by the taxpayers to win the war, but is ruinous when frittered away by irresponsible bureaucrats.

4. We shall work for a simplification of tax returns to make them understandable to the ordinary citizen.

5. We will strive for tax reforms based on capacity to pay and which will stimulate production; creating new wealth for the Nation and new jobs for millions.

6. We will plan for the return of our men and women from the fighting fronts and the peace-time employment of those on farms, in factories, mills, and shipyards. They will want real jobs at American wages and under American working conditions, not doles or handouts. We must see that we do not fail them.

7. We shall care for the disabled veterans and for the rehabilitation of the maimed. We must give educational opportunity to those who lost that opportunity through the call of their country. A comprehensive educational and rehabilitation program is vital at an early date.

8. We must prepare a forward-looking post-war program which will maintain private enterprise and will permit us to go forward to a new era of prosperity and progress. We must provide for the freedom of labor, the freedom of the farmer, and the freedom of management. Each group in our Nation must be given a fair deal and a fair chance to enjoy the fruits of American progress. Equality of opportunity for all and not limitation of opportunity for some must be the watchword of the future.

9. We must watch carefully the use of the powers granted by Congress to the bureaucrats. We must have the courage to take them away if they are abused and to make corrections when necessary. Above all, we must stand ready to see they are returned to the people at the earliest possible moment when the war is over.

10. We must guard against increasing regimentation. Some regimentation we must endure, of course, as an unavoidable consequence of the war; but we do not want unnecessary regimentation, and we do not intend to be a permanently regimented people.

11. We must go forward with expanding plans for the better care of the aged people of this country. They have helped to build up this country and we shall not allow them to suffer distress in their declining years.

12. We must put an end to class prejudices, and class preferences. We must put an end to unfair and unwise coercion by the Government. With the elimination of special privilege groups we must guarantee under the Constitution fair and honest treatment to every man, woman, and child, regardless of race, color, creed, or position in life. An honest deal to every American is the only guarantee of genuine Americanism. We must win the peace as well as the war, and build a better America. We must not be stampeded away from precious American ideals and American institutions. With freedom of initiative, freedom of enterprise and opportunity for progress we can go forward with hope and confidence. Only an expanding economy—increased production of better goods and services at good wages and lowered prices—will assure our future prosperity. We can take advantage of the demands of a goods-starved world and of an expanding home demand to give employment to our people. Only in this way can we overcome the handicap of an enormous national debt, and bring about a stabilized financial condition. Only a solvent America can aid the other nations of the world in their struggle back toward a better day; only a strong, free America can bring happiness and security for all the people of this great land.

When the last World War was at an end the people of this country instinctively turned to the Republican Party to perform the difficult job of reconstruction. We did that job well. We brought America out of the wilderness into an era of expanding progress. Four times during that Republican administration we reduced taxes. Four times we secured more revenue by that method, and during that time we reduced the national debt an average of a billion dollars a year for 10 straight years. We did it before; we can do it again.

There are people who paint a gloomy picture of the America of tomorrow. There is no denying the facts; it will be a difficult tomorrow. It will be a period of work and sacrifice. It will be an era which, if we fail to be vigilant, can end the American way of life; it can, unless we refuse to accept it, be an era of few opportunities for the individual; it can be a period when wealth could be beyond the reach of the poor people of our country if we allow it to be so.

But this need not be the picture which will unfold. If we will face realities and concentrate on the job ahead, we can have a greater America, a new prosperity, a longer era of peace. We will win the war. No one disputes this, but we can win it more quickly if the prosecution of the war is stripped of political maneuvering. I hope none will be injected in this election year.

It would be unthinkable that we should permit the great sacrifice of blood and treasure which we are making in this war to be futile. It is unthinkable that we should fail the men and women on the battle lines by losing the peace on the home front. It is unthinkable that we should permit the free America for which they are fighting, to become shackled by the control of a political bureaucracy or to drift into a political dictatorship, by whatever name it might be called. It is unthinkable that we should betray the blood and sacrifices our forefathers have made to bequeath to us this great rich Nation to be held in trust by us for our posterity. It is unthinkable that we should betray those great immortals, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and the other illustrious Presidents who labored so valiantly to make this a great free Nation of prosperous, progressive, contented people. May providence strengthen our hearts and strengthen our arms that we may meet the difficulties ahead as our forefathers met them in their day, with courage and confidence, that we may "have faith that right makes might; and in that faith * * * dare to our duty as we understand it."

Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Post, Tuesday, February 8, 1944:

RIGHT TO VOTE

In the face of the President's denunciation of the States' rights vote plan for men in the armed services as "a fraud," Members of Congress, who oppose a Federal ballot that overlooks voting regulations of the various States, will find it difficult to maintain their stand

against public pressure. The men in service wish to vote. Those on the home front want them to vote. We have done the impossible in a number of ways in this war. Some way can be worked out to allow men fighting for their country to decide who shall be their Commander in Chief. Some way must be.

The Coming Structure of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the recent review published in the New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review of the book, The Coming Structure of World Government, edited by Dr. Howard O. Eaton. The book is published by the University of Oklahoma Press.

While I do not agree with many of the conclusions of this symposium, it does offer the conclusions of many deep students in international affairs and their thinking of possible solutions to world peace. Many of the contributors to the book disagree among themselves as to the methods, plans, and extent of world cooperation for peace, but this is illustrative of the wide range that the book covers.

The following is the review of the book from the New York Herald Tribune Weekly book review section, February 6, 1944:

The Coming Structure of World Government. Edited by Prof. Howard O. Eaton, 234 pages. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, $3. Reviewed by Frances Witherspoon.

"We must recognize that the state and not the individual is the inherently fighting animal and that it is the state and not human nature that must be reformed." Thus arrestingly Prof. Norman L. Hill, of Nebraska University, sums up what is the basic contention of all world federalists. And it is to this task of "striking at those attributes of the state which make wars so apparently inevitable" that the 15 eminent scholars and statesmen whose essays comprise the volume edited by Prof. Howard O. Eaton, of Oklahoma University, dedicate themselves with idealism and balanced good sense.

The nationalistic state, these writers tell us, must be deprived of all independent action which might lead to dangerous competition with its fellows. It must be forever deprived of the power to make war. Tracing efforts at international cooperation through the leagues and confederations of history, including the ineffective League of Nations, here is agreement that wars will never be averted nor a basis of peaceful and prosperous living be worked out for the peoples of the world until the nations are brought into a definite political structure.

Consultation by internationally constituted bodies, such as the Pan American Union makes for fruitful understanding of common problems. Collaboration in such functional agencies as were set up after World War No. 1—International Labor Office, Narcotics Board, etc.—show records of technical accomplishment. But government alone and not mere international organization will meet today's need of security—world government, or government for as large a portion of the earth's inhabitants as are prepared to meet the basic requirement of membership, a definite reduction in national sovereignty.

For sovereignty is the core of the matter. How much of its independence will each State give up in the settlement of questions affecting all States? In what manner can the peoples of the world rather than their official spokesmen choose world representatives who will fulfill human needs rather than the demands of mutually distrustful nations? To what areas of jurisdiction shall the world government be limited so as not to overstep the purely domestic field of the national member state? In what bodies shall administrative, legislative, and judicial functions reside? How finance the world government? How defend it?

A summing-up chapter by Prof. Cortez A. M. Ewing, also of Oklahoma, gives the group conclusions on these points, and Professor Eaton embodies them in a drafted constitution such as might be submitted to the United Nations. Speculation on Liberty and Freedoms is offered by Prof. Carl L. Friedrich, of Harvard. Vice President Wallace contributes his own familiar prophecy of The Century of The Common Man, Wendell Willkie his insistence on immediate popular discussion of both the war and the peace. And T. V. Soong asserts China's place in the creation of a truly democratic world.

That tomorrow's government will rest ultimately on force is axiomatic to all those writing in this volume. An international policing body with ground, sea, and air arms is assumed. But if it is the guilty individual or recalcitrant group of individuals on whom the government proposes to act and (this, one understands, is fundamental to the Federal principle) one may ask of what need are heavy armaments and a world army? Why not a true police force of civilian law-enforcement agents? Prof. Pitman B. Potter, of Oberlin, alone faces this quandary and attempts to solve it by suggesting that the central government may have to be prepared to act on both state and individual.

This book will not satisfy all comers. But it offers an effective invitation to the modern citizen, conditioned as he is to a narrow nationalism to "peer over the wall of his patriotism" sufficiently to glimpse a new world secured from both want and the perpetual threat of war.

The Morals of Morale or the Principal of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on the state of the Union. If I were to take a text for these remarks it would be:

Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people.—Proverbs xiv: 34.

During the last several years we have been lectured continuously on home-front morale. There is nothing wrong with American morale that cannot be charged to American morals. Some of the reasons for this remark follow.

First are some startling facts and figures given me this week by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Incidentally, Mr. Hoover has done more toward law enforcement and crime prevention in America than any other individual in this country's history. In referring to juvenile delinquency, Mr. Hoover states a preference for the term "adult delinquency" as parents are primarily responsible for the character of their children. Wherever the fault lies, figures recently released indicate moral decay in this country. According to F. B. I. figures, arrests of girls under 21 increased 55.7 percent in 1942 over the 1941 figures. Among girls, arrests for drunkenness increased 39.9 percent, disorderly conduct 69.6 percent, for prostitution and commercialized vice 64.8 percent, and for other sex offenses 104.7 percent. During 1943 arrests of girls under 21 years of age increased 47.9 percent over the 1942 figure. As for boys, during 1943 for the first time in more than 10 years age 17 predominated in male arrests. In the 17-year-old group there were 27.7 percent more arrests in 1943 than in 1942. Mr. Hoover tells me that at least a dozen times a week he gets reports of attempted sabotage by children of 15 years of age or younger.

F. B. I. figures show that drunkenness during 1942 was 2½ times greater than during 1932; that during 1942 more than 16,000,000 offenses were entered of record, 1,436,000 of these being of a serious character, and that our crime bill is still more than $15,000,000,000 per year.

Each year just prior to the President's birthday ball a leading New York stage show is brought to Washington for a so-called command performance, showing in the capital city for one night only. This year's command performance was entitled "The Voice of the Turtle." It was a sensuous, sexy performance featuring a soldier spending the night with a young lady whom he chanced to meet in the city. Notwithstanding its obscenity and immorality it was attended and applauded by many of the leading people in Washington. We also glamorize depravity on the screen. Apparently no big Washington function can be staged without the command attendance of a flock of so-called Hollywood stars, some of whom would have been expelled from the average respectable American community of a generation ago. On stage and screen we tend to substitute vulgarity for humor and sordidness for art.

Recently New York elected to her Supreme Court for a term of 14 years, at a salary of $22,500 per year, an admitted associate of thugs, a judge who attributed his election to the influence of a racketeer by the name of Costello.

During this session of Congress there have been introduced in the House by Representative SABATH, of Chicago, Ill., and in the Senate by Senator GUFFEY, of Pittsburgh, Pa., bills to create a national lottery to be run by the Government for the purpose of raising revenue. Editorials have appeared in leading newspapers seriously advocating the enactment of these bills, urging the Government to go into the gambling business and to become a teacher of vice to its people. A further logical step would be to license and operate for Government profit race tracks and houses of ill fame.

Within the last few days, perhaps the most brilliant economist and politician of Sweden, Senator Gunner Myrdal, has released a 2-volume, 1,400-page study of American democracy. This study was based on 5 years of research, in which the Swedish Senator was assisted by 75 members of the staff of the Carnegie Foundation. The Senator, among other things, finds that while we are a highly idealistic people, we do not live up to our ideals. He states we are suffering from a century-long lag of public morals, and that while we are quick to pass many laws, we are equally quick to disregard and violate them, looking, in fact, with mild suspicion and contempt upon all laws, and thinking ourselves smart to escape from self-imposed inhibitions. He might have added that we have substituted a false aristocracy of wealth for a real aristocracy of service.

We are horrified by the thought that America's best blood may again be spilled largely in vain. Only the basest scoundrel could be indifferent to this possibility. To suffer willfully or carelessly any impairment of the institutions for which our boys fight, to forfeit willfully or carelessly any opportunity to preserve the peace which they will win, is unquestionably criminal. Hundreds of books and thousands of booklets are now being published and additional thousands of speeches are now being made on the subject of post-war planning. Yet few of these indulge in honest self-analysis or express concern over moral foundations. Should we not at this time take inventory of our moral resources and of our moral worth? Should we not determine whether or not we have moral stamina to deal with social, political, and economic problems here at home, as well as to discharge our international obligations? These things are vital not only in the winning of the war but also in the winning of the peace.

We are not here compiling pious platitudes. We are simply restating fundamental principles of human conduct. War, crime, and disease have always been the greatest enemies of humanity. First and foremost these problems are moral problems. All of history, both sacred and profane, teaches that individuals and nations alike ultimately prosper in accordance with their adherence to right principles. Individuals and nations alike decay and are destroyed from within. Moral break-down precedes morale break-down.

Archeologists have recently deciphered some of the history of Nuzi, a nation existing 35 centuries ago on the site of ancient Iran. They find this nation perished because of the dishonesty and wickedness of its public and private citizens. When Rome ruled the world the average Roman respected and lived up to a code of decent morals. In fact, the Pax Romana, a century of relative world peace during an era of Roman dominance, was based upon two things—strength and justice; the strength of Roman arms and the justice of Roman administration. But wealth and power ate away the moral fiber of the individual Roman citizen and of the Roman nation. When Romans no longer respected law, when they demanded and accepted doles and bribes, when Roman homes became hotbeds of iniquity, then Rome was an easy prey for barbarians who were strong and tough through the discipline of hardship and denial. Tragic old Marshal Pétain recently pronounced a fitting requiem over fallen France in these words, "Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We tried to spare effort and met disaster."

From ancient Nuzi to modern France the records are always the same. Nations and individuals alike reap whatsoever they sow. Destruction inevitably follows moral decay. The pages of history are littered with the records of men and nations who have confused values, who have ignored or defied moral laws.

Unless shaken out of our indolence and lethargy, unless induced or driven to reverse our downward moral course, unless inspired to a spiritual reawakening by the valor and heroism of our fighting youth, unless the dross of materialism is burned from our hearts by the fires of war, we are doomed to ignominious post-war defeat in our battles of peace.

Both Napoleon and Voltaire had something to say about the Lord being on the side of those with the heaviest artillery. Such has never been true. The laws of justice and right are as immutable as the law of gravity, otherwise we, even now, would be writhing under the heel of Axis domination.

The difference between democracy and fascism is a difference between faith and fear. Democracy is based upon faith in human dignity and decency, while fascism assumes the degradation of man and the right to rule him through force and fear. Democracy can only flourish among people of good morals. Faith without works may die. Lacking in moral character, individuals and nations alike are unable to stand either adversity or prosperity. Without moral foundation there is no perspective upon which to build or plan. Without moral stamina there is always resort to temporary expediency, without regard to future consequences. The immoral person has no regard for either heredity or posterity. He ignores the lessons of the past and refuses to be responsible for the future. He submits to the whims and temptations of the present for easy living, for selfish advantage, for temporary gain. Lacking in public and private morals we fail to acknowledge any stewardship or trusteeship whatsoever, debt and duty become meaningless words, and ingratitude becomes a condition of mind.

In America we brag about tolerance when often such tolerance is simply a lack of sincere convictions. Unless our pride or ego is wounded in some way we are never aroused even to express righteous indignation. We know the wages of sin have always been and will ever be death, yet our gambling instinct leads us to hope that someone else will have to settle our accounts.

To advocate international morality is not to advocate international softness. Our sins of omission have perhaps been greater than our sins of commission in this field. Seemingly we have always been appeasers and pussyfooters. We have permitted domestic and international crime to go unpunished, and in some cases actually to become respectable. If there is to be a Pax Americana it must be based upon not strength alone but also upon firmness and justice. Culprits, both national and international, must be made to account for their wrongdoing. Our morals must be positive rather than negative.

Firmness and the punishment of evil is taught in Christian ethics. We have the story of Jesus driving the money changers from the temple. We know that Jehovah is a God of war as well as a God of peace. Holy Writ is filled with accounts of the Almighty wreaking vengeance upon wrongdoers. We cite the flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the battles of Joshua under the Lord's command as evidence of human destruction on a basis of moral justification.

But let us get back to America. If we continue to wink at immorality, if we continue to pray one way and act another, we will not only forfeit the lives of our boys now dying but the lives of boys yet unborn. Self-interest and Christian morality alike impose upon us today and tomorrow many solemn duties. Our churches must condemn and not condone sin. Our homes must teach love and loyalty, instead of being just places to eat, sleep, and change one's clothes. Our schools must acknowledge that learning without virtue is self-destruction and must teach first civic righteousness and individual responsibility. Insofar as the state goes, we must be ever conscious of the truthfulness expressed generations ago by the poet in the following verses:

What constitutes a state?
  Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
  Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,
  Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
  Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.

No: Men, high-minded men,
  With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brakes, or den,
  As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude,
Men who their duties know,
  But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain;
Prevent the long-aimed blow, and crush the tyrant
  While they rend the chain:
These constitute a state.

Free to Work and Save?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of February 12, 1944:

FREE TO WORK AND SAVE?

There could be many worse slogans for our friends the Republicans, girding for battle against the fourth term, than the "freedom to work, freedom to save" suggestion of Representative FRANK B. KEEFE at Thursday night's Lincoln banquet in Grand Rapids.

Mr. KEEFE expanded these freedoms somewhat, urging a "government where there shall be freedom to work, freedom to save, freedom to engage in business or agriculture or the professions, freedom from the blighting hold and influence of excessive and unnecessary government regulation and direction," leaving the Government's own task simply that of "seeing to it that elements of special privilege are restrained and controlled." But the two primary freedoms mentioned first, the right to work and the right to save, are strong encugh to stand by themselves as party planks.

Far too much attention has been paid the last few years to "freedom from want" as though that freedom, like free speech and assemblage and press and worship, was something the Government ought always to provide. The fear of want has been the principal fear appealed to by the present Administration in getting votes. The promise of all sorts of "security" has been the great lure. It has differed little from the lure of the Roman politicians' repeated distributions of free grain. It belongs in a society where the individual man has little to say or do about his future; where ambition is a hopeless will-o'-the-wisp, saving impossible, opportunity monopolized, and the "right" to self-respecting work something obtainable only by birth or the favor of the few.

The United States has not been that kind of a country. The production which supported its hundred and thirty millions has been a production created by self-respecting individual effort of independent citizens. They have relied upon themselves not only to make their own livings but to invent, improve, invest, and advance in their own pursuit of happiness. Take away these freedoms and the incentive disappears which produced enough to feed and house the population. Something else then must be put in the place of that incentive. During wartime the substitution has been the patriotic urge. We have been engaged in a vast "made work" program to turn out, not useful and permanent wealth, but wealth to be blown to bits or sunk to the bottom of the sea. All war is a waste of wealth and a vast W. P. A. In this "made work" enterprise the Government has been the sole ultimate paymaster, whether directly or indirectly.

We are now about to reconvert to peacetime industry. There will be a brief period of unemployment when we are changing back, to be succeeded by one of the busiest periods in our history. We shall be producing to fill the lacks of these years of priority and rationing—many lacks piled up during the war. The opportunity can again exist for free men to make their way in free industry, competing in service and efficiency, self-respecting, self-investing, and reinvesting, saving seed money for tools and greater production and better living. But if government guaranties born out of a craven fear of want, are substituted for individual ambition and effort, production will suffer and the result will be that less actual wealth will be created to divide among all of us. The urge of a self-reliant people will be emasculated by new guaranties and will-destroying protections.

The fiber of the Nation had already been weakened by excessive pampering during the long depression years. We need to renew faith in ourselves as men, if the American system is to have its chance again.

The Republicans have their chance to say: "Government should get out of the road of men's ambition to make their own way in the world, make their own contribution of talent and brain in a free, competitive plan. It should not hamstring the field of investment by discriminatory taxation and excessive regulation destroying the willingness to risk funds in expansion. It should not destroy men's impulse to save and make provision for their own future. It should not make the right to work a commodity monopolized by business agents and turned off and on in jurisdictional disputes or irresponsible walkouts where a few can throw the many out of wages."

Not all Republicans take this view. Some are as willing as any New Dealer to buy votes with Government pay-roll pap whether the Nation's condition requires pap or not. Some deny the value of saving and self-improvement either for industry or individuals, and believe in the notion of spending and taxing ourselves silly. Mr. Willkie's talk of doubling the war Budget when a vast part of it is already being wasted was not reassuring. But if the party would take Mr. KEEFE's suggested freedoms—to work and save—and fight for them as the best way to assure freedom from want, it would have a telling point in the coming campaign.

Conditions in Louisiana Internment Camps for Axis Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, below I present a resolution adopted by the Vermilion Post, No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Louisiana. I join this post in calling for a full and impartial investigation and, in order that justice may be done, we should let the chips fall where they may.

The resolution was unanimously adopted by Vermilion Post, 29, American Legion, Department of Louisiana, at its regular meeting held on Wednesday, February 9, 1944, as follows:

Whereas on Sunday, December 19, 1943, Walter Winchell, a news commentator, called to the attention of the F. B. I. conditions existing in Louisiana camps for Axis prisoners. It was stated that prisoners were allowed to visit houses of ill repute and other liberties; and

Whereas the F. B. I. in taking note of this broadcast, immediately confirmed the statements made by the commentator, and stated that it knew of the condiion, but that it was the duty of the Provost General and not the F. B. I. to regulate conditions in internment camps; and

Whereas the enemy submarines are still operating in the Gulf of Mexico, a ship having been reported sunk during the month of December; and

Whereas the German Government has threatened to bring to trial members of our Army Air Forces who are interned in German prison camps, and hang them for bombing German cities; and

Whereas we of Vermilion Post 29, American Legion, Department of Louisiana, have sons in the Army Air Forces, who some day may meet this same fate; and

Whereas we deplore and condemn the ones responsible for lending succor to our enemies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Vermilion Post, 29, American Legion, Department of Louisiana, in regular meeting assembled, memorialize Congress to make a rigid investigation of the Louisiana internment camps for Axis prisoners of war, and if such conditions exist as reported, that the guilty party or parties be brought to trial and punished according to law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by registered mail to President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Navy, Attorney General Biddle, the two Senators from Louisiana, the Congressmen from the various districts of Louisiana, to Gov. Sam H. Jones of Louisiana, to the national headquarters and Louisiana State department headquarters of the American Legion, to all newspapers in Vermilion Parish, La., and to Walter Winchell.

Spruce Budworm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters received from C. S. Herr, chief forester, Brown Co., Berlin, N. H., and John H. Foster, State forester, Concord, N. H., respectively:

FEBRUARY 9, 1944.

HONORABLE SIR: Within the last 5 years, serious outbreaks of spruce budworm have occurred in Canada, principally in the Province of Ontario, and to a lesser degree in Quebec. These devasted areas are moving generally eastward and southward toward the spruce-fir forests of the Northeast and Lake States. Over 90,000 square miles have been infested in Canada and the loss is estimated to be over $30,000,000.

Heavy outbreaks of this insect occurred in Maine in 1920, and the presence of the insect is known in the Northeast but its exact location and quantities are not recorded. Our second growth softwood forests in the Northeast are predominately balsam fir and are therefore seriously threatened.

An effort is being made on the part of the landowners throughout the Northeast and Lake States to secure a Federal appropriation of $80,000 which would be a part of the entomology section of the agricultural appropriation bill. This fund to be used for—

1. Detection service and surveys.
2. Research in the distribution of insecticides from aircraft.
3. Research in biological control.
4. Prevention through forest management.

This matter is urgent as our pulp and paper mills in New Hampshire utilize 517,000 cords annually. The economic importance of the pulp and paper industry to New Hampshire is very apparent and anything which affects our supply of raw material is indeed serious.

Please give this matter your consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

C. S. HERR,
Chief Forester.

FEBRUARY 7, 1944.

DEAR MR. MERROW: Foresters in the Northeastern States bordering on Canada are much

concerned by reports of new outbreaks of the spruce budworm in Quebec and Ontario. This insect has done untold damage as far back as 1880 but particularly during the period from 1910 to 1920 during which time it invaded northern New England. In eastern Quebec and New Brunswick the kill of spruce and fir timber was tremendous. In the Gaspe country thousands of acres of dead timber give testimony today of the seriousness of this epidemic. During the last 10 years there has been little spread but we are now told that the budworm is on a rampage again with the more serious new outbreaks in Ontario.

I do not understand it to be the purpose of our northern foresters or landowners to advocate specific or extensive expenditures of funds at this time. It is our belief that the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the United States Department of Agriculture should be taking steps to explore the means of combatting this pest. Numerous possible methods of attack require investigation to finally determine the cure. Surveys should be made in the Northeast and Lake States to determine the presence and extent of new infection. Use of certain insecticides to be sprayed from the air need to be tested. Parasites not existent in the Northeast are known to assist in keeping budworm population down in other parts of the Dominion and should be collected and transplanted for our benefit in the States. Experiments should be tried on selected test areas of some size by cutting all the marketable fir on the theory that this will immunize the areas against budworm attack on the spruce since fir is the more highly favored host.

I do not know how much should be spent for these purposes the next fiscal year but it is estimated by private and State foresters that $80,000 should be made available, some of which might well be needed during May of the present year for aircraft spraying research. We know that the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has no funds to undertake any of this work and is in no position to initiate requests for appropriations. Dr. Annand, Chief of the Bureau, must be conversant with the situation in the past as well as acquainted with present depredations in Canada. The proper subcommittee of agriculture should give immediate attention so that a program can be presented with the approval of the Budget for consideration of the Appropriations Committee while there is yet time.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FOSTER,
State Forester.

Germany's Peace Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of February 8, 1944:

GERMANY'S PEACE PLANS

While the tempo of the war quickens, and signs multiply that the blows raining upon the Germans will shortly assume the force of an avalanche, the Allied Commission at London is weighing terms to be imposed upon the enemy at the hour he acknowledges defeat.

This is a wise precaution. The problem of managing matters when the debacle arrives for the Nazis will be simplified immensely if Britain, the United States, and Russia have hammered out agreement on this point beforehand. Thus far, drafts of plans drawn up by the British and our own Government have been submitted to the Tripartite Commission for study. Russia is expected shortly to offer her own views on the same subject.

One question of vital purport arises. What steps, if any, are the Allies proposing to take to scotch the carefully-laid plans of the German military, and Junkers, for World War No. 3. With a tenacity characteristic of their past history, the powers-that-be in the Reich, even while they see clearly that the present war is being lost, are preparing for a more ensanguined tomorrow.

The following excerpts from documents garnered by the French Underground Information Service, set forth ideas on this subject entertained by German officials and organs which need no other identification than their names:

I

"What does a temporary defeat matter if, through the destruction of people and material wealth in enemy countries, we are able to secure a margin of economic and demographic superiority even greater than before 1939? If we can succeed in doing this, this war will have been useful, since it will enable us, within the next 25 years, to wage another war under better conditions. Russia will need that much time to repair the destruction we have wrought. We need not fear peace conditions similar to those we might have imposed ourselves, since our opponents will always be divided and disunited.

"We must strive to introduce into the coming peace the seeds of future dissensions. Our enemies are aware that the 1920 formula of 'making Germany pay' has neither sense nor value. We shall therefore furnish our enemies with a few squads of workers, we shall return to them a few unsold objects of art, plus our obsolete machinery, and we can always say that the stolen articles claimed by them were destroyed by their bombings.

"It is necessary that we begin immediately to prepare a dossier as to the loot 'destroyed by Anglo-American bombs,' and time will do the rest. Our enemies will grow weary before we do. We shall have to organize a campaign of pity designed to induce them to send us needed supplies at the earliest possible moment. Above all we must hold on to the assets we have deposited in neutral countries." (General Von Stulpnagel, commandant at Paris.)

II

"Total destruction of our neighbors and their wealth is indispensable to our future victory. One of our great mistakes in 1918 was to spare lives of civilians in enemy countries. We Germans must number at least twice the total population of our neighbors. Therefore we shall be compelled to destroy at least one-third of the population of all adjacent countries. We can best achieve this through systematic malnutrition, in the end far superior to machine guns, for there is a limit as well as a disadvantage to mass murders. Starvation works more effectively, especially among the young." (Marshal von Rundstedt, to the Reich Bureau of Economic Warfare.)

III

"Our plundering must be methodical and organized, so that we may convert stolen articles into financial assets to be put away in places of safety. This plunder, combined with the destruction of factories and machineries, with deportations and scientific starvation applied to civilians, including children, will enable us to stage a comeback in the not too distant future." (General von Mannstein, in confidential circular dated September 1943.)

IV

"We must destroy in other lands more than our enemies can destroy in Germany. Therefore, it is in our interest to have the war last as long as possible, as, the greater the destruction, the more effectively will economic and demographic chaos work to our advantage." (Das Schwarze Korps, October 14, 1943.)

These samples of the mentality of those presently running Germany provide ample warning. They explain the manhunts in western Europe, the extermination policies applied in Russia, the hostage murders, and the wholesale looting and destruction of European culture now under way throughout the Continent. Any peace which leaves intact the German military machine, its Junker industrialist backers, and their cartels, or its underground formations now in training, will be but another delusion.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

The Republican Party, Its Traditions and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Lincoln Day address by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]:

It is fitting that on the one hundred and thirty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln we Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana should honor the memory of the greatest man the party ever produced and, in my opinion, the greatest man America has ever produced. It is fitting because this greatest of all Americans spent his formative years in the rolling hill country of Spencer County in this district.

The environment in which men grow very often forms their character and shapes their destiny in much the same manner as a sculptor engaged in his creative work. For that reason we are justified in believing that not only the arduous demands of nature helped to form the character of Abraham Lincoln, but we are also entitled to believe that the simplicity, honesty, and ethical standards of the peoples with whom he grew up, helped to give him that appreciation of the fundamental dignity of man, the equality of man, and the high ethical standards and personal self-effacement, which are his outstanding characteristics. At the same time, just as we know that no sculptor can produce a thing of beauty out of base, ugly, and false materials, so we know also that the boy Abe Lincoln brought with him into Spencer County, Ind., an inherent decency and greatness, which afforded an opportunity to the environment, of which we are justly proud, to work its ways upon a transcendently great soul.

It is improper to memorialize the birth of a great leader if we do not understand and appreciate the significance of his life and demonstrate, at the same time, not only an intent, but a capacity to emulate it. He taught us this truth at Gettysburg. We will desecrate his memory if we forget it.

The life of Abraham Lincoln is so completely interwoven with the chain of events which brought the Republican Party into existence and with the beginnings of that party that it is eminently proper that in paying respect to Lincoln we, the Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana, who are the inheritors of the great traditions of that party, which he not only helped to formulate but which he emulated by his living, tonight renew our study of those traditions; that we may better understand them so that from this better understanding of the traditions of our party, of the forces which created it, and of the conditions under which Abraham Lincoln served the country as the leader of that party, we may better evaluate the true position which that party should occupy in this country today.

By so doing we Republicans of this congressional district will escape the pitfall of reactions and negative criticism advanced by a few men in our party within this district and by too many men without it, in the name of Republicanism. Such men neither understand nor respect the traditions of our party. They manifest an ignorance of history and a capacity for blind hatred, approaching Vallandinghamism. If permitted to assume leadership in this district they will destroy us. We will not permit them to do so.

The history of the United States conclusively proves that the Republican Party is the hereditary possessor of the great democratic philosophy first given to America by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and extended by him and the other great liberals among the delegates to the Constitutional Convention into the Constitution of the United States. By tradition it is not the party of monopoly or oppression, but it is the party of the common man. It came into existence with the support of the industrial workers and the small farmers of the North, the so-called rag, tag, and bobtail of their generation, who rallied together to support the great moral issue of their day—that man should be free without regard to his color.

By the year 1852, and from then until at least 10 years after the Civil War, the Democratic Party, which Jackson had named by dropping the name Republican from the party's name, Democrat-Republican, had been completely captured by the representatives of the slave-owning aristocracy of the South and the representatives of capital of the North, who were enjoying not only the prosperity of trade with the plantation owners of the South, but the benefits also of a nominal abandonment by the South of its agitation for free trade. For, in exchange for the right to enjoy the benefits of the labor of the black man without wage, the southern slave-owning Democrats tacitly permitted tariff barriers to be placed upon the things they bought, in turn passing on the inequalities of this burden upon the backs of the black man who toiled for them for nothing. At the time our party came into existence, the Democratic Party was desecrating the memory of Jefferson and Jackson, and its party name had become but a snare and a delusion. On the other hand, the Whig Party, which had formerly been the vehicle of the special interests of the North was deserted by them, so that it was completely and decisively defeated in 1852. The Whigs refused to acknowledge that the issue of slavery had to be met and not temporized with. They attempted, instead, to capture the support of all the dissident groups of their day, with weasel words and compromises. They disappeared. Let those who today advocate a similar course for our party in this district mark this well.

The times demanded a new party. Courageous men founded one.

The first Republican platform of 1856 therefore began with these words:

"*Resolved,* That, with our Republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that the primary object and ultimate design of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction."

We Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana have not forgotten that on the first informal ballot for Vice President at that convention, Abraham Lincoln was the second choice; and we have not forgotten that among the delegates to that convention were such men as Charles Francis Adams, David Wilmot, Alphonso Taft, Joshua Giddings, and Samuel C. Pomeroy; and we Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana also know that Thomas Jefferson was elected President of the United States twice as a Democrat-Republican; that James Madison was elected twice as a Republican; that James Monroe was elected twice as a Republican; that Myers in his History of the Republican Party says "The Republicans took their platform from the old Jefferson-Jackson Democratic Party and placed a special emphasis upon the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, and other typically Jeffersonian measures." Therefore we Republicans in southern Indiana, who understand the traditions of our party, know to whom this platform of 1856 referred when it spoke of our "Republican forefathers."

And, we also know that Abraham Lincoln, speaking in Philadelphia on February 22, 1861, on his way to Washington for his first inauguration, said this:

"I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence * * * it was not the mere matter of separation * * * from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

Now, then, what do we learn here tonight as we reexamine the great tradition of this party? We learn that it came into existence not as the vehicle of economic oppression, not as the instrumentality of economic slavery, but that its founders were imbued completely with and motivated solely by the great truths embodied in the Declaration of Independence and thereafter translated as a philosophy into the Constitution of our land. And we also know that the people who supported this party through the terrible days of the Civil War, by their steadfast belief in the true principles of the Republican Party, by their steadfast desire to see its purposes effectuated and by their steadfast support of Abraham Lincoln, marched with him through Gethsemane, and in so doing furnished the first example to the world of a group of men bound together so resolutely in a political organization known as the Republican Party, that they willingly went as white men to battle other white men—and to die—in order that black men might be free. History nowhere else records any other group of men so devoted to the cause of extending democracy into the field of economics and racial relations and to the destruction of economic shackles. This then is our heritage. God granting us the strength, we shall not desecrate it.

But we Republicans of this congressional district also know that an opposition party cannot be only negative in its criticism; that it must offer a positive program to solve social and economic problems; that soldiers are more devoted to their duty than civilians; that people will ferret out appeasement and defeatism and purely political oppositionism no matter how thickly coated with affirmation of patriotism and dishonest protestations of obeisance to the Constitution. We know this because history proves it.

Listen again to the voice of history.

On August 20, 1864, the Democratic Party met in convention at Chicago. It was the vehicle of the special interests whose greatest desire was the renewal of trade relations with the old order in the South. August Belmont, one of the richest men of his day, was their national chairman. The notorious traitor Vallandigham came out of Canada to manage that convention and to make the successful motion that General McClellan's nomination be made unanimous. They adopted the most negative, defeatist platform ever adopted by a political party in all of our history. They sent their candidate, a dissatisfied Union general, upon that platform before the American people. They were ignominiously overwhelmed in that election, but what is more pointed, they never elected another Democratic President until 1884, when they elected Grover Cleveland, all this despite the fact that we Republicans must admit that the corruption which was rife in the administration of Grant assumed the proportion of national scandal.

Listen to but some of the provisions of that Democratic platform of 1864:

"*Resolved,* That this convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that after 4 years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired—justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to the ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States.

"*Resolved,* That the aim and object of the Democratic Party is to preserve the Federal Union and the rights of the States unimpaired, and they hereby declare that they consider that the administrative usurpation of extraordinary and dangerous powers not granted by the Constitution * * * the suppression of freedom of speech and of the press * * * the open and avowed disregard of State rights * * * is calculated to prevent * * * the perpetuation of a Government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

"*Resolved,* That the shameful disregard of the administration to its duty in respect to our fellow citizens who are and long have been prisoners of war and in a suffering condition, deserves the severest reprobation on the score alike of public policy and common humanity.

"*Resolved,* That the sympathy of the Democratic Party is heartily and earnestly extended to the soldiers of our Army and sailors of our Navy who are and have been in the field and on the sea under the flag of our country, and, in the event of its attaining power, they will receive all the care, protection, and regard that the brave soldiers and sailors of the republic have so nobly earned."

Listen to the Republican Platform of 1864:

"We pledge ourselves as Union men, animated by the common sentiment and aiming at a common object, to do everything in our power to aid the Government in quelling by force of arms the rebellion now raging against its authority.

"That we approve the determination of the Government of the United States not to compromise * * * or to offer any terms of peace except such as may be based upon * * * unconditional surrender."

Abraham Lincoln was overwhelmingly elected on that platform and for the next 20 years the people of the country entrusted our party with the reins of the National Government.

Those who can read—let them read; those who can hear—let them hear.

We the people of the Eighth District of Indiana speaking only for ourselves do hereby declare that we can both read and hear.

And so we know as a matter of historical truth that the Republican Party came into existence as the party of the common man and as a party with a constructive program, designed to meet squarely the issues of the day; and therefore, from the history of our party, we know that within 6 years after it came into existence, at a meeting of 53 people in the little town of Ripon, Wis., it elected as its candidate for President, the greatest man the Americas have ever produced, it destroyed the institution of slavery, it freed the black man, and it remained continuously in power for 24 years, solely by virtue of the impetus which it obtained from the constructive greatness of its initial principles.

We also know from a study of history of this party that its great leaders have consistently been in the forefront of all campaigns for international cooperation, and that no member of this party in all of its history worthy of the name of leadership has ever been an advocate of a negative, inept foreign policy for this Nation.

On the contrary, this party, in its earliest days, evidenced its capacity for constructive thinking on matters of foreign policy. In that same eventful election of 1864, in the midst of the greatest domestic crisis in the country's history, Lincoln and the founders of our party, still had the constructive vision to denounce in our party's platform the attempt of Napoleon the Third to destroy Mexican freedom and to establish Maximilian as the symbo. of monarchy in this hemisphere. And in that same year, the Democratic Party was so blinded by its negative defeatism that it indirectly condoned that awful threat to hemispheric freedom with a platform which was silent on that tremendous issue.

Again today, those who can read—let them read.

We know also that in 1881 James G. Blaine, as the Secretary of State of President Garfield, fathered the principle of South American cooperation, and that again, as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of Indiana's own President, Benjamin Harrison, Blaine completed the first multipowered international agreement with reference to the killing of seals in the Bering Sea; that he advocated the abrogation of the Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, which would have prevented our building the Panama Canal; that our party, under the leadership of Harrison and Blaine, advocated the building of a canal through Nicaragua at a time when the nations of Europe were attempting to obtain concessions to build one through Panama without our cooperation or consent. We know that our party built the Panama Canal. That it instituted in the Philippines the most progressive policy toward the yellow man the white man ever instituted. We know that not only ex-President Taft, but also Theodore Roosevelt—the greatest leader produced by our party after the death of Lincoln—advocated the adherence of our country to the League of Nations and a constructive policy toward that proposal designed to make it workable and equitable.

And, if any man would deny that, we quote to him the following from a public letter of ex-President Taft published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger of January 15, 1919:

"The last editorial of Colonel Roosevelt on the League of Nations, posthumously published, is one of the most important he ever wrote. It is important in its useful suggestions and limitations as well as in the spirit of constructive statesmanship which prompted it and shines through it.

"His attitude toward the problems involved in the League may well furnish an example to the doubters and opponents. Let them treat the League as something in its purpose to be desired, and let them lend their thoughts not devising and imaging objections but to finding alternative substitutes in its structure which will not be subject to their own objections."

From this review of our party's history, we again know that the leaders of the Republican Party are worthy of the name, from Abraham Lincoln down to the present time, have not been carping, negative critics, but men of vision, constructively proposing and executing both domestic and foreign policies calculated to give hope not only to the oppressed people of our land, but to the oppressed, hopefully waiting peoples of the world.

We, the Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana, also know that ours is the party which, in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century and the early part of the Twentieth Century, advocated and enacted laws against the growth of monopolies and gave them the most vigorous enforcement under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt that they have ever been given since their enactment. In the Eighth District of Indiana, where we know the history of our party, we know that in 1904, at Chicago, the Republican Party unanimously nominated Theodore Roosevelt as its candidate for President and sent him before the country upon a platform which contained the following provisions:

"Laws enacted by the Republican Party, which were intended for the protection of the public against unjust discrimination or illegal encroachment of vast aggregation of capital, have been fearlessly enforced by a Republican President, and new laws insuring reasonable publicity as to the operations of great corporations and providing additional remedies for the prevention of discrimination in freight rates, have been passed by a Republican Congress.

We also know that with Theodore Roosevelt running as the candidate of our party on that platform, the people of America gave us the most tremendous victory which our party had obtained at any time following the Civil War era.

It is satisfying to review history because, by so doing, we analyze the past, we learn our traditions and we observe the decisions made by men in the past which led both to success and failure. We have learned tonight, above all things, that our party came into power because there was a surging demand by people to extend the concept of freedom which is but a demand that we extend democracy or the Christian ethic into a new field of human relations. From this study, we learn above all things that life is dynamic, not static; that the great people of history are those who have acted constructively in a time of social upheaval and crisis, and we have particularly learned from this study tonight that men will follow and give political rewards only to those who offer them a constructive program.

But it is futile and completely negative for us to learn the truths of history and then fail to act upon them. These truths are valuable only if we analyze the conditions of our own times, see whether there is an analogy between the present and the past, and then, if we would be men worthy of the name, we must courageously apply the lessons of the past to the present. Again history is a relative term, it is both remote and immediate, and again I say to you that much has taken place within our time which will enable us to profit from our mistakes and to chart for ourselves in the Eighth District of Indiana, a policy for the future calculated to bring success.

Today revolutionary forces are at work all over the world, people are consciously or subconsciously seeking greater freedom from both political and economic oppression. The peoples of continental Europe, mentally saturated with various materialistic philosophies, have sought to solve their problems by various forms and various degrees of totalitarian or dictatorial governments. In our country, we are seeking to solve this problem under the philosophy of democracy, the application of which in the field of government is fundamentally expressed through the Declaration of Independence which, as Republicans, we have learned tonight was the basic creed of our founding fathers. In the field of economics, we believe that democracy will best be expressed by developing and expanding along democratic principles that form of economic life which we call the capitalistic system. So we know that today the fundamental issue confronting the American people is a democratic solution of the problems inherent in a capitalistic economy; just as at the time our party came into existence, the issue confronting the American people was the question of slavery, which involved in it both the extension of democracy to give black men civil rights and also the extension of democracy in the field of economics to give them economic freedom, by destroying forever the idea that any human being could possibly be a chattel, the subject of an agreement of barter and sale and doomed to labor without monetary recompense for his services.

Under these circumstances, what did the founders of our party do? They proposed initially very reasonable remedies—first, that the institution of slavery should not be extended into any States formed out of Federal lands; second, that the union of States must be preserved; and as the conflict developed in intensity, they declared finally in their platform of 1864, that when the Union was restored, the institution of slavery must be abandoned by the enactment of a constitutional amendment abolishing it forever in every State in the Federal Union.

These were constructive proposals. Some of these proposals were first stated in 1856, restated in 1860, and stated in their final form in 1864. Then, as now, there was waste and extravagance in the conduct of the Government under the Democratic administrations of 1852 and 1856, so that the Republican platform of 1860 contained this now so familiar plank:

"That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the Public Treasury by favored partisans, while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal metropolis show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded."

Of course the people of 1860 knew, as we know, that waste and extravagance in the conduct of government, and the resultant increased tax burden, always falls eventually upon the backs of those who labor on the farm, in the factory, and in the office, and produce and distribute the material wealth of a country. And the Republicans of 1860 rightfully denounced that waste and extravagance. But, the lesson which history teaches us is this—that waste and extravagance were but an incidental issue before the American people; that the burning issue was the question of slavery. So that it is inevitably true that it was the forthright, head-on meeting of that issue by the Republican Party in 1860 that brought about the election of Abraham Lincoln and not the provision in its platform denouncing waste and extravagance in government—the Republican Party was victorious because it announced a constructive program, calculated to meet the problems of the day.

Because we know these facts of history and because we know that the people of this District, and, indeed, the people of America, know well the failings of the present administration, we know also that we will not be victorious in 1944 if we limit ourselves solely,

as Republicans, to reviewing and denouncing the failures and errors, both of omission and commission, of this administration. If we did not know this by a study of remote history, we still know that the Republican Party of 1936 and in 1940 has repeatedly called these things to the attention of the American people and that the American people, by their vote, have said, in substance:

"Yes; we know these things are true; we don't like them, but the great issue before us today and the great issue before the world today, is the solution of the economic and political problems of our country and of the world thrcugh the application of the Christian philosophy and ethic, inherent in the concept which we know as democracy. What do you Republicans propose to do about that?"

Just as we know that the proposals of our Republican forefathers were forthright, even radical proposals for their times, we also know that our Republican forefathers were denounced as radicals and crackpots and people unfit to administer the National Government by the people of their times, who either were unwilling to admit that the question of slavery had to be solved, or who sought to avoid or stave off a forthright solution. But we also know that because our party then offered the people of America the only hope of solving the burning question of their time, they turned to it, despite those denunciations, as the party best qualified to govern and to solve that problem.

And so tonight we, the Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana, speaking for ourselves alone, know that if this party is to be true to its traditions, that if this party is to be successful, that if this party is to justify its existence as a political vehicle and medium through which people can work out the solutions of their problems under law, that we must, and we shall, offer to the people of this district, a constructive program, calculated to help solve both the domestic and foreign policies which to date have been met by this administration only by palliatives and expediencies.

And, finally, we Republicans of the Eighth District of Indiana, know that when we are true to the traditions of our party, the people of this district will accept us and we will enjoy political success. In 1942 we sent our candidates before the people of every township, of every city, and of every county in this district and we said to them, "We are not the party of the special interests, traditionally we are the party of the poor, the oppressed, the decent, the hard-working and the frugal. Give us your suffrage and we will demonstrate that fact." And the people believed us, and we in the Eighth District of Indiana know that throughout this district we attained the confidence of the people and greater political success than we had had in 12 years.

And we did more than that. We went to the Republicans of the State of Indiana and said, "Demonstrate to the people of Indiana that this party again is on the path of its traditions and that it is the party of the common man." And we nominated at the Republican State convention, from Clark County, Ind., and placed on the State Republican ticket, the first man from the ranks of union labor who had ever been a State candidate in the history of the Republican Party in the State of Indiana. And that man, your own Thomas E. Williams, in the election of 1942 obtained the greatest majority of any candidate which the Republican Party offered to the voters of our State.

And, if you will permit me to personalize—as the candidate of the Republican Party for the Congress of the United States, I told the people of this district that I understood, respected, and believed in the true traditions of the Republican Party; that I understood that it was not the party of monopoly and oppression, that it had come into existence as the party of the "rag, tag, and bobtail" and the party dedicated to the cause of freedom, and that whenever it had remained true to those traditions it had been successful and earned the respect and applause of the people of this country; and that God giving me strength in the performance of my duties in the Congress of the United States. I would attempt to remain true to those traditions. And the people of this district believed me. Again, for the first time in 12 years, our party elected a Republican to the Congress of the United States to represent the Eighth District of Indiana.

During the last year there have been some few, who, not knowing the traditions of our party, have denounced me because I have chosen as my republicanism, the republicanism of Abraham Lincoln and the founders of this party. But I want to say that I am convinced that those efforts have been in vain, and that all of the people of this district, without regard to party, who earnestly desire, in this time of war and great social upheaval, that a better society come out of it, have given me their confidence so unstintingly, that tonight I stand before this audience—and I hope I speak to a greater audience—and say:

"I am proud to represent you, the people of the Eighth District of Indiana. You are a great people; you are still the same kind of people who helped shape the character of Abraham Lincoln; you are true descendants of the decent, courageous people who helped create this Republican Party; you are the honorable, worthy, inheritors of its most sacred traditions.

"No man in America today represents a greater or a finer constituency."

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on February 12, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, no one ever deserves all the fine things said about him when he is introduced to speak. I am glad that I accepted the invitation to come into your midst, and I hope that we may all have a profitable time together.

These are the days when Republicans are very ready and willing to stand up and be counted, regardless of what the President might say to the contrary. These are the days when the Republican Party is really the hope of the Nation. God pity the Nation if there were no one among us but New Dealers. I heard Uncle Joe Cannen say once that he would rather turn his children over to a stepmother than to turn the country over to the Democrats. However, inefficient as they might have been, they could hardly be compared to this outfit that is now scuttling the ship of state. The real Democrats of the Nation are fast repudiating those who now operate the Government, and many of the real Democrats will find it convenient to support the Republican Party this year.

It is a pleasure to come into the district so ably represented by my good friend, WILSON D. GILLETTE. Mr. GILLETTE has been a regular and a stalwart Republican who always can be counted upon. There is no doubt that he will be reelected by a big vote.

It is a pleasure to come into the district that was represented so long and so faithfully by my very distinguished friend, Mr. Rich. You may think that we Congressmen are much given to praising and flattering those who have served with us. That is not the case with me tonight. A successful Congressman always has some good characteristics. In fact, he must have many good traits of mind and heart to achieve the distinction which WILSON GILLETTE and Robert Rich enjoyed in Washington. Brilliance and ability are good assets for a Congressman but they are not absolutely necessary assets. Good character is the most essential asset. There is no place in the world where the demagogue and the unreliable are so quickly cataloged as in the House of Representatives. I am glad that Mr. Rich is to be your candidate again. There is no question but that he will be reelected and there is no question but that he will be gladly received by his colleagues on the floor of the House. He made for himself a Nation-wide reputation by his demand that the Government cease its wastefulness and return to the practices of thrift and honesty. Nearly every day Robert Rich stood up on the floor of the House and called attention to the extravagance with which the Government was being operated. His laconic query: "Where are you going to get the money?" has given him a reputation that few Congressmen have ever attained. I am sure that when he comes back, he will still be accorded the privilege of asking that question if the New Deal is still in power. But if the Republicans are in power he will no doubt devote himself to the task of helping all Republicans to get the money to pay for the folly of these wastrels who have placed upon the backs of the Nation the greatest debt under which any Nation ever staggered in the history of the world.

I hope that I may be back in Congress and if I am I shall be glad to welcome Mr. Rich into our followship once more. The great State of Pennsylvania proved her Republicanism again by electing two Republican Congressmen just a few days ago. I was glad to welcome them to Washington.

All over the Nation tonight in the cities and in the county seat towns and in many rural communities, meetings similar to this one are being held. Republicans are militant and they should be because I predict and hope that they are about to receive a responsibility greater than that ever assumed by any other party in the history of the country. Whoever cleans up the mess made by Roosevelt and his wild theorists will assume a task that would be unwelcomed by anyone except genuine patriots.

February is the birth month of two of the world's mightiest men. Lincoln with his usual fairness speaking once of Washington said: "Washington—the mightiest name on earth." We can safely and proudly say tonight: "Washington and Lincoln—the two mightiest names on earth." History will support us in this statement. The growth of freedom and liberty on the earth as measured in the affections of the peoples of all countries toward these two men will also support us in this statement. A kind Providence guided Washington and gave him the courage and fortitude necessary to establish the Nation. A kind Providence also gave Abraham Lincoln the wisdom to save the Nation and the patience to bind up the Nation's wounds.

We as a Nation have always felt that Providence has intervened in our behalf, and we hope that in spite of the grievous manner in which our leaders have sinned in the past 12 years that we can still feel that there is truth in the words of the poet when he said:

"Judge not the Lord with feeble sense,
But trust Him for His grace,
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face."

Lincoln was the gift of providence to the Nation in its second great crisis. Those days were similar to these in that in both cases the Nation was moving away from its great anchorage, the Constitution. Lincoln was a young man when Henry Clay and Daniel Webster were guiding the ship of state. Lincoln followed closely the activities of Henry Clay as he developed the Missouri Compromise and as he held back with fine statesmanship the tide that inevitably would carry us into war. He knew the developments in Clay's life that gave to him the title of the "Great Pacificator." When Clay laid off his mantle as the leader of the protective tariff forces of the Nation, Lincoln was ready to assume it. Lincoln also followed closely the activities of Daniel Webster. Lincoln was a Member of Congress at about that time and he may have heard Daniel Webster make the great speech in which he said "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable." Whether Lincoln heard these words or not, it became his solemn duty and responsibility as President of the United States to prove that liberty and union were one and inseparable as he guided our Nation through the Civil War.

With Clay and Webster gone, the Nation drifted as a ship without a rudder. Then it was that the Whig Party lost its grip and went to pieces. The Democratic Party also became divided and a weak, vacillating Buchanan permitted the country to drift into a whirlpool of indecision and discontent which led us into the maelstrom of war.

Then it was that Abraham Lincoln raised his voice as one crying in the wilderness. In his speech before the Republican convention in 1856, he called the country back to its anchorage—the Constitution. That speech, known as the lost speech, considered by many as his greatest speech, and of which there is no authentic record, established him as a leader competent to take the place of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson—all of whom were strong in their support of the Constitution. As Andrew Jaskson had threatened to hang John C. Calhoun for his threats to draw away from the Constitution, so Abraham Lincoln said that a nation divided against itself cannot stand and he said that he would sooner be assassinated than to yield his allegiance to the Constitution.

As the Constitution was the foundation of the Republic in the days of Washington so it was the foundation upon which Lincoln builded the Republican Party and so it must be the foundation of the party which again will restore the Government to the people.

For the past 11 years, things have been different. I never thought I would live to see the day when the Chief Executive, spurred on by adherence to foreign ideologies, would with subtle persistence circumvent the strict application of the Constitution.

I was terribly shocked as a member of the Ways and Means Committee when he sent a letter to Judge HILL, one of my colleagues on that committee, in which letter he encouraged Judge HILL to force the passage of a certain bill regardless of reasonable doubts of its constitutionality. The whole country was shocked by his persistence in trying to pack the Supreme Court by most unconscionable methods, and in the fact of positive constitutional inhibitions. Repeatedly have we seen our Chief Executive smirk and quip about the horse and buggy days but my friends, truth and honesty are unchanging virtues. They are as eternal as God himself and no one can long prosper who flaunts these virtues and substitutes on their stead subtle innuendo and happy ambiguities. Our Government cannot endure if we abandon the Constitution. When the Constitution is cut from under us we fall. When we move from our constitutional foundation we fall.

While in the days when Lincoln was called to the helm the times were similar in many respects to our times; still there was one very noticeable difference. In those days there was no subtle effort to undermine and to destroy the great principles upon which the Republic was established. The Constitution of the Southern Confederacy was very similar to our Constitution. It was an honest difference among the States growing out of an institution which was always wrong. No one could honestly champion slavery but it had so entrenched itself that its eradication was not easy to accomplish. But in this day, there is in the Nation a sinister movement which, if permitted to carry on, would change our form of Government.

Foreign ideologies, as represented by the Frankfurters and the Hillmans, the Tugwells and the Browders and encouraged by the New Deal administration and even by the President and the First Lady of the land, have become so strong as to be a real menace. Something must be done about it. It has become so strong and so obnoxious that a great many and, I think, by far the best and most substantial element in the Democratic Party, is now ready to break away. It has become so obnoxious that the President has said the New Deal is dead. We agree that the New Deal in name is dead but those who championed it are yet alive and as busy as ever. They are becoming more militant every day and they are welding their forces together and the Communist Party is increasing its activity in all parts of the country.

These New Dealers of this faith are now occupying thousands of high positions in the Government and are close advisers of the President and have great influence in the President's cabinet. Among those who represent us in foreign countries, this element operates continucusly. When I consider the class and character of many of the men who have free access to the White House and the class and character of many honest men who never darken the door of the White House. I feel that it is only natural that many of the leading Democrats of the Nation have turned their faces against the New Deal.

There is no question but that in the country there is a tremendous resurgence of sentiment toward the great fundamentals in government that made our country great. This resurgence is coming together from all directions and in all walks of life. I hope that the Republican Party may in the next few months conduct itself in such a way as to command the confidence of the patriotic people of the Nation who will restore it to power. It is time to drive the money changers from the temple. America is a great country. Dishonesty and chicanery are not characteristics of greatness. We have no record that Washington and Lincoln turned the White House over to the Earl Browders and the Harry Bridges and the Sidney Hillmans of their day.

So, my friends, while things are in a terrific turmoil, I think I can see the dawn of a new day. You will remember the story in the Bible of the king who sent his messenger into a foreign field to bring back some information, and as he sat against the wall looking into the distance he saw the messenger coming and guessed from the manner of his movements that he was bringing good tidings. And then the king exclaimed: "Beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings."

I should hope that I might be a messenger of that kind for I do feel that I can bring you good tidings. I feel certain that next year when we will be holding these Lincoln Day celebrations we will be holding them under a Republican administration. I think that this resurgence of sentiment that I have mentioned is an irresistible force that will reestablish the affairs of the Nation upon a firm foundation according to the blueprints set out in the Constitution.

When the impartial historian has written the story of the New Deal I fancy he will say that our Nation must have been a nation of great vitality to have withstood the terrific strain that was placed upon it by Franklin D. Roosevelt and his followers.

In every great political conflict there has been one great issue. Lincoln took the position that liberty and union were one and inseparable and that the States could not separate from the Union. McKinley took the position that for America to be great it must learn to depend upon itself and not depend upon other nations. It must protect its own industries. McKinley won and the Nation entered an era of prosperity that made it the greatest commercial nation in the world. In the days of Wilson the country considered whether we should tie ourselves up in European quarrels and the people spoke emphatically. In these days the question is whether the Government in Washington shall dictate every activity of the people or whether this is yet a country of the people set up by the people for the protection and benefit of the people.

Personally I still believe that the most potent sentence in any American history book is the preamble to the Constitution, which says:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Let us now proceed to consider the practical problems which confront us. They are many and varied. Some of them have come to us because of the war but many of them have their origin in the desire of the New Deal to change our form of government. International problems have naturally be increased and intensified because of the war. The tendency of the New Deal has been decidedly toward dictatorship, which is evidenced by the growth of bureaucracy. At present there are over 3,000,000 civilian employees in the Government. In the State of Ohio there are a hundred thousand Federal employees while that great State operates its own business with about 20,000. No doubt the same is true of Pennsylvania but in greater proportion because JOE GUFFEY himself, I presume, would be responsible for placing many hundreds in this State if he packed all the departments as he did the Bituminous Coal Commission. It was his conduct in that respect that contributed greatly to set the coal industry back many years because of the failure of Congress to extend the life of the Coal Commission laws. That helped to put the coal industry into the hands of the Government.

I hope you will rid yourself of Joe because I can conceive of no greater service any one could render dear old Pennsylvania. My, what a contrast between him and Senator George Wharton Pepper and Senator Dave Reed and Senator Jim Davis.

Although many of us in Washington have been putting up the cry against bureaucracy I am still afraid that the American people do not appreciate its danger. Today there are hundreds of alphabetical combinations that overlap each other in wastefulness and extravagance. Government by directive touches as many people today as does government by statute. In fact, nobody escapes these thousands of alphabetical directives. This bureaucracy has changed our form of government as far as the power and influence of the President's Cabinet is concerned

I dare say that many of you cannot name the President's Cabinet. Sometimes I must think a little in naming them. The reason is that many of them have been relieved of their official functions. For instance, we have not heard from Madam Perkins doing anything for months. We never hear the Department of Commerce mentioned, and I myself do not know who is the real Secretary of Commerce. Likewise, the Secretary of Agriculture had as well be back on

his farm in Iowa or Indiana, wherever he comes from. The Secretary of the Treasury is not Morgenthau; it is Franklin D. Roosevelt and Randolph Paul. Since Jim Farley left the Postmaster General's office nobody knows who is the Postmaster General. And so it goes. The President has taken Jimmy Byrnes and Fred Vinson and Marvin Jones from their places on the bench and has given to them authority that overlaps and supersedes the authority of all and any Cabinet member. These men operate almost exclusively by directive and by Executive orders. In other words, with a carefully selected New Deal Supreme Court and with the Cabinet completely sterilized, and with the President bent on the establishment of a United States of the World, with himself as its President, there remains but one bulwark for the defense and maintenance of the Constitution. That is the Congress of the United States.

The Congress of the United States is the greatest obstacle in the way of the New Deal in its march to totalitarianism. That the President wants the Congress discredited is evidenced by the attack which is being made by the New Deal scandalmongers of the Nation. Over the radio and in the scandal press of the Nation you can detect a studied effort to discredit Congress as a whole and also individual Congressmen. One organization has set aside a large sum of money for the sole purpose of defeating certain Congressmen who have had the courage to oppose New Deal tactics. At the head of this group has been placed a man who typifies their philosophies and who speaks for them. But the Congress has courageously shown its determination to drive back the forces that would destroy the Government. Regardless of the taunts of these scandalmongers, the Congress more nearly represents the views of the American people today than any other agency in the Government. Congress, through the control of the purse strings and through its attempt to interpret the wishes of the people, is going to advance in power and influence, and it will save the Nation. I have no doubt that the next Congress will be overwhelmingly Republican, and if it is, you may rest assured that the days of the New Deal are done. And this even if we have not been able to rid ourselves of the Roosevelts.

I think the most blatant episode in the history of the New Deal was that enacted a short time ago by the President when he sent to Congress his message attempting to force the Congress to enact legislation providing him with an opportunity to steal at least a million votes from the armed forces of the country.

With your permission, I wish to discuss with you for a few minutes this important question of the soldiers' vote. The newspapers with whom I have no quarrel and who always have been more than fair to me, made, I think, a great mistake in giving the people of the Nation to understand that there was a considerable number of Congressmen and Senators in Washington opposed to giving the armed forces the opportunity to vote. All over the Nation the story has been circulated that the Republicans as a group were opposed to giving the soldiers in foreign countries the opportunity to vote. This was not true, and of course was without any foundation in fact. I can say without any doubt that it is my considered opinion that there was not one single Congressman or Senator of either political party in Washington who was opposed to giving the armed forces the opportunity to vote. That such a story should have been circulated was very unfortunate and the newspapers should have corrected this false impression.

Congress passed a law in 1940 which is now on the statute books. This law is fair and provides that every soldier or sailor and Army nurse, etc., qualified to vote under the law of the State of his or her residence shall be entitled to vote for electors for President and Vice President, United States Senators, and Congressmen. That is exactly what we contend for now. Mr. Roosevelt demands a drastic change. By the law of 1940 those in States requiring the payment of a poll tax would be released from payment of that tax. That law provides that the ballots should be sent out by the State authorities and that the ballots should provide for the names of State, county, and local candidates as the State legislatures may decide. Thus it may be seen that the law which Congress passed in 1940 provides for State ballots and for State supervision. This law was fair enough and satisfactory during the 1940 campaign. Why is Mr. Roosevelt so anxious to change it so drastically now?

I also think that newspapers failed most unfortunately when they gave the impression to the country that the Republicans in Congress were afraid to stand up and be counted. Where did they get the idea that any considerable number of Congressmen were opposed to the armed forces voting? Where did they get the idea that the Republicans were afraid to stand up and be counted? They took that from the message of the President. The President used his high office to send a message to Congress as Commander in Chief of the Army. The Commander in Chief of the Army as such has no authority to send a message to Congress on any subject which the Congress was then considering. Naturally the newspapers give great play to any utterance of the President. In his message he says:

"Our men cannot understand why the fact that they are fighting should disqualify them from voting."

There never was a more subtle and a more sinister innuendo ever uttered against Congress. The President knew that it was not a fact that anyone in Congress considered that because a soldier was fighting for his country that that should disqualify him from voting. The President further in his message says:

"As their Commander in Chief I am sure I can express their wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discrimination which is being practiced against them."

In a speech in Congress a few days ago I stated emphatically that I doubted the soundness of the assumption that he had any authority from the soldiers to express their wishes to Congress. He could not have had because he would have no right to canvass them and to get from them their views. He knew that he was misrepresenting the facts when he said that he could express their resentment against the discrimination which Congress was practicing toward the soldiers. The fact is that the soldiers could have had no resentment because there was no discrimination being practiced.

Further he seeks to attack the rules of the House and taunts the Congress by making the statement:

"Most Americans will agree with me that each Member of the two Houses of Congress ought to be willing in justice to stand up and be counted."

He in effect accuses Congress of being afraid to stand up and be counted. He found out when that bill came on for consideration that Congress was not afraid to stand up and be counted and that Congress did stand up and was counted. On a straight-out vote on the merits of the President's voting scheme as against the plan provided by a proper committee of the House of Representatives, Congress turned the President's proposition down by a vote of 224 to 168. Later when the matter came up for final vote in the House, the President's plan was rejected by a vote of 328 to 69. On this vote practically every Republican voted against the President as did 90 percent of the Democrats. Most of those who stood by the President were those who have always stood by him regardless of the merits of the matter at issue.

As I have already stated, the efforts of the President to force through his scheme of a military ballot is nothing more or less than another evidence of his determination to force his election for the fourth term and to override the Congress of the United States.

Just for a minute let us discuss the President's voting proposition. I feel sure that if the newspapers had printed this shameful excuse of a ballot so that the people could have read it there would have been such a revulsion of sentiment that the vote in Congress would have been more pronounced than it was.

I hold in my hand a copy of the bill which includes a copy of the soldiers' ballot that the President proposed to send out. You will see that it is just a little dinky affair that deserved the designation of bobtail ballot. Purposely it was made as short as possible and as indefinite as possible with no other purpose than that such a ballot would give the President the greatest possible advantage. For instance, there are four little blocks on this proposed ballot into which the soldier would write. In the first block he is asked to write the name of his choice for President or the name of his party. In the second block he is asked to write the name of his choice for Senator or the name of his party. In the third block he is asked to do the same with reference to the Representative in Congress. And in the fourth block the same with reference to the Congressman at Large.

From this you can see that there is no party designation on this ballot and neither is there the name of any candidate. There is no consideration given to the election of Governors or any State officers or any county or local officers. In many cases the soldier would not know who the Republican candidate for the Presidency was and neither would he know who the candidates for Senator were, but every soldier would know and be reminded that Franklin D. Roosevelt was the President and was a candidate for his fourth term and that he was the Commander in Chief of that soldier. This ballot would not be accepted under the laws of most, if not all, of the States of the Union and any action taken by Congress would not make it acceptable because the Constitution provides that the States control the manner and method of elections. The President cannot be elected by popular vote.

Perchance there should be some State that would count these ballots, and if the election was close and the electoral votes of that State were required to name a President, then it is very probable that the whole election would be in the courts or before Congress for a final recount or final determination. There are three States that do not provide for voting by absent voters' ballot. How, then, could these bobtail ballots be counted in those States? Suppose one of these States counted such ballots and the other did not: This would surely result in litigation. If they would not be valid in some States and would be valid in others, how then could there be a general election as far as the votes of the soldiers are concerned? If the whole election was not a general election, how could it be determined that it was a valid election?

There is a provision in the bobtail ballot bill which provides that a special day must be set aside by the commanding officer at which time the soldiers will be gathered together and their bobtail ballots will be gathered in. What a grand chance to gather a lot of ballots marked for no one but F. D. R. If you were a soldier in an outfit in which the commanding officer was afraid of his commanding general who was afraid of offending his Commander in Chief, I think you

would hesitate before you would mark your ballot against the Commander in Chief.

Setting aside all these considerations that I have spoken of, let us consider the Constitution. The Constitution provides that the President shall be chosen by electors, which electors are chosen respectively by their States. This is the language of the Constitution:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and for all persons voted for as Vice President, and the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United Sates, directed to the President of the Senate; etc."

My friends, how in the name of common honesty can we advocate the setting aside of such a plain provision of the Constitution?

Now, my friends, the Republicans in Congress are just as anxious to have the soldiers vote as the New Dealers or the Communists or the Socialists In fact I would be sorry if our soldiers and sailors would have to depend upon either of these three groups for the privilege of voting.

The Republicans propose that everything possible be done to provide facilities by which the armed forces can vote. Forty or more of the Governors of the Nation indicated to Congress that they were in favor of furnishing the armed forces with the privilege of voting for a full ticket, and will call their legislatures into session to enact such legislation that may be necessary. We Republicans took the position that we should not only make provision for the soldiers to indicate their preference for President but we should provide a method by which they could vote the whole State ticket. It is important to them that they be permitted to vote for their friends back home who may be candidates for some courthouse job or for a position in the legislature or for Governor of their State.

It is just as easy to transport a full ballot as it is to transport a ballot which would be largely for the benefit of Franklin D. Roosevelt and no one else. The bill that passed the House by a vote of 328 to 69 provides that we avail ourselves of the 12,000,000 post cards that have already been printed and that are now available in foreign camps, and that these be used by the armed forces as applications for ballots, and we recommend that every State amend its law if necessary so that these postal cards can be accepted as applications for ballots. We further recommend that the States amend their laws so that election officials may upon receipt of these postal cards or any other authentic application be permitted to send immediately to the veteran making such application a full and complete ballot, thereby giving the soldier, or sailor, a chance to vote privately and without being herded by a lot of high-powered officers into one place where the voting would be done more or less under military supervision.

The difference between Roosevelt's plan and the plan which carried the House overwhelmingly was that Roosevelt wanted an illegal, unconstitutional ballot upon which no name was written and no party was designated and on which from a practical standpoint he knew that most of the sailors and soldiers would write his name upon the ballot and probably the name of no other person. I measure my words when I say that this was the plan out of which the New Deal thought that they would gain at least a million votes.

I am glad to report that from all indications Roosevelt's bobtail-ballot plan will not prevail, and that he will be required to be elected in the constitutional way—if he is elected at all.

Further commenting on the baneful effect of New Deal muddling through the overlapping of countless unnecessary New Deal agencies, I want to discuss with you briefly what I think is probably the greatest of all our domestic problems. At least, it is one of the greatest. The problem of winning the war is the greatest, but next in importance is the food problem. We Republicans have successfully established to the world that winning the war is not a partisan matter, and that no political party has a monopoly on that phrase. The President just recently said that the New Deal is dead and that "win the war" would be a good name for his party. His suggestion met with such universal condemnation that he has not mentioned it since. I repeat that the food problem is a very important one. It is important because it concerns every living human being and it concerns every living animal, and also food products are used commercially in so many ways that the commercial life of the Nation depends largely upon the chemicals derived from food products.

The food situation in Washington has been bungled terribly, and one of the results is that the housewives of the Nation have been driven to desperation by the rationing and point regulations. Another result is that there have been terrible dislocations in the quantity and quality of foods offered for sale. Another is that price of food products have advanced terribly and much higher than the figures put out by the Government agencies. Movement of commodities has been so hampered that for a time there was no poultry moving, but shortly thereafter the poultry market was flooded. There was a time when there was such a scarcity of beef that it was impossible to secure a steak and later we found that the cattle had been driven to the stockyards in such great numbers as to overtax the capacity of the stockyards. In spite of this, beef is still scarce and hard to get. Hogs were forced upon the market in such great numbers that regulations had to be drawn against the sale of hogs, with the result that the farmer lost many millions and at the same time there was no oversupply of pork in the markets. All these dislocations have been caused by the failure of the New Deal to handle the food problem. They were so jealous of their own viewpoints that they stubbornly declined to give consideration to the recommendations of anyone, not even Mr. Herbert Hoover, who, as everyone knows, is the greatest authority on food in the world. There are 10 or 12 agencies in the Government that have to do with the food problem. Each of these has stubbornly vied with the other in exercising its functional authority, with the result that chaos has been manifested in all food production and also in food transportation.

Realizing the importance and the seriousness of this problem, the Republican leadership in Congress a few months ago, appointed a committee of Republicans to investigate the food situation. This committee consists of 45 Congressmen representing all sections of the United States and representing all phases of the food problem. This committee is known as the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. I was honored by being selected to act as chairman of this group. In this group are several stock raisers, fruit growers grain producers and men familiar with the production and processing of all kinds of food. Likewise there are men from the large cities who know the problems of the consumer. This committee has made many suggestions to the New Dealers, some of which suggestions have been ignored and others have been followed. Early last spring we suggested that we were surely riding to a shortage of feed and a shortage of various kinds of food. The departments indicated that we were unduly excited and that there would be an abundance of everything. We suggested that production should be encouraged rather than that food should be restricted. We claimed that the New Deal should abandon its fallacious plans of killing little pigs and destroying crops but should rather return to the philosophy of plenty. They steadfastly refuse to remedy conditions. You probably do not know that during the year 1943 the Government paid out many thousands of dollars to people for not raising commodities. They will probably do the same in 1944. As you know they have made changes in their personnel from the days of Leon Henderson on down to the present time. They have cleared out many of their crackpots and their rattle-brained theorists but they have not done away with many of their overlapping agencies but rather have increased them.

You will remember that early in the spring the President brought Chester Davis back into his circle and put him in charge of the food problem. It was hoped that he would give to Chester Davis the authority to control this whole problem and give him autority to work it out. Our food study committee instructed me, as chairman, to introduce a bill in Congress providing that the whole food problem should be placed under one head. It was our idea if this were done that the President would put Chester Davis at the head for although he is a Democrat, it is well recognized that he is an honest, sincere man who would do his duty if he were permitted to do so. When the President found that our bill was very popular and would be sure to pass the Congress, he fired Chester Davis and appointed another man. Since that time our committee has not been very active in pressing for the enactment of this bill but as soon as the subsidy fight is out of the way I think we will do so again. The food producers of the Nation favor this legislation and the food processors favor this legislation and I am sure a one-man administration would relieve the situation as far as the consumer is concerned.

I would again repeat that our committee is a Republican food-study committee and its membership consists only of Republicans and I would announce further to you that this is one committee of Congress that operates without any expense to the Government. This is an innovation which in itself should recommend our committee as being very distinctive at least.

I am sorry to say that from all indications the food problem will get worse, for the meat producers claim that in 3 or 4 months we will have serious shortages of meat of all kinds, and serious droughts threaten the wheat crop.

Another very important problem is pending in Congress and I wish I had time in this address to discuss it, but I will only mention it. I refer to the question of consumer subsidies. You recall that this has been before Congress at different times and the House of Representatives has repeatedly rejected consumer subsidies. It is now being debated in the Senate and something must be done about it by the 17th of February. If something is not done by that time, the Commodity Credit Corporation will cease to function and the payment of roll-back subsidies will be dispensed with unless the President can find some way under his numerous alleged war powers to circumvent the action of Congress and to pay these subsidies regardless of the action of Congress. The Republican Party is not opposed, and never has been opposed, to any legislation that would permit the consumer to get his food with the least trouble and the least delay and the least expense. The Republican Party has been opposed to the payment of subsidies under a plan which will benefit neither the

producer nor the consumer. The roll-back subsidies now have cost millions of dollars but the price of food has continued to rise. The working man who in many instances was led to believe that this was greatly to his advantage now has changed his mind and many of the labor groups are taking a different position that what they did a short time ago.

Being a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I should probably talk to you something about that very important subject with which our committee deals in season and out of season. I refer to the unpopular but very necessary little word in all Government activities. I mean the word "taxes." The Ways and Means Committee consist of 25 members. When the Democrats are in power they have 15 members and we Republicans have 10. After the next election I hope that will be reversed and we will have 15 and they will have 10. Upon the Ways and Means Committee devolves the duty under the Constitution to initiate all legislation for the raising of revenue. No organization functions long without a ways and means committee. Roosevelt characterized the dollar sign once as the "Silly Dollar Sign." I do not wonder that it has become silly when we consider the enormous debt that the New Deal has placed upon our Nation. The duties of the Ways and Means Committee are to provide the finances with which to operate the Government. I am sure you will agree with me that that is not an easy task in these days. Occasionally someone tells me that he feels sorry for us who have this arduous task to perform and wonders how we stand it. I tell him that we have become used to it and although we are supposed to gather in $300,000,000 a day, which is the cost of operating the Government, we gather in about a hundred million and the rest of it we just charge and put it on the book. We leave it to the next generation to pay. I know you think that is cowardly of us but if I would reverse the proposition and ask if you are willing to pay three times as much taxes as you pay now in order that we might pay as we go, I am sure you will say that it cannot be done. When the New Deal came into power in 1933 the national debt was about $18,000,000,000.

At first we jumped the debt gradually until it had reached what we thought was terrible proportions when we surpassed the debt that followed the last war. We felt that it was terrible that our country in peacetimes should incur a debt larger than that we had incurred during the last war. The debt at the close of the last war was twenty-seven and a half billion dollars. We passed the twenty-seven and a half billion mark without anyone dying of apoplexy and we went over the $45,000,000,000 mark. We then passed a law providing a debt limitation of $49,000,000,000. Then we passed that and we were still in peacetimes. Then we went to $65,000,000,000. Then it was that the people realized that the poet was right when he said:

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mein
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

From sixty-five billion we took a jump to one hundred and twenty-five billion. We thought then that we would make it large enough so as never to be compelled to go through the ordeal again. But this was not to be our good fortune. From one hundred and twenty-five billion we jumped to two hundred and ten billion, and we will be past two hundred ten billion at the end of this year, and we will still be strong. It is likely we will not stop short of three hundred billion. Most all of our bonds call for more than 2 percent interest but taking 2 percent average, you can see that the interest on our public debt would be $6,000,000,000 a year. This is one-third more than the total Budget was when our frugal, conscientious, retiring Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to office.

My friends, what are we going to do about this enormous debt? Can we with Roosevelt say that it matters not how big the debt will be because we owe it to ourselves? Ladies and gentlemen, there are three ways by which a national debt can be paid: First, by inflation, second, by repudiation, and, third, by taxation. Inflation is dangerous. Enough inflation to pay this enormous debt would take the Government down to destruction. The economy of no nation however rich could withstand the ravishing flames of such a burning course.

Repudiation is a course for cowards. If the New Deal administration is continued in power, repudiation will be its course. It has been the course of all dictators. A dictator is one who breaks precedents. He is one who claims he is tired of the chains of tradition and he must show his people a new deal. His philosophy is the philosophy of the mob. Ladies and gentlemen, our Government was founded on honesty of purpose. George Washington was honest. Benjamin Franklin was honest. We like to think every President that has ever occupied the Presidential chair was anxious for the perpetuity of tne Republic. No President has ever willfully skirted so closely to the brink of destruction and with such a nonchalant attitude as our present incumbent.

Then we come to the last remedy. That is the remedy of taxation. I know that the present tax laws are terribly cumbersome. I know that the tax blanks are terribly and I fear unnecessarily complex but when you consider that in the 11 years that the New Deal has been in power they have passed 17 new tax bills each of which raised the taxes by many millions, and when you consider that 10 years ago only about three million paid taxes as against fifty million who pay now, and when you consider that 5 years ago the annual cost of government was only about four billion while it is forty-two billion now, you can naturally expect many more people to complain and to complain much louder. I am sorry that I cannot promise you much relief although we Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee are demanding immediate action. It is not likely that permanent relief will come until after a Republican Congress has been elected.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have for years said in my speeches over this land that the good people of the United States will call the Republican Party back into power out of sheer necessity. When the Government wrecked itself on the rocks of loose financial policy in Cleveland's day the Nation called William McKinley to the helm, and as if by magic, the Nation was restored. When the country struggled under the most terrific debt it had incurred up to that time—I mean in 1920—the people called Republicans back into power. For 10 years while the Republicans were in power—1920 to 1930—the Congress passed several tax bills, but in each instance the tax bill lowered the rate of taxes on the backs of the people, and under every tax bill under a Republican administration we were able to reduce the debt. We reduced the debt a billion dollars a year for the 10 years under which we operated. The Democrats have always made the debts and we have always paid them. Ladies and gentlemen, we will pay them again. How? By return to honesty and frugality and common decency. We will pay them in sweat and in tears, if necessary. They must be paid because ours is a free country for which precious blood has been shed. Next fall we will elect to the Presidency, I hope, some man who will appreciate the seriousness of his position; who will recognize that laughter and lying and deceit and chicanery are not the qualifications that will enable a man to pay this enormous debt. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee when that name shall be an honor and distinction in the Republic. I hope to be a member of that committee when we can do something constructive and when we can see the daylight again.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will win the war, but not until after the election. The people surely are tired of the present maladministration of national affairs and surely will restore the Government to themselves. The welfare of the people demands it. The perpetuity of the Republic demands it. Our party must be ready to assume the responsibility that the people are sure to give to us at the next election.

I wish to thank you and I hope that this will be the year of jubilee to the American people.

The British White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over radio station WHN, Saturday, February 12, 1944:

The President in his humanity and wisdom, has offered a directive setting up the War Refugee Board. His purpose and aim are to rescue hapless and homeless Jews and other refugees from the charnal house of Hitler's Festung Europa. In that same spirit of mercy, there has been introduced in the House of Representatives two resolutions, one by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WRIGHT; the other by the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. COMPTON, which seek at long last to have definite action taken by way of urging Great Britain to abrogate the Malcolm McDonald white paper of 1939, and to reestablish Palestine as a haven and National homeland for the Jews, in accordance with the principles laid down by the famous Balfour declaration of 1917. Since this white paper of 1939 limits immigration into Palestine to 75,000 (only thirty-odd-thousand certificates of entrance are left), and thereafter by April 1 next precludes entrance of Jews except by the will of the Arab majority, it violates:

1. The Balfour Declaration which guarantees Palestine as a national homeland, which declaration was abetted and approved by 52 nations, including our own.

2. It violates a concurrent resolution of Congress adopted in 1922 favoring the said Balfour declaration as the basis for ceding of Palestine to Great Britain as a mandatory power.

3. It violates the Anglo-American treaty of 1924, wherein the said Balfour Declaration was reaffirmed and wherein it was mutually agreed—

(a) That there could be no unilateral infraction of the treaty by either party, and

(b) that there could be no discrimination as to the immigration into Palestine of peoples on the grounds of race or religion.

Thus, aside from the moral and spiritual ties, there is a legal nexus between the United States and Palestine. Thus far our administration has been strangely silent in the face of treaty and mandate violation. It has failed to make public protest against this so-called white paper. There was ample grounds

for so doing, since this white paper was a unilateral infraction of the Treaty of 1924, and further involves discrimination as to immigration into Palestine on the grounds of religion and race. Frankly, our official silence at such attack upon the sanctity of a treaty is a sort of "mystery wrapped inside an enigma." Congress should not be silent. Favorable action upon the resolutions aforesaid and now pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House will needle England into action. Be assured that England is very solicitous of a favorable public opinion in America. She covets our good will. She wants a continuous flow of lend-lease benefactions. Favorable consideration of these resolutions will be a warning to England that she must change her policy in Palestine. Otherwise, she will incur the enmity of thousands upon thousands. The open hostility of many Irishmen in America and Irish descendants grew out of England's adamant and cold-blooded treatment of the inhabitants of Ireland. England dare not risk the development of additional festering sores of hostility on the part of another segment of the American population.

England will heed congressional warning and admonition. She dare not flout the will of our Congress.

It is not my intent or purpose to drive a wedge between us and our brave ally, England. We must acknowledge her tremendous tasks and contribution in this struggle for democracy's survival. Nonetheless, we cannot blind existent circumstances, realizing that even the sun has its spots.

Once before there was a violation of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. In 1937 there was an exchange of notes between our then British Ambassador, Robert W. Bingham, and the British Foreign Office concerning partition of Palestine by slicing off Transjordania, and Ambassador Bingham reminded Anthony Eden (then Foreign Secretary) that no change in the political status of Palestine could take place without the previous consent of the Government of the United States "having regard to the terms of the American British Convention of December 3, 1924." America has not consented to the white paper, which materially changes Palestine's political status.

In a note of July 7, 1937, from the British Foreign Office to our American Ambassador at London, the British Government stated, "The United States Government has accepted the provisions in article 27 of the mandate, which lays down that the mandate may be altered with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations." Great Britain submitted the white paper to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as a condition precedent to seeking necessary approval of the Council of the League but the Permanent Mandates Commission (which contained a British member) and the latter authority not only refused to accept the terms of the white paper limiting immigration as well as the purchase of land by the Jews, but in very forceful language repudiated the terms of the McDonald white paper. The exigencies of the war precluded England's presenting the white paper for approval to the Council of the League of Nations.

Thus, then, the white paper is stripped of all legality. It has no legal justification whatsoever. By its own admission, Britain states it cannot alter the terms of the mandate given to it by the League of Nations without the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, and that consent has not been obtained.

Also, at San Remo, on April 25, 1920, the Allied Supreme Command allotted the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain, for the express purpose of putting the Balfour Declaration into effect. In correspondence subsequently between Secretary of State Colby and the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the United States Government claimed and was accorded, the right to pass on the terms of the mandate. The draft of the Palestine mandate was submitted to the United States Government and, at its request, minor alterations were made in it. At the same time, in the crests of the Jewish National Home, the United States expressly gave up certain economic rights which it had in Palestine. The white paper, since it stops Jewish immigration, alters the mandate given to the mandatory power, Great Britain. There can be no alteration of the mandate without the consent of the United States, as well as the Council of the League of Nations as aforesaid. The United States has not consented.

Upon Britain's announcement of its change of policy, as contained in the white paper, President Roosevelt was asked to take action in protest by a petition signed by 51 Senators, 194 Representatives, and 30 Governors. The President expressed his sympathy and promised to do "all in his power," to prevent curtailment of Jewish immigration to Palestine. On May 17, 1939, despite animadversions against it from all over the world, the British Government published its white paper, which in effect as of April 1 next, would freeze the Jewish minority in Palestine as a permanent ghetto and Palestine will be sold down the river.

That the British Cabinet itself felt that its proposed solution for the future of Palestine was not based on the merits of the case but rather on political expediency of the moment is evidenced from a statement reputedly made by Lord Halifax, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, now British Ambassador here, that "there are times when ethical considerations must yield to practical necessity." That is a fine bit of sophistry. If such practical necessity may be deemed just, I say "There is a point beyond which even justice becomes unjust."

In the House of Commons in the debate on the white paper, Leopold S. Amery, formerly first lord of the admiralty and formerly secretary of state for the colonies, and who was closely associated with the discussion which preceded the Balfour Declaration when he was Secretary to the War Cabinet, said, "The Jews were to be in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. The white paper is a direct invitation to the Arabs to continue to make trouble. As for the Jews, they are now told that all the hopes that they have been encouraged to hold for 20 years are to be dashed to the ground, all their amazing effort wasted—insofar as it was an effort to create a national home—all the pledges and promises that they have been given, broken. That is to be their reward for loyalty, for patience, for almost unbelievable self-restraint."

Herbert Morrison, now Home Secretary, in the historic debate on the white paper in the House of Commons, said, "If we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern, and which is dangerous to British security, to peace, and to the economic interest of the world in general and to our own country. Moreover, it will not work."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the House of Lords on May 23, 1939—"When I come to the actual policy as outlined in this white paper, then I am bound in honesty to say that I have very grave misgivings. I cannot feel that it holds out a prospect of reasonable justice to the Jews. Consider their position, as indeed it was put before your lordships by the noble viscount opposite. In 1914 they were 80,000; they are now more than 450,000. They have been encouraged to enter the country; they have been encouraged to invest great sums of money in industrial and other enterprises; they have erected very noble buildings; and, apart from the industrial and agricultural improvements which they have wrought, they have set a seal upon the genuineness of their belief in a Jewish culture of their own by their noble university in Jerusalem."

The views of many other distinguished men, like Lord Wedgwood, Lloyd George, and General Smuts are reflected in the following views uttered by Winston Churchill who, on the occasion of the debate on the White Paper, said, "I say quite frankly that I find this is a melancholy occasion. I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government. As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or, and it will be a vain hope, for the sake of a quiet life. Like my honorable friend, I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself, by silence or inaction, to what I must regard as an act of repudiation. There is much in this White Paper which is alien to the spirits of the Balfour Declaration, but I will not trouble about that. I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of an Arab majority. That is a plain breach of a solemn obligation. I am astonished that my right honorable friend, the Prime Minister, of all others, and at this moment above all others, should have lent himself to this new and sudden default.

"To whom was the pledge of the Balfour Declaration made? It was not made to the Jews of Palestine, it was not made to those who were actually living in Palestine. It was made to world Jewry and in particular to the Zionist associations. It was in consequence of and on the basis of this pledge that we received important help in the war, and that after the war we received from the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine. This pledge of a home of refuge, of an asylum, was not made to the Jews in Palestine, but to the Jews outside Palestine, to that vast unhappy mass of scattered, persecuted wandering Jews whose intense, unchanging, unconquerable desire has been for a national home—to quote the words to which my right honorable friend the Prime Minister subscribed in the memorial which he and others sent to us: 'The Jewish people have through centuries of dispersion and persecution awaited the hour of its restoration to its ancestral home.'"

Churchill continued by saying that the white paper was equivalent to filing a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy, and then said, "Can we—and this is the question—strengthen ourselves by repudiation? Shall we relieve ourselves by this repudiation? The triumphant Arabs have rejected it. They are not going to put up with it. The despairing Jews will resist it. What will the world think about it? What will our friends say? What will be the opinion of the United States of America?"

His peroration was as follows: "Yesterday the minister responsible descanted eloquently in glowing passages upon the magnificent work which the Jewish colonists have done. They have made the desert bloom. They have started a score of thriving industries, he said. They have founded a great city on the barren shore. They have harnessed the Jordan and spread its electricity throughout the land. So far from being persecuted, the Arabs have crowded into the country and multiplied till their population has increased more than even all world Jewry could lift up the Jewish population." They have fulfilled his hopes. How can he find it in his heart to strike them this mortal blow?

In a little over one month Jews will be barlocked from Palestine. How ill have the

Jews used Palestine that now the one open door must be slammed shut in their search for dignity and security? Indeed, they husbanded its arid soil, made it rich in the fruits of the earth. They built hospitals for Jews and Arabs alike. The brought music and science that had been left behind in civilization's march.

The British Colonial Office says, "Let the Jews go elsewhere." That is said in mocking parallel to, "Let them eat cake."

Many suggestions have been made for havens for Jews. How fruitful were these suggestions is revealed by the attitude tersely expressed by the Australian delegate at the refugee conference at Evian. "Gentlemen," he said, "we in Australia have no racial problem, thank God. We do not intend to have one started." That summation is brilliant in its brevity, finality, and tragedy. Palestine is the only place where the Jews are not unwanted. Now, the white paper even precludes. Palestine must be opened as a temporary as well as a permanent shelter. It has an absorptive capacity for 2,000,000 more Jews.

Be it remembered that shortly before the signing of the mandate, a statement of policy was issued on June 3, 1922, by Winston Churchill, then Secretary for Colonies, in which the principle of absorptive capacity was set up as the sole criterion for immigration into Palestine. The white paper sets up another but illegal—a moral standard. Jews trapped by the Nazi jackals will manage to escape if they know Palestine is open. The underground will help them, just as our underground railway helped escaping slaves to the North before and during the Civil War.

Jews will make the anabasis to Palestine. No matter how perilous the trek may be, they will make it. Their nostalgia for their homeland will sustain them and they will go rejoicing and singing into Zion.

Among the real pleasures of Winston Churchill was his tender care for his 10,000 tropical fish which he maintained in several ponds on his estate at Chartwell Manor. In peaceful times, he used to watch them for hours, feed them, and call some of them by name. He remembered them when Hitler's attacks on man and beast in England grew ever more ruthless. As First Lord of the Admiralty, he took care to have them removed to safer ponds.

I petition Churchill to have the white paper (a real cataract of disaster to humans) abrogated so as many as possible of the Jews be taken from Hitler's cesspools of iniquity and death and removed to safer ponds.

While the Palestinian Jews fought and died and worked and produced for the Allied cause, the Arabs would not even give as much as a donkey or camel to aid the Allied soldiers. The open hostility of the Arabs to the Allied fighters is no secret, the treachery of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and the revolt in Iraq are known. Yet the British Government called to Cairo to decide the fate of Palestine, the Prime Minister of Iraq, a country that had to be beaten into submission a few months before the call, representatives of Ibn Saud who waited until the tide turned to declare himself friend; Abdullah, Emir of Trans-Jordan, as well as King Farouk, of Egypt, all were and are openly pro-Nazis. The Egyptian Prime Minister was caught betraying British military secrets to Axis headquarters in Tobruk.

These are the Arabs that the British Colonial office sought to appease with the white paper. Munich did not appease the Nazis, and the white paper has not even appeased the Arabs. It has only whetted their appetite for more appeasement. There is an old saying that comes out of the East: "Appease a rascal as you will; he was and is a rascal still."

Cato in the Roman senate terminated all his speeches with the famous statement, "Delenda est Carthago." "Carthage must be destroyed." I, too, terminate my remarks with the phrase, "Delenda est Charta Blancha." "The white paper must be destroyed." It will be destroyed by favorable consideration of these resolutions.

H. R. 4103—Expatriation Is a Natural Inherent Right of All People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the above bill, I submit some legal data which should convince anyone of the legality of providing means whereby there may be a public finding or declaration that a native-born citizen has, in fact, denationalized himself.

It is my purpose to offer an amendment to the above-named bill which will make it mean something. H. R. 4103 is perfectly innocuous and while it sounds good, it will do nothing. In support of the position taken in my amendment I append herewith certain law notes that may be of help to those considering the legislation.

My amendment provides, in brief, that the conduct, writings, or oral statements of a person, since the enactment of the selective service in 1940 and up to and during the time we are at war, may be considered in making a judicial finding and determination whether or not a citizen has, in fact, denationalized himself. The Attorney General's bill only provides for written formal renunciation of citizenship after the passage of the bill. It means that all those Japanese, for instance, who have already signed statements which in effect amount to a renunciation of their citizenship, will have to sign another, which they may decline to do.

RIGHT OF EXPATRIATION

The Constitution is silent on this subject, but from the very first there was recognized the right of a citizen to expatriate himself, under certain conditions and subject to proof. In *Talbot* v. *Janson* (3 Dall. 133 (1795)), the absence of a Federal statute, there being no constitutional prohibition in the way, was commented upon by Justice Iredell, who said, "It not only is a proper instance in which (the legislative power) may be exercised, but it is the duty of the legislature to make such provision * * *." (See also *Murray* v. the *"Charming Betsey"* (2 Cr. 64 (1804)); the *"Venus"* (8 Cr. 253 (1814)); the *"Santissima Trinidad"* (7 Wheat. 283 (1882)); *Inglis* v. *Sailor's Snug Harbor* (3 Pet. 99 (1830)); *Shanks* v. *Dupont* (3 Pet. 242 (1830)); *Comitis* v. *Parkerson* (56 Fed. 556 (1893)); *M'Ilvaine* v. *Coxe* (4 Cr. 209 (1808)). It was, however, 1868, before Congress expressly recognized the right of expatriation and declared that any restrictions thereon were inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic.

U. S. C. 8: 800. "Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas in the recognition of this principle this Government has freely received emigrants from all nations and invested them with the rights of citizenship; and whereas it is claimed that such American citizens, with their descendants, are subjects of foreign States, owing allegiance to the governments thereof; and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed: Therefore, any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officer of the United States which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation is declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic (R. S., sec. 1999)."

A citizen may throw off his allegiance to this country if he desires, especially in view of this section, declaring that the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people (*U. S.* v. *Howe* (D. C. N. Y. 1916, 231 F. 546); *Ex parte Griffin* (D. C. N. Y. 1916, 237 F. 445); *U. S.* v. *Husband* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1925, 6 F. 2d 957); *In re Sariyanis* (1940 (19 N. Y. S. 2d 431, 173 Misc. 881)).

Any citizen, native or naturalized, may now expatriate himself, subject to such limitations as the law of nations or acts of Congress may impose (*Elk* v. *Wilkins* (Neb. 1884, 5 S. Ct. 43, 48, 112 U. S. 94, 28 L. Ed 643); *Boyd* v. *Nebraska* (Neb. 1892, 12 S. Ct. 375, 382, 143 U. S. 135, 36 L. Ed. 103); *Fong Yue Ting* v. *U. S.* (N. Y. 1893, 13 S. Ct. 1016, 149 U. S. 698, 37 L. Ed. 905); *U. S.* v. *Wong Kim Ark* (Calif. 1898, 18 S. Ct. 456, 169 U. S. 649, 42 L. Ed 890); *U. S.* v. *Crook* (C. C. Nebr. 1879, Fed. Cas. No. 14, 891); *In re Look Tin Sing* (C. C. Calif. 1884, 21 F. 905, 907, 908); *Charles Green's Son* v. *Salas* (C. C. Ga. 1887, 31 F. 106, 112, 113); *In re Rodriguez* (D. C. Tex. 1897, 81 F. 337); *Jennes* v. *Landes* (C. C. Wash. 1997, 84 F. 73, 74); *Ruckgaber* v. *Moore* (C. C. N. Y. 1900, 104 F. 947, certified questions answered, *Moore* v. *Ruckgaber*, 1902, 22 S. Ct. 521, 184 U. S. 593, 46 L. Ed. 705 and affirmed, C. C. A. 1902, 114 F. 1020); *Jansen* v. *The Vrow Christina Magdalena* (D. C. S. C. 1794, Fed. Cas. No. 7, 216, affirmed, 1795; *Talbot* v. *Janson*, 3 Dall. 133, 1 L. Ed. 540); *Juando* v. *Taylor* (D. C. N. Y. 1818, Fed. Cas. No. 7558); *Browne* v. *Dexter* (1884, 66 Calif. 39, 4 P. 913); *Mackenzie* v. *Hare* (1913, 134 P. 713, 165 Calif. 776, L. R. A. 1916D, 127, Ann. Cas. 1915B, 261, affirmed 1915, 36 S. Ct. 106, 239 U. S. 299, 60 L. Ed. 297, Ann. Cas. 1916E, 645); *Burkett* v. *McCarty* (1874, 73 Ky. 758, 10 Bush 758); *State* v. *Succession of Marquise De Circe* (La. 1880, Man. Unrep. Cas. 412); *U. S.* v. *Husband* (C. C. A. N. Y. 1925, 6 F. 2d 957); *Edwards* v. *U. S.* (C. C. A. Okla. 1925, 7 F. 2d 357)).

Expatriation is a matter of intent on the part of the person concerned, which intent must be shown by some express act or some other act from which it can be gathered (*Perkins* v. *Elg* (App. D. C. 1938, 99 F. 2d 408, 69 App. D. C. 175, certiorari granted, 1939, 59 S. Ct. 245, 305 U. S. 591, 83 L. Ed. 373, and modified on other grounds, 1939, 59 S. Ct. 884, 83 L. Ed. 1320); *Elg.* v. *Perkins* (1938, 99 F. 2d 408, 69 App. D. C. 175, certiorari granted, 1939, 59 S. Ct. 245, 305 U. S. 591, 83 L. Ed. 373, and modified on other grounds, 1939, 59 S. Ct. 884, 307 U. S. 325, 83 L. Ed. 1320)).

The fact of expatriation is to be proved like any other fact for which there is no prescribed form of proof; that is, by any evidence that will convince the judgment. *Charles Green's Son* v. *Salas*, C. C. Ga. 1887, 31 F. 106. But see *Belcher* v. *Farren*, 1891, (26 P. 791, 89 Cal. 73).

RETROACTIVE ASPECT

The provision against ex post facto laws applies only to penal and criminal statutes. The debates in the Constitutional Convention show that the term was understood in a restricted sense relating to criminal

cases only.[1] It is inapplicable to retrospective legislation of any other kind.[2]

In *Mahler* v. *Eby* (264 U. S. 32, 38), Mr. Chief Justice Taft said: "The theory of the draftsman of the petition for the writ and of the assignment of errors was that the same constitutional restrictions apply to an alien deportation act as to a law punishing crime. It is well settled that deportation, while it may be burdensome and severe for the alien, is not a punishment (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States*, 149 U. S. 698, 730; *Bugajewitz* v. *Adams*, 228 U. S. 585, 591). The right to expel aliens is a sovereign power necessary to the safety of the country and only limited by treaty obligations in respect thereto entered into with other governments. *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States*, supra. The inhibition against the passage of an ex post facto law by Congress in section 9 of article I of the Constitution applies only to criminal laws (*Calder* v. *Bull*, 3 Dall. 386; *Johannessen* v. *United States*, 225 U. S. 227, 242; and not to a deportation act like this, *Bugajewitz* v. *Adams*, 228 U. S. 585, 591). Congress by the act of 1920 was not increasing the punishment for the crimes of which petitioners had been convicted, by requiring their deportation if found undesirable residents. It was, in the exercise of its unquestioned right, only seeking to rid the country of persons who had shown by their career that their continued presence here would not make for the safety or welfare of society.

DENATIONALIZATION

Burkett v. *McCarty* (1874, 73 Ky. 759): "But while a citizen may with consent of his State, express or presumed, expatriate himself, no mere act of State legislation can per se denationalize him against his will or without his concurrence. Such compulsive excision of a citizen is a heavy punishment, which cannot be constitutionally inflicted without judicial conviction of some crime or other act denounced by legislation as a forfeiture of citizenship, any more than a bill of attainder without judicial conviction can constitutionally punish a citizen."

[1] *Johannessen* v. *United States* (225 U. S. 227) [1912]; *Bugajewitz* v. *Adams* (228 U. S. 585) [1913]; *Calder* v. *Bull* (3 Dall. 386, 393)]1798]; *Watson* v. *Mercer* (8 Pet. 88, 110) [1834]; *Ogden* v. *Saunders* (12 Wheat 213, 266 [1827]; *Locke* v. *New Orleans* (4 Wall. 172 [1867]; *Baltimore and S. R. Co.* v. *Nesbit* (10 How. 395) [1850]; *Carpenter* v. *Pennsylvania* (17 How. 456) [1855]; *In re Sawyer*, 124 U. S. 200, 219 [1888]; *Mahler* v. *Elby* (264 U. S. 32, 39) [1924].

[2] *Bankers Trust Co.* v. *Blodgett* (260 U. S. 647, 642) [1923].

1943 Christmas Story, Navy Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in the Navy Post Office News of December 29, 1943, published in London. The author of the article is Lt. (Jr. Gr.) James J. Lyons, United States Naval Reserve, whose father is the Honorable James J. Lyons, president of the Borough of the Bronx, New York City.

Thousands of Christmas dinners were eaten in Welsh homes this yuletide, but the grandest feast was one that 41 United States Navy gunners didn't eat at all. "We've had 3 good meals every day since we have been in the Navy," reasoned the armed guard crew of the steamship *Nameless*, an American merchant ship in Barry. "We'd like to go without our dinners this Christmas and give them to someone who otherwise would have a turkeyless holiday."

The plan was conceived on Christmas eve. The gun crew appealed to its A. G. O. He in turn went to Lt. A. R. Gale, morale and recreation officer at Cardiff USNAVPO. Gale worked fast and soon set the stage.

Christmas morning after breakfast the Navy mess on *Nameless* was locked, not to be opened until suppertime. At 1100 hours 41 Christmas dinners, complete right down to cranberry sauce and walnuts, were put in thermos pots and placed in a truck, both furnished by the United States Army Dock Battalion. Fifteen of the sailors volunteered to go along as waiters and by noon the culinary caravan was on its way.

The recipients of this American Christmas gift were 43 old-age pensioners of the Workman's Hall, Aberthan, Wales. There for 3 hours the old men whose work in the Welsh coal mines in the last war had helped bring victory to the Allies, were served by young men in navy blue whose service on American merchant ships is helping to speed victory in the present conflict.

After dinner there were speeches. Mr. George Hall, M. P., Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, praised the pensioners for their contributions to World War No. 1. The institution director thanked the Americans for playing Santa Claus on a wholesale basis and Lieutenant Gale responded for the gunners.

At 1700 the party was over. The Navy boys then cleared the tables. Left-over food later was delivered to a local hospital. Every miner present was given a cigar and as they sat back puffing contentedly, an 85-year-old youngster arose and sang Land of Our Fathers, the Welsh national anthem. When he finished there was not a dry eye in the room.

The Navy gunners didn't get back to their ship in time for evening chow, but not a single one was heard to grumble. Stomachs were empty, but hearts were full.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on February 12, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, lately a few radicals in our area have attempted to undo the fine work the Hall Furlough Clubs are accomplishing for the boys in service. They have been busy spreading false stories about how I stand on soldiers' voting.

Everybody knows my record in behalf of the soldier. Everybody knows I was the very first to call for benefits to our servicemen, even before the war started. Certainly, after going this far, I would not let the soldiers down by denying them their God-given right to vote. To the contrary, I depend on their votes.

While telling lies of this kind, these radicals know very well I voted for every bill that has come up in Congress giving our soldiers the right to vote. I call them imposters who pose as friends to our boys and then try to undermine the very ones who are voting in the boys' interests.

If these radicals really want to help the soldier as they pretend to, let them get behind the Hall furlough transportation bill. Instead of lying about me, I demand they try to do something constructive and put their shoulders to the wheel.

Dear friends and fellow Americans, I appeal to you to back up these fine patriotic women who are organizing the Hall Furlough Clubs. In their behalf, I ask you to join them in their efforts to better the lot of our boys fighting all over the world.

Write me if you desire to know more about the clubs.

At this time let me read to you a letter I wrote to Mr. Henry Cerinetti, of Endicott, who is the organizer of the Hall Furlough Clubs.

"DEAR MR. CERINETTI: I want you to know how greatly I appreciate your faith and confidence in me by urging me in your recent letter to become a candidate for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate. By this time you have probably read the comments of Mr. Roland Allston, distinguished newspaper observer and reporter for G. N. S., on the same subject.

"Naturally, I would scarcely be human if I did not want to aspire to the Senate of the United States. This is a distinct honor as well as an added opportunity to be of patriotic service to one's countrymen in these most difficult days.

"It is my opinion, however, that I can put my humble abilities to best advantage in my present capacity as Representative from the Thirty-fourth District of New York. I have three times been elected to this high office and find that as the years go by I am able to improve myself by learning my job better.

"Therefore, I feel that I must decline your request that I seek election to the Senate. I am most happy where I am and, proud to say, I would rather enjoy the closer contacts among friends of the smaller area of my congressional district than I would if I served in a greater capacity.

"Feeling sure you will accord me the same warm support that you have always given me if I elect to continue in my present position that you have offered me for this other honor, I remain, with kindest personal regards,

"Your Congressman,

"EDWIN ARTHUR HALL."

Form of Ballot for Soldiers' Vote

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, two important, unquestioned, and significant facts stand forth in the action of the House of Representatives on the bill to provide absentee ballots for our fighting forces.

Who, in the House of Representatives, would have the deepest and most sincere interest in the method by which service men and women might participate in the election of public officials?

The answer is obvious—the fathers, mothers, and next of kin of those who have answered the call to the colors—those Members of this House who are themselves organized as the Congressional War Parents Association.

How did they vote? Sixty-six and four-tenths percent of them were recorded against Mr. Roosevelt's bobtailed ballot and in favor of a complete, constitutional, Federal, State, county, and local ballot.

Who, in the House of Representatives, equally with the fathers and mothers, would be most sympathetic to giving absent service men and women fair votes?

The answer is again obvious—the ex-servicemen, the older buddies of those who are today in the fighting lines.

How did they vote? Sixty-six percent of them recorded themselves as likewise opposed to Mr. Roosevelt's bobtailed ballot.

Despite all propaganda to the contrary, despite all misrepresentation, despite all distortion of the facts, these fathers and mothers of boys "over there," these ex-servicemen in the House of Representatives, who were most concerned over this question, rejected the unconstitutional bobtailed ballot and favored a full constitutional ballot for the troops. That was the test and these figures are the answer.

These fathers and mothers as Members of the House—these ex-service Members of the House, naturally made the closest study of the relative merits of the two proposals because they were the most intensely interested from the respective standpoints of kinship and comradeship. It is a fact, the significance of which cannot be ignored, that these Members of the House, with the greatest interest in the bills, who studied and considered them most carefully, turned in greater percentages against the bobtailed ballot than did the rank and file of the House, which was recorded in its entirety as being 56.7 percent against Mr. Roosevelt's proposal and in favor of the full constitutional vote for our boys.

Senate Document No. 94, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, is entitled "America's Fighting Congress." It is a historical document written and compiled by William P. Kennedy, Litt. D., dean of the Capitol Press Galleries and shows the military records of the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and of the members of their families. Part IV thereof on pages 49 to 55, inclusive, lists the officers of the Congressional War Parents Association and includes a tabulation of those in the immediate families of Members of Congress who have joined the fighting forces.

Reference to this list discloses that on February 3, 1944,—the day on which the so-called soldier ballot bill was determined by a record vote of the House—there were 130 Representatives having members of their immediate families in the uniformed forces. One hundred and twenty-eight of these Representatives were recorded on that vote. Of this number 43 Representatives—33.6 percent—voted or were paired in favor of the bobtailed ballot while 85 Representatives—66.4 percent—voted or were paired against it.

Part III of the document above referred to, on pages 43 to 47, inclusive, is a roster of war veterans in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Of those Representatives therein listed, 2 have since died and 4 have resigned. Three new ex-servicemen have subsequently become Members. On February 3, 1944, there were 160 war veterans in the House of Representatives. One hundred and fifty-six of them were recorded on the so-called soldier ballot bill. Of this number 53 Representatives—34 percent—voted or were paired in favor of the bobtailed ballot while 103 Representatives—66 percent—voted or were paired against it.

On February 3, 1944, there were 427 Members of the House of Representatives. Four hundred and fourteen of them were recorded on the soldier ballot bill. Of this number 179 Members—43.3 percent—voted or were paired in favor of the bobtailed ballot while 235 Members—56.7 percent—voted or were paired against it.

Are there any so gullible as to believe that two-thirds of the war fathers and war mothers in the House of Representatives would vote against the best interests of their own sons and daughters?

Are there any so credulous as to believe that two-thirds of the congressional war veterans would vote otherwise than for the best interests of their comrades in this war?

The American Merchant Marine and Trans-Oceanic Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have previously invited attention to the British policy of encouraging overseas shipping companies to engage in post-war air transportation. Further confirmation of that policy is contained in the following Reuters news dispatch from London under date of February 9, 1944:

FIVE LEADING BRITISH SHIPPERS PLAN AIR LINE TO SOUTH AMERICA

LONDON, February 9.—A new air line company has been formed by five leading British shipping lines to conduct an air service to South America. Its name is British Latin-American Air Lines, Ltd., with a nominal capital of £10,000.

Subscribers are Lord Essendon, chairman of Furness Withy and Royal Mail Lines; Lord Vestey, of the Union Cold Storage group; W. H. Davies, managing director of the Pacific Steam Navigation Co.; John W. Booth, of the Booth Steamship Co., and Sir P. Haldin, chairman of the Lamport Holt Line.

George Booth, chairman of the Booth Steamship Lines, said today that the new lines would be operated with the cooperation of Portuguese, Brazilian, and Argentine authorities.

It is understood that Portuguese authorities are interested in development of a line to serve Portuguese positions, and it is possible that these services may be managed by the British Latin-American Air Lines.

These five leading shipping companies recently announced that they were forming a separate company for the purpose of operating an air service between the United Kingdom and the Continent and South America as soon as the necessary consents and machines could be obtained.

A similar step is being taken by shipping companies for eventually starting air lines to the Continent, to the East, and Far East, and also for North America and African trade routes.

No one can accuse the British of a short-sighted policy when their merchant marine is involved. This newspaper dispatch not only verifies what I have previously invited to the attention of the House of Representatives, but it indicates practical steps are already being taken in the form of negotiations with foreign governments to insure the operation of air lines by shipping companies.

The United States has been spending billions of dollars in building up international good will in its good-neighbor policy with South America. We have been building airfields under the stress of military urgency over the entire world. Unless Congress takes immediate action to unshackle the United States merchant marine from the interpretation which has been placed on the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, these great opportunities which inherently belong to the overseas commerce of the United States will be taken over by our peacetime competitors in foreign trade, forcing conditions upon our merchant marine with which they cannot compete. H. R. 3420, known as the Lea bill, now pending before the House, should immediately be amended to meet the policies being established by all other maritime nations. The very existence of our merchant marine in post-war years is dependent upon such action.

Labor for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Labor for Victory" delivered over the radio by John P. Frey, president of the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, on February 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am speaking to you this afternoon, not as a trade-union official, pleading the cause of labor or defending it, but as an American endeavoring to assist in adjusting one of our major wartime labor problems.

To win this war, unity of purpose and of spirit is essential. The home front must be as unyielding as the firing line. Labor is definitely included in the home forces making for a united front.

It has become urgently necessary that we examine this home front, for there is accumulating evidence that industrially we are drifting toward a dangerous division of viewpoint and purpose.

In the industrial field there are groups and individuals who, because of differing viewpoints, are now accusing each other of giving assistance to the enemy. In the heat of accusation, men who should know better are attacking symptoms instead of sanely examining the facts and then dealing with the causes. The present moment is too serious a one for further preachings, recriminations, charges, and countercharges.

The time has come, not only for labor but for the American people, to give more careful consideration to causes which may operate in any way to weaken the war-production effort.

It is worse than folly to look to legislation to improve this situation, for legislation and its administration never have and never will make men brave, patriotic, or self-sacrificing, or united.

What is gravely disturbing is that there are strikes, each of which reduces the necessary war-production program and which may well at a critical moment prevent the armed forces from having the material required for victory.

Strikes and threats of strikes during wartime are indefensible. They are intolerable. And the American people have a right to demand that they shall not occur.

But there are also other conditions during wartime equally indefensible. One of these is profiteering; and another, equally indefensible and intolerable, is mismanagement of the labor situation by employers and representatives of Federal agencies.

Organized labor, as represented through the American Federation of Labor, is as deeply interested in the winning of the war as any other group of Americans, for among other things the continuation of free institutions is at stake in the outcome, and without these trade-unionism could not exist.

Yet there are strikes and threats of strikes. Why?

The problem is not as simple as some would lead you to believe. It is not a few labor leaders calling strikes or issuing threats for the fun of it. The problem arises through millions of workers, men and women, in the war industries whose justified complaints at times have received no prompt or adequate consideration.

I would fail in my responsibility if I did not frankly tell you that the morale of our industrial workers has been injured—seriously injured—and that it is now vitally necessary that it should be restored. Abuse or arbitrary directives will not do it. Attempted punishment through legislation will not do it. Efforts to turn the members of our armed forces against the munition workers will not do it. Some local strikes may have been caused by individuals having mixed ambitions, industrial and perhaps even political, but the great majority of strikes have resulted from an unnecessary irritation, an irritation which like a chafing harness has finally created an open sore.

Workmen who have given their solemn pledge not to strike during the duration of the war must be protected from anyone in private management or governmental position who would take advantage of that no-strike pledge to see how far they can go in imposing upon them.

American labor has been forced to contend with an almost impossible admjnistrative condition in our Government. There is in fact no national labor policy to which labor can look for definite guidance. Instead of a national labor policy, administered by one central authority, governing labor problems, there has developed more than 25 Federal agencies which issue regulations and decisions affecting terms of employment and conditions of labor. In addition, there are a few personally advertised, self-appointed individuals who busy themselves advising Government representatives and some labor leaders, with conflicting and harmful results. These agencies, through their regulations, directives and decisions, have established definitely conflicting policies.

Those of us charged with labor responsibility frequently find it difficult to know which way to turn, or to whom to go. Problems which should be settled accumulate and become enmeshed in the multiplicity of Government agencies and their conflicting policies and decisions.

There is no central agency to which we can go and arrive at definite final understandings. Such a central agency—a central clearing house—is industry's essential wartime need and my purpose this afternoon is to urge that such an agency be created without further delay so that the morale of the American worker may be restored.

It is not my purpose to level criticism, to add to the accusations and counter-accusations now filling the press. Instead, the present most unsatisfactory condition requires constructive proposals. It is my purpose to present a constructive proposal.

There was within our Government a well-established agency, a clearinghouse through which all questions affecting labor were considered and passed upon. That agency is the Federal Department of Labor, created before the First World War through the urgent initiative of the American Federation of Labor. Labor sensed the necessity of a department of the Government covering the field of labor which would give the same service to labor and the Nation as the farmer received through the Department of Agriculture and the businessman through the Department of Commerce.

Unfortunately for the Nation and the war effort, the Labor Department was not strengthened when war came. Instead it was shorn of many of its important bureaus, which were divided among other Federal agencies created for wartime purposes. Lacking this central clearinghouse labor is now compelled to go from one agency to another and not infrequently understandings and agreements reached with one Federal agency are afterward thrown out of the window by another agency.

Our Government-labor relationship is the very opposite of that existing in Great Britain, where matters affecting labor must go through the clearinghouse of the Minister of Labor.

The almost fatal confusion and conflict between Federal agencies affecting labor is illustrated by two fairly recent examples.

The railway brotherhoods and railway shopmen, in their efforts to secure a justified increase in wages, went to the well-established Federal agency—the Railway Mediation Board. For some 3 months they presented their case and then received an award much less than they believed themselves entitled to, but which their leaders were willing to accept and recommend to their membership. After this award had been made, another Federal agency ruled that it could not be put into effect. Here was an inexcusable conflict of authority—a conflict which greatly weakened labor's confidence in Federal agencies.

If the award was justified it should not have been vetoed. There should have been within the Labor Department a clearinghouse which would have pointed out to the Mediation Board, before its decision was made public, that such a decision could not be approved, or the power to inform another Federal agency that it could not and must not veto the Mediation Board's award.

What happened in the railway situation has occurred in many other instances, even where collective bargaining between management, labor, and the Federal procurement agencies had resulted in an agreement.

In May 1942 the organized shipyard workers, numbering over a million, responding to President Roosevelt's request, accepted a reduction of the wage rate which had been approved and granted by the Government itself a year before. Labor made this sacrifice to assist the President in his praiseworthy effort to prevent ruinous inflation. At that conference the Government pledged itself to a subsequent revision of wages if the cost of living was not stabilized. But the Government's pledge was not placed into effect.

What happened was that directives were issued which removed previous authority conferred by the Government upon the National Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, composed of the representatives of Government, management, and labor in the shipbuilding industry, and conferred authority in the matter of wages upon another Federal agency. That agency held that it was not bound by the Government's pledge to the shipyard workers in May 1942. Is it surprising, in view of this, that shipyard workers should look askance at other promises and pledges made by the Government?

Men cannot be assured of one thing one day and then publicly rapped over the knuckles the next. The confusion and the conflict of decisions between Federal agencies has caused labor to lose much of its previous confidence in them. The morale of labor has been seriously injured. It can be restored. It should be—through the establishment of a central Federal agency dealing with labor, handing down decisions which will stick and not be vetoed by any other Federal agency.

There are facts connected with the home front which profoundly influence its morale. Approximately a million and a quarter of those now in the armed forces are members of the American Federation of Labor. What of their family ties? Their fathers, mothers, wives, sisters, and brothers in large numbers are employed in the war-production industries. Are those production workers planning to create family enmities when their soldier boys return? Or are they eagerly looking forward to the day when the family can be reunited with internal peace and affection? Are the members of the American Federation of Labor deliberately or selfishly applying a policy which will make other members in the armed forces turn against them with bitterness when they return? These questions answer themselves, for American workers have not ceased to be Americans.

The no-strike pledge was given by the American Federation of Labor in all sincerity. In the manufacturing industries members under temporary irritation violating this pledge, have been promptly instructed by their officers to return to work, and in practically every instance they have done so without delay.

Why have there been exceptions to the no-strike pledge? Even in England, where there is labor conscription, strikes have taken place. At home labor has at times been imposed upon by employers and by Federal agencies because of labor's pledge not to

lay down its tools. In numerous instances justified complaints, properly presented to Federal agencies, have remained without action and decisions for many, many months. We are convinced that had there been a national labor policy consistently applied from the beginning, the dissatisfaction which caused strikes would not have developed. Knowing labor as I do from an official contact of over 44 years, I am convinced that there can be a material improvement in labor's morale, provided a central clearing house in labor matters is established in Washington—preferably in the Department of Labor, which was originally created for that very purpose. Threats of conscription of labor, threats of any kind by anyone at this time, only tend to make a bad situation worse. What the Nation now needs is efficient Federal organization in the field of labor, instead of the disorganization which now exists.

Progress in Scientific Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. Don K. Spalding, county extension agent for Osage County, Mo., showing such exceptional progress in practical and scientific agriculture in that county that it must rank close to the top, if not at the top, in the records made by counties similarly situated in a like period of time. It is evident at a glance that as result of the able and effective work of Mr. Spalding and those associated with him in cooperation with the farmers of Osage County, the county has made a notable contribution to the war program through the production of food that would have been impossible in 1935–36, the year previous to the initiation of the Osage County work, I commend to Members of the House a careful perusal of this report as ample and convincing justification for the appropriations made in support of the program for increase in agricultural production extending over the last 6 years:

LINN, MO., *November 30, 1943.*

DEAR MR. CANNON: I am not sure I can answer your questions regarding the changes which have been made on Osage County farms since I came here in 1936–37. However, at this time we are preparing the annual report, and I have gathered a few figures which may be of interest.

According to the 1935 annual report, 65 farms and homes were visited by the agricultural extension agents, as compared with 1,329 this year. Also, 91 news articles were released to the papers in 1935, as compared with 539 this year. Probably more significant is the 18.575 people who attended extension service sponsored meetings this year, as compared with 3,537 in 1935. Also, we estimate approximately 1,700 farm families were influenced one way or another by the extension program this year, as compared to about 630 at that time. There were no 4-H Clubs in 1935. Our records show that we had 410 boys and girls enrolled this year with 92 percent completing. Also, 220 farm women are now enrolled in home-economics clubs, and, of course, there were none in the other year checked against.

We note in 1935 there was no agricultural limestone used in the county, and our records indicate, for 1936 to 1943, between seventy-five and eighty thousand tons have been used. Our records also show that, whereas farmers used 20,046 tons last year, they will use less than 15,000 tons this year, due, of course, to shortage of labor and repair parts and other factors which have made it impossible to deliver stone this year.

Of course, the things I have been speaking about are not changes on the farm altogether, and perhaps one of the projects in which there has been visible change is in connection with terracing. In 1935 one community had done some terracing. At the present time thousands of acres have been terraced in the county, including every community. A large amount of assistance in connection with this problem has been given by the Soil Improvement Association which was organized by the Extension Service and incorporated for the specific purpose of assisting farmers with such problems as limestone, equipment for terracing, spreading limestone, etc.

You might be interested in the fact that the association and the farmers own at the present time the following equipment which is used to assist farmers with these problems: (1) one set of contract terracing equipment, including a large tractor, a whirlwind terracer, a 7-foot terracing blade and a "bug" for fill work; (2) 11 farm levels; (3) six 6-foot terracing blades used by the farmers; (4) 3 fresno scrapers; (5) in addition to equipment owned by the association in connection with terracing, farmers own 13 terracing blades, and (6) 12 lime spreaders, and the farmers themselves own 13.

Of course, another interesting fact is that a good many farmers (about 12 this year, which is not as many as usual) helped in the job of running terraces and contour lines and the construction of terraces.

In 1935 there was a very small acreage of lespedeza in the county as compared with approximately 116,324 acres at this time. This acreage of lespedeza has enabled farmers to produce a legume crop for hay and has also assisted materially with pasture. The cropping system has changed in the entire county, except on part of the river bottom land, to a small grain, hay, and pasture system. This has materially stepped up livestock numbers, particularly beef cattle and dairy cattle, and has permitted these classes of livestock to be produced more economically.

Beef cattle herds average about one-third larger than they did in 1935. There are now about 8,000 head of dairy cattle as compared to approximately 5,000. According to the estimate for the next 12 months there will be about 40,000 head of hogs to market and still leave adequate breeding stock, as compared to the total hog numbers, approximately 18,000 head, at the time I came here.

Poultrymen, hog men, and other livestock men have caused to be imported approximately 300,000 bushels or more of commodity credit wheat in the last 12 months.

During this period there has been quite a change in the comforts and conveniences enjoyed by farm families. At the present time several are users of rural electrification current coming through our Three Rivers Electric Cooperative which was organized in 1939 with the assistance of the extension service.

Also you will notice quite a lot of development in agricultural leadership, some of which is demonstrated by the 302 members of the rural leadership structure which was set up by the extension service to help get wartime information to every school district in the county. Last year 1046 rural people in Osage County served as voluntary leaders and gave about 546 days of their time.

Understand, not all of the changes which I have mentioned have been brought about as a result of the extension service alone. The various Federal farm programs have had an influence on agriculture in general. Naturally, I feel that the extension service is still the organization rendering maximum assistance to farmers in this county, and has and will continue to do its part to help with Federal and other wartime programs. Such is the policy of the extension service throughout the United States.

As to the attitude of farmers, so far as I hear farmers' comments, they do not want subsidies at this time. Recently in connection with the dairy-subsidy program only about 300 farmers took advantage of the milk subsidy in this county.

Farmers object also to injustices, as they call them, in connection with the price ceilings established by the O. P. A. This year we had a corn crop which was above normal in spite of the flood. At the present time most of the large producers are refusing to sell their corn at ceiling price and in some cases are being offered $1.25 at the field for their corn, and because it will be a violation of the ceiling prices are not selling, and are putting it in the crib. Also, dealers are able to get very little corn through the regular market channels and inventories of corn in the dealers' hands are almost zero at this time. Many of our large feeders are caught in a difficult situation as a result of these conditions and may, if something doesn't happen in the near future, be forced to liquidate their livestock in an unfinished condition.

Many farmers are not clear as to why the support price on hogs has recently been lowered $1 per hundredweight.

As I mentioned previously, farmers are pretty much mixed up after the enormous amount of comment in the papers and over the radio in the last 2 weeks and need to be given the facts. Farmers, generally speaking, say they don't want inflation. On the other hand, they are apparently not satisfied with present conditions.

DON K. SPALDING,
County Agent.

New Deal To Blame for Tax Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bewildered and confused taxpayer, when he finishes making out his complex income-tax return—if he ever does, and I hope that he does—is going to be asking, "Who got us into all this mess?" And he has a right to know. The answer is the New Deal.

Since March 4, 1933, when the New Deal came into power, we have had an endless succession of tax bills—17 in all—which have been piled one on top of the other until our tax law is such a maze that it is not understood even by the ablest experts. Every day we see in the press where an identical tax problem has been presented to several different Internal Revenue officials, who always come up with different answers as to the tax liability. It is no wonder that the poor

taxpayer is ready to throw up his hands in despair.

The 17 New Deal tax bills which are the cause of the present state of confusion were brought forward so frequently that the ink was hardly dry on one measure before another was started through the legislative mill. As a consequence, Congress has never had an opportunity, until now, to take enough time to go over the tax structure as a whole and endeavor to smooth out the wrinkles and streamline and simplify the provisions. However, with the passage of the two and one-third billion dollar revenue bill, now before the President for approval or disapproval, Congress has indicated that it is through with tax-raising measures for the time being and is now going to devote itself to income-tax simplification. Prompt action on this long-delayed and essential matter is contemplated.

The two complexities in the law which seem to cause the most confusion are the double set of exemptions and rates under the income and Victory tax, and the carry-over of a portion of 1 year's tax under the pay-as-you-go law. The New Deal is to blame for both.

The Victory tax was enacted as a substitute for the sales tax, which the administration has always resisted with all the power and influence at its command. If a real sales tax had been enacted instead of a subterfuge sales tax on a few items as in the present law, the confusion resulting from the Victory tax would have been avoided.

The carry-over of a portion of 1 year's tax is the result of the administration's unyielding opposition to the Ruml-Carlson plan, which had it been enacted would have wiped the slate clean as regards the past year's liability in changing over to a pay-as-you-go system. The bill which was finally enacted was not the Ruml-Carlson plan, but a strange hybrid, involving only partial abatement, which not only complicated the law but added 12½ percent to the burden of most taxpayers for each of the years 1944 and 1945. If the Ruml-Carlson plan had been adopted, the change to a pay-as-you-go method of collection would have been effected without complication and without any doubling up of taxes.

So far as the printed forms for making income-tax returns are concerned, it should be emphasized that the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Bureau are wholly responsible for these. Congress has nothing whatever to do with the preparation of these complicated forms.

The time has come when this income-tax complexity must be cleared up, and it is a hopeful sign to know that the Ways and Means Committee now proposes to make tax simplification its first order of business until the job is done.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks a table which shows what happens to the taxpayers whenever a reckless spending "outfit," such as the New Deal, gets control of the Government. It means, of course, higher taxes, increased cost of living, threatened inflation, interference with the prosecution of the war, and eventually the weakening of public morale when its maintenance in all its possible vigor is vital to an all-out successful prosection of the war. A study of the number of returns for each year from 1913 to 1944, inclusive, the change in exemptions for single and for married persons during the same period, and the income-tax rates from year to year, presents a vivid picture of what happens when there is neither stability nor responsibility in the executive branch of our Government:

Individual income tax

Year	Taxable returns	Exemptions		Income tax rates		
		Single	Married	Normal	Minimum surtax	Maximum surtax
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1913	[1] 357,598	$3,000	$4,000	1	1	6
1914	[1] 357,515	3,000	4,000	1	1	6
1915	[1] 336,652	3,000	4,000	1	1	6
1916	[2] 362,970	3,000	4,000	2	1	13
1917	2,707,234	1,000	2,000	2, 4	1	63
1918	3,392,863	1,000	2,000	6, 12	1	65
1919	4,231,181	1,000	2,000	4, 8	1	65
1920	5,518,310	1,000	2,000	4, 8	1	65
1921	3,589,985	1,000	2,000	4, 8	1	65
1922	3,681,249	1,000	2,000	4, 8	1	50
1923	4,270,121	1,000	[3] 2,500	4, 8	1	50
1924	4,489,698	1,000	2,500	2, 4, 6	1	40
1925	2,501,166	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1926	2,470,990	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1927	2,440,941	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1928	2,523,063	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1929	2,458,049	1,500	3,500	½, 2, 4	1	20
1930	2,037,645	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1931	1,525,546	1,500	3,500	1½, 3, 5	1	20
1932	1,936,095	1,000	2,500	4, 8	1	55
1933	1,747,740	1,000	2,500	4, 8	1	55
1934	1,795,920	1,000	2,500	4	4	59
1935	2,110,890	1,000	2,500	4	4	59
1936	2,861,108	1,000	2,500	4	4	75
1937	3,371,443	1,000	2,500	4	4	75
1938	3,048,545	1,000	2,500	4	4	75
1939	3,959,297	1,000	2,500	4	4	75
1940	7,504,649	800	2,000	4	4	75
1941	17,587,000	750	1,500	4	6	77
1942 [4]	29,000,000	500	1,200	6	13	82
1943 [4]	[5] 44,000,000	[6] 500	[6] 1,200	[7] 6	13	82
1944 [4]	[5] 52,000,000	[6] 500	[6] 1,200	[7] 6	13	83

[1] Total.
[2] Taxable only.
[3] For net incomes in excess of $5,000, married exemption was $2,000.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Income and Victory tax.
[6] Victory-tax exemption $624 for both married and single persons.
[7] Plus Victory tax (approximately 3 percent net).

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to call attention of the House to the rapidity with which the New Deal, under its loose fiscal policies has each year increased the tax load, and how at the same time it has increased the national debt by its annual deficits. The figures in the table I am submitting as a part of my remarks show how quickly incapacity to govern can weaken the structure and credit of a nation:

Taxes collected under New Deal	
Fiscal year:	*Net receipts*
1933	$2,080,000,000
1934	3,116,000,000
1935	3,800,000,000
1936	4,116,000,000
1937	5,029,000,000
1938	5,855,000,000
1939	5,165,000,000
1940	5,387,000,000
1941	7,607,000,000
1942	12,799,000,000
1943	22,282,000,000
1944	41,186,000,000
Total	118,422,000,000

Despite this terrific tax burden, the national debt has increased from $22,000,000,000 to $174,000,000,000 since 1933.

Address of Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] before Middlesex County, Republican organization at the Pines, Metuchen, N. J., on February 10, 1944:

My fellow Americans, in standing on an occasion like this before a group of loyal citizens of the United States, I am thrilled beyond measure and at the same time humbled; thrilled because of the eagerness of all Republicans to take advantage of the great opportunities presented to us to solve the many and complex problems that are facing our beloved country and humbled, because of the tremendous responsibility involved. At no time in our history have our American institutions and form of life been subjected to such strain and stress; at no time since the

founding of the Republic has our free enterprise system of life been in so much peril of being destroyed. This system and ideology, my friends, has made us a great Nation, a powerful and wealthy people, the envy of the world.

I know that we are gathered here to honor the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, one of America's great men, and once again to draw inspiration and virtue from the inexhaustible well of his character, but I want to quote from the writings of another of America's great men of the past and dwell for a moment on his American philosophy, even if he is claimed by the opposition as their patron saint. Thomas Jefferson may have been a Democrat, we know he never thought of himself as anything but an American. Certainly he was not a new dealer and he never admitted that our country needed a doctor, much less Dr. New Deal. Yes, he was first and always an American and his patriotism and loyalty to the principles on which our country was founded come down to us through the years and are our inspiration and guidance. Listen to what he said in his first inaugural address. After enumerating various advantages enjoyed by Americans he said, "What more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, my fellow citizens, a wise and frugal government which will restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."

Thus spake the Sage of Monticello, the framer of our Constitution, the great champion with George Washington and Abraham Lincoln of representative government, founders and preservers of our system of free enterprise based on the Bill of Rights. Ever since those days, our people have cherished that heritage, have fought and died for it, are shedding their blood for it today. Let us take oath here and now that "these men shall not have died in vain."

What is the state of the Nation today? Have the spirit and provisions of the Constitution been preserved? Have we a "wise and frugal Government"? Are we a united people within? Do we know whither our way is leading? Do the people know the truth about the Nation's affairs or are we being told only what is thought best for us to know? In short, have the men hired by us to fill high positions of trust shown wisdom and vision with singleness of heart, or have they been busy meddling with the fundamental machinery of our Government and our system of living? Has political expediency and favoritism been permitted to undermine our constitutional system? Has the ship of state built by our forefathers become a raft bobbing about in the water, with wet feet for all?

For the past 10 years our Government has been controlled by the New Deal party, the party that was going to make America a better place to live in. We were going to do away with the old precepts of the "horse and buggy" days of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and enter the era of "we have planned it that way." We are now told that the country had to be treated as a patient would be treated by a doctor and the doctor who was called in had just finished serving his internship in a big and prosperous State, and when he graduated he left it sicker than ever before, with an enormous growth on its back known as the cancer of debt. That bewildered patient staggered along for a few years until a practical, common-sense Republican doctor came along and gave the patient a good scrubbing, washing away much dirt and many barnacles, cured the debt disease, and told the patient to get up and walk while he busied himself with putting the rest of the house in order. And, my friend, another Republican doctor who is just as good is hard at work in our State today, and the patient has already shown marked improvement. In this instance Doctor Edge and his assistants are giving the patient a brand-new constitution.

But to get back to Dr. New Deal. He packed up his tools and his staff of research men and women and went to Washington, full of loud promises as to how he would fix things up by reducing expenses and eliminating waste. Well, he has been fussing around, trying this, experimenting with that, for the past 10 years or more, and the poor patient who needed only a good cleaning out because it had no organic trouble has had everything from prickly heat to housemaid's knee ever since. Its Constitution is sound; all it needs is a chance to let it work.

The people of this country have been treated to all sorts of things during the past 10 years and are left bewildered and dismayed. Social reforms have been many—some good, some bad. Class has been set against class; personal modes of life have been changed; power has been assumed without constitutional authority; fancy names have been given to simple truths; and edicts have been endowed with the force and effect of law by bureaucratic authority. We have become a ruled and governed people and our rights and liberties, derived from the Constitution written by our forefathers, are being threatened. The people don't like it. The people are going to send "Dr. New Deal" on a vacation before long and hire a Republican doctor. He will find plenty of mess to clean up and the mess will be cleaned up if we all work together in harmony and with a will. Yes, my fellow Republicans, it is a tremendous opportunity for service and a responsibility which is a challenge to strong men and women.

Let us accept this challenge in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson and carry the responsibility of the preservation of the Republic with the faith and consecration of Abraham Lincoln. Let us think and act together with one single purpose—the preservation of our constitutional liberties. Let us lean on the examples set by our great men, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others who spoke out honestly and fearlessly from the heart what they thought was right as "God gave them to see the right." At Valley Forge, when the days were darkest for our Nation then young, General Washington prayed to his God for strength and guidance. His words were his own; he had no need for a modern ghost writer. Thomas Jefferson wrote his own inaugural address; Abraham Lincoln had no help when he wrote his immortal words at Gettysburg and his second inaugural address. These men thought their own thoughts, these men never compromised with political expediency, these men were truly servants of the people and they served "in singleness of heart."

Here, fellow Republicans, Americans, is our challenge. It is ours to accept so that when our victorious sons and daughters come home again they may find a better America than ever before, with her arms outstretched to welcome them to a land of honest thinking and that great freedom—freedom of opportunity.

Ours is not an easy task, it is grim with reality. It requires the spirit of unselfish sacrifice and dogged determination that the principles of honest thinking and simple justice must prevail. We Republicans must approach the task with the words of our great President, Abraham Lincoln, ever ringing in our ears: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Cotton Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from leading newspapers in my district, the Tyler Morning Telegraph and the Gilmer Mirror. They both voice a situation which is real and which I have been trying to do something about since I first came to Congress 5 years ago. The membership of this House is aware of the many statements I have made on the floor of this House advocating giving the smaller cotton farmers the privilege of producing more cotton. For a long time my pleas fell on ears that heard not, but thanks to our great Texan, Hon. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, the situation is different now.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD a short statement made by me October 11, 1943, and copy of the letter Hon. Marvin Jones wrote me about suspensions of quotas:

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the War Food Administration announced, according to the press, a crop program for 1944. The article I read, a copy of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD October 7, 1943, indicated that the same amount of cotton is to be grown in 1944 as was grown in 1943. This would infer that each individual cotton farmer is to grow about the same amount of cotton in 1944 as he grew in 1943. Such an inference is at variance with the facts, according to information many of us heretofore have received and according to a letter Hon. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, wrote me October 7, 1943. One sentence of the Jones letter states:

"With quotas suspended on the named commodities—cotton is one of the named commodities—a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions."

I want the entire country to know that the quotas on cotton have been taken off by the authorities of the War Food Administration and the little farmer now has a chance because of this action to make his fair and equitable share of income from cotton.

I herewith include the letter written to me by Mr. Jones:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 7, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: This is in response to your letter of September 27 inquiring about any quotas or restrictions in the production of

cotton and other crops in the 1943 and 1944 agricultural programs.

Flue-cured and Burley tobacco are the only crops for which marketing quotas are applicable in 1943 and 1944. The proclamation of 1944 quotas on these crops has been made on the basis of Public Law 118, Seventy-eighth Congress. Quotas on cotton, wheat, and peanuts were in effect in 1942, but were terminated on the 1943 crops during the current year and will not be applicable for these commodities in 1944. The terminations were made under authority contained in section 371 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. With quotas suspended on the named commodities, a farmer may plant within or in excess of the acreage allotment previously established for the particular commodity and may sell his entire production free of the marketing penalties and restrictions.

Under the 1943 programs a farmer who planted within the farm cotton acreage allotment, or only slightly in excess of it, is eligible for an agricultural-conservation payment, no deduction being made, as was done in prior years, for the small excess acreage. In addition, the cotton produced on the farm is eligible for Commodity Credit Corporation loans. If the acreage planted to cotton exceeded the farm cotton acreage allotment to the extent that the farm is determined to have been knowingly overplanted (sec. 302 (f) of the act) payments and loans cannot be made.

As announced, the 1944 program will provide for establishing farm goals for certain essential food and fiber crops. On a voluntary basis farmers who carry out approved soil and water conservation practices will earn payments at rates now being established. Excepting tobacco, farm-acreage allotments will not be established for any crop, and there will be no restriction on the acreage planted or the quantity of the commodity marketed. Likewise, the acreage planted to any commodity or the extent to which farm goals are met will not affect the payment earned with respect to conservation practices.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, many people of this country are just now waking up to the fact that King Cotton is also the source of King Protein Feed for stock and, furthermore, an excellent source of food for people.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph of January 5, 1944]

PLANT MORE COTTON

Texas, the largest cotton-producing region in the Nation, now finds itself in the incongruous position of not producing sufficient cotton to furnish protein feeds for its expanded livestock industry. There is not now available enough cottonseed meal and cake to keep the cotton-oil mills of the State busy, and they are importing from the Corn Belt great quantities of soybeans for processing into soybean meal to furnish feed for Texas livestock.

There is no logical reason for this in a State which can produce as much cotton as Texas. Moreover, the supply of soybeans from other States may be cut off at any time, thus removing this source of feed for Texas livestock.

Through Government restriction of cotton acreage and the long and widespread educational program for less cotton and more diversified crops, the Texas acreage planted to cotton has become dangerously low. In normal times this situation might have been all right, but in wartime with its greatly increased demand for cotton, cottonseed, and livestock, the shorter cotton crop has almost proved disastrous. In 1930 Texas had 16,138,000 acres of cotton, and there were 6,500,000 head of beef and dairy cattle, 6,387,000 sheep, and 1,673,000 hogs in the State.

In 1943 Texas had 7,888,000 acres of cotton and there were 7,518,000 cattle, 10,677,000 sheep and 2,665,000 hogs in the State. These figures show why there is now a great shortage of the protein feed obtained from cotton.

The Government has increased the cotton acreage permitted for Texas in 1944, but farmers have demonstrated little enthusiasm toward increasing their acreage. Smith County formerly produced in the neighborhood of 28,000 bales a year, whereas the 1943 crop was only slightly over 10,000 bales. In the meantime the number of livestock in the county has increased steadily to a point where the protein feed from cotton is not sufficient to feed it.

Texas should not and cannot depend on soybeans from other sections of the country to feed its livestock. It should be producing enough cottonseed meal and cake to ship large quantities to sections which do not grow cotton instead of having to import its protein feed. This system of hauling coals to Newcastle is not only depriving Texas of the needed protein feed, but is also greatly reducing the income of the farmers. We are increasing our acreage in peanuts, sweetpotatoes, and other crops to such an extent that they are more than meeting our demand, but they will not provide the necessary protein feeds.

More than 5,500,000 bushels of northern soybeans have been shipped into Texas to overcome the feed shortage. This has made it necessary for dairymen and beef cattle and hog producers to pay much higher prices for their feed, causing many dairymen to have to go out of business because the prices received for their products were too low to provide a profit. And this situation developed at a time when the demand for dairy products was the largest in history.

It is up to Texas farmers to remedy the situation. More cotton must be grown in 1944 or the situation will be even worse.

[From the Gilmer (Tex.) Weekly Mirror]

MORE COTTON NEEDED FOR PROTEIN FEED

In 1930 Texas had 16,138,000 acres of cotton. There were 6,500,000 head of beef and dairy cattle, 6,387,000 sheep, and 1,673,000 hogs in the State. In 1943 Texas had 7,888,000 acres of cotton. There were 7,518,000 cattle, 10,677,000 sheep, and 2,655,000 hogs in the State. These figures tell the story of the present critical shortage of cottonseed meal and cake in Texas. They plainly show that Texas agriculture has swung out of balance from one extreme to another—that today we are not raising enough cotton to supply the feedstuffs that our expanding livestock industry must have to exist.

Impossible to show by figures, of course, is the recognized fact that Texas farmers and ranchmen have been feeding more adequate rations in recent years—would feed these improved rations today if they could get the feed. Even without taking improved feeding methods into consideration, however, it is apparent that this State no longer is on a live-at-home basis on its feed and livestock program. We are producing the grains and a part, but not enough, of the pastures and roughage that our livestock needed; but we are critically short in our production of the most essential of all nutrients—our protein.

As a result of this deficiency, Texas cotton-oil mills are busy today shipping in carloads and trainloads of soybeans from Corn Belt States for processing into soybean meal for livestock. The soybeans that can be secured from the Corn Belt, while not sufficient for our present needs, are a lifesaver for the livestock industry; but certainly offer no permanent solution to the problem of feed and livestock production in the Southwest. How long we can hope to continue to get soybeans, even this year, is anybody's guess; and the prospect of such long-distance feed shipments in future years is most uncertain. Furthermore, Texas cannot possibly build a permanent livestock program on a foundation of Corn Belt-grown feed.

As we sacrifice our livestock during the coming months, because we have scraped our feed bins bare, we must look ahead to next fall and winter. Will the situation be as bad or worse then?

Unless we produce more cotton in 1944, it seems certain that the feed situation next winter will be even worse. We've expanded our peanut acreage to just about the maximum area that is suited to it; unsatisfactory production in many counties this season and last season proved that. Other protein-producing crops, such as flaxseed and soybeans, are extremely limited or not suited at all to most areas of this State. Cotton remains our single hope for increased production of protein concentrate feed.

This feed situation offers a challenge to every Texas cotton grower. Cotton growers themselves need this feed, and ranchmen and dairymen who do not raise cotton need it even more.

Furthermore, there is need for the cottonseed oil, linters, and hulls that come from cotton. Every added acre planted and ton of seed produced in 1944 means a greater contribution to the war effort by the cotton farmers and livestock raisers.

Will Texas meet this challenge as it has met every other call for helping to win the war? Will Texas, despite labor shortages and other difficulties, make an all-out effort to increase cotton production in 1944—or must Texas livestock producers face another winter of disastrous sacrifice of production and breeding stock that will give the balanced farming program a set-back from which it will take many years to recover?

Texas cotton farmers hold the answer in their hands as they plan the 1944 crop—it's up to you.

An Opportunity for Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which was given by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day banquet held in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, February 10, 1944:

It is a privilege to join in welcoming my good friend, the distinguished and able Governor of Ohio, Governor Bricker, and my old friend of many years, Judge Rivers, to this splendid gathering of Republicans.

This inspiring assembly is significant, particularly to those of us who have struggled through the days when Republicanism was at low ebb. Significant because it definitely reflects the new courage, the new hope, and the new opportunities of the Republican

Party, and also the deep sense of responsibility with which we approach them.

Not in a dozen years has there been so large a Republican meeting as this one in the Nation's Capital. The old elephant is on the march; he sniffs victory in the air. Nineteen hundred and forty-four will record a notable triumph for sound, honest government.

It will not be a Republican victory alone. Victory will come because millions of honest, sincere, patriotic Jeffersonian Democrats will submerge party to the welfare of their country, because millions of independent voters, fearful of the threatened loss of what they have come to know as the American way of life, will unite with us to bring about, not a Republican victory, but a victory for Americanism.

But let me warn you that it will not be an easy task to dislodge those who are determined to continue for all time their powerful hold over the destinies of the American people, and to perpetuate their theories of a regimented nation. They can be counted upon to utilize all the enormous resources which they control in every branch of government to maintain their power. Millions of dollars of the people's money will be spent in "educational" political propaganda. Through their great power over the radio and the movies they will attempt to deceive the people. But their efforts will be in vain because America is awake, and because through the Republican Party the people are ready to change to a government that will be sound, solvent, and safe.

The people are not fooled as easily as some folks believe. To paraphrase Lincoln, you can fool some of the people by glittering promises never intended to be kept; you can fool some of the people by tempting them with offers of selfish advantage, but you can't go on indefinitely fooling a majority of the people.

The rosy headline promises of the last 11 years lack fulfillment, and the people are going to seek other cures. They realize at last it is wise to change horses if a new horse is better equipped to carry the burden.

The course of the new militant and progressive Republican Party is as clear as a bright noonday sun.

We must accept, and we will accept, the challenge of the people of this Nation to serve by enlisting the best brains and the best ability available, not only in the winning of the war, but in the solution of the equally as difficult problems which will beset us after the war.

This is not the hour to apply the test of political enrollment. The fate of this country and the world are at stake. Faced by the supreme tasks which confront us, we need the best man or woman for every job regardless of their political affiliation, their race, color, or creed. Eliminate politics, substitute merit for favoritism, and we will win the war more quickly and with less cost of life and money; and we will be able to build a better civilization when peace once more blesses this harassed world.

We must continue to give, as we have already given, the fullest cooperation in the war effort.

This is not a New Deal war or a Democratic war or a Republican war. It is a war of all the American people and our allies against a common enemy. It will not be prosecuted to a successful conclusion by New Deal generals and admirals, or Republican or Democratic generals and admirals, but by American generals and admirals and their millions of gallant American fighting men. No little group or clique will lead this Nation to victory in this war. Victory will emerge through the combined, coordinated efforts of all our men on the fighting fronts of the world and the people who are producing the implements and essentials of warfare at home.

While we devote our efforts to the winning of the war, we must, at the same time, stand as vigorous defenders of the Constitution of our country. This is the last fortress of a people's government; it protects the rights of the minority groups of our country; it makes certain we shall continue as a government of laws and not by men. If changes in form need be made, the founders of the Republic provided the way. We must make certain the protection which the Constitution provides against the destruction of the liberties of the people shall not be swept aside.

We must make certain our system of private enterprise, with all its priceless opportunities for individual progress and achievement, shall not be abandoned to a form of state socialism and the permanent regimentation of all groups in our national life.

We must be eternally vigilant of the use of the vast powers which have been given to the executive branch for the emergencies of war, and we must be prepared to insist upon the return of these powers to Congress and the people at the conclusion of the war.

We must press for a more equitable and a sounder tax system, one which will provide incentive to enterprise and make jobs for millions of war veterans and war workers at good American wages. And with this system based upon capacity to pay, we should insist upon a simplification of tax forms so that taxpayers will understand what it is all about.

We must aid and encourage industry in planning and executing a comprehensive program which will provide work for the people of America in the factories and on the farms. We must adopt a program of rehabilitation for returning veterans who have suffered the ravages of war, and we must create educational opportunities for those whose schooling has been interrupted by their country's call to arms.

We must keep America a solvent nation through the elimination of waste, extravagance, fraud, and unnecessary spending of any character.

We must be ready to free America from the shackles of arrogant bureaucracy and regimentation. We must allow the free spirit and genius of our countrymen to soar to new heights of accomplishment, which they can and will do, if a sound and sensible government gives them the chance.

And as a great nation, we should be prepared to undertake our full share of responsibility for rehabilitating a shattered, war-torn world, insuring world peace and the security of liberty-loving people.

These problems are so great as to stagger our imagination, but we cannot escape them. We must face them, and if we tackle them in the American way, with God's help, we shall overcome them.

What a challenge to the party of Lincoln. Let us meet it calmly and unafraid.

After the First World War, the people turned to the Republican Party to rebuild and reorganize the economy of this country. History is repeating itself. They are doing so again.

Let us march ahead in this year of destiny with hope and courage and faith. We will win because the Republican Party is the one great hope for the restoration of a free government of the people, the one great hope for sound, sane, constitutional government in this great land.

Benefits of Operations of Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial relating to the efforts to compel the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to dispose hastily and prematurely of mortgages and properties in their care. The editorial is from the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLUNDER LEAGUE

In the dark days of the depression millions of American families were in danger of losing even the homes in which they lived. The stock market and banking collapse of 1929 was followed by an unprecedented mortgage panic. From 1930 to 1932 mortgages were foreclosed on more than half a million urban homes, housing approximately 2,000,000 Americans. By the spring of 1933 foreclosures were being effected at the rate of 1,000 a day. To meet this situation, the administration and Congress acted with imagination and courage. They established the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, authorizing it to grant loans on generous terms to distressed home owners and to arrange for amortization over a 15-year period. More than a million such loans were made in an aggregate amount of close to three and one-half billion dollars. It is no overstatement to say that this action, more than any other single measure taken to meet the depression, preserved the stability and the savings of the average American family.

The operations of H. O. L. C. had a collateral benefit of no small consequence. They saved a great number of private lending institutions from financial disaster by taking over their wobbly mortgages and the unsalable properties which they had captured through foreclosure. But now, ironically, the banks and mortgage companies and loan associations rescued by H. O. L. C. are clamoring for the agency's liquidation. Their potent Washington lobby, the United States Savings and Loan League, working through Representative DIRKSEN in the House and through Senator BYRD in the Senate, has sought to compel H. O. L. C. to dispose hastily and prematurely of the mortgages and properties it now holds. The purpose, of course, is to enable the private bankers to pick up the desirable items in the H. O. L. C. portfolio at cut rates.

The hypocritical pretexts on which this raid is based are shamefully transparent. The mortgage bankers, suddenly wrapping themselves in the banner of "free enterprise," have come to the horrified conclusion that the Government is in competition with them. No such qualms assailed them in the days of their despair when they pleaded piteously for governmental aid. Now, with the danger apparently passed, not content with having fed at the public trough, they seek to bite the hand that fed them. There is something even more ludicrous about their second pretext, especially from the lips of that arch-apostle of economy, Senator BYRD. He wants

to abolish H. O. L. C. to reduce nonwar expenditures. A glance at the record should reduce this argument to absurdity.

When H. O. L. C. undertook to save the home owners of America and to bail out the private lenders, it was naturally expected to incur huge losses. These were commonly forecast at anywhere from half a billion to a billion dollars. But by rehabilitating the families it assisted, H. O. L. C. has put most of them in a position to pay their own way. More than half of its loans have already been liquidated. More than 90 percent of the properties it was forced to take over have been sold. Earnings from its sound mortgages have offset losses from the shaky ones. As a result, the total loss sustained by H. O. L. C. to date amounts to scarcely more than $65,000,000—less than 2 percent of its three and one-half billion dollar investment. There is every reason to believe, moreover, that, given time to liquidate its holdings in the patient, orderly fashion originally prescribed by Congress, H. O. L. C. will be able to wind up its affairs without a single penny's cost to the American taxpayer.

Senator BYRD's "economy" course would cost the taxpayer, on the other hand, about $373,000,000 in mortgage losses. It would give the mortgage companies a rich, quick profit on the sound loans and leave the Government holding the bag with the unsound ones. Even in a period when public plunder seems to be the vogue, this looks like a monumental piece of effrontery. The families scattered all over the United States who hold their homes today by virtue of H. O. L. C. mortgages have no organization with which to counter the pressure of the United States Savings and Loan League. But they are entitled to expect their Government to save them from a return to such greedy hands. They are entitled to expect their Government to abide by its contracts with them.

Disposition of Surplus Government Property

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House and to the country that if this Congress does not immediately pass a real law that will provide for the sale of surplus property we are going to have scandal after scandal. There is no telling how many Government agencies are now engaged in handling surplus property. There does not seem to be any uniform program. We cannot wait if we are to protect the interests of the taxpayer.

I have been interested in the disposal of surplus property, not only that which will accrue after the war but also what might be declared surplus at the present time. We are all aware that from week to week methods that have been followed by the armed forces change and as a result all kinds of commodities become obsolete. Some are sold as surplus. Not long ago, I think it was in Detroit, some tools were disposed of for a price far below their value. The Department immediately straightened that matter out, as I recall by canceling the sale and recovering valuable tools which if they have not already been disposed of will be disposed of at a much higher price.

There came to my attention recently, and I know from conversation with various Members, others are aware of the transaction, that a quantity of dry-cell batteries were disposed of by the War Department in the State of Utah at a ridiculous price.

An article was published in a Utah paper to the effect that two individuals purchased the batteries for less than $200 and the same articles were sold for over $25,000. I immediately called this to the attention of Under Secretary of War Hon. Robert P. Patterson. I have heard from Mr. Patterson and his indignation was apparent. He frankly stated that the War Department, nor no one else, could defend such a sale and it was not his purpose to try to do so but he further added that this transaction was at the present time under investigation and that he proposed to see that a thorough investigation was made. I was fully convinced by my conversation with him that if there was any irregularities of any kind in connection with the disposal of this Government property or any other Government property under the control of the War Department that was not justified, those responsible would be severely punished.

For the moment I withhold judgment and I feel that others should until this matter is investigated and the War Department makes known its findings, but what impresses me most is the determination of the War Department not only to investigate this transaction but to carefully scrutinize all future transactions relating to surplus property.

The Congress, in my opinion, has a real responsibility to see that a proper law is passed that will take care of this subject. Some five or six committees of the House and numerous committees of the Senate are considering the disposal of surplus property. In my opinion it should be in the hands of one agency. When we consider that some have estimated our surplus property at the close of the war will be valued at at least $25,000,000,000 it is easy to realize the situation that will confront the country. Not only should the Government receive a fair price for the disposal of this property but likewise the Government should see that it is handled in a businesslike way, not thrown on the market as was done after World War No. 1. Industry will be destroyed if we flood the market with this surplus property.

The House passed a bill in the last session which is pending before the Senate. I do not think that the provisions in the House bill are sufficient to handle this gigantic problem, but I do hope the Senate committee will strike out all after the enacting clause, substitute new language on the subject, send it back to the House, let the bill go to conference where legislation can be written that will meet this situation.

The Oil Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the supply of oil for our Nation is daily becoming more important, not to say critical. To protect us with a sufficient reserve, the Committee on Mines and Mining has before the House H. R. 3209, looking to the production of liquid fuels by the hydrogenation of coal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, dated February 13, 1944.

This bill is the answer to the question raised by the editorial:

WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF OIL

President Roosevelt in his Friday press conference stated as a fact that we are running out of oil and that we must look to foreign sources.

Let's assume that the President did state a fact. From everything we have been able to find out from the oil experts, he did.

What does that mean?

It means that we're going to be a third-, fourth-, fifth- or sixth-rate Nation unless we have oil. Hence the importance of that proposal for a pipe line to tap our biggest known source of foreign oil—in the Middle East concessions owned by three American companies, Gulf, Texas, and Standard of California, for which our Government would supply a pipe-line outlet.

To sense the full significance of what oil means to us, let your imagination play on what oil does for us. In the air, on the ground, and on the seas, we run on oil. Our expensive highways, our busses, our autos, our Diesel-propelled streamliners, our oil-propelled ships, our air lines, all exist on oil. If we can't get oil at home we've got to go after it abroad. And that is that, unless we want to go back to old Dobbin and the shay.

We've seen in the last two decades a false picture about oil. In those years we came to believe that oil was running out of our ears, and would continue to run indefinitely. Great geological discoveries, calling for proration and other hold-downs, were brought in—east Texas, Oklahoma, the Gulf region, California, Illinois.

The independents now say that if they could get a better price, the wildcatters would go to work and find more of the same. No doubt they would start wildcatting, but they can't say for sure how much oil they would find.

So the known quantity is what the President says it is. We are running out of oil. Our powerhouse is closing down. Since 1938 we've been living off our fat. Yet we consume two-thirds of the world oil production.

And what we have to pay will be determined by what part of the oil supply we control. We use more than a gallon a day per capita.

The source involved in the Middle East, which would be served by the pipe line Mr. Roosevelt referred to, amounts to 25 to 30 percent of that rich store, and with good management maybe 50 percent.

We'd better get it while we can.

We say that, recognizing that oil has a bad name, in national and international politics—Fall, Doheny, little black bag, Tea-

pot Dome, Elk Hills, "call out the marines," dollar diplomacy, and all that.

But, we've got to have oil. Let's see that the oil game is properly policed—but let's get the oil.

Report and Question Period Would Be Helpful to House and Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a few of the recent editorials commenting on House Resolution 327, which is a resolution to amend the rules of the House to permit the establishment of a report and question period on the floor of the House during which heads of departments and agencies may be invited to the floor for reporting and questioning.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 12, 1944]

QUESTION PERIOD

On the 19th of last October Members of the House of Representatives were invited to the auditorium of the Congressional Library to hear reports on the war from Secretary Stimson, Under Secretary Patterson, and General Marshall, Chief of Staff.

The session lasted 3 hours, and the Members arose from it better informed on the progress of the war. But some of them saw how another arrangement might greatly have improved the opportunity afforded the War Department people to communicate their views and information to the Members of the popular branch of Congress. Why not invite Cabinet officers for questioning by the Members from the floor in regular sessions of the House?

This was by no means a new idea with Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of the Third Tennessee District. As a matter of fact, Mr. KEFAUVER had long planned to do something about writing a question period for Cabinet officers into the Rules of the House. On the day of the War Department meeting Mr. KEFAUVER introduced House Resolution 327.

H. R. 327 would provide for a report and question period on the floor of the House at least every other week. During it the Cabinet officer or the chief of an independent agency would be invited to answer written questions prepared and submitted in advance by the legislative committee through which the invitation would be extended. After the written questions were disposed of there would be approximately the same amount of time devoted to carefully sifted oral questions.

What Representative KEFAUVER proposed was by no means new, in 1864 a select committee headed by Representative Pendleton, of Ohio, approved a bill giving heads of the executive departments seats on the floor of the House. In his annual message to Congress for 1912 President Taft asked for something like the Pendleton plan be adopted.

But such proposals have always been resisted by Members with an over-literal view about the separation of powers laid down in the Constitution. It is true that the KEFAUVER, like the Pendleton and the Taft proposals, is something like the British practice. It followed, said critics, that the proposal was unconstitutional because it violated the principle of the separation of legislative and executive powers. Everybody knows that British cabinet members appear in the House of Commons because they are actual members, with all the rights appertaining to that status. But they are members of the House because the American theory of separated powers does not hold in England.

To that objection the answer is quite easy. To begin with, though the Pendleton and Taft proposals provided for an actual seat on the floor of one or the other Houses of Congress for the Cabinet Members, Mr. KEFAUVER'S resolution would give them only an opportunity, on express invitation, to appear for questioning.

Beyond this, however, Mr. KEFAUVER has found ample support for his plan in our early constitutional and congressional history. As every student of the Constitution knows, there is no express ban on the appearance for questioning in the Houses of executive officers.

In addition, Mr. KEFAUVER has found at least 14 instances in which a Cabinet member appeared before the Senate during the First Congress, and 8 instances in which such officers appeared before the House. There is evidence that President Washington took such appearances for granted.

If there is no constitutional bar to the Kefauver resolution, its advantages are quite apparent. For one thing, it would almost certainly improve the caliber of Cabinet and other executive officers. Only strong and able men could carry themselves well in the exacting question period.

Again, the Kefauver plan would save the time of the executive officers. Especially since the war broke out it has been notorious that top executives have had to waste many precious days in appearances before various committees on much the same problems. Mr. KEFAUVER recalls that Mr. Jeffers, the Rubber Administrator, went before five committees in 1 week at the height of his great drive to set up a synthetic-rubber industry. He argues that one session before the whole House would have informed House Members of many committees on a question of common interest to them all and the public as well.

The question period moreover, would broaden every Congressman's knowledge of the general business of the Republic. At present the committees of the Congress breed specialists—specialists in taxes, in appropriations, in agriculture, in interstate commerce, etc.

The result is a narrowing of information and even of interest which can't help hurting the over-all efficiency of the Congress. Mr. KEFAUVER offers his question period as a method by which members of the House, at least, could once more see the larger issues in the whole, so to speak, and in their broad relationship to the complete picture of domestic or foreign policy. Not that the work of the committees would in any way be supplanted. But it would be most generously supplemented, Mr. KEFAUVER believes.

The Kefauver resolution now reposes in the Rules Committee, waiting for a hearing. A hearing was originally set for February 1, but the row over the soldiers' vote required a postponement. So far, however, no other date has been set. Certainly the question is important enough to require immediate action by the Rules Committee, with early and full hearings.

[From the Washington Post of February 9, 1944]

FACE TO FACE

The lack of sympathy existing between Congress and executive is a problem in organization as well as in politics. A device is needed to keep Members of Congress more closely informed about the doings of the executive departments. We dare say that never before in our history has our Congress been in its present state of ignorance. Representative ESTES KEFAUVER makes himself an example of this condition. "I am frank to confess," he says, "that there are many departments of the Government with which I am very poorly acquainted." He wants a report-and-question period to which executive chiefs would be invited for the purpose of enlightening Congress and has introduced a bill to this effect. He and those who are backing his project know that with light there would be less heat. And with less acerbity in the relations between executive and Congress a big step would be taken toward more orderly and harmonious government.

The report-and-question period on the floor of the House as provided for in the Kefauver bill would be held at least once every 2 weeks, but not more often than once a week. The session would not last more than 2 hours. During this time a member of the Cabinet or the head of an independent agency, if he has accepted an invitation, would appear on the floor of the House and answer written questions already prepared and submitted to him by the legislative committee issuing the invitation. The last half of the report-and-question period would be taken up with questions by Representatives from the floor of the House. The project sounds like a radical innovation in our system of government. In point of fact, it would be a revival of an old practice, just as was President Wilson's decision to appear in person in giving the Presidential report on the state of the Union. The founding fathers felt that our separation-of-powers system could not function with any ease without consultation. The theory was supported by practice in the early days of our Government. That it lapsed into desuetude may have been due to the jealousy which developed between the two coordinate branches as time went on.

The development of intimate liaison between executive and legislature is the more necessary today because only with it can we do our proper part, both at home and abroad, in the reconstruction of our society after the war. Lip service often has been paid to that need. Now the time has come to do something about it. We have two suggestions to offer which would make the Kefauver bill into a reform which would be real and lasting and rewarding. The first is that the report and question period should be held in a joint session of Congress. If it isn't, then the time of our administrative chiefs would be wasted at duplicate sessions, for the Senate would certainly follow the lead of the House in the matter of interpellation. As it is, Congress wastes the time of our wartime administrators shockingly. At the start of the war Congress could have made its own contribution to conversion by temporarily combining House and Senate committees doing the same work. Nothing was done. So that Congress is perhaps the only group in the country which has not made any organizational change as a concession to war. Administrative chiefs, in consequence, often have to tell the same story twice, sometimes more. If, in addition, they had to appear before full sessions of House and Senate meeting separately, the toll on their time might be insupportable. Of course, the Kefauver bill is intended as a permanent reform, but, even so, Congress might tighten up its machinery so that the time of the administrators might be conserved.

Another suggestion is that in bringing the old practice of interpellation into effect Congress should adopt a procedure which would sustain dignity and decorum in the report and question period. What must be avoided

is the unmannerliness which sometimes attends colloquies in committee. That would be intolerable. In parliamentary countries, where the Executive sits with the legislature, rules, unwritten as well as written, are in effect which prevent interpellation from degenerating into mere heckling. Here the need for procedure is apparent from the fact that the executive chiefs would be present as guests. Interpellation died out in this country as a result in great part of its abuse by the legislature. George Washington was kept waiting for 2 days before he was permitted to consult with the Senate on the Jay Treaty. He was then treated so badly that he strode out and swore he would never return. He never did. If consultation is carefully circumscribed, nothing but good could come from the Kefauver bill, and we hope that it will soon appear before the House for consideration.

[From the New York Times of February 1, 1944]

QUESTIONS IN CONGRESS

A Washington dispatch to this newspaper yesterday called attention to the fact that recently the President has sharply curtailed the number of his conferences with the press. This has been due largely to his illness, but in all of 1943 the President held only 59 press conferences, compared with 96 the year before.

There is no compulsion on the President to hold press conferences. Mr. Roosevelt's total record in this respect, moreover, has probably been more liberal than that of any predecessor. Nevertheless, the President's press conference has become the most important single means by which the American people can learn the policies and plans of the Government. It is also one of the chief ways that the President himself has of learning the questions that are uppermost in the minds of the people.

The press conferences of the President, and of the heads of Federal departments and agencies, have become, indeed, the American substitute for the British Parliamentary question-and-answer periods when members of the legislature may ask the ministers questions regarding their policies. But there are important differences. Our press represents the public, but not in any formal, official way. The President and cabinet Members can refuse with impunity to answer questions put to them by the press. A member of the British Cabinet, it is true, may also refuse on alleged grounds of public policy to answer a specific question in Parliament. But both question and answer are then a matter of official record. The question-and-answer periods in Parliament are explicitly recognized as an inherent part of the governmental process.

Congress can adopt this procedure whenever it sees fit to do so. It would establish a closer working relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It would keep the public better informed, through Congress, of what is going on. A recent Gallup survey showed that 72 percent of the voters questioned favor in principle the proposal of Representative KEFAUVER that Cabinet members appear before Congress, when requested, to answer questions about their departments.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 8, 1944]

A CONFEDERATE PRECEDENT

"Anyone familiar with public life in Washington knows that, under some administrations, there has been an injurious lack of sympathizing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments, and especially between members of the Cabinet and committees of Congress concerned in matters of peculiar interest. The absence of facility of communication often proves a bar to the easy and better working of the Government."

That is a statement that could well be made today and applied to conditions in Washington today. It is in fact an explanation given by J. L. M. Kerr, a member of the convention that adopted the Confederate States Constitution, of the proposal to incorporate in the Confederate Constitution an article giving the principal officer in each executive department a seat upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

What was true then is true now. There is not that sympathizing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments at Washington that there should be, but which could be brought about by the proposal of Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to permit heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the House.

Governor Bricker's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Miss Dorothy Thompson. In my opinion Miss Thompson has analyzed the recent address of Governor Bricker very correctly, and has shown very clearly that he is not a man of the caliber required to lead this country through the fateful and important years ahead. Miss Thompson writes:

ON THE RECORD

(Dorothy Thompson)

Gov. John W. Bricker chose Lincoln Day on which to fire the opening shot of the Old Guard Republican campaign. It was not a shot that will be heard 'round the world. A long time from now, when American school children will still be learning the Gettysburg address, this one will be forgotten. Does any one remember any words of Warren Gamaliel Harding? In this case the face was the face of Bricker, but the voice was the voice of Harding.

Nevertheless, the speech must be taken seriously. It is probably the most candid statement we shall get of the real mentality of the leaders who still control the Republican party. Their attitude is that nothing that has happened in a generation—the collapse of a peace, the revolutionizing of the greatest Eurasian power, the fall to internal or external enemies of every continental European democracy, a disastrous world-wide collapse of traditional capitalist economy, and a new and terrible war—none of these events in any way disturb the placid certainty that the ideas of the Republican Party deserve any reconsideration whatsoever.

Under no circumstances must the people of the United States, thinking and acting as a community, undertake any planning for the more constructive use of their manpower and materials. "Our war accomplishments prove the soundness of our traditional system," says Mr. Bricker.

This just is not true. Our accomplishments are the result of a planned, organized, and integrated communal effort. Our industries did not, of themselves, prepare us for war. They tried as long as possible to continue business as usual. The war effort is the result of Government plans, Government financing, Government debts, Government contracts, Government rules, and Government effort to keep profits and labor in line according to some standards. The achievement of industry inside this framework has been colossal, but to attribute it to the harmony of initiative and popular cooperation is wrong.

In not one single point does Governor Bricker indicate awareness of any post-war problem at all—except the problem of taxation, and the restoration to complete sovereignty of the businessman's view of life. He is strong about strike legislation. He wants absolute freedom for management and restriction of freedom for labor. And he speaks in the name of the soldiers at the front.

I do not know how he sees into every soldier's mind. But I think that what is concerning our troops more than anything else is whether, when they return, they will get jobs at sufficient wages to enable them to marry, live in a decent home, and bring back the pay check every Saturday night without the interruption of months or years of unemployment and depression. On the primary question, upon which the future of our society will rest—whether we can bring about, in peace, as effective a use of our manpower and materials as we have done for war—on this question Governor Bricker is as silent as Lincoln's tomb.

I think it worthless to listen to the speech of any candidate of any party who does not put this question in the very center of all considerations. All the other questions, and especially the tax question to which Governor Bricker paid considerable attention, depend upon the answer to the primary question, How do you intend to create work for all, and thus taxable income for all?

Governor Bricker ignores the fact that the increase of State debt started out of a depression. He sees the debts, but he does not calculate the loss during a decade from idle plants and men. The most conservative estimate of such losses is $250,000,000,000, which is $80,000,000,000 more than the national debt including the cost of war to date.

Governor Bricker's attitude, which is that of the Republican Party leaders, is that the community exists to serve business, not business to serve the community. He is so scared of socialism that he will not open even a crack in his mind to any concept of private enterprise as part of a large social integration and aim.

He rightly attacks the overextension of bureaucracy. Since the "arrogant bureaucrats" are as many of them Republicans as Democrats—particularly in the highest places dealing with industry—one wonders where the party line comes in. Nor does he seek to analyze the reasons for the vast overextension of bureaucracy in the immense corporate enterprises. In fact he analyzes nothing.

The speech is not even reactionary. No; Governor Bricker's speech is Rip Van Winkleism. The terrors of a generation have not disturbed his comfortable sleep.

To the Republican Party: That's eliminated. Give us the next one.

Serviceman Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following letter to the editor, which was published in the Washington Post for February 16, 1944:

SERVICEMAN VOTE

We have sent the following letter to Mr. Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford Standard Times, in reply to his article The President and His Oath, which appeared in your paper on February 3.

"DEAR MR. BREWER, thanks for letting us know how we feel and think. We never knew we were a bunch of sex-mad maniacs solely interested in pin-up girls until you told us so. We never knew that we were not interested in our voting rights until you informed us of that fact.

We are sick and tired of civilians who assert that we servicemen are nothing but a group of morons who do not know or care about what is going on in this country of ours. Your statement that we would prefer pin-up girls to ballots is an insult to every man and woman who wears the uniform.

Let's get things straight, Mr. Brewer. We want the vote and are determined to get it. The Stars and Stripes in a poll among servicemen overseas asked them whether they preferred ballots to pin-up girls and the ballots won by an almost unanimous vote. The same attitude is prevalent everywhere. Those among us who fill your description are, thank God, few and far between.

You claim that the Federal vote bill is unconstitutional. We do not wish to argue with you about the constitutionality of this bill. After all, the final authority on such a matter is the Supreme Court. Yet you who claim to be such a lover of the Constitution, want Congress to accept your interpretation of it and thereby violate the Constitution by exercising judicial as well as legislative powers.

You know well enough that there is only one way we can vote, through a uniform Federal ballot. You are right when you say that we will not be able to vote for local officials under such a system. But remember, Mr. Brewer, if we left the matter up to the States, most of us would not be able to vote for anyone at all because of inadequate laws and inadequate facilities.

So you see, Mr. Brewer, that this soldier-vote bill is not a plot of our Commander in Chief to reelect himself, but merely a means to let us participate in the affairs of our country, for which we are asked to give our lives.

Pvt. (1st. cl.) A. Passen, Ed. R. Cressman, C. W. Riley, H. L. De Luce, R. J. Verner, A. Wadler, S. C. Morrison, J. H. Hood, K. H. Schmudde, N. Von. Eberstein, Martin S. Schmitt, M. Tocouni; Corps. D. L. Jones, W. Bailey; T/5 R. Chickering.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *February 6.*

Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

FARM INCOME RISES TO $19,009,000,000—LIVESTOCK FOR 1943 IS A MAJOR FACTOR IN INCREASE OVER 1942—OIL CROPS ALSO HIGHER

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The Agricultural Department estimated cash income from farm marketings for 1943 today at $19,009,000,000, compared with $15,336,000,000 the previous year. Livestock and livestock products contributed the major factor to the rise.

Hog sales made sharp advances over 1942 and there were marked increases in poultry and eggs, at higher average prices.

Oil-bearing crop income was 70 percent higher. This source of income was more than 3 times the 1942 figure. Receipts from peanuts in Texas were 6 times as great as in 1942 and income from soybeans was 12 times as great.

Income from vegetables and truck crops from January to November 1943 increased in all regions. The largest gain was in the South Atlantic sections where receipts were 52 percent greater than for the same 11 months of 1942.

Income from cotton for the 11 months was down 24 percent in the West.

Wheat income increased 13 percent in the North Central regions but dropped 2 percent in the Western area. In North Dakota receipts from wheat were 40 percent greater than in 1942 but in Kansas they were down 5 percent.

Income from livestock rose 20 percent in the 11 months, up 40 percent in the South Atlantic region alone. In Georgia income from eggs and poultry was nearly twice as great as in 1942 while income from livestock as a whole was 57 percent above 1942.

Receipts from hogs were high in all sections and increased 41 percent in the West North Central regions. The gain in income in Iowa was 39 percent.

Twenty-sixth Monthly Message to Japan by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the twenty-sixth monthly message broadcast by me to the people of Japan.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. For the twenty-sixth time since the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the voice of America presents the monthly message of Senator ELBERT THOMAS to the people of Japan. Senator THOMAS is a leading figure in American public life, and currently is chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor. He is also an authority on Far Eastern affairs. His years of residence in Japan and his continuing interest in the people and problems of the Far East have helped him to advise the United States in its foreign policies.

Senator THOMAS. In all important matters there is a time for reflection. There is a time to pause and consider the future in the light of the present and the past. There is a time for self-appraisal; can any occasions be more suitable for this than those which commemorate beginnings?

Since the attack on Pearl Harbor, I have spoken to you many times. I have tried to convey to you, the people of Japan, some idea of the situation which confronts you, as it appears to those who stand outside the wall of thought control. I have spoken to you directly, prompted by the ghost of what was once our friendship. Today, I am reminded that only a few days remain until the great festival of Kigensetsu, when all Japan will celebrate the accession of the first Emperor. On this occasion, as you consider the past centuries of Japan's history, would it not be well to reflect seriously upon the present and the future?

Seventy-six years ago Japan emerged from the shadows of medieval militarism to enter the community of civilized nations. The outworn policy of isolation was discarded. Western learning and western science were introduced. On the day of Kigensetsu, in 1889, the imperial constitution was promulgated, and the parliamentary government was established. The prosperity and the peaceful prestige of Japan grew with the decades.

Only 76 years have passed. Yet where does Japan stand today? Once again Japan is governed by the sword. Once again, Japan is isolated. The imperial constitution and the imperial Diet have become a mere mask for arbitrary power. The peaceful prestige of Japan has been sacrificed in an alliance with barbarians, and a revolt against civilization.

Do you, the people of Japan, know the true situation which confronts you? Twelve and a half years have passed since your military extremists invaded the northeastern provinces of China in open defiance of your Government and of international law. Six and a half years have passed since they started their bloody and indecisive campaign of aggression against China proper. More than 2 years have passed since they completed their usurpation of all power within Japan, and brought you into a war against the most powerful coalition of military and industrial strength that the world has ever seen.

What have they accomplished? Like Hitler and Mussolini, they have earned the contempt and hatred of the civilized world. Brutally, they have seized lands and resources which they have not even been able to exploit. In attempting to gratify their lust for conquest and arbitrary power, they have wasted the fruit of decades of patient labor and undermined the economy upon which Japan's prosperity was founded.

You, the people of Japan, will not need to be told of the terrible depletion of your Navy and your merchant marine. You will not need to be told of the depletion of your natural resources. You will not need to be told of the inadequacy of your war industries. You will learn of these. The great offensives planned at the Cairo Conference will tighten the circle of United Nations' power around Japan just as it has been tightened around doomed Germany. Shortages of food and fuel and medicines will speak eloquently of your sunken merchant vessels. The overwhelming war production of the United Nations will be reflected in the increased appeals of your militarists for one more gun and one more ship and even one more plane. You, the people of Japan, will not need to be told of privation and bereavement and useless death.

For over a year your militarists have brought only disaster and defeat upon Japan. For over a year Japan has been on the defensive militarily, industrially, and politically; each empty boast of victory has been followed by the loss of another island bastion in your overextended Pacific defensive line. The constantly increasing scope of United Nations offensive operations has revealed the growth of United Nations land, sea, and air supremacy.

You, the people of Japan, perhaps are not aware that your armed forces have faced only part of the total strength of the United Nations. Perhaps you are not aware of the might of the forces which now are concentrated for the final blows against encircled Germany. Do you not realize that this is the year of doom for Germany, the Germany upon whose promised victory the militarists

gambled your nation's destiny? Do you understand the power of the forces which will concentrate against Japan when Germany has fallen? Do you realize what has happened to Berlin and Hamburg, Essen and Cologne, and a score of Germany's other great industrial cities?

In a few days Japan will celebrate the great festival of Kigensetsu, commemorating the accession of the first emperor. Could there be a better occasion for considering the future in the light of the present and the past? You, the people of Japan, have a long and unfortunate tradition of subservience to military usurpation. Do you believe that Japan was given a constitution and parliamentary government only as a screen for a government by the sword similar to that which the Emperor Meiji called the disgrace of the middle and succeeding ages?

(NOTE.—Imperial rescript to soldiers and sailors.)

During the 1930's, you, the people of Japan, were faced with a choice between two ways. One was the way of progress and peaceful prestige and parliamentary government. The other was the way of submission to the arbitrary power of the miltary extremists. It was the way of the aggressor. It was the way of Hitler and Mussolini.

During the 1930's the choice was made for you. It was made by the assassination of progressive statesmen. It was made by terrorism and open mutiny. It was made by oppressive thought-control measures. * * * Today, in Europe, you can behold the fate of those who followed that way before you.

Today you, the people of Japan, again face a choice. It is a choice between an eventual return to a peaceful greatness and utter disaster and defeat. I sincerely hope that, before it is too late, you may abandon the way which the militarists have chosen for you. It is the way of disgrace and death.

ANNOUNCER. From the United States of America we have presented a special message to the people of Japan. On this day in every month since January 1941, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, has addressed a special message to the people in whom he has taken a deep interest for nearly 40 years. Senator THOMAS spent a number of years in Japan, where he earned the respect and confidence of those with whom he came in contact. Since that time he has been active in far eastern affairs and has known and worked with many Japanese leaders.

In Post-War America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the introductory remarks and addresses on the subject of post-war America delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the National Radio Forum on February 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the addresses, with introductory remarks, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN. If you've ever been to the Capitol at Washington, you've no doubt heard the big bell that calls your lawmakers to their desks. That's the sound of history in the making. Once again tonight, the Washington Evening Star asks you to join us here in the shadow of the Capitol to meet the historymakers of today—your Senators, your Congressmen, and your Congresswomen.

These men and women represent you—they make the laws of the Nation—what they say and do today, the schoolboy of tomorrow will study in his textbooks.

Our country needs your intelligent cooperation in making this history, a history of the people, by the people, and for the people.

One of the major domestic problems of this vast war is to be found in the effect it has had, and will continue to have, on the small business enterprises in the United States.

Small business has suffered greatly; in fact, hundreds of small business concerns have given up the struggle while thousands are still barely holding on to existence. Of necessity the bulk of war orders had to be placed with large industries that could handle and turn out huge production in the shortest possible time. It was the only course open to this Nation at an hour of such great crisis. Many products made by small business were forced out of the running because they were either nonessential or because the materials were needed for products more urgent. This, naturally presented a tremendous problem to this Nation. Small business in the aggregate is normally larger than what we call big business. Many of us don't realize this. But it was big business that got the big share of the war orders and there was no other way really to handle this situation.

In its wisdom, the United States Senate set up a special committee to study and survey the problems of small business enterprises. As a matter of fact, this committee has studied at length ways and means of helping small business not only in this difficult stage of its existence, but during the inevitable unscrambling of war production at the close of the war.

The National Radio Forum is happy this evening to be able to present two members of this special committee, both United States Senators, who have given largely of their time and energy to this problem of helping small business. These two legislators will give their views, opinions, and suggestions on this all-important subject.

Our first guest this evening comes from Montana. He is serving his second full term in the United States Senate. Born on a farm, he decided to become a lawyer. After graduating from New York University he took Horace Greeley's advice, went West and was admitted to the bar of the State of Montana. He came to the United States Senate in 1934. He is a member of three important committees of the Senate—Military Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor. In addition to this, he is chairman of the Senate special committee to study and survey the problems of small business enterprises.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. Boykin.

Before we can return to a peace economy, we must, of course, first win the war. Victory over Hitler and his Fascist partners must be absolute and complete. The character of the peace we win will determine the extent to which democracy and free competition can be maintained in the world.

Although the war is not yet won, it is not too early to begin thinking about our goals for peace. The President, in his recent message to the Congress, gave us an outline of the kind of a post-war world which America should strive for. He proposed a second economic Bill of Rights, including among other things, the right of every businessman—large and small—to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

There is no fundamental reason why we cannot achieve such a goal and full employment as well in the post-war world. Our record of war production demonstrates that it can be done.

We cannot succeed, however, if our economy continues to be dominated by monopoly dedicated to the policy of high prices and limited output. The only hope for full employment and prosperity in the post-war years lies in the strengthening of small business enterprise, as vital to the maintenance of free competition.

Unfortunately, we must recognize the fact that small business lost ground materially during the war. This is so even though many individual small businesses may have prospered. In the early months of the war, thousands of small businesses were frozen out of civilian production and were allowed no war work to take its place. The Congressional Small Business Committees enacted legislation compelling the utilization of small plants in war work when it became evident that the procurement agencies were confining war production to the larger corporations and denying small plants any part in the program.

This effort to protect small business, in which Senator MEAD and I have been engaged, must be carried over into the post-war period. We must plan now for reconversion if the serious blows inflicted on small business through failure to plan during the period of war mobilization are not to be repeated during demobilization.

Concretely, I propose that small business be given the first chance to reconvert to civilian production. The armed forces must, of course, get every gun, every plane, every single item they require. But, after those requirements are met, whatever essential civilian production we can afford should go first to those small concerns which are not needed for military production.

But we now hear considerable arguments to the effect that it would be inequitable and unwise to permit small civilian goods manufacturers to reconvert to peacetime production while their big competitors in the same fields are still tied up in war production. This argument is designed to justify a policy of preventing small concerns from engaging in civilian production until the big concerns are also able to resume. That argument is as unsound as the former one that war production was a program exclusively for big plants.

When the congressional small business committees made a struggle to induce the War Production Board and the procurement agencies to mobilize small plants in the war production program, we were told that the country was in a desperate war—that the War Production Board and the war agencies had to get production where they could get it quickly. The say that small plants should be regarded as casualties of the war. They contended that the War Production Board and the war agencies should not be expected to serve as relief agencies for small business, and thereupon proceeded to build $16,000,000,000 worth of new plants over the country. No effort was made to utilize the existing facilities in the small plants, a program which would have rendered unnecessary the major part of the costly plant expansion which took place. In other words, no regard was given to the consequential effect of our war production policies on small business until action was finally forced by the Congress.

And now when the easing of the raw-material situation makes it possible for small

plants to resume the manufacture of civilian goods, we find great symphy expressed for the protection of the big industrial corporations still engaged in war work. It is argued that it would be unfair to permit the small plants to start civilian production while big plants in the same field are not given an equal opportunity. If such a policy is adopted, it will mean that thousands of small plants all over the country will go broke waiting at the barrier in order to give the big manufacturing organizations an even start in reconversion.

Of course, if that is to be the policy, small business will be lost in the shuffle of the final mad scramble when demobilization comes.

The big plants, already overexpanded, with overflowing treasuries, modern plants, extensive research laboratories, and well-organized retail outlets, will have little difficulty in promptly reestablishing their dominant position in the market when they are no longer needed for war production. If the small concerns are to be hung up in the air until the big plants fully complete their war work, the future of small business will be threatened.

If small concerns can be turned over now to civilian production, it would enable small business to gain a better competitive position in the post-war struggle. It would provide sharper competition. It would lower prices, increase consumption, and encourage full employment. The goal of full production and full employment in the post-war period depends on real competition of small business. There should be an expansion of small business instead of contraction.

If such a policy is not now adopted, the small plants will fare the same as they did at the beginning of the war. Then they were denied war work and opportunity for civilian production as well. Thousands in that period were forced out of business.

Our congressional committees made an effort to remedy that situation. Following public hearings exposing the plight of small concerns and the enactment of legislation, a substantial job was done in compelling the utilization of small plants in war production, but, as I have pointed out, not until after many thousands of plants were put out of business.

Now again on the eve of reconversion, we see signs of the same process in reverse. This conflict between big business and little business, this jockeying for favorable position, will interfere with a successful program of reconversion and full employment. A definite program should be fixed now and a gradual start in reconversion made by returning small plants to civilian production as they are being freed from war work.

This is a sound program. If we delay this program and permit a wild reconversion scramble later on, we will have made a serious mistake. This program can be carried out without any injury to big business, while at the same time, it will give small business an opportunity to survive. It will tend to prevent a further concentration of business in the hands of the big monopolistic concerns of the country which will emerge from this war with swollen treasuries, expanded plants, and whetted appetites for further control of industry.

Now is the time to lay a solid foundation upon which our system of free competitive enterprise will be able to stand firmly and lastingly. Thus we may be able to preserve and expand our American system of free enterprise through which we have attained our present high position of power and influence in the world.

Mr. BOYKIN. And now let me introduce our second guest, a gentleman who comes from the great Empire State of New York. He has held public office for 31 years. Coming up through the ranks of his State legislature, he graduated from there to the Sixty-sixth Congress of the United States. After serving 10 terms in the House of Representatives he again took a forward step by his election to the United States Senate in 1938. He is a member of 6 important committees of the United States Senate as well as 4 special committees, including the special committee to study and survey the problems of small business enterprises. You can see from this that he is a pretty busy man.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to discuss certain aspects of small business which have interested me particularly. We may look forward, I am sure, to a wholesome rebirth of small industry after that great day of victory is achieved. Those small manufacturers who succeeded in converting to war work will return to peacetime production strengthened by the experience encountered in dealing with war production. Others who produced nonessential goods and were, therefore, unavoidable casualties of the industrial mobilization for war will be eager to recapture markets on the basis of new ideas and new products. Those thousands of businessmen who have taken time out from their careers to don uniforms and fight the war will be eager to return to a democracy which offers them the opportunity to reestablish themselves.

What sort of a world will small business face after the war? I listened with great interest to the remarks of Senator MURRAY, the chairman of our Senate Committee on Small Business. I agree with him that we must set our sights high for the entire Nation if small business is to prosper. The American people will not allow themselves to slip back again to the despondent swamp of depression.

Small business has a tremendous role to play in achieving the post-war goals set by President Roosevelt and Senator MURRAY. Our independent enterprises, revived and rehabilitated, can raise the mass of the Nation's economy to new heights of expanded production and prosperity. Any large institution is subject in time to a certain bureaucratic hardening of the arteries. Big business needs younger, smaller, and more flexible competitors to keep it in trim.

Small business has been sorely handicapped for years by the drying up of the accustomed sources of credit and capital. While this has been a long-term trend, it is likely to hit small business with particular severity in the period immediately following the war. Then, the speed with which funds are secured for reconversion will be all important and the delays which small business has experienced in getting loans in recent years could well be disastrous. For that reason the Senate Small Business Committee—the Murray committee—has under consideration a bill to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and broaden its lending powers to include reconversion and termination loans. The fastest and most direct route to the credit needs of small business is through local banks. Accordingly, our committee proposes to do the bulk of the lending through the local banks with guaranties by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

I have been particularly interested, however, in providing a permanent system to stimulate the flow of risk capital to small business in the post-war years. In past decades, during the period of America's greatest growth, there was no lack of capital available to finance the thousands of new plants and factories which had sprung up to put into production the fruits of American ingenuity. Then business was small business. If a businessman had an idea or a patent which he wished to develop commercially, he could find among his friends those willing to stake him on his character and reputation with some of their own savings. The banks also made a remarkable contribution to the building up of our Republic. As industry has grown, this character method of financing small business has become less and less generally applicable. The size of industrial units and commercial and retail establishments increased, so that now more capital is required to commence operations. Simultaneously, the financial center of gravity has moved from the smaller cities and towns to the great metropolitan centers. In the most impersonal atmosphere of the great metropolitan stock exchanges and investment houses it has become increasingly difficult to get financial backing for those new ideas and new products which sprout from the fertile soil of American small business. We must, therefore, find ways of reviving the flow of risk capital into small business enterprises again.

After several years' study of this problem, I have worked out a bill to create a small business finance corporation within the Federal Reserve System to serve as a permanent financial foundation under the small business structure of the country. Through this corporation, small business could secure working capital funds for periods up to 10 years. Moreover, these ends would be accomplished without the necessity for a congressional appropriation or the creation of a new agency. The working capital of the corporation would be secured by the transfer of certain funds now held by the Treasury. Administrative and operating personnel for the corporation would be obtained from among the trained staff of the Federal Reserve System. Similarly, office space and other facilities of the Federal Reserve System would be used by the corporation, thus providing quarters in each Federal Reserve District as well as in Washington.

Inadequate financing is one of the handicaps confronting small business. Another handicap is the lack of adequate business management, marketing and research facilities. Large corporations are able to establish elaborate departments for this purpose, and thereby keep themselves informed on the latest business and marketing techniques. The small businessman, harried by scores of pressing problems, is fortunate if he can find time to confer with his closest business neighbors. I have submitted a bill directing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a field service for the purpose of giving such technical aid to small business.

Senator MURRAY and I have discussed small business entirely in terms of the domestic scene.

In closing, I should like to suggest that we take a look abroad. During my recent tour of the world's battlefields, I came to realize the universal impact of this war on the habits and techniques of people in every corner of the globe. In North Africa and the Middle East I saw native dock workers unloading cargoes with American equipment. In India, I saw Hindus whose lives were walled about by the caste system, but whose hands were freed and grown more powerful because they were operating fine American machine tools. I left Australia with a feeling that half the population wanted to purchase American cars. I came home convinced that the lend-lease goods which have flowed from America to every theater of this global war are planting seeds which will yield a tremendous harvest in the free world trade of the post-war world. There are two aspects of this question for small business. First, we should begin to study the type of organization which can carry the products of small and medium-size industry to the world markets alongside the goods of those corporations able to support individual sales organizations. Second, the goal of full employment in the post-war world, a precondition for a thriving small business, seems less distant when we consider the tremendous potential of the world market.

Blot on History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blot on History," published in the San Antonio Light of February 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOT ON HISTORY

The plot of the New Deal administration to steal the forthcoming Presidential election by means of an unconstitutional ballot will be a permanent blot on the pages of American history.

This will be true, regardless of the success or failure of the plot.

The blot that is already smeared across the pages of American history and is ineradicable is the fact that the attempt was made and that an American national administration was capable of making it.

This is not the first time in American history that a Presidential election has been conducted in the midst of war, with the incumbent President of the United States seeking reelection.

There was such an election in 1864, and Abraham Lincoln was the President whose tenure was at stake.

But this is absolutely the first time a wartime administration and President have sought to scuttle the Constitution of the United States in order to be assured of continued tenure.

Abraham Lincoln most certainly did not flaunt the Constitution, although he was very doubtful of reelection by the constitutional process.

Then as now, the President was pretty sure of Army support.

But then also as now, there was an undetermined proportion of soldiers who would not be able to vote.

Probably Mr. Lincoln could have made sure of those votes much easier than it can be done now. All of the soldiers were within the continental limits of the United States.

But Mr. Lincoln said:

"Except it be to give protection against violence, I decline to interfere in any way with any Presidential election."

Moreover, said Mr. Lincoln:

"By the Constitution and laws the President is charged with no duty in the conduct of a Presidential election in any State."

Think of the contrast now.

President Roosevelt is not simply seeking reelection, but is seeking a continuous term of 16 years in the White House.

He is not simply interfering with the conduct of the Presidential election by the States, as the Constitution provides, but is trying to conduct the election as a Federal enterprise—insofar as the armed forces are concerned.

He proposes an illegal ballot

He proposes an interested and prejudiced Federal commission to handle the ballot.

If this is not for the purpose of stealing the election, what other motive can there be?

Such a conspiracy is unworthy of the President—at least of any other President.

It constitutes a permanent disgrace to the country.

Even if it fails, it will stand for all time as a discredit to the American political system.

If it succeeds, it may very well accomplish the ruin of the American system—not merely the political system of the moment, but the historic constitutional system by which the freedom of the American people has been assured.

President Roosevelt should have emulated the high example of Mr. Lincoln.

But since he has not done so, let the American people avail themselves of the opportunity the forthcoming Presidential election affords to have a national administration in the Lincoln pattern—faithful to the American system, and dedicated to its preservation.

A Significant Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 14, 1944:

A SIGNIFICANT MOVE

In suppressing a Polish newspaper published in London, the British Government has taken a step which may prove to be of considerable significance.

The newspaper—Wiadomosci Polskie—was forced to suspend publication because some of the material it published was offensive to the Soviet Government. Dispatches reaching this country do not disclose the nature of this allegedly offensive material, the official British announcement merely stating that the Polish editor had been warned on several occasions for printing articles calculated to stir up "discord among the United Nations." The editor, in his turn, professes not to know the specific reason for suppression of his paper, and says that every article published had been submitted to British censorship and that all suggested deletions had been made.

On this record, and from this distance, it is obviously not feasible to form any judgment as to whether the British authorities had adequate reasons for this drastic move. But whatever the justification, it seems significant that the British would be willing to go to this extent to remove a source of friction with the Soviet regime. Various Russian newspapers, all subject to the strictest governmental control, recently have printed articles calculated to stir up discord among the United Nations. They have not been suppressed, of course, and there naturally has been no demand from Britain or this country that any such step be taken. But when this attitude of the Russian press is added to the attitude of the Russian Government in the Polish border dispute, it is not especially reassuring to learn that the British, for reasons that are but vaguely defined, have seen fit to suppress an organ which presumably has been espousing the Polish view of the border question.

There is no need to argue that the principle involved in the settlement of the Polish controversy is important to the future relations of the Allied world. This is obviously the case. If a settlement, even a reasonably just one, is imposed on Poland by force a precedent will have been established which could prove capable of working a great deal of harm. At the least, this country and Britain should refrain from any act which might fairly be construed as implying even tacit approval of such a settlement. If we cannot prevent the arbitrary bypassing of the present Polish Government we can and should refrain from becoming parties to it unless there are reasons for such action which can be revealed and which will enlist the support of public opinion among the peoples of the United Nations.

Short Cuts to Roll-Back Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merlo Pusey, from the Washington Post of February 15, 1944:

SHORT CUTS TO ROLL-BACK SUBSIDIES

(By Merlo Pusey)

It is a mistake to assume that the fight over subsidies is entirely on an economic plane. If it were, a compromise might be reached with comparative ease. For Congress is not in any sense insisting that all subsidies be abolished. On the contrary, the majority is definitely in favor of subsidies to marginal producers for the purpose of increasing the production of food. The fight centers chiefly on the roll-back subsidies, and this is a struggle for political power as well as a dispute over the best way to control inflation.

Congress appears to be unalterably opposed to the use of Federal funds to help pay the grocery bills of every family in the country. But it is especially irritated by the President's usurpation of authority to launch such a policy. Congress has never given the administration a green light on this venture. In the Price Control Act it authorized payment of subsidies to "domestic producers" to obtain maximum production of essential commodities. But this was merely an authorization measure. It was the intention of Congress, as Senator TAFT pointed out the other day, to keep a checkrein on subsidies by requiring the O. P. A. to go to Congress for its funds. Instead, the President authorized use of R. F. C. funds for that purpose.

And these funds are not being used to induce producers to bring about a maximum output of scarce foods. They are being used to roll back the prices of a few commodities for the benefit of the consumer. That appears to be a direct violation of the law, even if it should be conceded that the R. F. C. has authority to step in and finance the kind of subsidies that Congress authorized.

Now Congress has made its attitude toward this usurpation of the policy-making function unmistakably clear. Both Houses have voted on several occasions to abolish R. F. C. financed roll-back subsidies. Yet the administration continues to pay the forbidden subsidies in defiance of the chief policy-making arm of the Government. Why does it do so?

Economists seem to be in pretty general agreement that there is no economic virtue in subsidies of this particular type. They merely transfer to the Treasury costs that

would otherwise be borne by the consuming public. The chief difference is that the Treasury has to borrow more money from the banks to pay the subsidies—an inflationary operation—while consumers by and large already have more funds than they can usefully spend in wartime. So, economically speaking, roll-back subsidies are inflationary. The only reasonable argument that can be made for them is political. In other words, organized labor wants them, and if labor is thus appeased it may not press so hard for inflationary wage increases. The administration unquestionably acted in response to this argument.

Let's not dodge the implication of these facts. The administration has put into effect a policy favored by organized labor in defiance of the policy approved and enacted into law by the country's lawmaking body. That is a sorry state of affairs for any democracy to find itself in.

If we forget all about the specific legal issues in this case, moreover, the dangers arising out of this scrap between the administration and Congress are frightening. We are still neck deep in war. When victory is won, staggering problems of world peace and reconstruction will crowd in upon official Washington. We shall need the closest teamwork between the President and Congress if we are to avoid the kind of botchery that followed the last war. But no basis for such teamwork has been laid. On the contrary, the breach between the executive and legislative is becoming wider. In that fact lies one of the greatest perils that American Government will have to meet in this revolutionary age.

Congress shares responsibility for this schism. It is sometimes stubborn and uncompromising and is no less susceptible than the administration to the pleas of special interests. But far more serious than this is the growing belief in Congress that the administration cannot be trusted to carry out the legislative will without distorting it—without twisting a law to mean the opposite from what was intended. And for that distrust the administration has only itself to blame.

In some instances temporary advantages may be won by misinterpretation or open violation of the acts of Congress. But it must be obvious that the end of such a practice can be only disastrous. For even if the tendency to break down the principles of democratic government could be ignored, the gigantic problem of securing teamwork between the executive and legislative arms in the face of such provocation of distrust would still remain. It seems to me incredibly short-sighted for the administration to jeopardize harmonious relations between our two chief arms of governmental power by short cuts of this character.

This Is Autonomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 9, 1944:

THIS IS AUTONOMY

Additional light on the autonomy decree recently voted by the Supreme Soviet Council is provided by the appointment of Alexander Korneichuk, erstwhile Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, as Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian Republic. Korneichuk is a Ukrainian who happens to be married to Wanda Wasieliewska, leader of the Soviet-sponsored Free Poland Committee which the Kremlin is obviously grooming as a rival government-in-exile to the Polish Government at London, which the Soviet Government does not recognize. Between them Alexander and Wanda should have no difficulty in arranging the Soviet-Polish border in a manner eminently satisfactory to themselves, if not to the Poles. As a Ukrainian official Korneichuk is already on record as demanding a good deal more of Polish territory in eastern Galicia (a region which, incidentally, was never Russian) than Moscow has claimed. And as the wife of Alexander, Wanda Wasieliewska can be expected to be compliant.

Win the War—Address by Hon. Martin F. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely address delivered by our former colleague, Hon. Martin F. Smith, of the State of Washington, before the Sons of Norway, Nansen Lodge, No. 410, at their sixth anniversary dinner held at the Meurot Club, St. George, Staten Island, N. Y., on January 15, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and my fellow members of the Sons of Norway, it is indeed a happy privilege and honor to join with you on this auspicious occasion and to extend felicitations upon the sixth anniversary of the founding of Lodge Nansen, No. 410, which has grown and prospered until it has become one of the outstanding and largest lodges in the New York City area. I heartily concur with our district officers in their words of congratulation and praise which I feel are richly merited and I, too, predict a still brighter and greater future for Lodge Nansen in the months and years to come.

You all have every reason to be proud of the splendid record which Nansen Lodge has made in the purchase of War bonds, contributions to the Red Cross, to the War Chest, to the Seamens' Fund, donations to the blood bank, and other war activities. I particularly wish to commend the ladies and sisters of the lodge for their weekly visits to the United States Marine Hospital on Staten Island, which we can well understand are eagerly looked forward to by our Scandinavian seamen who are hospitalized. I shall speak later of our brave brothers who are in the service of our country and who were remembered with gifts by the service committee of the lodge during the Christmas holiday season.

It is 2 years ago since my wife and I were your guests at the fourth anniversary dinner, being precluded from attending last year due to the pressure of official business in Washington, and many important events have transpired during this crucial period of world history. Fortunately, we can rejoice in the fact that considerable progress toward final victory has been made and all the United Nations occupy a far stronger and more promising position than 2 years ago.

Here on the home front our people, with very few exceptions, have wrought together in unity and achieved miraculous results in production which have made our victories on the battlefields possible. We can truthfully say that as a whole the American people, in all the walks of life, have discharged their duties with an energy, efficiency, and loyalty which has probably never before been equaled by any other people anywhere else in the world. All our people, regardless of race, color, creed, class, or party, have proved their patriotism and are entitled to share in the credit for the final victory which we hope will be achieved by our gallant fighting men in the near future.

The vast majority of the American people have submitted with good grace to the restraints and deprivations which the war has rendered necessary. Price control, rationing of food, shoes, gasoline, tires, and other commodities have caused irritations and inconveniences, but most citizens have accepted them in their stride and cooperated with the public officials whose unpleasant task it has been to enforce the regulations. It is true that it is the unquestioned right of the citizen and the press, under our form of government, to criticize the acts of our public servants and this right exists in wartime as well as during peacetime. However, this right should be exercised with caution and based upon proven facts. The criticism should be fair, taking into account all the difficulties of the situation, and impelled by a sincere desire to be helpful and to improve the situation. Anything short of that is apt to be harmful, serve no useful purpose, and give aid and comfort to the enemy.

To sow discord among our people and among our allies is unpatriotic and unwise. Loose fault-finding and criticism directed against our allies, particularly Great Britain, is ill-advised and a disservice to them and to us. Our lend-lease program did aid in saving Great Britain and the British Fleet, but let us bear in mind that the fall of Britain and the surrender of the British Fleet to Germany would have endangered our coast cities and rendered our winning the war doubtful, at least far more difficult and costly in American lives and treasure. This is certainly a time to rise above all small considerations, to submerge the things which divide us, and to remember only those things which unite us, and to keep our hearts and minds concentrated upon the big objective to win the war and to bring it to a victorious conclusion at the earliest possible moment. In the stirring words of Speaker SAM RAYBURN in a historic speech recently delivered in the House of Representatives:

"Unity in this war effort we must have. And I trust the brains and the patriotism of all Americans after it is all over to look after our interests. It is going to take the work, the loyalty, and the love of every citizen throughout the length and breadth of the earth who loves liberty and who is willing to sacrifice to preserve liberty in this world and make it again a decent place in which to live. I am saying this not for you so much as hoping that it might get out somewhere and might help somebody and might stop some complaints which are wholly unjustified. When I think of the millions of men and women who are making the supreme sacrifice in sons in this war, when I think of the bravery of the best equipped soldiers that ever went to battle in the history of mankind, how our production has put into their hands the greatest instruments of defense and for attack of any soldiers ever called to battle in all the history of mankind, if we do our job on this front in unity, not only here but with those who fight with us, God knows, and you know, that the boys who wear the uniform will do their part."

We have been spared the losses, sufferings, and hardships of the people in the invaded and occupied countries, which have been indescribable. There has been written in Norway a glorious record of hardihood, endurance, and heroism which will shine with increasing luster as the years pass and the full story becomes known. The underground in Norway has demonstrated an activity which is almost beyond belief. The Norwegian merchant marine, second only to that of Britain as the largest in the world, has continued to be one of the most important factors in the war and which it has recently been declared is rendering a service to the United Nations equivalent in effectiveness to that of an army of a million men. The Norwegian Air Force, established in Canada, is training pilots and crews which are winning renown in the skies over Europe. The contribution which the people of Norway have made to the cause of liberty and freedom will never be forgotten.

The time is fast approaching when all the combined might and force of the United Nations will be hurled at the enemy in western Europe, probably not only from one but from many directions and upon many battle fronts. The cowardly and treacherous attack upon Norway in 1940 will soon be avenged. There are indications that a powerful offensive attack by land, sea, and air will be made to drive the Nazis out of the fjords and coasts of northern Norway and ultimately from every foot of Norwegian soil which they have desecrated. Norway will be liberated and the new Norway will take her proud place with the other United Nations in building a new world with security, justice, and peace for all mankind.

Our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, in his annual message to Congress and the Nation has eloquently set forth his conception of what he believes the new America should be like. Every man, woman, and child in our land should be thrilled and inspired to new and higher hopes and aspirations as we contemplate the future glorious destiny of our beloved country and the manifold blessings and benefits which can and will become ours if we strive unitedly and with all our might to attain them.

The grand goal which our Commander in Chief has set before us is stated in these words:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

"The right to a good education.

"All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

Tonight as we celebrate the sixth anniversary of the founding of our fraternity, we are thinking of those of our members who are unable to be with us in person, although they are present in spirit and loving remembrance, because they are with our armed forces in many parts of the world defending everything which they and we hold dear. They are making the real sacrifices in this war; they and their loved ones who miss them even more intimately and closely than we do. The men and women who are in the military service and their mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, are placing upon the altar of liberty and freedom an offering and sacrifice compared to which we as civilians can contribute little of value and compared to which the things about which some of us complain seem very small and trivial, indeed. Many of our boys will never return, and some of those who do return will never be the same again, but they will not complain.

We are thinking tonight of these brave boys who are facing the cruel, cunning enemy, the lethal bombs and shells of modern mechanized warfare, the morbific elements of nature, and the deadly germs and bacillus of disease in foreign climes, and all the hellish ordeals of total war. We recall the lines of one of the most beautiful and majestic poems in the English language, which many of us learned to cherish and committed to memory during our school days—Abou Ben Adhem, by Leigh Hunt. It is a touching tribute to those who love their fellow men, and by their deeds prove their love, which applies very appropriately to our friends and brothers in the armed forces, to whom I respectfully dedicate its stanzas:

"ABOU BEN ADHEM

"Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold:
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said,
'What writest thou?' The vision raised its head,
And with a look made of all sweet accord,
Answered, 'The names of those who love the Lord.'
'And is mine one?' said Abou. 'Nay, not so.'
Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low,
But cheerily still; and said, 'I pray thee, then,
Write me as one that loves his fellow men.'

"The angel wrote, and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great awakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blessed,
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest!"

The names of our absent brothers will be written in the book of gold, and "their names will lead all the rest," for, in the words of Holy Writ: "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." May God make us worthy of the heroic deeds and the loving memories of our gallant men in the armed forces. May we be as true to our trust as they have been and are to theirs.

Politics in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Frank Kingdon and broadcast from Station WMCA, in New York, on February 3.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty years ago today Woodrow Wilson died, a major American prophet broken on the wheel of partisan politics. His chief enemy was Henry Cabot Lodge, the whining Harvard aristocrat, whose soured personal ambition turned him into a vindictive feudist unable to see either the world or his own country through his deflated vanity. He played precinct politics with a shattered world, and the echoes of his speeches are the Axis guns firing on American men in Italy and the Pacific. The United States failed 25 years ago because, in an hour of destiny, it passed from the high mood of war into a spiritual eclipse. The Nation walked in spiritual darkness then, and now the manhood of the Nation keeps tryst with danger in the world-wide valley of the shadow. Twenty years after Woodrow Wilson, his vision once more walks among men; and 20 years after Lodge, his successors are trying to stifle that vision with politics. Senator Lodge might have looked down his aristocratic nose at such a man as Representative RANKIN, but they belong in the same partnership, and the modern counterpart of the arch-enemy of Wilson is enlisted in his own way in the assassination of the great President's dream.

History is repeating itself, even though the cast is new; and now, in another hour of destiny, dark forces are at work to obscure the issues of our time in another spiritual eclipse; and the unmistakable symptom is the rise of partisan and regional politics at the lowest possible level, something terrifying—and I mean literally terrifying—at the profoundest level of our national character, has happened to us when a Member of our National House of Representatives can rise on the floor and use such a phrase in reference to an American citizen as "that little kike I told you about yesterday." Something even more dreadful, as dreadful as the medieval visions of hell, has come upon us when the House laughs at such an evil thing. It was as though they were laughing at the death of all that the United States has been. It was like the obscene laughter of an old man unashamed of his drooling nakedness. It was shame and spiritual death.

I sometimes hope that a man's death is kind enough to let him sleep after his fitful fever is done, for I would not like to think that Lincoln might be standing in the shadows of the House when such words and such laughter could echo in it. His tired shoulders would have to stoop again at such a scene. I hope that Meyer Levin and a hundred others like him did not hear it. And I am sure that Colin Kelly did not, or his honest American anger would have slapped the mouth of every grinning Congressman who thought it funny to hold a fellow American in contempt. Yet this is the level to which we have come in this year of grace 1944, when the future of the world waits on our decisions. It is futile to rage at Congress. It is our Congress and its Members are there because we have chosen them. It is not in the House but in ourselves that we are faltering in this hour that cries for greatness. Just ahead of us are battles larger than any we have yet seen and upon them hang the whole life of our country. Yet we indulge the vain and foolish belief that the war will soon be won, and that anybody is free to push personal and party ends without regard to the national interest. This goes farther than Congress.

Papers and magazines out to play opposition politics with the state of the Nation, print wild and whirring words to arouse passion on any pretext against the President. One quotation is enough. The Reader's Digest, busy in its anti-Roosevelt bias, printed last August an article by Louis Bromfield in which he discussed the Nation's food supply, and wrote "If it were possible, I would rather not think about next February; by then, most of our people will be living on a diet well below the nutrition level." The footnote of the article says that "he has spent months investigating the food crisis"; well, what did you have to eat today? I just called a gour-

mand friend of mine and he reported that he had "Smoked salmon, mock turtle soup, broiled bluefish, roast beef, potatoes, lima beans, salad, ice cream, cake, and coffee, besides a few highballs."

This is Mr. Bromfield's February. What do such follies mean? At best, that intelligent men are so blinded by partisan feeling that they cannot think straight; and, at worst, that a partisan campaign is so unscrupulous that it will distort any facts to win an argument. And this in our Nation's most critical hour. This is spiritual darkness. Against it a speech like that of Wendell Willkie yesterday shines like a great light. I am not interested in discussing just now whether he was right or wrong. He was honest. A candidate for the Presidency does not put forth such a drastic proposal for increasing taxation to gather immediate favor with the masses, he has to believe what he says. He proposed that we determine exactly what is necessary to keep our manpower and womanpower at a healthy level, and what is essential to our industrial structure, and then tax every other dollar, even lowering our standard of living to put all we have into paying for the war now so as not to mortgage the future.

He dared to present such a program because he has the democratic faith to believe that people will do all that is asked of them if they are given the facts. It was a brave speech and warms the cockles of the heart because it rises above the petty "stuff" in which so much of our public discussion founders. But contrast it with the handling of the issue of the soldier vote. Lest anyone think that I am talking of this in any partisan way, let me quote the Republican Herald-Tribune editorial of this morning: "It has been involved to a disgraceful degree in purely partisan maneuvering which threatens to obscure entirely the one thing that really matters—that is, insuring to our fighting citizens their right to a voice in the affairs of the Nation for which they are fighting." This goes to the heart of the issue. It is primarily one of keeping faith with the men, and its deepest importance is that it is a moral test. This is not the level at which it is being debated at all. This central phase is being muddled by every conceivable kind of political consideration. The large majority of the Republicans voted against a roll call on the measure, almost as though they wanted to make a partisan question of it; and of the Democrats who voted against the roll call, 50 of the 55 were from the South, as though they were intent on making a regional issue of it. The plain and unmistakable background of the political manipulation of this bill is the fear that if the men in the services vote, the President will stand a better chance for a fourth term and the Republicans will be weakened in Congress. Nobody knows that this is true. It is just a supposition, but the fear of it is reducing elements in Congress to play any kind of politics to defeat it. Put into plain terms, what a large number of Republicans and southerners are saying is, "Here is a block of votes that we fear may go for Franklin Roosevelt, so we will disfranchise these men to serve our own ends." The only decent thing to say is "It does not primarily matter whether my candidate is elected or defeated. There is one thing more fundamental and that is that every American citizen everywhere in the world be given a chance to share in the election of his country's officers." This is so plain that there is no possible answer to it. The only thing that can stand in its way is moral blindness, and the cavortings of the politicians make it plain that this is the basic difficulty.

The latest argument upon which they have seized is that the bill will not actually enfranchise all the soldiers because some of them are under 21 years of age, as though a good argument for not letting men who have a legal right to vote exercise it is that others who have never had the right will not be able to do so. This is casuistry of the most obvious kind, and it is not strange that it should have its origin in the curly-headed boy of the Chicago Tribune. The more pontifical opponents puff themselves out as the defenders of the Constitution, as though one of the objects of that august document was to take the vote away from men who are engaged in fighting to preserve it. The whole business has a hollow ring precisely because it is hollow. The serious fact is that it indicates the moral level to which we are sinking and dramatically reminds us that we are in danger of being as little prepared to meet the issues of this peace as we were the last one. Twenty years ago, Woodrow Wilson's last public words were, "I have not the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist providence before, and I have seen their utter destruction, such as will come on these again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns." This is the level at which alone we can win our real victory, and that victory begins in each of us.

Russian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's Washington Post:

RUSSIAN POLICY CAUSES CONCERN

(By Mark Sullivan)

Last week in Washington occurred an incident which amounts to a factual report of Washington feeling on an important matter. A speaker—his identity is not material, but it was Governor Bricker of Ohio—was answering questions at a luncheon of the National Press Club. His answers had brought occasional bursts of applause. One answer, however, brought more than any other. The question was whether the speaker favored setting up a bipartisan congressional committee which should be kept fully informed as to what is done at international conferences—such as the Teheran Conference of President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill. The speaker replied that Congress, and the public, ought to be fully informed.

It was this that brought the burst of emphatic applause. That it came from newsmen, familiar with Washington feeling, gave it special significance. It was one of those cases in which important news lies not in a specific overt event but in the revelation of a prevailing atmosphere.

What the incident reflects is a prevailing Washington atmosphere of puzzlement, accompanied by concern, about our relations with Russia—whether Russia's attitude about Poland, and some other Russian policies, were discussed and agreed upon in the conference at Teheran or whether the Russian Government is going its own way, without regard to the Government of the United States and that of Britain.

Following the Teheran Conference in December, and especially after President Roosevelt's return, there was in Washington and throughout the country a feeling of assurance, of pleased confidence, that any uncertainty about our relations with Russia had been ended, that understanding had been reached about post-war policies. This feeling was important and comforting, because it kept the road open for us to go on with an international association for the settlement of post-war problems, and the preservation of future peace.

This comforting atmosphere was interrupted about mid-January by news reports of incidents in Russia. The official Russian Communist newspaper, Pravda, printed a violent denunciation of Mr. Wendell Willkie. This was caused by an utterance of Mr. Willkie in which he implied that the Tehran Conference had not agreed upon post-war policies, but had left Russia to follow policies of her own with respect to Poland and other post-war matters.

Presently it turned out that Mr. Willkie was right. The Russian Government proceeded with a policy of its own about Poland. And when our Government offered to mediate between Poland and Russia, the Russian Government did not accept our offer.

In early February the Russian Government announced, with an effect of sensation in America, that henceforth the Russian Soviet Union would consist of 16 autonomous governments. About the meaning of this move there was no information in America—President Roosevelt, at a press conference, said he had no knowledge of it. There was a flood of interpretations by commentators and others, all admittedly guesses. A prevailing surmise was that the Russian Government was changing its set-up to be able to take into the Soviet Union some countries along her border heretofore independent.

Further disquiet was caused by a bitter denunciation, by the official Russian newspaper Izvestia, of the Vatican as pro-Fascist. The effect of this in America is illustrated by the strong words of the ordinarily restrained New York Times, which called it an "incendiary literary bomb manufactured in Moscow * * * thrown into the unity of the Allied Nations."

The sum of these incidents has had, in Congress and elsewhere, an effect of concern and chill. Sentiment for international collaboration, confidence that it will come about, has ebbed It has lost some of the hopefulness of last November 5, when the Senate, with a near-unanimous vote of 86 to 5, passed a resolution looking to post-war collaboration.

This ebb of hopefulness, in Congress and elsewhere, is a concrete fact. It is more serious than is expressed in the news, or in the utterances of public men, who feel the desirability of restraint. The ebb must be taken into account by persons who place facts above wishes.

South Pacific Soldiers Oppose National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an intelligent young man from my district, who has been in the armed service for more than 3 years, during 2 years of which he has suffered the hardships and tortures of the jungle war against the Japanese, has written a letter in which he expresses himself rather frankly as to his feelings, and

those of his comrades, relative to the proposed national service law. His letter gives to those of us in Congress something to think about in connection with this legislation. It is:

We men at these extreme outposts of the world are helpless to combat such things and it is with an actual terror that we read of women being conscripted into war work—of our wives being taken from the safety of the homes and positions in which we left them. Can there be an actual need for such a bill—is it necessary for the complete victory that we must have? How can it be, when we read that we have reached our peak Air Force, that training schools are being closed; that our industry has sufficient ammunition of some types to supply us until victory; that already some manufacturers are in the process of retooling their plants to peacetime demands? Isn't labor and industry in a sufficiently muddled condition already without completely risking the homes we left—the very things for which we are fighting? Isn't it sufficient that we are sacrificing years of life and happiness together—must we have the hopes of returning to our homes, as we left them, destroyed? Won't you, our preceding generation, our example, the ones we left behind to look out for our interests, do something to combat these dangers to our morale?

Post-War Disposition of Government Land Acquired for War Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

House concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to give to the original owners of the lands acquired by the United States Government for war purposes during the present war, or to the legal heirs of said owners, the priority right or first preference, to purchase from the Government these lands after the end of the war, when the Government shall decide to dispose of said lands

Whereas during the present World War, the United States Government has acquired title to many thousands of acres of land in Mississippi and elsewhere in the United States, the ownership of said lands by the Government being necessary for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas after the United States and our heroic allies have won the war and secured the peace the Congress of the United States will probably decide that a wise public policy would require the sale and disposal of a large portion of these lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the State Senate concurring therein), That we do hereby petition the President and the Congress of the United States to give to the original owners or their legal heirs, at the time of the Government's acquisition of said lands preferential consideration and priority right to purchase the said lands they formerly owned, at a fair and equitable valuation; and we respectfully make this request because of the personal and financial sacrifices many of these patriotic Americans made for their country in giving up their ancestral homes for the purposes of war; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each of our Mississippi Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives, January 26, 1944.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate, February 1, 1944.

F. L. WRIGHT,
President of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add that I subscribe to the intent and purposes set forth in this resolution. The people who once resided on these lands should, by all means, Mr. Speaker, be given the privilege of returning thereto at the close of the war.

I am confident that a bill designed to carry out this purpose will, at the proper time, come before the Congress, and I trust that all Members will support it.

Shall the League of Nations Be Reconstituted With the United States Participating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John A. Lloyd, Jr., a 16-year-old high-school student, of Cincinnati, Ohio, which will be of interest to many thinking people:

The question for discussion is: Shall the League of Nations be reconstituted, with the United States participating?

There are two parts to this question, and I shall take them up one at a time.

First of all, the League of Nations should not be reconstituted. As an instrument for the preservation of peace, it is conspicuous only by its failure. In spite of the fact that the League had been in operation for 19 years we are involved in the most horrible and bloody war in the entire history of mankind. No other fact need be cited to establish that the League, as constituted, failed utterly in its purpose and, this being true, there can be no valid reason for reconstituting it. It should be written off the balance sheet of human effort as a total loss and some new arrangement designed, if such be possible, to achieve the noble and lofty purposes for which it was created.

As to the second part of the question, if the League be reconstituted, the United States should not participate in it. There are two sound reasons for nonparticipation, the first of which is grounded in ordinary common sense and simple arithmetic, while the second rests upon the sacred altar of our country's Constitution.

The League Covenant provides for two voting houses: the Assembly and the Council. In the Assembly each member nation has one vote. The Council is composed of France, Great Britain, and, before they withdrew from the peace-loving atmosphere of the League to start the present war, Italy, Japan, and Germany, plus nine other members from among the other nations.

If the United States joins the League, she cannot do so on a basis of equality with two other great national groups—the British Commonwealth of Nations and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Already the British Commonwealth has six votes in the League. We would have one. In any point where our interests were at stake, the British could outvote us 6 to 1. Already the Soviet Union is anticipating the revival of the League, and is preparing each of its 16 member republics to cast a vote, so that in any conflict of interests with Communist Russia we would be outvoted 16 to 1. The League is no place for the United States because we could not be—under the fundamental law of the League—on a parity with the imperialistic British and the communistic Russians.

Were there no other reason, the United States should not participate. But there is another, and a far greater and graver reason—a reason so fundamental that it touches the rights, freedom, security and independence of every man, woman and child in America. That reason is, like the first, found in the language of the League Covenant. Article X of the League Covenant reads:

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

If the United States should join the League we would commit ourselves to obey the order of the League Council and if that order were to go to war, the United States would be compelled to go to war.

We cannot, under the terms of our own Constitution, make such a commitment. Our Constitution recites clearly how the United States can go to war. In Article I, section 8, you will find these words:

"The Congress shall have the power * * * to declare war."

The language is exclusive. Under its express terms only Congress can declare war and Congress cannot delegate that power to any other person, or group of persons, or organization on the face of the earth. That wise provision was written as a protection to the life and liberties of the people of this country—their guaranty that only their elected representatives could plunge them into war. Our membership in the League would nullify the Constitution and make a pawn of every American boy in the great, selfish, greedy game of European and Asiatic power politics. America should not and will not defile her Constitution—legal reasoning and common sense both tell us that we cannot join the League because it would be unlawful as well as unwise.

Our people are concerned about the peace of the future and are determined to see to it that peace shall be preserved, if it is possible to do so. We do not take the position that America will not cooperate for the preservation of world peace—we do not say that we would not join any organization of nations if such were its goal. But as for joining the League as it was and is constituted, that is impossible.

Whether we would join a new league or federation of nations cannot now be determined. Only when the war is over and the nations of the world sit down at the peace table can we answer that question. Then our answer must be based upon stark realism and intelligent patriotism.

Butterfat Versus Vegetable Oils and O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received many complaints from farmers and farmers cooperative creameries alleging that the O. P. A. is discriminating against Wisconsin creameries and cheese factories. Our farmers and their associations have thousands of dollars invested in their creameries and cheese factories which represent their life work. In addition to this they have been induced by the Government to invest thousands more in plants and equipment for the manufacture of powdered milk. Citing as an example, the O. P. A. fixed the price of butter at $0.415 in Chicago plus a 5-cent subsidy, and the price of dried skim milk at $12.50 a hundred at the plant. The creamery can get 4.2 pounds of butter and 8.2 pounds of milk powder out of a hundredweight of milk, a gross return of $2.95 which does not include manufacturing costs, insurance, depreciation, and so forth.

However, condenseries are allowed to pay $3 a hundred for the same milk. O. P. A. regulations have made it impossible for local cooperatives to sell print butter, for example, beyond a radius of 50 miles from the factory. The local associations would have to sell their print butter for 2 cents a pound less than they may sell it for at home, if the market is over 50 miles distant. Thus, they are compelled to give up their outside markets. These outside markets being unable to secure butter for their city consumers are thus persuaded to replenish their shelves with oleomargarine. The consumption of oleomargarine in the cities has increased 25 percent and over since these restrictions have been placed on the sale of butter, and since the condenseries have been allowed to pay higher prices for fluid milk. The farmers' cooperatives are complaining to me that the O. P. A. is thus putting the creameries out of business.

Along this line of thought, here are further facts to justify the complaints of the dairy farmers and their associations: The W. P. B. allocated 67 percent more vegetable oils in 1943 for the manufacture of oleomargarine than in 1942. The oleo interests used up all the vegetable oils allotted to them for that purpose, indicating that 67 percent more oleomargarine was consumed and manufactured in the United States in 1943 than in the year before. Doubtless this increased consumption of oleo had a deterrent effect on the dairy industry. To stimulate the production of vegetable oils and fats, the O. P. A. proposes to subsidize vegetable oils to the tune of $65,000,000. The dairy farmers will thus be paying additional taxes to produce more vegetable oils to make more oleomargarine to help put the butter market on the skids and the creameries out of business. In contrast to this situation, the O. P. A. since August 1, 1943, allocated 128,000,000 pounds of lard for the manufacture of soap, and then raised the ration points on lard to the housewife to make it harder for her to use lard for cooking. The housewife was thus "persuaded" to substitute vegetable oils and fat in place of lard for shortening and cooking purposes.

Further discrimination against our creameries and butter production is shown in the fact that the O. P. A. allows powdered eggs to be sold at $1.10 and $1.20 a pound. But the same amount of animal fats and proteins in butter and powdered milk bring a ceiling price of only 44 cents. Powdered skim milk has an O. P. A. ceiling price of 12½ to 14½ cents a pound and contains 35 percent animal proteins.

Fluid milk is not rationed. The national consumption of fluid milk has increased 67 percent since the O. P. A. was established. This increased consumption of fluid milk is reflected back in a lower and decreased consumption of butter and cheese. As a result cheese production in some parts of the United States has fallen off 33 percent during the past year.

Many synthetic food products are now allowed on the market by O. P. A. without ceiling prices or rationing. Examples of this are the high moisture and low butterfat type of cheese that has sprung up on the market. Many types of filled-milk products have also sprung up during the past 2 years. In this type of dairy product the butterfat is removed and replaced by vegetable oils. This synthetic product is sold for as much as though it contained butterfat. The butterfat that has been removed is worth 50 cents to $1 a pound, and is replaced by vegetable oils worth 13 cents a pound. A good illustration of this type of synthetic dairy product is the new type of whipping cream now on the market, which is half cream and half vegetable oil. All this points to an apparent determination on the part of the Government through its various agencies to build up the vegetable-oil market at the expense of the dairy industry.

The Stake Is Our America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a recent editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Tuesday, February 15, issue, entitled "The Stake Is Our America."

THE STAKE IS OUR AMERICA

Our country is at war. At such a time our minds should not be concerned with partisan politics. That is the way the people would have it were they permitted to choose. That is the way politicians and public officeholders would have it did they place the welfare of their country above their selfish political ambitions.

But such is not the case. We are to be given no choice. The campaign has begun. It has been introduced by those who should be the very last of all of us to inject politics into the life of a nation fighting the most desperate war in all history; fighting for its very existence.

Washington is leaving no political stone unturned. Bids are being made for the labor vote; offers are being made for the soldier vote; men high in our Government, despite the solemn obligation of their offices, are finding time to devote their energies to the coming political struggle.

Under these circumstances we have no alternative but to accept the challenge. There is too much at stake to remain silent; the implications are too serious to remain inactive.

The Presidential election in 1944 will be the most vital in our national existence. The crisis will have been reached—the result will mark the turning point.

Mr. Roosevelt, or one of his choosing, will be the New Deal candidate. It matters little who shall oppose him. This will not be an election of personalities; it will be an election of principles. The issues will be clear. On the home front the American people must decide whether we shall return to constitutional democracy or shall continue as a bureaucracy with the distinct possibility of evolving into some form of totalitarianism. On the international front they must decide between a world of planned economy, an international new deal on the one hand, and a participation in world affairs only insofar as is consistent with our own national welfare, on the other.

With such issues at stake there can be no party lines as we have known them in the past. The New Deal Party is not the Democratic Party. It is composed of ex-Democrats, ex-Republicans, ex-Socialists, and ex-Communists. It is as its leaders define it; a socialistic philosophy closely allied with the radical labor movement. It will have as its allies those organized minorities, those corrupt political machines whose support it has purchased with public moneys, with class legislation.

The candidate who opposes Mr. Roosevelt will be a Republican candidate only in name. The old Republican Party's framework will be used to unite all those who still believe in the American way of life; those who believe in representative government; those who believe in free enterprise; those who believe that free people should govern rather than be governed.

Nor will our platform be confined to the old Republican doctrine. Rather shall we cull the past of both parties for its best and add thereto such recent conceptions as are calculated to bring happiness and prosperity to our people as a whole. We shall embrace the one time democratic doctrine of State's rights, local self-government. We shall embrace the Republican doctrine of the protective tariff. We shall not hesitate to borrow from the early days of the New Deal such ideas as we shall believe properly enacted into law and properly administered shall protect and assist labor in its legitimate aspirations and shall provide adequately for those of us who through age or misfortune are unable to provide for themselves. We shall demonstrate that isolationism is nonexistent. We believe the United States should take its place in world affairs, but we shall insist that no opprobrium attaches to the consideration of "America first."

Such shall be our coalition; such shall be our platform. The great unorganized majority of selfless patriotic citizens espousing

government for the mutual benefit of all shall be pitted against the selfish organized minorities seeking special privilege for the few at the expense of the many. And we shall win. We shall win if we all pull together. We shall win if there shall be no recriminations; no false loyalties to past partisan ties; no foolish boasting of partisan victory.

The stake is too important to permit of such pettiness. The stake is our America.

Simplification of Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by David Lawrence, in the Washington Star of February 15, 1944, is certainly timely and worthy of the consideration of every Member of this Congress:

TAX LAWS CREAKING—SIMPLIFICATION IS CALLED IMPERATIVE BUT FIRST MOVE IS UP TO CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

The cry for simplification of the income-tax returns is a mere whisper compared to the roar that's coming when millions of the people who never had the experience before find out what it means and get caught in the red tape of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

People are being assured they'll get refunds if they overpay, but they don't know how long it takes to get refunds. They don't know how long it takes to settle simple tax problems. For the truth is the present system of handling taxes was tolerated only because it has affected a relatively small proportion of the electorate. Today, as the hand of the tax collector has necessarily had to reach many millions of persons, the administrative task of the Bureau has become almost the largest nonmilitary operation of the Government.

It will not be persuasive to blame the present congestion or the red tape on the Bureau of Internal Revenue or on the Secretary of the Treasury or on the President. The tax laws and regulations are the product of nearly 30 years of torture specially devised under Republican as well as Democratic administrations after trying to understand what the legislators wrote each time when they finished a tax bill.

The simplifying should start at the source—the legislation itself. The theory of the political mind while writing a tax bill is that if by some remote chance, someone might possibly make a larger profit or income the chance must be guarded against. This is called plugging loopholes. As a matter of fact, it often results in a dragnet that penalizes the innocent but the Bureau of Internal Revenue appears to have no discretion in the matter of separating the obvious evasions from the avoidance of taxes though time and again the courts have seemed to indicate that it is lawful to avoid taxes.

The difficulty is partly in the failure of Congress to provide an adequate staff or to provide a means for checking the efficiency of the Bureau so as to ascertain whether delays in handling returns are due to complicated regulations or insufficient personnel or any other reasons.

The British system seems to be different. They seem to place reliance on their personnel and entrust to them the task of making equitable settlements on the spot. With a fine civil service and men of integrity who are instructed to do an equitable job of tax collection, the public seems to have a chance to find out each year what has to be paid. The same trust ought to be bestowed on the Internal Revenue Bureau personnel. The staff of auditors should be given power to examine returns and deal with technicalities on the spot—even to the point of making lump-sum settlements. The cost in the end is smaller, and the revenue to the Government probably would be larger in the long run.

But there can be no simplified tax returns till the laws are simplified. Instead of allowing certain deductions to apply to everybody, deductions are applied to individuals in business which do not differ from expenses incurred by individuals in personal affairs. Probably the best way out of the deduction mess is to make a flat tax graduated up to the first $5,000 and allow no deductions up to that point but let the rates be lower on that account for that bracket. This would eliminate much of the difficulty and at the same time would treat everybody alike. As for sums above $5,000, a series of deductions also reduced in number would make the filing of returns simpler for administrative purposes.

The Congress is largely to blame for some of the complexities. Thus a bad debt has for years been charged off 100 percent when ascertained to be really a bad debt. Now, after January 1, 1943, a bad debt can be given only a 12½-percent deduction and can be applied as an offset only against a capital gain. This is but one of many complications invented by the legislators or else forced into the bills by the Treasury Department till each tax law adds more and more perplexities to the previous one.

The wonder really is that the taxes are ever collected in as big sums as are obtained. It would be a public service if some congressional committee took it upon itself to find out how many income-tax returns are not audited or settled, and how many hundreds of millions of dollars—perhaps billions—are in dispute and subject to litigation. How much more inexpensive it would be to empower the bureau to have the discretion to settle such cases on an equitable basis instead of confining it to rigid provisions written so ambiguously that it takes the courts years to interpret the intent of Congress. Simplification begins in the Treasury, but it also must be accepted on Capitol Hill in the writing of tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, according to the best information I can secure from the Treasury Department and the Committee on Ways and Means, there have been some twenty-eight major revenue bills enacted by this Congress since the first income tax law was passed in 1913. If the information I get is correct at least twenty-six of these revenue bills dealt with income taxes in one form or another. Twenty-six income tax bills piled one on top of another, each with different provisions and each with different and sometimes conflicting interpretations by the Department of Revenue. The complexity of the situation that has developed is emphasized by the fact that neither the Treasury Department nor the Committee on Ways and Means seem to be able to advise me just exactly how many bills have been enacted. If the Ways and Means Committee, which draws these bills and pilots them through the legislative channels of this Congress, and the Treasury Department which interprets the bills and collects the taxes imposed thereunder, cannot even tell us how many tax laws have been passed, it becomes very apparent that they themselves have become confused in the mass of legislation. So I ask you, how in the world do they or how can we expect the average taxpayer to be able to figure out what he owes. Let me emphasize that Johnnie Q. Public, the taxpayer, is expected to take this maze of tax laws and figure out what he owes the Government in income taxes, yet the very committee that wrote the laws and the department of the Government that interprets and administers the laws seem not to know just how many laws have been passed. How can they know what is in them when they do not even know how many laws there are?

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know that our estimable Committee on Ways and Means has at last awakened to the intolerable situation that exists and are now holding hearings with the view of simplifying these income tax laws. However, may I suggest to them and to the Treasury Department that the proper approach is not the enactment of another law to be piled up on top of those now existing and amending the present laws by section and paragraph, but that the real and sensible solution lies in the repeal of all existing income tax laws and the enacting of a completely new, sensible, simplified, over-all comprehensive act. Surely with some 33 years of experience, of trial and error, they should be able to do the job. I believe they can. I know they should.

England Should Set Up Its War Refugee Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Lord Halifax:

FEBRUARY 16, 1944.

The Right Honorable
The VISCOUNT HALIFAX, K. G.
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: The directive of President Roosevelt setting up the War Refugee Board has been universally proclaimed. That Board is already functioning and well on its way seeking temporary shelter for helpless Jews and other refugees trapped in the charnel house of Hitler's Festung Europa.

Ours is the will to pry open the Hitler pincers of torture of the driven Jews and to spirit the victims out of Axis-controlled prisons and concentration camps. I am sure that the good people of England share that trustworthy aim. Therefore, how much more effective will that work of mercy be if England, in the spirit of cooperation, likewise sets up its war refugee board.

Frankly, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees now functioning in London to which both England and the United States have sent representatives, apparently has

bogged down with protocol and diplomatic niceties. It unfortunately follows the pattern laid down at Evian and Bermuda. It has neither the will nor the means to render immediate aid. Time is of the essence. The starving, shivering, naked bodies of the driven Jews cannot survive longer unless rescue is immediately forthcoming. They cannot wait until battle victory crowns our efforts. By then Europe will have become a complete Jewish sepulchre. The dead need no havens save the grave. Disembodied spirits need no rescue.

It is earnestly and respectfully urged that you petition in turn the Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of England, that he follow the lead of our glorious President and establish an English war refugee board. There can be no delay. Your own Magna Carta in pentecostal manner says, "We will deny justice to none nor delay it." Simple justice requires expeditious action. Just as the President cut through the argument that "military necessity precludes," Mr. Churchill may do likewise.

The martyred victims of Hitler's reign of terror will more hopefully emerge from their hiding and make the perilous trek out of Europe if encouraged by both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. The diplomatic, consular, and intelligence aides of both nations could render inestimable aid.

These victims will scale the Pyrenees, cross the Dolomites, swim the Hellespont, and buffet the tides of the Skagerrack if they know that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are with them. They will manage to escape by way of the underground just as the runaway slaves during and before our own Civil War fled to the north by way of the so-called "underground railway."

Organizations are forming in Slovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Spain and elsewhere that seek to aid these refugees make good their get-away.

The distinguished British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden declared in the House of Commons that the British Cabinet is Britain's war refugee board. Frankly, that answer will not satisfy. The British Cabinet is no more a war refugee board than the American Cabinet is.

The closeness of our two countries, allied as we are in arms and aims, prompts me to communicate with you in this manner. Your own Honorable Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, has said, "Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies, even during the heat of war, is not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy." It is because I subscribe to that doctrine that I write to you in this vein.

Most respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Joseph J. O'Brien, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Lincoln Day address of Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, of New York, in Appleton, Wis., February 12, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen and my Republican friends of the city of Appleton, I want you to know I consider myself singularly privileged to have the honor of being with you this evening, the one hundred and thirty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Lincoln.

I am happy to be here in the good State of Wisconsin, the birthplace of the Republican Party, for I understand it was not so far from Appleton, near the town of Ripon, that the Republican Party, the party, should I say, of Abraham Lincoln, was founded.

We have gathered here tonight to commemorate that great man's birthday and it is well that we meet. Oh, not for any message that I may bring you, or the words that will be spoken here this evening for as Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." And so I say, it is well that we meet here this evening to renew our faith in the form of government that Lincoln believed in so devotedly.

The world can never forget what they did here, here in the great State of Wisconsin, those founders of the Republican Party. It was inevitable that the Republican Party should be born. If not here in Wisconsin, then somewhere else; if not under the name "Republican," then by some other designation. Other opposing political parties of the time had weakened and fallen into decay. There remained only the Democratic Party as the dominant political faction of the Nation. Our whole system of government is based on the principle of two strong political parties. Under our Constitution it was never intended that one party dominate the picture too long, just as it was never intended that one man become a permanent resident of the White House.

Our Government is built on a system of checks and balances—the Congress checks the executive, the judiciary checks the laws passed by the legislature and the executive, and the President by his veto and the power of appointment exercises control over both the Congress and the courts.

In turn, the two major political parties act as a check on each other. However, when one group remains in control too long and has too great a majority in both Houses there arise abuses of government, more and more control is built up in the Capital City, and unlimited power is given to the man who sits in the driver's seat. Finally, the one who went into office as the servant of the people decides that he is the master of the people. This arrogance increases until he at last reaches the conclusion that he is the indispensable man.

For the past 12 years we Republicans have been groping through the fog and sometimes we have felt lost when we surveyed the staggering bureaucratic New Deal government that has replaced the American system, but I want to emphasize tonight that we are not lost—it's only the houses that are different and praise God we have in our hands the power to change all this come next November and get back the old familiar structure that spells the American way of life.

To mention a few of these structures that have grown up mushroom-like overnight, something like the balloon houses that are blown up and ready for occupancy in a few hours, I contend that we now have in Washington in place of a government of checks and balances, a government by Presidential edict. With the tremendous power granted the President by a subservient majority of New Dealers in Congress, Mr. Roosevelt is able to circumvent the will of Congress, and this he does consistently. I give you an example. In making his requests for appropriations the President always asks for a great deal more money than is needed. In this way he builds up a tremendous reserve which he uses for his pet projects. In time of war this is especially easy for him to do because no Member of Congress wishes to vote against any measure that affects the war effort.

Someone at this point might well ask the question, "Well, you're a Member of Congress, why don't you vote against these huge appropriation bills?" Let me explain.

The President sends his bill to the Appropriations Committee with a request for funds for the Army and Navy, but this is often far in excess of what is needed. When the bill comes to the floor of the House amendments may be offered by the minority, but here again the Democrats have a majority and by mustering their forces they can outvote us. If we cannot amend the bill to remove the slush fund we are then faced with the alternative of voting "yes" or "no" on the bill. We can't say "I'll vote for the part that is good, but not the other." If we vote "no" we vote against all appropriations for the Army and Navy; if we vote "yes" we take care of our armed forces, but we also vote for the excess funds which the President can use for any boondoggling scheme he desires. That, my friends, is the sorry story of how the will of the people is destroyed by an Executive with too much power and the only way you can cure it is to see to it that we have a Republican victory next fall.

As an illustration of how the President uses these grants of money to defeat the will of Congress, I cite the case of the Pentagon Building in Washington. Congress appropriated $35,000,000 for this monstrosity known as Somervell's Folly. The building when completed cost $75,000,000, in utter disregard of the will of Congress and forty million in taxpayers' money went down a rat hole. A congressional investigation of the wanton waste of funds in the erection of the Pentagon is to be started, but that will not restore the money that was squandered on this grotesque edifice, money that should have been spent to send bombers to General MacArthur so he could have rescued the heroic boys of Bataan.

Another strange structure that has been erected in Washington is bureaucracy. There is a city ordinance in the Nation's Capital against the building of skyscrapers. Fourteen stories is the limit, but under the New Deal the piling of one crazy bureau on top of another has created an edifice that reaches to the sky and darkens the sun. The chiefs of these bureaus try to regulate every waking hour of our day. We are informed by Washington how to tie our shoestrings and when to plow the back forty.

A third construction that menaces your Government which might be termed a subterranean cavern because it operates underground is a structure known as the vilification of Congress. Not content with packing the Supreme Court with puppets to the extent that the judicial branch is now just a weak echo of Mr. Roosevelt, the President has been viewing with alarm the growing tide of Republicanism in Congress. Consequently he has let loose his gang of White House stooges, many of whom are radio commentators and newspaper columnists. They have been carrying on a strenuous campaign to malign Congress and put the blame for all the New Deal blunders on the legislative branch.

The recent case of the soldier vote bill is an example. Roosevelt and his gang attempted to make people believe that the two sides were lined up as follows:

1. Those who want the soldiers to vote.
2. Those who don't want the soldiers to vote.

Such is not the case.

It was suggested on the floor of the House that we weigh Eleanor and all her baggage and send the boys ballots instead of giving her priorities for her next jaunt around the world. I believe the boys would be just as happy to get the ballots and I'm sure that a nice picture of an attractive pin-up girl would please them more than either one.

I want to congratulate you Republicans who have helped to keep our party alive during these last 12 long years. In doing so you have rendered a great service to the Republic by preserving our two-party system. I want

to caution you against those who spread pessimistic talk about not being able to defeat Roosevelt. All signs point to a Republican victory, etc.

Yes, there are some strange houses in Washington and we have wandered far down a rocky road, but I have no fear that we are lost—not as long as we have the indomitable will of the American people, the country that Lincoln loved and the splendid boys who are out there tonight fighting to preserve it.

On this auspicious occasion you and I have many reasons to be anxious and most willing to do everything within our power to bring this awful world conflict to a speedy termination. We want to do everything that we as individuals can do, to settle a confused world, and bring those who are responsible for this global conflict to justice, and in doing so we hope for a peace that will be lasting; even if we Americans have to insist on such a peace by means of force. Americans believe in fair play and consideration and surely will want cooperatin in this prodigious undertaking—but cooperation or no cooperation we will insist on a peace that will mean security for Americans as well as all other nations who desire happiness and prosperity under a form of government of their own choosing. America must lead the way, and what is more we will lead the way exactly as we have led the way in manpower, production, money, and food. Yes, as we led the way in past invasions and will lead the way in future invasions.

The only way this much-longed-for objective can be obtained is by using every effort to bring about unity in our great country; unity as it is recognized by true Americans—and I don't mean supposed unity or fictitious unity promulgated by the New Deal. You have a perfect right to ask, What do I mean by unity? When I speak of unity, I speak of solidarity of thought, complete synchronization of action, and the willingness to accept constructive criticism. I repeat, constructive criticism, not criticism for the sake of criticizing. There is an old saying, "He who continually criticizes and fights with the past very seriously jeopardizes the future." Speaking of unity, I do not mean agreeing on unity of mistakes or Nation-wide agreement on wrong policies. I do not mean agreement of all the people on New Deal blunders, failures, or weaknesses.

It is apparent to every clear-thinking person that there is one paramount issue which I know our people can distinguish and that is the issue and the importance of winning this war just as quickly as possible so that our boys may return home and take their places in a social order which must be perpetuated by every true American and particularly by the Republican Party.

There must be unity in the preservation of our ideals, of our precepts, our policies, and our free institutions, and let us remember that it is up to us to keep America of the future in exactly the same status the boys knew it when they left to fight on the numerous expeditionary fronts throughout the entire world.

May I grasp this opportunity to inform you fathers and mothers that we Americans have the best and bravest fighting men in the whole world. Our boys are fearless, hard-hitting, determined, well-trained, and, what is more, the American boys in the armed forces are distinctly individualists. Now the American fighter, even though he does possess all of these qualities, is absolutely useless unless he has the weapons—weapons as good or superior to the enemy—and let me most emphatically state right here that the American fighter at this time has weapons better than the enemy and uses them in a more devastating manner. Tunisia, Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Attu, Sicily, Salerno, and the continual bombing of Nazi industrial centers are examples of his ability to use these war weapons most effectively. We cannot because of these victories relax, and I hope no one here will allow the extravagance of his or her imagination to be so exerted as to believe that this war is all over but the shouting, or "in the bag."

We have a hard job ahead of us. Yes; the word "hard" expresses what is to come in the future very mildly. Make no mistake, my Republican friends, we may whoop and hurrah all we will; we may have blaring bands and flying banners, but the tools those boys out there need to do the job they have to do must be produced by unity of will and energy on the farms and in the factories and in the shipyards here at home.

Dictators and those who vigorously disagree with us have no scruples in promulgating the fallacy that our own American unity will not perpetuate our democracy and predicate their theory that a republic cannot continue because it is a luxury of civilization. My Republican friends, please permit me to inform you with all the vigor at my command and impress upon you that a republic is not a luxury of civilization; it is a responsibility of civilization.

We, in Congress, can appropriate billions upon billions and that is only the first step. The real job—and again I stress the indisputable fact—that the appropriation of billions is futile, unless we convert those billions into planes, tanks, guns, munitions, ships, and food. This can only be the result of unity and hard work. This may be a long war. It may be a hard war and its cost will be terrific sacrifices. Whether that be so or whether it not be so, we must prepare for a long war. We have the greatest resources of any single nation; we have the greatest production capacity; we have the best inventive geniuses, the best chemists, and again, I repeat, we have the best soldiers and sailors of any nation in the world.

Our job is to ripen into action American capacity, workmanship, and brains and produce the tools with which our boys in the far-away places, on ships, in the planes, submarines, and in the tanks will vanquish the foe and preserve freedom in the world and maintain those spiritual and cultural as well as material gains which man has made in his journey from the caves to the cathedrals.

Washington, and I am not enlightening you in the least when I say this, is a fine example of New Deal confusion right at the present time. The overlapping of agencies, interdepartmental jealousies, and the constant off-the-record fights and disagreement within the New Deal ranks certainly has not made a substantial contribution to unity on the home front. Do you remember, and not so long ago, the terrific discussion held within the official family of the New Deal concerning the critical food situation?

And may I refresh your memory with reference to the numerous obstacles Bill Jeffers experienced in putting through his synthetic-rubber program. Why, within the last few days the Chief Executive publicly announced that Members of Congress ought to stand and be counted so the country would know exactly and precisely how they felt about the soldiers' vote. New Deal propagandists, New Deal radio announcers, and New Deal columnists would have the American people believe that the only sure and positive way the soldier would be given the privilege and opportunity to vote would be by a Federal ballot.

My friends, let me say right here, that no one in Congress has any desire to deprive the soldier of his privilege or opportunity to vote. New Deal spokesmen refer continually to the soldier's right to vote. The soldier's right to vote was never questioned. He has the right to vote, but what we were seeking to do was to give him the privilege and opportunity. Surely we all want them to vote, but we do strenuously object to having anyone conspicuously identified with the New Deal given the privilege to vote them. How can you expect unity when Frankfurter, Niles, Hopkins, and many others are doing their utmost to keep the people in a constant state of confusion.

I have stated on numerous occasions, publicly, privately, and through the press that the New Deal's secret of success was its intense desire to keep the people in a constant state of bewilderment.

Surely we all rejoice when we realize that the people of the country today are acutely conscious that if unity and confidence is to be restored the party to restore that confidence and unity is the Republican Party which bases its legislative program and has as its guide the Constitution of the United States.

You know, I know, and everyone else knows the Constitution has been flagrantly violated and Executive orders and bureaus set up with such amazing rapidity that even we in Washington, we who are close to the picture, cannot keep track of them by actual count.

It is my ardent belief and my firm conviction that it is about time the administration publicly announce what our post-war program is, if any. We are dissipating our natural resources and we have been throwing billions around with reckless abandon and now is the time to state in a very clear and concise manner, as England and Russia have stated, just where we stand and what we intend to do. Having made their announcements honestly and sincerely, I am one who believes that some of our confusion could be eliminated. Let us make sure while we are doing a splendid job on the war front we won't be holding the bag on the home front.

In conclusion, the spirit of unity strengthens the moral fiber of the Nation. Unity develops the character of a nation. Unity makes us more determined to do a job well—thus doing the job so well that our way of life and civilization will not be wiped out. Our Republic must continue. It will continue and our American way of life cannot change because every red-blooded, two-fisted, hard-hitting American citizen will not permit any man or group of men or political party nor will we allow any demagogues or bureaucrats to change it.

In our country unity such as known by the Republicans encourages free enterprise and free enterprise is of tremendous importance.

We want no part of regimentation. We, the members of the Republican Party, have always welcomed criticism—criticism if honestly and courageously given bolsters our courage. It gives confidence to the individuals making up our party. The American people can take it and as history repeats itself or should I say "we repeat history", the American people aroused will demand unity, because a united people cannot be defeated. With unity we will win this war, and in a united manner we will preserve the Constitution.

May I leave with you this thought as I terminate my remarks: This is your country; it is my country; and, above all, it is God's country; and with our American determination and with the help of Divine Providence we intend to keep it such. There are times when we Americans take just a little too much for granted. We have a right to do that, but we must never lose sight of the fact that eternal vigilance is the price we pay for our liberty and freedom. Forever let the words of Abraham Lincoln ring in your ears, "this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Your responsibility is sacred, Republicans. Let's stand before God and the world and repudiate those who would abolish the Constitution and our way of life. I ask you to stand with me and your Republican leaders; the time has come; the die is cast; let's slug it out.

The Bill, H. R. 3209, Authorizing the Construction of Demonstration Plants to Produce Synthetic Oil From Coal and Other Products Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very enthusiastic in support of this measure. During the spring and summer of last year, I had several conferences with Under Secretaries of the Interior Fortas and Straus relative to this program. These gentlemen furnished me with a great deal of information, many pamphlets and booklets, which I have read and studied in detail. Regardless of the section of the country we come from and regardless of whether or not coal is mined in our district, we should with equanimity support the purposes of this legislation. Personally, I wish to congratulate the gentlemen of the Interior Department for their foresight in proposing this legislation. I also feel that the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH and his associates on the Mines and Mining Committee of the House deserve a vote of praise for the intelligent and vigorous manner in which they have presented the facts which show beyond any doubt the necessity of immediately inaugurating this project.

The facts are that we are today faced with a shortage of crude oil. The discovery and development of new oil reserves has not kept pace with the increasing demands of the armed forces and civilian requirements for petroleum products. Mr. Ralph K. Davies, the very able Acting Petroleum Administrator for War, has told us that by the end of 1944 it will be necessary to import approximately 300,000 barrels of crude oil daily to meet the demand for petroleum products at that time.

We are also told upon good authority that, at the present rate of consumption, the oil reserves in this country will be exhausted within 14 to 18 years. American economy is built around the use of vehicles and machines which consume petroleum products. Our economy cannot operate for a single day without petroleum. Faced with this situation, it is the duty of Government to experiment to ascertain the most feasible and economical methods that can be found to secure petroleum from other products.

We know that England is only able to carry on her great aerial offensive against Nazi Germany because of the fact that she has developed a substantial number of plants for the making of synthetic petroleum from coal and other products. Three-fourths of the oil used by Nazi Germany is synthetically made. It is appropriate and fitting that we should at this time begin experimenting so that when the time comes when we must find another source of petroleum, we will be in a position to build plants which will operate efficiently and economically. In the Bureau of Mines we have capable scientists who have already devoted much time and study to this new process. We are fortunate that we have such eminent and capable men in the Bureau of Mines, and we may be sure that this program will be carried on intelligently and in the public interest.

After Pearl Harbor our supply of natural rubber was completely cut off. It was necessary for the Government to spend $650,000,000 in building synthetic rubber plants. Many mistakes were made, and a great deal of this money was not economically expended because we had not been previously experimenting with the production of synthetic rubber. Fortunately, the program is now in very good shape but the situation might have been otherwise. We cannot take a chance on the catastrophe that would occur when the supply of petroleum is greatly diminished. We must be prepared to meet that contingency.

We have a great supply of coal in all regions of the country. In my district there is an unlimited supply of high-grade coal that I am advised would be usable in this process. I know that the Bureau of Mines will take into consideration the supply of coal in all regions of the country in determining where these plants should be located. They are giving consideration to my section. But, regardless of the location of the plants, this is a project that should and must be carried out as quickly as possible. I hope that the measure will be carried by a unanimous vote.

Regional Economies and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on February 14 the Vice President of the United States delivered an address at Minneapolis, Minn. It is an excellent address dealing with the question of monopolies and a regional balanced economy for the people of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of the Middle West have always brought constructive imagination and vision to their work and to their activities as citizens. With the faith and determination of their pioneering ancestors they seek to develop for themselves and for the Nation the potential wealth of their country.

This country cannot continue half prosperous and half depressed. The experience of the early 1930's proved that we have to share our poverty. The experience of the 1920's demonstrated that the new era of permanent prosperity was undermined by continuing depression on the farm, in the mines, and elsewhere. Looking back on the 1920's, we see that business activity then was extremely spotty and that prosperity was not broadly shared.

Today I wish to discuss with you a grave national problem—the development of balanced regional economies, all articulated into an expanding national economy, and characterized by full use of all productive resources. You have long fought for elements of such a program. Now I ask you to think about the over-all aspects of the problem.

What is a balanced regional economy? Each geographic region should produce all the goods and services which it can produce at lower real costs than they can be produced elsewhere. Each region should make full utilization of all of its resources and economic opportunities. Within each region there should be a healthy balance between agriculture and industry.

A balanced development of regional economies does not mean that each region will seek economic self-sufficiency. Such an objective would defeat the great advantages growing out of legitimate regional specialization. Minnesota is not the best place for Minnesotans to obtain oranges or cotton.

Why have we not had a balanced development of regional economies within the national economy? Industrialization naturally appeared first near the centers of population, close to the sources of raw materials; but, with the westward movement of population, with the growth of larger markets in the South and the West, with improvements in transportation, there should have come a growth of new manufacturing in the West and South. Yet these developments have not taken place, and even some promising industries here in the Middle West have been abandoned. Looking back we can see many obstacles which checked these developments—obstacles which should have disappeared long ago.

Let us consider the nature of these difficulties:

1. Modern industry, when highly mechanized, requires extensive markets in order to produce in large volume at lowest cost. In some areas, extensive markets exist in close proximity to the manufacturing center, as in the East. In others, as in the West, extensive markets depend upon cheap and rapid transportation. High transportation costs limit markets; discriminatory rates artificially restrict industrial opportunities. At present differentials in freight rates are one of the basic causes for the undue concentration of industry in the North and the East.

2. Monopolistic restraints seriously obstruct the development of balanced regional economies. Where a few large concerns control virtually all of an industry, marketing policies are framed to protect investments in the older centers of production. Thus, Pittsburgh-plus and other basing-point price systems have the effect of perpetuating the industry locations appropriate to a bygone era. The striking down of such uneconomic price policies must precede new industrial developments in response to legitimate economic demands.

The impact of monopoly extends beyond its restrictive price policies. Resources have been held idle. Hydroelectric power developments that would stimulate new regional industries have been delayed. Cheap power is indispensable for decentralization of industry and the growth of small enterprise. What the development of public power can mean in terms of new communities, new trades, new industries, and new living standards has been shown by the Tennessee Valley development and is being demonstrated anew by the hydroelectric developments of the Columbia River Valley. Twenty years after the war stops there should be no undeveloped hydroelectric resources in America; and if we have a balanced development of regional economies, there will be none.

Vested interests have also been responsible for the suppression of new inventions and industrial processes. The control of a few basic patents has many times given control of a whole industry, and has enabled those holding the patents to determine where, and under what circumstances, their industry shall grow.

3. Regional differences in the cost of capital have delayed industrialization in the South and the West. It is to be expected that capital costs will be high in frontier communities where the demand is great and the volume of savings small. But there is no justification for regional differences in the cost of capital in America today.

Why do we need a balanced development of regional economies within the national economy? The answer is obvious. All of our people are entitled to the higher standards which can come only from a full employment of our productive resources. No full employment of our productive resources is possible without healthy regional economies.

Development of regional economies will give us more production, new investment outlets, greater opportunities for the talents of our people and fuller employment, both seasonally and throughout the business cycle.

Not only prosperity in peace but military security in war require a diversification and a decentralization of American industry. If this war had come after the development of superbombers, and if America had been one of the first countries to be drawn into the conflict, it is more than likely that our concentrated industries would have been bombed to rubble just as Germany's Ruhr has been.

How is the balanced development of regional economies within the national economy to be secured? The answer to this question is being sought with determination by leaders in the South, the Southwest and the far West, as well as here in the Middle West. The obstacles and obstructions I have described should be removed at once. The conversion of war industry to peacetime production should take place in an environment which will permit the balanced regional developments which must be the foundation of our national prosperity.

What are the conditions necessary to the creation of regional economies? Adequate markets must exist for the sale of industry's products. Cheap and abundant raw materials must be obtainable. Capital must be available to finance the establishment of new enterprise and the expansion of old. The technologies employed by industry must be as open to new enterprises as established skills are to new workers. Industrial development requires trained manpower and competent management. What measures will assure all of these?

1. Access to markets will require concerted action by government and business. The State governments should promptly remove those trade barriers by which they have sought to prefer their own business enterprises over those located in other States. The United States is a market of 135,000,000 people, each of whom—given full employment and full use of our resources—should be able to spend the equivalent of $1,000 a year. There will be ample markets for the special products of each State without the necessity of any "Balkanization" of our country through protective tariffs erected by taxes, fees, quarantine regulations, and the like.

The people of the Middle West, the South, and the far West have long known that their markets have been confined by high and discriminatory transportation charges. The Middle West has, moreover, been placed at an added disadvantage since the Panama Canal reduced the cost of transportation from coast to coast. The intercoast water rate is less than the rate by rail from the central United States to any seaport. As a result of these handicaps, the Middle West has not only been unable to develop new industries but has actually lost industries to regions more favorably located with respect to transportation charges.

The people of this region were unwilling to accept this trend; they determined to do something about it. A group of your outstanding citizens turned to the development of the upper Mississippi River to secure the low-cost transportation so essential to agriculture and the development of industry. They recognized that the upper Mississippi, as a part of a great trunk system of inland waterways, would afford low-cost transportation to and from important markets throughout the Mississippi-Ohio Basins, and would, through an all-water route to the Gulf of Mexico, give access to the three coasts.

The people of this region owe much to that courageous group for spearheading the battle to free this great area—as large as Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy combined—from those vested interests which sought to maintain the status quo. This group was singularly successful in creating a united front between the South and the West. It was wise in joining forces with the South to complete the Mississippi waterway system under the vigorous leadership of President Roosevelt. Unfortunately, the railroads and allied interests have thus far succeeded in blocking the St. Lawrence seaway, long advocated by President Roosevelt.

The Middle West, like other sections of the country, still depends largely upon rail transportation for the movement of manufactured goods. Hence, the freight-rate structure which handicaps the Middle West, the South, and the Far West must be corrected if these great regions are to develop as part of a progressive national economy. I, therefore, urge you to follow the course adopted by your leaders in the development of the Mississippi; join hands with the South and far West in removing high and discriminatory freight rates.

The battle for low-cost transportation over our inland waterways and highways has been without permanent victory. The railroad interests have seemingly forgotten the elementary fact that before they can prosper the country must prosper, that a more prosperous people will benefit the railroads. Their policy has been one of controlling and suppressing competition. Having failed to stop the construction of our navigable rivers, they now seek to restrict their use. As Secretary of Agriculture, I joined with the then Secretary of War and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission in opposing the Transportation Act of 1940. Our fears as to its destructive effects have been realized.

Private rate bureaus and rate-making conferences have been established in all fields of public transportation, and aided by the minimum rate orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, they have eliminated all competition in rates and perpetuated high and discriminatory rates against the West and South. Recently I addressed the Southern Governors' Conference on this subject, and urged that this private rate-making machinery be stripped of its power to continue its monopolistic pricing of transportation services and that the Interstate Commerce Commission should protect the public interest in accordance with the direction of Congress. I hope that the middle-western and far-western Governors will join the southern Governors in a constructive program to remove existing discriminations against the Middle West, the far West, and the South.

2. The development of regional economies will require large capital investments to finance new enterprises. To the extent that the requisite capital is not available it must be attributed to the concentration of investment banking under the control of a few large New York houses.

It lies in your power to correct this situation. Savings occur throughout the country, but under present financial organization the little streamlets of savings flow in widening rivers to the New York market. The alternative is to develop your own regional capital markets so that the savings of the West will be used to finance industrial enterprises which will add to the wealth and welfare of the West.

A quarter of a century ago we created a Federal Reserve System to provide reserve banking facilities on a regional basis. The Federal Reserve System has succeeded in practically eliminating differences in the cost of commercial loans as between different sections of the country. A system of farm-credit organizations has brought cheap credit to farmers in all parts of the country. The time has come when similar developments must occur in the investment-banking field.

The development of regional capital markets is a task for local business and financial interests. Here is an opportunity for small investment banking houses and security dealers to expand their services in behalf of local industry. Here is an opportunity to reduce the cost of financing so as to encourage the growth of regional enterprises which will ultimately develop into more financing.

Investment in the development of regional economies will require venture capital rather than the timid capital which seeks safety in the bonds of established enterprises. Federal legislation has done much to relieve those who would invest venture capital of the unnecessary risks that attach to fraudulent financing. A revision of our tax laws can provide further incentives to invest in the common stocks of new enterprises.

3. The complex technologies of modern industries, with patented equipment, patented processes, and patented products, make it difficult, if not impossible, for a newcomer to break into established industries.

Our patent system, instead of serving to promote progress in science and the useful arts, has been converted into a tool for building and perpetuating closed domains and monopolies. One or two basic patents may provide a basis for policing an industry and eliminating all competition. All of this is possible because the patent laws have been interpreted to permit the owner, not only to exclude others from the use of the patent but also, if he licenses them, to dictate the quantity which they may produce, the markets in which they may sell, and the prices which they must charge. Furthermore, the patent system has been used by international cartels, notoriously by I. G. Farben, the German trust, to establish a dangerous measure of control over industry in this and other countries. Our unpreparedness in many vital industries was the result of deliberate cartel policies designed to weaken the military potential of democratic countries.

For all of these reasons, we should proclaim the right of free access to the technologies of modern industry. No dominating industrial or financial group controlling patents should be permitted to condition its licenses upon restriction of output, limitation of market, maintenance of prices, or any other practices which restrict the fullest development of free enterprise and production.

4. Trained manpower is necessary to any development of regional industries. Yet no region should undertake to exploit labor as the means of creating an industrial economy. Disadvantages in freight rates or in capital costs must not be offset by substandard wages. Such a condition affords an unstable base for a sound regional economy. The workers, like the other members of the community, should share to the full in the advantages inherent in balanced industrial development.

5. If regional economies are to create a balance between agriculture and industry, particular encouragement must be given to small enterprises located in the smaller communities. The establishment of such small enter-

prises requires cheap transportation, and access to the most modern industrial methods. A cheap source of power is also essential, for small plants cannot economically generate their own power. All of these things can be had if we choose. New technical inventions, such as the recent developments for the production of magnesium, alcohol, and plastics, will open up new frontiers for small enterprises. These new processes will make it possible for relatively small plants to produce these materials at costs much below those we are presently paying.

6. The development of regional economies has been advanced by the building of war plants in some sections of the country. These plants must be kept in full production. Their production will be required to create the living standard which Americans must have after the war. However, there is grave danger that these plants may be acquired by dominant groups; and that they may either be withheld from production or equivalent capacity retired elsewhere. It should be a part of our public policy to lodge the control of these plants in new hands. Of course, there would be no guarantee that such firms would not be acquired by a monopolistic firm. I therefore propose that instead of selling these war plants, the Government proceed to lease them on terms which will assure their continued independent operation.

7. The balanced development of regional economies will require economic planning. Already many communities and States are engaged in programs of post-war planning. But such projects partake of an emergency character; they are largely negative; they are concerned with meeting post-war unemployment on a temporary basis. I recommend that all such community and State planning be oriented to the larger geographic region and directed to positive and constructive goals. Each region should study its possibilities for developing greater balance in its economic activities. It should determine what undeveloped resources, what new industries, what improvements in transportation, what sources of capital, and what resources of manpower are available to expand production.

The development of regional economies within a full-production national economy will open a new era in American history. New opportunities for employment, for capital investment, for enterprise will be the first effects. The use of new natural resources, plus the fuller employment of labor and capital, will mean enlarged production, both regionally and nationally. A balanced regional development will provide increased stability for business and the foundation for a new post-war American standard of living.

Address of Senator Walsh of Massachusetts to Lithuanian Meeting at Worcester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently delivered by me at a meeting of the Americans of Lithuanian birth or parentage at Worcester, Mass., which was held in connection with a drive for the purchase of War bonds and the celebration of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

At this meeting over $100,000 worth of bonds were purchased, and it was stated that during the days previous to this meeting approximately another $100,000 of War bonds were purchased by the Lithuanian people, making a total of $200,000 with a Lithuanian population of about 15,000.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 16, 1944, the people of Lithuania and their children, scattered throughout the world, will celebrate the twenty-sixth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This celebration will be observed by Lithuanians not only in the United States but in Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Great Britain, Switzerland, Sweden, the Vatican City, even in German-occupied Lithuania, and in spirit by the many Lithuanian exiles in Siberia, in German prisons and labor camps.

Here in Worcester we are gathered together to commemorate this anniversary by the purchasing of American War bonds, thereby pledging our loyalty to America, and, at the same time, expressing our sentiments of love and affection for the homeland.

It was while the First World War was still raging that Lithuania was declared free and independent.

For 22 years prior to the tragic events of 1940 all true friends of Lithuania exalted in her triumph and looked forward confidently to her future.

We may well be proud of her record during these 22 years of the country's independence. During these years the political, economic, and cultural life advanced rapidly; the standard of living of her people steadily increased; her ports were open to all the world; in brief, she won favorable recognition from all nations, without exception.

Lithuania is today one of the small nations unjustly deprived by force of arms of its life and independence. On this account these days are days of sadness and serious reflection for the Lithuanian people at home and in every part of the world. Shattered, humiliated, suffering Lithuania bemoans her lost independence. You Lithuanians in exile who have availed yourselves of free American hospitality have good reason to celebrate this occasion with heads high, for your country, tortured and desecrated, is still alive and resistant. The spirit of the Lithuanian people will survive to the bitter end and will resist enmeshment in any federations, confederations, or unions sponsored by its neighbors. Lithuania must never become another nation's vassal. It is foreign to your God-given right to be free people.

Lithuania is proof that a nation's strength is not necessarily in her size geographically or in her wealth. Her greatest might is the iron souls of her people, who refuse to surrender their souls to aggressors or to compromise with evil. The invader may conquer the lands, the possessions of your people, but never their souls. Even those who are not of your ancestry are proud in witnessing the dauntless spirit and more than human courage of your little nation.

The hope of your people for the future of Lithuania depends upon the United Nations, their honesty and sincerity in facing the critical issues that will be settled in the peace treaty. On the question of national integrity both the Holy See and the Atlantic Charter have laid down supreme and guiding principles. The very first of the five principles laid down by Pope Pius XII in his Christmas speech of 1939 states: "The fundamental condition of a just and honorable peace is to assure the right to life and independence of all nations, large or small, strong or weak. One nation's will to live must never be tantamount to a death sentence from another."

The Atlantic Charter states: "The right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they shall live, * * * to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

God grant that these declarations and principles be fulfilled and that these truths may be gloriously exemplified in the case of Lithuania and her sister republics.

A former great citizen of this city, a nationally renowned statesman, Senator Hoar, in 1900, when the question of Philippine independence was under consideration in the United States Senate, declared: "Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression or usurpation or by any form of injustice, is soon dethroned. We have no right in law or morals to usurp that which belongs to another, whether it is property or power. No people can go under the Government of any other people or any ruler without its consent. The law of nature and of nature's God entitles every people to its separate and equal states among the powers of the earth."

What Senator Hoar said on another occasion, applies aptly to Lithuania today: "You may pacify this country on the surface; you may make it a solitude, and call it peace; you may burn towns; you may exterminate populations; you may kill the children or the boys over 10, as Herod slew the first born of the Israelites. But the volcano will be there. You will not settle this thing in a generation, or in a century, or in 10 centuries, until it is settled right."

"Government without the consent of the governed—an authority which Heaven never gave—can only be supported by means which Heaven never can sanction."

Like the people of other small nations, the people in Lithuania and their kith and kin in America are against both Russian, German, or domination by any other country, and are determined to fight for the restitution of independence at all cost. It is beyond cavil that Russia is just as much a symbol of aggression as Germany to the Lithuanian people.

Lithuanians everywhere are concerned about the recent Soviet autonomy move. The Lithuanian Minister to the United States refers to it as "an attempt to make the world believe that the Baltic states were willing members of the Soviet Union." The Minister asserted that "ever since the Red Army's occupation of Lithuania in 1941, Moscow has been saying that 'Lithuania voluntarily joined the Soviet Union.'" As a matter of fact, the Minister claims the Soviets have forced their rule on Lithuania.

Let it be said again and again, any peace which does not restore the indisputable rights of the Lithuanian people and other small nations to govern themselves will not be a just peace. Small nations are entitled also to insist that the pledge of the United Nations for equal access to free trade and raw materials be carried out. The very life of small nations depends upon moderate freedom of trade.

Small nations are also entitled to an effective post-war organization to prevent aggression and maintain justice for modern military technicality has destroyed the possibility for self-defense by small nations; but, I repeat, no effective post-war organization can be established without small nations first being given their freedom.

Let me congratulate you on the noble purposes that have prompted this gathering here tonight. You are here to mobilize all Lithuanian resources here in Worcester County for the success of our fighting forces, for a complete victory in order that peace based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter may be realized by all occupied and invaded countries.

You Americans of Lithuanian descent who have helped so much in the rebuilding of

independent Lithuania will not fail, I am sure, to keep her alive during this war and make certain that she continues to live free and strong again. A real unity of the American Lithuanians will do much to help the motherland.

Take courage, Lithuania's cause, as is the cause of all occupied and invaded nations, is the cause of America. In other words, it is our fight. Every life lost and every body maimed in our fight against Germany and Japan is a blow struck for all the countries in the world that love liberty and independence.

Here, assembled in this noble building erected by the free people of this city in memory of her sons who have died in the cause of freedom, we pledge our hopes, our lives, and our sacred honor to the cause for which America is fighting and to the speedy restoration of bleeding Lithuania to peace, prosperity, and freedom.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very dynamic, illuminating, and instructive address delivered by a great jurist of Wisconsin, the Honorable Roland J. Steinle. The subject he discussed so thoroughly and ably is the problem of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ever since the memorable incidents at Pearl Harbor the subject of juvenile delinquency has occupied a bright spotlight of American thought through the mediums of the press, the pulpit, and the rostrum, in legislative halls, and at professional gatherings. This situation, of course, is due to the fact that delinquency amongst juveniles from coast to coast has been tremendously accentuated since the beginning of the war in comparison to its prevalency before the war.

Generally speaking, judges charged with jurisdiction over juvenile courts have witnessed in the past 3 years an increase in the amount and type of delinquency by American youth. Actually, delinquency amongst children dates back to the beginning of civilization. Increased juvenile delinquency in wartime is not a new phenomenon in America or anywhere else. In our own country every generation has experienced the reality of war. From 1776 to 1943 America has been engaged in seven major wars, an average of 1 in every 24 years. Out of our 167-year existence we have been at war 21 years.

Statistics regarding increased juvenile delinquency in America are available for the period of World War No. 1. History generally records the prevalence of crime and delinquency during our past war periods although these items were not then computed on a statistical basis. This war has undoubtedly presented new challenges of the problem. Police officials know that wartime tends to create a lawless spirit.

It is common knowledge that war creates the problems of family separation, widowhood, orphanage, family desertion, and domestic discord. War affects the stability and solidarity of family life. During wartime the mental and physical health of many men, women, and children suffer. Family problems become accentuated and many families do not adjust well to the restless conditions created by war. Tensions and anxieties are increased. Uncertainty arises. Juvenile delinquency increases in wartime as a natural result of the disruption of family life, of widespread emotional tension and confusion and a let-down of the customary attitudes toward life and property.

This war was thrust upon us. We find it an unpleasant necessity. We extended ourselves to avoid it. No true American enjoys it. We have determined to win it at any cost. We will. All of this does not detract from the fact that war is primarily a matter of destruction and debases the humanity of those participating in it.

Bovee once said that "every war involves a greater or less relapse into barbarism. War, indeed, in its details is the essence of inhumanity. It dehumanizes. It may save the state but tends to destroy the citizen." Louis Napoleon declared that "war, which society draws upon itself, is but organized barbarism, an inheritance of the savage state, however disguised or ornamented."

Because of the intensity with which this war is being fought by the peoples of the United States and because of the tremendous change in the living conditions of millions of our people, with its attendant movement of families or members of families into new territory, it is not surprising that there has been an increase in the matter of juvenile delinquency.

A court is obliged to view juvenile delinquency from its legal aspect. The National Probation Association defines a delinquent child as (a) one who has violated any laws of the State or any ordinance or regulation of a subdivision of the State; (b) one who by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient is uncontrolled by his parent, guardian, or custodian; (c) one who is habitually truant from school or home; (d) one who habitually so deports himself as to injure or endanger the morals or health of himself or others.

Indiscretions, mischief, and shortcomings on the part of our young people not within the purview of this definition are not generally considered juvenile delinquency by judges called upon to function in juvenile courts.

Each State in the Union has its own definition of "delinquent child," some shortening the classification as given by the National Probation Association, others extending it.

No matter what else is involved, delinquency contains a threat at the security of the state. This is probably the paramount reason why modern countries have legislated on the subject.

Claims that juvenile delinquency has been on the increase since the beginning of the war are based largely on the number of children brought into juvenile courts. The Children's Bureau gathers the statistics from juvenile courts covering a considerable part of the Nation. In 1942 the Children's Bureau reported that of the juvenile courts presenting statistics about 80 percent indicated an increase and 20 percent a decrease for the previous year.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the astute Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, says that since the beginning of the war juvenile delinquency has generally increased at least 20 percent and is mounting rapidly everywhere in the United States. Figures released by Mr. Hoover about 8 months ago indicate that records show a 55-percent increase in arrests of girls under 21 in 1942 as compared to 1941. His figures also indicate that arrests of girls for drunkenness increased 40 percent. For disorderly conduct almost 70 percent; for prostitution and commercialized vice 64 percent; for sex offenses 104 percent; for vagrancy (which often veils more serious offenses) 124 percent. The increases were greatest among girls of 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 years of age. Even among girls under 15 there was an increase of more than 49 percent.

Mr. Hoover's figures disclose also that amongst boys the increase is 3.6 percent, but considering the number of boys under 21 in military service, this numerical decrease actually represents a large relative increase among the boys remaining in civilian life. Amongst boys arrests for assaults increased 17 percent. For carrying concealed weapons there was an increase of 15 percent. For disorderly conduct the records indicated an increase of 26 percent; for drunkenness, an increase of 30 percent.

Granting that this is a war problem on a national scale, these statistics definitely present an alarming situation and must be considered a challenge for solution by all thinking Americans.

War apparently is responsible for an increase of juvenile delinquency; so is a depression. Many experts see in our present problem a combination of causes resulting from both the recent depression and the present war. The fact is that juvenile court records throughout the country generally showed that an increase of delinquency was beoming larger even before we entered the war.

Social workers know that in peacetime the greatest cause of delinquency amongst juveniles is the result of homes broken by death, divorce, desertion, crime, poverty, or discord. Bad environment, bad companionship, bad example, bad home influence, emotional instability, a feeling on the part of a child of inferiority or inadequacy, a feeling of not being wanted or not being trusted or not belonging, each may be the cause for delinquency. Economic stress of a family sometimes plays a part. In the well-known report of the Commission on Delinquency of the White House Conference is found the statement that: "Behavior is always an affair of stimulus and response between a human individual and some feature or features of his environment; delinquency is no exception. * * * In his inner feelings and emotional life a delinquent very often is found to be unsatisfactorily 'adjusted to other personalities or conditions in his environment.'"

Frustration and discouragement sometimes cause juvenile delinquency. There have been other factors, detected in late years, which are the bases of juvenile delinquency, some of which concern unrest of the times, or absence of religious or good moral training, or wanderlust tendencies, or craving for amusements, or the lure of moving pictures, or lack of adequate recreational facilities and playgrounds, or too much or too little spending money, or the automobile, or low standard juke-box rendezvous, or indulgence in alcoholics. Home discipline sometimes is too severe; sometimes too lax.

No boy or girl is born a criminal. The earlier idea that delinquency and crime result from inborn general physical constitution has been entirely discounted by scientific research. Nor is the notion of any direct inheritance of criminal tendencies accepted today. However, there is proof that the existence of certain physical defects, diseases and peculiarities have an important bearing on the incidence of misconduct. Psychiatrists and guidance clinic experts frequently report as to such.

In the proper upbringing of America's youth the home, the church, the school, the community, industry, and the state each have a responsibility. All in all, I think that America never has had better young people than it has today. They are serious, high-minded, studious, courageous, and enlightened. They are scholars and thinkers, and as to character and development, stand head and shoulder above any of our previous generations. Their leadership in governmental

affairs, in industry, in science, in athletics and, particularly, of course, in the actual prosecution of the war, which field they rightfully dominate, is superb.

While delinquency does exist on a larger scale among our young people today than it did before the war, we ought never lose sight of the fact that, fortunately, the number of those who become involved in delinquency is small as compared to the population of our American youth.

Basically, the cause for the high rate of delinquency is deep and transcends back for a long time. J. Edgar Hoover pointed to the general underlying cause when he so well said at Rutgers University last spring: "In the sophistication of the past generation foundations were laid, not only in America, but in other countries, upon false premises. The idolatry of materialism came close to transforming our land into a modern 'Sodom and Gomorrah.' Fundamentals were ignored. And, judging from the surveys of the study of history in some of our educational institutions, we have come close to forgetting the experiences and identities of those who made this Nation great."

Juvenile court judges know that disrespect for authority on the part of adults and children is rather common in our time. The attitude, "So what!" prevails. The validity of all that is traditional is questioned. Our heritage of the tried and true rules of living are seriously threatened in a belief that only that which is new has worth. Many families have no connection with a church. Many parents prefer to leave the entire training of their children to the schools. In our age philosophies, relationships, spiritual values, ethics are shifting, so that it is difficult for even the most enlightened parents to know where they stand or where their children stand. Social changes have created new or intensified old moral hazards of childhood. We must never forget that "as the twig is bent, so grows the tree."

Amongst the immediate causes of the prevailing condition may be cited the following:

(a) The poisonous attitude of hate which is being inculcated in the minds of those in our armed forces, in our factory workers, and in everyone taking a part in the war effort. This has a demoralizing effect upon children exposed to it.

(b) News and information of the wholesale killing on the battle front, Commando raids, etc., has a tendency to create much emotional instability amongst our children. Lessons in school seem dull compared to the flaming headlines in newspapers of hard-fought battles on land or sea. Fear of bombing, blackouts, and air-raid drills are too strong an emotional stimulus for children. Sixteen- and seventeen-year-old boys are restless, thinking of the time when they shall enter the service, and they find themselves unable to properly concentrate on steady, settled work. Many of them desire to have a last fling and enter upon a spirit of reckless abandon. Acts of violence are bound to spring from such conditions. The National Probation Association reported in April 1943 that many of the shootings, stabbings, and muggings in New York City recently were committed by boys and that an all-time high record was established in the 6 months previous when six minors, aged 16 to 19 years, were admitted to the deathhouse at Sing Sing for murder in the first degree.

(c) Another cause is the migration of families or members of families into new territory, usually industrial centers, where they are deprived of the social life to which they were accustomed and where the influence of the new-found diversions frequently prove disastrous. In many of these situations family members find themselves adrift, isolated from the controls of family, friends, church, and neighborhood. The city has always had more delinquency than the rural villages.

(d) The proximity of military training camps to communities has been a factor leading to the increase of juvenile delinquency, particularly as to young girls. The uniform is an attraction. Young girls go out to parties with soldiers and sailors, partly for fun and thrills and partly to display their new-found boy friends in uniform. Statistics show that social diseases in many places are being spread by young girls 12 to 17 years of age today.

(e) The matter of women, particularly mothers in war plants, has affected the situation. Latch-key children are the result. The home is no longer a home. Discipline is weakened and supervision of children dwindled. Children prefer to roam the streets rather than to continuously remain in empty homes. Some working mothers don't even want their children around when they return from work. Truancy from school, which actually is rebellion on the part of the child against the authority of the community or State, is a common result of parents' absence from home and their accompanying neglect thereby.

(f) The increase of child labor (some illegal) at an unprecedented rate is a cause of much delinquency today. A commission of the National Education Association when meeting in Indiana a few weeks ago declared: "Demands that young people be released from school to work on farms, in stores, in service industries, and in factories has become alarming to those who put the educational welfare of children before the commercial value of their services. At the most crucial age of their lives, young children are walking the streets undisciplined and uncontrolled. We are subjecting them to all the bad influences of society without any kind of supervision. The best place for these pupils from the standpoint of winning the war and peace is in the classroom."

The fact is that juvenile court authorities hear much today of children who earn good wages rebelling against parental restrictions and insisting that they have the right to act as adults when they earn their livelihood as adults.

(g) The actual participation of members of the family in the armed services has an effect that sometimes contributes to juvenile delinquency. The drafting of fathers and brothers deprives the younger children of guidance to which they are accustomed. Worry over the fate of loved ones at the front creates a psychological atmosphere in the home which tends to produce a frustrating effect on the emotional life of children there.

(h) Due to war conditions understaffed schools, understaffed juvenile court probation departments, understaffed social-welfare agencies, lack of community and organization planning for children, all have the effect of reduced control where the delinquency problem exists.

The matter of reducing juvenile delinquency is a community problem. All of our children, not only those who live on the other side of the track, are affected by the existing wartime conditions. Parents must be held responsible for their children's training. However, we are too prone to blame the parents altogether when children go wrong.

England learned some bitter lessons during this war in the matter of the treatment of its children. In 1939 that country reduced its welfare services, social agencies, and schools. It experienced the problems of bombings, black-outs, air-raid shelters, homeless and destitute children. Juvenile delinquency increased one-third. Then England corrected the situation. It reopened its schools, restored and extended its health and recreational services, and opened hundreds of new nurseries. America may well profit when England warns us today: "Don't close your schools. Don't close your clubs or recreational centers. Avoid the breakup of families as much as possible. Don't throw an army of youngsters into industry."

We face a condition and not a theory. We must meet our problems intelligently and courageously. Many communities today have a curfew law, but we cannot expect that such medium alone will assure the protection necessary for our children. We must keep our youth occupied in wholesome endeavor and to as great a degree as possible relieve their young minds from consideration of the difficult problems of the war. We ought to discourage mothers with young children from going into industry when their offspring are not adequately cared for. We must encourage school interest and discourage our too-youthful sons and daughters from taking responsible war jobs with high wages. We must provide wholesome recreation and spiritual opportunity and guidance and counselling for the members of disrupted homes. We must assist all of our youth organizations in the development of greater programs than before. We must continue to provide respectable and interesting entertainment for our visiting sailors and soldiers. We must keep our schools, probation and welfare agency staffs well manned, and intensify and expand their activities even though such action may require an increase in personnel.

Every good citizen ought work to keep within reasonable bounds the bad effects of the new conditions created or made more serious by the war. Our civic leaders dare not relent from pointing out the danger of situations affecting our children. We must provide facilities and services against neglect of our youth, furnish opportunities for their energy and activity, and give them salutary outlets for their imagination. If ever American children needed attention, care, understanding, and friendship, it is now. Let us never lose sight of the fact that every child needs someone to go to, in or out of trouble. The children certainly are not responsible for the conditions of today.

What will it avail America to win the war and win the peace, but lose the soul of its young people of today?

As good Americans we all have a duty to present in our own lives such patterns of honesty, sincerity, and courage as shall challenge the emulation of the youth with whom we come into contact.

In conclusion, may I direct attention to the caution of the late Chief Justice Winslow of the Wisconsin Supreme Court when in a celebrated case, he said: "A democracy cannot long exist unless the great body of its voters be not merely intelligent but moral. The children of today are the voters of tomorrow. It is the greatest concern of the State, therefore, that its children be preserved from vicious habits, for the vicious child is the father of the vicious man."

Repeal of Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CHUNGKING, *January 1, 1944.*

Representative MAGNUSON,

Washington, D. C.:

My best wishes for a happy and victorious New Year and my heartiest congratulations to you and Members of the Congress for repeal of Chinese Exclusion Act, which is profoundly appreciated in China. To us it is one of the most significant events of the historic year of 1943, contributing as it did to the ever closer ties of friendship between our two countries.

H. H. KUNG.

Simplifying Your 1943 Income Tax Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House a simplified analysis of the 1943 income-tax blank which is timely and should prove of inestimable value to our 40,000,000 income taxpayers. Inasmuch as Congress seems to be blamed for the complexities of the income-tax form, I am including herewith the simplified analysis as a public service and with the realization that it is our duty to be helpful in this situation.

The value of making this simplification available is indisputable, although to do so involves printing in the RECORD pages 1 and 4 of the 1943 income-tax Form 1040.

The simplification analysis which I submit has been prepared by Richard T. Jones, assistant trust officer, and Herbert Flint, public relations aide of the Union & New Haven Trust Co. at New Haven, Conn., and circulated locally by the bank in its monthly journal, by a display advertisement in the New Haven Journal Courier, and by the Sunday Herald, a Connecticut weekly newspaper.

I realize I may be doing the bank a disservice by disclosing the identity of two employees whose services could well be used by Mr. Morgenthau in the Treasury Department. Nevertheless, I offer the following simplification as a much-needed aid to 40,000,000 taxpayers and as a recommendation to the Treasury Department.

FORM 1040
Treasury Department
Internal Revenue Service

UNITED STATES
INDIVIDUAL INCOME AND VICTORY TAX RETURN

1943

Optional Form 1040 May Be Filed Instead of This Form if Gross Income Is Reported on the Cash Basis for the Calendar Year, Is not More Than $3,000, and Consists WHOLLY of Salary, Wages, Other Compensation for Personal Services, Dividends, Interest, or Annuities

FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1943

or fiscal year beginning _____, 1943, and ending _____, 1944

PRINT NAME AND ADDRESS PLAINLY. (See Instruction C)

(Name) (Use given names of both husband and wife, if this is a joint return)

(Street and number, or rural route)

(City or town) (State)

Occupation _____ Social Security number, if any _____

(Do not use these spaces)

File Code

Serial No.

District

(Cashier's Stamp)

COMPUTATION OF NET INCOME	COLUMN 1 Income Tax Net Income	COLUMN 2 Victory Tax Net Income
INCOME		
1. Salary, Wages, and Compensation for Personal Services (Members of armed forces see Instruction I) — Employer's Name / City and State	$	$
Total	$	$
Less: Deductible expenses. (Attach itemized statement)		
Compensation after deductible expenses	$	$
2. Dividends		
3. Interest on corporation bonds, bank deposits, notes, etc		
4. Interest on Government obligations, etc.: (a) From line A (8), Schedule A		x x x x x x
(b) From line B (5) and (3), Schedule A		
5. Annuities		
6. (a) Net gain (or loss) from sale or exchange of capital assets. (From Schedule B)		x x x x x x
(b) Net gain (or loss) from sale or exchange of property other than capital assets. (From Schedule B)		
7. Rents and royalties. (From Schedule C (1))		
8. Net profit (or loss) from business or profession. (From Schedule C (2)) (State total receipts, from line 1, Schedule C (2) $_____)		
9. Income (or loss) from partnerships; fiduciary income; and other income. (From Schedule C (3))		
10. Total income in items 1 to 9	$	$
DEDUCTIONS		
11. Contributions. (Explain in Schedule D)	$	x x x x x x
12. Interest. (Explain in Schedule E) (See Instructions 12 and 16 for Victory Tax deduction)		x x x x x x
13. Taxes. (Explain in Schedule F) (See Instructions 13 and 16 for Victory Tax deduction)		x x x x x x
14. Losses from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or theft. (Explain in Schedule G)		x x x x x x
15. Medical, dental, etc., expenses. (Explain in Schedule H)		x x x x x x
16. Other deductions authorized by law. (Explain in Schedule G)		$
17. Total deductions in items 11 to 16	$	$
18. Income Tax net income (item 10, col. 1, less item 17, col. 1)	$	x x x x x x
19. Victory Tax net income (item 10, col. 2, less item 17, col. 2)	x x x x x x	$
INCOME AND VICTORY TAX		
20. Unpaid balance of 1943 Income and Victory Tax (from line 22, page 4)		$
21. You may postpone, until not later than March 15, 1945, payment of the amount you owe up to one-half of item 19 (c), page 4. Enter the amount postponed. (For persons whose surtax net income for 1942 or 1943 exceeded $20,000, see Schedule L–2)		
22. Amount paid with this return (item 20 less item 21)		$
23. Refund or Credit — If the total of your payments (line 21 (d) on page 4) is larger than your tax (line 20 on page 4), enter the difference. Indicate by a check mark (√) what you want done with this overpayment: Refund it to me ☐; Apply it on my 1944 estimated tax ☐.		$

I declare under the penalties of perjury, that this return (including any accompanying schedules and statements) has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge and belief is a true, correct, and complete return.

(Signature of person (other than taxpayer or agent) preparing return) (Date) (Signature of taxpayer) (Date)

(Name of firm or employer, if any)

(If this is a joint return (not made by agent), it must be signed by both husband and wife) A return made by an agent must be accompanied by power of attorney. (See Instruction G)

16—57129–1

SIMPLIFYING

Your 1943

Income Tax Return

Follow Steps 1 to 8 as numbered

COLUMN 1

COLUMN 2

8

NOTES ON STEP 1 (Column 1)

This is where net income for purposes of Income Tax is determined. No fundamental change from the 1942 return is encountered. Some additional details are required to be reported, and the format has been altered, but otherwise it is no more formidable than in 1942.

NOTES ON STEP 2 (Column 2)

This is where net income for purposes of Victory Tax is determined, and is a new addition to the tax form. Care should be exercised to eliminate those items included in Step 1 but not required or permitted in Step 2. That is, in general all items subject to Income Tax are subject to Victory Tax except gain on sale of Capital Assets and Interest on those classes of Treasury Bonds which are subject only to Surtax. Loss on sale of Capital Assets is not recognized, and other deductions are limited to those arising from (a) carrying on a trade or business, (b) the production or collection of income, and (c) the management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income.

NOTES ON STEP 8

This step, where final settlement of your tax account is made, is also new. If you owe the tax collector you will indicate what part of what you owe may be postponed and what part you are paying now. If a refund is due you will indicate the amount of the overpayment and whether you wish the sum refunded to you or credited against your 1944 liability.

SIMPLIFYING YOUR 1943 INCOME-TAX RETURN

In spite of the fact that Congress has been working for months on a new tax bill, the tax-paying individual today is about where he was last July following the enactment of the withholding tax and the institution of the September 15 estimate of 1943 income tax in the course of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis—that is, the law is essentially the same. On or before March 15, 1944—

1. A final income-tax return for 1943 is required if gross income exceeds the maximum allowance or if you were liable for tax in 1942.

2. One-half of the forgiveness tax—being 12½ percent of either the 1942 or the 1943 tax, whichever is the lower—must be paid.

3. Where your income requires it, an estimate of 1944 income tax must be filed and at least one-fourth of the estimated tax must be paid.

If the taxpayer can use the—short form—of return 1040A on March 15 he will have one great advantage: He can start at the top of the form and work straight down to the bottom, detouring to the reverse side of the form only long enough to determine the amount of his tax from the table there and to compute his Victory tax. He may become puzzled and make mistakes along the way, but at least he will need only follow his nose.

In the case of Form 1040, however, his path will be a tortuous one. As we look at the form, it divides itself into eight distinct steps. These are not arranged in numerical order, but skip about in confusing disorder.

We herewith reproduce pages 1 and 4 of Form 1040 with the eight steps numbered and marked in what seems to us the logical and normal sequence. We believe you will find it a little easier to complete your return if you will follow the order we suggest. At least we hope so.

COMPUTATION OF INCOME AND VICTORY TAX. (See Tax Computation Instructions)

1. Income Tax net income (item 18, page 1)		$
2. Less: Personal exemption. (From Schedule I-(1))	$	
3. Credit for dependents. (From Schedule I-(2))		
4. Balance (surtax net income)		
5. Less: Certain interest on Government obligations (item 4 (*a*), page 1)	$	
6. Earned income credit. (From Schedule J-(1) or J-(2))		
7. Balance subject to normal tax		$
8. Normal tax (6% of line 7)		$
9. Surtax on amount in line 4. (See Surtax Table, page 3 of Instructions)		
10. Total Income Tax (line 8 plus line 9). (If Schedule B is used and alternative tax computation made, enter line 16, Schedule B)		$
11. Less: Income Tax paid to a foreign country or U. S. possession. (Attach Form 1116)		
12. BALANCE OF INCOME TAX		$
13. NET VICTORY TAX (line 6 of Victory Tax Schedule, below)		
14. Total of lines 12 and 13		$
15. Income Tax paid at source on tax-free covenant bond interest. (See Footnote 1)		
16. Line 14 less line 15		$
17. Income Tax for 1942. (See Statement, Form 1125, from Collector) (First, see page 4 of Instructions)		$
18. Enter line 16 or 17 whichever is LARGER. (Members of the armed forces see page 4 of Instructions)		$
19. FORGIVENESS FEATURE (Don't fill in (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) below, if either line 16 or 17 is $50 or less):		
(*a*) Enter line 16 or 17, whichever is SMALLER	$	
(*b*) Enter $50 or three-fourths of (*a*), immediately above, whichever is LARGER. This is the FORGIVEN part of the tax	$	
(*c*) Enter the UNFORGIVEN part of the tax which is the BALANCE (subtract (*b*) from (*a*)). (See Footnote 2)		
20. TOTAL INCOME AND VICTORY TAX. (Total of lines 18 and 19 (*c*))		$
21. Less: (*a*) Income and Victory Tax withheld by employer	$	
(*b*) Income Tax paid on 1942 income		
(*c*) Tax paid on 1943 income on account of Declaration of Estimated Tax		
(*d*) Total payments		
22. UNPAID BALANCE OF INCOME AND VICTORY TAX. (If line 20 is larger than line 21 (*d*), enter the difference here and also as item 20, page 1; if not, see Item 23, page 1)		$

FOOTNOTE 1.—If you claim a credit in line 15, disregard lines 19 (*a*) and (*b*), complete Schedule L-1 on page 4 of Instructions, and enter result in line 19 (*c*). Attach completed schedule.

FOOTNOTE 2.—If your surtax net income for 1942 or 1943 exceeded $20,000, requiring you to complete Schedule L-2, enter here the amount shown on line 10 or 27 of such schedule, $_____ and increase 19 (*c*) by such amount.

Schedule K.—VICTORY TAX. (See Tax Computation Instructions)

1. Victory Tax net income (item 19, page 1)		$
2. Less: Specific exemption ($624 if return reports income of only one person; otherwise, see Instructions, page 3)		
3. Income subject to Victory Tax (line 1 less line 2)		$
4. Victory Tax before credit (5% of line 3)		$
5. Victory Tax credit:		
(*a*) Single person, or married person not living with husband or wife: 25% (plus 2% for each dependent) of line 4, but not more than $500 (plus $100 for each dependent)		$
(*b*) Married person living with husband or wife if separate returns are filed: 40% (plus 2% for each dependent) of line 4, but not more than $500 (plus $100 for each dependent)		$
(*c*) Married person living with husband or wife if only one return or a joint return is filed, or head of a family: 40% (plus 2% for each dependent) of line 4, but not more than $1,000 (plus $100 for each dependent). (See Schedule I-(2) for exclusion of one dependent by head of a family)		$
6. Net Victory Tax (line 4 less line 5). (Enter in line 13, above)		$

Schedule L.—To be used only by individuals whose surtax net income for 1942 or 1943 exceeded $20,000
Schedule to determine whether Section 6 (c) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 is applicable

1. Surtax net income for 1942 (item 23, Form 1040 (1942))	$
2. Surtax net income for 1943 (line 4, above)	$
3. Surtax net income for base year, $_____ plus $20,000: $_____ (Check year used: 1937 ____; 1938 ____; 1939 ____; 1940 ____)	

If either line 1 or 2 is greater than line 3, separate Schedule L-2 should be secured from the collector and filed with and as a part of this return.

Note.—If a joint return is filed for either 1942 or 1943 and separate returns for the other of such years, enter the aggregate of the separate surtax net incomes for the separate return year. The surtax net income to be entered in line 3 shall be determined in the same manner as the surtax net income entered in line 1 or 2, whichever is the lesser.

3 **NOTES ON STEP 3**

This is where you compute the income tax on 1943 income. Here again there is no basic change. The rate of tax is the same as last year and the same rules for determining personal exemption, credit for dependents and earned-income credit prevail.

6 **NOTES ON STEP 6**

This section of the return is new and is used to combine income and Victory tax and then to compute and add the forgiveness tax.

7 **NOTES ON STEP 7**

This step is new and is the place to take credit for amounts paid to the Collector of Internal Revenue or withheld from your wages during 1943.

4 **NOTES ON STEP 4**

This is where you compute the Victory tax on 1943 income and is a new addition to the tax form.

5 **NOTES ON STEP 5**

This section is new and applies only to persons whose surtax net income exceeds $20,000 in either 1942 or 1943. Even then, it amounts to nothing more than a report of the figures requested unless surtax net income for 1942 or 1943 is greater than the surtax net income for the selected base year, plus $20,000. (Either 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940 may be selected.)

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am including an editorial from the Portland Press Herald, Portland, Maine, of January 24, 1944, under the caption "Can you bear it?" This editorial comments on some very important information that should concern every American. I trust that it will be widely read.

CAN YOU BEAR IT?

Here are some facts to ponder. They were disclosed before a House committee last Friday. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., testified that he asked the Federal Communications Commission, September 8, 1941—3 months before Pearl Harbor—for the fingerprints of radio operators, at a time when he had knowledge of surreptitious messages from the United States providing Japan with important military information. This request of Mr. Hoover's was supplemented by a letter from the Justice Department on January 22, 1942, in which Attorney General Biddle pleaded for the fingerprints. The F. C. C. did not comply with the request until March 1943, 14 months after the Attorney General made his plea, 18 months after Mr. Hoover asked for the prints. The testimony at the hearing brought out the fact that Chairman Fly, of the F. C. C., refused the request "on the grounds that he had agreed with radio union officials not to turn the F. C. C. fingerprint file over to the F. B. I."

Can you bear it? We had been at war with Japan for 15 months before it was graciously permitted to our great Bureau of Investigation to see a fingerprint file held by another Government department; our F. B. I. was on the track of something big 3 months before Pearl Harbor, and was impeded by the F. C. C.; one governmental agency had knowledge of subversive action by somebody, with a lead pointing straight at persons over whom the F. C. C. had some control, and was prevented from following up this lead; for all anybody knows, the important military information Japan was known to be getting from this country she continued to get for 18 months after the first attempt to shut it off was made. That will require a lot of explaining.

But the grounds upon which the F. C. C. refused cooperation is vastly important, also. The F. C. C., it is declared, refused because it "had agreed with radio union officials not to turn its fingerprint file over to the F. B. I." The country will wish to know why the radio union officials exacted this promise from the F. C. C.; what it had to conceal; what secret motives impelled one agency of the Federal Government to block another agency of that Government; how many American lives this collusion may have cost.

Answers to these questions, good and sufficient answers, must be forthcoming. This country is in no mood to condone a course which, on the face of such facts as are now available plainly disclose an attitude on the part of the Federal Communications Commission that was stupid, obstructive, unpatriotic, and, in effect, treacherous. If we have got to the point where favoritism for a labor union can hold up the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its unceasing and extraordinarily effective efforts to keep us safe, the American people ought to get upon their hind legs and begin to howl.

Hon. Robert Crosser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 23, 1944, pertaining to our distinguished and esteemed colleague, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER:

CROSSER, 69, IS CAPITAL FIXTURE—PHILOSOPHER CONGRESSMAN IS ACTIVE DESPITE ARTHRITIS

(By Harry Humphries)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—After 27 years in Congress, white-haired, philosophic ROBERT CROSSER likes his job and wants to make a career of it.

At 69, the Scottish-born Cleveland Congressman has a good start. A Member of the House Interstate Commerce Committee since 1923, he is a recognized authority on transportation and is author of the acts for the settlement of railway labor disputes, and for retirement and unemployment insurance for railway workers.

The role of legislator fits Representative CROSSER'S philosophy that "The only true happiness is experienced in the realization of the verities of being."

"I sought a seat in Congress because I believe the best place for a man who has a philosophy of things is in the lawmaking bodies, where he may speak openly and freely advocate principles believed by him to be right," he asserts.

ADVOCATES HIS BELIEFS

Often urged to seek the nomination for Governor of Ohio, and suggested for Federal judgeship, CROSSER avers he would not be happy in a position where he would be expected to administer or interpret policies he might not believe in.

"You live the best life you know how, despite yourself," he says, "and I get a lot of satisfaction out of developing ideas."

CROSSER is one of the best-known figures about the marble halls of the Capitol. Recovering slowly from the effects of arthritis, the former Kenyon College football star conducts his daily business with vigor and regularity.

The walls of his office are lined with photographs and framed testimonials to his untiring service in the development of aviation.

Active despite his painful physical handicap, he carries on in his office a chain of interviews with constituents, representatives of transportation industry and labor, newspapermen, and others. It is not unusual for him to attend or preside at as many as three congressional meetings and hearings in a day, then participate in House debate and spend late hours in his study preparing the next day's work.

WRITES ON PHILOSOPHY

His library contains hundreds of books, many on his favorite subject—philosophy. Few of his callers know, however, that among the papers on his desk is the beginning of his own book on philosophy. Already long-delayed and often interrupted by everyday business, CROSSER can't say when he will finish the job or what title he will give it.

"It will deal," he says, "with humanity's goal—perfect happiness—and the hindrances to its attainment."

The book will explain the philosophy which has steered the Ohio Congressman along liberal lines of thought and away from close identity with all kinds of organizations, including rigid adherence to political party programs. A Democrat, he does not always agree with party officials.

CROSSER, the son of a physician, was born in Holytown, Lanarkshire, Scotland, June 7, 1874, and came to Salineville, Columbiana County, Ohio, with his parents at the age of 7. Later the family moved to Cleveland.

He attended public schools in Salineville, and after being graduated from Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, studied law at Columbia University and the Cincinnati Law School. He began law practice in Cleveland in 1901.

HELPED WRITE AMENDMENT

Ten years later he was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives and was a member of the fourth Ohio constitutional convention, serving as chairman of the initiative and referendum amendment committee, and writing the initiative and referendum amendment to the Ohio Constitution in 1912.

He was elected Ohio Congressman at Large in 1912 and was reelected twice as Representative of the Twenty-first (Cleveland) District. After a 4-year interruption (1919-23), he returned to the House from the Twenty-first District for two decades of continuous service.

CROSSER'S wife, the former Isabelle D. Hogg, of Cleveland, has been an invalid since 1921. Two of his four children, James and Justine, died after reaching maturity. His son Robert is a private in the United States Army overseas. His daughter, Mrs. Barbara Sweeny, acts as his secretary and assists him as he moves about the Capitol.

That Bobtailed Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Federal war ballot, with my comments thereon:

THIS IS THAT BOBTAILED BALLOT

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

Electors of President and Vice President of the United States

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President_____

United States Senator

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

United States Senator, Unexpired Term

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

Representative in Congress for your district

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district_____

Representative at Large in Congress

(Only in the States entitled thereto)

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large_____

(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

CONGRESSMAN C. W. VURSELL SAYS: "DON'T SELL THE SOLDIER SHORT"

This is the ballot provided under the Green-Lucas bill which they want to send to the soldiers overseas. The only way the soldier can vote is to write in the name of the candidate. He cannot vote a straight Democratic ticket, neither can he vote a straight Republican ticket. It prohibits him from voting for the State, district, or county candidates, and permits him to vote for only President, United States Senator, and Congressman.

It would give Senator LUCAS a great advantage, as it would the President, because their names are well known. Is that why they want this Federal short blank ballot?

Most soldiers overseas would never know the name of the candidate from Illinois who will oppose Senator LUCAS in the coming election. The administration will control the news to the soldiers. Few would know the names of the candidates who are running for Congress. Not knowing the name of the candidates, 80 percent of them will not be able to vote for the various Congressmen.

Our House bill provides for sending to the soldier direct by mail the complete ballot with all the names on it from coroner to President. This would give him a chance to vote for all of the candidates and vote either straight Democratic or straight Republican as he so desired. This ballot can be gotten to every soldier from Illinois in time for him to vote it secretly and mail it back to his county clerk. This ballot is legal and will be counted. The Federal ballot is unconstitutional and there is grave doubt if it can be counted when returned in Illinois and most other States.

Is it fair to deny the full ballot to our soldier boys who are fighting in the fox holes and swamps for $50 a month and give the whole ballot to those at home working in the munition plants at from $10 to $15 a day?

We think it unfair to give only the short ballot to General MacArthur in the Pacific and at the same time give the full and complete ballot to Harry Bridges and to Earl Browder at the head of the Communist organization of this country. These men are demanding that the short ballot go overseas, but they want the full and complete ballot for themselves and their ilk here at home.

Our efforts from the beginning have been to give to the soldier overseas the same type of a ballot that his father, mother, and relatives will vote here at home.

We want the election to be settled, by keeping it legal, rather than to take a chance on throwing it into the Supreme Court after election day, which would leave the choice for the Presidency in doubt and would bring confusion and chaos to the Nation.

We don't want to sell the soldier short.

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress.

Arizona Takes a Significant Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following release of the Department of Interior under date of February 10 on the signing of a contract by Secretary Ickes to furnish 2,800,000 acre-feet of water to Arizona out of Lake Mead. The release is as follows:

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today he had signed, on behalf of the United States, a contract to deliver to the State of Arizona annually 2,800,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water from storage in the Bureau of Reclamation's Boulder Dam reservoir, subject to its availability for use in Arizona under the provisions of the Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore said the contract would become effective when ratified by the Arizona Legislature and when this body unconditionally ratifies the Colorado River Compact. The legislature on March 25, 1943, voted to ratify the compact, provided a contract for the delivery of water from Lake Mead was executed between the United States and Arizona.

The Secretary signed the contract after considering fully the objections presented by the State of California in a hearing on February 2 and representations made by the State of Arizona in reply. The contract had previously been approved by the Committee of Fourteen, which is composed of two Representatives of each of the seven Colorado River Basin States. All members of the committee except those from California approved the agreement which the Secretary has now signed.

In announcing his decision, Secretary Ickes issued the following memorandum:

"MEMORANDUM RE HEARING FEBRUARY 2 ON CALIFORNIA'S OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED CONTRACT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ARIZONA FOR THE DELIVERY OF WATER FROM LAKE MEAD

"There has been submitted to me for approval and execution a proposed contract between the United States and the State of Arizona for the delivery of water from Lake Mead for use in Arizona. Section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorizes me to contract for the storage and delivery of water impounded by Boulder Dam. Under subdivision (a) of article 7 of the proposed contract the United States agrees to deliver annually from storage in Lake Mead for use in Arizona a maximum of 2,800,000 acre-feet of water, subject to its availability for use in Arizona under the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and under subdivision (b) of article 7 the United States agrees to deliver one-half of any excess or surplus water unapportioned by the compact to the extent such water is available for use in Arizona under the compact and act. The contract is conditioned upon the unconditional ratification of the compact by Arizona.

"The proposed contract was drafted by the Committee of Fourteen after the Arizona legislature last spring passed an act contingently ratifying the compact—the contingency being the execution and ratification by the legislature of a contract for the delivery of water from Lake Mead. Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation worked closely with the committee and made a number of modifications which were accepted by the committee and Arizona. Bureau representatives, under my instructions, have taken the position throughout the negotiations that any contract proposed should not commit the Department as to any controversial issue regarding the amounts of water available to Arizona, or to any compact State, under the compact and the act. The proposed contract has been approved by the representatives of each of the Colorado River States, except California.

"I have considered carefully the objections made by California in its printed brief and at the hearing before me on February 2. California is fearful that subdivisions (a) and (b) of article 7 construed together create an inference that the maximum of 2,800,000 acre-feet which the United States agrees to deliver under subdivision (a) is water apportioned to the lower basin under article III (a) of the compact and that Arizona could contend, to California's prejudice, that this constituted an administrative determination that Arizona was entitled by this contract to 2,800,000 acre-feet of article III (a) water. I am convinced that California's fears in this respect are unfounded for at least two reasons: First, I wish to make it clear, and to emphasize, that the delivery of water under both subdivision (a) and subdivision (b) of article 7 is expressly 'subject to its availability under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act.' The proposed contract does not attempt to obligate the United States to deliver any water to Arizona which is not available to Arizona under the terms of the compact and act. Secondly, article 10 was purposely designed to prevent Arizona, or any other State, from contending that the proposed contract, or any provision of the proposed contract, resolves any issue on the amounts of waters which are apportioned or unapportioned by the compact and the amounts of apportioned or unapportioned water available to the respective States under the compact and the act. It expressly reserves for future judicial determination any issue involving the intent, effect, meaning, and interpretation of the compact and act. The language of article 10 is plain and unequivocal and adequately reserves all questions of interpretation of the compact and the act.

"It is my opinion that I have authority under section 5 of the act to execute such a contract as is proposed to be made with Arizona. The Department has made contracts with California and Nevada for the delivery of waters from Lake Mead subject to its availability under the compact and act. Now that Arizona has agreed to ratify the compact, it is my opinion that Arizona is entitled to be accorded the same consideration that the Department has accorded to California and Nevada. Accordingly I have decided to approve and execute the proposed contract with Arizona.

"HAROLD L. ICKES,
"Secretary of the Interior.
"FEBRUARY 9, 1944."

California and Arizona have been at odds for more than 20 years over the division of the waters of the Colorado River system. The fundamental controversy between the two States concerns the amount of water to which each State is entitled under the compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

The dispute dates back to 1922 when six of the seven States in the Colorado River basin agreed to the Colorado River Compact which apportioned the waters from the main river and its tributaries to the upper and lower basins. Arizona was the lone objector. Subsequently the legislatures of all States, except Arizona, ratified the compact.

In 1928 the Congress passed the Boulder Canyon Project Act which provided that the act would not become effective until the California Legislature agreed to limit its use to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water apportioned in article III (a) of the compact, plus one-half of the excess or surplus unapportioned water. California passed such a limitation act in 1929.

Can We Realize the American Dream?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Jewish Veteran for February 1944:

CAN WE REALIZE THE AMERICAN DREAM?

In this, our good-will issue, we take time to review just what we mean by good will and by the problem of American unity.

The United States of America is historically a unique country. It is the one major world power whose population is derived from an almost infinite variety of peoples, of all religions, of various races and customs, of numerous national origins.

It has become a great country, a world power of the first rank only because these people have, somehow, found a way of living together, working together, and subordinating differences to a common national development.

Had things been different, had the pattern been one of division and subdivision by all these groups, the United States would not have been one great Union, but a replica of Balkanized Europe.

Throughout American history, the integrating force has been dominant. But there have always been contrary forces trying to pull the country apart, voices which almost prevented the Confederation in the beginning, and later forced the crisis of a civil war. Periodically, the disintegrating forces became highly organized and powerful—such as the Nativist Movement of the 1830's, the Know-Nothings of the 1850's, the APA of the 1890's, the Klan of the 1920's, the Silver Shirts and Fronters of today. But they were never sufficiently powerful to bring about the logical outcome of their actions—the fragmentation of our country.

Within comparatively recent times, the existence of the forces that would make for our fragmentation provided a useful instrument in the hands of a foreign imperialist power, Nazi Germany. By encouraging the forces of disunity, by collaborating with them, by propagandizing for them, Nazi Germany hoped to weaken us to such an extent that we would be a negligible factor in world affairs, in today's crisis; and "easy pickin's" for conquest sometime in the future.

The American people informed of this historic process and of the alternatives before them would, no doubt, make a wise choice.

It is becoming clear that racial or religious bigotries in this country transcend the area of personal luxury and proclivity that, maintained in this country, they would have a disastrous effect upon the stability of the United States and lead to its ultimate disintegration.

The forces for cohesion will be put to their greatest test to grapple with the enormous social and political post-war problems that will confront the United States. If we meet those problems by the willing collaboration among Americans, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews of all nationality and racial origin; if we do that without steamrollering over differences (Charles Evans Hughes has said: "If we lose the right to be different, we lose the right to be free"), we will assure our strength and security, realize the American dream and serve as a model for world brotherhood.

A Factual Picture of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been conducting hearing on House Resolution 418 and House Resolution 419, identical resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] and by me, to implement the national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.

To me the striking and illuminating factual testimony offered by Mr. Emanuel Neuman, of New York, is worthy of special attention and consideration by the House.

It is interesting and important to each of us here to have a clear picture of the relationship between the Jews and the Arabs in the Holy Land. This testimony presents such a picture; it furnishes facts for those humanitarians who would right the wrongs, if wrongs there be, to the Jewish people. Here is the testimony of Mr. Neuman:

I am an American of Jewish descent and have been interested in the Zionist movement since my youth. In 1932–33 I served as a member of the executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and resided there for several years thereafter in a private capacity. These 7 or 8 years spent on the spot have helped me, I believe, to a better understanding of the problem.

In order to deal with the question under consideration within a short space of time, it is necessary, I think, to strip it so far as possible of nonessentials and cut through to the heart and core of the matter. The issue, whatever its complexities, can be reduced to its essential elementary terms.

The case as between the Jews and the Arabs is in the nature of an international dispute submitted to the bar of public opinion. Actually it was adjudicated many years ago, and the resolution we are considering is essentially a reaffirmation of a judgment rendered in the past. The case may be considered under two heads: (1) Zionism and the Arab world, and (2) the position of the Palestinian Arabs. While the two aspects are related they are nevertheless distinct.

So far as the Arab world is concerned—and by that I mean for the moment the Arabs of Southwestern Asia: Arabia, Iraq, Syria, and so forth—their case regarding Palestine is easily stated. They claim Palestine as part of the Arab domain, which Arabs are entitled to rule, and they assert that Palestine should have been included in the Arab domain and should never have been promised to the Jews in any form. They rest their claim chiefly on rights of possession, the record of the Arab revolt in the First World War and the promises allegedly made to them at the time.

From the point of view of international law the record is by this time pretty clear, having been minutely studied and dealt with by many competent authorities. I will attempt to summarize it briefly. Historically, the Arabs had lost their sovereignty over nearly all of these lands many centuries ago—in fact, during the Middle Ages. They had been overrun by successive invasions and finally conquered by the Turks, and the countries in question were incorporated in the Ottoman Empire and governed as such since the year 1517. The Arabs were subjected to the autocratic rule of the Turkish sultans. They were steeped in poverty and misery. Their physical as well as moral fiber was affected. Their hopes for freedom and a brighter future depended upon the ultimate collapse of Turkish power and the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. But there was little prospect of this being brought about through the efforts of the Arabs themselves. They were too weak, too dispirited, disunited, lacking in leadership and resources.

Their chance came with the outbreak of the First World War, when Turkey took her plunge on the side of Germany, which brought her into conflict with Great Britain, France, and Russia. For the Arabs it was a historic opportunity. Even so it required a great effort on the part of the British and all their skill and diplomacy, as well as the expenditure of large sums of money, to induce the Arabs of the Hejaz in the interior of Arabia to revolt under Hussein and Feisal. And it took continued British effort, British leadership and British money—more than $50,000,000 of it—to keep the revolt from collapsing after it was started. This revolt was confined to only a part of the tribes in the Arabian Peninsula and some of the Transjordanians; while other sections of Arabia as well as the Arabs of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine did not participate in it, but remained largely passive. On the other hand, many of them served with the Turkish Armies fighting against the British. Authorities differ as to the military value of the revolt. Certainly it has often been exaggerated beyond all proportion. Whatever assistance was given by the tribesmen, who harried the Turkish flank, unquestionably it was British troops and British Empire forces who fought the major campaigns, defeated the Turkish Armies, and liberated all these regions. The cost in British life and treasure was heavy, particularly in Mesopotamia.

What would have happened in an earlier age under these circumstances? Either the outright annexation of these countries, their incorporation in the British Empire, or the establishment of protectorates on the old model. But there was a new spirit abroad, and new ideas, which found expression in Wilson's 14 points. The principle of national self-determination had been enunciated primarily to hasten the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire; but there was a disposition to apply these principles reasonably, and to the extent possible also in the case of the less-developed countries of the Near East, which were not considered quite ripe for self-government. In that spirit, negotiations went forward between the representatives of the British and the leaders of the Arab revolt. These negotiations were complicated by parallel negotiations which were going on simultaneously among the Allied powers themselves regarding their respective spheres of influence. But the British and Arabs did reach a certain understanding.

What was that understanding? In a nutshell it was this: The Arabs were to get independence in Arabia proper, i. e., in the Arabian Peninsula, and they were to get semi-independence in what is now Iraq and in the interior of Syria. Two small areas were definitely excluded under the terms of this understanding, two small countries which were reserved because of special circumstances and considerations. The first was Lebanon, with its important Christian population, who had been oriented toward France as their traditional protector. The other was Palestine, which was to be set aside for Jewish resettlement and the reconstitution of the Jewish national home.

II

That, in substance, was the Anglo-Arab understanding, the plan which they hoped to put through at the peace conference. The Arabs were there and represented by a delegation headed by Feisal, working earnestly for the adoption of this plan which gave them 95 percent of all they had claimed. Pursuant to this plan, Hussein was already recognized as king of the Hejaz in Arabia, while his son, Feisal, was to reign in Damascus, capital of Syria, and another son, Abdullah, was to become king of Iraq subject to British guidance.

Under the contemplated arrangement the Arabs had the prospect of independence and semi-independence in all these areas aggregating over 1,000,000 square miles of territory. Moreover they also had the prospect of ultimate unity or confederation through the

circumstance that these various countries would be ruled by members of the same family, the new dynasty of Hussein. It was from their point of view an excellent bargain. Under the circumstances they considered it reasonable and prudent not to press their claims with respect to Lebanon and Palestine, in view of British commitments there. As the situation was summarized by the Royal Commission: "If King Hussein and the Emir Feisal secured their big Arab state they would concede little Palestine to the Jews."

Before and during the Peace Conference Feisal had numerous conferences with Dr. Weizmann and other Zionist leaders and repeatedly placed himself on record in support of Zionist aspirations. Indeed the Arabs and Zionists presented a united front at the Peace Conference and they supported one another reciprocally, as had been agreed between them. In the sight of the world by their words and actions, the Arab spokesmen recognized the validity of Jewish national aspirations with regard to Palestine.

Had the Anglo-Arab understanding been fully carried out at the time, the subsequent history of Arab-Jewish relations might have been different. The Arab-Jewish alliance established by Emir Feisal and Dr. Weizmann might have continued indefinitely. Unfortunately as it turned out, the Anglo-Arab understanding was not implemented at one stroke at the Peace Conference, but only in stages in successive years, after much agitation and rioting in Syria and Iraq, which had their repercussion, also in Palestine. In their resentment against the European Powers the Arabs broke also with the Zionists. Step by step, however, the Arabs achieved almost all that had been promised to them, and in some respects even more.

In April 1920 the Supreme Council met at San Remo to decide on the disposition of the Ottoman Empire and the terms of the Turkish peace treaty. It awarded to France the mandate over Syria and Lebanon, and to Britain mandates over Iraq and Palestine. The Arabs protested this arrangement, chiefly with respect to Syria, and Feisal had himself proclaimed king in Damascus, only to be driven out by the French. Thereupon the British, in the following year, placed Feisal upon the throne of Iraq, while his brother Abdullah who turned up in Trans-Jordan, was recognized as the ruling prince of that country. So far as Palestine was concerned, the terms of the Balfour Declaration were incorporated in the treaty of Sevres negotiated between Turkey and the allied powers. As is well known, the Balfour Declaration, as subsequently incorporated in the mandate for Palestine, was recognized and accepted by all the allied powers and indeed by 52 nations by the community of nations. It had become part of the fabric of international law.

In 1932 the British mandate for Iraq was terminated and replaced by a treaty of alliance between Great Britain and the independent kingdom of Iraq. Four years later, in 1936, a similar development seemed imminent in Syria, where the French Government negotiated with the Syrian Arabs for the termination of the French mandate and the recognition of independent states in Syria and Lebanon, with treaties of alliance between them and France. This arrangement failed of ratification by the French Chamber of Deputies at the time. Recently, however, during the present war, official declarations have been made, both on behalf of the French and the British, declarations which were approved by the Government of the United States, promising the independence of these countries in the near future.

In the net result the democracies have finally recognized virtually all the original claims of Arab nationalism to Arab independence with respect to Arabia, Iraq, Syria, and Trans-Jordan—an area covering about 1,200,000 square miles of territory and equivalent to the combined areas of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain—embracing all so-called Arab lands in Asia, and including some non-Arab districts—with the single exception of western Palestine, with its 10,000 square miles, constituting less than 1 percent of the total area. Even that ardent champion of the Arab cause, the famous Lawrence of Arabia, declared years ago that the promises made to the Arabs had been fulfilled and "we have come out of the Arab affair with clean hands."

So far, then, as the Arab world is concerned, it has, substantially speaking, achieved 99 percent of its goal and given up more than 1 percent. And though it took years to achieve, the deal has been a highly satisfactory and profitable one from their point of view. All in all, the Arabs were perhaps the greatest beneficiaries of Allied victory in the First World War, considering their very modest contribution toward that victory. Perhaps no other nation gained so much in territory and independence for so little as the Arabs had contributed toward their own liberation. If today they come forward and renew their claim to the inclusion of Palestine in their vast domain, that claim is unwarranted from every point of view. Not only have other rights and interests intervened, not only has Palestine advanced a long way in its evolution as the Jewish national home, not only is there today a more pressing need than ever for maintaining and developing that national home, but what is also pertinent and relevant, there is no pressing need which should actuate the Arab states to demand this additional strip of land. Their present domain is not only vast, but greatly underpopulated. The combined population of all the Arab territories I have mentioned does not exceed 15,000,000. All of them could be comfortably accommodated in Iraq alone, if fully developed, and there would still be ample room for many more millions in the future. Actually, the sparseness of population in the Arab countries is one of their greatest problems, their greatest weakness, and the greatest source of danger for their future security. The Arabs have not too little land, but too much land, and lack the means and the manpower to develop what they have and to defend it.

In a paper presented to the Royal Asia Society in England in 1926, Jafar Pasha al-Askari, the Prime Minister of Iraq, stated: "The size of the country is 150,000 square miles, about three times that of England and Wales, while the population is only 3,000,000. * * * What Iraq wants above everything else is more population." A similar situation obtains in Syria, where only one-sixth of the cultivable land is being cultivated. For the Arab world, thus richly endowed, to reach out its hand and strike at the international commitments solemnly made with respect to Palestine, with a view to its annexation and its incorporation in the Arab domain, is not only a breach of international law but a case of incipient imperialism.

III

I come now to the second part of our discussion: The position of the Palestinian Arabs. Here the position taken by their spokesmen is simple to the point of oversimplification. They are there; they have been there for centuries; they therefore have the right of ownership, as it were, of sovereignty, of domination. They contend that whatever Feisal and the other Arab delegates to the peace conference might have said or done by way of waiving Arab claims to Palestine in favor of the Jews, they, the Arabs of Palestine, had not given their consent and were entitled to be masters of the land.

But the question is not so simple. Considered as a group, the people who inhabited what is now Palestine at the time of the World War were not a nation, had never been recognized as such and had never exercised national sovereignty over that territory. In fact, there was no such thing as Palestine, in the political sense. It was merely a geographical concept. What is now Palestine is made up of certain parts of the Turkish vilayets, or provinces, of Beirut and Damascus, and of the sanjak or district of Jerusalem. The inhabitants were largely Arab speaking, but of diversified and mixed origins. The majority were Moslems, with important Christian and Jewish minorities. They had no sense of nationality as Palestinians, and such of them as were Arab nationalists insisted that Palestine was and should remain southern Syria. There was no Palestinian nation.

Nor did the Arabs of Palestine help the Allies to liberate the country as did Palestinian Jews, who enlisted in the famous Jewish battalions. They either fought with the Turks against the British or deserted in large numbers to become prisoners of war, fed and sheltered by the British Army.

The Palestine we know today was the creation of the peace conference and the mandate. Palestine was constituted as a distinct country in its present frontiers, precisely because the Allied Powers, representing the democratic world, did not intend to make it another Arab state. If that had been the intention, there was no need or justification for carving out this territory and separating it from the surrounding country. On the contrary, the Allied Nations clearly recognized that this small country held a unique position—unique in many respects. It was the birthplace of three great religions; it was held in veneration by half the world; it was the ancestral home of the Jewish people, whose continued historical association with the land was known and sympathetically recognized throughout Christendom. On these grounds and because of the determination of the civilized world to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish national home, Palestine was definitely excluded from what was to be the Arab domain, and was placed under a special mandate which took full account of the peculiar character of the land and the special purposes to which it was to be dedicated. That mandate, an international instrument validated by 52 nations, expressly recognizes the "historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine" and "the grounds for reconstituting there their national home." In this connection, the prefix "re" is of decisive importance. What was clearly intended was not the creation of something new, vague, and without precedent, but the reconstruction of something which had existed in the past. By the force of this word "reconstitute" the national home was identified with the Jewish commonwealth which had existed in Palestine in the Biblical period and in post-Biblical times.

The argument now tendered is that this determination does not square with the principle of national self-determination, as some of the Palestinian Arabs would interpret that principle. The discovery that there was for the time being a majority of Arab speaking people in Palestine is not a new discovery. It was vividly present to the minds of Lloyd George and Balfour, of Woodrow Wilson and Prime Minister Smuts, and of all the Allied statesmen when they rendered their verdict, in favor of the Jewish National Home. The doctrine of self-determination did not spring from Arabia, but from the minds and hearts of the most enlightened and progressive statesmen in Christendom. They, if anyone, were entitled to interpret the principle and give it proper application. If they made this determination in the case of Palestine, they did so after weighing all the equities and balancing the needs and claims both of the Arabs and the Jews, the claims of both races to life, liberty, and happiness. They decided that the Jews were likewise entitled to national self-determination, in the sense that

they should be given the opportunity to reestablish a national existence in the one tiny spot on the face of the globe to which they had a moral and historical claim. They squared it fully with their conscience on the ground that this disposition was necessitated and sanctioned by the dictates of humanity and justice on the highest plane. In their view the national interests of the Arab peoples and their national aspirations were being recognized in the vast Arab domain.

So far as the Arab speaking population of Palestine was concerned, who numbered at the time between 500,000 and 600,000 souls, their rights were to be safeguarded in Palestine not only as individuals, but also as a religious and cultural community. All of these rights have been scrupulously safeguarded hitherto and must be scrupulously safeguarded in the future. No one who has spent time in Palestine can fail to be impressed with the extraordinary extent to which the Arabs of that country, the common people, have prospered under the mandate and benefited by Jewish immigration and economic development. They are undoubtedly in that regard the most fortunate group of Arabs in the world.

There is one further consideration. It must be borne in mind that whatever was the position in 1919 or 1922, and whatever were the contentions of the Arabs a quarter of a century ago, the situation has changed materially during the years which have intervened. The Palestine we know today is not the country we knew then. In a very real sense it is a new country, a new Palestine. The land has been transformed. In reliance upon the solemn pledges made to the Jewish people then, in reliance upon solemn international covenants, a half million Jews have entered and settled in the country. They have poured into it their energy, their love and devotion, and some $600,000,000 in cash. They have drained its swamps, reforested its naked hills, built cities, established industries, planted great stretches of orange groves, harnessed the water power of the Jordan, and electrified the countryside, developed the mineral resources of the Dead Sea. In short, they took a neglected and derelict country, the mere carcass of a land, as someone has described it, and transmuted it by their labor, sweat, and blood into something new—a thriving, modern, progressive, semi-industrial country. The new Palestine is almost as different from the old as southern California is different from the desert which we took over about a century ago. And it is this new Palestine, this oasis of civilization on the rim of the desert, which Arab nationalism would now have the democratic world place under Arab national control.

And why? What new claim has pan-Arab nationalism upon the consideration of the democratic world? What contribution have the Arabs made to the democratic cause during this, its greatest crisis? Where did they stand when Rommel stood at the gates of Alexandria? What Arab banner was carried to the field of battle to defend not merely the cause of democracy but their own countries, the freedom and independence which had been so dearly won for them with the lives of Britons and Frenchmen and Americans during the First World War? For now it may be told. Now that the dire threat to the Near East which was so imminent 2 and 3 years ago has been definitely removed, the truth may be spoken.

During those dark and anxious days, the whole Near East was a veritable quagmire of intrigue and treachery. Would-be Quislings, the leaders of fifth columns, were active everywhere. Axis-minded, Fascist-ridden Arab oligarchies attempted to seize power and stab the democratic nations in the back. In Egypt the Prime Minister himself, Ali Maher Pasha, had to be removed from power and kept in isolation in a country villa because of his complicity with the enemy. The Egyptian chief of staff, al-Masri, had to be arrested under suspicious circumstances. In Iraq, Rashid Bey al-Gailani, struck at the British prematurely before help could reach him from his Nazi allies. The leader of the Arab extremists in Palestine, the notorious Mufti, was commuting between Rome and Berlin doing the Fuehrer's work. Nowhere in this entire region did the democratic cause, hard pressed as it was, find firm and active allies save in Palestine, which had become an outpost and bastion on our far-flung battle front—Palestine, with its Jewish national home.

Ladies and gentlemen, the resolution you are considering is a reaffirmation of an American policy and a word of cheer and of hope to the harrassed multitudes of the Jewish people in Europe and their brave vanguard in Palestine. Why this reaffirmation and why the express reference to the goal of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. The answer is obvious. The Balfour Declaration was unquestionably meant to help, in the words of President Wilson, "to lay the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." The policy was so understood, quite definitely, by our own Government at the time. There is clear documentary evidence of that fact. Our Government interpreted the Balfour Declaration as a policy leading to the establishment of Palestine "as a Jewish state." The record attests it. But in the course of these years, under pressure of Arab intransigeance and a campaign of terror carried on with the help of the Axis, the original contract was gradually whittled down, interpreted and reinterpreted beyond recognition, a process which culminated in the white paper. It is, therefore, not enough to repudiate the white paper, but to avoid recurrence, in the future. It is, therefore, necessary to go over the record now and cross the t's and dot the i's. That can best be done by a clear and unmistakable reference to the underlying purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the goal it contemplated—a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Subsidy Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on February 16, 1944, there appeared in the New York Times a letter written by Mr. Chester Bowles, on the subject of subsidy savings, which I think is very interesting in connection with the matter now under discussion. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me inquire whether the Senator has reference to the entire page of the New York Times on which the letter from Chester Bowles is printed. Does the Senator also mean to have printed in the RECORD the editorial in reply to the letter?

Mr. MALONEY. I did not request unanimous consent to have the editorial printed, as well as the letter; but if the Senator from Michigan would like me to make such request, I do so, and ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, following the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDY SAVINGS DISCUSSED—MR. BOWLES SEES A POTENTIAL RISE IN PRICES AND WAGES UNCONTROLLED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On the editorial page of February 3 you listed five varying statements attributed to members of the O. P. A. organization on the extent of the savings to American housewives which will be brought about by the use of subsidies in connection with the present price-control program.

So that there may be no mistake or misunderstanding about our point of view or the recommendations that we have made to Congress, let me restate briefly our analysis of the present price-control situation and the relation of subsidies to it.

There are, as you know, two entirely different types of subsidy payments which we use to keep prices from rising. First, the differential-type subsidy, paid to a few high-cost producers in a given industry. And, second, the general subsidy paid to all producers in a given industry.

The differential subsidy is most frequently used to maintain a lower level of prices on basic raw materials. The savings from it are direct, obvious, and sometimes spectacular.

The subsidy on copper is a good example. Before the war it was unprofitable to work certain high-cost copper mines. During wartime, however, we have needed all the copper which we are capable of producing, regardless of how expensive it may be to produce.

CHOICE OF TWO PLANS

There are two ways in which we could have paid for it. First, we could have established a ceiling price for all copper high enough to cover the costs of the least efficient mines, plus a reasonable profit to those mines. In 1943 this would have required an increase in the present 12 cents a pound price of copper to 22 cents for all mines, regardless of their cost of production.

Or we could leave the market price of all copper at 12 cents and then allow a direct subsidy payment to the high-cost producers sufficient to pay for their cost of operation in excess of 12 cents a pound and to allow a reasonable profit.

By choosing the second, or subsidy, method of dealing with this copper-price problem already a huge amount of money has been saved the American Treasury and the American taxpayers. The cost of the present copper subsidy, given only to high-cost producers, has amounted to only $45,000,000 since Pearl Harbor. An increase in all copper prices, the only other alternative, would have increased our war costs by $930,000,000 during this same period.

In general, there is very little question in anyone's mind about the wisdom of this differential type of subsidy in wartime as a means of getting full production without raising over-all market prices to an unnecessary extent.

FOOD PRICE CONTROL

The present controversy, as I see it, concerns the use of subsidies to keep food prices from rising above their present levels. At present, the Government is spending $1,250,000,000 on an annual basis on subsidies of this type.

These subsidies on food provide a direct saving of only $378,000,000 in lower retail prices to all of us as consumers over the amount paid by all of us as taxpayers. This $378,000,000 savings would not in itself justify the use of these subsidies. If that were the only saving involved I would personally be opposed to them.

However, there are other considerations, some of them psychological and some economic, which make these subsidies abso-

lutely essential if we are to maintain the present level of prices during the coming year. These other considerations give rise to indirect, as distinguished from direct, savings.

Under the terms of the Economic Stabilization Act, the O. P. A. and the War Labor Board were directed to stabilize prices and straight-time hourly wage rates "so far as practicable" on the basis of the levels of September 15, 1942. The extent to which this balance has been obtained is a subject of some argument.

Today, some labor groups feel that wages should be allowed to go higher to compensate fo. the increase of 5.8 percent in the cost of living which took place between September 15, 1942, and April 1943. (Since April 1943, according to the Department of Labor, the average over-all cost of living for middle and lower income groups has remained stable.) Other groups feel that wages in general have risen high enough.

This obviously is not a question for the O. P. A. to decide. We must, however, accept the fact that the present balance between wages and prices, imperfect though it may be, is the only balance that we have.

HARD TO MAINTAIN WAGE LEVELS

If we should remove subsidies, it is clear that certain food prices must be allowed to rise immediately. Otherwise an intolerable squeeze would be placed on farmers, food processors, or retailers. If these food prices are allowed to rise, everyone who is familiar with the present tense wage situation agrees that the present wage level cannot be held. If the present balance between wages and prices (imperfect though it may seem to the various groups concerned) is destroyed, no one can foretell exactly to what extent all prices and all wages will rise.

Experience both in the O. P. A. and the price control agencies in Canada and England has indicated clearly that in wartime there can never be absolute control over costs. And if some costs rise, no price line can be held for very long without the use of subsidies in some degree, regardless of psychological and political factors.

In all statements which I have made on the question of subsidies I have emphasized that, in my opinion, the world will not come to an end if subsidies are eliminated, nor will we be forced to tear up the Constitution if their use is continued. I have, however, continually maintained that from a practical point of view if subsidies are thrown out both wages and prices will be increased to an undetermined extent.

If the abandonment of the present wage-price balance results in a price level 10 percent higher than at present, the increase to the American consumer and the increase in national debt, for which the American taxpayer must eventually be responsible, will be substantial.

A 10-percent increase in the cost of all war materials for 1944 will, for instance, amount to over $6,000,000,000. A 10-percent increase in the cost of consumer goods and services will amount to another $9,000,000,000. If, as the result of abandonment of the present balance between prices and wages, prices go up 5 percent or 15 percent instead of 10 percent, the extent of the extra load in increased consumer prices, increased prices of war goods, and eventually in increased taxes must be adjusted accordingly.

Let me repeat that no one can tell exactly what the psychological and economic effects would be from an increase in certain food prices, resulting from an abandonment of the present food-subsidy program. I have used the modest 10-percent figures, not in any sense as a prophecy, but simply to illustrate the over-all result in dollars and cents of any increase in our present price levels.

The direct savings from the use of consumer subsidies are, as I have said, insignificant. If, however, you will accept my statement that the elimination of subsidies, for whatever reason, will result in a higher level of prices and of wages, you must also agree that the $1,500,000,000 subsidy expenditure which we are now seeking is a taxpayer's bargain.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration.
WASHINGTON, *February 11, 1944.*

SUBSIDY "SAVINGS"

Elsewhere on this page we publish a letter from Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, taking exception to an editorial which cited a bewildering range of estimates, all from O. P. A. officials, of the savings that would be achieved by the use of subsidies. We remarked in this editorial that "perhaps these estimates are made on different bases, but there is no clear indication of this." In his present reply Mr. Bowles does not explain the discrepancies among these estimates.

Mr. Bowles begins by drawing the distinction that this newspaper has itself frequently drawn between differential and flat or general subsidies. As an outstanding example of the first, he cites the subsidy on copper. This newspaper has never opposed the type of wartime subsidy on copper; it has, on the contrary, approved it. The savings effected by it are substantial. It has been estimated, however, that the vast bulk of the copper output (possibly more than 95 percent) could have been obtained by a price of 17 cents a pound. It seems somewhat unrealistic, therefore, to make the assumption that a universal price of 22 cents would have been necessary if there had been no subsidy.

Mr. Bowles' estimates of the savings to be achieved by the Administration subsidy program on food are based on several major assumptions, none of which seems to us to be warranted. The first is that a balance has already been achieved between wages and prices and must not be destroyed by a refusal to continue or expand existing food subsidies. Just what balance Mr. Bowles has in mind is not clear. Between January 1, 1941, and last November, according to official Government statistics, the cost of living increased 23.1 percent, while average hourly industrial earnings increased 45.6 percent and average weekly industrial earnings increased 70 percent. Is this the balance to which he refers?

"If the abandonment of the present wage-price balance results in a price level 10 percent higher than at present," Mr. Bowles continues, "various unfortunate results will follow." This is, of course, true. But where does Mr. Bowles get the 10-percent figure which he then proceeds to use almost as if it were an established fact, even calling it a modest figure? His implication is that if the subsidy program is abandoned prices and wages will jump by at least this amount. But it is easy to show that an abandonment of the roll-back subsidies on food would mean an increase in over-all living costs of only 1.1 percent.

Still a third assumption by Mr. Bowles, on which his whole subsidy argument depends, is that there is in fact the closest tie-up between prices and wages and that a clear, rigid future policy has been announced on this. There is in fact no such close tie-up and no such clear policy. Does Mr. Bowles mean to assert that a rise in hourly wage rates of 45.6 percent compared with a rise of 23.1 percent in living costs constitutes a balance, but that a rise in hourly wage rates of 45.6 percent compared with a rise of 24.2 percent in living costs would upset this balance? Does he mean to assert, on the other hand, that if the administration subsidy program went through there would be no more demands for increased wages? Does he think the steel workers would then withdraw their demands? Has he read the Thomas-Meany report, in which the labor representatives on the War Labor Board now argue for an additional 28.5 percent increase in wages?

Mr. Bowles writes at one point: "Under the terms of the Economic Stabilization Act, the O. P. A. and the War Labor Board were directed to stabilize prices and straight-time hourly wage rates." Here is another misconception. The act to which he refers says nothing whatever about straight-time hourly wage rates. It merely authorizes the President to "issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries." The President's general order does mention wage rates but says nothing about straight-time wage rates. Estimated straight-time wage rates have merely been taken—unrealistically, we think—as the standard of W. L. B.

This newspaper has opposed any blanket prohibition of all subsidies. It believes that certain subsidies have a minor but useful role in wartime. Administration officials only hurt the case for subsidies by overstating it. They hurt the prospects for stabilization, too, by supporting the propaganda of industrial union officials, when they imply that industrial wages have barely kept pace with living costs and that the unions would be justified in asking for very substantial wage increases if the roll-back subsidies were discontinued. Such a discontinuance would, in fact, still leave industrial wages far in the lead in the race with living costs. It is the administration's duty to publicize the actual facts and to announce a firm price and wage policy.

Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a group of very timely and inspiring verses by Mr. James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar and a veteran officer of the First World War, entitled "Win the War."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIN THE WAR

Win the War,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
This vital call rings clarion-clear
To all who have the will to hear,
To all who hold their country dear;
To every woman, child, and man,
To every American—
Win the war.

Win the War,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
This goal transcends all civil strife,
Now that the need is doubly rife,
Now that the millions fight for life;
So let each woman, child, and man,
Let every American—
Win the war.

Win the War,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The soldier fights where hell holds sway,
He bleeds thru twice twelve hours a day,
He dies with duty his aim and pay;
Then have each woman, child, and man,
Have every American—
Win the war.

Win the War,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The fronts abroad and home are one,
A shot may mean we've lost or won,
Whate'er your part be sure it's well done;
Then may each woman, child, and man,
May every American—
Win the war.

Win the War,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The slacker smites at each one's breast,
He serves himself who serves the rest,
The country of all, by all be blessed;
So must each woman, child, and man,
Must every American—
Win the war.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Fly in the Ointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of January 14, 1944:

FLY IN THE OINTMENT

James L. Fly is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

As such, he is one of seven members.

He is not the whole Commission.

He is not legally a dictator over the radio industry, or any other type of communications.

But there is a good deal of evidence to indicate that he is trying to be.

The act of Congress which created the Federal Communications Commission sets up as its purpose the regulation of the communications systems, especially radio, for the common good.

It was not the purpose of the law to create a bureaucratic dictatorship which would run the radio industry, or any other facility in the communications field.

Mr. Fly is now accused of pampering the C. I. O. American Communications Union at the expense of the national war effort.

He is accused of blocking efforts to make positive the loyalty of radio operators in the merchant marine.

He is charged with causing the transfer and later retirement of the Navy's top authority on radio.

All these, and more, are serious charges.

It now appears that there shortly will be a full airing of these allegations and that a more or less complete story of Mr. Fly's manipulations and machinations will be spread on the public record.

This cannot happen too soon, and it cannot be too thorough when it does happen. Mr. Fly has been asking for it a long time. It's about time he got it.

Those Income-Tax Blanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following timely news item which recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune:

THOSE INCOME-TAX BLANKS

Paragorically speaking from a diabolical standpoint, these new tax forms are the sooper-dooper, streamlined models of the age—with plenty of free wheeling and knee action. They constitute the combination prescription of "Dr. New Deal" and "Dr. Win-the-War." They contain all the vitamins from A to Z, including sunshine, pep, and birth control. And may act as a sedative stimulant, or laxative—depending upon the status quo of the person concerned.

The new forms set a record for instructions. They reek with them. In fact, the batch of papers you receive are so full of instructions that it is quite a job to find anything else. There are so many explanations you can't get any information for certain.

There are four pages of all-out instructions. These pages are double-decked and 8 by 11 inches, all small type and practically no margin. It does not make any difference which page you start on. You can read them backward or forward and get the same results.

Some of the computations look a whole lot like the chemical formulas I used to study when I was in school. Except the chemical formulas really had some meaning. You could read 'em and tell whether you had sulfuric acid, stump water, or the new Peruna. But in the income-tax forms you can't tell the gases from the fluid extracts.

Oh, well. It all boils down to this: If you try to figure the thing out, you're going to the bughouse; if you don't you're headed for jail. I can't tell what my address will be by March 15.

America Can Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before a meeting sponsored by the Democratic, civic, and labor groups of Seattle, Wednesday evening, February 9, 1944, at Seattle, Wash.:

There once was a man by the name of Job. Job had a lot of hard luck, and worst of all had to listen to the false consolations of three so-called friends. After it was all over, the Lord was pleased with Job and gave him twice what he had had before.

The United States in some ways is like Job. We are now going through great adversity but after it is all over, we can have nearly twice what we had before. At any rate, we can have the things I described at San Francisco last Monday and most of the things I described at Los Angeles last week. Curiously enough, the problem with us, as with Job, will be largely a spiritual one. Once we get our minds clear and our hearts pure with regard to certain fundamentals, we shall make extraordinary progress. I am not talking about human perfection; I am talking about a little more vision in our own long-range self-interest. Heretofore we have never been permitted to use our reserve of natural resources, manpower, and technological skill to the limit. Now we have no choice. There is no halfway point. It is "Pike's Peak or bust." Curiously enough, the full utilization of our resources, manpower, and skill is the formula both for our necessity and our blessing. Its application will require a great spiritual strength and in the process of developing that strength in a practical way we shall bless ourselves and the world. The problem of full utilization of all resources is first economic and second political.

The economic explanation of how civilized nations drifted into practices of scarcity goes back to the rise of factory mass production, the great corporation, vast investment, and banker control in behalf of investment security. Modern factory civilization has become highly geared up and there is always danger of tremendous overproduction unless mass purchasing power is geared up to match it. This fear can vanish only if as much imagination is put into the art of distribution as into the science of production. Many who have tried to finance a business in Wall Street have found that scarcity economics is the very heart of the system. The Wall Street financing house will demand control of the most important type of stock issue, and then will want to make sure that a loan to the new concern will not imperil, because of competition and new methods, the loans to older concerns.

Wall Street calls this system businesslike. I deny that it is businesslike, and say that it is the dead hand of the past trying to make a profit by blocking the progress of business. The day has now come when we must release the business system to act through increased production for the benefit of all the people. Many businessmen now understand this as they couldn't have understood it in 1929.

I have asked several friends who have visited Russia during the past 18 months what we could learn from Russia to make our system work better. Invariably the answer has come back, "Give our workers more incentive, more free enterprise, more initiative. Hold the profit motive out to them in the same way as the Russians." Don Nelson tells me that he visited a number of towns in eastern Russia and western Siberia which 3 years ago contained less than 200,000 people, but which today number from 600,000 to a million. There he saw steel furnaces as large and well-equipped as any we have in the United States. There he saw production goals scientifically set for different groups of workers. There he saw large cash prizes given to the men who went furthest beyond their quotas. The Russians can't understand how we can get along in the United States without giving our workers incentives of this kind. Nearly everyone in Russia feels he is directly working for the welfare of the whole nation. He has no fear whatever that he is being exploited for the sole profit of the management or stockholders.

Another friend, a Latin American who is living in Russia at the present time, wrote me under the date of last November, "What you

in the United States preach on Sunday the Russians do here every day."

That the Russians could go so far in the past 20 years and evoke such an extraordinary response from the people in time of stress is the greatest indictment I know of the scarcity economics as practiced by those who believe that profit and free enterprise are only for the few.

We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States. It was made for Russia and not for us. But the system of rewarding men for inventing improvements in their own jobs is already well established in some progressive American industries. Once the management and the workers learn to trust each other and to work together, it is proved that they can get a spectacular increase of output. Both Russia and America are showing the advantages of good engineering. Under free competition we may hope that the less progressive companies in America will be obliged to catch up to the best practice. The problem is whether we can modernize the backward areas in our present system so as to make it stand from top to bottom for full use of resources, full use of skills, full use of inventions, without the bottlenecks created by cartels, unfair banking control, unwise labor restrictions, or unenlightened farm leadership. As we face the future, the leaders of the great pressure groups must ask themselves continually, "Is my pressure group in its demands helping the general good? Is my corporation in its program doing what it can to bring about full employment? Or are we just trying to get a rake-off by obstructing full activity? Are we fighting for the biggest piece of the pie as it is, or are we also trying to increase the present size of the whole pie?"

One aspect of modern scarcity economics is the belief that men will work only when they are hungry and that they will stop work when they have enough money to keep their bellies full for 3 or 4 days. This cynical attitude of exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few has no place in modern civilization. The moment the many are taught to read and write, to build better homes, to eat better food, to see an occasional movie, to listen to the radio, desire is created and markets are enlarged. People want more and are willing to work to get what they want. This increased longing of the people for light and abundance is going on at an increased tempo all over the world.

The modern Russians, as well as enlightened employers everywhere, have never believed in the keep them hungry, keep them in darkness system of economics. When they evacuated workers by the hundreds of thousands from Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, and Stalingrad, to escape the advance of Hitler's armies, they evacuated the artists along with the workers. As a result, you find today the finest Russian drama and concerts in towns with names which not one of us in a hundred in the United States can pronounce or locate on the map. The Russian art is for the people, not merely for those who can afford to pay $5 The Russians know, and we know, that man cannot live by bread alone. We have been accustomed to think that it was the United States that was prepared to give all men food, education, and an opportunity to work and live in freedom. Let us live up to our own national ideal. Once all of us wholeheartedly adopt the doctrine of economic abundance instead of economic scarcity, we can have nearly twice as many of the good things of life as we had before. Incidentally, it's the only way in which those who have can hang on to what they've got. We must pull together for a glorious future. We must not pull at cross-purposes until a time of dark despair is upon us and archangels rather than ordinary men will be needed to get us out of our mess.

One serious danger of unemployment, for example, is in those industries producing machine tools and machinery for big construction jobs. These industries did a marvelous job preparing us for a magnificent war effort. Their services will be needed all over the world—in China, Russia, India, all Latin America, and Africa, and in the United States, building flood-control, irrigation, and power projects, building roads, and equipping factories. At the end of the war we shall have a tremendous surplus of these goods and services. The whole world has a great hunger for them. The question is to discover some sound method by which the world can pay for them. Our young men shall open undreamed of frontiers which will unleash tremendous purchasing power to keep the world economy revolving for a half century. But these dreams will not come true unless the world can discover some practical method of paying the United States. The basic method of payment is, of course, through goods. If we keep our people fully employed, we shall require fully twice as much in the way of imports in 1949 as in 1929 in order to keep our factories running. Furthermore, from the standpoint of national security we must purchase certain strategic materials. The United States must build up large permanent stock piles of those materials of which this country has been proved to be short in time of war and which can be preserved without loss. Mr. William Batt, of the War Production Board, developed this idea in a very interesting way in a recent speech of his in Chicago. Such stock-piling as outlined by Mr. Batt need not concern domestic producers of these materials because Congress would hold the key until it had declared an acute emergency.

Russia wants machine tools. All right, let Russia pay in terms of manganese and platinum, of which she has a surplus. China wants an irrigation system. She has more tungsten than she needs for her own use. Let her pay in terms of tungsten. Persia wants a power project. She can pay in terms of oil which we can store in underground reservoirs. Chile wants to build some airports. Let her send us copper and nitrates. There are at least 20 strategic materials of which we are seriously short in the United States as a result of our tremendous war effort.

One of the best ways to make sure that there will not be another war is to build up in all the peaceful countries of the world such large supplies of the materials of which each is short that no friendly nation anywhere in the world will ever be caught helpless by sudden attack. The manganese, the copper, tungsten, platinum, oil, etc., will be of great value to us in terms of security and real wealth. The export of these machine tools, equipment, and construction services will greatly increase the wealth and production power of friendly nations all over the world. If this is properly done the result will be in 15 years to draw the world together by highway and airway so that every man in truth will be the brother of every other man. We shall appreciate economic interdependence as we never have before. We shall know that a prosperous Asia helps to make America prosperous. We shall know that the prosperity of the poorest is of great significance to the most well-to-do. It has to be that way in an economy of abundance. It is only in an economy of scarcity that the few can sit on top and scorn the misery of those below.

After the last war several groups of hard-headed businessmen decided that they would make profits for themselves without regard to harmonizing their individual activities with the needs of our foreign economic policy. One group did its best to expand its sales of goods and services to the world. They made money. Another group loaned money to foreigners and sold bonds to the Americans. They made money. The bonds sold by the second group furnished the money which paid for the goods sold by the first group. Europe got the goods and the services without paying us what she should have paid for the simple reason that we made it impossible for Europe to pay in the only way she could pay. Because Europe couldn't pay, the unsuspecting investor in the United States got bonds that often turned out to be worthless. The hard-headed businessmen made their profit but they helped destroy the general welfare not only of the United States but of the entire world.

The same type of so-called hard-headed businessmen will exist after this World War as after the First World War. Some of them will have the same kind of unsound finance to sell. We must not let them lead the world astray again. We must not let such men lead us headlong toward another world-wide depression and world war No. 3. The best break on such men will come from other businessmen who see the world picture more clearly. Such men will help this country to rise to abundant prosperity and in that way will give other countries a greater chance to sell their goods to us. The trading of the United States goods and services for huge stock piles which can be unlocked in times of national emergency is one way of making sure that we get paid for our exports. Another way is to encourage tourist travel.

The furnishing of our goods, services, and engineers for the building of great construction jobs all over the world is only a small part of our task of making full employment here in the United States. The big job is to supply a standard of living to the 135,000,000 people in the United States which is at least 40 percent higher than it ever was prior to the war. That's the greatest single contribution we can make to greater foreign trade We must have no business booms, no business busts.

We want efficient planning but without regimentation Our chief need is the green and red light kind of regulation. We want carefully designed rules of the road which will not block traffic but release it.

In order to get full employment, together with the maximum of free enterprise and profits for the many instead of the few, it will be necessary after the war to use our taxation system for economic objectives much more skilfully than we have in the past. There is just one basis for judgment of our taxation in the post-war period and that is, "Will this system of taxation over a period of years give us the full employment of people producing the kinds of things which the people of the United States most need and want?"

Undoubtedly we shall have to continue with heavy, steeply graduated taxes on personal incomes after the war. But in the case of corporations it would seem to be wise policy to tax in such a way as to force corporate reserves either into the building of plant and equipment or into distribution as dividends. Huge corporate reserves, beyond legitimate business needs, which are held out of use are subtracted from the purchasing power of the Nation. In a time of unemployment each billion dollars stored up as savings means at least half a million men unemployed for a year. Unemployed men mean less goods produced and a smaller market. By our taxation system we must encourage the small and rapidly growing enterprise because such enterprises are the seed-bed of the employment of the future. But corporations which have lived far beyond the life of the founding father and which have huge corporate reserves and which no longer expand, represent the dead hand of the past. They should be prodded awake

by the right kind of taxation system so that they will find incentive for putting their money to work instead of letting it lie idle.

To get full utilization of all resources for the benefit of all the people, the most important single economic readjustment is to do away with internal trade barriers. I am referring to those monopolistic practices on the part of some manufacturers, bankers, labor unions, doctors, and farm organizations which serve their own welfare without regard to the welfare of the unorganized. I don't say that each member of each of these groups deliberately practices scarcity economics. But enough of them do it so there is continually sand in the bearings of the economic machine. There is enough sand so that 10,000,000 families are continually living in poor houses with inadequate clothing, without enough to eat. Except in time of war, 10,000,000 families, whether living on the land or in the city, are given an opportunity to produce only about one-tenth as much as their more fortunate fellows. The war has demonstrated what they can do for themselves, and for the entire Nation, provided only these families are given an opportunity to work without the continuous imposition of bottlenecking controls.

It is not necessary to break up the big organizations which have deliberately produced bottlenecks. But it is necessary that in time of peace there be created a moral climate, backed up by a big stick in the Department of Justice, to convince every monopoly group that in the future its welfare can be served only by that all-out production which serves the welfare of all.

Everyone must recognize that it is sound Government policy, even in terms of the large monopolistic groups themselves, for Government to stimulate the economic activity of the weak on behalf of abundance economics while restraining the economic freedom of the strong to practice scarcity for temporary self-profit. There is a growing and vigorous support for this position within industry itself.

The experience of Russia during the past 10 years and in the United States during the past 2 years has demonstrated what a tremendous job of production can be done once the monopolistic bottlenecks are effectively broken. In the investment of money, in determining volume of output, in setting prices, in bargaining for wages and hours of labor, the decision made must be the one which best promotes full employment, full production, and full consumption.

The leaders of the respective groups must become experts in determining how the activities of any particular group are affected by the public good and how they affect the public good. When the respective pressure groups are led by men who know that the size of the whole pie is more important than the size of the slice they want for themselves, our fear of bread lines and soup kitchens will be largely over. Then every worker in the United States will have the creative satisfaction of doing his part in helping the common cause.

In many other parts of the world there is a small landowning military clique composing 1 percent of the population sitting on top of the pile, exploiting the rest of the population, part of whom are workers and part farmers. The task of the century of the common man is to bring these oppressed people into the market. As their productivity and consumptive power are gradually increased, they will within a few years create for the post-war world new frontiers of unimagined richness—new frontiers of peaceful abundance. It is up to us in the United States to demonstrate by our own example the tremendous productivity and happiness of a general welfare economy. Latin America will follow our example faster than we think, and as she follows it her economy will benefit ours and our economy will benefit hers. Our good-neighbor policy should make it possible for Latin-American countries to get the good points in our experience and to avoid such mistakes as we have made. Speaking here in Seattle, I may say the same applies to our relations with China and Siberia. Here at the port which is the closest of all American ports to the Far East, it is important to mention that general-welfare economics and modern technology will make the Far East a market of such vast proportions that eventually there will be more trade across the Pacific Ocean than there once was across the Atlantic. Private enterprise is dependent upon these broadening markets for its very survival.

The political aspect of getting full utilization of all our powers is more important in some ways even than the economic. By politics I mean the mechanism whereby the people, themselves, thinking in terms of the needs and the welfare of all of the people, make clear their will to the State legislatures and to Congress so that the lawmakers will serve the people more than they do the high-pressure groups which are continually selling the people down the river. The people, standing for just one thing, namely "the maximum use of all our resources in the service of the general welfare," must guide Congress to stand for that objective at all times and to resist all pressure groups except the one big pressure group—the general welfare pressure group. In action this means the constituents will have the good sense to reelect Congressmen more for their national statesmanship than for their service to their local groups which are a minority even in the particular congressional district.

The general welfare pressure group must believe in democratic planning and must engage in it at the precinct level, the county level, the State level, the regional level. Wall Street and the Wall Street stooges say that such planning is un-American. I say that it is only by such planning that we can preserve and further develop the American way of life. It is only by such planning that we can prevent American Fascists from taking us over. When I refer to American Fascists I mean those who believe that Wall Street comes first and the country second and who are willing to go to any length through press, radio, and demagog to keep Wall Street safely sitting on top of the country. American Fascists at this very moment are desperately striving to control the delegates to the county conventions so that they may in turn control the delegates to the State and national conventions of both parties.

Operating on the precinct level, the people thoroughly aroused can at any time they wish throw the American Fascists out of control. They can put the man above the dollar and march straight up from the precinct to the county to the State and to the national convention. They can see that the right men are nominated for Congress and the Senate. They can see that the Congressmen and Senators after they reach Washington are kept informed and eager to respond to Main Street instead of to Wall Street. Dollar principles are all right insofar as they serve human principles, but when they fail in such service they have no meaning except to American Fascists.

The issue is very simple. The question is whether the people, keeping themselves fully informed, can operate through democratic government to keep the national interest above the interest of Wall Street. Or will the old-line politicians, financed from Wall Street, again succeed in making Washington the servant of Wall Street. What we need in this country is a new partnership in which Main Street and Wall Street, as well as Washington, will put nothing ahead of all-out production in our America of tomorrow.

The people can come out on top provided they remain continually awake and really believe they can have a higher standard of security and a higher standard of living and if they will not let up in their fight until they get what they want and must have. They must hold their Congressman responsible for getting that higher standard of living. They must make him feel responsible at all times to the general welfare and above everything to the principle of complete utilization of all resources, all manpower, all skills, in the service of the common man in his search for jobs for all. In this fight of the people it is quite possible for those who control the big corporations to gum up our system so that it cannot work. It is possible for an incipient American fascism to precipitate a depression which will defeat all the desires of labor and government and most of business. Personally, I think they are too enlightened today to do a thing of that kind. Statements by the presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers indicate that they realize there has been a great change in the moral as well as the business climate. Thousands of businessmen subscribe wholeheartedly to the principle of full utilization. And so I am sure that the managers controlling our great corporations will not deliberately produce a situation where there are 20,000,000 men unemployed. Nevertheless the people will smash their system unless they are willing to furnish such active leadership in wholehearted cooperation with labor and government as will prevent serious unemployment.

We are in for a profound revolution, partly as a result of the aftermath of two great wars and partly as a result of 150 years of modern technology and democratic thinking about the rights and duties of man. Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be gradual and bloodless instead of sudden and bloody. We believe it can be gradual and bloodless if the makers of public opinion, if the politicians, if the pressure group leaders will only influence their millions of followers on behalf of the public good instead of regional and class prejudices. It would be simple if light could come down from heaven, but we all know that God helps those who help themselves. The people themselves will have to educate their leaders on behalf of the general welfare, measuring every article in the press, every statement over the radio, every act of Congress by the one yardstick, "Does this help use all our resources, employ all our men, develop all our skills?" If the people everywhere hold these judgments up as a measure, we shall gradually find this principle of "goodness" permeating our national life like a leaven. In no other climate can there be profits for our private enterprise economy. We must fight with all our might to do this thing. Otherwise we shall have a bloody revolution and slavery. Time is pressing. Victory will bring problems on us so thick and fast that we must be prepared to make instant and correct decisions.

Today we can take the necessary steps. Tomorrow will be too late. We have the resources, both material and human. We have the machines, the tools, and the skills. We have evidence of new attitudes with greater vision. We have a hundred billion dollars of savings. All we need to do is to press forward in confidence, believing in the complete use of all our resources. That confidence must come first; once we have it, the many specific actions on many specific fronts will all add up to a total picture that makes sense.

But if we do not press forward toward total peace in the same complete spirit as we have pressed toward total war, the $100,000,000,000 will melt like snow in April and the machines and skills will become a mockery. I can't overemphasize the time factor.

We must have the full employment, total use peacetime system ready to begin its march the moment the wartime system slackens. Halfway measures will produce chaos, and a democracy which is afflicted with pressure-group sickness does not have the vitality to stand that chaos. There is one yardstick by which we can judge those who would lead us in the future. Are they or are they not in favor of using our resources to the utmost? When they oppose this or that specific program, are they ready with a concrete alternative to achieve the same end? It is the job of the common man to ask these questions again and again in the years ahead.

Job, before he could enter into his period of abundance when he was to be twice as rich, had to go through his time of misery and then have a change of heart toward God. We are not yet through our misery but I have faith that we will have sufficient change of heart in all sections of the country and among all groups of our people to correct our pressure group sickness. We are eager to save ourselves. It was never easier, and it was never more urgent. If all groups know how vitally important is a complete full-use peace system, if we put the same energy into the peace effort as the war effort, all the rest will be easy. We are the hope of the world. We must set our own house in order so that our light may shine as a comfort and a beacon to the whole world.

Red Cross War Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 31, 1944.

To the Rabbis of America:

Your help in connection with our 1943 war fund was invaluable. The Jewish people of America have always responded loyally and generously to our Red Cross appeal. Now, as our 1944 war fund appeal approaches, we confidently count on the continuance of this response.

Your local Red Cross will share with you the details of the 1944 war fund in your community. I earnestly request that you join again in the Nation-wide observance of Red Cross Sabbath on Friday evening, February 25, or Saturday, February 26. Christian churches will observe Sunday, February 27.

The Red Cross is the embodiment of human mercy. To keep it at full strength you will doubtless be glad to take occasion on Red Cross Sabbath to stress again our world-wide human need, and will urge on your people the privilege of responding generously through their local Red Cross chapters. Their services as well as their funds will be needed during March.

Our opportunity and responsibility exceeds all the heavy demands of earlier years. However the war goes, our task will grow heavier, not lighter. Even after the conflict ends, the Red Cross will have a continuing obligation to ex-servicemen and their dependents as well as to our armed forces.

Faithfully yours,

NORMAN H. DAVIS.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Frank B. Keefe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] at Cincinnati, on February 12, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster and my fellow Americans, I esteem it a rare privilege to be permitted to join with you tonight in honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln. This gathering is symbolic of the spirit of a free people exercising even in time of great national crisis those fundamental freedoms that are inherent in our system of constitutional government. I address you as fellow Americans because in the present crisis and in the battles that lie ahead, we are first of all Americans.

While these meetings, being held throughout the country to honor the memory of Lincoln, are generally held under the auspices of Republican organizations, I am profoundly convinced that there are untold thousands of men and women who may have heretofore been affiliated with the Democratic Party or who have been pleased to consider themselves independent voters, who are joining with us and swelling the ranks of Republican organizations throughout the country. We are all possessed of a passionate and indomitable determination to see to it that the forces of new dealism and radicalism, which have steered our Nation to the brink of planned state socialism shall be driven from power wherever they may be. We welcome these additions to the ranks of those who believe in constitutional government and the preservation of the American way of life. We are especially pleased to note the increasing and sustained interest of the women of this country in the vexatious problems of government which so vitally concern them. The women of this country will play an important part in determining the policies that will guide our Nation in the perilous days that lie ahead.

We gather here tonight freely and without fear or intimidation. We are Americans living in free America. Despite the necessary curtailment of some of our peacetime rights and privileges resulting from the necessities of the war effort, we are still free to assemble to discuss our common problems without fear and to petition our Government for redress of any grievances we may have. As Americans, we enjoy even today the largest measure of liberty and freedom of any people in the world. We are proud of our heritage. As Republicans, we are loyal to our country and its traditions and are determined to preserve, protect, and defend our way of life. Lincoln was a Republican. I am proud that I am honored to represent in the Congress of the United States the district in which the Republican Party was born.

On March 20, 1854, at the city of Ripon, Wis., a group of militant citizens, aroused over the burning question of slavery, met and with high resolve determined to organize a new political party. The men there assembled were Americans of various political faiths. Confronted with a confusion of thought quite similar to that which exists in the United States today, they determined the necessity for full and complete mobilization of the forces of the United States that were opposed to the extension and continuation of slavery. They adopted the name Republican for the new party. Because their program was sound, they enlisted the aid of Horace Greeley, one of the great editors of the day. With his tremendous influence, the new party was presented to the Nation, and on June 6, 1854, the State convention at Jackson, Mich., christened the infant party. Offers of help and encouragement came from many other States. It was the spontaneous action of a determined people. On June 17, 1856, the first national convention of the Republican Party met in Philadelphia and nominated its candidates for President and Vice President. The subsequent history of the Republican Party is academic. The dominant role played by Abraham Lincoln in its formative years needs no amplification. The party has endured through victory and defeat, through war and peace, as the vehicle through which citizens of these United States may express their views and attitudes on great public questions.

When Lincoln entered the White House he took with him the spirit and hopes of the common man. He knew and understood their problems. He faced the perils that threatened the complete destruction of the Union without fear and without vacillation. He knew that right was right and wrong was wrong. He never compromised with justice. The presence of human slavery in a nation dedicated to the cause of freedom for all people had burned itself into his very soul. With knowledge that he was right, he never wavered during those critical years. He was no opportunist. Despite his profound grief because of the devastating effect of civil war, he offered any honorable alternative that embodied preservation of the Union and the abolition of slavery. He was a simple man of the people. Protected by a rough exterior, his heart and soul radiated charity for all mankind. He never abused his contemporary critics. He charmed them by the pure force of his simple faith and logic. When defeat on the battle front appeared imminent, and when Cabinet officers and generals lost hope, an unquenchable faith inspired him to carry on to final victory. It is small wonder, therefore, that on this anniversary of his birth, in the midst of another great world conflagration, worried and confused people gather to discuss their common problems and to receive inspiration in the hope that we may be able to solve these problems with the charity, faith, courage, and determination that so characterized his life.

Today, the Republican Party is a virile, active, aggressive, patriotic force in the Nation. We are marching on undaunted and unafraid. We are determined to win this war at the earliest possible moment and with the least expenditure of blood and treasure. The Republican Party represents the true hopes of millions of Americans who are determined that the wasters and saboteurs of our system of constitutional government shall be driven from public office at the next November election.

In the midst of the gravest crisis in history, when the very life of the Republic is at stake, we again find the same gang of New Deal political racketeers agitating for another so-called draft of the indispensable man for a fourth term. They are being actively aided by the British press, the foreign recipients of lend-lease, the Communist Party and the Committee for Political Action of the C. I. O. They have loudly proclaimed the necessity for another 4 years of the New Deal. The fourth-term candidate says little publicly and tries to create the impression that he is too busy with the war to even think of politics. Let me assure you, however, that Harry Hopkins, Dave Niles, Benny Cohen, Charlie Michelson, Judge Rosenman, and Felix Frankfurter, who after all are the real inner cabinet

planners, are busy as termites boring in all directions in a frantic effort to hang on to their badly damaged and whittled scow of state. They have decided to toss the slogan New Deal overboard. The President has so announced. He suggested the slogan for the New Deal Party—"Win the war."

Let it be understood here and now that the President of the United States as a candidate for a fourth term has no monopoly on the slogan "Win the war." This slogan was adopted long ago by all the people of America. I conceive it to be a bit of cheap political maneuvering on the part of the fourth-term candidate to seek to arrogate to himself the authorship of such a slogan. I do not question the fact that the fourth-term candidate wants to rid himself of the stigma of New Dealism as a slogan in the coming campaign. We serve notice upon him and those connected with his campaign that he cannot fool the American people into the belief that he or the New Deal Party have any monopoly on the slogan "Win the war." If I were to suggest a slogan for Americans and all political parties, it would be "Win the war and win the peace." As a Republican, I would add a further slogan "Preserve constitutional government."

I warn the American people not to be fooled by any apparent indication that the fourth-term candidate has turned completely away from his old gang of leftist advisers. The same gang are still there. Hopkins is still the fair-haired boy. Madam Perkins is still there. Eleanor is still there, occasionally. You get the real facts when you recall that at the $100-per-plate Jackson Day orgy, recently held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington Vice President WALLACE loudly declaimed on the wonders and glories of the New Deal and again projected it along with his other visionary plans as the basis of the milk-and-honey Utopia he sees for the future under continued New Deal guidance. No, my friends, the New Deal, with its good and its bad, is very much alive. Despite all statements to the contrary, its officeholders and beneficiaries are more busy right now planning for the fourth term, pulling all wires in that direction, than they are with the problem of war or government.

My fellow Americans, we Republicans have no illusions as to our fundamental obligation at the present time; we must rise above the tangled, snarled, and confused mass of crimination and recrimination engendered by conflicting social and economic philosophies and above all dedicate ourselves to the task at hand. That task is to win the war. That task means that we must all go to work and keep at work. That task means that some of the New Deal planning for future social and economic changes must be laid aside. Every obstacle to the war effort must be removed. Every dollar of expenditure must be dedicated to the task of winning the war. This means continued and sustained work. This means continued and sustained sacrifice. I mean work and sacrifice for all the people—not merely for the courageous men and women on the battle fronts. It means eternal vigilance behind the lines on the home front to see to it that even in the face of the necessities of war those who for years have sought the dissolution and destruction of our system of government shall not be permitted to use this emergency as a vehicle and a cloak to enable them to carry out their nefarious schemes for a planned economy along socialistic or communistic lines. We must be vigilant to see to it that when we have won military victory we shall not have destroyed our system of government and liberties that are inherent under it. I am not one who condemns every aim and attitude of the New Deal. Many pieces of legislation have been written in the past 10 years which have been in the public interest. It is the secret, undisclosed but nonetheless clearly apparent purpose to set up a planned economy under a system of gradualist development that causes us such great concern.

I wonder sometimes how the American people can continue to think as clearly and dispassionately as they do when overwhelmed by the constant barrage emanating from prejudiced columnists and radio commentators, who, instead of giving people the truth, many times have poured out reams of distorted and prejudicial misinformation. I am amazed that the American people—befuddled by the confusion of rationing, price control, wage stabilization, job freezing, subsidies, agricultural problems, labor disputes, strikes, income-tax returns, questionnaires, regulations, bulletins, and many other perplexing and irritating questions—are able to maintain their equilibrium and continue with their respective occupations and view these problems with the calmness that we find inherent in the thinking of the majority of our people back home. Why can we not have some clear-cut clarification of some of these problems? Why has not the administration given us a clear, unequivocal, and honest labor policy? It is nothing short of criminal that in the face of the absolute necessity for continued production of the implements of war thousands of workers are now out on strike because of interunion jurisdictional disputes that in no way involve wages, hours, or working conditions. This intolerable situation which the fourth-term candidate has made possible by his failure to realistically grapple with the problem makes those of us whose sons are at the various fighting fronts see red.

Congress has tried time and again to deal with this problem, but our efforts have been repeatedly balked by the Chief Executive, whose desire for continuation in office is apparently so great that he will not face the facts. If the administration had adopted a national labor policy when we entered the war and had set up one coordinated agency to deal with this question instead of some 25 different Federal agencies muddling with the labor problem, I have no doubt that the wonderful record which has been generally made by labor in the production effort would not have been marred so frequently by these intolerable and indefensible strikes in vital war plants. Labor itself can now clearly see that this administration has utterly failed to realistically, firmly, and decisively deal with this problem. I state again that if we are to win this war, we must all go to work and stay at work.

Why was it necessary to fool the people and give them the misinformation which has been passed out in relation to the subject of soldier voting? Can it be possible that the overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives can be entirely wrong, and only the President right on this question? There is not a single Member of Congress who does not want every man and woman in the armed services to vote. We insist upon the soldier voting, and resent the efforts of certain politicians who are trying desperately to vote the soldier. We insist upon their having the right to vote in primaries as well as general elections. The President would limit this right merely to general elections and thus disenfranchise the members of the armed services from voting in the highly important primary elections, which in many States determine who the Representatives in Congress shall be. We have insisted that the members of the armed services have the right to vote in State and local elections. The President's proposal would disenfranchise the members of the armed services from voting in State and local elections. We have insisted that the members of the armed services be permitted to vote a legal ballot that will be counted when returned to the local election boards.

Under the President's plan, no State could count the type of ballot suggested by the President. The propaganda agencies of the administration have attempted to make the people believe that the majority in the Congress were trying to deny members of the armed services their right to vote. It is to the everlasting credit of the House of Representatives that its membership, in the face of the President's vicious message, stood up courageously and were counted publicly on this issue. It is to their everlasting credit that they have refused to be a party to the clear-cut attempt to control this next election through the medium of a short bobtail ballot as proposed by the President. I say to you, my friends, that when the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress, representing all shades of political opinion, speak as was indicated by the vote in the House on this issue, it is unthinkable that we can all be wrong and only the fourth-term candidate be right.

Why has the attitude of Congress toward consumer subsidies and cost of living been so grossly misrepresented by the administration? Let me give you some facts:

I have never met a single Member of Congress who is not terribly concerned over the subject of inflation. Some of the New Deal bureaucrats who are speaking most loudly about the attitude of Congress had better examine their own personal situations first. Take the case of Mr. Fred Vinson. He was formerly a judge and drew a salary of $12,500 a year. The President created by Executive order the position of Economic Stabilizer. He appointed Mr. Vinson to this job and fixed the salary at $15,000 per year. Mr. Vinson has the power to say whether any wage increases shall be given to the working people of America. Thus, Mr. Vinson received a raise in pay of $2,500 a year. That is not all. Under Public Law No. 49, passed last year by this Democratic Congress over our protests, he and every other employee of the Government service was given a so-called cost-of-living bonus. In the case of Judge Vinson it amounts to $628.32 a year. Thus Mr. Vinson stepped from a job at $12,500 a year into a job as Economic Stabilizer with a salary amounting to $15,628.32 a year. Now, I am not complaining because Judge Vinson gets this salary. The fact is, however, that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. He has been telling the country that an 8-cent-per-hour increase in the wages of railroad laboring men who earned an average of about 57 cents an hour in 1942 would cause inflation. The point I want to make is—what do you conceive the morale of the railroad workers must be when they learn that their demand for an 8-cent-an-hour increase was denied by an Economic Stabilizer who had just received a wage increase of $3,128.32 a year?

Take the case of Chester Bowles, recently appointed head of O. P. A. He had been receiving $7,138.32 as State administrator of O. P. A. in Connecticut. In his new job his salary is $12,000 per year, plus $628.32 cost-of-living bonus. Thus he received a raise in pay of $5,500. I haven't heard either of these gentlemen suggest that they ought not to accept the salary raises because they were inflationary. Follow on down the line with each and every one of these high-salaried gentlemen who are so piously speaking about the possibilities of uncontrolled inflation. Not a word from any of them. None have ever refused to take their pay raises.

The point is that this administration, by Public Law No. 49, passed last year, raised the pay of 3,000,000 people in Government service some 15 percent to 21.6 percent and not a word was said about inflation, even though hundreds of thousands of salaries are in brackets from five to fifteen thousand a year. To raise the wages of the nonoper-

ating group of railroad employees 8 cents an hour, even though they had agreed through collective bargaining with their employers, was determined to be an inflationary movement. To me, this just does not make sense and is typical of the economic planning and thinking of the New Deal. If one act is inflationary, certainly the other is. If one pay raise should be denied, certainly the other should. Simple justice would demand nothing less. It would come with much better grace, it appears to me, from these highly paid executives who are enjoying these tremendous increases in income, if they would say to the American people, "We refuse to take these great increases in income because we want the burden of fighting inflation to be borne with equality by all the people."

It should be perfectly obvious to the fixed-income and low-salaried groups of this country that the hidden part of this plan is to keep them satisfied without substantial wage increases to meet the increased cost of living by promising a roll-back food subsidy. Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, admits that this so-called roll-back food subsidy would in reality amount to about 3 cents per day. I am just as conscious of the disastrous effects of inflation as any person can be. There must be some equality, however, in this picture. The burden of curbing inflation should be placed upon the shoulders of Government workers and Government bureaucrats as well as upon the shoulders of the public generally, especially the low and fixed-income groups of this country. To attempt to satisfy them with talk of a roll-back subsidy that at the top figure would amount to about 3 cents a day in exchange for a much-needed increase in wages to meet increased cost of living is an insult to the intelligence of the wage earners and fixed-income groups in this country.

Why have we not been able to bring some order out of the chaos and confusion of O. P. A. regulations? Why is it necessary to confuse and confound the people of America with this amazing barrage of questionnaires, rules, and regulations that are changed and amended so frequently that no one knows when he is complying with the last order? Little bureaucrats, swelled with pride and power, are issuing orders that affect the lives and welfare of the people of this country only to capriciously revoke them or amend them with unlimited addenda until even a Philadelphia lawyer would find it difficult to keep up with the continued changes. Neither business, management, labor, nor agriculture knows from one day to the next just what to expect. Let me illustrate:

A farm woman buys a bushel of feed corn from a retail feed dealer in my town. She paid $1.35. A week later she bought another bushel of feed corn from another dealer and paid $1.55. She could not understand this variation in price. Disturbed over the situation, she went to the local rationing board with a simple question, "What is the ceiling on feed corn in this county?" The rationing officials being themselves overwhelmed with the voluminous mass of regulations and orders issued by O. P. A., were unable to answer that simple question. She was advised that they would refer her question to the officials of the district rationing office. She was told to come back in a few days, when they would perhaps have an answer to her simple question. When she returned a week later, the secretary of the local rationing board handed her a letter from the district rationing authority. This letter was in answer to her question. What sort of answer did she get? The district office of O. P. A., is supposed to have all of the knowledge and apparently they were also stumped by this very difficult question. They advised that in substance the answer to the simple question, "What is the ceiling price on feed corn in this county?" involved a great many factors that would have to be determined before a correct answer could be given.

First, was the dealer from whom she purchased the feed corn a wholesaler or a retailer? Second, was the dealer located in a primary or secondary market? Third, what was the carload freight rate on feed corn from Minneapolis to point of delivery? Fourth, what were the handling charges to get the feed corn into the distributor's place of business? Fifth, what was the moisture content of the corn? Etc., etc. Imagine the mental confusion and disgust of this good farm woman when she read this letter coming from an agency of her government. We know of few, if any, real Americans who do not thoroughly believe in the necessity for rationing and the necessity for price control. An overwhelming number of Republicans in the House voted for rationing and for price control as instruments essential to the fight against uncontrolled inflation. To charge that Republicans have been derelict in their duty in this fight against inflation is to state an untruth. The new chairman of the Democratic National Committee in a recent speech at Birmingham, Ala., made this astounding charge:

"The opposition must answer to the charge of making capital of the inconveniences necessitated by such things as rationing and price control. It has sought to turn the laborer against the farmer and the farmer against the city dweller."

Imagine this statement from the new political master mind of the New Deal. It is simply false. We have never complained of rationing or price control as such. We have denounced the administration of these programs and the arrogant failure of O. P. A. to comply with plain mandates from the Congress. We have denounced the little communistic bureaucrats who are to be found in the legal bureaus and economic agencies of O. P. A. and who are more determined to control little business and profits than they ever were to control prices or rationing.

The Republican Party need make no appeal to the American people in reference to the inconveniences necessitated by such things as rationing and price control. The great wave of resentment that has arisen spontaneously from all classes of our people is apparently worrying the New Deal. Most of the new blood in O. P. A., many of whom are trying to do a good job, are constantly apologizing for the action of their predecessors in office. I am sure that we do not need to appeal to the thousands of small businessmen who have been ruined by the capricious and unlawful regulations and orders of O. P. A. We do not have to appeal to the millions of citizens who have been shamefully mistreated by the unnecessary dictatorial actions of the O. P. A. We do not have to appeal to the farmers, the stockmen and cattle raisers, the butchers and food processors who have felt the whiplash of unnecessary New Deal bureaucracy. No, Mr. Hannegan, your attempt at Birmingham and any other similar attempts to smear the Republican Party on this issue is bound to boomerang. Consider for a moment the last part of the statement quoted from the chairman of the New Deal National Committee, where he says: "It has sought to turn the laborer against the farmer and the farmer against the city dweller." Coming from the chief political spokesman of the New Deal, this statement is indeed pitiful. No party in the history of this Nation has ever stirred up such violent hatreds as has the New Deal. Labor has been stirred up against management. Labor has been stirred up against the farmer. Consumers have been arrayed against the producers. I say to you, my fellow Americans, if this is the best argument the new political genius of the New Deal can muster in justification of their miserable failures on the domestic front, then indeed their fourth-term campaign is sure to collapse when the pitiless spotlight of publicity and analysis is turned upon it.

Amazing as it may be, these little bureaucrats that get control of a little agency (and we have thousands of them in Washington and scattered from coast to coast throughout the country) are all jealous of their own prerogatives. They want to build up as big an agency as they can. Their pay under Civil Service rules depends, among other things, upon the number of employees under their direction. So the slogan seems to be "Start in a small way and build and build, employ and employ and employ, and spend and spend and spend." I say to you, my fellow Americans, that until we get a house-cleaning from top to bottom, I see no relief in sight.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, I certainly am cognizant of the desperate situation that faces our Nation in its fiscal policies. One thing must be understood. We are in this war to the bitter end and we must spend whatever is necessary to see it through to final victory. The New Deal planners, however, are not satisfied with confining their activities to the direction of the war effort. The little, self-seeking planners that hide in the background have one scheme after another designed to catch votes through the expenditure of untold billions of dollars for the promotion of new socialistic plans. If we are to continue as a nation we must think courageously and honestly of the financial problems that confront us. The national debt at the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1945, according to the President's own budget, will be at least $257,000,000,000.

It is freely predicted that the national debt at the end of the war effort will be in excess of $300,000,000,000. No one can predict with certainty just where it will end. Assuming a national debt of even $300,000,000,000 and an average interest rate of 2 percent, the interest charge and the personnel charge for servicing that debt will be at least six and one-half billion dollars. This sum must be raised in taxes, together with all other funds necessary to maintain our Civil and Military Establishment. This will require a national income of tremendous proportions in the post-war period. To insure that national income will require that our factories work at full capacity with full employment. This will necessitate a tremendous consumption of consumers' goods and durable materials. It is expected that in order to stimulate the purchase of consumer goods at the end of the war the people of America will seek to redeem their savings in the form of War bonds in order to purchase the consumer goods. These bonds are a direct obligation of the Treasury and must be paid 100 cents on the dollar when offered for redemption. Assume, if you will, that a considerable proportion of the people who wish to buy automobiles, refrigerators, build homes, etc., surrender their bonds for redemption in order to obtain the cash. Where will the Treasury get the money?

The Treasury Department must and will redeem these bonds, either through the sale of refunding bonds or by printing money under the present authority of law. Either way will present a tremendous problem. With nearly 60 percent of the deposit liability of all the banks of the country invested in Government bonds, with all of the Government trust funds, unemployment compensation, old-age and survivors' insurance, national-service insurance, civil-service-retirement funds, etc., all invested in United States Government bonds, with the funds of insurance companies and trust companies and excess funds of municipalities and building-and-loan associations invested in Government bonds, it is perfectly clear that there must

never be any shrinkage in the value of these securities.

The American people must realize that the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States and everything we own and can produce are security for the ultimate payment of these bonds. There is nothing more behind the cash that some people hide in their safety-deposit boxes than there is behind a United States Government bond. We must have no run on the Treasury of the United States through the offer of bonds for redemption. The large percentage of purchasers of E bonds, who are offering them for redemption right now should realize that those bonds are as safe as is the United States Government itself. I am one of those who believe that, desperate as the fiscal situation appears, we can solve our fiscal problems with sound men in control of the destiny of our Nation. It will mean hard and sustained work and sacrifice, but as against repudiation of the Government faith and credit, I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people will insist on making all necessary sacrifices. I say to you, however, that we will never solve our fiscal problems if the dreamers of the Hopkins type are permitted to continue to plan our future. I am not opposed, nor is the Republican Party opposed, to social change and social betterment. I want no return to the so-called good old days when special entrenched privilege plundered and raped the resources of our Nation and used the people as mere pawns in the development and accumulation of private wealth. On the other hand, we must realize that if we are to work out our fiscal salvation, we must put an end to the continuation of the expenditure of billions of dollars in the promotion of untried dreams and schemes of social planners who have no acquaintance with the realities of life and who apparently give no thought to where the money is coming from to achieve their ideals.

As Republicans, we want a government in which constitutional processes shall prevail. We want a government where there shall be freedom to work, freedom to save, freedom to engage in business or agriculture or the professions, freedom from the blighting hold and influence of excessive and unnecessary Government regulation and direction. We want a government in which the greatest freedom of individual action shall be assured; where the Government acts as a stern judicial referee or umpire to see to it that elements of special privilege are restrained and controlled.

Yes, my fellow Americans, we are facing a desperate situation. Take a look at the lame-duck politicians whom the people have repudiated at the polls. The third- and fourth-term candidate has not forgotten them. Most of them have been placed in positions of great power and authority by Executive appointment. Thus, they can carry on their schemes and programs to control the lives and fortunes of the people of America in administrative agencies of government in a manner unrestrained and far beyond their power to do as elected public officials. I think it a sad commentary upon our system of government that these men, repudiated at the polls by the people, can be in such large numbers rewarded by Executive appointment to important positions in judicial and administrative departments of government, there to carry on the same policies with increasing effectiveness which the voters themselves back home have renounced.

Let me hurriedly discuss the results of such a policy: Mr. WALLACE, in a recent speech at Los Angeles, declaimed on the dangers of domestic fascism which face the country. The President, in a message to the Congress dated September 17, 1943, said: "We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world." Speaker after speaker, commentator after commentator, writer after writer, are constantly alluding to the presence of Fascist tendencies, Fascist policies, and Fascist groups in this country. I wonder if the American people are not being pushed around by this barrage. I have no quarrel with those who seek to wipe out fascism. I want fascism stamped out wherever it raises its ugly head. However, we should understand what we are talking about.

The best definition that I have been able to find states that fascism is the type of government in which a small group controls the military, governmental, economic, and cultural life of the people. Pure fascism, therefore, means a centralization of power in the hands of one man or a small group of men, who by their directives and decrees control and rule the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people. It is a philosophy based upon the theory that the individual is subservient to the state and as such is willing to exchange his liberty and freedom for a promise of so-called social security. I ask you, my fellow citizens, in the light of these accepted definitions of the term "fascism," whether or not it is perfectly clear that true fascism is in fact entrenching itself in the vitals of our own system of government under the auspices of the New Deal. I am fearful that a new political gangsterism has been developed in this country which seeks to include as Fascists all individuals or organizations who dare to express dissent from the existing New Deal order. Today the word "Fascist" is being bandied about by many self-styled liberals in order to cloak and cover their own political bigotry.

It will be recalled that only a few years ago, the word "Red" or "Bolshevik" was used in much the same way. Certain new political gangsters who seek to import foreign ideologies into our American system are using what they conceive to be a very clever technique. These racketeers are demanding the suppression of this or that group of Americans, because it is claimed that they are Fascists or that their principles are motivated by Fascist tendencies. This group is constantly engaged in well-organized and well-financed political intimidation with only one purpose in mind—namely, to keep the New Deal in power and gradually, by boring from within, to establish by a process of gradualism, a planned socialized economy. I want to warn you that this group is busy working day and night. They gloss over the development of true fascist tendencies in our own domestic economy and divert attention from the plain facts by constant reference to the terrors of fascism abroad. I say to you that the constant grasp for power of a well-entrenched small group of this country, the constant growth of federalized bureaucracy, the constant demand for greater and further Federal control—the constant destruction of State sovereignty, together with the arrogant contempt of New Deal radicals for any semblance of constitutional authority, represent in my humble judgment the purest fascistic threats that face the American people.

Is it not high time, therefore, that we wake up as citizens and critically examine the Fascist character of many executive actions. The attempt to pack the Supreme Court, the attempt to purge from the Congress any opposition, the attempt by Executive order to override the express will of Congress, the expenditure of public funds in defiance of the express will of Congress, the Executive defiance of the efforts of Congress to exclude subversive individuals from the Federal pay roll, all indicate pure Fascist tendencies. It comes with poor grace, therefore, in my judgment, for the Vice President and his left wing radicals in the Government to talk about fascism when their very program indicates their desire to establish a country in which a small group or one individual controls the military, governmental, economic, and cultural life of the people.

Take your Declaration of Independence and read it. Listen to the complaints that were registered then of the Fascistic acts of an intolerable king. Jefferson listed them in language that should impress every American with the familiarity of conditions then and today. Listen to a few of their complaints.

"He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices and the amount and payment of their salaries. He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out of their substance. He has rendered the military independent of and superior to civil power. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws. He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good."

Today, due to the abject surrender of legislative responsibilities by New Deal Congresses, we are now being ruled as a people from above by a multitude of directives and regulations issued by a grasping, giant bureaucracy. This above all things is typical fascism. We are being ruled by the whims, attitudes, and caprices of mere men who owe no responsibility to an electorate but whose orders nevertheless have the full force and effect of law. These bureaucratic agencies of government being operated by mere human beings are lustful in their grasp for power. The result has been a duplication and multiplication and confusion of powers, all of which has resulted in a situation where the people of the Nation are now at long last beginning to realize what being ruled by mere men instead of law really means. I fully realize that in order to conduct a successful global war, great grants of power necessary for quick decision must be lodged in the Executive. The difficulty, however, arises from the fact that this complexity of bureaucratic control over the lives and fortunes of the people of America, much of it unrelated to the war effort, was well under way under the New Deal long before Pearl Harbor. Exigencies of war have only added to the lust and grasp for more and more power. Is it not clear, therefore, that this centralization of power in the hands of the Executive who is surrounded by a small group of "inner cabinet" advisers, results in effect in the placing in the hands of one man or a small group of men the power to control the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people?

Does this not present a situation, Mr. WALLACE, which meets every accepted test of fascist government? The defenders of this philosophy will immediately exclaim that it was accomplished through the medium of democratic processes and that it is expanded and continued only because of the exigencies of war. While I am not unmindful of the shameful and abject surrender by New Deal Congresses in the past 10 years, I am convinced that the influence of Executive pressure manifested through the medium of tempting Federal judgeships and other juicy jobs, patronage, Treasury raids, useless spending, and the usual trappings of the spoils system, has done away with much of the semblance of democratic process in the time before the war when these great grants of power were abjectly transferred to the Executive.

My fellow citizens, the American people are willing to sweat and to serve and to sacrifice in order to win this war and secure a just and lasting peace. We are disturbed, however, by the fact that this pattern of

government now in vogue, most of it legally supposed to be temporary in character, may become a permanent pattern of government under a system of planned and controlled economy. There must be no interference with the necessary controls and regimentation incident to the successful prosecution of the war effort. It must be made clear, however, that we do not intend to permanently submit to the surrender of our fundamental rights when peace and order shall have been restored to the world. We insist that assurances be given that the pattern of government incident to national crises shall not be insidiously fastened upon us as a permanent pattern of government. We in this Nation want to be governed by law and not by the whims and caprices of mere men. We fully realize the responsibility of government in providing for human welfare. We know that governments are instituted to protect the people against special privileges and that as conditions change and society becomes more complex, it becomes the duty and obligation of government through the enactment of just and equitable laws passed by the people's representatives, to provide for justice and equality of opportunity. We conceive it to be the duty of the Government not to act in the role of tyrant and master through the issuance of executive decrees but rather to provide safeguards for freedom of action and freedom to work by assuming the role of constant arbiter between human rights and special privilege.

To whom shall we turn for relief from the agonizing specter which confronts us? I say to you that the revitalized Republican Party offers the only solution. To say that there is only 1 man to lead us out of this morass is to stultify the genius of 135,000,000 people. America has a host of outstanding men and women who have ability who can be called to the public service. If America is to be saved, if freedom and liberty under a constitutional government is to survive, then the wasters and saboteurs must be turned out. This is your job and mine.

Radio Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal of January 16, 1944:

RADIO OWNERSHIP

Newspapers are not to be denied radio ownership merely because they are newspapers, the Federal Communications Commission has decided after consideration of the matter over a period of 2 years. The decision says, however, that diversification of control will be encouraged.

The Commission made an extended study of the subject, recognizing the problem involved in the broader field of the media of mass communications and the importance of avoiding monopoly of the avenues of communicating fact and opinions to the public. But it reached the conclusion that it should not deny a license merely because the applicant is engaged or interested in a particular type of business, but rather that licensing of stations should be considered from the standpoint of public service and public interest.

The Commission's decision is in line with various court decisions which have held the present Communications Act does not empower the Commission to discriminate against any class in the issuance of licenses. Its findings and a summary of the evidence it collected is being sent to the Senate and House which have radio legislation under consideration.

The decision appears to take a sensible view of the subject and the public interest considerations.

United States Army Discharge Policy Must Be Changed—Bitterness, Unmerited Disgrace, Civilian Future Jeopardized—Result From Present Stupid Policy—Veterans' Publication, Stars and Stripes, Attacks "Conditional Discharges" and Pleads To Give Soldier the Opportunity To State His Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is urgent that this Congress, that the Military Affairs Committee of the House, immediately call in the high-ranking officers of the Army, and investigate and find out who is responsible for the stupid and senseless policy that is now being practiced in discharging men from the armed services. Under the present policy many a good man is being cashiered out of the service just because a superior officer does not want him around.

If the Army is overloaded with officers in certain branches of the service and it is necessary to discharge several thousand of them, then notice and publication should be given to the public generally, and particularly to the family and friends of the so-called reclassified men, so that the stigma of unmerited shame and disgrace does not follow them in civilian life. Capable and efficient young officers with their whole life before them are being eased out of the armed services for any minor or inconsequential infraction of regulations, without these officers being given an opportunity to enjoy the right to face their accusers. The accusing officers may hide behind depositions and sworn statements, and the accused is denied the right to examine his accusers on the charges, which are oftentimes trivial, if not entirely false.

Let us be frank, honest, and decent about this matter of discharges. It means everything to the young man in the service. How can he ever explain to his family, friends, and associates that he was honorably discharged, and then his commission and uniform taken away from him? Especially now, at a time when the Army has requested the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. How can a young officer explain his return to civilian life? To me, this whole procedure is cruel and unfair. It will lead to a break-down in morale and to much bitterness and unhappiness. How would you feel if you were a young man 24 years of age and had enjoyed a splendid record in high school, in college, and then in officers' candidate school, and rose from private to first lieutenant, and if you had put your whole heart and soul into your work? Yes; I ask, how would you feel if you were kicked out without any general explanation to the public and were returned to civilian life, only to be drafted again by your local draft board to reenter the service as a private? Mr. Speaker, the House Military Affairs Committee must act immediately and stop this disgraceful procedure.

At this time I wish to include in my remarks an editorial which appeared in big, bold type on the first page of the veterans' publication Stars and Stripes on February 17, 1944:

A technical sergeant out on the west coast has asked the National Tribune to "go to bat" for the boys who are receiving questionable discharges from the armed services. He is not concerned much about men or women who have been discharged dishonorably after general or summary courts martial, but he is, with many others, worried about several types of discharges being handed out willy-nilly by discharge officers, discharges that mean separation from the Army or Navy with a certificate citing neither honorable nor dishonorable service.

For many years the veterans' organizations have been confronted with demands for a house cleaning in War and Navy Department application of discharge regulations and procedure. In the good old days before red tape was so popular, a man was separated from his uniform with a paper showing his service to country was concluded either honorably or dishonorably, and so recorded on his certificate, or with a bobtail that was a sort of a toss up, meaning that service performed was neither and that the holder had just better devote his energies to some other field of endeavor.

Nowadays, things are different. So-called efficiency experts have wormed into the services and they are trying to run them about as their brothers in distress are gumming things up in other departments of government; they are having less success because we still have some generals and admirals with enough good old-fashioned intestinal fortitude to cut their way through red tape and win wars, but they are causing trouble. And we have with us a new brand of medical experts, styled psychiatrists, whom we are compelled to admire if for no other reason than that their profession is so special it takes a lunatic to appreciate them.

The net result is that in the Army the three usual systems of discharge call for more than a dozen controlling regulations. The Navy's three types of discharge are regulated by 15 definitions, and the Marine Corps' 4 kinds require application of 18 different definitions. Even though it appears that in many instances strictly honorable discharges are reserved for old-line regulars, we point to these conditions for the sole purpose of calling attention to injustices that can and do obtain as a result of discharges being handed out by inexperienced persons. The result is that some men who have only mildly offended and some sick and disabled men are being unfairly branded for life. Once an error has been made—and the margin for error is

great—it takes a special act of Congress to make a correction and, when such application is made, the service department concerned must recommend against approval, and will not actually correct the records even when special relief bills are enacted.

Under stress of conditions in modern warfare, it is possible to err greatly. Our attention nas been called to two instances at point. R—— enlisted in the Navy in an eastern State on the day after Pearl Harbor. He served on a cruiser that was shot up in the South Pacific on August 9, 1942, and he was wounded and hospitalized. Surveyed by a medical board January 14, 1943, he was discharged as "undesirable," the Navy's equivalent of a discharge without honor. There are probably thousands more like R—— who have faithfully served their country in war. He may have deserved his type of discharge but we believe that the weight of evidence is not against him. His offense was probably the act of a sick man, but the Navy has no power to correct that discharge no matter what facts are adduced.

C—— enlisted September 16, 1940, served in the South Pacific for a year, wears many ribbons on his breast and was recommended to train for a commission because of outstanding talents, but on January 19, 1943, he was let out with a blue discharge—without honor—and is living under a cloud of suspicion that must be borne as a cross for the rest of his life unless something is done about it. Perhaps the Army was right in this instance, but C—— is only one of many whose disabilities may well be blamed on a mild infringement of discipline that results in a discharge other than honorable. The Army cannot make a correction of its records without an act of Congress.

During wartime the armed services are not supposed to produce sissies. Men are taught to hate and to kill. Discipline there must be, but peacetime discipline is not conducive to the development of fighting men, and in the type of war these men now fight, with insignia and distinctive uniforms discarded, one finds it difficult to distinguish between officer and enlisted man. Doubtless this and similar conditions are recognized to some degree in judging delinquencies, but human nature being what it is, there is much room for errors of judgment.

For several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars have tried to obtain congressional approval of boards of review in the Army and Navy before which men with blue discharges or their equivalent might appear, with accredited representatives, to fairly present their claims with a chance for correction of records in the calm and unbiased atmosphere of justice. Nothing has ever come of their search for fairness. While we do not think the provisions are worded clearly enough, the American Legion looks for similar relief in its omnibus bill now pending before both House and Senate. This agitation of the veterans has already brought about one modification by the Navy, but there is much room for further improvement all around.

Many a good man has been cashiered out of the services just because a superior officer did not want him around. Courts martial in theory give a man his day to defend himself, but in practice an officer named to defend an alleged culprit still owes his allegiance to superiors, and his heart is not always in his defense arguments. Decisions reached are often far from equitable. Discharges by courts martial are few as compared with those handed out promiscuously by discharge officers and based alone on questionable and prejudiced records. Here the opportunity for error is much greater.

We do not by any means suggest that all conditional discharges are questionable, or that court findings are wrong, but there is no doubt whatever that mistakes are made in all branches of the service. Our men are fighting to preserve constitutional rights. Among them are the right to be tried by a jury of peers and the privilege of being faced by accusers. Fair and competent boards of review, preferably divorced from the service departments, should be set up. These boards should have authority to change, correct, or modify any discharge in accord with facts presented, and those accused should have the right of competent and friendly advice. The Congress, in fairness, should act now. It should pass a general bill with provisions to direct that changes in discharge records be made in accordance with facts, and such a bill should have the encouragement of War and Navy officials.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on February 12, 1944:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this evening I propose to talk to you about the much discussed question of soldier voting. It has occupied a good part of the time of both Houses of Congress in the last fortnight. It was the subject of a special message by the President to Congress, and it has been widely discussed by the press. Unfortunately many newspaper articles have shown little understanding either of the legal or practical aspects of the problem. For that reason the press has been less helpful to the people than on any issue since I have been in Congress.

If all our soldiers were within the continental limits of the United States, the difficulties of soldier voting would be unimportant. Probably no one would question the adequacy of State absent voting laws and there would be no pressure on Congress to pass legislation. The difficulty arises when we come to garnering the votes of let us say 5,000,000 men overseas in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia, to say nothing of the large islands like Iceland and New Guinea, the small islands like Tarawa and Kwajalein, and big and little ships at sea.

The plain fact of the matter is that until just lately the possibility of having absent voting on such a global scale never occurred to anyone. The whole idea of relaxing our electoral laws to permit of absent voting at all is a fairly new one. Maine's absent voting law dates from 1921. Many States' absent voting laws are more recent than ours. At best, absent voting dispenses with some of the safeguards of secrecy and isolation that we can throw about a polling place at home, where curtained booths offer privacy, and the police can enforce laws against solicitation or corruption of the voter.

So great are the difficulties of soldier voting overseas that the War Department at one time openly opposed it. Thus, as lately as September 8, 1942, Secretary Stimson wrote, "The War Department is opposed to the authorization of voting by members of the armed forces serving outside the United States or in Alaska."

And in the last war, on April 17, 1918, Acting Secretary of War Crowell wrote: "After a most careful consideration of this entire matter, the War Department is of the opinion that it is neither advisable nor desirable to allow soldiers in the theater of war to vote. Their votes cannot be taken without seriously interfering with the military efficiency of our fighting forces."

These letters, written before the beginning of the present political controversy, sufficiently evidence the practical difficulties involved.

When we come to the legal aspects of the subject we find section 2 of article I of the Federal Constitution which places the qualification of voters entirely within the jurisdiction of the States. "The House of Representatives," it provides, "shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The Federal Constitution also provides (art. I, sec. 4) that "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to places of choosing Senators." Note that this language relates to the holding of the elections but not as to who may vote thereat.

Accordingly anyone who takes the Constitution seriously must feel that any legislation passed by Congress setting up Federal standards as to who shall vote or where elections for Senator shall be held will be unconstitutional and void.

To be sure, some people say, "This is war. Let's not take the Constitution too literally. Let us invoke the war powers of Congress." The same argument was made after the Civil War and the United States Supreme Court said: "The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism * * *."

From what I have said it should be plain that the granting to soldiers overseas not of the right to vote but of the opportunity to exercise the right to vote is a matter of practical difficulty. If the opportunity granted is to cast an illegal ballot, then it is of no value. If the opportunity granted is to be an opportunity to vote legally, then the States must pass on the qualifications of the voters, notably with respect to age, registration, and residence, and also on the validity of the ballot.

Notwithstanding all these legal and practical obstacles, I know of no one in Congress who does not wish and has not wished to give the soldiers the opportunity to cast a legal and honest vote. All rumors and accusations to the contrary are false and misleading.

The accusations by the President that some Members of Congress were trying to prevent the soldiers from voting was hotly resented by many Congressmen who were conscientiously concerned by the difficulties, both legal and practical, of the soldier-vote problem.

The Senate just before Christmas passed the McClellan-Eastland bill, which provided for voting under State absent ballot laws.

In the House last week the bill which came from the House committee simply recommended to the several States appropriate legislation to make their absent voting laws available to soldiers, and further provided that the Federal authorities should carry the absent ballots to all soldiers who applied therefor on post cards to be furnished by the Government which the States were asked to accept as legal applications for absentee bal-

lots. There is a further recommendation that the weight and size of the State ballots be diminished to permit of ready carriage by air mail. All over the country the States are revising their laws to meet this emergency. There are only a few States in which this cannot be done. Texas has a constitutional provision against soldiers voting and Kentucky and New Mexico by constitution forbid absent voting.

The alternative provision offered in the House to the committee bill contained substantially the same provisions as the committee bill but also provided for a so-called Federal ballot to be uniform for all soldiers but designed to enable the soldier to vote only for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman. Because this Federal ballot made no provision for a vote for State officers it came to be referred to as the bobtailed ballot.

A Maine soldier voting the bobtailed ballot for President and Vice President in November could not vote for Congressman, because in Maine Congressmen are elected with the State ticket in September. On that account the Federal ballot would disfranchise Maine voters not only on the State ticket but also on Congress. It would be useless in 37 other State elections being held in 1944.

But to my mind the most serious defect of the bobtailed ballot is that it is only a blank containing at the top the party names but not the names of any candidates. On this account I have elsewhere referred to the bobtailed ballot as an electoral monstrosity. The soldier being presented with such a ballot would not be able to tell from the ballot itself who were the rival candidates and he might very easily not have this information from any other source. On this account he would have a tendency either to write in the most familiar political name that he knew or else treat the ballot as something of a joke and vote for anyone whose name occurred to him.

While it would be possible to print a Federal ballot bearing the names of the candidates for President and Vice President, it would not be possible to print the names of Senators and Congressmen, because the ballot would no longer be a simple uniform ballot.

I question whether the election laws of any State would recognize the validity of a bobtailed ballot or permit it to be counted; on the other hand, I do not think there can be any serious doubt of the ability of the Army to transport by mail from the States to the soldier the necessary number of State ballots which would weigh only about 300 tons. The Army carried by mail 40,000 tons of Christmas gifts last Christmas season.

Up to the present moment the House has refused to authorize the Federal ballot but the Senate is willing to sanction its use under certain limitations. I voted with the majority of the House and shall continue to insist that all Maine soldiers and sailors have a chance to vote for State as well as Federal officers on a ballot that sets forth the names of all the candidates to be voted on.

I may have occasion to discuss this question further in a later broadcast.

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two editorials from the Pittsburgh Press relating to the soldier vote:

THE HARDEST WAY

By leaving it exclusively to the States to provide ways and means of enabling members of the armed forces to vote, as a majority in Congress seems determined to do, the statesmen in Washington are deciding that the hardest way is the right way.

The contrary is true. Voting is an inherent right, provided in the Constitution, the same Constitution which created Congress and details what it may and may not do.

Since voting is a basic right, it follows as a fundamental corollary that the qualifications for voting, the methods for voting, and the rules for voting should be as simple as possible.

Democracy functions through free suffrage. If suffrage is not free, the functioning of democracy is restricted if not actually endangered.

Any obstacle thrown in the way of full opportunity for suffrage on the part of any group of free citizens is an interference with democracy.

The opponents of a uniform, simple ballot for use of the armed forces claim any regulation of voting, save the 48 different systems set by the States, is unconstitutional.

But the Constitution does not say so. It says laws governing the election of Members of Congress shall be prescribed by the States, but it also says Congress may "at any time" alter such regulations.

It also says that neither Congress nor the States may abridge the right to vote because of race, color, or "previous condition of servitude." And in another amendment, it forbids abridgement of the right to vote because of sex.

In both articles, Congress is charged with the duty of enacting legislation which will make these prohibitions effective.

Isn't it logical, then, that Congress also has the power to enact legislation which will prevent the abridgement of the right to vote for other reasons, such as the conglomeration of State regulations which will prevent hundreds of thousands of voters in the armed forces from exercising their franchise?

If the opposition Congressmen will read the instructions issued the other day by the Army for the benefit of voters in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Nebraska, and Louisiana, they will find an irrefragable example of how to keep the armed forces from voting.

Pennsylvania voters in the military and naval forces must apply for a military ballot within the 20-day period which occurs not more than 50 days before the election and not less than 30 days before the election. Election officials must then mail these ballots at least 15 days before the election "to the address furnished by the elector in his application."

With Pennsylvania voters scattered in hundreds of places around the world, many of them bound to change addresses between the time they apply and the time ballots are mailed, it manifestly is impossible to provide more than a fraction of them with ballots, even if they were thoroughly acquainted with the law.

Nebraska is even worse, for the elector from that State also must apply for a form on which to apply for a ballot.

As the Army suggests, "It is not desirable to burden overseas air mail with applications for ballots where the time interval is manifestly too short to accomplish receipt, execution, and return of the ballot."

There is nothing more constitutional than the right to vote. Let's make the Constitution work by providing a simple, uniform method by which the armed forces may exercise their constitutional franchise. Let's make it as easy as possible for them to vote, not as hard as possible.

SNAILS AND SOLDIER BALLOTS

Since Congress has wasted so much time playing politics with the soldier vote bill, the least the Senate and House conferees can do is to arrive at their compromise quickly. There is no excuse for more delay. There is a very practical reason for speed.

Whatever the nature of the final measure may be, one thing is certain. The States will have to pass upon and count the ballots. This will be true whether the so-called States' rights bill of the House is accepted, or the Senate-modified Federal ballot bill, or the more probable adjustment of the two.

But the rub is that many States are not geared for this responsibility. Not only changes in State laws are required, but in some cases State constitutions must be modified to make such mass absentee voting practicable. This takes time.

Meanwhile several governors take the position that they cannot call their legislatures into special session and otherwise start the involved technical preparations for a change-over until they know definitely the scope and requirements of the Federal law. So further delay by Congress easily might defeat the purpose of the law by making State compliance impossible in the relatively short time remaining.

Nobody is in any doubt as to where the American public and the servicemen stand on this issue. The demand that the men doing our fighting for us be allowed to vote is virtually unanimous—as Members of Congress discovered when they went home for the recent recess.

The point for the politicians to remember is that pious motions and slick parliamentary jokers will not be acceptable to the public this time. Here is one case in which only results will count. If the fighting men are disfranchised, come November, they and their families and friends and all believers in democracy will hold the politicians responsible. Excuses will not help.

More About Soldier Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 10, 1944:

MORE ABOUT SOLDIER VOTING

The passion of the New Deal in Washington for changing America over to suit its ideas has been manifested in the manner in which the President and his friends have advocated a Federal ballot and sought to discredit the ballot provided by the States. The Federal ballot is alleged to be simple, the State ballot complex and cumbersome.

The most sacred thing in the United States next to the flag is the ballot box. Laws have had to be passed to prevent repeating, chain voting, miscounting, and stuffing. This is why we have personal registration and voting qualifications. Admitting the honesty of the men in charge of our Army and Navy and the bravery and patriotism of the men and women who are serving their country, elections must have every safeguard thrown around them. The States have done this.

Take voting at home. The voter gets his ballot. This is handed to him by a member of the election board. He cannot boast how

he is going to vote. He cannot take any person into the booth with him unless he is disabled or cannot read and write. After the ballot is marked it is deposited in the box in plain view of the board. When the ballots are counted they must check with the number furnished the board and all unused ballots with the check list placed in the box, which is then sealed and deposited in the courthouse for safekeeping in case of a contest.

This machinery is absolutely necessary to guarantee the honesty of elections. Can we have election boards in the camps, buildings, hospitals, and plants in this country or among the men and women on the front? Can the conduct of elections which by virtue of the Federal Constitution reposes in the States, be turned over to the Federal Government? There is no denying that absentee voting has been somewhat complicated, but Pennsylvania and other States are simplifying the process and at the same time respecting the sanctity of the ballot.

Some compromise was reached in the Senate the other day whereby Federal ballots will go to military voters within the United States, only if their home States fail to provide an adequate absentee system by August 1. Overseas voters can use the Federal ballot if a State ballot is not available or not delivered in time to be available. This sounds fair enough if the Federal ballot is absolutely legal. No risk should be taken with an important election. Ballots cannot be circulated or handled promiscuously. The Federal ballot would have to be checked as closely as the State ballot.

Moreover, the Federal ballot is only a makeshift. It would not contain the names of State candidates. For instance, Pennsylvania voters using Federal ballots would not have a chance to vote for a justice of the State supreme court, two judges of the superior court, a State treasurer, an auditor general, half the members of the State senate and all members of the State assembly.

Besides, how could one using the Federal ballot vote for President without voting for the Presidential electors set up in each State? The President is not elected by popular vote but by the electoral vote of each State. This in itself emphasizes the function of the States. There are 531 electoral votes, with 266 necessary to elect. New York has 47 of these votes, Pennsylvania 36, Ohio 26, and so on according to population.

Suppose the commissioners in this county should receive a batch of Federal ballots. They would have to be accompanied by a list of names. This would mean checking every name with the registration lists, and even if registration is waived how would the commissioners know the voter is qualified to vote by residence, naturalization, etc.?

This year's election might easily be vitiated by doubt, irregularity, or illegality. The electoral vote in any key State might depend upon a few votes. Would the voters of the United States want to see the election thrown into the courts, with the Supreme Court deciding who shall be our next President? Seven of the nine members of this Court have been appointed by Mr. Roosevelt.

There will be an official ballot in Pennsylvania which will contain the names of the Presidential electors as well as the names of all candidates for Federal, State, and local offices. This ballot will be made available to every voter no matter where he may be. It will be the only ballot which will give Pennsylvania's people in the armed services the opportunity of voting for members of their State government.

A mere post-card request from the Pennsylvania man or woman in the service will mean that he or she will be furnished with a Pennsylvania ballot. All the voter has to do is to mark it and mail it back in a self-addressed envelope. The votes on this ballot will be counted the same as if the ballot were cast in the voter's home precinct.

At home the matter of registering and voting is a process so simple that a child can understand it, but the election laws, decisions, instructions, and penalties in Pennsylvania will fill a book half an inch thick. These laws are to guarantee the honesty of the elections. No law that Mr. Roosevelt proposes or that Congress will enact can set aside these official safeguards.

These are facts which are not generally understood because the public's lack of knowledge of the country's election machinery is appalling. Let this election be regular. Let it be legal. Let there be no doubt about it that will throw it into the courts and nullify the people's choice in November.

Address at Convention of American Road Builders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a speech which was delivered by me February 1, 1944, at the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, held in Chicago:

I am exceedingly happy to have the opportunity to meet the Road Builders of America and to meet you as chairman of the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you men on what you have done, and if possible, to lend encouragement to you in your future activities. I want you to know that the members of the Roads Committee all appreciate the constructive and splendid work that is being done in Washington on the road problem by Charlie Upham and his efficient staff. We regard his organization as most important and very helpful.

You are all keenly interested in what is going on in Washington—the problems that are before Congress, and how Congress is going to solve these problems. In our representative form of government, the problems that confront Congress are problems that must be solved by the people themselves. We can only do those things which public sentiment will permit. At the present time public sentiment is fairly well crystallized on three very important questions. In fact, public sentiment is so strong on these three questions that they should be considered in the "must" class. First, we must win the war. Second, we must stop uncontrolled inflation. And, third, we must plan during the war for an orderly and efficient reconversion to a peacetime economy.

Concerning the first problem, I think we can all agree that a splendid job has been done by the American people. Mistakes have been made, of course, but when we take into consideration the tremendous problem involved and the condition that this country was in when the war overtook us, it seems to me that we can all feel a sense of personal pride in what has been accomplished in so short a time.

I remember sitting in Congress when the President announced that in order to prepare for the approaching war we must build at least 50,000 airplanes a year. At that time he also presented to us his stupendous program for expanding our Army and our fleet. It seemed to me, as I know it must have seemed to you, that such a program was a figment of a vivid imagination and would be impossible to attain. And yet, within so short a time through the ingenuity, the skill, the courage, and industry of men such as you men here, that schedule has not only been reached, but doubled in practically every particular.

When we reach the summit of a hill, it is refreshing and sometimes enlightening to pause and look back over the road we have climbed to see how far we have come. In this spirit, let us just for a moment look over some of the road we have traveled.

When the President, in May 1940, came before Congress and made this seemingly outrageous, unthinkable request, this is how we were equipped to conduct a world war:

We had an Army of 220,000 men. We had a Navy of 180,000 officers and men, including a Marine Corps of 26,500 officers and men. At that time the total personnel of our air forces consisted of 43,118 men. In other words, at that time the total number of men in all of our armed forces was about 405,000. This was the total number of men scattered throughout the world who wore the uniform of this great country. This was not just the Marine Corps or just the Coast Guard. Not just the airforces. This was the total of the men sworn under oath and trained to defend this country. We were relying then on a total armed force, which, in all branches, made up a total almost exactly equalled now by our Marine Corps alone.

When we fully visualize the picture of the true condition of the personnel of our armed forces in 1940, it is not then difficult for us to understand how tremendous was the task that has been accomplished in building up an army of 7,300,000 men, fully equipped and ready to fight—a Navy of more than 2,500,000—and an air force, an arm of the Army, which alone has almost 2,500,000 highly trained and technical men.

We might say that a veritable miracle has been performed in shaping the organization of our Army and our Navy, but, as astounding as these figures are, our achievements in production of ships, planes, and materials of war are even more miraculous.

You men here are in the field of production, and are, therefore, personally responsible for the performance of this miracle. Let me point out to you a few of the so-called impossible tasks that you and others in your field have accomplished.

During the fiscal year 1940, the Army Air Forces actually received only 886 airplanes of all kinds from the manufacturers. When we were struck at Pearl Harbor, we had a total of about 3,000 planes, but of these a total of only 1,157 were actually suited to combat service.

The total number of all kinds of aircraft in the Navy was 2,179. It had only 369 combatant ships and the total number of ships in the Navy at that time was 582. As of January 1, 1944, the Navy had 20,000 airplanes, 880 combat ships, and its total number of ships was 23,000. But listen to these words of our Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, who sums up our accomplishments in production far better than I can—I quote:

"From the ashes of Pearl Harbor, this great Nation of ours rose to build 86,000 airplanes in 1943—a production feat that defies our imagination. Simultaneously, the brawn of American labor and the brains of our engineers combined to produce countless military vehicles—everything from jeeps to heavy tanks. For the same period, the arsenals of America supplied our fighting men and those of our allies with 20,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition—more ammunition than this country produced in all its previous wars put

together. From the ways of our mighty shipyards came vessels in such vast numbers that today we are transporting 8,000,000 tons by water monthly—a figure seven times greater than the peak for the last war. While industry and labor wrought these weapons for victory, the American farmer shattered all records. Last year, his production of food was 36 percent greater than in 1929—an amazing achievement."

The way that our Army and Navy have been mobilized and equipped, the way that our boys have been fed and given the arms and ammunition and material to work with is a marvel to the world and a compliment to our industrial courage and genius. There is ample praise and glory for everyone in America, and we are entitled to bask in this glory—when the time comes to relax. But we have not won the war yet. With the same spirit, the same courage, and the same industrial genius that have thus far been displayed, however, we know that this war will be won and that it will be won speedily and completely.

As to the second problem, we must stop uncontrolled inflation. Congress passed a law which, with the proper cooperation and with efficient administration, would unquestionably solve this problem. But we Americans are an independent lot. We are jealous of our freedom. We like to do and we have always done pretty much as we please. If we don't like something we make a lot of noise—we gripe. We don't like to be rationed—when we want gasoline we want gasoline. When we want steak for dinner—we want steak for dinner. We like to buy our clothes without being told how, when, and where we can buy them.

In America we like to "razz" the umpire and throw an occasional pop bottle, but we have educated ourselves to accept his decision—we don't break up the ball game. If we control inflation don't we have to accept these inconveniences in the same spirit?

We have not all cooperated 100 percent. There have been "black markets." Many of us, possibly thoughtlessly, have obstructed the working of this law, feeling that its accomplishments were insignificant and that it merely added to our already-mounting inconveniences.

We all must admit that this law is thoroughly democratic—it treats everyone alike. Those in the O. P. A., we in Congress, and you men here all have some pet peeve with the workings of this law. But it treats us all alike. It is no respecter of persons. Let us take a look at the dividends we have received by putting up with its restrictions.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, had prices risen during this war as they did during a corresponding period in World War No. 1, we would have spent $65,000,000,000 more than we now have spent for munitions alone. To illustrate—steel plate during the last war increased in price 187 percent and steel bars increased 159 percent. During this war neither of these items has increased in price.

Chemicals during the last World War increased in price to as high as 284 percent. During this war increases have been only those allowed by the Government—and, in most cases, there has been no increase at all.

Bituminous coal in the last war rose 135 percent in price. During the same period of time in this war the price has risen only 22 percent. Crude petroleum rose 200 percent in the last war, as against only 25 percent during this war.

With the knowledge of the enormous quantities of these materials consumed in the war effort, it is easy to see how our controls on prices have saved us $65,000,000,000 in the price of munitions alone.

The same situation is reflected in the figures with respect to the cost of living in general. For example, the average price rise during the First World War was 62 percent as against 26 percent over a period of the same number of months during this war. Food, for instance, increased 80 percent as against 47 percent. Clothing increased 107 percent as against 34 percent. And house furnishings increased 95 percent as against 27 percent.

Each of you appreciate fully the fact that when there is a scarcity of goods, as there is bound to be during a war, and when money is so plentiful, we must adopt some system of distributing these goods and controlling the prices paid for them. Otherwise prices would increase abnormally, thereby, demanding a corresponding increase in wages. We would thus have uncontrolled inflation which would bring about an entire break-down in our economic if not our political system. To avoid this, a law has been passed and put into operation. However, in order for this law to be effective, and to accomplish what it is intended that it should accomplish, it is absolutely necessary that the administrators of this law have full cooperation and support of the American people.

We have faith in this form of government. While all that could have been accomplished in holding the line and stopping inflation may not have been accomplished, we have made a real contribution to the solution of a difficult problem, and we have demonstrated conclusively that with your help, and with the help of the people of this country, we can stop inflation, we can stop black markets, we can hold the line. I think it has also been shown conclusively that without the help of the people, no matter how good the law may be, we cannot strike down this evil.

As to the third problem—that of being prepared for the post-war period—Congress thus far has been so busy with winning the war and controlling inflation that very little has been done in the field of post-war planning. Certain committees have been appointed and studies made, but these committees, so far as I know, have not completed their reports. I think I am safe in saying that, so far as a constructive post-war plan is concerned, the Roads Committees of the House and the Senate are the only committees which have before them legislation involving an effective post-war program.

The post-war bill that is now pending before the Roads Committee of the House, H. R. 2426, will be considered in the very near future. We have set February 29 as the day for opening hearings on this bill. At that time we will hear representatives of all organizations interested in this subject. We hope to have a representative from each State in the Union appear and discuss this problem from his local standpoint.

After these hearings we expect to report out a bill that will fully cover post-war road construction.

For months we have been urging the various States to prepare detailed plans and have them ready for use just as soon as the war ends. Congress has appropriated money for the purpose of aiding the States to make these plans. Many of the States are up to date in their planning and will unquestionably have a program ready to put into effect as soon as the war ends.

The bill as it is now drawn, authorizes the appropriation of a billion dollars a year for each of the 3 years immediately after the termination of this war, this sum to be augmented by a 25-percent contribution from each of the States and Territories.

We in Congress have taken the position that we should avoid at all hazards another W. P. A. program. The road program will make work—but it is not a make-work program. It is an essential and vital task which must be carried out whether our employment problem at the war's end is one of scarcity or overabundance. It is estimated that at least $12,000,000,000 of construction work should be done on our highways. When peace comes, if the various States have their plans ready, a million men can immediately be put to work on our highways under contract in the regular, usual, and efficient way of constructing highways—on highways that will be real investments—highways that are necessary and that will be of lasting benefit to the people.

When this bill is passed, and I feel sure that it will be within the next 6 months, you men who are interested in highways will have the assurance that Congress and your Government have done everything they can to encourage you to put men to work and to build better highways for the future. You will have the further assurance that Congress has insisted on the accomplishment of this work through the usual and customary processes.

There is one other problem that I think should be discussed with you men here today—a problem that is vitally important in connection with any post-war plan. Congress passed a law which would give the soldier who returns from the front the right to return to his job after the war is won and he is released. So far as the Government is concerned, anyone working for the Government will have the absolute right to return to his job. There may be some constitutional, technical, or practical barriers making it difficult for industry to carry out this provision of the law. In view of this it seems to me that at the present time this organization should start to create a sentiment which will make it possible for every soldier to return to his job—or, if possible, a better job.

This country will be saved and the war will not have been fought in vain if we see to it that the boys, when they return, return to a country that will embrace them with open arms and with suitable employment.

In every city, in every town, and in every hamlet the leaders of service clubs, of civic and industrial organizations, and of every other type of activity should advocate a job for every soldier who returns. They should make this a real project. If this sentiment is fostered, I am sure the boys when they return will return to jobs worthy of their sacrifice. You men here, who are representing large industries, who will play such an important role in the conversion to normal, peaceful life, can do an untold service to your country and an absolute justice to the soldier who has done so much for us, by adopting as one of your major projects the achievement of this goal.

Biggest Steal in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by the Honorable Josephus Daniels:

BIGGEST STEAL IN HISTORY

It is a good thing to get a frank and forthright Navy man in Congress now and then. This is particularly true as to Representative IZAC, of California. He served in the Navy during the World War and is now on the Naval Affairs Committee, which is investigating war profits. Referring to the camouflage measure to replace the renegotiation law, Mr. IZAC says: "The greatest steal in the history of this country is about to be perpetrated.

"If industrialists win their battle," he declared, "they will not only deprive the Treasury of two and a half billion in taxes but will enable war contractors to regain more than five billions which they have been forced to disgorge. All restraints on profiteering will be lifted and the sky will be the only limit on greed," he said.

IZAC, from his Navy experience in 1917–18, recalled that "when the fighting men came back they learned 29,000 millionaires had been created in their absence." If renegotiation is scrapped, he predicted that figure will not be a marker to what will happen this time.

Common Sense on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post, February 15, 1944:

COMMON SENSE ON SUBSIDIES

The Senate has just kicked subsidies out of the food picture and opened the door to inflation. Unless its action is reversed, the American consumer can expect the price of the family meat and potatoes to start a fast uphill climb that will leave the family dollar 'way behind.

An argument that opponents of subsidies have been making lately is that subsidies don't save us anything since "we pay for them with higher taxes, anyway." We might as well pay higher prices directly to the grocer, the argument goes, as pay higher taxes to the Government to support subsidies. It all goes to the same place.

This argument is a fake from start to finish. There are two clear answers to it:

First, we don't pay nearly as much in subsidies as we would pay directly over the grocery counter. The fact is that a billion or a billion and a half dollars spent in subsidies saves eight to thirteen billions on the total food bill.

HERE'S HOW IT WORKS

How? Well, let's say that the dairyman finds that his feed costs have increased, that he must charge a cent more on a quart of milk to break even, or to make his usual profit. He raises his price to the jobber by that cent.

The jobber, in turn, does not increase his price by just 1 cent. When the milk leaves his hands, it has risen not by a cent a quart but by a cent and a half or perhaps 2 cents.

When it gets to the groceryman, he would be less than human if he did not announce that henceforth, due to the higher prices he has to pay, milk will now cost the consumer 3 cents more per quart. It is a law of inflation that an increase in price at the origin of the product always means a doubling or tripling of that increase to the final purchaser.

Under the food-subsidy program, the Government pays the dairyman that extra cent he requires in order to break even. But the price then stays the same to the jobber, to the groceryman, and to the consumer. The snowballing of prices is stopped. The price rise is quarantined at one level; the infection is localized.

That's only one argument for subsidies. Here is the second: While it is true that the $1,000,000,000 used for subsidies may be tax money, not all of it is the tax money of the average consumer. Only a small part of it may, in fact, come from his specific taxes.

The rest may be excess profits, collected by the Government from war-profit-swollen firms. The Government thus redistributes these profits, takes them from those who have made too much and uses them to keep down the food prices of the millions who have made too little.

SUBSIDIES ARE GAINING FRIENDS

When the Senate killed subsidies, it counted on the rapid march of the war to dull the keen interest of a few months ago in the subsidy debate. But along with soldier voting, subsidies have been the great issue of the year.

A measure of the rightness of the people's fight is that even the New York Times has shifted its position to come out carefully for a few subsidies. Those two stalwarts of stalwart Republicans, Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT, have also joined with the prosubsidy forces.

These men are not innovators. They simply acknowledge, as most Republicans and fewer Democrats (mostly southern) will not, that subsidies are an established part of the wartime food picture. They know that in the past year, 25 food subsidies have been operating, holding down prices all the way from tomatoes to milk.

They know that there is nothing new about subsidies; that, indeed, there is something new and dangerous about a wartime economy that does not subsidize its food prices.

We call upon all Americans to join together to save a working part of their economy. Their very bread and butter is at stake here.

Let your Senator and your Congressman know how you stand. If you don't fight hard and at once, you and your children, after June 30, 1944, will be eating less and paying more.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following address which was delivered by me at the Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Republican Clubs of Rhode Island, at Providence, R. I., on Saturday, February 12, 1944:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet tonight to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln; to recount his contribution to the cause of representative government and to rededicate ourselves to the principles of the party which he founded. I feel a peculiar pride and kinship in this occasion, not only because of your valued invitation to be with you but because I was born within a few miles of Lincoln's birthplace in Kentucky.

It is proper that we should contemplate the life and the accomplishments of this matchless man. There is nothing in history, romance, or realism to compare with his faith in and his fight for the weak and the worthy, the downtrodden and the oppressed, unless it be the life of Him who carried His cross to Calvary. It is to be expected that Lincoln should come from among the humble and lowly of his time, and that a certain mystery should surround his origin. However, this calls for no apology as it finds a commendable counterpart in the lives of the great of this Nation and furnishes living proof that the best leadership to be found in a great crisis is forged in the furnace of human experience and adversity. Now, as at the time of his immortal Gettysburg speech, this Nation is engaged in another great war—a war testing whether Lincoln's concept of human liberty, human diginity, and human sovereignty under God shall be supplanted and superseded by the iniquitous proposition that a state socialistic government of bureaucracy, by bureaucracy, and for bureaucracy shall now despoil the earth.

While the Nation fights a global war to rid the world of foreign dictators, the starry-eyed planners and disciples of the discredited and almost defunct New Deal insist upon establishing and maintaining a domestic dictatorship in Washington. The purpose of these plotters is plain. They attempt to tear down American institutions as well as our form of government and substitute instead the master plan of state socialism. Shall we allow them to succeed? Shall we win the war but in doing so lose our constitutional form of government? Shall we sacrifice priceless American lives and treasure in destroying foreign dictatorships and the evils which they have inflicted upon the world only to set up a scheme for a permanent dictatorship here? The answer is an emphatic "No." They cannot succeed if the American people are aroused to a full realization of their foul purposes.

The issue today is far more important than was the great issue of Lincoln's time. The question that confronts us now is whether men shall remain free or whether they shall become the helpless pawns of those who hold the reins of power. In Lincoln's time, when our Nation was in its second great crisis, the intelligent and courageous citizenry of the country rose to the emergency and saved the Union. In this third crisis, you are called upon to render a greater service, and see to it that while the boys are fighting and winning the battle for democracy upon every front of the world, we do not lose it here at home.

For nearly 11 years the New Deal party has controlled our Government in Washington. It has made the laws, fixed the taxes, issued the orders, and fashioned the policies under which we live. The failure of this party to cope with and solve the peacetime problems of 1933 to 1941 proves its unfitness to meet and surmount the problems of a perilous post-war period, and to wage and win a global war requires more ability, courage, and brains than is necessary to administer a boondoggling W. P. A. project.

Lincoln knew, sympathized with, and loved his fellowmen. He had implicit faith in the common sense of his fellow man. Lincoln also had faith in and followed our constitutional form of government. He believed that human rights in large measure depended upon property rights. He strongly upheld the right to own property in these words: "Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world; that some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise." Thus Lincoln stated his belief in human rights and the rights of labor as well as his belief in the right to own property. He believed that these rights were guaranteed every American under the Constitution.

The New Deal Party has become the mouthpiece of the Socialist and Communist Party in America. It abandoned the Democratic platform in 1932 and has since followed the Socialist and Communist plat-

forms. The hands may have been the hands of Esau but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The support given the New Deal during the past 11 years by Communist Browder and his crowd of left wingers, shows that its policies have been so pink that the Communists saw red.

In the crisis of 1860 when the Nation stood at the crossroads—one way pointing toward slavery and the other toward the abolition of slavery, Lincoln repeatedly exclaimed: "This Nation cannot exist half slave and half free." Today another so-called Democratic Party has brought the Nation to another crossroads—with one way pointing toward private enterprise and free labor and the other pointing toward totalitarianism and slave labor. This Nation cannot exist half communistic and half capitalistic. There is no half-way place as proposed by the New Deal. We must either continue the profit system or abolish it. Whether we wish it or not, this is and will be the great domestic issue of the coming campaign. I have no fear of testing this issue on the public platform and in the ballot box, but I do resent a surreptitious attempt to foist this brand of New Deal socialism upon the American people, under the pretext of a war emergency while promising them constitutional government.

Another great problem with which we must deal is the centralization of power in Washington. After November of this year Rhode Island will be able to receive some first-hand reports from its Republican representatives in Washington. This power has steadily increased until it threatens the foundations of State and local government. Each day boards and bureaus pass hundreds of regulations in the maladministration of public affairs, which are not approved by the people's representatives in Congress. There is no way in the world for the average businessman, and especially the small businessman, to keep informed of these voluminous rulings, edicts, and directives which have the effect of law. And if you should unknowingly violate one of these bureaucratic edicts you will not be tried by a jury, but you will be summarily summoned before a board of political parasites and penalized according to rules promulgated by some ex-professor who has never had one day's actual business experience before coming to Washington. And there is no appeal to the courts. The citizen is presumed to be wrong even before he is tried. This is bureaucracy at its best.

What is the philosophy that pervades the centralization of power in Washington and the staggering growth of bureaucracy? Is it the well-known practice of the politically minded New Deal to place upon the public pay roll every potential voter? An examination of the record will throw some light on this interesting subject.

Under the New Deal the bloated bureaucracy of Washington boasts over 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees, which means an average of about 1 Federal employee to every 43 citizens. One agency of this New Deal octopus, the O. P. A., boasts a proud pay roll listing over 2,700 lawyers. While a similar organization in England, after which the Washington plan was largely copied, gets along with only 10 attorneys. The great State of Pennsylvania conducts its business with 44,000 State employees, while at the same time the bloated bureaucracy of Washington maintains 214,000 Federal employees on its pay roll for that State; the State of Wyoming transacts its business with fewer than 1,000 employees, but the Federal Government maintains over 6,000 on its pay roll to handle the Federal business of this sparsely settled State.

When Jefferson was President there was 1 Federal employee to every 5,308 citizens.

But the obligation of the taxpayer does not end here. He must support his State, county, and municipal government. There are approximately 3,237,000 at present employed in local and State government. This makes a vast army of 6,337,000 Federal, State, and municipal employees—a ratio of about 1 to every 21 persons. However, when you consider that in ordinary times there are only about 42,000,000 persons gainfully employed, this leaves a ratio of 1 civilian Government employee to a little more than every 6 wage earners. If we add 11,000,000 men and women in the military services on the basis of the above figures, there are, roughly, 2½ private workers supporting 1 person hired by the Government.

During the reign of Diocletian, A. D. 285, Lactantius wrote that the time had come when there were almost as many tax gatherers as there were taxpayers in the Roman Empire. The burdens of taxation became so oppressive that it was no longer profitable to cultivate the soil and as a consequence the farmers abandoned the soil, which soon grew up in weeds and woodlands. Then the Roman Empire decayed and fell.

According to the President's recent message to Congress, the public debt at the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1945, will aggregate $258,000,000,000. We are told that this debt may reach the tremendous sum of $300,000,000,000, or twice the assessed valuation for every piece of property, real, personal, tangible, or intangible on the assessment rolls of the various States. If the public debt should amount to twice the assessed value of all property in the Nation, then it would be very much like living in a $5,000 home upon which had been placed a $10,000 mortgage.

What does this stupendous sum mean in terms of dollars and cents to the average individual and the average family? What does it mean to the millions of peacetime workers of all types in America who constitute the bone and sinew of this Republic, and who must earn the taxes to pay for the waste and the bungling of 12 years of New Deal bureaucracy?

Assuming that we have a population of 130,000,000 persons and a national debt of $300,000,000,000, that would mean a per capita personal debt by the individual to the Government of $2,307. If we assume further that the average family consists of four, and that the average annual income of this family before the war was approximately $1,500, this means that the share of each family in the total national debt, if it reaches $300,000,000,000, will be $9,229 per family. But do not forget the fact that out of this annual income of $1,500 must first come the living expenses of four people, together with the annual operating costs, not only of the Federal Government, but of the State, county, and municipal branches as well, together with payments on the outstanding State, county, and municipal bonds. And, if the family is in debt, that too must be paid.

Let us get down to cases and see just who is paying and will pay the tremendous waste which will aggregate billions of dollars in the war effort. The records of the Treasury Department show that in 1944 over 67,000,000 people will receive incomes of $157,000,000,000 and pay $22,000,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes. A break-down of these figures shows that 21,600,000 individuals, including heads of families, will receive this year over $19,000,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or less, or an average income of $890 per year per person, and will pay $500,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes. Over 24,000,000 more individuals including heads of families, will also receive in 1944 over $42,000,000,000 in incomes ranging from $1,000 to $2,000 and pay over $4,000,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

The records of the Treasury Department also disclose that over 12,000,000 more individuals will receive over $34,000,000,000 in incomes ranging from $2,000 to $3,000 a year and will pay over $3,000,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

It must not be forgotten that 60 percent of the 1944 income is going to people with incomes under $3,000 and 80 percent of the total 1944 income will go to those with annual incomes of $5,000 a year or less. These are the people who will pay the heavy taxes.

The present Administration, following the platform of the Communist Party in 1928, would limit all incomes to $25,000 a year. Let us see what the record shows. The Treasury report indicates that 110,000 individuals will receive $7,000,000,000 in incomes of $25,000 and over, and pay back in taxes $4,400,000,000. If you would take the entire income of every person in the United States who will receive $25,000 or more in 1944, you would only add $3,000,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States.

I will go along with anyone in cutting war profits to the bone and in reducing excess incomes to a minimum, but I will not support a policy limiting incomes to $25,000 or $5,000 a year, and thereby take the incentive out of competitive business. Therefore, when we speak of wanton waste and the staggering sum of the public debt, it will be shown that 60 cents out of every dollar wasted must come from taxpayers earning less than $3,000 a year and 80 cents out of every dollar dissipated must come from those earning less than $5,000 a year.

While this war is making entirely too many millionaires in industry through excess profits and while excess profits are being taken by some both in labor and in industry, thousands of small businessmen are being forced to the wall financially because of conditions beyond their control. The reason for the unfortunate failure of thousands of small businesses has been due to their inability to obtain needed peacetime materials and help. These people too are paying heavy taxes.

The question arises after 11 years of the New Deal. Are one-third of our people still ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed? According to the Labor Department, a minimum wage budget for a family of 4 runs from $1,541 a year to as high as $1,809 a year, with an average of approximately $1,700 a year for a family of 4. This means that after 11 years of the New Deal, over 37,000,000 Americans are living on an average income of approximately one-half the amount the Labor Department says a family of 4 requires for a decent living in the 33 largest cities.

The Treasury records reveal that 7,450,000 more heads of families will receive incomes this year of from $1,000 to $1,500, which means that over 29,000,000 more Americans are earning less than what the Labor Department has laid down as a decent living wage.

Summarizing these two last groups alone, and not including 12,250,000 single persons with incomes of $1,000 or less, we find 16,820,000 heads of families supporting or trying to support 67,820,000 Americans on incomes of $1,500 or less.

When the New Deal party in the coming campaign points with pride to the $157,000,000,000 wartime income produced by the issuance of bonds and taxes, let them point to these 67,000,000 Americans in the low-income group and answer the question of whether or not there are now, after 11 years of the New Deal, not one-third but approximately one-half of the population which is ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed.

While we are thinking of the plight of the small wage earner let us never forget the condition of the small businessman; a man who risks his entire capital and the effort of a lifetime in building up some small but useful enterprise to his community. Frequently, from these small businesses spring the ideas and the sinews from which are built the larger businesses that make possible the employment of greater numbers of our citizens.

I believe that small manufacturers, who are able to do so, should be permitted to resume the production of civilian goods now. Such a policy, if followed, will mean that

thousands of small plants will not have to go broke while waiting for the big manufacturers to get out of war production. We want to provide full employment, lower prices, increased production, and a stronger competitive position for small business. The return to civilian production now is the solution to the problem.

America has become and should remain the most highly industrialized Nation in the world. American ingenuity, scientific skill, and initiative have amazed the Axis world with its unparalleled production of the implements of war. As phenomenal as this record has been, it has been made possible by the magnificent cooperation and contribution of American labor. Free American labor, working with and under a system of free American enterprise, has won the battle of production against the slave labor and the conscripted enterprise of Germany. Employers and employees alike have given freely of their sons, their sweat, and their savings to win the war and sustain the system of free enterprise. We must think of the years that lie ahead. We must think in terms of the America of tomorrow. We must think in terms of the sons and the daughters of present-day employers and employees and keep for them the kind of America which has always afforded the greatest opportunity to the greatest number of people.

When I speak of free enterprise, I mean that system here under which men have been free to engage in manufacture and trade, in the arts and professions, that system which we have modified and tempered in accordance with the march of time and what we call progress. I mean, too, what we call social progress, social legislation. I mean, too, the continuance of the ever closer growing partnership between capital and labor, between employer and worker, under which the right of labor to work and enter into collective bargaining through representatives of its own choosing, has become the law of the land.

There are those who are willing to junk this system for some planned economy which in Germany and Italy made paupers of employers and peons of employees.

Lincoln's own conception of the democratic system and private enterprise was expressed in the following words: "That form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the role of life."

There are times when we grow faint of heart and sick at the sight of what has been done during the past 11 years to change and destroy our beneficent form of government.

But our lives are as nothing compared with the cause to which Lincoln long years ago so courageously dedicated our party. May you, the leaders of that party, standing unflinchingly in defense of the ideals which Lincoln served so faithfully, hear once more down through the ages, his heartening words at a council of war, when the cause of the Union seemed to have ebbed to its lowest level as he said, "Courage, gentlemen, it is almost daybreak."

America, tonight, and in the dark days that lie ahead, has need to remember the great courage, clear vision, and matchless leadership of Lincoln.

America needs in Congress, in the councils of the party and from Rhode Island, men of high courage and clear vision; men who do not merely occupy a political job but who feel that they have a higher and more sacred service to render; America needs a Congress whose Members consider themselves priests in the temple of legislation, selected to serve at her altars and aid in her administration; America needs a Republican Party in office that thinks of democracy, not as a symbol but as a sure shield of protection. It needs a party that will maintain and defend at all times the inalienable rights of life, labor, and property, upon which the safety of government depends, against the encroachments of dictators, either domestic or foreign. It needs a party in power now and in the days to come with enough of the courage, vision, and leadership of Lincoln, as will see to it that this form of government shall not perish from the earth.

Letter to the London Daily Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 17, 1944.

The AMERICAN EDITOR,
Trans-Atlantic Division,
The London Daily Mail,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have read with amazement, if not chagrin, the article entitled, "Snap Judgment Won't Do on Palestine," one of George Murray's weekly commentaries from the London Daily Mail. I suspected when the microfilm edition of the Daily Mail was to be published in the United States that it was to be done for propaganda purposes. To say the least, English public relations in the United States have been for many years abominable. For example, the hostility of the great bulk of Irish-Americans in the United States has never been assuaged. The British Information service and other agencies have been eminently unsuccessful in that regard. The weekly editions of the Daily Mail will likewise be as useless as slops going down the drain, if it offers such inane and ridiculous propaganda as that of its correspondent George Murray. The same appears on page 6 of the American edition of the weekly digest of the Daily Mail dated Wednesday, February 2, 1944. It attempts to justify the British white paper. It attempts to justify the adamant and cold-blooded attitude of the British Colonial Office toward the Jews in Palestine. It speaks of pledges given to the Arabs and specifically mentions the so-called McMahon pledge, and implies that it offered independence to the Arabs and that the position of the Jews and Arabs in Palestine rests on that pledge.

That conclusion is as false as a theatrical storm. As far as Palestine is concerned, it was promised only once, and then to one people only—namely, the Jews. That promise is involved in the Balfour Declaration of 1917. This declaration was abetted and accepted by 52 nations, including the United States, and was interpreted at the time of its issuance as a pledge to set up a national homeland for the Jews. The Arabs were aware of this. Not a word of protest was voiced against the declaration by any Arab inside of Palestine, or outside of Palestine. Mr. Murray and the British Colonial Office now create a dust storm to confuse the issues.

As to the McMahon pledge made to the Arabs as a condition precedent for their going into the war against Turkey, not one mention was made therein of Palestine.

The pledge of independence of Arabs was limited by McMahon to Arab territory exclusive of French interests in Syria, and Palestine was administratively a part of Syria. Furthermore, if Mr. Murray knew his business, he would have consulted the life and letters of Sir Henry McMahon. The latter wrote, under date of March 12, 1922, a letter to the British Government wherein he stated that Palestine was to be excluded from the area of Arab independence. He wrote another letter to the editor of the London Times on July 23, 1937, when he said, "I feel it my duty to state, and do so definitely and emphatically, that it was not intended by me in giving this pledge [of independence] to King Hussein to include Palestine in the area in which Arab independence was promised."

What about the pledge that England gave to the United States in the form of a treaty of 1924, wherein England agreed that there were to be no restrictions on immigration into Palestine on the grounds of race or religion? The Malcolm MacDonald white paper of 1939 does restrict immigration on the grounds of race and religion. Jews are barlocked after April 1, 1944.

What about the concurrent resolution of Congress adopted in 1922, favoring the Balfour Declaration as the basis for ceding of Palestine to Great Britain as a mandatory power? England thus flouts the Congress of the United States. It sells Palestine down the river as a Jewish homeland. It would freeze the Jews in Palestine as a permanent ghetto. Arabs may come in without hindrance. Also the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League not only refused consent to the white paper, but condemned it.

I warn Britain that she is only a trustee of Palestine. She does not own it. At the next peace conference it will be wrested from her unless she acts as an honorable trustee and not as a highway robber that puts a gun at the head of the cestui que trust.

The British Cabinet itself felt that this proposed solution for the future of Palestine was not based on the merits of the case when it issued the white paper. It was based rather on political expediency. This is evident from a statement reputedly made by Lord Halifax, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, now British Ambassador here, that "there are times when ethical considerations must yield to practical necessity." That is a fine bit of sophistry. If such practical necessity may be deemed just, I say "there is a point beyond which even justice becomes unjust."

Winston Churchill called the debate on the white paper in 1939 a melancholy occasion and that the paper itself was like the filing of a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy, and that it was a breach of trust. He said, "How can he find it in his heart to strike them [Jews] this mortal blow?"

No amount of palaver or balderdash in the Daily Mail can justify this white paper. The Daily Mail must think we are a bunch of infants in America and need her as a wet nurse. The Daily Mail had better change its tactics else there will be trouble and plenty of it.

In a little over 1 month, Jews will be barred from Palestine. How ill have the Jews used Palestine that now the one open door must be slammed shut in their search for dignity and security? Indeed, they husbanded its arid soil, made it rich in the fruits of the earth. They built hospitals for Jews and Arabs alike. They brought music and science that had been left behind in civilization's march.

The British Colonial Office says, "Let the Jews go elsewhere." That is said in mocking parallel to, "Let them eat cake."

Many suggestions have been made for havens for Jews. How fruitful were these suggestions is revealed by the attitude tersely expressed by the Australian delegate at the refugee conference at Evian. "Gentlemen," he said, "we in Australia have no racial problem, thank God. We do not intend to have one started." That summation is brilliant in its brevity, finality, and tragedy. Palestine is the only place where the Jews are not

unwanted. Now, the white paper even precludes. Palestine must be opened as a temporary as well as a permanent shelter. It has an absorptive capacity for 2,000,000 more Jews. Be it remembered that shortly before the signing of the mandate a statement of policy was issued on June 3, 1922, by Winston Churchill, then Secretary for Colonies, in which the principle of absorptive capacity was set up as the sole criterion for immigration into Palestine. The white paper sets up another but illegal-amoral standard. Jews trapped by the Nazi jackals will manage to escape if they know Palestine is open. The underground will help them, just as our underground railway helped escaping slaves to the North before and during the Civil War.

Jews will make the anabasis to Palestine. No matter how perilous the trek may be, they will make it. Their nostalgia for their homeland will sustain them, and they will go rejoicing and singing into Zion.

Among the real pleasures of Winston Churchill was his tender care for his 10,000 tropical fish which he maintained in several ponds on his estate at Chartwell Manor. In peaceful times he used to watch them for hours, feed them, and call some of them by names. He remembered them when Hitler's attacks on man and beast in England grew ever more ruthless. As First Lord of the Admiralty he took care to have them removed to safer ponds.

I petition Churchill to have the white paper (a real cataract of disaster to humans) abrogated so as many as possible of the Jews be taken from Hitler's cesspools of iniquity and death and removed to safer "ponds."

While the Palestinian Jews fought and died and worked and produced for the Allied cause, the Arabs would not even give as much as a donkey or camel to aid the Allied soldiers. The open hostility of the Arabs to the Allied fighters is no secret; the treachery of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and the revolt in Iraq are known. Yet, the British Government, called to Cairo to decide the fate of Palestine, the Prime Minister of Iraq, a country that had to be beaten into submission a few months before the call, representatives of Ibn Saud, who waited until the tide turned to declare himself friend, Abdullah, Emir of Trans-Jordan, as well as King Farouk of Egypt—all were and are openly pro-Axis. The Egyptian prime minister was even caught betraying British military secrets to Axis headquarters in Tobruk.

These are the Arabs that the British Colonial Office sought to appease with the white paper. Munich did not appease the Nazis and the white paper has not even appeased the Arabs. It has only whetted their appetite for more appeasement. There is an old saying that comes out of the East: "Appease a rascal as you will; he was and is a rascal still."

The Daily Mail has asked for this and it is getting it. In the above discussion it is not my purpose to create disunity among the Allies. I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The common man in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by this greatest scourge in civilized history. I repeat my avowal of admiration for England's saintly sacrifices that have saved us and the world. But how reconcile that with her attitude toward Palestine? A halo need slip but a few inches to become a noose. "Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies," said Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, "even during the heat of war are not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy."

I am reminded of Pierre van Paassen's paraphrase of Erasmus, "Angliae amicus sed magis justiae."—"I am a friend of England, but I am still a greater friend of justice."

The MacDonald white paper must be set aside. Great Britain must open Palestine to mass Jewish immigration at once; otherwise, Europe becomes a massive Jewish sepulcher.

Yours very truly,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Coming Events Cast Their Shadows Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I am glad to see the recognition given to France by our great war President in the presentation of a destroyer escort to that great nation.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I would like to have printed in the RECORD the newspaper story on this event from the Washington Herald of Sunday, February 13, 1944, as follows:

F. D. RENEWS PROMISE TO FREE FRANCE—PRESIDENT GIVES SHIP TO OCCUPIED NATION

(By Virginia Pasley)

President Roosevelt, reaffirming this country's determination to drive from the soil of France the Nazi invaders who today swagger down the Champ Elysees in Paris, transferred a destroyer escort, the *Senegalais*, to the French Navy under lend-lease.

In a speech made at ceremonies in the Washington Navy Yard and carried over the radio, the President added a new sequence to the "Lafayette we are here" legend of World War No. 1 by calling the warship presented yesterday a form of reverse lend-lease for help in Revolutionary times.

SHIP WAS FRENCH GIFT

"At that time, instead of France receiving an American-made ship," the President declared, "the young Nation of the United States was glad to receive a ship made in France by Frenchmen—the *Bon Homme Richard*—a ship made illustrious under the command of John Paul Jones, in the days of our Navy's infancy."

As he turned the vessel over to Vice Admiral Fenard, chief of the French naval mission here, the President also recalled "That it was a French ship which fired the first salute ever rendered to the Stars and Stripes flying from a United States man-of-war."

"We remember that salute," the President said, "and symbolically return it."

In his short address the President noted that while "The land of France fell to the enemy" it was not so with the ships of France, which today proudly "fly the tricolor in battle against the common enemy."

TIME WILL SOON COME

Then referring to the coming invasion, Roosevelt declared that the time will soon come "when the Nazis in France will learn from millions of brave Frenchmen—now underground—that the people of France, also, are not all out of this war."

The President pointed out that this ship will be followed by others for French sailors to man and was but one transfer among thousands under lend-lease which are bringing closer the day of inevitable victory over our enemies on all the fronts all over the world.

"I hope that the Nazis and Japs are listening today as we make this transfer," the President asserted. "For it will help them better to understand the spirit and determination which binds together all of the fighting fleets and armies of the United Nations on the road to ultimate victory."

Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware, Before Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a brilliant address delivered by the eminent Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] before the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware, at Wilmington, Del., on February 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a good deal of diffidence that I approach a subject with which the great majority of my audience are entirely familiar, and have a greater knowledge than I could possibly have. Poland, the land of your ancestors, is unfortunate in that it has been placed between two larger nations, each at times having plans that were inconsistent with the territorial integrity of Poland or the sovereignty of its government. With a population of approximately 35,000,000 people, it has few natural boundaries that can serve as any protection to its territory. Its population is large for its territory. Its population and the natural resources of the country have been a continuous temptation to Germany and Russia. The population of Poland is a dense one. There are 233 Poles to the square mile. The country has 11 cities each with a population of 100,000 or more. By comparison we might remember that we have nearly 3,000,000 square miles of area and 130,000,000 people, or approximately 44 persons to the square mile. We have an immense country thinly populated. It might be of interest for us to remind ourselves that every man, woman, and child in the United States could be placed in the State of Texas, and each assigned one and one-half acres of land. It is an interesting fact with reference to Poland that its population in the last 10 years prior to this war increased 4,600,000 and the population of Germany, which is twice as large, increased only 3,500,000.

For 1,100 years, the problems of Poland have been the problems of civilization. Perhaps to a greater extent now than ever before, these problems enter into a complex world situation in a vital manner. At this time its citizens are aiding in every possible way the military efforts of the Allied nations. Its leaders have recognized that the freedom of its people is involved in the larger problem of the freedom of the world. These leaders have rightly determined to cast their lot insofar as it is possible for them to do so with the nations that have the same objective as they. The success of the totalitarian powers in this war would automatically eliminate any hope of self-government for Poland. Thus it became apparent to those

leaders that the Nazi Powers should be overcome in order to make possible any government of themselves by the citizens of Poland. Unfortunately, there is also the problem of Russia-Poland relationship which enters into the problem when Germany shall be defeated. The Russia-Poland question cannot be settled now. Premier Sikorski in 1942 at the inaugural session of the Polish National Council in London said, "The Polish Government was the first to stretch out its hand to Soviet Russia, proposing friendship." Gen. W. Anders, commander in chief of the Polish Army in Russia, at Moscow in 1941, said, "Our relations with the Red Army are very friendly. I am confident that the comradeship now existing between the Polish and Russian Armies will cement a lasting friendship between the two nations." Premier Sikorski, at the Princeton Club in New York, on March 30, 1942, said, "Soviet Russia was treacherously attacked by the Third Reich. But Russia is fighting heroically, and she will continue to fight valiantly. Soviet Russia therefore must be helped honestly and thoroughly, quickly and effectively."

The Atlantic Monthly in July 1943 said, "The American Poles have responded to this call 100 percent. Answering our President's plea to buy War stamps and bonds they buy them every day, every week, and every month. The Polish workers of America do their utmost to help Russia in her struggle with the Nazi armies. All the Poles are in the gallant battle on the civilian front and a great percentage of them is in the American, Canadian, and Polish armies to support the United Nations' victory effort with guns."

The events that are occurring in the war zones are in line with the victories that must be won for Poland to be recognized as an independent government and its people permitted to be restored to a control of that government. But even the success of allied armies does not necessarily guarantee a happy solution to this problem. However, at the conclusion of World War No. 2 there will be no more pressing or vital question than will be the freedom of Poland. Its history, its population, its location, and its record in this war will combine to make a sensible solution of its problem a world problem. There can be no permanent, satisfactory solution of world problems that leaves unsettled the problem of Poland. For after all, the things that Poland is demanding are the things for which the Allied Governments stand. In the Atlantic Charter, agreed upon by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on August 14, 1941, it was agreed that: First, our countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; second, they desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. The Allied Governments stand for self-government by small nations as well as large, by small populations as well as those of overpowering numbers. However, if the people of the United States of America and their allies succeed in establishing the principle that all nations, large or small, are entitled to a government of their own choosing, the Polish people must be no exception to this rule. For if there is an exception as to these 35,000,000 people, the principle will not have been established and the democracies of the world will have failed to secure a guaranty of self-government, to separate peoples who have constituted separate nations for more than a thousand years. There is no fundamental difference between the problem of Poland and the problem of the United States of America. The establishment of the principles of democracy is necessary to the liberties of both.

It is useless for me to remind this audience of the lives and accomplishments of such men as Copernicus who was able to become the founder of modern astronomy without having a telescope, Kosciuszko who was such a valiant fighter for the freedom of Poland as well as of America, Pulaski who was a contemporary and colleague of Kosciuszko in both Poland and America. I need not remind you of Chopin, the greatest Polish musical composer. The name of Paderewski, diplomat and pianist, stands as a shining light in the world of music. There is also Pilsudski, one of the great names of all history, patriot, reformer, warrior, and creator of modern Poland. The Poles who have distinguished themselves in the world progress are legion.

We in America are desirous of maintaining the "four freedoms" of speech, of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Many of you realize perhaps more clearly than I do the great freedom of speech which we have in America. This becomes clearer by comparison. How long would one who criticized the government of Hitler in Germany be permitted to go at large? Yet, in America every act of the Government, in many instances even the acts of war, are the subject of adverse and frequently unfair criticisms. And yet that is one of the basic principles upon which democracy rests. If the average man cannot speak and discuss the things with which he is dissatisfied, he has lost one of the freedoms for which your ancestors and mine came to America. I heard Quentin Reynolds a few days ago say that he heard a soldier boy in Europe tell of what he wanted when he came home. He said he wanted a job, he wanted good wages, he wanted a raise in his wages when he deserved it, he wanted the right and liberty to go to a baseball game when the occasion arises. He said he wanted the right to throw a pop bottle at the referee if he was dissatisfied with the decision. That boy understood the very fundamentals of freedom. He wanted a right to protest on anything and about anything that did not interfere with the general good of his Nation, and which he conceived to be for the interest of himself individually. Any interference with freedom of speech strikes directly at governmental freedom. According to our system of government, we have a right to protest. We have a right to petition. We have a right to vote and express our protest. Much of this comes under the general heading of freedom of speech.

Then there is the freedom of religion. The millions of those who have come to America in order to enjoy freedom of worship are almost untold. Those who have sought to establish the totalitarian system of government have tried to destroy freedom of religion as one of the ways of striking most effectually at democracy. In America we think of the Huguenots and Quakers, the Catholics, the Jews, and many others who have left their homes in order to worship God as they pleased. They have left civilization and its luxuries and settled in American forests and on American prairies for the privilege of worshiping God as they pleased and as their conscience dictated. It is one of the most fundamental of the privileges for which man has an innate craving.

Again, there is the freedom from want. We in America have been spoiled. We have had a continent of natural wealth. We have had our forests, our mines, our great water power, our fertile soil. There has been from the early days of America a freedom from want. Want has only come when civilization has crowded man into compact cities. There is very little want in America today. But we have known within the last 15 years what freedom from want means. We have seen our men and women suffering for the lack of jobs. We have seen our banks closed. We have seen our mortgages foreclosed. We have seen our farms sold for debt. I am one of those who believe that freedom from want is a possibility, and when we are cursed with want in America it indicates that there is bad management in our governmental or economic affairs.

Again, we must have freedom from fear. No nation on the face of this earth has had more reason to know the curse of fear than the nation from which you have descended. Polish people have never known when a new impulse on the part of either Germany or Russia would take from them their freedom. This fear has not been confined to the smaller nations. Twice within a little more than a quarter of a century the large nations as well as the small have seen their liberties threatened, their homes destroyed, their business wiped out by combinations of governments ambitious to grasp and eliminate all that is dear to the individual. When this war ends there must be some guaranty to the nations of the world, including not only Poland but nations such as the United States, that we shall not again have our peace interrupted, our sons drafted, our estates dissipated, our homes wrecked by threats on the part of ambitious nations or combinations of nations to control the destinies of mankind. We in America must endeavor to establish the freedoms necessary to happiness and prosperity in lands less able to compel a respect for their rights and liberties. In America those rights must be guarded at all times.

A continuation of the rights of man in America is not automatic. We have just seen a struggle growing out of a lack of confidence in democracy in the Senate of the United States in the last few weeks. I am a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the United States Senate. Our Government has sent our young men to the far corners of the earth. A simple bill was offered permitting the boys wherever they were to vote for the President of the United States and Senators and Representatives in Congress. Never was a bill more desperately fought than has this bill been fought by those who lacked confidence in democracy. We were told that the boys cared nothing about voting. We were told that they would be forced to vote for the Commander in Chief. We were told that they would be marched to the polls and voted in bulk. We were told that they would not vote intelligently. Mr. EASTLAND, who introduced the so-called States rights bill told us plainly that his object was to maintain white supremacy. Those who were making this fight for white supremacy were aided in the struggle by those who fear that the vote of the servicemen would be for President Roosevelt. They fear the vote of the servicemen from a political standpoint. Each of these classes in my opinion was exhibiting a lack of confidence in democracy, for without the opportunity to vote democracy does not and cannot function. The bill which was so desperately fought in no way interfered with any effort on the part of the States to send ballots to the men in uniform throughout the world, so that on local matters the boys could also vote.

The Federal Government has no authority to provide for State ballots. Yet, those who have fought this attempt to cause democracy to function fought the Federal ballot even though there was a provision in the Federal ballot bill that if a man should vote a State ballot and also the Federal ballot, the State ballot should be the one counted. The Army and Navy made it clear to the Members of Congress that they were willing to aid in the delivery of ballots for the States throughout the world. They did say that with 10,000 changes in address each day, and with men in uniform on the seas and scattered throughout the world the probability of the delivery of postals asking for ballots, the delivery of the ballot from the various States to the soldiers and sailors, and the delivery of the voted ballot became a long and in most instances an almost impossible process. With probably 20,000 different kinds of ballots to be delivered to 11,000,000 men in uniform, each to

receive a ballot from his particular precinct, and delivery back to that precinct, there was an almost impossible task to perform.

But America will survive. Democracy will function, and each separate attack upon democracy and upon its functioning will be met and defeated by those like you and me who know the history of the struggle for self-government by the peoples of the world. There is in every red-blooded American who has confidence in the Stars and Stripes, in the Constitution of the United States, and in the innate integrity of the manhood and womanhood in America, not only a confidence but a determination that democracy shall work. Democracy shall function, and liberty shall exist and be transmitted by the American of today to his children and grandchildren of tomorrow. Each new question that arises will bring to the fore a specific instance of the success of Americans in their determination to cause democracy to function.

Bobtailed Soldiers' Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the bobtailed ballot or the so-called official Federal ballot provided for in the so-called Lucas-Worley bill.

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

Instruction.—To vote, write in the name of the candidate for your choice for each office

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President. [ ]

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(ONLY if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator. [ ]

UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM

(ONLY if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator. [ ]

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district. [ ]

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

(ONLY in the States entitled thereto)

Vote for one or two as the case may be

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large. [ ] [ ]

I call attention to the fact that this ballot does not contain the name of a single candidate for President, Vice President, Representative in Congress, or United States Senator; that it makes no provision whatsoever for the members of our armed forces, using such a ballot, to vote for any State, county, or other local official.

I call attention to the further fact that it makes no provisions for the members of our armed forces, using such a ballot, to vote for Presidential electors, as the Constitution requires; nor does it make any provision for their voting in the primary.

On the other hand, the bill which we propose, S. 1285, as amended by the House, would leave the election machinery in the hands of the States, and every member of our armed forces would be provided with a ballot enabling him to vote for everything from President, including Presidential electors, down to constable, in a constitutional election.

I repeat what I said before, that the passage of the Lucas-Worley bill would do more to break down constitutional government and to destroy the rights of the States than anything else that has been done by Congress in the last 150 years.

Our boys are fighting to protect American institutions on every battle front in the world; and it is our duty to preserve those institutions at home.

Oil for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have depleted our oil reserves, and have just finished aiding in the depletion of our financial resources, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "Oil for Tomorrow," by William Philip Simms, of which I wish to read one paragraph:

Last Friday, President Roosevelt warned the country that it was running out of oil. Secretary Ickes says that at the present rate of production our reserves may not last longer than 20 or 25 years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL FOR TOMORROW

(By William Philip Simms)

Thunderheads are already gathering on the horizon, although we have barely begun looking abroad for the necessary oil to conserve our dwindling reserves. Even some of our allies—for whom our supplies, in part, at least, are being depleted—seem to be eyeing us suspiciously.

Hardly had Petroleum Administrator Ickes announced the project for a 1,200-mile pipe line across Arabia than Foreign Secretary Eden was plied with questions in the House of Commons. Members wanted to know if the United States would acquire extraterritorial rights along the right-of-way. Had the British Government been consulted? Would it be consulted? What about the proposed senatorial committee to study American oil policy? Would Mr. Eden report on these things soon?

This gives a hint of what lies ahead if we seriously start acquiring foreign fields to take the place of those at home now going dry. And start we must. If we fail, we court swift and terrible defeat in our next major war.

Last Friday, President Roosevelt warned the country that it was running out of oil. Secretary Ickes says that at the present rate of consumption our reserves may not last longer than 20 or 25 years. But our oil consumption is far from static; it has been mounting dizzily for years. We now consume approximately two-thirds of the total world production.

In the past 165 years, we have been involved in seven major conflicts—two of them world wars. That means an average of one every 25 years. And despite all the talk of a brave new world tomorrow, few realists expect mankind suddenly to reform. In any event, we can't count on the coming of any such millennium. It's up to us, therefore, to make certain of the national defense and its most vital need, namely, oil, a dearth of which we may expect 25 years hence, just when, judging by the past, we may expect just as we enter another war.

Mere possession of oil fields in the Middle East, however, is no guaranty. If we run through with our supply at home, we may find ourselves cut off from our foreign sources when our national life depends on them. Washington has not forgotten the U-boats nor the lesson of rubber. We never lacked for rubber as long as we had peace, but the day after Pearl Harbor we suddenly found ourselves up against it. Even now our synthetic-rubber production is only beginning to satisfy essential requirements.

According to the experts, the United States must make certain of access to oil reserves abroad as conveniently located as possible; conserve a domestic supply adequate to take care of future military, industrial, and civilian needs in time of possible crisis; plan well ahead for utilizing its vast oil-bearing shale deposits should an unforeseen emergency require

Failure, say those who ought to know, might be fatal. And it is to head off disaster that wheels have now been set in motion.

But there is reason to believe that it will not be easy sailing. Obstacles may be placed in our way. And this, say diplomatists, is the time to overcome them—not after our need becomes so urgent that we can be forced to pay through the nose for what we must have.

Resolution of Conference of American Small Business Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the conference of American small business organizations at Washington, D. C., on February 1, 1944:

"Whereas the small merchants, retail dealers, and manufacturers of the Nation represent a vitally important segment of the economic life; and

"Whereas these small businesses are in the aggregate large taxpayers, employers of millions of citizens, contributors to the morale and life of their communities; and

"Whereas these same groups maintain real-estate values, develop and attract patronage for the members of the professions and otherwise serve the farmer, laboring man, and citizen; and

"Whereas the welfare and destiny of the people of this Nation, especially small business, are seriously threatened by the tax exemptions, and preferential privileges granted to cooperative organizations by the Government and to Government owned, operated, or subsidized businesses; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America stands for equality of taxes for all competitive business enterprises, whether they be publicly or privately owned: Be it

Resolved, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be and they are hereby authorized to appoint a joint committee of the Senate and House to investigate the financing and operation of Government owned or subsidized organizations and such other agencies which compete with private business; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee shall be composed of seven members, no more than four of whom shall be from one political party; be it further

Resolved, That said committee shall report and recommend to the Congress at the earliest possible date such remedial legislation looking toward the elimination of all discriminatory privileges, subsidies, preference in handling Government business, promotional services, and propaganda provided by governmental agencies which compete with private business."

The foregoing resolution was recommended by the conference of American Small Business Organizations at Washington, D. C., on February 1, 1944, to the favorable consideration of the Congress of the United States.

LOUIS E. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Competition.

Farm Wage Ceiling Set at $2,400

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, there are so many bureaus and agencies in Washington seeking to regulate the agricultural industry that it is timely to consider the views and reactions of farm leaders. The Grange is a spokesman for the organized farmers and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Idaho Granger:

FARM WAGE CEILING SET AT $2,400

The Government has set the new ceiling on farm wages at $2,400 a year and many farmers who employ labor are being approached by their help asking for increased rates and an upping to this ceiling.

With prices of farm products frozen under ceilings, and with agencies kicking the "floor" out from under farm prices, the question of where the farmer "gets off" is becoming of supreme importance.

It is well for every farmer to remember that the parity price on farm products does not include the allowance for wages paid by the farmer. In other words, agriculture is the only business that must operate on a basis of not including in its costs the amount paid for labor. And now, the ceiling on farm wages is set up to $2,400 a year.

Why shouldn't the consumer pay for the costs of producing his food the same as he pays for the labor that goes into producing his liquors and other necessities of life?

Why should the farmer have to have his floors kicked out from under the prices he receives for his products, then not allowed to charge for his labor in his selling prices, and then have some starry-eyed bunch of wise men at Washington set the ceiling on farm wages at $2,400 a year?

Then to cap it all off, we now have a lot of fellows drawing pay from the Federal pocketbook, running about the State saying it is necessary to impose subsidies on farm products.

The boys fighting our battles, bleeding and dying for $50 a month, are being asked by these economists to pay for the folderol of such a program as listed above.

No wonder the reports coming from the boys at the front are those of disgust and discouragement.

What a picture of incompetence, ignorance, and downright crookedness we must make to those boys lying out in fox holes, bitten by insects, drenched by torrential rains, sleeping in fetid-putrid water, and, between snipers' bullets and bomb bursts, they read such a story.

What they will do and say when they return will be of great interest to those who are fettering future generations with such blunders and plans for mortgaging future generations.

The American farmer has not laid down on the boys. He has not gone on strike or threatened to go on strike. He has not worked on a 40-hour week nor got overtime for all over 40 hours.

The American farmer, his wife, and children have put in 80 hours a week and have produced the greatest crops on record. They have done it with less outside labor and with less machinery and machine repairs than ever before.

The American farmer has not stabbed the boys in the back.

The American farmer has made his outstanding record in spite of governmental interference and bungling.

And now, as a reward for being a good and faithful servant, he is now advised by his Washington employees that the ceiling on farm wages for 1944 is $2,400 a year.

Such a fantastic tale could only originate in Washington.

Union Dues for Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD H. McLEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Elizabeth Daily Journal, of Elizabeth, N. J., in its issue of February 15, 1944. The editorial relates to the demand for the payment of union dues by German prisoners of war employed on farms in southern New Jersey.

This situation is comparable to that which developed last summer in the same area when soldiers from Fort Dix were employed in an emergency to save the tomato crop and were compelled to pay union dues.

UNION DUES FOR PRISONERS

There is something incongruous about making prisoners of war pay union dues for the privilege of keeping themselves busy during their confinement. The problem has arisen in South Jersey where a number of German prisoners are engaged at Seabrook farms helping to prune fruit trees and harvest crops that otherwise might go to waste. But the president of the Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America has raised the issue and the right solution is yet to be found.

Incidentally, one is impressed with the fact that men engaged in tree pruning are included in a butchers' union. We have often heard of the so-called pruners butchering trees, but this is the first time the pruning has been actually so designated.

As for the prisoners, they know nothing about our unions. They are in no position to receive benefits from the dues paid. It may be countered that the men themselves do not pay as they receive regular prisoners' wages of 80 cents a day while the company employing them pays 50 cents an hour. The difference goes to the Government, so it is the Government that is out the amount of the dues. In other words, Uncle Sam pays dues into a labor union in order that prisoners of war may work.

The whole thing looks a little too much like labor leaders being mainly interested in money coming into the treasury to build up funds for which no accounting is required under the present set-up. In wartime when the armed forces are taking so many real union men so that there are not enough left to do the work required, labor leaders would do well to overlook a little irregularity like the South Jersey situation, and charge up whatever disadvantage it may be to the union to labor's contribution to the war effort.

Soldier Vote Conference Committee Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, soldiers want to vote. I have frequently said on the floor of the House and in my remarks that they are first concerned with winning the war; however, they want to vote, too, if an easy and simple method of voting is provided. The Worley-Green-Lucas Federal ballot meets the soldiers' needs. I am happy to include in my remarks an editorial sent by Lt. Burton Duke, a paratrooper, to his aunt, Mrs. M. J. Anthony, 2135 Galbreth Road, Pasadena, Calif., which article appeared in the Static Line, published by the Five Hundred and Forty-first Parachute Infantry Regiment, Camp Mackall, N. C., indicating how soldiers feel about voting:

SOLDIERS' VOTE

Nineteen forty-four is election year. At present chances for the citizen-soldier to participate in the elections in November are slight.

Distribution of ballots is handled by the States. Under most State laws absentee voting requires a lot of red tape. Some States have no provisions at all for absentee voting.

All States are late in setting up effective machinery for the handling of soldiers' ballots.

This situation requires immediate and effective remedy. We believe that a bill authorizing the War and Navy Departments to distribute and handle soldiers' ballots would be the best solution.

Some people, however, prefer to ignore the issue, or even to block attempts at its solution. They are afraid of the soldiers' vote. But they should learn from this war, if they are still able to learn, that robbing people of their opportunity to govern themselves peacefully just doesn't pay.

Men of power and influence who denied others the chance to vote are being outvoted today by people all over the world. And they are being outvoted not by paper ballots, but by steel, fire, and blood.

Stalin Makes the Peace Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Makes the Peace Terms," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 15 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN MAKES THE PEACE TERMS

Secretary Hull has told Finland to sue for peace, make terms with Russia, and get out of the war or take the consequences. Four years ago when Finland, having been attacked by its big neighbor, was forced to surrender territory, it had the sympathy of what are called the liberty loving lands. Even Mr. Roosevelt, moved by the public indignation here, made his only severe remarks about Mr. Stalin, and quickly forgot them.

Four years ago the Soviets had absorbed the little Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The gloss on the picture was a plebiscite such as Hitler used to make the rape of Austria seem a consent arrangement. Here again it was thought in what are called the liberty loving lands that the rights of peaceable small peoples had been outraged. Stalin had also divided Poland with Germany, taking over his share in agreement with Hitler.

At the time there were no mixed feelings in this country regarding these aggressions. The American Communists thought they were sanctified. The rest of the people thought they were terrible It is a giddy change of position for this country when Mr. Hull throws Finland to Russia. It's a hard case, to be sure, and the Russians in Leningrad have reason to know the Finns as enemies. But in the war the Finns made their own hard choice and took the course they thought would protect their freedom.

It is to be observed that we did not offer to get bearable terms for the little republic from our ally Russia, but although not at war with Finland, treated it as if it had no excuse for its conduct. That is a violent reversion of attitude. Surely the principles involved have not changed so greatly in 4 years. If the Finns had a leg to stand on then they must have at least a crutch now.

Russia, by great victories, is advancing to the frontiers it held when all moral judgment was against it. Now the official moral judgment is for it. Stalin 4 years ago was a reprobate. Now he is a great liberal. If our moralists would publicly confess that military necessity goads them to surrender we'd all concede that they are in a tough spot. Mr. Churchill has been a changed man since the Teheran Conference and it took more than pneumonia to do that. Stalin smiled at the British Premier and the American Chief Executive. He may have been much amused by the position in which he found his good friends.

Post-war conditions in half of Europe are being determined now by the gentlemen in the Kremlin, without regard for promises of cooperation in settling peace terms. Britain's 20-year treaty with Russia is just what Mr. Churchill can manage to make of it, and that may not be much. Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Jugoslavia know the terms. They are all to be included, either within the Soviet Union or within its influence, and many of them will be under the economic system of the hammer and sickle. Czechoslovakia has freely consented to an alliance. Its experience with the guaranties of the Western Powers was not happy.

Half the map of Europe after the war can be drawn now. Stalin has dictated it and the victorious Russian armies will make good. To this extent the peace conference will be simplified. Most of the vexatious questions already have been decided by one man. We might as well begin to take down the sales signs. Most of the transactions have been concluded. Even Germany may escape the peace table discussion by accepting what Stalin has to offer.

In an off moment Mr. Roosevelt confessed a slight dubiety. It isn't going to be so easy for American politicians to ignore the sentiments of national groups here. Mr. Browder and his new cultural institution will not offset the votes of Americans attached to the countries which the "four freedoms" missed.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday will be Martha Washington's husband's birthday.

The milk subsidy has been costing the Government $20,000,000 per month.

"Lincoln faced secession of the States. In our time we have seen abdication by the States."—Dewey.

The farmers' eternal and basic desire is only for a fair price in an open market and without subsidies, Mr. and Mrs. Consumer.

Alf Landon, speaking last week in the shadows of Andrew Johnson and Andrew Jackson, made the best speeches of his life, all Tennesseans say who heard him.

Kansas "Nudealers" and fourth term Democrats will break bread on February 22.

We will read again the Farewell Address in the House here. What a people we are to follow a habit.

The upper Missouri River people want irrigation, the lower people want a 9-foot channel and the cities want flood control. We are looking for a Henry Clay or a Robert Taft.

The bond drive army held their beachhead and took a mountain or two. While gas and tires may gradually tighten, the American people will accept any sacrifices so long as their soldier boys are over there.

F. D. R.'s near hysterical desire for a soldier ballot for President, when a candidate himself, and while their Commander in Chief, is no more fervent than was his denunciation of a proposal to allow the soldiers' parents to vote on the sending of these boys to foreign soil to fight.

The Nation paused a moment in respect to Stephen Hopkins, the 18 year old, and his group with their luck. Let us repeat with Randolph Harrison McKim—

> Not for fame or reward,
> Not for place or for rank,
> Not lured by ambition,
> Or goaded by necessity,
> But in simple obedience to duty,
> As they understood it,
> These men suffered all, sacrificed all,
> Dared all—and died.

Address by Lothair Teetor, President of Perfect Circle Co., of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Lothair Teetor, president of Perfect Circle Co., of Indiana, delivered an address to employees, in which he set forth some vital facts which relate to both employer and employee. His address is both sound and constructive. It is my hope that all may read his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therewith the splendid address made by Mr. Teetor, who resides in the congressional district which I have the profound honor to represent.

The address follows:

The purpose of this message is to talk about the future. Of course, that is a pretty big subject and I do not intend to cover all phases of it, but I do want to tell you what we think about the future for business generally and Perfect Circle in particular.

As long as the war lasts there isn't much question what the future of industry must be. Most of American industry will continue to make the implements of war. There will be cut-backs in some of the programs, increases in others. But over all, there must be greater production of war materials in 1944 than in 1943. It is true that some materials will probably be released for the production of civilian products, but this does not mean that we have produced an abundance of war materials and we can now slow down a bit. That is the thing about which Generals Marshall and Eisenhower and MacArthur are quite fearful. They know the war is not over yet by a long ways. They know that most of

our war plants must continue to turn out war materials at increasing rates. There can not be a let-down in our individual efforts now. We have too many boys across the seas who are depending on American industry to produce the airplanes, the ships, the trucks, the guns, the ammunition, and the food to permit us to think of slowing up now.

And we must never forget that Perfect Circle plants are war plants—100 percent war plants. Every ring we make either goes into a military machine, or into some domestic truck or automobile or engine that is used in producing military goods. It is true our aircraft program has been cut back, but our truck and replacement ring programs have been greatly increased.

And while we are on the subject of the immediate future, I would like to give the correct answer to a few questions that seem to be bothering some of our Perfect Circle folks. The report still persists that our war business is on a cost-plus basis—that we are not particularly interested in costs, because the more a thing costs, the more profit we make, due to profit being figured as a percentage of cost. Let me say to you, there is not one word of truth in such a statement. Every order that this company has ever had was accepted at a definite price per ring. It is up to us to make a profit, if we can, from the price we quote.

As a matter of fact, I haven't heard of cost-plus contracts for any war material. That plan was so abused in the last war that it was not even started in this war. The plan quite generally used has been the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract in which the contractor collects his cost plus a definite profit per ship, or per bullet, or per piece. The profit remains the same regardless of cost, so there is no incentive to increase cost to increase the profit. But no Perfect Circle orders are even on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

Another statement which seems to be repeated with surprising regularity and inaccuracy is this: "The owners of the company make $2 for every $1 paid to employees in wages." When I hear these things I can scarcely believe my ears, for we have conscientiously tried to give our employees the facts regarding the distribution of the income of this business. Now here are the facts on dividends and wages. In 1943 Perfect Circle stockholders received 3 cents for every dollar paid out in wages. In 1942 they received 5 cents for every dollar paid out in wages. In 1941 it was 10 cents.

You might also be interested in knowing that dividends to stockholders have remained the same since 1938 with the exception of 1942 when payments were reduced. Salaries to directors have not been changed for the last 4 years.

In the farm industry it is customary for the man who owns the farm to make as much from his investment as the man who does the work, but that is not true in manufacturing. In manufacturing, the investors seldom receive more than 12 cents for every dollar paid to workers.

And the last statement that we are beginning to hear with greater frequency is this: "There is going to be a big depression following the war and industry isn't doing anything about it."

Let's break this statement down into its parts. First about the depression. Most businessmen don't expect a big depression following this war. There may be a short period of unemployment during reconversion of factories back to peacetime products, but it should not last long. Some businessmen expect a tremendous boom to follow the war and give statistics to prove it. I don't agree with this viewpoint. If all of us would rush into the market as soon as the war is over and try to buy all the things we want, then there would be a boom. But I think most Americans will show better judgment than that. I don't believe most Americans will start spending their savings until they are fairly sure of the future. They want to know they have a reasonably steady job. They will want to be sure the merchandise is first class. And they must be convinced the price is reasonable.

So I predict that there will not be a boom, but I fully expect good business. Probably the Perfect Circle Co. is more favorably situated than most companies. We think the automobile repair business will be exceptionally good, which will make our replacement business good—much better than normal, we think. We also believe there will be a lively market for new automobiles, and this will maintain our standard equipment production at a high level.

Now, most industrial leaders feel that just normally good business will not provide sufficient jobs for all the people who are ready and willing to work. They think it is going to take many new industries and expansion of old industries to employ the people who want to work. Such industrial growth means new products, risking new capital, new plants, new selling methods, new customers, both domestic and foreign. And management is doing something about it.

Practically every trade organization in the country has a post-war planning committee. Two of the largest national organizations of manufacturers are spending most of their time and effort on the problem of employment following the war. One of these organizations is the committee for economic development. Throughout the length and breadth of our country, this organization has formed manufacturers into local groups to study the future employment problem of a community and to impress upon employers the importance of expanding their business, adding new products, and finding new markets. There is such a committee at work in New Castle, another in Richmond. Perfect Circle executives are members of both committees.

The other organization that is doing splendid work in the post-war jobs field is the National Association of Manufacturers. In December over 4,000 manufacturers, members of this association, met in New York to adopt a post-war program for industry. The National Association of Manufacturers' plan is built around more and more production as the only source of jobs, high standard of living, and real security. No one knows better than manufacturers that the welfare of business and the welfare of workers are inseparable. Unless employers supply jobs, there won't be wages to buy manufactured goods. Yes; employers want to make jobs, more jobs than ever before, and at high wages, too. Most of the employers I know are giving this problem all the time they can spare from their war work.

Perfect Circle has some very definite plans for the future—plans that mean jobs. Our research engineers are working on several new products that we cannot talk about at this time. We confidently expect, however, that out of the engineering department will come new products, and improvements in old products, that will make more jobs for the future.

The sales department is just now starting some new methods in the sale of piston rings which we think are great improvements. Our advertising appropriation for 1944 is the largest in our history. When the time comes for millions of people to repair their cars, we want them to know more about Perfect Circle rings than any other brand. That builds an acceptance that will produce more jobs for Perfect Circle workers.

So Perfect Circle does have plans for the future and so do most other industries—plans that can mean more jobs and a more prosperous America.

We must remember, however, that honest-to-goodness jobs do not come from a benevolent Government, or from a dreamy program to share the wealth without producing it. Only in "make-believe land" do storks bring babies and only in fairyland do government bureaucrats bring jobs. Real jobs are born—brain children of engineers, investors, and production experts. Workers, too, help to create jobs as they qualify under those headings.

It takes investment to provide these real jobs. In the United States it requires on an average of $7,000 of somebody's savings to provide the plant, the machinery, the inventory, and the working capital for just one job. To put one's savings into a manufacturing venture involves considerable risk and frequently the savings are lost. If there is opportunity for reasonable profit, people will risk their savings in business. If the opportunity is small, they will not risk their savings.

During the 1920's when big business was supposed to be gobbling up little business, but when there was still opportunity for reasonable profit, there were added to the Nation's business 36,000 new employers each year. Unemployment as a national problem was unknown. But during the thirties, when there was little opportunity for profit and business was under strict Government regulations, the Nation lost 6,000 employers per year.

Is it much wonder we had widespread unemployment for 10 years and would have it yet were it not for the war? No one wanted to go into business. The enterprising young man had every chance to fail and little to gain if he didn't fail. The only things he could be sure of were high taxes, complicated Government regulations, and condemnation if by some rare chance he became prosperous. Those same unhealthy business conditions still exist today.

Some of you ought to be seriously thinking about going into business for yourself when the war is over. Most employers were at one time employees. But, I ask you, how many of you would like to take your savings, and start a new business under the laws that were enacted during the thirties most of which are in the law books today. The opportunity for a small business to start, to grow, and to become a bigger employer must be restored if the employment problem is to be settled satisfactorily.

I sincerely believe that American management and American labor, working together can solve the job question of the future if we, all of us, through our elected representatives, get the business blockades out of the way.

I realize that we have not answered two vital questions which are in the minds of most of our employees. "Will I have a job with Perfect Circle after the war?" "Will my wages or salary be reduced after the war?" We have no direct answer for those questions. No one has. We only know that if we operate this business intelligently and efficiently there will be more jobs available and we can pay higher wages and salaries than if we operate inefficiently. That has always been true.

New products, improved old products, new manufacturing processes, new markets, reduced costs—these are the things of which new jobs and higher wages are made. We want and need your help in this program for a better Perfect Circle Co. and a more prosperous America.

The Ill-Considered Mexican Water Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks, I include an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook on a subject which is of vital interest to my State. With the sentiments of the editorial I am in full agreement. I wish all Members would read this editorial, for it explains precisely what this unfair treaty will do to one section of the United States.

THE ILL-CONSIDERED MEXICAN WATER TREATY

The treaty to adjust the water problems of the two Nations which has been signed by our State Department and Mexico contains a serious threat to the rights of southern California in the water of the Colorado River. If this treaty is approved by the Senate it will guarantee 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to Mexico annually. This guaranty will have precedence over the rights granted by contract with the Interior Department to the Colorado River States and the California organizations which assured the building of Boulder Dam, when they agreed to buy the electric current generated there at a price which would pay for the dam through a term of years. They are the Los Angeles Bureau of Water and Power, the metropolitan water district, and the Southern California Edison Co.

Santa Monica, in common with the 13 other cities of the metropolitan water district, is directly concerned. It is well known that the flow of the Colorado River, like all streams, varies with the precipitation. Heavy snowfalls in the mountain areas it drains, when they occur, provide ample water for both California and Mexico, but if the snowfall is scanty, as it has been this year so far, the flow is reduced greatly. In two of the years that are carried by the records of the Colorado River, the total annual flow was scarcely one-half what it is in normal years. To guarantee Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet annually means that in drought years this water would have to be taken in large part from the allotments that have been made by Government contract to the river States, including California.

The cities of the metropolitan water district are affected because this guaranty would be prior to their rights to water and in dry years would reduce the amount of water they could take from the river. This treaty is without any limit in years. It is for all time as are the contracts which the United States Government, through the Interior Department, has made with the metropolitan water district and the Colorado River States. The guaranty of a large amount of water to Mexico without proper regard to the varying flow of the river simply means that Washington is pledging Mexico water that by right belongs to California and the other Colorado River States.

This is the serious and primary objection to the treaty. But it is not all. Mexico is required to build diversionary works to turn the water she receives into irrigation canals. These works in time of high water might easily flood the rich Imperial Valley which lies below the level of the river and below sea level. Further, without any compensation the United States agrees to deliver to Mexico 500,000 acre-feet through the All-American Canal for the next 37 years and after that in perpetuity 375,000 acre-feet annually.

This canal was built by the United States at a cost of many millions of dollars for the development of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. Mexico gets to use it without the payment of a thin dime. It seems as though this is carrying the good-neighbor policy beyond all limits of sound finance and public policy. It is giving Mexico the free benefit of millions of dollars' worth of public works constructed with the money of American taxpayers without respect to the rights or future needs of the people of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

It is to be emphasized in this connection that all the water of the Colorado River comes from precipitation in the United States. Under the established principles of water rights, as accepted in the United States, the American people have prior rights to all the water of the Colorado River. Mexico has no sound claim on it, except as it is not put to beneficial use in the upper river basin. This makes the generosity of this treaty indefensible.

It is evident that California had nobody in Washington who had the prestige which would permit him to advise the State Department on these points. It is part of the penalty which this administration has put on the Pacific coast as a result of President Roosevelt's exclusive preference for eastern men and his refusal to give this great section proper representation among his advisers. As a result the cities of the metropolitan water district and the people of the Imperial Valley will have to bear the expense of making a fight in Washington to secure such modifications in the treaty as will protect their rights.

About That Treaty With Mexico—It Is Highly Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from California [Mr. HENSHAW] raised the question this afternoon concerning the treaty signed with Mexico on the 3d of this month, my interest was stirred deeply, although I had not yet seen a copy of the treaty, having tried in vain several days ago. It has been available only a few hours in print. Meanwhile I have obtained a copy and have read it once. This document deserves intensive study, and I shall give it more than casual reading, for it is of great moment to my State and section of the country. In fact, it is momentous from several different angles. I would not on this short notice and limited reading attempt to discuss it for I have not yet had time to analyze it. Therefore, I merely sense its tremendous significance. My reasons for commenting on it now is because the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] earlier today dramatically called the attention of the House to it.

The Colorado River is one of the most remarkable rivers in the world. It is an international stream having as its watershed parts of seven of the Southwestern States of this Union. It flows less than a hundred miles through its delta within the Republic of Mexico. If the Gadsden Treaty of 1853 had run entirely a straight line, the parallel of latitude 31 degrees and 20 minutes north, throughout the whole distance between Arizona and the Republic of Mexico, the river would have had its entire course within the boundaries of the United States. But since the boundary line near Nogales bends toward the northwest and reaches the Colorado River 20 miles below the junction of the Gila, it leaves the mouth of the Colorado and a portion of its delta within the Republic to the south of us.

There are many unique and remarkable things about the Colorado River. Some of these unique features are physical and natural, and others almost as unique are economic and political. The great canyon of the Colorado, the Grand Canyon, is more than a mile in depth and at places more than 14 miles in width, but there are questions of a political and economic nature about this river which are also wide and deep. Volumes might be written to explain the implications of laws and treaties, both domestic and international, on regulations pertaining to this river.

When I first went into Arizona, about a third of a century ago, I found a fear expressed there that the waters of the Colorado River would be put onto rich delta lands in Mexico and an agricultural empire established near us tilled by Japanese in competition with our own American farmers. I have heard many in Arizona say, "We must watch with strictest care any treaty arrangement regarding its waters or any appropriation of water by Mexico under the common water law of the West which will establish her claim to so much water that thirsty acres in our own country can never hope to be reclaimed. The central facts we must hold in mind are that this remarkable river is fed by the rains and snows on the high mountains, and it flows through a desert country for most of its distance; that there can be no farming throughout most of its basin without irrigation and, furthermore, that there are several times as many acres of land, level and fertile, awaiting water, as could be irrigated by all of its waters applied within our own country.

Another important fact to remember is that this unique stream tested the daring of the early explorers like Major Powell and tested to a greater degree the ingenuity of the hydraulic engineers to control it and utilize it. Close to $500,000,000 have already been spent on the Colorado River within our own country and scarcely any use could be made of its waters on the soil of Mexico without the great engineering projects which our country has provided. What are the benefits offered us in return for what we would give? This merely indicates some of the vital matters into which we need to look with great care in analyzing the treaty and in judging the wisdom of such an international arrangement.

Shipping and Shipbuilding in the Great Lakes in the Post-War Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I submit the following remarks by Leathem D. Smith, representative of the Great Lakes shipbuilding and shipping interests and the United States Maritime Commission, relative to post-war planning having as its object shipping and shipbuilding in the Great Lakes area touching upon lake operation and ships for lake-to-coast and foreign service:

We are pleased to see the formation of the Post-War Planning Committee of the Maritime Commission, with Rear Admiral H. L. Vickery as chairman, and, together with shipping and shipbuilding interests of the Great Lakes, to be in conference with him, Commissioner Woodward, and Mr. Harvey Klemmer today.

I have been requested to speak for the shipbuilding industry on the Great Lakes, but, since the building of ships is dependent on the needs of the shipping industry to show any prospect for post-war shipbuilding on the Lakes, we must analyze the needs and possibilities of ship operations.

To simplify this analysis we have broken this down into ships for strictly lake operation and ships for lake-to-coast and foreign service.

One of the basic methods of stimulating ship operation and construction is to develop new functions or services which water transportation can perform. After the last war, when the smaller bulk carriers of the lake fleet were idle from reduction of ore and coal tonnage and the competition of the more efficient larger carriers, we designed self-unloading apparatus to permit the conversion of these low-cost vessels for the self-unloader coal and stone trades. This independent self-unloader fleet has grown to a fleet of 40 ships of all sizes. The service they perform has been a wonderfully useful one, giving low-cost water transportation of coal and other bulk materials to dozens of small tonnage ports and water-front industries. This fleet operated practically 100 percent through the worst days of depression when two-thirds of the lake bulk-carrier fleet were idle.

Some expansion of this self-unloader fleet is in prospect both by the building of new vessels and by the conversion of old. Also, modifications of the self-unloader design to handle ore is feasible and would permit the utilization of unimproved water frontage for cheap winter storage of ore.

The package freight fleet which once operated many ships on the Lakes and reduced transportation costs on miscellaneous freight to many harbors of the Lakes succumbed to obsolescence because of the high cost of manual freight handling and the excessive port time of high-operating-cost vessels. We have hopes that improvements in freight handling and economies in ship propulsion and operation may restore this service, at least in part.

Another trade where improvements in cargo handling should warrant new ship construction or conversion is in the handling and transportation of scrap and other magnetic materials.

One of the largest fields for prospective shipbuilding for lake use should be in the gradual replacement of much of the bulk carrier fleet of the Lakes by new ships of modern design. Out of the 369 bulk carriers on the Great Lakes, 120, or 33 percent are more than 40 years old; 172, or 46 percent, are 30 to 40 years old.

The dredging of deeper channels on the Lakes and the establishment of the load line will give an advantage to deeper ships.

The development of the all-welded ship, with its savings of about 18 percent in weight of steel over the all-riveted ship, makes it possible to increase the molded depth of a new ship almost 20 percent without increasing the light displacement or draft. The long lake ships have been known for their extreme length-depth ratio, which can be greatly improved by this new design. Their increased carrying capacity on deeper load-line draft should justify the construction of new ships and the scrapping of many of the old. Economies in propulsion and auxiliary equipment can be counted on to pay the interest charge on the new ship cost, but extra carrying capacity and speed must write off the new investment.

The fact that overhead and write-off costs for 12 months must be carried on an operating season of 7 months has deterred new construction. The Maritime Commission, through long-term financing and low interest rates can greatly encourage this new construction and keep alive the shipbuilding industry of the Lakes.

The second field which Great Lakes shipbuilders can look to for some employment is for the lake-to-coast and foreign services. Before the war directed the entire shipbuilding effort and materials into ships for the war effort considerable progress was made, in spite of depression, in the design and construction of ships for the lake-to-coast route through the New York barge canal. The great development in diesel engines in the smaller power for ships of this class, together with lightweight welded hulls, made it possible to design, build, and operate ships profitably in this trade. We may look for an expansion of this construction after the war, in which expansion the Maritime Commission can be of great assistance both financially and in helping to maintain rate structures on a sound basis to prevent discriminating rates being established in favor of rail and highway transport to destroy this budding traffic.

The development of towboats and barges for the rivers and inland waterways was also well under way, and some experimental trips and much investigation had been completed on the possibilities of self-propelled combination motorships for inland waterway, Lakes, and coastal service. The improvement in river channels and in hull and propulsion design will help develop the field.

The opening of the bridges over the Chicago drainage canal has partially removed the bottleneck in Great Lakes shipbuilding for ocean service by permitting the passage of ships over 400 feet in length from lakes to coast. This development opens the possibility of the use of special-design ships, especially tankers, during the open season on the lakes and during the winter in coastal trade.

For a number of years prior to the declaration of war in Europe there was a steady increase in the number of small ships under foreign flags operating directly between the Lakes and European ports. The long cruising radius of the Diesel ship has made this mechanically possible. The low foreign cost of operation made it financially profitable. Most of these foreign-owned ships have been destroyed during the war. A real opportunity exists for American operators to enter this field if building and operating subsidies to equalize American and foreign costs can be applied to this service. In requesting support of this proposal from Great Lakes area farmers and manufacturers it can well be pointed out that, in addition to the employment of Americans in the construction and operation of these ships, having them operated by American crews means that we will have the officers and men on these ships as salesmen and contact men in our foreign trade.

In analyzing the possibilities, but also the difficulties and handicaps, attendant to confining Great Lakes foreign ship operation to vessels within the St. Lawrence or New York Barge Canal limitations, we cannot help but have our imaginations drawn to the prospect of what the opening of the St. Lawrence deep waterway might mean to industry in the Great Lakes area.

It goes without dispute to say that it would remove the only handicap to Great Lakes shipyard construction of ships of any size and type, and as a shipbuilder I am naturally interested in this.

However, I believe that, because of the changes brought about by the war, many new factors have been brought into play to make the St. Lawrence development a vital necessity to the Great Lakes area in a much broader sense.

The terrific program that the United States has been carrying on in the war effort, not only in supplying its own forces but, through lend-lease, acting as the arsenal of the United Nations, is going to leave a lasting effect on the industries and resources of this country.

We are using up our basic raw materials at a tremendous pace; our best grade iron ore and other ores and our oil supply have moved many years nearer depletion because of this greatly accelerated consumption. Our future national policy, for many reasons, should be the greatly increased importation of raw materials from foreign lands and the conservation of our own resources to spread their life over a longer span. National security demands that sufficient reserves of ores and oils be assured to future generations to maintain a war effort if foreign supplies are shut off by hostile powers, as was the case in this war in rubber and tin.

Secondly, foreign markets can be greatly stimulated for our manufactured products if we will take essential raw materials from the foreign lands which buy our products.

Thirdly, to operate our new merchant fleet freight must be provided, and this must be largely in cargoes to and from our ports. We have developed a fine force of merchant sailors, and their continued employment should be a major concern.

The Great Lakes shipping interests have, as a rule, been opposed to the opening of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, largely because of its bringing foreign ships into competition with Great Lakes American shipping, and I have always partly sympathized with this attitude. However, Great Lakes shipping is largely owned by iron and steel and coal interests, whose major interests should be and is the maintenance of the leadership of the Great Lakes area in the production of steel and the prosperity of the great diversified industry which has grown up here because of steel production.

We have seen many forecasts of the length of life of the Minnesota and Michigan high-grade ore supplies. It is beyond argument to state that war consumption has rapidly hastened their depletion. It is against all interests of national security to allow this program to continue without taking all reasonable steps to supplement our raw material supplies on the Lakes with foreign imports.

There is only one way in which the lakes can import many raw materials without being put to a serious freight disadvantage over seacoast centers, and that is by the opening of the St. Lawrence deep-draft shipping. It is the responsibility of industry in the Great Lakes area to safeguard their future by long-range planning in this regard.

The use of the ships of the new American fleet for this traffic would provide employment for many men and keep the supply of essential materials, even from foreign lands, strictly under American control.

Authorship and Character of Mr. Wallace's Speeches

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that Mr. HENRY AGARD WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, has recently returned to Washington after another of his extended journeys. I sometimes wonder just what are the duties of the Vice President and why we do not change the title to Grand Exalted Smearer of all Loyal Americans who disagree with his pet theories.

I bring this to the attention of the House today, because many people are wondering as to the origin of his speeches, in which is advocated a philosophy so foreign to our American way of life.

Accompanying Mr. WALLACE on his smear campaign tour, as a member of his entourage, was one David Karr.

Mr. Karr, by his own testimony under oath before the Special Congressional Committee on un-American Activities, on April 6, 1943, admitted having been a writer for the Daily Worker, official newspaper of the Communist Party, also Equality, a Communist-front publication, as well as having lectured for the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization declared to be a Communist-front organization by Attorney General Biddle.

In order that there may be no doubt as to the facts regarding David Karr, I insert at this point testimony from the hearings of April 6, 1943:

Mr. Karr testified at considerable length:

"I was born under the name of David Katz. The name was never changed legally. I assumed the name Karr about 1937, 1938, for professional purposes as a newspaperman.

"In 1934 I got a job with the New York World-Telegram as assistant to the school sports editor, while I was in high school. I kept that position until about 1936; writing school sports, and later covering other sports such as polo, track, hockey, baseball, and football. In 1936 I started covering various sports for most of the morning papers in New York. I would cover one event for three or four papers at one time on space rates. And at the same time, in order to make a living, I went to work as a shipping clerk for a handbag manufacturer, a firm in New York City, by the name of Rosenthal & Co. I was unemployed for a brief period after that, and then I went back to the same firm in 1937. Then I started selling Fuller brushes—about 9 or 10 months. I stopped selling Fuller brushes when I was employed by the American Council Against Nazi Propaganda, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York City, as a reporter on the news letter called The Hour, about a year. I went to work for Transradio Press Service in New York as a reporter and rewrite man. I worked for them until February 3, 1942, as reporter, rewrite man, Washington correspondent, and assistant to the managing editor. On February 3, 1942, I was employed by the Office of Facts and Figures. My duties as senior liaison officer in the Office of Facts and Figures were to keep liaison with other Federal agencies, dealing with problems concerned with foreign nationality groups in the United States; also with various nongovernmental agencies, embassies, private organizations, which had any bearing on foreign nationality groups in the United States. I never applied for any position in the Federal Government. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of Facts and Figures, sponsored me for the position. I am now Assistant Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information, $4,600. My duties are the same ones that I had before, when I first started with the Office of Facts and Figures, in addition to which I supervise a group of people who translate material for the foreign language press and radio. I develop material for the foreign-language press and radio; maintain liaison with other sections of O. W. I.; to get the material which would be pertinent to the foreign-language press and radio; and, further, examine foreign-language newspaper translations which are given to us by the Department of Justice, which does all of our translating work, to determine which papers are cooperating in the war effort."

The witness was questioned as follows by Mr. Matthews:

"Question. Are you a specialist in foreign languages?

"Answer. No, sir.

"Question. Do you speak any foreign languages?

"Answer. No, sir.

"Question. Do you read any?

"Answer. No, sir.

"There are two papers in Pittsburgh, one a Communist paper and one a pro-Serb paper, the Srobrobran and the Narodni Glasnik. Both of these papers were in a violent cat fight over the situation in Yugoslavia, to a point where actual fights had broken out in several factories in the Pittsburgh area.

"On receipt of those reports and on examination of those papers, and developing the evidence, we developed what we felt was concrete evidence that they were harming the war effort.

"We called that to the attention of the Special Defense Unit of the Department of Justice for action.

"We have been zealously careful not to go into the question of the freedom of the press, or undermine it. We take no action whatsoever ourselves. All action is up to the Department of Justice. We may recommend to the Department of Justice for certain action, but that is as far as we go."

Mr. Matthews questioned the witness as follows:

"On February 1, 1943, the Honorable MARTIN DIES made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, speaking in his capacity as an individual Member of the House and not as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, inasmuch as that committee was not at that time legally constituted, and in the course of that address, he made a reference to you in the following language:

" 'Here is the case of David Karr who is Assistant Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information at a salary of $4,600. For 2 years Karr was on the staff of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker. There is not the slightest doubt that all members of the Daily Worker staff were required to be members of the Communist Party. Karr was a writer for the Communist publication "Equality," whose editorial council was composed largely of well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers.

" 'David Karr was also Public Relations Director of the American League for Peace and Democracy, one of the Communist fronts which Attorney General Biddle branded as subversive. Karr was a frequent writer for the League's magazine "Fight." '

"Do you have any special dissent to make with respect to the facts which are stated in that passage?"

Further testimony by David Karr as follows:

"About five or six articles, including the attack upon the chairman of this committee, by myself, were printed in the Daily Worker. I collaborated with Lowell Wakefield and the Daily Worker 4 or 5 months."

The witness was questioned as follows:

"Question. Did I understand you to say that this material which you embodied in these articles was obtained by you from a young lady who worked at the Department of Justice?

"Answer. She worked in the United States attorney's office in New York.

"Question. In the United States attorney's office in New York?

"Answer. I met her one night at a party at one of my friends' house, and she told me about it. * * *

"Question. Did you write for the publication, 'Equality,' as alleged in the speech of the Honorable MARTIN DIES?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Do you know how many pieces you wrote for 'Equality'?

"Answer. I think there were two.

"Question. Did you offer this piece to 'Equality,' or these pieces, or were they solicited by persons on the staff?

"Answer. They were solicited by a fellow by the name of Abraham Chapman, I think his name is.

"Question. How do you spell his last name?

"Answer. C-h-a-p-m-a-n, whom I subsequently found out was John Arnold, of the New York Daily Freiheit, a Communist Jewish publication.

"Question. You have no doubt about its ('Equality')—let us say—general Communist complexion or orientation?

"Answer. I would not pass judgment on the material contained in the magazine because I have not seen the stuff for 4 or 5 years, but I would definitely say that it was Communist penetration of the editorial direction of the magazine; that is clear.

"Question. Now, when you were writing for the Daily Worker, did you write any book reviews for the Daily Worker?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Did you write several articles for the magazine Fight?

"Answer. I think one, two, or three.

"Question. The records of the publication, I believe, show that you wrote an article for the issue of Fight in May 1939, another in the issue of March 1939, and a third in the issue of June 1939.

"Answer. That is right.

"Question. Are you satisfied in your own mind that the American League for Peace and Democracy was a Communist-front organization?

"Answer. As satisfied as you are."

In previous testimony the witness testified: "I didn't want to work for the American League. I made several talks in their behalf, and had come to their offices a number of times to secure research material from their research files."

Mr. Speaker, in light of the foregoing, some of us are wondering if when we hear the voice of HENRY AGARD WALLACE we are listening to the words of David Karr.

Petroleum Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives this week passed a bill appropriating some $30,000,000 to experiment with the production of synthetic petroleum. Mr. Ickes as head of the Petroleum Administration for War is recommending the spending of more than $100,000,000 to develop foreign oil resources. Notwithstanding these emergency measures and the admitted shortage of petroleum on the home front, we still hold the price of crude oil down to around 60 percent of parity and have done nothing to stimulate increased exploration for and discovery of new petroleum reserves within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter to O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles from Mr. Russell Brown, general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1944.

The Honorable CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Recently, January 5, 1944, in a letter of yours to Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, the possibility of incentives or "special inducements" to stimulate oil exploration and development was suggested as being more desirable, from a public standpoint, than the general increase in crude oil prices which the oil industry, the Petroleum Administrator for War, and numerous committees of the Congress and State officials have urged upon your office.

On January 17, 1944, I wrote to Mr. Ralph T. Zook, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, suggesting that the association's members contribute their views on the incentive question. Copies of the letter were sent to the members. I enclose one to you. We are thus endeavoring to obtain as wide an expression as possible on the subject to which you have so recently called public attention.

Incentives—which we in the industry interpret as another term for subsidies and bonuses—have long been suggested by your office. The first Price Administrator gave general advocacy to the theory on several occasions. No definite plan, however, has even been proposed barring the one occasion when your immediate predecessor revealed a partial concept of Government aid to wildcatting which stopped far short of being an implemented, detailed plan.

At this time, in view of my request for discussion by oil producers, I wish to make certain inquiries to which I believe the oil industry and the consumer would like to have an answer; I include the consumer because he is being deprived of petroleum products in the amount he needs and, as you have warned, is likely to be still further restricted.

As I have said, there has been for many months considerable discussion of a general character of Government incentives. So that we may know something of the progress toward a defined plan, I believe the following questions are pertinent:

1. Does your office consider that it possesses the legal authority to put into effect an incentive plan?

2. Are the funds now available, without further exercise of the appropriating power of Congress, to support whatever plan may be decided upon or likely to be formulated?

3. Has your office arrived at an estimate of the amount of money which would be required for the several forms of stimulus to the oil supply of the Nation. If so, will you state at this time what such estimate is?

4. As all expressions which have come to me to date on this question, including that of the Petroleum Administrator, agree that an incentive plan for the oil-producing industry would be one of the greatest of administrative tasks yet undertaken, will you now state whether your office is prepared to undertake such administration? If not your office, can you suggest which department might be the appropriate one?

5. Assuming that all answers to the foregoing have been arrived at satisfactorily to your office, can you now give an estimate of the date when an incentives plan that would meet the needs would be put into effect?

Our plan—a general increase in the price of crude oil—has been rejected by your office. We have contended that it would be immediately responsive to the requirements and that it would be self-administering. Ours is no new plan. It is the one which has always stimulated the supply of petroleum. We now believe that our plan having been rejected, it is only fair that we have an explanation of your plan, specific in nature, so that the oil producers who would have to attempt to fit their operations to your plan may know what it is that is being arranged for them.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL B. BROWN.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown asks of Mr. Bowles several important and pertinent questions. It seems to me that the American people as well as the Independent Petroleum Association is entitled to an answer to this letter.

The Soldier-Vote Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Jack Cuthbert, president, Associated Students, Montana State University, which gives the results of a poll conducted by the student body on the soldier-vote question. This came to me in this morning's mail, and I am extremely glad to note the interest shown in this very important question, not so much because of the results with which I agree, but because these young people have shown sufficient energy to display their interest in the affairs of their Government. These young men and women are really acting the part of citizens and I hope that their interest will never lag but will ever widen. The example of the student body at Montana State University should spur others to recognize their obligation to understand the principles of a democracy, to realize their right to make their views known, and to look upon their Representatives in Congress as their public servants.

Mr. Speaker, on the soldier-vote question I have always and will continue to recognize everyone's right to an opinion, and I for one do not question the sincerity and honesty of those who raise the constitutional question of States' rights in the study of the problem. As one who supported the Federal ballot bill, I agree with the argument that the State ballots should be distributed as widely as possible among the armed forces, but where they cannot get the State ballot the service men and women should not be denied the right to vote at all. The Federal ballot bill provided the means and methods of obtaining the State ballot just the same as the States' rights bill and, in addition, it provides that where it would be impossible to get the State ballot into the hands of those in the armed services, they would at least be given the opportunity to vote for candidates for national offices. The State ballot would be given every priority and if by chance a veteran filled out both a State and Federal ballot, the State ballot would prevail in the counting.

Many States have tried diligently to improve their laws but the practical difficulties arise because of circumstances over which they have little or no control and with which they cannot deal effectively by legislation. It would seem to me that 48 different State procedures would present an almost insurmountable problem. As an example, there is no provision for absentee voting whatsoever in Kentucky and New Mexico, and Minnesota limits absentee voting by servicemen to those physically in the United States. There are other difficult problems to be considered, all of which were brought out in the debate on the bill. I want to see the service men and women given the utmost opportunity to express their wishes at the polls and I am just as interested in the soldiers and sailors from Kentucky, New Mexico, and Minnesota having this right as I am in those coming from Montana and the other States. They are not Kentuckians, New Mexicans, Minnesotans, or Montanans. They are Americans and as such should be given every consideration within the power of the Congress.

The letter referred to follows:

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., February 11, 1944.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congressman from Montana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Upon request of the students, central board conducted a poll last week on the soldier-vote bill. The survey included students and faculty, and the results were as follows:

Eighty-six percent marked "Yes; the servicemen should be allowed to vote," while the remaining 14 percent circled "No."

Sixty-seven percent checked "If the servicemen are given the vote, the Federal Government should supervise the election," and 33 percent favored State supervision.

The students wished to have these results conveyed to their Congressmen, as they felt that they truly represent the attitude of students on the campus toward a vital issue, as well as the attitude of the former students whom the bill directly affects.

During the last 2 years there has been much more interest on the campus concerning affairs in Washington, and the students are particularly interested in your activities there.

Sincerely yours,

JACK CUTHBERT,
President, Associated Students.

Cattlemen and Livestock Industry Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by W. E. Patterson, an attorney in Prescott, Ariz., for the Yavapai Cattlemen's Association, over radio station KYCA in that city, February 9, 1944:

The cattle producers of Yavapai County desire to inform the public of certain conditions affecting their industry at the present time in order to clarify certain misunderstandings among the people and to obtain assistance from the citizenry in solving problems which affect those not engaged in the cattle business, as well as those who are.

There are two outstanding factors today that justify severe Government regulation:

1. Bend all to win the war.
2. Curb inflation.

As to the first, we all agree that tremendous sacrifices must be made to win this war and no individual or industry that is truly American will complain of contributing his share or even more than his share.

As to the second factor, curb inflation, we are told that many of the Government controls placed in operation today are necessitated for the purpose of curbing inflation and to insure proper distribution. Therefore, let us consider inflation and its relation to the livestock industry.

The principles of inflation which I use are taken from an address by Dr. Curtiss of Cornell University.

Inflation is a name popularly given to a rising price level. Prices rise rapidly in wartime because of increased incomes which are ordinarily accompanied by a decrease in goods that civilians can buy. Since 1939 the national income in the United States has more than doubled.

The increase in our national income and the cost of the war have been paid largely by governmental deficit financing. Deficit financing, or borrowing by the Government, is inflationary. When a government borrows money to hire workmen to produce something which these workmen cannot buy, it is inflationary. If, for example, the war workers were producing something like cars or refrigerators, which consumers could and would buy from the Government, the result of all this increased income would not be inflationary. But, since about half of our national income is from the production of war goods for which civilians have neither the desire nor the opportunity to buy, the increased income from that production becomes a tremendous inflationary force on the prices of things that civilians can buy.

It makes no difference whether the Government hires men to build bombers, to build highways, or to rake leaves; if these projects are financed by borrowing, the effect is inflationary. On the other hand, if these projects were paid for out of taxes, the effect would not be inflationary. The reason it would not be inflationary is that the Government would be taking as much money away from people as it would be paying out in wages or in relief payments. True, those who benefit from increased incomes or relief payments may be different individuals than those who pay the taxes.

With increasing wage rates, together with increasing prices which producers have received for their products, our national income has doubled and the inflationary force has become tremendous.

In our efforts to control inflation, some of the policies we have adopted on a national basis have been inflationary and some have been anti-inflationary. Our talk about wages has been anti-inflationary but our actions have been inflationary. For example, the miners received higher wages from the Government than they asked for in their demands. Price control of raw materials and their allocaion by a system of priorities has been in the direction of controlling inflation. The system of price control and rationing goods to consumers is in a sense anti-inflationary, but has left purchasing power in the pockets of consumers which has broken out as inflation elsewhere.

We are now considering subsidies of various types as a means of inflation control. Such subsidies will be paid for by deficit financing and are therefore inflationary. An argument for subsidies, even though they are inflationary is that they might be less inflationary than would be wage increases without the subsidies. There is nothing to indicate that labor would be satisfied with a subsidy which is less in amount than they are demanding in wage increases. If the subsidies are as great as the wage increases would have been, then the cure is as bad as the disease. In fact, it is worse because we would have had in addition, the costs of administration and the controls which go with such regimentation.

Thus you have a very good picture of the inflation situation.

Now let us consider the situation of the cattle producer today in relation to what effect the Government O. P. A. program is having upon this industry, and remember, the O. P. A. justifies its actions on account of the necessity of curbing inflation and effecting proper distribution.

First, let us disabuse the public mind of the erroneous propaganda that has been disseminated that the cattle producer is not satisfied and is complaining and wants more money for his product. Such is not the case. The cattle producer is satisfied with his returns during the past few years and is not complaining, but it is only fair to state that a goodly portion of his monetary returns has been used to liquidate heavy mortgages under which he has struggled for many, many years, heaped upon him by droughts and depressions, and also to meet higher costs in labor, feed, material, and taxes.

His anxiety and complaint today are based upon the realization that the O. P. A. bureaucrats, who apparently know little about a sound method of regulating the cattle and meat situation, are heading his business toward ruin and disaster if changes are not quickly made.

You know a farmer or rancher must bring about the uniting of three great factors if he conducts a successful business:

1. Hard work and efficient management to produce the product.
2. With the help of God, sufficient moisture.
3. An adequate price for his product.

If he can make these three factors function in unison or at the same time, he is successful. Permit any one of these factors to fall out of line and he travels a hazardous road.

In January 1943 the cattle inventory in the United States was approximately 71,000,000 head. This inventory increased during 1943 until in December 1943 cattle on hand approximated 81,000,000 head.

It is reasonable to expect that under the present program in force under the O. P. A. regulations pertaining to livestock and meat there will be an additional, material increase during the coming year of several more million head of cattle.

If we consider a 71,000,000 head inventory normal, which authorities believe to be sound, the producers of the Nation will have a surplus of cattle on hand of about 15,000,000 head by the fall of 1944. Their ranges will be overstocked and the producer will will find himself in a serious situation.

To paraphrase—cattle, cattle everywhere, but not much meat to eat.

This is not a healthy picture, and ranchers are becoming alarmed and have a right to be when they know that means can be devised to make these cattle available, first to the military forces and then to the civilians.

We know that cattle on the ranges at certain times of the year are not meat. They do not carry sufficient flesh. But we do know that for a major portion of the year, under normal moisture conditions, that cattle are marketable in fair flesh condition.

If this surplus exists and the people with the purchasing power cannot obtain meat, where is the bottleneck? Speaking broadly, I say that the O. P. A. is the bottleneck. Why? I must give reasons for the statement.

1. The O. P. A. by its killing quota allotment to packers put numerous packers out of business and reduced the number of livestock killed by those who remained in business by many millions. Note, in Yavapai County, the Yavapai Packing Co. and the Sandler Packing Co. were put out of business. The Yavapai Packing Co. is now operating only to supply its own retail markets and the Sandler Packing Co. butchers for individual concerns. Many packers in Maricopa County were put out of business and when Tovrea began to operate for military contracts only, the O. P. A. arranged to ship meat into Arizona from Missouri and other places and at the same time, another branch of our Government was doing all in its power to conserve our national transportation system. It is a ridiculous situation with all of the cattle available in Arizona.

2. Many people are under the impression that the O. P. A. has placed a ceiling over and a floor under the price of livestock. It has on hogs, but not on cattle. The packer may pay as much as he wishes for cattle and may pay as little as he wishes. The packer only loses his subsidy if he does not keep within certain price brackets. There is nothing to prevent the packer from buying low enough below the subsidy bracket to make more money than he would be receiving with the subsidy. However, the O. P. A. subsidy program forced cattle prices down materially last fall.

3. The O. P. A. has placed measures in force which, if not changed, will entirely eliminate the cattle feeder. We know that the cattle feeder has always been the outlet and the main market for the cattle producer. The cattle feeder is the man who places the animal in the most edible condition and makes the animal worth more.

Last year the O. P. A. took action that reduced the price of cattle and yet not only kept the price of feed at the same level but

in some instances raised the price of feed. For example, cottonseed meal was arbitrarily raised about $10 per ton and I am told that the $10 raise in price was given to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

You cannot leave the cost of feed on a high plane and reduce the price of livestock and expect the feeder to stay in business. The price of each has a direct effect on the business of the other.

I might cite many other instances of the O. P. A.'s inconsistencies, but other speakers are going to deal with this topic who can handle it better than I.

The foregoing is sufficient to illustrate that the O. P. A. is not using its power to curb inflation nor to obtain a fair and equitable distribution of meat.

The confusion created by its regulations in the face of the facts refutes its claim. Subsidies paid to the packer do not help the laboring man. These subsidies are today being paid by Government deficit financing which is inflationary, and therefore are not for the protection or welfare of the people.

The livestock producers, the feeders, and representatives of the packers met at Kansas City and formulated a practicable, workable plan and presented it to the O. P. A., only to have it ignored; why, we do not know.

The cattle producer wants the O. P. A. to make these surplus cattle available, first to the military forces and second to the civilians and keep one of the largest and grandest industries in our country in good condition. The producer is not asking for more money for his product as long as other commodity prices which affect him keep within reason. But the producer knows and realizes that if the huge surplus of cattle now on hand on the ranges is not eliminated, that his business will be ruined and his life's work jeopardized.

Why the O. P. A. will not heed or cooperate in the face of these facts we cannot understand, but it is an important matter for the people to take up with their Congressmen.

Allied Veterans of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, America is indebted to the patriotic organizations of our Nation for their support of things worth while. A new organization has been formed, called the Allied Veterans of America. Its founders are Sgt. Robert Morton Baldwin, chairman; Sgt. H. Wayne Baldwin, secretary; and Staff Sgt. Francis F. Hudson, recorder. It was organized at Hebron, Nebr., where its national headquarters are located.

Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that the Congress might be interested in the origin and purpose of this organization. I am, therefore, extending my remarks by including certain excerpts from the statement issued by the Allied Veterans of America:

ORIGIN

An organization such as the A. V. A. was inevitable. Now it's here and well under way, reaching out to all corners of the Globe. Founded November 11, 1943, by a group of enlisted men of the Field Artillery, the A. V. A. has men with enthusiastic support on all sides. It is just what the service men and women want—an organization exclusively of and for veterans of World War No. 2.

WHAT IT IS

The A. V. A. is a nonmilitary, nonprofit, patriotic organization of soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen, incorporated under the laws of the State of Nebraska. It is devoted to the welfare of all Americans, and not to the advancement of the selfish interests of one particular group. It is a nonpolitical, independent, forward-looking band of service men and women who love their country and are pledged to the principles of liberty, equality, and progress for which America stands.

PURPOSES

The purposes of the A. V. A. are:

Today, to win the war.

Tomorrow, to win the peace.

Why do we organize now? So that we can lay the foundation for a great organization and be ready to step into our place in the post-war world. When the war is won we can go on fighting for the American way of life and the freedom and equality of all Americans. We can offer the unselfish devotion of a strong organization for America as a whole and for the principles of the American Constitution.

In addition to the serious purposes, we are joining the A. V. A. so that we may enjoy continued association with other servicemen, so that we may have our club houses and entertainment, our conventions and our memories together.

MEMBERSHIP

All men and women in the armed services or who have been honorably discharged therefrom, of World War No. 2, are eligible for membership. The American principle of complete equality will prevail. It is expected that affiliated groups will be formed in other countries. Men and women, old and young, from all parts of the world, members of every business and profession, from every race, color, and creed, serving in every branch of the service will join to form a mighty organization with one common characteristic—all of them have aided in the destruction of the enemies of America.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Olbum from the Pittsburgh Press of February 13, 1944:

STATE AND FEDERAL SOLDIER VOTE EXPLAINED BY ELECTIONS OFFICIAL

(By David Olbum, director, county elections department)

The Pennsylvania acts of 1941 establishing a system of registration and voting by persons in military service were enacted before Pearl Harbor, and contemplated registration and voting by persons in camps in continental United States.

For these purposes that legislation may be considered fairly adequate, but to administer a system of registration and voting for persons in military and naval service scattered throughout the world, this legislation is obviously cumbersome and inadequate.

The fact that at the November election of 1943 only 2,386 military electors from Allegheny County applied for military ballots, and that only 1,285 of this number actually voted and returned the ballots mailed to them, would in itself seem to indicate that the voting system provided for by State law is inadequate.

MUST BE REGISTERED

It is my understanding that the experience of Allegheny County in this regard is fairly typical of that of other counties of Pennsylvania, and judging by figures I have seen of the number of military electors who have voted under the laws of other States, there seems to be no doubt that the various State laws do not provide a simple and feasible plan.

Under Pennsylvania law the military voter must be registered, if he was not registered under the permanent registration law at the time of entering the service. He may register by mail if he files a written application with the registration commission.

The registration cards are then mailed to him and he must appear before a superior officer, execute his registration cards properly, and then (in substantially the same manner as a civilian registers at the office of the Registration Commission) he must have his superior officer subscribe to his affidavit on the registration card. This registration card must then be returned to the Registration Commission not later than 30 days prior to any election, which is the same time limit imposed by law for the registration of civilians.

MUST ASK FOR BALLOT

After he has registered he must still file a written application for a ballot before he is entitled to vote. This application must be filed with the county board of elections not later than 30 days before any election.

A person in military service stationed in a remote part of the world, who is fortunate enough to know the procedure which he must follow in order to vote under the State law, may have registered properly and may have filed an application for a ballot 2 or 3 months before an election.

Under the State law it is virtually impossible to mail the ballot to the soldier earlier than 15 or 20 days prior to the election.

In the meantime, before he receives his ballot, the voter may have been transferred a number of times, and it becomes utterly impossible for his ballot to reach him in time for him to mark it and to mail it back in order to have it counted as a valid vote.

In addition, the soldier who actually receives his ballot in due time, must in the course of voting, appear before a superior officer and take the affidavit, which must be subscribed by the officer. The confusion which must necessarily be entailed in voting by military electors from a great many different States under a great many different State laws is obviously so great as to render the process of voting not only cumbersome, but undoubtedly a great handicap to military activities at any particular camp or combat unit.

While it would seem impossible to achieve a system whereby all persons in the armed forces can secure a complete ballot and the right to vote for all local and State officials, it is possible under a sound Federal law at least to give such persons the right to vote for Federal officials under a uniform simple system administered by a Federal body such as the Federal War Ballot Commission, proposed in the original bill introduced into Congress.

TWO-SYSTEM VOTE

If any voter receives a complete ballot under the State law, and also votes under the Federal law, this can be checked by the affidavits when the ballots are returned to the county boards of election, and if the

State ballot is received in time, his Federal ballot can simply be disregarded. In fact this was the procedure set up in Public Law 712 of 1942, which was passed by Congress to provide a Federal system of voting by persons in the armed forces.

The Secretaries of War and the Navy have already stated that it is impossible for them to administer a system of voting under the provisions of different laws of 48 States. However, it is possible for them to administer a Federal system under a Federal act which would make it a simple thing for a voter to secure his ballot without complication.

FEW WOULD VOTE

It seems to me that if a person in military service is required to file applications within certain time limits and to follow provisions of State laws with which he is not and cannot be familiar, very few of such persons will actually be given a ballot.

The theory of a Federal vote law, which requires the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to send the necessary ballots and supplies to the various military and naval units where the voting will be conducted by the commanding officer, is that the military voters will be given an opportunity to vote very simply and without subjecting themselves to legally imposed requirements.

The Dingell-Wagner-Murray Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken cognizance of the volume of violent and misleading, to say naught of the vicious, propaganda originating with and emanating from a reactionary element within the medical profession, which is a static force opposed to the Dingell-Wagner-Murray bill.

That this hidebound, selfishly rapacious group does not represent the sentiment of the great bulk of ethical, humane, and charitable doctors of America has always been my contention. I now submit in proof for the RECORD a letter received from a practical and progressive group of nine doctors from Vermont and New Hampshire, who, after a series of meetings and discussions, submit their views and valuable constructive criticism which is as helpful as it is welcome. To these eminent and distinguished spokesmen of their profession I have not as yet had an opportunity to reply, having received their communication only yesterday, but I shall do so at my earliest convenience, and I shall inform them how deeply gratified I am to have their good counsel and to assure them that my bill is but a basis for the consideration of amendments to liberalize the Social Security Act in order to better serve suffering humanity. Further than that I want the medical profession and all other parties concerned to know that I believe my proposal of the bill, should it become law, would for a certainty be a failure unless before enactment all were given a hearing and that doctors should have a part in the formulation of rules and regulations for the successful administration of the law.

HANOVER, N. H., *January 25, 1944.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The proposed Wagner-Murray-Dingell Federal legislation calling for enlarged Government administration of medical care was the subject under discussion at a recent series of three informal meetings attended by the undersigned physicians of Vermont and New Hampshire, who voiced the following conclusions:

1. Aware of a public belief that the present methods and amount of medical and hospital care as distributed are unsatisfactory, and believing that it is inevitable that some improvement must and will be attempted, the conference group recognized the bill as a significant proposal which must be reviewed constructively. After careful and detailed consideration of the bill's provisions and their implications, the following concensus is recorded:

(a) A compulsory unified national social insurance system as provided in title I–A is sound and reasonable and the only practicable way of securing the immediate and essential degree of universality in coverage. The sum needed to be raised when considered in the abstract is not necessarily an objection to the plan provided the plan is adequate. To give perspective the amount of money involved should be examined on the basis of the fact that in 1939 the national bill for tobacco, drinks, candy, cosmetics, and jewelry added up to over three and a half billion dollars.

(b) Definitive exception was taken, however, to title IX, "Federal medical hospitalization and related benefits," beginning with section 903, as being too complex and impossible of administration. Instead the plan might well end where the individual, having been permitted to seek his own medical and hospital care, receives the cash-benefit payments to meet his obligations, thus preserving the individual responsibility essential in the sovereign citizenry of a national democracy. The patient should claim his insurance on the basis of a voucher type of national standard doctor's bill.

2. If any federalization of medical and hospital care were to be contemplated, as proposed by the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills:

(a) The concentration of responsibility in one individual should be avoided by the more democratic provision of a five-man board of authority, consisting of the Surgeon General, U. S. P. H. S.; the Chairman of the Social Security Board; one physician to be chosen by the National Advisory Medical Council; one representative to be chosen by the American Hospital Association; and one layman to be chosen by the President of the United States from a panel of three to be named by the United States Senate.

(b) Rather than a National Advisory Medical Council of 16 members appointed by the Surgeon General, he to be the chairman, we recommend a council of 12 members representing 12 geographical districts (such as the Federal Reserve districts). The district representative shall be chosen by the State medical societies of the district on a State rotation basis.

(c) There should be complete coverage of all groups by the plan including civil service, railway, and similar special designations not so far mentioned.

(d) There should be more positive, specific, and complete provisions for the indigent.

(e) Experience with attempts at relocation of physicians has shown that to get proper geographical distribution of medical care there must be proper geographical distribution of centers of training. Grants-in-aid for medical education and research should, therefore, include provisions for the establishment of a medical school in each State or other suitable unit of population.

(f) The preservation of the integrity of administration of any such plan must depend ultimately upon the medical profession, and the protection thereof best be lodged with the profession at the outset rather than in elaborate attempts to standardize and qualify.

We sign ourselves to this record of our aggregate opinions with the understanding that in substance it approximates our individual opinions if due allowance is made for the natural variations in the wording of expressed thoughts.

Clarence H. Beecher, M. D., Burlington, Vt.; John P. Bowler, M. D., Hanover, N. H.; Benjamin F. Cook, M. D., Rutland, Vt.; James W. Jameson, M. D., Concord, N. H.; Richard W. Robinson, M. D., Laconia, N. H.; Deering G. Smith, M. D., Nashua, N. H.; Charles H. Swift, M. D., Rutland, Vt.; Leslie K. Sycamore, M. D., Hanover, N. H.; Rolf C. Syvertsen, M. D., Hanover, N. H.

Michigan Legislature Urges Congress to Preserve States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Michigan was quick to adjust its election laws to safeguard the rights of its citizens when they left for Army camps in the United States 2 years ago and it has moved with equal rapidity in revising its election laws to enable Michigan men and women with our fighting forces overseas to exercise their elective franchise in the coming election. This was done at a special session of the Michigan Legislature called by our capable Governor, Hon. Harry F. Kelly, himself a veteran of World War No. 1 and a leader in the program for vocational rehabilitation of veterans and for adequate hospital and medical care for them.

While enacting laws providing for insurance of soldier voting, the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to take similar steps and at the same time preserve the fundamental principles of democracy. Under unanimous consent, I submit the resolution adopted by that branch of the Michigan Legislature:

House Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation safeguarding the rights of the members in the armed forces in the exercise of their elective franchise, and preserving to the several States the fundamental principles of democracy

Whereas the Congress of the United States now has under discussion and debate the urgent need of enacting legislation which will safeguard the rights of the members in

the armed forces in the exercise of their elective franchise; and

Whereas the United States of America is founded on principles of democracy and freedom of choice in the selection of its leaders and statesmen; and

Whereas the history of our great country clearly demonstrates that the conduct of election is properly a function to be exercised by the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature, convened in extraordinary session, and realizing the importance of the rights of the several States and the fundamental privileges of citizenship, for which our youth and the people are now engaged in earnest and all-out conflict, earnestly request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation safeguarding the rights of the members in the armed forces in the exercise of their elective franchise, and preserving to the several States the fundamental principles of democracy; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Scheme to Sovietize Business Charged by Commerce Aide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the startling things in connection with the attemps of those in high administrative circles in Washington to sovietize American business, came to light the other day when Mr. William LaVarre, formerly chief of the American Republics Division of the Department of Commerce, resigned his $8,000-a-year job as a protest against such activities by followers of Vice President WALLACE.

Mr. LaVarre registered his accusations in a letter to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Therein he disclosed that the B. E. W. and the F. E. A. have been waging a secret war against American business and the Nation's export industries. He charges these activities have been undertaken through powers usurped from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress and the country should know the particulars of the charges made and what appears back of this undertaking to socialize or sovietize the free enterprise system. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks further by including an article by Mr. William Moore, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 13, 1944:

SCHEME TO SOVIETIZE BUSINESS CHARGED BY COMMERCE AIDE—LAVARRE AGAINST FLY-BY-NIGHT ALIENS

(By William Moore)

Protesting that followers of Vice President WALLACE are waging a secret battle against American business and trying to substitute Soviet-style commerce for the American free-enterprise system, an $8,000-a-year Government executive resigned yesterday.

He is William LaVarre, former chief of the American Republics Division of the Department of Commerce. His protest was not against his Department, but "experimenters, refugees, fly-by-night foreigners," and Russian Utopian planners, who, he said, have gained control of American foreign commerce since the Foreign Economic Administration was placed in charge.

BITTER FEUD RECALLED

LaVarre's resignation recalled the bitter feud between WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jones over the field of foreign economics. It ended last July 15, when President Roosevelt abolished WALLACE's Board of Economic Warfare, deprived Jones of foreign purchase powers, Jones held as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and placed foreign economic operations in charge of a new agency, headed by Leo T. Crowley.

LaVarre made his accusations in a letter to Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat), of Virginia. Majof charges were:

1. The B. E. W. and F. E. A. have been waging a secret war against American businessmen and the Nation's export industries under powers usurped from the Department of Commerce.

2. Efforts are being made to change the American free-enterprise system into one of socialistic, collective commerce patterned after Russia's Amtorg Corporation and to promote future American commerce exclusively through state-owned corporations.

3. As Alien Property Custodian and F. E. A. Administrator combined, Crowley tries to build up the profits of Axis companies in competition with American firms, and licenses the products of Axis firms in competition with loyal American industries.

WRECKED BY INEXPERIENCE

4. Most of the trade of smaller American exporters in other American republics has been "wrecked by the inexperienced or subversive policies of individuals who, in such great numbers, were brought to Washington by friends of the Vice President, Milo Perkins, or Leo Crowley, and given draft-exempt employment in the mushrooming agencies."

LaVarre said he joined the department April 27, 1941, at the invitation of Undersecretary Wayne C. Taylor. Shortly afterward, he said, President Roosevelt transferred powers of the department to Wallace's agencies.

"With the creation of the Economic Defense Board," LaVarre said, "and its metamorphosis into the B. E. W. under executive administration of the Vice President and his friend, Milo Perkins, I witnessed a constant program of bypassing the constitutional authorities of the Department of Commerce and its long-trained economic and international specialists. I was also forced to witness the decimation of American private enterprise assets.

SYSTEMS COMPARED

"In the Department files there are weekly reports of these subversive activities, prepared by me for the Secretary of Commerce each Wednesday prior to the meeting of the Cabinet."

Turning to free enterprise versus the Soviet system, LaVarre wrote:

"I have witnessed a constant attempt to change the heritage of private enterprise and initiative into a system of socialistic collectivist commerce patterned along the formula of Russia's state-owned Amtorg Corporation to do away with our established private-brand names and to promote the future commerce of the United States exclusively through state-owned corporations.

"The record will show that the B. E. W. and now the F. E. A., usurping the administration of projects which Congress originally delegated to the Department, under the guise of war necessity have been waging a secret war not against our national enemies so much as against American businessmen and the export industries of the United States."

STAGNATING TO BUSINESS

"While our English allies have developed many projects under which the foreign commerce of Great Britain will be expanded some 30 percent as soon as the war ends, we in the United States face the probability that, if these current executive philosophies and policies continue, the foreign commerce of the American people will stagnate."

LaVarre said of F. E. A. Administrator Crowley:

"Today we have the incongruous, if not malodorous, phenomenon of an Administrator who acts both as Alien Property Custodian and F. E. A. czar, purporting to serve American industry in all its commerce and economic warfare throughout the world. With one hand he attempts to build up the profits of Axis companies in competition with old American firms and trade-marks. With the other his offices issues export licenses for products of alien, Axis firms, in competition with the export products of loyal American industries.

"While we persuaded our neighboring governments to confiscate and sell all Axis commercial assets to natives, the Alien Property Custodian—F. E. A. czar—much to our neighbors' amazement—has put his friends into these alien, Axis corporations and set up a policy of building up these Axis estates."

LaVarre said no administrator considering himself the trustee of Axis assets can act at the same time in the best interests of American foreign commerce.

He continued:

"While many of our American exporters and importers have been curtailed by lend-lease policies and other restrictions, or forced out of business, and their experienced personnel has been drafted, there has arisen a plethora of fly-by-night foreign-born individuals who open desk-room offices and, with a strange ability to secure export licenses and production priorities, are rapidly dominating many export and import services."

Referring to the Wallace and Crowley agencies, LaVarre said:

"Instead of making use of the accumulated knowledge and talents of civil servants, these new agencies subsidized the hasty pseudo-education of impractical tyros and experimenters, at exceptionally high wages and with unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

"In addition, these agencies employed refugees, many with limited knowledge of the English language, and with no personal allegiance to the United States, and with strange European idealogies, who came to my office demanding to see confidential reports."

DEMANDED BY ALIENS

"I learned that they were being paid an average of $25 a day as consultants by these agencies, and that I was supposed to provide them with confidential war information. This I have refused to do.

"Throughout my service in Washington I have observed a definite scheme for wrecking all American private enterprise and personal initiative in inter-American, in fact international, commerce, and substituting the Soviet form of state-owned. Whenever I have exposed some detail, the individual responsible, after costing the American people much money, has been fired.

"But another similar individual takes his place. And the discharged man shows up in a key post in some other executive agency.

"Upon the liabilities of the B. E. W. have been piled the new personnel of F. E. A., the Administrator of which is frequently advised by Mr. Thomas Corcoran and Mr. Victor Emanuel."

(Corcoran, known as "Tommy the Cork," is an erstwhile White House intimate. Emanuel is a New York capitalist.)

LaVarre told the Times-Herald he has recently voluntarily relinquished his director's title to an assistant and that his resignation will be effective Tuesday.

Who's Who in America lists LaVarre as an economic geographer and writer and executive Latin-American assistant to Secretary Jones, as well as Jones' Chief of the American Republics Division.

New Deal Expenditures in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Naples (N. Y.) Record of January 26, 1944:

CONGRESSIONAL GLEANINGS

(By Ilco Cortes)

THAT BUTLER BOY MAKES GOOD

Some weeks ago, Senator HUGH A. BUTLER, of Nebraska, came out with a whale of an attack on the New Deal for its perfectly insane expenditures in Latin America. Ye scribe remained silent on the subject, despite his Latin-American identification, because he simply did not believe BUTLER'S statements would stand up under analysis, for BUTLER had declared that we had spent in Latin America the astronomical sum of over $6,000,000,000. Now getting back to our old, realistic method of approach, that means $185 for each head of a family of four. Now, take a piece of paper, and, allowing a population of 1,080, or 270 heads of family, you have practically $50,000 which your burg will have to "pungle" in one way or another to meet its share of New Deal largess to Latin America. Speaking for the county of Ontario, which has a population estimated at 56,000 (it was 55,000 in 1940), and it is stuck for nearly $2,600,000. If you want the Empire State, multiply by 7,000,000.

Well, there was a hullabaloo when BUTLER made his attack. Nelson Rockefeller, Lend-Lease, State Department—all of 'em fell on BUTLER tooth and toenail and accused him of moronism, credulity, deceit, isolationism, political marplotting, and everything they could lay their tongues to, and then they selected the ancient MCKELLAR, New Deal Senator from Tennessee, to show BUTLER up and they gave him their figures. It recalled the late Champ Clark's bon mot of 30 years ago: "Figgers don't lie, but liars figger." MCKELLAR cut the estimate to $1,500,000,000 or 2 percent of the BUTLER total. Fact is, we used to run our own Federal Government for less than half that before we got into the First World War.

It looked sort of bad for BUTLER to this writer, and to most everyone else not on the inside of what the New Deal actually was doing. I couldn't see how he could "ooch" out of a tight spot because I did not have access to the figures to the extent that an aggressive Senator could command.

Folks, BUTLER came through, and how.

On November 26, 1943, Senator BUTLER stated to the United States Senate: "Our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in or for Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, and 1944 total more than $6,000,000,000." And then they threw everything at him, including the bound volume of fireside chats for July 1933-43. Just to be nice about it, he added $397,000,000 to his original total, found on the re-check, or an increase of 6.6 percent. And since you, Mr. Neapolitan Head of Family, are now stuck to the tune of $196, I quote in part from his address of January 20, to wit and as follows:

"Mr. President, the document I hold in my hand is an item-by-item list of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit relating to Latin America during those 3 years. Every item in this list has been documented. Every item has been documented as to its source. The source is set forth in these tables. Every item has been documented as to amount. The amount has been set forth in these tables.

"More than that, Mr. President, the documentation of every item and of every amount has been certified and authenticated by the well-known Washington accounting firm of James A. Councilor.

"Mr. President, this documented, certified total of our expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit relating to Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, and 1944, amounts to $5,733,953,534.

"It was said on the floor of the Senate that my figures were 95 percent wrong and 5 percent right. * * * On the basis solely of this first, documented, certified list, which I have just exhibited, I am 95.5 percent right.

"But I was not wrong. Here, Mr. President, is another document. This is a list of our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit during 1942, 1943, and 1944, in and to our Latin-American possessions—the Panama Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Every item in this list has been documented. Its documentation has been certified by the firm of Councilor & Co. The total amount thus documented and certified is $662,806,970.

"That sum, Mr. President, is not part of the $5,733,953,534 documented and certified in the previous list. I am not including this in that total. This is a different three-quarters of a billion dollars altogether.

"But let no one assume that this sum of $662,806,970, separated though it is in the total, can be separated from any honest, overall account of what we are doing in Latin America. These are our possessions. We have responsibility for them in peace. We have greater responsibility for them in war. We will spend what is necessary to meet those responsibilities.

"But the place where this sum has gone, is going, and will go is not somewhere else. The place is Latin America. The amount we spend in these Latin-American possessions has some effect on adjoining areas. The way we spend it has a great deal of effect. If we are lavish and wasteful in the Territories under our flag, the consequences of our lavishness and wastefulness cannot be confined to those Territories. They set precedents; they stir unrest; they create ill will elsewhere.

"Let no one assume that that grand total of $6,396,760,504 to Latin America and to our Latin-American possessions is all that we have expended, committed, and extended down there. That total of $6,396,760,504 is only the documented, certified total. That is the amount that we can be absolutely sure of.

"There is evidence of much additional, unrevealed expenditure, commitment, and extension of credit."

As an example, he cites the agreement of the United States Government to foot the bill for the Mexican Government-owned railroad all the way to Guatemala, for which competent estimators have set $100,000,000 as the cost. And he calls attention to the fact that American taxpayers' funds are going into cinchona (quinine) plantations, sansiviera (fiber), sryptosetgia, hennequin, sisal, abaca, rotenone plantations, etc., to infinity.

Not only have the American taxpayers suffered from these orgiastic expenditures of their money, but the people of Latin America, the working classes particularly, have been utterly demoralized by the torrent of American dollars that has rushed in, completely upsetting their economic systems. The Democratic Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, recently returned from a Latin-American itinerary, reported, speaking of so-called military projects we had built in Latin America: "In every instance known to the committee, these wage scales are much higher than native wages. Since there was little competing employment in these areas, the additional incentive was not required to obtain workers. But as a result of these higher wages misunderstanding and resentment have been created among the local people and unrest and jealousies among the workers. The War Department is continuing to pay its native workers more than the prevailing wages."

Floyde Ransome, one of the best known and liked of the American businessmen in Mexico, is alarmed "at the inflationary pressures which were resulting from excessive United States spending in Mexico." Marquis Childs, well-known writer, found Brazil thoroughly demoralized by American spending there. Writing of the rubber efforts which so far have not produced enough rubber to make a hot water bottle for Paul Bunyan, Frank Kelley writes to the New York Herald Tribune that "Their (the New Dealers) plan calls for the gift to the tappers and their wives of a variety of supplies and equipment including sewing machines and bathtubs." Those must be the bathtubs which should have gone to the American farmers who were to be taught by the Japanese how to bathe and when to bathe.

Space does not permit any sort or itemization of Senator HUGH BUTLER'S figures. But there they are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20, and if the speech is printed as a separate, I will see that the the RECORD has a copy. I recall a fine old Naples grandfather banker, his son, a banker, and his son's son a banker. Two of them are going to turn over in their graves when they see that list; and the one now living is going to cut his vitamin intake by 50 percent. Fellow Neapolitans, it just makes you sick to the stomach. And this is the assertion of one who knows Latin Amerca as well as he once knew Hatch Hill.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BATTERY I, TWO HUNDRED AND TENTH COAST ARTILLERY, ANTIAIRCRAFT,
A. P. O. 980, Seattle, Wash., February 4, 1944.

MR. ROBERTS: A lot of noise is being made back there about this soldier-vote business. We hear it way out here "somewhere in the Aleutians."

Here is my point. I have a suspicion that someone (or some group) is trying to kick this issue about until I am deprived of my vote in the coming Presidential election. That scares me. Suppose I and many more are denied that privilege? Maybe we will have a new Chief. That couldn't be the reason behind all this, or could it? Well just in case someone is trying to pull a fast one I'm going to ask you to see to it that I get a ballot. Maybe this isn't the proper procedure but you can set me straight on that.

You see some of us are interested enough to want to vote and in case we are held up we want to know what's going on. We don't like to have suspicions, but well you know "Brutus was an honorable man."

I don't get much chance to talk with the lawmakers so if you see any of them tell them we want to vote, oh yes, I don't think it will hurt to tell them that the man I want to vote for is a fellow who is doing a good job, a man better known as President Roosevelt.

Thanks for past kindnesses.

Lots of luck and good health.

Sincerely,

Sgt. PAUL F. HENRY.

The Palace Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of the "palace guard" in the past several years, but it remained for R. E. A. Administrator Harry Slattery to bring before the people just what the "palace guard" is and how it operates.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Harry Slattery for more than 30 years. He was born in the South and came to Washington under the Theodore Roosevelt administration. He has remained here since and during the years has contributed much to efficient administration of the public business. He is highly intelligent and of fine character. When he speaks he is fully informed as to the subject under discussion.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Slattery is devoted to constitutional government and a nonpartisan administration of the public business. The office he occupies and the salary he receives together with his term of office was fixed by the Congress. No bureaucrat has the authority to separate him from his office.

It is apparent from what he has testified to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Subcommittee on Appropriations that the "palace guard" are determined to get rid of him in order that they may name someone to this highly important position who will subserviently do as the "ghost" committee wishes.

A most enlightening report on Mr. Slattery's appearance before the Senate committee was contained in an article by Willard Edwards in the Washington Times-Herald of February 17, 1944. I wish to say in connection with Mr. Slattery and his testimony, and I speak from long acquaintance and friendship, that what he says can be depended upon as the truth and nothing else. So that the Congress and the country can have a clear picture of what is going on and what is being undertaken in order to control the votes of the farmers, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks this article by Mr. Edwards:

"PALACE GUARD" PLOT BARED BY R. E. A. CHIEF—SENATE QUIZ TOLD OF VOTE SCHEMING

(By Willard Edwards)

Lifting the veil on White House politics, R. E. A. Administrator Harry Slattery yesterday told a Senate investigating committee of "palace guard" pressure to force his resignation, leaving the way clear for use of his agency to manipulate farm votes in the coming Presidential campaign.

The bluff Irish head of the Rural Electrification Administration revealed details of a 9 months' campaign to oust him.

SAYS HE REFUSED TO QUIT

Department of Agriculture investigators rifled a safe containing his private papers, questioned scores of his acquaintances in an effort to impeach his integrity, and spread malicious stories about his physical and mental health, he said.

The climax came when he was summoned before Jonathan W. Daniels, administrative assistant to Mr. Roosevelt, and Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, the "palace guard's" legal adviser, last Thursday in the White House, and handed a letter of resignation to sign. He refused.

Dangled before him, Slattery said, was the offer, which he indignantly spurned, of a State Department appointment as head of a foreign R. E. A. which would presumably undertake the furnishing of electric light and power to African bushmen and Italian peasants at the American taxpayers' expense.

"SINISTER AND CORRUPT"

The Senate committee, headed by Senator SMITH (Democrat), of South Carolina, has been delving for more than 2 months into R. E. A. affairs and has exposed a plan for New Deal control of 4,000,000 farm votes, branded as "sinister and corrupt" in the testimony, which would be accomplished through setting up of a Nation-wide system of private purchasing groups under R. E. A. control.

Slattery's opinion of this scheme was given in a letter to Presidential Assistant Daniels last August 17 after another attempt to force him to resign. He denounced the "machinations of the Craig-Tate-Ellis cabal" to inject politics into the R. E. A. and warned:

"There is danger to the President in acceding to these unscrupulous and ambitious men."

Slattery testified, under questioning by Senator AIKEN (Republican), of Vermont, that Mr. Roosevelt was aware of the efforts to force his resignation.

Members of the cabal are Robert B. Craig, former deputy R. E. A. administrator who was permitted to resign in May 1943 during a general whitewash investigation; Stephen Tate, wealthy Georgia marble manufacturer who is head of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, a Washington pressure group; and former Representative Clyde T. Ellis, Democrat, of Arkansas, now in the Navy.

TO SAVE R. E. A.

Because of his opposition to political control of the R. E. A., Slattery said, he was first called to Washington by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard in June 1943, and asked to resign.

[The R. E. A. was stripped of its independent status by the Presidential reorganization plan of 1939 and put under the Department of Agriculture.]

When Slattery refused, he said, Wickard argued that his resignation was essential to save R. E. A. Slattery said he consulted former Senator Norris, of Nebraska, one of the congressional sponsors of R. E. A., and was told to "stand by his guns."

The following day, without being consulted, Slattery testified, a new deputy administrator, William J. Neal, was appointed, and proceeded to exercise much of the authority delegated to the Administrator.

Oklahoma Contest Settled—Committee Unanimous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire at this time to comment rather briefly on the unanimous report made by the Elections Committee No. 3 recommending dismissal of the contest of one E. O. Clark against our former colleague, Mr. Jack Nichols, who, I regret to say, resigned his seat in this House several months ago in order to accept a very responsible position with one of the great air lines of the country.

The report of the Elections Committee, of which the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. HUGH PETERSON, is the distinguished chairman, and the gentleman from Vermont, Hon. CHARLES PLUMLEY, is the able and industrious ranking Republican member, and signed by all members of that committee, both Democrats and Republicans, is couched in plain, simple language that all can understand. Members of that committee are to be highly commended for their comprehensive, straightforward, definite report to this House, which I am glad to say was adopted also unanimously by the House without any member so much as raising his voice in protest against the conclusions and decision of the committee.

Now, 2 days later, there is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy statement by our very affable and politically astute Republican colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. Ross RIZLEY, in which he quotes extensively from the contestant's voluminous brief and in which a number of questions are again raised that have been passed on by all members of the committee after full presentation of all of the alleged evidence presented by the contestant and his battery of lawyers.

The heart of the report of the Elections Committee, which my colleague "overlooked" in his extension of remarks, is the following statement:

On the strength of the evidence offered and from the mouths of the witnesses produced, it was established to the satisfaction of the committee that no fraud was perpetrated on the contestant by any election official in the discharge of his duty whereby the contestant was deprived of any vote; that the election officials undertook to see to it that every person entitled to vote was granted that opportunity; that no person not entitled to vote was permitted to vote; that the result of the balloting as certified to by the election officials was true and correct.

To the surprise of all, including, no doubt, the contestant himself, in that district that is normally safely Democratic, the election in that congressional district was close. The principal reason was that only 40,000 votes were cast in 1942 against approximately 70,000, 2 years previous.

Immediately following that election, the contestant and his attorneys and political advisers openly and repeatedly charged "fraud and conspiracy." It will be noted that the contestant filed his first petition on January 5, 1943, and twice later filed amended petitions. Although there were 23 charges against the county and precinct election officials, who incidentally are well-known and respected citizens of that district, and the record shows that the committee was very patient with the contestant and gave him almost a year to collect all of that alleged evidence to sustain his charges, that he failed dismally to do so. It is interesting to note that the unanimous committee report, signed by all Republican members of the committee, as well as Democrats, shows that not a scintilla of evidence was presented to substantiate those rash and reckless charges. This is not only a vindication of our distinguished former colleague, Mr. Nichols, who was unable to be in the State either for the campaign or the election, but it is definitely a deserved compliment to the integrity of the precinct and county election officials who held the election.

In the extension of remarks by my genial colleague, made obviously for political purposes, wherein he "forgot" to quote from the heart of the report, to which I have just referred, it is noted it is alleged that the registration laws were not fully complied with in one county, which happens to be the one in which Nichols received his largest majority. The report shows that the registration was carried out substantially in the same manner in all counties of the district, but it is rather amusing that no objection is made to the manner of registration in the counties carried by the Republicans.

The contestant boldly charged that he was "illegally, wrongfully, and fraudulently deprived of his election to Congress through frauds and irregularities perpetrated and through repeated gross violations and the entire disregard of the election laws of Oklahoma" by election officials. That is a mighty serious charge and covers lots of territory. After 18 months of "ballyhoo" and publicity, he was not able to show that a single, qualified voter was prevented from registering and voting, nor that a single, unqualified voter was permitted to register or vote.

It would seem that in desperation an attempt is made now to befuddle the minds of the voters, with reference to the conclusion of the House committee in its report on this election contest because Mr. Nichols did not offer any evidence. The fact is, it was such a flimsy, weak case with no evidence whatever on which to base any one of the 23 charges, much less the serious charge of fraud, that it was wholly unnecessary for Nichols to present any evidence. This decision not to present evidence enabled the committee to expedite and conclude the hearings by several weeks.

Again I desire to warmly commend Chairman PETERSON and all members, both Democrats and Republicans, of Elections Committee No. 3 on the fair and nonpartisan manner in which this, as well as other election contests, have been handled. It is significant that only a few weeks ago, by another unanimous decision, the same committee seated a Republican Member from Missouri, whose election was being contested by a Democrat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I am submitting for the RECORD the entire report of the Elections Committee, not just a few sentences taken from the context of same, in order that anyone who may be interested can follow the full reasoning of the committee in making its unanimous report to this House. It follows:

The Committee on Elections No. 3, having had under consideration the election contest of E. O. Clark, contestant, against Jack Nichols, contestee, Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, submits its unanimous report and recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the election contest of E. O. Clark, contestant, against Jack Nichols, contestee, Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, be dismissed."

STATEMENT

The record in this case shows that this contest was filed by the contestant on December 5, 1942; the answer of the contestee was filed on January 5, 1943; an amended petition was filed by the contestant on January 9, 1943; and an amendment to the amended petition was filed on February 15, 1943. It is also a matter of record that a certain petition of the contestant filed with the State election board of the State of Oklahoma was dismissed "for want of jurisdiction and authority in this board to entertain the same."

Reference is also to be had to all the records in the case now on file with this committee without burdening this report with the necessity of reprinting the same in detail.

The contestant in his brief stated 23 propositions on which he relied, together with a conclusion and a citation of cases in support of his contention generally stated to be that he was illegally, wrongfully, and fraudulently deprived of his election to Congress through frauds and irregularities perpetrated, and through repeated gross violations and the entire disregard of the election laws of Oklahoma by election officials.

By reference to the contestant's brief and to the testimony adduced and offered, it will be found that in substance the foregoing statement, though general, is in effect a fair statement of the reasons given by the contestant why his contentions in the case should be found to be correct and he should be declared to have been elected.

The contestee did not take advantage of any opportunity to obtain or to file any evidence in contravention of the statements made by the witnesses produced by and for the contestant in support of his contentions.

The contestant submits in his conclusion that the record shows that he received a greater number of the legal votes cast in the legal elections held in the district than was received by the contestee and that he should be seated.

On the strength of the evidence offered and from the mouths of the witnesses produced, it was established to the satisfaction of the committee that no fraud was perpetrated on the contestant by any election official in the discharge of his duty whereby the contestant was deprived of any vote; that the election officials undertook to see to it that every person entitled to vote was granted that opportunity; that no person not entitled to vote was permitted to vote; that the result of the balloting as certified by the election officials was true and correct to the best of their knowledge and ability.

Over and over again the election officials testified, as appears from the record, to the truth of the statements last above made, from which the committee is bound to find that there was no fraud per se.

It is charged by the contestant that the election was held and conducted in disregard of the election laws of Oklahoma in that no registration book as is prescribed by law shall be had and kept in the different precincts was had or kept in certain precincts with respect to which testimony was offered. Other irregularities of a similar nature with regard to omission of certain requirements were referred to.

That there were such irregularities, which this committee does not condone, was fairly proven. It is not the business nor the province of this committee, however, to attempt indirectly to compel the State of Oklahoma to enforce its laws with respect to certain provisions therein which patently were not complied with, but grossly disregarded. The electors, the people, of the district did choose between two candidates and they should not be deprived of their rights by the failure of those responsible for the administration of the law to do their duty.

In general, it may be said that while the constitution and the statutes of the State of Oklahoma provide that this registration book should be kept on which shall be registered and enrolled the names of the legal voters, that requirement, not complied with, is not such an irregularity as to vitiate an election unless the performance of the act of keeping the book be declared by law to be essential to the validity of the election.

In the case in hand both the constitution and the statute merely provide that certain things shall be done but neither declares that the doing or performance of the same are essential to the validity of the election. It follows, therefore, that the provision is merely directory and the final test as to legality of the election is whether or not the electors have been given an opportunity to express and have fairly expressed their will.

It is well established that such requirements as those above referred to are always treated as directory unless the law, either expressly or in effect, makes them essential to the validity of the election. Electors must not be deprived of their votes on account of any technical objection to the manner in which the election has been held or to any misconduct on the part of the election officials if these have not affected the true result of the election.

This has so often been stated to be the law and has been followed so generally as the precedents show.

See *Goodrich* v. *Bulloch* (51st Cong. (Fla.), 2 Hinds, sec. 1037):

"The committee are clearly of the opinion that voters complying with all other requirements of the law cannot be disfranchised by the neglect of public officials to furnish them opportunity to register."

Williams v. *Settle* (53d Cong. (N. C.), 2 Hinds, sec. 1048):

"The burden is on the party objecting to the vote to show that the elector objected to for illegal registration was illegally registered and for whom he voted."

Threet v. *Clarke* (51st Cong. (Ala.), 2 Hinds, sec. 1025):

"Voters being prevented by no fault of their own from obtaining registration certificates required for voting, the House counted the votes as if cast."

Buchanan v. *Manning* (47th Cong. (Miss.), 2 Hinds, sec. 974):

"Although many electors have suffered by arbitrary refusal of registration officers to do their duty, yet the House requires a contestant to show specifically the resulting harm."

Dodge v. *Brooks* (39th Cong. (N. Y.), 2 Hinds, sec. 860):

"Hearsay testimony is not admitted in the determination of an election case."

If the irregularities of which the contestant complains did in fact obtain, even so it has not been made to appear that he was deprived of any rights thereby. The claim that there were irregularities sufficient to constitute a fraud is not sustained. The claim that the irregularities were of such a nature as to invalidate the election is not tenable for that the provisions of the law governing the alleged irregularities were directory and not mandatory.

Now, right here it should be said that this Committee on Elections is determined that, insofar as the established procedure of this House is involved, the precedents heretofore established shall be followed.

What are the precedents? Among others, and first, they are to be found in the case of *Frank* v. *LaGuardia* (68th Cong. (N. Y.), 6 Cannon's Precedents, sec. 164), quoting from *Ansorge* v. *Weller*, wherein it is stated:

"It has been said again and again by the House, by the courts, by every tribunal that has this duty of passing upon contested elections, that the returns which are made by the inspectors, regularly appointed by the laws of the State where the election is held, are presumed to be correct until they are impeached by proof of irregularity and fraud, and that the House will not erect itself, nor will it erect its committees as mere boards of recount. It is conceived that when the statutes of the State have set up these bipartisan boards and made due and proper provision for their selection, that it is a matter of public policy, wise and right that their conclusions shall be accepted by the parties to the election, by the public, and by any board charged with the duty of passing on the result, until such time as such irregularities and frauds are proved as to raise a fair presumption that their duties were not honestly performed."

In the case of *Galvin* v. *O'Connell* (61st Cong. (Mass.) Moores Digest, p. 40), it is stated:

"It is a principle well established that when, under all forms of law, a person has been duly returned and certified as elected to Congress it is presumed that the election officers have done their duty and the count is correct. To justify the committee in ordering a recount there should be a case made out that would warrant the presumption of fraud, or still more, in the case of an alleged mistake or error of judgment in the counting of ballots, a case made out that would clearly justify the presumption that a mistake had been made that would set aside the return. In other words, there must be evidence and proof other than that of speculative possibility."

The precedents are uniform in holding that the returns which are made by election officials regularly appointed by the laws of the State where the election is held are presumed to be correct until they are impeached by proof of irregularity and fraud. It was well stated in *Bailey* v. *Walters* (69th Cong. (Pa.), 6 Cannon's Precedents, sec. 166), quoting from *Ansorge* v. *Weller:*

"The House will not erect itself nor will it erect its committees as mere boards of recount."

To recapitulate briefly, it appears from the evidence that those who conducted the election were honorable people, that they knew or thought they knew who the voters were, that they permitted nobody to vote whom they believed not to be entitled to vote, that they allowed everybody to vote whom they thought had a right to vote, that no objection was offered by the contestant or by his watchers to any vote that was cast or to the right of any man or woman to vote, and that no fraud was perpetrated on the contestant by any election official in the discharge of his duty whereby the contestant was deprived of any vote.

Whatever may have been said heretofore, the fundamental issue in this contest is whether or not the contestant has borne the burden of showing that, due to fraud and irregularity, the result of the election was contrary to the clearly defined wish of the constituency involved. The committee is of the opinion that the contestant has failed to carry this burden, and, therefore, recommends that this election contest be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH PETERSON,
Chairman.
EUGENE J. KEOGH.
JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
O. C. FISHER.
JOHN W. MURPHY.
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY.
RALPH A. GAMBLE.
ANGIER L. GOODWIN.
HOMER A. RAMEY.

Thompson Versus Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on February 15, 1944:

THOMPSON VERSUS BRICKER

Dorothy Thompson's savage attack against Gov. John W. Bricker will make more friends than enemies for the Ohio Governor.

Her effort to compare Bricker with the late Warren G. Harding was so unfair and out of bounds that it will be resented by all fair-minded Ohioans, whatever their political affiliations may be. For, regardless of Bricker's shortcomings—and the Plain Dealer has not hesitated to point them out when it thought the occasion so warranted—no one familiar with the Governor's record would think for one moment that he would countenance having around him another "Ohio gang" similar to the crew which moved in on Washington when Harding went to the White House.

Miss Thompson's main argument, however, is that Bricker is mistaken and ignorant in ascribing the miracles of war production achieved by American industry to the traditional system of free enterprise.

The columnist contends that "our industries did not of themselves prepare us for war" and that they "tried as long as possible to continue business as usual."

What's wrong with that? We don't believe that anyone, including Miss Thompson, will contend that industry, of its own volition should have stopped making automobiles, baby carriages, washing machines, and thousands of other civilian products and turned to the production of planes, tanks, guns, and ships before the Government placed orders for these and other implements of war.

Then Miss Thompson goes on to say that "the war effort is the result of Government plans, Government financing, Government debts, Government contracts, Government rules, and Government efforts to keep profits and labor in line according to some standards."

Quite so. When the Government gave the word, industry started to produce. But it was American inventive genius, mechanical skill, resourcefulness, and research—all products of the free enterprise system—which produced the amazing production records, not the omniscience of an all-powerful government.

As a matter of fact, there is room for argument as to how well the Government carried out its part of the job.

Some of the Government's plans were botched and unnecessarily delayed by endless conflicts between Government agencies, the Government's financing of the war has been woefully inadequate, Government regulations have created widespread confusion and dissatisfaction, and the Government's labor policy has been a dismal failure.

Miss Thompson charges Bricker with failure to indicate awareness of any post-war problem except taxation. The Governor, she says, is as silent as Lincoln's tomb on the fundamental problem of "whether we can bring about in peace as effective a use of our manpower and materials as we have done for war."

Since Miss Thompson assigns the credit for our war effort to the Government, we assume that she favors a continuation or extension of Government plans, financing, debts, contracts, rules, and standards, rather than a return to the free enterprise system, to make the most effective use of our manpower and materials after the war has been won.

Right here is where we part company with Miss Thompson. The Government's handling of the war effort has given us a byproduct of unparalleled confusion, waste, and extravagance, much of which cannot be avoided in time of war when the Nation is in danger and results are all that count. But we want no continuation of confusion, waste, and extravagance when the war is ended. Rather, we prefer a system under which the Government by wise policies of taxation and the restraint of monopolies will encourage business activity and the investment of capital to the end that our system of free enterprise will be able to provide the jobs and security which everyone wants.

If we have to choose between Dorothy Thompson and Governor Bricker, we'll take Bricker.

Information Please—Tax Day Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the new parlor game, "Figure your taxes," has taken the place of bridge, gin rummy, and poker on the Nation's home front. Newspaper reporters from one end of the country to the other have found the answer to the feature writer's dream. By taking the same set of income-tax figures to 10 different "experts," including those specifically entrusted by the Government with the collection of internal revenue, anywhere from 7 to 10 different answers seem possible, creating a sure-fire front-page feature. It is just possible that the same thing could have been done with taxes since the year they were born, but no one will deny that this year's tax muddle is just about the

world's worst. Considering the withholding taxes, the forgiveness of part of 1942 taxes, plus the awe-inspiring prospect of another quarterly tax estimate which is to be filed shortly after March 15, 1944, in addition to the completion of the 1943 return, the Nation's taxpayers are getting an awful headache.

Far from crying in despair over the situation, it is possible even under the current taxation act for our Treasury Department to work out a set of forms far simpler than those now in use. Thousands of men and women earn more than the $3,000 figure upon which the simplified form now available is based. It would not require a Thomas Edison to invent a simpler form for the use of all people whose incomes are derived from salaries, wages, commissions, regardless of how large their income may have been.

Critical Needs of the Lumber, Pulp, and Paper Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am chairman, has been holding hearings recently on H. R. 4000, by Mr. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts. This bill is designed to defer from selective service induction into the armed forces men engaged in the forest industries such as logging and cutting of pulpwood.

The hearings of the subcommittee have just been concluded and I have been much impressed by the critical condition of the lumber, pulp, and paper industries in America due to the shortage of the basic raw material used by each, namely, logs and pulpwood. In my judgment, this has been due to an increasing shortage of forest labor which is reducing the output of logs and pulpwood to the point of closing down many mills and having others reduced to a 4- or 5-day week.

We have received many telegrams and letters regarding this critical situation. To show that this critical condition is affecting the war effort in all parts of the United States, and to further show the critical nature of it, I am asking to have reproduced representative telegrams received by me and by the chairman of the full Committee on Military Affairs, the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY. I make no request to print the many letters received from all parts of the country as the cost of printing in the RECORD would make this unwise at this time.

The telegrams follow:

LONGLEAF, LA., *January 28, 1944.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Knowing you are a member of the House Military Affairs Committee and have before you at this time a bill known as H. R. 4000 which has to do with manpower shortage in logging operations this situation with us is serious and your favorable action on this proposal will be greatly appreciated.

CROWELL LONGLEAF LUMBER CO., INC.,
R. D. CROWELL.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 10, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

May I respectfully request that hearings be promptly held on H. R. 4000, and that you use your good offices to influence favorable consideration thereon. The critical situation in the pulp and paper industry is becoming increasingly worse and unless more men are released immediately for woods operations a shortage of paper and paper products much more serious than anything experienced to date will inevitably occur.

DWIGHT G. W. HOLLISTER,
President, A. P. W. Paper Co., Inc.

PALATKA, FLA., *February 8, 1944.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Re H. R. 4000. This company with monthly capacity of 3,000,000 feet has been operating at only 800,000 feet per month for the past 10 months and is closing down next week for lack of woodworkers. Our men 80 percent colored, having gone into agricultural pursuits in this vicinity. For the past 2 years 85 percent of our production has gone to war services under priorities. Favorable legislative action by your subcommittee needed if we are to get workers back on job.

WILSON CYPRESS CO.,
C. R. MACPHERSON,
General Manager.

THOMASVILLE, ALA., *March 9, 1944.*

OVERTON BROOKS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Shortage of trucks and labor have reduced the sawmill units we operate from four to one. We will experience extreme difficulty in securing necessary labor for this one mill when the farming season starts. If you expect to have lumber produced, urge you support H. R. 4000.

FOUR QUARTER LUMBER CO.,
J. G. BRADFORD.

URANIA, LA., *February 9, 1944.*

T. OVERTON BROOKS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

I want to urge very strongly your support of H. R. 4000, reference draft deferment workmen in woods; important in keeping up production of needed lumber.

Q. T. HARDTNER.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *February 11, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the members of Justice Local No. 426, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, urge your support on bills H. R. 4000 and S. 1662.

ARTHUR DAVIES,
Recording Secretary.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *January 31, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

War effort's critical need of lumber and rapidly declining hardwood production Appalachian region due to shortage sawmill and woods labor necessitates lumber industry employees receiving same draft status as farmers. Appalachian emergency war committee representing Appalachian lumbermen urges favorable consideration H. R. 4000 at Military Affairs Committee hearing February 1.

APPALACHIAN HARDWOOD
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *January 28, 1944.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

House Office Building:

Understand your Military Affairs Committee has under consideration H. R. 4000, which would give loggers same draft deferment status as farmers. Hope your committee's action on this bill will be favorable as it is help sorely needed by lumber industry. Decline in lumber production, which is getting worse, is due primarily to manpower shortage in logging.

E. A. FROST.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 2, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

House Office Building:

As a result of pulp shortages sanitary tissue production seriously curtailed with unprecedented demand for Government, hospital, and civilian health requirements. We urge favorable action bill, H. R. 4000, which authorizes deferment of pulpwood loggers to relieve serious shortage of essential papers.

WM. MEDOFF SITROUX, INC.

BUCKSPORT MAINE, *February 14, 1944.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

United States House of Representatives:

Unable attend hearing Brewster bill, S. 1702, but wish to state that shortage woods labor during current season has reduced production pulp nearly 50 percent of normal and unless more men available during summer and fall this year doubtful if sufficient pulpwood can be procured for required production this year and the first 6 months of 1945.

GEORGE D. BEARCE,
Maine Seaboard Paper Co.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *February 1, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We cannot express to emphatically critical situation due to shortage of wood pulp and effect on our production for Army overseas barracks, Navy mobile hospital units, and other essential war production. May we ask Military Affairs Committee to consider favorably H. R. 4000 as soon as possible.

THE UPSON CO.
HENRY W. SCHMIDT,
Assistant to the President.

STEVENS POINT, WIS., *February 14, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Due to critical situation because of a shortage of wood pulp it is our desire that hearings be held and favorable consideration be given to bills No. H. R. 4000 and No. S. 1662. Consideration of our request will be appreciated.

WISCONSIN LOCAL 359, INTERNATIONAL
BROTHERHOOD OF PAPER MAKERS.

NEW HOPE, PA., *January 28, 1944.*

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Owing to the extremely critical situation due to the shortage of pulpwood, we request the favorable consideration of your committee to H. R. 4000.

UNION MILLS PAPER MFG. CO.

BOGALUSA, LA., *February 14, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We earnestly request you demand hearings on bills H. R. 4000 and S. 1662.
W. L. MCAULIFFE,
Recovery Local No. 189, I. B. of P. M.

SALYERSVILLE, KY., *January 28, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Congressman:
Will say that I have been operating the timber business for the past 40 years and we have never seen a situation like the present. If we cannot get men deferred to operate the timber business, I see no hope to relieve the shortage of lumber in this section.
D. W. HOWARD.

NEW HOPE, PA., *January 28, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Owing to the extremely critical situation due to the shortage of pulpwood we request the favorable consideration of your committee to H. R. 4000.
UNIVERSAL PAPER BAG CO.

MIDDLETOWN, OHIO, *January 31, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the interest of essential paper production we respectfully request your support of bill (H. R. 4000) authorizing deferment of workers in timber and pulpwood logging on same basis as agricultural workers.
THE SORG PAPER CO.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *February 2, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Congressman From Kentucky,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee, House of Representatives:
In the interest of production of lumber, veneer, and plywood for war production we urge your support of H. R. 4000 entitling men engaged in logging operations to same draft deferment status now enjoyed by farm workers. Production already seriously affected by shortage of log supply.
THE MENGEL CO.,
J. F. X. OREGAN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *February 7, 1944.*
Honorable CHAIRMAN,
Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.:
We urgently recommend the permanent deferment of all employees in the logging, lumber, and shook industries. To withdraw men now deferred would close sawmills and box factories as well as logging camps. Replacements are unobtainable.
KESTERSON LUMBER CORPORATION,
KESTERSON BOX CORPORATION,
D. W. CATER,
Personnel Director.

LITTLE FALLS, N. Y., *February 7, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Will appreciate your favorable consideration to H. R. 4000 as critical situation in wood pulp necessitates shut-down causing manufacturing curtailment of essential papers in our plant.
MOHAWK VALLEY PAPER CO.

NACOGDOCHES, TEX., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge your careful consideration of H. R. 4000. Lumber producers seriously handicapped by shortage of men to work in woods getting out logs. Lumber production cannot increase unless labor situation definitely improves. We urge that men so badly needed in producing logs and lumber be deferred by draft boards in all lumber-producing sections.
FROST LUMBER INDUSTRIES, INC.,
H. W. WHITED, *President.*

BREWTON, ALA., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:
Further drafting of woods employees will be vital to the lumber industry. These men should be deferred if production of lumber is to go on.
T. R. MILLER MILL CO., INC.,
W. T. NEAL, *President.*

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives:
The continuing decline in the production of lumber can best be stopped by draft deferment of woods workmen where the greatest labor shortage now exists. This is necessary if lumber is to continue to contribute its part toward the war effort.
D. M. ROSE & CO.

ROCHELLE, LA., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are greatly interested in H. R. 4000, with reference draft deferment workmen in woods. Lumber production ultraessential and already subnormal, account labor shortage in logging woods. Unless H. R. 4000 acted upon favorably, further decline in production certain. Am sure entire lumber industry will appreciate your favorable support H. R. 4000.
W. T. MURRAY,
Tremont Lumber Co.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives:
Manpower shortage, especially logging operations, has resulted in decreased production of lumber, which is a critical war material. H. R. 4000, now before House Military Affairs Committee, will help correct this situation by giving woods employees same draft deferment as farmers. Strongly urge your support of this bill.
MCKNIGHT LUMBER CO.,
C. F. MCKNIGHT.

CLEVELAND, TENN., *February 9, 1944.*
OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
We strongly recommend passage of bill H. R. 4000. If not passed, lumber production will continue to decrease and, therefore, will retard the war effort. There is no other thing you could do that would do more to help increase production of lumber.
W. J. HARGIS LUMBER CO.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *January 28, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Representing over 260 paper companies depending on the purchase of wood pulp and manufacturing paper and paperboard products for the war effort or essential civilian needs, we urge an early hearing on H. R. 4000.
ASSOCIATION OF PULP CONSUMERS, INC.,
GEORGE R. WALLACE, *President.*

BENNINGTON, N. H., *January 29, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
It is very important your committee hold hearings and report favorably on bill, H. R. 4000, as operation of paper mill is most critical, due to shortage of wood pulp.
A. F. BELL MONADNOCK PAPER MILLS.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *February 18, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs,
Washington, D. C.:
Manpower shortage, especially in logging, has resulted in a critical lumber situation. We understand bill H. R. 4000, giving logging same draft deferment status as farmers is now before House Military Affairs Committee. We respectfully ask that you and other members of the committee take favorable action on this proposal.
PINE PLUME LUMBER CO.

CONROE, TEX., *February 8, 1944.*
OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
We urgently requested that you do everything possible to secure passage of House bill 4000. If this or similar action is not taken lumber production will continue to decrease. In our particular case, a complete shut-down will be imperative unless we can retain the number of men we now have.
GROGAN COCHRAN LUMBER CO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully urge your most careful consideration of House bill 4000 providing that men engaged in logging operations be given same draft deferment status as farm workers. Labor situation with us is critical, and shortage of men in woods has substantially reduced our lumber production so badly needed for war purposes.
KIRBY LUMBER CORPORATION.
H. M. SEAMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 1, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building:
Urgently request you take every effort to recommend H. R. 4000 due to critical situation in our paper mill and many others caused by shortage of wood pulp and pulpwood at present time operating only because of available waste paper supply, which is rapidly diminishing.
DILL & COLLINS, INC.

HOUSATONIC, MASS., *February 1, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building:
As paper manufacturers for nearly half a century and large consumers of wood pulp, we urgently request the House Military Affairs Committee hold hearings and give favorable consideration to bill H. R. 4000, to prevent catastrophic condition which appears certain for the paper industry, due to critical shortage of wood pulp.
Respectfully,
RISING PAPER CO.,
R. H. DEMPSEY, *President.*

CARTHAGE, N. Y., *January 31, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building:
On account of critical situation in woodpulp shortage we respectfully request your committee hold hearing and give favorable consideration to H. R. 4000.
H. M. FORNEY,
Carthage Paper Makers, Inc.

HELENA, ARK., *February 7, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:
The operation of all lumber, veneer, and box plants in this vicinity is seriously cur-

tailed because of the present log shortage. We hope you will give your active support to bill H. R. 4000, which provides for logging employees the same draft status as farm workers.

R. V. KIMBLE,
Chicago Mill & Lumber Co.

FISHER, LA., *January 28, 1944.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building:

Account manpower shortage of loggers in this State exceedingly important enactment bill H. R. 4000 now before you in Military Affairs Committee.

P. A. BLOOMER.

PHOENIX, N. Y., *January 28, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Production of paper and paper products important to defense purposes and essential civilian sanitary needs being seriously curtailed due to manpower shortage in cutting and logging of pulpwood. Unless some relief is found now, an even more critical situation will develop latter half of 1944, too late to correct due to unavoidable lag between wood cutting and paper production. Respectfully request your serious consideration Congressman PHILBIN'S bill, H. R. 4000, and prompt hearings thereon.

SWEET BROS. PAPER MANUFACTURING CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 4, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We will appreciate your support of H. R. 4000 to the end that hearings be scheduled at the earliest possible date.

THE NATIONAL GRAVURE
PRINTERS ASSOCIATION,
ALFRED B. GEIGER, *President.*

PARK FALLS, WIS., *February 8, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Wish to stress the critical situation in the paper industry due to shortage of wood pulp. Our own mill is forced to curtail operations due to this. In behalf of our members I request the House Military Affairs Committee to hold hearings and give favorable consideration to bill H. R. 4000.

EARL NESSMAN,
President, Local 445,
International Brotherhood of Paper Makers.

HOLYOKE, MASS., *February 1, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge prompt hearings and favorable report H. R. 4000 authorizing deferment timber and pulpwood logging workers. Quantities of pulp now being allocated by W. P. B. to paper mills insufficient to satisfy wartime demands for paper. Supplies of pulp inadequate. Vigorous action necessary to correct situation.

AMERICAN WRITING PAPER CO.

SHEBOYGAN, MICH., *February 4, 1944.*
Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are large suppliers of paper to various governmental agencies but due to lack of pulp are unable to satisfy shipping schedules required of us. We urgently direct your attention to Congressman PHILBIN'S bill H. R. 4000 and Senator BREWSTER'S bill S. 1662. Sincerely thanking you for your cooperation.

NORTH AMERICAN PULP & PAPER CORPORATION.
GEO. LUTZ.

A President Fights Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this eloquent American plea for tolerance by the president of Hunter College, in the city of New York, is herewith commended to the earnest attention of my fellow Members. It was first praised, then, quite characteristically, in a subsequent issue, damned, by PM—a remarkable tribute to the truth and vitality of Dr. Shuster's statement:

As a zealous proponent and supporter of liberal legislation and an equally zealous foe of all restrictive or narrow proposals aimed at minorities, my interest in Dr. Shuster's Declaration of Tolerance is far more than academic. During a quarter century of public service, from my years in the State legislature at Albany to the present, I have continuously championed the cause of the oppressed and the persecuted. When we see what is happening in the world today, when every day, every hour, every minute one of our own gallant lads is giving his life to preserve and perpetuate our way of life, then, indeed we rejoice that an upright citizen like Dr. Shuster has lifted his voice in behalf of tolerance. Proudly we welcome him into our ranks.

I have a personal, as well as a public, interest in this matter. First, because Hunter College is a great and renowned institution of higher learning in my home city. Second, because it adjoins my district and many hundreds of the daughters of my constituents make up a large part of the student body. I am glad and grateful indeed to have them under the care and tutelage of a man of so fine a character, so American a vision as Dr. Shuster. Last, thought hardly least, my wife is an alumna of Hunter College.

Dr. Shuster's admirable testament of tolerance, as printed in a paid advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune for February 17, follows:

A PRESIDENT FIGHTS INTOLERANCE
COMMON SENSE

In a determined stand to make democracy live in the classrooms of Hunter College, the world's largest college for women, Dr. George N. Shuster, its president, issued the following document to more than 500 of its faculty members:

"To the Members of the Staff of Hunter College of the City of New York:

"It is with deep reluctance that I address this letter to the staff at the beginning of what we all hope will be a rewarding semester. I have tried on numerous occasions to express my personal gratitude for the loyalty to duty and the readiness to cooperate which have characterized our common service to the college. What must now be said must not be taken to detract from this sincere appreciation or to refer to more than a few unfortunate and isolated occurrences.

"There have been reported to me and to the dean a number of instances in which members of the staff, no doubt affected by the unsettlement of the time, have made remarks which either insulted or wounded their students. These reports are not based on hearsay or on hastiness in giving credence to gossip. Let me say, therefore, that while every member of the staff is entitled to his or her opinions, indoctrination in terms of these opinions is clearly limited by the rights of parents who send their daughters to us. Such rights cannot in any way circumscribe the process of scholarly or scientific inquiry, which is inevitably in part subjective. Thus one teacher will stress the role of spiritual convictions in the making of history, while another will prefer to emphasize the importance of economic factors. This process is the main concern of our educational enterprise and you may be sure that the college authorities will always endeavor to defend its freedom at whatever cost.

"But it is another thing entirely to undermine the courtesy which underlies our necessary acceptance of cultural pluralism by indulging in quite personal attacks on the convictions, sentiments, and legitimate pride of student groups. Let me illustrate. It is wholly fitting that an instructor should, if he deems it necessary, be critical of the Salazar regime in Portugal. But to go on and declare that all Portuguese are contemptible would be a serious mistake, which any Portuguese student would bitterly and properly resent.

"Accordingly I am announcing that henceforth charges will be preferred by the President against any member of the staff who, while on duty in the classroom or in a counselor's office, is guilty of demonstrable misconduct in the following ways:

"By asserting that this war has been "wished on" the American people and ought not to be supported.

"By asserting that the Papacy and all Catholics are at heart advocates of nazi-ism and fascism, and therefore anti-American.

"By asserting that the Jewish group is a race, different from and inferior to other groups in the community, and so unassimilable.

"By asserting that the Russian system of government and the Russian ideology are superior to our own, and by gratuitously injecting propaganda to this effect into classroom discussion.

"By asserting that the Negro is an inferior being, who can legitimately be discriminated against, either economically or socially.

"I regret to say that these forms of misconduct are apparently not hypothetical. And I should like to reiterate that when they are authentically reported from the classroom this office will take action without further regard for anything except the facts in the case. I shall add, of course, that the thoughts of members of the staff can be of no concern to the administration. In these times, all of us should refrain as much as possible from suspicion of his confreres, as well as from setting up superrighteous standards of conduct. But the classroom is another domain, and it will be protected.

"Finally, please note that the areas of complaint are clearly defined in this letter. If any additions are necessary, these will be plainly announced in due time.

"Sincerely,

"GEORGE N. SHUSTER,
"President."

Presidential Politics in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a mild blitzkrieg upon my good

State of Oregon recently by Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The Oregon primaries are held May 19 and there is no little activity in the pulling of political strings by those who are planning to enter the primaries.

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE has for several weeks been barn-storming throughout the country in what some believe to be the beginning of a campaign of the President for a fourth term, and at the same time a build-up for his own renomination as Vice President on the Democratic ticket. Mr. WALLACE and Oscar Ewing, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, visited Portland, in my district, recently and displayed their wares to the voters of Oregon and the surrounding territory in the Northwest.

Likewise, Mr. Wendell Willkie was a speaker at the Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, and formally announced at that time his candidacy for the nomination for President on the Republican ticket. Our own colleague, the efficient and effective leader in the House, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, who has also announced his candidacy for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, was scheduled to speak in Portland last week but, unfortunately, his plane was grounded on account of storms, and he did not meet the engagement and was compelled to turn back.

There are two metropolitan daily newspapers published in Portland, Oreg., the Oregonian, an independent Republican newspaper, and the Oregon Daily Journal, an independent Democratic paper. You will be interested in reading the appraisements of these two big daily papers through the editorial columns of the speeches delivered in my home city by these candidates, and I include as a part of these remarks the editorials from the two papers, as follows:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal of February 8, 1944]

THE TWO WHO COME TO OREGON IN BEHALF OF INEVITABLE FOURTH TERM

The converging upon Oregon of Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, and Vice Chairman Oscar Ewing, the two of them for a fourth term, would, but for a single reservation, seem to be unnecessary pleading for something that appears to be written in the stars.

The fourth term of President Roosevelt is not dependent upon the New Deal or even the Democratic Party; it is hitched to the war. If Roosevelt keeps his health and doesn't say "No"—and there is no present sign that his health will break or that he will say "No"—he will be nominated at the Chicago convention in June. If the war goes on—and there is no present sign that the war will end that soon, or very soon—November will bring its election with less emphasis upon a fourth term than upon a continued term in order to continue the present war administration.

The single reservation, of which Messrs. WALLACE and Ewing are beyond all doubt aware, is that, after all, the voters do decide. Predetermined primaries and rubberstamp delegates to a national convention do lead up to the exercise of the franchise by the great American electorate. The machinery of an election must operate. It is very likely that Messrs. Wallace, Hannegan, and Ewing would, in their various ways, agree that the machine must function.

The Vice President, who hasn't hesitated to inspire his chief with doubts concerning his, WALLACE'S, eligibility as a fourth-term running mate by entering the lists against management, labor, women's groups and the railroads, still clings to the teachings and tenets of the New Deal. He still toils toward Utopia. He still insists that the New Deal is the breath of life to Mr. Roosevelt in spite of the latter's wish to discard the term. And he still hopes to go on with Roosevelt.

The text of Robert E. Hannegan may be discerned in the short and snappy speech the St. Louisan made when he succeeded the less assertive Frank Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. "I am a 100-percent organization Democrat," announced Mr. Hannegan. Which means, naturally, not only the continuance of the Roosevelt term and the war administration, but the jobs and patronage of an entrenched bureaucracy. To which anything Vice Chairman Ewing might add would, at least, be 100 percent agreement.

The presence of two national political leaders in Oregon does make the home scene a center for a day of party plans and discussion that are not only interesting but significant. Yet the two have much of value to learn as well as to give. This, too, has become a mighty interesting part of America, with power, with war industry, with a front on the battle of the Pacific—and a lot of independent-minded voters.

[From the Oregon Journal of February 12, 1944]

PIGS IS PIGS

Secretary of Agriculture HENRY A. WALLACE, in 1933, promoted a $55,000,000 program whereby the market supplies of hogs were to be reduced by 16 percent.

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, in 1944, in a speech at Seattle, denounces scarcity economics of the American Fascists of Wall Street.

One wonders if this thing called Wall Street is to be haunted by the ghosts of the 5,000,000 pigs that Secretary WALLACE condemned to death in 1933.

[From the Oregonian of February 10, 1944]

BRINGING IN DIVINITY

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt's intimates do not relay to him the stories in which he confuses himself with divinity. Or perhaps they do tell him, and he thinks it hot stuff. In any case, such an observation as that made in Tuesday's press conference, when he defended HENRY WALLACE'S recent platform appearances with the argument that some people find the Sermon on the Mount to be political, does nothing to discourage the storytellers. Indeed, quite the opposite. It causes even sane people, let alone those who are temporarily pixilated by their prejudices, to wonder whether the storytellers don't have something, after all.

Certainly no one who attended the Jackson Day dinner or listened to Mr. WALLACE over the radio could be confused as to whether what he had to say bore any blood relationship to the Sermon on the Mount. Mr. WALLACE'S speech was an unprepared talk, no doubt, contrived after arrival out of the things fed to him by the local stalwarts—and most offensive, of course, to all intelligent listeners. It followed the regular WALLACE-New Deal line of advocating increased Government participation in everything after the war, and in this was interesting. But its lack of preparation was decidedly uncomplimentary to the community.

So far as Mr. Roosevelt's implication is concerned—the implication that Mr. WALLACE'S current stump oratory bears a resemblance to the principles set forth on the Mount—we are reminded of something which happened to Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln was waited upon by a delegation of ministers who advocated their cause and at the end made it quite clear that they considered themselves the voice of God. Whereupon Mr. Lincoln bade them good day, with the observation that he did not see why, if the Lord had instructions to give him, He should send around through the wicked city of Chicago. Mr. WALLACE is not wicked, of course, in intention, but as a route he is quite as unthinkable as Chicago.

[From the Oregon Journal of February 12, 1944]

WENDELL WILLKIE

Wendell Willkie's presence in Oregon brings close to the consciousness of the people of this State one of the strong currents running counter to the trends of American Government under the multiple terms of President Roosevelt.

Whatever may be said of Wendell Willkie's ultimate chances for the Republican Presidential nomination, in his present campaign he is consistent with his campaign of 4 years ago. He has only added to his fight against the entrenchments of bureaucracy and his demands for a self-speaking, self-governing American people, the concept of unified democratic peoples which he set forth in his widely read book, One World.

Opposition to Mr. Willkie is now about what it was in the contest for the Presidency. The regulars and the professionals of politics care no more for him than they did. The book One Man—Wendell Willkie, which was intended to blast his hopes for the Republican nomination by identifying him with utilities he has served as executive and legal counsel, has had little effect, largely because its indictment of Willkie, both as man and as candidate, relies upon presumption rather than fact or demonstration. His record does not indict him. Rather it is the record of a strong and courageous American who prefers the American way of free life and free enterprise with equality of opportunity meeting half way every ambitious individual.

Coming to Oregon on the birth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, Wendell Willkie cannot escape the thought—nor can the people here—that in a critical hour it was the personality and the message of a great man that brought this Nation to abrupt realization that the house divided cannot stand, that America cannot survive half slave and half free. To aspire to the stature of a Lincoln could be effrontery; to incorporate the spirit of Lincoln in ambition for public service is permitted to any American. In his Tacoma speech, Friday, Willkie said:

"We need a new leader. * * * A leader who recognizes that all groups are essential parts of America. A leader with malice toward none. For, as Lincoln so well knew, malice is the very essence of disunity. And make no mistake about it; we cannot survive as a nation divided against itself. The penalty of disunity is as heavy today as it was in Lincoln's time. Indeed, it may well be greater. For the world has become one world in the last few generations, and this one world is full of danger for any nation which allows itself to be divided."

Whatever his political future, Wendell Willkie is a voice crying out in a vast confusion the way a united America must go. Oregon welcomes him.

[From the Oregonian of February 12, 1944]

MR. WILLKIE

Whatever the fate of Wendell L. Willkie in this Presidential year of 1944, we at least wish him to know—on the occasion of his visit in Portland today and his appearance at the annual Lincoln Day banquet—that we appreciate (all, at least, who are not hog-ridden by prejudice) what a revivifying influence he has been both upon the Republican Party and the American people.

Mr. Willkie may win or lose at the Republican convention at Chicago in June. If nominated, he may win or lose in Novem-

ber. But whether he goes to the White House or back to the law office, his candor and enthusiasm and quick rise upon the political horizon have restored American sanity. He has reduced to absurdity the politicians, both Republican and Democratic, who were playing an overly cautious game. He has reminded everyone that the citizens, after all, are the final judges. And he has chosen to approach the people not with the wily maneuvers so prevalent in these latter days, but forthrightly and sometimes even impulsively. He has called it to attention that even a lowly businessman, as well as the occupant of a log cabin or a Hyde Park, may aspire to the Presidency—a reminder much needed.

He has the character and the caliber for the White House. That is not to say he is the only one. To say so would be to deny the very principles which he has taken the forum to establish. But whether or not he is the choice, his influence upon the American political scene has been widespread and healthy. Portland receives him today not only as a Republican leader but as a man who has deeply refreshened the Nation's understanding and faith in democracy.

Francis M. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the caption "Did you happen to see?", this morning's Washington Times-Herald pays tribute to Francis M. Sullivan, the American Legion's top legislative chief.

Frank came to Capitol Hill as a secretary early in 1924 a few months after I took up a like assignment. Fellow Legionnaires, we soon became close friends and we have been so ever since.

To know Frank is to like him. He is a good American. He is sincere and friendly and his feet are on the ground. He loves his work, promoting the welfare of all veterans of World War Nos. 1 and 2 and I know the Congress will be glad to see this newspaper write-up. It reads as follows:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN?

Our service boys won't have a lot of worries to come home to from the battle fronts if he has his way.

There'll be home, security, a chance to earn a living, even education, if need be, waiting for our fighters.

For keen-witted, loyal-hearted Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director of the American Legion, spends his days promoting legislation to that end.

"I suppose a lot of people refer to me as a lobbyist," he says with a grin. "But it doesn't much matter to me what I'm called so long as I can do something for the civilian security of our boys in uniform.

"In the 8 years I've been with this office, I suppose we've had an average of 125 resolutions a year from our national conventions and meetings of the national executive committee to attend to—all concerning the welfare of veterans of World War Nos. 1 and 2.

"At present there are approximately 200 bills before Congress that the Legion is interested in, mostly dealing with the protection of veterans of this war and their dependents.

"You know we're chartered to take in any veteran, male or female, of World War No. 2 as soon as he or she is discharged, and we've already taken in 130,000.

"There's been too much piecemeal legislation for postservice security of these veterans. So, right now, I'm promoting the Legion's omnibus bill, which is a general overall plan that provides step by step for the veterans' readjustment to civilian life from predischarge to postdischarge days.

"Our bill provides for financial aid in buying farms, homes, small businesses, and for education, for better unemployment compensation, for the streamlining of Veterans' Administration, and for making the employment office more effective."

It takes a man as wise in the ways of Washington as he is wise in psychology, common sense, and the ways of the world to do a job as encompassing and important as Sullivan's.

"Sully" came to Washington in 1924 as secretary to a Connecticut Congressman and has been here ever since. Seven years were spent in the aforementioned job, five practicing law, and the others in his present position.

"Sully," who always answers to the nicknames of "Frank" and "Duke," was born in Westford, Mass., 46 years ago. He's married to a Washington girl, the former Katherine Schrider, and they have four children. His hobby used to be golf.

EILEEN ETTEN.

Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a very appropriate editorial, which strikes at a very vital problem for our country today:

ELK HILLS NAVAL OIL RESERVE SHOULD BE DRILLED AT ONCE

The Elk Hills naval oil reserve was set up to provide petroleum products for the armed forces of the United States in time of war.

Instead, the reserve appears to have become a political football, and at a time when the oil production of California is being strained to the uttermost the development of this field has been halted by a dispute over the powers of the President and Secretary of the Navy to make a valid contract. The last heard of the controversy was a declaration by Attorney General Biddle that it is up to Congress to decide how the field shall be developed; but if Congress is even thinking of making any such decision, there has been no sign of it.

Without attempting to go into any of the Elk Hills controversies, old or new, it may be said that here is oil which could be used to relieve a stringency the critical nature of which is everywhere admitted, and that nothing is being done to get the oil out.

Besides some 50,000 barrels a day of crude oil which could be obtained from Elk Hills within a reasonable period, the field would go a long way toward relieving the present shortage of natural gas for industrial and domestic use and toward supplying fuel for war plants.

How the field should be developed and who should do it is a matter of comparative indifference. Certainly Congress and the lawyers of the Justice Department between them should be able to make arrangements which will safeguard public and private rights adequately, and to do it without further delay. The affair has been studied from all angles so many times that if adequate knowledge does not now exist, it is not likely ever to be acquired.

The Navy Department wants the field developed. Secretary Knox tried to make a contract for its development a year ago, which was approved by the President; but it has been declared invalid.

Let's call that water over the dam and go ahead with some other arrangements. Nobody wants to see anybody deprived of rights; but it would seem to be possible to get the oil out and put it to use in the war and settle the rights afterward.

Such rights are measurable in dollars. But time and oil are not measurable in dollars. The price of not getting out the oil may be measured in human blood and suffering. The oil is needed to fight Japs with and it is needed now and in the next few months.

Somebody seems to want to save Elk Hills oil for the war after the next one. We have a war on now that is serious enough.

The Elks Hills naval oil reserve should be drilled without further delays.

A Soldier in the Aleutians Wants to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with this soldier in the Aleutians who writes to the Hon. David B. Roberts, present prothonotary of Allegheny County, and one of the former outstanding liberal workmen's compensation referees in Pennsylvania, to see that he gets a ballot so he can vote in the Presidential elections this year. I am happy to include the soldier's letter in my remarks:

OFFICE OF PROTHONOTARY,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
ALLEGHENY COUNTY,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 15, 1944.

Congressman SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEISS: I received this interesting letter from a soldier who is out in the Aleutians.

It is self-explanatory and I thought you might want to read it.

Respectfully yours,
DAVID B. ROBERTS,
Prothonotary.

BATTERY I, TWO HUNDRED AND TENTH COAST ARTILLERY (ANTIAIRCRAFT),
Seattle, Wash., February 4, 1944.

MR. ROBERTS: A lot of noise is being made back there about this soldier-vote business. We hear it way out here "somewhere in the Aleutians."

Here is my point: I have a suspicion that someone (or some group) is trying to kick this issue about until I am deprived of my vote in the coming Presidential election. That scares me. Suppose I and many more are denied that privilege? Maybe we will have a new Chief. That couldn't be the reason behind all this or could it? Well, just in case someone is trying to pull a fast one, I'm going to ask you to see to it that I get a ballot. Maybe this isn't the proper procedure, but you can set me straight on that.

You see some of us are interested enough to want to vote, and in case we are held up we want to know what's going on. We don't

like to have suspicions, but, well, you know, "Brutus was an honorable man."

I don't get much chance to talk with the lawmakers, so if you see any of them, tell them we want to vote; oh, yes; I don't think it will hurt to tell them that the man I want to vote for is a fellow who is doing a good job, a man better known as President Roosevelt.

Thanks for past kindnesses.

Lots of luck and good health.

Sincerely,

Sgt. PAUL F. HENRY.

Safety in War and Post-War Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the text of an address delivered January 29, 1944, by Mr. Sidney J. Williams, general manager of the National Safety Council, before the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Officials, meeting in Chicago.

Mr. Williams is one of the Nation's outstanding industrial and public safety engineers, having joined the National Safety Council in 1918 as its chief engineer, and being founder of the council's public safety division.

In this significant analysis of war and post-war highway problems, Mr. Williams declares that the MacDonald report by the National Interregional Highway Committee, submitted to the Congress by President Roosevelt on January 12, 1944, is "the greatest single contribution ever made to highway safety." His discussion of the economies and lifesaving factors involved in the MacDonald recommendations, and his observations on traffic enforcement and speed problems, make this address one of unusual interest:

For the past 2 years, highway policy has been the child of military need. The results are only too familiar to you: New construction cut almost to zero; planning, design, maintenance, policing, driver licensing, and public educational work sadly hampered by personnel losses if not by reduced budgets.

These handicaps, incurred through the highest patriotic motives, resulted in serious delays, especially in the early days of the war. Many workers spent 4 hours or more each day driving to and from work and truck movements were equally delayed because of congestion and accidents due to inadequate facilities and control. Engineers and police struggled manfully to overcome these obstacles and keep essential war traffic moving, and in most places their efforts have been successful.

The arbitrary wartime speed limits, first 40 and then 35 miles an hour, sought to conserve scarce equipment and protect life and property. The general and growing disregard of this low limit reflects our traditional dislike of arbitrary restrictions and also our failure to realize the imperative need for conservation of gasoline as well as equipment.

Motor-vehicle traffic deaths dropped from 39,969 in 1941 to 28,309 in 1942 and about 23,300 in 1943, due to the decline in travel. The death rate—deaths per 100,000,000 vehicle-miles—decreased 14 percent in 1942 but increased slightly in 1943. This rate however is an inaccurate barometer because two-vehicle collisions tend to vary with the square of the travel. Taking account of this square factor and computing a more accurate exposure rate we find that this rate went down 7 percent in 1942 and 5 percent in the first half of 1943 but went up 15 percent in the last half of 1943.

In October, November, and December of 1943 there were actually more persons killed than in the same months of 1942. This completely explodes any popular illusion that wartime restrictions have even temporarily solved the traffic-accident problem.

On the whole, wartime traffic problems have been met with patriotic energy and with characteristic American ingenuity. We might have done much worse—but we need to do much better. The degree of conservation which we have achieved would still seem reckless extravagance to our allies. We tolerate unnecessary travel, increasing violation of the wartime speed limit, cheating on gasoline coupons; we kill or injure over a thousand workers every day. I submit that it is our duty—your duty—as responsible public officials and leaders of public opinion, to arouse the public to a much more realistic understanding that the war is not yet won, that vehicles and gasoline and lives must not be wasted, that not all the sacrifices shall be made at Tarawa or Cassino.

What will face us after the war, and what are we going to do about it?

Immediate post-war problems will include the subnormal condition of vehicles and tires, which will require months if not years to remedy completely; the subnormal condition of highways due to inadequate maintenance and almost no reconstruction; the decline in the quantity and often the quality of police enforcement, driver licensing, and other preventive activities—all added to the quick increase in miles driven which will surely follow the lifting or relaxing of gas rationing. Speeds undoubtedly will increase even before the 35-mile limit ends; and this may be serious indeed, in view of the deterioriated condition of both vehicles and highways and the depletion of police forces. About the only bright spot on the immediate horizon is a possible decrease in drinking, and in driving or walking under the influence, which we have, I hope correctly, ascribed to war tension.

The long-term prospect, as you well know, embraces a great increase in the number of motor vehicles, and many probable changes in the traffic pattern—decentralization of metropolitan areas, and the shifting of industrial, commercial, educational, and recreational establishments, all of which can be met only by the most far-sighted planning and prompt action on the part of all concerned.

How are we to meet these many and varied problems? By hasty palliatives, born of desperation after the emergency has become acute? God forbid. The wise planning and handling of traffic, as of many other elements in our joint life, presents as great a challenge as this Nation has ever faced—more complex in many ways than the challenge of survival in global war—a challenge which is at the same time the greatest opportunity we have ever had, to utilize properly the tremendous productive energies that will be suddenly released.

If we handle traffic wisely, we shall handle it safely, for safety is not a thing in itself, to be added or withheld at will. It is a by-product of efficiency, of doing the thing the right way.

The MacDonald report on interregional highways, and particularly the design standards in appendix V, are, in my opinion, the greatest single contribution ever made to highway safety. Here is a program to thrill the imagination of every one of us who looks forward to a better highway transportation system—indeed, of everyone who looks forward to a better America. It fulfills the famous admonition of Daniel Burnham to "make no little plans." Its final consummation runs into billions of dollars, yet practical considerations have not been overlooked; the end is to be reached by many easy steps. That is the essence of all great planning—not to do everything at once, but to do nothing that will have to be undone, to have everything that is done fit into the final picture.

I fervently pray that no sectional, political, or other jealousies will prevent universal acceptance of this as the master plan for American highways, and that the design standards will be accepted as the ideal, and will be followed as closely as is humanly possible, on all new construction and improvement of present highways outside as well as within the interregional system. It is far more effective, far cheaper in the long run to build safety into a highway (or into a factory or a home) than to continue, generation after generation, the painful process of education and enforcement to avoid hazards which should never have been created.

The MacDonald standards are based on safe travel at speeds of 50 to 75 miles an hour, depending on terrain. I hope this will, once for all, lay the ghost of hundred-mile-an-hour highways. We can build—at a price—hundred-mile-an-hour highways and hundred-mile-an-hour cars, but where are we going to find hundred-mile-an-hour drivers? Not enough of them, in our generation at least, to keep the cars and the highways busy.

This matter of speed, on all kinds of highways, is one of our big post-war traffic problems. Speed is not something to be abolished, like grade crossings, or punished, like driving under the influence. Speed is an attribute of motion; speed, properly controlled, is a great asset. It can and must be properly controlled, through design, through intelligent enforcement, and most of all through education of and self-control by the driver himself. The facts about speed in relation to accidents are much better understood than they were 10 years ago but our knowledge is still incomplete. The American Association of State Highway Officials has taken a wise forward step in joining with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Safety Council, and others in setting up a joint committee to study this elusive yet vital subject—to find the facts and draw the lessons of wartime speed limitation and, we hope, to present a united front on speed policies after the war.

Another thing we must all strive for is the prompt reestablishment of official traffic departments from which so many of the most active and most promising younger men have been loaned to the military services. I refer not only to highway but to police, driver licensing, and public educational forces and I say "loaned" because it is greatly to be hoped that these men will be among the first to be returned to civilian duties. These departments should be quickly restored to, and in many cases above, their highest pre-war efficiency, and this means adequate budgets. To this end you will have the strong support of all the organized safety and traffic forces of the country.

But let me emphasize that the aim is a high standard of efficiency, not merely a large number of employees. We surely have learned that every phase of traffic is a highly professional job, requiring intelligence, devotion, and special training. A vital post-war need is to expand the training programs, both preservice and in-service, which were just getting a good start before Pearl Harbor.

Intelligent designing, maintenance, signing, policing, and all the other traffic functions are impossible without accident records.

An accident is not merely a personal misfortune, it is a symptom of something wrong in the highway or in the traffic on that highway. We need much better accident records, better analysis, and better use of them, than even the best of today or of yesterday.

We need general records, combining the experience of many States and cities, to sharpen our knowledge of what is really essential in design and to strengthen our arguments for those features which we already believe to be essential. We know, without statistics, that a divided highway without grade crossings is safer—but how much safer? It is no credit to any of us that such data are not already available.

The cost of collecting them is an infinitesimal fraction of the money spent on construction.

We need better accident data, not only in general but in particular; data that will put the spotlight on the hazards of particular intersections, particular stretches of highway, particular times of the day, week, or year; particular kinds of violations; particular drivers and types of drivers. A small fraction of a cent out of every highway dollar will provide this information and will repay its cost many times over in more efficient policing, driver training, licensing, and general public education, as well as in highway design maintenance, and equipment.

Many traffic laws need overhauling. Probably the Uniform Vehicle Code needs overhauling; due to wartime stresses, it has not been revised since 1936. Then, we all need to get together on uniform rules of the road, universal effective driver licensing, uniform signs and signals, universal use of chemical tests for liquor influence, pedestrian protection and control.

In fact, we need to get together "period." Through the highway traffic advisory committees and in many other ways, we have gotten together during the war much better than ever before. With our country in great peril, we have been ashamed to quarrel. That is one war condition that should not cease with the armistice. The MacDonald program, all the other things I have mentioned, cannot possibly be accomplished without unselfish, generous, energetic cooperation among all the departments dealing with traffic; among the Federal, State, and local governments; among the officials and the many private agencies which can support and complement your efforts.

As one contribution toward this great task, the National Safety Council recently set up a post-war traffic safety planning committee in its street and highway traffic section. Many of the things I have said this morning will be amplified in the report which this committee will soon release. I should like in closing to quote from the preamble to this report:

"A high traffic death toll cannot and will not be tolerated in America after the war. Socially, we cannot countenance the unnecessary carnage—economically, we cannot afford the attendant financial loss. We must, then, prepare now to meet the complex traffic problems which will surely arise.

"The committee is aware that the solution of many of these problems lies mainly within the statutory responsibilities of Federal, State, and local officials. As in the past, it is the governmental agency which actually does the job and it is deserving of the highest degree of support.

"We earnestly believe that upon two single factors rests the ultimate success of any official program: first, an informed public opinion; second, a broader degree of cooperation and coordination among all of the agencies involved—governmental or otherwise. To this end the National Safety Council extends its fullest cooperation and offers all its facilities."

Dangers to Banks as Result of the Interpretation of Regulation Q by Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, banking is a fundamental part of our national life, and the protection of the rights and welfare of our financial institutions is necessary for the safety and maintenance of our country and our Government.

There has been submitted to the House of Representatives a measure that is of outstanding importance to the banks and particularly to the smaller banks throughout the land. We all know that the business and financial life of the community centers around these banks. We know further that in addition to their primary purpose, these banks are rendering many other services. Throughout the war they have faithfully and tirelessly carried on various activities necessary in the emergency, especially in connection with the promotion of bond sales and in the matter of rationing. This, of course, is done without remuneration and despite reduced staffs and other difficulties caused by wartime conditions. The banks accept these duties just as they accept civic responsibilities in peacetime—in a spirit of public enterprise and public interest.

Because of the necessity for maintaining these services, it is most unfortunate that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has rendered a ruling which strikes at the well-being of so many of our banks. I refer to the Board's interpretation of regulation Q. While Congress was in recess last summer the Board ruled that the absorption of exchange constitutes an illegal payment of interest on demand deposits. The purpose of H. R. 3956, now under consideration, is to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits.

As was pointed out by the author of this measure, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], during the hearings on H. R. 3956, there is no law prohibiting the absorption of exchange by banks. There is only a ruling of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I do not believe that Members of Congress intended to prohibit absorption of exchange when they voted several years ago for an amendment under which this ruling over regulation Q has been issued. I feel that undue advantage was taken of the broad powers delegated by the amendment, when this interpretation was given, at a time when Congress was not in session and therefore had no opportunity to take immediate steps to prevent the dealing of a severe blow to the small, independent banks, already confronted by lack of help, wartime demands and competition from Government agencies.

In order to relieve these banks of the drastic effects certain to result from enforcement of the Board's interpretation, it is necessary that legislation be enacted promptly. H. R. 3956 provides a quick and sure way to meet this condition. Unless legislation of this nature is adopted, we face the prospect of the voluntary liquidation of many banks, especially those in the smaller communities, because of the loss of exchange revenues if the Board's interpretation prevails. The loss of these revenues means to the banks the difference between profit and loss in their operations.

The situation that has arisen over the interpretation of regulation Q is one which involves even more than the future of so many banks. It creates the danger that we are on the way to regimentation and unification of the banking system. It could easily be another step toward doing away with the very important check-and-balance system supplied by the dual banking program in this country.

I believe the dual system of banking has safeguarded the mutual interests of State and national banks, and that every effort should be made to evade dictatorial authority that would endanger our system of private banking.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System says that the absorption of collection charges by banks in certain cities—without making this ruling applicable to all cities and all national and member banks—constitutes a violation of regulation Q, which provides that no bank shall, directly or indirectly, pay interest on demand deposits.

As stated by one banker in my congressional district, Could not the Board just as well say the banks must prorate their rent among their demand depositors, or prorate their clerk hire, or check books, or pass books, or any of the innumerable items of expense in the banking business? Once such rulings are started, where will be the stopping point?

I am advised of an instance in which one of the large city banks had deposits of country banks aggregating $20,000,000 and had set aside $5,000,000 of deposits for the purchase of United States Treasury bonds. The income from this was sufficient to defray the entire cost of servicing the $20,000,000 of deposits, including the absorption of collection costs, and still leave a very substantial profit. Here is one case alone which appears to me to contradict any argument that the absorption of collection costs is unsound banking practice. Certainly any practice which returns a legitimate profit to the bank cannot be considered as unsound banking procedure.

I find apprehension prevailing to a considerable extent that a bureaucratic control of the banking system of our Nation is sought; that the plan of bringing this about is to penalize the depositors of nonmember banks to the extent that they would be forced to join the

Federal Reserve System or nationalize. If there is any such idea as this, now is the time to eliminate it.

With low interest rates and limited investment opportunities, the smaller banks are dependent upon exchange and service charges, for their bare operating expenses. It can readily be seen how serious will be the effect on these banks if regulation Q is enforced to the extent that the banks with which the smaller institutions carry their reserves are no longer able to pay for their account the exchange charges on items remitted for credit.

The gap between the earnings of the city banks and the country banks is already widening at an alarming rate. While low interest rates may bear alike upon the large and small banks, the ration of increase in the amount available for investment under present conditions is largely in favor of the city banks. Deposits of the average country bank have not increased in recent years in proportion to those of the city banks. As a result, the fixed operating costs of the larger institutions have a much wider spread, which, coupled with the largely increased amounts available for investment, gives them an advantage over the country banks whose deposits have remained more static. It is extremely regrettable that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should see fit to deprive the smaller banks of this service and take from them a source of income essential to their success.

There is no justification for disrupting the charging of exchange by hundreds of small banks which have engaged in this practice for years and are dependent upon it for their chief source f income. Banks have charged exchange for more than a century, and ever since checks became in such extensive use as a form of currency, a great many banks have charged exchange in cases where they are required to settle by bank drafts on other cities where they maintain balances. Every depositor who keeps funds in city banks or in banks in the larger towns has been taught by these banks to accept a system of service charges. Many smaller banks prefer to retain the service charge, which they call exchange, instead of using the more complicated systems of the city banks. Apparently, however, there is really no difference between the service charge of the large banks and the exchange charge of the smaller banks, except one is collected from the depositors and the other from persons presenting checks which depositors have given.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System held that banks which have been handling the collection of exchange charge items could no longer absorb these charges as part of their expenses, but had to pass them on to the individual payees of the checks. Those familiar with banking say this will require a great amount of bookkeeping which will in many cases cost the banks far more than absorbing the charges.

The welfare of the country banks is tied in closely with the welfare of the business concerns of the communities served by these banks. Congress is justly concerned with the future of small business. To destroy the small, independent bank would be to also wreck great numbers of these business enterprises.

I have received many protests from my congressional district with reference to the interpretation of regulation Q. I judge other Members of Congress have likewise received numerous communications pointing out the grave dangers of the ruling. I am sure my colleagues realize the seriousness of the situation. It is our opportunity and our duty to give to the smaller and independent banks the help they so greatly need in this connection, and by aiding them we will render a distinct service to the whole economic, financial, and commercial structure of our Nation.

Basic Breaks World Record in Magnesium Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Pioche Record, Pioche, Nev., in its issue of February 10, 1944, under the caption "Basic magnesium breaks world record in magnesium output."

The article is about Basic Magnesium, Inc., of Henderson, Nev., a "war baby" which promises to become the most robust industrial adult in the Southwest.

A true picture of the magnitude of this colossus of the desert is difficult to convey. The total cost of construction ran to around $140,000,000. In a metropolitan area such as Los Angeles or San Francisco, the plant would cover an entire business area, approximately 12 to 25 blocks.

The plant essentially is a war industry, supplying the Air Forces with the material for magnesium bombs, tracer bullets, tracer shells, star shells, flares, and other munitions, and with metal for building the aircraft to use these implements of modern warfare.

When peace returns, Basic Magnesium, Inc., is expected to take a large place in industry. Indications are that magnesium will be in great demand for manufacture of portable household appliances, automatic equipment, aircraft, lightweight streamlined railroad cars, plumbing fixtures, furniture, and other items requiring a light, strong, durable metal.

The article referred to follows:

BASIC BREAKS WORLD RECORD IN MAGNESIUM OUTPUT

Basic Magnesium, Inc., last week broke another world's record to add to its long string of similar performances. Production in January 1944 broke all plant records for any single month in Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s history. Sunday, January 30, was the high day with a record production of 111 percent of rated capacity.

The Clark County plant today is producing more than one-fourth of all the magnesium now being produced in the United States. If the ingots cast at Basic Magnesium, Inc., in the month of January were laid end to end they would reach from Las Vegas to Anaconda's great copper plant near Butte, Mont.

The high day production was 10 times greater than the average daily production of all United States plants in the year 1940, and daily production would provide a full load of incendiary bombs for 50 Flying Fortresses every day in the calendar year.

With increased production has come decreased cost in production and the Basic Magnesium, Inc., organization today is bending every effort to make February production top January and March, April, and the other months to come to break the record of the month before.

On January 20, at 11:30 a. m., Basic Magnesium, Inc., poured the one hundred millionth pound of magnesium, with William Owens handling the ladle. It marked the production of more magnesium than the total world output for the year 1940.

Jewish Devotion to American Ideals and Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the facts concerning the services rendered to our country by Americans of Jewish blood and Jewish ancestry are not more widely recognized. The story of Jewish courage, of Jewish devotion to American institutions, and of Jewish sacrifice even unto death for their maintenance and perpetuation is a glorious one. It is a story which has not yet been fully told. It is a story which ought to be quickly and completely laid open to the inspection of all Americans.

I am happy indeed to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Mr. Archie H. Greenberg, national commander of Jewish War Veterans of the United States. It discloses in part the courage and devotion of Americans of Jewish blood during the American Revolution. The example given by these early Jewish residents of America has been followed in innumerable instances by their descendants in subsequent American wars:

JEWS FOUGHT WITH GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Archie H. Greenberg, national commander, Jewish War Veterans of United States)

With more than a half million Jews presently serving the cause of liberty in the armed forces of the United States, it is appropriate as we celebrate the two hundred and twelfth anniversary of George Washington's birth, that we recall the part played by Jews in the War of the Revolution. Then, as now, Jews contributed their all to the cause of American democracy. Except possibly for the romantic story of Haym Salomon, and the aid he gave in financing the Revolutionary War, little is known about the valorous record of our forefathers in this country.

Today, much stress is placed in educational circles on intercultural education as an antidote to intergroup prejudice. If only the various nationality and religious groups knew and understood each other, the educators say, a great step would be taken in the eradication of group hatreds. That this theory is basically sound there is no denying; but, obviously, a first step is for the individual groups to know about themselves. Too few Jews, in my opinion, are the least bit aware of their heroic and historic past in this country. Thus, as we again commemorate George Washington's Birthday, I turn to the pages of Jews in American Wars, a history of American Jewish valor, recently published by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. To authors J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk, I am indebted for the following historically accurate and romantically glamorous picture of American Jewry at the time of the War of the Revolution:

"By the time the movement for American independence began, the more than 2,000 Jews were already deeply rooted in their new homes. From Georgia in the South, where Sephardic Jews had introduced viniculture, to Massachusetts in the North, where Puritan thought and philosophy were heavily underlaid with Hebraic ideals, Jewish contributions were being made to all sectors of American life. In Rhode Island, Jews were engaged in a variety of pursuits, from soap making to whaling, from manufacture of sperm oil products to shipping. Part of the success of Newport was due to Jewish energies. Aaron Lopez alone had more than 30 ships engaged in coastal and overseas trade. In New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, in fact, in every colony, we find evidence of individual Jews who were helping to build the social and economic foundations upon which the structure of liberty was to be reared.

"From the very beginning of the rift between the Colonies and England, Jews were active in the patriotic cause. When indignant merchants gathered in Philadelphia in 1765 to adopt the nonimportation resolutions, by which they agreed not to have any goods shipped from Great Britain, until after the repeal of the Stamp Act, there were nine Jews among them—Benjamin Levy, Samson Levy, Joseph Jacobs, Hyman Levy, Jr., David Franks, Mathias Bush, Bernard Gratz, Michael Gratz, and Moses Mordecai. Five years later leading importers met again to strengthen the nonimportation resolutions—among them could be found such men as Samuel Judah, Hyman Levy, Jacob Moses, Jacob Myers, Jonas Phillips, and Isaac Seixas.

"When the seething volcano erupted into revolution and the war for liberty was on, the majority of the Jews in the Colonies joined the Revolutionary cause. Many served with distinction in Gen. George Washington's army.

"Less than a month after the earnest band of patriots in Philadelphia pledged to liberty 'our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor,' Francis Salvador, colorful plantation owner of South Carolina, who won the sobriquet of the southern Paul Revere, was killed in battle against marauding Indians who had been incited to attack by the British. In the words of Judge William Drayton, leader of the South Carolina patriots, 'Salvador was intimately known and esteemed by the first revolutionary characters of South Carolina.' A member of his colony's provincial congress, Salvador rounded up volunteer troops to stave off the Indians' attack. There were three fierce engagements. In the last he was killed and scalped.

"Jews were also active in the revolutionary cause in Georgia. David Emanuel, who was later to become Governor of Georgia, was one of the moving spirits among the patriots in his colony and leader of a community called Rebel Town, situated not far from Augusta. At McBean's Creek he was captured, together with several companions, and they were marched off to a nearby field to be shot. One of his companions asked permission to deliver a final prayer before the execution. The request was granted and the patriot dropped to his knees, launching into a solemn and lengthy prayer.

"Nearby some horses were tethered. The British paid little attention to Emanuel who dashed toward the horses, mounted one, and rode off. The British took to their horses in pursuit, but Emanuel escaped them in the swamp by dropping into the bog up to his neck while his pursuers beat the underbrush in search of him, several times coming so close that he could hear their muttered curses. Next morning he made his way to the army of General Twiggs.

"In South Carolina there was a 'Jews' Company,' commanded by Capt. Richard Lushington. Contrary to popular impression, this volunteer infantry was not composed entirely of Jews. It derived its name from the fact that it had been recruited from a section of Charleston in which Jews predominated and the majority of its members were Jews. The company, comprising some two dozen men, saw service in the Battle of Beaufort.

"Col. David Salisbury Franks was an aide first to Gen. Benjamin Lincoln, and later to Gen. Benedict Arnold. General Arnold's treason threw suspicion on Franks, but in a famous letter to Washington, Arnold cleared his aide of complicity: 'In justice to the gentlemen of my official family, Col. Richard Varick and Major Franks, I think myself bound to declare that they are totally ignorant of any transactions of mine that they had reason to believe were injurious to the public.' Nevertheless the colonel demanded a complete military investigation to dispel the shadow which Arnold's act had thrown on him. He wrote to General Washington:

"'I had here nothing but a Name unspotted I trust, until Arnold's baseness gave the Tongue of Calumny Grounds sufficient to work against anyone so unhappily connected with him.'

"The military tribunal completely exonerated Colonel Franks and later developments indicated that he retained the complete confidence of his superiors. He was given a military promotion and was dispatched with secret documents for Ambassador Benjamin Franklin in France. Franks was included by Thomas Jefferson in his planned delegation to the peace conference, but peace came quickly and before the assignment was concluded. He did, however, continue in the diplomatic service of his country for sometime after this.

"Isaac Franks was only 17 when he enlisted in the Rebel Army shortly after the Battle of Lexington. He served under Washington in the Battle of Long Island, was wounded several times in battle and at one time was taken prisoner by the British. He continued in active service in various posts until illness forced his retirement in 1782. It was at his home in Germantown that President Washington resided when the capital was located in Philadelphia. He sat for Gilbert Stuart, who is renowned for his portraits of Washington and other colonial leaders. In 1794 he was appointed as lieutenant colonel in the Pennsylvania Militia.

"Among Jews who distinguished themselves in the Revolutionary Army was Lt. Col. Solomon Bush. Serving with the Pennsylvania Militia, he made such a noteworthy record that he was cited for valor by the State's supreme executive council. In one battle he was severely wounded and was for a time prisoner of war. A member of his family, Capt. Lewis Bush, was killed in the Battle of Brandywine.

"Maj. Benjamin Nones was one of the group of Frenchmen who came to America in 1777, at about the same time Lafayette arrived. Major Nones left a thriving wine business in Bordeaux to come to the assistance of the embattled American rebels. He served as a private under Count Pulaski in the Carolinas and under Baron de Kalb. When De Kalb fell in the Battle of Camden, in 1780, Nones was one of the officers who removed him from the battlefield. He later became major of a unit composed partly of Jews.

"Ensign Mordecai Davis of Pennsylvania died in the service. Three Pinto brothers, Solomon, William, and Abraham, left Connecticut to fight for American independence. A fourth brother, Jacob, was active in patriot politics in New Haven. Capt. Jacob Cohen, of Virginia, commanded a cavalry company. Capt. Jacob De Leon and Jacob De La Motta, together with Nones, were with General De Kalb when he fell at Camden. Dr. Philip Moses Russel, who served as a surgeon's mate, was praised by Washington, in a letter for his 'assiduous and faithful attention to the sick and wounded.' He was with the Army at Valley Forge during the winter of 1777–78."

I have intentionally omitted extended mention of Haym Salomon, and the part he played in the financing of the War of the Revolution. That story is too well known to need repetition now; further, it is more to the point to recite the story of Jewish valor on the battlefield, rather than the contributions of our Jewish bankers.

Every American should know the story of Jewish patriotism during the formative days of the American Republic. Very likely, a greater knowledge of these facts will become widespread with the growing emphasis on intercultural education in the school system of our Nation. But, in any case, the Jews should most certainly know of their own historic past. Surely, as Jews and Jewish organizations celebrate the natal day of our founding father, they should commemorate the memory of those colonial Jews who fought side by side with George Washington in the founding of the American Republic.

The Late Honorable Leonard W. Schuetz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when word reached me last evening of the sudden and untimely death of our beloved colleague, and my personal friend the Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, who represented the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States with distinction, ability, and unselfishness, for almost 14 years. In his passing I have lost a true friend, his district an able statesman, and the Nation one of its finest citizens.

LEONARD SCHUETZ'S life may well be symbolized in the following words—a kindly gentleman, quiet and unassuming in manner, loyal and sincere, an industrious worker, faithful to his oath of office, and to the ever-increasing tasks entrusted to him by the residents of the district he had the honor to represent.

Coming to these United States from foreign soil when only a babe in his mother's arms, our departed colleague in

later years through perseverance and industry overcame insurmountable obstacles to reach the highest pinnacle of success. Prior to his election to the Seventy-second Congress he engaged in the construction business, and to his memory there now stand, not only in the great city of Chicago, but throughout the Nation, many churches, schools, and other edifices which pay a silent tribute to some of his vast accomplishments. Since coming to Congress he has rendered yeoman service to his district and to the Nation. As a Member of important committees he has served well and faithful, and his sound and friendly counsel will be missed in the deliberations of the many important problems confronting the Congress in the trying days ahead.

I join with other Members of the House in expressing to Mrs. Schuetz and daughter my sincere sympathy in their great bereavement. Their loss will be shared by all of us. He has answered the last roll call—may his soul rest in peace.

Free Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend my remarks by inserting a most interesting statement on free ports from the New Yorker of February 12, 1944:

We can tell you all about free ports if you have 2 or 3 minutes, and it's a timely subject, what with the wise men of the Teheran Conference announcing that they favored a far-flung system of free ports. New York has a free port right now, and has had since 1937, when "Hylan's Folly," the unprofitable municipal port development at Stapleton, Staten Island, was opened by the city as foreign trade zone No. 1 under the Celler Act of 1934. The war broke out before this country got around to opening up any more free ports, and, foreign trade being what it is now, the zone has been transferred to several North River piers and Stapleton taken over by the Government for other purposes. A description of the way the zone was run before the war—and will be afterward—will serve as an explanation of what a free port is.

At Stapleton, as at any well-organized free port, there are facilities for docking, unloading, and loading ships, and there are warehouses, sheds, and lofts which may be rented for inspecting, processing, repacking, assembling, or storing almost any kind of goods. The facilities aren't free of charge; that's not what "free port" means." "Free" refers only to the freedom from United States customs inspection, embargoes, and import duties. A trade zone is a little, neutral, stockaded area where a shipper can put down his load, catch his breath, and decide what to do next. For example, the first shipment to arrive after trade zone No. 1 was opened was 6,000 tons of chick peas from Mexico. These were unloaded, sorted, graded, and cleaned and then shipped in smaller consignments to South America, Central America, Australia, and to wholesalers within this country. The shipments to these last were the only ones our customs men were concerned with. This procedure was more practical than trying to ship direct to all the ultimate consumers, as far as the Mexican exporter was concerned, the city of New York, and a good many local workers collected some dough, and everybody was happy. And that's the way a free port works.

Here are a few other typical transactions at trade zone No. 1. Corned beef was brought in from Argentina in unmarked tins. When the United States dealers had had a chance to inspect and bid on it, it was labeled by the purchasers and then, after customs inspection, officially brought into this country. If there had been too much beef on our market, the cans could have been stored in the zone indefinitely. Imitation pearls from Czechoslovakia were brought into the zone, repacked in fancy small boxes, and then sent to South America. Watch movements from Switzerland were fitted into American-made cases and shipped to other countries. A batch of posters advertising French movies was stored until the South American bookings were set, then shipped in small lots directly to the exhibitors. The zone has proved a lifesaver to European refugees; their effects can be kept in storage until they finally settle somewhere and then be sent on to them without customs red tape.

The first free ports were set up in Leghorn and Genoa in 1547 and 1595, respectively, and by 1938 there were over 40 free ports throughout Europe. Before the war Hamburg had one of the great free ports. In 1871 the newly unified Germany set up a customs union, but Hamburg wouldn't play ball with Bismarck in the matter of joining up until assured that her free port could be kept going. There are (or were, before the war) free ports all over the world—they are scarce in the Orient—but not as many as there will be after the war. When moving of freight by air becomes economically practical we will probably have inland free ports.

A Wise Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 16, 1944:

A WISE DECISION

The Federal Communications Commission has voted unanimously not to adopt as a general rule any ban on newspaper ownership of radio stations. This is a reversal of a decision reported to have been reached by a split vote earlier in the month, under which further expansion of newspapers into the radio field would have been impossible.

The Commission's present position is welcomed as the rejection of a policy which was at once discriminatory and illegal. It opens the broadcasting field to all newspapers, although the Commission reserves the right to grant licenses so as not to permit concentration of control in the hands of the few. In the future each application will be decided individually on the basis of public interest.

After the war, broadcasting will be a much-changed industry. In relation to its mechanics, it will be almost a new industry. For that reason it would have been unfair to deny newspapers which are not now in the radio field the opportunity to supplement their printed pages with news over the air distributed through facilities which represent the last word in radio engineering. This would have given a discriminatory advantage to newspapers which now have radio adjuncts.

Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to incorporate therein a letter I have received from the American Palestine Committee, together with statement of aims and principles of this organization. I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the American Palestine Committee, inaugurated April 30, 1941, is the vehicle for expression of the sympathy and good will of Christian America for the movement to reestablish the Jewish national home in Palestine. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the principles underlying this humanitarian cause. Letter and statement follows:

AMERICAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS F. BURCHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURCHILL: The American Palestine Committee, formed in 1941, has become the vehicle through which leaders in American life are expressing their support for rebuilding the Jewish National Home in Palestine. On behalf of the officers of the committee, we take pleasure in extending to you an invitation to join our membership.

A Hitler edict has pledged the destruction of all the Jews of Europe. About 2,000,000 have already been wantonly slaughtered. The voice of conscience and humanity calls to leaders of American public opinion to express their sympathy in practical terms; to assure the Jews of Europe still living that the hope of re-creating their lives in a free, democratic Jewish National Home will be realized with our support.

In the years between two world wars, the Jewish National Home has received moral and political support from the United States under successive administrations, regardless of party. The reasons which have led our people and Government to favor this cause from the outset are still valid; but the case for the Jewish National Home is far stronger today. First, the resettlement of the Jews in Palestine is no longer a doubtful experiment but a convincing reality. The Jewish National Home has made a truly inspiring record in peacetime pioneering and development, in saving hundreds of thousands of refugees from Nazi terror and in contributing valuable manpower and economic support to the United Nations' war effort.

Secondly, the need for the Jewish National Home—for many hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of uprooted Jews—will be far more pressing on the termination of the present war than at any previous time.

The American Palestine Committee is working earnestly and constructively toward that humanitarian goal, in cooperation with the leading responsible organizations of all faiths throughout the country. By signing the enclosed statement of principles signifying ac-

ceptance of membership, you will strengthen the hands of the American Government in its traditional support of the Jewish National Home policy, and hearten the homeless Jews of Europe with the assurance that the pledge to rebuild the Jewish homeland will be redeemed with our help.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER, *Chairman.*
CHARLES L. MCNARY, *Cochairman.*

STATEMENT OF AIMS AND PRINCIPLES

The American Palestine Committee, inaugurated April 30, 1941, is the vehicle for the expression of the sympathy and good will of Christian America for the movement to reestablish the Jewish national home in Palestine.

On September 27, 1922, this sentiment of sympathy and good will received official expression from the Government of the United States when President Warren G. Harding affixed his signature to a joint resolution adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and reading as follows:

"That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of the national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

The policy expressed in this resolution has also received the public endorsement of all the Presidents of the United States since 1917: Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The fulfillment of the millennial hope for the reunion of the Jewish people with the land of its ancient inheritance, a hope that accords with the spirit of Biblical prophecy, has always commanded the sympathy of the liberal Christian world. Today, by reason of the appalling persecutions of which millions of Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe are the victims—persecutions that avowedly aim at the total extermination of the Jews of that Continent—the fulfillment of this hope is an urgent and tragic necessity.

In the past 20 years, moreover, Palestine has demonstrated its capacity to absorb large numbers of immigrants. In 1920 the Jews in Palestine numbered 83,000; today they number nearly 600,000. Since 1933 Palestine has given refuge to more than 300,000 victims of persecution, more than have found haven in all the rest of the world. That Palestine could accommodate millions of additional inhabitants is attested by competent expert evidence.

The record of Jewish heroism and achievement in the Holy Land has been among the most inspiring works of free and liberty-loving people in the Old World in the last two decades. Cities, villages, and farmsteads have sprung up over sand dunes, marshes, and rocky wastes. Agriculture, industry, and commerce have been modernized and extended. These achievements, moreover, have brought benefits to the Arabs as well, raising their standards of health, education, and living in Palestine, and introducing the leaven of progress and democracy throughout the Near East. The foundations for a sound and liberal commonwealth have been laid in Palestine, and a people for whom no sacrifice has been too great in the furtherance of the task is pleading for the opportunity to build further upon them.

In the present world emergency the Jewish community of Palestine, by its valiant contributions in manpower, industry, and science, has become a tower of strength to the cause of the United Nations in the Near East.

In truth and in fact, the Jewish National Home in Palestine has been a world-sanctioned experiment in democracy. It must be protected and cherished today as an outpost of freedom and social justice. Its continued upbuilding must be a vital part of a just world order when the present conflict is over.

The aim of the American Palestine Committee is to give every possible encouragement and moral support to this statesmanlike and humanitarian cause. The committee will disseminate correct information to the American public on the progress of the Jewish national home and will second, with its collective and individual influence, all proper measures that may be taken for its furtherance.

My signature hereto testifies to my approval of this statement and my readiness to serve as a member of the American Palestine Committee.

THOMAS F. BURCHILL,
Member of Congress,
Fifteenth District, New York.

A Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the editor of the Chicago Sun, and reprinted in that newspaper under date of February 14, 1944, from a soldier somewhere in England:

FLIER IN ENGLAND REBUKES SPANGLER FOR "MUDSLINGING" AT PRESIDENT

The following letter, reviewed and passed by Army censors, has been received by the Chicago Sun. It was written by First Lt. Marvin S. Cantz, stationed somewhere in England. It is being reprinted in its entirety.

SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND, *January 8, 1944.*

The EDITOR,
Chicago Sun, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: If you should find my statement unworthy of publication, or otherwise not in keeping with the policies of your paper, would you kindly forward this letter to Mr. Harrison E. Spangler, president of the National Republican Committee?

In recent magazines and various publications that have reached us here in England, statements made by a certain Mr. Spangler regarding our President, have caused considerable comment among the officers and men of our squadron. It's quite feasible to understand that in conducting a campaign to elect a Republican President, Mr. Spangler would naturally attempt to publicize and in most cases unduly criticize the work of the present administration and the President.

However, the manner in which Mr. Spangler has attacked the President has been most ungentlemanly. His method of referring to President Roosevelt as if he were some small-time ward heeler and a detriment to the American commonwealth has caused many of us to think less and less of Republican Party tactics. If the record of President Roosevelt were the worst in the history of American Presidents, which it definitely is not, he would still be unworthy of the type of criticism Mr. Spangler has been in the habit of dishing out.

To us, President Roosevelt is the overwhelming choice of the American people, and has been for the past 12 years. To minimize the significance of that choice is to reflect poorly on the American form of government, as well as the intelligence and ability of the American people to govern themselves. How can we possibly expect other nations of the world to respect our Government and our President if men like Mr. Spangler continue to besmirch Mr. Roosevelt's character and ability with obvious selfish motives in mind?

To us, Mr. Roosevelt is not only our President, but actually a symbol of our philosophy of government—no different than the American flag. It is that very symbol that we are fighting for today, and to have men ruthlessly abuse that symbol for selfish motives is a crime. Regardless of who our President might be, or whatever his background might have been, he is still the popular choice of the American people. And, although some of his policies may be subjected to criticism from time to time, I believe it is still possible to criticize the President with due respect to his position—the same respect bestowed upon prime ministers and kings.

We here are agreed that it is still possible for the political organizations of America to conduct a campaign without mud slinging and semislanderous propaganda directed at the opposing party. Mr. Spangler has made full use of these tactics and, to our way of thinking, he has maliciously abused one of our basic liberties—freedom of speech. It would appear to me that the Republican Party has grown desperate, and now Mr. Spangler is finding it necessary to forget all the rules of the game in order to accomplish his purpose. I think even Mr. Spangler could learn to be a gentleman with a little application.

It's true that the President is not infallible, and at times may commit errors which warrant the criticism of the minorities—that is a distinguishing characteristic of our democratic form of government. But let's try to keep our politics clean, and not subject our Government to foreign criticism because of ruthless and selfish attacks by political party leaders. For if we allow these unethical practices to dominate our political system, then the men on the far-flung battlefronts of the world are dying in vain.

MARVIN S. CANTZ,
First Lieutenant, Air Corps.

Palestine Must Be Established as a National Home for the Jewish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement that I made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, urging the passage of the Wright-Compton resolution:

Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wright-Compton resolution as I have always objected to persecution of any kind and I feel that our country must take the leadership in this matter and that Palestine must be kept open as a haven to the Jewish people.

In 1922 we passed the Balfour Declaration. Great Britain was given the mandate by the League of Nations. It promised the Jewish people a national homeland. Some fifty-odd nations constituted the League. This promise must be kept. The Covenant must be respected.

The bleeding children of Israel have no place to lay their heads. How can we in America stand by without sounding a mighty protest that will be heard around the world, should the doors of Palestine be closed next April. Several years ago I cabled Neville Chamberlain that England must keep its sacred Covenant.

The Wright-Compton resolution must be passed and I urge favorable action by your committee so that the stricken, bleeding, homeless refugees may be saved. There is one country which was designated by the nations of the world after the last World War as the national home for the Jewish people—that country is Palestine—the land of their forefathers.

Assault Without Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to do so and insert a very logical and demolishing editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer in answer to one of Dorothy Thompson's articles. The Cincinnati Enquirer is one of America's leading newspapers.

The editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer shows that Dorothy was unduly partisan and servile to the New Deal.

ASSAULT WITHOUT REASON

Most emphatically do we disagree both with the text and the tone of the article of Miss Dorothy Thompson published in adjoining columns yesterday morning purporting to analyze the Lincoln Day speech of Ohio's Gov. John W. Bricker.

Obviously, Miss Thompson approached the subject of Governor Bricker's appearance in Washington with a closed mind. Throughout her article the use of pat phrases was a clear indication of a desire not to reason but to detract. Her piece did not have the flavor of an honest judgment of the presidential stature of Governor Bricker on the basis of one speech. To have attempted that, of course, would have been wholly unfair. We hope the day is past in America when the destiny of the Nation is to be entrusted to a man for the brilliance of his oratory, or denied to another for his lack of it. These are not times for orators; they are times for doers.

Governor Bricker asserted that our war accomplishments prove the soundness of our traditional system, and Miss Thompson disputes it. She says the war effort is the result of Government plans, Government financing, Government debts, Government contracts, Government rules, and Government effort to keep profits and labor in line, and but grudgingly does she admit that the achievement of industry inside this framework has been colossal. Only indirectly do we find in her article an admission that the New Deal has not been solely responsible for the accomplishment—and that came when she declared that the arrogant bureaucrats of which Governor Bricker spoke are as many of them Republicans as Democrats—particularly in the highest places dealing with industry.

Where Governor Bricker demanded antistrike legislation in the name of the soldiers at the front, Miss Thompson says "I do not know how he sees into every soldier's mind." This was the pinnacle of the columnist's devastating logic. It was she who had accused Governor Bricker of being asleep. Where has she been that she doubts that the men in the Army think that strikes should be outlawed in wartime, when at every opportunity they have so emphatically registered their convictions in this matter?

In the past we can recall reading Miss Thompson attacking one of Walt Disney's film fantasies as being the essence of nazi-ism, and assailing with equal fury a film depicting a group of survivors in a lifeboat, reading into it the most sinister propaganda motive. Perhaps her piece on Governor Bricker was just in character. But we think she should stick to the movies when she feels such a spell coming on.

Federal Income-Tax Reporting Can Be Simple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, taxpayers look at the forms furnished them by the Federal Government and read terms like "normal tax," "surtax," "Victory tax." "earned-income credit," and what not. They become confused, then bewildered, then exasperated. They want to pay, they want to obey the law, but the Government fails to cooperate with them. Naturally, they wonder why anything which can be simple is, in fact, so utterly complex and, consequently, uncertain.

Let us look at the record. Sixteen tax bills have been enacted into law since the present administration came into power in 1933. The seventeenth bill was passed by the Congress recently and now awaits the pleasure of the President. During this interval of over 10 years, Government spending has grown apace and annual deficits have been incurred.

Obviously, this spending has required new and heavier taxes. But no attempt has been made to rebuild the tax structure with proper attention given to shape and form in the light of numerous alterations and additions. Our tax structure has come to look like the pioneer houses out on the prairie where I was born. There something was added to the house as the family grew, and the householder could not afford to buy a competent architect's advice and service. The Government on the other hand has not held back for lack of money to spend; yet nothing more grotesque could be imagined than the tax structure we now have.

Small wonder that taxpayers think of March 15 with dismay and bewilderment. They used to be able to make out their own returns. Now lawyers find it necessary to attend special tax schools before they dare to advertise their services to clients.

That is not all. If two or more tax experts are hired to make out independent returns for a certain taxpayer, the results will be unlike and the variations so considerable that he who bought the service does not know whether he has paid his tax in full, overpaid it, or underpaid it. "So many men, so many minds" should not be a hazard to which the taxpayer is put by his government.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that something which can be simple may be made simple, I introduced House Joint Resolution 236 on February 16, 1944. It is designed "to provide for a streamlined, simplified, and coordinated Federal tax system," as the language of the resolution states. It is not too soon to give this vital matter prompt and proper attention. The time for action is in fact long overdue.

It is hoped that the Committee on Ways and Means may act on my resolution immediately. It is hoped further that from the labors of this committee may come something which the average American can understand. Most taxpayers know what their incomes are. It should be possible for the Government to determine what percentage of a taxpayer's income it wants in return for services rendered to the taxpayer. A whole array of rates with fancy names, which added together amount to a certain percentage, could be noted as a single rate at the outset. If a single rate will not serve well for everybody, some basic rate could be established and graduated upward.

Mr. Speaker, the average American is both honest and intelligent. The Federal Government will not lose money by assuming that to be true. Certain it is that nothing is gained by employing a system which causes dismay, confusion, and bewilderment. The men and women who pay the bills incurred by the Federal Government have every right to expect early and positive attention to this pressing problem. May that which can be simple, be made simple.

National Homeland for the Jewish People in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is now conducting hearings on Resolutions 418 and 419, identical measures, sponsored by Representative COMPTON, of Connecticut, and myself, reaffirming the historic position of the American Government with reference to the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

Because the resolution, which is also pending in the Senate, has attracted such widespread attention, and because Members of the Congress are so anxious to have full information on the subject, I beg leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an informative statement on the subject made before the committee by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, Ohio.

The statement of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who is chairman of the executive committee, American Zionist Emergency Council, follows:

I am deeply grateful to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the privilege afforded me to appear here and speak in approval of the resolutions, No. 418 and No. 419, which have been introduced in the House. These resolutions reflect the spirit of a similar resolution adopted unanimously by both Houses of Congress in 1922. They evidence again the profound interest of the American people, speaking through their chosen Representatives in Congress, in the great historic cause of the rebuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

May I say at the outset that nothing is further from the minds of those for whom I speak—and I believe I speak for millions of Jewish citizens of the United States, who through the representatives of their national organizations and the elected delegates of their respective communities gathered at the great American Jewish conference last September and voiced overwhelmingly their endorsement of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine and called for the abrogation of the white paper—than to embarrass our great and gallant ally, Great Britain, whose heroic defense of civilization against Nazi barbarism in the dark days when she stood alone will remain an epic of high courage and spiritual grandeur to inspire all future generations. We have no quarrel with Great Britain. We can never forget that it was Great Britain which, first among the nations, gave recognition to the national aspirations of the Jewish people in the issuance of the Balfour Declaration. But a wrong and unjustifiable political policy affecting the Jewish national home which this very declaration welcomed and committed His Majesty's Government to its achievement is about to be consummated. It would to all intents and purposes liquidate the Jewish national home. It is this policy, which has been sharply criticized by the foremost statesmen of Great Britain herself, that we ask to be rescinded. We retain our strong confidence in the integrity and the abiding good will of Great Britain that this will be done.

We feel that this very resolution when adopted will, as was pointed out here a moment ago, strengthen the hands of our many friends in Great Britain who wish to see this wrong, unwise, and illegal policy abrogated.

May I also be permitted to give a brief historical background to the movement to reconstitute the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, perhaps a subject which will not be covered by the other people who will speak here? It is not a recent movement. It did not begin with modern Zionism, nor with the first Zionist colonies which were established in Palestine 65 years ago. The ideal of national restoration dates from the year of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple in the year A. D. 70, and from the beginning of the widespread dispersion of the Jewish people.

Throughout the following centuries the hope of rebuilding their national home was never absent from among our people. Modern Zionism is only the latest expression of that undeviating will to national restoration which has persisted throughout the ages.

For 15 centuries and more prior to the time of the great dispersion, the Jewish people lived in Palestine as a nation, undergoing all the changing political vicissitudes which all nations, large or small, are bound to experience over a long period of time.

During some of those centuries they made their greatest contribution to civilization in the religious field. They gave the Bible to the world and formulated the great spiritual and ethical ideals of mankind. In Palestine and from the Jewish nation came both Judaism and Christianity.

Whenever disaster threatened their national existence, they found strength to surmount it. The destruction of the first temple in the sixth century B. C. and the exile of the best part of Israel to Babylonia did not result in the death of the nation. By the rivers of Babylon they sat down and wept as they remembered Zion, and in their exile they vowed, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget her cunning."

In the second pre-Christian century, the Jews revolted against their Syrian overlords and regained their political independence. A century later they lost it again to the Romans. When the oppression of the Romans became too great, they revolted again. This great revolt lasted for 6 years, until A. D. 70, when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed. But the Jewish nation did not perish then. In 115 the Jewish people revolted again. And in 135 they revolted a third time. Determinedly they resisted the greatest empire of the earth in defense of their national life and liberties.

In the following centuries and as a result of persecution, Jewish life in Palestine sharply declined from its high levels, but it continued in a relatively large scale up to the seventh century, when we again hear of Jews fighting for their freedom. Jews clung to Palestine all through Roman, Byzantine, Arab, Christian, and Turkish domination, to this very day. Throughout the ages, even in the darkest periods of the Crusades, the protracted wars of the Middle Ages, and in modern times, the Jews never entirely left the soil of Palestine. They never surrendered the hope that some day they would rebuild their national life there. The bitter experiences of 2,000 years of exile, outlawry, ghettos, and massacres only served to reinforce that hope.

The effort to return to Palestine was unremitting through the ages. The living bond with Palestine was never broken. The hope of return became part of the Jews' creed. It echoed through the pages of his prayer book. His festivals were redolent of memories and hopes of Palestine. The Messianic hope which sustained the spirits of our people throughout the bleak centuries was essentially the hope of Israel's return to Palestine. All through the Middle Ages, when traveling was most difficult and dangerous, Jews found ways singly or in groups to return to Palestine.

In the ninetenth century this age-old national aspiration finally entered the phase of political organization and practical action.

Orthodox rabbis and lay leaders, moved by convictions both religious and national, were among the first to advocate planned and concerted colonization projects to Palestine.

A strong urge toward political action for national emancipation came also from the circles of Jews of western Europe who had become disillusioned with the results of the nineteenth century enlightenment and emancipation. Sudden and violent outbursts of anti-Semitism in unexpected places forced upon these Jews who had so sanguinely awaited the early liquidation of the Jewish problems, the necessity of taking stock of their position anew.

They realized that the problem of the national homelessness of the Jewish people was the principal source of the Jewish millennial tragedy and that it remained as stark and as menacing as ever. It simply could not be circumvented by wishful thinking or pleasant daydreaming.

These Jews began to look for the basic solution of the problem and they soon discovered it. Fundamentally the root of all the trouble was that the Jewish people was a national homeless people in the world and the only solution for national homelessness is a national home.

Great thinkers from among the intellectual circles of westernized Europe Jewry formulated this new insight and conviction. The theme common to all was emancipation through national restoration. Not that all Jews should return to Palestine any more than that all Englishmen in all parts of the world should return to England, or all Frenchmen to France, or all Germans to Germany. Every nation today has many of its former nationals citizens of other countries. The Jews in other parts of the world will remain as heretofore loyal citizens of the country which will permit them to remain equal citizens of those countries, and the American Jews who have served their country so faithfully both in peace and in war, intend to remain citizens of the United States, and their relationship with the Jewish commonwealth will be no different from that of other American citizens with respect to their ancestral homes. But, just as there is an England, a France, and a Germany, so must there be a land of Israel in order that the status of the Jewish people might be normalized throughout the world. Politically the Jewish people as a people must become, like every other people, possessed of an independent life in a national home.

In 1897, Theodore Herzl convoked the first Zionist Congress at Basle, Switzerland. There the official Zionist platform was adopted: "The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law."

Within 20 years of the organization of modern political Zionism, the movement received formal approval at the hands of the greatest empire on earth—Great Britain.

On November 2, 1917, Arthur James Balfour, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, issued the famous declaration in the name of the British Government: "His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home"—note the term "national"—"for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

The Balfour Declaration, which represents a turning point in the history of the Jewish people, was not, as has sometimes been represented, a purely British formulation of policy. It was for many months the subject of long and earnest negotiation between the principal Allied Powers. In February and March of 1918 the French and Italian Governments, respectively, issued parallel statements in support of the Balfour Declaration. President Wilson had followed the negotiations, and had encouraged the issuance of that declaration, and our Government insisted on having a hand in the drafting of the mandate.

At a meeting of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, held at San Remo in April 1920, the Balfour Declaration was unanimously adopted and embodied in the mandate for Palestine which was offered to Great Britain.

On July 24, 1922, the Council of the League of Nations unanimously ratified the British mandate, with the incorporated declaration as an integral part. That same year the Congress of the United States adopted the resolution which has been read to you this morning:

"Resolved, etc., That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done"—

And so forth. And then occurs the rest of the Balfour Declaration.

The preamble to the mandate contains this significant clause, and I would like to call it to your attention:

"Whereas recognition has hereby been given to the historical connections of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

These are the words of the preamble of the mandate. In other words, the creation, or reconstitution, of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was thus accepted as a world policy. It was also regarded as an act of restitution. It was a recognition both of the present need of the Jewish people and of the continuity of its claim to its homeland, a continuity unbroken by the vicissitudes of 2,000 years of history.

What did the framers of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate have in mind when they spoke of the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine? Their utterances leave no doubt as to their clear intent. They meant a Jewish state, a Jewish commonwealth.

Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain at the time of the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, writes in his memoirs:

"It was not their (the British Cabinet's) idea that a Jewish state should be set up immediately by the peace treaty without reference to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants. On the other hand, it was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national homeland and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish commonwealth. The notion that Jewish immigration would have to be artificially restricted in order to insure that the Jews should be a permanent minority never entered into the head of anyone engaged in framing the policy. That would have been regarded as unjust and as a fraud on the people to whom we were appealing.

General Smuts, still one of Great Britain's foremost statesmen, perhaps next to Churchill the most powerful political figure in the British Empire, who, in 1919 was a member of the Imperial War Cabinet, declared that he envisaged an increasing stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine and in generations to come a great Jewish state rising there once more, and that he is convinced today, no less than he was in 1917, of the necessity of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine: and he expressed the hope and confidence that there could and would be peace and cooperation between the Jewish state and other neighboring states.

Winston Churchill, when he was Secretary of State in 1920, declared:

"If, as may well happen, there should be created in our lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

President Wilson, in 1919, declared:

"I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and our people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

Our then Secretary of State, Charles E. Hughes, writing to Lord Balfour in January 1922, concerning the mandate for Palestine, which was a subject of extensive negotiation between our Government and Great Britain, and which negotiations resulted in substantial modifications in the draft of the mandate, assumes that what was being planned in Palestine was a Jewish state. There were three or four drafts. (See p. 60, Mandate for Palestine—prepared in the Division of Near Eastern Affairs—publication of the Department of State, Washington, 1931.)

It is, therefore, historically accurate, and in view of what has transpired since those years, politically sound, for the resolutions which have been introduced in the House, to speak of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. It is not a new concept. It is exactly what was originally contemplated. Attempts have been made to whittle down the meaning of the terms, "a national home," employed in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate. It has been asserted that a Jewish national home already exists in Palestine and that a permanent Jewish minority within a Palestine state, such as the white paper envisages, is quite consistent with the avowed purposes of the mandate. This, of course, is not the case. It is well, therefore, to stress the true objective of the mandate which was the reconstitution of the Jewish commonwealth, which presupposes a Jewish majority in the country, as Mr. Lloyd George correctly points out. The experiences of the last 25 years indicate that no such majority will ever be attained unless the control of immigration is vested with the Jewish agency, which alone is interested in the creation of absorptive capacity and in the intensive agricultural and industrial development of the land in order to absorb rapidly large numbers of immigrants and provide them with the means of earning a livelihood.

It was not contemplated to set up two states in Palestine, or to set up a Palestine state in which Jews would be a permanent minority. The mandate made Great Britain "responsible for putting into effect the declaration officially made on November 2, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty," i. e., the Balfour Declaration. The mandatory was charged with the responsibility "for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" (art. 2). The mandate nowhere speaks of the establishment of an Arab national home in Palestine.

The mandate calls for the recognition of "an appropriate Jewish agency as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home * * * and to assist and take part in the development of the country." The mandate nowhere speaks of the recognition of an Arab agency, for it was not required, inasmuch as it was not contemplated to set up in Palestine an Arab national state.

Under the terms of the mandate the Zionist organization of the world was invited "to secure the cooperation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home" (art. 4).

The mandatory was charged with the duty of "facilitating Jewish immigration" into Palestine and of encouraging "in cooperation with the Jewish agency" close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes (art. 6).

It was called upon to enact a nationality law, "so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine" (art. 7).

There are no provisions in the mandate for facilitating Arab immigration into Palestine or their close settlement on the land.

The administration of Palestine was asked to "arrange with the Jewish agency to construct or operate any public works, services, and utilities, and to develop any of the national resources of the country (art. 11).

What do all those clear provisions mount up to? That Palestine was to be built up as a Jewish national state, and that for the transition period, until a Jewish majority is achieved and the country is ready for self-governing institutions, Great Britain was entrusted by the principal Allied Powers with a mandate to administer the country upon terms and powers clearly defined in the mandate by the Council of the League of Nations.

Was the proposed reestablishment of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine unfair to the Arabs? May I be permitted to quote the words of the Right Honorable Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the British Admiralty, spoken here in Washington in the spring of 1940:

"In 1914 there was hardly any territory which the Arabs could call their own. They were almost throughout the Near East subject to Turkish suzerainty. Since 1914 they have acquired vast tracts of territory where they are independent; the whole of Arabia; Transjordania, which was taken away from the original conception of Palestine; Syria, where again they exercise semi-independent rights. No nation in the world has so little ground for complaining of what the Germans call lack of lebenstraum as the Arab race. They have vast spaces in which to expand. They have been amongst the greatest beneficiaries of the World War, and now they are subject to no particular evils."

Realizing that the Arabs would have their national aspirations satisfied after the war by the establishment of a number of Arab national states, and that these states would have land areas so large that it would take them centuries to develop them, and realizing, also, that the Jews stood in desperate need of a place of refuge for their people, the Allies reserved the tiny notch of Palestine, as Balfour called it—just 10,000 square miles for the Jewish people. The Arab lands cover more than a million square miles, and they are underpopulated and largely undeveloped.

Provision, of course, was made in the Balfour Declaration and in the mandate for the political equality of all citizens, and for the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities. These rights have been fully protected. The Palestine Arab has not been exploited. In fact, there are no Arabs on the face of the earth today more prosperous than the Arabs of Palestine.

The establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine will, we believe, be a great boon to the entire Near East and to all the Arab peoples. Jews are bringing scientific skill, technical knowledge, material resources, and high enthusiasm to the upbuilding of Palestine. Palestine is destined to become the hub of a great and rapid economic development of the entire Near East. The prosperity of Palestine will stimulate, and, in the course of time will come to depend upon the prosperity of all adjacent Arab countries.

It has been alleged that promises were also made to the Arabs during the last war to the effect that Palestine was to be included in the area in which Arab independence would be established. Sir Henry McMahon, then His Majesty's High Commissioner in Egypt, who negotiated with the Sherif of Mecca, later King Hussein, is alleged to have made such a promise. The British Government has consistently maintained that Palestine was definitely excluded from McMahon's pledge.

McMahon, himself, in a letter to the Times, London, July 23, 1937, stated:

"I feel it my duty to state, and I do so definitely and emphatically, that it was not intended by me in giving this pledge to King Hussein, to include Palestine in the area in which Arab independence was promised.

"I also had every reason to believe at the time that the fact that Palestine was not included in my pledge was well understood by King Hussein."

During the years 1917 to 1921 no claims to Palestine were raised by the Arab representatives. Indeed, they did in various ways explicitly agree to Palestine being treated differently from Arab territories.

Emir Feisal, son of Hussein, afterward King of Iraq, the leader of the Arabs in the crucial war years, stated in December 1918:

"The two main branches of the Semitic family, Arabs and Jews, understand one another, and I hope that as a result of interchange of ideas at the Peace Conference, which will be guided by ideals of self-determination and nationality, each nation will make definite progress toward the realization of its aspirations. Arabs are not jealous of Zionist Jews, and intend to give them fair play, and the Zionist Jews have assured the Nationalist Arabs of their intention to see that they too have fair play in their respective areas."

And in January 1919, Emir Feisal, for the Arab Kingdom of Hedjaz, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, on behalf of the Zionist Organization, signed a treaty of friendship which clearly shows that Feisal regarded Palestine as a land reserved for Jewish national settlement. He also submitted to the Peace Conference a memorandum on the Arab claims in which he asked for the independence of a number of Arabic areas with the explicit exception of Palestine.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read into the record the documents to which I have referred.

The record, then, of what was intended for Palestine and what was undertaken is quite clear. The civilized world recognized the right of the Jewish people to rebuild their national home in Palestine. Great Britain accepted a mandate to facilitate its consummation. The Jews of the world set themselves to the task of upbuilding.

Thus a new era in Jewish history was ushered in. The Jewish people threw themselves into the work of upbuilding with incomparable zeal and enthusiasm. The task was enormous—untrained hands, inadequate means, overwhelming difficulties. The land was stripped and poor—neglected through the centuries. European Jewry was shattered and impoverished by the war and could not be quickly rallied to the work of reconstruction. Plans had to be improvised and carried through piecemeal. Nevertheless, the record of pioneering achievement of the Jewish people in Palestine in the 20 years between two world wars, the story of their heroic labors and sacrifices and their courageous experimentation have received the acclaim of the entire world. A veritable miracle of colonization was performed. The Jewish population increased from 55,000 to 600,000. Close to 300 colonies have been established. Social vision and high human idealism went into the planning and structure of many of them. Some 2,000 factories and 4,000 small workshops were opened. The waters of the Jordon were harnessed for electric power. The Dead Sea was made to yield up its vast chemical resources. Barren hills and valleys were reforested. Marshes were drained. A splendid educational system was developed, crowned by the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. A modern health service was established throughout the country, available to Jews, Mohammedans, and Christians alike.

I hope you will have the privilege of hearing later on one of the great experts of our country, Dr. Lowdermilk tell you of what has been accomplished in Palestine.

It was fortunate indeed that Palestine was available, readied, and prepared by the labor of these Jewish pioneers, when the horrible Hitler persecutions swept over European Jewry. For that little country was able to absorb more than 300,000 refugees from Germany and Central Europe, a country so small that it could hide itself in one of the great States that you represent. Today Jewish Palestine is again vindicating its claim to full life and national freedom by the extraordinary contributions which it is making to the war effort of the United Nations, have fought bravely, many of them with rare distinction. The civilian population is engaged in an all-out effort to back up the fighting armies in the Near East by providing them with many vital supplies and services; 50,000 Palestine Jews are engaged in defense work.

And here we come to the point back of this resolution. The administration of Palestine has unfortunately not always been conducted on a plane corresponding to the high intentions of the framers of the Balfour Declaration, nor did it reflect the good will and unflagging sympathy of the English people whose historic friendship the Jewish people will never forget. Local British officials, though of high integrity, have shown little understanding of the processes involved in the building of the Jewish homeland, and there are always great difficulties associated with the upbuilding of a new homeland. They have not grasped the implications of the organic relationship between the Jewish people outside of Palestine, to whom the Balfour Declaration was issued, and the land which they administered. The rebuilding of the Jewish homeland implies a dynamic outlook. The outlook of British officials has been in the main static, based on the tacit assumption that Palestine alone, and not the integration of large numbers of immigrants with an evolving Jewish homeland, was their concern.

They have, therefore, tended to look upon the local difficulties associated with the upbuilding of the Jewish homeland as unnecessary disturbances of the status quo, instead of a natural part of the task assigned to them. No corrective to this attitude was applied by the home government in London. No consistent attempt was made to bring home to the Arabs of Palestine the fact that the Balfour Declaration was an interallied policy, and later, that the mandate was international law, and the first evidence of recalcitrance on their part—namely, the riots of May 1921—was rewarded by a temporary suspension of Jewish immigration.

Concession led to concession. The white paper issued in 1922 declared that "the terms of the Balfour Declaration do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be established in Palestine."

This was the beginning of reinterpretation. It introduced an element of ambiguity into what had been quite clear till then.

The Palestine contemplated in the mandate has consisted of Trans-Jordan and cis-Jordan. In the year 1922, Trans-Jordan—three times the area of cis-Jordan—was closed to Jewish immigration.

In subsequent years, Palestine's British officials took the view that they were not primarily concerned with the facilitation of the creation of a Jewish homeland, but with the administration of the country in its existing condition.

This view has dominated the policies and actions of the Palestine administration ever since. The national rights of the Jewish people in relation to Palestine which had been internationally acknowledged and which alone gave legal basis for the mandatory presence there at all were progressively and consistently sacrificed.

Following the disturbances of 1936, a Palestine royal commission was sent to Palestine to investigate. Its report proposed to partition the country, to create an Arab and a Jewish state, and an area reserved for British administration.

A technical commission was then set up to work out the details of a partition plan. It finally declared that the partition plan was unworkable.

Following discussions in London in 1939, to which representatives of Arabs and Jews were invited and which brought no positive results, the British Government of the late Mr. Chamberlain prepared the white paper of May 17, 1939. The House of Commons reluctantly consented to it during a tense period of international complications, only after the Government insisted on acceptance as a vote of confidence. The white paper was formally disapproved by the permanent mandates commission. It was never submitted for approval to the Council of the League of Nations, although article 27 of the mandate clearly states that "the consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modifications of the terms of the mandate."

It was thus denied legal validity. However, despite all this, it was put into effect.

Under the terms of this white paper, Jewish immigration was limited to 10,000 a year for the next 5 years. A bonus immigration of an additional 25,000 was allowed in consideration of the plight of Jewish refugees. However, after March of this year, 1944, Jewish immigration is to be discontinued entirely "unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it."

The white paper likewise grants the High Commissioner of Palestine general powers to prohibit and regulate transfers of land. Regulations have been issued according to which Jews are allowed the right of free purchase in only 2.6 percent of the total area of Palestine—260 square miles. A total prohibition on transfer of land to Jews was imposed in about two-thirds of the country; in the remaining area transfer is permissible only under severe restriction and subject to the consent of the high commissioner. Thus discriminatory laws against Jews were introduced in their own national home.

Thus the Jews were left to build their national home without men and without land, just as their ancestors in Egypt were expected to make brick without straw.

The white paper is by no stretch of the imagination the fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Jewish people recognized in the mandate. It is their total liquidation. This white paper when it was issued in 1939, in the disastrous Munich appeasement era and as part of that tragic political and spiritual debacle of those days, aroused the bitterest opposition. It was denounced both at home and abroad. It was violently opposed by some of the foremost statesmen of Great Britain. I would just like to quote this sentence from the great statement of Winston Churchill which he made in the House of Commons when the policy of the white paper was being discussed. He said:

"We are now asked to submit, and this rankles most with me, to an agitation which is fed with foreign money and ceaselessly inflamed by Nazi and by Fascist propaganda."

If the white paper was found odious and morally unjustifiable in 1939, before the Second World War and before the appalling disasters swept over the Jewish communities of Europe, driving hundreds of thousands of Jews helpless and impoverished from their homes to wander over the face of the earth, how utterly insupportable and insufferable it is today!

The last 5 years have been the blackest in Jewish history. They climaxed 5 other years which the Nazi regime ushered in, during which one Jewish community after another in central and eastern Europe was broken and myriads of Jews were driven into exile from countries and homes where they had known dignity, honor, and where they and their ancestors had lived for centuries. Myriads of them crowded the highways of the world in quest of refuge and sanctuary and finding most doors barred against them. But a worse fate awaited those who could not escape in time. For them Hitler has decreed total extermination—systematic, ruthless annihilation in gas chambers, by machine guns, in human slaughter pens. Two million perished. Some who managed to escape, and after months of wandering finally reached the shores of Palestine—the shores of the Jewish national home—were turned away. They were refused admission. They had no

certificates. The last door of hope was shut to them. Many tried to enter illegally. Hundreds of them were apprehended, sent to concentration camps, and later forcibly evacuated to the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, where they are rotting to this day. Many perished in Haifa Bay; 760 souls perished in the Black Sea on the ill-fated *Struma* because permission to enter Palestine was refused to them. But for this infamous white paper they might have been saved. Had the doors of Palestine been wide open these last years of Nazi terror and had the mandatory government fully cooperated in the task, tens of thousands of additional refugees might have been saved from Hitler's mass execution.

In March of this year, the pitifully restricted immigration schedule permitted under the white paper will come to an end. Only the 30,000 unused visas—unused, principally because of the administrative difficulties put in the way by Palestine officials—remain. Thereafter no more Jews will be permitted to Palestine except on Arab sufferance and consent. This confronts the Jewish people and the whole civilized world with an appalling prospect. It is self-evident that Jewish homelessness will be widespread after the war. There will be hundreds of thousands of Jews, perhaps millions, who will seek new homes in a world which will be inhospitable to immigration. The struggle for existence in a ravaged post-war Europe will be harsh and bitter. Famine, poverty, and misery will stalk over the face of that war-riven continent. There will be ruined economies, worthless currencies, social collapse, and revolutions in every defeated country—just as after the last war. The youth of half the world which has been indoctrinated with the racial and nationalistic mythologies of Nazi-Fascist dictatorship will be spiritually lost and unsuited to a democratic way of life which they have been taught to hate and despise—and they will be virulent Jew haters. Jews will again be eyed sullenly as unwelcome economic competitors by millions of job-hungry and career-hungry men. Economic hostility will once again be rationalized into the well-known and quite serviceable anti-Semitic thesis.

No doubt the Jews of Europe, following an Allied victory, will be restored to their political rights and to equality of citizenship. But they possessed these rights after the last war—even minority rights in some of the countries of central and eastern Europe; and anti-Semitism was never so rampant and so vicious as after the last war.

Can Europe, can the world, can America, which is for all time to come so inextricably bound up with the rest of the world, permit this menacing situation to continue indefinitely after the war?

The Jewish people must be permitted and helped to develop their homeland in Palestine in such a way as to be able to drain off, in a relatively short time, two or three million Jews from the crowded and economically tensioned centers of central and eastern Europe. This will ease the pressures upon the Jews who will remain there, who will then cease to be foci of irritation, conflict, and unrest.

And this brings me back to what Mr. HAMILTON FISH said. He told you a fine story of what he tried to do and earnestly tried to do about the establishment of other colonies, but you heard the conclusion of it. Nothing was done. We have had experience with other colonies. There was one recently founded in Santo Domingo in which we placed very high hopes but which perhaps will take care of only a few thousand souls, perhaps of only a few hundred souls.

There are no other opportunities for mass emigration of Jews anywhere else in the world. There will be none. We wish it were otherwise, but wishes are not horses. Feeble trickles of immigration will be permitted in this or that country, but waves will be fiercely resisted; but it is with waves and not with trickles that we must concern ourselves. We Zionists are not opposed to Jewish immigration to any country in the world. Quite the contrary. We hope and pray all countries will open their doors to refugees. But those things do not happen.

We must not forget the experiences of Jewish refugees in the last 10 years. These experiences will be no different after the war. They may be even more difficult; for nations will then be in the grip of vast economic dislocations and they will be thinking in terms of helping their own people over the extremely formidable transition period when their national economies will be passing from a wartime to a peacetime footing. They will refuse to complicate their lives with large influxes of impoverished immigrants. The Jewish colonies are ready to expand and take in Jewish immigrants.

A free and open Palestine is the indispensable condition not only for a peaceful solution of this most obdurate problem of Europe, but also for the pacification of Europe and the world.

Statesmen should clearly understand this. If the problem of mass Jewish emigration and of the national homelessness of the Jewish people is not clearly faced and solved after the war, it will return over and over again to harass and unsettle the world. Reaction will exploit the situation again and again. The defenseless position of the Jews was exploited by the Nazis to rise to power. They employed it as a weapon to achieve the disintegration of Europe. Fascist adventurers after the war will continue to exploit it. The Jewish problem is quite as much the world's problem as it is that of the Jews.

What the world will do concerning the Jewish people and concerning the restoration of its national life in Palestine after the war will be the true index of the nature and character of the entire program of world reconstruction. The world patterns of reconstruction will unerringly reflect the decisions which will be made concerning the Jewish people and its national status. If in the case of the Jewish people, which possesses no armies or navies, and which will emerge from the World War the most shattered of all peoples, the United Nations will act in a spirit of justice, vision, and true statesmanship, then there is hope that by the same spirit the entire world will be healed and saved

Surely the Jewish people are no less deserving than other peoples whose national independence and freedom have been guaranteed by the United Nations. They have been the worst victims of Nazi brutality, and their casualties have been proportionately the heaviest. The Jewish people desperately need Palestine for its homeless millions now and after the war, and for its national security, dignity, and normalcy. Jews have shown a remarkable capacity for pioneering, for labor and sacrifice. They have built worthily and well in Palestine. They have made Palestine their own again by their heroic labor, by their blood and sweat. Nearly all that is hopeful, promising, and progressive in that country today the Jews have created.

What has been called the noblest enterprise of our time must not now be cruelly sapped and undermined.

These resolutions which have been introduced in the House and in the Senate, and which have received the endorsement of the leaders of both political parties, ask our Government to use its good offices, as it did once before, to assist a sorely tried and harassed people in accomplishing the task of rebuilding its national life in its ancestral home—a task approved of by our Government and our people and by 52 other nations at the close of the last war—a task, however, which cannot be accomplished without the free entry of Jews into the country and without the fullest opportunities for colonization and economic development. The reconstitution of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth would be to us men of faith a fulfillment of prophecy and to all an act of historic justice to an ancient and long-martyred people.

"Black Markets"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I am enclosing as part of my remarks the radio talk of Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, delivered February 15, 1944, over the Blue Network. The address follows:

You hear a lot of talk about black markets these days. But a good many people seem to be a little vague on the subject. I have been asked often, "Just what are black markets; are they a myth or a menace?"

In a few minutes I shall tell you of some actual cases that prove they are anything but a myth. In fact, until we all get together and smash them, black markets are a vicious menace to the security of every honest American and to our entire wartime stabilization program.

Literally black market means illegal business conducted in the dark, safe from the light of day, or, more loosely, the light of public gaze. This would include the out-and-out thieves who steal cattle off the range at night, slaughter them by the side of the road, and sneak them into market to sell above ceiling prices. It would include the professional burglars who steal gasoline ration coupons from war-price and rationing-board safes to sell for their personal profit. It includes organized gangs who work in attics and cellars to print counterfeit ration coupons. It includes the one-time prohibition racketeers and hijackers who now traffic in nylon stockings and onions and steaks, which they deliver surreptitiously up the back alley. And the unscrupulous businessmen who will do anything for their own personal profit.

But here's the important point which too many people forget. It takes two to make a wartime black market. If nobody thought illegal goods or coupons, if no one paid more than O. P. A. ceiling prices, there would be no black markets.

Thus, the man who buys a couple of extra gas coupons is just as much a part of a black-market operation as the man who sells them and the man who stole or counterfeited them in the first place. A housewife who accepts rationed goods without paying coupons for them or who pays higher than the O. P. A. ceiling prices is contributing to the black market just as much as the merchant with whom she deals or the racketeers from whom he buys his supplies. The black markets are all one vast interwoven operation right from the original theft or the counterfeiting press through the final sale in the retail stores or at local gas stations.

And in many cases black markets do not even bother to keep in the dark. They are carried on right out in the open, through regular channels of business.

Today one of our most serious problems—because it is sapping the strength of the whole war effort—is the black market in gasoline. Of the 2,451 convictions for all types of rationing and price control violations in the criminal courts last year, almost half were gasoline cases.

But the gas black market is doing more than encouraging crime. It is actually robbing you honest car owners of part of your share of our limited supply. Our rationing people tell me that every day about 2,500,000 gallons of gas are being siphoned out of our limited supply by black-market parasites who steal, buy, sell, and counterfeit gasoline coupons. Do you know what that means to you honest car owners?

It means that you are being robbed of just about 45 miles of driving every month. But for this illegal drain, the value of your A coupons might now be 25 percent larger. And remember, there is only so much gasoline available for our use here at home. That amount cannot be increased because there is an actual shortage of crude oil.

Now, obviously, our armed forces must get every drop of gasoline they need. The closer we get to invasion, the greater those needs will be. And they will be met.

Consequently, let me issue this solemn warning to every motorist on the home front. If there is any cutting to be done, it will have to be to your rations. So the more you allow black markets to drain gasoline away from your supply, for the benefit of some chiselers, the greater the possibility of lower gasoline rations for all honest drivers.

Our enforcement people are making progress in this fight to protect you against the gasoline racketeers. One-third of all the chiselers whose cases were completed in the criminal courts last month went to prison. The rest were fined or put on probation. But enforcement people can't do the job alone. In the last analysis the issue is squarely up to you car owners.

You can help smash the black market by writing your license number and State on all your ration coupons now. By showing your colors in this way, you make it easy for our enforcement officers to trace illegal coupons. You can also help by refusing to buy gasoline without coupons—by refusing to buy the coupons themselves—and by asking your local war price and rationing boards for only as much gasoline as you actually need when you apply for rations.

But gasoline is not the only fertile field for black-market racketeers. Let's get down to cases and see how some others actually operated.

There was the case of a big meat-packing company in Wisconsin, which shipped huge quantities of meat to New York City—and during the acute meat shortage last spring and summer they saw a chance to cash in on it by collecting money on the side from all the wholesalers they shipped to. Thus their invoices and records still showed perfect compliance with O. P. A. ceiling prices. Although O. P. A. enforcement officers suspected that they were violating the regulations, it was difficult to get any real evidence.

But one evening an agent of the company brought a black bag to the clerk of a New York hotel where he was registered. He asked to have this bag placed in the hotel safe until he returned from dinner. When the clerk inquired as to its value, he was told "$40,000." The astonished clerk took the bag and then called in turn the F. B. I., the local police, and O. P. A.

The O. P. A. enforcement officer recognized the name as being that of an agent of the particular meat-packing company which had long been suspected of black-market dealings. And when the bag was examined, it was found to contain approximately $40,000 in neat little bundles, each bearing the name of a particular New York meat wholesaler.

As a result of the leads obtained from the bag of "black-market" money, O. P. A. was able to uncover sufficient evidence to go to the grand jury to request an indictment. And in November 1943 the grand jury returned a conspiracy indictment against the Packing Co., its officers, and many New York wholesalers, 39 defendants in all. They are now awaiting trial.

Then there was the big "black market" in oranges just last November. This one was brought to light when numerous customers in New York City complained to their local war price and rationing boards that oranges were selling for a dollar a dozen and more—way over the legal ceiling price. O. P. A. enforcement officers went to work and traced the violators all the way back, through the retailers and the wholesalers, to one principal firm. This firm bought the oranges from the growers at the regular ceiling prices. It then slapped on an excess charge. This charge was in turn passed on by the wholesaler to the retailer, and by the retailer to the customer in the form of oranges at $1 a dozen.

When the case came to court each of the three officers of the firm was fined $10,000, two of them got 60 days in jail, and the third a 60-day suspended sentence. And the day after those fines were imposed the price of oranges all over New York City went down to the ceiling price and has stayed there ever since.

Nor is food the only line in which the wartime racketeers operate. There was a recent case of rent gouging in which a father and son, who jointly owned the apartment building involved, were fined $500 and each sent to jail for 60 days.

The Federal judge, after setting these penalties, told the defendants that the O. P. A. rent regulation they had sought to evade was a wartime measure that would be of no value at all unless enforced. "There is no question but that these defendants knew they were violating the law," he said. "The sentence in this case will act as a warning to others."

Then there was the sensational case this winter, of a fuel-oil company on the Atlantic coast which, knowingly and consistently, delivered fuel oil to both householders and dealers without collecting ration coupons. Consequently, at the time of the hearing before our commissioners, the company had delivered 63,646 gallons of excess fuel oil to its 430 consumers—and 9,941,398 gallons more fuel oil to its dealers than there were coupons to pay for.

Now that's a lot of fuel oil—over 10,000,000 gallons of it out of our common supply which was allocated to take care of everybody's rations in that eastern area—10,000,000 gallons drained off illegally to provide extra fuel oil for a few at the expense of the many. Every individual or dealer who accepted that extra fuel oil was as much a part of that vicious black-market operation as the company that sold it to them.

I emphasize that point, because there seems to be a tendency by some people to duck any responsibility for the carrying out of all our wartime laws and regulations. But nobody should "let George do it" here on the home front any more than we would expect our boys to hang back and "let George do it" at the battle front.

Now, obviously, if everybody abided by our O. P. A. price and rationing regulations, there would be no necessity for enforcing them. We all know that the great majority of businessmen are honest. They would abide by the rules as a matter of course. And honest merchants and producers are particularly anxious to cooperate with wartime rationing and price controls because they realize what a protection these controls provide for business as well as for the consumer. Nine cases out of 10 our only problem is to explain a regulation, and the need for it. Once they understand, their cooperation is quick and wholehearted. It is only a selfish minority who persist in violating any regulation that stands between them and higher prices.

Thanks to them, the work of enforcing our wartime regulations is a staggering one. In America we have 600,000 stores selling food. We have 260,000 gasoline stations selling gasoline and automobile repairs. We have 150,000 clothing stores. We have over 350,000 manufacturing and wholesale concerns. We have 350,000 restaurants and eating places. We have millions of hotels, apartment houses, and rooming houses. For your protection against privation and hoarding, O. P. A. rationing regulations apply today to dozens of different food products. For your protection against a high cost of living, O. P. A. ceiling prices cover practically every product sold in the United States. For the protection of our tenants against rent gouging we have O. P. A. rent ceilings in 14,000,000 American dwellings.

Our O. P. A. annual budget only allows us 2,800 investigators with which to cover the entire United States. That means less than one investigator for every county. When you consider the fact that there are over 10,000 firemen in New York City alone, you can see what a very small staff that is to handle the vast responsibility which has been given us.

Now our staff of O. P. A. investigators are, I believe, as fine a group of patriotic, hard-working men and women as you'll find anywhere in this country. Many of them used to be in business themselves and they look on their present job as a means of protecting honest businessmen as well as the public against this evil menace of our wartime black markets. And through their conscientious efforts in 1943, more than 650,000 cases were investigated. Of these, over one-third proved to be definite violations of O. P. A. price ceilings and ration regulations. Only 36,913 were serious enough to take formal enforcement action, either in the courts or through administrative proceedings. Our entire court record speaks for itself. Of the 5,832 black-market cases tried in court in 1943, over 96 percent were decided in our favor.

Now I have said that our O. P. A. enforcement job is a big one, but it is certainly not a hopeless task. We are smashing black markets wherever we can find them—and we shall continue to ferret out every possible deliberate violator and bring him to terms with the laws of the land. Obviously, though, the more cooperation we get from you, the public, the better job we can do in providing you protection against higher costs and an economic blow-up.

That is why we constantly urge everyone of you to check O. P. A. ceiling prices whenever you shop and to accept no rationed goods without paying ration points in full. In that way you can back up the volunteer members of your local board who are trying to hold prices in line—your local price panel.

And another thing—remember that it is not smart to break the rules at any time. It is downright unpatriotic to do so in wartime. So when some friend boasts that he can get "all the gas I want without coupons" or has a friend who knows where to get black-market steaks, don't condone him. Don't laugh it off. Have the courage to tell him exactly what you think of such violations.

Next week I shall talk about the new O. P. A. ration tokens and how they will simplify your food shopping and save your grocer both time and money.

Until then, good-bye to you all.

Need of Coal in Massachusetts for Heating Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution passed at a meeting of the city council of Lynn, Mass., February 8, 1944, requesting that proper measures be taken by the authorities to furnish their section with coal for heating purposes:

Whereas it appears that the city of Lynn is located in a defense area of the United States of America and by reason thereof a great many of the inhabitants and workers therein are dependent upon coal for heating purposes, and it further appearing that by reason of the lack of adequate supply thereof, a great deal of suffering and sickness has been caused to those depending upon such type of fuel: Wherefore, be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Lynn in meeting assembled, respectfully requests that proper means and measures be taken by the authorities in charge to furnish this community with the much-needed supply of coal for heating purposes; and be it further

Ordered, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council, be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this resolution to the proper board or authorities in charge of coal distribution and to Senator DAVID I. WALSH and to Representatives LANE and BATES.

Is It a little Unfair?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the English want to designate conduct as being a little unfair, they suggest that it is not exactly cricket.

Might we ask whether it is cricket for the President to insist that the servicemen receive a blank ballot where the name of the candidate must be written in; then to place in the hands of each soldier leaving the home ports a letter signed by himself, giving his name in full; and then have or permit his English friends to greet the arriving soldier with propaganda advocating as a candidate for President for a fourth-term Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Republican tax dollars go into the United States Treasury. Republican money purchases War bonds. Tax dollars, War-bond dollars, go into lend-lease funds; billions of dollars, at least one-half of them Republican dollars—for the nominally northern Republican States pay at least one-half, probably more, of the national tax bill—by way of lend-lease go to England and to the British Empire and the least that England could do, would be to keep her nose out of our domestic political situation.

But she is not content to carry on her own political activities; she is not content to receive from us billions of dollars through lend-lease and war aid; she is not content to have us furnish a disproportionate share of the oil needed, more than 85 percent of the aviation gas, 70 percent of the men needed for invasion; she must, forsooth, tell us whom we should elect for President. Naturally the British want Roosevelt for President, for they consider him to be to them a compliant, generous Santa Claus.

Oh, I know that anyone who ventures to criticize anything that England does, who places the interests of his own country first, will be charged with a lack of patriotism. Nevertheless, it is about time that the British were told that there is a limit to what we will stand by way of interference by them in our domestic affairs. Some of them act as though they thought we were still a colonial possession of the Empire.

Last summer Churchill told us, in substance, that we should reelect Roosevelt. More recently, influential papers in England have been telling us that we must have Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth-term President, and now the British are filling our soldiers full of fourth-term propaganda in anticipation of the coming election. Is there any reason why Republican soldiers or Navy men who want to vote for Bricker or Dewey should, on arrival in England, be told the war effort will be aided if they vote for Roosevelt?

It is no wonder that the President wanted a ballot which would not contain the names of the candidates; which deprived servicemen of all opportunity to vote for State and county officials, but gave them a chance to write in the name of the candidate for President and, if they happened to know it, the name of their choice for Senator and Congressman.

If the President could have succeeded in depriving those in the service of a chance to vote for State and county officers, forced on them a ballot wherein they would have to write the name of the candidate for President, he would have had a tremendous advantage, with his name ever before them and with his name—none other—on the last official message they received as they left the home shores.

Do not forget that one of the last things the serviceman receives when he leaves American shores is a letter purporting to be signed by the President.

Now the British are following this up by an official letter of welcome, published by the Ministry of Information, to the same serviceman. In that letter, he is told that he will be welcome everywhere in England—that the British are his buddies. Then he is told that $50,000,000 will be spent to beat President Roosevelt. Never was there a more unfair political untruth put out.

All informed people know that campaign contributions are limited and the truth of the matter is that the big money is being spent by the C. I. O. in its campaign to reelect Roosevelt in return for special favors granted that organization.

Apparently, the British politicians think that they have taken America so far into camp that, in addition to having us make the major contribution of men, money, and material, they can control our domestic policies, our coming elections, select our President.

If the British will confine their efforts to the defeat of our enemies, we of the United States of America will take care of our own domestic political problems.

A part of the British propaganda put out by the British Ministry of Information, headed by Brendan Bracken, who is an intimate of Churchill, reads as follows:

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS TO BEAT F. D. R.

Roosevelt's opponents are ready to spend $50,000,000 to beat him as, they assumed, he makes a fourth-term bid for President at the November elections.

Despite this, no political expert is willing to put his money down and bet Roosevelt will be beaten.

BIG OFFENSIVE

In the unofficial anti-Roosevelt campaign which is already booming, "constitutional clubs" in 250 key constituencies controlled from New York and supported by many industrialists, are attacking the New Deal, food subsidies, and high taxation.

One of the results is that organized labor, with the exception of John L. Lewis, the miners' leader, is again rallying behind the President.

Mr. Roosevelt's personal physician, Rear Admiral Ross McIntyre, recalling that the President's birthday was on January 30, said that he was "basically in fine shape for a man of 62."

LIVING COSTS JUMP

The cost of living in the United States has increased by 43.5 percent since January 1941.

The above ignores the fact that political parties are limited to an expenditure of $3,000,000 for Presidential campaigns.

According to figures issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the cost of living for the period from December 1940 to December 1941 increased 10 percent; from December 1941 to December 1942, 9 percent; and from December 1942 to December 1943 the increase was estimated at 3½ percent.

It is a little unfair to use Republican tax dollars to campaign for a fourth term.

The President's letter to the servicemen, referred to above, is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

To Members of the United States Army Expeditionary Forces:

You are a soldier of the United States Army.

You have embarked for distant places where the war is being fought.

Upon the outcome depends the freedom of your lives—the freedom of the lives of those you love, your fellow citizens, your people.

Never were the enemies of freedom more tyrannical, more arrogant, more brutal.

Yours is a God-fearing, proud, courageous people which, throughout its history, has put its freedom under God before all other purposes.

We who stay at home have our duties to perform, duties owed in many parts to you. You will be supported by the whole force and power of this Nation. The victory you win

will be a victory of all the people, common to them all.

You bear with you the hope, the confidence, the gratitude, and the prayers of your family, your fellow citizens, and your President.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Establishment of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution passed February 8, 1944, at a meeting of the city council of Lynn, Mass., requesting that a Jewish homeland be established in Palestine:

Whereas, by House Resolution 428, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the aforesaid resolution having been offered by Congressman LANE, which resolution appears as follows:

"Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected; and

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth;" wherefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Lynn in meeting assembled, approves the adoption and passage of said resolution; and be it further

Ordered, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council forward a copy of this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to Representatives LANE and BATES and to Senator DAVID I. WALSH.

Lincoln and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the memory of no other man in Civil War history has had so much influence in unifying the Nation as that of Abraham Lincoln. There are many things for the South to recall in tenderness and appreciation but the utterances and actions of no others arrayed against us in 1861–65 compare with those of the man who "though the leader against her in war can never be justly said to have been her enemy." These were the words of J. G. de R. Hamilton of the University of North Carolina, in 1915 and he also said of Lincoln:

With the rest of the united Nation the South will not only honor and revere but will cherish the name of her son, the first American.

The author probably meant that in Lincoln new and historic forces produced for the first time a distinctively American type of statesmanship. Jefferson might be regarded as occupying that position but if we consider influences with roots entirely in the New World, the tribute would doubtless be accepted without reservation, particularly since the South's great orator, Henry W. Grady, made use of the same language in his eloquent reference to Lincoln:

From the union of these (northern and southern) colonists, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slowly perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace of this Republic—Abraham Lincoln.

The sources of the South's feeling are found in the great human qualities of Lincoln. When others misunderstood the South he seemed to know the mind and purpose of our people. When others expected humiliating admissions of error which the South could not give he asked only that we take our place as restored and honored members of the Union. To Mr. Adams in 1861 he gave instructions "not to indulge in expressions of harshness or disrespect or even impatience concerning the seceding States, their agents, or their people" and further to remember that the people of the South "throughout all political misunderstandings and alienations, still are and always must be our kindred and countrymen."

These are examples of the kindness of Lincoln in a period of intense bitterness and are evidences of his greatness of soul and loftiness of character.

There are other reasons beside the charity of Lincoln for the South's cherishing his memory. Our years of reflection upon the forces which brought the rupture in 1861 has produced a clearer judgment regarding the impersonal character of those forces and has emphasized the fairness of Lincoln and the soundness of his policies for readmitting the South. Wisdom and fairness, as well as charity, won the South's affection. His sense of fairness often found expression in his speeches, as, for example, his message to the Congress on December 1, 1862, dealing with compensated emancipation:

It is no less true for having been often said that the people of the South are not more responsible for the original introduction of this proposition [slavery] than are the people of the North.

Lincoln and Grant were kind to Lee as the great ordeal neared its close and the South could never forget a kindness to its most beloved son.

Lincoln's democracy, his simplicity, his appreciation of the common man—these were qualities which found a response in our hearts. In reverencing the memory of Lincoln we would not detract from the possessive feeling which is rightfully the North's and our pride is sufficiently served in recalling that he lived during the first impressionable years under southern skies and that he spoke feelingly of his southern heritage.

The South does not question that Lincoln shared our suffering in the war. To his friend, George P. Floyd, the hotel keeper at Quincy, Ill., he wrote:

I have not suffered by the South, I have suffered with the South. Their pain has been my pain. Their loss has been my loss. What they have gained, I have gained.

This was one of the deep and moving sentiments of his nature and partially accounts for the high place he holds in the affections of the South.

Such a life helps us to pierce the mystery contained in the beautiful lines of St. John: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Many of us carry the impressions gained in boyhood from those who could speak from personal memory of the work of this great man. From their accounts as from the pages of recorded history we conclude that the idea of human sympathy and limitless good will for a little while became flesh and dwelt among us.

Liquidation of Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said recently about the advisability of immediately liquidating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently carried an editorial on this subject which I hope the membership of the House will read and which will, I think, help greatly in forming a decision on this question. The editorial is as follows:

H. O. L. C. NOT FOR SALE

The wisdom of permitting the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to continue its liquidation in an orderly manner, instead of ordering a pell-mell sale as proposed last spring by Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, is sharply shown in the special report on H. O. L. C. which Administrator John H. Fahey recently made to Congress.

The borrower who is not yet financially out of the woods benefits from the orderly liquidation. Mr. Fahey reports that "despite the faithful performance of H. O. L. C. borrowers as a whole, many have not yet paid

off to a point where the average lending institution would consider their loans as safe."

H. O. L. C. has 11,000 borrowers who have made no repayment on principal, though they have kept up with interest, and 27,000 others who have reduced their debts by less than 10 percent.

"Of vital importance to H. O. L. C. borrowers who have not yet attained financial stability," Mr. Fahey observes, "is the fact that State laws prevent most private lending institutions from extending them the leniency the H. O. L. C. can allow in case of further trouble. It can be taken almost for granted that many foreclosures would result which can be averted through the H. O. L. C."

The borrower who has reduced his loan to a small balance, or who lives in an isolated community where there are only a few other H. O. L. C. loans, also is the beneficiary of the sound liquidation policy which the Government corporation is following. Two hundred and twenty thousand of the loans represent balances of less than $1,000 and there are fewer than 10 loans in every one of 14,000 of the 19,000 cities, towns, and villages where H. O. L. C. does business.

As Mr. Fahey points out, a great many of these loans "would not be attractive to lending institutions because of their small balances, extended terms, and scattered location in remote communities, which increases the cost of servicing." If a commercial mortgage loan concern acquired these mortgages from H. O. L. C., it would probably be only with the intention of closing them out as quickly as possible, regardless of the distress that would be suffered by the homeowner.

The taxpayers of the Nation also profit from the business-like liquidation procedure of H. O. L. C., and would be the losers if Congress should ever yield to the demands of the mortgage-loan pressure group for the assets of the corporation to be put on the auction block.

The Administrator's report makes it very clear that liquidation has been accomplished thus far at a net loss of only 2 percent, and with the prospect of breaking even at the end of the operation, because H. O. L. C. has nursed sick loans along to convalescence, and because it has been able to offset earnings on good loans against losses on inferior loans.

H. O. L. C. has liquidated 58 percent of its $3,500,000,000 investment in what is very properly terms "an extraordinary adventure in lending." It expects to complete the liquidation and break even 8 years hence. The only opposition to going ahead with the application of good business practices to this governmental business operation comes from mortgage-loan concerns that see a possibility of some quick, easy profit and are oblivious of the interests of the thousands of home owners involved.

Administrator Fahey says the views of these would-be profiteers of distress are not shared by the vast majority of bankers and executives of savings and loan associations and insurance companies. "These officials," he reports, "declare emphatically that they have no wish to participate in any plan to purchase the H. O. L. C.'s good loans and leave the corporation with the slow accounts and the losses which the Government would have to absorb under such a transaction. They decline to campaign for profits for their institutions at the expense of taxpayers. Any forced liquidation of the H. O. L. C. certainly would have just that result."

The majority in Congress has taken the same attitude in beating back all the attempted raids on H. O. L. C. to date. Congress would be well advised to remain on the alert against further attempts which, the predatory instinct being what it is, are not likely to be totally absent in the future.

O. P. A. Regulations

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1943, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration:

DECEMBER 15, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I would very much appreciate an answer to the following questions:

1. How much longer is the O. P. A. going to let the man with the price obtain cream without points and make the average citizen pay 5 points for cottage cheese made from the skim milk?

2. How much longer is the O. P. A. going to allow cream to go point free so that the man with the price can secure all he desires from which to make butter and yet compel the average citizen to pay 16 points for butter?

3. How much longer is the O. P. A. going to, knowingly or unknowingly, protect the oleo interests by not putting a ceiling on oleo? Since there is an O. P. A. ceiling of some 11 cents on soybean oil, 13 cents plus on cottonseed oil, 13 cents on peanut oil, and 12½ to 14½ cents per pound on powdered skim, and since the oleo institute in its table shows that these products make up a large percentage of the ingredients of this concoction, why should there be much difficulty in arriving at a ceiling? Why does the O. P. A. allow this oleo to sell for 17 cents to 29 cents per pound with a 12-cent spread when they seem to have been able to figure out to a mathematical nicety as to just what the ceiling should be on a bottle of milk, a pound of cheese, a pound of butter, and even a pound of powdered skim?

4. Why does the O. P. A. allow filled milk to be sold point free and evidently with not even a ceiling price on it? At least it sells for 9 cents per can in Illinois while here in Washington three cans of good natural evaporated milk with natural butter fat in it can be bought for 26 cents. I in no way hold the O. P. A. responsible for the 7,600 tons of tin plate allocated to this filled-milk industry the past 2 years as I realize that was done by the W. P. B., but I would like very much to know how the O. P. A. can know exactly how to ration and fix prices in the dairy industry, but appear to be helpless when it comes to a substitute that includes largely two ingredients on both of which the O. P. A. has already placed a ceiling.

If the O. P. A. is not to operate to give every individual equal consideration, it is not living up to its obligation. As long as the O. P. A. provides the cream for the man with the price, and then does not even allow the average citizen to secure desirable foods made from skim milk, something is wrong with the picture.

Please accept this letter in the spirit in which it is sent. I will very much appreciate your early answers to my questions.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

On January 21, 1944, I received the following reply:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1944.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 15, in which you request a reply to your questions regarding rationing of certain dairy products and ceiling prices on filled and modified milks and margarine.

The questions will be answered in the order in which they were stated.

1. How much longer is the O. P. A. going to let the man with the price obtain cream without points, and make the average citizen pay 5 points for cottage cheese made from the skim milk?

2. How much longer is the O. P. A. going to allow cream to go point free so that the man with the price can secure all he desires from which to make butter, and yet compel the average citizen to pay 16 points for butter?

Determinations as to what foods shall be placed under rationing by the Office of Price Administration are made by the War Food Administration. This Agency rations food commodities after receiving a directive from that Agency instructing the rationing and stating the quantity to be distributed for civilian consumption.

In answer to questions 1 and 2, in the case of fluid milk and cream we have not received a directive and therefore have no control over their distribution. However, we have been directed to ration creamed cottage cheese containing 5 percent or over butterfat, but have no authority to ration cottage cheese of between 4 percent and 5 percent butterfat content.

(3) How much longer is the O. P. A. going to knowingly or unknowingliy protect the oleo interests by not putting a ceiling on oleo?

Oleomargarine is under price control at all levels. Prices at the manufacturer's level are determined in accordance with the provisions of the General Maximum Price Regulation, i. e., prices at this level may not exceed the highest price charged during March 1942. Wholesale and retail prices of this product are determined in accordance with the provisions of Maximum Price Regulations Nos. 421, 422, and 423, which provide for fixed mark-ups over cost to the wholesaler and retailer. We are now engaged in planning a detailed cost and financial survey of margarine manufacturers, and on the basis of the information gained from this survey a decision will be made as to whether any further price action is necessary.

4. Why does the O. P. A. allow filled milk to be sold point free and evidently with not even a ceiling price on it?

When the War Food Administration directed the rationing of evaporated and condensed milk, consideration was given to the rationing of modified and filled milk. At that time, it was decided that filled milk should not be rationed since the production of it is controlled under ration order 16. The rationing of filled and modified milk offers some disadvantages in that it would be necessary to also ration baby formula milk sold through some fifty-odd-thousand retail drug stores. This is due to the fact that a definition cannot be devised which would include filled milk and exclude baby formula milk.

Filled milk prices were frozen at the highest price charged during the period of September 29 to October 2, 1942. The mark-up on filled milk depends upon the class of store through

which the milk is marketed, as shown in the following table:

Class store:	*Retail mark-up (percent)*
1	20
2	20
3	10
4	9

Class store:	*Wholesale mark-up (percent)*
1. Retailer-owned cooperatives	0.035
2. Cash and carry	.035
3. Service and delivery	.045
4. Institutional	.095

We appreciate your interest in this matter and should you have any further question, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the points I wish to call to your attention are first, how easy it is for one agency to pass the buck to another agency by saying no one has asked them to ration a product like cream in this instance, secondly, that oleo has been frozen at all levels as of March 1942. The oleo hearings brought out that oleo was selling for from 17½ to 29 cents a pound, or a 70 percent spread, while the price of butter had been pegged at 46 cents per pound Chicago, without difficulty and without having consulted with the industry. Thirdly, I wish to call attention to the helplessness acknowledged by the Office of Price Administration in their answer about the concoction known as filled milk. This, a synthetic product, is allowed to sell for as much as the natural evaporated milk and the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. publicly admit their inability to meet the situation.

The dairy industry is being attacked from still another angle due to the fact that the W. F. A. and O. P. A. are allowing a new synthetic concoction known as creamola to be sold evidently without rationing. This concoction is composed of vegetable oils and unrationed cream.

Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, our recent experiences with legislation concerning the Commodity Credit Corporation prompt me to take this moment to express the hope that the same procedure will not be found necessary when the time comes to extend the life of another agency which expires very shortly. I here make reference to the Price Control Act which expires on June 30 of this year. The functions of this much discussed agency have received our attention perhaps more than any other agency on the home front. Hardly a day passes in this Chamber when something is not said about them. The time to examine all the various angles and problems that confront our people as a result of the operation of the Price Control Act is when it comes up for renewal. With this object in mind and, of course, anticipating that a thorough examination of the operations of the O. P. A. will take place when its extension comes up for action, I have written to every chairman of every ration board in my State to obtain their views, their suggestions, and their advice. The response was most pleasing. To date I have received over 70 letters from the respective chairmen of the ration boards out of a possible 186. While they all agree that the Price Control Act is most essential at this time, most of them suggest corrections in the administration of the act and possible legislation by way of amendment.

I am giving these letters a most thorough study and hope to give the Members of this House the benefit of the views expressed.

I believe that my State could be used as a good source of correct information because by far and large the members of the boards and their chairmen are unbiased patriotic citizens who would not allow partisan politics or prejudice to affect their views.

We have in our State large industrial communities composed of a cosmopolitan population and then we have the small rural communities in small farm districts which are apt to be found in any part of our country.

These people are all volunteer workers and sacrifice every moment of their spare time for the success of this agency.

It is little wonder then that the most common suggestion and desire expressed in these letters thus far is that the orders and regulations issued by the price control agency be written in plain simple English language; easy to understand in order that it may be simple to put them into operation.

I shall have more to say about the various expressions of opinion. At this moment, however, may I again express the hope that when the time comes to extend the life of the O. P. A. and when certain improvements will be made in it, we shall not be confronted by a Presidential veto and then forced to make only temporary extensions while the administration runs the O. P. A. in a manner that will please its own whims and disregard the will of the majority of the people.

Congressman Edwin Arthur Hall Answers C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on February 19, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, last week outside organizers of the C. I. O. paid a lot of money to write me an open letter and feature it in a big expensive newspaper ad. In this letter they laid the law down to me and warned that the next move is mine.

If I had a campaign fund of over a half million dollars, such as the public press recently announced that the C. I. O. has on hand to try to defeat all Congressmen at the polls this year whom they don't like or who won't do just as they tell them, I, too, would buy space in the newspapers to answer them. But I don't have a big campaign fund. I have to depend on friends to support me; and, by the way, I'd rather have my friends in the Triple Cities with me than all the dollars in the C. I. O. war chest.

But to get back to the letter they wrote me, I wouldn't be financially able to answer it if it weren't for my friends in the Hall Furlough Clubs, those patriotic women who are backing up their men so generously and bravely at home. I want to thank my sponsors for making this time possible to answer such vicious charges.

Out-of-town agents of the C. I. O. are saying I don't answer my mail. They know better. I have answered every letter they have written me if the address of the sender was on it. Nearly half the writers didn't let me know where they lived.

They warn me that the next move is mine. What do they mean? Do they think they can scare me? These out-of-town agents haven't lived around here long enough to find out that I do not respond to the pressure or the threats of a few would-be dictators. I was elected by the people of my district to represent them, and I have never and will never, as long as I am in Congress, take orders from outsiders.

No, boys; I think the next move is yours. Prove your interest in the soldiers by buying newspaper ads to help me, not hinder me. Let the people of this district know you are true friends of the soldiers by getting behind the Hall furlough bill now. Why not adopt a resolution endorsing the Hall bill just as the patriotic Building and Construction Trades Council of Binghamton, which is affiliated with American Federation of Labor and the Binghamton Central Labor Union, has done. At this time I want to express my most sincere thanks to the boys of this A. F. of L. union.

The majority of the membership of the C. I. O. who are residents in the Triple Cities are my friends. I want to do business with them, not with outsiders. They are the ones who want to help the soldiers. They are the ones who want their boys to vote.

To them, I will say that I have voted for every bill brought before Congress which will allow their sons to vote. Why not? My own election depends upon the votes I, myself, must receive from the boys who have gone across. I would be cutting off my nose to spite my face if I did anything different.

The Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert in the RECORD the following broadcast made by Rupert Hughes on February 5, 1944, as I think this is a very good discussion on the soldier vote bill:

Patience overcomes all things—including usually the patient. As far back as September 5, I told you all how I had been trying to get a telephone message through, not to Uncle Sam but to Uncle Joe.

I wanted to tell Marshal Stalin that, while he and his troops were doing a grand job in their own country, there were a lot of American Communists who were making us see red over here. I tried to tell him how little credit they were to him, and I begged him to disown them or call them over to Russia, where they could enjoy the blessings of communism direct instead of living in this benighted republic and peddling second-hand pink ideologies.

Perhaps he had as much trouble getting me on the phone as I had in not getting him. Be that as it may, he has just told the American Communists to disband as a party, to dissolve, disperse, get the—well, get out of business, put up the shutters, and shut up the shop.

Now, if they obey Stalin, it proves that they are not good Americans. If they disobey him, they are no better Americans than they were before. So it's a case of—commies if they do; commies if they don't; commies anyhow.

Unfortunately, when Stalin told them to commit hara-kiri, he advised them to join the Democratic or the Republican Parties. Earl Browder, their perennial Presidential candidate, promptly obeyed and dispersed himself and began to praise his former opponent, President Roosevelt. For a less popular candidate that would amount to what is known as the kiss of death.

I can't imagine either a Democratic or a Republican candidate boasting publicly of his Communist supporters. Bill Nye said that there were three classes of persons entitled to use the word "we"; royalty, editors, and people with tapeworms. Hereafter, when a candidate says "we," you can know what ails him.

Earl Browder and his ex-Communists have actually come out now for free enterprise. Hitherto they accused everybody who wasn't a Communist of being a Fascist. Now they're Fascist. What will they do for epithets now that Stalin has written their epitaph? He wrote another epitaph this week, it seems to me. Vast numbers of good people have been dreaming of, and planning for, a bigger and better league of nations, or some form of one-world federation with its own police force. Stalin has just put the Gypsy's curse on it before it is born.

We have been thinking of Russia as a peculiarly unified government under one supreme head. Now Molotov announces that hereafter it is to be regarded as 16 individual republics, each empowered to enter into direct relations with foreign states and make treaties with them. This is as embarrassing as inviting a gentleman to drop in for the week end and having him bring along his wife and 14 children.

The 16 republics are at present in fact only 11 for 5 of them are only, in Molotov's words, "preparing for imminent liberation."

The Soviet Constitution of 1936 divided Russia into 11 republics. In 1940 were added Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, the portion taken from Poland, to be called Moldavia, and the segment to be taken from Finland, called the Karelo-Finnish Republic.

In all these five republics there are elements that denounce the so-called liberation as confiscation and enslavement. But who is to hear their arguments or heed their protests? Can anybody still pretend that there will ever be a parliament of nations or a world court with power and willingness to issue a summons or an injunction in the case of *Five Little Nations* v. *Stalin et al.*? Can anybody seriously count on an international police force with power to enter Russia carrying a search warrant and a writ of replevin?

Who is to be the chief of such a police force? Who is to drive the patrol wagon? Who are to be the policemen? How many? And how armed? Who is to adjudicate the case?

Only today I received another letter denouncing me as an enemy of humanity and peace for saying that the international police force would never get itself ever organized. Do you think it will? If it is not powerful enough to coerce the most powerful nations, it can only be an instrument of convenience for keeping the weak nations suppressed.

But before you can even begin your international police force, you have to establish an international government and world court with jurisdiction acknowledged and unresisted. There is constant talk of reviving and enlarging the League of Nations with the United States as a member this time.

I can't believe for a moment that when it comes to a show-down our country will show up. After the last World War, there was immense talk about the eagerness of our people to enter the League and the thwarting of their desire by a few wilful politicians. But when the League became the issue of the Presidential race between Cox and Harding, the American people were so overwhelmingly against it that somebody—Will Rogers, I believe—said, "It wasn't an election; it was a census."

One of the chief reasons for our refusal to enter the last league was the fact that, while we should have had one vote, the British Empire under its new name and set-up would have had five votes. That was right and proper because each dominion was an independent member of the British Commonwealth, able to enter a war or stay out of a war, no matter what the other dominions did.

If another league should be organized, the British group would probably claim even more than the 5 votes, and with perfect justice. Now if Russia should come in, she would claim 16 votes.

Can anybody imagine the United States entering a league or a world federation or what-you-may-call-it, in which Great Britain stands at the door with 5 votes and Greater Russia stands there with 16, and they say to Uncle Sam, "come on in, you with your 1 vote."

I cannot believe that any real world federation is humanly possible. It seems to me that no end of preliminary trouble and eventual confusion has been saved by the blunt candor of the Russians.

Our common sense and our Constitution both forestall our entry into any such league with nothing like a parity of votes; and no officer has any authority to make any surrender of sovereignty. He would be guilty of treason if he tried to.

Our own little federation of forty-eighters is in a bit of a pandemonium over the soldiers' vote. The President tells the State representatives in Congress assembled that they are trying to put over a fraud on the soldiers. He has little respect for their references to constitutional difficulties. But in 1935 when he urged the passage of the Guffey coal bill, he said: "I hope your committee will not permit doubt as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the proposed legislation." Congress obeyed, and passed the bill. The Supreme Court promptly annulled it as unconstitutional.

The President organized the gigantic N. R. A. and the Court killed it in an afternoon.

As for voting, the Constitution is exceedingly explicit in putting the whole matter into the hands of the States. It does say that in the matter of electing Senators and Congressmen, Congress itself may make slight changes. But as to electing the President and Vice President it is very rigid. The States elect the electors themselves as they please and the electors elect the President. Anything else is absolutely illegal. Soldiers and everybody else must vote for Presidential electors selected by their States. There is no such thing as a national ballot. The idea violates the A B C's of our Constitution.

It dazes me to hear and read so much violent talk about cheap politicians in Congress trying to cheat the soldiers out of their votes. I always supposed that the cheaper the politician, the more he is interested in votes. A politician who would calmly rob thousands of his best customers of their votes while they are in the Army would have to be singularly indifferent to what they would do to him at the next election.

I don't know anybody in this country who would deny that everybody in the armed forces has a better right to vote than anybody else. To disfranchise our heroes and heroines deliberately is unthinkable. In the last local elections 48,000 soldiers voted. But the national election is enormously more complex.

The Congressmen naturally want to have a little say about who distributes the campaign material, who qualifies the voters, who collects and counts the ballots.

The Republican objection to the bobtailed ballot is rather natural and based on experience. They don't want the soldiers' vote collected and delivered by the Democrats. And the Democrats don't trust the Republicans.

If the soldiers' votes were all handled as the President wants them to be and as the first Green-Lucas bill proposed, the whole election might very well be voided.

Suppose that President Roosevelt should be reelected or re-re-reelected; and then suppose that as he was about to take his fourth oath, some nasty Republicans stood up and said, "Stop! Halt! We forbid the banns. The election was a violation of the Constitution."

Then suppose it was taken to the Supreme Court or thrown back into a Congress which might very easily have a Republican majority. In all the hurricane of talking and writing about the coming election, I haven't heard anybody refer to a previous Presidential election, also under partial military control as this one must be. It came near plunging the country into a new Civil War—only 11 years after the previous Civil War. The war was averted by a miracle, and the President was declared elected by one vote 1 day before inauguration day. And then by a majority of only 1 electoral vote.

In 1861–65 while the Republicans were winning the War between the States, a radical element arose that nearly defeated Lincoln for reelection and would probably have impeached him if he had lived. His Vice Presidential successor was impeached and came within one vote of being convicted and custed. After the war, the carpetbaggers inflicted reconstruction on the South with such horrible results that the Republicans lost control of Congress in 1875.

Appalling scandals besmirched the good name of President Grant and when it was hinted that he might accept a third term, the House, in which the Democrats had a majority, passed a resolution, 234 to 18, declaring that a third term would be "unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

The Republicans nominated General Hayes, Governor of Ohio. The Democrats nominated Governor Tilden of New York. The carpetbaggers still controlled Florida, Louisiana and South Carolina. There were bloody race riots, and Federal troops were called out.

The election returns gave Tilden 184 votes for sure and Hayes was lost unless he could win Florida, Louisiana and South Carolina, and even then, he would have only 185 against Tilden's 184.

The country rang with charges of corruption, bribery, intimidation, perjury, and forgery. In South Carolina, both Republican and Democratic electors declared their candidates elected. In Florida, the Republicans claimed the State by only 45 votes; the Democrats claimed it by only 90. Electors of both parties voted for their candidates. Two Governors were inaugurated.

In Louisiana, the Democrats claimed a majority of 6,000. The Republicans rejected most of the polls as illegal. The electors of both parties voted for their candidates.

Congress met on December 6 in a state of tension like that preceding the Civil War. Many Democrats vowed to put Tilden in the White House, by force of arms if necessary. The Republicans were ready to meet violence with violence. It was decided to submit the matter to an electoral commission, including five Justices of the Supreme Court.

After unbearable suspense, the commission by one vote declared that Hayes was elected by one vote—1 day before inauguration day. If Governor Tilden had not nobly used all his influence, the infuriated Democrats would have started a revolution.

That is what happened once. It could happen again. Such turmoils are part of a free government. They are better than slavery.

The National Constitution has brought us through 157 years of storm and stress. It recognizes the State constitutions. Let us not tamper with the foundations of our security and our freedom.

The soldiers must vote. A way must be found. They are fighting for the American Republic of federated States. For those on the home front so to violate the laws of the States and of the United States that the soldiers' votes will be thrown out as illegal and unconstitutional would be ruinous to them and to us and to the cause of human freedom. The Constitution is the obstacle to a free and easy solution of the soldiers' votes—if one may call an obstacle that great document that has been our Gibraltar, our Rock of Ages.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter giving the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: We believe you will be interested in having some current facts concerning the progress in liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State.

Out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value, including subsequent advances chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly three and one-half billions of dollars. Of this amount, 16,611 loans were closed in Alabama, representing an aggregate amount of $41,194,599.

Citizens of Alabama can take real pride in the way its home owners who formerly were in distress and were helped by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, have shown a determination to pay off their obligations. They are not only reducing their interest expense and increasing their equities, but they are also by this process making a substantial contribution to the Nation's anti-inflation program of private debt reduction.

The total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Alabama, together with the value of the properties acquired, has now been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $17,750,975, equivalent to 56.8 percent. A total of 3,838 borrowers have paid their accounts in full, and approximately 1,615 borrowers are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contract. The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure a total of 3,126 properties. As of September 30, 1943, all but 11 of these have been sold. From August 1939, pursuant to an act of Congress which authorized the extension of loans in justifiable cases from the original 15 years to a maximum of 25 years, a total of 4,858 loans of the Corporation in Alabama were extended.

Despite extensions and the delay of payments of some who are still unable to meet their obligations on time, the Corporation in its Nation-wide operations has liquidated its assets to the extent of 57 percent as of September 30, 1943.

Certainly the people of this country can well be proud of this record, particularly when it is recalled that legislation in 1933 providing for the longest term amortized mortgage at the most reasonable interest rate on properties that as a class were the poorest financial risks, was the most advanced measure ever undertaken for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership. You will recall that the average H. O. L. C. borrower, at the time his loan was refinanced, was delinquent 2 years on his mortgage payments, in arrears 2 to 3 years on his taxes, and was either facing foreclosure or had already lost his home.

Such a record should be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original H. O. L. C. legislation by a nonpartisan and virtually unanimous vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, in Behalf of Candidacy of Carl Wuertele

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a radio speech I made today in behalf of Maj. Carl Wuertele, candidate on the Democratic ticket for Congress in the First District of Colorado.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Voters of Denver, it is my pleasure today to talk to you on the subject, Swat the Japs and Swat the Bureaucrats but Elect Major Wuertele.

The First Congressional District has the unhappy task on March 7 of filling the position made vacant by the untimely death of Lawrence Lewis. While in a sense his place can never be filled, yet someone should be selected to go to Washington with the capacity to grow and develop into an able and influential representative for this very important district.

TOSSED TO THE WOLVES

During the past 10 days I have received many disturbing letters from Denver voters with respect to this special congressional election. A friend who is not a Democrat writes today, "Carl Wuertele is a good boy and I hate to see him tossed to the wolves. I have not seen signs of support from the Democrats." Many, many other letters carry the same disquieting message. Folks, this isn't right. Carl Wuertele was pushed into this race. He was drafted for public service if ever a man was drafted. He accepted only when he became convinced that the office would give him a further opportunity to fight the Japs. Carl Wuertele was the first aviator to get into the air that day at Pearl Harbor and he fought the sneaking invaders with all he had until they disappeared in retreat far out on the broad Pacific, and now Denver tosses him to the wolves.

FIRST AT GUADALCANAL

Carl didn't stop fighting the unspeakable Japs when they were driven from Pearl Harbor. He followed them into the jungle and the volcanic islands of the South Pacific. He was the first American pilot to land on Guadalcanal. The mud never got too deep, the going too tough, nor the weather too bad for Carl Wuertele. He destroyed Japs on the earth, on the sea, and in the air. His breast was covered with citations for daring and blood-curdling blows struck at the enemy. He had the adventurous spirit and the indomitable will of Colin Kelly, and now Denver tosses him to the wolves. I refuse to believe it.

ANKLE SHOT AWAY

Came the day when Major Wuertele was shot out of the air; when his fighting days were at an end. No longer could he hide in the clouds and when the sun was just right pounce upon the enemy. Major Wuertele was sent home for his wounds to heal. His combat days were over; but with your help he will continue to fight until the pagan enemies of mankind have been driven from the earth. Since he was released from Fitzsimons Hospital he has hobbled about, not cursing the war agencies and bellyaching about everything in general, but he has been doing what he could to strengthen the morale of the people on the home front.

HIS BUDDIES NEED HIM

I cannot believe that the War Dads or the Army and Navy Mothers, will permit Major Wuertele to be tossed to the wolves. He is the buddy of their flesh and blood now fighting on all the war fronts and these patriotic parents will resent every effort to toss him to the wolves. His buddies need him in Congress and if they had the ballot they would vote for him to the last man. The parents of these fine Americans fighting and dying all over the world will send Major Wuertele to Washington.

REARED IN DENVER

This boy was reared in Denver. He is the product of Denver's public school system. A fine, clean, wholesome, manly, athletic chap—the sort that warms the cockles of your heart when you see him giving his best on the old gridiron for his beloved high. No, Denver will not toss him to the wolves! Denver will elect Major Wuertele to Congress!

PATRIOTISM

In public life today we need men who have faced gunfire without flinching—aggressive men with fire in their hearts and iron in their souls. Let's not toss Major Wuertele to the wolves, rather let's toss him against the wolves who would destroy this Republic. His patriotism was tempered and tested under enemy fire and not exploited by shadow-boxing on the home front with the straw men of discontent.

SOLDIERS OF DISCONTENT

Speaking of discontent, let's consider OPA, the major sore spot, as exhibit A. If any crimes were committed in adopting the present national policy of price control, both political parties are to blame. Both parties worked out its provisions and both parties in Congress voted for its enactment. Chester Bowles, the Administrator at Washington, is a Republican. Richard Batterton, Rocky Mountain regional director, is a Republican. George Bull, State director, is a Republican. Sixty-five percent of the personnel of WPB are Republicans and I think the same holds true of O. P. A. O. P. A. was not created to oppress and persecute the people. It was created to protect the people and to equalize among them the Nation's inadequate supplies of food, fuel, and clothing. Its administration has been spotted and in some instances vicious. But good or bad, Major Wuertele had absolutely nothing to do with its adoption by the Congress, nor with its administration by the President.

SWAT THE JAPS

The opposition battle cry to defeat Major Wuertele is "Swat the bureaucrats!" Fine! Splendid! But Major Wuertele isn't a bureaucrat. He was swatting Japs on the battle front when bureaucracy took over on the home front. Voters, don't swat Major Wuertele, swat his traducers. It is striking below the belt for Denver to make Major Wuertele the whipping boy for all the discomforts, inconveniences, and outright blunderings on the home front. Obnoxious Washington regulations and Washington stupidity and Washington arbitrariness have been nothing short of scandalous; but what has that to do with Major Wuertele? He was not a party to any of these mistakes and he will do his best to correct them.

CONTEMPT FOR BUREAUCRATS

Voters are urged to oppose his election to show their contempt for Washington bureaucrats. That's like taking a healthy kick at the dog because the toast was burnt. Such an attitude is not worthy of intelligent, fair-minded Denver voters. Major Wuertele had no more to do with launching this unfortunate Nation on a program of bureaucracy and regimentation than did General MacArthur. While Senator TAFT (Republican) and Senator Brown (Democrat) were urging their colleagues of both political parties to vote for O. P. A., Major Wuertele was helping General MacArthur swat the Japs.

YOUNG MEN GROW OLD

If Denver is going to stone him, let the Denver citizen who has done more to win this war step forth and hurl the first stone. It is whispered that Major Wuertele is too young and too inexperienced. Stuff and nonsense! Out where it is a Jap's life or yours, the too young and the too inexperienced don't come back. Your own young son became a grown man in his first hour of combat service. If you don't believe that wait until you talk with him.

MUST HAVE MERIT

A man without pull or influence and with nothing to offer doesn't rise from the status of an enlisted man to the rank of major in a few short months. Such unusual progress calls for merit of the highest order. The Army does not promote men because they wear a military cap well. It promotes them for what is under that cap. Make no mistake—Major Wuertele has what is required. I have talked to his superior officers and I know what they think of his ability and I know what they think of his capacity.

HULL WAS INEXPERIENCED

Most of the outstanding congressional leaders in Washington came here as young and inexperienced men. They made public service their career. Secretary Hull is an outstanding example. His value to his Nation cannot be calculated in dollars and cents. No one reaches the top in Congress by a short cut. It takes a long time before any man is accepted. Therefore wise congressional districts have sent young men to Congress and have kept them there to develop political strength and gain legislative wisdom with the years. Recently Colorado lost the most powerful Member of Congress, Ed Taylor, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Ed Taylor earned his place of honor and distinction by long and faithful service. It cannot be acquired any other way.

YOUR DAY IN COURT

On November 7, not March 7, will be the time to call President Roosevelt to task for his sins if any he has. November 7 will be the day to repudiate the New Deal and the administration, if you are mad at them. That will be your day in court to protest against Washington bureaucrats. Don't take your spite out on the man who was away fighting your war and had less to do with these things than you yourself.

NEW DEAL IS A FRAUD

As I see it the New Deal has been the worst fraud ever perpetrated on the American people. It has bankrupted the Federal Treasury and it has tried with considerable success to destroy the free-enterprise system. I wouldn't walk across the street to give aid or comfort to a rubber-stamp New Deal candidate for Congress. They come a dime a dozen down here in Washington and I have yet to see one worth the salt in his bean soup. But everything that has been done in Washington in the past 12 years has not been bad. Much that has been done is good, sound, wholesome, and permanent. What the Nation needs is discriminating Congressmen with the courage and intelligence to support the good and reject the bad—discriminating Congressmen, free to separate the wheat from the chaff.

AVOID NEGATIVE REACTION

What the Nation needs is a fearless, forward-looking Congress prepared to assume its constitutional responsibility and take quick decisive action. It would be a major disaster for this country to have a faint-hearted or negative and reactionary Congress that would strike down everything that was proposed merely because it hated the proposer. Somewhere between State socialism on the one hand, and negative reaction on the other, lies the road America must travel. If we would preserve this Republic, we must steer a middle course and avoid the temptation of a sham Utopia purchased with borrowed money, and we must avoid the stagnation of stupid and petrified reaction. This is a time for courage, common sense, and discrimination. I am convinced that Major Wuertele has them in abundance.

ALL RUBBER STAMPS ARE BAD

If Denver would serve her interest and the interest of the Nation, she will elect this promising young man to Congress and keep him there. In time if she does so, she will have a powerful voice in the affairs of the Nation and the world. One learns to be a Congressman only by serving in Congress. Older men discover this when they get down here; they soon become dissatisfied and feel lost and out of place. Youth, and a fresh viewpoint with freedom of action, is what Washington needs most. There are many varieties of rubber stamps in Washington. All of them are bad. Some are rubber stamps for the President; others are rubber stamps for pressure groups, and still others are rubber stamps for special interests. Major Wuertele is not a rubber stamp for anyone. He is clean. He is wholesome. He is bold and resourceful. He is new. He thinks straight and acts quickly. Otherwise the Japs would have brought him down.

UNDER OBLIGATION TO NO ONE

Major Wuertele is under obligation to no one. He didn't ask to run for Congress. He didn't even volunteer to run. He was drafted. I have never known a candidate to be in a more advantageous position. He doesn't owe the New Deal anything. He doesn't owe any faction or any pressure group a thing on this earth. He can take his oath of office without one mental reservation. His obligation will be to his constituents of the First Congressional District and to the United States of America. He wore the uniform of his beloved country with honor and distinction. Equally well he will grace the toga of congressional service.

Denver will do well on March 7 to elect Major Wuertele to Congress.

Smear Force Sets Stage To Keep F. D. In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Frank Hughes from the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1944:

SMEAR FORCE SETS STAGE TO KEEP F. D. IN—ALL OPPOSITION PURGED BY FOURTH TERMERS

(By Frank Hughes)

The 1944 Presidential election campaign is opening.

The plans and plots of the persons who are seeking to perpetuate Mr. Roosevelt in office through a fourth term by winning that campaign for him form one of the most momentous chapters in the history of the Republic. Abraham Lincoln said that "when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen * * * and when we see those timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few * * * in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that * * * all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft, drawn up before the first blow was struck."

REFERRED TO SLAVE PLOTTERS

Lincoln was talking about the plot of the slavery advocates who fitted the beams of the Dred Scott decision and the Nebraska Act and the different timbers of planned delay and timed endorsement into a carefully blueprinted framework so that President Buchanan might be elected and the cause of slavery forwarded in a dissident and slowly angering Nation.

That was 86 years ago, and the framework is vastly different today, but the timbers are being cut, mortised, and proportioned, the new ones to fit the old, by a group of men far more skilled and more sinister than the political "workmen" Lincoln exposed in 1858.

The issue then was slavery against freedom. Today it is American nationalism and individualism—and the nationalists' demands for more efficient conduct of the war—against Mr. Roosevelt's internationalism and collectivism.

The people who want America to continue as a sovereign and unfettered republic also want to win the war without any further bungling and without the profligate waste of money, materials, and the lives of soldiers that has characterized Mr. Roosevelt's conduct of it so far.

RELY ON SMEAR AND PURGE

To beat down this powerful and rising demand from the whole of America, Mr. Roosevelt and the internationalists are relying on the New Deal's old and trusted weapons, the smear and the purge.

The idea is to vilify your opponents and discredit them in the eyes of the electorate if they are Republicans or honest Democrats, and to purge them out of their elective offices if they are Senators or Congressmen.

It worked in 1936 and 1938, and to some extent in 1940, although it backfired sadly in the congressional elections of 1942. But the White House palace guard already has sent out directives to try it again in 1944 in a last-ditch do-or-die offensive.

SMELLY OPPORTUNISTS

The purge and smear brigade is, for most part, a smelly group of opportunists, and its most interesting and most notorious goon squad is the proadministration press. This consists of a few old-line newspapers which once had sterling community reputations and which are allied now for Roosevelt with the Communist rags and the come-lately playboy sheets.

The founders of these once respectable newspapers would have recognized the owners of the latter publications only for purposes of horse-whipping.

Most of the smear newspapers like to be called Independent Republican or Independent Democratic, although all of them have so far departed from any Republican or Democratic political philosophies that the names have no meaning.

LOOKS LIKE COLLUSION

So similar is the editorial and news policy of these sheets that they might be the work of one editor. Their identical direction is sufficient evidence that they are working in collusion, and there is reason to believe that the director of this collusion is ex-Judge Sammy Rosenman, the current field marshal of the White House palace guard.

The Independent Republican wing of the international press is not yet ready to acknowledge that it has sold out its readers to Mr. Roosevelt, so it has adopted Wendell Willkie as a presidential stalking horse to uphold the Republican end of the label. All of these newspapers are in Mr. Roosevelt's pocket, but they do not dare to admit it openly, so they support Willkie, the man Mr. Roosevelt can always beat.

Among them are the New York Herald Tribune, the leading pro-British organ in the United States; the Milwaukee Journal, the Cowles papers in Des Moines and Minneapolis, the Detroit Free Press, Akron Beacon Journal, Miami Herald, and other holdings of John S. Knight; the Adler newspapers of Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Wisconsin, known as the Lee Syndicate, and Henry Luce's Time-Life-Fortune magazine axis.

WILLKIE HAS HIS FOLLOWING

Mr. Willkie also has plenty of apologists among the other internationalist newspapers which do not advertise themselves as Republican, but pretend to tell Republicans how to vote.

These include the New York Post, now operated by Mrs. Dorothy Backer, the daughter of an international banker, the late Mortimer Schiff—she was married to Theodore O. Thackery July 30, 1943—J. David Stern's Philadelphia Record, Eugene Meyer's Washington Post, the Marshall Field press in New York and Chicago, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the once fearless St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Press, Plain Dealer, and News of Cleveland.

Their content is the same, except for different type fonts and column rules.

The financing of some of these newspapers through the inheritance of great estates and of others through intrigue with the New Deal's financial giants and Government-operated banks is a chapter that will be dealt with separately in ensuing articles.

Rubbing around the legs of the internationalist publishers are the more vicious practitioners of the gutter grade of smearing, the radio commentators and columnists. They also take their orders from Mr. Rosenman.

WINCHELL'S CRACK AT RANKIN

The whirling dervish of this cloak-and-dagger gang is a radio commentator and columnist who goes by the name of Walter Winchell, and who has done more to stir up anti-Semitism in America than the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, or all the Naziphile organizations he berates.

Winchell recently smeared Representative RANKIN (Democrat), of Mississippi, by calling him "Reprehensible RANKIN," of the "House of Reprehensibles." The Congressman replied before the House that Winchell's real name is Lipschitz and that he "does not represent the decent Jews of America."

David Lawrence, a columnist who imbibed his internationalism from Woodrow Wilson, is somewhat more calm and much more grammatical. He trades on the liberal label that the internationalists and Communists have tried to swipe for a drawing card and calls Republicans who oppose Willkie reactionaries, as if the Wall Street millionaires, who put Willkie over at Philadelphia in 1940 and are trying to do it again this year, are or ever were noted for their liberalism, political or otherwise.

PULITZER IN REVERSE

When Joseph Pulitzer died in 1911, he left two outstanding newspapers, the New York World and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Within 20 years the World failed, in the opinion of the editor of its successful competitor, J. M. Patterson, largely because of its un-American editorial attitude after Pulitzer's death.

Walter Lippmann was editor of the World at the time of its demise. Lippmann is just another columnist now, although he has been in the business long enough and has collected enough college degrees to be known in the trade as a pundit. He used to be an isolationist, but now he abhors pre-war nonintervention and whoops it up for an Anglo-American alliance and collective security.

Mr. Lippmann thinks collective security is fine for every State except Poland, the causus belli of the present conflict, which he is willing to turn over to the "humanitarian" administration of Communist Russia to help the New Dealers out of a spot.

SMEAR BATTALION LEADERS

The real senior wardens of the smear battalion are the members of the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party, headed by Mr. Roosevelt, who is no mean besmircher himself.

It was the President who sent a German Iron Cross to John O'Donnell, Washington correspondent of the Nationalist New York Daily News, on the eve of the trial of O'Donnell's $50,000 libel suit against David Stern's internationalist Philadelphia Record.

O'Donnell won the suit in spite of the President's insult, the jury awarding him $50,000 without knowing that was the amount he sued for. The common pleas court in Philadelphia set the verdict aside, and the case is now awaiting a new trial.

STARTED ON HOOVER

Charles Michelson, the New Deal press agent, is a supreme artist in the tactics of the smear. He started smearing President Hoover in the late twenties and has imparted much of his veteran skill to the young and ambitious New Dealers operating today.

Working happily in this heterogeneous army of vilifiers is the Communist Party of America, whose members are old hands at the game and got their technique as well as most of their cash at the fountainhead in Moscow. Attorney General Francis Biddle found officially that the Communist Party has long been subsidized by Soviet Russia to overthrow the American Government "by force and violence."

That does not stop Mr. Biddle's boss from making use of the Communists. Their leader is Earl Browder, whom Mr. Roosevelt pardoned from a Federal prison sentence for passport fraud and who is paying the debt through one-night stands on the Roosevelt chautauqua circuit.

BROWDER'S ABOUT-FACE

The party has numerous fronts and outlets, including the Soviet subsidized Daily Worker in New York, whose denunciation of isolationists is equaled only by its fulminations against the interventionists who wanted to go to war from August 1939 to June 1941 while Russia was an ally of Germany and Communists were picketing the White House against war and sabotaging war production.

None of the internationalists like to have attention called to the Daily Worker's about-face because they are still trying to forget that Mr. Roosevelt said "again and again and again" in 1940 that "your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Among the front organizations working for the Communists or the New Dealers, or both, are the communistic New Masses and the pinko New Republic; the Union for Democratic Action, with which Mrs. Roosevelt recently associated herself; the communistic C. I. O., which has a new ultra-red and ultra-Roosevelt "political action committee"; and the Friends of Democracy, which is closely affiliated with the Luce press and other Willkie organs.

SMEAR BOOKS WRITTEN

The four-star generals of the smear brigade have not forgotten the more literate section of the electorate, and several smear books have been written, including Under Cover, the undocumented work of a many aliased hack who claims to have been a private investigator—so private that people he writes about say they never saw or heard of him.

The internationalists and collectivists are trying to elect Mr. Roosevelt again on a platform of thoroughgoing internationalism embracing a world supergovernment to enforce peace, the dissipation of American resources for the benefit of other nations, the establishment of an international W. P. A. at

American expense, the continuation of Government-controlled and subsidized enterprise, and the other features of a collectivist economy.

Mr. Roosevelt, unless he is convinced beforehand that he will be beaten, will stand for a fourth term on grounds that he is indispensable in the prosecution of the war and in the negotiation of the peace.

CONDUCT OF WAR BUNGLED

The nationalists who oppose him contend that he has bungled the conduct of the war from its very first day when his administration allowed the debacle at Pearl Harbor to occur in the face of repeated warnings from Secretary of State Hull that just such an attack could be expected from the Japanese.

The naticnalists say Mr. Roosevelt has had his head turned by European royalty and money interests who insist that the European war must be prosecuted first while America's most vicious and wanton enemy has been allowed to complete its Pacific conquests and for 2 years faced only token force opposition.

They blame Mr. Roosevelt's personal ambition to be the head of the first world supergovernment for his disregard of national interest and his benign trust in and subsidy of European allies. They accuse him of allowing the British and the Russians to set American strategy while drawing liberally on American lend-lease and American manpower for their battle needs.

DENOUNCED AS TRAITORS

The internationalists reply that the nationalists are unrepentant isolationists whose rejection of the League of Nations led to the Second World War and whose fear of surrendering a little sovereignty to a supernational agency to preserve peace will, if it prevails, doom mankind to perpetual war.

If this argument is weak in the face of close-at-hand facts, the internationalists intend to make it strong through the smear, through the pillory of the nationalists and the pre-war noninterventionists as defeatists and traitors.

More details of the way the smear campaign is working will be told in subsequent articles.

Tax Simplification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Corning Benton, treasurer, the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H., February 19, 1944:

DEAR MR. MERROW: I am writing a letter similar to this to the other three New Hampshire men in the House and the Senate. Probably you are getting many similar letters.

I think that our four representatives should do everything they can in the next year to help protect our citizens from the deplorable income tax situation which they are suffering under now. I don't mean the paying of taxes—I mean the method by which income tax data are declared.

It happens that I work in a community of unusually well educated people all of whom pay income taxes—and have for years. This year I have not talked with a person who could speak of his income tax without bewilderment and uncertainty. It is true that we have had deputies from Portsmouth who have come to Exeter to help people. But some people have had to sit waiting to see these men from 3 to 5 hours, and then find that even the deputies disagree on various points. Lawyers in town who make a business of income-tax returns are uncertain about many decisions. I have found no individual who has any assurance in filling out his form alone.

Patriotic people do not object to paying high taxes in wartime—they may even welcome it. But why can't it be possible to work out a system that at least compensates for the burden of high taxes with an easy method of declaration? Even that would make citizens feel better.

I don't know anything that the Government has done in recent years—and that is saying a lot—that has unsettled and baffled people so much as this income-tax job. Won't you work to help us out?

Respectfully yours,

CORNING BENTON.

Prestige of the United States and Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have here a very able article entitled "Slipping Prestige," by William Philip Simms, who writes for the Washington Daily News. In this article Mr. Simms refers to the precarious situation in Europe, particularly as it relates to power politics, the Atlantic Charter, and the like. I ask permission that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLIPPING PRESTIGE

(By William Philip Simms)

The prestige of the United States and Great Britain—so bright about the time of the Atlantic Charter and their first glowing championship of the weak against the strong in this war—is slipping.

"Today," said one of the most brilliant foreign diplomats in Washington, "America is still looked up to by small nations everywhere. On her they pin most of their hopes for justice during and after the war. It would be a most terrible thing—for them, for America, and for the world—if she failed them now."

Pretty strong language. But read this:

"Great Britain is calling forth such hatred and distrust amongst nations who have hoped so much from her," observes the 19th Century and After, independent London publication, "that she may, when she has won the war, find herself without a friend in Europe."

Behind what the Washington envoy and the London editor said was fundamentally the same thought, namely, that the apparent tendency of the two great democracies to abandon some of their less powerful friends in favor of the strong will eventually cost them dearly.

British policy in Yugoslavia was used by the London periodical to illustrate its point. Once King Peter's commander in the field, General Mihailovich, was in favor in Britain, it points out, and tributes were paid to him there. "But," says the magazine, now "they have ceased. Tito is officially in favor and that settles it. * * *"

"There is, in the British press," the publication proceeds, "an almost complete uniformity, from the Times to the Daily Herald, in the treatment of the Yugoslav situation—even the Daily Worker does not differ widely from the Times. This is but one of the many symptoms of the Gleichschaltung of the British press in the treatment of foreign affairs. * * * The British public was rarely so ill-informed with regard to foreign affairs as it is during the present war, * * * and Yugoslavia, although an Allied country, fares worst of all in the British press."

The reason, it is explained, is that Partisan communiques, coming from Tiflis, far from the battlefields, are publicized in Britain while those of Mihailovich, emanating from the scene, are not—the one being of Communist origin, the other Chetnik, or Serb. And the upshot of it all, concluded the magazine, is that "political warfare, as conducted by Great Britain, threatens to promote national unity in hostile countries and social upheaval in Allied countries," the ultimate result of which may leave her without a friend on the Continent.

I have heard much the same sort of comment applied to the United States. It is pointed out that American sincerity is also at stake in Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, and wherever else little nations are expecting us to live up to the Atlantic Charter and the pacts of Moscow. Even the republics of the Western Hemisphere—though not now menaced—are watching the outcome. They, too, want to know if the United States is a fair-weather friend or can be counted on in a storm.

No one expects, or wants, the Big Four to engage in rough stuff with each other. All want the grand alliance to go ahead and finish off the Axis. But the foundations for the post-war world are being laid, it is observed, and unless we can agree on principles now there'll be no unity after the war.

Gov. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Real Bricker," from the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1944, and a portion of a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., of February 11 last, relating to Governor Bricker.

Ordinarily I should not make such a request, but the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] a few days ago chose to insert an editorial attacking Governor Bricker, and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] had the extraordinary idea of attacking Governor Bricker and other Republican candidates in a speech he made on the floor of the Senate last week.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpt from the broadcast were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1944]

THE REAL BRICKER

After Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, had delivered in Detroit last month what was advertised in advance as the "keynote speech" in his bid for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, we ventured to say that it keynoted nothing. We could not believe that a man of Mr. Bricker's stature could hope to win the nomination, to say nothing of the election, with platitudes and vague generalities.

This view was justified Thursday, when Ohio's chief executive hit his stride in a Lincoln Day dinner address in Washington that was marked by clarity of vision, courage in facing difficult issues and specific remedies for the evils he attacked. There was no sidestepping. Candidate Bricker waded into the hottest sectors on the political front, without flinching and without leaving anyone in doubt as to where he stood.

"I do not care whether a strike is against management or government," he declared, "the consequences are the same. Some life is endangered by every idle hour. I do not care whether the strike is induced by selfish labor leaders or unthinking members of the union, the result is the same." Wartime strikes not only prolong hostilities and lengthen casualty lists. They irreparably injure labor in the eyes of men at the front and of their kin at home.

A labor draft is not the answer, said Mr. Bricker. "The strike problem can be solved by fair legislation and just enforcement of the law," he declared. "A law should be enacted by this Congress laying down fundamental principles for the administration and adjudication of labor disputes and the prohibition of strikes in time of war."

What labor leader, who has taken the no-strike pledge, but claims he cannot prevent wildcat or unauthorized stoppages of work, would not welcome such legislation? It would reinforce his promise that men shall work in America while men are dying abroad in its defense.

Governor Bricker showed no less understanding of the dangers of permitting the present administration's fiscal policies to continue into the post-war era. The end of reckless deficit spending, as he sees it, can only be national bankruptcy. The end of Executive encroachment upon the legislative and judicial branches of government, if not checked, will be the disappearance of State and local autonomy and the concentration of all taxes and power in Washington. That is absolutism.

While repeating his conviction that the United States must cooperate with other countries in the post-war world, the Governor declared himself opposed to putting any supergovernment over this country. What promise, he asked, does an administration, which has failed in the domestic field, give of being able to shape the destiny of other nations?

A challenger has appeared whose real keynote speech contains meat into which the people can get their teeth. A new dignity has been introduced into the battle for the White House. The campaign will not be wasted effort if the other contestants reach the plane of statesmanship upon which John W. Bricker has now planted his standard.

[From broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual Network, February 11, 1944]

Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, who has openly announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, is finishing, tonight, a 2-day personal appearance here in Washington, during which time he spoke before a Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Party last night, and made a further talk at a luncheon of the National Press Club today. And the net result of the whole visit was unexpectedly favorable. The impression seems to be just about unanimous, in Republican circles in Congress and through the press, that he is considerably more of a Presidential possibility than was commonly thought in advance, although it was recognized that he has achieved considerable of a reputation from the job he did while he was Governor of Ohio, and that he must have been a formidable vote getter, or he wouldn't have been able to sweep Ohio on repeated occasions as he has done.

The fact is that Governor Bricker has spent very little time here in Washington, during the last 6 years, and very few people knew him personally, or knew anything much about him except that he had put Ohio in very good financial shape, and had the reputation for having cleaned up the State government pretty well. Beyond that, he was generally thought of as a quiet, conservative Governor of a key State.

The fact of the matter is that in these 48 hours which have opened his preconvention campaign, he has played a very striking and unusual role, that is just about the extreme opposite of what political leaders here had expected.

As you well know, there has been a growing tendency over the last 20 years for all Presidential candidates to talk in the vaguest possible terms, and to qualify everything, and to make every statement so ambiguous and so general that no one can take offense at it, and the candidate himself can never be held to anything.

It's an old—and if I may inject a personal opinion—an extremely unhealthy game, but it has become more and more the accepted procedure. What you don't say can't be held against you.

On this occasion Governor Bricker tossed that to the winds and, to the particular amazement of the press and political writers, he laid down one statement after another, in a-b-c language that was direct and unmistakable, with the attitude that those were his ideas. He had no reason to be ashamed of them or afraid of them because they were honest ideas, and he would stand or fall on them.

To begin with, he did what no Presidential candidate yet has done within my memory—he laid down a flat, definite labor policy, without any double talk and without any hedges. He said there should be strong antistrike legislation, which would forbid any union or any group of individuals from striking during wartime. He said that, so far as the Roosevelt administration is concerned, its weakest spot is that it has no labor policy at all.

He said unequivocally that the administration's spending policy is wrong, and must be stopped; that the soldiers' vote should be on a State-ballot basis, not on a Federal-ballot basis; that the entire philosophy of the New Deal about a Washington-controlled economy is wrong.

He said that the first thing any government needs is a responsible cabinet, which will really function, and the next thing we need is a sound financial policy, devised by people who know the value of money, and he said that there should be the widest and most sweeping elimination of bureaus, agencies, commissions, and the like, and that every Cabinet officer ought to have real responsibility placed on him for the conduct of the agencies under him, and should be held responsible.

He said that the Federal Budget should be balanced—just as soon after the war as possible.

So far as taxes are concerned, he said that post-war taxes should be completely revised, and that taxation should be used for the sole purpose of collecting Government revenue, and not for the purpose of creating social changes.

And, finally, he said that in revising the tax laws there should be a careful plan to encourage the investment of capital in new business ventures, in order to help create employment.

That is the flattest talk that any Presidential candidate has dealt to the public in a great many years. You may not agree with it. You may, on the basis of it, decide that you want to vote against the man, not for him. But to the political writers and observers who have been sitting around since the last World War, listening to the double talk of candidates who are afraid to express convictions, for fear of losing a few votes, this was a very refreshing Lochinvar that came out of the West, and I think that's the almost unanimous opinion of those who heard him.

Maybe it's not such bad politics at that. Maybe the people of the country are as tired of double talk as we reporters are.

Maybe the smartest political strategy is to be courageous, and to win votes with positive action, not to avoid losing them with negative action.

Resolutions of Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD some resolutions as adopted by the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of Nebraska.

These resolutions reflect the thinking of the farmers and members of the cooperative union in Nebraska. If they were adopted by the Federal Government we would find our Nation going along on a much smoother economic path than at the present time. I commend these resolutions to the House and the country.

1. We, the legislative committee of the Farmers Educational and Co-operative State Union of Nebraska, recommend that this State convention of 1944 repeat the request of 1 year and 2 years ago asking the Congress of the United States to outlaw all strikes as sabotage against the war effort of the United States.

2. We asked for pay-as-you-go taxation a year ago. We now ask that a simple and understandable income tax report form be provided so as the enormous costly and useless waste of time now necessary to fill out these complicated tax schedules be saved for productive war effort.

3. We repeat our admonition of past years, that increased living costs and lower standards of living are an inevitable part of war and increased taxes. Increased wages to certain groups only passes their share of this burden on to still other groups. Agriculture being the end-man, who cannot pass the tax and production burden on, demands honest thinking and honest sharing of this burden by all groups by stopping the continual wage increases that continue to shift the war burden.

4. In past years we recommended a large draft of Federal employees into the actual war effort, a 48-hour week, and an actual draft of workers into vital industries as a solution to the manpower problem. Inasmuch as strikes have not yet been outlawed as sabotage, many unnecessary Federal bureaus still waste manpower, and the men deferred from military draft to help in vital industries waste time in

strikes and jumping from job to job, we would therefore withhold our approval to a new general service act until good faith has been shown in administering war measures already enacted. When a deferred man does not stay on the job, he should be drafted at once.

5. As in past years, we urge that price ceilings in agriculture be fixed high enough to permit adequate production without the use of subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

Subsidies are inflationary, as they leave the consumer with money in his pocket that would otherwise pay the balance of the grocery bill.

Subsidies are wasteful of not only Federal money borrowed for war purposes, but are wasteful of time of thousands of persons used to administer them.

Subsidies have discouraged production by the uncertainty and the lower prices to farmers that have accompanied the subsidy system.

Subsidies are only another wage increase to other groups at the expense of agriculture. Can we back the attack with subsidies?

6. In the matter of a Federal ballot for soldiers, we hold that any and all election laws should remain in the jurisdiction of State governments.

We believe that the men who drew our Federal and State Constitutions had good reason to keep the Army and Navy out of politics both for the protection of the armed services and the men in them, and the country at large.

If a ballot is given to the soldiers, we insist that it be the same as used in his home precinct.

7. *Be it resolved*, That the laws of Nebraska be amended to place gravel on farm-to-market roads, other than country roads, from the money obtained from gas tax.

8. Inasmuch as family labor and the increase in price of farm labor has not been included in parity prices, we recommend fair prices for agriculture based on parity and cost of production, including a fair wage for all farm labor.

9. We know that after the last war a lot of war equipment that was suitable for civilian use was destroyed or rendered useless. There will be demand for new equipment, and we know also that a lot of farmers and construction companies, etc., would be glad to pay a good price for the left-over equipment.

Therefore, we demand that the Congress of the United States take the necessary steps to make this usable equipment available for sale to private enterprise at a reasonable price.

10. We favor the change of the Nebraska Constitution making the legislature a 100-member house instead of the present 43.

11. We are opposed to any plan whatsoever of Federal aid to our public schools, since it will inevitably lead to centralization of control and dictation of our educational program from Washington, D. C.

HARRY PARMENTER,
Secretary.

Tribute to the Late Senator Van Nuys by H. C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for some time I had the honor of occupying the seat in the Senate next to that of one of the finest men I have ever known. Unfortunately for America, he passed away not so very long ago. I refer to the late able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, Senator Fred Van Nuys.

I have before me a poem in tribute to Senator Van Nuys, penned by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, to whom I am pleased to refer as the poet of the Capitol. I ask that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VAN NUYS

S–enator Van Nuys, a statesman who stood
E–ver on guard for his countrymen's good,
N–ever surrendered, but labored along,
A–bly denouncing the thing that was wrong,
T–ender in heart, intellectually strong—
O–n all occasions, he met every test,
R–eaching always for the highest and best.

V–ictory meant more to him than success,
A–nd, in these times, when there's so much distress,
N–ever did he from distress turn apart—

N–or did he harbor hate in his great heart.
U–ntil his death, from his noble life's start,
Y–ielded he never to anyone's quest,
S–olely, to feather his own selfish nest.

I–n his sad passing out from us, our great
N–ation has lost a true friend, but his State,
D–eeply grieved by his untimely decease,
I–n its sad heart, felt its own faith increase,
A–s he passed into the sweet Land of Peace—
N–ow he's at rest where, if we're faithful, we,
A–fter a few years, at longest, will be.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative LEON H. GAVIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, delivered over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, February 19, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, there is an active, insidious campaign on in this country to misrepresent a subject which is vital to all of us. I refer to the soldier vote. It is doubtful if any matter with which we in Congress have had to deal has ever been attended by so much confusion; it is doubtful if there is any matter about which there is so much misunderstanding. The purpose of the misrepresentation and the confusion I shall leave for you to judge.

The simple, plain, unvarnished facts are these:

The administration forces proposed a so-called Federal or bobtail ballot by which the armed forces would be permitted to express their choice only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. I say "express their choice" advisedly because there is a serious question whether this would constitute casting a vote because of the further serious question as to whether these so-called ballots would be counted. Certainly there would be all sorts of contests, challenges, and litigation that would probably throw the next election into the courts and the Congress.

But momentarily let's say that this is beside the point.

The opponents of this form of ballot proposed a complete State ballot about which there would be no question of its validity and which would permit the armed forces to vote for all of their officers—county and State as well as National. Thirty-four Governors of our States are to be elected this year. Have we gone so far in concentrating authority in Washington that it is of no importance who these Governors are? Is it the contention that the armed forces are not concerned in them? Is it the contention that they are not concerned in their other State and local officials?

Why seek to disenfranchise the young men and women who are serving us all over the globe in the matter of their State and local officials? The rest of us will be permitted to vote for them. Why not the armed forces?

The answer which the proponents of the Federal bobtail ballot have sought to give is that it is impossible, that the States would not provide the necessary facilities.

But 46 Governors have already said they would. It may be that at the outset there were some reasonable doubts as to what the States would do. There are certainly none now. I repeat that 46 Governors have now reported that action has either already been taken or will be taken to insure the armed forces of their State an opportunity to vote, not only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress but for their State officials as well. This is the sort of ballot the rest of us will have. We at home certainly deserve no advantages in a matter of this kind over those who have been called away on the greatest mission of their lives.

It has been contended, less vigorously, that the military authorities cannot transport the complete State ballots to the armed forces. There need be no quibbling about this. There need be no misunderstanding. These ballots will weigh 100 tons. During the Christmas period, 40,000 tons of Christmas packages were transported. One of my colleagues, Congressman VURSELL, of Illinois, who has given considerable study to the subject, says that four large planes will accomplish the job, two planes for the European theater and two planes for the Pacific.

There is one thing of which you can rest assured—out of all this confusion, all this propaganda, all this abuse—

The armed forces—those young men and women who are offering their very lives for the preservation of our institutions—they are going to have the opportunity to vote to the same extent as we at home. We take away many of their rights when we draft them and send them to 50 fighting fronts all over the world. But this is one that we will not take from them.

And the reason this right will not be taken from them is because a majority of the Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, were not swept off their feet by hysteria, because they would not permit themselves to be high-pressured by forces whose purpose I shall leave for you to judge. As the result of our steadfastness, these young men and women will not only have a complete ballot available but they will also have available the names of the candidates. This they would not have on the Federal bobtail ballot. They would have voted blindly, except for what information as they would be able to obtain, for either the Democratic candidate for President, for Senator, and for Representative, or the Republican ones, and I believe that at one stage of the Senate discussion of the bill it was also provided they could vote for Progressive or Socialist candidates without knowing who they were.

This was an entirely unconstitutional proposition that was put up to us, and it is seldom that Members of Congress have been subjected to such a campaign of abuse and hate. This is something, however, that collectively we have become accustomed to. Your legislative body is still in existence in Washington, and it is still serving you.

Frankly I can't imagine anything more unsound and un-American than the implication of the bobtail ballot—that the Governors of your State are of no importance; not of enough importance for those who are fighting for us, to be concerned about. We are all aware, of course, that this has been the trend in our country for the past 11 years. We know of the efforts to make our State officials but puppets of the vast political autocracy in Washington. And we know of the degree of success which was met. We know that the Washington Government has become so contemptuous of State's officials that it does not consider it important that they be voted upon.

But, fellow citizens, we can thank our stars that this trend has been arrested. Just as you have seen a rejuvenation of our Congress, you have seen a rejuvenation of your State governments. Able, high-minded men have come to take the places of those who shunned their responsibilities and to the extent that they have, more orderliness has come into our affairs.

State Governors, in the estimation of Congress, are all important. I want to say to you that in their ability, in their sense of honor and their sense of duty largely lies our salvation. It is for these gentlemen to take back the responsibilities that are theirs. In that way largely lies the solution of our problems. Continued unloading of them on the bureaucracy of Washington will bring us immeasurable grief; it will bring us disaster.

Never in our history, fellow Americans, has the caliber of our Governors, our other State officials, been of such vital concern to us. And that being the case we intend to see that those in the uniform have an opportunity to say who they shall be.

All sorts of rumors have been afloat in Washington as to the underlying purposes of the so-called bobtail ballot. There have been rumors that it was designed to help this candidate or that candidate. Maybe so. Those of us who have supported the full ballot have had just one purpose in mind. And that purpose is that regardless of what the armed forces might, individually or collectively, do with their ballot, they are entitled to it—entitled to a full ballot. The idea of a restricted franchise is something new to us in a Republic. But we have seen many things new in recent years and we have come to expect most anything.

What has taken place here is a justification of our legislative processes. Out of the maze of propaganda, the false charges, the deliberate effort to confuse, a clarity has come. I doubt that I have ever heard so important a subject so mistreated in the press and on the radio. But the majority of the Members of Congress were not stampeded. And now light is beginning to prevail.

We were falsely charged with trying to deny these young men and women the opportunity to vote. In a recent message to Congress which was broadcast to the service men and women overseas, we were charged with trying to impose a fraud. I leave it to you to judge the purpose of a statement by such high authority that this country's legislative body, composed of men and women elected by you, made up of men and women who have sons and daughters in the armed forces just the same as other parents, men and women whose sons have died in action on our farflung fighting fronts. I leave it to you to judge the purpose of a charge that this body would impose a fraud on the American people. There are 531 of us. We have the human frailties and the strengths of the American people. We have the responsibilities of the country as a whole. Our individual judgments are often wrong, but seldom is our collective judgment. When that errs then the people as a whole have erred because we are the composite of them. On this soldiers' vote legislation the bill passed the House by a vote of 328 yeas, 69 nays.

Some day this war will be over and those young men and women out there carrying the torch of liberty will return to their homes—those of them who have not paid the supreme sacrifice. They will return to take up their lives. And they want to take them up under the democratic processes which they went away to defend. They have a right to say who their officials are—their State and county officials, not just who is their President, their Senator, or their Representative.

Furthermore, they will know just exactly whom they are voting for under the full State ballot The candidate's name will be right there on the ballot for them to see. It will be a secret ballot just as that which we at home will have.

In passing, I might say that the conferees between the House and the Senate handling the soldier-vote question are in a deadlock. What the outcome may be I cannot say. There is still a determined effort on the part of some to put across some form of a bobtail ballot. But I am sure that in the end right will prevail.

I insist the men and women in the service must be given the opportunity to vote. Every man and woman ought to be given an opportunity to vote for a complete State and National ticket. Legislation must be within the borders of the Constitution, and the States, we have been assured, will put their voting machinery in order so that every service man and woman will be enabled to vote and have his vote legal when it is returned.

In conclusion, I want to say that I sincerely hope this war will soon be over and that we, on our knees, can offer profound thanks to God who gave us these great victories and to the men and women in the service who paid for them with their time and lives. In the interim let us remember "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Washington and Our Present-Day Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Washington and Our Present-Day Problems," broadcast by me over Wisconsin radio stations last Saturday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By honoring today the memory of George Washington we honor ourselves and strengthen ourselves to meet the problems of the present and the future.

Why should the commemoration of the birth of Washington bring about such a result? Because in contemplating the life of the Father of our Country we drink in those noble characteristics of mind which he possessed. His love of God, of truth, of country, his unselfishness, become our own. Human greatness is not a matter of glitter. It is a matter of who best serves God and his fellows with a humble and contrite heart.

Washington—first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen, with other great men of his age—Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Paine, Madison, and the Adamses—were in the flesh, fallible men, like each of us. But Washington towers above them all. In the midst of the environment of the age in which he lived he met and solved, as the leader of men, the problems of his day, using such gifts and limited facilities as were at his command. He was not a creature of vanity. He cared more for the common weal than for his own personal gain.

We must realize that Washington not only staked what was in his day a great fortune, but that he staked his head when he revolted against Britain for principle's sake. He joined with his fellow countrymen and pledged his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor, so that what they thought was best for America and Americans would come to pass.

Compared with the average school boy of today, he was indeed limited in worldly knowledge and outlook. The world had not been contracted as it has in these latter days. But he lived in a day when great ideas were being born. He felt and recognized the value of those ideas. Great impulses rose in his mind.

The story of his life is the heritage of every American schoolboy. He was industrious, thrifty, courageous. After America had won through to victory and peace with Britain, Washington returned to his lordly acres and home at Mount Vernon, that lovely estate we all never tire of visiting. But up ahead of him were the days which were to test men's souls, and what is more, to test their vision. He had proved himself great as a general and war strategist. He was now to prove himself greater still as one who could see beyond the borders of Virginia, his native State, and encompass in his vision and in his deeds, the formation of a more perfect union for the thirteen embryonic States.

Such men as Patrick Henry and many of his other associates, differed with him; but again he persevered; he carried on. To understand the bigness and the capacity of this man, we have to imagine ourselves back in the period in which he lived. Thirteen colonies they were, independent nations having their own currency and tariff barriers. Travel from Mount Vernon to New York was farther in time than the circumnavigation of the globe is now. While the Colonies had fought for independence and found in the Revolution a basis for unity, they were fast becoming separate and distinct political units. There were many ancient rivalries among them.

Then it was this God-directed man, and others, instigated those steps which resulted in the Constitution, making this one Nation indivisible.

In these few words we have shown the results, but it is well for us to realize that honest men differed about what should be done.

Washington was a man who believed in the efficacy of prayer. He sensed that this physical unit called man was a finite creature, but he also sensed that in the spirit he lived and moved in God. So he reached up to the Infinite for guidance and direction. If ever there was an example of God using men for the growth and development of the human family, this one fact that Washington took the leadership of the Nation toward unification of thirteen segments into one whole is that example. If this had not been done, it doesn't take much imagination to see that we on this continent would have been another boiling pot for war and revolution—another festering Europe.

We have just celebrated a few days previous the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. He too sensed that need of oneness for the Nation. If he, when men like Horace Greeley and others said, "Let the South go," had not insisted on one nation, then the handiwork of Washington and his comrades would have been undone. "God works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform." Yet God only works through the hearts, the minds, and the hands of men, his servants.

In this particular period, when the world has again taken up the sword to fight for political, economic, and religious freedom—things for which Washington staked his all—it is well for us to turn briefly to some of the ideas for which this man stood.

We believe, with Washington, that there are universal laws which make for harmony in the individual and harmony in the nations and in the world. One of these laws is that one must love his God with all his heart, mind, and soul, and his neighbor as himself. If one indulges in the antithesis of that, and loves himself and hates his God and hates his fellow men, then the door is locked to those beneficent forces which make for the growth and development of the race. It is my belief that only as man makes contact with God, or harmonizes his life, his thinking, his deeds, and himself with the Divine—only then does the Divine work through the individual and the Nation.

What if Hitler, after he had occupied the adjoining countries, had by his acts and deeds lived up to the principles of brotherhood and love of man, instead of attempting to enslave them, and had not attempted to force upon the German people themselves a new concept of deity, discarding the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth? But, of course, Hitler wasn't fighting for liberty. He was fighting for world conquest. He wasn't fighting to make men free. He was fighting to establish his boasts that the Germans were the master race and all other races slaves. Thus God could not work through him because he would not work in the ways of God.

Of course, the persecution of the Jews, the Catholics, and the Lutherans by Hitler was likewise an antichrist or antigod manifestation. The killing of his own people who disagreed with him, the curtailing of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the wiping out of all organizations which made for Christian culture—all these indicate that he was not an instrument of the Most High.

Now, Washington loved his fellow man. He didn't hate the English he fought. He himself was of English descent. But he sensed, and we are grateful that he did, that on this continent a new breed was coming into existence—not English, not Polish, not German, not Scandinavian or French, but an American breed. He sensed that when his forebears came to this country (like our own forebears) that they dug their roots deep down into the soil of America, and became something separate and apart from what they had been in the old country. They became creatures of liberty and freedom, and they were destined to light a new flame, which in time would burn out the dross of slavery and autocracy and hate among and in the nations. So he took up the sword, but when the fight was won, he laid it down and followed the ways of peace. He wanted no crown; and when the battle for unity came, he took up the sword of the spirit, and when he and his associates had accomplished a unification of the Thirteen Colonies, he again departed for Mount Vernon.

Washington was a man of faith. Perhaps one of the greatest needs of our people today is a need for faith. No great struggles have ever been won by men of little faith, but only by men of good courage, willing to risk their all. Washington would never have accomplished the freeing of the Colonies and the establishment of an independent republic based on principles such as no other government had ever been founded upon, if he had not had faith, not only in God, but in his fellow men and in the future of the country. And on what an apparently delicate foundation that faith rested. Thirteen weak, pioneer States to fight against the greatest nation of the world. But with faith, he led ragged legions in triumph against the armies of a king.

Such faith and courage as that shames any weakness on our part today. We must remember what he said about weakness. He said, "There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness." We must be careful to see that our country assumes and maintains her proper place among the nations of the world.

If we have faith in our future, and the courage of our convictions, we can keep our country secure upon the foundation he builded so well. We have every potentiality for doing so; we are a young, vigorous nation; we have wealth, inventiveness, many successful years of experience in living peaceably with our neighbors of other nationalities.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that from Washington's day until this present time, we have been a self-governed people. We are so accustomed to this fact that we are apt to forget its significance. These United States of America are self-governed to a greater degree than any other nation on earth. The peoples of Europe, Asia, and South America—none of them have the experience that our people have in governing themselves. The world needs that example today as never before, for all the nations must live in closer relationship than ever before. America stands on the threshhold of a great opportunity to teach these peoples the art of self-government.

For that reason, perhaps one of the greatest contributions America can make toward the advancement of the world today, is to keep America American. I mean by that, to hold fast to those great principles upon which our form of Government is founded; for all the world knows that under that form of government, the individual citizen has enjoyed a greater degree of personal freedom than have the citizens of any other country on earth. For nearly 200 years, we and the preceding generations, have enjoyed in fullest measure the blessing of liberty gained for us by Washington and those who stood by him in his day.

Today, the ideas of Washington, which have held this Nation on so true a course during all the intervening years, are challenged in the East and in the West. All the material and cultural gains which have been made by our country are under assault. We are engaged in a struggle, the outcome of which will determine whether civilization itself shall survive. On the results of this conflict will depend whether those yet unborn shall be born into bondage, ignominy, and lifelong suffering, or whether they shall be born into a world where human values, spiritual development, cultural advancement, and material comforts may be theirs. I solemnly say to you that the destiny of all humanity rests upon our efforts now.

In such times as these, the memory of Washington should nerve every American, arm and cheer every American heart. Let America take heart and be of good courage. It is America's destiny to lead the peacetime world which will come after the war toward the attainment of those principles and ideals, on a global scale, upon which our country was founded and has so magnificently progressed ever since. America has had the intelligence, the capacity, the ingenuity, and the energy to outbuild all her enemies and her allies in the instruments of war. If she exercises those same qualities in the implementing of the peace, she can fulfill that destiny.

Washington said: "Let us impart all the blessings we possess, or ask for ourselves, to the whole family of mankind." When he said that, he was not thinking of the material resources of our country. What he had in mind were those blessings which we possess by reason of the new form of government he had established, which other peoples do not have, or, if they have them, not to the extent we do. Having never been without them in our generation, we perhaps fail to realize what it is to live in a land where they do not exist.

We can scarcely imagine what it would be like to be prohibited from gathering in peaceable assembly, as we are at this hour; to be prohibited from expressing our ideas, as I do at this moment, to now know whether when we return to our homes this evening, we might find the beloved head of the family gone, thrown into prison without cause, and perhaps treated with cruelty, and then be without a chance for a fair trial. We can scarcely imagine not being able to sit in the quiet of our homes and read in our daily newspapers, not only the latest news from all over the world, but the opinions of all who wish to express themselves on the questions of the day—even to criticizing our own Government.

What a magnanimous thought was Washington's when he said, "Let us impart all the blessings we possess, or ask for ourselves, to the whole family of mankind" It should be America's highest privilege and joy to fulfill such a destiny.

We are told by the proponents of the "new order" that a nation built upon the ideas expressed in our Bill of Rights cannot be strong. We are told that the idea of individual freedom for man is a foolish notion. In the presence of this challenge, the democracies of the world must demonstrate that freemen, through organized self-government which they themselves have established, can be stronger than any people who have surrendered their personal freedom to the dominance of a dictator.

Jefferson said, "The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought, for so dear a stake, to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity." What a challenge! Let us strive to be not only the last hope, but the best hope of human liberty.

One more lesson from Washington's life: Before we can guide others into the way of peace we must be masters of ourselves here at home. Washington's own self-mastery is a shining example to us. In most of his undertakings he was on new ground, with no precedents to guide him. Our country today is in somewhat that same position, for never before have we faced such perplexing problems of international relationships as those which confront us now. But Washington's firmness in holding to his convictions, his faith and fortitude, enabled him to blaze the trails upon which America has so safely gone forward ever since.

The courage which Washington manifested at Valley Forge—and which saved the day when others were ready to give up the struggle, when others doubted that right would win through, when quitters were on every side—this courage of his kept the Army intact and lighted a flame which made victory possible. Such courage and faith does the impossible, casts out discouragement. It is the same which our fighting men on all the fighting fronts of the world are manifesting. It is this same spirit of faith—a conquering spirit—which provides strength and sufficiency to meet and overcome all the forces of destruction.

It is my belief that there is no death; that while the mortal body may cease functioning something which the Eternal has created for eternal purposes—the real man—never stops functioning.

So I believe today that the spirit of Washington hovers over this Nation, to inspire it, to enthuse all those who study his life with the desire for growth and justice and liberty.

Thus, in recalling his memory, we honor ourselves and rejuvenate ourselves, making ourselves fit instruments to gallantly, wisely, and courageously face the present and the future.

Keep America Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Thursday night I had the honor of addressing the American people through courtesies extended to me by the Mutual Broadcasting System in the use of a Nation-wide hook-up. The subject of my address was Keep America Free. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege this evening to talk with you concerning America, the one country in which we should all center our first and most profound interest.

Unfortunately, many of our people today seem to be more concerned about what will happen to post-war Europe and Asia than they are in what will happen to post-war America.

During the course of this war I have visited many of our military establishments throughout the country. In the camps I saw the flower of America, our young manhood in uniform, preparing to fight wherever sent. Those boys are a part of the millions that we are now dispersing, well armed and well trained, to theaters of war in every part of the world. Under the banner of democracy, under the flag of our country, millions of our men and women go forth imbued with the hope they may be instrumental in preserving the American way of life and keeping America American.

Over there—across the Atlantic and in the vast reaches of the Pacific at this very hour—assault boats loaded with American lads are preparing, and others are actually now participating in their greatest adventure, many living the last moments of their youthful lives.

While those American heroes carry on over there, they expect us here, on the home front, to keep faith by preserving for them the freedom for which they themselves are fighting. They are counting upon us to preserve American ideals and to banish from our shores the ideologies of crackpot, long-haired bureaucrats who infest our Capital. There are many alien Communists today who are actually participating in the administration of our country. In this connection you will be interested to learn that since the beginning of the present war in Europe, September 1939, more than 600,000 aliens of all classes have been admitted to the United States from foreign countries, amongst whom are several hundred thousand who entered this country as temporary visitors. I protest these admissions. I criticize the admission of more than half a million aliens to this country since war began, at a time when we are sending our sons to their lands to fight their battles. While our men are on foreign shores, in uniform, in more than 70 different places throughout the world, those for whom they fight leave their battle zones, desert their own national interests, and come to America to bask in the sunshine of safety and prosperity. We should stop all immigration now. Stop the influx of thousands of aliens—many of whom are admitted on temporary permits, but once here will never leave. They will remain here to take the jobs that we should hold for our own American heroes who will need them when they return.

While our men fight and bleed and die on foreign soil for the nations of the world, here at home there is constant bickering in every department of the Government. Bickering even amongst our Cabinet members. It would appear that many in high positions in this Government are more interested in their own personal glorification than they are in the welfare of the Nation. The American people are sick and tired of all this muddling and these contradictory statements. Is it any wonder that the people are confused?

On the home front there has been such maladministration of manpower that millions of pounds of foodstuffs so sorely needed have spoiled and rotted in the open fields. Know-it-all theorists, many of whom never saw a farm, prevented and delayed the manufacture of essential farm machinery and parts—and Government fuel dictators who failed to recognize the farmers' need for gas with which to get his products to the markets have contributed to the critical food situation.

We have to clean house and clean house now by getting rid of those wishy-washy, zigzagging, pop-eyed pinks, reds, and Communists in high position, bureaucrats galore, who are attempting to destroy here the very things for which our boys are fighting in every part of the world.

Prior to Pearl Harbor the one main question before the American people was isolationism versus interventionism. Those of us who opposed the lifting of the arms embargo, opposed the repeal of the neutrality laws, opposed sending of American soldiers outside of continental United States, and opposed the lend-lease-give act, knew that they were all steps toward war. We were the so-called isolationists. The interventionists who favored these afore-mentioned steps declared that they were all steps away from war. The interventionists won. We are at war.

The question of the hour and the burning question of 1944 is nationalism versus internationalism, or Americanism versus globaloneyism. Either with the war ended or still in progress next year or the years to follow there will, it seems to me, be only one major question with respect to our foreign relations. The question: Is the United States to remain an independent nation with its Stars and Stripes as its symbol of the "four freedoms," or will it be internationalized and made merely a part of a world government? A mere 135 million people participating as a minority in a world government composed of a population of 2 billion?

There are those who are deliberately taking advantage of these dreadful hours to advance their own selfish interests and to carry out their own schemes, and theories. Even a Supreme Court Justice of the United States is advocating that we become a part of a world state—Union Now—thus giving up our scvereignty. To all of these international plans I am opposed. These proposals have gone so far that it is now proposed by some internationalists that the Star-Spangled Banner be merged into a United Nations flag.

As to peace, we all seek peace, world peace, eternal peace, and to secure that peace we are willing to cooperate with all the nations of the world. However, it seems to me, that the best we can possibly hope for as a result of these wars is that a revival of common sense will be forthcoming. As for peace, we of the Western Hemisphere may assure ourselves of it by building a system of hemispheric defenses in cooperation with our sister republics of Central America to the south, and Canada to the north, so strong that no foreign aggressor or any conceivable combination of foreign aggressors will ever dare contemplate a military or economic invasion of our part of the world.

Yes, today the burning question of the hour is nationalism versus internationalism. What is nationalism? Nationalism is the law of self-preservation nationally applied. Therefore, being interested in the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the welfare of America, I am proud to declare to you that I am for America first; that I am an American nationalist—one whose first interest is the security and welfare of his own Nation.

War or no war, the time has arrived when the citizens of the United States, native-born or naturalized, should look after the interests of their own country and conserve, protect, and guard well here at home the "four freedoms" for which we are fighting in every part of the world.

I, like millions of others, am sick and tired of all this smearing of Americans who speak out in the interest of their country. What we need today is a showdown between the world-do-gooders, save-the-world internationalists, and real, genuine Americans who are interested firstly in the preservation of their own country. We need candidates for public offices who have the courage of their convictions and are not afraid to give utterance to those convictions in clear and decisive words—American leaders of integrity who will deliver us from this mess of "one-world" globaloney nonsense that is leading us to bankruptcy, socialism, and destruction.

As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, the very nature of my work compels me to think of your sons, your daughters, brothers, and loved ones, who are in the armed forces. I want you to know that we in Washington are not all bureaucrats. I want you to look upon me as a true friend of real Americans (native born or naturalized) who is not ashamed to put America first in war and in peace. In short, I believe that we should never fail to be the good Samaritan with all neighborly nations, but I do not believe that we should endanger our national or international security or bankrupt our Treasury by playing Santa Claus to the whole wide world.

You say, "Yes, but what can I do?" In the first place, you can write me a letter and tell me exactly how you feel about things. Your letter will be treated with great confidence, and no matter how humble, unknown or poor you may be, or high your position in life, feel free to say anything which you think is for the good of our country.

The first thing I will do in response to your letter will be to send you a copy of this address, and from time to time I will send you important information which you need concerning affairs in Washington.

Don't worry about my address. Just write United States Senator BOB REYNOLDS, Washington, D. C. I repeat—just address your letter: Senator BOB REYNOLDS, Washington, D. C.—and I will send you a copy of this address and keep you in touch with affairs in our National Capital.

Let's stand together under the slogan, "America first in war—America first in peace," for was it not spoken well of the Father of Our Country when it was said he was "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

The Sugar Research Foundation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, in common with others who are concerned with the future of the sugar industry, I am intensely interested in the program of the Sugar Research Foundation, which is supported by virtually all cane and beet producers and refiners. In cooperation with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the foundation has embarked on a large-scale sugar research program. By providing facts to answer every challenge to the use of sugar, it will undoubtedly destroy the arguments of those endeavoring to kill our markets for sugar.

There has come to my attention an article on the Sugar Research Foundation program in the Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGAR: THE UNKNOWN—INDUSTRY BACKS SCIENCE TO FIND CHEMICAL USES FOR SURPLUS PRODUCTION—HOPES TO SUBSTITUTE BROADER MARKETS FOR CLUMSY CARTEL CONTROLS OF PRE-WAR YEARS—SETS UP RESEARCH FOUNDATION

(By Sydney B. Self)

The sugar industry is substituting the research man's test tube for the production controls of a cartel system in its search for stable markets.

For 25 years the industry, including its billion-dollar American-owned segment, has been plagued by the fact that with very little effort it is able to grow and process far more sugar than the world has ever shown any ability to buy at a profitable price. The American industry, believing the answer may be found in development of nonfood markets, has commissioned top-ranking chemists to explore new uses for its product. The aim is to give sugar the profitable dual role of basic industrial raw material and basic food.

To implement this program, the sugar research foundation has been formed with the backing of 25 big cane and beet refiners and the whole list of Puerto Rican and Hawaiian producers.

The foundation has been bountifully underwritten; its first project is a $125,000 grant to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to finance a laboratory exploration of sugar's organic chemistry. Research projects of similar magnitude are being arranged with other universities, and will be announced within the next few months. This test-tube mobilization constitutes the first broad, scientific examination of a material which was first introduced to Europe by the Crusaders.

TWO RELATED AIMS

The research program has two related aims: (1) To uncover sugar's real function in the diet in the light of many recent discoveries in the field of vitamins and nutrition; (2) to develop chemical uses which will go a long way toward easing the industry's worry about surpluses and export (in effect, production) controls of the type exercised before the war by the now moribund International Sugar Committee.

No one within the industry will hazard a guess as to what all this test-tubing will develop. They do think that the basic composition of sugar gives it the earmarks of a promising raw material for the chemist.

There are lots of "sugars." The product obtained from cane and beets is "sucrose." Its chemical formula is $C_{12}H_{22}O_{11}$, which simply means it is a carbohydrate composed of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen. These are the building blocks of most organic chemicals; thus sugar, like the multiuseful coal tar and petroleum, has the potentialities of conversion into a variety of useful chemical products. Sugar also has the advantage of being relatively cheap and, from the chemist's point of view, one of the purest materials available in bulk for synthesis.

SUGAR AS A RAW MATERIAL

Sugar already has achieved a limited usefulness as a chemical raw material which may point the way to expanded markets. Aside from being a basis for alcohol, it is used to produce such solvents for lacquers and finishes as butanol and acetone. The notable drug, penicillin, and a wide range of important organic acids, still comparatively new to industry and medicine, are made by mold or bacteria acting chemically on molasses or a sugar syrup. The largest production of citric acid, widely employed in pharmaceuticals, results from a process of sugar fermentation.

But so far the micro-organisms have been able to do things chemically to sugar which are still beyond the powers of the human laboratory worker. The sugar molecule is hard to handle and one task confronting research men is to so change its nature as to give a new chemical starting point for this sensitive combination of hydrogen, carbon, and oxygen.

Laboratory technicians have made a start by developing a process known as controlled oxidation. In nontechnical language this means the use of mild substances that act to change the sugar molecules without burning them up as would the acids and heat generally employed in chemical processes. This controlled oxidation technique has been a laboratory success; among other things, it has resulted in a base for making vitamin C, ascorbic acid. The question now to be solved is whether the delicate laboratory touch can be adapted to large-scale commercial production.

SUGAR AS A PLASTIC

Research men are particularly interested in sugar's potential role in the field of plastics. They have the idea of obtaining from sugar the combination of atoms called the hydroxyl group, which is found in glycerin. This group is basic in the manufacture of alkyd resins which, in turn, are used in making the special paints that now are monopolized by such armaments as warships and tanks.

As for molasses, the chemist sees this product of the sugar process as another important and all but unexplored field. Molasses is a highly complex mixture of substances. Among other things it contains generous amounts of the vitamin biotin, essential to the growth of yeast, and also other vitamins.

Some molasses, it has been discovered, behaves better than other types in fermentation operations. This has led to the supposition that ingredients are present which may poison certain molds. Removal of these hostile elements, the chemists think, might open the way to the use of molasses in manufacturing new fermentation products.

SUGAR AS A FOOD

The other side of the sugar industry's research program will deal with an exploration of the mysteries of sugar's dietary role. For one thing, the industry is disturbed by the aggressive campaigns of other food processors, notably the flour industry, which has its vitamin enrichment program in full swing. Sugar people fear that by emphasizing the value of cereal foods some shadow may have been cast on their product.

The industry's position is that there are few real facts on which to base either blame or praise of sugar as a food.

One problem that will receive attention is the need for sugar to correct semistarvation diets in Nazi-occupied Europe. Researchers recall the old saying among doctors that "fats burn in the fires of carbohydrates," which means that sugar is essential to the proper utilization of body fat.

Nutrition experts here say it is likely that in the poorest-fed areas of Europe there is apt to develop ketosis, a disease in which the muscles slowly waste away, the victim becomes lethargic, lapses into a coma, and eventually dies if the poisoning which caused it reaches an advanced stage. This happens sometimes to sailors more than half-starved from being long adrift in lifeboats.

It's ketosis that does the damage in diabetes. Research has shown that the liver "burns" (chemically changes) both sugars and fats. From the fats are made chemicals called ketones, one example of which is acetone, the solvent now used in making rayon and explosives. Normally these ketones circulate around the body and are converted into energy. But if there is no sugar for the liver to work on, it consumes reserve fats in the body and makes excess ketones which the body can't use; these accumulate in the blood causing a sort of solvent poisoning. That's what happens to sufferers of diabetes because they are unable to assimilate sugar.

SUFFER FROM MILD KETOSIS

A milder form of this condition is what starved people of Europe are up against. Therefore, there may be large demands for sugar for shipments to Europe to offset this condition in areas suffering from German domination. An indication of this value of sugar under emergency conditions is shown by the fact that some lifeboat rations contain about 85 percent sugar, plus some fats and proteins.

Something else the Sugar Foundation plans to study is: What's the relation of thiamine to sugar and nutrition? This B vitamin serves as a catalyst (that which causes a chemical reaction without itself being changed) for the proper assimilation of sugar. One of the curious things that has been tracked down is the fact that thiamine is synthesized by the bacteria in the intestines of some people tested for vitamin deficiencies. It makes the researchers wonder about the need for feeding vitamins to people and whether they ought not be fed materials to help the body build its own vitamins.

The Foundation plans to try to find whether the average American is actually deficient in thiamine and if possible what the basic requirements are. It might be found advisable to fortify sugar with this vitamin.

The sugar makers want to know more about the real role played by these intestinal bacteria in vitamin making, what vitamins are needed for sugar metabolism (assimilation) and the effect of different diets on the production of vitamins by bacteria within the body.

They also want to know more about the relative values of the various sugars—corn sugar for example—and of the starches. They want to find out whether it is true that sugar causes tooth decay and what high sugar diets do to animals and to human beings in affecting disease resistance, longevity, and general activity.

Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, to Polish-American Citizens' League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] yesterday, February 20, delivered an interesting address at the twenty-third annual banquet of the Polish-American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania, at the Adelphia Hotel in Philadelphia. The address was on a subject in which we are all interested, and I am sure it has an appeal to a much wider audience than the one which was present in person on the occasion referred to. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I should like to discuss briefly the subject of the relations between the Polish republic and the Democratc Party. Since I am speaking to you, not only as your Senator but as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I shall have to speak somewhat less freely than is in my heart to speak. But as you are Polish by ancestry, and Americans by citizenship, I feel sure that you will guess at those things which I must leave unsaid.

In 1918, when Woodrow Wilson formulated his Fourteen Points, he stressed that peace in Europe would not be possible unless an independent Poland should be constituted with a secure outlet to the sea. That pledge was the diplomatic beginning of the Polish republic which rose from the ashes of partitioned Poland a century and a half after the crime of the 3 empires—Austria, Prussia and Russia—had sought to wipe Poland from the atlas.

At the Peace Conference, when the frontiers of Poland were discussed, President Wilson refused to give American endorsement to the contemplated Polish-Russian frontier, lying far to the east of what his experts told him was the true ethnographic frontier of the Polish people. I state this as a fact, because it is a fact, that Woodrow Wilson, the best friend that the Poles have ever had in modern times, refused to encourage the desire of the Polish government to assert sovereignty over the regions of Eastern Poland which are now in dispute. The British and the French governments—particularly the French government—on the other hand, encouraged Poland to take what she could get after the Polish-Russian War of 1919–1920 and the miracle of the Vistula which saved Warsaw from the Red army in 1920. At that time, as you know, there was much talk of a Cordon Sanitaire to fence the Soviet Union off from Europe. Whether this was a good idea it is not for me to say; at any rate, it suited the mood of the times and it stood for nearly 20 years—a whole human generation.

As to the present situation and the diplomatic question over the post-war frontiers of Poland, it is not for me to say. The Soviet Union is this country's ally and a lifetime of politics has taught me that it is always best to assume that a man's or a nation's word is good until events prove otherwise. It seems to me the part of wisdom and good faith to give full value to the Soviet intentions in this regard.

However, I also remember that free Poland is America's ally in this war against totalitarian tyranny and I am also enough of a practical politician to value an ally not only for the strength but for the spirit which he brings. Poland, whose so-called government in exile at London is the only legally acknowledged representative, is fighting alongside of England, America, and the Soviet Union for the defeat of the Nazi tyranny and the reconstitution of a free and warless Europe.

I refuse to accept that materialistic doctrine that right is measured by might and that the claims of any one nation for justice can be measured only by the number of military divisions, warships, and aircraft that that nation can bring to battle. I am sure that our great democratic Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, spoke not only for me but for every American when he publicly responded to the request of the Polish Government for mediation in the boundary dispute with the Soviet Union. It is true that this country, unlike England, did not guarantee the Polish boundaries of 1939 but it is also true that this country does not believe that a lasting solution of such disputes can be obtained by the unilateral decision of the stronger nation or the will of the most powerful army.

What I see clearly is this: Poland is more than a nation. It is an idea, a civilization, a faith. I do not hold with the old cordon-sanitaire idea so dear to men like Clemenceau and Lord Curzon. But I see that Poland, however constituted, has a destiny in the life of Europe and the world which is superior to many narrow technical arguments. The Poles are, in fact, the bridge between Europe and Asia—a Slavic people, Catholic in religion, proud of their race and their nationhood, seeking the right to live their own life, regardless of the nationalistic convenience of their powerful neighbors. Poland is a nation without strong national frontiers and hence every Pole tends to become his own frontier. That has been Poland's history since the dawn of European history, and that will, in my judgment, be Poland's history in the generations to come.

Speaking to you, who are not only Polish by race but are Americans by citizenship, this should be a source of particular pride, for America, too, is a great idea—the idea of human brotherhood and equal citizenship, without reference to race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude. We are now engaged in a great struggle to expand our franchise and, in addition to the historic freedoms, we have decreed that conditions of sex shall not disenfranchise an American and are striving to add the thought that neither poverty nor military service shall be deemed to disqualify an American from the right to vote. That is why the Poles have always seemed to belong in America and, above all, to belong in the party of human rights and human dignity as against property rights and corporate privilege. Here in America—"the last best hope of earth"—it has twice within a generation been our privilege and duty to fight to expand the frontiers of freedom.

Your boys, your husbands, your brothers are today fighting in every part of the world, as Americans, against the world-wide Axis conspiracy against human dignity and human freedom. Here, it seems to me, is the best guaranty that free Poland will rise once more from the Nazi tyranny and eastern darkness to resume its place as one of the heirs and executors of world freedom in the post-war world. For Poland is indissolubly linked to western freedom, to western civilization, and to Christendom, and cannot be ignored, wronged, or suppressed in the establishment of a lasting peace.

And here, according to my personal belief, is where Poles can best serve Poland—by remembering that the real fury which fell on their country came from Nazi Germany, from the Wehrmacht, which cut the Polish troops to bloody ribbons, from the Luftwaffe, which bombed Warsaw and other Polish cities to smoking ruins, from the Gestapo and Nazi commissars, which set up the concentration camps, which sent Polish girls to German Army brothels or to the select stud farms established by the so-called master race, and which have made Poland the grave of millions of Polish citizens.

I earnestly urge you, Americans of Polish ancestry, to remember these things when you are tempted to protest about your pre-war frontiers and the unreasonableness of allies. Allies are always unreasonable, I know, but we should always remember that we, too, are allies, and doubtless seem unreasonable to other nations. In the last analysis, it is a matter of having faith in one's self and in keeping that faith. On this, and this alone, depends the destiny of nations. There is no people more worthy of that faith than the Poles, and no nation whose future has been more deeply consecrated than has the Poland which has lived through the passion, the death, and the resurrection of a race which could never be held down by knout, bayonet, tank, or police spy.

Ceiling Price on Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. F. Timm, of Big Spring, Nebr.

This letter states in a vivid manner the difficulties which confront the growing and the marketing of hogs. It does seem that the farmer is always taking the short end of the economic stick. Here is a man who was forced to sacrifice $62.97 on 21 head of hogs simply because the ruling for the marketing of hogs permits this type of treatment.

Unless the farmer can be guaranteed a fair profit for his hogs certainly there will be fewer hogs raised.

BIG SPRINGS, NEBR., *February 14, 1944.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER.

DEAR SIR: Just want to tell you how the ceiling on hogs is working. I took 37 head to Denver last week, and this is the way they do us at the markets:

All hogs averaged 228 pounds. They took out 15 that weighed 246, gave me the price of $13.75; then the other 21 hogs weighed 199 pounds; for these they only gave me $12. They could have taken out 3 head and all the rest would have weighed over the 200, and they were all well finished, too, even the 3 smaller ones. They are getting by with it, too, with everybody. Several of my neighbors got the same treatment. It does look that if we are to be guaranteed farmers' prices why don't they make it stick? Whenever a hog weighs 200 or over, make them pay the floor at least.

We can't feed hogs at 12 cents with the grain as high as it is. Corn, $1.20; barley, $1.05; rye, $1.05.

They have asked us to raise the hogs and then let us lose money on them. In the Corn Belt they possibly can do it cheaper than we. We haven't been raising as many hogs and are not as well equipped as they. Most farmers are patriotic enough to raise the hogs, even if we have to lose on them. I'm not complaining of the $13.75. That is good enough, but the buyer gets too many at $12. It cost about 60 cents per hundred to get them to market, which leaves us $11.40 to $13.15.

Can anything be done to stop the buyer from stealing $1.75 per hundred on our 200-pound hogs?

We could buy lots more bonds if we got the other $1.75 on the 21 head of mine on which they took off $62.97.

Please, what is possible?

Yours very truly,

W. F. TIMM.

Candidate Roosevelt and the Veterans of America's Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, is it not strange that Mr. Roosevelt should suddenly turn friend of the veteran, now wanting to give them the vote, and open the coffers of the Treasury to them? Why does he do it? He knows that he is now licked unless he can get the soldiers' vote, so he is trying to deceive them by making them believe that he is their lifelong friend. He is the same Roosevelt who told the soldiers at their Legion convention in Chicago a few years ago that no soldier in uniform deserved more consideration than any ordinary citizen. He is the same Roosevelt who, in the first year of his first term, 1933, forced through the so-called economy bill that cut off the compensation and pensions of thousands of veterans of the First World War, men who have never been put back on the rolls and who are now in dire need. He is the same Roosevelt who has invariably vetoed every private pension bill which Members of Congress succeeded in getting through both Houses. He has vetoed a score of my own, until the Senate no longer will pass those which get through the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of the soldier vote in this election. They are the boys whom Mr. Roosevelt promised in the last campaign that he would never send to fight on foreign soil. We all want the soldiers to vote, but we want them to vote a legal ballot in the constitutional manner which will allow them to vote for State and county as well as for Federal officers. Of course, the young men in our present Army have never known any President other than F. D. R., but enough of them have fathers who served in the last war and will advise them just how good a friend Delano has been to the veterans. Just to keep the record straight, I include a little memorandum on Candidate Roosevelt and the veterans of America's wars, prepared, published, and distributed by the Republican Service League of Jackson County, Mo. Any Democratic Service League could give our people the same factual information. The soldiers should certainly have it before casting their ballots this fall.

CANDIDATE ROOSEVELT AND THE VETERANS OF AMERICA'S WARS

For 10 years Candidate (Fourth Term) Roosevelt (on the record) has opposed veterans' legislation.

The first Roosevelt Congress convened on March 9, 1933; March 10, 1933, Roosevelt sent his economy message to Congress in the shape of Public, No. 2, Seventy-fifth Congress. Congressman WOODRUM of Virginia, Democratic chairman, described this bill as follows:

"This bill was framed by the President (Roosevelt); he knows its every paragraph; its every provision."

The effects of this Roosevelt economy bill were:

1. Changed the word "compensation" for wounded veterans to "pensions."

2. "Compensation" for veterans permanently crippled by battle wounds were reduced 20 percent.

3. Fifty-five thousand combat casualty cases were abolished.

4. Civil War veterans and widows were reduced 10 percent.

5. Four hundred and fifty million dollars was taken from the veterans of all wars.

6. Monthly service-connected pensions were cut from $43.54 to $23.95 in the name of economy.

7. Allowances to 154,848 service-connected veterans were disallowed.

8. Fifty-five percent of Spanish-American veterans were abolished and the balance reduced 10 percent (in the name of economy).

9. All presumptive cases were wiped out.

10. The $100 burial allowance was eliminated.

However, Roosevelt did allow the dead veteran's parents to receive at the veteran's burial the American flag.

This Roosevelt Economy Bill also attempted to abrogate outright 616,069 war risk insurance policies, plus the 20,000 pending claims.

However, the Supreme Court of the United States (the nine old men) unanimously declared this insurance provision void as violative of the Fifth Amendment. Query: What would the present slap-happy Supreme Court have done? This unanimous opinion (292 U. S. 571) in part reads:

"To abrogate contracts in the attempt to lessen Government expenditures would not be the practice of economy but an act of repudiation with all the wrong and reproach that term implies."

In June 1934 Congress passed Public, No. 141 which remedied many of the injustices of the Roosevelt Economy Bill; Candidate Roosevelt immediately vetoed this bill; Congress immediately passed this bill over Roosevelt's veto.

On May 22, 1935, for the first time in the history of the United States a President (Roosevelt) delivered his veto message of the adjusted-compensation bill in person before Congress on a national broadcast and announced:

"That Government assistance was not due the veterans as a class; that there was no room for national gratitude; that veterans must sacrifice for all the others, but they in turn should incur no sacrifice for them."

This bill was then, by Congress, passed over Roosevelt's veto.

More bills vetoed by Candidate Roosevelt:

H. R. 8421. Pensions for widows of sailors and soldiers.

H. R. 8422. Pensions for Civil War widows.

H. R. 8423. Increases in pensions.

H. R. 8424. Increases in pensions.

H. R. 8425. Pensions for helpless children of veterans.

H. R. 8426. Pensions for certain classes of veterans.

In 1938, W. P. A. average pay was $65 per month; at this time the pension for a totally and permanently non-service-connected World War veteran was $30 per month. H. R. 8729 increased this to $40; Roosevelt immediately vetoed this bill, deliberately misleading the public in his veto message. June 10, 1942, Public, 601, Seventy-seventh Congress, did the same thing—increased from $30 to $40. However, now June 15, 1942, Candidate (now running for fourth term) Roosevelt signed the bill.

The Seventy-fifth Congress passed the soldiers and sailors insurance bill, which Roosevelt immediately vetoed; Congress passed this bill over Roosevelt's veto—House 368 to 13 (the 13 all New Dealers); Senate 69 to 12 (the 12 all New Dealers).

The Seventy-sixth Congress had seven major veterans' bills vetoed by Candidate Roosevelt; however, H. R. 2899, Philippine back-pay bill, was passed over Roosevelt's veto—House 275 to 83 (all New Dealers except 1 Republican); Senate 76 to 3 (the 3 all New Dealers).

This antiveteran record has been so consistent (until 1942), so inhuman, so unfair, so unjust, so dishonest, so un-American as naturally to suggest its author—one who has never served, never fought, never earned, one who has never been hungry—Fourth Term Candidate Roosevelt.

Know the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by my nephew, Lt. Reginald Auchincloss, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune which explains itself.

Lieutenant Auchincloss, United States Naval Reserve, is one of my nine nephews on the firing line of this war in different parts of the world. He has had some adventurous times, perhaps the most exciting being when his ship was torpedoed and sunk off the southern coast of Africa and he floated around in a rubber lifeboat for 2 days and nights before being rescued by a British destroyer. His brother is an Army flyer and his sister is with the Red Cross on an island near New Guinea.

This young man, like his comrades, knows what war means with all its horrors and destruction and when he and his comrades come home they will have little patience with those who complain and who play politics in handling the destinies of their country. They do not want to return to a kingdom ruled by an indispensable dictator; they want to come home to a democracy where the Government, from President to town clerk, is elected by the suffrage of all the people.

Members of Congress, in both Houses, have many relatives and friends fighting for our freedom of life all over the world, and shame on anyone who accuses them of perpetrating a fraud on these gallant men and women at any time, anywhere.

KNOW THE ENEMY—OFFICER HOLDS HE HAD TO BE TOLD OF JAP ATROCITIES

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A great deal has been said by many so-called prominent citizens concerning the advisability of publishing atrocity stories such as the recent one concerning prisoners of war in Japan. This is not, however, the first atrocity story that has appeared in our newspapers. There have been many stories concerning atrocities committed on Poles, Russians, Italians, and Norwegians. The mothers of those men have no doubt read and certainly know by now that frightful things have happened to their sons. They have survived the shock.

Maybe the "prominent citizen," who sees bayonets being driven into American mothers by these stories, cannot visualize a Russian mother watching her husband being tortured and then shot by Nazis—or maybe he cannot picture her stumbling over the frozen body of her dead son. But those women have lived through it somehow. We can talk of our long-suffering mothers. Believe me, they have not known the suffering the women of war-torn Europe have undergone.

I have all respect for the mothers of America and for their sacrifice—but the people of this country who do not and will not ever experience the true, naked terror and horror of modern warfare must be brought to realize what it is all about. They must come to know the enemy, even as well as the soldier who fights the enemy till one or the other is dead. The information concerning our enemy must come through the press, and Americans should be ready to read the worst. It is only through complete knowledge of the creature we fight that victory can be gained over it. And that is true as much for the soldier or sailor who hunts him down and kills him as it is for the civilian who does his or her part at home.

R. AUCHINCLOSS, Jr.,
Lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.
BOSTON NAVY YARD,
Boston, Mass., February 11, 1944.

How to Get the Century of the Common Man

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an address delivered by me at the People's Lobby luncheon, Washington, D. C., recently:

War breeds not only famine, pestilence, and death; it also breeds reaction. And, just as mankind has to take especially energetic measures in wartime to defend itself from famine, pestilence, and death, so also it must battle with vigor and unremitting determination against the plague of war-inspired reaction—or suffer consequences from which it will take a generation or more to recover. The fourth horseman of this unholy apocalypse is today in the saddle in this country, ready to ride our people to disaster if not checked through united action by the common people.

This danger of reaction resulting from the present war is specially serious for two reasons:

In the first place, American big business, the most highly developed form of corporate enterprise the world has ever known, has perfected its mechanisms to the highest point in its history. This is particularly noticeable and disquieting in the almost 100 percent control it now enjoys over the channels of information and the organs of public opinion, and in the high degree of control it has always held, and still holds, over the machinery of the two dominant political parties—and thereby over the agencies of Government.

Secondly, the menace of reaction in this country is rendered still more alarming, not only to ourselves but to the entire world, by the emergence of the United States as a world power, one of the two most powerful nations on earth. Certain ruthless and reckless elements in American business, gorged with war profits and drunk with greed for more, are already making plans and initiating measures for launching this Nation on a mad career of imperialism which, if not checked, must inevitably plunge us and the world into the horror and utter ruin of World War No. 3.

The clamor for far-flung air bases and domination of the airways of the world, first given voice in Congress in the "globaloney" speech of the lady from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]; the undercover reaching out of the tentacles of the oil octopus into the dangerously explosive regions of the Near East; the tenacious vitality of the pre-war cartels in drugs, chemicals, rubber, oil, aluminum, copper, nickel, among others—these and other unmistakable signs and portents are evil omens of the fate in store for us if we allow empire-minded American businessmen and financiers to have their unbridled way.

Their determination to corral a lion's share of world trade can have but one result in international relations, namely, to destroy any possibility of effective world organization for collective security and drive other nations into alliances for mutual protection against the American peril. Already, I am informed on reliable authority, some far-seeing Britishers have come to despair of a workable understanding with profit-mad America and are casting about for some plan for safeguarding the peace of Europe, not bolshevism or the yellow peril, but from the insatiable greed of American monopolists and protagonists of cartelization.

This menace of American business imperialism does not only endanger other nations; it threatens the existence of our own people, who, as always, would be called upon to bear the crushing burdens and pay the terrible costs in blood and treasure, in toil, tears, and suffering of another international holocaust.

To check this oncoming juggernaut, to destroy it and usher in, not only the century, but the era, of the common man, two general lines of action should be clearly laid down and vigorously and persistently followed—organization and education.

The people must come together in great numbers in liberal and democratic organizations, and they must extend and improve their services of information; they must combine their strength and they must also arm themselves with facts to meet the false arguments and specious reasoning of the enemy.

We must all work tirelessly to build up and strengthen labor unions, liberal organizations, consumer groups, cooperative enterprises, and to bring them into closer and more harmonious relations for united economic and political action.

Even more work needs to be done, and is even more urgently needed, in the field of public information. Never before in the history of this or any other country have the agencies which mold public opinion been so completely under the sinister control of selfish and unprincipled minority, utterly without scruple or shame in using this power to deceive and mislead the public. Our educational system, from kindergarten to university, is under the close surveillance of the business interests and their servile "stooges." By them the twig is bent to the will of corporate monopoly. The independent teacher, school principal, or textbook writer is soon brought to heel or eliminated.

Movies and radio are under the same domination. Newsreels and news commentators "slant" the day's happenings as directed by big business. The broadcaster who tries to give the people the truth as he sees it is liable to be yanked off the air. Within the past few weeks at least five honest commentators have been thus silenced, while two others, too well intrenched to be removed, have been subjected to censorship.

The recent death of William Allen White, the last of the front-rank independent editor-publishers, has brought into sharp relief the virtual monopolization of the newspaper field by organized business and its allies. Only a few conscientious and courageous dailies, such as the Philadelphia Record, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Chicago Sun, the New York Post, and PM, still strive to give their readers the truth. The others—as is persistently pointed out by that fearless gadfly of the corrupt press, George Seldes, in his valiant little weekly, "In Fact"—are shameless, not only in suppressing, but actually in falsifying the news and misinterpreting it in their editorial comment in whatever way will best serve the interests of "Big Business."

It is good news, in this connection, that Scott Nearing, one of the ablest and most disinterested and incorruptible economists this country has ever known, is planning to issue a news letter in which he will analyze, interpret, and expose the evil forces at work in this country and abroad.

"Give the people the facts and they will make the right decision" is good democratic doctrine, but unfortunately the converse is equally true—if the facts are hidden from the people, or misrepresented to them, they are only too likely to make the decisions desired by their exploiters and misleaders.

"Whenever the people are well informed," said Thomas Jefferson, "they can be trusted with their own government." We must resolutely and untiringly do all in our power to increase and extend the channels through which honest information on public questions can get to the people. No patriotic duty is more urgent than this.

The likelihood of mass unemployment after the war makes it specially imperative that public opinion be kept steady and well informed. The tragic experience of Germany and Italy in the depression following World War No. 1 shows how a hungry and bewildered nation can fall prey to the siren promises of unscrupulous demagogues and to the blandishments of false leaders serving secretly the interests of the ruling class.

Let us not be lulled into a false optimism by the soothing-sirup lullabies of those who seek to croon the labor giant to sleep while they bind him with restrictive legislation and fetter his protective organizations. In its monthly business analysis for October 1943, the Research Institute of America, told the American businessman to expect ten to twelve million unemployed in this country 1 year after the end of the war, and up to 15,000,000 the year following. Clear thinking and disciplined group control will be needed to prevent such an army, in the grip of hunger and fear, from falling victim to the ambitious schemes of some popular military hero, some general who may lack the strength

of character Smedley Butler displayed when he spurned the call to lead a march on Washington.

In the approaching election campaign, it is of vital importance that the people elect officials who have demonstrated that they can be relied upon to serve the people, not grasping special interests. Where no such tried and proven servants of the people are up for reelection, we must be watchful to support the candidates who give binding and unequivocal pledges to act always for the common good. These candidates should also be required to promise wholehearted support of the basic principles of democratic international policy formulated in the Atlantic Charter and presumably implemented in the Moscow, Tehran, and Cairo Conferences.

There are two measures which would aid greatly in preparing for the coming campaign and which could be instituted very quickly. They would meet an urgent need experienced by the liberal elements in Congress and strengthen their hands in the running fight against reactionary propaganda. A relatively small sum of money, which could easily be spared from the treasuries of some of the larger labor unions, would suffice to maintain a research bureau here in Washington, to equip labor and liberal spokesmen in Congress with facts and figures with which to demolish the specious arguments and expose the phoney statistics advanced by the representatives of reactionary interests in order to hoodwink and mislead the public. None of the Congressmen defending labor and liberal interests commands the means, public or private, to finance such a research bureau.

In like manner, it would be relatively inexpensive and equally useful to set up here a publicity bureau to attend to the mechanics of getting the voice of the liberal Members of Congress out to their constituents and to the public at large. No Congressman on the liberal side of the House has the means to handle this work adequately with his limited office force.

These bureaus, one for research and one for publicity, should be established as soon as possible, as the 1944 election campaign is already upon us.

Serious though the general situation is, it nonetheless offers us a golden opportunity. While the forces of reaction are powerful and arrogant, the sleeping "Gulliver" of the common man is beginning to stir and to become conscious of his potential strength. Never before have the democratic forces in this country been so clear as to their aims or so hopeful of making progress toward achieving them.

And this is even more true of other countries. Across the Canadian border, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, with a complete program for government ownership of natural resources, basic industries, and public utilities, is growing in power at an unprecedented rate. In the recent election in conservative Ontario Province, its representation in the Provincial parliament was increased by 39 votes, while several seats were won in the Dominion House of Commons. The next general election is expected by many to make the C. C. F. the dominant party, charged with the duty of forming the Dominion Government.

In Australia and New Zealand the Labor Party is more firmly in the saddle than ever; in England it is steadily gaining ground and is demanding the extension of social security along the lines of the Beveridge plan.

The democratic forces of Spain, despite years of savage butchery by Franco and the Falange, are ready to rise again at the first opportunity. In Yugoslavia and Greece, the crushing weight of Nazi occupation has proved unable to keep the common people down, nor have the combined efforts of the British Foreign Office and our own State Department been able to bolster up their tottering monarchies in exile. In China the spread of industrial cooperatives and the extension of democratic processes are harbingers of a new day.

The glorious example of Russia has demonstrated what a resolute people can do when the shackles of economic and political enslavement are cast off.

We must not disappoint these, our potential democratic allies, in other lands. When the moment comes to determine the form that the peace shall take, the liberal and labor forces in America must be ready to take their part in the deliberations. There must be no repetition of the mirror game of the Palace of Versailles with "business as usual" going on backstage.

More than that will be necessary, however. For we know that it will not suffice to draw up rosy plans and sign idealistic agreements. Fascism and reaction—it was Mussolini himself who bragged that they were synonymous—are not going to surrender and disarm along with the armies of Germany and Japan. We shall have them with us for many a year. Eternal vigilance is the price, not only of liberty, but also of progress toward real and full democracy.

We shall have to be watchful, therefore, to see that truly democratic agents are selected to supervise and direct the operation of whatever overall machinery is set up to preserve the hard-won peace and to allow the world to march forward toward that security and plenty which must be the material basis of the century of the common man.

War Preventers Worried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, before the war this Nation had a lot of high-powered organizations with high-sounding names, organized and carried on for the alleged purpose of promoting world peace.

Investigation has disclosed that many organizations were Nazi inspired. Some others have been definitely found to be Communist or Communist-front organizations. Because a vast majority of the American people are peace-loving, God-fearing, and war-hating citizens, some good, patriotic people joined up with these so-called peace organizations in the fervent hope of making some contribution toward an enduring peace. Since their exposure many such organizations have disorganized or become inactive. In recent weeks, however, some of those same organizations are beginning to raise their heads.

Remnants of several alleged peace organizations that have been exposed as un-American are again moving in on the Nation's Capital and some such organizations have the unmitigated gall to once again start up their propaganda campaign against high officials of the armed forces, as well as those in Congress who are supporting the war effort. One such organization is shouting for "peace now." Another wants to stop the war until our peace aims are agreed upon. Some, no doubt, are sincere, but much of such propaganda is Nazi inspired.

It will be recalled that many of the "peace" organizations and societies in their heyday opposed vigorously and effectively every effort of the President and the Congress to have the United States prepared for any eventuality on land, in the air, and on the sea. But, despite this sorry record of bad foresight, to say the least, some of their leaders boldly emerge now as armchair generals with an abundance of advice on how to run the war.

Under the leave granted me, I am including a very timely editorial from the fluent pen of one of Oklahoma's leading editors, George Evans, of the Chickasha Daily Express. As usual, Editor Evans hits the nail on the head. The editorial follows:

WAR PREVENTERS WORRIED

In wartime it is just one worry after another. The National Council for Prevention of War is all hot and bothered. This bunch, whatever it may be, is puzzled. In a letter to the President, Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary, appeals to him to broadcast to the world "our peace aims before we invade Europe." He is quite sure our soldiers don't know why they are fighting; in fact, he fancies Americans at home and abroad are groping in the dark. And so he insists that Mr. Roosevelt should turn on the light. Presumably, the show will have to be stopped till the confusion is cleared up.

On this subject, the President has been piping plainly ever since Pearl Harbor. However, it appears, his umteen speeches haven't percolated the minds of the war preventers. It is rather difficult to believe Americans are as dumb as Mr. Libby supposes. "The American people are not at all clear as to what constructive purposes are to be achieved by a military victory either in Europe or in Asia," says Mr. Libby. The implication is that it won't promote peace to lick the dickens out of the Nazis and Japs, put them in their place, make them powerless to resume their aggression. If this is the idea, it will suit Hitler and Tojo to a t-y ty. They would be quite happy if we would quit and let them keep all they have stolen.

With all the Germans and Japs have grabbed they would be in a position to push around peace-loving peoples at will. They have blatantly proclaimed their plans to lord it over the earth. If we let them get away with their ill-gotten gains, we have every reason to believe we'll have to keep on fighting them till kingdom come. As a practical, immediate peace aim, isn't it enough to render them helpless to carry out their hellish purposes? In all plans for preventing world conflicts in the future, this step comes first.

Precisely what scheme will be worked out for the preservation of international order, is a matter of speculation. Possibly Mr. Libby and his bunch want Mr. Roosevelt to reveal the pattern for it. Do they think the President can pull it out of his hat? Master minds of the United Nations will have to take a crack at fixing it up. America, Russia, and Britain are moving steadily in that direction. It will have to be a joint product, probably representing a compromise of conflicting ideas. In all probability, years will pass before it is put in final form.

The objectives America and her allies have in this war are perfectly clear. They have been shouted from the housetops repeatedly. Our primary purpose is to knock out military powers that menace our existence as a peaceful, free people. After that, we shall do our utmost, in cooperation with other nations, to devise a set-up to keep it from happening again. Though some of our people seem to think we can have peace by mouthing about it, that isn't the way we can get it. The vast

majority of Americans are not confused, not under any delusions; they know full well they can get it only by fighting. This is why they are concentrating on winning the war and have no patience with boat-rockers. The President is a busy man. He need not take time out to ease the minds of professional war preventers.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the text of an address delivered February 2, 1944, by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, before the American Road Builders' Association convention in Chicago.

Mr. Hoffman stresses the importance of advance blueprinting of needed and useful construction projects, both public and private, as essential to the orderly conversion to a peacetime economy and to the continued functioning of that economy at an adequate level to maintain employment and business opportunity.

This recognition of the value of public and private construction and of the need for its planning during the war comes from one of our leading industrialists, the president of the Studebaker Corporation, and one whose civic spirit, exemplified in his founding and continuing chairmanship of the Automotive Safety Foundation, was well known many years before he accepted the distinguished assignment to head the Committee for Economic Development. His address follows:

It was with particular pleasure that I accepted the invitation to speak before the American Road Builders' Association. I welcomed the opportunity to address you because for more than 30 years I have had a genuine interest and have been active in the field of highway development. That perhaps makes me eligible for the old-timers along with President Carl Brown and Charlie Upham. Today my interest is greater than ever because I sincerely believe that a sound and intelligent post-war program of highway construction and modernization can make a significant contribution toward winning the peace.

Because my subject deals with the post-war situation, I want to remind myself that we are still in the midst of a global war—the greatest in history. We certainly have not won this war yet. The most sobering thought of all comes from the fact that on the last day of the First World War, there were some 26,000 casualties. Before we can hope for peace in America, American men and boys must join with those of our allies and fight their way down the road to Mandalay; before we can have peace in America, American, British, and Canadian men and boys must force their way through the pass of Thermopylae; and before we can have peace in America, American, British, and Canadian men and boys must not only continue to roar over the Ruhr, but must also march through it.

Nevertheless, while we have not yet won the war, the three international gangsters have lost it. But it is well to remember that they missed by only a hair, the re-creating of a feudal world in which they would have been the masters. Today, Mussolini, who said, "I spit on democracy," is living in abject terror. Hitler, who, according to Time magazine, danced for joy when France fell because he thought his dream of world conquest had been realized, is now having nightmares. Tojo, who predicted victory in 6 months over the Chinese in July 1937, is now telling his people that the war may last 100 years. The same men who are responsible for the fact that the gangsters have lost the war are going to bring us victory far short of that 100 years. For that we owe them an obligation of such magnitude that we can never hope to repay it.

Winning the peace may take even longer than winning the war. Those very men who are winning the war for us are going to have an important part in winning the peace. It is going to be our job to see that they have the opportunity to make that further contribution. We must take action now to make certain that the peace is not lost long before they come back.

The phrase "winning the peace" does not mean exactly the same thing to all of us. Perhaps you and I would agree that the very minimum specification for winning the peace is the achievement of a post-war economy in which there is neither mass unemployment nor regimented Government employment. Either would put our freedoms in jeopardy. In my opinion, we can avoid those pitfalls only through the attainment after this war of a new high level of peacetime productivity.

As businessmen, I suggest that it is important that we try to measure as precisely as possible the task that lies ahead from the standpoint of jobs. The phrase "full employment" which one so frequently hears is vague and perhaps has implications of overpromise. Fortunately, when the various groups most seriously interested in the post-war employment situation cease dealing in phrases and start dealing in figures, they reach about the same conclusion.

The Committee for Economic Development estimates that we will have a very satisfactory situation if, after reconversion, we have fifty-five to fifty-eight million peacetime jobs in our working-fighting force, or some nine to twelve million more than in 1940, our last peacetime year. The C. E. D. further estimates that after this war we will have a minimum of 2,000,000 men in our armed forces, which leaves a net figure of fifty-three to fifty-six million civilian jobs.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., has named 55,000,000 civilian jobs or some 9,000,000 more than in 1940, as a goal that would be satisfactory to labor. The Brookings Institution recently estimated that 8,000,000 more civilian jobs than in 1940, or approximately 54,000,000, will have to be provided after the war. Both the Murray and Brookings Institution figures fall within the bracket set by C. E. D. The important figure on which to concentrate is that of seven to ten million, representing the increase in civilian jobs over 1940 needed if we are to meet the minimum requirement in winning the peace—that is, the avoidance of mass unemployment or mass Government employment.

And now having measured our task in terms of jobs may I say, despite the fact that our ultimate objective must be an economy of abundant employment, that it seems terribly important to me that our goal be stated in terms of productivity rather than jobs. We might have "jobs for all," to make use of a popular phrase, but they might not be the right kind of jobs. If they were not productive and well paid, we might be marching straight down the road to disaster.

As an example of what may happen if we continue to build up the impression that all our problems will be solved if we attain that nebulous goal, "full employment," I call your attention to House bill No. 3677, which was introduced by Representative KLEIN, of New York. This bill, to quote its own language, is "to aid in the stabilization of the economic structure of the United States after the present war by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the gradual reduction of the workweek to 30 hours."

From certain other persons has come the suggestion of a 30-hour week with 40 hours' pay immediately at the close of the war. Neither Mr. KLEIN nor other proponents of the 30-hour week contend that 40 hours of work per week is excessive. Their aim is to create more jobs by spreading the work. No doubt this suggestion is well meant and springs from a sincere desire to see everybody employed. But it is simply a suggestion to lower the living standard of the whole Nation, and that includes labor. We cannot have the things we want to eat and wear and enjoy except as a result of productive work.

Again, labor is in substantial agreement with us, to judge from Mr. Philip Murray's recent speech before the Economic Club of New York. "When the war ends," said Mr. Murray, "hours will be reduced by some amount, possibly to a national working average of less than 40 per week. But we must avoid the concealed unemployment that hides behind short hours, and means only a sharing of misery."

There is only one safe goal on which we dare focus, and that is an increase in the gross national output of goods and services. Only by producing more can we have more to divide. We cannot loaf our way back into prosperity, particularly in a post-war world where we face the need of carrying a very heavy burden of taxation. If we are to achieve the necessary increase in employment on a sound basis we can do so only by attaining a 30- to 45-percent increase in productivity over 1940, when our gross national output of goods and services was approximately $97,000,000,000. That increase in output should be our No. 1, all-important, immediate post-war objective.

The idea that shortening hours is by itself a cure-all for all our post-war problems is not the only erroneous conception that I find prevalent today. There are several more to which I should like to pay my respects.

First. The impression that the objectives of the committee for economic development are in conflict with the objectives of those responsible for public works. I want to say here and now that the C. E. D. is fully conscious of the need for a post-war program of public works. That need will be greatest in the immediate post-war period. Therefore, there is not a moment to lose in blueprinting public works projects at the Federal, State, and local levels. The importance of getting these projects blueprinted will be brought into sharp focus when we consider that in 1940 there were almost 2,000,000 people on W. P. A. and P. W. A. We don't want another W. P. A. after this war The bigger the shelf of public works projects we have when this war ends the less likely are we to get another W. P. A.

Much needs to be done in the field of public works after this war. During the war we have been forced to defer not only new construction but also maintenance of necessary public-works projects. That is particularly true in the case of our highways. Speaking before a large group of automobile dealers in Detroit last week, I urged that they give even increased support to programs of sound and intelligent highway development. I pointed out that before war restrictions cut down the volume of traffic, we were vainly trying to operate twentieth-century transportation system on eighteenth-century roads and streets. I added that, immediately after the war, conditions will be even worse because highways are being pounded to pieces; they have had little or

no maintenance; there has been practically no new construction.

Fortunately, in Thomas MacDonald, Chief of the Public Roads Administration, we have a highway leader who is fully aware of the need for prompt action. In his most recent report on interregional highway needs in the United States, we find provided for the first time an official master plan for superhighways, which is challenging and which in itself will provide for several hundred million dollars' worth of construction. Several States already are well along with their highway programs, but there is still plenty of room for progress. We can't get highway blueprints out too soon. In speaking of the MacDonald report, I am aware that the American Road Builders' Association has proposed a program for a national highway development. I am not an engineer and, therefore, I am not in a position to pass judgment on the merits of the two programs. But I take the position that we would back the official programs already submitted.

Just one last word on public works. It is probably needless to say that any post-war public-works program should cover only necessary projects and should provide that the work be done by private contractors under the competitive system of bidding.

Second. There is the impression that V-day is a long way off and, therefore, we shall have plenty of time to prepare for the problems which peace will bring. Such thinking is utterly unrealistic. T-day, or termination day, has already arrived for thousands of war contractors. As of January 1, the dollar volume of canceled war contracts in this war was more than twice the total cancelations of World War No. 1. Due to the fact that Government policies have not yet been determined and that contractors themselves are unprepared, terminations are taking an unduly long time. If this situation is not corrected, there may be a serious interference with the war effort.

May I also call your attention to the fact that demobilization day also is already here. Every weeks brings the honorable discharge of thousands of men from the armed forces. The time is here—and—for business to organize and insist on taking care of demobilized men and to help them in realining themselves in civilian activities.

It isn't only these thousands of returning servicemen for whom the war is over—it is over for certain industries as well. It is over for both the construction and machine-tool industries. They are already face to face with most of the problems which peace will bring.

V-day to most of us means that glorious day when Japan surrenders unconditionally. That's the day when we shall be entitled to do our cheering, but it's A-day that will bring the great shock to our domestic economy. By A-day, I mean the day an armistice is signed with Germany. On that day our domestic economy will be confronted with a high percentage of the problems which total peace will bring. It is essential that we be prepared to meet them. If we are not, partial peace may bring a partial paralysis of our economy. That would be disastrous, not only from the standpoint of winning the peace, but also that of finishing the war with Japan in the shortest possible space of time. Confusion and chaos on the home front would delay the day of ultimate victory.

Third. I encounter with surprising frequency the fallacy that post-war planning is the exclusive province of manufacturers and industrialists. I have yet to find a retailer who doesn't believe that every manufacturer should be planning boldly—and planning now—but a shockingly large number of retailers are doing no planning for their own enterprises. Yet manufacture accounts for only about 23.4 percent of total employment in America.

No one in the field of distribution has the right to aloofness or complacency in the matter of post-war planning. All hope of achieving a rapid and substantial increase in gross national output will be shattered unless wholesalers and retailers, including the corner drugstore, play their part in planning for expansion. Indeed, they can and should do much to see that the manufacturer from whom they buy is doing his part.

Fourth. I have found a dangerous belief on the part of a larger number of businessmen that post-war planning is a particular function of big business; that it is not the type of activity in which smaller businesses can engage with profit. In view of that I thought perhaps it would be well to take a look at what we call business in America, to see how many big businesses, medium-size businesses, and small businesses there are.

Nothing more than an approximation can be given because of the high mortality rate prevailing at the present time in the case of small business. As a round figure there are today something less than 2,000,000 separate business establishments, not including farms employing 1 or more persons. Of these only about 3,200 employ 1,000 or more workers each. Some 35,000 each employ between 100 and 1,000 workers, and the balance of slightly less than 2,000,000 each employ fewer than 100 workers. Significantly, those businesses employing less than 100 workers account in the aggregate for about 45 percent of the total business employment in the United States. The statistics I have just quoted should dismiss forever any thought that big business can, by itself, win the peace. It is vitally important that small business plan and plan now. If our smaller enterprisers do plan, there is every reason to hope for a great resurgence of small business in the post-war period.

Fifth, and finally, among the fallacies I have encountered I list the failure to take into proper account the potential additions to the ranks of employers in the post-war period. Much has been written—and properly so—about the millions of men who left their jobs to take up arms. Little or nothing has been said about the hundreds of thousands of employers who closed up shop and went into service. Those men, when they return, will have a natural preference to get back in business for themselves.

Nor are those former employers now in service the only ones who will want to become job givers rather than job holders. Several hundred thousand men who were employees before the war are filled with just this ambition. Quite recently, Ensign Norton Frank, who until he joined the service was chairman of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce Post-War Planning Committee, made a spot check among a fairly large number of servicemen ranging from Army private to colonel, Navy apprentice seaman to commander, Marine private to major, and Coast Guard yeoman to lieutenant. Ensign Frank makes no claim that his survey was sufficiently comprehensive to guarantee the accuracy of his findings, but they are indicative at least. More than one-third of the men interviewed hope to go in business for themselves. Many of them may not make the grade, but the fact that they want to paddle their own canoe is vastly encouraging. Those of us on the home front are under obligation to see that these prospective job givers do not lack opportunity.

THE C. E. D., ITS BACKGROUND AND ORGANIZATION

Now I should like to tell you briefly how the C. E. D. hopes to make its contribution toward the achievement of an economy of high productivity. The C. E. D. is composed of a board of 26 trustees, 12 regional chairmen, approximately 100 district chairmen, and more than 1,100 community chairmen. The committee is completely independent and self-financed, but has the active support of Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones and Under Secretary Wayne C. Taylor, and has been given the finest of cooperation by other governmental agencies, as well as great national business organizations.

Basic responsibility for the committee rests with its board of trustees. Its activities are carried out by the two major divisions: The field development division and the research division. The field development division has two functions: (1) to gather from all possible sources helpful information on post-war planning, and (2) to disseminate that information to as high a percentage of America's employers as possible. Under the leadership of Chairman Marion B. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., and C. S. Fletcher, an extraordinary job of gathering information is now in progress. Experts in manufacturing, marketing, sales, finance, and management engineering, are pooling their knowledge and making it available to expert writers, who can tell the story in such a way that you and I can understand it. A total of 11 committees are hard at work, in some of which you will have a particular interest.

First. The marketing committee, of which Mr. MacGowan is chairman, and Professor Albert Haring, president of the American Marketing Association, is vice chairman. Among the projects on which this committee is working is an estimate of probable post-war demand for some four to six hundred different commodities. They recognize that when this work is concluded there will be a large element of error but their guesses should be extremely helpful.

Second. The consulting management engineers' committee, members of which are preparing a handbook for smaller manufacturers. Probably no group of men in the Nation is better qualified to do this job. Six past presidents of the Association of Consulting Management Engineers comprise the membership. The book they are writing is primarily for those who employ 500 or less, and have a capitalization of $1,000,000 or less. But it will undoubtedly find use with most businessmen regardless of company size. Edwin Booz, senior partner of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, of Chicago, is chairman.

Third. The new materials and design committee, which, as its name implies, is concerned with new materials, new processes and new designs. Public-opinion polls show that the people are well aware of the tremendous strides in these fields resulting from the war. No manufacturer, therefore, can afford to overlook the importance of planning product development now, so that as soon as possible after hostilities cease he will be able to make—in larger quantities than ever before and sell at a profit—products which will not only look better but will operate more efficiently and sell at a lower price.

Under the leadership of G. F. Nordenholt, editor of Product Engineering, chairman, and Gerald Johnson, of Johnson-Cushing-Nevell, vice chairman, this committee is at work on three projects: (a) Production of a soundslide film. Here, for the first time, will be a visualization of the advances made in development of materials, processes, and design. Here will be an opportunity for the sales manager and the manufacturer to see the importance of investigating and capitalizing on these advances. (b) Preparation of a handbook which will bring to the attention of post-war planning executives the facts on at least 13 new materials—plastics, magnesium, plywood, steel, aluminum, glass, and others. (c) Stimulation of approximately 150 magazine editors in their field, urging them to dig up, write up, and print the latest facts on new materials, processes, and design.

A unique board of review, comprising some of the Nation's prominent industrial designers who have never before worked together on a common project, will give valuable aid to

this committee. They are Walter Dorwin Teague, Henry Dreyfuss, Raymond Loewy, Egmont Arenz, Donald Dohner, and John Morgan.

Fourth. There are several committees at work on the problems of distribution. The need of a rapid stepping-up in sales and advertising programs by individual concerns is clearly recognized. Unless aggressive marketing programs are ready, purchasing power will not be translated into effective demand.

Fifth. The finance committee, which concerns itself with financing problems for the transition and post-war periods.

The fact that this information has been, and is being, gathered does not, of course, fulfill the second function of the Field Development Division. To disseminate this information and to stimulate a high percentage of America's 2,000,000 employers to plan boldly and intelligently calls for a carefully conceived campaign. We are operating on three fronts: (1) Through direct contact with the largest corporations; (2) through trade associations; and (3) through C. E. D. committees in the more important employment centers.

Credit for much of the progress which we have made to date we cheerfully give to the trade associations and chambers of commerce which have been cooperating in this activity. a total of some 70 important trade associations which have very active post-war committees at work are engaged not only in studying the particular problems of the industry represented but also in promoting community post-war planning.

One year ago there were three C. E. D. committees operating in the United States. Today there are considerably more than 1,100. Top-flight leaders in these communities have, or are, organizing C. E. D. committees on a basis of complete collaboration with existing business organizations. In most cases the local committees are staffed by the chamber of commerce or some other existing business organization.

There is much inspiration in what has already been accomplished by these local committees. If time permitted, you would get a thrill out of the story of Memphis, Cleveland, Peoria, and perhaps an additional hundred communities which have really gotten under way. Your faith in the resourcefulness and inventiveness of the American businessman would be deepened regardless of how strong it may have been heretofore.

THE RESEARCH DIVISION

The individual businessman, in planning for expanded production, is faced with problems beyond his individual control—problems of securing prompt payment on termination of Government contracts, of disposal of Government-owned surpluses and Government-owned plants, of taxation and foreign markets and many others. We businessmen of C. E. D. do not pretend to know the answers. But C. E. D. has a research staff composed of leading economists and scholars, which is studying these problems. This staff will, after careful study, supply the data on which realistic recommendations can be based. With the facts known, business, agriculture, and labor can approach Government agencies with concrete proposals, drawn up in the interest of the national economy as a whole—that means all of us—for legislation and policies which will liberate and stimulate business to provide its maximum share of jobs and production in the post-war world.

The set-up of this research division is unique in that while independence is guaranteed the scholars, they have the opportunity to consult with businessmen and other scholars as their studies progress. Because of the eminence of the scholars, it is our hope that the findings of the research staff will have considerable influence on the future policies of various segments of our economy.

The research division suggests that many of the present policies of Government, business, labor, and agriculture have sprung from fears that are inherent in an economy of scarcity. Monopolistic practices in that area of our economy where competition should prevail result from fears that there won't be enough customers for our goods. Labor's support of feather-bedding rules, in opposition to incentive payment, has its roots in a conception that there are not enough jobs to go around. All restrictive measures in the field of agriculture spring from the fear of production in excess of demand. As far as Government policies are concerned, they are a mere reflection of all these fears. There must be an abrupt about face on the part of all of us if we are not to miss a genuine opportunity to achieve an economy of plenty.

SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

During the last few minutes I have tried to set before you a precise measurement of the post-war task which lies ahead. Now, as to the prospects for attaining these new high levels of employment and productivity: It is the studied opinion of the committee for economic development that an increase in productivity of from 30 to 45 percent is attainable. All the tangible material factors essential to the attainment of the objective will be present when peace comes. At the end of the war, speaking generally, our supply of raw materials will be ample, and certain of these materials will be available in greatly increased volume over pre-war levels. We shall have a peak supply of skilled production and management workers. We shall face the necessity of rehabilitating and revitalizing our system of distribution, but this can be done. We shall have a pent-up demand for goods tremendous in volume. The volume of savings will be at record-breaking heights. In 1943, for example, savings exceeded $35,000,000,000, as against an average of $5,000,000,000 during the 1930's. By the end of 1944 savings in the hands of individuals should exceed $100,000,000,000.

But there are also certain intangibles to be considered. We can miss the chance for a dynamic economy in which more people will have more, if Government, business, labor, and agriculture fail to subordinate their group interests and to work together for the common good. We can miss that chance if, when A-day comes, we, the people of this country, and particularly the job givers, hesitate, show timidity, and choose to proceed with caution.

This must not happen, because time is the essence. Unnecessary delay might lose the peace for us. In the final analysis, the question of whether we achieve an economy of abundance depends on whether we have courage and faith in ourselves.

To quote from an editorial by John H. Sorrells, Scripps-Howard columnist: "What we need is a revival of an authentic spirit of revolution—a revolt from the tyranny of fear and reactionaryism; a recapture of the will, as well as the means, to venture; a triumphant march to the far horizons of the soul, not a retreat to a Maginot of 'security.'"

Mr. Sorrells sees signs that there has been a revival of the spirit of adventure in America. Quoting further, he says: "We must give our kids most of the credit for this recapture of our faith and courage—those jitterbugging, rug-cutting, 'decadent' kids, who stood up to a powerful and ruthless enemy and licked him at his own game. Some of them had to die in order to teach their fathers courage and faith and many more will die before it is over. The torch was handed back to us, not forward to them. "But the torch is lit. They kept it lit—those who had fewer tangible assets in democracy than their elders—who are fighting to preserve something which we, in our bewilderment and fear, had almost surrendered."

The Indispensable Irritator

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the remarkable characters of our time is Ben Marsh. He is well known to most public figures of America. He does not operate along any established lines. He is sui generis. There is no one of whom I am aware who faintly resembles this piquant personality. He delights to deflate pomposity. He enjoys bringing the arrogant down to earth. He glories in aiding the rapid descent from the clouds of dreamy visionaries. He never fails to have facts and statistical data as a basis for his arguments. He is original, unusual, unpredictable. We need more like him.

Recently an article appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post discussing Ben Marsh. Here it is:

"NO. 1 HELL RAISER"—BEN MARSH, THE SPOKESMAN FOR THE PEOPLE'S LOBBY HERE, BECOMES LOUDER WITH AGE

(By Frank I. Weller)

Nothing quite suits Ben Marsh.

He won't let it, because then he couldn't complain about it.

Ben has been The People's Lobby, Inc., and vice versa for a quarter century. He gets louder as he gets older. He'll be 67 next month.

Old-timers watch him trot—long, lanky, with his chin a step ahead of his feet—toward the Capitol and say:

"Oh, oh. Congress is gonna catch hell. There goes the People's Lobby."

Some never know him by any other name. Who's Who says he is Benjamin Clarke Marsh, Phi Beta Kappa of Iowa (now Grinnell) College, post-graduate student at the Universities of Chicago and Pennsylvania, lifelong social worker, born in Bulgaria, son of an American missionary.

When Leon Henderson was O. P. A. Director, he fished out a five-spot and said:

"Here, Ben, you danged old Socialist, I'm on your side but I can't join. You are the people's kibitzer around official Washington. You are the No. 1 hell raiser."

That's the way the lobby gets some of its funds. Guys just like to watch Ben raise hell. The lobby is eminently legal: It's president is a Methodist bishop, its chief contributor is the daughter of a railway magnate. Ben is the business.

In his office at 1410 H Street NW., two girl clerks and piles of papers printed before they were born are wedged into the outer room. Ben and more papers are wedged into a cubbyhole.

He floods the press with daily statements. He reads the calendar of congressional committee hearings and mutters:

"Let's see. The lobby is against that. I gotta go."

Ben doped out a personal philosophy years ago. He is for the underdog.

He fumes at foibles of human nature. He is Diogenes in the wilderness of Washington confusion. He looks like Diogenes.

CREDIT NO OBJECTIVE WITH BEN MARSH

Congressmen like him. He has ideas, lots of them. CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS are filled with his ideas. Congressmen use them. They can get the credit. Ben doesn't care * * * if they vote right.

"See?" he says. "Ideas are no good unless they have a vehicle."

Ben says his basic economic philosophy is Government ownership of basic industries and natural resources, with technicians and "not politicians doing the operating." In other words, socialization of those industries and resources.

Bureaucrats hold their breath when he pops up with their own facts and figures.

He beefed to the Patman Small Business Committee, pre-Pearl Harbor, that 90 percent of defense contracts were going to 10 percent of the Nation's industry.

He had a 2-hour beef. A news photographer broke in to make pictures. No howled Ben, get a full committee first. They got it.

"Now," grinned Representative PATMAN (Democrat) of Texas "we're all here and you can just file your statement."

"Now," grinned Ben, "I'll just reread it for those who weren't here."

Ben's foxy. He has swell connections. He gets big names on his radio forums on such subjects as Living Costs, Capitalism, After the War, What?

He's a puzzle, too. He dabbles in Wall Street * * * and bawls out "big money."

HE COULD HAVE MADE A FORTUNE

Friends say he could have made a fortune. Comparatively, he's never had a dime. He never wanted a dime. Silk hat "special interests" ride to the Capitol in limousines. Battered old Ben boards a streetcar. He represents people who ride streetcars.

Ben visits the Capitol about 3 times a week, testifies before perhaps 6 or 7 congressional committees a year, but talks to Congressmen by phone at a rate of about 10 a day to make his views known.

For 40 years he has been organizing charities, protecting children from cruelty, redistributing congested populations, rehabilitating the poor, writing books such as An Introduction to City Planning and Taxation of Land Values in American Cities.

Two years ago a national magazine wrote a story about him but hasn't used it. Ben keeps buying a copy each week and saying:

"Not here. The durned capitalists."

Beef Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in submitting an address made by my good friend and predecessor in Congress, the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, over the Farm and Home Hour, Wednesday, February 16, 1944, on the subject Beef Goes to War, in which he pays tribute to the beef producers of the Nation who are making a real contribution to the war effort:

I am going to talk today about beef cattle and beef. It is a subject well worth talking about. The genius of America has made many wonderful things, but no one has ever invented a substitute for a good beefsteak.

Important and healthful as beef is to our diet, it is just as important and just as healthful to our national economy. We couldn't live without it. Beef sticks to our economic ribs.

In the first place, the cash income from beef animals last year in the United States was more than from all of our cotton and wheat combined, and it is usually more than the cash income from our hogs.

Right now it is especially important and presents some special problems.

During the last 3 years we produced more beef and veal than in any other 3 years in our history. Our biggest previous production was 8,500,000,000 pounds during the other World War in 1918, stimulated by the war demand and by the high prices of those days. Now our farmers and ranchers have broken that record by averaging nearly 9,500,000,000 pounds each year for the last 3 years. This year it may be even more than that.

Now, since this means beef and veal produced from the slaughter of animals, an immediate question is, "What has that slaughter done to our supply of cattle on the farms and ranches? Have we eaten them up faster than we have been producing them?" Another question is, "What have we done with all that beef?" Those are two important questions.

First, in spite of this heavy slaughter our cattle numbers are now the highest in our history.

Our pre-war record supply was the 74,000,000 head in 1934, which, together with the drought, contributed to the overstocking of the range that occurred at that time. Our ranges had never before had to carry so many cattle as in 1934, and when the dry years came, as dry years do, there followed disaster. The Government had to come to the rescue and buy cattle to keep them from dying on the range. We must remember those dry years and realize that they may come again.

Today, instead of 74,000,000 cattle there are upward of 80,000,000. Maybe if we are lucky enough to have the same excellent weather conditions that we have enjoyed for the last 5 years our ranges and available feed supplies can carry this record number. But, of course, we can't count on that. That is a problem we must keep in mind.

Now, what has happened to all this beef? First, our Army is one of the beef-eatingest armies in the world. Nobody wants to change that. Last year about one-fifth of all our enormous beef production went to our armed forces. This year we have allocated about 1 pound out of every 4 of our beef supply to our soldiers. That accounts for a little more than 25 percent.

About 1 percent goes to lend-lease, to our allies, but we receive from Australia and New Zealand, under reverse lend-lease, practically the same amount, for our soldiers in the Pacific. In fact, until last year we actually received about the same amount of beef and veal from Australia and New Zealand under reverse lend-lease as we sent to all countries.

The other 73 percent of our enormous production of beef and veal is for our own civilians.

With our national income now at record levels, our civilians have had more money to spend for quality foods like beef than they have ever had before, and they have demanded more beef and have been able to pay for it. Before the war, our people ate on the average about 63 pounds of beef and veal a year. In 1941 and 1942 our civilians averaged about 69 pounds. Last year it was about 59 pounds. For 1944, based on present indications, it should be about 63 pounds per capita, or the pre-war level, for the people as a whole. But these indications can be changed by changing conditions.

But many of our people ate less beef before the war, because they could not afford it. Now they have the money to buy their full share. That means that some of our people who have been eating above the national level now eat less than before the war. There is enough beef for all of us, if we share it equally, to eat at practically our pre-war level.

We can have this tremendous amount of beef because of our great cattle industry on which it rests. Except for India where the cow is a sacred animal, the United States has more cattle than any other country in the world. We have about one-third more cattle than Russia. We have twice as many cattle as Brazil or Argentina.

But it has been a long trail from the handful of cattle that the first Spanish explorers brought to America, and from the early cattle days of the Southwest and other producing areas to what exists now as the greatest cattle industry in the world. Most of that development has come within the past 100 years. We can still trace the trails of its development, along which the pioneers and their droves of cattle moved as the West was built. The Mormon Road and the Oregon Trail fed the great cattle kingdom of the West. The posts along these trails were the markets for the cattle on their thousand hills.

Then those trails gave way before another series, like the Chisholm and the Santa Fe Trails, which developed in their turn, and which led the cattle to the season's best grass and feed and finally brought them to the railroads and the markets of the East.

These trails, in turn, gave way to the modern migrations by railroad and by trucks from the ranches to the feed lots, to the markets, for more efficient production of better quality beef.

And now with the war these beef trails extend far beyond our shores as our beef goes to our soldiers throughout the world. Modern refrigerated ships, blacked out and guarded by planes and destroyers, and paratroopers dropping from the skies in the remotest jungles of the world with their precious C ration in their kits, are an extension of the cattle trails to move beef where it is needed most.

But the cattleman has had his problems. Recurring cycles of prices have plagued the cattleman at almost regular intervals. Periodically he has expanded and gone broke. But with improved feeding, better breeding, improvements in marketing, inspection, and handling, the cattle industry has continued to break new trails.

During the First World War the United States exported in 1918 about a billion pounds of beef—four or five times what we exported under lend-lease last year. Prices soared, both for beef and for the grain that produced it. We remember that, and we remember the crash that followed. In August 1919 the monthly average steer price at Chicago was $16.45. In September a year later it was $15.05, and 7 months later it crashed to $8.15, and by December to $7. That spelled disaster to our cattlemen, and because of the importance of this industry to our national economy it was a shock to the banks and the Nation.

Now another war is upon us. Let us see what some of the problems are.

Past experience should be a warning of the danger of overstocking the range. No one knows how long our luck on weather and range conditions will last. Cattlemen's associations and individual ranchers agree on the need for somewhat more conservative stocking of the range country to play safe,

and nearly two-thirds of our strictly beef cattle come from the 17 Western States.

It would seem wise to market in 1944 more cattle than in recent years. Our goals suggest marketing and other disappearance of about 3,000,000 more cattle this year than the number of calves dropped. While that would slightly reduce our inventory, there are two fortunate related facts.

One is that our record cattle numbers are so high that we can balance them with our feed supply and still have considerably more cattle left than we ever had before this war. The second fortunate coincidence is that we now have an urgent and a critical need for the additional beef that this adjustment in cattle numbers will provide. Unlike 1934 when there was not sufficient national income in the hands of the folks to absorb the beef even at $6.76 per hundred for steers, which was the price that then prevailed in Chicago, we now need all the beef we can get for our armed forces and to help meet our record civilian demand.

If our cattle slaughter in 1944 totals thirty-three or thirty-four million head we will still have as many cattle on hand next January as we had in January 1943. Thus, we can continue to kill more cattle in 1945 than will be born that year and still have more cattle than we ever had pre-war. This would give us an opportunity to improve the quality of our beef cattle by culling out the less desirable animals and keeping the better cows.

Now let's come from the range to the feedlot. While most of our strictly beef cattle originate on the range, many of them move through Corn Belt feedlots where they are fattened and the quality is improved. About 200,000,000 bushels of corn and 300,000 tons of protein supplement were used to feed cattle in the 11 Corn Belt States in 1942. Now because of our record numbers of cattle and hogs and dairy cows and poultry we need to use our feed to the very best advantage in order to get the greatest possible production. If Corn Belt feeders will place emphasis upon feeding more cattle and marketing them as good quality rather than as choice and prime, they can make the same quantity of corn and protein concentrates go further as feed and increase the amount of beef produced. What we need is the biggest possible production and the most efficient use of feed.

Since we need all the meat we can get with the least amount of feed, this deserves careful consideration.

American cattlemen have always been proud of the quality of their product. Down the years in the future we want to continue that high quality standard and increase it. Our systems of meat grading, as a guide to quality, is being perfected and extended. Research on refrigeration has increased the quality and tenderness. During the years before the war quality deserved the greatest emphasis and the progress that has been made should continue when the war is past. Meantime, we have a war to win and our need is for the greatest quantity of good beef that can be produced. Fortunately we can meet this challenge and greatly increase the quantity and still maintain a reasonble quality standard.

We need to find out the best way to bring about this adjustment. We shall continue to welcome the advice and cooperation of the cattlemen through their associations, the feeders, the processors, and others who have a part in this great business of production, in our joint efforts to meet these important problems that confront the cattle industry today.

I salute the beef producers of the Nation. They are making a real contribution to the war effort

Strategic Importance of Alaska and Wrangell Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "A Little on Account," from the pen of Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, a special feature writer for the Washington Times-Herald. The first paragraph reads as follows:

Whoever controls Alaska in the air age controls the world. That was the forecast of Gen. Billy Mitchell back in the days when the air age seemed just a dreamy Sunday newspaper feature. Today the air age is grim actuality.

This is a worth-while article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a Senate resolution, No. 123, which I submitted on June 2, 1941, and which requests the Secretary of State to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to whether or not the United States has a valid claim to sovereignty over Wrangell Island.

Mr. President, I might add that Wrangell Island is in the Arctic regions, and in flying from New York to the Philippines the plane would pass directly over it. If we are in the future to have air routes, as unquestionably they will be established after the war, between continental United States and Moscow, Leningrad, and other points, Wrangell Island will be one of the most important stations in the world.

There being no objection, the article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 18, 1944]

A LITTLE ON ACCOUNT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Whoever controls Alaska in the air age controls the world. That was the forecast of Gen. Billy Mitchell back in the days when the air age seemed just a dreamy Sunday newspaper feature. Today the air age is grim actuality.

We think, in large round terms, that we control Alaska, the pivot of the air world. But we don't altogether. Herewith some background facts:

The Truman committee report of November 5 states that lend-lease was never intended to shift war costs from the United States and demands that the Allies really do something on their own part to furnish greater quantities of reverse lend-lease supplies.

Rubber, petroleum, and metals are listed among the commodities with which the British might after the war repay part of their debt to us.

Of far greater importance to America's future security, however, is the Whitehorse and Yukon Railroad in Alaska, a railroad described by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger in the Saturday Evening Post of November 27, 1943, as ending "squarely in the center of the chain of strategic airports at Wason Lake, Whitehorse, and Northway."

That railroad is the only nonflying method of getting supplies to this strategic control area, and every competent authority knows that a strategically critical military airport cannot be served adequately from the air alone.

The strategic importance of our Alaskan airports today and in the predictable future can hardly be exaggerated.

Billy Mitchell, who was right about so many things, said (February 13, 1935) to the House Military Affairs Committee: "Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft, and that is true either of Europe, Asia, or North America. I believe in the future he who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most strategic place in the world. * * * If Japan seizes Alaska, she can take New York. * * * Alaska is of much more ultimate importance than the Panama Canal."

Our military authorities apparently agree today that the Territory of Alaska is strategically vital, for they have placed the railroad serving our air fields there in the hands of the United States Army.

But the arrangements they have made will allow the railroad to revert to private English ownership after the war.

Oh, yes! This Alaskan railroad, so critically important to the security of the United States, is owned by private British capital.

The arrangements are also subject to considerable criticism from the point of view of good business.

The United States Government, on November 5, 1942, leased the railroad from the British for $27,708.33 per month. Our own Army engineers had appraised its value at $7,000,000, so that we arranged to pay the owners 5 percent of the value per year.

In today's money market that is an extremely high return—especially when the lessor is a government and an ally giving away its shirt, anyhow.

The lease further provides that 1 year after the termination of the war with both Axis Powers the railroad shall revert to the owners, leaving the United States Government with no method of servicing its military airports except this private enterprise, which will be in the hands of alien citizens.

Not only that: The United States Government is, in addition, paying all taxes levied on the road, is paying the costs of insurance, is taking over all the employees of the company, except executive officers, is continuing an agreement with the Standard Oil Co. of California, under which the railroad acts as its agent and distributor in this area, is undertaking liability for any suits for damages successfully filed against the railroad during the lease.

Even more alarming to American taxpayers is the fact that one clause states: "The contractor will reimburse the Government currently for additions and betterments to existing facilities or property which are properly chargeable to capital account."

To date the United States Army has spent $2,000,000 on improvements of the road, and it has not even raised the question with the railroad owners of being reimbursed "currently."

Moreover, an Army letter indicates that the United States Government has no expectation of ever charging the railroad owners for the vast improvements it is making.

Yet our Railway Operating Battalions have performed engineering miracles in improving the road so that its capacity is vastly multiplied.

A resident of one village says that more trains pass through that hamlet in a day now than used to pass in a month.

In the period of 16 months the United States Government has paid $415,624.95 in

rent and, in addition, has sunk $2,000,000 in improvements. The exact additional amount paid out for taxes and insurance can be obtained from Government records.

But aside from these, we have spent two and one-half millions on a railroad whose owners have expressed their willingness to sell the whole works at the appraised value of $7,000,000.

But let's forget how poorly the Army is doing with the British in this matter strictly from the standpoint of business. That's money now gone, forever.

Let's look at this strategic railroad as a vital part of the security system for Alaska, key to control in the air age.

Our British friends are always saying they wish they could do more to show their gratitude for lend-lease, wish they could pay us faster in reverse lend-lease.

Fine! How about the British Government buying up the stock of the railroad abovementioned and turning it over, title clear, to the United States of America, as a little something on account?

Senate Resolution 123

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to make a report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to whether or not the United States has a valid claim to sovereignty over Wrangell Island.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the House Foreign Affairs Committee is considering the Wright-Compton resolution which deals with the British Government's white paper policy in Palestine. I have received considerable correspondence from constituents on this subject and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein an article by George Murray, which appears in the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail. It is an article which should throw considerable light upon the attitude of the British under a most difficult situation:

GEORGE MURRAY'S WEEKLY COMMENTARY—SNAP JUDGMENT WON'T DO ON PALESTINE

A group of American readers have asked me to explain the reason for the British Government's white paper policy in Palestine. The inquiry is timely, for that policy comes to a head this year. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, head of the Jewish Agency of Palestine, has just said that he has a hunch that it will not survive the war. I am inclined to agree with him, though maybe not for the same reasons. But neither Dr. Weizmann nor I will agree with a further comment made by one of my American correspondents who wrote: "I believe I speak for most Americans when I say that in some respects Great Britain is more Fascist than the Fascists." Dr. Weizmann obviously does not subscribe to that idea, because he wants to see a Jewish state incorporated in the British Empire. Neither do I subscribe to it—otherwise I would not be writing this. The white paper of 1939 recommended that the further immigration of Jews into Palestine should be restricted to 75,000 in 5 years—bringing the total up to about 400,000—after which it would be resumed only if the Arabs agreed. This, on the face of it, was a harsh decision. But it was not reached lightly. Before anyone can indulge in snap judgments on a matter of such importance they should know something of its background. That background I propose to sketch.

TWO PLEDGES

The position of Jews and Arabs in Palestine rests upon two pledges which have never been reconciled. In 1915, when Britain was trying to enlist the aid of the Arabs against Turkey, Sir Henry McMahon, then High Commissioner in Egypt, promised them independence. Unfortunately, the wording of the pledge was not precise. It reserved certain territories whose exact situation has never been settled. British Governments have always maintained that they included Palestine, but the Arabs have denied it. By 1917 America was in the war, and the influence of world Jewry had become of the highest importance. In that year Mr. Balfour, the Foreign Secretary, stated: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people * * * it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." The Arabs interpreted their pledge as giving them an independent Palestine. The Jews interpreted theirs as meaning the creation of a Jewish state.

ARAB FEAR

When we remember that Palestine is a holy land for three of the world's greatest religious sects—Christians, Moslems, and Jews—and that anything done there concerns them all, we begin to realize that here was a setup which invited trouble. The trouble came. From the beginning the Arabs feared they would be outnumbered by the Jews and that their land would be taken from them. The British promised, in 1922, that Jewish immigration should not exceed the economic capacity of the country. That same year the British proposed self-government for Palestine, but the Arabs objected. In 1928 the proposal was revived, but the Jews objected. It was dropped in 1929 when racial riots broke out. In 1930 the Arabs demanded a complete stop on Jewish immigration. The British refused. During the next few years Jewish immigration was speeded up. The Arabs reacted violently. In 1934 immigration was reduced. The Jews protested and went on strike. So it has gone on. In 1935 the British proposed self-government again. The Jews strongly objected. In 1936 serious disorders broke out. In 1937 the Peel Commission reported: "Conciliation has failed. It has been tried for 17 years, and the Arabs are more hostile to Jews and government than they were at the beginning." This Commission recommended partition in Palestine. Both Jews and Arabs denounced it in violent terms—though the Jews afterward modified their views. There was also a row in Parliament. Another commission went out. They rejected partition as impracticable. The Government then invited Arabs and Jews to a conference in London. It failed. So, at long last, the British Government announced that they would impose their own solution and stick to it. The patient British public sighed with relief. The solution was the white-paper policy of 1939. Now what should the British have done? Set up a Jewish state? That would have incurred the hostility of all the Arabs in the world. Should they have washed their hands of the idea of a Jewish national home? They could not, because they had given a promise. But if they had, what cries of "perfidious Albion" would have echoed round the globe. Should they have walked out of Palestine? That would have meant leaving the Jews to their fate. Besides, it would have meant abandoning a vital strategical position. Think what might have happened in that case. If Britain had not been in Palestine this war might well have been lost 3 years ago. Where would Britain and her friends have been then? Where would the Jews have been? The position would have been as bad if Britain had declared for a policy of unrestricted immigration in 1939. Egypt, Iraq, Trans-Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Yemen, would have been our enemies.

TRIED TO BE JUST

The British have made mistakes. They have at times been too lenient, at times uncertain, even irresolute. But they have at all times tried to be just. They have striven to introduce self-government and to reconcile Jew and Arab. We have been all these things, but not Fascist—definitely not Fascist. The British taxpayer, abused by all, thanked by none, has poured out millions of pounds in Palestine. He, at least, would be happy to see someone else have a cut at that troubled country.

Letter of John Locke Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, John Locke Green is now serving his second term as treasurer of Arlington County, Va. He is a loyal and genuine Republican who was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia in 1940. Below is a letter which he recently addressed to Wendell L. Willkie which is self-explanatory. It is full of sound advice, which I trust the delegates to the national convention this year in Chicago will read and heed.

DECEMBER 29, 1943.

WENDELL L. WILLKIE, Esq.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: I have at last found time to look over your One World, which you sent to me after my telephone talk with you some months ago. In my talk with you I was direct, and I will try to be equally so in this letter. However, the probability is that you will ignore it, as you did the one I wrote you in January 1941, which you denied over the telephone as ever having received, but countered that you received many hundreds of thousands of letters. I answered, "I mailed it to your home address, where you are now talking from, so you would be sure to get it, and it never came back to me." To your explanation, I stated that you found time to write me, and have written to me two letters, without my ever having written you.

Now, Mr. Willkie, let's get down to some obvious truths. I certainly would like some expression from you in straightforward, simple language, provided you do not think yourself too important to state them to an ordinary citizen, such as myself.

I feel that I am entitled to this, since, in our conversation, I asked you if the New York Herald Tribune quoted you correctly in connection with your statement relative to the Republican nomination for President for 1944. You replied that it did. Then I asked

if I could consider you an active candidate for the nomination. You stated that I could; also, later on in our conversation you wanted to know whether I would again be a delegate and if so, expressed the wish that I would vote for you again. But more of this phase of the matter later.

In view of the fact that I voted for you in the convention as a delegate in Philadelphia, you wanted to know how the people in Virginia now felt about you. To that query, I told you that you had lost ground, and that assuming that the same people made up the delegation in the 1944 convention, I felt that you would have only one, and that one delegate represented a utility company, one of the many companies which flooded the Philadelphia convention with telegrams; that I, too, had received several hundreds of them, to vote for you.

In reply to this statement you said you were surprised and asked what the reason was for this reversal of sentiment. To that question I told you that the people had lost confidence in you, that it appeared that you were the "yes-man" for the administration, and that your so-called foreign policy was muddled thinking, was vague, but out of it appeared that you were more concerned about international affairs than our own.

You answered that you were indeed surprised that the Virginia people felt that way and that you "thought certainly that, of all people, the Virginians would back you up."

I then pointed out to you that you drew this assumption because of certain historical factors, such as religion and a further factor, because the oldest families came from the British Isles; also of certain intermarriages between the Virginians and the English nobility. I pointed out to you that, in addition to your relying on your historical knowledge, your present-day information was gathered from people who were out of touch with the ordinary people of whom I am one.

In this connection, I stated to you that your chief cronies, advisers, and associates were those people with whom you came in contact through your Wall Street law firm and the international bankers. You laughed at that and said, "I don't know any international bankers."

I answered, "You don't? What about that party Mrs. Ogden Reid gave for you, when certain international bankers were present and that the chief topic of conversation was what could be done to involve America in the war? And this dinner party was a long time before Pearl Harbor."

Do you recall your reply to that statement, Mr. Willkie? Well, here it is: "Green, when are you coming to New York? I want to talk with you."

Remember it, Mr. Willkie?

The facts concerning the persons present and the topic of conversation at that dinner have, since my telephone conversation with you, been made public through other sources. However, I did not know until recently that this dinner was held before the Philadelphia convention, as was pointed out by Nelson Sparks. You never volunteered any information about what was said or done at that historic dinner; instead, you wanted to know when I was coming to New York so that you could talk to me.

With respect to another phase of our talk, Mr. Willkie, I began a statement that your father came from Germany. Rather irritated and in a raised voice, you asked, "What the h—— has that got to do with the case?" My explanation was, "Your father was a known political refugee, and my information is that he had strong socialistic convictions, and, therefore, I do not feel that you have entirely become acclimated to the American constitutional doctrine." You exploded on that and began to question whether I believed in certain things. Those certain things involved elements of the none-too-clear doctrine, which you have, in a muddled and vague way, been haranguing the public with for the past 3 years. Therefore, no need to recite this part of the conversation to you.

In my letter to you dated January 13, 1941, above referred to, and which you did not answer. I stated, in part:

"I voted for you in the convention as a delegate. I voted for you in November as a citizen, but I am frank to tell you I regret having done both, if you are correctly quoted in your most recent statement. And like Landon, I believe if your position had been known at the time of the convention, you would not have been nominated."

Certainly Governor Landon could not have known about the Reid dinner, where you helped commit us to a false premise, and certainly, if we delegates had known about that dinner session, you would not have been nominated.

It all comes to light now why you conducted your campaign in the manner and method you did, why you sought, in a veiled way to lead the people to believe that election of Roosevelt meant war, whereas yours meant peace; yet at no time during the whole campaign were you specific on this subject. No wonder. You had a halter on your neck and your soul and mind were shackled by the persons present at that dinner.

Yet with all this background of duplicity you again express the wish that I vote for you. How are you going to explain your conduct to the American people and to the delegates of the 1944 Republican Convention?

Is there any reasonable doubt in your mind why some should seek an investigation as to how that convention and nomination was connived in Philadelphia?

I doubt the legality of a senatorial committee to have authority to investigate a national convention. However, I note that you have signified your willingness to appear before it. In that case, I assume that you have no hesitation in having Russell Davenport, one of your top campaign managers in 1940, former editor of Fortune magazine (one of Henry Luce's publications), to appear and explain his close personal relationship with Harry Hopkins. This should be done, in view that Nelson Sparks has injected Mr. Hopkins' name into the picture.

You have, in the last 3 years, talked considerably about forthrightness. If there is a legal investigation, now is your time to come forward and not dismiss the matter as campaign oratory. This is no time for light remarks, clothed with duplicity.

In conclusion, let me make a remark or two about One World, which you evidently sent me to convince me that I should support you again.

When I was a boy, I read practically all of the books G. A. Henty wrote for boys. Henty always wrote about the glory of England. Most of the things, the people, and the conditions you write about were used in the Henty books for boys.

His theme was generally the same in all his stories. He always began sooner or later with a young English boy getting a commission in the English Army, going to one of the lands you write about in One World. On reaching there he had many narrow escapes, always came out; fell in love with some English girl; married her, finally retired from the army; went back to England and lived happily ever afterward on a pension; had children, and they, in time, repeated his career.

So, Mr. Willkie, there is nothing new in One World. G. A. Henty wrote it long before you, and better.

Last and most important, tell us exactly where you stand, if you can.

Respectfully,

JOHN LOCKE GREEN.

NOTE.—The original of this letter was mailed Mr. Willkie by registered mail December 30, 1943, to his home address.

J. L. G.

Foreign Trade Credit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 2, 1944.

The EDITOR,
The New York Evening Sun,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In any adequate planning for the post-war era, it will be essential to take into consideration the subject of Foreign Trade Credit Insurance. After the war, we will have the biggest Merchant Marine afloat. We will have the largest fleet of cargo vessels ever owned by any country in the history of the world. This gigantic fleet will total 35,000,000 tons or more. All the nations of the world combined will have but 45,000,000 tons.

To show the progress that we have made in ship building, it is interesting to note that prior to this World War No. 2 the rest of the world had 61,000,000 tons, while the United States had only 11,000,000 tons. Therefore, we will have advanced from 11,000,000 tons to 35,000,000 tons.

Thinking men and women of the Nation are considerably disturbed as to what we will do with this vast ship tonnage. It is hoped that our liberty ships and victory ships and other vessels will ride the waves of the 7 seas and convey our goods to all the ports of the world, and bring back to us essential cargo and goods. Heretofore, the emphasis has been on the building of liberty ships, but they are slow and may be too slow for vast post-war cargoes. But our new fleet includes a vast number of fast victory ships and C-type vessels. After the war, it is estimated we will have 15,000,000 tons of fast ships and a little more than 20,000,000 tons of libertys.

Before the war, most of American foreign trade was carried in foreign bottoms. Our position will be reversed in the post-war era. Other maritime nations are worried at the prospect. However, they need not be worried if American post-war planners do not envisage post-war foreign trade credit insurance.

We must keep these ships afloat, and they must be loaded at all times to the gunwale, going and coming. We have a fine maritime tradition to maintain, a tradition that goes back to the famous clipper ships, barks, and brigantines. Those vessels carried our flag to the nethermost portions of the world, to the Cape of Good Hope, to Vladivostock, to Valparaiso, to Singapore, and to Melbourne. But again, I maintain that that kind of traditional foreign trade cannot be maintained after the war without foreign trade credit insurance. To keep these ships laden with goods means that our exporters must capture the foreign trade held in pre-war days by their competitors in Germany, England, France, Holland, China, Sweden, Norway, and Japan.

Most of those nations lent every aid and comfort to their exporters. They equipped them with foreign credit guaranties facilities. As far as my research could go, I find that the United States was the only major world trading nation which failed to equip its exporters with adequate and effective foreign credit guaranty facilities.

England and Germany and Holland—in fact, 17 nations—furnished credit guaranties to their exporters. Developments in our trade relations with Europe, Asia, Africa, and

Latin-American countries and other friendly markets will make it increasingly obvious that such foreign trade credit insurance is absolutely essential, in order to keep those Victory ships and those C-type vessels busy. It is quite obvious that prior to the war we were still in our diapers when it came to foreign business. England, Germany, Holland, and the others were far ahead of us in equipment, experience, and willingness to aid and claim foreign trade. If we are to compete with those nations again and those nations set up entities to insure against foreign trade losses, and we have no such insurance available to our exporters, then there will be an uncontrolled had-debt loss hazard which will be fatal to all of us. We can never hope to develop legitimate overseas markets unless we can first reduce to a predetermined cost figure what the bad-debt losses will be. Only foreign trade credit insurance can offer a sound solution and answer to this difficulty. With such bad-debt uncertainties translated into a fixed premium charge and with a financially strong guaranty upon which bank discounts may safely be made available, our exporters will be equipped with credit tools placing them on a par with their foreign competitors. The need for such tools will be especially urgent in post-war years, when American exporters will face bitter rivalry in world markets. But even under present conditions the provision of credit guaranty facilities for United States exporters would be a most constructive step toward placing our foreign merchandising and banking structure on a solid, permanent foundation.

That such need exists is evidenced by the resolutions passed by the National Foreign Trade Council in their annual conventions, advocating the provision of credit guaranties on bases equal to those available to their foreign competitors, by numerous expressions from American exporters and buyers abroad, particularly in the Latin-American countries, and by the participation of several thousand United States exporters in mutual foreign credit information and limited insurance provided in conjunction with the services of American foreign credit underwriters.

The British have operated with excellent success in this field through their Export Credits Guarantee Department. German exporters had available to them export credit guaranties through Hermes, a priavte company with government backing. Italy had its Societa Italiana di Assicurazione Credito, with state participation. France had a private company (Societe Francaise d'Assurances pour Favoriser le Credit) to which the government gave support on certain types of business. Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Holland, Japan, Norway, are among other countries which made credit guaranties available to their exporters, directly or indirectly through funds supplied by the respective governments.

It is my fond hope that similar credit insurance facilities be made eventually available to United States exporters through a private insurance company, and that such business be operated on a self-supporting basis, where the premiums would cover all losses and operating expenses and leave some dividends for the stockholders of that company. It is my fond hope that the exporters themselves be always tied in with, and through underwriting bear a part of each risk, and that as far as possible the credit guaranties be confined to sound, legitimate transactions.

At this juncture, however, in our affairs I do not believe a private company would be available for such purpose. If it is available and financiers, if found, are willing to take the risks involved, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the private initiative and enterprise that would go with such a private venture. However, if a private company cannot be formed to meet the requirements, there should be no hesitancy on the part of exporters and the public to encourage a governmental set-up. A subsidiary corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may well be formed to meet the needs of the exporters. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has already had some experience in matters of insurance. It set up the War Damage Corporation to cover insurance against damage to property from air raids.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Committee on International Trade of the Advertising Club of New York recently adopted a resolution recommending the establishment of a Federal agency empowered to furnish proper facilities for the effective insurance to American firms and individuals of foreign credits created in the course of regular international commerce.

But the American Foreign Credit Underwriters which was established in 1919, and its facilities, is the only concern in this country ever to engage in foreign-credit insurance. It expended about $3,000,000 in such activities. It has, however, over the years built up and maintained huge credit files and labor experience records on buyers of American products and of world markets. It has a market guide today which lists with complete names, addresses, lines of business, capital, and credit ratings, some 55,000 buyers and agents handling American merchandise in various Latin-American countries. It ceased, however, to carry on this foreign-credit insurance back in 1932. It has, however, a vast store of information which should be available to any insurance company, be it governmental controlled, semigovernmental controlled, or individually controlled.

To provide our exporters with sound and strong credit protection, a huge capital reserve may be essential so that the insurance company can make its credit guaranties available to competitive American exporters and acceptable to all the banks. At this juncture in world affairs, the reserve would have to be so large that I doubt whether any private company would meet the requirements. To be successful, said company would have to provide a sufficient security upon which the banks would be willing to discount on insurance certificates. I am informed that on the basis of an average premium of 2 percent, and given sound and experienced management, the loss ratio might well be within a loss reserve fund of 1 percent. Expenses should not run over 30 percent of gross premiums. This would leave 20 percent of the gross premium to be set aside for dividends and other requirements. I am not an insurance expert, so I ask the readers to accept these figures with no degree of finality. Investment income would provide a further source of revenue. Furthermore, risks will be enhanced due to fluctuations in the dollar exchange and foreign currencies. Difficulties experienced by foreign countries in balancing their accounts with the United States, as well as trade restrictions imposed by other countries likewise will have a bearing on the amount of risks involved.

We in this country are still unused to long-term credits. Credits of long duration, upward of 2 years, are essential for expanding and maintaining foreign trade. Banks will not loan of their resources, if the borrower in turn uses the borrowed funds to extend long-term credits. If, however, those long-term credits are properly insured, banks will loan liberally. Unless banks do grant liberal discounts and loans for extended periods to our exporters, our foreign trade will go into the doldrums.

The British foreign credit insurance organization covers the exchange risk for an additional premium, keeping its commitments in each country within predetermined limits and always reserving the right to withdraw, on due notice, further exchange guarantees with respect to individual markets. It would be feasible to provide similar guarantees for American exporters. Such guarantees could well be tied in with the credits made available for exchange purposes to the central banks of other countries through Export-Import Bank and other agencies of the United States Government. While recognizing that no credit insurance operation can in itself provide a complete solution to the exchange problem, we believe that a foreign credit insurance organization may be utilized as a convenient medium for regulating the commitments of our exporters in markets as and when the exchange problem in these markets requires such regulations.

In today's complex pattern of international trade it must be conceded that foreign credit insurance has its definite place, and, with the increasing variety of problems confronting our exporters, they certainly need to be equipped with the most effective machinery that can be made available.

Of course, in any such plan for a governmental authority or a privately operated foreign trade credit insurance company, due consideration will have to be given to the activities of our Lend-Lease Administration, the War Production Board, the Foreign Economic Administration, the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Administration, and the so-called joint area agreement dividing world markets—for the present—for export trade between the United States and Great Britain.

I am sure encouragement must be lent to this scheme of credit insurance by the information we get from the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of the National Association of Credit Men, namely that all Latin-American nations get good risk ratings. The Latin American Credit and Collection classifications during the last 6 months of 1943 continued the upward trend which has been in progress since July of 1940. In all respects collections in Latin-American countries have been good and prompt.

Be it remembered that after the war, competing nations will do their damndest to recapture lost world markets. All their skill, cunning, and ingenuity will be brought into play. We must not rest on our oars. We must use every artifice in our bag of tricks—otherwise, we are licked and we will again buckle together our surplus of ships and let them rot in our harbors as we did after the last war. Isolationists then were in the saddle and our glorious merchant marine became a romantic memory.

A reviving of any program of again junking our merchant marine would simply be a case of the "fool returning to his folly."

Remember that our future national defense depends upon our merchant marine and our merchant marine depends upon our foreign commerce which ultimately depends upon foreign trade credit insurance. That chain is no stronger than its weakest link.

Yours very truly,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Interest on Rural Electrification Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, great sums of money have been appropriated by Congress for rural electrification. This was done not because the Government was seeking an investment for

profit, but in order to advance the program. The contract for the repayment of these sums should be one that will ultimately return the Government's money and at the same time be the most lenient possible on the people who are paying it.

I wish to extend my remarks by including resolution V, adopted at a recent meeting of the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power Districts, which is composed of 20 operating districts, representing some 20,000 presently connected farmers. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That we favor Federal legislation which will permit the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans to borrowers at a rate of about 1 percent per annum and permit reduction of existing interest rates to same figure.

Resolved further, That we favor permitting R. E. A. to make loans for a period of 50 years.

It's a Good Tax Bill—Welfare of Country Demands It Be Enacted by the Congress Without Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is rumored in the press that the President will veto the tax bill, one of the provisions of which requires labor unions and other tax-exempt organizations to file an annual statement of their receipts and disbursements. It would be interesting to know to what extent the President's reputedly unfriendly attitude toward the bill is influenced by this provision. It should not be forgotten that the C. I. O. has urged the President to veto the bill, no doubt because of a fear of having to disclose its handling of the dues exacted from its members.

From the revenue standpoint, the bill will not affect the Government's income to any vital extent, since we are already collecting forty-two billions in Federal taxes, not to mention ten billions of State and local taxes. But the bill has other important provisions the benefit of which would be lost should a Presidential veto be forthcoming. These include:

First. The freezing of the social-security tax at the existing 1-percent rate, which will otherwise be doubled as of March 1. This affects nearly all employed persons and nearly all employers.

Second. Increase of exemption under the war contract renegotiation law from $100,000 to $500,000.

Third. Provision for court review of recapture of excessive profits under war contracts.

Fourth. Relief from penalty for underestimating 1943 income-tax liability where the taxpayer reported at least as much income as on his 1942 return.

Fifth. Exemption of servicemen's mustering-out pay from income tax.

Sixth. Allowance for corporate contributions to veterans' organizations.

Seventh. Relief from the 90-percent penalty where the State unemployment tax is not paid in time to be credited against the Federal tax.

Eighth. Requirement that tax-exempt organizations file information returns.

Ninth. Various administrative amendments relating to the cutting of timber, percentage depletion, bankruptcy reorganizations, relief from excess-profits tax on excess production of mines and timber tracts, and so forth.

Tenth. Exemption of lighter-weight newsprint paper from tariff during emergency.

Eleventh. Partial simplification of individual income-tax returns.

Enact the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times urging Congress to enact the tax bill over the President's veto:

ENACT THE TAX BILL

The President's remarks at his press conference last week were taken by most of his listeners to imply that he intended to veto today or tomorrow the tax bill now on his desk. We hope that this interpretation was a mistaken one. A veto of the present tax bill would be an irresponsible act.

The Treasury, it is true, had asked for a tax bill to yield an additional $10,500,000,000. The bill actually passed by Congress is calculated to yield only an additional $2,300,000,000. We believe this amount under present conditions to be inadequate. But it is not insubstantial (it is greatly in excess of the total revenues from the individual income tax as late as the fiscal year 1941, for example), and the Treasury could ill afford to lose it. It has been estimated that the new bill would increase the total Federal annual revenues to what a few years ago would have been regarded as the incredible sum of $42,239,000,000. The practical effect of a Presidential veto, unless Congress were able to override it, would not be to force Congress to bring in a new bill increasing revenues but to deprive the Treasury even of the revenues provided by the present bill. The President's delay in acting on the bill has already, in fact, deprived the Treasury of increased excise taxes of $85,000,000 that it could otherwise have collected in March.

The President's advisers may have told him that, if he vetoes the bill, the net loss in revenues will be only about half as much as those provided by the bill, because he would also be vetoing the provision in the new bill that postpones the increase that would otherwise take place in the social-security pay-roll tax. But this argument is weak on several counts. The veto would still cost the Treasury at least $1,000,000,000 a year in net loss of revenues. And it would substitute an ill-advised tax for better taxes.

The present social-security tax is 1 percent on wage and salary earners and 1 percent on the pay rolls of employers. It yields $1,300,000,000 a year. If the congressional postponement were to be canceled by a Presidential veto of the tax bill, there would begin next month a 2-percent tax on wage earners and a tax on employers of 2 percent of their pay rolls The yield of the tax would be increased to $2,600,000,000 a year. So far as the social-security program is itself concerned, there is no need to increase the tax rate now. The present Social Security System is designed to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. The act even provides that if the contingency reserve exceeds three times the highest yearly outlay expected during the following 5-year period Congress must be notified. The present contingency reserve is close to $5,000,000,000. The $1,300,000,000 in social-security taxes that we now collect is already more than six times the outgoing benefit payments, and more than four times the estimated maximum outgo in 1949. So far as the social-security program itself is concerned, there is no good excuse for raising the rates now.

The argument that we should raise the social-security rates now on anti-inflation grounds implies that social-security revenues ought not to be considered merely in relation to the needs of the Social Security System but rather as part of total revenues, and that the Social Security System itself should be treated as part of a compensatory program of Government taxing and spending. Such an implication is a serious one for the future of the Social Security System, but it does not need to be examined here. The anti-inflation argument, even if directly applicable to the social-security program, could not justify a veto of the present bill; for such a veto would mean an annual net loss of $1,000,000,000 in taxes.

It is worth examining, moreover, the kind of increased taxes that doubling of the social-security rates would now impose. A tax on pay rolls is a tax on employment and an increase in costs of production. Under present conditions it would force up prices further. The Government, moreover, would have to pay for its increased revenues from this source either in loss of other corporation tax revenues or in increased subsidies; so that the amount of its gain on net balance would be questionable. From the standpoint of the workers the increased tax would mean an added income tax, without exemptions, of 1 percent.

Here is a strange inconsistency in administration policy. The President has refused to accept a general retail sales tax at any level whatever, on the ground that low-income families cannot afford it. Yet a general retail sales tax of 2 percent would obviously press much less heavily on low-income families than would a flat social-security tax of 2 percent without exemptions. A retail sales tax would discourage spending which is a highly desirable end when inflation is threatened. A family could to some extent mitigate the tax by reducing its spending. But there is no way under which an employed man can escape the flat income tax under the Social Security System. It can be argued, of course, that in such a tax a man is only being forced to pay for his own future security. But does not the same argument apply to any tax to defray the costs of the present war?

This brings us back to the weaknesses of the administration's own tax program. Congress rejected that program for the sound reason that the increased taxes it proposed would have imperiled the productive processes themselves. Congress failed to compensate for this rejection by even a moderate general sales tax because the administration was flatly opposed to such a tax. How can such opposition be reconciled with an effort to increase a flat income tax without exemptions?

It is hard to believe that the President would veto the new tax bill simply because it contains a provision requiring labor unions

to file financial statements with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This is merely a mild and belated step to bring some measure of publicity and accountability into the handling of union funds. It is necessary, among other reasons, to help protect the individual union member against exploitation by unscrupulous union bosses wherever these exist.

Even if the President were otherwise justified in vetoing the new tax bill, he would not be justified in allowing Congress to waste months of precious time in framing the measure without having made unmistakably clear from the beginning precisely what he would veto and why.

If the President vetoes this measure there can be but one answer, Congress should override the veto.

American War Dads Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, permission granted me, I submit 3 resolutions for printing in the RECORD sent to me by Mr. Henry C. Klemme, secretary of the American War Dads, St. Louis Post Office Chapter, No. 38:

Whereas there are now millions of sons and daughters away from their homes, many of them outside of the continental limits of the United States of America, fighting and dying in order that America might live; and

Whereas such sons and daughters, were it not for the crisis in which their Government now finds itself, would be at home exercising their right of suffrage as citizens of this country at the ballot box; and

Whereas it is now, under the laws existing, impossible for them to exercise such rights which, in effect, deprive them of the ballot and force them to accept elected officials who may or may not be contrary to their idea of the type and kind of official who should represent them; and

Whereas by being deprived of the use of the ballot certain ideas and changes in Government may or may not be made that are contrary to their belief as citizens of this Government; and

Whereas these millions of our men and women have offered themselves as a sacrifice upon the altar of liberty in order that justice and freedom might be relieved of its shackles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the American War Dads, Chapter No. 38 of the Greater St. Louis Council in meeting assembled in St. Louis, unanimously command our representatives in both Congress and Senate to see that such changes in laws and regulations are made that will enable our sons and daughters to cast their ballots and not be disfranchised even temporarily; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the national headquarters of the American War Dads with instructions that it be forwarded to every chapter of the American War Dads that they might issue the same command to their representatives in Congress and Senate.

GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE.

We, the members of the St. Louis Post Office Chapter, No. 38, of the Greater St. Louis Council of the American War Dads, having been advised of the cold, thoughtless, and disinterested method that this Government uses in the notification of parents of the death of their sons and daughters in service by telegram, and further having this matter brought to our attention by the fact that one Mr. and Mrs. George Gannett, of this city, received such notification by telegram and such telegram was shoved under the door and no attempt made to personally deliver it.

Whereas this Government of ours is now spending billions of dollars for the conduct of this war and hundreds of millions of dollars in radio, newspaper, and any and all kinds and types of publicity to build morale, not only among the troops but among the civilian population as well, we, the American War Dads, believe that this great Government of ours should show its sympathy to the families of sons and daughters who have been either killed or are missing in action in a way that would express to the parents the gratitude that is in the hearts of the American public for the great sacrifice that this son or daughter and the family have made in order that others might live, and that by so doing they could create and build a greater morale among the troops and the civilian population than much of the useless propaganda building today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senators and the Congressmen representing St. Louis and St. Louis County be sent a copy of this resolution along with a letter, and furthermore that they be instructed that it is the command of the American War Dads that necessary steps be taken at once to have either the Army or Navy personnel, as a special representative of the President of the United States, personally deliver to the family the news of either the death or the report of missing in action of the son or daughter, and that at the same time this personal representative express the sympathy of the President of these United States and the American public to the bereaved family or the nearest of kin. And, if no Government official is available, that the American War Dads or similar organization be delegated as the official representative of the President to convey such message; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American War Dads' national headquarters in Kansas City, requesting that they notify every chapter of the American War Dads to take similar action to this.

GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that there will be from time to time attempts made to pass legislation that will take away from the members of the armed forces the rights that were theirs under our Constitution before they entered such branches of the armed forces.

Whereas our sons and daughters are now fighting on 74 fronts to restore at least a semblance of liberty and freedom to all classes of people in every section of the globe: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the St. Louis Post Office Chapter, No. 38, of the Greater St. Louis Council of American War Dads, assembled and meeting in St. Louis, notify the Congressmen and Senators, representing us in this district, that we are commanding them to watch carefully the rights of our sons and daughters who are in the service and to see to it that if any legislation is presented that would deprive these sons and daughters of any right that was theirs when they entered the service, that such legislation be deferred until such time that every man or woman in the armed forces of this Government can have an opportunity to express his or her opinion upon it and thereby insure our sons and daughters that they will not lose at home the precious heritages that have carried them into the raging conflict in order that they might extend the same rights to others; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Council of the American War Dads in Kansas City, requesting that they notify all chapters of the American War Dads to take similar action.

GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE.

Brumidi Still Speaks from the Capitol Dome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

BRUMIDI STILL SPEAKS FROM THE CAPITOL DOME

Some things cannot be, irrespective of cost,
Replaced, hence Brumidi's sublime,
Much treasured creations must never be lost,
Nor dimmed by the tarnish of time—
As long as the National Capitol stands,
To which multitudes daily come,
They'll worship the wonderful work of his hands,
Inside the high top of the dome.

The top of the dome, through this painting so rare,
Apparently, bids us behold
"The glorification of Washington" there,
Uniquely, but graciously told;
For this work of art, representing the birth
Of this great Republic, whose vast
Resources have made it the greatest on earth,
Illumines its pioneer past.

Surrounded by virgins that there represent
The Thirteen Original States,
George Washington, ready to spend and be spent
For his Nation's welfare, awaits
The growth of its Government which, as he'd planned
And hoped for, at some future day,
Would meet every need of this law-loving land,
In justice's peaceable way.

When he had completed the scene 'neath the Dome,
Brumidi instinctively felt,
Perhaps, that his masterpiece was yet to come,
As he went to work on the belt
Around the rotunda, there on the inside,
Halfway from the circular floor,
Methinks, with a feeling of national pride
That he'd never felt theretofore.

Brumidi, when he had perfected his plan,
And on his new task had begun,
According to trustful tradition, began
To meditate proudly upon
The perfect fulfillment of his master-dream,
But fell from his scaffolding there,
Yet caught and held on, with a power supreme,
Till rescued from his fatal scare.

His artist-assistant was then deputized
To finish this great work of art,
Which brilliant Brumidi had aptly devised,
And made a most promising start;
But he left the work—when death folded his hands—
Unfinished, just as it appears,
Which may stand unfinished, as it today stands,
Unchanged, through the challenging years.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Coast Guard's Great Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared February 17, 1944, in the Newport News Daily Press on the Coast Guard's great record, as follows:

COAST GUARD'S GREAT RECORD

The Coast Guard, the oldest naval unit in the United States, is again covering itself with glory. Too many Americans have long been accustomed to think of the Coast Guard as mere guardians of the beach. But even in time of peace the Coast Guard does far more than this, for it is the great humanitarian branch of our sea service as well as the watchdog of our waters and shores. In time of war the Coast Guard takes its place alongside the best of our Navy. And in this war it has been covering itself with glory as well as with water, ice, and blood.

The United States Coast Guard operates on the sea, in the air, and on land. Its men ride bucking ships and bucking horses with equal mastery. They can handle a boat or an airplane with equal expertness. And, as they demonstrated soon after the Japs attacked us, they know how to trap and catch spies and saboteurs.

In the present war Coast Guard men have distinguished themselves on many fronts. Coast Guard men put troops ashore at Tonga Islands, the first American offensive operation in the Pacific. Coast Guard men helped land marines at Guadalcanal. Coast Guard men put marines ashore at Tulagi. In fact, Coast Guard men may be found wherever the fighting is hottest and the going is toughest. Heat and cold, air and water, boat and plane, horse and dog, rifle and pistol, are all one and the same to them.

Members of the Coast Guard are inordinately proud of their record. And we don't blame them. The Nation is proud of the great work they are doing now, as they have done down through the years.

George Washington and Alexander Hamilton builded well when they created the Coast Guard. And the traditions and exploits of this historic naval unit stir the hearts of all Americans. During his long service in Congress Representative S. O. BLAND has helped strengthen the Coast Guard, and for this service the American people owe him a debt of thanks in our hour of great peril.

William A. McLaren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Friday afternoon William A. McLaren died at his club here in Washington. He died as he had lived, in the midst of good companionship, firm friends, and with unruffled composure. Bill McLaren was long active in American political life, although his actual administrative work was limited to 2 years as acting director of the N. R. A. in Puerto Rico. At the time of his death he was associated with the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. He breathed the atmosphere of public service; to some of us who were younger he fondly referred as his "boys," and to himself in that relationship as "senior counselor." For years he labored enthusiastically for the cause of better relations with our Latin-American neighbors.

Bill McLaren is best described in the words of a telegram that arrived from a friend in Santa Barbara, Calif., soon after his death: "What a wonderful world this would be if all of us were like him."

Our First Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this is the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country. I found in this morning's Times-Herald an excellent editorial entitled "Our First Commander in Chief." I wish to say now, in reference to that great American patriot, that George Washington was our first great "American Firster," and he was our first American nationalist.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FIRST COMMANDER IN CHIEF

We don't suppose the argument will ever cease as to whether George Washington or Abraham Lincoln was our greatest President. We have always inclined to the opinion that Washington was bigger than Lincoln—though Lincoln undoubtedly was more a man of the democratic people than was Washington. Washington was great both as a statesman and as a soldier, Lincoln as a statesman only.

Washington was about as much of an aristocrat as the eighteenth century American Colonies of Great Britain produced. He was the son of a wealthy Virginia planter, Augustine Washington. George Washington was always interested in acquiring more land, had plenty of business sense, and married a wealthy widow after unsuccessfully wooing Mary Philipse, New York heiress.

He was a soldier of considerable ability long before the Revolution. In a preliminary skirmish to the French and Indian War (1755–63), the American part of Europe's Seven Years' War, Lieutenant Colonel Washington managed to get himself and 350 men captured by the French at Fort Necessity near what is now Confluence, Pa., July 3, 1754. He wiped this smirch off his escutcheon the following year by covering General Braddock's retreat from Fort Duquesne. Braddock was killed; it was Washington's courage and cunning that saved the bulk of the British and Colonial forces from capture.

After Fort Duquesne's final capture in 1758, Washington retired as a soldier to live the life of a wealthy farmer. He liked to drink and gamble (though not excessively), and to hunt, fish, ride horseback, and oversee his slave-operated properties.

When the Colonies broke with England, most Americans in Washington's economic group remained loyal to England. Washington did not. He sided with the rebels, thereby gambling his money, his property, and his neck if the British should catch him. The Continental Congress on June 15, 1775, appointed Washington Commander in Chief of the continental armies.

WASHINGTON IN WAR

It is hard to make out a case for Washington as a top-flight tactician. He took a series of classical trimmings—Long Island, Harlem Heights, White Plains, Fort Washington, Fort Lee, Brandywine, Germantown, as against his victories at Trenton, Princeton, and Monmouth—and Yorktown.

Washington was plagued throughout the Revolution, however, by two tough handicaps. He was illy served by treacherous generals such as Arnold and Charles Lee; and he was unable to keep his volunteer soldiers from going home whenever they got fed up with the war.

Always, though, Washington proved able to reorganize after a defeat. In any war the last battle is what they pay off on; and Washington won his last battle, at Yorktown, October 19, 1781.

WASHINGTON IN PEACE

For almost 7 years after that, the 13 States stumbled along as 13 little independent nations, and it looked as if the first determined wind from Europe would wreck the whole combination.

Largely at Washington's urging, a convention was at last assembled in Philadelphia to try to put together a body of laws which would set up a strong central government but leave the States reasonably free. Washington presided. The Constitution, produced in 4 months, was later called by British Prime Minister William E. Gladstone the greatest single product of the mind of man.

Washington was elected President in 1789, inaugurated in New York on Wall Street, served two terms with efficiency and integrity, and refused a third term on the ground that it would not be good for the Nation. Shortly after Yorktown, he had fiercely rebuffed a group of Army officers who wanted to make him king. His no-third-term precedent was honored by Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Grant, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge. Grant and T. R. wanted to break the tradition after an interval out of office, but the people would not stand for it in those days.

George Washington's chief characteristic as President was his fear of foreign entanglements for the United States—a fear which he expressed with great force in his Farewell Address.

Problems of Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at Kirksville, Mo., the night of February 17, in which he discusses the problems involved in foreign trade.

I wish to say that I think Mr. Landon has taken a frank and courageous stand in this speech, pointing to the impossibility of establishing permanently one-way foreign trade, either through too high tariffs or through subsidizing exports.

I recommend the reading of Governor Landon's Kirksville speech to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a dangerous paucity of information from our Chief Executive on America's foreign policies and commitments. He led the whole country to expect a frank report to the Senate on Cairo and Tehran.

Again and again I have protested the "hallelujah" approach to our foreign affairs. As a part of this unsound approach, we are heading into trouble because the New Dealers have convinced many of the American people that they can eat their cake and have it, too. Their disillusionment when this proves impossible will sour them toward the participation in world affairs that our humanitarian instincts impel, our interests require, and our strength warrants.

I think our public welfare requires that we face a few elementary economic facts of national and international life so that we will be better prepared to make tough choices which are going to be inevitable.

Because of false propaganda at the time of its enactment a lot of people have the idea that a substantial portion of our lease-lend materials will be repaid. Many assume that we can export recording-breaking quantities of finished goods to Europe, the Orient, and South America, and that we can carry most of our foreign shipments in our own ships, and while doing all this we can still maintain airtight tariff barriers for the protection of all domestic industry.

In foreign trade, a nation gains capital in three principal ways: The sale of goods, the sale of services, and the receipt of income from foreign investments. When the balance of trade remains unfavorable over a long period a nation's ability to buy diminishes and trade comes to a halt.

Conversely, the nation that habitually enjoys a favorable balance of trade from everyone is some day going to find its customers in distress. Then it is in distress. The time comes when it cannot continue in foreign trade unless it agrees to purchase more goods, or more services, or arranges to extend credits to these customer nations.

Following the First World War, we were unwilling to accept large imports. Under the Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariff bills, which incidentally I opposed, we hiked tariff rates to an all-time high until the monetary devaluation of the Roosevelt administration had the indirect effect of raising them still higher. However, we had to sell abroad so we subsidized our customers with large credit grants.

Most of these loans have been lost. We find now that all we were doing in effect was paying for the goods ourselves, but leaving them on foreign soil for the benefit of foreign people.

Are we going to make that mistake again? If we are to avoid it, we must learn that international trade is a two-way street that can't be blocked at either end without creating a traffic jam.

If we participate in creating a traffic jam, there will be little trade unless we lend-lease a lot of our hard-earned cash. In which case history will probably repeat itself and we may find out that once again we will simply be giving the goods away.

There are still other grave possibilities. If the demand for sterling should drop, the pound will be devalued. In other words, the British may be forced to compete for business on a bargain basis. This will put pressure on the dollar for similar devaluation. If the devaluation goes far enough, it would cost all American holders of cash and securities billions in real wealth.

Moreover, a desperate trade situation in Britain might force the British Government to enter into bilateral trade agreements. The British could lick us beautifully in South America, for example, because the British Isles produce nothing that competes with South American mineral and agricultural production, while Latin America produces many of the same things we do.

Let's not overlook the political implications either. Nations become entangled politically with those countries upon which they are economically dependent.

If we are not willing to purchase the products of other nations after this war, Russia will, if she can.

The great advantage of the Communist system in international trade is that it is just as willing to import as it is to export. There are no private interests either of capital or labor seeking protection. The Soviet can control and set prices below cost if they think it desirable, and take it out of the standard of living of the Russian people.

Those of us who champion private enterprise do so with an appreciation of personal freedom not possible under the planned economy of the New Deal.

Therefore we must now ask ourselves whether the capitalist system is going to kill itself by its reluctance to engage in an expanding world commerce.

If the post-war European states find they cannot trade with us, they can trade with Russia.

If we don't do business with the world and Russia does, we merely force helpless and unwilling nations to attach themselves to a Soviet economic empire. American free industries will certainly feel the effect of expanded competition from new Communist states.

Finally, let's look at gold. We have 80 percent of the world's gold supply buried in the ground at Fort Knox. Gold is the most useless metal on earth. It is good for filling teeth and for ornamentation, but for little else.

It is valuable primarily because of its traditional role as an international yardstick. If ever that yardstick is destroyed—as the New Dealers are attempting to destroy it—they will have practically destroyed the value of the very gold they have bought with good American dollars.

Fortunately, our two greatest allies, Britain and Russia, are both interested in reestablishing gold as the medium of international exchange. With a Republican President, they will have cooperation on that score.

Therefore, we could apply this threatened treasure house of ours to no better purpose than to help support foreign currencies that will, in turn, maintain gold value.

But let's do it in a sound way. The Keynes plan and the White-Morgenthau plan are both examples of New Deal faulty economics. Under these plans we put up the major part of the assets with a minority voice in their disposition.

We should make outright gold loans only to those countries who are putting their own financial and political houses in order. We would not attempt to dictate their political structures, but we should insist that their financial structures be built on a sound basis. We had better risk some of our buried gold that way than to have the value of the whole accumulation destroyed.

But these loans will only help to get foreign trade started off dead center and foreign exchange stabilized. Trade must be encouraged by private long-term credits and abolition of trade monopolies in mandated territories and spheres of influence.

Without a balanced foreign trade, the American people would have to continue bolstering foreign currencies until even our great reserves would be exhausted and collapse would eventually overtake us.

I believe, in view of Britain's desperate position and Russia's dominance of eastern Europe, the assumption that a continued high-tariff system in America would bring prosperity to our people is wrong.

We cannot sell if we do not buy except when we subsidize, and when we subsidize, sooner or later, we lose our shirts.

If we do not buy, we force European states into the Russian orbit, force the British to debase their currency, probably force the future devaluation of our own dollar, risk the loss of everything for which we are fighting this war, and insure nothing but the emergence of a national socialist state.

All of which is the primrose path to World War No. 3.

We Republicans must face these facts. The New Deal has met this situation by putting America's domestic economy in a strait jacket.

Our industrial system, which in its infancy desperately feared the competition of foreign imports, is now a colossus hungry for world markets.

In a mature economy such as America has achieved under the impetus of the historic Republican program, the time has now arrived when everyone's interest requires that there be a universal removal of impediment to international exchange.

With the whole world our debtors, with our once inexhaustible natural resources diminishing, with our industrial machinery overexpanded, with our gold accumulation in danger, we desperately need foreign trade. And lots of it—both ways.

I don't want this to be construed as advocating an immediate and hysterical abolition of all tariffs on everything.

The world has taken a generation to get into the mess it is now in. And it's going to take more than one stroke of anybody's pen to get it out.

But, basically and fundamentally, the world is just simply going to have to move in the direction of a gradual increase of the freedom and ease of international trade if national or personal prosperity, freedom, and honest good will are to prevail.

Let the high-tariff traditionalists in both parties reveal how we can expand our markets without lowered tariff rates. Let them explain how else we can compete after the war with a desperate Britain and shrewd, horse-trading Russia. Let them say how the American worker, the American businessman, and the American farmer will be better off if we maintain our traditional tariff policy with the result that we block ourselves from the post-war competition for foreign markets, or seek to keep our foot in the door by throwing money across the sea in the hope that somebody can throw orders back to us for a while.

The Republican Party was founded on a great truth, the immorality and economic folly of slavery. It proceeded on another great truth, that in an infant nation of great resources infant industries could grow quickest to maturity under a system of reasonable protection from established foreign competition.

Now, it seems to me, if the Republican Party is to assume the leadership of the Nation in this chaotic age it must dare enunciate a third great truth, that a free and easy interexchange of raw materials and finished products among all the nations of the world is the quickest way to world prosperity, and that world prosperity is the No. 1 prerequisite not only for American welfare but lasting peace as well.

Now if the administration and the Republican Party were to join on that kind of a foreign plank something worth while might be accomplished. Such a plank will give the small, economically dependent nations of Europe a reasonable hope that they can look forward to that freedom of exchange which made the world prior to 1914, on the whole, prosperous and peaceful. Then there will be no need for them to fall into the clutches of any vast empire. This will be their fate unless the great nations of the world join in initiating such a step.

And on such a straightforward practical plank as that—repudiating the adminstration's planned economy for America and avoiding its "globaloney" of which even the foreign beneficiaries are at heart suspicious or contemptuous—we can hold out to the world the hope of a unified American foreign policy which will really contribute to world peace.

A Tribute to the Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have here an article entitled "A Tribute to the Forgotten Man," which I myself wrote for the National Record and in which I speak of the splendid work which has been done throughout the country by labor generally in the production field in our war effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THE FORGOTTEN MAN

(By Robert R. Reynolds)

Through the press and over the radio every day, we read and hear of the valor of the American fighting man—this is understandable. The bravery and tenacity of the American soldier, sailor, and marine is historical. These men who have fought at Bataan, Corregidor, in Africa, at Salerno, Tarawa, and now in the Marshalls are a further exemplification of the fighting qualities of our armed forces which has been true in every war in which we have participated since we became a nation.

It is high time, however, that someone in high places pay a tribute to the forgotten man of this war. I mean by that, the civilian on the home front, the man or woman who every day, in their own respective ways, are doing their parts as they see it to contribute to the war effort and to bring about an early and complete victory for the Allied cause.

It is hard to reconcile the psychology of some who are constantly low-rating the efforts of those at home. It is grossly inconsistent for one group to tell us that the home front has broken down and at the same time for another group to tell us that production is reaching an all-time high. The American people cannot understand such inconsistencies. The American people are willing to do their utmost in their individual ways to win this war. Every man in America cannot be a soldier. Men at the front cannot win battles unless they receive an unbroken supply of material and equipment. This must, of necessity, be furnished by the people at home.

Someone in this country since December 8, 1941, has done some work. In the first 2 years of the war 27,000,000 tons of deadweight shipping was built in America. That represents a lot of hard work on the part of somebody. In the past 2 years 3,500,000 tons of naval craft of all kinds has been built in this country; 134,000 planes of all descriptions have been constructed and put into the air; over 400,000 pieces of artillery of all sizes have been turned out by the various arsenals and ordnance plants. All of this, in addition to the millions of machine guns and other small arms, as well as the hundreds of millions of rounds of ammunition of all calibers, as well as thousands upon thousands of tanks—such production speaks for the efforts of the home front.

There have been strikes—too many strikes—and this tribute is not intended for those who have shirked their duty in wartime and left their workbench, the result of which unquestionably in many instances seriously impeded the flow of the sinews of war to the fighting front. Nor is it intended for those selfish, greedy tycoons of industry who are interested only in their own selfish attainments. This tribute is intended for the average everyday American, both man and woman, who, day in and day out, through the long months since Pearl Harbor have unstintingly and unselfishly done his or her part toward the great American contribution.

Now is the time that someone, as stated previously, should stand up and give a boost to these war patriots. It must also be remembered in the paying of this tribute that these same men and women, in addition to the expenditure of physical effort, have dug deep into the coffers of their income and resources to purchase billions upon billions of dollars of War bonds. Three War bond issues have been oversubscribed, and there is every reason to believe that the fourth and current bond issue will be likewise oversubscribed.

The patriotism and loyalty of the great masses of the American people should never be questioned. Our country, however, has not been geared like the Fascist and Nazi warmonger nations, and as a result of this the transition in the United States from peace to war has been by far a much greater task than it was in those war-conscious nations. America is a peace-loving Nation, but our people, if given an opportunity and acquainted with the real facts of the progress of the war, will not be found shirking. The greater majority are ready and willing to do their utmost to bring to a quick end this the most terrible of all wars. Come on! Let's see who will be the first to give the soldiers on the home front a pat on the back.

Victory, What Then?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLISON D. SMITH

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Victory, What Then?" delivered by Judge Neal W. Workman at Laurens, S. C., on November 11 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Post Commander, fellow Legionnaires, members of the Auxiliary, ladies and gentlemen: It is with peculiar pleasure that I respond to the kind invitation of your post commander to speak to you on this splendid occasion.

Armistice Day, 25 years ago. A great day that, filled with memories that have lingered ever fresh in our every mind. To us over there that morning, the air was fresh and crisp; the sun seemed unusually late in getting up and out on his daily rounds. After so long a time he slowly dragged himself over hills, and more slowly still climbed the sky, making bold, now and then, to look over the tall timbers and even to peep through the clouds which so recently had watered the countryside. All along the battle line, on the hilltop and in the valley, the roar of battle grew in intensity; the boom of cannon, great and small, increased at an ever rapid rate, for each belligerent vied with the other in sending over the greatest possible number of shot and shell that morning. Men, many who had lived through it all to see the dawn of that very day, fell and joined the ranks of the dead, while others, until then whole and strong, had their bodies broken and maimed. While thus the battle raged, the atmosphere was tense with expectancy, for 11 o'clock was the hour in every mind. At intervals, ever shorter between, officers and men alike glanced at their watches over whose faces the hands seemed to move with incredible slowness. The seconds lazily ticked themselves out into long and lingering minutes, the minutes dragged themselves out into hours, and the hours into days. Finally, at long last, the awaited hour came. Of a sudden, everywhere, with unbelievable abruptness, the firing ceased, and the roar of battle moved off into the silent past. Peace again had come to earth; in man reason once more had climbed upon the throne and judgment prepared to take command. So we hoped, and so we dreamed. The war was at an end, so we thought. A war to end all wars had been fought, so we were told. Here on the home front many of you will recall how the bells rang and the whistles blew that morning, and how joy reigned supremely in the hearts of men. Such was Armistice Day 25 years ago.

Yes, an armistice had been arranged and now was in force and effect. Armies about-faced, and men, with high hopes and lofty dreams of a world henceforth free from war, began a journey that was to lead back to billets and then to their respective homes. Our own General Pershing, and Marshal Foch had advised against such an armistice, and urged that the war be continued on German soil. Their advice was not heeded. In the light of what since has happened, we now full well know that in failing to heed that advice the Allied Nations erred. We also know that that armistice marked, not the end of that war but only the beginning of a truce; that the years which have since passed have been years of truce and not years of peace. We had won that war, but we did not keep it won. We failed and failed utterly to win the peace. The conduct of the Allied Nations then and down through the years since made possible the rekindling of the flames of that unfinished war. The war-mongers across the Rhine, foreseeing for themselves defeat and ruin, had sued for peace—not because they had lost their will to fight, nor yet because they wearied of their warlike way, but rather that they might live and prepare the better to fight another day.

With shattered hopes and unfulfilled dreams, we again find ourselves at war—not in World War No. 2, as we sometimes are told, but in the rekindled flames of that other and unfinished war. Indeed, why longer call this Armistice Day, when in fact there is no longer an armistice? That armistice lasted so long, and only so long, as it suited the wish and whim of the haughty Hun.

Today, in the midst of these rekindled flames of war, in accordance with our long-standing custom, we meet to pay tribute and do honor to our comrades who did not come back 25 years ago, as well as those who since have fallen by the wayside. But as we do this, we are reminded that another generation has come upon the scene. Boys—then in their mothers' arms, or yet unborn—today are men. In the air, on land, and sea, they boldly carry the fight to the enemy in every part of the earth to which these rekindled flames of war so widely, so swiftly, have spread. They have taken up where we left off. They have put their hands to the plough to complete that which we left unfinished. Some of them, so soon, too, have fallen and joined the ranks of the dead. May we not also pause to pay them tribute and do them honor. And those that live, let us bid them Godspeed in their great task. For the moment let us forget the dead and think of the living. Let us cease to think and talk of that armistice of yesterday, and think of and labor for a Victory day of tomorrow. Not again must there be an armistice with the Hun. For him, surrender—unconditional surrender—only must be his terms. Are we giving these boys now in uniform that material and moral support they need and must have if that Victory day shall come? Or do we, by our actions say, This is their war, let them fight it"? No; this is not their war. It is our unfinished war. Had we finished that war, and won and preserved the peace, there would be no war today. Twenty-five years ago we brought the Hun to his knees and took from him his arms. Mystified at what since has happened, today we ask: "How did he so quickly rise?" Upon what meat has he fed so quickly to grow and become so great and strong? The answer is not difficult to find. During the last days of that war the Allied military forces effected a fairly well unified command and concert of action, but the Allied Nations themselves never effected any such unity of purpose or of action. But so soon as the fighting stopped they each went their own way making no effort for unity of thought or of action, either to win or preserve the peace. Cross purposes at once developed, and as a result Germany was soon free to burst the bonds of the Versailles Treaty and go back to her war-making business.

The continued discord and lack of unity among the Allied Nations made his task all the easier. When Hitler first denounced that treaty and marched in the territory by it forbidden to him, the French wanted to stop him, and they had the army and the tools to do the job and do it well. But England said, "No." Hitler, expecting England and France to act, gave his army two sets of orders—one, to advance so long as there was no resistance, the other to withdraw if and when resistance should come, while he himself, trembling with fear, went to bed and required a shot in the arm. Who among us would say that had he been stopped still in his tracks that day, it would not have had a salutary effect on his subsequent career? Before that, on the other side of the world, in Asia, the Japs moved into Manchuria. Mr. Stimson, then Secretary of State, now Secretary of War, wanted to stop them. England said, "No." Later, one Benito Mussolini, dreaming that he was one of the immortal Caesars, and the greatest of them all, must have an empire commensurate with his greatness, too began to march. He moved into Ethiopia. This was too close to the British possessions in Africa for comfort, so they said, "Let's stop him." America said "No." As a result of this lack of unity of purpose and of action, the embers of that war were fanned into living coals of fire and later into flaming war. A war that need not have been. A war that should not have been. A war that easily could have been prevented, but was not on account of the jealousies and suspicions of the Allied Nations. All the while the Germans were busy on two fronts—on the home front making tools of war, and on the foreign front fanning the fires of discord and disunity among the Allied Powers. Not only did we, in the long run, lose that other war, but by reason of this discord and disunity, we came dangerously near losing this war even before it burst into open flames.

Let us remember and not forget that civilization has hung in the balance; that we and our allies, until recently, have been on the losing side of this war; that we are not yet out of danger; that victory still lies far away, and that the road that leads thereto is long and rugged; that before that goal is reached many that today live then will be dead.

And, too, let us remember that in this war—as in the last—the real struggle is not tank against tank, nor plane against plane, nor yet man against man, but idea against idea, philosophy of government against philosophy of government. This struggle is not confined or limited to the war between the Axis against the Allied Nations but is going on within the respective nations on each side. In this war it is our task—those of us who stay at home—not only to support those boys now in uniform with our prayers, with our every resource and every energy that victory may the sooner and surer come, but to defend, protect, and preserve the Constitution of these United States and the American way of life. Let us face the facts and openly admit that during the last 25 years in general and the last 10 years in particular, this Nation has been filled with saboteurs—with men and women who have been engaged—not in dynamiting factories, and trains, and bridges, to be sure, for they played for higher stakes than that—but who, in season and out of season, by day and by night, with all their might and main, have sought to destroy the Constitution of this Nation and the liberties and freedoms by it vouchsafed to the American people. As great as is our first duty—to furnish these boys with tools to do their job; the second duty, namely, to preserve the American way of life, is even greater. Is it not time for us to pause and ponder the question propounded many years ago by that keen analyst of human destiny when he asked, What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? We are going to win this war if it takes every dollar of our wealth and every mother's son and daughter of us to do it. But what then?

Of what value will victory on the battle front be to us if we lose our American soul—our American way of life? When this war is over and these boys come back, to what kind of country will they come? To a country whose Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, or to a socialized country fashioned by bureaucracy, whose unjust powers are derived from the consent of the planners? From the planners—the reformers—Gracious God, deliver us. In his little book entitled "When a Man Comes to Himself," by our Commander in Chief of the other war, Woodrow Wilson, he had this to say about reformers: "Men come to themselves by discovering their limitations no less than by discovering their deeper endowments and the mastery that will make them happy. It is the discovery of what they cannot do, and ought not to attempt, that transforms into statesmen; and great should be the joy of the world over every reformer who comes to himself." Great would be the joy in America today if some of the self-appointed "remakers" of America could only find themselves. We have no right to wish or expect these boys to win the victory on the battle front unless we at every necessary cost win this battle on the home front. Will we win that battle for them, as well as for ourselves and our posterity, or will we unconditionally surrender to the superimposed new order? Will the pertinent question asked in the tomorrows be, Were we weighed in the balances and found wanting? Shall men in other lands and in other ages answer this question in the affirmative, or will we in this land and in this age meet the challenge and answer it in the negative? Frankly, my friends, are we fighting this war to preserve the American way of life or to make America safe for bureaucrats?

Just what the outcome ultimately shall be I cannot tell you for I do not know. But this I can tell you, for this I do know: To this land liberty came to live. Your duty and mine it is to see to it that here it shall not die. In this land freedom made its home. It is your duty and mine to see to it that it shall not be banished from these shores. I claim no ability to walk with unstumbling feet the uncertain paths of prophecy, but I make bold to predict that when the smoke of this war's battles shall have cleared away it will clearly be seen that Old Glory, unstained and untorn, will yet be waving over this land—still the land of the free and home of the brave; that when the constitutional infidels and saboteurs, the liberty thieves and freedom's foes are dead and in their forgotten graves, the Constitution, unaltered and unchanged, will be the supreme law of this land, and the liberty-loving, God-fearing men and women of this Nation, unashamed and unafraid, will still put their unfaltering trust and unfailing faith in that Constitution and pay undivided allegiance and unstinted tribute to that flag. May God grant it so!

Prospect of Russian-Finnish Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have here an article written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of February 16, 1944. I think it is quite well understood that Mr. Constantine Brown is one of the most careful and one of the best informed writers on international politics, sometimes called diplomacy. In this article he makes a very interesting comment on the apparent drift of international politics. It would be interesting to know what the other members of the Moscow agreement think of this. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The prospect of a Soviet-dictated peace with Finland may not disturb our State Department, but it appears to have caused grave concern in Sweden and among the members of the Norwegian Government in exile.

The Norwegian Government's uneasiness is said to be due to the demand of the Russians that the port of Petsamo be surrendered to them.

This would place the Soviet's borders within a few miles of the Norwegian frontier.

Norway does not expect any territorial aggrandizement after the war. She is too small a country to wish to play power politics. But neither does she intend to relinquish any portion of her present territory.

There have been rumors and hints in the last few months that Russia must have an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean in order to forestall any future difficulty such as she has encountered in this war and in the World War when her allies had a hard time shipping supplies over the ports of Murmansk and Archangel. Also, from the economic viewpoint, there are obvious advantages in a better outlet to the Atlantic.

In some quarters it was hinted that the Norwegian port of Narvik would suit Russia's desire for such an outlet to the sea. Some Norwegian officials in London are said to feel that the Moscow demand for the otherwise unimportant port of Petsamo is only the first step toward a Soviet expansion farther west, to Narvik.

The situation is being watched with even greater concern by the Stockholm Socialist Cabinet. Sweden never relished her proximity to the Russian borders. But so long as there were buffer states between her territory and Russia, there was only a potential threat to her sovereignty. Sweden is an industrial country which depends for her coal on imports from Germany and Poland. It is vitally important to that country that the Baltic Sea should not be dominated by any one power. This sea may soon become a Russian lake. The absorption of the Baltic states into the U. S. S. R. will give the Russians the important islands of Aaland and Dago.

The well-informed London Observer said last week that the Moscow Government intended to annex Koenigsberg, the capital of East Prussia, after the defeat of Germany. Should this report prove correct, the annexation of the Koenigsberg area, together with the Soviet ownership of Aaland and Dago, and Moscow's domination of Finland, would make the Baltic a Soviet sea.

From reports received from Stockholm, it appears that the Soviet Government does not intend to make Finland a seventeenth Soviet republic. The principal Finnish negotiator is the former cabinet minister, Juho Paasikivi, who concluded a peace with Russia in 1940 after the first Russian-Finnish War.

There seems to be an understanding that as soon as the Helsinki government agrees to sign, President Ryti, of Finland, will be succeeded by Mr. Paasikivi. Mr. Paasikivi is described by diplomats as "the Benes of Finland." Like the Czechoslovak President, he is convinced that the future of his country is intimately tied to that of the U. S. S. R.

A peace between Finland and Russia is now regarded as certain. The withdrawal of the Nazis from Leningrad has liberated Soviet forces for an all-out drive against Finland.

The Germans foresaw this development several months ago. Travelers arriving from Finland reported that since last December the Germans have been withdrawing forces from the Finnish front. These withdrawals started in the north and early in January the reserves stationed near the Baltic Sea joined in. It is probable, according to these observers, that not more than 30,000 Nazi troops are now in Finland. Marshal Mannerheim, the commander in chief of the Finnish forces, is said to have informed the Nazi general staff that the withdrawal of German forces from the Leningrad area would compel the Finns to sue for peace. The Germans realized the situation, but were not able to do anything about it. By common agreement, however, they began the withdrawal of their forces and war material in such numbers and quantity that today it is doubtful whether the Russians will get anything of any consequence when the Finns surrender unconditionally.

Selfishness, America's Public Enemy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Selfishness, America's Public Enemy No. 1," by Chaplain Grover C. Schwartz, of Corinth, Miss.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELFISHNESS, AMERICA'S PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

(By Chaplain Grover C. Schwartz)

We used to hear much of America's public enemies, but the courage and the efficiency of J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. have about driven this crime scourge from our land and delivered America from its loot-maddened violence.

Our latest public enemy is selfishness, which, like a vile dragon, glides through our land contaminating our people, impeding our war work and handicapping our fighting men.

Selfishness causes anxiety in high places, it is the handmaid of inflation and a traitor working behind our lines. All of America's wars have been characterized by a most beautiful spirit of sacrifice and self-denial at home but today as a wise friend of mine recently said, "Everybody seems bent upon making a financial killing out of this war."

Read of Congressman ALBERT J. ENGEL and his crusade against waste and inefficiency in our defense industry and know that as he goes about the country in his patriotic investigations, he gets frequent glimpses in nearly every plant of the base dragon of selfishness at his devastating and dastardly work.

Steel firms are fined for turning out defective steel on Government contracts; airplane workers are arrested for defective riveting, hurriedly done so that more piece work could be turned out, with additional shekels in the pay envelope; soldiers are brought into a cannery to save a tomato crop, while union officials demand and get a cut of their wages, black market operations and purchases so that some can gorge themselves illegally while others sacrifice; miners refusing to work even on Armistice Day without heavy overtime pay. Whenever and wherever we note these things we know that the black dragon of selfishness has passed that way.

But there is one place where the dragon of selfishness never shows his face, and that is in our combat areas all over the world. In a noble spirit of sacrifice, an infantryman marches out to come to grips with the enemy, forgetting self, an American dive-bomber pilot swoops down to make his kill, the crew of a torpedo boat hears the rustling of the wings of Death as they move out to attack the enemy, in sublime self-effacement a tank crew throw themselves into the melee of battle.

Yes; selfishness has been banished from these combat areas and the noble story of their sacrifice is written in the scarlet fluid that flows from their open wounds.

Some Americans seem willing to let our boys at the front do all the sacrificing. According to them, war for our veterans is to be a thing of wounds, disablement, and suffering, while at home profit and plenty are to be the reward of those who stay behind.

Our noble ancestors who froze at Valley Forge, perished at the Battle of New Orleans, went down before a tornado of lead at Gettysburg, shivered with fever in Cuba or broke the line on the Marne were well acquainted with sacrifice, and it was with their very lifeblood that they paid for our most cherished possessions.

As we meditate upon our past let us go to our knees in repentance, and as the tears of our shame and sorrow flow down our cheeks let us solemnly resolve that selfishness shall no longer have dominion over us.

The experience of the ages teaches clearly this lesson: Sacrifice leads to the heights; selfishness leads to the pit.

Opposition to Mr. Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Churchill Is Slipping," written by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, and printed in the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL IS SLIPPING

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Mr. Roosevelt is not the only ruler whose hold on the political grass-roots is being loosened by time and changing public tastes. Latest news from Britain indicates that Mr. Churchill, too, is taking one licking after another in his campaigns to keep men in Parliament who think his way, Tory.

There has not been a general election in Britain since 1936, when a "national government" was organized behind Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain.

When Chamberlain went out in 1940, the managers of British politics by common consent avoided a majority vote of "no confidence" in the House of Commons, for that would have thrown the country open to a general election campaign at the very crisis of its existence.

Instead, Churchill took over and began his series of magnificent speeches that, reviewed today, stand supreme in world history as examples of what can be done in oratory.

First, he defied Hitler to do his worst, and declared that Britain would fight on the beaches, in the fields and cities, and from the hills until all invaders were driven off.

Churchill's brilliant speeches and courageous showmanship held the Empire together until the United States of America came in, the ideal Churchill bluntly told the world he had "aimed at, dreamed of, and worked for."

That pronouncement in 1942 just after the fall of Singapore and the smash of the British Empire in eastern Asia, was another galvanic invigorator of the British people.

Churchill's third great speech was his declaration in the midst of the struggle with India that he had not "become the King's First

Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

Churchill is honest, a courageous British Tory who believes in the old-fashioned British Empire, as it was when he grew up, and is proud to say so, publicly.

Churchill has never made any secret of his feelings about Socialist Russia, any more than he has about Socialist Germany. He never has trusted either. And you may be sure that as Germany grows weaker, he eyes Russia more closely, every day.

In doing so, he falls afoul of some very tricky domestic British politics, the solution of which is beyond the grasp of us sitting in the broad expanse of continental and self-sufficient America.

Great Britain is a small collection of small islands, overcrowded as to population and undernourished as to every natural resource except intelligent self-interest. Even in peace, Britain cannot maintain more than a 6 weeks' food supply within her own borders, but must depend on overseas sources.

The same is true as to materials for Britain's factories.

The British Empire is essential to the survival of the British people in their present pattern, and some of the British people know it.

But few of them like to admit it. Those who don't have been offended by Churchill's candid declaration that he intends to have the Empire back bigger and better than ever, as the fair profit of victory in this war.

Just why Britons should attempt to conceal the truth of the Empire's part in maintaining their standard of living is hard to see, except that socialism is rising to power in Britain, and the Socialists have a propaganda weapon that fits in poorly with truth about empire.

Not that the Socialists would do away with the British Empire if they got control of it. They couldn't if they expected to keep Britain powerful.

But they consider it good politics to act ashamed of the Empire, and to talk loudly about their intention to let go of it tomorrow or next day.

They claim they would sign elaborate treaties with Soviet Russia, a Socialist empire in being. Said treaties, of course, would put no potatoes on plates in London.

The Socialist politicians in Britain have been after Churchill's hide ever since it became obvious that the period of his greatest usefulness was ended—that was when he won the object he aimed at, dreamed of, and worked for. They mean to get rid of him this year, and they're doing a steady job of whittling, too.

Recently, the Liberals in London issued a declaration that after the fall of Germany Britain should call home all her conscript troops and leave only volunteers in the field against Japan.

That was intended as a sign to the world that the Empire is of no interest to the working people of Britain.

In the elections the Socialist tide has set hard against Churchill. A few days ago the seat for Brighton, a Tory stronghold of many years standing, was saved by the Churchill faction only after the strongest sort of battle. And very narrowly saved at that.

On Thursday of last week there occurred an even greater upset. In West Derbyshire the Marquess of Hartington was defeated by a cobbler's son for representation of a constituency that has been dominated for 300 years by Hartington's family, the Dukes of Devonshire.

Hartington had a letter of praise and endorsement from Churchill himself to wave around, but it did no good.

Churchill is sampling the voters again by endorsing another Conservative candidate in another byelection at Bury St. Edmunds, another precinct in which the Tories have been successful heretofore, now wide open for the Socialists.

Where the British people are headed is anybody's guess. They can't live without their Empire, yet their domestic political trend is toward its seeming repudiation. What it all means to us is hard to say just yet, except that we do wonder why all this trouble is being taken to save the British Empire if the British Socialists really mean to throw it away.

War Problems in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 last the Naval Affairs Subcommittee investigating progress of the war effort published a report in which the State of Washington was vigorously assailed on the alleged grounds that it had failed to meet its responsibilities to its war-booming communities.

The committee, in effect, charged my home State's administration with neglecting the cities and towns within it which are bearing the main brunt of the war boom, with all attendant evils such as housing, school, and hospital shortages. The committee, in effect, declared my State should spend more of its money to help minimize the bad effects of these war-borne conditions.

The committee said, and I quote:

> The Federal Government is meeting its responsibility to these municipalities, but the State of Washington is not. It is not fair for the State so to shun its responsibility, or to take unfair advantage of Federal financial assistance.

This was a very grave charge; it caused a furor in my home State. The State's administration, headed by the very able, honest, and conscientious Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, was subjected to criticism from opposing elements, who based their attacks on the committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to prove today to the House and to my home State that these charges are unfounded, and that, as a matter of unassailable fact, the State of Washington leads the entire Nation by a very wide margin in its efforts to take care of the war problems of its communities.

We all know that most of the war public works projects, such as hospitals, schools, and so forth, which are built in war-boom communities are financed under the Lanham Act. I am happy to disclose that the Federal Works Agency, which administers the Lanham Act and distributes these funds for these various shortages in war-boom communities, completely substantiates my statement that my home State leads the Nation in its efforts and expenditures for its war-boom cities and towns.

The latest annual F. W. A. report gives the official figures for all States. It was called to my attention by Mr. L. R. Durkee, regional engineer for F. W. A. Region No. 7, with offices in Seattle. In his accompanying letter, Mr. Durkee rightfully underlines the following paragraph:

> The State of Washington and its communities have contributed, under the Lanham Act, practically three times as much money as any other State in the Union.

A native of Washington, Mr. Durkee goes on to say:

> I am very proud of my home State. I am very proud of the spirit in which the State of Washington and all its local subdivisions have cooperated with the F. W. A. in administering the Lanham Act. Even a cursory analysis of the enclosure proves that this cooperation was furnished in a very material way, also.

The enclosure to which he refers is a list showing the sponsors, contributions, under the Lanham Act, to the various war public works projects in all the States.

On this list the contributions of the State of Washington loom up like a mountain, far above any other. My State leads all the States in these contributions; my State has contributed under the Lanham Act three times as much as any other State; considered on a relative basis, with adjustments for area and population, I feel safe in saying that my State has contributed from 10 to 20 times as much as any other State.

In the face of these facts, I consider that the investigating committee picked the wrong State to pick on.

The F. W. A. report shows that, as of mid-1943, a total of 109 of these War Public Works projects had been authorized or built in Washington. It shows that they cost a total of $27,838,992. It shows that of this sum slightly more than five millions went for projects that were exclusively Federal in character. Of the balance it shows that Washington contributed a total of $12,779,127, and that the Federal grants amounted to $9,242,522. In other words, it shows that my State bore 58 percent of the cost of such projects and that only 42 percent came from the Federal Government.

This report shows that where my State contributed $12,779,127 to these projects in war-boom communities, the next largest contributor was the State of Texas, with $4,600,544; that the next was Michigan with $4,006,528; that the next was Virginia, with $3,093,566, and so on down the line.

The investigating committee said my State "shunned its responsibility." Yet the official figures show that, far from shunning any responsibility, the State of Washington met that responsibility completely. More than that, they show that my State met that responsibility three times better than any other State in the Union.

In short, it has done the best job in the country in this respect that has been done.

The chairman of this committee is the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I like and respect him, and I have never doubted his judgment. Yet I feel that his committee was grievously misled by somebody, somehow, in its work in Washington. How can my State be justly criticized in this matter, for in-

stance, when the great State of California contributed, under the Lanham Act, only about one-tenth of the amount that Washington contributed? I mean no reflection on California nor any other State. But I certainly cannot let the committee's reflection on my own State and its Republican administration go unchallenged and unrefuted.

My State of Washington, beyond all question, has done a most outstanding job in helping to solve the problems of war-congested communities within its borders. It has done the best job in the country. Who can say it should have done better, when already it has done three times as well—not relatively, but actually—as any other State in the whole Union?

The Late Honorable Leonard W. Schuetz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply grieved when on Sunday evening, February 13, I was informed that one of our colleagues and my personal friend, LEONARD SCHUETZ, had died suddenly. I knew LEONARD SCHUETZ for many years. I knew him long before he was selected as a Representative in Congress from the Seventh District of Illinois, the largest district in the United States. I knew him as one of the outstanding building contractors in Chicago. He was a self-made man. Obstacles and difficulties in life's battle were no threat to him. He loved hard tasks and their accomplishments were a source of pleasure to him. Before he was elected to Congress, he was a successful businessman and brought to this body a wide and rich experience. He was a hard worker and devoted his time and energy to his duties very unstintingly. He represented the people of his district loyally. He had the respect and admiration of his constituents, and the best proof of their esteem was his reelection as their Representative for seven consecutive terms.

He had a very wide acquaintance. His home was in Chicago and many of its finest citizens were his personal friends. Because of his many years of experience in the House, and as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I often sought his opinion on the many questions and problems with which we have to deal, and always found him to be well informed and possessed with a keen mind and sound judgment.

From my long acquaintance with him I knew how faithfully and conscientiously he represented his district. In his death the district he represented, the city of Chicago, the State of Illinois and the Nation has lost a distinguished and able public servant.

I feel a deep personal loss in the passing of my personal friend, LEONARD SCHUETZ, and I join with his many friends and Members of the House in expressing to his widow and daughter my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Our Petroleum Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, because of the current interest in our petroleum reserves, I feel that it is of importance to the membership of the House to avail itself of the information on that subject which has been made available by the oil committee. The record of the extensive hearings in 1942 and 1943 is available and a study of those hearings would bring to the attention of any interested Member the intensive research and investigation into our petroleum reserves which your special subcommittee on petroleum investigation has made through the past 2 years. Subsequent to the hearings of 1942 and the hearings of 1943, the committee filed important reports and made important recommendations.

In House Report No. 2744 on December 31, 1942, the committee announced important findings and recommendations. Amongst other things at that time, we said:

> We recommend that our governmental authorities, upon whom this responsibility rests, aggressively seek to augment these available foreign supplies, the oil from which can help to relieve our transportation problems, both for oils and materials, and retain for our people a large proportion of our present reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the following excerpts from House Report No. 663, made July 3, 1943, after extensive hearings and investigation, bear directly upon the question of petroleum reserves:

OUR PETROLEUM SUPPLIES

Let us review the situation in somewhat more detail. The United States is the world's great consumer of oil. While the rest of the world has drilled 100,000 wells, we have drilled a million.

While our proportion of the world's oil is, of course, very uncertain, we probably have about one-tenth of the world's supply. We are producing two-thirds of that being currently consumed. We are infinitely more dependent on oil than any other country.

America has known reserves of crude oil generally estimated at 20,000,000,000 barrels. From these reserves, plus future discoveries, America must obtain our domestic supply of oil.

Our normal consumption has approximated 1,500,000,000 barrels a year. This level of consumption was reached progressively and with a continuing prospect of an increased demand to supply the expanding need of oil for fuel, power, and other purposes.

If our present known reserves could be assembled in one giant tank it would require a reservoir a mile square and three-fourths of a mile high to contain it. If that supply could be obtained simply by turning on a multitude of faucets, it would take care of the needs of our country at the pre-war rate, for 14 years. Then the total supply without future discoveries would be consumed and the country would be without oil. Those who regard the oil supply as if it were in such a reservoir, and so conveniently available, totally ignore the practical situation.

The normal and economical drainage of these known reserves would require about 40 years for their substantial exhaustion. It is true that for a brief period production could, at the expense of ultimate waste, be substantially increased. The increased recoveries due to such forced production would be limited to immediate returns, followed by a premature decline, wasteful of a valuable resource, and in the end detrimental to the consumers of the country.

The waste of oil, due to a maximum production under such forced measures, would vary according to the circumstances, but in many locations would constitute a waste of 25 to 50 percent of the recoverable oil in our most productive fields.

Estimates have been made, with a considerable show of reason that forced production of wells in earlier years made billions of barrels of oil unrecoverable and to that extent subtracted from the reserve, which otherwise we would have today. A forced premature abandonment of wells, through overcrowding production, would be a resumption of that wasteful policy.

A careful review of the present situation indicates that under present practices and rate of discovery within 1 year we will reach the decline in the productive capacity of American oil fields.

OUR PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

The marvelous increase in oil production and refining in the last few decades has been based on demands of new uses for its products and better discovery and production methods. The Nation has gone for its supplies first to the most easily located oil sources. Marvelous developments for a time more than equaled the equally marvelous consumptive demands of the Nation.

Since 1939 this relation between discovery, production, and consumption has changed.

For a considerable period new discoveries more than equaled the current consumption and thus there was an easy supply of oil. During this period we built up our reserves of 20,000,000,000 barrels. Later we reached a short period when production and consumption were fairly balanced. For 4 years now discoveries have declined and current discoveries do not now maintain our volume of reserves.

Current demands have exceeded productive capacity to such an extent that above-ground stocks have been depleted by 55,000,000 barrels in the last 12 months. Forecasts, probably optimistic, indicate that production from our presently developed sources will reach a maximum daily production of 4,420,000 barrels for 1943, 4,212,000 barrels for 1944, and 4,022,000 barrels for 1945.

Against this background of declining supply and reduced stocks we have a tremendously accelerated demand on our supplies for military purposes. No one can forecast with exactness the quantity of new discoveries which may be obtained or the exact needs of our Military Establishment. It is probably conservative to say that our increased demand on our oil supplies, due to our military operations and lend-lease supplies will amount to more than 1,000,000 barrels a day. This would be an increase of 25 percent above a peacetime peak of consumption.

We might hopefully conjecture an early termination of the war, but plans with primary regard for military effectiveness, must provide for a continuance of the war for at least 2 years. America is even yet in the initial stages of the tremendous war power it will be able to assert in 1944. The big demand upon petroleum products is yet to come. Those plans call for a vast increase

in our military planes; thousands of combat vehicles; and millions of tons of merchant shipping. The plans look to oil as the motive power for practically every movement of men, materials, and equipment for our armed forces.

The limit of our provision should be our ability to produce rather than an effort to confine production to possible minimum requirements.

The easy resort to meet increased military demands is a cut-back on civilian supplies. That is the necessary method of meeting increased war demands when production supply is inadequate to supply both military and civilian needs. Such a cut-back limits our domestic fuel and power supply. The horses, mules, vehicles, and implements, which petroleum supplanted, have disappeared from the fields and highways of our country. America is on wheels. Ours is a petroleum economy. There is no way for an early return to the horse and buggy days. A cut-back on civilian supply does not go very far until it begins to break down domestic economy on which the success of the war effort is dependent. No argument is necessary to show the obvious need of securing and maintaining the greatest possible supply of petroleum products.

THE DECLINING TREND

As a background to the trend of supply and consumption we have these facts:

The oil crop does not reproduce. Every field is giving up a nonrestorable supply.

The maintenance of a balanced production and supply requires new discoveries equal to current consumption.

For 4 years we have had a declining rate in the number of new fields found each year.

There has been a decrease each year in the number of barrels of oil recoverable for each field discovery.

We have a dwindling domestic area capable of producing oil.

Exploratory costs have greatly increased due to the necessity for more intense geographical and geophysical surveys and increased drilling depths.

Men experienced in the oil industry and reliable have informed our committee that the discovery costs per barrel have in the last 4 years increased from 15 to 50 cents. Statistics indicate that nearly five times as many exploratory wells are required to locate the same amount of oil as 6 years ago.

In the face of this situation we have a definite trend under present war conditions and industry regulation by the Government toward the elimination of the independent producer. He belongs to that branch of the industry which has been most responsible for the major portion of past discoveries. The pinch of inadequate prices for crude hits him first and hardest.

We have inadequate provision for conservation of present developed reserves through secondary recovery methods. Ceiling prices do not admit of such necessary methods.

In the face of the present war needs, wells are being abandoned because of disparity between crude ceiling prices and increased operating costs.

The aggregate production of such wells is enough to be important. New discoveries have been declining since 1939. We use 1,400,000,000 barrels of oil a year, yet discoveries since 1939 have been at the rate of only about half of the consumption rate. This is a forcible announcement of a productive decline.

Much of the crude now being furnished for our war and civilian needs is supplied below the cost of production. Practically all the crude supply of the Nation is being furnished below its replacement value from new sources.

We face a period of declining supplies, increased demand, increased costs and prices.

The low rate of discovery is due in a large part to the diminishing size of the pools found rather than slackening exploratory effort. The drilling of the same number of wildcat wells discovers a far less amount of new reserves. The time now required for production from discovery wells would be from a minimum of 6 months up to a somewhat more normal period of 2 years.

The importance of new discoveries is so great that necessary incentives to accomplish them must be established. The situation calls for understanding treatment, purposeful and aggressive action. It does not yield itself to delay or policies of mere expediency.

We must give the Nation its best possible security. It is better we err on the side of too much than too little. None can say that the delay of an oil supply for 1 day might not prolong the war with its vast destruction, for many days, or weeks.

SUPPLIES FROM OTHER LANDS

The war is making a heavy demand upon our reserve supply of oil. A very high percentage of all the petroleum products now being used by the United Nations comes from the oil fields of America. The long-distance transportation to the battle lines is slow, expensive, takes a high toll of critical materials and proportionately subjects transportation to the hazards of war.

There are great supplies of oil in the Persian Gulf area. More substantial war supplies should now come from that source. The production in that area could be greatly increased by more wells, establishment of refineries and pipe lines to connect the supply with water transportation at the Mediterranean. That and other sources of foreign oil could increase the war supply of petroleum products if the war long continues.

In the judgment of the committee, the conservation of our own resources, as well as a more assured supply for military and civilian purposes, require that every practicable effort be made to increase these foreign supplies for war purposes. Such increase would decrease the demands upon our oil reserves, shorten our ship lines, reduce the war transportation hazards, increase the amount available for civilian use, and prolong the available supply of oil for America. Unquestionably, our military authorities are not unconscious of this situation.

This committee believes that they and other agencies of our Government should, within the limits of their authority, make every practicable effort to develop these known oil fields for the aid of the war cause of the United Nations and to the lasting benefit of our country.

As measured by the life of a nation, our domestic supply of oil is brief. Beyond that, America must eventually share in the supplies of other lands. And then beyond that perhaps we must resort to substitute fuels such as can be gained from oil shales, coal, and alcohol.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the greatest requisites of this war is an assured supply of petroleum products of the kind and at the time and place needed.

Assuming that the war is to continue for 2 years or more, our supplies will not be adequate for all civilian and military needs. Our supply must be limited by our production and delivery capacity. Preparation for increase for our own supply is a basic need for both our civilian and military requirements.

In the absence of an adequate supply, restrictions must be made in our military uses, our civilian uses, and economy in all uses. On the basis of relative needs, the increase of our capacity for production is the elementary problem of supply at this time.

More discovery and enlarged and sustained production must be established.

Where we have had duplicated and conflicting authority, we should have unity of determination and control.

Without disparagement of other agencies, we recommend to the President that the War Petroleum Administration be given unified control over the problems of government as to the production, supply, and price ceilings of oil and petroleum products.

We again reiterate the recommendations of our committee made in its report of December 31, 1942, as to the supply of manpower and critical materials in aid of the production of oil and petroleum products.

We recommend that the appropriate officers and agencies of the United States exert every proper effort to augment our supply of petroleum products for war and future needs by the prompt development and supply from available known reserves in other lands.

Our problems as to petroleum in wartime require understanding aggressive action by our administrative agencies. It calls for such centralized control as can make prudent and prompt decisions to anticipate and meet emergencies as they arise.

Garbled Subsidy Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 20, 1944:

GARBLED SUBSIDY ISSUE

President Roosevelt's veto message, which was sustained by the House on Friday, leaves the consumer subsidy issue in as dense a fog as before. It is clear that neither the attitude of Congress nor that of the White House can prevail. In the circumstances, Congress would have done much better, as we have said many times before, to compromise by leaving existing subsidies alone and preventing any further resort to the dangerous subsidy habit. In the absence of a compromise the administration is presumably free to extend the program in spite of its doubtful legality and the opposition of Congress.

The President's message added only further heat to the discussion. "The bill presented to me," he wrote, "would destroy the stabilization program. I cannot accept responsibility for its disastrous consequences." This extreme statement is based on the estimate that elimination of consumer subsidies would increase the cost of food by 7 percent and the cost of living from 2½ to 3 percent. Actually, however, it is misleading to speak of consumer subsidies as decreasing or holding down the cost of living. What they really do is to transfer part of the cost of living to the Government, which means that the public must pay for the immediate saving, in large measure, through higher taxes in the years to come.

Subsidies may be extremely useful in a period like the present if judiciously used to stabilize our economy. The President rightly says that we cannot hope to hold the wage line if we let living costs get out of hand. The critical weakness in this argument is that basic living costs, according to Department of Labor statistics, have been held relatively stable in the last year and wages have continued to increase, thus putting more inflationary surplus cash into the hands of the public. Average hourly earnings of workers in all manufacturing industries have increased about 10 percent in the last year. An increase of 3 percent in the cost of living to absorb the consumer subsidies would still leave the average workingman better off than he was a year ago. So there is no economic

argument whatever for continued payment of subsidies that add to the general surplus of purchasing power.

At the same time we recognize the strength of the politica' argument against upsetting even the very lopsided and insecure balance that has been attained. Sudden abolition of the subsidies would give organized labor just the excuse it is looking for to move in for a final smashing of the stabilization program. The blunt truth is that subsidies are necessary because of the deplorable weakness of the administration's wage-stabilization policy. No injustice would be done by letting the people pay all their own grocery bills in wartime. But the administration would be given another excuse for surrendering to pressure. We believe that it is in the public interest not to give the administration that excuse and so hope that it will still be possible in the months ahead to work out a reasonable compromise on this much-garbled issue.

Colorado River Water Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of February 17, 1944:

WATER PACT CRISIS SEEN BY WARREN—GOVERNOR SAYS DIVERSION OF RIVER TO MEXICO WOULD MEAN DESERT HERE

Governor Warren, warning that California is facing a "real crisis," asserted yesterday that the recently negotiated water treaty between the United States and Mexico would condemn hundreds of thousands of rich American acres in California and Arizona which can be irrigated from the Colorado River to be desert forever.

In a message delivered personally to members of the Colorado River Commission and representatives of other agencies who have united in opposing the pact, Warren declared:

"It jeopardizes Arizona as well as California and indeed the whole Southwest. The treaty, now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for ratification, would guarantee Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet per year of Colorado River water. This is twice the maximum amount of water Mexico did receive prior to the construction of Hoover Dam.

TOO MUCH WATER

"It is twice what Mexico ever could have received from the river except for its regulation by Hoover Dam. It is twice what Congress, by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, intended Mexico to have."

He said it is "unfortunate" the matter has been presented with such suddenness and declared he is confident that if the American people were aware of the full implication of the treaty "there would be an upsurge of every part of the country."

Warren said he is in agreement with a statement made earlier in the meeting by board member Fred J. Toole of the Coachella Valley water district, that "it would be just as practical to give the land to Mexico as it would be to give her water rights which turn the land into a desert waste."

VIOLATES PROJECT ACT

"The proposed treaty flatly violates the Boulder Canyon Project Act," he asserted, "and would make it impossible for the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill contracts which he has signed in the name of the United States. These are contracts to deliver Colorado River water to American communities in California, Arizona, and Nevada. On the faith of such contracts California communities alone have expended hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of municipal and irrigation water utilization works.

"We must not let this treaty go unchallenged."

Reviewing the history of the treaty, Commission Counsel Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., said first discussions were begun between the two Nations on the Colorado River water as early as 1910. He expressed the belief that if the treaty is ratified—granting Mexico exactly twice the amount of water she now receives from the river—"there just wouldn't be enough to go around."

E. F. Scattergood, advisory engineer of the Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light, and W. P. Whitsett, chairman of the board of directors of the metropolitan water district, were bitter in their condemnation of the pact which on Tuesday was sent for ratification to the United States Senate.

"People of southern California have spent $200,000,000 to bring this water to the coastal plain here and we feel that if our rights are made junior to those of Mexico and we are again revisited by drought as we have been in the past, it will be a limiting factor which will prevent from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 and their accompanying industry from settling here in the southern California coastal plain area," Whitsett declared to the board.

FARMERS TO SUFFER

Dr. Harry W. Forbes, president of the Coachella Valley Water District, and a member of the commission, said that if the waters of the Colorado are directed toward Mexican agriculture in the huge quantity provided for under the treaty, the farmers throughout his district will suffer a great shortage. Every farm agency throughout Riverside County is uniting, he said, in battling for the preservation of United States rights to the river which has been harnessed by United States money.

San Diego's perilous water situation was described by City Councilman Fred W. Simpson, who warned the commission that the civilian population, which has more than doubled since 1940, will be in desperate straits if there is any curtailment of water there.

Federal agencies, including the military, already use 41 percent of their available Colorado River water, he declared, and the city is now overdrawing its local water resources by 56 percent.

Chairman Evan T. Hewes, of the commission, said that efforts are being made through Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY to obtain a hearing on California's position before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington.

A Woman's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 17, 1944:

A WOMAN'S WORK—

When victory brings the closing of the war agencies and the cessation of much of the now booming defense industry in the United States, a lot of workers will be thrown on the labor market, and if we face the figures, we must acknowledge that a vast number of these will be women.

Recent Labor Department statistics reveal that about 800,000 women are now employed in Government war agencies throughout the country and nearly 2,000,000 in wartime industries. This is in addition to the more than 155,000 girls who will be mustered out of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and will be looking for civilian jobs. Also it takes no account of the other hundreds of thousands who are pinch-hitting for the men in clerical jobs everywhere.

While many will, of course, return to housekeeping and raising families and many older women will again feel at liberty to retire from work entirely when the emergency is over, there will still remain an impressive surplus of womanpower.

A regrettable disposition is observable in some quarters to think of this problem as vexatious but not important. Some employment officials, in Government and out, even deny that there will be any such problem after the war.

Fortunately there are many men and women who are giving the problem serious and constructive thought. A number of the largest industrial plants of the country are planning post-war expansion which will permit them, they estimate, to retain all the women employees now on their pay rolls who wish to continue at their jobs.

There is no over-all program yet devised which can solve the problem ahead of time perhaps, but certainly women cannot be left out of post-war reemployment planning.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted a radio address of this same gentleman which touched on the soldier-vote bill, but this time he has covered it exceedingly well, and has definitely hit at the crux of the whole question, namely, are we going to have a centralized, totalitarian form of government, or our regular constitutional form of government?

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents Rupert Hughes, soldier, novelist, historian and humorist. In his commentary he phrases present-day history in his own entertaining style. The views expressed, however, are those of Mr. Hughes and do not necessarily represent the view of the National Broadcasting Co. Now, Mr. Rupert Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES. The war abroad grows bigger and grimmer every day. The question is, Can we hold the ground we have gained in Italy? The civil war at home grows bigger and bitterer every day in every way. The question is, Can we hold the ground our forefathers gained in America?

The tug of war over the soldiers' vote has become a tug of real war, a battle between the Constitution and a centralizing and monopolizing of government.

Great numbers of people are still shouting that certain cheap politicians are trying to

cheat our warriors out of their hallowed right to vote. So it seems to me that there is a very serious question who is doing the cheating, and that if Congress is really cheating it is only trying to cheat the cheaters out of cheating the voters out of their votes.

It is one of the necessary evils of a free government like ours that many sins are committed, since this is a Nation of men and women, not of seraphim and cherubim. Our elections have often been scandalous in some communities.

People who had every right to vote have been ruled out or scared away from the polls, while repeaters have cast vote after vote, using false names, sometimes drawn from cemeteries. Ballot-box stuffing and ballot-box exclusion have been familiar practices, as everybody knows. 'Tis true, 'tis pity; and pity 'tis, 'tis true.

The party now in power and the party trying to get back in both have blots upon their 'scutcheons.

Take dear old Tammany. Almost anybody can have it now. It has fallen on evil days since the present Governor of New York sent to the penitentiary jovial Jimmy Hines, who had all the patronage of New York City entrusted to him by former Governors of New York.

There are other places where they would think nothing of taking a ton of soldiers' votes and dumping them in the river to save the trouble of counting them. It would be poor business even in these days of spending ourselves rich to squander a billion or so and hold up the war just to collect autographs from our soldiers and entrust them to some of our bosses. They wouldn't have to trouble the courts to declare them illegal, as the courts would have to do. The bosses would simply chuck 'em aside.

I used to live in New York, and the Bowery wasn't the only part of town where they used to do such things and say such things. I had friends of all sorts, and among those who condescended to know me were a number of Tammany politicians. More charming and amusing persons you could never find.

One of them I came to know quite well. He didn't mind my not voting his ticket. They didn't need my vote. One day this delightful leader, high in the ranks of Tammany, was reminded of a funny incident in his early life. And he confessed—or was he boasting?—the part he played in one of the elections.

At that time he was only a young fellow trying to get along—a mere beginner in practical politics. To test him out they gave him a certain precinct where the ridiculous Republicans were trying to get their votes counted. My friend was told to make sure that the Republican precinct went Democratic. It was before the day of the balloting machines. So he and his pals allowed the voters to go through the motions and fill out their ballots and parade in and out all day imagining they were citizens exercising the franchise.

A little before the polls closed, my young Tammany brave and his strong-arm young friends just dashed into the voting places like a football line going to town. They knocked down the Republican and independent watchers and made off with the ballot boxes.

Then they scampered gleefully to headquarters and gleefully and literally stuffed those boxes full of straight Democratic tickets. Then they returned their boxes to be counted. And they were counted and duly reported.

What a laugh went up. In their young ardor these Tammanescent leaders had put into the boxes more Democratic votes than there were men, women, and children in the whole precinct. Even the New York courts of those days had to throw the precinct out.

The older politicians remembered their own early days and took it all as good clean fun, saying "Boys will be boys."

The man told it to me himself and he laughed himself sick over the youthful indiscretion. That sort of thing was done thousands of times. It is still being done in certain communities by one party or the other.

But it will not have to be done in the case of the proposed Federal ballot, for, unless the matter is very carefully handled, every Federal ballot will find itself excluded from the ballot box as plainly and demonstrably unconstitutional.

The Constitution is open to debate on many points, but it is in nothing more explicit and emphatic than in the assignment of complete control of voting to the States.

You don't need to be reminded at this late hour that Abraham Lincoln was born 135 years ago today, or that he is immortal for his part in the War between the States, which was in a very real sense a debate on the interpretation of the Constitution. When it came to giving the ballot to male Negroes, it had to be done by way of an amendment passed upon by the States.

When Lincoln was 27 years old—back in 1836—he put out a handbill proclaiming the startling idea that women ought to have the right to vote. His friend and partner, Herndon, wrote that Lincoln's "keen sense of justice could not refuse a woman the rights he demanded for himself. He said to me often that the woman's suffrage question was one of time only."

It took only 84 years to get the vote for women. If all the soldiers in all our armed forces were cheated out of their votes, they would be hardly a drop in the bucket compared to the countless millions of American women who were cheated out of their share in our Government.

Yet it was better that they should wait and gain the franchise by constitutional amendment than that the law should have been overthrown.

And who is shedding any tears over the 2,000,000 warriors of ours who are being debarred from voting because they are under 21?

A year after Lincoln published his belief in women's right to vote, he made a great speech in 1837 during a period of violence and political passion. He said that the only true peril to the United States would come not from without but from within.

He gave us special warning against persons with great ambitions. "They would not be content with nothing more than a seat in Congress, a gubernatorial or a Presidential chair. Think you these places would satisfy an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Napoleon? Never. Sometime a man will spring up among us who will require an intelligent and united people devoted to the Government and laws, to successfully frustrate his designs."

He called particularly for a reverence for the Constitution. So long as the proud fabric of freedom rested on that rock, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The Constitution has been having a prolonged fight for life of late. It has been attacked, not by gross and selfish moneycrats but by high-souled reformers, lovers of the whole world, millenium-mongers, and worshipers of something they call the common man—a kind of overgrown idiot child that can't attend to its own functions and has to be taken care of by Vice Presidents and such.

Even in the Supreme Court there has arisen a civil war. Some of the New Deal judges have been deciding cases according to their own superhuman moral standards instead of remembering their oaths to uphold and protect the Constitution. Some of the other Supreme Court Justices have actually rebelled against these angelic ministers of grace. They say that it is a judge's sworn duty to uphold the laws, not to remake them.

One of the chief jobs of the Supreme Court has been the branding of acts of Congress as unconstitutional, when they are.

Today we have the curious picture of Congress trying to defend the Constitution from the administration and all the new idealists in the matter of the soldiers' vote.

Lincoln's second election came up along toward the end of the Civil War. Though he felt certain of defeat, he felt debarred from interference. But many of the States made arrangements to take the votes of their soldiers, and the total of 150,000, of which 116,000 were for Lincoln and only about 34,000 for General McClellan.

Our present Commander in Chief of the armed forces is often referred to as the Commander in Chief of the civilian population, which, of course, he is not. He wants to distribute certain ballots to the armed forces enabling them to vote for a President, Vice President, and Congressman—or just for a party. This last is against the law of many States.

Nobody has yet proposed that the Federal Government should count the ballots or register the voters. The supreme courts of the various States would be compelled by their State constitutions to throw out such ballots. If the case went on up to the Supreme Court of the United States, it would be stopped cold by the Constitution from interfering with the authority of the States.

In any case there would be a delay of decision that might stretch into years.

Last week I told how near we came to a second civil war over the disputed election of Hayes and Tilden in 1876. That concerned the vote of only three States and it was decided 1 day before inauguration day by an Electoral Commission which by 1 vote declared Hayes elected by 1 vote.

If this coming election should be tied up in the courts by a dispute over ten or eleven million soldiers' votes, we should find ourselves with no President at all. The Constitution makers never foresaw such a situation. There is no provision for President Roosevelt to go on holding office indefinitely. His third term ends next January and unless he is definitely reelected or somebody else elected by constitutional procedure, we shall be without a President or a Vice President and in a state bordering on anarchy.

It ill behooves people to denounce our Congressmen for trying to uphold the Constitution. They have taken their oath to do just that; and so have the President and all the other political and military and naval officials and officers.

It would be a wicked and cruel thing to cheat the armed forces out of their votes, but to dupe them into making illegal ballots that would be thrown out would be a wickeder and crueler thing.

The simplest and sanest solution to the mess that I have heard of has been proposed by Mr. Attwood R. Martin of Louisville, Ky. He has sent me a telegram and a copy of a letter to the New York papers in which he outlines a plan of authorizing the soldiers to vote by proxy and power of attorney.

Mr. Martin writes: "In the current discussion as to absentee voting I would like to suggest the simple plan of permitting the absentee voter to cast his vote at his home by proxy.

"All the machinery necessary would be a scrap of paper and a pen or pencil. Merely announce in the usual manner by which orders are issued, a simple form of power of attorney, appointing some trusted person at home—wife, father, friend, legal adviser—as attorney with authority to perform all functions as to voting which could be done by the voter were he present in person.

"Legality of this plan would be as easily handled as any of the complex methods under

discussion. And the advantages would be manifold, including almost complete absence of expense, saving of time, preservation of the rights of the States and perhaps most important, at this time, the preservation of the secrecy of the ballot.

"The attestation of the power of attorney in distant parts in the absence of the usual notary public might be delegated to any similar local officer at his base camp.

"When so attested the power of attorney to be mailed to the appointed attorney with instructions of the voter, if any. * * *

"ATTWOOD R. MARTIN."

The only possible objection that I can see to this is that it is simple and safe and sane. Worst of all it is inexpensive and it will save tons of freight both ways. Every soldier should be able to find a person at home whom he can trust. If he can't trust any of the home folk to vote for him, he can't trust them to count his ballot honestly.

The method strikes me as perfectly constitutional provided the State legislatures authorize it. The State legislatures have to do something about it—why not authorize proxy voting?

The Constitution, like other stone walls, is an inconvenient thing to bump against. But it has been our salvation for a century and a half.

Let us not forget Lincoln's advice to base the proud fabric of our freedom on the Constitution and his promise that, if we do, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Just now we are not in so much danger from the open gates of hell as from the swarms of self-appointed angels who are going to turn our Nation into a heaven where our great American symphony of freedoms will be limited to a quartet and all the peoples of the world shall have access to our riches; and free enterprise shall be given freedom to get out and bother us no more, since a divinely wise and all-powerful Government will give us security from fear and want from the cradle to the grave—security from everything but our self-perpetuating wet nurses.

I fancy that, if we let them have their way, we shall find the world changed, indeed, for the infants will dread the cradle and the adults will welcome the grave. New babies cry anyway and nobody will mind the woes of old babies in their second childhood maundering, "What a brave and beautiful republic this was while it lasted—as a republic."

The Late Honorable Leonard W. Schuetz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, just as we all are subject to human weaknesses and frailties, we react in the same manner when grief strikes us. Members of Congress always feel deeply when one of their colleagues departs on the long journey, from which there is no return. As Members we mingle together; our responsibilities govern our associations and in this way we come in contact with certain Members more so than with others. Socially, too, we are naturally attracted by personalities and characters of Members, which are most pleasing to us.

The late LEONARD W. SCHUETZ was one whom I came in contact with because of congressional duties and because of activities outside of Congress. I met him when I first came to Congress in 1939. He impressed me immediately. His dignified appearance, his gracious, retiring manner, his sound thinking expressed with the fewest possible words affected me. His statesmanship, his generosities, his willingness to be of aid to less experienced members were of immense help to the beneficiaries of his fine qualities.

Leonard was always on duty, whether in his office, on the floor of the House, at his apartment, or among the public. He was a Congressman. He lived it, he respected it, and he enjoyed it. At all times he preserved the integrity, the dignity, and the honor of his position. He was an idol of the people that he represented. He had their faith and their confidence and he was always conscious of it—ever anxious not to fail them.

The passing of LEONARD W. SCHUETZ is a loss not only to the people of his district, but to a great many people throughout the country. He was looked upon as a pioneer, and a leader of those who came here more recently to enjoy the blessings of America. His demise is a great personal loss to me. He will ever remain in my memory as one of the finest persons that I have ever known.

First Bryson Bill Hearing Gives Wets a Jolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, recently published in the National Voice, the Bible Advocate, and other periodicals:

Our national lawmakers can no longer claim that the people back home are not interested in the liquor problem, "otherwise we would hear from them on the subject." They spoke out emphatically last month as the time approached for opening the hearings on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) for the enactment of wartime prohibition to stop absenteeism due to drinking sprees, conserve grain and sugar, release shipping space, and free those engaged in the liquor business for essential occupations.

On January 14 the Associated Press released a dispatch to the effect that Chairman SAM HOBBS of the House Judiciary Subcommittee, which held the initial hearing on the Bryson bill the day previous, had been swamped with 100,000 letters demanding the bill's early enactment. A vivid description was given of weary clerks in his office segregating thousands of letters to the neglect of routine business.

A Member of Congress from a Midwestern State told the writer that his office had received easily a thousand letters in favor of the Bryson bill. Doubtless every Member of the House heard from constituents favoring wartime prohibition. An average of only 230 letters per Congressman indicates that the House of Representatives received an additional 100,000, making a grand total of 200,000 or more letters demanding that the waste caused by the liquor traffic be stopped for the duration of the war. Naturally this estimate does not include the flood of letters received by the Senators.

Another evidence of public interest in the Bryson bill was the capacity crowd that gathered for the opening hearing on January 13. The wets derived small comfort from this display of militant sentiment. That probably accounts for Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and wet member of the subcommittee, taking the floor in the House after the hearing was over and declaring "prohibition rears its ugly head again to divide the American people at a time when unity is our greatest need."

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and bitter foe of prohibition, likewise sees "the handwriting on the wall." He promptly issued a statement to the press warning that "the Nation had better take heed" because "the drys are working like beavers" to bring back prohibition. He frankly stated that the House Judiciary Committee, of which he is a member, might approve the Bryson bill to restore prohibition for the duration of the war "unless the right-thinking people of the Nation bestir themselves and make their influence felt."

The witnesses at this hearing were limited to dry leaders from out of town, who had come to Washington for a meeting of the executive committee of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council. Dr. D. Leigh Colvin, Prohibition Presidential nominee in 1936; Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, president of the National W. C. T. U.; Dr. Wilbur L. Dubois, Milwaukee chemical engineer and food chemist; Dr. George W. Crabbe, president of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council; W. Earl Hotalen, of the Alabama Temperance Alliance; Dr. H. H. Parish, of the Minnesota Temperance Movement; and Dr. John Coleman, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, addressed the subcommittee in behalf of the Bryson bill.

Before adjournment, Chairman HOBBS announced that later hearings would be held at which "everybody who cares to speak will have the opportunity." The date for the resumption of said hearings had not been announced at the time of dropping this release in the mail box.

In the meantime, Congress should be constantly reminded that one effective way of winning the war is to stop the colossal waste inherent in the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages. Letters and more letters will be necessary to keep Senators and Representatives alert as to the need and timeliness of the Bryson bill, or similar legislation, seeking to hasten victory and the return of our boys from the battlefields around the world. Christian citizen, lose no time in writing your Senators and Congressman as to where you stand on this important issue.

The Washington National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted by the House of Representatives, I extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

the following radio address made by me on Sunday afternoon February 20, 1944, over stations KWTO and KGBX, at Springfield, Mo., and KDRO, at Sedalia, Mo. This was the forty-eighth consecutive weekly broadcast I have made to the people of my district over these stations at the invitation of the stations:

Good afternoon, fellow citizens. Next Tuesday is February 22. It is Washington's Birthday and observed by patriotic Americans as a national holiday, although with the war in progress this year most business will continue as usual. I have been requested by a number of school children who listen to these broadcasts as part of their study in civics and current events, to give some information today about George Washington. With your indulgence we will, therefore, skip the news of last week and review the news of yesteryear. We will not talk about the things everybody knows about Gen. George Washington, first President and Father of his Country. We will not talk about the Revolution, Mount Vernon, the Constitutional Convention, and the Farewell Address, nor the Cherry Tree. Instead, I would like to bring to you the little-known story of the Washington Monument.

Few people come to the National Capital for the first time without visiting this tall shaft of masonry in memory of Washington, going up its 898 steps, or in its fast elevator. This is a landmark as well known in America as the dome of the National Capitol or the White House. But there is a wealth of interesting background, of political feuds, financial difficulties, religious intolerance, and intrigue behind the monument. Let us lift the veil of history today and look at some of it. We will not have time for the whole story.

WASHINGTON SAID "NO"

The history of the Washington Monument begins with the close of the Revolutionary War. In 1783, even before the British troops had evacuated the Colonies and while George Washington was still living, the Continental Congress passed a resolution providing that "an equestrian statue of General Washington be erected at the place where the residence of Congress shall be established." When the plans were drawn for the Capital City in 1791 they included a statue of Washington riding a horse. Washington, in his modesty and humility, objected to any expenditure of funds from the limited Government resources, so the matter was dropped and not brought up again during his lifetime. But the statue later was erected and now stands in Washington. It is the only one in the world with Washington on horseback. Nine days after Washington's death John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, proposed a marble tomb in Washington, D. C., a project to which Martha Washington consented. After 2 years of haggling the appropriation bill for the tomb failed to pass the Senate.

Fifteen years later Virginia proposed a tomb at Richmond for Washington and Congress awoke from its procrastination and immediately passed an appropriation providing funds with which a tomb was built in Washington in the Capitol Building itself. I have had the pleasure of showing many of you who have called at my office in Washington, D. C., the place where this tomb is located in the Capitol Building. But George Washington's body is not there. He provided in his will that he wanted his remains to rest at Mount Vernon where they are today.

CONGRESS SAID "NO"

But, let's get back to the Washington Monument. Unsuccessful attempts were made in Congress to authorize such a monument. These attempts were made over a period of many years and bills were introduced by Congressman James Buchanan, later a President, by Congressman John Quincy Adams, later a President, and by Congressman Henry Clay. All these and many other similar bills failed to pass.

Finally, the Librarian of Congress formed the Washington National Monument Society for the purpose of raising by private subscription $1,000,000 to build a monument in Washington, D. C., to the memory of the Father of our Country. But, the association was able to raise only $20,000. The association then asked the census takers of 1840 to aid in the drive but they couldn't get anyone to contribute. Finally, the society decided to spend the funds it had on hand so on July 4, 1848, the cornerstone was laid with elaborate Masonic rites. Then the citizens of Alabama donated a stone and other States followed suit. Also, fraternal orders and even foreign powers contributed stones and gradually the Monument grew in height. One block of marble was sent from the Temple of Concord at Rome by Pope Pius IX. And therein lies a tale.

RELIGION AND POLITICS

An antiforeign, anti-Catholic group known as the Know-Nothing Party, protested this gift from the Pope. Their protests were disregarded and they turned to violence. One dark night they slugged the watchman at the Monument and stole the disputed block of marble. It was never recovered. It is believed the members of the Know-Nothing Party smashed it with sledge hammers and dropped the fragments into the Potomac River. This act of vandalism outraged the entire world and the effect of it was to stop all donations of money and stone for the Monument. The Know-Nothing Party packed a meeting of the Washington National Monument Society and elected their own crowd as its officers. Then they announced possession of the Monument. This theft of the Monument really threw a monkey wrench into the whole proposition. Meanwhile, clouds of the impending Civil War began to darken the horizon and for the following 16 years the Monument was forgotten. It stood incomplete and abandoned to the elements. Today there is a definite mark or ring on the Monument showing where progress stopped on the job.

After the Civil War interest in the Monument was revived by a little political shenanigans I will tell you about. The 1876 Centennial Exposition was being held in Philadelphia. All was not going well and, hoping to liven things up a bit at the Exposition, the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives voted to have the House meet in Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, to reenact the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The Republican United States Senate, pointing out that the House majority had been elected on an economy platform and now proposed what is called a grand jollification on public funds, refused to approve the measure. Unhappily for the Republican Senate the public took this move as an unpatriotic gesture. The Senate then cast about for some means to redeem itself. The Washington Monument, bleak and unfinished, was there before their eyes. Senator Sherman hastily introduced a measure appropriating $100,000 to complete it, fully expecting the Democratic House, still smarting under its recent rebuke, to reject it. But, to his surprise, the House doubled the appropriation, and it was enacted. From that time on, work proceeded rapidly. On December 6, 1884, during a howling winter gale, the capstone was finally set and the aluminum tip put in place. This top of then rare aluminum was the largest block ever cast up to that date. The story is told that when the aluminum tip was exhibited in New York and Washington visitors requested the privilege of stepping over it so they might say they had stepped over the top of the Washington Monument, at that time the tallest man-made structure in the world. It is still the tallest structure of masonry work in existence although, of course, some of the steel towers or skyscrapers of our big cities are taller. On February 21, 1885, Robert Winthrop, who had delivered the formal address at the laying of the cornerstone 37 years before, dedicated the Monument. It has been open since and millions of people have climbed the stairs to the top or have gone up in the elevator. A year or two ago the practice of charging 10 cents per person was begun and is still in force today. So much for the history of the monument.

STATISTICS AND PECULIARITIES

You may be interested to know that the Monument stands 555 feet, 5⅛ inches high, and weighs more than 36,000 tons, making the Monument capable of withstanding a tornado of 145 miles per hour. At the completion of the Monument the aluminum tip was surrounded by 144 platinum-tipped lightning rods. It is also interesting to know that the Washington Monument breathes, has tuberculosis, and produces its own rain. The Army engineers report the Monument has a regular pulsation, described as breathing, and this lateral contraction and expansion has necessitated channel irons to support the stairway. This is a natural phenomenon due to its elongated shape and in no way endangers the Monument. It was also claimed at one time that the Monument was disintegrating. In other words, it had geological tuberculosis. This disintegration has been checked by drilling through the inner walls and forcing in new cement under hydraulic pressure. Because of the slow response of the stone walls to outside temperature changes, a sudden warm spell following cold will cause a condensation of moisture in the air within the shaft and a definite precipitation follows. The rain is sometimes so pronounced that the attendants wear rubber overshoes and rain coats though the sun is shining outside.

The Washington Monument was cleaned for the first time in 1934–35 by the W. P. A. A tubular steel scaffolding was erected around the shaft, the erection of the scaffolding taking more time than the actual cleaning. It was discovered that the only substance that would clean the shaft without damaging it was water mixed with sand, energetically applied with steel bristle brushes. The work took almost 5 months and cost over $100,000. While the scaffolding was up some vandal climbed it and stole the 144 platinum-tipped lightning rods from the top of the Monument.

An electric elevator in the Monument makes the ascent in 1¼ minutes. There is also a stairway of 898 steps, from which one may view the tribute blocks I have mentioned. However, this stairway has been closed since the outbreak of the war, which is also the date on which visitors were no longer permitted to take cameras into the Monument. I have mentioned the blocks of stone given by various people and groups. There are 202 of these blocks. There is one from each State of the Union. There are stones from the Governments of Brazil, China, Greece, Japan, Siam, Switzerland, Turkey, Wales, and the city of Bremen, Germany. The stone from Japan, by the way, was one of the earliest exports from that island and was brought to the United States by Commodore Perry. One stone was brought by an American from the historic and ancient library in Alexandria, Egypt. There is a stone from the Parthenon at Athens and one from the ruins of ancient Carthage. The Cherokee Indian Nation pays a tribute to the first Great White Father with a block of its own. There are stones donated by churches, Sunday schools, and temperance societies, by State militia regiments, municipal fire departments, by college and alumni

groups, by labor and fraternal organizations. There are also stones from the Revolutionary battlefields of Bunker Hill and Long Island, as well as one from the battlefield of Great Meadows, Fort Necessity, where Washington won his spurs as a soldier and near which Braddock was defeated by the French and Indians.

THE GREATNESS OF WASHINGTON

Appreciation of the true greatness of George Washington increases with the passing years. Like all great men, truly great men, he was a humble man. He was not vindictive toward those who disagreed with him. He did not call them names. He struggled for enduring principles. He spurned pressure-group politics and foreign alliances, entanglements, and wars. He was not activated by personal ambition. He led the Nation through a revolution when he did not have the cooperation of a Congress which would provide more money than he needed to equip his troops. The Continental Congress was composed of representatives of 13 quarreling little States, and they neglected the Army shamefully. The Revolutionary soldiers did not have the latest and best weapons; they did not have regular pay; they did not have barracks to live in; they did not have allowances for their dependents back home; they did not have pensions and hospital care and vocational rehabilitation and mustering-out pay. Yet this ragglety-taggle army tackled the greatest empire on earth at that time, the British Empire, and brought her to her knees. Through all the trials and tribulations of that period the character and leadership of George Washington was evident. He stood as his monument stands today, a rugged feature on the landscape about which men rallied and to which they looked to renew their faith and hope in democracy. In the years that followed the Revolution the people with one accord again turned to Washington for leadership, and as President of the Constitutional Convention he helped to create the document under which this country has grown to be the greatest in the world. As President, an office to which he was twice elected without opposition, he proved himself a statesman as well as a great soldier. It is well that a grateful Nation honors him on his birthday.

Views on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, February 20, 1944, entitled "Views on Congress":

VIEWS ON CONGRESS—PROBLEMS CONFRONTING MEMBERS ARE OUTLINED FOR CITIZENS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is always a shock to meet a Member of Congress—he is so unlike a "Congressman." A "Congressman" is a man who buys and sells votes; who spends all his time getting elected and keeping elected; who represents some particular pressure group; who advertises himself and adopts whatever photogenic postures he thinks will appeal to the eye, and who is against "the administration."

A "Congressman," in short, is a sort of composite picture of all the faults of Members of Congress. When, however, you meet a Member of Congress, and then a second, and a third, you begin to suspect that there is no such thing as a "Congressman." How does it happen that these well-meaning, decent and typical human beings acquire the traits by which they are represented in the popular stereotype?

Our system of government is known as the system of checks and balances. Hence a Member of Congress thinks of himself as engaged in checking and balancing. As this works out there tends to be more checking than balancing. There is, in other words, a jealousy of prerogatives and watchful suspicion. The Executive becomes not the partner but the rival. This hostility is aggravated by the fact that the Chief Executive is the leader of a party. To the ambitious members of the same party he is a party rival; to the members of the other party he is the leader of a rival party. In either case he has defeated them in the past or threatens to defeat them in the future.

PATRIOTISM PUT FIRST

This puts a great strain on the human nature of the very human Members of Congress. They are forced to distinguish between the Chief Magistrate and the past or prospective candidate for office, which is very difficult when both roles are filled by the same man. The Congressman's patriotism has to rise above his personal or party interest. As a good American he has to serve the President and at the same time as a good Republican or Democrat, or as a servant of his own political fortunes, he has to oppose him; exalt him, pull him down—the same man at the same time. It is not surprising that the narrower and less magnanimous attitude should very often prevail.

A certain professor of government once undertook to set down the laws of politics, with special reference to American politics. He never, so far as I recall, got beyond the first law—namely, the law of the pendulum. Power swings back and forth between the two parties, or between the conservative and progressive tendencies. Whoever goes up tends to come down. We say that the people get tired of the party or the crowd in power and want a change.

LAW OF GRIEVANCE

But why do they want a change? Why don't they grow used to the party in power and fond of it? There is, I suggest, a deeper law which underlies the law of the pendulum and which might be called the law of accumulated grievance. Whatever be the still deeper reasons, it appears to be a fact that grievances accumulate, whereas gratitude does not. Governments interfere with private life; that, of course, is what we have them for. They permit, and they forbid. They also make mistakes along with their successes. But they are remembered with resentment and disapproval for their forbiddings and their mistakes rather than with grateful appreciation for their permittings and their successes. The score is corrected later by the verdict of history. Past administrations which in their day turned out as failures, guilty of gross blunders and of interferences with liberty, are later recorded as great and beneficent. But the verdict of history does not govern elections.

It may be that the law of accumulated grievance is a provision of nature or history or deity by which to save democracy. If the contrary were true—if a government in power were remembered only for its benefits and successes, with a steadily mounting volume of gratitude—since sooner or later it could contrive to do something for everybody and score a respectable number of hits, no government would ever be removed from power. But however providential and mysterious the cause, the effect is that as an administration, that is, the leadership of the Government, grows in age it grows in popular disfavor; and this popular disfavor is reflected in Congress.

The poor Congressman, whom I am inviting you to pity, is also the victim of another difficulty, inherent in the idea of representation. Representation means that a section of the people choose a man from their number who is best fitted to govern—for the country's good. But representation also means that a section of the people choose from their number one who is pledged to represent the special interests of the section, regardless of his proficiency in the art of statesmanship.

PROBLEMS GROW COMPLEX

The first kind of Representative is given a free hand, until he proves himself incompetent; the second kind of Representative is an instrument, with strings attached. Again, the Member of Congress is confused and divided against himself.

The problems of Government have of late grown more complex and more technical. More threads of interest are woven into policy. Economic problems, notorious for their difficulty, have become political problems. Monetary problems, problems of taxation, problems of corporate law, the technological problems of agriculture and industry, and a dozen others are problems for specialized experts.

It is true that the experts disagree, but they are the only people who even understand the language, and they are the last resort of bewildered minds. The executive, through its administrative departments, hires the experts. The result is to give the Member of Congress, who is a layman like his constituents, an inferiority complex. Its symptoms are familiar. The inferiority complexity begets a desire to take down the superior, or to belittle any form of attainment in which he excels. Hence the Member of Congress joins the popular hue and cry against the expert, more commonly called the professor.

The sense of inferiority assumes other disguises. The Member of Congress, unable to meet the administrative expert on technical grounds, falls back on his power, drags him before committees and heckles him before the public; or sabotages his work by refusing him funds. The man who cannot get a hearing because of his ideas raises his voice or uses the loudspeaker, and does what he can to destroy the atmosphere of discussion and to substitute the amphitheater, where his vocal superiority will count.

DIVIDED ON ISSUES

Here, then, is the Executive, the focus of all eyes, the custodian of all interests, whose doings are front-page or headline news, who mobilizes and commands the experts, and who represents the country at Tehran, where he hobnobs with the nabobs. And here, on the other hand, is the Senator or Congressman, a great man when he left home—or great enough to be elected—but in Washington comparatively obscure, powerless, and ignorant. If he feels no jealousy or suspicion and is guilty of no overcompensation, then there is no truth in psychology.

We are and always have been sharply divided among ourselves. Even in these days of war, when the bond of common country is comparatively strong, party is ranged against party, free enterprise against New Deal, labor against employer, agriculture against industry, and, among some of us, to our shame, race against race and religion against religion. The air is so full of the clamor of pro's and anti's these days on every conceivable issue that a visitor not knowing our quaint habits would naturally suppose that we were all about to cut one another's throats.

PROPHECY PROVED FALSE

Once every 4 years the American people divide into two nearly equal groups whose leaders solemnly assert, nay, eloquently proclaim, that the country can be saved from utter destruction only by their election to

office and the defeat of their opponents—not in the least inhibited by the fact that this prophecy of impending doom has now been 40 times repeated and proved false.

Why has this prediction not proved true and why, as I venture to predict, will it prove false in 1944, whichever party triumphs? Because we still have so much more in common than we have apart, and because we know this in our hearts, even though we belie it by our words. Somewhere in the back of every partisan American's mind there is another self, which never wholly consents to his narrower mind or takes it with entire seriousness. Somehow we usually arrive in the end at a policy not too far from that which reason would have dictated at the beginning. I suspect that after every falsity, distortion, prejudice, and selfish interest has had its day we shall somehow stop inflation, tax ourselves, settle our labor disputes, save the Nation, and even win the peace.

WISDOM IN GOOD SENSE

I do not believe that this will happen by accident. I do not believe that it will spring from an equilibrium of opposing forces. I believe that there are widely scattered sparks of light, that is to say, of intelligence and good will, lurking even in the minds of Congressmen, and that sooner or later those sparks draw together and provide a beacon light for action. So if there is any moral to the tale it is this, to fan these sparks. A little good sense here and there somehow assembles itself into a sum of wisdom; let us encourage it and help it to get together.

No doubt it is necessary that political action should be organized and militant, and that pressures should be overcome by greater pressures. My purpose here is not to reject this method, but rather to suggest another method which may commend itself to the temper of some minds—namely, the method of collaboration.

Learn to know one or more Members of Congress in the flesh and substitute this experience for stereotypes and clichés. Write to your Congressman as you talk to him when you know him, with the courtesy and respect which one man owes to another, assuming his good faith, acknowledging his difficulties, and claiming no more than a right to share his counsels and responsibilities, since he is your Government. I can testify that this sometimes produces surprising and gratifying results. It is one way of being a citizen in a democracy.

RALPH BARTON PERRY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *February 15, 1944.*

Bibles for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things done by the churches of this country has been distribution of Bibles to those in the armed services. There are countless authentic stories of the comfort and strength these Bibles have given to our service men and women, often in critical situations.

The American Bible Society, by private subscription, has raised funds with which it has distributed, since Pearl Harbor, 3,312,000 pocket-size Bibles to servicemen. In addition, it has given away 500,000 printed in 38 foreign languages to war prisoners through the help of the International Red Cross.

The Gideon International has also distributed a similar Bible in an approximate sum total of 3,000,000 copies.

The Federal Government has duplicated this activity by spending $932,387.24 for publication of 5,883,457 of these Bibles, 1,242,600 of which are still on order in the Government Printing Office. G. I. Bibles are for Army men only. Other branches of the service use the Bibles made available by the A. B. S. and Gideons. Any man or woman in the service can get one of these Bibles by requesting a copy from a chaplain, and an Army man has his choice of the G. I. or other editions. The G. I. edition is said not to be as popular as the others because the Government has made it in a larger, heavier, and inconvenient size. The War Department will not give a Member of Congress one of these Bibles for inspection, but through the cooperation of a friend in the service I have received one. Like the A. B. S. and Gideon Bibles, the G. I. edition is prepared in Protestant and other versions. The G. I. Bible, although containing 76 more pages, does not contain one very helpful feature of the Bibles or Testaments distributed by the American Bible Society. I refer to a section in the back, on different colored paper, containing the Ten Commandments, various psalms, prayers, hymns, and passages available for instant reference. This special helpful section also contains an index showing the reader where to look for scripture on given subjects of importance to those in the service.

The G. I. Bible has a letter on the front page, bound as part of the book, purporting to be on White House stationery and addressed to members of the Army by the Commander in Chief. This Testament says, in gold letters, on the front of it: "Presented by the Army of the United States." To clear up any misunderstanding that might arise from those who think it a personal gift from the President because it states it is presented by the Army and the letter I have referred to on the first page endorsing the Bible is written, "As Commander in Chief," and starts out with those words, I want to make it plain that this G. I. Testament is paid for by the taxpayers and duplicates in a rather unsatisfactory way the fine volunteer work done by the A. B. S. and the Gideons without expense to the taxpayers. One effect of this duplication is that already the total number of servicemen's Bibles exceeds the contemplated size of our armed forces.

The Bible needs no endorsement from any candidate for public office. But in case anyone else has in mind adding to the Bible, I respectfully direct attention to the twenty-second chapter of Revelations, verse 18, reading as follows:

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.

The religious magazine Signs of the Times carried in its edition of February 15, 1944, an interesting short article entitled "An Assembly Line for Bibles," by the editorial secretary of the American Bible Society. I commend it to your attention.

The article follows:

AN ASSEMBLY LINE FOR BIBLES—TWELVE THOUSAND TESTAMENTS A DAY

(By Francis C. Stifler, D. D.)

They weren't coming off fast enough to meet the demand. Chaplains were writing the Bible House, telephoning from great distances, coming in person to get supplies of pocket Testaments for their men.

There was nothing new about this, for the American Bible Society had been supplying Scriptures for the Nation's armed forces for almost a century, beginning in 1846 for the soldiers who fought in the Mexican War. During the Civil War, by a sort of truce of God, the society supplied Bibles for both armies, shipping more than 300,000 across the lines to the Confederate Army. During World War No. 1 1,150,000 Testaments were printed, the largest grant of Scriptures ever made up to that time by the American Bible Society. But when the present mobilization got under way, all former records were quickly surpassed.

From the 1st of October 1940 the society published 353,398 Testaments with special covers for the Army and Navy. Then came Pearl Harbor and the rapid expansion of the Nation's military forces. The chaplains began writing in for Testaments. They needed them promptly and in ever-greater quantities. The society's printers were working overtime to meet the demand; but the daily output of about 3,000 was not keeping up with the orders, so the assembly line was set up.

A great wing of one of the foremost printing houses of the country was cleared of all its other equipment and an assembly line was then set up of all the machines required to fold, stitch, trim, bind, gold stamp, inspect, pack, wrap, and label for shipment 12,000 Testaments a day. At one end of the room were tons of huge sheets of very thin paper, on both sides of which 176 pages of the New Testament were imprinted. At the other end of the room there were tumbling down a chute a stream of neat cartons labeled for chaplains stationed at scores of camps and forts, on naval vessels, and with overseas postoffice addresses for shipment across the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The books, though labeled "New Testament," contained more than the text of that part of the Bible. Bound in with the Testament itself are pages containing 8 of the favorite Psalms, the Ten Commandments, and a collection of prayers and hymns. At the end of the volume are 2 pages entitled "Where to Look," in which there are 24 suggestions of helpful passages to turn to "when you are facing a crisis," or "when you are discouraged," or "if you are sick or in pain." As one chaplain remarked on looking through the society's Testament, "Here is a book which if one or more copies were on hand when a small detachment of soldiers were on duty wihout a chaplain, they could use for guidance in the conduct of a whole service of worship."

The way in which the society's books are bound has made them most popular with the men—yes, and the women—of the forces. They come in two different colors of flexible, moisture-resistant material stamped in gold. In brown, besides coming in plain covers, they are stamped with the official insignia of the Army Air Corps, the marines, and the WAC's. In blue, besides for the Regular Navy, they are available with the official insignia of the Navy Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Seabees, the WAVES, and the merchant marine.

In the spring of 1943, as a result of the dramatic rescue in November of the preceding year of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and

his comrades after 3 weeks' drifting on the South Pacific in rubber rafts and of the prominent place with John F. Bartek's Testament played in their rescue, the Bible Society determined to do what it could to ensure that no group of men should ever be set adrift on any sort of a raft at sea without the ministries of a Testament. A waterproof envelope made of heavy kraft paper, impregnated with asphalt and lined with lead foil, was prepared to protect the Testament which has now become a part of the standard equipment of every life raft and life boat of the merchant marine and has also been supplied to thousands of rafts and boats of the Navy and some for the Army. A total of more than 40,000 of these are now in service.

In spite of the fact that the Government itself is furnishing a pocket Scripture volume for every enlisted man and that many other private groups are supplying them to both the Army and the Navy, the American Bible Society, to fill orders from chaplains and to meet the requests coming constantly from churches and friends who purchase the boc to give to the men as they leave their homes, continue to ship from 20,000 to 30,000 Testaments a week, until the total figure as of October 1, 1943, had reached 2,928,530 Testaments for the forces.

Besides the pocket Testaments, the society has supplied more than 1,600 beautiful lectern Bibles for the Army chapels in the camps and for use on the ships of the Navy and the merchant marine. Many whole Bibles have also been supplied to naval crews and for libraries and pews in the Army camps. For special services to men on maneuvers, Gospel portions have also been supplied. The total furnished through all channels to October 1, 1943, has been 60,133 Bibles, 2,928,539 Testaments, and 708,429 portions, a grand total of 3,697,101 volumes of Scripture. The donated portion of these, which includes all but one-quarter of the Testaments has cost the American Bible Society $337,990.93 from its special war emergency fund. The fund was created in 1940, not only to supply our fighting men with Scriptures, but also to furnish Bibles and Testaments to prisoners of war in Europe and elsewhere, to supply the churches in European countries cut off from their supplies of Scriptures, to aid the Bible societies of England, Scotland, Holland, and elsewhere, and, more recently, to build up a stock in this country of Bibles and Testaments in various European languages for immediate supply to the impoverished European countries as soon as the fighting ceases.

Union Voting at Willow Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the soldier-vote bill is still being considered by the conference committee. As one who is most anxious that as many as possible of our service people be given an opportunity to vote and have their votes counted, I am especially interested in an article appearing on the front page of Washtenaw Post-Tribune, a newspaper published at Ann Arbor, Mich., with a strong prolabor policy.

The Willow Run bomber plant, which is a closed C. I. O. shop, is located in Washtenaw County. Employees in this plant are members of local 50, U. A. W.-C. I. O. Officers of local 50 are about to be elected and the union has devised a method whereby it is hoped members of the local now in the military service throughout the world will be permitted to vote for the officers of their union. This endeavor is most commendable.

The article makes it clear that the nominations close on Saturday, February 19, and that the election will be held March 6–8.

The ballots are to be sent through the mail by the local to its members in the service. These members are to vote the ballot and return it to the local to be counted on March 6–8, when the election takes place. Of course some members cannot be reached by this ballot, or any other ballot, and will of necessity be deprived of their right to vote. I feel sure, however, that these members are interested in voting for their local union officers and I feel just as sure that they are just as interested in voting for their local township, city, county, and State officers.

The bill now passed by both Houses of Congress, and which is in conference, allows ample time for the forwarding and returning of ballots to all available service people. The Congress should immediately follow the example of local 50 and forward complete ballots for the November election at the earliest opportunity. The article is as follows:

LOCAL 50 ASKS V-MAIL VOTES—MEMBERS IN SERVICE TO GET VOICE IN LOCAL'S ELECTION

Ballots for choosing officers of local 50, U. A. W.-C. I. O., the Willow Run Bomber Plant Union will be mailed to all men and women in uniform who are members of the union, officials of the union announced this week.

The action was announced after criticism had been leveled against local 600, the U. A. W. branch at the Ford Rouge plant for not providing voting means for the 1,800 men and women they have on military leave.

For those members of local 50 serving overseas the balloting will be by V-mail the union spokesman said announcing that they had obtained an informal postal ruling that there was no regulation which would interfere with the plan they intend to use.

Lists of candidates, which will be compiled as soon as the nominations are closed at 7 p. m. Saturday, will be put in a personal V-mail letter to each of the men and women serving overseas, with the request that the member write his choices on another V-mail blank and return it immediately to the local.

The election committee of the union has approved this procedure and said that such votes would be legal even though not cast on an official ballot form.

The elections are scheduled to be held March 6–8 with polling places set up either at the plant gates or at convenient places in Wayne, Ypsilanti, and Inkster.

Membership lists of the local show more than 400 members on military leaves of absence for which military addresses are known.

Technocracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout the country are advocating the adoption of technocracy and universal service as a national program.

The congressional mail contains many communications in support of this plan. I fear that the people advocating this program as a governmental policy are not taking into consideration the fundamental principles of government—and the forces responsible for our present state of civilization.

In answering correspondence, I have had occasion to state my views on technocracy in a series of letters which are submitted herewith for the RECORD:

TOTAL CONSCRIPTION—MEN, MACHINES, MATÉRIEL, MONEY

The United States and Canada must install total conscription to ensure military victory and internal security in the post-war.

Total conscription will exclude fascism from the North American continent.

Do we not realize that politico-business-economic methods are incompetent in total war and will be disastrous in the post-war?

Must our technological efficiency be sapped by the prerogatives of business and political expediency?

Why should not all citizens serve on the same basis as the armed forces—national service for all and profits to none?

Technocracy asks: Can the people of the United States and Canada achieve a fighting morale and internal efficiency while some citizens gain wealth and economic advantage in war prices, war wages, war profits, and war racketeering, while other citizens give their lives?

It there are 30,000,000 unemployed in the United States and Canada after the war, we will need total conscription more in the peace than in the war. Urge total conscription now for Canada and the United States.

TECHNOCRACY VICTORY PROGRAM

Technocracy proposes that the Governments of the United States and Canada institute total conscription in their respective countries. Technocracy proposes this as an organization with a membership of citizens in both countries. Total conscription includes the following:

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall institute conscription of all effectives, male and female, between the ages of 18 and 65 for national service both civilian and military; all citizens shall serve on the same basis of pay as the armed forces of the two countries with the same standards of food, clothing, and health protection and with the same allowances for all dependents regardless of rank or social position.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall institute, as part of this program of continental operations, conscription of all their national corporate wealth and its attendant institutions such as banks, trusts, and insurance companies.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall conscript in each of the two countries, all physical facilities and operating personnel of rail, bus, water, and air transportation; all telephone, telegraph, and radio communications systems; all of the manufacturing industries; all of the oil wells and refining industries; and all corporate enterprises engaged in mining.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall conscript all physical facilities and operating personnel of all export and import corporations. The two Governments shall be the sole importers and exporters.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall conscript all patents, inventions, and processes extant in their national domains whether of foreign or domestic ownership.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall assume all financial indebtedness of municipalities, counties, States, and

provinces; and in return for assuming these financial obligations shall arrogate to themselves the sole power of levying all taxes now levied by the municipalities, counties, States, and provinces.

The Governments of the United States and Canada, as a measure of continental safety and welfare, shall close all public bars and limit the sale of spirituous beverages, wines, beers, and liquors to restaurants, hotel dining rooms, and licensed liquor stores.

The Governments of the United States and Canada, as a measure of continental safety and welfare, shall abolish all foreign language periodical publications, foreign language advertising, and foreign language radio programs for domestic consumption.

The Governments of the United States and Canada, as a measure of continental safety and welfare, shall abolish all foreign language and hyphenated organizations, associations, and fraternal societies, regardless of whether they have been formed to promote political, commercial, cultural, educational, linguistic, artistic, or other relationships.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall prohibit the transfer of purchasing power in the form of currency, notes, drafts, or money orders of all corporations and residents of the two countries to any corporation or resident of any alien country.

Total conscription proposes that in the United States the Army shall be directed under the unified control of a land command; the Navy shall be directed under the unified control of a sea command; the Air Forces shall be directed under the unified control of an air command; the fortifications shall be directed under the unified control of a fortifications command; that the entire military command shall be unified in a general staff with the constitutional Commander in Chief in supreme command. Total conscription proposes that in Canada there shall be a similar structure of the Canadian armed forces.

All industry, mining, transportation, communications, and other necessary units of operation shall be unified under their various functional commands under a technological command of the whole. The entire technological command and the entire armed-force command shall be under the direction of the constitutional Commander in Chief in the United States, and in Canada there shall be a similar unified Canadian direction.

The Governments of the United States and Canada shall peg the Canadian dollar to the United States dollar, and shall place the Canadian monetary structure and exchange rate on a parity basis with the United States rate. Technocracy proposes that Canada and the United States abolish all tariff barriers at their common boundary line. Technocracy proposes that the entire productive effort of both countries be interlocked as one unified program under total conscription. Technocracy proposes that the prices of products exchanged be pegged at a standard parity in both countries. The Governments of the United States and Canada shall create an equal standard of living in both countries on the same cost basis.

The people of the North American Continent must realize that in this age of technology the methods and practices of history cherished by the upholders of the price system are incompetent to operate a continent under the demands of total war. The facilities of yesterday's success have suddenly become the futilities of today and the defeat of tomorrow. The structure of America's economy demands that we North Americans abandon the haphazard conflict of private and group interests in order that we may win this World War in such a way as to defeat the enemies of North America and win the peace. Total conscription would conduct the war and post-war operations of United States and Canada without new debt, inflation, black markets, unemployment, racketeering, and profits.

Total conscription calls for a "quick freeze" of all corporate enterprise and all labor-union structure; for the suspension of all dividends, profits, interest, rents, dues, and taxes; and for a moratorium on all debt and litigation for the duration and 6 months thereafter.

TECHNOCRACY CONTINENTAL
HEADQUARTERS,
New York, N. Y.

OCEANSIDE, CALIF., *January 20, 1944.*
Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The discouragement and dissatisfaction which the present situation on the home front is causing the people in America as well as those who are fighting on the various battle fronts, can be changed only by the adoption of a streamlined, scientific, and efficient plan of national operation.

To conscript labor alone is fascism; to conscript money alone is communism; but technocracy's program of total conscription of men, machines, matériel, and money is the real American way.

This plan would shorten the war, conserve our resources, stop any addition to the war debt, and solve many of the problems of peace.

Why not try it now? Please reply.

Yours truly,

M. F. TATE,
JESSIE V. TATE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1944.
Mr. and Mrs. MILLARD F. TATE,
Oceanside, Calif.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. TATE: In considering your recommendation for technocracy, made in your letter of January 20, I assume you have a knowledge of history and know of the many forms of government that had been tried in this world before our Government was established.

It is my feeling that the founders of the American Government were guided by the experience and the wisdom of the ages in devising and establishing the system of government under which we are at present living. It is my feeling that instead of experimenting with such schemes as technocracy, communism, and socialism, our efforts should be directed to protecting our present form of government.

I am old-fashioned enough to adhere to the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution rather than to experiment with some plan which might deprive us of the priceless heritage that has been bequeathed to us by the great leaders who have given us the best government on earth.

I enclose a pronouncement of the principles to which I propose to adhere, as stated in a recent letter.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 22, 1943.
Mr. EDWARD L. BERNAYS,
New York City.

MY DEAR MR. BERNAYS: Answering your inquiry of November 15. The paramount issue pressing for solution by the American people today is the same issue that has been pressing for solution since the Civil War—the money question.

My efforts have been and shall continue to be directed primarily to accomplishing two things. First, to provide the American people with a sound, workable, adequate money system that provides for the creation and circulation of sufficient cash freed from an interest charge as the price of its issuance and circulation with which to transact the Nation's business. Second, to procure the equitable adjustment of the price structure by the free play of the law of supply and demand to be effected by unrestrained competition through the elimination of unfair trade practices and unfair competition.

If the American people can have the necessary cash with which to support their national economy, and the equitable distribution of the fruits of industry, adherence to the liberal and constructive principles of government established by the designers of our form of government will keep the people of our country foremost among the progressive nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

OCEANSIDE, CALIF., *February 12, 1944.*
Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate the time and trouble you took to answer our letter advocating total conscription, and thank you for the enclosure of a copy of a letter expressing your views.

Yes; we have read history and know it to be the more or less inaccurate, prejudiced and, incomplete story of the movements of a great river of life as it flows through time. For life is a flowing stream and not a stagnant pool as you and many others seem to think. Every revolution in history has been the breaking down of a dam built by some group of people who tried to stop the stream in its course—and maintain the status quo.

The principles of the Constitution are sound, but the means and methods of adapting them to changing conditions and needs should show steady growth. An economic structure which suited this country 200 years ago when the population was small and room for expansion exceedingly large, is certainly not adapted to the present condition of a great population and no new frontiers at all. Sixty years ago man-hours accounted for most of the work done; in fact, about 2 percent extraneous energy and 98 percent man-hours. Today it is just the reverse, 2 percent man-hours and 98 percent kilowatt-hours. A change like this surely calls for adjustments in many phases of life. Think it over.

To say our Government is the best in the world might still be saying very little for it today.

You begin the last paragraph in your letter to Mr. Bernays with the word "If." A small word but it negates all that follows it.

The statement of your views makes smooth reading, Mr. WHITE, but the phrases mean little in terms of work for the unemployed, food for the hungry, or care for the sick, and these are the cold realities which face us today. These form our problem rather than the seeing that "free enterprise" remains free to exploit and enslave the people.

However, we do appreciate your letter. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

M. F. TATE.
JESSIE V. TATE.

FEBRUARY 21, 1944.
Mr. and Mrs. MILLARD F. TATE,
Oceanside, Calif.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. TATE: Your letter deals with the fundamental principles of civilization—the organized effort of every human individual. In performing labor, man has always worked for an inducement—the more trying the circumstances, the more controlling the inducement. The first and most important inducement to labor is to supply the personal need for food, shelter, and clothing—supplemented by the desire for amusement, recreation, and personal distinction; and with the advancement of civilization, man has striven to obtain liberty and achieve security.

No doubt, you agree with the fundamental principles presented in the findings of the

United States Monetary Commission of 1876 quoted here:

"Labor, cooperating with the forces of nature, is the source of all wealth, and to reach the highest degree of effectiveness it must be classified through the aid of capital and supported by capital during the process of production and be measured and paid in money, each unit of which is a sight draft on all other forms of property, bearing a value in proportion to the number of such drafts. In order that any country may reach the maximum of material prosperity, certain conditions are indispensable. All its labor, assisted by the most approved machinery and appliances must be employed and the fruits of industry must be justly distributed."

In dealing with human nature—constituted as it is—we find there must be an inducement to labor. In Bible days, the Pharoahs induced people to work by enslaving their neighbors—thereby securing the manpower used in constructing the pyramids and the great public-work projects of their time. As civilization advanced, and money became the medium of exchange, money and wages became the inducement to labor.

Now, in considering technocracy, what do you propose as an inducement to work—total conscription—involuntary servitude? Since Moses led the Israelites out of bondage, civilization has advanced to where humanity has thrown off the shackles of slavery.

When I was a boy—even before we utilized the energy of electricity and petroleum so extensively—I remember I was told that if the work could be divided up and everybody did their proportionate share—that 2 hours of labor per day would do all the world's work.

The civilization you enjoy is the outgrowth of human initiative and industry—fostered and protected by the application of the principles of good government—a boon that man has been striving for since history began.

I cannot accept the theory that universal conscription as proposed by technocracy would advance civilization or the welfare of the common people. Individual efforts in organized industry, fostered and protected by good government, is the best solution of our momentous problems.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Bataan Relief Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the proceedings of a meeting of the Bataan Relief Organization, held at the Mount Vernon Methodist Church, Washington, February 10, 1944.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Opening prayer by Mr. McCahon.

Allegiance to the flag by Mr. McCahon.

Dr. SPENSLEY. Is is my privilege and pleasure to introduce to you at this time the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina.

Senator REYNOLDS. I really didn't have any idea that I would be called upon to speak this afternoon. As a matter of fact, I had a very nice invitation to come here; Senator CHAVEZ suggested that I come, and I wanted to pay my respects to you fathers, mothers, and relatives who have boys who are prisoners in the Orient.

I deem it my duty to pay a tribute to my colleague here, the Senator from New Mexico. He has been most sincerely interested in this matter which is so close to your hearts. He has been most deeply interested in a matter now pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. He has been most just, and I hope that favorable action will be taken on the bill now before the committee. I believe that he will appear in the Capitol tomorrow morning with the witnesses from this delegation.

I want to say to you who are interested, you relatives of the boys who are prisoners of the Japs, my heart goes out in the deepest sympathy to you. I had no idea the situation was as bad as it really is until recently information was brought to my attention by persons who are supposed to know and that has been added to by the articles recently appearing in the Times-Herald telling of the atrocities performed by the Japanese on our men. I only hope that we will provide General MacArthur with aid at the earliest possible moment.

Yesterday Mr. Grew, former Ambassador to Tokyo, appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and I addressed some inquiries to him in regard to the situation in the Orient with a view to providing more help to General MacArthur at this time. I think that one of the most important theaters of war is that in the oriental waters. I feel that the real battle of this war will terminate in the areas of Japan. As Ambassador Grew stated yesterday, the longer time we give them to consolidate their forces, the more difficult it is going to be to bring about the defeat of the Japanese. It is needless for me to tell you at this time how hard it is going to be to bring about the defeat of these people who attacked us at Pearl Harbor.

I do want you to know that every real American's heart goes out to you and that we hope and pray that the time is not far withdrawn when we can bring help to your relatives and friends who are now prisoners in the Philippines.

I thank you.

Dr. SPENSLEY. I am sure that I am expressing the feelings of everyone here when I say that you have given us a great deal of encouragement in knowing that the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee feels this way.

According to ordinary procedure, I should introduce to you another Senator at this time, but since this Senator is such a close friend of mine I am going to set aside ordinary procedure and present to you Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota.

Congressman KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I may say at the outset that I am here at the request of fathers, mothers, and relatives from Brainerd and Crow Wing County, who furnished a battery that met with misfortune in the Philippine Islands.

I think it is a fine thing that you have set up this organization and I hope that the work can be carried on to bring needed help to those over there who now are in the hands of the unspeakable Japs; that they may know that they are not forgotten.

I think that together with Senator REYNOLDS and Senator CHAVEZ, I can assure you the Congress of the United States will do everything within its power to wipe out what happened at Bataan and Corregidor and it is up to ourselves to see that we do a good job. Let's all hang together and if we do I know that success will crown our efforts.

There are two things that must be done: First, get men and supplies to the brave MacArthur in such huge quantities as will enable him to win a speedy and conclusive victory over the barbarian Jap. At the same time we must get food, medical supplies, and clothing to those gallant Americans now held in Japanese concentration camps so there may be no more needless deaths among them. Your organization can be of very great help in putting this necessary program over, and at the same time show the sons of America that they are ever in our minds and hearts.

Dr. SPENSLEY. Thank you Congressman KNUTSON.

At the various meetings of the B. R. O. in Albuquerque, N. Mex., I was, as I am now, the temporary chairman. Many of you have felt no doubt as I have felt, but since have found out differently, that we did not have any friends in Washington. On February 19, 1942, we did find out that we had one friend here and it is the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senator from New Mexico.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am going to ask a favor of Dr. Spensley before I make a few brief remarks that might be of some help at this meeting. I am going to ask Mrs. King to come to the platform for a moment. I presume that most of you know her, but she is Mrs. King, of Georgia, wife of General King, who was at Bataan with our boys to the last. May I present Mrs. King.

Generally I am not reluctant or afraid to address a gathering, but for obvious reasons I am rather reluctant to address this gathering. I know the purposes for which you are here. I know that you are not here on any promotional scheme. I know that you are thinking of your dear ones (may the Lord protect them), and I know your feelings because I have some of my own in the Philippines—and they do not like fish heads.

We are not here for the purpose of criticizing military plans or naval strategy but we are here, and we are worthy to be here, to advise the Government that we are interested in the lives of the prisoners in the Philippine Islands. As I have said, we are not here in a spirit of criticism, or to condemn what might have been done, but we do want the authorities of the Nation to realize that we have a war in the Pacific which is just as tough as the war in any other part of the world. Because Bataan fell some 2 years ago, because Corregidor fell some 2 years ago, because it became absolutely necessary, under the circumstances, for an officer of the United States Army, for the first time in the history of the country, to surrender his sword, there is no reason why we should forget it. An American officer would not surrender on the spur of the moment; he would surrender only to save the lives of the soldiers under his command. An American does not surrender unless his superior officer gives the command. King and Wainwright surrendered in the Philippines when there was nothing else to do, and God bless you for still thinking of the boys under their command.

I can fully appreciate the feelings of the mothers, fathers, and relatives gathered here. I can appreciate the feeling of Dr. Spensley, whose boy will not come home. I know many a mother and father in New Mexico whose sons will not come back; but shouldn't we act as we are acting today—carrying out the thought that a dutiful Government will do something for the ones who are still alive?

I do not know what can be done, but we shall certainly insist that something be done.

I believe in law and order. I believe in constituted authority. I believe in the flag. I believe in those things because I believe in the flag. I still think that American traditions and ideals will prevail. While I do not want you to criticize the Federal Government, I still will fight for your right to criticize and petition—that is what the boys died for in the Philippines.

It is best that I not continue in this emotional vein. These words have come from the heart, believe me. The time of rhetoric and oratory is past. It is now time for

action. I am going to read, with your permission, a few words which I have penned as to what I think should be done by this organization. I have tried to keep it on a high level because that is what should be done. I know that you are reasonable people and that you do not want to act like a mob. I know that you want to act like free-born Americans. I shall read you these few lines.

We are all familiar with the tragic situation which faces us on the Pacific battle line. I need not add to or detract from this painful scene.

You men and women, representatives of the various organizations which in turn represent the relatives and friends of our boys in the Philippine Islands, have met for the consideration of solemn and serious business. Your purpose and mine is to see that relief is tendered to our men now in Japanese prison camps. This, of course, has also been the purport of deliberations within the councils of the War and Navy Departments. Your purpose and mine is not to interfere in any way with the fluent and planned conduct of the war. We are not here to determine military strategy; however, even in the atmosphere of the horrors of war and national emergency, the right of expression and the right of petition never have been, are not, and never will be denied an American citizen under our system of government. Suggestions made by us to the established authorities should not be taken as antagonistic to their plans or policies. In view of this manifest circumstance, I would be false to my own ideology were I to fail to urge you to proceed in your laudable cooperative efforts to further and carry out the purpose for which you were organized. Toward this end leave no stone unturned; contact your Representatives in Congress, presenting your problems to them. Do not hesitate to pester them to a point of mutual exasperation, if need be, and this seasonable advice is to include my own humble office. This is precisely what we are all here for at the present time.

We cannot, of course, tell the military authorities how to proceed; but we now know the conditions which maintain in the Pacific theater and as far as we are concerned they have come to be basic with us. If anyone should know that our country is at war, we New Mexicans, and those of you who have kinfolk in the Philippines, certainly are more than conscious of this fact. There is much perhaps that the War and Navy Departments would like to say, but which, for reasons which are patent to all of us, they do not feel free in conscience to express. Likewise, there is much that we as citizens of the Republic should like to say, and perhaps even do say in moments during which we find ourselves under emotional pressure. But events have come to such a pass that within the limits of decency we should not hesitate to strain every possible means of achieving our goal. I know and you know that there is an over-all plan; but an over-all plan will never explain the deplorable situation which faces us in the Far East.

We are not here as part of an effort to inject ourselves into the councils of the General Staff, but I insist, and I will continue to insist, that our Government go much beyond the efforts heretofore expended to bring about a more pleasurable situation than the one with which we are faced today. I pledge to you my own efforts in this praiseworthy undertaking.

Now, before I leave the platform, I shall try to tell you what has been done in this respect so that you will know that I have not tried to impose upon the authorities but, believe me, I am going to inquire about the boys in the Philippine Islands.

On February 1, 1944, I addressed a letter to Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, and one to Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, concerning the release by these departments regarding the atrocities of the Japanese upon the American prisoners of war. A copy of the letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I need not refer to your familiarity with the recent release by the War and Navy Departments concerning the horrible conditions suffered by American boys in the wake of Bataan and Corregidor. You are probably familiar also with my press release in connection with this matter, and my remarks on the floor of the Senate, yesterday (January 31, 1944).

"As evidenced by every observation which I have made in connection with the Japanese prisoner situation, the one point which I have continually emphasized is the complete absence of the faintest note of encouragement in the wording of the release referred to.

"The purpose of this letter is not to interfere in any way with the fluent and planned conduct of the war. This would be the most presumptuous kind of performance on my part, as I do not consider myself in any way suited or fitted to the task of determining military strategy. My reason for communicating with you at this time is to urge that your Department jointly with the War Department, issue some kind of statement which will to some extent allow the penetration of a ray of hope into the dark night which is beclouding the heart of every American mother, father, brother, and sister of a man now in Japanese hands. I plead with you to assure the American people that something is being done and will be done beyond the efforts which have heretofore been expended on the Pacific battle line. I assure you on the basis of personal contacts and experience that neither I nor you nor anyone else can alter the opinion of the mothers and fathers mentioned by which they maintain a firm conviction that our Government had not done what is possible in the Pacific theater of war. I know, and you know, that there is a general over-all plan; but over-all planning will never explain to American mothers and fathers the deplorable situation which faces us in the Far East today.

"Permit me to reiterate that I am not trying to inject myself into the councils of the General Staff, but I insist, and I shall continue to insist, that the War and Navy Departments should go further than issuing a release as pregnant with despair as it is devoid of hope, as the one which came out on Friday last.

"Permit me to request a favorable reply to this communication and to remain

"Sincerely yours,

"DENNIS CHAVEZ,
"United States Senator."

The following is copy of a letter which I received in reply to the above from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, which was dated February 8, 1944:

"DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I wish to acknowledge your letter of February 1, suggesting that the War and Navy Departments issue a joint statement which will serve as some encouragement to the dependents and relatives of Americans held prisoner by the Japanese.

"You may be assured that your suggestion will be most carefully considered and that a further reply will be made within the very near future.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENRY L. STIMSON,
"Secretary of War."

I do not want them to divulge any military secrets. All I want them to do is to tell you that they are going to try to save our boys. I have read somewhere that Russia will try to get food to British prisoners. If Russia can get food to English prisoners of war why can't they send food to American prisoners of war? There is a possibility that it can be done. I certainly want them to carry on this war but with all due deference to them, I want America and the flag to be first.

DR. SPENSLEY. I feel that the folks have expressed their thanks through their applause and there is nothing that I might add.

I want to say here that there is no criticism of the release of the news but there is criticism of the manner in which it was released and at the time it was released.

I believe I should report to you, as relatives of the boys on Bataan, my stewardship as president of the Bataan Relief Organization, and let you know just how far we have gone in our efforts to present to you what I consider not only a feasible but a strictly American solution to our problem—and I mean American.

In accepting the responsibility of calling this meeting in response to many requests, the uncalled for and heartbreaking circumstances which so brutally pierced the very hearts of the mothers, wives, and other relatives and friends of the heroes of Bataan were, from most bitter experience, fully realized. It would have been far more humane to have driven bayonets to the hilt into the ventricles of you mothers of your boys than to have broadcast the atrocity reports of the 28th and in the press the 29th of last month. That would have been incisive instead of the continuing torture due to the procedure employed. To not warn the long-suffering mothers, who are among the noblest of God's handiwork, as to the nature of that news, is the most brutal, the most dastardly, and reprehensible act in the history of the United States. What do those responsible think the mothers of America are made of, anyhow?

It should be asked, "What course has been charted for America?" Has our sense of human decency, our very standards of morality disintegrated to such a low ebb that it requires such a hideous act to make anyone even just living in America sensible to their duty in financing this war? Is that the only remaining means of selling bonds? Surely every other possible course would have first been exhausted. Or, has it been found necessary to dishonor the very fundamental principles of decency which are an essential part of our country and which have made the Stars and Stripes second only to the Cross on Calvary as a God-given emblem of peace, mercy, and justice throughout the world? Is our beautiful edifice, constructed of everything necessary for the advancement of Christianity and civilization actually crumbling because of the destruction of its roof of humanitarianism? Have not the boys of Bataan earned more humane treatment of their sorrowing mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, and other relatives and friends than that?

I am sure that all of you will agree that any hero of Bataan is justly entitled to every consideration which this country affords. I am thinking of that boy whose mother went stark, raving insane after that infamous news release. That boy was proud to be able to serve his country, and ours. Now what is his reward, what does he have to come home to? While his most cherished possession, his mother, is maybe far better off, yet that boy deserved better, far better treatment than that. I sincerely hope he will be able to find it in his heart to forgive, and ask God to forgive those who brought on such terrible anguish to one he so dearly loves for whatever reason it was perpetrated.

The only visible answer to the questions which I have asked is, What do we care, just so we win? Then, what are our boys fighting all over the world for? And what will be their task when they return? If we accept our responsibility and perform our duty, they will come home to find the things which they are fighting for, not the least of which is the attribute, mercy. But, if they come back to find what America is degenerating toward today, then our defenders of America will have fought, bled, and died in vain. Do we accept the challenge as did our boys, God fearing, yet unafraid, or will we allow America to become the moral Sodom and Gomorrah of

tomorrow? If we prove ourselves worthy of our heritage, as did our sons, we will see to it that American principles of human decency are revived and continue to survive. Only then will we have the kind of America, which our valiant sons have fought, died, and are fighting for. We must not, we cannot, we will not let them down.

Through Senator CHAVEZ I was warned by the O. W. I. to cease my activities, which they said were breaking morale in New Mexico. The Senator most emphatically gave them to understand that it was impossible for me to break the morale of those in whom the administration had already broken their hearts. I realized that further torture of the relatives of our boys by atrocity news releases would only cause a revival of the most distressing hardship and accomplish no real good whatsoever. With that in mind, on the eve of General MacArthur's last birthday, I broadcast an earnest plea that the finer instincts of traditional American humanitarianism be observed. The news release by our Army and Navy on January 28 was the answer to my plea. Where are we headed if that is considered to be the finer instincts of humanitarianism by those in control of America's destiny today? Without any purpose except to be worthy of being an American, I say we are headed for moral oblivion if those guilty of such a despicable act are allowed to retain any positions of responsibility whatsoever. They should and must be brought to justice and brought to justice before it is too late.

Anyone with a lick of common sense will make all haste to get off of a horse which is floundering in the quicksands of deceit, treachery, inhumanitarianism, and personal aggrandizement. He will grab anything, even a twig, to pull himself to safety and our beloved country needs, sorely needs, some means of reaching safety, here at home, as well as abroad. Let's get humbly down on our knees and ask Almighty God to extend us a means, any means, to reach the safety of the shore of decency, honor, humanitarianism, integrity, love of country, and self-respect.

In exploring every means of sending relief to our heroic sons, I took it upon myself to go far beyond those ordinarily used, even running the risk of incurring the displeasure of our State Department, but it was my son, God bless him, who was out there and not theirs. Not one of them had a son there. It was fully realized that ordinary means would most probably result in dismal failure. So, when the news was released that the Holy See at the Vatican had finally recognized the Japanese envoy, after 12 long years of waiting in Rome, I arranged for our problem to be placed before that envoy by the papal secretary of state. The late archbishop of the archdiocese of Santa Fe, His Grace Rudolph A. Gerken, expressed a most humanitarian desire to cooperate in every way possible, and it was from him that I received the information that the Japanese Government could not see any reason why the B. R. O., constituted as it was, could not send a mercy ship to carry everything necessary for the relief of our boys. It was with the fear that false hopes might be raised that I did not give out that information and it was proven that my caution was entirely justified. There is one important reason, as I see it, why that ship, the *Kanangoora*, did not sail after being fully loaded through the generosity of real Americans all over this great country of ours. According to information told to me by my cousin who lived, practiced his profession, and lectured at the University of Tokyo for many years, the Japanese have no respect whatsoever for anything even remotely connected with the American Red Cross. That has been most evident in many ways, many times. It is evidently due to the overbearing attitude of our Red Cross officials in dealing with the Japanese Red Cross at the time of the great earthquake in the early twenties. When the Red Cross took over, the *Kanangoora* was immediately prevented from sailing. Many reasons, and all of them obviously utterly false to me, were given as to why that ship did not sail. I cannot see it differently that our boys paid, and how they paid, for some so-called Americans' perverted sense of self-importance.

The problem which faces us is to find and use any means necessary to save at least some of the survivors of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake. In view of what has transpired and in abiding by the rules of common humanitarian decency, it is our constitutional right—more than that, it is our duty to our beloved country by redeeming its honor, as well as our duty to our suffering sons—that we demand by petition or any other available means that the full fighting force of America, wherever it may now be dispersed, be brought to bear on our mortal enemy, Japan, so that enemy shall be brought to its knees at the earliest possible moment and in the most complete, unconditional surrender. That is one way by which we can prove ourselves worthy of our sons, of our honor as Americans, and our hopes of eternal redemption. Only by some such token of our sincerity of purpose can we even hope that a just and living God will listen to our pleas for mercy. May He grant us the strength and courage to prove ourselves worthy.

"Have faith, oh noble sons,
Hold on, just for awhile;
Though your world has toppled
And you see no cause for smile.

"Have faith, oh sons of freedom
Who lived through Bataan and Wake,
And the hell of old Corregidor,
Though left there to your fate.

"Have faith, you who fought and lost,
Your pals died not in vain—
For ten million fighting comrades
Will avenge their blood and pain!

"Have faith, you weary and sick,
We'll settle each separate debt—
Though precious lives were sacrificed,
This time, we won't forget!

"Have faith, we'll square the uneven score,
And we'll worship at the shrine
Of the men who died for freedom—
No, we won't forget, this time!"

My friends, let's make sure that we don't forget the heroes of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake by living up to our B. R. O. pledge, "We will not let them down."

Mr. ADAMS. I would like to say that Hon. ELBERT THOMAS, Hon. HARRY TRUMAN, and Congressman W. C. COLE, Third District, Mo., were unable to be here. They have promised their sincere and conscientious cooperation in everything that they can do, and I assure you that they have been invaluable to us.

(Mr. McCahon read letter from Mr. Moorehouse.)

(Following this officers were duly nominated and elected.)

(Following this there were addresses by Mr. Pate and Mr. Cotton, of the Red Cross.)

Dr. SPENSLEY. I am now going to call on Dr. Yap to address the gathering.

Dr. YAP. After the very interesting show we had—to put it one way—yesterday afternoon I tried to put down some concrete and practical suggestions which I have had the privilege of discussing with our able chairman and some of the delegates here present.

Since I have had the opportunity of publishing my humble Bataan magazine for almost a year now, it has been my good fortune to receive notes from you mothers, letters expressing your thoughts and desires how best my humble publication can serve your cause.

Since the beginning of the Bataan Relief Organization at Albuquerque and the other auxiliaries all over the country I have watched with interest the activities whether in California, North Carolina, Georgia, or elsewhere, because I feel, and I would like to make it known to you, that you have sons, husbands, and relatives there, and my father and mother are now victims of the atrocities of the Japanese, and I know that I speak just like you do. I have come to the conclusion that your organization, to which I am affiliated by the way—I am an honorary member—has for its main objectives the sending of tanks and planes to General MacArthur and the speeding of aid to our boys in the prison camps who are held as prisoners of war either in the Philippines, Formosa, China, or Japan, and then a speedy return of these boys back home to us to enjoy the family fireplace. I feel that these are the cardinal objectives of the B. R. O.

Yes, we are thinking of those boys who are still alive, who are crying, who are bleeding, who are dying, and we are thinking of you whose husbands and sons have been reported killed in action or who have died in prison camps and also of you who came here to refresh in the mind the sad and bitter memories in which you live. We have cause to be grateful to those who are in the prison camps. Yes; there are three times as many Filipinos in those camps as Americans, so 85,000 Filipinos join with you both in your prayers and in your work to make possible the time when your boys will be returned to you. Yes, we are thinking of those who are already dead and buried in shallow graves marked "unknown." What shall we do about them? Shall we forget them? Shall we just close them in the memory of our hearts? Are we just going to sit here? No; we are going to do everything possible to take the war to the Pacific. Yes, we all want help to go to General MacArthur. We want to send planes or those boys will never return home.

I could tell you many stories, first-hand stories that I have had the privilege of hearing from some of the boys who came from the Philippines and arrived here in Washington. These stories would break your heart.

As Mr. Cotton has said, there are others who went there of their own volition, who went there for business purposes, to make money, or to make a visit for adventure; they are now prisoners in the Philippines. There are several thousand of them. Our State Department told them to come home because war was imminent. The State Department asked them to please come home otherwise they would be caught in the war. Thousands of them did not heed this warning. Consequently, we have today in the Philippines 7,000 civilian internees who have never worn the uniform of America. There are thousands of their relatives and friends here who want to do something also for them and I know that these relatives, parents, and next of kin of these civilian internees would be willing to work under the banner and under the leadership of our able chairman, Dr. Spensley. Because of this I thought it would be possible, as the saying goes, to kill two birds with one stone. While we are working for the prisoners of war, at the same time we could be working for the civilian internees. I think in this way we could accomplish much, but we should never for the moment lose sight of the fundamental objectives of B. R. O. to the prisoners of war who were sent there not of their own volition. The civilian internees went on their own but those men from New Mexico, Texas, Illinois, and all of the 48 States were sent there in uniform at the request of our good Government, and they are the responsibility of the Government, and they were sent there unprepared. They were fighting for the wealthiest nation on the earth, yet the Americans and Filipinos died of hunger and starvation. Those boys who were in the fox holes of Bataan were without clothing, food, medicine, even without guns. It was physically impossible for them to defend themselves. If we can do something to let those boys know what we are

doing on the home front we will be accomplishing a great deal.

In closing, I think it would be fitting and proper to recite the poem written some 27 years ago—

"IN FLANDERS FIELDS

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If you break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

Mr. MCCAHON. I think we should appoint a committee to coordinate the prisoners of war and the civilian internees. I think it would be a good idea to federate the two groups and my suggestion is that a chairman be appointed at this time to check on the advisability of doing this.

Dr. SPENSLEY. Our boys were sent over there and the civilians went over there to make money. If we in time invite them to work with us, they should not in any way interfere with our work. We are still trying to work for the boys who served. They can't get our boys out without getting the civilians out, too. We should consider the prisoners of war of prime importance. However, I think they should be invited for the sake of numbers.

(A motion was made and seconded that a national executive committee be selected. It was stated that this should also include the District of Columbia because there are people here with relatives who are prisoners of the Japs.)

(A resolutions committee was appointed by Dr. Spensley.)

Dr. SPENSLEY: I will now read the purpose of the Bataan Relief Organization:

"To obtain immediate relief for all American soldiers held as Japanese prisoners of war, their release as quickly as possible, and their safe delivery home."

It was decided to change this to read as follows:

"To obtain immediate relief for any of our armed forces held as Japanese prisoners of war, their release as quickly as possible, and their safe delivery home."

(Conference was held with the newspaper reporters.)

(In discussing the releases by the Army and Navy Departments, Dr. Spensley read a quotation of Bronson Cutting: "Let the American people know the truth and they can and will think for themselves." Dr. Spensley said: "Let the American people know the truth as it happens," if it does not jeopardize our military efforts and not let us have it as a broadside.)

Corn Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this body, who was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whom we all affectionately regarded as a friend, and who was distinguished for the superior aid and wisdom which he gave to agriculture, left us about 3 years ago to go upon the bench under a Presidential appointment to the Court of Claims. In this capacity he has shown great judicial learning and ability. But the President needed him in the war food-production work and asked him to discard his judicial robe and to become War Food Administrator for the duration. He is now acting in that capacity and has given aid and comfort to the war and to the farmer because of his great knowledge and understanding of the problems of producing food during this war and of getting food to our citizens, to our armed forces, and also to our allies by way of the lend-lease program.

I recall that Dean Jonathan Swift in the immortal Gulliver's Travels told of the voyage to Brobdingnag, and, among other things, Swift says that Gulliver gave it for his opinion that whosoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together.

It is a privilege for me to affirm that our good friend Justice Marvin Jones is exactly that kind of a man. He makes two ears of corn to grow where but one grew before. On January 19, 1944, and over the Farm and Home Hour program he gave out a radio address entitled "Corn Goes to War." It is a mighty fine talk, and it gives me pleasure to set it forth here under the leave of the House, as follows:

I am going to talk today about corn. It is our biggest single crop. We had more acres in corn last year than in our next two largest crops, cotton and wheat combined. One acre out of every four in crops in the whole United States is corn.

The value of our corn crop last year was more than our entire wheat crop plus our entire cotton crop including cotton seed, plus all our sorghums for grain and forage, plus all of our barley and rye. Our corn was worth more than all of these combined.

The value of our corn crop was worth more than our entire hog production, although, of course, you can't separate one of these from the other.

That is why I am talking about corn today. When food in any and all of its forms is as important as food is now, we must look with special care at our greatest reliance, corn—a reliance shared by so much of the stricken world today.

Four hundred and fifty years ago a little fleet of ships arrived in Europe from America. Christopher Columbus had come back. He reported two great discoveries. One was a new world. The other was Indian corn. Each was a richer discovery than the wealth of the Indies he was seeking.

Last year, exactly 450 years later, the farmers of America harvested 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn.

They turned that corn into thousands of tons of lard, into butter, and bacon and ham. They turned that corn into dried eggs and dried milk and cheese, and they turned it into leather for shoes. They turned that corn into nitrostarch for explosives, into adhesives for making ammunition containers, into starch for textiles and paper products; they turned it into special molds for castings for airplane engines and into fibrous glass cloth for bomber brake linings—and last year, 450 years later, more fleets of ships arrived in Europe from America.

Corn has gone to war.

This spring American farmers will plant 100,000,000 acres of corn to muster on our farms the ranks and files of one of the greatest war crops ever mobilized.

If the enemies of America could see what we will see next summer when we review the tassels waving across that 100,000,000 acres of growing corn; if the enemies of America could hear what we will hear when we listen to the wind rustling in the cornstalks at harvest time—there would be less heart in them than there is even now in their troubled breasts. For food fights for freedom, and corn is the spearhead of the attack.

This reliance on corn in a time of need is no new thing in American history. The Pilgrim Fathers learned its value, and we are stirred today when we read in the journal of William Bradford and John Winslow these simple words:

"We found a little old basket, full of fair Indian corn; and digged further and found a fine, great new basket full of very fair corn of this year, with some six and thirty goodly ears of corn, some yellow and some red, and others mixed with blue, which was a very goodly sight."

Yes; corn is a very goodly sight.

So great is our reliance on the productiveness of this crop that with the national goal set at 100,253,000 acres of corn to be planted this spring we can have a comfortably good expectation that this fall our corn harvest will not be very far from 3,000,000,000 bushels.

Now, 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn, like 10,000,000 men in the armed forces, is a mobilization that deserves most earnest and thoughtful attention. Neither must be mismanaged. A farmer who has given his son to the service of the Nation in the emergency will not only be willing but will insist that his own and his neighbor's corn also serve the Nation, and he will want things to be so managed that it serves to its fullest usefulness. With corn accounting for something more than two-thirds of all our feed grains and at least half of all our concentrate feeds, it is a war material of utmost importance.

Let's see what some of the problems are.

In the year or two before Pearl Harbor, we had the largest feed reserves in history, chiefly corn. Our feed supply at that time was relatively high compared to our livestock numbers. Because of that relative abundance of feed compared to livestock numbers we could afford to expand those types of food production that would give the quickest results from our food reserves, and so an increased production of hogs, chickens, eggs and milk was encouraged. That was wise because it used our supplies to the best advantage.

But the American farmer responded so fully to the request for increased production that most livestock goals were exceeded—and the balance between feed supply and livestock numbers is now tipped the other way. We have relatively more livestock than feed—in spite of the fact that our last two corn crops were the largest two in our history. That means we must now depend largely on what we produce, because our reserves are low. It is not wise to count on more than normal yields nor to place too great a dependence on big future production.

The problem now—as it was at the beginning of the war—is to make our livestock pattern fit our feed cloth.

To do that, let us measure our cloth. How much feed do we have to work with? How much are our reserves? How much may we safely expect from our 100,000,000-acre crop in 1944? That is the limit of our feed cloth. Our livestock pattern must recognize that limit.

In deciding how much livestock production that feed will permit, we must take into account our total needs for all feeds, our civilian needs, our military needs, our lend-

lease needs. These indicate we will need at least as much milk as last year, as many eggs or more—and then every pound of meat that the remaining feed supply will permit.

As for hogs, it is apparent that the remaining feed supply will not permit continuing the large yearly increases of the past few years. It will permit maintaining hog production at the high 1942 level—which was nearly 52 percent above the 1935–39 level. It simply means making the pattern fit the cloth. It simply means managing our feed supply to the best advantage to the Nation.

As for beef cattle, there is enough to feed about as many cattle as were fed last year. It will be necessary to conserve feed and to secure the best possible results from the feeding.

As for poultry and dairy products, we need to use enough of our cloth to maintain egg and milk production at as high a level as last year. But the feed must be used efficiently, and this means, in the case of poultry, culling 50,000,000 nonlayers and some adjustments in broiler production.

In addition we must reserve enough of our cloth to meet our industrial and food needs—for corn is not used for feed alone.

The War Food Administration has been aware of this shift in the balance between livestock and feed supply and several steps have been taken to bring about a proper relationship. During the last few months farmers have been advised that the problem is one of stabilizing livestock production and of conserving feed. This situation has been recognized by the farmers themselves, and in the State meetings in which the 1944 goals were set, the balance of feed and livestock was carefully considered.

We have used and are still using a lot of surplus wheat for feed, probably 500,000,000 bushels during the year ending June 1944—three or four times what we once considered normal. We are bringing in feed wheat from Canada to supplement our needs.

Farmers know better than anyone else that feed must be used efficiently because it is a munition of war just as surely as our ships, our planes, our tanks. They are not wasting and will not waste it.

As for the consumer, he, too, will recognize that our cloth will not permit the luxury patterns of peacetimes. We have extra point rations now but those are for pork that was made out of our reserve feed stocks of the past and out of our unusually good corn yields, which cannot be safely counted on in the future.

If some individual adjustments are necessary, we must keep in mind the tremendous importance of corn as a vital weapon of war.

Corn is distinctively American and must be used, like all our resources, to best serve the Nation.

Tributes to Joseph B. Eastman, at Testimonial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an article published in the Traffic World, containing an account of a testimonial dinner given to Mr. Joseph B. Eastman here in Washington. As Senators know, Mr. Eastman is Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

At the dinner, as recounted by the Traffic World, there was read a very fine letter from the President of the United States, and tributes were paid Mr. Eastman by the general counsel of the Association of American Railroads, and likewise Mr. Eastman was commended by me. He must be a good man when the President of the United States, the American railroads, the Traffic World, and myself all praise him.

I ask that the account of the dinner given in the Traffic World be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTMAN TESTIMONIAL DINNER

Mingled with the tributes paid to Joseph B. Eastman at the silver anniversary dinner tendered him by the District of Columbia Chapter of the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners, February 17, to mark the completion of his twenty-fifth year as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, were commendations of the Commission itself as standing foremost among administrative agencies of the National Government.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, said that the Commission, as a whole, was "the finest Commission we have in the Government of the United States." Representative LEA, of California, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, said he agreed that the Commission was "the greatest Commission this Government has ever known."

High points in the marks of honor paid Mr. Eastman were a letter from President Roosevelt, delivered by hand from the White House, and Commissioner Aitchison's nomination of Mr. Eastman for the Distinguished Service Medal.

The President, with the salutation "Dear Joe," said:

"The 25 years which have passed since you assumed your duties as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been pointed by the continuous development of grave and complex problems.

"Upon your entry on your duties in 1919, we were demobilizing our armed forces and returning to the pursuits of peace after World War No. 1. Today, we are in the midst of a global war of an intensity and violence and degree of horror hardly dreamed of in the earlier struggle.

"This war, too, has presented us with unprecedented problems, particularly in the field of transportation. As an Interstate Commerce Commissioner you had gone through a thoroughgoing school of experience before I added to your responsibilities by making you Director of the newly created Office of Defense Transportation.

"But I am happy to say that you have risen to the opportunity for service which confronted you. Your industry, vision, and all-around efficiency have been assets of incalculable value, not only to our own Nation, but to the cause of the United Nations, of which our destiny is a part.

"Hearty congratulations on all the fine things you have done through a full quarter of a century. I know you will carry on until the job is finished."

J. Carter Fort, general counsel of the Association of American Railroads, speaking for the practitioners; Senator Wheeler, Representative Lea, and Commissioner Aitchison dwelt particularly on the services of Mr. Eastman in the development of administrative law, to which Mr. Fort referred as "that prodigious and at times unruly newcomer to our system of jurisprudence."

Joseph C. Colquitt, chairman of the practitioners' District of Columbia Chapter, acted as toastmaster. Warren H. Wagner, president of the Association of I. C. C. Practitioners, made the presentation to Mr. Eastman of an illuminated scroll bearing the practitioners' expressions of esteem. Several weeks before the date of the dinner, the association announced that it was unable to take care of all of the reservations for the affair, and more than 700 people filled the 2 large Hotel Statler dining rooms thrown together for the occasion.

EASTMAN'S "PRIMER"

In his acknowledgment of the illuminated scroll, and his reply to the congratulations tendered him, Mr. Eastman reminisced about his early contacts with the Commission, and after pointing out that, although a New Englander, he had personally written the opinions in a number of cases dealing with southern rates, Mr. Eastman set forth 12 things—a sort of primer—that he said he had learned in 25 years about the Commission. They were as follows:

"1. With the country as big and complex as it is, administrative tribunals like the Interstate Commerce Commission are necessities. Probably we shall have more rather than less. To be successful, they must be masters of their own souls, and known to be such. It is the duty of the President to determine their personnel through the power of appointment, and it is the duty of Congress to determine by statute the policies which they are to administer; but in the administration of those policies these tribunals must not be under the domination or influence of either the President or Congress or of anything else than their own independent judgment of the facts and the law. They must be in position and ready to give free and untrammeled advice to both the President and Congress at any time upon request. Political domination will ruin such a tribunal. I have seen this happen many times, particularly in the States.

"2. The courts were at one time much too prone to substitute their own judgment on the facts for the judgment of administrative tribunals. They are now in danger of going too far in the other direction. The principle that it is an error of law to render a decision not supported by substantial evidence is a salutary principle. The courts should enforce it.

"3. An administrative tribunal has a broader responsibility than a court. It is more than a tribunal for the settlement of controversies. The word 'administrative' means something. The policies of the law must be carried out. If in any proceeding the pertinent facts are not fully presented by the parties, it is the duty of the tribunal to see to it, as best it can, that they are developed of record. A complainant without resources to command adequate professional help should be given such protection. The tribunal should also be ready to institute proceedings on its own motion, whenever constructive enforcement of the law so requires.

"4. There is no safe substitute in the procedure of the tribunal for full hearing and argument of the issues, when they are in controversy, although the hearing need not always be oral. This takes time, but it is time well spent.

"5. The decisions of the tribunal should present succinctly the pertinent facts, as they are found to be, and the conclusions reached, but also state clearly the reasons for the conclusions.

"6. The statutes which the tribunal administers should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnel which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law."

NO PLACE FOR ZEALOT ON I. C. C.

"7. It is not necessary for the members of the tribunal to be technical experts on the subject matter of their administration. As a matter of fact, you could not find a man who is a technical expert on any large part of the matters upon which the Interstate Commerce Commission finds it necessary to pass. The important qualifications are ability to grasp and comprehend facts quickly, and to consider them in their relation to the law logically and with an open mind. Zealots, evangelists, and crusaders have their value before an administrative tribunal, but not on it. Other important qualifications are patience, courtesy, and a desire to be helpful to the extent that the law permits.

"8. Moral courage is, of course, a prime qualification, but there are often misapprehensions as to when it is shown. The thing that takes courage is to make a decision or take a position which may react seriously in some way upon the one who makes or takes it. It requires no courage to incur disapproval, unless those who disapprove have the desire and power to cause such a result. Power is not a permanent but a shifting thing. I can well remember the time when it was a dangerous thing to incur the displeasure of bankers, but there has been no danger in this since 1932. It became a greater danger to incur the displeasure of farm or labor organizations. There is nothing more important than to curb abuse of power, wherever it may reside, and power is always subject to abuse.

"9. Selection of the members of an administrative tribunal from different parts of the country has its advantages, but they turn to disadvantages if the members regard themselves as special pleaders for their respective sections.

"10. Sitting in dignity and looking down on the suppliants from the elevation of a judicial bench has its dangers. A reversal of the position now and then is good for the soul. It has for many years been my good fortune to appear rather frequently before legislative or congressional committees. They are a better safeguard against inflation than the O. P. A.

"RECOGNITION FOR STAFF

"11. In any large administrative tribunal, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, a vast amount of the real work must necessarily be done by the staff. It is a difficult problem to give the individual members of the staff proper recognition for work well done—recognition on the outside as well as the inside. It is very important that this problem be solved, but I am frank to say that its full solution has not yet been reached.

"12. One of the great dangers in public regulation by administrative tribunals of business concerns is the resulting division of responsibility, as between the managements and the regulators, for the successful functioning of these concerns. For example, there was a tendency at one time, and it may still exist, on the part of those financially interested in the railroads to think of the financial success of those properties solely in terms of rates and wages and the treatment of rates and wages by public authorities. Sight was lost of the essentiality of constant, unremitting enterprise and initiative in management. The importance of sound public regulation cannot be minimized, but it must not be magnified to the exclusion of those factors in financial success upon which ordinary private business must rely."

Mr. Fort, who was a member of the Commission's staff when Mr. Eastman first became a commissioner in 1919, said that after he and his associates had appraised Mr. Eastman, they decided he ought to be President of the United States. Alluding to that remark Senator WHEELER said most of the Democrats in the Senate, if not the Republicans, would be delighted to see Mr. Eastman nominated for President.

Mr. Fort, enlarging on his remark concerning Mr. Eastman's contribution to administrative law said that "his constructive instincts led him to recognize the potentiality for good in this new instrumentality, while his hatred of tyranny in any form led him to understand that there must be preserved and carried forward into any modern technique of litigation those age-old safeguards against oppression—full and fair hearing, reasoned decisions based on evidence, and rule by law rather than by men."

GOVERNMENT BY LAW—NOT MEN

Senator WHEELER repeated Mr. Fort's thought concerning government by law rather than by men as applied to the Commission. He said that one might disagree with the Commission, but that "you know when you have left the Interstate Commerce Commission they have decided your case conscientiously, earnestly, and fearlessly." That was a great deal to know, he said, when trying a case before "one of these commissions." Referring to Mr. Eastman as an ideal public officer, he said that, if there were thousands of officials like him on the various commissions and bureaus, "the people of this country would have more respect for their own Government and for the commissions of the United States and there would not be the disunity you find now."

Representative LEA said the Commission had established its greatness by the confidence and respect it enjoyed from the American people—a confidence due to its fairness. In the 25 years in which Mr. Eastman had served the country, said he, a new phase had followed the physical achievements of transportation—that of regulation, and added that the story of our wartime transportation could not be told without giving Mr. Eastman credit for the morale he had injected into the competing transportation agencies of the country.

AITCHISON'S COMMENDATION

Commissioner Aitchison, speaking for his colleagues, said that "we add our fervent wishes that he may continue with us for many years, full of health and with unabated energy. We enjoy his genial comradeship; we derive inspiration from his example; and we are profited by his ripened wisdom and his vast fund of experience.

"And from the broader viewpoint," he continued, "it is good for the Nation and those who engage in its commerce that in the difficult days ahead the devoted service and wisdom of Commissioner Eastman will be employed loyally in protecting and furthering the public interest."

Commissioner Aitchison nominated Mr. Eastman for the Distinguished Service Medal, following a review of his service to the Commission and his duties as Federal Coordinator of Transportation and as director of the O. D. T. When the war was over, said he, the Commission anticipated tasks in its field that would call for administrative statesmanship of the highest order. The public service would then demand all of Mr. Eastman's energies as a member of the Commission, he said, and that the other commissioners hoped that he could then devote all his experience and great intellectual powers undividedly to his functions as a member of the Commission. He called attention to the fact that this was only the fourth time that any member of the Commission had completed 25 years of service. The others were Commissioners Clement, Meyer, and himself.

Adopting a lighter mood, Commissioner Aitchison said that, at that point in the life of a new-born baby when it was customary to take the youngster by the heels and upend him, and apply a few vigorous slaps, the result of which was commonly a plaintive wail from the infant, there had been a different reaction from the guest of honor.

EASTMAN'S FIRST DISSENT

"Instead of letting out the expected healthy wail," said Commissioner Aitchison, "to the amazement and consternation of the physician, nurse, et al., the child turned his head to the physician and unmistakably said in a high but forceful childish treble, 'I dissent.' That child has become our hero. But during the dismal years he served as Federal Coordinator, and the trying years since he became director of the O. D. T., he has voted as a commissioner only when the remaining Commissioners were equally divided. Therefore it has been, and even now is, impossible for him to dissent. The vote he casts is the vote which prevails. It must have caused him many sad hours to go around chock full of dissents, and to realize that he couldn't get a single one of them out of his system."

American Attitudes and Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject American Attitudes and Leadership, which I delivered at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, February 21 last. It was the final lecture in a series on international postwar problems.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The spirit in which we approach our national and international issues is all important. I emphasize five civic virtues which, when practiced, have accounted for much of America's rise to unique influence in the world. . I recommend their practice today. Two are typified by George Washington, two by Abraham Lincoln, and the fifth by both of them and by millions of Americans "known only unto God."

Shortly before his inauguration as the first President of the United States, Washington wrote to his friend, General Knox: "Integrity and firmness are all I can promise." Those virtues thus became the foundation stones of the character of the Republic. They are essential to a sound personal, national, and international character. President Washington was the living embodiment of them.

Integrity requires men to be honest both with themselves and the world. It requires them to speak the truth and to keep their word. It is only thus that men and nations can become dependable, and international stability can be built only upon dependability. The nearer men and nations come to having deserved faith in one another, the nearer will they come to peace on earth.

Firmness is a product of integrity. Only he who tells the truth can afford to be firm. With truth as a foundation, firmness is natural. These civic virtues fixed the form and cast the features of our early body politic.

Three generations later, Lincoln became so much a part of America that today we cannot describe our national character without emphasis on some characteristic of his. He added to American public life qualities as important to it as those which the New Testament added to the Old. He demonstrated the outstanding value of fairness and

kindness. He developed a human and understanding heart in our body politic.

The fifth and most fundamental virtue of the five is that of reverence for God and man. Too often forgotten today, reverence for God, coupled with a deep appreciation of His equal Fatherhood of all men greatly influenced the spirit of America in the days of the making of the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Gettysburg Address. Such reverence not only has filled the hearts and minds of our leaders but it has united the efforts of countless men and women who by their faith and works have made America a beacon of hope for mankind everywhere. Such men and women are the sinew and the soul of our body politic.

In her international relations, it is important that America be genuinely herself and that she approach her post-war international problems with integrity, firmness, fairness, kindness, and reverence. If she does less, she will not be true to the purpose for which America was founded. We are a Nation built on faith in God and man. Our Declaration of Independence was not a document claiming territory. It was not a document claiming rights in the name of a sovereign. It was a declaration of faith that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and are instituted among men to secure to each one of them certain inalienable rights with which they have been endowed by their Creator, including especially their respective rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As Lincoln so clearly interpreted this statement, this declaration was not limited to men in any one place or of any one time or race. In 1858 he said that it applied to "the whole race of men," and "to the economy of the universe." He said it represented a "noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to his creatures. Yes, gentlemen, to all his creatures, to the whole great family of man." And, referring to the beliefs of our forefathers, he added, "In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built." This is the attitude of deep faith in the cause of man with which America should approach her new problems in the world-wide field of expanding human relations as she did in 1776 in the field of her newly declared national independence.

We are a Nation founded in the interest of the individual man and dedicated to his freedom and advancement, as fast as circumstances shall permit. This purpose we must apply to the changing needs of our time. Our horizons expand but our guiding star remains the same. Our numbers grow but the sacredness of each human soul is preserved. "America is not so much a place as it is a people." It is primarily a human institution established for the benefit of human beings. As beneficiaries of a great past and trustees of a greater future, we, of America, must constantly rededicate ourselves to human service worthy of our increasing responsibilities and opportunities.

In 1944 we are looking into the dawn of the most critical year of our generation. It is for us to meet its tests with faith and vigor fully equal to those of our forefathers and thoroughly consistent with the purposes and principles of which our Government is the product.

Turning to the field of action, decisive military victories are our first essential need. Whatever we say or do about post-war plans must be so said and done as to help win the victories that will make peace possible. It should be so said and done as to add new strength and unity to the efforts of the United Nations to win the war as quickly and completely as possible in both hemispheres. At the same time, failure to make tangible progress with plans for the peace while fighting the war would be as serious a failure in our civic duties as if our generals failed to plan their next military campaigns while fighting the battles of today. Timing and preparation are as important to peace as they are to war.

Peace involves 34 United Nations, about 10 associated nations, 3 or more enemy nations, and in some degree all other nations. This totals over 60 nations and over 2,000,000,000 people. On such a scale the horizons of antiquity or even of a generation ago disappear. We speak, we see, and we act around the globe. We think of and deal with more men at a time than ever before. Our opportunities and responsibilities have expanded together. We catch a new sense of the need for a world-wide devotion to the practice of the golden rule to do unto others as you would have others do unto you under conditions that have made all the world a neighborhood.

In our post-war international relations we shall be dealing with subject matters comparable to those with which we have been accustomed to deal but on a larger scale and with greater means for quick and widespread action than ever before. We must adapt our technique of government to the new needs and speeds of our time. We must meet the novel demands for constructive action with the same courage and faith that filled the hearts and minds of our forefathers when they met the novel demand of the men and women of the Thirteen Original States for some new procedure that would reflect the will of the governed in national as well as local affairs. With the principles of the Declaration of Independence in their hearts and their hard-won freedom at stake, they met in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787. No one took to that Convention the plan that came from it. Yet from that Convention came the Constitution of the United States, which has been a source of infinite strength to us and a model of infinite value to freemen everywhere. While today there are some similarities to that situation as the United Nations face the problem of international stability with their hard-won freedom again at stake, yet there also are great differences between the two situations. I mention the earlier experience not so as to copy the solution then reached, but rather to draw from that experience the lesson that if men will face new problems in the light of great principles and with an invincible determination to find solutions worthy of the opportunities, they may be able to create new and workable plans of human relations that will preserve the peace for a long time and thus justify somewhat the infinite price paid for that peace.

Several steps already have been taken. I mention three and quote three statements from them. The first is the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, the second is the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and the third is Senate Resolution 192 adopted by the Senate of the United States of America November 5, 1943, incorporating in it a part of the Moscow Agreement of October 30, 1943.

While the Atlantic Charter is but a joint declaration of the personal points of view of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and has not been incorporated in a treaty between those nations, yet it has received such formal and informal world-wide recognition that any step that departs from it will call for a justification of such departure. I quote its sixth paragraph, which states: "After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they (the President and the Prime Minister) hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

On January 1, 1942, 26 nations joined in the declaration by the United Nations. Since then 8 more have adhered to it. I quote the preamble to this declaration because of the subscription to the Atlantic Charter there expressed by all the signatories. It says: "The governments signatory hereto, having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, * * * declare" that each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources to fight those with whom it is at war and not to make a separate peace.

On November 5, 1943, by a vote of 85 to 5, the Senate of the United States adopted Senate Resolution 192 which incorporated as its fourth paragraph, word for word, the fourth paragraph of the Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943, entered into by representatives of the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China. This paragraph states: "That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

It is notable that these provisions emphasize the need for unity of action among all of the United Nations, large and small, the need for action that will create a living organization capable of meeting the changing needs of the future and the last statement, already 3 months old, emphasizes the need for early action along these lines.

As indicating further active consideration of these issues by the 21 American republics, including the United States of America, I quote also the following:

First from resolution XXV on post-war problems adopted at the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 21 American republics at Rio de Janeiro and released February 2, 1943, which:

"Resolves:

"To request the governing board of the Pan American Union to convoke an inter-American technical economic conference charged with the study of present and post-war economic problems; and

"To entrust the Inter-American Juridical Committee with the formulation of specific recommendations relative to the international organization in the juridical and political fields, and in the field of international security."

Next, resolution XXXV adopted at the same meeting resolves:

"To take note of the contents of the Atlantic Charter and to express to the President of the United States of America its

satisfaction with the inclusion in that document of principles which constitute a part of the juridical heritage of America in accordance with the convention on rights and duties of states approved at the seventh international conference of American states, held at Montevideo in 1933."

Finally as demonstrating the thinking even in 1939 on the relation of these republics to the world we find the following joint declaration issued by the ministers of foreign affairs of these republics at that time:

"The inter-American system is not founded on any spirit of isolation, nor is it in any sense antagonistic to any other section of the world or to any other international organization. The American republics feel that they have a set of problems peculiar to themselves, and that these can best be solved by cooperative action among the several states. At the same time they recognize the interdependence of the world as a whole, and the inevitable necessity of every state and region maintaining contact with and being influenced by developments in every other state or region. The American republics have therefore adopted a series of rules and principles to govern their relations with noncontinental states and regions. These rules and principles are free from any selfish purpose of isolation, but are inspired by a deep sense of universal cooperation."

Dedicated as America is to the cause of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery, we eliminate from our program any plan for a lasting peace comparable to a Pax Romana based upon conquering and enslaving the world by the aggression of any one or more of the United Nations. Similarly, the United States sees the inevitable failure which has attended so often efforts to keep forever in balance the shifting power of one group of nations as against that of another group of nations. The system of balanced powers probably has prolonged many an armistice. However, when changing weights of the respective powers have upset the balance new and greater wars have followed. For these reasons, the above declarations and the logic of our time suggest as the next step toward a just, a lasting and a living peace, the formation of an international organization open, at least, to all of the United Nations, large or small, and probably providing a means for the later acceptance of all nations of the world. This organization shall have as its primary objective that of establishing and maintaining the peace and security of the world.

The United Nations, when victory comes, will have demonstrated, by that victory, that as long as they remain united there is substantial assurance of military peace and security. On the other hand, if this "championship team" of World War No. 2 disintegrates to any degree there is created immediately a corresponding degree of uncertainty as to the future. Regardless of the reason which may cause any nation, large or small, to withdraw from the United Nations such withdrawal will produce at once a need on the part of every other nation to offset that uncertainty. This will lead naturally to alliances and counteralliances until the pattern of the next war is written in them.

More important, therefore, to the peace of the world than any other national or international policy of America or of any other nation is this essential need to insure continued unity among the United Nations. It exists now in time of war. As long as it exists among all the United Nations the assurance of military peace and security as against outside aggression is reasonably sure. The primary obligation of every peace-loving nation is to see to it, therefore, that this unity continues in time of peace. To this end, it is important that there be no period of uncertainty following the relief of the United Nations from the pressure of common danger from the enemy. This makes it correspondingly important that at least preliminary understandings leading toward peacetime unity shall receive widespread advance consideration and approval before the coming of the peace. The chances of reaching such understandings probably are better in time of war than they will be in time of peace. Today each of the United Nations is under substantial pressure to find a way to maintain its unity with each of the others so as to insure its own safety and so as to help to win the war. This immediate pressure, will end with the war.

It is appropriate to recall, at this point, that apart from any new organization of the United Nations and apart from any new understandings for the establishment and maintenance of peace, the United States already is a party to hundreds of treaties and to scores of international working arrangements helping to meet the current needs of our time. These official working arrangements cover many questions relating to legal matters, labor problems, agricultural, industrial and financial relations, communications, health and social conditions, standards and statistics, art, science and education to say nothing of the military boards reaching into production and distribution of materials, and to say nothing of an organization of such general scope as the Pan-American Union dealing with many international interests of the 21 American republics. The day of complete isolation for the United States or for any civilized nation has in actual fact long since disappeared. There can be no question but that the United States wishes to take full advantage of the scientific, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and cultural developments of modern civilization. As an isolated nation, America cannot do this any more than a hermit living alone in a cave can keep up with the opportunities and standards of living in the modern world. The freedom, national independence and sovereign equality of a civilized state does not mean that it shall live apart from the world. Its freedom includes freedom to exercise its judgment to enter into treaties, contracts, and agreements with others to the mutual advantage of both parties, just as the individual citizen of today improves his standards of living and his opportunities by specializing in his labor and by taking active part in a state of society in which he depends in large part upon others for many of his needs while they in turn depend partly upon him for their needs.

Modern standards of living depend upon international relations. These depend upon many international agreements and undertakings. These benefits, however, are of little value if the world frequently is forced to fight desperately to defend itself from slavery. The primary duty, therefore, that we owe to those who are paying the infinite price of victory today is to see to it that some means is found to keep the victorious United Nations united in peace as well as in war. Such an organization of the United Nations must then draw into itself all of the other nations and peoples, large and small, so that, except for the outlaw, there will be none left outside to wage aggressive war against them. As for any outlaw nation, it must be restrained and resisted as effectively by the society of nations as the individual outlaw today is restrained and resisted by the organized governments of today. He is not exterminated but he is so effectively restrained and resisted by community force that his own lawlessness becomes a minor nuisance rather than a major danger.

Even the tragedy of two world wars in the same generation may be worth the price paid to win them, if the people of the world shall gain from them a clear understanding that the world's first obligation to itself is to maintain unity and stability among substantially all the nations of the world. The form of the unifying organization is not as important as the fact of the unity. This brings us directly to the question as to what the next step toward such unity should be and who should take it.

The Moscow agreement and the Senate resolution, of 3 months ago, point the way. The first step was spelled out in the Senate Resolution 114, introduced nearly a year ago by two Republican and two Democratic Senators. The substance of it was included in Senate Resolution 192 as adopted in November, but the November resolution omitted any plan of procedure, whereas the earlier proposal stated what should be done and who should do it. It proposed that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority as there stated.

This is the step needed to be taken now. In recent months, there have been meetings between leaders of the four major United Nations. These have been helpful. We also have seen a recent gathering of representatives of the United and Associated Nations resulting in the formation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This has been helpful.

It is important, however, that long before the armistice arrives, that the nations of the world, large and small, determine upon an elemental course of procedure which shall be followed as the fighting stops so that there always shall be an orderly continuance of united action among the United Nations. It may be necessary to defer agreement on the final form of the organization in many particulars, and it may be well to leave for the future the determination of many regional problems. We should, however, soon agree upon an orderly method of procedure through which the nations of the world, large and small, shall recognize that there is before them a road to a just, a lasting and a living peace under which they may look for procedure marked with attitudes of integrity, firmness, fairness, kindness and reverence even though agreement on the precise form of organization may be postponed until circumstances shall permit of more clear representation of the wishes of many of the peoples directly affected. In the meantime, separate international agreements can be reached on such urgent and separable issues as those of international civil aviation and international exchange which may be essential to the economic stability of the world regardless of its political organization.

Next come the questions as to who shall initiate this step and where shall these meetings be held. It may be well for the initiation of the meetings to come jointly from the nations who are bearing jointly the primary burdens of the war; namely, Britain, China, Russia, and the United States. But even then leadership must come from somewhere among these four in suggesting the initiation of these meetings. I believe that this responsibility falls upon the United States of America. America's long-standing friendly relations with most of the other nations of the world and her freedom from suspicion of imperialistic motives makes her leadership especially natural. The place of the meetings is not vital, but might well be within the United States of America. Ours is the only one of the lands of the larger United Nations which is free from the scourge of war. Our facilities, therefore, are now more readily available for activities of this kind than are those of our allies. Furthermore, of the 34 nations now constituting the United Nations 15 of them are in North, Central, and South America, including the Dominion of Canada. The remaining 7 of the 21 American republics might well take such an occasion as this to voice their formal adherence to the declaration by the United Nations. This would result in 22 of the 41

United Nations being located in the Western Hemisphere.

Within the United States we have the equally important problem of taking governmental action leading up to the step which I have suggested and leading up to the full and cordial support of the plan by the people of the United States. To this end it is vitally important that at once there be increased unity of action and understanding between the executive and legislative branches of our own Government on questions of post-war stability, both domestic and international.

The internal stability of the United States quite as much as its hemispheric and international stability depends upon the establishment and maintenance of the peace of the world. If America is to carry a $300,000,000,000 national debt without default, as she must, and if America is to develop the necessary earning power to carry that debt and to maintain reasonable prosperity at home, it is essential that there be peace and stability in the world. It is only when we have such peace and stability that we and our allies can dare to reduce substantially our post-war military and naval expenditures.

For the American people to see the vital importance to their own industrial and agricultural recovery and to their own security against another great war, it is essential that our national administration take the people genuinely into its confidence and demonstrate deep faith both in the people at large and in their elected representatives.

Not long ago the United States of America was a small nation seeking the same freedoms for herself that she now supports for all peace-loving nations. If the United States is to live up to her full responsibility for her own peace and security and live up to her ultimate ideals for the individual man, she should take the course indicated. She would soon call to her aid leading representatives of her own people. With their loyal cooperation she should then initiate meetings among representatives of the United Nations, to be held here in the interests of further consolidating their united efforts in winning the war completely in both hemispheres, and in furthering the establishment at the earliest practicable date of a general international organization based upon the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

This is the obligation of the people of America to their forefathers and to their children and their children's children. It is the natural obligation of America as a leader in the cause of freedom and progress of the individual man.

When General MacArthur was welcomed to Australia he replied: "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen."

That is the pledge that is being redeemed on the front line. That is the standard of service of the American citizen who is winning the war. It is for all of us to match that standard. Let each of us make the pledge: We are soldiers in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end we pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of our country and all the blood of our countrymen and all our efforts as American citizens to see to it that there shall be established and maintained a just, a lasting, and a living peace, so that when our soldiers and sailors return from the front they and their children and their children's children can enjoy here the America of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

Fertilizer for 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, food is becoming more important each day. The press release of the War Food Administration states that commercial fertilizer can increase food production by 20 to 25 percent in 1944. This, however, will depend upon other factors which must be taken into consideration. They are, first, the rainfall; and second, whether or not fertilizer is applied to food-producing crops.

The following table shows the amounts of commercial fertilizer used by States from 1930 to 1942, inclusive:

TABLE 759.—*Fertilizer: Consumption, by States, 1930–40* [1]

State and division	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942 [2]
	1,000 tons	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*
Maine	196	195	155	135	138	125	130	142	138	135	140	143	143
New Hampshire	12	10	11	12	14	16	16	14	12	10	12	12	17
Vermont	16	15	12	10	13	15	16	25	20	13	15	13	14
Massachusetts	67	65	62	55	58	63	64	74	69	64	65	66	71
Rhode Island	8	7	6	8	9	10	10	11	12	11	12	12	12
Connecticut	64	65	52	47	45	51	53	67	56	59	62	62	65
New York	325	285	235	250	270	285	315	351	333	319	369	379	362
New Jersey	156	151	138	128	138	149	161	184	172	176	184	184	211
Pennsylvania	334	287	242	232	268	295	318	370	359	357	359	376	358
North Atlantic	1,178	1,080	913	877	953	1,009	1,083	1,238	1,171	1,144	1,218	1,247	1,253
Ohio	327	249	169	209	264	307	337	363	325	346	362	394	428
Indiana	246	188	101	105	141	190	246	227	221	201	255	273	335
Illinois	41	32	16	17	19	24	31	36	36	41	50	61	73
Michigan	145	106	82	80	82	111	126	144	133	145	167	169	188
Wisconsin	51	46	27	16	20	28	32	43	46	43	64	73	96
Minnesota	16	18	9	7	9	11	10	12	14	13	19	21	25
Iowa	25	22	10	5	5	5	6	9	11	13	14	17	25
Missouri	60	49	26	32	52	59	94	82	70	68	88	87	71
Kansas	6	3	3	2	5	7	11	15	18	14	18	19	11
Other States	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	4	4	5
North Central	920	715	444	474	598	743	894	932	877	888	1,041	1,118	1,257
Delaware	43	36	33	28	36	38	39	44	36	36	36	34	38
Maryland	177	146	125	133	146	165	165	186	166	165	160	172	183
Virginia	449	379	280	308	336	379	386	440	405	418	393	390	421
West Virginia	45	40	35	40	48	55	55	40	34	38	40	43	48
North Carolina	1,242	1,003	696	889	877	1,000	1,040	1,238	1,106	1,215	1,076	1,151	1,242
South Carolina	749	599	446	582	572	614	626	771	661	679	685	729	699
Georgia	929	686	357	416	549	617	685	867	768	690	763	807	852
Florida	489	419	381	353	423	418	513	579	555	557	569	655	651
South Atlantic	4,123	3,308	2,353	2,749	2,987	3,286	3,509	4,165	3,731	3,798	3,722	3,990	4,134
Kentucky	114	105	55	58	63	73	89	117	110	120	123	122	146
Tennessee	164	119	63	77	92	96	117	141	128	130	147	141	174
Alabama	644	420	205	287	358	422	468	630	529	563	576	582	575
Mississippi	404	197	85	104	162	214	239	325	326	319	320	369	377
Arkansas	158	62	17	22	42	40	49	69	68	74	101	124	140
Louisiana	176	94	49	62	76	93	117	157	149	160	157	182	173
Oklahoma	7	7	3	2	5	7	6	7	8	8	7	13	9
Texas	145	65	34	34	56	62	66	89	84	95	118	143	134
South Central	1,812	1,069	511	646	854	1,007	1,151	1,535	1,402	1,469	1,549	1,676	1,728
Washington	24	20	15	16	19	21	23	28	27	24	30	35	42
Oregon	14	12	10	11	12	13	14	19	18	18	20	20	22
California	142	132	127	126	149	179	207	233	208	218	217	265	302
Other States	8	17	11	8	10	15	19	27	31	30	32	36	39
Western	188	181	163	161	190	228	263	307	284	290	299	356	405
United States	8,221	6,353	4,384	4,907	5,582	6,273	6,900	8,177	7,465	7,589	7,829	8,387	8,777

[1] Excludes concentrated superphosphate distributed by Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the T. V. A. rock phosphate sales in Illinois, and tonnages in the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.
[2] Preliminary.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from reports of the National Fertilizer Association; based on tag sales, records of State officials, or estimates.
Source: Farm capital and income statistics separate from Agricultural Statistics, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, the commercial fertilizer supply for 1944 is estimated at 10,000,000 tons, an increase of 2,000,000 tons over the 1943 applications. Part of this increase in commercial fertilizer is due to war and war industries. It will be noted that in 1942 four States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida—used about 40 percent of the fertilizer, though these four States produced less than 5 percent of the food crops and livestock products of the Nation. North Carolina alone used 14 percent of the national supply, yet produced less than 2 percent of the Nation's total food crops and livestock of that year. This fertilizer evidently was allocated or distributed on an historical basis, but this method, if continued, may not insure its use for the purpose of producing the greatest amount of food. For the maximum food production in 1944 this supply, especially the additional 2,000,000 tons of fertilizer, should be allocated where it can make the greatest contribution to food production. For example, sweetpotato or Irish potato production should be fostered by adequate supplies of fertilizer rather than to have these allocations applied to crops that make little or no contribution to the food program.

The controls over acreage on crop production for 1944 have been removed

except for those on tobacco. Any producer interested in making purchases of commercial fertilizer for his 1944 crops should make plans to secure his supply at his earliest convenience.

There are 500,000,000 acres of available cropland in the United States of which 340,000,000 are usually harvested. A total of 380,000,000, an increase of 40,000,000, are expected to be cropped in 1944. Every available acre should be put to work for the war food program.

According to Ely & Wehrwein, page 209, there is an annual loss of over 4,300,000 tons of nitrogen, a loss of 1,400,000 tons of phosphorus, 31,400,000 tons of potassium, a loss of 39,800,000 tons of calcium. By studying page 384 of U. S. D. A. Year Book, Soils and Men, one would conclude that the yearly loss of phosphorus is about twice as much as is being replaced by commercial fertilizer, crop residues, manures, and other sources. There is apparently, according to C. J. Chapman, nine times as much potash being lost annually as is being gained by the application of commercial potash.

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Reynolds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Washington, an American Nationalist," delivered by me last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, AN AMERICAN NATIONALIST

This is George Washington's birthday. This day we celebrate the birth of America's most illustrious son, America's Commander in Chief of the Continental Armies, America's real, unselfish hero who was interested a thousand times more in the welfare and future of his own country than in what the political future held for him.

Gen. George Washington, the first President of the United States, then a mere 13 colonies, was an America Firster. He warned against foreign alliances and entanglements—he advised against becoming involved in the intrigues of the Old World—the same Old World with which we are enmeshed and involved today. He was for America first, he was against those whose feet were upon American shores but whose hearts were in foreign lands. Washington was what some term "an isolationist"; Washington was truly for America first—he was an American Nationalist. He was "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

This country of ours is rich and fortunate in its origins and its glorious traditions.

First among them in point of time was the Mayflower Compact, which was the baptismal paper of our liberties, of our doctrines of self-government and of our national integrity.

For it is truly said that the separation of the Thirteen Colonies did not wait for the Battle of Bunker Hill.

That separation began in the seventeenth century when the Jamestown settlers and the Pilgrim Fathers departed from England to establish a new commonwealth in a new continent; and our War for Independence was but the culmination of prior events.

The Mayflower Compact in 1620 thus marked the beginning of that which is truly the basic principle of American nationalism and which is now called—somewhat scornfully by those little minds who do not understand America or whose hearts and interests and loyalties dwell elsewhere—American isolationism.

Companion piece to the Mayflower Compact was the Declaration of Independence, inscribed 156 years later. Mark you what it named itself: It was not a "discovery" of independence, nor yet a "promise" of independence—it was a "declaration" of independence.

The patriots who took up arms at its call were not slaves. They were already freemen.

They were not Europeans, neither were they internationalists. They were Americans.

They intended to remain free and to remain American, and they notified Europe, in their momentous Declaration, that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Then came the constitutions of the free States, and crowning them, the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution is not an internationalist document. It is wholly nationalist. In its design and in its abiding effect the Constitution is isolationist.

The document which belongs next in the venerable list, and one which should be read reverently by every American on this date, was issued by the first and greatest of our Presidents, whose birthday we gratefully observe.

It is called his Farewell Address to the people of the United States.

Since it first appeared in a Philadelphia newspaper, it has been reprinted many times.

For this occasion I refer to a reprint of it which was made only a few years ago, under the auspices of the Federal Government, by the George Washington Bicentennial Commission.

In this edition, the document bears a brief official introduction which says:

"Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States was issued September 17, 1796, primarily for the purpose of eliminating himself as a Presidential candidate for a third term.

"The address may be analyzed as consisting of two parts:

"The first, the definite declination to serve a third term as President.

"The second, and more important part of the address, presented Washington's thoughts upon the Government of the United States as a result of his experience as a last legacy or advice."

It is always well for us to be reminded on this day—as in the high praise of a Federal commission which you have just heard—of George Washington's patriotic refusal to serve more than two terms in the Presidency.

Washington ardently wanted the Republic, which he fought for and toiled to found, to endure.

He knew that excessive tenure in the Executive Office would, by creating bureaucratic patterns and otherwise, be detrimental and demoralizing.

So he put his country's welfare above his own ambitions.

Washington also warned, in his farewell address, against perverting the Constitution.

He wanted the Constitution, which he especially fathered, to endure so that his countrymen's civil liberties might also be enduring.

"Let there be," he said, "no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

In our foreign affairs Washington was our first and wisest adviser. Note these, his words:

"A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils.

"Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification: It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from which equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity—gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

"As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot."

Washington wanted us to have friendly international relations. But, he said:

"The great rule for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as possible."

In time of attack from abroad he wanted us not to be friendless nor unfriendly toward natural allies. So he said:

"Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

But Washington did not want us to reenter the traps and intrigues of Old World politics from which we had delivered ourselves. As to this, he said:

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation.

"Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. * * *

"Our detached and distant situation invites us to pursue a different course. * * *

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation?

"Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground?

"Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

Washington, therefore, would certainly have opposed our merging any part of our sovereignty in any scheme of international or supergovernment. As to this he plainly said:

" 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world."

When you read George Washington's words, and when you survey George Washington's public acts, you know the kind of man Wash-

ington was. Like the men of Jamestown and of Plymouth Rock, and like the other founding fathers of his own time, Washington was an isolationist.

Washington, as all of his fellow citizens, was always for America first.

So let us pursue Washington's immortal advice and let us strive in these things to follow his sublime example.

Let us realize that if there had been no isolationism in the beginning, this Republic would never have existed.

Let us understand that should our isolation cease America will no longer be free.

What we need today are candidates for public office who have the courage of their convictions—those who are not afraid to speak out in the interest of America. We should demand of all candidates for national offices—be they Democrats or Republicans—a clear-cut statement of their positions upon national and international matters. America today needs more than ever before men who have at heart the interest of this country—men who will strive with all their might to firstly win the wars in which we are involved all over the world, and who will deliver us from this mess of internationalism into which the interventionists—world do-gooders and save-the-world theorists—have involved us to the brink of bankruptcy, revolution, and destruction.

What we need, therefore, is a President who is a genuine American nationalist who is for America first.

What do you think about it? I should like to know. America today needs your advice, your help, your active, patriotic cooperation. Write me. Feel free to say anything which you believe to be for the good of our country. Just address me: Senator BOB REYNOLDS, Washington, D. C., and I shall be pleased to send you a copy of this address.

Thanks very much for listening in.

Veto of the Revenue Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have three editorials placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on the veto of the tax bill, one from the Washington Evening Star, one from the New York Times, and one from the New York Herald-Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 23, 1944]

AN UNWISE VETO

It may be said without fear of contradiction that the tax bill which the President has vetoed was not an adequate measure under existing wartime conditions. It fell short of raising the revenue which the people of this country could reasonably afford to contribute. But the President does not rest his case on that fact. He advances other reasons which are open to question and states them in language which will create resentment rather than a desire to enact a satisfactory measure. From that point of view, it seems clear that the veto was unwise.

The bill was vetoed over the advice of administration leaders in Congress. At no time during his consideration of the measure did the President consult with either Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, or Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee. In other words, the President condemned the bill without granting a hearing to its principal authors, both members of his own party.

The President complains that the bill "purports" to increase revenue by a "little over $2,000,000,000." Actually that total would be about $2,300,000,000—most of which will be lost if the veto is sustained. The original administration proposals called for $10,500,000,000. But approximately $8,000,000,000 of that would have been added to the burden of those already paying income taxes. The President denounces Congress for retaining the Victory tax for fear of dropping from the tax rolls those taxpayers who are at the bottom of the scales, while at the same time "granting extensive concessions" to special-interest groups. He neglects to say that the abandonment of the Victory tax, which was included in the administration proposals, would have relieved some 9,000,000 taxpayers of any obligation. Nor does he say that the administration proposals, when they came before the Ways and Means Committee, were rejected by a unanimous vote of that group.

Mr. Roosevelt says that the bill grants relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least $150,000,000. Then he goes on to enumerate some of the "special privileges" which this would confer—three or four minor instances which do not involve any great amounts of revenue and against which the administration certainly made no conspicuous fight when the bill was going through Congress. Perhaps these things will cost the Treasury $150,000,000. But what about the $600,000,000 which will be lost as a result of the veto through retention of the earned-income credit? And while on the subject of special privileges, what about the $500,000,000 which the Treasury will lose through defeat of the increased excess-profits tax? The President's veto, not Congress, is responsible for this.

The President argues, in effect, that the Treasury will not lose the full amount of the new taxes since it will gain about $1,100,000,000 through the veto's nullification of the social-security tax freeze. But this is not an entirely valid contention. In the first place, the proceeds from the social-security tax are not an offset to normal revenue. If the Treasury gets $1,100,000,000 from higher social-security taxes it must deposit Government bonds in the social-security trust account before it can use the money. In effect, this will be borrowed money; not tax revenue in any realistic sense of the term. Secondly, employers deduct social-security taxes before computing their income taxes. Many of these employers today are subject to the highest excess profits tax. The result is that the Government will lose in income taxes much of what it collects in social-security taxes. But this is a fact which the President ignores.

Other things might be mentioned, such as the surprising attempt to saddle Congress with full blame for the complexity of tax forms, when the Treasury certainly shares this responsibility. What is the President's stand on the bill's provision requiring labor unions to file tax reports? This was strongly opposed in Congress by labor spokesmen and the President's veto kills it. But his message is silent on the point. Is he for it or against it? Although firmly opposing a general sales tax, Mr. Roosevelt tells Congress he will approve higher excise taxes, which are nothing more than selective sales taxes. Yet these would produce relatively little revenue and he proposes nothing new to raise the revenue which he says should be secured.

Cutting through all of these questions, however, is another issue which seems of more fundamental importance. Under the Constitution, it is the exclusive function of Congress to originate tax legislation. But Mr. Roosevelt now says, in effect, that this must be done on specifications which he lays down, and he says this in a manner that derides and ridicules a Congress of which his own party is supposed to be in command. With an election in the offing, what sort of a relationship between the President and Congress may this attitude be expected to produce in the future?

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1944]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

It is the duty of Congress, we believe, to override the President's veto of the new tax bill. Admittedly this measure is inadequate in the light of the needs of the present situation. It does not go far enough, and particularly it does not spread wide enough in its search for the additional revenues that are needed for the purpose both of financing the war and of siphoning off excess mass purchasing power which now threatens inflation. Nevertheless, the bill does promise, by the President's own estimate, to bring something like a billion dollars annually into the Treasury, and congressional estimates of its yield are considerably higher. The President's veto message does not give good enough reasons to warrant the sacrifice of this additional revenue.

Mr. Roosevelt reminds Congress that the administration asked for a tax bill that would yield ten and a half billion dollars. On the basis of an estimated deficit of $60,000,000,000 in the next Federal Budget, the administration was clearly right, as against Congress, in aiming at greater tax revenues. But it was wrong in the kind of taxes it advocated. It attempted to exploit still further the individual income and corporation taxes and refused to turn for supplementary revenues to the field of general consumption taxes. Secretary Morgenthau rightly declared: "We know where the bulk of the new money lies and where, therefore, lies the greatest danger of inflationary pressure. Today, four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is going to people earning less than $5,000 a year." But the actual program he put forward bore little relation to this statement. The administration favored types of taxes which would have endangered the Nation's productive processes themselves. If a sounder tax program had been presented to Congress, even with the larger revenues involved, it would doubtless have been received more hospitably. But no such program was forthcoming, and both Congress and the administration, each yielding to the pressure of political considerations, must bear responsibility for a situation which, already bad enough, will become still worse if the present veto is sustained.

At one point in his message the President takes note of the present widespread dissatisfaction over the complexity of Federal tax forms. He rightly says that this complexity is not the fault of the Treasury. If the forms are complex, it is because the tax laws themselves are complex, and this is the fault of Congress.

Fundamentally this is true. Yet the administration's own attitude has been one barrier to that simplification of the tax laws which the President again urges in his present message. For the argument made in Congress against absorption of the Victory tax in the regular income tax, which would be the logical way of beginning the work of simplification, is that repeal of the Victory tax would drop millions of taxpayers from the rolls just when there are the strongest

possible reasons why they should be kept there. It would be a simple matter, of course, to prevent these present taxpayers from escaping taxes altogether by imposing, even at a low rate, a general sales tax. But against the imposition of such a tax the administration has been adamant.

[From New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1944]

THE TAX BILL VETO

This newspaper has frequently expressed regret that Congress did not set its sights higher with respect to tax legislation than the $2,300,000,000 provided in the bill which it sent to the White House a fortnight ago. But to make such a criticism, along with a miscellany of other feeble objections, the basis for a veto, as the President has now done, is quite another matter. Mr. Roosevelt's action of yesterday, it seems to us, was one of the most arbitrary and capricious of his entire Presidential career.

Whether or not one believes that the Congressional bill is the best that could be obtained, it represents many weeks of earnest work and serious debate on the part of those charged with the formulation of revenue policy. Although the President likes to contrast the $2,300,000,000 provided by this bill with the $10,500,000,000 he asked for, the fact is that he has at no time offered any genuinely constructive tax leadership. He not only did not tell Congress what kind of taxes he wanted, but although all of the points to which he objects in his veto measure were a matter of public discussion many weeks ago he never hinted until the bill reached the White House that he might make these objections the basis of a veto. To make matters worse, while he now suggests enactment of the excise provisions of the bill by themselves, through his own action in holding the measure up for more than 2 weeks before sending it back to Congress, he has already made it impossible for these taxes to become effective before April 1, a circumstance which alone will cost the Treasury about $85,000,000.

So specious are most of the reasons advanced by the President for sending the revenue bill back that it is difficult to avoid the conviction that they are not reasons at all, but pretexts for reasons which must be sought in the unwritten word. He complains, for example, about the provision under which the social security taxes are "frozen" at their present levels, instead of being permitted to rise automatically as originally scheduled. There is much that could be said on this highly controversial point, but perhaps it is sufficient to quote Senator VANDENBERG'S observation of yesterday that in this instance the President "is not vetoing Congress, but his own Secretary of the Treasury, who agreed that no increase in pay-roll taxes would be justified in 1944."

Mr. Roosevelt objects to the provision of the bill which would terminate renegotiation of war contracts at the end of the present year. It would be hard to imagine an objection—to use a favorite Presidential adjective—more picayune than this one. Certainly, he knows that there are time limits placed on all emergency legislation, and that those limits can be, and almost invariably are, extended if conditions later warrant such action.

The President also urges that something be done about simplifying the individual income tax. With March 15 approaching, this suggestion is well-timed politically, yet here again the President seems to be less than forthright. He should know, if he doesn't, that the House Ways and Means Committee has already started work on such simplification. His little excursion into the causes of the present confused state of the income tax is equally misleading. He implies that they stem from the adoption of the Ruml plan, on the one hand, and the Victory tax, on the other—with respect to both of which he disclaims administration responsibility. The fact is that there was nothing complicated about the Ruml plan itself; that the complications were the result of the administration's successful effort to add to the Ruml plan its own rider in the form of the carry-over of a quarter of a year's taxes. As for the Victory tax, he seems to be unaware of the circumstance that, bad as this tax is, it has at least the historical justification of having been the Senate's alternative to the even more complicated administration spending tax.

We agree with Senator GEORGE, who declared yesterday that never in his experience had he seen "a major piece of legislation vetoed on such inadequate and unconvincing grounds." If it has any sense of its own dignity and self-respect Congress will administer to the Executive the rebuke which this captious message deserves by passing the measure over his veto by an impressive majority.

Biddle, Jones, Eastman, and McNutt Crack Knuckles of the "Drys"; Give Views on Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the "drys," with their usual misguided enthusiasm, asked the opinions of various department heads as to the Bryson prohibition bill. They sought advice of Attorney General Francis Biddle, Food Administrator Marvin Jones, Chairman of Office of Defense Transportation Joseph B. Eastman, and Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of War Manpower Commission. They got it and are their faces red. Biddle, McNutt, Jones, and Eastman are no Simple Simons. They practically told the "drys" that they are as "blind as buzzards."

In letters to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee they put the "drys" in their place.

Attorney General Biddle said, February 17, 1944:

This is in response to your request for my views concerning a bill (H. R. 2082) entitled "A bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war."

The bill would prohibit for the period of the war the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent by volume of alcohol, or the importation of such beverages into the United States. An exception is made for industrial and medical uses, but not for sacramental purposes.

The practical experience gained in connection with attempts to enforce the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, irresistibly leads to the conclusion that the proposed legislation is unenforceable and, therefore, undesirable. It is a well-known fact that prohibition was found to be largely unenforceable in spite of numerous arrests, prosecutions, and convictions. In addition in many sections of the country major crimes, many of them on an organized scale, followed in the wake of prohibition.

I do not believe that abstinence should be compelled by law. From a practical standpoint, the real question is not whether the objective sought to be attained is beneficent, but whether it can actually be achieved by legislative enactment. The past experience to which I have referred leads to a negative answer.

In its present form the bill seems to contain a number of defects and omissions which would have to be cured and supplied in the interest of enforcement, if the legislation is to receive favorable consideration. I withhold any suggestions of this kind, however, for the time being, in view of the fact that I do not recommend the enactment of any legislation whatsoever on this subject.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget informs me that this legislation is not in accord with the program of the President.

Food Administrator Jones, February 5, 1944, said in part:

The bill indicates that its purposes are "to reduce absenteeism in war industry and speed production and to save rubber and shipping space for essential industry, and for the purpose of increasing efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, planes, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy." Since other Government agencies have a more direct responsibility for production of war materials, other than food, than does the War Food Administration, it is assumed that the committee desires our comments regarding whether enactment of the bill would increase efficiency in the production of food.

Although it may be possible, in concentrated industrial establishments, to obtain data regarding the effects of alcoholic-beverage consumption upon war production, such information is not available with regard to agriculture because farming is generally carried out individually or in such small groups that it is not practicable to ascertain definitely the net effect of alcoholic-beverage consumption upon the production of food.

The question of its effect on food production would depend somewhat on whether there is a practical method of enforcement and the degree to which such difficulties could be met.

The principal advantage would be in the saving of the materials that are used in making such beverages, rather than in food production directly. This, too, would depend to some extent on the degree of enforcement. The main question is whether the advantages in this saving would be offset by the difficulties, as shown by our experience, that are connected with efforts at enforcement. This involves a question of broad policy which is not within our province to determine.

Chairman Eastman, February 9, 1944, said in part:

An adequate appraisal of the bill involves many considerations of a character beyond my qualifications and which do not fall within the jurisdiction of the agency which I head. The possible impacts of the bill upon the civilian economy, the social and moral implications and consequences, and the degree to which alcoholic beverages, or any type thereof, are essential to wartime needs, are matters which I shall not undertake to discuss. What I shall have to say will be confined to the possible effect, if any, of enactment of the bill upon the existing transportation situation.

It is well known that all of our domestic transportation facilities are now heavily burdened. The superimposition of the movement of the tremendous volume of war mate-

rials and military personnel upon that of civilian materials, supplies, and passengers has taxed and will continue to tax our available equipment almost, if not entirely, to its total capacity. Consequently, any substantial reduction in transportation demand, through restrictions upon production or otherwise, is welcome to those who have transportation responsibilities. Whether prohibition would result in a traffic reduction of real consequence is a question which it is somewhat difficult to answer. However, there are figures available to us, as a result of waybill studies made by the division of traffic movement of this office, from which we can arrive at reasonably satisfactory estimates in respect of the quantity of alcoholic beverage shipments transported by rail carriers. These studies show that, in 1942, carload shipments of beverages having an alcoholic content of 1 percent or more constituted less than one-half of 1 percent of the total carloadings in the United States. The approximate figure for that year is 0.480 percent of the total. For the first 6 months of 1943, the estimated figure is slightly higher but is still in the vicinity of one-half of 1 percent of total car loadings. Because of existing restrictions upon production of various types of alcoholic beverages, it is my opinion that the above figures are reasonably constant and that the current proportion is about the same as that above stated.

No adequate figures are available as to the amount of alcoholic beverages transported by motor vehicle, but in my judgment it is quite small when compared either to rail shipments or to total shipments of motor carriers.

From these estimates, it would appear that the volume of alcoholic beverage shipments is comparatively insignificant. Elimination of all such shipments, or their retention, would not make or break our wartime transportation situation. It must be borne in mind, in this connection, that the prohibitions of the bill might lead to a greater production and distribution of beverages of a character not prohibited.

Chairman McNutt, February 19, 1944, said in part:

Reference is made to your letter of January 18, in which you request an expression of my views with respect to H. R. 2082, a bill "to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war. This measure proposes to achieve these ends by making unlawful "the manufacture, sale, or transportation * * * of alcoholic beverages containing more than one-half of 1 percent by volume of alcohol."

Absenteeism and waste of manpower are caused by diverse and complex factors, e. g., plant conditions, wages, prices, community and transportation facilities, personnel practices, etc. The War Manpower Commission has approached these problems on a plant-by-plant basis, and in cooperation with other agencies of government has sought to provide maximum assistance in correcting their causes. Legislation which prohibits the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic beverages will not in my judgment substantially affect the most basic and widespread causes of absenteeism and wasted manpower. If the primary purpose of the proposed bill is to reduce absenteeism and conserve manpower, I would recommend that there be substituted for this bill a measure which would encompass the diverse causes of our manpower problems in this field.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Discriminating Against Our Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Discriminating Against Our Neighbors," by Sumner Welles, published in the Chicago Sun of February 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATING AGAINST OUR NEIGHBORS

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

Recently I received a letter from a correspondent in Texas telling me of the efforts which he and other citizens of his community were making to put an end to the offensive discriminations being practiced in a few localities in the United States, and particularly in certain communities of the Southwest, against Mexican nationals.

Like most of us in the United States, my correspondent is profoundly interested in the healthy growth of inter-American relations, and he is convinced that unless this obstacle is rapidly eliminated, what he terms "a sane and firm friendship with the people beyond the Rio Grande" cannot be expected to grow.

The problems involve the unfriendly and unfair treatment accorded in some scattered regions of this country to Mexicans who have come to reside in our Western and Southwestern States. These Mexican citizens have for many years been coming to this country to seek profitable employment in order to better themselves and the members of their family. They have, however, at the same time contributed greatly to the development of the resources of our Southwest, and during the last 2 years the cooperation shown by the Mexican Government in facilitating the entry into this country of Mexican laborers has been of the utmost assistance to our national war effort by relieving labor shortages on the farms and in many branches of our industrial enterprise. But the Mexican Government has insisted that Mexican labor in the United States be given nondiscriminatory treatment, and has very properly made it plain that Mexicans will not be aided in going to those States where they are not given fair consideration.

Our own Federal Government, anxious as it has been to remove these discriminations, which have already resulted in deep resentment in Mexico, has been powerless to do more than bring flagrant cases to the attention of State and municipal authorities, because of the fact that the discriminations practiced can, under our form of government, only be corrected by State or municipal law and regulation and by the force of public opinion.

Some officials here have thought it expedient to refrain from mentioning these questions publicly, in the belief that any open discussion of them would result in increased ill feeling.

I believe, however, with my Texas correspondent, that no lasting correction of this evil can be brought about until public opinion in the United States becomes aroused to the dangers inherent in its continuation. If the press and the responsible citizens in those States where these discriminations are practiced take a hand in the matter, because of their own realization of the basic harm which the prolongation of this unfair treatment will work to the relations between the peoples of the United States and Mexico, a satisfactory solution of these problems will soon be found.

During the last 10 years there have been formed in the United States many organizations of private citizens created to bring about better relations between the peoples of the American republics. There is no more useful service which they could render at the present moment than the enlightenment of American public opinion as to the nature of the unfair practices of which our Mexican neighbors so justly complain, for the purpose of bringing about the removal of these poisonous discriminations.

For it is certain that the overwhelming majority of people in this country have no conception of the type of discrimination being practiced against Mexican residents in a few localities.

They do not realize that Mexican children are not permitted in some places to attend the public schools. They do not realize that Mexicans are not permitted in certain regions to travel in cars set aside for white persons. They do not know that in some communities they are not permitted entrance into hotels or moving-picture theaters. They would be amazed to learn that only recently a high official of the Mexican Government was refused service in the restaurant of a leading hotel in one of our Southwestern States.

They would be shocked to hear that the proprietors of a public recreation center announced that they would not permit the entrance of Mexicans or persons of Mexican origin, regardless of their state of culture, either social or economic. They are probably not aware that the slum conditions in which many thousands of Mexicans are forced to live in some of our Southwestern States are solely due to the unwillingness of the authorities and residents of those communities to afford them the same opportunity for betterment afforded their neighbors of United States origin. They do not know of the exploitation to which some Mexican laborers have been subjected.

There has been no more constructive chapter in the history of the foreign policy of this country during the last 11 years than the establishment during that time upon a firm and understanding basis of official relations between Mexico and the United States. Many old and long-rankling controversies have been settled to the satisfaction of both countries. Other problems, such as the adjustment of the distribution of the waters of the Colorado and Rio Grande Rivers, are fortunately in a process of equitable solution.

The visit of President Roosevelt to Mexico last April and the visit paid by President Avila Camacho to this country immediately thereafter signalized the commencement of a new epoch in Mexican-American understanding.

But no such relationship as that which the vast majority of people in both countries desire to see built up can long continue if unfair, humiliating, and wounding discriminations are practiced by communities in either nation against nationals of the neighboring country.

Discriminations of this character inevitably cut deep. They create lasting resentments, which no eloquent speeches by government officials nor governmental policies, however wise, can ever hope to remove. They exist only in a few places. They are regarded as detestable, and as wholly un-American, by every thinking United States citizen. But so long as they continue anywhere in the United States they are bound to undermine

the foundations which the two Governments have laid for those cooperative ties which are so greatly to the interest of both countries, and they will, in the wider sense, impair that inter-American relationship which is today more necessary than ever before. Unless these discriminations are obliterated, and obliterated soon, the term "good-neighbor policy" will lose much of its real meaning.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the gentleman from Texas, Representative EUGENE WORLEY, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on February 18, 1944, entitled "The Soldier Vote." In view of our present parliamentary difficulties, I think this address by the chairman of the House Elections Committee is important. It follows:

Seven men aboard a destroyer in the Southwest Pacific wrote the House Elections Committee a letter the other day. Parts of that letter read as follows: "We have been hearing both pro and con concerning the privilege of the armed forces to vote, and we find that the bill which will give us the privilege of voting has so far failed in passage. Let us remind you that the Thirteen Original Colonies fought for their independence over 'Taxation without representation.' We cannot understand how you can call our country a democracy, when you take the things away that the armed forces are fighting for. We are still citizens of the United States of America and demand our rights as such."

Seven men on a destroyer wrote that letter. And my desk is piled high with letters written in similar vein asking that Congress help them have a voice in the forthcoming elections. They know that the November elections will be the most important to be held within their lifetimes. They feel they have a stake in the future—if they come back.

Why do these fellows ask for the right to vote? If they were at home most of them would vote. What has happened to deprive them of their vote? Did they lose all the rights and privileges of a citizen of this country when they donned the uniform of our citizen Army? Yes; they lost most of them, theoretically they still retain their political rights but actually the average member of the armed forces now has little or no chance to make his voice heard in the conduct of things back here at home.

Surely no one intended this undemocratic dilemma whereby millions of this Nation's finest citizens have been disfranchised. Briefly these are the reasons.

In times of peace the States have no difficulty in holding elections. Most States have an absentee voting system designed to care for a handful of civilians who might be out of the State on election day. The State systems operated well when Main Street was sleepy and peaceful and quiet. But today millions of men and women are absent from their home States—and they don't expect to be home when election time rolls around this year. We have taken the soldier away from his home ballot box. He won't have time to bog down in the mass of red tape pressed on those who would vote an absentee ticket. The old peacetime laws just won't meet war-time conditions.

Let's take a look at what a soldier must do if he wants to follow the average State voting procedure. First, he writes to the officials of his State for a ballot. Second, instead of a ballot he receives an official application blank for a ballot. Third, he must fill out innumerable spaces and return the application to his State. Fourth, the State officials return the ballot to him. And fifth, if the soldier has not given up in the meantime, he marks the ballot, searches until he finds a notary public to acknowledge his signature, pays registered mail both ways, and returns the ballot to his State, and hopes it will arrive in time to be counted.

Please remember that the average State procedure permits absentee voting only 30 days before the election is held. Now each of these 5 steps I've listed is time-consuming, and burdens mail facilities which are already sagging. We must bear in mind, that at least 10,000 soldiers are moved from one spot to another every single day—therefore this particular soldier might be transferred at any time from his original point of application, and, therefore, the ballot might never reach him.

In describing this procedure, I have had in mind the soldiers stationed within the continental United States. I would like for the opponents of the uniform ballot plan to please say how in the world a soldier in the Solomons, in Italy, in Australia, and 56 other spots on the globe could ever hope to vote under these amazingly involved procedures.

But if the soldier does not meet present absentee voting procedures of his home State—if he does not have time to look up a notary public and if he does not have the money to pay for two-way registered mail on the ballot and a thousand and one other things, then he just won't vote. As an illustration, one State allows but 7 days in which an absentee vote can be cast. Two States have constitutional provisions against absentee voting. So under present laws the average soldier is denied a vote just as effectively and just as positively as though the States and Congress had passed a law absolutely prohibiting his participation in the elections.

What is the answer? Some say Congress should take no action whatever. They say, leave it to the States. As a Texan myself, and a strong believer in States' rights, I say the States don't have the machinery to meet all the problems involved. It is not all their fault. I wish they could overcome the tremendous emergencies that the war has brought about.

But we have been in war for 2 years. Operating under the present technical and complicated voting procedures set up by Congress and the 48 States, only 28,000 out of nearly 7,000,000 members of the armed forces voted in the 1942 general election. This means 1 out of every 250. The Army and Navy have stated officially they could not carry out the present State voting laws to any appreciable degree, especially to the men overseas.

Now what is the best answer—what legal and constitutional steps can be taken to eliminate these wartime obstacles which have thus far disfranchised the soldier? The States should change their laws and make it easier for the soldier to vote. That is the States' responsibility. The Congress should provide every means to expedite transportation of the State ballot to soldiers everywhere. My bill does this. It provides free air-mail postage and the closest possible cooperation with the States. However, where the States fail to amend their laws and where war conditions prevent the soldiers from voting a State ticket then my plan provides for a uniform Federal ballot. This is the only effective solution months of work have produced. The Army and Navy have said this plan will work. The uniform ballot is printed by the Federal Government, distributed and collected by the Army and Navy. Upon the ballot the soldier may vote for President, Vice President, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress. This is the best kind of a ballot Congress can provide. The ballot is placed in the hands of the soldier wherever he might be, which at once relieves him of the burdensome red tape and time-consuming delays which prevail today.

The Army and Navy see that it is returned to the election officials of the soldier's home State in plenty of time to be counted. Thus, it is seen that the Federal Government is simply cooperating with the States in getting ballots to the men in the field and getting the ballots back to the States.

The Federal Government acts only as an agent. It provides the means; the States do the canvassing and counting. The ballots are returned to the man's own neighbors right in his home voting precinct. And his friends and neighbors are the ones who will say whether, in accordance with State law, his vote will be counted. In this way the soldier's voice in his Government is protected, yet the sovereignty of the States is not invaded.

Some say the soldier is more interested in voting for local officials back home than he is in voting for national officers. I'd much prefer he have the opportunity to vote for all officials, but while that might be true in peacetime let's take a look at what the Federal officials elected this coming November will do. They will write the peace. Will that peace be the kind to prevent another war 20 years from now? Will it keep faith with the soldiers of today? Will it keep faith with the sons and daughters whom many of our soldiers have never seen and sons and daughters whom so many of them may never live to see again? But that is only the beginning. The Federal officials elected this time will also determine what kind of treatment the wounded veteran will receive when he comes home from the wars. They will determine in large measure whether we will have bread lines or prosperity. They will say whether the veteran will return to a good job or to a tin cup on the street corner. Can any of us forget the bread lines and soup kitchens after the last war? Maybe the average soldier is not interested in voting for or against men who will determine these policies. I say maybe they're not, but my mail from soldiers all over the world states positively that they are interested. And let's don't kid ourselves that the soldiers don't know what's going on back here at home. They want to pass judgment on the President, the Senators, and Congressmen who have been charged with the duty of sending them guns, bullets, ships, and tanks and planes and medicine and the other things to keep them alive. They want to pass judgment on those responsible for strikes and stoppages and disputes which kept them from having weapons upon which their very lives depended. They want to say whether they approve of some of the politics that is being played back here at home. And I ask you—as one American to another—who in all this world is better qualified or has a better right to pass judgment on these questions?

Our fighting men have forgotten politics—they are united shoulder to shoulder but a a lot of otherwise well-intentioned men back here at home are still playing politics. We have taken the soldier away from the ballot box and it is our solemn duty to take the ballot box to him. For what candidate he might express his preference should not be anyone's concern. The soldier is fighting for a cause much greater and much bigger than anyone of us—much bigger than the political success or failure of any individual or any party—his cause is the bigness that comes with freedom—and the freedom that comes

with democracy and the right to a voice in that democracy.

Yes; seven men on a destroyer—and several million more on bloody battlefields all over the world—are wondering whether their voices will be heard or whether they will be choked back into their throats by the failure of their elected officials to rise to the level upon which our soldiers live and stand ready to die.

Social Security Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the President's message of February 22, accompanying his veto of H. R. 3687, includes this statement:

As a tax bill, therefore, I am compelled to decide that it is wholly ineffective toward that end. More specifically, the bill purports to provide $2,100,000 in new revenues. At the same time it cancels out automatic increases in the social security tax which would yield $1,100,000.

The President further states:

These automatic increases are required to meet the claims that are being built up against the social security fund. Such a postponement does not seem wise.

The Social Security Act is embodied in chapter 7 of title 42 of the United States Code. Among other provisions of the Social Security Act, subchapter 2 provides for Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits and subchapter 9 provides for unemployment compensation. Section 1001 of subchapter 8 of chapter 7 is titled "Income Tax on Employees" and provides:

In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of wages (as defined in sec. 1011 of this title) received by him after December 31, 1936, with respect to employment (as defined in sec. 1011 of this title) after such date:

(3) With respect to employment during the calendar years of 1943, 1944, and 1945 the rate shall be 2 percent.

Section 1004 of subchapter 8 of chapter 7 is entitled "Excise Tax on Employers." This section provides:

In addition to other taxes, every employer shall pay an excise tax with respect to having individuals in his employ equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in sec. 1011 of this title) paid by him after December 31, 1936, with respect to the employment (as defined in sec. 1011 of this title) after such date.

Subsection (3) provides:

With respect to employment during the calendar years 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent.

Thus it will be observed that the existing rates of income tax on employees and excise tax on employers will automatically be raised from the presently frozen rate of 1 percent to 2 percent. This employee's income tax applies to the earnings of every worker in the country regardless of the amount earned. It is deducted from his pay. He cannot pass it on to someone else. The employer's exise tax is no doubt added in the costs of consumer's goods. It will be observed that such income taxes on employees and excise taxes on employers are collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and are paid into the Treasury of the United States as internal revenue collection.

Section 401 of subchapter 2 of chapter 7 of title 42 of the United States Code provides for the creation of a Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. This law appropriates out of any moneys of the Treasury each year 100 percent of the taxes—including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes—received by the Treasury. The law provides that the managing trustee of the trust fund may invest only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. These obligations may be original issues of the Treasury at par or may be acquired by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market prices. Thus it will be seen that as to the income taxes levied upon employees and excise taxes levied upon employers, while these moneys are paid into the general funds of the Treasury, they are immediately appropriated to the trust fund. In actual practice, I believe it can be said that the money is spent each day as it comes into the Treasury and the trust fund is reimbursed by the delivery to it of direct Government obligations.

How it can be said, therefore, that such taxes would swell the tax revenues of the Treasury, is beyond comprehension? It is true that the Government has the daily use of this money and does actually spend it for the ordinary expenses of government each day, but under the continuing appropriation heretofore referred to, every dollar that is collected by the Treasury is already earmarked for the benefit of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund. The Treasury uses the money and then substitutes bonds in the trust fund. These bonds must ultimately be paid with interest. The principal and interest can be raised only through taxes. Thus many of those who have been taxed to create the fund will have to be taxed again in order to collect under the law.

The other trust fund handles the tax collected to provide for the payment under State laws of unemployment compensation. This law, found in subchapter 9 of chapter 7 of title 42 is entitled "Tax on Employers of Eight or More" and provides a flat rate of 3 percent after December 31, 1937. This is a tax paid entirely by the employer. Subsection 1104 of subchapter 9 provides for the establishment of an unemployment trust fund. These funds are received by the Secretary of the Treasury and in effect what happens is that they are treated in the daily treasury statement as daily receipts in the general fund of the Treasury. They are disbursed in the same manner that other general funds are disbursed. The Secretary of the Treasury, however, must keep an account of the money received by virtue of the 3 percent tax and reimburse the trust fund by placing therein Government interest-bearing obligations equal to the amount used by the Government out of the general funds of the Treasury.

In view of these two provisions requiring the Treasury to account for the expenditure of taxes collected for both unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors' insurance, it is exceedingly strange that the President of the United States would attempt to fool the people of this country into the belief that such taxes are to be considered as revenue of the Government. Every dollar of these taxes will have to be repaid at some time. General taxes will ultimately have to be levied to provide for the payment of the interest on the bonds held by the trustees of these two funds as well as to provide the funds with which to make payments to the beneficiaries of these trust funds ar provided by law. I cannot conceive by what stretch of the imagination the President speaks of social security taxes as general revenue. To me, this is just another illustration of the loose thinking of the President and his advisers when dealing with the subject of Federal finance. He seems to be concerned about the loss of revenue from increased social security taxes, although he must know that they are not in any real sense revenue for general Treasury purposes. He does not seem to be concerned with the fact that money taken from the social security taxes and spent must be replaced by issuing more and more Government bonds. These mounting issues of bonds do not seem to concern him. This is perhaps due to his announced philosophy that we need not worry about it because we owe it to ourselves.

I cannot allow this portion of his veto message to go unchallenged.

Political Reform in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Are We Going To Reject the Bill?" from the February 18, 1944, issue of El Mundo, a newspaper published at San Juan, P. R.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE GOING TO REJECT THE BILL?

(Translation made in the office of Senator CHAVEZ of editorial which appeared in the Daily El Mundo of February 18, 1944, published at San Juan, P. R.)

Puerto Rico should afford a welcome which its importance merits to the news that the

Senate of the United States approved by unanimous vote the bill for the political reform of the island as drafted by the Chavez subcommittee.[1]

The single fact that the approval was unanimous at a time when the situation of the island was focused in so many different ways in the Congress credits the Chavez subcommittee with an achievement that cannot be minimized.

The island is fully aware of the manner in which the Standing Delegation of the Legislative Assembly on the Political Status[2] expressed itself concerning the bill. The delegation, as we reported in due time, has reaffirmed its decision to support the bill, provided the congressional veto is eliminated and also the provisions which deny the Governor the power to appoint the justices of the Supreme Court and deprive the legislative assembly of the power to tax reexportation of goods and merchandise. It vigorously supports those amendments which eliminate the office of Commissioner General and provides that the office of attorney general be an elective one. The resolution of the delegation has been accompanied by protests on the part of various political leaders who are opposed to the amendments made to the original bill.

The Chavez subcommittee has not been able to hide the fact that, in the face of protests issuing from the island, it feels itself in the position of a friendly agency which after doing everything within its power considers itself unjustly misunderstood. The subcommittee, by means of various statements, has not left any doubts that it saw itself obliged to favor a compromise measure, adjusted to the atmosphere which prevails in the Congress, in order to submit to the two Houses of Congress a bill which, far from being a simple academic effort, without any possibilities, is, on the contrary, an effective and possible undertaking capable of assuring to the island the greatest political reform which the present Congress might be disposed to approve.

Precisely, in his recent message to the Puerto Rican Legislature, Governor Tugwell, after making an elegant, generous, and comprehensive picture of our political problem, pleading at the same time that this problem be solved in harmony with those democratic practices which Puerto Rico aspires to enjoy in their fullness, refers to the work of the Chavez subcommittee as follows:[3]

"As to the problem of status, your views will doubtless be of value in congressional deliberations. And it is to be remembered when you are formulating these that legislation after all is in preliminary stages and that ill-will is not to be imputed to those who differ from us honestly and without special interests to be served. If you dissent from the findings of Senator CHAVEZ and his colleagues, recall that when they were among us we found them to be disinterested friends; they are still that."

These words of Governor Tugwell are just and becoming, because the members of the Chavez committee were our good friends in the past and continue to be so, as pointed out so truly by the Chief Executive. It would be absurd for Puerto Rico, so misunderstood and so neglected by the Congress across the years, not to know how to retain the few friends which we have in the Federal Congress. An elemental sense of gratitude and even of natural selfishness and convenience should impel us to keep them as such.

Our position in this matter of the amendments, which we have always considered of vital importance to the island, is clear and conclusive.

Not only do we aspire to the amendments proposed by the President's Committee, those proposed by the Chavez subcommittee, or the combination of both, with the elimination of the restrictive feature which they have, but we say, in all frankness, that we aspire to much more than that. However, our aspirations, as Puerto Ricans, cannot blind us to the extent of ignoring the hard and imperative realities which surround us, and through which it is necessary for us to work our destiny, forging it by dint of effort and sacrifice.

The members of the Chavez subcommittee, in whose council the bill originated, had to renounce many of their aspirations, painful as it was, in order to temper themselves to the measures of the administration, so that the latter would support the claims to liberalize the regime as far as it considered them convenient and advisable. The members of the Chavez subcommittee, whose friendship we cannot doubt for a single moment, had in their turn to forego many of their views regarding Puerto Rico in order to submit a bill which, besides drawing as far away as possible from our colonial status, would have possible and certain probabilities of passing in both Houses of Congress. Let us not forget the fact that one of the Houses of Congress has not yet even considered the bill.

The sacrifice of will which was made by both the Puerto Rican members of the President's committee and by our friends in the Chavez subcommittee follows the same realistic and positive trajectory which we are advising, a trajectory which is inspired by the lessons we learned in the course of our history, taught us by the beloved leadership of the illustrious "Son of the Baranquitas"[4] through struggles and sacrifice under Spanish sovereignty and under the sovereignty of the United States.

Our stand follows in the glorious steps of Munoz Rivera, that unforgettable master who, though aspiring to the maximum recovery of rights for Puerto Rico, accepted as a compromise our present organic act in spite of the fact that it did not satisfy nor meet his uncompromising ideals. These were the ways of Munoz Rivera, as a Puerto Rican, who, when reality stared him in the face had to choose between absolute negation or positive remedial measures. Munoz Rivera compromised and his name is immortal in the heart of Puerto Rico.

Are we going to reject the bill, or are we going to compromise in the midst of the undeniable realities of the day so as to gain as much as possible in the path of our solution?

[1] S. 1407, approved Feb. 15, 1944.

[2] The Legislature of Puerto Rico in its last session passed a resolution creating a delegation, composed of 18 members of both houses to demand from Congress the solution of the political status of the island.

[3] Governor's message, delivered February 14, 1944.

[4] Local historical reference to Luis Munoz Rivera, political leader, who in 1917 was Resident Commissioner in Washington. At that time he introduced a bill for autonomy of Puerto Rico. Three other bills were pending at the same time; the Jones bill and the Shaffroth bill were combined and passed Congress as the Jones-Shaffroth Act of 1917.

Do We Need a National Service Law Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio program of the American Forum of the Air, Tuesday, February 1, 1944:

Chairman GRANIK. Congress is again wrestling with the national-service bill.

A year ago this legislation was introduced as a means of alleviating the critical manpower shortage on the home front. However, it was not brought to a vote in Congress.

Last month the President, in his annual message, urged Congress to enact national-service legislation, to help speed up the winning of the war. So the bill is being considered anew in the Capitol.

Unions are as determined as ever, in their opposition to this bill, which it regards as an unconstitutional draft of labor. It has been called an antistrike bill, but critics insist that it would not reduce strikes.

Meanwhile the manpower situation, while perhaps not as acute as a year ago, remains serious.

Women have not volunteered for the armed services, or for war work to the extent expected, and this bill is proposed as one solution.

"Do we need a national-service law now?" To answer this question, the American Forum of the Air this evening has invited the national commander of the American Legion, Warren H. Atherton; Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri; the chairman of the women's committee for the national-service bill, Ernesta Barlow; and Robert J. Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor.

Each has a brief prepared statement. Then all will join in an extemporaneous round-table discussion of "Do we need a national-service law now?"

First, then, the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Warren Atherton.

ADDRESS BY WARREN ATHERTON

The American Legion has long advocated the enactment of a national service law as a necessary element in the total mobilization of the Nation's resources in support of our soldiers and sailors. The reasons are self-evident from the following statement of the principle underlying national service:

In time of war the civilian on the home front has the same duty to serve the Nation in the capacity for which he is best fitted as the soldier, the sailor, and the marine. No right-thinking American can possibly question the rightness or fairness of this principle. A national service law would merely provide the mechanism by which this principle could be carried out most effectively and fairly, and through which men and women could be guided in an orderly fashion to the jobs where the country needs them most. This is the democratic way of meeting the problems of human mobilization which total war presents. In a democracy we ought not have a double standard of duty—one standard for the soldier and another for the civilian, because it is of the essence of democracy that all citizens shall have equal obligations as well as equal rights. The present system places an unfair share of these obligations on the men of the armed forces.

Today, more than ever before, we need an affirmation of that duty. We are on the eve of the greatest test of arms that this Nation has ever undergone—the storming of fortress Europe—and after that, the reduction of the sprawling Empire of Japan. Our troops poised for action require the total support of every one of us. They have the right to know that the Nation is mobilized behind them and to expect that every weapon they need will be there in the crisis. We may no longer doubt our ultimate victory, but we should never forget that the cost of this victory in blood and pain will be very high. We must do everything possible to reduce that cost. If we neglect anything which might increase the chances of any soldier

and sailor to come home again—alive and whole—the effects of that failure will be with us for a generation to come.

Passage of a national service act will increase that soldier's or sailor's chances.

In the first place, it demonstrates to him that the entire Nation is behind him. This will help him to fight, and it will bring him home without any bitter feeling of having been let down.

Second, it will give the lie to the Axis Nations who say we are collapsing from within and using such propaganda to bolster the morale of their own people and those of their faltering satellites.

Third, it will assist in curing manpower shortages which are today seriously affecting the production of weapons which our soldiers need now, and which threaten to interfere far more seriously in the months to come.

Before summer the armed forces must withdraw another million men from the civilian work force and others must take their places. How can this be done? The present methods are not succeeding in solving the lesser though very serious, shortages of the present—on the railroads, in the foundries and forge shops, throughout the ball-bearing industry, on the construction of aviation-gasoline plants, and in a host of other important industries and plants.

Unless these manpower and production shortages are remedied now—not sometime in the future—the soldiers and sailors will lack some of the items which they critically need.

These shortages cannot be remedied in time without a national-service law.

Under such a law men and women could be guided to these critical vacancies and our fighters assured of the things they want in time.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Atherton. Now, Congressman DEWEY SHORT, Republican, of Missouri. Congressman SHORT.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE DEWEY SHORT

Mr. Granik and fellow Americans, no pancake is so flat that it does not have two sides. There are two sides to this controversial issue. All true Americans do not want to see excessive profits made in this war, or any gains advanced on blood money. All our citizens should sacrifice equally in time of war, but that cannot and will never be.

The President of the United States has asked for a national service law. He has waited a long time to do it—perhaps because there is an election in November this year. The Congress of the United States has passed many laws giving the Chief Executive power over the lives of our citizens. He will not even enforce the Smith-Connally Antistrike Act, which was passed over his veto. What the country needs is not more legislation but some efficient, courageous, and honest administration. If strikes should be called off, the President can call them off. Simply because he has not done it, he now comes forth with an extreme and absurd propcsition to conscript all Americans. The remedy he offers is much worse than the disease. No one should ignore or condone strikes but this is the last step toward a totalitarian government. Personally, I do not want to raise up a Hitler here to get rid of one abroad, and yet if the bill proposed by the President were enacted into law it would reduce our farmers, laborers, and all other citizens of our country to a state of serfdom. It will destroy the very thing we are fighting for. It invades the home and disrupts our long-established life.

If we were in imminent peril of invasion there might be some excuse for this law, as when Britain passed it. It perhaps would have been passed by Congress after Pearl Harbor. But now that the enemy is on retreat in all theaters and when we are not threatened by immediate invasion there is absolutely no excuse for it. The American people still want their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and wives to control what they shall do. We do not want their daily lives regulated by bureaucrats in Washington. Already we have too much regimentation. But, pass this law and we will have what Hitler has—a Prussianized state. We cannot and will not accept it.

As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I have visited many of our plants and cantonments. I know that the battle of production has been won. Thousands of workers and soldiers are now being laid off. There is absolutely no necessity for the enactment of such drastic legislation as this. I do not believe the President wants it. In his message he presented it with many qualifications and with many political implications—because in his own heart he knows we do not need it.

What is the President trying to do? Pass the buck! With all his powers and authorities under existing laws he wants to place Congress behind the "eight-ball"—to cover up his failures of administration.

I deliberately charge that the President's recommendation for the passage of this legislation was insincere, deceptive, hypocritical, and dishonest. And he well knows that if Congress fails to pass it, he can then say to the public that he would end these strikes but Congress will not give him the power. He already has the power. No one can deny it.

Mr. Roosevelt, all these delays, stoppages, shortages, and strikes are your baby and you will have to tend it. Don't try to shuffle the blame on the Members of Congress, but be an American and a man, and admit that you have miserably failed after all your coddling of the Communists. We shall pour the oil where the squeak is, and the squeak is in the White House.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman SHORT. Next, Ernesta Barlow, chairman of the Women's Committee for the National Service Bill. Mrs. Barlow.

ADDRESS BY ERNESTA BARLOW

Speaking purely as a woman and a private individual on the proposed national war service bill, here are my credo and some of my reasons for supporting this measure unreservedly.

It is not that this country is short of man or woman power. It is short in certain widely scattered vital industries. Labor is not where it is most needed, and there is no legislative machinery for allocating workers to labor shortage areas, or even for finding the available unemployed workers now in those areas. Under the volunteer system workers do not go where someone else wants, they go where they want. Civilian workers are not sufficiently mobile. While there have been cut-backs in some industries there have been and will be increases in others to take up the slack.

Our naval program is being stepped up one-third in 1944. General Arnold has asked for a still greater Air Force. We were 10,000 planes behind schedule last year. The labor turn-over in many aircraft industries has been 100 percent. Between July and November 1,500,000 women quit working in essential jobs. There is now no way to get them back.

I do not believe it is too late to pass this bill. If it were it is hardly credible that the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the Commander in Chief would ask that it be passed now.

In transportation alone 137,000 women will be needed in 1944. Workers cannot get to their jobs if our transportation systems do not function. Our civil service is short hundreds of women, hospitals are short.

I maintain that women are completely unpolitical-minded in regards a national war service act. Election-year arguments do not hold water with us for one moment. Nor do we believe this war is almost won. Labor asks that many other things * * * perhaps very necessary and right things, be done before we mobilize civilians for work. Our argument is that Hitler and the Japs will not wait while we impose conditions. The aggressors are the only ones who enter a war at their convenience. We have to jump in and get ready afterward. Why should America, alone among her allies, refuse to pass a law which equally distributes our wartime obligations? Democratic peoples do not like regimentation. But by what process of reasoning does civilian egotism place its personal liberties and privileges above those of the man on the firing line? If he must go, perhaps to die, our very safety puts upon us a clear direction. To back him up fully here at home. Not part way.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. Barlow. And now, Robert J. Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Watt.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT J. WATT

"Do we need a national service law?"

There is an old story that it is unwise to swap horses in midstream. I think that story applies to the suggestion that we enact a national service law.

To make any drastic change now involves the risk that we might miss our footing and tumble into a raging river of political confusion in which tens of thousands of additional Government employees would be engaged in filling out forms to help win the war.

If a law is enacted to compel civilian workers to serve private corporations engaged in business for profit, would it not be necessary for the Government to take over the plants and factories so that workers would serve their Government rather than private corporations?

The real question boils down to our deciding whether our present production is meeting demands, if it is likely to be able to meet future needs, and if the enactment of a national service law will bring victory sooner.

To the best of my knowledge every major production objective is being accomplished. In fact, we have exceeded our needs in aluminum, steel, machine guns, tanks, and scores of lesser items.

Right now large numbers of workers are unemployed because they have completed their production jobs ahead of time. American workers and management have achieved what seemed impossible.

There is a scarcity of labor in some places and an overabundance in others because of poor planning or planning for profit. As a result, a national-service law would force mass migrations to suit the convenience of and cover up the mistakes of those who have failed to plan and whose ability to confuse cannot be questioned.

Would it not be advisable to consider using the idle factories now shut down and the idle workers and bring the jobs to the places where factories, labor, and community facilities exist rather than force any mass migrations into already overcrowded areas. You know, some State laws make it a criminal offense to sign up labor for outside jobs.

We will agree that the country is not making the best use of its available manpower. I hope we will agree that it is a problem of such importance that it justifies us asking for the facts as to the best method of making full use of our manpower.

This problem is not one which should be made a political football. I submit that the Congress should appoint a commission of representatives of the two Houses of Congress, industry, labor, and the public to find the facts and report to Congress within a period of 30 days.

The War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board have the specific responsibility for the supply of men and material. They have not requested a national service law. In the absence of any evidence

that such a law would enable us to improve the magnificent production achieved under democratic methods, let's get the facts before we accept the dogma of those we fight against.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Watt.

The American Forum of the Air continues with its round-table discussion Do We Need a National Service Law Now?

Mr. Atherton, would this national service bill or any other law, for that matter, stop strikes?

Mr. ATHERTON. In my opinion, it would stop strikes, because a national service law would enlist men in the army of industry, just as men are now enlisted in the Army which fights at the front. I presume that those men enlisted in an army of industry would show the same loyalty and the same obedience to law that soldiers and sailors show when they obey the command of the Commander in Chief of this Nation in time of war.

Mr. WATT. Has it been our experience, Mr. Atherton, that a law did stop strikes in other nations which were free nations?

Mr. ATHERTON. The answer to that, Mr. Watt, is that it has apparently bettered conditions, because through 4 long years of war, England, a very democratic nation, has retained that law. Australia, under a labor government, has retained that law. New Zealand, the most democratic—I say socialistic—government among republics, has retained the law throughout the war.

Mr. WATT. I assume you read, did you not, Mr. Atherton, the article by James B. Reston in the New York Times of January 28, 1944? I will read the first paragraph:

"There were more strikes in Great Britain and Northern Ireland in 1943 than in any other year in this century, a survey disclosed today."

Mr. ATHERTON. My reply to you is that there were more man-hours of work in those countries than ever before in their history, in 1943.

Representative SHORT. As I stated in my opening remarks, if we were in grave danger of imminent invasions, perhaps we would pass the law in this country. England passed the law when only the channel stood between the British people and the Nazi hordes. However, since they passed that law, strikes have returned each year. Mr. Watt is just back after a 3 weeks' stay there and he will tell you that Ernest Bevin himself, the Minister of Labor, said they don't try to enforce the law because they can't enforce it today.

It is true that while we have had too many unexcusable strikes, which I deplore every bit as much as I do sin, I know that freemen will do both.

Mr. ATHERTON. Did you not say that we would have passed the law after Pearl Harbor, had it been presented?

Representative SHORT. I think it would be bad to pass it at any time. We have never had to have it in any other war, and I do not think there is any necessity for it in this war. Least of all do we need it today. I think the mailed fist has always lost, but the free mind and the loyal heart have always won.

Mrs. BARLOW. We seem to be treating this law as an antistrike law. There is no antistrike clause in it.

I want to go back to Mr. Watt's speech and take up one clause of it. I should like to debate it with him, clause by clause, but it does not happen to be our debate, so we cannot do that.

Mr. WATT. We might do that.

Mrs. BARLOW. Let's do it some day. You spoke of the objection of labor to civilian workers being compelled to work for private corporations engaged in business for profit. If labor balks at the direction of workers to private industry, would it be willing to forego the wages and hours it is able to have under the profit system and to forego the 48- or 40-hour week, and take the $50 a month and the 15-, 20-, or even 24-hour day of the man in the armed services?

Mr. WATT. There are literally tens of thousands of our workers in this country who would be simply tickled with $50 a month, plus housing, plus clothing, medical care, insurance, and allowances for dependents. In fact, Mrs. Barlow, there are today actually hundreds of thousands of workers who are getting $8 and $10 a week and who would actually be getting a real wage increase on even the $50 a month, without the food, the housing, the clothing, medical care, insurance, and allowances for dependents.

Mrs. BARLOW. This is not a law for social reform. There are a great many social reforms which are needed, but social reform is not the purpose of this law. You merely objected to being directed to work for corporations under the profit system. Now, I cannot quite see why unions object so strongly to this bill. After all, in essence this bill is for labor registration and assignment under a central controlling body. What are the unions themselves but that, really? Aren't they asking for a monopoly of direction—the unions? This bill provides for the direction of workers to employment for the good of the whole Nation instead of for one industry.

Mr. WATT. I would merely like to ask this: Would you also agree, Mrs. Barlow, that the Government would take over each plant in which civilian workers were compelled to work, and would the Government also be required to restrict salaries of management and the profit of management? In other words, when you and Mr. Atherton talk about equal sacrifice, you don't mean that, do you? You don't mean, for instance, $50 a month for all. You mean $50 a month for labor. But do you mean $50 a month for the people who are getting $100,000 and $150,000 a year?

Mrs. BARLOW. Certainly I do; yes, yes.

Mr. ATHERTON. If there are hundreds of thousands of people getting only $8 and $10 a week, why would they not accept employment that is not only offered but in which there is a serious effort being made to get employees in the airplane factories of California, the shipyards of San Francisco and Seattle, and the plane factories of Seattle?

Mr. WATT. I have no record whatsoever of any manpower shortages except in the instances reported to us by the War Manpower Commission. We have no other source of information. The most recent report indicated that those shortages were steadily decreasing. The question that you ask involves long periods of training, and I assume that the people in the area from which you come, where planes are manufactured, are training today to the extent that their facilities will allow them.

Mrs. BARLOW. You say you have no authority, that there is no authority for saying that labor shortages exist. I have a report from people who are running the war—the War Department, after all, is supposed to be doing some of the running of the war. They say there are 67 labor shortage areas. Now, aircraft is to be stepped up to 71 percent of the dollar increase in 1944. There will be shortages. You said there is excess labor, that there were a lot of people out of work. A great deal of that unemployment is merely in the shifting of labor at the moment.

Representative SHORT. You speak of manpower shortages and manpower production, It is true that in the airplane industry, which is the only one great industry connected with the war effort where we do have these serious shortages, we have had shortages because we will never produce as much as we would like to produce. But I want to say that in spite of all the strikes and stoppages the most amazing thing to me has been the output in production of America in this war. The completeness and rapidity with which we converted from peacetime to wartime manufacture is amazing.

Mrs. BARLOW. I do not deny that.

Representative SHORT. It's the marvel of the age. I have been recently to the Alcoa plant in Tennessee, and they are laying off thousands of men there. They have closed the plant, partly, at East St. Louis, and the great ordnance plant at Weldon Springs, Mo., one at Williamsport, Pa., and another at Pittsburgh. Literally thousands of workers in aluminum, steel, copper, and machine tools have caught up with and even exceeded their production goals. We have no labor shortage, and we have unemployed in certain regions.

Mr. ATHERTON. Why don't the employees go to the places where they are needed?

Representative SHORT. Labor will find its own level if left alone. They will go where they are paid these high wages.

Mr. ATHERTON. In the meantime men are dying every day waiting for the planes that are needed.

Mr. WATT. You imply, Mr. Atherton, that there are millions of men who are not working at all, who are loafing around. Is there any record to indicate that?

Mr. ATHERTON. I have only the Congressman's word for it. I am presuming I can take his word.

Mrs. BARLOW. I don't agree at all with Mr. Atherton that there are millions of men lying around doing nothing.

Mr. WATT. Do you agree that in the cases the Congressman just talked about, in the aluminum field, for instance, not many months ago there were great shortages of men and today there is a great surplus?

Mr. ATHERTON. Why don't they move?

Mrs. BARLOW. We have no way to move them.

Mr. WATT. Is it your and Mr. Atherton's opinion that you can move a worker out of an aluminum pot line into making planes without any transition and training period?

Mrs. BARLOW. There may be training necessary.

Mr. ATHERTON. The sooner the man enters training the sooner he will be prepared, and the courses I saw in operation in Los Angeles took from 3 to 6 weeks for a man to be prepared to go into a factory.

Mrs. BARLOW. A great many of these courses are short.

Mr. WATT. I come back to the original point, and I don't know whether Mr. Atherton answered the question. Does he also agree, as the commander of the American Legion, that this national service law shall also do the same to management as it does to labor in relation to telling a person where he might go? In other words, assuming that there is a man making $25,000 a year who would be better fitted in a $50-a-week job, is it Mr. Atherton's position that a national service law should put him in that $50-a-week job and also regulate the profit for both management and——

Mr. ATHERTON (interposing). Absolutely, Mr. Watt, and for 18 years we went to Congress proposing such a law. We still think that type of National Service Act should be passed. If it is passed, drafting business and management, restricting profit, freezing prices, placing labor under direction, will you be for it then?

Mr. WATT. You agree with us, then.

Mr. ATHERTON. Will you be for it, then, Mr. Watt?

Mr. WATT. Yes; yes. In my opinion, labor would consider, along with every other segment of the life of the community, any legislation which was not unfair to workers and which was no discriminatory of workers.

Mrs. BARLOW. The military draft takes everyone in alike—the man who makes $50,000 a year or the man who makes $1,200

a year. This is civilian selective service for everyone.

Mr. WATT. Does the selective service law and such legislation——

Mrs. BARLOW (interposing). Military, you mean?

Mr. WATT. As is now before the United States Congress—the National Service Act being proposed and such other legislation as is before the Congress now.

Mrs. BARLOW. We are not dealing with other legislation. We are dealing with this piece of legislation.

Mr. WATT. Does this legislation as presented to the United States Congress propose to draft management and profit?

Mrs. BARLOW. Not profit. There is nothing in the law which deals with profit. That is one of the President's five points. However, this has nothing to do with profits.

Mr. ATHERTON. Congressman, if this law would speed the day of victory and would more equally divide the burden, would you then be for it if it were not a Presidential year?

Representative SHORT. If it would speed victory and save life and human treasure, I would be for it at any time. But instead of speeding victory I think it would retard it. Let me say that I have talked to literally hundreds of veterans, abroad and in our camps here, and if anything incenses them it is the strikes back home. Let me say to the radio audience and to the audience here that I voted for the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill, in spite of the threat of my friend Bill Green and the $700,000 slush fund of the C. I. O.; neither the American Federation of Labor nor the C. I. O. frightens me. We passed that law, but the President refuses to enforce it. He has the right to seize plants. He took over the railroads; he took over plants in New Jersey and California. He needs no additional legislation.

Mr. ATHERTON. He does have the power to draft business now.

Mr. WATT. I should like to ask this question because I think it is the heart of the matter: If you take any other nation (it doesn't matter what nation you take), the production of the American worker is so far above the production of other nations that there is no fair comparison. If you take the nearest comparison it would be Great Britain, and our production is way ahead of theirs. If that is a fact (and, after all, we can ignore facts but we can't disagree with them), that the American worker, the free worker living in a free Nation, has produced more per worker than the worker of any other nation, what do you believe a national service law, which would offer compulsion, would do to improve that production?

Mrs. BARLOW. Give us still greater production, which is what we want. Production is our national boast. We have accomplished the utmost miracles, but under the volunteer system we are not accomplishing what is required of us now. Both of you are for the volunteer system. You advocate it as though is were an innovation, as though we were about to try it for the first time. The volunteer system has had over 2 patient years to prove itself already. The people who are running this war say it is inadequate. I am merely backing their say against yours.

Representative SHORT. Let me say that I believe firmly in letting the military conduct the war in the field of battle. I have no respect for armchair strategists and parlor generals. But on the same score, I resent the military trying to tell the United States Government how to conduct our civilian life in time of war.

Mrs. BARLOW. All that you are saying means to me that you think our civilian rights and privileges should be sacrosanct in wartime, while those of the man risking his life should not be.

Representative SHORT. Not at all. What I insist on bringing out is that you cannot dig coal with bayonets and you cannot turn out airplanes with pistols. I say that the mailed fist of a Mussolini or a Hitler will never get people to succeed in producing what the free mind and the loyal heart of a patriotic citizen can produce, and most of our laborers are patriotic. They have sons and brothers fighting abroad.

Mrs. BARLOW. Mr. Short, you can talk me down any time; your voice is stronger. I believe also in the military running the war. However, they would be quite helpless without what we civilians can supply them.

Mr. WATT. You have a distinct advantage over me, Mrs. Barlow, in view of the fact that you have all your replies written out.

Mrs. BARLOW. Why didn't you think about that?

Mr. WATT. Some of your replies don't fit the particular question and you are sort of going off the beam.

Mr. ATHERTON. What is your question?

Mrs. BARLOW. I'll take my eyes off the ball.

Mr. WATT. I think we ought to pay a great deal of attention to what our leaders have to say—the armed services and others—but in the field of producing material and deciding on the securing of men, that is a field which has been operated for a period of 2 years by the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission. Are you prepared to disregard them entirely and simply take the position that they do not know what they are talking about?

Mrs. BARLOW. I don't think that is what we are doing at all. We are maintaining the volunteer system under this bill, which is what they have been advocating all along. We are not throwing the volunteer system out at all.

Mr. WATT. You are presenting a case which, in effect, says that a worker who is compelled to work in a certain plant for a certain wage will produce more than a worker who is free and who works in that plant by choice.

Mr. ATHERTON. In my opinion he will produce equally as well, if he is a loyal American, under either condition. If he is interested in winning the war and getting his son back from overseas, he will produce under either system.

Mr. WATT. All right, Mr. Atherton. Let's not raise that question, because, after all, on the question of war service or the question of where one's son is, I'll match my record with anyone in this hall. We will let that go. The point I am making is simply this: That the other side is arguing about a change in the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States when they say that men will do better under a system of involuntary servitude than they will under a free system. I deny it.

Mrs. BARLOW. May I just answer one more thing. You may say this is unfair because it is written. However, I did not write it. I am equally as anxious as you to see that our rights under the thirteenth amendment are upheld, so I quote this pledge in part:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. * * * And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Mr. ATHERTON. I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Watt, that the American Legion is unselfish in urging the passing of a national service act, because none of us is now eligible to the draft law. All of us would be liable to the provisions of a national service act, and so we would be brought within the provisions of selective service, which at this times does not apply to us. But I want to ask you this question: What is the difference between taking a 37-year-old father of three children to carry a gun on his back and taking his next door neighbor, 39 years old and without children, and asking him to make that gun?

Representative SHORT. Mr. Atherton, as a Legionnaire myself (and I have talked to many other members of the Legion and listened to testimony on this national service act for the past 2 years as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs), I know that this particular law we are discussing tonight, or the proposed legislation, is not the national service act which the American Legion wants. They want the conscription of wealth as well as of labor, and to take the profits out of war. That is their chief concern.

Mr. ATHERTON. That is entirely true, Mr. Short, and if the bill provides that, will you be for it?

Representative SHORT. I think I would be; I think I would be.

Mr. ATHERTON. Fine.

Representative SHORT. And we could have passed such a bill, I repeat, if we had done it at first, after the declaration of war.

Mr. WATT. May I reply to your question, Mr. Atherton? My reply would be quite similar to the Congressman's in this respect: That I think the big difference and the only difference is that when they take a person, or when a person goes, as I went 25 years ago to serve my country, I question very much if it is the same thing. Under the President's suggestion that I be taken, that I be asked not to serve my country but to serve a private corporation in the making of a private profit, there is as much difference between the two things that you are talking about as there is between freedom and involuntary servitude.

Mrs. BARLOW. Mr. Watt, it seems to me we haven't time for a social revolution before we pass this bill. I quite agree that there are many social reforms which are needed. I am not keen to see great profits made, nor is anyone who supports this bill. But we haven't the time to regulate all those things first.

Representative SHORT. You would have a social revolution if you pass this bill, right here in the midst of war.

Mr. WATT. The wonder about people like you, for instance, is that I have heard you, and I have heard Mr. Atherton in particular, talk—and talk intelligently—about this question, beginning at the Boston convention, Mr. Atherton, which you and I attended. On the other hand, I find here, and I have in my hand, a document of much interest. I am assuming that you people are interested in producing more to win the war sooner and bring about a speedier victory. However, I notice here in the last few months some interesting figures on industrial accidents, and this is the latest Government report, dated January 30, 1944. This is what it says:

"Industrial casualties since Pearl Harbor (to January 1, 1944) are 37,600 killed—7,500 more than the military dead; 210,000 permanently disabled and 4,500,000 temporarily disabled—60 times more than the military wounded and missing.

"Injuries account for 4 times as many lost man-hours as strikes. Manufacturing has 50,000 workers absent every day because of accidents."

And lo and behold! I don't find, much to my surprise, either Mr. Atherton or Mrs. Barlow or any of those other leaders who are so keenly concerned in this question—and rightly so—of man-hours lost, are interested in another problem which is four times as costly.

Mr. ATHERTON. Isn't it true, Mr. Watt, that the figures you cite are taken with respect to 50,000,000 workers, while we only had at the same time approximately 500,000 men in the front lines?

Mr. WATT. These figures, Mr. Atherton, are figures from the Government of the United States, and who am I to say that they are wrong?

Mr. ATHERTON. But they are applicable to 50,000,000 workers, are they not?

Mr. WATT. I don't know whom they are applicable to.

Mrs. BARLOW. Mr. Watt, I still think you are making this bill conditional on the passage of a vast number of social reforms.

Mr. WATT. No, I am not! No, no, no!

Mrs. BARLOW. You want to cure all these ills. You say if all these ills were cured then it might be a good thing. We haven't the time, as I said in my first preamble. We can't make conditions with Hitler and the Japanese. We have to go in now and do these other things afterward.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, our time is up. You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air discussion Do We Need a National Service Law Now?

Government's Place in Post-War Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. W. Prentis, president of the Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., at the two hundred and fifty-seventh meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board in New York on January 20, 1944:

Naturally, I appreciate the honor of representing industry in this triumvirate tonight. However, as I warned the president of the board before accepting his invitation, I do not consider myself in any sense an expert on the subject under discussion. Hence, to enter the lists with these two distinguished authorities requires no little temerity on my part. So I ask you all to remember that I am merely a "run-of-the-mine" industrial executive like the rest of you. Preparing addresses for bodies like this is out of my regular line. However, everybody is stimulated by departing from his accustomed role occasionally and, while there is some peril in so doing, the additional danger a businessman runs is really not so very great for, like Tennyson's immortal six hundred, the executive of a corporation these days is quite accustomed to have the cannon of competitors volleying in front of him, the guns of Government bureaucrats firing on him from the left, stockholders' artillery enfilading his right, occasional potshots from dissatisfied customers in his rear, plus a steady rain of demagogic poison-gas bombs from the air. The very ground that he treads is mined with political propaganda. Hence, it is not too bad to venture for an hour or two into the relative quiet of a fact-seeking organization like this, particularly when I can enjoy the company of two such able thinkers as the gentlemen with whom I am teamed up tonight, who, I know—no matter how our views may differ—are sincerely seeking the formula for a brighter, better America in the post-war years.

GOVERNMENT'S THREEFOLD ROLE

Government's place in post-war labor-management relations, according to my way of thinking is threefold: First, it should fix the rules; second, it should administer them efficiently; third, it should function as an umpire, not as a czar.

The exigencies of the present crisis have justified—in the minds of some Government administrators—the adoption of opportunistic methods in smoothing over labor difficulties in the interests of full war production. However, the time has come when Government, labor, and management must see to it that a sound, permanent program adapted to times of peace is established. The legal basis for that program should be set up as soon as it is feasible to do so by congressional action.

ORGANIZED LABOR NOW OF AGE

In setting the post-war rules, government should keep in mind that organized labor in the United States has now come of age. It is no longer an "infant industry." In the past decade it has passed through a lusty period of adolescence and must now assume the full obligations of manhood. The arguments formerly used to justify legislation and judicial decisions granting special privileges to labor—because it was the under dog—no longer hold water. In every field of human relations injustice and chaos inevitably result when individuals are placed in position to exercise power without the assumption of commensurate responsibility. If a man desires to be a brigadier general with the honor and authority inherent in that position, he must assume responsibility for his brigade, or the army could not tolerate him. If an individual wants to be an officer of a corporation, he must perforce take on his shoulders the legal, social, and moral responsibility which statutory law and ethical tradition impose upon him. He cannot escape such obligations and it is well that he should not. Power is a heady drink. Our forefathers knew it, for, as Pitt said, "Where law ends, tyranny begins." So, setting the rules for post-war labor-management relations boils down to this: Existing statutes must be modified so as to require the assumption by organized labor of a degree of responsibility for its actions commensurate with the enormous power which it now exercises by governmental sanction and edict.

SETTING THE RULES INVOLVES VITAL ISSUES

In the past, while the issues involved in most labor disputes have been important, nevertheless they have been chiefly concerned with matters of more or less transitory character: The determination of collective-bargaining units, the recognition of unions, wage scales, working conditions, etc. None of these questions strikes at the roots of the Republic. Now the situation has changed. Labor-management relations involve problems that go deep into the vitals of constitutional self-government: The right to work freely at a lawful vocation of a man's own choosing; the control of labor supply—and hence the volume of production and the scale of living—by the sort of invisible government that the closed shop makes possible; the tremendous power of labor pressure blocs on Government administrative bodies; the protection of minority and individual rights in labor disputes; the financial impact of horizontal class groups on our political elections; the dilution of the power of management to control and direct private business efficiently—these are some of the portentous issues that impend in the crucial years ahead. If the rules are not set by government so that these problems will have to be worked out essentially by private organization effort—even though of great travail—the end of American freedom is not many decades distant; and management, labor, and the people at large will all find themselves crucified once more on the cross of dictatorship and tyranny.

In pioneering new ground, popular self-government has always pursued the trial and error method. So in modifying the National Labor Relations Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Sherman Act, and other laws affecting labor-management relations, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act, we shall not be proceeding in other than strictly American fashion. The Interstate Commerce Commission Act has been amended 25 times; the Securities and Exchange Act, twice; the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, twice; the Federal Alcohol Act, twice; the Motor Carriers Act, once. Of course, no changes should even be considered which would affect the fundamental right of any workingman freely to seek the benefits of collective negotiation when and as he desires to do so. But the public interest and the interests of the 75 percent of the workers of the country who are not union members are of equal concern.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION NEEDED

Existing labor-management legislation should, therefore, be amended with the following basic principles in mind: Recognition that monopoly and monopolistic practices in the field of labor are as harmful to the public interest as similar practices are in either manufacture or distribution; recognition that employees have a right to represent themselves in dealing directly with their employers, if they so desire, and that when they wish to have others represent them they are entitled to choose such representatives without coercion of any kind; recognition that employees have an equal right to join or not to join a labor organization; recognition that while employees have the right to quit work, either individually or collectively, they have no right to prevent others from working or any right to intimidate customers or their employers. In the interest of employees no strike should be permitted which has not been approved by a secret ballot by those directly involved. Minority rights might well be protected in such cases by separating all employees into two groups—those with 5 years' service or more, and those with less than 5 years' service—and requiring majority approval by both groups before any strike could be called. In the interests of the public, limitations might properly be placed on the right of employees engaged in essential public services to strike. Strikes of Government employees should be absolutely prohibited.

In revising the rules, the employer's right to freedom of speech in labor disputes should be clearly defined. Cognizance should also be taken of the fact that collective bargaining between employers and employees should never be used to compel either party to surrender basic principles, or to permit them to establish collusive agreements between themselves to the disadvantage of the public. To insure union responsibility, legislation should provide for the distribution of audited financial reports to members, the regular election of union officers at reasonable intervals by secret ballot, the prohibition of political contributions, and the elimination of those sweeping immunities from the antitrust and antiracketeering acts which, according to the Supreme Court, the unions now enjoy. In the public interest, all of these legal restrictions have long been applied to business. In the public interest, they must now be applied to organized labor also.

PRESERVING INCENTIVES

In setting its rules, the Government should proceed, it seems to me, on the principle that the fixing of maximum wages by law is undesirable during peacetime in all instances. Such procedure would destroy the initiative of workmen, undermine the use of wages as an incentive for accomplishment, and make it exceedingly difficult for employees to advance on the basis of their demonstrated individual ability. In other words, the purpose of all legislation to control wages and hours should be social and not economic and should be strictly confined to the worthy so-

cial objectives of preventing exploitation and protecting a decent standard of living. Finally, all legislation should be avoided which would inhibit the authority of management ultimately to determine what and how much will be produced, where and how it will be produced, and how it will be sold. This last point is of paramount importance, for if government destroys the right of an employer to supervise and develop the general efficiency of the plant that is his property or that of his stockholders, the industrial progress of America will be crippled, the establishment of new enterprises will be discouraged, and the expansion of existing businesses gravely handicapped.

ADMINISTERING THE RULES

Mr. Watt spoke publicly on January 13 of the grave disadvantage of "duplication, scattered authority, uncertainties, and unbelievable details" in handling wage disputes. So it seems obvious that Congress should provide from the concentration of authority and responsibility for handling all post-war labor-management problems in one governmental body. In my opinion, whatever board is set up should be an independent commission—like the Interstate Commerce Commission—reporting directly to Congress. Under its jurisdiction should come everything pertaining to labor-management relations, including the functions now being performed by the National War Labor Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Conciliation Section of the Department of Labor, the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, etc.

Personally, I should prefer this board to be a relatively small body in which no factor but the public interest would be officially represented. This does not mean that its members should not be men of experience in the fields of labor, industry, governmental administration, etc., but they should, in my judgment, not be considered as representatives of any particular segment of the population, but should be appointed solely on the basis of ability and patriotism, with the understanding that their function is to consider the vital problems that come before them with only one thing in view, namely, the interests of the whole citizenry of the Republic.

Men are not appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States because they represent one group of the population or another. They are selected for their intellectual and legal attainments and their reputations as good citizens. These, in my opinion, are the only qualifications that should apply to appointments on what might be termed the "high court of labor-management relations." This body, whatever its name, will have more to do with the preservation of our free institutions in the critical years ahead than any other governmental commission that I know of, for there is no gainsaying the fact that we are in the throes of revolutionary changes in respect to our basic concepts of economic organization, and if these relationships are not solved in accordance with the overriding principle of our peculiar form of popular self-government, namely, the protection of the individual and of minorities from the unbridled will of the current majority, the ultimate collapse of our free institutions will follow just as surely as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, and we shall have fought this war against tyranny in vain.

HIGH COURT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Obviously, to function effectively, the high court of labor-management relations will have to decentralize its activities by district and regional bodies clothed with appropriate responsibility and power. Moreover—and I know I here tread on dangerous ground—the States, I think, should be encouraged to take their due share of the burden in this field. Certainly purely local difficulties should be solved without the intervention of Federal authority, and being, as I am, a firm believer that local responsibility for local affairs, closely tied in with local taxing power, is indispensable to the preservation of the American Republic, I hope that there may gradually be some reversal of the Supreme Court's action in stretching the interstate-commerce clause to the point where virtually every labor dispute comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Physical administration can be handled by effective regional organization, but no organization, however widespread, can solve the basic problem that is here involved, namely, making the individual citizen at the local level feel his civic responsibility. As Theodore Roosevelt pointed out years ago: "No man can be a good citizen of the Nation unless he is first a good citizen of some community, and no man can become a good citizen of any State, county, town, or city unless he is forced by local circumstances—through personal action or merely as a part of that inchoate thing we call public opinion—to help solve the political, economic, and social problems of his own community." When the local citizen is allowed to feel that, no matter what he does, some remote Federal bureau will take all his troubles off his hands, the foundations of the Republic are in serious danger.

GOVERNMENT UMPIRE, NOT CZAR

In respect to the third point that I mentioned at the outset, namely, that government should function in the field of labor-management relations as an umpire and not as a czar, I believe that farseeing leaders on both sides will find common ground on which to stand. Certainly, I can subscribe to the statement of Mr. Watt at a meeting here in New York in September 1942 that "there is a considerable drift toward a strong-man rule—which will gather momentum unless employers and workers together prove very definitely to the American people that they are capable of operating a real practical economic democracy."

This raises the question, What does that phrase "economic democracy," that we bandy about so freely, mean? If economic democracy signifies that monopolistic practices must be prevented so that any rising young businessman can have his chance, or if it means collective negotiation in behalf of a group controlled by the majority of that group, I can understand the phrase clearly. However, to many people, economic democracy seems to imply more than either of these concepts involves.

WHAT IS ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY?

If economic democracy, in addition to collective negotiation and freedom of opportunity, means that industry should be so organized as to provide opportunity for budding ability wherever it may be found; that every worker should be fully trained in the technique of his job; that constant effort should be made to disclose and explain the economic problems of a business to its workers; that suggestions for its betterment from every employee of high or low degree should be encouraged; that men in supervisory positions from the humblest assistant foreman to the highest executive should be trained to lead rather than to drive; that every employee should be treated with dignity and consideration; that constant effort should be directed to improve all those conditions of employment that make for comfort, safety, happiness, and peace of mind—then I can also understand what the phrase "economic democracy" means and can subscribe wholeheartedly to the vital importance of bringing such practices into being in American business wherever they do not already exist.

On the other hand, if by economic democracy is meant an attempt to manage industry by a sort of soviet system of workers' committees, participating directly in all phases of day-by-day executive management, then I can see such a mountain of practical difficulties and obstacles ahead as to obstruct, or even destroy, the present tremendous effectiveness of our American industrial organization—that organization which has wrought such miracles of production in peace and war, and which has lifted our scale of living to such unprecedented levels.

In an address by a sincere academic analyst of economic problems not long ago, the assertion was made that the conflicting interests of employers and workers in industry could not be integrated except through "a joint undertaking to discover what the optimum distribution of the product of the enterprise should be." The writer went on to say: "This integrated interest requires nothing less than that all who are concerned in industry shall make no prior or arbitrary assumptions as to what wages or profits must be; that they shall make only one assumption; namely, that the functions of industry as a public service must be carried on." All that is admirable in intent. I agree with the objective sought, but from a practical viewpoint, would the proposal for "a joint undertaking to discover what the optimum distribution of the product should be," work? As the manager of a business, try to build a budget on that basis. Sit down with me with a committee representing our present 18,000 employees. Start with "no prior or arbitrary assumption as to what wages and profits must be." Tell the committee that in building our budget we shall make only one assumption; namely, "that the functions of industry as a public service must be carried on." What would happen? We would be greeted with blank stares and silence.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR ABLE MANAGEMENT

In other words, it is easy to postulate ideal procedure but, unfortunately, human nature in the mass does not always work that way. Here and there you will find a workman who is genuinely concerned with the economics of industry, but 19 out of 20 are not interested in budgets, cost accounting, the problems of pricing, or the intricacies of corporate finance—any more than I, as a business executive, am interested in Sanskrit or the life cycle of the fruitfly. The average worker expects fair wages, satisfactory working conditions, decent and respectful treatment from his supervisors, but he does not want to be bothered with the grave and detailed responsibilities of management. As a matter of fact, he finds great comfort—like the rest of us frail human beings—in leaning on somebody else's shoulder in whom he has confidence. He, too, likes to follow intelligent leadership. Good management consists in selecting and training capable individuals at all levels so that there will be management from the bottom up, not merely from the top down. Sound collective negotiation and fair-minded, intelligent labor-union leadership can contribute much to that objective. But no matter how much assistance is sought and secured from the employees of any business, there is no substitute for the dynamic vision and catalytic power of forceful management.

We can distribute wealth by political action, but not genius and character and leadership. The uncommon few who possess such characteristics in an outstanding degree are the great benefactors of civilization. It was Washington who held the struggling Colonies together in their fight for liberty—not a junta of the rank and file. It was McCormick who built the first successful reaper—not a group of farmers in Rockbridge County, Va. It was Bell who invented the telephone—not some manufacturers' association. It was Marconi who discovered wireless telegraphy—not a labor union. It was Lincoln who drafted the Gettysburg Address—not a government commission. So, whatever government may do,

whatever labor may do, whatever management may do in its search for economic democracy, let us all resolve not to countenance anything that will destroy for the generations of Americans yet to be, those wellsprings of individual initiative from which, in a very literal sense, all our earthly blessings flow.

LABOR AND BUSINESS INTERDEPENDENT

Of course, business cannot exist without labor, and labor cannot exist without business. But wise labor leadership will always remember, too, that the opportunity for a union arises only after a successful business has been established. And from their many published expressions, I know that those who guide the policies of organized labor are ready to join with management and all farseeing Americans in opposing any action on the part of Government in its role as umpire of labor relations that would discourage the creation of new enterprises or the steady growth of those already in existence.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION LEADS TO FASCISM

In this category would fall any legislation or administrative orders designed to coerce labor and management into compulsory arbitration, industry-wide collective bargaining, and the closed shop. Arbitration of the meaning of the terms of an existing contract is quite in order. However, compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in times of peace, I think, should be opposed just as much by labor as by management. For example, if Government assumes the power to fix wages through compulsory arbitration, it must, sooner or later, also assume power to control prices in order to protect the public interest. The argument for the prohibition of strikes and work stoppages in essential public services, such as transportation, electric power, gas, water, etc., rests on this fact. For in these industries, public authority already controls the rates at which such services are sold. Apparently one of the prices that we must pay for freedom in general is a certain amount of suffering and trouble in resolving the labor problems that are a part of our free, private, competitive business system. Compulsory arbitration will lead straight to some form of the corporative state—fascism—and eventually to the loss of all our hard-won liberties. We cannot have the cake of freedom and eat it too. What grave responsibility this places upon both labor and management. I shall have a further word to say about this before I close.

Any legislative or administrative sanction of so-called industry-wide collective bargaining should also, in my judgment, be definitely discouraged. When I speak of industry-wide bargaining, I am not referring to local organizations of either labor or management in a given community or regional area along horizontal lines. Such procedure, it seems to me, can serve a useful purpose in certain cases by balancing the powers of one local group against those of the other, thus promoting the general welfare of the community at large.

THE DANGERS OF INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Industry-wide collective bargaining, however, is fraught with many dangers when applied to a country as large as the United States, with its many diverse sectional conditions. It certainly would not encourage the establishment of marginal enterprises in small communities where disadvantages of location are frequently overcome by lower operating costs, including lower wage rates. It would tie the hands of those employers who wanted to do more for their workers than the rest of the industry was prepared to do. It is open, also, to the same criticism that has been lodged against so-called big business. For it creates big labor, and big labor, because its leaders are human beings just like the leaders of business, is just as prone to misuse its authority as certain elements in big business have misused their power in years gone by. Experience in England with industry-wide bargaining and in certain industries in this country where it has already been applied, indicates that the public interest frequently suffers by collusive action under which the cost of abnormally high wages, arbitrary restriction of production, and feather-bedding rules, are passed along to the consumer through higher prices than would otherwise obtain. Hence, industry-wide collective bargaining, if generally adopted, will bring in its wake, just as surely as we are sitting here tonight, a high degree of governmental control of labor-management relations and a corresponding decrease in that freedom of action on which economic progress and our future liberties depend.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

The right to work freely at a lawful vocation of one's own choosing was regarded as so obvious and undebatable by our forefathers as not even to require specific mention in the Bill of Rights. In the Turgot Edict in 1776, in France—which was well known to them—by which the industries of France were emancipated from the previous state monopolies, we find this affirmation: "God, in creating man with necessities, has compelled him to resort to labor, and has made the right to labor the first, most imprescriptible right of man." And a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in an early decision stated: "There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner."

A Presidential commission appointed by Theodore Roosevelt years ago declared:

"The right to remain at work where others have ceased to work or to engage anew in work which others have abandoned, is part of the personal liberty of a citizen that can never be surrendered, and every infringement thereof merits and should receive the stern denouncement of the law. * * * The assertion of the right seems trite and commonplace, but that land is blessed where the maxims of liberty are commonplace."

Today I know of no right that is being so thoroughly circumscribed by statutory enactment, by extralegal methods employed under the cloak of law, and by Executive fiat, than the right to work.

THE CLOSED SHOP—A STATE WITHIN A STATE

Yet, the maintenance of that right, in my opinion, is a sine qua non of our free American institutions. Any restriction of that right, which finds its culmination in the closed shop, is impossible to fit into a democratic order. Its maintenance creates a state within a state and, as Woodrow Wilson said, "The business of government is to see that no other organization is as strong as itself; to see that no body or group of men, no matter what their private business is, may come into competition with the authority of society." So advocacy of the closed shop—regardless of the weight of the arguments that may be advanced in its favor—simply hastens the day when organized labor in America will find itself dominated by government. The American public will not tolerate indefinitely the arbitrary exercise of economic power by labor leadership backed with a closed shop—some exhibitions of which we have seen recently—any more than it has been willing to tolerate arbitrary power in the hands of management.

The processes of democracy are hard to establish and maintain in any field of human effort. They can be preserved only in the political sphere if the citizen is free to express his satisfaction or displeasure through the exercise of freedom of speech, freedom of petition, freedom of assembly, and the secret ballot. How can the worker maintain his freedom if similar privileges are denied him through any form of union organization? Theoretically such rights may still exist under the closed shop; practically they do not, because, as the authors of the Federalist papers said: "Power over a man's support is power over his will."

The actions of management are not only under legal control, but are regulated every day by the reactions of employees, customers, and stockholders. The employee may refuse to work; the customer may refuse to buy the product; the stockholder may sell his stock. In a free society it cannot be otherwise. Similarly, if the labor union is to be a truly great instrumentality for the preservation of human freedom, it must be equally willing to subject itself to appropriate checks and balances. None of the coercive or undemocratic racketeering aspects of trade unionism can long exist, if members can resign when they see fit, and management is free to employ any qualified individual whether he is a union member or not.

WIDENING THE AREA OF GOOD MANNERS

Lord Moulton, the great English lawyer, asserted that there are three areas of human conduct: At one pole, the area of complete freedom—to eat spinach or to fall in love with whomever we please; at the opposite pole, the area of legal control—laws against thievery, murder, etc.; the segment in-between he termed the area of good manners. Obviously, the more that labor and management can broaden this in-between area by voluntary adherence to high standards of conduct in which the public interest is placed above all group interests, the less will be the area of governmental intervention. Representative democracy is that kind of government in which self-restraint is substituted for external restraint. So, if labor and management really want the spiritual, intellectual, and political blessings that our democracy brings, we shall conduct ourselves accordingly. I tremble to think what will happen to our whole system of government in the post-war years if we in labor and management cannot find a satisfactory solution of all our problems by mutual understanding and peaceable negotiation. If we call in government to settle our difficulties, we shall rear a Frankenstein monster that will ultimately devour all the liberties that we hold so dear. We both know what happened to labor and management in Italy, Germany, and Russia long before the present war broke out. With the destruction of the freedom of labor and the freedom of management in those countries, also went the destruction of all civil, religious, and political liberty.

VOLUNTARY UNDERSTANDING THE REAL SOLUTION

So, in the last analysis, Government's place in post-war labor-management relations will be just about what we jointly choose to make it. If management will universally and voluntarily do its utmost to make collective bargaining work successfully; if it will universally and voluntarily refrain from any semblance of unfair practices such as labor-union baiting in any form or discrimination against any man who wants to join a union; if labor will voluntarily relinquish its efforts for the closed shop or any form of coerced union membership; if the labor union will regard itself as an integral part of the business enterprise in which it operates and give voluntary support to management in the intelligent handling of wage rates and the maintenance of production efficiency—by such voluntary procedure, and only by such voluntary procedure, can America remain the land of the free, in which our children and children's children can continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty long after we are gone.

A CONCRETE PROGRAM

The problems we are discussing tonight are so urgent that I venture to suggest that labor

and management might well join now in setting up a small committee of the most eminent and public-spirited citizens that this country possesses—men of the caliber of Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, Mr. Bernard Baruch, Dr. Charles A. Beard, Dr. Robert C. Sproul, of the University of California—to work out, in consultation with representatives of labor and management, a program of concrete recommendations for submission to Congress at the earliest possible moment. The voluntary exercise of social stewardship is literally the keystone of freedom. So if we are really sincere in our desire to preserve our free institutions, why can we not act as intelligent, free men, and go to our elected representatives with a constructive program of our own?

The great English economist, Sir Josiah Stamp, who lost his life in a German air raid on London, said in one of his last books, the Christian Ethic as an Economic Factor: "I firmly believe that only by a general raising of human sentiment to deepen spiritual quality and to carry it over a wider field can the factor of human motives and mutual trust be sufficiently changed to have an economic result."

So whatever betides, let us all be patient and forbearing and courageous; let us all—labor and management alike—do what we can to quench the fires of class hatred; let us all try to generate hope and faith and respect for all sorts and conditions of men. For the crucial problems of labor-management relations in the Republic—if solved in a fashion to preserve freedom—can be solved only through real cooperation carried forward in a genuine spirit of self-restraint and mutual understanding. Here all patriotic citizens of fine sensibilities and keen imaginations—regardless of their stations in life—find a challenging opportunity to leave the United States of America a little better, because they, too, have passed through it.

Letter by Abraham Lincoln, Concerning the Presidential Election of 1864

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Abraham Lincoln, on October 22, 1864, to William B. Campbell and others, concerning the Presidential election of 1864:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1864.

GENTLEMEN: On the 15th day of this month, as I remember, a printed paper, with a few manuscript interlineations, called a protest, with your names appended thereto, and accompanied by another printed paper purporting to be a proclamation by Andrew Johnson, military governor of Tennessee, and also a manuscript paper purporting to be extracts from the Code of Tennessee, was laid before me. The protest, proclamation, and extracts are, respectively, as follows:

(The protest is here recited, and also the proclamation of Governor Johnson, dated September 30, to which it refers, together with a list of the counties in east, middle, and west Tennessee; also an extract from the Code of Tennessee, in relation to electors of President and Vice President of the United States, the qualifications of voters for members of the general assembly, and the places of holding elections of officers of popular elections.)

At the time these papers were presented, as before stated, I had never seen either of them, nor heard of the subject to which they relate, except in a general way, only 1 day previously. Up to the present moment nothing whatever has passed between Governor Johnson, or anyone else connected with the proclamation, and myself. Since receiving the papers, as stated, I have given the subject such brief consideration as I have been able to do in the midst of so many pressing public duties.

My conclusion is that I have nothing to do with the matter, either to sustain the plan as the convention and Governor Johnson have initiated it, or to revoke or modify it as you demand. By the Constitution and laws, the President is charged with no duty in the conduct of a Presidential election in any State; nor do I, in this case, perceive any military reason for his interference in the matter.

The movement set on foot by the convention and Governor Johnson does not, as seems to be assumed by you, emanate from the National Executive. In no proper sense can it be considered other than as an independent movement of at least a portion of the loyal people of Tennessee.

I do not perceive in the plan any menace of violence or coercion toward anyone. Governor Johnson, like any other loyal citizen of Tennessee, has the right to favor any political plan he chooses, and, as military governor, it is his duty to keep the peace among and for the loyal people of the State. I cannot discern that by this plan he purposes any more.

But you object to the plan. Leaving it alone will be your perfect security against it. Do as you please on your own account, peacefully and loyally, and Governor Johnson will not molest you, but will protect you against violence so far as lies in his power.

I presume that the conducting of a Presidential election in Tennessee in strict accordance with the old code of the State is not now a possibility.

It is scarcely necessary to add that if any election shall be held, and any votes shall be cast in the State of Tennessee for President and Vice President of the United States, it will belong, not to the military agents, nor yet to the executive department, but exclusively to another department of the Government, to determine whether they are entitled to be counted in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Except it be to give protection against violence, I decline to interfere in any way with any Presidential election.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint statement of Chairman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, and Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, ranking minority member:

The President's veto of the revenue bill places squarely before the Congress and the American people the question whether the taxing power shall continue to be exercised by the duly elected Representatives of the American people, or whether such power is to be surrendered and turned over to, or be dictated by, a small group of irresponsible theorists in the Treasury Department who advise the President on taxation and who seem to have lost patience with constitutional government by law and who favor government by Executive decree.

The position taken by the President in his veto message on the tax bill is indefensible.

The Congress gave most careful consideration to the administration's request for ten and one-half billions of additional taxes, and after months of deliberation came to the conclusion that any such increase, added to the existing Federal tax burden of forty-two billions, and the ten billions of State and local taxes, would be oppressive to taxpayers and dangerous to the national economy. The Congress did, however, increase taxes by $2,300,000,000, which it felt was as high as it could safely go at this time.

By limiting the increase to $2,300,000,000, Congress was simply being realistic in recognizing that there is a limit to the ability of the American people to pay taxes, even in time of war. The President, in insisting upon the enactment of his ten and one-half billion dollar program of additional taxes, to be raised in the manner prescribed by him, is being unrealistic.

In vetoing the tax bill because it does not meet his revenue demands, the President adopts a strange attitude, which ignores the primary responsibility of Congress, under the Constitution, in matters affecting taxation. Moreover, it is difficult to understand why, if ten and one-half billions of increased taxes is desirable, an increase of $2,300,000,000 is undesirable and is deemed to justify a Presidential veto.

The President's advocacy of a drastic general increase in individual income taxes on those of small and moderate incomes, is based upon the wholly false assumption that all have benefited from the war boom and are in an equally favorable position to pay still higher income levies. The fact is, however, that the incomes of a substantial portion of our citizens either have remained stationary or fallen off as a result of the war. To this group any general increase in the income tax, such as the President urges, would be a crushing blow. The President fails to suggest any means by which swollen war incomes can be reduced by increased taxation without unduly burdening those who have not benefited from the war.

In the field of corporate taxation, the President and the Congress differ as to whether the increase should be levied on normal profits or on war profits. The President favors the former course and the Congress the latter. The soundness of the position of Congress in placing the increased burden on war profits is so patent as to need no argument to support it. The President's proposal, on the other hand, would threaten the solvency of all business and undermine its ability to provide jobs when the war ends. Unless this bill becomes law, the way will be paved for many large corporations to make excess profits out of the war.

There are many good features of the bill which will be lost to the country if it should fail to become law. The increase in the excise taxes, amounting to over $1,000,000,000, will be lost to the Government. In fact, more than $87,000,000 from excise taxes has already been lost to the Government by failure of the President to sign the bill by February 19.

Some of the important features of the bill which will be lost through failure to pass it may be listed as follows:

1. The renegotiation provisions, which give the contractor or subcontractor the right to appeal from the arbitrary decision of the Department and have his day in court, as is the

usual American custom. There are many other provisions, among which is that requiring the services to state the facts and the reasons upon which their decisions are based. It is recognized by almost everyone, including the departments, that the renegotiation provisions are a decided improvement over the existing law.

2. The removal of the penalty for underestimating the amount of the individual income tax, so long as the previous year's income is used.

3. The simplification of the individual income tax through the elimination of the earned-income credit and excise-tax deductions, and the making of the Victory tax a flat 3 percent without regard to status.

4. The requiring of information returns from tax-exempt corporations, including labor unions, some of which are in direct competition with organizations subject to heavy Federal taxes.

5. Excluding from income tax of mustering-out pay to our soldiers and sailors.

6. Allowing corporations a deduction for contributions to veterans' organizations for rehabilitation purposes.

7. An easing of the tax burden upon the employer and employee by freezing the social security rate for the balance of 1944 at 1 percent.

8. Allowing relief, at the request of organized labor, in the case of back pay received for services rendered in prior years.

9. Permitting businesses coming out of bankruptcy or receivership proceedings treatment similar to that now accorded railroads.

10. Abatement of the 90-percent penalty in the case of the unemployment tax where taxes were not paid into the State fund within the required time.

11. Preventing corporations from gaining income and excess-profits tax relief by buying up defunct corporations.

12. Various other administrative provisions which remove many of the inequities existing.

There are some provisions in the bill, as there are in every bill, to which some of us disagree. But this is a natural result of a democratic form of government. It is to the bill as a whole, that we as legislators must direct ourselves in judging its soundness.

The President seeks to absolve the Treasury from any responsibility for the complicated income-tax system and forms. Of course, the Treasury prepares the forms and not the Congress. In speaking of complications, is the President aware of the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury, submitted to the Ways and Means Committee on November 5, 1941, for a new supplementary income tax on net income to be withheld at the source on salary, wages, dividends, bond interest, and similar items, and to be collected on other incomes quarterly throughout the year, the supplementary rate to be 15 percent. Or, is the President familiar with the Treasury proposal for a spendings tax in addition to the income tax?

If we had adopted the supplemental income tax recommended by the Treasury, or the dual spendings tax with its variable exemptions, as suggested by the Treasury, or the post-war refund provisions preferring single people over married people and people with dependents as suggested by the Treasury, we would have had confusion worse confounded.

While some of the complications in returns result from the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, the President must know that this law is based largely on Treasury recommendations.

The country knows, if the President does not, that the Congress is now busily engaged in preparing legislation simplifying the tax laws and returns to the greatest possible extent. Now that he is informed we trust he will direct the Treasury to adopt a more cooperative attitude, and cease trying to obstruct when it cannot dictate.

It is our hope that the Congress will retain its constitutional taxing authority by overriding the veto.

Willkie Versus the President on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal of February 17, 1944:

Wendell Willkie's address of a fortnight ago on United States tax policies in war and peace contained so much sound thinking about the relation of taxes to our economic health, and has been so little understood in many quarters, that it should be read by all who are interested in vital truths about our fiscal front.

It will be seen that Willkie did not say simply that we ought to raise $16,000,000,000 more in taxes instead of $2,000,000,000 more or $10,000,000,000 more; and it is still farther from the truth to say that he "out-Roosevelted Roosevelt" on the tax issue, or that his address was chiefly a criticism of Congress.

He showed the relation of taxes to the whole range of domestic and foreign policy and sketched the kind of stiff wartime tax program which would pay such perpetual dividends in our post-war economy that the wartime sacrifice it entailed would be an investment, more gilt-edged than War bonds, in post-war economic health and individual well-being.

The popular idea that the Roosevelt administration has stood for any such program is erroneous, as Willkie points out. President Roosevelt, who never has had any real interest in or understanding of sound Federal financing, has adroitly purveyed the idea that he wants $10,000,000,000 more in taxes and that Congress will only grant a little more than $2,000,000,000. The fact is that it is not the amount the administration wants which is the bone of its contention with Congress, but the ways the administration proposes—or rather, the ways it does not propose—to raise it.

The real reason Congress has set its teeth against Treasury drafts of revenue legislation is that it sees in them not primarily a program for financing the war, but a social reform program to put a floor of about $3,000 under and a ceiling of about $14,000 on individual incomes—a project which, of course, has nothing to do with financing the war. That is approximately what the last revenue measure proposed by the Treasury aimed to accomplish indirectly, and the amount of money it proposed to raise was almost incidental.

On the central issue of stiff wartime taxes for all who can help bear them, the administration's position is what it has always been: to make this, for the majority and for political reasons, a soft war.

Soldier or Senator?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World Herald, of February 7, 1944:

SOLDIER OR SENATOR?

It would have been easy and comfortable for Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., scion of one of America's distinguished families, to stay in the physical safety and comfort of the United States Senate.

But, at 41, and with the bloody battle of Europe about to open, Senator Lodge felt that his duty lay in another direction. He resigned from the Senate and prepared to activate his reserve commission as an Army major. If everything goes according to plan he will be at the front within a few weeks, perhaps leading his men into the jaws of Adolf Hitler's mighty defenses on the channel coast.

A gallant decision. Americans everywhere will admire the young Senator for making it.

But there is an implication in Senator Lodge's action which should be rooted out and examined. An implication that the only suitable job for a young and vigorous man in America today is to handle a gun, and that other jobs—such as service in the Senate of the United States—are for the aged and the infirm.

Probably the Senator actually meant no such thing. Nevertheless his action invites a comparison: Which is the more important, which has the greater opportunity to serve his country, the soldier or the Senator?

This country is engaged in two wars, one against foreign enemies and the other a war to safeguard the liberties of the people.

Every real American knows the foreign war will be won, no matter what the cost.

But the domestic war to protect our freedoms probably will never be won. It has been waged by every generation since history began, it is being fought vigorously in our times, and in all probability our children and our children's children will be obliged to carry on.

The foreign war must be fought by men using guns. The domestic war must be fought by the millions of civilians who believe that one of the greatest boons of life is the right to be free from arrogant, dictatorial, and all-powerful government.

In the United States the Halls of Congress provide a principal battleground. Hardly a day passes but that the two forces meet there in bitter conflict.

On one side are those who demand constantly greater powers for the Executive; power over elections, power over the purse, power to inflate or deflate, power to elevate the Federal Government over the sovereign States, power to issue legislation by bureaucratic regulations. On the other side are those who resolutely say: "No, this has gone far enough. The time has come to get back to the law and the Constitution."

There's no glamour or glory in this civilian war. No medals of honor, no Purple Heart.

In fact, the people sometimes refer, half jokingly and half contemptuously, to their Representatives in Washington as if they were a form of life somewhere between the toad

and the skunk in the scale of the animal kingdom.

Perhaps that attitude is one of the reasons why the morale of Congress is so low, why its enemies and critics even have become so bold as to cry fraud. Perhaps it is also one of the reasons why Senator Lodge convinced himself that he could be more useful and would be more highly regarded as one of many thousands of Army majors than as one of 96 Senators of the United States.

If so, we, the people, have made a terrible mistake. For Congress is and must be the people's chief line of defense. If Congress should lose its self-respect, or its will to resist dictation, or its determination to save the spirit of the Constitution, military victory could prove a very empty husk.

War Damage Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on February 18 and February 21, 1944:

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 18, 1944]

INSURANCE BILL IS INTRODUCED—D'ALESANDRO WANTS END TO WAR DAMAGE PAYMENTS

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Representative D'ALESANDRO, Democrat, Maryland, member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, today introduced a bill in the House designed to save home and other property owners millions of dollars in premiums on war damage insurance policies.

The Maryland Representative, who is head of an insurance firm in Baltimore, will be affected, as will every other fire insurance company and agency of the country.

The bill would preclude the further payment of premiums on existing policies for war damage upon homes and other property until the termination of the war, resulting in temporary paid-up insurance.

TWO BILLION DOLLARS IN BALTIMORE

Mr. D'ALESANDRO said information furnished him by Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, shows that the amount of war-damage coverage on homes, apartment buildings, office buildings and other property in Baltimore as of December 31, 1942, totaled $2,000,000,000.

The Maryland Representative pointed out that in 1942, the last year for which complete statistics are available, the War Damage Corporation issued in excess of 4,700,000 policies and has collected gross premiums of approximately $130,000,000. At the end of 1942 there was an aggregate insurance liability of $122,000,000,000.

Of the total of $122,000,000,000 aggregate liability, $71,000,000,000, or 58 percent, is in the States of California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania. War-damage insurance, it was noted has been written in every State of the Union and all of the Territories and possessions.

EXPECTED TO TESTIFY

The measure will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and Mr. D'ALESANDRO is expected to testify and urge the approval of his bill.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO said today that while the enactment of the legislation would deprive his firm of some revenue, he felt that home and other property owners should not be required to bear this additional expense of insurance on loans on their property in view of the increased income tax and living expenses. While the rate is only 1 percent on the loans, Mr. D'ALESANDRO said he felt that any danger of bombing of the cities and coast lines of the country has passed.

The War Damage Corporation explained that 891 claims, aggregating $63,000,000, for losses sustained prior to the time the corporation started writing policies had been filed. Most of the claims grew out of the enemy action against Pearl Harbor and the Philippines. Claims aggregating $102,000 have been paid.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 21, 1944]

WAR DAMAGE INSURANCE

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN.

SIR: I read with interest of Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO'S bill concerning war damage insurance introduced in Congress last week. I feel that many property owners share my sentiments when I voice approval of this bill.

It would seem logical, in view of the fact that no claims were paid, that these premiums for the second year should have been lowered or that these policies assume the status of temporary paid-up insurance.

F. J. GRAY.

BALTIMORE, *February 21.*

America's First Duty Will Be To Be Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester Sunday Telegram of February 20, 1944:

AMERICA'S FIRST DUTY WILL BE TO BE STRONG

America's chief duty after the war will be to be strong. All other responsibilities will depend on this one. Power is not a fixed and static thing. Already its fluctuations are clearly visible. We shall have no influence that we have not the power to make effective.

This is a reality which we should begin to examine at once before we commit ourselves to noble causes or to dreaming splendid dreams that may lead to frustration. Before we determine what we will do we should determine what power we will maintain to do it. We must stop visualizing a post-war world of sweetness and light in which we are to preside as the Elder Benevolence. There are unmistakable indications that it will not be that way.

Less than a year ago we were in influence and in available military resources, the strongest Nation in the world. Since then our power has increased. But if we examine the present situation with detachment we shall find reason to believe that our influence has decreased. The events that have decreased it—given the condition of favorable progress of the war for our side—were inevitable. They are rooted in centuries of European history. And they are typical of events that will follow. Before we commit ourselves too deeply into the outcome of these events we should be aware of them.

Russia's tremendous victories are victories for us. It is by our aid and that of the British that she has been able to win them. It was vital to our interests that we should give her that aid. But it has made Russia the strongest military power in the world.

There are none but the most fanciful reasons to suppose that Russia's military power, as such, will ever clash with ours. Our direct interests and Russia's do not conflict anywhere. Even our forces could never come together for anything like serious combat. She is a great military power hemmed in by buffer states and vast distances. We are the supreme naval power and Russia has no navy with which to approach us. The idea of war between us is little short of fantastic.

But Russia's great military power establishes her influence in fields in which she may consider her interests vital and our sentiments secondary. If that influence is unanimously accepted in those fields, our sentiments will not be adversely affected. But where great numbers of our people feel that it is implemented by power, and that justice is challenged and freedom denied by it, we shall need a background of something more than a mere protest to maintain our influence in other parts of the world, where our own interests may be more vital. We shall need the outward and visible signs of ability and willingness to protect those interests from any other influence.

Thus, how far we are willing to commit ourselves to sentiments, however noble, must depend upon how far we are prepared to defend them when they cease to be only sentiments, and become, from whatever source, threats to our interests and security.

The influence of Russia in supporting anti-government factions in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece, may or may not have delayed our activities in prosecuting our side of the war against Germany; may or may not be amicably settled; may or may not be all for the best for all concerned in the long run; may be justified or not by her geographical position. But the events themselves are typical, in their instabilities if not in their pattern, of what may happen in any part of the world, including the Near East, where we have important interests, and in this hemisphere, where our interests are vital.

Wherever we turn we see confusions or the possibility of confusions. Besides Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece, we have seen them in north Africa between factions of the French, and in Lebanon and Syria between the French and the Arabs. We see them in violent operation in Italy. What we may see in France is yet to be explored. What we shall see in Germany after we have conquered the Nazis will be chaos, and many divided councils. If we wish to be a dominant factor in shaping a world peace that will endure, our only guaranty will be our strength, not only then but as a continuing and unchallengeable force until that peace is firmly established on a basis of acknowledged justice, reason, and cooperation.

The problems are not only European or Asiatic. They come much nearer home. We have seen Argentina and Bolivia seething, Colombia restless, and there are other American countries in which we cannot feel that government rests securely upon the will or good will of the people.

We are in a state of the world in which victory may bring the appearance of peace, but it will not bring peace of mind. Only our strength can do that, until justice and reason are established, and that can come only through a united purpose based on commitments within the reach of our reasonable duties and our power.

With peace will come a new era of national, as well as international responsibility. To be enduringly strong without we must be enduringly strong within. We cannot be strong and poor. Our military strength may prove to be a hollow shell that will break on impact unless it is made strong by prosperous and responsible citizenship.

The day of electing people to govern us because of a gift of phrase-making, or a pleasing personality, or as a party reward, will not be adequate for the acute requirements of a world that will require, above all things and at all points, administrative excellence. We shall have a new and pressing need for quality, distributed throughout the length and breadth of the country. Blatant politicians, shrewd or stupid, will be useless to us. Demagogues who set class against class will be useless to us. Pressure groups will be useless to us. Shibboleths from the old trust-busting, muck-raking days of predatory capitalism will be useless to us and have long been outgrown. Government as a personal prerogative and a personal ambition will be useless to us.

If we are to meet the demands of this new era of a devastated world eager to reestablish itself by the competition of minds made eager by sacrifice and suffering, and competent in ways of trade which we greet with suppression, we shall have to gird ourselves. Our Government will have to be based on scientific inquiry, not on punishment and reward, nor on haphazard pressures. Trust will have to take the place of suspicion. Cooperation will have to take the place of antagonism. Government for the people will have to take the place of government for the party.

With the capital of great corporations distributed among the millions of thrifty people throughout the country, the slogans, the suspicions, and the persecutions of 1907 will throttle the industry of 1945. All the guardianship we need we can obtain if we realize that the political ways of 1907 are dead also.

We shall need to realize it if we are to maintain our place in a world which, after the war, will be not only confused but demanding; greedy after long impoverishment; listening to a thousand voices that will agitate its wrongs. One clear voice must be heard, powerful and resolute to restore faith and guard it, because only thus can its own people be secure and happy.

America's chief duty after the war will be, within and without, to be strong.

This War Job Is Not for F. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 1, 1944, under the heading "This war job is not for F. C. C.":

THIS WAR JOB IS NOT FOR F. C. C.

Now that the House has approved its committee's $1,500,000 cut in F. C. C. funds for war activities, the way is opening to transfer the Commission's military and naval intelligence service to the Army and Navy, where they belong. By not opposing the reduction, the House has tacitly endorsed the Appropriations Committee's recommendation for this reform.

This move was urged nearly a year ago by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but the Executive order has never been issued. T. A. M. Craven, a member of the F. C. C., testified before the Cox committee that the Commission had been "more a hindrance than a help" to the armed forces both before and after Pearl Harbor.

Chairman VINSON of the House Naval Committee has told the President it is vitally important to place the direction of military communication activities "directly under the armed services, with an experienced Army or Navy officer in charge."

It is on record that Rear Admiral Hooper, retired, in a memorandum to the Navy Department while he was still on active duty, accused F. C. C. of interfering with the war effort in Hawaii. Attempts to obtain more light on this subject were blocked by an official ban on testimony by representatives of the Army and Navy.

The Federal Communications Commission has enough to do in attending to its civilian duties. Its performances even in this field have incurred widespread criticism, including charges that it has exceeded its lawful authority. Its war activities should be taken over by those who have the responsibility of conducting the war.

Bigotry Is Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman entitled "Bigotry Is Un-American," which appeared in the American magazine of March 1944:

BIGOTRY IS UN-AMERICAN

(By Archbishop Francis J. Spellman)

(I have written this article for the American magazine because I feel that bigotry, like a cancer, is spreading through our Nation, and is retarding victory and peace. I believe that it is the personal and patriotic duty of every American to cooperate in checking the spread of this malignant disease. Even though we may not be able to take out of the minds and hearts of others the spirit of selfishness, harshness, injustice, and contempt, we can at least make sure that it has no place in our own.—Francis J. Spellman.)

In the assault from many fronts on the fortress of Europe, in the southwestern Pacific, on sea frontiers, on battlefields and in skies, the men of our armed forces are living and dying together to gain victory and peace. They are men of all racial origins and of diverse religious beliefs; but for their country, for themselves and for us, they are fighting the armed might of nations that began a war of destruction and enslavement against us.

Despite differences in character, despite varied and contrary beliefs on many matters, all are one in their desire to make their lives or deaths count for something constructive and good.

They do not all agree with one another, they may dislike one another's personalities, attitudes, beliefs, and actions, but nevertheless, patriotism and common interests lift them above disunion and unite them in devoted service to their country.

Unfortunately, things are not the same on the home front. Indeed, they are tragically different, and Army and Navy men of all ranks from coast to coast and from post to post have expressed incomprehension, bewilderment and even terror at what is happening here. They cannot understand how so many Americans at home are unwilling to sacrifice or subordinate their prejudices for our country's welfare, when they in the military service must be ready to sacrifice their lives. For all Americans, wherever they are and in whatever circumstances, have vital obligations to do their utmost for our country's righteous cause.

One of the highest ranking officers in our armed forces, and one with many years of meritorious foreign service, recently returned to the United States and came to see me. We talked of the war, its developments, its possible results and effects. "I am not worried about the progress of the war," he told me, "or about what our men in the armed forces are doing, what they are going to do and how well they are going to do it, but I am worried about what is going on right here at home. I do not, I cannot, understand the changes that have taken place in our country and in our people."

The day after Christmas, I met a man who came to the United States as an immigrant boy. He is now a manufacturer of anti-aircraft ammunition, producing more than 1,000,000 shells a day. He said: "Our country is very rich. She has everything, and we everything but 'peace on earth' to men of good will.' "

Recently I stood in line before a ticket window in a railroad station and during the wait of an hour, I talked to a sailor who, after two years of foreign duty, had just returned to the States. He spoke simply and frankly of many things but chiefly of his impressions since reaching home. "Many things have changed since I went away," he said, "but what has changed most is the people."

Yes; there have been great changes at home since the war began and some of these changes have not been improvements. One of the things that has taken place has been an increase in the prevalence of bigotry, evidenced by what has occurred in many parts of the country. Race riots, assaults on groups and individuals because of racial and religious differences, desecration of synagogues and churches, attacks on our foreign-born, are all tragic symptoms of this disease.

I am one of those who yearn to promote a better spirit of mutual understanding and forbearance among my fellow countrymen and do my share to promote the realization of American ideals and hopes for unity in essential things, liberty in nonessential things, and charity in all things. With all my heart, I deplore the growth of the cancer of bigotry penetrating American life, shriveling America's heart, retarding America's victory and peace. For bigotry undermines the fundamental principles avowed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These human and humane documents chartered and charted a new way of living—the American way. They were a gospel of liberation and they are a gospel of liberty, a proclamation of equality among men insofar as the protection of life and property is concerned.

If our country is to remain a human, humane homeland in a world where millions are homeless and millions are enslaved, we must be loyal to the spirit of those God-inspired principles on which our Government was established and has progressed. These principles are inconsistent with political despotism, racial prejudice, and religious discrimination.

How, for example, does the bigot interpret the immortal preamble to our Constitution? For the hallowed words, "a more perfect union," he reads "disunion"; for "justice" he substitutes "injustice." Instead of helping

to insure domestic tranquillity, he incites domestic strife. He sabotages the common defense and general welfare of the Nation, and instead of helping to secure the blessings of liberty, he sows the seeds of dissension and tyranny.

Bigotry thrives on ignorance, but intelligent people can be bigoted if they are sufficiently ignorant in fields of knowledge that have not come under their observation. The apostle of bigotry employs a technique that is often effective with intelligent men. He lays a foundation of falsehood having the appearance of truth—and in our day, he employs for this foundation, every means of communication known to modern man. If a lie is told often enough, it is said, even the liar himself will believe it, and it is certainly true that lies have survived many generations of periodic exposure.

Did our forefathers foresee the possibilities and dangers of bigotry? They surely did, for they knew there had never been a century, a country, a race, or a religion that did not have its small-minded men; and bigotry is a disease which thrives in small minds. Fortunately, from the earliest days of her beginnings, America has been blessed with great-minded men who by word and example have protected the Nation from ravages of bigots. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson eloquently vindicated our religious liberties, and our constitutional amendments proclaim time and again the un-American character of bigotry.

For example, the fifteenth amendment of our Constitution states that the rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude. Another proof that bigotry, racial and political, is un-American is evidenced by the unanimous rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States that all persons without distinction of race, color, or nationality, have equal protection of the law, which is a guaranty of the protection of equal laws.

But despite these guaranties of political, racial, and religious freedom, bigotry has existed down through the years of our history to the detriment of our country and to the regret and shame of all fair-minded Americans.

In some periods and in some places, it has been more prevalent or manifest than in other times and places, and in certain ways, it seems more widespread and more virulent now than ever. And this is wartime, when America is least able to tolerate intolerance. Perhaps it is because it is wartime, when 10,000,000 of our most generous-hearted young men no longer walk the streets of our communities, that bigotry is more widespread and active. War-inspired passions warp the judgment of the less generous-hearted and more selfish-minded among us and make them a prey of agitators who, in more normal times, would lack an audience.

Possessing intellectual convictions is a virtue which the bigot transforms into a vice by brutally imposing his convictions on his fellowman. Bigotry's source and bigotry's force is hatred, and the bigot is a fautor of the cult of hatred. Even the word "bigot" in its old French connotation meant one who did not love his country. In blind sincerity or malicious insincerity, the bigot arraigns himself against his fellow Americans and, so far as it is in his power, virtually undermines the Constitution, the foundation of our security, liberty, and prosperity. He cannot see outside himself because he looks through windows frosted with prejudices. His method is misrepresentation and slander. He disdains the use of free speech as an unwounding sword to present his own convictions and refute error. He must stab, slash, smear, and sneer.

All fair-minded Americans must oppose bigotry, not only from a sense of justice but also from a sense of safety, for, if tolerated, it can be directed at any race or religion and then may rebound against all of them. If we incite, participate, or connive in violence against our fellow citizens, we are bad Americans. If we stir up, propagate, or cherish race hatred, we are likewise bad Americans and traitors to American ideals.

If we are real Americans, we must cooperate in checking the spread of bigotry, which is a contagious, virulent disease. However, it is not only patriotic to try to cure this disease; it is essential to do so if America is to remain America. And how can we check the spread of this disease? The first step which each one of us must take to eliminate bigotry, selfishness, harshness, injustice, and contempt from the minds and hearts of others is to make sure that they have no place in our own.

Not only for patriotic reasons should we purge our minds and hearts but also because we should obey the commandment to love our neighbor as ourselves. Catholics, for example, are bound by a principle of personal tolerance to love all men, not merely for humanitarian reasons but also because their religion teaches them to do so. If they follow these religious teachings, their love must be generous and self-sacrificing and must include the willingness to help those who are in need—Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, pagans, and atheists. Some who profess to be Catholics do not act in accord with this principle, and therefore they do wrong. The country suffers and the church suffers.

In these days Catholics are frequently accused of anti-Semitism, and doubtless some Catholics are guilty of it. That anti-Semitism is wrong from a Catholic and humanitarian standpoint as well as from an American viewpoint has been demonstrated countless times, in countless ways by countless persons, so that it may be jarringly repetitious to say it again. I feel, however, that for completeness, I may quote from one authority, the Pope, the highest authority in the church. In 1928, before Hitler came to power, Pius XI ordered anti-Semitism to be condemned clearly and officially in these words:

"Moved by the spirit of charity, the Apostolic See has protected the people (of Israel) against unjust persecutions, and since it condemns all jealousy and strife among peoples, it accordingly condemns with all its might the hatred directed against a people which was chosen by God; that particular hatred, in fact, which today commonly goes by the name of anti-Semitism."

And on July 30, 1938, Pius XI said: "It is not possible for Christians to take part in anti-Semitism. It is inevitable that any time we abandon the life of the gospels, human lives perish. Toward the Israelites we are not only extremely anti-Christian and anticivil, but inhuman. For them the misery of exile and outlawing is not enough; it goes on to pillory, beatings, wounding, and death."

Of anti-Catholic bigotry I shall say but little. Persecution of the Catholic Church is no new thing. It has continued unabated through 20 centuries. Eleven of Christ's disciples died a martyr's death, and even during the past few years thousands of priests and nuns have been martyred in many countries.

In our own country, either through ignorance, malice, or greed, the church is viciously and constantly attacked. Publications exist for the evident purpose of maligning it. Paid snoopers, snipers, and agitators are in the employment of anti-Catholic organizations to bait Catholics and incite anti-Catholicism. In charity, I prefer not to react to nor answer them.

Some anti-American organizations are not so exclusive as to concentrate their venom solely on Catholics, but also group Jews, Negroes, and foreign-born citizens with them. Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution, deplored the revival of the Ku Klux Klan and expressed the hope that there might not be a recrudescence of religious and racial intolerance, and said:

"There are not many Catholics in Georgia, which is a pity in a way, because they are almost invariably good Christians, good citizens, and worth-while members of a community. There are not many Jews in Georgia either, but they, too, are good citizens. Their contribution is one of decency and hard work. There are also about 5,000 members of the Greek community in Atlanta alone, and they, like the Catholics and Jews, have been buying War bonds and sending their sons off to fight. They do not hate any other group."

Malice toward none, justice to all is the general American formula and practice. No true American will nurture, promote, or incite anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, anti-any group of fellow law-abiding American citizens. After Abraham Lincoln's divinely inspired pleadings for understanding and charity proved unavailing to many, he wrote:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it, 'All men are created equal except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read, 'All men are created equal, except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty."

Today I am saddened to realize that these words which flowed from the soul of a great American are more true now than they were fourscore years ago. Still, our consoling hope is that the great majority of the American people have an instinctive and fundamental sense of civic and political justice and respect for their every fellow citizen.

In the United States there are approximately 13,000,000 Negroes. But even if there were only 1,300 or 13, they, like all Americans, must be free to exercise the rights given to them in our Constitution. And when they have these rights in fact as well as in law, they will treasure their national heritage and not be influenced by agitators whose aims are not to improve, but to destroy our American way of life.

It is not the vocation of Americans to allow the elements of racial and religious prejudice to poison and pollute the blood poured forth from the wounds of the older nations of the world into the great crucible that is America, a crucible of common sacrifice, suffering, work, and triumph. Our vocation calls for love of God and country and a sense of brotherhood, a vocation which we Americans of the present can learn from Valley Forge and from other American shrines, and not from the resurrected corpses of intolerant strife.

To this end, we have the example and the inspiration of our fighting forces, fulfilling their vocation to live and die united among themselves and with us and for us at home. I have learned this truth a thousand times in a thousand ways, and I learned it again just now from a letter written by a United States Army Chaplain:

"It is with much happiness that I inform you that the officers and men of my regiment are sending you the sum of $3,000 to use in memory of their fallen brothers in arms, who faithfully served their God and country even until death and who, in their sacrifice, fulfilled that great precept of love which Christ gave to us, 'Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'

"With a generosity and thoughtfulness so characteristic of them, they are asking you through me, their chaplain, to provide a memorial to their dead comrades in the

form of a mission chapel in these islands where they have served so conspicuously for the glory of their beloved flag.

"Originally the Catholic boys conceived the idea of this memorial, but scarcely had they started, when officers and men of other faiths requested to share in this loving tribute.

"Most of us had lived together for 2 years. We knew one another intimately and loved one another with a friendship that will always be treasured by each and every one of us. To the honor and glory of our fellow soldiers who no longer live except in our memories, all the members of the regiment—Catholics, Protestants, and those of the Jewish faith—send you this remembrance of our love and esteem, for our departed brothers.

"It is our earnest prayer that by this tribute a new happiness may fill the hearts of their dear ones as they realize the deep affection and esteem with which we cherish their memory."

Can any American be disloyal by word or act to these men on the fighting fronts, and fail to keep united for them, these United States? America guarantees to each one of the millions of her citizens all freedoms with only such limitations as are inherent in the mutual rights of others; for liberty, without such limitations, is tyranny. Believing in this America, dare any one us be in heart or hand party to any group that seeks to tear apart this country that we love!

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of his reasons for vetoing the revenue act, the President stated as follows:

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold.

This sounds like plausible reasoning. Actually, it is completely implausible.

The amendment referred to in this bill was aimed at conservation of timber, one of our greatest natural resources. It gave some tax protection to the owner of timber, so as to provide protection for the timber itself, and to foster more reforestation. In that way, it was designed to bring about an increasing supply of this resource, with the consequent increase in the number of jobs for labor in our big woods, and in the mills and other plants which process the timber.

I agree with the President that timber should be treated as a crop, as a perpetual yield resource. But in his veto message, I wonder if he is talking about a real timber crop or a mere Christmas tree crop. Any fair-minded and informed person must recognize that there is a tremendous difference between the timber crops of my State, for example, and the little Christmas trees which the President grows on his Hyde Park estate.

The timber in my part of the country, and, indeed, in most sections where timber is produced commercially, is considered a part of the realty, the land, upon which it grows. Hence, if a timber owner sells his trees to a mill company he treats his gain as a capital gain. He has sold a part of his realty. Now, under existing law, under the laws in effect previous to our passage of this revenue bill, if a timber owner takes his own mill onto his own land and cuts and mills his timber and sells the lumber from it, he is taxed for all that income as if it were all produced in that year. This does not reflect the 50 to 100 years during which the owner's father and possibly his grandfather, as well as the present owner himself, protected and conserved this timber, this realty. In other words, the work of many years is transformed into income for 1 year, and the owner is thereby pushed up into the higher tax brackets. His timber and his many years of work and risk are pretty much taken away from him.

This is unjust. It is this injustice which the current revenue bill would correct. The amendment in question referred only to timber. It is not a loophole for timber owners to escape tax; it is merely intended to free them from a wrong taxing method, and thereby allow them to build up and perpetuate their holdings, which, mark you, increases and perpetuates jobs in my part of the country and in all other commercial timber sections of the country.

The President declares that the contrary view "would encourage reforestation." I cannot agree. This may be true if you are talking about little Christmas trees, but it certainly is not the case if you are talking about real timber crops. In fact, the amendment which he criticizes was designed to do the very thing which he claims it would not do—that is, help encourage reforestation. This amendment would unquestionably encourage reforestation. It would conserve timber and boost reforestation because it helps the owner to put his timber operations on a perpetual yield basis. He does not have to cut the timber all at once to make any profit at all; he can put it on a genuine crop basis. It makes timber cropping more profitable than the old "cut and get out" theory under which our forests hitherto have been devastated for years. So, it is designed not only to pereptuate the timber supply, but the jobs which accrue through such perpetuation. The amendment permits the owner to treat his income from his realty as a capital gain; in so doing, it allows him to effectuate a perpetual, permanent timber operation. That is sound economics. It is sound taxation. I intend to vote to pass this bill over the veto, because I disagree with the President not only on other phases of the matter, but specifically on this timber taxation aspect.

H. R. 3403

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3403 contains amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, recommended by the Hawaiian Homes Commission and by concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its twenty-second biennial session in 1943.

The changes do not involve any vital points of basic policy. They relate almost entirely to administrative problems that have developed in recent years, and more particularly in direct consequence of the war effort in the Territory of Hawaii.

The first section of the bill covers the position of the executive officer of the Commission into the system of classification that was adopted by the legislature of the Territory, and now covers all their principal executive offices. This classification was adopted some years after the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission differs from other agencies of the executive branch of the territorial government in that it was created by an act of Congress instead of by an act of the territorial legislature.

Although the act of Congress creating the Hawaiian Homes Commission fixed the limitations of the salary of the executive officer and provides other conditions under which this agency shall operate, the funds for this salary and other persons employed in this department are provided entirely out of territorial funds, as are the funds needed for the territorial departments.

The amendment would make it possible to adjust the salary of the executive officer to the same level paid officers holding corresponding responsibilities within the executive department of the Territory.

This change is important so as to enable the Homes Commission to maintain in this very important position a man whose ability is commensurate with the responsibilities. It is only fair, too, that the man holding this position should be compensated on a basis comparable to a man carrying like responsibilities in the territorial government.

Section 2 of the bill returns to the jurisdiction of the Territory land on the island of Hawaii and on the island of Molokai that has already been added to Army airfields since the outbreak of war. The principal airfields on both these islands were located adjacent to the Hawaiian Homes Commission projects. These met the requirements of the fields from the civil standpoint.

The outbreak of war made it necessary immediately to enlarge these fields so

they could accommodate the heaviest planes necessary for the defense of the islands.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission, not having authority to negotiate with the Army for the use of these areas, this bill returns this land to the Territory so that it can carry on the proper negotiations. The amount of land involved is less than 70 acres.

On page 2 of the committee report on the bill, an error is made in the designation of the contents of section 2. The changes referred to in the report as coming within section 2 are those contained in section 3. The office of the delegate was responsible for this error.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 207 (1) (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to allow homesteaders on the Island of Molokai, in the Kalanianaole Settlement, an additional residence lot not adjoining the agricultural or pastoral lot, provided the residence lot shall not exceed 4 acres, and the gross acreage of both lots does not exceed the present acreage limitation under the act.

This change in the law is to correct a situation that developed on the island of Molokai where the first settlement was established. The water developed for purposes of irrigating the homesteads was obtained from wells drilled within the vicinity. It developed such high salt content that it could no longer be used for irrigating purposes. The homesteaders had in the meantime established their homes in this settlement.

The Commission finally decided that these same homesteaders should be allowed to retain their homes on this area close to the seashore, but in order to carry on their agricultural activities should be given farm lots in another area on property where another settlement was subsequently developed.

This was done, so the purpose of this bill is to legalize what is obviously a sound and fair decision.

The final section of the bill contains amendments designed to empower the Commission to grant licenses to churches, hospitals and similar community institutions to operate within the Hawaiian Homes areas. The Commission proceeded on the assumption that it had this power up until recently, when it was advised by the Attorney General that, in the absence of some such specific authorization, such was not the case.

As the importance of such institutions is obvious, and as they are already operating in the Hawaiian Homes Commission areas, the adoption of this amendment is important.

The second change within this section would empower the Commission to grant the Federal Government certain rights-of-way within certain limitations so that the armed forces operating the air fields adjacent to the Hawaiian Homes Commission areas can be allowed to proceed with the development of the necessary utilities under the proper authority.

Post-War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday February 23, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over Columbia Broadcasting System February 15, 1944:

My fellow citizens, we must concentrate on winning the war and prepare a post-war program that will furnish full employment to our disbanded armed forces and war workers. We must have the wisdom and foresight to plan in advance against mass unemployment. Will we rake leaves for the Government or will be have real jobs in private enterprise? We will have to make our choice. There is no question as to how real Americans will decide. Free enterprise must lead the way, unfettered by Federal restrictions. Our people are opposed to regimentation and political control. They want to be governed by law and not by executive orders, or directives coming from Federal boards and bureaus. Any Federal agency which allows you to own, produce, or sell by permission only, instead of by legal rights can so circumscribe you that the time might come when that agency so held that you have no right to exist. We do not propose to have our people live by permission only. We will stand by our legal rights which are guaranteed by our Constitution. The hope of the world lies in free men and women for only they can establish lasting peace and security.

We must keep faith with the men and women in our armed service by intelligent planning, for their future. Our returning veterans want jobs with fair wages in private enterprise. It is our patriotic duty to fight for all that may contribute to the reestablishing and maintaining free private enterprise. Not an enterprise financed and controlled by the Government but a private enterprise financed and controlled by American individuals.

Any post-war plan worthy of the wholehearted support of the American people must necessarily be one which protects their interests. This must be true whether national or international in scope. One of the main objectives in a post-war program is to improve our home towns. Have you ever stopped to look at your home town? Did you ever compare it with other towns you have visited? Does your home town have a post-war planning committee? Every city, town, and community should have such a committee.

Many of our communities grew without a plan. In most towns you will find a highway running through the center and the public buildings built on narrow streets. This was not so bad until the arrival of the automobile. But just take a look at main street today and notice the traffic. It is difficult to get a place to park your car to do your shopping. In many communities two houses were built on one lot, leaving no place for the children to play. There is little space to enjoy your home or have a small garden.

Intelligent planning is all important. Without a program your community will lose. With sound planning any community can benefit. Every community must take an active part in such a program. In the past few years many communities have depended too much on the Government for aid. Most of us realize that Federal aid is too expensive. Every community will soon find out that it will be much cheaper if we solve most of our own problems. If each community will accept its share of responsibility, I am certain America will prosper in the post-war world.

In the past many groups and individuals have been too selfish. The time has come when selfish interests of groups and individuals must be put aside. We must adopt a live-and-help-live policy. Our big job is to make democracy work. If we insist on better communities we can maintain and improve the democracy for which our boys are fighting. We must stand united for the future and all can benefit if all will serve. No group in America shall achieve special favoritism to the detriment of other groups. There must be no monopolies whether in the field of industrialization, financing, or politics.

After the war is over we must be ready with an orderly program of demobilization of our armed forces and war workers. This problem will be much greater than it was after the First World War. A prompt settlement of war contracts will be necessary to obtain free working capital and floor space. Thousands of small manufacturers will have their money tied up in war work and they will not be able to convert to peacetime production unless their working capital is released. A tax program should be evolved to permit the free flow of capital from individuals to industry. Throughout the years seed money and risk capital have been used to purchase inventions, new machines, new factories, and research for better products. Business can produce more and better goods for less money if seed money and risk capital is not eliminated by our tax laws. There must also be a satisfactory disposal of Federal-owned plants, equipment, and surpluses or much confusion will follow.

The miracle of American war production is proof that the job can be done in peacetime. We will have all that it takes in natural resources, trained labor, trained managers, and productive resources to carry on. Private industry must organize and operate in a manner which will make unnecessary another W. P. A. Only through the processes of private enterprise will the American people enjoy a higher standard of living. The American system is the only one which has stood the test of time with suitable and proper reward to individual initiative, ability, and ambition.

America will get the job done with teamwork. We learned the value of teamwork from our pioneer ancestors. They worked together in their corn-husking bees and threshing rings. Our armed forces are demonstrating American teamwork on the fighting fronts to the highest degree. Thousands of war plants are participating in teamwork production. Americans using their heritage and experience in teamwork can outproduce any economy devised by dictators. We need emphasis on good management and persuasion rather than regimentation and compulsion. There must be mutual confidence and understanding between capital and labor.

Many industries will have to be decentralized geographically in order to get out of industrial mobs. In the past several years many working people migrated to the large cities to get a job. Now there is a demand to bring some of the suitable industries to the rural areas.

With the right kind of planning America will have much to offer her returning servicemen. Many of them will be provided with educational opportunities using the existing facilities of our regular established high schools and collegiate institutions. Some of our servicemen will start a back to the farm movement, as the Government owns millions

of acres of land which can be irrigated into fertile fields and farms. Thousands of workers will be needed in building American homes. Thousands will find jobs in private industry making automobiles, planes, radios, tires, and other products. Our transportation system will be expanded and modernized. Public highways and roads will have to be expanded and improved. Many new airports will be built.

Our first objective is to provide millions of jobs for these servicemen and war workers. At present there are 62,000,000 persons gainfully employed including 10,000,000 in the armed service. If we assume that 2,000,000 men will remain in the armed service, 2,500,000 young men will return to school, and at least 2,500,000 women will return to homemaking, it will leave a labor force of 55,000,000 persons. In 1940 there were 46,000,000 gainfully employed. If private enterprise does as well in the post-war period as it did in 1940 we will still have to find jobs for 9,000,000 more persons. It will take a sound post-war program to find jobs for them. How will we do the job?

1. If each employer, who employs 1 to 8 persons will average hiring 1 extra person we can add 1,850,000 to our pay rolls.

2. If each employer, who employs 8 to 1,000 persons, will average 10 extra persons it will put to work 1,467,000 persons.

3. If the 3,300 large firms will average 100 new jobs we can put to work 330,000 more workers

4. A back-to-the-farm movement can accommodate 1,500,000 persons.

5. A private-housing program will put to work another million persons.

6. At least 100,000 school teachers will be needed to teach the 2,500,000 young men returning to school.

7. The remaining 2,750,000 can be employed in private industry if individuals will invest their idle capital in business.

If everyone does his or her part throughout the Nation in making these investments coupled with sound planning, America can build an economy and a standard of living the likes of which the world has never dreamed Will you accept the challenge of assuring jobs for our fighting men and war workers?

Fellow Americans, this will be the greatest drive we ever made for American prosperity. Our volunteer citizen organizations who have worked so well in civilian defense must turn to our post-war problems and take an active part. All of us will be called upon to make small and large investments to create more jobs. We cannot expect Uncle Sam to appear as Santa Claus to distribute money for post-war work.

At this point, I would like to give you a few concrete examples of the things we might do to create more jobs.

1. New factories will be needed to extract oil from coal and shale. These will be located in coal and shale regions.

2. Parachute and powder bag sewing projects can be utilized in making shirts and other garments after the war.

3. Small machine shops may be utilized to make small parts for industry.

4. More factories will be needed to extract the oil from soybeans and castor beans.

5. Indiana limestone operators can modernize their system in order to compete with other building material in building homes.

We must not only put idle men and idle capital to work but we must also put idle acres to work if we want prosperity. Food is one of the most challenging problems in America today. Food will win the war and it will also win the peace. There are millions of children in the small democracies who are in need of food at the present time. We must not only produce more food but we must save the food which has been produced.

While we are making plans to feed nations and find jobs for our returning war veterans, we must not overlook the necessity of taking care of our disabled citizens and elders of America. It is incumbent on governments to remove the fear of want for our disabled and our old folks. Our social security program is in need of revision. Federal funds should be distributed to the States on the basis of need rather than through matching of State funds. We should at least provide a minimum basic protection. Our elders of America have been neglected during the war period.

Victory or defeat in the post-war period will depend upon the cooperation of labor, agriculture, industry, and you.

A post-war commission must be formed with a chief director and other directors of labor, agriculture, industry, Government, religion, veteran, and education Capable persons with some practical experience should be selected as directors. These directors and their assistants should receive good pay for a full-time job. The commission should collect data, study the economic problems, and formulate a comprehensive program for the full utilization of our resources of men and machines in maintaining the economic well-being of our people. This commission would make recommendations with respect to legislation necessary to effect the elimination of unemployment and to adjust the economic life and financial structure of our Nation. Each State should have a post-war planning director. State directors should organize all counties and all communities. A sound post-war plan must be presented to the American public in such a form that it will be accepted by all.

America is the hope of the world today. A free America, a strong America, an America with constitutional government unshaken, is the only kind of America which can be a beacon of hope and progress for all other peoples of the world in the years to come. We must, and we will, keep the torch of liberty aflame in our own Nation. We will keep it burning to light the way.

Randolph Bill for Synthetic Fuel Development Wins Editorial Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post, February 21, 1944, in commendation of an important and far-sighted measure recently approved by the House. The bill referred to by the editor of the Post is H. R. 3209, sponsored by my colleague Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and has as its objective the establishment by the Government of adequate plants for the development of synthetic fuel.

The editorial that follows is only one of many expressions of approval appearing in the press throughout the Nation:

SHORT OF OIL

Official warnings that our known reserves of domestic petroleum will last only 13 or 14 years at the present rate of consumption have caused Congress to bestir itself. The House has just passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of up to $30,000,000 to enable the Bureau of Mines to build experimental plants for the production of gasoline from coal, oil shale, agricultural and forestry products. And the Truman committee has issued a report dealing with our fast-vanishing oil supplies suggesting that our allies, particularly Great Britain, be asked to transfer to us "a compensating volume of proven reserves outside this country." The Truman committee further calls for the establishment of some policy to govern acquisition of Middle East and other foreign oil reserves. Finally Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, and the Senate Commerce Committee has approved a resolution sponsored by Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, calling for appointment of a special committee of 9 representing 4 Senate committees—Commerce, Interstate Commerce, Foreign Relations, and Public Lands—to investigate the oil problem. The recommended composition of the proposed committee shows that the sponsors of the resolution are keenly aware of the fact that our oil problem has ceased to be a matter of purely domestic concern.

The depletion of our oil supplies constitutes a threat to the stability of our economic structure and endangers the future security of the Nation. That explains why the House, with only a handful of dissenting votes, has approved spending money to finance governmental research in developing synthetic fuels. Since oil is indispensable to the conduct of war as well as to the conduct of peaceful activities, we dare not rely upon private enterprise to produce needed substitutes when natural supplies are exhausted. The failure of private industry to develop synthetic rubber products is an ever-present reminder that the Government must not again be caught unprepared in an emergency.

Congressional action in furtherance of a national oil policy that would protect our interests at home and abroad is in no way inimical to private industry. On the contrary, conditions will be more propitious for development of American-owned oil properties abroad if the Government provides limited financial aid and gives American companies a measure of political support. Experimental work to develop synthetic oil products at home, involving as it does considerable outlays without hope of immediate return, cannot be carried on effectively except by concerns with large capital, and they may not choose to risk such expenditures for the sake of an uncertain return. Developmental work of this kind is, therefore, especially deserving of Government support. Furthermore, the benefits of the discoveries made by Government agencies will be available for general use instead of being the property of some private producing group. The fact that the bill passed by the House had the support of the petroleum industry, independents as well as organized companies, according to Representative RANDOLPH, is best evidence that the program does not contemplate Government competition with private industry but rather Government aid to private industry.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent to me from one of my constituents:

THE EGYPTIAN MESSENGER,
Zeigler, Ill.

DEAR SIR: "Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise," is a good adage for many

who argue a Federal ballot. I wonder just how many of the advocates of a Federal soldier ballot have ever read the Constitution of the United States. If they have, they will find article XII given over to the method of franchise very clearly defined. If the States are to be overlooked in this fall's election, then it is as unconstitutional as the possession of slaves or refusing the women their ballot. "The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President. But in choosing the President the votes shall be taken by the States." It seems this is so evident, that, by reading, any school child may be able to comprehend and a wayfaring man, though a fool, might not err therein.

My grandfather and father served in the Civil War. A representative of my family served in the Spanish-American War; I personally served in World War No. 1. I have two sons in this present war. Are they any better than their sires? The same Constitution these sires respected is the Constitution governing the votes of my two sons. They have been so raised as to respect this document. If they vote, I shall want them to do the thing they would naturally want to do, vote as the law of the land provides in its basic governing document—the Constitution. This is what, in my mind, constitutes an American.

I might add that I spent several years in the Army and never once did I have the privilege of voting. I do not say I am opposed to servicemen voting. No, but let it be done in a constitutional American manner.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. PHIFER.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the open forum of the Jewish Daily Forward at Dorchester, Mass., February 20, 1944:

There is one matter engaging the attention of our country to a larger extent than any other—the problem of national unity in the face of this war for survival. It is absolutely impossible to maintain the liberties of our people if we are to have intolerance and racial hatred. This way lies the utter destruction of everything we hold dear.

In this city of Boston, as well as in other large cities in the United States, gangs of hoodlums have attacked peaceful citizens, caused them to run and hide, have besmirched churches and synagogues, and left their filthy notes of intolerance in railroad stations and other public places. Such must not be tolerated in any free country.

America was built on the principle of racial and religious liberty. Eighty years ago we fought a bloody and destructive war to bring freedom to all the people of the United States. We cannot afford any less for all groups inhabiting this glorious country of ours.

There was always some intolerance in ages past, but this was reserved for the "lunatic fringe," that small group in the United States which always created trouble and brought about a cleavage among our citizens. But no such group ever succeeded in destroying the well-known principles of our Government—the love of liberty and freedom of speech, press, and assembly. Hitler sent paid agents to the United States and in 1934 there were many pamphlets, publications, and other methods used to make Germans out of Americans, to imbue them with the spirit of intolerance and a master race and to cause trouble and dissension among our people.

It was my good fortune to make a thorough survey of the situation when in 1934 I succeeded in inducing Congress to appoint a committee to study Nazi propaganda and examined scores of witnesses who gave us a picture of the manner in which this propaganda functioned. Every German ship that came to this shore carried tons of literature which was distributed promiscuously among the people of this country and every German "Aryan" resident of the United States was enlisted in doing the work of gaining adherents for the fatherland. I am afraid that a great deal of the seed which was then sown remained to plague us today and there is no question but that many of our good native Americans became infected with the poison which was then spread from Berlin. It is therefore because of this hate-spreading propaganda of 1934 that we are now reaping the harvest in this year of 1944. Hitler may have become thoroughly discredited in the eyes of our American citizens, but Hitlerism is by no means dead.

We cannot win this war if we do not destroy the seeds of intolerance. America must never allow the doctrine to become established that there are races which are superior and races which are inferior. We are all children of one God and we are all members of one race—the human race. Even the Germans, much as they may deserve the hatred of the whole world, are members of the human race.

We believe that all men are created equal, and there never should be in this country, at least, a distinction made of any of its citizens, by reason of his race or his creed. Our Constitution grants the humblest of our citizens the same rights which it gives to its mightiest. However, man or woman, irrespective as to their race or creed or whatever country his or her parents might have been born in has the inherest right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

It has been the policy of our Nation to enlarge the liberties of every individual, so that we can look forward to the time that all of us will reach the condition where we will be free from want and free from fear and will be able to lead peaceful lives under the protection of our Government and peacefully rear our families in the way in which human beings should be able to lead a quiet and undisturbed existence.

It is perhaps too early at a time when millions of men are engaged in a titanic struggle to be discussing world peace and prosperity, but it has always been the ideal of the United States that there should be world peace and prosperity.

We know very well that it is impossible for Americans to be free if the rest of the world is not free and it is impossible for us to live in peace if the rest of the world will not be at peace.

Human progress in the last 100 years has made the world smaller. Transportation is much quicker and in the last few years our President was able to conduct important conferences in many places on the globe, where formerly it would have taken weeks and months of travel to reach. Today, any place in the world is distant no further than it takes to get to it by airplane. There was a time when it took weeks to get from New York to Boston or from New York to Philadelphia. Today, we can make the trip in a few hours and it does not take very much longer to get to such places as Cairo or Teheran.

Conferences between nations will always be held, but they should be conferences for peace and not conferences for war. If every nation should be allowed free access to all the raw materials of the world and a free development within its own country, there will be no cause for any future wars and we may indeed celebrate the time when in the words of the prophet "they will turn their swords into plow shares and will learn war no more."

Peace may be a prophetic ideal, but unless we have such an ideal clearly before our eyes, we will suffer from the misfortunes of the world and will never bring about a more favorable turn of events. It is the ideals of yesterday which have become the achievements of today. It is what we plan and strive for that our children and children's children will enjoy in days to come.

In the peace of the world we must not forget the fate of the most haunted group of human beings, the Jews, who were the first victims of Hitler's wrath and are the last to find any help in a war-torn world. Jews suffer from the added disadvantage of having no country to which they may go in escaping from Hitler's tyranny. How many millions of Jews were killed in Europe and all those countries which Hitler overran or to which Hitler's legions came we will never know. The best statistics on the subject are to the effect that all of the Jews of Germany and most of the Jews of Poland, Hungary, and Rumania have been totally wiped out. Even in Russia, whenever Hitler was able to occupy any portions of its territory at one time or another, he saw to it that no Jews were left alive. Those who were able to escape the murder of Hitler's henchmen are now in the most precarious position in the world. They have no place to go, since the doors of every country are closed in their faces. There are hundreds and thousands of human beings who have no place to go, since no country will admit them.

Palestine was supposed to become a national home for the Jewish people, for since in November 1917 the then British Foreign Minister Balfour issued his famous declaration to the effect that Palestine was to become a national home for the Jewish people. But in the year 1939 the British Government issued its famous white paper, which would close all immigration to Palestine on March 31 of this year.

After March 31 Palestine will not only cease to be the national homeland of the Jewish people but will be, paradoxically, the only country in the world which will be definitely barred to Jewish immigration.

American Jewry is united in its attitude that only Palestine can furnish at the present time the place of rescue to which the uprooted and disinherited Jews of the world can go.

I have dwelt at length on the question of Palestine's becoming a Jewish national homeland because the problem of intolerance is bound up with the problem of a national home.

I am sure that if the Jews of Europe who found themselves in the throes of Hitler's persecution had the foresight 20 years ago to emigrate to Palestine a great deal of the tragedy which has overwhelmed our people would have been avoided.

It is against a homeless people and a people who have no place to go that Hitler's persecutions were particularly directed. He could not have been successful in his program of slaughter if his prospective victims had been out of his reach when he was stirring up the masses against the helpless and powerless Jews of Germany.

You must, therefore, bear in mind that one of the practical methods by which persecution may be checked whenever it raises its ugly head, will be to remove the victims of intolerance from the clutches of their enemies.

The program, therefore, which is now being debated in Congress by way of crystallizing public opinion of the United States in favor of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, is a highly practical one.

This program will save many thousands of lives and will give an opportunity to the

Jewish people of the world to be rescued where otherwise they might perish.

I wish to stress upon my audience the advisability of doing everything that any one of us can in urging upon Congress and the American people to give a helping hand to the persecuted Jews who have no other friends to turn to but the people of the United States, a people always so generous when it comes to giving real help to the oppressed of the world.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on brotherhood week for the National Conference of Christians and Jews by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, C. I. O.:

It seems rather incredible that while we fight a war against Hitlerism on one hand, we can cultivate religious persecution in our American cities on the other. And yet some of the creeping malice of our military enemies seems to be undermining American democracy here and there around this country.

Brotherhood week (February 20–26) which is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews represents an intelligent attempt to combat this situation and to cement in mutual tolerance and brotherhood our citizens of varied religious faiths. The C. I. O. is particularly conscious of the need for such action. A free labor movement is dependent on the ability of its members to perpetuate the principles on which this Nation was founded. Unless our workers continue to respect the tradition of freedom which has allowed them to organize in trade unions and to worship in the churches of their choice, they cannot expect these privileges to be protected by other groups. Union members themselves must remain conscious of the necessity to actively fight against religious and racial discrimination in all forms wherever they encounter it.

Our national enemies are seeking to divide us into hostile camps on the home front, behind the backs, as it were, of the men who fight for democracy and human equality on the battlefront. It is unthinkable that they should succeed. More than ever before, it is up to every American to be on his guard, to resist the traps laid for him, and to uphold with all his might the right of every Protestant, Catholic, and Jew to preserve his faith in dignity and to work with his fellow countrymen in the interest of a better world for all.

Talent Search Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

TALENT SEARCH WINNERS—TWELVE GIRLS, 28 BOYS ARE AWARDED TRIPS TO WASHINGTON TO ATTEND SCIENCE TALENT INSTITUTE—ONE BOY AND ONE GIRL TO RECEIVE $2,400 GRAND SCHOLARSHIPS

Twelve girls and 28 boys have been invited to Washington, March 3 through March 7, to compete for the Westinghouse science scholarships in the third annual science talent search conducted by Science Clubs of America, administered by Science Service. They will spend 5 days together at the Science Talent Institute in Washington.

The names of the trip winners were announced by the judges as the result of a strenuous competition in which superior seniors of all secondary schools in the United States were invited to participate. The 40 winners were selected from about 15,000 entrants. About 3,000 of these students completed a science aptitude examination, submitted recommendations and scholarship records and wrote an essay on My Scientific Project.

The trip winners come from 33 localities in 15 States and the District of Columbia. Entries were received from every State in the Union.

Those who come to Washington for the Science Talent Institute in March on the all-expense trips, will compete for scholarships which will allow them to go to any college, university, or technical school of their own selection to continue science or engineering training. One boy and one girl will be awarded $2,400 Westinghouse grand science scholarships ($600 a year for 4 years), while six boys and two girls will be awarded $400 Westinghouse science scholarships ($100 a year for 4 years), and $3,000 more in Westinghouse science scholarships will be awarded at the discretion of the judges.

Selected without regard to geographic consideration, the results show that this year winners come from some States that have not had winners before. Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, and the District of Columbia have winners this year for the first time.

Only two schools in the United States have produced more than one winner this year. They are: Brighton High School, Rochester, N. Y., and the Bronx High School of Science, Bronx, N. Y. Each of these schools will send two winners to the Science Talent Institute.

* * * * *

Most of the winners live at home and attend their local public or parochial high school. Five, however, are enrolled in private schools. * * *

More than half, 68 percent, or 27 of the 40, of the Science Talent Search trip winners rank first or second in their graduating classes.

Twenty-eight of the winners are members of science clubs and at least seven of them are presidents of their clubs.

Many of the trip winners already have chosen their field. Their choices range from naval architecture to biochemistry. Eleven hope to do research in the fields of biology, chemistry, medicine, or physics. Three hope to be electronic engineers. Two hope to be theoretical chemists and one a mathematical physicist. Radio and chemical engineering and medicine are choices of careers for four others.

The proportion of boys and girls who submitted completed entries in the Science Talent Search determined the distribution of boys and girls among the trips awarded. Girls accounted for 31 percent in comparison to 26 percent last year, and 22 percent in the case of the first search. The scholarships, with the exception of the two grand scholarships, will be distributed among boys and girls in the same ratio.

"A major need for America today is the discovery and development of scientific ability among boys and girls now in high school," the Science Service announcement states. "Real ability for creative research and engineering is rare. Many who do not now have the opportunity to develop their scientific talents will be discovered and made available for America's future progress through this Science Talent Search.

"This is more than a scholarship contest. It is a major step toward making available potential scientific talent to important tasks in war and peace. Within the next 5 years, either in war or peace, boys and girls now in high school must begin to take leadership in scientific research and engineering."

The Annual Science Talent Search is conducted by Science Service, as one of the activities of Science Clubs of America. Awards are provided and the Science Talent Search made financially posible by the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., a leader in scientific research, engineering, and manufacture in the electrical industry, as a contribution to the advancement of science in America.

Science Service is the nonprofit institution for the popularization of science, with trustees nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the E. W. Scripps Estate, and the journalistic profession.

Science Clubs of America, administered by Science Service, today has more than 4,000 affiliated clubs, with a membership of more than 100,000.

FORTY TO MEET IN WASHINGTON

The 12 girls and 28 boys (proportion determined by ratio of boys and girls entering the contest) are being invited on all-expense trips to Washington, D. C., March 3 to 7, 1944, to attend the Science Talent Institute, where 1 boy and 1 girl will be awarded $2,400 Westinghouse Grand Science Scholarships, 6 boys and 2 girls will be awarded $400 Westinghouse Science Scholarships, and $3,000 additional in scholarships will be awarded.

Alabama

Anniston: Rodman Jenkins, 14, Anniston High School.

Birmingham: Cyril Vaughn Stelzenmuller, 15, West End High School.

Arizona

Tucson: Wildon Fickett, 16, Tucson Senior High School.

California

Tahoe: Richard Gordon Hinkle, 16, Tahoe Br. Placer Union High School.

District of Columbia

Washington: Nancy Agnes Durant, 15, Dunbar High School.

Jacques Charles Poirier, 16, Woodrow Wilson High School.

Florida

St. Petersburg: George Fiske Hardy, 16, St. Petersburg Senior High School.

Georgia

Atlanta: Nan Honour, 17, Girls High School.

Illinois

Edwardsville: Eleanor Jane Springer, 17, Edwardsville High School.

LaGrange: Ben Roy Mottelson, 17, Lyons Township High School.

Michigan

Hazel Park: Irving William Rozian, 17, Hazel Park High School.

New Hampshire

Exeter: Kenneth William Ford, 17, Phillips Exeter Academy.

New Jersey

Atlantic City: Donald Paul Tschudy, 17, Atlantic City High School.

Millburn: Joyce Mildred Marrison, 17, Millburn High School.

Passaic: Leon William Green, 17, Passaic Senior High School.

New York

Brooklyn: Gilbert Samuel Daniels, 16, Brooklyn Technical High School; Lionel Francis Jaffe, 15, Erasmus Hall High School.

Garden City: William Adrian Newcomb, 16, Garden City High School.

Manlius: Victor Mayper, Jr., 15, the Manlius School.

Marlboro: Mary Ruth Bond, 17, Marlboro Central High School.

New York: Anne Hagopian, 16, the Brearley School; Murray Gerstenhaber, 16, Bronx High School of Science; Leonard Zablow, 16, Bronx High School of Science; Ellen Mary Irving, 15, Walton High School.

Rochester: Patricia Ann Dunkel, 17, Brighton High School; Theodore Edwin Houck, 17, Brighton High School.

Rome: Edmond Granger Dyett, Jr., 15, Rome Free Academy.

Roslyn Heights: Eric Mayorga Howlett, 16, Roslyn High School.

Staatsburg: Steadman Thompson, 18, the Anderson School.

Whitesboro: Joan Audrey Baird, 17, Whitesboro Central School.

Ohio

Mount St. Joseph: Rosemary Julia Dieters, 17, Mount St. Joseph Academy.

Pennsylvania

Elkins Park (Philadelphia): Robert Harry Kraichnan, 15, Cheltenham High School.

Overbrook (Philadelphia): Albert Porter Earle, 16, Friends' Central School.

Pittsburgh: Lee Morton Hershenson, 16, Taylor Allderdice High School.

West Virginia

Williamson: Nancy Waddell Slaven, 17, Williamson High School.

Wisconsin

Fennimore: Ruth Hulda Miles, 17, Union Free High School.

Madison: Charles William Butler, 17, West High School; Wayland Evan Noland, 17, Wisconsin High School.

Milwaukee: Royal Marden Corr, 17, Whitefish Bay School.

Wyoming

Lyman: Amber Charles Davidson, 17, Lyman High School.

Constitutionality of the Federal Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Judge Francis Carr, a distinguished California attorney, on the constitutionality of the Federal ballot:

The qualification of voters is defined in section 1, article II, California Constitution, and it is there declared that such qualified voters "shall be entitled to vote at all elections which are now or may hereafter be authorized by law."

It is further provided in that section the legislature may provide by general law "for the casting of votes by duly registered voters who expect to be absent from their respective precincts" on election day.

The legislature has provided for absentee voting (Elections Code, ch. 5, arts. 1, 2, 3). And it is provided that "This chapter shall be liberally construed in favor of the absent voter."

While the machinery provided in the Election Code is not adequate to meet the present emergency, it recognizes the right to cast an absent ballot for "the Presidential or direct primary" (sec. 5907).

If the voter is away from his place of residence he may appear before any officer of any "Federal district" (sec. 5931).

The ballots may be counted if they are received by the clerk within 6 days after election day (sec. 5932).

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States (art. II, sec. 1).

Among the powers given to the Congress are "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof" (art. I, sec. 8, clause 18; *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U. S. 1, 36 L. ed. 869).

The State law is not repugnant to the United States Constitution, where there is a collision between the two—the State law yields only to the extent of the collision (36 L. ed., p. 879).

The Congress has concurrent power with the States to provide equal right of suffrage, and where the State has not provided for soldier voting by absent ballot any discrepancy in the method of obtaining and casting the ballot would be reconciled (*U. S.* v. *Classic*, 313 U. S. 299, 85 L. ed. 1368).

"If we remember that 'it is a constitution we are expounding' we cannot rightly prefer, of the possible meanings of its words, that which will defeat rather than effectuate the constitutional purposes" (85 L. Ed. 1378 (Stone, J., delivered the opinion)).

"But one of the objects of the Constitution as declared by its preamble, is to 'provide for the common defenses.' As a means to that end the Constitution gives to Congress the power to 'provide for the common defense,' article I, section 8, clause 1; 'To raise and support armies,' 'To provide and maintain a navy,' article I, section 8, clauses 12, 13; and 'To make rules for the government of the land and naval forces" (art. I, sec. 8, cl. 14).

And finally the Constitution authorizes Congress "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof" (art. I, sec. 8, cl. 18; ex parte Richard Quirin, 87 L. Ed. 1, 7–8 (Stone, C. J., delivered the opinion)).

"The war power of the National Government is 'the power to wage war successfully.'" (See Charles Evans Hughes, War Powers Under the Constitution, 42 A. B. A. Rept., 232, 238.)

"It extends to every matter and activity so related to war as substantially to affect its conduct and progress. The power is not restricted to the winning of victories in the field and the repulse of the enemy forces.

"Since the Constitution commits to the Executive and to Congress the exercise of the war power in all its vicissitudes and conditions of warfare, it has necessarily given them wide scope for the exercise of judgment and discretion in determining the nature and extent of the threatened injury and in the selection of the means for resisting it.

"Where, as they did here, the conditions call for the exercise of judgment and discretion and for the choice of means by those branches of the Government on which the Constitution has placed the responsibility of war making, it is not for the courts to sit in review of the wisdom of their action or substitute its judgment for theirs" (*Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.*, 87 L. ed. 1327, 1343–1344).

"While emergency does not create power, emergency may furnish the occasion for the exercise of power" (*Home Bldg. & Loan Ass'n* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U. S. 398, 78 L. ed. 413, 88 A. L. R. 1481–1489).

"A study of similar enactments in other jurisdictions, of various soldiers and sailors' relief acts, and of the trend of judicial decisions, reveals a growing recognition of the necessity of protecting those in the military service against the loss of civil rights, and of the potency of a national emergency to justify broad and appropriate relief" (*McCoy* v. *Board of Supervisors*, 18 Cal. (2d) 193–196).

"Not only have State and national legislative bodies been alert to meet the need for special protective measures, but State and Federal courts have kept pace and have evinced a firm intention to take a liberal view of these emergency enactments in order that their protective purposes may be fulfilled without undue imposition of constitutional limitations or hindrance through narrow judicial construction" (*McCoy* v. *Board of Supervisors*, 18 Cal. (2d) 193–196; *Martin* v. *Riley*, 20 Cal. (2d) 28, 36).

"The provision in the Constitution that 'All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States' means that Congress—keeping within the limits of its powers and observing the restrictions imposed by the Constitution—may, in its discretion, enact any statute appropriate to accomplish the objects for which the National Government was established" (Watson on the Constitution, vol. 1, p. 115).

"The electors are not officers of the United States, though they are appointed or elected under and in pursuance of the Constitution. Congress has not undertaken to interfere with the election or appointment of electors, but has left such matters to State control and the State courts have jurisdiction of an indictment for illegal voting for Presidential electors" (Watson on the Constitution, vol. II, p. 1567).

CONCLUSION

It is my opinion that the power of Congress expressed in the Constitution, viz:

"To provide for the common defense" (art. I, sec. 8, clause 1).

"To raise and support armies," "To provide and maintain a navy" (art. I, sec. 8, clauses 12 and 13).

"To make rules for the government of the land and naval forces" (art. I, sec. 8, clause 14).

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof" (art. I, sec. 8, clause 18).

carries with it by necessary implication the power to provide the means whereby the men and women in the land and naval forces may exercise their right of suffrage. To that end the Congress may enact laws which will provide the means to enable them to cast their ballot while they are outside the United States and by rules and regulations not inconsistent with their duties in the armed services to have those ballots cast and delivered to the election officer in their respective voting precincts in the several States in time to register their preference at the election for selecting candidates for President and Vice President as well as for the Members of the Senate and for the House of Representatives.

Such legislative enactment if passed by Congress would not materially conflict with the Constitution or laws of California and in other States the conflict, if any, should be reconciled with the congressional enactment to construe the meaning of the words used to effectuate the constitutional purpose, rather than to defeat it.

The congressional enactment would not be rendered invalid if it caused to be delivered to the voting precincts of some of the States the ballots of some who are not qualified voters.

The questions involving illegal voting could be determined under the rules for contesting elections in the several States and the State courts would have jurisdiction in cases involving the elections pertaining to the election of President and Vice President, and the Senate and the House of Representatives have the power usually exercised with respect to the qualification of their own Members.

State statutes and constitutional provisions and State court decisions are discussed at some length under the title "Voting by Person in the Military Service" (140 A. L. R. 11000; 144 A. L. R. 1521).

Varying legislative and constitutional provisions have been enacted by the several States and conflicting court decisions are discussed, but I find no decision directly applicable to the queston of the power of Congress to provide the machinery for enabling armed forces on land and sea to exercise their inherent right of suffrage.

Chicago Tribune and Union Now Trans-Ocean Plans Compared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a most remarkable exchange of views on the pressing problem of future international relations recently published in the Chicago Tribune. While it is of exceptional interest to Members in the Midwest, I believe that a much wider circle, one that extends even beyond the lands where English is spoken, will appreciate at once its significance. It may, and I hope it will, prove to be a most promising constructive development in a field where constructive thought and action has seemed sadly lacking.

On January 15, 1944, the Chicago Tribune published this editorial:

THREE PLANS

If their relations are conducted on an equitable basis—that is, by Americans speaking as Americans to British speaking as British—the United States and the British Empire can coordinate many of their activities in the future to their mutual benefit.

This obvious fact has produced several proposals that the desirable end would be facilitated by closer political ties or by actual union. When Mr. Churchill advocated common citizenship at Harvard, with the apparent approval of Mr. Roosevelt and President Conant, he was suggesting that Americans return to the status of the Thirteen Colonies, modified, no doubt, by those advances in statescraft that have brought the British dominions into being.

The Tribune, disbelieving that American citizens would ever consent to become the subject of a king-emperor, had suggested an alternative plan. If the British are desirous of a political union with the United States, the only constitutional way in which it can be accomplished is through application by Great Britain and those other parts of the empire that have achieved self-government, for admission to our Union of States. This suggestion aroused some fury in the British press, not to mention a few pip-squeak protests from British-dominated newspapers in this country.

The third, and apparently the only other avenue to closer relationship between the two nations, is a military alliance, the principal sponsors of which have been representatives of our international bankers. This alliance would be for the purpose of maintaining intact the British Empire, into which no one can doubt the bankers have bought extensively at distress prices. It has the same defect found in our present relations with the British, namely, that they would still be free to start the wars and we would be obligated by an alliance to fight them.

Only three plans are proposed: The colonial or Churchill plan, the state or Tribune plan, and the alliance or bankers' plan. If we are mistaken and there is still another plan, we would like to hear what it is.

Then, on Sunday, February 13, the Chicago Tribune devoted all the space in the correspondence columns on its editorial page, where it normally confines letters to 200 or 300 words, to one 1,600-word letter in reply. This letter was from Clarence K. Streit, president of Federal Union, Inc., a nonprofit membership association with national headquarters at 1728 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 9, D. C., "open to all Americans who believe in educating the public in the principles of the United States Constitution and the best means of applying them between nations in the interests of individual freedom, prosperity, and peace."

That the Chicago Tribune should give so much space to his letter is a guarantee of its exceptional interest. Here it is in full, as published in that paper:

HE HAS ANOTHER PLAN

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 8.*

Your editorial of January 15, Three Plans, states that the obvious fact that the American and British people can coordinate many of their activities in the future to their mutual benefit has produced several proposals that this "desirable end would be facilitated by closer political ties or by actual union." You conclude:

"Only three plans are proposed: The colonial or Churchill plan, the state or Tribune plan, and the alliance or bankers' plan. If we are mistaken and there is still another plan, we should like to hear what it is."

I wish to respond to your generous invitation, for there is another plan. But, first, I would say that I strongly agree with you in rejecting both the alliance plan and the Churchill plan for a common citizenship without a common government, though I would not question the motives of their authors any more than I would question yours. I would also agree that your plan has great advantages.

The Tribune plan would end the danger of foreign powers playing the United States and Britain against each other. It would remove the weakness and peril inherent in separate American and British navies, air forces, and armies; it would create a unified war force so powerful that none would dare to challenge it.

No less gigantic are the economic advantages we and the British would gain. Gone would be the danger of cutthroat British and American competition for air lines, shipping lines, markets, raw materials, and the disastrous, communism-breeding unemployment, low prices, red balance sheets, and bitter animosity that would result from this. At one stroke the Tribune plan would provide a stabler money than the world has ever known, and fling open to American business all Canada, Australia, New Zealand, much of Africa, and all the British Isles, while opening to them our own market. Alongside the stupendous economic opportunities in the Tribune plan, the opening of our West would seem a modest beginning.

Critics, of course, object that the Tribune plan, by removing all tariff and immigration barriers between us and the British democracies, would "ruin our farmers, lower our standard of living, destroy our industries, flood us with immigrants." You need no help from me to confound these misguided men. They are, however, so numerous that I must pay a hearty tribute to the Tribune's courage and common sense in brushing aside their objections to union as of no consequence.

In all these military, monetary, migratory, and economic respects the Tribune plan is so far ahead of the plans thus far made public by our Government and Presidential candidates, so much sounder, more liberal, more advantageous to us and the British, as to constitute a memorable step.

Agreeing as I do that a Federal union solution is the only practical one, I regret to differ with the Tribune on one point. I refer to the method by which it would achieve the union, by our admitting the British democracies into the United States as states. I can understand some of the reasons why the Tribune chose this method, but I find it much more advantageous to the British than to us. Here are three objections to it that you seem to have overlooked:

1. Your method would make Great Britain the biggest state in the United States. True, you have suggested that England, Scotland, and Wales be admitted as separate states, but England alone has 37,000,000 people, and so it would have three times the weight of New York State and five times that of Illinois in Congress and in the electoral college. In the Republican National Convention, England would have more votes than Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri put together. The odds would favor the candidate who could carry England. What American could carry it against President Roosevelt except, possibly, Wendell Willkie? I find it hard to believe that this is what the Tribune wants.

2. The Tribune plan would inevitably and automatically extend our present bureaucracy through the British Commonwealth, enormously increasing its numbers, cost, inefficiency, and danger. It would extend the W. P. A., for example, to all the dole areas in the British Isles Think of all the jobs the administration would have to give, the terrific possibilities of building up a political machine. Couple this with the political power England would enjoy by virtue of being by far the biggest State in the United States. Doesn't this add up to giving the British, the bureaucrats, and their buddies a strangle hold on the United States? Again I find it hard to believe that this is what the Tribune wants.

3. The Tribune plan would end the United States as the Nation we know today. Surely you have not thought through where your method leads. Your editorial insists that Anglo-American relations be conducted on "an equitable basis, that is by Americans speaking as Americans to British speaking as British." But by bringing the British into the United States as a State you give them the same right we have to speak as Americans, while letting them retain the right to speak as British. You take away the right of the people of the 48 States to speak as Americans in the sense they speak now, as a nation apart from the British. We of the 48 States would no longer have any means of governing our mutual interests except the Federal Government we would share with England and New Zealand.

The Tribune plan would add luster to Missouri and Montana; they would rank equally with England in our Senate. But the land from Manhattan to the Golden Gate and

from New Orleans to Chicago would no longer form a nation in itself. I love that land even more than Missouri where I was born and Montana where I grew to manhood. I do not want to see it turned into a ghost and left to wander through the future as a land without a country.

Happily, we Americans need not make the sacrifices and run the dangers your plan involves in order to gain its tremendous advantages. We need only change the method of forming the union. There is a plan to do this which your editorial overlooked. It is known as the Union Now Plan from two books I wrote to advocate it, "Union Now" and "Union Now With Britain."

(True, it would also include among the founders of the Union some non-English speaking democracies, such as France, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries. But I understand that when you first proposed your plan you indicated that you, too were willing to include such western European peoples. For present purposes, however, we can limit the discussion to Anglo-American union.)

Whereas you would achieve union by admitting outside nations as states in the United States, Union Now would achieve it by forming a new union, composed of those nations and the United States as a nation, on the same basic principles as our Constitution. This simple change in the Tribune plan would remove its disadvantages and dangers for the United States. The proof:

1. The Union Now plan would make the United States the biggest state in the union. In this respect it would give us all the advantages your plan would give England.

2. The Union Now plan allows us to start the Anglo-American union with a clean page as regards bureaucracy. Both in framing the constitution of the new union and in applying it we could profit from our present experience and keep bureaucracy down to a minimum. The Tribune plan gives us no chance to tackle this huge problem afresh. Moreover, the Union Now plan, instead of extending our existing bureaucracy automatically, would eliminate a great deal of it, all of it that is devoted to trying to make national sovereignty work in certain fields where it has become obsolete.

To an appalling degree, as I pointed out in Union Now, "taxes and government in the democracies today are devoted only to the maintenance of their separate sovereignties as regards citizenship, defense, trade, money, and communications." Only the Union Now plan, I added, "seriously tackles the problem of how the democracies are to recover from the taxation, and borrowing, and bureaucracy, and unnecessary government with which nationalism has afflicted them."

3. The Union Now plan would preserve the integrity of the Nation formed by the area, people, history, and Government of the 48 United States. Just as the Tribune plan insures that there would always be an England, the Union Now plan insures that there would always be this United States, with a government of its own to govern independently the mutual affairs of the 48 States. We would keep our Nation's name where it is, and use a new name to designate the new union. Suppose the founders named it the Union of the Free. Then we would still call ourselves Americans and the British would still call themselves British, and the Canadians, Canadians; but we would all also call ourselves Freemen citizens of the Union of the Free. None of us would lose a name that we love; all would gain a name that all would love to have.

There are other reasons why I believe that the Union Now method provides a better method than yours of saving us, through Anglo-American federal union, from the grave dangers in our present relationship while retaining all the incalculable advantages in the Tribune plan. However, I hope these reasons will suffice to lead you to make the adjustment in your plan Union Now involves.

If not, I trust we can surely agree that the best way to settle such issues is to convoke a constitutional convention representing the American and British peoples and, I would hope, other experienced Atlantic democracies. That would certainly be in the great tradition of 1787. If the convention should agree to your method, I would bow to its superior wisdom. And if it preferred the Union Now plan, or some compromise, you could still, should you so desire, use your great influence to persuade the American people not to ratify the plan the convention approved.

If the Tribune will take the lead in calling for such a convention and in throwing its columns open, meanwhile, to a fair and full discussion of this whole problem, I am confident that it will make a name for itself in world history such as no newspaper has ever made.

CLARENCE K. STREIT.

Record of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my fixed conviction that a history of the Republican Party's record should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That history should record the glories of the Republican Party, if any. Well, I would begin with Lincoln and I would say "Lincoln, period." Then we come to the Grant administration. Well, how can that be described? I would say by the simple word "graft."

Of course, we all know that Hayes was, whether intentionally or otherwise, a receiver of stolen political goods.

Garfield was assassinated, therefore we do not know what he would have done. We do know, however, that Arthur, a typical Republican reactionary, was of the complacent type who did not care what the party did, so long as they did not bother him.

Then came Cleveland. Following Cleveland, came Harrison, principally known as the glacial period in Republican history.

Cleveland was reelected and while his administration was not marked by liberalism, it did, in a degree, restore a genuine American policy, both domestic and foreign.

Then came McKinley with his high tariff policies, fostered by the Mark Hanna school of philosophy.

His untimely taking-off undoubtedly checked a more liberal tariff policy.

Theodore Roosevelt's administration was, I believe, one of the most boisterous in American history. It drew to his support the progressives of both parties, but those of us who later carefully analyzed his activities, found that he was just a bell wether for reaction, full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing.

Then came Wilson and the First World War. The Wilson administration had to fight the war on two fronts, foreign and domestic, just as the Roosevelt administration is now doing. At the close of the war the Republican Party, led by Lodge and others, succeeded in rendering our great war effort futile.

Then came the most noxious period in the history of the Republican Party. Harding came in and repudiated all campaign promises for an association of nations. That declaration discouraged European nations, anxious to base a peace on secure foundations.

The Harding administration was distinguished for corruption. Then Harding passed out. Coolidge, who was at all times an apostle of inaction, held sway. Then came Hoover and reaction. So my friends we have had the enlightening spectacle of Harding symbolizing corruption, Coolidge symbolizing inaction, and Hoover symbolizing reaction.

That, my friends, is the real history of the Republican Party.

Keeping the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Times of February 17. I believe this editorial will be of interest to Members of the House who are concerned about the carrying out of flood-control projects already authorized by Congress. In connection with this editorial, it is interesting to note that the whole State compact plan called for an expenditure of $2,700,000, but a recent estimate on the cost of building just one flood-control dam and reservoir in Vermont was $29,001,000.

Of this expenditure, the Army engineer admits that $20,000,000 is definitely chargeable to future power development. This in an area that has no shortage of power facilities.

I believe in appropriating money for flood-control purposes, but when $20,000,000 out of a $30,000,000 appropriation is chargeable to power, I fail to see why we should refer to such a project as a flood-control project.

KEEPING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

A statement was made at the Connecticut Valley flood-control hearings in Washington last week which ought not to go unchallenged.

Chairman WHITTINGTON of the House committee told Attorney General Parker, of Vermont, that the interstate compact method of dealing with the situation failed and that was why the Federal plan was adopted.

We are sure that if Chairman WHITTINGTON were to refresh his memory by the record he would wish to revise the statement.

The compact plan never became effective, but that was not because of any failure upon the part of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut to agree. The

States agreed upon and all signed a compact which was approved by the Army engineers and the Secretary of War, favorably reported to the House of Representatives, and even won a statement of approbation from President Roosevelt himself. It was ratified by the legislatures of all four States.

Not only was the agreement accepted, but the cost of putting it into effect was determined and allotted. Of a total of $2,700,000, Connecticut was to pay 40 percent, or $1,080,000, Massachusetts 50 percent; these two States being the chief beneficiaries; while Vermont and New Hampshire, which would benefit very little, but would be obliged to furnish sites for most of the reservoirs, would each pay 5 percent of the cost. Maintenance costs of $80,000 a year—$39,000 a year for Connecticut—were to be similarly divided. Connecticut, at least, and we believe all four States, voted the necessary appropriations.

This agreement was reached in 1937. Obviously the failure of the compact plan was no fault of the States. What happened was that the Federal Power Commission and hydroelectric power bloc in Congress prevented the compacts from coming to a vote and finally substituted legislation introduced by Senator BARKLEY and passed hurriedly. This transferred all responsibility and authority for such control works to the Federal Government.

President Roosevelt, who had expressed approval of the compact arrangement in October, when speaking in Hartford, had decided by the following August that he "could not approve of any compact which deals with the water resources of the Nation or their development." It had become his "profound conviction that these matters are properly the subject of Federal legislation and not of interstate compacts." This change of attitude on his part and the activities of the power bloc in Congress killed the compacts, not failure of the States to reach an agreement or unwillingness on their part to assume responsibility for their share of the cost.

There ought to be no misunderstanding upon that point.

Shadowy Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley:

SHADOWY TAX BILL

(By Ernest Lindley)

LITTLE REVENUE, NO SIMPLIFICATION

In dollars, the tax bill now before the President is insignificant. It adds taxes estimated to yield $2,315,000,000. It subtracts approximately $1,400,000,000 by freezing the old-age and survivors insurance tax at 1 percent each on employer and employee. Under present law this tax would rise to 2 percent on each beginning March 1.

So the bill would add only about $900,000,000 to the Treasury's revenue. Part of this might be lost through the amendments to the Renegotiation Act included in the tax bill. The most destructive amendments adopted in the House or proposed by the Senate Finance Committee finally were eliminated. Those which remain are not seriously damaging and in most respects are quite reasonable. However, they probably would cost the Treasury some revenue, reducing the anticipated net yield from the tax bill to below $900,000,000 a year.

When at least $10,000,000,000 more in taxes should be levied—Willkie says sixteen billion—this tax bill is not even half a loaf. It is nothing more than a few crumbs. Whether these crumbs are better than nothing is a close question.

The proposal to freeze the old-age and survivors insurance tax at 1 percent is serious, not only because of its immediate effects on revenue but because it tends to undermine the contributory idea. Many arguments can be made for and against the contributory system, as distinct from the payment of old-age and survivors benefits solely out of general revenues. But the original decision was in favor of the contributory plan. Benefits paid to an individual or on his account bear a direct relationship to his contribution to the fund. The employers' half of the tax is used to level up the benefit payments to some extent. The present tax is insufficient to build up the reserves to meet the future claims which are being built up simultaneously. The tax should go to 3 percent on each employer and employee, and higher if other types of insurance are added.

It is true that the old-age and survivors insurance system does not, and cannot, operate exactly like a private insurance company. But the individual contributions through the pay-roll tax create a moral obligation on the part of the Government to pay benefits commensurate with these contributions.

The less that is accumulated through the special pay-roll tax, the more the payment of future claims will depend on general funds. Some future Congress might decide that there was no moral obligation to pay in full the benefits now promised. Congress can alter the system whenever it sees fit. But surely it would be unlikely to permit a default or scaling-down in payments if the books showed that adequate reserves had been built up through the special pay-roll tax.

There is an added special reason why the pay-roll tax should be allowed to rise now to 2 percent each on employer and employee. It is deflationary, especially the half paid by employees. It would draw off purchasing power.

There are many other defects in this tax bill. It contains log-rolled tax favors to special interests. It would sentence the Renegotiation Act to death not later than mid 1945. The act may not be needed after that, but there is protection to the public interest in retaining it on the books until after the war.

It fails conspicuously to take the most elementary step toward tax simplification. That is, it does not consolidate the Victory tax and the graduated personal income tax.

Most important, of course, it does not raise anywhere near enough money. It is a miserable shadow of a tax bill, unworthy of our economic strength and of the performance of our armed forces.

Army Paper Slings Mud at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the American people should know the kind of propaganda going to their soldier boys. For that reason, the following exchange of letters with the War Department will be interesting:

FEBRUARY 14, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary, Department of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STIMSON: The Army Times claims the largest A. B. C. circulation in the United States Army. Likewise, it is distributed to all Army hospitals through the American Red Cross. You will be interested in the propaganda line being followed by this paper as shown by the January 29 issue. The following are direct quotations:

"Evidently Senator TAFT and his cronies fail to appreciate either the intelligence or the patriotism of the men and women who are fighting for their Nation—and the right to vote. * * * They don't want their constituents back home to know that they are sacrificing the democratic right of soldiers to vote for pure and simple partisan politics.

* * * * *

"HOW DOES IT LOOK TO YOU, SOLDIER?

"1. The soldier vote: You have probably heard how Congress has messed with this this week. (See p. 1, and editorial, p. 4.) What are your ideas about this?

"2. Mustering-out pay: More messing by Congress. (See p. 1.) Has Congress dealt with this matter fairly?

"These topics are suggested for barrack discussions and group talks."

Is there any paper of Army circulation with an editorial policy as friendly to Congress as the Army Times is unfriendly?

Does the War Department believe that the Army Times should use their news and editorial columns to create and foment among soldiers distrust of the institution of Congress?

Does not the War Department believe that the morale of troops will be lowered by inflammatory and derogatory statements concerning civil branches of Government by a service publication?

I am disturbed by many evidences of a one-sided presentation of home front affairs to members of the armed forces of which the foregoing excerpts are only one example.

It seems fundamental to me that the American soldier should be given a fair break on the matter of domestic news. If the news sources available to him are limited and censored in any way, the Department of War has a solemn responsibility to see that both sides of controversial matters are equally presented. If the Department finds that impracticable, then it would seem appropriate to take off all restrictions and give the boys all sides, and all views, on domestic political controversies.

Your comment will be awaited with interest.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BUFFETT,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
Washington, February 18, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: Your letter of February 14 addressed to the Secretary of War has been referred to me.

The Army Times is a civilian publication. The War Department has no control over its editorial policies any more than it has over those of any other newspaper.

The Army News Service which reaches all military installations at home and abroad uses the facilities of all press associations. The news transmitted to military personnel in this manner is impartial and carries both sides of any controversial question.

It is regrettable, if anything published in any newspaper that is unfavorable to any branch of the Government, carries with it the implication that the publication of such material has the approval of the War Department.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. SURLES,
Major General, U. S. A., Director.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing exchange of letters shows the cleverness of this part of the anti-Congress smear campaign. Here is a service publication attempting to make Congress appear ridiculous and contemptible. Yet the War Department piously proclaims that it has no control of this paper of Army circulation.

Here is a fantastic situation: the War Department, plus the Office of War Information and other agencies, is spending tens of millions of dollars for control of editorial and news policies for propaganda and morale purposes; yet the same Army disclaims control over a privately published Army paper, primarily, if not entirely, circulated among United States military forces.

Monmouth a Munitions Dump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the Monday, February 21, edition of the Asbury Park Press, one of the outstanding newspapers in New Jersey, entitled "Monmouth a munitions dump."

Monmouth County in New Jersey has frequently been referred to as the garden county of the State, and for the Navy and Army to select Monmouth County for the installation of a large munitions dump, the construction of a railroad about 8 miles in length, and the building of a pier into lower New York Bay over 2 miles long, may properly and certainly be considered an intrusion by the patriotic citizens who live there. There are other locations in New Jersey, as this editorial points out, where there is wasteland for the construction of such an unwelcome though necessary project, and it is to be regretted, to say the least, that the authorities of the Navy and War Departments could not have adjusted their demands more nearly for the convenience of the people.

Homes that have been lived in by literally generations of families have been evacuated; farm land, particularly poultry land, has been seized; the value of private estates and farms has been impaired; the fine recreational and fishing value of lower New York Bay, including the entrance to the well-known Shrewsbury River, has been encroached upon, and some 12,000 acres of land have been removed from the tax rolls. This comes as an awful shock to the people of my district who live there, and it has raised the very definite question in the minds of many as to whether this project had to be located where it is and if it is not extravagant and wasteful in the use of the taxpayers' money.

While the estimates are as high as $24,000,000, there is no question in the minds of many that the ultimate cost will be well over $50,000,000. The matter has been referred to the Truman committee of the Senate for investigation, and I sincerely hope that they will investigate not only this but similar projects which have been undertaken under the pressure of the war by the autocratic authority of the War and Navy Departments.

MONMOUTH, A MUNITIONS DUMP

We applaud the seizure of every foot of enemy territory by the Army and Navy, but when the armed forces combine to conquer a large part of Monmouth County we believe that it is time to resist. We are not fighting this war to convert Monmouth County into an arsenal. The county was a battlefield during the Revolution, after which it was permitted to return to more peaceful pursuits. World War No. 2 apparently will convert the county into a permanent powder keg.

Last year the Navy condemned over 10,000 acres in the heart of Monmouth County for use as a munitions depot. Valuable property was seized to build a munitions railroad through the northern end of the county to tie-in with docks being constructed far out into Raritan Bay. Although the depot in this particular location did not appear necessary to the prosecution of the war, it met with little resistance because it is not popular to oppose anything that the armed forces propose to do during wartime, even though their proposal involves the permanent loss of thousands of acres of valuable property.

Now, to add insult to injury, the Army would condemn an additional 1,500 acres, including the Asbury Park incinerator, to establish a depot of its own. At the present pace it will not be long before the entire county is converted into a munitions dump. Incidentally, the value of these projects in the present war is limited. They are apparently being built for future use.

We believe that every official and citizen in the county, including Representative Auchincloss, should vigorously oppose this development. There are a thousand spots along the Atlantic seaboard where a munitions depot could be constructed without so seriously interfering with civilian pursuits and without damaging so much valuable property. It is unfortunate that the site chosen for this vast Army-Navy arsenal should be hard by a flourishing residential, agricultural, industrial and resort area. And it will be a perilous disregard for the future not to demonstrate to the armed forces now that while we are eager to give them all support for winning the war we do not intend sitting by while they jeopardize the peace by converting Monmouth county into a permanent munitions dump.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following suggestions from a friend, now in Uncle Sam's Navy, concerning post-war problems which I think will be of interest to other Members of the House:

WORLD ECONOMIC UNION—AN OUTLINE FOR A DURABLE PEACE

(By R. W. Castleberry)

I. The establishment of an economic union of nations.

A. The abolition of all trade barriers between nations.

B. The establishment of an international bank, owned, controlled, and operated by the respective nations involved.

The monetary systems of such nations shall be based upon economic goods and services, bearing scientific and mathematical relations thereto; and, each such system shall be equitably coordinated with each and all, through the international bank.

C. There shall be no kind or character of political union between the United States and any nation, with each nation retaining its own sovereignty inviolable.

II. The extension of the jurisdiction of the present World Court to include matters of international economic concern.

III. A 10-year military alliance between the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China; with an invitation to all other United Nations to join such alliance.

A. The purpose of such military alliance is to preserve the peace, thereby permitting the proper functioning of the economic union of nations until it will stand alone.

B. Any extension of such 10-year military alliance is not deemed necessary.

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Kennedy:

KENNEDY'S WASHINGTON LETTER

(By Robert Kennedy)

WHY ROOSEVELT DOESN'T TALK

Few politicians have any doubt that Mr. Roosevelt will be unanimously renominated. From all checks of public opinion at this writing a majority of the public wants him to remain at the helm while the war is going on, regardless of the fact that an election happens to come along under the constitutional formula.

The November election to many will be merely a test of confidence—or nonconfidence—in Mr. Roosevelt as our Nation's leader. The eyes of a war-torn world will be upon us. Those of us who vote against Roosevelt will be assuming grave responsibilities for writing "finis" to his career with the ballot X's we give to another candidate.

So it seems, as Mr. Lincoln said, "we cannot escape history," that Mr. Roosevelt cannot escape the flow of history which is inexorably moving him to answer in the November vote—whether the answer is one of confidence or one of rejection.

To appear to be personally seeking a fourth term, Mr. Roosevelt not only would be confirming the dictator cries of his domestic enemies, but he would indicate a failure to realize that it is not up to him to suggest that he shall or shall not run. It is up to the people.

Mr. Roosevelt, who very keenly feels and usually understands his own historical importance, certainly must realize this. From a purely political point of view, he would handicap his own chances of reelection—of winning a vote of confidence—if he showed so shallow a view of his own place in history.

Nor can he announce that he will not run. Philosophically, his own desires cannot be taken into consideration at this stage of world affairs. Actually, many persons would refuse to take the disavowal seriously. Mr. Coolidge hoped the party leaders wouldn't take his statement seriously in 1927. Many Republicans even now refuse to take seriously Governor Dewey's clamish attitude.

Such a renunciation of fourth-term desires would so muddy up the political waters that the war effort would undoubtedly be affected—and this on the eve of a great world-shaking second front. In the hopes that Mr. Roosevelt really meant to retire, Republicans would be tempted to nominate their worst possible candidate, for the polls indicate that only with Roosevelt at their head can the Democrats hope to remain in power.

In the Democratic ranks, there would be utmost confusion and such sparring for position that men could hardly keep their minds on their war jobs. Mr. Roosevelt's grip in both domestic and foreign circles would be weakened, even while his friends here would refuse to believe it possible for him to retire.

In a word, if Roosevelt should break his political silence—which remember he has officially kept since Pearl Harbor—he would throw this country into a maelstrom of politics such as it should never suffer during wartime, and he would confuse our allies abroad. By his silence, he bows to the future and to the flow of events. While what he does is the politically practical thing to do, he also does what, in the perspective of history, is the only right thing he can do. His every word, these days, makes history. In this case, he is morally bound to restrain himself from making history.

Flood Control by Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the Members of Congress to the hearings, when printed, held and had by the Committee on Flood Control on the flood-control bill for 1944, with particular reference to those pages which will contain the arguments made by Attorney General Parker of Vermont, Senator Austin, Senator Aiken, and myself, and the brief of Freemen, Inc., in opposition to the establishment of the proposed Williamsville flood-control and power dam on the West River in Vermont.

Vermont is for flood control per se, but opposed to the devastation and destruction, confiscation and condemnation of its real estate, without its consent, for flood control or the generation of electric power in connection therewith.

That the right of the Government to cross State lines to acquire title for such purposes is more than questionable, despite permissive statutes is admitted by all good lawyers, notwithstanding any and all decisions of any and all courts swept off their feet by the tide of the theory of federalization and centralization to the contrary.

A man's title to his home is his anchor of freedom. Vermonters fought for 20-odd years to defend their right of ownership by title to their lands against Great Britain, New York, and New Hampshire and won the fight at last, because it was right.

Power distribution to those who have lost their title, their homes, their lands, is a poor sop to the victims who will have no use for it.

All that the Government can do or will undertake to do, can and would be done by compact between the States, or by Federal cooperation with the States.

I am opposed to the Williamsville project or any of a similar nature for the reasons I undertake to set forth in the following statement, which I filed with the committee this forenoon:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I cannot add much to what has already been said by the attorney general of the State of Vermont and by Senators AUSTIN and AIKEN, but I do wish you to understand very thoroughly that the people of the State of Vermont are not opposed to flood control as such. They are intensely interested in any program for the protection of themselves or of their neighbors against any loss of life or property due to the ravages of uncontrolled waters.

Now, we in Vermont know something about floods and about flood control. We have seen the terrific devastation and destruction and loss of life which accompanies the unleashing of torrents. We have also observed what can be done to control and to protect as against a recurrence of any such disaster.

We have had two kinds of experience with respect to the proposed erection of dams to control floods. One was, as you might say, wholly internal, for, although the Government played a large part, the officials of the State of Vermont were consulted and business was done with them with respect to the planning of the locations and the type of the dams prior to their construction. We know what those dams have accomplished.

On the other hand, while the junior Senator was Governor of the State of Vermont, and when, through him, Vermont offered to cooperate with the Federal Government by providing a dam site for flood control, the War Department used every means at its command to wrest the land completely away from State control by condemnation proceedings. Concerning his experiences the junior Senator said: "By spurning our offer of cooperation for legitimate purposes the Secretary of War has stripped the situation of all pretense. He is evidently impatient with democracy. We can only conclude that neither flood control nor water power but domination is the Federal Government's secret motive."

As the Senator suggests by indirection, and as we all know, the long struggle for human life has been essentially a battle against governmental power to acquire and to maintain certain individual rights. Life is nothing but the sum of these rights and among the most important of them is this right of acquisition and conservation by individuals and States against unlimited claims of governmental power. The very essence of despotism is the claim of supreme power which a government undertakes to make over the property and the rights of its citizens. As someone has said, the form of the old order remains to deceive us, but the substance is gone.

I wish to make my position perfectly plain, for to me much more is involved in this legislation than is found in the possible location of a dam or the attempt to make a power plant out of a flood-control proposition. I am opposed to that, of course. However, I am not unmindful of the age in which I live or of its great opportunities and endless possibilities. Nevertheless, all of these things never would be or could have been were it not for, and are basically dependent upon, the continuation of our form of government. This bill is just another of those attacks which if permitted to grow are bound, termite-like, to destroy the vitals of and to topple into the dust the temple of our Republic. I feel that we have gone far enough, and already too far, in permitting the mighty hands of centralized power to get a strangle hold on the throats of the 48 States on which it stands while it tries to choke them to death.

In the last 25 years the dual system of free government peculiar to the United States, established by the fathers in order to preserve their liberty to themselves and their posterity, with the restrictions imposed on the Federal Government by the Constitution, has been broken down. The Federal Government has become practically absolute, and, like an octopus, it has stretched its numberless tentacles around every State and every county and practically every home in the land, usurping to itself all the power it needs to bring about the eventual destruction of this Republic.

With respect to this situation the then Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, told the New England Council at Providence, R. I., way back in December of 1926, that "the growing encroachment of Federal power threatens national disaster." He said that electric-power transmission should be controlled by individual States rather than by the Federal Government, making interstate compacts when necessary, and he went on to say that which we know to be true, that unless the growing encroachment of Federal authority was checked it would eventually break down our Government.

What interested me particularly was his final statement to the effect that "New England should take the lead in a movement that would check the system. States must run themselves."

When he made that statement he was substantially quoting President Andrew Jackson who said in his second inaugural address: "My experience in public concerns and the observation of a life somewhat advanced confirm the opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments and the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy, and finally to despotism. In proportion, therefore, as the General Government encroaches upon the rights of the States, in the same proportion does it impair its own power and detract from its ability to fulfill the purposes of its creation."

In his farewell address, as long ago as March 4, 1837, discussing the then evident intent to expand the powers of the General Government, Jackson said that it was apparent "that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification

for claiming anything beyond them. Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed."

So, Mr. Chairman, while we are in favor of flood control, we are opposed to the attempts of the Federal Government to mix up its program of flood control with power generation and production under the pretext of flood control. We are opposed to being ignored in the premises with respect to matters and things which vitally affect us. We are opposed to the further centralization of power in the Federal Government in contravention of and disregard of the rights of the States and particularly in this instance as it is evidenced by the proposed devastation and destruction of the West River Valley in Vermont in order to afford slight relief to an area but primarily to develop an opportunity for the production of power. The destruction which would be incident to the construction of that dam must naturally be so great as to make the resulting benefits to others so insignificant that reasonable men must agree that such a proposition is unreasonable, unjustifiable, and that the project should not be approved.

The project should not be approved because, for one other reason, the engineers have offered an alternative plan which shows that it is not absolutely necessary or essential that the Williamsville Dam be constructed.

When it became apparent that the War Department engineers were really making a survey and the preliminary work had been done, those people living in the area comprehended by the plan took stock of their situation and organized for their own protection under the name of Freemen, Inc. I quote from a brief they have furnished me:

"Freemen by no means oppose legitimate flood control. They admit and endorse its extreme necessity. We are Vermonters, and we subscribe to Vermont's attitude toward flood control, which always has been enlightened and generous.

"The dam at West Dummerston, for which we are told surveys have been completed, will have a height, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, informs us, of 526 feet above mean sea level. The minimum level to which the water behind the dam ever will be permitted to fall is 440 feet above mean sea level.

"By the Connecticut River flood-control compact of 1937, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut established a practical agreement for flood control. During this negotiation, Vermont made manifest its willingness to grant all its sister States required and pledged itself, at need, to give still more.

"The compact and the machinery it established were approved by the Army engineers; they were acclaimed by the then Acting Secretary of War as a model other States would do well to follow. The Flood Control Committee of the House, the Commerce Committee of the Senate favorably reported the measure. Despite this general endorsement, neither House of the Congress was permitted to vote upon it.

"We believe that flood control is only a collateral or even a subsidiary purpose of the monstrous dam proposed at West Dummerston. We are certain that future high-water damage can be more economically averted, with infinitely less disaster for an entire area. We base our contention on the following facts:

"1. Earlier surveys of West River by Army engineers established that dam, wholly adequate for flood control, could be erected at Newfane or Williamsville. The Newfane dam's cost would have been $4,500,000; the Williamsville, $7,000,000. Lieutenant Colonel Garbisch, of the Engineer Corps, recently was quoted in the New York Times as fixing the cost of the proposed dam at West Dummerston at $30,000,000.

"2. Members of Freemen who have spent their lives in West River Valley hold that full protection from high-water damage may be obtained in this area with far less consequent destruction of homesteads and disruption of local economy than by any of the proposed dams cited above.

"Freemen contend that the projected enormous dam will be dedicated only fractionally to its expressed purpose—flood control. The surveys of the Army engineers already have proved that this sole purpose can be obtained by smaller, less-expensive structures. Literally, possibly one-third of the height of the great dam may be devoted to restraining destructive high water. The remainder will be employed primarily for power production and for such subsidiary purposes as stream regulation and the establishment of a so-called recreation area about the reservoir."

There seems to be some misunderstanding with reference to the State compacts originally entered into between the several New England States. Let me read you what the Hartford Times has to say about them:

"KEEPING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

"A statement was made at the Connecticut Valley flood-control hearings in Washington last week which ought not to go unchallenged.

"Chairman WHITTINGTON, of the House committee, told Attorney General Parker, of Vermont, that the interstate compact method of dealing with the situation failed and that was why the Federal plan was adopted.

"We are sure that if Chairman WHITTINGTON were to refresh his memory by the record he would wish to revise the statement.

"The compact plan never became effective, but that was not because of any failure upon the part of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut to agree. The States agreed upon and all signed a compact which was approved by the Army engineers and the Secretary of War, favorably reported to the House of Representatives, and even won a statement of approbation from President Roosevelt himself. It was ratified by the legislatures of all four States.

"Not only was the agreement accepted but the cost of putting it into effect was determined and allotted. Of a total of $2,700,000, Connecticut was to pay 40 percent, or $1,080,000, Massachusetts 50 percent, these two States being the chief beneficiaries, while Vermont and New Hampshire, which would benefit very little but would be obliged to furnish sites for most of the reservoirs, would each pay 5 percent of the cost. Maintenance costs of $80,000 a year—$39,000 a year for Connecticut—were to be similarly divided. Connecticut, at least, and we believe all four States, voted the necessary appropriations.

"This agreement was reached in 1937. Obviously the failure of the compact plan was no fault of the States. What happened was that the Federal Power Commission and hydroelectric power bloc in Congress prevented the compacts from coming to a vote and finally substituted legislation introduced by Senator BARKLEY and passed hurriedly. This transferred all responsibility and authority for such control works to the Federal Government.

"President Roosevelt, who had expressed approval of the compact arrangement in October when speaking in Hartford, had decided by the following August that he 'could not approve of any compact which deals with the water resources of the Nation or their development.' It had become his 'profound conviction that these matters are properly the subject of Federal legislation and not of interstate compacts.' This change of attitude on his part and the activities of the power bloc in Congress killed the compacts, not failure of the States to reach an agreement or unwillingness on their part to assume responsibility for their share of the cost.

"There ought to be no misunderstanding upon that point."

Now, Mr. Chairman, while all the issues involved are matters with which I have been seriously concerned, to be perfectly honest I have rather left it to the governors of the States to handle these questions and to incite my interest than to initiate opposition so far as I was concerned in Congress.

I have always entertained the opinion, however, that the ownership of flowing water and the right to dispose of and regulate and control the use thereof within its borders belongs exclusively to the State as a part of its sovereign power subject only in case of navigable streams to the power of the Federal Government to regulate and promote commerce between the States. So, therefore, I have always been opposed to the attempts of the Federal Government to undertake to exert, as against the rights of the States, a domination and control of nonnavigable water within the States. The far-reaching effects of this legislation, which is only an additional chapter in a book which has already been written and a continuation of the evident attempt of the Federal Government to usurp the powers of the sovereign States, bring the matter right straight home to me and make it necessary for me to consider more particularly the effect of the principles upon which the Government undertakes to support its position with regard to this matter.

Nobody can successfully deny that before the formation of the present Government all sovereign powers were vested in the States, from which it follows that the Federal Government derived only such powers from the States as they bestowed upon it, all others being reserved to the States.

A very careful examination of the original grant of powers and the reservations therein contained reveals that it does not include the power to regulate or control the use of water of streams flowing in the States except to regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations and under treaties with the Indians. There is nothing to be found which authorizes the Federal Government to exercise any power or to have any jurisdiction over or to undertake to regulate and control the use of water of a stream nonnavigable.

Despite anything any court may say at any time, my opinion will never be changed that any attempt to legislate to the contrary or to vest any such power in the Government is unconstitutional and void.

This bill which you propose to report and which is under consideration provides for a usurpation of power such as is not justified nor authorized. As against the rights of the Federal Government regarding nonnavigable streams the States reserve to themselves all the rights in the premises. Notwithstanding what any court may have found and which may temporarily be understood to be the law, what you are undertaking to do is an infringement upon and a usurpation of the sovereign powers of the several States. Under cover of legislation you are undertaking to transfer from the States to the National Government the control of the use of the water of streams within the States which you have no right or power or authority to try to control under the fundamental law. You are undertaking to assume that the Government has a sovereign right to control the use of the water, which control is a right which the Government does not possess under the Constitution and cannot acquire by statute; one which absolutely, perennially, and perpetually, and forever, so long as the Union exists, belongs to the States despite temporary decisions of handmade courts to the contrary.

You should not be swept off your feet by reason of the fact that in your opinion because the National Government has the right to look after navigation and commerce it can,

therefore, control the non-navigable streams or the water rights which the Supreme Court of the United States, when it was a Court, has said belong to the States.

As the late President Coolidge once said, "Laws must be justified by something more than the will of the majority."

In recent years I have been astounded and disturbed by the fact that representatives of sovereign States will surrender rights and powers of their States which they ought to safeguard and protect. I am distressed that they are willing to surrender rights and powers which the Supreme Court has over and over again held belong to the States.

The power of the Federal Government with respect to the nonnavigable streams stops with the control of the stream for navigation purposes. It must be so. The right to control the streams for flood purposes and for the development of power belongs to the States, or it is the end of the Republic.

These rights are the prerogatives of the States. Those who have set up a program superior to court rulings and who would take away from the various States of the Union the right to control the water rising, flowing, and within their States for all other than navigation purposes, and turn that power over to the centralized, bureaucratic control of the Federal Government, have indulged in a determination, knowingly, purposely, or ignorantly, which can spell only the destruction of this Government as a Union of our several States.

The Supreme Court has often held that the ownership of flowing water and the right to dispose of and regulate and control the use thereof within its borders belongs exclusively to the State as a part of its sovereign power subject only in case of navigable streams to the power of the Federal Government to regulate and promote commerce between the States. It follows, therefore, that the United States has no such right either of ownership, regulation, or control for flood purposes or for the generation of power as is undertaken to be extended by this bill under a mistaken construction of the Constitution.

No other opinion can be had or held by anybody who is not swept off his feet by the recent theory that in the magnification and the centralization of all power in Washington lies our only hope of continuing and perpetuating a form of government which, always to the contrary of and despite these recent precedents and purposes, nevertheless has succeeded in enduring longer and in establishing a better standard of living than any government which has heretofore existed, the end of which, however, can be seen if the policy proposed in this bill is permitted or allowed to be continued.

The founding fathers would faint away even at the suggestion of such a program as is responsible for the submission of this measure.

Too many, not realizing that this path leads to the pit of fascism, are ready to sell their souls for a mess of Federal pottage. I believe in the preservation and continuance of our dual system of government. I am opposed to that program, against further surrender of our rights, opposed to the strangulation of free enterprise at the hands of a power-drunk bureaucracy, opposed to socializing our Government into a totalitarian state to be operated and controlled by Executive order.

I believe that the States should be aroused to save themselves, to recapture what they have lost, and to take their place in the sun to fight further Federal depredation, destruction, devastation, and confiscation.

It would be interesting to have heard Justice Jackson speak in Toronto on Saturday last, or to be able to read his speech in its entirety, but I read an excerpt from it which ran as follows:

"Justice Jackson said the security of democratic institutions may depend on keeping struggles for power from 'getting out of legal bounds,' with the burden of adjustments and reconciliation falling primarily upon legislators and executives. * * * 'In solving these great conflicts our judicial power is no substitute for that of the legislative or the executive, and the future of free government depends upon their adequacy to their problems even more than it depends on any exercise of power entrusted to the judiciary.'

"In smart intellectual circles in his home country he said it is regarded as naive to put any credence in natural law and as unsophisticated to think that men have inherent and inalienable rights.

" 'The feature which makes one uneasy about some modern-law theory in the United States is that in repudiating natural-law doctrines (to the effect that men have inalienable rights) it pretty much embraces the philosophy of absolutism of the state.

" 'Then law becomes only a phase of state policy. When policy is made manifest in legislation or in executive action or administrative decision, it follows that its finality is not to be questioned. From such premises it is hard to avoid the conclusion that in America all is law that has the votes, just as in some parts of Europe all is law that has the guns. We thus have a new-world variety of the European philosophies of no law.

" 'But even if these doctrines are not intended to afford support to absolutism, they at best are only feeble instruments of opposition.' "

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the proposition to build a dam on the West River Valley for all the reasons that others have given and for those which I have reiterated and, further, because I think we have gone far enough away from the idea and the ideals of the founders. It is high time for us to do what we can to block the road and make it impossible for those who follow us to ride to their destruction, and that of our form of government along the lane of further centralization and usurpation of power by the Federal Government and disregard of the reserved rights of the States.

Somebody said the other day that confidence is what human nature needs for happiness and prosperity and that confidence is what a modern democratic nation needs for individual and political and economic accomplishment. It follows, therefore, that a well defended freedom is the essential need of today, for only in freedom is there found that confidence which motivated the founders of a democratically organized and administered society as recorded in the Declaration of Independence and in the Federal Constitution with its reservation to the States of the rights not otherwise granted. That is to say, as set forth in the tenth amendment to our Constitution, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Strange as it may seem to some of us, those framers and founders of our Government were straight thinkers and the more we study what they did and seek to find the reasons therefor, the more our respect for them increases. In everything they did and said they made it perfectly clear, as has been justified by the years, that freedom is not the creation of government but that it sets up government to be its servant.

As Nicholas Murray Butler said, "There can be no greater fallacy than to assume that in a democratic society government comes first and that freedom exists incidentally and afterward. Precisely the opposite is the fact."

It is with no idea of being boastful that I state it to be a fact that so far as Vermonters are concerned independence is our boast. That could be said as well of many of the States in the Union whose people do not realize what has been and is being done to them by those who have attempted to take away from the States, under cover of laws mandated and passed by direction, their ownership and control of the air, the land, and the water, the fundamentals of that great government of, for, and by the people.

In order to retain their vitality as local governmental units, the States must be secure against Federal invasion. The inviolability of States' rights is more than a question of constitutional interpretation. It is an essential feature of our constitutional system. "To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential for the preservation of that balance of power on which our institutions rest." So said Abraham Lincoln in his first message to Congress.

The signs on the road along which we are traveling point to the vanishing of the States and the destruction of the American Republic as we have known it.

Let it be understood that I am just as much and as actively opposed to abdication by the States as to usurpation by the Federal Government.

I am against the theory that this is a good government to live in so long as we can live off it.

I am not opposed to contribution by and the cooperation of the Federal Government to help the States adjacent to the Mississippi and the Missouri and the other big rivers to help to control floods. I do insist that the State interested should have a voice in the proceedings and that this great giant, the Federal Government, should not dominate and determine and dictate in the premises.

The dominant and the servient States should have a right to compact for their safety and security and have something to say about it, or else pass out of the picture and become a part of a fascist state, centrally controlled by edict—by men rather than by law.

No Habla Español

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the New Yorker magazine.

Mr. Speaker, this letter, sent by the New Yorker magazine to its regular contributors, has probably not reached many Members of Congress. Offhand I cannot think of a single probability. Many Members, however, have contributed to the Reader's Digest and they may, therefore, find interest in this extension of remarks.

Certainly this letter deserves inclusion in that most remarkable of all digest publications, the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FEBRUARY 9, 1944.

To Our Contributors:

The New Yorker has renewed its agreement with the Reader's Digest this year and has decided that no permission will be given the Digest to reprint our text or pictures. Since you, as a contributor, have a stake in this

we presume you will want to know our reasons. They are roughly as follows:

The Digest started out as a reprint magazine but grew into something quite different. Nowadays a large proportion of its contents is frankly original with the Digest and not presented as reprint material; and of the stuff that is presented as reprint material much actually originates in the office of the Digest and then gets farmed out to some other magazine for first publication. The effect of this (apart from spreading a lot of money around) is that the Digest is beginning to generate a considerable fraction of the contents of American magazines. This gives us the creeps, as does any centralization of genius. The fact seems to be that some publications are already as good as subsidized by the Digest. Our feeling is that if the Digest wants to publish a magazine of original material it should do so in a direct manner. We believe it should not operate through other publications to keep alive the reprint myth. We don't want to be in the position of receiving for consideration a manuscript that has already been bought and paid for by someone else, for we regard such a situation as unhealthy. We were willing to be digested, but we are not willing to be first supplied, then digested.

The New Yorker, furthermore, has never been particularly impressed with the Digest's capsule theory of life and its assumption that any piece of writing can be improved by extracting every seventh word, like a tooth. We have occasionally been embarrassed to see our stuff after it has undergone alterations at Pleasantville. Mostly, however, we object to the Digest's indirect creative function, which is a threat to the free flow of ideas and to the independent spirit. We trust that you will see our point and approve. THE EDITORS.

George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address entitled "George Washington," which was made by me at 7 p. m., February 22, 1944, over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass.:

This, the 22d day of February, must be, for all Americans, the day of rededication. In the greatest crisis that has ever threatened our Nation we pause, for a moment, to commemorate the man who made our independence possible.

In the distractions of daily living we often lose sight of our heritage—of the free and fair traditions that have made our country the hope of the world. It is well for us now, in this solemn hour of decision, to contemplate our beginnings that we may draw renewed strength and inspiration from them.

George Washington has been described as "a man whom God left childless that he might be the Father of his Country." He put aside every personal comfort and convenience to devote himself to the service of his country.

The spirit of Washington is with our men today; with the fleets that are challenging the enemy over the far reaches of the Pacific; with our soldiers in the Marshalls, at Anzio and Cassino; with our airmen who are bringing the war home to its perpetrator, Germany. From housewife to factory worker to President that same spirit must activate all of us whose responsibility it is to support the war effort on the home front.

There was a time, in the fantastic twenties, when it was fashionable to scoff at loyalty to one's country. Those were the days when rampant individualism was exalted higher than any other conceivable value. We mocked patriotism; we sometimes derided those who had fought for us in the World War. We all wanted to be sophisticated and cynical—to doubt everything.

Those days of unrestrained individualism—or license—are gone. Today we have found our roots again. The dignity of man and his responsibility to others—that unbroken heritage that has come down to us from Wilson and Lincoln and Washington, is spiritually alive in us again.

Remember how the Fascists and the Japanese war lords planned to destroy us? They judged us by the whimsical happenings in our country during the past 20 years. Flagpole sitters and marathon dancers—star worship of Hollywood personalities and promiscuous morality, they thought this was the clue to America. Millions of unemployed and blind isolationism; these they interpreted as signs that we could not cope with the serious economic problems at home, that we were divided and unprepared to defend our sovereignty. They estimated that we were a nation of playboys, quacks, and traitors, weak, degenerate, confused, and ripe for conquest.

Then came the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Many of our ships were sunk and the toll taken of American lives shocked the Nation. The enemy had caught us by surprise and inflicted a serious blow. We did not have the strength to defend our outposts in the Far Pacific. But America did not quit. We roused ourselves, brushed away the cobwebs and resolved to the grim task of fighting back. Then came Guadalcanal, Salerno, Midway, and the Coral Sea, to serve notice to the supermen that their judgment was in error. These are but the beginnings. More emphatic proofs are imminent.

Dr. Goebbels might have studied American history to better advantage, for he had made the fatal mistake of taking appearance for reality. Now that the chips are down, America is running true to form. The froth is gone—America is in earnest—because the spirit of Washington is still with us.

Back in 1775, they said he didn't have a chance. There were 13 separate and mutually suspicious colonies, and no army. The enemy had veteran troops with which to invade the provinces. But Washington knew that spirit could move mountains, that a man who believed in what he was fighting for was worth 10 mercenaries who did not. And so he gathered the ragged citizens to form the Continental Army. They did not fight in squares, the orthodox military method of the time. Taking advantage of every cover, fighting from behind trees and rocks, fighting a war of movement, they survived. There were defeats and retreats but still they fought on toward the end of 1776, and early in 1777 Washington won his great victories at Trenton and Princeton. Then came the bitter days, when, after his defeat at Brandywine, he set up winter headquarters at Valley Forge. The camp was a pesthole of disease and suffering. Most of the soldiers were in rags and during those terrible months Washington saw all about him "sickness madness, and starvation." At this time the criticism of Washington's leadership grew stronger, not only in military circles, but among the people and in the Continental Congress. It is this detraction which inspired Washington to write to the assembled delegates back home in Philadelphia:

"We have, by a field-return this day made, no less than two thousand eight hundred and ninety eight men now in camp unfit for duty, because they are barefoot and otherwise naked. Since the 4th instant, our numbers fit for duty, from the hardships and exposures they have undergone, particularly on account of blankets (numbers having been obliged, and still are, to sit up all night by fires, instead of taking comfortable rest in a natural and common way) have decreased near two thousand men.

"But what makes this matter so extraordinary in my eye is, that these very gentlemen, * * * who were well apprised of the nakedness of the troops from ocular demonstration * * * should think a winter's campaign, and the covering of these States (New Jersey and Pennsylvania) from the invasion of an enemy, so easy and practicable a business. I can assure those gentlemen, that it is a much easier and less distressing thing to draw remonstrances in a comfortable room by a good fireside, than to occupy a cold, bleak hill, and sleep under frost and snow, without clothes or blankets."

Out of the magnificent courage and endurances of these men whom Washington led through 8 long years of war, came this Nation which it is our privilege to be members of today. The character of Washington brought this starved, ragged and ill-equipped army of citizens through to victory in spite of despair in the ranks, in spite of vicious criticism leveled at him by the politicians of his day and in spite of the indifference and complacency of those who did not have to fight.

On the Memorial Arch at Valley Forge is this inscription which should, on this day, have the reverent attention of all Americans:

"And here in this place of sacrifice, in this vale of humiliation, in this valley of the shadow of that death out of which the life of America rose regenerate and free, let us resolve with an abiding faith that to them union will seem as dear, and liberty as sweet and progress as glorious, as they were to our fathers and are to you and me, and that the institutions which have made us happy, preserved by the virtue of our children shall bless the remotest generation of the time to come."

Within 4 years after Valley Forge Washington had led his untrained troops to successive victories over enemy reinforcements, and in 1781 he forced the surrender of General Cornwallis at Yorktown. As a military leader, Washington won the praise of Frederick the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, and the Duke of Wellington. Von Moltke, the great strategist, said: "No finer movement was ever executed then the retreat across the Jerseys, the return across the Delaware a first time, and then a second, so as to draw out the enemy in a long, thin line." Washington's march through the enemy lines was described by Horace Walpole as a "prodigy of generalship."

The honesty and courage of Washington as the first President of the Nation did much to tide the infant Republic over difficult days and to set the pattern for future leadership. He wrote to the people: "Honesty is always the best policy." And it applied to public as well as private affairs.

During his first year as President of the United States he was attacked by a severe illness that required a surgical operation. Great anxiety was felt in New York, the Capital at that time, as the President's case was considered extremely dangerous. Dr. Bard and his son attended him. The elder Bard, being somewhat doubtful of George Washington's nerves, gave the knife to his son, bidding him "cut away deeper, deeper still; don't be afraid; you see how well he bears it." The President was suffering from a malady which seemed to be incurable. He was attended day and night by Dr. Bard, who was considered one of the most skillful physicians and surgeons of that day. The painful tumor was upon his thigh and was brought on by the excitement and labor which he had undergone since his inauguration.

On one occasion, being left alone with him, the patient, looking the physician straight in the eye, desired his candid opinion as to the probable termination of his illness, adding with perfect composure, "Don't flatter me with vain hopes; I am not afraid to die and can bear the worst." Dr. Bard expressed a hope but acknowledged his apprehension. Washington replied, with the same coolness, "Whether tonight or 20 years hence makes no difference; I know that I am in the care of a good Providence." Happily the operation proved successful and the President's recovery removed all cause for alarm.

During his 8 years as President, Washington's honesty and courage prevailed over all political bickerings to give the fledgling Nation a wise, moderate, and sure leadership. He applied the two great talents of a statesman; the faculty of concealing his own sentiments and of discovering those of other men.

Then as now there were those who clamored for military action before we were ready, and there were those who advised that we should sell out to the enemy. But Washington, calm and dignified, did what he believed to be best for the Nation, and in the end he was right. In time all learned to trust his wise leadership and saw that in his able hands the independence of our country was assured.

George Washington, of his own choice, left the ease and comfort of his Virginia plantation to suffer physical hardships and mental anxieties such as few men have experienced. He pledged his own fortune to support a nation without money or credit; he refused all pay for his services. He did all this because he knew that in the greater family of our country there are duties, loyalties, and sacrifices. He knew that America, as it developed to fulfill its historical destiny, would not merely symbolize the freedom to get but also the freedom to give.

Our enemies of today thought we were afraid to fight. But they have seen American boys in countless numbers leave the comfort and security of their homes to meet and best the enemy under primitive conditions that would have broken other men. Again and again the enemy is bewildered, unable to understand how the peaceful and pleasure-loving American people can so readily adapt themselves to the grim necessities of war when they have to.

We Americans who are civilians have been amazed and stirred to the depths of our being as we see our men give everything, even life itself, for us. We wonder where this transcendent character comes from. Then we think of their homes, free from state control; of the give-and-take, fair-play environment of American life; of their religions, and their education.

Because America is a young and energetic Nation, we know that our national life will show passing extremes. But far more important than this, we know that in times of crisis, the genuine American character, honest and courageous, will assert itself.

America has come of age and is meeting the test of manhood, thanks to the spirit and example of the Father of our Country, George Washington.

Call a Convention!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Call a Convention" which appeared in the Irish Echo, January 15, 1944.

CALL A CONVENTION

Before the United States entered the war we urged the wisdom of holding an Irish race convention in some city where it would be convenient for delegates of many Irish organizations to attend and discuss their common interests in this country and the attitude of the race regarding Ireland's future.

Our suggestion met with considerable sympathy, according to letters we received from different parts of the United States, but nothing practical materialized.

Within the last month or so sentiment for a gathering of representatives of the Irish race in the United States before the world returns to peace has become so prevalent that we think the time is opportune for the leading Irish organizations in New York and other American cities to take definite action.

There are many problems that may be expected to develop in the post-war period which Irish men and women in the United States should be preparing how to meet. Time is really of the essence in such preparation. Delay is dangerous.

The world is about to enter on an era that may completely change the actions and reactions of men and women toward morals, manners, traditions, and customs. How is any fragment of the human family to know how it should face the new era if it does not take the means of learning beforehand what is expected of it?

The spiritual heritage of the Irish is sufficiently important to move all who value it in directing their thoughts to the future. An exchange of ideas and opinions at a race convention is the best medium, we are convinced, of getting the race ready to take care of itself when peace comes. The preliminaries for a convention should not take long to complete. There are enough societies in the United States to guarantee its representative character and assure its success. No delay should be permitted in getting the convention under way.

The Baruch Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It follows:

The Baruch report comes close to being a blueprint for the Nation's economy in the transition from war to peace. The recommendations are made with this qualification—that they are secondary to the prompt and effective prosecution of the war. It was on this basis that the task of preparing the report was undertaken by the two authors, Bernard M. Baruch and John M. Hancock.

The plan deals with demobilization, both military and industrial. The objective is to prevent unemployment and depression and to prepare for a new adventure in prosperity. If this pattern is followed, or the main principles of it, there is good reason to hope that the country will avoid the confusion and waste that were involved in demobilization after the First World War.

"It is an easier task to convert from peace to war than from war to peace." This observation in the summary of the report is the key to the complexity of the problem. What needs to be done now in preparation for peace must be done against the currents of intense war activity. It must be done without in any way weakening the conduct of the war.

On the policy side, the proposal that the Government should get out of business as soon as possible after the war will be generally approved. The war, in its urgency and magnitude, has forced Government to take over many business functions not normally within its sphere. How to get disengaged from and unscramble these activities and restore them to private enterprise is a problem overshadowing the whole program of war demobilization and reconversion.

The job this time will be much greater than it was after the last war, when there was a deplorable muddle over the termination of contracts and the disposal of surplus military supplies and equipment. Then, there was huge waste, great stocks of goods deteriorated in warehouses, new ships rusted away in ports, merchandise got into the hands of speculators who made fortunes at the public expense and many perfectly reputable manufacturers whose contracts were terminated waited for years before their claims finally were settled. There was scandal and extravagance, incompetence and negligence, dishonesty and profiteering.

It is estimated that after the First World War there was about $7,000,000,000 worth of surplus goods to be disposed of, and that this time the amount may be 10 times as much. How well we succeed in meeting the situation this time, and in applying the principles of the Baruch report, depends in large degree on whether the war ends suddenly, as it did the last time, or the end can be foreseen fairly far in advance.

There will be widespread agreement with the report's declaration that "there is no need for a post-war depression." But to prevent a depression requires, as the report well states, "getting us all back to work in peacetime enterprises." There will be agreement, too, with such proposals as prompt settlement of war contracts; early disposal of surpluses "as in a goldfish bowl"—with full publicity to prevent fraud; equal opportunity for small as well as large business to bid for surpluses; continuance of artificial business controls only so long as is necessary; development of a public works program.

The proposal for national debt reduction is good, but it is doubtful that Congress could intelligently draft now a definite post-war tax schedule, as suggested. A general policy of tax reduction when feasible might well be adopted, but many factors of public welfare must be considered before lower rates are established.

This is a comprehensive, considered plan embracing virtually all the problems that are foreseeable in connection with the reconversion of industry, and the transition to peace; the only one of its kind. In some respects, Congress and Government officials will be able to improve it; in general, it is a valuable guide for an intricate, highly important task.

Mountain Out of a Mole Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

MOUNTAIN OUT OF A MOLEHILL

Chairman DIES, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has disclosed that its members are studying the Peace Now movement. If the committee cannot unearth more virulent forms of un-American activities, all, indeed, is well on the patriotic front.

The Peace Now movement is composed of small groups of militant pacifists, numbering about 2,000, the great majority of whom are honest, religious folk who somehow contrived to contort themselves into the conviction that any and all war is iniquitous. They have become conscientious objectors. To demand that they remain silent about their convictions because wartime is an inappropriate time for voicing them is like criticizing the chanticleer for crowing in the early morning.

The avowed purpose of the Dies investigation is to avert the impression upon the Axis Powers, our allies, and our armies that there exists in this country a significant demand for a negotiated peace. An investigation by the Dies committee will probably do more to create this impression than any Peace Now movement, if ignored, could ever produce.

The Peace Now literature in behalf of a negotiated peace is semireligious gibberish, readily discerned as such by the man in the street, and just as readily ignored. Lest the Dies committee believe that the mere announcement of an investigation will frighten the pacifist groups into folding their tents, we suggest that it spend a little time on the study of the conscience and its strange compulsions.

Not an investigation but a program of reeducation is in order, conducted by enlightened ecclesiastical thought, in an endeavor to reorientate the conscientious objector on the subject of war, or, failing in this, to counsel him to greater restraint.

Federal Aid to the States for Highway Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and report:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION,
Boston, February 21, 1944.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Sometime ago the attention of this commission was directed to a bill, H. R. 2426, which would provide for appropriations amounting to $3,000,000,000 at the rate of $1,000,000 a year for the 3 years immediately following the end of the war, to be used in making grants to the States for the construction and improvement of highways, including both through routes and local roads. The corresponding Senate bill is S. 971.

These two bills were referred by this commission to its committee on taxation, which held a hearing at which several persons, well informed regarding the subject matter, were present, including Commissioner Herman A. MacDonald, of the Department of Public Works. On the basis of the facts presented at the hearing and additional information obtained from other sources, the committee submitted to the commission at a meeting held on Tuesday, February 15, the draft of a report regarding the two bills in question. That report was approved by the commission, with some modifications, and the commission voted to send copies to the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress.

A copy of the report is therefore enclosed for your information. We hope that you will find it practicable to take a position regarding H. R. 2426 consistent with the conclusions set forth in this report.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. PLAISTED,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION IN REGARD TO PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR FEDERAL AID TO THE STATES FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES IN THE AMOUNT OF $3,000,000,000 FOR 3 YEARS PURSUANT TO H. R. 2426 OR RELATED BILLS

This Commission having considered this proposed legislation, and the report thereon of its committee on taxation, makes the following recommendations:

"1. If legislation along the proposed lines is adopted, there should be incorporated therein a plan or formula for the distribution of the funds to the several States which will not be inequitable to the more densely populated States and to those States which bear a heavy burden of Federal taxation, having in mind that the purposes of this bill include not only through-route rural highways, but also urban roads, and in fact the entire road-building program of a given State.

"2. The proposed amount is excessive and should be drastically reduced; and the purposes for which the Federal aid may be expended should be limited to recognized fields of Federal activity.

"It is desirable and necessary that the Federal Government should take part in the financing of post roads and through routes, and an adequate amount should be appropriated to provide Federal aid for such purposes. In this way the States having large needs for such highways and less ability to pay are in effect aided by States having lesser needs and greater ability to pay. But it is unsound, un-American, and contrary to the proper relationship of the States to the Federal Government to have this sound principle carried further than is required for the above purpose.

"As a general principle the construction of local highways and the financing of a State's highway program should be a function of the State, and should be financed from State funds. If further financial resources will be needed by the States during the post-war period for their road-building programs, it would be preferable to have those sources made available directly to the States rather than to have the Federal Government collect the money by taxation or by borrowing, and return the same to the States in the shape of Federal aid under such plans of distribution as set up in the proposed legislation.

This could be accomplished by having the Federal Government release to the States sources of taxation now preempted by the Federal Government, such as the Federal gasoline tax. Figures submitted to this Commission show that under the proposed legislation the contribution by the taxpayers of Massachusetts will be approximately $107,400,000, of which the State of Massachusetts will be allocated approximately $54,127,000; whereas if Massachusetts itself financed this program, it would receive the whole $107,400,000. Similarly, if the Federal program is reduced in amount, and Massachusetts finances its own program for local roads, Massachusetts citizens will receive 100 cents on the dollar of the amount they pay in taxes for such purpose; whereas under the Federal-aid plan they will receive only about 50 cents on the dollar.

"It is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States for the Federal Government to finance the local road-building programs of States. This is clearly a State matter, and not within the constitutional provisions granting power to the Federal Government 'to establish post offices and post roads' and 'to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.' To tax the citizens of Massachusetts and have this money distributed among other States for purposes not provided for in the Constitution, and in a manner over which the taxpayers of Massachusetts will have practically no control, is a form of taxation without representation. The time has come to restore constitutional government.

"The time to oppose Federal intrusion upon the prerogatives of the States is in respect of each individual case as it arises. The broader question of preserving States' rights will not arise as a clear-cut issue by itself; it arises only in this piecemeal fashion. The problem of secession by States has been met, but the problem of abdication by the States must still be faced.

"Persons interested in the Massachusetts post-war highway problem should not be hypnotized by the huge amounts of Federal grants dangled before their eyes. They will in fact receive from such grants only about 50 percent of the tax dollar which they pay. The proposed legislation in addition to being reduced in amount should be limited to recognized fields of Federal activity; and provisions permitting the financing of local highway programs should be eliminated.

"A history of Federal aid for highways shows that the new proposal is an unprecedented expansion of past theory and practice. The first Federal act was in 1916. From then until 1930 the amount allocated to Massachusetts averaged about $1,000,000 a year. In 1931 and 1932 the addition of emergency funds brought the total amounts up to $3,000,000 and $3,500,000, respectively. In 1934, $6,000,000 of National Industrial Recovery funds were available. In 1936, $7,383,718 of Works Progress funds were available in addition to nearly $2,000,000 of regular Federal road-aid funds. Since then the total amounts available in any year have not exceeded approximately $3,000,000. The 1943 figure was under $2,500,000. The proposed new legislation is in the amount of $18,000,000 a year for each of 3 years, total $54,000,000.

"Beyond that, up to the present time 50 percent or more of matched State funds were usually required. Under the new bill that figure is reduced to 25 percent. Prior to the new bill Federal aid was in general limited to the Federal aid highway system; under the new bill local road building programs may be included.

"This increase of the proportion of Federal aid from 50 percent in the present law to 75 percent in the proposed law looks superficially highly advantageous to the States. Yet, in reality, Federal grants come largely from the taxpayers of the States; and States like Massachusetts which pay a heavy share of the Federal tax bill will be worse off under this 75-percent provision. Massachusetts, and other States similarly situated, will in fact, contribute toward the total appropriation much more in taxes than they will receive back in Federal grants under any formula so far proposed. The inclusion of local road programs will not only increase this burden on States like Massachusetts, and build up a huge Federal expenditure, but will involve Federal encroachments in a field that belongs properly to the States alone.

"This Commission therefore urges that the bill be amended to reduce drastically the amount to be appropriated and to restrict to actual post roads the use of the money granted; also that any money appropriated

be distributed according to a plan or formula equitable to all the States. If the bill cannot be revised along these lines, the commission urges that it be rejected."

Adopted at a meeting of the commission held at the State House, Boston, Mass., February 15, 1944.

Attest:

JOHN W. PLAISTED,
Secretary.

Strike at Rouge Plant of Ford Motor Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it might well seem that the strike mentioned below will be known in the years to come as "the strike to end all strikes":

FEBRUARY 19, 1944.

From Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

More than 1,100 production foundry workers in the Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. were either idle or on strike today in what appeared to be a well organized slow-down effort by the U. A. W.–C. I. O. local 600. One department struck to force a demand for a half hour rest period after each half hour of work, adopting as their slogan "A half hour on and a half hour off." In an adjacent department core makers had slowed down their production to less than half normal. During 1940 their voluntary production rate was 566 units per man per 8-hour shift. This has been cut to 275 units per man. Present Army schedules call for 450 units per man.

Production costs for war materials have skyrocketed during the last few days because of the slow-down, company officials said. The company last week offered the union an opportunity to correct its difficulties but the slow-down continued. As a result nine men were suspended for 1 week under clause 13 of the U. A. W. contract which stipulates working schedules and the strike followed. The half-and-half work schedule was demanded by metal pourers who normally alternate a half hour pouring metal and a half hour of light work. They had pressed their demands by sleeping in the foundry aisles during the half-hour periods after pouring, the company said.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article from the magazine, Broadcasting, which appeared in the February 21, 1944, issue. The article follows:

GOVERNOR COX SAYS FLY PLANS UNITED STATES OWNERSHIP—1920 NOMINEE POINTS TO STUDIED CAMPAIGN BY CHAIRMAN

A studied campaign toward Government ownership of radio in the United States is attributed to F. C. C. Chairman James Lawrence Fly by former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, newspaper publisher and owner of three stations. Governor Cox in 1920 was the Democratic nominee for President.

"I am convinced that Fly wants radio to be turned over, if not abruptly then by easy stages as political conditions permit, to the Government," Governor Cox said. The disclosure came in a letter to J. Leonard Reinsch, managing director of WSB (Atlanta), WIOD (Miami), and WHIO (Dayton), the Cox-owned stations. A copy of the letter, dated January 20, is in the hands of Chairman BURTON K. WHEELER, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

"If we had Federal ownership," Governor Cox commented, "then a Huey Long administration could never be gotten rid of."

Governor Cox had Franklin D. Roosevelt as his Vice Presidential running mate in the 1920 campaign. A close relationship has existed between them since that campaign. The 73-year-old statesman has made few public utterances, however, in recent years, and never has commented publicly on the New Deal or F. C. C. radio policies or regulatory methods.

Governor Cox is publisher of the Dayton Daily News, the Atlanta Journal, and the Miami Daily News, each identified with station operation. He was a Member of Congress from 1909 to 1913 and served 6 years as Governor of Ohio, having been nominated for the Presidency while serving his last term.

In his letter to Mr. Reinsch, who was a witness before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in favor of the White-Wheeler bill (S. 814) to restrict F. C. C. powers, Governor Cox said there were three things highspotted in his mind regarding the whole radio situation.

"First," he said, "there is the duty of Congress in doing something to clarify the present state of things emphasized by the fact that the Supreme Court has almost supplicated the law-making body to indicate the path for a more sensible, efficient, and just regulation of the whole industry.

"Second, I am convinced that Fly wants radio to be turned over, if not abruptly then by easy stages as political conditions permit, to the Government. If we had Federal ownership, then a Huey Long administration could never be gotten rid of.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

"Third, Senator WHEELER has put his finger on the very definite need of providing some way, somehow, for an equal division of time in the discussion of vital public questions. It might be difficult to write this into law. Jefferson was a very wise man and he once said that it was a mistake to make either charter of government or statute too specific. The important thing was to express the principle involved, having some confidence in the intelligence and integrity of both administrative officers and the courts.

"We live in a democracy which cannot go on in good health unless we have a healthy public opinion and that cannot be unless our public has presented to it the truth, and all of it. After all, that is the very essence of democracy and this form of government is not going to live if truth is diluted through misrepresentation. It is as necessary to keep the current of public opinion protected as it is to balance the diet of a baby.

"Elaborating a little upon this basic philosophy, we have a job to do in the making of a world peace. The truth from all over the world must come unshackled. If our civilization knows what is going on, then we can assume that the rightness of things will have a much better chance to prevail than it ever has in the past."

A Tribute to the Memory of the Late Edward E. Cushman, United States District Judge at Tacoma, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the late Edward E. Cushman was an eminent and respected jurist of the State of Washington, who, during his lifetime had earned the admiration and deep respect of his colleagues of the bench and bar. Judge Cushman was a profound scholar, not only of the law but of literature and history. He was a member of a distinguished family. His home for decades was one of the attractive sites of my scenic home city of Tacoma, standing high and white against the sky on the seaward terminus of a lofty hill reaching to the edge of Puget Sound. Judge Cushman's home is a show place.

His successor on the Federal bench in Tacoma, following his retirement, is our own former colleague, the Honorable Charles H. Leavy, who for three terms represented the northwest section of the State of Washington in Congress.

Incidentally, Judge Leavy's new home on Madrona Way in Tacoma is situated on a promontory in a geographical position similar to that occupied by Judge Cushman's home. Its beautiful grounds, like those of Judge Cushman, are restful yet inspiring to all who are privileged to see and visit them.

Judge Cushman had a long and distinguished career in the public service to which another Federal judge, the Honorable John C. Bowen, paid condign tribute recently at memorial exercises held in the Federal court room at Tacoma, in which ceremonies, dozens of the most distinguished lawyers and judges of the State of Washington participated. Judge Cushman was a brother of the late Frank Cushman, who served in Congress as one of my predecessors for a long period of time. The memory of the late Congressman Frank Cushman is still cherished among old timers here because that distinguished Republican statesman was so outstandingly witty, and engaging in his personality. Congressman Frank Cushman was one of the greatest raconteurs who ever graced the Halls of Congress. As a story teller, he has been rivaled only during the past 4 decades by former United States Senator J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama.

The senior United States judge of western Washington, is the personable, likable, and gifted John C. Bowen. He has summed up in exquisite language, most appropriately, the feelings entertained by those who know him best in appraising the career of Judge Edward E. Cushman. Here is Judge Bowen's address:

My brothers of the Federal and State courts, members of the bar, and friends of Judge Cushman, we all as friends of Judge Cushman are met here to pay our respects

to his splendid private life and honored public career.

Judge Cushman was devoted to his city and country, his family, and profession.

The city and people of Tacoma, where he lived the greater part of his life, held a very warm place in his heart. He was intensely loyal to his country and his patriotism was of the highest order.

His watchful and tender care for the personal well-being of his beloved wife and those dear to him was always evident. The family circle was his personal pride and joy, and in his stately home and beautiful gardens with their panorama of entrancing bay and sound and mountains, he found refreshing relaxation from the arduous tasks of his judicial office.

Judge Cushman's long public service spanned a period of about 40 years beginning in 1900. As assistant United States attorney, as special assistant to the attorney general for the ninth circuit, as United States district judge for the third division of Alaska, and as senior United States district judge for the western district of Washington, he gathered wisdom from his varied experiences. This court and all with whom he came in contact were the beneficiaries of his wise counsel.

For more than 27 years Judge Cushman gave the full measure of his outstanding ability to the service of this court and the Federal judiciary. His conscientious attention to the court's work characterized his long career on the bench. He was noted for his painstaking consideration and limitless patience. His presence on the bench guaranteed to a litigant his day in court, and no one was turned away without a full hearing.

It has been my happy privilege to have appraised Judge Cushman's work from the standpoints of both a lawyer practicing before him and a colleague on the bench working with him. He loved the work and life of a judge, and by his constant attitude and conduct he unfalteringly upheld and strengthened the highest traditions and integrity of the Federal courts. In him, nature combined an abundant gift and purpose for doing impartial justice between the strong and the weak. No judge ever succeeded more than did Judge Cushman in bringing real satisfaction to those affected favorably or unfavorably by his decisions. He was in all respects a good judge and a successful judge. He was, I believe, one of the ablest and fairest judges of all time.

His exemplary record in the faithful service of this court will sustain the lifelong gratitude of all who knew him, and will ever be a guiding inspiration to those of bench and bar who come upon the scene after his departure. But we who knew him shall always miss him, and we shall honor him as a champion among those who would maintain the majesty of the law.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Post of February 24, 1944:

BARKLEY'S RESIGNATION

The President's telegram to Senator BARKLEY suggests that he is now belatedly trying to heal the breach between himself and Congress. His veto of the tax bill made the breach into a yawning gulf. The message was one of the most extraordinary messages that we remember. It is no wonder that it brought forth the indignant and bitter resignation of the long-suffering majority leader in the Senate. The Kentuckian called it a "deliberate and calculated assault upon the honesty and integrity" of Congressmen. He did not use extravagant language. When a President writes that a tax bill is "not a tax bill but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy," when he says that the bill "is replete with provisions which * * * afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups"—when he says such things only one conclusion can be drawn. That conclusion is that he is assailing the motives of Congress.

Why the President should go to such demagogic lengths in attacking Congress is anybody's guess. He has invited a break with the legislature. But why? Is he encouraging the country to put the finger on Congress as the branch responsible for the failure to enact a "realistic" tax law? That would seem to be the case. It follows that the tax message must be regarded as a document giving off the ancient and fishlike smell of politics. Even if the President doesn't intend to run again, his record will. And the message seems destined to be added to the record of Roosevelt virtue outraged by a Congress devoid of virtue. That may or may not be a winning appeal. In view of the public ignorance of the history of this measure, in view of the diversion of public interest to wartime pursuits and war news—this form of campaigning may count. As to that, time only can tell. All that can be said now is that electioneering conducted on such a low level will be injurious in the long run to the welfare of our Nation.

The record, in point of fact, doesn't at all bear out the construction which may be read in the veto message as to the sole responsibility of Congress for the tax fiasco. Congress and the Executive are coordinate. In tax matters they have a joint responsibility which is plainly stated in the law of the land. The sponsorship of taxation as of treaties belongs to the executive department. It is the President's task, according to law, to make specific recommendations in the budget message whenever receipts fall short of expenditures. If the history of the present tax bill is examined, the conclusion is forced upon the impartial observer that the President failed in this particular duty. He did not make specific recommendations. On January 12 a year ago the Post, commenting on his budget message, said:

"Mr. Roosevelt does not present any specific recommendations. * * * Indeed, he has left our legislators a greater liberty of choice in respect to methods than many of them will relish."

All he did was to give Congress the dimensions of its task. To be sure, Secretary Morgenthau later came along with a $10,500,000,000 tax program. That program, however, failed so miserably to bite into war-created incomes that it let off between 9,000,000 and 11,000,000 income taxpayers. It was thus as much a political document as his veto message. Even the men responsible for the administration of the stabilization policy damned it with faint praise. No wonder, therefore, that the Congress couldn't stomach it. In other words, the President has never given the Congress the requisite leadership in the coordinate job of framing the "realistic" tax measure he so often requests.

The Post did not like the bill that came out of the Congress. And it said so. So far as we are concerned, a realistic tax measure in this inflationary period would rest squarely on a general sales tax and compulsory savings. But on both these necessary bases for wartime taxes the President has blown alternately hot and cold. As far back as January 5, 1942, he envisaged a general sales tax "as a temporary wartime necessity." But he never recommended it. In the Budget message, out of which grew the present bill, he said we should strive to collect "not less than sixteen billions of additional funds by taxation, savings, or both." But he left the plea for compulsory savings implicit, and even backed down under press conference questioning. If half the vigor and particularization he has put into the veto message had been put into his Budget messages, the country would not now have arrived at its present fiscal pass. All that the veto message accomplishes is to add a political to a fiscal crisis. Statesmanship certainly took a holiday when the President indited the message which is now rocking Congress.

TAX BILL

In detail the President's veto of the tax bill raises several points which require clarification. Mr. Roosevelt complains about the loss of revenue due to the freezing of social-security payments and to the termination this year of the renegotiation law. But neither item is properly the concern of the tax collector. Social security is a system in itself. In other words, whether or not it was advisable to raise the rates, the problem was one of social-security policy. But in saying that the freezing "does not seem wise," the President leaves the impression that social security is an exclusively fiscal concern.

As to the renegotiation law, this is a price and not a tax law. Under the present bill the law comes to an end at the close of 1944. By that time the procurement branches of the armed services, after a 3-year experience, should surely be able to reprice contracts so that no profiteering is left. If not, the excess-profits tax is available. If the procurement officials have not by the end of 1944 developed the necessary experience, then they will have been grossly deficient in their function. At any rate, under the new bill they can have another 6 months of renegotiation, or till the middle of 1945, though the President didn't mention this period of grace. It is significant that just as Secretary Morgenthau was satisfied with the social-security item, so the armed services were content with the way that the renegotiation item was handled.

The President, finally, is off the mark in inveighing against Congress for its sole responsibility for the lack of simplification of our tax laws. The major cause of tax mystification is the bastard pay-as-you-go system which is now on the statute books. Originally pay-as-you-go was as simple as daylight saving. It should have been accepted or rejected. Instead, the Treasury saw in the idea a chance of collecting more revenue by a lot of double talk about "forgiveness." The result was a compromise with the Rumlites in Congress—and the present major cause of the confusion in our tax laws.

Soldiers Need Countable Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post. To my mind, it is a fine, analytical exposition of the present absentee-voting problem.

SOLDIERS NEED COUNTABLE BALLOTS

The tumult which has been raging around the question of votes for soldiers could have been cut down to standard size if some attention had been paid one fact—namely, that a soldier has not voted when he has written a name on a ballot provided by a Federal commission, but only when the ballot has been accepted and counted by the election officials in his State and voting precinct. The "fraud" which Mr. Roosevelt said he detected in proposals to amend the Green-Lucas bill might as justly have been charged against the original bill itself. That bill, before its amendment, provided a Federal ballot and a system of soldier voting which would have been unacceptable to election officials all over the country.

Start with the fact that under our Constitution the Presidential election is conducted by States, and the confusion disappears. Mr. Roosevelt cannot carry Italy or Fort Moresby. He has to carry California, Ohio, and the sixteenth ward in Philadelphia. To be counted, ballots must be delivered to election officials in places where people are entitled to vote. The ballots must satisfy the requirements of State laws. You can fly a ballot from New Guinea, but you can't make an election moderator put it in the box. So what was the use of Mr. Roosevelt belaboring Senators and Representatives who tried to prevent endless election contests in the future by making the ballots acceptable in the first place?

The explanation that will occur to some people is the hope of the fourth-term boys to represent themselves to the soldiers and their relatives as carrying on a heroic battle against overwhelming odds in behalf of votes for soldiers. Actually, almost everybody favors it, but some responsible political leaders believe that ballots should not only be printed and distributed to the soldiers but put in ballot boxes and counted. This group, with no help from Mr. Roosevelt, forced amendments to the Green-Lucas bill which conferred on that measure a considerably greater degree of constitutionality. Some of the opposition feared that the administration was planning to grab the soldier vote and do its own counting, and the effort in Congress to prevent amendments which make this more difficult did not assuage these fears. The new dealers and their allies tried to make the customers believe that the "reactionaries" were afraid of the soldier vote.

If this were 1945 or 1942 instead of 1944, votes for soldiers would have been taken care of in the course of a day's routine. Because it is 1944, a job like this can only be done after everybody, from the President down, has had a kick at this bouncy political football.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said the last few days about the responsibility of the Congress in maintaining its self-respect. All this argument originated, of course, because the President of the United States vetoed a bill passed by the Congress, which everyone concedes he had a right to do. He undoubtedly has this right, because it is said that he has vetoed some 600 other bills passed by the Congress. I was amazed at the implication some distinguished Members expressed on yesterday that, in order to maintain our self-respect, we should vote to override the veto. I do not agree with this position. I thought the bill was bad when it was first introduced and worse, if possible, when it was finally passed. I voted against the bill, first, because I thought the amount was inadequate and, second, because of other provisions in it that were bad. I still think they are bad, and, in order to keep a clear conscience and maintain my self-respect, I intend to keep on voting against it.

A peculiar thing when you follow the course of this particular bill to its final passage. As I remember, the Treasury Department asked for a tax bill of ten and a half billion dollars. When this was first proposed and before it was formally placed before the committee, from press reports the proposal found little favor with some members of the committee. I am sure we all appreciate the great amount of work the Ways and Means Committee did, but when they emerged with this bill a great number of the majority members were opposed to it, a few majority members joined with a solid minority group and passed this bill out of committee. I make this statement with no first-hand knowledge but only what I have been told by members of the committee. The bill came onto the floor of the House one afternoon, was debated and passed the same afternoon. Usually it takes 2 and 3 days for debate on a tax bill. There was about one-third of the membership on the floor when it was passed. It passed without a roll call, went over to the Senate and was made infamously worse, brought back by a conference committee and was passed. It did pass by an overwhelming vote, but 100 members voted against it on final passage.

As we all know, the Ways and Means Committee members are elected to represent the House on this important committee, and their responsibility is great inasmuch as they are responsible for tax legislation. I think it is unfortunate, but perhaps a necessary rule of the House, that tax bills are brought here upon the floor under a closed rule. No matter how much one disagrees with the provisions of these bills, the only alternative one has is to either vote for the entire bill or against it. As I said before, all the minority members and a few of the majority members brought out this bill, asked for a closed rule, and got it, and no matter how much they may dislike the criticism, they are the responsible people who passed this thing they call a revenue measure.

We are all proud of the heroic fighting done by our armed forces and I am sure we appreciate the great sacrifice they have made. It seems a sad thing to me that on many of our so-called home fronts we have failed to measure up to our responsibility when compared to their sacrifice. Surely we who are left at home in secure places should be willing to furnish and pay for the bullets that these defenders of ours used to defeat our enemies. Inasmuch as they are giving their all, there is no reason why we should not give at least half of all our time, energy, and money to support our war effort. In my opinion this bill is a timid gesture to the men who are out there fighting and dying for us this very minute, and I am glad to say again that in their interest and in the interest of the country and to maintain my own self-respect, it will be with a great deal of pleasure that I will support the President's veto.

Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State, I said last week when the bill was being considered by the House that "We cannot afford at this time not to have a strong Department of State."

This morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial on the reorganization of the Department entitled, "Teamwork." Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this editorial today:

TEAMWORK

In the complexity of the modern world, diplomacy and economics are closely linked. This is why the President found it advisable to bring all foreign economic operations together in a single agency and to make that agency responsible to the State Department for policy directives. The reorganization, for one reason or another, is still in the birth pangs. Much has yet to be done, as we have said before, to perfect it. However, in connection with the recently negotiated Cuban molasses agreement, we are glad to chalk up a good mark for the new arrangement.

Because of the shortage of shipping and the critical nature of the submarine menace in the Caribbean, the United States found it impossible to purchase and transport the 1943 blackstrap molasses production of Cuba. As a result, the Cubans used their molasses to manufacture rum, gin, and other beverage liquors now in short supply in this country. But molasses is much more urgently needed for the manufacture of alcohol as a source of synthetic rubber. Accordingly, a mission headed by F. E. A. representatives was sent to Habana recently and concluded an agreement under which the Cuban Government will reduce its liquor exports for 1944 and sell its molasses output to the United States for industrial uses.

A good many agencies of the United States Government were interested in this molasses agreement. The Defense Supplies Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation as well as F. E. A. were represented in the mission. It worked, necessarily, in close cooperation with the State Department and with our Embassy in Habana, with the War Production Board, which must administer the restrictions on beverage alcohol imports, and with the Department of the Interior, which has jurisdiction over Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, also affected by the agreement. Here is a noteworthy example of the kind of teamwork which is indispensable to all our operations in the foreign field.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, of the three-horse team there are still two left.

It was hard luck that subsidies had to be voted on a week ago.

A fourth-term slogan: "Again, and again, and again," and again.

There is a big, white slaughterhouse here quarantined because of veto-itis.

The only reason the soldier-vote bill is still here is because it is still, here.

All we had read to us on February 22 in the House were the Farewell Addresses of the first and last Presidents.

"As a grower and seller of trees."—F. D. R. BARKLEY says it was only Christmas trees. Why should not Santa Claus do that?

"These little pine bushes are to the sturdy oak as the cricket is to the stallion."—BARKLEY. Yes, Senator; but the stallion is just a horse today.

There is quite an extensive habit here of celebrating birthdays of the alphabetical set-ups. This is one place where there should be more funerals.

The Vice President says the President should have another 4 years because he has "a sense of how it all adds together"—sum total of two hundred billions in the red.

The three great bases in the John Marshall Islands: Tea party and taxation without representation, guaranteeing in the Constitution the sole right of Congress to levy taxes, and February 1944, when Congress overrode the tax veto.

Army Dentists' Vital Role in Keeping Fighters Fit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Robert C. Harper, entitled "Army Dentists' Vital Role in Keeping Fighters Fit."

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question if the average citizen, including Members of Congress, realize the vital role which the dental profession is playing in our all-out war effort both on the battle front and on the home front.

I trust that you will find time to read an authentic article on this subject, which I am today inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ARMY DENTISTS' VITAL ROLE IN KEEPING FIGHTERS FIT

(By Robert C. Harper)

Fifty divisions—or approximately 750,000 men—have been rehabilitated and made available for military duty through the work of the Army Dental Corps in correcting teeth deficiencies.

Without these 50 divisions America's military punch would have been considerably less effective in far-flung battle zones.

When the history of America's role in World War No. 2 is written, the part played by the dental profession in the Army shall have earned the Nation's gratitude, not only in helping win the war but also in promoting good health through dental hygiene in the post-war years.

Let's take a quick glance at results achieved, after 2 years of war:

Since Pearl Harbor, the Army Dental Corps has constructed and inserted 1,050,000 dentures (artificial plates).

More than 25,000,000 fillings have been made by the Dental Corps, in addition to more than 2,600,000 prophylactic and pyorrheic treatments given.

Thousands of soldiers had teeth extracted and infections removed.

The corps averages 94,000 dental appointments every day.

Those 750,000 men inducted under the Selective Service Act did not have teeth good enough to masticate Army food. Dentists brought them up to par.

SOLDIERS NEED GOOD TEETH

The work of the Dental Corps under the leadership of Maj. Gen. Robert H. Mills, director of the dental division, office of the Surgeon General of the Army, has been no less beneficial even i it has not been shouted from the housetops. There is nothing glamorous about a dentist's chair, yet generals in charge of combat divisions know that the Army Dental Corps has vindicated in striking manner Napoleon's maxim that an army moves on its belly. It takes good teeth to chew and digest field rations in a combat zone.

The minimum dental requirements in the last war were that each prospective soldier must have at least three posterior or masticating teeth, as well as three anterior or incisor teeth. When the present war began, these requirements were modified, simply because too many men were ineligible because of teeth deficiencies.

STRIKING FACTS

Approximately 13 of each 1,000 men in the Army are wearing full upper and lower dentures. The absence of natural teeth has not interfered with their enjoying a good meal.

Here's another striking fact:

In the United States the incidence of trench mouth is 4½ per 1,000 men per month, while among our troops overseas the incidence rate is less than 3 per 1,000 men. The only reason military authorities assign for this disparity is the fact that soldiers overseas have fewer contacts with outside sources than those in this country.

At present no soldier can go overseas or to a port of debarkation until he is cleared by his dental officer at his home station. That means all his emergency work has been taken care of; he is, in fact, a healthy soldier, since good teeth is one of the prime requisites of a healthy body.

When the President's greetings are sent to a prospective soldier and he hears in fancy the familiar refrain, "You're in the Army now; you're not behind a plow," the Selective Service Act becomes anything except selective. Men show up who have had little, if any, daily familiarity with a toothbrush. This G. I. is not only given a toothbrush; he is told to put it to good use. Once his deficiencies have been corrected, he takes pride in keeping his teeth in good condition. A compliment from a junior hostess at a U. S. O. dance makes him aware that good teeth are a great physical asset, any way you look at the subject.

AFTER-WAR BENEFITS

Millions of these boys are coming home after the war to marry, raise children, and take their place in community and national life. The Army's insistence on good teeth will leave benefits of permanent value. To them a dentist will be a real friend, instead of one whose name is associated with unpleasant memories.

In 1941 and early 1942, 8.8 percent of all men inducted under selective service were rejected because of poor teeth. Since October 1942 rejections have been reduced to 1 man per 1,000 selectees. Those rejected now are confined to the group suffering severe malocclusion or irregular teeth and arches, cleft palates, or hairlips, or malignancies in the arches.

Government Issue Joe boards a transport and reaches a war zone. It is interesting to note the role of the Army dentist overseas. Dentists are to be found on hospital ships, on transports, among ski and paratroop units, in short, with every tactical unit in combat zones. Dentists act as auxiliary medical officers. The dental officer and his assistant have with them dental kits in which will be found all the necessary instruments and material to perform emergency work.

Overseas, the over-all picture finds one dental officer to every 850 men, compared with one to a little over 1,000 in the last war.

IN THE WAR ZONES

The Army Dental Corps in war zones also have a mobile dental laboratory which is primarily set up for the repair of dentures or prosthetic appliances or the construction of new ones. In this laboratory there is a prosthodontist or specialist in making plates and three technicians.

In the last war the soldier who broke or lost his denture became a casualty. That meant his removal, sometimes over long distances, to the nearest hospital unit. Today the presence of the mobile dental laboratory saves the Army precious time in converting a casualty into a normal fighting man. This, in turn, gives a greater degree of mobility to our troops.

Auxiliary surgical groups are doing a great work overseas. Each group has four maxilo-facial teams, consisting of a dental officer, a medical officer, two nurses and two technicians for each team. They are available for service anywhere. They are frequently utilized at surgical, evacuation, convalescent, field, and general hospitals to supplement the surgical service at stations where the normal personnel cannot meet the demands of combat. Some of the finest surgeons in America are in this service. Most have had special training in postgraduate schools, such as the Army Medical Center in Washington and in civilian institutions.

The first time that a soldier receives dental treatment he is inspired by the knowledge that good teeth means good health, thus increasing his economic possibilities.

The soldier in war zones knows the value of his dentist. Not until the post-war years, perhaps, will the great contribution of the dental profession to improved American health achieve full fruition.

Override President's Veto of Tax Bill To Give Majority in Congress the Right To Determine Our Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the tax bill recently vetoed by the President. When the conference report on this bill was before the House I voted against its adoption. I did this as a protest to certain provisions of the bill and because the total amount proposed to be raised by the bill was, in my humble opinion, too small, considering the fact that we are in the midst of a great war.

The conference report carried by an overwhelming majority of both Houses. If the veto to this bill is sustained, we will have this situation: A bill which has the endorsement of a large majority of the Congress will not become a law; so, in effect, the policy as to taxation this year will be the policy of the minority. In other words, we will have government policy determined by veto, which is purely negative in its aspect. It is a fundamental principle of representative government that the majority of the people's elected officials shall be permitted to determine the governmental policy to be pursued.

Already one veto has permitted a policy on roll-back subsidies to continue as the policy of the Government, when, in fact, the great majority of Congress—barely less than two-thirds—is opposed to the policy. The people have no other way to express themselves on legislative matters than through their Representatives and Senators

Furthermore, in the particular case, the leaders of both Houses and of both parties tell us that should this bill fail, there is probably not enough time left, considering the legislative calendar, to prepare and have passed another tax bill this year. It might again be subjected to Presidential veto if every provision in it did not meet the approval and fancy of the President and his advisers, none of whom were Members of Congress, who had participated in the preparation of the tax bill.

Therefore, if we are to have government policy that the majority of Congress wants, it seems to me to be imperative that I vote to override the veto of the President. After having voted against the bill which the great majority of my colleagues think is the proper tax bill for this year, I believe it to be my duty to submit to their judgment so that our policy may really reflect the majority of those whom our people have designated as their representatives to formulate the policies for the operation of our Government.

I make a part of my statement an article by Mr. David Lawrence in the Washington Star, which I think analyzes the situation very well:

TAX BILL VETO DECRIED—ACTION VIEWED AS BLOW TO DEMOCRATS AND PRESIDENT'S FOURTH TERM CHANCES

(By David Lawrence)

President Roosevelt has precipitated an unfortunate and wholly unnecessary crisis in constitutional government in the midst of war. His veto of a tax bill on which both Houses of Congress worked for several months is a blunder of major proportions—far beyond the issues in the tax legislation itself.

For the issue is whether Franklin Roosevelt has not outlived his usefulness both as a party leader and the leader of the Nation on the home front. The veto message, instead of being a political asset for his fourth-term campaign, will become a political liability for the President.

This development will be regretted by millions of citizens who favor the President's foreign policies, but who see the big impetus Mr. Roosevelt has given to antiadministration elements which are unfriendly both to the foreign and domestic policies of the President.

In other words, Mr. Roosevelt is making precisely the same mistake that Mr. Wilson did in 1918. Mr. Wilson disregarded the wishes of his party leaders at that time and scorned their advice. He didn't heed the protests of the people on domestic issues, but submerged himself in foreign policy and lost touch with the true friends of public opinion.

MANY FOUGHT VETO

The best friends and most loyal supporters Mr. Roosevelt had on Capitol Hill advised him not to veto the tax bill, but to let it become law even without his signature, if necessary, and with a message outlining his criticisms. The veto message is full of inconsistencies and will not stand objective analysis. It is true that there are some provisions in it which benefit the rich and the selfish. It is true that there are provisions which ought never to have been put in the tax bill. But this can be said of almost every major piece of legislation that reflects a compromise and it is the solemn duty of the President to register his protests to his party leaders and make an issue of the objectionable things while the bill is pending in committee or before either House or while it is in conference. Mr. Roosevelt has seen fit to transmit his views on specific items on other bills before they reached final stages and he could have done the same with respect to the tax bill.

The episode shows that Mr. Roosevelt does not get along even with his own party on Capitol Hill and if the veto should be overridden it will be proof that he has lost the confidence of many Members of Congress. On the other hand, if it is not overridden it will mean that a few votes more than a one-third minority can block legislation and that the majority does not rule in Congress even on a matter of levying taxes, which is by the Constitution given to Congress as a specific power.

SENATE BLOC DEPLORED

While the Presidential veto was intended to check Congress it has never been used to interfere with the judgment of Congress on tax measures. Mr. Roosevelt may be a stickler for the literal right to veto but he will encounter another form of veto if bad feeling between the Executive and legislative is intensified. It is the veto of a one-third bloc in the Senate which may refuse to allow treaties to be ratified. The presence of this third bloc in the Senate has been deplored by many observers, including the writer, but if Mr. Roosevelt persists in using a one-third minority of one House to block a tax bill he will be knocking the props from the argument that Congress should surrender its two-thirds rule on treaties while the President retains his insistence on a two-thirds rule on such matters as tax legislation.

The country cannot readily learn in the present crisis who is right and who is wrong. Under a parliamentary system of government such as exists in Canada, the executive or the legislative can be held responsible. Under our present system—or rather the abuse of Presidential power under our system—neither the executive nor the legislative can be held responsible for the loss of $2,315,000,000 in revenues and the muddle into which the whole tax situation has been thrust overnight. It will be said that Mr. Roosevelt vetoed the bill so the provision requiring labor unions to make an accounting to the United States Treasury would be prevented from becoming law. It seems incredible that such a reason could influence the President but there are so few reasons which logically support Mr. Roosevelt's snub of his own party leaders and their work that his opponents will constantly point to that reason as the real motive behind the message. Mr. Roosevelt made a big mistake. Congress could save him from the consequences of his error by overriding the veto.

The Late Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by the Philippine Cabinet on the occasion of the death of Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre, who so effectively served the Philippine Government on different occasions:

Whereas the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the members of his Cabinet have learned with deep regret of the passing of Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre, former Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs and at one time trade commissioner of the Philippines in the United States;

Whereas the late Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre gave the best that was in him in the service of the American and Filipino peoples; and

Whereas Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre has been a faithful public servant and a true friend of the Filipino people: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the President of the Philippines and his Cabinet extend their condolence to the family of Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre in their present hour of bereavement.

Justice for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most scenically attractive cities in our Nation is the enterprising city of Enum-

claw, in the county of King, State of Washington. The people who comprise this lovely city are intelligent, progressive, warm-hearted, and altruistic.

In a manner similar to that of numerous other areas in America, the citizens of Enumclaw are profoundly concerned about the welfare of the men and women who are in the armed services of the United States in this war. Recently, various civic-minded, fraternal and patriotic groups and organizations gathered together in Enumclaw to consider the adoption of a resolution which would incorporate the consensus of their convictions relative to the proper steps which they felt should be taken through legislation by the Congress for the rehabilitation of honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2.

I commend these thoughtful neighbors for the intelligent and big-hearted attitude they have assumed. I warmly concur in their recommendations. Though the men and women in the armed services of the United States are today accorded the most generous treatment of that of any soldiers in the world, are better housed, fed, clothed, hospitalized and have more done for their dependents than is vouchsafed any other soldier of any other nation, there is vast room for improvement.

Congress will not be niggardly in undertaking the difficult task of reconstructing human lives which have been adversely affected by the travail of war.

I am inserting herein below a resolution by the various organizations who met together for this commendable purpose and a brief article from a local newspaper summarizing the situation. The article and the resolution were printed in the Enumclaw Courier-Herald, an enterprising and public-spirited newspaper, well edited and well printed.

The resolution and article are as follows:

We, the undersigned, once more do hereby request our Congressmen to draw up a sound rehabilitation program for our men and women being discharged—and do it now, no matter what the cost. The healing of tired and broken bodies and the restoration of battle-confused minds is our sacred duty. No tax on those of us who enjoy health and home in these days of peril can be too great if it accomplishes this purpose. If we can spend billions for war and victory, we can also spend billions for those who have made the real sacrifices so that we may be free.

Furthermore, to our Congressmen, we do hereby state that we, the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and wives have oversubscribed every war loan drive, Red Cross drive, War Chest drive, built more planes, tanks, and war material and have produced more food than the most optimistic of our men in Congress had hoped for.

We have taken our 18-year-olds out of school and have sent them to all parts of the world to help restore a semblance of hope for a more tolerant world to broken-hearted mothers and starving children.

We have done all this, and our boys in the service know we have done all this. We have let no one down here in our own land or any other place on earth.

Therefore, in justice to our boys and girls, we do not plead, we demand that you meet this obligation so that American mothers and fathers will not have to face these problems alone after the war. We, as taxpayers who live on all the main streets of this great republic, will know, as we meet Johnny coming down the street on our way to our offices and our jobs, and we will be able to face him knowing in our hearts that he is being taken care of as a truly great republic should take care of her most precious gift—her youth.

American Legion Auxiliary, Theodore Roosevelt No. 23, Labor-Management Committee White River Lumber Co., Local 2-157 International Woodworkers of America, Our Boys Service Club, Enumclaw Ladies of Red Cross, War Mother's Club, Carbon Fuel Co., Sunrise Grange, Business and Professional Women's Club, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Courier-Herald.

ENUMCLAW GROUPS URGE CONGRESS TO PROVIDE JUSTICE FOR SERVICEMEN

This week a large number of Enumclaw groups and individuals endorsed a resolution (printed above) calling upon the United States Congress to enact a bill that would provide adequate compensation and fair treatment to returning servicemen. Feeling that the program has been bandied from pillar to post, the citizens of Enumclaw want to see justice done for these boys when they return home after this war.

Enumclaw boys are cognizant of the problem of post-war difficulties as evidenced by the letters received from many of them who are worried about their place in the community after the war is over. One thing is self-evident from opinion expressed during the past 2 weeks by local citizens and groups. Enumclaw is going to do everything in its power to give these boys a chance when they return. The community as a whole is going to back them up 100 percent.

HERE ARE SOME LETTERS

Some of the thoughts of local boys are contained in the following letters received here by Our Boys Service Club:

"Do you suppose our Government will arrange it so that adjustments back to civilian life and the many difficulties that may arise for us after this war we may take to a board in our home town where we are known and our families are known? Each case then can be treated as an individual case; it surely can without having to travel to a large city, which will take so much time, and, as we fear, become political, too. We would feel a lot better about it in our smaller towns. We know we have independent businessmen of integrity who feel their responsibility to their community as a whole and therefore rise above petty politics."

Another boy writes: "If I came back without a limb, can I be assured of my job again, knowing I have been trained by our Government to handle it as capably as before? Will I be assured that my former employer, seeing able-bodied young men back again, perhaps indirectly, make me feel I am not physically fit as before, and I will then give up position because I cannot take it? Will I have some center to go to in my home town for advice and perhaps a fresh start, for my own peace of mind?"

A third boy writes: "I was in my first year at W. S. C. when inducted into the Army. I understand provisions have been made or have been promised to us that after the war we may return to our studies at Government pay of $50 per month for the period we served in the Army. Will you please see if that is in a bill and mail me a copy?"

The above letters are just a few that are being received from servicemen everywhere. The resolution as printed above is being forwarded to our Congressmen and other representative officials to show them just where Enumclaw stands on the subject. Any other groups or individuals who wish to endorse the resolution may do so by leaving their names at the Courier-Herald office.

Mr. Speaker, the publisher of the Enumclaw Courier-Herald has written an editorial in which he expresses himself forcefully regarding the soldiers' vote bill now pending in the Congress. The editor attributes to politics a leading role in connection with votes cast by Congressmen and Senators on this bill. In my judgment, the editor is emphatically correct in insisting that the man and woman in uniform should be provided an opportunity to cast a ballot and that technical and specious excuses for delaying or denying such a privilege to servicemen should be pushed aside and resolved.

Here is the editorial:

SOLDIER VOTE BILL

It is about time that Congress quits fiddling around with the soldier vote bill and takes some action to insure our servicemen of the opportunity to vote. Politics are playing too great a part in the move to create the machinery to provide that every soldier receives the chance to cast his ballot.

Democrats and Republicans alike should be united in an effort to get the boys their ballots. Neither side should try to be political to gain an advantage in such a situation. Congress sits in Washington, D. C., and argues whether it should be handled this way or that way while the boys in the service carry on a war for their very lives.

There must be a practical and simple solution to this problem that will be fair to all candidates and most of all see to it that every boy who is fighting has an opportunity to cast a ballot. After all that is what he is fighting for—the right to vote for whom he wants.

Tangled Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio talk which I delivered over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday evening, February 19, 1944, on the subject Tangled Taxes:

Fellow Americans, I wish to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for so generously giving me this time to discuss with you a subject that concerns directly 52,000,000 Americans, and, indirectly, every person in the United States.

The subject is Federal taxation—one that we cannot forget. It greets us in the morning mail. It causes us long hours of form-filling grief. It makes us stand in line, consult experts, lose sleep and time from work, and, in some cases, tear our hair. Most important, Federal taxation slips long fingers into our pockets and takes away $1 out of every $3.50 we earn.

Tonight, a bill providing for $2,300,000,000 in new taxes lies on the President's desk. He may sign it. He may veto it. Whatever he does, he has made clear his thoughts on this bill, which was passed by your Congress after

months of hard work and earnest debate. He says that he wants you to pay $10,500,000,000 in new taxes and wishes he had nerve enough to suggest more. It should strike any logical American as strange that tax-expert Franklin Roosevelt, who thinks you can afford so many new taxes, is the same man as politician Franklin Roosevelt who on yesterday vetoed the so-called antisubsidy bill because he says you can't buy groceries without a government dole. This is the same man who thinks that he and his bureaucrats are infallible and that this Congress is a poor substitute for his old "rubber stamp" Congresses.

Mr. Roosevelt has said a lot about taxes in his life—and he used to make sense. Back when he was a candidate for President the first time, he said, and I quote:

"I know something about taxes. For 3 long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching."

Those are the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, delivered in July 1932 in Chicago.

Well, I regret to report that he did stop preaching along those lines. No sooner had he gotten the feel of his new chair in the White House than he forgot all about the costs of government. He also forgot that he had said taxes are paid in the blood and the sweat of every man who labors.

Since that day in March 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt took office the Congress of the United States has passed 17 successive tax bills, and nearly all of them were tailor-made to White House specifications and made necessary by the flagrant peacetime wastes of the present political administration.

For 9 solid years before Pearl Harbor the thoughtful men of this Nation urged on Mr. Roosevelt the policy of pay-as-you-go in national expenditures, but he continued recklessly to borrow against the future and to spend your money before you had even earned it. He wasted it on make-work projects, such as airports in Mississippi that never had an airplane land on them. As a result, we entered this war with the greatest deficit ever to face this or any other representative government in the history of the civilized world.

This is the same man who has, in effect, accused Congress of not knowing the fiscal score.

Congress knew last fall the need for more revenue and after long months of work we wrote a tax bill that, stacked on top of the 16 other tax bills passed since the New Deal came into office, will raise $42,000,000,000—which is almost 20 times as much taxes as the Nation paid in 1932. Some persons in the higher income-tax brackets now pay 90 percent of their income in Federal taxes—and the New Deal would have you believe that these persons are getting away with huge profits.

The President's criticism of Congress' last tax bill is ill-founded and unwarranted, for if Congress had enacted such a bill as he and his lieutenants proposed, the American taxpayer would be run through a wringer that would leave him flatter than the proverbial pancake. It took no courage for the President to present such a proposal to Congress as he did—for he knew before he sent it that no self-respecting Congressman would vote for such a fantastic program. He was just "making the record," as we say in Congress, and only God knows for what reason, for few people will care for that part of Mr. Roosevelt's record.

Incidentally, remember this, when Mr. Roosevelt delivers a tirade against Congress he is blasting his own party, for, after all, the New Deal has been in undisputed control of the Congress since 1933.

There was a time when every fantastic measure the President proposed was rushed through Congress with little or no consideration. But fortunately for the country Congress is now doing some thinking of its own, although the Democratic Party still is the majority party and has the responsibility for many of the bills passed, voting as it does, in a bloc on many issues. Yet, many of the President's most servile followers have been retired to private life—and others, seeing the signs of the times, have repented of their ways. As a consequence, the New Deal steamroller is no longer in good working condition.

It is very significant that, although the President's budget message renewing his request for ten and one-half billions of additional taxes was received in the Senate during the consideration of the tax bill by that body, not a single Member of that body—not even one of the President's most ardent supporters—offered an amendment increasing the amount provided in the bill. It must be that even the New Dealers are losing confidence in the infallibility of their leader.

Every sensible American will agree, I feel sure, that we should pay currently, by taxation, as much of the staggering cost of war as is humanly possible, in order to lessen the amount which must otherwise be borrowed against the future. But there is a ceiling to the amount of taxes we can safely raise, even in time of war, for, as Chief Justice Marshall well said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

The Federal Government, as I have said, already is collecting $42,000,000,000 from 52,000,000 taxpayers. To this amount must be added the ten billions collected by the State and local governments, making the total tax burden some $52,000,000,000. This is one-third of the national income. Or, to put it another way, you are now paying $1 in taxes out of every $3 you earn. Mr. Roosevelt says you are not paying near enough. Congress challenges him to tell you how you can pay more.

The New Deal talks a lot about how much greater the tax burden is on the poor Canadians and the poor British, but the truth is, according to the Treasury Department's own figures, the annual per capita tax burden in the United States is now $357, while Britishers pay only $291 per year and Canadians pay only $261, on an average.

You would infer from the President's amazing statement that we, the people, are living in a taxpayer's paradise, when, as a matter of fact, we are weighted down under the heaviest tax load in all history. Single persons earning as little as $10 a week now must pay an income tax, while all individuals making more than $624 a year must pay the Victory tax.

If new taxes are imposed they will fall on the great mass of the people in the lower and middle income brackets, since rates in the upper income brackets cannot go higher without actual confiscation. Congress recognizes fully that many citizens—those who have benefited from the war boom—may be in a position to pay still higher taxes, but it is difficult to reach this group without crucifying those whose incomes have remained stationary, or fallen off, as would be the case under any general increase in the income tax, such as the President advocates. The New Deal opposes the sales tax, which is the only remaining untapped source of revenue.

The New Deal, which has been the party of waste and the party of borrowed money, but now preaches a doctrine it does not believe, tries to give the impression that we who remain on the home front should pay for the whole war as we go. This is a very appealing thought, and as a generality, we can agree to it, but if carried to its logical conclusion, it means that we would have to raise $100,000,000,000 annually in taxes—which, of course, is utterly preposterous. Our boys at the front realize this.

This is not to say that the unavoidable recent increases in the national debt, resulting from the astronomical war expenditures, are to be viewed with complacency. Every sensible man knows that we must whittle down the cost and the debt in every way possible. In this connection, we Republicans suggest to the present chief executive that he exert some effort toward saving tax money, instead of wasting it. For concrete example, we cite The Pentagon in Washington, originally scheduled to cost not more than $35,000,000, which actually cost $75,000,000 by the time the bureaucrats got through having a joyride at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Roosevelt, during his first riotous 8 years in office, filled the pockets of the New Deal spendthrifts with money the Nation has not yet paid back in full. In those 8 years he spent as much as it cost to run our Government from the day George Washington took office through the last day of the administration of Woodrow Wilson, including the World War No. 1 expenditures. The deficits piled up year after year and no effort ever was made by the New Deal Congress to stop them, although the Nation was in a far better position then to balance the Budget than it is now. Much as we all dislike to see the national debt increased, further deficit financing at this time presents less danger to our economy, in my opinion, than the alternative of excessive and unwise taxation. Of the two evils, we should choose the lesser.

Those who are fearful of passing some of the cost of the war on to the fighting men should remember that those same fighting men will inherit and will have to pay a substantial part of the New Deal spending orgy of pre-war days.

We in Congress have passed what we plan to be the last wartime revenue tax bill and are now devoting our full attention to simplifying the tax law and the returns. We are giving first consideration to the individual income tax, for this is most in need of clarification and affects the greatest number of people. We of the House Ways and Means Committee already have held several meetings on this matter and we are proceeding as expeditiously as possible to work out a simplified procedure for income-tax payment.

The Republicans in Congress are wholeheartedly behind this move. In fact, the Republicans have advocated it for some time, but remember, our party is still the minority party and we are outvoted every time they call the roll. I personally do not believe matters such as the current jumbled confusing income-tax form would ever have come up if the Republican Party had been in power in place of our present leaders, whose philosophy was well expressed as "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

Among the many matters being considered by the Ways and Means Committee is the merger of the Victory tax with the regular income tax, so as to have only one tax on incomes, with a single set of rates and exemptions. Another is the elimination of the requirement of tax returns in the case of persons whose tax is withheld substantially at the source. Another is the simplification of the short and long form of income-tax return, with the possible extension of the permissive use of the short form to persons having up to five or ten thousand dollars gross income. We are giving attention also to simplifying the filing of the declaration of the estimated tax and to relief from penalty where the tax is underestimated. As a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, I feel that I can hold out real assurance to the taxpayers of the Nation that we will cooperate in doing everything possible to make the individual income tax as simple and as understandable as possible in the future.

Not only the individual income tax, but the whole tax structure, is in need of a complete overhauling. We need to set up a streamlined, simplified Federal tax policy based on sound tax principles and designed to raise maximum revenues consistent with maximum

encouragement to individual and business enterprise. It may be that we will have to wait until we get a Republican administration next November before much progress is made on this idea, but we have waited 11 years for some relief, and we must be patient for a few more months.

I have introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a tax advisory council—representing agriculture, labor, industry, tax accountants, and other interested groups—to assist Congress in this work. I feel that the participation of the public in the working out of a long-range, simplified tax system is vital and would have beneficial results to all.

Regardless of the current tax muddle, brought on by the New Deal, I urge all of you to pay your taxes as quickly and as accurately as possible. The Government needs your dollars.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Washington Post, issue of February 24, entitled "Tax Bill." The President may be able to deceive some people into believing Congress was responsible for the complicated pay-as-you-go legislation approved last year. Those of us who are familiar with the circumstances surrounding its enactment know otherwise. The fact is that the executive department is solely responsible for the complex and intricate transition to pay as you go.

In the President's veto message he states that the Ruml plan was not the product of his administration. No; the Ruml plan was too simple and forthright a method for the transition to a pay-as-you-go for the administration to accept. The record will show, however, that the Executive and the Treasury wanted pay as you go. The printed hearings also show that the executive department was willing to have substantial abatement. Yet they would not favor the simple, clean-cut transition that was proposed in the bill I introduced on this subject. The President stated he would veto the bill if approved by Congress, and the Treasury opposed it so vigorously that a compromise had to be adopted in order to get tax collections current. No better term was ever used in describing this legislation than the one used in the editorial I am quoting. No one is responsible for the complications in the present income-tax return dealing with pay-as-you-go taxation except the executive department. They may talk long and loud about Congress being responsible. Congress, without Executive interference, would have enacted and approved a simple, honest plan for transition to current liability.

When you make out your tax return place the blame where it belongs.

The editorial is as follows:

TAX BILL

In detail the President's veto of the tax bill raises several points which require clarification. Mr. Roosevelt complains about the loss of revenue due to the freezing of social-security payments and to the termination this year of the renegotiation law. But neither item is properly the concern of the tax collector. Social security is a system in itself. In other words, whether or not it was advisable to raise the rates, the problem was one of social-security policy. But in saying that the freezing "does not seem wise" the President leaves the impression that social security is an exclusively fiscal concern.

As to the renegotiation law, this is a price and not a tax law. Under the present bill the law comes to an end at the close of 1944. By that time the procurement branches of the armed services, after a 3-year experience should surely be able to reprice contracts so that no profiteering is left. If not, the excess-profits tax is available. If the procurement officials have not by the end of 1944 developed the necessary experience, then they will have been grossly deficient in their function. At any rate, under the new bill they can have another 6 months of renegotiation, or until the middle of 1945, though the President didn't mention this period of grace. It is significant that just as Secretary Morgenthau was satisfied with the social-security item, so the armed services were content with the way that the renegotiation item was handled.

The President, finally, is off the mark in inveighing against Congress for its sole responsibility for the lack of simplification of our tax laws. The major cause of tax mystification is the bastard pay-as-you-go system which is now on the statute books. Originally pay-as-you-go was as simple as daylight saving. It should have been accepted or rejected. Instead the Treasury saw in the idea a chance of collecting more revenue by a lot of double talk about "forgiveness." The result was a compromise with the Rumlites in Congress—and the present major cause of the confusion in our tax laws.

The President's Lost Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1944:

THE PRESIDENT'S LOST LEADERSHIP

The significance of the resignation of ALBEN W. BARKLEY as majority leader of the Senate on the issue of the President's veto of the revenue bill obviously far transcends the immediate question of the merits of that legislation. The cleavage recorded is far too deep to be repaired by any eleventh-hour repentance by the President, however abject.

Senator BARKLEY has been majority leader since 1937, when the President threw his influence behind him to defeat the late Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, by a single vote. He was keynote speaker and permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1940, which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for the first third term in the Nation's history. As spokesman for the administration on the Senate floor the Senator from Kentucky has served the President for 7 years with complete and absolute devotion, going along with him on many occasions when it was an open secret that he disagreed privately with the President's views. As he himself bitterly recalled yesterday, he has "carried the flag over rougher territory than perhaps any other majority leader, often with little help on the Senate floor and more often with less help from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue."

When a man of such unquestioned loyalty to his party and his President, and occupying such a key position as Senator BARKLEY'S, takes the Senate floor, and in measured words accuses the President of indulging in "a deliberate and calculated assault upon the honesty and integrity of every Member of the Legislature of the United States"—when such a thing as this comes to pass it is clear-cut evidence of a spirit of open revolt against the Executive. If there were any possible doubt on that point it should be dispelled by the almost unanimous acclaim with which the Senate received Mr. BARKLEY'S stinging public rebuke to the President.

For the existence of this ugly state of affairs the President clearly must accept the major share of the responsibility. Since the present Congress convened he has displayed an attitude toward the legislative branch verging on the contemptuous. He has ignored or openly repudiated his own party leaders and has encouraged the growth of a spirit of disunity in a series of messages, including his annual message, his message on the soldier-vote bill, his observations in connection with the anti-subsidy-bill veto, and, finally, his veto of the tax bill, which was not only based upon garbled information and distorted figures but which infuriated honest and humanitarian legislators by accusing them of voting for a tax measure which would "extend relief to the greedy and impoverish the needy."

Two theories have been advanced to explain this growing rift between the President and Congress—a rift which yesterday reached crisis proportions. One is that the President, like Woodrow Wilson in 1918, has become so immersed in world affairs that he has lost touch with public opinion at home and contact with those party leaders on whom he would normally lean for information. The other is that he has embarked upon a deliberate campaign to discredit the legislative branch as part of his fourth-term campaign. Whatever explanation one accepts the situation is one which gives cause for the gravest concern to the whole country, regardless of party lines. Persons who agree fully with the President's foreign policies must ask themselves whether, in the light of the present disunity which he has so needlessly provoked, his value as a party and national leader during the critical months immediately ahead may not have been seriously impaired. As for reelecting for a fourth term a President so completely at odds with Congress—with all the certainties of deadlock and recrimination which such a lost leadership involves—it will be difficult, indeed, for the most loyal defender of the New Deal to justify it.

Feeding of Starving Children of Occupied Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging events that has transpired in Congress for some time was the

action recently in the other body authorizing the feeding of millions of little children and aged and disabled persons who are the unhappy and pathetic victims of war in the occupied countries of Europe. Action along these lines has too long been delayed and it is refreshing to know that Congress is now ready to give expression to the deeply felt humane impulses of an overwhelming majority of our American people that effective relief be furnished to these afflicted and innocent groups of suffering humanity.

Billions of dollars have already been spent and more will probably be authorized to provide lend-lease help and assistance to multifarious peoples throughout the whole world. Unfortunately, however, very little, if any, of this aid has been able to filter through to the beleaguered and helpless peoples of occupied Europe, among whom innocent little children are the chief sufferers. In my opinion, we cannot let any influence of diplomacy, asserted comity between nations, or the exaggerated statements of difficulties and military objections, deter us from taking prompt action to extend succor and assistance.

Private agencies working through the Red Cross and the Swedish and other neutral governments have already managed to render considerable assistance to the pitiful victims of Nazi aggression in Greece, thereby demonstrating that "where there is a will, there is a way."

Certain of our allies have opposed relief to the bleeding, starving children of occupied Europe on the ground that the food, medicines, and supplies so furnished would fall into the hands of the enemy. In view of the long-endured and continually aggravated suffering of these poor little children, we can no longer be moved by these arguments. To the contrary, we must manfully go forward speedily with plans to hold out the humanitarian hand of sympathy, brotherly love, and practical assistance to these poor children and the aged and disabled suffering with them so that the hungry may be fed, the naked may be clothed, and the shelterless, the sick, the infirm, and the helpless, may be given some chance to be relieved. This is a duty which we owe, not only to suffering humanity, but to ourselves, to our American sense of fair play and sympathy which has never in all our history failed to be moved by the misfortunes of human beings of other nations.

I repeat, we cannot longer leave the starving, bleeding children of Europe and their equally pathetic, helpless elders to endure further starvation, hardship, and suffering. Let us apply the remedy now by authorizing a decent appropriation and instructing appropriate agencies of our Government to act at once through international channels to correct these terrible conditions which cry to all humanity for prompt, effective relief.

Opium Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1944:

OPIUM CONTROL BILL WOULD FIGHT JAP-SPREAD DOPE TRAFFIC IN EAST

(By William Philip Simms)

The opium control resolution introduced by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota, if carried out, would do more good to more millions in the post-war world than any measure yet proposed.

In Manchuria, in 1936, I visited a number of "tea houses" with a Chinese official. We had to go in disguise, for if the Japs had found out what we were doing there is no telling what might have happened to my guide.

We found opium and its derivatives being sold to anybody and at very low cost. "Tea houses" in Manchuria are as common as soda fountains over here and narcotics were as easily obtainable as a bottle of pop in the United States. The Japs deliberately dope the natives, the more easily to rule them.

Representative JUDD told the House of some of his personal observations in China. "Within 10 days after the Japs captured the city in which I was working just 6 years ago," he declared, "I saw their soldiers passing out opium seed free and compelling the Chinese farmers to plant it." This was in Shansi, he said, where opium had not been grown since 1911.

Not only is Japan officially forcing on conquered peoples the growth and use of opium, Representative JUDD continued, but is actually making addicts of them.

"In order for a farmer to get through the city gates in the morning as he brought in his load of vegetables or grain," he explained, "he had to have a hypodermic from the Japanese guards. When he went home in the afternoon, they gave him another hypodermic. The Japs explained that there was cholera about, but the truth became evident when these victims developed heroin addiction."

Representative JUDD's resolution requests the President to urge the governments of all opium-producing countries "to take immediate steps to limit and control the growth of the opium poppy and the production of opium and its derivatives to the amount required for medicinal and scientific purposes."

Already, Mr. JUDD pointed out, the British and Dutch Governments have signified their intention to abolish the traffic in their respective areas. Heretofore foreign possessions in the Far East were partly financed by it, the revenue ranging from 2 percent of the income of the Dutch East Indies Government up to 20 percent of the British Straits Settlements Colony, which includes Singapore.

AGE-OLD EVIL REAPPEARS

In the Orient there are approximately a billion people—one-half of the total population of the earth. Narcotics have always been easy to obtain there. In recent decades, however, there has been a tightening up—in spots, especially in China since the revolution.

But everywhere the Japs have gone the age-old evil has reappeared. Formerly, opium-smoking was the usual method of imbiding. Today the far more insidious heroin is to be found. It is even in the cheap cigarets sold by the Japs.

The first opium conferences were sponsored by the United States. Now is the time, said the Minnesotan, for it to take the lead in ending the evil.

Wages in War Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some quotations from two letters relative to wages in war plants.

The first letter addressed to me is as follows:

I am enclosing a letter which I just received from a day laborer in Oakland, Calif., who worked for me in 1941 as a ditch rider at a salary of $110 per month. I offered him a job again this season at a salary of $150 per month and the attached letter is his reply.

The reply reads, in part, as follows:

DEAR SIR: Received your letter last night. Wish it were so I could work on the ditch, as I sure like that kind of work, but I have a job in a repair shipyard that pays $580 to $620 per month, and I don't feel like giving it up as long as the war is on, as working is the only way I have of making a living. But as soon as this is over or whenever they cut the working hours here so I can't make any more here than I can at home I expect to come back, and if there is an opening on the ditch, then I will be more than glad to take it.

The first letter goes on to state:

It is beyond me why these New Dealers—yes, including the United States Senate and Congress—are allowing these unprecedented spending spress to go on. Believe me, if this spending is not stopped, the men in the service will retaliate. They are treated as common dogs—not even allowed the privilege of voting.

Franklin Roosevelt and John Lewis and his gang, are the king bees of the country. The rest of the people in the old United States are not supposed to know anything.

I have a son in the service and I am sending him a copy of the attached letter so he can see what a common day laborer in Government work is getting, and compare his pay with that of the common day laborer in Government work.

For your information I bought $30,000 worth of series E bonds in the last drive to help pay these outrageous wages, but I will think twice in the next drive.

Mr. Speaker, there are undoubtedly many fine, patriotic citizens in this country who are greatly concerned with the thousands of times the above situation could be multiplied and demonstrated. It is such things which will eventually destroy this country unless this present

administration recognizes some of the fundamentals in prosecuting a war and preserving the democratic ideals of this country.

War Costs and Who Will Pay Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Thursday, February 10, 1944, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Chattanooga, Tenn.:

I want to talk to you tonight about war costs and war debt. Before I do so, however, and to avoid any possible misunderstanding, I want to state my position clearly.

I believe in the profit system. I believe in free enterprise. I believe that a corporation or individual engaged in business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit including a surplus for reconversion to peacetime industry and to cushion against another depression. I believe in a high standard of wages and a high standard of living. No nation can be prosperous in peacetime which pays starvation wages to its workers or which insists upon starvation income for the millions of investors who are depending upon corporate profits for a livelihood. I am opposed to excess war profits, whether those excess profits be corporate profits or individual profits, whether such excess profits are being made by industry or whether they are being made in the form of excess wages paid to labor. Congress has reduced the personal income-tax exemption as low as $500. This reduction of income-tax exemption applies alike to all, whether it be a worker in a factory, on the farm, or whether it be a widow whose only source of income is small dividends on stock or interest on bonds which she may have purchased with the lifetime savings of her dead husband and herself. No one can justify the taking of that tax and paying it to industry or labor in the way of excess profits. I am sure we can all agree on these principles.

WHAT WILL THE WAR COST?

What the war will cost the American people in terms of dollars and lives cannot be determined until the last soldier and the last dependent of the soldier has passed away. Until recently we were paying compensation to a dependent of a soldier of the War of 1812. America always has and always will take care of her soldiers and their dependents. The cost of such care must be considered as a cost of war. Calvin Coolidge once said that World War No. 1 would cost the American people what was then considered the tremendous sum of $100,000,000,000. Today we can only measure that cost in terms of expenditure of money and in debt. I want to give you a few of the facts which will give some idea of what the war is costing us in money.

The President in his first message to the present Congress in January 1943 gave some revealing facts. He stated that he had on hand at that time an unexpended balance of $170,000,000,000. This amount exceeded the assessed valuation of every piece of property in America by $20,000,000,000. He asked Congress for an appropriation of $109,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year. Subsequent Budget estimates brought his requests to $115,000,000,000, which he was given. The President had, therefore, for expenditure from and after January 1, 1943, the tremendous sum of $285,000,000,000 or a sum that is almost twice the assessed valuation of the country. His last Budget message stated that the national debt on July 1, 1945, would exceed $285,000,000,000. A $300,000,000,000 national debt is not only a possibility, not only a probability, but almost a certainty.

EXPENDITURES

The President, in his message to Congress on June 13, 1944, stated that the appropriations, contract authorizations, and Government corporation commitments from June 1940 through December 1943 totaled $344,000,000,000; that by June 30, 1945, $307,000,000,000 of that money will have been obligated and $202,000,000,000 will have been spent. They are colossal figures. It has been estimated that it would require $9,000,000,000 a year to pay the interest and amortize a $300,000,000,000 debt in 50 years.

UNITED NATIONS WAR EXPENDITURES

It is amazing to note that, according to the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Congressional Library, the latest available figures on war expenditures show the total amount expended by all United Nations for 1943, translated in United States currency, was as follows: Total expenditures last year, $105,000,000,000, of which the United States expended $67,584,000,000 up to June 12, 1943, or almost twice as much as all the other Allied Nations put together. The United Kingdom spent a total of $19,553,000,000. The United States figures are preliminary figures. Compare this cost with the hundreds of billions of dollars that the war is costing this Nation. You and I must come to the conclusion that the time is here when we are going to have to stop being the financial angel of every Hottentot on every island, nook, and corner of the world.

YOUR SHARE OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

I recently compiled a table giving the latest figures available on the assessed valuation of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. This total is just a few dollars more than $150,000,000,000, which means that the Nation's Federal debt on conclusion of the war will be twice the total assessed valuation of every piece of property, real and personal, in the entire United States.

On May 29, 1943, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement giving each State's share of a $300,000,000,000 debt on a per capita basis. The population of Tennessee in 1940 was 2,915,841. The assessed valuation of the State, according to the latest available figures, was $1,536,324,625. Tennessee's share of the $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $6,624,285,798 or approximately 432 percent of its assessed valuation. If the people of Tennessee were compelled to vote upon themselves a bond issue of nearly $6,642,285,798 or nearly four and one-third times the assessed valuation of every piece of property, real and personal, placed on the assessment role by various assessing officers, would the people of Tennessee be as apathetic toward waste and extravagance in the future as they have been in the past? The population of Chattanooga, according to the 1940 census, is 128,163. Chattanooga's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis would be $291,955,314. Would the people of Chattanooga be as apathetic toward waste and extravagance if they had to vote upon themselves a bond issue for this tremendous sum? Would they keep on voting the Democratic ticket or would they call a halt to waste and extravagance?

MR. ICKES SAYS WE ARE WORTH $12,000,000,000,000

According to Mr. Ickes, however, we have nothing to worry about. He stated, in a recent magazine article, that the United States was worth $12,000,000,000,000, that each person was worth $89,000. The population of Tennessee, according to the 1940 census, was 2,915,841, so if each person in Tennessee is worth $89,000, as stated by Mr. Ickes, then the State of Tennessee is worth $259,509,849,000—so why worry about a mere $300,000,000,000 national debt, Mr. Ickes argues. According to Mr. Ickes, Chattanooga is worth $11,306,507,000. I received a letter the other day from a man who has a wife and 10 children. According to Mr. Ickes, this man is a millionaire because each member of his family is worth $89,000 and this man is worth $1,068,000. Yet this man complained to me that he was getting pre-war wages with 25-percent deductions and 30-percent wartime price increases. Mr. Ickes' trillions are not helping him buy bread or pay his income tax or grocery bill. The fact is Mr. Ickes has out-Longed Huey Long, out-Townsendited Dr. Townsend, and cut-ham-and-egged the ham-and-eggers of California. There is, however, a serious danger that Mr. Ickes may be right in the future, if the present administration continues its spending policies.

The country may someday be worth $12,000,000,000,000, but they will not be the same kind of dollars that you and I are using now. Germany at the conclusion of the last war talked of trillions of marks and they found it was cheaper to paper houses with German marks than with wallpaper. The Ickes' dollar may have the same kind of value as last year's Sears, Roebuck catalog hanging on the side wall of the famous building referred to by Chic Sales in his Specialist. However, speaking seriously, it is a tragedy when a Cabinet member tries with methods such as these to blind the public to the real dangers of inflation and spending.

WASTE AND GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Not only millions, but literally billions, of dollars have been wasted in the war effort. While war is waste and while waste is inevitable in wartime, there comes a time when waste impedes progress. Waste can never win the war, but waste could help lose the war. I have taken the position that the taxpayer is entitled to value received for his tax dollar, that it is the duty of Congress not only to appropriate money, but to see to it that the taxpayers receive as nearly as possible a dollar's worth of value for every tax dollar spent. It is impossible for any one individual to lay his finger on all sources of waste. I was able merely to scratch the surface. But I want to comment on some of this waste I discovered.

CANTONMENT WASTE

You have perhaps read about an investigation I conducted into the cantonment construction. That story illustrates beautifully how this Government of waste and extravagance is being conducted. The whole story can be told in one paragraph.

"The Graham committee, appointed by Congress to investigate war costs in World War No. 1, reported back to the Nation that it cost the taxpayers $206,000,000 to build the cantonments in which 4,000,000 men were housed and trained in World War No. 1. It cost the taxpayers of this war $800,000,000 to build the cantonments where the first 1,200,000 men were housed and trained."

Price costs of subsequent cantonments went still higher. This was the beginning of inflation.

THIS NATION CANNOT EXIST HALF SOCIALISTIC OR COMMUNISTIC AND HALF CAPITALISTIC

The New Deal party has been charged repleatedly and not without cause, with trying

to change our form of Government. Anyone who examines the republican, democratic, and socialistic platforms of 1932 will be forced to the conclusion that the New Deal party has been following the socialistic platform of 1932 rather than the Democratic platform since that time. The hands may have been the hands of Esau but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The endorsement and support that the New Deal administration has been receiving from Communist Browder and men of his belief during the past 11 years is some indication that these policies have been in some respects so pink that Communists saw red. The Socialists and Communists have given their unqualified support to the New Deal.

The Republican Party believes in the capitalistic form of a government as provided for by the Constitution. We believe in the profit system. We are opposed to socialism and communism.

During the years preceding the great political campaign of 1860, this Nation was at the crossroads—one way pointing toward slavery and the other toward the abolition of slavery. During the debates of that period, Abraham Lincoln repeatedly said that, "This Nation cannot exist half slave and half free."

Today this Nation is again at the crossroads—one way pointing toward the capitalistic form of a government as provided for by our Constitution and the other toward socialism, if not communism. This Nation cannot exist half communistic or socialistic and half capitalistic. Whichever way we go, we must go all the way. There is no halfway stopping place. We must either continue the profit system or abolish it. Whether we like it or not this is and should be the great issue of the coming campaign. The people should have an opportunity to express themselves at the polls. No one can criticize an American for advocating any principle in which he believes so long as that principle is not actually immoral and so long as he advocates bringing about the change by the ballot box. No one has a right to lead the people down a blind alley toward socialism or communism, while promising them constitutional government.

These issues should be presented to our people squarely. If this Nation is going to abolish our capitalistic form of government and the profit system, let us do it in a constitutional way with our eyes open and by ballot.

THE MASSES WILL DETERMINE WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE

There are 54,000,000 peacetime workers of all types in America. While they place human rights above property rights, they own real and personal property and believe in property rights. They have been taught in the schools, churches, and in the homes to respect property rights. They have been taught that the right to own property is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. These 54,000,000 workers constitute the bone and sinew of this Republic. They are America. It is because of the fact that these workers and those who preceded them through 150 years of our constitutional history have believed in constitutional rights that we have constitutional rights. It is because they have believed in and still believe in property rights that we have property rights. They are in the majority. In the final analysis, they will determine the kind of government we are going to have. Once you shake the faith of the millions of workers in these principles, constitutional government, including the right to own property, is a thing of the past. Injustices are quickly noted and resented by the average American, and the worker is an average American.

MR. ROOSEVELT AND THE NEW DEAL PARTY CRUCIFY LABOR

While labor owes much to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party, Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party owe more to labor. Without the support of labor, Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party could not have been successful. For 11 years labor has befriended Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party. Today we find Mr. Roosevelt and his New Dealers crucifying great masses in the ranks of labor, organized and unorganized.

MILLIONS OF WORKERS FROZEN AT PRE-WAR WAGES

Millions of workers are frozen at pre-war or nearly pre-war wages while others are frozen at wages far in excess of pre-war wages all by the same Executive order and all have the same increase in the living costs. Millions of workers today find themselves with 20 to 25 percent wartime deductions from a pre-war or nearly pre-war living wage to meet an increase in the cost of living of from 20 to 30 percent, while millions of unskilled workers are receiving outrageously high wages to which they are not entitled, and while some corporations are taking large excess profits and squawking when we try to make them refund those excess profits. I have taken the position repeatedly that to the extent to which an industry is engaged in war production, to that extent their pay rolls are Government pay rolls and their excess profits are taken out of the United States Treasury.

WORKERS ARE ENTITLED TO A DECENT WAGE

I have always strongly supported a decent-wage policy for both skilled and unskilled labor. Skilled labor should be well paid and paid in proportion to the skill. From my office window I can see the new Mellon Art Gallery. Month after month I watched workmen erecting that beautiful structure. Day after day I was amazed at the skill with which craftsmen built that beautiful dome. The architect drew the plans. The workmen erected the building. The one was as important as the other. The trowel was as necessary as the architect's pen. However, you and I can agree that the workmen who with broom and shovel sweep away the broken stones and debris at the foot of that building should not be paid the wages of the skilled craftsmen who fashioned that beautiful dome.

THE UNSKILLED WORKER HAS NO RIGHT TO DEMAND THE WAGES OF A SKILLED WORKER

In making my study of war costs which took me through 47 defense plants and the reports of which I made to Congress on June 29 and July 2, 1943, I was impressed by 2 outstanding facts. I found workers with little or no skill being paid as much, or more than the skilled workers who had been years learning their trade, and I found corporations operating on Government funds making large excess profits to which they were not entitled.

I found 18-year-old girls leaving the ribbon counters of dime stores, and after a few weeks of training being paid $65 a week. Farmers' boys, gas-station attendants, grocery-store clerks, automobile salesmen with little or no skill, being paid from $120 to $220 every 2 weeks. A superintendent of a Government arsenal being paid $6,500 a year after 38 years of service told me a defense plant offered his $4,000-a-year assistant $11,500 a year, including $5,000 bonus. Tank welders, after 4 to 6 weeks of training, are paid $67 a week or the same wages expert welders were paid. Girls after 2 and 3 weeks of training are being paid $269 a month for a 48-hour week. Girls assembling oil pumps receive $146 every 2 weeks.

In one factory I found machine-gun assemblers were paid in 1942 from $4,774 to $8,741 a year. The United States Employment Service advertises for laborers to go into northeastern Canada at $300 a month plus room, board, clothing, and overtime; for welders at $214 a month while learning and after a few weeks of training $270 a month, plus bonuses; for dishwashers, kitchenmen, and waiters at $250 a month plus bonuses.

All unskilled labor and labor requiring very little skill were paid excessive wages, adding excessive costs to the war production program which must be paid by the millions of workers in the low-income brackets. The dime-store girl who is not so fortunate is still working for $18 a week and paying income taxes to raise the money to pay the other dime-store girl in the factory $65 a week.

EXCESS PROFITS

In my report to Congress on July 2, 1943, I gave the results of a rather extensive study on excess profits by corporations giving numerous illustrations. I found corporations with little or no capital operating on Government funds and making tremendous profits. One corporation with $65,000 capital stock and surplus and $6,696,000 defense plant capital took 60 percent net profit before taxes on $50,771,000 worth of machine-gun sales to the Government after paying themselves $3,000,000 management and engineering fees through another corporation owned by them. After paying back $23,000,000 under renegotiation, including half the fee, and paying $4,800,000 in taxes, this little corporation had a net profit in 1942, after renegotiation and after taxes of $1,880,918, in addition to a $1,500,000 engineering fee, on a paid-in capital and surplus of $65,000.

Another corporation showed a net profit before taxes of $18,000,000, or 37½ percent on gross sales to the Government of $48,000,000. After refunding more than $6,500,000 under renegotiation, paying $8,500,000 in taxes, this corporation had $3,200,000 profit left after taxes and after renegotiation, or nearly 16 percent on the invested capital and earned surplus.

Another corporation took a net profit, before taxes, of $125,000,000, or 28 percent on the gross sales of $450,000,000. After refunding $65,000,000 under renegotiation and paying $45,000,000 in taxes, this corporation had $13,600,000 left on an invested capital and earned surplus of $47,000,000. This corporation increased its surplus more than $8,000,000 from 1940 to 1942.

Another corporation took a net profit, before taxes, of $35,000,000, or approximately 27½ percent on gross sales of $127,000,000. In addition, approximately $10,000,000 was earned on cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, making a total net profit before taxes of $45,000,000. After refunding $14,000,000 under renegotiation and paying $24,000,000 in taxes, this company had left approximately $7,000,000 profit, after renegotiation and taxes, or approximately 37 percent of the invested capital and earned surplus of $20,000,000.

JACK & HEINTZ

One of the corporations which has taken the greatest profit on the smallest capital is Jack & Heintz. I would not mention this corporation by name but for the fact that they have been flooding the desk of every Congressman with charges that the Government has been unfair. Let us examine the real facts. This company was organized in November 1940 with a capital-stock structure consisting of 100 shares no-par-value stock for which the three Jacks and Mr. Heintz paid in the sum of $500, or $125 each. They also paid in $99,500 in surplus which was not in cash but in assets and patent rights of an old corporation. Thus we have a corpora-

tion of four individual stockholders who show a paid-up capital stock and surplus of $100,000.

My records show that this company obtained Government funds through the Defense Plant Corporation up to August 31, 1943, in the following sums: First commitment approved, $396,021; second commitment approved, $3,046,292.34; third commitment approved, $1,613,346.25; fourth commitment approved, $5,137,650.29.

In other words, the taxpayers furnished $10,193,309.88 of their cash capital and Jack & Heintz, according to these figures, furnished $500 actual cash and $99,500 in property and patent rights. Of course, they can operate cheaply when they have no depreciation to charge off, no capital invested, but let us see what the real picture is.

Earnings for the calendar year of 1941, before taxes, were $932,024, and, after taxes, $289,089. Earnings for the year 1942, before taxes, were $7,740,829. The earnings before taxes were 7,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus and after taxes 1,740 percent of the capital stock and paid-in surplus.

Thus, in 1942, after setting aside $173,680 for depreciation and obsolescence; after paying the three top officers $116,645 each; after giving a Christmas bonus of $944,300 (I am told one secretary was given a bonus of $39,000); after paying wages that, according to their statement, averaged an annual rate of $5,172 per employee, as shown in my statement to the House on June 29, 1943, and after paying $6,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes, this company showed a total 1942 earnings of $1,746,839 on an invested capital and paid-in surplus of $100,000. The total pay roll for 1942 was $8,886,000 while the annual sales for the year were $23,661,000. This company has an exceptionally good production and low cost record.

Jack & Heintz forget to mention in their statement that the Jacks and Mr. Heintz paid themselves in 1942, $116,645 each in salaries; that they had paid $944,000 in Christmas bonuses, including $39,000 to one secretary; that the Defense Plant Corporation furnished them with defense plant facilities, equipment, etc., in the amount of $10,193,309 and that they themselves only contributed $100,000 in actual cash, property and patent rights. Of course, the Government would not allow the $944,000 in bonuses to employees who were being paid the wage scale that Jack & Heintz were paying. Of course, they would not allow a $39,000 bonus to a secretary. Of course they would not allow $116,645 salary for two of the Jacks and Mr. Heintz when those funds came out of the United States Treasury. These people are being paid with Government funds because their factory pay rolls are being met with Government funds. They are just as much a Government employee insofar as being paid out of the Treasury is concerned as is the $1,260 or $1,440 Government clerk under civil service.

EXCESS PROFITS WILLINGLY REFUNDED

Hundreds of corporations have found themselves with excess profits and are cheerfully and gladly refunding them. Ninety percent of the corporations are in this classification and the other 10 percent must be compelled to refund their excess war profits.

WHO PAYS FOR THESE LABOR COSTS AND EXCESS PROFITS?

A part of the money wasted, including moneys paid in excess wages and excess corporation profits, is being paid out of current taxation and the remainder is being paid by borrowing and issuing bonds.

Let us be specific and see just who is paying and will pay for this tremendous waste which will aggregate billions of dollars in our war effort. The Treasury Department records show that in 1944, 67,300,000 people will receive in incomes $157,000,000,000 and pay $22,000,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

A break-down shows that 21,600,000 individuals, including heads of families, will receive this year $19,200,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or less, or an average income of approximately $890 a year per person, and will pay $500,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

Twenty-four million four hundred thousand more individuals, including heads of families, will receive this coming year $42,400,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 to $2,000 and pay $4,100,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes.

Twelve million two hundred thousand more individuals will receive $34,600,000,000 in incomes of $2,000 to $3,000 a year and will pay $3,400,000,000 in Federal and personal taxes. Sixty percent of the income this year is going to people with incomes under $3,000 and 80 percent of the income is going to those with annual incomes of $5,000 a year or less. These are the people who will pay the heavy taxes. It is their money that the President is using to meet the factory pay rolls, including machine gun assemblers who are receiving as high as $8,700 a year and 18-year-old girls who receive as high as $65 to $75 a week.

Oh, but the President says we will limit incomes to $25,000 a year. Let us see what the record shows. The Treasury report shows that 110,000 individuals will receive $7,400,000,000 in incomes of $25,000 and over and pay $4,400,000,000 in taxes. If you take the entire income of every person in the United States who will receive in 1944 an income of $25,000 or more you would only add $3,000,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. Incidentally, may I say that I will go along with anyone in taxing incomes down to a minimum. I will not go along with a policy limiting incomes paid in competitive business. So when we are wasting money it is the money of the low-income group and wage earner which we are throwing down a rat hole.

SMALL BUSINESS PAYS

While we are making millionaires in industry through excess profits and while excess profits are being taken by both labor and corporations, thousands of small businessmen are being forced to the wall financially because of business conditions and are forced out of business due to inability to obtain peacetime material or help. These people are paying heavy taxes. Thousands of other small businessmen are making small profits or no profits and are paying heavy taxes which go to make up both excess labor and excess corporate profits.

WHO PAYS?

Who pays for all this waste of public funds, extravagance, and inefficiency? The railroad worker, the day laborer, the low-paid factory worker, the skilled worker who has spent years learning his trade, the miner, the school teacher, the farmer, the white-collar worker, the businessman—these and millions of others will pay for this waste, extravagance, and inefficiency. They will pay for excessive costs and excessive profits. It has been estimated that it will take a tax levy of $9,000,000,000 annually to pay for and amortize a $300,000,000,000 debt in 50 years. The returning serviceman, who has won the war, will have to work and toil and sweat and pay a tax the rest of his life to pay for this waste. His children, and perhaps his children's children will pay. Every citizen, rich or poor, big and small, will pay and pay and pay. There is no easy way out.

REPUBLICAN PARTY OPPOSES WASTE

The Republican Party has a splendid record on economy. It was the Republicans in Congress who, with the help of a few old-time Democrats, saved the taxpayers millions of dollars in abolishing, over administration opposition, the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. In 1941, after my trip to the cantonments, I offered an amendment to the War Department apropriations bill outlawing cost-plus contracts in cantonment construction. The War Department opposed it, the Democratic administration and leadership opposed it, and the Democratic chairman of my subcommittee read a War Department letter on the floor of the House opposing the abolition of cost-plus contracts. Despite the fact that we only had 163 Republicans in the House at the time and the tremendous pressure of the Democratic leadership of the House, we came within 3 votes of carrying that amendment. The Secretary of War testified before our subcommittee a short time later that they abolished 95 percent of the cost-plus cantonment contracts. They could not stand the publicity, and we saved hundreds of millions of dollars more than would have been wasted had we not put up that fight.

The Army was charging up 11 percent for engineering and overhead on construction projects, with the Army officers on the Government pay roll doing a great deal of the engineering. I offered an amendment in my subcommittee and finally compromised, and the Army officials agreed to cut overhead from 11 percent to 7 percent. This amendment saved $180,000,000 on one industrial plant construction bill, and millions of dollars more on subsequent appropriations. To the Republican Party belongs the credit for this.

BILLIONS MORE SAVED BY THE REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS

The amendment put on the War Department appropriation bill providing for the renegotiation of war contracts was brought up in my subcommittee by Republican members. The subcommittee did not put it on the bill. It was offered on the floor of the House by Representative FRANCIS CASE, from South Dakota, a Republican member of the subcommittee. The Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee made a point of order against it and knocked it out. Representative CASE then offered another amendment which was ruled in order and that was the beginning of the Renegotiation Act which has paid back into the Treasury $5,500,000,000 and has saved billions of dollars in price reductions, according to the testimony later given before our subcommittee by the Under Secretary of War.

TWENTY-SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS RETURNED TO THE TREASURY

On November 15, the War Department was called before our subcommittee. After taking testimony they agreed that the Budget should impound $13,163,519,000 of appropriated funds. On January 25 of this year, they were called before our subcommittee again and agreed to impound an additional $14,214,877,000. The total sum impounded by the War Department alone was $27,378,396,000. It is rather difficult to comprehend just what this means.

The highest point reached of the national debt after World War I was $25,482,000,000. The War Department is turning back into the United States Treasury $27,377,000,000, or a sum that is almost $2,000,000,000 greater than the highest point of World War No. 1 debt.

On November 5, the Signal Corps Service of the Army told us that we would impound $1,740,000,000 of the funds which had been given them. A major general of that corps on November 5 testified that the Signal Corps could actually turn over $3,000,000,000. The next morning a colonel from this staff came to our subcommittee and informed us that it was all wrong; that the Signal Corps could not get along without that money; that they had to have it. Two months later, on January 15, the Signal Corps changed their mind again and turned back another $1,390,000,000,

making a total of $3,130,000,000 that they turned back.

BREAK-DOWN

A break-down of this amount shows that the Ordnance Division of the Army turned back $12,300,000,000; the Air Corps $8,000,000,000; $800,000,000 allowed by Congress in a lump sum to the Secretary of War for expediting production of equipment and supplies was turned back into the Treasury. It was this fund that was raided and used to the extent of $24,000,000 to furnish funds to erect the Pentagon Building; funds which Congress refused to give them. I asked the War Department budget officer the other day in subcommittee by what stretch of imagination he thought that Congress intended the Secretary of War to use $24,000,000 of the funds provided for expediting production of equipment and supplies to erect the Pentagon Building. The chief engineer turned back $200,000,000 lump sum we gave him for various engineering services in the Army. I asked him in subcommittee the other day by what stretch of imagination he thought Congress intended him to use $16,000,000 of the engineer service funds to erect the Pentagon Building after Congress specifically limited the amount that could be spent for that building to $35,000,000 dollars. The amount turned back in these last 2 items amounted to $1,000,000,000 and should have been increased by $40,000,000,000 had they not used these funds in what I contend was an illegitimate way.

Twelve billion eight hundred million dollars was brought about because of reduced requirements either because we had overproduced or because of reduction in requirement. However, the interesting thing to me is that $12,416,000,000 of the twenty-seven billion was brought about by actual price reduction. This included $3,500,000,000 under renegotiation turned back to the Treasury by the War Department. The total amount turned back by all departments was $5,500,000,000.

I have continuously hammered away at unit prices. Signal Corps units that the Army had in for $4,000 were reduced in price to around $1,100 to $1,200 per unit; certain types of tanks reduced $30,000. Unit cost of numerous other pieces of equipment was likewise reduced. Part of this reduction was due to added experience in production, nevertheless the fight the Republican Party made against high costs, the fight for unit cost reduction, the giving to the public the facts has aroused public sentiment to a point where they dare no longer disregard it. If these requirements had not been reduced, if this $27,000,000,000 were not being turned back into the Treasury and had actually been spent, your call for the present bond issue would have had to be $41,000,000,000 instead of $14,000,000,000. Where would we have been without a fighting Republican Party in Congress? We Republicans are trying desperately to compel the administration to eliminate waste, extravagance, and unnecessary expenses in the war effort. We are trying desperately to hold the national debt down to a minimum.

THE NATION CANNOT STAND 4 MORE YEARS OF ROOSEVELT

One of the questions confronting the Nation in the next election is, not whether the country can finance another 4 years of Mr. Roosevelt, but can this country recover from the waste, extravagant spending, and debt policy of the 12 years of Roosevelt we have had? You and I know that another Roosevelt administration following the same policies we have had during the past 12 years will ruin the country financially and destroy our constitutional Government. It will bankrupt the Nation financially and spiritually.

America's Greatest Farm Crop—Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. T. C. Richardson before the Dallas Agricultural Club, November 15, 1943:

America leads the world in the production of a great many farm crops. Measured in bushels, bales, tons or money values, calories of food, or garments of raiment, the list in which we excel is long and varied. We have spread the plants and animals of the known world from the subtropic to the subarctic regions of our geography, improved their quality, multiplied their volume, and have combined their infinite variety in pattern of agriculture, which gives us the highest per-man production in the history of the world.

The American farmer enjoys the highest standard of living in all agricultural history, for the simple reason that he translates his abilities and available resources into production; not per hour, or per day, or per acre, but per man, which is the only true measure of efficiency. Despite the saying that an Asiatic or European family could live on what Americans waste, and the American farmer is only a little less prodigal than his urban brethren, he still has more than any other farmer in the world, because he creates more.

Is this because of a superior blood strain? No, for the American farmer is a composite of all the European races in Hitler's list of superiors and inferiors. Is it due to greater intellectual genius? No, for many of the scientific discoveries and inventions which make this remarkable production possible were contributed by men of other lands and races.

Is it by virtue of the special favor of government that American agriculture, comprising one-fifth of the population, and far less of the effective manpower, feeds and clothes the Nation, the armed forces, and supplies a surplus of lend-lease? No, for agriculture was the red-headed stepchild of government for three generations after manufacturing, and for two generations after finance received law-made grants of economic advantage.

How, then, has American agriculture achieved so much? How has it survived the natural economic disadvantages which pertain to the production of raw materials, and the artificial handicaps thrown in its pathway by other interests, and by Government policies?

It is because, until recently, the American farmer was free to stretch himself to the limit of his ambition and his managerial capacity; to exercise the initiative of free enterprise, to utilize his meager resources and the labor of himself and his family according to his own judgment, circumscribed only by the unpredictable seasons and his physical and intellectual capacity.

He learned to stand upon his own feet, to think for himself, and to kill his own snakes. Forty years ago Edwin Markham won acclaim with a poem which depicted The Man With the Hoe as a "dumb, driven ox"; but this was never true of the American farmer, for he has never thought a peasant's thoughts nor been content with a peasant's lot. As time passed, he substituted headwork for legwork, grasped every new scientific discovery and mechanical invention, and applied it in his productive enterprises as seemed to him best.

That, my friends, is the very essence of democracy—the freedom of opportunity, and the responsibility of the individual for his own use of opportunity. All the while that he was producing cotton and corn and beef, and a hundred other products of the soil, in quantities that astonished the world and almost destroyed agriculture itself by the failure of governments to provide the mechanics of distribution, which should have found a place for every bale and bushel of so-called surplus somewhere in the world—all this time that the materials of food and raiment were being produced in astronomical quantities, American agriculture was preserving and nurturing the greatest crop of them all—democracy.

For democracy is of the soil, not of city pavements and factory machines. Every basic concept of democracy was generated from the land, out under the sun and the rain that make the land fruitful and remind mankind daily of his responsibility to, and his dependence upon, a higher power. Every doctrine adverse to democracy, from the divinity of kingship to Marxism, is the product of urbanism and not of agrarianism.

But the name of democracy has been bandied about until its meaning is obscured, and we may well paraphrase the historic epigram to read "O Democracy, what crimes are committed in thy name." You can find several definitions of democracy in the dictionary, but we are concerned only with that social and economic system in which humanity can attain its highest potential satisfactions, both individually and collectively.

Democracy is not patriarchy, not plutarchy, aristocracy, theocracy, nor bureaucracy; neither is it paternalism in any form or by any philanthropic theory by which the individual is coddled or encouraged to become either a passive recipient of benefits or an inert unit of society. As we understand it, democracy is a system in which the whole of society is the sum of its individual members, and its fruits are the result of their combined abilities. No other system so well inspires or rewards the full development of natural talents.

To put it another way, the kind of democracy in which we are interested is a pattern of life in which every individual counts one. That principle was taught by the Master in the parable of the talents—that each individual is responsible for the full use of his abilities. For that reason, true democracy in the collective sense is actually individualism at bottom, and in this democracy and Christianity stand upon the same ground. There are no proxies in Christian democracy.

There is no paradox in the statement that democratic collectivism and individualism are two phases of the same thing, but for some years we have been hearing self-styled liberals decry individualism as something sinister and antagonistic to democracy. As a matter of fact, every experiment in collectivism during the past century has shown that the efficiency and intelligence of the individual units is the key to success, and the deficiencies of the individual are the rocks on which collective experiments are wrecked.

This was true of the idealistic socialism of Fourier and Ruskin; it is equally true of godless Marxism, the pagan tyranny of fascism and nazi-ism; it will be true of that intellectual "snobocracy" which assumes to know better what is good for us than we ourselves, and to direct our daily lives by regulations and directives fearfully and wonderfully concocted out of starry-eyed inexperience and statistical generalizations, which, Mother Hubbard-like, cover everything and fit nothing.

It was the agrarian outlook of Thomas Jefferson that framed the Declaration of Independence. It was the rural pattern of Virginia life and its concept of true freedom—the freedom of the individual from arbitrary acts by even a government created by him—that George Mason expressed in the Virginia resolutions, which in essence became the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

When the founding fathers wrote, "We the people" in the preamble to the Constitution, they meant just that—the individual citizens. In formulating the collective pattern, however, they did not sufficiently safeguard individual rights to satisfy all their contemporaries, and to remove any lingering doubt that the new Nation was to be founded on individualism, the ninth amendment declares that "the enumeration * * * of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Certainly this is clear enough. It is in complete harmony with Jefferson's dictum that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed." But if any lingering doubts remained in the minds of any rugged individual, they are set at rest by the ringing repetition of the tenth amendment, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, now prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

But within a generation after the adoption of the Constitution it became clear that urban interests, close knit and powerful, were securing advantages for themselves at the expense of the country as a whole. The resurgence of democracy which enabled Andrew Jackson to scotch the monopolistic trend and wrest the economic welfare of the country from the greedy hands of special privilege, rose like a mighty wave from the rugged, and ragged, if you please, countryside, where men took their fortunes in their own hands with only an ax, a gun, and self-reliance, and asked of Government only that it protect them from exploitation by finance and industry.

That Government should do for anyone what he was capable of doing for himself was foreign to the creed of the frontiersman who attacked the wilderness with only an ax and a rifle, hewed his cabin logs alone, and called in his neighbors only for the house raising, planted his fields with his gun strapped to the plow, and fought Indians with bullets molded at his own fire. That sort of self-reliance and resourcefulness made this country great, and if it remains great it will be by virtue of the same spirit recaptured and nurtured in its natural environment—which is rural America.

That classic remark of Grover Cleveland that "It is the duty of the people to support the Government, not the Government the people," needs to be rehearsed and reiterated on every occasion. It harks back to Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy before it was polluted by the idea that society owes everyone a living regardless of his contributions to his own and the public welfare. It is implicit in the pioneer philosophy that every man should kill his own snakes, that he should use his own hands and his own intelligence in winning his share of the world's goods.

There are three essentials for the perpetuity of democracy—a sense of individual responsibility, an abundance of opportunity, and a full measure of freedom to exercise abilities within the limits of social desirability. It is the function of government to keep open the gates of opportunity, to protect the citizen against oppression by either private agencies or the Government itself. Beyond that, the obligation is on the man to enter into the fields of opportunity of his own choice, and fulfill his responsibilities as a unit of society to the extent of his mental and physical powers.

To do less is to abdicate his citizenship and invite increasing control of his life by others. Rest assured that there are always those ready to do for us—and to us—whatever we do not do for ourselves. It makes no difference whether it is a limber-tongued demagog seeking his own glory, a cynical racketeer scheming for pelf and power, or an altruistic bureaucrat sincerely believing in his mission of uplift, the impact on democracy is the same in the long run; its lifeblood oozes from every puncture in its armor made by delegating its responsibilities to others.

"Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," said Mirabeau Lamar as president of the Texas Republic a century ago. But he added, "and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that free men acknowledge and the only security that free men desire." We have become one of the most literate nations on earth, but in our zeal for "cultivated mind" we have not given due consideration to the inculcation of virtuous standards, with the result that a generation grew up in a cynical disregard of private and public morality. "Anything goes if you can get away with it," was the slogan.

As Henry C. Link expresses it in his book, Return to Religion, we have substituted the dogmatism of science for the dogmatism of religion. The cult of education took precedence over the cult of faith; in doing so we have "become the fools of reason," says Dr. Link; and without the balance wheel of personal virtue and national integrity, intellectual and material progress becomes destructive rather than constructive. A well-educated outlaw is the more dangerous to society, and a nation of literates without moral standards is best equipped to wreck a world's peace and collective well-being.

"There can be no solution of life's deeper problems, no increased happiness for the individual, through the development of greater scientific knowledge alone," asserts Dr. Link. Science must be subordinated to and integrated with the "homely facts of everyday living, and this integration is not inherent in the sciences nor a subject for scientific proof. It must come from a faith, a belief in certain values of life which is fundamental, and which no logic can explain."

Yet we have been told by university-trained economists that "any system or practice which works successfully, is economically sound." This cynical doctrine is out of the same cloth from which Hitler fashioned Mein Kampf, and means simply that the end justifies the means. It ignores the eternal principle of equity between man and man, between group and group, and between nation and nation.

With all the emphasis possible, I insist that no transaction or practice is economically sound in which both parties do not benefit to approximately the same degree. When one party, one industry, or one nation, consistently, or most of the time, derives greater advantage than the other, the inevitable result is the bankruptcy of both for lack of the means with which to continue dealing with each other.

We saw this most forcibly proved during the twenties and thirties, when all other sections of society except agriculture prospered. Manufacturing expanded with seven-league boots, labor wages rose, finance indulged in a veritable orgy of piling paper stocks and holding company burdens on producing industries, and the public poured its savings and its borrowings into speculation based on nothing but the expectation of selling out at a higher price—to get something for nothing, to collect without earning. This vicious cycle came to its inevitable end when agriculture had used up its reserves and ceased buying for lack of means, and for once in history, all other elements were forced to recognize their dependence on the basic industry of all.

Most of the economic evils of then and now are the fruit of the monopolistic principle, applied by first one group and then another until our whole economic structure became a conglomerate of special privileges, either granted by law or foisted upon the country by the machinations of those with an ax to grind at public expense. First industry, then finance, then organized labor sought and obtained governmental grants of tariffs, corporate forms, and the right to say who shall work, on what terms, and when.

It did not invalidate the initial fallacy of protective tariffs to give to organized labor the legal right to take toll from the public in another form; and today as we stand appalled at the sorry spectacle of a nation at war deprived of guns by the overt acts of labor's so-called leaders, we see the fruition of our national policy of appeasement by the granting of special privileges.

Let us not for a moment forget that labor and industry, however they may battle each other, are riding the same horse, at public expense. Every law-made privilege they enjoy is rooted in the monopoly principle, and monopoly is incompatible with democracy. Its intent is to close the door of opportunity except on terms dictated by the monopolistic group, to limit the freedom of the individual, and ultimately to give less and get more. Monopoly is not sanctified by giving it a high-sounding name.

I like to think of agriculture as a natural activity of man, an inherent right to occupy the land and make it fruitful. It is not a privilege, to be granted or withheld by kings or other governments. In the divine scheme it seems to me that the natural person and the natural resources of earth belong together, without special dispensation of any agency under the Creator himself. It, therefore, seems to me that agriculture trades its birthright for a mess of sorry pottage when it rests its case on the same law-made status that corporate bodies rely upon for their very existence in society.

We cannot consistently attack the grants of privilege to others if we pitch our own future on a grant of privilege for a temporary advantage. Therefore, it seems to me that agriculture must stand on its God-given rights and fight it out on that fundamental principle, rather than move over on the flimsy legal ground with those minority groups which are endowed with no such inherent right, and which exist solely by virtue of law-made concessions at the hands of organized society.

We must face the fact that if we place ourselves in the same legal status as other minorities, we subject agriculture to the control of those minorities acting together as a majority.

For, whether we like it or not, and whether it is a desirable condition for the perpetuity of our cherished institutions, agriculture is, and will remain, a numerical political minority in whose welfare labor, industry, and finance are concerned only to the extent of its usefulness to them. The agricultural cow will be fed just enough to keep her producing the milk her masters need, but never enough to fill out her ribs and grow a slick coat of hair.

All primary wealth is the product of man's labor and intelligence applied to the natural resources of the earth. All real wealth is in the things man wants and needs, whether it is a turnip that can be eaten raw where it grows, or a radio created from a score of raw materials by skillful hands directed by highly technical knowledge. How can we square that simple and irrevocable principle with the theory of fewer working hours in productive effort for more and more pay?

Time employed in productive effort enriches; time not so used is lost forever, both to the laborer and the world. Any law enforced system based upon such false economics bears the seeds of its own destruction, but in destroying itself, it pulls the whole house down. Every farmer knows and every successful farmer applies the principle of using time in its fullness, for that is the one resource of which everyone has an equal share doled out with every dawn, and its usage or wastage is one of the most potent factors of success or failure.

I would be thoroughly pessimistic with regard to the future of our country did I not believe that the sound horse sense of its citizens is sufficient to the task of deflating the something-for-nothing philosophy before it enternally wrecks the Nation, and gives proletarian communism or fascism its chance to establish a dictatorship.

From Rome to Russia, proletarianism is an urban disease, spawned in the concentration of populations. It is subversive of democracy in every land and age, for it encourages mass thinking and mass action, and gives demagogy, either economic or political, its most fertile field.

Mass concentrations of population have been accelerated by war conditions, and the decentralization of industry has been set back for years, perhaps permanently. Where shall we turn, then, for the preservation of democracy, when millions of citizens are subjected to the emotional and economic pressures of power-mad labor racketeers and time-serving politicians?

As Antaeus, in Greek mythology, lost his strength when separated from the soil, and regained it by touching his feet to the ground, so mankind becomes socially anemic when removed from his natural environment, with his feet in the grass and his head in the sun. Pent up within walls and exposed to every germ of physical and intellectual disease, subjected to the influence of artificial environment, men tend to rely less and less on their own powers and the laws of nature, and more and more on man-made systems. When man-made systems break down, as they inevitably do, its victims wreak their vengeance on the nearest object, be it government, or the private institutions fostered by government.

Not only do we see increased concentration of industry and the evils it engenders, but on the other hand, such a concentration of governmental powers as has never before existed in an alleged democracy. The rights "reserved to the States or to the people thereof" are daily violated in the name of war, and as Senator McCARRAN phrases it, "with every upsurge in the power of the administration lawmaker and his alter ego, the bureaucrat, there is a concomitant slackening of initiative, a mushrooming of inertia, in the handling of State and local problems—it breeds opportunity for personal arrogance; evades the courts; sneers at the rule of stare decisis; affords no precedents, and fortifies itself by pointing ridicule at Congress." And he might have added, with haughty contempt for the lay citizen and his constitutional rights.

You can centralize industry and you can centralize government, but agriculture, thanks be, can never be centralized. It answers mass treason on the part of organized labor with loyal persistence in its own job of production. It meets the hampering regulations of bureaucracy and the shortages of manpower and machinery by resourceful management and working longer hours.

Its diverse interests, commodity versus commodity and region versus region, do not incline it to monopolistic methods or philosophies. Its very diversity of special commodity interests and its wide geographical distribution will always incline it to democratic processes, and safeguard it against the same hysteria to which compact groups of people are subject.

Finally, rural life and occupations require independent thinking and action, and individual resourcefulness of a high order. The faculties that are called into play to meet the changing conditions from day to day and year to year are those of the capitalist, the manager, the laborer, and the consumer all in one, and the farmer-ranchman will never tie himself up with either of the warring groups for its exclusive objectives. Nor can he be corralled by any self-styled leader of the masses.

Since individualism is the very core of democracy, we must look to the soil and climate of individualism to conserve and promote democracy, and the most favorable soil and climate for democracy is in rural America. There we find the strongest undercurrent of resistance to special privilege pressures and to bureaucratic muddling alike.

It is not very articulate yet. Rural America has contributed disproportionately of its sons and daughters to the military exigencies of the Nation, and utters no word that might cost another life or prolong the war another hour. When that job is done, however, and its sons are home again, the pure democracy of the countryside will rise in its might and smite every undemocratic and disloyal cult that rears its head, as Samson smote the Philistines.

But its weapon will be the ballot, not the jawbone of an ass.

Keep the Money, the Power, and the Responsibility in the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at St. Paul, Minn., on December 14, 1943:

I am greatly honored and highly privileged to have the opportunity to speak in the great State of Minnesota, a State which has produced great statesmen both past and present. I am also grateful that this opportunity was afforded by the Minnesota Employers' Association.

Everywhere in the Nation it is evidenced that the desire of the people is to learn more of the principles of Government and of the details of our Government's operation.

FIRST EPOCH

To me, there are three great epochs in the history of our Nation. First, the Revolution and the Constitution. The Constitution was the most liberal document ever devised by the mind of man. Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and other signers of that great document were not only liberal, but they were wise—wiser far than the propagandists of today, who cloak the mantle of liberalism about them and hurl names and epithets against all who disagree with them.

To Washington goes the credit for the Constitution. He was the greatest modern example of unselfishness. He was the richest man of his time. He abode in a castle on the banks of the Potomac. Already an old man for his time, when the call to arms came, he laid aside comfort, home, business, and assumed the commander in chiefship of the Army. He did not set foot on his own threshold for 6 years after taking the oath as Commander in Chief under the famous elm at Boston. Not until he went south to capture Cornwallis did he have a chance to visit Mount Vernon again.

When the Articles of Confederation failed, Washington assembled a group of the businessmen of his time at historic Gadsby's Inn in Alexandria and there the plans for the Constitution were laid. He was now a much older man, but again he laid aside comfort, home, and business and directed the framing of the Constitution. Almost against his will he accepted the Presidency and in 1797, while a very old man, again he answered the call to public duty as against personal comfort and assumed the commander in chiefship in our near-war with France.

Without him, there could have been no successful Revolutionary War, no Constitution, and no Republic.

The Constitution was formulated by real liberals, not by professional liberals of the modern type. A great age of inventive genius overtook the world in the last half century. It originated in the United States of America. It spread all over the world where men of genius existed. Our 130,000,000 people, with our industrial marvel, are winning the war for countless millions of oppressed people. We are aided by other powerful nations, but without the assistance of our industrial machine the forces of autocracy, centralization of power paternalism, and personal domination would have overwhelmed the world.

Have you ever wondered why this age of inventive genius arose in America? Why nearly every useful article of peace and war is the result of some American mentality? The complete answer? Our form of government! Under the Bill of Rights the American freeman has freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of contract, freedom of person, freedom from search and seizures; the writ of habeas corpus; the right to marry as he please; to go where he please; to act as he please, with due respect to his neighbor's rights. Generation after generation of Americans have had these rights under our Constitution. Freedom of mentality states all freedoms. Beware of any slogan of freedoms that includes freedom from responsibility!

Every man's house has been his castle. Can it be any startling wonder that this age of inventive genius has flowered here from these generations of freemen? No. We have been taking it all for granted. These rights are not worth while unless the citizen and his public men rise up and fight for them at all times, both in peace and in war, even if he has to criticize and correct the ponderous machine called government. Home, property, comfort, personal rights are but ashes and cant unless they are asserted by the citizen and his representatives.

SECOND EPOCH

The War between the States to me is the next great epoch in American history, when brother was pitted against brother in internecine strife. Bloody as this war was, in which more than a million out of 19,000,000 males of American population were killed and 2,000,000 maimed by disease and wounds, still it was a chivalrous war, not a cruel and murderous episode like modern wars. One of its chivalrous aspects is illustrated by an incident related about Gen. George Pickett, the gallant young southerner who led 14,000 Confederates up Cemetery Ridge on July 4, 1863, at Gettysburg. When the news of his son's birth reached the Confederate Army his men built bonfires up and down the lines in celebration. As soon as Grant heard of it he ordered his men to do likewise. So both armies celebrated the birth of young George Pickett and Grant sent Pickett a wire, "We are sending congratulations to you and the young mother and to the young recruit." A few days later there came to Pickett's headquarters from the Federal lines a baby's silver service with this inscription: "To George W. Pickett, Jr., from some old friends of his

father's." Signed U. S. Grant, Rufus Ingalls, and George Sucklay—all Union generals.

THIRD EPOCH

The adoption of the sixteenth amendment in 1913 marks the beginning of that period in the history of the United States which period may be called a tragic financial era. That is the date when the orgy of spending of public moneys in the United States began and which has continued full blast until the present day.

In 1913 we had a population of 90,000,000. In that year our total Federal expenses were $700,000,000. Immediately the Federal Budget began to rise and in 1916 the Federal Government spent one thousand and thirty-four millions. There was some talk about this being a billion-dollar country.

This spending spree has not been political. Under Harding the Federal Budget was $4,100,000,000; under Coolidge it rose to $4,200,000,000, and in 1940 the Federal Budget, including Army and Navy, but exclusive of the emergency defense budget, amounted to approximately eight billions. Thus in a little over a quarter of a century, while our population grew from 90,000,000 to 130,000,000, our civil Federal Budget had grown from seven hundred millions to $8,000,000,000.

This spending orgy was not confined to the Federal system. The States and municipalities followed suit so that in 1938 our total tax bill in America was $18,300,000,000 of which more than $7,000,000,000 was Federal. Eighteen billion and three hundred million dollars is a great or small amount of money, depending on what you compare it with. Let us compare it with the national income for that year. That national income for 1938 was $64,000,000,000. Quick calculation illustrates that the total tax-take from the American people for Government so-called, State, Federal, and municipal, in 1938 was 29 percent (plus) of all the money made by all the people. Only the disciples of "we owe the money to ourselves" can argue that an economy can stand for the long pull, with one-third of the people's money taken for taxes, in times of peace.

Only about 15 or 20 percent of this money went for Government per se, that is, the protection of life and property. The remainder went for frills and furbelows and governmental trinketing. Nearly every human activity now operates under the furtive eyes of some Federal agent. Millions of galloping wastrels roam the country with some type of Federal commission to tax, to pester, to annoy, and to regiment the people.

The governmental travel bill which you citizens paid in 1940 was $99,000,000. In 1941 it rose to $150,000,000. The Federal telegraph and telephone bill was an immensity in that period. I haven't the exact figures.

The Farm Security Administration actually lent money to farmers in the last bond drive, with which to purchase bonds of the Government.

In order to aid the First World War effort, the Congress suspended the 8-hour law. This Government refused to suspend the 40-hour week, but tried to persuade labor to work by granting overtime pay. Even the Congress granted overtime pay to Federal employees. The country went hell-bent for overtime with the soldiers crying for guns and shells to shoot the enemy, in the Nation's greatest stress.

It will interest you to know about what is generally known as the franking privilege. In 1928 the Congress spent $825,000 franking out mail, answering constituents, etc. Maybe some political mail went out. Not much, because with the Federal Frankenstein so large the most politically minded Congressman has very little time to devote to political mail, except upon occasions. In that same year, 1928, the departments spent six millions. In 1940 the Congress was more penurious and spent $737,000, but the departments continued their mad orgy and spent thirty-nine millions of your money in franking out mail to ingratiate themselves to the people. In 1942 the cost was $71,900,000. There are 113 publication departments in Washington. What the cost of the material franked out is, I don't know. It will run into many more millions.

Our individual tax rates run as high as 90 percent. The new tax bill fixes the normal rate, the lowest rate, at 10 percent. It has been at 6 percent for several years. The normal rate on corporation is 40 percent, and the excess-profits tax between 80 and 95 percent.

Now let me startle you with a little-known bit of American history. Chief Justice Hughes, when Governor of New York, cautioned against ratification of the sixteenth amendment because, as he said, the Federal tax rate might get as high as 10 percent.

We entered World War No. 1 with a public debt of $1,282,000,000. We emerged from that war with a debt of twenty-six and one-half billions. We entered World War No. 2 with a public debt of $65,000,000,000. Congress has appropriated three hundred and forty-five billions since July 1, 1940, of which two hundred and eighty-five billions have been obligated. This vast expenditure for World War No. 2 has been justified beyond measure, although the waste has been terrific. The War Department followed the example of the President and the Congress and threw economy to the winds. Last week it reported that it has thirteen billions too much money. It is variously estimated that the armed forces have from six to nineteen billions in unneeded surplus property.

But to return to the civil aspects of the Federal Government, Chief Justice Marshall said that the "power to tax is the power to destroy." We can go further, and say: "Give me the power to tax and I will take the power to govern."

Money is temporal power. This growth of the Federal system from seven hundred millions in 1913 to eight billions in 1940 has created a fearful Frankenstein—the executive department. The framers of the Constitution organized three coordinate and independent branches of the Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. The Executive has no power in domestic affairs, except such as are given him by the Congress. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy—yes—but under the Constitution only of the movements of the armed forces. He cannot build a navy, raise an army, pay an army, or supply an army. The representatives of the people do that. Under the Constitution the President may not even call out the National Guard without the consent of the Congress. The President is not Commander in Chief of the people but only of the Army and Navy.

Money, tax money, money out of your pockets has created the Federal Frankenstein—the executive department—which has towered to such great strength and temporal power that the judicial and the legislative branches have gradually lost power and prestige and are becoming comparatively insignificant from the pressure that the executive department can, and does, exert.

Democracy does not exist at Washington. It has no place in those marble halls. It does exist down in the school boards, the justice of peace courts, in the courthouses, in the legislatures of the States. It cannot be transferred to Washington. If it could be so transferred, it would cease to exist. Here among the people—in the breasts of the people—rests democracy itself. Democracy is dependent on the ability of the average man to reflect sound judgment, and of his representatives to activate that judgment into legislation.

Recently a great statesman, HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, in a widely read article, said, we must "take the power back to the States." How? He suggests no remedy. This power has left the States most rapidly since the adoption of the sixteenth amendment.

My thesis is: Take the money, the power, and the responsibility back to the States where it belongs and where democracy exists. After all, the money comes from the people of the States, and is transferred back to them via Washington through a vast and expensive system of bureaucracy.

This is no diatribe in favor of States' rights. This is a plea for State responsibility. If the States assume their responsibility, then they maintain their rights and sovereignty.

Recently, we have seen interviews by Governors that their State budgets are being balanced. The Governor of my own State points with pride to the fact that the State debt is being reduced. Why not? Oklahoma has received millions from the Federal Treasury—probably half a billion in the last 10 or 12 years. Millions of that money was Oklahoma money, which if the States had been assuming their responsibility, could have been used at home.

EFFECT OF EXCESS SPENDING

I repeat, money is temporal power. So let me take you with me and investigate the effect of this revelry of spending, first on the executive department itself; second, on the Congress; and third, on the States.

Normally, we have about a million Federal employees. Now we have about 3,060,000. I have heard it stated that Ohio has 25,000 State and municipal employees, and that there are 90,000 Federal employees operating within that State. A more striking example is Pennsylvania. In my own State of Oklahoma, the number of Federal agents, operators, and employees is vastly in excess of State and municipal employees.

See how this Federal Frankenstein has mushroomed and developed. The Department of Agriculture started with a $3,000 appropriation for statistical purposes. Beginning with 1937, its annual appropriations were more than a billion and a half annually. The Labor Department started with an appropriation of $25,000 for statistical purposes. Its 1940 appropriation was nearly twenty-six millions. In fact, we now have three Labor Departments, the Labor Department itself—which has hardly been mentioned in months—and the National Labor Relations Board, which I presume is still operating; and the War Labor Board, which has been recently given orders by the administration's overlord, John L. Lewis. The Children's Bureau started about 25 years ago with an appropriation of $25,000. Last summer, Miss Lenroot, its head, advised Congress that the department positively must have twenty-five millions for the next fiscal year. The N. Y. A. took seven hundred and seventy-four millions of money out of your pockets. It was a battle to dispose of it, because it claimed to be a component element in the war effort. When we did abandon it we found that it had $55,000,000 in real and personal property. A dairy farm in Atlanta and a steam laundry at Birmingham. The C. C. C. was agreed by all to be a good thing, but when we check up we find that it cost $2,700,000,000 of your money.

It is now proposed to go to the aid of education in the common schools, if you please, down where democracy actually exists, and furnish Federal funds for that purpose. What are the necessary consequences? The curriculum, the salaries, all regulated by Washington. A horde of auditors, checkers, recheckers, and double-checkers would vie with each other to make life miserable for the school people and the school systems of the States. Only three hundred millions is asked for now for that purpose, but can you imagine the appropriation for the second year being less than a billion?

At the outset of the war, certain interests conceived the idea that we must spend three hundred millions for the compensation of labor, while factories like the automobile plants were being converted to the war effort. All the forces of the administration were put behind it. Notwithstanding the fact that it was proved that every State had sufficient funds already for every purpose, this drive went on. Even the most abject slave of the administration in Congress admitted that it was unnecessary, and the whole sordid deal was defeated.

The Byrd economy committee reports that the Federal Government now owns one-fifth of the land of the country—383,600,000 acres; now, what is more startling, no central agency keeps track of how much land the Government owns, where it is, or how much it costs.

An Executive order prevents the Army and Navy from giving testimony before a House investigating committee looking into the Federal Communications Commission.

That $25,000 income limit: The present tax rates prevent any American citizen, no matter how high his salary, receiving more than $23,618.14 a year.

One of my constituents wrote that his was just a little "one-horse institution," but he wanted me to see the catalog of his taxation:

1. Taxes to which we are subject:

Federal capital-stock tax, Federal excess-profits tax based on declared valuation, Federal excise tax, Federal income tax, Federal excess-profits tax based on income, Federal income tax of individual owners, Federal income surtax of individual owners, Federal documentary tax, Federal old-age-benefit tax (social security—part paid by employer), Federal gasoline tax, Federal use stamp tax for trucks, Federal telephone and telegraph tax, Federal tax on travel tickets, Federal tax on purchase of trucks, State license tax, State unemployment and compensation (social security), State corporation income tax, State individual income tax of owners, State sales tax on purchases not for resale, State use tax, State gasoline tax, State motor-vehicle excise tax, State truck-title fee, State auto license, State auto drivers' license, ad valorem tax, intangible tax.

2. Taxes which we are required to collect and pay to the Federal Government or the State:

Victory tax, withholding tax, Federal excise tax, Federal old-age benefit (social security—part paid by employees), State sales tax.

The above is an approximate list of taxes under which a retail merchant operates.

I ask any thoughtful, forward-looking man, who isn't carrying a torch, or beating his breast, How long can the Nation's economy stand this tyranny of taxation? No student of mathematics can justify it.

Are you taxpayers aware that the so-called Government corporations have capital assets of $35,000,000,000 either of your money or on your credit, and that they are issuing bonds without specific authorization by Congress, only general authorization being awarded them?

These bureaus have grown like the Rose of Sharon. They have become all-powerful. They are arrogant and bulldozing. They go on the so-called liberal theory that the citizen is not fit to look after his own affairs. Take his money away from the bureaucrat, and he is sunk without trace.

These bureaus have become arrogantly powerful. A lawyer for the Securities and Exchange Commission said before a committee of Congress, "We do make the law. it." This is carrying the doctrine of "government by directive" to its logical, modern This order supersedes any laws opposed to limit.

Referring to the growth of bureaucracy in his own country, the Lord Chief Justice of England in a book, the New Despotism, in which he pointed out the subversion of Anglo-Saxon ideals of justice by the power of bureaucracy, referred to the bureaucrat of his country as follows:

"This course will prove tolerably simple if he (1) fill up the gaps with his own rules, orders, and regulations; (2) get legislation passed in skeleton form; (3) make it difficult or impossible for parliament to check the said rules, orders, and regulations; (4) secure for them the force of statute; (5) arrange that the fact of his decision shall be conclusive proof of its legality; (6) take power to modify the provisions of statutes; and (7) prevent and avoid any sort of appeal to a court of law."

This runs exactly true to form in the American system of bureaucracy.

A witty allusion to the subject matter is found in Federal Octopus by Sterling E. Edmunds, when he says:

"By analogy, the bureau is, in the realm of government, what protozoa are in the realm of zoology. Originating as a single cell they immediately begin to reproduce by fission, a self-division of the body into two or more complete cells. The protozoa abound in stagnant waters, as the bureau can flourish only in the stagnation of public spirit. Protozoa are parasites and the cause of certain diseases, as bureaus are parasitic and destructive of the vigor and health of the body politic. Again protozoa are the simplest and lowest form of animal life, as bureau-government is one of the earliest and crudest forms of arbitrary rule. Protozoa are apparently content to remain protozoa, but there the analogy ends; the bureau is ever striving onward and upward, and not only subdivides itself indefinitely, but each subdivision, in turn seeks to elevate itself ultimately into a mighty department."

EFFECT ON CONGRESS

What has been the effect on Congress of this extravagant spending (by the Congress itself)? The Congress has become a group of glorified errand boys—not too glorified. It spends all of its time in Washington. It has to. Its duties relate to this $8,000,000,000 Frankenstein and the activities of the executive department. There is not a thorough student of government on Capitol Hill. There simply can't be. The time of the Representatives and Senators is entirely taken up with dancing attendance on the executive department. Congress has become quasi executive—a type of merger with the executive department. Congress spent 1,261 out of 1,281 days prior to its last recess in session and in Washington, still running errands on the executive department. It has no opportunity to be in touch with its constituency back where democracy really exists. No one who believes in the American system will contend that this is a healthy governmental situation.

As I conceive it, the duty of Congress is to make the laws, pass the tax bills, make the appropriations, investigate the Government departments. Then to go back to the people and leave the responsibility on the executive department for the operation of the Government. Not so under the present conditions. The executive department is so large that Congress is compelled to be at the seat of the Government to look after the affairs of the people who are under the domination and the will of the wonderland of bureaucracy of the executive department.

EFFECT UPON THE STATES

The effect upon the States has been a steady, consistent loss of sovereignty. The States are furnishing the Federal system their money and the Federal Frankenstein returns it through the bureaucrats to the same States, with the attendant nuisances, annoyances, and provocations. The States are bribed by Washington with their own money under this system into activities never dreamed of by the founding fathers. The power is where the money is. If the States will not accept the responsibility, if they abjectly furnish Washington the money, if the States will not govern, the Federal Government will.

There is a school of thought in Washington which advocates the gradual abolition of the States and the substitution therefor of economic zones. If the centralization of all power in the Federal Government, if the individual citizen is to be compelled to operate his every activity under the watchful eye of some Federal agent, if that is liberalism, then the scheme and plan is perfect. But in Europe a complete centralization of power in the central government is not known as liberalism. A reactionary has been said to be the man who is a disciple of complete centralization of power at Washington.

The liberals of the days of the formation of the Constitution felt that the diffusion of power among the States and the creation of three coordinate but independent divisions of the Federal Government was liberalism. Not a nation in history but has floundered and failed on this rock of centralized authority.

THE REMEDY

Is there a remedy? Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, and I have introduced resolutions in the Congress for the submission to the States of a constitutional amendment providing in substance that the Congress may not appropriate more money than the estimated revenues, except upon a three-fifths vote of both Houses with a vote of yeas and nays. Everybody on record. This would take care of peacetime situations as well as war emergencies. No individual or organization, except the most foolhardy, operates on any other system than that of spending no more than he has. In recent years, the question in Washington has not been "How much have we got?" but "How much can we borrow?"

Another remedy has been suggested. Fifteen States have passed resolutions demanding that Congress call a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the sixteenth amendment to provide that except in an emergency no tax rate should be more than 25 percent. If the States compel the submission of this amendment, some relief from inordinate taxes is in sight.

Up to the Civil War, the Ways and Means Committee levied the taxes and made the appropriations. Thereafter it was divided, and the Ways and Means Committee was left the taxing power, and the Appropriations Committee given the spending power. Believe it or not (and you may think it ridiculous), no committee of Congress is charged with the specific duty of determining the over-all Budget and the over-all revenue. I have proposed a Budget committee composed of members of the House Ways and Means Committee and House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Finance and Senate Appropriations Committees, to determine the over-all Budget and the over-all revenues. This committee would report to each House the fiscal situation of the Government and fix a ceiling for appropriations. When its report is adopted by both Houses, no appropriation or aggregate appropriation bills could pass, except by a two-thirds vote. Any individual Member could raise the question on a point of order.

The effect of these proposals would be to pull down this Federal frankenstein. It cannot operate without money. Its sumptuary paternalism would be past history if these three measures were adopted. We will crusade for these measures, and we believe that an aroused public opinion will demand that they be inaugurated. By this process we will take the money, the power, and the responsibility back to the States.

We cannot spend our way out of difficulty. We must produce our way out, if democracy is to survive. Democracy itself is in most serious danger from the centralization of all power, of all activities, yes, of overlordship

of all personal and property rights at Washington. This centralization gives the minority groups the most intense pressure power. I have heard men say that "we don't want this authority lodged in 48 separate States. We want it at Washington where we can get at it." In other words, where we can put pressure on Congress and on the executive department in one spot.

Inordinate taxation destroys incentive of the individual and the corporation. Why go into business if the fruit of your labor, your sweat, your toil goes to taxation? Without incentive there can be no self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sustaining individual. We cannot support the philosophy that 130,000,000 Americans can maintain the rest of the world in idleness. The goal is a nation of self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sustaining individuals, of self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sustaining States.

George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy delivered by me at Washington's Tomb, Mount Vernon, Va., February 22, 1944, as the Irish War Veterans placed a wreath on the tomb:

Two hundred and twelve years ago at Wakefield, Va., 50 miles below this spot on the Potomac, there was born a man whose character, deeds, and principles have more greatly impressed themselves on his own times and our subsequent history than any other man in history. George Washington, born February 22, 1732, lived on this spot from the time he was 3 years old and he died here December 14, 1799, at the age of 67. Soldier and statesman, he in large measure won the national independence and existence of the American Colonies by force of arms and then with equal devotion laid the foundations of principle that have kept and preserved us a nation.

Three times during his life—at 23 when he served under General Braddock to preserve the western boundaries of America, at 43 when he put on his general's uniform which he wore from 1775 to 1783 in the war of America's independence, and at 66 when again commissioned for the threatened war with France in 1798—George Washington placed his life and his sword at the command of the people of his native land.

Three times during his life—at 55 when he presided over the Constitutional Convention in 1787 at Philadelphia, at 57 when he became the first President of the United States April 30, 1789, and at 61 when he began his second term in 1793—he put aside all concern for his private fortunes and comfort to stand at the head of his people and country in times of peace. It is impossible to exaggerate the influence had on the people and institutions of his own time and nothing was more true than the tribute of John Marshall on his death that he was "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

During his life it is estimated Washington wrote between 8,000 and 10,000 letters—all hand written. Most of these have been collected in work of 24 volumes. All through the Revolution, to the Continental Congress, and for the years when a substitute for the Articles of Federation was desired—Washington's pen was as mighty and industrious as his sword. Literally hundreds of letters went from him urging the calling of the Constitutional Convention and when it was called his election as Chairman insured a harmonious and successful outcome. It was largely through Washington's influence as a delegate from Virginia that the Old Dominion ratified the Constitution in spite of strong dissent from Patrick Henry and others.

In the Presidential office, Washington scrupulously preserved the division of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. He, with his Secretaries of State, conducted the foreign relations without interference from Congress but presented the finished work with full information whenever the concurrence of the Senate was required. He knew that to burden the members of the legislative branch with executive duties would be contrary to the Constitution and in addition would work confusion because of the large numbers of coworkers who would be enlisted. Such a plan at present would add more than 500 extra delegates and negotiators to such conferences as were had at Casablanca, Cairo, and Tehran and the added members would be without legal standing.

The spirit of Washington is not dead. It is the spirit of independence, of sacrifice, of discipline and order. We see it on our fighting fronts, in our State papers, and in the hearts of our citizens and from Washington we learn and remember that for each of us there is a part to play in each changing drama of democracy.

The Americanism of Washington places unbounded confidence in the people and trusts them and them alone with government and we elect men to serve, not rule us. The citizen is made the sovereign; we have now about 30,000,000 kings and a large number of queens sitting upon the American throne and the responsibilities of government rest heavily upon their royal shoulders.

The conditions now confronting the citizenry of this Nation require that the traditions of Washington and Jefferson be fulfilled and that every citizen render allegiance to government, for when rulers abandon the scepter, fools hold court, and when a citizen of this Nation neglects his duty to the Government he abdicates a throne, surrenders his rights to the blessings of citizenship, mocks the patriots who followed Washington to victory, and tramples upon the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Appeasement and a Scrap of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address, Appeasement and a Scrap of Paper, given by me before 2,500 pupils and teachers of 518 Jewish religious schools at the second annual community assembly at Hunter College, New York, on February 22, Washington's Birthday.

The information and data included in the speech are of interest to the Members of Congress at the present time in connection with H. R. 418 and H. R. 419 introduced by me and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRGHT].

The address follows:

I was happy to cancel a speaking engagement in Connecticut, my own State, to come here and speak to you in furtherance of a cause that transcends all State and national borders. I was particularly pleased when I learned that you were an educational group of young people interested not only in the problems of the Jews, but in the glorious history and greatness of the United States and its founding father whose birthday we commemorate today. And what a magnificent memorial you mean to share in building to George Washington. What could be more lasting and more impressive to the eyes of man than the grandeur of a forest? A living memorial—growing in strength and beauty every day and giving pleasure and inspiration to all who view it. The "George Washington Forest"—my imagination rushes across the seas to that hill near Nazareth swept by soft winds and with 10,000 majestic trees swaying and whispering that "America shares in this"—a perpetual living, moving, growing memorial worthy of the man we honor and whose birthday we commemorate today.

This country was blessed from the beginning with many great and courageous men to whom injustices had become insufferable and who acted with courage to correct abuses that threatened the progress and the growth of America. We need more men with that kind of courage today—men like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and the hundreds of others who place honor and country above fear of consequences and above personal ambition—men who speak and fight for what is right, not what is merely expedient.

The authors and signers of the Declaration of Independence recognized 168 years ago that experience had then shown, and I quote, "that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing forms to which they are accustomed."

And so down the years we, the people of America, have often been disposed to suffer and accept what can be endured. A peaceful people, we have been slow to take up the battles of those in far-off lands of whose problems we only hear or read, and whose suffering is beyond the bounds of ordinary experience. We in the United States have been prone to follow the easy way; to give generously of our material wealth to alleviate the suffering of others; but to avoid what we consider entanglements or interference with the causes for the suffering. We have been profligate and sympathetic with our material wealth, but miserly with effort and positive action to rescue the oppressed of the world.

Although coauthor of the so-called Palestine resolution, I am novice in the defense of the right of the Jew to immigrate freely and to establish a national home in Palestine. Therefore I do not come here to lecture you upon a subject on which, undoubtedly, most of you could instruct me. But the British white paper promulgated by the Chamberlain government in 1939 so boldly breaks the pledge made 25 years ago—so unjustly cancels the marvelous work of love and devotion achieved in Palestine—and withal closes the haven of Palestine to the suffering millions in Europe—that my interest and sympathy were aroused—my emotions and compassion stirred and late though it be, I am enlisted finally in the fight to reopen the doors of Palestine. Since I came easily and readily to the cause when I listened to the truth, it is our duty to enlist other right-thinking people who will surely come as easily as I. Our mission is to spread the appealing story and thus create a vast sea of public opinion here in the United States which will pound its weight against those who are responsible for the abandonment of a solemn pledge to the Jews and to the people of the United States.

My strength to carry through the effort I am making with my colleague Mr. WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, lies not in my knowledge of the details of the problems, but in the knowledge that I am right and in my determination to do all within my power to see that the Government of the United States lives up to the good faith it pledged more than 20 years ago in a signed covenant. And let there be no mistake on that score, we and other nations have pledged our good faith to the Jews of the world.

Briefly, the governing facts of the situation up to today are these: The historical record shows the rise and fall of the Palestine problem. In 1917 the Balfour Declaration raised Jewish hopes in all parts of the world. It was thought that at long last there was the Jewish Magna Carta. But as early as 1921 Trans-Jordan was cut off; in 1922 the Congress of the United States recognized and approved the mandate for Palestine only. Also, in 1922 free immigration became immigration on the basis of economic absorptive capacity, and quite properly; in 1933 land sales were restricted; in 1937 partition was accepted by the British Government; in 1938 partition was rejected by the British Government; and in 1939 we witnessed the funeral of the mandate. It was then the Chamberlain government promulgated the white paper which restricted Jewish immigration into Palestine to approximately 75,000 immigrants for a 5-year period. At the end of the 5-year period (March 31, 1944) no further Jewish immigration would be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine acquiesced in it. That white paper violated the mandatory entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations with the formal consent of the United States, and which was freely approved by us in 1925 with the stipulation, and I quote: "Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

Since 1939 we have neither assented nor protested, but up to now we have stood silently by as a party to injustice—hesitating to assume our obligation or lacking the courage to assert our signatory right to interfere in an international problem in which Britain is only a trustee.

Now we come to the March 31 deadline—a few weeks away—and without any positive action having been taken by the Government of the United States, which through the President and Congress pledged its good faith to every article and clause of the mandatory. At this late hour I and one of my colleagues, Mr. WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, have demanded action by introducing identical congressional resolutions which call upon our Government to use its good offices to bring about abrogation of the British white paper to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews with full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

To that end public and executive hearings on our resolutions are now being held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

It is almost a foregone conclusion that if this Foreign Affairs Committee recommends favorable action on the resolutions the House of Representatives will accept that recommendation and pass the resolutions. Public opinion is rising in favor of congressional action. The majority and minority party leaders in the House and leading figures of both political parties in the Senate have endorsed our action. If the committee withholds a favorable recommendation, or otherwise fails to report out promptly these resolutions, we must look beyond Congress for the pressure and the cause. Lack of prompt and favorable action on the resolutions can only mean that influences in the Government over and beyond Congress have intervened. But Congress is ready and we hope the Executive and State Departments are ready. We only await their leadership and declarations publicly proclaimed.

Critics of the present United States Government contend that this country has no real foreign policy. I do not intend to debate that conclusion or to confuse a problem that is neither partisan nor political. All I ask is simple justice. I must call attention, however, to two assumptions which cannot be avoided in any study of the attitude of our Government in tacitly accepting by lack of action the British white paper of 1939.

The white paper was part of the policy of appeasement adopted by the Chamberlain government in 1939. Acceptance by this Government of that policy concedes it a just and wise one. But we in America are done with appeasement. The American people gave up that policy with Pearl Harbor. Continued acceptance of this white paper places the Government of this country in an unenviable position—the position of a government which looks upon a treaty signed and sealed as a mere scrap of paper. Even though we have no set foreign policy of our own, must we accept the appeasement policies of the Chamberlain government or borrow the scrap-of-paper attitude of the old Kaiser Wilhelm regime of Germany? Aren't we sending thousands of Jewish and Christian boys to march and die side by side on foreign battlefields to uphold justice and the right of freemen to live unmolested in the lands of their birth or their choice? Aren't we fighting all over the world to show our good faith to the oppressed peoples of the world?

Where are the tenets of the "four freedoms" and the hopes of the Atlantic Charter to which our President and the British Prime Minister subscribe so heartily? They and we must not be charged with hypocrisy in this unjust and inhuman exclusion of the Jews from their homeland.

There has been and is a great deal of misunderstanding about our responsibilities for Palestine not only in the minds of the public but in the minds of individual Members of Congress and in the minds of persons high in the Government. These people constantly ask, "What business have we to interfere with the British Government in its handling of the Palestine problem?"

Let me answer that here and now. It is our business because we made it our business when the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States ratified and signed the convention between the two Governments setting forth the following three highly important facts, and I quote the exact language of the mandate over Palestine and the convention between our Government and Great Britain:

"1. The mandatory [that is, Great Britain of course] shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home as laid down in the preamble and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race or religion.

"2. The administration of Palestine, while insuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish agency referred to in article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including state lands and wastelands not acquired for public purposes."

And mark you—

"3. Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate as recited above unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

These are exact quotations from the mandate and the convention.

I repeat, we have not assented to the modification embodied in the British white paper.

But neither, I repeat, have we protested against its injustice.

In 1925, over the signature of President Calvin Coolidge, we pledged, and I quote again, "that every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof."

I ask now that our Government back up its pledge of good faith with direct action. Our resolutions call upon our Government to take such action. As hearings on our resolutions progressed before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I began to hear expressed from some quarters a fear that passage of the resolutions by Congress will be a signal for an uprising of the Arabs in Palestine. That is old stuff. Vacillation and appeasement have heretofore only brought us disrespect and disappointment and the violence we sought to avoid.

It is better to face the threat than to bow in an attitude of continued hopeless appeasement, because a few disloyal, and perhaps well-paid, Arabs prefer injustice to justice and who still cling to the ideologies of Hitler. A firm hand now for justice can only bring healthy respect for law and order. Prompt action can be taken to wipe out the remaining Axis influence which might incite a few terrorists and saboteurs to riot. We must not halt progress in Palestine.

If we must have a scrap of paper, let's scrap the British white paper and not the inspiring and fruitful covenant signed by a President of the United States.

Our Common Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, United States Department of Justice, delivered at dinner of Refugee Relief Trustees, Inc., Town Hall Club, New York City, February 18, 1944:

A few weeks ago a leading attorney in one of our large cities was addressing a group of foreign-born petitioners who were about to be sworn in as American citizens. The speaker opened his address by saying that he was going to read several lines from the preamble to the Constitution. As soon as he started almost the entire group of petitioners—more than 200 strong—recited in unison and from memory the lines he was reading. Incidentally, the man who reported the incident to me commented that the speaker was about the only one in that room who had to read that part of the preamble.

Among these newly naturalized Americans were a number of persons who were probably refugees. We in the Immigration and Naturalization Service make no distinction in our records between so-called refugees and other immigrants—that is why I say "probably." But these persons had been here only a few years and had come from such coun-

tries as Germany and Austria, so it is quite likely that they would have been considered "refugees." They, too, knew the preamble by heart. It was more than a series of sentences and words for them. Their experiences, if we are to judge them by the common experiences of many refugees who have told their stories, had given the words of the preamble profound significance. Like so many refugees, they had learned the meaning of freedom by the direct and painful experience of having been deprived of it; of having seen freedom and human decency replaced with tyranny and race prejudices.

Our refugees, perhaps more than any of us, have a great understanding of what American citizenship can mean. They know, with an emotion that the rest of us have not experienced as deeply, what the war is all about. Even before we entered the war they had done a great deal to warn us of the dangers of nazi-ism and fascism and to bring home to us by their first-hand accounts the horrors of the slavery that those systems impose on human beings.

But who are our refugees? Notwithstanding Mr. Noah Webster's rather clear-cut definition, the word "refugee" seems to have become almost as controversial as the word "propaganda." It appears to have a variety of meanings for a variety of groups. Hollywood and the Broadway theater have one conception of the refugee, based largely on physical characteristics. Some of our Government agencies have another. The organizations represented here tonight have their own and, finally, the refugee, may have his own definition, which is probably the most valid of all.

The question is more than one of definition; for in essence our entire Nation can be said to consist of refugees and their descendants. The idea of flight seems to be implicit in most of the current definitions. But it can easily be argued that the immigrants who poured into the United States early this century were refugees since they were in flight from economic or political conditions they did not like. The question then rises, When does a refugee cease to be a refugee? Should we not assume that an immigrant who has established his base here and intends to become a permanent member of our American society is no longer a refugee? I was interested to note that a magazine recently described as a refugee a famous anti-Fascist who came to this country nearly 20 years ago and has long since become an American citizen. Are we to assume that he will never cease being a refugee as long as he remains anti-Fascist?

These questions are important only insofar as they might affect our Nation's policy on the admission of refugees into this country. There are those who would have us believe that we have admitted a tremendous number of refugees in the past 10 years, while there are those who argue that we should have admitted a great many more. Since the immigration laws make no distinction between refugees and other immigrants, we have no exact statistical information on the subject available. Those who come here for permanent residence have the right to become a regular part of our society; there seems to be no point to label them as "refugees" or to continue to think of them as a group separate from the rest of our population. When they first arrive, they may need the kind of help and advice that some of our social agencies can provide—but that is true of any immigrant who finds himself in a new environment and wishes to become adjusted as soon as possible.

As many of you know, there was a great deal of misunderstanding recently as a result of testimony presented before a Congressional committee which was considering the number of refugees who had been admitted into the United States from European countries which are now occupied or dominated by the Axis. Although the misunderstanding has been somewhat dissipated by subsequent explanation and correction, it has served to reopen the question of how many persons, who might properly be called refugees, have been admitted in the last 10 years.

You all know, I'm sure, that the State Department is the agency that concerns itself with the records of visas it has authorized and issued. But records of persons who are actually admitted into the country are kept by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We are therefore in a position to state exactly how many persons from countries which are now Axis occupied or dominated came here during the last decade.

The statistics, which are quite revealing, should quiet the fears of some alarmists who have the impression that we have admitted large numbers of refugees. First of all, let me explain that persons admitted into this country fall into one of two categories of the immigration laws: Those who have been admitted for permanent stay are known as immigrant aliens; those who have come here for temporary stay only are classified as non-immigrant aliens. The latter category includes tourists, students, treaty merchantmen, and persons in transit. In the period between July 1, 1933, and June 30, 1943, we admitted for temporary stay 228,068 persons from countries which are now Axis dominated or Axis occupied.

Two hundred and seventy-nine thousand and seventy-one persons from those same countries were admitted during the same period as immigrant aliens; that is, for permanent stay, in full accordance with immigration law. In other words, the total number of persons in both categories admitted from those European countries which are now under the Nazi thumb amounted to 507,139. How many of this number are refugees? Many of those who came here for temporary stay—students, tourists, persons in transit, etc.—could never be considered refugees and have by now returned to their native countries.

Nor can we say that all of the 279,071 persons who entered the country as immigrant aliens were refugees in the sense that they were escaping religious or political persecution from the Axis. Although all of this group came from European nations that are now dominated or occupied by the Axis, many of them came here long before they had any idea that their countries would some day be Axis controlled. It would probably take an expert historian to determine exactly when a nation became dominated by the Axis, but it would be erroneous to suppose that the immigrants from such countries as Denmark, Norway, France, the Netherlands, who came here before the German invasion of these nations, were political or religious refugees. It would be just as illogical to classify as refugees the large majority of Czechoslovak nationals who came here before October 1938 when the Nazis robbed their country of the Sudetenland.

Several estimates have been made as to the number of so-called refugees who have been admitted from Europe in the past 10 years. Most of them seem to range between 200,000 and 300,000. On the basis of the figures I have mentioned, I would guess that such estimates were generally on the right track. But again I ask, when does a refugee cease to be a refugee? The majority of persons represented in any of the current estimates came here to establish themselves permanently. They came under our regular immigration law and, regardless of the motives that brought them here, they were admitted under the same rules by which we would admit any group of immigrants in more normal times.

A large number of them have already taken steps to become American citizens, indicating their desire to become part and parcel of our Nation. Several thousand of those who have fulfilled the 5-year residence requirement have already become citizens. Regardless of what their present status might be, they are demonstrating, in numerous ways, their fondness for this country and their loyalty to our war effort. Probably no other group of immigrants in the twentieth century has been able to adapt itself so readily to our way of life. I myself have seen what a wonderful change has come over some refugees after they have been here a comparatively short time. At first they seemed bewildered and afraid; when I saw them about a year later they were blooming with the self-assurance that comes to people who feel that they have been truly accepted by their community. To me it has been thrilling to witness that transformation. The process of adjustment is far from complete, of course. I daresay that some of our folk ways and mannerisms must still be bewildering to some—but that is not surprising when we consider how they bewilder even some of us who were born here.

I think that this audience would be the first to admit that American public opinion has been inclined to be somewhat wary of the whole refugee question. Obviously, there has been the fear that if we admit refugees on a large scale, we would be creating an unemployment problem, particularly in the years after the war when millions of American soldiers must reestablish themselves in the economic life of the community. This is reflected in a number of bills introduced into Congress which would restrict immigration further. Thanks to the educational work done by the organizations working with refugees, I believe that public opinion toward refugees is becoming more and more enlightened and favorable as it becomes more evident that many of our so-called refugees are making valuable and specialized contributions to our national life. In making the refugee picture clearer to the public, in eliminating any misunderstandings it may have about refugees, organizations like those represented here tonight can be and have been of great service to the Nation as well as to the refugee. Naturally a great deal of that responsibility must be assumed by the refugee himself in his day-by-day activities. As he learns more about the psychology of the American public, I think he will find that fair play is at the root of most of our public opinion, and that we are a democratic and hospitable people in fact as well as in name.

I have said little about the contributions our refugees are making to this country because it would be like carrying coals to Newcastle to dwell on that subject tonight. However, I do want to make the point that those contributions, whether they be in the field of medicine, science, literature, or the arts, may have an effect on our post-war attitude toward other peoples seeking a better life in this country. What that attitude will be ultimately may depend largely on the terms of the peace settlement and the economic conditions of the Nation. But at this stage it seems reasonable to suppose that the extent to which our most recent refugees can fit their skills and professions into our scheme of life may suggest a new approach to our immigration policy.

The days of unrestricted immigration are probably gone forever. But in the light of our history and the fine record made here by those who have come from other lands, we will undoubtedly keep our gates reasonably open. From the humanitarian point of view, we cannot do otherwise; from the point of view of self-interest, new immigrants would be giving our country the strength that the infusion of new blood always brings to it. Without venturing any prediction, it is possible that Congress, reflecting the will of the people, might eventually adopt an immigration policy which would be based partly, at least, on the occupation and skills of the immigrant. As you know, our present immigration laws make it possible to grant

nonquota or preferential status to certain professions; perhaps a similar nonquota or preferential status might be extended to other groups as certain employment needs in this country arose.

Internationally, the nations of the world are facing the fact that post-war problems of migration need their collective attention. More nations than ever before are recognizing the fact that these problems, being truly international in character and calling for a high order of cooperation between nations for their solution, go far beyond any domestic and internal issues. A few months ago I had the privilege of being a delegate to the Inter-American Demographic Congress in Mexico City. The Congress made it clear that every nation had the right to determine its own immigration policy, but it recognized that immigration in the Western Hemisphere is a matter that calls for some agreement and cooperation between the American nations. It is significant, I think, that among the resolutions passed by the Congress was one recommending educational programs to promote the assimilation of the foreign-born and another for the maintenance or raising of standards for the selection of immigrants.

From such straws in the wind it would appear that, regardless of what our immigration policy is after the war, the social and economic adjustment of the newcomer will become a more important consideration than it has been in the past. Our experience with refugees in that respect has been, on the whole, most fortunate. We have gained new Americans already geared to the necessity of fighting for a democratic way of life; new Americans who, thanks to the colossal stupidity of the Nazi regime, are rapidly enriching our Nation with the fruits of their skills and their brains. There can be no doubt about the goals these people share in common with the rest of our population. The most immediate one, of course, is to win the war. The other goals are the goals of any democratic people living together harmoniously and striving to give all possible life to the principles of freedom and human decency. Those are the goals that the writer Fredrika Bremer probably had in mind when she wrote:

"The narrow valley widens,
Paths become more numerous,
There shall be room, work,
Light-heartedness, enough for all
Who honestly seek and desire."

Receiving Room of United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle:

RECEIVING ROOM OF UNITED STATES SENATE

In the National Capitol's northeastern part,
And adjoining their guarded retreat,
Is the mem'rable room, rich in picturesque art,
Where the Senators purposely meet
Their constituents when they inquiringly come
To discuss the great problems that weigh
Upon their minds, concerning the war-threatened home
Of the free and the brave of today.

This receiving room owes its American charm
To the tactful Brumidi, whose art
Has inspired proud America to keep a warm
Place for his wonderworks in her heart.
No one ever comes into this room, and looks up
At the colorful scene, so sublime,
Without feeling its pictures fill his hopeful cup
With a gratitude that grows, with time.
Tho Brumidi has long since passed on, still he lives
In his pictures, of national thrift,
As apparently thru them he purposely gives
Aspiration an inspiring lift.
Until Washington fades from America's mind,
And his influence dies in her heart,
And his hopes in oblivion's tomb are enshrined,
Will Brumidi live on, thru his art.
Just as actions speak louder than words, to us all,
Pictures tell more than mere letters can,
As they silently speak from the ceiling or wall
To the subconscious heart of a man,
And implant in his mind such historical truth
As should therein be fixed, firm and fast,
To remain, like the things learned in childhood or youth,
Unforgotten on thru to the last.
That Brumidi was partial to children we know,
From the fact that they predominate
In the most of his Capitol pictures, which grow
On us there, as beneath them we wait;
But, methinks, next to children, he justly admired
Lovely women, as his picture prove,
Whom, with his humble brush, he has richly attired
In a beauty that age can't remove.
At the right of the entrance to this royal room,
Overhead, upon its southern wall,
Three immortal Americans seem to assume
Supervision, there, over it all.
Since Brumidi was such a past master of art,
All Americans ought to take pride
In the wonderful works of his mind and his heart,
Which will, down thru the ages, abide.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Post-War Planning for the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems that confront the country is to plan for post-war employment. The Speaker of the House has been one of the first to recognize the necessity of solving that problem and his public utterances on that subject have caused wide and favorable comment throughout the country. The passage of the resolution by the House for the appointment of a select committee on post-war planning is a further evidence of the recognition of his leadership in preparing for the days that will come after demobilization.

It is particularly gratifying, however, to know that in New York City real efforts are being made in post-war planning. In the Borough of the Bronx, part of which lies within my district, Hon. James J. Lyons, president of the borough, in cooperation with the city planning commission, has developed a $200,000,000 post-war program that will give employment to approximately 40,000 persons for 2 years.

At a public exhibit and discussion held at the Bronx County building on February 8, last, Borough President Lyons made the following statement:

In 1942 the mayor of the city of New York and the city planning commission recommended to the board of estimate and to the city council the approval of a program of public improvements for post-war execution aggregating some three-quarters of a billion dollars. The justification therefor was ably set forth by the mayor, who has been universally commended for his vision in attempting to provide a real barrier against the dangers of mass unemployment immediately following the war. This justification, together with other generalizations, has from time to time appeared in the public press. Today post-war planning in the city of New York is much further advanced than in any comparable political unit in the Nation. New York State has also made provision for a post-war program of public works, but on a much smaller scale than the city of New York. To date the Federal Government has not proceeded very far beyond the stage of congressional discussion.

The approvals which were given by the board of estimate and the city council carried with them the appropriations to prepare the plans and specifications, without which no works program could proceed. These instruments were to be made ready, to the extent of the appropriations granted, within a period of about 2 years.

As a matter of policy city staffs were to be utilized to the fullest extent, but were not to be expanded in order to prevent the unhappy and undesirable necessity for discharging at the end of a year or two large numbers of temporary employees appointed solely for preparation of the plans in question. Such work as could not be performed by existing civil-service personnel was to be contracted for under the direction of the several agencies after investigation and approval by a special committee comprising the comptroller, the director of the budget, and the chief engineer of the board of estimate. This committee, together with the city planning commission and a special scheduling committee consisting of the commissioner of public works, the chief engineer of the board of estimate, and the commissioner of parks, with the latter as chairman, has aided materially in progressing the task to its present stage. The mayor has directed the general considerations of the entire program. His foresight and energy have made possible this unparalleled undertaking.

Exclusive of transportation, water supply, and quasi-public proposals, more than $200,000,000 is involved in the program presently being planned for the Borough of the Bronx. Approximately one-half of this program is being developed under the direction of the president of the Borough of the Bronx.

On the matter of transportation, the mayor in his message of January 5, 1944, to the city council stated:

"I do not recommend any new subways in the coming capital budget. Before opening new sections of our city, it is necessary that we pause for a while and improve, rehabilitate, and reconstruct the vast area of our city now developed and settled. This is no time for new frontiers within the city limits."

Chairman Delaney, of the board of transportation, has recently advised the president of the Borough of the Bronx that the following new post-war projects are the ones deemed most important to the Bronx:

"Subway in Second Avenue, Manhattan.

"Extension of Lenox Avenue local tracks from One Hundred and Sixty-second Street to a connection at One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Street and Eighth Avenue with the branch of the Jerome Avenue line.

"Lengthening of stations on Lexington Avenue line south of Forty-second Street.

"Additional car equipment."

No further information can be supplied at this time on additional transportation facilities.

In addition to the projects actually being processed, the office of the president of the Bronx has been, and is, studying numerous future improvements, aggregating even greater expenditures, the execution of which will require the approval of other city officials and agencies and, in some instances, quasipublic and private institutions and organizations. The justification for this latter planning is to be found in the fact that the development of projects and improvements under the direct supervision of the borough president involves many apparently extraneous factors, envisions both public and private considerations, and requires a comprehensive approach to the development of the community as a whole. Furthermore, regardless of legal limitations as to jurisdiction, the borough president is and has been, since the inception of the office, regarded as a "Great White Father" responsible alike for the good and the bad, as well as the attributes, defects, and omissions, with which the borough may be blessed—or otherwise—be they matters of a public or private nature, common or personal concern.

Highways, parkways, sewerage and sewage disposal, water supply, housing, hospitals, health centers, schools, libraries, parks, recreational areas, police and fire structures, correctional buildings, transportation, and various other improvements are included in those projects for which final plans are progressing toward completion.

A Bronx civic center, a Bronx airport, Bronx helicopter landing fields, shore-front improvements of the Harlem and Bronx Rivers as well as Westchester and Eastchester Creeks, local community centers, shopping and theatrical districts, industrial areas, parking facilities, conversion of depreciated areas into boulevard and new housing sites, railroad, water-front and air-terminal facilities, together with the rezoning of the entire borough, are some of the items which, although not yet advanced to the stage of definite planning, are nonetheless receiving the attention of public officials of the borough who hope for an early approval when studies have been completed and their advancement justified.

Two main considerations underlie the development of the present post-war program of public works for this city and borough: First, the immediate issue of providing against widespread unemployment; and, secondly, the execution of necessary public improvements, the completion of which will provide essential services, increase property values, and improve the social, esthetic, and economic, as well as the physical, features of this great county and borough.

With the close of hostilities will come the demobilization of millions of men and thousands of industries. The effect of this will be felt in the Bronx as well as elsewhere throughout the country. While every effort to make this demobilization gradual will doubtless be undertaken, sight must not be lost of the fact that few will choose to remain in the armed forces longer than the restraining hand of compulsion decrees. Public opinion and congressional action will undoubtedly insist that men in the armed forces be not so held longer than necessary, and in no event so long that civilians who have made no sacrifices comparable to those of the military personnel will have possessed themselves of most of the available and attractive opportunities that will follow the coming of peace. Industries will likewise have to turn their attention to peacetime endeavors at the earliest opportunity. Under any circumstances, the opportunity for employment must be provided; and while the hope and prospect for private endeavor are great, there will unquestionably be a period between the end of the war and full industrial activity that cannot be overlooked. It will be the obligation of Government to provide the opportunity for widespread employment, or else.

With adequate cooperation upon the part of Federal, State, and local governments, and the necessary collaboration from the mayor, the board of estimate, the city planning commission, the controller, the budget director, the commissioner of parks, and other involved agencies, the program in the Bronx can be sufficiently developed to have ready within a year to a year and a half of this date a reservoir of plans adequate to provide through contract execution employment for approximately 40,000 persons for a period of 2 years.

At the moment the greatest problem confronting the office of the president of the Borough of the Bronx is the lack of personnel qualified to perform the work involved in the preparation of the essential plans, designs, and specifications. The existing available staff of this office, greatly depleted by the absence of many in the armed forces and in special technical war work, is today considerably less than at any time since the formation of Greater New York. Men skilled in the design of sanitary projects are not available at the salaries offered by the city of New York. This is to a lesser degree the case in the matter of persons experienced in such practice as skew arch and rigid frame design. The small staff presently engaged in this work is rendering unusual service in order to produce results. Plans for a considerable number of the projects listed herein are presently being prepared, under the direction of the office of borough president, by recognized private engineering firms whose qualifications have been approved and whose services have been contracted for. To Commissioner Arthur V. Sheridan, Chief Engineer Thomas B. Dyer, and those members of the engineering staff who have planned, directed, and executed the program to date, a word of commendation and appreciation is in order.

The line of demarcation between necessity and desirability is not easily defined or agreed upon. It is believed however that all the proposals herein referred to are or will be essential to the future growth and maintenance of the Borough of the Bronx.

There are numerous other thoughts, ideas, and proposals that might be noted but any further consideration at this time would but serve to confuse and perhaps make more difficult a consensus.

Of great concern as well as interest is the development of a program whereby the intentions and requirements of private industry can be made available. Public improvements contemplate the needs of such industry but without knowledge of the intentions of, or collaboration from, those engaged in busines and commerce, public planning cannot give full expression to the influences that should be exercised by such factors of community life. Herein lies a responsibility as well as an opportunity for private endeavor.

It is the hope and expectation of public officials that Federal funds will be forthcoming for the execution of the major portion of this program. An appropriation of one-quarter of that required annually for the conduct of the war would provide ample funds for a Nation-wide public-works program. There will probably be made available some financial assistance from the State. The remainder of the financing will have to be borne by the city through its various forms of raising revenue for public improvements.

In conclusion it is perhaps pertinent to direct attention to the fact that the program here discussed serves but to illustrate the scope and magnitude of the problems that continually confront public officials entrusted with responsibility for the conduct of municipal government. Social services, economic stability, recreation, public safety, justice, education, and many other objectives and endeavors are vital factors in the welfare of community life, but it must be borne in mind that all depend for their operation upon the presence of the physical provisions without which none of them could function. Water supply, sanitation, facilities for locomotion, shelter, and other elemental requirements for the maintenance of human life must precede the development and expansion of other endeavors. Before the amenities and urbanities must come the necessities of life. It is hoped that this program will provide increased opportunities for increased aspirations, as well as greater opportunities for the people of the Borough of the Bronx.

Passing the Tax Bill Over the President's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to give the House my views on the President's veto message before the vote this afternoon, but the many splendid addresses yesterday, in both Houses, exposed the unsoundness and viciousness of this veto, and made any further analysis from me seem redundant. It is most significant that the most scathing and penetrating attacks on the veto came from men who had been up to that moment stanch supporters of this administration. It has been well said that when day before yesterday, February 22, the House heard Washington's Farewell Address, and the President's veto message, we were listening to the farewell addresses of two Presidents. The House wisely decided to proceed to a vote on the veto today without further debate, and none was needed.

When I was asked by the papers where I stood on the veto, I gave out the following statement: "There are things I don't like about this tax bill, but I'm voting for it because we must have money to run the Government in wartime. Nobody likes taxes, but it is a cheap, political trick to vote against a general revenue bill and expect others to vote the necessary revenues, and this veto was that kind of cheap, political trick." I still feel the same way.

Now, the historic vote has been taken. Congress has upheld its constitutional power of the purse, a power gained by elected representatives of the people through centuries of struggle with would-be absolute rulers and a power that could be lost overnight through refusal to accept the responsibility that

goes with it. By a vote of 299 to 95, the House of Representatives has gone ahead with financing the war. The needless, baseless charges in the veto have all been answered. Congress has had the courage to add to the tax burden of the people in wartime, in an election year. The President lacked this courage, although his excuse was that the new burden was too light. To call a tax increase of $2,300,000,000 a mere crust, instead of a loaf—to say that takes "crust." To say that this is "a tax-relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy" is, as Senator BARKLEY said, "a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress." This is an insult not only to our integrity, but to our intelligence when we remember the words of Candidate Roosevelt in 1932, "Taxes are paid by the sweat of everyone who toils."

On this same afternoon, after passing the general revenue bill over the veto, this House has continued the life of the much-needed Commodity Credit Corporation, after the President killed it with a veto, because he did not like a part of the bill that forbade consumers' subsidies. Thus, twice in 1 day Congress has upheld two sound principles of free government. First, that the functions of government must go on in spite of a petulant, domineering Executive, who insists upon having his way at the risk of wrecking the Government, who would rule or ruin. Second, government by insult and falsehood will not work in our Republic.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I have received from Mr. Donald C. Butcher, of Freehold, N. J., a constituent of mine. This letter was written by Mr. Butcher when he heard of the President's veto of the revenue bill and his fine, patriotic, American ideals moved him to write me the way he did.

He expresses the thoughts in many minds today and depicts the sentiments of true Americans all over the country who are fearful that constitutional Government will be undermined by Executive intrusion.

I trust this letter will be widely read and its sentiments well digested.

FREEHOLD, N. J., *February 23, 1944.*

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congressman from New Jersey,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN AUCHINCLOSS: Some of us had hoped that the administration would consider the will of the people as clearly indicated by the last election. The veto by the President of the tax bill is another indication that the will of the people receives very little consideration. The voters by their ballots very definitely expressed their displeasure with the New Deal policies, and you and many other of our Representatives have faithfully attempted to carry through the mandates of the public. We now see demonstrated with the vetoes such as the veto of the tax bill, the executive branch of the Government in the person of the President again attempting to strip both Houses of Congress of its powers by assuming the power of legislation and throwing back to Congress these vetoes requiring two-thirds majority, rather than have the executive branch subordinate its will to that of the legislative branch of our Government as should be.

Month after month we the people are being criticized and spanked by the administration. We are very unpatriotic if we even think of politics during this war. This privilege remains only with the President, 130,000,000 of us should not raise our voice in criticism of the New Deal while the Vice President includes us all under the category of Fascists. We are not permitted to travel by automobile and told it is unpatriotic to travel by any other means. So we stay at home and struggle with a damn fool tax report while the Secretary of War in this crisis vacations in Cuba, and Mr. Morgenthau enjoys a heart attack (the public has long since come to the conclusion he has no heart) and basks in the sun of Miami, while we clean up one tax report for March getting ready for another one in April.

I thoroughly agree with the administration in their criticism of the rest of us whose sons are fighting this war and whose lives have been cheered a little by the thought that Germany might be defeated this year; yes, we should be spanked considering we were told this before Christmas by the President and the Vice President and also by Secretary Hull, and the President is thoroughly justified in telling us that we should know better than to believe anything he tells us. We should remember his original campaign statements that he was going to balance the budget, that no American boy would ever again fight on foreign soil, that multiplicity and duplications of Government bureaus as established by President Hoover would be eliminated. I wish that you could sit in an American home and see some of the reactions and crack-up in morale such as last night with my son's mother when the administration let forth their blast at us for even believing them in the promise that the war with Germany would probably be over this year.

Yes, I know that you, as was Senator Barbour, are a stanch believer in our democratic form of government and I do not have to ask you to vote down this veto, but I hope you will lend your efforts in getting across to some of these other Representatives who oppose this bill that, as a matter of principle more than the tax money involved, the American people demand that both Houses of Congress again take over the reins of Government.

Very truly yours,

DONALD C. BUTCHER.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Perth Amboy, N. J., February 3, 1944.

To the Girls and Boys, Grades 7 to 12,
Perth Amboy Public Schools:

February 20-26, 1944 is to be brotherhood week in every part of the United States. This is the annual observance of brotherhood week. The purpose of brotherhood week is that its observance shall serve as a reminder and as a dedication. It is a reminder of the bases on which our American Government and our representative democracy were founded. It is a reminder of the basic faith of those who wrote and adopted the American Declaration of Independence and of those who wrote and adopted the Constitution of the United States of America. That faith is freedom of worship, the right of every person to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It is the faith that in this country although people may be of different religions and different races their rights as citizens are equal rights, and that their obligations and duties to the flag and to the republic for which it stands are equal obligations and duties.

The observance of brotherhood week dedicates us to the proposition that in the United States the welfare of the Nation and the welfare of the individual depend upon the practice of justice for all groups and for all individuals without regard to race or religion. It dedicates us to the idea that freedom for all of us depends upon the practice of the principles of justice and equality. It dedicates us to the hard and true fact that to deny the rights of freedom and equality to a minority group because of race or religion leads surely to the loss of the rights of freedom and equality by all the people. That is what happened in Germany as a result of the persecution of the Jews. First there was the denial of the rights of the Jews. Next the Jews were persecuted. Then the rights of organized Christians were done away with. Next the rights and the freedom of all the German people were abolished and Hitler became dictator.

Many of you have brothers in the armed forces of the United States. All of you know young men who a short time ago were high-school boys and who now wear the uniforms of Uncle Sam on the land, on the sea, and in the air. These men are of different religious faiths. They come from many different racial and nationalistic backgrounds. But they are Americans all. They are members of the brotherhood of free Americans. In this war they live and fight as Americans.

It is a principle of American Government and American freedom that freedom and liberty within the framework of our Government must be freedom and liberty for all without special handicaps or special privileges for any group. If we believe in America we must believe that race, color, or religion must not be allowed to be a reason for discrimination against anyone or any group.

We know that in Germany discrimination and persecution of the Jews was responsible for and led directly to persecution of all organized Christianity, Protestant and Catholic, and finally to the elimination of all freedom, and to the persecution and killing of all who raised their voices against oppression and in favor of freedom.

The girls and boys now in the upper school years all over this country will have a great deal to do in helping to solve the great political, economic, and industrial problems that will demand solution in the decade following the close of the war. You are familiar with the Bill of Rights. The rights of individuals and of groups are guaranteed and protected under the Constitution. There are individuals and groups that insist upon their rights but who fail to recognize the important fact that every right has its corresponding obligation and duty. The welfare of our country and the permanence of our form of government depend not only upon the protection

of the rights of all the people but also upon the willingness of individuals and groups to fulfill their own obligations and duties in respecting the rights of others. The test of good citizenship is not insistence upon one's own rights. The test of good citizenship is the degree of our concern that the rights of others shall be preserved.

The splendid spirit of fellowship and good will existing among the students in the Perth Amboy schools is a thing of great value. It is the spirit of America at its best. It is a part of the American tradition and the American way of life founded upon the principles and ideals of justice, freedom, and equality, which have preserved us a nation since the days of George Washington. In trying to be true to those principles and ideals now and in the years that lie ahead you will find your greatest help in your religion whether you are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. McGINNIS,
Superintendent of Schools,
Perth Amboy, N. J.

Congress and the President—There Must Be Unity in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of February 24, 1944:

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT—THERE MUST BE UNITY IN WAR

President Roosevelt's veto of the tax bill—the first such Presidential veto in half a century—brings to a climax the long-continuing deadlock between the Executive and Congress.

We are not going to join those ever ready to mourn at what they call "the bier of democracy." We do not believe for an instant this conflict means the end of representative government or paralysis of our war effort or a break-down of our constitutional system.

But all of us should, as intelligent American citizens, recognize the seriousness of the situation. We cannot afford to be Pollyannas about what is now going on along the Potomac.

As for the veto itself:

The Record has never been convinced that the administration had proved its case for the need for $10,500,000,000 additional revenue. We thought the bill passed by Congress providing for $2,325,000,000 new revenue was about the most the country's economy could stand at present.

We still think the need for $10,500,000,000 unproved.

But we recognize the President's political courage in vetoing the measure and standing by his guns.

And we wholly approve of the President's attack on the smart little jokers that have been sneaked into the bill to butter up special interests.

Here we must confess to an error of omission. This newspaper, along with all others throughout the country, failed to spot many of the special-privilege features pointed out by the President.

The President is right in objecting to weakening of renegotiation by providing for appeals to tax courts and setting December 31 of this year as the end of renegotiation. He is right in opposing special favors for certain mine owners, for the lumber interests, for natural gas pipe lines, for commercial air lines, for bondholders of corporations reorganized in bankruptcy.

The President is right, too, in blaming Congress for income tax complexity.

The President said a lot of things that needed to be said.

As for the broader implications in the conflict between the Executive and the legislative branch of our Government:

The rift is deep, and it has been growing.

Just how deep is shown dramatically by the strong protest against the President's veto delivered by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY as he resigned as Democratic leader of the Senate.

Senator BARKLEY, a stanch New Dealer, has held that post for 7 years. He has fought the administration's fight on all major issues. He has not succeeded too well. Perhaps someone else could do a better job of bringing the President and Congress together. But the chances are BARKLEY will be reelected today, thus making his resignation a sort of political gesture rather than a complete change of course on his part.

We do not believe that Congress should be a perpetual rubber stamp for the President. Neither should it be a perpetual road block on the way to victory on the home front.

In his new book, The Republic, Charles A. Beard rightly says: "The framers of the Constitution expected that Congress should be the dominant branch. They sought to establish a strong executive, but, reasoning from past experience in America, they assumed the supremacy of the legislature."

It was assumed, too, that Congress, particularly the House, would be closer to the people than any President possibly could be. That is not true today.

The President better represents the people on such issues as votes for soldiers, consumer subsidies, even taxes, than a Congress more dominated by blocs and special interests than at any time since Hoover.

Perhaps, as a means of improving relations, Congress might grant the President the power of item veto he asked for 6 years ago. That would permit him, for instance, to veto the objectionable parts of the tax bill while approving increases in excise taxes.

Certainly, the two great branches of our democratic government must find a way to achieve that unity of purpose we must have. Failure to attain it won't lose the war. But it can delay victory and cost thousands of lives.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem from the Stars and Stripes in England, January 28, 1944:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

My Uncle Sam said, See here, Joe,
I know you're earnin' lots of dough,
A workin' on the farm all day
To make the harvest really pay;
But now I need you for a fight
To fix things up and make 'em right,
So men can work an' live an' pray
In what we call the U. S. way.
So I an' millions left for war
To finish off this newest chore.
Yet while we're gone, it's in the mill,
A few at home are out to kill
Our right to exercise franchise
Through politics and even lies
Designed to keep us from the polls.
Though votin's done from deep fox holes.
But we have beaten super-Huns
With bayonets and planes and guns.
We've beaten, too, the tricky Japs
Who thought all Yanks were braggin' saps.
These victories none can deny,
Though each in turn caused some to die.
An' G. I.'s we will never fail
No matter where the troop ships sail.
All liberties we will defend
At home, abroad, until the end.
Then we will beat the rats who say
You cannot vote election day.

—*E. M. L.*

Germans Meet Poles Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times concerning the Polish situation and the valiant fight the Poles are making on the various fronts with the Allied forces:

GERMANS MEET POLES AGAIN

News that the Second Polish Corps has gone into front-line action against the Germans in Italy is more than a reminder that the Allied Army moving on Europe is really an international expeditionary force, composed of elements from 17 nations. This in itself puts into high relief the character of the war against the Nazis. It is easy to forget, especially in the great military crises when the accent is all on strength of arms, that the Allied Army fighting Hitler is not merely a Russian, British, and American Army. It is an army of many nations, literally a people's army. And while this diversity creates some minor problems of liaison and replacement, it spells out the true meaning of this struggle in letters everybody can read. It is a popular rising against the mastery of the world, or any continental segment of it, by any one power; and there will be no victory, and no peace, while the threat of domination persists.

The sight of Polish regiments fighting their way back to Poland on the battlefields of Italy makes the meaning even clearer. It is like a searchlight that lights up the long Odyssey of the war and reveals the pyrrhic quality of the German conquests. These Polish soldiers are commanded by the almost legendary General Anders, released by the Soviet Government to organize the Polish prisoners when Russia entered the war. Some of them fought at the gates of Warsaw. They stood on the Riga line and the Curzon line, unmindful which was which, concerned only to drive back the German invaders. Some come from Siberia, some have escaped from occupied Poland, others are Poles living abroad who have gathered from the ends of the earth to redeem their country and avenge the fate of their people. Molded into a new army in Iran and Iraq, they are fighting the Germans again at the gates of Rome.

The Poles in Italy are fighting their way home. They have still a long way to go, but every man in the ranks is convinced that he is on the last lap of the road back. They

cannot be expected to forget, and the world will remember, that Poland was the first nation that stood up to Hitler and put an end to his arrogant plan of bloodless conquest. For that act of reckless defiance, so stubbornly maintained that the Germans have never found a Quisling in Poland, they have suffered longer and more bitterly than any other occupied country.

Now the Germans are meeting them again on the battlefield, the sign that from the fall of Warsaw to the siege of Rome they have really conquered nothing. But it is also a sign that a "strong and independent Poland" is a necessity of the peace. For what defeated Hitler in the first place was the resistance of the nations he tried to conquer and absorb. The great powers would be helpless against him if he had succeeded in alining the small nations on his side. The concern of democratic peoples in the Russian-Polish dispute springs not only from their sense of obligation to restore the freedom of Poland but from a deep conviction that nations are undefeatable and indigestible, and that attempts to decide their fate without their consent imperils the future security of the world.

Shall Democracy Die? 1944 Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 11, 1944, issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Chattanooga, Tenn.:

SHALL DEMOCRACY DIE? 1944 ISSUE

Backing up his assertion that "a fourth term for President Roosevelt would destroy our constitutional government" with a wealth of facts and personality background, Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL gave to Chattanoogans in an interview yesterday and an address last night a vivid picture of the processes at Wr. hington that are undermining to its fall the American form of government.

One could not listen to the crusading Congressman without feeling that a vote for Frankiin D. Roosevelt next November will be a vote to discard democracy, as America has known democracy, and substitute therefor a socialistic form looking and leading toward a dictatorship. Millions of sincere Democrats who are following the President because of loyalty to the party label need to take warning and think of freedom before party.

Few New Deal supporters are willing to face the plain mathematical facts as Representative ENGEL gave them in his Lincoln dinner speech. The inescapable truth is that the President's financial system, even in peacetime, instead of being the economy he promised in 1932, is an extravagance that must certainly bring on national bankruptcy. When a firm goes bankrupt, as has been often said, a receiver is named; the receiver for a bankrupt nation is and must be a dictator. When the national debt rises to more than four times the national wealth, no expert in economics is needed to envision whither we are headed. Hence, even without regard to the dreamers who surround Mr. Roosevelt or even if the President should try to turn conservative, the system of spending he has forced on the country means socialism and dictatorship soon, because the bill is greater than the debtor, which is private ownership, can pay.

In 1932, as Mr. ENGEL effectively pointed out, three party platforms were adopted—namely, Republican, Democratic, and Socialist. The first named went down in defeat. The second won at the polls but was discarded almost in its entirety by the candidate who was supposed to stand upon it and was elected. The third, the Socialist platform, then was taken over and put into effect by the allegedly Democratic victor. Compare the planks of that Norman Thomas platform with what Mr. Roosevelt has done and you cannot but admit that the Roosevelt program glaringly violated the Democratic promises and adopted the Norman Thomas ideas almost in their entirety. The fundamental planks in the Democratic campaign buncombe were a reduction of the number of bureaus at Washington and an end of Mr. Hoover's "wild spending" in a balanced budget with expenses of the Government reduced by not less than 25 percent. Never was there such another flagrant breach of faith with the American people as what Mr. Roosevelt actually did.

Mr. ENGEL'S details of New Deal bungling as evidenced in unbalanced wage scales, in its futile tax program and many other sectors covered familiar territory but with more first-hand vividness than has been heard here previously. His visit was a distinct contribution to launching the 1944 Republican campaign in this area with a victory impetus.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1944.*

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

I appeal to you to vote to sustain the President's veto of tax bill H. R. 3687. This bill is particularly objectionable to labor because it freezes social-security deductions and eliminates earned-income credits. The income provided to the Government by this bill is inadequate. The reasons assigned in President's message for his veto of this tax measure are sound and unanswerable. His veto should be sustained.

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Cutthroat Competition Reported in a Market of Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Care Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Major companies in St. Louis are quoting 33⅓ to small dealers and commercial accounts. Also some independents apparently financed by majors are doing same thing. Looks like a deliberate attempt to disturb price market at a time when it is utterly uncalled for to force the recapper at no profit while his taxes, labor, and overhead are still high. We think this should be given attention.

COMMUNITY TIRE SERVICE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Care Washington Hotel:

Major companies here in St. Louis quoting 33⅓ off list to small dealers and filling stations. Also a few independents closely associated with majors doing same thing. Other independents getting jittery for fear they will have to follow suit or lose out. No reason for price cutting with all costs remaining high. Looks as though majors are cutting price to get independents to follow suit, and when they do the majors will cut again, and independents will soon be cut of the picture.

BECKER VULCANIZING SHOP.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Care Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Majors cutting discount to 33⅓ off list to dealers and filling stations. Some independents financed by majors doing same. Other independents getting jittery. Looks as though majors are trying to start price war and break independents. Pure folly to cut discounts with operating price remaining high.

GENERAL TIRE CO. OF ST. LOUIS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE BURGER,
Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Destructive price cutting by the major rubber companies up to 33⅓ on recapping is having a disastrous effect on independent dealers here. If the shortage of camelback for the independent dealer along with this price cutting continues much longer there will be no independent recappers here.

R. W. FILKEY,
Chairman, Independent Recappers of St. Louis.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Care Washington Hotel:

St. Louis major companies quoting 33⅓ and more to small dealers and filling stations on recapping also are some independents financed by majors looks like an attempt to push independent recappers into a no-profit basis when taxes, labor, and operating costs are still high. This should be given attention on behalf of small business.

FROESELS VULCANIZING CO.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Majors cutting discount to 33⅓ to small dealers and filling stations some independents sponsored by majors doing same other independents getting jittery. Pure folly to cut discounts when operating costs remain as high or higher. Looks like majors are trying to force a price war and break independent shops.

CRADER TIRE CO.
ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 22, 1944.*
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Majors cutting discount to 33⅓ to dealers and filling stations some independents following suit. Others getting jittery. Pure folly to cut discounts when operating expenses remain as high or higher. Looks like majors are trying to force a price war and break independent shops.

BUCK LEE TIRE CO.

Revolt in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 24, 1944:

REVOLT IN CONGRESS

The tone even more than the fact of Mr. Roosevelt's veto of the tax bill has precipitated a crisis in the relations between the President and Congress. It has led to the resignation of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, who, in his own words, has "carried the flag of the administration" for the past 7 years as majority leader of the Senate. The President's unjustified charge that the tax bill is "a tax-relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy" has provoked from Senator BARKLEY the retort that the veto itself is a "deliberate and calculated assault upon the honesty and integrity of every Member of the Legislature of the United States." The accusations in the President's veto were an obvious blunder; the President in his telegram to Senator BARKLEY has wisely recognized how essential it is for the sake of collaboration with the legislative branch to repair that blunder.

The more the President's veto message is studied, indeed, the more extraordinary does it become. In it he does not merely veto 6 to 8 months' work of his own party leaders in Congress. He vetoes also, as regards the freezing of the social security levy, his own Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Morgenthau agreed that under the requirements of the Social Security System itself no increase in pay-roll taxes would be necessary in 1944. But the President's veto goes even further than this. It repudiates even the President's own record. In his present veto message Mr. Roosevelt declares:

"The Ruml plan was not the product of this administration. It resulted from a widespread campaign based on the attractive slogan of 'pay as you go.' But, as was said many years ago in the State of New York in regard to that same slogan, 'You don't pay and you don't go.'"

But it was Mr. Roosevelt himself who said in his Budget message to Congress on January 11, 1943: "It is more important than ever before * * * to put our taxes as far as feasible on a pay-as-you-go basis." Mr. Roosevelt repeated this recommendation at several press conferences.

The President's veto of the tax bill is justified neither in tone nor in substance. The tax bill, it is true, is inadequate in the amount of revenue it would raise. The President would therefore have been justified, perhaps, in allowing it to become law without his signature, or at least in asking Congress to supplement it as soon as possible with larger revenues. But as it is, the President, ostensibly asking for additional revenues of $10,500,000,000, throws out a bill that would have raised additional revenues of $2,300,000,000. This is surely rejecting the real substance for the sake of a doubtful shadow.

This is treating very lightly a sum greatly in excess of the total annual revenues from the individual income tax as late as 1941. The President must know, as a practical matter, that if Congress fails to pass this bill over his veto the result is most likely to be, not to force Congress to pass a larger tax bill in accordance with his wishes, but merely to deprive the Treasury of the sum that the bill would have provided.

Oddly enough, while the President in his veto message asks for an enormously greater sum than the Congress bill would raise, he does not hesitate at the same time to recommend again the abandonment of the Victory tax and the consequent dropping of 9,000,000 income taxpayers from the tax rolls. It is important that the Victory tax be merged with the general income tax; but this need not be at the cost of a wholesale tax exemption—an exemption that would be wholly inconsistent with a more drastic tax policy.

The veto message underlines once more other strange inconsistencies in the President's tax policy. He has opposed even a moderate general retail sales tax on the ground that it will press too heavily on low-income families. Yet if his veto is sustained, he will be doubling a flat tax on wage and salary earners getting $3,000 a year or less. This pay roll tax is in effect an income tax without exemptions. How the President can reconcile such an additional tax with flat opposition to a general sales tax at any level whatever is difficult to understand.

The President has never thought through the question finally of what his own tax responsibilities are. On March 12, 1943, when asked at a press conference to comment on the Ruml plan, he specifically said that he did not think he could, because taxes are squarely a Congressional function. At a later press conference, asked his opinion on which pay-as-you-go bill he would favor, he replied that he had made it plain that he was not drawing tax legislation. In the present case, however, the President has allowed Congress, including his own party leaders, to spend months of precious time over a tax bill only to step in at the last moment to repudiate their work.

Congress should override the President's veto and enact the tax bill into law.

The President's Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I shall be able to furnish additional concrete information removing, in my opinion, any doubt as to the justification of the action of the House in overriding the Presidential veto of the tax bill.

The President stated:

Many months ago, after careful examination of the finances of the Nation, I asked the Congress for legislation to raise ten and one-half billion dollars over and above the existing revenue system.

Let us trace the background of, and circumstances surrounding, this request. It will be recalled, no doubt, that in his Budget message of January 1943 the President asked the Congress to raise $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue in the form of taxes, savings, or both. At the same time, the Bureau of the Budget estimated that the deficit for the fiscal year 1944 would amount to $71,000,000,000. Primarily as a result of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, enacted June 9, 1943, the estimate of the fiscal year 1944 deficit was reduced by over $5,000,000,000 when the Budget Bureau revised its estimate on August 1, 1943. About this time, Secretary Morgenthau was talking in terms of $12,000,000,000 of additional revenue, and when he appeared before our committee he asked for ten and one-half billions in the name of the administration.

During the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, it was announced that the War Department had returned $13,000,000,000, representing funds that it did not intend to use for the purposes for which it was originally provided, and the day before the hearings began in the Senate Finance Committee, the Budget Bureau announced that it had again reduced its estimate of the fiscal year 1944 deficit—this time by $11,000,000,000. A short time later, it was announced that the funds returned by the War and Navy Departments had reached the total of $27,000,000,000. In view of these facts, it is small wonder that the Congress concluded that the revenue needs, in proportion to expenditures, had been exaggerated.

On the question of the revenue yield of the bill, the President stated:

The measure before me purports to increase the national revenue by a little over $2,000,000,000. Actually, however, the bill in its net results will enrich the Treasury by less than $1,000,000,000.

In this connection, I hold in my hand what "purports" to be the official estimates of the Treasury Department on the bill. I read from this tabulation:

Net yield, general and special accounts, $2,194,400,000.

This figure is followed by the footnote numeral 10, and the footnote is as follows:

Excludes the effect of freezing the tax rates of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, since these funds would have to be automatically appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

It is a queer sort of tax relief bill which raises, by the Treasury's own estimates, $2,194,000,000 of additional revenue. The President spoke of "relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least $150,000,000 and possibly much more." On the basis of the Treasury's figures before me, it is difficult to know how the President arrives at this figure. If the Treasury estimates have been properly made, any recurring losses of revenue must certainly have been deducted before arriving at the net yield of the bill. I have been able to locate only one-half of the sum mentioned by the President and that in footnote 2 of the Treasury's table which reads:

Estimated nonrecurring refunds of $75,000,000, resulting from the bill as agreed upon in conference, are not shown.

Another footnote indicates that nonrecurring revenue in the amount of $63,000,000 from the floor stocks tax on alcoholic beverages is omitted from the estimates. The net result of these two omissions is that the Treasury's final figure should be reduced by only $12,000,000, or to $2,182,000,000, to arrive at the over-all net yield, considering both recurring and nonrecurring losses and gains.

The President claims that freezing of the social-security tax rates represents a loss of revenue to the Government. Properly, the Treasury Department has never included social-security tax receipts in its general revenue total, and such receipts do not enter into the determination of the Federal deficit. In analyzing the yield of the tax bill, why should the President take liberties with the form of accounting employed for years by the Treasury Department? Why should he attempt to nullify the intent of the Social Security Act in this respect?

Next, the President took up the provisions relating to the renegotiation of war contracts and complained of the termination date established in the act. Of course, no one knows when the war will end, but everyone should know that the procurement agencies have by now certainly acquired sufficient knowledge of negotiation of contracts to avoid excessive profits. Should the renegotiation provisions be necessary on or after June 30, 1945, beyond which they may not be effective under the bill, the Congress can renew them.

With respect to the formal right of appeal to The Tax Court, the President stated:

> The present Tax Court exists for a wholly different purpose and does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

The Tax Court has jurisdiction over Federal income, estate, and gift taxes. It, therefore, determines what profits shall be retained by taxpayers. Our committee was advised by members of the court that they are now performing work similar to that involved in the renegotiation statute. On the question of the volume of work of The Tax Court, the docket of the court is in a much better condition than it has ever been, and, from the information received from members of the court, there will be no difficulty in handling the extra work.

The President complained of "special provisions" granted in the tax bill. Among these were provisions which will enable hundreds of small businesses to emerge from bankruptcy and provide employment during the post-war period. The bill places such businesses upon the same basis as railroads, a similar basic treatment for which was approved by the President in the Revenue Act of 1942.

The percentage depletion allowances for minerals, whose production needs to be stimulated as a part of the war program, are complained of by the President. Many of these minerals would not be produced if depletion allowances were not granted. The President's objections are evidently based upon the worn-out arguments advanced by the Treasury against any depletion allowances regardless of merit.

The provisions permitting income from the cutting of timber to be treated as a capital gain rather than as ordinary income merely grant to owners of timber property who wish to cut their own timber the same privileges which can be obtained under present law only if the owner disposes of his entire tract to another person who will do the cutting. Why should not thousands of farmers who own timberland be encouraged to retain their property and protect forest growth by doing their own selective cutting? The Congress intended that they be permitted to do so and that the discrimination should be removed.

The President has apparently been misinformed on the effect of provisions relating to natural-gas pipe lines. It appears that he has been led to believe that such companies are entirely exempt from the excess-profits tax. This is not true. A reading of the bill will disclose that only one-half of the excess production over the normal period is exempt. The relief is similar to that granted coal and iron companies under the Revenue Act of 1942, when it is considered that transportation facilities are an integral part of the production of natural gas. The President approved the extension of this treatment to coal and iron companies.

The provisions relating to commercial air lines, to which the President objects, merely give effect to the subsidy exemption already granted by the Congress in the Revenue Act of 1940, which was approved by the President. Due to a technical wording of the law, the full benefit of this subsidy was denied to a corporation which had an unused excess profits credit carry-over from a prior year. This action does not extend a subsidy, it only makes effective a subsidy already granted and approved by the President in the 1940 act. In view of the development in air transportation desired after the war, there appears to be more than sufficient justification for this provision.

In regard to the pay-as-you-go legislation passed by the Congress last summer, it has already been made clear that the President had opportunity to veto that legislation, and that simpler provisions for the transition period would have been adopted if the Congress had had the cooperation of the Treasury Department. The President blames the Congress for the complication of the income-tax forms with which taxpayers are currently struggling. Everyone knows that these forms are prepared in the Treasury Department and not by the Congress. If the policy back of the forms and the law is complicated, as it is, that is a result of compromises which have been made in the face of strong Treasury opposition to the policies favored by Congress.

As for the suggestion for withholding of individual income taxes at graduated rates, I recall that some mention of this was made by representatives of the Treasury Department before our committee, but the proposal was still in a very nebulous state, and it was thought by all, including the Treasury representatives, that the matter should be studied further in connection with the next tax bill, and should not be included in this bill.

The President spoke of delays by the Congress in framing tax legislation. Perhaps he does not know that work by the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill was delayed several weeks at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury so as not to interfere with his Savings bond drive.

This controversy should convince all concerned of the necessity for limiting revenue bills to the actual needs of the Treasury and for not using such measures as vehicles for social reforms or political issues wholly unrelated to taxation.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Dangerous Drift, Congress and the Soldiers' Vote," by Loren E. Souers, in the Canton (Ohio) Repository of February 3, 1944.

Mr. Souers is a profound lawyer and a successful businessman. He points out in this article how dangerous it would be to set aside the Constitution, our basic law, for expediency. Every person, in Congress and out, wants to give the fighting man the right to vote. He has, in fact, a right to the same complete, safeguarded, constitutional ballot which we at home shall cast.

The so-called Federal bobtailed ballot is not only unconstitutional but would deny the serviceman even the names of the three or four candidates for whom he could vote. It would, likewise, deny him any voice whatever in State, county, and city elections. It would not be even a half vote and would do violence to the Constitution and the election laws of every State in the Union.

I am convinced that the States can revise their election laws to give the soldiers a full, complete, legal, and constitutional ballot.

The article follows:

DANGEROUS DRIFT—CONGRESS AND THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

(By Loren E. Souers)

The controversy which has been raging in and out of Congress as to voting by men of the armed services in the election next fall, has reached a stage during the past week which presents the gravest threat to our system of constitutional government since the Civil War.

A determination is apparent, on the part of advocates of Federal conduct of the election in the Army and Navy, under the insidious guise of enabling the servicemen to vote, to effect a revolution in our political system of the most far-reaching conse-

quences, involving a deliberate disregard of constitutional limitations of the power of the Federal Government and the virtual destruction of the States as sovereign political units within their proper sphere.

If, upon the pretense of an emergency, the Constitution of the United States, which distributes the powers of government between the Union and the States, can be ignored or suspended by Congress and the President at will, on one occasion, then there can no longer be any limit beyond which they cannot go; and if an emergency is thought to be needed as an excuse, no one can doubt that one can always be found.

Undoubtedly the great majority of our people are entirely confused about the issue involved in this controversy, which is not at all whether the men of the armed services shall be given the best practicable opportunity to vote, but whether the Federal Government shall be made completely supreme over the States, so that all rights, liberties, and activities of the people of every part of the Union shall be subjected to the policies, whims, and even tyrannies of a central government.

The very purpose of preserving the States under the Constitution when it was adopted and reserving to them powers denied to the Federal Union was to keep government as close as possible to the people, to give the people of each State the means of expressing their own will as to questions particularly affecting them, and to prevent sectional domination of the whole Nation so far as could be done.

Necessarily this required independence of the States in the matter of the selection of their Senators and Representatives in Congress, and in the exertion of their proportionate influence in the election of a President. This independent power of the States would be nullified in principle and fact by any control of the national election by the Federal Government, which, as to the election of the President is entirely forbidden by the Constitution, while the power of Congress to control the processes of election of Senators and Representatives is very limited, though not wholly prohibited.

Everyone wishes the soldiers and sailors to vote, so far as is possible, without unreasonably delaying and complicating the election process. I wish my own sons to vote; and in the elections of 1942 and 1943 they both did vote, though absent with the Army. Indeed, in 1943 one of them voted from Africa, proving that the great majority of our boys, if they and their friends at home are sufficiently anxious for them to do so, can vote even under present State laws, though I admit diligence and careful timing contributed to the arrival of my son's vote in time last fall and under present regulations many would not be able or sufficiently informed to accomplish a like result. Reasonable remedies for that condition I will suggest later.

But, important as it is that soldiers and sailors have a full opportunity to vote in this coming election, even that is not important enough to justify the nullification of the Constitution, which is the charter of the liberties of these same boys, for which they are fighting. Voting in one election cannot be worth that price—especially when it is clearly unnecessary to pay such a price.

It is assumed by most people that the right to vote derives from the Federal Government. In fact the right to vote is not and never was given by the Federal Government, but by the States. The only control which the Federal Government constitutionally exercises over the right of the citizen to vote is negative: The States are forbidden by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments to deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex. Subject to those negative limitations, the power of each State to determine which of its citizens may vote is absolute, so long as no arbitrary discrimination is made by the laws of the State, as between citizens similarly situated.

This principle of State power to decide who may vote is so firmly and clearly established that it required a great civil war and four amendments of the Constitution (the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth) to take away the power of States even to deny the vote to Negroes and to women.

What, then, are the powers of Congress as to the election of the President and of Senators and Representatives in Congress? They are very limited. Congress may not determine who is eligible to vote, nor impose or remove any limitations or conditions of the right to vote, adopted by the several States, except that any attempt to deny the right to vote to colored citizens or women is void.

The provisions of the Constitution as to election of the President and of Senators and Representatives, are very different, and as to the former the Congress has almost no power at all. Clearly, the President, the Senators and the Representatives, since their offices are created by the Constitution, can only be elected in the manner prescribed by that instrument. Let us see what are these provisions.

First, as to the President:

1. He is to be chosen by electors, who are to be selected by each State in such manner as the legislation thereof may direct. Clearly, Congress has no authority whatever to decide who may vote for Presidential electors, or in what manner, or by what form of ballot, or by whom the ballots shall be received or counted, since the whole choice of the manner of election is left to the State.

2. The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes, which day is to be the same throughout the United States. This is the only power concerning the election of the President which Congress possesses. Therefore any attempt by Congress to prescribe any regulations or conditions for the election of the President would be sheer usurpation and a flagrant subversion of the Constitution.

As to Senators and Representatives:

1. They are to be elected by the people of the States.

2. Those who may vote for Senators and Representatives must be the same persons who are qualified to vote for members of "the most numerous branch of the State legislature." That is to say, those citizens of this State who may vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress must be those qualified by the State constitution and laws to vote for representatives to the General Assembly of Ohio. Since the election of the State representatives must necessarily be by electors qualified under State law, it follows that qualification to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress (e. g., citizenship, place, and length of residence, registration, etc.) must also be determined by the State. Otherwise, the Congress could determine who may elect representatives to the State legislature, and all existence of the States as governmental sovereignties would be at an end, and the States become merely large counties, completely dominated by the Federal Government. All of the people of the Nation would become subjects of a central authoritarian government, no longer bound even by its own Constitution, nor by the Bill of Rights.

3. Congress may make or alter regulations as to the "times, places, and manner of holding elections" for Representatives to Congress; but only as to times and manner (not places) of electing Senators of the United States. Even these regulations, which relate only to election procedure, are ordinarily to be prescribed by the States.

4. Each House of Congress is the "judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members." Thus, after the election, each House may determine whether the election of any Member has been honestly and legally conducted, whether the result has been truly returned, and whether the person elected is fit and qualified to be a Member of that House. This relates only to action that may be taken after an election, not before or in the process of election.

The foregoing are all of the powers which the Constitution grants to Congress concerning the election of the President and of Senators and Representatives. As to the President, the Congress has the solitary power of fixing the time of election, and no other power whatever. As to the election of Senators and Representatives, the powers of Congress are considerably greater, but do not include the power to say who may vote or upon what qualifying conditions; and such powers as are granted must necessarily be exercised with great caution, to avoid intolerable confusion and opportunities for coercion or fraud, and the greater the emergency, the greater the danger to be apprehended from such confusion, coercion, and fraud.

Therefore, any such action by Congress as is proposed, setting up Federal machinery to formulate, print, distribute, and collect ballots, especially for Presidential electors, to be voted under military supervision, with no possible adequate means of determining whether any particular soldier or sailor is a qualified voter or to preserve the secrecy of his ballot, and wholly disregarding State constitutions and laws, would be a flagrant abuse of power by the Congress, involving a wanton flouting and nullification of the Constitution.

It would be no kindness to our boys thus to subvert the system of constitutional government for which they are fighting, without their even suspecting that such a revolution is being perpetrated in their names. I repeat that, much as I desire my own sons to exercise the sacred franchise of citizenship they have been taught to cherish, I do not desire it at such a price, nor will they.

Nevertheless, it does not follow that nothing can be done. Undoubtedly, present State laws present obstacles which will make it difficult for soldiers and sailors to vote, because of too late printing and distribution of absent voters' ballots, too rigid and complicated registration rules and other regulations, and difficulties of transportation, distribution and return. Some of these difficulties the States must remove, but the power and obligation are theirs and theirs only. In other matters Congress can, without any violation of the Constitution, render great assistance.

I suggest the following remedial measures:

1. Let the States—

(a) Advance the time for printing the ballots and issuing absent voters' supplies;

(b) Advance the time for filing applications for absent voters' supplies, and permit an application to be filed by either the soldier or sailor or a member of his family or duly authorized agent, with proper precautions against duplication, thus eliminating the necessity of two round trips (first of the application and then of the ballot), which was one of the difficulties I had to overcome for my son overseas, but by diligence did overcome;

(c) Suspend, as to voters in military service the provision of law under which registration as a voter lapses if the person has not voted within a fixed period, since this must already have caused the lapsing of registration of many men who have been absent in service for 2 or 3 years; and

(d) Suspend any requirement that the precinct of the voter be designated on his application, so long as his home residence is stated.

2. Let Congress—

Provide for expediting the transportation, delivery, and return of the ballots issued by

the State authorities, and for affording to each voter an adequate and easily accessible means of secretly preparing his ballot and having it duly attested and forwarded.

If such measures are adopted, it is safe to predict that at least as many votes will be effectively cast as under the unconstitutional plan now so violently advocated in high Federal places. Endless confusion, uncertainty, and fraud will be avoided; no violation of the constitutional prerogatives of the States will be committed; and the soldiers' and sailors' right to vote will be assured to the greatest possible measure and yet the Federal Union of the States under the Constitution will be preserved, and the obligation of the Federal Government to obey the organic law, ordained by the people of the United States, by which that government exists, will be vindicated.

F. D. R. and the Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Globe:

F. D. R. AND THE BIBLE

TO THE EDITOR:

This is a letter we have sent to Congressman CALVIN D. JOHNSON, at Washington:

"In a dispatch published here in India appeared a news item concerning a charge made by you that the Commander in Chief is making a political move for a fourth term as President of the United States through his message to the armed forces on the flyleaf of the Bible.

"One who is in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, whether at home or overseas, is pained and shocked by such charges against a message which is nothing but inspirational and which shows the quality of leadership of a President and Commander in Chief who would take the time and interest to write a short personal message to the men who are not only going to project, through their eventual victory, a right which guarantees your freedom to make such a charge in public.

"If the Commander in Chief had used personal stationery and had said something relating to politics in the message, some foundation might be seen for such a charge. But to men overseas, it only serves to intensify our intention to support President Roosevelt to the last, as it shows the weakness of the opposition forces if that method of approach to the coming election must be used. The charge borders on an insult to all fighting men, as it touches upon an alleged connection of politics with religion, and nowhere in the two short paragraphs may be found any such connection.

"The signers of this letter have possessed a copy of the Testament 2 years or more and have never thought of any political considerations attached to it. A message from Mr. Willkie, Mr. Dewey, or any other man in the same position of Commander in Chief and President would be treated with the equal respect and feeling of personal touch with their leader.

"Whether you are a Republican, Democrat, northerner, southerner, or westerner, your charge represents a reflection of the pettiness of many Members of Congress who should be devoting their energies to the passage of legislation to help on a national and impartial scale and to bring us home as soon as possible with a safe and secure peace in the years to come."

CHARLES W. GALLAGHER,
Master Sergeant,
ARTHUR J. KAHN,
Private First Class,
EVERETT W. FREDERICKS,
Private First Class,
MALCOLM KRAVITS,
Corporal,
JOHN LABAN,
Private First Class,
ANTHONY A. SULLO,
Sergeant.

SOMEWHERE IN INDIA.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Conference of American Legion Posts of the City of St. Louis, Department of Missouri, in regular meeting on January 21, 1944:

Whereas 11,500,000 of our men and women are in the armed services of our country; and

Whereas the present voting laws of the various States and of the Federal Government do not provide for such contingency; and

Whereas no part of our citizenship is as much entitled to vote at elections for not only Federal but also State officers, as the man or woman who is offering his or her life that we may continue to hold elections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the conference of American Legion Posts of St. Louis, That it is the sense of this American Legion conference in regular meeting convened, that all posts and all city, county, and State departments, and the national department of the American Legion immediately exert all the effort of our organization for the purpose of having enacted the necessary laws or constitutional amendments, that will make possible the right and opportunity for every citizen serving in the armed forces of the United States, whether within our borders or in the remotest parts of the world, to cast his or her ballot in the elections to be held in 1944 for not only Federal offices but also the offices in his or her particular State; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators from Missouri; to the Congressmen of the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Missouri Districts; to the Governor of Missouri; to the national commander of the American Legion; to the State commander of Missouri; to the national executive committee of Missouri, and to the district commanders of the eleventh and twelfth Missouri Legion districts.

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Maloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a Washington's Birthday dinner held under the auspices of the Democratic Central Committee of Connecticut at the Hotel Taft, New Haven, Conn., on February 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here in observance of the birthday of George Washington—the Father of our Country—referred to more often than any other as the most noble American. He was not chosen for the Presidency by a political party. At that time he considered political parties perilous—but in the selection of his Cabinet he sought the best men in the two parties which then existed. Thomas Jefferson, founder of our party, became the official head of Washington's advisers.

From a purely personal standpoint I should enjoy making an address devoted in its entirety to Washington—but this is a Democratic Party dinner—so I borrow the words of the first President, and Commander in Chief, to engage in political discussion. It was in his Farewell Address that he admonished his country to be united and to be Americans. It was in the same immortal statement that he warned his fellow Americans against party excesses. Washington loved his country more than life itself. Under his leadership our Nation was born and baptized. He suffered abuse and ridicule—but the torch he lighted is still aglow.

I shall not on this occasion attempt to heap praise upon our party—but I would be less than honest if I did not insist that along with the mistakes of the past decade there have been tremendously great accomplishments—and I would violate my own feeling if I did not point with a great measure of confidence and satisfaction to the leadership of President Roosevelt in the war in which all the world is now engaged.

Connecticut Democrats assembled tonight owe it to the country and the State to avoid making the occasion one of mere partisan politics. This is an election year. It is proper; indeed it is essential, to demonstrate to the world that even in a time of war, free elections can be held in America. But we Americans have also the solemn obligation to see to it that our open discussion of the issues of the campaign do not give aid or comfort to our enemies; and do not create disunity that may render the path to victory more difficult to travel.

Frankly, I am in no mood to devote my talk to party politics. Realizing that the sons of my Republican neighbors are fighting and dying as Americans, the distinctions between political parties do not now seem very important to me. And when I realize that all Americans are dedicated to an unrelenting prosecution of the war, I am not in the frame of mind to claim that Democrats in all offices are indispensable for victory.

The sacrifice that comes with war, and strikes all families of America in one form or another, produces a community of suffering that ought to obliterate the lines of political demarcation. The growing intensity of our common will to win this war should give to all of us an enlightened outlook on the election this year.

For that reason, I do not propose that we Democrats gathered here tonight should indulge in fulsome self-praise. On the contrary, I think this is a good time for all of us to indulge in some self-criticism.

I am afraid that some of us may be inclined to shape the coming campaign in terms of class issues, and derogatory challenges to large groups of our fellow Americans. Such tactics have no place in a country united against its enemies and in the midst of the most terrible war in recorded history.

Particularly, I wish to denounce the growing tendency on the part of some prominent members of our own party to label some groups of honest Americans as Fascists. No businessman, or banker, or doctor, or lawyer, or workingman that I know in Connecticut, is less of an American than I am because he disagrees with one or more of the policies of the present administration. Many of our fellow citizens are honestly opposed to a fourth term for the President. That does not make them Fascists. Many of my own neighbors believe with the utmost sincerity that the time has come for a change of administration. Whether or not I agree with them is beside the point. They are entitled to voice their opinions without being charged with alien purposes.

I care not how exalted a position some of these self-appointed spokesmen of our party may now hold. When they seek to brand groups of free Americans with the ignominious labels of foreign political doctrines, they do not speak for me; and I am certain they do not speak for the Democratic Party.

It is well for us Democrats to remember that the party we have chosen as our agency for developing good government in America, is not and never has been the tool for any single leader or any group of leaders. Indeed, its strength as a force in good government, and its survival for more than a century as the guardian of true American liberalism, have been because no man and no coterie of men have ever been able for long to control the party organization for purposes of their own personal power.

Great leaders have emerged from the ranks of the Democratic Party because they have learned the lessons of American liberalism in the party. The greatest leaders of our party have been those who have remained true to the liberal principles for which the party has stood—and who have not arrogated to themselves the authority to commit the party to their own personal lines of thinking. The party has become strong over the years not because it has been molded to the ideas of any particular leader, but because it has attracted to it constantly increasing numbers of persons who have become convinced of the soundness of its platform for Government action.

What we need this year, it seems to me, is a resurgence of the Democratic Party as such, and a campaign on the basis of a party platform which states the position on the party, fairly, openly, and honestly, on important issues upon which the citizens of America have a right to vote. What we do not need is irresponsible speeches and abusive assertions by so-called party leaders who seem to think that we Democrats should applaud or approve any crackpot idea they may cherish.

And there will be important issues for decision in the coming election—issues which can be decided only by the American people themselves. These issues will arise on the course this country is to follow in foreign affairs, and on the reconstruction of our domestic economy. Party responsibility in meeting these issues squarely is what we Democrats must insist upon. Moreover, we must likewise insist that those whom we choose as our candidates discharge that responsibility by adhering to the age-old principles of our party.

The day is past, in my opinion, when any large segment of Americans will blindly follow a leader on faith alone. The price of war is measured by the lives of individual fighting men. Victory is a victory of individual and collective Americans, and not the triumph of a vague concept of one class or another..

Those of us who have tried to develop a strong Democratic Party need not apologize to anyone, nor need we be stampeded into an abject surrender of the party to any special group of self-appointed spokesmen. The political party is an essential institution of American freedom. It gives direction and effectiveness to the franchise of free citizens. It permits the development of ideas of government upon the basis of consistent principles, and, above all, it lessens the dangers that can arise from aggressive personal leadership.

We often talk about party responsibility, but the members of a party do not insist often enough that their leaders respect the obligations of that responsibility. Right now, it seems to me, the Democratc Party needs to have some of its supposed leaders devote less time to the indiscriminate expression of their personal views, and more time to reflection upon what the party itself stands for, and what have been its traditions during the generations of its development.

Too frequently campaigns are being waged on the personalities of the candidates alone, while the candidates themselves demonstrate little fidelity to the platforms upon which they are supposed to stand. The time is coming, in my opinion, when the Democratic Party, great and strong as it is, will collapse from dry-rot unless we do more than we are now doing to insist that those who accept the support of the party, respect the principles for which it stands.

Let me demonstrate by a concrete example. With victory seemingly less distant than it was a year ago, post-war planning is properly becoming the subject of much study. This year the Democratic Party, meeting in national convention, will have an opportunity to determine its stand upon many issues of post-war government. You all know that in the haste and urgency of war tremendous amounts of public funds have been expended to erect factories, mills, power plants, and many other facilities for expanded industrial production. The basis upon which these vast facilities are to be operated in peacetime will in large measure determine the kind of industrial economy we are to have in America for a generation to come.

If, as has been estimated, the Government now owns anything like a quarter or a third of the industrial capacity of the Nation, it is obvious that the way is open for governmental invasion of industry to an extent not hitherto dreamed of. It is also undeniable that if the Government undertakes in peacetime to operate industrial plants on a large scale, private enterprise as we have known it in America, will be at an end, and collectivism of an alien brand will be well on its way to triumph here.

At the least, the question of what is to be the part of Government in industry after the war is highly controversial; at the worst it is an issue which may wreck the American system. Yet right now there are men who claim to be Democrats who are proposing that the Government keep its hold on American industry through the retention of wartime plants. I know of no authority which permits any such propositions on behalf of the Democratic Party, and to me they are at variance with what our party has stood for since its creation more than 100 years ago. Of course I am not referring to the objective and scholarly report, on the entire problem of adjusting our peacetime economy, which was issued by Mr. Baruch a few days ago.

The Democratic Party is founded on the basic American principle of individual freedom. That means freedom of people and freedom of the institutions created by people. I challenge anyone to show me where the Democratic Party has ever favored the destruction of private property or free enterprise. Of course, we have been champions of freedom when those who were undermining it were the wielders of special privilege and monopolistic power. But, more important, the Democratic Party has in all its history been chiefly concerned with the dangers and threats to private enterprise thrcugh the exercise of arbitrary governmental power.

On this birthday of Washington it is well for us to remember that the fathers of our Nation were concerned over such arbitrary governmental power; and the founders of our Democratic Party, Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson, took issue with the Federalists and the Whigs on the degree to which the Government should be kept out of the affairs of private citizens.

The charge now is made that the New Deal represents a repudiation of those early traditions of the party. I do not accept the charge. The modern legislation sponsored by the Democratic Party during the past decade was all in the interest of preserving individual freedom in America. It has all been compatible with the continuation of free or private enterprise.

Of course, the Democratic Party is unalterably committed to the principle that a government instituted by a free people should be administered in the interest of the people. The party has recognized that some problems, economic, and social, must find their solution, simply because of their size and complexity, through the leadership of the Government. That was the legitimate aim of the New Deal. But the New Deal, insofar as it as been sponsored by the Democratic Party, never has stood for the Government taking over everything. We have not and we do not support the alien idea that free American citizens should be vassals of an all-powerful state.

We want our children to have the opportunity to make their own way, to develop their own initiative, to enjoy the fruits of their own thrift; and we still believe that the American system of free enterprise should be preserved.

The real trouble is that Democrats are being misrepresented. They are being misrepresented by the spokesmen of other parties, and they are being misrepresented by some people who hold public and elective office in a Democratic administration.

The job for decent, honest, and American Democrats—like the citizens of Connecticut who are here tonight—is to correct these misrepresentations of a great party. Let us be as alert to repudiate those undemocratic voices within our ranks as we are to assail critics outside our party. Let us be vigilant to see to it that persons holding power through our support are not seeking strange objectives for which we cannot stand.

I have not sought to discuss specific questions of governmental policy tonight, because, as important as those questions may be, this seemed to be the appropriate time and place to talk about the more fundamental question of where the Democratic Party is going. For my part I want it to regain its standing and

respect as a responsible institution of free government dedicated to the promulgation of liberal ideas; but steadfastly adhering to American principles of freedom, and unalterably committed to achieving better and more wholesome living for our people in the American way. I am so personally devoted to that objective that I am prepared, at any time, to challenge any leader or any spokesman who tries to corrupt the party or turn it away from that high purpose.

At the outset I stated I was in no mood to discuss partisan politics. I said that, with American men of every political faith fighting and dying side by side on distant shores and on the seas, disputes of a partisan character seemed small to me. But to call for a regeneration of the Democratic Party as a thoroughly American institution is not to sound a partisan keynote. Millions of Americans still rely upon the party leadership—millions of Americans expect the party to reassert its responsibility as an institution for good government. If the Democratic Party abdicates that responsibility, if it becomes a device for personal government, then American freedom as we know it is threatened. I do not believe that any other party has the virility, or the constancy of principle and purpose, to hold for long the great mass of the American people; and if that confidence is not reposed in a party, it may be given to a single person.

The Democrats of Connecticut have always been a steadying force in the party's councils. The time has arrived, I think, when we Connecticut Democrats, who like the way people live together in this State, in small towns, and cities not too large, who are not anxious for radical upheavals, and who find harmony among themselves because the distinctions of class are not strong enough to overcome the friendliness of neighbors, must do our best to keep the party on the right path. And with that mention of the Connecticut viewpoint, I want to talk a little bit about our party here in this great Commonwealth.

We have at this meeting a very good representation of the active Democrats who have carried on the fight through many years which have seen both success and failure.

Certainly as neighbors and friends we can agree that one of the things for which our soldiers, sailors, and marines are fighting is the continuance of the democratic American way of government. The founding fathers and their successors created and developed a form of government—yes, and a political system—which has proven its worth through the years.

Our form of government calls for the voting expression of our citizens at stated intervals, even in times of crisis. At a time like this there may seem to be some justifiable reasons for regretting the necessity of an election contest, but the years have shown the wisdom of insisting that these contests be held regardless of surrounding circumstances. If we are to survive and prosper as a nation, we must, in the future as in the past, rely on the cheerful acceptance by the minority of the will of the majority. In turn, the majority must show tolerance and respect for the views of the minority. This, I believe, has been the great strength of the American democracy. Once, on the slavery question, this principle was broken, and the great Civil War followed. That terrible lesson served to install our great democratic principles more firmly, I hope, forever.

Unquestionably, the maintenance of a stable and respected government has been largely the result of the development of the two-party system. We do not have in this country numerous groups each of which is imbued with a fanatical sense of its own righteousness, and each of which is convinced that the success of any of the others means the inevitable destruction of the Republic. As a matter of course two great Nation-wide parties must each contain persons of rather widely divergent views. Every intelligent person must, of necessity, hear views expressed by certain members of the opposition party with which he will agree and, on the other hand, know a few persons in his own party whose opinions he cannot accept.

This is not to say that the two parties are the same. It is not even to say that there is no great difference between the parties. They are, in fact, very different. It is true that the parties do overlap to some extent. But within each party can be found a consensus of opinion on important issues which becomes the party policy. It is the difference in these party policies that marks the fundamental differences between them.

This is a Democratic gathering. We are here because we are Democrats. We are Democrats because, on the main issues, and over the years, we consider the Democratic Party to be the best agency for promoting the principles in which we believe. We don't have to believe in every last policy of our party. As long as we continue to believe that our party, in the long run, is fundamentally sound and fundamentally devoted to our principles, our continued support is logical and sensible.

We here in Connecticut may say with confidence that the Democratic Party has been liberal and progressive. Legislation to promote the welfare of labor and the farmers, reorganization of the State government for efficiency and economy, a vast expansion in our facilities for caring for the unfortunate and ill, improvement of our educational facilities, and many other beneficial acts, have been primarily the result of Democratic administrations. Of course, the compliance of the Republican Party has been necessary under the system of representation existing in this State. Naturally, the Republican Party claims a share of credit, but I think it is not unfair to say that only public opinion expressed in support of the Democratic Party succeeded in overcoming the natural inertia of an entrenched organization in this State. We have reason for pride. Let us keep the faith.

It is a long time now since this State was ruled with almost unchallenged arrogance. We challenged the arrogance and we broke it down. Let it not be said of us that we failed to recognize the faults of our own party. While our neighbor's children offer their lives for the preservation of the American way of life, let us have no fear of political death in the same cause.

I believe that we have justification for an appeal to the people of this State to support our party. I believe that the record will show that the people of the State have benefited when our strength has increased. We who are here as Democrats have a cause which justifies our support.

But we cannot succeed merely by criticizing our opponents. We must, as I said earlier, examine ourselves. We must see if we are on the right course within our own party and within our own organization.

I think that all of us here will agree that in order to win we must deserve to win. Our policies must command the support of the voters and our candidates must justify their trust and respect. No political organization, any more than a business organization, can hope to obtain acceptance of the product that it offers if that product is not tested and proven good. But even a good product needs organized support. There is an old story about the man who makes a better mousetrap and the world beating a path to his door. This may be true, but I have noticed that the producers of the most excellent goods do not rely too strongly on this theory. A powerful selling organization is placed behind the best of products whether they be cigarettes, automobiles, or even machine tools. Our candidates and our principles, however good, will receive a fair test in the laboratory of public opinion only if our organization support matches that of our opponents.

I know this is an old story to most of you here. You have worked long and faithfully for the Democratic Party and are thoroughly aware of the importance of organization. I think, though, that it is worth the time, once in a while, to review our situation together, even if that involves repeating things that we all know.

I have been an active Democrat for a very long time, and in a number of different positions. I know that you will understand, as I recite my experiences, that I am not being immodest. I served as a member of the town committee of my home city of Meriden. Later, for some years I was the town chairman, and I served on our State committee. In these positions I learned very well the meaning of local organization. I know that new voters must be registered and that registered voters must be persuaded to vote, and that the local organizations must do this work. I know that the political ideals and candidates of a party are not given an equal chance unless this sort of work is done.

When I first ran for public office, it was as a candidate for mayor of my native city. As I became mayor I felt, and I have not since had any reason to change my opinion, that the first requirement for reelection was to conduct the duties of my office in such manner as to deserve reelection. Later, as I think you know, my friends in this district enabled me to become a candidate for Congress. And, finally, I have been a candidate in two strenuous campaigns for election to the United States Senate.

I tell you all this not because I think that it is information that I need to give you. It is only a reminder that my activities for over a period of 25 years have been closely associated with the men and women who make up the Democratic organization. I would be stupid indeed if I could have avoided developing rather definite convictions about the relationship of politics and government during all that period.

Perhaps my most fundamental conviction is that a political party best serves its own interests when it supports the highest ideals of a government for the people. Some people seem to think that practical politics is the opposite of good government. This is cynical and untrue. On the contrary, the most practical method of assuring political success is to truly deserve public support.

Of course, I know that some people use the term "practical politics" when they mean organization politics. I think I have said enough to show that I could not possibly fail to recognize the importance of that part of political work which must be done by the party organization. But organization work can no more win by itself than can the highest ideals and the best candidates succeed without organization support. When, in the name of organization politics, any party does things which lose public support it is on the way to destroying itself, and certainly that is not practical.

Today we are entering into another election year. We must adopt our policies, write our platform, and choose our candidates. In these serious times we cannot look on a political contest as a sort of glorified sporting event. We are not justified in spending our time and our effort merely to celebrate a victory or to share in its results. We, individually and collectively, have a responsibility to work solely to finish this war, and

to make this country the sort of place which justifies the sacrifices now being made. One of our obligations is to fight for the kind of Government which will best achieve these ends. If we do so through the Democratic Party, it must be because we believe that our party is the best political agency through which our purposes can be accomplished.

May I conclude by once more thanking you and the people of Connecticut for the opferred upon me, during these past several years. I have endeavored to merit and maintain the confidence of the people of Connecticut—and to get and to hold the confidence of my colleagues in the Congress. Over these past 10 years there have been many questions which have excited great controversy. Always I have hoped that those who sent me to the United States Senate would believe that I was acting in accordance with what my judgment told me was best for our country. With such feelings and intentions I go on, praying for God's help, to the end of my term. In time of peace, public office is no less than a public trust. In time of distress and war, that man who accepts public office assumes the solemn and almost sacred obligation of unlimited devotion, next to God, to his country, and thus to the protection of his countrymen.

Gilbert Benjamin Bookout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Hon. W. H. Underwood, member of the Legislature of Oklahoma from Bryan County, relative to Mr. Gilbert Benjamin Bookout.

Mr. Bookout is Bryan County's last surviving Confederate veteran. He has lived through 5 major American wars, under the administrations of 22 United States Presidents, and will celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of his birth on February 26, 1944.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gilbert Benjamin Bookout, Bryan County's last surviving Confederate veteran, and who has lived through 5 major American wars and under the administrations of 22 United States Presidents, will celebrate his one hundredth birthday February 26.

Happy and intensely interested in current affairs, especially what goes on about him, the centenarian veteran, makes his home with his daughter, Mrs. Anna Woods, on a farm 14 miles northwest of Durant.

A small man, with a long, flowing beard of the style commonly attributed to Kentucky colonels, Mr. Bookout loves to recall experiences he has had in his long and eventful life. He enjoys especially to review his Civil War experiences and he recalls incidents and details of the battles of Chickamauga, Missionary Ridge, and Kennesaw Mountain, north of Atlanta, in which he engaged, with a remarkable clarity.

"I remember incidents and details of those battles almost as clearly as I recalled them when I returned to my 200-acre farm in west Tennessee during the reconstruction period immediately following the war," he said.

Though totally blind for the past 16 years, he enjoys life by listening to the radio, for his hearing is as good as that of a man of 50. His hair, though gray, is thick and closely cropped, and his face is remarkably free of wrinkles.

He has difficulty getting around, but he attributes that to his blindness, which has prevented him from taking the necessary exercise.

Mr. Bookout was born February 26, 1844, in North Carolina, but the family moved when he was a small child to west Tennessee, where they occupied the farm adjoining that of James K. Polk, who was later to become the last Democratic President before the Civil War.

"My brothers and I played with the Polk boys, and it was then we learned to shoot guns which came in handy later during the war," he said.

Bookout was a member of Company A, under the command of General Bragg, who the aged veteran recalls as his pal and a fine, resourceful, and able general.

"He out-foxed the Yankees many a time, and in the Battle of Chickamauga, we whipped them though they had us outnumbered 3 to 1," Bookout said.

"The battle lasted 2 days and nights. Later the Yankees were reinforced and drove us into northern Georgia where we fought them at Kennesaw Mountain in '63.

"At Missionary Ridge we fought for 7 days, with first one side gaining the advantage and then the other. That was the way it was in a number of smaller engagements and skirmishes throughout that year and in 1864. We would get the best of it for a while and run 'em and then they would reinforce, and get more guns than us, and would get us on the run."

Bookout received his honorable discharge at Durham, N. C., after General Johnson's surrender in 1865. Tired and weary from many battles, wearing only rags, he walked back to his Tennessee home place. Back on the farm with a steer and a heifer, hitched up to form a team, he plowed his fields which yielded him 4 bales of cotton and 200 bushels of corn the first year.

The Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., dated February 24, 1944, entitled "Determined To Disagree." It has reference to the soldier vote and says, among other things, that—

Politics and politics alone is blocking action on this bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETERMINED TO DISAGREE

After 2 weeks of futile House and Senate conferences the passage of legislation which would give men and women in uniform a reasonable chance to cast a ballot this fall looks further away than ever. It will be a surprise if the conference manage to produce any bill at all for soldier voting out of their present hopeless deadlock.

This failure to reach a satisfactory compromise cannot be blamed upon the advocates of a Federal ballot plan. In the course of the conferences they have offered to meet virtually every objection that the States' rights proponents could think up. They were apparently even ready to go so far as to agree to repeal the present law waiving poll-tax payments and registration requirements—which would automatically disenfranchise millions of servicemen—if the House conferees would permit distribution of Federal ballots subject to validation by the States.

The flat refusal of this offer by the House conferees makes one wonder if they are not deliberately trying to create a deadlock which will make it impossible to adopt any soldiers' vote legislation at all. From a political viewpoint this might suit their purposes even better than the straight-out States' right bill on which they have been insisting.

Politics and politics alone is blocking action on this bill. It will be to the enduring shame of Congress if it now fails to adopt legislation which will honestly and squarely meet the problem of giving the men who are fighting for their country a chance to cast their votes.

Removal of Restrictions on Individual Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have introduced Senate bill 1311, having as its objective the removal of restrictions on lands allotted to individual Indians as their distributive shares of tribal estates. The bill is now pending before the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman. I think this proposed legislation is responsive to a desire on the part of the Indians, and I think it will be conducive to their general welfare.

Mr. O. K. Chandler, of Oklahoma, is himself an Indian, a member of the Cherokee Tribe of Indians, and has spent most of his life in consideration of Indian affairs, and, in my opinion, is well informed about them. He has addressed a letter to my colleague and myself, setting out valuable factual data. I desire to have unanimous consent for this letter to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is estimated that it will make five and a half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at an estimated cost of $247.50. I am attaching a memorandum from the Public Printer, and ask the

unanimous consent of the Senate that the letter be printed as requested.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.
February 17, 1944.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Indian Committee,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Member, Senate Indian Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: What a day! What a day!

What a day was Monday, January 10, 1944, to the Indians of the United States, particularly the full-blood Indian.

On January 10, 1944, at Muskogee, Okla., was held a meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs to hear Indians and Indian Bureau officials with reference to lifting the hand of the Bureau from what remains of the individual property of certain citizens (Indians) who have been held down, held up, pushed backward and forward—first as tribes and later as individuals—the past century and three-quarters by the Federal Government through its Bureau of Indian Affairs, a Government bureau antedating the Government itself.

The present United States Indian Bureau is an inheritance of our Government from Europe. It came into being in advance of the Declaration of Independence. Within 10 days following the Battle of Lexington (1774) representatives of the Colonies appointed a committee to "prepare a speech to be made to the Indians." Out of this committee grew an Indian committee to deliver the speech. The committee was instructed to immediately contact 'influential members' of the several tribes.

In 1786 the Continental Congress created two Indian districts—one extending north of the Ohio River, west from the Allegheny Mountains to the Mississippi; the other extending south of the Ohio to the Gulf of Mexico, west of the Allegheny Mountains to the Mississippi. Two agents, with two assistants, were appointed to supervise the Indians throughout this area; the total annual salaries and expenses of these agents and their assistants was $6,000; they were heavily bonded; they had the custody of "many presents for the Indians."

Thus we have the beginning of the present United States Indian Bureau, with its eight to nine thousand employees, requiring, for support and maintenance, annual appropriations of $30,000,000 to $60,000,000—from tribal Indian funds and the pockets of plain taxpayers.

INDIAN BUREAU NOT CHRISTIANIZING INFLUENCE

Contrary to popular belief the Indian Bureau is not the originator of Christianizing, civilizing, and educating the Indians—that honor falls to Christian men and women of all denominations who went alone, with the Bible under the arm, to the wigwam and tepee of the Indian, in the wilderness, on the plains, and in the mountains. The work of these missionaries started 250 years or more previous to the creation of the United States Indian Bureau.

Our present Indian Bureau, in its infancy and for many years thereafter, was a part of the War Department. From its infancy, years and years following, its mission largely was to treat with the Indians for cession of lands and recommend to the War Department "Chastisement of the hostiles" when the Indians did not comport themselves agreeable to the Bureau. The public of today cannot know the injustices which have come down to the Indians directly from this department of Government the past 160 years.

Christian influences finally took the Indian Bureau out of the War Department and established it as a bureau unto itself, within the Department of the Interior. Even after its establishment as a bureau unto itself in the Interior Department, Christianizing, civilizing, and educating the Indians, was for many years, largely the work of the church—Christian effort and influence.

Racial or Government Indian boarding schools which the Indian Bureau and would-be friends of the Indians hold are today necessary (they assume there is a natural Indian-backwardness or racial inferiority which demands retention of Government Indian boarding schools) were the original creation of the missionary, in small mission schools supported by church denominations. The missionary early admitted and realized the Indian was human—capable of Christianizing, civilizing, and educating.

INDIANS EDUCATED BEFORE ADVENT OF BUREAU

A quarter of a century before the creation of the United States Indian Bureau there were educated full blood Indians.

"In colonial times the conversion of the Indians to Christianity was expected and promoted; hence several leading seminaries of learning were specifically endowed for the benefit of those Indian youth who could be gathered in as students, while at others the doors were opened to them so that they could be trained side by side with their white contemporaries. The earliest movement in this direction was at Henrico College in Virginia. The charter of what is now Harvard College, issued in 1650, described its object as the education of the English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and Godliness' and the first edifice on the ground was for the Indian college, built about 1660. Perhaps 30 years later an Indian department was added to William and Mary College; Dartmouth actually owes its origin to an institution founded to prepare young Indian men for missionary undertakings among their own people; and Princeton long figured as a leader in Indian work." (Cyclopedia of American Government, vol. 11, p. 162.)

Here we have Indian education 126 years previous to the creation of the United States Indian Bureau.

COLLIER DISCOVERS INDIANS

One would think—if he read the tons and tons of present-day Indian Bureau propaganda literature—that the Indians were not discovered in 1492 by Christopher Columbus, but in 1933 by John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Not only did Mr. Collier discover the Indian but he discovered the "native American church." And, he extended his explorations "south of the border, down Mexico way" and discovered Mexico had "almost the most perfect school in the world," which he forthwith brought to the Navajo of Arizona and New Mexico at a cost of some million or more dollars to American taxpayers. This "almost the most perfect school in the world"—imported to the Navajo—is reputed to be a godless school system; that teachers in Mexico were required to take an atheistic oath prior to their appointment as teachers of this "almost most perfect school in the world."

Be that as it may. In 1942, Commissioner Collier, in his statistical report for that year, shows 7,144 Indian children in Arizona and New Mexico not enrolled in school.

And, from Arizona in 1943, comes this information from a white friend of the Indian:

"Yesterday there was here in Graibi, of one family, four generations. Not one of them speak a word of the English language."

S. 1311 INTRODUCED AS TO INDIANS

No doubt to correct this condition and other conditions equally as flagrant in the management of the Indians' property on the part of the Bureau, S. 1311 was introduced into the Congress, resulting in the calling of the meeting at Muskogee, heretofore noted.

Supt. A. M. Landman, of the Five Tribes Agency, Muskogee, Okla., was the first witness called. The Five Tribes of Oklahoma are assumed to be the most advanced and enlightened of our Indian citizens, which may be true. Nevertheless, they have more nursemaids (Indian Bureau officials) than any similar number of Indian tribes in the Nation.

Mr. Landman was asked as to the number of Indians under his jurisdiction. Approximately, his reply was "104,000."

The rolls of the Five Tribes were closed by act of the Congress in 1907. Approximately 2,000 names were added in 1914. The total Landman gave includes some 26,000 or more Negro freedmen of no Indian blood whatever; also included was a considerable number of intermarried or white adopted citizens of these tribes. Tribal rolls were closed 37 years ago; approximately 60 percent of the original allottees or enrollees are now dead.

It is very improbable that there are more than 1,500 Five Tribes Indians—with lands and moneys now under Indian Bureau control—now living, who own their full allotments as of the day allotment was made.

The Five Tribes Agency has spent more than 35 years of its best days, selling its Indians out of land. And the lands it sold would approximate upward of 80 percent of the best land these Indians owned, agriculturally.

HOW IS INTELLIGENCE MEASURED?

Superintendent Landman was asked if the intelligence of an individual of Indian blood increased as white blood increased and decreased as Indian blood increased. He could not or did not answer this question yes or no. He was sure, however, that the full-blood Indian was not capable of protecting his interests without Indian Bureau help.

A full-blood Indian of the Five Tribes, 24 years of age in 1902, is now 66 years of age and a grandparent in 9 cases out of 10 if living—thus giving the Bureau one full generation in which to produce educated and self-sustaining full-blood Indian citizens, and room for improvement with the grandparent and grandchild.

Here is a true picture, which does not speak well for the Bureau. Very distinctly, in my judgment, does the Bureau's own act condemn it to a speedy death throughout the Five Tribes:

The superintendent, assistant superintendent, field clerk, supervising field clerk, probate attorney, supervising probate attorney, farmer, supervising farmer, supervisor of schools, and his assistant or assistants, and other lesser officials of the Bureau, time after time have passed in almost continuous cavalcade within a stone's throw of the home of full-blood Indians—the past 40 years—whose children were allowed to grow to manhood and womanhood without entrance into any institution of learning; not once did these guardians of the property of the Indian (on their way, many of them, to dispose of the Indian's property) turn aside to encourage or force the schooling of these full-blood Indian children.

Now—after more than 40 years of such guardianship—we find Superintendent Landman of the Five Tribes appalled at the thought of ending forever such a farce of governmental paternalism, bottomed solely upon self-perpetuation. "The poor uneducated full-blood Indian, what will become of him, he cannot read, write or speak English; he has had no business experience?"

As a matter of fact the poor, ignorant non-English-speaking full-blood Indian, not alone of the Five Tribes but every Indian tribe in the United States, has had business ex-

perience with his Indian Bureau guardian—most of it bad and sad, neglectful of his mental development and destructive of his property rights.

What a day! What a day!

Following Landman—to testify as to the mental status or development of the full-blood Five Tribes Indian—came the sons of Ross, Standwaitie, Pushmatahah, Pitchlynn, Colbert, Weatherford, Opothleyahola, and Osceola. No, they were not the sons of these red men of the past, who were practically all full-blood Indians, had not tasted of the poison of Indian Bureau paternalism, and in defense of justice to their people faced death unafraid and unflinching; they were members of the tribes to which these noble red men belonged.

The representatives of the tribes of Pitchlynn, Pushmatahah, and Colbert (Choctaw and Chickasaw), well dressed and speaking knowingly of treaties and Government commitments of the past, felt sure the "poor, ignorant full-blood Indian" could not withstand the shock incident to placing the refuse of his original allotment into his hands; it would immediately disappear—presumably into the hands of the white man. All wanted the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands sold immediately—to the Government or anyone who would buy—and their share delivered to them and the "poor, ignorant full-blood" Indian's share delivered to Dick, Tom, and Harry for safekeeping, provided these three worthies (?) were attached to the Indian Bureau.

What a day! What a day!

This noble plan should appeal strongly to the "poor, ignorant full-blood" Choctaw and Chickasaw who feels the need of money and knows its purchasing power as well as the best of us—mixed-blood Indian or white citizen.

An enlightening incident developed when one of the Choctaw representatives was asked about distributing the proceeds (rents and royalties) from the Choctaw-Chickasaw coal lands, under Bureau supervision the past 40 years. He replied that payment would have to be made to the original allottee or his heirs; that in many cases heirship had split the original allottee's interest into so many parts that the amount due each heir would be so small it was wholly impracticable to now make distribution of the rents and royalties. Naturally the same situation will be met in the sale of this property. Yet these Choctaw and Chickasaw representatives wanted the "poor, ignorant full-blood" Indian's share Indian Bureau supervised.

What a day! What a day!

Commissioner Collier testified before a committee of the Congress in 1938 that the Bureau then had under its control an 80-acre tract of land located in South Dakota; that the land was worth $1,200, with a rental value of $50 per year; that the Department did not think it wise to sell; that the cost of determining and redetermining the successive heirs to this land, by the Bureau, was then $3,600; that the total number of heirs was then 133; that he could not write a check for less than $1; that the heirs with the "smallest equity in the estate will receive their first check for $1 a thousand years from now"; that at that time there were 83 additional heirs to determine and the cost of heirship determination would then total $5,664; that the smallest rental would then be "one-fiftieth of 1 cent per annum, and the payment of the dollar check to the heir having that equity in the estate * * * would be 1,500 years from now."

Will the Choctaw and Chickasaw representatives please take this sheet of Indian Bureau music to the home of the "poor, ignorant full-blood" Choctaw or Chickasaw and carefully note the rhythm he develops playing it on a Choctaw-Chickasaw tom-tom.

The question was finally asked each of these Choctaw-Chickasaw representatives if the mentality of an Indian of the mixed-blood rose as his white blood increased and decreased as his Indian blood increased. They could not or did not answer this question "Yes" or "No."

What a day! What a day!

NEXT CAME A CHEROKEE

Then came the representative of the tribe of Ross, Sequoyah, and Standwaitie (Cherokee) in the person (Indian) of a former State senator from Muskogee County, Okla., who claimed to speak for several Indian tribes and the "Kee-too-yah or Night Hawk Society of Full-blood Indians." He, too, was positive it would be fatal to allow the "poor, ignorant full-blood Indians" control of what now remains of their individually allotted land and money—in the hands of the Bureau the past 40 years.

The Cherokee representative was asked the white and Indian blood question. He did not answer "Yes" or "No." He said, in substance: "We Indians are smart enough, but we just don't know how to handle money."

What a day! What a day!

The First National Bank of Muskogee, the First National Bank of Tahlequah, the First National Bank of Miami, the First National Bank of Vinita—and many other banking institutions throughout eastern Oklahoma—were organized by Indians or Indians were included as original stockholders or directors. Many Indians are now identified with banking institutions throughout Oklahoma. Millions and millions of dollars have been the direct creation of the Indians of Oklahoma—mixed-blood and full-blood.

And touching the mentality of the Indian: Mixed-blood and full-blood Indians are in practically every activity known to present-day Oklahoma. They are in the legislative, administrative, and judicial branches of our State government, from justice of the peace to justice of the supreme court, inclusive.

Indians helped write the Oklahoma State Constitution. They have helped write every law upon our statutes; they have helped interpret such laws. If our State constitution is bad—against the Indian; our State laws bad—against the Indian; interpretation of such laws bad—against the Indian; enforcement of such laws bad—against the Indian, the Indian must bear his share of whatever penalty attaches to this condition. He certainly helped create it.

Some of the outstanding businessmen (bankers), the most extensive and successful farmers of northeast Oklahoma, are enrolled Indians. This is not alone true of northeast Oklahoma, it is true of other sections of Oklahoma.

It should not be necessary to slander a race of people in order to rid the taxpayer of an outmoded, outworn, self-perpetuating, paternalistic machine which had no right of existence in the first place.

BUREAU FAILED TO FORCE EDUCATION ON NIGHT HAWKS

About the Kee-too-yah or Night Hawk Society—Night Hawks known as Snake Indians in the Seminole, Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw Tribes:

No organization, white or Indian—to my personal knowledge or of whom I have read—since the landing of Columbus to the present ever stood more firmly against the enlightenment and education of the full-blood Indian, as has the Night Hawk Society. And this organization 20 and 25 years ago held great sway over the full-blood Indians of the Five Tribes. It—and the Indian Bureau—are directly responsible for the illiteracy of any Five Tribes full-blood Indian who is today less than 50 years of age; more so than any other organized group or groups; individual or individuals. The Night Hawks were opposed to the education of their children and the Bureau failed or refused to force them to obey the law—send their children to school.

Much was tried to be made at the hearing, in a veiled manner, of the lack of Indian protective law in Oklahoma; or laxity in the enforcement of the law.

Upon the statute books of Oklahoma, since statehood, has been a compulsory school law, applicable to all citizens of the State.

If Mr. Full-blood Indian, now 65 or 70 years of age—if that old and the Bureau has sold his land he is now drawing a State pension—had been made to comply with Oklahoma's public-school law, there would be no ignorant full-blood Indians in Oklahoma today under 50 years of age.

What a day! What a day!

NEGRO TESTIFIES

Whence came the Negro and why to testify to the incompetency of the present-day full-blood Indian of the Five Tribes? The Negro was present—in the person of a full-blood Creek freedman—and testified. He was sure it would be fatal to give the full-blood Indian control of the residue of his property—after 40 years under the control of the Bureau. He compared what he considered the incompetency of the Creek freedman of 40 years ago, as representative of the competency of the Oklahoma full-blood Indian of today.

What a day! What a day!

WOULD INDIANS BE "ROBBED"?

Next came the Seminole, a full-blood Indian possibly. He was sure the full-blood Indian should not be allowed control or management of his property, after 40 years of control and supervision by the Bureau. Asked why, he said: "The full-blood Indian would be robbed." "Who would rob him?" he was asked. "The white man," he replied. He made no attempt to say that a full-blood Indian—given the same environment and educational opportunity would respond comparably with any race. He presented the full-blood Indian as a child—mentally. He left him as a child—mentally.

What a day! What a day!

No tribe of Indians has yet produced a member superior to Osceola, a full-blood Seminole.

Applause swept the audience of the hearing when the representative of the present-day Seminole said the full-blood Indians—if given control of their property—would be robbed by "the white man."

(NOTE.—Few, very few, white hands ever found their way into the pocket of the illiterate non-English speaking red man, unless guided there and entrance effected through a red man's hand, attached to a supposed friend of the red man victim.)

OSAGE ANSWERS TO "INTELLIGENCE" QUESTION

An Osage—full-blood educated Indian—was invited to testify. She was asked if the intelligence of an individual of Indian blood increased as white blood increased and decreased as Indian blood increased? "No," was her prompt reply. Asked about closing Indian boarding schools, "Yes," she said, "they should be closed and the Indians attend public schools and other institutions of learning with white children; we are all citizens of Oklahoma and should be educated alike." "What about closing Indian hospitals?" she was asked. "They should be closed; Indians should be treated no different from other citizens." She claimed no advantage on account of Indian blood; that Indian blood was the equal of other blood; just as capable under equal opportunity and environment.

What a day! What a day!

The testimony of this full-blood Osage undoubtedly brought a glow of pride to the face of Chief Clairmont, the Osage, in spirit land.

Weatherford and Opothleyahola, Creeks, the latter a full-blood Indian, were outstanding characters.

To save the women and children of his tribe from starvation, following the battle of Horseshoe Bend, where 1,000 of his warriors fell, Weatherford rode alone into General Jackson's camp, knowing Jackson had vowed to kill him on sight. He surrendered to Jackson personally, in these words:

"I am in your power; do with me as you please."

Opothleyahola fought Jackson. After the fight he signed a treaty not to again fight the United States. When others of the Five Tribes, in violation of their treaties, took up arms against the United States in 1861, Opothleyahola refused to join them. He raised an army and fought his own people. His action, more than any other, saved the lands of the Five Tribes from confiscation following the close of the Civil War.

The last witness heard—a full-blood educated and experienced businessman—was a representative of the Creek Tribe. He was sure it would be fatal to the "poor, ignorant full-blood Indian" to now give him control of his property—following 40 years of Indian Bureau control.

THINK OF EASTMAN RICHARDS!

Surely this man, as well as others who testified, had personal knowledge of the Bureau's method of handling Indian property. Almost in the shadow of his home lived, at one time, Jeanetta Marshall and her father, Eastman Richards, two—just two—restricted Indians.

The combined royalty income of these two Indians—Mr. Landman testified he had 104,000 Indians under his jurisdiction—approximated $2,000,000, in my judgment, not one dollar of which could either Jeanetta or her father Eastman use, except and until the Indian Bureau said, "You may use it."

First off, a town was built for Eastman. And what I mean, it was a town—not a post-office address. It was named for Eastman. To go into this story complete would require a volume of several pages.

One instance: Eastman tired of his town—and the Lord knows he was justified, for there was enough going on and coming in and going out of his town to make any man tired—of living.

The Bureau leased Eastman's town. It was not long until Eastman wanted his town back. He was lonesome. That was natural, he could easily have suspected the world was at an end or about to reach that point—everything was so quiet and peaceful. The Bureau bought back Eastman's town—and thereby hangs a short story, too long to here recount.

The plundering of Eastman Richard's estate and that of his daughter, as well as the estate of Exie Fife and many other rich Indians of the Five Tribes—under the nose or with the approval of Bureau officials—is a well-worn story of eastern Oklahoma. The plundering has been engaged in by white, red, and a few blacks—the latter on a small scale, too small to note. And it is now assumed by some leading representatives of the Five Tribes that Indian Bureau supervision should be handed in perpetuity to the "poor, ignorant full-blood Indians" of the Five Tribes, and all other Indian tribes of the Nation—who have been given their share of a tribal estate in the form of an allotment; allotments in some instances which have been under Bureau control for almost 60 years.

What a day! What a day!

My dear Senators, your committee may call meetings tomorrow, to be held in the door or on the inside of every agency of the Bureau field force—giving 5 or 10 days or 6 months' time for the forces to gather—and you will get very much the same testimony as was given at the Muskogee hearing. The superintendent of each and every agency will be present, ready and willing to testify as to the incompetency of the Indians under his jurisdiction. Incompetency of the full-blood Indian will be revealed—so thick it can be sliced with a dull knife—notwithstanding such admission is the best evidence of the uselessness of the Bureau. The Indian Bureau is responsible for the illiteracy of the full-blood Indian of today, his reduced resources, and lack of self-sufficiency. As heretofore noted, the Bureau's existence antedates the Government itself. And every hour of Bureau existence the Indian and his property has been in its hands.

You will also find, as at Muskogee, Indians testifying as children in favor of Bureau continuance. Indians have been called children so long by our Government and the British Government during colonial days—regarded as such—that on occasion many of them to this day cannot help but act the part.

BUREAU EMPLOYEES WANT TO KEEP JOBS

And, whether the attempt to close the Bureau is made tomorrow or 100 years from now, there will always be Bureau employees to testify to the existence of "poor, ignorant full-blood Indians." To testify otherwise would be cutting their own throats. And, to ask them to testify with the view of rejecting their testimony is much akin to sentencing a man to be hanged—with the understanding he is to furnish the rope. Self-preservation is the first law of nature and its use as old as the history of man—Adam, to save his own hide, laid the apple-eating on Eve. These Bureau employees are human. When asked their opinions—the first law of nature will control their answers 9 times out of 10.

BUREAU JOBS SAVED ONCE BY EXTENSION BILL

I have a distinct recollection of a threatened Indian Bureau closing many years ago. I was then an employee of the United States Indian Agency, Muskogee, Okla. We were operating under the allotment acts of 1902, affecting the Five Tribes, which contained a 5-year restrictive period against the sale of the lands of these tribes. We were nearing the end of our rope. Restrictions were about to expire—likewise our jobs.

Senator McCumber came to our rescue when he tacked a rider on the 1908 Indian appropriation bill extending restrictions on the lands of the half-blood, as to homestead, and three-quarter bloods to full-bloods, inclusive, as to homestead and surplus, of all Five Tribes Indians, for a period of 25 years. Long faces became round; smiles replaced sadness; we were "safe and secure from all harm * * * leaning on the everlasting arm" of Uncle Sam for 25 years. As this 25-year period closed—there were Indians and some land left—gloom once more enveloped faces of Federal employees at the Muskogee Agency. Again they were lucky—another 25-year restriction-extension was handed to them by the Congress in 1928. Meanwhile the original Muskogee Agency employee-group of 1902, in many instances, were gathered to their fathers, or given Federal pensions. Incidentally, no pensions were passed out to the Indians, who had suffered a quarter-century control of their property and interference in their private affairs by this Federal bureau group.

I was also employed at the Quapaw Agency, Miami, Okla., in 1921, just after that little band of patriots (Bureau employees) had passed from under a dark cloud. Long faces were round, and smiles the order of the day; the Congress had passed the 1921 act extending restrictions for a further period of 25 years covering the lands of some 62 or 63 Quapaw Indians. As at Muskogee, "none are left to greet us Tom, and few are left to know" who worked with us at the Quapaw Agency some several years ago.

Agency employees at Miami—much increased in number, although all the old Quapaws have long since passed on and the younger group in all respects and manner are white people—received another 25-year lease on life when the Congress in 1939 extended the restrictive period on Quapaw lands, beginning 1946.

The Quapaw Agency claims 3,711 Indians under its jurisdiction, asked and received from the Congress last year, for maintenance and support of the bureau, $69 per capita for that number. Possibly a half dozen Quapaws—original allottees with land and money under Indian Bureau supervision—are living today. Of the 3,711 Indians which the Quapaw Agency claims, for appropriation purposes, 1,581 do not live within the county in which the agency is located. Of the 1,813 reported to be "residing at jurisdiction where enrolled," less than 100 have land or money in the hands of the local agency. But all are counted for appropriation purposes.

The Quapaw Agency and the Five Tribes Agency are not peculiar to other agencies. Unquestionably conditions prevail elsewhere throughout the Service as at these agencies.

Senator THOMAS, I wish to commend you and your subcommittee of the Senate Indian Committee for Senate Report No. 310. This report is the result of 18 years of careful investigation of the affairs and condition of the Indian by your subcommittee—visits to Indian reservations and Indian homes throughout the Nation. It is supported by facts.

SENATE REPORT NO. 310 SHOWS BUREAU DISHONESTY

It opens with the uncoverage of the dishonesty of the Indian Bureau in counting, for appropriation purposes, 400,000 Indians as under its jurisdiction. It specifically points out that there are less than half this number of Indians in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau, which is a fact beyond disproof.

Commissioner Collier, himself, in 1933, through Senator King, of Utah, said there were only 195,000 Indians in the United States under Bureau supervision. If in 11 years he has developed an additional 200,000 Indians into incompetency, most certainly his Bureau has earned the ax.

I wish to agree with you as to the $15,000,000 reduction you recommend in Indian Bureau maintenance and support for the fiscal year ending 1944—it should have been taken. Not having been taken, the Bureau's maintenance and support for the fiscal year 1945 should at least be $20,000,000 under that

LINCOLN, GRANT, AND OTHER TRUE AMERICANS CONDEMN BUREAU

Government management of the Indian's affairs through its Indian Bureau has been bad almost from the hour of creation of the Bureau. And Bureau reformation and abolishment has been talked of and attempted over the past century. The act of the Congress creating the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1832 provided for reduction of Bureau personnel:

"SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That the Secretary of War shall, under direction of the President, cause to be discontinued the services of such agents, subagents, interpreters, and mechanics as may, from time to time, become unnecessary, in consequence of the emigration of the Indians or other causes."

* * * * *

"If I survive I will reform the Indian system." (President Abraham Lincoln.)

"From the foundation of the Government to the present, management of the original inhabitants of this country—the Indians—has been a subject of embarrassment and expense, and has been attended with continuous robberies, murders, and wars." (President U. S. Grant.)

"The agent who perfunctorily performs his duty and slothfully neglects all opportunity to advance their (the Indians) moral and physical improvement and fails to inspire them with a desire for better things will accomplish nothing in the direction of their civilization." (President Grover Cleveland.)

"Conditions prevailing among the Indians in 1913 were virtually identical with those of a century or more before * * * there has been an unpardonable failure in the governmental process applied to them." (Gen. Hugh Scott.)

"That the Indian is confused in mind as to his status and very much at sea as to our ultimate purpose toward him, is not surprising. For 100 years he has been spun around like a blindfolded child in a game of blindman's buff. Treated as an enemy at first, overcome, driven from his land, negotiated with most formally as an independent nation, given by treaty a distinct boundary which was never to be changed 'while water runs and grass grows,' he later found himself pushed beyond that boundary line, negotiated with again, and then set down on a reservation, half captive, half protege." (Franklin K. Lane, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Interior.)

"Bureau of Indian Affairs should work itself out of a job." (Lyman K. Wilbur, Herbert Hoover's Secretary of Interior.)

"Our Indian Bureau is paternalistic and bureaucratic and pretends to do through paid employees all and everything which human beings normally do for themselves. Coupled with this paternalism is the Indian Bureau's policy of monopolizing the Indian Service and of duplicating through pigmy services of its own, the work of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, the work of the State agricultural, educational, health, and welfare departments, and even the work of the courts.

"The system is indefensible and is the worst in the whole field of government." (John Collier, when not Commissioner of Indian Affairs.)

INDIAN BECOMES PUPPET UNDER COLLIER IDEA

In view of these strong words on the part of Commissioner Collier when he was on the outside looking in—a constant and bitter critic of the Bureau—naturally every informed and interested person in Indian affairs was sure Bureau administration under Mr. Collier would effect economies and give wide latitude for the Indian to go forward and grow into the life of the Nation.

"LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD"

1. Indian Commissioner Collier prepared, or had prepared, a far-flung governmental Indian structure—independent of State or Federal Government—except that the Indian could do nothing without Mr. Collier's approval.

The Commissioner's Indian—government within a government—idea was incorporated in a bill introduced into the Congress. The Commissioner claimed for it: 'Self-government for the Indians.' In reality, under the bill, the Indian became a Charlie McCarthy—he could neither legislate, interpret, nor administer under his new government without the voice, hand, and mind of Mr. Collier. In a drastically revised form the Commissioner's Indian self-government scheme was approved by the Congress.

In passing, it is interesting to note briefly the method employed by the Commissioner to gain Indian support for his legislative Indian program.

The Commissioner made a grand swing throughout the so-called Indian country, holding public meetings, presumably to acquaint the Indians with the provisions of his bill. These meetings were seldom if ever under the folds of the flag and only one was opened with prayer, which was really a new day for the Indians—certainly a new experience. Nine out of ten, if not all treaties between the Indians and the Government, bound the Indians to the flag and defense of the Nation:

"ART. 5. It is agreed that the flag of the United States shall be our protection, and token of friendship, whenever and wherever we meet." (Quotation from a general Government treaty, dated November 12, 1833, between the United States and the Indians—signed by more than 100 chiefs and headmen.)

Spiritually, Indians universally open their public gatherings with prayer—in acknowledgment of the existence of a power above man.

The Indians were told by the Indian Commissioner:

"There was a time when it was the policy of the United States Government to rob Indians."

The Indians were also informed by the Commissioner that in the administration of the affairs of the Indian:

"The guardianship of the United States is carried out under a body of laws that are wicked and stupid."

A graphic picture of despair and destruction—in store for the Indians—was wordpainted by the Commissioner:

"I desire for you to realize what I know to be true, that * * * forces are moving * * * to destroy you."

INDIANS NOW FIGHTING VALOROUSLY UNDER THE UNITED STATES FLAG

Is it not amazing that the Indian citizenship of the Nation—in the face of such preachment on the part of the head of the Indian's assumed department of Federal Government—is now fighting the battle of democracy for oppressed peoples of the world on every front where the American flag flies?

Today Commissioner Collier's Government-financed propaganda sheet, "Indians at Work," bears a close resemblance to a military college catalog. Pictures of Indians in uniform, including nurses and other female units of our armed forces; military equipment being handled by Indians, with accounts of deeds of valor performed by Indians on the field of battle, predominate—some change, Mr. Commissioner, from the days you allowed the flag, the American Legion, and the Christian religion at Cherokee, N. C.—other places, too—to be dragged and kicked about.

Possibly there are those who feel that Indian Bureau administration under Mr. Collier, or the assumed fact that the Indian by nature is savage and warlike, is responsible for present-day Indian achievement on the field of battle.

Both theories are wrong. The Indian, when first contacted by the white man, according to the white man's own printed record, was not a savage:

"In none of the islands I have visited have I found any people of monstrous appearance; they are all of pleasing aspect, with straight hair and complexion not very dark. After they have shaken off their fear of us, they display a frankness and liberality in their behavior which no one would believe without witnessing it. No request of anything from them was ever refused, but they rather invite acceptance of whatever they possess, and manifest such generosity that they would give away their own hearts." (Letter dated February 1493, from Columbus to King and Queen of Spain.)

Many of the Indians and accounts of Indian military prowess, pictured in the May-June 1943 issue of the Commissioner's Government-financed propaganda sheet, "Indians at Work," have never had any connection whatsoever with the Indian Bureau. Those who have are now operating without Indian Bureau interference. Naturally they can and do distinguish themselves when recognized, as they are recognized in the Army, as human beings not unlike other human beings.

World War No. 1 accomplished more in demonstrating to the world, particularly the United States, that the Indian is capable of carrying his load, regardless of weight or circumstances, along with others, than has the Indian Bureau in its entire 160-year existance.

INDIAN'S INTELLIGENCE WILL PROVE BUREAU'S SUPERFLUITY

World War No. 2 should and will place the Indian of this Nation so far in advance of the accomplishments of the Indian Bureau in establishing the Indian as a capable, dependable, worth-while citizen that the Congress itself should and will rebel against following the Bureau in its asinine appropriation excuses for further existence.

UNITED STATES GIG AND HOMINY-PESTLE SCHOOL

2. Did Mr. Collier, as he had preached and talked as an Indian Bureau critic—on the outside—lower the cost of Indian Bureau operation when he became Indian Commissioner by adopting sane and sound methods of Bureau conduct? He did not. In a short time he was reaching into this department and that, extracting $60,000,000 annually from the taxpayer, with which to carry forward his "new day" of useless effort for the Indians. Illustrative:

Down in Oklahoma he installed a school for teaching Oklahoma Indians the art of making gigs. The laws of Oklahoma prohibit the gigging of fish—certainly the same law would apply to the gigging of a man. So, a gig would be a useless Indian appendage as a lawful means of providing food and self-protection.

Commissioner Collier also had a school and teacher—at a substantial monthly salary—to revive and teach the lost Indian art of making the hominy pestle.

The Indians of Ottawa County, Okla., where the hominy-pestle school was located, know about as much about the construction and use of this lost Indian art as they know about the construction of the Indian arrowhead. The full Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, handling the finances of the county, are duly enrolled and recognized Indians. Ottawa County is also represented in the State legislature by an Indian. And the dean of women of Northeast Oklahoma Junior College, located at Miami, Okla., is an enrolled and recognized Indian.

To those who don't know, Ottawa County, Okla., is not the wigwam of an Indian chief nor is it an Indian reservation. The intelligence of its citizenship—10 whites to 1 Indian, possibly—will compare favorably with citizenship-intelligence of the most advanced counties, intellectually, in the United States. And its financial institutions are not of the piggy-bank type. Its county commissioners must at least know how to add and subtract intelligently.

The teacher of Commissioner Collier's U. S. I. H. P. S., a ful-blood Indian, was half drunk much of the time and whole drunk some of the time—when not on duty, possibly. Drunk or sober, to him his school teaching was a joke. He didn't know what he was doing nor why, and he didn't give a whoop. He knew that those above him connected with this "new day enterprise for the Indians" didn't know what they were doing, except spending the people's money, for which they didn't give a whoop.

Mr. Collier is not a man of small parts, and he has visions. In the July 1, 1936, issue of his Government-financed propaganda sheet, "Indians at Work," he laments:

"There is no way to guard the half-Indian natives, the Spanish-American peasants who are more numerous than the Indians and who are not now wards of the Government."

Strange as it may seem, the Commissioner was successful in putting through the Congress a measure specifically providing for this class of peasants—then or now within or without the United States—to become, with the Commissioner's approval, a part of any Indian community submitting to the Collier

New-day Indian program. Without, or with little or no security, they could borrow money from the Federal Government with which to engage in cooperative enterprises under the Commissioner's direction.

DOES COLLIER WANT FREEDMAN'S BUREAU REVIVED?

Commissioner Collier's mind is still active, though the Commissioner is advancing in years and just starting his second venture in "double harness." He says editorially, page 5, May-June 1943 issue of his Government-financed propaganda sheet, "Indians at Work":

"I believe that it is sheer obscurantism to contend, in the face of the achievements of the Indian Service, that the resources of Government cannot effectively be used to bring about better adjustment of minority groups. If the Indian Service can reduce Indian death rates, the same death rate among Negroes can be reduced by the same or similar methods. The special problems of other colored minority groups are no more insoluble than the Indian problem."

Shades of Uncle Tom's Cabin. If Commissioner Collier now contemplates reviving the Freedman's Bureau of the Federal Government, abolished in its infancy—a godsend to the Negro—in the interest of production for war needs agriculturally, if the Commissioner's word has any weight with anyone outside the President and Secretary Ickes, he should be estopped by the Congress.

Recently Commissioner Collier, while prowling the records of the Census Bureau of the Federal Government in search of Indian numbers by which to boost appropriations for support and maintenance of his Indian Bureau, discovered that "even the Negro has more cropland under his operation" than the Indians. Also, that the Negro was "14.7 percent more illiterate than his Indians."

NEGROES TAKE WARNING

If the Negro is putting the Federal Government Negro bureau idea into the Indian Commissioner's head, I seriously suggest to the Negro that he should ponder well the present-day plight of "Lo, the poor Indian, who sees God in the clouds and hears Him in the wind" but doesn't know where he is going nor where he has been these 160 years under Indian Bureau tutelage and protection.

Again, in the May-June 1943 issue of the Commissioner's Government-financed propaganda sheet, "Indians at Work," the Commissioner quotes Thomas Jefferson on the people's contribution to war.

It is too bad the Commissioner has not read deeply of the life, aims, and purposes of Thomas Jefferson. Aside from being a statesman of unusual achievement, Thomas Jefferson was deeply interested in the education of the youths of the Nation—rich and poor. "During his entire public career and long after his retirement to private life, Jefferson gave much thought and serious study to the part education was to play in the success of the newly formed American Republic."

Surely, had the Commissioner of Indian Affairs given the educational plan of Thomas Jefferson thoughtful study, he would not have rushed down into Mexico for a school system of proper development of his Indian wards—mentally.

Thomas Jefferson's school plan was not anti-Christian.

CONGRESSMAN M'GROARTY SPEAKS

"If I had the time I could tell you things here that you would think hard to believe, but which are true; things like when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs wanted to reorganize the Indian schools he sent to Mexico for a man who comes from a country where every teacher in every public school has to take an atheistic oath. Nobody in the United States being capable of reorganizing the Indian schools he sent to Mexico; and on the agrarian question, when the lands were to be surveyed and reorganized, he sent to Turkey or Russia for another foreigner. There is nobody in the United States available.

"The Indian Bureau is so vile that it makes the blood of an honest American run cold in his veins and brings the blush of shame to the cheeks." (Hon. John Steven McGroarty, of California, on the floor of the House of Representatives, January 30, 1936.)

BUREAU NEEDS REMINDER FROM CONGRESS IT CANNOT RUN FOREVER

Today the Indian Bureau spreads its wings from Canada to the Gulf and the Atlantic to the Pacific, in a feigned sweep of Indian education, protection, and development. Its spread is far and wide, its lasting, worth-while results or accomplishments few and far between, considering the years it has been on the job and the multiplied millions of dollars of hard-earned taxpayer money, to say nothing of other millions of dollars belonging to the Indians—which it has squandered.

It needs a reminder from the Congress—through drastic curtailment of its useless activities—that it cannot go on forever.

IS DEGREE OF BLOOD THERMOMETER FOR INTELLIGENCE?

The Indian is capable—full-blood or mixed-blood. There is nothing lacking in the mind of a full-blood Indian merely because he is a full-blood Indian. The Creator gave the Indian—full-blood Indian included—his share of talents. The full-blood Indian can and will use such talents to advantage and well-being—the same as the full-blood of any other race—if given equal opportunity and environment.

"Civilization is a habit; language is nothing but a habit. We aren't born with language, nor are we born with ideas, either of civilization or savagery. All these things are forced upon us by our environment after birth."

S. 1311 IS SOLUTION

S. 1311, implementing Senate Report No. 310, is the correct solution of the present nightmare of Indian inferiority foisted upon the Indian by the Indian Bureau, cultivated by the Bureau and perpetuated by the Bureau.

S. 1311 relieves the Indian Bureau of supervision and control over the land and money of the allotted Indian and his heirs—whose property is now under control of the Bureau—making it possible for the Bureau to demonstrate whether it can be of real service to the 150,000 or more unallotted Indians: Navajos, Pueblos, and others.

S. 1311 has no direct application to the Indian who has received his or her share of a tribal estate, in whole or in part—not now under control of the Bureau—through allotment of land and division of money. It destroys no constitutional right of any Indian.

It makes no mention of closing Indian schools or Indian hospitals—both should be closed.

When you build a school for any race and set that race aside from other races you have "Jim Crowed" that race. No amount of argument can destroy this fact.

In Oklahoma even the Bureau has erected Indian day schools for Indians within a mile or half mile of white public schools.

Let any Indian who feels like laughing laugh this off as not "Jim Crowing" the Indian.

In our madness to seek advantage we sometimes cut our own throats.

The Bureau has made other Indian-segregating moves in Oklahoma—equally as ridiculous and fatal to the Indian—requiring an admonition from former Gov. William H. Murray that such could not and would not be tolerated, violating as it did a fundamental provision of the Oklahoma Constitution.

MERGE INDIAN DAY SCHOOLS WITH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

July 1, 1940, Mr. A. C. Monahan, of the Bureau, wrote Commissioner Collier that the Bureau was then conducting 15 Indian day schools within the Five Tribes of Oklahoma. Today this number has no doubt increased—once you let the camel's nose (bureaucracy) inside the tent he is soon in and you out.

The Oklahoma Constitution treats of but two races, white and black. It provides separate schools, separate waiting rooms, separate coaches, and other racial distinctions for the colored man. The intent of the Constitution of Oklahoma—it has been so regarded as have all laws thereunder—is that the white man and red man in the public schools and elsewhere are one.

Four hundred and fifty-two years ago the white and red man first met.

Thirty-seven years ago, under the Constitution of Oklahoma, race distinction between the white man and red man was erased.

This relationship should not be disturbed or undermined.

Government Indian day schools in Oklahoma are cancers of Indian inferiority or race prejudice projected into the public-school system of Oklahoma by the Indian Bureau; and if not in violation of the law of Oklahoma, certainly in danger of disrupting the relationship now existing in the public-schol system of Oklahoma, as between the red man and white man.

Indian day schools in Oklahoma should be immediately merged into the public-school system of Oklahoma—including buildings and other equipment now the property of the Federal Government—without cost to the counties or school districts in which now located.

INDIAN INFERIORITY IN MIND OF BUREAU

Again, there is nothing wrong with the full-blood Indian. He has received his share of natural mental equipment. And it is not necessary that he be placed to himself, on a stump or in a hollow—miles from nowhere—in order to properly acquaint him with the English language and promote his mental development into the same channels of usefulness as are being taught the white boy and girl.

The public school is the place for Mr. Full-blood Indian.

PRACTICABILITY OF IMPROVING INDIAN CAME—NOT FROM BUREAU

"From these sources of information, which have been drawn from experimental knowledge of several religious societies, and associations of friends, who at their own expense, and by their unwearied exertions have done much to ameliorate the distressed conditions of those wretched inhabitants of the forest, little or no doubt remains of the policy and practicability of improving the friendly Indians in agriculture, manufacture, education, and all the arts of civilized life; and at the same time teach the hostile tribes that their safety, interest, and happiness will be promoted by cultivating peace and amity with us." (Vol. 1, House Indian Committee, 15th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 91, January 15, 1819.)

The Indian Department had been in existence 33 years when this report of the Congress was made, yet the report says the House Indian Committee is drawing its information from "religious societies and associations of friends" of the Indians.

No place in this report is the Indian Bureau mentioned.

And, this committee of the Congress says these "religious societies, and associations of friends" of the Indians, "from experimental knowledge" and "at their own expense", have found "that little or no doubt remains of the * * * practicability of improving the * * * Indians in agriculture, manu-

facture, education, and all the arts of civilized life."

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS AGO STATE OR LOCAL LAWS APPLIED TO INDIAN

State or local statutes are not new to the Indian. The Colonies—250 years ago—legislated for the protection of the Indian as to his personal and property rights. Every legal measure known to the ingenuity of man was adopted by the Colonies to protect the Indian from harmful uses of whisky. In some of the Colonies Indians were made a part of law enforcement.

The Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1693, by law, made it possible "to nominate and appoint constables and other proper and necessary officers amongst them"—the Indians—for the enforcement of the laws of the Colonies.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS AGO INDIANS WILLED PROPERTY

The Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1693 also provided that the Indian could, by will, devise property, but that "all such devises of lands, or other real estate whatsoever, by any last will and testament from any Indian or Indians, to any English person or persons, that have heretofore been made, and have not been approved by the General Court; and all such as shall hereafter be made, unless approbation of the General Court shall be first obtained, are hereby declared utterly void and of no effect."

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE YEARS AGO INDIANS HAD FIRST LEGAL GUARDIAN

And there were guardians of Indian property and person as early as 1805. Section 1 of an act of the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1805 provides:

"That His Excellency, the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of council, be, and he hereby is, authorized and empowered to appoint two good and discreet men as guardians, to have the care and oversight of said Indians and their property, with full power to superintend the same."

Under this guardianship "all deeds, bargains, sales, releases, quit claims, or any other conveyance whatsoever * * * of any lands * * * which do, or shall hereafter, belong to any of said Indians * * * shall be utterly void and of none effect, excepting such deeds, leases, or other conveyances, as shall first be examined, approved, and confirmed, by said guardians."

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX YEARS AGO INDIANS ADOPTED WHITE MAN'S LAW

In 1785, 9 years subsequent to the Declaration of Independence and 5 years previous to the adoption of the Federal Constitution by New Jersey, the last of the Original Thirteen States to take such action, at Hopewell, Ga., the National Government made a treaty with one of the now Oklahoma Indian tribes, carrying in it a provision for delegate representation of the tribe in the Congress. This tribe's first written law was in 1808. In that year it levied a poll tax for the benefit of its treasury. In 1827, 37 years subsequent to the final adoption of the Constitution of the United States, this tribe adopted and put into operation a written constitution governing its conduct. Only a few years followed and the constitution of this tribe was printed in the Indian and English languages.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-TWO YEARS AGO—"TAKE CHRISTIANITY TO INDIANS"—COLONIAL LAW

In 1672 the Colonies by law enforceable upon the Colonies provided for taking Christianity to the Indians:

"That one or more of the teaching elders of the churches in this jurisdiction, with the help of an able interpreter * * * shall go among the neighboring Indians to draw and direct their ways according to the rules of His word; and the Governor and Deputy Governor, and other magistrates, are desired to take care and see the thing attended, and, with their presence, so far as may be convenient, to encourage the same."

INDIAN AND WHITE MUCH ALIKE—NOT ALL SAVAGES NOR CROOKS

In colonial days, as now, not all Indians were blood-thirsty savages. Then, as now, not all white men were crooks, cutthroats, thieves, or dirty politicians, lying in wait for an Indian to devour or rob of his property. Then, as now, there were white men and red men, good and bad, in the Governors' Colonies and the chiefs' tribes.

BUREAU'S BOASTS FRAUDULENT OR IGNORANT

When the Indian Bureau today points to itself as the one and only one who has, can, or will Christianize and educate and protect the full-blood Indian in his property rights, it does so fraudulently, with a will to deceive, or ignorantly. The printed record is against it from the hour of its creation to this good day.

The Bureau does nothing for the Indian except that an advance appropriation to cover its services is first made by the Congress.

BUREAU 137 TIMES MORE EXPENSIVE THAN FIRST 42 YEARS

From the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1791 to the 31st day of December 1833--Report 472, pages 49 and 50, House Indian Committee, Twenty-third Congress, first session, volume 1, 1816 to 1834—Indian Department expenditures, exclusive of annuities and treaty stipulations, were $3,623,697.40.

During the past 10 years—Senate Indian Committee, June 11, 1943, page 6, paragraph 2, lines 10 and 11, Senate Report No. 310—"the Bureau has had the supervision of the spending of more than $500,000,000."

From these figures it will be readily observed that the Indian Bureau over the past 10 years has spent 137 times the amount required to cover its operations from 1791 to 1833—42 years.

Like whisky, as the Bureau ages the more expensive it becomes.

INDIANS COULD HAVE BEEN PAID $2,500 EACH

During Commissioner Collier's administration, according to Senate Report No. 310, he has supervised the spending of tribal Indian money and public funds in an amount sufficient to have made a per capita payment of $1,250 to his 400,000 Indians. The Commissioner in 1933 said there were only 195,000 Indians under Bureau supervision. Give him 5,000 more Indians and divide $500,000,000 by 200,000. The result shows the Commissioner could have made a $2,500 per capita payment to this Indian group.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLARS

Had other departments of the Federal Government been appropriated for and allowed to spend on a per capita basis of $2,500 for each and every citizen of the United States—over 130,000,000—the national debt by reason of such expenditure would now be in excess of $325,000,000,000.

The actual cash the Indian received of Mr. Collier's $500,000,000 was small indeed—none you might say.

MENTAL DECAY AND PROPERTY DESTRUCTION INDIAN'S INHERITANCE

External Government paternalism leads to a wilderness of mental decay and property destruction—regardless of whether the red man or white man is the victim.

Again quoting Mr. Monahan of the Bureau—with reference to Oklahoma Indians:

"Approximately 3,000,000 acres of land is still exempt from taxation although the original owers of more than half of this are dead and the land is in what is known as heirship status, that is, it has not yet been divided among the heirs."

Recalling the testimony of Mr. Landman at Muskogee, and those supporting him, and the testimony of Commissioner Collier before the House Appropriations Committee, 1938, wherein the Commissioner states he was holding a tract of land belonging to Indian heirs who had grown so numerous it would be 1,500 years before he could pay them $1 rental for such land, has not the allotted Indian—under the thumb of the Bureau—just about reached a wilderness of mental decay and property destruction?

INDIANS WILL WORK, CAN WORK, AND DO WORK—BUREAU TRAILING

Law—Federal, State, county, or township—is not new to the Indian. Land and its use has been known to the Indian throughout his existence. The Indian is as physically strong and mentally alert as other races. And the Indian of today is not dead. Yes, the Bureau's telling, constantly telling, the Indian he is dead, going or gone, has weakened him. He will have to kick himself free of such ghosts—he will when the Bureau is kicked free from him.

Mr. Monahan, of the Bureau, while sojourning among the Indians of Oklahoma, discovered that "Indians have to earn their own living just as members of the white race earn their own living."

"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," man's first lesson, the Indian knew before Columbus landed, Commissioner Collier's Government-financed propaganda sheet "Indians at Work" to the contrary notwithstanding.

To be sure, not too many Indians possess college degrees nor as many as should speak the English language. The lesson of self-preservation is simple and easily understood, as Adam, the Indian, from the beginning has known this lesson.

Again the Bureau is trailing—ever trailing.

As an Indian and taxpayer, I endorse S. 1311 100 percent. It is the beginning toward the end of Indian Bureau Indian inferiority, which will never end as long as the Bureau can successfully hoodwink the Congress into appropriating for its maintenance and support, using Indian destitution and Indian incompetency as an excuse.

No honest citizen, regardless of race, can or will endorse Indian Bureau spending of the past 10 years. With the facts before them the Indians will condemn such woeful waste of public money.

As previously shown, Commissioner Collier, during his administration, according to Senate Indian Committee Report No. 310, has spent upward of $500,000,000.

With $500,000,000 every claim against the Federal Government which the Indians are today asserting could be settled, finally and forever.

At this hour Indians do not ask the Federal Government to pay Indian claims; the Government's struggle to successfully finance the present war is too great. Indians should and will, if given the opportunity, protest the waste of millions of dollars by the Bureau, using the Indian as the excuse, which could be converted to necessary war needs.

Senator MOORE, I hope it will be possible for you to write many Indians, giving them an opportunity to express their views. Their rights as Indians, in tribal claims, tribal funds which the Bureau is spending, and as taxpayers, are involved. Every Indian knows the Bureau is costly to the Indians and the white taxpayer, and that as long as it exists as a tax-eater, large or small, just that long will final settlement of Indian claims and the affairs of the Indians with the Federal Government be delayed.

I trust S. 1311 is speedily enacted into law. It is economical and just. The Bureau digs into the white taxpayers' pocket and the Indians' tribal funds. S. 1311 is just to the

Indian. It recognizes him as a human being, capable of standing on his own feet, seeing through his own eyes, and directing his own activities into lines of thought and endeavor which will regain and retain his self-respect and provide for his needs and comforts.

It takes one hand of the Bureau off the Indian's throat and out of the white taxpayer's pocket now. As stated, it is the beginning of the end of the Indian Bureau—the oldest and most useless, and the past 10 years the largest per capita spending bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Sincerely,

O. K. CHANDLER.

George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "George Washington" written by Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, and published in the Georgia Farmer's Market Bulletin of February 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON

History records only a very few names that compare with George Washington in mental power, genuine patriotism, and honest conscientious manhood.

George Washington and his brother were reared by a widowed mother. Young George, when only 16 years of age, was a surveyor. With a few companions, he took his surveyor's compass and marked land lines in Virginia and Maryland.

The country through which these land lines were marked was at that time a vast wilderness, full of wild game and Indians. George Washington surveying land, sleeping on the ground at night, shooting game for meat, and defending himself against unfriendly Indians, became an expert woodsman and Indian fighter.

Washington also explored the Potomac River from the Chesapeake Bay far up into the mountains of what is now West Virginia.

Being of a practical mind, Washington spotted all the waterfalls and suitable sites for water mills. In later years Washington built water mills at various points along the Potomac, which he operated for toll and ground corn and wheat for his neighbors for many miles up and down the river. In this way Washington accumulated what in that day was a comfortable fortune. He also married the Widow Custis, who was possessed of a fortune, and between them they were among the wealthiest people in America at the time of the Revolutionary War.

At the time of the French and Indian War the English King sent a British Army in red uniforms, under General Braddock, to America to fight the Indians. General Braddock being strictly a military man, insisted on marching his troops into battle against the Indians in strict military formation, just as battles were fought in wars in Europe. The result was disastrous for the British just as Washington had warned Braddock it would be because the Indians fighting behind trees, rocks, and bushes mowed down the red coats who were unable to fight effectively an enemy whom they could not see. General Braddock and many of his men were killed outright, but Washington who was there with a number of American pioneers immediately took command. Washington, who had learned from his experience in surveying in the Indian country how to fight the Indians on their own ground, immediately gave orders to fight the Indians in their own way. That was, from behind trees, rocks, and bushes. Washington saved the day and saved the American settlers from massacre by the Indians because he knew how to fight Indians.

When trouble arose with King George of England, Washington, being a man of wealth and having a lot to lose by war, was disposed and inclined to maintain peace with the mother country so long as possible. Nevertheless, when conditions became intolerable and the Declaration of Independence was signed in Philadelphia, in which the signers pledged to each other "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," Washington immediately threw off restraint and became the leader of the Continental Army.

Washington, as their commander, pledged his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor. Washington did not send his men into battle, he led them.

Washington did not leave his men to suffer hunger and cold in camp. He stayed with them.

In the terrible days at Valley Forge, Washington slept in the snow with his men, suffered the same hunger, hardships, and privation that his men suffered. Not only did Washington suffer the same hardships that his men suffered, but he used a large part of his own private fortune to buy food for those men who followed him in this war for American liberty.

When Washington decided to cross the Delaware River to surprise the British, he did not send his men through the icy waters of the Delaware. Washington was in one of the first boats that went across and helped to push the boat through the floes and break ice jams.

Finally, when victory was achieved, it was but natural that a grateful people would make him the first President of the United States. Washington served as President during the first 8 years of the life of this Nation. He was called the Father of his Country and was in deed and in fact, the Father of his Country. After serving two terms of 4 years each as President, Washington declined to be President any longer.

In declining a third term as President, Washington demonstrated to the greatest degree the pure patriotism and love of his country.

Washington knew from the history of the past that no nation could remain a free nation if any one man were kept too long in the highest seat of authority.

Washington knew from history that if a precedent was ever set for a President to hold more than 8 years, that sometime some man who was lacking in pure patriotism would seize the opportunity to become a dictator of the people and destroy American liberty.

It took a big man to do this. No small man would ever refuse a third term or fourth term. Only a big man who loved his country more than he loved himself would refuse more than two terms.

Washington did not refuse a third term because Americans had anything to fear from a third term by Washington. Washington had fought and suffered privation and spent his own money and had risked his own life to win freedom for the people of this Nation. Washington was the Father of the Nation. Washington would never have done anything to the detriment of his country no matter how long he had been President.

Washington knew that in the course of time men would arise who would inherit the benefits of the American Revolution but who had no part in the suffering and dangers of the Revolution. Washington knew that such men would have dreams of power and grandeur akin to the royal courts of Europe. Washington knew that if such men were permitted to retain the President's chair more than 8 years, that the constitutional liberties which Washington and his men had won at such terrible costs at Valley Forge, at Bunker Hill, at King's Mountain, and other bloody battlefields might be lost forever and that the America which he loved so well might once again become a pawn and a stake in the hands of men with vaunting ambitions.

A leader who can save this country will not come from any great metropolis. Such a leader has never come from the city. Men in cities do not have that nearness to God and to nature that is requisite to a true understanding of God's laws and God's way of life for man.

A leader who can save this country must come, like Moses, from the bulrushes along the creek in the countryside. He must come like George Washington from the rocks, trees, and bushes of the wilderness. He must have a heart like Washington that can turn in childlike faith to the Creator of the universe. He must have the unselfish spirit like Washington, that can put his country first and himself last.

God has never in all history failed to provide a leader for any nation whose hearts and minds turned to him and asked for a leader. He will not fail America now if she turns to Him in meekness and contriteness of heart.

In the dark days of Valley Forge, when it seemed there was no hope for Washington and his ragged, cold, and hungry soldiers, shivering in the snow and wind along the Atlantic coast, history records that at night Washington retired to a secluded spot under a great tree, where he knelt and prayed to Almighty God for guidance and deliverance from the enemy which so sorely beset him.

As February 22 goes by we commemorate the birthday of this, the greatest American, and probably the greatest man of all nations since Christ. Let us stop and ponder. As we see the 22d of February 1944, with millions of American boys fighting and giving their lives all over the world, as we see ourselves, like driftwood, being carried helplessly on and on into endless entanglements with foreign nations of every kind, let us, 130,000,000 strong, do as George Washington did—let us retire to a secluded spot as individuals and ask the guidance and protection of Almighty God for the preservation of our country, ourselves, and our posterity.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

No Time for Political Mud Slinging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "No Time for Political Mud Slinging," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR POLITICAL MUD SLINGING—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The United States has never conducted a Presidential election in which there weren't some pretty bad foul balls and offside tactics.

In times of peace we can, perhaps, assimilate a certain amount of political name-calling, part-time demagoguery and falsification—and mark it all off to the quadrennial campaign spree.

But this year the Nation's unity, its poise, and its mutual good will and good faith are not expendable.

At a time when the duration of the war is in balance, when the peak of the hardest fighting in Europe will be at hand, they are certainly not expendable in an election which will determine the shape of the American Government for the next 4 years and may determine the shape of the peace for the next 100 years.

The encouraging fact is that some people, in politics and out, in the capital and in the country, are beginning to think that some voluntary restraints ought to be accepted by both parties and by all candidates in this wartime election—not any soft-pedaling of honest, candid debate, not any muting of courageous differences, but some reduction of plain campaign abuses, which are deplored but tolerated in peace, but are dangerously divisive in war.

"From the standpoint of national unity," a prominent member of the Republican National Committee remarked to me recently, "probably the most important emphasis that we could place on the campaign would be the insistence by both parties on the elimination of any campaign activities which would bring in racial and religious issues.

"Both parties should publicly and privately prevent the circulation and use of scurrilous and defamatory matter in campaign literature, and particularly that cowardly brand which appears anonymously and destroys reputations and characters without being courageous enough to accept responsibility.

"As I see it, both our parties should move strenuously to eliminate class hatreds, racial hatreds, and religious hatreds, with their resulting inevitable conflicts.

"In this connection, it has even been suggested to me that a Nation-wide committee might be set up on the invitation of our political parties, the function of which would be to watch for and condemn the appearance of any defamatory matter which would tend to stir up racial or religious antagonisms. Such a committee might be composed of such outstanding citizens as former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, one of our leading Republican statesmen; former Gov. Alfred E. Smith of New York, one of our leading Democratic statesmen, and a Roman Catholic; Bernard M. Baruch, one of our leading Hebrews who has done such notable service in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; and Judge Francis E. Rivers, who was recently elected to the City Court of New York, one of our leading colored citizens."

Here, certainly, is one constructive approach to a problem which merits responsible attention.

A phase of the problem is illustrated in a recent column by David Lawrence in which he reports that "there is one piece of misrepresentation, still being circulated by isolationists, which ought to be eliminated from the campaign. It is the assertion that President Roosevelt, although promising 'to keep our boys out of foreign wars,' did nevertheless send them abroad to fight, in fact to many stations overseas."

What the President really said was:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

Mr. Lawrence notes that "the phrase that is customarily eliminated by the isolationists is 'except in case of attack.'"

On both sides of the argument, Mr. Lawrence's column illustrates one kind of political tactic which can impair this critical wartime campaign. In this instance, his column does not cite the evidence on which he bases his accusation against the isolationists—although this is not to suggest that he does not possess the evidence. But if the evidence is not substantial, then the isolationists deserve public exoneration, and if the charge is true, then the exposure cannot be too vigorous.

A distinguished trusted nonpartisan panel, such as suggested, might effectively deal with campaign falsification without regard to party. It would be a healthy corrective at a time when national unity is more than ordinarily not expendable.

Tribute to a Mississippi Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a poem, To a Mississippi Boy, written by Johnnie A. Jones, of Drew, Miss., which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of February 17, 1944.

Because this poem describes so well so many of our servicemen, not only from Mississippi, but from every other State, who are offering their lives in this war that our Constitution, our free institutions, and our way of life may be preserved, I believe mothers and fathers all over the country will enjoy reading it and applying it to their own sons now in the service of their country.

The poem follows:

TO A MISSISSIPPI BOY

From the hills of Mississippi,
Where the pines and dogwoods grow,
Came a chubby, blue-eyed youngster
Whom I wish the world could know.

He was not a child of Midas,
Or a famous diplomat;
But he had a clean, clear conscience—
Many kings could not say that.

I recall this friendly youngster,
Wearing knee pants, blouse, and cap,
Fussing with a knotted shoestring
As he sat upon my lap.

I recall his early school days,
Readin', writin', 'rithmetic;
How he learned to make a baseball
Do a crazy, curving trick.

Had a boundless sense of humor,
Tempered by the Golden Rule;
Learned the game of life the hard way,
In life's complicated school.

Took no part in shady habits,
Stood for what he knew was right;
Hated squabbles and confusion,
But if crowded he would fight.

He was neat in his appearance,
He was thoughtful and polite;
His devotion to his mother
Was his life's eternal light.

Then, almost before we knew it,
By the cruel hand of fate,
He was just another soldier
From our dear Magnolia State.

Sworn to fight for God and country,
And the things that freemen love;
Sworn to do the soldier's duty,
By the help of God above.

Quick of eye and keen of hearing,
Thorough, dependable, alert,
He was picked for special missions;
Proved himself a born expert.

Now he's fallen for Old Glory;
Gave it all he had to give.
See him wounded, bleeding, dying,
That our Nation's cause might live.

We cannot recall our loved one
From his grave, so cold and still,
But we have that precious mem'ry,
And a mission to fulfill.

We shall cherish all he lived for—
This we know would bring him joy.
This, we pledge, our humble tribute,
To a Mississippi boy.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to show some respect for itself. The tax bill threatened by this veto is none too good, but a veto makes it worse for those who in the lower tax bracket think they are protected and relieved, while on the contrary will suffer most.

WE HAVE LOST $87,000,000 ALREADY

People do not realize that excise taxes in the tax bill vetoed by President Roosevelt would return to the Treasury an estimated $87,000,000 per month. Had the bill been signed by the President 10 days before March 1, this amount of excise taxes would have been collected in March. The people lost $87,000,000 by the delay. Even if the bill is passed over the President's veto, excise taxes will not be collectible until beginning April 1.

THE RAPE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The tax bill contains a provision freezing the social-security tax at 1 percent for this year, whereas it would increase to 2 percent under the provisions of the original Social Security Act. This amounts to $1,100,000,000, an awful lot of money, half of which will have to be paid by workers with incomes of less than $3,000 per year, and the other half paid by their employers, if the President's veto of the tax bill is not overridden by Congress. I propose to vote to override the veto in the interest of those people.

The Social Security Board has a surplus now of $11,000,000,000. This is more than the estimated demands under the Social Security Act for a period of 5 years. All of this money has gone into the Treasury and Government bonds issued therefor.

The tax bill increases excess-profits taxes of corporations to 95 from 90 percent, and if the veto is not overridden the tax will remain at 90 percent.

The veto should not be sustained.

Under consent heretofore granted, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "The Tax Bill Veto":

THE TAX-BILL VETO

This newspaper has frequently expressed regret that Congress did not set its sights higher with respect to tax legislation than the $2,300,000,000 provided in the bill which it sent to the White House a fortnight ago. But to make such a criticism, along with a miscellany of other feeble objections, the basis for a veto, as the President has now done, is quite another matter. Mr. Roosevelt's action of yesterday, it seems to us, was one of the most arbitrary and capricious of his entire Presidential career.

Whether or not one believes that the congressional bill is the best that could be obtained, it represents many weeks of earnest work and serious debate on the part of those charged with the formulation of revenue policy. Although the President likes to contrast the $2,300,000,000 provided by this bill with the $10,500,000,000 he asked for, the fact is that he has at no time offered any genuinely constructive tax leadership. He not only did not tell Congress what kind of taxes he wanted, but although all of the points to which he objects in his veto measure were a matter of public discussion many weeks ago he never hinted until the bill reached the White House that he might make these objections the basis of a veto. To make matters worse, while he now suggests enactment of the excise provisions of the bill by themselves, through his own action in holding the measure up for more than 2 weeks before sending it back to Congress he has already made it impossible for these taxes to become effective before April 1, a circumstance which alone will cost the Treasury about $85,000,000.

So specious are most of the reasons advanced by the President for sending the revenue bill back that it is difficult to avoid the conviction that they are not reasons at all, but pretexts for reasons which must be sought in the unwritten word. He complains, for example, about the provision under which the social-security taxes are frozen at their present levels, instead of being permitted to rise automatically as originally scheduled. There is much that could be said on this highly controversial point, but perhaps it is sufficient to quote Senator VANDENBERG'S observation of yesterday that in this instance the President "is not vetoing Congress, but his own Secretary of the Treasury, who agreed that no increase in pay-roll taxes would be justified in 1944."

Mr. Roosevelt objects to the provision of the bill which would terminate renegotiation of war contracts at the end of the present year. It would be hard to imagine an objection—to use a favorite Presidential adjective—more picayune than this one. Certainly, he knows that there are time limits placed on all emergency legislation, and that those limits can be, and almost invariably are, extended if conditions later warrant such action.

The President also urges that something be done about simplifying the individual income tax. With March 15 approaching, this suggestion is well-timed politically, yet here again the President seems to be less than forthright. He should know, if he doesn't, that the House Ways and Means Committee has already started work on such simplification. His little excursion into the causes of the present confused state of the income tax is equally misleading. He implies that they stem from the adoption of the Ruml plan, on the one hand, and the Victory tax, on the other—with respect to both of which he disclaims administration responsibility. The fact is that there was nothing complicated about the Ruml plan itself; that the complications were the result of the administration's successful effort to add to the Ruml plan its own rider in the form of the carryover a quarter of a year's taxes. As for the Victory tax, he seems to be unaware of the circumstance that, bad as this tax is, it has at least the historical justification of having been the Senate's alternative to the even more complicated administration spending tax.

We agree with Senator GEORGE, who declared yesterday that never in his experience had he seen "a major piece of legislation vetoed on such inadequate and unconvincing grounds." If it has any sense of its own dignity and self-respect Congress will administer to the Executive the rebuke which this captious message deserves by passing the measure over his veto by an impressive majority.

Clayton Selection Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, no man could be selected who is better qualified to head the Surplus War Property Administration than is Mr. Will L. Clayton. He has excellent training and the proper philosophy toward the responsible duty which has been given to him. Mr. Bernard Baruch deserves high compliment for selecting Mr. Clayton and Mr. Clayton deserves our backing and support. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial about Mr. Clayton which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of February 23, 1944:

A BIG JOB FOR MR. CLAYTON

Will L. Clayton, whom many Chattanocgans know well, will head the important Surplus War Property Administration. We suppose that makes him a bureaucrat. But anyone who has had opportunity to analyze the reasons why Mr. Clayton is one of the big men the South has furnished the Nation understands that the simplicity with which he takes apart and deals with great matters is the distinguishing mark of his ability. He doesn't think the way bureaucrats are supposed to do.

The disposal of war surplus property is about the biggest business of getting the Government out of business that one could imagine. In his recent speech in Chattanooga, Mr. Paul Hoffman, head of the Committee for Economic Development, made the astonishing statement that already more billions of dollars in war contracts had been canceled than were terminated at the close of the First World War.

That means we are face to face already with some problems in a complicated puzzle. We did not handle the issue sensibly after the last war, and the dumping of a lot of goods and materials coupled with the severe decline in prices contributed to the drastic deflationary crisis of 1921.

The late Dwight Morrow once said that a number of economists in a private meeting had been in agreement on only one point in the last war. That was that there had been such a wastage of raw materials, such as copper, wool, leather, etc., that the world would not catch up on its supplies for years. Yet we finished the war with such stock piles of many commodities that the industrial world had indigestion. Many companies lost more money on their inventories in 6 months than they had made in all the war years.

Orderly disposal of Government property will call for good judgment and a sure and sound business sense. Long-range policies must be framed, and after that must come the important matter of timing in the application of these policies to the restoration of private business to its proper place in the American economy.

We do not know of anyone to whom we would rather trust the great task of working out the job than Mr. Clayton. Among other special qualities he has is that of looking at our economic structure in relation to the world picture. We cannot come out of this war a world political power and then look at our economic problems in a narrow nationalistic and parochial way. Chattanoogans will be cheering on Mr. Clayton as he takes on a job that means so much for the future of all of us.

Washington's Birthday Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. John I. Cosgrove, a member of the bar of South Carolina, at the one hundred and thirty-seventh annual banquet of the Washington Light Infantry:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, officers and members of Washington Light Infantry, at the call of your committee I come, on short notice, to try to fill the shoes of a distinguished citizen and brilliant orator—your selected speaker, Senator Brown, of Barnwell. I am sure that you join in our regret at his enforced absence because of illness and in our sincere hope that he soon will be restored to health. It is with much trepidation, I can assure you, that I have mustered sufficient boldness to attempt to replace on this program that able and experienced speaker and outstanding son of South Carolina. Friendship for him and respect for this ancient and honorable organization, however, have greatly quieted my fears and emboldened my courage in the circumstances.

May I express the hope that when I have concluded my remarks, at least, I will escape the "compliment" accorded another speaker on a similar occasion. Having been called on by the toastmaster for a few extemporaneous remarks, the speaker proceeded to withdraw from an inner pocket a typewritten address that lasted for over two hours. Meeting a friend, who had attended the dinner, the next day, the speaker inquired how his speech had gone. The friend promptly replied: "Why, Sam, it was moving, soothing, and satisfying." Swelling with pride, the speaker said, "That's fine! But what do you mean by 'moving, soothing, and satisfying'?" "Well," said the friend, "it was moving because by the time you had spoken an hour, one-half of the audience had moved out, and it was soothing

because by the time you concluded the rest of the audience was dead asleep." "I can understand that", said the speaker, "but what about 'satisfying'?" Replied the friend, "I'm satisfied you'll never be invited to speak again."

Conscious of the truth of the foregoing I will endeavor to avoid a like result.

In keeping with your history and tradition, today has been set apart to honor the Father of our Country. We mark, tonight, the two hundred and twelfth anniversary of his birth. This day that we commemorate belongs not alone to America but to the world. The results of his achievements are the heritage of mankind; his name and his fame the precious possession of all peoples. The experiment in democracy instituted under his guidance is a trust for which each and every one of us is accountable. For, said he, in his first inaugural:

"The destiny of the republican model of government (is) justly considered as deeply, perhaps, as finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

It is appropriate, therefore, on this occasion to accord recognition to his achievements, to pay just tribute to his sterling qualities, his great sacrifices for his country and his noble deeds, but, above all, to render an accounting of the experiment entrusted to us as American citizens.

A grateful Nation has erected in Washington a monument to this great leader that typifies in its grandeur, no less than its simplicity, the attributes of its national hero. Reaching to the heavens, higher than the dome of St. Peter's at Rome or that of St. Paul's in London, it exemplifies the high ideals of our first citizen, his rugged strength of character, his simplicity of taste, his purity of motives, and, above all, his abiding faith in a just and watchful Providence.

God blessed America when Washington was born. In her hour of trial he rose as a Moses to lead his people from oppression and tyranny into a land of justice and liberty. Guiding her untrained and ill-equipped soldiers with grim determination and consummate skill through periods of dark despair, through times when all seemed lost, when the appeasers were urging peace, he, finally, by an unyielding perseverance, born of virtue and a knowledge of the right, achieved that liberty which is our birthright today—and for which we honor his memory throughout this broad land.

The story of his life is in the history books of our schools. Every boy and girl in America is familiar with it, in whole or in part. His great love of country, his distinguished services as Commander in Chief of the Continental Armies and as our first President, his refusal of compensation for these services, his wise direction of the infant Nation in its first steps toward self-government, his sage admonitions on how to cherish and protect the resulting union of States, are known to all of us. His tolerance in victory and fortitude in defeat, his private virtue and public integrity, his greatness as a leader and his wisdom as a counselor, have been recalled and extolled by many more able than I on occasions without number.

In ordinary times an extended oration on these subjects, no doubt, would be proper and fitting. However, we are not living in ordinary times. We are living in hours of a time pulsating with so many forces of immediate consequence to ourselves that it is well-nigh impossible to concentrate, even momentarily, on that period of history in which the great Washington moved and had his being. It seems so remote, so out-of-touch, that it is difficult to visualize its existence. So far removed is it, indeed, in perspective and thought, if not in years, that one, in pondering the two ages, finds little or no ground for comparison.

The insignificant Confederation of States of the time of Washington has expanded and grown to a giant among nations. Sprawled over the continent of North America up into Alaska and across the waters of the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the Caribbean, the Nation of Washington has become the leader of the world—rich, powerful, and colossal by comparison with others.

Up to the Civil War period our people were concerned with pushing back the frontier. Following that age, with the coming of invention and industry we followed the chase for material comforts and riches. Mass production of essentials and even luxuries brought them within reach of the many. Notwithstanding economic reverses the sound basis of material life remained undisturbed and social gains moved us forward in the field of personal security.

Came then the tragic catastrophe in Europe. Nation upon nation fell under the heel of the tyrants. Individual liberty was crushed, religion ruthlessly stamped out, personal initiative and opportunity strangled. A giant contest of the philosophies of government was attempted to be settled to the roar of cannon and the hissing of bombs.

There stood America, powerful, rich, and colossal. That truth, that freedom, that liberty which Washington had achieved and which lighted the world and inspired its peoples was being challenged.

In this period, our great President, knowing full well the forces at work, counseled the Nation: "Arm for defense, make our democracy impregnable to all assaults, and, meanwhile, give aid to our struggling sister nations."

But the heart of America hesitated. Less than a quarter of a century before we had joined a war to end all wars. We had journeyed more than 3,000 miles across the sea to make the world safe for democracy. The boys who emerged from the trenches in 1918 were now mature men. Their eyes had seen death and destruction, all that hate and hell on earth could muster. They had seen the ingratitude and cynicism of former allies. They had read the secret treaties of the belligerents unearthed from the archives of the Czars and Hapsburgs and others. They had seen the fruits of victory soured through jealousy and chicanery at the peace table. The ideals for which their brothers had fought and died were in ashes. America had won that war but had lost the peace. Disillusioned and chagrined they resolved against war and all its horrors.

Then suddenly and without warning came the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor. America was again at war, allied once more against nations which scoffed at the greatness of Washington and the principles and ideals for which he fought. The experiment, for the second time in a generation, was under attack.

The answer to that challenge has been found in the millions of our men and women in the armed forces in all parts of the world, the thousands of our planes and ships, and the death and destruction even now being dealt these foul enemies of democracy.

To achieve final victory through unconditional surrender of the Axis powers, however, national unity is essential.

An appeal for unity to you men of the Washington Light Infantry I know is not only unnecessary, but, perhaps, comes with ill grace. You, who in every crisis of the Nation's history for nearly a century and a half have responded to every call of your country; you, who, at St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and the defense of Toul, under the command of your gallant Captain Withington, maintained with desperate courage your proud record; you, who fathered our great Citadel making possible the training of American boys from all parts of the Nation; you, who braved the criticism of your fellow citizens to participate in the centennial of Bunker Hill as the first southern military company to visit the North after the Civil War; you, who are the proud possessors of the sacred Eutaw flag of the Revolution; you, who today, to a man are engaged in the present world conflict; you, who tonight, before me, constitute the defense forces for our beloved city and State; you, my friends, need no appeal for unity at my hands.

But it is you and men like you upon whom our Nation must depend for leadership in this great crisis. There are thousands, nay millions of our citizens, who need to be spurred to the realization of what we are fighting for. If properly understood, I feel sure that the grumbling over rationing, strikes, and conflicts between capital and labor, political acrimony, and the like would soon disappear, and a united nation would emerge—to strike the final blow for victory.

As loyal American citizens we must stand foursquare behind our leaders. Petty bickerings and willful criticism should receive no toleration. Our boys are dying upon battlefields all over the globe. If we lose, we lose everything. That patriotism, fidelity to duty, and sense of fair play innate in the spirit of America must be developed and brought into action. An intelligent understanding of the issues involved in this great conflict must be brought home to everyone. Let us think more about big things and talk less about little things. How many of us have suffered any serious deprivation thus far, except those whose sons have been killed or maimed in battle?

Let us tonight, on this great anniversary, dedicate ourselves to that task. Not only to the task of unity for victory but also unity for a just and lasting peace.

Our men in the fox holes, under and upon the sea, and in the air know what they are fighting for, for without such knowledge their will to fight would be destroyed. They know that the experiment of Washington and the founding fathers is being tested to the utmost. They know that unless a just and lasting peace is won our dead will have died in vain. Tonight throughout the world they are preparing the accounting for the American people of their stewardship to George Washington. May the final report be: Sir, "the experiment entrusted to the hands of the people" has been preserved.

Shadows of the Crooked Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 14, 1944, Hon. Norman M. Littell, Assistant United States Attorney General, delivered in New York City an address entitled "Shadows of the Crooked Cross." The address deals with the subject of intolerance, and particularly with the wave of anti-Semitism which was let loose by the enemies of our country and mankind—the German people under the leadership of their sadistic masters.

In view of the timeliness of the subject, and the scholarly character of Mr. Littell's address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An obscure incident on the threshold of American history marks an epoch in a struggle of the Jewish race for almost 2,000 years to attain religious freedom. On August 15, 1790, a Hebrew congregation of Newport, R. I., addressed to the first President of our newly born Republic this devout and profound comment:

"Deprived as we hitherto have been of the invaluable rights of free citizens, we now—with a deep sense of gratitude to the Almighty Disposer of all events—behold a government erected by the majesty of the people—a government which to bigotry gives no sanction, to persecution no assistance, but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming every one of whatever nation, tongue, or language, equal parts of the great governmental machine."

George Washington could well reply with pride that the United States had "given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy—a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship.

"It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it were by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights, for, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Here at last was a new page in the history of persecuted minorities among religious and racial groups. Members of the Newport Synagogue were among the earliest settlers in the Colonies. They were Spanish and Portuguese Jews who had sought a haven of religious freedom in Roger Williams' colony of Rhode Island.

A long and weary trail had led from the fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 79, when Jewish groups were scattered throughout the world, to this settlement in the colony of Rhode Island. First came persecution under the Roman Empire—not strictly religious persecution for the Empire embraced many diverse and strange religions varying from belief in the Egyptian Goddess Astarte and the cults of Orphic mysteries to the pagan worship of the Roman gods and the followers of the Persian god of Ahura Mazda. The Jews would not admit the divinity of the Roman emperor or burn incense before his statue; nor would the Christians. Therefore, both Jews and Christians were cast into arenas of Rome—side by side.

The Christian minority became a majority with the Edict of Constantine in A. D. 325, adopting Christianity as the religion of the Empire, and with the tendency often fatal to attaining a majority, Christianity itself turned to the persecution of the pagan, the Jew, and the heretical Christian sects.

The path of the Jew wound painfully through the Dark Ages into modern history, through a gauntlet of persecution in Spain, Austria, Portugal, France, England, Germany, Poland, and later Russia.

Small wonder that the congregation of Jews in Newport, R. I., in 1790, having witnessed the birth of a nation founded upon a basic concept of religious tolerance, gave thanks for a new day in the history of the Jews. For the first time in history—and not in the Old World but in the New—the Jews were enfranchised by the Constitution as citizens of the United States.

In the 145 years which followed, American Jews took their place with other minorities in the shelter of this protecting principle of legalized tolerance, reinforced in the constitutions of every State as each one came into the Union. Not that they were wholly free of persecution, for that would assume a country wholly free of bigotry, and no such happy land has yet been known, but here the Jews were only one of several minorities in a new and growing country. Even though there were a few dark days and occasional waves of bigotry striking at the Irish, the Mormon, the Catholic, and the Jew—the prayer of the congregation of Newport and the hope of George Washington was nevertheless substantially realized. With the fears and oppression of the Old World left behind, the Jew moved, lived, and made his vital contributions in the generous atmosphere of American life and good will—more secure during four generations of freedom and justice in this country than he had ever been before in all of his history.

Then suddenly across this American pattern flashed the panzer division of new attacking forces, the vanguard of a ruthless and brutal fanatic who became Chancelor of Germany on January 30, 1933. So tolerant were we of crackpot religious zealots and noisy advocates of one cause or another in the bedlam of democracy debating its way to the truth, that for a time we scarcely noticed the shadow of the swastika over American life—the crooked cross which twists and distorts and divides and destroys.

A William Dudley Pelley established a quasi-military force called the Silver Shirts with over 25,000 members extending through 47 States. To trusting Americans there was a reassuring facade: "Memberships were open to anyone who had the Christian faith and believed in the Constitution of the United States and who had a willingness to support the Constitution of the United States at any cost."

But behind this facade the Silver Shirts meant "to save America as Mussolini and his Black Shirts saved Italy, and Hitler and his Brown Shirts saved Germany," and "to recruit enough men and have them trained in explicit obedience to dare to intimidate the Federal Government." By January 1934 California had more Silver Shirts than either policemen and National Guard men. Meetings were being held in private homes "under a chaplain to perfect themselves in knowledge and tactics for the master battle that is surely imminent."

Playing upon ignorant prejudices and fanning the spleen of the disappointed and frustrated elements of society, the organization attempted to convert the latent prejudices against a religious minority into active and virulent race hatred. Of all the articles published in Pelley's paper, the Galilean, from December 22, 1941, to March 2, 1942, there were 1,195 consistencies with only 45 contradictions of the 14 major Nazi themes of propaganda. With 1,500 subscribers and 3,500 to 5,000 publications a week, in all of which anti-Semitism was a major theme, the stream of race hatred was pumped into readers' minds, beguiled by quotations from the scriptures and praise of the American Constitution.

This was only 1 pocket of German influence. Fritz Kuhn, national bundist leader, organized an eastern department of the United States with over 26 local chapters, a middle western department with over 14 local chapters, and a western department with over 10 local chapters, sponsoring 4 newspapers in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

The bund had seven different camp sites for training purposes and there were numerous affiliated organizations, one of them being the Deutscher Konsum Verband, Inc., designed to promote a boycott in the purchase of Jewish goods. The Ordnungs Dienst was a militant association organization having its uniform, a swastika arm band, and firearms. It was designed specifically to fight Bolshevist and Marxist movements. The German-American Youth League was to establish camps throughout the United States to school American youths in the customs, ideals, and traditions of the German race, with anti-Semitic literature at hand and inflammatory speeches against the Jews a frequent occurrence. American boys took oaths of allegiance "to be faithful to the German way," pledged "as a boy of German stock."

Piece by piece the pattern of this preliminary Nazi invasion of the United States took shape. Scattered but related organizations, and individuals such as Elmer Hartzell, Franz Fiedler, and Robert Edward Edmondson, spread the Nazi poison of race hatred. Edmondson was vigorously supported by the German-American Bund, which held mass meetings and advertised for donations for his legal defense when he was prosecuted and indicted by the grand jury.

The anti-Semitic propaganda was fed into this country by organizations and publications working under the authority and direction of Dr. Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment. Nazi money was distributed in convenient denominations to agents and publications here and abroad—in packs of $20 bills in the United States and in £5 notes in England. Not only in our country but throughout the world the German publication World Service spread anti-Semitic racial hatred, the overthrow of existing governments, and advocated the adoption of national socialism. Other German organizations which in pre-Hitler days were known through the world as advocating pan-Germanism, such as the Fichte Bund, the League for Germandom Abroad, and the German Foreign Institute, were taken over by the Nazis and their original purposes were turned to the use of the Nazi Party in fostering its propaganda throughout the world.

Here and abroad these organizations spread the germs of anti-Semitism, penetrating at every opportunity through carefully compiled lists of names into the armed forces, attempting to undermine their loyalty to the existing form of government in this country. Each of these organizations was recently indicted by a grand jury in the District of Columbia together with 30 individuals for conspiracy to undermine the morale and loyalty of our military and naval forces.

Through such channels, from a land in which a new order reeked with unprecedented corruption and degradation of human dignity, trickled the familiar streams of Goebbels' propaganda. Anti-Semitism was the common theme here as it was in Germany before Hitler's rise to power: Constantly linked together were the Jew and corruption, the Jew and the plutocrats, the Jew and democracy, the Jew and revolutions, the Jew and internationalism. Anti-Semitism was a cement which bound together in the United States all of the groups and individuals from the Pelley followers and the bund leaders to the 30 individuals now facing trial and many others not named here. The proof is overwhelming. As Joseph McWilliams, one of the defendants awaiting trial in Washington, had said to George Pagnanelli in regard to this rabel-rousing anti-Semitic program:

"Between you and me, George, this isn't my class of people. But you've got to have the mob with you in any revolution and this movement of ours is nothing but an American national-socialist revolution in the first stages. I don't believe half of this anti-Jew stuff I preach, but you can't talk politics to these people unless you make it simple by bringing in the Jew every time. It's the only language they understand—the language of hate. Hitler made it work and that's what I'm trying to do here. I want to give the man in the street a Christian new deal."

Herman Schwinn, another defendant in the impending trial, was the western district leader of the Bund whose citizenship was canceled in 1940. He said in a speech on October 13, 1940:

"There will be a new world order guaranteed by Germany, Italy, and Japan. * * * 'Jewmocracy' is the real name of democracy today."

Thus a minority of 5,000,000 Jews in a nation of 130,000,000 persons became the scapegoat of Hitler in this country. Hitler said:

"My Jews are a valuable hostage given to me by the democracies. Anti-Semitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable medium for the extension of our political campaign. You will see how little time we shall need in order to upset the ideas and the criteria of the whole world, simply and purely by attacking Judaism."

It was overwhelmingly clear even before the outbreak of war that the problem had ceased to be a problem of the Jews. The Federal Government acted—not with firing squads as in Germany, but with indictments in the courts where the judgments of average American citizens sitting in the jury box sent 60 persons to the penitentiary, including William Dudley Pelley, Elmer Hartzell, Franz Fiedler, Fritz Kuhn, and 26 Bund leaders associated with him, while George Sylvester Viereck, Joseph McWilliams, Herman Schwinn, and 27 others linked in this gigantic conspiracy to undermine and overthrow the United States Government have been indicted by a Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., and are now about to go on trial.

Does anyone suppose for one moment that all who were guilty were indicted? The trails of investigation lead much further. Remnants of the broken Nazi pattern still remain—much of it still under cover.

Here lurks a potential attack upon a minority of our citizens and a menace to each and every one of us. Surely we now know that the test of democracy does not lie solely in casting ballots at the polls—Hitler's "Ja" vote proved that. The test of democracy lies, above all else, in the protection given to minorities to preserve their liberties, their integrity, and their self-respect under the rule of a majority. Can we not see in the fate of Europe under tyranny that the persecution of one minority leads promptly to the persecution of another? As stated by Edward Joseph Smythe, chairman of the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, and one of those now under indictment and facing trial with George Sylvester Viereck, in an article entitled "Hitler, Stalin, and the Pope":

"We will destroy Judaism and communism in America. We will likewise destroy Romanism here as Hitler has in New Germany. * * * Every Protestant throughout the world (except those in the employ of the Jews) look upon Hitler as the greatest living Christian since Jesus Christ. Romanism, communism, Judaism, fascism is our enemy. We will destroy them, one and all, even if we have to use machine guns to do it. This Nation belongs to the Protestants."

When the pattern is clear, the place of the Jews is clear. As Rauschning says:

"Hitler has firmly believed that with the sole aid of anti-Semitism he could really destroy the moral and legal order in America. He made it clear that anti-Semitism in the United States is the weapon to extend national socialism there, as it had been the weapon in Germany. With the help of all these stirred-up animosities, he could confuse the Nation and seed disruption and injure and disintegrate the whole political and social machinery of America."

In the same conversation with Rauschning Hitler made it clear that by anti-Semitic propaganda he could not only gain the support of important elements of all kinds in a nation—sympathizers and followers of other ideas—but by destroying a vital part of the society he would seduce a nation to use methods of terror and force and so destroy the feeling for right and order.

"Propaganda," Goebbels said, "helped us to power; propaganda kept us in power; propaganda will help us to conquer the world." Goebbels might have said more accurately "unchallenged propaganda." The voice of destruction prevailed in Germany because it remained unchallenged by meek and submissive citizens. Liberty died in Germany and the Weimar Republic with it—not with Hitler's "Ja" election and not when Hindenburg capitulated and made Hitler his Chancellor on January 30, 1933. It had already died. Recently I saw a picture, taken in the early days of Hitler's rise to power, of a man being marched down the streets of Berlin by four storm troopers, wearing an insulting sign on the front and back labeling him as a Jew. Neither the Jew nor the storm trooper determined the fate of Germany, but rather the passive bystanders witnessing without protest the humiliation of a human soul. Jew and non-Jew watching the procession saved their own skins but lost their own souls. Invisible but nevertheless side by side with that lonely Jew marching to a concentration camp or death marched the liberties, the sense of justice, the self-respect of the German people.

How rightly Mr. Justice Murphy has recently said, "Our action in respect to the Jews may well be considered the measure of our civilization and the test of our institutions of government." How rightly he and other leading Americans have said that we must leave no stone unturned to save those who can still be saved in Europe, lest we stand in the position of the German bystanders watching a tragic procession without raising a hand to stop it.

But we scarcely need to seek a guide for action from experience abroad. What is the traditional American method of meeting a menace from without or evils from within? Whether we are facing merely the remnants of the Nazi pattern for America or related forces at home which would rule by might, the objectives of these forces are the same and the solution is the same—the traditional American solution: Attack, attack, attack, wherever the forces of tyranny show their heads.

Let us turn the full light of informed public scrutiny upon every incident, upon every specious argument, upon all those who give lip service to our liberties but condone oppression and ignore attack upon minorities.

Let us awaken an embattled public opinion, an outraged sense of justice, a clear and understanding conviction that the issue is greater than the individual, greater than the Jewish minority of our citizens immediately involved—as great indeed as the very future of our country, for the price of defeat or even compromise with these forces is the loss of human dignity and decency—the loss of our soul as a natien.

The battle lines throughout the world today are drawn between men of good will and men of ill will. Those same battle lines exist on the home front. Let us proceed by law, as Federal prosecutors are now proceeding, to strike and strike hard wherever the facts justify, and let us turn the light of public scrutiny mercilessly upon the soldiers on the home front, our public officials in the cities, counties, and States wherever the virus of apathy, indifference, or prejudice denies to any citizen the equal protection of the law. Let us, with Thomas Jefferson, take a new and more fundamental oath of allegiance and say, each of us as American citizens:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We of this generation inherited—we did not earn the institutions of democracy. With gratitude for the past, let us clearly perceive that as surely as the clock ticks by every tragic second on the battle fronts abroad, the kind of world our children will live in is being determined. Hereafter, that kindly human world which we have known, epitomized by the great figure in the Lincoln Memorial, that kindly world with "malice toward none, with charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," that world will be preserved only as we earn and reearn the right to our inherited liberty. We must think clearly, decide fearlessly, and act decisively. Only then will we keep faith with and discharge the trust reposed in us by citizenship in this great land.

New Food Ration Tokens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include a very interesting radio talk by Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, with Mrs. R. W. Luekel, chairman of the homemaker section of the District of Columbia Home Economics Association, and Mr. Charles Janssen, executive secretary of the Food Industry War Committee, over the Blue Network Tuesday, February 22, 1944:

Mr. BOWLES. I'm sure most of you know by now about the new food-ration tokens. Some are red and some are blue depending on whether you are buying processed foods or meats. They are like little coins that you use for change and I believe you're going to find that they're a wonderful help both to you and your grocer in speeding up shopping and cutting down on rationing red tape.

You've seen posters explaining this new ration plan in your stores, and probably discussed it with your neighbors. But tonight I thought I'd like to describe the new token plan to you in detail, with the help of Mrs. Leukel, who, like yourself, will be using them for the first time and Mr. Janssen, of the Food Industry War Committee.

First of all, let me remind you that food rationing, as a wartime measure, will be almost exactly 1 year old when this token plan goes into effect next week. A year isn't a long time, but in that year we've learned a lot about how to ration food and how not to ration food. And I mean all of us have learned, you people who do the buying, your storekeepers, and we of the O. P. A. whose job it is to prepare the rationing programs and to establish the coupon values each month in line with the actual supplies which the War Food Administration is able to make available to us civilians.

The new token system, I believe, is going to make rationing a great deal easier to live with. That goes for our storekeepers, who, after all, have borne the brunt of the responsibility thus far. It also goes for millions of you women who do the shopping. After a week of the new token system, I predict you'll agree with me that it's a real improvement.

Right now, however, the plan is new, and naturally, you have questions. I'd like to clear them up for you if I can. And I guess the best way will be to let our special guests

ask the questions which may be in your mind, too.

Mrs. Leukel, you keep house, don't you?

Mrs. LEUKEL. Yes, I do, Mr. Bowles, for my husband and family.

Mr. BOWLES. You'll be doing your share of shopping then. Do you have any questions about this plan? Of course, I realize that you haven't begun to use it yet, and won't for a few days.

Mrs. LEUKEL. Well, I've seen the poster in some of the stores in my neighborhood which shows how the new system works. It says that all our food ration stamps are going to be worth 10 points and that these tokens you speak of will be given as change. In other words, if I want to buy a can of soup worth 8 points, I give my grocer a 10-point stamp and he gives me 2 tokens, each worth 1 point, as change.

Mr. BOWLES. You know, Mrs. Leukel, I've learned to have a lot of confidence in the housewives of this country. You justify that confidence. You've given all of us the gist of the whole ration-token idea in what you've said, and I hope every woman who shops will get it as quickly.

Mrs. LEUKEL. Well, it's really pretty simple. As I see it, we'll still use our ration stamps, and the tokens along with them.

Mr. BOWLES. That's right. Tokens aren't taking the place of ration stamps. The really basic change is that your food stamps, the red and blue ones in War Ration Book 4, are all going to have the same value beginning next Sunday. They'll be worth 10 points each. The tokens came about because we needed a simple, practical unit for making change. They will be the small change of rationing, under this new system. They have been made in colors, too—in red and blue—to correspond with the stamps. And they'll be worth 1 point each.

Mrs. LEUKEL. About these red and blue stamps in my War Book 4, Mr. Bowles. I wanted to ask, will we use them the same way we've always done? I mean, will the red be our meat points and the blue for canned goods, and so on?

Mr. BOWLES. That's right.

Mrs. LEUKEL. But—er—perhaps I'm still not quite clear. Those stamps, they've still got 8, 5, 2, and so forth printed on them——

Mr. BOWLES. That's true because we didn't want to go to all the trouble and expense of putting out a new ration book. We've counted on the alertness of the average housewife to make the switch in her mind. Once she knows that the value of those stamps is 10 points each, we will have no problem. Every stamp from next Sunday on, regardless of the number printed on the face of it, will be worth ten points. We went into this question of possible confusion pretty thoroughly. We talked with retailers and housewives, and considered what would be involved in printing a special ration book—the expense, and the transportation difficulties and the time of the hundreds of thousands of school teachers who have helped us in distributing these books before. In the end we decided the simplest thing to do was just tell you people that the stamps were worth 10 points. We've had a lot of wonderful cooperation from everyone—the food industry and the advertising people, the newspapers, movies, and radio. In a couple of weeks, you'll just think automatically; stamps, 10 points; tokens, both kinds, red and blue, 1 point each. Now, Mr. Janssen, how does this new ration token plan look to you?

Mr. JANSSEN. This new plan is good news from the storekeepers' point of view, Mr. Bowles, because it will save a lot of time and trouble. Why don't you explain about the longer validity period for all the stamps. That's important.

Mr. BOWLES. Tremendously important. Under the old system now in use, Mr. Janssen, it takes 12 stamps each month to ration processed foods, as you know. These stamps are good for 1 month with a carry-over of 20 days. Under the new method, 5 stamps will do the job now done by 12 stamps. What is more, they will be good for 2 months with a carry-over of 20 days, or almost twice as long as before.

Mrs. LEUKEL. You mean we're not going to have those expiration-day dithers, when we'd suddenly come to and realize that certain stamps wouldn't be any good unless we spent them in a hurry.

Mr. BOWLES. That needn't happen any more, with a little careful budgeting. You'll have about 12 weeks, now, Mrs. Leukel, in which to budget points.

Mr. JANSSEN. And she'll have less stamps to handle. You know, Mr. Bowles, I was skeptical about this whole idea at first. Frankly, I figured it was more Government red tape. Then I got to thinking about what you've just explained to Mrs. Leukel, how 5 stamps will do the work of 12 in shopping for processed foods. On meats it works out, as I've been told, 6 red stamps instead of 16. Then it hit me, all of a sudden, what it would mean to about 600,000 storekeepers.

Mrs. LEUKEL. They won't have to handle nearly as many stamps; is that it?

Mr. JANSSEN. You know, Mrs. Leukel, your part, just doing the buying, was easy. Under the old system, a storekeeper had to take in more than twice as many stamps as he does now, and he had to sort them in 8 different piles—a pile of red 8's a pile of blue 8's—red 5's, blue 5's—same thing with the brown and green stamps later, brown 3's, green 3's—Now he's got only two piles to think of—one red, one blue.

Mr. BOWLES. One of the biggest things in favor of this new token method was that it would relieve you people, the storekeepers of this country, at least 60 percent of all that extra rationing work.

Mr. JANSSEN. Believe me, they've done their share of counting stamps and keeping ration accounts straight in the bank. Some of them even got up Sundays to do it. With the help problem what it is, anything that cuts down counting ration stamps, I'm for it.

Mr. BOWLES. The savings from this new plan are going to be very worth while both to our grocers and to the taxpayers. Let's figure it out together. The 600,000 grocers and butchers in the country have been handling about 4,000,000,000 stamps a month. After this new token plan gets working, they'll handle about 2,500,000,000 less. Some very conservative estimates I've seen place the money that our food merchants will save at a minimum of $35,000,000 a year. Then you've got an additional saving because your present ration books will last you much longer. If it weren't for this new token plan, we'd have to get out a new ration book every 5 months. But by standardizing stamp values and bringing in tokens as change, we increase the life of book 4 to nearly 2 years. That will save $4,500,000 in printing costs alone, not to mention the savings in manpower, paper, transportation, and the time of a couple of hundred thousand volunteer workers every few months to distribute a new ration book.

Mrs. LEUKEL. Yes; and we housewives will save all the bother of going to our schoolhouse for a new book. How many tokens will be needed, Mr. Bowles?

Mr. BOWLES. We've ordered about 2,000,000,000 and may order 200,000,000 more. We've asked the advice of bankers, Treasury officials, and everyone else who knows and has experience on this sort of thing and it is generally agreed that this number should be enough.

Two billion two hundred million is only about 16 tokens for every one of the 128,000,000 ration books issued. We think we've ordered enough, because as I've said before, tokens are the small change of rationing. You don't keep pennies in your pocket or purse, you keep them moving. Do the same with your tokens, and we'll be all right.

Mr. JANSSEN. Here's one way of looking at it, Mr. Bowles. We don't get in a street car and hand the conductor a $5 bill. I hope people appreciate that storekeepers will only have a limited supply of tokens. If a customer wants a box of prunes worth 3 points, and she's got 3 blue tokens she shouldn't ask him to change a 10-point stamp.

Mrs. LEUKEL. I'll try to remember that. And I think all the other housewives will, too. You know I should think this system would speed up lines at the checking counters in the stores.

Mr. JANSSEN. That used to be a bottleneck all right with both money and ration points to worry about.

Mr. BOWLES. You'll both be glad to know that in a recent test demonstration, the line using the new system of 10-point stamps and receiving tokens in change moved past the checking counter in less than half the time required by the line using stamps under the old system.

Mrs. LEUKEL. Mr. Bowles, there's just one question that's been bothering me. Some brown stamps in my book three will still be good and some green stamps in book four.

Mr. BOWLES. The point values on those stamps are not changed. They keep their present values: 8, 5, 2, and 1, as long as they last. Your grocer, if he wishes, may give you change in tokens for these stamps too, the ones that are now valid. But you won't have to think about those green and brown stamps much longer. They'll be out of the picture by March 20, in less than a month. Meantime, just remember to use them up first.

Mrs. LEUKEL. Well, I've certainly been glad to have this discussion, Mr. Bowles. The token idea ought to make my shopping easier.

Mr. JANSSEN. And that goes for the grocers and butchers too. I'm thinking of the headaches it's saving for about a half a million other storekeepers.

Mr. BOWLES. This is the biggest single change in any rationing program that we at the O. P. A. have ever undertaken. And we've tried to handle it carefully and sensibly. When there is plenty of food again for everybody, food of all kinds, we'll all want to forget rationing just as soon as we can. But meanwhile your O. P. A. has a double responsibility, as far as food rationing is concerned. When the War Food Administration tells us that some food is scarce and must be rationed, and that just so much is available for us here at home, our first responsibility is to see that food is distributed so that all of you can have a fair share, at prices that are fair to all.

Our next job, and we've been doing our darndest at it for a year now, is to see that rationing, as a wartime measure, becomes as easy as possible to live with. Easy for you who shop. Easy for storekeepers who serve you. Before we decided to go ahead with this plan, we canvassed the whole situation. We held meetings with the food industry, with the banks who handle the ration stamps after they leave you grocers. We talked with individual grocers and butchers, with housewives, and consumer groups. In the end they were all agreed, as I'm sure you will be in another week, that this new system, a 10-point value and a long validity period for your food stamps, with tokens as small change, was the most valuable and forward-looking move that could possibly be made to simplify wartime food rationing. There may be a few bugs and minor difficulties that haven't occurred to us. But even if there are, the huge savings in time and money will be so worthwhile that I'm sure we'll all be patient until this new system is working smoothly.

And now thank you, Mrs. Leukel and Mr. Janssen. And good-bye to all of you until next week at this same time.

A Soldier on Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Dalton News, Dalton, Ga., of February 22, 1944:

A SOLDIER ON VOTING

TO THE EDITOR: Just a letter to let you and some of the people at home know how most of the boys who are away feel about those coming elections and, also, to give you an idea of what we hope to find when we do get home for good.

I think the main thing we want to happen in regard to the elections is to have the best possible men available in office. It doesn't matter so much whether we vote or not, if the home folks keep their faith with us and provide the good government and the best possible officials for all of the political offices.

While every one of us is interested in the officeholders, we are more interested in the way the office will be run. To choose a man that is incapable of holding public office is not only unfair to those at home, but also to the boys who can't be there to fight for what they deem right. It will also be a deep injustice to the coming generations, because one misused term of office will unavoidably set our governmental system back a few years.

Just because a man has a good name and a lot of friends doesn't mean he will be a good public official. We want the man who can best do the job even if we do have personal dislikes for him. That is just like the services in that respect. You may not like one of your leaders, but if he is the guy to take you there and bring you back, then he is the leader to follow.

There are a lot of our boys who won't be back to help out in running a very efficient government. If what the rest of us are fighting or preparing to fight for is not worth the efforts of those people at home in running an honest efficient government, then those boys who lost their lives over there and the ones yet to give their all are fighting and have fought in vain.

The people during the last World War allowed many undesirable things to happen, and those things were the rewards of American fighting men who had offered everything and some had given everything. Those men are our fathers, friends, and relatives.

All we ask is that it doesn't happen again. Keep faith with us, but mainly keep faith for those of us who won't ever be back.

The majority of your boys want to find the same old friends there when they return, as well as some new ones to be added; but they also want to find improvements finished that they would have fought for had they been home. Here's to a better and improved regime of politics than the one which met our fathers when they returned.

Take care of the trust we have left, for we are unable to do so now, and we ask no more. Your boys will have that same unconquerable spirit that Americanism has always fostered and that will be the force which will be able to build a completed house upon the base and framework you must, and will, supply for us.

Give us the foundation for the new world and we shall supply the rest, because if faith is kept then the hardest job is finished.

It's up to you whether the new world will find peace. "Large oaks from little acorns grow," and from small political mistakes come the the ones that are to bring another war. So keep us from sending our sons into another bloody conflict.

Again I put it before you, for the boys who can't or haven't the time to write: Keep well that faith we have in you and do not allow anything or anyone to keep us from coming home soon to a town, county, State, and Nation with a better government and a better place to live than the one we left behind.

Keep faith with the boys who can't be there to keep it for themselves.

Pvt. (1st Cl.) SANFORD P. CARR, Jr.,
U. S. M. C.
CAMP LEJEUNE,, NEW RIVER, N. C.

Safeguarding of Vessels, Harbors, Ports, and Water-Front Facilities Throughout the United States by the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, the President's Executive Order No. 9074 delegated to the Secretary of the Navy the primary responsibility for safeguarding all vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities in the continental United States, Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Shortly thereafter, the execution of this job was assigned to the Commandant of the Coast Guard by the Secretary of the Navy and has been carried forward by Coast Guard personnel since that time. This work is not of a spectacular nature and little publicity or renown has been given to it. I believe, however, that the accomplishments of the port-security program which the Coast Guard has instituted constitutes one of the more important contributions to the success of our Nation's war efforts, and I feel that the second anniversary of the undertaking of this work should not go unnoticed or unnoted. For a remarkable record of achievement has been made during the past 2 years which has resulted in expediting our Nation's war potential being brought into action against our enemies.

The work of protecting our ports and the merchant shipping using our ports is not a defensive program, but is an integral part of our offensive efforts. Battle operations against the enemy can only be conducted successfully if an adequate line of supply is maintained, and this port-security program constitutes one of the most important links on this supply chain. The picture is a simple one. We are producing large quantities of war materials and training great numbers of American fighting men in this country. Our armies and those of our allies in the far-flung battle areas of the world require these supplies and these men. We must maintain, therefore, a transportation system to link the source of supply and the places at which it can be utilized against the Germans and the Japs. This transportation link is one of water-borne commerce, requiring great numbers of merchant vessels and sufficient port facilities to load them. Any injury to these vessels or to these port facilities which hinders the expeditious handling of this transportation job will, in direct proportion, reduce the volume and speed with which we can bring our tremendous war potential actually to bear against our enemy forces. Because of this it is vital that these port facilities and these vessels while in port be protected against injury or damage from sabotage, accident, negligence, subversive activities, or any other cause. That is the job which the Coast Guard has so remarkably accomplished during the past 2 years and which it is continuing to do so well.

It is difficult to list the accomplishments of the Coast Guard's port security program because its success is evidenced by the absence of injury rather than by any concrete physical results which can be seen and counted. The success of its program is best demonstrated, however, by the fact that during these 2 years no injury or damage of importance has occurred by any vessels or facilities for which the Coast Guard has been responsible.

The objective of the Coast Guard port security program has been to protect all vessels, ports, harbors, and water-front facilities from any injury which would slow the expeditious handling and transportation of war cargo. To attain this objective, the Coast Guard, through its captains of the port, has instituted the following port security measures: (a) Control of the anchorage and movement of all vessels in port; (b) issuance of Coast Guard identification cards and supervision of ingress and egress to vessels and water-front facilities; (c) fire prevention measures, including inspections, recommendations, trailer pumpers, and other extinguishing agents; (e) supervision of the loading and stowage of explosives and military ammunition aboard all vessels; (f) boarding and examination of vessels in ports; (g) sealing of vessel's radios; (h) licensing of vessels for movement in local waters and departure therefrom; (j) guarding of important facilities; (k) enforcement of all regulations governing vessels and water-front security; (l) maintenance of water patrols; (m) general enforcement of Federal laws on navigable waters and other miscellaneous duties.

The achievements of the Coast Guard's port-security program are even more remarkable when it is realized that they started, at the time of the President's Executive order, with merely a skeleton organization. Today a highly coordinated organization of officers and men are carrying out the port-security program through 75 captain-of-the-port units and 91 assistant captain-of-the-port units. To combat fire, the most prevalent source of injury to vessels and water-front facilities, a fleet of 253 fireboats, the smallest having a pumping capacity of 2,000 gallons per minute, have

been built or converted and now constitutes the largest fleet of its kind in the world. Over a thousand patrol and picket boats, as well as miscellaneous other equipment, are also used to carry out this program. It is truly amazing that a job having the scope and importance of this port-security program can have been so adequately fulfilled by the utilization of comparatively so few officers and men.

Tremendous credit for the success of this port-security program must be given to Vice Admiral Russel R. Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard; to Capt. Norman B. Hall, Chief of the Port Security Division, who has directed the Nation-wide program; to the district Coast Guard officers and captains of the port who have put it into operation; and to the officers and men of the Coast Guard who have contributed to this effort. Their job is a continuing one of constantly increasing importance. Within the past 2 years the number and tonnage of merchant vessels using our ports have multiplied manyfold.

The volume and importance of the war cargoes passing over port facilities and carried by these vessels have similarly increased many times. With this increase has come a proportionate increase in the responsibility of the Coast Guard, as they are now required to protect and safeguard the greatly augmented number of vessels, cargoes, and water-front facilities. As our armies and those of our allies enter upon the offensive stages of this war, it has also become of ever-growing importance that the materials and men of war reach them promptly and without delay, and that nothing be permitted to slow their maximum flow. As this flow is dependent upon these merchant ships and the water-front facilities which they use, no injury to them can be permitted which will delay the shipment to our armies of the matériel and men they need. The Coast Guard must take increasing efforts, therefore, to insure the protection of those bottlenecks of our war effort.

I believe the men of the Coast Guard deserve the appreciation of the people of our Nation for the unsung contributions which their port-security program has made to the successful prosecution of the war. And I feel confident that the Coast Guard can be depended upon to carry on this increasingly important job in the trying and difficult days to come in the same successful manner which it has done during the past 2 years.

The Transition to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which was delivered by Arthur G. Drefs, chairman of the board of directors of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce at the chamber's annual dinner held recently in St. Louis:

When historians write about the epoch-making periods of America, the years that we are now going through will rank as the most critical and far-reaching. Decisions that are being made today and tomorrow will have a profound effect on the kind of country that will be in existence for the next 50 years. Are we going to have a free America or will our lives and businesses be subjected to the iron heel of bureaucracy?

Unless we reach wise solutions to all of the many colossal problems confronting us today, all of the war sacrifices—the supreme sacrifice by many of our finest young men—will have been in vain. Military victory alone is not enough. Measures to prevent future wars must be established. Our democratic form of government—particularly the preservation of the rights granted by our Constitution and by our Bill of Rights—must be reaffirmed in forthright words translated into a convincing program of sound action.

What are some of the problems? Let's examine a few.

The President admitted in his address to Congress that to date contracts amounting to over $12,000,000,000 have been canceled. In most cases canceled contracts have been replaced by other orders, so that generally the impact of these cancelations has not been unfavorable. Here and there, however, plants have been completely shut down. Most of these have been Government-owned, so that individual businesses haven't as a rule been critically hurt. But some have. More will be. It is therefore of the first importance that legislation for the prompt settlement and payment of terminated contracts be enacted now. Delayed contract settlements will result in widespread bankruptcy with mass unemployment.

Our chamber of commerce has taken a position of national leadership on this vital subject. Already several important meetings have been held which have been beneficial to the St. Louis area contractors. On February 24 we will hold a meeting at the Jefferson Hotel which will have national significance. The ranking officers of the Army and Navy to whom the job of contract terminations has been delegated will be on hand. We hope to work out a pattern that will be usable effectively in all parts of the country.

A second problem, closely akin to contract terminations, is the disposal of Government-owned plants, equipment, and supplies. It is generally conceded that the value of Government plants and equipment alone is approximately $20,000,000,000. How can the Government dispose of this tremendous plant and equipment without permanent harm to our economy?

It is obvious that if these plants and the machine tools in them went to the larger concerns exclusively, an untenable monopoly would be created. Nothing would be more disastrous.

Some individuals recommend disposing of the machine tools abroad. I am personally opposed to such action until after industry in this country has first been modernized. Many American plants are antiquated. How can they compete if we sell or give away our newest equipment and our industries continue to operate with obsolete facilities? After our permanent military requirements are satisfied, the next step should be the modernization of American industry—particularly small industry. The surplus, including machinery replaced, can then be disposed of abroad.

Perhaps of greater concern to all business is the disposal of surplus merchandise of all kinds which will be owned by the Government when hostilities are ended. Unless such surpluses are disposed of in an orderly way—over a period of years, the markets of most businesses will be glutted for months or perhaps years.

It is recommended that a seven-man commission of businessmen, each with at least 5 years of executive experience, be created by adequate legislation. The President would appoint the members of th commission, subject to the stipulations of the legislation. This commission would first find out what supplies were in existence and then arrange for their disposition in an orderly manner. Here the advice of industry and business groups would be necessary. For example, if trucks were to be disposed of, the manufacturers of the trucks and their distributors would constitute an industry advisory group.

Here again our chamber will play an important part. Our local industries—large and small—must be both represented and protected. The chamber of commerce is the logical agency to handle this important problem in the metropolitan St. Louis area.

The demobilization of war industries involves the demobilization of labor. What's to be done with the returning soldiers? What's to be done with war workers? What about wages? Are they to be reduced, or will high wages continue?

The answer to all of these problems is necessarily national; yet St. Louis cannot adopt a do-nothing policy. It must willingly accept its responsibilities and work diligently and boldly for a satisfactory solution.

The only complete solution is jobs for all those who want to work. It is expected that many young men will complete their education before seeking employment. There are several million women and men who will withdraw from the labor market as soon as the emergency has ended. Finally, there are always a couple of million unemployed even in the most prosperous periods. This condition will likely continue.

It should be recognized that no matter how skillful the transition from war to peace, there will be what economists call a primary depression. The length of that depression will depend on the successful handling of at least six fundamental things:

1. Adequate legislation on contract terminations and on the disposal of Government-owned facilities and the intelligent enforcement or handling of it. If either the enactment of the legislation is delayed or the administration of it bungled, then unemployment will be prolonged.

2. If the war in Europe ends several months before the war against Japan, then there should be a substantial industrial conversion from war operations to operations for peacetime products. It is generally agreed that with the ending of the European phase of the war, roughly 50 percent of all war contracts will be terminated. Even now there are adequate supplies of most raw materials. Such materials as aluminum, copper, zinc, and steel are no longer critical. They cannot now be diverted to consumer goods merchandise because of the continued manpower shortage. When manpower is available, there should be a skillful transition which will take into consideration the competitive conditions within an industry and the labor situation in the areas in which the competitors within an industry are located.

3. There must be a realistic approach to the wage problem by both management and labor.

Management must realize that except in a very few locations and industries, the hourly wage rates will not be reduced. We are amassing a national debt which may ultimately total $300,000,000,000. This debt cannot be reduced or even serviced unless wages and prices are continued at approximately the same levels that prevailed during the war years when the debt was being contracted. We learned in the depression years of the

early thirties that farmers' debts as an example—contracted when their products sold at inflated prices—could not be liquidated by dollars having a much greater purchasing value, with consequent deflated prices for farm products.

On the other hand, labor must realize that the change from war work to peacetime production will result, at least temporarily, in down-grading of workers into less skilled categories. Many workers will have to go back to the jobs that they had before they entered war work. This step does not mean that their wage rates will be pre-war. On the contrary, I believe all wage classifications, especially unskilled, will remain at a permanently higher level. But their former jobs will not generally yield the higher pay that prevails in most war industries.

In the latest report of the St. Louis office of the United States Employment Service, comment is made on the number of workers who refused during December to accept new employment at lower wages than they had been earning. The jobs that were available at less pay were not filled by war workers who had lost their higher paid jobs.

The transition of labor from war jobs to peace jobs constitutes one of the most difficult problems, because it is a human problem. Nevertheless, it must be made successfully if the primary depression is to be short lived.

4. Further inflation must be prevented or rigidly controlled and confined to narrow limits.

The extent of inflation is not generally understood. The automotive industry estimates that pre-war designed cars, if built at present labor and material costs, would be sold at prices from 25 to 40 percent higher than those that prevailed when production was stopped. Since that estimate was made, railroad wages have been increased, which will probably be translated into higher freight rates. Further, demands have been made for higher pay in the steel industry and in the automotive industry. Should these pay increases be granted, it is conceivable that a car that formerly sold for $800 will be priced at $1,200.

While every market survey shows a tremendous potential demand for automobiles, it is probable that there would be a severe shrinkage in demand if prices were 40 to 50 percent higher than prevailed before the war.

Many articles that are being sold today have price ceilings created 2 or more years ago. At present costs, most of them are being sold at an actual loss.

The Office of Economic Stabilization recently ruled that when commercial items are released for production, they would have to be sold at cost when gross profits were considerably above those prevailing in the 1936–1939 base period. When gross profits were higher than the base period but not considerably higher, a profit of 2 percent will be allowed.

It must be evident that we have not yet felt the inflationary effect of higher costs in our retail selling prices.

Business will have to adjust itself to this situation by greater efficiency in manufacturing and selling. It will have to adopt the policy of large volume at a low profit per unit. Satisfactory profits will result only from large sales and production volume.

5. There must be realistic post-war taxes—both for individuals and corporations—immediately after the ending of the war. During the war all but a limited few agree on very high taxes not only to help pay for the costs of the war but to eliminate the criticism that prevailed after World War No. 1—that several thousand millionaires were created while thousands of men were giving their lives for their country.

Post-war taxes must provide an incentive both for individuals and corporations if full employment is to result.

6. Finally, governmental agencies must be prepared with detailed plans for long deferred maintenance and improvements. Such work would provide an excellent cushion during the dangerous transition period.

Jobs must be found for the returning soldiers and sailors. Particular attention must be paid to the handicapped. Job studies should be made now to determine the type of work suitable for the handicapped.

The chamber of commerce must be particularly concerned with the returning soldiers and sailors fired with new ambition. Thousands will have acquired new skills and other thousands will have demonstrated executive ability of a high order. St. Louis should make attractive inducements to all its returning fighting men, particularly those who want to start a business of their own. Here they should find a suitable location, whether it be a factory, a retail store, a garage, or a filling station. That isn't all. Some method of providing capital—risk capital—should be evolved. And, finally, existing business should lend them a helping hand.

In so brief a period it is only possible to point out a few of the most urgent situations that confront us. They are so many and so difficult of solution that a timid soul would look askance at them. It is no time for timidity. It is a time for boldness—for concerted action. This St. Louis Chamber of Commerce is bold. It is at work now. Our members, and all St. Louisans, will recognize the truth of this statement as its many dynamic plans unfold for the betterment of business, labor, and the community.

Flood-Control Program of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I include a statement I made before the Flood Control Committee of the House respecting the proposed flood-control program of the Missouri River Basin and its tributaries, and attached hereto is a letter written to me by the Chief of Engineers relative thereto under date of December 11, 1943:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, the people of Montana have been vitally interested in the conservation of water ever since the first settler camped on our plains and in our mountains. This conservation for use of our waters, as I have said before, is vital to our daily lives. Since being a Member of Congress I have constantly worked to obtain the necessary legislation to use our existing water resources for the maximum beneficial results to our people.

In 1937, through the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of this committee, I sponsored a resolution calling upon the Corps of Engineers to review their 308 report on the Yellowstone to determine what, if any, modification should be made respecting the use of the water of the Yellowstone and its tributaries for irrigation, power, flood control, and allied purposes. This investigation was made. In addition, such proceedings were had before this committee as that and passed resolutions directing further investigation to be made by the Army engineers, and finally last August the division engineer of the Missouri River division, Col. Lewis A. Pick, submitted a report. This report was never submitted to the Congress, being held in abeyance for comments and reports from the Bureau of Reclamation, Agriculture Department, the Federal Power Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. The plan submitted by Colonel Pick, to use the words of Maj. Gen. E. Reybold, "gives full consideration to all of the water uses in the basin."

General Reybold goes on to say in a recent letter to me, a copy of which is herewith attached:

"The report proposes projects to provide a large amount of storage in multiple-purpose reservoirs on the main stem of the Missouri River and on tributaries for all of the beneficial water uses of the area. The plan contained in the report is designed to be a framework on which all Federal and State agencies concerned with the development of the Missouri Basin can build additional projects for the best use of the stored water. The plan is entirely flexible to meet changing conditions and to meet the unforeseeable needs of the future, and it provides for desirable modifications as the projects are built and as other conditions show to be advisable. It provides also for further expansion by all agencies in the fields with which they are directly concerned * * *. A definite part of the plan is the use of existing storage for multple purposes. * * *

"Throughout its investigations in the Missouri River Basin and in fact everywhere in the West, the Department cooperates fully with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and other Federal agencies in order that the plans proposed in the Department's reports may be fully coordinated with the plans of all other agencies and that they may clearly fit into the best development of the water resources of the region. For several years the Department has had definite agreements of cooperation with these agencies which provide for free interchange of factual data, cooperative investigations, and review of conclusions. The Missouri River report is now with the Commissioner of Reclamation for his review and comment. The Department of Agriculture has advised the Department of its concurrence with the plan contained in that report."

Thus, it will be seen from the interpretation of the Pick plan by the Chief of Engineers, that it is a plan sufficiently elastic to serve all multiple purposes. It applies in the several locations along the river the theory of dominant use, which, of course, would mean in the northwest section of the country including Montana, that irrigation and reclamation and power would be given first place. I see no substantial disagreement with any of the Departments to the framework of the engineers that cannot be easily solved by the Congress and cooperation of the Departments. The testimony submitted to the committee clearly shows that if dams are constructed as contemplated on the Missouri River below Fort Peck and above Sioux City, that more water will be released from the reservoir at Fort Peck for irrigation and power purposes.

The testimony further shows on the part of the Army engineers that the plan for a proposed dam or dams on the Yellowstone and on the Big Horn is an elastic and flexible one. Colonel Reber, in his testimony, stated that if more than one dam was required on the Yellowstone and Big Horn to accomplish the purpose of irrigation and development of power, that such would be looked on with favor and would be developed. He also made the statement that irrigation would be the primary use for the water impounded in such

dams. He further stated that they would leave open the exact location for the dam or dams in order that the needs and wants of the people would be met. Therefore, you will see that there is no foundation and no reason for acute apprehension on the part of the people of the Northwest that they will be denied the proper uses of their water as a result of the framework of the Pick report, and nowhere in the record on the Pick report do the Army engineers attempt to place irrigation and reclamation at a disadvantage or in an inferior position.

Remember the Pick report is before the Committee on Flood Control of the House on which no official action has been taken except holding hearings. The only threat to the use of the waters of the upper Missouri River and its tributaries in such States as Montana is contained in a bill reported out by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, Chairman Judge MANSFIELD, of Texas, which provides for the deepening of the channel from 6 to 9 feet, and widening the channel from 200 to 300 feet. This proposal is independent of the Pick report entirely. This threat, however, I am quite sure, will be removed by either the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, or by the House or the Senate by adopting a proposal made by the President in substance as follows:

Page 21, line 13: After the word "Congress," substitute a colon for the semicolon and insert the words: *"Provided,* That the use of waters of the Missouri River for municipal, domestic, and livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby."

A committee of Congressmen representing the 17 Western States, of whom I was appointed chairman of the steering committee, have endeavored to add the following:

Page 21, line 13: After the word "Congress," substitute a colon for the semicolon and insert the words: *"Provided,* That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses heretofore or hereafter established."

You will see at a glance, however, that this has nothing whatever to do with the Pick report, which deals with flood control whereas the bill reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors deals with navigation.

The Bureau of Reclamation, through its Commissioner, Mr. Bashore, made the statement before this committee that the Bureau's complete report would be in by May 1. Also in a communication to me that Department made this statement:

"The Bureau of Reclamation is prepared to integrate the results of its surveys with those of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, for the early recommendation of a comprehensive program for the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. This program will comprehend irrigation, power production, and flood control, navigation, silt detention, and other purposes."

The Bureau of Reclamation surveys include the main stream of the Yellowstone River, the Powder River, the Tongue River, Big Horn, Clarks Fork, Stillwater, Boulder, and Shields Rivers, and minor tributaries. The development of these various projects, the Department says, would increase the total irrigation acreage about 100 percent, being now a little less than 100,000 acres. Multiple-purpose reservoirs would be installed which would include power as well as irrigation. The Bureau of Reclamation's plan would include also, as in the case of the Army engineers' plan, a dam by Boysen, Wyo., which would be the key structure, and the Bureau of Reclamation recommends the three dams on the Big Horn system, making possible the expansion of irrigation to about 440,000 acres in the Big Horn Basin both in Wyoming and Montana.

The Bureau of Reclamation also brought into the picture the survey which was made of the proposed site at Mission, Mont., on the stem of the Yellowstone, east of Livingston. The estimated capacity of the reservoir would be 890,000 acre-feet and a power installation of 50,000 kilowatts. It would extend irrigation to about 165,000 acres.

Then surveys in the Missouri River Basin by the Bureau for the development of the water resources from Great Falls to the mouth of the Yellowstone River including the Milk, Musselshell, Marias, Teton, and Judith Basins are brought in. In this area the irrigation acres could be increased by a fourth million acres or nearly 100 percent over what it now is, and the same is true by the Three Forks at Great Falls, including the Sun, Smith, and Dearborne Basins, increasing the irrigation acreage by about 50 percent. Above Three Forks including the Madison, Gallatin, and Jefferson Basins, an increase of 145,000 acres from the present approximate one-half millions acres and with two reservoirs on the main stem of the river in the Helena Valley area which would have a total capacity of 2,002,600 acres. It is expected that when the final report of the Bureau of Reclamation is at hand that it may elaborate on these proposals.

It might be properly added that power at Fort Peck is already produced and that it, were it not for the war, would be distributing power now for distribution to points in eastern Montana and western North Dakota for irrigation pumping, rural electrification, and other purposes. It was planned to serve irrigation projects in operation, under construction, or proposed in the vicinity of Miles City, Glendive, Glasgow, Poplar, and Medicine Lake, Mont., and Williston, N. Dak. The power output on account of the war was sold to the Montana Power Co. for distribution over eastern and northern Montana.

I wish to make some general observations on the flood control, soil erosion, and silt which in my opinion are inseparable, and I think these observations generally have been developed in the course of my examining witnesses who have appeared before the committee and who have agreed in the main with me.

Flood control, to be fully effective, should, I believe, originate as close to the source of the headwaters as possible. By numerous dams close to these headwaters the silt problem will be greatly modified. In examining the engineers' report I feel that that view is shared by them and that the proposed plan is flexible and constitutes a framework around which can be built an effective program of control.

Two factors which would go a long way in arresting the devastating floods, which seem to be more numerous in recent years, and which have been greatly overlooked, are the proper care of the topsoils to prevent erosions and the keeping of as much silt as possible out of the main streams and tributaries.

The Rio Grande is at the present time a perfect example of what silting does for a river. Also on the Mississippi we see how the silt deposits have built up the level of the river until the river gradually becomes higher than the surrounding country.

Now, if these unnatural deposits of silt were kept from the main stream and tributaries by means of checker or other large dams the problem of flood control would be helped greatly as the times of high water are silt times and should be checked from entering these main bodies of waters for two very good reasons. One, it is at high-water time, due to an unusually large run-off of rain waters or melting snows, that much of the silt is carried into these streams, and, secondly, it is at this same time that it is necessary to keep this unusually large volume of water from joining the already swollen waters farther downstream. Thus, these dams would have a twofold purpose. One, they would arrest silt which in turn would keep the stream from building up so quickly, and, two, they would hold off abnormal volumes of water from flowing into streams already swollen by rain and melting snows downstream.

I have always maintained that one of the big reasons for these ever-increasing floods downstream has been the utter disregard for any proper or planned program of soil conservation upstream. Much of our land has been denuded of trees by fires and by the acts of man, and erosion has developed momentum by droughts and overgrazing. These soil-erosion losses may in time prove to be far greater and more costly than flood losses.

The whole picture is so broad that it seems to me to be effective we should use every available service and proposal to the end that the fullest possible use may be made of all the water available. Accordingly, I would suggest that it is imperative that a plan of cooperation be developed between the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army engineers.

Speaking for the people of Montana I can assure you that we of the West are vitally interested in water and water conservation as it is vital to our daily lives and to our future as a State. Therefore, I know that any flood-control program which would impound waters having their origin in our State and which water could be used for irrigation and reclamation before leaving the borders of the State, I know that any such program would have the blessing of not only the people of the State of Montana but also of all of the people of those Northwest States through which those waters flow.

In the eastern part of the State of Montana there are almost only two principal times of flood. Those two times are in March and June. The March flood and run-off is occasioned by the rapid melting of snow in the plains area while the June run-off is occasioned by the melting snow in the mountains and from rainfall occurring in the plains.

Now, with the exception of the June run-off, when some moisture for irrigation is necessary besides the normal rainfall, the waters of both these times is lost beyond recall. Not only is that water lost but it is neither needed nor wanted downstream in the volume in which it is received at that time. The soil of those States through which the Missouri and its tributaries flow is potentially very productive and those States could stand out like little green gems if only the water now being wasted were impounded to be made use of when needed. However, the people of Montana and the people of those States who are first users of those waters insist, and rightly so, that they be allowed to continue to be first users of their own water for their own purposes and needs. And in that insistence I do not see where any unreconcilable controversy should ensue. We would be merely storing up waters at a time when they were neither wanted nor needed downstream to be released for our own and their use when both of us needed that water most, true for two different purposes, but I do not think either use would harm or be at all inconsistent with the other, and it certainly would not be inconsistent if it was the intent of the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army engineers to recognize the rights and needs of all

involved and be governed accordingly. I think they intend to do that as they have so stated.

As a member of the Flood Control Committee, I invited to come to Washington to appear as witnesses before our committee Gov. Sam Ford; Wesley A. D'Ewart, president of the Montana State Reclamation Association; D. P. Fabrick, member of the State water conservation board; and H. W. Bunston, president of Yellowstone Basin Association, who were very cooperative and helpful in presenting before the committee the Northwest problems, including Montana's. It is my firm belief, after reading the so-called Pick report and its interpretation by the Chief of Engineers, and listening to the testimony offered before the committee from all the departments that the Congress today may write an authorization or bill which, if it becomes law, will answer as nearly as humanly possible the irrigation and reclamation problems of arid and semiarid States, the development of power and flood control, and secure to the people of the State as nearly as possible and establish the primary use of water in their respective locations.

It seems to me that the only sensible course to follow at this time is to take advantage of these flood-control and navigation subsidies which Congress has written into the law of the land. In this way we in the upper States can get our irrigation and our power at considerably less cost than we could if those two uses of water had to pay their own way without these recognized and legitimate Federal subsidies.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, December 11, 1943.

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: Reference is made to your recent telephone conversations with this office regarding the Department's investigations in the Yellowstone and Missouri River Basins. As requested by you, I am pleased to furnish the following information to supplement the telephonic data given you on those occasions.

In accordance with a resolution of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives which you sponsored and which was adopted on August 18, 1937, and also pursuant to other directives from Congress, the district engineer at Omaha, Nebr., and the division engineer of the Missouri River division made thorough and careful investigations of the entire Yellowstone River Basin and a separate study of its principal tributary, the Big Horn River. The division engineer in August of this year also submitted a report on the entire Missouri River Basin made pursuant to a resolution of May 13, 1943, by the Committee on Flood Control, which called for a review of previous reports with a view to determining appropriate measures for flood control from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the Missouri River.

All of these reports are comprehensive in scope and consider not only flood control but also irrigation, hydroelectric power, navigation, and all other beneficial water uses. The reports all recognize the necessity for the development of additional water supplies to meet water shortages for irrigation projects in the upper Missouri Basin, and the projects proposed therein are carefully developed with the needs of irrigation in mind. In the Yellowstone River survey a number of proposed reservoirs outlined by yourself and upon which you submitted valuable data were carefully studied, and the report of the division and district engineers stated that the proposed Lower Canyon Reservoir near Livingston is a necessary unit in the continued development of the Missouri River Basin for all purposes. The report is also favorable to the construction of a reservoir on the Big Horn River in Wyoming to meet the urgent needs of that area. The division and district engineers also recommend local flood protection projects at Billings and Miles City, Mont., and Greybull, Wyo., to provide positive flood protection for those important communities.

The reports of the division and district engineers on the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers were referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for review as required by law. As you will recall, the local interests requested a hearing and the Board, at your request, held this hearing in Billings, Mont., on January 30, 1941, at which time the interested local parties were given full opportunity to express their views. It appeared from the tenor of this meeting that the local interests preferred that the Board withhold its action on the reports until such time as they had had an opportunity to examine the reports which the Bureau of Reclamation was then preparing on those streams. Since the Bureau has not yet completed its reports, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is still holding the reports of the division and district engineers without final review by the Board.

The report of the division engineer on the Missouri River made in response to the Flood Control Committee's resolution of May 13, 1943, is also a comprehensive report which gives full consideration to all of the water uses in the basin. The report proposes projects to provide a large amount of storage in multiple-purpose reservoirs on the main stem of the Missouri River and on tributaries for all of the beneficial water uses of the area. The plan contained in the report is designed to be a framework on which all Federal and State agencies concerned with the development of the Missouri Basin can build additional projects for the best use of the stored water. The plan is entirely flexible to meet changing conditions and to meet the unforeseeable needs of the future, and it provides for desirable modifications as the projects are built and as other conditions show to be advisable. It provides also for further expansion by all agencies in the fields with which they are directly concerned. It in no way precludes the development of single-purpose projects for any of the desirable water uses on streams where multiple-purpose development may not be feasible. A definite part of the plan is the use of existing storage for multiple purposes. The report treats all water uses on a comparable basis and does not restrict the use of the projects to any single purpose.

Throughout its investigations in the Missouri River Basin and in fact everywhere in the West, the Department cooperates fully with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and other Federal agencies in order that the plans proposed in the Department's reports may be fully coordinated with the plans of all other agencies and that they may clearly fit into the best development of the water resources of the region. For several years the Department has had definite agreements of cooperation with these agencies which provide for free interchange of factual data, cooperative investigations, and review of conclusions. The Missouri River report is now with the Commissioner of Reclamation for his review and comment. The Department of Agriculture has advised the Department of its concurrence with the plan contained in that report. The comments of the Federal Power Commission are expected to be received within a very few days. As soon as the views of these agencies have been received and carefully considered, the full report of the Department will be completed and submitted to Congress.

It is essential to the success of the development program as outlined in the report of the Department that there be the fullest cooperation among all of the Federal agencies concerned, and with the officials and organizations of the States and local communities. Full opportunity exists for constructive action by all agencies. I am certain that as the plan proceeds it will become increasingly more clear that the interests of each region are served best by the development of projects through the combined efforts of everyone throughout the entire basin.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Veto of the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in all the heat that has been raised in the discussion of the recent tax bill, it is most encouraging to find nonpartisan, objective analysis on the part of one of America's outstanding columnists. In today's Washington Post there appears such a column by Mr. Ernest Lindley, which strips away the smoke screen and the verbiage, and tells those of us in the House of Representatives some facts that all of us should heed. I respectfully call to the attention of the Members on both sides of the aisle Mr. Lindley's discussion.

VETO OF TAX BILL

(By Ernest Lindley)

CONGRESS VERSUS THE EXECUTIVE

The political consequences of the uproar in Congress over the President's veto of the tax bill cannot yet be measured. The immediate effect, especially of Senator BARKLEY's outbreak, is obviously to widen the breach between Congress and the Executive. The later effects will depend largely on whether the voting public, as a whole, believes the President to be right or wrong on the grave matters of public policy with which he has been at odds with Congress.

In leading the counterattack on the tax-bill veto, Senator BARKLEY, Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee, and others, made only a weak defense of the tax bill. They strove, rather, to make the issue Congress versus the Executive, or perhaps more specifically the House Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committees versus the Executive. Senator BARKLEY is a member of the Senate Finance Committee.

Some of the Members who assailed the President spoke as if he did not have the right and duty to veto a tax bill which he disapproved. Under the Constitution, of course, he has the same right and duty with respect to tax bills that he has with respect to other bills.

Senator BARKLEY had disagreed with the President on the merits of the tax bill and on the wisdom of a veto. As the President's message to the Senator disclosed, he altered the wording of his veto message to meet objections raised by BARKLEY.

The President, in effect, had made it plain that he does not expect the members of his own party, or even the leaders of his party in Congress, either to agree with him on everything or always to subordinate their views to his. Since he did not make an issue of this divergence of opinion between himself and BARKLEY, it is not easily explained why BARKLEY did.

The President's veto message was directed to the defects of the bill. The first of these was that it provided only a small fraction of the additional revenue requested. That shortcoming, in itself, would not have led to a veto. If he had not regarded the bill as seriously defective in other respects, the President would have accepted the additional revenue and renewed his plea for still more. But the bill contained a number of tax-relief provisions for special interests, introduced by log-rolling methods. Some of these set precedents which it would have been difficult to refuse to extend later to similar special interests. It contained the clause freezing the pay-roll tax for old-age and survivors' insurance—a serious step, the possible consequences of which were not adequately considered in Congress. And it contained amendments to the Renegotiation Act which the President deemed objectionable.

If the bill had provided for ten or even five billion dollars in revenue, the President almost certainly would have signed it, in spite of other defects. But since it provided, in the net, for something less than $1,000,000,000 in new taxes, the other shortcomings became, in the balance, more important.

The central difference between the President and Congress was over the amount of additional taxation to be imposed. This had been clear for months. Senator BARKLEY, echoing Chairman DOUGHTON, called the demand for more than $10,000,000,000 in new taxes "fantastic." This view is untenable. As the President pointed out in his Budget message, individual incomes, after payment of all taxes—Federal, State, and local—will be approximately 40 percent higher in 1944 than in 1941. Corporate profits, after taxes, are running at an all-time high. To assert that the Nation "can't stand" far heavier taxation is at variance with all the known facts. It amounts to saying also that the American people "can't stand" what their principal allies are bearing in weight of taxation. If the President's veto message was an "insult" to Congress, the tax bill was an insult to the American people.

The tax controversy is only one of several between the President and Congress in which the real issue is full mobilization for war versus money making and politics as usual. In this respect, the record of the executive branch is by no means impeccable. But on the whole, it has stood for all-out prosecution of the war and protection of the national economy against inflation. Congress, on the whole, has continued to cater to the pressure groups, striving to pick up votes by the well-tested methods of peacetime. And it is because the record of Congress is so vulnerable that so many of its Members are so sensitive about it, and are unable to respond rationally to criticisms.

Bernard Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News declares editorially that "the time has come for the President and Congress to consider a civilian distinguished service medal for Bernard Baruch for outstanding civilian contributions in two war eras." The Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News editorializes that "he deserves and will receive the thanks of his countrymen."

The Paterson Evening News editorial runs in part as follows:

The people of the United States, individually and collectively, owe an ever-increasing debt of personal gratitude to Bernard Baruch, the Nation's number one nonpolitical patriot, for another vitally important and outstanding contribution to the welfare of 132,000,000 of his fellow Americans, rendered in true Bernard Baruch style, honestly, efficiently, unselfishly, and without compensation or desire for reward or praise.

Twenty-five years ago, when the Nation was in the travail of World W[illegible] No. 1, Mr. Baruch rendered service of equal importance to that which he is now performing; and now that a quarter of a century has passed it is highly gratifying to find Mr. Baruch mentally alert and possessed of an even greater ability of constructive discernment in connection with the greatest problems which will affect the country as the war ends, problems which are of vital concern not only to the United States as a Nation but to each and every one of its citizens as individuals.

The News feels that the services rendered by Mr. Baruch are of such vital importance to Uncle Sam and of so outstanding a nature that President Roosevelt and the Congress should recognize them officially in a form much more definite than a mere expression of appreciation.

Every American from coast to coast, the News feels confident, would thrill with pride and satisfaction if the President and Congress would take the necessary steps to bring into being a Civilian Distinguished Service Medal, to be presented to Mr. Baruch by the President of the United States before a joint session of the House and Senate as a visible indication of the Nation's gratitude to one of its most outstanding sons.

A grateful America has not forgotten Mr. Baruch's valuable services in World War No. 1 as Chairman of the War Industries Board nor his recent survey and solution of the rubber problem, now supplemented by his greater accomplishments as the Director of a great post-war planning unit in the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. Baruch stands out as one of America's most successful organizers and businessmen in his own right and understands the problems of big business, small business, and the problems of the millions who toil in America's far-flung industries better than any other living man.

His latest masterpiece will stand as a monumental accomplishment and a guiding beacon for the Nation in the troublous days ahead, when victory has been won and we must again return to peacetime pursuits.

Summed up, this report can honestly and conscientiously be characterized as the outstanding "home front" document of World War No. 2. It rests its case on a complete faith in private enterprise: "There has been too much loose parroting of the slogan that if individual enterprise fails to provide jobs for everyone it must be replaced by some one of the other systems that are around. The war has been a crucible for all the economic systems of the world, for our own, for communism, fascism, nazi-ism—all the others. And the American system has outproduced the world."

The Passaic Herald-News editor writes:

The Baruch report laying out a program for returning the country to a peace economy after the war is too voluminous and covers too many phases of this great task to warrant any complete consideration of the recommendations in one article.

The report is clear and readable; it shows careful study of the problem, so much more difficult and perilous than converting from peace to war; it is definite in most of its recommendations; it puts foremost the public interest as the author sees and understands it; it insists, of course, that the war must be won before reconversion can be begun, that nothing can be allowed to hamper our all-out war effort, but that we must indeed be ready with plans when the moment comes that a shift back to peace economy is possible.

It is the simplest, sanest, soundest demonstration of clear thinking that has been given this vital issue—in fact it represents the only thorough consideration that has been given to the question of how we are to turn production back from war to peace in the shortest possible time, in the fairest and most effective way, with the least harmful effects for the moment and the greatest possible benefits in the long view.

Bernard Baruch and his chief aide, John M. Hancock, do not profess to have all the answers. They are thoroughly sincere, are devoid of cant, and have no axe to grind. They put humanitarian considerations at the top, where they belong, both as to returning service people and war workers whose employment for a time is bound to be seriously disturbed.

Mr. Baruch sees no reason for any economic debacle following the war, provided we lay our plans for reconversion now, and those plans are sound and workable. On this point he says most wisely:

"There is no need for a post-war depression. Handled with competence, our adjustment, after the war is won, should be an adventure in prosperity. Our soldiers will not be let down. They are our chief concern. No pressure groups of self-seekers will take our thoughts from the duty we owe them."

In addition to the need for prompt action by the Government in effecting all contract settlements, paying its bills, removing its materials from war plants, and extending what help may be needed, Mr. Baruch stresses especially the need for lower taxes in order to encourage industry, develop new enterprises, and so stimulate high production and employment. He recommends that the Congress draft a post-war tax law now, which, while it will have to be put on a shelf for the present, will give notice in advance what will be the reductions in tax rates from present wartime levels, rates high enough to provide for gradual reduction of the national debt, thus putting America in a "strong position of national defense," yet low enough to put a new heart in enterprise.

Whatever may be said in criticism of any other feature of the report, this is so sensible that it is to be hoped it will bring prompt action along the lines suggested.

We see the objection raised by leading figures in the Congress that the plan vests our economy in the Chief Executive rather than in the Congress, but this is a point the Congress itself will settle, and it will be expected to see to it that democratic principles, and not autocratic practices, are followed.

As to the merits of the program in general, there seems no division. Mr. Baruch has done an exceedingly fine and very important job, for which he deserves and will receive the thanks of his countrymen. Already he has given us solid ground for confidence in our future.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. law will expire in June. Much consideration will be given to this whole subject by the Congress and by the peo-

ple of the country during the weeks that are to follow. Price control and rationing affect all of our people and it is perfectly natural that they should express their opinions to their representatives in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am this day in receipt of a letter from one of the leading citizens of Ypsilanti, Mich., which city is in close proximity to the Ford Willow Run bomber plant. Pursuant to the permission granted me, I am including that letter which is as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1944.

Hon. EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re: O. P. A. Rent Control.

DEAR SIR: If the Price Control Act is renewed this summer, we believe that property owners should be very definitely protected against some of the arbitrary rules and regulations of the Rent Control Division. We call your attention to three such rules which seem especially unjust:

1. Court procedure: The O. P. A. specifies the court to which one can appeal from its decisions. There is now no court in the State of Michigan to which one may appeal; we must go to Cleveland. The distance, expense, and time necessary to do this makes it impossible for the average person to make any appeal. We believe the local, county, and State courts should be available for this purpose.

2. Adjustment of rents: The present rules provide for the lowering of rents at the whim of the O. P. A., without so much as even inspecting the property; but these same rules provide that rents cannot be raised, no matter how unfair and unjust the low rent may be. The new act should provide definitely that rents shall be adjusted either up or down, to establish a fair rent for both tenant and owner.

3. Control over sales: Present regulations require 20 percent down payment for tenant-occupied homes; requires a permit from the O. P. A. to secure possession, and then 3 months' notice to tenant after such permit is received, providing the O. P. A. does not refuse to grant such permit. State laws should govern, and the O. P. A. should have no contdol over sales.

We have tried to state our case briefly. We can supply much supporting evidence. Also, we wish to call your attention to the fact that Willow Village, just outside our city, is not more than half occupied. There are now vacancies for ten or twelve thousand people. Many units are vacated each week. Local residents are now being admitted to this housing project even though they are not war-plant workers. While there still is need for rent control, the problem is not nearly as acute as it was a few months ago.

Very truly yours,

———.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me and my reply thereto:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS, OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.), LOCAL NO. 685,
Kokomo, Ind., February 17, 1944.

Representative FOREST A. HARNESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading your article in the Kokomo Tribune in regard to the soldiers' vote bill, it seems that you are trying to cover up a suffering conscience on the question.

How can a man in your position take the attitude that you take? It is beyond the comprehension of a man in the Army, Navy, or Marines, I am sure. I have spent some time in the Army and expect to spend some more soon, but it is hard for me or any laboring man to go fight for a country that has men of your caliber and attitude for leaders. Are you planning to run for reelection and afraid of the vote the servicemen would cast? This is one question we would like to have answered.

After thinking this over, don't you think the men who are fighting for us should have a right in selecting our leaders?

We would like to have a reply answering these questions.

Sincerely yours,
CECIL B. TEMPLETON,
Chairman, Educational Committee.

———

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1944.

Mr. CECIL B. TEMPLETON,
Chairman, Educational Committee,
UAW-CIO Local 685, Kokomo, Ind.

DEAR MR. TEMPLETON: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of February 17, intended to take issue with my position on the service-vote question as stated in the article recently appearing in the Kokomo Tribune. Since you offer nothing specific to support a so-called Federal ballot; and since you advance no single argument against the complete, properly safeguarded, constitutional ballot I advocate, your letter provides no basis on which we can discuss our differing opinions on this subject.

I do, however, want to comment on certain aspects of your letter. You ask three questions, all of which I believe my original printed statement answered adequately First, you inquire how I reached the decision to oppose the administration's bobtailed ballot plan. I, like every other Federal officeholder, including the President, pledged in my oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution. I took that oath literally and sincerely. Bearing the letter, as well as the spirit of the Constitution in mind, I cannot see how the Federal ballot proposal can be squared with that basic law. Furthermore, I believe the Federal ballot advocates have failed completely to show how the plan can be squared with the Constitution.

The decision, therefore, was quite clear and simple. There was no other position I could honestly and consistently take in the matter.

You have also asked, "Don't you think the men who are fighting for us have a right in selecting their leaders?" and "Are you * * * afraid of the vote the servicemen would cast?"

First, a word about questions of this character. They are based, of course, on the violent and wholly unwarranted assumption that I and others who oppose the bobtailed ballot scheme are deliberately seeking to deny the fighting forces a voice in elections. They are exactly in character with the demagoggery of which the President was guilty when he charged that opponents of his pet voting scheme are committing a "fraud" upon the fighting forces.

I think my printed statement adequately covers the question of fraud or denial of constitutional rights, but a few salient facts are worth repeating for emphasis. I feel sure that if there is fraud or denial of rights in this matter, it will occur only if the administration forces the bobtailed ballot upon the armed services. Such a ballot would give a fighting man no more than half a vote. It would deny him any voice whatever in State, county, and city elections. The bobtailed ballot would deny him even the names of the three or four candidates for whom he could vote. And because such a plan would violate the Constitution and every State election law, it would give the fighting man a ballot of doubtful legality. At best, his vote would be involved in controversy and court contests. The strong likelihood is that the vote never would be counted. That would indeed be fraud and in my opinion, an intentional fraud.

All this being true, I might with greater propriety put the same questions to you. Do you believe, as I do, that the Constitution is far too valuable a heritage to be scrapped for expediency? Do you believe the fighting forces have a right to a voice in our elections? If they do have such a right, do you think that you and I have a superior right to say that they may cast just half a vote? Are you willing to say to them, "You may vote for three or four Federal offices if you can guess who the candidate is, but we are not going to let you have anything to say in the selection of officials in your home town, your county, or your State"?

I believe I have made my own position in the matter perfectly clear. Certainly the fighting man has the right to vote. He has, in fact, the right to the same complete, safeguarded, constitutional ballot which we at home shall cast. I shall continue to defend that right.

The right of an American citizen to vote fortunately is not determined by his politics. It should, also, go without saying that my own political fortunes have nothing to do with this issue. Your second question, therefore, does not properly belong in this discussion, but I am happy to answer it as a part of my comment on the political phases of this whole question.

No matter how the service people might vote, my position on this matter would be exactly the same. I can see how the question might occur to you, though, since I believe the Federal ballot proposal is based almost entirely upon political motives. For perfectly obvious reasons which I shall mention, the administration believes the service forces will vote strongly New Deal. For other reasons which I consider equally good, and which I shall also point out, I believe the new dealers may be bitterly disappointed when the service vote is in.

Far better than anyone else, administration leaders know what a glaring partisan handicap the service voters labor under, since the Office of War Information and other New Deal dominated agencies discolor and propagandize practically everything which is released overseas. The performance records of these agencies pretty well guarantees that Americans abroad may never expect full and unbiased news, except for the little trickle which may reach them through personal mail and other prvate sources. As an example of this administration policy, the President's "fraud" message went across in full detail. The Director of O. W. I. then promised that the other side of the story would be told. Despite that promise, however, not a word to date about the bobtailed ballot violating the Constitution, denying the fighting voter a voice in all elections, denying him even the name of Federal candidates on the ballot, and jeopardizing his vote in court contests has ever issued from these Washington agencies.

It would seem that the New Deal strategists are right in believing that they have the service vote in the bag, and that they now need

only to sew the bag shut with this bobtailed ballot scheme.

These strategists may wake up to find, however, that their tactics are not really as clever and effective as they think. For one thing, the young Americans fighting abroad have been doing a lot of thinking on their own. That is indicated by the increasing signs of dissatisfaction with the conduct of affairs on the home front. You are so fully familiar with the failures and shortcomings on the home front, of course, that I do not need to elaborate on them here.

For another thing, the families and friends of our fighting forces are also doing a lot of thinking about our home-front difficulties. They are passing their comments along to the men and women at the front. You might be surprised how many Americans abroad are getting, scrap by scrap, a totally different picture than the one the administration news agencies tries to sell them; and you might be even more surprised at the reaction of those men as they find out that their own official news agencies have been deliberately holding out on them.

Predictions on the service vote, however, has nothing to do with the basic issue. Whether they vote 100 percent for the New Deal, or 100 percent against it, they still have the right to the ballot. Just as I have fought the administration's denial of complete and unbiased news for the fighting services, I will oppose every attempt to infringe the soldiers' right to a ballot. Perhaps I totally misjudge the sentiments of the American people, but I confidently believe that the mothers and fathers of our fighting men want them to have the same, complete, legal, fully protected ballot that we at home have the right to vote.

If you have any specific arguments to support the proposed Federal bobtailed ballot, or if you can point out specific weaknesses in the case against the administration scheme, I shall naturally be glad to discuss them further with you.

Since this subject is of such widespread and vital interest to all patriotic Americans, but particularly to the families of servicemen, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to the Kokomo Tribune in the hope they will be able to use it in whole or part.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

New Opportunities Open to United States Ships After War Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the January 22, 1944, issue of the Victory Bulletin entitled "New Opportunities Open to United States Ships After War Victory," by Rear Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator:

What are the opportunities of the United States in the shipping business of the world after the war?

This is a question being asked frequently as post-war plans are discussed.

There is no pat answer, but the elements that contribute to such an answer are known and can be weighed.

Some important steps already have been taken and others are being considered in the development of a permanent United States shipping program for the years after the war. A post-war planning committee has been established by the Maritime Commission to gather and collate the information necessary to frame a sound shipping policy. This committee is making numerous studies of the country's probable shipping requirements.

There are certain known facts which may be used to "take a departure," in navigation parlance, for arrival at the answer to the question of future shipping needs by "dead reckoning."

One of the certainties is that the United States will be expected to supply large quantities of food, raw materials, equipment, and finished goods to meet the necessitous demands of the populations of war-ravaged countries. Undoubtedly, there will be a market for all that we can produce and ship. Thus we have the necessary elements of business, even though they may be an ocean's breadth apart.

People in the stricken countries must obtain a complete new start in establishing economic and political security for themselves. Years of bombing and passage of fighting armies have seriously crippled their industries, lessened food production, and reduced their national economies to a shambles. War does not always stop when the guns cease firing. These people must have help. They must have tools to work with and machinery with which to reequip productive industry.

United States industry and agriculture already have demonstrated that they can produce far in excess of our home needs. This is evidenced by the lend-lease material we are supplying to our allies which is about 35 percent of our export shipping at present, with the military taking about another 50 percent.

Every United States fighting man on foreign soil requires 7 to 10 tons of equipment and supplies at the time of landing, with an additional 3 to 5 tons monthly while in combat service. More than 700,000 different items of supply were required for the north African campaign alone. The larger portion of this shipping was carried in ships of the United States merchant marine.

Another certainty is that the United States will have the ships that will be needed to carry the cargoes which the post-war foreign commerce will require.

In no field of production have the accomplishments of the United States been more spectacular than in the building of ships. It is not with complacency or boastfulness that the Maritime Commission points to the record established by United States merchant shipyard labor and management during the past 2 years of war production. Early in 1942 the President asked for what to many seemed an impossible production of merchant tonnage—24,000,000 tons dead weight to be completed by the end of 1943. That this goal was not only reached, but exceeded, is now history.

Full credit must be given to the more than 700,000 workers in some 70 yards for their construction of the Victory fleet. December production was at the rate of nearly seven ships per day, with the average for the entire year running between five and six ships per day. It was this truly miraculous feat which enabled them to exceed the President's directive for 1942 and 1943 of 24,000,000 tons dead weight by more than 3,325,000 tons.

In 1942, the Maritime Commission delivered into the service of the United Nations 746 ships totaling 8,090,000 dead-weight tons.

In 1943, a total of 1,896 ships, 19,238,600 dead-weight tons, was delivered. Of these, 1,238 vessels were of the Liberty design. Others were as follows: C–1's, 70; C–2's, 53; C–3's, 39; C–4's, 5; tankers, 167; coastal tankers, 28; Liberty tankers, 57; passenger-cargoes, 3; coastal cargoes, 33 (2 concrete); ore carriers, 16; P–1 (transports), 2; P–2 (transports), 4; seagoing tugs, 46; military tugs (not transports), 108; concrete barges, 27; tota , 1,896.

The 59 C–types built in 1942, together with 167 of these vessels delivered in 1943 are transporting a great portion of the many tons of freight needed to keep Allied armies on the move. These faster cargo vessels are proving the efficiency of the basic ship designs of the Maritime Commission.

In 1942 the Commission built 62 oceangoing tankers. The number of deliveries in 1943 totaled 252 oceangoing tankers of all types. These ships carry the "lifeblood" of our mechanized Army, high octane gas for planes, tanks, and equipment of the supply lines of mobile fighting forces.

Outstanding among the 108 vessels constructed in 1943 by Maritime Commission shipyards for delivery to the armed forces are 19 aircraft carriers. They were built to a special design of the Commission and are augmented by other carriers which are conversions from fast merchant hulls. More than 20 troop transports were made available by conversion of high-speed vessels.

1942–43 saw the delivery of 75 special large landing ships, constructed at the request of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. These boats gave valiant service in landing United Nations troops on beaches during the invasions of north Africa, Sicily, and islands of the Pacific.

Ship production in 1944 will, as in the past, be controlled by the demands of war as interpreted by the Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The keynote of shipbuilding is shifting from speed of construction to speed and efficiency of ship operation. Maritime Commission yards have the capacity to use in 1944 the same quantity of steel and shapes they used in 1943, but the exact number and type of vessels to be produced cannot be stated definitely at this time. Quality rather than quantity is the 1944 goal.

Keels for many Victory ships have been laid and the first, the steamship *United Victory*, was scheduled for launching January 12. The Maritime Commission plans to build some 300 of these vessels in the coming year, and will continue delivery of tankers, special designs, standard C-types, and Liberty ships, as dictated by the demands of war.

The main battle of ship production has been won, just as other production battles are being won. But a slow-down in effort by fighters on the home front, after winning a few battles, would be as ill-advised as a general furlough for the Army after the Battle of Salerno, or any other isolated victory. Battles must be won on all fronts before total victory is ours.

Just as the Maritime Commission met its "impossible" goals in construction, the War Shipping Administration has met equally difficult goals in delivering cargoes.

By late 1943, War Shipping Administration had under its control some 2,900 ships, operated by approximately 100 general agents. These serve in a pool of United Nations' vessels, all working for a common cause—Allied victory.

Under direction of War Shipping Administration millions of tons of battle freight have been transported to fighting fronts. Ships delivering American-made goods to the armed forces have not made the return trip with empty holds. Our own resources have been supplemented by such necessities of industry as bauxite, nitrates, wool, hemp, scrap metal, burlap, tin, and coffee. The last-named item may not be an essential of industry, but a sufficient supply of it has added to the comfort and pleasure of many workers in industry.

Where needed to accommodate the ever-increasing stream of Allied war materials, port facilities were expanded, or where none existed, they have been established. Ships flying the flag of the United States are carrying war supplies to Allied forces in ports all over the world.

The War Shipping Administration performed its assignments in 1943 and lived up to its agreements. The promised goals were reached, the goods delivered.

In summation:

We have the goods to sell and the ships to carry them to the markets that are waiting all over the world for the resumption of peacetime commerce.

Today our ships and shipbuilding facilities are engaged wholly in prosecution of the war. When these facilities are returned to peacetime schedules, operations and vessels now directed by the War Shipping Administration, will be returned to private ownership as rapidly as possible, consistent with the ability of operators to absorb them.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 it is the declared policy of the United States that there be maintained a merchant marine adequate to carry a substantial portion of the Nation's commerce.

It may not be all clear sailing ahead to the far horizons, but there can be no doubt that the opportunities of the United States in the shipping business of the post-war world will be many, and favorable to the maintenance of a great merchart marine.

Cooperation Is Urged With Liquor Industry by Methodist Pastor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, as during the First World War an attempt is now being made to foist national prohibition upon the people of the United States.

I feel very strongly that this is a most unfair procedure, at a time when millions of our boys are out of the country fighting for democracy and the rights of self-determination, and will thus have no opportunity to express themselves on this important subject. There is no need for such legislation, and none will arise if everyone cooperates as does the Ministerial Alliance in Kansas City, as set forth in the following newspaper interview given by the Reverend Edward Potts, its president;

COOPERATION IS URGED WITH LIQUOR INDUSTRY BY METHODIST PASTOR

CHICAGO, February 7.—A young Methodist minister today urged cooperation with the liquor industry and declared "the liquor problem is not going to be solved by the return of prohibition."

The Reverend Edward Potts, of Kansas City, president of the Kansas City Ministerial Alliance and pastor of the Paseo Methodist Church, expressed this view at a Midwest conference of tavern men.

"We've tested prohibition and it brought about conditions we don't want to see again," Mr. Potts said.

"In Kansas City the ministerial alliance is seeking to eliminate evils of the liquor industry by cooperating with the Tavern Owners Association. The more intelligent ministers today are trying to cooperate with the public relations departments of liquor industries. Their objective is this—to bring tavern owners around to complying with the law, thereby eliminating many evils of the industry."

For their own benefit, he proposes that tavern keepers close shop 1 day in 7, try to keep minors out of their places, be careful in treatment of women patrons, and remember that drunkenness is a principal cause of absenteeism in war plants.

Wartime Child-Care Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 24, 1944.—In a joint appeal for immediate funds for the continuation and expansion of the wartime child-care program under the Federal Works Agency, six women Members of Congress, MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, New Jersey; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts; FRANCES P BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, Maine; WINIFRED C STANLEY, Republican, New York; and CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican, Connecticut, appeared today as a group before the House Appropriations Committee.

The full text of the statement submitted by them follows:

"Mr. Chairman (Hon. CLARENCE CANNON), as of course you know, under the wartime child-care program, funds are allotted for assistance in the operation of facilities for the care of children whose mothers are employed in jobs essential to the war effort. Local communities participate in the cost of the service to the extent that funds are available and the parents pay a fee which must cover, at least, the cost of food. As of January 31, 1944, a total of $20,204,565 of Lanham Act funds had been allotted for wartime child-care services. As of February 9, the last date for which a report is available, there were in operation 1,431 nursery schools with an enrollment of 37,439 preschool children and 812 centers with an enrollment of 28,333 school-age children. This makes a total of 2,243 centers with an enrollment of 65,772.

"You have under consideration before your committee a request from the Director of the Budget for an appropriation of $150,000,000 to the Federal Works Agency for war public works. An important part of this fund is for the continuation and expansion of the child-care program.

"We want to call to your attention the urgency of this program because of the vast number of women now in industry and the need for more than 1,000,000 additional women workers by July 1.

"At the present time, only 65,772 children are being taken care of in 2,243 projects. This does not begin to meet the existing need, as evidenced by the fact that 4 out of 5 women hired today leave their jobs because of home problems. One of the most common of these is lack of adequate care for these children. The War Manpower Commission estimates that 1 out of every 7 women workers has a child needing care. This means that at least 142,000 more children than at the present time will need care by July 1 if the recruitment program is to be successful. As you know, an increasing number of women with small children are being forced to seek employment, as fathers are drafted into the armed forces.

"The health and safety of our children, as well as the achievement of our war-production goals, depend on speedy provision of the necessary funds.

"The program at present is at a standstill. No new projects can be opened even though applications for 302 child-care projects from local communities, certified as essential to the war effort, are pending. Facilities cannot be provided for the children in these areas and the existing projects will be forced to close as their grants expire unless this appropriation is granted at once.

"A further step is necessary to the fulfillment of the program. The limitation of $40,000,000 imposed by act of Congress of July 15, 1943, on the amount of funds permitted to be used for maintenance and operation of these war services should be lifted. Allocation of funds to the child-care projects already approved and pending would bring the total allocation up to the limit imposed. Therefore, the failure to remove this limitation would mean a total collapse of the child-care program.

"Therefore, we women Members of Congress, assume the responsibility of speaking for the millions of working mothers of our country and of impressing upon you the need for action. Women cannot do their best work in their war jobs, or are prevented from making a contribution altogether, if they are constantly worried and insecure about the care of their children. We owe it to our fighting fathers to safeguard the health and future of American youth. We sincerely hope that this committee in its wisdom will join with us in making it possible to secure the services of the thousands of women who are anxious to do their part in providing the means to achieve victory. We know of no better way to secure their services than in making adequate provisions for safeguarding the health and happiness of their children.

"Very sincerely yours,

"MARY T. NORTON.
"EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.
"FRANCES P. BOLTON.
"MARGARET CHASE SMITH.
"WINIFRED C. STANLEY.
"CLARE BOOTHE LUCE."

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, until this time I have not felt impelled to explain any vote which I have cast on any bill in the Congress; but I feel constrained in this instance to make a few observations with respect to my vote on H. R. 3687, the pending revenue or tax bill.

I voted against adoption of the conference report on this bill because there were certain features of the bill to which I could not subscribe. Among these was the provision in the bill relating to the renegotiation of war contracts. I was very much opposed to any legislation which would concede or make possible to any contractor the opportunity to derive unconscionable profits from war contracts, especially at this time when we are in the midst of a great war, calling for sacrifices on the part of everyone. There were other features of the bill to which I

could not give support with any great satisfaction to myself. I did not conceive myself to be able to write a new tax bill. There were other things contained in the bill which appeared to me to be somewhat of concessions to certain industries that I did not feel the circumstances presently required.

I, therefore, did vote against the adoption of the conference report. Then, the bill, having passed the House and the Senate, went to the White House for the approval or disapproval of the President. There was considerable speculation as to what action the President would take, it being generally supposed that he would probably veto the bill. This he did, and among the reasons assigned was his objection to that part of the bill modifying the law heretofore passed by Congress with respect to the renegotiation of war contracts. He gave several other reasons for his action in vetoing the bill. Some of the reasons assigned seem to me to be positions well taken; others I may not have subscribed to so definitely.

The message of the President accompanying his veto brought on, in my opinion, other important considerations, and the largest among them the matter of the disturbance of the relationship obtaining between the President of the United States and, by virtue of that office, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the Congress. I have been much disturbed that there has not been a better and a more cooperative understanding obtaining between the different departments of the Government, so needful during this time of great distress, brought on by the war. I have realized that under one excuse and another it was to be expected that there would be differences between Members of the Congress and the President, and the only hope one could entertain would be that these differences might be minimized in view of the importance of unity so necessary in the prosecution of this war in an efficient manner.

I was grieved and disappointed in the use by the President of the language contained in his message to the Congress in connection with his determination to veto the tax bill. Personally, I am not resentful of that. I feel, however, that an important consideration arises on account of and because of the language used in returning the bill to the Congress. What disturbed me most was that it tended to disunity between the Congress and the President, a result greatly to be deplored. Speaking with great respect, but frankly, the President's message was pretty caustic and contained considerable sarcasm, with respect even to the action of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress in the consideration and adoption of the bill which was sent to the President to be signed. Then came to me the problem of the immediate healing of the wounds which I regarded the message to have caused and the problem of the best way, so far as my little part in the matter was concerned, to approach this effort toward a better understanding and actually a better feeling between the Congress and the President.

It is to be admitted that the Congress is not without fault in giving occasion to division between the executive department and the Congress. I have seen too much of this to deny that there has been too great a tendency to interfere with the Executive in the performance of his duties. In this instance, however, I feel that the message of the President did not lend itself to a reestablishment of a better understanding between the Congress and the White House. I felt that this was one time when the President made a mistake in the character of message, including the wording of the same, which he transmitted with his veto of the tax bill. In my opinion, a recognition of this fact led to the necessity that the Congress should prevail and that the bill should be passed notwithstanding the President's veto. I believed that less serious consequences would follow, in that there would be afforded another opportunity for concord and good feeling between the Chief Executive and the Congress. This is an important consideration.

I confess that my attachment to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who justifiably felt aggrieved on account of the message the President sent to the Congress in relation to the tax bill, is a matter of interest to me. Probably the President did not intend to make accusation of bad faith toward anybody, but it must be admitted that the tenor of the message was well calculated to produce in the mind of a faithful servant the feeling that he had been unkindly dealt with. While this may seem a personal matter, I think it goes further than that.

Hoping that the President, on reconsideration of his message to the Congress on the occasion, might feel inclined to give assurance in some way that he did not intend any offense, and realizing the necessity of concord and good understanding, I felt that to accomplish these the bill should pass. In some instances, which I have made partial reference to, it remains that amendments and corrections may be made by legislation hereafter. Men may, in the best of faith, differ as to the additional amount of taxes that could wisely be levied at this time, and any errors of judgment are susceptible to correction. What we desire now so much is to establish good will, concord, and consideration; one for another, between all branches of our Government so that, as one, we may protect and preserve our country and its institutions.

Petition of Farmers of Cloud County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter signed by a number of farmers of Cloud County, Kans., who are the chosen representatives of a much larger group favoring the proposal submitted in the petition, which I am also including.

My mail indicates that the signers of this petition represent the views of the greater portion of farm people in my congressional district. The farmers are definitely opposed to subsidies and cannot understand why the administration would oppose a program that would give them a fair price in the market rather than send them weekly or monthly subsidy checks on basic crops. The present policy of the executive branch of the Government in dealing with farm production is seriously hampering the production of needed food for our own citizens and our allies.

MILTONVILLE, KANS.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned committee, representing 125 signers in this locality, are sending you this petition which is one of a continuance of petitions sent out all over this Nation, and are asking you to put this petition before your Agricultural Committee and see it is put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And then see its delivery direct to Claude Wickard for his consideration. Will send a great many petitions signed, later. And give us a report as soon as possible.

Respectfully,

Henry Demars, Aurora, Kans.; A. W. Melton, Floyd Woodworth, Irvin Pearce, E. A. Simpson, Walter J. Hadorn, E. J. Regnier, G. W. Coffey, Concordia, Kans.

PETITION

To whom it may concern:

As our Government is calling for more wheat and is planning to ship millions of bushels into the United States,

We, the undersigned, demand all be refunded their penalty money for 1941–42 for which you call excess wheat, and

We go on record opposing a subsidy on any commodity,

And we are asking all persons concerned in the Wheat Belt to send a similar petition to their representative in Washington,

Getting Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of February 22, 1944:

GETTING OUT OF BUSINESS?

When Representative JERRY VOORHIS of California yesterday denounced the Government's agreement to construct a trans-Arabian oil pipe line as a gift to a cartel-in-the-making, he may have been seeing little men who are not there, and maybe he was not.

Certainly it is an odd coincidence that the representatives of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, Socony-Vacuum, Texas, Gulf, and Shell—the beneficiaries of the deal—should have quit

their Government jobs as VOORHIS states, as soon as it was negotiated.

It is even more baffling that he should report that the companies have refused to grant the Government any of the oil from these fields in exchange for building the $150,000,000 line. They certainly intend to sell the stuff at a profit, so it may be well to ask, at least, just what arrangements have been made in the way of payment for the use of the line. And, if it is true, as VOORHIS also charges, that the project cannot be justified as a war measure, then an investigation certainly is in order.

The prospect that the United States may be committed to the protection of a pipe line on the other side of the world for the benefit of a group of oil companies is not one likely to appeal to the American people. It smells strangely of a dip into imperialism for the benefit of private interests—a strange venture in these days when there is such a clamor for getting Government out of business. Or does it make a difference for whose benefit Government is in business?

Expedite Veterans' Claims

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] says, that the Congress of the United States has passed a great deal of legislation beneficial to the ex-servicemen and women and their dependents, but we have not gone far enough.

There is considerable legislation pending at the present time. One of the bills, I think, is commonly called the American Legion's bill of rights. I confess I have not studied that bill sufficiently to make any remarks in reference to it, but I do say that the first legislation we should pass, and there should be no delay, is to expedite the claims of those who have suffered disabilities in the armed forces and the claims of the dependents of those whose death occurred while serving in the armed forces.

On February 15 I introduced two bills, one, H. R. 4190; the other, H. R. 4191. Later I amended H. R. 4190 and introduced what is now known as H. R. 4227 as a substitute. H. R. 4191 was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which the distinguished gentleman, Mr. MAY, is chairman, because it amends the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. That bill has to do with expediting the claim of dependents of a deceased member of the armed forces. Under existing conditions when information is received that a man or woman has died, any allotment that might have been paid as a result of their service is automatically suspended. The dependents, whether it be a widow or dependent parents or children, are required to file a claim with the Veterans' Administration. Heretofore it has been necessary to prove legal widowhood by submitting the marriage certificate, birth certificates as far as the children are concerned, or if it be dependent parents, a certified copy of the birth certificate of the enlisted person, together with affidavits showing that these documents represent either the widow, the children, or the parents. All this takes a great deal of time, and in the intervening period the dependents are without financial assistance.

Section 123 of my bill provides that the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, are authorized and directed to continue the payment of the monthly family allowance for 1 month.

Section 122 reads as follows:

SEC. 122. Upon receipt of an official report of the death of a member of the active military or naval forces as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by such service, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall certify to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator), (1) the name and other identifying data respecting such member; (2) the date of death; (3) the fact that the death was the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service; (4) the names, addresses, and relationship of any dependents of such member who, at the time of his or her death, were being paid monthly family allowances under this act, and the amount or amounts thereof in each case; (5) the date on which any such allowances will terminate in accordance with section 123; and (6) any other information necessary for the Administrator to perform the duties required of him by this act.

Section 124 provides that when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs receives the information from the War and Navy Departments, he is to immediately determine whether any of the dependents named in such certificate are entitled to pension or compensation, is to learn the exact amount or amounts due under existing law, and to pay the dependents such amounts as the law provides. It also specifically provides that such a pension or compensation awarded the dependents becomes effective the date following that of the termination of the payment of monthly family allowances. In other words, some financial assistance will be rendered the dependents continuously. There will be no intervening period where they will not be receiving help from the Government. Long delays in some cases creates tremendous hardships and in many instances the dependents find themselves objects of charity.

The same applies to the disabled service men and women. H. R. 4227, which was referred to the Committee on World War Veteran's Legislation, provides that whenever a member of the armed forces is to be honorably discharged or released from active duty other than through retirement under existing laws for disability, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall notify the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of such contemplated action and shall provide for the Administrator to examine such member medically and otherwise and shall furnish the Administrator with such records and other information that it be necessary to enable him to determine what benefits such member is entitled to under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. It further provides that the Administrator is authorized and directed upon receipt of such notification to make such determination prior to the discharge or release of such member from active military or naval service. Section 3 provides that no member of the armed forces shall be discharged or released until the Administrator shall have determined first whether such member is entitled to pension or compensation or both and the exact amount, if any, to which such member is entitled, and also whether such member is entitled to vocational rehabilitation under any act of Congress administered by the Veterans' Administration. The pension or compensation pursuant to this act shall become effective immediately upon the discharge or release from active military or naval service of such member.

Both the Government and the veteran are protected by provisions of the bill in that they will not be deprived of the right to challenge the amount that has been awarded. There are other provisions of this bill which will be beneficial to the veterans as far as rehabilitation is concerned. In many instances individuals and the press have been extremely critical of the delay in extending benefits to disabled veterans. Under the terms of the legislation I suggest, there will be no delay but financial assistance will be available to the disabled immediately upon their release from the service.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, there will be little additional cost, the main feature of the legislation being to remove the delay in granting benefits which the disabled veteran or the dependents of the deceased veteran are now entitled under the law. Criticism will be eliminated immediately upon the passage of this legislation.

I have asked both the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to secure reports from the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration on this proposed legislation. They responded immediately and advised me that the requests had been made.

There is other legislation that we must enact to assist the disabled veteran so that he or she will not be continuously a charge upon the public. For instance, practically every State in the Union has what is known as workmen's compensation law. The insurance is written by a private corporation and provisions are made at the time where employees must pass a physical examination to determine whether or not they would be a good risk. It is not the personnel director of the private corporation that has sole authority to employ because there must be a clearance through the examining physician of the company that furnishes the insurance. In other words, the private physician representing the insurance company can give an applicant a death sentence if he is any way disabled. Take, for instance, a disabled veteran who has been rehabilitated. He might have lost a leg or an arm but it would interfere in no way with the performance of his duties if employed by the corporation. Still he is denied employment because the physician representing the insurance company refuses to approve. I say in such instances as that, provision should

be made whereby the Veterans' Administration could provide the insurance for that rehabilitated veteran that would enable him to secure the employment with the private corporation. I do not want the Government to go into the insurance business and I would only want such a provision to apply where the private corporation declines to insure the rehabilitated veteran. Many such cases as this have come to my attention. I have discussed it personally with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, General Hines. The general was impressed and is working now with a view to suggesting legislation that will meet this situation.

We cannot do too much for the disabled veterans and their dependents, but I hold that it is extremely essential that we provide immediately to expedite all cases where there is a legitimate claim against the Veterans' Bureau, be it a disabled veteran or dependents of a deceased veteran.

Smear Chiefs Unscrupulous, Slick, and Foxy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 22, 1944:

SMEAR CHIEFS UNSCRUPULOUS, SLICK, AND FOXY—MANY HOLD WELL-PAID GOVERNMENT JOBS

(By Frank Hughes)

Cartoonists often picture the New Deal smear-and-smirch gang as a group of woolly haired, wild-eyed radicals daubing tar with long-handled brushes from dirty, black pots and buckets. The figure is apt, but unreal to life.

Most of the top-flight smear artists will be found in comfortable chairs, behind tidy desks, in air-conditioned offices. A good many of them sit in Government offices where the pay ranges from $5,600 a year upward. They wear conservative business suits and neatly shined shoes, and their barbers trim them regularly once each week.

SMOOTH, SHREWD, SMART

They are smooth and shrewd and plenty smart. They have the average complement of personal vices—bridge, golf, horses, highballs, and cigarettes—and the normal quota of virtues and legitimate interests, including, no doubt, wives and children who love them dearly. Not a few of them are well within draft age and embarrassingly healthy.

The New Deal bosses get a business value out of these white-collar workers because they have contacts and because they have the ability to unearth and shape up vilification for Mr. Roosevelt and his cohorts—in other words, the ability to smear.

The contacts are important, first, because they lead to the dungheap where the smear is dug, and, second, because they provide an outlet—the venal press, radio commentators, columnists, political rostrums, and front organizations—through which it is hurled.

TECHNIQUE IS COMMUNISTIC

The technique of the smear was introduced by Communist artisans who studied under the Moscow Soviets and was perfected over a decade by industrious new dealers. It is complex, but it has it inviolable rules. The first and most important of these is to associate the loyal with the disloyal and the reputable with the disreputable.

Senator Paragon, although no prude, is a loyal and intelligent gentleman, with a clean voting record and an even more irreproachable private life. His political beliefs are those of Lincoln and Jefferson and his public utterances have always been wholly American and unassailable. He is a formidable leader of the New Deal opposition.

How can a man like that be discredited? It's simple. All the smear gang has to do is to associate him in the public mind with a fellow like Judas Lickspittle, the Nazi, who is secure in a Federal lock-up for sedition, treason, and assorted felonies and conspiracies against the United States and is a stench in the public nostrils.

HOW IT WORKS

The smearers set to work. Senator Paragon and Mr. Lickspittle eat the same breakfast food. That's no good. They both vote Republican—again, no good—so did 22,000,000 other people in 1940.

Before Pearl Harbor, Senator Paragon opposed the entrance of the United States into the war against Hitler. So did Brother Lickspittle, the German. Ah, ha! There's a lead. Senator Paragon belonged to a patriotic association that opposed the war. Mr. Lickspittle belonged to the bund, which also opposed the war and sought unsuccessfully to climb up on the platform at rallies of the Senator's association.

The smear campaign is on, and the slick boys at their tidy desks begin to earn their money. Their contacts now come into play. The listening posts on the smear network are alerted to pick up anything connecting Senator Paragon and Mr. Lickspittle, the Senator's patriotic society and the bund.

COLUMNISTS FED TIPS

The columnists and commentators are fed tips and bits of the latest Washington gossip. Editorials begin to appear in the kept press asking why Senator Paragon and his fellow noninterventionists aren't indicted for sedition since they have been proved to be associates of Lickspittle, the traitor. These newspapers are published in widely separated cities—Washington, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New York, Des Moines, Louisville, and many others—but they ask the same question at about the same time. They, too, are on the party line.

Maybe the smear boys hang another Federal sedition indictment on Lickspittle and drag in Senator Paragon's patriotic organization for good measure. The Senator's colleagues who are in the New Deal fold begin to attack him on the floor. Some of them are just gullible gentlemen who have always swallowed the party line and have no reason to gag on this hank of it. Others are part and parcel of the smear cabal and enjoy their work.

OUSTER THEN SUGGESTED

Two or three potent new dealers and New Deal stalking horses within Senator Paragon's party suggest that the Nation would be a lot better off if the Senator was purged from his seat and thrown off Capitol Hill, along with all the other stalwart nationalists who think the way he does—and the way the bund does. The stock of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal party jumps a few points on the political market.

This is the smear, and it can—and has—happened here. Gen. Robert E. Wood, president and chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck Co., a West Point graduate and quartermaster general of the American armies during World War No. 1, was chairman of the America First Committee which, along with an overwhelming majority of Congressmen, was opposed to American intervention in the European and Asiatic wars before Pearl Harbor. They were squarely and exclusively for the safety and the self-interest of the United States. So were about 80 percent of the American people.

The German-American Bund, subsidized by Hitler as the Dies committee has disclosed, didn't want America to go to war either. The bundists tried on several occasions to climb up on America First rostrums, but the Americans would have none of them.

FOR AMERICAN REASONS

The America First Committee was against war for American reasons. The bund was against American participation in the war for reasons of its own. The new dealers chose to ignore this fact completely, however, and Mr. Roosevelt's college of smear and purge, working through New Deal Attorney General Francis Biddle and Eugene Meyer's halitosis newspaper, the Washington Post, engineered two indictments for seditious conspiracy, naming known Nazi propaganda agents, crackpot anti-Semites, and the America First Committee as their agent and instrument.

The indictments were phony as far as the America First Committee was concerned, and everybody in America, including the Attorney General, knew it. That is why, after these disgusting legal libels had served their purpose, they were shoved aside and a third indictment omitting the America First Committee was drawn and voted by a grand jury of which four Government employees and the wives of four other Government employees were members.

PURGE DIVISION ACTS

While this was going on, the New Deal's purge division went to work, Edward J. "Paving Blocks" Flynn, then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, joining up with Wendell Willkie, the stooge of Roosevelt. Flynn got his sobriquet from the fact that he paved a courtyard of his country estate with paving blocks owned by the Bronx Borough government of which he is political boss, and laid by New York City employees. He made restitution and was whitewashed by a Bronx grand jury, but the scandal resulted in his political eclipse.

Flynn and Willkie thought they might as well knock out a few nationalist Congressmen. They were aided in the campaign by the Communists and by other internationalists. Flynn launched the attack by declaring that "no misfortune except a major military defeat could befall this country" comparable to the election of a Republican Congress. Willkie, who confessed before a Senate committee that his 1940 attacks on the President's foreign policy were only "campaign oratory," demanded the purge of every Senator and Representative who had opposed intervention.

HEAVYWEIGHT TEAM

This was a heavyweight, if smelly, team in any battle royal, but it ended up sadly outpointed. When the 1942 election returns were tallied, only 11 of the 144 Congressmen Messrs. Flynn and Willkie picked on had been counted out. In the Senate it was about as bad. Only 1 of the 8 Senators who had been proscribed failed to return.

The post mortem in the New Deal dressing room didn't sound much better. Willkie had, in effect, asked the people not only to repudiate their Representatives but to repudiate themselves, for 80 percent of America was noninterventionist. As a purger, he had flown in the face of Edmund Burke's dictum that you cannot indict a people. And, properly, he had come out of it well bloodied up.

The New Deal bosses are apt to use the purge against anyone they want to get rid of, even one of their own beliefs and sympathies. Sumner Welles, an ardent internationalist, resigned last September as Under Secretary of State after the Chicago Tribune had predicted his resignation in an exclusive story the month before.

SUBJECT OF VILE CAMPAIGN

Before he was forced out of his high post, Welles was made the subject of one of the most vile and insidious whispering campaigns ever started in Washington. This was a vicious word-of-mouth attempt at character assassination too horrible to reach public print even in the New York Evening Post, but the little men in Washington saw that it got around to everyone who counted.

The Communists hadn't been much help in the congressional purge. They had been on the other side only a short time before. From the moment Soviet Dictator Stalin made his pact with Hitler in August 1939 until Hitler attacked Russia in 1941, the Communists were the most ardent antiwar party in America

They picketed the White House against intervention and they instigated strikes in factories producing weapons and war materials. The Communist-dominated C. I. O. unions took the leadership in turning this trick. Alongside the Communists, the German-American Bund was a piker outfit. All they did was march and talk and drink beer.

BROWDER SOUNDED KEYNOTE

Earl Browder, the Soviet political commissar for America, sounded the keynote for the Communists in 1940 when he said: "Not a cent, not a gun, not a man for war preparations. No aid to the imperialist war makers in London. Oppose all war loans and credits to the warring imperialist powers. Stop the sale and shipment of munitions and armaments. Resist the militarization and armament program of the administration and Congress. Combat the imperialist policies and acts of the President."

Mr. Roosevelt's position on the politics of treachery has been made clear. He pardoned Earl Browder after the Communist leader had been sentenced to a Federal penitentiary for passport fraud during the Russian-Nazi alliance. Not a Communist has been imprisoned or indicted and New Deal offices are still full of them. The German bundists, however, have been made to feel the full weight of Federal prosecution, and along with them, for political reasons, an irresponsible group of the lunatic fringe.

The Communist Daily Worker in New York characterized the President as a "warmonger attempting to plunge American youth into the maelstrom of another European conflict merely to save the British Empire." The German agents and the crackpots who made similar assertions are in the process of making bond before a United States commissioner. Under the New Deal, it pays to be a Communist.

FRIENDS FOR ENEMIES

The Daily Worker changed friends for enemies almost as quickly as Adolf Hitler did after June 22, 1941. From attempting to halt American participation in the war, it began to denounce the pre-war noninterventionists as defeatists and traitors and daub them with the most mucilaginous kind of Communist smear.

The Daily Worker said that the 30 persons named in the Justice Department's most recent indictment of German agents, crackpots, and anti-Semites were supported by big shots who are "known to every true American and anti-Fascist. They are known to the Government. They have been accused and exposed innumerable times by anti-Fascist writers and investigators.

"They are: Henry Ford, industrialist; Lamont du Pont, industrialist; J. Howard Pew, industrialist; J. H. Rand, industrialist; Capt. William (sic) Patterson, paper publisher; Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher; William Randolph Hearst, newspaper publisher; Gen. Robert Wood, retired corporation head; Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator Robert Rice Reynolds; Senator Gerald P. Nye; Representative Clare E. Hoffman; Representative Hamilton Fish; Representative John E. Rankin."

WILLKIE EULOGIZED

Nothing quite as funny as the Daily Worker's sudden apostasy had been witnessed in this country until recent weeks when Governor Wills, of Vermont, a pseudo Republican, got before a radio microphone and damned the Republican Party and eulogized Mr. Willkie and internationalism in almost the same phrases that Mr. Roosevelt used when he commented, the week or so before, on the possibility that General Marshall might be kicked upstairs from his post as Army Chief of Staff.

The ways of the smear are as unpredictable and frequently as hilariously hectic as the characters who carry it out. More about their activities will be told in subsequent articles.

Hilton Ultimus Brown, Aged 85

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, perhaps if we were to look into the matter we would find that every State in the Union and nearly every community has its grand old man.

In Indiana we have our grand old man and we Hoosiers who know him and love him, which is all of us, would like to nominate him for the high and honorable distinction of grand old man of America.

The name of Indiana's candidate is Hilton Ultimus Brown.

In a State noted for its violent political repercussions, where the normal sustaining diet of the ordinary citizen is one-eighth food and seven-eighths politics, a phenomenon has happened. The State has settled down to a calm subnormalcy. Interest in politics has vanished. For the time being we do not care a hoot who runs away with the Presidential nomination. We are only interested in paying our sincere tributes of respect and affection to Mr. Brown, who attained the ripe age of 85 on February 20.

When we Hoosiers speak of Mr. Brown as Indiana's grand old man, we do not think of him as being old in the ordinary sense of the word. He is old only in years. Time has debited him on the calendar without diminishing his physical or mental powers. His zest in life remains as keen as a Damascus blade, his love for people is changeless and undimmed, and he retains in full flower all of the faculties of his brilliant mind.

I have often wondered how Mr. Brown got that middle name "Ultimus." His surname, Brown, is common enough and nothing to get excited about. There are lots of Browns. I assume that Hilton is a family name and therefore easily enough explained. But that word "Ultimus," how come? I can only figure it out that a wise Providence, knowing the kind of person he was preordained to be, saw that the name Ultimus was bestowed upon him as descriptive of the ultimate, or extreme, in kindliness and nobility of character. Anyway it appears to be a happy happenstance that he got that unusual name.

Mr. Brown has endeared himself to the people of our community and State by his undeviating championship of high ideals and his innumerable acts of kindness. Visitors in Indianapolis who call at his office in the Indianapolis News Building, as thousands, especially newspaper people, do, find a host of the most engaging manners and pleasing personality who is ever willing to lend a helping hand or to give generous advice from an inexhaustible store of information. He is the Nestor of Indiana journalism. His also is one of the best known names in newspaper circles throughout the entire country as he has long been outstanding in the councils of the Associated Press, and a publishers' meeting would seem a flop without him. He has been connected continuously with the Indianapolis News for 63 years, starting as a reporter and rising to the position of chairman of the board and secretary-treasurer, which he now holds.

When in 1892 I emerged from the tall corn of Fayette County, Ind., and went to Indianapolis to try to get a newspaper job Mr. Brown already was well established and I sat at his feet and drank of his wisdom. We were not working on the same newspaper in those days, but we were thrown together a lot, especially at the old Indianapolis Press Club located in a basement room on South Pennsylvania Street, in property that is now a part of the Indiana National Bank Building. We had a bon homme associate, a hail fellow, well met, who knocked around town a good deal in those days, and who afterward achieved some fame. His name was James Whitcomb Riley.

While Mr. Brown's life has been cast in newspaper channels and he has made a notable contribution to the journalism of his time, it is equally true that in the field of education he has shone most luminously. He has been an inspiration and a character-building force in the upbringing of the youth of the land and especially those who have felt the beneficent effects of his immediate touch. It is but natural that he should love children, as he has had 10 of his own. One of these, who bore the father's honored name, died nobly in action for his country in France in the First World War. Mrs. Brown, a lovely matron who shared her husband's popularity, passed away a few years ago and Mr. Brown has continued to reside at the big house which is an Irvington—Indianapolis suburb—landmark and which in the lifetime of the gracious mistress was a center of

hospitality for more than half a century. In 1888 Mr. Brown became a member of the board of trustees of his alma mater, Butler University, and he has been president of the board since 1903, a period of 41 years of distinguished service.

When the eighty-fifth anniversary of Mr. Brown's birth loomed in the offing a grand idea occurred to Col. William H. Rankin, Colonel Bill to those of us who know him best.

Colonel Bill is a Hoosier of the type that may well be described as the "salt of the earth." He is fuller of ideas than a pup is of fleas when it comes to thinking up ways of doing nice things and of being of service to others. He called in a stenographer and dictated letters to all of the Hoosiers he could think of, simply reminding them that February 20 would be Hilton U. Brown's birthday. That was all that was necessary. The makings of the spark were there and all that was needed to touch it off was this reminder from Colonel Bill.

If the Western Union was threatened with a deficit before Colonel Bill sent out those letters, it was wiped out by the developments that followed. The increase of postal volume which immediately ensued guaranteed that the Post Office Department will be in the black at the end of the present fiscal year. Everybody and everybody's aunt, uncle, and forty-second cousin joined in the congratulatory rush. Colonel Bill's round robin was a paralyzing success. Kent Cooper, the general manager of the Associated Press, grabbed a pencil and wrote to Mr. Brown:

It is difficult to believe that you have gotten around to being 85 years young. It doesn't seem so long ago that I gave you worries as a reporter on the Indianapolis Press.

That message made the bells ring in my memory as I was a reportorial colleague of Kent on the Press staff As far as we were concerned in those days, it did not have to be proved that the Press had the best staff in the world. We admitted it.

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, "Puddler" JIM, who began puddling in the tinplate mills at Elwood, wrote to Mr. Brown:

As an old Indianian may I at this time congratulate you on your great service, not only to the cultural and educational life of Indiana but to the country in general. Your record as a citizen is one that all of us are proud of.

At this point in the letter "Puddler" Jim's foot slipped a little and he digressed to add:

Of course, old Jim Watson we all know.

And then he went on with some nice comment about Jim Watson which may be described as ultra vires and which need not be repeated here.

Mr. Watson added his own epistle to Mr. Brown in the deluge of congratulations and Henry F. Schricker, the Governor of Indiana, sent to Mr. Brown the following nice letter, which may be said to represent the sentiments of all of the people of our State:

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I count it one of the happy privileges of my administration to join your legion of friends in extending warmest congratulations and sincerest felicitations upon your eighty-fifth birthday anniversary. Your long years of service with the Indianapolis News and your faithful devotion to Butler University, together with your fine support to every worthy enterprise for the good of Indiana, have won for you the undying affection and high esteem of all of your people.

We rejoice today that a kindly providence has spared you to this happy day, and that Indiana has been enriched beyond measure by your long and useful life.

With cordial greetings and with assurance of my highest personal regard, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, an old newspaperman, wrote as a sincere friend of many years:

I know it must be most gratifying to you, as it is to your legion of friends, that at 85 you are still active. You have seen much history written in this country and have reason to be proud of the outstanding contribution you have made to the Indianapolis News and to journalism generally during your long and useful life.

I am reminded, too, that you have been chairman of the board of Butler College for the past 20 years, and certainly you should take pride in the part you have had in the upbuilding of this outstanding educational institution.

I know it will be your desire to stay in the harness and you have my very best wishes for continued health and success.

It remained for Booth Tarkington to cap the epistolary climax, which he did in the following clever and original style:

DEAR HILTON: At a meeting of the board of the Herron Institute not long ago I was unbeknownstly looking at you and wondering how much younger than I am you are. I remembered that on the occasion of a birthday of yours some years ago I had written a letter of congratulations, but as I looked at you it seemed to become plain that when I'd done so I'd been all mixed up about the number of your years. Now I learn that I was mistaken in this and counting arithmetically you're actually a slight somewhat my senior.

Well, you've always been that, not only in beauty and arithmetically but in wisdom, in goodness, and in the affection of your fellow men. Because of these things, on this birthday of yours, I again salute you and hail you as City Father Illustrissimus.

Compared to your virtues, how few are your years and how infinitesimal these latter compared to the number of your fellow townsmen, beneficiaries all of them, to whose grateful cheering I add this ever-devoted voice.

Affectionately yours,

BOOTH TARKINGTON.

It must be most comforting to Mr. Brown, as he walks serenely with head unbowed toward the sunset, to know that he has so many real, honest-to-goodness friends in the world. He need not now worry for something to engage his attention. He has a large job cut out for him counting, sorting, and reading his congratulatory mail. But it is safe to say that this will be only his incidental occupation. Most of his time in the future, as always in the past, will be spent in doing good to others.

Congress Is the Obstacle in the Way of Revolution by Consent

REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the war is not interfering with the plans of those who are determined to stage a revolution by consent in the United States, and smearing Congress is but one of the vehicles on which the revolutionaries hope to ride over American traditions and establishments.

One of the clearest, soundest, and most pointed articles I have seen on the subject has been written by U. V. Wilcox, of the Washington News Bureau. He strikes a blow straight from the shoulder, and his article certainly should cause every thinking American to arouse and assist Congress in holding the line against this revolution by consent. After all, Congress, representing the people, is the obstacle now in the way of the revolutionaries whose offensive is based on smear tactics.

By unanimous consent, I submit the article by Mr. Wilcox for consideration of the House:

LASKI AND WALLACE ON "REVOLUTION BY CONSENT" NOW

WASHINGTON.—A revolution in concepts of government unfolds here. At times it reaches crescendoes of bitterness and feeling, momentarily making headlines, as public issues bore deep to the economic problems of a world war. The tax bill, food and credit subsidies, a Federal ballot are actually but the battle markers on the new road that America is traveling. Fundamental is leadership—leadership in party, in Congress, in the White House.

It is unfortunate that the easygoing, somewhat cynical newspaper-reading, radio-listening America should have fallen into the habit of belittlin' Members of Congress. It is especially unfortunate now, when the constitutional feature of the Nation is there being debated.

Congress with all its faults, compounded largely out of its lumbering machinery, which was designed in the first instance to protect its influence, is made up of hard-working, sincere, patriotic citizens. If the Members of Congress are hesitant and slow, it is because they are anxious to respond to the wishes of the folks back home. Not being bureaucrats, not being certain that they are always right, anxious—if sometimes too anxious—to reflect the voter's wishes, they instinctively question the God-complex of the executive departments of the Government.

Whether it is in credit subsidies, or a tax bill, it is only Congress that stands between "revolution by consent" and the constitutional processes of enacting the laws. Congress has come to feel intensely on this issue, typified especially in the philosophies of such men as Harold J. Laski and HENRY A. WALLACE.

Congressmen have been receiving many letters on this subject from their constituents, some of whom are old-time friends. For example, Mr. Zach Lamar Cobb, lawyer and lifelong Democrat, recently circularized Members of Congress, with chapter and verse,

on the writings of Laski, an administration adviser, who openly favors revolution now, even while engaged in war. Laski argues "that war is a condition peculiarly adapted by its nature to enable the process of adaption by consent to begin" (p. 147 of his book, Where Do We Go From Here?).

Mr. Cobb's letter to many of his old friends in Congress quoted other such passages and compared them with Vice President WALLACE'S comments made on his last western trip, when he said: "Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be bloodless and gradual, instead of bloody and sudden." Also: "We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States. It was made for Russia, and not for us, but Russia is doing every day what we in the United States have only preached on Sunday."

The financial leaders of the Nation have at times shuddered at the economic theories advocated by high executive officials of the Government. Many of these theories have challenged Congress and its right to legislate. "Revolution by consent" is an alternative. Thus, even now, during a war, the issue of revolution in Government must be met. Members of Congress are resisting, and they need support and encouragement, as they fight to hold the line against programs foreign to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Interview With John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Henry J. Taylor:

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH JOHN LEWIS, WHO HATES COMMUNISTS AND READS PEGLER

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When John L. Lewis speaks he does not whisper. And in an exclusive interview given me today he did not whisper about American Communists inside and outside the ranks of organized labor.

The 220-pound labor leader was angry clear through when I brought up the subject, and this is what he said, while I kept one eye on the door. You can't tell what may happen when John L. Lewis really gets mad.

"About once a week," he said, "somebody asks me about Communists, as though I saw a place for them in our country's labor picture. There isn't any place for these parasites as far as I am concerned, never has been, and never will be. Fifteen years ago I had a clause written into the United Mine Workers of America constitution outlawing any Communist from membership. I do not know a single Communist in that union today and if you can find one in it for me he will go out on his head tomorrow.

"If I had my way not a single Communist would belong to any labor union in the United States.

TECHNIQUE IS SIMPLE

"As heroic Russia battles against our German enemy, the Communists in our labor movement naturally hang on to the coattails of the Red Army and try to build an ideological bridge between our loyalty to Russia and their own pet schemes. The Communists play hard on the trick idea that America cannot fight side by side with Russia in the war and at the same time fight against American Communists and fellow travelers here. That is an outrageous contention. They do not help the two great nations win the war together. They simply help themselves."

"How can American Communists be so effective in the labor unions when the total membership of the Communist Party in America is supposed to be so small?" I asked. Mr. Lewis fairly snorted his answer.

"Their technique is simple," he explained. "The American Communists limit their membership to only the cleverest schemers they can find. Then they worm their way into key places in local chapters of unions. In this way they control whole organizations which our public, therefore, thinks have "gone Communist. But the more the newspapers and our public shout about such a union as a Communist hotbed, the more misunderstood and abused the rank and file of the ordinary members feel—and the thing goes around and around in a vicious circle."

C. I. O. CHIEFS HELPLESS

"Oh, they're clever," the miners' leader continued, "believe me, I know. When I was organizing the C. I. O. we picked up a lot of Communists as we grew—including Harry Bridges. But if I had not resigned the chairmanship and left the C. I. O. in 1940, I can tell you the Communists would have been weeded out.

"Instead, as anyone might expect who has seen them throw their weight around inside labor organizations, the Communists dominate the C. I. O. today. Philip Murray today is the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists how—or die."

"This is the way communism takes hold. This is the way it endangers the labor movement, and our country. For the same thing happens in governments. Communism has an antinatural and basically antieconomic quality. History shows that communism is only compatible with primitive and undernourished economic surroundings. In its control and destruction it does not distinguish error from truth, good from evil, justice from injustice. It does not care for history or the experience of humanity, for freedom or for the dignity of man. And the last thing on earth the American Communists are interested in is the American way of life."

"You sound like Westbrook Pegler," I said.

"Believe it or not," said Mr. Lewis, "I read him every day."

Address Before Jewish Teachers Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Jewish Teachers Seminary, on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary, at New York, February 27, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, members of the faculty, ladies, and gentlemen, I am greatly pleased and honored to participate in your celebration of your twenty-fifth anniversary. Your institution has during that period been preparing young men and women to be the spiritual and intellectual leaders of the Jewish people. I am myself not Jewish. I recognize the Jewish religion as the foundation of the Christian religion which I profess. I honor also those high spiritual and moral qualities with which the Jews have enriched and inspired our western civilization.

There is no subject which is closer to the hearts of Jews today than that commonly known as Zionism, the establishment of a Jewish home in Palestine, the encouragement of immigration and close settlement there, with the eventual aim of creating a national Jewish commonwealth. As I say, I do not approach this subject as a Jew. I approach it as one deeply sympathetic to the sufferings of the Jewish people in Europe, deeply impressed with the justice of their cause, and determined to use my best efforts to assist in its accomplishment. I approach it as an American whose country has by its convention of 1925 of Great Britain adopted the furtherance of this national home as part of its considered foreign policy. I approach it as a member of that religion which, like the Jewish religion, has as one of its principal tenets of faith the dignity of the individual and good will among men. I consider also as one who lives in a world which is today ever shrinking and growing more interdependent, and who has learned that justice and security for any of us are impossible unless justice and security be afforded to all people. Neither am I unmindful that in the present great crisis in world affairs all nations are looking to us anxiously to determine our post-war intentions, hoping to find in us great democratic leadership which will guide the world along the path of a just and lasting peace. Our attitude toward the suffering Jews of Europe is significant to all suffering and oppressed peoples of the world. Our attitude toward the Jews might well be significant to the Chinese and Europeans of all faiths as to our attitude and intentions toward them.

First, there are no peoples who are in such dire need of our assistance as the Jews. Of all those persecuted peoples, the Jews have been the most sorely persecuted. I will not recount the details which are so well known to you and which undoubtedly have filled the Jews in all America with anguish.

Secondly, there is no group of people more justly entitled to the relief and recognition which it now seeks than is the Jewish people. The Jewish claim to Palestine is based not only upon common justice and humanity but likewise upon the firmest foundations of international law. We are asking Britain to execute a trust which she has assumed at the request of the 52 signatory nations comprising the League of Nations, as well as of the United States, and of which the White Paper is a breach. There is no attempt to obtain any new privileges for the Jews when we ask that the White Paper be abrogated. This movement is merely an insistence upon the maintenance of that status which was agreed to by solemn treaty among all civilized nations of the world.

Prior to the last World War all Arabia was under the domination of Turkey. In the prosecution of the war the Allied Nations freed the Arabs of a yoke under which they had smarted for many hundreds of years. The nations of the world met in solemn conclave to decide upon the future government of this vast peninsula comprising approximately 1,000,000 square miles. The Arabs sent their delegation to the peace conference headed by Prince Feisal. The Jews likewise made their representations that they

be permitted to occupy their ancient home in Palestine. At that time the Arab and Jewish delegations were upon the most cordial terms. Feisal directed a letter to Felix Frankfurter expressing his sympathy with the Zionist aims. He entered into an accord with Dr. Chaim Weizmann wherein they both agreed to establish a new, free Arabia, the Jews to hold the small corner of Palestine as their own country and the Arabs to govern the remainder of the land.

The Balfour Declaration representing the decision not only of Great Britain but of the other nations as well, was issued. In it it was stated that Britain viewed with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. This was in November of 1917. The Supreme Council of the Allied Powers met in San Remo in April 1920 and unanimously adopted the Balfour Declaration and embodied it in a mandate for Palestine. Great Britain was made the mandatary under the terms of this mandate. In 1922 the Congress of the United States passed a joint resolution embodying the precise language of the declaration. This was merely an affirmation of President Wilson's expressed position at the time the Balfour Declaration was signed. In 1925 the United States of America entered into a treaty with Great Britain in which was embodied the Palestine mandate and the United States consented thereto. Article 7 of this treaty provided that no modification in the mandate would be effective unless agreed to by the United States.

Due to the issuance of the White Paper in 1939 in which the clear meaning of the Balfour Declaration was distorted in such a manner as to effectively deprive the Jews of access into Palestine, it becomes important to find out exactly what the declaration and the mandate mean.

The White Paper attempts to argue that the provision for a Jewish national home in Palestine does not mean that Palestine should be a national home for the Jews, and attempts to justify the restriction of immigration by reason of the asserted danger to the security of the inhabitants of Palestine and the nearby Arabian states. Did Lord Balfour mean that Palestine was to be a national home merely for those Jews who had immigrated there until the British had decided to stop any further influx? Was it the sense of the mandate that the British could by restrictive action make the Jewish people a permanent minority in Palestine?

That these arguments were misleading and a distortion of the true purpose of the declaration and mandate is abundantly clear. The Mandates Commission of the League of Nations condemned them and condemned the white paper as a betrayal of the trust imposed by the mandate. Contemporaneous statements made by those responsible for the declaration show that it was intended that Palestine was to belong to the Jews, that their immigration would be encouraged until they would form a majority of the population, and that eventually they would form their own government. Lloyd George stated that it was contemplated by the Balfour declaration that when the Jews had become a majority of the inhabitants then Palestine would become a Jewish commonwealth. General Smuts, Lord Cecil, Lord Samuel, and Winston Churchill spoke to the same effect. Woodrow Wilson stated on March 3, 1919, "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish commonwealth."

It is obvious that if, as the words of these leaders attested, Palestine was to become a Jewish commonwealth, immigration could not be left to the will of the Arabs, who at present constitute a majority, because the Arabs do not wish a Jewish commonwealth, even though they agreed to one in 1919. The white paper by restricting immigration destroys the essential idea and governing purpose of the declaration and the mandate that Palestine was intended to be a Jewish country.

When the White Paper was presented to Parliament in 1939 Winston Churchill bitterly assailed it. He called it a moral and physical bankruptcy, an act of repudiation. He predicted in May 1939 that long before the 5 years provided for in the White Paper had elapsed either Great Britain would have lost the war to come or "there will be a Britain which knows how to keep its word on the Balfour declaration and is not afraid to do so." Wedgewood, Amery, and other British leaders likewise assailed this act of repudiation and appeasement.

So it is seen that the overwhelming evidence points to the fact that the white paper is a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration, a violation of trust imposed by the mandate, and a violation of Britain's treaty with the United States. It is argued that the British made contradictory pledges to the Arabs and the Jews; and certain letters written secretly by Sir Henry MacMahon to the Arab leaders promising the Arabs their freedom are pointed to as evidence for this contention. That this is not true is proven by the statements of MacMahon himself who said emphatically that Palestine was not included in any pledges that were made and that the Arabs understood it at the time. The statements of Feisal prior to the mandate, to which I already have referred, indicate clearly that the Arabs had no thought that Palestine was to be included in the new, free Arab lands.

Why are we pressing this matter now? Because on March 31 the prohibition of the White Paper will become effective and no further immigration of the Jews will be permitted. We will be presented then with a fait accompli, a situation which is already fixed. The present resolution is therefore the proverbial ounce of prevention. Furthermore, at the present time claims are being presented and tentative decisions are being made as to national boundaries and national governments. The Jewish commonwealth must be considered now. It should not be merely a belated afterthought. But the most overpowering and desperate reason for the passage of this resolution is the plight of the European Jews who are in danger of being exterminated. It is hoped that a declaration by the people of the United States, acting through their Representatives in Congress, will provide some ray of hope to these unhappy people, that it will move the British Government to reaffirm the noble and statesmanlike position which she took in 1917 and will enable in some manner the present admission of refugees who are knocking at the door of Palestine.

Argument is made by some that the last part of the resolution should be deleted and that nothing should be said about the ultimate object of reconstituting Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. If this is done the resolution is nothing but an empty expression of good will. It leaves in the air the future policy of the United Nations toward Palestine. As Representative BILL ROGERS 2d, so well said at the hearings just the other day before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, "There is no doubt in my mind that at the time of the declaration it was intended that the Jews should govern Palestine. If the words of the declaration are ambiguous, if they are capable of the interpretation given them in the White Paper, it is high time that they be clarified, and the original intent which was merely implicit then should now be explicitly stated."

The world is at the cross roads of history. After the present war will we again abandon the idealism and hope of President Wilson, who tried so desperately to build a better world after the last war? If this is our intent, if we are cynical in our affirmation that we are fighting for a just and lasting peace, if we are willing to fight another war in 20 years then there is no use in worrying about the White Paper. But if, on the other hand, we have learned a terrible lesson at the cost of so much bloodshed and so much destruction of our wealth and resources, if we realize that peace is impossible unless justice be accorded to all people, then it is important that we make a sincere start. There are no people whose condition is so desperate as the European Jews. There are no people who are so justly entitled to what they seek in this resolution. Let us, therefore, implement the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter and declare that it is the intention of the American people that we will work and strive for a better world.

Soldier Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of February 23, 1944:

SOLDIER SPEAKS OUT

A letter from a soldier in Iran is worth reading. It is here condensed:

"The thing that bothers me most is the terrible job of educating that was done on my generation of Americans. What I mean, to put it bluntly, is that 20 years of soft and sentimental pacifist education have made it unfashionable to believe in dying for an ideal. We're wise guys, too worldly wise for that. Ideals are out of date.

"In spite of that big mental handicap, our fighting men are doing a great job. Why? Self-preservation alone isn't enough to explain it. There seem to be two reasons. First, the traditions of the services and devotion to each other. It's unthinkable that one leatherneck would let another down. That goes for all our men. Secondly, Americans never start something and then not finish it. In spite of our soft background of 20 years, we have not become a Nation of weaklings or cowards.

"But it seems to me a tragedy that such a great army of fighting men as we have should not have any sense of greater purpose than to 'get through and go home.' That shows a lack of understanding of the causes of this war and of our contribution, a great one, to these causes. That in turn shows an even greater lack of understanding of how the next one can be prevented. It can be prevented, by exactly the same sort of international teamwork that is finally winning this war. Nothing less can do it.

"I'm not saying the Englishman, Russian, Chinese had more or better education in their schools between wars than the American. But they got their education out of the skies over their own homes, quickly and thoroughly. There's nothing wrong with Americans, soldiers or civilians, that wouldn't be cured by a good blitz on our cities. But

it's too darned bad that the job couldn't have been done just as well by our schools, churches, homes, and newspapers during that fatal 20 years between wars.

"These are the things that are bothering me, not personal matters like women, money, etc. Somebody has got to speak out, and keep speaking out, until the American people begin to think—and I mean think with their heads. If they don't, we shall start the same old vicious circle of more depression and more war.

"I'll sign off now, before the censor has cat fits."

Well, Johnny, some Americans do think, and some have ideals. Your letter proves it. More of us will begin to think and lift our sights because of it.

It Makes a Difference Who Says It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, speaking at Niles, Mich., when we were threatened with Nation-wide strikes which would have held up production and transportation of war materials desperately needed on the battle fronts, I said in substance that it was time for the people to march on Washington and end "playing at war"; that, if necessary, the armed forces should be used to prevent sabotage of production and transportation; that we should wholeheartedly get into this war and back the fighting men or get out of it. I then made a plea that with a singleness of purpose we wholeheartedly support the war effort.

Forthwith the Daily Worker, the Communists, and other of their publications, a few C. I. O. racketeers, and the New Deal smear artists went into a conniption fit and came up with the suggestion that I was advocating the overthrow of the Government, should be expelled from Congress, and prosecuted by Attorney General Biddle.

They all ignored the fact that the Constitution guarantees the right of petition; that time and again businessmen, women's organizations, the Communists, and repeatedly C. I. O. lobbyists have marched on Washington, and that at that time the Army had taken over the railroads.

They chose to ignore the fact that for almost 10 years some new dealers have been advocating the remaking of America; the Communists have been openly advocating the overthrow of the Government by force; that while our men are fighting and dying by the thousands all over the world, here at home the administration on the home front has been playing at war—devoting altogether too much of its time to the advancement of its own political interests.

If Vice President WALLACE can plead for a fourth term and continuation of the ruinous New Deal and can say, as he did on February 9:

We are in for a profound revolution. * * * Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be gradual and bloodless instead of sudden and bloody.

There is no reason why I or any other patriotic American cannot advocate the preservation of constitutional government; an all out, wholehearted support of those who are fighting this war; and that, regardless of the New Dealers, the Communists, and a few racketeer labor politicians, I propose to do.

Neither the administration smear artists; its lying stooges like the Armenian author of Under Cover; nor its boasting, foul-mouthed Walter Winchell, who is a disgrace to the Navy and who, after the election, said that "What worries me most are all those damned fools who elected them," meaning all those who voted for certain successful candidates for Senate and House, will prevent me from exposing the waste, the extravagance, the incompetency and worse of the present New Deal administration. I have been doing it for 8 years and the dictatorial, arbitrary methods of the President himself have become so open, so overbearing, that not even his own party leaders can longer stomach his insults.

It is long past time that representatives of the people came to Washington and, face to face, told their Senators, their Congressmen—yes, and the bureaucrats and the administration itself—that they have had enough of the New Deal. If they do that, there will be no revolution, bloodless or otherwise. There will just be a housecleaning of the Wallaces, the Tugwells, and all those who apparently believe that the American who works, earns, and saves should have his business and his property taken over by a bureaucrat, his life regulated by a dictator.

Stalin and Churchill each insist that the interests of his own country, of his own fighting men, come first. Because I have insisted that the interests of my country, of our fighting men, come first; because I have, in no uncertain terms, criticized the New Deal and some of the President's policies, I have taken a lot of kicking around and been called a lot of names. But my criticism was weak and colorless compared with that handed to the President this week by his floor leader, Senator BARKLEY, and by Representative DOUGHTON, Democratic 80-year-old chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The President told Congress that it was perpetrating a fraud when it insisted that those in the Service should have the right to vote for every candidate from coroner to President and that something more than a ballot without names should be sent to those on the battle front. Then he sent Congress an insulting veto of a tax bill.

In a tense and dramatic session of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, the President's own Senate floor leader, with a record of 32 years' continuous service in Congress, arose and deliberately charged that—

The President has resorted to one of the most unjustifiable methods of calculation it is possible to conjure up, which obviously was handed to him by a mind more clever than honest.

That he "has gone forth with a searchlight and magnifying glass to find inconsequential faults."

Not a Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, challenged Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader, when he said:

In his effort to belittle and discredit Congress throughout his veto message of this bill, the President says:

"It is not a tax bill but a tax relief bill, providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they please; but as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down.

BARKLEY concluded his castigation of the President by stating that he would, on the following day, resign his position as Senate Democratic leader. That he did, but he was unanimously reelected. The President was forced to eat crow and apologize.

Words equally strong were used on the floor of the House by Congressman DOUGHTON, who, in substance, charged that the President, in his veto message, did not know what he was talking about, and further pointed out that the complexity of the income-tax blanks, which so irritate and aggravate the taxpayer, was due, not to Congress but to the Treasury Department under Morgenthau.

The politicians in the C. I. O., the New Dealers, and the Communists can charge me with this, that, and the other for opposing the racketeering of the first, the political fallacies and policies of the second, and the subversive activities of the last. But do not forget that some of the C. I. O. organizations have, by the A. F. of L., been branded as Red, as controlled by Communists; that the New Deal has itself been condemned by its chosen leaders in the House and Senate, that the President has himself tried to discard the name, the New Deal, and that the Communists, although Harry Bridges was let out of jail by the President, has been invited by the C. I. O. to speak at their meeting in Detroit, have been designated by Attorney General Biddle as a subversive group, advocating the overthrow of the Government by force.

Yes, it makes a difference who says it. For years—9 long years—anyone who ventured effectively, persistently to attack either the New Deal, the racketeering of labor politicians or the Communists, was the favorite target of the smear artists of all three. But truth has its own peculiar way of coming to the top. The old saying that "murder will out" is still true. Now we know from the lips of those well within the New Deal party council just what the New Deal has been up to.

It is time to kick the New Deal, the Communists out of Washington; forget its fantastic schemes and devote all our energies to the defeat of our enemies and the care of the returning veterans.

Consumer Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of my colleague from Michigan, Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT:

The desire of man to be free from those who would rule without restriction dates back centuries before Magna Carta. The struggle between democracy and autocracy is as old as history itself. Running the gauntlet of Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right, the Habeas Corpus Acts, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the people have succeeded in definitely establishing here in America the political truism that the Government is endowed with only such authority as the people delegate to it. These documents severally and collectively vest the sovereign power in the people. To protect the sovereign people from usurpation of these powers by any individual, numerous safeguards are provided, chief among which is that the people shall be represented in the Government by persons of their choice who, before they can assume office, must take an oath which in effect guarantees that all the prohibitions against autocracy shall be respected.

Whether this autocracy takes the form of communism, fascism, socialism, or any other form of collectivism is not material. They all add up to central control of our economic, social, and political destinies. This struggle between the people and their representatives and those who would establish a central control is still going on.

In the 1935 Banking Act, and in another bill considered in 1939, the fundamental problem before the House of Representatives was, "Shall the Federal Government socialize banking and credit?" Just as this issue is involved in some of the bills pending in Congress today, which would socialize medicine, which would socialize social security, which would socialize industry and business, so the fundamental issue involved in the consumer subsidy fight is whether the administration is to be given absolute control over the production, the processing, and the distribution of food, thereby effectuating the socialization of agriculture.

There are those in the Government who insist that America should become a socialistic nation in order that it may take its position in a probable confederation of socialistic nations following this war. Perhaps they are sincere in the belief that if we do not socialize America in order that we may take our position as one of this coalition of socialistic nations following the war we might find ourselves isolated economically, politically, and socially from the rest of the world. However, there are many of us who believe that the United States can wield greater influence in the post-war economic, political, and social world if we strengthen ourselves under our Constitution, thereby impelling other nations to join with us, instead of our having to destroy the American form of government in order that we may join a socialistic coalition of nations repugnant to the republican democracies. That is the fundamental issue involved in the consideration of almost all major legislation before the Congress.

In this connection I want to stress this issue of consumer subsidies. The authority to pay consumer subsidies has never been granted by Congress. The administration, however, assumes to have this power; it has arrogated this power in defiance of authority to pay subsidies only for the purpose of obtaining an adequate amount of production of all goods, including food. It is necessary to distinguish between producer and consumer subsidies. Producer subsidies are those which are paid to farmers, wage earners, miners, and manufacturers for the purpose of securing an adequate production of goods. The bill which the President vetoed in no manner interferes with or prohibits the payment of these producer subsidies. Consumer subsidies are those which are paid to purchasers or processors of goods for the purpose of maintaining or to reduce, or in lieu of increasing the maximum retail prices established under the price-control acts. These acts already provide that prices shall be raised to absorb increases in production costs, so the acts of Congress not only do not authorize the payment of consumer subsidies—the payment of consumer subsidies is specifically prohibited by law.

There has been more superficial thinking, more demagogy, more exaggerated and confusing statements made in respect to subsidies than any other issue I can recall. As an example of some of these, the President in his veto message says that the anti-subsidy bill should not become a law in order that farmers might know the support prices upon which they can rely. There is nothing in the bill which he vetoed in any way affecting any producer support price program. In this message he characterized the bill as an inflationary measure, and yet there is not an economist, not on the Federal pay roll, but who contends that the payment of consumer subsidies is inflationary. In fact, Mr. Chester Bowles, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, says: "Of course, there are arguments against subsidies, the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt. They introduce new principles into the American economy which have never before been experienced." Of course, anything which increases the national debt increases the danger of inflation; it is a well-known economic truism that so long as there is an affiliation between our national debt and our money, the value of our money depreciates in proportion as the debt increases. The President goes on further to say that if the bill becomes law, the housewife will pay 10 cents a pound more for butter. We cannot understand his arithmetic in this respect, because the subsidy being paid on butter is not 10 cents a pound—it is 5 cents a pound. He says that the price of cheese will go up 8 cents a pound. The subsidy being paid on cheese is 4 cents a pound. He says that the average price of meat will go up more than 5 cents a pound, while the average subsidy on meat is 3 cents a pound. The President is 100 percent wrong in his figures.

He goes on further to contend that the bill would have resulted in an increase in the cost of running our factories and conducting the war. There is little or no connection between the payment of a subsidy of 5 cents a pound on butter and 3 cents a pound on meat and the cost of operating a war plant, or the cost of conducting the war. The consumer subsidies which the bill would have prohibited amount to less than 1 cent per capita per day. The size of an average American family is less than 4 persons, so the difference between the payment or nonpayment of consumer subsidies is less than 4 cents a day to the head of the average American family.

Mr. Chester Bowles, in a radio address last November, is quoted in the press as saying, "The continued use of subsidies, now costing about $800,000,000 a year, is a businessman's bargain considering that it can prevent a minimum increase of $8,000,000,000 in the cost of living in a single year." Three weeks after this broadcast, Mr. Bowles said in a letter, a photostatic copy of which I have: "Let us examine the possible consequences if subsidies are defeated. There will be an immediate rise in the cost of living by an amount 20 to 25 percent greater than the amount now being expended in subsidies." Mr. Bowles says in his radio speech that we are paying eight hundred million in subsidies. On these figures, which are generally accepted, the cost of living therefore, according to Mr. Bowles' later statement, would rise not $8,000,000,000, but by only $1,000,000,000, or by only 12½ percent of the claim made in his radio address. When was Mr. Bowles right—when he said the cost of living would go up $8,000,000,000 or when he said it would go up $1,000,000,000?

The President in his veto message said that the cost of food would go up 7 percent unless subsidies were paid, which does not agree with either of Mr. Bowles' figures. The net result of this has been to so confuse the public mind as to make it almost impossible to treat this subsidy question other than politically. This fight over subsidies is not an economic quarrel. If it were, a compromise might be agreed upon very easily. No, the controversy involves the age-old struggle to determine whether sovereignty shall remain in the people or be arrogated to individuals.

The President and Mr. Bowles have asked for a billion and a quarter to pay subsidies. These subsidies would be paid to all of our 132,000,000 people, rich and poor alike. The Government would subsidize the millionaire as well as the pauper. But in his message to the Congress in disapproving the tax bill, the President recommends that social security deductions from wages be doubled; that about $1,100,000,000 be raised by contributions from the pockets of the workingmen. Understand this does not increase the benefits to the wage earner under social security. Significantly enough, the amount which the administration would take from the wage earners as a class is approximately the same amount that it would use to pay a part of the grocery bill of everyone in the United States. This deduction of 1 percent of his wages would go into the general fund of the Federal Treasury to be used to meet current Government obligations.

Yes; to be used to pay consumer subsidies—the money taken from the wage earner and distributed to all of our people, including the very wealthy, equals 1 percent of the wage earner's income. In the case of a wage earner receiving $2,400 a year, he would have deducted 1 percent or $24. The Government out of this $24 would pay back to him in consumer subsidies less than $7 of his grocery bill. So the wage earner would be out more than $17 in the transaction. For the purpose of having his grocery bill reduced by $7 he would pay $24 into the Federal Treasury. This is not only economically and morally unsound—this manipulation of the wage earner's hard earned money approaches intellectual dishonesty. The President gives as his reason for increasing social-security deductions that industry and labor are now best able to adjust themselves to such increases. He means by this, of course, that individual and family income is higher now than it ever has been in the history of the Nation. He must by the same token, to be consistent, concede that it is economically unsound for the Federal Treasury to pay any part of the grocery bill of our people at a time when, according to the Bureau of Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, the total cost to consumers of fixed quantities of foods making up a typical consumer's food basket is smaller in relation to average consumer income than at any other time on record.

Consumer subsidies are objectionable: First, because they constitute the vehicle by which free enterprise may be destroyed; the vehicle which would result in the socialization of agriculture and a decided curtailment in food production.

Second, they are objectionable because they constitute the basic threat of inflation by increasing surplus purchasing power; every dollar which the Federal Treasury pays in consumer subsidies increases the potential in-pocket purchasing power with which we bid for inadequate supplies of consumer goods. This demand increases the cost of living and makes the control of prices that much more difficult.

Third, consumer subsidies are objectionable because we merely postpone the day when we will have to pay our food bill, and then we will have to pay it twice or three times over in taxes; it is quite generally agreed that inasmuch as the Government has to borrow the money by the issuance of bonds to pay these subsidies, we will have to pay two or three times as much in taxes to the Treasury as we would pay in food costs to our groceryman.

Fourth, consumer subsidies are objectionable because the wage earner of this generation and following generations would have to pay a disproportionate share of that part of the national debt which results from the payment of subsidies. The 5 cents which we seemingly save on a pound of butter becomes 15 cents when we or our returning soldiers and sailors and our sons and daughters have to pay it back into the Treasury.

Finally, consumer subsidies are objectionable because it is economically wrong to pass on to our sons and daughters and to the men who are fighting our battles, any part of the war debt which we can possibly pay ourselves. It is morally wrong to obligate our soldiers, our sailors, our sons and our daughters to pay for years to come for the food which we are eating today.

Word in Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 28, 1944:

WORD IN SEASON

William L. Batt, Vice Chairman of the W. P. B., has made an interesting contribution to current discussions of post-war foreign-trade problems. In speaking before the Bond Club in New York, he raised that old but ever live issue of how we are to be paid for the goods that we shall want to sell abroad when the war is over. The answer is old, too; goods shipped out of the country must be paid for with goods. Of course, some buyers will have gold or sound credits with which to make payment. But as a creditor country we know full well—in theory—that we cannot maintain a flourishing foreign trade by continually selling more than we buy. By selling for cash, moreover, we should be loaded with more gold—gold that we do not need and that we would be taking in exchange for valuable commodities.

We can also lend abroad, thereby building up dollar credits for purchase of our goods. But here again Mr. Batt registers a caution. We have suffered heavy losses from unwise foreign loans in the past. Foreign loans have to be limited in amount and must be used for constructive purposes; otherwise they simply create debts that in the long run reduce the purchasing power of the debtor and impair or destroy his ability to buy our goods.

So we get back to the familiar thesis that goods must be paid for with goods. But that raises a question as to what goods. It also creates a doubt as to our willingness to receive goods in payment, when there is any danger that imports would depress market values. Fully aware of these objections, Mr. Batt points out that this country is running short of a good many basic materials, such as high-grade iron ores, petroleum, zinc, and copper, because of the rapid rate of consumption. We have no nickel, very little high-grade bauxite, and next to no tin. He suggests, therefore, that we might import all of the critical raw materials that we can, and use as little as possible of our remaining supplies of critical materials.

Any such program, of course, would result in surpluses of some commodities, necessitating the creation of Government stock piles that would have to be held off the market. Mr. Batt envisages the possibility of keeping such surpluses under control of the Army and Navy, subject to release only in an emergency. Of course, if considerations of national safety should warrant such accumulations, Mr. Batt's proposal would have much to commend it. Otherwise, it would involve a form of governmental control over foreign trade that certainly diverges widely from the announced aims of our policy makers to encourage a return to free enterprise in the foreign field as well as at home.

Mr. Batt admits frankly that there is going to be a greater need than ever before for "intelligent and forceful assistance from Government in meeting the problems of our foreign trade." And even Attorney General Biddle in a speech denouncing international cartels concludes by saying that the Government "should stand ready to assist American producers, if necessary, to gain access to foreign markets." In short, while lip service is being paid to the principles of free enterprise, its supporters are well aware that we confront problems that private enterprise cannot solve unaided.

Mr. Batt's views are particularly significant because he is a capable businessman whose belief in the principles of free enterprise is undoubtedly sincere. But he realizes that our businessmen will be engaged in an unequal contest in dealing with foreigners unless this Government gives them the kind of support that other countries afford their nationals. "It seems to me quite clear," he says, "that unless American businessmen cooperate with and have the same support from their Government as foreigners have from theirs, we shall be at a great disadvantage. That calls for the strongest possible organization in those agencies of the United States Government which have to do with foreign trade, and a recognition on the part of business of the necessity of working with them." Mr. Batt's words of wisdom should be taken to heart by some of our unrealistic policy makers in Government and business.

The Lincoln Letter to a Jewish Congregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rabbi Moshe Davis, registrar and teaching-fellow in American-Jewish history at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, delivered at the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society, held on February 12, 1944:

In the course of my studies in the early history of American Judaism, I have come across a letter of Abraham Lincoln, the martyr President, addressed to congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia. The letter was found among the papers of Sabato Morais, rabbi of the Mikveh Israel congregation, founder and first president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. They were placed in the archives of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning by the late Cyrus Adler, president of the college and of the seminary. I am indebted to Dr. A. A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College for permission to examine them. The signature of President Lincoln has been identified by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, president of the American Jewish Historical Society, and internationally famous bibliophile. This letter is, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the only known letter written by Lincoln to a Jewish congregation.

The Lincoln letter was addressed to Abraham Hart (1810–1893), an outstanding figure in American-Jewish life. For 32 years he was president of the Mikveh Israel congregation (translated "Hope of Israel" in the letter), which, organized about 1740, is the oldest Jewish congregation in Philadelphia and the third oldest in the United States. Haym Solomon of Revolutionary War fame was one of its early members.

The letter expressed President Lincoln's thanks for a prayer written by Sabato Morais, and read at the synagogue on a day set aside by Presidential proclamation for prayer for the casualties of both armies in the Civil War, and for the preservation of the Union. Morais was a devoted follower of Abraham Lincoln. He rarely missed an opportunity to preach and pray for the Union cause. Shortly after Lincoln's death Morais published two memorial sermons, the first originally delivered at a special service on Wednesday, April 19, 1865, and the second on June 1, 1865, on the "day appointed for fasting, humiliation, and prayer for the untimely death of the late-lamented President of the United States."

Legends passed on by the Morais family and friends relate that all the children of the Morais household were taken to the Lincoln funeral in order that the memory of the Great Emancipator's face would be indelibly impressed on their minds.

The prayer to which this letter was a response is as follows: "Author of all good! We implore Thy almighty protection on behalf of the American Republic of the North. Let Thine eyes, which never slumber be open upon her, that she may not be erased from among the family of nations. Be with her in this struggle for life, that she may survive it, and wax greater and happier. Speak to the hearts of her disaffected children, and let them again throb with undying affection. Let both the weapon of aggression and that of defense be buried into the bottomless ocean, and cast Thou with it the spirit of acrimony that has sharpened its edge. Direct the hands into which the temporal welfare of this people is entrusted. Sustain them that their strength may never flag. Bless the President of the United States. Bless him for his sterling honesty, bless him for his firmness and moderation. Rekindle with joy his domestic heart; pour on him the balm of divine consolation. Grant that the issues of his momentous obligations be a united and prosperous country. Grant that the end of his career be the maintenance of this Government, unimpaired and unsullied

as bequeathed by our illustrious ancestors. So may it be. Amen."

To this prayer President Lincoln responded:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, May 13, 1862.

A. HART, Esq.,
President, Congregation Hope of Israel, Philadelphia.

MY DEAR SIR: Permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of April 23 containing a copy of a prayer recently delivered at your synagogue, and to thank you heartily for your expressions of kindness and confidence.

I have the honor to be
Your obedient servant,

A. LINCOLN.

The Predatory Animal Menace and the Need for Adequate Funds for Its Control

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported to me, from reliable sources, that depredation by wild animals is the greatest single cause of sheep losses on the western livestock ranges of our country.

That statement has pretty serious implications when you think it over in connection with our national program for increasing food production to meet wartime needs. It gives us the paradox of endeavoring to increase our food supplies while at the same time we are decreasing our efforts to control the predatory animals which destroy potential food. Insufficient funds and an insufficient number of predatory animal hunters are responsible for the decrease in our control efforts.

Predatory animals such as coyotes, wolves, bobcats, and mountain lions kill thousands of head of sheep, cattle, and poultry every year. It is serious enough to lose that much potential food in normal times, but now that our country is at war we simply cannot afford to sustain such losses.

It is time we stopped emulating the ostrich with its head stuck in a hole so that it will neither see nor hear anything unpleasant. Heavy losses to livestock and crops caused by predators are unpleasant things to see and hear about in wartime, but we must face the facts and do something tangible to stop such losses.

In case you are not aware of the gravity of this problem I am going to cite a few examples of livestock and crop destruction caused by predatory wild animals.

A sheep raiser near Carlsbad, N. Mex., was recently forced out of business because of severe coyote depredations on his flocks. He lost over 500 lambs to coyotes during 1 year's operations. A goat raiser near Ardmore, Okla., lost 2,000 of his 2,300 fine Mohair goats to wolves during the past year. A sheep rancher in Miner County, S. Dak., lost all of his lambs and 65 percent of his entire herd as the result of coyote depredations. In the Casa Grande, Salt River, and Yuma Valleys, in my own State of Arizona, the loss of lambs to coyotes has been the worst in the past year within the memory of the sheepmen in those areas and many of these sheep raisers have reported that they cannot stay in business if such losses continue.

Hundreds of poultry raisers in the Western States are being forced to discontinue the production of poultry because coyotes have so seriously depleted their flocks. A poultryman in western Nebraska lost 66 of his flock of 90 turkeys in a single daylight raid by coyotes, and last fall a North Dakota farmer lost 96 of his 110 fully grown turkeys 2 weeks before they were to have been shipped to market.

The aggregate livestock losses throughout the country on farms and open livestock ranges is enormous. In many sections of the western range States losses of range sheep to coyotes and other predators run from 5 to 20 percent of the flocks and herds. It is needless to point out that this is a very important factor in slowing down the Nation's meat production program when we realize that the 11 Western States, together with Texas, Oklahoma, and the Dakotas, range more than 37,000,000 sheep and lambs—75 percent of the Nation's total.

The Federal Government has a distinct responsibility to control predatory animals because in the Western States it owns approximately 47 percent of the total lands, on most of which livestock range, and the owners of the livestock pay grazing fees to the Federal Government for the privilege of ranging their livestock on these areas.

Coyotes, wolves, bobcats, and mountain lions are not the only predators we have to contend with in the production of food. Rodent pests, such as ground squirrels, prairie dogs, and jack rabbits, are responsible for an appalling amount of destruction to growing agricultural crops and range forage. The damage done by rats in the farmers' fields, and in the food-processing plants and warehouses throughout the country runs into millions of dollars annually.

In 1943 it was estimated that damage caused by rats probably reached the highest figure in history—possibly more than $200,000,000. In towns and cities the value of material destroyed by rats is probably more than $2 for each rat, and the rat population is generally conceded to be the equivalent of the human population.

As far as field rodents are concerned, these pests destroy range forage that should be utilized in the production of beef and mutton. The carrying capacity of many livestock-grazing areas has been reduced 50 percent, while others have been rendered useless for grazing purposes, all because of the destruction of range forage by prairie dogs, ground squirrels, and jack rabbits.

These same pests also make heavy inroads on grain and other croplands and seriously curtail the production of vital food resources and livestock feeds. Last winter jack rabbits destroyed 425 acres of newly planted alfalfa and barley in the vicinity of West Chandler, Ariz. A Marion County, Tex., farmer lost 500 bushels of peanuts as the result of pocket gopher depredations. Other Texas farmers sustained a loss of over 50 percent of their tomato crops because of damage inflicted in the fields by cotton rats.

I do not want to leave you with the impression that the rodent problem is confined entirely to the Western States. In the eastern part of the country, principally in the commercial fruit growing areas, field mice constitute one of the toughest obstacles that the fruit grower must overcome in order to maintain fruit production. In many of these areas as high as 75 percent of the apple trees in individual orchards have been killed through the activity of tree-girdling mice.

Last but definitely not the least of our rodent problems is the notorious house rat. Although this pest is found in every State in the Union, its depredations are greatest in the Eastern and Southern States. This rodent brings destruction not only to farms but also to food-processing establishments and warehouses. Its devastations, unfortunately, are not limited to the amount of food he consumes. They extend to the huge quantities of food which it contaminates and renders unfit for human consumption.

Here are a few examples of the damage that rats can do.

Not long ago the Galveston Wharf Co., Galveston, Tex., reported that over 25,000 sacks of flour were destroyed or fouled by rats every month in the company's warehouses so that food storage on several piers had to be abandoned.

A large rice mill in southern Texas last year sustained a loss of over $2,500 worth of rice as the result of rat depredations. Other mills having contracts for delivery of rice to the Army suffered similar losses. A considerable part of the loss was sustained through the contamination of the rice with rat feces. That does not sound very nice to listen to, but it is a truth we have to face.

A poultry raiser and egg producer of Clyde, N. Y., reported the loss of a case of eggs per day because of rats. Other poultry producers in the Eastern States have reported that as many as 600 chicks have been killed by rats in 1 night.

With food as vital today as ammunition, how can we permit predators to ruin so much of it?

Men and money are essential if we are going to make real progress in eliminating predatory animals and rodent pests. At the present time, however, control operations conducted or supervised by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior in cooperation with States, counties,

municipalities, and farm organizations cannot be expanded because of lack of funds. This agency's present appropriation of $750,000 to handle control work is totally inadequate. I sincerely urge that not less than $1,500,000 be made available to the Fish and Wildlife Service for the purpose of expanding their activities aimed at the destruction of predators.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram of February 23, 1944:

THE PRESIDENT VETOES THE TAX BILL

Tax leaders in the House are bitter today in their denunciation of President Roosevelt for his veto of the tax bill. They declare that the so-called White House advisers are seeking to usurp tax powers which rightfully belong to Congress. The tax leaders in Congress are calling on their colleagues to override the veto.

We believe a lot of people will take a sympathetic attitude toward Congress in this matter as many long hours of intensive study have been devoted to the tax question. After due consideration of all factors involved, Congress passed a tax bill which President Roosevelt feels is inadequate.

The fact is plainly evident that the President is making a definite issue with Congress over the tax question. Some observers believe he is laying down a barrage on which he hopes to make political capital to be used as the basis for a fourth-term campaign.

As average country editors we would like to know if it is not within the province of the President to challenge expenditures, to show the Congress where definite savings of the taxpayers' money can be made instead of constantly asking for more taxes.

It is generally agreed that the bill comes far from providing the revenues which are needed in this period when war is in progress. The bill does not provide all of the additional funds needed. However, the bill is the result of much effort, would produce a part of needed additional revenues and would be a factor in further curbing the forces which make for inflation.

It would make effective at once a further cut in consumers buying power which is the thing that the administration is contending must be done to hold prices in check. As it stands now it is very unlikely that there will be a new revenue act during 1944.

The program of war finance is extremely difficult. It is unfortunate that the administration and Congress are at loggerheads in this matter. This is one issue on which all politics should be set aside and a comprehensive tax program worked out and adopted which will meet the cost of war, which will give stability to our financial program, which will further curb inflation, and in a nutshell will fit the need of the times.

Experts agree that our wartime tax structure is not based on a firm foundation. The administration has repeatedly opposed enforced savings and a Federal sales tax.

The problem is particularly difficult in the election year. After all the politicians have their ears to the ground. There is no particular gain in placing the responsibility for failure to enact an equitable and effective tax program. The fact is, however, that the Nation would be in a much stronger position if the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury were in accord on a well-grounded program of taxation based only on fundamental principles, which past experience has shown to be the best. Politics should be left out entirely. The one thing that is certain is that Government finances should be put on a sound basis. All possible waste should be eliminated. Every function not absolutely necessary should be discontinued.

Investigation of Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

[From the Washington Post of February 24, 1944]

A. F. OF L. SUPPORTS DIES INQUIRY INTO "POLITICAL ACTION" GROUP

Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the House Committee Investigating un-American Activities, yesterday received support for his investigation of the C. I. O. political action committee, headed by Sidney Hillman, from an unexpected quarter—the American Federation of Labor.

Writing in the A. F. of L.'s Weekly News Service, Philip Pearl, the federation's publicity director, charged that the Hillman committee was following a policy of collaborating with Communists in the labor movement in the face of objections from other C. I. O. officials.

DENIAL CHALLENGED

Pearl, who recently castigated a group of left-wing C. I. O. leaders, including Harry Bridges and Joseph Curran, for having indorsed President Roosevelt's plea for a national service law, challenged Hillman's assertion that the committee was not "subversive."

"Come, come, Mr. Hillman," Pearl said, "you of all people should know better. You have had long and bitter experiences with the Communists in the past, experiences which should have taught you that the Commies are un-American and subversive to the core. You can't 'play possum' now and get away with it. It's too obvious. There cannot be any united front with the Communists by either the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L., and the longer you flirt with the idea the sooner and the deeper will you sink into complete oblivion."

WAS PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER

Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management and labor adviser to the President when Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen headed O. P. M. His selection as head of the C. I. O. political action committee has been widely interpreted as an indication that the committee is prepared to support the President for a fourth term.

When DIES announced his investigation of the Hillman committee, Hillman said that he would not produce the books and records of his committee for the Dies committee, although he was willing to provide the Federal Bureau of Investigation with any requested information.

Pearl stated that he had received favorable comment from some C. I. O. officials with respect to his previous attack on Curran and Bridges, whom he accused of taking a cue on national service from the Daily Worker.

CITES REVOLT SIGNS

"The signs of revolt within the C. I. O. against the Communist line are increasing," Pearl said. "Besides our personal discoveries of the past few weeks, there is abundant evidence of this fact in the eruptions within the American Labor Party in New York City.

"This political organization is in the throes of a desperate internal struggle for control with the forces of democratic trade-unionism on one side and the Communists on the other. The group of A. F. of L. organizations which make up the right wing of the party are being joined by increasing numbers of C. I. O. leaders who are enraged by the fact that Sidney Hillman has sought to bring about a 'united front' with the Communists."

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1944]

ROSE DENIES AIDING DIES INVESTIGATION—HILLMAN ALLIES RESPONSIBLE FOR INQUIRY INTO C. I. O. ACTIVITIES, HE ADDS

Alex Rose, State secretary of the American Labor Party yesterday unqualifiedly denied the charge of Louis Hollander, president, and Harold J. Garno, secretary-treasurer of the New York State Congress of Industrial Organizations, that he had inspired the Dies committee's investigation of the political activities of the C. I. O.

Mr. Rose declared that it was not his opposition and that of other right-wing leaders to Communist control of the Labor Party that had inspired the Dies committee's investigation, but rather the names of the allies of Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. political action committee, among whom he listed Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, Eugene P. Connolly, Michael J. Quill, Saul Mills, and Joseph Curran. These names, he asserted, linked Mr. Hillman with Communists.

"Mr. Louis Hollander in making false and irresponsible statements proves that he is fast learning the art of public deception from the Communists with whom he is now politically associated," Mr. Rose said.

"Our support of the national activities of the C. I. O. political action committee as well as our denunciation of the Dies committee are matters of public record. The joint statement issued last Tuesday by Dr. (George S.) Counts and myself, denouncing the Dies committee for its attack on the C. I. O. political action committee, followed unanimous condemnation of the Dies committee at a liberal and labor committee meeting Saturday, February 19, held at the Governor Clinton Hotel."

Mr. Rose said that he and other Labor Party leaders had repeatedly warned Mr. Hillman that collaboration with Communists in their efforts to capture the Labor Party at the primary election on March 28 would play into the hands of reactionaries and hurt the national political efforts of the C. I. O. political action committee. The same warning, he said, was made to Mr. Hollander, Mr. Hillman's assistant, who previously had fought the Communists in Labor Party primary contests.

Mr. Rose declared that the majority of the members of Mr. Hillman's committee on vacancies and of his candidates for the State

committee of the Labor Party were Communist Party line followers. In this primary contest, he asserted, Messrs. Marcantonio, Connelly, Mills and others, who in 1940 opposed the re-election of President Roosevelt, lend-lease to the Allies and the President's foreign policy, are leading the fight while Messrs. Hillman and Hollander "front" for them.

"The present primary fight in the American Labor Party is not new and not of our choice," Mr. Rose said. "This fight is between our party forces who consistently supported the democratic ideals and objectives of the party and against those who consistently followed the Communist Party line and opposed Roosevelt's foreign policy and our national defense program in the tragic years, 1939–41."

Soldiers Need Countable Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of February 26, 1944:

SOLDIERS NEED COUNTABLE BALLOTS

The tumult which has been raging around the question of votes for soldiers could have been cut down to standard size if some attention had been paid one fact—namely, that a soldier has not voted when he has written a name on a ballot provided by a Federal commission, but only when the ballot has been accepted and counted by the election officials in his State and voting precinct. The "fraud" which Mr. Roosevelt said he detected in proposals to amend the Green-Lucas bill might as justly have been charged against the original bill itself. That bill, before its amendment, provided a Federal ballot and a system of soldier voting which would have been unacceptable to election officials all over the country.

Start with the fact that under our Constitution the Presidential election is conducted by States, and the confusion disappears. Mr. Roosevelt cannot carry Italy or Port Moresby. He has to carry California, Ohio, and the sixteenth ward in Philadelphia. To be counted, ballots must be delivered to election officials in places where people are entitled to vote. The ballots must satisfy the requirements of State laws. You can fly a ballot from New Guinea, but you can't make an election moderator put it in the box. So what was the use of Mr. Roosevelt belaboring Senators and Representatives who tried to prevent endless election contests in the future by making the ballots acceptable in the first place?

The explanation that will occur to some people is the hope of the fourth-term boys to represent themselves to the soldiers and their relatives as carrying on a heroic battle against overwhelming odds in behalf of votes for soldiers. Actually, almost everybody favors it, but some responsible political leaders believe that ballots should not only be printed and distributed to the soldiers but put in ballot boxes and counted. This group, with no help from Mr Roosevelt, forced amendments to the Green-Lucas bill which conferred on that measure a considerably greater degree of constitutionality. Some of the opposition feared that the administration was planning to grab the soldier vote and do its own counting, and the effort in Congress to prevent amendments which make this more difficult did not assuage these fears. The New Dealers and their allies tried to make the customers believe that the reactionaries were afraid of the soldier vote.

If this were 1945 or 1942, instead of 1944, votes for soldiers would have been taken care of in the course of a day's routine. Because it is 1944, a job like this can only be done after everybody, from the President down, has had a kick at this bouncy political football.

Adjudication of Disability Claims of Veterans of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 19, 1944.

Mr. H. RALPH BURTON,
General Counsel, House
Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURTON: This is in response to your request to be informed of the steps that have been and are being taken by the Veterans' Administration to accelerate the adjudication of disability claims of veterans of World War No. 2.

It is conceded that undue delays were occasioned in the adjudication of a number of these claims, but in many instances those delays must be ascribed to conditions beyond the control of the Veterans' Administration. In addition, this Administration was not originally classified as a war agency. Want of priority in securing additional personnel plus the loss of many trained personnel to the armed forces and to agencies having priorities rendered it impossible to keep the increasing load of claims on a current basis.

The Bureau of the Budget has recently placed all activities of the Veterans' Administration in priority classification No. 1 under Executive Order No. 9243, and this reclassification will do much to improve services to those discharged from the armed forces. There is, however, difficulty under present circumstances in securing qualified personnel, particularly medical personnel. The War Department has been very helpful in assigning to the Veterans' Administration 100 doctors for use on rating boards. The Navy Department has also agreed to assign medical officers from the naval service. Under a joint agreement by the Secretary of War and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, qualified professional medical and dental employees of the Veterans' Administration will be commissioned and placed on active duty in Veterans' Administration facilities. Militarization of professional medical and dental personnel will not only enable the Veterans' Administration to retain those already on its rolls but to secure additional personnel from the retired or Reserve officers' list as well as from civilians. It is felt for the present that the Veterans' Administration will be able to staff rating boards with sufficient doctors to meet the load. Other necessary employees are being recruited as rapidly as possible, but it must be understood that all personnel will require certain periods for adequate instruction and training before they can be expected to function efficiently.

It is believed that the arrangements which are being worked out in cooperation with the service departments will adequately eliminate or reduce to a minimum delays in the adjudication of disability claims of World War No. 2 veterans. Steps have already been taken to speed the collection and transmission to the Veterans' Administration of clinical and service records required in adjudication of claims for disability pension. It was ascertained that excellent results could be secured in the adjudication of claims by sending rating boards to the points where discharges from service were to be effected. This was exemplified by the trial board established at Walter Reed Hospital which was not only able to clear cases which had accumulated prior to the detail of the rating board but was able also to keep ahead of the C. D. D. Board. The Army, however, is effecting discharges from more than 600 points and it would be impossible to cover all these points without sufficient rating boards and other personnel which are not available. Recognizing the impracticability of attempting to establish rating and adjudication agencies at each discharge point, it was determined to meet the problem by the establishment of a branch of central office in each of the 9 Army Service Command areas. Each person to be discharged from service because of disability will be informed of the benefits to which he or she is entitled and assisted in making claim for disability pension and securing evidence necessary to support such claim. These papers will be forwarded to the branch of central office in the area from which the individual is to be discharged. Where possible, adjudication will be made upon available evidence even though it appears further evidence will be available at a later date. When claim is adjudicated the case folder and related records will be transferred to the regional office having jurisdiction over the territory in which the mailing address of the veteran is located. Upon receipt of the case folder in the regional office cases will be handled in accordance with established procedure and the award account card will be forwarded direct to the finance officer who will, without further certification from the adjudication division, authorize future payments as reflected by the account card.

Under this new procedure it will be possible to eliminate much of the delay previously encountered in the adjudication of disability claims. The branch of central office initially handling such claims will handle only original claims for disability pension filed by veterans of World War No. 2. There will be no claims of other veterans and dependents to delay immediate consideration of this type of claim. Each branch office will assign its own C numbers; rate, adjudicate, award, and arrange for payment by the Treasury Department of benefits direct to the claimant, thereby eliminating all interoffice correspondence previously required in the adjudication of claims.

The managers of the nine central office branches for the Army Service Command areas have already been selected and have been instructed to secure personnel necessary to adequately staff their offices. The number of rating boards and other personnel for each individual branch office will be determined by the rate of disability discharges within the area concerned. May I not say that the War and Navy Departments are cooperating with the Veterans' Administration to the fullest extent in making this procedure effective? Arrangements have been made whereby assembly of necessary service and clinical records will be accomplished prior to

discharge, and in no case will a disabled veteran in need of further hospital or medical treatment be discharged until arrangements have been completed for his transfer to a Veterans' Administration facility.

The mustering-out-pay bill provided under Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved February 3, 1944, should in all future cases meet the immediate need of money for adjustment to civil life in those cases of disabled veterans discharged from service in the present war until entitlement to disability pension can be determined.

It is my conviction that under the new procedure being established adjudication of disability pension claims of veterans of World War No. 2 will be materially expedited and that unnecessary delay in the adjudication of any claim for disability benefits or hospitalization will be satisfactorily curtailed. Any additional changes found necessary to further speed up adjudication, as a result of a close study of this new procedure which will be maintained, will be promptly taken.

I trust that the foregoing will be of substantial benefit in providing an insight into the procedures being made effective to accelerate the adjudication of these disability claims.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

"Half Hour On And Half Hour Off" Strike Gives Impetus to National Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to add to the discomfort of those reasonable elements of organized labor with whose efforts to better the conditions of working men and women I am in full sympathy. Neither do I wish to say anything which will make more difficult the task which they are facing in combating what they, and I, consider the iniquitous proposal by the administration to enact the so-called National Service Act.

Nevertheless, I feel I would be derelict to the Members of this House and to the responsible leaders in organized labor if I failed to call attention to an incident in the Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. at Detroit, one of the great Michigan industrial plants engaged in producing vitally needed war materials.

A group of keymen in this plant recently went on strike because management did not immediately accede to their demand. Approximately 1,000 workers joined in the strike.

What was the demand, Mr. Speaker?

The demand was that they should be given one-half hour rest after every half hour of work. In other words, they demanded 4 hours of rest out of every 8 hours of work.

The thing sounds like a dream conjured up by some enemy of labor in a wild and frantic effort to discredit the labor movement. It was so inconceivable that such a movement could actually be a fact that I made a personal investigation. In this connection I have here the following news release of February 19, which substantiates the facts:

More than 1,100 production foundry workers in the Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. were either idle or on strike today in what appeared to be a well-organized slowdown effort by the U. A. W.-C. I. O. Local 600. One department struck to force a demand for a half hour rest period after each half hour of work, adopting as their slogan "A half hour on and a half hour off." In an adjacent department, core makers had slowed down their production to less than half normal. During 1940 their voluntary production rate was 566 units per man per 8-hour shift. This has been cut to 275 units per man. Present Army schedules call for 450 units per man.

Production costs for war materials have skyrocketed during the last few days because of the slow-down, company officials said. The company last week offered the union an opportunity to correct its difficulties, but the slow-down continued. As a result, nine men were suspended for 1 week under clause 13 of the U. A. W. contract, which stipulates working schedules, and the strike followed. The half-and-half work schedule was demanded by metal pourers, who normally alternate a half hour pouring metal and a half hour of light work. They had pressed their demands by sleeping in the foundry aisles during the half-hour periods after pouring, the company said.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, with a slogan "A half hour on and a half hour off" these men actually tied up production in their own department, and since that department is essential in the war production chain, they tied up the efforts of thousands of other workers engaged in war work.

It is such things as this, Mr. Speaker, that make it difficult for those friends of labor to combat the forces which in the past have opposed labor organizations.

We who now face a tremendous fight to keep labor out of the strait jacket of the proposed national service act need all the help we can get.

And I fear that we will not be able to gain any new recruits to the fight if essential war workers are to be hampered on the production front by those who have mistakenly adopted the slogan of "A half hour on and a half hour off."

Responsible leaders of organized labor must control the irresponsibles in their organizations. Unless this is done, mothers and fathers of the boys on the fighting fronts will demand Government control. They will demand that we back the attack.

Why the Global Alphabet?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Hon. Robert L. Owen:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1944.*
Hon. JOHN W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner,
United States Office of Education.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: The world tragedy of totalitarian war involving all nations in the world is due to the fundamental ignorance, or misunderstanding, of the leaders of mankind as to the great problem of governing man through processes based on reason, justice, friendly cooperation, instead of attempting to govern man by fear, by physical violence, by organized military power and strategy for the exaltation of the few at the expense of the many. The remedy is now proposed by the marching millions of God's soldiers defending the principles of righteousness, of tolerance, of friendly cooperation in which equality of sovereignty for each of the United Nations and of all other nations based on the principles of justice and human brotherhood.

The illiteracy of the great mass of mankind has resulted in poverty and exploitation of the mass of mankind, both in and out of the nations which excel in literacy, in knowledge, in the arts of science and war. It is now proposed to end these conditions and the battle against illiteracy has made enormous progress within the last two decades by the use of a mechanism through which illiteracy has been abolished and is being abolished. This mechanism is the phonetic alphabet.

This mechanism consists of the phonetic alphabet, supported by Government and by intensive education made immediately possible through the global alphabet, which can be learned in a single day. Thus is opened the printed word of knowledge made immediately available to all of the people, children and adults, who employ it. The people welcome this reform with great enthusiasm where it has been taught to them.

The most remarkable results of this world movement appears in Russia where within two decades intensive education has not only abolished illiteracy, but has opened wide the doors to every human being within its borders of knowledge of the arts and sciences of technology and has developed hundreds of thousands of engineers, technicians, and experts in all kinds of manufactures, improved transportation, and perfected means of distribution.

These processes and the astounding results will be found fully explained by disinterested trained observers who have rendered the world a great service in publishing these books, such as The Russians, by Williams; Soviet Power, by Hewlett Johnson, dean of Canterbury; Soviet Asia, by Davies and Steiger; Mission to Moscow, by Hon. Joseph Davies, our former Ambassador to Russia, and many other books, a list of which may be found in Soviet Power.

In Turkey Mustapha Kemmel Pasha by edict abolished the Arabic alphabet and adopted a simple phonetic alphabet of 29 letters. Turkey has been regenerated.

It takes a Japanese student 7 years to learn how to read a Japanese newspaper which employs Chinese ideograms. The Chinese people have been kept in ignorance because of the Mandarin system of writing with ideograms.

Comparatively few people realize that the English language of our current literature employs hundreds of thousands of words unphonetically spelled, compelling our children to learn such words by sight, by verbal instruction as ideograms, thus taking from 5 to 10 years in which to spell, read, write, and understand such unphonetic words. This enormous loss of time could be almost immediately obviated by teaching American

children the 33 letters of the global alphabet with which they could learn to read English printed in the global letters within a few days of instruction, thus opening to them thousands of books such as are listed in the Inexpensive Books for School Libraries, published by your Office of Education and prepared by Miss Edith A. Lathrop, associate specialist in school libraries, a copy of which I received this morning. Russia is publishing about 30,000 new books annually in the phonetic alphabets for the wholesale education of the Russian people.

Outside of Russia, the war against illiteracy is moving grandly forward under the guidance of Dr. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., and the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City, which has the cooperation and support of 123 foreign missionary societies. See his wonderful book The Silent Billion Speak, published by the Friendship Press, New York City.

Within the last month in Jamaica, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Dr. Laubach and his associates have established a new system of abolishing illiteracy in the Caribbean. From there he goes to Puerto Rico and South America where the demand for his services are urgent. Let me quote what he says with regard to the global alphabet:

"I have long since learned that the greatest single obstacle to the use of English as a universal language is its chaotic spelling. Experience in 80 languages shows that if we can adopt a phonetic spelling it will be exceedingly simple to pronounce every word correctly. We then have only the problem of acquiring the meaning of words to make English universal.

"I grow increasingly satisfied with your alphabet as I experiment with it, for I find it easy to write connected letters, and it is swift, since there is but one stroke for each letter. I believe your idea of writing above and below a line and of using curves upward, downward, and straight lines is the best ever yet devised.

"Yours for a great cause,

"FRANK C. LAUBACH."

A thorough examination of the recent book, Languages for War and Peace, published by S. F. Vanni, 135 Bleecker Street, New York City, demonstrates that the global alphabet can be employed to write and print with equal facility Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, and Japanese. I have just received a letter from Professor Scott, of Trinity College, a recognized authority on Japanese, that the Japanese language can be written in the global alphabet.

In the work of Lepsius, Ph. D., Standard Alphabet, he reviews a great number of languages and dialects using alphabets which can be completely covered by the global alphabet, as proposed and explained in Senate Document 133 on the global alphabet, copies of which have been sent to your office.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE GLOBAL ALPHABET IN THE UNITED STATES

1. It can enable millions of people now illiterate in the United States immediately to read and write the English language phonetically.

2. It can enable all the young people in the United States, without loss of time, not only to read and write English phonetically, but to read printed books, some of which I have referred to which could be, and would be, printed in the global alphabet if the children of the United States were taught the global alphabet.

3. It would save an enormous time in acquiring a knowledge contained in such books printed in the global alphabet. It would advance the knowledge of the children of the United States by 5 or 10 years in advance of what they now obtain through the books and papers published in the unphonetic spelling of English.

4. The global alphabet with greater legibility of 12-point type could be printed on about one-half the paper otherwise employed in printing such books, or papers, as now published.

5. It would take only half the cost in the mails because only half the weight.

6. It would take only half the storage.

7. Being stenographic, it could be written with the pen several times as fast as writing with ordinary script.

8. But, above all, it would equip the individual in a knowledge of vocational instruction; would stimulate his creative power and multiply the production of the American people in factory, field, in the forest, in cultivating the soil, in gardening, in animal industry, in horticulture as well as agriculture, in building homes with all the modern conveniences where intelligent labor would be available at the crossroads.

9. It would teach people how to take care of their physical health and would develop in the United States innumerable sports and entertainment already developed in Russia to a high extent.

I remind you that the Army is teaching many languages conversationally by small pocket books, through which, using vocal instruction and phonograph records, our soldiers and sailors are able to carry on social and business conversations within 3 or 4 months; but they are compelled to spell the foreign words out phonetically instead of one spelling in global letters which would suffice. Using the global letters to write Spanish phrases, for example, and English phrases of identical meaning in parallel columns would enable them to quickly learn to pronounce correctly the Spanish through the eye, thus avoiding the necessity of a trained teacher, with the expense of a trained teacher and the limited scope of such teaching. The interlinear system could rely on the printed word alone and would enable an American soldier to teach English to a Spaniard and would enable the soldier to learn Spanish by the aid of any Spanish speaker, even illiterate but who spoke the Spanish language. The "each one teach one" plan has had great success under Dr. Laubach, as he so fully explains in his book. The world can be taught English speedily by this mechanism and Americans could speedily learn other languages. The material for all these books is immediately available. I again call your attention to the commissioners of education of the nations of Europe and their London meeting, where they urged a world language to follow the war, preferably English or French. The children of America could thus be taught any desired foreign language.

It would equip the people to take advantage of multiplied laboratories and fit them to expand the production of transportation and communication through the multiplied forms now being developed, especially including the airplane and radio.

For the above and other reasons, I am appealing to you and to the other leaders in education in America to cooperate in giving to the children of America, and to the illiterates of America, the mechanism by which within a few weeks to learn how to read, write, and print in the English language.

I appeal to you to use your great office to encourage the printing of selected books in the global alphabet for the instruction, education, and higher standards of living which can be made the fruits of the new system within an incredibly short time.

My dear Mr. Commissioner, I am not unaware of the tax upon your time and attention by many official duties, but I pray you to consider the importance of first things first and to give to this system your personal blessing and cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Lincoln—Can We Learn From Him?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent address delivered by the Reverend Paul Wolfe, of the Brick Church, New York, N. Y., upon the occasion of the annual Lincoln Day dinner held on February 12, 1944, under the auspices of the National Republican Club.

Mr. Chairman, Governor Dewey, Governor Edge, members of the National Republican Club, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a pleasure to address you again. I have been asked to speak about Abraham Lincoln.

You all know the eulogies of him—his sense of duty, his vast good nature, his noble humanity, his broad good humor, his unerring common sense. Tonight, instead of repeating these eulogies, instead of praising his, let us try to learn from him.

Abraham Lincoln was elected the sixteenth President of the United States on November 6, 1860. It was a disquieting election. It had dealt with large issues, the authority of the Federal Government, the economic and political position of slavery, but it had not settled those issues. No single party and no single candidate received a majority of the votes cast. There were not a few people who pointed out that the election had expressed no clear majority will.

Abraham Lincoln, the successful candidate, was comparatively unknown. Wendell Phillips in Boston said he had an empty mind. Emerson wrote later that his unknown name was heard coldly and sadly.

Perhaps the most disturbing fact of all was that the election had been charged with moral sentiments, it had aroused passions. You can make everything else out of the passions of men except a government that will work. The election left America with a Government that did not work.

Within 3 months seven Southern States had set up the Confederacy. In the Cabinet at Washington were men who were actual leaders of the secession movement. The National Government did nothing. President Buchanan said the Southern States have no right to secede. And he also said the Federal Government has no right to stop them from seceding. President Buchanan was stopped at dead center.

But if the President was weak, Congress was not much stronger. In each House committees were appointed to deal with the crisis. In each House the committees reached approximately the same verdict: Nothing could be done. Tom Corwin of Ohio wrote to Lincoln: "I have been for 30 days in a committee of 33. If the States are no more harmonious in their feelings than these 33 men * * * we must dissolve."

Public opinion was no more effective than Congress. From Massachusetts came a petition signed with 36,000 names pleading for some compromise, anything but war. From Massachusetts came another petition signed with 37,000 names pleading for a firm stand, anything but compromise.

On February 4 delegates from 21 States assembled in a peace convention in Washington. These delegates came with the best intentions to preserve the Union. If high hopes and earnest desires could have done it, the Union would have been preserved. But

when the convention adjourned its major accomplishment was a record volume of eloquent oratory.

The Chief Executive, the Congress, public opinion, all at dead center. This was the Nation and this was the Government of which Abraham Lincoln was chosen Chief Magistrate. By his firmness and his courage he brought order and strength to it. What was it that Abraham Lincoln did? I invite you to examine his conduct between November 6, 1860, and March 4, 1861.

First of all, he kept silent. Between February 27, 1860, when he made the Cooper Union address in New York, and March 4, 1861, when he delivered his first inaugural address in Washington, Abraham Lincoln made not a single major speech. Of course, he was urged to speak. He was urged constantly. Where did he stand on the tariff, on slavery? The conservatives wanted to be reassured. The radicals wanted to be reassured. Lincoln replied "There is the platform; there are my previous speeches." For the good men of the North and South he was willing to repeat his views 70 and 7 times. "But," said Lincoln, "I have bad men to deal with, men who are eager * * * to base new misrepresentations." Lincoln did not encourage them.

After the election the clamor for a public declaration increased. John A. Gilmer wrote from North Carolina wanting "a clear and definite exposition" of Mr. Lincoln's attitude. Lincoln wrote a long and courteous letter. He gave the pages of the volume of his debates with Douglas on which pertinent statements would be found. He asked, "Have you ever read the Republican platform or my speeches? If not, why should any additional production of mine meet a better fate?" The editor of the New York Times, Henry J. Raymond, wrote. Lincoln waited 2 weeks to answer it. Then he said further statements would do no good. "They seek a sign and no sign will be given them." Lincoln kept silent.

Now why did Lincoln do that? He did it because he had respect for himself and respect for his statements. He thought words meant something. The purpose of talking was to state a truth. When a truth had been stated, when he could not improve on the statements, why should he play into the hands of mischievous men? "To press a repetition * * * upon those who have listened is useless; to press it upon those who have refused to listen and still refuse would be wanting in self-respect * * * excite the contempt of good men and encourage the bad ones to clamor more loudly." (Letter to Truman Smith.)

Or again he was silent because he had the notion (naive to us, perhaps) that the platform of a party meant what it said. He wrote that he was not at liberty to shift his ground in regard to the platform and that if he did shift it the party had a right to denounce him.

Or again he knew the pitfalls of undefined terms. What is "coercion"? What is "invasion"? This is what he said to the legislature at Indianapolis: "When men wrangle by the mouth with no certainty that they mean the same thing while using the same words, it perhaps were as well if they would keep silence."

But perhaps the chief reason for the silence of Lincoln was that he knew there is a right time and a wrong time to speak. There is a time when speaking carries authority and conviction. At Philadelphia on his way to his inauguration Lincoln said: "I shall speak officially next Monday week if ever. If I should not speak then, it were useless for me to do so now. If I do speak then, it is useless for me to do so now." On March 4, 1861, Lincoln broke his silence and uttered the magnificent first inaugural address.

Can we learn from Lincoln? We Americans are a wordy people. We have efficient agencies of communication—the radio, the novel, the press, the magazine, the newspapers. We have a great many people who make a living by using words—preachers, commentators, columnists, correspondents. It is difficult for us to imagine that words are not the chief instrument of government, that public opinion may be created by actions as well as by propaganda. It is difficult for us to recognize that after all a man, a government, or a nation stands or falls not by words but by deeds. Lincoln understood this. If democracy is to survive, we must understand it.

Before Pearl Harbor a native of Asia remarked that the representatives of the democracies were the "talkee-talkee people." The Japanese were the "walkee-walkee people." If we had had the wisdom to talk less and to do more, there might not be so many dead in the cemeteries at Tarawa.

Lincoln kept silent. What else did he do?

In those 4 months Lincoln played politics. He was the head of a party. For the first time in its history that party would be in power. The party was not united. It contained Democrats who had bolted Douglas, Whigs who had tired of defeat, Radicals who wanted slavery abolished. Lincoln understood that it was up to him to see that there was harmony.

So he played politics. He built a Cabinet to head his administration. In the Cabinet were the four Republicans who had been his closest rivals for the nomination to the Presidency. There was Seward, there was Chase, there was Cameron, there was Bates. Lincoln chose them not because they were close to him or close to one another but because they represented the various elements of the party which he was called upon to lead. His business as the head of the party was not to read men out of it but to read men in.

Yes; Lincoln played politics. Perhaps that should not surprise us. All his life Lincoln had been a politician. He had attended caucuses, conventions, conferences with county chairmen, State leaders. He knew the people in his own precinct. He knew how they would vote. He knew that of the 23 ministers in his town only 3 would vote for him.

All his life he had been a politician. He had started out in Sangamon County running for the legislature. He had debated with Douglas, quarreled with Democratic editors as early as 1840. When his own county refused to support him for Congress, Lincoln was big enough to support his rival. When he was unable to control sufficient votes to be elected Senator in 1855, he threw his votes and his support to Trumbell. Trumbell was elected. It made Mrs. Lincoln so mad she wouldn't speak to Julia Trumbull. But Lincoln spoke. Men liked that. They said he kept faith with other men. He worked with them. They said he was close to people, common people, close to the way they thought and the way they acted. He handled people well. He was a good politician.

That knowledge and that experience stood him in good stead when he went to Washington. The Presidents who have failed have been the Presidents who couldn't handle people, who didn't know how to get along with Congress. Lincoln knew how.

It was Sunday afternoon, March 3, 1861. The House of Representatives had the Force bill on its docket. Boteler, a Representative from Virginia, was afraid the Force bill might pass. He went to see Lincoln. He told Lincoln that if the Force bill did not pass, there was a chance that Virginia would remain in the Union. Would Lincoln stop it? Lincoln thought the bill could be stopped. He said, "I may promise you it will be." Boteler asked if he might announce that on the floor of the House. "By no means," said Lincoln. "That would make trouble. What right have I to interfere with the legislation of Congress? Whatever is done must be done quietly."

At 10 o'clock on the evening of Sunday, March 3, 1861, the Force bill was called up for consideration. Hardly had the bill been announced when a Republican Congressman, Washburn, from Illinois, was on his feet; he moved adjournment. His motion was not accepted. Immediately Hickman, a Republican from Pennsylvania, was on his feet. He moved adjournment, but before he could be recognized Cochrane, a Republican from New York, had the floor. He moved adjournment. The motion was put. The House adjourned 77 to 60. The Force bill died. There was still a chance to keep Virginia in the Union.

Two years later Congress passed the Habeas Corpus Act. Lincoln had suspended the right of habeas corpus because of the war emergency. His action had been challenged. Lincoln referred the matter to Congress. If the constitutional procedures which safeguard democracy had been neglected Lincoln was willing to return to them. To be sure! How can a man talk about government of the people and by the people if he scorns the people's representatives? Congress on its part authorized the President to suspend the writ. And when the Habeas Corpus Act was passed a Senator said: "The Executive is as much clothed with authority and bound in duty * * * as we are." (P. 155, vol. 2, War Years.) Lincoln knew how to work with Congress.

Can we learn from Lincoln? Can we learn that in a well-organized democracy, power is entrusted not to a man, but to a man and a party? Responsible political parties are essential for free government.

Of course there are politicians and politicians, good ones and bad ones. There are politicians who say, "I am right. I have intuition. I know what needs to be done. I don't need anyone who disagrees with me. I am the party." Hitler is that kind of a politician. He has intuition. He knows what policies to adopt, what plans to follow. He doesn't need a single representative in the Reichstag. He burned the building down.

But there is another way—the American way—Lincoln's way. It teaches that party organization and party responsibility are the life blood of democracy. It is out there in the precincts, in the town committees, in the county organizations that democracy lives. No substitution of pressure groups, of particular interests, labor, or business, or sections can preserve the democratic process. That requires the two-party system. When that system fails the result is political chaos. This system makes allowances for differences. It seeks to unite men—to harmonize points of view. It's the tolerant way—the democratic way. It keeps freedom alive. It makes a nation strong.

But Lincoln was more than a politician these 4 months. He was a thinker. He was making decisions. He was selecting the policies by which the issues which the election had left unsettled would be settled. He was becoming a statesman.

Buchanan had been willing to "surrender a part or the whole of the Constitution in order to preserve the remainder." Lincoln could do that. He could let the South go. Many men favored such a policy. It would get rid of slavery. Some men thought no other policy possible. How can you coerce 8,000,000 people?

Other men said compromise. Make peace with the South on her own terms. Give guaranties regarding slavery.

Still other men said stand by the Union. Don't give an inch. Recapture the lost property. That meant war. Former Governor Moorehead, of Kentucky, begged Lincoln not to resort to bloodshed. All the waters of the

Atlantic, he said, will not cleanse your hands from that blood.

Still other men said let there be war. This is a great moral crusade. This is a death blow at human bondage. Now is the time to free our country forever of social wrong.

Events—foggy events—had arisen which confused public opinion and blurred political judgment.

I have told you Lincoln was a party politician. He was. But the party had no answer to these events. No collective judgment could penetrate them. To search out the path, to see the way forward, Lincoln had to go on ahead of his party. He had to go alone. This was the first test of Lincoln's statesmanship. No man can be the great leader of a nation who remains a partisan.

I do not know by what Jabbok's Brook or with what midnight wrestling Lincoln strove with his adversary and cried, "Tell me thy name." I only know he wrung from those events their secret and he emerged a prince with power and conviction. The Union could not be dissolved. The South could not go. This was no time for compromise. He would be patient but he would be persistent. He would exhaust all peaceful means, but he would not hesitate to resort to stronger ones. No war could be as disastrous to the cause of freedom as a peace bought at the price of disunion.

But if war came, for what was he fighting? Was he fighting to abolish slavery? Was the chief issue a moral and social problem? Or was he fighting for the Union? Was the chief issue political? You know the answer he gave. The chief issue was the Union. And by the Union Lincoln meant the Constitution, the people whose will it expressed, the laws operating under it. Lincoln meant that whole system of institutions by which a free people exercising their freedom had ordered their life. He was fighting for the Union.

Here are his words. To Congress he said, "I have thought it proper to keep the integrity of the Union prominent as the primary object of the contest.

"In considering the policy to be adopted I have been anxious and careful that * * * the conflict shall not degenerate into a * * * revolutionary struggle."

To the man who urged him not to plunge the Nation into bankruptcy and go to war, Lincoln replies, "If ever I shall come to the great office of President of the United States, I shall swear that I will * * * preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is a solemn duty. I shall undertake to perform it. It is not the Constitution as I would have it, but as it is, that is to be defended."

Are these really the words of Lincoln? Is this the great humanitarian whose brow was furrowed by the remembrance of 3,000,000 men in bondage? Not slavery but the Union? Not social reform, but the Constitution?

Yes; these are Lincoln's words. And in those words you understand how and why Lincoln was a great humanitarian. Lincoln perceived that social reform cannot take place in a political vacuum. It requires the enlightened traditions of freemen. He saw clearly that it was within the Federal Union and under the Constitution that permanent social gains would be made. Indeed, that was what he did. By rallying his fellow countrymen to the cause of the Union and the Constitution, he was able in course of time to emancipate the slaves and to abolish human bondage within the Republic.

Can we learn from Abraham Lincoln? He refused to interpret a great war as a revolution. He refused to permit social reform to take precedence over the Constitution. In so doing he was able to direct contending forces toward a common goal, to organize the general tumult into a national will; he was able to unite the Nation.

I repeat, can we learn from him? Recently, in this city, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court spoke on the "divergent and uncompromisable outlooks" within the Nation; the right moving further to the right; the left moving further to the left. "Political parties," he said, "are badly divided, racial animosities and competitions are assuming a more ominous and sullen aspect."

That is only too true. Yet how could it be otherwise? Since World War No. 1 there has been an increasing tendency to state every problem of government in terms of particular groups, to encourage divisions, to appeal to passions. We have been brought up to think of ourselves as wage earners, employers, workingmen, farmers, capitalists, men with particular and selfish interests, rather than citizens of a common country with common interests.

Within recent years we have been summoned to a social crusade. In waging that crusade we have been told that we live in an age of rapid social change; that, in the solution of the problems before us, the Federal structure of our Government, the Constitution, the decisions of our law courts are not aids and helps but barriers and hindrances. A social philosophy must be substituted for our inherited institutions.

Let me interrupt for a moment. The expression "Fascism comes from the left" is receiving wide circulation among us. The expression is true. The danger to democracy comes from those who rely on a social philosophy rather than from those who support constitutional and democratic processes.

And, as though the crusade at home were not sufficiently divisive, the war has been used to create further divisions. We have been told that this war is part of a world revolution; it is "a people's war," a war of the common man. And who is the common man for whom the war is fought? Well, the common man is not all of us. The common man is only some of us, some special and preferred class. So this war has been made into a battle of some of us against the rest of us.

Oh, the folly of it! This war is not a revolutionary war. It is not primarily a war for social gains for some of us. By all means let us hope that social gain will come out of it. But that is not the cause of the war. If it were then we had better not fight it. Hitler has a better program of social gains than we have. He offers to everyone who will say "Heil," security, full employment, equality, high wages, vacations. But he offers it at the price of a man's soul. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

We are fighting this war for our souls, for the right to be freemen rather than slaves to an omnipotent state. Therefore this is a people's war. Therefore it is a war of the common man and the common man includes all of us from the poorest coolie on the Yangtze to the noblest aristocrat in the House of Commons. It is a war for all of us; for our right to be souls. We are fighting this war to preserve, protect, and, if possible, extend the institutions and traditions of freemen.

To win this war our great need is unity, a conception of our common humanity; our great need is someone who will express that conception.

We are fighting a war and the war is not yet won. We do not know when it will be won. If the American people are wise, they will expect a long war. To win it will require staying power the sort of endurance here at home which American and British soldiers are exemplifying this night on a beachhead in Italy. That endurance will require unity.

And when the war is won, we must win the peace. That too will require unity, a President that will work with and respect Congress, a Congress that will believe in the President, a country that has confidence in both. Above all, it will require a leader who will appeal not to group interests, to love of gain, or selfish passions, but a leader who will appeal to our souls, to our love of country, our reverence for God, our aspirations and hopes which bind us to each other and to all humanity, "the dead to the living and the living to the unborn."

Eighty-three years ago an unknown man who embodied these principles of democratic leadership was inaugurated President of the United States. As he took the oath of office he looked out upon a torn and divided people. And when he spoke to those people he appealed to their common humanity, to the better angels of their nature. Let me paraphrase the closing words of his inaugural address.

"I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield (in Africa and Italy) and from every patriot grave (at Guadalcanal and Attu), to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched as surely they (these chords) will be by the better angels of our nature."

Soldiers' Absentee Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Booneville (Miss.) Independent, issue of February 24, 1944, headed "RANKIN makes hard fight," quoting an article by Mr. George Morris which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on February 14, 1944.

The matter referred to follows:

RANKIN MAKES HARD FIGHT

Our Congressman, JOHN E. RANKIN, has been doing some big things in the House of Representatives. He may not get results, but he has rendered a high-class service to the Nation and a very distinguished service to the South in the great fight he has made for the rights of the States in the matter of legislation. The minute the Nation ceases to recognize the rights and powers reserved to the States by the Constitution of the United States that minute this Nation starts on a downward slide. The Union is made up of different States, and the Constitution reserves to the States the right and the power to legislate, regulate, and control their own affairs so far as it does not interfere with the local interests of other States.

Our own JOHN RANKIN'S speech made in the House a few days ago is recognized as one of the most powerful and sweeping arguments ever made on the floor of Congress. George Morris, who writes from Washington to the Commercial Appeal, pays a great tribute to Mr. RANKIN in the following letter to the Commercial Appeal of Monday, February 14. Mr. Morris writes as follows:

"RANKIN'S SPEECH

"WASHINGTON, February 13.—At the conclusion of the speech of Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, advocating passage by the House of the Rankin soldier vote bill, the reporters for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD inserted: 'Prolonged applause, the members rising.' The remarks inserted by the report-

ers were the most elaborate permitted in the sedate RECORD.

"The tribute paid Mr. RANKIN was an ovation not witnessed on the floor of the House since the days of the President's popularity. It was a tribute the House pays one of its Members probably not more often than once in a generation. It is not once in a generation that a Member of the House rises to the heights attained by Mr. RANKIN on that occasion. The speech, by common consent, was one of the greatest ever delivered on the floor.

"The speech was not a sudden inspiration. It was perhaps the climax of a lifetime of study and devotion to the Constitution, heightened by the gift of superb oratory. Throughout the discussion of the bill there was rancor and resentment against the President's message denouncing Members of the Senate for perpetrating a fraud upon the soldiers and upon the American people for passing the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan bill, charging Members with voting with tongue in the cheek, and demanding that Members stand up and be counted, as though they were insincere and ashamed of the measure they supported.

"Also, throughout the debate, supporters of the administration or Worley bill, written by Hubert T. Wechsler, of the Department of Justice, repudiated the President's language and put themselves on record as having no sympathy with the President's charge of fraud, dishonesty, and cowardice.

"In fact, in an effort to cool the tempers of Members, administration lobbyists, discovering that the message reacted against the President, were said to have given assurance that the message was written by Samuel Rosenman while the President was out of the city and did not know its contents.

"Mr. RANKIN made no reference to the President's charges. He defended the Constitution and denounced those who attacked it. Members agreed that the time had arrived for patriotic citizens to go to the defense of the Constitution. A canvass of congressional mail showed that the public generally was willing to leave the issue of determining how soldiers should vote to Congress in the belief that it is becoming sufficiently trustworthy and independent to be relied upon to insist upon a constitutional method. Members of the armed forces manifested slight interest beyond pleading that they be not overwhelmed with propaganda and be protected from being voted en masse and forced to cast their votes under military direction.

"The only pressure groups active in the soldier vote issue were the administration, the political action committee of the C. I. O., the Communists, and a few other Red and left-wing organizations, all pumping for the administration bill. Mr. RANKIN enjoys the hostility of all such groups, including the administration to which he has given partisan loyalty even when it stretched his conscience to the limit.

"It was no set speech Mr. RANKIN delivered. He did not read a paper. He made his best points under the nagging of those seeking to harrass him. A Tammany representative sought to impugn his party loyalty. Mr. RANKIN replied: 'I voted for President Roosevelt every time he has run and I expect to vote for the Democratic ticket this time no matter who is the nominee.

"'I voted the Democratic ticket in 1904 when President Roosevelt voted the Republican ticket. I voted the Democratic ticket when Mr. Knox was running on the Republican ticket. I voted the Democratic ticket when the Taft administration was going down to defeat with Secretary Stimson as a Republican in the Cabinet. I voted the Democratic ticket when Mr. Ickes was a Bull Mooser. I voted the Democratic ticket when Harry Hopkins was a Socialist. I do not want any fly-by-night or fair-weather Democrats to try to tell me how to vote.'

"Then the Tammanyite tried another tack: 'Did the gentleman,' he asked, 'vote for Al Smith when he was running for President?' That was another one down Mr. RANKIN's alley: 'I not only voted for Al Smith,' he replied, 'but I stumped both Kentucky and Ohio for him.' These were just diversions—detours from the main issue, of course.

"In conclusion he declared: 'Mr. Chairman, they can abuse me all they please, and I will answer them all in due time. Since I have been a Member of this House I have not submitted to being browbeaten or intimidated by anyone on the outside. I have tried to follow my own conscience and to represent the people of the First District of Mississippi. I have tried to do what I thought was right. When my conscience is clear and when I have studied this one, I am not afraid of all the forces of evil. * * * When I turn to behold for the last time that flag behind the Speaker's desk, or to take a last long lingering look at the receding dome of this Capitol, I want to feel in my heart that I have done my best, that I have fought the good fight and have kept the faith. So far, in all sincerity, I can say that—

"'"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul."'"

Last Dairy Herd Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, various members of the House Committee on Agriculture have from time to time reported on the sale of dairy herds. Those of us from California, in particular, have reported on the difficulties of dairymen in that State. O. P. A. prices, set below the prices established by the State milk control administration as the lowest possible prices if dairymen are to stay in business, plus the rising cost of hay and other feeds have united to make dairying increasingly difficult. The most recent report I have from California stockyards is that approximately 50 percent of the cattle received there are dairy cattle.

I reported some time ago that not a single dairy was left in the Palo Verde Valley, one of the richest agricultural areas in the country, and now I report that the only remaining dairy herd in my home town of Banning has been sold at auction. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news item from the Banning Record of December 23, 1943:

BANNING'S ONLY DAIRY HERD SOLD AT ONTARIO AUCTION

Banning's only herd of dairy cows was sold at auction last week because the owner, Vern Owen, became tired of losing money month after month.

Owen, owner and operator of the Sun-Up Dairy, took his herd of 48 high-grade cows, 35 calves, and 2 bulls to Ontario last week and had Colonel Caldwell sell them to the highest bidder. Owen states he received $4,000 less for the cows than he paid for them a year ago, and that he has had an operating loss of about $400 a month for some time.

A year ago milkers received $70 a month and lodging, he said; now they receive $250 a month and lodging; dairy feed has advanced from $30 to $62 a ton during this same period, and hay from $10 to $33.

Thus it is impossible to continue in the dairy business at present ceiling prices set by O. P. A., so Banning's only dairy has suffered the fate of dairy herds throughout the Nation, Owen declared.

Owen has 600 acres of land planted to grain and alfalfa, so he'll raise the feed and let others feed it, he said.

Hall Furlough Clubs To Support Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF, February 26, 1944:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, tonight, I feel that I am speaking not only for myself but for the patriotic women of the Hall Furlough Clubs when I express the hope that every man, woman, and child in our locality will get behind the Red Cross in its drive to raise funds this year. Our boys across the seas and the unhappy and suffering peoples all over the globe have great need for the healing hands of our angels of mercy, the Red Cross nurses, who bring forth a silver lining to every black foreboding cloud of war.

I think it is significant and heartening to note the reassuring presence of a great business leader as chairman of the Broome County Red Cross campaign this year, Mr. George W. Johnson; a man who in the midst of his ponderous responsibilities of directing a great war industry has consented to devote a part of his energies to this important Red Cross work. Good luck to you, Mr. Johnson, and may you enjoy the united support of all of us at home.

While I am on the subject of the Red Cross and nursing, I wish to direct a few remarks to the local members of the New York State Nurses Association. Some time ago you expressed to me your interest in the Bolton bill. Last week, I received a letter from Mrs. Lydia Schultz, president of Binghamton City Hospital Alumnae group who wrote, "May I ask you on behalf of the nurses, to give this measure your utmost consideration?

"We feel our professional knowledge and training are essential to the military service. Therefore, we should have full rank, the same as women of other organizations in the service."

With Miss Schultz's statement, I fully agree. You nurses have undergone many years study and training for your jobs. You have made great sacrifices to attain your goal. You must, then, be rewarded by due recognition and I pledge to you my support in your fight to bring this about.

Perhaps the foremost of all to whom honor and respect of the American people should be extended are the Gold Star Mothers. Those who have lost sons in either the First

or Second World Wars. Those great patriots are deserving of the highest possible praise we can give them.

No one but a mother can know the depth of sorrow, the degree of pain, the days and years of anguish which follow her the rest of her life after the loss of a beloved son. Only yesterday, he was, in quick succession, a toddling child, a schoolboy, a young man filled with the zest and joy and desire to live. Nothing I can point to will adequately describe the work, the sacrifice, the hopes and fears each mother endures to raise her son to manhood. Suffice it to say that her own life sinks when his death comes. The shock is numbing but the long years during which full realization of her loss starts forth are the mother's actual burdens.

To you Gold Star Mothers of my district, I say, the Hall Furlough Clubs salute you! They want you to have your just due from your fellow Americans. Of late many Gold Star Mothers have written me, asking my support of H. R. 3843 which was recently introduced in Congress. My answer to you, dear Mothers, is that I look forward to the day this measure comes before the House so that I can vote for it.

Last week, another Hall Furlough Club was organized, this time on the south side of Johnson City. The officers elected are, president, Mrs. Dorothy Orzel; vice president, Mrs. Marion Hamilton; secretary, Mrs. Robert Taylor, and treasurer, Miss Leah Carkuff.

We wish them every success and know that their sincerity of purpose, their determination to back up their fighting men on the home front, their loyalty and patriotism will serve as an inspiration for the boys who will return to them after victory is won.

Garnishment Bill—Experience of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in considering H. R. 2985 the Members will find the experiences of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. Charles B. Henderson, Chairman of the Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, dated November 13, 1943. The letter is as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, November 13, 1943.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: Reference is made to your letter of November 9, 1943, with which you enclosed copy of H. R. 2985, which, if enacted, will permit garnishment of the salaries of Federal civil officials and employees.

Prior to February 12, 1940, when the Supreme Court decided *Federal Housing Administration* v. *Burr* (309 U. S. 242), it was the opinion of our counsel that R. F. C. was not subject to garnishment, but the creditors of R. F. C.'s employees continually harassed the Corporation by having writs of garnishment served upon it. Much of the time of one lawyer was occupied in caring for such cases. The decision in the Burr case, holding that Government-owned corporations which can sue and be sued are subject to garnishment, settled the rights and liabilities of all parties, and, we believe, was advantageous to R. F. C. so far as personnel administration is concerned.

Before the decision in the Burr case, the Corporation kept no record of the number of writs of garnishment served upon it or of the number of letters received from creditors of employees requesting assistance in the collection of amounts due them by employees. Since that time the number of writs of garnishment served, in my judgment, has not increased and the volume of correspondence relating to debts of employees has almost disappeared, due to the fact that creditors of employees now have a certain remedy.

The following figures may be of assistance to you and your committee. They show the total number of garnishments for the periods stated and the number of garnishments per hundred employees:

Period	Number of garnishments	Number of garnishments per 100 employees
Feb. 12 to Dec. 31, 1940	82	4.6
Dec. 31, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1941	37	1.5
Dec. 31, 1941, to Dec. 31, 1942	75	1.4
Dec. 31, 1942, to Nov. 1, 1943	58	1.0

These figures apply only to the Washington office. We have been advised of only 20 garnishments served upon the managers of the R. F. C.'s 32 field offices. These figures indicate to us that employees, now thoroughly conversant with the fact that they must pay their bills or have their pay checks tied up by writs of garnishment, have decided that the better course is to honor their contract obligations.

The handling of writs of garnishment when they are served is quite a simple matter. The general counsel advises me that the procedure briefly is as follows:

The marshal serves the writ upon an assistant secretary, who promptly advises the treasurer and the pay-roll section of service of the writ and refers it to one of our lawyers. The lawyer communicates with the debtor and tells him that if he does not arrange with his creditor for a release of the garnishment the Corporation must file an answer in court and that his next pay check will be withheld. If the debtor obtains a release, that ends the matter. If he does not, the Corporation, after 7 or 8 days, sends a brief answer to the clerk of the court stating the amount of salary or wages then due the debtor. Thereafter the court enters a judgment of condemnation for the amount due the creditor. The clerk of the court advises R. F. C. that the judgment of condemnation has been entered and the Corporation, pursuant thereto, issues a check to the creditor for the amount of the judgment.

When the procedure has once been set up the amount of work entailed is negligible.

We trust that the foregoing gives you the information which you desire. With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Chairman.

The Lynch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Parents' Association of Public School No. 47, Bronx, N. Y., urging the speedy enactment into law of the Lynch bill, H. R. 2328:

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION OF
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 47,
Bronx, N. Y., February 21, 1944.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our interracial rally, held on Monday, February 14, 1944, the Parents' Association of Public School No. 47 and its community unanimously endorsed the following resolution:

"Whereas there is now pending in the United States House of Representatives H. R. 2328, introduced by Congressman LYNCH, which would make nonmailable all papers, pamphlets, magazines, periodicals, books, pictures, and writings of any kind containing any defamatory and false statements which tend to create hatred against any religious or racial group, and which further provides that the mailing of such false and defamatory matter is a crime subject to punishment by imprisonment and fine; be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference endorse this bill and urge the Congress of the United States to enact it into law as speedily as possible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable THOMAS G. BURCH, chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and to all members of that committee."

Respectfully,

MIRIAM G. SCHECTER,
President.

Our Military Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid article giving proper credit to the ability and gallantry of our military and naval leaders, written by John Griffin and appearing in the Boston Post of February 27, 1944.

The credit properly given by Mr. Griffin to the great leadership of Lt. Gen. George Kenney—whose outstanding ability and achievements have been given very little credit to date—is particularly pleasing to those who are aware of General Kenney's brilliant planning and leadership, and his extraordinary courage.

There are many aspects of the situation prevailing at the moment which give encouragement and satisfaction to Americans. Not the least is that which presents us a picture of the ability and gallantry of our military leaders.

For no matter what the political situation is, or has been, there has been one shining fact always visible and always valuable by way of encouragement. That is the outstanding record of our military and naval leaders since the debacle at Pearl Harbor.

North Africa was a good example. History will probably place as much emphasis on the north African invasion and final success as anything else in the war to date. For that was the turning point as far as the military and naval action is concerned.

PROVED METTLE CLEARLY

The north African invasion was certainly one of the most remarkable organizational jobs in the history of warfare. And this is a war in which organizational work is of special importance because of the tremendous distances that armies and navies and air fleets and supply ships have to travel. That is the logistics that you read about so often.

Some 850 ships were used in that invasion. Some of them sailed from England and others from the Atlantic coast ports of the United States thousands of miles away. Yet they all arrived at their rendezvous exactly on time. It was a performance which will always carry luster.

SICILIAN TRIUMPH

Then came Sicily, an even greater invasion effort and even more quickly successful. Then into Italy and the hazardous but completely successful landing at Salerno, where the Americans demonstrated their mettle again.

History may record lost political opportunities during this period, for there is pretty general agreement that the Allies were not ready, as they might have been, to take advantage of the fall of Mussolini when they might have secured Italy against the German hordes.

But there will be no dispute about the effectiveness of our military forces and their leaders. Salerno was a gamble for it was the absolute limit of range for our fighting planes operating from the bases then available. But this is a war in which daring pays off, provided it is undertaken with a full and adequate view of the possibilities.

It was then a question of time before air bases could be pushed forward in Italy so that all the area from Rome down would be within the influence of fighter planes as well as bombers. The time having arrived when another invasion from the sea could be undertaken, the military and naval leaders made their plans.

Seldom have such plans been carried out so easily and so completely as in the Nettuno landing. They were made with hardly the loss of a man and the enemy was placed in an almost impossible position.

GOOD INTELLIGENCE REPORTS

The intelligence service of the Allied forces functioned to perfection. The strike was made at exactly the right moment, for a preceding attack at Cassino had forced the Germans to bring three reserve divisions from Rome. Hardly had those divisions left the Rome area when the great landing was made at Nettuno.

Since then there has been some criticism to the effect that the Allies should have pushed on from the beachhead instead of consolidating forces there and waiting for the Germans to strike. But the criticism is probably unjustified, although the fighting leaders cannot stop now to explain their actions. Everything the Germans have thrown has been handled, and when our Army is ready to strike, you can be sure it will strike hard and successfully.

Since the defeat at Kasserine Pass in Africa, which was the first time the American troops had faced the experienced enemy, the American and British forces in Africa, Sicily, and Italy have scored many notable victories. Not only has the strategy been excellent but the leadership in the field, on the sea and in the air has been unexcelled.

The same was true in the Pacific area, where the problems are different and in many cases more difficult.

The intelligence units cannot function as well in the Pacific, and as a result of their difficulties, something like Kiska occurs. But in every instance since the Japs were definitely stopped at the Battle of Midway, our leadership has been remarkably efficient and, in most cases, inspiring.

The manner in which General MacArthur has operated, limited as he has been by the scarcity of materials and equipment and the relative scarcity of men, has aroused admiration everywhere, particularly in Australia, where the people are able to see the picture more completely.

General MacArthur, as everyone knows, was not a leading advocate of air power when the war started, but the manner in which he became swiftly and completely sold on the air arm revealed the youthfulness of his mind and his eagerness to use everything possible that would add to his fighting power.

INGENUITY SHOWN OFTEN

Lt. Gen. George Kenney, in charge of the air force in that area, proved to be one of the world's greatest airmen. His adaptability and his ingenuity in meeting new circumstances are now traditional, but his genius in pushing forward and expanding previously known uses of the airplane, has aroused interest the world over.

The record of the Navy can probably only be fully told after the war, but certainly the leadership in the Navy has made up for the blemish that Navy leadership incurred at Pearl Harbor. The admirals in the Pacific and the captains of naval vessels in that area have added glowing deeds to the great story of the American Navy.

The recent attack on Truk and the capture of several important island bases indicate that the Navy is far ahead of what was generally considered a schedule only a few months ago. The manner in which heavy blows are being struck almost daily in the central Pacific is pretty good evidence that our Navy leadership has the Japs baffled.

This is not to belittle the achievements of the enlisted man in any of the services. He needs no defense, for he, after all, is the man now upon whom victory, in the last analysis, depends. But people are so prone to criticize those at the top that it is well to look over the record and give credit where credit is due.

FULL DETAILS LATER

Of course, it is not possible to know now all that is being done by the military and naval leadership. The tremendous things that have been accomplished, for instance, in the field of air transport, have only been partly told and must await the war's end for the full story to be given.

As we move forward on the road to victory, it is well for Americans to think gratefully of those men who have the responsibility of leading our tremendous Army and Navy and air force. They have done well by their country, and will continue to do so without thought of personal glory. They rate a salute from all Americans.

Necessity for Water Conservation of the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings granted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee on February 18, 1944, to those of us that are opposed to use of the waters of the Missouri River for the purposes of navigation, without first giving consideration to the great need and prior rights which the States through which the river flows have on these waters for irrigation and reclamation, I wish to submit for the record two charts which have been prepared for me by the Department of the Interior, through the good offices of the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The first of these charts shows the annual and average flow in second-feet of the Missouri River at stations between Fort Peck Dam and Sioux City for the years ended September 30, 1929, to 1942.

The second shows the annual and average flow of the Missouri River at Sioux City, Omaha, and Kansas City, above and below Kansas River for the water-years 1929 to 1942.

These two charts contain information which should be studied by every Member of the Congress in connection with the controversy over the use of the waters of the Missouri River that will be before this body when the rivers and harbors bill and the flood-control bill are considered:

Annual and average flow in second-feet of Missouri River at stations between Fort Peck Dam and Sioux City, for the years ended Sept. 30, 1929 to 1942

Station	Below Fort Peck Dam	Wolf Point	Williston	Bismarck	Mobridge	Pierre	Yankton
Drainage area	57,800	83,200	164,500	186,400	208,700	243,500	279,500
1929	----------	8,330	23,300	25,700	26,800	[1] (30,000)	[2] (33,000)
1930	----------	7,430	19,500	20,800	21,300	22,500	[2] (24,500)
1931	----------	5,510	13,200	13,000	13,000	13,600	[2] (15,200)
1932	----------	7,510	19,300	20,700	21,300	23,000	25,400
1933	----------	7,720	19,600	21,100	20,500	22,300	24,300
1934	[3]	7,522	13,710	13,810	13,740	14,090	15,810
1935	5,691	6,177	15,730	16,030	16,510	17,450	19,620
1936	5,687	6,220	15,320	15,460	15,680	16,050	18,060
1937	4,692	4,891	14,440	16,000	15,940	17,200	19,040
1938	[4] 6,889	7,802	20,360	20,760	21,490	22,020	23,770
1939	8,776	10,300	19,990	21,170	21,940	22,510	24,360
1940	4,342	5,168	12,600	13,040	13,260	13,630	15,000
1941	4,190	4,445	14,660	15,700	16,340	17,910	19,180
1942	3,650	4,103	17,960	19,260	20,220	22,200	27,660
Average second-feet	5,490	6,652	17,130	17,970	18,430	19,680	21,780
Average acre-feet	3,975,000	4,816,000	12,401,000	13,009,000	13,342,000	14,247,000	15,768,000

[1] Flow at Chamberlain minus Bad River.
[2] Record begun November 1930. Flow estimated October 1928 to October 1930.
[3] Record begun Mar. 16, 1934.
[4] Regulation by Fort Peck Dam since November 1937.

Annual and average flow of Missouri River at Sioux City, Omaha, and Kansas City, above and below Kansas River for the water years 1929–42

Years ending Sept. 30—	Missouri River at Sioux City	Missouri River at Omaha	Missouri River above Kansas City	Missouri River at Kansas City	Kansas River at Bonner Springs
	Second-feet	*Second-feet*	*Second-feet*	*Second-feet*	*Second-feet*
1929	34,900	36,700		64,700	9,030
1930	25,500	26,300		43,200	5,420
1931	15,700	16,100		28,100	4,050
1932		27,200		48,600	6,310
1933		24,600		34,700	2,650
1934		16,210		22,500	1,547
1935		20,260		37,840	7,559
1936		19,330		29,900	3,400
1937		21,130		30,410	2,811
1938		26,280		36,920	4,319
1939	25,330	25,990		35,760	3,175
1940	15,550	16,280		22,680	1,704
1941	19,930	20,650		32,470	5,871
1942	29,250	31,510		58,820	13,260
Average second-feet	(22,520)	23,470	(32,520)	37,600	5,079
Average acre-feet	16,305,000	16,991,000	23,545,000	27,222,000	3,677,000

NOTE.—14-year average for Sioux City derived from Omaha average by the same ratio as the sum of 7 concurrent years of records.

14-year average for Missouri River above Kansas City obtained by subtracting the average for Kansas River at Bonner Springs from the average for Missouri River at Kansas City. The station at Kansas City is below Kansas River.

Mr. President, Just What Is Your Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Members of Congress at the time were very much interested in the President's spectacular meeting on the high seas with Mr. Churchill whence was announced our Atlantic Charter and our commitment for the establishment of the "four freedoms" everywhere in the postwar world. The American people and Members of Congress at the time were very much interested in the President's meeting with Mr. Churchill at Casablanca. If I recall correctly after this conference came the announcement that we were going to prosecute our war on Mr. Hitler with an immediate attack on the soft underbelly of Europe. That belly has not proven as soft as some optimists figured. To many of us at that time it seemed passing strange that the acknowledged leaders and spokesmen for two of our greatest allies in the United Nations front were not present. It has never been made exactly clear as to whether or not they were ever invited to those historic conferences. Furthermore, I do not personally recall on any occasion when either Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek or Premier Josef Stalin ever gave any assurance to the world that they subscribed to, or would follow, our post-war policy announced as in the idealistic—but hardly realistic—Atlantic Charter.

Later, of course, the American people and the Members of Congress were very much interested in the conferences Secretary Hull had in Moscow presumably with Premier Stalin. Unfortunately, I did not happen to be on the floor on the day that Secretary Hull supposedly reported to the Congress on the tangible results of those conferences, but so far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has yet learned what, if any, were those tangible results.

The American people and Members of Congress at the time were also very much amused, and to say the least somewhat entertained, by the glowing accounts coming back from that around-the-world aerial junket in an Army bomber, presumably furnished by and certainly with the approval of the White House, and seemingly enjoyed tremendously by our No. 2 world traveler and amateur statesman, "Windy" Wendell Willkie. He always has been, and still is, star gazing into the glories of a super world state of the future. Seemingly he obtained at first hand great copy for his well-bound treatise on his ideal One World. Too, he might have been preparing a script for a supercolossal motion picture to be produced by his sponsors and certainly without question with the customary handsome profit for himself. One thing we do know, that we have since had very tangible proof that seemingly he learned little of authoritative and responsible information as to the exact aims and intentions of Mr. Josef Stalin, because he has since been rather soundly spanked in public by our friend from Moscow.

Later the American people and the Members of Congress at the time were extremely interested in the spectacular conferences held by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Premier Josef Stalin. These conferences in Cairo and Tehran must indeed have been very enjoyable judging by reports which war correspondents sent to the newspapers in this country. One story told of a gay party which American and British military officers attending the Tehran Conference held at Jerusalem after the conference was over. The officers, numbering 43, consumed, we are told, 26 bottles of Scotch, 12 bottles of French champagne of 1928 vintage, 9 bottles of Chablis, 2 bottles of claret, 3 bottles of 1864 French brandy, and an unspecified quantity of sherry. Then we have reports on the food expense in connection with the Tehran Conference, From November 22 through December 7, the delegates, members of their staffs, and the troops on hand to guard them, consumed 22,000 pounds of meat, 1,000 pounds of coffee, 17,000 loaves of bread, 78,000 eggs, 1,050,000 cigarettes, 3,000 cigars, 740 pounds of tea, 5,000 cans of milk, 800 pounds of turkey, 4,000 pounds of sugar, 19,000 pounds of potatoes, 5,000 cans of fruit, and 25,000 pounds of vegetables. All rather interesting, if true.

But the interesting aftermath of the Cairo and Tehran Conferences is this, Mr. Speaker: What, if anything, tangible was accomplished? What decisions were arrived at? To what future foreign policy has Mr. Roosevelt committed us, or possibly to what future policy has Mr. Churchill inspired us?

Is it not about time that Mr. Roosevelt gave us the answer to these questions? Or has he nothing tangible and of future benefit to report to us? Witness that Russia has now dissolved itself into 16 separate republics, each of which presumably will expect a voice at the peace table and probably also on the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Council. Undoubtedly each of them eventually expect us to deal with them separately and with separate and individual representatives here in Washington. Witness the fact that Mr. Stalin has never committed himself on the unconditional surrender policy adopted and insisted upon at Casablanca. Witness that Mr. Stalin has not yet shown any inclination to support us in the war in the Pacific over which sea lanes he still obtains his Lend-lease supplies in ever-increasing quantities from our own west coast ports and entirely unhampered by our Japanese enemy's submarines roaming the Pacific. Witness that Mr. Stalin continues to overrun and has shown no inclination to grant their previous freedom to either the Balkan countries or the Baltic states. Witness Russia's and even our own attitude toward brave little Finland, one of the first countries to which we sent supplies, not in sufficient quantities to help her in her war against Russian aggression when Joey and Adolf were pals but mere dribbles of outmoded planes; Finland, the only country which has dealt more than honorably with our country in meeting every payment due on the World War No. 1 debt it incurred. Witness that Mr. Stalin has never openly informed us or the world as to just how far he intends to pursue the fleeing Germans. Witness the fact that he has declared his complete opposition to the Polish Government in exile and his own decision as to what shall be the future boundary of Poland; while at the same time our friend Mr. Churchill, and seemingly also Mr. Roosevelt, continue to enjoy the respect and confidence of that same Polish Government in exile. I do not recall that they have been too outspoken in their opposition to Mr. Stalin's establishment of the Curzon border line.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just what is the report from Tehran and Cairo, just what was actually accomplished, if anything, of a tangible nature? Why has a report so strangely been withheld from the American people and from the Congress? We all have the greatest admiration for

the success of the Russian armies, if the reports of those successes be completely factual. We can sincerely hope that they are, but remember that their glorious victories have not been witnessed by official observers of our Army or of the British Army. The stories of those victories are not written by American reporters employed by American newspapers. No, the stories are not even released by Elmer Davis' Office of War "mis" Information.

May it not be possible, Mr. Speaker, that instead of these crushing defeats reported to us daily by Pravda with the tens upon tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of German troops being slaughtered day after day that as a matter of cold truthful fact the Germans may indeed be skillfully conducting a carefully prepared strategic retreat, in order, that they may maintain their enormous armies intact? May it not be that they are so conducting themselves as to be seemingly pulling the famous football sleeper play trick upon ourselves in order that they may have these armies intact and ready to pounce upon us when, as, and if our long projected—and as announced by Mr. Churchill recently—delayed across-the-channel frontal invasion shall have begun? Remember this fact that not long ago Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Chief of our own Army Intelligence, issued a formal report to each and every Member of this House setting forth the strength of the Axis and clearly pointing out to us that Germany is stronger today by far than she was at the start of this war.

He repeated again and again that she has today more and better equipped troops in the field than she had in 1939. How can this statement by our own Chief of Military Intelligence be correlated with the summation of the enormous losses sustained by the Germans not only in the Anglo-American African and Italian campaigns and also with the tremendously more enormous losses sustained on the Russian front, as reported to us by the Red Star, Pravda and other official news organs?

How much of the four and one-half billion dollars' worth of American military matériel and American food and clothing, American trucks and airplanes have been consumed by Mr. Stalin or have been stored up by him? How many millions of dollars' worth of American industrial equipment is being carefully maintained by him to provide industrial competition with American products in the post-war world? Just how far has Mr. Stalin committed himself to cooperating with us or competing with us in that post-war world? What is the report from Tehran and Cairo? The American people have a right to know. The question has long been a timely one.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Washington Times-Herald, Mr. John O'Donnell had a very interesting column on this same subject, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his column at this point:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Those happy days are gone forever when the golden voice in the White House could intone that honeyed, "My friends * * * you know and I know," radio appeal and so bind the radio audience—and their representatives in Congress—into one big happy family, where ever-trusted Papa knew best and children shouldn't ask too many questions.

Those days have gone forever. Within the next couple of months, well before the national conventions pick their Presidential candidates, you can be certain that the now victory-flushed Congress (Democrats as well as Republicans) will do its best to force an unwilling, secret-loving F. D. R. to talk cold turkey with the citizens of the Republic about this country's war aims and peace plans.

Congress is just waking up to the fact that this Nation knows less about the specific foreign policy dictated by the White House and carried out by the State Department than do the people of Great Britain for example. In London, Prime Minister Churchill has reported to the Commons and his people definite and specific objectives—and told them he would call a halt—as liquidating any pre-war holdings of the Empire, for instance.

The present resentment in Congress is that the "Big Brain" on Pennsylvania Avenue has refused to reveal in definite terms exactly what this Nation is fighting for in Europe in terms of Europe's future and our future relations with Europe—or to state, as Wilson did in his 14 points, what the United States will demand at the peace table.

From the very start, the White House has fobbed off all specific and definite questions about war aims which come seriously from the Congress, which must ratify any peace treaty. The fobbing-off trick is usually accomplished by an eruption of pious generalities, sermonizings on the sanctity of a crusade against all evil, all tossed out in a hurricane of political "horsefeathers."

We gather that Congress is pretty weary of all this—as they are bored with listening to F. D. R.'s personal theme songs—the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," "everywhere in our time."

Congress wants Papa to put it on the line: Does the Atlantic Charter apply to Poland, Finland and the democratic nations of eastern Europe now facing the western sweep of the Communist armies? Or doesn't it? Our guess is that Congress, pounding away on this issue in the next few weeks, is going to break through the diplomatic fog pumped out from the White House.

The sustained White House determination to keep diplomacy a deep, dark secret and all American foreign policy an enigma tucked away in the circuitous brain of F. D. R. has brought some curious results. On the one hand, Director of War Information Elmer Davis has frankly stated that his big headache on the propaganda front is his inability to explain the White House foreign policy to this Nation and abroad. This rests solely on the fact that F. D. R., unlike Woodrow Wilson, has never made the specific objectives of the war definitely clear.

On the other hand, comes the case of Finland—a nation with which the United States is not at war but which, by White House order enforced by State Department decree, is strictly prohibited from even stating its case to the American people in its second defensive war against Soviet Russian aggression.

At the present time there are reports of tentative armistice proposals designed to end the Russo-Finn fighting. And there are the definite reports of last week-end's blasting of the Finnish capital Helsinki by 600 bombers of the Communist forces.

By order of Secretary Hull, Finland's Minister Procope is enjoined from issuing a statement, holding a press conference, or making a speech—so that the American people or the Congress may understand the attitude of his nation or the facts of the present conflict as the Finns understand them. The Finns are also prohibited from replying to propaganda from their enemy even when it appears on the front pages of American newspapers or is broadcast, with official O. K. over national networks.

The Finns have not complained. It wouldn't do them much good if they did. And they have the comfortable assurance that, regardless of what happens in the field of high diplomacy, they have the warm friendship of the American people—despite the surface chill of high diplomacy.

After all, it was only a few years ago when the Congress stood and cheered when a Roosevelt message pointed out that Finland, alone of all the nations in Europe, honored her war debt.

And later, in '39, when Russia, then Hitler's partner, suddenly invaded Finland, it was Franklin D. Roosevelt who proclaimed: "The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, known to you and known to all the world, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world. * * * It has invaded a neighbor—Finland—so infinitesimally small that it could do no injury to the Soviet Union, and that seeks only to live in peace as a democracy, and a liberal and forward-looking democracy at that."

Common Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I herewith include an editorial recently appearing in the Christian Science Monitor:

COMMON GROUND

Where do we go from here? The American people, settling back again after the Barkley-Roosevelt excitement, may well be giving thought to the course of their Government in the next few months. The explosion has released a great deal of pent-up steam—particularly in Congress—and should have cleared the air, particularly around the White House. The conciliatory exchange between the President and the Senator sets an example which can help to maintain some essentials of national unity in the hard days ahead.

Mr. BARKLEY, in his message to Mr. Roosevelt, said something which should be taken to heart by every citizen, every politician who may be tempted to emphasize personal or political differences:

"In this great crisis of our Nation's history we must all seek some common ground upon which we can meet and have confidence in one another."

In these days that common ground is easier than usual to find. It is the necessity for carrying on the war and the even greater task of carrying through the peace. What bedeviled the controversy between the President and Congress possibly more than anything else was suspicion on each side that the other was putting political expediency ahead of the war. Such distrust rises easily in election years and if it is not to cause worse trouble before November the people and their officials will have to show such sincere and clear devotion to the Nation's main task that even opponents can have "confidence in one another."

In the present situation the President has been more aware than Congress of the

soldiers' troubles and what unfolding military tasks will demand in the way of home-front sacrifices. Congress has been more aware of the troubles the home front has experienced and of popular discontent with administrative restrictions. Both have been very conscious of the election coming up. With the opening of the second front both may find that the best politics is not concern with personal or party victory, but single-minded devotion to victory for the Nation.

Table Showing the National Debt, 1790–1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the country's present financial situation and the Government's taxation policies, I am sure that my colleagues and the taxpayers throughout the country will be interested in the table showing the national debt of each administration from the first Presidency down to the present day, which I desire to make available to the Members with the information contained in Mr. Roy A. Foulke's informative article appearing in Dun & Bradstreet's magazine inserted herewith:

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PEACE

(By Roy A. Foulke)

With a post-war gross public debt in excess of $300,000,000,000, what will be our Federal Budget 1 year after the end of the war in the Pacific? No one knows. Estimates, however, may be made even by laymen who have carefully followed the expenditures of the Federal Government in recent years, of the financial burden which private business will be called to bear if peacetime business resumes production and distribution, banking, finance, and service under traditional rules of risk, ambition, competition, and reward.

In the first place, it is evident that the first call on our national income will be greatly multiplied interest charges. In the second place, it is evident that we shall retain a larger standing Army than during any previous peacetime period in our history. In the third place, with the mightiest navy afloat, it would seem evident that we will not repeat, at least immediately, the error of the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1922, and that the costs of maintaining and operating the greatest navy and the greatest merchant marine on the seven seas will be appreciably larger than during any previous peacetime period. In the fourth place, if the entire financial history of the United States is any criterion, it would seem evident that expenditures for pensions and for the care of veterans, within a few years, will again be headed for record expansion. In the fifth place, even though there might, by some rare chance, be a shift from the philosophy of the virtue of spending to the philosophy of Coolidge thrift in governmental operations, the great increase in civil employment and in the number of relatively new bureaus, agencies, corporate entities, and other appendages to the Federal Government will involve added costs compared with the expenses of a decade or so ago. A budget, broken down into the more important broad divisions, as of a period 1 year after the armistice in Asia, might not vary too greatly from the following estimates:

	Billions
Interest on the national debt	$7.5 to $9.0
War Department	2.0 to 4.0
Navy Department	3.0 to 5.0
Merchant marine	1.0 to 3.0
Veterans' pensions and benefits	1.0 to 2.0
Civil departments and agencies	1.5 to 2.0
Public works	1.0 to 2.0
Social security	3.0 to 14.0
Total	20.0 to 41.0

If our gross national debt does not greatly exceeded $300,000,000,000 1 year after the end of the war, the annual interest carrying charge will be about $7,500,000,000 at the average interest rate of 2½ percent. If interest rates should rise to 3 percent, the annual interest carrying charge would be in the neighborhood of $9,000,000,000, or as much as the entire operating costs of the Federal Government per year during the pre-war New Deal period, with its extensive programs of public works, relief, and social security. And that is only the initial call on taxes.

All other costs are in addition to this amount and include no estimate for the retirement of the national debt. After World War No. 1, the national debt was retired at the rate of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year during the prosperous decade of the lush twenties. In the coming post-war period, no hope for substantial retirement will exist unless the national income exceeds $100,000,000,000 per year, since a minimum of 30 percent of this income will be required merely to support the National, State, and local governments.

The estimate for the War Department is based upon the assumption that we shall maintain a standing Army of 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 men during the post-war period, or until such a time as normal intercourse among the nations may be reestablished.

The estimate for the Navy Department assumes the continued maintenance of the mightiest battle fleet in the world, and the facilities to repair and to replace naval losses faster than any other nation on the face of the earth. The post-war cost of our merchant marine, a byproduct of the war, will depend upon policies still to be decided.

Veterans' pensions and benefits are likely to double. Such expenditures slightly exceeded one-half billion dollars in 1940 and have been expanding rapidly over the intervening years. On October 27, 1943, President Roosevelt recommended that Congress set up a $1,000,000,000 post-war educational program offering vocational and academic training for 1 year to ex-service men and women.

COST OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

In the civil end of the Government the cost of the regular departments and agencies is estimated at $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 per year. The actual cost of these departments and agencies during 1942 was about $1,450,000,000.

The cost of public works of one kind or another is estimated from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. In the year before we entered the war expenditures for public works reached $950,000,000; since then spending for such purpose has tapered down to approximately one-half of this amount.

The social-security program will entail immense expenditures if the broad recommendations of the National Resources Planning Board are put into effect. The Wagner-Dingell bill proposes to extend social security to 15,000,000 persons now excluded, to include all soldiers after the war under unemployment insurance, to increase unemployment and old-age benefits, to establish national health insurance, to provide benefits for temporary and permanent disability, and to set up a unified Federal insurance system.

Before World War No. 1, during the fiscal year of 1914, the total expenditures of the Federal Government amounted to approximately $700,000,000. Ten years later, during the fiscal year of 1924, after we had thoroughly settled down following the dislocations of World War No. 1, the expenditures of the Federal Government were in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000. In contrast to these sums the minimum annual expenditures after we settle down from the dislocations of World War No. 2 will be $20,000,000,000.

Productive capital engaged in free business activity, in the production, the distribution, the financing, and the servicing of all kinds of goods is the ultimate source of all taxes, wages, salaries, rent, dividends, interest, profits, and annuities. No matter by what form savings are represented, by railroad, public utility, or industrial stocks and bonds, bank stocks, bank deposits, life insurance, or Government securities, the return flow of income can arise only out of the activity of capital. There is no other source. These broad estimates of tax requirements cover the prime minimum costs of the operation of the Federal Government; they give no consideration to the additional taxes, in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000, which must also be collected annually to support all State and local units. Here is a grand minimum total of $30,000,000,000 which must come directly or indirectly from business activity, annually.

At the end of World War No. 2, our industrial and commercial life will go through a period of dislocating readjustments, a mixed condition of economic expansion and contraction in different areas, in different industries, and affecting individual business concerns in the same industry differently. The length and the gradualness of this period will depend upon the distance between the ends of the two phases of the war, the European and the Asiatic phases; the gradualness with which war contracts are terminated by the Army, the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission; the gradualness with which our armed forces are demobilized; upon the decision as to what will be done with the tremendous inventories of war materials and supplies scattered from Attu to Guadalcanal, from Casablanca to Chunking; and the manner in which the Federal Government retires from the field of business, if it retires.

During this period of dislocating readjustments, industry will begin to produce the products on which a moratorium has existed since the early days of the war, such as houses, automobiles, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, stoves, sewing machines, hairpins, nylon hose, clocks. Our entire manufacturing capacity will not be put to work, as a peacetime economy does not consume as fast as a wartime economy which is based on production for destruction. If, however, a substantial portion of our wartime capacity is put to work and no pragmatic arrangements for supporting trade are devised, it will not take very many years for production to catch up with our needs and then, as in the past, exceed demand at the existing level of prices.

NEED FULL EMPLOYMENT

Full employment and good times, that is, a sustained level of net profits in industry and commerce, will be essential to furnish the absolute minimum of $30,000,000,000 in annual taxes which will be needed to keep our gross national debt from rising, and to support all current operating expenses of the Federal Government, State and local units. This tremendous sum includes no consideration for amortization which, heretofore, has been one of our oldest and strongest national fiscal policies.

Economists tell us that $30,000,000,000 is one-half, one-third, or one-fourth of our national income, depending upon the year of comparison. The concreteness of $30,000,000,000 is brought home more effectively by the repetition of the simple fact that the entire sum must come directly and indirectly from business.

It was important that integrated business management find the way out during the era

of the great depression beginning in 1929 when our gross national debt was $16,931,197,000; it will be many times more important for the preservation of capitalism and free enterprise for business management to find the answer to a reasonable level of sustained prosperity with little or no involuntary unemployment after this war, when our gross national debt will exceed $300,000,000,000 and when our minimum complete annual tax budget will be one-tenth of that stupendous sum.

Integrated business management failed to find the answer during the depression years and it became necessary or politic for the Federal Government to take hold. We know now with what results. The gross national debt increased, year after year, by deficit spending to the record peak up to that time of $48,978,919,000 in 1941.

In the days of the great depression, liberal economists said we could support a gross national debt of $50,000,000,000. One year after the end of World War No. 2, our debt will be at least six times that amount, and no one has or will broadcast how easily business will support such a staggering debt. The fact is, it will not be easy, and if accomplished, it will be accomplished only by harnessing the integrated ability, ingenuity, sincerity of purpose, broad-mindedness, and skill of business management in solving problems in a practical way.

The mission of making the United States the "arsenal of democracy" involved vast problems that were solved by business management. The magnitude of this over-all job is overwhelming. But it was accomplished in world record time.

When the peace finally comes over the horizon in Europe, and then in Asia, the problem of unscrambling Government and private business with Government owning one-quarter of all manufacturing facilities, the problem of disposing of plant facilities and the tremendous quantities of excess inventories, the problems incident to the termination of war contracts and of rationing, and the problems involved in demobilization, will be just as big as the earlier unprecedented problem of miracle production in world-record time. Simultaneously, there will exist the great, over-all, fundamental, post-war problem of supporting a gross national debt which was beyond all comprehension 3 years ago.

Each and every one of these problems affect business; they will affect the level of prices, the level of production, the level of prosperity with net profits or loss at the end of the fiscal year, and the level of involuntary unemployment. Today they are abstract problems. Tomorrow, they became the actual daily problems of individual business managements. Small retail stores, medium-sized wholesalers, and large representative manufacturing corporations will feel their solid impact.

If free business enterprise, directly or indirectly, foots the bill, then free business enterprise should accept the responsibility for the maintenance of the well-being of the democratic economy which it partly comprises and which it helped to create, for the broad public good, as well as for itself. That responsibility must, first of all, see that there is maintained a solid unquestioned basis for supporting a minimum annual taxation load of $30,000,000,000 with honest dollars, and second, that tangible plans are created to prevent the rise of involuntary unemployment as our huge industrial, commercial, banking, and servicing machinery is converted from war to peace. If private enterprise is not successful in organizing to carry out some such planned program, and accordingly fails to carry out some such program, the Federal Government will, of necessity, step into the picture as it did so completely in 1933, and this time, on top of a debt in excess of $300,000,000,000 and not a mere $16,185,308,000. The ceiling above this plateau is relatively low.

DEFICIT SPENDING

If deficit spending again should be allowed by Congress and by free business enterprise to raise its ugly head in the guise of maintaining necessary employment, confidence in our financial future, in the economy which provided the background for the creation of our wealth and the miracle of war production, might well be viewed with deep apprehension. Even the richest country in the world, with economic legerdemain, and legislative sophistry, cannot maintain deficit financing ad infinitum; sooner or later, the end is loss of financial control which means economic and financial calamity, or a shift toward Government ownership of the means of production.

Here is the opportunity and the challenge to integrated business management, a challenge which is greater than any that has confronted free business since the rise of the industrial revolution. Today, in the life of our country, may well be as critical in our history as were the years immediately prior to the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

The establishment of a single integrated policy-making organization within private business, comprising and representing all private business on a representative democratic basis, is essential to plan for this great objective. Such an organization would provide the medium, the technique, the means by which the immediate problems and other crucial problems, as they rise, would receive the continuous, concentrated attention of businessmen.

Business management must cope with the responsibility of another depression by the application of preventives, and an integrated policy-making organization representing all business would seem to be the logical medium through which to cooperate and to guide the energy and the potentialities of our business world to this dominant economic end. In the absence of such an organization, and with the development of a slump in business, irresistible political forces will provide additional deficit spending with concomitant greater and greater problems to business and to what, by that time, will be our debt-burdened economy.

Here is a job as fundamental in the light of our economy of free business enterprise as that solved by the 55 founding fathers who assembled in convention at Philadelphia in 1787 to give us our Constitution. We need a single-chambered council of representative policy-making businessmen, of the caliber of these great men who planned our constitutional government with such infinite care, men of wide and tried experience who will represent all business, and who will meet day after day, week after week, month after month, in continuous session; businessmen who know what the solution of vital problems means to our industrialized economy, to venture capital, to ambition, to free enterprise, to democracy, to the support of a gross national debt in excess of $300,000,000,000; men who will develop broad policies for business so there will be little or no involuntary unemployment, so that profits will be sustained, so that the level of business prosperity will not suddenly collapse.

We need a permanent council of representatives of free business enterprise that will be organized and supported by small business, big business, manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, banking, insurance, transportation, and public utilities, to solve vital business problems within business, not for the sake of business, but for what the solution of these vital problems will mean to the future happiness, welfare, and prosperity of every man, woman, and child in this great country—our United States.

The national debt, 1789–1944

President	Year	Gross national debt	Per capita debt	Significant events influencing national debt
	1789	----------	----------	
	1790	$75,880,000	$19.32	
	1791	75,463,000	----------	
	1792	77,227,000	----------	
George Washington	1793	80,358,000	----------	
	1794	78,427,000	----------	Years of organization and adjustment.
	1795	80,747,000	----------	
	1796	83,762,000	----------	
	1797	82,064,000	----------	
	1798	79,228,000	----------	
John Adams	1799	78,408,000	----------	
	1800	82,976,000	15.63	
	1801	83,083,000	----------	
	1802	80,712,000	----------	
	1803	77,054,000	----------	War with Tripoli.
	1804	86,427,000	----------	
Thomas Jefferson	1805	82,312,000	----------	
	1806	75,723,000	----------	Maritime commerce prosperity.
	1807	69,218,000	----------	
	1808	65,196,000	----------	
	1809	57,023,000	----------	Controversies with Great Britain.
	1810	53,173,000	7.35	
	1811	48,005,000	----------	
	1812	45,209,000	----------	
James Madison	1813	55,926,000	----------	War of 1812.
	1814	81,487,000	----------	
	1815	99,833,000	----------	
	1816	127,334,000	----------	Post-war spending expanding customs receipts.
	1817	123,491,000	----------	
	1818	103,446,000	----------	
	1819	95,529,000	----------	
	1820	91,015,000	9.45	Business depression.
James Monroe	1821	89,987,000	----------	
	1822	93,546,000	----------	
	1823	90,875,000	----------	
	1824	90,269,000	----------	
	1825	83,788,000	----------	
	1826	81,054,000	----------	
John Q. Adams	1827	73,987,000	----------	Expanding customs receipts.
	1828	67,475,000	----------	
	1829	58,421,000	----------	
	1830	48,565,000	3.77	
	1831	39,123,000	----------	
	1832	24,322,000	----------	
Andrew Jackson	1833	7,001,000	----------	
	1834	4,760,000	----------	Increasing sale of public lands.
	1835	33,000	----------	
	1836	37,000	----------	

The national debt, 1789–1944—Continued

President	Year	Gross national debt	Per capita debt	Significant events influencing national debt
	1837	$336,000	----------	Panic of 1837.
Martin Van Buren	1838	3,308,000	----------	
	1839	10,434,000	----------	
William H. Harrison	1840	3,573,000	$0.21	
	1841	5,250,000	----------	Period of nominal public debt.
John Tyler	1842	13,594,000	----------	
	1843	20,201,000	----------	
	1844	23,461,000	----------	
	1845	15,925,000	----------	
James K. Polk	1846	15,550,000	----------	
	1847	38,826,000	----------	Mexican War.
	1848	47,044,000	----------	
Zachary Taylor	1849	63,061,000	----------	Post-war spending.
	1850	63,452,000	2.30	
Millard Fillmore	1851	68,304,000	----------	
	1852	66,199,000	----------	
	1853	59,804,000	2.36	Industrial expansion and prosperity.
Franklin Pierce	1854	42,243,000	1.62	
	1855	35,588,000	1.32	
	1856	31,974,000	1.15	
	1857	28,701,000	1.01	Panic of 1857.
James Buchanan	1858	44,913,000	1.53	
	1859	58,498,000	1.93	Decreased customs and increase in public improvements.
	1860	64,843,000	2.06	
	1861	90,582,000	2.83	
	1862	524,177,000	16.03	
Abraham Lincoln	1863	1,119,773,000	33.56	Civil War.
	1864	1,815,830,000	53.33	
	1865	2,677,929,000	77.97	Post-war spending.
Andrew Johnson	1866	2,755,763,000	77.69	
	1867	2,650,168,000	73.19	
	1868	2,583,446,000	69.87	
	1869	2,545,110,000	67.41	
	1870	2,436,453,000	63.19	
	1871	2,322,052,000	58.70	
	1872	2,209,690,000	54.44	
Ulysses S. Grant	1873	2,151,210,000	51.62	
	1874	2,159,932,000	50.47	
	1875	2,156,276,000	49.06	
	1876	2,130,845,000	47.21	
	1877	2,107,759,000	45.47	
	1878	2,159,418,000	45.37	
Rutherford B. Hayes	1879	2,298,912,000	47.65	26 years of almost unbroken reduction in public debt.
	1880	2,090,908,000	41.69	
James A. Garfield	1881	2,019,285,000	39.35	
	1882	1,856,915,000	35.37	
Chester A. Arthur	1883	1,721,958,000	32.07	
	1884	1,625,397,000	29.60	
	1885	1,578,551,000	28.11	
	1886	1,555,659,000	27.10	
Grover Cleveland	1887	1,465,485,000	24.97	
	1888	1,384,641,000	23.09	
	1889	1,249,470,000	20.39	
	1890	1,122,596,000	17.92	
Benjamin Harrison	1891	1,005,806,000	15.75	
	1892	968,218,000	14.88	
	1893	961,431,000	14.49	
	1894	1,016,897,000	15.04	
Grover Cleveland	1895	1,096,913,000	15.91	Decreasing customs receipts.
	1896	1,222,729,000	17.40	
	1897	1,226,793,000	17.14	
	1898	1,232,743,000	16.90	Spanish-American War.
William McKinley	1899	1,436,700,000	19.33	
	1900	1,263,416,000	16.56	
	1901	1,221,572,000	15.71	
	1902	1,178,031,000	14.89	
	1903	1,159,405,000	14.40	
	1904	1,136,259,000	13.88	
Theodore Roosevelt	1905	1,132,357,000	13.66	
	1906	1,142,522,000	13.50	
	1907	1,147,178,000	13.33	
	1908	1,177,690,000	13.46	Period of public debt stability.
	1909	1,148,315,000	12.91	
	1910	1,146,939,000	12.69	
William H. Taft	1911	1,153,984,000	12.28	
	1912	1,193,838,000	12.48	
	1913	1,193,047,000	12.26	
	1914	1,188,235,000	12.00	
	1915	1,191,264,000	11.83	
	1916	1,225,145,000	11.96	
Woodrow Wilson	1917	2,975,618,000	28.57	
	1918	12,243,628,000	115.65	World War No. 1.
	1919	25,482,034,000	240.09	
	1920	24,297,918,000	228.32	
	1921	23,976,250,000	221.09	
Warren G. Harding	1922	22,964,079,000	208.97	
	1923	22,349,687,000	200.10	
	1924	21,251,120,000	186.86	The Great Prosperity.
	1925	20,516,272,000	177.82	
Calvin Coolidge	1926	19,643,283,000	167.70	
	1927	18,510,174,000	156.04	
	1928	17,604,290,000	146.69	
	1929	16,931,197,000	139.40	
	1930	16,185,308,000	131.49	
Herbert Hoover	1931	16,801,485,000	135.37	
	1932	19,487,009,000	155.93	
	1933	22,538,672,000	179.21	
	1934	27,053,085,000	213.65	
	1935	28,701,167,000	225.07	The Great Depression—Deficit spending and boot-strap financing.
	1936	33,545,384,000	261.20	
	1937	36,427,091,000	281.82	
Franklin D. Roosevelt	1938	37,167,487,000	285.43	
	1939	40,445,417,000	308.34	
	1940	42,971,043,000	325.66	
	1941	48,978,919,000	368.08	
	1942	72,495,182,000	540.68	
	1943	[1]136,696,000,000	1,007.64	World War No. 2.
	1944	[2]206,000,000,000	[3] 1,486.00	

[1] From "unrevised" Treasury figures. [2] Treasury estimate. [3] Author's estimate.

Filipino's Magnificent Creed of Resistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of the Philippines, Mr. ELIZALDE has brought to my attention an article in last Sunday's Washington Post entitled "Filipino's Magnificent Creed of Resistance." This article includes a letter written by one of the Filipino patriots, Gov. Tomas Confesor, who is now a fugitive in the mountains of the Philippines. Governor Confesor represents the real spirit of resistance to the invaders—and the spirit of friendship to America.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is so magnificent and so broad that it could well apply to the peoples of all occupied countries.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the RECORD:

DEFIANCE TO JAPANESE—FILIPINO'S MAGNIFICENT CREED OF RESISTANCE

You will note that the date on the letter printed below is February 20, 1943, which means it is more than a year old now. But it is possible that this letter never will be allowed to grow really old. Even now it is being circulated under cover within the Japanese-occupied Philippines; its circulation there most certainly will continue. And if future generations of Filipinos want to know how some heroes of their race thought and acted in a period of crisis, they can find the answer in these paragraphs.

As far as is known, this is the first time the letter has been printed in full in the United States, although reference has been made to some of its passages.

The copy below, described as an exact transcription, came through Australia. There is another version, reconstructed by passengers on the exchange ship *Gripsholm*, who were unable to take a copy of the letter itself with them.

Background and characters—Tomas Confesor, 53, who holds degrees from the Universities of California and Chicago, is author of the letters. Informed persons in this country say there is no question of the authenticity.

Confesor still is Governor of the Philippine Island of Panay. He has been an economics instructor at the University of the Philippines, a director of the bureau of commerce, and a delegate to the Philippine Constitutional Convention in 1934–35.

At the start of the war Confesor was Governor of the Province of Iloilo, largest of the three that make up Panay. He had been elected in 1937. President Quezon, using his emergency powers, appointed him Governor of the entire island for the duration. When the Japs occupied Manila, Confesor was caught there. He refused the enemy's offer to become mayor of Manila and escaped on a sailboat.

Little is made public on the extent or nature of opposition on Panay to Japanese occupation. It is emphasized that Confesor is not a guerilla. We do know that the Japanese have sent military forces against these loyal Filipinos, but that the opposition continues. We know, too, that the Japanese have made collaboration offers to the patriots, but they must have ceased them in dismay after this reply of Tomas Confesor printed below.

Mountainous Panay is no flyspeck. With its 1,291,548 souls it about equals Colorado in population; its 4,446 square miles make it nine-tenths the size of Connecticut. It is the sixth largest of the Philippine Islands. It has fishing, rice, coconuts, hemp, sugar, and lumber. Its production of pina cloth makes it important in weaving.

The other personality inescapably involved in the letter is Dr. Fermin G. Caram. His pre-war record, as available in this country, shows nothing to justify suspicion. The 50-year-old physician and surgeon had held relatively high public positions and had a reputation for integrity and ability in his private practice.

Apparently he just decided to play ball with the Japanese.

The letter indicates that Dr. Caram and several of his friends had contacted Tomas Confesor with a proposition that he cease opposition in the interests of peace and tranquillity.

Tomas Confesor's reply, addressed to his friend, Dr. Caram, tells what he thinks of this kind of peace and tranquillity. It follows in full:

COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
February 20, 1943.

MY DEAR DOCTOR: I am happy to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 14 last, signed at the same time by former General Quimbo, Senator Veloso, and Captain Tando. I regret very much that your letter reached me more than a month after it was written, despite the fact that the party to whom it was handed was just living across the river from my place on the other side of the hill. Had I received it earlier, I would have been only too glad to meet my good friends Quimbo, Veloso, and Tando.

I would have had no objection to the pleasure of the acquaintance of Colonel Furukawa. He came on a mission of peace and I would have taken advantage of his presence to present to him my views on the subject. I regret much, therefore, not to have met him. Nevertheless, I hope that he and his companions had a good time while they were in our province. I wonder how successful they have been with their mission.

I feel flattered, indeed, by your statement that should I return to the city I would bring relief, peace, and tranquillity to our people in Panay. In this regard, I wish to state with all frankness that peace and tranquillity in our country, specially in Panay, do not in the slightest degree depend upon me nor upon the Filipino people, for as long as America and Japan and their respective allies are at war with one another, peace and tranquillity will never obtain in our country nor in Panay.

This is a total war in which the issues between the warring parties are less concerned with territorial questions but more with forms of government, ways of life, and those that affect even the very thoughts, feelings, and sentiments of every man.

In other words, the question at stake with respect to the Philippines is not whether Japan or the United States would possess them but more fundamentally it is: What system of government should stand here and what ways of life, systems of social organizations and code of morals should govern our existence. As long, therefore, as America and Japan remain at war, these fundamental questions will remain unsettled. Consequently, peace and tranquillity will not reign in Panay, much less in the whole Philippines.

THERE IS A MEANS FOR PEACE

Despite this fact, however, there is a means to bring about peace even under the present circumstances if Japan is really sincere in her desire to see peace and tranquillity here. To this effect, she should declare the Philippines free and independent, proclaiming at the same time our neutrality.

To further demonstrate her sincerity of purpose to this end, she should evacuate all her forces, military establishments, and other governmental organizations from the islands with the guaranty that she would not land forces therein nor within her territorial waters.

I am sure that should Japan declare this proposition and formally present the same to the United States, the latter would be compelled to accept it. Her sense of honor would give her no other alternative but to back up Japan in this regard. You must be already aware that the Allies have signed a treaty with China lifting their extraterritorial rights whereby their citizens within Chinese jurisdiction upon committing any offense or crime will have to be tried before Chinese courts under Chinese laws.

Assuming that this proposition is acceptable to both Japan and America, we would then be free to establish and maintain our own system of government. We would be free to follow such ways of life as we may deem convenient to us. In other words, we would enjoy real and true independence in the exercise of governmental powers and not one like that of Nanking under Wang Ching Wei. Please present this to your friend Colonel Furukawa, with the request that he submit this to superior authorities of the Imperial Government of Japan for consideration to put to a test the sincerity of Japan's desire to give us independence.

I have carefully read and studied the three conditions for accomplishment by the Filipinos to entitle us to our independence under Japanese promise.

Let me tell you frankly that we will never be independent under such conditions because they are impossible of accomplishment for at least a century.

I entirely disagree with Mr. Vargas when he stated that the Japanese independence proposition is definite and clear while that of America is ambiguous. On the contrary, it is that of the Japanese which is nebulous, vague, and indefinite. The terms and conditions in this regard are phrased in such a manner that only puppets could understand them clearly, people who have no freedom to use their will and other mental faculties.

JAPS BLAMED FOR WHOLE HOLOCAUST

The burden of your so-called message to me consists of the entreaty that further bloodshed and destruction of property in Panay should stop and that our people be saved from further sufferings and miseries resulting from warfare and hostilities now obtaining between Japan and ourselves. The responsibility, however, of accomplishing this end does not rest upon us but entirely upon your friends who have sworn allegiance to Japan.

For it was Japan that projected and created these conditions. Japan is the sole author of this holocaust in the Far East.

I agree with you when you say that our people are "experiencing unspeakable hardships and sufferings" because of these hostilities, but you should realize that our people are bearing these burdens cheerfully because they know that they are doing it for a good and noble cause. They know why we are resisting Japan. They are aware that Japan is trying to force us to accept her system of government and ways of life which are unacceptable to us, to say the least. You may not agree with me, but the truth is that the present war is a blessing in disguise to our people and that the burdens it imposes and the hardships it has brought upon us are a test to our character to determine the sincerity of our convictions and the integrity of our soul.

In other words, this war has placed us in the crucible to assay the metal in our being. For as a people we have been living during the last 40 years under a regime of justice and liberty regulated only by universally accepted principles of constitutional governments. We have come to enjoy personal privileges and civil liberties without much struggle, without undergoing any pain to attain them. They were practically a gift from a generous and magnanimous people—the people of the United States of America. Now that Japan is attempting to destroy these liberties, should we not exert any effort to defend them? Should we not be willing to suffer for their defense?

If our people are undergoing hardships and are doing it gladly, it is because we are willing to pay the price of those constitutional liberties and privileges.

You cannot become wealthy by honest means without sweating heavily. You very well know that the principles of democracy and democratic institutions were brought to life through bloodshed and fire. If we sincerely believe in those principles and institutions, as we who are resisting Japan do, we should contribute to the utmost of our capacity to the cost of its maintenance to save them from destruction; the same currency that other peoples paid for those principles.

NEVER WIN WITHOUT PRINCIPLES

You were a member of the constitutional convention that adopted the constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth. You did not only subscribe to it but you became a Filipino citizen by virtue thereof.

Now that the hour of test has come, how dare you advise the people, as you do now, to forsake that sacred document and accept anything for peace and tranquillity which at all events will only be temporary?

Should I hearken to you, I would be conspiring with you and the Japanese military authorities to destroy the constitution that you and I signed with all solemnity, and everything for which that constitution stands. Do you not realize, therefore, that what you are doing now is a repudiation of your Filipino citizenship and all the sacred privileges attendant thereto, things which I am sure you hold dear and precious.

This is not enough. I firmly believe that it is not wise and statesmanly for our leaders, in this their darkest hour, to teach our people to avoid sufferings and hardships at the sacrifice of fundamental principles of government and the democratic way of life.

On the contrary, it is their duty and responsibility to inspire our people to willingly undergo any kind of difficulties and sacrifices for the sake of noble principles that they nourish deep in their hearts. Instead of depressing their patriotic ardor, the people should be inspired to be brave and courageous under all kinds of hardships and difficulties in defense of what they consider righteous and just.

We shall never win nor deserve the esteem and respect of other nations if we lack principles, and if we do, we do not possess the courage and valor to defend those principles at any cost. Undoubtedly if you and your fellow puppets are today receiving a certain degree of consideration from the Japanese Army, such consideration may be attributed exclusively to the heroism of our soldiers in Bataan and the demonstration of the readiness and willingness of our people to suffer—especially of the common man, not the rich, the learned, and ambitious and crooked politicians and office seekers who are hungry for power and influence—not to your personal qualities or wealth.

You, puppets, love ease and comfort so much as to compel you to barter the liberties of our people for anything. You underrate the nobility and grandeur of the character and soul of the Filipinos by such action. Such sentiment is terribly ignominious. You are besmirching by the maximum degree by it the character of our people.

DEMOCRACY CONDEMNED BY JAPAN

America is at war with Japan not because she wants to keep the Philippines but to uphold and maintain the principles of democracy therein. In the speeches of Japanese military authorities, especially that of General Homma, formerly commander in chief of the Japanese imperial forces in the Philippines, they condemned democracy and the principles of liberty under such a system of government.

It is, therefore, evidently fallacious and insincere on your part to state that you are not pro-Japanese when you are exerting all efforts to bring about the surrender of the people in Panay.

You declared that you are neither a pro-Japanese, not a pro-American, but a pro-Filipino. What do you mean by being a pro-Filipino? What are the principles for which you stand as a pro-Filipino? What national objectives do you have in mind when you expressed the thought that you are a pro-Filipino and not a pro-Japanese, not a pro-American? What ideals do you propose to realize as pro-Filipino?

If you have any objectives, any ideals at all, do you believe in realizing them more effectively under a totalitarian and absolute system of government than under a democracy? Please make concrete specifications of your being a pro-Filipino as against being pro-Japanese or pro-American. In other words, on what concrete grounds does your pro-Filipinoism rest?

You were decidedly wrong when you told me that there is no ignominy in surrender. That may be true in the case of soldiers who were corralled by the enemy consisting of superior force with no way of escape whatsoever. For when they gave themselves up they did not repudiate any principle of good government and the philosophy of life which inspired them to fight heroically and valiantly, to use your own word.

Should I surrender, however, and with me the people, by your invitation and assurance of guaranty to my life, my family, and those who follow me, I would be surrendering something more precious than life itself: the principles of democracy and justice and the honor and dignity of our people.

I noted that you emphasized in your letter only peace and tranquillity of our people. I do not know whether by omission or intentionally you failed to refer in any way to the honor and dignity of our race. You seem to have forgotten these noble sentiments already, despite the fact that Japan has hardly been a year in our country.

It appears clearly evident, therefore, that there is a great difference between the manner you and we are using in trying to lead our people during these trying days. You and your fellow puppets are trying to give them peace and tranquillity by destroying their honor and dignity, without suffering, or if there is any, the least possible. On the other hand, we endeavor to inspire them to face difficulties and undergo any sacrifice to uphold the noble principles of popular rule and constitutional government, thereby holding up high and immaculate their honor and dignity at the same time. In other words, you are trying to drive our people to peace and tranquillity on the road of ignominy, to borrow your own language.

RECALLS LINCOLN'S ATTITUDE

Peace and tranquillity are easy to achieve if you choose the easy way, but in that case, however, you would be living beneath the dignity of a human being. You would be reducing our people as a result thereof to the status of a dumb animal like the good carabao, which lives in peace and tranquillity because it is properly fed by its owner. Is that the peace and tranquillity you are talking about—that of a carabao? Would this not be clearly ignominious?

You also brought up the point that the Japanese are generous because they freed the Filipino soldiers whom they captured. In this connection let me ask you this question: Is it not a fact that the former U. S. A. F. F. E. men are now working as P. C. under the Japanese Army—are compelled to fight and kill their own people who are resisting by means of inadequate arms and by moral and spiritual resistance?

Do you believe it dignified of Juan Quimbo, who formerly wore on his shoulders the star of the Philippine Army, representing thereby the valor and courage of our people, and the integrity of our system of government, to preach now the acceptance of the totalitarian and autocratic form of government? Do you believe that by so doing he dignifies and honors our people?

DESCRIBES USE OF FORCE BY LINCOLN

It pains me to read your letter saying that you and I at one time nursed devotedly identical convictions on democracy and liberty, but that you have to revise your own for the sake of peace and tranquillity.

How can you honestly and truthfully say that you may enjoy peace and tranquillity when you are unfaithful to your own convictions? Do you mean to tell me that you have revised your convictions because you believed that you were not righteous or because you considered your personal convenience over and above that of the Filipino people?

You may have read that story of Lincoln who held firmly to the conviction that the secession of the Southern States from the Northern was wrong. Consequently, when he became President and the Southern States seceded he did not hesitate to use force to compel them to remain in the Union. The immediate result was civil war that involved the country into the throes of a terrible armed conflict that, according to reliable historians, produced proportionately more loss of lives, hardships, and miseries than the First World War. The sufferings of the people of the South were terrible but the Union was saved and America has become thereby one of the strongest and most respected nations on the surface of the earth.

If Lincoln had revised his convictions and sacrificed them for the sake of peace and tranquillity as you did, a fatal catastrophe would have befallen the people of America.

With this lesson of history clearly before us, I prefer to follow Lincoln's example than yours and your fellow puppets. In other words, I sternly refuse to revise my own convictions for the sake of temporary and false promises of peace and tranquillity.

I wish to thank you for reminding me what General Bell wrote to Mabini that "the possibility of success is the sole justification of a war and as soon as that possibility disappears, civilization demands that for the sake of humanity the vanquished should submit to the victor."

In calling my attention to the above contents of the letter of General Bell, you make the affirmation thereby that there is no possibility of success on the part of America and the Allies to defeat Japan and her colleagues. Here again you are evidently wrong. You people who have surrendered to the Japanese do not know of any news but that given by them to you. It shows again that you are ignorant of what is going on.

For your information and guidance, let me tell you that Japan is digging her grave deeper and deeper every day in New Guinea.

In China and in Burma she is on the run and is losing extensive territories which she formerly conquered.

In Europe, Germany is in flight, pursued by the Russians.

In Africa, Tripoli and Tunisia have fallen into the hands of the Allies. Every day the cities of Italy are being bombed and smashed to pieces. The Italians will soon demand for separate peace.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—While Tripoli fell on January 22, 1943, Confesor was misinformed on the fall of Tunisia. Organized resistance there did not cease until May 13.]

By June next the Philippines will be redeemed from Japan definitely. What are you going to do next—revise your convictions again? Thank you once more for reminding me of the words of General Bell to Mabini. They served to fortify my convictions more than ever, for the possibility of success of America and the Allies over the Axis is as clear as the day.

"NOT—AS LONG AS I CAN STAND"

I hope I have made myself clear enough to make you understand my position. I will not surrender as long as I can stand on my feet. The people may suffer now and may suffer more during the next 6 months. The use of the words of St. Paul, the Apostle:

"The sufferings of the present are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that shall be revealed in us."

In the language of a wise and devout priest:

"When the hour of deliverance has come, we shall count as nothing the anxiety and sorrows through which we have passed."

According to the same religious writer, "sufferings afford opportunity for the practice of many virtues—virtues which develop greatness and nobility of soul." He further declares that "The grandest music of the human heart breaks forth in the day of trial; the sweetest songs are sung in sorrow; the best things in character are developed in the time of affliction."

Finally he writes, "Suffering develops manliness and tries earnestness of purpose." This is the crying need of the hour—manliness.

With my kindest regards and may God bless and guide you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

TOMAS CONFESOR,
Governor.

Soldier Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 25, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

REPRESENTATIVE RANKIN REFUSES A BRIBE

Representative RANKIN'S refusal to accept the so-called compromise on soldier voting, which would have removed restrictions on the poll tax, but would have retained the unconstitutional Federal ballot, was a refusal of a bribe offered him and other Congressmen from the poll-tax States.

Opposition to the Federal ballot scheme comes from all those who see clearly that the bobtailed Federal ballot is an open violation of the constitutional mandate that vests control of the election of the President in the State legislatures. The Constitution says:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof shall direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which that State may be entitled in the Congress." There is no getting around this language.

There is no room for Federal action. Only the State legislatures can give lawful ballots to soldiers.

The offer to Representative RANKIN was an effort to split the opposition to the Federal ballot by placating its opponents from the poll-tax States. What Mr. Roosevelt said to these Representatives, through his spokesman, Representative WORLEY, was in effect this: "You may go ahead and disfranchise Negro voters and poor whites as you have in the past, through the poll tax, if you will permit me to steal the election with my unconstitutional ballot and my hand-picked ballot commission."

Representative RANKIN did not fall. No other Member of Congress who takes seriously his oath to defend the Constitution can fall. There can be no compromise with a proposal to violate the Constitution, whatever specious arguments of expediency may be advanced.

The framers of the Constitution did not vest control of Presidential elections in the States by mere accident. They foresaw that if a national administration could control Presidential elections it could perpetuate itself in office, regardless of the will of the majority. That is exactly the circumstance that has come about today. Mr. Roosevelt's maneuvers are a confession that he must steal the election to stay in office.

This self-styled liberal has now demonstrated that he is willing to disfranchise Negro voters if that will help accomplish his end. He had previously shown that he was not interested in soldiers voting. The action of his Secretaries of War and the Navy, in sabotaging the 1942 voting bill, was proof of that. Mr. Roosevelt doesn't want a Federal ballot merely that soldiers may vote, or he would accept the workable plan to have them vote, legally, through State absentee ballots. He wants a Federal ballot, and a ballot commission of his own selection, so that he can steal the election.

The Home-Front Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial, Workers Have Won the Home-Front Battle, which appeared in the January 19, 1944, edition of the Toledo Times:

WORKERS HAVE WON THE HOME-FRONT BATTLE

It is time to call the hand of those who complain about production. The figures will not bear them out.

President Roosevelt promised to produce 50,000 war planes a year. The figure has been doubled.

The Axis laughed at us and jeered with "too little and too late." They said the decadent democracies would neither work nor fight. What a bad guess that was!

In 2 years our production-equipped armed forces of 10,000,000 men and women, with enough left to help England and Russia. No one can laugh that off.

In the 2 years the United States has produced more fighting equipment than the Axis Nations had produced in 7 to 10 years.

Our production index rose to 665 last November as compared with 100 in November of 1941. More than six times the results, with fewer men employed, should show the Axis the kind of stuff Americans are made of.

Our workmen built the most powerful Navy in the world and 26,000,000 tons of shipping to bridge the oceans.

The American workmen have tackled the war-production job with such tenacity that some industries already want to cut back to part-time civilian production to keep their men busy. They are not doing this in Europe. Even our allies are amazed.

There has been a drastic cut in the production of tanks and small-arms ammunition. About the only fields in which there are increased schedules are aircraft tonnage and artillery ammunition. The rest are leveling off or cutting back.

Even Great Britain and Russia have not matched American production energy and organization—and output. They still are straining at their production schedules while America is knocking virtually every production record into a cocked hat.

In fact, American workmen have hit their production schedules so hard they have equipped the armed forces with enough equipment to win almost before the big fight has started. Achieving this amazing feat since Pearl Harbor is something to shout about in any man's language.

The war is not over. And we have not produced all we are going to need. But from scratch this country has turned out the greatest mass-production feat the world has ever seen. American workmen did that, our neighbors, those men who crowd the busses and the streetcars at the end of every shift, did the job.

There have been some rough spots. There have been some unfortunate experiences. There have been a few bad boys. There has been some selfishness—you know, "pay me more or I won't work." That sort of unpleasantness may have marred, but did not halt American production.

Most American workmen have the hang of it. They know they are fighting a war just as much as if they were spraying lead at the enemy from the slit trench. Instead, they do their fighting at an oil-soaked workbench, and virtually all of them do it well.

Hats off to the American workmen. They have won the first major battle of the war—the battle for production on the home front.

Tucumcari Irrigation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has repeatedly approved funds for the construction of Conchas Dam in New Mexico, and we are all happy that that splendid structure is finished and doing its job in the prevention of floods.

However, it is an economic waste in these days when food is so essential to allow this great reservoir to be filled with water and that water, in turn, not be put to beneficial use. This Congress has voted funds for the completion of the irrigation project at Tucumcari. Money was made available in the last Interior Department appropriation bill and we were all hopeful that the work would get under way. It has not and the people of New Mexico, particularly those in the vicinity of Tucumcari, are deeply disappointed. Worst of all, we are unable to understand why so many other projects have been approved by the War Production Board while this one, so close to completion, still hangs in the balance.

It is my purpose, MR. Speaker, to devote an extraordinary amount of time to this problem in the next 3 weeks. I see no valid reason for any further delay. I know that every Member of the New Mexico congressional delegation has militantly advocated the completion of the Tucumcari project as an aid to the war effort and I think our labors should now result in some action.

Last week the Kiwanis Club, of Tucumcari, N. Mex., passed a resolution, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

Whereas we understand there is now pending in the War Food Administration, among other projects, proposals to establish war food projects, a proposal to set up the Federal Tucumcari project; and

Whereas development of the Tucumcari project is approximately one-half completed and offers many attractive features not only in producing food for war needs but for the future stability of economic conditions in this portion of New Mexico; and

Whereas the War Department, in the construction of the Conchas Dam, has provided the storage facilities for the Tucumcari project water supply, which has been full and overflowing for nearly 3 years; and

Whereas the city of Tucumcari has not been supplied with any appreciable war effort projects; and

Whereas the irrigation development of 45,000 acres surrounding our city will increase the resources of the county, in that the livestock industry will be protected by providing adequate feed food and eliminate the necessity of shipping feeders to distant points as has been done in the past; and

Whereas this will ease up the use of rail and trucking facilities during the war and for all time; and

Whereas the development of these 45,000 acres of fertile irrigable lands should provide farm homes for 600 or 700 families as well as provide critical food feed for our people, which should double the present population of the city of Tucumcari; and

Whereas the immediate development of the project in its present state of large ownerships will place the land in good shape for post-war settlement and provide attractive developed lands for our returning service men and women; and

Whereas the completion of the irrigation project will provide and furnish adequate and plentiful water for the use of the inhabitants of the city of Tucumcari and for the operation of the railroads that operate through said city; and

Whereas the people of Tucumcari and Quay County, in addition to fulfilling their patriotic duties by furnishing their sons and daughters to the armed forces, providing labor for war industries elsewhere, and exceeding their quota by purchasing War bonds and stamps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the directors of the Kiwanis Club of Tucumcari, N. Mex., are wholly in favor of immediate reopening of construction of the Tucumcari project, and hereby petition New Mexico's delegation in the Congress of the United States, Hon. Carl A. Hatch, Hon. Dennis Chavez, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, and Hon. A. M. Fernandez, and Gov. John J. Dempsey, officials of the War Food Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the War Production Board, to use all effort in proceeding with the final

consideration of the proposed war food development of the Tucumcari project.

Dated at Tucumcari, N. Mex., this 24th day of February 1944.

N. PARKER,
President, Kiwanis Club.

Attest:

NEWT A. GETTINGS,
Secretary.

Disposition of Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H. R. 4281, a bill to authorize the disposition of excess Government food stocks and related products.

As secretary of the Committee of Forty-eight Interested in Food Production, composed of 1 Representative from each of the 48 States, and as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have acquired considerable information that prompts me to believe that the need for such a bill exists and will exist in a much greater degree during the year immediately following cessation of hostilities.

The purpose of this bill is to afford protection to producers, labor, and the food industry, to assure adequate food production, to protect and stimulate small business and support farm prices, and to provide the orderly and equitable distribution or disposition of excess food. Such food should be disposed of by a single agency of the Government in an orderly and equitable manner through established and recognized channels of distribution; i. e., the War Food Administration.

The bill does not affect existing laws allowing 85 to 90 percent loans on certain agricultural products.

There is no conflict with the John Hancock-Baruch plan.

The bill further provides that the Administrator shall appoint a coordinating committee of not less than 15 persons who shall be representatives of food processors, food distributors, agricultural producers, and such other interests as the Administrator may deem appropriate and the chairman of such advisory committee, shall become ex officio member of the coordinating committee.

I have conferred with representatives of all wholesale and retail food and processing groups and this bill meets with their approval, after careful study of the original bill and revision in its present form.

Likewise, the terms of the bill meet with the approval of the War Food Administration officials.

The expiration date of the proposed act is fixed as June 30, 1946.

I shall confer with farm leaders, labor leaders, and consumer groups. I feel that the provisions of the bill will meet with their wholehearted approval.

I am a Democrat; however, this is a nonpartisan matter in which we are all interested; therefore, I hope some Republican Member will introduce a similar bill.

I understand that Senator MEAD will introduce a companion bill in the Senate.

I trust that the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee will secure a report on the bill and hold hearings in the immediate future.

Calculated Deliberate Assault on the Integrity of Every Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotations from well-known newspapers and commentators regarding the President's tax veto message and attack on the Congress.

There has been a good deal of guesswork in the Congress and in the press as to the authorship of the veto message. According to Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, United Press staff correspondent, in a statement appearing in the Washington Daily News on February 28, 1944, Judge Samuel Irving Rosenman is identified as the author of both the tax veto and soldiers' vote "fraud" message to the Congress.

I agree with what Mr. Pegler and Mr. Kent have to say about these messages as being intemperate, abusive, and insulting, and constituting a deliberate attempt to undermine the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives and our republican form of government.

This issue transcends all party lines. These attacks on Congress must cease, and if continued the American people will know that it is a brazen attempt by the Communist and radical elements associated with the New Deal to destroy our representative and constitutional form of government and set up a dictatorship in the United States. Senator BARKLEY was right when he denounced the tax veto message as a "calculated, deliberate assault on the integrity of every Member of Congress."

I would also like to point out one phase of the tax bill veto which has been overlooked or obscured in the controversy over the attack on Congress. Did not the President know that if the tax bill was not enacted into law, millions of American wage earners with incomes less than $3,000 would have to pay 1 percent more per year for their social security? The bill as written by the Congress froze the social-security tax at 1 percent, whereas if the President's veto had prevailed this tax would have been doubled. Why place additional burdens on those least able to pay?

The increased cost of living and of taxes is already affecting the standards of living of the middle class, small storekeepers and professional men and women, the white-collar employees, school teachers and civil-service groups, the farmers, and wage earners both organized and unorganized. The New Deal spenders are squandering the social-security funds for other purposes. It is a form of embezzlement, by spending the 1-percent contributions of the workers and employers while pretending to create a social-security reserve. It must be evident by now that the American wage earners are being grossly deceived by the manipulation and misappropriation of the social-security-reserve funds for general Government expenditures.

The action of the Congress in overriding the veto by a vote of 3 to 1 clearly demonstrates that it will no longer stand for usurpation, domination, and dictatorship by President Roosevelt or any other Chief Executive. From now on the Congress will exert its constitutional rights, duties, and power to legislate for the American people.

The articles referred to follow:

ROSENMAN AUTHOR OF "DYNAMITE" THAT SET OFF TAX VETO REVOLT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Judge Samuel Irving Rosenman was reliably identified today as the author of the veto and soldier-vote messages which accused Congress of seeking to give tax relief to the greedy and of fraud. Rosenman is the White House legal aide, an old New York associate of President Roosevelt, who may become the newest White House whipping boy. Republicans, taking Democratic protests at their face or political value, already are accusing Mr. Roosevelt of being ill-tempered, abusive, intemperate, and violent in his relations with Congress.

These complaints from Democrats, including Senate Majority Leader BARKLEY, already have been fired back at the President by Wendell Willkie and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK (Republican, Indiana), chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. The Democrats may be compelled to spotlight Rosenman as author of the offending message to divert the Republican attack.

COMPOSE DIFFERENCES

BARKLEY, who resigned the leadership in protest against Rosenman's tax veto effort, called it a "calculated deliberate assault on the integrity of every Member of Congress."

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

KANSAS CITY, February 28.—There is no excuse for anyone to believe that President Roosevelt has learned a lesson from his fracas with "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY. There was no indication of reform in his telegram. He just realized that he laid the whip a little too heavily on an old servant who then blew the job and threatened to picket the premises. The original insult to Congress was written with deliberate intent. He meant to insult Congress, and he did; nor was this the first time, a recent similar instance being his charge of fraud in the controversy over the soldiers' vote.

Before that, he had threatened to take action himself if Congress failed to pass a law to his liking by a certain dead line and before that he had, by stealth, attempted to impose a $25,000 limitation on the salaries of civilians unconnected with the war effort or any

public project, after Congress had deliberately and pointedly refused to comply with a suggestion first tossed off by Mrs. Roosevelt, who may or may not have known that it had been an article in the platform of the Communist Party.

Of course he wanted to insult Congress. what other regard would he have for a body which early in his rule, delivered itself into a condition of helplessness, servility and mockery by handing him, without restriction, billions of dolars in the naive belief that he would hold himself above politics in its distribution?

The return of manhood and civic decency to Congress has been slow. And, to the credit of the House of Representatives, it must be acknowledged that the House was the first to pass a number of bills in defiance of the White House and the entire Fascist movement in Washington 2 years ago, only to be strangled in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. But the House, too, had been bad enough and had earned over a number of years of miserable and corrupt betrayal of the whole American concept of government that contempt which Mr. Roosevelt revealed in the "take a law" days.

This rebellion against the New Deal and pointedly against the sneering arrogance of the Treasury has been long overdue. But its effect will be lost if any important section of Congress permits itself to be seduced again by the back-slapping which has followed. The whole history of the Roosevelt Administration stands against any hope that the dominating personality and his ideological advisers and coaches have the slightest respect for the constitutional status of the legislature.

Mr. Roosevelt gave orders to Congress too long to be able to change now. He just doesn't think that way.

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is entirely accurate to say that Mr. Roosevelt emerges from the tax bill veto incident with diminished prestige, damaged in Congress and in the country. For the first time his own leaders really revolted. Few will miss the significance that the only Senators who failed to join in the tribute to Senator BARKLEY after his sensational speech were four who, distinctly, are not among our first—or even our second—grade statesmen.

From whatever angle the performance is viewed, no credit attaches to the President—and almost none is claimed for him by the pro-Roosevelt publications and commentators. There was so little to say in defense that mostly they were silent. Detached judgment generally is that the message was one of Mr. Roosevelt's major mistakes. Even if he had had right on his side, the long delay in acting would have cost the Treasury many millions in taxes that could have been collected and are now irretrievably lost. But he did not have right on his side. Inadequate as the bill concededly is, the reasons he gave for the veto were unsound; the facts, as he presented them, were twisted; his own words and his own Secretary of the Treasury were repudiated by some of his own statements.

In addition, his language was violent, badtempered, indefensible. Phrases such as "not for the needy, but for the greedy" did not make sense. Most of the phraselogy is attributed to ex-Judge Sam Rosenman. Only two deductions seem possible from this one—first, that Mr. Roosevelt was confused in his mind, did not know the facts and was badly advised; second, that, as Senator BARKLEY declared, this was a "calculated assault upon the integrity of every Member of Congress," for campaign purposes. In brief, it was fourth-term strategy, designed to discredit Congress in the country.

Not the least interesting part of the affair was the President's telegram after the Senate demonstration. It was a retreat. He said he did not mean it—that he had not the slightest intention of reflecting upon "Dear Alben" or any other Member of Congress. He pled with the indignant Senator. He was apologetic in tone, clearly alarmed and in complete contrast to his abusive message. As for the effect upon the coming campaign, no one can be sure about that. Certainly, it has done Senator BARKLEY, a candidate for reelection, good. One of the primary candidates against him has withdrawn in his favor. Today he appears a self-respecting man instead of an administration tool whose abject devotion made him an object of derision and whose sufferings, when compelled to advocate proposals in which he did not believe, aroused both pity and contempt. Of course, it is absurd to start a Presidential boom for Senator BARKLEY just because he showed there was a limit to what he would stand. And it is not likely he will stay indignant with an apologetic President. His letter of reply shows that.

However, notwithstanding assurances of his affection and his adulatory wish for future cooperation, he will never return to his former slavish attitude. For one thing, his reelection to leadership relieves him of all obligation to Mr. Roosevelt, enables him to talk to him on even terms—not as a job-holding subordinate. And Mr. Roosevelt will not treat him again as though he were a high-class old family servant—a habit he has with the faithful—and which, strangely enough, some seem to like. Concerning the effect upon the fourth-term prospects, there are two views.

One is that no President can make a mistake like this and receive such a rebuke without losing political strength. The other is that the only voters who will be alienated are the discerning and intelligent. But, it is argued, he alienated 90 percent of those long ago, and the great unthinking masses who constitute the chief Roosevelt strength will not be affected. Either view may be right, but certainly that accumulation of resentments, which is the real danger to the man who tries to hold on too long, has been added to.

Probably the most pregnant thing is the convincing demonstration that Mr. Roosevelt has completely lost control of Congress—lost control of a Congress in which his own party has a majority—lost control of his own selected leaders; lost it publicly and humiliatingly. With the trend strongly toward a Republican House, it seems impossible now to believe that should Mr. Roosevelt be reelected he would have a Congress he could lead, boss, or cajole. If he cannot do it with this Congress, he certainly will not be able to do it with the next. And that, of course, means governmental paralysis. It is the strongest argument against the fourth term.

Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt's veto of the tax bill and the resulting resignation and reelection of Senator BARKLEY as majority leader are viewed by many commenting editors as marking an end to White House domination of Congress and diminishing the President's chances for a fourth term.

While "not gladdened by this strife," the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer says that "if the incident serves to impress upon Mr. Roosevelt a more wholesome respect for congressional independence, it will have helped all around."

"In vetoing the tax bill, President Roosevelt just about committed political suicide," says the Denver Post.

Commenting that the "ire in Congress is justly drawn," the Portland Oregonian agrees with Senator VANDENBERG that the President "is running for relection on an anti-Congress platform."

"The chances of the Democrats for victory have been markedly reduced, whether or not Mr. Roosevelt runs," says the Richmond Times-Dispatch, while the Kansas City (Mo.) Times regards the veto as "political, rash, and impulsive, and a calculated assault upon Congress and designated to create disunity."

Congress Gains New Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 25, 1944:

CONGRESS GAINS NEW PRESTIGE

The Democratic Members of the Senate have given Mr. BARKLEY a resounding vote of confidence and by the same token have recorded an equally resounding vote of no confidence in Mr. Roosevelt. There seems to be little doubt that today the Senate will override the veto of the tax bill by a majority as impressive as yesterday's 3 to 1 division against the President in the House, where he was able to muster fewer than 100 votes in nearly 400.

It is no exaggeration to say that now, for the first time in nearly 7 years as majority leader in the Senate, Mr. BARKLEY commands the respect of most of his following. He got that way by a show of self-respect and more especially by a valiant defense of the legislative branch of Government against a bitter and ill-considered attack on it by the President.

In the controversy arising from the veto Congress has overwhelming popular support. The people have been waiting for the day when their representatives in the legislative branch would throw off the yoke and had almost despaired that this day would ever dawn. Now that it is here the people hope that Congress will retain the initiative, guard its constitutional prerogatives, and carry on the fight for the Republic against the machinations of the men here and abroad who have been leading the country toward dictatorship.

Congress has been the butt of many jokes and the object of much abuse, but today it stands before the country with greatly enhanced prestige. It can hold it and build on it only if the Members continue to think and act for themselves. A subservient Congress is worse than useless if only because it preserves the form but not the substance of representative government and by doing so destroys the people's belief that they are the sovereign.

If the new spirit of independence holds Congress can work a vast improvement in the Government of this country, freeing it from the control of the bureaucracy that has hampered the prosecution of the war and bedeviled the citizens with senseless regulations. Congress can do that if it will. Mr. Roosevelt's savage veto message has united the Members and aroused a spirit of cooperation between the opposing parties that may bear fruitful results.

Mr. Roosevelt himself appears to be somewhat chastened, though it is too much to hope that the rebuke he has received will have more than a temporary effect. His letter to Mr. BARKLEY showed the President in

full retreat. The tone was wholly defensive, in contrast to the aggressively insulting quality of the veto message. He had had no idea that he was impugning the honor of Mr. BARKLEY and his colleagues. Nothing was further from his thought. He hoped that the Senator would resume his leadership. Mr. BARKLEY had used harsh terms in his denunciation of the veto, but Mr. Roosevelt, who is usually unforgiving, was more than eager to appease and conciliate.

Congress clearly has the upper hand today. The country prays that Congress will keep it.

Dewey Obtains 48 Percent of Republican Vote in New Midwestern Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the largest daily newspaper in five Midwestern States, the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has just completed a comprehensive and carefully conducted personal poll of political sentiment in South Dakota. I am incorporating the results in the RECORD herewith as a matter of public interest.

ROOSEVELT LOSES 31 PERCENT SINCE 1940

One of the significant features of this vote is the fact that President Roosevelt's strength has slumped by 31 percent since the last election. Inasmuch as South Dakota earned the honor of being designated "the most Republican State in the Union" in the last election by giving the Republican candidate for President the largest percentage of votes of any State, it is indeed indicative of the swing away from the New Deal to realize that this Republican tide has further reduced the Roosevelt showing by 31 percent.

Ten years ago, South Dakot was 100-percent Democratic in its political voting with a Democratic Governor, two Democratic Senators, and a 100-percent Democratic representation in the House. It begins to look as though the independent and clear thinking people of South Dakota who were the first in the Nation to revolt against the totalitarian trends of the New Deal and start returning Republican majorities in 1936 will once again in 1944 pace America in its victory drive away from the reactionary political monopolies established under the tory New Deal generalissimos who disguise themselves behind the camouflage language of "liberals" while practicing the concepts of centralized political powers which bona fide liberals throughout the ages have consistently opposed.

The matter referred to follows:

DEWEY OBTAINS 48 PERCENT OF REPUBLICAN VOTE IN STATE-WIDE POLL—WILLKIE RUNS SECOND WITH 22 PERCENT—STASSEN, MACARTHUR, BRICKER FOLLOW—ROOSEVELT DOWN FROM 1940

(By the Poll Editor)

In a final compilation of returns today in the Argus-Leader Presidential poll, conducted throughout the State the past 2 months, Gov. Tom Dewey was shown to have 48 percent of the votes cast for the five most prominently mentioned candidates for the Republican nomination for President.

DEWEY CLIMBS

Favorite from the start, the Governor has climbed from a 43-percent lead early in January as more polls were taken among various groups and organizations.

On the Democratic side President Roosevelt drew 95 percent of the votes.

That the President is not as popular as he was in South Dakota in 1940 is indicated by the announced intention of a large number marking ballots to desert the Democratic column in favor of some Republican candidate in 1944.

F. D. R. LOSES 31 PERCENT

It was indicated that Roosevelt has lost 31.3 percent of his 1940 strength in South Dakota. It will be remembered that he failed to carry the State at that time, Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate, getting the largest percentage of votes here of all the States which went Republican.

Willkie, titular head of the party, now takes second place in popularity in his party. The Argus-Leader poll shows he gained only 22 percent of the votes cast for the five most prominently mentioned Republicans.

Third place goes to Stassen, with 16 percent of the vote, fourth to MacArthur with 9, and fifth to Bricker with 5 percent.

A number of persons chose not to name their candidates, but merely indicated they would vote for whatever Democratic or Republican candidate were nominated.

A total of 78 different groups and organizations, representing both sexes and all walks of life in different parts of the State were polled by Argus-Leader employees or friends. The purpose of this sampling was to determine, as a matter of reader interest, the trends of political thought in this election year.

GRAND TOTALS LISTED

Tabulations show the following grand totals:

Republican: Bricker, 101; Dewey, 922; MacArthur, 175; Stassen, 300; Willkie, 430; unnamed, 4; Hurley, 1; Landon, 3; Johnston, 36; Taft, 4; Vandenberg, 4; Hoover, 5; Martin, 1; MacNider, 1; Brewster, 1; Marshall, 1; Eisenhower, 1.

Democratic: Roosevelt, 471; Hull, 1; Byrd, 8; unnamed, 10; Berry, 1; Wheeler, 4.

Shift: Democrat to Republican, 197; Republican to Democrat, 28.

Is Centralized Government Destroying Local Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio discussion:

CONGRESSMAN DISNEY OPENS

The question would seem to answer itself if we look about us or study current or past history. Centralized government is the antithesis of local democracy. Statism is the antithesis of individual freedom. Centralized government is the pattern of totalitarianism or the authoritarian state. Obviously, statism and local self-government cannot exist autonomously in the same nation without the one destroys the other. Louis XIV's "I am the state" does not admit of local self-rule, individual freedom or local democracy. These statements sound like truisms, but they are the fruit of history. The framers of the Constitution were convinced centralized government and local democracy were not compatible. They were determined that government should be diffused amongst the people and built a foundation creating the Federal Government, but of limited powers. Democracy is not located in Washington. It has no place in those marble halls. It does exist down in the school boards, the justice-of-peace courts, the courthouses, the State legislatures. It cannot be transferred to Washington. If it could be it would cease to exist. Among the people, in the breasts of the people, rests democracy. Democracy is dependent on the ability of the average man to reflect sound judgment, and of his representatives to activate that judgment into legislation.

DR. LENGYEL CHALLENGES

Centralized government is not an aim in itself, but a trend. Modern life is far more centralized—more highly organized—than life in the past. Centralization is merely a mold, not the substance. It may be filled with either democratic or nondemocratic substance. Switzerland, one of the old democracies, moves toward centralization, as does the United States. Great Britain, highly centralized, is a democracy. The Scandinavian countries, the best types of democracies, have long been centralized. Republican France was centralized and democratic. The anarchists used to stand for highly decentralized, self-contained units—for good reasons. In this world of speed a high degree of decentralization would lead to anarchy.

CONGRESSMAN DISNEY REPLIES

The Scandinavian-Swiss-British concepts of democracy are not our concept of pure democracy. Their achievements do not match ours. Under the Bill of Rights, the American ideal has been freedom of the individual necessarily implying freedom of local self-government. For what purpose? For the sake of the liberty of the individual. Woodrow Wilson wisely stated, "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation on government." Centralized government grows stronger feeding on its own strength. It abhors limitations. Statism knows no bounds nor limitations. That is not pure democracy. I insist historical facts prove local democracy dies under centralized authority.

DR. LENGYEL OPENS

To think that only local government is democratic is a mistake. Certainly it is not true of England, was not true of republican France; the freedom-loving Scandinavian countries—all centralized. It was the mayor of an American city, not the President of the United States, who declared: "I am the law." Local government necessarily shrinks as the globe's surface shrinks. Obviously, it was extensive when an English county was a vast territory. Today, from your airplane, it is a speck on the map. Local democracy is part of the central democracy—not its enemy. With the interconnection of local interests, self-sufficient local democracy actually defeats the aims of real democracy—the execution of the will of the people. It cannot be the real will of the people to mutilate it by retaining traditional units because they were useful in the stage-coach era. Far from being the enemy of local democracy, centralized government, conducted in the real democratic spirit, strengthens local democracy by placing behind it strong government resources. Democracy is far easier to safeguard in the central government, which citizens can watch with great vigilance, because it occupies a central position. Local government does not;

hence, it is easier for local autocrats to falsify the people's will.

CONGRESSMAN DISNEY CHALLENGES

It is impossible to have both a centralized, powerful administrative Federal system and a free play of individualism in local self-government. History proves democratic tendencies have been destroyed by centralized authority. When the Roman Republic faded by degeneration of the senate, local democracy died, tyrannical dictatorships succeeded. In modern Italy when centralization through fascism took over, local democracy and individual freedom died. When legislative authority failed in Germany, all government was centralized in the dictator. What good did it do the people to watch this monster grow without a voice in its growth? How could local self-government assert itself? What became of individual rights?

DR. LENGYEL REPLIES

When there were more than 10,000,000 unemployed in the United States, local democracy was reduced to flashing S O S signals to Washington. Luckily, the fathers of the country foresaw the future and made provisions for centralized action through the "general welfare" clause. Without such centralized action there would have been revolution in the country. Modern government is big business, the business of the people. Modern times call for the efficiency of large organization, and not for the "local democracy" of the village smithy. May I also remind Congressman DISNEY that the Roman senate was never a pillar of local democracy; centralization did not precede fascism; and Germany never had a real democracy.

The Wheel Chair Brigade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, a story of personal interest to the Members of the House appeared in the February 25 issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. It is an item in the column entitled "Washington Notebook" written by Nelson C. Hyde.

I have asked unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD because it is an appreciative and friendly story about four of the most gallant, beloved, and useful Members of this body:

LEGISLATORS ON WHEELS

There is no jollier group in the House of Representatives than those making up the so-called Wheel Chair Brigade. The four members of this exclusive organization have lost the use of their legs and propel themselves about the Capitol and onto the House floor in rubber-tired vehicles.

"Out of the way there, you old jitney; let a limousine pass," one will call out to another. Or he'll imitate the sound of an automobile horn and cry out, "Make way for a jeep," or the blast of a siren with a hearty, "Heave ho, battleship approaching."

Two of the members of the brigade are chairmen of important committees—JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, Democrat, Texas, of Rivers and Harbors, and JOHN J. COCHRAN, Democrat, Missouri, of Accounts. The others are ROBERT CROSSER, Democrat, Ohio, dean of his State's delegation in the House, and WILLIAM J. MILLER, Republican, Connecticut.

MANSFIELD is a lawyer, one of the few pre-World War No. 1 Members of Congress, having taken his seat March 4, 1917. COCHRAN, a "watchdog of the Treasury" in his position as Accounts chairman, was secretary to two Representatives and to a Senator at various times before his own election to the House in 1926. CROSSER, native of Scotland, moved to Cleveland in 1881, practiced law, came to the House in 1923. MILLER, from Wethersfield, who is serving his second term, enlisted as a private in the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps in the last war, won a commission as a military aviator in France, suffered the loss of his legs in a plane crash.

All frequently address the House, attendants lowering the microphone to accommodate these popular Members.

The Tax-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Iola (Kans.) Register of February 24, 1944, containing the observations of Mr. Angelo Scott, editor, on the veto of the tax bill and the congressional reaction to the veto message:

THE POT BOILS

Senator ALBEN BARKLEY'S resignation as Democratic leader in protest to President Roosevelt's veto message on the tax bill is the hottest thing that has happened in democratic politics since Roosevelt was first elected.

Whether it presages a revolt against Roosevelt's fourth-term candidacy which will really be effective remains to be seen. But the incident is, itself, a powerful argument against a Roosevelt fourth term because it illustrates so clearly the inherent danger of keeping one man in power so long that he begins to think he's God instead of the servant of the people.

The trouble with Roosevelt is that he has arrived (long since) at the point of believing that he is infallible; that he must always be right; that those who challenge his wisdom are not only fools but churlish rascals who deserve to be held up to public scorn and ridicule for their temerity in suggesting that he could be wrong.

If Roosevelt had felt called upon to veto such a tax bill 10 years ago, he would have said something like this:

"Dear Congress: I know you have worked long and faithfully and conscientiously to produce a tax bill which you think is in the best interest of the Nation, but I feel that I have no other choice than to veto it. It simply doesn't raise enough money to protect the country against inflation, and it seems to me that it is deficient in the following respects: (citing chapter and verse and opposing arguments). I respectfully urge you to give this matter your further consideration."

And if Roosevelt had sent such a message to the Congress day before yesterday, there would have been no revolt. BARKLEY never would have opened his mouth. The chances are that today he would be quietly, if not enthusiastically, urging his comrades to uphold the President.

Instead, the President has said, in effect:

"Dear Congress, I told you bums 2 months ago what kind of tax bill I want this year, and here you have the effrontery to present me with this wretched monstrosity. It isn't that you didn't know better, because I told you what was needed and what was right. It is only because you have deliberately chosen to toady to special groups and substitute your own political advantage for the Nation's needs. Now toe the line and give me what I asked for. And if anything goes wrong, don't think I won't let the good people know whose fault it is."

It isn't much wonder that even "Dear Alben" couldn't stomach that kind of message from his Chief. He spoke the simple and literal truth when he said that the message was a "deliberate and calculated assault upon the honesty and integrity" of the whole Congress and that if Congressmen "have any self-respect left they will override this veto and enact this tax bill into law."

If Roosevelt could have done anything further to emphasize the indefensible intemperance of his message, he did it in his subsequent honey-and-sugar telegram to BARKLEY, when he said:

"You and I may differ and have differed on important measures, but that does not mean that we question one another's good faith."

Question one another's good faith, indeed! Did he question Congress' good faith when he declared this tax measure was a bill not for the needy but for the greedy? Or just what construction would you put on such a remark?

And how about his message of only a couple of weeks before when he denounced the soldier-vote bill passed by the Senate as a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines? If that wasn't a case of questioning the Senate's good faith, I don't know what you would call it.

That is precisely the point at issue. If President Roosevelt had been able to preserve that touch of humility which characterizes the really great, he would still have a sense of proportion, a sense of tolerance. He would be able to follow his own advice and grant others the privilege of differing with him without questioning their good faith.

Because he has not been able to do this, he has lost, one after another, the support of the closest friends and followers he has had—Farley, Garner, Woodring, now Barkley, and a host of lesser lights in-between.

He has been the head guy too long. That's the whole story.

President Denounces Acts of Bigotry—The Sturdier Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an article appearing in the Washington Star and an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun bearing on the subjects of brotherhood and hatred, which should be read and heeded by all good citizens. They are as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

PRESIDENT DENOUNCES ACTS OF BIGOTRY

As President Roosevelt, in a statement to the Federal Council of Churches in New York, denounced "acts of violence, prejudice, bigotry, and division," the council's Washington branch today made plans for an interracial religious service next Sunday at the Asbury Methodist Church, Eleventh and K Streets NW.

The President's statement, made in connection with the council's plan for observance of Race Relations Sunday on February 13, criticized those who foster dissension between races as missing "the meaning of America, as they are incapable of understanding the brotherhood of men in terms of divine teaching and democratic living."

"Such men," Mr. Roosevelt said, "deserve our censure. Some are entitled to our contempt. All require the never-ceasing reiteration of the Christian and American faith in the dignity of all peoples and right of all men to equal treatment in this land and on earth."

Dr. Frederick E. Reissig, executive secretary of the Washington Federation of Churches, said that the service at the Asbury Methodist Church, opening at 4 p. m., would feature an interracial choir of between 100 and 150 voices, including white, colored, and Chinese singers. The group will be directed jointly by Prof. Warner Lawson of Howard University and Prof. James McLain of American University.

The District observance of Race Relations Sunday, Dr. Reissig said, goes back for 20 years. It is always held on the Sunday nearest Lincoln's birthday. The service this year, he added, will be the first to be held in a colored church.

[From the Chicago Sun]

THE STURDIER WEAPON

Hate is a potent weapon of the Axis, and the leaders of the Axis nations have known well how to use it.

Against their hatred, we must, by the life-and-death necessities of the moment, throw our own. Our hatred of oppression and, consequently, of German and Japanese militarism, is a weapon of war.

But there is a weapon more sturdy than hate, and that is brotherhood. Brotherhood Week, now being observed by churches, schools, and civic groups in Chicago and 3,000 other communities across the Nation, reminds us that in fellowship we have a course of action that is positive where Hate, and its pallid little brother, Fear, are negative. Brotherhood thrives in the light; Hate and Fear cling to the darkness.

We cannot expect to win the war and to establish and maintain a real peace among all nations unless we unceasingly foster brotherhood among our own diverse peoples and races. Based on the American tradition, Brotherhood Week is an opportunity to gird our Nation so that its inherent strength will not again be threatened by Hate and Fear.

The Disloyal Japanese Should Declare Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, some Japanese, the traitorous minded, would, perhaps, take any oath with their tongues in their cheeks if the penalty for failure to do so would be loss of citizenship and deportation to the country of their ancestors. But I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are tens of thousands of American citizens of Japanese ancestry, disloyal to our cause, who would refuse to state under oath, whatever the penalties may be, that their god-Emperor's pretensions to a divine character are absurd and ridiculous, unworthy of belief by any save those who are bereft of reason and devoid of common sense.

It is time that our disloyal citizens of Japanese origin stand up and be counted, be stripped of the citizenship they have disgraced, be deported to the country whence their ancestors came.

The enactment of H. R. 4137, a bill which I recently introduced, would do much toward that end so devoutly to be wished for.

As an evidence of the widespread support by proposal—H. R. 4137—has aroused through the country, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks an editorial which appeared simultaneously, on February 8, 1944, in the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News and the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram, a most interesting and highly informative discussion of a most vexing problem.

The editorial to which I have just referred is the following:

JAPANESE OATH OF LOYALTY

Sound reason of public policy supporting the proposal by Representative GEARHART of Fresno that all persons of Japanese blood in the United States shall appear in a court of naturalization within 60 days and take an oath of allegiance or suffer loss of citizenship in the case of those who are American citizens, and furthermore be subject to deportation.

The Gearhart bill provides that in the event the Japanese-American refuses to declare himself, he will be presumed to have willfully expatriated himself and will be deported. It is a fair and wise provision. There is no place in this country for a person who is not willing to declare his loyalty to it.

There are two classes of Japanese in this country, and problems involved in applying the Gearhart bill to one class are not the same as problems involved in applying it to the other class. Persons born in Japan are aliens and are barred by law from American citizenship. Even before the war they did not share the naturalization privilege enjoyed by the nationals of most other countries. The oath of loyalty required of them could not be the same as the oath taken by Japanese born in the United States and in consequence of their nativity, United States citizens. The loyalty of an alien barred from citizenship could not be more than the obligation to do nothing harmful to the country giving him residence and the opportunity to make his living and keep and educate his family. Unless he is willing to give that limited pledge he has no claim on this Nation's hospitality and his presence here is a menace.

The situation of Japanese-Americans, born here and United States citizens, is more complex. Under the Constitution their status is identical with the status of all other American citizens.

Whether they may constitutionally be required to give a pledge or take an oath of loyalty not required of other citizens is a question for lawyers. The special reasons for exacting such a pledge of Japanese-Americans are known to all. They must suffer under the ancient rule that the sins of the father are visited upon his children. The acts of Japan and its agents have brought all Japanese under suspicion and the innocent among the Japanese people must expect to be required to give proof of their innocence. The world, and particularly the United States, will not take it for granted.

The Tax-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Kansas City Star of February 23, 1944, which reflects the sentiment of the citizens of the Middle West with respect to the recent veto of a revenue act:

A POLITICAL VETO

The President's veto of the tax bill is a continuation of his fight on Congress for political campaign purposes. His veto message is a political document, and nothing else—part of the build-up for fourth-term propaganda use.

It is right in line with his previous charge that a majority of the Senate had been guilty of "fraud" on the soldier-vote bill, as it turned out, that an overwhelming majority of the House had been guilty of the same thing. It is right in line with his request for a labor-conscription bill when there wasn't one chance in a dozen that he would get it and when that fact was known. It is right in line with the original Treasury-White House demand for a $10,500,000,000 tax bill when the fact was known that couldn't be had either.

In these and numerous other moves Mr. Roosevelt clearly has been framing an alibi record for campaign use. He wants to be able to say that he tried this and that and Congress wouldn't let him do it—in other words, to shift responsibility for whatever may happen in the future and as the excuses may be needed.

Just as a majority of the Senate and House were allegedly guilty of fraud, so now they are guilty of passing a tax bill, "not for the needy but for the greedy." They are accused of extending "indefensible special privileges to favored groups,' although with respect to these charges and other features of the message to Congress, Democratic Senator GEORGE is constrained to say that he had never seen a veto of important legislation "based on such inadequate and unconvincing grounds." At the same time the veteran tax authority, Democratic Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, says, "I couldn't maintain my self-respect if I didn't vote to override the veto."

Naturally so, with every Member of the big congressional majorities who voted to enact the tax bill. They could not acquiesce in the veto without convicting themselves of having voted special privileges to favored groups. If there is such favoritism in the bill, it ought to be eliminated. But the President's charges on that score are no more convincing than are his other contentions about the bill.

The political nature of the veto is indicated further in the attempt to evade responsibility for the last complicated tax law that is giving the taxpayers so much grief today. He tries to create the impression that this was due to the Ruml plan which "was not the product of this administration." But the Ruml plan for a simple shift to current tax payments was not adopted—and the President knows it. What was adopted was a complicated compromise plan which is causing much of the grief today—a plan which Mr. Roosevelt's own leaders in Congress insisted upon and a plan which he himself endorsed when he signed the bill and made it law.

Another example is the President's implication that the millions of workers and employers who pay the social-security tax are among the greedy groups favored by the bill he has vetoed. He wants that tax doubled, whereas Congress voted to freeze it for this year at the present rate of 1 percent. But collections from the tax are six times the benefits being paid out. Why, then, double the tax? Because the administration wants this money to throw into the general funds and spend for other purposes, which it has been doing all along.

These are samples of the character of the Roosevelt veto. If Congress has either courage or self-respect, it will override that veto and thus open the way to the more than $2,000,000,000 in revenue which the tax bill provides.

Gearhart Bill Would Make Japanese Say Where They Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because an editorial expression from such influential journals as the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee, McClatchy Publications, newspapers which are published and circulate widely in that section of California wherein resided, prior to the tragedy at Pearl Harbor, the bulk of our Japanese population, reflecting, as it does, the opinions of those who knew the Japanese best, is of especial importance at this particular time, I ask that an editorial which appeared in all three of these newspapers during the week of February 19, 1944, under the caption of "Bill would make Japanese say where they stand" may be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The editorial, urging, as it does, the speedy enactment of the measure H. R. 4137, which I recently introduced, is the following:

BILL WOULD MAKE JAPANESE SAY WHERE THEY STAND

Pending in Congress is a bill by Representative B. W. GEARHART, of Fresno to require all American-born Japanese to take an oath swearing allegiance to the United States and forswearing loyalty to Japan and belief in the divinity of the Emperor.

Under provisions of the proposed law, all citizens of Japanese extraction would have to take the oath publicly in naturalization court or face the alternative of internment and deportation to Japan after the war.

The text of the oath is such that anyone sincerely taking it would have to sever himself from all loyalty to Japan, whether that loyalty was active or merely sentimental. For it states:

"I repudiate and deny any belief in the divine character or deific ancestry of the Emperor of Japan or in any divine mission of the Japanese people, the Emperor of Japan or the members of the Yamoto race, and, in this connection, I denounce and decry all such pretensions and assertions as absurd, ridiculous, unworthy of acceptance by any save those bereft of reason, and devoid of common sense."

While no doubt many Japanese of disloyal tendencies would be willing to take the oath with tongue in cheek, it would smoke out thousands of Emperor worshipers whom the wishy washy procedure of the War Relocation Authority has failed to uncover.

For a Japanese to denounce the deity of the Emperor and the divinity of the Japanese people would be for him to lose face and become subject to the scorn of those who fervently believe in the holy mission of the descendants of the sun goddess.

When the W. R. A. circulated a questionnaire among the Japanese in the relocation centers asking them to swear loyalty to the United States and denounce allegiance to Japan, such a large proportion refused to do so that the W. R. A. quickly withdrew the question and merely required them to promise obediance to the laws of this country.

This either was a deliberate sleight of hand or revealed the W. R. A.'s abysmal ignorance of the Japanese, who are commanded by tradition and proverb to obey the laws of the country where they are, regardless of their heartfelt beliefs and loyalties.

It probably would be discovered that a surprisingly large number of American-born Japanese desire to go to the homeland of their parents.

For instance, Walter Imai, one of five Tule Lake Japanese brought into Federal court here last week on Federal liquor charges, asserted frankly that while he is American born he is willing to be sent to Japan.

Imai and those like him should be accommodated.

In America, either during the war or after, there is no place for those content to share in the benefits of this country while their loyalties and hearts are elsewhere.

GEARHART's bill certainly is a move in the proper direction.

Economic Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the mistaken concept held by many of the new dealers, that it makes no difference how deeply this Nation goes into debt because, as our economic magicians claim, "we owe the debt to ourselves," apparently has released all restraints on Government projects to be paid for out of our tax dollars. An ever-increasing amount of Government obligations is piling up against you, against me, and against everybody else. Appropriations are being asked for, expenditures are authorized without considering whether the necessary means are available or in what way they may be obtained. If an individual assumes financial obligations, accumulates debts without any regard to his present or future earning capacity, you know where he inevitably ends; yet our New Deal economic magicians would have us believe they can work miracles and do things which every sensible citizen knows cannot be done. The Congress is being flooded with messages from the President and others urging the appropriation of even more billions of dollars for this, that, and the other purpose. Some of these are good purposes, which we all wish some day to see realized. Yet we know from our private lives, from our private experiences, that there are many good things we should like to do, that there are many purposes for which we should like to spend money, but which common prudence and just plain common sense decree we shall not.

It has been suggested that the Congress restrict its own freedom of action to the extent that no appropriation would be made without a corresponding measure to acquire the funds so appropriated. As it is, billions and billions of dollars are being asked for with the best intentions, but without any assurance that the required funds will be available. The result is that the public debt is mounting to fantastic heights while the printing press in Washington is working overtime pouring ever more fresh dollar bills into circulation and continued inflation results.

It is interesting to notice how our new dealers slowly, indeed very slowly, let us in on what is in store for us. It is not so long ago that the public debt was discussed on the basis of accumulated obligations at the end of the war of some $200,000,000,000. Then it got to be two hundred and fifty billions; and now in a recent magazine article Harry Hopkins—good old irrepressible Harry—tells us it may be three hundred billions. At the rate we are going, it may not be two hundred; it may not be two hundred and fifty, nor $300,000,000,000. The public debt—your debt and my debt—at the end of the war, and—of course, we have to include in the war the period of demobilization and readjustment to a peacetime economy—undoubtedly will be very much more than any of these figures would indicate. Just how much more will, of course, depend on how many years it will still require to finish the job, and, in the meantime, how carefully we scrutinize and expend every dollar of the American people. In the same article to which I referred a few moments ago, Mr. Hopkins also tells us that we are the richest Nation in the world, because we have, during this war, saved up an incredible number of billions of dollars. What an incredible viewpoint. All the savings of this Nation have been exploded, sunk, or given away to doubtful friends all over the globe. If we want our savings back some day, even without interest, we shall have to pay a like amount into the Treasury once more in order that there be the money with which to pay. Unfortunately, miracles do not happen, despite the hocus-pocus of our New Deal economists.

The Congress is now being asked to appropriate huge sums for an international organization created by our Government and subscribed to by the so-called United Nations. It is no secret, however, that a number of these United Nations, even those who would be the alleged beneficiaries of this activity, signed the agreement with the minimum of enthusiasm. I am afraid they do not believe in the expressed noble intention

of the framers of the plan. I can think of nothing more unfortunate than if there should develop any justification of the suspicions that we, perhaps in association with a very few of our particular national intimates, are trying to serve our private interests under a cloak of philanthropy. Furthermore, it would indeed be disgusting if the plain duty of every man to love his neighbor, and to act accordingly, were being exploited to serve political ends, war propaganda, or other international questionable purposes. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or the U. N. R. R. A., as it is going to be called, as indicated in the name, has two functions—to bring relief, and to organize rehabilitation. I should like to know how much of the money we will be asked to appropriate will be used for relief and how much for rehabilitation. No one doubts that the sufferings and the misery in this world as a result of the war will assume hitherto unknown proportions.

There is no doubt that every one of us will be faced with a veritable storm of demands to come to the aid of our distressed neighbors in all other parts of the world. Perhaps many of these distressed neighbors will be right here at home, and not necessarily in far distant lands. In response to a general and world-wide wish that those who suffer shall be helped to help themselves a great organization has grown up. I refer to that magnificent organization we all admire, the International Red Cross, and the American Red Cross in particular. Many other organizations have been moved by religious or philanthropic considerations to organize help to suffering humanity. To mention only one of the many, I refer to such humanitarian activities as those of the Friends. Now, believe it or not, the agreement establishing the U. N. R. R. A., in article 55, contains this amazing provision; I quote:

> Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General.

Here we see a political organization trying to assume a monopoly on the right to help people in distress. Is it strange that suspicion has been aroused? Do these people who try to establish a monopoly for themselves to help people in distress have other purposes in mind than the Christian one of helping the unfortunate? Are there political or economic interests involved rather than humanitarian considerations? If so, are these political and economic interests, those of the American people thus justifying the expenditures of vast billions of our money? Moreover, does this Nation want to secure political or economic advantages under the false pretenses of nobly bringing relief to people in need?

The second activity of the U. N. R. R. A. is supposed to be rehabilitation. There is no doubt that all nations involved in this terrible war shall need to be rehabilitated. This country will be no exception. Now what exactly are we planning to do in the line of rehabilitation, and why should we spend our money on putting foreign industries back into shape and creating others while trying to make our own industries over to peacetime production? What are we trying to do or planning to do? Are we going to dump our surpluses? Are we getting ready to perpetuate a kind of lend-lease throughout the world? Are we being led into some U. S. A.-W. P. A. unlimited arrangement? Are we trying to make investments, acquire financial control of foreign enterprises? Are we trying to create jobs abroad for our citizens? Are we trying to gain political influence in other countries by virtue of our hold on the economic life of those countries? I think the Congress, before it appropriates billions of dollars, your dollars and everybody's dollars, for such nebulous projects, should try to get at the facts and the real intention of the promoters of this gigantic scheme.

There is another point in which I am interested, and that is how the share of the total expense of the U. N. R. R. A. allotted to this country has been derived. The generosity with which the lion's share of the costs has been granted to us seems to me to reflect the old foreign idea of the rich uncle in America.

To sum up: I want to preserve the right to act as Christians toward every human being, wherever he may be. I want politics kept out of charity, that there may be at least one field of human endeavor left untouched by selfish or wicked designs. Furthermore, before appropriating the people's money for world rehabilitation, I want to know exactly how and why it shall be spent. Finally, I want responsibilities placed where they belong. When our troops invade and occupy foreign lands, they assume the responsibility for the life and the welfare of the people whom they, by force, have brought under their military government. Whatever may be needed to fulfill those obligations should be treated as military expenditures, administered by the Army. Theirs is the full responsibility. Never before has this Nation faced a test like this war. We have a tremendous opportunity to lead the world in the march back to decency, integrity, generosity, and humanitarian endeavor. We have a tremendous opportunity to show that this Nation has been dedicated to the pursuit of happiness, and not of destruction. I hope the old American virtues have been preserved. If under the stress of war they have been pushed into the background, let this Nation insist upon their full restoration. Unless the American people insist on that, we can lose at home the war our fighting forces win on the fighting fronts.

Now a word about the season in which we find ourselves.

On this eve of the greatest celebration the Christian world knows, we must resolve that the statement made in the Teheran Declaration shall be something more than words from the lips of three men. They must be made the principles motivating the hearts of the peoples of the world. As men and women are dying and suffering everywhere for the cause of freedom, we must try to see to it that their sacrifices are not in vain, and that these lofty sentiments so oft expressed are not forgotten as soon as the political reasons for their expression have ceased to be.

May God's beneficence, mercy, and His consoling grace rest upon those everywhere in the world who are suffering for the cause of righteousness, including our men and women on the fighting fronts. More than that, we cannot say, and it remains for us and for the other peoples of the world in the future to try to make rise in this world of ours a new spiritual structure of the brotherhood of man.

The Disloyal Japs Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 18, 1944, issue of the Argonaut, a highly influential journal of widespread circulation in the States of the Pacific Southwest, an editorial which refers with approval to a bill, H. R. 4137, which I recently introduced, the enactment of which will, I feel confident, provide a method through the pursuit of which we can rid ourselves of thousands upon thousands of disloyal citizens whose ancestry is Japanese.

The editorial, from the able pen of the Argonaut's distinguished editor, Mr. William Wallace Chapin, of San Francisco, Calif., follows:

THE DISLOYAL JAPS MUST GO

Congressman GEARHART, a Republican Congressman from this State, has introduced a bill in Congress that would require every Jap in this country to renounce any allegiance to Japan, and to file an oath of allegiance to this country. Failure to do so within 60 days would be punished by loss of United States citizenship and ultimate deportation to Japan.

There ought not to be the slightest opposition to this bill. Mr. GEARHART says that there are, in his opinion, over 30,000 disloyal Japs in this country, and that 2,772 of them have openly requested deportation. Over 20,000 have refused to give any written expression of loyalty to the United States.

The oath of allegiance called for in Mr. GEARHART's bill would pledge support to the Constitution of the United States, to bear arms against Japan, and to declare "disbelief in the divine character of deific ancestry of the Emperor of Japan, or in any divine mission of the Japanese people, the Emperor of Japan, of the Yamoto race," and to "denounce and decry all such pretentions and assertions as absurd and ridiculous, unworthy of acceptance of any save those bereft of reason and devoid of common sense."

We do not suppose it is any more absurd and ridiculous for a Japanese to regard his emperor as a god than it was for the ancient Romans to deify their own emperors, but if the Japanese insist on so regarding him, the place for their religious belief is Japan, and not America. Why did these disloyal Japs come to America? Most of them came here

to work against the United States, and to benefit from the day of the Rising Sun when America would be defeated. But if they came here, as probably most of them did, for the purpose of improving their economic condition, they ought to be told that a god who is unable to take care of his own people is a god so poor as to be unworthy of the slightest reverence, and that they need to go back to their homeland to be made more fully acquainted with his impotence. When they do go back through deportation they will find that we have crucified their god, in one manner or another, and he is not likely to have any resurrection. Every disloyal Jap should indeed be deported, and we fully believe that most of the Japs in this country are disloyal and dangerous, no matter what some of them may say to the contrary.

Establishment of Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee is now considering a resolution which, if passed, will reaffirm our traditional interest in the Jewish national home in Palestine, I ask leave to make a few remarks on that subject, prior to reading the text of a resolution which was submitted to me by six Jewish societies in Cleveland.

Palestine was recreated as a homeland for the Jewish people in 1917 through England's historic Balfour Declaration. In 1922, by the action of the League of Nations and by the unanimous consent of the Sixty-seventh Congress of these United States, the civilized world declared itself in favor of this great humanitarian project.

These facts are fairly well known; they have always been considered quite sufficient reason for perpetuating the Jewish homeland which, during the past two decades, has been so valiantly and so magnificently rebuilt by the Palestinian Jews. No one questioned the legality of those international pledges, or considered England's role in Palestine as anything but that of a powerful trustee, until in 1939 the unprecedented happened.

Quite unconcerned with the fact that England was but one part to the Palestine bargain, Prime Minister Chamberlain's Colonial Office issued a White Paper which arbitrarily announced that as of March 31, 1944, no more Jews might enter the Jewish national home. Appeasement was the rule of the day. For a number of years Palestine had been troubled by gangs of Arab marauders who preyed on Jewish, British, and Arab residents. Under the influence of Axis agents, these terrorists used the threat of fascism as a wedge to secure their personal ambitions. Similar tactics had worked effectively at Munich; they worked equally well in Palestine. And the result was that the whole colonization program for Palestine, which had brought new life to half a million Jews and which had been laid down by the nations of the world, was threatened with extinction.

Today we are faced with the consequences of that White Paper which will cut the life line extended from Palestine to hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees in Europe. March 31 is almost here. So many Jews have been murdered by the Nazis that the world has finally been shocked into setting up relief agencies. And Palestine is still on the map as the logical place for Jewish rehabilitation and settlement.

I want to emphasize that Americans have more than a moral right to demand the free entry of Jews into Palestine and the reconstitution of that country as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

The Anglo-American Convention, signed by President Coolidge in 1925, should be of special interest to the Members of this House. That treaty provides that no changes shall be made in the terms of the Palestine Mandate without the approval of the United States. It is quite clear, then, that this White Paper question involves the United States—directly and challengingly.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave to read the text of the resolution submitted to me by the Cleveland Zionist district, the Cleveland Zionist Society, the Hadassah and Mizrachi organizations of Cleveland, the Cleveland Zionist Labor Council, and the Cleveland Heights Zionist district:

We American Jews dwelling in security in this our beloved land, which because of its democratic institutions and just laws "gives to bigotry no sanction and to persecution no assistance," and dedicated in undivided loyalty to the noble spirit of our country, are gathered here in meeting assembled and herewith move the following resolution.

"Be it resolved:

"1. That we demand the immediate withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939 with its unwarranted restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement. The White Paper is a violation of the rights accorded to the Jewish people under the mandate for Palestine and is repugnant to the concept of the "four freedams" in that Palestine should become the one land on earth, outside Axis-dominated nations, where, by specific legislation, Jews are to be denied admission.

"2. We call for the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration, and of the mandate for Palestine whose intent and underlying purpose, based on the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine, was to reconstitute Palestine as the Jewish commonwealth.

"3. We demand that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and that the Jewish agency, recognized under the mandate as the authorized representative of the Jewish people, be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine, to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country, and to utilize its uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonization and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

"4. By international convention of 1924, Great Britain may make no changes in the status of Palestine without the consent of the United States Government. The White Paper is a complete reversal of Palestine's status and is, therefore, a clear violation of Great Britain's covenant with the United States.

"In the face of the disasters that have befallen the Jews of Europe under Hitler, it is unconscionable that they should be deprived of the hope of eventually finding peace and freedom in the future Jewish commonwealth.

"The measures here urged constitute the essential prerequisites for the attainment of a Jewish majority and for the re-creation of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, and the Jewish people pledges itself to scrupulous regard for the preservation of the religious, linguistic, and cultural rights of the non-Jewish population of Palestine and to the civil and religious equality of all its inhabitants before the law."

Adopted by all of the following Cleveland Zionist groups:

CLEVELAND ZIONIST DISTRICT,
SUGGS GARBER, *President.*
Rabbi BARNETT R. BRICKNER,
Vice President.
CLEVELAND ZIONIST SOCIETY,
Rabbi ABBA HILLEL SILVER, *President.*
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS ZIONIST DISTRICT,
Rabbi RUDOLPH ROSENTHAL,
Honorary President.
MYER MARCUS, *President.*
HADASSAH—ZIONIST WOMEN'S GROUP,
Mrs. ALBERT (ALICE) GOODMAN, *Chairman.*
MIZRACHI ORTHODOX ZIONIST GROUPS,
JULIUS SCHWEID, *Chairman.*
CLEVELAND ZIONIST LABOR COUNCIL,
M. KURSCH, *Chairman.*

Campaign of Abuse Has Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Citizen-Herald of February 24, 1944, one of the largest and best weekly newspapers in my district, located at Walden, Orange County, N. Y. This editorial, presumably written by its able editor, is interesting reading, because it shows the type, character, and extent of the campaign to attempt to discredit Members of Congress who have opposed the Communists, radicals, and the left-wing New Dealers, and the entrance of the United States into the war until attacked. That, apparently, is still a crime in the minds of a handful of rabid interventionists who would have had us fighting all over the world regardless of the will of the American people and of the Congress.

I voted for war after we were attacked, and for every war measure since Pearl Harbor, and have wholeheartedly supported every effort to win the war as soon as possible and with the least casualties. If I have made any mistakes in judgment at any time, it is because I loved my country too much and not too little. No one with any respect for the truth

has ever questioned or impugned my loyalty, patriotism, or Americanism.

However, I am opposed to the establishment of a glorified world-wide W. P. A. and the draining of our resources and placing additional burdens on the American people. My position is the same as it always has been, that is, putting the interests of the American people first and keeping them uppermost all the time, both in time of war and in peace.

I voted for the Fulbright resolution to promote peace after the war through international cooperation, and there is nothing I will not do to help bring about a lasting and enduring peace, except the sacrifice of American sovereignty, assuming that the peace will be fair, as an unjust peace would be merely a prelude to another world war.

I am convinced that we are on the march to victory and that it is just a question of time when the war will be won. The biggest domestic issue, affecting the interests of 130,000,000 Americans, is to solve our own post-war economic problems through congressional action. It is essential that we preserve free American enterprise and encourage its expansion so that it can provide jobs for 11,000,000 returning soldiers and another 11,000,000 who will be demobilized from our war industries. As the ranking minority, or Republican, member of the newly created House Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, I expect to devote a large part of my time to trying to solve this most vital of all issues, the employment of American wage earners after the war and the establishment of economic peace and prosperity in our own country.

The attacks upon Congress and the attempts to undermine the faith of the American people in their elected representatives, coming from radical, international, and interventionist sources, is nothing new. President Roosevelt has likewise, very properly, been accused of trying to make an anti-Congress campaign issue, which means he wants to usurp the taxing and legislative powers vested solely in Congress by the Constitution, and to dominate and dictate legislative policies.

The editorial from the Walden Citizen-Herald is a sound and to the point reply to the motley group who seek to undermine and destroy representative and constitutional government in America by name-calling and such malicious and false propaganda as is contained in Under Cover, written by Avedis Arthur Derounian, an alien-born fellow traveler and New Deal stooge of many aliases. These purveyors of abuse and vilification will stop at nothing to impugn the sincerity, honesty, patriotism, and Americanism of all those who sought to keep us out of war before Pearl Harbor, and who refuse to compromise with the Communists, radicals, left-wing New Dealers, or with those who cooperate with and play the New Deal game by permitting themselves to be used as stooges for them.

The editorial follows:

CAMPAIGN OF ABUSE HAS STARTED

The campaign of abuse and vindictiveness against Congressman HAMILTON FISH, which was so disgusting in its "cleverness" and which was repudiated by the voters 2 years ago, has crept up again and is with us once more in all its mock patriotism. It was worked for all it was worth 2 years ago for its nuisance value. (Remember those filthy sheets that appeared at the last moment before voting—with suggestive pictures and innuendos which sought to show that Congressman FISH, an honorably discharged veteran of World War No. 1, who was awarded a Silver Star and the Croix de Guerre as well as citations for his gallantry in action, was a Nazi sympathizer and not a good American citizen.)

There is a motley brew in the so-called "opposition" to Congressman FISH. First of all come the Reds, the Communists who are seeking to make over this country to suit themselves. Then come the New Dealers led by President Roosevelt, who lent himself in person at a rally in Newburgh for this kind of bally-hoo. Then comes publications of the nature of PM and radio commentators of the stripe of Walter Winchell—the outside influence, if you please. Then come some Democratic newspapers which still cling to the decaying New Deal which even President Roosevelt himself is trying to make us forget.

Lastly comes a small but noisy group of local people. Prominent among them is Augustus Bennet, of Newburgh, who opposed Mr. FISH 2 years ago in the primaries and had the gall to raise the issue of Americanism. This issue was so disgusting to Republican voters that they buried Bennet in an avalanche of FISH votes. Mr. FISH carried every city, village, and town in the whole congressional district. Bennet could not even carry his own district in Newburgh. Bennet is drawing public money as referee in bankruptcy which is his chief political distinction. He has been busy with Democratic help the past several months in going about the congressional district and seeking to "line up" the so-called FISH opposition. Most of the committeemen and prominent citizens whom he buttonholes are stringing him along while Gus puts 'em all in his adding machine and has a lot of chickens to hear him tell about it. Just what kind of a political talk he must put up may be judged from the fact that Gus openly supported the New Deal Democratic candidate for Congress at the polls 2 years ago this coming November. He has queer ideas about American loyalty and political loyalty which do not harmonize.

The interest shown by New Deal Democrats in the effort to sidetrack Congressman FISH is simply wonderful. Their desire to be of assistance to the Republicans and help them to choose their congressional candidate comes with a Big Hearted Herbert enthusiasm that is touching in its sincerity and nobleness of purpose. But this bouquet of cooperation only conceals the opening of the sewer from which the campaign filth has already begun its stinking emergence.

Yes, the campaign of character assassination has started. Everybody who disagrees with the administration at Washington is a traitor to his country and must be pushed out of the way.

One Orange County newspaper which supported the New Deal candidate 2 years ago actually printed the statement that FISH "must have a lot of little Goebbels out in the field working for him."

Well, we can be certain of one thing at least. This is a free country. This newspaper can differ with the New Deal. So can the Republican Party. So can the original Democrats, of whom so many are FISH supporters. And we can all be good Americans together. This newspaper may not count very much in either the publication field or the political arena, but such as we are, we're for FISH all the way. If that makes a Goebbels of us, so be it. We'd rather be a Goebbels than a Quisling or a quitter, just so long as it is the Quislings that feel that way about it.

The Wartime Strike Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, lately I have had two letters from a union official in my district. His first letter requested an explanation of my appeal to the chairman of the House Labor Committee for action on the Smith antistrike bill pending in that committee. I replied that I had written the chairman and each member of the Committee on Labor, demanding early and favorable action on the bill. I sent him a copy of the antistrike proposal and asked that he read it and let me have his comments. He replied that he bitterly opposed it and asked me the question, How do you stand on this bill? I include his letter to me and my reply:

PARAGOULD, ARK., *February 22, 1944.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
Congressman, First District of Arkansas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 18 with copy of bill number H. R. 3962 introduced by Mr. SMITH of Virginia, attached. Which bill is labeled "To prohibit strikes and other interruptions of production during the present war."

I read with much interest your letter which was in answer to my request that "since you were quoted in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., as calling on the committee for consideration of this bill H. R. 3962, that you divulge just what is contained in the bill, and to my surprise, you only answered a part of my letter.

However, I do wish to thank you for the copy of this bill and shall try to fill your request that I advise you after I have considered the bill. First I must say that the article as referred to above and which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, and which copy was mailed to you in my previous letter, would indicate as I see it, that you were anxious for and calling upon the committee for a consideration of this bill, and now I note in first paragraph of your letter February 18, that you say in part "I understand that many of the committee are not favorable to the committee taking action of any kind on this measure. Now what I would like to develop is "What is your position in this case; do you favor action on the measure?"

And may I further ask do you favor enactment of such a measure? I cannot fully express just what I think about the bill as introduced by Mr. SMITH of Virginia and known as H. R. 3962 for the reason that I am afraid the postal laws would not permit, but I will say that I think it was conceived in sin, brought forth in iniquity, patterned after and surpassing oppressive power, as has been usurped by one across the Atlantic to shackle,

hog-tie and forever obliterate the rights of free Americans.

That should about cover the matter, what do you think?

I will appreciate an answer.

Yours truly,

T. J. CROWLEY,
Division Chairman, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

Mr. T. J. CROWLEY,
Division Chairman, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Paragould, Ark.

DEAR MR. CROWLEY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter asking how I stand on the Smith wartime antistrike bill. It is the first time I have ever been asked this question by a constituent, to my knowledge. I was under the firm impression that my attitude on legislation to stop strikes was known to not only my own people but to the country. Make no mistake about it, I was in the forefront of every fight waged in Congress during my service here to cut out the dilly-dallying, whether by union or nonunion workers which have tied up war production of planes, ships, tanks, munitions, and supplies for our fighting forces. I will no deviate from this course. I am not unmindful of the record attained in this country along the production front by all of those patriotic Americans who have stuck by their job and turned out the goods. Did you ever stop to think what could have been produced in American plants and shipyards had there been no strikes during this war?

The Smith bill simply says, if you strike during wartime you lose certain benefits Congress gave you in peacetime—that's all. Do you contend that union privileges do not carry responsibilities?

This provision was carried in the Smith-Connally bill when it passed the House; it was also in the Smith bill which passed the House a week before Pearl Harbor. Due to the opposition of organized-labor heads and White House pressure, it was not enacted. There is even a greater need today for the passage of this bill than ever before. Our fighting men want to know if this Nation intends to back them up. It is a grave mistake, in my opinion, to oppose enactment of proposals which will shorten this war and save the lives of our brave warriors. A cooperative attitude would advance the interests of organized labor, not retard it.

The farmer doesn't strike. He is faithfully doing his job and will continue to do it if he is given sufficient farm labor and machinery as well as favorable weather. Never in our history has such a remarkable record been made as that of the farmer in this war in producing food and fiber, and he did it under most adverse conditions. With his hired hands lured away to war plants at wages of from 5 to 10 times what he is able to pay, with a shortage of tools and the loss of his sons to the services, he has steadfastly done his job, without fanfare or quibbling.

Let's have a look at the record. What has been the result of the war-plant strikes in the last 2 years? According to the United States Department of Labor, there were 2,968 strikes in 1942, causing a loss of 4,182,500 in man-days, not man-hours. In 1943 while our men were fighting in the Southwest Pacific, in Europe, and in the Aleutian Islands, there were 3,425 strikes, causing a man-day loss of 12,765,000 or more than 3 times more than in 1942. Yes; I am for the Smith bill, and I will continue to fight for its passage.

With sincere best wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

E. C. GATHINGS.

Britain Crushes Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WEAF at New York and over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Friday, February 25, 1944:

In our naïveté, we have somehow been led to believe that the voice of indignation, officially expressed, would be as terrible as an "army with banners." Expressions of sympathy, of horror, of commiseration on the fate of the Jew in Nazi-controlled Europe have not been lacking. On the contrary, there have been barrels full, issued in the best style and most becoming to nations fighting against barbarism and for a better world to be.

The good peoples of the world cannot but stand aghast before the knowledge that over 2,000,000 of the Jewish faith have perished in the most miserable manner, in the concentration camps, through starvation, lethal gases, bullets, and asphyxiation. Four million remain, pleading for precious life, liberty, and dignity. It is scarcely imaginable that anyone of civilized breeding and instinct could remain unmoved by the authentic revelation of such horror and degradation faced by a homeless people. The moral responsibility of the world to the first victims of the Nazi scourge cannot be denied.

For well-nigh 11 years, the terror program against the Jews has been carried into execution. What was once the foamy-mouthed sputterings of a wild-eyed paperhanger have become the reality, evidenced by the mass graves into which the torn body of the Jew has been thrown.

The Evian Conference on Refugees in France in 1938 at which 31 nations attended could find no answer to the refugee problem. The Bermuda Conference on Refugees 5 years later could find no answer. Blueprints of relief and rescue were drawn and redrawn to be discarded. All the while the answer was there—painfully obvious, for, truly, none is so blind as will not see.

I speak of the little mandated territory of Palestine, over which Britain had thrown her cloak of guardianship by authority of the League of Nations and of the United States by separate treaty. Yet, Palestine was deliberately erased from the agenda at Bermuda as a permanent or even temporary haven for the Jew, tossed about like dried leaves, and whose destiny seems to be a sea without a shore.

At the Evian Conference on Refugees in 1938, the tragedy of Jewish homelessness was high lighted by the remarks of the delegate from Australia, who said, "We in Australia have no race problem, thank God. We do not intend to have one started." That was a summation for all the delegates from all the nations present as to all possible suggested places for rescue.

It is brilliant for its brevity, finality, and—alas—tragedy. Palestine, indeed, is the only place where the Jews are not unwanted.

Long-patient, long-suffering, long-wandering Jewry had placed its trust in British honor only in its greatest travail in all of history to find itself betrayed.

In 1917, Great Britain, aware of how much the supporting weight of world Jewry would count toward Allied victory, issued the document known as the Balfour Declaration. His Majesty's Government, it said in essence, view with favor, and would facilitate, the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people. The promise was given, the desired result of world Jewry support obtained, the Arabs were freed from the Turkish domination. And the driven Jews for a tiny instant, as time is reckoned in its history, rejoiced. The 2,000-year trek now led homeward. The unbroken faith, the never-ending association with the land of Zion, was to be fulfilled.

So, it would appear, the Balfour Declaration was incorporated into the terms of the mandate over Palestine given to Great Britain. Fifty-two Nations, including our own, ratified the mandate. France refrained from extending its sphere of influence into Palestine in reliance upon the promise that the terms of the mandate would be honorably and scrupulously observed by Britain. The United States, by congressional resolution, favored and approved the Balfour Declaration and in a separate treaty with Great Britain in 1924 reiterated the terms of the mandate, with all emphasis placed upon the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.

Palestine flourished and blossomed. Intrepid colonists from all parts of the world brought the fruit of their culture. They drained and planted and irrigated the soil that heretofore had been labeled uncultivable, the great Hebrew University was established, hospitals and schools sprang up for Jew and Arab alike. The highest standard of living in all the Middle East was established. For the first time in modern history a people had moved into a territory without the accompaniment of force and sword. Each inch of soil was bought and paid for by the slow collection of pennies and dimes and quarters from Jews all over the world. The masses gave their small coin for the realization of a cherished 2,000-year-old dream.

Lord Wedgwood in his Testament to Democracy, recently published, says: "The Jews of all the world have done their part nobly in Palestine. Five hundred thousand of the best intelligence and morality have converted a wilderness into a garden. For the first time in history colonists from a higher civilization have neither robbed nor exploited nor exterminated the wilder native race. The Aztecs and Incas of Mexico and Peru, the Redskins on the Great Lakes of North America, the aborigines of Australia and Tasmania, the Hottentots and Kaffirs of South Africa—all have been enslaved, or exploited and gradually exterminated. Wherever settlers have come, they have taken the land by force or fraud under the plea of necessity and expediency. Only the Jews of Palestine have paid for barren lands at a blackmail price and labored to make such lands productive."

No less an authority than the British Government, itself, has said, "The growth of the Jewish national home and its achievements in many fields are a remarkable constructive effort which must command the admiration of the world and must be, in particular, a source of pride to the Jewish people." The returning Allied soldiers from the Levant speak with astonishment of the modern, cosmopolitan, progressive city of Tel Aviv, a monument to the perseverance, energy, and ingenuity of the Jewish settlers. They bring back tales of the wondrous agricultural and industrial developments, and tales of the magnificent contributions in medicine and the sciences to the Allied war effort. The Jew in Palestine conquered sloth, ignorance, and disease.

From many lands they came and commingled many cultures to shape, build, and hew the national homeland.

But after the toil and sacrifice, after the sacred expression of an unquenchable faith had been translated into farms, buildings, schools, hospitals, ships, and manufacturies, then did Britain betray her pledge. She betrayed it at a time when refugee ships sailing the seas were turned back from every shore. She betrayed it when the number of Jewish corpses were mounting and mounting.

In May 1939 Great Britain issued the infamous White Paper. In what she called a Palestine statement of policy, Great Britain set forth to crush Palestine as a national homeland, to bar it forever as a haven of refuge for the Jewish people. Jewish immigration was to be limited to a total of 75,000 in the 5 years to follow, and thenceforth there was to be no further Jewish immigration into Palestine. Land purchases were to be restricted.

Two sections of the White Paper must be particularly noted. Subsection 3 of section 14 reads: "After the period of 5 years no further Jewish immigration will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it." Note then section 15: "His Majesty's Government are satisfied that when the immigration over 5 years which is now contemplated has taken place they will not be justified in facilitating, nor will they be under any obligation to facilitate, the further development of the Jewish national home by immigration regardless of the wishes of the Arab population."

Great Britain chose to forget the Balfour Declaration, the ratification of its purpose by 52 nations, its treaty with the United States. She chose to forget the pleading of the persecuted in Naziland. She chose to forget that hers was only a guardianship entrusted to her by the League of Nations; that hers was not the right and title of ownership. She forgot that she herself had stated that the Jews were there by right and not on sufferance. She remembered only that Arabs must be appeased, for so brilliant a performance as Munich deserved to be repeated in Palestine. She remembered only that oil lay in the ground of the territory surrounding Palestine. She remembered that she could best keep her control over the little strip of land by her maintaining her policy of divide and rule. If Arab were divided against Jew, hers would be the role of keeping the peace. If the chimera of a pan-Arabia could be waved before Arab eyes, the tremendous strides made in Palestine could be checked. In encouraging the belief that Palestine is the stumbling block toward Arab unity, it is keen politics not to mention that Palestine is 10,429 square miles, while Arabia has 7,000,000 square miles.

These she remembered—her dubious property rights—and set them above all human rights.

Colonial administrator superiority in carrying the "white man's burden" found not the lesser breed in Palestine. It found men and women of determination, of culture, steeped in a tradition of learning and dignity. The lord-and-master attitude could not prevail.

In the Arab pogrom that flared up in Palestine, strangely enough the Arab had a sufficiency of arms; the Jews were forbidden their use. The Arab cried as he killed, "The government is with us." The arms trial of two alleged Jewish gun runners recently held in Palestine resulted in a sentence of 10 years with all attendant fanfare and publicity. The trials of Arab gun runners were hidden in obscurity and resulted in sentences of 1 year. It must be kept in mind that the perfidious white paper must be defended and justified in some way before the eyes of the world.

I remind the members of the British Cabinet that way back in 1215 their forebears drafted the Magna Carta wherein is indelibly stated "We will deny justice to none nor delay it." What is the infamous MacDonald White Paper but a dreadful denial of justice?

Voltaire in a letter to Frederick the Great in October 1737, said, "I defy the boldest liar among travelers to say that he has ever encountered a country or tribe where it is laudable to break one's word." Yet, be it said to England's shame, she has broken that solemn word and pledge to the United States that she would under no circumstances discriminate as to immigration into Palestine on the grounds of race or religion. Yet, the White Paper forbids the entrance of Jews into Palestine after April 1 next, save by the will of the Arab majority. The failure of our State Department to protest this violation of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 is more than passing strange. It is a sort of "mystery neatly wrapped inside an enigma." By its silence, unfortunately, the State Department is a coconspirator in the shame of this White Paper.

When Churchill became Prime Minister on May 13, 1940, he introduced his Cabinet to the House of Commons with these words: "Have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." That is what Palestine offered to the Jews. They accepted. They sweated and cried and toiled and bled. Now, even the door to Palestine is to be slammed shut in their search for peace and dignity.

Today, Colonial Secretary Oliver Stanley asserts that there will be no change in the policy written down in the White Paper of 1939. The condemnation of the White Paper by Winston Churchill in 1939 (he termed it a breach of faith and the filing of a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy), by Lord Wedgwood, Lloyd George, and General Smuts is brushed aside as is the declaration of its illegality by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

All policies of appeasement have been disowned by Britain save one—the Arab appeasement policy which produced in ironic fashion the Iraq revolt, the Saudi Arabian indifference, and the Grand Mufti treachery in Jerusalem.

As a party to the recent Bermuda Conference on Refugees, England made all the suitable gestures for finding a haven of sanctuary for the persecuted, so situated that it be willing, able, and ready to absorb all who could escape. None was found—for consideration of Palestine, the only answer was barred by the MacDonald White Paper.

When the thirty-one thousand-odd remaining certificates of entrance into Palestine are exhausted, Palestine as a haven of refuge ceases to exist. With immigration bars in operation throughout the world, the work of rescue, rehabilitation, and resettlement directed toward the 4,000,000 uprooted European Jewry must, of necessity, collapse in a heap pile of unrealized blueprints. The doors of Palestine must remain open to Jewish immigration. The alternative would be mockery of justice—a betrayal of conscience, and the negation of humanity.

I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The common man in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by this greatest scourge in civilized history. I repeat my avowal of admiration for England's saintly sacrifices that have saved us and the world. But how reconcile that with her attitude toward Palestine? A halo need slip but a few inches to become a noose. "Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies," said Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, "even during the heat of war are not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy."

Such a statement gives me the confidence to criticize.

I am reminded of Pierre van Paassen's paraphrase of Erasmus, "Angliae amicus sed magis justiae"—"I am a friend of England, but I am still greater friend of justice."

The MacDonald White Paper must be set aside. Great Britain must open Palestine to mass Jewish immigration at once; otherwise Europe becomes a massive Jewish sepulcher.

There is pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee the Wright-Compton resolution which demands that England redeem its honor and abrogate the terms of the infamous White Paper so as to permit the establishment of Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews. That resolution must pass.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented by me to the House Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman, the privilege of appearing before you today is a courtesy which I very much appreciate. I would not occupy your time as a witness but that it seemed to me that I might contribute constructive information which is not only of grave importance to our farm population, but also germane to the appropriation bill which you are now considering.

It had been my first intention to present these facts in the form of a speech on the floor of the House with a view to bringing impeachment proceedings against the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

In the past weeks, however, it has become abundantly evident that an impeachment proceeding against the Administrator might do him a grave injustice and, even if the case were proven, would hardly serve to remedy the conditions which I am about to discuss. It is now apparent that for some time the Administrator has held that job in name only and the real responsibility rests elsewhere, although legally he still can be held culpable.

It seems to me that since impeachment proceedings would be ineffectual, the only adequate and immediate recourse would be with this subcommittee on Agriculture Department appropriations, which must pass on the funds for R. E. A. If Congress is to assert its authority against bureaucratic usurpation outside of the law and the will of Congress, this committee has available to itself means, within the parliamentary limitations against new legislation in an appropriation bill, to bring about effective remedial action.

The matter to which I would direct your attention is the radical, if not revolutionary, change of direction and policy within the R. E. A. over the past 2 years.

Millions of dollars, in money earmarked by Congress for the lighting up of farm homes which have not received the benefits of electricity, are being diverted from that purpose into the purchase of electric-utility systems in city areas where the customers are not only receiving electric service but which cannot be considered farm electrification.

Stock-market speculators, electric utility holding companies, and political middlemen or brokers appear to be the sole beneficiaries of funds intended for farmers.

These purchases have been made on the basis, in many cases, of inflated values, placing a burden of debt upon the farmers who ostensibly will own them, which will perpetuate economic enslavement of rural electrification cooperatives to Federal bureaucracy for many years to come. The economic and political implications of this policy are so far reaching that I must beg of you a little time for the presentation of the more salient phases.

Considerably more than a year ago there sprang up an amazing story in my State to the effect that a small cooperative of less than 400 members was being asked by the Federal R. E. A. to go into debt to the extent of about a quarter of a million dollars for the purchase of a small utility system with nearly 2,000 customers serving 6 Oklahoma cities and towns, 2 of which had a population far in excess of the 1,500 population limitation set up in the law as the rural-area definition.

As a member of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce which originated the R. E. A. law with its later amendments, I am familiar with that act and I could not at that time give credence to this rumor. Since it was obviously a flagrant violation of certain cardinal limitations in the law designed by Congress to confine the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration to bona fide farm electrification, it hardly seemed possible that this proposal was under serious consideration.

When this rumor was confirmed, however, the Comptroller General, on December 1, 1942, replied to an inquiry from me as to the legality of acquisitions, a reply which is quoted almost in full in the record of the hearings of this committee a year ago (p. 1259, exhibit 1.)

Mr. Warren, in his letter to me, stated that he was legally disqualified from rendering an opinion on the basis of an inquiry from a Member of Congress and confined himself wholly to quoting the ex post facto explanation by the Department of Agriculture Legal Division of the theory upon which it justified purchases of city electrical property with farm electrification funds. This portion of his letter to me was not contained in the record of your hearings and I add it here for your information.

To my amazement I have since learned that city purchases has become a major activity of the R. E. A. and that the instance of the Oklahoma purchase was only a drop in the bucket among the millions being diverted from farm-electrification funds for this purpose.

As a result of this episode, however, it seemed apparent that a diligent search for the facts would be of service not only to the Interstate Commerce Committee but also to your committee and Congress. In the course of some months I have made a study of hearings before Congress, before State public-service commissions, and from many other sources to try to develop the pattern of this policy. A goodly number of instances are at hand. But I believe that an intensive exploration of two or three sample case histories would probably be more effective than to burden the record with a volume of testimony on which my data are not complete. Parenthetically it should be added that the dearth of statistics and other data on this major policy by the R. E. A. is so noticeable as to suggest willful suppression of vital information. In many instances I have run into a blank wall when seeking facts that should be readily available in public documents. Perhaps this information is available to members of this committee, which is more directly concerned with R. E. A. than I am. But for the purpose of this record I should like to append a series of questions that would provide a number of missing links to complete the story of R E. A.'s acquisition program. [Hands to clerk.]

To illustrate my point, the record of the testimony of Mr. Nicholson before this committee last year indicates that he contended that less than 4 percent of R. E. A. funds had been spent for R. E. A. acquisitions. (Exhibit 2.) Vice President WALLACE at one time made the statement that some things may be literal truths but can be stated so that they are actual falsehoods. I think this is a case to illustrate his point. Mr. Nicholson did not lie to you, but he omitted a very cogent factor, which was that in the fiscal year of which he was speaking it would appear to me, from the incomplete data available, that about 66 percent of all funds spent by R. E. A. in the fiscal year 1943 involved acquisition of existing electric properties. (Exhibit 2, Annual Report, R. E. A., 1943, p. 7.) Obviously there is a very compelling need for full and complete information from R. E. A., information that has not been available to the average Member of Congress.

I think you will agree with me that in discussion of any public policy undertaken by a Federal agency we should apply two tests:

First. Is it a good sound public policy?

Second. Does it proceed within the framework of the law?

I shall address myself to the first question now, although there will be times when the question of sound policy and sound law are, as we like to say in the Interstate Commerce Committee, "inextricably intermingled."

The real development of the R. E. A.'s policy of purchasing city properties has its genesis back in the fall of 1941, just before Pearl Harbor, when, as the members of this committee will recall, you held rather extensive hearings on the question of availability of copper for rural lines, in view of the critical shortage of that vitally necessary war material. After your hearings were held, the copper situation became even more critical, since we had by then been plunged into actual war. In the following spring (of 1942) the Military Affairs Committee of the House made another examination of R. E. A.'s use of copper. After long and serious investigation, that committee brought forth a report which summarized a series of activities by the R. E. A. which can only be characterized as an unpatriotic, business-as-usual failure to cooperate in the war effort. From my standpoint, the worst indictment by the Military Affairs Committee against R. E. A. was its glaring failure to use what little copper it had to extend the benefits of electricity to bona fide farmers. It was conclusively shown that R. E. A. had let the farmer down when it squandered what copper it had on transmission lines which would not light a single additional farm home.

It was shown that this agency had recklessly ignored War Production Board orders for copper conservation, had hoarded copper in vacant fields to be used later for the construction of high transmission lines not designed to illuminate a single new farm home. Without going into the details of that exposure, I refer Members to House Report No. 1873, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session (exhibit 4). Therein, in cold, terse language, you will discover the story of a Federal bureaucracy caught red-handed in acts that came very close to sabotage of the war effort.

Until that episode, I had shared with many of my colleagues the opinion that the Rural Electrification Administration was a shining star in the firmament of the current bureaucracy. I still believe the act itself deserves that reputation. Only those who, like myself, were born on farms, who learned their three R's by the light of a flickering kerosene lamp and who know the primitive conditions that still exist in millions of farm homes even today, only they can truly appreciate the powerful stimulus to rural life brought about by farm electrification.

And now it is beginning to appear that the worst enemy of farm electrification is the administration of the Rural Electrification Act itself.

By the summer of 1941 the R. E. A. bureaucrats had distinctly slowed down in their work of extending rural distribution lines to actual farms. More and more of the annual appropriation was being devoted to high tension transmission lines which connected widely scattered electrical cooperatives already locally served by local companies. More and more of the funds were being spent on generating plants whose production costs were higher than purchased current. The simple neighborhood farm electric cooperative became a one-vote unit in a series of holding-company type cooperative which hypothecated a new and heavy debt to the Federal Government for these high lines and generating plants, few of which had any economic justification.

If there is a basic flaw in the Rural Electrification Act, it flows from the fact that bureaucracy, which passes upon the economic feasibility of these projects, is the only possible beneficiary if they fail to pay out—thus continuing the economic dependency of the individual cooperative to the bureaucracy. It will be remembered that before accepting P. W. A. bonds, R. F. C. had the right to, and did, investigate such loans and refused to accept the bonds on many projects. R. F. C. made an independent study with its own engineers and appraisers before it accepted bonds from P. W. A. The result was that P. W. A. exercised a much higher degree of caution in extending financial assistance to public agencies than it might otherwise have shown.

Under the R. E. A. Act, in the event of a default by a farmer cooperative, the only result would be the extension of the life of the control by the bureaucrats over this project. It may be urged that R. E. A. claims a very satisfactory record in financial statements of existing cooperatives. This may be fairly true as to bona fide farmer cooperatives up to the time the R. E. A. embarked upon its new program. However, as you will see, the farmers are now being loaded down with debts which they will have difficulty in paying off within the lifetime of their mortgages. In fact, in many cases the likelihood of ever paying out is remote. Even now R. E. A. is actively lobbying for an amendment to the act which would extend the life of existing loans from 25 to 50 years—and coincidentally extend the life of their control over these farmer cooperatives.

When war struck, these officials were feverishly working to complete a system of high-lines in the Southwest. Only drastic orders from the War Production Board, following the scathing report by the Military Affairs Committee, brought a halt to this scheme with consequent reversion of millions of pounds of copper to war-production channels.

This is the story of what happened after the R. E. A. program of high-line construction was cut short in the spring of 1942:

Caught with millions to spend and no place to spend it, the R. E. A. was "all dressed up with no place to go." They well knew that if they came back the following spring with a record of funds unspent, your committee would naturally be expected to limit them to an amount proportionate to their apparent needs. And that meant the further calamity—to them—of a relative cut in their administrative allotment.

Nothing strikes terror into the heart of the bureaucrat like the thought of shrinkage of his agency. Come hell or high water, the bureaucrat spends a goodly share of his mental efforts exploring and acting on means of expanding his bureau.

In the face of this crisis to bureaucracy, millions of dollars were quickly allocated for the purchase of existing utility systems.

This activity was not a change of policy but a change of pace. Buying occasional bits of private company lines had been common practice since 1937, so that this sudden expansion of purchases already had a shadow of precedent. But there was an extraordinary difference between this new policy and previous purchases.

"Cats and dogs" of the utility industry—obsolete and junk-pile properties whose holding-company owners must unload anyway under the provisions of the death sentence—were the items that could be bought most quickly and with least haggling. And building up dollar volume of purchases to show justification of continued administrative budgets was vital to these bureaucrats fighting for their jobs.

At this point permit me to present to you, chapter and verse, a few of the major examples of how these officials of the Federal Government have saddled with a mountain of debt the farmers who accept in good faith the written certification that these projects are self-liquidating. This record will show you how the cooperative movement has been prostituted, has been distorted beyond all recognition from the original idealistic conception of the rural electric cooperative. It should convince you that the present group running the R. E. A. is nothing more than a conspiracy to capture rural America and perpetuate it in economic serfdom, answerable only to their bureaucratic bosses without regard to the needs of the local farm electric cooperatives.

These examples were chosen because they point up one or more of the vicious characteristics of the new R. E. A. purchase program.

To my mind the doubtful honor of being horrible example No. 1 goes to the Grimes Pass case, not because of the amount of money involved, but because of the callous recklessness with which the members of a little struggling farm cooperative was saddled with a white elephant, the cost of which will be reflected in higher rates for years to come.

THE GRIMES PASS CASE

The Grimes Pass Power Co. was a very small company pocketed off in the Idaho Mountains on the south fork of the Payette River. Its chief power customers were three gold-dredging companies operating dredges in nearby workings. There were about 100 customers scattered among nearby villages which are almost ghost towns. The area is almost exclusively devoted to gold mining. (Exhibit 5.)

The War Production Board order shutting down gold mining closed down these dredges automatically in the fall of 1942. The power company, however, was forced, under the law, to continue to supply light to the villagers. With more than 80 percent of its revenue gone, the company was rapidly going bankrupt. It tried to sell out to the nearby Long Valley Cooperative. But the R. E. A. on November 13, 1942, informed company officials that because the project would not be economically self-liquidating, the R. E. A. would be acting illegally to advance funds.

Remember that statement in view of later events. The letter, signed by the late C. O. Falkenwald, chief of the applications and loans division of R. E. A., was admitted in evidence by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Idaho on January 25, 1943, at a hearing on the application of the company to permit it to discontinue service to its remaining customers on the ground that it was losing money at the rate of $30,000 annually.

But, Mr. Chairman, on May 31, 1943, the Long Valley Cooperative bought the property despite the Falkenwald official acknowledgment that such a purchase would be illegal. The deal, consummated at a price of $42,500 on May 31, 1943, was described by Falkenwald on November 13, 1942, as follows (Exhibit 6):

"Our studies have * * * indicated that" the Long Valley Cooperative of Donnelly, Idaho, "could operate these properties at the present time only at a loss * * * and I have been advised by our legal division that under our act, we could not * * * legally advance funds for the purchase of properties which could not be feasibly operated by our borrower."

The point may be raised that the letter was predicated on a higher price than the one finally offered. That argument carries no validity in view of the fact that with a property geared to produce and sell five times as much power as its market, the mere maintenance costs would be so great that it would lose money if the cooperative had taken it as a gift. The highest price any private company offered for the property was $15,000 minus the antique Diesels. That offer was on the speculation that eventually gold mining might be resumed as a profitable business sometime after the uncertain date of the termination of war. The R. E. A. paid nearly three times as much as the nearest similar offer. Why they didn't overbid the private offer by a reasonable amount, say a total price of a thousand dollars more, I cannot tell you, unless they deliberately wanted to soak the Long Valley folks deeper into debt.

Your committee has been led to believe that the R. E. A. has had very able and conscientious engineers on its staff. Among the duties of that staff the job of inspecting properties about to be purchased is or should be one of its chief justifications for existence.

It may be presumed that the farmers of the Long Valley cooperative, having every right to believe what the R. E. A. told them, accepted the property. In good faith they purchased it on the presumption that R. E. A. was advancing the money and, in protection of its own bankers' interest, must have thought it a sound property.

Somebody slipped on that point. Somebody on the vaunted engineering staff of R. E. A. Either they made no inspection of the company's dam or their inspection was so inefficient as to fail to detect its fatal weakness.

The dam which the cooperative purchased as part of the Grimes Pass Power Co. properties was one of the principal assets acquired. It was 35 years old, made of wooden cribs filled with rock, and was the main source of power. The only other source of power was an ancient Diesel outfit, used for stand-by purposes.

In the light of these circumstances it is important to note that on July 7, 1943, scarcely a month after the cooperative took over, the Grimes Pass Dam washed out!

Destroyed completely, the leaky old dam held out just long enough for its holding company owners to unload it on the Long Valley farmers.

On August 15, 1943, Ralph McDougall, of Donnelly, Idaho, president of the board of the Long Valley Power Co-op, stated that his R. E. A. had bought out the Grimes Pass Power Co. in the hopes of using its water-power generators, but on July 7 the Grimes Pass Dam broke, and here I quote him: "Making the property without value. The Grimes Pass Power Co. had a book value of $42,000 when we bought it. With the dam gone, I don't see how * * * the Grimes Pass property has any value at all." (Idaho Daily Statesman, August 15, 1943.)

The cooperative's new customers, the citizens of Grimes Pass, Idaho, felt that they should continue to receive service at least as cheaply as they had from the private company. But the Long Valley farmers, faced with the cost of supplying power from the old high-cost Diesel generating unit, decided to raise the minimum bill rates. The villagers protested against the increase to the State public utilities commission, as they had had every right to do under previous ownership.

These citizens of Grimes Pass, bought on the hoof as captive customers, were told that they were the property of the cooperative and that the rates charged by a cooperative were beyond the control of the commission. They were without redress.

The farmers of Long Valley have paid an outrageously high price for a utility system that fell apart almost as soon as it was unloaded on them. The system is unconnected with the nearest poles of their own system, 22 miles away. Yet they must continue to operate it even though it loses them money and though the best service they can render is unsatisfactory. And the customers at Grimes Pass now must pay a higher rate for poorer service than they had under private operation.

So much for the Grimes Pass case. It speaks for itself. I need not further point up the evils of a policy which opens the door to such reckless misuse of funds dedicated by Congress to bringing electricity to rural America.

THE SHO-ME CASE

Example No. 2 is the Sho-Me case.

Sho-Me is the name of a supercooperative made up of most of the individual distributing cooperatives in the State of Missouri.

As one of the first and biggest purchase allotments after the Rural Electrification Administration was cut short from its high-line program, the Rural Electrification Administration allotted to Sho-Me the sum of $4,275,000 for the purchase and "rehabilitation" of the Missouri Electric Power Co. This was on June 12, 1942, while the admonitions of Congress against its copper program was still ringing in the ears of Rural Electrification Administration officials.

The facts in this case should be considered in the light of the limitations set up in the Rural Electrification Administration Act. For one thing, the law says that Rural Electrification Administration shall operate in rural areas only and it defines a rural area as any community of 1,500 population or less. For another, the law states that Rural Electrification Administration shall be used to extend service to persons not already being served. These are wise provisions designed to husband Rural Electrification Administration funds for the purpose for which they are intended by Congress, bona fide farm electrification.

The fact that the Mepco purchase included 6 towns and cities with population above the 1,500 legal limit for rural areas, and 10,000 customers—97 percent of them urban—already receiving service, would indicate that by June 12, 1942, officialdom in R. E. A. had decided that the laws Congress set down to guide them in administering the act could be safely and completely ignored.

But the legality of this city purchase program deserves separate discussion. Before I address myself to that question it should first be established that the program is bad public policy, bad for the farmer particularly and bad for the public generally.

It is difficult, however, to separate at all times the legal from the public policy aspects of this case. For example, there is nothing in the law which by the widest interpretation would permit R. E. A. to advance funds in the name of farm electrification for the purchase and operation by a farmer co-op of a city water system, and three ice plants. Yet these were included in the deal.

Quite aside from the patent illegality of these waterworks and ice plant purchases, the very grave question is raised as to the wisdom of R. E. A. in underwriting such purchases. What group of farmers wants to undertake the operation of the waterworks

of any city? And if R. E. A. can use money earmarked by Congress for honest farm electrification for such properties, why can't they use such money to buy out radio stations, newspapers, undertaking parlors, and moving-picture theaters.

These incidental purchases, however, are picayune beside the question of what is going to become of the farm cooperative movement if such wholesale purchase of urban electrical systems is to continue.

For many years now the farmer's cooperative has been described as the heart of the Federal rural electrification program.

In his annual report for 1941 the R. E. A. Administrator said—and I quote: "The fundamental distinction between R. E. A. cooperatives and ordinary public utilities * * * lies in the fact that * * * no service is rendered to the general public as such" by cooperatives.

Again, in the 1938 report we find these words on page 43: "Cooperatives, to be successful, 'must be run by the people they serve for the benefit of the people they serve.'"

And yet again, in the 1939 report, we find these words on page 58: "A cooperative is owned by the people it serves. The consumer is not only a customer but a member * * * invariably the principle of one member, one vote is followed."

If these reports to Congress mean what they seem to mean, then the Sho-Me cooperative has been willfully distorted from a bona fide farmer cooperative to some strange and wonderful kind of hybrid corporation.

Sho-Me lost one of its fundamental farm cooperative characteristics by the R. E. A.'s own yardstick as stated in the 1941 annual report when, on October 13, 1942, it amended its charter so as to do business with the public generally. Under its previous charter it could do business only with its own members and therefore could not consummate the Mepco purchase.

So now 10,000 nonmember customers are the property of a supercooperative consisting of 31 members, all of them local farm distributing cooperatives scattered over the State of Missouri, and many of which can never be physically interconnected with the system.

What will be the fate of these nonmember customers? Are they to join the Sho-Me which is the holding company of the little cooperatives? Are they to organize themselves into one or more rural electrification cooperatives? I cannot answer that question. I do know this, however, that for them to organize as rural electrification cooperatives would be a farce. According to the Federal Power Commission reports less than 3 percent of the Mepco customers are rural—and obviously all of them already are receiving service.

And unless they do join a farm cooperative, Sho-Me will be in a fix when the tax man comes around and presents his bill. Our Federal tax laws protect the Government against tax evasion by dummy or fake cooperatives by the rule that unless 85 percent of the gross revenues of a cooperative come from its members it shall be subject to the usual Federal corporate taxes. And it is probable that Federal excise taxes would also apply to such cooperatives. By the criterion of the Federal tax laws Sho-Me will be just another utility holding company unless 85 percent of its revenues come from its members. And it should be borne in mind that many of Mepco's best customers, municipalities, and other governmental agencies, may not legally join a cooperative. There are 61 such public customers which cannot join, most of them heavy consumers.

But what becomes of the farm cooperative movement when these 10,000 city dwelling captive customers are dragged into an ostensible farmer cooperative? There is sworn testimony before the Public Service Commission that these people who were bought along with the Mepco properties are being told they won't get electricity unless they join up. It would appear that Federal R. E. A. officialdom is urging membership on the grounds that if 85 percent join they can avoid paying Federal corporate taxes. Is Sho-Me a real farm cooperative or a tax-evasion racket? Is R. E. A. a conspiracy to avoid payments of Federal taxes? No. The local farmer cooperative is not for that sort of thing, it is for the bureaucrats and the utility speculators who are forcing them into these deals. Has the farm cooperative movement descended to that level?

Rural Electrification officials have traditionally held that the farmer cooperative should not be subject to the jurisdiction of State utility regulatory commissions. (See particularly R. E. A. report for 1941.) On the grounds that the public interest cannot be affected since the cooperative serves only its own membership, the official attitude of R. E. A. has always opposed State regulation. It has also urged the principle that the Federal lender has a paramount interest in the welfare of the local cooperative and that that interest could be injured in the hands of State regulatory bodies, which, it was broadly hinted, could be influenced by private utility interests. Most States have recognized this principle, in many instances at the request of R. E. A. itself.

Yet in the Sho-Me case this cooperative, once free of State regulation voluntarily surrendered its independence to the State commission as a condition of approval of the purchase of Mepco. And R. E. A. so amended its loan contract with Sho-Me to subordinate and subject the Federal interest to the regulations and control of the Missouri State Utility Commission.

When R. E. A. thus subjected its relations with Sho-Me to the regulation of the State commission, it vitiated, in fact it destroyed, the only legal justification thus far advanced by R. E. A. for this purchase.

Insofar as it has been practicable I have sought to avoid any discussion of the legality of the so-called acquisition policies of R. E. A. at this time, addressing myself wholly to the question of its wisdom as a matter of public policy. However, at times the two questions cannot be separated as in the case at point. Let me explain: In allocating $4,275,000 to Sho-Me for the Mepco purchase R. E. A. separated the funds into two accounts. The first, in the amount of $2,504,000, was the purchase price to the current owners of the property. This is in excess of 58 percent of the total allotment. The remaining sum, $1,771,000, is set aside for the extension of service after the war to persons in rural areas not now receiving central station service. In testimony before the Missouri Public Service Commission the R. E. A. brought out that in order to extend service to some 5,000 rural homes after the war it was now purchasing a system with 10,000 customers at the present time. Its justification was that the loan for acquisition of these 10,000 customers was in fact only—and I quote—"incidental" to the purpose of the act of serving persons not now receiving service. The reverse of this coin is that unless the acquisition could be demonstrated to be incidental to the serving of persons now unserved, the acquisition would be illegal. By their own admission the prospect of service in a purchase of this category must not be vague and indefinite (solicitor's opinion—November 1942).

Yet, by their own legal reasoning, such as it is, when the R. E. A. surrendered to an agency outside the framework of the Federal Government its sovereignty over decisions as to extension of service to these alleged and supposedly unserved customers, then the whole transaction automatically became illegal.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is just exactly the kind of disregard of the law which has been going on daily without let or hindrance from Congress or any other source. Apparently R. E. A. has torn up the Rural Electrification Act and considers itself above the law.

If the $2,500,000 advance by the R. E. A. for the acquisition of Mepco were solely for that purpose and not contingent upon extension of rural lines elsewhere to farmers not now served, this deal would be illegal by R. E. A.'s own definitions of what is legal.

The Missouri Public Service Commission in approving the Mepco acquisition specifically waived the question of the legality of the use of Federal funds for such purposes as beyond the scope of its powers. With equal emphasis it reserved to itself the right to approve or disapprove that part of the total allotment which, according to the R. E. A., was to be used to extend service to unserved persons (exhibit 7). As of this moment Sho-Me is powerless even if it had the equipment to take advantage of this allotment. No man here can say or safely predict when or whether this acquisition will ever be legitimatized by the extension of electricity to so much as one unserved farmer.

Even if approval had been granted, the testimony of the manager of Sho-Me before the Commission indicated that he knew of no plans for the extension of electricity to farmers. This man, H. J. Williams, further stated that extension of service to these farmers could be made without this acquisition (exhibit 8, p. 628).

Moreover, testimony further developed that many of the towns in the Mepco area contemplate as soon as the war is over to take over the electric plants within their city limits by condemnation proceedings (exhibit 7, pp. 15, 31). In the latter event, with the urban loads removed, Sho-Me will be left with the skin and bones of a system without the flesh and blood which might economically justify the purchase.

When the R. E. A. surrenders its control over the funds it advances because the rural cooperative to which it has lent money has assumed so many of the characteristics of a public utility as to be so deemed by public-service commissions, then you must agree that the farmer cooperative movement has become big business.

If the experience of Sho-Me is duplicated in other States, then we must enact a death sentence on the holding-company power trust of the Federal Government. We must return the rural electric utility business to the farmer and take it away from the power-hungry bureaucrats who have prostituted the fine ideal of farm electrification.

My primary interest in this study has been the fate of the farmer cooperatives in the hands of bureaucrats and speculators whose conspiracy to foist upon the farmers these cats and dogs and odds and ends of overvalued utility properties bids fair to wreck the healthy development of sound economic farmer electric cooperatives in America.

Aside from the farmers, however, there are others with an interest at stake in this program. What of the 10,000 captive customers who were sold in a deal between the officers of a holding company and executives of a Federal bureau here in Washington? What of the citizens of Donophan, Mo., with a population of 1,600? Of Fredericktown, with 3,400? Marshfield, with 1,800? Mountain Grove, with 2,400? Sullivan, with 2,500? And Willow Springs with 1,500? Was this purchase made with the approval of these communities? Did they agree to become willing members of the Sho-Me cooperative? The answer is emphatically in the negative.

Remember that 22 of the 31 members of Sho-Me are located north of the Missouri River and far remote from the problems and operations of these cities (exhibit 8, pp. 626–628).

You will remember a speech the President made in Seattle in which he discussed the question of public versus private ownership of public utilities. He then said (September 21, 1932):

"I * * * lay down the following principle: Where a community—a city or county or a district—is not satisfied with the service rendered or the rates charged by the private utility, it has the undeniable basic right, as one of its functions of government, one of its functions of home rule, to set up, after a fair referendum to its voters has been had, its own governmentally owned and operated service. * * *

"That is the principle which applies to communities and districts, and I would apply the same principles to the Federal and State Governments."

By the Roosevelt test the R. E. A., in this and in every other instance where it connives with public-utility speculators to sell whole cities into public ownership, has deliberately ignored the basic principles of democracy. They either dared not trust the electorate of these communities for a simple expression of their will, or they just didn't give a damn.

These two cases are not isolated examples of an otherwise sound policy. As a matter of fact there are dozens of acquisitions as bad as these or worse, either consummated, pending, or contemplated. To cite the details of each one would repetitiously burden this record inasmuch as they all follow much the same dangerous pattern, with only minor variations.

THE INDIAN ELECTRIC CASE

The pending purchase of the Oklahoma Utilities Co. in my own State by a small farmer group, the Indian Electric Co-op, is a case in point. Briefly, some of the major details here will show you how the policy of acquisitions varies from State to State only in detail:

1. The Indian Electric has fewer than 400 tied-in customers. It proposes to purchase a private, tax-paying utility system, the Oklahoma Utilities Co. That company has 1,824 urban customers.

2. Under Oklahoma laws the farmer cooperative is protected by a provision which permits it to serve no more than 10 percent nonmembers. So, if the deal goes over, there will be an urban vote in this cooperative of more than 4 to 1 against the farmer vote. Even if the ambitious dream of R. E. A. comes true, to add 600 new farm customers after the war, the farmers will still be outvoted 2 to 1.

3. This purchase again steps far beyond the "rural area" as defined by Congress as communities of 1,500 or less. The city of Fairfax with a population of 2,327 and the city of Cleveland with a population of 2,500 are both served by this system and would become the customers of 385 widely scattered farmers.

This purchase does bear one peculiarity that is not apparent in the information available to me in the other cases which I have cited. I don't pretend to know all the inner and hidden ramifications of all of these deals. Only the power of subpena by a properly authorized investigating committee could reveal them. But in the case of Indian Electric there is one odd factor that has never been satisfactorily explained.

It is a well-known fact down in Oklahoma, having been published in the local press, that the Crescent Public Service Co., the holding company which owns Oklahoma Utilities, accepted the offer of the R. E. A. for $237,000, despite the existence of a firm offer from an adjacent highly solvent private concern amounting to $12,000 more than R. E. A. offered.

Now in my part of the country folks still follow the old-fashioned idea of selling to the highest bidder and of buying from the lowest. We are glad to see the farmers getting a bargain price. But we can be forgiven if we are still curious as to the motives which compelled the executive officers of the Crescent Co. to ignore an offer which would have netted its stockholders a cool $12,000 more than R. E. A. offered. Could this purchase actually have been part of a larger and as yet undisclosed secret deal involving sale of additional properties to R. E. A.? Was the S. E. C. informed of the existence of this additional and higher offer when its approval of the sale was sought? If not, why not? For that matter, as the public protector of stockholders interests, did the S. E. C initiate inquiries as to existence of other offers?

I do not state these questions as charges. I merely assert that until these mysteries are explained the motives of the Federal R. E. A. officials and of the holding company officials must remain open to question.

The R E. A. is in a fine position to boast to its Indian electric members that it bought the property at a bargain. But it can't do that until it can explain how this happened—and why. R. E. A showed no such solicitude for the farmers of Long Valley, Idaho, on whom they unloaded the Grimes Pass junk yard which it deluded the farmers into believing was a utility system.

Nor did it show such solicitude for the debts of the farmer members of the Wasco Electric Cooperative of Oregon in the purchase of the Maupin River Co. One word on that case and I am through, for now, with instances of these acquisitions.

According to the statistical report of the Oregon Public Utilities Commission for 1940–41, the Maupin Power Co. was valued at $53,331. Included in that valuation was a depreciation reserve of $19,169. According to the bill of sale, that reserve was not transferred Yet on December 30, 1942, R. E. A. paid $52,500 for the property—when the actual cash value was about $34,000—an overcharge, a write-up, a gravy spoon, or whatever you want to call it, of 50 percent, or about $18,000.

This deal is small potatoes, of course, in terms of the millions which R. E. A. is accustomed to throw around, but it certainly will add a lot to the cost of electricity when padded into the light bills of the Wasco farmers.

These cases are but a few of many. I have not the resources at my disposal nor have I access to information, even had I the time to make a similar exposé of the dozens of similar acquisitions either consummated or pending.

These should be sufficient, however, to establish the fact that a new and ambitious policy involving millions earmarked by Congress for farmers has been inaugurated by R. E. A. without a shadow of authority by Congress. Some of the alarming results of this policy can be summarized briefly:

1. Millions of dollars intended by Congress to bring light into farm homes of America are finding their way into the bank accounts of utility holding companies, without benefit to farmers.

2. In their haste to build a record of money spent, the R. E. A. officials have been reckless in acquiring, far above their proper value, obsolete "cats and dogs" of the utility industry to the benefit of brokers and holding companies and to the grave detriment of the financial position of fine, sound farmer co-ops.

3. This has created an unnatural merging of town and country in a system of hybrid cooperatives that are neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. Captive customers are dragooned into farmer cooperatives which they had no part in creating and in which their urban power requirements are often contrary to the less costly rural power requirements and in which, eventually, the farmer interest can be outvoted and made secondary to that of the city group. In short, the farmer cooperative ideal which is the core of the rural electrification movement has been distorted and debased beyond recognition.

4. This policy has been accomplished in the face of stringent strictures contained in the act itself and could only have resulted from a contemptuous disregard of the intent of the law and of the intent of Congress. Persons already receiving central station service and who do not live in rural areas as defined in the act, cannot by the remotest stretch of the legal imagination, be included within the benefits of the R. E. A. Act. Yet in every one of these acquisitions one or both of these strictures has been flagrantly violated. Such disregard of the law, if left unchallenged, will only lead to further emasculation by administrative action of one of the finest laws enacted in the past decade.

5. One of the principal motives behind the transfer of ownership of public utilities from private to cooperative or public agencies is that these revenue-producing properties automatically are removed from all Federal tax rolls and most of the local tax loads. In the case of co-ops, however, there is no automatic release from Federal corporate taxes until at least 85 percent of the revenue comes from bona fide members. (Whether the same rule applies to the Federal electrical energy excise taxes of 3.3 percent of gross sales remains an open question.) Inasmuch as the wartime tax load now averages almost 30 percent of the gross revenues of privately owned utilities as against 15 percent only a few years ago, it is apparent that this enormous differential not only constitutes a tremendous incentive toward public acquisition of such properties but also handicaps private bidders who normally would be interested in purchase. Thus, the S. E. C. in executing the holding company death sentence and the R. E. A. in vigorously pursuing a policy of acquisition of city properties for farmer co-ops are placed in the anomalous position as Federal agencies of defeating the very purposes of the Federal tax laws and the efforts to raise war funds in our various war loan drives. Their position in pursuing this policy in time of war is especially unsound and unpatriotic. Furthermore, they unfairly place the farmer cooperative actively in the same role when it seeks membership from newly purchased customers with the implied or announced inducement of tax evasion.

6. One of the most fundamentally unsound phases in this policy is the danger of shackling the electric co-op movement into semipermanent economic bondage to a Federal bureaucracy. No matter how high-minded that agency may profess itself to be at the moment, it is apparent that the fathers of the R. E. A. Act never contemplated such a result and sought to avoid it.

This danger is inherent in all governmental adventures in the banking business: The use of banker control on its borrowers for political or bureaucratic motives beyond the narrow limits of the banking function. At this point it is my purpose to close my discussion of the public policy phase of this question by quoting a recent resolution by the Cooperative League of America. To qualify the witness I should add that the Cooperative League is a federation of some of the oldest and finest cooperatives in the country, almost exclusively rural. Adhering to the traditions of the Rochdale cooperative ideals, this group through its affiliated members speaks for millions of American farmers. It dwarfs into insignificance the entire group of R. E. A.-fostered co-ops. Where R. E. A. co-ops count their revenues in thousands, the turn-over of these cooperative league members count theirs in millions. The league is the genuine spokesman for the cooperative movement in America. This resolution speaks more clearly than I on the problems raised by

the recent adventures of R. E. A. into the realms of Wall Street finance. It was adopted by the league in January 1943, and it reads as follows:

"VIGILANT SUPERVISION NEEDED TO PREVENT MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT GIFTS, LOANS, ETC., FOR UNDEMOCRATIC POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PURPOSES

"A resolution adopted by the directors of the Cooperative League at their meeting on January 7-8, 1943.

"Whereas the obligation of every democratic government is to govern best by governing least and the obligation of every public servant in a democracy is to strive for conditions which will encourage and enable self-government by all groups, or government by internal forces, and thus lessen the necessity for external political government; and

"Whereas our Government in Washington, in the years of depression and panic, established through loans of public money and otherwise certain business enterprises as relief measures and also for the improvement of conditions on farms and in towns and cities; and

"Whereas there is inherent in every gift or loan of public money the opportunity for persons or forces in government to attempt to gain control of the people to whom loans or gifts are made, and the temptation to seek such authority and control is so insidious that it must be guarded against with the eternal vigilance recommended to those who would preserve their liberties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cooperative League of the United States of America shall advise the President of the United States and each and every member of the Cabinet of the President, and every administrator of war agencies of government, and the Congress of the United States, that the league and the millions of cooperators for whom the league speaks states and affirms these principles to which every democratic government must subscribe:

"1. That every society of people interested in preserving a democracy will and must seek every possible means of freeing people, as rapidly as possible, from each and every influence and obligation which might restrict their freedom and their right to fulfill their obligations as citizens of the democracy, and particularly must seek and approve of means which will enable citizens to repay all loans from public funds and thus escape from the ever-present threat to their political freedom which exists in a debt of a citizen to any agency of government.

"2. That every society of people which is interested in preserving democracy must oppose, resolutely, every attempt to use any funds of government or public funds, or any resource of government or public resource in association with any organization or corporation or company which might influence or attempt to influence the will of the people and particularly the will of any persons who have been affected in any way by the use of those public funds or those public resources.

"3. That the high ideal of democracy expressed by Hon. George W. Norris in writing into the law which provided for the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration the legal mandate against political activities and political influences in Rural Electrification Administration should be adhered to in letter and in spirit.

"4. That cooperative organizations of consumers, owned by consumers, organized on the soundest of democratic principles which are government of the organizations by men and not by money, organized and operated on a nonprofit basis, organized and owned in large part by the same citizens who are members of rural-electrification cooperatives, are fully capable of producing and distributing all the goods and services desired by rural-electrification cooperatives and their members and no benefit to cooperatives or to the members of rural-electrification cooperatives or to the public can be had from duplication of cooperative organizations; and

"5. That the menace to democratic institutions inherent in the loan of public money by any agency of Government and to any citizen or group of citizens is so great that it is the obligation of the Congress of the United States to maintain constant vigilance over such loans and a constant spotlight of publicity should be kept on the activities of all such agencies of Government, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its subsidiary agencies, the Department of Agriculture and all of its agencies, so that the temptation to misuse public funds will be minimized; and

"6. That therefore every agency of Government in these United States should declare immediately against each and every person and each and every organization of persons and every activity of such persons and such organizations which would:

"(a) Permit or induce the use of any Government funds, by direct or indirect means, for the promotion of any organization which might directly or indirectly influence the opinion or the policies or the decisions of any agency of Government; and

"(b) Permit or induce the expenditure of any Government funds in the employment of any person any part of whose official activities would be associated in any way with the promotion of any organization which would attempt in any way to influence or control the actions or decisions or policies of our Government or any of its agencies."

THE AFTERTHOUGHT OPINION

Until now I have confined my remarks as far as possible to the simple question of the wisdom of using farm-electrification funds in the acquisition program. If you have been persuaded that this policy is unsound, there still remains the question of whether it is legal. If it can be demonstrated that, right or wrong, this policy has legal sanction, then the road to an adequate remedy will be a long and difficult one requiring the legislative machinery of amendment. But if it can be shown that it is not legal, recourse can be had immediately through this committee. These lawless bureaucrats can be brought to heel by the language of this appropriation without embarking upon new legislation.

Those of you who are attorneys and have had the privilege of a legal education have an advantage over me at the outset in any discussion of a legal question. But I do profess to be a student of government and to have a working knowledge of the English language. Proceeding from that point I can say that I have submitted this question to some of the leading legal lights of this House and I speak with the considered judgment of Members whose legal reputations are as high as any attorney in the land.

To my knowledge there exists only one formal, official, legal opinion addressed to the question of the statutory powers of the R. E. A. in making purchases such as we have considered here. That opinion was written by Robert H. Shields, Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture. (Exhibit 9.) It is dated November 24, 1942, just about a month following my request to the Comptroller General for his opinion of the legality of the acquisition program and a week prior to his letter to me dated December 1, 1942 in which he quotes from that opinion. By its own admission R. E. A. had made 245 acquisitions of existing operating utility systems or parts thereof in the previous 4 years without troubling to examine its basic legal authority to spend Federal funds after this fashion. A more bland and unconscionable confession of misfeasance in office I have never encountered in the years I have been in Congress. Millions of dollars had been spent in the name of the farmer-cooperative movement to acquire utility systems without so much as a general legal opinion on this question from the Department Solicitor. Only when the Comptroller General requested it, in response to my inquiry in October 1942, did R. E. A. officialdom even bother to obtain such an opinion.

It is a matter of conjecture whether there ever would have been a legal opinion by the Department of Agriculture on this subject had not the Comptroller General requested it. The very fact that this policy had proceeded apace for 4 years without a legal peg to hang on reflects contempt for the law and for the will of Congress that is hardly compatible with sound administrative practice—if I may understate the case.

For your consideration I am appending as part of my remarks the full copy of the Agriculture Department Solicitor's opinion on this matter. It came into my possession in response to an inquiry to Secretary Wickard last December. But to my knowledge it has never before been made public in full, although the opinion has been drawn upon in part in letters by the Comptroller General to myself and to the Chairman of this committee, Mr. TARVER, both of which letters were incorporated in the record of the hearings of your committee a year ago. Careful perusal of the text of this opinion will reveal probably the most compelling reason for the obscurity in which it has languished unseen in the archives of the Department of Agriculture for more than a year.

With his legal reputation at stake, I can well understand the blushing reluctance of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture in exposing to the gaze of competent lawyers this classic of legal casuistry. It requires no legal knowledge to understand this opinion for what it is. Written after the policy had become an accomplished fact, after 245 such acquisitions had been approved, the job of the Solicitor was to draft an ex parte tissue of legal sophisms and special pleadings which would lend, if not the odor of sanctity, at least the color of legality to several hundred past cases involving millions of dollars to say nothing of supplying the Rural Electrification Administration with a shadow of justification for future operations.

What would have happened if the Solicitor, on full examination, had rendered an opinion that these acquisitions had been illegal? From the standpoint of the bureaucrats, chaos would have reigned, jobs would have been vacated over night, contracts would have been invalidated, and not only the Rural Electrification Administration but the Department of Agriculture, by its own admission, would have been brought into disrepute before the public and the Congress. So this opinion comes before you with two strikes on it. It is a tailor-made opinion, cut, fit, and made to measure in an attempt to square past activities which are quite apparently beyond the pale of the law under which they were undertaken. The Rural Electrification Administration and the legal department were in far better case had this opinion been dated January 1, 1938, before this extensive program had been undertaken than at a date so far advanced in the program that the good faith of any opinion rendered at so late an hour must be subject to suspicion.

This is an afterthought opinion.

If this is an example of administrative law then a reform along the pattern of the Walter-Logan bill is long overdue.

Studded with legal pseudosyllogisms, this opinion attempts to prove by mental acrobatics that black, after all, is white.

Let us examine the theories set forth in this opinion. The law authorizes that loans be

made to construct rural systems. This opinion blandly asserts that the word "construct" means to "acquire" or "to purchase." In substantiation the Solicitor points to a case, and I quote here from the opinion:

"In order to determine whether certain claimants possessed maritime liens it was necessary to decide whether the claims arose during the construction of a ship. The facts urged to establish construction involved the purchase of a hull, and the installation of a power plant within the hull, with the final result that there was created a suction dredge or ship. The conclusion of the court is as follows:

"'He gathered certain elements, which, when brought together, assembled, coordinated, resulted in, or brought into existence the entity, the thing, which he desired. The "old hull" was the first element obtained, and upon this he placed certain machinery and appliances, which, being brought into orderly relation, constituted the dredge. The process, described by the master, is not "reconstructing" or repairing an existing entity, but, by bringing together—correlating—a number of independent entities, constructing a definite entity; and this process is construction.'"

The above is the strongest single case cited, the nearest to validity. The case, however, does not bear upon the problem we are considering. Of course, Congress meant that the R. E. A. was to construct rural systems by means of the buying of poles and wire and substations and, if necessary, generators and dynamos, all of which might have been old or new, and to put them together to construct a system. How the Solicitor can read into the above opinion a justification for R. E. A.'s acquisition program is beyond my grasp. If Congress had meant anything else, it would have so stated.

According to the opinion, the provision of the act prescribing that the purpose of loans shall be "the furnishing of electric service to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service" was inserted in section 4 because of a legislative intent to exclude loans for the purpose of paralleling existing systems and thus creating duplication with established facilities. Ex-Senator George Norris, sponsor of the bill in the Senate, and Representative SAM RAYBURN, sponsor of the bill in the House, are quoted to support this interpretation. Norris interpreted the limitation to mean: "There will not be set up an organization and money loaned to it for the purpose of electrifying a rural area which is now supplied." Mr. RAYBURN interpreted the limitation to mean: "This organization * * * would finance projects in virgin territory only."

On this point the opinion is right when it interprets the limitation and the intent of the Congress as excluding duplication; it is wrong when it interprets the limitation and intent of the Congress as including acquisitions.

This is revealed by the simple test of paraphrasing the pertinent parts of section 4 to include the word "acquisition." So paraphrased, section 4 reads: "The Administrator is authorized to make loans * * * for the purpose of financing the acquisition of existing facilities for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central-station service."

Or, "The Administrator is authorized to buy the facilities that are being used to serve persons in rural areas who are not being served by central-station service."

The result is, of course, ridiculous, meaningless, for in effect, it empowers the Administrator to buy facilities so long as the facilities are not those of a central station system. The only electric facilities in rural areas that would not be included as an integral part of a central station system would be farm Delco outfits.

The effect of this simple test is even more revealing when applied to the statements quoted by the Department solicitor to prove the intent of Congress. Paraphrasing the Rayburn quotation to include acquisitions one gets: "This organization would finance the acquisition of facilities in virgin territory only." (According to Webster the word "virgin" means "new; hitherto unused.")

The conclusion is inescapable that acquisitions are not authorized by section 4, and that the word "construction" refers to the construction of new lines.

The R. E. A. Act also outlaws loans for serving urban customers and authorizes the administration to do business in rural areas only. Section 13 of the act specifically defines the term "rural area" to mean "any area of the United States not included within the boundaries of any city, village, or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants" (exhibit 10).

How the R. E. A. lawyers hurdle the specific statutory limitation of section 13 must be read to be believed. In the following excerpts from this prize opinion note particularly the argument to the effect that if the employees of manufacturers of line equipment and electrical appliances are collaterally benefited (and there is nothing illegal about this) why not urban consumers?

"1. The Administrator is financing the construction of a system. The erection of the new lines plus the acquisition of existing lines including certain small urban facilities and the integration of the whole as one system, is the construction of a system.

"2. The purpose of the loan and the construction of the system is to bring electric energy to the unserved persons in rural areas. To deny to the Administrator the authority to exercise his power for the declared purpose because a portion of the system financed is within a nonrural area would violate a primary rule of statutory interpretation.

"In other words, the unserved persons whose benefit is the purpose of the loan must be in 'rural areas' but all the facilities necessary to serve them need not be. In its legal aspects the problem is no different than the financing of a generating plant which serves a rural system but which is located in a city of more than 1,500 population. There are many reasons which require an urban location for generating facilities, such as better access to transportation, coal, water, skilled labor, etc. R. E. A. has financed several such generating plants. Similarly the purpose of acquired urban lines is not the service of the urban consumers but the service of prospective rural consumers. The fact that the urban consumers will be collaterally benefited or affected is immaterial to the legal question here under discussion. Many persons are collaterally benefited by an R. E. A. loan—contractors, engineers, and their employees; manufacturers of line equipment and consumer appliances; employees of such manufacturers; etc. The statutory limitation deriving from the definition of 'rural areas' presents exactly the same problem as the limitation already discussed deriving from the clause 'persons * * * who are not receiving central station service.' If the benefit to persons already served, whether they be rural or urban, is incidental to an accomplishment of the essential statutory purpose the doctrine of incidental power is applicable."

If consistency is a jewel, the master minds of the R. E. A. legal department are as unadorned as naked Dukhobors. Time was when their present legal position was rank heresy. Time was when they contended that they could not under any conditions serve towns in excess of 1,500 population. But, necessity being the mother of invention, they have thrown consistency and the R. E. A. Act out the window in the magnificent invention contained in the fabric of the afterthought opinion.

Only when R. E. A. funds for down-to-earth, grass-root, honest-to-goodness farm electrification could no longer be spent for that purpose, because of the copper shortage, did they see the error of their ways. The great light dawned upon them only when the W. P. B. ordered construction—as Congress conceived the word to construct—to be halted. But the synchronization of the change of the legal theory with the change of policy made necessary if R. E. A. could maintain the full volume of its appropriations did not become apparent until the Comptroller General raised the issue in response to my query in October 1942. Is this just an odd coincidence?

That there was a time when R. E. A. piously foreswore any intention of invading urban areas is revealed in the following exchange of remarks between Representative WIGGLESWORTH and the R. E. A. Administrator on December 14, 1936, in hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill (p. 483) for the fiscal year 1938:

"Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Are we to understand that your work is limited by the definition of 'rural area' to those portions of the country where there are less than 1,500 inhabitants per town, we will say?

"Mr. COOKE. Any rural country and any town with a population of less than 1,500."

R. E. A. officials expressed the same opinion on December 6, 1937, in hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill (p. 648) for the fiscal year 1939:

"Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Carmody, would you care to make an informal statement about your work?

"Mr. CARMODY. If it will save your time and serve your purposes, I am prepared to answer any questions that you may want to ask without making a preliminary statement, except to show you a map that will give you a notion of what we are talking about. * * * This gives you an idea of the spread of the projects throughout the country.

"Mr. WIGGLESWORTH This is all in communities of less than 1,500?

"Mr. CARMODY. Yes; cities and towns are not served by lines built with R. E. A. funds."

Less than 5 months before, the R. E. A. made its first known sizable allotment to a cooperative to buy an urban property—$4,375,000 allotment to the Sho-Me Co-op, of Columbia, Mo., to buy Missouri Electric Power Co., announced June 24, 1942—Deputy R. E. A. Administrator V. D. Nicholson categorically stated:

"Under our statute we are limited to rural areas, and we have no right to serve urban areas beyond 1,500 population." (House hearings, February 3, 1942, agricultural appropriation bill, 1943, p. 418.)

That R. E. A. didn't think it could purchase urban property under the law is also revealed by the following exchange of remarks on February 3 between Representative Terry and R. E. A. Administrator Slattery, in hearings on the House agricultural appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1943:

"Mr. TERRY. Mr. Slattery, you are purchasing power plants in various localities to use in connection with the cooperatives; are you not?

"Mr. SLATTERY. Yes, sir, Judge; small ones.

"Mr. TERRY. Is there any limitation to the size of the towns in which you make the purchase of these power plants?

"Mr. SLATTERY. Towns of 1,500, under the limitation contained in the act.

"Mr. TERRY. That comes within the terms of the act?

"Mr. SLATTERY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TERRY. And you can go into towns of not over 1,500 population and purchase power plants?

"Mr. SLATTERY. Yes, sir." (House hearings, agricultural appropriation bill, 1943, p. 428.)

Deputy Administrator Nicholson qualified this opinion somewhat by observing that the R. E. A. could buy a plant in a town of more than 1,500 persons provided the "sole" purpose

was to serve persons in rural areas or in areas of less than 1,500 people. In other words, R. E. A. could buy a plant in a town of more than 1,500 people, but it could not use that facility to serve customers in that town. Nicholson stated:

"I might say that if the plant was for the sole purpose of serving people in rural areas, the fact that the plant itself was located in a town or city of a larger size would not make it come within the limitation of the statute. There are very few such instances, but it is possible for that to happen, and I think there have been a few of them."

It is indeed strange that the R. E. A. would change its tune in regard to the legality of serving towns in excess of the statutory limit. R. E. A. lawyers have asserted ever since 1937 that acquisitions were legal but that it was illegal to serve customers in towns of more than 1,500 population. These same lawyers, however, awoke on a morning some time in 1942—when construction on R. E. A. projects had been curtailed by Government action and when R. E. A. was hard pressed to spend funds at its disposal legally—and discovered that they had been wrong, that the R. E. A. could serve and even buy properties in cities with a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants.

In the light of the points which I have brought out in this discussion some of the finest legal minds in the House of Representatives are in complete accord with me in that as a legal opinion it is not worth the paper it is written on. It is a strained, labored distortion of the clear intent of Congress and of the law. It is a vain seeking after legal loopholes to accomplish objectives which the law intended to prevent.

And yet, with nimble-witted agility worthy of a better cause, the Rural Electrification Administration has made a virtue out of its own necessities. Having been smoked out by the Comptroller General and forced to put in writing its legal justification, it now interprets these two letters of the Comptroller General as valid, legal decisions which give them the green light of the law for pursuing this policy.

At one point in the Administrator's annual report (1943) we read, on page 7:

"Allotments were relatively small because R. E. A. deferred action on many loan applications for several months in order to make absolutely certain of the legal propriety of the loans for acquiring existing systems which these applications included. With the added assurance of two decisions of the Comptroller General, early in 1943, sustaining the legality of the financing of the acquisitions, R. E. A. made allotments totaling $4,442,800 for the purchase and rehabilitation of existing systems, and for extending service to adjacent rural areas not now receiving central station service."

To refer to the letters of the Comptroller General as "decisions" is an abuse of the credulity of Congress. I refer to the text of the letters themselves to refute this impudent mendacity in the annual report of the R. E. A. for the fiscal year 1943. In his letter to me on December 1, 1942, in one of the two alleged "decisions," the Comptroller General said:

"The jurisdiction of this office is such that decisions are not required or authorized by law to be rendered at the request of other than a disbursing officer, a certifying officer, or the head of an executive department or other Government establishment, except in connection with the review of specific claims settled by this office."

That, Mr. Chairman, is from the very language of what is now being called a decision which supposedly constitutes a legal milestone for the establishment of this policy. I call your attention to the note of pious disinterestedness where they claim that they have withheld allotments for acquisition until they had received the assurance of these so-called decisions and that not until they had received them did they make allotments totaling $4,400,000. But they failed to note that in the preceding fiscal year the Sho-Me allotment alone totaled $4,375,000, an amount not included in this annual report, and for a prior year. Again on page 13 of the annual report we read as follows:

"On December 1, 1942, informally, and again on March 12, 1943, in a formal opinion, the Comptroller General sustained the legality of the financing of acquisitions with R. E. A. funds, and confirmed the long-standing opinion of the R. E. A. legal staff and of the Solicitor's Office that acquisition loans are permissible where the acquisition is incidental to the statutory purpose of providing service to unserved persons in rural areas" (p. 13).

Thus we find that the letter to me referred to on page 7 as a decision turns out to be only an informal opinion and that the letter to the chairman of this committee on March 12, 1943, was a formal opinion. This despite the fact that in his letter to me the Comptroller General disclaims any authority under the law to render a decision at the request of a Member of Congress.

It will be noted in the above quotations the Administrator, in the first instance, referred to decisions of the Comptroller General and, in the second instance, to opinions. It is assumed, following a careful reading of the text, that the Administrator has used the word "opinion" synonymously with the word "decision," since only a decision would be capable of sustaining the legality of an executive action.

Decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States are published annually by the United States Government Printing Office and contain all the decisions of that Office made during a given fiscal year. The decisions for the fiscal year July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, were published as volume 22 of the series. A search of that volume, however, fails to reveal the decisions referred to by the Administrator of the R. E. A. There is no decision of the Comptroller General dated December 1, and although there were two decisions dated March 12, neither referred to the R. E. A. The first was a decision by the Assistant Comptroller General to the Secretary of War and the second was a decision by the Assistant Comptroller General to the Secretary of State.

As a matter of fact the Comptroller General is not authorized to make decisions on the basis of the request of a Member of Congress or a committee of Congress. As noted by the Comptroller General in his letter to me dated December 1, 1942, "the jurisdiction of this Office is such that decisions are not required or authorized by law to be rendered at the request of other than a disbursing officer, a certifying officer, or the head of an executive department or other Government establishment, except in connection with the review of specific claims which have been settled by this Office."

Reference to the law under which the Comptroller General operates indicates that he is only authorized to "make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue appropriations or expenditures" (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 31, par. 53 (b)). And at no place does the law authorize the Comptroller General to issue anything which even resembles an informal opinion capable of sustaining the legality of an executive action.

Therefore, the Comptroller General's letters dated December 1, 1942, and March 12, 1943, are not decisions of the Comptroller General as referred to by the R. E. A. Administrator. They are informatory reports—that and only that. And, as reports, they were based to a great extent upon information furnished the Comptroller General by the R. E. A. This is freely indicated by the Comptroller General in his letter dated December 1, 1942. Therein he stated: "* * * with a view of giving you so much information relative to the matter as reasonably could be obtained at this time, I have examined the terms of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 * * * and obtained a report from the Secretary of Agriculture, under whose supervision the R. E. A. now functions, concerning the matter."

The R. E. A. attempt to make a distinction between the letter dated December 1, 1942, and the letter dated March 12, 1943, by calling the first an informal opinion and the second a formal opinion is an interesting, though strained, interpretation that refuses to stand up when carefully scrutinized. The major part of the March 12 letter is a reproduction of the December 1 letter and therefore the letters cannot be read or interpreted apart from each other.

Waiving for the moment the validity of the Comptroller General's billets doux to Chairman TARVER and to myself as legal pins to support the acquisition policy, there still remains the fact that in neither of these letters was there any attempt to give legal justification for serving cities with population in excess of 1,500. On that point the Comptroller General is silent. Yet most of the objectionable acquisitions include towns far in excess of that statutory limitation. Even if they seek to cloak their illegal acts behind these letters, there remains a large gap which at this late date remains unexplained. It is entirely possible that some further color of justification may have been or will be concocted to bolster up the sagging mental processes involved in the Solicitor's opinion of November 24. But until and unless Congress expressed itself affirmatively, I am sure that you will agree that R. E. A. has acted without sanction of law in pursuing a policy that is not only illegal but of grave danger to the farm-electrification movement.

Last year this committee apparently attempted to confine the activities of R. E. A. to new construction. The phrase appears not only in the appropriation bill but also in the accompanying committee report. But under the theory that construction means and includes acquisition of existing electrical systems, the supposed limitation had no force and effect in restraining the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is my sincere hope that all true friends of farm electrification in this House will band together to put a stop to this rape of R. E. A. by power-hungry bureaucrats. It is my request to this committee that limiting provisions be placed on all moneys granted R. E. A. to compel the proper use of those funds.

Recently I ran onto a word that is new to me which fits this situation like a glove. It is "kakistocracy." Derived from the Greek, it means "government by the worst of men." I think that the time has arrived when Congress must deal with the "kakistocrats" in the R. E. A.

I thank you.

George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the introductory portion of an address on the life of George Washington, prepared by

the Reverend James E. Chessor, of Centerville, Tenn.:

"Where may the wearied eye repose,
When gazing on the Great;
Where neither guilty glory glows,
Nor despicable state?
Yes—one—the first—the last—the best—
The Cincinnatus of the West,
Whom envy dared not hate,
Bequeathed the name of Washington,
To make men blush there was but one!"
—*Byron.*

THE FATHER OF HIS COUNTRY

Byron, in his Ode to Napoleon, is dissatisfied with that blazing meteor, smiting Europe with its devastation, and thus turns his eyes toward the west, where a new and constant star had risen to cast a light over the western world, especially over the new American Republic. This light was pleasing to the fiery poet who was himself a champion of freedom in the Old World. Washington had won American independence and was stabilizing a constitutional Government which was destined to be the model for liberty-loving peoples the world over and for centuries and generations. * * * And if Washington stood so high above Napoleon, the scourge of Europe, how low sinks Hitler, the madman of Europe, below Napoleon? A mere travesty in human nature, a braggart, a vile usurper and murderer, a disgrace and reproach to the people who gave him power, or from whom he filched a weak confidence. But the world will soon be done with Hitler and those of his ilk—the last vestige, perhaps, of his perpetrated villainy. For this we hope—and to this end our boys fight in Europe today.

If America has "given to the world no better contribution than the character of Washington," as Bancroft affirms, we can well afford to pause on the two hundred and twelfth anniversary of his birth to contemplate the shining traits of the man whose life was so blameless and whose reputation was so untarnished and unenvied that the mere mention of his name is calculated to make men blush. Indeed, the character of Washington is the peculiar bequest of America to all the world as an example that men, both in public and private station, may emulate henceforth in each succeeding generation.

Byron's characterization, in a single line, is remarkable—"The Cincinnatus of the West." Henry Lee's is known to all school children, "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Still simpler and known to every true American heart is the title, "Father of His Country." We may well cherish these sentiments this February 22, in a time of national crisis in which every soul that is not dead to patriotism is being tried and tested.

Michigan Livestock Growers Urge Action by Congress To Halt Government Interference and Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include resolutions adopted February 19, 1944, at the annual meeting of the Michigan Live Stock Exchange, held at Lansing, Mich. I believe every Member of this House will be interested in the reaction of some 27,000 farmers, who are primarily interested in the livestock industry, to the efforts of various Government agencies to control all agriculture.

The resolutions point out the inequalities and hardships imposed by Washington bureaucrats, at the same time urging Congress to take steps to correct the situation. The resolutions follow:

AGRICULTURE AN ESSENTIAL WAR INDUSTRY

We demand that all governmental agencies recognize that agriculture is an essential war industry of primary importance. Food is just as vital to the success of the war effort as ammunition or armaments. It is with pride that we call attention to the fact that despite drastic curtailment of its manpower, machinery, and various important supplies, the farming industry has year by year increased its output of food and has made a substantial contribution to the successful prosecution of the war. This has not been accomplished on the basis of a 40-hour workweek. There has been no time and a half for overtime. There is a limit to what can be done in this connection. The average age of Michigan farmers is continually mounting and unless full consideration is given to agricultural needs in the deferment of essential farm labor and the furnishing of needed machinery, repairs, and supplies, it will be impossible to meet food-production goals.

PROTEST AGAINST GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE AND BUNGLING

One of the greatest handicaps under which the agricultural industry has been laboring is that of governmental interference and bungling. The dilemma of the hog raisers is a case in point. Pork producers responded in 1943 with a large increase in production at the specific request of the Federal Government, believing that definite commitments were made by the Government to intelligently direct the production, marketing, and processing of this increased production. For the second time this year hog prices have been arbitrarily rolled back notwithstanding earlier appeals by the Government for increased hog production and promised price supports. The fact that the Government has not acted in good faith has caused widespread resentment among hog producers. Such action on the part of the O. P. A. and W. F. A. cannot help but reduce the production of pork in the near future. Furthermore, establishing ceilings on live hogs without taking into consideration quality and seasonal differentials will discourage the breeding and feeding of good hogs.

Many factors have contributed to the present chaotic condition of the hog industry, among these being two increases in the ceiling price on corn; the increased price and scarcity of protein supplements; roll-backs in hog prices accomplished by the imposition of a live-hog ceiling, unprotected because of a nonfunctioning support price; and a completely demoralized marketing situation.

Because of these and other contributing factors, the producers feel that the commitments made by the Federal Government have not been met. The morale of the hog producers has dangerously declined and there is confusion and doubt throughout the entire industry. As a result of this producer state of mind, it is the unanimous opinion of the delegates at this meeting that hog numbers in 1944 will be reduced much below the goals set by the Government, to the extent of endangering the war effort. If this results, the blame should not be laid upon the hog producers. They have been badly handicapped by conflicting and frequently changing regulations which have placed them in a position of uncertainty, where it is impossible to make definite plans for future production. It is manifest that producing pork is a long-time enterprise, requiring approximately 12 months from the breeding of sows until the time of marketing of their pigs.

Responsibility for failure to reach needed production levels will be plainly that of the governmental officials and administrators who have promulgated the various regulations and have not kept faith with the pork producers.

In order that the present glut of hogs upon the market be relieved, we recommend that the support price be applied to hogs weighing from 200 to 350 pounds as a protection to producers who are forced to hold their hogs until they exceed the maximum weights eligible for the floor price. To avoid repetition of the present glut of hogs on the market, we recommend seasonal differentials in the support price to encourage spreading out of marketing.

OPPOSITION TO LOWERING OF HOG SUPPORT PRICE

In September 1943 the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration made a joint announcement that the hog support price would be lowered from $13.75 to $12.50 as soon as the present commitment expires on September 30, 1944, and that at the same time the ceiling price on hogs will be reduced correspondingly. As a means of reestablishing the confidence of hog growers to the extent that production will be maintained at a level consistent with meat needs and feed supplies, we urge the retraction of this announcement and that there be no reduction in either the support price or the ceiling price of hogs on October 1, 1944.

UNIFIED FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAM FAVORED

We urgently request the creation of a single Federal Food Administration with full authority and power to act in handling the entire food situation. We recommend the real functioning of the War Meat Board and endorse the war meat plan proposed by the Livestock and Meat Council.

Raisers of other kinds of livestock have experienced and are experiencing much the same difficulties and discouragements as those outlined for the hog raisers. Nearly all the present rules and regulations governing the livestock and meat industries have been drawn up by New York attorneys and a few economists in Washington. We recommend that hereafter all such rules and regulations regarding the livestock and meat industry should be formulated by the War Meat Board and Livestock and Meat Council.

OPPOSITION TO FOOD-PRICE ROLL-BACKS AND CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

We insist that under present economic conditions there is no justification for a roll-back in food prices or for consumer subsidies on foods. Actually, present food prices are slightly lower than prevailed in 1926. The general wage level is 23 percent higher than it was in 1926 and industrial wages are 62 percent higher than for that year, giving American consumers abundant purchasing power. In fact, present food costs represent a smaller portion of wages than at any other time in the past 30 years during which such statistics have been maintained by the Federal Government.

We believe that the effect of food-price roll-backs would be inflationary in that consumers would have more money left after paying for their groceries and such subsidies would have to be financed with bond issues. Such bond issues would eventually have to be retired with interest. The expense of administering such a program would be very great. Acceptance of subsidies would place farmers under bureaucratic control, domination and regimentation. For these and other reasons, we emphatically condemn the food-price roll-back and consumer-subsidy program, in lieu of fair prices in the market

place for farm products. We heartily commend the 12 Michigan Congressmen who have steadfastly represented us on this important issue.

GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO CHANGE DIETARY HABITS OPPOSED

We seriously object to the efforts of high Government officials and so-called nutrition experts to inflict new dietary habits on American consumers at the expense of the livestock industry. Encouragement of consumers to eat more cereals and less meat would increase crop farming and thus tend to destroy all the progress we have made in soil conservation in recent years. Our whole agricultural program is founded on livestock production and such a change in the dietary habits of the American people would seriously jeopardize the whole economic structure of agriculture. Furthermore, the health of our war workers and civilians would deteriorate with serious consequences to the prosecution of the war.

THE MENACE OF GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE WITH FARM WAGES

We view with concern the announcement by the War Food Administration of a Nation-wide wage-control program for agricultural workers. This not only establishes a ceiling, but prohibits reductions in wage rates below the highest wage or salary paid for the particular work between January 1, and September 15, 1942. It has also been announced that War Food Administration labor offices have been directed to set up State farm-wage boards. We insist that the majority of the members of any of these boards, which might be established, should be comprised of practical farmers who are thoroughly familiar with local conditions in the area involved in their jurisdiction. This whole program has evidences of being another step toward the complete regimentation of all agriculture. It holds the threat that its administration would result in endless confusion and red tape.

CERTIFICATES OF WAR NECESSITY FOR FARM TRUCKS OPPOSED

In connection with certificates of war necessity required for farm trucks and pickups, the Office of Defense Transportation has insisted that farmers maintain detailed records showing the number of trips, the number of miles operated, the gallons of fuel used and the number of units hauled, specifying tons, cubic feet, packages, gallons, etc., summarized on a weekly basis. Under the conditions found on the average farm, the maintenance of such records and reports is exceedingly difficult and inconvenient and would seriously interfere with the farmer's productive efforts. No farmer would wear out his truck needlessly or use it for pleasure driving. We cannot see that the maintenance of such records contributes in any helpful way to the winning of the war and we do feel that insistence on such reports is a nuisance to the farmers. We, therefore, recommend that the O. D. T. officials discontinue such requirements in the case of trucks owned by farmers and used entirely in connection with farm operations.

SATISFACTION EXPRESSED AT ALLOCATION OF COPPER FOR BULL RINGS

We were gratified to learn that on January 22, 1944, the War Production Board approved the allocation of copper for the manufacture of bull rings. For many months suitable bull rings had not been obtainable and tragic accidents had resulted in consequence and many farmers were daily taking chances with unrung bulls. We express our appreciation to the Michigan State Farm Bureau and the National Committee for Farm Production Supplies for the part which they played in permitting the resumption of the manufacture of copper bull rings.

Wanted in Radio—An Industry-Wide Trade Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the radio industry, the Federal Communications Commission and the need for revising legislation dealing with the establishment and maintenance of a free and impartial radio in this Republic are occupying more and more attention in Congress, I am utilizing permission granted me by the House to include at this point an informative article appearing in the February 28 issue of Broadcasting. The author of the article is Ed Craney, of Butte, Mont., who is further identified by the statements included at the beginning of this article.

Mr. Speaker, if radio is to remain free in this country as I, for one, very much desire it shall, it is necessary that legislation be passed which will set up clear-cut and understandable rules and regulations which will not be subject to the whim or interpretative impulse of the F. C. C. It is also essential that the public be protected against some of the existing flagrant abuses in broadcasting by which individuals, organizations, and institutions are attacked over the air without adequate provision being guaranteed that they shall be assured the right of free speech by being given the opportunity of rejoinder. In other words, to remain free the radio industry must demonstrate its right to be free.

Freedom of speech on the air, Mr. Speaker, must not be the monopoly of the few, nor the exclusive privilege of the favored. Congress has a responsibility to the listening public and to the integrity of our great Bill of Rights to set up rules of fair play and correct behavior on the air waves which shall apply alike to the great radio networks and the independent radio outlets. It is gratifying to know that a Senate committee is about to report out legislation designed to establish a code of ethical rules and regulations for broadcasting which will protect the rights of free speech for all and prevent the radio industry from either being subjected to the extralegal decrees of the F. C. C. or the nonlegal dictations of a few monopolistic moguls presently enjoying almost exclusive access to the best air waves. It is hoped and expected that legislation approaching these objectives will be enacted by the present Congress.

The statement and article follow:

Ed Craney is no stranger to broadcasters. Identified with practically every major controversy of the craft for a dozen years, he quit the N. A. B. at the stormy St. Louis convention in 1941, announcing he wouldn't return until there was a change. With the departure of Neville Miller as N. A. B. president, he applied for readmission, which was approved by the N. A. B. board February 3.

Friend and confidante of Chairman WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, Mr. Craney, in characteristic fashion, volunteers his views herewith from his vantage point as unofficial attaché of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee now writing a new radio law.

WANTED—AN INDUSTRY-WIDE TRADE GROUP—CRANEY SAYS NETWORKS ARE IN CONTROL OF PRESENT ASSOCIATION

(By E. B. Craney, general manager, Z-Bar Network, Butte, Mont.)

I am happy that the N. A. B. board has indicated it would accept the applications for membership of stations with which I am associated. Tom Symons (the late T. W. Symons of KFPY, Spokane; KXL, Portland, and KGIR, Butte) and I resigned during the St. Louis debacle because we felt that the N. A. B. was not representing the interest of independent stations. Its management, in our opinion, was under the direct control of the networks. Their domination of the St. Louis meeting and in the copyright controversy, I believe, bore out our convictions.

RECALLS 1939 MEETING

This year, I believed the networks when their spokesmen said they were going to get rid of Mr. Miller at the Chicago board meeting. Then some of the board members came to Washington following the FM meeting in New York and I learned of the activities of certain well-known broadcasters in Mr. Miller's behalf. These broadcasters kept the long-distance telephone lines hot until I began to think Mr. Miller was going to "stay in," at least until July 1, when his contract expires. I must be getting soft to underestimate the networks' ability.

During the 1939 Atlantic City N. A. B. convention the networks seemingly went along with the idea of clearing music at the source. At a meeting in Washington, immediately following the convention, Mr. Miller learned that the networks considered the convention just so many words and had no intention of assuming responsibility for program content. From that time until now, in my opinion, Mr. Miller was so definitely under the networks' domination on every major issue that it became virtually impossible for him to adequately represent the viewpoint of the independent broadcaster.

The reason, of course, for Mr. Miller's "resignation" is not the apparent one that was widely advertised at the Board meeting. It goes much deeper than that. The plain fact is the Board members were sold a "bill of goods" in a clever campaign preceding the actual meeting. In my opinion, probably for the first time, Mr. Miller did not follow the networks' bidding when he refused to insert a. the suggestions of the networks into N. A. B.'s own proposed changes of the bill S. 814. He opposed the networks, I believe, because he maintained that the networks' proposed amendments were for their own particular benefits and not necessarily for the benefit of the whole industry. It wasn't until this happened and until he disagreed with the networks with respect to future policy on Mr. Petrillo that the networks really went to work on Mr. Miller.

But enough of the past; let us look and build for the future. Startling as this statement may seem to many broadcasters, the independent stations have no one; let me repeat that, absolutely no one who is their recognized representative before Congress and the administrative departments. By this, I mean that the N. A. B. as now constituted never has, does not now, and there is no immediate prospect that it will represent what it purports to represent—namely, the independent broadcasters of America.

A VOICE NEEDED

Our problem—the problem of the broadcasters—is not Mr. Miller or Mr. [J. Harold] Ryan or any other successor. Our problem is

to make the Washington head of N. A. B. a recognized representative of the independent stations of America so we may have at least as powerful a voice in our Nation's Capital as does any one of our national networks.

Contrary to what one may hear from some network officials, I am not opposed to networks as such nor do I have any personal feeling toward any individual connected with any network. There can be no disagreement that network broadcasting has performed a noteworthy service for the people of the United States.

The networks have made available to America instant communication and exchange of a few selected ideas from coast to coast; they have brought the city to the country and made available to all our people entertainment and information which in the past has been available to but a few. However, no one will contend that all network policies are such that they have made for "good" broadcasting. I believe some of their policies have led to very bad broadcasting and at times the networks have rendered a very distinct disservice to the American listening public.

I do not want to see American broadcasting Government owned or Government operated. Neither do I wish to see a broadcast system which is privately owned but is subservient to any one particular political, social, or economic ideology, or to the ideologies of a few men in a single metropolitan area who attempt to run our media of national mass communication.

RADIO'S DUTY

Today a free people cannot maintain a free government unless they have a free radio—a radio available alike to minorities of all races and creeds. Frequencies, we must remember, whether they be AM, FM, facsimile, or television, in use or out of use, are not the personal property of the radio-station owner. Radio frequencies belong to no one and to everyone—the butcher, the lawyer, the garbage collector, and their wives and children have just as great a proprietary interest in them as the station operator.

Under our system it is not the prerogative of the licensee to earn as much as he can from exploitation of a temporary grant. Rather, it is his duty to make it a useful medium of communication for the use of the representatives of majorities and minorities alike. Radio must be a medium of information, education, and entertainment for a the people; a frequency is licensed to a station only so long as its use is administered with the judgment of a Solomon and from the use of which a licensee is allowed a very fair profit for his endeavors. That is the American way—let us protect it.

Congress is conducting hearings which began in July 1943, affecting American radio. Dirty linen is being dragged about. Let us hope, for the good of the American people, that it is properly cleaned.

During November and December of last year the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce held hearings on a radio bill, S. 814. Many people paraded before this committee. A few independent broadcasters, representatives of the F. C. C., some labor officials, heads of two major networks (the other two networks refused to send representatives even after receiving verbal and wired invitations), officials of the F. C. C. Bar Association and of the N. A. B.—these were the people who testified. A transcript of those hearings is now available. I do not urge that every word of the hearings be read, but I do emphasize that there are some paragraphs that should be read by every broadcaster.

GOOD AND BAD

There are paragraphs from which station operators will learn what Members of Congress and qualified witnesses consider bad broadcasting—broadcasting which is not in the public interest and for which a renewal of license could and should be refused.

There are paragraphs from which broadcasters may learn what is considered good broadcasting.

There are paragraphs from which the whole industry may learn that no intelligent person should interpret a 20-page Supreme Court decision on the basis of 5 words in one of its paragraphs. Those 5 words "the composition of that traffic," even in themselves, do not mean Government control of program content.

There are paragraphs from which the broadcaster may learn that there are limitations on the power of the F. C. C.—limitations, I should add, which have not always been observed by the F. C. C. and for which they have been publicly censured. Lack of proper reporting by the trade press and in the N. A. B. bulletins is the reason why a majority of the industry does not know all the facts, and why the cold factual record should be read by every broadcaster.

Many may be amazed to learn that those who are supposed to represent the industry said they wanted an F. C. C. with power only to grant licenses and yet agreed that such broadcasters as Baker, Schuler, and Brinkley should have been taken off the air.

FINES AND PENALTIES

Broadcasters also will be amazed to learn that a system of fines to be imposed by the F. C. C. was advocated by broadcaster spokesmen, and yet these same spokesmen never raised the question before the committee of why the F. C. C. pursued its doubtfully legal policy of using a system of granting temporary licenses as a penal instrument designed to make licenses conform to some particular idea.

Unquestionably, this temporary-license policy has been the major cause for the much-advertised fear of the regulatory agency by the broadcasters. It may well be asked why this point was not raised by broadcaster representatives. Could it be because no one appeared before Congress with clean hands and could say he was representing independent broadcasters? Certainly N. A. B. couldn't afford to speak loudly after a breakdown of its income became public.

The networks are opposed to permitting independent broadcasters to organize as a free group which will honestly represent independent stations because they are afraid of what we may do without their ever-present "advice" and pressure. After all, most broadcasters get together only once or twice a year in a district or a national meeting. Most of them get to Washington only once a year or possibly only at the time of a hearing. What then, say the networks, can the individual broadcaster know or do for the good of the industry?

After all, whose business is this radio industry? Let us nail this down once and for all. Who speaks for the radio industry in America—the licensees of 900 broadcast stations, small and large—or the licensees of a half-dozen stations who also operate a network? Why, if we take the spokesmen of the networks at their word at the Senate hearings, the networks are actually not in the broadcast business.

Their spokesmen contend they are "program-producing organizations"; they are a business like a grocery store or a gasoline station, selling service. They complained bitterly because such businesses are not licensed and that they have to be, because they happen to run a few stations. Why, they argued, we run these stations only incidentally; these stations are necessary only because we have to have some place to originate programs! Does this sound fantastic? Well, then, read the testimony of the network spokesmen.

And yet these are the people who insist on speaking for the industry. By whose permission? Who gave them authority? Isn't it clear that the present situation is unhealthy and dishonest? Isn't it clear that we now have a situation where the tail is wagging the dog—where a couple of "program-producing" organizations, to use their own definition, are attempting to speak for 900 independently owned stations about whose problems, policies, and listeners they know little and care less?

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Who is it that placates the local listener when a popular serial program is abruptly discontinued in a particular area?

Who is it that soothes irate sport fans who have been glued to a radio for 30 minutes listening to a boxing match and then are suddenly cut off and shifted to another program because of the network's prior commitments?

Who is it that sends out the alarm and asks for volunteers to fight a forest fire, or a cricket invasion, or asks for help to aid in any community disaster? Who is it that furnishes the local weather reports and local time signals? Who is it that is interested in the local school-board election—the community's social, economic, and political problems?

Isn't it clear that local problems cannot be understood and handled by men 1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 miles away? Milwaukee, Peoria, or Butte can neither be served nor built up from New York, Washington, or Hollywood.

Most broadcasters know Frank Russell, who is vice president in charge of National Broadcasting Co. in Washington. They also know Earl Gammons, formerly of WCCO, who took over Harry Butcher's Washington position for Columbia Broadcasting System. These men might deny it—but deny or not—they are, in my opinion, exceedingly expert lobbyists for their companies in the Nation's Capital. So expert are they, in fact, that no group of broadcasters could suggest legislation which might be against the interest of their companies which these two men could not kill or have altered to an extent that all the "sting" would be removed.

And by the same token, neither should these men be able to suggest any legislation for their principals that might be detrimental to the interests of independent broadcasters (such as a network being allowed to own all of its outlets—and don't think it hasn't been talked about) without there being on the job another man, as astute as they, but representing independent stations who should be able to take the "sting" out of their suggestions.

Think how this check and balance system would bring to the broadcasters a guaranty against concealed aggression from within which has ever been our nemesis. Think also of the strength we would have as a whole industry when we, as duly organized and recognized independent stations, joined with an organization of national networks and their owned and operated stations to support some special law or proposed Commission order that would work to our mutual advantage and consequently the welfare of our listeners.

SEPARATE INTERESTS

I mention networks and their M. & O. stations? Yes, I am certain their interests are distinct and separate from those of independently owned stations. Neither Mr. Gammons nor Mr. Russell will assert that they vote either in a National Association of Broadcasters convention or as a board member with the welfare only of the Washington station they represent in mind. In fact, Mr. Russell, if the vote were an important one, would have to look even beyond National Broadcasting Co. and find out what might be the over-all interests and policies of Radio Corporation of America, with its myriad of subsidiaries.

This is one of our very vital problems of the moment. I am certain the networks are well able to take care of their own interests in Washington through their present representatives. I would like to see them organize an association of all networks and their M. & O. stations with which our association is

independent stations could collaborate from time to time. There are many problems that must have our combined thoughts and efforts; there are likewise many problems which can be better thought out, argued and voted upon without the presence of individuals from M. & O. stations.

INDUSTRY WELFARE

These are individuals who must lay aside their thoughts as individual station managers and think instead as those who are concerned with the welfare of a recording or a transcription company, or as a licensee holder of many short-wave stations, or as a manufacturer and therefore a holder or negotiator of millions of dollars in Government contracts. These are the kind of individuals who, for example, after an exhaustive hearing on a bill would suggest that it might be wise to forget all about such a bill because the industry wouldn't go for it.

I am fully convinced that the independent stations should maintain their own association and also should hire someone as competent as a Russell or a Gammons to head its Washington office. This representation should be exclusively for the independent stations—for us and not with the interests of a network or a great manufacturing or communications company always in the background.

OR ELSE

Don't you see that when Russell or Gammons go in and talk about N. B. C., R. C. A. C., R. C. A., Victor, Columbia, C. B. S., N. A. B., B. M. I., or any other combination of the alphabet that everything they talk about is immediately interpreted as being connected with network ownership, and it can't be otherwise? What independents must do is to take the three little letters "N. A. B." out of the networks' repertoire. And we must do it now, because the broadcasters are probably not going to be given more than just one more chance at self-regulation. If we can't cure some of the ills and alleviate some of the criticism that is now prevalent, it may be Government ownership in the not too distant future.

What can we do for the benefit of ourselves? How can we raise enough money to support an N A. B. without the networks? Representation in Washington is of primary importance to us. But we need not carry on alone all the work of the present N. A. B. Many functions can be usefully and properly collaborated between our independent organization and a networks' organization and funds can be supplied jointly for that work. N. A. B. used to operate on much less than the $350,000 budget of today; under wise and competent management, it will not be difficult to do so again. Moreover, the industry will have better standing if it is not running an expensive Washington corporation lobby.

Of course, many station owners are going to have to take a great deal more interest in their public responsibility. We, as an independent group of broadcasters, must see that the standards of all broadcasts, local and national, be raised above the reproach of anyone.

Sgt. James J. Gaffney

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall place in the Appendix in connection with my remarks a letter written to the Lowell Sun in respect to a hundred-dollar bond that the Sun presented to all men at Christmas who had gone into the service from that newspaper office. The Lowell Sun also presented $500 bonds to the families of men who gave their lives in the service. This is a very fine thing for a newspaper or any other organization to do. This young man, Sergeant Gaffney, states in his letter, as will be observed, that he has been in the South Pacific for 2 years. He makes no complaint in the letter because he has been there for such a long time, but that makes us all the more anxious that these men be brought back. I have been steadily trying to have men brought back who have been in too long a time in bad areas. Only 14 of the original group of 60 who went out from Lowell are there now.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a letter from the manager of the Lowell Sun, written at my request, together with a newspaper clipping, and a letter referred to from Sergeant Gaffney written to Mr. Thomas Costello, one of the owners of the Lowell Sun. Lieutenant Costello is now serving with the United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEBRUARY 26, 1944.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: * * * Sgt. James J. Gaffney was the first of 60 to leave this plant for service with the colors, going out with the National Guard from Lowell.

Yours very truly,

THE LOWELL SUN,
FRANK A. LAWLOR,
General Manager.

WAR BONDS FOR SUN EMPLOYEES IN SERVICE—FOUR $500 BONDS, 53 AT $100 EACH TO BE PRESENTED

LOWELL.—Signal recognition of the 57 men and 1 woman whose names appear on the honor roll of the Lowell Sun will be given by Lowell Sun Co. during the Christmas season. Of the 57 mentioned 2 are known to have been killed in action overseas, 1 is missing in action over the Caribbean Sea, and a fourth is a prisoner of war in Germany. Three have been mustered out and have returned to work at the Sun.

Lowell Sun Co. is to purchase a $500 War bond in memory of Thomas Quinn, killed in action with the Forty-fifth Division in Sicily, and another $500 bond in memory of Charles Edward Mulvey, veteran of the Coral Sea battle, killed in action while serving at Salerno with the United States Navy. These bonds will be presented to proper members of the families of the deceased.

Likewise a $500 War bond is to be purchased for presentation in the name of Raymond Allaby, staff sergeant on a bomber shot down over Germany and now a prisoner of war in Germany, and Thomas Gleason, missing in action over the Caribbean Sea. These bonds will be presented to proper members of their families.

The 54 others who left full-time employment with the Lowell Sun will each be purchased a $100 War bond. They are:

James J. Gaffney, Joseph L. McGarry, Jr., John B. Roughan, Gerald O'Neill, Thomas C. Gallagher, Clement C. Costello, Warren P. Riordan, Jr., Joseph Principato, John J. McKallagatt, Edward L. Garrity, Joseph Gentz, Raymond Vivier, John H. Costello, Edward McDermott, Fred Dudley, Timothy Reardon, James Dwyer, Alton Brine, John Flood, Edward Harrington, Fred Stowell, Victor E. Romaneski, Francis Hogan, Russell McCollister, Leo Flanagan, Armand Rocheville, John Kenney, Edward McNamara, Jean Dube, John Walsh, Edward Lynch, Robert Payton, Paul T. Hillman, George McGuane, John McParland, Joseph Killeen, David Copley, Miss Frances Lovejoy, James Fanning, William Hogan, William Jurnesky, Gerald McDermott, Donald O'Neill, Kenneth V. Whittemore, Thomas Gleason, Raymond Staveley, Richard Townsend, Joseph L. Hamel, Daniel J. Neylon, Frank Barrett, John E. Kearns, Francis W. Bujnowski, and Stanley Butler.

Of the above named Fred Dudley, William Jurnesky and Jean Dube have been mustered out by honorable discharge and have returned to work at the Sun.

JANUARY 27, 1944.

DEAR TOM: I was a very happy fellow yesterday when on this (censored) island, still here in the Pacific area, I received your letter informing me of your generous gift of a $100 War bond. I, for one, am very thankful, and I am sure that the rest of the "Sun family," wherever they may be, feel the same way.

It is a great feeling that one gets upon receiving a letter which contains the news of the home town. Your letter was something special, for not only was I pleased to hear that I received the War bond but, after showing the letter to some of my friends and hearing all the comments that were passed back and forth among them regarding your generosity, I felt pretty proud, to say the least, of having worked for you.

I am sorry to hear that you had to give out those $500 War bonds. The only one of the four who I knew was Torsi. He was a very likable fellow and I am sure all of the folks back home were shocked to hear of his death. I hope the future is more kind to the "family." It will be a happy reunion when we all meet to tell of the different places we have been during our travels.

We have left the Fiji Islands, but are still here in the Pacific. We are having our air raids once again and it is just like old times again. The rumors are sounding pretty good these days and as a result we hope to be getting out of here one of these days, I hope.

There are only 14 of us Lowell fellows left here in this company. We celebrated our 2 years of overseas duty about a week ago. The best we could do was to talk of home and what we plan to do when we get back. We hear that the town has changed a great deal since our leaving. The place may have changed, but to us it will look like the promised land.

I guess that is all for now, Tom. Give my regards to Frank. Tell him that I would have liked to have gone to the party you people had for him. I heard that it was one great party. Give my regards to all the boys and girls and I hope I will be able to drop in to see you all real soon. Thanks once again for your generosity.

As ever,

JIM.

Atlantic Charter Dead, Says Dorothy Thompson

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is busy "coming to" and resuming its functions under the Constitution,

and while Barney Baruch, the "father of the depression," like the bureaucrat in Gulliver's Travels, is diligently working out a plan to extract economic sunbeams from post-war cucumbers, Dorothy Thompson, the lady in the international ivory tower, wails a post-mortem shriek to notify the world that the Atlantic Charter is dead and cites the speech of Prime Minister Churchill as its funeral oration.

For the information of the House, I am inserting Dorothy Thompson's article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, March 1, 1944, and which reads as follows:

ON THE RECORD

(Dorothy Thompson)

Although some days have passed since Mr. Churchill made his report to the House of Commons, the speech can furnish food for comment for a long time to come. It was the most revelatory speech to have been made by any Allied statesman for months, with much more implied in it than is clearly expressed.

But at least one thing was made clear. Mr. Churchill buried the Atlantic Charter. Since the President, coauthor of the eight-point document, has not taken issue with the speech, we may take it the abandonment of the Charter is established policy.

The purpose in framing principles for a peace is to plan future security. In August 1941, when the Atlantic Charter was drafted, its principles were considered in this light. Thus, territorial changes by force were considered as a menace to security; so was intervention in the political affairs of other nations; so was continued heavy armament after the war.

Furthermore, the presumption of the Atlantic Charter was that its basic principles applied to all—victor and vanquished alike. In points 4, 6, and 8, this was made specific. The Allied Governments pledged to "all states, great or small, victor or vanquished" equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world (4); all nations were assured "the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries (6); the unilateral disarmament of the Axis was to be a preface to general disarmament (8).

Until a few weeks ago our psychological warfare was based on the Atlantic Charter, and airmen were dropping leaflets with its text over German towns.

But Mr. Churchill's speech undoes all this. He made the flat statement that the Atlantic Charter does not apply in any sense to the enemy. The term "unconditional surrender" means that we end the war, he explained, with no promises of any kind. We remain free to do exactly as we please, bound by no principles whatever—beyond the assurance, hardly necessary to make, that we will not behave in a "barbaric" manner.

Dr. Goebbels has struggled for 2 years to explain to the German people that the Atlantic Charter was window dressing. He can now cease his efforts.

Now why do we want to free our hands and rid ourselves of all commitments? Is it because we have a plan for Germany and Europe which we prefer not to publicize? Or is it because we have no plan at all, and wish to be free to adjust ourselves to events as they may develop?

This question is of primary importance. I am aware that in discussing the future of Germany, I run the risk of being accused of peculiar consideration for our enemy. But no one capable of coherent thought can deny that the solution arrived at in the German question will determine the future of the whole of Europe and the future relations between the great powers.

If we have no plan, but intend merely to adjust ourselves to whatever events may turn up, the question is, Has the Soviet Union a plan?

The answer to that is certainly "yes." The Soviet Union has, no doubt, several plans. It, too, will adjust itself to events. Soviet policy is predicated on what steps the Anglo-American powers may take. The Soviet Union obviously cannot make a unilateral decision about Germany. On the other hand, it has a unilateral policy to follow in case no other policies develop, or in case the policies that do develop are unsatsfactory to the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is using its policy as an instrument of psychological warfare—day in and day out. It is not throwing it into the wastebasket in the middle of the war. That policy goes back to the Free German Manifesto of July 1943; it has never changed, and is being beamed from Russia to the German armies and people continuously. That policy advocates the establishment of such a strong, democratic national German state as the German masses will be prepared to defend.

The Moscow propaganda is not incompatible with frontier changes. But it is incompatible with the disintegration of the German Nation, and it defines unconditional surrender.

It becomes increasingly clear that the Soviets approach the question of security from an entirely different viewpoint than we. We base our hopes on the permanent weakening of the present aggressors. The Soviets base their hopes on transformation of the social structures of states with such shifts in the dominant classes as will seem likely to assure strong governments naturally friendly to the Soviet Union. There is no indication, nor is there any rational ground for believing, that they wish exclusively to enjoy this future friendship. The Soviet Union realizes, perhaps more strongly than we, that future peace rests on agreement between the Anglo-American powers and itself.

Nevertheless, if we enter Europe without a plan, while the Soviets have a clear one in reserve, we stand to become caught in situations for which we are completely unprepared.

Federal Communications Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 of last year, after Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and Mr. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, refused to give evidence to the then committee investigating the F. C. C., thereby raising the grave question of the power of Congress to investigate a creature of its own making, I made a statement which, because of its pertinency to the same question that has now arisen in the Senate, I desire to repeat:

A situation has arisen in connection with the inquiry of the congressional Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission which involves such fundamental issues as to require a statement of the committee's position concerning them.

The committee's counsel had requested certain information from the War and Navy Departments. The committee had also requested the attendance of military officers to testify concerning the information sought from the War and Navy Departments. The committee is now in receipt of advice from the War and Navy Departments, each stating that the respective Secretaries have been informed that the President refuses to furnish the committee with the documents it requires.

It should be clearly understood that the committee did not ask, did not seek, and would not have accepted for public exposure any secret military information because the responsibility for safeguarding such information would have been greater than the committee would want to assume. Therefore, no information or testimony was requested by the committee that would reveal any secret military information.

The committee is advised by these letters from the War and Navy Departments that the President bases his refusal to allow the documents to be delivered to the committee on the ground that "it would be contrary to the public interests," thereby recognizing that the documents would not reveal secret military information.

Thus emerges a question so fundamental as to involve the entire structure of our Government under our Constitution, based upon its underlying concept of three coordinate independent branches.

The committee believes it the wisest policy not to press this incident at this time, but it cannot pass the issue presented because it is too fundamental.

If it is possible and appropriate for the Chief Executive thus to limit the investigations of a select committee of the Congress, and to impede its work on the ground of his determination of the public interest, then it would follow logically that he or some other Chief Executive could so interfere with the functions of a standing committee of either House.

The committee has consulted and carefully deliberated on this action of the President. Without conceding the right anywhere to limit the constitutional powers of the Congress, the committee has determined, for the time being, to refrain from insisting upon the appearance of officers of the Army and Navy or to press for the production of memoranda and records called for in those departments. However, as to all other departments and agencies the committee takes no such position. It has neither the disposition nor the authority to deviate from the direction of the House in this investigation. It is important to note that in letters from the Army and Navy Departments it is stated that the President's order is put upon the ground that to furnish the committee the documents called for would be contrary to the public interests. This raises the question: Where rests the power to determine what the public interest is? Is it a power that belongs to the Government, or to only one branch of the Government? Is Congress to be rendered powerless to determine for itself what is or is not in the public interests? If this be so, then who is to legislate in the public interest—or is there to be no legislation at all? Thus we are brought face to face with possible congressional frustration.

It scarcely need be said that the whole concept of our American system of government under our Constitution rests upon the fundamental principle that each of the three coordinate independent branches of the Government, although checked and balanced each by the other, cannot be subject to domination by the others without the whole structure crumbling.

Thus is presented an issue in which there is involved no question of personalities whatsoever, but a fundamental issue of the proper exercise of the appropriate constitutional

functions of each of the three branches of Government.

Unless this select committee, which is the agent of the House of Representatives, insists upon its authority and its right to determine, within the limits set by the House of Representatives, how it should proceed, then this committee will have failed to maintain the dignity and the constitutional authority of the House of Representatives. This committee means to maintain and defend that dignity and that authority.

The committee desires to emphasize that this investigation involves no persons anywhere in the Government insofar as malfeasance or misfeasance in office may be found.

If the committee finds itself too seriously handicapped by the present situation, it will feel called upon to refer the matter back to the House of Representatives for action.

It is deeply to be regretted that exception must be taken to the action of the President. It is with great reluctance and due respect that the committee does so. But the issue is so fundamental, the conflict of authority is so clear, the duty of the committee to the House of Representatives so paramount, and the issues of constitutional processes so completely involved, that the committee is left no other course to pursue.

The Opium Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 29, 1944, and an article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 26, 1944:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 29, 1944]

THE OPIUM WAR

For the first time the United States has some chance of winning its 40-year fight to destroy the international illicit traffic in opium.

Hitherto the British, Dutch, French, and other governments, which financed colonial empires on drug monopolies, have sabotaged effective action. Now the British and Dutch have agreed to cooperate.

Chief sources of opium and its derivatives are Iran and other countries of the Middle East, the Jap-occupied areas of China, and a few Latin-American countries.

China, through heroic effort, had almost eliminated the opium production forced on it by other powers when the Japanese invasion revived the curse. Systematically the Japs have used this method to debauch and enslave the Chinese, while making it a capital offense for Jap soldiers to use the drug. The Chinese Government will root out the evil as rapidly as it regains its territory.

So the main problem, besides defeat of Japan, is to persuade middle eastern countries to limit production.

Representative JUDD, in his masterly presentation of this problem to Congress, pointed out that most of the opium-growing countries are now dependent on the United States, financially or otherwise, and therefore may be encouraged to shift from drug to food crops.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 26, 1944]

UNITED STATES IS URGED TO HEAD ATTACK ON OPIUM EVIL—JOINT ACTION SPONSORED IN CONGRESS TO ELIMINATE MENACE TO SOLDIERS BY CONTROLLING ITS OUTPUT

WASHINGTON, February 26.—The United States Government is today considering action, influentially sponsored in Congress, to summon the principal United Nations to a joint attack on the age-old opium evil by controlling the cultivation of poppy in the principal producing countries.

This step is brought into prospect with the disclosure that the opium is becoming an acute menace to American and Allied soldiers in Iran and that several South American countries have only recently entered the field of opium-poppy growing.

Assurances have lately been received by the State Department that the British and Netherlands Governments are now ready to join the United States in common action and will agree to prohibit the use of opium for smoking and to prevent reestablishment of their Government monopolies for the sale of smoking opium in the territories formerly controlled by them in the Far East when these territories are freed from Japanese domination.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

On the basis of these assurances Representative WALTER H. JUDD (Republican), of Minnesota, introduced a resolution in the House this week requesting the President to approach the governments of all opium-producing countries throughout the world to take immediate steps to limit and control the growth of opium poppy and the production of opium for all but natural science purposes.

Representative JUDD told Congress that there was great need of acting promptly to "protect the health of American and Allied citizens," thousands of whom are now stationed in Iran where, he said, conditions are menacingly bad. He reported that opium smuggling to the United States from the Near East is growing increasingly serious.

The State Department has already taken note of the improved prospects of cooperative action and recently stated:

"On September 21, 1943, the United States Government addressed aide-memoire to the British, Netherlands, and other interested governments in regard to the suppression of the nonmedical use of narcotic drugs in areas in the Far East now occupied by Japanese forces when such areas are reoccupied by the armed forces of the United Nations. It is a source of deep gratification that the action taken by the British and Netherlands Governments is so closely in accord with the policy of the United States Government in this regard."

AMERICA GETS SUPPORT

Representative JUDD told Congress that these assurances from Britain and the Netherlands give America for the first time the support of certain western empires without whose support efforts to control the opium traffic are doomed to failure. He put the problem in these terms in his speech from the floor of the House:

"The above decisions by Britain and the Netherlands give us for the first time the support of certain western empires without whose support our efforts have been doomed to failure. They, in turn, state frankly that their efforts to suppress the use of opium in their colonies will depend upon the cooperation of the opium-growing countries; otherwise smuggling cannot be effectively controlled.

"The countries which are now producing the largest amounts of opium are mostly in the Middle and Near East. Iran is the greatest producer. As many as 50 or 75 percent of the gendarmes and police force in Iran, we are reliably informed, are addicts. Both raw and prepared opium can be bought readily.

"This constitutes an acute menace to us and to our allies. Our ships are in the great new port of Basra every day unloading lend-lease war materials, mostly for Russia. We have thousands of American citizens working in Iran, and the British and the Russians and other Allied countries have thousands there, too."

LURE OF PROFIT

"The situation is most conducive to the development of addiction among curious or lonely or discouraged boys. Others succumb to the temptation to pay 50 cents for a small package of opium which they can sell for as much as $50 in America. It seems so easy; the package can be so readily concealed aboard ship. High officials in our merchant marine have expressed concern at the increasing number of such small packets found here and there on the returning ships.

"The opium addict in America has been very hard pressed. Because of the dislocation by the war of the usual channels of supply, it has been almost impossible for him to get his drug. He will do anything to get it, pay any price. We cannot close our eyes to this mounting danger to our own domestic control of narcotics, which is very effective at present.

"At this particular time we have an unprecedented opportunity to overcome the old objection habitually raised by the opium-growing countries that limitation of cultivation will upset their economies.

"The pouring of lend-lease materials and moneys into some of the countries, such as Iran, the development of highways, railways, harbors, and factories, is making them prosperous as never before. They now have an ideal opportunity to restrict the growth of opium without seriously disturbing their financial stability. Their people need good food from their land more than the money from opium."

WHEN JAPAN IS SMASHED

Representative JUDD emphasized that the nations desirous of coping with the opium evil ought to be ready for the time when Japan will be smashed and will thereby set up the opportunity to end the illicit traffic which has been carried on by the Japanese all through the Far East and elsewhere.

"The British and the Dutch are willing to go along now," he said. "I am sure the Russians will also because they have controlled opium very rigidly in their own land. Most of the producing countries are in considerable degree dependent upon us, and we need only to urge that they put into effect promises they made 30 years ago in the Hague Convention.

"So surely we have here a chance not only to stop the extension and expansion of this vicious, destructive, demoralizing traffic, we have an opportunity to take vigorous leadership in advocating measures which will once and for all eliminate it from the world as we eliminated it from the Philippines.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

"The Asiatic peoples trust us on this score. They have confidence in us because of our record. Such a unique opportunity may not come again in years. We must not delay.

"I did not know until I began to investigate, that two or three countries in Latin America have begun the cultivation of the opium poppy in the last few years.

"This is the first insidious beginning in our own hemisphere. We do not like it, and yet, of course, we have no power to forbid them to grow it.

"The people of Asia particularly look to America for moral leadership as well as for

political, military, and commercial leadership. I believe we should take this action now for moral and humanitarian reasons; yes, and also for reasons of intelligent, long-term, national interest."

The People Should Choose Between Empire and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Ickes' plans that the American Government shall spend $165,000,000 or more on an Arabian pipe line. The objective is to provide substantial oil supplies to supplement America's diminishing oil reserves.

This proposal presents squarely to the American people the issue of empire versus freedom. No, I am mistaken; the proposal does not present to the American people the issue of empire versus freedom. The people are having nothing to say about this gigantic long-distance venture into imperialism. Not even the representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States, are given the opportunity of passing on this issue of empire versus freedom. No, the people or their elected Congress are not consulted on this venture. Why not?

A few short years from now, the sovereign Government of the United States may conscript your boy and mine and send them to fight, bleed, and die on the trackless sands of Arabia to defend this pipe line. Why? Because then it will be the patriotic duty of that boy to defend the honor and the possessions of the United States, as represented by this investment. The fighting and the dying is always done by the people. Why, then, should not the fundamental decision on this fundamental issue be made by the people or their elected representatives?

I use the phrase, "empire versus freedom." What does the term "freedom" have to do with empire? Simply this: That to defend this far-away imperialistic economic venture a volunteer army large enough could not be raised. This war has demonstrated that no modern government commands sufficient confidence of its people to depend on a volunteer army.

It is difficult to appraise properly the evil consequences of this scheme. Perhaps first a comparison would be helpful. Suppose that Russia made a deal with Mexico to finance and develop tremendous oil or other resources in Mexico? How would America regard such a scheme? The probabilities are fairly clear. It would arouse violent opposition in this country, sooner or later, and probably sooner. Similar results can be expected from a United States Government venture in Arabia.

This proposal is advocated on the basis of the barrels of crude petroleum it will add to our own diminishing reserves. Against this hazardous addition to our oil reserves must be measured the many-sided effects of this imperialistic adventure on both America and the rest of the world.

The Arabian pipe line would mark a clear-cut change in American policy abroad. It is, of course, a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Atlantic Charter.

It would terminate the inspiring period of America's history as a great nation not resorting to intercontinental imperialism. This venture would end the influence exercised by the United States as a government not participating in the exploitation of small lands and countries.

These traditions are America's greatest asset in international affairs. This venture will destroy them within and without. It would mark the elimination of the fundamentals of genuine morality in our foreign policy.

I am no expert on the economic or military value of this proposed venture. However, it is safe to say that militarily it would be at least as indefensible as the Philippines. From an economic standpoint there is no practical way to judge it because it would probably mean war sooner or later—and no one can measure by any finite standards the monetary and material costs of twentieth-century warfare.

This proposal either should be dropped or should be presented fairly and squarely to the American people or their Congress. Let the people decide.

It may be that the American people would rather forego the use of a questionable amount of gasoline at some time in the remote future than follow a foreign policy practically guaranteed to send many of their sons, if not their daughters, to die in far-away places in defense of the trade of Standard Oil or the international dreams of our one-world planners.

The Late Honorable Thomas H. Cullen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of THOMAS H. CULLEN, the House loses a valuable member, his district an able Representative, and the Nation a great and distinguished citizen.

TOM CULLEN, as his colleagues called him, was beloved of all. He was a gentle, courteous, and kindly soul who attracted friends as a magnet does metal.

His service in this body was distinguished in character. He served for 14 of his 24 years on the Ways and Means Committee.

But it is not only for his distinguished service that TOM CULLEN will be remembered. He was one of those who loved his fellow men and delighted in extending courtesies to the newer Members who were wise enough to seek his sane advice and be guided by his friendly counsel.

Hail and farewell, Tom. It was good to have known you. Peace to your soul.

From Me to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very splendid newspaper article written by my personal friend Mr. H. E. Castleberry. The article is very informative and eloquently sets forth what in my judgment is my correct view on a vital problem:

FROM ME TO YOU

(By H. E. Castleberry)

Since Hitler started on his escapade of destruction and subjugation of the races of Europe the Jewish question has loomed large on the horizon and invoked much thinking, especially as it affects the Jews. That the Jews have been badly mishandled and administered treatment that no race is entitled to receive is an undebatable question. In this discussion of this subject it is not our purpose to condone any national sin or error of the Jewish race, but we here rather hope to bring the question out in the open and discuss it on merit and present some actual facts.

In the outset I will drop this thought and observation, based upon history and teachings of the Bible, and it is that no nation or nations have prospered or endured who persecuted the Jews. In the Balfour Agreements of 1939, when Britain decreed that Palestine should be the home of the Jews once again, thousands of these people from over Europe and the world migrated back to their ancient but destroyed shrines. And now comes the order that after March 31 this privilege is going to be denied these people.

But I am going to let another talk with you in the remainder of this space allotted today for this column. Joe N. Croom, of the Okmulgee Times-Democrat, has the following to say:

All the world knows what Hitler and Mussolini have done to the Jews. Millions have been killed, other and more millions are destitute refugees, facing a future as hopeless and uncertain as their immediate plight is pitiable.

There is a way in which Americans can help these wandering outcast people at no expense and little trouble. That way is to urge our Senators and Representatives to throw the weight of the United States Government behind a request to Great Britain to reopen Palestine to Jewish immigration.

The Jews aren't the only broken victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution. There are also the Poles, the Czechs, French, Belgians, and many others. But there is far less hope that when the victory has been won the Jews will be able to reestablish themselves where they once lived than for these other refugees.

It would be impossible for the United States, Great Britain, or any other of the Allied and anti-Axis Nations to absorb all the refugees of the war-ravaged countries without

seriously, perhaps fatally disrupting their own economies. If a haven can be found for a few million Jews, such a haven as Palestine can be made, the post-war problem of what to do about the world's refugees will have been partially solved.

Field Marshall Allenby took Palestine from the Turks in 1917. The League of Nations, with the sanction of the United States, entrusted it to British mandate in 1923.

The British, until 1939, ruled Palestine under the broad policies of the Balfour Declaration which present Prime Minister Churchill had much to do with forming. It pledged Britain to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine, without affecting the rights of others who lived there. These others are mostly Moslems.

This policy resulted in an increase in the number of Palestine Jews from about 88,000 in 1922 to more than 478,000 in 1942, a gain of 390,312. In the same 20-year period the Moslem population, which was between 600,000 and 700,000 in 1922, gained only 383,000.

The great increase in the Jewish population obviously came through immigration. The great stride toward eventual establishment of the Jewish national home was financed by Jews all over the world, to whom the Balfour Declaration or pledge was made.

Palestine has an area of only 10,429 square miles, while there are hundreds of thousands of other sparsely settled square miles for the Arab (Moslem) peoples. In spite of this there always has been friction between the Moslems of Palestine and the Jews. It is due largely to the rival claims of the sacred historic places in Jerusalem. This friction has been a constant source of annoyance to the British.

After Chamberlain "appeased" Hitler by giving away a part of Czechoslovakia, the British Government, in May 1939, sought similarly to appease the Moslems, who were pro-Axis. This appeasement attempt was set out in a white paper in which, contrary to the terms of the mandate and the Balfour Declaration, Jewish immigration to Palestine was limited to 75,000 for the 5-year period that ends March 31, 1944. After that, according to the white paper, no more Jews may establish themselves in Palestine without the approval of the Moslems, who outnumber the Jews 2 to 1. Obviously, that means that 60 days from now no more Jews may move to Palestine.

Prime Minister Churchill has denounced the White Paper as a virtual betrayal of Britain's mandate trust and her pledge to the Jews of the world.

However, there has been no indication that Britain will renounce the White Paper and redeem her Balfour Declaration pledge. It is understandable that Britain does not want to borrow trouble with the Moslems at this stage of the war, but unfortunately the plight of the millions of refugee Jews makes solution of the Palestine problem a matter that can't wait.

It is considered likely by the Jews of the world that a little friendly insistence on the part of the United States would result in Churchill going to bat for the Balfour Declaration that he helped formulate during World War No. 1. Neither Britain nor the United States is any longer in a mood to appease anybody nor in a position where appeasement might seem even expedient.

The Jews, without expense to anybody but their own kind throughout the world, have done wonders in Palestine. They have used the Jordan River to irrigate former waste lands. They have established nearly 3,000 industries, more than 5,000 enterprises in 20 years. They have increased the acreage of land that they own and farm from a little over 100,000 acres to 400,000.

The Moslems, who consistently have opposed the Jewish National Home, have increased their population in Palestine largely because the Jews made it attractive. They are still mostly pro-Axis, however, Jews charge that when Marshal Rommel was on his victorious march and appeared likely to take Palestine and Egypt the Moslems were eager to sell their lands to Jews, figuring that when the Germans came the Jews would be driven out and they would regain their lands at no repurchase cost.

On the other hand, there are 30,000 Jewish volunteers in the British Army. Many Jewish dead lie in north African graves where they gave their lives to drive out the Germans.

The Jews of the world are entitled to their national home in Palestine not only because of the 26-year-old pledge made to them, but because they have earned the right to have a nation of their own with their own sweat and blood and tears.

Individual letters to Members of Congress might well result in British denunciation of the White Paper and resumption of the policy of establishing the Jewish state, so delicately is the problem balanced.

Production of Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the American people have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in synthetic-rubber plants. There is difference of opinion as to the operation of these plants after the war is over. I think the discontinuance of these plants after the war should be viewed with great caution. The Shreveport Times, of Shreveport, La., on February 29 had an editorial on this question which merits most earnest consideration. For that reason I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP THE RUBBER PLANTS

Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and secretary of commerce, has come out strongly for post-war use of synthetic-rubber plants not only to help employment and maintain pay rolls, but as a means of blocking international cartel monopolies. Mr. Jones has taken a very sound and solid course in this matter, presenting his views recently before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The proposal to scrap the synthetic plants after the war on the theory that production of synthetic-rubber goods — particularly tires—is more expensive than natural-rubber production when crude rubber from the Far East is available is not built on any sound foundation. It is backed chiefly by the inner New Deal clique which usually backs anything and everything that will promote political socialistic control of the Nation's economic life as opposed to the right of the citizens to work for himself and gain for himself. There is no foundation at this time for any positive assumption that production of synthetic rubber actually will mean higher prices to consumers for rubber goods after the war. The cost of synthetic production during the war has been dropping steadily as the amount of production was increased and as the "bugs" have been ironed out of the production processes. Just as American ingenuity in invention, and mass production, brought the automobile from a luxury for the rich down to the reach of all of moderate income, so also the cost of synthetic prduction may go below all present dreams and is certain to go below present levels.

The American people have hundreds of millions of dollars of their Federal-tax money invested in synthetic production plants. These plants support tens of thousands of families. To toss all of this thoughtlessly out of the window at the end of the war would be simply to destroy jobs for tens of thousands of American families and destroy business for firms with tens of thousands of stockholders in favor of jobs for natives of the Far East and business for the firms of foreign nations.

Powder Metallurgy Opens Way to Vast Advances in Machines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent edition of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Powder Metallurgy Opens Way to Vast Advances in Machines," being the contribution of Dr. Paul Schwarzkopf, one of the foremost authorities on powder metallurgy:

THE WORLD AHEAD: STRIDES OF WAR-LASHED INDUSTRY PROMISE FULLER PEACETIME LIFE—POWDER METALLURGY OPENS WAY TO VAST ADVANCES IN MACHINES—DR. SCHWARZKOPF, PREDICTING BETTER PRODUCTS AT LOWER PRICES, CALLS FOR WIDER DISTRIBUTION TO MEET ENORMOUS POTENTIAL POST-WAR DEMAND

(By Emmet Crozier)

The urgency of war has produced a variety of new materials and new processes, some of them certain to improve peacetime living and perhaps to change it greatly for the better. In the tense months since the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor engineers and metallurgists have pressed ahead with what may be described as scientific recklessness to meet goals set by the desperate needs of war.

The synthetic-rubber program is an example of the bold and resourceful accomplishments of American production under the lash of war. New industrial uses have been found for silver. Recently the almost unbelievable feat of welding aluminum directly to glass was accomplished. New tool materials—multicarbides—have made possible greatly increased speeds in cutting and machining steel.

Many of the developments of this high-pressure production period cannot yet be disclosed, but enough can be told now to suggest the new miracles of industry that lie ahead.

In a recent interview Dr. Paul Schwarzkopf, one of the foremost authorities on powder metallurgy and director of research for the American Electro Metal Corporation, outlined some of the notable advances being made in that field which open up new horizons for industry. Dr. Schwarzkopf's Yonkers, N. Y., plant is stamping out thousands of pole pieces for use in Army Signal Corps field telephones by the powder-metal process.

IN MASS PRODUCTION

Mass production of these small, concave blocks by pressing measured quantities of pure iron powder in huge hydraulic presses has supplanted the costlier and more laborious process of cutting and machining the pieces from cold-rolled steel.

Through the technique developed in powder metallurgy, Dr. Schwarzkopf foresees a revolutionary advance in modern industry. His theory involves replacing the metals now subjected to wear and deterioration in modern machines, such as the internal-combustion engine, with improved hard metals capable of withstanding great heat, wear and abuse, such as the cemented carbides now used for tool material.

Developing this theory, the metallurgist says:

"Before the war, valuable goods were meant only for the comparatively few; after the war we should aim at their wider distribution. American pre-war production was enormous, but it was as nothing compared with the potential post-war demands both of the United States and of other nations, less advanced industrially, for which the United States in a sense may adopt responsibility.

"True, even with products capable of withstanding roughest usage, a large consumption may be expected, and therefore mass production, and cheap prices will be possible.

"It is generally known that the tremendous use of oil and its derivatives in the modern world, especially since the war, has reduced the resources of this material, and the world faces the possibility of shortages at some measurable time. It is not so well known that the same is true of iron, copper, nickel, and other essential ores. We shall have, therefore, after the war, also to economize with these raw materials.

"EXPECTATIONS HIGHER

"Not only do we want to make available as many of the fruits of technological progress as possible to as many people as possible, but in every field the more sophisticated users demand a higher grade of performance. A hundred years ago, people were satisfied to cross the ocean in 4 months; before the war, in from 4½ to 7 days; after the war they will expect to cross in 12 hours. The automobile driver who 20 years ago was content if, during a short trip, he experienced one flat tire or one small motor defect, now wants to be able to drive from coast to coast without having to worry about his car more than about his shoes.

"All these factors call for ever improved motors, cars, airplanes, machine products, machinery—which means motors, cars, airplanes, machine products and machinery more and more able to withstand wear and abuse, and therefore made with more and more wear-resistant materials.

"It is clear, of course, that machines and apparatus need never be entirely built from maximum wear-resistant materials. Only those parts that will have to stand the greatest abuse need to be made of such materials. But it is obvious that the deterioration of ever so small a part can compel the shut-down of a great machine."

Automobile valves, brake shoes, spark-plug electrodes are some of the parts cited by Dr. Schwarzkopf as subject to heat and wear.

Powder metallurgy, Dr. Schwarzkopf explained, had made possible the processing of metals with very high melting points, such as tungsten and molybdenum. First used successfully in modern times in the production of rods, wires, strips and sheets for lamps, electronic tubes, and electrical contacts, the powder method of pressing and sintering later brought about the technical miracle of the so-called hard metals, or cemented carbides.

SCHWARZKOPF A PIONEER

Although he minimized his own role in the development of these cemented carbides, Dr. Schwarzkopf generally is acknowledged as one of the pioneers in the field, whose processes have greatly advanced the machining of steel and bronzes.

"These developments," he said, "represent a progression in wear-resistance. The tungsten wire produced by powder metallurgical methods for incandescent lamps does not deteriorate, even at the highest attainable temperatures and is accordingly wear-resistant to heat and electricity to the highest degree. Some combination materials of tungsten and copper or molybdenum and silver, manufactured for electric contacts by powder metallurgical methods, will make and interrupt electric circuits millions of times without deteriorating either mechanically or electrically, and spark-plug electrodes made from similar materials by the same processes have a superlative resistance against the effects of high temperatures and the electric arc."

Dr. Schwarzkopf said that modern tool and die materials cemented from carbide powders, which made possible the machining of metals and nonmetals with 10 to 50 times the speed of earlier tool materials, and with increased efficiency and greater precision, "rival the diamond in hardness and are marvels of wear-resistance against abrasion."

OTHER TYPES OF RESISTANCE

Describing the various kinds of wear, some caused by heat and others by arbasion, to which metal machine parts were subject, he said:

"But there is another type of mechanical wear, for resistance to which toughness as well as hardness is required. This is the type of wear-resistance that many machine parts subjected to high mechanical stresses demand. Steels possess it. For the mechanical stresses operating on the parts of a machine are not limited in their effects to surface abrasion, but include also vibration, torque, shear, and strains that affect the internal structure of the materials of which these parts are made. The best of our hard metals, and even the diamond, the hardest material found in nature, would crumble under many of the uses to which we put steel parts in machines, because lacking the degree of toughness necessary for these uses. On the other hand, even the best steels cannot match the resistance against abrasion of hard metals, not to mention diamonds."

Reviewing the accomplishments of powder metallurgy, as represented in the production of pole pieces, and multicarbides, Dr. Schwarzkopf added:

"Today I am able to state that we are one step further on the road to the ultimate goal—the production of parts combining the hardness of the diamond with the toughness of the best steels. Not only superhard metals but also super steels are in process of attainment, even though their perfection must not be expected by the day after tomorrow. We know today that it is possible, on the one hand, to increase the toughness of our best hard metals without diminishing their hardness and, on the other hand, that the strength of molten or forged steels may now be not only equaled but surpassed by powder metallurgical methods.

"We may expect confidently in the near future the development on a mass-production basis, from powders, of bushings, brake shoes for automobiles, locomotives, railway cars, and other vehicles; valves, valve-seats, and other parts for automobile and airplane engines, and many metal parts little known to the layman because they perform their necessary functions in the obscure insides of complicated machines—all possessing a wear-resistance far superior to any heretofore attainable, and therefore certain to contribute to developments that may appear startling even to our sophisticated modern machine-mindedness."

Race Equality Agitators Denounced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in yesterday morning's Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, as follows:

BLAMES YANKEE SLAVE TRADERS

The race resolution, blistering in its denunciation of those who "are seeking by insidious utterances and actions to stir up trouble and bring conflict and strife between the white race and the Negro race of the South," asserted that "Yankee slave traders and New England shipmasters instituted and commercialized the vile North American slave traffic * * * during the infancy of the Republic."

The resolution said "we indignantly and vehemently denounce the intentions * * * of all organizations seeking the amalgamation of the white and Negro races by commingling of the races upon any basis of equality as being destructive to the identity and characteristics and integrity of both races and as being un-American and hostile to the existence and preservation of the American Union of States.

"We reaffirm our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy as now prevailing in the South, and we solemnly pledge our lives and our sacred honor to maintaining it, whatever the cost, in war and in peace.

"That insofar as racial relations are concerned we firmly and unequivocally demand that henceforth the damned agitators of the North leave the South alone."

INTRODUCED BY LONG

The resolution was introduced by Representative John Long, of Union, a lawyer and one-time private secretary to United States Senator Cole L. Blease, Democrat, South Carolina.

At one point the resolution said that "certain persons in high official and semiofficial quarters acting in concert with strong subservient influences of the North, actuated by malice or ignorance or both toward the South in general and the white race in particular, taking traitorous and treasonable advantage of the critical situation brought about by the war, are seeking by insidious utterances and actions to stir up trouble and bring conflict and strife between the white race and the Negro race of the South, thereby kindling a fire that they may not be able to put out, and shaking the South from center to circumference.

NAZI PHILOSOPHY

"Thereby agitators of the North are playing into the hands of Nazi philosophy of conquest to first divide, then conquer; and by their treasonable utterances and conduct are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our common country. * * *

"History and tradition prove that the wisest and safest policy is to allow each race to work out its own destiny in the South by a

process of progressive evolution within the confines of its own racial borders * * *."

Meanwhile the senate agreed to debate tomorrow a resolution which would fix a time for electing two members of the Winthrop College board of trustees succeeding Mrs. George M. Stuckey, of Bishopville, and Angus MacAuley, of Chester.

Senator Baskin, of Lee, sought to block debate on the resolution in order to call up a bill by Senator Leppard, of Chesterfield, which would abolish the present Winthrop board and substitute it with a legislature-elected board.

Senator Sims, of Orangeburg, chairman of the senate education committee, answering a charge that the Leppard bill had been delayed in the committee, said his group would meet tonight to act upon the measure, but predicted that a move to revamp the board would not get anywhere inasmuch as the house already had killed a similar proposal.

The senate reversed a previous vote and killed the Ellerbe bill to reduce membership of the State public service commission from seven to three members.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an article which appeared in yesterday morning's Washington Post, entitled "Race Equality 'Agitators' Denounced":

RACE EQUALITY "AGITATORUAS" DENOUNCED

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 29.—The South Carolina House of Representatives adopted a resolution today demanding that "henceforth the damned agitators of the North leave the South alone" in interracial relations and reaffirming "our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy."

The resolution then went to the senate for consideration.

In part, it said:

"We indignantly and vehemently denounce the intentions * * * of all organizations seeking the amalgamation of the white and Negro races by commingling of the races upon any basis of equality, as being destructive to the identity and characteristics and integrity of both races, and * * * as being hostile to the existence and preservation of the American Union of States."

PLEDGE TO WHITE SUPREMACY

"We reaffirm our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy as now prevailing in the South, and we solemnly pledge our lives and our sacred honor to maintaining it, whatever the cost, in war and in peace;

"That insofar as racial relations are concerned we firmly and unequivocally demand that henceforth the damned agitators of the North leave the South alone."

Representative John Long, who wrote and introduced the lengthy resolution, received congratulations from many members after it had been adopted with only a few dissenting "noes." Long served as private secretary to the late Cole L. Blease when the latter was a United States Senator.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including some very valuable data which has been compiled after a most exhaustive study of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal project. The possibilities of this extension of our system of inland waterways are of such importance to the national defense and to our post-war economy that they call for our most careful consideration.

When one compares the relatively small cost of this development with the savings it will make in the costs of transportation and the resulting benefits to the people of our entire Nation, I say without fear of successful contradiction that no other national investment of equal amount—$66,000,000—has ever shown the potential return to our people that this project offers. Its savings in 5 years are estimated to be more than sufficient to amortize the total cost of this work:

This report is submitted in support of the Tennesseee-Tombigbee Waterways project which is now receiving the attention of the Congress in H. R. 3961.

The wheels of economic progress contain six spokes, namely:

1. Raw material.
2. Manufacture.
3. Transportation.
4. Commerce.
5. Finance.
6. Civics and manpower.

This wheel to be kept in balance needs two weights to maintain that balance, namely:

A. Production.

B. Distribution.

When these two weigh fair, our wheels of economic progress stay in balance, resulting in prosperity.

We have overcome production through mass production and the machine age. Then it must be distribution that causes our wheels of economic progress to get out of balance.

I believe the shipper and the general public are now beginning to realize that one of our greatest needs is a stable and coordinated transportation system, with a definite provision that the rates under such a system be as low as consistent with reasonable profits to the carriers.

Plans for a larger and better utilization of our inland waterways should be comprehended, as far as economically justified, with improved and modernized types of equipment. The Congress has consistently gone on record, and rightfully so, to preserve and foster in full vigor, both rail and water transportation. Our Nation is so large in physical area that economical means of distribution from and to the different sections of our country are essential to the well-being of the people. Certainly the public should enjoy that service which is of the greatest value to them. Full recovery in the post-war period awaits an improvement of our distribution system. I am convinced that the development of our waterways can be made the basis of improved transportation for this great country.

When we improve our waterways and fit our vessels and equipment to fit the rails and trucks, at the same time modernize our rails and terminals to fit the waterways and trucks, then we will become real nation builders, but we must do the job on a sound constructive basis and not follow the wishes only of selfish pressure groups, as has been so often the rule in the past.

Now that motortruck lines have come into being, the store door delivery and pick-up is here. Over $20,000,000,000 have been expended in the development of our highways and motor transportation. Over $25,000,000,000 are invested in our railroads. These two agencies makes up two of the legs of the tripod of transportation. We have over $1,000,000,000 expended so far in our waterways, which is the third leg of our tripod of transportation, which approximates one-twentieth of the investment in rails, highways, and trucks.

This third leg of the tripod of transportation (inland waterways) can be developed to its proper and full effectiveness at comparatively low cost of construction; it is folly and unsound economic thinking, which would argue against the full development of our great inland waterways. The important economic and military value of such development cannot be disputed.

I am convinced that any plan for the utilization and development of the waterways of the United States, should be upon a basis that would in every way assist and make possible the development of rails and trucks correlated with water transportation. By so doing, the country as a whole would enjoy the very lowest rate structure consistent with fair profits to each type of carrier. At the same time, once and for all times, this plan would solve the distribution problem for industry, mining, and agriculture. Every dollar saved in distribution costs make an additional dollar of purchasing power in the hands of the consuming public, which, when used to raise their standards of living, makes for more jobs.

In speaking further of the relationship between the water, rail, and truck carriers, it is well to remember that many of the great cities of the world have been developed on the waterways of each country.

The people of the United States are appreciative of the economic and defense value of our waterways. Take for example the great Mississippi River and its tributaries, which drain an area of some 1,240,000 square miles, or about 41 percent of our entire country, excluding Alaska, and which includes all or portions of 31 States.

Now that we have developed the efficiency of the Diesel engine and of self-propelled barges, which can operate in the Caribbean area, such a barge designed as a seagoing barge of shallow draft, could ply in and out of our inland waterways. And if we are foresighted enough to coordinate our inland waterways for national distribution, there would be no railroad or truck line operating in the 31 States of the Mississippi Valley which would not reap directly, or indirectly, the benefits of such developments. I might add that it would at the same time make for increased trade with our Atlantic and Gulf territories and with our Latin-American cousins to the south of us.

Civilization is groggy under the blows of this total war. The wounds inflicted are very deep, but how deep remains a question. Naturally, the uncertainties are very grave. I can say this much, however, that civilization will not recover its strength and well-being if at the end of this total war there does not follow a total peace.

It would be a serious mistake, then, if agricultural problems are not given now the study and careful attention they deserve. Sound farming and sound industry are the essential elements for the making of our total peace at home. Peace plans recently proposed have not taken into consideration the basic factor of our own national industrial and agricultural and/or rural life.

One of the major problems confronting this Nation is the cost of distribution of our basic commodities, and among these costs transportation is an exceedingly important factor. Little has been done voluntarily in recent years to lessen transportation costs; to coordinate or correlate facilities; or to bring about processes designed largely to improve existing routes and transportation media. Transportation should be a friendly correlative of industry and agriculture, as one cannot successfully endure without the helpful assistance of the other.

In these days when scientific technique has pointed the way to mass production and old

methods are being replaced by new improvements and inventions in industry, the answer to our transportation problem does not appear to lie in higher rates and cost; rather the objective should be to discover cheaper means of distribution of all needed commodities to all available markets, both domestic and foreign.

A river is so many rain drops lifted by the sun from the ocean, dropped on mountains and plains, carried back to the ocean by the rivers. Men and their achievements, and so-called civilization are so many drops of consciousness raised by Divine power from some ocean of life and dropped here to do their work and sustain life. One drop of water is nothing; Niagara's many drops represent power. An individual man is nothing except as he ccoperates with millions of others to produce good government and create civilized society. The roads he has marked out, on land, sea, and in the air, measure his progress. Water, the perfect ball-bearing surface, that men unfortunately have not yet learned to utilize fully, was the first highway and always will remain so, for is it not a fact that many of the great cities of the world are located on waterways?

There are the mighty midcountry rivers of the Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, Cumberland, Tennessee, Warrior, Alabama, Coosa, and Tombigbee, which drain so many square miles of this great country, defying man and his power, but eventually to be controlled completely by man.

The policy of Congress as enunciated in section 500 of the Transportation Act is designed to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation, and to foster and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation.

If we fully believe such declaration of policy to mean exactly what it says then reccgnition of the importance of the development and maintenance of our waterways is apparent.

Prior to World War No. 1 there was not enough transportation available to meet the expanding needs of our commerce, and to do so wholly by railroad expansion would have cost the railroads a billion dollars a year for 10 years to expand, modernize, and put them in condition to meet the needs of the future.

Water transportation facilities that are presently available are inherently cheaper than any other form, and if utilized and improved in connection with rail and highway transportation there will result a net saving to the public and a living revenue to the participating carriers, resulting in greatly increasing commerce and employment, as well as being a stand-by for national defense.

Inasmuch as everyone in the United States has been taxed to create these navigable streams and highways, there should be reflected in every consignee or consignor of freight in the United States some of the savings inherent in water transportation.

Waterways are Nature's highways, for through the use of waterways we can reach the four corners of the earth. Improvement in waterways and the use of new scientifically developed equipment for use thereon, will greatly lessen the cost of distribution on that part of transportation the waterways can do best. This means a saving to our people, such savings then being available can be expended for plant expansion and in other directions for raising the standard of living. All of which makes for the creation of additional commercial activities and the creation of jobs.

When the Tombigbee-Tennessee project was first visioned in 1875 it was due to farsighted men who had a vision of future needs; but a bill to that end at that time failed of passage by the Congress by 2 votes. Now, the development of the Tennessee and Ohio Rivers being completed, it is imperative that connections with other rivers should and must be brought about. It does not require much of a vision to realize that transporting goods cost more to haul over mountains, either by highway or rail, than it does on level ground or on inland waterways. The downstream is helped by the river current, but the upstream movement requires the bucking of the downstream currents. Now any improvement through using a new route that will allow the upstream movement to be made at practically the same cost as the downstream movement, plus shortening the distance and no current to buck, should be considered and passed by the Congress forthwith, for it is certainly a step in the right direction toward lowering transportation costs. Then, too, by such improvement a substantial saving in distance can be made. We now wonder how we ever got along heretofore without such improvement, no matter what the cost, for the direct and indirect benefit to the public is apparent.

Another example is in the construction of the Panama Canal. Intercoastal steamships by its use have greatly benefited, not only the States of California, Oregon, and Washington but our Atlantic and Gulf Coast States as well, and its value in our national defense has been proven. Now if this service is expanded by improved inland waterways, it is self-evident that our interior States will be greatly benefited. Any saving in cost of transport, whether it be by rail, water, and/or truck, makes for more purchasing power in the hands of the consumer. At the same time, it improves our national defense highways.

To understand why we have a transportation problem at all, or why in a period of 20 years from World War No. 1 it has attained such dangerous proportions, let us retrace our steps and look into the rate structures of our railroads functioning before and after World War No. 1. Prior to World War No. 1 railway transportation enjoyed, to all intents and purposes, a monopoly over all overland transportation—the only competitive service available being the horse-drawn vehicle, whose economic range of operation was not more than 7 to 10 miles.

Under the conditions then existing, the backbone of railroad transportation, especially in the older sections of the country, was what is known as short-haul traffic. As the volume of this traffic in areas mentioned above was sufficient in itself to return a reasonable return on the capital investment, railway management was able to look upon long-haul traffic as little more than a welcome byproduct. For if it moved at rates sufficient to cover out-of-pocket costs, plus a reasonable contribution to administrative expense, that was all that it was expected to produce, a viewpoint which, under prevailing conditions at that time was, in my opinion, wholly rational and in the public interest.

Cheaper transportation can only be extended to the whole country through further development of our waterways and improvements to the existing ones, looking toward coordination and cooperation of rail, water, and motor carriers, and the participating carriers receiving a living revenue through such cooperation. This is the only way we can improve our national distribution system, enhance our national defense, and increase our domestic and foreign commerce.

Oil for the east coast, scrap for the steel mills, steel for war plants, etc., are boosting barge traffic on the Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers to their biggest years in history.

In the middle of the last century, when steamboating reached the heights of its wellsung glory, the holds and decks of white, gleaming packets carried about 10,000,000 tons of freight a year—cargoes to bulge the pockets of the owners and the eyes of the world. Then Civil War came and the rivers were battle lanes rather than arteries of trade; and the railroads came to hurry passengers and freight across the Nation, along the rivers and valleys.

Today the Mississippi River and its tributaries are surging along with new energy—largely generated by the war—that has lifted river traffic to the mechanized level of modern civilization. Steel towboats and barges carry ten times as much freight as Mark Twain's pilots saw, and river transportation is now big business instead of romance. Last year barges loaded with hundreds of wartime commodities carried 106,000,000 tons of freight. And this year will carry more. And were the Tombigbee-Tennessee River Canal in being it would greatly enhance water transportation in the war effort.

Obviously, railroads and motortrucks will continue to haul most of the freight, but rail and motortruck rates are high, and railroads and motortrucks may not be able to handle all of the new burden that war has placed upon them. Secretary Ickes and Defense Transportation Coordinator Eastman have emphasized the importance of barge transportation on our inland waters and in the war effort.

The barge rates for common carriers under the Interstate Commerce Commission are usually 80 percent of rail rates. For instance, the barge freight charge on 5,000 tons of finished steel products from Pittsburgh to New Orleans is $32,550, the rail charge is $72,000. The rails take 4 days to make the trip and the tow downstream takes 15 days. However, it takes the tow more than a month to come up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh. The average tow speed downstream is 5.9 miles per hour, average speed upstream 2.7.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries' ports north of Cairo would be in common with the Tombigbee-Tennessee River project. However, from Cairo, when destined to New Orleans, the Mississippi River would best serve the public, even though the distance is longer than via the Tombigbee-Tennessee route, as the downstream current on the Mississippi is an advantage.

However, on all upstream business, either from New Orleans or Mobile to the Ohio, Tennessee and tributaries, and the upper Mississippi, the Tombigbee-Tennessee River route northward would best serve the public interest for the trip upstream, say as far as Cairo, can be made in approximately half the time of that via the Mississippi, with its resultant savings in cost of operation. In other words, if the Tombigbee-Tennessee project comes into being, a counterclockwise route can be established using the Mississippi route downstream to New Orleans and upstream from Mobile via the Tombigbee-Tennessee. This would permit a lowering of rates and attract considerable more business to the Mississippi River route, either from New Orleans or Mobile, than now enjoyed, at the same time greatly increase upstream movements via water and open up water transportation to rich farming, mining, chemical and forestry products, creating new wealth and increasing employment.

It is pertinent to note that modern river traffic is carried on steel barges, the largest of which holds as much as 3,000 tons of freight—a capacity equal to 75 boxcars. The large towboats can push a number of barges carrying approximately 15,000 tons, the equivalent of 375 freight cars. The average tow, however, runs around 5,000 tons, equal to 125 freight cars.

This brief on inland waterways transportation covers only what is known as the Mississippi River system and the Tombigbee-Tennessee route. It does not include the Great Lakes, the eastern and far eastern rivers and canals or intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic seaboard. The Mississippi System (so-called) is made up of the river itself with some 20 main tributaries, another 20 small rivers, and the Intracoastal Water-

ways along the Gulf coast. There are 15,000 miles of partially navigable waterways in the system 4,500 miles with a low-water channel of 9 feet on the Monongahela, Allegheny, Ohio, Tennessee, Illinois, Kanawha, Mobile, Warrior, and the Mississippi itself from Minneapolis-St. Paul to the Gulf and the Intracoastal Waterway from Freeport, Tex., to St. Marks, Fla.

The drainage basin for the Mississippi system covers approximately 1,240,000 square miles of the United States midcontinent. It covers all or parts of 31 States and two Canadian Provinces, stretching from the Rockies to the Appalachian Range, from New York State to Idaho. In this basin are 71 percent (by value) of the country's farm land, 69 percent of the farm population, 99 percent of the iron ore, 95 percent of the bituminous coal, 82 percent of the petroleum, and many new war plants.

With improved navigation resulting from the canalization of the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the T. V. A. development on the Tennessee River, traffic on the Mississippi River system is increasing each year. And with the canalization of the Tombigbee-Tennessee, which gives a second water route to the Gulf, as well as making possible still lower costs for transportation, through a counterclockwise route with the Mississippi River, and the connecting water link of the Intracoastal Canal between Mobile and New Orleans, to say nothing of the tremendous new wealth the Tombigbee-Tennessee project will bring into being. Added to all this constructive development the smaller tributaries of the Mississippi system can be made to serve those sections of the country through which they flow, even though their waterways are of shallow depth, 6 feet deep or under, by the employment of shallow-draft craft. This would greatly open up these sections of our country to the cheaper water transportation and would act as feeders to the main routes outlined above.

There are over 600 operators on the rivers, over 160 lines under regulation of the I. C. C. They own an aggregate of five thousand-and-odd barges and some 800 towboats. The lines are divided into 3 categories—the Government-owned fleet, industrial companies carrying their own products, and independent commercial operators.

The Federal Barge Lines operate some 25 towboats and approximately 290 barges from Minneapolis-St. Paul to New Orleans, from Kansas City to St. Louis on the Missouri, from Chicago to St. Louis va the Illinois River, through the Intracoastal Waterway to Mobile, along the Gulf coast to Mobile, and up the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers to the port of Birmingham, Ala., to serve the great steel and coal center located there.

The Federal-owned fleet is best known to the public. The private companies carry the most freight, but the independent commercial lines are the majority operators. One of the largest of the barge lines, and in many ways typical of all the lines, is the American Barge Line, operated by Patrick and Andrew Calhoun, great-grandsons of the statesman, John C. Calhoun. They operate some 200 barges and 10 towboats on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers from Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, and Chicago to New Orleans. Then there is the Union Barge Line. Only within the last 7 or 8 years has traffic really been important on the upper Mississippi and the Illinois Rivers. Traffic in peacetime has increased at the rate of a million tons a year since 1935. This increased tonnage was due to the building of locks and dams which assured navigable channels. The largest of the northern operators is the Central Barge Co., which holds contracts with several large public service corporations, the John Hays Co., with 30 barges in service between New Orleans and Minneapolis and Chicago, running paper and petroleum upstream, grain, and steel downstream.

There are times when the Mississippi is rampant and barge operation is hard and hazardous. With the Tombigbee and Tennessee River project in being, this north-bound route would be available, for the route is practically in slack water, until the Tennessee River is reached. Then the current of the Tennessee can be taken advantage of up to Cairo, Ill.

If land-locked water routes were interconnected where possible and feasible, as is proposed for the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers, it would permit light pleasure craft to make long trips with maximum safety. In time of war, especially in this airplane era, wherein enemy bombers could attack our rails and gateways, our country then would have land-locked routes behind our coast lines, where destroyers, torpedo boats, transports, and barges could successfully operate, and materials and men transported. When this country was still young no less a statesman than John C. Calhoun advised Congress to "bind the Republic together with a perfect system of waterways," and Calhoun's advice was never better than it is today. The Government could add enormously and permanently to the national wealth and well-being of its citizens by providing better channels of inland-waterway navigation and utilizing the great sources of hydroelectric power wherever feasible.

For the years 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 the average annual movement of commerce on the Mississippi, Ohio, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers was 48,280,000 tons.

The use of slack water in the Tennessee-Tombigbee route for north-bound traffic would produce large savings in transportation costs. The following computations are based on the average performance of a representative tow of one 1,200-horsepower Diesel towboat and eight barges of various standard types and dimensions loaded with a typical mixed cargo, at 55 percent load factor of 3,500 revenue-tons, to and from locations on these waterways:

Cost per mile in slack water	$3.86
Average current in Mississippi River below Cairo (miles per hour)	2½
Cost per mile against 2½-mile-per-hour current	$7.08
Cost per mile with 2½-mile-per-hour current	$2.66
Average lockage time:	*Cost*
Tennessee-Ohio River section, 30 minutes	$11.00
Tombigbee section, 45 minutes	16.00
Warrior River section, 1 hour	21.00

If as now constituted it costs $7.08 per mile on the upstream movement against a 2½-mile current, the canalization of the Tombigbee-Tennessee Rivers as projected brings the cost down to $3.86 per mile, which will permit operation in slack waters, thereby bypassing the upstream movement against the 2½-mile current in the lower Mississippi River. It brings the cost down for the upstream movement and makes for a saving of $3.22 per mile. A saving of a minimum of only 50 cents per ton in the operating cost based on the average movement outlined above would result in an operating saving of $24,140,077 per year based on pre-war tonnage. In other words, the savings which would accrue in the public interest in 3 years would be greater than the total cost of the Tombigbee-Tennessee project—namely, approximately $66,000,000—to say nothing of the added potentiality for national defense and increased commerce.

Via the Tombigbee-Tennessee route the Gulf coast will be 630 miles shorter from Sheffield, Decatur, Chattanooga, Knoxville, and other Tennessee River points.

The Gulf coast will be 200 miles shorter from Evansville, Louisville, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and other Ohio River points.

The Gulf coast will be 108 miles shorter from St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Kansas City, and other points on the Mississippi, Missouri, and Illinois Rivers.

From the Cumberland Valley the Gulf coast will be 200 miles shorter.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway—Waterway distances to Gulf ports

From—	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,718	1,610	108	6
Chicago	1,398	1,290	108	7½
St. Louis	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo	860	752	108	12½
Hickman	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati	1,397	1,179	200	14½
Louisville	1,236	1,036	200	16
Paducah	906	706	200	22
Chattanooga	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal	1,121	491	630	56.2

The canalization of the Tombigbee River with that of the Tennessee River is one of the most important and urgently needed waterway projects in the United States and will greatly benefit, economically at least, 31 States. Other rivers of shallow draft can eventually be improved, thus adding to other States great benefits and serving to knit our water transportation system on a national plane of outstanding efficiency and be the forerunner in improving the distribution system we now have here in the United States.

This projected Tombigbee-Tennessee River project will materially aid the Mississippi River system and increase freight movements to the other media of land transport.

A quick visualization of what this project will mean is herewith set forth:

Serious inland waterway transportation development in the United States was gotten under way in the First World War, and it has afforded great service and savings ever since. This policy on the part of the Government at that time avoided an acute domestic transportation crisis, and its continuance in World War No. 2, shows it to be more important today than the First World War. Everything that must be moved is being moved. One reason is that the railroads are carrying a tremendous burden. But there is still another reason that seemingly has gone virtually unnoticed and that is the past development of the country's rivers, canals, and lakes into highways have proven their worth in the movement of unprecedented tons of wartime freight.

The Nation's sprawling web of inland waterways today is carrying a big share of the wartime load. Its lake steamers and snub-nosed towboats are hauling iron ore and coal to the steel mills on a scale impossible for the railroads. They are delivering steel to the Gulf coast shipyards. They are hauling southwestern chemicals a long way to eastern destinations. And, important among other things, they are increasing the flow of oil to the eastern oil-famine area, adding up to a lot of materials being delivered, thus easing the strain on the overburdened railroads. Exact tonnage totals are military secrets, but enough random figures are available to make it plain that the present activities on the rivers have been a life-saver to our wartime efforts. By way of illustration—commerce on the rivers, lakes, and canals for 1941 was more than triple the peak of the last war. There was a marked increase in 1942 and still a further increase in 1943.

This wartime contribution of the waterways is limited only by the manpower and equipment and further developments that are made available. With business at present levels the rivers and canals are not congested.

However, they can be greatly improved upon, in that distances can be shortened, as illustrated by the Tombigbee-Tennessee project. And the Government and private industry are building more and more equipment, and since barges and towboats are made of scarce materials, it demonstrates the importance which Government attaches to waterway traffic in the public interest.

Informed sources estimate that our inland waterways will carry well over 120,000,000 tons of freight in the year 1943, with greater increases expected in the year 1944, which amount of tonnage is almost four times the peak in the year 1918, the First World War period. Can anyone with such a showing before them doubt the value of inland waterways to our national defense activities?

Now, with all this before one it is clearly demonstrated what increased values will accrue nationally in our waterways development, especially if the Tombigbee-Tennessee project is carried out, for it will increase the operating potentialities of the Mississippi River route and offer to the country as a whole an enormous saving.

These two north and south river routes, namely, the Mississippi and the Tombigbee-Tennessee, and their tributaries, reach into an area rich in natural resources—coal, petroleum, farm products, chemicals, etc. In peacetimes river barges carried a multiplicity of items, with such things as coal, corn, agricultural implements, cotton, linters, bar steel, sheets, pipe, beer, sulfur, furnishings as the major cargoes. Today there is an unprecedented movement of petroleum for one thing. It is carried to Cincinnati and other Ohio River points for shipment eastward. Sulfur of prime importance to war industries is moving in great quantities. Large tonnage of scrap iron and steel are delivered to the Birmingham and Pittsburgh areas. Cement, steel products, and recently a 60,000-ton consignment of soybeans.

Oil for the East is moving along the Intracoastal Waterway, which parallels the Gulf coast from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Panama City, Fla., and the Atlantic coast from Miami, Fla., to Trenton, N. J. A pipe line fills the overland gap across northern Florida, with its eastern terminus at Jacksonville. New barges are being built to increase the capacity of the system.

The modern waterway system is a child of the last war, grown to greater maturity in this one, and can stand considerable more growth. Waterways highly important in earlier days were neglected during the period of railroad expansion. When the last war brought with it a severe transportation problem the waterways came back. Federal funds built equipment and terminal facilities. After the war Congress laid down a plan for developing the rivers and connecting channels. During the last war river depths in many places were not more than 4 feet. Today they run from 6 to 9 feet, and are mostly 9. Many will no doubt be increased to a minimum of 12 feet.

Now, as to the technical feasibility and value of this Tombigbee-Tennessee Canal project, I call your attention to the able presentation made by Col. P. A. Feringa, United States Army, resident member, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, at the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, held October 20, 21, 1943. Also Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, Member of Congress, from Mississippi, in his extension of remarks ir the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 3, 1943, page A5266, as well as the stamp of approval of Chairman MANSFIELD of Texas and the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Statistics and supporting data in this declaration are based upon reports from the Army engineers and the Department of Commerce, and various State reports, and careful analysis of the effect of the construction of the Tombigbee-Tennessee project show that this project when developed will bring large benefits to all of 31 States, to the connecting railroads and truck lines as a whole, and will be of tremendous economic and military value to the Nation.

With the above before you I hope I have made it clear that the development of this project is highly essential in the public interest. There will be other improvements from time to time that earmark themselves as of strategic value and in the public interest, and they, too, should be developed.

I earnestly request your support and help on this project. History will prove that the construction of this project will be another milestone in the intelligent development of the transportation and distribution systems of our United States.

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
First District, Alabama.

Labor Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address over the Blue Network by John P. Frey, president, Metal Trades Department, A. F. of L., February 25, 1944:

When the Nazi launched their murderous war, after years of industrial and military preparation, no country attacked was adequately prepared to defend its borders. There was a desperate, almost fatal, shortage of war munitions. It was evident that these nations, if they were to successfully defend themselves, must be supplied with war munitions by the United States. Our country immediately became the arsenal of democracy.

We are now actively engaged in the war against Germany and Japan, called upon to equip the largest armed forces our country has ever placed in the field and upon the sea, and in addition, supply our allies with increasing amounts of military equipment. Without the industrial production of America, the Huns and the Japs could not be defeated in their purpose to dominate the world.

Since Pearl Harbor it has been evident that if the American arsenal failed, the destruction of free institutions throughout the world would follow, at least for the time being. The winning of the war—a speedy victory—now depends almost wholly upon what the American industrial arsenal can produce.

What is the present condition of this arsenal? Is it meeting the extraordinary demand placed upon it by war, or is it failing?

It is vitally necessary to ask this question because the President's advisers prevailed upon him to recommend to Congress that the free labor of the United States be placed under conscription.

Is there dependable evidence that conscription would increase the industrial output and also prevent strikes? These are questions which must be asked and answered.

If American labor is to be conscripted, who would have charge of its enforcement—the military or some existing or new Federal agency to be created?

Why conscription of labor? The record of wartime production in our country is an astounding one, for production has increased to a fabulous extent during the very period when millions of industrial workers have been taken from the shops and factories and inducted into the armed forces.

A few days ago the mightiest battleship afloat—the *Missouri*—was launched at the Brooklyn Navy Yard 9 months before the estimated period set for the launching when the keel was laid.

What American shipyards have done has astounded the world, and overwhelmed Germany and Japan with fear.

In 1943 the number of workmen employed in the production of Liberty ships increased 52 percent over 1942, but the number of these ships launched in 1943 increased 140 percent.

Last year American shipyards produced over 19,000,000 dead weight tons of merchant shipping, 2½ times the tonnage built in 1942.

The first Liberty ships took an average of over 1,000,000 man-hours to build. Recently 3 yards, each of which have delivered over 200 Liberty ships, have brought their average down to less than 400,000 man-hours, a tribute to the cooperation of management and labor.

Aircrafts are as essential as ships. What does the record production show?

In 1941, 19,290 aircraft were delivered; in 1942, 47,873; and in 1943, 85,946. This data, however, tells only a part of the story for since 1941 and 1942 the average size of the aircraft built has almost doubled.

In 1941 the average weight of an airframe was 4,440 pounds. In 1942 it was 6,110 pounds, and in 1943 it was 8,630 pounds.

Our production of airframes by weight has increased 900 percent since 1941.

The goal set for aircraft production for 1943 was 100,000 planes, and we produced but 86,000. It has been implied that we failed to meet our goal. Actually, however, in terms of the lighter weight 1942 plane, the production in 1943 was equivalent to 122,000 airplanes.

The record of increasing productivity per man-hour in the manufacture of our fighting aircraft is outstanding. In spite of numerous engineering changes in design and structure, certain types of our bombers are now being made in one-fifth the time required at first, and in the case of certain types of trainer planes the ratio of improved productivity last year was 10 to 1.

In 1942, 276,000,000 pounds of airframe were fabricated. In 1943 the weight increased to 667,000,000 pounds. What adds to the impressiveness of these figures is the fact that during this period output per man-hour increased materially.

For understandable military reasons it is impossible to give the over-all record of the production in navy yards.

Where fighting ships are constructed and repairs made, an official report on repairs says:

"It is difficult to compare the battle-damaged repair work, as each repair job is entirely different, but there has been much favorable comment on the speed with which repairs are completed on both our own and on foreign ships."

But some data indicating trends can be given. One navy yard reports it has completed a destroyer escort in 54 percent of the estimated man-hours. Another navy yard before the emergency constructed a battleship in slightly over 45 months. Since then, it has built the largest and most modern battleship in 33 months. One navy yard reduced its building time on a destroyer from 32 months to a little over 12 months. Another yard reduced its building time on a submarine from 28 months to a trifle over 7 months. Both the destroyer and

the submarine were larger and more complicated than the previous ones.

How about the costs? Again the record is impressive. Cost of material has increased. Wage rates are higher, yet we find a reduction in one yard of 15 percent in the cost of producing submarines. In another 17 percent in the cost of constructing destroyers, and in another a decrease of 27 percent in the cost of producing destroyer escorts.

These data on production of Liberty ships, fighting ships, and of aircraft are all from authoritative governmental reports. The production facts presented apply generally to the production of all war munitions. Man-hour production, the product of the individual worker per hour, has been steadily increasing.

This astounding production record for 1943 becomes all the more impressive when it is realized that millions of trained workers in these industries were inducted into the armed forces and inexperienced workers trained to take their places. It has been a patriotic demonstration in the field of production for labor and for management, an evidence of the outstanding cooperation which the two have established.

But we are told these American workmen are exposed to none of the physical dangers which face our armed forces, that they are not called upon to take the risks unflinchingly faced by our fighting men. Here again those who are advocating conscription of labor have failed to give all of the facts.

The total casualties in our armed forces since Pearl Harbor, given in the official release of January 25, this year, amounted to 142,289. This list includes our dead, wounded, missing, prisoners of war, and those who died in prison camps. This is a costly sacrifice, but what about the workers in industry?

During the same period 38,000 industrial workers were killed; 3,600 received permanent total disability which completely eliminated them as wage earners; 217,800 received permanent partial disability. They are the permanently crippled.

As for the industrial wounded, 4,612,900 suffered temporary total disability. The industrial workers have no assurance when they leave home in the morning that they will return at night, safe and sound. They, too, constantly face total disability and death in connection with their employment.

It is true that a larger number are employed in the industries than are included in our armed forces, but the Government data just given indicates that man for man, up to the present time, the workers in industry have suffered more severely.

There have been strikes, there have been stoppages of work on vital war production, but the essential, all important fact is that over 99⅔ percent of production has been carried on without any interruption through strikes. The less than one-third of 1 percent of interruption has evidently stimulated the call for labor conscription or served as an excuse. Is the authority and resourcefulness of our Government so weak that it cannot deal effectively with the less than 1 percent of labor which has been recalcitrant?

Labor is fully justified in asking what lies behind the campaign to arouse a prejudice against American workmen in the public mind, and particularly in the minds of the men and women in our fighting forces. The data for production in 1943 is outstanding evidence that the fighting forces have received extraordinary support from the workers in industry.

It is an evil genius who, at this time, would endeavor to create a wrong impression in the minds of our fighting men relative to the support being given to them by American industry. It is an unconscionable act to use the one-third of 1 percent of American workers who have interfered with production as a criticism of the 99⅔ percent. What motive can animate those who, while attacking the one-third of 1 percent of American workers wholly fail to mention the extraordinary and patriotic production of the 99⅔ percent of American labor?

Why labor conscription? Would it stimulate greater production than the astounding figures for 1943? Would it stop strikes? If it could there would be at least that argument in its favor.

Since Dunkerque, Britain has had a compulsory labor service law, but the number of strikes and the number of man-hours lost through them has increased since Dunkerque, as shown by the official British statistics. If compulsory service failed to stop strikes in Britain, and the number of man-hours lost through them increased, is there any reason for believing that compulsory service would bring different results in our production of war material?

When American workmen reach the conclusion that they are being unfairly imposed upon their reaction will be the same as that of workmen in any other country where free institutions exist. Much of our fabulous record for production is due to the active cooperation between management and labor. Would compulsory service increase this splendid cooperation; would it stimulate the workers to a still greater degree to study ways and means by which more complete cooperation can be established?

There are many vital questions to be asked of those who are advocating conscription of American labor. To whom would it apply? Who would administer such a law, and who would make the rules and regulations affecting those conscripted? Would it give the military complete control over civilian industrial conditions, and should it be the military, would they set up the boards to hear the complaints, the grievances which develop in industry? Is it the intention to militarize labor?

If labor conscription would be administered by a civilian Federal agency, would labor be given adequate representation? What would be done to correct the present Federal confusion and conflict of industrial policy now bedeviling employer and employee alike?

Is there reason to believe that military control of civilian labor is advisable in this land of free institutions, or that a bureaucracy centered in Washington can accomplish better results than those secured through the splendid cooperation already established between management and labor?

What reason is there to believe that a national service act, administered from Washington, would be any better than Washington's handling of our food problem?

We are informed a conscription act is not essential, but that it would assist the morale of the fighting boys to "know that we are a united nation behind them."

I suggest the better and most effective way would be to end the propaganda which is ceaselessly telling them that we are not united behind them, that an end be brought to the propaganda that while they are fighting their parents are profiteering and labor is cheating and laying down on them while they are at the front.

Is it possible that there are those in responsible administrative positions who honestly believe that American labor will produce more satisfactorily under conscription than it did as free labor during 1943?

The answer to these questions now lies in the hands of Congress. We cannot believe that Congress will now endeavor to militarize labor and convert this American arsenal of democracy into a citadel of bureaucracy.

Intelligent Use of Water for Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before this Congress H. R. 3961 known as the river and harbor bill. This bill has for its object the construction and maintenance of a 9-foot channel in the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

There is apprehension on the part of the people living in the upper Missouri River Basin States that the waters that originate and pass through their States may be used to keep up a 9-foot channel to the detriment of irrigation and domestic uses.

I am sure we all agree that water conservation in the drought stricken areas for irrigation and domestic uses must be our first consideration. Next in importance comes flood control and then navigation. The truth is that irrigation and flood control go hand in hand in taking care of the surplus waters and then if there is more water than is needed for irrigation and domestic uses that surplus can be used for navigation.

It is for this reason that I insert here the statement made by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Bashore's statement follows:

The problem presented by the Missouri River has arisen because of a clash between policies that are not uniformly adjusted to the climatic differences between the humid East and Midwest and the arid and semiarid West.

The conflict is between the beneficial, consumptive use of water in the drier areas for domestic, irrigation, industrial, and mining purposes, and the use of waters in the humid areas to maintain flowing navigation channels. It arises on many if not all of these streams which, like the Missouri, arise in the mountains west of the one-hundredth meridian and flow out of arid lands into humid climates where irrigation is not necessary to sustain agriculture.

The decision will have to be made by the Congress as to which use of the water resource will take precedence in the West. This same problem was before some of the Western States. The common law of riparian rights which was inapplicable to the conditions of the arid region, was supplanted in most instances quickly by the theory of appropriation and beneficial use.

There is a parallel instance of efforts to apply to the same arid region a policy that had proved its worth in the humid region without considering the existence of fundamental and inescapable differences. The Homestead Act, when passed in 1862, applied the most progressive agrarian policy that had been attempted anywhere in the modern world. The thesis behind the 160-acre homestead law was that the land should not be monopolized but should be placed in the hands of settlers who intended to build homes, develop communities, and habitate the area. One has only to see the great States of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and the remainder of the Corn Belt West to

observe how well the homestead law worked in the humid area. It has built there for us of this generation a rural civilization that is perhaps without a rival anywhere in the world.

But the Homestead Act without modification was applicable only in the humid zone. As migration continued and settlement progressed westward homesteading was continued, even though the wave of colonization had lapped over the one hundredth meridian and into the short-grass country and eventually into the arid lands. You can find many areas west of the one hundredth meridian in which it is now perfectly plain that efforts to establish a family on each 160 acres of land, through the Homestead Act, failed in its purpose of building stable settlements. It not only failed but also proved there to be a vicious instrument to despoil and ruin the hopeful people who were lured by the success of that type of settlement in humid areas to attempt to wrest a living from 160 acres where the rainfall was not sufficient for cultivated agriculture.

The paradox that is presented by these examples of successful application of the Homestead Act and its utter failure, disappears when it is understood that the failure in the semiarid and arid zone was not the failure of the act, but sprang from foolhardy attempts to apply it to lands where the agricultural economy could be made suitable for close settlement only through irrigation. The blind optimism of the era led to the belief that the acts of settlement and of plowing would bring sufficient rain to make the crops grow.

If any further proof should be required that the failure was not inherent in the law but resulted from its misapplication to unsuited areas under unsuited conditions, that proof can be found in the fact that where the Bureau of Reclamation has irrigated the land of the Western States and has applied the provisions of the old Homestead Act to its subdivision and settlement, the results have been uniformly successful. This is true even in areas that were homesteaded and abandoned under dry-land conditions and then resettled with the aid of irrigation. Permanent communities have been developed, based on small farms and cultivated agricultural crop production.

You may wonder why I developed the parallel case at such length. The reason is found in the closeness of the parallel between the mistake that was made with respect to the application of the homestead law and the mistake which the West fears may now be made with respect to the western waters. The uniform application to the arid and semiarid region of the water policies that are applicable in humid areas, many feel, holds as great a danger of failure in our efforts to reach the sound and permanent development of the West.

Decades ago the Congress recognized the fundamental difference between the arid and semiarid States, and the remaining two-thirds of the country, with respect to water use and development. The enactment of the Federal Reclamation Act in 1902 was such recognition. Under this act it became the national policy to develop the waters of the streams in the 17 Western States for use in irrigation. It was recognized that without irrigation the development of these States could not progress, and that the States themselves must remain empty colonies, largely made up of sparse ranges, mountains, and deserts.

The Federal Government, with the passage of the Reclamation Act, took cognizance of the fact that the Western Territories and States themselves had developed a more realistic attitude toward the waters in streams of the arid and semiarid States than theretofore had the Federal Government. It was then provided by the Congress that the Bureau of Reclamation should file on water for the Federal irrigation projects in conformity with the laws of the respective States. Except for irrigation, there is no function performed by the Federal Government in connection with water where this requirement is made. The reason is not hard to find. Only in the irrigation States have laws been necessary to apportion water among its users. That happens only where water is scarce. The fact that the water is apportioned under State laws in the West is a reason why there is very serious danger in the dedication by the Congress of the waters of the great rivers that arise in the arid zone and flow into the humid zone to the purpose of navigation to the exclusion of future irrigation development upstream.

I believe that no one doubts the authority of Congress to manage the waters of navigable rivers. That is all the more reason for the Congress to exercise great care in the discharge of its responsibility in connection with these waters. The problem of management of the water is not at all simple on a river like the Missouri. It is made the more complex because different agencies in the executive branch of the Government have primary responsibility for various functions and because different committees of the Congress, itself, similarly have responsibility for separate functions. Under these circumstances it is difficult to obtain complete coordination.

The Bureau of Reclamation has recognized the difficulty of coordination. We have felt our responsibility to appear as an advocate of irrigation and power development. At the same time we understand the need for flood control and sympathize with the desire for navigation improvements.

The upper basin of the Missouri River cannot reach its optimum development without the use of waters from this stream and its tributaries for irrigation. The future development of such States as Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado will require additional irrigation. If there is even a remote possibility of that future development being stifled because of something that may be done by this Congress in the pledging of the waters of the Missouri River for navigation, I am sure that all will agree that the action of making that pledge should be taken only after full and careful consideration of all the factors.

There are three substantial interests to be served by works in the Missouri—irrigation, flood control, and navigation. I assume that the Army engineers would have the proposed flood-control works very closely integrated, in their operation with the proposed navigation works. Such integration makes good sense and was indicated, I understand, in the testimony of witnesses from the Corps of Engineers, given before this committee yesterday. The proposed flood-control works, therefore, with their inevitable integrated operation for navigation purposes, cause concern to the irrigation interests of the upper basin.

According to the Army engineers' report, contained in House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, page 10, paragraph 25, the existing project on the Missouri provides for securing a channel 6 feet deep and 200 feet wide. The proposed project as indicated in Committee Report No. 1000, page 73, being the report on H. R. 3961 in this Congress, recommends the adoption of a project for the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth, to provide a channel 9 feet deep and 300 feet wide.

In House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, an Army engineers' report, it is assumed that a discharge of 20,000 second-feet at Yankton will be required to maintain a 6-foot channel from Sioux City to Kansas City and that a channel between 8 and 9 feet in depth could be maintained with a discharge of 30,000 second-feet at Yankton. My concern arises when I consider the fact that Geological Survey stream measurements show an average annual run-off at Yankton over the period 1929 to 1942 of 21,780 second-feet. Some years it was higher, some years it was lower. The data furnished to me by Geological Survey are set forth in a table which I have attached to this statement and shall be glad to have incorporated in the record.

It seems to me that the Congress should consider the effect the proposed navigation project and the closely coordinated flood-control projects presently before this committee may have on upstream irrigation developments. Perhaps only still-water navigation effected through the installation of a system of locks would permit the proposed 9-foot channel consistently with the increased consumptive use upstream for irrigation that is essential in the interest of the uper basin States.

I strongly recommend to your committee that whatever flood-control projects on the Missouri your committee concludes to report out favorably, you report with language making it abundantly clear by a protective proviso that the construction and operation of the authorized works shall not in any way curtail beneficial consumptive use of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

Budget Bureau Review Replaces National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the communications which he attached thereto:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: In reviewing the printed transcript of my testimony on December 13, 1943, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1945, I notice that you raised some question with respect to the activities of the Bureau of the Budget in the field of public-works programing, and referred to some arrangements previously in effect for coordinating the reports on multiple-purpose projects prepared by the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission.

At that time of the subcommittee hearing, I was under the impression that you were referring to the activities that had previously been carried on under the provisions of Executive Order No. 8455, dated June 26, 1940. With the discontinuance of the National Resources Planning Board, that Executive order was revoked and has been replaced by Executive Order No. 9384, dated October 4, 1943, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

I am not inclined to believe that I misunderstood your questions during the subcommittee hearing, since during the debate in the House of Representatives on January

27, 1944, on the bill (H. R. 4070) entitled "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945" you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the agreement on Procedure to Insure Cooperation in the Preparation of Reports on Multiple Purpose Projects entered into by the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. This agreement, originally concluded on August 8, 1939, and having as one of its four original signatories the National Resources Planning Board, instead of the Federal Power Commission, was revised and extended as of December 29, 1943.

I was not aware at the time of my appearance before the subcommittee on December 13, 1943, that steps were being taken to revise and extend the original agreement. Under date of December 29, 1943, the same day the revised agreement was signed, Maj. Gen. Thomas Robins, Deputy Chief of Engineers, War Department, forwarded to me a copy of the revised agreement. For your information, I am enclosing herewith a copy of my reply to Major General Robins dated January 11, 1944, with regard to this situation. Copies of this letter were also sent to the three other signatories, Commissioner Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, Land Use Coordinator Wiecking, Department of Agriculture, and Chairman Olds, Federal Power Commission.

While, as I advised its signatories, I consider the agreement a real step forward in implementing the intent of Executive Order No. 9384, I do not consider the activities to be carried on under the agreement as replacing the duties and functions of the Bureau of the Budget under the President's recent Executive order. I regret that because of a misunderstanding on my part, I was not able to clarify this situation for you prior to action by the House of Representatives on H. R. 4070.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9384—SUBMISSION OF REPORTS TO FACILITATE BUDGETING ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and particularly by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (title 31, U. S. Code, secs. 1-24), it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. In order to facilitate budgeting activities, all departments and establishments of the executive branch of the Federal Government, now or hereafter authorized by law to plan, propose, undertake, or aid public works and improvement projects financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall prepare and keep up to date, by means of at least an annual revision, carefully planned and realistic long-range programs of such projects (all such programs being hereinafter referred to as "advance programs").

2. (a) Whenever any estimate of appropriation is submitted to the Bureau of the Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau") by such departments and establishments for the carrying out of any public works and improvement project or projects whether by contract, force account, Government plant and hired labor, or other similar procedure, or for the financing of any such project or projects whether by grants-in-aid, loans, or other forms of financial assistance, or for examinations, surveys, investigations, plans, and specifications, or other planning activities, whether preliminary or detailed, for any such project or projects (all such survey and planning activities being hereinafter referred to as "plan preparation"), the advance program or programs relating to the proposed work or expenditure shall be submitted to the Bureau as an integral part of the justification of the estimates presented.

(b) All such departments and establishments shall submit to the Bureau at the earliest possible date estimates of such supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 as are necessary to provide plan preparation for those public works and improvement projects proposed for undertaking during the first 3 years of their advanced programs. Thereafter, in order that plans for these public works and improvement projects will always be available in advance, all such departments and establishments shall prepare and submit to the Bureau during each fiscal year estimates of such appropriations as may be necessary to provide plan preparation for those projects proposed for undertaking during the succeeding 3 fiscal years of their advance programs. All such estimates shall be accompanied by recommendations as to the additional legislation, or amendments to existing legislation, that may be necessary to bring projects in their advance programs to an appropriate state of readiness for prompt undertaking when and where needed.

3. The Director of the Bureau, upon the basis of the estimates and advance programs submitted in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of this order, shall report to the President from time to time, but not less than once a year, consolidated estimates and advance programs in the form of an over-all advance program for the Executive branch of the Government.

4. Before any department or establishment shall submit to the Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, a report relating to, or affecting in whole or in part, its advance programs, or the public works and improvement projects comprising such programs, or the results of any plan preparation for such programs or projects, such report shall be submitted to the Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. When such report is thereafter submitted to the Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, it shall include a statement of the advice received from the Bureau.

5. The data and reports required by this order, and such other data, reports, and information as may from time to time be requested by the Bureau concerning advance programs, or the status of any public works and improvement projects included therein, or the results or status of any plan preparation for such programs or projects, shall be submitted to the Bureau in such form and manner as the Director of the Bureau shall prescribe. The Director of the Bureau shall from time to time issue such regulations as he deems necessary to effectuate this order, and his determinations with respect to the scope and application of this order shall be controlling.

6. The term "departments and establishments" as used in this Executive order shall be deemed to include any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, regulatory commission or board, Government-owned or controlled corporation, or other establishment of the Government, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, but shall not include the legislative or judicial branches of the Government.

7. Executive Order No. 8455, dated June 26, 1940, is hereby revoked.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1944.

Maj. Gen THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Deputy Chief of Engineers,
New War Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL ROBINS: I was pleased to learn from your letter of December 29, 1943, that the agreement of August 8, 1939, to insure cooperation in the preparation of reports on multiple-purpose projects, has been revised and extended as of December 29, 1943, to include the Federal Power Commission, in addition to the original signatories, the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, and that provision is now made for monthly meetings of the Chief of Engineers, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Land Use Coordinator of the Department of Agriculture, and the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, for the purpose of discussing the results of studies and investigations for multiple-purpose projects, and for adjusting differences of opinion thereon.

I consider the revision and extension of this agreement as a real step forward in implementing the intent of the President's recent Executive Order No. 9384. Moreover, this agreement should be of material assistance to the Bureau of the Budget in discharging its duties and responsibilities under that order.

I hope that ways and means can be devised to keep this Bureau informed as to the actions that are taken pursuant to the agreement.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

National Service Act Would Leave Deep Scar in War for Democracy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include newspaper comments on the National Service Act by Mr. Paul Mallon:

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT
(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON.—A week after Mr. Roosevelt's demand for a civilian draft bill, his floor leader, BARKLEY, had not emitted a word of approval. His leaders on the House side went further and assured newsmen, off the record, the bill would not be passed.

Indeed, the prevailing congressional suspicion seems to be that the President had possibly entered upon promotion of the bill (in his message, at least) to remove the curse from his record on the strike situation. In any event, the bill will not be even seriously considered unless some manpower or strike emergency arises, which the leaders obviously do not expect.

The printed reaction out in the country was somewhat amazing. Endorsements came from conservative commentators largely—but also from the Bridges Communist-controlled longshoremen's union on the Pacific coast. When you get Communist and conservatives together, you may be sure someone is being fooled.

The reaction of the man in the street, as I get it conversationally, was likewise surprisingly approving. People generally hate strikes and sympathize with the unequal positions of the soldier with the war worker. They are irrefutably right in these positions.

But in their righteous wrath they are apt to be misled into espousing a remedy far more unjust than the injustices they want to cure. Few of them have studied the bill (AUSTIN'S revised proposal, January 10) and understand what it would do to them and the country. Congress knows.

To me it seems as unjustified as using an ax to eliminate flyspecks on glass, and in this case the glass is the final container of individual human rights, individual liberty—all that we are fighting for and including our

way of life—in favor of male and female enslavement to the state for war reasons that are not apparent to all—including Congress.

Theoretically, it would practically declare national martial law on all the people to make a few work—and this in a Nation whose production (work) is already so good that Mr. Roosevelt justly brags it is the best in the world.

You can see this clearly by a detailed study of the bill—empowering the President by proclamation to move anyone anywhere away from his home into any other job at any rate of pay (that is, anyone except Federal, State, county, and local officials, including bureaucrats who are exempt along with pregnant mothers and those with minor children, and the other established military exemptees, although I do not see clergymen exempt).

One phrase promises exemption to those necessary to the maintenance of national health, safety, and interest, and another warns the boards against being unfair, arbitrary, or causing personal hardships. But obviously the door is left wide open for local boards to differ in their interpretations and to enter new fields of politics, graft, and corruption.

Appeals could be taken to the national draft director and to the courts, but only after the deed is done, and we all know what crowded places those are now for timely justice. (Incidentally, no provision is made for the drafted civilian to vote away from home, a rather pertinent matter this year.)

The urge for this thing is the injustice of drafting the soldier. Not even there do the proponents propose justice in lieu thereof. A drafted soldier has his whole life provided by the Federal Government and all are treated alike as to pay and special privileges, including insurance, allowance for dependents, medical care, etc.

Nothing comparable is promised the civilian draftee. He can be uprooted from his home, sent across the country to work in a field at half the salary or less—and all the Government would give him is transportation and a polite invitation to the draft boards to consider housing conditions in the area to which he is sent. It would only equalize present injustices by creating more.

In short, its theory is to absorb the human being completely into state totalitarianism. Mr. Roosevelt's pen slipped badly when he wrote Congress:

"National service is the most democratic way to win war."

It proposes final abandonment of civilian democratic independence. Its theory is that of both fascism and communism, but bears no slight resemblance to that of democracy which espouses voluntary contributions of effort and individual freedom of patriotic conscience.

It would leave the deepest scar of this war on democracy.

Hon. Thomas H. Cullen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise to express my grief and personal loss at the passing of our dear colleague and dean of the New York delegation, Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN.

As one of the younger members of the New York delegation, I may not have had the years of personal association and contact with him that some of my other colleagues may have had. However, during my short period here I have come to know him and to love him.

He was the first Member that I met when I came down here to Washington as a neophyte. As a matter of fact, even prior to my election, I came down to Washington to meet TOM and was taken by him over to the White House and was introduced to our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

From TOM CULLEN I learned how to conduct myself as a Member of Congress, and I am sure I shall always remember the kind words of advice which he gave me.

In extending my condolences to his family, I know it will be of some comfort to them to know how much their dear one was loved and respected by all who knew him.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening in New York Hon. Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration delivered an address before the American Retail Federation at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. It seems to me that this address should be read by all retailers. Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks Mr. Bowles' speech:

I am very glad of this opportunity to speak to the members of the American Retail Federation.

There are 1,000,000 merchants in the United States doing an estimated 1943 volume of business of $42,000,000,000. Of this number, 400,000 are nonfood stores with sales last year of $25,000,000,000.

American retail merchants are in daily contact with 130,000,000 people. Every move that the O. P. A. makes in its efforts to control the cost of living affects our retailers in one way or another. In large measure the success of our efforts to prevent inflation and to maintain prices at a stable level depends on them.

When war broke out, a little more than 2 years ago, I do not believe that many people in this room even began to suspect the kind of changes which lay ahead of all of us. At that time few of us realized the real meaning of all-out war.

During the last year all of us have been subjected to countless strange rules and regulations. We have often found ourselves enmeshed in what seemed to be needless governmental red tape. We have seen confusion and fumbling.

Today, we are deeply conscious of the irritations and the errors and controversies. When the war is won, however, I believe these irritations will be quickly forgotten. They will be forgotten because one major and all-important fact will by that time be evident to all of us. That fact is that for the first time in the course of any war in which the American people have participated we have managed to prevent the devastating chaos of wartime inflation and the inevitable collapse and bankruptcies which must always follow a period of skyrocketing prices. I speak as though this battle to control inflation and prevent runaway prices has been won. I mean just that—but with one very big "if." If only we are not foolhardy enough, with victory over inflation almost within our grasp, to succumb to the pressure of those groups, sincere and otherwise, who are constantly seeking to weaken the controls which so far kept the cost of living in check.

During the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Civil War, thousands upon thousands of American business firms first saw their sales and profits rise to unheard of heights only to meet with collapse and bankruptcy in the deflation which followed.

During these three early wars many fortunes were wiped out. Many thousands of small businessmen and farmers lost their lifetime savings.

During the First World War, which most of you can easily remember, prices rushed steadily upward. Wholesale prices finally reached a level of 150 percent above the base from which they started.

As a protection against the ever-recurring price rises, retailers frantically laid in stocks at higher and higher prices as goods became more scarce. When the collapse came in 1920 and 1921 these stocks were dumped on the market for any price they would bring.

Retail food prices fell by a third, and the cost of living declined 17 percent. Wholesale prices in general dropped by 45 percent. Inventory loss that resulted cut heavily into reserves built up during the war and in many cases wiped them out entirely. Forty-four thousand retail businesses went into bankruptcy.

In this greatest of all wars we have been determined to avoid the economic devastation which inflation had caused in the past. Our job has not been an easy one.

During the Second World War, the inflationary pressures have been far greater than at any time during our history. The national income of all groups has risen to the unbelievable figure of $150,000,000,000, twice the national income of 1936.

And yet while pressures for higher prices—pressures for inflation—have been greater than at any period during our history, the price level has been held to a remarkable degree.

According to the Department of Labor wholesale prices have risen only 4 percent since May 1942. In the first 11 months following the introduction of retail price control in May 1942, the cost of living rose only 7 percent. Today the cost of living remains at the exact same level as last April, 10 months ago.

Some items have gone up but others have gone down. Some areas have been better off than others. There has been widespread deterioration in clothing quality. But the fact remains that the cost of living average throughout the country during the last 11 months has remained the same.

It is surprising that these facts are not more generally known. It would be healthy if they were more generally known. It would make it easier for all of us to forget the errors and delays which, I am afraid, will always be inevitable in spite of our best efforts in the administration of any organization as large and far-reaching as the O. P. A.

We in the O. P. A. are determined to continue to hold prices at their present levels. In spite of the troubles which we may have caused you, I believe every man in this room should be praying and hoping for our success. If we can keep prices from going up we are offering you the best protection that businessmen can hope to have against the economic suffering which so particularly afflicted retailers in every previous post-war period in our history, as a result of wartime inflation.

As a protection to all of us against the menace of inflation we in O. P. A. are determined to hold the present price levels. But we would like to do it as painlessly as possible. We would like to do it as practically as possible. We would like to do it with as little disturbance of business methods as possible.

For 2 years you retailers have been operating under the general maximum price regulation well known as the general max.

General max was an emergency measure, put in almost overnight to keep prices from soaring during the early period of the war. It was quick. It was understandable. It was simple. And—it was effective: In a rough over-all sort of way.

But as time went on its disadvantages became more and more apparent. First of all, any freeze type regulation of this kind is bound to be unfair to a certain few in every group which it covers. Second, the general maximum price regulation failed to recognize the great variety of marketing practices among various types of retailers and among different commodities.

Third, the general max created a need for constant changes in retail prices as costs increased at the manufacturing level.

Fourth, it called for the continual pricing of new items as they appeared with resultant delays.

Fifth, for all of these reasons the general max was difficult to enforce and difficult to administer and in many ways difficult for you to live under and to work under.

Late last summer when I took over the responsibility for the administration of price control, rent control, and rationing, I was determined to see that a new over-all retail regulation be substituted as early as possible for the complexities of the general max.

During my business career and in my work with the Office of Price Administration in Connecticut, I had considerable first-hand experience with all types of retailers ranging from the country general store to the large city department store. I was well aware of the difficulties of preparing a simplified regulation which would cover such an amazing complexity of business operations.

A single regulation would have to be flexible enough to cover 50 different types of stores, from the department store to the infants' wear shop on the corner; from the hardware store to the drug store; from the shoe store to the furniture store.

A single regulation has to be flexible enough to cover different kinds of pricing methods; different kinds of accounting systems; different kinds of record keeping.

We knew from the beginning that to develop a single regulation to cover most of the retail stores selling in the country, outside of the food stores, was a staggering assignment. We have been working on it now steadily since last September.

But, frankly, we are now optimistic that the answer lies well in sight.

I knew from the start that it was essential that the men who were to tackle this retail problem must be men from the retail trade with practical experience, men whom you know and who know your problems.

Reagan Connally, an experienced retailer, well known to most of you, spent several fruitful months in Washington with us last fall. Byres Gitchell, who has spent much of his business life in retail-store work, took his place as head of our retail division in December.

Gordon Creighton, who has been working with Mr. Gitchell, knows store operations from one end to the other.

These men and their various assistants have been working in closest cooperation with merchants of all types for several months. Many dozen meetings have been held with members of different retail groups by our retail division in the last 6 months.

In our efforts to develop a practical over-all retail price regulation we have traveled up many false alleys. We have run down many promising theories only to find them impractical at the end. We have had many disappointments.

But I am confident that we are now on the right track. And I am particularly glad that the over-all regulation which has clearly been evolving is a product of American retail trade itself.

It is our plan to present this new retail regulation for the consideration of the retail council during the next 2 or 3 weeks. No detailed public announcement of any kind will be made until the council has had an opportunity to review the plan in detail and to give us their ssuggestions—pointing out any further bugs that should be removed.

Once it is finally ready for presentation to the trade as a whole we will need all your help in the education and explanatory period before the plan actually goes into effect. We must organize retail meetings of retail groups in every section and part of the country. We must prepare simple explanatory material which everyone can understand. It is essential that this educational period be long enough to eliminate to the greatest possible extent needless confusion.

Now let me give you one word of warning. No price control regulation can ever be perfect, nor even nearly perfect, no matter how many able and practical men have been working at it. No matter how great an effort we have made to consult and seek advice from merchants from one end of the country to the other, an over-all regulation of this kind is bound to have certain defects. All regulations in wartime are a necessary evil. We would like to do without them. We will be glad to be rid of them when the final victory comes.

I believe, however, I can say with confidence that in the next 60 to 90 days you will agree with me that a major improvement has been made in the retail pricing system under which you are operating your businesses and your stores.

As I have talked to retailers in the past, it has seemed to me that their requests of the O. P. A. summed up about as follows:

Retailers have hoped that we would be able to give them more simplified and easier to understand regulations. This, I hope, the new retail regulation will accomplish.

Retailers have told me that they wish that their retail pricing could be based on a historical mark-up basis. Our own ideas, as expressed in this proposed new regulation, are in line with the principle.

Retailers have requested us to eliminate the highest price line limitation. This limitation order has been a particularly controversial point throughout the retail trade. Certainly there is much to be said against it.

It sometimes has worked peculiar hardships. Many retailers have found ways of getting around it which is not fair to those who stick to the line. At the same time it is undoubtedly true that the highest price line limitation has served to retard the disappearance of low end merchandise.

I, myself, do not know whether the advantages of the highest price line limitation today outweigh the disadvantages or not. To settle this question, I have asked Mr. James Brownlee, my Deputy Administrator for Price, to establish a committee and to hold a conference at which retailers and others can give us their ideas on whether the highest price line limitation should be continued in the new retail regulation in its present form; whether it should be modified; or whether it should be eliminated.

I can assure you that the question of the highest price line limitation will be settled once and for all before the new retail regulation goes into effect.

Finally, retailers have asked us to do all in our power to give them a large supply of inexpensive goods. On this I can also report that a great deal is being accomplished. On sheets, work shirts, overalls, dungarees, children's clothing, and inexpensive women's dresses, we are making steady progress.

On this program the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration are working closely together. We both see the problem clearly and I can assure you of the greatest cooperation and a most vigorous effort on our part to make sure during the coming months that you will be able to find more of the goods which you need at the lower price levels.

Now in closing this talk, there are two particularly important questions which I would like to answer. The first question deals with the problem of prices and reconversion. Many people ask us just what our price policy on new items will be.

I believe I can answer that question in general terms rather simply. Right now we are faced with the grave danger of inflation. Right now if our controls are relaxed in the slightest degree we will run the risk of skyrocketing prices and an inflationary spiral which can only end in collapse and deflation and ruin for many thousands of American businessmen.

As long as this period of acute inflation danger lasts, our price policy must be extremely tight. New goods coming on the market must be priced as tightly as those which you have been selling during the past 2 years.

However, there will come a time, and it may not be so distant as we think, when inflationary pressures will begin slowly to subside. At that point our pricing policy can begin to be relaxed on items brought out under the reconversion program.

During that period, it will be our responsibility to do everything in our power to encourage full production and full employment. I can assure you that we are well aware of this responsibility.

While I cannot promise you any relief from a tight pricing program during the next few months, I can promise you and I do promise you a more flexible pricing program—a practical, understanding program—once reconversion on a broad scale really gets under way, and the danger of inflation starts to subside.

That first question leads to a second and final question. How long will we need to retain price controls?

If you could tell me how long the war is going to last in Germany and in the Pacific, I think I could answer that question rather definitely. But since none of us know how long it will take to win the war in Europe and in the Pacific, I can only give you my own general thinking.

It is always interesting to me that those of us in the O. P. A. are usually more optimistic than many outsiders about the speed with which price controls can be dropped when the war draws to a close.

Frankly, I am optimistic that we can get rid of many of our price controls and many of our rationing controls far more quickly than most people think. It has often been said that the greatest inflationary dangers came directly after the last war rather than during the last war. That was true.

But we must remember that during the last war itself there had been no effective price control. When the war ended in 1918, the price structure was in an extremely wobbly condition. More than that, we lacked the huge production capacity that we have today and which will serve us well in quickly balancing supply with demand.

Once Germany is beaten (and I for one most emphatically do not believe that this happy event lies just around the corner) the process of reconversion will be rather rapid. On

clothing and other soft goods in particular there should not be a lapse of many months before we can bring supply into balance with demand. Once that balance is achieved on various items, price control on those items can be removed at once.

On food, we shall probably have to retain our price controls and rationing controls until after the first harvest in Europe following the German surrender.

On consumer durable goods it will take somewhat longer, for here the pent-up demand is enormous, and production will be slower in getting into full swing. Right now there are many people who would pay $10,000 for a new automobile or $1,000 for a new refrigerator.

Our controls on consumer durable goods will probably stay in effect longer than our controls on other parts of the economy. However, there is one factor which should be helpful in this field. In most instances the original maker of a vacuum cleaner, refrigerator or automobile has final control over the price at which his product passes to the consumer. For this reason our price controls in this field during the reconversion and immediate post-war period may be of a greatly simplified type.

I can assure you most emphatically that there is no group of people in the country who are quite as anxious to get rid of price control and rationing as those who work for the O. P. A.

We carry large responsibilities. We work long hours under great and conflicting pressures. We will welcome the day when we can turn to other work.

Let me say in closing that you and I are living through a critical year. Many people who should know feel that 1944 will be one of the most critical years in American history. This year, above all years, we must work closely together, on a tolerant and understanding basis. Above everything else we must vigorously resist this growing urge to divide into pressure groups and classes and to put the blame for our troubles on others.

The greatest battles of the war still remain to be fought. The equally great problems of the reconversion period and the peace lie still further ahead. The years immediately following the war will be filled with overpowering difficulties. They will also be filled with overwhelming opportunities.

Our goal for the future is full production, full employment, full economic and social security—under a system that guarantees full free opportunity for every individual. Our ability to reach that goal will depend on the ability of all of us to work as a team. The first test of that ability is now—today.

Yukon Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority heretofore granted, I am including as a part of these remarks an article entitled "Yukon Adventure," written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, aide-de-camp of General O'Connor, of the Northwest Service Command, This article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of February 19, 1944. Captain Neuberger served with General O'Connor throughout much of the momentous history-making months while the Army engineers as well as the Public Roads Department were forging ahead, building the 1,600-mile highway through the bleak northland, connecting continental United States with central Alaska. This road will be known in history as one of the great adventures of road construction as a military project.

This article vividly portrays to us the hardships encountered by these brave men of our fighting forces who were detailed to this work, as well as the civilian employees who carried on where the Army left off, through temperatures varying from 90 degrees above to 60 below. These men relentlessly forced through a wild, bleak wilderness in the northland a modern highway within a short period of approximately a year. I am sure that every Member of Congress will not only be intensely interested but will be made acquainted with the effectiveness of our armed forces in military highway construction by reading this informative article. The article to which I refer is as follows:

YUKON ADVENTURE—ARMY LIFE IN AMERICA'S BITTEREST CORNER, WHERE MOTORS FREEZE WHILE RUNNING, TIGHT SHOES MEAN AMPUTATED FEET, AND ICE FORMS INSIDE A BOTTLE OF WHISKY

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger)

For a couple of fellows from the great Southwest, where a mere 32° above zero is cause for a meeting of the Hot Stove League, Lt. Boyd Pestotnik and Sgt. Philip Robichaud were in a cold spot. The motor in their carry-all had been quavering ominously for half an hour, and finally it had frozen fast on the Alaska Highway, 21 miles from the nearest Army camp.

Under ordinary circumstances, 21 miles is not a long way. But it is as far as 100, or even 1,000, when a Yukon winter clutches the land in its fiercest grip. Pestotnik came from Tulsa, Okla., and was wearing long underwear for the first time in his life. The sergeant was new to subzero temperatures, too. In fact, not in his 35 years in San Antonio, Tex., had he ever seen the thermometer drop to zero, let alone below it.

But the thermometer was below zero now. How much below, the two stranded Army men did not know. All they knew was that the cold clawed at them like a beast of prey. It seared their faces and bit their ears with invisible fangs. In the gathering gloom of the early Yukon afternoon, it was an unseen foe against which G. I. parkas and woolen underwear were now their first line of defense. The young officer from Tulsa and the noncom from San Antonio might have felt even colder had they known that at that particular moment the Canadian meteorologist at Mayo, the nearest weather station, was writing "67° below zero" in his report for the day.

The problem confronting the pair from America's sunny Southwest was one of survival. Their vehicle had quit for keeps. They did not dare remove their fur mittens to tinker with the machinery. Darkness was muffling the wilderness. No other vehicles would brave the blast that night. Too late, they realized they should not have fared forth themselves. Without snowshoes, they could not leave the highway to forage for firewood. The heater had quit along with the motor. The carry-all was a virtual refrigerator, but few refrigerators ever had been so frigid. The car offered some protection against the wind, but the cold—practically 100° below the freezing point—seeped through doors and windows like a deadly gas.

"We better start hiking," the sergeant said. "We'll freeze to death if we stay here. We gotta keep moving. Otherwise we're finished. I never would have believed it could get so cold anywhere this side of the moon."

Pestotnik was trying to remember what Handford, the square-shouldered mounted police constable back at Burwash Landing, had said when he saw Pestotnik's eider-down G. I. sleeping bag with its double layers. The words were coming back to him. "Lieutenant," the scarlet-jacketed mountie had said, "this is the best sleeping bag I ever saw. It'll be your best friend if you ever get stuck in a Yukon monsoon. Lieutenant, a Yukon monsoon is cold enough to freeze the blood in a musk ox's veins. But you just get into this sleeping bag and sleep it out. You may get awful darn hungry, but in this sleeping bag the frost will never nip you."

Now the lieutenant assumed command. "We stay here," he decided. "Take our sleeping bags out from under the back seat. We'll sleep 'er out, like Handford said."

With fingers already stiff, the two Americans marooned in a sea of frigidity unzipped their sleeping bags and crawled in. The hard seats of the carry-all pinched their backs and corrugated their legs. But they were warm, and eventually they slept.

They were still in the sleeping bags at noon the next day when a pair of Army trucks poked out of the storm and took them to the camp along Beaver Creek and a pot-roast dinner, 21 miles away. At the station hospital at Whitehorse down the highway, Maj. Mendel Silverman looked them over. There were no chilblains, no frostbite, no nipped lungs. They were intact. Ninety-nine degrees below the freezing point, and their G. I. sleeping bags had brought them through.

This was when we began to think we might have the Arctic licked. A couple of cheechakos from the balmy Southwest had survived the worst Yukon weather in 4 decades.

When the route for the 1,592-mile Alaska International Highway was first selected, veteran Army men had looked at the map with some misgivings. The job would mean stationing American soldiers in the coldest patches of North America. Year after year Alaska's lowest temperatures are always recorded at Tanana Crossing, and the highway goes straight through it. Canada's gaunt and lonely Yukon Territory has frozen and maimed more men than any other Arctic region, and the highway twists across the Yukon for 551 wilderness miles.

In such a land it was inevitable that trucks would freeze, bulldozers would be immobilized by ice, and manifolds and differentials and carburetors would fail to function. But what about the soldiers? This was the Army's dominant concern. Could recruits from Florida and Mississippi and southern California come unscathed through a Yukon winter?

During the last great influx into the Yukon, that of the Klondike gold rush in 1898, men had died along the trail every day during December, January, and February. Frostbitten lungs and frozen limbs had sent scores of others back to Seattle and Edmonton crippled wrecks. The trek to Whitehorse and Dawson was studded with pain, and men caught by the kind of weather which snared Lieutenant Pestotnik and Sergeant Robichaud often were not found until the thaw of the following spring.

The present Yukon migration rivals the one of '98. Approximately 20,000 soldiers have worked on the Alaska Highway and such associated projects as telephone lines, barracks, and landing strips. Construction of the road commenced in April of 1942. Today soldiers are driving trucks its full length, from Dawson Creek on the British Columbia plains to Fairbanks in the heart of Alaska.

In that time, with 20,000 men—many of whom had never felt even freezing temperatures before—working out in the open in the coldest part of North America, there has been only one death from exposure.

In addition, Col. Walter F. von Zelinski, surgeon of the Army's Northwest Service Command, has said, "We have treated 140 men who were incapacitated by the cold. Of those 140 cases, all except 4 recovered completely, with no ill effects. The 4 required amputations of 2 or less toes. No amputations of hands or feet were necessary.

"In my opinion," Colonel von Zelinski has added, "this constitutes an all-time record for protection of the human body in the coldest imaginable temperatures. The record becomes all the more remarkable when one considers that three regiments of Negro soldiers, composed almost wholly of men who never had been out of the deep South, played an important role in the construction of the Alaska Highway."

THE LESSONS OF MOUNT M'KINLEY

Colonel von Zelinski attributes this showing to three major factors: "First, the cold-weather discipline instilled in the troops, in the form of repeated instructions for behavior and living in extreme cold. Second, the studies made by the Army for safeguarding our personnel in temperatures touching 70 degrees below zero. And third, the excellent Arctic clothing and unsurpassed sleeping equipment which have resulted from those studies."

The Quartermaster Corps of the Army was ready for the great road-building adventure in the far north long before that adventure began. On the 20,300-foot summit of Mount McKinley, loftiest spot on the continent, Bradford Washburn conducted special clothing experiments for the Quartermaster General. Washburn is one of the best known mountain climbers in North America. He also is director of the New England Museum of Natural History.

"I believe Mount McKinley is the coldest point in the world which men can reach," Washburn told Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States Army.

It was on McKinley's frigid crest that Washburn discovered that blankets and quilts, no matter how numerous, are a frail reed against extreme cold, and that a sleeping bag is essential. There he found that eider down is warmer than any other material as a filling for the bag. He also found that a smaller sack fitting within the outer bag provided considerably more protection than a single bag of double thickness. And he insisted that the bag be made light enough for a man to carry with ease. "We don't want soldiers getting separated from their equipment," he warned.

Along the full length of the Alaska Highway's 1,592 miles—at truck relay station, airport, and signal unit—the G. I. sleeping bag is the most popular as well as the most vital article of equipment. I have eaten in a tent so cold that canned corn froze in my mess kit and I dared not take off my gloves, yet that night I slept as snug as in a steam-heated hotel room. The G. I. sleeping bag bridged the temperature gap. When he came to the opening of the Alaska Highway, Maj. Gen. George R. Pearkes, wearer of the Victoria Cross and commander of Canada's Pacific Army Command, told Brig. Gen. James A. (Patsy) O'Connor, who heads the Northwest Service Command, that the American Army's sleeping bag was the best piece of Arctic equipment he ever had seen.

This was the voice of authority, for as a young man in 1913 Pearkes had been a Mountie constable at Dalton Post on the Alaskan border. And when the Canadian general left Whitehorse he had in the pocket of his battle dress all the specifications of our G. I. sleeping bags for his own army to study.

The tendency of our soldiers at the start of their Arctic service was to wear too many clothes. This sounds paradoxical, but one of the facts definitely established by Bradford Washburn and his associates in the cold-weather tests was that perspiration and overheating are the gravest perils to a man on the northern trail. It is practically second nature for a soldier, especially if he has come straight from an orange-blossom climate, to wrap everything around himself except the kitchen linoleum when he feels the temperature failing to 60 below.

This is where Colonel von Zelinski's "cold-weather discipline" enters the situation. Our soldiers along the Alaska Highway have been schooled against dressing too heavily. All of them have been warned that men freeze to death when their inner clothing, becoming saturated with moisture from perspiration, conducts the heat from the body and then freezes hard. Another maxim hammered home is that several layers of light clothing are infinitely warmer than a single layer of equal weight. And no soldier is allowed to wear tight shoes or breeches that pinch at the knee. "Tight shoes mean frozen feet" is virtually an aphorism all the way from Dawson Creek to Fairbanks.

When the American Army moved into the Yukon nearly 2 years ago, it found a military organization on the scene which had endured Arctic winters for almost half a century. It was a small organization, but its experience and knowledge could be applied to the Army's thousands. This was the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. From the Mounties our troops have learned much. "No leather on the feet after the thermometer hits 10 above" is a Mountie rule, and the American Army follows it too. Both organizations recommend rubber shoe packs between 10 above and zero.

When the temperature is well below zero, fur mukluks or fabric galoshes generously stuffed with socks are standard footgear. "In extreme cold," says General O'Connor, the commander of the first United States military force in the Yukon, "soldiers must wear galoshes large enough to contain two pairs of light wool socks, a pair of heavy knitted wool socks, a jute foot sock, and an insole of felt. Evergreen needles stuffed into the shoe outside the socks is extra insulating material. But our main emphasis is on having the cold-weather footgear fit loosely. The feet are the part of the body most vulnerable to abnormally low temperatures. Tight footgear cuts off circulation, stimulates perspiration, and invites freezing."

Patrols as far north as the polar sea have taught the Mounties many tricks of travel in the Arctic. Now these tricks are saving American as well as Canadian lives. Dog sleds have been used by our soldiers in running surveys and carrying out reconnaissance missions. Capt. William Hammond, of the Twenty-ninth Engineer Battalion, mushed 560 miles across the Mackenzie Mountains from Whitehorse to Fort Norman, but first he asked the Mounties how they would keep alive on such a trek. Throughout his equipment and around the sled, on their advice, he scattered big blocks of sulfur. If his hands froze too stiff to grip a match, he could always use wrists and palms to ignite the blocks. He also carried a pail of oil-soaked rags. Perhaps survival might depend upon getting a fire started quickly. If you break through a hidden spring on the trail, it requires only a few minutes for wet legs to freeze. And around his neck on a blue lanyard he hung his G. I. mittens of wolfskin. Once laid down, the mittens might never be picked up again by fingers rapidly stiffening at 70 below. The lanyard was assurance that the mittens would always be available. It was 70 below and winds scoured the Mackenzie passes, but Hammond completed his mission and returned by dog sled, too, a total journey of more than 1,100 miles across unexplored terrain.

Meat and vegetables had to be thawed in an oven before being cooked. Seasoned lumber which had been outdoors froze, too, and would not take a nail, but split into kindling at the first stroke of the hammer. I saw soldiers starting trucks by building bonfires under the differentials and waving blowtorches over the spark plugs and cylinder heads. It was common practice to coax bulldozers into action in the morning with huge, roaring fires beneath the treads and engines. Frequently truck convoys were accompanied by a steam caboose. This was a truck at the end carrying a small boiler, fed with wood from along the road, which could generate live steam. Wielding steam hoses, the crew of the caboose could thaw out the other vehicles of the convoy. When the thermometer stood at 66 below on the Donjek River, near the Alaska-Yukon international line, truck motors froze up while going at full speed in low gear. One of the first freezing points was the line between the gasoline tank and the carburetor. Each truck driver carried a small hand pump to open the gas line, but frequently the cold which froze the line paralyzed unmittened hands before the pump could be put to use.

"Mittens are much warmer than gloves," read the instructions to soldiers along the Alaska Highway. "Fingers numbed from cold completely impair a soldier's efficiency, and gloves warm enough for habitual wear are too bulky for the proper handling of instruments and weapons." Immobilized fingers were the greatest obstacle to the repair of trucks, aircraft, and bulldozers. I have seen a heroic Air Corps mechanic at the Whitehorse Airport require nearly an hour to screw a small nut on the back of a transport-plane engine. With his face muffled in scarfs against a 56-below wind, he would warm the nut at the heater of a nearby jeep, so that it would not stick to the flesh. Then he would hurriedly pull off his heavy mittens, run up the ladder to the engine and try to start the nut in place. But his fingers would freeze into immobility too scon. He could not get the nut adjusted quickly enough. Eighteen times he repeated the procedure, warming his hands over and over again at the jeep engine. On the nineteenth attempt he was able to get the nut started on the bolt before his fingers stiffened. Then he put on his mittens and tightened it with a wrench.

This is what temperatures can do in the coldest part of North America—and it actually is colder along the strip served by the Alaska Highway than 500 miles northward on the Arctic Ocean. When it was 55 below at Tanana Crossing and 57 below at Whitehorse last winter, it was a mere 47 below at Aklavik, where the Mackenzie piles its delta on the shores of the Beaufort Sea. Point Barrow is seldom as cold as Tanana Crossing. Grease and oil in Army trucks and planes at Tanana froze as hard as ice. Many shivering pilots had to start their aircraft by attaching a rope to one of the blades of the propeller and winding the other end around the hub of a truck.

MEN AGAINST THE NORTH

The cold did strange things and created strange problems. We cracked open eggs to find crystals of ice inside the shell. Potatoes became so ribbed with frozen strips that they looked like Italian marble. Jean Louis Coudert, Catholic bishop of the Yukon, and a veteran of many years in the Arctic, visiting Army camps along the Alaska Highway, watched a hot dinner freeze on his plate as he rushed the 120 feet from the kitchen to the mess tent. I can vouch for the fact that chunks of ice were floating in my shaving lotion one morning when the mercury touched 61 degrees below. Water pipes buried far beneath the ground split apart in weather like this. The water in 85-proof Scotch whisky froze into lumps which floated in the alcohol, although 100-proof retained its liquid form in toto.

One difficulty never licked was that of frozen culverts along the highway. Ice would plug these as tightly shut as a corked bottle and the rampant creek would pile a glacier of ice on the road. The highway patrol would come along with oil drums and build a big fire to thaw out the culvert, but in an hour or so it would be plugged once more.

At Whitehorse, headquarters of the Northwest Service Command, the Army had to build virtual barns over its water tanks and put stoves inside. Dawson had to heat the entire city water supply with electric coils and wood stand-by boilers from October until March. In each house and building, a ⅜-inch valve of hot water was drained into sewer pipes to keep the sewage system open during the winter months. And throughout the coldest weather of December and January, when it was 70 below along the White and Donjek and Duke Rivers, the antifreeze solution for trucks and bulldozers actually froze hard in the containers. Officers of unimpeachable integrity have made affidavit to this, when questioned by skeptics.

The Northwest Service Command commenced operations in an old C. C. C. building. Offices were at the front. We slept in a long hall at the rear. General O'Connor's office was barely large enough for a plywood desk and a chair. Most of the time our plumbing was frozen. The building faced toward the Whitehorse Rapids on the Yukon River, where once Jack London had boated outfits through the roughest stretch of water on the way to the Klondike. The Yukon River watershed, commencing at Whitehorse and including Mayo, Selkirk, Dawson, Tanana Crossing, and Northway, is probably as cold as any region inhabited by man except northern Siberia. This was the scene of London's famous story To Build a Fire, the tale of a cheechako who lost his life when snow sliding off a spruce tree quenched his campfire. Many of our soldiers have read that story, and none of them will ever build a fire beneath an evergreen laden with snow. It is not uncommon for the temperature to be a maximum of 50 degrees below from Whitehorse to Tanana for 2 weeks without relief.

Our Army's equipment and personnel suffered cruel punishment during such periods. But all emphasis was put upon the safety of the men. If abandoning a truck piled with ice meant saving a driver's life or limbs, then the truck was abandoned. Vehicles moved on the most savage winter days, but not at the expense of human life. The sole casualty due to a winter unparalleled in brutality even for Alaska and the Yukon was a Negro truck driver whose vehicle failed on the Slana cut-off in Alaska. Brush and cleared-away timber slashings enabled him to build a fire alongside the road. Had he stuck by the fire, eventually he would have been picked up and rescued. But he decided to walk the 14 miles to camp. It was a fatal decision. He froze to death on the way. The temperature was 66° below zero that afternoon.

Three of the seven regiments engaged in the pioneer construction of the Alaska Highway—the Ninety-third, the Ninety-fifth, and the Ninety-seventh Engineers—were made up of colored troops. Most of these Negro soldiers had never before been out of the South. The bulk of them had yet to see a thermometer register zero, let alone half a hundred degrees below zero. How did they survive the Yukon winter?

"The Negro troops have distinguished themselves," reported Col. John W. Wheeler, former Indiana highway commissioner, and then engineer in charge of the Alaska Highway. "Of the 1,592 miles of road, they have built about 460. Working under the severe handicap of extreme cold and moving ahead so rapidly that their living quarters were primitive and sketchy, they have nevertheless constructed a road through some of the most rugged wilderness on the North American continent. The morale of the Negro battalions has been good. From the health records, it appears that they have withstood well the rigors of the far North. The interest they have displayed in the task is remarkable. And they are top-notch cooks. Some of the best meals on the road have been served in their camps. I believe biscuits with country gravy constitute their favorite dish."

After studying health records and medical reports, Colonel von Zelinski has declared that the colored troops suffered no more than their white comrades from such cold-weather maladies as arthritis, rheumatism, and respiratory infections. "In fact," the colonel has added, "there were comparatively few colds all along the road. It is possible that the extremely low temperatures reduced the virulence of the cold virus."

Yet, in sickness or in health, everyone came to appreciate just plain honest-to-goodness warmth. Outdoors at almost 100° below the freezing point, your face feels as if it were being branded with a hot iron. Knees encased in woolen underwear quaver involuntarily. Feet tingle painfully and then become numb. One yearns for warmth, whatever the source of the warmth may be. Col. K. B. Bush, Northwest Service Command chief of staff, came to duty in the Yukon straight from Lt. Gen., then Maj. Gen., George S. Patton's staff at Desert Training Center in Indio, Calif. He said his idea of heaven was to be as close to an oil stove as one could get without being burned alive.

THAWING OUT

And I remember the colored staff sergeant who grinned at me as we sat in a pyramidal tent on opposite sides of a glowing little wood stove that had been fashioned from a discarded oil drum. Outside, a 50-below wind swept down from the St. Elias Mountains—loftiest range in Canada. "Ah's happy, lieutenant," the sergeant said, "'cause ah's warm."

We felt somewhat more comfortable when Colonel Wheeler wrote us from India, where he was on a new assignment, and said that 66 below was considerably more bearable than 146 above, but we also wished we could devise a way to trade weather back and forth with him and thus ameliorate both extremes.

Construction companies hiring men to build installations and facilities along the highway have warned their prospective employees what conditions they may face. One sign gave this advance notice:

"THIS IS NO PICNIC

"Working and living conditions on this job are as difficult as those encountered on any construction job ever done in the United States or foreign territory.

"Men hired on this job will be required to work and live under the most extreme conditio- imaginable. The temperature will range from 90° above zero to 70° below zero. Men will have to fight swamps, rivers, ice, and cold. Mosquitoes, flies, and gnats will not only be annoying but will cause bodily harm. If you are not prepared to work under these and similar conditions, do not apply.

"BECHTEL-PRICE-CALLAHAN."

The sign does not exaggerate. Ordinary pleasures and sensations, taken for granted by all of us as civilians, are viewed from a new perspective after a Yukon winter. I remember how it felt to get to the States at last. I was riding on a train between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Seattle. We were 3 hours late. My fellow passengers had commenced to grumble loudly. They damned the railroad company, the Government, and all things in general. I looked around me. The parlor car was warm. The seat I was sitting in was soft and comfortable. Along the track, the lush green of the Puget Sound lowlands was a welcome contrast to the endless miles of ice and snow. Across the aisle, the pretty brunette with trim legs looked all right too. I glanced up ahead toward the dining car. I had just had my first glass of fresh milk in 5 months. I knew there was more where that had come from. I pushed back my shoulders and again felt the delicious warmth of the parlor car. Me? I didn't care if the train rolled on forever.

Wheat Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, over the Farm and Home Hour Wednesday, March 1, 1944:

Wheat is older than history. The Chinese used it 2,700 years before Christ. It was used in Egypt a thousand years earlier than that. It was cultivated by the prehistoric races such as the Swiss Lake Dwellers, and has been found in the pyramids and in Egyptian tombs. Wheat is often referred to in the Bible, which tells of separating the wheat from the chaff.

The ancient civilizations of Babylonia, Egypt, Crete, Greece, and Rome were based on wheat as one of the principal food plants. The stories run back until they are lost amid the mysteries of tradition. All stone age findings include grinding bowls and pestles. These were the first crude flour mills.

Through the centuries wheat has been the chief ingredient in the "staff of life." Wheat therefore is of universal interest.

When the history of this war is written, there will be one chapter on wheat. That chapter cannot be written yet because no one knows the ending. But the story to date deserves our attention now.

Wheat was important in the other war—as food. It is important in this war—as food and more than food. As a basis for industrial alcohol it goes to war as synthetic rubber in a hundred forms. It goes to war as smokeless powder for our guns. It goes to war as shatterproof glass for our planes and trucks. Its use as feed for livestock is now at a rate four times what it was pre-war. Because of this use by livestock, wheat now goes to war on fronts throughout the world in concentrated forms, as dried eggs, and and dried milk, as butter and cheese and meat.

There are other differences. Wheat is a bulky food requiring a lot of shipping space in proportion to its food value, but during the other war we sent two or three hundred million bushels a year to our allies in Europe. In this war we have become temporarily a net importer of wheat. Now we use more wheat as livestock feed and for industrial alcohol in a year than we shipped to Europe in any 2 years during the other war.

And here is another difference. During the other war we in the United States were asked to observe 2 wheatless days a week, and we were asked to have 1 wheatless meal a day. We remember the food regulations of

the Food Administrator of that time which forbade us to buy wheat flour without buying an equal amount of substitutes.

Today is the 1st of March. In March 1918 the Food Administrator asked that no wheat or wheat products be served in hotels or restaurants until after the harvest. In this war we are now actually eating 60,000,000 bushels per year more than we did pre-war and much of this is in the form of enriched flour and bread. That is another important difference. There are others.

In January 1918 the British Food Controller sent a cable to the United States Food Administrator which read in part as follows: "Unless you are able to send * * * wheat * * * I cannot take the responsibility of assuring our people that there will be food enough to win the war. Imperative necessity compels me to cable you in this blunt way. It now lies with America to decide whether or not the Allies in Europe shall have bread. * * *"

We furnished them that bread. This war will not be won by bread alone, but by wheat in other forms as well.

Due to soil conservation and other improved methods our production of wheat for the past 3 years has been the largest of any 3 consecutive years on record. Our goals for this year call for a still greater production. Wheat is a national crop. There are scores of types and varieties grown in many States. Nothing is more beautiful or inspiring than a field of ripening grain waving in the sunshine on our vast prairies.

If our stocks this July, after 2 years of war, should drop to 300,000,000 bushels, as seems likely because of our heavy uses of wheat for livestock feed and for industrial alcohol, our reserves would be low, but they would still be more than three times the size of our stocks in July 1919.

Another important difference is in the realm of price. Prices generally have been more stable than in the other war. We hope to avoid the morning-after headache that was felt 'round the world when the price of wheat crashed to ruinous levels in the aftermath of the other war.

I have mentioned these differences in order to outline some of our current wheat problems against the helpful background of experience. But this experience will have been in vain unless it points the way toward meeting some of the problems that confront us now. One problem is to maintain an adequate supply, and particularly a domestic supply, because of the shipping hazard.

We must make certain that there will be plenty of wheat for our armed forces and for our civilian needs, as well as for essential needs for livestock feed in the deficit areas and our industrial alcohol plants for synthetic rubber. So far we have had no wheatless days in this war. We hope to avoid them if possible.

It was for this reason that, in spite of our tremendous supplies on hand, and in spite of our record production of the last 3 years, all restrictions were removed on all food crops and our goals of 1944 have been increased.

Other safeguarding steps have been taken. To prevent another price disaster, the Congress, with the approval of the President, has protected producers of basic commodities including wheat by authorizing and directing loans at not less than 90 percent of parity for the 2-year period following the end of the war. Wheat farmers who remember the previous price disaster will know the value of this protection.

Every effort is being made to limit the amount of wheat used for livestock feeding to the most essential and efficient uses.

Increased shipments of molasses are being imported for industrial alcohol and for feed purposes, in order to reduce the amount of wheat used for these purposes.

Then, still further to protect our supply, we have been drawing on Canada's large stocks of wheat to help meet our extra needs. Transportation difficulties prevent bringing in as much of this Canadian surplus as we would like, but substantial shipments have been made. Meantime, this reserve supply exists as a safeguard against the possibility of a reduced crop this year or next, or for unexpected needs that may develop.

Fortunately, for the present at least, the world has an adequate supply of wheat. The principal problem is more one of transportation than of supply.

This fact suggests the ever-important problem of what will happen after the war. We must remember that wheat is a world commodity, with many foreign trade complexities. It is probably the most widely grown food crop in the world. It grows in 50 different countries. It is important even in China, which normally produces more wheat than any other country in the world except our own and Russia.

Because of this importance of wheat both as food and feed, domestically and in world trade, wheat has always been an agricultural problem child of this and other Governments.

Many nations have tried to meet this problem. Even before the war all important wheat exporting and importing countries had various district government measures designed to support wheat prices. All the foreign major exporting countries now have guaranteed prices to producers.

Under these conditions it is wise to have the fullest possible cooperation with all these countries to avoid alternate periods of surplus and scarcity, which injure all concerned and in the end benefit no one. Progress has been made along these lines.

In June 1942 a wheat agreement was entered into by the five principal export wheat producing countries: The United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Argentina, and Australia. That agreement lays the groundwork for international cooperation once the war is over. It provides for the full use of world markets so that consumers will have plenty, while the producers will be protected against the disastrous effects of widely fluctuating prices. We, of course, must have a full part in those markets. We want expanded production for expanded use just as far and as rapidly as it is possible to achieve it along practical lines. This means, of course, expanded production of finished articles as well as of raw materials, and at fair prices for both.

If by joint action we can solve some of the basic problems affecting these important commodities in foreign trade, such as wheat, for instance, we will have taken an important step against misunderstandings and will have made real progress toward maintaining peace.

Our Two-Front War in Domestic Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a provocative address delivered by Carleton Putnam, president of Chicago and Southern Air Lines, before the annual banquet of the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce, Houston, Tex., January 18, 1944:

One of the troubles with the phrase "free enterprise" is that so few people agree on what it means. The shark grunts it while swallowing the minnows, and the minnows die with "free enterprise" in their prayers. In fact it is used so often and so loosely that every time I see it now, even in my own speeches, I think of Ambassador Grew's old story about the visitor to the farm who went out to the barn one morning and found the farmer milking the cow, then taking the pail up to the front of the stall and offering it back to her to drink. Upon being asked why this procedure the farmer replied, "Well, it looked sort of thin, so I thought I'd run it through again." For somewhat the same reason I shall attempt tonight to give you an explicit definition of free enterprise, or at least of one vital aspect of free enterprise, with the warning that it is only my definition, and that there are plenty of sharks who won't agree with me.

Personally, I would say that free enterprise prevails in a society where there exists the maximum possible number of independent business units compatible with the economic health of them all. Notice that this definition is simple and inclusive, because it states a theoretical ideal. Notice also that it is very difficult of application because it depends in practice on a question of degree. Whether, in any given instance, what we need is a little less profit to gain a little more diversity, or whether a little more profit and a little less diversity would be better from the standpoint of society as a whole, is a subject no man can cover in a definition. We run into the problem all the time in transportation under the caption "The public interest." The public interest of the passenger as a traveler might, in certain cases, be better served by having the whole country covered by one huge air line or railroad—it might even cost less—yet the interest of the passenger in the stimulating effect of competition on development and his interest as a citizen in living in a society where diversified opportunity for leadership in the air line or railroad business is open to him and to his children, would then be entirely neglected.

Of course, we can go too far with the cultivation of independent units. When we carry duplication of effort and facilities to the degree that the cost outruns the benefit, we have ridden a good horse to death and everyone suffers. This is particularly true in industries where we need units of substantial size to perform the service properly. It is even more true in public-utility industries. The financial burden on the stockholder and taxpayer, the moment we cross the line into excessive duplication pyramids rapidly. But I maintain that in most industries we can have economic health without great combines and consolidations, that the air-transport business is one such industry, and that now is the time as we stand on the threshold of our post-war aviation pattern to lay down the principle—to mold the clay before it hardens—and we're too late.

I cannot stand idly by and listen to people talk about free enterprise as if it simply meant freedom for the biggest fish who gets there first to eat everything else in the pool. We businessmen are spending too much time today defending capitalism instead of finding out why we need to defend it. And we'll always be defending it until we take free enterprise, which is the guts of capitalism, and diversify it as widely as economic health permits. The elements that have made capitalism a dynamic force in the building of our America spring from certain rudimentary instincts in men's hearts—the instinct of personal adventure, the instinct

of self-fulfillment, the hunger to build and manage one's own shop (as nearly as may be possible upon the face of this imperfect earth), and the minute you take the accent off the individual and his personal hungers and needs, and start putting it on organizations and mass effects like the Nazi festivals at Munich, you have taken the soul out of free enterprise, and no matter how long you keep propping up the corpse, you won't bring it to life again.

Let us examine the underlying elements in the problem for a moment. In the first place what do we mean by "freedom"? We mean the maximum amount of inner personal self-direction and the minimum amount of outer social compulsion compatible with an orderly society. And isn't this just a translation of my definition of free enterprise in the business world? Merge the two concepts and what do we get? We get this objective: That we strive for an economic structure in our society, a structure of industry in which the individual man and woman shall have the maximum possible opportunity for personal adventure, for self-direction, and for leadership in earning his living, as well as in all other aspects of his life.

The memorable thing about the early days in America, the days of Sam Houston, the age of the pioneer, was that they provided to individual men and to small groups of men almost unlimited horizons of this kind. Free land, a ranch, a trading post, a mill, a trapline—there was a rich abundance of economic adventure for the individual in the beckoning west, and this abundance conditioned our national psychology from colonial times until the end of territorial days west of the Rockies. Now we are told the frontier is gone, and we must reconcile ourselves to a different order and spirit of society. I am a realist, and if this were true, I believe I would be courageous enough to face it. But I am convinced that while we cannot have the almost unlimited freedom of the frontier in a matured democracy, we can and we must preserve the essential ingredients we have named—the ingredients that go into what I have sometimes called the "wide American chance." Otherwise, our American experiment, our American contribution to human society, stands abandoned.

Again I remind you that the problem nowa-days has become the most universal problem in all living, the problem of achieving the best blend—how to keep open as wide as possible the gates of personal opportunity, and at the same time serve the cause of order and efficiency in a complex industrial economy. But we must remember that the essence of doing almost anything well is a task in mixtures. From the best tobaccos to the best perfumes, nature is always presenting us with a blending problem if we want the finest results. When your engine begins to cough, it doesn't follow that you must throw away your car. It may simply mean: Check your mixture. And it is my contention that the mixture problem in our society today is largely one of adding to the blend another dash of the wider chance, injecting it into all fields of endeavor, and particularly into this great new field of air transport. Granted that the public interest in a sound transportation system is paramount, marry this principle to our free enterprise objective and both will gain.

* * * * *

Let me point out a few practical examples of what I think is involved here, because I like to tack things down to cases. I am going to use the air-transport industry as an example since I am more familiar with it than with others. But beyond that, we have in air transportation one of the most typically American things America has ever produced. No industry today is more symbolic of the American brand of adventure on new frontiers. The airplane was not conceived in the laboratories of a great corporation. It was conceived in a two-man bicycle shop. All of its early sagas were the sagas of individuals. The very physical fact of flying an airplane is a lonely, free, unshackling experience. The rising generation of Americans, fighting at the fronts, knows this. To thousands upon thousands of them returning after the war, air transport will seem the perfect channel for their hands and hearts. * * *

So here we stand with this instrument of destiny, or the threshold of the great air age, waiting for the returning influx of a million minds and hearts and energies, and we have to decide the pattern of its development, its integration into our society. * * * What is needed to enable air transport to fulfill its promise as a symbol of free enterprise to uncounted young Americans? Just a lot of jobs? No. Rather jobs with what Buchan calls "hope and daylight" in them and a "glimpse of some attainable goal." Not to be always just a cog in a machine. Not to see the positions of leadership, creativeness, and responsibility so limited in number that there will be room for only a few geniuses in the entire industry. Not to feel that one's whole future is dependent on the grace of one or two ruling cliques. In other words, to see enough doors opening on that western vista so that reasonable capacity may have reasonable hope of achieving its own personal odyssey. There is your American heritage which we have now either to preserve or to destroy.

Picture the situation for yourself. You find in an average air-line company a president, and vice presidents in charge, let us say, of operations, traffic, and finance. Then you have important jobs such as superintendents of maintenance, communications, personnel, stations, meteorology, flying, publicity, and so on. You may have a legal department, complete with general counsel and staff. Each of these jobs is in the category of what I have called leadership, creativeness, and responsibility. Now, if you limit the number of your air lines to 3 or 4, you multiply those jobs by 3 or 4, present them to a million Americans and say, "There you are, boys, come and take them." And many a man of courage and judgment will answer, "What's the use." But increase your lines to 15 or 20 or more, and you begin to get diversity. The window is lifted and fresh air starts to come in. You have begun to make your economic world more fluid. You have begun to widen the approaches so that honest ambition may have elbow room. You have reinjected into your mixture that indispensable American ingredient of the wider chance. If you have done it wisely, you have done it without wasteful duplication or excessive competition.

And when this happens throughout a whole society, the motor starts to purr again.

Please notice that it is just as dangerous to use the word "competition" loosely here as it is to use "free enterprise" carelessly. How dearly your shark loves to swim in the warm, inviting waters of competition. And how quickly he uses it to eliminate every atom of it that he possibly can. It is no exaggeration to say that uncontrolled competition in the first generation leads to very limited opportunity to compete in the second generation, and to practically none in the third. In a mature society the government must referee the game. You may do it by antitrust laws with some types of private business, or you may do it by more direct commission regulation in the case of utilities. But by some means it must be done, and when we hear people complaining about the Government destroying the free-enterprise system, we must learn to distinguish between the screams of the resentful shark who sees his predatory instincts curbed, and the legitimate fears of those who may feel that government is exercising too much control, or is trying to enter the game itself, instead of acting as umpire.

Mind you, I'm filing no brief tonight against the existence of large corporations. I believe in them. I think we often need them. But not them alone. Because that is the final ceiling zero on our horizon of adventure. That is the shutting in of the fog at the end of our unrestricted competition day. When we had an open frontier we had no problem because the solution was free land farther west. Today a young man doesn't have free land beyond the Cimarron to give him his chance and his horizon of hope. This he must find within the existing economic structure. And nothing but an impartial government, acting as referee, is available to give him that chance and that horizon. Unrestricted competition will not do it—through successive generations—now the open frontier is gone.

But let me come back to the problem we face today in air transport. Today we have in the air-transport industry 4 air lines doing 80 percent of the Nation's business and the 12 remaining lines doing the other 20 percent. We also have the powerful ground carriers—railroad, bus, and steamship companies, representing great aggregations of wealth—bringing pressure to bear on Congress to change the law and permit them to control air carriers. Our principle is therefore threatened on two fronts. On the one front, unless the tendency to concentration of power in the hands of a few great air lines is curbed, we will see the remaining carriers slowly starved and finally strangled. Along that road lies certain death to the principle of multiple independent units, and the diversified opportunity it represents. I believe the Civil Aeronautics Board is conscious of the danger and will strive to administer the law to avoid this pitfall.

On the other front, if we allow the big railroad corporations to start running air lines, we will soon have an even more complete strangulation of a different and even worse variety. The Pennsylvania Railroad, just that one railroad, has more than 30 times the capital of all the air lines in the United States. Turn that kind of a shark loose in this pool of youngsters, and does anyone suppose our diversity of units will be maintained? Not only will we find the ground carriers absorbing such independent units as now exist in aviation, so that all air lines will be dominated by the old railroad managements, but we will be dependent upon the railroad mentality with its overwhelming preoccupations and investments upon the aging earth for all of our future pioneering and development in the air. That way lies ruin not only for free enterprise in aviation but for aviation itself.

Therefore I warn you, a crucial battle is being fought on two fronts today in this new industry. If what I conceive to be the true principles of free enterprise are wisely applied by our Government, a rich contribution to our society can be made by air transport. We have sound prohibitions in the law now on the subject of ground carrier control. Don't change them. We have the nucleus for diversity of independent units in our 16 air lines already. Strengthen them. Along that road lies health and fulfillment of an early destiny, and the star that points it is the star that shone beyond the Cimarron in 1844.

But I have no wish to limit what I have said to any one industry. We are living in dynamic years of social upheaval and vast questionings. It is wise these days to dwell on basic things. I can sit back in my chair and conjur up a sunset across west Texas. I can almost smell the cedar smoke of supper campfires a 100 years ago. And around those campfires, in the dusk, I can see the

faces of men who were your ancestors and mine. Most of them are young, all of them are keen and eager and a little grim. Those men knew what they wanted. And they left us a legacy they never put in words. They left us the American dream, the American passion for adventure and the wider chance.

An Independent Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Polish descent residing in Wilmington, Del., through their patriotic societies and clubs, observe important historic anniversaries associated with our country and do not forget upon such occasions to recall the services and virtues of the heroes and leaders of their native land.

Mindful of the history of Poland which is replete with conquest by one aggressor nation after another; mindful that it has been the battleground of contending armies throughout its long history; impressed by the fact that should there be a new partition of Poland, the hopes of their countrymen for a free and independent existence and for a continued peace would be destroyed, these societies composed of loyal Americans are nevertheless gravely concerned about the future of their countrymen in Europe.

Their hopes and fears are expressed in the following resolution, adopted on February 13, 1944, which as will be noted therein, calls for an independent Poland, the boundaries of which as established after the First World War, will be recognized by all the Allied Nations and thus will remain inviolate when the present world conflict is ended:

We Americans of Polish origin, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, February 13, 1944, to honor George Washington and Thaddeus Kosciusko for their sacrifices made in winning the freedom and independence which we enjoy this day in these whole United States of America, and Abraham Lincoln for perpetuating this freedom and independence in upholding the Union of the whole Nation.

Further, we, as Americans of Polish origin, standing by the democratic principles that were created at the birth of the United States and kept to this day.

Whereas the reconstruction of a free Poland, undiminished in her borders in the east and rectified in her borders in the west, is an indispensable moral issue, and condition of permanent peace in Europe and the most substantial assurance for the United States against involvement in future wars;

Whereas the Polish Nation, which through its decision to resist German aggression, gave the free nations of the world the chance to prepare for victory, paying for that the supreme price measured by the death of every tenth Pole and the banishment from its ancient domains of one-third of the nation by both aggressors;

Whereas Great Britain has obligated herself through her treaty with Poland, signed in full awareness of the conspiracy between Germany and Russia, on August 25, 1939, to defend against any aggressor threatening her integrity and independence.

Whereas our President of the United States announced to the world that this war is being fought for the purpose to establish four fundamental freedoms in all parts of the world—the freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Whereas failure to fulfill these pledges and obligations would not only be an act of betrayal of Poland, with its only legal and rightful government in London, and all suppressed European nations, but also a betrayal of American democratic principles created at the birth of the United States by which the Nation stood and upheld to this day, never agreeing to uphold any desire, aim of any aggressor to take away freedom and independence of another nation.

Whereas if our American principles would be sacrificed now, to allow Russia to partition Poland and occupy other European nations, then the moral issue of this war would be lost, and the post-war peace conference would be a mockery of any future peace or stoppage of wars: Be it solemnly

Resolved, That we unite our efforts and pledge ourselves:

To defend the principle that obligations are sacred,

To defend the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms,"

To defend the rights of enslaved nations,

To defend the sacred rights of the Polish Nation, based on Poland's moral credit earned by her bravery and martyrdom.

Furthermore, we here assembled, declare as endangering victory, ignoble, dishonorable, and contrary to right and justice, all attempts aimed at endorsing the criminal action of the predatory powers of more than a century ago in again partitioning Poland and renewing the slavery of the Polish Nation.

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Presiding Chairman of the Meeting.
ADAM J. ROSIAK,
Secretary of the Meeting.

Endorsement of American Legion's Bill of Rights for World War No. 2 Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., heartily endorsing the American Legion's bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans:

Whereas the American Legion as a result of their 25 years' experience in the field of veterans' rehabilitation, on behalf of their comrades of World War No. 1, have prepared and presented to the Congress a comprehensive legislative program to aid the veterans of World War No. 2 in their return to civil life upon their honorable separation from the military service; and

Whereas this comprehensive legislative program, designated as the American Legion's bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans, presents a sound program, fair to the veterans and fair to the Nation, embracing the following: Adequate hospitalization, prompt settlement of disability claims, opportunity to complete education, vocational training, employment opportunities, unemployment allowances, home and farm purchase aid, centralization of all functions in a Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago, in meeting assembled, That we do hereby heartily endorse the American Legion's bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans, and do hereby petition Senator LUCAS and Senator BROOKS and all Congressmen from the Chicago districts to vote for said bill of rights; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby commend the American Legion for their unselfish service to the veterans of World War No. 2 and offer our encouragement to them in support of their sincere efforts to alleviate the plight of those who have already returned, and for the preparation of a sound long-range program for eventual return to civil life of our sons and daughters now serving in the armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our Senators and Congressmen and to the Illinois Department of the American Legion, and that this resolution be spread upon the permanent records of the city council.

The Coast Guard's Fine Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Newport News Times Herald of February 25, 1944, entitled "The Coast Guard's Fine Job." This editorial reflects my own sentiments and the sentiments of all who know the Coast Guard's great work.

I extended my remarks on this subject recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it affords me the greatest pleasure to see the splendid achievements of this great organization recognized so generously by the press. Congratulations to these men of all ranks who are making the motto of the Coast Guard, Semper Paratus, a real living inspiration for us all. May the Nation too be always ready.

The editorial follows:

THE COAST GUARD'S FINE JOB

Did you read this little item in the news report yesterday?

"BOSTON, February 24.—Not a single disaster in an American port has marred the shipment of munitions and other war material during the past 2 years, according to a report made by the Coast Guard on the second anniversary of its port security operations. Pointing out details of the largest fire-protection and fire-fighting force ever organized, the Coast Guard said there were 250 Coast Guard fireboats operating in 121 ports in the United States. These vessels, with the Coast Guard land apparatus, the report added, have responded to 2,852 waterfront fires between September 30, 1942 and October 1, 1943."

The occasion for this brief summary of achievement by an organization that does not seek publicity is celebration of what the

Coast Guard terms port security week. It comes on the week of the anniversay of February 25, 1942, when Secretary of the Navy Knox ordered the Coast Guard to be responsible for the security of American ports.

Locally, the Coast Guard has executed that assignment by a patrol of the harbor, guarding and maintaining a constant fire watch over the great shipping and shipbuilding installations of the port, supervising the handling of great quantities of explosives shipped through the port and performing manifold other duties. Most of our amateur and sport fishermen, as well as the commercial seafood men, know the strict watch that has been kept to avert sabotage, through the requirement that all operators traveling in local waters in privately owned boats carry identification cards issued by the Coast Guard.

All these things add up to a job well done and so smoothly and efficiently accomplished that most of us are unaware of its scope and detail. Our felicitations to the Coast Guard for its record on this, its second anniversary of intensive war service.

H. R. 3956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill and I hope it will be enacted into law with substantial unanimity on the part of the Members of Congress. In my opinion the absorption of exchange, like the absorption of any other service cost, is a matter that should be left to the discretion of the banks. If the collection bank desires to assume the cost of collection of exchange, I do not see how any harm is done, or where the public is detrimentally affected. The practice of collecting banks absorbing the cost of collection has worked equitably for a number of years and therefore I feel that the Federal Reserve Board should not have upset this practice at this time. The evidence shows fairly conclusively that when the national banking law was under consideration in 1939, that Congress did not intend to authorize a ruling such as the Federal Reserve Board has issued. An examination of the hearings shows that on page 1, the Honorable PAUL BROWN stated:

In 1935 I voted for the law under which the Federal Reserve had issued their ruling. I did not vote to prohibit absorption of exchange.

Again, on page 3, the Honorable R. L. DOUGHTON, Congressman from North Carolina, made the following comment:

In 1933, when I voted for the Banking Act, which contained the provision prohibiting banks from paying interest on demand deposits, I had no idea that 10 years later this law would be used to disrupt the charging of exchange by the many hundreds of small banks in this country which have engaged in this practice for years, and are dependent upon it as a chief source of income. Had there been any indication that this provision would be so misconstrued, I would have insisted upon an amendment such as that proposed in the pending bill.

Also, on page 268, the Honorable D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH, Representative from Pennsylvania and a banker with some 33 years experience, had this to say:

I am recommending to you the passage of this bill because of my firm conviction that if the practice of absorbing exchange is eliminated, a lot of rural banks * * * will disappear from the communities which they now serve. * * * I am sure that the sponsors of the Federal Reserve Act never intended to outlaw the practice of charging exchange.

Following these comments, it is very illuminating to read the legal opinion of Mr. Francis C. Brown regarding this whole matter, as set out in his letter of February 9 to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House committee. Mr. Brown is general counsel for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and a copy of his letter is enclosed.

It is said that most of the larger banks are against this bill and in favor of the directive of the Federal Reserve Board. I do not think the facts bear this out. In any event, I refer you to the statement of Mr. Frank Morast, assistant vice president of the Hamilton National Bank in Chattanooga, Tenn. The Hamilton National Bank is one of the largest and, I may say, one of the best operated banking institutions in the South. Its president, Mr. Thomas R. Preston, who is a past president of the American Bankers Association, is one of the most capable men and financiers of our Nation. As set out in the hearing of Mr. Morast, Mr. Preston has had great success in the direction of the Hamilton National Bank because he realized that a very important factor in the success of any bank is a thorough understanding of the customers' needs and problems, and the necessity of rendering friendly, cooperative service. Following out this principle is one of the reasons why the officials of the Hamilton National Bank were glad to meet the cost of exchange in collecting items of its customer banks, and this is one of the reasons why these officials favor the passage of this bill.

At this point I want to read part of the statement of Mr. Morast:

These, gentlemen, are helpful services which we are glad to render to our banker friends and, as a result of personal contacts that have been established over a long period of time, we are frequently called upon to discuss operational problems as they arise from day to day. But of all the various facilities available to our customer banks none is used so regularly as our transit service, for it is a daily service offered for a clearing of checks, drafts, and other collection items. Our transit department is operated in two shifts, one during the day and one during the night, the purpose of this double shift being to speed the presentation of items for payment and to make possible a quicker return of unpaid items.

And again reading from Mr. Morast's statement:

This exchange cost with us, therefore, is no great item, but the amount involved means much to some of our small bank customers, and we trust that the policy of absorbing it or not absorbing it may be left to the discretion of the bank. As previously mentioned, for about 7 years now it has not been our practice to accept accounts on the basis of absorbing the exchange costs which are charged by remitting banks; and furthermore, although it was our policy, prior to the ruling, to absorb such costs for our older country bank customers which were sending us nonpar items for their credit, even in those cases we were charging back the exchange on certain large nonpar checks which cost more than a nominal amount to collect.

This policy was established as a result of two lines of thought. First, insofar as new business was concerned, we did not wish to be in the position of accepting accounts on a basis which might be contrary to the views of the Federal Reserve Board, as expressed when this matter came up several years ago. Second, insofar as our older country bank customers were concerned, and since we understood that the ruling regarding the absorption of exchange was a dead issue, we did not want to do anything that might disturb the very satisfactory relationships which had existed with them over a long period of time.

We should like very much to have the privilege of continuing to formulate our policies in this connection. Our volume of business, like that of banks in other communities, regardless of population or location, has grown during recent years, as reflected in our year by year deposit figures shown below, and as conditions are constantly changing, bringing about new problems from time to time, we feel that it would not be improper for management to be allowed some discretion when establishing policies to meet those changing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the small banks, of course, desire to have this cost assumed by the larger collecting banks. I think it is in the interest of the collecting bank to assume this cost. It adds to the goodwill between the banks, it is not an onerous cost, and after all there is considerable benefit accruing to the collecting bank by virtue of having the smaller bank as its customer. I do not consider this assumption of collecting costs as a payment of interest. It is merely an arrangement that may be worked out between the two banks and, if agreeable to the two banks, no one is adversely affected. I do not see how this arrangement adversely affects the public.

Smaller banks, during these days, are having difficulty in finding investments for their funds. They are being called upon to render much service to the Federal Government and to their local communities. They handle ration coupons. Their officers and officials take the lead in all the bond drives. Certainly at a time when it is difficult to earn a great amount, and at a time when they are rendering so much gratuitous service, I do not see why they should be penalized by the issuance of the Federal Reserve directive. Passage of this bill will not create confusion. It will leave things as they were and I believe it is in the public interest to give this legislation our approval.

Prophet of Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Easton (Pa.) Express of February 29, 1944:

PROPHET OF DOOM

Louis Bromfield, author who has turned gentleman farmer in Ohio, foresaw our dour and dire doom last summer in an article in Reader's Digest entitled "We Aren't Going to Have Enough to Eat."

"I would rather not think about next February," sorrowfully pronounced Bromfield with about as much accuracy and sense as most self-appointed prophets. "By then, most of our people will be living on a diet well below the nutrition level."

Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard offered the editors an article in refutation of the outrageous scare piece by Bromfield, but it was refused. Drew Pearson writes from Washington that Secretary Wickard again wrote Editor DeWitt Wallace of the Digest a few days ago, pointing out to him that February has come and gone, the populace is well fed, and there is a greater accumulation of stored foodstuffs than at any time in the history of the United States. His only reply was a note from William Hard, Jr., associate editor, and son of William Hard, Sr., former member of the staff of the Republican National Committee, that Wallace is "fighting off a cold" and is not at his office.

In the meantime it is to be assumed Bromfield is as fat and frisky as ever in spite of his silly sounding off of alarums better suited for Axis than Allied consumption.

Holmes Bible College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, having been asked by Holmes Bible College, of Greenville, S. C., to prepare a short article on Value of Christian Education at Holmes, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a copy of said article, as follows:

VALUE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AT HOLMES

(By Hon. Joseph R. Bryson)

Attempting to adequately present this subject in the space allotted to me would be like trying to ensphere the sun in a dewdrop. It is impossible.

If I were as eloquent as Henry Clay, if I had the vocabulary of a Shakespeare, the lexicology of a Webster, the oratory of a Bryan, yet words and utterance would fail me to express adequately the importance of the religious, moral, and educational welfare of our young people.

The one supreme treasure of civilization is its youth. The one surpassing value of a nation is the character of its youth. The one essential process for the mind is education. The one essential need of the whole personality is religion.

Somehow we must see to it that these young persons grow not only in stature and wisdom, but in favor with God and man. They must not only have every facility for developing splendid bodies and alert well-stored minds, but they must also learn how to use these bodies and minds for the welfare of their fellowmen and the glory of God. Nothing less than this will suffice.

The program of Christian education at Holmes is enriching souls in Christian experience, enlightening minds in Christian knowledge and enlisting lives in Christian service.

Christian education prepares one for more effective service. It is a fact that there is in the church a dearth of young men and women who are both educated and consecrated. Opportunities beckon every hand to young people with highly trained minds and truly consecrated hearts. The Lord and the church have always needed that type of worker. In three great crises of sacred history, how the Lord did use the trained minds of Moses, Daniel, and Paul! What Christian dare carelessly omit from his life that training which, properly consecrated, will multiply his efficiency in God's cause?

Spencer says that there are five objects for which men strive: First, the preservation of life; second, the necessities of life; third, the care of off-spring; fourth, social and political preferment; fifth, literary and art culture. Holmes Bible College adds another, that of Christian ethics, and reverses the order. It holds that the moral and esthetic being is above the material.

The most important issue before the world is the religious issue. The history of religion is the history of the world. The history of the Christian religion is the history of civilization. The future of the Christian religion is the future of civilization. Our duty, then, is manifest. The young people must be placed in the best environment possible for the development of Christian character, and where the call to Christian service for the world is paramount. To this end let Holmes Bible College have our unqualified support.

Three centuries ago, a wise philosopher said: "Our studies should be neither 'a couch on which to rest; nor a cloister in which to promenade alone; nor a tower from which to look down on others; nor a fortress whence we may resist them; nor a workshop for grain and merchandise; but a rich armory and treasury for the glory of the Creator and the ennoblement of life.'"

If education is to make life useful, beautiful, and noble, it must be motivated by the spirit of the Supreme Teacher of mankind, who said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." The Master set the goal for all worthy educators in these familiar words, "I came that they might have life abundant." And He spoke a word of wise caution when He said, "The life is more than meat."

I assert that Holmes Bible College was never more needed in the national life than it is today. I bring hearty greetings and best wishes, and utter the prayer that Holmes Bible College may always be found in the way of life, as a fearless, outstanding, unswerving Christian college.

Christian education as taught at Holmes Bible College is the linchpin of our civilization.

Nevada Indian Youths Make Record in Marine Corps, Get Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of February 25, 1944:

NEVADA INDIAN YOUTHS MAKE RECORD IN MARINE CORPS, GET PREFERENCE

STEWART, NEV., February 24.—Indian youths from Nevada have made such excellent records in the United States Marine Corps the Reno recruiting substation has advised Ernest C. Mueller, principal of the Stewart Indian school, 17-year-old boys from the school will be given preference when applying for enlistment.

It was stressed the preference would be granted regardless of any quota assigned the Reno substation, even when such enlistments would put the station in excess of its monthly mark.

Edward S. Montgomery, staff sergeant in charge of the Reno station, in his letter to Mueller, said every Nevada Indian boy in service with the marines has "made a splendid reputation for himself and for the State and school."

Indian youths who have enlisted from Stewart now are serving on almost every battlefront with the marines in capacities as aviation mechanics, bombardiers, waist and tail gunners, tank corps men, paramarines, radio technicians, and motor transport corps men.

Need for Increased Transcontinental Airline Service to New England States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was passed February 17, 1944, at a meeting of the board of directors of the Aeronautic Association of Boston, Mass.:

The directors gave serious consideration to the report of Examiner Wrenn, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, on the question of the extension of various air lines to Boston, and on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution:

"The directors of the Aeronautics Association of Boston, with reference to the various questions involving air-line facilities to and from Boston and with specific reference to the recommendation to Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn in his report to the Civil Aeronautics Board, hereby resolve that—

"The recommendation that Northeast Airline routes be extended to New York and the extension of American Airline New England routes are commended and approved; but

"While we approve in substance the report of Examiner Wrenn we feel that this report is inadequate in that it does not furnish an answer to the problem of providing competitive through service to the South or West, for which services applications are already on file by United Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines, and T. W. A.

"We are deeply interested in the development of metropolitan Boston as a trunk line or international center for air lines, and any attempt to limit such facilities will not furnish the necessary development to accomplish this purpose.

"This statement is based on our present knowledge of prospective traffic and possibilities for the future. As our needs appear to increase, we shall wish to amend this statement to provide for such increase of services or facilities as is indicated."

Four Ways of Solving the Alcoholic Beverage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, while speaking at Bloomington, Ind., lately I met a young ministerial student by the name of Robert Gemmer, who is attending the University of Indiana. The Reverend Mr. Gemmer is an enthusiastic temperance worker and lately has delivered an impressive address, which he has entitled "Faith Without Works Is Dead." Four suggested ways of solving the alcoholic beverage problem are advanced in this excellent speech, which, under unanimous consent, I extend in the RECORD:

I'm not going to talk today about the evils of beverage alcohol and the harm it is doing our country especially during the war period; we already know all this. But instead I'm going to talk to you concerning the four ways or means of solving the alcoholic-beverage problem. I do not think that any one of these methods alone will be as effective as all four being done at once.

First, there is our own personal abstinence from any beverage containing alcohol. No matter who we are there are people who look up to us. If we drink there will be some people influenced to drink; and although we may be able to hold our liquor they may not and may some day become drunkards. Conversely, if we do not drink, those who look up to us will be influenced by our good example to abstain also. I pray that none of us will lead someone astray; but, unfortunately, I feel confident that if we do drink we will, knowingly or not, entice others to do so likewise.

Second, our patronage is very important. If we patronize an establishment that sells alcoholic beverages, we are helping to maintain that place in business. And so long as the owner of that establishment thinks that he can keep the business of those who oppose liquor as well as those who want to buy liquor, obviously he will continue to sell it, for if he can get money from both the "dry" and the "wet" it is to his advantage to do it. But if we should say to that owner, "We can no longer patronize your place of business because you sell alcoholic beverages," he would be faced with the problem of choosing whom he would seek to serve.

Now just why shouldn't we patronize a dealer that sells beer or liquor? We think: "Why, just because he handles liquor doesn't influence me. I'll never buy any." All right, maybe you won't, but somebody else will. He may sell the liquor that the driver buys before he gets into his automobile and kills an innocent pedestrian. Thus by your patronizing that establishment you have been helping that man to stay in business and thereby making it possible for him to sell the liquor that caused the harm. Thus indirectly you have been partially responsible.

Imagine what would happen if the Christians all over America would say that they would no longer patronize any restaurant, grocery, or drug store that sells any beverage alcohol. Wouldn't there be a lot of changes made? Wouldn't a great many establishments have to change their policy? You can help in starting this movement by going to those establishments that you have been patronizing and telling them of your intention to patronize only places that do not sell beer or liquor (whether by the drink, bottle, or package). Thus you will encourage those establishments that do not sell such beverages and perhaps influence those establishments that do. Perhaps you may have to go a little farther to find a drug store that doesn't sell alcoholic beverages, but I think you will begin to find it worthwhile. There are countless thousands throughout America who have decided to only patronize non-alcoholic establishments. Will you also decide?

Our patronage goes beyond the actual places that sell liquor. We, when we buy magazines and newspapers that advertise beverage alcohol, help those publishing companies. Don't you think that it would be more Christian to support those newspapers and magazines that have lost millions of dollars by not accepting such advertising than to support those publications that are full of ads which try to entice young and old to drink "with no regrets" or "no bitterness," etc. The Curtis Publishing Co. alone loses over $3,000,000 a year because of its policy of no liquor or beer advertising. It and the hundreds of other newspapers and magazines that carry no such ads deserve our support. And we can increase the publications that carry no such advertising by letting the publishers that do know why we buy some other publication instead of theirs.

Third, education is needed in our schools and elsewhere as to the scientific effects of beverage alcohol. By education we can show what beverage alcohol does. But just how effective will such education be when we see all around us beer, wines, and liquor being presented as the socially accepted things to drink. And this with the encouragement of our own Federal Government. I will just give two of the many possible illustrations of this: First, I wish to quote from a letter a boy in the Army wrote to his parents last May:

"I should really be in bed, but I'll take time to give you a few lines. I think you'll be interested in this first little matter. Last night the Six Hundred and Fourth Training Group had a party to celebrate their winning the E pennant last week. It was compulsory to attend, and all passes were pulled. The point is that there were no refreshments except beer and pretzels. Most of the men here are between 18 and 22. I know that a lot of fellows drank beer who had never drunk before, simply because there was nothing else available. That seemed particularly unorthodox after the big fuss was up in Congress not to allow liquor to be sold in the vicinity of camps, and here they are compelling kids under 21 to attend a party where nothing else is served. Just thought I'd mention it."

The Brewer's Digest in May of 1941 said:

"One of the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence by high ranking Army officers to make beer available at Army camps.

"The opportunity presented to the brewing industry by this measure is so obvious that it is superfluous to go into it in detail.

"Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population."

We see by the letter I have just quoted that the brewing industry has indeed taken advantage of its opportunities.

The other illustration concerns the Navy. Dr. Norbert Talbott, a Methodist minister, swore out an affidavit this last January that he was asked to resign from the naval chaplaincy because of his being unwilling to help men on his ship to drink or commit immoral practices upon their reaching port. This story was carried in Time and other magazines around February 1.

Indeed it is hard to educate against the use of beverage alcohol when it is encouraged by our own Government. This leads me to my fourth point.

Fourth. We must have legislation. Legislation without education would be tragic; education without legislation is futile.

Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, has introduced a bill, H. R. 2082, to forbid the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war. It is common knowledge that a person under the influence of an alcoholic beverage is not as capable as he would be if he were not. This is especially important during the present conflict when the Government needs its citizens in their most capable condition at all times, no matter what task they are performing.

It is absolutely ridiculous to propose the drafting of women and labor to do forced labor when whatever work is needed could be done more efficiently and reasonably by forbidding that which is undoubtedly the largest single cause for absenteeism. And this could be done without adopting the fascist method of total conscription.

Hearings have been held on Mr. BRYSON'S bill recently. His worthy bill will be passed if we show to our Congressmen that we are behind him in his noble effort for a better America. We should write our Congressman, who is in Washington to represent us, and ask that he do so by doing everything he can to help in the passage of this bill.

But we must not only ask our Congressmen to work and vote against liquor but we must be willing to do it ourselves at every opportunity. For we are hypocrites if we will ask our Congressmen to do something and yet be unwilling to do it ourselves. Thousands of people have accepted this challenge and have signed the following pledge:

"A recent Gallup Poll says that 38 percent of American voters (nearly 20,000,000) would vote for a Prohibition Amendment.

"But if Prohibition is to be effectively enforced, we must elect clean, fearless, public officials who are in sympathy with the law, therefore:

"I pledge my vote for all laws designed to prohibit the traffic in Alcoholic beverages and will vote only for State and National candidates whose party platform calls for the complete destruction of the liquor traffic.

"This pledge to be binding until after the Presidential election in 1944."

This pledge does not specify what party you will support, but you are pledged to support only a party that will do all within its power to destroy the liquor traffic.

"But wait," you may say, "we tried prohibition before and it failed." Suppose, for the moment, we grant your statement. Then why did it fail? It has been said that law is 5-percent legislation and 95-percent administration. We had the legislation last time, but what about the administration? Despite the fact that the prohibition amendment was ratified by larger majorities and by more States, both in total number and percent, than any other amendment ever adopted to the Constitution, the party in power did not want to enforce the law.

Fletcher Dobyns in his book, "The Amazing Story of Repeal," tells the way that repeal was brought about. We may blame President Roosevelt and the present administration all we want for bringing about repeal and thereby causing the present conditions which are far worse than those of the days of prohibition, but we must remember it was the Republican Party that was charged with the enforcement of the prohibition amendment during almost all the time it was in the Constitution.

Just how did the Republican Party enforce the Prohibition amendment? Immediately after the adoption of the amendment, con-

sumption went down tremendously—the American people were expecting Uncle Sam to begin to enforce the law. But just how did they do it? President Harding was charged with the responsibility of appointing the administrator of the prohibition law. Whom did he place in charge of the administration? Andrew Mellon, then Secretary of the Treasury, who was one of the Nation's biggest distillers! Now, just how much do you think Mr. Mellon wanted to enforce a law to put himself out of business? That's right, not very much!

So what did Andrew Mellon do? Instead of keeping the excise staff which had been doing the enforcement work of the old liquor laws, pretty well, he fired most of them and hired a new staff. The vast majority of those whom he hired had previously been connected with the alcoholic-beverage business in some one of its branches; manufacture, distribution, or sale, etc.! That's right they didn't want to enforce the law very much either! Oh, yes, of course there were a few attempts at enforcement for the newsreels, etc., but there was no real strong program of enforcement.

Every President after Harding again appointed Mr. Mellon to enforce the law, and so conditions went from bad to worse. And all along there was a very clever campaign going on to change the opinions of the American people. The prohibition law was made unenforceable by every means possible, and then the American people were told that it could not be enforced. Gradually they came to believe it; and so the present administration "swam" into the White House on the platform of bringing back legalized liquor, but never the saloon. (Oh no, never the saloons—they may not be called that, but they sure enough are.)

Even despite all this, prohibition did not totally fail for it did reduce consumption of alcoholic beverages by approximately 50 percent (if you take an average of all the estimates both wet and dry). But it could have been far more effective if the administration in charge of its enforcement had wanted to enforce it really. When our Government wants to prohibit something, it can. Just a few years ago we passed the Harrison anti-drug law to cut down drug addiction. It was enforced and drug addiction went down enormously. Today we have many prohibitions through the rationing program. True, the rationing program may not work 100 percent, but it must be working pretty well or else the Government would not have established and maintained the program.

Prohibition of alcoholic beverages can be enforced and made effective if those charged with its administration want to enforce it. That is why so many thousands are signing the pledge which I quoted earlier. They realize that. Frances Willard once said, "So long as I support my party while it is going wrong, it will never go right." She was right. So long as individuals support their party, Democrat or Republican, when it is doing wrong it will never go right. So long as the party officials see that they can have the support of both the drys with their votes and the liquor interests with their contributions, they will not do anything to hurt the liquor interests. But if the drys should say to their parties, "Reform or else," they'd sit up and take notice.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "So long as the people who are opposed to slavery continue to vote with those who are for slavery we will have slavery." He called on those who were opposed to slavery to come out of their old parties and join in the formation and election of a new party opposed to slavery. The situation is similar again today. We find those who are opposed to liquor voting with those who are for liquor, and so we continue to have liquor.

Both the old parties have rumblings within them. There is talk of the anti-Roosevelt Democrats calling their own convention, and so forth. Perhaps one or both of the old parties will disintegrate and new parties be formed. But at any rate, it is high time that the Christian voters of America awakened to their influence and said, "Listen here, we mean business." If the Christian voters of America would go to polls this next November and unitedly cast their ballot against liquor, legal liquor would be abolished and officials elected who would enforce the prohibition. At the present time it looks as if those voters will have to cast their ballots for the Prohibition Party unless one of the old major parties awakes quickly. The time is right for us to begin voting the way we pray. We may be in a minority at first, but so was Christ.

These are four powerful methods of dealing the alcoholic-beverage traffic a fatal blow. By our example, our patronage, by education, and our vote we can show the world where we stand on this important question. If I had chosen a text for this address it would have been "Faith without works is dead." For, indeed, faith that liquor is bad, without works to do something to get rid of it is worth practically nothing.

Again, education without legislation is futile, and legislation without education would be tragic. Write your Congressman today and ask him to work and vote against liquor by supporting Mr. BRYSON's bill, and then decide to do the same yourself, both now and at the election next November.

Divide and Conquer—The Old Shell Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Farmer is the leading farm paper in my State. It is the publication of the Missouri Farmers Association, the leading farm cooperative in my State, and an organization that has done more good for the farmer, particularly the little farmer, than any organization I know about. The March issue of the Missouri Farmer contains a significant editorial which I commend to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and to the country. This editorial shows the real motives behind some of the radical big city newspapers and others who have never been a friend of agriculture and are now trying to use the war as an excuse to make the farmer the scapegoat for many of the Nation's ills which should be laid directly at the door of the selfish partisan radicals and reactionaries who seek to feather their nests by sowing seeds of discontent and suspicion and stirring up class hatreds.

It is encouraging to those of us who fight the farmer's battles in Washington, and must thereby often endure the abuse of entrenched interests, to know that our efforts are appreciated. The editorial follows:

DIVIDE AND CONQUER—THE OLD SHELL GAME

For centuries it has been the tactics of warmongers to first divide a people, then conquer them. Hitler's tactics are a more recent example of how it's done. The enemy always seeks to drive wedges into the ranks of his opponents so that they will be weakened and may be the more easily overwhelmed.

Entrenched wealth and their political stooges have, from time out of mind, kept various groups of the masses at loggerheads—have encouraged us to quarrel with one another over politics, have set one religious group or race of men against others, or whipped up animosity between farmers and workers. The strategy is to keep the producers of wealth disorganized, with their minds centered on something else beside meat and bread, so that their attention will be diverted from the things which count the most.

"Ruling by fooling" is indeed the old shell game—now you see it and now you don't—and it catches a lot of suckers. Right now attempts are being made to divide the farmers so that their organized power will be dissipated. Enemies of the farmer are seeking to drive a wedge between the big farmer and the small farmer, to sic them onto one another, so that they will be unable to protect themselves in their struggle for economic equality with other classes.

An example of this scheme appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which reprinted an editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette entitled "Power of the Farm Bloc." The article begins like this: "Although the little farmer's worst enemy is the congressional farm bloc, he knows next to nothing about it and how it works. He has a hazy idea that anything the farm bloc does is in his interest. Exactly the reverse is true."

Then the editorial proceeds to tell how the farm bloc strictly represents the big farmers. It says that what these big farmers want is to impoverish the little farmer so he will have to work for the big farmers. The big farmer, says the editorial, "will offer the bankrupt farmer a house, garden plot, cow, and two hogs and up to $60 a month."

Finally, the article winds up by giving the little farmer some advice: "He ought right now to be finding out whether his Representatives or Senators are affiliated with the farm bloc and be ready to vote against them next fall if they are."

This is the most vicious piece of propaganda that has come to our attention in a long while, and it is unfortunate that space will not permit reprinting it in toto. It is vicious and dangerous because bigness among farmers is relative. Just what is a big farmer? Is it a farmer owning 500 acres? or 10,000 acres? To a man with only 10 acres, a 200-acre farm might look big. To a man with 1,000 acres, a 200-acre farm might look small. The truth is there's a great variation, and the M. F. A. membership, for instance, includes farmers owning all sizes of farms, with most of them ranging from 160 acres on downward.

The editorial says, "The farm bloc is a close organization of Senators and Representatives. * * * It is the tool in Congress of the great industrial farmers whose interests are directly opposed to those of the small independent farmer."

This statement is utterly false. In the first place, there is actually no organized farm bloc. Congressman MAX SCHWABE, of Missouri, a Republican who represents an agricultural district, said recently: "People are always denouncing the farm bloc, but I have never found just what the farm bloc is. If by 'farm bloc' they mean Congressmen who vote for things beneficial to agriculture, then I guess I'm guilty of belonging to the farm

bloc, although I've never joined anything, and have never seen, or been able to find the farm bloc in Washington."

CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, a prominent Democrat, and one of agriculture's long-time friends, is always pointed to by the big newspapers as one of the farm-bloc leaders. Congressman MARION BENNETT and WILLIAM P. ELMER, both Republicans, and all other rural Missouri Congressmen, as well as Senator BENNETT C. CLARK, always vote for what they believe to be the best interests of agriculture simply because they realize the importance of agriculture to their State.

What actually happens is that when a bill comes before Congress which affects agriculture favorably, Congressmen and Senators from the agricultural States and districts vote for it. If a bill affects agriculture adversely, they vote against it. Being outnumbered by legislators from the industrial States and districts, they are usually outvoted. The big daily newspapers, which represent city consumers who want cheap food, regardless, denounce them as selfish and grasping, and, in order to identify them as a group, call them the farm bloc, and have tried to make the name an ugly one.

The charge that these legislators who vote for good agricultural legislation are representing only the big farmers of their States is perfectly silly. How can a law possibly be passed which will help the big farmer on one side of the road and not his poor, small farmer neighbor on the other side of the road?

If through legislation the price of hogs is increased 5 cents a pound, to use an illustration, will not the price be increased on the small farmer's hogs as well as on the big farmer's hogs? The only difference is that the big farmer might have a thousand head of hogs while the little farmer has only a dozen. To this extent a law would help the big farmer the most, but only because he had more hogs. It would probably be unconstitutional to pass a law which would only increase the price on the small farmer's hogs and not the big farmer's, and in any case it would be impracticable.

Another example of this is in the case of A. A. A. benefit checks. The big farmer gets a bigger check than the small farmer, but only because the big farmer's farm is bigger, and not because of any favoritism in his behalf by law.

And if Congressmen want to keep their jobs, and they all do, they need votes—and lots of them—and, since there are more small farmers who vote than big farmers, would not a Congressman be committing political suicide to vote against the numerous small farmers' interests and in favor of the fewer big farmers if such a possibility arose?

There can be only one reason why selfish interests in this land want to divide farmers into a big class and a little class. They want the more numerous little farmers to get mad at the Congressmen and Senators who have been voting for the farmer's best interests. By so doing, they can dissipate the organized power of agriculture; and, having accomplished this, they can make the farmer hold still while they deftly pick his pockets as they have been doing these many decades.

It will do these selfish interests no good if farmers become more and more powerfully organized, and so they want to disorganize the farmers, to weaken them by arousing their distrust of their neighbors. Not many farmers will be fooled by these unscrupulous tactics of their enemies, and no doubt they will keep on weeding out the legislators who vote against the best interests of agriculture. As a group, farmers are learning that it pays to vote for the candidates on election day who vote for them.

Gifts to Religion and Charity Are Exempt From Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a situation in our Nation which merits the attention of all thoughtful citizens. The national income has gone up, the tax rates have increased manyfold, Government expenditures have increased by a tremendous amount, yet the gifts to religious institutions have declined. They have gone in the opposite direction. We are hitting an all-time low in reference to the percentage of our national income that is being given to religious institutions.

On Wednesday, March 1, 1944, I appeared before the tax experts on the staffs of the Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the representatives of the Treasury Department in reference to this problem. I wish to extend my remarks by incorporating my statement made at that time:

Gentlemen, the efforts of this group to simplify the tax returns for the American people are something that will be appreciated by millions of taxpayers in every part of the United States. I favor the putting forth of every effort possible to simplify our income tax structure. The statement is often made that a plan will be worked out whereby some 30,000,000 taxpayers, who are subject to the withholding tax, will file no tax return, the entire matter being handled through the withholding tax. I do not oppose such a plan. On the contrary, I think it is advisable, but I do stress a very serious problem that must be met in connection with our withholding tax.

I refer to that portion of an individual's income, not to exceed 15 percent, which is exempt from taxation, if given to religion and charity. I can best state the problem by citing an illustration. We will imagine that Mr. A and Mr. B work for the same employer. They live in the same neighborhood, and they both receive the same pay. Mr. A contributes nothing to religion and charity. Mr. B, motivated by deep convictions, and through self-denial, gives generously of his hard-earned money to support his local church, to contribute to foreign missions, to support the Boy Scout movement, to assist in the Red Cross drive, and the U. S. O. drive. He contributes to a hospital that does charity work, and he donates to his college.

Shall we support a tax system that taxes Mr. A and Mr. B alike? I assume the answer is "No." If the answer is "No," then will we tax Mr. B's exempt income and make him file a claim for it at the end of the year? There, gentlemen, is the problem.

The United States has a stake in the answer to that problem. It is not a preacher's problem or a problem that belongs to those charged with raising money. Because men give a few dollars to support the Boy Scout movement, a community may be saved the expense of a costly trial and a prison term. Because men give of their substance to support a church, that inspires people to high living and restrains their bent for evil, homes are saved and children are not sent to public institutions supported by taxation. Because men give of their substance to provide charity and philanthropy, the taxpayers of America are saved millions of dollars. Because devout individuals prayerfully give to missionary programs, the causes of war were removed in the far corners of the earth. There is no other antidote for the causes of war. Again, I say the question of taxing exempt income given to religion and charity is a public question and means much to our country. Giving to religion and charity is patriotism in its highest form.

I would remind the committee that there are millions of people—the majority of them of low incomes—who give 10 percent or more of their income regularly. There are some denominations in our midst that maintain such a record for all of their members. Justice cannot be done by averaging what they give with the millions who give nothing, and including it in the withholding tables. That is contrary to the inherent right of an American to be an individual and lacks simple fairness.

May I suggest to the committee that, if a system is adopted to eliminate the tax return for great numbers of people, the provisions of H. R. 3472 be incorporated. You will recall that a hearing was had on this bill and its companion bill before the Senate Finance Committee and the same can be found on pages 747 to 776 of those hearings. In the event that the mechanics of H. R. 3472 cannot be incorporated in your new measure to simplify taxes, then I suggest that provision be made which grants to those taxpayers, who certify that they are regular and consistent givers to religion and charity and that they expect to give an amount in excess of 3 percent of their net income, the right to reduce their tax base upon which the withholding tax is applied by 15 percent, and that at the end of the taxable year, they be required to file a return on that 15 percent of their income. That should be accompanied with such appropriate conditions and penalties as this group in their wisdom think best.

Report of Committee on Post-War Economics of California State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the attached report of the committee on post-war economics of the California State Chamber of Commerce:

GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES AFFECTING FREE ENTERPRISE

The Committee on Post-War Economics of the California State Chamber of Commerce, having determined that its first objective should be to make recommendations upon matters of public policy and the attitude of government affecting free enterprise, submits the following as fundamental problems which the American people will face in the immediate and subsequent post-war era.

The first task undertaken by our committee has been to define and to point out:

1. The obstacles to the functioning of free competitive enterprise and the conditions under which it may be expected that business can function most effectively in the production of goods and in the rendering of services at the lowest possible cost for the widest distribution and consumption;

2. The fundamental premise that business includes capital, management, and labor, which are all segments of free enterprise in the production and exchange of goods and services;

3. That free enterprise can do a better job of providing employment of free men than any other system, and within the framework of that system effort should be made to find ways and means to minimize or ameliorate abnormal periods of depression and unemployment;

4. That there are maximum limits to which governmental guaranties against the ills of life can be afforded without substantially impairing the functioning of free enterprise, and that there are dangers to free enterprise and the solvency of government in the extension of social-security plans beyond these limits;

5. That the laws or practices on the part of capital, management, or labor which restrict output, create artificial work, or too minutely segregate the functions that can be performed by workers of various crafts, and restrictions on production which hamper output of the most goods and services at the least cost for distribution to the most people, should be eliminated.

It is our conviction that post-war planning for maximum production and employment by business can be carried on successfully only in an environment where public policy and the policies of government remove restrictions upon production, and offer the encouragement, the incentives, and the rewards for risk taking that are the mainspring of a free-enterprise economy.

The following report of our committee gives in broad outline the major issues in the demobilization and post-war period, and our recommendations of policies necessary to provide an environment under which free enterprise will operate in a healthy fashion. Further detailed and specific recommendations within this framework of general principles are being and should be developed by the agricultural, industrial, transportation, natural resources, taxation, social security, and other permanent committees of the California State Chamber of Commerce. Such further extension and elaboration of these policies as the board of directors may thus approve, later can be added to this broad outline of policy.

A. POLICIES PRIOR TO OR IN THE DEMOBILIZATION PERIOD

Termination of war contracts

Recommendation

That—

1. The Congress create now an efficient governmental organization of well-trained personnel for the purpose of carrying on prompt contract cancelation procedure and payment.

2. The Congress enact legislation to provide that the Government may not be permitted to avoid termination procedure by sending out stop-work orders without previously giving termination notice. If stoppage continues for an unreasonable time contractors should have the right to invoke termination procedure. As a part of this legislation, that provision be made for suitable action to define basic policies for termination procedure.

3. In fixing allowable costs in the termination procedure, reasonable consideration should be given to post-war conversion costs where the manufacturer has not been otherwise compensated; and that on general termination, losses on one contract shall be an offset to profits on another.

4. Delegation of clear-cut authority to contracting agencies to make final settlements with contractors within the framework of policies established by the organization created by Congress for that purpose, subject to review by the Comptroller General only in cases of suspected fraud.

5. Enactment of legislation to establish a clear and simple avenue for appeals to courts by contractors for settlement of disputed claims, and to establish adequate legal machinery to expedite the handling of such cases.

6. That every contractor and subcontractor be granted the right, under proper safeguards, to obtain mandatory loans from the Government equal to a substantial proportion of reasonable settlement claims to be based upon a formula to be established.

Statement

Manufacturers have invested large amounts of working capital in plant conversion, plants, machinery, and raw materials to enable them to produce war goods needed by the armed forces. Delay in the settlement of claims arising from the termination of war contracts would prevent this working capital from being available for the prompt conversion of plants, purchase of new machinery, and employment of workers in resuming peacetime production.

Uncertainties as to policies and methods of contract termination, and as to the nature of costs or claims which may be disallowed, prevent manufacturers from being able to estimate accurately how much money they will have for post-war production and employment and when it will be available.

Simplicity of procedure, speed in settlement of claims, and removal of all possible uncertainties as to policies and methods of war contract termination are fundamental essentials to the most rapid and complete achievement of a high level of post-war production and employment.

Accumulation of post-war reserves

Recommendation

That Government cushion the shock of the abrupt termination of war business by a more liberal policy with respect to the accumulation of reserves, both through amendments to the tax laws and through changes in the mandatory renegotiation laws.

Statement

Present tax laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to the renegotiation of war contracts make it impossible for many war industries to build up the reserves necessary for an orderly demobilization of war workers and reconversion of these plants to peacetime production.

These enterprises should not be penalized or destroyed for meeting their obligation to produce war materials. Extraordinary costs of war mobilization and demobilization should be equitably spread.

Substantial cash reserves are indispensable to the most efficient preparation for post-war production and employment. They are needed to finance the transition of economic activities from a wartime to a peacetime basis and to reestablish peacetime markets.

Disposition of Government-owned plants and facilities

Recommendation

That Congress enact legislation now to provide:

1. For the setting up of an independent commission to determine all policies for the prompt and orderly disposition of lands, buildings, facilities, war plants, materials, and supplies acquired or constructed by the Federal Government for use in prosecution of the war;

2. For restoration of such properties to private ownership and local tax rolls;

3. That such properties shall not be used as Government-owned or operated ventures in competition with private enterprise;

4. For industrial advisory committees to be appointed by the commission, to aid the commission in its relations with the various industries.

Statement

Governmental enterprises growing out of the war effort which compete with the private economic activities of the American people should be terminated as soon as possible after the war is over.

As part of its war program, the Federal Government has invested over $15,000,000,000 in new manufacturing plants. The portion of the facilities which are owned by the Government are tax free. Operation of these by the Government in competition with tax-paying private enterprises would be unfair and destructive.

Disposition of surplus stocks of war supplies

Recommendation

That the disposition of stock piles of supplies not needed by the Government after the war shall be conducted in such a manner as will create the least practicable disturbance of the economy of the country and the least practicable destruction of values.

Statement

Freedom from Government competition in the sale of goods is a condition essential to the attainment of maximum post-war economic activity by the American people.

At the close of hostilities the Federal Government will have on hand a huge surplus supply of clothing, manufactured goods, and raw materials. Estimates of the value of these stocks vary. There can be no doubt that it will be many billions of dollars. The destruction of these supplies would be unnecessary waste. If these surplus materials are thrown on the market by the Government to be sold at any price, such competition will destroy the means of production and employment by citizen-owned business.

Timing and method of removal of economic controls

Recommendation

That—

1. The Government by legislation or declaration of policy make provision now that it shall surrender its war powers at the earliest possible date consistent with the war emergency and with an orderly return to peacetime conditions.

2. Congress enact legislation placing definite time limits on various wartime emergency controls, such as, for example, have been placed on similar State laws.

3. In the event the war in the Pacific continues after the war in Europe the Government should so conduct its operations as to avoid so far as possible undue hardship to Pacific coast industry.

Statement

Complete removal of Government wartime controls over the economic activities of the people, and a proper timing thereof, are necessary to an equitable return to maximum peacetime production and employment.

Recent events indicate that the European phase of the war may end before hostilities in the Pacific cease. This may result in continued emphasis upon production of ships and aircraft, the two industries in which California's war production is concentrated, after production of tanks and land Army equipment has been reduced. Continuation of the Pacific coast upon a full wartime basis after other sections of the country have returned to at least a partial peacetime production

would place California manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage in securing markets for peacetime goods.

Demobilization, retraining, and reemployment

Recommendation

That immediate steps be taken to obtain a national study of the problem of demobilization of men in the armed forces and of war workers.

Statement

During 1943 there were about 900,000 more wage and salary workers employed in California than in April 1940, when the total was about 2,000,000. The number of residents of this State who have entered the armed services is estimated as upward of 500,000. If all who are now working were to remain in the labor force after the war, and all who entered the services return to this State, the potential addition would be 1,400,000, or 70 percent more than were employed in April 1940. The minimum number of demobilized servicemen and war industry workers, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, will be about 1,000,000. Somewhere between these upper and lower limits is the measure of California's post-war demobilization, relocation, and reemployment problem.

To assure the most equitable and efficient transition of men in the armed forces and war workers to peacetime pursuits there is need for:

1. A determination of fact as to what the demobilization problem actually will be in each community when peace comes.

2. A thorough analysis as to how well the various proposals for demobilization would meet the actual problem.

3. Public discussion and understanding as to the effects of the demobilization proposals upon future employment and production and the solvency of present social security funds.

4. Careful consideration of the desirability of a complete separation of any cash benefits which may be paid to men demobilized from the armed forces from existing social security programs.

5. A study to be made of the question of severance pay for war workers.

6. A study be made of the problems in respect to the absorption of returning servicemen into industry, created by union membership requirements and restrictions.

7. Representation of private employer and employee groups as well as Congress on any national commission appointed to study this problem.

In striving to attain maximum employment in private enterprise after the war, the management of business should not place itself in the fallacious position of assuming responsibility for full employment, or of making promises of full employment which it may not be able to fulfill. The demand for labor is a joint demand and is derived from consumers' demands for the products of labor. These demands for the products or services of the business in turn are influenced by their selling price. The achievement of a condition of full employment in a free and competitive economy depends upon whether effective means are found to obtain such a balance in the relationships of wages, material costs, prices, and other factors as will result in maximum production and consumption. For either business or government to promise or attempt to provide full employment, regardless of whether the proper means are taken to achieve such a balance, is to invite bankruptcy.

B. POLICIES IN POST-WAR YEARS

Taxation policies

Recommendation

That the Government eliminate all unnecessary expenditures to the end that there be a reduction in the present corporate and personal income-tax rates, and as a part of this procedure so equalize the tax burden that venture capital will again become available.

Statement

To facilitate the increased production of needed peacetime goods and services and to encourage venture capital, present high wartime taxes should be reduced as soon as the war is over. Adjustment and equalization of the tax burden is needed.

Existing national policies of taxation are destructive to new enterprise, and a barrier to full production and employment. A tax method which takes nearly all of the gains or profits from a venturesome enterprise, and compels those who put their savings into such undertakings to take all of the losses, strangles the kind of enterprise which creates new jobs and better products. With a national debt of the size we will have at the end of this war, it is necessary that every opportunity be given to create new wealth.

Monetary and credit policies

Recommendation

That Government give assurance now it will not further devalue the dollar, and that Congress not again delegate to the executive branch of the Government the power to change the value of the dollar.

Statement

The supply of capital available to business for the financing of progress and production and employment is affected also by uncertainty as to future value of the dollar.

People are reluctant to invest their money in business for a long period of years unless they are reasonably certain that the Government will not reduce the value of the dollar during the period of the investment.

Budgetary and debt policies

Recommendation

That Government adopt a policy for the progressive and continued reduction of the national debt.

Statement

A sound governmental fiscal policy is basic to the success of any program for post-war prosperity and progress in the United States. Deficit spending must not be continued into the post-war years.

Any uncertainty as to the financial stability of the National Government affects all citizens in their activities. Any lack of confidence in the ability or willingness of Government to meet its obligations will retard long-term investment in productive activities and hold back expansion of production and employment.

Social security policies

Recommendation

That Congress and the legislatures of the several States, in acting upon social security or other public assistance plans, be guided primarily by these considerations:

1. Increased output of goods and services and the expansion of productive work in private enterprise is fundamental to the future security or standard of living of all of the people and to the solvency of their governments.

2. Under existing and probable future burdens of taxation, higher pay-roll or similar taxes upon business for the support of large new social-security programs will restrict needed expansion of production and jobs. The adverse general results of such a restriction on jobs and pay rolls are likely to be so much greater than any of the intended benefits to specific groups of individuals, as to justify opposition at this time to any large extension of social-security programs.

Statement

The American people cannot wisely or justly raise social-security benefits to the point where it does not pay all able-bodied individuals to live productive lives. To attempt to place social-security benefits at too high a level is to strike at two of the main sources of America's strength—the acceptance of responsibility by the individual for his own welfare and the incentives which enable our people to promote progress and employment.

The best security for an individual is that the individual develop within himself the qualities of the American spirit and his own abilities and skills to perform the useful and constructive work for which he is most suited.

Another limit upon the extension of collective aid to the unfortunate, which cannot be exceeded without injury to the productive enterprise which sustains all such activity, is the size of the tax load.

Labor relations and wage policies

Recommendation

That the national labor legislation be amended now to:

1. Require election of all labor representatives by secret ballot of a majority of the employees eligible to vote in the appropriate units for collective bargaining.

2. Ban the use of force or threats of injury to secure membership in any labor organization.

3. Require a majority vote of membership by secret ballot before any labor organization could call a strike.

4. Outlaw the use of secondary boycotts.

5. Provide for uniform financial accounting and reporting by labor organizations.

Statement

There is need for consideration by all groups of labor relations and wage policies that will promote maximum production and employment by business enterprises.

More than two-thirds of the new wealth created annually by private enterprises goes to employees, as wages, salaries, or social security benefits. Employees have the most to lose if business enterprises fail to achieve maximum production after the war.

The right of employees to create or to join organizations through which they may be represented by those of their own choice to negotiate with employers is an established and recognized part of the free enterprise system. The bargaining strength which is thus guaranteed by national legislation should not be abused. There should be developed a wider understanding of the fact that labor has nothing to gain in the long run by encroachment upon reasonable margins of profits necessary to keep a free enterprise economy functioning and expanding. The great gains to labor, as to all other partners in such a system, must come from more production and distribution at a lower cost, and from full use of resources and technological improvements.

Monopoly and restrictive practices

Recommendation

That reasonable and effective restrictions be enforced against monopolistic practices contrary to the public interest, on the part of capital, management, or labor; and that in fields where monopolies are in the public interest (e. g., public utilities) they be subject to reasonable and effective public regulation.

Statement

To permit maximum production and employment in post-war years, the fullest use of resources and technological advances, and the competitive production of more goods at less cost for more people should not be checked by monopolistic practices on the part of capital, management, or labor. In the comparatively limited areas of economic activity where experience has shown that the public interest is best served by legally restricting competition, as in the case of public utilities, reasonable and effective regulation of practices or price levels must be substituted for the free play of economic forces which should govern all other economic activities of the American people.

Government operation of enterprise

Recommendation

The very essence of civilization is that there be placed upon the individual only

that degree of restraint which shall prevent his encroachment upon the rights of others, thus releasing to the utmost individual initiative in every proper direction. Our form of government most effectively expresses and maintains this principle. Within our basic law exists ample provision for such changes as may from time to time be necessary to safeguard our people. It is therefore essential that our Government should scrupulously refrain from any activity in business or industry when it can be successfully undertaken and conducted by private enterprise. Any tendency of Government to enter such fields should be carefully weighed in the light of its possible effect on the very genius of our institutions.

The Transition to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Arthur G. Drefs, chairman of the board, made before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce on January 25, 1944:

THE TRANSITION TO PEACE

(By Arthur G. Drefs)

When historians write about the epoch-making periods of America, the years that we are now going through will rank as the most critical and far-reaching. Decisions that are being made today and tomorrow will have a profound effect on the kind of country that will be in existence for the next 50 years. Are we going to have a free America or will our lives and businesses be subjected to the iron heel of bureaucracy?

Unless we reach wise solutions to all of the many colossal problems confronting us today, all of the war sacrifices—the supreme sacrifice by many of our finest young men—will have been in vain. Military victory alone is not enough. Measures to prevent future wars must be established. Our democratic form of government—particularly the preservation of the rights granted by our Constitution and by our Bill of Rights—must be reaffirmed in forthright words translated into a convincing program of sound action.

What are some of the problems? Let's examine a few.

The President admitted in his address to Congress that to date contracts amounting to over $12,000,000,000 have been canceled. In most cases canceled contracts have been replaced by other orders, so that generally the impact of these cancellations has not been unfavorable. Here and there, however, plants have been completely shut down. Most of these have been Government-owned, so that individual businesses haven't as a rule been critically hurt. But some have; more will be. It is therefore of the first importance that legislation for the prompt settlement and payment of terminated contracts be enacted now. Delayed contract settlements will result in widespread bankruptcy, with mass unemployment.

Our chamber of commerce has taken a position of national leadership on this vital subject. Already several important meetings have been held which have been beneficial to the St. Louis area contractors. On February 24 we will hold a meeting at the Jefferson Hotel which will have national significance. The ranking officers of the Army and Navy to whom the job of contract terminations has been delegated, will be on hand. We hope to work out a pattern that will be usable effectively in all parts of the country.

A second problem, closely akin to contract terminations, is the disposal of Government-owned plants, equipment, and supplies. It is generally conceded that the value of Government plants and equipment alone is approximately $20,000,000,000. How can the Government dispose of this tremendous plant and equipment without permanent harm to our economy?

It is obvious that if these plants and the machine tools in them went to the larger concerns exclusively, an untenable monopoly would be created. Nothing would be more disastrous.

Some individuals recommend disposing of the machine tools abroad. I am personally opposed to such action until after industry in this country has first been modernized. Many American plants are antiquated. How can they compete if we sell or give away our newest equipment and our industries continue to operate with obsolete facilities? After our permanent military requirements are satisfied, the next step should be the modernization of American industry—particularly small industry. The surplus, including machinery replaced, can then be disposed of abroad.

Perhaps of greater concern to all business is the disposal of surplus merchandise of all kinds which will be owned by the Government when hostilities are ended. Unless such surpluses are disposed of in an orderly way—over a period of years, the markets of most businesses will be glutted for months or perhaps years.

It is recommended that a seven-man commission of businessmen, each with at least 5 years of executive experience, be created by adequate legislation. The President would appoint the members of the commission, subject to stipulations of the legislation. This commission would first find out what supplies were in existence and then arrange for their disposition in an orderly manner. Here the advice of industry and business groups would be necessary. For example, if trucks were to be disposed of, the manufacturers of the trucks and their distributors would constitute an industry advisory group.

Here again our chamber will play an important part. Our local industries—large and small—must be both represented and protected. The chamber of commerce is the logical agency to handle this important problem in the metropolitan St. Louis area.

The demobilization of war industries involves the demobilization of labor. What's to be done with the returning soldiers? What's to be done with war workers? What about wages? Are they to be reduced, or will high wages continue?

The answer to all of these problems is necessarily national; yet St. Louis cannot adopt a "do nothing" policy. It must willingly accept its responsibilities and work diligently and boldly for a satisfactory solution.

The only complete solution is jobs for all those who want to work. It is expected that many young men will complete their education before seeking employment. There are several million women and men who will withdraw from the labor market as soon as the emergency has ended. Finally, there are always a couple of million unemployed even in the most prosperous periods. This condition will likely continue.

It should be recognized that no matter how skillful the transition from war to peace, there will be what economists call a primary depression. The length of that depression will depend on the successful handling of at least six fundamental things:

1. Adequate legislation on contract terminations and on the disposal of Government-owned facilities and the intelligent enforcement or handling of it. If either the enactment of the legislation is delayed or the administration of it bungled, then unemployment will be prolonged.

2. If the war in Europe ends several months before the war against Japan, then there should be a substantial industrial conversion from war operations to operations for peacetime products. It is generally agreed that with the ending of the European phase of the war, roughly 50 percent of all war contracts will be terminated. Even now there are adequate supplies of most raw materials. Such materials as aluminum, copper, zinc, and steel are no longer critical. They can't now be diverted to consumer-goods merchandise because of the continued manpower shortage. When manpower is available, there should be a skillful transition which will take into consideration the competitive conditions within an industry and the labor situation in the areas in which the competitors within an industry are located.

3. There must be a realistic approach to the wage problem by both management and labor.

Management must realize that except in a very few locations and industries, the hourly wage rates will not be reduced. We are amassing a national debt which may ultimately total $300,000,000,000. This debt cannot be reduced or even serviced unless wages and prices are continued at approximately the same levels that prevailed during the war years when the debt was being contracted. We learned in the depression years of the early thirties that farmers' debts as an example—contracted when their products sold at inflated prices—could not be liquidated by dollars having a much greater purchasing value, with consequent deflated prices for farm products.

On the other hand, labor must realize that the change from war work to peacetime production will result, at least temporarily, in down-grading of workers into less skilled categories. Many workers will have to go back to the jobs that they had before they entered war work. This step does not mean that their wage rates will be pre-war. On the contrary, I believe all wage classifications, especially unskilled, will remain at a permanently higher level. But their former jobs will not generally yield the higher pay that prevails in most war industries.

In the latest report of the St. Louis office of the United States Employment Service, comment is made on the number of workers who refused during December to accept new employment at lower wages than they had been earning. The jobs that were available at less pay were not filled by war workers who had lost their higher-paid jobs.

The transition of labor from war jobs to peace jobs constitutes one of the most difficult problems, because it is a human problem. Nevertheless, it must be made successfully if the primary depression is to be short lived.

Further inflation must be prevented or rigidly controlled and confined to narrow limits.

The extent of inflation is not generally understood. The automotive industry estimates that pre-war designed cars, if built at present labor and material costs, would be sold at prices from 25 to 40 percent higher than those that prevailed when production was stopped. Since that estimate was made railroad wages have been increased, which will probably be translated into higher freight rates. Further, demands have been made for higher pay in the steel industry and in the automotive industry. Should these pay increases be granted, it is conceivable that a car that formerly sold for $800 will be priced at $1,200.

While every market survey shows a tremendous potential demand for automobiles, it is probable that there would be a severe shrinkage in demand if prices were 40 to 50 percent higher than prevailed before the war.

Many articles that are being sold today have price ceilings created 2 or more years ago. At present costs most of them are being sold at an actual loss.

The Office of Economic Stabilization recently ruled that when commercial items are released for production they would have to be sold at cost when gross profits were considerably above those prevailing in the 1936–39 base period. When gross profits were higher than the base period, but not considerably higher, a profit of 2 percent will be allowed.

It must be evident that we have not yet felt the inflationary effect of higher costs in our retail selling prices.

Business will have to adjust itself to this situation by greater efficiency in manufacturing and selling. It will have to adopt the policy of large volume at a low profit per unit. Satisfactory profits will result only from large sales and production volume.

5. There must be realistic post-war taxes—both for individuals and corporations—immediately after the ending of the war. During the war all but a limited few agree on very high taxes, not only to help pay for the costs of the war, but to eliminate the criticism that prevailed after World War No. 1: That several thousand millionaires were created while thousands of men were giving their lives for their country.

Post-war taxes must provide an incentive both for individuals and corporations if full employment is to result.

6. Finally, governmental agencies must be prepared with detailed plans for long deferred maintenance and improvements. Such work would provide an excellent cushion during the dangerous transition period.

Jobs must be found for the returning soldiers and sailors. Particular attention must be paid to the handicapped. Job studies should be made now to determine the type of work suitable for the handicapped.

The chamber of commerce must be particularly concerned with the returning soldiers and sailors fired with new ambition. Thousands will have acquired new skills and other thousands will have demonstrated executive ability of a high order. St. Louis should make attractive inducements to all its returning fighting men, particularly those who want to start a business of their own. Here they should find a suitable location, whether it be a factory, a retail store, a garage, or a filling station. That isn't all. Some method of providing capital—risk capital—should be evolved. And, finally, existing business should lend them a helping hand.

In so brief a period it is only possible to point out a few of the most urgent situations that confront us. They are so many and so difficult of solution that a timid soul would look askance at them. It is no time for timidity. It is a time for boldness—for concerted action. This St. Louis Chamber of Commerce is bold. It is at work now. Our members, and all St. Louisans, will recognize the truth of this statement as its many dynamic plans unfold for the betterment of business, labor, and the community.

Doughboy's Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem entitled "Doughboy's Thoughts," of which Miss Mary Virginia Rose, of Springfield, Ohio, is the author:

DOUGHBOY'S THOUGHTS

O'er the sound of the battle
O'er the din and wail of a shell
A doughboy's heart is crying
Whispering a little prayer.

The bombs shriek o'er his foxhole
Bullets whiz o'er his head;
But onward he plows through blood and gore
O'er his comrades, who are dead.

He remembers as though it were yesterday
He was with those he loved so dear
But now he's out on some strange land
A land of dread and fear.

He's out there fighting for freedom
He's out there fighting strife
He's out there fighting the sin of the world
He's out there giving his life.

All that he wants from his fighting
All that he says in his prayer
All that he wants from his efforts
Is a world of peace and care.

We owe it to him out there dying;
We owe it to him who's in pain
We owe it to him out there fighting
His fighting is not in vain.

Let's work for a better tomorrow
Let's strike out oppression and sin
Let's make a world of freedom
And make this world peaceful again.

The Race Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article from the Columbia (S. C.) State on a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of South Carolina, February 29, 1944, expressing in no doubtful terms the position of the legislature and the people of South Carolina on present-day agitators of the race question:

The house of representatives of South Carolina yesterday demanded that "henceforth the damned agitators of the North leave the South alone" insofar as "racial relations are concerned" by adopting a concurrent resolution introduced by Representative John D. Long, of Union.

"We indignantly and vehemently denounce the intentions, utterances, and actions of any person or persons and of all organizations seeking the amalgamation of the white and Negro races by a comingling of the races upon any basis of equality as being destructive of the identity and characteristics of both races and as being un-American and hostile to the existence and preservation of the American Union of States. * * *

"We reaffirm our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy as now prevailing in the South, and we solemnly pledge our lives and our sacred honor to maintaining it whatever the cost, in war and in peace," the resolution declared.

GOES TO SENATE

It was adopted by the house with no debate and now goes to the senate for concurrence.

In the lengthy preamble it was set out that "Yankee slave traders and New England shipmasters instituted and commercialized the vile North American slave traffic, bringing the Negro from his native Africa and selling his body at a profit to the plantation owners of the South during the infancy of this Republic. * * * It is recognized that the States of the North and the States of the South each, due to geographical, climatic, racial, and other differences, have their respective political, social, economic, and other diversified peculiarities and problems that may be solved satisfactorily only by local self-government. * * *"

"The white race of the South and the Negro race of the South," it was set out, "have been residing side by side in the same section in comparative peace, harmony, and mutual helpfulness, without material disturbance or friction, for a long period of time, during which with their different talents and limitations they have been contributing to the preservation and growth of the Nation * * *."

DESTINY

"It is believed," the resolution set out, "that the true destiny of the Negro race, like that of the white race, lies in the jealous preservation and promulgation of its own integrity and characteristics" and that any mixing "would be destructive of the identity of both races * * *."

"Certain persons in high official and semi-official quarters," the resolution reads, "acting in concert with strong subservient influences of the North, actuated by malice or by ignorance or both toward the South in general and the white race in particular, taking traitorous and treasonable advantage of the critical situation brought about by the war, are seeking * * * to stir up trouble * * * between the white and the Negro races, thereby kindling a fire that they may not be able to put out * * *."

"Agitators of the North are playing into the hands of the Nazi philosophy of conquest to first divide, then conquer, and by their treasonable utterances and conduct are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our common country, these United States of America. * * *."

"History and tradition prove," it is set out, "that the safest policy is to allow each race to work out its own destiny * * * by a process of progressive evolution * * * in a spirit of mutual respect, confidence, and helpfulness, without outside interference."

Constitutional Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, so many communications are being received in congressional mail dealing with the money question and proposing plans to improve the national monetary system, that I deem it appropriate to present in the RECORD an expression of my views on this vital issue, as stated in recent correspondence. There is inserted herewith a letter on this subject and my reply thereto:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 21, 1944.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I fail to see what the prosperity of a country has to do with a

money base of convertibility into gold or silver. The real nature of money is a medium of exchange for the goods and services (the wealth) of a nation in lieu of actual barter. The quality and amount of production integrates the standard of living, and necessitates, of course, a national fiscal policy. Naturally there can be no national fiscal policy where there is international control of the national money creation power.

When the Government loans (as under the Banking Act of 1863 and the Federal Reserve Act) money into circulation the base for such money is credit and debt. In my opinion the Government should "pay" all money into circulation according to the volume of consumer goods produced. How else can prices be honestly controlled for the benefit of the citizens of the United States (not for foreigners) except by controlling the volume of the currency proportionately to the volume of consumer goods? Production is the answer to starvation and misery, and scarcity is the answer of the O. P. A.

A very small amount of our money is now paid into circulation by the Government, and I can well see that those with sinister motives could hope to get that, too, away from us. Also this small amount is sometimes used to make people feel that all of our money now in circulation is of the same kind, that is paid into circulation by the Government.

If we are ever so fortunate as to have constitutional money as the founders intended, I fail to see how making it convertible into gold and silver is anything but a handle to the internationalists, for any commodity, including gold and silver, can be cornered by foreign nations at least to some extent if those foreign nations are in the hands of the internationalists. Then give the internationalists even a small handle and they will get a bigger one through international control of the weak nations and those off guard, pitting as many nations against each other as they are able to for their own private money creation power.

To my mind, money to be a medium of exchange must be based on the physical goods to be distributed. Until we face this issue, the fundamental one for our existence, we are a lost Nation given away to the rest of the world.

I hope you will not think that this letter is written in any spirit of being contentious.

Sincerely yours,

MARIE E. KENNEDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1944.

Mrs. MARIE E. KENNEDY,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MRS. KENNEDY: It is a pleasure to receive your letter of February 21, which I had placed in the preference file until the disposition could be made of pressing committee commitments and pending legislation.

The opportunity to exchange views with you on the money question is very much appreciated. The financial condition which followed the collapse of prices in 1929 should be the complete answer to your first observation—or lack of observation, as you express it.

This country had everything in the way of natural wealth, i. e., raw materials and manufacturing and distributing facilities in the years following the business depression of 1929 and 1930, that we had in the preceding years; and it had then, as now, the perfected banking and money-creating facilities devised and built up with so much painstaking care by the banking interests of this country, whose failure may be responsible for conditions pointed out by the pithy statements of Will Rogers at the time:

"Some writers are having a little trouble scraping up a reason for Thanksgiving this year. * * * The original idea was to give thanks for a bountiful harvest. Well, the 'bountiful harvest' is the very thing that's the matter with us. Too much wheat, too much corn, too much cotton, too much beef, too much production of everything. We are the first nation to starve to death in a storehouse that's overfilled with everything we want."

I may add to Will Rogers' observation—at the same time we were told, and the fact was accepted, that we had too much land and too many people. If all the expedients that have been found necessary by the Government to move and distribute the necessities of life to people able and willing to work—from the R. F. C. and its kindred financing organization down to the Surplus Commodity Corporation—did not demonstrate to your entire satisfaction the inefficiency and failure of our monetary system, "I fail to see" how these facts can be demonstrated without completely destroying our national economy.

I agree with you that if our money system is to be managed by any agency empowered to issue legal-tender paper money, that agency should be the Federal Government—and the Government issues should be paid into circulation, interest free, just as Treasury notes (so-called greenbacks) were created and placed in circulation by the administration of President Lincoln during the Civil War.

The only money that is now being paid into circulation by the Government, i. e., legal-tender silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars, is superior to bank-note money, as it has both the national credit and the equivalent in silver dollars behind it; and their creation and issuance is a source of profit to the Government that puts these silver certificates into circulation by paying them out in meeting Government expenses; and they are paid into circulation, interest free, and not loaned into circulation as bank-made money is in exchange for interest-bearing Government bonds or interest-bearing business notes (i. e., eligible paper). We did have constitutional money that bought for us Louisiana and Florida, financed the acquisition of Texas, California, and the Oregon Country—bought Alaska, developed this country in most progressive stages until the supply of the larger portion of our constitutional money was cut off in 1873 by the demonitization of silver. Later, constitutional money was completely replaced by bank-note paper money when gold was nationalized in 1934. The constitutional money you mention was provided by one of the first acts of Congress. I quote from the speech of Senator Cockrell, found on page 236 of part 3, volume 25 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "Congress by 'an act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,' approved April 2, 1792, exercised its constitutional power by establishing a mint and authorizing the coinage of gold, silver, and copper coins, and placed gold and silver upon a perfect equality, and gave to each unlimited coinage, and to the coins of each full legal tender in all payments, the gold coins to be eagles, half eagles, and quarter eagles of the declared value of ten, five, and two and one-half dollars, respectively, 11 parts pure gold to 1 of alloy; and the silver coin to be dollars or units, half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes, and made them all a full legal tender in payment of any and all sums.

"The weight of the gold in one dollar if coined would have been 27 grains standard and 24.75 pure, and the weight of the silver in the dollar or unit was 416 grains of standard and 371¼ grains pure, and the value of this silver dollar was to be that of the Spanish milled dollar then current."

The answer to your second observation, or failure of observation, is that in basing the value of money on the precious metal of recognized international value, money is largely freed from dependence on the credit of the several national governments—including the credit of our own Government—a plan which stabilizes money's international value, and tends to eliminate the inequality of international exchange. And, second, this plan provides for automatic control of the increase in the volume of money regulated to the production of the precious metals, and by using both gold and silver at a ratio of value fixed in relation to the quantity of production of each metal under the system you best provide for the necessary increase in the volume of money to keep pace with increasing population and growing commerce—estimated to increase at the rate of 3 percent annually. The use of gold alone as basic money fails to meet this requirement—silver and gold taken together come nearest to fulfilling this need for a gradual increase in the basic money volume. In periods when business conditions were favorable, the banks with the cooperation of the Government, have succeeded in making banknote paper currency work in place of silver, which was discontinued as money by demonetization, and this banknote money has sufficed the country's money needs until some financial disturbance caused a depression which impaired bank confidence and resulted in the withdrawal of banknote currency when money was most needed, with disastrous results.

The constitutional money of gold and silver as established by the First Congress has the advantage of being acceptable in international exchange at its recognized value. It has the advantage of freeing the control of the expansion and contraction of primary money from the management of any banking group; it has the advantage of being in existence and available for use as a measure of value as a medium of exchange, and the storage of wealth regardless of bank confidence and the quality of any nation's credit. It is a price stabilizer in time of financial stress; and the full use of both gold and silver as money at a fixed ratio of value is the only solution of the money question which has been pressing for solution ever since the banks invented interest-yielding national bank paper currency in the stress of the emergency of the Civil War, when the National Bank Act was made law.

I welcome the opportunity to exchange views with you on this most vital national issue.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, poor Finland is again between the devil and the bear.

There have been 3,565 Executive orders from March 4, 1933, to January 1, 1943.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY is the minority whip of the upper body after a year in the Capital. He is a natural.

After 150 years our country still maintains its three separate branches of government, on paper.—Cloakroom, March 4, 1939.

A woman constituent wrote that the G. O. P. should nominate for President

a bachelor or a widower.—Cloakroom, March 2, 1940.

The one "indispensable" head of our land has changed a majority of his Cabinet members in the middle of the stream.—Cloakroom, September 7, 1940.

The people of my district seriously fear a military dictatorship here more than an invasion by Hitler.—Cloakroom, September 19, 1941.

The House is beginning to realize that its intended function was to represent the people and not the President.—Cloakroom, November 13, 1941.

The McNary and Cullen funerals this week, with the cooling of the lava from last week's eruption, leaves Capitol Hill exceedingly sad and dull.

Texas—the Lone Star State—became an independent republic 108 years ago today and remained so for nearly 10 years, electing Presidents instead of Governors. Funny, how in the last few years she has tolerated so much dictation from above.

A Just and Honorable Peace for Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter are to be used as a broad plan for the prevention of future wars then we must start invoking those principles now. For if the settlement of permanent questions such as boundaries and the sovereignty of governments are concluded before the war finally ends in utter and complete disregard of the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter it will be difficult indeed to use it as a basic document when peace finally comes.

In connection with the settlement of the dispute between Finland and the Soviet Union the following language from the Atlantic Charter is clearly pertinent:

> First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.
>
> Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
>
> Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. * * *
>
> Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established in a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

This charter was adopted by representatives of the United States and British Governments and although not an original signatory to it the Soviet Union later acquiesced in and agreed to its objectives, and formally adhered to it by signing the United Nations joint declaratory January 1, 1942. In this joint declaration, it was provided among other things:

> Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the present attitude of the Soviet Union toward Finland and the other small nations does great violence to the principles of freedom of nations desiring to live at peace with one another. Finland had war thrust upon her. It was not of her choosing. She has at all times been ready to quit the war whenever she could have peace on just and honorable terms. No one could fairly expect her to do any less. Speaking of the wanton aggression upon Finland on February 11, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

> Here is a small republic in northern Europe. A republic which without any question whatever wishes solely to maintain its own territorial and governmental integrity. Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland had any ulterior designs on the integrity or the safety of the Soviet Union. * * * It has allied itself with another dictatorship and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union, a small nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy and a liberal forward-looking democracy at that.

In January of the same year, Prime Minister Churchill, voicing his abhorrence on what was happening to Finland said:

> Only Finland—superb, nay sublime—in the jaws of peril—Finland shows what free men can do. The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent. * * * We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left to civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death by the full brutish force of overwhelming numbers. If the light of freedom which still burns so brightly in the frozen north should be finally quenched, it might well herald a return to the dark ages, when every vestige of human progress during 2,000 years would be engulfed.

These statements are as true today as they were in 1940. Yet there are forces in this country who would have us believe there is some justification to the demands of the Soviet Union. They would have us believe that since Russia is an ally, it is perfectly justifiable for her to dictate the boundary lines and control the government, as well as the lives and destiny of the people of that gallant little nation. There are those who think it perfectly justifiable for Russia to subjugate the sovereignty of Finland and make it a part of the Soviet Union. But in my humble way, Mr. Speaker, I desire to voice protest against any such inequitable procedure.

We all hesitate to criticize this conduct on the part of Russia who is now an ally in this conflict. But whether friend or foe, Mr. Speaker, we cannot condone or approve the arbitrary subjugation of a small nation and people by the government of a larger and stronger nation. Under the Atlantic Charter, and by common consent of all free governments, no specific form of government can be rightfully forced upon any country, large or small, without the consent of the people of such nations freely expressed.

The question of national boundaries involves the settlement of permanent policies. It involves policies which should be fixed and determined by the peace conference at the end of hostilities when all victorious nations can sit together and amicably arrive at fair and just terms.

If Russia or any other of our allies shall be permitted to make final peace treaties before the end of hostilities then what situation will each of the small countries of Europe find themselves in?

What will be the situation with respect to Finland if this policy is to be pursued and acquiesced in by us? America has never had a more honest and loyal friend than the Republic of Finland. Our friendly relations over the years have proven this conclusively. Is it fair or honest on our part to be silent while the Soviet Union makes a one-sided peace treaty with Finland which might destroy the territorial integrity of that country and its free institutions? No one in a free country would sanction unilateral peace treaties between other nations where all parties concerned were not given an opportunity to be heard. We would not permit our enemies to act in any such manner, Mr. Speaker, and in my judgment we should not permit our allies to do it without as much as raising our voices in protest.

If peace is to be concluded between Russia and Finland and some of the other smaller nations before hostilities end on other fronts wherein final and permanent policies and commitments are involved, then such negotiations should proceed in accordance with the terms and spirit of the Atlantic Charter. No nation, friend or foe, should be permitted to arbitrarily dictate peace terms to any other nation. If there is going to be international cooperation to keep peace between nations after the war, such international cooperation should be a factor in any peace treaty concluded from now on. If we cannot cooperate with, or if we cannot secure the cooperation of our allies, in peace arrangements which are concluded during the progress of the war, how can it reasonably be expected that we will secure such cooperation when hostilities finally and completely end?

Need for Additional Transcontinental Air-Line Service to New England States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was sent to me by the clerk to the

City Council, City of Boston, Mass., urging that the New England States be given additional transcontinental air-line service:

Whereas New England is today being unwittingly discriminated against in the issuance of transcontinental air-line certificates; and

Whereas there does not exist in the entire United States a situation in air transportation comparable to that of New England generally, and Boston in particular; of the five largest metropolitan areas in America—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Boston—only Boston is so isolated as to be served by only one transcontinental air line; and

Whereas Washington, which was also served by but one transcontinental air line, has had its situation rectified by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board so as to enjoy today the facilities of all the transcontinental air lines; and

Whereas this situation is working to the detriment of New England's commercial and industrial development: Be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Boston demand that the Civil Aeronautics Board grant permits to competing transcontinental air lines to bring all communities in New England up to an equal footing with all other comparable communities in the United States.

Tom Cullen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, having enjoyed a close personal friendship with TOM CULLEN since he became a Member of this House, I share the sorrow that has come to his family.

TOM CULLEN was devoted to the success of his country. Born and raised in the city of Brooklyn, his interest in the success of the farmer was as great as his interest in the success of those who resided in the urban centers. He was a national, not a local, legislator. Time and again I have seen him assist in passing legislation of little benefit to those he represented. No higher tribute can be paid him than to say he was respected by all who knew him.

Not only his city and State, but the Nation, has lost an outstanding public servant.

Federal Land Banks and Land Bank Commissioner

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has been giving and will continue to give considerable study to agricultural credit and will from time to time submit legislation on that subject.

Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans closed in 1943 were 33,208 in number for a total of $92,397,244, an increase of 10.5 percent in number and 12 percent in amount over 1942. Of these, 13,025 were joint land-bank and Commissioner loans. Both number and dollar volume of new loans closed were smaller than in 7 of the previous 10 years, exceeding only 1938, 1939, and 1942.

Repayments of principal were $427,119,112, an increase of $124,107,653, or 41 percent, over 1942. Repayments were $4.62 for each $1 of new loans made during the year. Principal payments included $242,447,618, representing payment in full before maturity of 160,902 loans, an increase of 64.7 percent over 1942. Payments in full were 2.62 times the dollar volume of new loans made.

On December 31, 1943, there were outstanding 801,061 Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, aggregating $1,764,127,623. This represented a net decrease of 14.5 percent in number and 16.6 percent in amount during the year. Land-bank loans decreased 15.3 percent in dollar volume; Land Bank Commissioner loans, 20.7 percent. On December 31, 1943, all matured installments were paid on 92.5 percent of the land-bank loans, and 90.8 percent of the Land Bank Commissioner loans, compared with 89 and 87.4 percent, respectively, a year earlier. The proportion of Federal land-bank loans with all matured installments paid was higher than at any year end since 1925.

The land banks acquired 1,434 farms and sheriff's certificates during the year, compared with 3,480 in 1942. Acquirements were smaller than in any year since 1925. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation acquired 1,983 farms, compared to 3,330 in 1942. On December 31, the land banks held 3,636 farms, compared with 8,339 a year earlier. Similar figures for the Corporation were 2,423 and 4,057. Land-bank holdings were the smallest since 1925.

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

Loans and discounts during the calendar year 1943 aggregated $927,435,580, an increase of 13.7 percent over 1942, being the largest total in any year since the banks were established in 1923. Of the total credit extended, $604,253,538, or 65.2 percent, was to production credit associations; $94,961,910, or 10.2 percent, to privately capitalized financing institutions; $223,220,132, or 24.1 percent, to banks for cooperatives; and $5,000,000, or 0.5 percent, direct loans to cooperative associations.

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

The 12 district banks and the Central Bank for Cooperatives made advances to cooperative associations of agricultural producers during 1943 amounting to $398,581,320, and purchased Commodity Credit Corporation paper from cooperatives amounting to $68,875,888, making a total of $467,457,208, compared with $252,379,499, $87,136,622, and $339,516,121, respectively, in 1942. On December 31, 1943, loans were outstanding to 1,388 associations for a total of $271,258,083, of which $36,084,173 represented C. C. C. paper. This total was 21.8 percent greater than that outstanding December 31, 1942, and was the largest on any month end since the banks were organized in 1933.

PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

In 1943 the production credit associations made 230,735 loans for a total of $501,211,688, a decrease of 2.3 percent in number and an increase of 4.9 percent in amount, compared with 1942. On December 31 the associations had 138,315 loans outstanding amounting to $198,734,411 compared with 142,471 loans for $184,662,139 outstanding a year earlier. Class B—active member-borrowers—stockholders at the end of 1943 numbered 278,029, which was 3.4 percent more than at the end of 1942.

EMERGENCY CROP AND FEED LOANS

Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Offices closed 121,335 loans in 1943 for $19,269,945, decreases of 11.9 percent in number and 2.1 percent in amount from 1942. Collections of principal, including 1934–35 drought feed loans, were $28,171,516, or $1.46 for each $1 of new loans made. Interest collections were $3,865,766, making total collections during the year of $32,037,282. Collections of principal and interest on loans made in 1936 and prior years, including drought feed loans, were $12,336,049. Total number of loans outstanding was reduced by 4.4 percent during the year, and total dollar volume by 5.8 percent.

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS

The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., under a special wartime program, made 108,820 loans amounting to $65,358,621 in the first 6 months of 1943, of which 52,296 loans for $29,073,019 were outstanding on December 31. On that date, there were also outstanding 996 other loans totaling $2,974,010. These totals were made up of 653 loans with balances of $2,678,298 in the Wenatchee-Okanogan area in the State of Washington—a continuing program of financing the fruit industry there; 329 loans for $270,557, representing outstanding balances from the 1932–34 R. A. C. C. loan program; and 14 loans in Florida and Oklahoma for $25,155 made since July 1, 1943, under the restricted operations of R. A. C. C. prescribed in section 2 of the Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1944.

Soldiers' Vote Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my view that the agreement reached by the conferees on the soldiers' vote bill means the disfranchisement of millions

in the armed forces. As I have repeatedly stated, I favor a simple law, removing just as much red tape as possible to guarantee the right of suffrage to all who are wearing the uniform of the United States in this war regardless of whether they be in this country or abroad.

I have talked to members of the armed forces who have been overseas, some in the Pacific and some in Europe. They told me frankly if the Members of Congress realized just exactly what conditions exist when men are at the front, they would reach the conclusion that there was little time for them or their officers to devote to carrying out provisions of such a law as is proposed. Men cannot be called back from the front, they said, for such purposes.

Everyone I spoke to favored a Federal ballot, but one noncommissioned officer made a suggestion which I felt is worth considering. The suggestion was that either the Congress or the States provide that the men and women in the armed forces be furnished with a Federal ballot and on that Federal ballot at the bottom would be space that would enable them to say whether or not they desired to vote a straight Democratic or Republican ballot, and if they did so express such a desire, their ballot should be counted in favor of the party candidates that they endorsed and that includes not only Federal candidates but State, county, and city candidates.

I do not think there is an individual in the United States who can with any degree of accuracy say just how many different ballots are printed. In a recent speech Senator KILGORE of West Virginia said that there were 350 magisterial districts in his State, each with a different ballot. He said that Rhode Island, the smallest State in the Union, had 100 different ballots, and he contended, and he was not corrected, that Illinois has 12,000 different ballots. In my own State, Missouri, we have 34 State senators, one-half elected every 2 years, and we have nearly 150 State representatives as well as 13 Congressmen. Aside from that, consider the large number of candidates from constable up, including our county and circuit judges as well as county officials. We have 114 counties and the city of St. Louis within the boundaries of Missouri, each having a separate set of county and city officials. In my own congressional district, which is located entirely within the city of St. Louis, there are any number of different ballots. The citizens on one side of the street do not always vote for the same district candidates as the citizens on the other side of the street, because that street might be a dividing line. We have any number of justices of the peace and constables with separate districts, State senators with separate districts, as well as State representatives with separate districts, each district requiring a different ballot.

I was in hopes, Mr. Speaker, that our conferees could come to an agreement that would not disfranchise those that are fighting for the preservation of our country, but it seems that this is impossible. When those wearing the uniform learn of the action of Congress on this legislation, it will not in any way improve the morale of the service.

Relations Between the Executive and the Legislative Branches of Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the relations between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government must be improved if there is to continue even pretended cooperation. If the legislative branch cannot be coequal with the executive branch, then one will have to pass out of the picture and the people called upon to determine for themselves the question as to whether they want to be governed by law or by men.

The question of the right of employees of the Government under direction of the Chief Executive to decline to furnish documents and papers to and to testify before investigating committees of the Congress is now constantly arising and is one on which some understanding must be reached between the Congress and the President. This same question arose during the administration of President Washington, and on the subject Mr. Jefferson made this statement:

> At a meeting of the Cabinet the subject (of discussion) was the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 27, to appoint a committee to inquire into the causes of the failure of the late expedition under Major General St. Clair, with power to call for such persons, papers and records as may be necessary to assist their inquiries. The President (Washington) said he had called us to consult, merely because it was the first example, and he wished that so far as it should become a precedent, in should be rightly conducted. He neither acknowledged nor denied, nor even doubted the propriety of what the House were doing, for he had not thought upon it, nor was acquainted with subjects of this kind. He could readily conceive there might be papers of so secret a nature as that they ought not to be given up. (The Cabinet was not then ready to give their opinions, but another meeting was held 2 days later when) we had all considered and were of one mind: 1. That the House was an inquest, and, therefore, might institute inquiries. 2. That it might call for papers generally. 3. That the Executive ought to communicate such papers as the public good would permit, and ought to refuse those, the disclosure of which would injure the public. Consequently, (they) were to exercise discretion. 4. That neither the committee nor the House had a right to call on the head of a department, who and whose papers were under the President alone; but that the committee should instruct their chairman to move the House to address the President. * * * Hamilton agreed with us in all these points except as to the power of the House to call on the heads of departments. He observed, that as to his Department, the act constituting it had made it subject to Congress in some points, but he thought himself not so far subject, as to be obliged to produce all papers they might call for. They might demand secrets of a very mischievous nature. * * * I observed here a difference between the British Parliament and our Congress, that the former was a legislature, an inquest, and a council for the king. The latter was, by the Constitution, a legislature and an inquest but not a council. (It was) finally agreed, to speak (separately) to the members of the committee, and bring them by persuasion into the right channel. It was agreed in this case, that there was not a paper which might not be properly produced, that copies only should be sent, with an assurance, that if they should desire it, a clerk should attend with the originals to be verified by themselves.

Production of Ammunition for Civilian Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Conservation Department of the State of Wisconsin:

> THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
> CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
> *Madison, February 26, 1944.*
>
> Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Mr. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, House of Representatives, has advised this department of the tentative program of production of ammunition for civilian use in 1944 subject to approval of the War Department Board.
>
> We are informed that the schedule now authorizes during the first 6 months of the current year only 26 percent of the pre-war normal production of shotgun shells.
>
> Last year representatives of the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service met with representatives of the War Production Board on this question. A very limited amount of ammunition was released, and for the most part too late to be of benefit to many Wisconsin hunters. Methods of distribution were inequitable.
>
> The people of Wisconsin feel strongly that we should have a larger production of shotgun shells for civilian use this fall if they can be furnished without interfering with the war effort. This feeling is based on three things:
>
> 1. The necessity of controlling wildlife damage to crops, livestock, and poultry.
>
> 2. The value of hunting relaxation to approximately 300,000 Wisconsin citizens.
>
> 3. Consideration of the millions of pounds of meat that are utilized annually during the Wisconsin hunting seasons.
>
> We wish to emphasize that we should like to have the larger production asked for only if it can be furnished without interference with the war effort.
>
> The importance of securing fairly large stocks of ammunition in sufficient time to be

of use and equitably distributed should be emphasized to the War Production Board. Any means that you can take to do this will, I know, be deeply appreciated by the people of this State.

Very truly yours,

E. J. VANDERWALL,
Conservation Director.

Three Messages in a Row Spell President's Disdain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks given in the House, I include an article by Daniel M. Kidney, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in many newspapers, including the New York World-Telegram, on February 24, 1944.

The matter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, February 24.—President Roosevelt's disdain for Congress has been spelled out by him in three messages sent to Capitol Hill within the last 30 days.

The first was January 26, when he demanded as Commander in Chief a Federal ballot for soldier voting.

Here are some excerpts which aroused congressional ire: "The need for new legislation is evident if we are really sincere—and not merely rendering lip service to our soldiers and sailors * * *.

"Some people—I am sure with their tongues in their cheeks—say that the solution to this problem is simply that the respective States improve their own absentee-ballot machinery.

"In fact there is now pending before the House of Representatives a meaningless bill, passed by the Senate December 3, 1943, which presumes to meet this complicated and difficult situation by some futile language."

FRAUD ON SOLDIERS

"I consider such proposed legislation a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines. * * * It is a fraud upon the American people * * *."

Last Friday, he sent a veto message on the antisubsidy bill which contained these reflections on Congress:

"The reasons for my disapproval of H. R. 3744—my most emphatic and vigorous disapproval—must already be known to every Senator and every Representative.

"The bill presented to me would destroy the stabilization program. I cannot accept responsibility for its disastrous consequences. I hope the Congress will not compel these consequences."

His masterpiece of vituperation was read in the House on February 22. Here are some extracts from the tax veto message which caused patient Majority Leader BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky, to explode and fight back:

RELIEF FOR THE GREEDY

"I regret that I find it necessary in the midst of this great war to be compelled to do this in what I regard as the public interest. * * * It is not a tax bill but a tax-relief bill providing relief, not for the needy, but for the greedy * * *.

"It has been suggested by some that I should give my approval to this bill on the ground that having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust.

"I might have done so if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials."

NOT TREASURY'S FAULT

"The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income-tax payers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified accountants cannot interpret them.

"No; it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear."

The day after the soldier-vote message was sent to the Hill, Representative FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, addressed the House on the subject Let the President Lead With Temperate Speech.

Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, had just urged more temperate language in House discussions of the soldier-vote bill, to which Mr. CASE replied:

"In all sincerity, and with all respect, I want to suggest to the majority leader that he convey that suggestion to the Chief Executive.

"Unity is not commanded and will never be produced in this country by name calling.

"Unity will never be produced by proclaiming that all those who are opposed to you take their positions with their tongues in their cheeks, are economic royalists, or whatever other title seems to most discredit them at the time.

"We can have unity in this country, we can prosecute the war with one mind, when there is leadership that respects and directs its appeals to the common sense and the fair-mindedness that exist in the average American citizen."

Simplification of Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina Legislature. I think every Member of Congress has made a desperate effort to compel the Internal Revenue Department and the Treasury Department officials to simplify the income-tax forms. I doubt if there is 1 percent of the Members of Congress who will be able to file their income-tax returns without the assistance of a C. P. A., and we should let the executive department know that the people throughout the country are dissatisfied with the complicated forms that they are required to file with the internal revenue collector this year.

I am delighted to join with other Members of Congress in bringing pressure to bear on the officials who have the responsibility of framing these forms, in an effort to see that they are simplified as soon as possible.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide that United States income-tax returns be simplified

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to provide means whereby the United States income-tax returns may be simplified; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of South Carolina's Representatives in Congress.

Bank of International Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1943, I introduced a resolution to authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to make an investigation of the Bank of International Settlements and addressed the House on that same date giving certain facts and asking certain questions about this bank.

It is my great fear that this international financial institution, in which even at this day German financiers sit down with Americans and British on the board of directors, and the controlling stock of which is held by banks under Hitler's control, contains the greatest danger to the real cause for which American men are today fighting on the battlefields of the world.

As a further warning to the Congress and to our country I include with my remarks herewith three articles appearing recently in the New York Post on the subject of the Bank of International Settlements, and I implore the Members of the House to read these articles with care:

[From the New York Post of February 2, 1944]

HOW NAZI MONEY BARONS PULL WIRES TO RULE PEACE

(By Tabitha Petran)

Germany's barons of industry and finance have made known to certain British and American bankers the terms of a peace plan under which the Nazi capitalists would retain power after Germany's defeat.

Under this plan British and American industrial-financial groups would gain joint ownership of German industry with the present owners; and the German industrialists and financiers would get a free hand in choosing the political leaders of post-war Germany and the right to maintain an armed police force to keep "order."

The plans of German bankers and businessmen to avoid the consequences of military defeat are closely related to similar plans in preparation by the Reichswehr and the Nazi Party. The machinery to put the plans of all three groups into operation the moment the Nazi regime goes down has already been set up.

The plan for which German industry and finance seeks to win the support of similar groups in the United States and Britain is referred to as the Schacht plan.

It is said to provide also that Britain and America allow Germany for a period of about 5 years an armed police force of from 400,000 to 500,000 men which, collaborating with the Allies, would insure that neither the "red" armies nor internal revolution threaten the stability of the new regime or the ownership of German industry and finance.

SCHACHT PLAN IS BORN

The so-called Schacht plan was prepared by the German World Economic Society—Deutsche Weltwirtschaftliche Gesellschaft—which was put in charge of preparing peace settlements for the industrial-financial group and of conveying these proposals to appropriate circles in Britain and the United States when the certainty of Germany's military defeat became apparent.

Last year at just about the time the Schacht plan was readied for feelers abroad, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, German Minister of Finance, conveniently moved one of his residences to Zurich, Switzerland, an hour's train ride from Basle, home of the Bank of International Settlements, and present residence of Schacht's old friend, Thomas H. McKittrick, American president of the B. I. S., of whom Dr. Harry White, monetary adviser to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, said in a press conference November 23, 1943: "There's an American president [of the B. I. S.], an American president doing business with Germans while the American soldiers are fighting German soldiers."

FIFTH COLUMN OF IMPERIALISM

The men in the inner circle of the German World Economic Society are prominent in the B. I. S. The key figures of German industry and finance are the Nazi representatives in the B. I. S. and at the same time members of the German Society. Dr. Schacht is a former director of the B. I. S.

The German World Economic Society was set up just before the last war, in April 1914, as a fifth column of imperialism by the German equivalent of the National Association of Manufacturers—Reichsverband der Deutschen Industrie. The society was revived from the moribund state it had fallen into after the last war when the Nazi geopolitician Karl Haushofer became a member in the early thirties.

Under Haushofer's direction, the society, working closely with the International Chamber of Commerce in Paris, embarked on a program of industrial and financial espionage especially in Britain, France, Belgium, and Italy and of establishing friends and contacts in these countries. German members of the I. C. C. and the society were the main fifth column in France, making the secret agreements with the French financiers and businessmen who betrayed the Republic.

FARBEN IS CHIEF POWER

The most powerful members of this society, author of the Schacht plan, today hold positions in the Bank of International Settlements, a veritable League of Nations of international high finance, which was founded in 1930 to fulfill loan functions incident to the Young plan for resuscitating Germany.

Chief power of the society is I. G. Farben Industrie, whose cartel arrangements are world-wide. Dr. Hermann Schmitz, president of I. G. Farben, is a key member of the society and a director of the B. I. S.

One of the most powerful bankers in Germany is Kurt Freiherr von Schroeder, of Cologne, a promoter of Hitler and the Nazi Party. Von Schroeder is a director of the B. I. S. and a member of the society's inner circle.

WHITE EXPLAINS B. I. S. ROLE

Dr. White, who declared that the B. I. S.'s American president, McKittrick, is now "doing business with Germans," made that statement in answer to a question whether the B. I. S. would figure in plans for a post-war international currency and world bank, as had been proposed a few days before by Leon Fraser, former president of the B. I. S. and now president of the First National Bank of New York, the American bank in the B. I. S. White said:

"The Bank of International Settlements has no significance with respect to this. The Bank of International Settlements right now is German-controlled, anyway, and it operates. Germany is anxious to keep it alive because she hopes to use it as an instrumentality for getting back into financial power, and she is being very nice to the bank, but she votes the shares, of course, of the countries she occupies—in effect, though not nominally—and she thinks it is a good instrument to have when peace comes."

AXIS-ALLIED MEETINGS DENIED

According to charges made in the British and American press, the board of directors of the B. I. S., comprising representatives from Axis and Allied countries, have sat down together at Basle at the annual general meeting of the B. I. S. each June since the war began.

These charges have been officially denied. But the statutes of the bank define the annual general meeting as one attended by its voting members and state that the only voting members are the board of directors. The 1942 annual report of the B. I. S., in possession of the Post, is headed: "Twelfth annual report of the president of the Bank for International Settlements to the annual general meeting held at Basle, June 8, 1942."

The B. I. S. is still doing business in Basle. President McKittrick travels between the United States and Axis-surrounded Switzerland. His permanent staff in Basle is composed largely of Axis men.

The Nazis could use the B. I. S. as a convenient avenue for the presentation of the Schacht plan to interested Allied circles. McKittrick, for instance, can communicate regularly with Montagu Norman, a director of the B. I. S. and governor of the Bank of England.

BANKER IS BIG INDUSTRIALIST

The enormous importance that the B. I. S. has for the peace plans of German industry and finance is evident from the powerful position that the Nazi representatives in the B. I. S. hold in the German industrial-financial set-up.

Banker von Schroeder is on the board of directors of at least a dozen of the big iron and steel companies of Germany, is vice president of the board of directors of the Reich's railways, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the Rhineland and of the German Commercial Credit Bank, managing director of numerous other industrial concerns. His Cologne Bank is the bank of German heavy industry. I. G. Farben, whose president is a director of the B. I. S. and a member of the German Society, is the most powerful corporation in Germany.

Nazi bank member of the B. I. S. is Germany's central bank, the Reichsbank, whose president, Dr. Funk, is a B. I. S. director.

RUN BY NAZI MINISTRY

The German Society, whose inner circle includes also the heads of the German Chamber of Commerce and Industry, of the Association of Iron Manufacturers, and of the Krupp works, is under the direction of the Nazi Ministry of Economy. One of its officers is Hans Erich Posse, Under Secretary of the Economic Ministry, an old-time Weimar official with good contacts in England. Dr. Kurt Wiedenfeld, economic adviser to the Foreign Affairs Ministry, is also a member.

[From the New York Post of February 3, 1944]

KEY NAMES IN NAZI PEACE PLOT AND BRITISH BANKING CONTACTS

(By Tabitha Petran)

Through the Bank of International Settlements at Basle, the German World Economic Society, an organization of Germany's biggest industrialists and financiers, is believed to be in touch with a powerful financial group in England which before the war was identified with appeasement and a pro-German policy.

The German society, as the Post reported yesterday, has prepared the Schacht plan, for which it is seeking support in Allied financial circles. This plan, so far as is known, offers the United States and Britain joint ownership with the present owners of German industry in return for a guaranty that Germany's financial leaders shall choose the political leaders of post-war Germany and that the new German regime shall be permitted an armed police force to keep order.

There is evidence that the German society is trying to push this plan through the Bank of International Settlements in Basle and that Germany places no difficulties in the way of communications between those connected with the B. I. S. in Axis-surrounded Switzerland and London.

CONTACT EFFORTS REPORTED

This German group, whose key figures include the Nazi banker Kurt von Schroeder of Cologne, and the president of I. G. Farben industries, Dr. Herman Schmitz, is reportedly trying to contact in England Frank C. Tiarks, a partner in the international banking house, J. Henry Schroeder & Co. of London.

Schroeder of Cologne, one of the biggest financiers in Germany, and Dr. Schmitz are directors of the B. I. S.

Tiarks was until 1939, at least, one of about 200 honorary non-German members of the German World Economic Society, and contributed articles to the society's publications. The owner of J. Henry Schroeder & Co. of London is related to the Nazi banker, Kurt von Schroeder of Cologne.

The B. I. S. is today doing business in Basle. Its permanent staff is composed of an American president, Thomas H. McKittrick, and six financial figures from Axis or Axis-occupied countries. One of the members of this permanent staff in Basle, the assistant general manager, Paul Hechler, is vice president of the Reichsbank, Germany's central bank.

MONTAGU NORMAN MENTIONED

Who are the powerful British financial figures who might be contacted through the B. I. S. by Baron Kurt von Schroeder and Dr. Schmitz, of I. G. Farben, directors of the B. I. S. and representatives of the inner circle of the German World Economic Society?

One is Montagu Norman, a British director of the B. I. S., one of the chief architects of Britain's pre-war policy of buying off the Nazis, a close personal friend of Dr. Schacht, who is living in Zurich, and governor of the Bank of England.

Another is Sir Otto Niemeyer, also a director of the B. I. S., a director of the Bank of England, considered second only to Norman in power, and also identified with Britain's pre-war appeasement policy. And the possible means of contact in this financial stratosphere that floats above national boundaries?

Paul Hechler, vice president of the Nazi Reichsbank, who is now serving on McKittrick's permanent staff in Basle, is an old-time protégé of Niemeyer's and Norman's.

LONG-TIME CONNECTIONS

What are the connections between the individuals whom Baron von Schroeder and Dr. Schmitz are trying to reach in the interests of the powerful German World Economic So-

ciety and between these individuals and German finance itself?

J. Henry Schroder & Co., of London, in which Frank Tiarks is a partner, did business for many years with the Schroeder banks of Cologne and Hamburg. It was the bridge between London's "city" and heavy industries of western Germany—strongly represented, by the way, in the German World Economic Society.

Baron von Schroeder, who until his death in 1940, was senior partner of the London Schroder bank and chairman of the board of its New York branch, J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation, of New York, was a kinsman of Baron Kurt von Schroeder. Present head of both the London and New York companies is Baron Bruno's son, Helmut W. B. Schroder, a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship before the war.

TIARKS' CONNECTIONS

Tiarks, partner of the London Schroder firm and one of the directors of the New York branch, is also a director of the Bank of England, the British bank in the B. I. S. Tiarks was a member, too, of the Anglo-German Fellowship.

Concrete evidence of actual negotiations and contacts between these potentates of international high finance is, of course, practically impossible to obtain.

However, it is interesting that Sir Aukland Geddes, chairman of the board of the Rio Tinto Co., London, owners of the Spanish Rio Tinto mines, is reported to have been in Spain within the last 2 months and in touch with German businessmen, including Georg von Schnitzler, a director of I. G. Farben. Schnitzler, who until Pearl Harbor was in charge of I. G.'s American business, moved his residence to Madrid 6 months ago and has made trips from there to Lisbon and Switzerland.

Geddes is the father-in-law of the Prince of Hesse. Before the war Geddes was closely connected with the General Metal Corporation of Frankfurt, which, with the Rio Tinto Co., constituted the European Pyrite Co.

[From the New York Post of February 4, 1944]

SCHACHT IS NAZIS' DOVE OF PEACE

(By Tabitha Petran)

Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, financial wizard of the Nazi regime, is slated for a top role in the plans of German financiers and businessmen who hope to enlist the aid of Allied bankers in securing peace terms which will leave them in power after Germany's defeat.

Dr. Schacht, former president of the Nazi Reichsbank and former director of the Bank for International Settlement at Basle, made many warm friendships in Britain and the United States during his years as Hitler's economic ambassador.

Schacht, it is believed, is being held in reserve by the powerful German interests represented in the German World Economic Society, while he undergoes whitewashing to make him presentable for use at a strategic moment.

OUSTED FROM PARTY

Following a report in December 1942 that Schacht had been named head of Hitler's peace negotiation office, dispatches from neutral capitals have reported Schacht ousted from the Nazi Party and Hitler's confidence, stripped of all official functions.

Schacht, who now has a residence in Zurich, was recently reported by the Algiers radio as about to succeed Ribbentrop as Foreign Minister. This rumor was branded by a former colleague of Schacht's, Dr. Max Immanuel, now in Washington, as a trial balloon preliminary to a peace offensive from Germany. Dr. Immanuel described Hitler "as relying on Dr. Schacht's friendship with businessmen in the United States and Great Britain to facilitate possible attempts at negotiation for an arranged peace."

CONTACT THROUGH LISBON

Dr. Immanuel recently wrote in the New York Times:

"In the past 2 months the general director of I. G. Farben, Hermann Schmitz, on behalf of Dr. Schacht, communicated with Lisbon friends, and they got in touch with New York bankers in the interests of peace."

Schacht became director of the B. I. S. in Basle the same year that Leon Fraser, now president of the First National Bank of New York, became its president. Fraser was president of the B. I. S. from 1933 to 1935, following a 3-year term as director. First National is the American bank in the B. I. S.

WARM RELATIONS

Of Fraser's relations with Dr. Schacht, Matthew Josephson wrote in a New Yorker profile, February 21, 1942:

"His relations with Schacht, perhaps the second most powerful man in the Nazi regime until Hitler demoted him in 1939, were warm and personal and the two men corresponded with each other until about a year ago."

Communications between potentates of international high finance which even in wartime tends to operate above national boundaries cannot be verified, but it is clear that such communications are possible.

SWISS BANKER'S ROLE

For example, in November 1943 there arrived in the United States Rudolf Ernst, Jr., the son of the director of one of the biggest Swiss banks, Swiss Banking Corporation. This bank and another, the Credit Suisse, had established offices in New York in the summer of 1939. These two Swiss banks do business with many of the most powerful German industries.

Swiss Banking Corporation is one of the chief banks of the Swiss I. G. Farben, which was exposed in hearings before the Truman committee as a subsidiary of the German I. G. Schmitz' right-hand man, Georg von Schnitzler, who, as director of I. G.'s American business until Pearl Harbor, came to the United States almost every year and had many friends here, now has headquarters in Madrid from whence he travels to Lisbon and Switzerland.

Ernst, Jr., came here officially on problems relating to a Treasury regulation requiring foreign banks to register customers of accounts held here.

CONFIDENTIAL MISSION

Ernst Jr. is believed to have been entrusted with the confidential mission of talking over with American bankers the points of view and proposals of German big business and finance as outlined in the Schacht plan.

The Swiss Banking Corporation with which Ernst is connected has been very useful to Nazi business. Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge brought this out in testimony before the Kilgore committee in December 1943, relating to the indictment of the Schering Corporation of Bloomfield, N. J., as a tool of the Nazi trust, A. G. Schering, of Berlin. Berge termed the transaction by which the Swiss Banking Corporation "got apparent control" of the Schering Corporation of Bloomfield "a mere sham to make it appear that the American corporation was controlled from Switzerland rather than from Germany."

Berge also pointed out that the Swiss bank similarly aided the Nazi cartel in England.

GOT SCHRODER LOAN

The J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation of New York, American branch of the London Schroder bank, made a loan to and was banker for the Schering Corporation of Bloomfield. Schroder of New York like Schroder of London had close relations before the war with Nazi banks, industry, and cartels.

German big business and finance, organized in the German World Economic Society, is at present feeling out the ground to lay a basis for favorable terms when peace comes.

Nazi businessmen have been greatly encouraged by the friendly policy Britain and the United States have shown in north Africa and Italy to business promoters and financiers of fascism and especially by such developments as the appointment of Guido Jung, Mussolini's finance minister for 6 years, a lesser Schacht, as Badoglio's finance minister. Jung represented Mussolini at international conferences just as Schacht represented Hitler.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo Times of March 2, 1944:

NEW DEALERS SETTLE FOR PART OF ARMY VOTE

It appears the administration is going to get a compromise Federal ballot through after all.

Most States fought the Federal ballot for soldiers. The handling of ballots comes strictly within State's rights. The Federal Government has no election rights. This is why there was so much protest against the administration's plan to vote the soldiers.

The administration has not lost its case entirely. The compromise seems to be that all States will have the right to accept or reject the Federal write-in ballot for soldiers.

The Federal ballot, if approved, will be used only in those States in which the Governors certify by August 1 that the Federal ballot is acceptable.

The Federal ballot, as agreed in the compromise, can be used to augment the State absentee ballot with the consent of Governors. Pro-New Deal Governors will accept it. But there are plenty of Republican Governors who will make every effort to get their own absentee ballots into the hands of soldiers to edge out the Federal ballot.

Service men and women must swear they have applied for State absentee ballots and have not received them before they can be given the Federal ballot.

The administration apparently is willing to accept such Federal ballot votes as it can get. Getting as many as possible will be better than none at all.

The Federal soldier ballot is a pro-New Deal ballot any way you measure it. The soldiers will be asked to vote for or against their commander in chief. According to Army discipline, drilled into every soldier from the day of induction, he is taught to please his superior officers.

Ousting the Commander in Chief, in the mind of a well-trained soldier, would be regarded as disrespectful. President Roosevelt will get the lion's share of the soldier vote.

If the States are on their toes and speed up the printing and distribution of the absentee ballots, they can block off some of the effect of the New Deal Federal ballots. But the problem has been made equally difficult for the States. They may distribute their ballots, and the distribution will be in the hands

of the Federal Government and the armed forces.

It will be well to watch New Deal campaigning among the soldiers. Campaign literature, radio broadcasts in the guise of official messages from the Commander in Chief, increased food rations and many other means available to Mr. Roosevelt must not be used.

We have been through three New Deal campaigns before, and everyone knows they do not miss a single election trick.

Plight of the Independent Oilman

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the independent oilman is still being driven to bankruptcy by the Government. Sales representing millions of dollars by independent oilmen, big and little, are going on each week—sales of valuable property which the independents desire to retain, but cannot. The sales are being made to the major companies, so the drift toward a monopoly is inevitable.

The independent oilmen who discovered most of the oil resources in the United States are being penalized for this effort by their Government in the O. P. A.'s stubborn, idiotic refusal to permit them to have a price that will enable them to live.

The bill we passed in the House to correct this evil is sleeping peacefully in the Senate committee under the ban of the administration. The other body is dutifully obeying.

In spite of the fact that in America there are 10,000 miles of wedge belts like the Joiner formation in east Texas, capable in many instances of producing vast quantities of oil remaining to be explored, bureaucratic stupidity keeps the independent oilman at the bottom of the list of all commodities in price.

Notwithstanding the vast resources in North and South America, yet to be explored for oil, the administration is doggedly furnishing to three great oil companies, who have plenty of money of their own, the vast sum of $150,000,000 for the building of a 1,200-mile pipe line in Iraq and Iran. It cannot be completed for 3 years, if then. The companies have the money to build the pipe line. What they want is assurance that the United States Government will enforce their concession by force of arms if necessary. This presents an international problem, but the proponents of the deal insist that the Senate of the United States has no right under its treaty ratifying power to have a voice in this international deal.

Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest statements of the independent oilman's plight is stated in an article entitled "Good-bye Oil" by Frank R. Ford of the Evansville (Ind.) Press reproduced in the Washington News. It reads as follows:

GOOD-BYE OIL

(By Frank R. Ford, editor of the Evansville Press)

EVANSVILLE, IND., February 25.—An oil-man friend of mine is pumping 17 wells in this area. Best 1 produces 10 barrels a day; worst, 3.

Recently he was pumping 19 wells. The 2 others made 7 barrels between them. Both of these have been pulled and plugged; out of production forever.

"We're running out of oil," says President Roosevelt. Our Government plans to spend one hundred and thirty to one hundred and sixty-five million dollars to build a 1,200-mile Arabian pipe line. Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Gulf will use the line, and are expected to repay the Government's investment in 25 years.

Asks the Evansville oil man: If we're running out of oil, why isn't more attention paid to the home situation?

He is one of the legion of independent producers. His story is fairly typical. He quit a job with a major oil company to hunt oil himself on a small scale, and has built up a good living. He leases ground, drills wells, and sells oil, when he finds any, to the major companies, at prices which in his opinion have been influenced by monopoly for a long time and are now fixed by Government at a figure so low that he and his fellow independents are being gradually forced out of business.

His 17 wells are "strippers"; that is, pumped at a relatively small profit margin. Pumping and processing costs eat up most of the return.

More than 70 percent of United States wells are "strippers." Last year 12,000 of them were plugged and abandoned. Nearly 44,000 of them have been plugged in 4 years, says the National Stripper Well Association.

Why are these wells being closed?

Principal reason is economic. Here's why the Evansville man closed his two:

Crude here brings $1.37 a barrel, so the two wells were good for about $290 a month. It used to cost $65 a month to pump them, the pumper working part time. Wage-hour legislation, etc., had increased that cost to $160, leaving $130 to pay for processing the oil and other operation expenses. These expenses added up to more than was coming in, so he got out.

Why doesn't he just quit pumping the wells for a while?

The wells must be pumped to be preserved. Quit pumping and the water comes in, drowning the wells permanently. Furthermore, he can't afford to leave valuable casing in a nonproductive hole.

The point is that this production is gone for good, along with that from 12,000 wells plugged last year, 44,000 wells in 4 years. The chance of secondary production, from forcing gas back into the played-out, water-ruined sand, also is gone.

This loss must be subtracted from the Nation's oil reserves, which, according to the President and other high authorities, are running out.

How much would it cost to keep these local wells in production?

In this particular case about 50 cents a barrel; in other cases more, or less. Any increase would save some wells.

And a fairer price would expand domestic supplies in other and more important ways, since it would make wildcatting more profitable and keep the independent oil man in business.

Here the Evansville oil man runs up against the circumstance that there has been relatively little agitation for higher crude prices among major companies which control the great bulk of the business after the oil comes out of the ground.

Major companies, he says, can afford to break even or lose money in the production end. They get it back from their pipe lines, refining, and the sale of refined products.

Up to Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press, of February 25, 1944:

UP TO BARKLEY

Members of the United States Senate yesterday, by an unprecedented move, accepted the resignation of Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, as majority leader, and a few minutes later reelected him to that position.

It was a show of confidence in the Kentuckian, who resigned earlier this week after a definite split with President Roosevelt over what he called an unjustifiable assault on the honesty and integrity of Congress.

BARKLEY, 7 years ago, was elected majority leader by one single vote. He is not any more shrewd or capable now than he was then, but the unanimous vote he received yesterday was a tribute to him personally as well as a rebuff to a Chief Executive, who, for the first time in history, vetoed a tax measure, and threw in a lot of uncalled-for criticism at the same time.

The American people now have more faith in BARKLEY than they ever did before, for they realize it must have been a painful task for him to speak out against a political leader with whom he had been so closely associated for years.

For many years there has been some question whether BARKLEY was representing the people or President Roosevelt as he maneuvered favorable votes on the Chief Executive's pet measures.

There should be no repetition of that in the future unless that letter written by BARKLEY yesterday takes away from him the independent spirit that flamed through his soul Wednesday afternoon.

For a brief time day before yesterday, Mr. BARKLEY reached heights he had never known before in the field of elocution. He delivered an excellent address as he came to the defense of Congress, and incidentally the American people, as Members of Congress are direct representatives of the people.

He offered then and there blunt criticism of the man whose flag he had carried 12 years and cried "halt" to a White House occupant who more and more has tried to encroach on the judicial powers of the Nation.

BARKLEY spoke out courageously against this trend, but then turned around and expressed his undying admiration for the man who only a short time before had tried to humble him and his fellow Congressmen.

Mr. Roosevelt in nowise tried to spare the feelings of the men who sit in the House and Senate, in fact his tax veto message was the third such this session when he used a highly sarcastic pen to belittle the Nation's lawmakers.

Senator BARKLEY was under no compulsion to tender an olive branch to President Roosevelt after his fellow Senators had elevated him to be their majority leader. That breach should not have been so quickly filled. As things look now no compromise is possible between Roosevelt and Congress. He will still

belabor them with bitter, stinging phrases when they do not jump at his crack of the whip.

Mr. BARKLEY should have maintained his spirit of independence. It's up to him to prove now that newborn faith in his principles are not mere illusions.

History of 11 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley, from the Washington Post:

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—HISTORY OF 11 YEARS

(By Ernest Lindley)

On March 4, 1933, probably there was no one in the United States who dreamed that 11 years later Franklin D. Roosevelt would still occupy the White House, or that he might not leave it until 1949. There were not many who at that time regarded him as a really strong man. During the campaign he had not posed, or been greeted, as a messiah. He was generally regarded as an amiable man with an attractive personality and many admirable characteristics, including the pluck with which he had overcome the physical handicap suddenly inflicted on him in early middle age. He was known to have a mildly progressive outlook, a rather long experience in public affairs, and ability to win votes.

Roosevelt's place in history can be appraised more accurately in later years. His contemporaries are too close to the events, and their judgments unavoidably are colored by personal experience. But his place surely will be a large one, both in our national and in modern world history. With the possible exception of Washington and Lincoln, no President has borne so heavy a burden, and with the possible exception of Wilson, none has exerted so much influence contemporaneously on the world as a whole.

Roosevelt's first term was devoted to economic recovery and the melange of reforms which came to be known as the New Deal. Recovery and reform were in conflict at times, but they were often inextricably bound together. The reforms had many origins: The old agrarian movements and the newer agricultural demands for equality; the Bull Moose platform of 1912; Wilson's new freedom; trade-unionism; and sundry liberal social and economic thinkers. Many of them were reforms long overdue. They could have been digested more easily if they had been introduced gradually in earlier years.

In most important respects they were similar to economic and social reforms which had been adopted in preceding decades in Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries. Although many of them were assailed at the time as extreme, they were, on the whole, middle-way measures and are now recognized as such by all but a few irreconcilables.

When Roosevelt took office, it was certainly his intention to complete his domestic program as rapidly as possible—certainly before the end of 4 years. He expected a brief period of change to be followed by a longer period of digestion and stability. He often commented that this had been the usual course of events in the United States, if the reforms were successful. But he was balked in this endeavor by a majority of the Supreme Court. The Court not only began to undo the New Deal but laid down interpretations which threatened to cripple the national Government. The best commentary on the Court during this period appears in the minority opinions written by the present Chief Justice, Harlan Stone, and the late Justices Brandeis and Cardozo. The majority of the Supreme Court as it was then constituted must bear a major share of the responsibility for 2 or 3 years of internal turmoil which judicial statesmanship would have spared us.

Roosevelt was thus thrown behind his earlier timetable and felt compelled to begin his second term with a showdown with the judiciary. He lost the battle, at no small cost to himself, but won the campaign. In the aftermath he challenged the conservatives of his own party on their home grounds, and was repulsed. The purge campaign of 1938 saw the beginning of the recession of the New Deal.

It has not been generally realized, but the President's own conscious turn from the New Deal to a different political base began immediately after the purge campaign. It was prompted chiefly by the Munich crisis. Roosevelt saw correctly that in all probability another great world war was just around the corner, and he moved to mobilize support for his foreign and national defense policies. He needed, sought, and obtained support from conservative Democrats and Republicans with whom he had been at odds on domestic policies. Since the fall of 1938, the new dealers have gradually been shelved, and their places taken by Republicans, conservative and middle-of-the-road Democrats, generals, admirals, and industrialists of no particular political affiliation.

Thus the transition from peace to war, and from the New Deal to defense and foreign policy as the dominant considerations in the President's mind, began in the fall of 1938, less than half way through Roosevelt's second term.

The war—or, more particularly, the Nazi onslaught on the west—produced the third term. The fourth term, if there is one, will bring victory and at least a temporary organization of the peace.

Hitler achieved full power in Germany almost exactly on the day Roosevelt entered the White House. In the history of the war, Churchill and Stalin and others will loom large. But the history of the last 11 years could be written satisfactorily around the two men whose influence during that time has been continuous, world-wide, and in constant conflict: Hitler and Roosevelt, the one now doomed, the other still going strong.

Teamwork for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 2, 1944:

TEAMWORK FOR VICTORY

America's production miracle has been, in essence, a miracle of cooperation. Sometimes the steady story of teamwork between management and labor seems obscured by the sensational news of occasional disputes and walk-outs. But when the record of great achievement is reviewed, the fact that employers and employees have, in the main, worked hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder, emerges as indisputable and paramount. The nature and the effectiveness of this cooperation can be judged from the exhibits now on display at the first National Labor-Management Production Exposition in the Commerce Department auditorium.

The exposition, sponsored by the War Production Board, is actually presented by the labor-management committees of 72 war factories. These committees are representative of the thousands which have been formed in plants all over the country to keep supplies rolling to the battle fronts with maximum speed and efficiency. The emphasis of the exposition is, as it should be, mainly on the contributions which workers have made through individual ideas and suggestions to the streamlining, simplification, and economy of production methods. Millions of man-hours have been saved in war plants by the know-how of intelligent employees in regard to their special jobs.

The show at the Commerce Department is a tribute to American labor and industry alike. Happily we have not yet become so completely submerged in mass-production techniques as to leave no play for individual acumen and initiative. Our wealth in these factors contributes much to our margin over the enemy. The Labor-Management Production Exposition dramatizes and celebrates the manner in which they have been harnessed for the war effort.

Sale of Obsolete and Damaged War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina:

Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to place proper restrictions and safeguards about the sale by the United States Government of its obsolete and damaged war materials

Whereas the press of this Nation carries numerous instances of obsolete and damaged goods, not longer useful in the war effort, being sold at ridiculously low prices; and

Whereas individuals are thereby making exorbitant, unwarranted profits; and

Whereas it appears that in many instances property sold by the United States Government as junk is actually useful as second-hand goods, and are put in trade by individuals who purchase junk, thereby seriously crippling small businesses; and

Whereas such practices are contrary to the good of home morale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina do memorialize the Congress of the United States to prevent by proper legislation the enumerated practices and the making of unwarranted profits through goods, manufactured for the war effort, by individuals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two Senators and each Member of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress from South Carolina.

Manpower Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a veteran of the First World War, known to me personally, with a son in this war, writes to me as follows, and encloses the newspaper clipping printed below his letter:

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Attached please find a clipping taken from the front page of the Lake Odessa Wave. How long do we have to stand for such uncalled for waste? To me, this is no different than sabotage.

A person can't pick up a newspaper without seeing that there is a strike in some war plant. Today three strikes listed in Detroit—the Ford Motor Co.'s Rouge plant, the N. A. Woodworth Co., and Aluminum Co. of America, involving 2,600 war workers. Do I blame the workers? No. Do I blame the manufacturers? No. Washington officials broadcasting over the radio and news items continuously pat us on the home front on the back, that we are doing as much for the war effort as the boys doing the fighting. And what difference does it make with the manufacturer, the larger the cost the larger the profit obtained.

These war plants are just a haven for fellows who don't want to get into this war as a fighting man, but do a lot of complaining. Take a factory in my home town: Last fall there was a mass deferment of men called for duty; the following week deer season opened, some of these men had the nerve to go deer hunting. If they were so essential to the war effort, it seems as though they would have been too essential to be left off duty for a week or so.

Last week I overheard one of the men working at this same plant say that "for all the deductions taken from my pay for this and that, a party had the nerve to ask me to buy some additional War bonds." He said that he told the party to go to h—. That is the way most people on the home front think about the war.

My son, who entered the service a year ago tomorrow and who went overseas in August, purchased nine $25 bonds and two $100 bonds; let some of these so-called war workers match this.

Mr. HOFFMAN, I can see no difference between this and World War No. 1—just another money war.

Very truly yours,
VETERAN OF WORLD WAR NO. 1.

LABOR WASTE AT MUSKEGON DISGRACEFUL

(By Gene Alleman)

EAST LANSING.—They say there is a manpower shortage in Michigan.

Just read this story about Muskegon: The waste of manpower in Muskegon war industries has become so disgraceful the town's daily newspaper, the Muskegon Chronicle, pronounces it to be "rotten" and worthy of the word "sabotage."

Proof is presented by the newspaper in the following cases, both of which are vouched for as authentic. We quote:

"1. I applied for work at the office of an industry where it seemed my previous experience would be of value. I was employed and assigned to a desk. I sat there for 9 days without a thing to do. I protested I would sweep floors if they did not have anything else for me to do rather than do nothing. The answer was, 'You are being paid, aren't you?' I found 200 men and women in the plant in about the same situation. I could not stand it any longer, so I am leaving.

"2. I sought employment in a war industry near my home. I am a pretty good mechanic and hoped to get a chance to operate a machine, so I went to work as a helper. On an 8-hour shift, I could manage to keep doing something for an hour and a half. Then there was absolutely nothing for a few hours; then about 20 minutes of honest work that I had to try to make last the rest of the turn. Everybody in the shop was killing time in the same way. I stood it as long as I could and quit."

The War Manpower Commission has bluntly told Muskegon that additional labor is not needed there; that the production job could be accomplished by workers who are already on pay rolls; that landing-boat parts are urgently needed today.

Ceiling Price on Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina:

Concurrent resolution asking the Office of Price Administration and other agencies to relieve dairy farmers from disastrous effect of present price ceilings

Whereas milk has been designated as the No. 1 basic food necessary to our efficient prosecution of the war and our dairy farmers have been requested by their Government to maintain an increased production; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has established a ceiling price on wholesale and retail sales of such milk to consumers, while at the same time allowing prices of feeds and labor to rise without restriction; and

Whereas the dairy farmers of South Carolina are, under these conditions, producing milk at such daily losses to themselves as to force many of them to discontinue production, seriously curtail production, or do irreparable injury to their farm enterprise through excessive drains upon soil fertility and other capital resources; and

Whereas this trend is threatening to break down an industry in this State which has been soundly built over a period of years and is seriously threatening our dairy farmers' contribution to the war effort; and

Whereas milk is being shipped into South Carolina at higher prices than our own milk producers are permitted to receive; and

Whereas the scarcity and quality of feeds available to our dairy farmers and other livestock and poultry producers has further adversely affected production of milk and other livestock and poultry products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Office of Price Administration, and such other Government regulatory agencies as are concerned, are respectfully requested to give immediate relief to our dairy farmers through such adjustment of price ceilings as will enable such producers to make a livable profit to themselves, maintain their production enterprises, and make their just contribution to the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That in the allocation of South Carolina produced feeds, especially the protein concentrates, that the needs of South Carolina dairy, livestock, and poultry producers be fully and adequately cared for before any allocations of such feeds be made to other sections of the country; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., to the Office of Price Administration, Columbia, S. C., and to each of the Senators and Members of Congress from this State.

State Aid to Municipalities in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 30, a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs investigating the progress of the war effort made a report of its investigation of congested areas.

Because of references in this report to the State of Washington it is deemed by the Governor and others that a statement showing just what has been done by the State in cooperation with the cities of the State should be made.

The statement by the Governor and letters from Mr. John Carroll, chairman, executive committee, Association of Washington Cities; Hon. Herbert G. West, mayor of Walla Walla, and Mr. L. R. Durkee, regional engineer, Federal Works Agency, follow:

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR LANGLIE

I am enclosing a copy of a letter directed to Congressman IZAC by John E. Carroll, chairman of the executive committee of the Association of Washington Cities. That letter speaks very plainly of the funds that are shared with cities and of the cooperation that these cities have had.

I also want to point out that during the biennium of 1943–45 incorporated cities and towns will receive from the State the following allocations:

From the State motor-vehicle fund	$7,500,000
From the State motor-vehicle excise fund	600,000
From the State general fund	2,000,000
From the State liquor profits	10,700,000
From the State 10-percent liquor war tax	3,700,000
From the admission tax (a field vacated by the State so that the cities could take over)	3,000,000

Making a total of $27,500,000, as compared to a total of approximately $10,000,000 in the biennium of 1941–43, which was the highest sharing of funds with the cities ever in the history of the State.

In addition to that the State supplies out of its general revenue 25 cents per day per pupil's attendance; to the teachers' retirement fund, $2,270,000; for school buildings, $2,000,000; and $700,000 for the tubercular program in the counties throughout the State.

Also, local government has been relieved of the responsibilities for the care of the aged, sick, those on relief, and dependent

children. The State carries a large load in public health, in State and local planning, in supervising highway work; has assisted tremendously in law enforcement; has given leadership in agricultural problems and labor supply problems; has led in civilian defense and in the promotion of all war services.

I doubt if there is a mayor in any city of the State of Washington who does not realize that our State government has gone all-out to be helpful to the municipalities in meeting their problems. Local newspapers have contacted these public officials and—in every instance that has come to our attention—these officials have responded in much the same manner as has Mr. Carroll.

I might call your attention to the fact that of the $2,000,000 that was allocated to the cities from the general fund, $1,000,000 thereof was distributed to all chartered cities upon relative population shown by the 1940 Federal census. But the remaining $1,000,000 is being distributed only to those cities showing a population increase of 3 percent or more over the 1940 Federal census. The division will be made on the basis of the increase that each city in that classification has had.

Also, the State is sharing funds with county government for highway purposes and sharing with them liquor profits and liquor taxes. All in all, our cities, counties, and school districts of the State of Washington are in the best fiscal shape in their history, because our State government has gone further than any other in the country in sharing its revenues with local government and taking over those State-wide responsibilities that local government has been unable to carry.

It occurs to us that, because we have built up some reserves in our State during a time when our people could afford to make contributions to government, thereby assisting in the control of inflation, that we are being criticized because of this fact.

It is our opinion that the only reason why the Federal Government should contribute to the support of certain selected cities is that the Government itself, through its various war activities, has created conditions which place financial burdens on these cities—all for the benefit of the entire Nation.

We do not ask for any different treatment, as far as sharing in revenues received by other similarly situated war centers, but we believe that if there are policies based upon congressional action which makes money available for certain purposes and these policies are being carried out in certain States, that they should likewise be applicable here and that our State should not be called upon to pay an obligation of the Federal Government because we are thrifty and have on hand surpluses deliberately accumulated for definite purposes, while, on the other hand, the Federal Government should reimburse similarly situated cities such as ours in other States where tax reductions have been made and no surpluses have been built up, although those States undoubtedly are as capable as our State to create surpluses.

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES,
January 10, 1944.

Hon. E. V. IZAC,
Chairman, Subcommittee, House Naval Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN IZAC: I was surprised to read the press report of your committee findings, charging that the State of Washington had been shunning its responsibility to aid municipalities in meeting their emergency and wartime problems. While it is true that for a number of years cities of this State were in acute financial distress, the large amount of aid now given by the State has brought about a very different situation.

The State of Washington is in the front ranks of those which share funds with their local units of government. In fact, as far as we have been able to determine, no State has shown more concern for the solution of municipal problems, nor has any made a greater per capita contribution to relieve the financial difficuties of its cities.

I wonder if your subcommittee had information on the actual amount of assistance cities in this State receive. If not, you will be interested to know that municipalities have allocations or shares from five State funds, and in addition occupy one complete field of taxation vacated by the State in favor of cities. This assistance may be broken down as follows with the per capita amount cities are expected to receive in 1944 from these funds.

Official estimates for 1944

	Per capita
A. All cities:	
(1) 15 percent of State gasoline tax	$1.89
(2) 52 percent of State liquor profits	2.84
(3) 50 percent of new 10-percent war liquor tax	1.23
(4) 15 percent of motor vehicle excise tax	.30
(5) War emergency appropriation	.47
(6) Admission taxes up to $1 (field vacated by State)	1.00
Total	7.73
B. Certain cities:	
(1) Cities below 1,500—value of State maintenance of primary highways, per capita	.58
(2) Cities with war industries—a special allocation is made to "mushrooming cities" which have boomed because of war industries; $500,000 is allocated per year for the present biennium in direct proportion the individual increase in local population bears to the total increase on a per capita basis. A check is made by a special census board every 6 months to allow for shifts in population. The probable allocation per capita based on population increase since 1940 will be	1.85

I wonder if you can mention any other State which has gone further to assist its cities and towns? If not, do you think it fair to single out the State of Washington for special attack stating that its responsibilities had been shunned?

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. CARROLL,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

WALLA WALLA, WASH, *January 15, 1944.*

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLMES: There has been considerable comment in the press of recent date regarding charges made by a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, charging the State of Washington with being neglectful as far as financial aid to the cities of this State is concerned. This is completely contrary to the facts.

The Association of Washington Cities gave considerable thought to the financial condition of the respective cities of this State prior to the last session of the State legislature. A program was initiated by the association and carried through practically 100 percent. This program had the full and complete support of the State legislature and of Gov. Arthur B. Langlie.

The program was divided in two parts; one, the immediate emergency need created by war conditions and the problems the cities had to face; and two, a long-time program with a view to strengthening the financial position of municipalities in the State of Washington. In the first category $2,000,000 were appropriated by the legislature to be expended in the biennial of 1943–44; $1,000,000 to be distributed during 1943 which the cities could expend irrespective of State budget laws. In other words, the money would not have to be duly and regularly budgeted, but we could take advantage of the emergency needed to provide for services and protection that the municipalities had to give to their citizens. The distribution was based on the 1940 census, plus the increase due to war conditions.

In our particular instance the city of Walla Walla received some $17,234.16 which I assure you was of material help and assistance. This money was confined to certain departments, namely, health and sanitation, fire, police, library, parks, or in other words, to departments of municipal government sorely taxed by increased activity due to war conditions.

The 10-percent liquor tax is in addition to the regular dividend received by the cities. In our city this amounted to $9,467.29, and by law was restricted for use to the police department, fire department, and health department.

On the automobile excise tax we have not received any dividends as yet. This money will be forthcoming in the year 1944. Likewise these funds will be restricted to the fire, police, and health departments.

In the long-time program the Governor sponsored legislation wherein the State withdrew from the 5-percent admission tax field, giving this entirely to the cities. This is very important, for in our small community this has amounted to $12,817.97 for 8 months of this year.

We have a Governor who formerly served as mayor of our largest city in the State, who brought to the Governor's chair a thorough knowledge and understanding of the needs of the municipalities of this State. Without question every community did not receive everything they would like to have had. They did receive, however, everything they needed and this program was initiated and supported wholly and completely by the Association of Washington Cities which is representative of at least 90 percent of the communities of this State, and in that 90 percent of its membership includes every large community.

Consequently it is the consensus of the city commission of Walla Walla that the charges made by the subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House is utterly unfair, erroneous, and even if true it is our judgment that a congressional committee certainly is stepping entirely out of its jurisdiction by attempting to criticize or dictate to States and municipalities any part of their program.

We do earnestly urge and request that the Washington State delegation voice their resentment to the intrusion of the congressional committee in strictly State and municipal affairs and more definitely because the charges made are without fact, utterly false, and can only be construed by the citizens of this community as being entirely political in nature and in effect.

Sincerely,

HERBERT G. WEST,
Mayor.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
REGION NO. 7,
Seattle, Wash., January 27, 1944.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: I have recently received the Fourth Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency, for the fiscal year 1942–43. Page 62 thereof contains a list of allocations made under the Lanham Act in each State. I am enclosing two copies of this recapitulation for your convenience, as you may not have received the annual report.

I am very proud of my home State. I am very proud of the spirit in which the State of

Washington and all its local subdivisions have cooperated with the Federal Works Agency in administering the Lanham Act. Even a very cursory analysis of the enclosure proves that this cooperation was furnished in a very material way also.

You will observe that the total cost of projects which it was necessary for the Federal Government to construct directly is small in comparison with the total. A large majority by far were constructed with funds contributed locally to match Federal grants. Of these so-called non-Federal projects, 58 percent of the total cost was contributed by the State of Washington and its local subdivisions; 42 percent was Federal funds.

The State of Washington and its communities have contributed, under the Lanham Act, practically three times as much money as any other State in the Union. (Note column 5 of the enclosure, "Sponsor contribution.")

I know you are facing problems today compared with which Lanham Act appropriations look insignificant and its administration relatively unimportant. Yet, the State of Washington has exemplified so nobly in this respect a principle of local cooperation that I am sure this message will provide you with a few moments of satisfaction in what will otherwise be probably a hectic day.

Sincerely,

L. R. DURKEE,
Regional Engineer.

Lanham Act war public works—Number and estimated cost of projects approved by the President, by State, and by source of funds, as of June 30, 1943

	Number of projects	Estimated total cost	Federal construction	Non-Federal construction		
				Sponsor contribution	Federal grant	Federal loan
Total	2,480	$322,770,915	$154,101,284	$49,914,768	$112,119,476	$6,635,387
Alabama	97	9,609,399	5,111,610	1,237,855	3,259,934	----------
Arizona	18	1,016,667	746,328	56,500	213,839	----------
Arkansas	34	1,991,848	1,101,835	183,113	705,900	----------
California	237	29,180,096	20,604,207	1,445,871	7,030,018	100,000
Colorado	22	1,203,030	93,171	434,963	674,896	----------
Connecticut	47	8,459,803	895,296	2,933,424	4,631,083	----------
Delaware	5	211,260	115,679	52,981	42,600	----------
District of Columbia	31	7,611,709	3,065,160	10,000	3,712,648	$23,901
Florida	95	8,008,565	3,262,656	2,064,801	2,595,108	85,000
Georgia	82	6,745,289	3,475,224	829,110	2,440,955	----------
Idaho	3	83,572	67,352	----------	16,220	----------
Illinois	75	4,389,759	1,268,565	408,609	2,429,585	283,000
Indiana	50	5,463,243	1,644,294	729,383	2,802,066	287,500
Iowa	14	967,200	396,355	105,592	465,253	----------
Kansas	31	3,873,866	2,223,390	356,702	1,293,774	----------
Kentucky	46	3,060,984	1,916,769	365,608	778,607	----------
Louisiana	68	5,578,378	1,447,058	678,623	2,992,697	460,000
Maine	24	3,483,967	2,116,959	50,000	1,317,008	----------
Maryland	59	10,301,722	5,516,247	1,399,682	3,036,307	299,486
Massachusetts	28	3,103,446	1,101,669	761,688	1,191,089	49,000
Michigan	117	20,794,810	6,438,524	4,006,528	9,537,758	812,000
Minnesota	6	134,859	75,698	13,000	46,161	----------
Mississippi	47	4,892,276	2,606,975	804,694	1,280,607	200,000
Missouri	58	5,571,852	2,538,293	575,875	2,459,684	----------
Montana	1	6,000	6,000	----------	----------	----------
Nebraska	8	474,037	198,755	----------	275,282	----------
Nevada	18	1,772,998	1,554,079	29,834	189,035	----------
New Hampshire	8	875,966	360,522	117,555	397,889	----------
New Jersey	28	3,163,812	1,125,235	543,485	1,450,092	45,000
New Mexico	7	199,897	86,755	4,150	108,992	----------
New York	60	6,107,117	3,538,076	1,095,730	1,473,311	----------
North Carolina	94	10,193,955	4,812,778	1,216,871	3,964,306	200,000
Ohio	58	8,241,382	3,277,788	1,601,790	3,312,804	49,000
Oklahoma	40	4,218,182	1,319,019	1,225,938	1,673,225	----------
Oregon	33	1,320,892	802,954	118,707	342,731	56,500
Pennsylvania	54	3,699,657	2,101,569	162,237	1,077,851	358,000
Rhode Island	18	5,182,801	4,685,098	47,720	449,983	----------
South Carolina	54	5,924,306	2,523,575	1,012,426	1,984,305	314,000
South Dakota	5	179,053	104,540	26,500	48,013	----------
Tennessee	58	4,585,738	1,383,167	627,504	2,475,067	100,000
Texas	242	30,200,300	13,013,623	4,600,544	12,263,133	323,000
Utah	32	3,866,490	2,957,648	229,064	679,778	----------
Vermont	4	208,148	110,804	37,092	60,252	----------
Virginia	146	34,946,183	22,146,801	3,093,566	9,555,816	150,000
Washington	109	27,838,992	5,177,343	12,779,127	9,242,522	640,000
West Virginia	19	1,326,935	883,614	20,200	423,121	----------
Wisconsin	13	1,218,529	347,700	317,206	553,623	----------
Wyoming	8	263,124	224,478	18,000	20,646	----------
Various [1]	----------	736,814	736,814	----------	----------	----------
Territories and bases	9	20,282,007	12,795,235	1,394,920	5,091,852	1,000,000

[1] Working funds for preliminary engineering and purchase of salvage materials.

[Press release, January 10, 1944, office of Governor]

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, commenting today on assertion attributed to a Naval Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, that the State of Washington has shunned helping its cities with wartime problems, said the statements made by Representative E. V. IZAK (Democrat), of California, are entirely supported by facts.

"It is unfortunate that statements tending to confuse and misinform, as these statements do, should be made by Members of Congress," Governor Langlie said. "The subcommittee of which Representative IZAK is chairman could be a very important committee, and could render a real service to the country.

"But statements such as have been made about our State, without apparent knowledge of the facts, tend to make cooperation more difficult and pull people apart, when unanimity in the war effort is essential. The charges that the State has shunned aid to its cities are entirely unsupported by facts.

"I doubt if there is a State in the Union that is allocating as much of its revenues to the assistance of cities as is the State of Washington," Governor Langlie said. "We not only assist the cities, but aid the counties and school districts as well. It is estimated that through distribution of funds this biennium, the State of Washington will share with its cities more than $28,000,000, whereas in previous biennium the highest amount that the State ever has shared has been $10,000,000.

"We have worked with those cities having problems brought on by war conditions in every possible way and the record speaks for itself. The State government will stand on that record.

"We knew before the meeting of the last legislature that we faced some of the most severe problems of any State in the Union. The subject is not new to us. State and local officials discussed those problems, Federal officials were brought into conference, and through effective and practical cooperation war production on a great scale was made speedily possible. Such delays as occurred were due to shortages of materials and priorities in many instances—the controls of which have been entirely in the hands of Federal agencies.

"We have not and will not attempt to shift any of our financial obligations to the Federal Government. We want no more aid than other war centers of the country are receiving on the basis of standards set up by the Federal Government. We will continue to give every assistance to local agencies of government as we have in the past, and we invite any constructive suggestions on how State and local cooperation can be made more effective than it has been to date."

Meat Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Hon. Marvin Jones:

MARCH 3, 1944.

MARVIN JONES,
Director, United States Agriculture Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Today I have a note from Guy Scudder of Sumner, Nebr., who has for many years been a dealer in the grain and livestock business. He has always fed a large number of cattle. I quote a part of his letter:

	1944	Ceilings, 1942
Corn, per bushel	$1.06	$0.65
Barley, per bushel	1.07	.46
Oats, per bushel	.75	.45
Alfalfa hay, per ton	22.00	8.00
Protein feed, 43 percent not available in 1944	----------	48.00

Mr. Scudder says that "the feeder cattle of all kinds are costing 10 to 15 percent more in 1944 than they did in 1942. He further states that the number of cattle are backing up on the ranches to an all-time high. If this is true it will mean ruinous prices after the war when normal supply and demand takes its course." He further says, "There is no chance to keep beef rolling to our armed forces and to our people unless something is done." Mr. Scudder suggests that people can afford to eat beef and they want it so why not get the points out of the way and get the ceilings adjusted so that the feeder can continue to operate and stay in existence, thus keeping the volume of beef up. He closes with these words, "Please help before it is too late."

I think you realize, Mr. Jones, that there will probably be an all-time high in the number of cattle on the ranges in America

this year. Probably 82,000,000 in 1944. There were approximately 74,500,000 in 1942. It seems to me, Mr. Jones, that with this large visible supply there should be better Federal management of the livestock industry. The ceiling prices established for feed have been a mistake because they do not allow for the increased cost of feed, labor, and other items going into the production of meat. If more meat is to be produced there must be a fair profit to the ranchers and to the men who put the animal in the feed lot. There has been a reduction of some 16 percent less cattle on feed than there was a year ago and this percentage is bound to get larger as long as the causes which produce the decrease remain in operation. There has been too much red tape and changing of the rules in the middle of the feed lot. If we are to produce more meat then the feeder must be permitted to put the additional pounds on the frame of the same animal which otherwise would go to the slaughter block from the range minus the extra pounds. There should be an adjustment.

There should be an adjustment of ceiling prices. It was ridiculous when the Washington bureaucrats fixed the price of corn at less than $1 a bushel on the farm and then guaranteed them a price on hogs that brought $1.40 a bushel for the same corn when converted into pork. You can now see what happened. The continued meddling with the laws of economics by inexperienced amateurs issuing illegal, ill-conceived directives have thrown the delicate mechanism of cattle and hog production and feeding out of balance. The roll-backs, the subsidies, livestock ceilings and slaughter allocations and other threatening directives have added confusion to all phases of the livestock industry.

I want to urge you, Mr. Jones, to follow the considered judgment and advice of the men in the livestock industry. Regulations that hinder and discourage production should be removed. Government agencies must quit meddling with the finer mechanism in the business of the production of meat. We must have less regulations if we expect to produce more meat.

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska.

The National Liquor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

NATIONAL LIQUOR BILL IN 1943 WAS SIX BILLION; JUMP OF 17 PERCENT

To the tune of more than $6,000,000,000, Americans spent nearly 7 cents out of every dollar paid for goods and services of all kinds for liquor in 1943, the Commerce Department estimates.

The Nation's liquor bill was 17 percent higher than in 1942, the Department reported yesterday, though it does not mean there was more imbibing last year.

The rise in spending, in the face of declining stocks, rather was attributed to an increase in liquor taxes from $4 to $6 a gallon. On April 1 the tax will jump to $9.

Outlay for alcoholic beverages in 1943 on a per capita basis amounted to $46 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, the Department said.

The War Production Board meanwhile reported a slight improvement in the alcohol situation, but asserted that there is no chance of resuming beverage-alcohol production at this time.

Improvement in supply, W. P. B. said, reflects the recent agreement with Cuba on alcohol imports and an anticipated 6,000,000-gallon gain in production in the Gulf areas.

Three-Legged Stool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 27, 1944:

THREE-LEGGED STOOL

The President, they say, was asked by a reporter to name the member of the United Nations he considered the most important ally. "I'll ask you one," said F. D. R. "Which is the most important leg on a three-legged stool?" (Walter Winchell's column.)

A sound simile. It could be applied with equal aptness to a domestic controversy which has been the topmost news of the last week. Which is the most important leg on the three-legged stool of United States constitutional government—the executive, the legislative, or the judicial?

The important role of Congress in our form of government is inevitably a thankless one. If it goes along with the President it is denounced as a rubber stamp. If it disagrees with him it is abused for obstruction.

The Executive is the personification of a man, a voice; Congress is many voices, often inchoate, confused. The President can be wrong, and Congress can be wrong. But over any period of time we have got to believe, if we really believe in representative government, that Congress is less likely to be wrong than the President.

The President vetoed a tax bill in a stinging message and Congress overrode his veto. The Constitution not only gives Congress major and final authority on legislation; it says "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"—because the House is closer to the people than the Senate or the President; its Members have to be reelected every 2 years.

The power to tax must be kept as close as possible to the people in a representative government, and if it is too mildly exercised in times like these, even that is better than the alternative of reposing the taxing power even obliquely in hands less directly responsible to the people.

The argument between the President and Congress about taxes is not how much we shall tax, as the President has tried cleverly to make it appear, but how we shall tax—and on that point it is supremely essential that Congress, not the President, be the final authority. For the power to tax is the power to shape the Nation's economic and social structure.

The President and Congress fell out on tax legislation, not at the point where the President vetoed the finished bill and Congress passed it over his veto but at the much earlier point at which the Treasury proposed a tax bill which the administration knew would antagonize Congress, instead of attempting to work with Congress to devise a measure which at least the administration's own spokesmen in Congress could support conscientiously. Such a bill could have raised far more revenue than the one now made law—perhaps as much as the administration wanted, or more. The clash over amount, which has now arisen, could have been avoided.

The President chose, instead, to be even more political-minded than Congress in the drafting of a tax bill—apparently with the purpose of drawing an issue between himself and Congress for his fourth-term campaign. The results are lamentable for the country. But in view of the President's choice and the fundamental issue which it put at stake, there was only one answer for Congress to make, and it has made it.

Washington, Ga., First of That Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Washington, Ga., First of That Name," which appeared in the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal on February 22, 1944:

WASHINGTON, GA., FIRST OF THAT NAME
(By Thomas J. Culhane)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—To the State of Georgia belongs the honor of naming the first town Washington. Nestled among the red hills of the Peach State lies the historic town of Washington, the first of all American villages, towns, or cities to be named in commemoration of the Father of Our Country.

The map of the United States is dotted with towns, cities, counties, villages, creeks, and rivers called after the man who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," for it has ever been a commendable trait of Americans to weave hero worship and patriotism into the heraldry and nomenclature of their country.

Particularly is this true of those from the South. The countless men throughout the southern country today bearing the names of George Washington and Robert E. Lee are living proof of this patriotism on the part of their fathers and grandfathers before them. It has always been a beautiful tradition in the South that the most marked evidence of friendship is to name a child in honor of a friend.

It is interesting to note how the county seat of Wilkes County, came to be changed from Heard's Fort to Washington and the role it has played in history since that time. The thought was born in the hearts of the patriots of Wilkes County in that never-to-be-forgotten winter at Valley Forge, when General Washington was begging the Congress to send aid to his half-starved, brave little army. They appealed to their State

lawmakers to authorize the changing of Heard's Fort to Washington. This was eventually done in accord with a legislative act which stated "that a town had been ordered and laid out in the county of Wilkes, at a place called Washington."

Thus Washington, Ga., was the first of many towns to be named after our first President, although there are Americans who believe that Washington, D. C., was the first. The Nation's Capital, actually, was the fourth city to be thus honored; Washington, N. C., being the second, and Washington, Ky., the third.

For 24 hours Washington was capital of the Confederacy. That was on May 5, 1865, when the Government of the Confederate States of America was formally and officially dissolved in the structure known as the Old Bank Building, formerly called Heard's Inn. This historical meeting was attended by President Jefferson Davis and some of the members of his Cabinet.

It was shortly after this that Gen. Robert Toombs, a conspicuous figure of the Confederacy, whose old mansion is still a landmark, was obliged to flee from the Federal authorities by leaping upon his horse in the back yard and dashing away while the Yankees were walking up the front steps.

There is an air of tranquility and peace of mind about Washington, Ga. It has been touched but lightly by commerce and the charming old white houses with their great Corinthian and Ionic columns and green blinds, the magnolia trees, the oak and the hickory, give the town that atmosphere of enchantment which typifies the old-fashioned home of southern aristocracy. It was our pleasure to visit this delightful place with its historical background a few years ago during a tour of the South and, if memory serves us correctly, its population at that time was some 300 souls. We hope it never changes.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Hon. G. Mason Owlett, president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, at this organization's annual meeting on February 22, 1944:

We meet today on a great national holiday, a day when this Nation, in all humility, pays homage to one of America's real noblemen—George Washington. As we meet, the sons and brothers and husbands of America are fighting in all parts of the world and on the seven seas, and many of them have given and will give their lives for their country before this grave conflict is over.

We know that this war is being fought for our very existence. We are being told daily that one of its vital objectives is to eradicate dictatorship from the face of the globe, and to permit the peoples of the earth to live their own lives free from fear and free from the brutal domination of lustful rulers.

We are entering upon the preliminaries of a national election which will determine the form of government we will have at the conclusion of this war and which will map the peacetime destiny of America.

This is an association of the manufacturers of Pennsylvania. We represent the industries of this Commonwealth which have, since the dark days of Pearl Harbor, provided a stupendous proportion of the mighty sinews of war. We represent the industries which are the lifeblood of the powerful industrial empire which is Pennsylvania. Their achievements have been like fibers of gold running through the history of this great Nation.

It seems proper, therefore, that for the moment we take stock of ourselves and reappraise our deeply rooted obligation to our fighting men and our equally pressing obligation as members of the body politic in this representative Government of ours.

The Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association was founded in 1909. The far-seeing men who conceived it and brought it into being and who have carried on its work through the years, had certain fundamental concepts concerning the place of private enterprise in the lives of all men. The cardinal purpose of this association has been to encourage industrial progress in this State and contribute, wherever possible, to the success and perpetuity of the enterprise system.

Our members, through the years, have recognized the abiding principle that if business is to prosper; if our resources are to be developed; if good wages are to be paid; in fact, if all people are to live their own independent, unfettered lives, enjoying the product of man's ingenuity, we must first create the kind of governmental climate under which private enterprise can live and flourish.

Our Constitution guarantees the right of political thought and action. The machinery has been provided whereby we can have the kind of government the voters themselves decree. For that reason, this association has continuously pointed out the necessity of individual political activity by its members. It has stood for honest men of character and courage who believed wholeheartedly in the American form of two-party government. It has urged upon its members the necessity for seeing that the right kind of men make our laws and that the best men administer them.

Barring the hiatus created by the political accident known as the little New Deal, during the Democratic regime of 1935–39, Pennsylvania has had a government sympathetic to private enterprise. It has been under that kind of government that Pennsylvania has become the mightiest link in the chain of America's industrial progress. It is under that kind of government that community after community in this commonwealth has witnessed the humble beginning and amazing growth of huge national industries.

If ever there was need to justify political action on the part of our industrial leaders, the tragic example of the last 12 years in Washington has provided it. If ever proof were required of the need for a sympathetic attitude on the part of government toward free enterprise, the New Deal, with its grasping bureaucratic controls and dynastic attitud, has furnished it. While we, in Pennsylvania, have been trying to encourage business, the New Deal in Washington has been trying to destroy it.

The history of those 12 years proves that no political faction has been more contemptuous of advice or intolerant toward criticism than the New Deal. Leaders of business, industry, and finance have been called in for consultation only to be ignored or worse. Member after member of the official New Deal family has resigned rather than continue to be a mere figurehead and follow policies opposed to conscience and reason.

I believe, as all of you do, that the United States is a Government whose just powers are derived from the consent of those governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established on those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

On the other hand, business today realizes that the unfriendly, punitive laws hatched in Washington by men of fragile intellect have almost destroyed industry save, of course, for the temporary prosperity produced by billion-dollar war contracts. We are all satisfied that our National Government is now in the hands of selfish, presumptuous dreamers who do not believe in the principles of private enterprise but who believe that happiness can best be brought about by abandoning our American traditions and embracing the dangerous philosophy of a socialistic state.

Billions of dollars, borrowed from the people, have been wasted on visionary, boondoggling projects. Bureau upon bureau has been created to build giant pyramids of governmental power. A doctrine of scarcity has been substituted for one of plenty. Government ownership and domination of business has been the watchword, and its evils are increasing day by day. Government regulation of business has multiplied manyfold. Capitalism has been treacherously criticized. Labor has been deluded and misled by crafty and mercenary leaders. Powerful propaganda agencies are at work trying to destroy confidence in private management. Government subsidies, with ugly political implications, have been forced upon producers. Faith in Federal Government has been seriously shaken.

We have been fingerprinted, numbered, and measured for a political collar. We have been told where we could work, when we could work, and for what salary we could work. We have been told what we could plant, how much of the crop we could harvest, where we could sell it, and for what price. We have been told what we could buy, when we could buy it, where we could buy it, and the number of points we had to surrender for it. It has all crept upon us so slowly and has been fed to us so adroitly, colored with high-sounding words, that before we knew it we were engulfed by its sinister ramifications.

Washington today is a nesting place for political obstructionists. Industry, under the New Deal, has been flogged and persecuted. It has been victimized by the destructive manifestations of a blundering government. Political morons, who couldn't find their way out of a revolving door, have sat in judgment and rendered decisions affecting all industry. Theirs has been a persistent demoralization and dissipation of constitutional government.

If we are to survive as a nation, we must exterminate the crackpots and political gangsters now living off the people and trying to debase and ruin every elemental decency of civilized life. We must exterminate the fleecy-minded cloud dwellers who say that we need not be concerned with the public debt because we owe it to ourselves. Plainly the New Deal is suffering from administrative infirmities for which there is no cure. The bureaucrats have made Washington a paradise of intellectual vacancy.

While Federal Government has been floundering pathetically in an economic whirlpool of its own making, industry in Pennsylvania has freed itself from the economic strait jacket imposed by 4 years of the "little New Deal." It has taken two Republican administrations to erase the painful burden of that political debauchery.

We know, therefore, from experience why it is necessary to have the right kind of government under which all men and all enterprise can exist. We know from experience that real jobs cannot be created by the wave of a magic governmental wand. They can come from only one source; private funds, representing the accumulations of individual investors and the capital reserves of industry. Funds for jobs will not be forthcoming if

industry's surplus earnings are stripped by excessive taxes leaving only a Mother Hubbard's cupboard to sustain private enterprise. Only through men with courage to speak out frankly, even at the risk of persecution and abuse, can we hope to retain the American way of life and our enterprise system upon which all America is dependent.

The American people have an opportunity this year to change this government of theirs and to drive into exile the men who have so perversely obstructed the Constitution and stigmatized the Bill of Rights. The American people have a chance to oust a parasite army of high-salaried, fumbling bureaucrats. They have an opportunity to abolish the meaningless bureaus and commissions hampering all human activity. Through the instrumentality of the American ballot, we, as a nation, have a chance to restore our self-respect, our initiative and our self-confidence. A political victory for the New Deal would mean the incomprehensible spectacle of national dissolution.

The question is: What are we going to do about it, and how are we going to do our part? That is the issue I wish to present on this national holiday to the sound-thinking men and women of Pennsylvania who are charged with the management of our industries. Educational programs alone are not sufficient. Definite, intensive and intelligent political action, as the first mandatory obligation of every citizen, is the only thing that will win. The great American populace does not want a socialized state. There are comparatively few of our people who look forward to a future made bleak and shapeless by Government regimentation of all industry. There are not many American workmen, once shown the light, who will want to remain forever under the thumb of some arrogant labor czar in order to have a job. When the issues are clearly understood, I believe the American people will turn irresistibly against the mad practitioners of bureaucratic Government. Every American will want a chance to support his Government instead of being supported by Government, for he will know that Government doles can never be a permanent cure for unemployment.

Certainly the people of America do not wish to be ruled by a group of fan-tailed theorists and political saboteurs who would change the calendar and the clock and try to repeal the law of supply and demand. Labor has the right to organize and bargain collectively as to wages, hours, and working conditions. But what good, may I ask, is the right to organize and bargain collectively with a bankrupt employer? Government ownership and operation surely is not the solution, especially for ambitious and active workers. How can labor get higher wages and better working conditions and shorter hours unless the industry for which it works is healthy and prosperous and operated by free private enterprise?

The people should and can be made to understand that self-seeking labor leaders who would socialize this country and make government the absolute employer of all are not the friends of labor, but its worst enemies. I am of the opinion that once American workmen understand the picture as it really exists they will realize that they have little chance to bargain with an all-powerful bureaucratic government operating the industries of this Nation. The rank and file of labor has every need for sound management in the industries which provide employment and a chance for each man to rise according to his will and abilities. The great partnership of capital, management, and labor so indispensable to our progress onward and upward must be understood and preserved.

Our American workmen must be taught that the overlords of labor—money-hungry, dues-chasing opportunists—are interested only in the kind of government which encourages their acquisitive tendencies at the expense of both labor and industry. We are all familiar with the C. I. O.'s brazenly announced plans for a $700,000 slush fund to help underwrite the fourth-term campaign. Isn't it high time that American workmen began to understand that their prosperity and the survival of private enterprise are irrevocably linked together? They must be taught to ask themselves:

"If private enterprise collapses, can the generalissimos of labor provide the weekly wage?"

Industry must act now to direct the thought of labor along constructive, cooperative lines. Businessmen, in their devotion to this task, must disregard the punitive action that may be taken against them. They must forget their Government contracts. This is the last time any of us will have a chance to catch the boat. Business insures against all types of calamity, but what insurance is it taking out against the death of free enterprise at the hands of political incompetents?

Industry, by recognizing this threat to its existence, can help bring to an end the weird illogicalities of government which have been cunningly incubated and promoted by bureaucratic demagogues. Industry must help to end forever the chance that America will again be lulled by the narcotic arguments of these political hypnotists.

American employers must take their employees into their confidence. They must institute a broad and cohesive program of political education—in offices and plants—to show their employees the ominous realities and dangers of bureaucratic government.

I believe that our industries should set up departments to study legislation and its effect upon all forms of trade and commerce. Such departments could show employees the infinite scope and vast importance of political thought and its relation to their own domestic economy. Knowledge of this kind would enable American workers to intelligently make their own political decisions instead of having their decisions made for them by beguiling labor chieftains. Knowledge of this kind would be an effective quarantine against the contagion of economic paralysis and class dissension. With this fount of information to enlighten his thought, the average worker would soon realize that neither employer nor employee can exist under an administration so hostile to their combined interests. An employee's intelligent self-interest compels him to conclude that he cannot separately prosper—that if his employer is bankrupted, the employee becomes jobless.

I solemnly warn you here today that American businessmen must become politically active or be destroyed in the furnace of hatreds and fears now being stoked by the New Deal's dream of complete domination of all industry and all human affairs.

Industry, through its legislative and political education departments, can show workers how the field of personal opportunity is being limited and restricted by the New Deal's assumption of questionable authority. It can show now government, by its absolute authority in negotiating reciprocal trade agreements—many of them dangerous to the economic security of American producers—is creating a form of political autocracy diametrically opposed to every sustaining feature of constitutional government.

How many individuals responsible for the successful operation of Pennsylvania industries are concerning themselves right now with the selection of candidates for Congress next fall? How many are preparing to see that the people are registered to vote next November? I repeat again—political action must be the first job of every citizen in this country during the coming months. Every father and mother with a boy in the service, and every other person with a loved one on the battlefields, owes them an obligation by doing their part to preserve the form of government for which these gallant men are now fighting.

Unless American industry organizes now, even more strenuously than it has organized for war, we may lose in the peace to come those precious things for which so many lives and fortunes are being sacrificed.

We cannot blindly embrace political promises of breakfast in bed for everybody without once stopping to inquire who would provide and serve the breakfasts.

Unless the growth of our industries is promoted in the American way, through teamwork between labor, management, and capital, free from the mental and physical exhaustions of an arbitrary bureaucracy, our strength to protect our freedom will vanish.

Destroy our enterprise system, and you destroy America.

Let us keep intact the inducements which for so long have inspired men in all departments of management and enabled them to direct men, money, and machines to better serve the public, elevate the American standard of living, and provide jobs.

Today the eyes of the world are on America. If we lose our great enterprise system and exchange our constitutional government for a bureaucratic monstrosity, I believe the consequences will be comparable only to the fall of Rome, which ushered in the period known in history as the Dark Ages and which continued through a thousand years.

Since these vital issues will be decided at the polls, every businessman with a grain of faith in the permanence of our enterprise system must get behind political candidates who will uphold the economic principles and traditions which have made America great. Ours is not an impossible task. We distinctly have something to sell. Private enterprise is a first-line item, but we have made the blunder of expecting it to sell itself. To atone for this, we must get the message across to the American people quickly and effectively.

We must redeem ourselves now or our last opportunity will have passed. My appeal to you is for immediate action before it is forever too late.

We must remember on this national holiday, that the greatness of George Washington is the greatness of America. He was the composite of a great people and I dare say his memory will be fresh in the minds of men long after the current self-seekers of governmental power have been lost in the sands of time.

If the post-war years to come are to be years of a better life; a grander attainment, a higher concept of individual energy and effort, a greater progress of all mankind, we will have to make the decision in 1944 or forever hold our peace. If we can assure the right kind of decision, the battle for the preservation of American principles and American government—of, for, and by the people—will not have been in vain.

Through this night of war and danger, through the storms which lie ahead, the organic law of our constitutional form of government, as exemplified by Washington, must guide and sustain us. Industry has a real, man-sized job to do. That is our destiny and we cannot fail to heed its call.

Birthday of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call, published in the city founded by Alexander Hamilton and named after William Paterson,

who helped write the Constitution, remembers that precious document of our liberties in the following editorial of Wednesday, March 1, 1944:

BIRTHDAY OF OUR CONSTITUTION

One hundred and fifty-five years ago today the United States Constitution went into effect—on March 1, 1789. Three days later George Washington was elected President of the United States. The Constitution took the place of the totally inadequate Articles of Confederation of 1777–78.

The limitation of the Articles of the year 1778 had become more and more apparent as time went on. There was no provision therein to allow Congress to raise money by taxation, and an income tax was not even a bad dream. Opposition of one or more States was even powerful enough to prohibit Congress levying tariff duties. Congress, in the words of George Washington, had no "coercive power." Out of all this grew the conviction that "a more perfect union" was mandatory, and the Constitutional Convention of 1787 met with the aim in view of drawing up a Constitution to this end. It was adopted and signed in September 1787. The first Federal Congress sat September 13, 1788, to consider methods of voting for President, choosing Presidential electors, "and other similar business" under its authority, and on March 4, the following year, the first United States Congress commenced its proceedings in conformity with the new Constitution which had just gone into effect.

Many say that credit for the adoption of our Constitution should be paid also to the Annapolis Convention held in September 1786, called "to consult on the best means of remedying defects in the Federal Government." Twelve delegates from five States attended, among them being our own Alexander Hamilton (soon afterward to found our city of Paterson) and James Madison, destined later to become the fourth President of the United States. Hamilton later signed the Constitution, as did Gov. William Paterson, after whom the city of Paterson was named.

The preamble to the Constitution is a work of political genius, expressing as it does, in a few words, the high aims toward which this Nation truly aspires. It reads: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

So to Gladstone's remarkable eulogy "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man" we say "Amen."

Let us guard it with eternal reverence and vigilance, for it is the guaranty of all our civic liberties.

Civilian Pilot Training Program, With Its Great War Contribution, Should Not Be Closed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to read in war communiques of the great American bomber fleets that range daily over Hitler's Europe, blasting the way for the invasion bringing victory to our arms.

But it is also sobering to realize that not many years ago we did not have in our Air Forces enough pilots to man half the bombers we now send over Germany on a single foray. When Gen. Henry H. Arnold assumed command of our Army Air Forces in 1938, we had but 1,600 planes and only 1,300 officers.

We have performed miracles since then, training and sending into victorious battle hundreds of thousands of men who in an incredibly short time have been taught the art of flight. How did we do it?

In his report to the Secretary of War in January, General Arnold points out that the air-force expansion which Congress decreed in 1939 was completely beyond the scope of the existing Military Establishment. The Army did not have the facilities to train anything like the number of pilots needed. The armed forces were forced to call on the civilion-pilot-training facilities to take our fat out of the fire.

We would not have had those facilities if we had not, in the previous year, taken steps to build them up by approving the Civil Aeronautics Administration's plans for the Civilian Pilot Training Program. Since 1941 it has been known as the War Training Service and has been devoted entirely to the needs of the armed forces.

We have allotted to this program some $288,000,000 and no money we ever voted has been better spent. The graduates of this program are the backbone of the service air forces—Army and Navy and marines. For $288,000,000 we have gotten a quarter of a million airmen.

Now this activity is scheduled to expire. The Civilian Pilot Training legislation expires June 30. The Army and Navy have decided that their main training need from now on will be only for replacements, and that their own facilities will be adequate. The CPT–WTS program would seem to be on the way out.

I submit that to allow this to happen would be terribly unwise. It might hamper our war effort in the crucial times still ahead, and it will certainly have a harmful effect on the peacetime aviation development around which the future of America will largely depend.

We have been fortunate in this war because the casualty rate for pilots has been far less than expectations. But we cannot assume—or should not—that this will always be so. We must be prepared for the possibility that once again we will need more pilots than the service schools can train. If that need arises, we must have civilian schools ready. We cannot afford to dissipate our training reserves by closing down civilian facilities and losing skilled instructors and mechanics.

C. P. T. does an economical, safe, and efficient job of training pilots, and we know that men with previous C. P. T. training wash out less frequently and learn faster once they are in Army training.

There are other factors that we must remember. No community in the postwar world can have any hope of development unless it has air contact with others thereby widening its circumference of influence and living. In hundreds of towns and cities throughout America, the local air facilities are those of the C. P. T. operator. If we make it impossible for him to keep his hangars open and his landing field in shape from now until the end of the war, we are very possibly throttling the municipality which he is trying to serve. We are making it just so much more difficult to reestablish the civilian pilot training effort we will always need to keep up our armed forces reserves and assure continued progress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following measure on which I have requested a hearing:

House Resolution 4181

A bill to extend the period of operation of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "and not less than 25 percent of the students selected for such training shall be selected from civilian applicants who have reached 16 years of age but have not reached 18 years of age."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after "July 1, 1944," the following: "or 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, whichever is the later," and by adding at the end of such section 7 a new sentence as follows: "As used in this section the term 'termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination."

Inexact Brethren of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial, Inexact Brethren of the Press, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald is worth preserving, especially for the benefit of those who argue that this year's revenue bill, as passed by Congress, is inadequate. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include this excellent observation on this year's tax bill:

INEXACT BRETHREN OF THE PRESS

We estimate that 9 out of 10 columnists, editorial writers, etc., have committed and repeated the same inaccuracy in the last pair of weeks. They have fallen into the error of saying that President Roosevelt asked for a "$10,000,000,000 tax bill," that Wendell Willkie urged "$16,000,000,000" in taxes, and that Congress under the urging of Senator BARKLEY repassed a "$2,000,000,000 tax bill" over the President's veto.

The fact is that the Government is already taking about $32,000,000,000 a year in income taxes. Therefore, what Roosevelt wanted was a $42,000,000,000 tax bill, what Willkie wanted was a $48,000,000,000 tax bill, and what Congress passed was a $34,000,000,000 tax bill.

We were surprised to see even so habitually accurate a columnist as David Lawrence, pub-

lisher of the respected United States News, fall into this error the other day.

Impossible though it is for any human mind to visualize so much as one billion units of anything, we should all have an accurate conception of just how much this administration is taking from us in taxes.

REVOLUTION BY TAXATION

We should all know, too, just what Mr. Roosevelt is aiming at. He wants not only to win a victory in this global war, but also, it seems, to bring about a social revolution in this country.

His plans are now so far along that a New York resident having the unusual net income of $1,000,000 a year must pay income taxes of $1,047,000 a year in 1944 and 1945 to the Federal and State Governments. Thus, such a person has less of an income after taxes than a person with an income of $3,000 a year.

The object of this administration is to confiscate the national wealth and blow it out of cannon mouths or into Social Security, W. P. A. and related schemes.

We aren't saying that this object is wrong. Maybe socialism or communism will and ought to supplant capitalist democracy in this country.

What we do contend is that all of us should know accurately what the aims and objectives of this administration are—that it is out to wreck the existing American system and replace it with some system which the administration believes to be a better one.

We should not call communism by other, less blunt names, or let ourselves be bemused by pretty words designed to camouflage the actual intentions of our ruler.

Address by Hon. Albert B. Chandler, of Kentucky, at Meeting of Western Mining War Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on January 29, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] made a notable speech at Denver before the Western Mining War Conference, held under the auspices of the Colorado Mining Association. The Senator from Kentucky spoke the vigorous, courageous language of the West, and he uttered the common sense economic and political philosophy dear to the heart of every real American.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it may be widely read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was with deep appreciation that I received the kind invitation of the Colorado Mining Association which I was more than glad to accept. For we in Washington have watched the fine work in this western mining country and also in Washington of your able secretary, Bob Palmer. So I looked forward with a great deal of pleasure to meeting the mine operators of the West in Denver. The invitation to speak in Colorado, which your association extended to me, was joined in by your distinguished sons of Colorado, Senators JOHNSON and MILLIKIN. You have reason to be proud of the magnificent services they are rendering to the people of Colorado.

AMPLE RAW MATERIALS IN THIS COUNTRY

With very few exceptions we have in this country ample supplies of raw materials. Some of these materials have to be mined and some have to be grown. National policies should be adopted that will encourage maximum production in this country when the war is over. It is a matter of degree of self-sufficiency that can be maintained and which must be determined in each particular case. In mining as in the fuels there must be an incentive to develop new supplies. It seems to me to be just as sensible and has the same effect upon the living standards of this country to import cheap laborers as to import the products of their labor.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO THE MARKETS AND TRANSPORTATION BASES THAT WE ARE COMMITTED TO DEFEND

We should establish once and for all equal rights to the markets and to the commercial use of airfields and harbors that we have constructed and improved all over the world and that we have committed ourselves to defend. It must be remembered that we have spent more than $500,000,000 on airfields all over the world and in most places we have reserved for ourselves only the right to get out when the war is ended.

There may have been some difference of opinion prior to the war as to the obligation of the American people to defend the Pacific area. That must have been dispelled by events which have occurred since the outbreak of the war. Except for the power and might of the United States of America, the Japs would have occupied Australia, New Zealand, New Caledonia, and the Fijis, and all of the islands of the South Seas. The United States is the only Nation that can defend this great area in the future.

COMMITMENTS TO DEFEND VERSUS MANDATED AREAS

We have long been committed by the Monroe Doctrine to defend South America against any invasion. We are likewise committed to defend the Pacific area through our possessions including Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines. We must establish a national and international policy that is realistic and we must fortify and hold in force strategic locations in the areas where we are committed to defend without a repetition of the sacrifices of American lives in a hopeless gesture such as the defense of the Philippines proved to be. The boys in the Pacific are out there taking back the country the hard way which we permitted to be mandated to Japan after the last war, but in the taking of this country we are losing many lives.

These boys do not want this country to permit these mandated islands to go back into the hands of the Japs. At the close of the last war we mandated many islands in dispute throughout the world, many of them located in the Pacific on our own doorstep, to our allies, France and England.

MANDATES MERGED INTO OWNERSHIP

Mandate normally indicates a protectorate, but such mandates amounted to virtually an ownership for all practical purposes, even to the imposition of tariffs against this country, thereby turning the trade into the nation under whose flag they were currently being operated. This siphoned the trade out of our own front yard into the coffers of other nations who have long realized that the employment and profit is in the manufacture and sale of processed and fabricated products, and always know what they want at the peace table. They know what wars are about and exactly what they are fighting for. They have a definite national policy, and to emphasize they are very realistic.

MUST MAINTAIN STRATEGIC BASES—TRANSPORTATION AND TRADE

We must get rid of our policy of "take and abandon" and take and hold where the future destinies of the American people are involved. World War 2 has emphasized the absolute necessity for a continued strong and industrially developed western region in the interest of adequate national defense. We must maintain our trade relations and our post-war merchant marine and our air-lines transportation.

PACIFIC GATEWAYS

The Pacific gateways are natural outlets for the Pacific areas and a considerable part of South America. To maintain the necessary strong transportation systems, including railways and highways for transcontinental solidarity, it is necessary to encourage the development of our raw materials, and processing and fabricating industries on a regional and community basis.

SOUTH AND THE WEST

Both the South and the West have suffered because of conditions that have been brought about which have permitted the processing and fabricating industries to congregate in a few so-called industrial centers. The natural result has been that large sections of this country have furnished the raw materials which have been shipped long distances to such centers and then a large part of the manufactured goods returned for consumption to the very area that produced the materials in the first place, again very realistic.

POPULATION TRENDS—REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT—FREIGHT RATES

When the population was largely congregated on the Atlantic coast in the early days it was a natural development, but for the past half century the trend of population has been to the South and to the West. And now with industry in a state of flux due to the war and with large Government investments in manufacturing and fabricating plants throughout the Nation it will be a great catastrophy if this Nation does not now thoroughly explore the possibilities of properly integrating and locating such processing and fabricating plants on a regional development basis where the products may go to the consumer at the lowest ultimate cost. If this is done the apparently inequitable freight rates will naturally be adjusted to the new set-up. The existing freight rates are more a reflection of a condition than the cause of the present situation.

This country is rich in raw materials and has the ability to maintain a high standard of living from its own resources, but the men responsible for our foreign relations policy have apparently not given adequate consideration to the necessity to provide for equal access to foreign markets in the area which we are committed and have for many years been committed to defend.

NATIONAL POLICIES—REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT—TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION

We are faced with a national problem of adjusting our own domestic affairs, which means the adoption of national policies, which will permit the development of the region and communities in every part of the United States. We are confronted with the necessity of working out and adopting a definite, clear-cut international policy that will forever protect our equal right to the trade and transportation facilities within the area we are committed to defend. We recognize the right of any nation to put a tariff on any product it may decide to develop within its own confines or to raise their standards of living, and I want to support a policy for this Nation that under proper conditions will maintain our standard of living, but we must definitely and forever abandon the policy of permitting any nation far removed from

placing tariffs against us in mandated or otherwise controlled countries within the area that we are committed to defend, and forcing the trade halfway around the world in the opposite direction.

The way to develop the raw materials and the processing and fabricating industries of this country is to adopt national policies which will prove an incentive to such development. The way to develop strong regions and communities in every part of the Nation is to foster proper integration of local industries during the reconversion period. The way to develop the needed international trade is to insist upon equal access with every other foreign nation to the trade within the area that we are committed to defend, regardless of mandates or present nonresident claimants, and to analyze and determine the products we can produce for ourselves and the products which each country has to offer with whom we would like to trade.

ENCOURAGE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

We must take a leaf out of England's book and encourage our business interests to expand throughout the world with a minimum of Government interference.

GOVERNMENT BY LAW—NOT EXECUTIVE ORDER

We must abandon the idea of a government by Executive order and get back to the policy of government by law. Stability is required for investments by individuals and the proper safeguarding of employment.

INDUSTRIAL SURVEY—WAR PRODUCTION—POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT

You people have just had completed for you an industrial survey of the 11 Western States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines, sponsored by the Governors and by the businessmen, utilities, and industrialists of these States, and the Congressional Delegates from the Territories. This survey has been made by George W. Malone, of Nevada, and is a factual inventory of your resources; an industrial encyclopedia, including the raw materials, markets, industries, and plant factors of the region. It should be, and I am advised that it will be kept up to date and extended to the remainder of the Pacific trade area and to the South American countries. Armed with the facts with respect to your situation, there should be no difficulty in mapping out a comprehensive program which will protect the interests of this section of the country in the future, and which will point the way to the best possible post-war utilization of the war plants and industrial units of the region.

STRONG WEST NECESSARY

The Jap war has proved for all time the necessity for a strong West—a well developed West—raw materials and fabricating industries, and well-developed harbors and airfields. The spotlight is turning on the Western States as the war momentum steps up in the Pacific.

MARKETS—FUTURE TRENDS

There are 21 countries and 250,000,000 people in the Americas alone. There are one-half billion more on the western rim of the Pacific. This is where our major interests lie and the possibilities for future trade and expansion are boundless.

POLICIES FOR LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICA—CHURCHILL—STALIN

The time has come to face the situation squarely. You should insist that this country adopt national and international policies that are to the best long-range advantage of America. Our allies are not embarrassed in proclaiming their policies and intentions. Mr. Churchill has emphasized that he did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, and he has said that the British Commonwealth of Nations means to hold its own unless it is given something that offers to it an equally solid guaranty.

Joseph Stalin shows no embarrassment in making clear that he intends that Russia shall take and hold the territory necessary for the future safety and economic security of that great nation. England has, over many generations, lived and become great through the control of the trade and its far-flung Empire. Being unable to protect it for a second time in a generation, we are sending American boys all over the world to assist her in the job. Russia has for many years wanted and sorely needed a warm-water outlet for her shipping, and the desire to enlarge its shipping through additional country now controlled by stronger countries. She is now frankly out to get that, and there is no question in my mind that she will succeed.

Some say that we should not offend our allies by indicating that we would be interested in so commonplace a thing as economic matters. I am a Kentuckian and an American, deeply interested and concerned in the future welfare of our people. I believe that the best and most effective way to obtain the best results in the future is to talk frankly with your partners and have realistic understandings with them now and not wait until the war is over.

VISITED FIGHTING FRONTS—BOYS ENCOURAGED

I have visited practically every fighting front all over the world. I know the hardships that your sons and daughters are undergoing. They have been sustained and comforted by a magnificent demonstration of the determination of the American people to produce effectively the weapons of war and transport them to places where they could be best used. In spite of strikes, for which there is no excuse, and for which no American can offer approval, the American people have confused and astounded the whole world by their splendid production of munitions of war during the last 2 years. The American boys on the battle fronts who are offering their lives for the freedom of the world are entitled to the maximum support of every citizen of the country. Their courage and their fortitude must be matched by those of us at home. They will win the war, just as their fathers did 25 years ago. We must not lose the peace, just as our fathers did 25 years ago.

One more than one-third of the membership of the Senate of the United States can destroy any agreement offered to be made by the officials of our Government with a foreign government, and therefore it seems highly important that we resolve to become acquainted with the realities of the war situation to such an extent that we do not fail again.

WESTERN PROBLEMS—MINING—PRODUCTION

Now to get to some of the particular problems in our western mining States. The mining industry cannot be complimented too highly for the extraordinary ability they have shown to produce absolutely all the necessary and strategic minerals and metals, with only one or two exceptions, not only to prosecute the war but to build up inventories of these minerals and metals to such an extent capable of carrying on this intensive war for months to come with—it is fortunate we can build these stock piles of metals—ease security and insurance. While these inventories of minerals and metals are building, we in the legislative branch must, be kept fully aware of the absolute necessity of your ability to maintain these inventories by keeping your development work underground somewhat abreast of your intensive production of these minerals and metals. This is becoming a serious problem, but to sell all the goods off your shelves without restocking—in this case producing ore without replenishing additional ore reserves.

JOHNSON AMENDMENT

I have kept abreast of the mining situation—the Johnson (Colorado) amendment will do a great deal in defining gross income by allowing usual metallurgical process in your costs. Other mining definitions are going to be necessary to keep the bureaus from making arbitrary interpretations of regulations for tax purposes.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

Some of these bureaus have borne down too heavily on your mining operators and in doing so may have hurt your manpower situation and God knows it is tough enough anyway without bureaus aggravating it. I know the Manpower Commission is going to take some of the heart-to-heart talks you have had with them very seriously, as the improvements in mining conditions, living, schools, doctoring, shipping, etc., are very real.

PRECIOUS METALS PRODUCTION

While all minerals and metals are getting into the inventory stage it seems time to think of post-war production of the precious metals, gold and silver. Gold has been declared nonessential to the war effort, principally on account of the manpower situation. We have bowed to the decision of the War Department and have cooperated to the fullest but we sincerely hope the gold mines will be reopened at an early date and our western mining towns come once more into vigorous life.

The American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask that a statement published in the Washington Post on March 1, paying a fine tribute to the American Red Cross, as set forth by Miss Mabel Boardman, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DOES THE RED CROSS DO?

THE HUMAN SIDE OF THE RED CROSS AS TOLD BY MABEL T. BOARDMAN

In approximately 60 countries of the world, Red Cross societies exist. They were started some 70 years ago for the purpose of protecting the sick and wounded of war as well as those caring for them, and also to protect the military hospitals. They function under an international treaty agreeing to this protection.

The American Red Cross began its existence in 1882, after we had signed the treaty. But, it was a very small organization until it was reorganized in 1905; though it had no great growth until the First World War, and since then its senior and junior memberships have amounted annually to over 30,000,000.

Besides its services to the sick and wounded of war, the Red Cross has the duty of rendering relief to the victims of great national and international calamities. At present, all over the country and in our island possessions as well as Alaska, the Red Cross, organized into approximately 3,800 chapters and 7,000 branches, is intensely active.

In the homeland, the Red Cross has representatives in all of the training camps and Army posts where there are a large number of military personnel. Its representatives are a link between the men and their families at home, aiding where there is need through the chapters in the localities where the men's families reside. This is entitled "Home Service."

In the foreign fields, wherever the American forces are stationed, there are also Red Cross trained representatives on hand to act again as a liaison between the men and the work in this country.

In connection with our hospitals overseas, there are recreation rooms, rest houses, et cetera, provided for convalescent men; and wherever there are large numbers of troops stationed, or where they may be allowed to go on leave—for example to London—the American Red Cross has provided hundreds of clubs for their rest and recreation. Few people realize the strain many of these men may be under during weeks of active combat service and the absolute need of relaxation and rest for their rehabilitation. Such care for both the physically and mentally ill and tired men is an obligation of the Red Cross. Men suffer mentally as well as physically. In these clubs overseas, the Red Cross provides coffee, doughnuts or sandwiches, home newspapers and magazines, games of various kinds, and Red Cross trained men and women workers; and everything is conducted as far as possible in a way that suggests the homelife to the men so far from their own land and families.

Another great service for the armed forces has been the response to the request from the Army and Navy Medical Services for some 5,650,000 units of the processed blood plasma. An additional amount of 5,000,000 units, or 110,000 units a week, is being asked for, which the Red Cross is continuing to provide. The blood is donated by volunteers and the additional expense for the processing is provided by the Red Cross with the assistance, where available, of Army and naval medical officers.

For the nursing service of the military forces, the Red Cross nursing department has been of great help in recruiting the needed nursing personnel.

Wherever our fighting forces are we know the Red Cross is ever present and that nothing is left undone that it can add to their well-being.

As for the volunteer services in our home chapters, these volunteers are numbered in the millions. They have provided hundreds of millions of articles in the way of surgical dressings, hospital garments, and clothing for peoples—especially women and children in the devastated countries where it was possible to reach them. Among the varied volunteer services, besides the production of these garments and surgical dressings, we have the staff assistance group who do an immense amount of office work, including publicity, etc. Then there is the canteen group that sometimes looks out for the men in transit or on guard duty around some military or other important Government establishment, by providing some light refreshment. A hot cup of coffee with a sandwich on a cold winter night, or a glass of iced tea on a hot summer night, mean much to the men who carry on faithfully these dull but necessary services. The motor corps of volunteers are a busy group who have done a great deal of important work in the transportation of supplies, personnel, convalescent patients, and made scores of other useful trips. The home service volunteers help in the work for the soldiers' families. The nurse's aides who are in the hospitals, short staffed because of the war, are giving so much help that these civilian institutions might without these aides be forced to close their doors. And, finally, though by no means least, the gray lady group which is so helpful in the hospital recreation departments and in their friendly contacts with the men in the many social events given in the recreation rooms.

Over 17,000,000 children in the schools, enrolled in the Junior Red Cross, also take part in many of these volunteer services of the Red Cross.

Help amounting to over $88,000,000 has been made available by and through the American Red Cross to civilian war victims in Allied countries and to refugees in neutral nations. The world-wide scope of the war is reflected in the nations which have been aided, including England, China, Russia, Greece, Australia, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the Middle East. In fact, it may truly be said that the sun never sets on the flag of the American Red Cross.

Another most important piece of work has been the aid to prisoners of war. Through an international prisoners' agreement, we are able to ship monthly hundreds of thousands of food parcels. For our own prisoners the Government pays for the contents, but the Red Cross meets all other expense. The work of packing the boxes is done by volunteers. Moreover, through the lend-lease, the American Red Cross has been able, at the request of our allies, to send hundreds of thousands of food packages to prisoners of the Allied countries. As American men arrive in prison camps generally from a battlefield, they are without any toilet articles or any clothing excepting what they have on, so prisoners-of-war packages containing warm clothing—including sweaters, socks, caps, gloves, etc.—are provided in the clothing boxes. As soon as American prisoners are reported as having arrived at a prison camp, these boxes are sent from the American Red Cross warehouse in Geneva to these prisons and distributed among the prisoners by one of their own number who has been selected by them as their head.

The Red Cross has also kept up its large first-aid department, training instructors in first aid for the military forces and also instructors to teach swimming, rescue work, and resuscitation. These may be helpful in shipwrecks and gas attacks. First aid instruction has been greatly increased not only among the military forces but the civilian population; and hundreds of thousands of women have been taught home nursing because of the increased demand for the graduate, trained nurse for military hospitals.

All of this work has been carried on without any interruption to the regular relief work of the American Red Cross after serious disasters, of which since 1939 there have been 838.

To carry on this tremendous and most vitally important work, the Red Cross needs both for the national organization and the home chapters a total amount of $200,000,000. There can hardly be an American who will not do his or her part in so great and so wonderful a work as that of the American Red Cross.

Your Red Cross is always by his side.

Mica Wealth of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mica Wealth of New England Has Been Strangled," written by Bill Cunningham, an outstanding writer and columnist, and published in the Boston Sunday Herald of February 20, 1944.

This article is of particular interest to the people of New England and the East—in fact, to all those interested in the war effort.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICA WEALTH OF NEW ENGLAND HAS BEEN STRANGLED—NEGLECTED FOR EAST INDIAN PRODUCT—VAST POSSIBILITIES FOR WAR AND AFTER

(By Bill Cunningham)

Even a native, asked to name the important industries of New England, would probably never say mining, yet depending strictly upon definition, mining is possibly the most important industry in this region at the moment. Important to the war effort right now, and of tremendous potential importance as an industry after the war are the mica mines, known and in prospect, from deep in Connecticut to the Rangeley Lakes region of Maine.

And in all the bungling and blocking, the deliberate skulduggery and undercover byplay for post-war monopoly characteristic of some of our bureaucratic war agencies, none surpasses the strangulation being visited upon New England in this particular field. The strangulation is being applied to domestic mica mining in the seven States of this section where the product is found for that matter, but the tightest squeeze has been on this part of the country.

OPERATED ON STOP-AND-GO BASIS

Mica mining doesn't make very much noise. It hasn't been a very big business. It's operated through the years on a stop-and-go basis, and the average citizen has never even heard of it. But, as a matter of fact, it's one of the oldest industries in New England, the Ruggles Mine, in Grafton County, N. H., having first started to produce in 1803. New Hampshire, now, after North Carolina, the second largest mica-producing State in the Nation, produced all the mica used in this country prior to 1868.

In 1926, the peak year, New Hampshire produced 1,371,890 pounds of mica, representing a value of $235,000. That was the high in a steady climb from 1908, when 12,000 pounds, worth $1,200, was mined, and then it began to slough away until 1939 produced 43,670 pounds, worth $3,738. Last year the State produced 500,000 pounds. It could easily produce a million pounds a year. And there's still Connecticut and Maine, and possibly some parts of Massachusetts to contribute their pounds. There's need for the stuff, war-vital need now and post-war need to come.

By absolute test, and contrary to all previous claims, domestic American mica is just as good as any in the world, but because of cartel monopoly and manipulation, the myth has been erected that mica imported from India and Brazil is better, and mica today, officially rated as the most essential mineral of the war effort is being flown into this country from those two far-away places. It has the topmost aerial transport priority, rated only by quinine.

But to start at the first, what is mica? And why is it so important?

A close enough answer is that it's the stuff isinglass is made of. It was big business in these parts back in the old days, when it was mostly used in the fronts of stoves. It fell into a state of desuetude in time partly because the old-fashioned stove heating was

supplanted by steam radiators and other improvements. The rest of the reason was because big business moved into the field with the story that India mica was superior, the domestic product was undersold, and the domestic mines mostly put out of business. Most of them weren't very big anyhow.

GRADUALLY GETS NEW IMPORTANCE

Modern inventions, involving the use of electricity, gradually gave mica a new importance, and the war has made it of vital importance. The reason for this is that it's vital in the making of condensers. The whole field of electronics is entirely dependent upon it. There are no substitutes for its essential critical uses.

Mechanized warfare is impossible without it. Not an airplane can leave the ground without it. Every plane, tank, submarine, jeep, truck, battleship, and freighter is absolutely dependent upon it. Radio, radar, and television can't function without it, although such substitutes as oiled paper have worked as feeble temporary stop-gaps.

We're newly dependent upon it in the world at war, and we'll be equally dependent upon it in the world that is to follow. There are probably 50 known mines, big and little, where it can be produced now in New England, and many others in North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, New York, New Mexico, and points farther, yet it's still being flown in, vital as air transport is, from India and Brazil, in such fashion that it's hard to escape the conviction that the monopoly of a cartel is being protected.

It has all the earmarks of the story on rubber, tin, quinine, and kindred essentials we were persuaded to import exclusively, rather than develop ourselves. The handling of the matter has been either a stubborn case of bungling, or deliberate protection of the mica-importing industry. Either way, the grip must be broken.

When one realizes that within 2 years, the radio and radar program alone has increased from $20,000,000 per month in actual shipments to $250,000,000, or more, per month, one begins to understand what sort of prize is here at stake.

SO ANOTHER BUREAU IS DECREED

The story of the struggle is interesting—to use an unbiased word. Right after Pearl Harbor, the War Production Board decreed that something must be done to revive the latent mica-mining industry in this country, small, scattered and, in places, abandoned, as it was; so another bureau was decreed. It kicked around for a time trying to find a home and finally wound up as a stepchild of the Metals Reserve Company, which is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

By processes rather vague, a man named George W. Purcell, a veteran mica importer, domiciled in New Jersey, but president of a mica outfit known as the Colonial Mica Co., was named coordinator, or whatever, by the Honorable Jesse Jones. His job was to stimulate domestic production, and the principal method looked toward encouraging domestic miners to reopen again, by helping them finance equipment, the banks assisting, getting them concessions in labor and supplies, and fixing prices that would make production worth their while.

This was only the first part. The rest was to buy the mica, and all the mica, no domestic operator being allowed to sell to any other buyer but this agency—which was, in actuality, the United States Government. The new agency had to have a name. The name it wound up with was Colonial Mica Corporation, which was Purcell's private company's name, with "Corporation" substituted for "Company."

The word was spread. Domestic mica men rallied, anxious to do their bit for the war, and likewise to make a dollar. The stories differed somewhat in the various States, but here's the New Hampshire one: The New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission created an advisory committee upon the State's geology and mineral industry and sent Dr. Harold M. Bannerman to Washington to find out what New Hampshire could do.

This developed into a request from the Colonial Mica Corporation for a meeting to which potential mica producers of the New England States were invited. The meeting was finally held at Canaan, N. H., May 28, 1942. About 250 people attended, spending probably $2,500 to get there and back. They were eager and enthusiastic. Some of them were ready to go to work the next morning. They had been called together to help tackle "a crying war need."

NOTHING READY TO OFFER THEM

The Colonial officials had nothing ready to offer. They had a program they hoped to put through. It included such nebulous bait as: Trying to get manpower exempt from the draft; possibly persuading ration boards to ease up on tires, gasoline, and oil; leasing machinery and equipment at a nominal fee; providing prospecting and mining services from the Colonial personnel; instruction in processing the product; the assurance of a market. But they said they weren't prepared to talk about prices. Since price was the keystone the entire structure depended upon, they might as well not have come. The meeting broke down there, the potential producers walked out disillusioned, and they finally wound up in a local dispute that did nobody a great deal of good.

A program of sorts finally did get under way, and is under way still, but it's been characterized by bickering, battling, and no real cooperation. The general attitude, according to New England mica men, who are as good as any in the business, is that there is definitely no desire to see the industry reborn in a big way in this general section.

Buyers and fieldmen were imported from other mica States, for instance, New Englanders evidently not being considered good enough. Men were brought up from the South to appraise the New England product. The current representative of the agency is an imported Californian, which is certainly nothing against the gentleman, but a New Englander, loyal to the region and fighting hard for it was fired as being too noisy, too this, and too that.

PROGRAM STAGNATED

The entire program, instead of making speed, was stagnated and is stagnated. New Englanders weren't the only ones who gradually grew red under the collar. The North Carolina mica people likewise raised up. This all terminated in an investigation by the Truman committee last June, and the minutes of that examination are pretty pitiful. They revealed that the southern representative of Colonial, one Burgess, since dropped, was a fourth partner in the outfit from which Colonial bought most of its machinery, although, to make it look better, he had transferred his stock to his wife for the consideration of love and affection. But he drew a salary from his machinery business, and another as president of a high-sounding outfit, which, under hammering from the senatorial committee, finally broke itself down to consist of one truck.

All this was testified under oath, as were the details of some of the buying, and price fixing which caused many of the operators to quit in disgust. From a study of the testimony, it's hard not to figure that that was the main idea.

It was the New England crowd that led most of the fight, but nothing happened after the hearing—not even more mica. A gentleman named Pitt, who testified under oath, "I had no experience in mica mining before I became president of this company," is now, and was then, the president of the Colonial, or Government, Corporation at $12,000 a year, his previous job having been in Australia. Purcell is officially vice president and treasurer, but he is a mica man. He provides the know-how, and, according to those who have business with the agency, he is the principal obstacle to domestic expansion.

MADE UP MIND AGAINST DOMESTIC MICA

The New England protestants grant him sincerity and don't go so far as to charge him with a deliberate foreign tie-up. They merely say he's stubborn in the belief that the only top-grade mica is India mica, that he's handled it for many years, has dealt with the firms that control it, that he's made up his mind that domestic mica is no good, and that he won't give it a chance.

He's an old school type, brought up to believe that mica should be graded by an expert's looking at it, and refusing to accept the proof of a machine developed by the Bell Telephone Co. which says, and which proves by test, that domestic mica is as good as any mined anywhere in the world. In fact, he testified before the Truman committee that, although his job was to encourage domestic production, he hadn't conducted any experiments to find out if perhaps, he weren't mistaken.

The Department of Justice, however, evidently isn't so sure that knowingly, or unknowingly, the man isn't serving the interests of another group of companies, that really represent a British-American monopoly in this vital war product. It appears that Purcell was recommended to Jesse Jones by one Howard C. Sykes, who is intimately connected with the British mica interests and who is the head of a company affiliated with the British group specializing in the India import.

FORMS PART OF BRITISH TRUST

And in Bloomfield, N. J., Purcell lives next door to J. P. French, vice president of Eugene Munsell & Co., which is part of the British trust. It's Munsell with which Sykes is affiliated. It's the British trust that has built the theory of Indian mica's superiority so high that the United Sates produces only 20 percent of its own requirements. And it's the United States Government's Bureau of Standards which says that that is strictly the bunk. Having tested all mica from all parts of the world, the Bureau of Standards says there's no difference whatsoever.

The structure of the British trust is amazing. Over all is the British Electrical Institute. Under that comes the Associated Insulating Products Co. This, in turn, controls the Chrestien Mining Co. and F. F. Chrestien & Co., both of India. Then there's the Mica Insulator Co., of which Howard Sykes, the man who recommended Purcell to Jesse Jones, is chairman of the board, and Munsell & Co., with which Sykes is also connected, and whose vice president lives next door to Purcell.

The British trust claims it gets a lot of competition from the American firm of Blood & Schoonmaker, and here we get the omnipotent Mr. Sykes again. He's the son of Alice Adele Schoonmaker.

NEW ENGLAND GYPPED EITHER WAY

There are further ramifications hooking up Blood & Schoonmaker with the British mica combine by family ties, and the net result looks like an over-all trust covering both the import and, at least the southern end of the domestic business, leaving New England gypped either way.

All this has been previously publicized, Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round column, for one, having carried it in this approximate detail last month. But still nothing's done, and the mica stock pile in this country is understood to be down to a 2-month supply, at most.

This is a job for the Department of Justice, and the colonial job is one for some man who's thinking American. And New England deserves more than a break in the shuffle. We've got mica. The war needs mica, and

the world will need it afterward. We can use a new industry. How about really going after this one? It's been pretty weirdly handled up to now.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is 'Free Enterprise'? A Florida Senator's Answer," published in the St. Petersburg Times of February 27 of this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS "FREE ENTERPRISE"?—A FLORIDA SENATOR'S ANSWER

Citizens who take their ballot seriously may want to arm themselves with a list of questions to ask their candidates and orators during the coming months.

Our guess is that a wide variation will occur if we ask each man to define what he means in his support of "free enterprise" and "State's rights"—two slogans which the conservatives, both North and South, are attempting to make a battle cry.

Whether our next administration is Democratic or Republican, our Federal Government will continue to become more and more a referee in the regulation of our economic system. Science, invention, and commerce based on specialization make such regulation inevitable. Business tends to gravitate toward bigger and fewer units of production and distribution. If unchecked, it means the little farmer, the little manufacturer, the little distributor, the little transporter has less opportunity to participate in a system of free enterprise and the worker and consumer do not get proper dividends from the efficiency of large-scale production and the elimination of overlapping competition.

Under a system of socialism the Government becomes the great monopolist. If well administered the system passes on to the people the savings it effects by eliminating wasteful competition. But this carries with it the danger of a static and corrupt control because no adequate check and balance is set up for such monopoly.

Under our democratic-capitalistic system the Government has monopolized certain unprofitable functions like national defense and the post office. As our commerce and communications became more national and less state in scope, the Government has become the referee or public's advocate with obvious monopolies like the telephone system.

But business has had invisible or less obvious monopolies or near monopolies. Antitrust laws were invented to curb such monopolies in order to perpetuate free enterprise and protect the public against overcharges by such private monopolies.

Fire insurance companies doing business in Florida and other Southeastern States ran into the antitrust laws when Robert Elmore, formerly of Jacksonville, now with the Department of Justice, started a suit. The Government briefs brought out that they were charging policyholders $52,000,000 while paying out only $18,000,000 on losses. Every householder and businessman in Florida has a stake in this action of the Government which was performing a proper function in protecting their interest.

When it became apparent that the insurance companies would get licked in the courts they started a high-pressure campaign to get Congress to exempt insurance companies from the antitrust laws. Hundreds of insurance agents were mobilized to bring pressure on their Congressmen to vote for such exemption. Little publicity has been given to the move.

We congratulate Senator CLAUDE PEPPER because he refused to surrender to such high-pressure tactics. Here is a conflict between every person who owns or rents a home or a building, and a few insurance companies which made a mockery of free enterprise and now attempt to hide behind the skirts of States' rights.

We are all for free enterprise and States' rights. It's common sense that as much business and as much government as possible should be carried on at a local or State level and thus avoid as much centralization as possible. But the nature of modern economic and political institutions makes a certain amount of centralized regulation or balancing necessary if the entire public is to be served. Our job is to preserve a balance of free enterprise and avoid the static dangers of socialism. We cannot do this by hypocritical or confused abuse of the slogans of "free enterprise" and "States' rights."

American Prisoners of War in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mrs. Merle Clark, president of the Lost Battalion Club, of Abilene, Tex., together with a copy of my reply.

There being no objection the letter and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABILENE, TEX., *February 7, 1944.*

The Honorable W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a mother of a member of the lost battalion of Texas, our own State National Guard unit, I am eagerly grasping each word that comes from our Capital, but so far I have failed to notice where any effort in particular has been made by either one of our State Senators in regard to aid for these, our boys who are now prisoners of the treacherous Japanese.

Why in Heaven's name do you men, whom we have sent to Washington to represent us in the law-making body of our great Nation, spend your time squabbling like a bunch of spoiled children over things about as essential to the war effort as those which bad little boys fuss over, when our boys, sons of mine and yours, are dying by the thousands? Take the soldiers' vote, for example. I have not heard any howling from the foxholes of the jungles or the cold wreckage of Italy but it issues forth from the politicians in blasts that echo even to our battle lines.

For shame our gallant fighting men have to give their lives that we at home may be free to abuse the privilege of being Americans. If the political bosses will get to work and do their part to bring this war to a speedy close they won't have to worry about the soldiers' votes. Right and justice in the final analysis will prevail.

Very truly yours,
(MRS.) MERLE CLARK,
President, Lost Battalion Club.

FEBRUARY 14, 1944.

MRS. MERLE CLARK,
President, Lost Battalion of Texas,
Abilene, Tex.

DEAR FRIEND: I am in receipt of your communication of recent date, in reference to the atrocities perpetrated on members of our armed forces who have been taken prisoner by the Japanese, and I, of course, feel as keenly as anyone the deplorable treatment accorded our brave soldiers and sailors.

I am greatly interested in our own Texas lost battalion because I knew so many of those splendid and heroic men while I was Governor of Texas and commander in chief of the Texas National Guard. I have been constantly contacting the proper officials in the executive department insisting that some information concerning these men be secured and given to us and that all aid possible be sent to them.

It is certainly distressing to know how our brave men are being so grossly and beastly abused, mistreated, and actually killed, and for our Nation to be in such a helpless position to protect them. I surely hope that we can soon find some way to rescue those who are held prisoners.

The matter of the over-all strategy of the war is, under the Constitution, in the hands of the Commander in Chief who was elected by the citizens of the United States to be President, and this being so, the full responsibility for carrying on the war rests in his hands. I have voted for every measure which he has requested which I considered to be a war measure and will continue to do so. If there develops any way in which the Senate can accelerate the defeat of Japan, you may rest assured that I shall do my part in efforts along that line.

I am very glad that you and I agree on the dilly-dallying of Congress on really important issues and the undue attention they give to relatively unimportant matters. I listened to them all day on January 27 discussing the so-called soldiers' vote bill and late that day made some remarks myself on that subject and some other subjects which I consider very important. I enclose herewith copy of my speech on that day.

Your letter is so sound, sincere, and timely that I am having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Assuring you that I will keep on doing everything I can to help our boys and with best personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours.

A Program for the Rural South After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

March 3, 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a program

for the rural South after the war, prepared by the general office of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, of Memphis, Tenn.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR THE RURAL SOUTH AFTER THE WAR

Last August a questionnaire was sent out by the general office of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, whose address is Box 443, Memphis, Tenn., urging that each of its locals hold one meeting during the month to discuss a program for the rural people of the South in the post-war world. Reports of meetings were made by 41 local groups in various Southern States. The executive council of the union prepared this report and submitted it to the union's tenth annual convention, where it was unanimously adopted by the convention delegates as the union's post-war program for the rural South.

(B) EXTEND FOUR FREEDOMS TO AMERICANS NOW

First of all the members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union want an early end to the war and a peace that will prevent all future world conflicts. They wish to see the "four freedoms" extended to all nations and races of the world. They believe that the United States Government should make every effort to end in our own country the injustices that make a mockery of the ideals set forth as the hope of all people throughout the world.

Members of the union believe that as a matter of wartime necessity the poll-tax laws of the eight Southern States should be repealed and the right to vote be given to all American citizens. They likewise favor the extension of social-security protection to all classes of farmers and farm workers as well as to other groups of citizens who are now excluded. Further, the National Labor Relations Act should be amended to include farm workers, and a special wage and hour measure be adopted to establish standards for farm workers.

(C) 40 ACRES AND A STEEL MULE

To our people in the rural South who are small farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers the "four freedoms" are all bound up in security in the possession of land upon which they can earn a living. Seventy-nine years ago one war ended and 4,000,000 chattel slaves were freed. It was proposed to give each freedman 40 acres and a mule, but nothing was done to bring this about. Instead there was imposed on the newly free Negro and the free-born white alike a new system of exploitation based on the ownership of the good and fertile lands of the South by a few instead of the many. Therefore the reconstruction of the economic basis of the agricultural South is as appropriate today as 79 years ago. In the post-war economy the small-farm operator will for the first time since the introduction of farm machinery be in the position to compete with large-scale commercial farm interests. The development of farm machinery in the last 10 years and the plans of farm implement manufacturers to produce low-priced tractors and other mechanized farm equipment point to this. Estimates have been made that a small farm containing upward of 40 acres can be equipped with farm machinery valued at about $1,000 and operated efficiently. Members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union therefore call for a program of "40 acres and a steel mule."

(D) A NEW LAND POLICY

Therefore we urge that a new land policy be adopted which will break up throughout the Nation the holdings of large tracts of farm land, commercial farming interests, and absentee landlords. We believe that a program should be adopted which will make the use of productive lands in the United States the responsibility of all of the people and that no individual should hold title to land which he and his family are unable to cultivate with their own labor power. The agricultural experts should be called upon to determine the size of farms to be held in each of the various crops and regions of the country. Moreover a law should be enacted placing a graduated land tax on all farm lands owned by individuals and corporate interests above the maximum set for individual farm ownership for each crop or region.

(E) A FARM OWNERSHIP ACT

The Congress should adopt a farm ownership act similar to the Federal Housing Act, which would permit bona fide farm families to purchase land and homes with a down payment of 5 percent and yearly payments spread over a period of 25 years at low rates of interest. The present owners of land should be paid the actual value for the land and improvements thereon .

Members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union believe that a governmental agency similar to that of the present Farm Security Administration should be continued for the purpose of administering the farm ownership act. Such an agency should also provide needed supervision, encourage cooperative ownership of heavy farm machinery, cooperative purchasing of farm supplies, and marketing of farm products through bona fide farmers cooperatives.

Further, members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, nearly all of whom have sons or husbands now in the armed service, believe that first consideration in the purchasing of farms of their own should be given to men now in the service. A bonus of 6 months' pay, as proposed by the President, should be given to all men of the armed forces at the end of the war. The men from the Nation's farms should be given an opportunity to have a part or all of their payments set aside for purchasing a farm of their own. Families of men who will not return at the end of the war should likewise receive the payments and be permitted to buy farms.

(F) MIGRATION AND OPENING OF NEW LANDS TO HOMESTEADERS

The cotton-picking machine, which has long been a threat to the economy of the cotton South, is now beyond the experimental stage, and will likely go into widespread use at the end of the war. The complete mechanization of cotton production will mean the displacement of approximately 1,000,000 farm families now partially employed in raising cotton crops. It is, therefore, imperative that plans be made to reestablish on land of their own a large number of farm families.

It has been estimated that there are about 30,000,000 acres of land in the United States that could be reclaimed for cultivation by irrigation and soil conservation. If this land were opened to homesteaders, 300,000 families could be absorbed. However, members of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union know that at the end of the war hundreds of thousands of farm workers now in the armed services and war industries will head back to the Nation's farms. We realize also that the same situation will prevail in other areas of the Nation as well as in the Southern States. We know that, unless the system of land ownership by a few is changed, the rural South at the end of the war will face starvation and revolt against intolerable conditions more intense than occurred during the depression of the 1930's.

In their discussions suggestions were made by members of the union that the way out for many of the people of the South was an organized migration out of the United States to other countries. These suggestions were the result of observations and reports by members of the union and their friends who are stationed on military outposts throughout the world, where they have seen millions of acres of undeveloped farm land lying unused. It was suggested that Brazil, Australia, Canada, and other allies of the United States might welcome some of our disinherited Negro and white citizens as settlers in areas suitable for farming.

(G) THE USE OF WAR INDUSTRIES OF THE SOUTH IN PEACETIME

Over a billion dollars has been invested by the Government in the construction of war industries in the Southern States. Members of the union believe that these war plants built with Government funds should be operated in the production of peacetime goods in the same manner as the Tennessee Valley Authority now produces and distributes electric power.

The suggestion was also made that permanent Army and Navy camps, no longer needed, be converted into small towns with industries operated part time and that adjoining farm land be put into cultivation for subsistence farming.

Further, members of the union advocate that military and naval buildings which are obviously of a temporary nature be dismantled and the material be put to use in the construction of better farmhouses and outbuildings here in the South and other areas where similar need exists.

Brumidi in District of Columbia Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Brumidi in the District of Columbia Room."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRUMIDI IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ROOM

A quarter of a century Brumidi proudly spent
In decorating, in his special way,
The Capitol in pictures, with one purposeful intent
Of painting scenes, to live beyond his day,
His heart within him yearned
To leave no stone unturned,
As daily toiled he, with determined zest—
And every small detail he wrought with great concern—
For he did nothing that was not his best.

The District of Columbia room gives ample evidence
Of his unquestioned mastery of art,
There painted on the ceiling, proving clearly his intents
To fix his pictures in the human heart—
He wished them to remind
The wide world of mankind
How great a debt of gratitude we owe
To this great Government, so wondrously designed
That no dictator's voice can overthrow.

"A little child shall lead them" must have sunk into the mind
Of great Brumidi, for the children play
A large part in his paintings, and are artfully enshrined
In District of Columbia room, where they
Look down on us in love,
It seems, from up above,
And lift the meditations of our hearts
To planes of thinking which Brumidi would approve,
For he admired admirers of the arts.

Beneath the paintings on the ceiling, just above each wall,
Of this historic room, one word appears,
Just half-way 'twixt the corners, at the center of it all,
Which widens in its meaning, with the years,
These tactful pictures tell
To human hearts quite well
The truths that he determined to impress
There on the people's hearts; for pictures do excel
The printed words whose purposes they stress.

Above the northern wall, while Physics, richly painted, shines,
Geography adorns the eastern wall,
Telegraphy the western wall becomingly enshrines,
And History tells the story of it all.
No one now living knows
Just why Brumidi chose
These words, and for what cause he put them there,
And history, till time shall come dow... toward its close,
May never to the wond'ring world declare.

The District of Columbia room belongs to all the States,
And yet it does, in fact, belong to none—
Herein the District laws are planned, but from it emanates
The rule of conduct for none but its own.
The artist, we presume,
Resolved to give this room
The very best that it was his to give—
And, through the coming years, down to the day of doom,
In these, his pictures, will Brumidi live.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Nation's Fishery Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Charles E. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Coordinator of Fisheries, delivered before the consultants of the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, on February 3, 1944, on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 112.

The manuscript has been submitted for estimate, and the cost is estimated to be $120.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 26 Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 112. The resolution directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a survey of the character, extent, and condition of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources and other aquatic resources of the United States and its territories, including the high-seas resources in which the United States may have interest or rights. The resolution sets forth in detail the type of information desired and requires a report on commercial and recreational fisheries to be submitted to Congress not later than next January 1. If the resolution is adopted, it will be the first time since 1871 that Congress has of its own initiative directed a report of this nature.

Seventy-three years ago Representative H. L. Dawes, of Massachusetts, introduced a joint resolution "for the protection and preservation of the food fishes of the coast of the United States."

Under the authority of this resolution the United States Fish Commission in 1887 submitted the final chapter of a voluminous six-volume report setting forth in detail the extent of the Nation's fishery resources and the number of men and vessels employed. The report issued a warning that contrary to general belief the fisheries of the oceans and rivers were not inexhaustible. It included a large number of illustrations of the various species of fish, the several types of vessels and boats, the character of the people engaged in fisheries, the communities dependent upon the prosecution of the fisheries, and other detailed data.

Senator BAILEY'S resolution goes much further. It directs an inquiry into the economic phases of the fishing industry and is designed to build a program for the future development of the natural marine and fresh-water resources of the Nation. It is indeed a hopeful sign when Congress again initiates an inquiry into the status of our fisheries.

The several laws of Congress enacted from time to time have granted rather wide authority to the Fish and Wildlife Service or its predecessor agencies, but unfortunately the frequent waves of economy in normal times and restricted appropriations to regular Government establishments in wartimes have so limited appropriations that we have insufficient trained personnel available to correlate the wealth of data in our files, much less conduct needed inquiries of the many species of commercial and game fishes, some of which are already being intensively prosecuted and are in danger of depletion. Year after year the Secretary of Commerce and lately the Secretary of the Interior have requested ample appropriations to carry on and enlarge our fisheries program, but unfortunately adequate appropriations have failed to materialize.

I agree with the statement in the resolution that the fishery industries of the United States have been neglected. The westward expansion of our Nation over vast land areas has placed the emphasis on land use. Consequently the American people have forgotten the potentialities of our marine resources. In fact there seems to be less emphasis on these resources at the present time than there was in the early history of the Nation. So rapid has been the advance of land utilization that the Government has found it necessary to undertake a program of taking millions of acres of marginal land out of production. And now we plan the expenditure of billions of dollars for irrigation to make deserts bloom. Such a program is necessary for a growing nation, but we have delayed too long the development of our extensive marine and fresh-water resources. The cost of developing these resources is insignificant when compared with land development, for neither planting nor feeding nor fertilization is necessary. Nature produces a crop of the seas without cost to man, leaving only the expense of harvesting.

Long before America was discovered, England, France, Spain, and Portugal were fishing the rich Grand Banks of the North Atlantic. It is interesting to note that early American settlements were located either on the coast or on the banks of rivers in order that the settlers might depend on the rich resources of the sea to sustain them pending the clearing of the land for agricultural use. Reports of early explorers and settlers painted glowing tales of the rich American fisheries. The New England fisheries constituted America's first export business. Lord Cornwallis, after traversing Senator BAILEY'S own State of North Carolina and while encamped in the adjoining State of South Carolina, reported to the English Crown that the colony of Carolina was worth maintaining if only to permit Englishmen to partake of the sweet-tasting, fresh-water bream.

Since 1871 a great many improvements have taken place in the American fisheries. Motive power of vessels has changed from sails to steam and from steam to gasoline and Diesel motors. In spite of technological advancements, however, progress in the fisheries has not kept pace with progress in other food industries.

It is interesting to compare the fishery statistics of the 1880's with those of 1943. Let us look at the list of 10 leading species of the 2 periods:

1880—Species:	*Pounds*
1. Menhaden	495,000,000
2. Cod	294,000,000
3. Oysters	153,400,000
4. Mackerel	131,250,000
5. Alewives	52,100,000
6. Salmon	45,000,000
7. Sea herring	42,820,000
8. Haddock	42,800,000
9. Lobster	28,880,000
10. Mullett	21,600,000
1943—Species:	
1. Pilchard	966,000,000
2. Menhaden	625,000,000
3. Salmon	496,000,000
4. Shrimp	150,000,000
5. Mackerel	139,000,000
6. Sea herring	132,000,000
7. Tuna	129,500,000
8. Rosefish	115,000,000
9. Haddock	100,000,000
10. Cod	60,000,000

You will note that some of the leading producers in 1943 were not taken in sufficient volume to be listed in 1880. Indeed, pilchard, tuna, and rosefish were not taken at all, while salmon was barely one-tenth of the 1943 production.

Cod, which was No. 2 in volume in 1880, is now No. 10. The sacred cod of Massachusetts was first displaced by haddock, but today rosefish has forged ahead of both cod and haddock. Only 10 years ago, rosefish were tossed back into the sea as worthless.

Pilchard has doubled its volume in the last 10 years and since 1934 has averaged about a billion pounds annually. Menhaden has been a consistent producer through the years. It was No. 1 in 1880 and No. 2 in 1943.

The production of food fish, as distinguished from fish used in byproducts industries, has increased little since the 1880's. If we leave out of consideration the Pacific coast fisheries, which were little developed in 1880, we find that in 1880 about 1,000,000,000 pounds of food fish were caught on the east coast and in lakes and rivers, while in 1940 production in the same areas had increased only slightly to about 1,400,000,000 pounds.

Now let us compare the number of persons—the number of vessels and boats in the fishery—1880 versus 1940.

1880:	
Fishermen	101,684
Shoreworkers	30,778
Vessels	6,559
Boats	45,012
Value of products	$44,546,000
1940:	
Fishermen	124,026
Shoreworkers	90,237
Vessels	5,577
Boats	62,830
Value of products	$238,000,000

In comparing the values the general rise in the cost of living and the consequently higher prices paid for fish and manufactured fishery products must be considered. A wholly accurate comparison of the figures for the two periods cannot be made because of the difference in methods. For example, in

1880 vessels were powered by sail, were much smaller than our trawlers of today, and were far less efficient than our purse seiners. The fishery in 1880 was largely a hook and line affair. Nevertheless, if the food resources of the sea had been developed in the years since 1880 to the same degree as the food resources of the land, we would have a great many more vessels than in 1880, and a great many more men engaged in the industry, both as fishermen and as shoreworkers. My only purpose in making these comparisons is to emphasize the accuracy of the statement in the Bailey resolution that the United States has neglected its marine resources.

The Bailey resolution further states that at the beginning of the war the United States' production of fish was second only to Japan. Current information is lacking due to war conditions, but the following production of leading fishery nations in the order of their importance is the best available:

	Pounds
1. Japan (1936)	8,100,000,000
2. United States (1943)	4,000,000,000
3. China (1939)	2,890,000,000
4. Russia (1933)	2,870,000,000

(The production of these four nations accounts for about ⅓ of the total.)

Other leading fish-producing nations before the war were:

	Pounds
5. England, Scotland, North Ireland, Wales (1937)	2,500,000,000
6. Norway (1939)	2,040,000,000
7. India, Persia, Burma (estimate)	2,000,000,000
8. Germany (1938)	1,600,000,000
9. Chosen (1937)	1,420,000,000
10. Canada (1941)	1,200,000,000

The total fishery production of the world is about 36,000,000,000 pounds annually.

It is believed that Japan employs more than a million fishermen in its industry. Japan does not waste its fish catch; every pound is utilized; there are no so-called trash fish. It is believed that Japan's 8,000,000,000 includes many millions of pounds of fish that our fishermen would throw overboard. Millions of pounds which our fishermen take are never brought to shore. Many of our fisheries involve a tremendous waste at sea.

Seaweeds account for one billion of Japan's 8,000,000,000-pound production, but they amount to only an insignificant fraction of the United States fishery yield. Before the war Japan exported to the United States agar and other seaweed products that we could have produced ourselves, and which we are now producing in ever-increasing quantities.

Japan's fishing activities extend over the ocean waters of the world. Before the war they were at our front door in Alaska, in Mexico, and off South America. United States fisheries in the main are close to home, though our tuna fleet operates off Central and South America in the Pacific and our New England fisheries take a considerable part of their catch from the Grand Banks and from off the coast of Newfoundland. Before the war, only 14 percent of our catch was taken off foreign shores.

If we should bring in and utilize our trash fish, make greater use of known resources of the North Pacific and North Atlantic, and develop our fresh-water fisheries, our total production might easily equal that of Japan, exclusive of seaweeds. The fishing history of our Nation indicates that we have fully exploited only a limited number of the most desirable species. Only 30 species are now taken in quantities exceeding 12,000,000 pounds.

Outstanding examples of fisheries that could be more fully developed and of new species that might be added to the catch may be found on almost every coast. For example, investigations of our Service off the Pacific Coast of Alaska and in the Bering Sea and the industry's development of the fisheries off the coasts of Washington and Oregon within the past 10 years have amazed us all. We have no measure of the abundance of bottom fishes in the Bering Sea, but it must be enormous. For 15 years the Japanese have been coming over from Japan with great floating factory ships to scoop up thousands of tons of wealth within a few miles of our shores. The war has temporarily driven the Japs out of the Bering Sea ground fisheries, but after the war they or some other nation will resume the harvest. Little is being done to utilize these vast resources for American industry.

There are five-hundred-odd species of fish in Alaska, and many kinds of shellfish, yet salmon, herring, and halibut contribute 98 percent of Alaska's total fish production.

It is believed that the flounder-type fishes, rock fishes, and cod are present in great abundance off the coast of Alaska, extending from the Aleutian Islands through southeastern Alaska and down the coast of British Columbia. A large trawl fishery has developed for these species off the coast of Washington and Oregon within the past 10 years. The catch has increased from 16,500,000 pounds in 1940 to 62,000,000 pounds in 1943. This fishery has doubled its production almost every year since 1932.

Two species of skate are present off our northwest coast in commercial quantities. Skates occupy a prominent place in the diet of the English and in many European and Asiatic countries, but our production and consumption are negligible.

Great schools of anchovies off the west coast plague the pilchard fishermen by gilling their nets. One observer noted a pilchard net gilled with 14 tons of anchovies. Two days of steam treatment were necessary to get the net ready for fishing pilchard again. These anchovies are going to waste while Americans complain of the absence of imported anchovies from the shelves of our delicatessen shops. This fishery could annually yield thousands of tons without danger of depletion, if the market would absorb them. Only a fraction of the supply might be used for human consumption, but the poultry, hog, and cattle industry is pleading for every pound of fish meals and oils that can be produced.

The waste of sharks of many kinds over a long period of years is a well-known story. Until 2 years ago, the shark was taken only for its valuable vitamin-bearing livers, but during the past 12 months we have seen the development of a lively market for shark meat. Soupfin-shark steaks from Seattle are now reaching the New York markets.

The King crab of Alaska is at last being utilized on a limited scale by a few packers. Others are planning to enter this fishery after the war. The Dungeness crab has been a favorite on the west coast for a long time, but it is believed to be so abundant over a wide range that the supply has barely been scratched. The red crab—found in abundance off the coast of Washington—is not used at all. It is smaller than the Dungeness but compares favorably with the blue crab of Chesapeake Bay.

The south Atlantic fisheries, which in 1880 were second to New England in volume, offer important possibilities for development. Much needs to be done in the south Atlantic and Gulf areas to improve technological development, to put more fish in cans, in packages, and in quick-freezing processes.

Very little is known of the Gulf of Mexico fisheries. Shrimp accounts for more than half of the total fish production of this area. Many unexploited species abound in the Gulf. Some species now being produced are capable of great expansion if markets can be found and if refrigeration facilities can be provided. Quantities of mullet were wasted and additional tons could have been produced in 1943 if refrigeration facilities had been available to care for them. Great quantities of small, edible fish are wasted. It has been estimated that in certain seasons the shrimp trawl fishery catches as many small fish as shrimp. There is no market for the former, and they go overboard. Spanish mackerel, snappers, and groupers could probably yield an increased production if markets were available. The crab resources of the Gulf and the south Atlantic undoubtedly could furnish much larger catches.

Agriculture of water farming, as distinguished from land farming, is still in its infancy in the United States. The wide use of farm ponds should be encouraged and in coastal areas oyster and clam production could be multiplied many times.

We are just beginning to appreciate the vast fish-producing areas available by reason of the large impoundments of water for power and irrigation. The Tennessee Valley Authority has produced some amazing results and the residents of that area have readily consumed the fishes produced in T. V. A. lakes. Dr. Wiebe informs me that the largest per capita consumption of fish in the United States is enjoyed by the people of that area—close to 100 pounds per person.

In periods of depression the poor white population and the Negroes of the Southeast resort to the fresh-water streams and lakes for their principal supply of protein foods. Without carp, catfish, suckers, and buffalo fish and an occasional squirrel or rabbit from the woods and waters of the Southern States, many a person would have suffered a deficient diet in the last depression.

I have said little about recreational fishing, because you men are mainly concerned with the development of commercial food fishes. But recreational fishing can bring about a large and profitable industry in the United States in the employment of guides, the use of innumerable boats, an increased use of fuels, the manufacture of sport fishing gear and the accommodation of sportsmen, bringing dollars to local populations on every body of water in North America.

To develop the latent fisheries of the United States it will be necessary to have teamwork among the Government, the fishermen, and the processor. As I see the problem, it is the Government's responsibility to undertake the exploration of our waters. We need vessels equipped with various types of gear to ascertain the abundance of supply by species; to determine the extent to which the fishery can be utilized without threatening depletion; to locate the most productive banks; and to determine what measures should be taken to insure an adequate spawning stock, perhaps by setting aside nursery or spawning areas. Experiments should be conducted to ascertain what type of gear can obtain best results.

We should also inquire into and sponsor the construction of adequate icing and refrigeration facilities; develop a marketing program; educate the public on the food values of little used fish; and find a use and market for waste products.

To carry on proper exploration of the possibilities of our fisheries, a research vessel or vessels are essential. The United States is the only important maritime Nation that is without a fishery research vessel, although our coastline is far more extensive than that of nations that have long had adequate research equipment. The history of our recent efforts to obtain a vessel are worth recounting briefly. The old *Albatross II*, which the former Bureau of Fisheries operated was practically worn out in 1934 and since the Government policy at that time was to reduce expenses we could not justify its operation expense. Later when we requested relief funds to build a research vessel we were

informed that funds would be allocated only to replace old vessels and on projects where no new personnel were needed. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Fisheries in good faith had several years previously abandoned its vessel and discharged its crew.

The New England industry proposed and Congress passed an act authorizing a research vessel for the North Atlantic. Although we repeatedly requested funds to carry out this mandate of Congress, no money was forthcoming. The General Seafoods Corporation sold us an old trawler—the *Harvard*—for $1. When the Bureau of Fisheries was transferred to the Department of the Interior, almost the first act of Secretary Ickes was to allocate P. W. A. money to rebuild the *Harvard* and convert it into a research vessel. Just before the work was completed the Navy took it over and reconverted it for Navy use. If the vessel should be released to us today it would be unsuitable for our work.

When Japan filed notice she would abrogate the fur seal treaty, we secured an appropriation and purchased the *Black Douglass*. Necessary repairs were made, a crew was hired, and scientific personnel made available to trace the migration of fur seals. The vessel sailed from Savannah, Ga., arrived in Seattle where investigation headquarters had been established, but a few days later was taken by the Navy. That's the tragic story of our efforts to get research vessels for the past 10 years.

We need not one, but several research and fishing experiment boats. Some should be of the practical fishing vessel type such as purse seiners. We need two or three large research vessels capable of following migrations of pelagic species wherever they may roam in the sea.

Except for the United States, almost all fishing nations provide subsidies to assist the development of their fishery industries. Our Government has subsidized agriculture, railroads, marine shipping, the airplane, and other industries. A fish subsidy might be desirable and would undoubtedly be profitable to Uncle Sam in the long run.

The fishermen themselves must carry their share of the load. The fisherman must be willing to curb his profits in the initial stages of developing a new industry. He should join hand in hand with industry in a joint effort to establish new industries. I was recently informed that a company on the west coast engaged one fishing vessel and its crew to take an experimental catch of anchovies. The company paid the same rate for an experimental catch of anchovies that was paid for the established pilchard fishery. Later it developed that industry could not pay such high rates for anchovies, but the fishermen demanded the same rate of pay as was used on the experimental trip. This new fishery cannot exist on this high-pay schedule, so anchovies remain unutilized. The details of this statement may not be accurate, but it serves to illustrate that fishermen will have to cooperate if new fishery industries are to be developed.

Industry must be willing to risk some investment in new ventures. The present income-tax law should lend encouragement to industry to do some experimenting even if it involves losses at first. No one can deny that the resources of the sea should be managed intelligently so as to produce an annual maximum catch without depleting the spawning stock. But because of insufficient funds and personnel and equipment, the Fish and Wildlife Service stands helplessly watching history repeat itself. A fishery has to be exploited almost to depletion before public opinion is so aroused that intelligent management is demanded. We have not forgotten that it required an international incident to arouse support for an appropriation to manage the rich Bristol Bay, Alaska, red salmon fishery. Not until the Japs had concluded 2 years of scientific investigation in Bering Sea and were actually observed catching our salmon did the fishermen and the public demand that Congress provide means for the Fish and Wildlife Service to investigate the salmon that the Japs were taking in the very shadow of Alaska. Do we have to repeat this waste on every species of fish?

If the Bailey resolution is adopted we must in a short period, with limited personnel, develop a report that visualizes the future of a potentially great American industry that will employ more people, increase our national income, improve the health of the population, and thus utilize our resources in an intelligent manner. Surely Congress, having initiated this proposal, will follow through. It is our responsibility to make the survey. It is the responsibility of Congress not to pigeonhole the report but to immediately provide the necessary means to carry it through. The resolution raises many questions—you can help us answer them:

Should the United States Government subsidize the fisheries?

Should the Government provide credit facilities for the fishing industry?

Should the Fish and Wildlife Service provide a service to develop new designs of fishing vessels and equipment and new types of fishing gear?

Should we make a study of transportation of fish via rail, truck, airplane?

Are transportation rates fair and equitable for the shipment of fish?

What about new and improved methods of packing, storing, freezing, and salting?

Should the United States plan to develop a fish-export trade?

Should we expand the use of fresh-water fishes and utilize for fish production the scores of new impounded water areas?

Should the fishpond development be encouraged?

These and a thousand other questions must be answered before next January 1. We invite you to cooperate, in fact, we pass on to you men of industry and labor a part of the responsibility to the end that the report will furnish full and complete information upon which to base a permanent national fish policy.

It is said that opportunity knocks but once. Let's open the door, fulfill our responsibility to the utmost, and support the able leadership of Senator BAILEY.

Use of Civilian Flying Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the use of civilian flying schools in aviation training for war and peace, delivered by R. McLean Stewart, executive director of training, C. A. A., before the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1944.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the address, which is $105.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have become a great air power. Each day brings news of fresh triumphs achieved by the Army Air Forces and by our naval air arm. In his report to the Secretary of War published, on January 4, General Arnold placed the total military personnel in the Army Air Forces at 2,385,000 men. In the same report General Arnold states that in 1938 "the Army Air Forces had about 1,300 officers and 18,000 men." Expansion of that small force into the great air arm which is in action today was a magnificent achievement. Manufacture of the fighter planes and bombers which are now being flown by the men of the air arm was, and is, no less brilliant an achievement. The fighter planes and bombers were produced, and are now being produced by our civilian economy in factories manned by civilian workers.

Throughout the years before the war began in Europe civil aviation was pressing vigorously forward. It was striving constantly to improve techniques, to develop better engines, and more efficient airplanes. In perfecting transport equipment for the air lines the industry evolved the DC–3 which, as the C–47, has become the work horse of military air transport. The great 4-engined C–54 transport, known to the air lines as the DC–4, also owes its development and perfection to civil aviation. The research, experimentation in design, and the experience gained in the development of these and other great passenger transports, and in meeting the needs of civil aviation generally, created a keenly efficient industry. It made possible the development and production of the great bombers and fighter planes which now dominate the skies of the world.

As Charles Beard says in his recent great work, The Republic, we are and have always been a civilian Nation. And so it was to be expected that the building of our fighting planes and the training of the men to fly them should have depended in large measure on civil aviation.

Turning again to General Arnold's report we find the statement that in 1939 we had "some 30,000 civilian pilots who could fly or train others." He points out that the heads of the civilian flying schools were called in to aid the Air Forces and that it would not have been possible to have trained the men needed for the expansion of the Air Forces without the aid of these civilian flying schools.

It was, indeed, a good thing that from Maine to California, from Washington to Florida, and everywhere throughout our country, our colleges and high schools and our civilian flying schools had been intensively engaged, long before Pearl Harbor, in the great work of developing an air-conscious people and in training young men—and young women—to fly. This work was, as you know, aided in substantial measure by the operation of the Civilian Pilot Training Act.

And you may be interested in knowing that in 1943 more than 207,000 young men received training as pilots in colleges and flight training centers cooperating in this work under arrangements with the War Training Service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The total of 207,000 men includes none but personnel of the Army Air Forces and Naval Aviation. During the year, all naval aviation cadets and all of the men assigned to training in the Air Force college program for air crew were given their initial training as pilots at the hands of civil aviation working in close association with the colleges. Since the inception of the Civilian Pilot Training Act in 1939, more than 9,064,000 hours of flight training have been given to student pilots. On December 31 we were using 7,564 airplanes in the training program.

Civilian flight instructors have been a great force in the building up of our military and naval air arm. More than 10,000 of these civilian instructors have up to now been employed in the training of pilots for the Army and Navy. This total includes those employed at centers under direct contact with the armed services as well as at centers working under arrangements with the C. A. A. General Arnold must have had this group of men in mind along with the commissioned officers who are working as instructors in Army schools when, after speaking of the heroism and sacrifice of the men on the fighting fronts, he said: (I quote) "On the training fields of the United States other men are making another kind of sacrifice. Top flyers themselves, they have been wanting more than anything else to get into combat. Cadets whom they have taught to fly return home loaded with honors. * * * But every German or Japanese plane brought down is a tribute to the quality of their work. They are the instructors." That is a well-deserved tribute.

And now a point has been reached at which it has become possible for the Army Air Forces to state that it is no longer necessary to employ the facilities of civilian aviation in the production of flight instructors for the Army. The naval air arm also finds that ample facilities will soon be available within its own establishments to provide for all of its aviation training needs without employing the facilities of civil aviation.

We have scaled the heights. We have reached our ceiling. So there appears to be no immediate need for the aids by means of which we made the ascent. But maybe we shall need to climb again. Meanwhile there is the task of holding on to the heights, of maintaining our place aloft.

It seems doubtful that openings can be found within the scope of the training programs proposed to be conducted directly by the War and Navy Departments to provide places as pilot instructors or as pilots for more than a relatively small number of the men who have recently been or who are soon to be dropped from those civilian flying schools where they have up to this time been engaged in providing flight training for the air forces or for naval aviation. Yet there is probably no way in which these men who are being released from work as instructors could serve their country as well as in continuing to give flight instruction.

Since 1939 approximately $228,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress to pay for pilot training given under the Civilian Pilot Training Act. Besides preparing many thousands of young men to take their places in the armed services, these funds have also served to develop training facilities at civilian flying fields and at the colleges which, if preserved, can scarcely fail to be of permanent value to our post-war economy.

What will be the future needs of aviation? What provision should be made for the training of pilots?

Operation of the National Selective Service Act will insure a steady stream of replacements to maintain the air forces and the naval air arm throughout the active war period. It is true that the provisions of that law expire in May 1945, but there can be no doubt that they will be extended as far as may be necessary to insure vigorous prosecution of the war to ultimate victory.

But there will still be need for training and for the maintenance of large forces in the period after the war. We cannot hope to preserve the peace and to remain secure in the enjoyment of our liberties unless we possess the strength and the means to defend ourselves and to strike down the aggressor wherever he may appear.

Speaking in Cleveland a few days ago Secretary Knox gave it as his profound belief that one of the best measures we can take, I quote, "to insure that our individual liberties shall be preserved and that free Americans will remain free would be to require that every boy, when he attains the age of 17 or 18, shall be required to spend at least 1 year in training on land or at sea against the possibility that some time in his younger manhood his services may be required to help protect the country." That is a plea for compulsory service as a part of our permanent post-war arrangements.

And we are informed by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, writing in the New York Times, that "permanent peacetime selective service is a basis for most of the Army's post-war military planning."

The decision which will ultimately be taken in this matter will be of first importance in determining the part to be taken by the colleges and high schools and by civilian aviation generally in providing the training which may be necessary to enable this country to remain strong in the air. Meanwhile, there can be no assurance that our people will not choose to rely on the traditional practice of maintaining our Military and Naval Establishments in time of peace by reliance on voluntary enlistments. Since this is so, it may well prove to be the part of wisdom, throughout the period of active war to adopt and apply policies which will insure that at the war's end we shall continue to have a healthy civilian organization for air training, working in our colleges and high schools and at our civilian flying schools, which will have the capacity and the vigor to indoctrinate and recruit for aviation enough of our young people each year to insure the maintenance of a strong air arm by voluntary enrollments.

Indeed, even when it is assumed that there will be a compulsory service law in effect in the post-war period, it still appears that there will be need for the assistance of civilian agencies. The 1-year term of service suggested in the bills which have been introduced in the Congress and contemplated in the proposal made by Secretary Knox would be insufficient to provide for the special technical training required in aviation. Unless supplemented by preliminary training in the high schools or colleges, the training which would be given in the 1-year period of required service might fall far short of meeting the desired objective. It is therefore not unlikely that our civilian institutions, our high schools, our colleges, and our civilian flying fields, will be the sources on which we must depend in the post-war years to hold our place in military as well as in commercial aviation.

The New York Times indicates that it may be necessary to maintain the permanent peacetime strength of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces at an aggregate of about 2,000,000 men. Fortune Magazine recently estimated that the post-war requirements of the Air Forces would call for about 750,000. These are large forces, but the estimates may easily prove to be too conservative.

It is of course true that immediately following the conclusion of the war there will be a large reserve available of trained pilots and other aviation technicians. We cannot long rely on them. Air strength demands reinvigoration each year by the infusion of new groups of young men. Their indoctrination for the air through training in actual flight as well as in ground school subjects could well begin at the high school level. The provision of flight training for not less than 100,000 each year would be a sound measure in the interest of preserving our security. And there are many good reasons for beginning it now as well as for the continued use of civilian facilities in war training.

An interesting view as to this was recently expressed by Dr. Everett Case, president of Colgate University, who said:

"As a matter of national policy, I do not think we can afford to be governed by short-range considerations alone. A glance ahead to America's post-war opportunities and obligations on the one hand, and to the future of aviation on the other, makes it abundantly clear that long-range factors have a legitimate and important place in the picture. Specifically, it would seem to me that, having demonstrated its usefulness, in peace and war, the civil aviation training program has established its claim to a permanent place in our thinking and planning for the future. * * *

"Continued use of civilian training facilities throughout the remainder of the war period would have the beneficial effect of insuring that some part of the large appropriations which are being granted by the Congress to the War and Navy Departments for training purposes would create facilities of value to our educational system after the war. The quality of the training which is being given in civilian centers is good. Many of the pilots who are returning from the battle fronts have stated unreservedly that the early training which they received at the hands of civil aviation had helped them through many a dangerous moment in air combat. So, it need not be feared that money spent in providing training through civilian agencies will not be well spent from the standpoint of the training given the men concerned.

"In my judgment," President Case continues, "liquidation of the civilian-training units at this time would be highly unfortunate in two important respects. First, it would destroy established and growing facilities which could be of the first importance after the war. Second, it would tend to impair the confidence and the will to cooperate, which are essential to any effective program for the future. Our colleges and universities by their very nature are not in the business of providing risk capital, and the extent to which we can wisely and properly go toward making permanent provision for a civil flight training program depends primarily upon adequate assurances regarding the continuity of the program itself. With such assurances we, for one, would be willing to consider more extensive and permanent commitments than we have so far made—commitments which in turn would play their part in assuring the most effective development of the training program for the long future. And this, I believe, is a matter of consequence not only to the Government and the colleges, but to the American people as a whole."

Observing that a point may have been reached where there is a surplus of pilot training facilities in the country which calls for a decision whether to discontinue the use of certain centers which are exclusively military in character, or to abandon the use of civilian-training facilities, President Case urges that in such a situation "it would be wise, from the standpoint of the national interest as a whole, to decide to make use of the colleges and private flight training centers—to such extent at least as would be commensurate with the relationship which has existed in the past year or more between the total pilot-training programs of the Army and Navy and the use which they have made of the facilities of civil aviation * * *" Dr. Case thinks that this should be done even though, as a result, less than full use would be made of centers which are exclusively military.

When the First National Clinic of Domestic Aviation Planning met in Oklahoma City in November that representative body adopted a resolution expressing the opinion that it would be in the national interest to continue to employ in aviation training the then existing organization of civilian flying schools and colleges engaged through the Civil Aeronautics Administration in providing certain training for personnel of the Air Forces and of naval aviation. Specifically, the resolution recommended that the life of the Civilian Pilot Training Act, which expires June 30,

1944, be extended indefinitely, and states that (I quote), "It is desirable in the national interest that the facilities of civilian aviation continue to be used to the greatest possible extent throughout the war period in recognition of the value of the pilot training which can be made available now through such facilities, and in consideration also of the importance of maintaining a vigorous and efficient civilian pilot training organization which can be relied on in the post-war period to recruit and train the pilots who will be required to maintain our position in military and commercial aviation."

Here are some of the features that might be embodied in a program calling for the employment of civilian flight-training agencies throughout the remainder of the war period and in the years thereafter. Let me, however, make it clear that this outline is in no sense an official or a definitive program. It is merely a broad-brush sketch of a means by which good use might be made of civilian agencies along the lines proposed by the aviation planning clinic, the National Aviation Association, the American Legion, and by many groups of colleges and other educational institutions:

DIRECT TRAINING FOR THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

First, there is the question of direct training for the War and Navy Departments during the remainder of the active war period. The proper field of activity for civilian training organizations during the remainder of the war would seem to lie in the provision of flight instruction in its initial or elementary phases. Civilian aviation has been remarkably successful in the work of "air-conditioning" or "indoctrinating" aviation students in the art of flying. Civilian aviation has taught many thousands of such students to fly, has carried them through their first solo flights, and has given them their first hours of actual flying experience.

The volume of training would necessarily be governed by the total amount of flight training deemed necessary for the purposes of the Army Air Forces and of naval aviation. The training task to be assigned to civil aviation could embrace the elementary phases of flight instruction up to about 20 hours of flying for each trainee.

The number of men to be assigned to training would be governed by the total input required in the more advanced training establishments operated directly by the War or Navy Departments.

Such a program would serve the important purpose of maintaining a nucleus of civilian training centers in operation in conjunction with the colleges. These centers would be in a position to go forward immediately with flight training under other arrangements when the large-scale training programs under the National Selective Service Act come to a close.

At the present time a flight indoctrination course for aviation cadet candidates of the Army Air Forces is being provided under the supervision of the C. A. A. War Training Service at about 150 civilian flying schools throughout the country in conjunction with the college program of the Army Air Forces. The continuation and development of this flight indoctrination program would, of course, make a very real contribution to the maintenance of civilian facilities. This program goes a long way toward fulfilling a policy calling for substantial use of civilian flying schools. And, I am happy to say that the record of performance shows that the training which they are receiving in the flight indoctrination course is proving of substantial value in the subsequent progress of the trainees.

About 90 colleges and associated civilian flying schools are also engaged through the Civil Aeronautics Administration in providing an elementary flight training program for the Navy Department. However, the present plans of the Navy Department do not contemplate the employment of these civilian facilities beyond June of this year. It appears to be the view of the Navy Department that use of these facilities should be abandoned in favor of maximum use of establishments which are exclusively military in character.

PILOT TRAINING IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE HIGH SCHOOLS

Next there is the matter of providing flight training in conjunction with the high schools. Under any program which would provide for effective use of civilian facilities, encouragement should be given to the further development of ground school, aeronautical training in the high-school systems everywhere throughout the country, financed by the States and local communities. In his report to the Secretary of War, which I have already mentioned, General Arnold states that the Germans "were smart" to have given their youth a thorough grounding in mathematics, meteorology, and physics. He added, "We had to take valuable time for such ground school work." We, too, should be "smart" enough to see that this does not occur again.

But we should go beyond ground school work. Elementary flight training would be made available for at least 100,000 trainees each year to be selected from amongst those who have made most satisfactory progress in their ground-school work and who are otherwise qualified for flight training.

A quota of flight training scholarships might be made available with the aid of the Federal Government for award to the successful competing candidates from groups in training at each high school or other institution engaged in providing ground-school instruction.

The flight-training scholarships would, of course, be awarded on a basis insuring fair and equitable geographical distribution throughout the whole country in relation to the total number of candidates competing, subject only to the availability of facilities for satisfactory and safe flight instruction and without discrimination as to race, creed, or color.

In each participating community it would probably be desirable to set up a board composed of private citizens serving on a voluntary basis who would have responsibility for awarding the scholarships. These boards might consist of not less than three nor more than five persons who, by reason of age, judgment, experience, and reputation, command the respect and confidence of their fellow citizens.

The training year could be divided into three sessions each of approximately 4 months duration so that an average of 8 to 10 hours of flight instruction would be made available to each candidate each month until he received the minimum of about 35 hours needed to qualify as a private pilot.

Flight instruction would be provided under contract arrangements with civilian operators of private flight-training schools.

It is probable that the Federal Government would be called on to provide the greater part of the funds needed to meet the costs of flight instruction. However, it would be desirable to require that some financial contribution be made by candidates who are capable of paying part of the cost of their flight training. Responsibility for determining whether a fully paid or a partially paid scholarship should be awarded to a candidate would be lodged with the board of citizens established in the community to govern the award of scholarships.

PILOT TRAINING IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE COLLEGES

When we consider what might be done to insure the carrying forward of pilot training activities at the colleges, it immediately becomes apparent that with all physically fit young men who have reached age 18 in the hands of the armed services, there can be no pilot training at the colleges during the war period unless such training is a definite part of the training programs of the War and Navy Departments. Looking ahead, however, to the time when in the post-war years young people will again be free to choose the activities in which they wish to engage, it would seem desirable that arrangements exist under which pilot training of a more advanced nature than that proposed for the high schools could be provided in conjunction with the colleges. Successful completion of elementary training in high school or elsewhere before entering college might be established as a necessary qualification for entrance to the more advanced training course.

So that every opportunity to acquire skill in the art of flying could then be made available to a broad cross section of the young people in the colleges, it would seem desirable that the Federal Government should also, to the extent necessary, aid in providing flight training scholarships for them. The selection of candidates could, as in the case of the proposed high-school program, be governed by local boards.

The maneuvers to be taught would be approximately the same as those which are currently being taught in the primary training schools of the Army Air Forces and of naval aviation, and in the secondary training schools operating under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Of necessity they would be revised from time to time so as to embrace improvements in technique as this became possible. A special grade of civilian pilot certificate might be established to be awarded to those successfully completing training.

Colleges participating in the program would be expected to include in their regular curricula ground-school instruction in meteorology, navigation, and other subjects in which pilots require comprehensive knowledge and highly specialized training.

So that all of the benefits of training experience and technical research would be available to guide and direct the training of pilots, close consultation would be had from time to time between the civilian agencies concerned and the Army Air Forces and naval aviation.

In consideration of the aid given by the Government in the provision of flight training, each trainee might be required to sign a pledge, undertaking in case of a national emergency occurring within 3 years after completion of his training, to make his services immediately available to the Army Air Forces or to naval aviation. It might be desirable to evolve in this connection some form of actual enlistment in the Air Reserve Corps.

The alternative to such a plan for post-war training as that which I have outlined would probably place all training directly in the hands of the armed services through some form of compulsory service following the pattern of the National Selective Service Act.

It will take effort and training to hold our place in the air. It should not be forgotten that in 1917 and 1918 the United States built 17,000 airplanes and taught some 10,000 young men to fly. In 1918 we were producing airplanes at the rate of 25,000 per year. Speeds were increased, engine power was stepped up, and aircraft structure was greatly improved. Then the pace of progress slowed down. Feet began to drag. General Marshall in his biennial report as Chief of Staff states that "in the 19 years prior to 1941, the Army Air Forces trained less than 7,000 pilots."

It may be said that this will not, cannot, happen again. This time the air age has arrived. And so it has. But that does not mean that the use of aircraft by private owners or private flyers in the period immediately following the war will be on a scale even remotely comparable to the private use of automobiles before the war. In December we celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the first successful airplane flight at Kitty Hawk. The automobile is not much older than the airplane. But the automobile has been, and is, a beast of burden for the urban dweller as well as for the man on the farm. It carries the children to and from school. It is used for commuting to work, for trips to the corner grocery, and for all of the utilitarian purposes of short and long haul transport as well as for journeys in search of pleasure and adventure.

A machine which will serve both as an efficient airplane and as an efficient automobile is yet to make its appearance. And not many of our people have escaped from the hard realities involved in balancing the family budget.

Most families in this country are, at best, one-car families. They cannot afford to have two vehicles for private transportation. If they must decide whether to own an airplane or an automobile, practical considerations will lead them to choose the more utilitarian automobile.

Navigation remains an art which must be acquired, and safe flight under difficult weather conditions is possible only to pilots having a large measure of special technical skills, using aircraft equipped with several highly responsive instruments which together represent a considerable investment. One manufacturer, himself a pilot and as eager as any for a mass market in small private planes, recently gave it as his opinion that a satisfactorily safe airplane for cross-country instrument flight should be equipped with at least $600 worth of instruments.

Organized air transport will undoubtedly experience a great expansion as soon as it becomes possible for the private air carriers to obtain the equipment which they need to provide additional services for the public. And we know that much thought and ingenuity is being concentrated on plans for the development and manufacture of an efficient roadable airplane which with folded wings and power-driven wheels can roll along the highways until a landing strip is reached when, spreading its wings and activating its propeller, it can rapidly take flight. Then there is the helicopter, which, many believe, will some day bring the air-age vehicle as a practical utility onto every front lawn. When everything that is hoped for from these sources and from the magic of American inventive genius has been realized, and private budgetary problems cease to be as important as they are now, it is quite possible that there will be no need to give aid or stimulation to aviation training, in order to keep America strong in the air.

The day may come when our young people will learn to fly as readily as they now learn to drive automobiles. But that day has not yet arrived and until it comes we will not be secure in our liberties unless we take measures through sponsored flight training and indoctrination to insure beyond any possibility of question that our young people shall achieve mastery of flight and that our position in military and commercial aviation shall be so strong that no one will dare to throw down a challenge.

Let us by all means keep alive and active in our high schools and colleges and on our civilian flying fields an organization competent and equipped to make a sound working knowledge of flying techniques available to all of those who may in some way be called upon to employ that knowledge for the good of the nation.

One of California's Native Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, since the days of gold California has had many interesting and colorful characters. California is truly the State of sunshine and romance. California's growth has been phenomenal. Admitted into the Republic less than 100 years ago, California today ranks fourth in population, fifth in wealth among all 48 States. California stands second in value of war contracts. Our people are all out for every war effort.

Paralleling the development of California itself has been the growth of the Bank of America under the guidance of dynamic and colorful A. P. Giannini. Mr. Giannini opened a small bank in San Francisco October 17, 1904. The assets were $150,000. Today Mr. Giannini heads an institution with assets exceeding $3,000,000,000. His bank stands third among all banks in the United States.

At 73, A. P. Giannini is regularly at his desk each day in the bank's head office in San Francisco.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "A. P. Giannini, Empire Builder." This article is from the San Francisco Daily Commercial News, February 23, 1944:

A. P. GIANNINI: EMPIRE BUILDER

At least one of the world's great bankers won't pay taxes on his salary this year.

In fact, A. P. Giannini, founder and chairman of the board of the Bank of America, hasn't paid income taxes on his wages in 12 years.

As the directorial genius who, in the short space of 39 years created the world's largest and most successful branch banking system, Mr. Giannini pays himself only $1 a year! After social security deduction he actually receives 98 cents for his year's labor.

Incredulous as this may seem to those who believe all bankers are very rich men who pay themselves fabulous salaries, the man who has written the most spectacular and colorful chapter in the history of American banking is not a rich man if one is to judge his wealth in terms of dollars.

At 73, A. P. Giannini, the empire builder, is neither rich nor poor.

Mr. Giannini may work 6 hours or he may work 16 hours in a single day. He has never learned to watch the clock when there is work for him to do.

True to the pattern of men whose vision and achievements have made America the greatest nation on earth, Mr. Giannini places desire to aid in the development of his country, particularly the great West and its people, above personal profit.

He has succeeded as perhaps no other individual in developing the tremendous resources of his native California and the West. Like many Americans whose accomplishments have skyrocketed them to world prominence, Mr. Giannini started life as a farm boy.

As a youngster buying farm products for his stepfather's commission house, he visualized San Francisco as the hub of a greater western empire. Fortunately, he has lived to see his youthful vision crystallize into reality.

Down through the years he has played a major role in the dramatic development of the West. He has, in fact, created many of its most colorful chapters.

As new opportunity, new resources, new prosperity became reality, the masterful figure of A. P. Giannini, the empire builder, was recognized and acclaimed for his part in creating this breath-taking pageant of progress.

As a boy on the family farm at Alviso, Mr. Giannini displayed evidence of the initiative and resourcefulness that has characterized his meteoric career in the world of finance.

Advertising has played an important part in the development of the Giannini enterprises. Mr. Giannini learned the value of advertising when he was a schoolboy working part time for his stepfather. He decided that if the firm was to increase its business it must advertise. He set about writing letters to fruit and vegetable growers soliciting their business. His letters brought immediate results.

That explains why the Bank of America long ago set the pace among financial institutions in the volume of advertising purchased in newspapers.

In 1901, at the age of 31, Mr. Giannini surprised his relatives and friends by announcing his retirement from the produce business. He said his savings and investments would provide him with an income sufficient for any man.

His retirement, however, was but a change of direction for his dynamic energy. He was soon to begin his real career—banking.

On October 17, 1904, he started his first bank—the foundation of the great Bank of America which today has approximately 500 branches in more than 300 California cities. From original assets of $150,000 the bank has grown to the third largest in the United States with assets far in excess of $3,000,000,000!

Mr. Giannini's whole object in building the bank and all other Giannini enterprises has been to create services and resources which would help to build the West, and to create opportunities for prosperity and improved living conditions to his fellow citizens.

He has often said: "Serving the needs of others is the only legitimate business in the world today."

Commenting recently on the founding of the bank, Mr. Giannini said.

"When we made our start all we had was one little rented room. There was no ceremony, no dedication, but among our little group there was the firm resolve to so conduct our business that we would serve every class, every nationality, every worthy enterprise.

"Thus we would aid in the greater growth and prosperity of all of California, and with it, the whole West."

Two days after Pearl Harbor, when the bank first achieved $2,000,000,000 in resources (it is now three billion plus) Mr. Giannini declared:

"Our Golden West is no longer dependent upon the formerly recognized centers of finance. California and the far west have come of age. Now I am doubly glad that we have achieved this great stature in resources and physical facilities. This is not a private satisfaction over personal achievement, but a deeply felt gladness that this organization is now so well equipped to carry on its policy of all-out aid to our country's war effort."

Although all his enterprises had been created on the ideal of service to the masses, the Giannini path has not always run smooth. Many obstacles to progress have appeared from time to time, some of them political, some born of jealousy, and some arising from fear

and covetousness, but the Giannini energy and genius for resource, backed by public approbation, has usually won through.

One famous battle was the conflict with some eastern financial interests represented by Elisha Walker. This developed soon after Mr. Giannini retired and departed for Europe in 1930. Walker disposed of New York banking affiliations at "bargain" prices, but when raids on the California organization followed, Mr. Giannini and his son, L. M. Giannini, now president of the Bank of America, and their supporters rallied against Walker and his interests and the war of giants which followed shook the financial world. The eastern interests were routed and A. P. was reinstated as chairman of the board of Transamerica Corporation. This victory ushered in a new era of progress for the Giannini organizations, which have since weathered further financial crises and political attacks of major proportions, emerging stronger and sounder than ever because of inspired leadership and continued tenacious clinging to the original Giannini ideals.

"If our institutions have become great," said Mr. Giannini, "it is by the consent of the people we serve. We can endure only by continuing that type of service. This we always intend to do."

It must, indeed, be a source of great satisfaction and pride to Mr. Giannini to know that the banking institution he founded and built into the third largest in the United States, is increasing its strength and service under the brilliant leadership of his son, L. M. Giannini.

The magnificent success of A. P. Giannini, the empire builder, is an inspiration and challenge to the youth of America to take full advantage of the opportunities that only America can offer. On the basis of personal achievement, Mr. Giannini is without question the world's No. 1 banker. Only under our free enterprise system could he have succeeded. His record as a builder is proof that America is truly a land of unlimited opportunity not for a few but for everyone who is willing to work. Agitators who would change our American way of life can offer no substitute for success and the rewards of free initiative—attainable only under the banner of free enterprise.

Unless the communistic New Deal is defeated at the November election and a pro-American administration installed—an administration pledged to cooperate with legitimate enterprise, the name of A. P. Giannini will be recorded in our history as the last of the empire builders.

Other Good Reasons for Tax-Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House for its consideration a portion of an article by Drew Pearson, of March 2, 1944, in the Washington Merry-Go-Round, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 2, 1944]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

"100 FIRST COMPANIES"

The Trumanites found that of the 100 companies getting 70 percent of the war contracts, only 9 were free of excess profits in 1942. Here are some of the companies and their lush profits unearthed by the Truman sleuths:

1. Jacobs Aircraft, of Pennsylvania, which made no profit before the war, netted $11,400,000 in 1942, of which $3,000,000 was left after paying taxes.

2. General Cable, of New York averaged $850,000 profit before the war, but made $19,400,000 in 1942.

3. Lima Locomotive Works, of Lima, Ohio, averaged $60,000 in the base period before the war, but made $10,000,000 in 1942.

4. Grumman Aircraft, of Bethpage, Long Island, averaged $540,000 profit before the war, but made $22,500,000 in 1942.

5. Beech Aircraft, of Wichita, Kans., made no profit before the war, but $16,000,000 in 1942.

6. Bell Aircraft, of Buffalo, made $43,800 before the war, but in 1942 its profits had multiplied 528 times, to $23,000,000. Even after paying taxes, it had a profit left of $5,403,000.

7. Not merely war factories but textile companies made lush profits too, as indicated by the American Woolen Co., which made no profit during the base period before the war, but knocked off an operating profit of $36,574,000 in 1942.

8. Again Edward G. Budd, of Philadelphia, the company which Senator GUFFEY champions so lustily during Senate tax hearings, came in for a juicy profit. Senator GUFFEY for a time threatened to vote against renegotiation because he said the Budd people had been treated unfairly by the Navy. However, the Truman committee found that Budd had made a profit of $18,650,000 in 1942, compared with $350,000 before the war. Later the Budd company complained because the Navy insisted on renegotiating its profits down to $3,796,000, even though this latter figure was 10 times its average profit before the war.

The Truman committee also found that if the Army-Navy's power to renegotiate contracts had been "emasculated by Senate amendments, the gratitude of the people would have been transformed into shocked resentment."

NOTE.—The tax bill as finally passed over the President's veto did partially emasculate the Army-Navy's power of renegotiation.

Campaign Facts, Not Campaign Oratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following series of observations under the general title "Campaign Facts, Not Campaign Oratory" for the consideration of my colleagues, with the hope that they may also provoke serious thought and discussion on the part of the American voters—Democrats and Republicans alike.

A HOUSE-CLEANING JOB

The administration in Washington has now reached such a condition that cleaning up the Government alone will represent a gigantic postwar task. For 10 years bureau has been added to bureau and agency to agency until we now have 19 Federal agencies engaged in lending money, 12 Federal agencies engaged in map making, 30 Federal agencies engaged in recruiting Federal workers, 60 different agencies which can and do buy land, some of them from one another, 18 Government agencies charged with some phase of the labor problem, and 15 Government agencies which have a hand in our public-power resources. These are only a few of the examples which show that the Federal Government, with its more than 3,000,000 employees is in the greatest muddle in our history. This constitutes a number one house cleaning job.

TAKING INVENTORY

Every good businessman takes an inventory or takes stock at the close of each year to determine profits or losses, to learn whether the year just closed was a good year or a bad year. Now that the President has officially declared the New Deal era ended, and has announced that the era ahead shall be known as the Win the War Era, the American people, interested stockholders in the now defunct New Deal, are entitled to an inventory to determine whether New Deal assets balance or outweigh New Deal liabilities. In making such an inventory and in attempting to strike a balance, we believe the following items should be placed on the credit side of the New Deal ledger:

First. Our Federal deposit insurance laws that guarantee bank deposits and tend to establish a sound banking system.

Second. Our social security system that provides old-age pensions and unemployment-insurance compensation.

Third. Our minimum-wage and maximum-hours labor laws.

Fourth. The Securities and Exchange Commission with all its faults. While these assets, like all new ventures in the field of legislation, are far from being perfect, and while we concede they need revision and clarification, yet we believe they constitute progress in the right direction and should properly be classed as New Deal assets.

The following items we would place on the debit side of the New Deal ledger: First, unlimited deficit spending, resulting in a huge national debt and heavy taxes—entirely aside from regular war expenditures. Second, a great, growing, and dangerous concentration of power in the Federal Government—over and above necessary war powers. Third, unnecessary and unreasonable bureaucratic control over American business and the private affairs of American citizens—entirely aside from necessary war controls. Fourth, a complete failure in handling or solving our labor problems, which has resulted in the present chaotic labor situation. Fifth, the creation of some 2,000 new Government bureaus and commissions, which has resulted in an increase in the Federal pay roll from $1,000,000,000 per year to nearly $8,000,000,000 per year, and an increase from 570,000 Federal civilian employees to over 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees. The American people must decide whether New Deal assets outweigh New Deal liabilities, and also whether they want the same management to continue to operate their business for the next 4 years.

JUST TO REMIND YOU

In case you have overlooked the fact, may I remind you that Uncle Sam has placed a debt load of $1,200 upon your

individual back. Your debt load is increasing at the rate of $50 per month or $600 per year. Your wife also owes that much, and each of your children. Just when and how are you going to pay that debt and again become debt free? Better be giving some thought to this debt you owe. It is your share of the public debt.

OUR POST-WAR FUTURE

What system of economy will we live under after the war? We have built war production plants in the last 3 years worth $20,000,000,000. Uncle Sam owns outright three-fourths of these new war plants. Federal officials will have the power to determine within the next 5 years what our future economic system shall be. Will we continue to have the American system of free enterprise as we know it, or will the Government take the savings of the people through taxation and use these savings to operate a Government-owned industrial system? The past 10 years have witnessed a decided trend in this latter direction. Now the advocates of a Government-operated economy are within reach of their goal.

Today the Government owns 50 percent of the country's annual productive capacity of aluminum, 92 percent of its magnesium capacity, 10 percent of steel, nearly 100 percent of synthetic rubber and high octane gasoline, 25 percent of machine tools, at least 90 percent of aircraft and varying amounts of other products. Furthermore, the Government owns $60,000,000,000 worth of materials ranging all the way from ships to shoes. If the war were to end immediately there would be $75,000,000,000 worth of war contracts outstanding; the Federal Government would be the owner of 47,000 square miles of land acquired solely for war purposes, an area approximately the size of the six New England States.

The Washington administration that will be elected in 1944 could throw the plants it owns into competition with privately run plants, instead of turning them over to private owners at reasonable prices; it could do its own selling of the left-over materials in competition with privately owned businesses; it could deal unfairly in the abrupt cancelation of war contracts—it has only to do this and we would be sunk. Then we would be saddled with a way of living that our boys have been sent abroad to defeat.

THE NEW BILL OF RIGHTS

President Roosevelt, in his annual message to Congress, outlines what he called an economic bill of rights. Included in this new bill of rights he listed the following: First, a fair wage; second, a good job; third, a decent home; fourth, medical care and good health; fifth, a fair price to the farmer; sixth, freedom from unfair competition; seventh, security from want; eighth, a good education. These so-called rights embrace a program of security, human happiness, and well-being. No one will take exception to any one of these eight objectives, but in view of the fact that they are goals still to be achieved after 11 years of the New Deal, many people are beginning to wonder whether they will be achieved in 4 more years.

Mr. Roosevelt was elected in 1932 on what has been pronounced by impartial judges as the best platform ever drafted by a political party, but he threw every plank but one out of the window as soon as he got into the White House. The one plank he retained and actually carried out was the plank calling for repeal of the prohibition amendment. He has now been President for 11 years and during that time has spent, directly and indirectly, more than $50,000,000,000 on social experimentation, yet it took the war to solve the unemployment problem, secure a fair price for the farmer, and good wages for labor. Judged by the record, should the American people take seriously the new bill of rights the President advances as a platform for his fourth-term aspirations?

WHAT IS AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE?

Free industry, free labor, free capital, free competition, and free opportunity—these are the elements of American free enterprise. Operating under rules of fair play, with Uncle Sam as umpire, these are the factors that have made America great. Under our free enterprise system Uncle Sam has achieved the greatest prosperity, as well as the most widely distributed prosperity, that the world has ever known. Free enterprise has produced for the masses of America the highest standard of living found anywhere in the world. Thinking Americans are neither ready nor willing to exchange our time-tried system—based upon open competition, freedom of opportunity, and square dealing—for planned economy with its crop control, its production control, its Government subsidies, and its other forms of regimentation. We want none of those things. We do not consider them essential to either our security or our progress. Free enterprise will face the test of its lifetime when it must change from wartime production to peacetime production, because while making that change it will have to provide jobs for millions of ex-servicemen and ex-war workers. In facing this test our free enterprise system should not be hamstrung nor handicapped by governmental regimentation or by New Deal monopolistic control. In this connection a representative of American small business stated:

The year 1944 will determine whether American free enterprise will continue to live or whether American business will become entirely socialized. During the past 3 years 273,000 small businessmen have had to fold up and go out of business because of the handicaps, restrictions, and shackles that bureaucrats at Washington have placed upon them.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of my remarks before the national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, February 3, 1944, which are as follows:

Mr. Commander, General Hines, ladies, and gentlemen, I am grateful for this opportunity of coming here for a few minutes, in the busiest hour of my career as a Member of the Congress of the United States, to speak to you on veterans' affairs.

Before I forget it I want to say, and while he is listening, that I resent a certain bunch of Communists attacking General Hines. General Hines may not have done what you and I would have liked for him to do at various times, but I am convinced that he has done his best and that he is doing it now.

Permit me to say, with reference to our diminishing medical corps, that we are getting too mechanical in our education in this country, and restrictions have been made such that your children's children cannot become doctors. I want you to look into that. Why should a man have to go to school for 5 years, or 10 years, and study sociology, and spend all his father's money before he can go to medical school? I want to see these boys who are now fighting the battles of the Nation, and their children, occupying the positions of responsibility in years to come. Education does not supply capacity, nor does it supply character. We are overlooking those fundamental things that go to build character when we undertake to impose education from the top, and try to substitute it for those great fundamental virtues that have made our Nation great.

Now let me talk to you for a moment about veterans' legislation. We have your bill pending before the committee, and as soon as we get time it is my intention to call the committee together in executive session and try to perfect the measure and bring it to the floor of the House for passage, with such changes as the committee may deem necessary.

We now have the widows and orphans bill before the Rules Committee. I have introduced that bill and fought it through the House several times, beginning back in 1932, I believe. Many of our buddies have died of service-connected disabilities who were unable to prove them, and their widows and orphans were without any compensation during the dark days of the depression. They dragged their children through the depression, fed and clothed and educated them as best they could, and today many of those children are fighting the battles of this country. I want to see their widows and orphans properly cared for.

Going back to 1933, I got almost as much abuse for my opposition to the so-called economy bill then as I am now getting from the Communists for supporting the Constitution of the United States.

Poor old Billy Connery, who has now passed to the Great Beyond, and I were the two men of those called into the conference on the economy bill in advance who opposed that provision that cut off the presumptively service-connected men. We had thousands of them, and hundreds of them were in hospitals, dying of cancer and tuberculosis and other incurable diseases. They realized that if they were cut off their wives and children at home would get no compensation, and when the news of that measure struck, several of them turned over in their beds, gave up the ghost and died of the shock. I was abused as much for my opposition to that bill then as I am being abused now for my stand in trying to uphold the Constitution of the United States—the ship of state upon which the hopes of you and me and our children depend.

There has been a disposition on the part of a certain element in Congress to try to take away some of the jurisdiction of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legisla-

tion, the only committee you have in either House of Congress. We introduced a rule to straighten that jurisdiction out. The chairman of the committee [Mr. SABATH] refused to put it to a vote in the committee and we had to petition that rule out. It took us a solid year; but we finally won.

Another thing, I want some amendment to the insurance law. As I understand it, the men in this war who become totally and permanently disabled cannot collect their monthly insurance as we men of the First World War can. They have to die to get it. I want to protect the widows and orphans of men who die, but I also want to protect the disabled men. A man who has seen as many disabled, insane, and helpless veterans as I have, certainly wants those men to collect their insurance while alive.

Then, too, I want the veterans rehabilitated through the Veterans' Administration. If that is not done they will simply become a common carrier to rake down appropriations for all the sick, lame, and lazy people who never worked nor fought either. In 1933, under the propaganda for the economy bill, I was abused unmercifully.

I can call you the names of some men who became millionaires out of the last war, who coined their fortunes from the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the United States; who bought up newspapers and still own them; and who hammered and maligned me for opposing economy.

Men and women were put on the pay roll to rake leaves and chase mosquitoes, some of whom have never worked or fought a day in their lives. I do not propose for the veterans of this war to become the common carrier to rake down all of the appropriations and take the abuse for it in the years to come, and for that reason I want them rehabilitated through the Veterans' Administration.

I am not opposed to rehabilitating and helping crippled and disabled people. I have always fought for that, but there is a difference between rehabilitating a man who once knew how to do something but got his hand cut off or his leg shot off or his eyes shot out—there is a difference, I say, between trying to rehabilitate him to do something else to make a living and taking up a man who had never done anything and habilitating him. I do not want his expenses charged up to the veterans. I have tried to take care of the veterans of this, as well as of the last war, and I do not want them to be charged with the expense of habilitating all the others.

We are going to have a great many of these young men come back who are going to want to become doctors and lawyers. A man was a stenographer we will say, and his hand was shot off; he thinks he can practice law, or medicine, or some other vocation if he is properly trained. Let's give him that training; but while we are spending a dollar on him let's not charge up ten, fifty, or one hundred dollars to him to spend on someone else who was not in the armed forces at all.

Those are the things that I am working for. In 1933, when they knocked us out in the economy bill fight, we began to try to beat our way back. I finally got the presumptive cases back on at 75 percent. I finally got the widows and orphans of the men with service-connected disabilities but who died of other causes taken care of. There are untold thousands whose disabilities were never proved or could not be substantiated or who d'd not attempt to prove their disability untill too late. Their widows and orphans have not been taken care of. They must be in the future. I know it is going to cost an enormous amount of money. But it is not going to cost any more to take care of our veterans than some people want to spend on other people and other countries not fighting in this war.

I am not half as interested in an irrigation project on the Oronoco, a flood-control project on the Ganges, or a T. V. A. on the Danube, as I am in taking care of these boys who are baring their breasts to the enemy's bullets, and their widows, orphans, and dependent parents when they are gone.

They have tried to tell you, and are telling you now, that we are trying to keep the soldiers from voting. They know that is a miserable falsehood. What we are trying to do is to make it possible for everyone in the service to vote for everything from President to constable in a constitutional election, but to leave the election machinery in the hands of the States, where it belongs and where the Constitution placed it.

You remember the bonus march—some called it a bonus, but we who were interested in the veterans called it adjusted compensation. Everybody agreed we ought to pay the boys $60 a month for their services in the last war. We introduced a bill and passed a law to pay it in 1945—27 years after the war closed. That is almost like insuring a man against disability only after he is dead. I wanted it paid then. We could have paid it then for $1,420,000,000. When we finally got it paid it cost around $3,000,000,000. But they said we were adjusting their pay, or compensation, and that is what we were doing. It took us 17 years to collect it, and we went through two depressions before the boys got it; and those depressions were inspired and put on by a financial element in this country who got rich out of the last war. They squeezed the currency, they reduced the circulating medium, they paralyzed the financial life of this country, and forced the depression of 1920, as well as the one of 1929. They were bitterly opposed, of course, to paying the soldier adjusted compensation.

I said then that if we got into another war we are going to adjust the compensation while the war was going on. So when the soldiers' pay bill came before the House last y r I had a profound secret. Without consulting any one, I offered an amendment to raise the boys' base pay to $50 a month. I know how to force a roll call. Probably I am not boasting too much when I say that I know the rules of the House of Representatives and the rules of the Senate. I know how to use them. I forced a roll call and we carried it by a vote of 332 to 28. It then went to conference. They brought it back and said: "You have to vote for a small increase we have agreed on or vote it down, either for the soldier or against him." I moved to recommit the bill to the conference with instructions to the House conferees to insist on the House amendment. We carried that by 332 to 31, or more than 10 to 1. It went back to conference, and they raised the pay to $46. I said, "we are going to get it all." I got my friend, Senator LA FOLLETTE, to offer a motion in the Senate to recommit with instructions, which he did and forced a roll call on it, and carried it 58 to 20. These men now have a base pay of $50 a month.

In other words, we pay them part of their adjusted compensation now, not all of it, but part of it. Some of the men who are criticizing me now voted against that $50 a month, and I am itching for them to take the floor so I can get a whack at them. There has never been a bill passed through my committee that I, or any of my family, can ever get a dollar's advantage from. What I am doing is impersonal. I am doing it for the men who fight the country's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace. We are fighting now to destroy Hitler and are doing a good job. We are fighting to destroy Hirohito, that little shriveled-up ape in Tokyo. We want to destroy the entire Nazi regime and then wipe Japan from the face of the earth and be sure that in the years to come that group of savages will not give the world trouble again.

One of the greatest organizations on earth for the perpetuation of real Americanism is the American Legion. You have been the quickest to detect subversive influences. Whenever you find someone cloaking himself in the American flag and questioning the patriotism of somebody else, you take an inventory, find out what is behind it all, and invariably you will find he is trying to cover up his own antagonism to American institutions and American principles. Be on your guard. I was delighted last year when you changed your rules to admit these young men of this war into the American Legion. I want them to come in. When we step off the stage, I want to turn the Legion over to them. I want them to take over this Government and not let it fall into the hands of those who are opposed to everything for which the Legion stands.

I did not come down here with the intention of making a speech. I made one yesterday, from which I have not altogether recovered yet. I wanted to say to you, and to the Auxiliary, and the Gold Star Mothers, and the Legionnaires, and civilians throughout the country that, when I turn over the gavel as chairman of this Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I can say to them that I have kept the faith, I have done everything I could to see that our servicemen and their dependents are properly cared for, and at the same time have kept in mind the Treasury of the United States. This is your country; it is mine. This is the only place to have to go, and God being my helper, we are going to keep it for Americans for all time to come.

A great Englishman, speaking before the House of Commons some years ago, quoted a verse, I believe from Swinburne, in which he said:

"All our past acclaims our future:
Shakespeare's voice and Nelson's hand"

And I am saying this in reference to the Constitution, which is our ship of state.

Whenever it is destroyed everything is gone. It took 2,000 years for our forefathers to build up to the Constitution. It is the only document on earth that has in it the Bill of Rights. We are the only country on earth that has a bill of rights, with the exception of the British Empire, whose constitution is not written. It took 2,000 years of struggle and blood and tears and suffering to build up to that Constitution. As far as I am concerned, I have sworn to uphold it. When I took that oath of office I meant what I said. Some say, "You southern Democrats and northern Republicans have made an unholy alliance" because we are fighting to preserve that Constitution our boys are fighting for.

Was it an unholy alliance when George Washington or Thomas Jefferson and John Adams joined hands in the Continental Congress to bring about the Declaration of Independence? Was it an unholy alliance when George Washington, the Father of our Country, and Benjamin Franklin, the greatest of all American philosophers, joined hands to establish the Constitution of the United States? Was it an unholy alliance when Thomas Jefferson, the great liberal of the South, and Alexander Hamilton, the great conservative of the North, joined hands to adopt the Bill of Rights that protects you in your personal life? If so, then you may accuse me and the men on the other side of the aisle from me of being in an unholy alliance to save the Constitution of the United States in its entirety. That Constitution is the ship of state. We have fought all over the deck on principles of policy, tariff, freight rates, and even the power question, but we have never attempted to shoot the bottom out of the boat. You have an element in this country that is doing that very thing. They want to destroy and get

rid of it; they want to wipe out the State governments, and so far as I am concerned, they shall not pass.

When this man Phillip Snowden arose in the House of Commons, he said, quoting Swinburne:

"All our past acclaims our future: Shakespeare's voice and Nelson's hand,
Milton's faith and Wordsworth's trust in this our chosen and chainless land,
Bear us witness: Come the world against her, England yet shall stand."

I would paraphrase that quotation today and say to you in all seriousness, that—

All our past acclaims our future:
Jefferson's voice and Washington's hand,
Franklin's faith and Marshall's trust
In this our chosen and chainless land,
Bear us witness; come the world against her
America yet shall stand!

[Applause.]

The Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past few months there has been increasing discussion and concern as to the underlying purpose of the articles that are printed in the Reader's Digest. A constituent of mine has recently written this famous American publication, pointing out what appears to him and to many other persons to be a significant point. I include this letter as a part of my extension of remarks:

CARPINTERIA, CALIF., *February 22, 1944.*
EDITOR, THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: When the first issue of Reader's Digest appeared, I was working in a wholesale magazine agency. I read it, enjoyed it, and have been reading it ever since.

However, I have been increasingly disturbed during the past few years by a number of articles in the Reader's Digest that were notably sensational, inaccurate, and biased.

In the interest of brevity I comment only on the articles by Louis Bromfield and Senator HUGH BUTLER, both of which I feel were seriously misleading to your readers.

When I read in last August's Reader's Digest the article by Louis Bromfield, We Aren't Going To Have Enough to Eat, I was, to say the least, surprised. Nothing that I had learned from farm leaders, farm-agency officials, or production statistics supported his assertions typified by his statement that "by next February most of our people will be living on a diet well below the nutrition level." Then I thought, surely the Reader's Digest isn't so irresponsible as to print an article calculated to spread the fear of famine and encourage food hoarding throughout our country unless it has some inside information not available through official channels; let's wait and see. Well, February is nearly over; people are still well fed in California and no reports of mass hunger have been coming in from other parts of the country. On the contrary, we are getting extra pork coupons and hearing of surpluses of eggs and potatoes.

The article by Senator HUGH BUTLER attacking our Latin-American policy in your issue of last December has been ably answered and many of his misstatements exposed by Members of Congress and Government officials. I have not noticed that you have published any of these answers. Instead, you print another article by Senator BUTLER in the same vein in your February issue, in which he states, "My own further investigation will confirm the assertions made in my article in the December Reader's Digest. The investigation is continuing under the direction of qualfied accountants. Its results will be published." In other words, Senator BUTLER admits that the accountants are working not to clarify the facts at issue, but rather to confirm his assertions, and perhaps to pave the way for a third article in the Reader's Digest.

As I see it, there are two paths open to the Reader's Digest. The first, to continue with an increasing number of special propaganda articles which I am sure will cause you to lose the confidence and respect of an increasing number of your readers. The second, to revert to your original policy of publishing condensations of significant articles originating in the other magazines of the country by which you will be performing an invaluable service for your readers.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART MEIGS,
Member, California State Board of Agriculture.

Jackson Day Address by Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a timely and able address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, at the Jackson Day dinner at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I think to most men and women there is a tremendously sobering sense of responsibility in the fact that this is an election year.

The decision to be made next November will have far-reaching consequences not only for the people of this Nation but for much of the civilized globe.

To control that decision, our opponents will seek to smear our record, discount our abilities, and challenge our intentions.

They will strive to conduct the war without experience or knowledge, to determine the peace and to order our post-war economy as directed by their bosses.

Their purpose will be to dictate on their own terms the shape of the future—for their bosses.

And in all these attempts—whatever the platform, whoever the nominee, they will fail.

On November 7, 1944, the Democratic Party will once more win a decisive victory. A victory for the great mass of the common people who are America. And a victory which our Allies will understand and applaud.

The issue before the country is one of leadership. And there is only one leadership capable of carrying the Nation through the next 4 critical years: The experienced, realistic, and successful leadership of the Democratic Party.

The people of this country know that. During a period of developing crisis they have seen this leadership move forward steadily, resolutely to meet the greatest threat to our liberties since the days of Valley Forge.

They remember the vigor with which, back in the early thirties, the administration set about to rebuild the strength of our Navy.

They remember the efforts to fortify Guam and to strengthen our position in the Pacific.

They remember the famous quarantine speech of 1937 in which the President trumpeted forth the growing menace of Nazi Germany. For this, he was called a warmonger. And other attempts to arouse the Nation to a sense of impending danger and the need for preparedness.

They remember the speed and promptness with which the administration acted when the danger could no longer be denied, even by his political enemies at home, for the Nazi hordes stood then just across the Dover Channel:

The first shipment of arms to the beleaguered people of Britain.

The exchange by which we gave them destroyers they desperately needed in return for bases which we desperately needed.

The precision with which our rearmament program was set in motion.

The determination with which we began to increase our armed forces.

And the imagination which went into the concept of lend-lease, whereby, for our hard-pressed potential allies, we became the veritable arsenal of democracy.

All this was statesmanship of a high order. Foresight which the Republican leadership consistently sneered at and belittled. Actions which Republican leadership and some Democrats strove in every way to circumvent.

A realistic grasp on the significance of world events which was completely foreign to the average Republican mind.

Now that the entire pattern of German and Japanese aggression has been made clear, is it any wonder that the American people do not listen very attentively to the blather of Republican hindsight? Or to the argument that under Republican leadership the war will go forward to a prompter and more successful conclusion?

I say a leadership that in a little over 2 years has raised, trained, and equipped an armed force of more than 10,000,000 men is quite competent to finish the job.

A leadership that has built the largest and most powerful Navy in the world is quite competent to finish the job.

A leadership that has achieved the greatest record of war production in the history of the human race is quite competent to finish the job.

The majority of the people of this country know these things to be true.

The majority of our men in uniform overseas know these things to be true.

They sense, even more perhaps than we do at home, that American leadership is today the leadership of the world.

And I think to most of them it would come as a profound shock to learn that that leadership had been turned over to a smug, pinch-minded Dewey—or to a volatile, erratic Willkie—or to a prophet of confusion like Bricker—or, in fact, to any dark-horse candidate for immortality which the Republicans have in their dreary Aegean stables.

But there is another and, to me, more profound reason why the people of this country will stick by its present leadership.

The American people have, as a whole, a deep and instinctive sense of the currents of history.

They know at the peace table the voice of America must speak for a new world.

They know in the difficult days of our own post-war adjustment our national economy must be geared to this new world.

For more than a decade the leadership of the Democratic Party has shown unexampled courage, realism, and imagination in grappling with the many difficult problems that have beset our land.

During that period the leadership of the Republican Party has been chiefly that of stubborn opposition to almost everything which smacked of social progress and to the clearly indicated trend of the times.

The plain people of this country trust Democratic leadership. They do not trust Republican leadership, or their bosses.

They have a well-grounded suspicion that the Republican Party is still the party of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. And that its basic thinking dates back to an era which is as dead as a model T Ford.

If they have any lingering doubts on the subject they have only to look at the Republican bloc in the present Congress.

An off-year election has given our opponents a substantial increase of strength in the Senate and the House of Representatives. They are using that new strength not only to jockey for political advantage but to serve those interests whose primary concern is the profit figures on their balance sheets.

In the midst of the greatest crisis in our Nation's history they are still fighting the old fight—for their bosses.

They have learned nothing. They have forgotten everything.

No! Leadership capable of charting a sound course for the Nation during the next 4 critical years can be—and will be—found only within the Democratic Party.

To invite any other is to invite disaster.

I want to talk for a few moments of this leadership and what it has meant to the people of America during the past 11 years.

To do this, hark back to the black years of the depression which followed the debacle of 1929.

To some of you this may mean a far cry from the imperative matters which concern us today. But these events bear a direct relation to the sound of guns below Rome and the roar of bombers over Berlin.

For the crash of 1929 touched off the world-wide crisis that in other countries had been smoldering ever since the end of the World War. And it was that crisis in Germany which gave Hitler his opportunity.

You all know the story of Hitler's rise to power, his swaggering armies of cutthroats, his demagogic appeals to the basest prejudices of a terrified people, the manner in which he took office and swept out all forms of constitutional government to assume absolute power.

You know, too, how promptly he smashed the labor unions, coerced the agricultural elements, regimented his people in a vast program of armament manufacture, and then joined hands with the great cartel industrialists of Germany in preparation for a concerted drive for world conquest.

Some say it was the ineptitude of the Government of Germany during the crisis which catapulted Hitler into power, but it was scarcely any greater than the ineptitude of the Republican administration as it was then viewed the widening circle of disaster in this country and did nothing.

For 4 years we suffered under the do-nothing policy of Herbert Hoover. Such aid as was offered was directed primarily to an effort to rescue the large banks, financial institutions, trusts, and holding companies from the consequences of their own greed.

The small-business man, the white-collar worker, the great mass of labor were left to shift for themselves. And the farmer, who incidentally had enjoyed little of the prosperity of the high twenties, was also left to shift for himself.

Our legacy from the Republicans ran to 12,000,000 unemployed, millions of others had lost their savings, thousands had lost their homes, and in our cities the bread lines stretched endlessly.

There is no need to remind you people of Iowa of the dangerous mood the country was in or of the farmers in your own State who pulled judges from the bench to prevent foreclosures on their farms.

Nor do I have to recall the bonus army—that hungry, ragged collection of World War veterans to whose petition a Republican President had no answer except tear gas and bayonets.

This country was nearer the brink of complete chaos than most of us like to remember.

Germany and America. But here was the difference.

We turned to no Fascist demagog or rabble-rouser. We kept our faith in the methods of democracy.

We waited the appointed time when we could turn out of office the ministers of disaster. And prayed that the new administration would by some miracle guide us out of the wilderness.

Then, on March 4, 1933, we heard the words of that first inaugural address, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And we knew that here at last was the voice of responsible leadership.

We need not recount in detail the swift action which followed those words.

The bank holiday which sorted out the sound banks from the unsound.

Adequate appropriations for unemployment relief.

The emergency farm bill to mitigate distress in agricultural areas.

The program for construction of public works, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control.

The legislation to provide farm mortgage refinancing and reduction of interest rates.

The establishment of the S. E. C. to make an end to the high-wide-and-handsome methods of stock promotion of the Republican twenties.

The establishment of a Federal corporation to insure bank depositors against loss.

The Tennessee Valley Authority—the first of a series of great dam projects to harness our water-power resources as well as to control floods, prevent the wasting of our soil, and replenish our forests.

And finally the N. R. A.—a concept of business and government cooperation which, however faulty in method, succeeded in starting once more the wheels of industry.

All these were the events of 3 short months. To the Nation at large they brought new hope, new courage, a new conviction of the inherent strength of their democracy.

As the program was gradually rounded out, it became increasingly clear that here in reality was a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. A concept that had grown strangely rusty during the days when big business dominated the councils of state and the stock market was the criterion of all good and evil.

A government for the farmer. For, in spite of many criticisms, no other administration has done so much toward the economic strengthening of agriculture and particularly the small- and medium-sized farmer.

A government for the workingman. For, in spite of many criticisms, no other administration has given to labor so broad and sweeping a charter of liberty.

A government for the small businessman. For, in spite of many criticisms, no other administration has so vigorously challenged the power of the large corporations.

It was this administration which laid down the principle of government responsibility for those who were unemployed through no fault of their own. And hundreds of thousands of men who might otherwise have starved were given jobs at which they could earn an honest living at work which had genuine social value.

It was this adminstration which for the first time developed a broad program for social security, insurance against poverty in old age, measures for the protection of public health, increased emphasis on education and training for the youth of our land, housing programs to promote home building, and better homes.

It was this administration also which put into action the first thoroughgoing program for conservation of our national resources—to safeguard and enhance the people's wealth in forests, minerals, water power, and farm lands.

I could go on almost indefinitely. But you know the story as well as I.

Certainly, I do not pretend that everything the administration tried to do was successful. Some of it was inevitably trial and error to meet emergency conditions.

Nor do I pretend that all of its acts were perfect. Many of you here tonight have, at one time or another, disagreed with certain aspects of its policies.

But here was leadership of a new quality—vigorous, imaginative, courageous.

A leadership which put the country back once more confidently on its own feet and set the mold for the Nation's future highest development.

Nor were all these things done solely by Federal authority. You know far better than anyone else the generous and practical aid that was given the individual States to help them work out their own problems.

Many of these States were literally bankrupt. They did not remain bankrupt for long.

So much of all this is now past history that we are prone to forget its full significance.

In an era where revolutionary impulses were rampant throughout the world, we effected our change through the sound, proven methods of democracy.

We gave our Nation the strength to meet the challenge of world unrest. A revolution which threatened to engulf the entire globe.

Can you imagine how this country would have fared in this war if it had been bogged down under another 4 years of Hoover republicanism?

Or if we had turned our destinies over to the timorous Landon?

Or if we had depended on the counsels of the reactionary, isolationist high-business men who would have surrounded the unpredictable Willkie?

Thank God, this Nation did not have to endure the answer.

There is one more thing this country remembers:

A quarter of a century ago a Democratic President voiced the hopes of the world in his plea for a League of Nations to outlaw the bloody-handed monster of war.

Those hopes he wrote into a document which represented perhaps the highest expression of world statesmanship in the tortured history of mankind.

We all know what happened.

We all know how in this country the issue was made a football of vindictive partisan politics, dragged through the mud of slander and lies, and finally killed by the Republican opposition.

Woodrow Wilson died 20 years ago, broken in health but not in spirit. His last public words were: "I have not the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist Providence before, and I have seen their utter destruction, such as will come on them again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

Today, Americans are dying on the beachheads of Italy and in the islands of the Pacific because the Republicans of 25 years ago chose the course of politics and isolation rather than the course of world peace.

The people of this country are determined that, after this war, no such blind counsels of selfishness and greed shall again succeed.

As we look toward the coming election there emerges the clear intent of the American people.

Their purpose is to win the war, to establish the foundations of a secure and lasting peace, and to create the basis for a post-war economy of full employment and sound prosperity.

During the past 2 years we have learned much of the country's latent resources and how they could be harnessed to a common task.

In the production of implements of war we set our sights and achieved our goal with a speed and efficiency which have been the consternation of our enemies abroad.

Only by the most careful planning and coordination—only by the full cooperation of management and labor working with Government—could this miracle have been accomplished. And the fact that it was accomplished is one more tribute to our realistic national leadership.

Can we not achieve the same miracle for the implements of peace?

We can.

If we have the will and determination—the courage and the imagination—we can by these methods create an economy of abundance that will outstrip any prosperity this country has yet known.

We can guarantee every man and woman who wishes to work a full-time job.

We can guarantee every farmer a steady, consistent and profitable return on his crops.

And in doing this we can give full scope to honest, private initiative—full opportunity for fair and reasonable profit.

We need ask only that the energies of the Nation be directed to an agreed-upon, constructive end—within a pattern that will serve primarily the common good rather than the purely selfish ends of the individual.

Our Republican opponents will inevitably brace themselves against this concept.

However much some of them may pay lip service to its plain necessity, their minds and hearts and intentions will be elsewhere.

They will be seeking once more the promise of Harding "normalcy."

They will be seeking to cut loose from all restrictions which hamper the pirating operations of big business.

They will be seeking an economy based on depressed agriculture, cheap labor, and restricted production, an economy devised to squeeze the utmost in profits for those on top.

And they will try to sell the American people this worn-out and discredited bag of tricks by the glib and specious argument that they are providing full employment.

Caveat emptor. Let the buyer beware.

I do not think the American people will willingly suffer themselves to be sold out again.

Certainly I know our returning veterans will demand something far more substantial than the Republicans offered after the last war.

They will want jobs. Yes.

They will want opportunity. Yes.

But they will want jobs and opportunity in some sort of an ordered world, where they will not be exposed to the hazards of a hit-or-miss economy and where all the results of their labor and efforts will not be swept away overnight in another catastrophe of monumental proportions.

There must be no more bread lines, no more bonus armies, no more wholesale foreclosures on farms.

We are met here tonight to honor the name of Andrew Jackson.

It is our glory that the Democratic Party still exists in the tradition of this rugged, vital defender of the rights of the common people.

It was his leadership that reinvigorated the principles of Thomas Jefferson, spearheaded a great revolt against the developing power of the moneyed interests, and gave back to the Nation the clear direction of its destiny.

His problems, like those of Jefferson, were problems inherent in the early nineteenth century. They differed widely, of course, from those which we in the twentieth century have had to face.

But at base, Jackson's fight was the same as our fight—to make the interests of the plain people prevail over those of privilege and greed.

It is no accident that the Democratic Party should have so genuinely the trust of the American people. Whenever the people have felt the crushing forces of privilege, whenever they have been sickened by corruption in politics and in government, whenever they have demanded progress and reform, they have called into power the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party has lived for 152 years—within 3 years of the entire life span of our Nation. It is the oldest voluntary political organization in the world.

It has given to the Nation its fundamental principles of government.

It has held the Presidency for a longer period of time than all the other political parties combined.

Its record as a party in power has been one of inspiring achievement. Its record out of office has been one of vigilance in behalf of the people's liberties.

It has suffered trials and tribulations. It has met with overwhelming defeat. But it has always risen from the ashes of defeat in renewed strength of wisdom.

Today, more than ever before, the Democratic Party is basically—fundamentally—the American people.

And the high decisions facing this Nation, in this period of crisis, will be made in that knowledge.

If this country is to go forward and not backward, it must and will retain its present leadership.

If this country is to gear itself to the realities of a changing world, it must and will retain its present leadership.

If this country is to hold its high place in the council of nations, it must and will retain its present leadership.

And to that end, ladies and gentlemen, I give you the party of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

The party of Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson.

And the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Let Us Provide for Our Returning Service Men and Women Now

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I filed a legislative measure which, I believe, is the most important and vital of any I have had the opportunity and privilege to introduce in this House. Its early consideration is most desirable.

I refer to the bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes. If it becomes law, it will be known as the Veterans' Adjusted Service Pay Act of 1944.

There is no group of young men and women in the history of the Nation to whom America will owe so much as to those now serving with distinction in our armed forces. When this conflict is over, the majority of them will return to their loved ones and to civilian life and occupations. Already to date about 1,400,000 men and women have been discharged from the armed forces. There is an urgent need for a measure of this kind and it should be considered by Congress at the earliest possible opportunity.

Congress, from time to time, has considered and passed legislative measures providing benefits and aid to veterans of one nature or another. However, as yet, nothing substantial or of a permanent nature has been enacted insofar as rehabilitating the veteran is concerned.

A man under fire has something taken out of him which cannot be measured from a monetary standpoint. Ask any of these returning veterans who have been wounded or injured in some manner or other. Many will never be the same and we cannot fully compensate them for their physical and mental anguish, but we must do something to rehabilitate them and assure the future security and prosperity of our Nation.

You may ask "What is the cost of this Adjusted Service Pay Act?" The answer is that it will cost approximately $30,000,000,000, which, I grant you, is a lot of money at any time. However, this amount of money is equal to about 16 weeks' cost of the war at the present time. We have spent and are spending hundreds of billions of dollars for necessary implements of war to defeat our enemies, as we certainly must. Therefore, all arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, we surely can spend thirty billion for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of those who have fought, bled, and sacrificed to preserve for all mankind the freedom and liberty we so nobly cherish.

Let us be generous with our pocketbook as well as joining in praise and approbation. Let us show them by deeds and action that while we appreciate their spirit of patriotic devotion and sacrifice and their great zeal for the principles for which they fight, we are not neglecting our duty in making every possible provision for their future happiness and physical well being.

Many hours of work have been spent in the preparation of this bill by officials and representatives of the following five national organizations of the various armed services of the United States:

First. The Army and Navy Union, United States of America.

Second. Regular Veterans Association.

Third. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Fourth. Disabled American Veterans.

Fifth. Military Order of the Purple Heart.

At the time this bill was being drafted, I contacted several officials and mem-

bers of the American Legion in northwestern Minnesota and Washington, D. C. Without exception, they approved of the intent and purposes of the proposed measure.

As I understand it, the Legion as an organization, because of some constitutional requirement, could not sponsor the measure or plan until the national convention had considered and acted upon it. However, Legionnaires everywhere are certain to approve of this or a somewhat similar measure or plan.

The sponsoring groups have prepared a statement outlining a brief explanation of this adjusted-service-pay bill for services rendered. I desire to insert it into the RECORD at this point in order to further explain the proposal.

The explanation follows:

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY BILL FOR SERVICES RENDERED

A credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with an extra credit of $500 where wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, would be allowed all who serve honorably in the armed forces of the present war.

A minimum credit of $100 for any home service and of $500 where any foreign service was had, with a maximum credit of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where foreign service was had, and where the extra credit of $500 for wound applies a maximum allowable of $5,000.

Upon application by the veteran to the War or Navy Departments, the respective Secretaries would certify to the Treasury Department the amount due, and the Secretary of the Treasury would issue bonds in the highest multiple of $50, according to amount due. Where the total amount due any veteran is less than $300 payment with check would be made by the Department honoring the application.

The bonds will bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which interest would cease. The bondholder would have the option to withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing the attached coupons, or could retain all or part of such coupons to draw the prescribed interest up to the full 10-year period.

The bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax-free, and not subject to liens, and would be a property right, reverting to the veteran's next of kin or estate in case of death. Where the veteran's death occurs prior to application, the application may be made by his next of kin or his estate.

EIGHT REASONS IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

1. This adjusted-service-pay method would provide a tangible, earned reward for all who serve honorably—from buck private or apprentice seaman to four-star general or admiral, inclusive.

2. The reward would be measured according to length and place of service, proportionate to the service rendered and the sacrifice made.

3. The reward belongs to those who earn it, or their estates, and would be usable without bureaucratic control or interference with State rights.

4. Determination and distribution of the reward would require the very minimum of administration and creates no new agencies or supervisory boards.

5. A reasonable safeguard is provided against hasty and unwise spending by permitting a withdrawal of only one-fifth of the total reward each year for a 5-year period.

6. An incentive to save is extended by applying 3 percent simple interest for the first 5-year period and 3 percent compound interest for the second 5-year period.

7. The over-all cost to the Nation would be less than the cost of 4 months of actual war expenditures in 1944.

8. This earned-reward method would be the American way.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. To adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay, including food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, of those who serve in the armed forces of the present war and civilians who work in war industry.

Question. Aren't the adjusted credits of $3 and $4 per day allowed in this bill, rather high?

Answer. No—not when you consider the pay of those in the armed forces compared to civilian war workers. The average yearly pay (365) days of all persons in the armed forces, including the value of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, is estimated at less than $2,300, or approximately $6 per day. Would the addition of the credits provided be unreasonable when compared to the earnings, comparative safety, and freedom of civilian war workers?

Question. Would a veteran who is eligible to receive pension, hospitalization, and vocational training because of service-connected disabilities, also be entitled to the adjusted service pay?

Answer. Yes; certainly. The other benefits are granted because the veteran actually suffered disability or vocational handicap in line of duty, and they have no relation to pay adjustments.

Question. Why not wait until the close of the war to make pay adjustments?

Answer. Already over a million persons have been discharged—many with combat disabilities—and others being discharged at a present rate of 30,000 per month. It is entirely possible 3,000,000 persons may be discharged long before hostilities cease. Why should they wait for their pay adjustment? The knowledge this adjusted pay will be available should be a decided morale factor.

Investigation of American Indian

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during the colloquy between the majority and the minority leaders Friday relative to the program for this week it was stated that House Resolution 166, reported by the Rules Committee, would be called up. This resolution, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], provides for an investigation by the Committee on Indian Affairs or a subcommittee thereof of the American Indian.

I make this statement now, Mr. Speaker, so the Members of the House can be advised that for the past 18 years a committee of the Senate has been holding hearings on this subject. Those hearings have been printed and are contained in 40 volumes. It so happens that this Senate committee has made reports from time to time, but June 11 last Senate Report No. 310 of the first session of this Congress was filed. I invite the attention of the Members of the House to this report, because it will be clearly shown that for the House to embark upon such an investigation it would be a duplication of effort and a waste of the taxpayers' money. For the information of the House I am including the recommendations made in the report that I have just referred to. They follow:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Do not fill vacancies that may occur in the staff of the Indian Bureau unless the position is one which is necessary to carrying on the process of elimination, in which case the vacancy may be filled by transfer within the Service, of some employee who came into the Service in a legitimate way and according to the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual.

2. Permit all Indian Service employees whose services in the Bureau are not immediately needed, to seek employment elsewhere, and, so far as possible, assist them to transfer to other Government employment in the interest of national defense and the prosecution of the war in which we are engaged. Annual savings, intangible.

3. Refuse Federal financing in any form or degree to conferences of field and central office employees in the Indian Bureau. Such conferences have been so continuously frequent that they have come to be taken as a matter of course. They are expensive of time and funds far beyond their value in returns. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual.

4. Eliminate surveys by the Indian Bureau. It has acquired the survey habit during the past 10 years. Survey is an interesting recreation, albeit expensive, whether it consists of a junket of specialists from Washington or a mixed group from office and field. Some of the experts made T. C. B. I. A. (Technical Cooperation Bureau of Indian Affairs) surveys while waiting for something to do. It was unfortunate because they were numerous and voluminous and cluttered up the offices and were not of sufficient value to send to the Archives. Many surveys by the Indian Office have required numerous high-priced specialists with many attendants from the office and from the field. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual.

5. Eliminate research and studies as carried on by the Bureau. The Indian Bureau type of research is mainly done by preferred employees who get into the Service to research for their doctor's thesis at Government expense. Research in the Bureau was initiated with $100,000 secured from private foundations for research in Indian education. It was used to employ desirables who did not have civil-service status, to do the work which, if done at all, should have been done by the regular employees. The latest of these studies is now going on—Indian personality and response to authority, it is called. Conducted in cooperation with the University of Chicago, it is now in its second year. It also requires the holding of expensive conferences like the one at Santa Fe last spring, but it is more expensive in that it occupies time and effort of the field personnel in the areas in which it is operating. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual and considerable.

6. Eliminate all supervisors, directors, and coordinators in the central and regional offices, except such as may be needed in transferring functional activities to the States or other agencies. Perhaps the supervisor of public-school relations and the educational field agents under his direction would constitute the only exceptions. Savings, actual, since this staff is in the upper

salary range, and many of them travel on a preferred basis at $6 per diem. Annual savings in excess of $100,000.

7. Eliminate all specialists, including anthropologists, various specialists in education, sociologists, social workers, and program planners. These are also in the upper 10-percent salary level and with per diem and transportation expenses. Annual savings, actual but indeterminate.

8. Eliminate all Federal control of law and order as specifically applied to Indians, except as to offenses actually committed on tribal, not individual, lands held in trust for Indian tribes by the Federal Government. Savings, $250,000.

9. Free all Indians from Federal wardship in any form, except those for whom the Government holds property in trust. This would eliminate divers excuses for interfering with State responsibilities and for maintaining an expensive Bureau organization. Or else, let Congress so define an Indian as to eliminate those who have in reality ceased to be Indians. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual.

10. Eliminate the rehabilitation of Indians as Indians; do not differentiate them from other citizens. If it is necessary for the Government to aid the States in the relief or rehabilitation of any of its citizen groups, that should not be done on the basis of color or race. Annual savings, indeterminate but in excess of $500,000.

11. Transfer Indian probate and inheritance matters to the States. The present inheritance tangle is directly due to Federal trusteeship, and no way has been found to correct it under existing conditions. Annual savings, actual but indeterminate.

12. Eliminate the central office and field staffs which are engaged in the planning and supervision of the construction of buildings for field schools and agencies. This staff has been built up during the past 12 years, has been most expensive, and has not resulted in any improvement in building programs, but has made them much more expensive and much less efficient than they were when they were planned and constructed locally. It should not be overlooked that the employment of a New York firm of architects a few years ago for supervising all Bureau buildings on a 7-percent commission on gross construction costs resulted in the loss of hundred of thousands of dollars to the Government while the results were most disappointing. Annual savings, greatly in excess of $25,000.

13. Put the supervision of Indian forests under the National Forest Administration. Annual savings, a considerable part of the appropriations to the Bureau for such activities in reduction of duplication.

14. Put all Indian irrigation under the Bureau of Reclamation which turns over to completed projects local autonomy of administration. Actual annual savings in addition to reduction of duplicating functions.

15. Transfer Indian education to the States. More than half of all Indian children are now in public school and a large number of the remainder are in mission schools. Now for 10 years the Bureau has had a supervisor and a staff employed specifically to expedite the transfer of Indian children to the public school, but the present director of Indian education appears determined to build up the Indian school even in territory well served by the public school. The present arrangements with California, Minnesota, and Washington are better than none but not very satisfactory. The Federal Government pays these States well for doing what they are under obligation to do for their citizens. Annual savings in excess of $5,000,000.

16. Eliminate all central office control of credit funds under the Indian Reorganization [Wheeler-Howard] Act. The administration of these funds by the Agricultural Extension Division has been expensive and inefficient. Its regulations are voluminous and intricate, requiring a technically trained staff, which operates for the benefit of the system and completely defeats the purpose of the fund. Let all credit funds be administered from the agency jurisdiction as originally intended. Annual savings indeterminate but in excess of $100,000.

17. Cease all land purchase under the Indian Reorganization [Wheeler-Howard] Act. So far this fund has been used for two kinds of purchases—quantities of low-grade land on which neither Indians nor non-Indians can make a living, and the purchase of a few highly developed and improved tracts which the Bureau must manage. In almost every case the land has been purchased for Indians who already have more land than they can use and are leasing much larger quantities to non-Indians. All land purchased under the Indian Reorganization [Wheeler-Howard] Act is transferred to tribal status under Government trust to be used cooperatively by the Indians while none of them are organized as communes nor are many of them communally inclined as to the use of land. Annual savings, indeterminate but amounting to several million.

18. Eliminate all Indian census rolls except such as may be made for a definitely specific purpose to meet a temporary need in bridging the way to a readjustment of Indian status. The national census collects all the Indian census facts needed. At present, census rolls at various agencies are built up mainly to show an increasing Indian population for the purpose of securing more Government support funds for the Bureau. At several agencies there has been recruiting of Indians for the rolls, though they may have little Indian blood and have been free from the Bureau for a generation. Annual savings, indeterminate but actual.

19. Eliminate the Indian Office statistical staff. The main purpose served by this new unit of the Bureau is to show Indian increase and the need for additional service which means more funds for the Bureau. Such statistics have little value except in the interest of building up a bureau. Annual savings, indeterminate but in excess of $10,000.

20. Eliminate the Indian Bureau publicity staff and service. It has merely served the ends of propaganda in building up an entrenched Bureau. Annual savings, indeterminate.

21. Eliminate Indian Agricultural Extension, since Indians, as citizens, have the same rights and access to such State and Federal services as other citizens in comparable circumstances. Annual savings in excess of $600,000.

22. Eliminate Federal trust over all individual Indian lands including those in inheritance status. This will free the Indian owners to become responsible citizens, neither in handicapped nor in preferred status. It will enable them to take their places in their communities without the stigma that attaches to them in either status, and will at the same time free the communities to build up through the contribution and to the advantage, of all their people. This will eliminate a large item in the administration of Indian property, and save the Government several million dollars.

23. Cease the purchase of land to be held in tribal status. All purchases of land for Indians under the Indian Reorganization [Wheeler-Howard] Act puts it in tribal status and under Government trust, or it puts it under Government title for the use of some tribe. In no case is the tribe prepared to operate the land as tribal communal land except as they may attempt it under Government supervision. The purchase and supervision of tribal land costs the Government several million dollars annually.

24. Eliminate all Indian boarding schools at the end of the present fiscal year. Fourteen years ago, it was planned to eliminate the last of them in 15 years. The schools may be sold or transferred to other uses not under the immediate supervision of the Federal Government. Annual savings in excess of $4,000,000.

25. Eliminate all day schools except such as may be located on unallotted reservations. This should be done at the end of the present fiscal year except that in some cases it may require longer to make the necessary transfer to the public-school system. This should result in a saving of approximately $2,000,000 to the Federal Government.

26. Dispose of the Indian Bureau library in a manner to make the books, reports, and official documents as generally available as possible.

27. Abolish the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Annual savings in excess of $20,000.

28. Transfer all Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service. This will result in an unestimated annual savings through the elimination of duplicate functions.

29. Close out the Federal accounts of approximately $50,000,000 of individual Indian moneys now on deposit in the Treasury by disbursing them to the individuals and thus eliminating administration costs.

30. Distribute the approximately $19,000,000 of Indian tribal funds in the Treasury, thus saving the Government an annual appropriation of $700,000 for the payment of interest thereon.

31. Beginning July 1, 1945, reduce the central Indian Office staff to a commissioner and not more than three assistants, a chief counsel, and a clerical staff not exceeding six persons. Beginning January 1, 1946, the central office staff shall not exceed a commissioner and three clerks.

32. Beginning January 1, 1944, reduce all agency staffs to one administrative officer who shall act as liaison officer between the Government and the Indians under the agency, and the absolutely necessary clerical and custodial staff not exceeding five Federal employees in any case.

33. Beginning January 1, 1944, not more than one administrative officer and not to exceed five clerical and custodial employees may be retained at each of the eliminated boarding schools to assist in the disposition, and to act as custodians pending such disposition.

The foregoing elimination should reduce the expenditures for the Indian Bureau for the fiscal year 1944 by more than $15,000,000, while for the fiscal year 1945, the appropriations for the Indian Bureau should not exceed $5,000,000.

Respectfully submitted.

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.
BURTON K. WHEELER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

It is my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to oppose this resolution, and as it will be hard to get sufficient time to properly discuss the matter, I seek by these few remarks to help the Members of the House to determine whether or not the resolution should pass. It seems to me that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House could take this Senate report and embody some of the recommendations in legislation and report the bill to the House.

Palestine and Arabian Protests—The Voice of Jacob But the Hand of Esau

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there have been received in Washington protests from the Governments of Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt, and finally this morning from Iraq and Transjordania, concerning two resolutions which have been introduced in the House, one by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] and the other by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] concerning Palestine and the British white paper.

I believe that these protests cannot go unanswered. They are in a way an insult to our intelligence. For example, one of the protests embodied in a letter to the Speaker states that if we pass this resolution it will be tantamount to our waging war against the Arabs in Palestine. This statement is utterly and woefully ridiculous.

Furthermore, these protests against which I inveigh are contrary to diplomatic practices. They should have all been contained in the diplomatic pouches of the diplomats accredited to those countries.

These protests are gratuitous insults to our intelligence, and in addition interfere with our functions. We are able to manage our own affairs without interference from these Arabians. However, all these attempts to undermine our effectiveness and independence as a legislative body follow a similar pattern. These officials of these Arabian states—all puppets of Great Britain—have been needled into action by the British Colonial Office. It is the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau.

I suggest these states keep their noses out of our business here.

Beneath the official protests of Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Egypt against the congressional statements in favor of the settlement of Jews in Palestine is easily discernible the last desperate maneuvering of the collected forces determined to crush Palestine as a national homeland for the Jewish people.

The gun-running trials in Palestine of two Jewish taxi drivers had failed in its obvious purpose to discredit the Jewish agency. The plot of the farce enacted had been too transparent and watered for public consumption. The plan for a federation of Arab states had collapsed, as was to be expected. A belief in the mirage that was and is a pan-Arabian union had long been assiduously fostered and nurtured and offered as a palatable dish to the Arabs by the British Colonial Office, which had all the while been aware of the impossibility of achievement. It was but another manifestation of British colonial policy of obscuring the issue under the pretense of sympathy to continue in control. The British Colonial Office knew as well as did all other mandatory powers in the east that the rival jealousies, the mores, and schisms inherent in the tribal lives of Arabia would halt any endeavor to consummate a real alliance. It is obvious that no encouragement for such a union would have been given by Great Britain had she for a moment believed that it could come to pass. Lawrence of Arabia's words are not unknown to the erudite British Colonial Office. He said:

> The Arabic-speaking peoples are as diverse as the English speaking and equally distinct. From Morocco to Mesopotamia is as far, spiritually, as from San Francisco to Aberdeen. Further, there is a world between the Bedouin of Azrak and the peasant of Amman, though the journey is only 50 miles. Only a criminal would wish to make them all alike. When people talk of Arab confederations or empires, they talk fantastically. It will be generations, I expect—unless the vital tempo of the east is much accelerated—before any two Arab states join voluntarily.
>
> The nearest approach to an Arab empire at present is ibn-Saud's. It is a figment built on sand. Nothing static will rise in the desert, which has seen hundreds of such tyrannies as his, all cemented with blood. It will pass.

Naturally, embedded in the talk of an Arab federation is always found the hollow exposition that the little bit of land of Palestine is the stumbling block in the path of unity. Remember, Palestine is about half the size of Vermont. It is about 7,000 square miles, while the Arab world comprises over 10,000,000 square miles.

Well, that, too, has failed. What now? The United States stirs itself to speak congressionally in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews. The next move must be more subtle, it is decided. Through diplomatic channels, protests against such activity in Congress are made. Again it is a bid for public attention to the Arab claim. These officers know that such protests are contrary to good diplomatic procedure. What nonsense is this—for an officer of a foreign government to tell the Members of Congress what to say and what not to say? Since when can an Arabian play censor of the utterances in the Congress of the United States? No official of the United States Government can censor what is said on the floor of the House, let alone an Arabian.

The significance of these protests is not lost; the timing was too perfect, coming when action is about to be taken on the Wright-Compton resolution, condemning the restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine.

But I make bold to say that such protests are actually the voice of the British Colonial Office. The denunciation of the MacDonald white paper is gathering in power; its policy, one way or another, must be sustained and justified. Arabian protest against Jewish immigration into Palestine would appear to be an excellent weapon to stem the tide of opposition. The Arabs issued no protest in 1917 when the Balfour Declaration was issued, nor was a protest forthcoming when 52 nations ratified the Palestine Mandate, which incorporated the Balfour Declaration. Our State Department was not deluged with notes of protest when, in 1922, Congress passed a resolution, similar to the present Wright-Compton bill, favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people. I recall no protest when, in 1924, the United States and Great Britain entered into a treaty wherein it was agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion. Nor do I remember any Arabian outburst when the State Department protested to Great Britain that there had been a violation of the Anglo-American treaty in the partition of Palestine, cutting of Trans-Jordan.

The hostility of the Arabian leaders to the Allied cause was no secret when Hitler's victory was imminent. Iraq had to be beaten into submission, the Egyptian Prime Minister was caught betraying British military secrets to the Axis; the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem fled to Berlin to continue his nefarious activities. This is the treachery that must be rewarded. The Arabs know no right but that of being on the winning side.

With their eagerness to accept baksheesh—a bribe—the Arabs have now placed themselves in a neat position. In short, they are now ready to bargain and bargain hard. They have oil for sale. The American-Arabian Oil Co. has been granted concessions by King ibn-Saud of Arabia—250,000 square miles. The King is being paid mighty well through royalties and commissions as well as 1,300,000 gallons of gasoline, annually, 100,000 gallons of kerosene, and some quantities of lubricants. In addition, under lend-lease, Saudi Arabia receives 20,000,000 ounces of silver for coinage purposes from our hoard at West Point.

There is no need to offer in addition the 10,429 square miles of Palestine, no matter what gratuitous promises have been made in complete disregard of the internationally ratified Balfour Declaration; the Anglo-American and the Permanent Mandate Commission oil concession in Arabia and Kuwait whether owned by American or British companies do not call for the throwing in of Palestine without Jews as an extra bonus. The development of these concessions in Arabia will produce much wealth for Arabia. It need not be feared that those Arabians who benefit thereby will back out of the bargain already made. Their greed is greater than their distrust of a national homeland for the Jews, official United States, Great Britain and the United States, notwithstanding.

We are informed that Brig. Gen. Patrick Hurley has made some acute observations on this matter, but, then, his objections to a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine are well known. Once before he had attempted to submit to Members of Congress an anti-Zionist memorandum. Once again the old clamor of military expediency is raised. I fear that the gentleman has dwelt too long in British Colonial

Office circles and, like the chameleon, has taken on the color of his surroundings.

Nor can we dismiss easily British domination of Lebanon and Syria. The recent explosions therein, it has been said, was a cleverly engineered British project. Who knows?

The success of Jewish colonization in Palestine will not be stopped—not by oil, not by power politics, not by framed trials, not by appeasement, not by talk of a pan-Arabian federation, not by senseless demands that House resolutions and Senate bills be withdrawn and committee actions be smothered, and certainly not by muzzling the mouths of Congressmen. We have but to recognize and name the enemies of honor to defeat them.

Problem of Post-War Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach below a very interesting news story captioned "Post-war job need to test free-enterprise system," by Mr. Charles G. Ross.

The problems outlined by Mr. Ross are outstanding, and I am sure that they are giving much concern to the Members of this House as well as to the people of the Nation generally.

The article follows:

POST-WAR JOB NEED TO TEST FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY TO BE DECIDED BY PRIVATE BUSINESS' ABILITY TO PROVIDE FULL EMPLOYMENT QUICKLY AFTER WAR

(By Charles G. Ross)

War solved the No. 1 problem of the great depression—unemployment. But war solved it only for a time. It is dust swept under a rug. With the coming of peace, the task of fitting the workers of the country into jobs will emerge as the great, overshadowing problem in our American life.

It is not only HENRY WALLACE who i saying that the capitalistic system will face an acid test; that "free enterprise and joblessness cannot long exist side by side in the same Nation." Businessmen are saying the same thing. Businessmen are aware that if private enterprise is to live it must provide jobs.

That is another way of saying that if the free-enterprise system, which has learned to produce on a miraculous scale, does not also master the art of distribution, that system will inevitably be supplanted by some other. As the experience in Europe has shown, democracy cannot hope to survive a protracted period of mass unemployment.

We have seen how the unemployment of our depression era brought about increased governmental controls. Can it be doubted that if there is again large-scale want in the midst of plenty the Government will move farther and farther along this road?

MANY ISSUE WARNING

Numerous voices of business have been raised in warning. Alfred Sloan, of General Motors, told a recent meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers that, if industry failed to meet the impending test, the private-enterprise system would give way to some form of socialism. Eric Johnston, the young and dynamic head of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has repeatedly warned the industrial world that it must ward off mass unemployment or face the certainty of the Government's taking over. The McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., a spokesman of business, put the matter bluntly in a full-page advertisement published throughout the country: "Idle factories lead straight to totalitarianism because, when millions of people are jobless and hungry, government becomes the employer."

A vivid summation of the problem has been given by the Committee for Economic Development, a post-war planning agency set up by private industry under the direction of Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation.

"The committee holds as fundamental the belief that the national welfare will be advanced in direct proportion to the number of workers employed by private business enterprise.

"Success in this endeavor will result not only in elimination of mass unemployment but also in higher standards of living than we have ever known.

"Failure will leave us with the choice of only two alternatives: Mass unemployment or mass Government employment. The committee believes that the existence of the free-enterprise system, and of democracy itself, depends largely upon our ability to avoid these two dangers after the war."

RELATED TO FISCAL POLICY

The problem is closely related to the whole fiscal policy of the Nation. It is tied in with the farm problem, for the welfare of the farmer is inseparably linked with the welfare of the industrial population. It has a direct bearing on our foreign-trade relations, for the scope and the character of these must depend on the use we make of the domestic market. It is connected intimately with the rate of demobilization of our armed forces. It impinges on the problem of monopolies and cartels, for any discussion of these must weigh the relative merits of free competition and restricted competition as producers of jobs. It touches, in short—this problem of conferring on the human being the dignity of remunerative work—every phase of our economic life.

If there were no other reason for considering this urgent problem while the war is on, there would be ample reason in the single fact that the problem concerns not alone the domestic economy of the country but concerns our foreign policy as well. This is a point that is not generally understood. What we do in an economic way will have a vital bearing on the peace of the world.

WARNING ON TRADE

Nowhere has this point been better made than in a recent study of post-war employment by John H. G. Pierson, Chief of the Post-War Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We cannot, he points out, have a sound policy of two-way trade, we cannot hope to work out the problem of an equitable division of the world's raw materials, if through failure to set our economic house in order we are forced to treat our foreign policy simply as a technique for providing jobs that we have been unable to provide through our domestic measures.

"Thus," says Pierson, "the final reason why we must find ways and means for permanently solving our employment problem is at stake. For if, after victory is won, we are so compelled by confusion or weakness at home that we are unable to stand squarely for cooperation with the nations and the peoples of the world, the pressure of events will eventually force us to the brink of another and even more terrible war."

The voices that have called for planning against joblessness after the war are the voices of a healthy realism—not of pessimism. They tell us the penalty of failure, but they tell also of the prosperity that is in store if we can keep our industrial machine going at its wartime rate and distribute its products among the people—if to mass production for peace we can add mass distribution.

The recent Baruch report on post-war adjustment policies is distinctly on the optimistic side. It does not minimize the difficulties of the change-over from a war to a peace economy—"nothing comparable has ever been known before"—but it declares that the adjustment, if soundly made, "should be an adventure in prosperity."

TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITIES

"It is our conviction," says this report, "that we will emerge from the war with the greatest opportunities any people ever had. A post-war depression is not inevitable. One-half the world will need rebuilding. Enormous demands, put aside during the war and added to pre-war demands, await satisfaction. Much depends on the settlement of the peace. If it be one under which men and women can look forward with hope—not fear—there will not be enough hands to do what needs to be done."

The American economic system, the report points out, has shown that it can outproduce the world; it "can perform still another miracle in a fine and lasting peace."

That is the bright side of the picture. The possibilities are indeed limitless. We have the raw materials. We have the plant and the tools. We have managerial daring and ability. We have, as a result of the war, the most highly skilled body of workers that this or any other Nation ever possessed. We have a population eager to improve its standard of living. We have, in fine, all the physical ingredients for an unexampled degree of national well-being.

But it must be remembered that we had all these in ample measure in 1929 and out of them got the bitter brew of depression. Thirteen millions were unemployed in the winter of 1932–33 and other millions were on part time. Despite all the Government effort and money that went to the rescue of a sick economy, there were still more than 7,000,000 unemployed at the end of 1940. An estimate quoted by Stuart Chase places the cost of the idleness in the decade of the 1930's at 100,000,000 man-years of work. It took the war, ultimate expression of what Chase calls a disaster, economy to sweep the ugly problem of unemployment temporarily out of sight.

A STAGGERING PROBLEM

A high "adventure in prosperity" beckons, to be sure. Full employment—jobs for all who are able and willing to work—will set us on the way. But full employment, or even an approximation that will stave off disaster is not something that will come about easily; it will have to be worked for.

A few figures will show the staggering size of the problem and its challenging nature.

Including more than 10,000,000 in the armed services, there are now some 62,000,000 Americans gainfully employed. In 1940 the total was about 46,600,000, including 600,000 in the armed services; there were also between 6,000,000 and 9,000,000 unemployed workers.

There will be deductions, of course, from the present total labor force when the war ends. Many women will go back to their home duties, older workers will retire, many young people will return to school. Even so, experts of the Department of Commerce calculate—and their figures appear to be generally accepted by industry—that the total number of those seeking work after the war (assuming 1946 to be the first post-war year) will be about 59,500,000. On the assumption that 2,500,000 of these will remain in the armed services, private enterprise and Government will face a demand for 57,000,000 jobs.

Now, full employment, as the Brookings Institution points out in a recent study, does not mean absolutely complete employment, for at any given moment there are not only the chronic unemployables but many workers who are shifting jobs or are idle for various other reasons, such as seasonal slack, prolonged illness, technological changes, or depression in certain industries.

"All these," says no less an authority than Sir William Beveridge, "are forms of unemployment consistent with general prosperity and progress." Even now, despite all our efforts to increase the labor force, it is estimated that 1,000,000 are unemployed.

The Committee for Economic Development, taking into account the inevitability of a certain degree of unemployment in any dynamic society, deducts 2,000,000 from the potential 57,000,000 civilian workers in 1946 and arrives at the conclusion that a satisfactory employment goal will be reached with the employment of 55,000,000 workers in civilian pursuits. This is about 9,000,000 more than were employed in 1940.

The C. E. D.'s figures, all derived from official sources, tally closely with those of the Brookings Institution, which finds that a state of reasonably full employment at the end of the change-over from war to peace will be realized at an employment level of 54,000,000, or, roughly, 17 percent over 1940.

INCREASE IN JOB SEEKERS

The employment problem is never static. In the first place, there is a steady growth in the labor force owing to population increase. It is estimated that about 2,300,000 persons reach working age annually and that about 1,400,000 of these enter the labor market. There is an offset of about 700,000 who quit the market because of age, death, physical disability, marriage, etc., leaving a net annual increase in the labor supply of about 700,000. This figure has been used in calculating the number of jobs that will need to be supplied in 1946.

In the second place, there is a steady upward trend in the output per worker. The Department of Commerce calculates that this increase in the 12-year period from 1929 to 1941 was roughly one-third, or at the rate of 2.5 percent a year, compounded. The rate is certain to be increased by the tremendous technological progress during the war.

What is in store in the way of new labor-savings devices may be gathered from two examples recently given a congressional committee: By February 1943 the production time on a medium bomber had been cut from 700,000 man-hours to 13,000, and on a 10,000-ton Liberty cargo ship from 1,100,000 man-hours to 680,000. There have been thousands of other instances of the same sort.

What does this mean in terms of employment? It means, the Department of Commerce says, that even if the future rate of increase in productivity is no higher than the 2.5 percent annual rate of the period 1929–41, the output per man-hour in 1946 will be 13.5 percent greater than in 1941.

In another striking calculation, the Department estimates, on the same basis of only the long-term normal increase in productivity, that 83 persons will turn out as much per hour in 1946 as 100 persons did in 1940. Obviously, if there is no increase in output and no further reduction of work hours, the other 17 persons will be thrown out of jobs—the victims of "technological unemployment."

MUST INCREASE OUTPUT

The figures on growth of the work force and increased output per worker add up to the conclusion by the Department's experts that if in 1946 (the hypothetical first year of peace) we attain no higher level of national output than we did in 1940, and if the hours of work remain the same as in 1940, unemployment will reach the catastrophic total of 19,000,000.

From these figures it is abundantly clear why the national output of goods and services, if we are to cure unemployment or even to mitigate it to bearable proportions, must be substantially increased over the $97,000,000,000 level of 1940—the highest up to that time.

With the labor force available to private enterprise and the Government, we shall have in 1946—again assuming the end of the war and of the immediate reconversion period by that time—a potential productive capacity of $142,000,000,000 in terms of 1940 prices, or $165,000,000,000 in terms of 1942 prices. In physical volume this capacity is nearly half as much again as the actual production of 1940.

The production necessary to employ 55,000,000 or more workers can be reached—there can be no doubt about that. We produced in 1943, with 53,000,000 civilian workers, $175,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. But there was no problem of distribution in 1943—the Government bought over half the product. The question we face is whether we can build up and sustain a purchasing power among the people sufficient to buy the goods we can make—whether we can solve the problem of mass distribution as we have solved the problem of mass production.

Flood Control and Its Relation to Navigation, Irrigation, and Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following statement made by me before the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, on February 23, 1944:

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi.) We next have the privilege of hearing from Representative SHORT.

STATEMENT OF HON. DEWEY SHORT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I would have been here earlier, but our Subcommittee on Military Affairs had a conference with General Marshall this morning. However, I did listen to the hearings a day or two last week, and naturally have been interested in the problems which are dealt with by this committee for many years.

I might say it was my good fortune to have served on the Flood Control Committee with the distinguished chairman, who is the only man on the committee now whom I had the pleasure of serving with when I was a member. Since then I served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; at the present time I am the ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and for the past 4 or 5 years I have had the honor to be president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

So, I have a triple interest; first, that of a citizen; second, as a Member of Congress; third, as President of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which is a nationally known nonprofit, nonpartisan, organization that is interested not only in flood control, but in the improvement of navigation, in irrigation and reclamation, in the generation of hydroelectric power and in the conservation of all our soil and water resources; in other words, this organization is composed largely of former members of Congress, and every Member of Congress, which includes Senators as well as Representatives, is an ex officio member of it. It is composed not only of present Members of Congress and former members of Congress, but many of the Governors of our States, leading industrialists, large shippers, manufacturers, and transportation agencies, as well as prominent leaders in agriculture, and in different sections of the country people who are interested in cheap transportation for the movement of bulk commodities.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I think, has made a magnificent contribution to all of these problems in the more than 40 years of its history. It is operated by men without pay, except our executive vice president, who has a small office force down on Connecticut Avenue.

I feel more or less like carrying coals to Newcastle to appear before your committee. Certainly I am not going to trespass on your time at this late hour in pointing out the destructiveness of these floodwaters that annually occur. They happen every year in some sections of the United States. I do not care whether it is the Connecticut River up in New England, or the Hudson, or the Susquehanna, or the Monongahela, or whether it is the Ohio, or Illinois, or Mississippi, or Missouri, the Red, the Arkansas, the White, or any of the rest of them out in the Colorado and Columbia Basins.

I have seen these floods, though, that are terrifying as they roll over bridges and wash away houses and drown good white-faced cattle and sometimes human beings, and as they spill over thousands of acres of our most fertile farm land.

You know what we suffered in the Missouri Valley last year. We are suffering down in my district, and I happen to represent the best part of Missouri, the Seventh District, which comprises the 15 counties in southwest Missouri. Every year we have a flood of some dimensions.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you and the members of your committee for the valuable work that you have been doing in the brief period since this committee has been formed in Congress. It has quickly grown to be one of the powerful and important committees of this House. It is important in time of peace and in time of war.

And I want to pause long enough to congratulate once more the Chief of Army Engineers and his very honest and competent staff who also serve well in peace as well as in war. They are doing a magnificent job today, the Army engineers, on their battle fronts. I do not see how the war could get along without them. But they are at war all the time. Even during times of peace they are warring on these recurring disasters that exact such a heavy toll in the Nation's wealth and sometimes in human life.

I think the Members of Congress fully appreciate the volume of work which Major General Reybold is doing, carrying on in fine style the splendid work of his predecessors.

Now it is absolutely necessary that we have this work continued even while the war is on, because it is a part of the war effort. It made my heart ache last year when I picked up the St. Louis and Kansas City papers and saw pictures of white-faced cattle drown out here, marooned on islands and many of them drowned, and our fertile farm lands along the Missouri River, with thousands of acres of corn covered and the soil washed away. I was wondering how our Army was going to be fed without all that.

I also shudder sometimes when I think of the important towns on the Connecticut

River and on some of these other important streams where are located many of our war industries.

You gentlemen, I am sure, are fully cognizant of the importance and the necessity of all these projects, and I think that we should be unselfish; we should be charitable with the other fellow; we should try and help all sections of the country, because after all we are in the same boat and we are going to sink or swim together.

I am selfish enough to say, since I am responsible for the 330,000 people I represent down in my district, I have been requested to bring to your attention once more the Table Rock Dam.

Table Rock Dam is located in Taney County on the White River in southwest Missouri. As you perhaps know, the huge dam at Norfork on the White River is fast nearing completion; that an appropriation has already been made in Congress to begin work on Bull Shoals, and while Table Rock was included in the authorization, because that dam and Bull Shoals must be considered together as a unit, it would be a great waste to go on and complete Bull Shoals and not complete Table Rock, because each one of them helps the other.

I might say those dams were designed for flood control and the generation of hydroelectric power, down in a rich valley, and where we really need some new industries.

As you know, the Army engineers, under the very efficient guidance of General Reybold, who at that time was chief of the southwestern division stationed at Little Rock, made a comprehensive and thorough survey of both Table Rock and Bull Shoals, and after spending much time and not a little money, the Army engineers recommended both of those dams as being practicable from an engineering point of view and very feasible from an economic point of view, which would not only prevent the severe loss that occurs practically every year or every other year, but that would add enormously to the wealth of that section of the country.

After the Army engineers recommended it unanimously and most heartily, this committee, after long and extended hearings, approved it, and favorably reported it, as did the Senate committee, and then it was authorized by the Congress, both projects, but when we brought in the appropriation bill recommended by the Budget Bureau and approved by the President, some of my obstreperous and bullheaded and hard-shelled Republican friends bucked and reared and put up a fight and they struck Table Rock from the appropriation. A small appropriation was made for Bull Shoals.

I know that you have done your part. I really should not be talking to you as much as to the Committee on Appropriations, but I do hope that when Table Rock Dam comes before the House for consideration, that some of the members of this committee and of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and other committees that are vitally interested in this whole program will assist me just a little to whip into line some of these fellows on the Appropriations Committee who, I think, out of their abysmal ignorance and lack of knowledge——

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, that applies to Republicans only?

Mr. SHORT. Republicans mainly; but also some Democrats, who, not having read all the hearings, which is an utter impossibility, of course, for any Member to do, and who do not have the benefit of all the testimony and evidence presented before your committee, will really cooperate a little more fully and will give us an appropriation to start work on that project.

As I say, Bull Shoals and Table Rock are tied in together, as the Chief of Engineers forcibly brought out. Hearings have been held and our statements have been made much more fully and accurately than I make this statement this morning.

I merely wanted to drop by to remind you—not to inform you, but simply to remind you—that Table Rock must not be forgotten. I want you to keep it in mind. That is just one of the smaller projects of many of the essential projects all over the country that deserve our careful consideration and our hearty support.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have had your statement, and I am sure the committee appreciates very much your excellent presentation.

United States Does Not Pay Union Dues for War Prisoners

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the attention of the Members of Congress was drawn to a newspaper story reporting that demands had been made on the War Department for the payment of weekly dues from the wages of 165 Nazi prisoners, employees at the Seabrook Farms, Bridgeton, N. J.

This was something new, it seemed, if the War Department should pay union dues to keep Nazi war prisoners in good standing in American labor unions.

I took the matter up with the War Department and on the 3d of March I received a letter written by Brig. Gen. George J. Richards, budget officer of the War Department, stating that no War Department funds have been used for the payment of dues requested by organized labor, as such payment is prohibited by law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this letter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of February 29, 1944, referring to an Associated Press item reported in the Washington Evening Star concerning union demands for the payment of weekly dues from the wages of 165 Nazi prisoners employed at the Seabrook Farms, Bridgeton, N. J.; and inquiring as to whether the War Department proposes to use any part of its appropriated funds for the payment of union dues in connection with prisoner-of-war labor.

No War Department funds have been used for the payment of dues requested by organized labor, as such payment is prohibited by law. Paragraph 1 of Army Regulation 35–780, states:

"1. Statutory provisions: The gross amount of all moneys received from whatever source for the use of the United States, except as otherwise provided in the next section, shall be paid by the officer or agent receiving the same into the Treasury, at as early a day as practicable, without any abatement or deduction on account of salary, fees, costs, charges, expenses, or claim of any description whatever." (R. S. 3617: 31 U. S. C. 484; M. L., 1929, sec. 1825.)

Some time ago an official of organized labor appeared at a camp in the seventh service command and requested information as to who would pay the union dues for prisoners of war then being employed on a work project. This official was informed that the United States paid no union dues; and nothing further was heard from him.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Budget Officer for the War Department.

Enlightened Self-Interest Is Not Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, opinions differ on which country contributes the more important share in the prosecution of the war. A recent poll taken in England revealed that only 2 percent of our British friends thought the American contribution ranked as No. 1. When it comes to the great political decisions of war and peace we shall have to admit, all of us, that John Bull means to be the concert master in the orchestra of the United Nations. It was England who made the fateful decision to embark upon a second World War when His Majesty's Government on September 3, 1939, declared war on Germany. By that action humanity was once more, and to a hitherto unknown extent, involved in a process of universal, mutual destruction and common misery. I doubt whether there has ever been a period in the history of mankind when, to use the favorite English expression, so much blood and sweat and tears have drenched the good earth. By the British declaration of war on September 3, 1939, the forces of England and the Empire were dedicated to the task of preserving the frontiers of Poland intact, including even small localities with predominantly foreign population. By the same declaration of war, the fate of France and the United States—not to speak of the many small nations—were sealed. France had to follow, though reluctantly, in the footsteps of the British Government and declared war after a delay of only 24 hours. We in this country gradually abandoned our established policy of neutrality and, finally, became active belligerents in December 1941.

There has been much criticism recently of the ways the British in the midst of war are developing their economic and political policies the world over. Now we can hardly blame our British friends, or, for that matter, our

Russian allies, for looking out for their interests to the best of their ability, and in so doing, in the case of the British, making full use of their long and widespread experience in the foreign field. It is hardly fair to criticize, because they occasionally take advantage of lacking alertness and aggressiveness on the part of their competitors. What I do resent is that those of our own people who are responsible for American interests abroad in so many cases seem to run a poor second in the international race. We might as well admit it. This war has long ago ceased to be one of the ideologies, one of aims glorified in the Atlantic Charter and the declaration of the "four freedoms." It has developed into a free-for-all fight for political and economic power. It is a great pity that this is so, but the sooner we realize the fact and act accordingly, the sooner shall we concentrate more of our efforts and our thoughts on protecting and developing the interests of this country of ours. We have known all the time that the Russians were fighting for Russia only and for Russian interests even beyond their rightful borders. We have learned in recent months, if we did not know it before, that the British Empire is deliberately, and with considerable success, laying the foundation for her own economic expansion when the war is over. It is high time, my friends, that we in this country stop talking nonsense about playing Santa Claus to the whole wide world instead of looking out fairly for the interests of our people. We must once more be able to create on this continent a high standard of living; a spirit of enterprise; a land of freedom; a true representative government; an America with all the glorious attributes which in the history of mankind have been preeminently called American, a fact of which we should be justly proud.

If you want to know these days what is going on in the world, and even what is going on in this country, you had better subscribe to a London newspaper or tune in on the British Broadcasting Co. Rarely have our political leaders deemed it worth while to take the people into their confidence and give them a full picture of the situation we are facing in the war which Mr. Churchill reports to his House of Commons. I think it is fair to ask the question, Why we in this country, with a supposedly democratic system of government, shall have to turn to the British Prime Minister to hear a full account of the war, of our war? It is still more amazing—not to use a stronger word—that a British paper, the Financial News of London, was the first to publish the story of the secret plans of our Treasury for the establishment of a world bank; a so-called United Nations bank for reconstruction and development. When the secret was out, Mr. Harry D. White, the adviser of the Secretary of the Treasury, and author of the American currency stabilization plan, admitted frankly on October 8 last that the new proposal would not have been made public at that time had the story not been published in London. There is no doubt that the moment for announcing a political step is of great significance for the success or failure of a plan. It is hardly reassuring, from an American point of view, that the timing of American events is done in London.

In this particular case, we may perhaps be grateful that our British friends, somewhat prematurely from the standpoint of the New Deal administration, informed us about what was going on behind closed doors. We might be able, in time, to do something about protecting our hard-earned dollars from being further given away abroad. I told you the other day of a way of visualizing what a billion dollars means—telling you that if we placed them side by side they would just about encircle the globe. Today I will give you another picture of what a billion dollars means. If you had gotten a billion dollars at the time of the birth of Jesus and proceeded to spend a hundred dollars a day, you would today have enough money left to keep you going for an additional 800 years at the same rate of spending. I am anxious for you and for all Americans to know what a billion dollars means in order to arouse you every time our administration hatches out a new plan for dispensing billions of your American dollars. This particular plan for a world bank would call for an American contribution of three and one-half billion dollars, over which the American people, even through their representatives on the board, would have no voting control.

When this war is over, we shall be facing the most stupendous economic problems this Nation has ever had to cope with. We shall have to rebuild our domestic economy; find reemployment for tens of millions of our people; and do all this with a stupendous load of debt on our shoulders. If, in addition, we are to engage in a kind of international reconstruction finance corporation to provide capital for rebuilding power plants, water works and factories, apartment houses, colleges, technological schools, and what not, the world over, we shall be attempting the impossible.

The purpose of the world bank, as stated by the Treasury, would be to encourage private financial agencies to provide long-term capital for the development of the productive resources of member countries. If necessary, the world bank would supply capital for such purposes. The capital of the bank, according to the plan, would be $10,000,000,000, contributed by the member countries within an initial payment of 20 percent of the shares, the rest being subject to later call. The bank would guarantee loans made with private capital of any member government, and through the government to business and industrial enterprises in the member countries. The bank would participate in loans made with private capital, or make loans out of its own resources, but only if and when the borrower should be unable to secure the funds from private investment sources on reasonable terms. The bank would, furthermore, guarantee international loans, and might sell or pledge its own securities. The administration of the bank would be vested in a board of directors consisting of one director appointed by each member government. The voting power of the member countries, however, would be closely related to their shareholdings. It is assumed by the Treasury that the proposed world bank would operate in close cooperation with the international currency stabilization fund, concerning which Lord Keynes from London and Mr. White, of the United States Treasury, are at present developing the detailed plans, and which, incidentally, would call for other billions of American dollars.

The basic assumption of all these schemes for international financial institutions is that out of this war will evolve some kind of a world supergovernment; a world organization somewhat like the League of Nations, only much more powerful. The question may justly be raised whether it is likely that such a centralized world power will emerge out of the present world conflict. There are undoubtedly many Americans who sincerely wish such an outcome of the war. It is safe to say that it is at least very doubtful whether such wishes will be fulfilled. Very many have, in fact, given it up and are talking not of a society of free nations, but of a society of nations dominated by three or four big powers. On October 10 the Polish Ambassador to the United States found it necessary in a speech to issue this warning:

> Much has been said and written about restricting the peace settlement to a close alinement of the three or four great powers in a sort of permanent coalition for the preservation of peace. According to their theory, the so-called small nations would become passing satellites of the great powers in respective spheres of special interest.
>
> Not only is such a conception contrary to the principles for which we have declared that we are fighting and which tend to regard all nations as equal before the law, equally entitled to enjoy freedom and independence and to share the responsibilities of defending peace, but, apart from these important considerations, such a system could not achieve the desired result of a just and permanent peace. It would in fact be a somewhat revised form of the Axis conception of a new world order, based on power politics and conducive to imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly evident that even the creation of a three-power coalition is meeting with great difficulties which the Secretary of State at the present time is confronted with in the Moscow negotiations. The outcome of that conference of the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and this country will probably show us in which direction we shall be moving. It is too early to prophesy, and it would serve no useful purpose. May we hope that our representatives in the negotiations keep first in their minds the vital interests of this Nation and the preservation of the ideals of liberty and freedom for all—the small as well as the powerful—those ideals for which this country has always been the champion.

Letter From Maj. Gen. John C. H. Lee on Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Maj. Gen. John C. H. Lee, United States Army, deputy commander to General Eisenhower in the European theater of operations:

UNITED STATES ARMY,
HEADQUARTERS, SERVICES OF SUPPLY,
EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS,
February 18, 1944.

The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: Really I should address this to you as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress because I want to thank you for sending me a copy of William H. Webb's fine address given November 9, in the Union League Club of Philadelphia, before the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. It is heartening to those of us serving overseas to know that you are planning to continue in the future.

We are using to great advantage the Engineer officers we have been training through the years on waterways and flood-control work. Most of the business side of the war effort overseas, as well as many of the command positions, is under the guidance of these Engineer officers who learned through positions of real responsibility how to manage men and equipment against time and the elements—the essentials of logistics—either in war or in peace. It is natural that commanders have turned to such men as Generals Somervell, Styer, Gross, and Clay there at home, not to mention Generals Reybold and McCoach, as well as Wheeler in India, Connolly in the Middle East, Crawford in Egypt and now here with us, Larkin in north Africa, Pence in Italy, and more than a score here in the E. T. O. with me, just to name a few: Lord, Stratton, Albrecht, Plank, Vaughan, Grower, and Broshous, all on command or important general staff duty; not to mention Moore, our chief engineer, with Hardin, Berrigan, Luplow, Strong, Chorpenning, Newman, Lock, Thompson, Talley, and others on engineering, not only with the ground and air forces but with our service forces as well.

Every one of us was trained on profitable engineer work between the war periods, gaining experience and preparing to undertake any duty that you gentlemen of the Congress had for us. It is the greatest comfort to me that I can turn to these officers with confidence and assurance that their jobs will be better done than I could do them myself. This proves the wisdom of your policy.

Thanking you for your unfailing interest and vision through the years, I remain, with personal regards.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN C. H. LEE,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Theater Commander.

Labor's Contribution to the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, while labor at times has been criticized for work stoppages, and undue emphasis has undoubtedly been laid on some of the interruptions on the production line, American labor, nevertheless, made one of the most notable contributions to the war effort. Not only has it astounded our enemies and the world with the magnitude of its output but there have been many casualties on the assembly line and in the American arsenals.

A very illuminating analysis of the part that labor has played and is playing in equipping the millions of men in the front lines is presented in an address delivered by John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the A. F. of L. on February 25, 1944, over the Blue Network. High lights of the American workman's and workwoman's challenge to the enemies of our country will be found in the following excerpts from that notable address:

A few days ago the mightiest battleship afloat—the *Missouri*—was launched at the Brooklyn Navy Yard 9 months before the estimated period set for the launching when the keel was laid.

What American shipyards have done has astounded the world, and overwhelmed Germany and Japan with fear.

In 1943 the number of workmen employed in the production of Liberty ships increased 52 percent over 1942, but the number of these ships launched in 1943 increased 140 percent.

Last year American shipyards produced over 19,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping, two and one-half times the tonnage built in 1942.

The first Liberty ships took an average of over 1,000,000 man-hours to build. Recently 3 yards, each of which has delivered over 200 Liberty ships, have brought their average down to less than 400,000 man-hours, a tribute to the cooperation of management and labor.

Aircraft are as essential as ships. What does the record production show?

In 1941, 19,290 aircraft were delivered; in 1942, 47,873; and in 1943, 85,946. This data, however, tells only a part of the story for, since 1941 and 1942, the average size of the aircraft built has almost doubled.

In 1941 the average weight of an airframe was 4,440 pounds. In 1942 it was 6,110 pounds, and in 1943 it was 8,630 pounds.

Our production of airframes by weight has increased 900 percent since 1941.

The goal set for aircraft production for 1943 was 100,000 planes, and we produced but 86,000. It has been implied that we failed to meet our goal. Actually, however, in terms of the lighter-weight 1942 plane, the production in 1943 was equivalent to 122,000 airplanes.

The record of increasing productivity per man-hour in the manufacture of our fighting aircraft is outstanding. In spite of numerous engineering changes in design and structure, certain types of our bombers are now being made in one-fifth the time required at first, and in the case of certain types of trainer planes the ratio of improved productivity last year was 10 to 1.

In 1942, 276,000,000 pounds of airframe were fabricated. In 1943 the weight increased to 667,000,000 pounds. What adds to the impressiveness of these figures is the fact that during this period output per man-hour increased materially.

For understandable military reasons it is impossible to give the over-all record of the production in navy yards.

Where fighting ships are constructed and repairs made, an official report on repairs says:

"It is difficult to compare the battle-damage repair work, as each repair job is entirely different, but there has been much favorable comment on the speed with which repairs are completed on both our own and on foreign ships."

But some data indicating trends can be given. One navy yard reports it has completed a destroyer escort in 54 percent of the estimated man-hours. Another navy yard before the emergency constructed a battleship in slightly over 45 months. Since then it has built the largest and most modern battleship in 33 months. One navy yard reduced its building time on a destroyer from 32 months to a little over 12 months. Another yard reduced its building time on a submarine from 28 months to a trifle over 7 months. Both the destroyer and the submarine were larger and more complicated than the previous ones.

How about the costs? Again the record is impressive. Cost of material has increased. Wage rates are higher, yet we find a reduction in one yard of 15 percent in the cost of producing submarines. In another 17 percent in the cost of constructing destroyers, and in another a decrease of 27 percent in the cost of producing destroyer escorts.

These data on production of Liberty ships, fighting ships, and of aircraft are all from authoritative governmental reports. The production facts presented apply generally to the production of all war munitions. Man-hour production, the product of the individual worker per hour, has been steadily increasing.

This astounding production record for 1943 becomes all the more impressive when it is realized that millions of trained workers in these industries were inducted into the armed forces and inexperienced workers trained to take their places. It has been a patriotic demonstration in the field of production for labor and for management, an evidence of the outstanding cooperation which the two have established.

But we are told these American workmen are exposed to none of the physical dangers which face our armed forces, that they are not called upon to take the risks unflinchingly faced by our fighting men. * * *

The total casualties in our armed forces since Pearl Harbor, given in the official release of January 25 this year, amounted to 142,289. This list includes our dead, wounded, missing, prisoners of war, and those who died in prison camps. This is a costly sacrifice, but what about the workers in industry?

During the same period 38,000 industrial workers were killed; 3,600 received permanent total disability which completely eliminated them as wage earners; 217,800 received permanent partial disability. They are the permanently crippled.

As for the industrial wounded, 4,612,900 suffered temporary total disability. The industrial workers have no assurance when they leave home in the morning that they will return at night safe and sound. They, too, constantly face total disability and death in connection with their employment.

It is true that a larger number are employed in the industries than are included in our armed forces, but the Government data just given indicates that man for man, up to the present time, the workers in industry have suffered more severely.

There have been strikes, there have been stoppages of work on vital war production. But the essential, all-important fact is that over 99⅔ percent of production has been carried on without any interruption through strikes. The less than one-third of 1 percent of interruption has evidently stimulated the call for labor conscription or served as an excuse. Is the authority and resourcefulness of our Government so weak that it cannot deal effectively with the less than 1 percent of labor which has been recalcitrant?

Labor is fully justified in asking what lies behind the campaign to arouse a prejudice against American workmen in the public mind, and particularly in the minds of the men and women in our fighting forces. The data for production in 1943 is outstanding evidence that the fighting forces have received extraordinary support from the workers in industry.

It is an evil genius who, at this time, would endeavor to create a wrong impression in the minds of our fighting men relative to the support being given to them by American industry. It is an unconscionable act to use the one-third of 1 percent of American workers who have interfered with production as a criticism of the 99⅔ percent. What motive can animate those who, while attacking the one-third of 1 percent of American workers wholly fail to mention the extraordinary and patriotic production of the 99⅔ percent of American labor?

War Damage Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 I introduced H. R. 4220, a bill to extend for the duration of the war, without payment of any further premiums, policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Corporation.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I respectfully ask the chairman and members of the committee for their prompt consideration of this bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of H. R. 4220 and a copy of a letter I received from Jesse Jones relative to this subject:

H. R. 4220

A bill to extend for the duration of the war, without the payment of any further premiums, policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Corporation

Be it enacted, etc., That during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this act and ending on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, each policy of insurance issued by the War Damage Corporation, which is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be continued in full force and effect without the payment of any further premiums or other charges.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 2, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: In reply to your letter of February 21, beg to advise that on June 30, 1943, the total insurance in effect was approximately $140,000,000,000.

Total premiums collected to December 31, 1943, aggregated $242,800,000, of which approximately $132,600,000 was for policies in effect prior to June 30, 1943, and approximately $110,200,000 for renewals and policies issued after June 30, 1943.

As of December 31, 1943, War Damage Corporation had paid $4,571.75 in satisfaction of claims under its policies of insurance, and as of that date 15 claims aggregating $88,327.99 (in large part for losses incurred in the Aleutian area) were pending. A considerable number of claims arising out of the explosion in New York Harbor of the destroyer *Turner* are in the course of investigation and adjustment. The amount of such claims is not yet determinable.

Public Law 506, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorized War Damage Corporation to make compensation for loss and damage resulting from enemy attack prior to July 1, 1942. Three hundred and sixty-five such claims, aggregating $256,712.82, have been paid and 552 claims and preliminary notices of prospective claims aggregating $69,108,783.06 were pending as of December 31, 1943. These latter claims include many, the true amount of which is undetermined, and which have been recorded in the nominal amount of $1. Of the $69,108,783.06 of claims pending on December 31, 1943, approximately $68,000,000 represents claims for losses in the Philippine Islands area, adjustment of which is impracticable at this time.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Acquisition of Citizenship in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting at this point a scholarly article written by our former colleague, Hon. Martin F. Smith, of the State of Washington. This article deals with a most important subject which is of great interest to the Members of Congress and the public generally—Acquisition of Citizenship in the United States. The article was published in the February issue of the Monthly Review of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is ably edited by Marian Schibsby. Mr. Smith was a prominent member of the bar of the State of Washington for many years before he entered the field of national politics. During this period he participated actively in Americanization programs and conducted lecture courses in citizenship and Americanism. This experience was a fine preparation for his present official duties as a member of the Board of Immigration Appeals, Department of Justice.

The article referred to is as follows:

ACQUISITION OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Martin F. Smith, member, Board of Immigration Appeals [1])

Ours is a prouder than Roman boast: "Civis Americanus sum"—I am an American citizen. The Constitution nowhere defines the meaning of the term "citizen" (*United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U. S. 654). The term is generally, if not always, used in a political sense to designate one who possesses the rights and privileges of citizenship (*Baldwin* v. *Franks*, 120 U. S. 690). Citizenship is defined in the *Luria case* (231 U. S. 9): "Citizenship is membership in a political society and implies a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of the society. These are reciprocal obligations—one being a compensation for the other."

Since the term "allegiance" is an important element of citizenship, it is pertinent to inquire the meaning of the term. Mr. Justice Story said that "allegiance is nothing more than the tie or duty of obedience of a subject to the sovereign under whose protection he is" (*United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U. S. 649). This tie falls into three main groups: (1) Natural allegiance—that which arises by nature and birth; (2) acquired allegiance—that arising through some circumstance or act other than birth, namely, by denization or naturalization; (3) local allegiance—that arising from residence simply within the country for however short a time (2 C. J. 1150).

Prior to the adoption of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, the case of *Lynch* v. *Clarke* (1 Sandf. Ch. (N. Y.) 583) was the leading case holding that birth within the United States created citizenship. The court said: "It is indispensable that there should be some fixed, certain, and intelligible rules for determining the question of alienage or citizenship. The place of nativity furnishes one as plain and certain and as readily to be proved as any circumstance which can be mentioned" (11 C. J. 778, note C).

By article I, clause 4, of the Constitution of the United States, authority was delegated to the Congress to "establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Thus two methods were provided whereby a person may acquire citizenship in the United States, by reason of birth and by naturalization.

It remained for the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution to give life and meaning to the methods provided for the acquisition of citizenship, the amendment providing, inter alia, as follows:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

The main object of this amendment was to settle the question upon which there was much difference of opinion as to the citizenship status of "free Negroes" and to provide beyond all doubt that all persons, white or black, and whether formerly slaves or not, who were born or naturalized in the United States, and owned no allegiance to a foreign power, were citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they resided (*Elk* v. *Wilkins*, 112 U. S. 101; *Slaughterhouse cases*, 16 Wall. 73). However, in the case of *United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S. 676), the Supreme Court pointed out that the opening

[1] Mr. Frank M. Steadman, legal examiner, Board of Immigration Appeals, collaborated and rendered valuable assistance in the preparation of this article.

words, "All persons born," are general, not to say universal, restricted only by place and jurisdiction, and not by color or race. The Court held that the fourteenth amendment merely affirms the ancient rule of citizenship by birth within the territorial allegiance and under the protection of the country, and that children born here of resident alien parents are citizens of the United States (*United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark*, supra; *Look Tin Sing*, 21 Fed. 905).

An exception to the foregoing is that children born of foreign kings, princes, or potentates, their ambassadors and ministers, or children born to enemies within the country under hostile occupation, would not be considered citizens of the United States (*United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark*, supra). Indian children owing direct tribal allegiance, and who were not taxed or naturalized, were not considered citizens of the United States, although born in the country, but were considered "domestic subjects" (*Elk* v. *Wilkins*, 112 U. S. 94; *United States* v. *Osborn*, 2 Fed. 58, 7 Op. Atty. Gen. 746). However, under the act of June 2, 1924, all noncitizen Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States were declared to be citizens of the country.

The act of February 10, 1855, amending the act of April 14, 1802, which became section 1993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, provided:

"All children heretofore born or hereafter born out of the limits and jurisdiction of the United States, whose fathers were or may be at the time of their births citizens thereof, are declared to be citizens of the United States; but the rights of citizenship shall not descend to children whose fathers never resided in the United States."

The phrase "but the rights of citizenship shall not descend to children whose fathers never resided in the United States" was the subject of interpretation in the case of *Weedin* v. *Chin Bow* (274 U. S. 657), wherein the Court held that the father of the child must have resided in the United States prior to the birth of the child. Citizenship descends no further than the second generation from a resident of the United States.

The phrase "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States as used in the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution was intended to "exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, * * * born within the United States" (*Butchers Ben. Asso.* v. *Crescent City Livestock, etc., Co.* (16 Wall. 36; 21 L. ed. 394)). Persons are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States only when they are within their dominion and under the protection of their laws, and with the consequent obligation to obey them when obedience can be rendered, and only those thus subject by birth or naturalization are within the terms of the amendment. It was designed to except from citizenship persons who, though born or naturalized in the United States, have renounced their allegiance to our Government, and thus dissolved their political connection with it. This country recognizes the right of everyone to expatriate himself and choose another country (*Look Tin Sing*, 21 Fed. 905). It is upon the basis of being "subject to the jurisdiction" that a child born abroad of citizen parents can be held to be a citizen of the United States under section 1993 of the Revised Statutes, the amended act of May 24, 1934, and which was carried over into the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137; 8 U. S. C. 907).

In the case of *Ludlam* v. *Ludlam* ((1860), 31 Barb. 486, affirmed (1863) 26 N. Y. 356, 84 Am. Dec. 193), it was pointed out that by the common law a subject traveling abroad on public or private business, with the express or implied license of his sovereign, is under the sovereign's protection, and consequently both he and his children, born while traveling or sojourning, owe allegiance to, and are citizens of the native country of the father. Thus it appears that, although born out of the jurisdiction of the United States, a child is nevertheless subject to the jurisdiction of the parents' country and born within the allegiance of the United States.

An illegitimate child, born within the territorial limits of the United States, is, of course, born a citizen of the country by reason of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution. However, a different proposition is presented when a child is born out of wedlock in a foreign country of an American father. Originally such a child was held to be "filius nullius," the son of nobody, and in contemplation of section 1993 of the Revised Statutes was not considered a citizen of the United States (*Guyer* v. *Smith*, 22 Md. 239). In 1920 the Attorney General (32 Op. Atty. Gen. 162) held that a child born out of wedlock in a foreign country, of an American father and alien mother, and who was subsequently legitimated in accordance with the laws of the father's domicile through marriage of the parents, or acknowledgment by the father, is a citizen of the United States within the provisions of section 1993 of the Revised Statutes. Under the provisions of section 605 of the Nationality Act of 1940 such a child is deemed to be a citizen of the United States at birth if, during minority, the paternity of the child is established by legitimation, or adjudication of a competent court. In the absence of such adjudication or legitimation, if the mother is a citizen of the United States, and whether the child was born before or after the effective date of the Nationality Act, and if the mother had resided in the United States or in our outlying possessions, the child is held to have acquired the mother's nationality status.

According to the "birth under the flag" doctrine, the authorities hold that a child born on a vessel at sea is a child of the sovereignty under whose flag the vessel sails. In support of that doctrine, the statement is sometimes made that a merchant vessel is a part of the territory of the country whose flag she flies; however, this is but a mere figure of speech, a metaphor (*Scharrenberg* v. *Dollar Steamship Co.*, 245 U. S. 122; *In re Ross*, 142 U. S. 453). The jurisdiction intended to be described arises out of the nationality of the ship as established by her domicile, registry, and use of flag, and partakes more of the characteristics of a personal than a territorial sovereignty (*The Hamilton*, 207 U. S. 398; the *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit*, 213 U. S. 347).

In the case of *Lam Mow* v. *Nagle* (24 F. (2d) 316), it was held that a child born on an American vessel on the high seas of Chinese parents, whose parents were subjects of China, but who were domiciled in the United States, and who were returning thereto when the child was born, was not a citizen of the United States, such birth not being "in the United States" within the meaning of the fourteenth amendment. The Court pointed out that this rule did not produce an absurd or unjust result of depriving the child of political status, as he was born in allegiance to and under the protection of the Chinese Government. This decision appears to present the American viewpoint concerning birth on vessels upon the high seas.

The term "naturalization" has been held to mean the acquisition of citizenship through any process whether it be by judicial proceedings, marriage, or otherwise. As to the meaning of the term "naturalization" prior to January 13, 1941, see *In re Bishop* (1927) (23 Fed. 148); and as to the meaning of the term on or after January 13, 1941, see section 102 (c), wherein the term has been defined to mean the conferring of nationality upon a person after birth (54 Stat. 1137; 8 U. S. C. 501).

Naturalization was defined in the case of *Boyd* v. *Thayer* (143 U. S. 162) by Chief Justice Fuller: "Naturalization is the act of adopting a foreigner and clothing him with the privileges of a native citizen." Apparently he was quoting the language of Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of *Osborn* v. *United States* (Bank. 9 Wheat. 738). Justice Marshall pointed out that a naturalized citizen enjoyed the same rights and privileges as a native citizen, except that he could not be elected President or Vice President, a privilege reserved to native citizens and persons who were citizens at the time of the adoption of the Constitution (art. II, clause 5, U. S. Constitution). Although a naturalized citizen is given his status by an act of Congress, that act does not proceed to give, to regulate, or prescribe his capabilities (*Osborn case, supra; Pintsch Compressing Co.* v. *Bergin*, 84 Fed. 140).

Article I, clause 4, of the Federal Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to establish a uniform rule of naturalization * * * throughout the United States."

The uniform rule provided for means that when a naturalization law is made by its terms applicable alike to all States of the Union, without distinction or discrimination, it cannot be successfully questioned on the ground that it is not uniform in the sense of the Constitution merely because its operation may be wholly different in various States (*Darling* v. *Berry*, 13 Fed. 659).

The naturalization of an alien is retroactive in effect, and thus it removes all liability to any forfeiture of land held by the person while an alien, and where an alien files a claim for public lands, his subsequent naturalization relates back and obviates every consequence of alien disability (*Osterman* v. *Baldwin*, 6 Wall. 122; *Manuel* v. *Wulff*, 152 U. S. 511; *Governeur* v. *Robertson*, 11 Wheat. 350).

Originally the statute provided for the naturalization of "free white persons," which may have been done for the purpose of solely excluding from that privilege Negroes and Indians; all races, including the yellow and brown of Asia, not being within the term "free white persons," were necessarily excluded. The use of the word "free" indicated and recognized the existence of slavery (*Ozawa* v. *United States*, 260 U. S. 178; *Yamashita* v. *Hinkle*, 260 U. S. 199). The Naturalization Act of April 14, 1802, and all acts prior to the act of July 14, 1870, disclose an intention on the part of Congress to prevent naturalization of all aliens who were not "free white persons." Commencing with the act of July 14, 1870, down to the act of June 29, 1906, except for the period of revision in 1873 and the amendment of 1875, the intention was to exclude from naturalization all aliens except those of the Caucasian and African races (*Bessho* v. *United States*, 178 Fed. 245). Under the act of May 6, 1882, it was provided "that hereafter no State court or courts of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

As a result of conditions growing out of the First World War, the basic Naturalization Act of June 29, 1906, was amended by the act of May 9, 1918, and provision made therein for the naturalization of native-born Filipinos. The Court held in the case of *Toyota* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 402), that Filipinos, other than those rendering service in the United States Navy, Marine Corps, or Naval Auxiliary Service, specified in the seventh subdivision of section 4 of the 1906 act, as amended, are ineligible to naturalization, not being white persons or of African nativity or descent.

On October 25, 1919, there was passed in the Congress and sent to the President a bill which became law without the President's approval, granting citizenship to certain Indians who had served in the armed services of the United States during the First World War.

By act of Congress dated June 24, 1935, naturalization was extended to any veteran

of the World War, notwithstanding the racial requirements contained in section 2169 of the Revised Statutes. Section 2 of the act permitted validation of certificates of naturalization which had been issued to alien veterans who were ineligible for naturalization because of race, the certificate having to be submitted to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to be appropriately marked, showing compliance with the statute.

On March 3, 1931, the act of September 22, 1922, as amended, providing that an American-born woman who had previously lost American citizenship by residence abroad after marriage to an alien, or by marriage to an alien ineligible to citizenship, might, if she had not acquired any other nationality by an affirmative act, be repatriated a citizen of the United States. The act specifically provides "that any woman who was a citizen of the United States at birth shall not be denied naturalization * * * on account of her race." Thus, persons of Chinese descent were entitled to become repatriated.

Under the Nationality Act of 1940, the privilege of naturalization or eligibility for citizenship was extended; and provided that all persons of the white race, or persons of African descent, as well as natives of countries indigenous to the Western Hemisphere, were eligible for citizenship. Under section 701 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended March 27, 1942, provision was made for the naturalization of persons in the armed forces of the United States regardless of the racial restrictions set forth in section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940. Thereafter, by the act of December 17, 1943, section 303 of the Nationality Act was amended to provide for the naturalization of Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent.

Prior to the act of May 24, 1934, a child born out of the United States of a citizen father and alien mother was deemed a citizen of the United States, but where born of a citizen mother and an alien father, the child was deemed not to be a citizen by virtue of parentage. By the 1934 act provision was made for acquisition of citizenship by a child thereafter born out of the United States of a citizen mother. Likewise an infant child of alien parents born out of the jurisdiction of the United States, if dwelling in the country at the time of its parents' naturalization, became a citizen through the operation of section 2172 of the Revised Statutes, or under section 5 of the act of March 2, 1907, which provided that if the child was admitted to the United States for permanent residence during minority, it was deemed to be a citizen of the United States (sec. 2172 Rev. Stat. as amended May 24, 1934) (*Kaplan* v. *Tod*, 267 U. S. 228). Since January 13, 1941, both parents (or the surviving parent) must be citizens before a foreign-born child is 18 in order for him to derive American citizenship through their naturalization or citizenship (secs. 313, 314, Nationality Act of 1940).

Generally speaking, prior to the Cable Act of September 22, 1922, the citizenship of a wife was that of her citizen husband during coverture, even though she resided in a foreign country. Thus a woman became a citizen of the United States through marriage without submitting to naturalization proceedings. The act of 1855 provided, in substance, that any woman who married a citizen of the United States, and who might herself be naturalized, was deemed a citizen of the United States, irrespective of the time or place of the marriage or residence of the parties. However, after an alien woman's husband had filed declaration of intention and died before completing naturalization, the wife and children obtained benefits of the decedent's declaration of intention, but were required to file a petition for naturalization within the 7-year statutory period (*United States* v. *Manzi*, 276 U. S. 463). The last-mentioned privilege was abolished by the act of May 24, 1934.

Conversely, an American-born woman marrying an alien subsequent to March 2, 1907, and prior to September 22, 1922, by the act of marriage lost her United States citizenship (*MacKenzie* v. *Hare et al.*, 239 U. S. 290). However, prior to 1922 an American woman who had lost her citizenship status as the result of marriage, at the termination of the marital relationship could resume her American citizenship if abroad by registering as an American citizen within 1 year with the United States consul or by returning to reside in the United States, or, if residing in the United States, at the termination of the marital relationship, by continuing to reside therein. Any minor child born outside of the United States, upon the resumption of citizenship by his or her mother, became a citizen under section 5 of the act of March 2, 1907 (*Re Drysdale*, 20 F. (2d) 957).

We also had another group of children who became citizens of the United States by reason of the marriage of their alien mother to a citizen of the United States prior to September 22, 1922, which children, if arriving in the United States and admitted for permanent residence prior to their twenty-first birthday, were deemed to be citizens of the United States through the marriage of their mother to a stepfather (*In re Graff*, 277 Fed. 969; *In re Bishop*, 26 F. (2d) 148).

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton, from the Boston Post:

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS

The pending attempt in Congress to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is a matter of concern to thousands of small home owners in New England, and more than 700,000 in the country at large. It also affects taxpayers generally, since, according to Federal Home Loan Commissioner John H. Fahey, tens of millions of dollars would be lost if the forces and individuals opposing the continuance of the H. O. L. C. are successful.

SAYS EASY PROFITS SOUGHT

Mr. Fahey's report to Congress has not received the attention which it merits. "Small groups of mortgage lenders repeatedly have asked to take over the Corporation's loans as rapidly as they were placed on a sound basis," states Mr. Fahey. "They seem to believe that the only purpose of H. O. L. C. was to bail them out of their poor mortgages, enabling them to put the cash received into good loans and then to take back their relinquished mortgages after the Government had spent millions in making them safe. They seek easy profits regardless of the public interest.

"While there are a few mortgage-lending institutions that apparently are entirely forgetful of the aid extended to them during the depression and who seek only easy profits regardless of the public interest, this attitude is not shared by the vast majority of bankers, and savings and loan associations, and insurance company executives. These officials declare emphatically that they have no wish to participate in any plan to purchase the H. O. L. C.'s good loans and leave the Corporation with slow accounts and the losses which the Government would have to absorb under such a transaction. They decline to campaign for profits for their institutions at the expense of the taxpayers."

THE SALIENT FACTS

Mr. Fahey asserts that the logical course to follow in the liquidation of loans is that chartered by Congress when the Corporation was established in 1933. It holds the chance of complete liquidation without cost of 1952, whereas any forced liquidation through sale of mortgages before they are sufficiently matured means tremendous losses to the Government.

Briefly here are the salient facts in the situation: The $3,484,000,000 total investment of the Government had been reduced to $1,632,000,000 by June 30, 1943, the end of the past fiscal year, or by 53 percent. By last November 30, liquidation of H. O. L. C. had reached 58 percent. On the same date, 31 percent of its million loans had been completely retired and the Corporation had sold 92 percent of the properties it was forced to acquire.

At the end of the fiscal year the Corporation's cumulative losses, chiefly from the sale of foreclosed properties, totaled $255,080,000. These were offset by $189,838,000 interest income on loans, plus rentals, resulting in a net realized loss of $65,242,000.

CONTACT CONGRESSMEN

Most private lending institutions, legally and in the exercise of prudence, can only buy safe loans. The sale of H. O. L. C. mortgages, which have been brought to an acceptable rating, after years of servicing at Government expense, would leave this agency only with the slow accounts and the small and widely scattered loans.

H. O. L. C. would be deprived of regular income on sound assets, but would still be obliged to maintain a Nation-wide organization to manage the slow and doubtful accounts, and the Treasury and the taxpayers would have to make up the difference.

Of vital importance to H. O. L. C. borrowers, who have not yet attained financial stability, is the fact that State laws prevent most private lending institutions from extending them the leniency the H. O. L. C. can allow in case of further trouble. It can be taken for granted that if all the H. O. L. C. loans were sold, many foreclosures would result which can be averted under the present act Owners of home-loan mortgages can best check marauding banks and loan associations by contacting their Congressmen and Senators.

High Wages for Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM for February 3, 1944:

HOW PAY IN MERCHANT MARINE AND NAVY STACKS UP—IT'S NOTHING LIKE WHAT THE PEGLERS TRY TO MAKE IT OUT TO BE

Now about these merchant marine wages which the Peglers et al. claim are terrific, but which aren't at all.

It's a sort of complex subject, and even PM, which thinks the merchant marine is swell, got a little mixed up in trying to explain it last week. So now we've gone back to the merchant service, got a complete break-down and have even drawn pictures to make it easier for us and for you to understand.

A particularly popular stunt is to compare the lowest-paid sailor to the highest-paid merchantman and to conclude therefrom that the merchantman is rolling in wealth. That's always good for a good viewing-with-alarm in the Hearst and Scripps-Howard chains.

So this study deals exclusively with two men on a merchant ship, a first-class seaman in the Navy armed guard and an ordinary seaman in the merchant crew. The U. S. M. S. (U. S. Maritime Service) says these are comparable classifications.

Now, looking at the chart below, you get the picture. It's true that the merchantman gets a higher monthly salary, but he gets only 10 months' work. O. K., for 10 months' work he still is paid more a year than a sailor who works 12 months.

But follow the two columns of this chart on down to the bottom and see what happens. Remember, these are official figures right out of the Government's pay rolls. And at the bottom you can see the proof that Pegler is right, by golly.

The merchantman gets some $11 more a year than the sailor.

The U. S. M. S. lists more comparative grades than the ones used in these charts, which were selected to make the charts as simple as possible. Another U. S. M. S. exhibit takes the cases of a Navy petty officer, second class, and an able seaman in the merchant marine as comparative grades.

The petty officer and the able seaman, carried down through all the processes of the chart, come out this way:

Petty officer's income after tax—$2,308.68.

Able seaman's income after tax—$2,163.58.

So the Navy man is $145.10 ahead of the merchantman for the year.

Now, pay isn't everything in this.

PRIVILEGES

It doesn't take much explanation. There are a lot of privileges which go with the uniform of the Navy which a merchantman doesn't get and which mean real money to a man with a family. The Navy man is fairly certain of getting some kind of attention for the rest of his life and the lives of his dependents. The merchantman is out in the cold when he walks off his ship.

This attempt to explain away a serious smear on a valiant, but largely unrecognized, arm of our fighting forces, is not, it must be emphasized here, an effort to derogate the Navy.

Comparative figures of the Navy and merchant marine were selected because these two services are close together. There are the same comparative ranks in the Army and marines, and the wages run about the same for the work done—with the accompanying privileges for the servicemen which do not apply to the civilian merchant seaman.

The foregoing phrase, "work done," is used advisedly. There is no comparison possible on a basis of hazards encountered. The merchant marine has lost thus far in this war a higher percentage of men than all of the armed services together, and until the Gilbert Islands fight had lost more men numerically than the Marine Corps, which has had the heaviest losses among the armed forces.

PATRIOTISM

And another thing, as to the patriotism of the merchant marine, which has been loudly traduced by the Peglers, here are words spoken by Marshall E. Dimock, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Recruitment and Manning of the W. S. A. (War Shipping Administration). No Red he, Mr. Pegler.

"A total of more than 35,000 experienced former seamen have left secure berths ashore to return to sea in the last 18 months," Dimock said Saturday.

"Another 4,370 men have declared themselves available for duty and have been going through the processes of assimilation. They will bring the over-all total of experienced recruits to approximately 40,000, slightly more than a third of the total number of active seamen in the offshore shipping industry, which is, roughly, 115,000."

Dimock estimated that, in addition, some 14,000 men have returned to the maritime industry directly through the maritime unions or the personnel offices of the ship operators.

"The W. S. A. has appealed solely to the patriotism of these thousands of seafaring men," he said. "Their country needed their seafaring skill and they responded.

"For most of them it meant a net decrease in annual income.

"For all of them it meant facing the utmost in hazards of war at sea."

Forest-Fire Prevention and Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on behalf of S. 45, which was introduced by the late Senator McNary, of Oregon, and passed by the Senate last July.

This bill deals with the extremely important subject of forest-fire prevention and control. It is, in fact, amendatory to the Clarke-McNary law of 1924. Specifically, it is designed to increase the Federal authorization for cooperative forest-fire prevention and control from $2,500,000, as established by the Clarke-McNary law, to the more nearly adequate sum of $9,000,000. It does so, however, in four steps. The first step would authorize an appropriation of $6,300,000 for the fiscal year beginning the 1st of next July. This, I understand, is the amount now available from sources authorized under the Clarke-McNary Act and in recognition of the current emergency. After annual increases through 1947 the authorization continues at $9,000,000. Enactment of this bill will go far to simplify the administration of similar funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and soon to be considered by this body in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year.

The need for this increased authorization is well substantiated in the recent hearing before the House Committee on Agriculture. In 1943, 42 States and Hawaii cooperated with the Federal Government under the existing law in giving protection from fire to 291,000,000 acres of timberland. There still remains about 137,000,000 acres of forest land without organized protection.

Federal participation in fire prevention and control has enabled my own State of Oregon in cooperation with timberland owners to make an enviable record. Final figures for the Oregon fire season of 1943, compiled by State Forester Nelson S. Rogers, show a total of only 35,889 acres of State and privately owned forest land burned over out of a total forest area under protection of 12,080,000 acres. A total of 877 fires resulted in losses in the amount of $117,572.

The area burned during 1943 is the greatest in the past 4 years, yet the State forester regards the season as extremely favorable. This enviable record was made possible because of an alert fire-fighting organization which extended over the entire State. Such organizations are being built up in all forest States, but their development depends to a considerable extent upon Federal cooperation such as is authorized in this bill.

While the total forest area of my State of Oregon is under protection, there is in the country as a whole a vast area of 137,000,000 acres of forest land which receives no organized fire protection. The repeated burning of this extensive forested area is a needless and shameful waste of an important natural resource which can and should be prevented.

State and private forestry organizations are striving to do the job and are cooperating fully with the Federal agencies. The extent of their effort and cooperation is clearly indicated by the expenditures made for fire protection during 1943. During that year State and private expenditures totaled $9,127,000 as against Federal expenditures of $5,026,000 for the same period.

The Clarke-McNary law of 1924 recognized forest fire prevention and control as a subject of national importance. To effectuate a program of fire prevention and control the law provided for cooperative action with the States and authorized Federal participation to the extent of 50 percent of the cost. Federal participation never equaled this proportion but has dropped during recent years, due perhaps in part to the $2,500,000 limitation established by the Clarke-McNary law, which S. 45 would correct.

The joint congressional committee on forestry in 1941 determined the cost of adequate forest fire protection for the entire country to be $18,000,000 and recommended that the Federal share of the cost be one-half or $9,000,000. State foresters and private timberland owners accepted this estimate as fair and adequate and have provided more than half as indicated by 1943 expenditures.

I know of no opposition to this bill, and I strongly urge its passage by the House.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD a letter I

have received from a fine and sincere citizen of De Berry, Panola County, Tex.:

DE BERRY, TEX., *February 29, 1944.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Am sure that you are very busy at this time, but will take the liberty to discuss some things that I think very vitally concerns the home front.

I notice that Congress has spent quite a lot of time discussing the soldier vote. I doubt very much whether the soldier on the different fronts of the world is thinking very much about voting or not.

My boy writes that they have a big job to do over there and all that concerns them is getting the job done and getting back home.

So I think it would be better for Congress to be thinking of passing some legislation that would make America a better country for them to come back to than they left.

We hear a great deal about our free enterprise and our way of life in free America. Sure we do not want to lose that, but if we don't want to lose it we had better become conscious of our surrounding condition. What I am trying to say is that we have a few people in this country that are doing everything they can to have a monopoly on everything in this country when the war is over. That should not be hard for anyone to see if they have their eyes open.

On the other hand we have a group that is doing everything that is in its power to cause labor to lose what gains it has made in the last 40 years. And we have another small group of labor leaders that is doing all it can to gain power, and all these groups are using the war emergency to secure their gains, which is a deplorable thing.

We have people going about the country saying the thing to do if we want to rid ourselves of these groups and bureaucrats and parasites would be to elect a Republican President and Congress. God knows we would not want to go back to that old blighted tree.

We all remember that old blighted tree back in 1932. I will say at this point that the Democrats have got more to do than just prune the blighted branches from the tree. It will be necessary for them to go down to the diseased roots of the tree and remove the cause which they have not done, as the very condition that exists all about us is proof enough.

So I will say in conclusion we should do everything in our power to produce everything our boys need to carry this war to a victory, and at the same time try to keep our own country safe and sound so when our boys come home they will not say that we did not do our part in keeping with our duty.

If we continue to argue among ourselves about whether we have a Democrat or a Republican President and Congress, and what kind of government the people of Europe have, and where the lines of Poland are, and what Finland does, and what part Russia is going to have after the war, we will be liable not to have very much left for ourselves.

If I understand the terms of the Atlantic Charter that was one of the things guaranteed to all countries, great and small, to have any kind of government that they chose to have. None of these things worry me, but I must confess that I am worried about the kind of government we have here in America after the war is over.

I wouldn't want to have a condition here that we would have twelve or fifteen million unemployed like we had in 1932, with an overproduction of everything that the people needed and nothing to buy it with.

I consider that an obsolete system of economic failure of production and consumption, and we are sure to have the same condition under the same circumstances again, so let us profit by our past mistakes and try not to make the same ones again.

Please accept my apology for taking your time with these remarks but it is in my heart and mind that way. As the saying is, however much you might disagree with me defend your right to say so.

Am sure that would be the heart and mind of the majority of the American people if they were to express it.

I remain as ever,
Your friend,

S. E. SHELL.

Training Service of Civil Aeronautics Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress are concerned about the termination of the war-training service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Undoubtedly this action struck a severe blow to the morale of thousands of flying students, many of whom are almost ready to qualify as pilots and to receive commissions. I do not question the fact that terminations in training must come at some time, but I feel that every precaution should be taken to utilize most advantageously the training of these men in rank comparable to their ability and experience. Consequently, I ask that early hearings be had by the Committee on Military Affairs on this important matter.

I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing recently in the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal on the subject:

A BLOW TO MORALE

Severe blow to the morale of thousands of flying students, many of whom have qualified as pilots, was struck last week when the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training service was suddenly terminated without explanation.

Many men were halted summarily in their training, told to go home and to await orders to report to technical training schools, where they will start new courses on new subjects.

These men, most of them either too old or possessing some minor defect which disqualifies them for combatant service, were trying to do their best for their country. Hundreds have passed their primary, secondary, and cross-country training and are well qualified to pilot ferry planes or to perform other flying service which does not require combat duty.

They suffered their first blow when they were told they could not be combat pilots, but they buckled down to train for the next best thing. Now, after a year and a half of training, they are thrown out as privates and ordered to start again.

Mrs. Harry Blanchard, manager of the municipal airport, who has sent many of these men to schools where C. A. A. gave training and who receives letters by the score from them, has started a movement to have Congress recognize their training and commission them for further flying duty. The movement is one deserving of full support from parents of such men all over the country.

Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, member of the Military Affairs Committee, has introduced a bill which will commission those who qualify as instructors, but other hundreds who have finished their pilot training are ignored. It would seem that Congress should go one step further and take advantage of the skill which these other men have mastered.

With the increasing air transport it would seem that these pilots would be of invaluable service. The Nation should not shunt them into other activities after their expensive and painstaking training.

We realize that such sudden changes of plans are necessary in time of war and that no one in particular is to be blamed for this change. But it would be better certainly to take advantage of their knowledge rather than to give them the idea they are the "forgotten men."

Flood Control Is Basic in All River-Improvement Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD herewith a copy of the formal testimony which I placed before the Flood Control Committee of the House on February 23, 1944. My brief is devoted to the specific problems presented by the Missouri River system, but I believe the general approach outlined is one which is applicable to other rivers where floods occur.

It is hoped and expected that the present Congress will have an opportunity to enact legislation recommended by our highly esteemed Committee on Flood Control which will change the destructive forces of the Missouri River into constructive factors which will pay rich dividends of various economic types, in addition to creating a vast new area of wildlife and conservation assets in the Middle West:

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to emphasize, if I may, the important relationship of flood-control works to the entire, comprehensive program of utilizing for constructive purposes the water of the Missouri River and its many and mighty tributaries I think we should all keep clearly before us in our studies and plans for Missouri River improvement the irrefutable fact that adequate flood control is a basic prerequisite to any wise and permanent plan of water utilization.

I have attended all of these hearings on the so-called Pick plan for Missouri River development which has been presented to this committee with the favorable recommendations of the War Department. It was also my pleasure to accompany Governor Sharpe of South Dakota and Col. Lewis A. Pick this summer on a tour of all eight of the Missouri River Valley States and to personally investigate with them not only such existing projects as Fort Peck but some of the potential projects designed for both irrigation and flood control. On this tour, we also spoke with many hundreds of public officials and private citizens throughout the valley and I can assure this committee that the people and the public bodies of these eight States are today fully cognizant of the tremendous dividends which will accrue to this area and to America as a whole once the

multiple purposes of the waters of the Missouri River system have been fully achieved.

In working to avert the dangers and damages of floods, this committee has one of the most challenging opportunities of any group in this Republic. In so doing, you are transforming destructive forces into constructive forces and as a result, the money expended under your direction does double duty by averting death and disaster from flood while at the same time creating new economic opportunities and recreational possibilities for the advancement of mankind. It is precisely this double duty which will be served by any public funds which you authorize at this time to begin the over-all, valley-wide, river-long regulation and utilization of the Missouri River through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs to avert floods, to regulate flowage for navigation purposes, to develop hydro-electricity, to promote conservation and development of our natural resources, and to provide water for the irrigation of many hundreds of thousands of acres of the best soil in the world upon which much of the world in the years to come may well depend in part for its food supply. In all the public works undertaken by our Federal Government, there are none which can be better justified in terms of dividends created and disasters circumvented than in the judicious development of a multiple-purpose river-control program such as you have before you at this time with regard to the Missouri River.

FLOOD CONTROL IS BASIC

As I have stated previously, it is logical that the Committee on Flood Control should initiate the action looking to the full development of the water resources of the Missouri River, since it is flood control which is a basic forerunner of all the tangible benefits and dividends to flow from this over-all improvement program.

Flood control is essential if river navigation is ever to become a useful, continuing complement to the great railroad, truck, and air transportation systems of America. Without protection against destructive and devastating floods, river navigation is as hazardous and as uncertain as it would be if no safeguards were established to provide for a continuing flow of water sufficient in depth to provide for the navigability of river transports.

Flood control is essential if hydroelectricity is to be developed from the great river current which now flows to the Gulf without rendering its full service to the people living along its banks. Reservoirs to harness the power to turn the turbines to create electrical energy cannot be safely built and effectively protected without a system of flood controls which will safeguard them against giant floods of such proportions that they defy the ingenuity of man to erect a single engineering unit to defeat them. A series of reservoirs throughout the river system is required if the science of engineering is to succeed in harnessing and controlling the mighty river so that in its mad moments it cannot storm down the valley to destroy and erase the power projects which can do so much to bring the benefits of electricity to our rural homes and to attract industries to our fertile plains.

FLOOD CONTROL AIDS CONSERVATION

Flood control is essential if fish and wildlife are to thrive in the river and its tributaries and if their natural habitats and infant progeny are not to be destroyed by the ravages of flood. The decrease of wildlife in America is more directly attributable to the destruction of its nesting, feeding, and resting places than it is to the collective bags of all the country's hunters and fishermen. Wise flood control can secure the spawning beds for fish and protect the nesting grounds of birds. By coupling this development with scientific antipollution measures, the Missouri River can become a great recreational area in the center of America instead of the biological desert which it has today largely become.

Flood control is essential if irrigation projects are to be developed to their maximum in order to bring moisture and productivity to all the irrigable acres of the Missouri River Valley. Unless the laterals and ditches of an irrigation system are protected against the destructive ravages of floods swirling beyond the river banks and over the farm lands of the valley, the assets of an irrigated agriculture can be changed into a liability. South Dakota and its neighboring States to the north, west, and south have thousands of irrigable acres which the Nation can ill afford to continue to fail to utilize fully and crop. By using flood control as a basic design from which to build, water which formerly destroyed crops and livestock in the lower reaches of the river cannot only be prevented from such depredations but it will be utilized to raise assured annual production figures of crops and livestock in the upper reaches of the river. Flood control and irrigation are not mutually antagonistic programs; in fact, the one serves to complement and complete the other and by wise planning, it is possible to harness the Missouri River and its tributaries to secure the optimum advantages of both for the greatest benefit of all.

Flood control, finally, is essential in its own right. Flood damages in themselves last year caused an estimated $50,000,000—more than one-tenth of the estimated total cost of the entire over-all river improvement program—in direct damages and perhaps again that much more in indirect damages. In addition, floods last year caused a serious loss in life and a lamentable loss of man-hours of labor at a time when, with our Republic at war, such a loss in the field of labor inevitably translates itself into a further loss of life on the field of battle.

FLOODS ARE THE ALLIES OF HITLER

Members of the committee, there was delivered to your desks a week or so ago, the 1943 report of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is significant, I think, that this departmental report put as much stress as it did on the relationship of the floods of 1943 to the food supply and production of the Nation. Eight pages are devoted to this specific problem. I hope the members of the committee will read them in full if you have not already done so. Let me give you just a quotation or two from this annual report from the Department of Agriculture.

On page 128 the report says: "The floods in the Midwest interfered seriously with cropping programs. Wet and cool weather over large sections of the East delayed spring planting; on the other hand, drought conditions prevailed in some western areas."

Thus in two short sentences the Department of Agriculture confirms the thesis of my testimony and the argument of the War Department and Bureau of Reclamation engineers to the effect that flood control is basic to the full utilization of river waters, and that both the ravages of flood and the ravages of drought can be corrected by the self-same string of engineering projects.

Let me give you one further quotation from the annual report of the Department of Agriculture. I read from page 134 of the report: "Flood problems cannot be quickly overcome. Much reservoir construction will be necessary to help bear the burden which has proved too much for levees, floodways, and other channel improvements alone. This will take time and careful planning.

"Extensive watershed measures will be essential also; but these likewise cannot be expected to accomplish their effects immediately. Certain benefits will accrue quite soon from the protection of soil and vegetation. In most cases some effects of proper land management should be evident within a very few years. These will include increased crop yields, more and better pasturage, and more productive forest growth. Erosion losses will decrease comparatively quickly. Storm run-off and flood-flow as the result of farm practices will also show up fairly quickly. In forest areas results will become apparent within a few years, but a long period may elapse before the maximum effect is obtained. In order to achieve the greatest possible benefit in the shortest possible time, it is essential that the upstream and downstream phase of flood control be properly timed and coordinated, through the development of one over-all plan for each of the major flood-contributing watersheds."

Mr. Chairman, there is much more which could be said in support of this comprehensive, river-long, valley-wide, all-time, over-all Missouri River development program. However, you have heard the testimony of experts and engineers representing both the War Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. You will hear other experts. There is little which a layman can add to the persuasive logic of the engineering data presented by these experts save to emphasize the fact that early action is needed in getting a beginning on this program.

Each year that is lost means an added drain on the natural and financial resources of this belabored Republic. Each year brings new floods, new droughts, new deficiencies in transportation and electrification. Each year means new Federal appropriations to correct the damages insofar as they can be corrected which result from too much water in the lowlands and too little water in the higher reaches of the river valley. My plea is that this money be conserved by spending it to correct the troubles at their source through the implementation of the Missouri River plan before you rather than that it be dissipated by using it in the hopeless effort to correct the damages which further neglect of the basic problem are bound to bring.

If there be differences of opinion and conflicts between interests as to where the final emphasis is to be placed in the utilization of the water assets of the Missouri River system, they are of small consequence compared with the unanimity of opinion prevailing on the theme that action should be started now to build reservoirs of such a nature that they will control the floods and supply the water needed for irrigation, conservation, hydroelectrification, and navigation. As we proceed with the program we can adapt its design to place the greatest emphasis where the river may be made to serve the greatest good for the greatest number. We are all agreed at this stage that the river-improvement plan should be kept flexible—that no proposed design should be frozen into perpetuity at this time. We agree, too, that substantially the same great reservoirs in the main stem of the Missouri River are needed regardless of the final disposition which is to be made of the water thus transformed from destructive purposes into constructive potentialities. Let us therefore get started with a flexible program in mind and, learning as we proceed, develop it in accord with the dictates of the experience and data which we accumulate as we build and progress.

As Governor Sharpe of South Dakota wisely suggested before this committee last week, we can write into the covering legislation of this program clauses making clear that no new vested interests in the water usage are to be created in the Missouri River system by the construction of the initial projects which we hope this committee will soon authorize. We shall have time for further study and investigation and conferences, many times repeated, as the program moves forward in its development. In the meantime, with no presently invested rights destroyed or impaired with no new vested rights created, and with a flexible plan for development recognized as the basis for be-

ginning we have no reason to delay further before authorizing the start on this great project.

The Missouri River flows through South Dakota from its north boundary to its south. Located in South Dakota are the greatest gold mines and manganese deposits in the world. Many other strategic and basic minerals are found in our mountains and our hills. There are many indications that vast oil deposits underlie our surface. An abundance of coal is available in South Dakota. We have timber to export. Our crops and livestock are shipped from one end of this country to the other and to many foreign ports. Mr. Chairman, all of these vast assets will be more cheaply and readily available to the rest of the country once the proposed Missouri River development program is substantially under way. South Dakota can conveniently support at least five or six times its present population in prosperity and happy circumstances through the utilization of the extensive advantages which will flow from the Missouri River development program.

What is true of South Dakota is likewise substantially true of the other States touching the Missouri River above Sioux City or which include tributaries flowing into the upper Missouri River.

The exact figures and data on irrigable acres, the potential needs for power and the river's ability to produce it, the transportation situation and the size and location of the reservoirs which will change the destructive factors of the Missouri into great constructive forces for good are found in the scientific data before this committee. I shall not belabor the record by a repetition or a recital of the engineering factors which so eloquently demonstrate the practicability and feasibility of the proposed program. I am firmly convinced that the committee has been impressed as I have been by the fact that while the Missouri River Basin is the largest remaining great neglected river system in this country it affords almost an ideal opportunity for the construction of a flood-control program which will be of great benefit to all and which will be disadvantageous to none.

FLOOD CONTROL WILL AID POST-WAR RECOVERY

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let us remember that following the war, America will need all of its resources available to provide work and opportunity for our returning service people and to provide food for hungry people in many parts of the world. Our tax burden will be colossal. By expanding our tax base through bringing into the realm of economic productivity many enterprises now nonexistent along the banks of the mighty Missouri, we shall be planning wisely since these projects and this development program will enable at least the equivalent of another whole State in our commonwealth to join in the task of reconstruction and rehabilitation. The Missouri River is not a static factor. Either it will continue to destroy and devastate and impoverish the people of its valley or it will be made to contribute to their happiness and economic well-being. What this committee does this spring and this year will determine whether the Missouri River in the years ahead will be an asset or a liability to a Republic badly in need of new assets and desperately desirous of avoiding new liabilities. I have the confidence and hope that action will be taken by this committee which will start the ball rolling in such a manner that the Missouri River will come to be recognized as one of the major assets of America and so that the people living in its valley and along its tributaries will be able to shoulder an increasingly large proportion of the tax burden and the support of government which are part of our responsibilities of citizenship.

Our Forest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to address the House on H. R. 1621, which was introduced by my colleague Representative LOWELL STOCKMAN as a companion bill to S. 250, which was introduced by the late Senator McNary, of Oregon, and which passed the Senate in amended form last July.

This bill deals with the welfare of our forest resources—their use and management. It is of vital interest to the timberland owners, the forest industries, and the Nation. In my own district the forests and the forest industries are the foundation upon which our local economy depends. Whether we have abandoned towns, cut-over tax delinquent lands, and stranded population or thriving communities built around stabilized permanent forest industries will be determined by our foresight and wisdom in properly protecting, managing, and developing our forest resources on a sustain-yield basis. A program designed to stabilize local economy, provide for continuous and permanent employment and perpetuate the forest resources of this country is certainly worthy of careful consideration. H. R. 1621 is proposed legislation which will permit timberland owners, local communities, State and Federal agencies to pool their resources in solving a common problem for the common good which accrues from wise use rather than abuse of forest resources.

In order to secure sustained-yield forest management on a Nation-wide basis it is necessary to provide for the full cooperation of Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of managing the publicly owned forests of this country. The enactment of this bill will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with timberland owners and local citizens in establishing cooperative sustained-yield units of forest land which will include both privately owned and federally owned timber. Each Secretary has given unqualified approval of the bill.

These cooperative sustained-yield units will be operated in keeping with standards and practices of forest management and will be worked out by the interested agencies for each unit established.

This bill is designed to enable many forest industries to establish permanent sustained-yield operations, and thus assure local communities of stabilized permanent operations. I see clearly what it will do for the permanent prosperity of my district and of my State of Oregon, and I believe it will be of far-reaching benefit to the people of every forest region of this country.

The provisions of H. R. 1621 were recommended by the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry in 1941. It has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior. Several States have recognized the value of this type of forestry legislation and have strongly recommended it. Oregon and Washington have enacted similar legislation applying to State-owned forest land. The Association of State Foresters has thoroughly studied the bill and strongly recommends its enactment by Congress. The House Committee on Agriculture, after holding public hearings on the subject, recommended it for adoption by the House.

I believe this legislation to be of vital interest to the proper management of the forests, to the maintenance and welfare of local communities, and to the security of the Nation. I recommend its immediate passage.

Behind the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an editorial entitled "Behind the Wall," which I think is worthy of reproduction.

It sets forth world conditions before this war started, and also existing conditions, and it should be considered in connection with reference to post-war planning, especially with reference to the prevention of future wars.

It dissipates the idea that walls may afford a protection or will immunize from danger those behind a wall.

I call special attention to the sentence wherein it is proclaimed that some nations have in the past regarded salt water as a kind of wall which would keep war from coming to them. This is particularly applicable to the views of some people in our own country in the past, and will doubtless be the views of some isolationists in the future.

Under leave granted, the editorial is herewith submitted:

BEHIND THE WALL

In this fifth year of their well-planned war the Nazis are behind a wall. This is a big war and theirs is a big wall. It is almost as big as Hitler's dreams in 1939. It runs from the tip of Norway to the Spanish frontier. It runs along the Mediterranean, becoming elastic and confused as it crosses Italy and in certain parts of the Balkans. There is also a wall somewhere between Germany and the advancing Russians. So Greater Germany, in the fifth year of its boasted thousand years, is very cozy.

Coziness is just the idea behind walls. One does not go adventuring from behind walls. One sits there and waits. One may be quite cheerful, what with the fire inside, the threatening weather outside, and the wall between. But one cannot control weather, or harden oneself to weather, from behind a wall. The experiment has been tried. The Chinese had a wall. The Romans had a wall, to keep the

Scotch out of England. The French had the Maginot line, the Finns the Mannerheim line. The Czechs had a wall, which unhappily traversed the Sudetenland. The earth's venerable surface is striped and streaked with walls, many of them now scarcely distinguishable, but all built in high hope. There have been nations which regarded salt water as a kind of wall which would keep war from coming to them.

Hitler has a wall. Nazi-ism has a wall. Hitler and the Nazis sit inside this wall and wait. Let us say again it is cozy inside walls. One can go on with one's favorite amusement, which may be reading, which may be playing games, and which may be stealing, torturing, and murdering, as is the case with the Nazis. The Nazis can still inflict pain and death on anyone inside their wall, though in some portions of Europe this is growing more difficult every day.

But they cannot, from behind a wall, work their will on the outer world. They can have nothing whatever to say as to how the outer world is run. And they daren't go outside, except in forays by air or under the sea, from which they do not always return. In 1939 and in 1940 they could afford to laugh at walls—other people's walls. They had secret weapons to deal with them. Could a wall stand against tanks and Stukas? But how long would a Stuka last in action today? Rake the Ukrainian fields—up come the metal bones of Nazi tanks. So this wall was necessary. The Nazi planning wasn't good enough. The Nazi attack wasn't good enough. It's defense now. It is cozy behind the wall—or would be if it weren't for the ghosts, ghosts of projects and people.

It isn't easy to batter down a wall. The Nazis are skilled wall-builders, as once they were apt at wall-breaking. But in winning a war it is better to be outside a wall, choosing one's points of attack, choosing one's hour, than to be inside knowing nothing of what is about to take place. One doesn't win wars, or get anything of importance done, by sitting inside an enclosure.

But the Nazis are definitely inside. They didn't succeed in abolishing walls and making the earth, as they fondly dreamed, a lovely welter of blood and tyranny. Their hearth fires flicker, for they haven't much fuel to spare. And they wait. They wait, as they loved to make others wait. They don't know when, they don't know where, they don't know how. Maybe, after all, it isn't so cozy behind their wall.

Exchange of Letters With Acting Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD herewith a letter recently received from Edward R. Stettinius, the Acting Secretary of State, together with my reply:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 28, 1944.

The Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1944, at page 1931, column 2, you are quoted as stating, with reference to the State Department and after mentioning Mr. Thornburg:

"His place was taken by Mr. Charles Rainer, present Petroleum Adviser to the State Department, who was for years the representative of the Socony-Vacuum Co. in India and the Orient, and who served under Mr. Victor Barry, another official of the Socony-Vacuum Co., in the Foreign Economics Administration before he came to the State Department."

Knowing your special interest in all matters relating to petroleum I feel that you will want to be corrected in regard to the above statement since you evidently have been misinformed as to the former connections of Mr. Rayner with the oil industry.

Mr. Rayner's only connection with the major oil companies was from 1909 to 1917 when he was with the Standard Oil Co. of New York. During the latter part of that period he was their manager for the Singapore area in the Far East. In 1917 Mr. Rayner resigned his employment to enter the Army. With the exception of the first 2 or 3 years following the First World War, which period he spent mostly in Europe, Mr. Rayner was operating as an independent oil producer in Texas. Therefore, since 1917 he has had no connection with any major oil company.

As a wartime service Mr. Rayner acted as the petroleum adviser for the Foreign Economic Administration and was in charge of their petroleum activities. Mr. Victor Barry was chief of the Petroleum Division.

In December 1943. Mr. Rayner was requested to join the staff of the Department of State as petroleum adviser. In addition to his personal qualifications and experience one of the principal reasons leading to his selection was the fact that he had no connection with any major oil company and for many years had been acting independently as an oil producer.

In all the circumstances and in view of your public statement on the subject, I bring these facts to your attention with the request that you will take steps to have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

MARCH 3, 1944.

Hon. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STETTINIUS: I am in receipt of your letter of February 28, commenting on my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, on the subject of the proposed pipe line across Arabia, and making specific reference to one sentence in that speech concerning Mr. Charles Rayner, which sentence you quoted in full in your letter.

In accordance with your request I am placing your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with this reply.

You state that I have apparently been misinformed as to the former connections of Mr. Rayner with the oil industry, but I should like to respectfully point out that your own letter to me confirms every statement which I made, with three very minor and quite unimportant exceptions. First, I misspelled Mr. Rayner's name and am sorry I spelled it with an "i" instead of a "y." Second, I stated that he was formerly an official of the Socony-Vacuum Co., whereas, as you point out, I should have said the Standard Oil Co. of New York. This, however, is actually a distinction without a difference, since at the time that Mr. Rayner was the far eastern representative of the Standard Oil Co. of New York, the Socony-Vacuum Co. was not in existence. The fact, of course, is that the Socony-Vacuum Co. was formed in 1933 by a merger of Standard Oil Co. of New York and the Vacuum Oil Co., and that the Socony-Vacuum owns 100 percent of the stock of the Standard Oil Co. of New York today. What I should have said, therefore, was that Mr. Rayner was the representative of the Standard Oil Co. of New York, the parent company by direct lineal descent of the present Socony-Vacuum Co.

In the third place, I stated that Mr. Rayner was their representative "in India and the Orient," whereas you state that it was "in the Singapore area and the Far East." Here again it does not seem to me that I was very far wrong.

You make the further point that subsequent to the First World War Mr. Rayner operated as an independent oil producer in Texas. I am glad to have this information, although, of course, the really important thing would be whether or not Mr Rayner has taken any public position in opposition to the point of view and purposes of the major oil monopoly of this country. For it is well known that few words in the English language have been so frequently misused as the word "independent" as applied to oil companies. There are a good many truly independent companies, but there are other independents which in point of fact cooperate completel. with the majors and even in many instances act as a front for them. Which of these positions Mr. Rayner occupied I simply do not know, but I am only saying that this is the important question involved.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, as I stated in my speech, that it certainly is no dishonor for a man to have been an official of a major oil company. Furthermore I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Rayner personally and found him to be a most likeable gentleman. The thing that deeply disturbs me, however, is the fact that this particular contract involving far-reaching commitments on the part of the United States clear on the other side of the world and requiring so long a time for construction as to make it virtually inconceivable that the project can be termed a war measure, should have had but 1 day's consideration in the State Department. For surely this proposal involves tremendous questions of broad future policy upon the proper handling of which the very peace of our own country and the world may in the future depend.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Address of Rear Admiral E. L. Cochrane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Rear Admiral E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, at the graduation exercises of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Boston, Mass., on February 28, 1944:

Dr. Compton, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, and members of the graduating class of 1944, the circumstances of this commencement, taking place as it does in the very midst of World War No. 2, have a special significance for me personally, for at the outbreak of the last World War, as a young ensign less than 3 years out of Annapolis, I was

here at the institute studying in the school of naval architecture. Within a week of that fateful Good Friday of April 6, 1917, mobilization orders came and we left our books to go to active service in the east coast shipyards. Two and one-half years later, with the Nation once more at peace, we resumed our studies, and finally, in June of 1920, I was privileged to sit among the graduating class in Walker Memorial in just such ceremonies as we are holding today.

This personal experience gives me, I believe, an insight into the thoughts and problems which you have had during the 2 long years since December 7, 1941, and which confront you now, as you leave your work at M. I. T., many to enter into the service of the Nation at war.

Many of you, I know, feel that you have been overlooked, neglected, in not having been permitted to join active units earlier. I, too, suffered from that feeling during the few days we waited for our orders in 1917.

You, however, are more fortunate than I in that you have been held on to complete your studies—a luxury in which the Nation could indulge itself this time, and from which it will get the better return from you as trained men during the war and in the future. In this respect yours is the good luck to have been born at just the right moment, for you are going out still in time to get a fair share of the accelerated experience that goes with active service in a war, and, what is more important, because you are able to look forward to years of participation in what will surely be a remarkable era of scientific and engineering development in the post-war period.

While I would not venture to predict the date of the war's ending, none will challenge the statement that the day of demobilization is still far beyond the horizon. Certainly there are enough months of the war still ahead to give every man among you an ample opportunity to win his spurs.

Following World War No. 1, as you will recall, the world was swept with a tide of optimism about the future of international relations, out of which there developed a series of treaty limitations on naval armaments. As an additional restriction, national policy at that time frequently set ceilings on the cost of ship construction which definitely limited the extent to which experimentation could be undertaken.

Beginning in 1933 these restrictions have gradually been lightened, and since July 1940, with the authorization of the two-ocean Navy, one expansion has followed on the heels of another, until today we are speaking of the Navy's many fleets which, when completed, will be strong enough to cover the five oceans and the seven seas.

For years Congress has met every request of the Navy for additional authorizations and funds to meet the needs of the emergency naval shipbuilding program. This cooperation, which made possible in 1943 alone the delivery to the fleet of one and one-half million tons of fighting ships, and 2,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels, is the answer to those in other countries who comforted themselves with the conviction that a democracy could not function effectively in time of war.

War periods are always periods of rapid development of military and naval equipment. So far as naval architecture and marine engineering are concerned, the war has done more than merely to lift treaty and cost limitation so as to permit us to build more ships. It has furnished us with that which no amount of money can buy—the tough but invaluable experience of operating under actual combat conditions.

Study of the damage from projectile, torpedo, and bomb attacks, which not a few of our ships have absorbed and survived, has clarified for us many points over which we had been pondering. In peacetime the design of men-of-war must be guided in the main by imagination supported only by imited experimentation. The lessons learned from the burning and sinking of the *Lexington*, the *Hornet*, and the *Astoria* have led to important improvements in the field of fire fighting and fire prevention. The salvage of the *Normandie* and the ships which were sunk at Pearl Harbor has made possible the development of skills and techniques in a field with which the Navy had previously had only a limited acquaintance. Other examples could be listed almost without end, but the point is clear.

Active warfare is a battle of skill and ingenuity between opposing forces, not only in operations on the field but in the development of all of the munitions of war. In peacetime we try to outguess ourselves on the blueprint and on the blackboard, for it is a fundamental, well-established by experience, that you can expect the enemy to turn up with weapons at least the equal of your own. We must be prepared to meet attacks equal to our best, and to encounter any developments which the enemy may have achieved beyond our own. Widespread employment by the enemy of influence mines put the Allied forces on their mettle in the early days of the war to develop effective mine-sweeping measures. The success of the Nazi submarine campaign in the Atlantic was matched by the development of the even more successful counterweapons of patrol craft, destroyer escorts, and the baby flattops.

The demands of our fighting forces for new instruments of warfare, especially designed for particular conditions of operation, have forced us to depart from conventional lines of approach and have opened up whole new avenues of development. Perhaps the outstanding example of this has been the design of not one but a dozen distinct types of landing craft. Some of these are adapted to navigate heavy seas, and at the same time to be capable of landing troops and tanks on beaches as they have done so successfully at Sicily and Salerno. Others are designed to travel on both land and sea, to negotiate coral reefs like those at Tarawa, and to cross swampy terrain like that of Bougainville and Guadalcanal.

Finally, the scarcity of critical materials which developed as the inevitable consequence of the magnitude of our war-production effort and from the loss of foreign sources of supply, has posed new problems. Under national mobilization, scientists and engineers have been called in from every branch of civilian endeavor to work out these problems, as well as the myriads of other problems which have confronted us. Truly great progress has been made in finding the best solutions, as is evidenced, for example, by the work which has been done in the development of plastics and synthetics, many of which are proving to be more effective and economical than the materials for which they have been substituted.

In a very real sense, therefore, war is a period in which the young engineer and scientists can in a few months take strides which in peacetime he would struggle for years to achieve.

I am convinced that all branches of science will emerge from the laboratory of this war with advances of far greater import than the mere development of highly perfected instruments of destruction. Who, for example, can foresee the lasting contributions to civilization which may grow out of peacetime applications of the work which has been accomplished in the field of electronics?

That is why I believe that this graduating class is in a position of unique good fortune in having been able to complete the sound basic training which M. I. T. gives you, and to finish it in time to test and apply its principles in the experiences of the war which lie ahead. With the background of this training and the practical lessons which you will learn in the course of your war service, you will be perfectly equipped to tackle what Mr. Baruch prophesies may be our "adventure in prosperity" after the war.

Looking for a moment to the position which our Navy may occupy in that post-war period, it is my earnest hope that the progress which has been made in the last 3 years, and which seems certain to continue at least until the end of the war, will not stop with the declaration of the armistice. It is now a foregone conclusion that we will emerge from the war as the greatest naval power the world has ever seen. By the end of this year the strength of our fighting fleets will be equal to that of all other nations combined. The maintenance of that relative strength in the post-war period is our surest guaranty of something approaching world peace.

The preservation of our naval supremacy is the responsibility of the Nation at large. It will be the responsibility of those of you who stay in the Navy to see that that organization continues to justify the confidence which the Nation reposes in it. Yours will be the task of keeping the progress of naval thinking and action in the forefront of the general advances which are looked for in the days to come.

Many of you will return to civilian activities when the war is over. We hope that you will carry with you an affection for the service. We know that you will leave behind you the respect and high regard of your associates for your accomplishments which, with your own satisfaction for a job well done, are the chief rewards for active duty.

It is a wonderful thing to have the opportunity to be of service to one's country in times like these. Yours is the greater opportunity, for you will be allowed to continue your service into the post-war period, when so much will have to be done to keep this war from also having been fought in vain. I envy you these greater opportunities. I know that you will make the most of them. You will make the most of them if you will keep two thoughts constantly before you: First, that whatever you have to accomplish must in large measure be founded upon what others before you have done in paving the way; and, secondly, that however far you may go, greater advances will still lie ahead.

May I extend to you my heartiest congratulations on your past successes and my sincere wish that your future may be favored with a fair wind and Godspeed.

A Radio Serial That Must Not End Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, of February 29, 1944:

A RADIO SERIAL THAT MUSTN'T END HERE

Representatives WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, and MILLER, of Missouri, Republican members of the five-man House special committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission, are expected to present to the House today their resignations from the committee, along with a protest.

We hope that Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and MILLER will make their protest as emphatic as they know how and that it will receive the attention not only of their fellow House Members of both parties but also of the country. Doubtless there is some politics in the indignation of Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and MILLER. They are Republicans and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH is an old and conspicuous enemy of what he likes to refer to as the "pernicious bureaucratic practices" of the New Deal. Nevertheless, regardless of politics, the two Representatives have a grievance that cannot be lightly dismissed.

The story, briefly, is this: Early this month in its investigation of the F. C. C., the committee turned up a witness, Donald Flamm, of New York, former owner of radio station WMCA in that city. Mr. Flamm alleged that under pressure from, as he had reason to believe, high sources and under what he had reason to believe was a real threat that WMCA's wavelength would be taken away from him by the F. C. C. unless he did so, he was compelled in 1940 to sell the station to Edward J. Noble, who had resigned shortly before as Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Flamm said the duress was applied to him by William J. Dempsey, who had retired the preceding spring as general counsel for the F. C. C. and who appeared as attorney for Mr. Noble. Mr. Flamm asserted that he did not want to sell WMCA at all, that, in fact, he had recently turned down an offer of $1,100,000 from Elliott Roosevelt, the President's son, but that he finally had to let Mr. Noble have the station for $850,000 in December 1940.

In the course of these negotiations, Mr. Flamm tried to bring counterpressure close to the administration to bear in his own behalf. He had as vice president of his company, Leslie E. Roberts, who had formerly been in charge of W. P. A. radio programs and whom he had employed, he said, at the suggestion of David K. Niles, who is now an administrative assistant to Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Flamm thought Mr. Roberts might have the "right" Washington connections to be of help in saving the station.

But nothing doing. According to Mr. Flamm: "He (Roberts) told me that the ways for this thing have been greased from the White House down. He said he had spoken to Dave Niles and been told by him that this proposed sale to Noble was to pay a political debt incurred by the administration. Roberts said he would be glad to straighten it out for me if he could, but that was too much for him." Various other rather significant names figured in Mr. Flamm's account, including that of Thomas J. Corcoran, once an aide to Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Flamm said he had been told by Mr. Dempsey, Mr. Noble's lawyer, that it was Mr. Corcoran who had brought Mr. Dempsey and Mr. Noble together in the WMCA deal.

Mr. Flamm said he signed a contract transferring the station to Mr. Noble December 2, 1940, and that the transfer was approved by the F. C. C. without a hearing just 2 weeks later. Now, all of this, as it was related by Mr. Flamm early this month, seemed definitely worth looking into—in fact, something that could not be left where it was in justice to anybody concerned. However, on February 16, the Democratic members of the investigating committee — Representatives LEA, of California, chairman; HART, of New Jersey; and MAGNUSON, of Washington—met in the absence of Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and MILLER, and suspended the inquiry. Their reason was that the New York Supreme Court ought to have "reasonable opportunity" to dispose of a pending civil suit concerning WMCA before the congressional investigation proceeded further. The civil suit is one by Mr. Flamm trying to get WMCA back. Mr. Noble has meanwhile acquired the Blue Network and, as network owner, had to go out of business as a station operator. Mr. Flamm thought he saw a chance to regain WMCA in this situation and filed suit to set aside the 1940 sale.

As soon as they heard of the suspension of the inquiry, Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and MILLER denounced the action as "a hush-hush move, pure and simple, to keep the unsavory facts from the public." Meanwhile, Eugene L. Garey and lawyers associated with him as counsel for the committee have resigned, Mr. Garey calling the excuse for suspending the inquiry "a patent fraud on Congress and the country." It does appear that the committee majority's pretext is rather thin. If congressional inquiry must wait upon the disposition of civil suits in the courts, then a means is ready at hand for almost anybody to delay congressional inquiry very tediously.

The Courier-Journal holds no brief for Mr. Flamm, does not share the anti-New Deal-ism of Messrs. WIGGLESWORTH and MILLER, and doubts that Mr. Garey was an ideal counsel for the inquiry, since he originally was the appointee of Representative Cox, of Georgia, a man so obviously biased for such obvious reason against the F. C. C. that congressional opinion forced him out of the chairmanship and off of the committee. But Mr. Flamm's story can never in propriety rest where Messrs. LEA, HART, and MAGNUSON so peremptorily interrupted it.

Forest Survey Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this bill—H. R. 3848—is an amendment to section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, and authorizes funds up to a total of $6,500,000 to complete the Nation-wide forest survey, already half finished, and maintain the results on a current basis. Its enactment is necessary to provide authority for appropriations to carry on the inventory of our forest resources. The survey is partly done, and to get the full value of this study and avoid losing much of the investment in past work it must be finished. This work includes timber cruising to determine the volume and quality of our forests, the amount of wood added by growth each year, the depletion on account of cutting, fire, insects, and other causes, and special studies of present consumption and of future trends of the use of wood and other forest products. This information is analyzed and distributed in reports and maps for the use of landowners, both public and private, in the formulation of forest-production plans. About 300,000,000 acres is now covered by these reports.

The Nation-wide forest survey, the first of its kind in this country, is now furnishing dependable information on the timber supply and forest-land situation. Forest depletion has progressed to a point where a careful stock taking of forest resources is necessary to guide forest industry plans and community development, give assurance of jobs, and point out the critical situations in forested areas needing attention. This country has been in the timber business too long without an inventory of stocks on hand and a record of timber income and outgo on account of growth and depletion. Successful business keeps good records of its transactions, unsuccessful business, poor records or none, and eventually fails. No one wants forestry and timber production to fail. And for this reason enactment of this bill is considered essential so as to make possible completion of the forest survey to provide information basic to permanent and effective use of our forest lands and to war and post-war plans. The provisions of this bill have the approval of the House Committee on Agriculture—Report No. 986—the Secretary of Agriculture, Bureau of the Budget, and numerous private and public individuals and agencies.

O. P. A. Regulations Affecting Livestock Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the hereinafter news item appearing in the Daily Oklahoman on March 31 is typical of the sentiment of the cattle raisers of Oklahoma, regardless of whether they produce a few or many head of cattle and regardless of their political faith. I wish to ask the Members of Congress to read this article where 1,600 cattlemen of the State of Oklahoma met in one of the most elaborate luncheon or meeting rooms in the State of Oklahoma—met to express their opposition to subsidies, rationing of beef at this time, when Canada, long in the war before we came in, has suspended points for beef. The cattlemen's solutions are sound: "That labor cost be considered in computing a formula for establishing parity or selling prices for all farm commodities."

Mr. Speaker, many a cattleman has been compelled to liquidate within the last 12 months and many more will go out of business unless a more liberal attitude is taken by those in authority, or as an alternative it is up to Congress to write into the law, in renewing the life of O. P. A., provisions with respect to the continuation of the livestock industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have a smattering idea as to the cattle industry, having been engaged in this business in a small way the most of my life, and many letters and telegrams have passed between Washington and my district in an effort to secure feed during the winter months of 1943–44.

The article appearing in the Daily Oklahoman is as follows:

STATE STOCKMEN RAP SUBSIDIES, LABOR POLICIES—GROUP CONGRATULATES CONGRESS ON STAND AGAINST TAX VETO

Strong condemnation of the national administration's attitude toward the livestock industry and its tax and labor policies was voted here Thursday at the annual conven-

tion of the Oklahoma Livestock Marketing Association.

Resolutions approved by more than 1,000 cattlemen delegates representing the association's 13,400 members in Oklahoma:

1. Bitterly condemned "the weak and vacillating policy" of the administration in permitting "domination of the National Government by racketeering leaders of labor unions."

2. Expressed unalterable opposition to subsidies, which "we look upon as the illegitimate child of an unholy alliance between scheming politicians and racketeering leaders of labor unions inimical alike to the best interests of the producers of livestock and the consuming public."

3. Warned Congress to "cease making appropriations and increasing taxes at the behest of irresponsible administration bureaucrats."

4. Congratulated Congress on its recent action "in refusing to comply with administration demands for increased taxation."

The strong disapproval of many of the administration's policies was voted as the cattlemen completed their business sessions, and after they had heard spokesmen for the industry predict a shortage of beef nearing famine proportions by late this spring.

The resolutions, drafted by a committee headed by William G. Davisson, Ardmore ranchman and general attorney for subsidiary groups of the association, described as "senseless and unjustified" the attempts of the Federal bureaus to regulate and control the livestock industry.

The cattlemen continued demands that labor costs be considered in computing a formula for establishing parity or selling prices for all farm commodities.

"We believe that the efforts of those in authority to roll back the prices of livestock, while permitting or promoting advance in feed and labor costs, is unjust, unfair, and wholly inconsistent, and that such efforts are not only inimical to the best interests of the livestock business, but that they will result in decreasing the quantity and impairing the quality of meat produced," the resolution continued.

The livestock business does neither need nor want subsidies, the delegates decided.

"It merely needs to be let alone and it will get the job done," the resolution said.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act was described as "unjust and one-sided legislation," and, it was charged, "they are creating here at home a menace to our American way of life equally as great as that which our soldiers are fighting on foreign battlefields to destroy."

"We are not in accord with the demands of the administration for increased taxation for the ostensible purpose of preventing inflation," the committee report continued. "On the contrary we believe that the greatest incentive to inflation is the vast expenditures of the Federal Government and the greater the taxes collected the greater will be these expenditures."

The cattlemen urged full prosecution of the war, and urged the Government to put an end to labor strikes.

"We look upon them as a shame and disgrace to our people and believe that they will bring into disrepute any government that encourages or permits them."

About 1,600 delegates and their wives ate steaks at a luncheon in the Silver Glade room of the Skirven Tower at noon Thursday.

Speakers were Lt. Col. Jess Larson, who fought with the Forty-fifth Division in Sicily and at Salerno, and Lt. Comdr. H. W. Forgy, Navy chaplain at Norman, who inspired the song, Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition, during the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor.

Servicemen, WAC's and civilian employees from Tinker Field and Will Rogers Field presented a patriotic tableau.

Ed Melencamp, Anadarko, was reelected president of the association. Delegates also named E. G. Jeffrey, El Reno, vice president; and A. W. Lucas, secretary, for new terms. Four directors were reelected. They are W. H. Mundy, Pawhuska; Sid Willis, Kingston; Wayne Rowe, Lawton; and Tom Swanson, Roosevelt.

Oil of Araby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post opposing the present agreement for construction of a pipe line across Arabia for exactly the same reasons I advanced against it in my speech to the House on February 21:

OIL OF ARABY

The controversy now raging, in and out of Congress, over Arabian oil goes to the heart of our post-war relations with the other nations of the earth. Here, in concrete form, we have the first test of our pretensions. We talk in terms of the Atlantic Charter—international cooperation and free access for all nations to raw materials. But we have begun to act in terms of the economic rivalry and imperialism which have led invariably down the road to war. In the territory known as Saudi Arabia, some 6,000 miles from the United States, there lies an immense undeveloped pool of oil—the stuff which moves the machines of war and peace. The pattern in which this oil is exploited and distributed may well determine the pattern of the post-war world.

Three major American oil companies—Standard, Texas, Gulf—have concessions in Saudi Arabia. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., controlled by the British Government, dominates the oil of nearby Iran and Iraq. In order to assist the American companies in exploiting their Arabian holdings, the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which Harold Ickes is president, proposes to construct a 1,200-mile pipe line at a cost of approximately $150,000,000 from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. This investment is justified by Mr. Ickes for both war and post-war purposes as a means of giving the United States access to strategic oil reserves.

The war uses of the pipe line may be dismissed summarily. It cannot be completed for 2 or 3 years at best, by which time the European war ought to be over; and since the oil is located on the Asiatic side of the Arabian Peninsula, no pipe line is needed to get it to our far eastern forces. We do, however, have an interest in this oil after the war. We must begin to conserve the oil resources of the Western Hemisphere. We can no longer afford to let these serve as the main source of supply for Europe. It is in our own national interest, therefore, to help promote the development of Arabian oil fields—to meet European needs for liquid fuel.

But European needs will not be met from this source, as Congressman VOORHIS has cogently pointed out, "unless the oil of the Persian Gulf area is supplied to the Eastern Hemisphere at a price sufficiently below the price of Western Hemisphere oil so as to prevent Western Hemisphere oil flowing out of this hemisphere." Under the arrangement approved by Mr. Ickes, the United States Government could have nothing to say about this price. It would be fixed by private American companies, in all probability through a cartel agreement with the British. A low price has never been a cartel policy.

The United States Government would have nothing to say, either, about other policies which the American oil companies might pursue—policies which, for example proved so offensive to the government at Mexico City as to result in expropriation of the company properties. If something of the sort should happen in Arabia, we should be faced with the alternative of abandoning our $150,000,000 pipe line or engaging in an imperialistic military intervention on the opposite side of the globe. Russia, the dominant power in this area, might not care for such a move. Britain, whose interests in the Middle East are far greater than ours, might not relish it either. Any move toward American hegemony in the Middle East would be an invitation to future dissension.

It would appear—again to quote Congressman VOORHIS—"that the main decisions in this matter ought to rest with the State Department." Yet the matter was arranged almost wholly by oil company executives working temporarily for the Petroleum Reserves Corporation with scarcely a nod to our authorities on foreign policy. The effect of their plan would be to have American foreign policy in the Middle East determined by oil companies vis-à-vis foreign governments. There are some who complain that Mr. Ickes' proposal involves too much governmental interference with private industry. In our judgment, it involves far too little.

Mr. Ickes, it seems to us, has put the cart before the horse. The proper approach to the Arabian oil problem is through international accord. And this accord ought to be on the basis solemnly pledged by the Atlantic Charter—"the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." Specifically, this accord should be achieved by the principal United Nations concerned with the oil problem—Britain, Russia, and the United States—with due regard for the interests of smaller states. Here is a practical test of our capacity for cooperation. Once it has been met, it will be time to determine methods for getting the oil out of Saudi Arabia. This is not basically an oil problem. It is a problem in international relations.

History of the St. Louis Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the acting postmaster at St. Louis, Bernard F. Dickmann, has compiled a very interesting statement relative to the history of the St. Louis post office and also included statistics showing the amount of business carried on by that office. Under the permission granted me, Mr. Speaker, I include the statement as part of my remarks. It follows:

Because everyone uses the Postal Service, because its appeal is so general and its coverage so universal, few people realize how

important it has been to the social and economic development of our country. On the main Post Office Department Building in Washington there is carved a fitting description of our great Postal Service:

"The Post Office Department, in its ceaseless labors pervades every channel of commerce and every theater of human enterprise, and, while visiting, as it does kindly, every fireside, mingles with the throbbings of almost every heart in the land. In the amplitude of its beneficence, it ministers to all climes, and creeds and pursuits, with the same eager readiness and with equal fullness and fidelity. It is the delicate ear trump through which alike nations and families and isolated individuals whisper their joys and their sorrows, their convictions and their sympathies, to all who listen for their coming."

The Postal Establishment in the United States from its earliest days has been ever alert to meet the increasing demands of the American public, demands which from the beginning have kept pace with the march of progress.

FIRST ST. LOUIS POST OFFICE AND FIRST POST OFFICE BUILDING

Likewise, the St. Louis post office has constantly met the needs of our community. A review of the history of our local post office is in itself a review of the progress of our city. Beginning with the one room at the southwest corner of Third and Elm, which constituted the post office in 1804 under the administration of Rufus Easton, St. Louis' first postmaster, we trace the expansion of the Postal Service. The first notable expansion was marked by the erection of the Customs House and Post Office Building at Third and Olive Streets in 1859.

FEDERAL BUILDING, EIGHTH AND OLIVE STREETS

The rapid growth of the city soon made it necessary to plan for larger post-office quarters, which resulted in the erection of what we now designate as the Old Federal Building at Eighth and Olive Streets. The post-office activities moved into this new and then pretentious building in March 1884.

MAIN POST OFFICE BUILDING, EIGHTEENTH AND WALNUT STREETS

The needs for more extensive postal facilities soon became urgent and in 1903 ground was broken for the erection of a building on the block bounded by Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Walnut Streets, and Clark Avenue, to house the activities of the main post office. The building was occupied in October 1912 and boasted a floor space of 184,608 square feet. This building had hardly been occupied when in 1913 the parcel-post service was inaugurated. Since no provision had been made for the handling of parcel post the new building was practically obsolete from the time of its occupancy and, consequently, it was necessary to add a wooden addition to the south end of the building to partially take care of this activity, along with outside leased quarters as annexes.

NEW MAIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Shortly thereafter, plans were formulated for the construction of the imposing structure which now houses the activities of the main post office. Ground was broken for the present building on October 25, 1934, by the Honorable JOHN J. COCHRAN, Member of Congress. The cornerstone of the structure was laid with imposing ceremonies on September 19, 1936. Moving into the new building began in November 1937 and the dedication ceremonies were held on February 1, 1938. The site of our new main post office building comprises 3 city blocks, an area of approximately 7 acres. The dimensions of the building are 323 feet by 480 feet, with a gross floor area of 618,000 square feet, and a cubic content of 11,500,000 cubic feet. The area of the first floor is approximately 3½ acres. There is a subbasement and a basement below grade, a ground floor at grade and first, second and third floors above grade. Five entrances on Market Street and 1 each on Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets give access to a public lobby with 53 service windows across the front of the building. The cost of the new post office building, including the site, was $5,500,000. The erection of the present main post office building contemplated the consolidation of all postal activities into 1 unit.

NEW POST OFFICE GARAGE BUILDING

To complete this consolidation it was, of course, necessary to provide for the activities of motor-vehicle service and as a consequence the post office garage was erected directly south of the main post office building and the two buildings are connected with a tunnel under the driveway. The post office garage fronts on Clark Avenue between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets and is 290 feet across the front with a depth of 130 feet. It has a basement and two stories. The ground area is 37,694 square feet and the content 2,223,000 cubic feet. Sufficient space is provided for the storing of 200 trucks. The post office garage building was erected at a cost of $680,000. In referring to the post office garage it naturally brings to mind the matter of mail transportation.

EVOLUTION OF POSTAL TRANSPORTATION AND POSTAL SERVICE FACILITIES

In this phase of the mail service there can be developed some of the most interesting and romantic incidents in the history of our Nation. In the early days, mail from Washington was relayed to the Midwest by stagecoach, flatboats, and mounted couriers. Letters and newspapers were 6 months old when they reached St. Louis. By 1825 the stagecoach service had improved to a point where mail from the East reached St. Louis twice a week. The first overland mail from the Pacific was received in St. Louis on October 9, 1858, from San Francisco by the Butterfield stage route. The National Park Service in their historic research of the Riverfront Memorial area, established the fact that the building at 207 North First Street was the St. Louis headquarters of the Overland mail. The Missouri Republican on October 9, 1858, had the following comment to offer in connection with the overland mail service: "* * * What heretofore has been regarded as a visionary and speculative enterprise has been established beyond all doubt, and St. Louis and San Francisco have been brought within 24 days' travel of each other, on a stage line and a route which will admit of easier and safer travel than did the trip from St. Louis to Philadelphia 30 years ago. * * *"

Little did the writer of that article realize that in less than 100 years the travel time between St. Louis and San Francisco would be reduced to a matter of 14 hours. Today most of us give but little thought to the post office and we seem to take the efficient and expeditious service for granted, and fail to realize that in addition to being a service institution the post office is likewise a large business and financial institution, requiring not only a main post office building to conduct its business, but also that of the 45 branches and stations within the territory of 61.6 square miles within the city limits of St. Louis and 63.5 square miles in St. Louis County—a total of 125.1 square miles, constituting the St. Louis postal area. To adequately serve the estimated 1,000,000 patrons in this large area requires the services of 740 foot delivery carrier routes, 69 parcel post routes, 25 regular mounted collection routes, 5 foot collection routes. In addition, we have 7 auxiliary delivery routes, 18 mounted delivery routes, 53 auxiliary collection routes, and 14 rural routes. The total personnel of the delivery division of the St. Louis post office includes 889 regular carriers, 129 substitute carriers, and 14 rural carriers, a total of 1,018. In addition to the carrier complement the entire personnel of the St. Louis post office consists of 3,484 employees with a total annual pay roll of $8,628,659.55.

The question may arise as to why so many employees. This can best be answered by a review of the business and activities of your local post office for last year—for example:

POSTAL RECEIPTS

For the year ending December 31, 1943, the postal receipts of the St. Louis post office were $12,568,500.08. This included the sale of postage stamps and other stamp paper. While referring to the postal receipts it is noteworthy that when the activities of the local post office were housed in the old Customhouse Building at Third and Olive Streets, we find that the receipts for 1880—the oldest on record—totaled $638,735. So your post-office business has in the space of 64 years increased some twentyfold.

SALE OF POSTAGE STAMPS

An example of the numerous transactions handled by the personnel of the St. Louis post office can best be had by an analysis of the sale of postage stamps which for 1943 totaled $7,718,037.72. About half of this amount was from the sale of stamps of the lower denominations and included 37,535,000 one-cent stamps, 55,480,000 two-cent stamps, and 99,000,000 three-cent stamps. These were sold through the stamp windows at the main post office and its 45 classified branches and stations and 54 contract stations.

STAMP STOCK

A fact not generally known is that the St. Louis post office acts as a central accounting office for post offices in the eastern half of Missouri. These district offices receive their stamp stock through the St. Louis post office. Funds remitted by these district offices in the eastern half of Missouri and stamps sold for the last calendar year totaled $2,173,755.77.

SURPLUS-FUND DEPOSITORY

As a depository of surplus funds, the St. Louis post office last year received $20,419,946.79 from all post offices in the State of Missouri except Kansas City. These surplus funds consist of money collected for various postal services and money-order funds.

POSTAL-CARD AND ENVELOPE SUBAGENCY

This is another activity of the St. Louis post office of which very few patrons are aware. Shipments are made from the subagency to all post offices west of the Mississippi River, as well as to post offices in the States bordering the east side of the Mississippi River and to Hawaii and Alaska, upon requisition made through the bureau of the Third Assistant Postmaster General. The local subagency last year shipped stamped envelopes valued at $1,176,594.44 and postal cards valued at $1,261,970.

MONEY-ORDER BUSINESS

The post office has always discouraged the practice of sending currency through the mail and advocates the use of postal money orders as a safe means for the transmission of funds. During the calendar year 1943 the St. Louis post office issued 2,353,075 domestic money orders, totaling $29,648,978.89, and 1,760 international money orders, totaling $24,191.81. During this same period 3,548,527 domestic money orders, totaling $49,848,269.87, and 321 international money orders, amounting to $3,958.39, were cashed. The international money orders, of course, showed a considerable decrease due to war conditions.

POSTAL SAVINGS

While dealing with the financial end of the Postal Establishment we might review one of the functions which is generally not taken into consideration when we refer to postal

activities. This is the banking business that is done through the Postal Savings System. As of December 31, 1943, the St. Louis post office had 23,390 postal savings depositors with a balance to their credit of $13,366,378.

UNITED STATES WAR BONDS

The issuance of United States War bonds is an extraneous duty of the post office. These bonds are issued and accounted for by the United States Treasury Department. During the past year the St. Louis post office and its branches and stations sold 352,006 War bonds with a purchase price of $13,962,993.75. In addition, $5,185,692.90 in War stamps were sold locally.

VOLUME OF MAIL DEPOSITED BY PATRONS

Cancelations of first-class mail totaled 283,769,688 pieces for 1943; second-class mail deposited (publications) weighed 21,282,478 pounds; third-class matter (merchandise and publications) weighed 5,618,286 pounds, and parcel post totaled 55,830,176 pounds for this same period.

AIR MAIL

It is well that we consider air mail as a separate subject because of its importance as a means for the rapid transmission of communications. Since the establishment of the Air Mail Service patrons of the St. Louis post office has been most enthusiastic about its possibilities and how extensively they have used this service is best indicated by the volume of air mail deposited locally. In 1934, 39,034 pounds of air mail was dispatched from the St. Louis post office, while the year just ended 630,000 pounds of air mail was dispatched.

SUPPLIES AND MAINTENANCE

Supplies for the operation of post offices of the third and fourth class for the State of Missouri are distributed by the St. Louis post office. The St. Louis post office is also a depository for and distributor to all post offices throughout the Southwest on requisitions through the Bureau of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General of twine and facing slips which are used in preparing and identifying packages of mail for dispatch. During 1943, 60,875 pounds of twine and 89,970,000 facing slips were distributed to these offices by the St. Louis post office.

MECHANICAL UNIT

Typewriters of all post offices throughout the Southwest and electric fans of post offices for the entire United States are serviced in our mechanical unit. This unit is also responsible for the maintenance of the mechanical equipment, including the extensive conveyor system and electrically driven power machines of the main post office and all 45 branches and stations.

MOTOR-VEHICLE SERVICE

The motor-vehicle service of the St. Louis post office, in addition to operating and maintaining 185 motortrucks used in the St. Louis postal area, also services and repairs 109 trucks assigned to post offices in the central repair district.

SALARIES

It naturally follows that in conducting these numerous activities that certain expenditures are involved, principally salaries. The purchasing power of our employees should be of interest to all since this money stays right in our own community. During 1943 the supervisors and clerks of the St. Louis post office were paid salaries totaling $3,969,102.46. Substitute and temporary clerks received $998,093.35. Regular letter carriers were paid the sum of $2,263,330.33. Salaries paid to substitute and temporary letter carriers totaled $370,423.15. Regular laborers received $357,207.14, while $69,834.73 was disbursed to substitute and temporary laborers. Motor-vehicle service employees' salaries for the year amounted to $238,699.08. Custodial employees received $350,535.41. Clerks in charge of contract stations were paid $11,433.90. So the total pay roll of the St. Louis post office for 1943 amounted to $8,628,659.55, disbursed to 3,484 employees. In addition, the St. Louis post office is the paying office for the employees of the seventh division, Railway Mail Service, whose salaries totaled $5,782,784.91 during 1943. It might be pointed out that the majority of the officials and employees of the Railway Mail Service maintain their homes in St. Louis. During the same period, rural letter carriers in the State of Missouri were paid a total of $4,557,828.23 and the personnel of the St. Louis division of the Post Office Inspection Service was paid $241,591.16.

OTHER EXPENDITURES

It is doubtful if very many individuals are aware of the large sum that is expended locally by the Post Office Department for services and materials, so a résumé of the expenditures for the main post office, post-office garage, and the 45 branches and stations for the past year is in order: Rents for leased quarters, $111,116; light, power, and steam, $53,238.14; fuel, including coal and oil, $7,086.51; water, $3,198.58; gas, $934.29; laundry service, $1,026.87; telephone service, $15,681.73. Other expenditures included streetcar and bus fare for transportation of letter carriers, $21,876.30; gasoline and oil required for the operation of the 185 trucks of the motor-vehicle service, $23,709.96; repair parts and materials required to repair and service the fleet of local trucks and trucks assigned to this district, $28,309.46; cost of leasing temporary quarters for the handling of Christmas mails, $627.11; miscellaneous supplies purchased locally, $1,525.98.

It is hoped that these figures and statistics give you an insight of the St. Louis post office, of which you are an important part and that you will have a better understanding and appreciation of its operation, primarily for the service of our patrons. It is also well that we consider that while we are principally serving the public, at the same time, through our purchasing power, we are making a definite contribution to the prosperity of Greater St. Louis.

On the Wings of Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since reading John Hays Hammond's article on Silver in Nation's Business in the days of the depression—in the early thirties—and becoming interested in the money question, I have been deeply impressed with a keen understanding of the money subject and the intellectual grasp on the financial situation by the informed writer, Garet Garrett. I was particularly interested in his presentation of the effect of gold movement and money manipulation as presented in his informative article entitled "Opening the Golden Goose," published in the Saturday Evening Post during that period—an article that gave a better insight into the effect of the subsequent manipulation of both gold and silver money, which contributed in such a large measure to the ensuing financial depression which so seriously impaired the stability of our national economy, and brought on the financial conditions in this country; that made necessary the Government's borrowing, that left us $63,000,000,000 in debt at the time circumstances forced the Government to undertake to finance a global war by deficit spending.

Through the courtesy of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Los Angeles, Mr. Garrett's views on post-war conditions as outlined in his article, On the Wings of Debt, is submitted for printing in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues and the American people in general:

ON THE WINGS OF DEBT

(By Garett Garrett)

On the day the war ends money will begin to take its revenge, returning evil for evil. We cannot escape the consequences; we may hope only to distribute them through time.

On that day there will be nowhere in the world any true measure of value nor anywhere a free natural market in which things may be priced. Dollars, pounds sterling, gulden, francs, rubles, pesos—no one will know what any of these is worth, no more one of them in exchange for another than any one of them in exchange for goods. Moreover, of all the principal belligerents, there is only one that will not be owing more than it can immediately pay. That one exception will be the United States. This country alone could write a good promissory note; but as the one great creditor nation it will not want to write a promissory note; and if it did, there would be no one to buy it. Only the debtor nations, already owing more than they can pay, will be wanting to sell their I O U's.

Monetary chaos on such a scale has never before been faced. By comparison, the most terrible world-wide panic that ever happened was but the symptom of a mild disorder. In a panic, too, all values are deranged; but this is from a delirium that will pass, and the remedy is to go to bed, whereas in this plight of the world the beginning of chaos must be the point of departure. The need of nations to borrow and lend and to resume the ways of civilized exchange will be desperately urgent.

The heroic way to meet this situation would be to do nothing about it. It would be to assume that order will rise from chaos. Therefore, let everything find its natural value, as in any case it must some time do. Let the world go through a process of bankruptcy, the debtor nations paying what they can afford, or what they will, and the creditors writing off what they cannot collect.

CONSEQUENCES NOT DOUBTFUL

What the consequences would be is not doubtful. First, the pains would be terrific, but we should live through them, even though with some extremely bad social convulsions; secondly, the American gold dollar would be the only good money in the world. All international exchange would be conducted in dollars, every other money in the world would be priced in dollars, New York would become the banking center of the world in place of London. We should not be able by this or any other means to evade our share of the economic and social pain; only, in the end we should gain the advantage.

But in all present ways of thinking and feeling the thought of letting nature take its course is taboo. It belongs, we understand, to the old jungle spirit of the world, it is selfish and nationalistic, and in any case it

is in conflict with our professions of interest in the welfare of others, under the Atlantic Charter.

There is also a general reason why the thought is unsuitable. Governments now take it upon themselves to be responsible for the economic life, minding it, directing it, controlling it, imposing upon it the design of their wisdom; and governments notoriously avoid the heroic solution or any pain that can be postponed. Well then, what can governments do?

Given the problem as one foreknown, you might suppose that governments to meet it would mobilize all the resources of experience and ideas in the world of finance, or that they might command the financial intelligence of the whole world to evolve and recommend measures. That is not the way governments now work.* If they know what they want the rest is easy. Their experts will produce the plan. And whereas it may be sometimes doubted whether governments comprehend the work of their own experts, especially the fine points of it, any more than the rulers of old understood why their oracles told them always what they wanted to hear, it cannot be doubted that the experts know their governments. They never fail to go beyond the problem and produce welcome ideas for the further aggrandizement of government.

In a parallel manner two sets of experts went to work, one to produce a plan for the British Treasury, and one to produce a plan for the United States Treasury. They worked in secrecy, though not without exchanging thoughts, as experts will in the uncontaminated atmosphere of their being; and by a happy coincidence both finished their work at about the same time. Then the two Governments exchanged plans—in confidence. The American plan was sent to 36 other foreign governments and still it was a secret document in this country.

In London there was a leak. News of the American plan began to appear in the press. Thereupon the Secretary of the Treasury, complaining that he had been scooped, handed the text of the American plan to the reporters. The committees of Congress that deal with banking and currency and foreign trade, members of the Federal Reserve Bank System, the Department of Commerce, foreign trade associations and private international bankers as a subdued species—all these read it for the first time in the morning papers. Just then the British Treasury published its plan as a Government white paper.

SOME UNRAVELLING ATTEMPTED

It is perhaps not expected that ordinary intelligence will meddle with plans so far removed as these from vulgar gaze. Nevertheless, there is no law forbidding it to unravel them if it can, and if that is what we are going to try, one forethought will be helpful. Here is revealed what each government wants. Neither may get what it wants, but getting less than it wants will not alter its way of thinking.

The British plan is entitled "Proposals by British Experts for an International Clearing Union." The author of it was Lord John Maynard Keynes. Expounding it in the House of Lords, he resented the suspicion from across the Atlantic that the idea was to make a "milk cow" of the United States.

Now, the business of clearing is simple. It consists in canceling out debits and credits by matching until you come to the last difference, which is the balance to be settled. A clearing union as such could no more milk the United States than an adding machine could milk a cow. He went on to say that there were two contingencies that might lead the United States to accumulate a large credit balance of the proposed new world money, called bancor. He would hardly deny that there is at least the possibility of milking large credit balances. That is made clear in the text of the plan. How could they be milked? For the answer you have to unravel the text and do it very carefully.

But before doing that you have to look also at the American plan. It is entitled "Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund."

The elements of stabilization are almost as simple as those of clearing. For purposes of orderly international trade you want a constant relation between the money units of any two countries—e. g., between the American dollar and the British pound sterling. Therefore you say, "One pound sterling shall be worth four and one-half dollars, or $4.50 shall equal £1." Then you have a free fund, preferably a gold fund, and stand in the international money market ready to buy or sell with all comers either pounds or dollars at those figures.

WHAT IS POOLING OF SOVEREIGNTY?

When the Secretary of the Treasury handed the American plan to the reporters there was some conversation about it. Out of this conversation the New York Times' reporter wrote that the interests of the United States would be fully protected even if there should be "some pooling of sovereignty in the interest of international cooperation."

What does pooling of sovereignty mean? And how can such a thing be involved in the simple business of stabilizing currencies?

The Secretary of the Treasury said, to be quoted: "We are going to be very careful not to act the part of the big rich brother."

The idea of a big rich brother in a stabilization fund is like the idea of a milk cow in a clearing union. How does it get in at all? Well, again, to find that out you have to unravel the meaning.

The great features of the two plans are visibly alike, allowing only for differences of light and shadow, as when a thing which in one plan is left in dimness shows up boldly in the other.

One calling it a clearing union and the other a stabilization fund, both plans propose to create a world bank and to invest it with extraordinary powers. This bank shall provide a new world money to an aggregate amount limited only by necessity, by circumstance and by the wisdom of the governing body. Every subscribing member nation, big or little, rich or poor, solvent or insolvent, shall have access to this new money according to its need.

How access? Well, take a Balkan country, as the Secretary of the Treasury did in his talk with the reporters, on handing out the text of the American plan. He asked them: "How could a country like Yugoslavia, to take an example, be able to start buying abroad without something of this kind? We have to give these people confidence and a chance to do business."

What the Secretary of the Treasury means is that when the war ends Yugoslavia will have no money of her own that anybody would call good and no credit on which to borrow unless at a heartbreaking discount. But the world bank will take her paper currency and assign to her a quota of the new world money. Then Yugoslavia can begin to buy before she has anything to sell or anything of her own to pay with. The countries from whom she buys will send their bills to the world bank and get paid in the new world money. Yugoslavia will not owe those from whom she buys and who perhaps would charge her exorbitant interest on her debt; instead she will owe the world bank, which will see her through, charging her only nominal interest or at first none at all.

EQUILIBRIUM, THE MIGHTY WORD

So then, international trade is resumed under the watchful eye of the world bank. Its business is to keep the nation in the state of economic equilibrium. That now is the mighty word—equilibrium.

If no nation bought more from another than it sold to that one, or if no one sold to another more than it bought from that one, then a state of equilibrium would exist naturally, and the world bank would have nothing to do. But that does not happen. Some nations, especially the poor ones and at first, will buy much more than they will sell and owe the difference. This means that others will be selling much more than they buy, and these will have to be paid the difference. Thus, debtor and creditor balances to be settled. The world bank will settle them. From the debtor nation's account it will transfer world money to the account of the creditor nation. In this way the difference is settled by a bookkeeping entry, and no money goes away. Never does any world money go away. It simply moves around on the books.

But you can see what would happen if this went on for too long in an uncontrolled manner. A time would come when all the world money in the bank would stand in the names of the rich creditor countries, and the poor debtor countries again would have nothing left to buy with. It is the duty of the bank to see that this shall not happen. It must keep the trade of the world in balance. That is to say, it must maintain the equilibrium.

How shall it do this? By exercising the powers that have been delegated to it by all members.

It says to the debtor country: "You are exhausting your share of world money. That is because you buy more than you sell. You must do something about it. You must reduce your imports and increase your exports. If the hardship becomes too great we may be able to make you some loans out of the surplus of the creditor countries. We shall see."

Then to the creditor country it says: "You are selling too much and buying too little, thereby creating a state of disequilibrium in the trade of the world. You must be willing to take more of other people's goods in exchange for your own. That is to say, instead of keeping your home market all to yourself you must share it with other people. You must increase your imports. You could do this by letting down your tariffs. Or you may have to revalue your internal currency in order to penalize exports. And if this is not enough to restore the equilibrium, then you must be willing to invest your surplus in other countries under the bank's supervision."

SUPREME ECONOMIC AUTHORITY

With these powers, the bank—called in the first place either a clearing union or a stabilization fund—becomes an international government, acting with supreme authority on the economic affairs of the world; and in order that it may be such and do such, each member nation will have had to surrender beforehand its sovereign right to make its own tariffs, control its own trade, and say for itself what it will do with its surplus. Therein lies the meaning of that phrase, "pooling of sovereignty in the interest of international cooperation."

Both plans are founded on what might be called a desperate hypothesis in monetary physics, namely, that if you can stabilize the whole the parts will stabilize themselves. Hitherto the law has been that each of the parts had to find stability in itself.

The thing to be avoided if possible is a frightful post-war debacle of money and credit. And why is that disaster foretold? Because debt has been so inflated, beyond anything before imaginable, that nations will distrust one another's money and there will be dread of a universal repudiation of promises to pay. Now, on the verge of this despair appears a world bank with a new kind of money and a new kind of credit—twenty

or thirty billions of credit—in one great pool for the benefit of all. On what does this new money and this twenty or thirty billions of new credit rest? What secures it?

The magic if any is here. The new credit rests of course upon the new money. On what does the new money rest? According to one plan, entirely, and according to the other plan, very largely, the new money will rest upon the faith of member nations in one another's debts. And this is so, notwithstanding the fact that want of confidence in one another's ability to pay the magnitude of debt already owing is the evil matter to begin with.

This seeming paradox is happily resolved. Faith itself is going to be pooled. Nations need not have faith in one another separately. They need only to have faith in the bank.

Each member nation brings to the bank its promissory notes, its own paper money, its own bonds, and such claims against other nations as are for the time being uncollectible, if it has any of these. It is all debt of one kind or another. A nation's own paper money is debt, its own bonds are debt, its uncollectible claims against another country represent that other country's debt. All of this the bank receives and gives the bringer of it a credit in the new world money.

It will not work at all unless everybody is willing to believe that the new world money is better than the debts on which it rests. Could this be true? Intrinsically, no; on faith, perhaps. You would have to imagine that from getting started again without having first to go through bankruptcy, and then from trading in a system of perfect equilibrium, the world would progress in wealth and well-being so fast that in the time of a generation everything could be made good.

ANXIETY FOR DEBTOR COUNTRIES

What else the two plans have in common is in the nature of things implicit. Both are conceived in anxiety for the debtor countries. That would have to be so. The threat of monetary chaos is from the plight of debtor countries. But since the United States alone of the principal belligerents will have a creditor position in the end, and since it cannot be permitted to have the controlling word, it follows that the world bank will be dominated by a debtor mentality—all the principal nations being debtors and only the United States a great creditor. Thus you have a world credit machine, the most momentous ever conceived, administered in effect by debtors.

Both plans proceed from the doctrine of the authoritative state to a doctrine of supreme world authority, and it is the same way in thinking. As the state, according to this doctrine, must impose its wisdom upon the individual and administer his affairs because he has administered them badly for himself, so now the disembodied wisdom of a world bank must be imposed upon nations. They cannot be permitted any longer to trade and to borrow and lend with one another in license and indiscipline, because they throw the economic affair into disequilibrium and the natural correctives are too painful. They must accept instead supernatural arrangements in an economic ordering of the world.

Therefore, the bank shall have ways of exerting pressure against a selfish hoarding nation that would build up a surplus behind high tariff walls and keep its markets to itself, ways of putting penalties upon a strong creditor nation unwilling to share its advantage with the weak and deficit nations, and ways also of restraining improvident and reckless borrowers.

"To help create conditions under which the smooth flow of foreign trade and of productive capital among the member countries will be fostered," says the American plan.

That does not mean freedom of trade. It means only that trade is to be free from nationalistic control. Those who created it and who have hitherto supposed that because it was their own they had a right to manage it as they pleased may continue to conduct it, but they shall not control it. All trading and all borrowing and lending among nations will be more controlled than ever before, only, not by each nation in its own way but by an aloof international intelligence, always seeing the good of all.

"It has been suggested," say the British plan, "that so ambitious a proposal is open to criticism on the ground that it requires from the members of the Union a greater surrender of their sovereign rights than they will readily concede. But no greater surrender is required than in a commercial treaty."

Yet in the next paragraph it speaks of the disorder that flows from the license nations have hitherto been free to exercise in making their own commercial treaties and says they must now be willing to submit to supernational arrangements. Certainly a commercial treaty is not a supernational arrangement.

HIGHLY LITERARY ABRACADABRA

Lord Keynes, who wrote the British plan, is probably the most imaginative living economist. If he were an economic illiterate he would be a ham-and-egger in southern California. But he is one who can say and believe that two and two make five and be led by the hand, not to an alienist but to a rostrum where he will receive the medal of a mathematical society. He conceives man to be engaged in a struggle to conquer money, and that until now he has been defeated in this struggle by his hoarding propensities, an instinct for thrift, and a fetish of solvency. For many years he was a prophet not without honor save in his own country. His brilliant exposition of deficit spending by government as a way of increasing the national income for everybody's greater happiness became New Deal doctrine. He could sell the idea here but not in his own country—at least, not then. There the superstition of solvency was still too strong. All his wizardry derives from credit; it is his only trick, with dazzling variations.

For all its wisdom and foresight the British Treasury probably did not know that a time was coming when it would need the imagination of John Maynard Keynes. But as it is with the British, when that time did come the man was there. He became economic adviser to the Chancelor of the Exchequer, took a seat on the board of the Bank of England, and entered the House of Lords.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE DEBTOR

In the world bank, called the Clearing Union according to his plan, the weak would support the strong, the surplus resources of the creditor would be employed in benefit of the debtor, and yet this would cost the creditor nothing. He would hardly know it, in fact, any more than the individual depositor in a bank knows what the banker is doing with his money.

"No particular member states," says the plan, "have to engage their resources as such to the support of other particular states or of any of the international projects or policies adopted. They have only to agree in general that if they find themselves with surplus resources which for the time being they do not themselves wish to employ, these resources may go into the general pool and be put to work on approved purposes." "This," says the plan, "costs the surplus country nothing"; and yet it performs the miracle of credit, which is that "of turning a stone into bread."

The words are romantically Keynesian; the apparatus they describe is extremely practical. Nothing strange has happened to the mind of the British Treasury. It is looking steadily at the two facts that concern it most. One is that when the war ends England will be the great debtor owing more than she can immediately pay; the other is that the United States will be the one great creditor, with a productive power equal to that of all Europe, or nearly so, and something like two-fifths of the world's monetary gold in her hands. Now, in the light of these two facts, examine the apparatus, namely the world bank according to the British plan, and you will see a wonderful thing. It has a one-way door. The creditor can get in but not out.

In the first gadget phase of the iron age there was a cast-iron mousetrap painted to resemble a brick house. The door stood open inviting the mouse to enter; the bait was just beyond the threshold on the floor. The trick was that the weight of the mouse on the floor caused a trigger to act and slam the door shut. The mouse might roam freely through the house, and looking back he would see the door standing open again just as it was when he came in, but if he approached the door his weight acted again on the trigger to close it.

MOUSETRAP FOR CREDITOR NATIONS

For the creditor nation the world bank of the British plan acts in that way, except for the refinement that the door goes shut only when the creditor attempts to walk out with his profits. If the creditor nation will lighten weight by leaving behind all that is owing to it by others, then it can walk out.

The description of this interesting mechanism is brief. Part II, section 6, paragraph 16, reads: "Members shall be entitled to withdraw from the Union on a year's notice subject to their making satisfactory arrangements to discharge any debit balance." (There the door stands open.) But, this paragraph continues—"They would not of course be able to employ any credit balance except by making transfers from it either before or after their withdrawal, to the accounts of other members."

Thus the surplus country, whose credit resources within the pool may be used in benefit of all, for purposes f turning stones into bread at no cost whatever to itself, is in this position: If it is willing itself to employ its surplus resources within the pool for the general good, all the better; if not, the bank will do it. In any case that nation cannot get its surplus out.

"In short," says the British plan, "the analogy with the national banking system is complete. No depositor in a local bank suffers because the balances which he leaves idle are employed to finance the business of someone else."

Complete but for this slight difference, that the depositor in the local bank can take his balance out. The complete analogy would be something like this:

Imagine an entirely self-contained community—the world in microcosm—with only one bank. Everybody does business with this one bank, keeping balances with it, writing and receiving checks to settle their accounts with one another. In this community there will be a few surplus people having always a credit balance, then the middle people who manage to get along, and lastly, the deficit people who are chronically in debt to the bank. The bank president calls one of the surplus people into his office and says to him: "Your credit balance is much too large. It is out of all proportion to the average. It tends to create a disequilibrium in the community. You will have to do something about it." The surplus person says, "Oh, all right, if you feel that way, I'll draw it down." The bank president says, "No, no; you can't do that. The effect would be deflationary." The surplus person says, "Well, then what?" The bank

president says, "You must employ it. If you don't the bank will. There are a lot of people here on the deficit side. You might lend it to them. You might invest it in their business. Or you might lend it to the community for public works." The surplus person says, "And when it comes back to me with interest, if it ever does, what may I do with it then?" The bank president says, "The same thing again. In any case you cannot draw it out because that would be bad for everybody, yourself included."

THE BANK CANNOT GO BROKE

Such a bank as this, or such a bank as the world bank will be according to the British plan, has the unique merit that it cannot go broke. "If no credits can be removed outside the clearing system," says the British plan, "but only transferred within it, the union can never be in any difficulty as regards the honoring of checks drawn upon it. It can make what advances it wishes to any of its members with the assurance that the proceeds can only be transferred to the clearing account of another member."

Thus it can exert upon world trade what the plan calls expansionist pressure—meaning inflation—and carry it to any extreme without the slightest fear of bad consequences to itself. The fetish of solvency at last is overcome.

Another peculiarity of the world bank, according to the British plan, is that it opens for business with neither assets nor liabilities. Nobody puts anything in to begin with, and yet, without having put anything in, each member nation has overdraft facilities. That is simply to say that any member nation may write its checks against that original nothingness. The bank honors the checks by putting down on the books to the credit of that nation a certain amount of new world money, called bancor, which will be deemed to be as good as gold or the equivalent of gold although it is never to be redeemed in gold or anything else. Whether or not this new money actually exists does not matter in the least. If it were imaginary it would serve the same purpose, for the only thing the member nation whose checks have been honored can ever do with the money is to transfer it to another member on the books, either as a loan or to pay a debt.

When in the course of trade it comes that one nation owes another a debt that cannot be paid in goods, but must be paid in money, they go to the bank and settle it by a transfer of bancor from one account to another. Such is clearing. There is no profit in this for the bank. Nevertheless, as the British plan unfolds, the bank comes to have enormous resources, which may be employed to support and finance international policies on a grand scale, such as post-war relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, ever-normal granaries, and great stockpiles of commodities to which all shall have equal access, and finally the cost of policing the world.

What is the origin of these resources? The bank does not own them; it only commands them. Yet how do they arise? Certainly not by clearing trade balances for member nations. That is done without profit. These resources are bancor credits, and they represent the profits of creditor nations, called also the surplus nations. Remember that no nation can take any profit out. All profits gained from trade must be left there in the form of bancor credits. The plan says: "In recognizing that the creditor as well as the debtor may be responsible for a want of balance, the proposed institution would be breaking new ground."

GOOD CREDIT FROWNED UPON

A nation that accumulates a very large credit balance at the bank is regarded as one that behaves in a selfish manner; it is one that would demand payment of debt in gold and hoard the gold or bury it in the ground. It is one that would deprive the world of the benefit of its surplus purchasing power, and the effect of that is deflationary.

The plan says that the bank "looks on excessive credit balances with as critical an eye as on excessive debit balances." It would like to "require the eventual cancelation or compulsory investment of persistent creditor balances in excess"; but on reflection it thinks that this would be going too far, at least to begin with, in the present state of world intelligence. Anyhow, they must be distributed, else they will "exercise a contractionist pressure against world economy." And the distribution of them does in fact become compulsory because, if credits or profits cannot in any case be taken out, they must necessarily be employed within the bank for the benefit of deficit countries in a deficit world, as the wisdom of the bank shall dictate.

When the British Treasury engaged the mind of Lord Keynes for this task it was bound to get an astonishing plan. It was not obliged to accept it. One may wonder why it did, especially that part of it which is Lord Keynes' fantasy of unlimited credit administered by and for debtors in a world of tame creditors—unless it was for the reason that Great Britain, seeing that she herself will be the great debtor, contemplates the role of debtor's champion. Debtors will be in the majority; all of Europe will be debtor. And the appeal of this plan to debtors against one great creditor nation on this side would be almost irresistible.

The American plan is much more discreet. There is no trick door. Any member nation that wants to get out is entitled to receive back the equivalent of everything it put in, together with any credit that may belong to it. The new money this bank creates, called Unitas, has some visible means of support. Every member nation puts in something to begin with, namely, as much gold as it can afford, its own paper money and its own bonds. Briefly, what the American plan calls the United and Associated Nations stabilization fund is a world bank on fairly orthodox lines. It can buy and sell all currencies, it can increase its resources by selling its own bonds, and its money—the Unitas—will be gold standard money redeemable in gold.

In the British plan gold is treated in a Morganatic manner. Bancor, its new world money, is related to gold but not married to it. "The purpose," it says, "is to supplant gold as a governing factor but not to dispense with it." Why not dispense with it? Because, as the British plan concedes, "gold still possesses great psychological value, which is not being diminished by current events."

BOTH PLANS ARE INFLATIONARY

The rub is that all but a "remnant" of the world's monetary gold is held in the United States. This important difference between the two plans is largely explained by that situation of fact—who owns the gold. Partly no doubt it represents the idiosyncrasy of Lord Keynes. His feeling toward gold is like the wavering pagan's feeling about holy water. There may be something in it. Certainly it is not wise to say positively no. Yet he hates it because it cramps his style. Specifically, Lord Keynes hates gold because it limits the expansion of credit and tends to bring back the fetish of solvency.

The inflationary powers of the American plan may be as great as those of the British plan, even greater. One cannot be sure. There are too many unpredictable factors. On the day the bank opens for business every member nation may begin to print money and exchange it there for credit in gold standard Unitas. In the British plan inflation is restrained only by the wisdom of the governing mind; in the American plan there are two limitations. The first limitation is the gold base; the second is that the bank must always be prepared to meet its own obligations, for the American bank, unlike the British bank, could go broke.

It may be for any one or all of these reasons that the American plan clings to some feeling for the creditor, as, of course, it should, seeing that the United States is and will for a long time continue to be the principal surplus nation in the world.

Nevertheless the American plan foresees that a surplus nation, selling its goods to deficit nations, will tend to accumulate large credit balances in the world bank, and it agrees with the British plan that if a surplus nation pursues its selfish course uncontrolled, it is bound to disturb the equilibrium of trade.

In that case it becomes the duty of the world bank to admonish the creditor nation and to recommend that it take corrective measures, such, for example, as to lower its tariffs, to spend more of its wealth in foreign countries, and to make large investments abroad.

Any one of these measures is bound to have internal effects, touching unemployment, wages, the standard of living, and so on, but this cannot be helped, and it is assumed that although some of the effects may be immediately bad for the surplus nation's internal economy, still in the sequel everybody will be benefited by what is good for the foreign trade of the world.

VAGUE TERM FOR HARSH FACT

At only one point does the American plan supplement the British plan, but it does this in an original and most extraordinary way.

The subject at this point is "abnormal balances," and by a coincidence both plans employ that vague term for a very harsh fact.

The British plan says: "The position of abnormal balances in overseas' ownership * * * presents a problem of special difficulty * * * a country in which a large volume of such balances is held could not unless it is in a creditor position afford the risk of having to redeem them in bancor on a substantial scale. * * * At the same time it is very desirable that the countries owning these balances should be able to regard them as liquid. * * *" It believes, therefore, and it suggests that "there should be some special overriding provision" for dealing with this problem. But it does not propose any special overriding provision. The American plan does that.

Before meeting that provision it will be well to understand what "abnormal balances" are. They are debts, largely in the form of bank deposits, subject to payment on demand, which the debtor countries cannot immediately pay. The principal nation in that awkward position is Great Britain. Of the principal nations, the United States alone is not in that position.

At the end of the war the United States will be owed more than it owes, and everything it owes it will be able to pay on demand, in gold if necessary. Not so with Great Britain.

Before the war all countries belonging to what was called the sterling bloc kept large bank deposits in London because London was the banking center of the sterling bloc and its clearing house. The Scandinavian and Baltic countries did and also of course all the countries of the British Commonwealth. Then there was refugee money in flight from the continent, like the gold smuggled out of Norway by hand and left in London for safekeeping.

STAGGERING LIABILITY TO FACE

Since the beginning of the war all these deposits have been blocked. Indeed, "blocked balances" is the exact financial term. There is no figure to express the prewar total of these balances, but it is a staggering li-

ability to have to face at the end of the war; and during the war it has been increased by Great Britain's buying of food and raw materials abroad outside the benefit of lend-lease. For all of this she has written down in her book sterling bank credits. These become blocked balances for the duration of the war, payable on demand when the war ends.

This is so far simple. Every bank depositor in this country knows by experience what a blocked balance is. In 1933 all the banks in the country closed. When they began to open up for business again, you could not get all of your money out, only a small part of it. The other part was the blocked balance, payable at some future time as prosperity returned or as the assets of the bank could be liquidated.

If at the end of the war all countries having blocked balances in other countries should demand immediate payment of them, as they would have a perfect right to do, there would be trouble. It would be like a run on the reopened bank. There would be trouble even in this country, although this country can afford to pay on demand all the refugee money that is here and all the demand deposits owing to foreigners. But for Great Britain, as the biggest debtor of all, it would be serious indeed. She might have to say simply that she could not pay, with all that that would mean to her financial prestige.

So the problem, as the British plan precisely says, is how to postpone payment of these blocked balances and at the same time give them a status in which it will be possible "to regard them as liquid." A very large order indeed. The American plan proposes the way.

For illustration, let it be a matter between Argentina and Great Britain. There are blocked balances in London standing to the credit of Argentina. Great Britain is the debtor; Argentina is the creditor. Now, according to the American plan, the world bank, called the stabilization fund, buys from Argentina her claim against Great Britain. Then Great Britain no longer owes that debt to Argentina; she owes it instead to the fund, and she undertakes to pay it off at the rate of 2 percent a year until 40 percent of it is paid. But Argentina, as a condition of selling her claim against Great Britain to the stabilization fund, has agreed to buy it back from the fund at the rate of 2 percent a year until she has bought back 40 percent of it. At the end of 20 years, therefore, Great Britain will have paid off 40 percent of her debt to the fund, Argentina will have bought back 40 percent of her original claim against Great Britain, and a residue of 20 percent will be left in the bottom of the pot.

NOBODY KNOWS WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

There the story ends. What happens after that nobody knows. Evidently the writers of the plan do not know. This, says the plan, is "to facilitate the effective utilization of the abnormal foreign balances accumulating in some countries as a consequence of the war situation."

The idea is original, profound, and fairly incomprehensible to any but the expert mind. But what is accomplished is perfectly clear. Payment of the debt represented by blocked balances is postponed and no loss of face or prestige will come of it because all countries alike will do it, even the United States, which is the one country that could pay what it owes because on the whole it will owe much less to others than others will owe to it. Ultimately 40 percent of the debt will certainly be paid if the plan works. The aggregate of it is incalculable. Each day of war makes it more and it will include, we suppose, such settlements as may at length be made of what the world at large owes the the United States on account of lend-lease.

Here the grand particulars only have been set out. Many details have been passed over, some of them important—details touching the procedures of stabilization, how the values of the different national currencies in terms of bancor and unitas shall be arrived at, how quotas shall be assigned to the member nations, and so on.

Some will say, "If you do not like either of these plans or any compound of them, what else? Do you prefer chaos?"

Chaos is not the only alternative. Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the Chase National Bank, says: "I would like to suggest as an alternative to the two plans proposed in tentative form by the American and British experts that at the earliest possible moment a 'free dollar' be established in the post-war world. This would involve the checking of domestic inflationary forces, the resumption of gold payments, and the removal of all foreign exchange controls. If these measures were taken, the dollar would constitute a sure anchorage for the currencies of other nations and would become a generally acceptable international medium of exchange. All international transactions, including those of a bilateral or multilateral character, including the exportation or importation of goods, including short- or long-term capital movements, could be cleared on th basis of a dollar freely redeemable in gold and freed of foreign exchange controls."

That would work. Would it be in tune with what Lord Keynes calls the spirit of the age?

Mr. Aldrich is a banker. He is thinking in monetary terms. He takes these plans to be designs for a monetary solution. They have that character only by technical definition. They are in fact political plans of a daring order.

Says the British plan: "The Clearing Union might become the instrument and the support of international policies in addition to those which it is its primary purpose to support. This deserves the greatest possible emphasis. The Union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world."

STABILITY OF TIRED WORLD WANTED

So it might. And so also might the world bank that is called a stabilization fund according to the American plan. The last paragraph of the American plan reads that each member nation agrees "to adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its obligation to the fund and to facilitate the activities of the fund."

So much for exegesis. Now prejudice and conclusion.

Neither of these plans is for the period of transition only. That is to say, neither one holds itself to immediate dangers of the post-war world. Both treat the impending crisis as an occasion. Both propose to introduce into this confusion a world government to act with supreme authority in the economic sphere.

One of the charter functions of this world government is to maintain in all things an equilibrium, omitting the truth that in disequilibrium lies the infinite source of human energy. Stability is for a tired world.

But the ultimate purpose is political, namely, to redistribute the wealth of the world in favor of underprivileged nations.

This will be done not by force but by manipulations of money and credit and by regulations and decrees touching trade, and it will be done, moreover, in a way to deprive surplus nations of the political power inherent in the right of a nation to dispose of its surplus as it will.

The British plan makes a special point of this, saying: "When financial contributions are required for some purpose of general advantage it is a great facility not to have to ask for specific contributions from any named country but to depend rather on the anonymous and impersonal aid of the system as a whole. We have here a genuine organ of truly international government."

WHAT A WONDERFUL SYSTEM

This is to say that if it should take, as it did after World War No. 1, $3,000,000,000 to uphold the buying power of the British pound sterling, and even if this money came out of the American surplus in the bank, still Great Britain would not have to borrow it from us nor owe it to us. She would owe it to the world bank. Nor would she have to repudiate it as a debt to the United States, as before, on the ground that she could not pay it in money and that the United States, by putting up tariff barriers, made it too hard for her to pay it in goods.

True, also in this case, she would be unable to pay it back to the bank unless she could sell her goods, only now in the new situation to be imagined the world bank would say to the United States: "You must open your market to British goods or else Great Britain will be unable to discharge her debt to the bank." If the United States should say: "But if we open our market to competitive British goods we shall throw many of our own people out of employment," the bank would say: "Great Britain has unemployment, too, and worse than yours. Anyhow, you are the richer. This is the new equilibrium and everybody, you included, will in time be benefited."

From the point of view of all debtor and deficit nations, enthusiasm for redistributing the wealth of the world, at least so long as there is one nation richer than all the rest, makes perfect sense. But that the one great surplus nation in the world should naively share that enthusiasm, thinking thereby to win the love and gratitude of mankind, will make one of the great fables of history—if it happens.

ADDENDA

On July 10 the United States Treasury issued a revised draft of the American plan, having by that time received suggestions upon it from the "technical experts" of nearly 30 countries. The principal changes from the first draft are as follows:

First, the statement of purpose is amended to embrace the objects of the Atlantic Charter;

Second, the size of the fund is left as before at $5,000,000,000, but each member country shall pay in its total subscription to begin with, and half of it in gold—if it has the gold. One that has not gold enough may use instead more of its bonds and paper money to pay its original subscription. The United States is probably the only country that could put in the full amount of gold.

Third, to avoid the danger that either the United States or Great Britain should be able to control the fund by having votes enough to represent absolute power of veto, it is provided that no member country shall be permitted to cast more than one-fifth of the total vote, regardless of the size of its stake in the fund.

The effects of these revisions are that—

(a) The United States being by far the largest holder of monetary gold in the world, its contribution of gold to the fund is increased fourfold;

(b) The United States being the principal surplus country in the world, its power over the fund is reduced by limiting its vote to one-fifth where before it was one-fourth; and

(c) The new preamble proclaims the social intention, which is to raise the standard of living of the whole world, whereas before only the monetary purpose was asserted.

NOTE.—On top of all this, the United States Treasury has proposed to create also a $10,000,000,000 world bank to function as a kind of international R. F. C. (the initials of our own Reconstruction Finance Corporation). Again it happened that the news broke first

in London, on October 8, and when confronted with it Mr. Morgenthau said it was true and gave out a brief memorandum entitled, "Guiding Principles for a Proposed United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development." This bank would deal only with member governments, to provide them with capital loans, and the American Government would put up most of the gold. That is all the public may know about it yet.

Adjusted-Service-Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article prepared by the Army and Navy Union, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Regular Veterans Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and a copy of a House bill to provide adjusted-service pay for veterans of World War No. 2:

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

A credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with an extra credit of $500 where wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, would be allowed all who serve honorably in the armed forces of the present war.

A minimum credit of $100 for any home service, and of $500 where any foreign service was had, with a maximum credit of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where foreign service was had; and where the extra credit of $500 for wound applies, a maximum allowable of $5,000.

Upon application by the veteran to the War or Navy Departments the respective Secretaries would certify to the Treasury Department the amount due, and the Secretary of the Treasury would issue bonds in the highest multiple of $50, according to amount due. Where the total amount due any veteran is less than $300, payment with check would be made by the Department honoring the application.

The bonds will bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which interest would cease. The bondholder would have the option to withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing the attached coupons, or could retain all or part of such coupons to draw the prescribed interest up to the full 10-year period.

The bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to liens, and would be a property right, reverting to the veteran's next of kin or estate in case of death. Where the veteran's death occurs prior to application, the application may be made by his next of kin or his estate.

EIGHT REASONS IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

1. This adjusted-service-pay method would provide a tangible, earned reward for all who serve honorably—from buck private or apprentice seaman to four-star general or admiral, inclusive.

2. The reward would be measured according to length and place of service, proportionate to the service rendered and the sacrifice made.

3. The reward belongs to those who earn it, or their estates, and would be usable without bureaucratic control, or interference with State rights.

4. Determination and distribution of the reward would require the very minimum of administration and creates no new agencies or supervisory boards.

5. A reasonable safeguard is provided against hasty and unwise spending, by permitting a withdrawal of only one-fifth of the total reward each year for a 5-year period.

6. An incentive to save is extended by applying 3 percent simple interest for first 5-year period and 3 percent compound interest for the second 5-year period.

7. The over-all cost to the Nation would be less than the cost of 4 months of actual war expenditures in 1944.

8. This earned-reward method would be the American way.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. To adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay, including food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, of those who serve in the armed forces of the present war and civilians who work in war industry.

Question. Aren't the adjusted credits of $3 and $4 per day allowed in this bill rather high?

Answer. No; not when you consider the pay of those in the armed forces compared to civilian war workers. The average yearly pay (365 days) of all persons in the armed forces, including the value of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, is estimated at less than $2,300, or approximately $6 per day. Would the addition of the credits provided be unreasonable when compared to the earnings, comparative safety, and freedom of civilian war workers?

Question. Would a veteran who is eligible to receive pension, hospitalization, and vocational training because of service-connected disabilities, also be entitled to the adjusted-service pay?

Answer. Yes, certainly. The other benefits are granted because the veteran actually suffered disability or vocational handicap in line of duty, and they have no relation to pay adjustments.

Question. Why not wait until the close of the war to make pay adjustments?

Answer. Already over a million persons have been discharged—many with combat disabilities—and others being discharged at a present rate of 30,000 per month. It is entirely possible 3,000,000 persons may be discharged long before hostilities cease. Why should they wait for their pay adjustment? The knowledge this adjusted pay will be available should be a decided morale factor.

A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Veterans' Adjusted-Service Pay Act of 1944.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "service in the military or naval forces" shall mean active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) The term "person who served" shall mean a person, whether male or female, whether commissioned, enlisted, enrolled, or drafted, who served as a member of the armed forces or as a member of one of the reserve components thereof.

(c) The term "period of the present war" means the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending with the termination of hostilities as proclaimed by the President, or declared by the Congress.

(d) The term "Department" means the War Department or the Navy Department, or one of the components thereof.

(e) The term "veteran" means any person who served during the period of the war whether or not such service shall have terminated.

(f) The term "overseas service" shall include all active service outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CREDIT

SEC. 3. The adjusted-service credit shall be computed by the Secretary of the Department concerned for each veteran. The amount of such credit shall be computed in the following manner:

(a) There shall be allowed $3 for each day of active service within the continental limits of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, and $4 for each day of active overseas service, during the period of the war: *Provided*, That any veteran who performed no overseas service shall be entitled to a minimum credit of not less than $100, and any veteran who performed overseas service shall be entitled to a minimum credit of not less than $500: *Provided further*, That the maximum amount allowable to a veteran who performed no overseas service shall be $3,500, and the maximum allowable to a veteran who performed overseas service shall be $4,500: *And provided further*, That any veteran may be given credit for active service in more than one enlistment, but the aggregate adjusted-service credit for all periods of service during the present war shall not exceed the maximum herein specified for the type of service performed.

(b) There shall be allowed in addition to the amount authorized in (a) above $500 for any wound for which the issuance of a wound chevron or other decoration or medal is prescribed: *Provided*, That under this subsection the amount of adjusted-service credit to any veteran as provided in (a) shall not be increased by more than $500: *And provided further*, That the adjusted-service credit under this section and payment thereof shall not be reduced by any amount paid or payable under the Mustering-Out Pay Act of February 3, 1944, Public Law No. 225, Seventy-eighth Congress.

SEC. 4. In computing the adjusted-service credit no allowance shall be made—

(a) for service as a civilian officer or employee of any branch of the military or naval forces, contract surgeon, cadet, or midshipman of the United States Military Academy, Naval Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, or for service while attending or stationed at a civilian educational institution and undergoing a course of academic instruction, or for service as a member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular forces of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps;

(b) for any period in excess of 30 days while confined under sentence of court martial or civil court, or absent without leave;

(c) for any furlough for the purpose of engaging in civilian pursuits;

(d) for service of any individual whose period of active military service is terminated under dishonorable conditions;

(e) for service of any person holding a permanent appointment, commission, or warrant in any governmental agency detailed to active service with the Army or Navy, or transferred as a part of the armed forces.

APPLICATION FOR ADJUSTED-SERVICE PAY

SEC. 5. (a) Each veteran at time of discharge after the date of enactment of this act shall be informed of his right to benefits under this act and shall be furnished an application for payment of adjusted-service pay

thereunder. Upon filing of such application with the Department at time of or subsequent to discharge, the amount of adjusted-service credit of the veteran under this act shall be computed and if $300 or more shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in bonds of the United States. Such certification shall be made by the Secretary of War or Navy Department as herein prescribed. *Provided*, That if the adjusted-service credit is less than $300, it shall be paid by the Department in cash.

(b) Any person who remains in active service after termination of the war and whose service has been honorable to that date shall be furnished an application for payment of adjusted-service pay and upon filing thereof payment shall be made as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 6. Upon application for adjusted-service pay filed with the Department concerned, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary thereof, by any person separated from the active service prior to the date of enactment of this act, the adjusted-service credit shall be computed and paid as provided in section 5 (a). Such application may be filed at any time subsequent to the enactment of this act.

PAYMENTS BY BONDS

SEC. 7. The amount of adjusted-service credit certified pursuant to this act by the Department shall be paid the veteran or his estate by the Secretary of the Treasury by the issuance of bonds of the United States, registered in the name of the veteran only, the denomination having a total face value equal to the highest multiple of $50 in the amount certified as due the veteran, and the difference between the amount certified as due the veteran and the face amount of the bond so issued shall be paid by check to the veteran or his estate by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation authorized to be made under this act. Each bond shall be dated the first of the month in which it is issued and shall mature 10 years from such date. The bonds shall be redeemable in the manner hereinafter provided and at such places, including post offices, as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate. Such bonds shall not be transferable, assignable, subject to taxation, attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, and shall be payable only to the veteran, except as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 8. In cases of deceased or incompetent veterans, the payments provided by this act shall be made to the next of kin of the person who served, or to his estate, as determined by the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury to be lawfully entitled thereto, without the necessity of the appointment by judicial proceedings or otherwise of a legal representative of the estate or person of any veteran or of any other persons, or of compliance with State law in respect of the administration of estates. The provisions of this section shall be carried out subject to regulations to be issued from time to time to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. Interest on each bond issued hereunder shall accrue at the rate of 3 percent simple interest for the first 5 years and 3 percent compound interest thereafter but not beyond the date of maturity, and any accrued interest will be paid with the principal. Each bond shall bear five coupons covering respectively the first 5 years immediately following the date of the bond, each coupon to bear necessary information, including record of the face value of the bond and the face value of the coupon, which latter shall be one-fifth of the face value of the bond. Each coupon shall be redeemable at any time within or after the year indicated on its face, except that no interest shall be payable on any coupon redeemed before the expiration of the year it covers. Face value of coupons redeemed before maturity of the bond shall be deducted from the face value of the bond, and payment on coupons redeemed after the expiration of the year or years they cover shall include the face value of such coupons with interest as provided herein.

SEC. 10. If any veteran shall have died or shall die without applying for or receiving the adjusted-service pay, application for the amount of such pay may be made at any time by such person or persons as may be authorized by the regulations issued under section 8, or the estate of the veteran. The application shall be filed with the Department concerned, which will, if less than $300, pay, or if $300 or more, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment the adjusted-service credit.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. The decisions of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury hereunder shall be final and not subject to review by any court or other Government official.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such regulations not inconsistent with this act as may be necessary effectively to carry out the provisions thereof, and may make such joint regulations as are necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to employ such additional personnel as may be necessary to administer their respective functions under this act subject to existing law with respect to personnel matters.

SEC. 14. Any person charged with the administration of any part of this act shall make a full report to the Congress the first month of each year as to the administration thereof.

SEC. 15. Appropriations necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized. The appropriations for the War and Navy Departments and the Treasury Department for personnel, travel, and other administrative purposes shall be available for the administration of this act.

SEC. 16. Any person who charges or collects or attempts to charge or collect either directly or indirectly any fee or other compensation for assisting in any manner the veteran, his dependents, or other beneficiaries under this act in obtaining any of the benefits hereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 17. Whoever makes any fraudulent statement of material fact in any application, certificate, or document made pursuant to the provisions of this act, or of any regulation made under authority of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. Any person who fraudulently receives any amount of the adjusted-service credit or bonds to which he is not entitled shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine not less than twice the amount of such sum so received, and in addition may be subject to imprisonment for a period of not more than 1 year.

SEC. 18. Whoever falsely makes, forges, counterfeits, or alters, or causes or procures to be made, forged, counterfeited, or altered a certification or bond issued under authority of this act, or whoever passes, utters, publishes, or sells, or attempts to pass, utter, publish, or sell, any such false, forged, counterfeited, or altered certificate or bond, with intent to defraud the United States or any person, or whoever has in possession any such falsely made, forged, counterfeited, or altered certificate or bond with intent to unlawfully use the same, or who shall refuse to surrender or release, upon demand by the veteran or lawful beneficiary, any certificate or bond, shall be punished by fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than 15 years. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to direct and use the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department to detect, arrest, and deliver into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction any person or persons violating any of the provisions of this section.

South Dakota Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America, Endorses Missouri River Improvement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, realizing the great dividends in the realm of conservation which will accrue from the curtailment of floods and the constructive use of the excess waters of the Missouri River, the Madison (S. Dak.) Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America has endorsed the proposed Missouri River improvement program and I am including with these remarks a copy of the resolution of endorsement and the letter accompanying it.

I have been advised that the Madison (S. Dak.) Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America has sent this resolution together with an appropriate letter of transmittal to other chapters of the league in the Missouri Rivery Valley and elsewhere. It is a true work of conservation which harnesses the floodwaters of a river and prevents their destruction of the natural habitat of fish, birds, and wildlife—producing instead a productive environment where fish, birds, and game can rear their young and make their homes with security against the demolishing forces of tremendous floods.

This South Dakota Chapter of the Izaak Walton League deserves the commendation of sportsmen and nature lovers throughout America on being the first to adopt a resolution of endorsement on this project of national significance to all true conservationists:

MADISON CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Madison, S. Dak.

GENTLEMEN: The old saying "Nine-tenths of wisdom is being wise in time" can well apply to us now in connection with the Missouri River development program.

Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution adopted by the membership of our chapter at our last regular meeting. The resolution is self-explanatory.

After careful deliberation we came to the conclusion that we had our choice of taking two attitudes. The first would be that of just sitting by and watching this thing become an actuality, and when some mistake was made, should it be, and we raised our voice in protest we probably would not be heard. The second would be that of jumping in now while the project still needs promotion and helping it along by an endorsement,

and as the thing grew and grew we undoubtedly would be consulted on various points from time to time, and in this way could probably iron out things that we thought should be changed as they came up, rather than after they had been done.

We choose the latter attitude, for, after all, many of the developments in this project will be in line with the objectives of the league. We felt it would be better to help formulate the plan than to sit back as critics thereby increasing the possibility of any suggestions, in keeping with the league policies, being given consideration.

We would be pleased to have you bring this up at your next chapter meeting toward the end of adopting a similar resolution, that the league may be united.

This resolution is the impartial and considered judgment of our chapter, and we feel it is in keeping with the ideals and principals of the league and is worthy of your support.

Sincerely,

JACK STEEN, *Secretary.*

Whereas the proposed Missouri River development program, when properly developed, promises to alleviate or entirely eliminate the serious flood condition now existing in many of our Southern and Southwestern States; and

Whereas this program would also provide much needed irrigation for the large expanses of semiarid regions in South Dakota and other States bordering that river, and that this irrigation will have a great tendency to decrease soil erosion by the introduction of vegetation and cultivation of these lands heretofore nontillable; and

Whereas this irrigation should also make possible the natural growth of timber, thus providing ideal habitat for various species of birds and animal life; and

Whereas this program, if properly developed, should greatly decrease the amount of silt always present in the waters of this great river, thus making it much more favorable to the habitation of fish life; and

Whereas this program should provide nesting places and resting places, favorable for migratory waterfowl; and

Whereas this program should afford enough control over floodwaters now raging down the river in mighty torrents laying waste every living thing in their path, that these same floodwaters can be used for constructive purposes, such as the establishing of a much more constant water level for many bodies of water now suffering, such as Devils Lake in North Dakota; and

Whereas previous experiences should provide proper administration so that all signs of pollution in this river and its tributaries shall be eliminated: Be it therefore:

Resolved, That we, the Madison chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, in keeping with our ideals and pledge to protect woods, waters, and wildlife, shall go on record as favoring, and actively devote our efforts to the promoting of the proposed Missouri River development program, that it may sooner reach a successful state of completion and add materially to the benefits to all living things within its scope.

"Bureau of Globaloney"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from John T. Flynn:

The war against the American mind never ceases. The latest offensive to be launched against it is in the United States Office of Education. That bureau, established to promote educational processes and studies, is now engaged in a secret attempt to create a Government-financed division of propaganda in the field of international politics. On the surface it is asking funds to establish what it calls a division of international education. If this were honestly named it would be called the "Division of Globaloney." What is more, this little job is being cooked up by one of those inevitable emigree professors who has been in this country less than 10 years and who is now prepared to take over the formation of the crude, untutored American mind in the interest of his internationalist and racial passions.

Last summer Dr. Walter Kotchnig, an Austrian, was brought into the Office of Education by its head, Commissioner Studebaker, and, without any official status whatever, given the run of the place and complete access to its files. In a few weeks he emerged with a 32-page report severely criticizing the Department of Comparative Education in the Commissioner's office and ending with a proposal for a department of international education, which, of course, is the idea he had in mind before he began his "investigation."

This proposed department will (1) distribute propaganda pamphlets and other material to schools and other institutions, promoting Dr. Kotchnig's international or globaloney ideas; (2) send out lecturers at Government expense propagandizing the same line; (3) distribute kits containing teaching materials as aids to the propagation of the globaloney faith; (4) send representatives abroad to be indoctrinated with internationalist philosophy. Of course, Dr. Kotchnig would head the department. Moreover, it seemed important to the doctor that at least two Englishmen be on the staff.

This writer has no objection to the presence in our communities of foreign scholars. On the contrary, as a member of the Board of Higher Education of New York City, I have favored and even urged the presence in our colleges of men truly representative of the cultures of other countries so that our youth might be exposed to the best that Old World civilizations have to offer. We must never close our eyes and ears to the sources of knowledge and wisdom from whatever corner of the globe they may appear. This is one thing. It is quite another to take in these busybody emigres who industriously seek to worm their way into positions of power and put them in charge of the very machinery of education here. It is also another thing to create an immense and expensive propaganda machine for their alien ideologies and put that machine in their hands to use against the minds of our people.

In this instance, however, the case need not be put wholly on this ground. What policy this Nation may pursue in international affairs is a subject which the people of America and their representatives must determine after deliberation and debate. Every side of the subject must be presented. In our society are many organizations well equipped to present all phases of the subject. The Government must be the instrument of the people in carrying out the policy on which they finally decide. It is unthinkable that a bureau shall be set up—and stealthily, too—to enter this discussion and use the power, prestige, and the funds of the people to tip the scales on one side or the other of this great debate. We should oppose such a bureau no matter what side it undertook to support. It is un-American and indefensible.

It is time to call a halt to this persistent drive of recently arrived teachers—some of them refugees—who keep everlastingly at the job of inserting themselves into our Government, to control its thinking and shape its decisions in favor of objectives which are dear to them not because they are Americans but because they are the angry or injured or vengeful victims of enemies in other lands.

The report of this Austrian interloper has been subjected to analysis by members of the staff of the Commissioner of Education and this analysis reveals his whole proposal to be superficial, self-serving, and worthless. Nevertheless, an effort is being made to push through an appropriation for this enterprise. I urge members of the Education Committees of the Senate and House to be on guard against it. I urge all Members of the Senate and House to keep an eye open for this oily scheme to plant in this Government a wholly un-American device of propaganda.

So Much Depends on Price of Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mining Record, Denver, Colo., of February 24, 1944:

SO MUCH DEPENDS ON PRICE OF SILVER

Provincial easterners have built up a hatred for silver to the detriment of the Nation and the world. Otherwise honest publications have libeled the white metal by printing untruthful articles designed to discredit silver, break its market price, and make it possible for eastern silversmiths and jewelers to buy the metal at cheap prices. There is a serious lack of patriotism in such actions, because silver is the metal that to a great extent controls the output of needed strategic metals and makes possible production of many metals needed in our prosecution of the war. Silver is a byproduct of many metals needed in the war effort and when the price of silver is hammered down, it is not possible to mine its sister metals in the same ore body at a profit. There has been a serious slump in silver production and this, in part, can be traced to the eastern cabal that has been knifing the white metal.

The Nation must awake to the fact that the immense metal production that has been made by the mining industry to supply the war needs is depleting the mines of reserves which should be held over and above production. The new dealers have prevented corporations from financing and developing new mines so the old mines developed before the New Deal came into power have had to provide the needed metals. Prospectors have left the field because financing of prospect mining companies had been stopped by New Deal laws. So it will be seen that some strong medicine is needed to bring the mining industry back to life so that new mines may be discovered and developed.

To overcome the disastrous injury that the present Washington administration has done the mining industry, the way is open through bimetallism. Prospectors would then return to the prospect trail and new discoveries would be made. Financiers would furnish speculative funds to develop prospects into mines. The Washington brain trust might even see the error of its way and allow speculators to place money in shares of new mining and oil corporations rather than to close this legitimate avenue

of speculation and allow touts and racketeers to fleece these speculators of many millions of dollars each year in crooked horse and dog races, as is now the case.

Complicated Forms Have Been Clarified and Size Greatly Reduced by the Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, has made many improvements in the administration of the act over which he has jurisdiction. I have just received from him a letter in which he enclosed an old form heretofore used consisting of 20 pages for the use of annual financial reports from business concerns. This 20-page form has heretofore been accompanied by an instruction book of 16 pages.

Mr. Bowles also forwarded the new form which takes its place of four pages with instructions occupying a single sheet of paper printed on both sides.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM WILL HELP

It occurs to me that instead of denouncing and condemning the Office of Price Administration that more good could be accomplished by working with this organization and trying to get complicated forms clarified and huge questionnaires reduced to the minimum in size.

I do not believe that any person who has given intelligent thought and consideration to the subject will advocate abolishing price control. It is absolutely necessary. Since it is, let us work together and make it as easy as possible. It should not be overlooked that the Price Control and Stabilization Act is saving the American taxpayers $50,000,000 every 24 hours on the cost of the war alone compared with the cost during World War No. 1. A program that is so helpful should not be destroyed or weakened.

We can afford to suffer inconveniences and condone some irritations in order to save such a huge amount of money each day which would otherwise be passed on to future generations including veterans of this war to pay.

I am inserting herewith a letter from Mr. Bowles, which is self-explanatory:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1944.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which at times has been critical of O. P. A. forms, you may be interested in the attached exhibits.

Exhibit A is the form for annual financial reports from business concerns and the book of instructions which accompanies it. The report, you will note, fills 20 pages; the booklet 16 pages.

Exhibit B is the new form which takes its place. As you will see, it occupies four pages, with instructions occupying a single sheet of paper, printed front and back.

This is one of several steps we are taking to simplify forms and procedures, which I believe will save time and trouble for industry, the Government, and the public.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

News From the Battle Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I include in my remarks two letters from our former colleague, the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, who resigned his seat in this body to serve the Nation on active duty at the front.

We admire the courage and spirit of any man who is willing to yield an honored place in the House of Representatives and face the dangers and rigors of war in defense of his country. Such was the decision made by our noble friend and colleague, Congressman Van Zandt:

SOUTHWEST PACIFIC, *December 19.*

HELLO GEORGE: Now that I am settled on board my own ship—was made commander of this ship September 9—will pound out a few lines for the benefit of yourself.

Well—I reached the war zone after flying 11,000 miles via Australia on November 2—going into training for amphibious warfare. The powers to be permitted me to arrange my own refresher program which I did. After 1 month's training during which I took part in six landing operations was given the going-over by a four striper who immediately ordered me to take command of this ship (LST No. 457).

No doubt you have followed our operations of landings, etc., through the press. So you will know the ship—she is 350 feet in length, 4,000 tons, crew of 77 and carries plenty of armament. "LST" means landing ship for tanks but frankly we carry most anything including troops, etc. It is interesting to stick the nose of these ships up on the beach to unload in a hurry when all my past training in the Navy has been to keep the ship off the beach.

This climate out here or down under is plenty tropical. We are not so many miles south of the Equator; thus it is hot (I said hot) with plenty of rain. It rains one minute, burns you up the next, but regardless, in the shade one can cool off, and best of all at night it is cool. The islands are all heavy jungle growth with towering coconut and banana trees. The jungle growth extends to the water's edge while in the background tree-covered mountains 15,000 and 16,000 feet high add to the beauty. Several of the mountains are snow covered but as yet I haven't seen them. One interesting thing is—these mountains have no such thing as a timber line—trees and foliage cover them to the top.

The natives are funny. We call them fuzzie wuzzies while no doubt they call us damn fools for looking at them as we do. The men drape themselves (hips only) with a cloth while the women employ the grass skirts. Naturally we look and look, but as yet none of us seem to think they are turning white. When that happens all hands will fly back to the States toot sweet as a Frenchman would say. These natives live in small villages made up of bamboo, etc. Frankly they are dirty and many have diseases. Where the missionary has been on duty they do try to keep clean a little. Just a little.

I cannot help but comment on the fine job all hands are doing out here. In the first place the weather gets one down, next we get no news except a few lines every now and then by radio, no movies for weeks and weeks, no liberty in a city since such things don't exist out here, and believe it or not we haven't seen a white woman for over 2 months. All we do is work and work. My heart goes out to the soldier and marine who slaves for 18 and 20 hours, first to build roads, dugouts, landing strips, unloads his own equipment plus supplies, then turns around and has to fight a Jap rat who lives in the jungle, who doesn't mind sleeping in a hole filled with water, one whom malaria doesn't bother, one who crawls around including trees like a monkey, one who can exist on a few handfuls of rice. Yes, siree, these boys work until exhaustion and gripe like hell when we hear of strikes back in the States. What the Government should do with labor leaders is to send them out to this part of the world and we'll show them what long hours and hard work for a little wage amounts to. I'm only sorry as a Member of Congress it was not possible for me to go through what I'm now going through. Had it been, my speech to the House on the subject would have startled the American people. Would and could tell you much but with Old Man Censor checking, naturally it is necessary the subject matter be generalized as I have tried to do.

Upon arriving in Australia it was my privilege to be greeted by the general. He sure took good care of me in the way of interviews, etc. He is as gallant as ever and, contrary to what you hear, liked a lot by his men. All world problems seem to be at his fingertips—sharply alert on any subject—above all well preserved and apparently in the best of health. Learned to know all of his staff a little better and at the same time pal with our mutual friend (General) who is the general's plans officer.

Well, George, give all my best wishes, assuring each I'm in the best of health and enjoying myself tremendously. Take good care of yourself and with my usual best wishes to a real friend, as always,

JIMMIE.

P. S.—Tell the boys on the floor also at the hotel I said "hello," especially Beecher Hess.

SOUTHWEST PACIFIC, *February 12.*

DEAR GEORGE: Between trips from our base to the north, will steal a few moments to answer yours of recent date. Both reached me this morning, and words fail me to explain how pleased I was to receive them.

I am delighted to know you enjoyed my last letter. As you no doubt realized, I kept right close to the censoring line and was still able to give you an idea of what we are doing out here. Would love to tell you many details which you and other Members should know, but the censor barrier is up. I'm sorry, but it cannot be helped.

Since writing you last it has been my pleasure to receive another promotion. This time my promotion calls for me to command a full division of landing ships for tanks. On February 1 the promotion took effect, and now in naval language I'm labeled as ComDiv. #40 of LST's attached to the Seventh U. S. Fleet. This new duty will continue to keep me in the forward area or right in the middle of the show daily.

We are still hitting the Nips between the eyes many times daily. I have been part of so many operations since early October that I have lost track of the number. The one

thing standing out in all of these shows is the fine teamwork of the armed forces. One talks about groups clicking; believe me, the Army, Navy, and Air Corps sure click out here. The stick this force carries is powerful, and when they strike it is done with almost unbelievable precision. Only one who is part of these shows can appreciate the effect of this powerful strike on the enemy forces.

Our summer is just about over; fall is setting in; change of season doesn't mean a thing. For the fall and winter we'll just have more heat and rain, but we do like to talk about the seasons.

Well, George, I'm feeling fine and trust you are likewise. Drop me a note when you can. Say hello to my colleagues for me. With best wishes as always.

Sincerely,

J. E. V.

A Quart of Milk and Allotments for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the War Department is advertising through an Associated Press article under date of March 2, and which I will extend in the RECORD, a statement made by the public-relations officer of the Office of Dependency Benefits, to the effect that any American soldier and misguided girl who wish to perpetrate infidelity through birth of illegitimate children can be recompensed for their efforts by the Government of the United States to the tune of $30 for the first child and $20 for each additional child. The question arose with respect to eligibility of an English girl for allotments for quadruplets. It is not necessary for the father even to make application for the allotments when he acknowledges parentage.

Some of my constituents who sympathize with the American wife of the soldier in question are reminding me that it was Adolf Hitler who first advertised and encouraged this kind of practice on the part of government. We have simply added to this practice the promise of our Vice President "a quart of milk a day for everybody in the world."

The article follows:

THE QUADS ELIGIBLE TO $90 MONTHLY FROM UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The quadruplets born in Heanor, England, will be eligible for a dependency payment of $90 a month if their father is an American soldier and acknowledges them as his children.

A War Department spokesman said the Army allows payments for illegitimate children if the father acknowledges parentage.

The monthly payment for the first child is $30, with $20 for each additional child.

Capt. George Schuyler, public relations officer of the War Department's Office of Dependency benefits in Newark, N. J., said if it were established that the father of the children were an American soldier, the quads' mother could receive dependency payments for them even if the father did not apply.

Time to Call a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago the United States Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture presented a proposal for the allocation of $100,000,000 to be used for the condemnation of lumber-manufacturing plants and private timberlands. This bureaucratic scheme was not approved, but it took the united efforts of the lumber industry and Members of Congress to defeat it. The plan was to set up an agency to be known as the Forest Products Service and to bypass the elected representatives of the people by obtaining approval through the war powers of the President. It was contended by the Government agency that the owners of the timberlands and manufacturing mills were incapable of operating in the public interest, that the timber stock was being dissipated and that Government competition and Government ownership was the solution. It can be said to the credit of Mr. Roosevelt that in the end he did not approve of the Government going into the lumber business. I vigorously protested the setting up of this bureaucratic scheme.

The Forest Service, although rebuffed in its effort to create the Forest Products Service and spend $100,000,000, continues to press for Government ownership of private timberlands and strict Federal controls over the industry. In the 1943 annual report of the Forest Service, filed with Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, is found the following statement by Lyle F. Watts, Chief, Forest Service:

I believe that Federal forest legislation, including but not limited to regulation of cutting practices on private forest lands, is now more urgently needed than ever before.

On page 15 of this report is found recommendations for legislation, and I quote:

Three major lines of public action have been suggested:

1. Regulation of forest practices on private lands.
2. Aid to forest landowners.
3. Extension of public ownership.

In a speech delivered at Indianapolis, Ind., on December 13, 1943, Mr. Watts said:

Within the borders of national forests and purchase units already established are 50,000,000 acres of private land; of these some 36,000,000 acres should be acquired by the public, * * * 50,000,000 acres outside of existing national forests and purchase units should be given national-forest status. For perhaps another 50,000,000 acres State or community ownership seems desirable.

If Mr. Watts' suggestions are put into effect, there would not only be Government domination, supervision, and competition, but thousands of public schools could not successfully operate if these vast forest lands were purchased by the Government and removed from the tax rolls. Local self-government has suffered tremendously due to the present forest holdings of the Government, which totals 196,300,000 acres; about one-fourth of all the land area of America is Government-owned. It is time to call a halt while we still have the American system of free enterprise and freedom of opportunity. The growth of the monster Federal Government must end, and at the same time priorities, allocations, restrictions, and other Government controls which were brought on by the war should be stopped immediately after hostilities cease.

I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat entitled "Bureaucracy Eyes Our Forests":

BUREAUCRACY EYES OUR FORESTS

For several years Washington bureaucracy has had an eager eye on the Nation's privately owned woodlands. Here was a juicy plum if it could be plucked—a huge field for the extension of bureaucratic controls, jobs and spending.

Guardedly at first, then boldly under the guise of war necessity, the scheme was put forward. Private owners were misusing and wasting our forest resources, the Nation was told. We were skidding headlong into a timber shortage unless the thrifty and nurturing hand of bureaucracy—a grating laugh goes with that one—took charge.

Forgotten was all the earlier talk from the same Federal sources about the handsome job of timber conservation that was being done and how growth was keeping up with increasing wood demands. Those words and figures didn't fit the tune of looming timber scarcity unless bureaucracy took over the seedling to saw-log.

The proposal was rebuffed vigorously by forest owners. But bureaucracy never lets go of an idea for expanding its powers—and jobs. Evidence that it still cherishes this one is clear in a statement, released Monday, from the United States Forest Service.

The statement pictures our forests as shrinking under the huge war use of timber, while another vast demand for rebuilding Europe hovers over them. It says our forests must have better care to meet the present and prospective drains on their growth.

Then, outlining remedies, the statement urges as a major one, regulation of forest practices on private lands.

And there you are, Mr. Woodlot Owner, marked out for a red-tape halter if an already powerful bureaucracy can manage it. Better decide now, before the halter is slipped on, how you'd like taking orders on managing your woodlot from a Federal official and running to the county seat for a permit when you wanted to cut a few saw-logs.

To Arkansas, one of the great forest States, this matter is vitally important. We have proved that we can take care of our forests ourselves, though there still is much to be done. Most other States have given the same proof.

It would be one more wallop at the structure of State and local rights, already tottering, which cannot go down without taking our democracy down with it.

Congress Rebukes the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the able editor of the Webster News-Times in my district, Mr. Ray W. Behymer, has commented on the recent congressional action overriding the President's veto on the tax bill. This editorial entitled "Congress Rebukes the President," is worth reading:

CONGRESS REBUKES THE PRESIDENT

The New Deal, in the person of President Roosevelt, was given a stinging rebuke last week through the action of Congress in overriding Presidential veto of the $2,300,000,000 tax bill. The override vote of the House of Representatives, 299 to 95, and the override vote of the Senate, 72 to 14, followed close on the castigation by Senator ALBEN BARKLEY of President Roosevelt for his veto of the bill—probably the most severe by a Senate majority leader of his party chief in the history of the United States.

Ostensibly the congressional revolt was against the specific action of the tax-bill veto, but actually the result can be viewed as a revival of constitutional government; of repudiation of government by executive decree, and of rededication of the American principle of Government of, by, and for the people.

The tax-bill veto was only the excuse for the congressional revolt. The reason lies deeper. It lies in the resentment of Senators and Congressmen to the high-handed disdain with which the Executive has treated the legislative branch; in the hatreds engendered by the New Deal in the class warfare it has persistently fostered; in the expressed demand that all processes of American political life be subordinated to the whims of executive and personal control.

Reaction of the American public to the spectacle in Washington, as reflected by newspaper editorials throughout the Nation, range from unqualified approval of Senator BARKLEY and the congressional action by Republican papers of the North and Democratic papers of the South, through half-hearted explanations of what happened by so-called independent papers, to sobbing defense of the President and denunciation of Congress by New Deal publications.

Among the latter, although classified as independent, is the Chicago Sun, which said in part:

"To explain Senator BARKLEY's resignation as floor leader and the angry outbursts of House leaders, then, one must look farther afield (than the tax bill). We think the explanation lies in party politics plus the increasing willingness of Congress, under reactionary leadership, to serve the special interests of special groups."

The Chicago Sun, established by New Dealer Marshall Field III, to provide direct opposition to the antiadministration Chicago Tribune, aware of the New Deal administration's record of "serving special interests of special groups" is in a specious position charging the people's representatives with a "crime," the place for which has been set by its political overlord.

But other quotation would be only repetition. Comment to this point has brought us, in memory, to a page of the Clarksdale, Miss., Daily Press, issue of Monday, February 21, 1944, which reached our desk a couple of days ago. The Clarksdale Daily Press, as News-Times readers know, is the publication of Capt. Tom Gibson, native and formed resident of Webster, who writes the "Away Back When" column which regularly appears in the News-Times.

Before getting to the page aforesaid, it ought to be shown that Captain Tom, if not an unreconstructed rebel, certainly is an unreconstructed Democrat. On an all too brief visit in Webster a few months ago, Captain Tom paid his respects to the News-Times, and while in conversation paid his respects, too, to the Republican Party, as well as to the New Deal administration.

As Captain Tom spoke about the Republicans, you could almost hear a whisper from the Deep South—something about "damyankees." But that's another story. This concerns a more immediate situation as we quote Captain Tom, who is up to his ears in helping to establish the National BYRD for President Club, in part:

"The New Deal * * * etc. It looks like Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated for the fourth term. If he is, it's going to put me in a tough spot. I have said all my life that I would never vote a Republican ticket, but next November might be different. In voting, the Republican ticket is just about as low-down as I'll go. The New Deal * * *."

Use of Tokens by Office of Price Administration Instead of Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent tests of the use of the new tokens by the Office of Price Administration, reported in the Chicago newspapers of January 26, 1944, showed that tokens saved more than 50 percent of the time of shoppers and clerks at the cash-register counters. More than 200 key Chicago retailers and 40 professional shoppers, representing consumer groups, witnessed the demonstrations and acclaimed the results.

These tokens were put into use nationally February 27, 1944. They will save food stores and housewives millions of manhours every week and do much to eliminate the regular Friday line-up in grocery and meat stores.

I am inserting herewith a letter from the American Association of University Women on this subject, which is self-explanatory:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1944.

Mr. CHESTER A. BOWLES,
Director, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: We have just examined the plan for issuing ration tokens and have seen samples of the tokens which are to be used. We believe that the use of tokens will be a desirable step for both simplification and economy. It seems to us that the tokens are clearly distinguishable from anything else which women carry in their purses, and should cause no confusion with money or car tokens.

The only problem in putting the ration tokens into use which we see is that the coupons in ration book No. 4 are numbered 8, 5, 2, and 1, respectively, in each column. In the initial stages of using tokens there may be some confusion when each of these stamps is given the same value of 10 points. We feel sure, however, that consumers will quickly accustom themselves to the 10-point valuation for each stamp and will find the token plan easier to handle than the present plan.

Perhaps the most important result of the token plan will be the speeding up of the lines passing the cashier's counter. Less time lost in waiting to pay for purchases will be a real boon to war workers, particularly the women who must carry on two jobs—one in industry and one in homekeeping.

Sincerely yours,
ESTHER COLE FRANKLIN,
Associate in Social Studies.
CAROLINE F. WARE,
Chairman, National Committee on Social Studies.

Bimetallism Would Bring New Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mining Record, Denver, Colo., of February 24, 1944:

BIMETALLISM WOULD BRING NEW PROSPERITY

The western metal-mining States are facing a big post-war problem. When the soldiers return home there must be jobs for them. The metal-mining industry must be reorganized to provide as much work as possible. We can expect little cooperation from Washington bureaucrats, but we can curselves outline a campaign that will bring results.

Congressional new dealers threw a monkey wrench into western economical machinery when they stopped the corporation method of financing of mining and oil development. These industries afford the brightest outlook for employment of returning soldiers. But the handicap must be overcome. The Sullivan bill now before Congress, which would exempt mining and oil shares from the provisions of the Federal securities law, would bring a return of needed corporation financing so necessary for employment of labor.

It is also true that the West and the entire world would attain new prosperity through increased commerce if a world bimetallic standard were adopted. The United States is trying to save the world. To accomplish this, the United States should advocate the immediate adoption by the Allies of world bimetallism. This action would, in part, overcome the bad legislation placed on the statute books of the United States which may ultimately make ghost towns of formerly prosperous mining centers.

Bimetallism, at an honest ratio, would bring a return of prosperity to mining districts and also bring new prosperity to the

entire Nation and the world through increased commerce. The world should adopt bimetallism as soon as possible, so that when the war ends the gold-standard nations and the silver-standard nations can do business with gold and silver money with one bimetallic standard all over the world.

The stagnation that we face in the metal-mining districts and oil fields as a result of ill-advised laws could be overcome in part by the adoption of bimetallism. The Washington administration can save its face through adoption of bimetallism and thus bring our western mining districts back to the activity to which they are entitled.

Adjusted-Service-Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed legislation providing for mustering-out pay for veterans in the service it was generally agreed that future legislation would be enacted providing for vocational training, rehabilitation, and adjusted-service pay. A number of bills are now pending in Congress dealing with these various subjects. The matter of adjusted-service pay has been under study for some time by the several veterans' organizations. Recently the Army and Navy Union, the Disabled American Veterans, the Regular Veterans Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States unanimously agreed on a proposal for adjusted-service payments to men and women discharged from the service.

I am today introducing the bill that they have unanimously approved as a basis for consideration. There will be no disagreement in Congress as to whether or not an adjusted-service-pay bill should be enacted. Congress will no doubt follow the example set in World War No. 1 by enacting legislation that will tend to equalize the compensation between those who served in civilian life and those who were called into military service. This is the least our Nation can do for the millions of men and women who were taken from civilian employment and placed in military service for the defense and protection of our Nation. There will no doubt be much discussion in the legislative halls on the amount that is to be paid. The decision on the amount of adjusted-service pay will be arrived at after extended hearings in both branches of Congress. I am introducing the bill sponsored by these organizations as a basis for these hearings.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a statement signed by the officers of the various organizations which have unanimously agreed on the proposal I am introducing today, together with a brief analysis of the bill:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1944.*

To Whom It May Concern:

The undersigned, duly authorized representatives of five national veteran organizations wholeheartedly endorse, and request early congressional consideration and favorable action on an adjusted-service-pay bill—for services rendered—which will provide adjusted-service-pay credits of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with a maximum of $3,500 for home service and a maximum of $4,500 where foreign service was had; plus an extra credit of $500 if wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, to all who serve honorably in the present war. Payments to be made in bonds, with coupons, issued by the Treasury Department upon certification from the War or Navy Departments.

THE ARMY AND NAVY UNION,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
WARREN E. MILLER, *National Commander.*
REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION,
W. M. FLOYD, *National Commander.*
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
MILLARD W. RICE,
National Service Director.
MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
FRANK HALEY,
National Legislative Representative.
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL FOR SERVICES RENDERED

A credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with an extra credit of $500 where wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, would be allowed all who serve honorably in the armed forces of the present war.

A minimum credit of $100 for any home service, and of $500 where any foreign service was had, with a maximum credit of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where foreign service was had; and where the extra credit of $500 for wound applies, a maximum allowable of $5,000.

Upon application by the veteran to the War or Navy Departments the respective Secretaries would certify to the Treasury Department the amount due, and the Secretary of the Treasury would issue bonds in the highest multiple of $50, according to amount due. When the total amount due any veteran is less than $300, payment with check would be made by the Department honoring the application.

The bonds will bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which interest would cease. The bondholder would have the option to withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing the attached coupons, or could retain all or part of such coupons to draw the prescribed interest up to the full 10-year period.

The bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to liens, and would be a property right, reverting to the veteran's next of kin or estate in case of death. Where the veteran's death occurs prior to application, the application may be made by his next of kin or his estate.

EIGHT REASONS IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

1. This adjusted-service-pay method would provide a tangible, earned reward for all who serve honorably—from buck private or apprentice seaman to four-star general or admiral, inclusive.

2. The reward would be measured according to length and place of service, proportionate to the service rendered and the sacrifice made.

3. The reward belongs to those who earn it, or their estates, and would be usable without bureaucratic control, or interference with State rights.

4. Determination and distribution of the reward would require the very minimum of administration and creates no new agencies or supervisory boards.

5. A reasonable safeguard is provided against hasty and unwise spending, by permitting a withdrawal of only one-fifth of the total reward each year for a 5-year period.

6. An incentive to save is extended by applying 3-percent simple interest for first 5-year period and 3-percent compound interest for the second 5-year period.

7. The over-all cost to the Nation would be less than the cost of 4 months of actual war expenditures in 1944.

8. This earned-reward method would be the American way.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. To adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay, including food, clothing, shelter, and medical care of those who serve in the armed forces of the present war and civilians who work in war industry.

Question. Aren't the adjusted credits of $3 and $4 per day, allowed in this bill, rather high?

Answer. No; not when you consider the pay of those in the armed forces compared to civilian war workers. The average yearly pay (365 days) of all persons in the armed forces, including the value of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, is estimated at less than $2,300, or approximately $6 per day. Would the addition of the credits provided be unreasonable when compared to the earnings, comparative safety, and freedom of civilian war workers?

Question. Would a veteran who is eligible to receive pension, hospitalization, and vocational training because of service-connected disabilities, also be entitled to the adjusted-service pay?

Answer. Yes; certainly. The other benefits are granted because the veteran actually suffered disability or vocational handicap in line of duty, and they have no relation to pay adjustments.

Question. Why not wait until the close of the war to make pay adjustments?

Answer. Already over a million persons have been discharged—many with combat disabilities—and others being discharged at a present rate of 30,000 per month. It is entirely possible 3,000,000 persons may be discharged long before hostilities cease. Why should they wait for their pay adjustment? The knowledge this adjusted pay will be available should be a decided morale factor.

Sponsored by Army and Navy Union, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Regular Veterans Association, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

More About Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me over the N. B. C. network on Saturday, March 4, 1944:

Perhaps you are tired of hearing about subsidies. Twice within the last year the ques-

tion of subsidies has come up for extended discussion in Congress. Twice both Houses, by large majorities, have passed legislation prohibiting certain types of subsidies. Twice the President has vetoed this legislation. In neither case were the opponents of subsidies able to muster the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the bill over a veto. It might be thought that this settles the issue, but I do not believe that any issue is settled until it is settled right. Up to date this issue has not been settled right. I am sure, therefore, that there will be further action on the subsidy question in Congress within the next few months.

It is unfortunate that the subject of subsidies is so complex. That accounts for the fact that there is and has been a great deal of confusion on the subject even in the minds of well-informed people. One reason is that there are subsidies and subsidies. Some types of subsidies, like those on copper and other strategic materials, or those on oil seeds such as peanuts, flax, and soybeans, have been helpful and have saved the Government and the taxpayers of this country substantial sums of money. I know of no objection to this type of subsidy. The continuation of subsidies of this kind has never been an issue in Congress.

The type of subsidy which is in disrepute is what is known as a consumer or roll-back subsidy. The purpose of these subsidies is to pay a part of everybody's food bill, irrespective of his ability to pay it himself. This is the type of subsidy which has been banned twice by large majorities in Congress. In some cases these subsidies are paid to farmers, in others to processors, but the payment is passed on to the consumer through an adjustment of ceiling prices. The consumer benefits to the same extent as if the subsidy were paid to him directly.

During all of the discussion of subsidies, the principal argument advanced for consumer subsidies has been that the Federal Government must pay a part of the food bill of this country or have the war effort sabotaged by strikes and labor trouble. This argument is set out succinctly in the minority report on the Steagall bill, which was recently vetoed by the President. On that subject the report contains this language: "The only protection against increased wages is the maintenance of the present price structure. If prices are increased, demands for increased wages will follow immediately. If these demands are resisted, production of essential war equipment will be impaired." Substantially the same argument has been advanced by the President in the course of several messages to Congress.

Those who take this viewpoint, apparently consider consumer subsidies as a program of appeasement to organized labor. If they are so considered, however, it must be admitted that the President's role as an appeaser has been no more successful than was that of Chamberlain at Munich. We have seen what happened in the coal and railroad strikes. We are going to see the same thing happen with respect to the demands of the steel workers for substantial wage increases. The fact that we had in effect a subsidy program costing over a billion dollars annually had no effect whatever in preventing or settling the coal strike or the rail strike. In both cases, after much maneuvering by the administration and a lot of mumbo-jumbo about the Little Steel formula, 15-minute lunch periods, and portal-to-portal pay, the strikers received, not all they asked, but substantially more than they ever expected to get. This administration has been in power long enough now that we know just about what it will do under any set of circumstances. I am sure there is no well-informed person who doesn't expect a flock of wage increases between now and next November. The only question is what particular method of higher mathematics will be used to get away from the Little Steel formula so as to save everybody's face and still grant substantial increases. What we do or don't do in the case of subsidies isn't going to have the slightest effect on wage increases.

There might be some justification for either wage increases or subsidies if the cost of living were actually advancing faster than wages and salaries. The facts of the matter, however, are just the opposite. Since the war began, hourly earnings in manufacturing industries have increased 42 percent, weekly earnings over 70 percent and the cost of living only 23 percent. In other words, the average factory worker is far better off today as far as income and the cost of living are concerned than he was when the war began. Since then our national income has doubled. It is true are a few people whose incomes have not increased, but their numbers are not as large as supposed. Most families have had substantial increases in income because wage rates have increased, hours are longer, and additional numbers of the family are working.

It is true that food prices have advanced more rapidly than some other prices, but in spite of this, the average American has consumed more good, wholesome, nourishing food during the last 2 years than ever before in our history. Notwithstanding this fact, we are today spending only 21 percent of our total income for food. If we were eating food of the kind and quantity that we ate for the 5 years preceding the war, we would be spending only 16 percent of our national income for food. There is no country anywhere in the world today whose people come anywhere near the American people as far as quality and quantity of food are concerned, and no nation where as small a proportion as 21 percent of the national income is spent for food. In the light of that, does the demand for food subsidies seem justifiable?

One of the amazing developments in connection with the discussion of subsidies has been the gross exaggerations which have been carried in the press and over the radio with respect to prospective increases in the cost of living if subsidies are discontinued. You have heard perfectly fantastic figures on this subject, all of them implying that if subsidies were discontinued, prices would advance at a terrific rate. Not one of these commentators or writers has been able to offer the slightest support for his argument, but naturally many housewives who have heard these statements have been alarmed. The only way these statements can be justified is on the theory that if we don't have subsidies we are not going to have price control. The people who make those arguments forget that the price-control law stays on the statute books whether we have subsidies or not. If we wiped out every consumer subsidy today, the O. P. A. would still have every bit of the authority which it has always had to impose ceiling prices. The fact of the matter is, the greatest increase in food prices has been in fresh fruits and vegetables, a field which the O. P. A. has barely touched. Housewives who paid $6 or $7 a bushel for canning peaches last summer and fall, and similar prices for other fresh fruits and vegetables, know how the O. P. A. has fallen down on the job in this particular. For more than a year the O. P. A. price schedules on citrus fruits were such that dealers' margins were far higher than in normal times, all of which was passed on to the consumer.

Recently the O. P. A. has acknowledged its failure in this regard and has come out with a new schedule which has considerably reduced citrus-fruit prices to the consumer. Yet, people in the O. P. A. who are responsible for these exorbitant prices are among those who have been making extravagant statements as to how much the cost of living would go up if we did away with subsidies. The American people have a right to demand that the O. P. A. do its duty by dealing with the price situation in a realistic way instead of demanding large appropriations of the taxpayers' money to cover up its mistakes. Let the O. P. A. enforce the law as Congress wrote it, and housewives will not have to worry about the cost of food.

Wages continue to go up, notwithstanding the fact that Congress directed the President to stabilize both wages and prices as of September 1942. As long as wages rise costs will go up. It will be necessary to have some slight price increase to take care of these advancing costs. If the O. P. A., however, will hold these price advances to the amount of actual increases in cost and if the President will carry out Congress' direction to stabilize wages we need have no fear of runaway prices.

Now, let me briefly refer to some of the objections to consumer subsidies. In the first place, they are inflationary. They have the same effect as wage increases. They give consumers expanded purchasing power without additional goods to purchase. They increase the amount of money available for purchases in the black market. They increase the national debt. They result in no increase in production.

Such subsidies are objectionable also because, once started, they are bound to expand. They started at the rate of only a few hundred million dollars annually. Now they are over a billion dollars annually and advancing all the time. The President has talked of $2,000,000,000 or more per year, and some advocates of subsidies have used even higher figures. Being in the nature of an appeasement, the extent to which subsidies will go depends entirely upon the demands of those advocating them.

Another question which is bothering a good many people is whether we can get rid of food subsidies after the war. Today we are paying a smaller proportion of our national income for food than ever before. If it is necessary for the Government to pay a part of the country's food bill now, how will it be possible to deny similar demands after the war, when unemployment and reduced wages confront us?

Processors and farmers object to subsidies because they have been, and are being, used to regiment and control those who receive them.

But I think the principal reason that most Americans oppose consumer subsidies at this time is because they regard them as a cowardly and unfair effort to pass a part of our grocery bill on to the next generation and to the men who are fighting our battles all over the world today. Here we are, safe at home, making far more money as a Nation than ever before in our history; here we are on the average consuming more and better food than ever before in our lives; here we are, so well off that we spent over $6,000,000,000 for alcoholic liquors alone in 1943; yet, if the supporters of subsidies have their way, when our soldiers come back from the fighting front we are going to present them with the biggest grocery bill in history. There may be good American citizens who want to take the responsibility for this. I do not. That is the reason I say this subsidy question has not been settled and will not be settled until it is settled right. I think the American people believe in a pay-as-you-go philosophy as far as that is possible. Unfortunately, we cannot pay the entire cost of the war as we go. We are going to have to pass on a large part of that expense to the next generation. Surely, however, in this, the most prosperous period in our entire history, we can at least pay our own grocery bills.

Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, in support of the Worley substitute for the emasculated soldier voting bill, in a speech in this House I said, in substance, that the substitute calling for Federal distribution and transmission back to the States was the surest, simplest, and most adequate procedure for affording the members of our armed forces an opportunity to vote; that due to the number of men in the forces, their location all over the globe, and the inability of the States to get the ballots to them, it was necessary that a Federal plan of distribution and collection be adopted; that this was no invasion of States' rights because when the ballots are returned by the Government the determination of their validity is left to the States; that the bill reported out on the floor was full of insurmountable practical obstacles which would prevent the men from exercising the privilege of absentee voting.

During the course of the several days' debate, statements were made that the soldiers were not bothering about exercising their right to vote. From my observation of our people, they value the right of suffrage. I believe that those who are carrying the brunt of this war are interested in having a voice in the selection of the officials of the country and in the form of government which they are fighting to preserve. No other American can have a higher right of exercising his voting privilege.

In this soldier-vote controversy they are not interested in technicaliites and conditions, but as far as this legislation is concerned, they are primarily interested in a simple practical means of voting.

The following poem, sent by Corp. Henry Bowen to the Calvert Independent, a weekly newspaper published in Calvert County, Md., evidencing an interest in the franchise and not technicalities and obstructions, recently appeared in that paper. Corporal Bowen is from Holland Point, Md., and is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Bowen. He was wounded in action and has been in an overseas Army hospital for some months:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

My Uncle Sam said see here Joe
I know you're earnin' lots of dough,
A workin' on the farm all day
To make the harvest really pay:
But now I need you for a fight
To fix things up and make 'em right;
So men can work an' live an' pray
In what we call the U. S. way.
So I an' millions left for war
To finish off this newest chore.
Yet while we're gone, it's in the mill,
A few at home are out to kill
Our right to exercise franchise
Through politics and even lies
Designed to keep us from the polls
Though votin's done from deep fox holes.
But we have beaten super-Huns
With bayonets and planes and guns,
We've beaten, too, the tricky Japs
Who thought all Yanks were braggin' saps,
These victories none can deny,
Though each in turn caused some to die.
An' GI's we, will never fail
No matter where the troop ships sail,
All liberties we will defend
At home, abroad, until the end.
Then we will beat those who say
You cannot vote election day.

Power and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an address delivered by Mr. Reber Boult, at Layman's Day services in the West End Methodist Church, of Nashville, Tenn.

The very thoughtful address follows:

POWER OF RESPONSIBILITY

I

This is layman's day. This has been an institution of the Methodist Church for years; and was only last year integrated into the week of dedication, where it found a wellspring of response in the life of the church. Last year, largely through the vitality of the board of lay activities, headed by a Tennesseean, Dr. George L. Morelock, more than 40,000 laymen spoke from Methodist pulpits or platforms in this season; this year it is thought that thousands more will actively participate.

The Methodist Church started as a layman's church. Part of its appeal was a revolt against the stultifying formalism of a ritualistic worship, and the repression of an autocratic church government. In past years, in this church, there may have been too much of a tendency to let the bishops, the general officers, the connectional boards, and the preachers run the church and its affairs, both temporal and spiritual; but there has been a growing tendency encouraged by those very church leaders (and centralized in the board of lay activities) to inject the voice of the Methodist congregation into the councils of policy, and to project the influence of Christian laymen more vitally into the life of the world.

John Wesley said: "The world is my parish." I say to you: There are not enough ordained preachers and consecrated missionaries in this and in all other denominations to serve that parish.

Therefore, on this day, I not only feel a responsibility to say something to you, which shall possibly feed and stimulate your thoughts; but more strongly still, I assume the privilege of speaking for you, for us, the laity of this church.

II

I am a Methodist layman.

I believe in Jesus Christ as the source of spiritual power, because He so claimed: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

I affirm that the church of God through the agency of the Holy Spirit is the recipient of that power, for such as choose to use it, that its membership constitute the heirs of its traditions; the proof of its message, and the voice of its promise.

I devote my obligations to its saints, my homage to its traditions, my respect to its leaders, my reverence to its inspiration; and

I accept my obligation to its calls; my responsibility to live according to its rightful demands; my consecration to its message.

III

Were I a minister, and entitled to dignify this talk with a text, I should select the eighth verse of the first chapter of Acts, where Jesus is quoted: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

"Ye shall receive power. * * *" The only condition imposed is that the Holy Ghost shall have come upon you—not after you have been ordained a minister, consecrated a bishop, or answered a call to serve as a missionary. When you accept Jesus Christ as your persona Saviour; in sum, when you join the church with all that the greater dignity of such a step demands "Ye shall receive power. * * *"

As a layman, we are in touch with power, we have power. While I do not wish to oversimplify, and thereby limit, it may be likened to the current of electricity which is wired into your home. You may sit the dark hours through, with no response from all the powerful current available to you, until you reach out and turn the switch. Then that power is converted into light for you to use.

"What power?" you ask. So also did the assembly of the San Hedrin ask Peter after he had made the cripple walk. Peter said:

"Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him does this man stand here before you whole."

Further he told them:

"This is the stone which you discarded, but which now has become the cornerstone."

Peter was telling these people that they had been offered the same source of power, but that they had discarded it.

You are in touch with this power, which in those days brought the dead to life and made the helpless walk.

Let's not hide behind the clergy on this. Far from blaming the official family of the church for assuming authority, I think our leaders have had a large measure of this responsibility pushed off on them by the laymen.

True enough, our bishops and ministers have their responsibilities and they are striving to measure up; in by far the greater number of instances. Then, too, even a bishop is only human. He's only a preacher who was once a layman. And as for the preacher, he's only a layman once removed.

Particularly in recent months, we have seen our College of Bishops take the lead in a crusade for a new world order; and this season of dedication is another example of the energy of the official family of the church.

What is it they are trying to do? They are devoting all of their lives to—well, to do what?—to interpret the gospel, and to fix on us a stronger realization of our place in God's Kingdom on earth; and to bring the unchristian to be like us.

"To be like us." Like you. Like me. Yes, that's it. And it's a test few of us like to face. But there we are—the majority of us reared in Christian homes, brought through the Sunday school into the church. At least we came into the church after a life in a Christian community. We are the proof of Christianity. We are the fruit of 2,000 years of living in the time of our Lord.

What do we prove?

Therein lies the personal, individual responsibility of every professing Christian. For with power in any form, as the night follows day, comes responsibility.

IV

This responsibility may well be divided into areas, without lessening its intensity. For orderly consideration, let us divide it into these areas: (1) Individual, (2) home, (3) church, (4) community and personal contacts, (5) nation, (6) the world.

1. More than a year ago I was sitting in this congregation with my family, and also with a young soldier. Later that day, at the dinner table, he began to ask each of us what we had been thinking about while the pastor was praying. While I must confess that his interest was based more on psychological study than churchly doctrine, it brought us all sharply up against a question we rather disliked to answer. I suspect that at our table that day some of us indulged in what might be charitably called half-truths. Are you taking the trouble to switch on the light?

2. I believe that in the home there is a larger measure of acceptance of individual Christian responsibility than in any other area. With the ties of love that bind hearts so closely, there is more inclination to find a way to render a service, to lighten a load, to brighten a lonely spirit. Of course, I know and you know that this responsibility is evaded by some, who do not send, much less bring, their children to the Sunday school and who do not make Jesus a friendly part of the household. By making of God a loving father, and of Jesus a friend by daily association, not only will the parents profit, but the children will absorb the idea that the heavenly friends, the parents, the home, and the family are all bound up together in a relationship that is beautiful to them, and will serve as a beacon light from which they can set out upon their uncharted sea as their years unfold.

3. Nathan Bedford Forrest once said, "One soldier in motion is worth three standing still." We have our share of churchmen in West End, and in all Methodism for that matter, who are standing still, if not sitting down.

Under no circumstances would I presume to tell you or any other layman just what you should do. My leading purpose is to suggest to you that you have a personal responsibility to do something.

I have heretofore affirmed that the church through the agency of the Holy Spirit is the recipient of the power made available to us all. It is more than that. It is the active agent through which this power is transmitted. It is charged with energy and is a source of light just as effectively as electric current is the source of energy and light. Just as you turn the switch and make electric energy and power available to you in light, heat, and its other manifestations, even so must you associate yourself with the church and take some affirmative action to make its energy and power available to you. You probably first came in contact with this power at or shortly before the time you joined the church. It is equally probable that none of us have availed ourselves of the tremendous resources which are latent therein.

It would be fine if it were not necessary to have organized churches in order to accomplish the evangelistic work of the world. However, no one could deny or wish to eliminate the uplift that comes from the worship service of the church. Since we are humans and are not yet eligible for the celestial choir, it was necesary to have an organization dedicated to the spread of the Christian doctrine and to its interpretation and worship. In this organization lies a directing plan to assist us in defining our responsibility; to furnish us with a plan under which we can give our energies, and accomplish the limited objectives of the single church, and the unlimited objectives of the general church.

It is a truism to say that any single church is simply a collection of individuals. To the degree that those individuals assume a vital responsibility for the advancement of the church, in that way only is the church successful. It is not possible for you on the one hand to claim allegiance to a church through your membership, and at the same time contribute to its progress by standing still.

4. This thought leads into a consideration of the next area of responsibility, that represented in your relationship to the community and your personal contacts. The church cannot be isolated from the community any more than you can keep from influencing the attitude of your friends and your community by your assumption of Christian responsibility, or your failure so to do.

We do have a greater responsibility once we have associated ourselves with the church. Many of us serve as horrible examples. I am sure that everyone present has, at one time or another, heard someone say that they did not want to join the church, or did not want to contribute to the church, because So-and-So was such an old hypocrite. In other words, the entire church is being judged by the community reaction to one or more members who are derelict in their responsibility.

Nor is it enough to be negatively nonoffensive. Wendell Phillips once said, "How prudently most men creep into nameless graves, while now and then some bold man forgets himself into immortality."

If we are the proof of 2,000 years of the Christian message, it is not enough to us to evade issues, cut through back alleys, and dodge responsibility, instead of aggressively pursuing the good for our church.

5. What is the Christian layman's responsibility to his Nation?

Again, I say that I cannot tell you just what you should do, but I am confident that there is a need for a more definite interest in national affairs on the part of churchmen, and a corresponding conviction on the part of governmental leaders that these laymen are the voice of the enlightened people. In this, as in other areas, we cannot sit idly by and trust that all things will work out well if let alone. Nor can we be content to say it will not do any good to take an active interest in governmental affairs since our vote will not be counted if cast. It is certainly true that it will not have a chance to be counted unless we do cast it. It is also true that our ideas will never have a chance to be considered unless we utter them. Let us be men in motion rather than men in waiting.

"Static right is no match for dynamic wrong." "Moral convictions serve no purpose until they are translated into action."

I said that I wanted to be able to speak for you, as well as to you. I believe most laymen, the grass-roots variety, are wholeheartedly in support of our Nation in its war effort. Their sons and daughters, the fathers of their grandchildren, are fighting it. Furthermore, I believe most laymen want our official church to go on record and say so in no uncertain terms. I believe that they resent such organizations as the Peace Now Movement. I believe that they do not want their religion, as represented by their church, to be a hothouse plant which would wither and die upon exposure to the rugged conditions of the world in which we live.

I agree with anyone who argues that war is terrible. There are things more terrible, such as the condition of the subjugated countries of the world. I believe in supporting this war, without which neither I, nor anyone else, would this day have an opportunity to speak his views from the pulpit of this or any other church.

I believe that pure pacifism is to religion what Christian Science is to the art of healing. It is fine, as far as it goes, but there are some conditions that only a surgical operation can relieve.

It is in this area that I think the Christian layman should make his influence felt in order that it may not be later said that the church went into retirement during the period of emergency, held its conferences in the sheltered cloisters, and returned only to enjoy the sunshine of peace and prosperity, then to tell the world how it should be run.

6. The last area is even more difficult of definition.

I do not see how there can be an enlightened Christian isolationist. We must assume our responsibility in world affairs. This is a Government of the people, and the Government will not assume such responsibility unless the people so will it. Therein lies our responsibility. We are the people.

We have tried the other way. Following the First World War we as a nation enacted the role of the Pharisee. We carefully drew our robes of nationalism around us, passed by on the other side of the ocean, and thanked God that we were not as other men. It took a world revolution to blow us out of our complacency. Revolution will succeed on revolution unless some form of world order is established.

In the days of our Revolutionary War, Thomas Paine wrote: "These are the times that try men's souls; the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink." Paine also relates the incident of his visit with a Tory innkeeper who refused to take any part in the Revolution because he wanted peace in his time. Paine pointed to the innkeeper's children, who were playing nearby and said to a friend, "Were this Tory a man, he would say: 'If there must be conflict with tyranny, let it come in my time. Let there be peace and freedom in my children's time.'"

The words and the story might be yesterday—today—tomorrow. These are the times that try men's souls, and in the field of our discussion today they might be paraphrased to read: "The summer Christian and the sunshine churchman will in this crisis shrink."

If there must be conflict with tyranny, let it come in our time and may we so plan that there may be lasting peace and freedom in the time of our children, and our children's children.

Just as it was truly said that a nation cannot exist half slave and half free, so a world cannot exist half slave and half free. That is a responsibility we cannot evade. We should make of the war an opportunity to emphasize the service to be given by the church rather than to be horrified when the subject is discussed in our pulpits. Bishop Arthur Moore said in Birmingham in 1936 that the Christian faith had made more progress in China during the Japanese invasion than it had in the 50 years preceding, because the Chinese learned and observed that the missionaries practiced a religion, which sometimes was their only source of material assistance and spiritual comfort.

Missions has come to be an unpopular subject in some circles. Yet, I dare say that the missionary effort has been the leaven which shall, in years to come, make possible the orderly spread of a peaceful world order. This field should be supported more strongly than ever before, not only by our dollars but by our convictions. Not only must we join in the conflict with tyranny, but we must contribute toward that better day of a brave new world when there shall be peace and freedom.

V

This is not only a dreadful responsibility, it is a wonderful opportunity. If we can overcome the scourge and build a permanent peace, then indeed we shall have seen the morning break and shall have experienced a touch of the eternal.

This fragment of a poem was taken from the body of a dead Australian soldier:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rends the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part
In Freedom's crowning hour,
That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
'I saw the powers of darkness take their flight;
I saw the morning break!'"

In this opportunity we are not alone. For not only did Jesus say "Go ye into all the world"; but he also said: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Washington, through a bill passed this week end by the State legislature and which is coordinated with the Federal measure reportedly approved by the House and Senate conferees, has guaranteed to every eligible service man and woman, and also, in fact, to every single Washington resident now serving his country in any way outside its borders, the right and the opportunity to vote in this year's elections.

By opportunity I mean that these service people from my State now have a full and a free opportunity to vote. They can vote a complete ballot; they can vote it through a simple, quick, and nontechnical method; they can be sure their votes will be counted. I am indeed proud to report that my home State has made every possible effort, and will continue to make every effort, to facilitate such voting. My home State wants its soldiers and sailors and marines and its merchant seamen and Red Cross workers and all its other citizens overseas to vote a full, countable ballot. That desire is realized in this new law of Washington.

This new law was born of unselfish, nonpartisan efforts on the part of the legislators and of the administration of a great Governor, Arthur B. Langlie. The Governor took the lead in creating this assurance that all our people overseas, and all our servicemen everywhere shall have the privilege of voting as easily, if not more easily even, as the folks back home. I want to extend my personal and official congratulations to Governor Langlie and to the members of the legislature, regardless of party, who have brought into being this new absentee voting law primarily for the benefit of our fighting men and women.

Governor Langlie and the legislature have thereby proved beyond question that my home State is not only clearly conscious of its responsibilities, in and to the Union, but that it has the men and the brains and the initiative to fully meet every test which those responsibilities entail. I feel that my State has again proved that it is sovereign within its realm, and that it does not need either the paternalistic or the dictatorial hand of the Federal Government to guide it, or to force it, in the conduct of its affairs.

I want to review briefly the salient provisions of the soldier-voting law just adopted in my State. First, it applies not only to service men and women everywhere, but to all those in service auxiliaries overseas, to Red Cross workers, merchant marine members, civilian employees of the armed forces, and to any citizen sojourning outside the 48 States. It also applies to every eligible person who has been discharged from the armed forces, but who has not had time to reregister for voting.

It provides these people may vote Federal ballots if they have sought but have been unable to obtain the State ballots. One applicatior for the ballots serves for all elections. The application is simplicity itself, and the law "leans over backward," as is proper, to give virtually any type of application the full effect of the most technically correct kind. Registration requirements are waived. The ballots can be voted very simply, and their delivery is by air mail, both coming and going. My State has appropriated $170,000 to administer this act. This includes the necessary air mail postage cost, in the event the Federal act does not give these ballots free airmail passage. The law also provides that the ballot can be shortened and lightened, to facilitate transportation, but its contents cannot be decreased or increased. In other words, my State's servicemen will get to vote a full ballot, not a "short-change" ballot, unless it so happens that the better ballot has been delayed in transit.

The law advances our State primary to July 11, 2 months earlier than usual, to give our soldiers plenty of time to get their ballots and to send them back. The ballots are countable for 25 days after the primary, and for 18 days after the general election.

The act takes effect immediately. I would like to quote in full one provision, which keynotes the evident and heartfelt desire of my State's present administration and of all those who worked for and voted for this new measure: "This act shall be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes, and so that all war voters may be afforded an opportunity to fully exercise their voting rights granted herein."

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of a law which the service people want. They do not want a bobtailed, short-changing ballot. They want the full opportunity to vote, they want this opportunity presented to them in the simplest possible way, and above all they want their votes to count. I am indeed proud and grateful that my State, and its Governor and legislature, has so completely fulfilled every one of these desires.

Old Man River Is Doing His Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and article which I have received from Mr. Lachlan Macleay, president, Mississippi Valley Association:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, Mo., February 28, 1944.

Hon. WALTER PLOESER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLOESER: Since December 7, 1941, all tonnage figures on the inland waterways have been regarded as a military secret. This month, information regarding a portion of the tonnage moved has been released. This does not include lend-lease commodities and certain strategic materials, about which information is still withheld.

From available figures we have been able to show the great increase in the movement of tonnage on the inland waterways and to indicate something of the tremendous value of the Mississippi River system to the war effort.

We enclose a copy of this statement which we hope will merit your interest.

Kindest regards,

Sincerely,

LACHLIN MACLEAY,
President.

How the inland waterways are performing a vital war service is revealed in the first detailed figures on inland-waterway tonnages released by the War Department since this country's entrance into the war. The figures, which have been made available to the Mississippi Valley Association, show that the combined tonnage on the Mississippi River system and the Intracoastal Canal in 1942 increased 35 percent over 1940, and the ton mileage increased 41 percent.

Heretofore inland-waterway-tonnage figures have been withheld because of censorship regulations. Information on the movement of certain strategic materials and lend-lease commodities continues to be withheld, but the information made public emphasizes the important role the water carriers are playing in helping meet the greatest transportation demand in the country's history.

Exclusive of ocean-going cargo on the lower Mississippi River and the movement of certain strategic materials and lend-lease commodities, the gross traffic on the rivers of the Mississippi waterway system in 1942 was 125,208,371 short tons—an increase of more than 29 percent over 1940. Eliminating all duplications of movements between two or more of the individual component waterways of the system, the net traffic in 1942 amounted to 92,147,944 tons—an increase of 26 percent over 1940.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, skirting the Gulf of Mexico between Texas and Flor-

ida via New Orleans, handled an additional 21,268,183 tons—an increase of 82 percent over 1940.

The combined traffic handled by all of the rivers of the Mississippi waterway system above New Orleans and the Intracoastal Waterway, exclusive of lend-lease and the strategic materials on which figures are restricted, was 146,476,554 tons—an increase of 35 percent over 1940. The ton mileage of commodities handled by these combined waterways in 1942 was 18,816,644,000—an increase of 41 percent over 1940.

Figures for 1943 have not been fully compiled. Those available for the first 6 months of that year show that ton-miles of 11 of the principal commodities handled substantially increased over 1942, although coal, which is included and is second in importance, decreased about 15 percent, evidently due to the temporary stoppage of coal mining in 1943.

In addition to the restricted items referred to, these figures do not include the tonnage of seagoing craft newly or partly built at shipyards on the inland waterways but destined for ocean service. Approximately 1,000 military and naval vessels of substantial sizes and various types have been built at inland yards during the years 1942 and 1943 and moved without accident to the tidewater ports of the Gulf via the improved channels of the Mississippi River system for placement in commission.

A large number of war vessels built on the Great Lakes, or others which have been requisitioned from the existing fleet, many of them more than 300 feet in length, have been moved via the Mississippi River, the short way to the seaboard, free from the submarine menace and other ocean hazards, for equipping or reconditioning in Gulf shipyards.

The highly useful role being played by the inland waterways is especially emphasized when it is realized that much of the commercial cargo upon which river transportation lines were dependent in normal times has disappeared during the war period.

Furthermore, this record was made despite the fact that during 1942 about 160 dry-cargo steel barges with a carrying capacity of approximately 250,000 tons were voluntarily relinquished by the river operators for conversion to oil carriers to relieve the acute shortage of petroleum products in the north Atlantic area. These barges were out of use for a considerable period of time, but since conversion to oil carriers have served a vital role in this emergency.

Old Man River, which has served the Nation in peacetime, is doing his part in the winning of the war, just as he will help win the peace by contributing to the economic prosperity of the midcontinent area.

Post-War Development of Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I urge that no further time be lost in making complete preparations for the construction of a vast network of waterways in the post-war period. For years the development of these waterways has proceeded toward the time that they can be joined in one great Nation-wide system. There are still many gaps, both in coastal and inland waterways. When they are joined, so that there can be an unimpeded flow of commodities benefiting from low-cost transportation, we shall find stimulus for trade as well as incentive for greater use of our ports.

The actual construction of these projects will serve a valuable purpose in providing work and in encouraging industrial activity during a period of transition from war to peace time production. But aside from this important consideration, the relatively small cost of completion of the waterways program will be justified many times over by the savings which will be made possible in the costs of transportation and the resulting benefits to the people of our entire Nation.

The Congress has consistently gone on record, and rightfully so, to preserve and foster rail, truck, and water transportation. Our Nation is so large in physical area that economical means of distribution from and to the different sections of our country are essential to the well-being of the people. Full recovery in the post-war period awaits an improvement of our distribution system. Undoubtedly, the development of our waterways can be made the basis of improved transportation for this great country.

Every dollar saved in distribution costs make an additional dollar of purchasing power in the hands of the consuming public, which, when used to raise their standards of living, makes for more jobs.

Water-transportation facilities that are presently available are inherently cheaper than any other form, and if utilized and improved in connection with rail and highway transportation there will result a net saving to the public and a living revenue to the participating carriers, resulting in increased commerce and employment, as well as being a stand-by for national defense.

Further development of waterways will open up water transportation to rich farming, mining, chemical, and forestry products, creating new wealth and increasing employment.

It is pertinent to note that modern river traffic is carried on steel barges, the largest of which holds as much as 3,000 tons of freight—a capacity equal to 75 boxcars. The large towboats can easily push a number of barges carrying approximately 10,000 tons, the equivalent of 250 freight cars. The average tow, however, runs around 5,000 tons, equal to 125 freight cars.

The Nation's sprawling web of inland waterways today is carrying a big share of the wartime load. Its lake steamers and snub-nosed towboats are hauling iron ore and coal to the steel mills. They are delivering steel to the Gulf coast shipyards. They are hauling southwestern chemicals a long way to eastern destinations. And, important among other things, they are increasing the flow of oil to the eastern oil-famine area, adding up a lot of materials being delivered, thus easing the strain on the overburdened railroads.

Oil for the East is moving along the Intracoastal Waterway, which parallels the Gulf coast from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Panama City, Port St. Joe, Carrabelle, and St. Marks, and the Atlantic coast from Miami to Trenton, N. J. A pipe line fills the overland gap across northern Florida, with its eastern terminus at Jacksonville. Another pipe line carries oil from northwest Florida's coast northward to Atlanta and Chattanooga. New barges are being built to increase the capacity of the system.

It is not unreasonable to say that Florida's coastal waterways made possible the success of the tremendous task of supplying oil to the East. Without these waterways the effort would almost certainly have collapsed. Necessary improvements to the Intracoastal Waterway from Corpus Christi to Carrabelle since the beginning of the war have greatly expanded its capacity and value.

Informed sources estimate that our inland waterways carried well over 120,000,000 tons of freight in the year 1943, with greater increases expected in the year 1944. This tonnage is almost four times the peak in the year 1918, the First World War period. Can anyone with such a showing before them doubt the value of inland waterways to our national defense activities?

This wartime contribution of the waterways is limited only by the manpower and equipment and further developments that are made available.

Upper Gulf coast ports have played a key part in coastal and in foreign shipments of essential war materials. Pensacola, Freeport, Panama City, Port St. Joe, Apalachicola, Carrabelle, and St. Marks all have a hand in this great work. Conversely, the importance of post-war shipping to these ports cannot be overemphasized.

With full realization of the value of waterway and port development I have asked for the inclusion of a number of items in the rivers and harbors bill now before the Congress. The authorization of construction of these items will go far to connect many presently uncompleted waterways and strengthen the economy of Florida and the Southeast. I wish to list the northwest Florida projects which have been placed in the bill for action by the Congress.

A project for St. Marks River as provided in House document No. 345 calls for the elimination of critical bends at the mouth of the river and at a point opposite Big Bayou. Total estimated cost is $172,000.

The Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to the St. Marks River is an authorized but unconstructed link in the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Authorization calls for the expenditure of approximately $512,000, which figure includes $32,500 for a removable-span railroad bridge across the Ochlockonee River near McIntyre. The annual maintenance cost of this waterway has been estimated by the United States engineers at $15,400. An alternate route possessing certain very desirable advantages will also be considered.

The improvement of Watson Bayou, on St. Andrews Bay at Panama City, contemplates a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the bay to the head of navigation in Watson Bayou, a distance of approximately 1¾ miles. The cost of dredging is not a major item in this project, and the annual maintenance is estimated at $1,000. Initial aids to navigation will cost an estimated $4,000 with an annual maintenance cost of $320.

There is a proviso in the bill which calls for great improvement in St. Josephs Bay, including a bar channel 32 by 300 feet, an inner harbor channel 30 by 200 feet, a turning basin 30 by 300 by 871 feet. The total cost of this work has been estimated at approximately $267,000, and the annual maintenance cost $25,000. My bill for the improvement of the Gulf County Canal and its acquisition by the United States was passed last year.

The improvement of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers in Georgia and Florida in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power development and other purposes has been proposed at an estimated cost of $6,500,000. Annual maintenance cost has been estimated at $200,000. Few projects can match this one in importance to the entire Southeast. Panama City with its new industrial importance will benefit markedly from cheap transportation to the Chattahoochee Valley.

Preliminary work has been done by the United States engineers with a view to improving the Chipola River in Florida in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power development.

A resolution calling for the improvement of LaGrange Bayou at Freeport includes the construction of a turning basin in the docking area which will greatly facilitate the discharge of oil and other cargoes at this point. The cost of this turning basin has been estimated at $12,000.

Extensive improvements are provided for in the bill for Pensacola Harbor, including deepening and widening the channels.

A waterway from the intercoastal waterway south across Santa Rosa Island to a point near Deer Point Light is proposed.

Improvement of the entrance to Perdido Bay—Alabama and Florida—from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in the Perdido Bay is included in the bill.

There is a resolution in the bill which calls for a waterway which will connect the Escambia and Alabama Rivers—Florida and Alabama.

These latter four items should be considered in their entirety, for they contribute jointly to port and shipping developments at Pensacola. This is one of the few ports of Florida strategically located to drain the rich and vast area of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and the industrial empire known as the Tennessee Valley.

The proposal to connect the port of Pensacola with the Alabama is to enable Pensacola to have a link with the proposed $100,000,000 Alabama-Coosa waterway project from Mobile to Rome, Ga.

With this connection, Pensacola would be able to obtain competitive rail rates, because of the water competition, which would be another great advantage for water-borne commerce.

The Alabama and Georgia territory is rich in such products as coal, steel, cement, cotton, and textiles. The Escambia link would place Pensacola closer to Selma, Montgomery, Gadsden, Anniston, and other points on the waterway to Rome, Ga., than competing ports. About 25 towns, ranging from 3,000 to 25,000, are situated in the river basin.

With the development of the Escambia link and the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee waterway, a gateway to northwest Florida ports would be opened from one of the most rapidly advancing industrial areas in the Nation.

Major activities of that area which have been stepped up by the war are steel, textiles, and chemical products. Mineral products include bauxite, Selma chalk for cement, coal, iron, arsenic ores, fluxing materials, lead, granite, marble, and slate.

In 1929 a survey by the United States engineers showed 2,000,000 tons of freight potentially available annually. Now it is estimated that from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 would be available.

Direct connections for this area through Florida ports and waterways with the Mississippi Valley and its great agricultural production, and with the oil-producing areas of the Southwest can lead to a trade and manufacturing revival of unprecedented proportions. The opportunity is there if we will capitalize on it.

Florida and the Nation stand to gain enormously by the logical development of its waterways. I urge again that the Congress lose no time in completing plans for this development.

A Patriotic Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call the attention of the House to one of the finest examples in service to country that I know of. I refer to the record of the family of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Norris, of Pensacola, Fla. Mr. and Mrs. Norris are the parents of 7 sons who are serving in our armed forces. They have 1 son who is serving as assistant supervisor at one of the United States Navy's auxiliary air fields, and 1 son and 2 daughters in school. Mr. Norris himself is a mechanic at the United States naval air station at Pensacola. The Norris boys in the service include twins Albert and Elbert, torpedomen, second class; Dewey D., storekeeper, second class; John T., torpedoman, second class; J. Edward, Jr., torpedoman, second class; and Garland H., seaman, first class; and Arthur J., United States Marine Corps. Other than their immediate family, the Norris' have 16 nephews and 1 niece in the armed forces.

Address by Lt. Col. H. H. Rice to Graduating Class of Athens College, Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address to the graduating class of Athens College, Athens, Ala., delivered on March 3, 1944, by Lt. Col. Heber H. Rice, formerly staff judge advocate of Huntsville Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., and now head attorney, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, in Washington; and following which address the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon Colonel Rice by Dr. Paul S. Haley, chairman of the board of trustees, with citation by Dr. E. R. Naylor, president of the college.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

It is with great pride that I am privileged to address you upon this occasion. To you who are going forth today into a new world of careers and activities, my hearty congratulations are extended. Your years of educational toil and effort leading to the degrees and tokens of scholastic achievements which you receive today, highly fit you to meet with courage and with confidence your sphere of life's requirements and the interesting problems and responsibilities which lie ahead. Education today is more significant and more vital than in former years, and those privileged to complete their college courses are very fortunate indeed. The war is breaking in upon all scholastic institutions and the college enrollments throughout our land are diminishing in a pronounced degree.

In the midst of a progressive world, we have a constant increase in new developments, such as radio, flying fortresses, magic carpets of the air, and the lightning media of communication and information. With the world's diversity of fields of action, and its myriads of specialized activities in this mighty age, your college education attained here will give you the sustaining power to meet competition in reaching your goals and objectives through the years to come. You will look back with pride upon your alma mater and cherish the recollections of these college days and accomplishments which have given you the required training for life's destinies. You will be ever proud of the opportunities made possible to you by Dr. Naylor, the president, whose great ability and fine educational background, including the fact that he has been president of three other colleges prior to the one at Athens, have won for him merited distinction among the educators of America.

As a battalion commander in the First World War and with long service in the Judge Advocate's field and its broad diversities in World War No. 2, I have tried to review history's panorama of events and study their causes and effects, that I may bring you a message of helpfulness.

Today finds us in the midst of the greatest war in all history, the first time a war with its staggering consequences has completely encircled the globe. The flower of America's manhood has now been called to the Nation's defense and the Nation's cause; compelled to leave in the midst of college careers and other fields of civil activities to meet the crisis and to help preserve our country's existence and its liberties, for the sake of our people and for the generations yet to come. The war has thus taken its toll from our colleges, but when the boys and girls return from the hundred fighting fronts, the college enrollments will rise to higher peaks, both with new students and some of the former ones returning to complete their courses intercepted by the bugle's call.

President Conant of Harvard University, who addressed a meeting which I attended last week, said that one of the first duties of the colleges to the servicemen returning to peace-time pursuits will be to dissuade them from the totalitarian government ideas and influences with which they will be imbued from their experiences in foreign countries. That is, the totalitarian nations believe that united and collective action of humanity in groups and numbers must be supreme over any individual considerations, and that the ends justify the means; whereas democracies believe, not in government by such cold rules of arithmetic, but that more of the standards of Christian ethics, shall be the criterion and be applied to our human peacetime dealings with each other. Another thought he presented was that speedier education will be in demand from those returning from war, in order to quickly prepare them to obtain suitable employment and resume their livelihood, or launch their careers anew. This may call for a college year of 12 months, consisting of three terms, with privilege to the student of entering at the beginning of any one of the terms.

In reviewing the war Gen. George C Marshall, Chief of Staff of the American Armies, and man of great personality and genius in the councils of war, told us at a recent dinner in Washington that "the Allied avalanche is at last in motion and will gather headway with each succeeding month," though he admonished that we must expect setbacks from time to time as we advance under the difficulties before us. Disclosing his receipt of protests from the public because flame throwers were used against the Japanese, General Marshall said that this shows a lack of "understanding of the meaning of our dead on the beaches of Tarawa." I heard Lieutenant General Vandegrift, who comprehended the invasion of the island of Tarawa, describe how our forces landed there and went ashore against the slaughtering fire of the Japs and finally took the beachhead after suffering these heavy casualties. Furthermore, the recent information received of our bleeding, starved, and beaten soldiers who died by the hundreds under cruelty of the Japanese captors on their march from Bataan as prisoners of war, contrary to the laws of war, teaches us that those enemies will show respect only to force and power in their severest form, and we must therefore act accordingly so long as we keep within the recognized rules of war, as we are doing. He further said that the bulk of the ground and air forces will be concentrated in Europe now, "where the great battles which are impending will decide the course of civilization." He described the 2,000 American heavy bombers now operating over Germany and occupied Europe as proceeding with the destruction of German industrial cities at a constantly increasing pace, that Berlin is now a shambles, and that "the people of Germany are experiencing the horrors of war, for which they are responsible, to a degree never before approximated in modern times." Also Admiral King, operating head of the Navy, said that the American offensive in the Pacific was gathering headway toward its objective—the defeat of Japan—and will move even faster when the time comes to make appropriate shift in our forces.

With 10,000,000 men called into service the women are taking over many of the responsibilities left on the home shores with both ingenuity and efficiency. Also many of our young women are now with the armed forces and some are at the battle fronts, all performing their parts with valor. The remarkable demonstrations of what the American women can do place them on a high pedestal and justly merit for them our Nation's tribute and gratitude.

Due to changes which this stupendous war will necessarily bring upon the world, you must expect to face and to bear heavier responsibilities than were hitherto required. The tremendous costs necessary to win the war must in time be liquidated and new adjustments made which call for sacrifices. Your splendid education here will better fortify you for the new responsibilities than any other medium of preparation that I know.

Athens College, founded in 1842, has stood through the century as a monument in the field of learning. The oldest building on the campus, Founders' Hall, with its historic columns, stands to grace the classic atmosphere of your cultured city of Athens. Though it bears bullet scars from the War between the States, time nevertheless has carried the institution through all the subsequent great events of history to the present moment, and has not and cannot efface its record of eminent success and as one of the fine institutions of learning in our land.

I see in this community and in more distant fields the graduates and former students of Athens College as outstanding citizens and leaders in their respective spheres of action.

You of the graduating class are fortunate in that your opportunities today for employment and success, or otherwise for immediate action in your own and in the Nation's interests, are perhaps the greatest known for many years. Take advantage of these opportunities while they are before you. The war has brought to the Nation's Capital for aid in its huge war program large numbers of young women and men from all the States, and thousands of additional employees are still being sought there, as well as in scores of other strategic centers throughout the United States. This may appeal to many of you and should not only put your education into practice, but increase your opportunities for success in new realms of influence. To the lady graduates, I can see for you brighter opportunities apparently than ever before. So many requirements and services are now in demand which women can fill.

In choosing your work and following your various avocations, be of fortitude, in mind and heart, and permit not yourselves to be too easily discouraged and disheartened by inconveniences, such as crowded conditions in war-production centers or in the National Capital, for we all must bear them, particularly in wartime, while striving to be efficient in our tasks. I know, with your preparation at this time, that you should and will achieve your aspirations and will win. To the young men, let your aims be success, be courageous, and with it all, be gentlemanly and courteous in your chosen business and professional careers as you go forward to attain new and higher goals of achievement. Doing the task a little better than the other person makes the difference between success and failure.

In addition, you have much to be proud of in the great State of Alabama. Her high place in the Nation will live in the annals of history. Montgomery, the capital of the State, with its historic traditions; Birmingham, the great industrial center of the South; Muscle Shoals and Wilson and Wheeler Dams, which produce inexhaustible electric power for this section of our country; Mobile, the great Gulf port; and the other important institutions of learning; all contribute to the State's high educational, commercial, and historic position in the Nation. The great statesmen and persons of prominence from Alabama, including her eminent Senators and Representatives in Congress, have taken a high place in America's hall of the illustrious. Further matters of historic interest include, among others, the battle on the Tallapoosa River in Alabama wherein the American troops, including those from this State, under command of Andrew Jackson, decisively defeated the Creek Indians at Horseshoe Bend. Likewise, the brave soldiers from Alabama, along with the sharpshooters from Kentucky and Tennessee fresh from the Battle of Tippecanoe, contributed to the victory of General Jackson at the famous Battle of New Orleans.

In World War No. 2 the sons of Alabama are playing a conspicuous part in the terrific engagements around the globe. As I read the accounts of her heroes whose bravery and daring in the jaws of death have won for them the medals of honor and the glories of war, I know the sons of Alabama will leave their names emblazoned on America's pages of history.

As we approach the crises in this war, not only have I complete confidence in Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, and our other great military leaders but I have also faith in the guiding hand of the Supreme Deity. Those generals state that there are no atheists in our bombing planes or in the fox holes where our brave lads are facing death. Our boys, while doing their physical utmost in this war, are maintaining an abiding faith in the God of Moses at Mount Sinai, where the Ten Commandments were received, and the God of Joshua at the gates of Jericho and Gibeon. It has ever been a part of God's program from the foundation of the universe to bring order out of chaos. Convincing modern evidence of it can be pointed out in the First World War and in Germany's attempt to invade England in 1940. I see in the trend of the war today the prospects for a gradual restoration of order out of chaos. The chaos was instigated by the Nazi leader seized with egotistical and vicious lust for world power. But his days are numbered. He overlooked, in initiating the campaign of slaughter to humanity, that there would be a time of reckoning. That day is now approaching when his regime shall crumble. One of Germany's most conspicuous occupations for the last 200 years has been war and preparation and training for war. Gruesome human carnage has paid the price. Such aggressor nations cannot and will not survive in a world filled with countries that live for the blessings of peace and not upon the calamities of war.

Let me conclude with the thought that many great leaders are developing and great heroes are emerging as the war goes on; some of them already are from Alabama; and some of your relatives and friends will leave as a heritage an illustrious record of their indomitable spirit, courage, and heroism, marshaled for the protection and security of the sacred land we love.

Constants in Russian Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the magazine the Nineteenth Century and After, which is published in London, England. The editorial is entitled "Constants in Russian Foreign Policy." I have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing the article. The printing will take one-third of a page more than the 2 pages allowed under the rule, and will cost $105.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTANTS IN RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

I

War aims may change as war develops. A power, fighting to repel unprovoked aggression, and, therefore, waging war with no other aim than to preserve its national independence, may, through successes in the field, so transform the balance of forces that it may achieve an overweight and pass from a defensive to an offensive that will, if successful, offer opportunities of aggrandizement unthought of when the war began, while the original aggressor will be fighting for no more than survival as a nation.

When a warring power seizes opportunities of this kind, the war will change its character. The transformation may be such that the belligerents will have to revise their war aims. And even if these remain the same, it may be that they can no longer be achieved, unless there are changes in the relationship not only between allies but also between allies and enemies. We have just seen a transformation of this kind. Italy, the foe of yesterday has become the ally of today. She was summoned to accept a formula—unconditional surrender. She accepted the formula, but she neither surrendered nor did she submit to any conditions—the so-called conditions of her so-called surrender were but the procedure by which she changed sides. To make the change appear less abrupt, or, rather, less fundamental, than it is, she is called not an ally but a cobelligerent, although it is not at all sure that the disparity of her war aims and those of her former foes will not be smaller than the disparity between the war aims of the present Allies. In any case, she will survive as a nation—which is more than can be said with certainty of several Allied Powers. Survival is the minimum she can achieve. The maximum is unpredictable, but it is not at all sure that when the time comes to make peace, she will make conditions, at least with regard to her European frontiers.

We are not suggesting that Great Britain and the United States should have done other than they did. We are only trying to expound what seem to us the realities, for it is from the realities and not from the appearances that the situation will develop. In any case, Italy has secured her future—a modest future, perhaps, but a future, nevertheless.

Great Britain went to war in self-defense and in defense of her Empire. She could, if she wished, revise her war aims radically. She could increase her Empire at the expense both of friend and foe. She has no intention of doing so. Her original war aims, namely, her own survival as a great power and the survival of her Empire, remain. But the war has so changed its character since the time when she was the only great power that defied the principal foe that, although the general conditions of her survival are what they were, the specific conditions are not.

There is one war aim which all the Allies, Italy included, have in common—the defeat of the German armed forces. They differ as to how that defeat shall be accomplished. They will differ as to whether the defeat of the German armed forces is the defeat of Germany. They will differ in their estimation as to whether Germany, when she has acknowledged defeat in the field, has herself been defeated, and whether it is desirable that she, as distinct from her armed forces, shall be defeated (they will differ as to whether there shall be such a distinction at all). And they will differ widely as to the character of the peace that shall be imposed upon the Germans, and of the peace that shall thereafter prevail amongst the victorious powers.

The clear recognition of irreconcilable differences will always be more politic than the pretense that differences do not exist when they do, for it is then possible to take the precautions that will be needed to avert an open conflict. Irreconcilable differences may be left in abeyance if recognized as such. If not, they will work themselves out under the surface and lead to the conflict that might have been avoided or averted. In politics, as in private life, it is best, when possible, to agree to differ—and to do so it is necessary to recognize differences clearly. When it is not possible, it may be necessary to wage war.

War is an instrument of policy—the ultimate instrument, but, nevertheless, an instrument. To propose the renunciation of that instrument is to renounce foreign policy altogether. To renounce foreign policy is to renounce the principal condition of national survival. Policy must be the master of war—to renounce war is, in the end, to make war the master of policy. If England ceases to be a great power, Europe will fall under the domination of one continental power, and she will herself fall under that domination. As two world wars have shown, she cannot prevail without the aid of the Empire. It follows that without her Empire she cannot survive even as a European power.

She is habitually misjudged by continental observers who credit her with the resolve to dominate. She has not, and never had, this resolve. She is, however, and always has been, resolved not to be dominated. To the continental mind, to dominate is the condition of greatness. To renounce the resolve to dominate is, to that mind, to renounce greatness. For England, on the other hand, not to be dominated is the condition of greatness—and, for her, alone amongst the powers, of survival.

All other European powers are secure if the armed might of the Germans is broken and remains broken. Only Germany can threaten Russia or France—from no other power have they anything to fear. But England could be threatened by any continental great power or coalition of powers. To meet that eventuality, she must always be prepared upon just cause to go to war and must always maintain her Empire.

For her it is not enough to defeat the Germans—not only the Nazis, the Junkers, the militarists, but the German Nation. This is the task that must precede all others. But when it is accomplished, it will be her task to promote and preserve a European order that will be balanced against the possible domination of any one power or coalition of powers. To say this is to say that it is England's task to preserve Europe, for a Europe that is not a community of free nations, big and small, is not Europe at all. This is not merely an ideal task—it is the condition of her own survival. In an immediate sense she and her Empire have survived, for they were twice saved—in the Battle of Britain and in the Battle of Stalingrad. But the survival of Europe is in doubt. And as long as it remains in doubt, the peace will not have been won, no matter what may have happened on the battlefield. And as long as the survival of Europe is in doubt, her own ultimate survival is in doubt. The issue, therefore, that has begun to transcend all others is not England, not Germany, not Russia, but Europe.

II

We have made these reflections before attempting our survey of Russian foreign policy, because Russian foreign policy cannot be surveyed intelligibly save, first, in its European setting; second, in its relationship to British foreign policy; and, third, in the light of certain constants, which we shall examine in our next issue.

Not much is known about Russia today. The Russian censorship is the severest in the world. In no country is so much power concentrated in the central government. The administrative apparatus controls the life of every individual. Powers of control so unexampled have produced a prodigious isolation. Those Russians who crossed into the Baltic States and Poland in 1939 entered a different world. And all who enter Russia enter a different world.

East of the Polish border there is one civilization, west of that border there is another. We are not suggesting that one is better than the other, but that they are different to a degree that cannot be imagined by anyone who has not been in contact with both. It does not follow that because they are different, they must be hostile to one another. Nor does it follow that they have not much to give one another. But to recognize the fundamental difference—a difference that affects the outlook on science, religion, art and literature, the family, law, justice, and politics—is the precondition of understanding.

Russia has shut herself off from the rest of the world as a matter of deliberate policy. It has been her intention to create within her own border the ideal society. But no society is ideal if its members do not believe it to be so. Even a society in the enjoyment of abounding peace, justice, freedom, leisure, and prosperity would not be ideal if it were discontented—if, for example, it believed that in some other part of the globe there were another society that enjoyed all these blessings in even greater abundance. The ideal society is only possible if just comparisons are impossible. It has, therefore, been a primary purpose of the Russian despotism to make just comparisons impossible. That is why Russia has cut herself off and why her people are subjected, as the people of no other country are, to the permanent influence of official propaganda and indoctrination—an influence from which none can escape. The Russians are led to believe that however great the evils that prevail in their own country may be, those that prevail in other countries are much greater. Thus it is, that although there is immense discontent in Russia, and although the administration, generally detested, there is no wish, except perhaps amongst the aged, to return to the old order or to adopt non-Russian forms of government.

Amongst the peasants, certainly, there is land hunger. No peasant anywhere considers the land his own if he does not possess some of it for himself and his family. If it is owned either by a landlord, or by the state, or by a "collectivity," he will never regard it as his own. But this desire, though wide and deep, cannot find organized expression.

The regime has no organized opponents. There is no alternative to the system of government, and no alternative policy, except in the mind of Stalin.

War has done a little to break the isolation of Russia. No wartime alliance is possible without some degree at least of professional intimacy. The advance and retreat of armies and the administrative measures accompanying the gain and loss of vast territories have caused displacement of civilian populations. Many Russians have been abroad for the first time in their lives, and many non-Russians have wandered in many parts of Russia with the freedom which, in a despotism, can only be brought about through the dislocation caused by war.

Although evidence is scanty, it is, for the first time, possible to form a picture of Russian life under Stalin. As for Russian foreign policy, we can see it at work today. And, although Stalin is an empiricist, he is also a theorist. What will sometimes appear opportunistic or inconsistent in practice, will, in the light of expounded theory, be seen to have a deeper consistency.

III

The power of the Russian state has three main foundations: The N. K. W. D. (formerly the O. G. P. U.), the armed forces, and the labor camps. The latter are an institution unique in the modern world. They are made up of men and women (chiefly men) who have been sentenced to detention in a labor camp for some real or alleged political offense. The usual sentence is 8 years. But as the sentence can be automatically renewed, the victim has little, if any, hope of returning to the community, even if he survive the 8 years. The conditions under which the prisoners live are such that the chance of survival are very small. He is as good as lost to his family who, as a rule, write him off. Various estimates of the number of these prisoners have been made, but there are no means of establishing the truth which is known only to the highest officials in the Government and the N. K. W. D. The estimates current in Russia vary from 10,000,000 to 18,000,000.

The number of labor camps runs into many thousands. They are situated in vast, inaccessible regions and escape from them is impossible. The administration therefore has at its disposal an immense volume of mobile labor, and it is with this labor that many public works—canals, roads, airdromes, and so on—have been constructed. The smallest political offenses, or the barest suspicion of an offense, is enough to transfer a man into one of these camps, usually for the rest of his life. As an instrument of intimidation they are unexampled. There is hardly a family in Russia that has not a father, a relative, or a friend in a labor camp. Almost every adult knows that his turn may come at any time. There may be unrest or incompetence in his factory, and, although he, himself, may have been without fault, he may be the victim of a system of administrative coercion that is collective as well as individual.

The attitude of the Russian people toward this system is revealed by the fact that the wife, let us say, of a victim will, from the moment he has been deported, find herself the object of especial kindness on the part of her fellow-workers, who will regard her as 'one of themselves' and above suspicion of being an official informer. There is abundant evidence of the immense humanity of the Russian people, of their willingness to help one another and to share every sacrifice. Under the despotism, there is a communal spirit that has no parallel in any other country. It has been said that in Russia class has been reestablished. This is true, but the Russian governing class—that is to say, the bureaucracy—privileged and powerful though it be (differences in real income are enormous), is not exclusive. Nothing, except perhaps political antecedents or associations, is regarded as an obstacle in the way of advancement. A workman who rises to a managerial post in his factory and thereby becomes a member of the bureaucracy, passes into another class and loses contact with his own, is under no disabilities at all by reason of his origin. Class distinction there is, but the passage from class to class is free.

Labor has no individual mobility in Russia. No one can wander about the country in search of a job and the peasant cannot try his luck in town. A passport is needed to travel from district to district. The peasant is tied to the soil, the workman to his factory. On the other hand, there is a special state-controlled mass mobility which, like so many other things in Russia, is unique. It is not only Balts, Poles, and Bessarabians who have been deported—to the extent of more than 1,000,000 men, women and children—from their homes into the Russian interior. Millions of Russian subjects have been deported from one part of the Soviet Union to another. There has, for example, been a mass-deportation of Ukrainians to Siberia; it is credibly stated that these deportees number about 9,000,000. Here again economics and politics intermingle. Vast undeveloped regions demand imported labor, especially peasant labor. And as the whole Russian system, with its complete control not only over collectivities of human beings but over every individual man, woman and child, cannot tolerate the free migration of labor, migration is compulsory. But it also serves a political purpose.

Ukrainian nationalism has declined. The younger generation has emerged from it almost completely (as the invading Germans discovered to their own discomfiture). But Stalin has not succeeded in solving the Ukrainian problem, the problem of a national collectivity, numbering about 40,000,000 with a strongly pronounced character of its own and therefore imperfectly amenable to a centralized despotism and a uniform secular orthodoxy. The collectivization carried out in 1931 was political as well as economic, insofar as it was intended to solve, amongst other problems, the Ukrainian problem. It was largely successful. But some of the problem remains.

The chief reason why Russia has claimed the Polish province of Eastern Galicia, which was never Russian even in Tsarist days, is that it harbors a Ukrainian population. Stalin will not tolerate the existence of a specific Ukrainian consciousness and, therefore, a Ukrainian population that is not under his control. If, through an improvement in Russian-Polish relations, the future Russian-Polish border leaves at least a part of Eastern Galicia, including the city of Lemberg, perhaps, to Poland, Russia will certainly demand that the Ukrainian population be handed over by the Polish authorities for deportation into the Russian interior. When, after the signature of the Russian-Polish Treaty in 1941, Polish subjects were released from Russian prisons, labor camps, and places of exile, none of the Polish Ukrainians, although Polish subjects, and entitled to release under the Treaty, were amongst them.

The Ukrainians have a genius for small-scale organization and for co-operative enterprise, but they are not étatiste. Nor are they revolutionary, but rather frondeur (not all the recent guerillas in the Ukraine have been behind the German lines). The break-up of Russia into several national states, the Ukraine being one of them, could not produce a new order, a number of communities living at peace with one another, but rather a general disintegration, in which the authority of Moscow would, in the end, have to be exerted anew. It is no accident that Russia has always tended toward centralized despotic government and has never known anything that resembles democracy as understood in western countries. It is maybe that there is no other way of ruling Russia than by centralized despotism, although Russians may, and will, differ as to the extent and the manner in which despotic power should be exercised.

There is in Russia a vast unrest—the unrest of many millions of peasants who are in exile and want to go home. There is also extreme economic distress. In some regions there is starvation. But the army must be fed somehow.

While his domestic problems are accumulating, Stalin has succeeded in making himself master of the Red Army. His title of Field Marshal is not an empty one. What he has done for Russia is comparable with what Clemenceau did for France. In the autumn of 1941 the Red Army was in chaotic retreat, whole divisions had surrendered to the Germans, who were welcomed in village after village by peasantry hoping for a redistribution of the land. Stalin was in daily telephonic communication with the retreating units. He personally sacked generals who had failed and he personally promoted subalterns who had distinguished themselves. It seemed that Russia was about to share the fate of France. But her great reserves and the immense distances gave her time which had been denied to France. She had, in Stalin, what France had not, a man of iron resolution and, in the despotism, an efficient instrument for imposing his will. The Russian officer corps, probably the youngest in the world today, owes almost everything to him. It has a new professional consciousness, it is, in the nature of things, less exposed to administrative intimidation, it has a will of its own, though not one that is at variance with his, and it looks forward to victory—and, beyond victory, to a Russia that will be strong and prosperous.

Reconstruction, a word which in England means so little, because so little has been destroyed, means much in Russia where the destruction wrought by the enemy is immense. The Russians—and not the Army alone—think of reconstruction with an earnestness that has no parallel. In spite of all that is said about a better life, in spite of all that is written and broadcast by our politicians and our literati about the "four freedoms" and a planned society, the Englishman thinks of the future in the hope that it may resemble the past. He would be happy if he could be sure that the old times could come back again. It was not so in the last war. The English, then, did believe in a better future and they did believe that the war would end wars. Today they are profoundly skeptical in this respect.

Russia has revealed her prodigious military prowess and her national resolve. That resolve will not vanish when the Germans have been defeated. To the English the war is a job to be finished—and finished thoroughly. To the Russian the war is a job that has begun. His national resolve will turn inward. He will want a better life—including a little more freedom, without which a better life is impossible.

That will be Stalin's problem. But the national resolve will also turn outward. To the English, the Germans are a nation whose military power is to be broken—and to be kept broken. This is all that matters, despite all that is being said about the "other Germany" and the distinction between the Nazis and the German people. The attitude of the English toward Germany is that, having been broken as a military power once and for all, she will no longer be anyone's concern. To the Russian, the Germans are a nation to be unmade—and then to be remade and shaped to serve the Russian national resolve. That is why Russia's attitude toward the Germans is fundamentally different from the attitude of England.

THE EDITOR.

International Monetary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include with my remarks herewith a discussion entitled "The International Monetary System," by the Economic Reform Club and Institute of London, and a letter written by former Senator Robert L. Owen to the secretary of that organization:

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Discussions are now proceeding in Washington on the Morgenthau and Keynes plans with a view to reaching some agreement on a future international monetary system. Unfortunately, both plans accept, without question, the right of a country to sell its goods in another country and, instead of using the proceeds to pay for imports, to employ them to buy up the fixed assets of the foreign country. For example, under both plans a nation could sell motorcars, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners in this country and use the sterling so acquired to obtain a controlling interest in existing British industries, to buy up British land, to own our newspapers, theaters, cinemas, and hotels. A country which exports the products of its estate is entitled, in return, to import the products from the estates of the other nations to a similar value. It is submitted, however, that it is not entitled to refuse to take the products and, instead, foreclose on the estate itself.

A country which supplies capital equipment on loan to another country may well claim to hold the title deeds until that capital equipment has been paid for in full, but that is quite a different matter. It may be wise and prudent for a country to incur foreign debt for the purpose of acquiring capital equipment for which it cannot pay in full out of its current exports. By the acquisition of such capital equipment its productivity may be greatly increased so that the capital and interest can be repaid over a period of years—again assuming that the creditor country is obliged to take the interest and amortization in the form of imports and is not permitted to refuse payment and compel the debtor to reborrow the interest at interest. It can, however, never be wise and prudent for a country to incur foreign debt for the purpose of paying for imports of current consumption goods, although it may be driven to do so by some disaster—"through an act of God or the King's enemies."

This memorandum is, however, not concerned with debt arising from the borrowing of capital equipment; it is concerned with debt arising from imports of consumers' goods which the importing country is both willing and able, and indeed anxious, to pay for with current exports. The importing country has, in the case envisaged, given the exporting nation a claim to its goods. It can do nothing more. You can take a horse to the water but you cannot make it drink; you can give a creditor your money with which he can buy your goods, but if he does not wish to buy them you cannot make him. A nation can, however, and it is submitted that it should, prevent the creditor country, which refuses to buy its goods, using the money to buy the title deeds to its fixed assets. A nation which allows a foreign country to buy its land, its industries, and its other fixed assets, in return for imports of consumption goods, has, in fact, sold its birthright for a mess of pottage. The foreign country will impose its tempo of life and scale of values, and, being the owner of all the fixed assets, will, in practice, if not in theory, control its politics. So long as, through the operations of the financial and economic system, one nation can in this way buy up and own another, it is evident that as much fear can be generated by this form of aggression as by the danger of physical invasion. In fact, it will generate greater fear because the danger is more insidious and more difficult to resist, although the ultimate outcome may be no less disastrous to any nation wishing to preserve its freedom and its own way of life.

It has been suggested that this country pursued the policy, which is here condemned, up to the outbreak of the last war. It must, however, be remembered that Great Britain in the last century exported on loan for the most part to new countries; that the people entering those countries were Europeans and were only too glad that we should go in with them, providing them not only with consumers' goods but also with capital goods; and that we took the bulk of our annual payments of interest and amortization in the form of excess imports, only reinvesting a relatively small fraction. Further, we were always ready to give them another loan with which to pay the interest on the last one, and did not make the mistake of refusing to give them another loan and demanding that they should pay in gold. Between the wars, however, the United States committed this cardinal error, and the debtor countries realized for the first time in what a fool's paradise they had been living. In accordance with the rules of the gold standard they inflicted upon themselves the most ferocious deflation whenever they lost gold. They learned their lesson in a hard school and are not again likely to forget in how perilous and humiliating a position a debtor country is. Moreover, those countries had come to full nationhood, and already between the wars the South American countries, for example, felt resentment that nonresident foreigners should own their fixed assets. It is evident that in the second half of the twentieth century the old civilizations of Europe, the South Americas, the British Dominions, and progressively India and China, will be far more alert to the dangers of foreign debt and will certainly not be prepared to incur it for current consumers' goods which they are both able and anxious to pay for with their own current exports.

A technique is merely a means to an end; apart from the objective to be achieved it is neither good nor bad. The real question which has to be settled is what sort of world do we want? Do we want, as in the past, a dominative world, a world in which nations during so-called peace do their best to obtain power over one another by debt, through the operation of their financial and economic systems or do we want a cooperative world? Do we want nations to cultivate their own gardens and, in a spirit of good neighborliness and kindliness, exchange their surplus produce with their neighbors, or do we want them to be trying to get their neighbor into debt with a view to foreclosing on his garden? If so, when he sees that this is imminent, he will barricade his garden. The creditor nation, fearing lest his debtor may think that offense is the best form of defense, will, in turn, barricade his. It is then merely a question of time before they are at one another's throats.

It is, on the other hand, quite simple to devise a technique under which nations must either take payment for their exports in the form of imports or go without—a system which would make it impossible for nations to pervert international trade, which should be a mutually advantageous exchange of goods and services into a weapon of aggression and domination. If we wish to maintain peace we must first establish it; you cannot maintain something which does not exist. When once economic peace is established we can set about providing guaranties that evilly disposed persons or nations shall not break it, but so long as we tolerate a system of financial and economic war during so-called peace, it will be impossible to prevent outbreaks of physical violence. The choice which must be made in this matter of international financial machinery is therefore crucial. It is a choice between peace on the one hand and, on the other, revolution and war.

FEBRUARY 4, 1944.

Hon. Secretary EDWARD A. HOLLOWAY,
Economic Reform Club and Institute,
London, England.

DEAR SIR: Accept my thanks for your letter of January 3 and the enclosed memorandum, The International Monetary System.

The memorandum speaks the truth with convincing clearness. These truths have been demonstrated by the experience of mankind. The failure of the world to recognize that in the past decade has inflicted suffering on the world, engendered bad feeling, and laid the foundation for physical conflict. The old policies of one nation, or its citizens, enslaving a foreign community through debt should cease.

The Keynes-Morgenthau plan has failed to perceive this important truth that, in a world of mutual cooperation, no nation should be enslaved by debt to another nation or to buy up the assets of a debtor nation and thereby establish a commercial overlordship similar to alien landlordism.

A new truth should be recognized in international affairs that in a world where equality of sovereignty is an objective, as declared by the Moscow Conference, each nation not only should be free from such enslavure but through the exercise of its own sovereignty create its local money and regulate the value thereof just as the United States does under its Constitution which imposes this duty on the Congress of the United States, article I, section 8, paragraph 5.

The United States has not yet completely established by congressional act its constitutional duty. I am glad to believe, however, this duty will not be long deferred as the anxiety of the American people to prevent either inflation or deflation is perfectly manifest now.

Certainly the wisdom of the economic policy that nations should pay for imports with exports and employ their own exports as a means of credit with foreign nations and use such credits for the purchase of the commodities and services with the credits so established is sound. Moreover, to prevent the equivalent of slave labor sending its goods abroad to compete with the price of free labor every exporting country should see to it as a matter of local policy and the exercise of local sovereignty that the money it creates should not only be regulated in its purchasing power, but that its purchasing power should be so arranged that the wages of day labor should be substantially the same throughout the world as the basis upon which a fair and just exchange of products can be internationally established.

These proposed principles should be subjected now to critical analysis so that in the proposed new world sound principles of the international exchange of commodities can be established by international agreement.

There is a grave obstacle in the way of establishing a minimum day wage scale of purchasing power and that is the grave illiteracy of 60 percent of mankind. But this difficulty can be removed within a few years by a mechanism which has already been established

and brilliantly demonstrated in its efficacy by the Soviet Republics.

Shall it be asked what is this mechanism? It is the intensive education pursued by the Soviet Republics using phonetic alphabets which can be learned in 1 day so that books printed in such alphabets educating the people can be made immediately available to the people instructing them in vocational training, in modern arts and sciences, in democratic government, as well as in modern technology which has developed unnumbered thousands of engineers and technicians who a few years ago were illiterate, unproductive, backward country folks. Illiteracy by this mechanism is being abolished in many other nations through a similar mechanism to which the people turn with avidity and enthusiasm. Witness the work done in over 80 languages by the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, established by the representatives of the foreign missionary societies, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York.

I am enclosing by separate mail my review of Dr. Laubach's work as set forth in his book The Silent Billion Speak. I include, also, a recent quotation from his book showing the importance of this movement to abolish illiteracy, if we are to have a world of peace, abundance, and honesty.

I enclose also for your information Senate Document 133, proposing a plan for making English a world language through the use of an improved phonetic stenographic alphabet which can be learned by a child in a day or two of instruction. This proposal has been submitted to the Secretary of State by the President of the United States and by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives. It has the endorsement of some of the best linguists in the world and you may find it of interest as the proposed contribution to the settlement of the questions discussed in your memorandum.

Yours very respectfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Production of Ships Since February 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have from Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, Commissioner of the United States Maritime Commission, a letter of February 5, 1944, showing the Commission's program to the end of January 1944. The vessels completed since the program's inception aggregate more than 30,000,000 tons deadweight. The letter and the accompanying chart reveal more eloquently than words, the contribution that the Maritime Commission has made and is making to the successful prosecution of the war. The letter and chart reveal the work that has been done and is being done by the workers in the yard, the shipbuilding companies, the officials, and everyone else who has had a part in this great work. The cold facts refute the critics in Congress and out, who criticize the war effort. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the letter and chart referred to.

The letter and chart follow:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a chart showing monthly and annual deliveries under the Commission's program to the end of January 1944. The vessels completed since the program's inception now aggregate more than 30,000,000 tons deadweight.

During January American merchant shipyards delivered into service 124 ships totaling approximately 1,204,730 tons. This output, while substantially greater than the tonnage delivered during January of 1943, the record year in shipbuilding, was considerably less than the all-time peak attained in December. The change-over from Liberty to Victory ships, the increasing emphasis on the building of military types, and the extensive conversion program, were responsible, to a certain degree, for the reduction in the number of ships delivered below the December figure.

Good progress is being made in the modification of the program to produce the greater numbers of fast ships scheduled for 1944 delivery. Four Victory ships, for example, have already been launched, and it is anticipated that two will be delivered this month. The end of the year should see the American merchant marine in a condition to meet whatever requirements the future may present.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Deadweight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program, February 1939 to Jan. 31, 1944

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January	----------	30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	----------
March	18,230	44,627	103,700	291,473	1,513,244	----------
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	----------
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	----------
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	----------
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	----------
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	----------
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	----------
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	----------
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	----------
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	----------
Total deadweight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	----------
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	----------

War Power Vested Exclusively in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject War Power Vested Exclusively in Congress, broadcast by me last night over the facilities of Station WHN in New York. I applied my remarks to the Austin-Wadsworth bill, the national-service measure.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The national war service bill proposed by Representative WADSWORTH and myself, contains the greatest promise of solution of the complex manpower and labor difficulties now impeding recruitment for the armed services, as well as for agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and transportation. It ought to have passed Congress long ago, but is still in the process of consideration.

One of the reasons for delay is the obstacle interposed by certain trade-union leaders who claim that it would violate the Constitution generally and the thirteenth amendment in particular. "Slavery" and "involuntary servitude" are the epithets employed to prejudice thought.

My purpose in speaking to you this evening is to emphasize the difference between the powers of the people in wartime and their powers in peacetime. This difference is of such a nature as to entirely refute any claim of unconstitutionality.

The war powers of this Nation are attributes of sovereignty and nationality. They would have existed irrespective of the Constitution. They were recognized before the Constitution in that great beacon of liberty which declares our inherent and inalienable rights and powers. The people concluded the Declaration of Independence with this commitment: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Therein is the foundation principle of the national service bill.

In the creation of this Republic, however, it was important to distribute the war powers carefully in order to avoid abuse of them that might result in military tyranny.

With venerable accent two of the framers of the Constitution speak to us tonight:

Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution:

"Security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objects of civil society. It is an avowed and essential object of the American Union."

Hamilton, another of the framers:

"The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite, and for this reason no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed. This power ought to be coextensive with all the possible combinations of such circumstances and ought to be under the direction of the same councils which are appointed to preside over the common defense."

Among the authoritative interpretations of the war powers given by the greatest of American lawyers and jurists, in times and conditions which endowed such statements with special significance, consider the following: Lincoln, in 1863, said:

"They tell us that the law is unconstitutional. It is the first instance, I believe, in which the power of Congress to do a thing

has ever been questioned in a case when the power is given by the Constitution in express terms. Whether a power can be implied when it is not expressed has often been the subject of controversy; but this is the first case in which the degree of effrontery has been ventured upon of denying a power which is plainly and distinctly written down in the Constitution. The Constitution declares that 'The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies.' * * * The whole scope of the Conscription Act is 'to raise and support armies.' * * * Shall we shrink from the necessary means to maintain our free Government? * * * Are we degenerate? Has the manhood of our race run out?"

Chief Justice Chase, speaking for four members of the Supreme Court in ex parte Milligan, stated:

"Congress has the power not only to raise and support and govern armies but to declare war. It has, therefore, the power to provide by law for carrying on war. This power necessarily extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of campaigns. That power and duty belongs to the President as Commander in Chief. Both these powers are derived from the Constitution, but neither is defined by that instrument. Their extent must be determined by their nature, and by the principles of our institutions. The power to make the necessary laws is in Congress; the power to execute in the President. Both powers imply many subordinate and auxiliary powers. Each includes all authority essential to its due exercise. But neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President."

And Mr. Justice Davis, rendering the opinion of the Court in the same case, stated:

"As our highest civil duty is to serve our country when in danger, the late war has proved that rigorous laws, when necessary, will be cheerfully obeyed by a patriotic people, struggling to preserve the rich blessings of a free government."

There is no proposal, other than the Austin-Wadsworth bill, tending to keep the authority over war legislation in the Congress, and the authority over conduct of war in the President.

Charles Evans Hughes, then a former Justice of the Supreme Court, and afterward the Chief Justice of the United States, in an address before the American Bar Association in 1917, from which I have drawn much in the historical exposition of the war powers, said:

"We are making war as a nation organized under the Constitution, from which the established national authorities derive all their powers either in war or in peace."

Later, he pointed out the distribution of the war powers—viz, to Congress is given the power to declare war; to the President and Senate the power to make peace by treaty; to the President the direction of war as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Continuing the quotation from Hughes:

"While the President is Commander in Chief, in the Congress resides the authority 'to raise and support armies' and 'to provide and maintain a navy' and 'to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces,' and as a safeguard against military domination the power to raise and support armies is qualified by the provision that 'no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.' Otherwise this power is unlimited."

Mr. Hughes further expounded the war power, as follows:

"The power to wage war is the power to wage war successfully. * * * In equipping the National Government with the needed authority in war they tolerated no limitations inconsistent with that object, as they realized that the very existence of the Nation might be at stake and that every resource of the people must be at command."

Again, he said:

"The power of the National Government (as exclusive of State government) to carry on war is explicit and supreme, and the authority thus resides in Congress to make all laws which are needed for that purpose; that is, to Congress in the event of war is confided the power to enact whatever legislation is necessary to prosecute the war with vigor and success, and this power is to be exercised without impairment of the authority committed to the President as Commander in Chief to direct military operations."

The distribution of power thus clearly pointed out emphasizes the fallacy of trying to mobilize our manpower for nonmilitary service through work or fight orders when it should be done through legislation such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill would provide.

THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT

The claim now made that the thirteenth amendment curtailed the war powers by its provision against slavery and involuntary servitude was then leveled against conscription for military service. Mr. Hughes dealt with it in convincing terms. Speaking of this amendment he said:

"It has been said by the United States Supreme Court that the plain intention 'was to abolish slavery of whatever name and form and all its badges and incidents; to render impossible any state of bondage; to make labor free by prohibiting that control by which the personal service of one man is disposed of or coerced for another's benefit, which is the essence of involuntary servitude.' It hits not only slavery but peonage. But the language of the amendment was not new. It reproduced the historic words of the ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory, and its terms, construed in the light of its history and plain purpose, afford no basis whatever for the conclusion that it interfered in the slightest degree with the power of Congress to raise and support armies.

"In the case of Robertson against Baldwin, it was argued that the thirteenth amendment invalidated certain provisions of the Revised Statutes authorizing justices of the peace to issue warrants for deserting seamen. In denying the claim the Court said, 'It is clear, however, that the amendment was not intended to introduce any novel doctrine with respect to certain descriptions of service which have always been treated as exceptions, such as military and naval enlistments.' The soldier drafted under the act of Congress is performing the duty which he owes of aiding in the common defense, and the constitutional amendment contemplates no escape from the duty to defend and preserve the United States.

"Similarly, it may be said that the power has been expressly given to Congress to prosecute war and to pass all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying that power into execution. That power explicitly conferred and absolutely essential to the safety of the Nation is not destroyed or impaired by any later provision of the Constitution or by any one of the amendments."

While the armed forces are running short of needed replacements, and agriculture is bearing down upon Congress to prevent drafting fighters from the soil, is it not ridiculous for leaders of thought to be out talking about peace powers of the Constitution? Is it not absurd to cry "slavery" at a proposed remedy which would furnish direction for the ample manpower to remedy these shortages?

There is no authority for such direction now, and there will not be any such authority if the war powers of the Constitution are treated as if they were paralyzed by the peace powers.

The shortages of recruitments and replacements in both combat and noncombat services have increased until now it is so stringent that remedies are sought even in reclassification based on lowered health standards.

The department of Government affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recently published an informative brochure analyzing opposing views on the Austin-Wadsworth national service bill. Its own views, as of April 1943, 11 months ago, were based on the assumption that voluntary service had been successful. Then they resolved:

"If on fair trial the voluntary basis fails, compulsion should be by authority of Congress only, in legislation containing appropriate safeguards. Creeping coercion by directives, without congressional authority, should cease."

If we have not the fortitude to discipline ourselves at home, and direct all of our resources and energies where they will best serve in winning the war, we have reached the stage which Lincoln characterized as "degenerate."

We have been informed by those responsible for the prosecution of this war that the National War Service Act is necessary. Are we to disregard the best evidence of its necessity? The miracle in transformation from the quiet peace habits and organization of our economy to unprecedented war production accomplished by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission establishes them as preeminent authority.

The timing of enactment of this legislation will effect the security of thousands of our boys on the battle fronts. Every day's prolongation of this war will cost thousands of lives.

There is no other proposal before the people which would enable us to regulate and stabilize manpower on the farms, in the factories and mines, and in transportation.

This proposal would carry out war powers expressly assigned to Congress, and would do away with creeping coercion under orders not authorized by the Constitution.

In conclusion, let us support our declaration of war on Japan, Germany, and Italy. We have a life-and-death stake in standing by it:

"To bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

Comment of Topeka Daily Capital on Address by Senator Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while it has been a long time since I resided in the great State of Kansas, having been so pleasantly located in New Mexico for much the greater part of my lifetime, nevertheless, as a native of Kansas, I have been and am intensely interested in everything that pertains to that State.

Recently I read an editorial appearing in the Topeka Daily Capital, of which our esteemed colleague the distinguished

senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is publisher. The comment refers to an address made in Topeka, Kans., by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. The editorial is one of the fairest of its kind I have ever read, coming, as it does, from the opposition party. The Daily Capital, a Republican Party newspaper, would naturally, under the stress of partisan bias, be expected to contain restrained or critical observations concerning the Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, and others, with which, of course, neither I nor the Senator from Missouri would or do agree. But in the main the editorial is so fair in its reference to the address of our good friend, HARRY TRUMAN, that I take pleasure in asking that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I trust the Senator from Missouri will not think I have been too bold in making these comments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DEAL SIDE PRESENTED

Kansas Democrats could scarcely have chosen a more able New Dealer to make their Washington Day address than Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri. Earnest, hard-working, and a gentleman who believes in presenting his own side rather than relying heavily upon smearing the opposition, he has exactly the right approach for politically hostile Kansas.

It is his view that Republicans, in and out of Congress, failed to grasp the necessity of preparedness prior to Pearl Harbor, and that carping criticism has impeded the President's efforts since then. But Senator TRUMAN hurls no charge of "fascisim" against anyone and everyone who fails to see eye-to-eye with the President on every public question. He makes scant use of invective, so dear to the heart of Harold Ickes, and he makes no ridiculous charges such as HENRY WALLACE utters on every occasion. He does not follow the President's lead in name-calling to cover up blunders.

This is a Nation which has developed and must continue under the two-party system of government, and it is a wholesome thing for citizens to hear both sides of every argument. In addition to being reported in the newspapers, the Truman address reached out from the banquet audience to those listening to radios. While those who heard it may have placed different interpretations upon the speech, according to political viewpoints, the Democrats had their say, and their side was explained in a most able way.

It is Senator TRUMAN'S contention that experienced leadership is the real issue in the coming campaign, and that Franklin D. Roosevelt has more experience than anyone else to equip him for going on to military victory and helping write the peace to follow. In making this admission, the Senator confesses the Democratic Party has only one man for the Presidency, and implies the Republicans have none at all. If something should happen to the President, the Democrats would be left politically bankrupt. Nevertheless, this is the only attitude the New Dealers can take and retain a fighting chance to remain in power. From the New Deal viewpoint, it is the only strategy worth adopting.

It was refreshing to hear Senator TRUMAN admit the administration in Washington is making mistakes with respect to the conduct of the war. But he insists that the over-all efficiency is what counts, and that mistakes are bound to happen under such a huge program.

Following the last war, investigations of frauds and mismanagement got under way far too late, and only a few "dead horses" were dug up to take the blame. Now, investigations continue while the fight is on, and a committee appointed by Congress, and headed by Senator TRUMAN, is attempting to find weaknesses which can be corrected in time to aid in facilitating our victory drive.

Anyone who talks to Senator TRUMAN privately, or hears him make a public address, realizes that his chief concern—amounting also to a crusade—is his committee's investigation work. He is in a position to know, more than any one man in the country, how rotten are some of the evils which have crept into the war effort. He regards the chore of cleaning up bad situations as his greatest contribution to victory.

For these and other reasons, the Truman address in Topeka on Washington Day undoubtedly added to the Senator's circle of personal friends in Kansas. It also achieved its prime purpose of presenting the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term in gentlemanly language and without the bitter accusations against the opposition which characterize so many New Deal speeches.

Kansas Democrats have had their big day to start the 1944 campaign rolling, as Republicans had theirs in January. Both sides had able speakers who stand high in their respective parties. From now on, it will be up to the rank and file to make their own decisions.

America's Greatest Farm Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address on the subject America's Greatest Farm Crop, delivered by T. C. Richardson, associate editor of the Farmer-Stockman, at the Oklahoma Farm Bureau annual convention, in Oklahoma City, November 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's greatest farm crop is not wheat or cotton or dairy products, nor any of the others for which we have recently set goals of production for 1944. However essential the material elements of food, raiment, and shelter may be, and of whatever heights of production we may boast, we shall labor in vain unless we preserve the pure seed of democracy—the greatest crop that ever sprang from the soil, and which will perish from the earth unless nurtured in the soil and protected from the choking tares of "isms" and "ocracies" of every sort.

For democracy is of the soil; not of city pavements and factory machines. Every basic concept of democracy was generated from the land, out under the sun and the rain that make the land fruitful and remind mankind daily of his responsibility to, and his dependence upon a higher power. Every doctrine adverse to democracy, from the divinity of kingship to Marxism, is the product of urbanism and not of agrarianism.

But the name of democracy has been bandied about until its meaning is obscured, and we may well paraphrase the historic epigram to read:

"O Democracy, what crimes are committed in thy name." You can find several definitions of democracy in the dictionary, but we are concerned only with that social and economic system in which humanity can attain its highest potential satisfactions, both individually and collectively.

Democracy is not plutarchy, aristocracy, theocracy, nor bureaucracy; neither is it paternalism in any form or by any philanthropic theory by which the individual is coddled or encouraged to become either a passive recipient of benefits or an inert unit of society. As we understand it, democracy is a system in which the whole of society is the sum of its individual members and its fruits are the result of their combined abilities. No other system so well inspires or rewards the full development of natural talents.

To put it another way, the kind of democracy in which we are interested is a pattern of life in which every individual counts one. That principle was taught by the Master in the parable of the talents, that each individual is responsible for the full use of his abilities. For that reason, true democracy in the collective sense is actually individualism at bottom; and in this, democracy and Christianity stand upon the same ground. No proxies are valid in either Christianity or democracy.

There is no paradox in the statement that democratic collectivism and individualism are two phases of the same thing; but for some years we have been hearing self-styled liberals decry individualism as something sinister and antagonistic to democracy. As a matter of fact, every experiment in collectivism during the past century has shown that the efficiency and intelligence of the individual units is the key to success, and the deficiencies of the individual are the rocks on which collective experiments are wrecked.

This was true of the idealistic socialism of Fourier and Ruskin; it is equally true of godless Marxism, the pagan tyranny of fascism and nazi-ism. It will be true of that intellectual "snobocracy" which assumes to know better what is good for us than we ourselves, and to direct our daily lives by regulations and directives fearfully and wonderfully concocted out of starry-eyed inexperience and statistical generalizations, which, Mother Hubbard-like, cover everything and fit nothing.

When the founding fathers wrote "We, the people," in the preamble to the Constitution, they meant just that—the individual citizens. In formulating the collective pattern, however, they did not sufficiently protect individual rights to satisfy some of their contemporaries, and the Bill of Rights was added. This is proof enough that this Government is founded in individualism; but individualism implies duties as well as rights. It is just as fatal to democracy for its citizens to shirk their duties as to abdicate their rights.

That classic remark of Grover Cleveland, that "it is the duty of the people to support the Government, not the Government the people," needs to be rehearsed and reiterated on every occasion. It harks back to Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy before it was polluted by the idea that society owes everyone a living regardless of his contribution to his own and the public welfare. It is implicit in the pioneer philosophy that every man should kill his own snakes, that he should use his own hands and his own intelligence in winning his share of the world's goods.

That government should do for anyone what he was capable of doing for himself was foreign to the creed of the frontiersman who attacked the wilderness only with an ax and a rifle, hewed his cabin lots alone,

and called in his neighbors only for the house raising, plowed his fields with his gun strapped to the plow and fought Indians with bullets molded at his own fire. That sort of self-reliance and resourcefulness made this country great; and if it remains great it will be by virtue of the same spirit recaptured and nurtured in its natural environment—which is rural America.

There are three essentials for the perpetuity of democracy—a sense of individual responsibility, and abundance of opportunity, and a full measure of freedom to exercise abilities within the limits of social democracy. It is the function of government to keep open the gates of opportunity, to protect the citizen against oppression by either private agencies or the Government itself. Beyond that, the obligation is on the man to enter into the fields of opportunity of his own choice and fulfill his responsibilities as a unit of society to the extent of his mental and physical powers.

To do less is to abdicate his citizenship and invite increasing control of his life by others. Rest assured that there are always those ready to do for us—and to us—whatever we do not do for ourselves. It makes no difference whether it is a limber-tongued demagogue seeking his own glory, a cynical racketeer scheming for self and power, or an altruistic bureaucrat sincerely believing in his mission of uplift, the impact on democracy is the same in the long run—its lifeblood oozes from every puncture in its armor made by delegating its responsibilities to others.

"Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," said Mirabeau Lamar as President of the Texas Republic a century ago. But, he added, "and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire." We have become one of the most literate nations on earth, but in our zeal for cultivated mind we have not given due consideration the inculcation of virtuous standards, with the result that a generation grew up in a cynical disregard of private and public morality. "Anything goes, if you can get away with it," was the slogan.

We have even been told by university-trained economists that "any system or practice which works successfully is economically sound." The trouble with that immoral theory is that it ignores the eternal principle of equity between man and man, between group and group, and between nation and nation. With all the emphasis possible, I insist that no transaction is economically sound in which both parties do not benefit to approximately the same degree. When one party consistently, or most of the time, derives greater advantage than the other, the inevitable result is the bankruptcy of both for lack of means with which to continue dealing with each other.

We saw this most forcibly proved during the twenties and thirties, when all other sections of society except agriculture prospered. Manufacturing expanded with seven-league boots, labor wages rose, finance indulged in a veritable orgy of piling paper stocks and holding-company burdens on producing industries; and the public poured its savings and its borrowings into speculation based on nothing but the expectation of selling out at a higher price—to get something for nothing, to collect without earning. This vicious cycle came to its inevitable end when agriculture had used up its reserves and ceased buying for lack of means, and for once in history all other elements were forced to recognize their dependence on the basic industry of all.

Most of the economic evils of then and now are the fruit of the monopolistic principle, applied by first one group and then another until our whole economic structure became a conglomerate of special privileges either granted by law or foisted upon the country by the machinations of those with an ax to grind at public expense. First industry, then finance, then organized labor sought and obtained governmental grants of tariffs, corporate forms, and the right to say who shall work, on what terms, and when. It did not invalidate the initial fallacy of protective tariffs to give to organized labor the legal right to take toll from the public in another form, and today as we stand appalled at the sorry spectacle of a nation at war deprived of guns by the overt acts of labor's so-called leaders, we see the fruition of our national policy of appeasement by the granting of special privileges.

Let us not for a moment forget that labor and industry, however they may battle each other, are riding the same horse at public expense. Every law-made privilege they enjoy is rooted in the monopoly principle, and monopoly is incompatible with democracy. Its intent is to close the door of opportunity except on terms dictated by the monopolistic group, to limit the freedom of the individual, and ultimately to give less and get more. Monopoly is not sanctified by giving it a high-sounding name.

I like to think of agriculture as a natural activity of man, an inherent right to occupy the land and make it fruitful. It is not a privilege to be granted or withheld by kings or other governments. In the divine scheme it seems to me that the natural person and the natural resources of earth belong together—without special dispensation of any agency under the Creator himself. It, therefore, seems to me that agriculture trades its birthright for a mess of sorry pottage when it rests its case on the same law-made status that corporate bodies rely upon for their very existence in society.

We cannot consistently attack the grants of privilege to others if we pitch our own future on a grant of privilege for a temporary advantage. Therefore, it seems to me that agriculture must stand on its God-given rights and fight it out on that fundamental principle, rather than move on the flimsy legal ground with those minority groups which are endowed with no such inherent right, and which exist solely by virtue of law-made concessions at the hands of organized society. We must face the fact that if we place ourselves in the same legal status as other minorities, we subject agriculture to the control of those minorities acting together as a majority. For, whether we like it or not, and whether it is a desirable condition for the perpetuity of our cherished institutions, agriculture is, and will remain, a numerical political minority in whose welfare labor, industry, and finance are concerned only to the extent of its usefulness to them. The agricultural cow will be fed just enough to keep her producing the milk her masters need, but never enough to fill out her ribs and grow a slick coat of hair.

All primary wealth is the product of man's labor and intelligence applied to the natural resources of the earth. All real wealth is in the things man wants and needs, whether it is a turnip that can be eaten raw where it grows, or a radio created from a score of raw materials by skillful hands directed by highly technical knowledge. How can we square that simple and irrevocable principle with the theory of fewer working hours in productive effort for more and more pay?

Time employed in productive effort enriches; time not so used is lost forever, both to the laborer and the world. Any law-enforced system based upon such false economics bears the seeds of its own destruction, but in destroying itself it pulls the whole house down. Every farmer knows and every successful farmer applies the principle of using time in its fullness, for that is the one resource of which everyone has an equal share doled out with every dawn, and its usage or wastage is one of the most potent factors of success or failure.

I would be thoroughly pessimistic with regard to the future of our country did I not believe that the sound horse sense of its citizens is sufficient to the task of deflating the something-for-nothing philosophy before it eternally wrecks the Nation and gives proletarian communism or fascism its chance to establish a dictatorship.

I am not trying to flatter you when I say that I believe the saving grace of common sense survives in its greatest vigor in the rural atmosphere. That the saving of real democracy depends more upon the agricultural population than upon any other group. That is a heavy responsibility for one-fifth of the population, but I believe it will be discharged.

But to do so we must return to the good old American principle of self-reliance for the individual and quit passing the buck to somebody else for everything that happens to us, and which could not have happened had not the sanity of the majority been overridden by the follies and self-seeking of minorities.

I am not forgetful of the complexity of modern life and the comparative impotence of the individual to be the master of his own fate, as compared with the pioneer period. Indeed, the new conditions demand more initiative and intelligence on the part of the individual than did those of our grandfathers, for where they could live after a fashion without dependence on others, we must live and work with others to live at all.

This thought naturally leads to the idea of farm organizations as a vehicle through which the individual can make himself felt beyond his own community. There are those who say all farm organizations have failed, but we have only to point out landmarks of progress initiated by the Grange, the Farmers' Union, the Equity, and the Farm Bureau Federation to prove that farm organizations have been the most prolific of any groups in the political, social, and economic progression of the Nation. That they sometimes wandered off after false prophets and sometimes generated fallacious theories is not evidence of failure, but rather proof of their vitality that they survive in spite of their vagaries.

If there has been failure on the part of agriculture, it has been not for lack of wisdom in its ranks, but from its very diversity of interests and all-embracing geographical distributions. For agriculture is not a unit, and by its nature cannot be regimented into a single pattern, for which let us give devout thanks. That is the very essence of democracy—that every individual and every special group within agriculture should think and act in the light of his own circumstances. But we are prone to place too much emphasis on the points of difference instead of seeking a common ground on fundamentals.

No great body of citizens engaged in a common enterprise will ever know its own business thoroughly without wide reading and free discussion. Discussion calls for assembling together, which means organization. Frequent assembly is possibly only in the local community, and the most conspicuous failure in farm organization practice is the lack of local program in which considerable numbers are interested, and in which all can participate.

I believe that every community holds the abilities and resources to solve its own local problems, and when these are so mobilized all the greater problems will have already become easier. "Do the duty that lieth nearest thee, and the next will have already become easier," said the poet.

The leadership which will preserve the best and improve the rest of our national structure is not in the Halls of Congress, in the bureaus at Washington, nor on the campuses of our colleges, though each has its part to play. Neither is that leadership in the marts of trade, the financial centers, nor yet in the ranks of either captains of industry or leaders of labor.

It is to be found at neither extreme of political belief, left or right, nor at the top or the bottom of economic status. It lies where it has always lain in America, and in every other successful democracy—among the great middle class—of which the self-reliant American farmer is the most typical example.

You, gentlemen, who have been chosen by your neighbors to represent them in this organization, are elected to a high and challenging task. We do not believe either agriculture or the Nation can be directed from above by any sort of autocracy or bureaucracy, either to the best interests of agriculture or of the Nation. This is not said to array class against class, or to the prejudice of any person or institution; but to bring home to our own doorsteps the responsibility that is ours for the part we play in preserving democracy by making it work. If it does not work at home, it will not work in the larger scene.

Materialism has had its fling in other countries to the destruction of all ethical ideals, and it has left its Satan's mark on the brow of our own in the too-recent past. But material prosperity alone is not enough; there must be a spiritual content in democracy. Cultural progress does depend on material accumulations, but they cannot be separated in civilization.

We hear a cry for leadership, and we build and support schools who purport to develop leadership. But I say unto you that leadership without intelligent followship is dangerous, and that both together are futile without fellowship. Let us, therefore, think of those as the three graces of democracy—leadership, followship, and fellowship; and nowhere else than in the country among farm and ranch people, will they be found if they are not kept alive at the grass roots. Therefore, I leave this thought with you—that the greatest farm crop for America is democracy, and if it is not grown there, it will perish.

Corporate Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Corporate Control" by Merlo Pusey, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. In this article Mr. Pusey endeavors to show that Congress has let control of the Nation's purse strings slip through its fingers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE CONTROL

(By Merlo Pusey)

A first-class row has been whipped up over the plan to build an immense pipe line across Arabia. Executive officials, legislators, oil men, and a wide assortment of commentators are clashing excitedly over the merits of the project and the terms of the agreement behind it. More important, it seems to me, is the method by which this momentous undertaking was set in motion.

Apparently the decision to spend $150,000,000 on a pipe line in far-off Arabia was made by the Petroleum Reserve Corporation. Yet the money to be spent for that purpose is to come out of the pockets of American taxpayers. How is that possible? The answer is a long story—the story of a fifth arm of government working under concealment. But it may be briefly summarized here for the benefit of those who still believe that the great decisions concerning the future of the United States are being made by democratic processes.

Petroleum Reserve was not created by Congress. It is a child of the R. F. C. It doesn't get its money from Congress. Whatever its need for funds may be, it borrows from papa—Jesse Jones. So we have a project with a most vital bearing upon our international relations emerging from a Government corporation created only 8 months ago, while the State Department merely chimes in as a sort of second-rate partner, and Congress is left entirely outside looking in. That is a very unsatisfactory way of running a government, even though Secretaries Hull, Stimson, Knox, and Ickes are members of the Board of Petroleum Reserve. It permits the tail to wag the dog.

Nor can we dismiss Petroleum Reserve as a mere freak. It represents a pattern that is being increasingly used to effectuate governmental policies. The most complete report I have been able to obtain lists 58 Government corporations. Many of them, of course, are carrying out vital functions connected with the war. But others appear to have become a permanent adjunct to our Government—an adjunct over which there is no consistent or unified control.

Together these governmental corporations have power to borrow, roughly, $33,000,000,000. In some instances no limit has been fixed to their borrowing capacity. Investigators found that they were spending at the rate of more than ten billions annually last year. Sometimes they draw upon the R. F. C. In many instances they use receipts from previous business operations, or they may be financed from the President's immense emergency fund as well as by direct appropriations from Congress.

A precedent for what Rubber Reserve is doing in Arabia may be found in what the Institute of Inter-American Affairs is doing in Latin America. In this instance the President created the Office of the Coordinator by Executive order. The Coordinator, in turn, set up a Delaware corporation, the aforementioned institute, and put it to work improving health and sanitary conditions in 14 or more Latin-American countries. More than $26,000,000 were poured into its coffers from the President's emergency fund. When the program—its estimated total cost is $48,000,000—was well under way, Congress was asked for an additional appropriation, and gave it.

Now the policy of promoting good health in neighboring countries is certainly commendable in motive, as is the effort of Petroleum Reserve to assure us of a future oil supply. Some of these health projects are directly connected with the war, although many others are not. My point is that a long-range foreign policy of great importance and considerable cost was inaugurated by a temporary agency outside of the State Department with funds appropriated to the President for wartime emergencies.

Congress has thus let control of the Nation's purse strings slip through its fingers. Most of these huge corporations do not have to go to Congress, not even for their administrative expenses. With some exceptions, they don't even report to Congress. Only a few of them have their funds audited by the General Accounting Office. A large number are even free of Budget Bureau control over their administrative expenses. Of course, many have been created for the specific purpose of avoiding the strict accounting required of a regular governmental agency. Some have even been created to permit evasion of laws by which departments and bureaus must abide.

The result is that the public knows little of what these vast undisciplined creatures of Government are doing. They can cook up a deal in the dark without any public discussion and without regard for what the people's representatives in Congress may think. By the time Congress hears of momentous policies inaugurated in this manner they are accomplished facts. The law-making body is reduced to the ignominious role of beating the air in protest against expenditures that should have been left to its discretion.

Our Own First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by some gentlemen who are residents of Los Angeles, Calif. I have assumed to entitle the letter "Our Own First."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 4, 1944.*

Senator ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Nostradamus of the twentieth century.

At a gathering of some of your boosters in Hollywood the other evening it was decided that the sobriquet applied to you. And in a most serious manner.

It was at a social affair that your name was brought up during a discussion of the manner in which aliens of un-American ideology have infiltrated into the United States, here to take jobs in American industries and to spread European and Asiatic propaganda detrimental to American principles, institutions, and safety.

It was pointed out by one man who attended the social gathering that you have consistently and persistently opposed the entrance into our independent Republic of Fascists, Nazis, and Communists. It was recalled that it was you who, in June of 1940, introduced in the Senate of the United States, a bill which would have outlawed the German-American Bund, the Communist Party (which was then attempting to scuttle the plans of our military officials to build an impregnable defense for America) and all organizations, groups, or individuals associated therewith advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. Had your bill been made a law of the land Stalin's stooges would not have dared picket the White House when Stalin and Hitler were palsy-walsy, the German-American Bunds would have been destroyed before so many gullible citizens could have been educated to racial and religious hatred, and, today, Washington, D. C. and American business institutions, labor organizations, and Hollywood's motion-picture industry would not be crowded with Communists and their un-American sympathizers who are sneering at our Constitution, smearing our leading patriots, and attempting to force us to surrender our birthright

of individual as well as mass freedom to crackpot internationalists' schemes of a "superduper" world government.

Evidently, years ago, when you began your battle to make it compulsory for all aliens to register and be fingerprinted, you knew the day would come when such a system would be of inestimable value to the Department of Justice. Today, realizing how dangerous they are to America, the American Legion is demanding the deportation of all undesirables who have entered this country under lax immigration laws and with the connivance of many foreign-complexed individuals and groups who are potential traitors to the land of their adoption. The deportation of undesirables, who have flooded into America for no good purposes, has been one of your basic principles for many years.

Because of the flagrant manner in which the motion-picture industrialists of Hollywood have been coddling Communists and cooperating with so-called intellectual superiors they have helped to import from Europe and Asia, there has been organized in Hollywood the M. P. A.—the Motion Picture Alliance—for the preservation of American ideals. All decent Americans who had the courage to protest the manner in which the motion-picture industry was spreading un-American propaganda before the war have been smeared as either anti-Semitic or pro-Nazi. You were one of the thoughtful Americans who realized the danger involved in using the American screen as a medium through, and by, which to spread hatred and intolerance, to boost the philosophy of governments with principles opposed to ours, and to give false impressions of American life to the citizens of nations with whom we would be good neighbors. You, too, have come in for more than your share of the smear campaign created and engineered by aliens, alien ideologists, and their paid mercenaries.

Yet, today, a new, decent, and patriotic element has had to rise in Hollywood to fight in the motion-picture industry the very clique against which you and other intelligent Americans made protest years ago.

The Motion Picture Alliance is headed by such outstanding Americans as Col. Rupert Hughes, Mr. Fred Niblo, Jr., Walt Disney, King Vidor, James K. McGuinness, Victor Fleming, Clarence Brown, and other American-citizen writers, directors, and such, who have declared in a public statement: "We refuse to permit the effort of Communist, Fascist, and other totalitarian-minded groups to pervert this powerful medium into an instrument for the dissemination of un-American ideas and beliefs. * * * We believe that we represent the vast majority of the people who serve this great medium of expression. The very love of freedom, of the rights of the individual, make this great majority reluctant to organize. But now we must, or we shall meanly lose the last, best hope on earth."

Discussing this subject the other night, all of us who attended the social gathering wondered if, as others have been who criticized the dissemination of un-American ideas and beliefs by the motion-picture industry, so would fine American patriots like Rupert Hughes, Fred Niblo, Jr., King Vidor, Walt Disney, and the other officers and members of the executive committee of the M. P. A. be publicly smeared as pro-Nazi stooges or sympathizers by such men as Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson, and assaults made upon their intentions and characters by the Communist authors of such slanderous books as Under Cover and Sabotage.

The very fact that such outstanding representatives of the decent, patriotic American element of the motion-picture industry felt it compulsory to organize to combat the "totalitarian minded groups" working in the industry for "the dissemination of un-American ideas and beliefs" or "meanly lose 'the last, best hope on earth'" is proof that such groups have and do exist in the industry. Otherwise men of Rupert Hughes' and Fred Niblo's and Walt Disney's intelligence would not feel it or find it necessary to organize the decent, patriotic American element of the industry to combat them for the welfare and safety of the American people.

It might be well for us to point out something of interest, though of a tragic nature, here. While members of the motion-picture industry are frantically engaged in begging funds from the American people to be used for the benefit and in the rehabilitation of the people of foreign lands, several local broadcasters are appealing for jobs and old clothes for American boys who have recently been released from our armed forces as no longer physically fit to fight. While the motion-picture industrialists are manufacturing and distributing such pictures as Mission to Moscow and The North Star, eulogies to communism and the Red Army, wounded and ill American boys returned from the battle fronts where they fought to preserve Americanism find it necessary to appeal to charitable fellow citizens for jobs and second-hand suits.

Yes, you saw all these things; years ago you realized they would come to pass unless the American people awakened to the dangerous enemies of Americanism who were working within their gates. You saw the Trojan horse and warned your countrymen to beware of its contents. Then, as now, you were fighting to preserve this Nation as an independent Republic. You were fighting, and courageously continue to fight, to preserve for the American people their birthright of freedom. God bless you, Senator REYNOLDS. You have proved yourself to be one of the leading patriots of America today. You have proved yourself to be, truly, the Nostradamus of the twentieth century.

With kind regards and best wishes from,
A GROUP OF YOUR FRIENDS IN HOLLYWOOD.

Condition of the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine, Mr. Fred Ater, of Rudyard, Mont., which bears on conditions affecting the farmer.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUDYARD, MONT., *February 29, 1944.*
Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am a dirt farmer and derive my income from production, and I purchase the products of labor and industry with that income; therefore, labor, industry, and business in manufacturing and distribution are dependent on agriculture for their income, as all wealth comes from the earth. American producers use machinery in their production, while imported competitive products are mostly produced without the use taxed to support our local, county, State, and of machinery. We domestic producers are taxed to support our local, county, State, and Federal governmental costs, the foreign producers that import competitive products and sell in the United States are not taxed except by tariffs to equalize costs.

I honestly believe our trade policies are vital to the general welfare of the Nation as a whole. It is very noticeable now since there is so much talk about our post-war policies that the trend is very strong in both political parties to remove protective barriers. This pressure appears to come from the international group that either have foreign investments, or interested in sea commerce, with a few labor groups in the large cities wanting cheap food. There is hardly any opposition to this movement that might destroy American agriculture, being publicized either in the press or even the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is not fair nor just to agriculture. Obviously we farmers cannot sell our products at world prices, and buy our machinery based on American prices. Now do not forget that if the consumers buy our products we get the income; but if the consumers buy cheaply produced foreign products they get the income, and we American farmers go out of business.

Let us look back at our own record and we find that every depression in our history was caused by low commodity prices, and I remember the Cleveland depression. Every depression cured itself when prices raised to above costs, and not until then. Remember the steel mills closed when the farm prices hit the all-time low in the thirties; labor and business suffered along with the farmers. Evidently all groups must have a balanced income, because after all we are customers of each other. It is possible to borrow from our future income and create an artificial or false prosperity; but that will result in a double burden later of paying back what we have borrowed and paying our current operating costs at the same time. This will mean less buying of productive machinery.

As further proof of what happens to the farmers I ask if I may quote from the 1940 yearbook entitled "Farmers in a Changing World." This yearbook was started under the direction of Mr. HENRY A. WALLACE, and completed under the direction of Mr. Claude R. Wickard. This yearbook was compiled and written by the B. A. E. staff and cites 219 references on pages 266 to 276, inclusive. I quote extracts from pages 240 to 241:

"The results of these huge cereal and meat imports on European social and economic life were of the most fundamental character. On the one hand, the laboring classes in cities were provided with cheap and abundant food. At the same time however, European farmers, unless protected by tariff barriers, were unable to compete, and many were ruined by declining prices and falling land values."—"Great Britain was our chief market, and with free trade prevailing after the repeal of the corn laws in 1846, agriculture there suffered particularly."—"Continental countries that imported sizable quantities of American foodstuffs suffered similarly. The results were mirrored partly in the tremendous migration from Europe westward during the seventies and eighties, partly in the flocking of farmers to cities, and partly in the agrarian movement that sought relief in Government policies."—"European governments, in an effort to aid their agricultural classes, raised duties and imposed embargoes on sanitary grounds, as in the case of hog products."—"After the eighties, new agricultural regions were opened in Russia, Argentina, Australia, and Canada and their produce began crowding American foodstuffs out of European markets."—"At the same time foreign markets were contracting, the domestic market was expanding. Industrial development in the United States caught up with the overstimulated agricultural development, and as urbanization increased, a larger share of the farm produce was consumed domestically. In 1899 the average number of wage earners

in industry totaled 4,700,000; by 1909 it had increased to 6,000,000."

The history of free trade as indicated above in England was to destroy the farmers of England. Up to just before the present war England had ghost farms and the dole and London had the slums. We have had in America the highest income of any nation in the world because we developed our resources and protected our producers and we have built up the standard of living and income above any other nation in the world.

It is obvious we can expand our own markets only by permitting our own producers to supply our own demand as there are large importations of almost every commodity the American producers raise, and in no case has importation of competitive products given any income to the American producers. But in practically every case importation of cheaply produced products forced prices down below the American parity price.

With a staggering national debt the people in America are facing the worst crisis in our history, and if we are to remain a free people we farmers must be allowed to supply a maximum domestic market at parity prices. The national debt cannot be paid off with the producers' markets forced down to world prices.

Sincerely yours,

FRED ATER.

Delay in Delivery of State Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Edward P. Morgan, foreign correspondent for the Washington Evening Star and the Chicago Daily News. This is a perfect example of what will happen to millions of ballots that are sent overseas under State laws. This is the very thing that I have always feared. This is the reason for the uniform Federal ballot. We know that the uniform Federal ballot will be taken to the men in the field where they are fighting and training, and we know that they will be returned with plane priority to the precinct where the voter resides. Under the bill introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, the vote will be canvassed, counted, and reported in that precinct.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRMAN GETS BALLOT OVERSEAS 3 MONTHS AFTER STATE ELECTION

(By Edward P. Morgan)

LONDON, March 1.—Memo to Congress:

If you want the soldiers to vote, you had better take a tip from Flying Fortress Bombardier Adam A. Mackow, of Newark, N. J., and start mailing out ballots now.

The latest issue of the Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes, reveals that Bombardier Mackow has just received his New Jersey absentee ballot for the gubernatorial election. The story does not mention whether the bombardier is a Republican or Democrat, but it won't make much difference to the outcome now because the election was held last November (Republican Walter E. Edge won).

The ballot was mailed to the young man on October 11, carefully marked, "For speedy delivery."

The envelope was addressed to Pvt. Adam Mackow. He is a second lieutenant now.

Status of Post-war Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank C. Waldrop, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date, in his column which appears under the heading "Looking ahead."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AHEAD

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Germany must be preserved. If Germany's industrial and trade systems were broken up there would be desperate repercussions all over Europe. And to blot out Germany as a great nation would be neither practicable nor morally acceptable.

No, startled reader, the above line didn't come from Hitler's house organ, the Volkischer Beobachter. It came from the lead editorial of the venerable Times of London, for February 29, 1944.

Said the Times:

"In spite of the burning detestation of German oppression that fills Europe at this moment, it is still axiomatic, even with her victims, that Germany cannot be other than an important member of the European body politic and economic, and that, while the firmest measures must be taken to prevent aggression, Germany cannot be allowed to become a cancer at the heart of European organism."

The Times goes on to say that Germany's industrial production is essential to European recovery and European standards of living, just as it is essential that Europe be relieved of the fear that Germany will swallow it whole.

"From this fear Europe must be delivered once and for all. But after all that Europe has suffered in loss and devastation, there will be no room in the terms of peace for further policies of mere destruction.

"Freedom from fear and want will be won not by breaking down what forms of economic organization are left, but by building them up into the broader structure of European unity."

Well, there's no reason to be surprised at all this. From a holy war in which the Germans are to be wiped off the face of the earth in punishment for their sins, this world struggle has shifted to a traditional political war in which the Germans are being punished in sorrow, rather than anger, and taught how to behave.

But what brought the Times to speak up at this point? Answer: The hour of settlement is approaching and the British don't want to be misunderstood.

The British are doing business at the only stand they know. It is labeled "balance of power." And they are, indeed, giving full, fair warning of their intentions.

The first such signal went up last September in a magazine called Nineteenth Century and After. Not official, of course, but well-known and identified as a publication in which the British Foreign Office casts shadows ahead of coming events.

In that issue, the editor, F. A. Voigt, plainly said that "the balance of power (in Europe) is, for Great Britain and the Empire, the immutable condition of survival."

He went on to say that not only must Germany be preserved, but also British influence in eastern Europe must be developed because—

"Eastern Europe has come to comprise the industries of central Europe and the eastern Mediterranean. To be master of eastern Europe, is, therefore, to be master of all Europe. If England were to abdicate in eastern Europe, she would be abdicating in all Europe. Such a policy * * * would compel England to reconsider her attitude toward Germany."

Well, Britain has been put on the spot by her Russian ally, as to eastern Europe. Russia is making it plain that eastern Europe, including Finland, the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and what else is yet unsaid—are Russia's sphere of power.

There is little, if anything, Britain can do to stop her. So Britain is doing the next best thing, as indicated in the Times. She is reconsidering her attitude toward Germany.

It wasn't so long ago, remember, that Britons were saying Germany must be pulverized, atomized, and Balkanized, so she would never again be either an industrial rival of the Empire or a military influence.

Now, British self-interest and survival indicate the time has come to shift emphasis, to balance Germany against Russia.

From the British point of view, it is perfectly logical and proper. In the long, bloody history of European power politics, it is not at all unusual nor should any of us have any excuse for being surprised.

We have only to bear in mind that England's politics is controlled by her geography and population—which are markedly different from our own.

She has her problems. We have ours. Fiddling with the balance of power in central Europe is Britain's business. But not ours.

War's Challenge to Forestry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, last month the Legislature of the State of Mississippi passed a joint resolution inviting the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to address the Mississippi Legislature and the Mississippi Forestry and Chemurgic Association. The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia accepted the invitation and delivered a very able and timely address at Jackson, Miss., on February 15, 1944, on the subject War's Challenge to Forestry in

the United States. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few months ago, as chairman of a committee of five Senators, I traveled 45,000 miles around the world by airplane to secure first-hand information for the Congress on the conditions under which our men are working and fighting in all of the overseas theaters of this great war.

The trip was a great adventure and a liberal education. It took us from the frozen tundras of Iceland to the scorching inferno of the Persian Gulf, where the temperature was 152 degrees at the airport on the day we landed at Basra. We visited the men who are doing the fighting in Italy. We saw our boys in the steaming jungles of the South Pacific islands, where disease and other hazards of existence are more feared than the hated Jap. Ours was a full picture of the power and might of America, harnessed to the job of bringing this world conflict to a successful conclusion.

A first-hand view of the efforts and sacrifices being made in this war gives rise to deep convictions. One that I brought home is the solemnity of the responsibility that we at home bear for a better post-war world for the men in the armed forces who are making such sacrifices for us. Make no mistake about it. The men of every rank and every branch of the service all over the world are thinking deeply about post-war problems at home and the kind of country they and their children will live in.

I returned home a more ardent conservationist than ever before, and I know that our men who have gone abroad to the four corners of the earth realize more than most of us who remain here how vital to the future welfare and security of our people are the natural resources of our Nation. Thousands of our men are stationed in England. They see how precious is wood on that island, where every scrap of lumber that can be salvaged is used over and over again. Many of our men are fighting in Italy. There they see how much effort has been expended to reestablish forest growth on long denuded mountain slopes and how the peasants toil in gathering up small twigs and branches for fuel to heat their homes and for cooking. Some of our men have been in north Africa and the Middle East. There they see stark desolation and unspeakable poverty, where once prosperous cities that obtained ample water from forested hills now lie in ruins midst desert sands.

After such experiences these men will return to their homes with a genuine concern about a program of conserving the forests in this country, lest our civilization go the way of Nineveh and Babylon. This war should bring to everyone of us an acute awareness of the increasing urgency and importance of forest conservation. The insatiable demands for timber products for war uses have caused everyone familiar with the subject to realize the utter impossibility of supporting and supplying our troops and conducting successful military campaigns all over the world without an abundant supply of lumber.

FORESTS IN WAR

I have been told that it required 15,000,000,000 board feet of lumber, more than half of the total cut in the years before the war, to supply the requirements for boxing and crating alone of the food, munitions, and equipment shipped to our own troops and our allies in the year 1943.

We are all familiar with the use of lumber in war construction in the United States, but it must be remembered that lumber is needed for bases and repair shops in many out-of-the-way places to enable us to keep our trucks, tanks, planes, and ships in operation. In all the overseas theaters huge quantities of lumber have been required for new construction, and for repairing the damage wrought by enemy bombs.

In the manufacture of fighting equipment, the products of the forest have proven their versatility, if not indispensability. The frame of the Mosquito bomber, which nightly rains bombs on our enemies, is of all wood construction. Wooden landing barges carry our men to enemy shores. The wooden PT boats have written a glorious page in American naval history. Wooden ships are adding to the tonnage of our merchant shipping, and the Navy's air attacks take off from the wooden flight decks of scores of aircraft carriers.

War is always wasteful, and we are now engaged in the greatest war of all times. One cannot witness this enormous expenditure of human energy and natural resources without concern for the future. The use of lumber in so many ways and in such immense quantities causes us to wonder about the adequacy of the sources of supply. We thought that we had a forest problem before these unusual demands. If that be true, the problem is certainly more acute as a result of wartime consumption.

Our soldiers and sailors, with first-hand knowledge of how vital wood has been in this war, have a right to the assurance that our Government, in cooperation with the several States, will adopt an adequate forestry program which will provide an abundant supply of timber for the future and the element of security which it will bring.

The demands of war have been so great that the use of forest products for civilian purposes has been drastically curtailed, particularly in the construction field. When the war is over, millions of young Americans will return, determined that the dream of owning their own homes shall materialize without undue delay. There are other reasons to believe that the demand for forest products will remain high for many years ahead. It will be required for reconstruction abroad, and the accumulated need for new houses here at home has been estimated at 1,000,000 new homes annually for 10 years.

The wartime drain on our forests has been almost 60,000,000,000 board feet annually of saw-timber size.

NEW USES WILL INCREASE FUTURE WOOD REQUIREMENTS

Recent years have seen the development of hundreds of new uses for forest products. Here, again, the war has lent impetus. New engineering methods have enormously improved the utility of wood in heavy construction. By a new gluing process, ordinary lumber cut from second-growth timber has been used to construct a blimp hangar a thousand feet in length with a 237-foot span, and with 153 feet of clearance in the center. These gluing processes and the use of plywood hold great promise for economy and revolutionary methods of house construction in the future.

Here in our Southland we have witnessed an amazing development in the field of pulp and paper. Let me pause here to pay tribute to the pioneer work done by the late Dr. Charles Herty in demonstrating the great possibilities for the development of an industry in the South to manufacture paper from pine pulp. During my term as Governor of Georgia the State appropriated funds to establish a laboratory for Dr. Herty at Savannah. As a result of Dr. Herty's research, the South now accounts for half of the pulpwood cut from the forests of the country.

In speaking of Dr. Herty, it should also be remembered that his early work with naval stores did much to stabilize and expand the fields of use of this industry which has meant so much to the South.

Other technological developments are broadening the fields of use. The use of paperboard in the container field has resulted in enormous savings in shipping. Fiberboards and wood pulp are being increasingly used for construction purposes and roofing materials. Wood cellulose is now the most important raw material in the manufacture of rayon. Wood waste is used as raw material for the production of the finest plastics.

Perhaps the most promising chemical development lies in a fermentation process by which waste from pulp mills, which in the past has polluted our streams, is now being converted into ethyl alcohol at a cost that compares favorably with that involved in producing ethyl alcohol from either grain or molasses. This ethyl alcohol is adapted to any of the ordinary commercial uses, including the manufacture of synthetic rubber. I have been told that by following certain processes of fermentation high-protein-content foods for livestock, or even for human consumption, may be produced, instead of this alcohol, from the waste from pulp mills.

THE FOREST SITUATION AND NEED FOR ACTION

All of these facts indicate that if we hope to remain self-sufficient as a Nation in forest products it is imperative that we adopt a more comprehensive conservation program. Our careless methods and prodigal use of our natural inheritance has brought us perilously close to the danger of future scarcity. We cannot avoid this danger by continued indifference to the heavy toll taken annually by forest fires and by wasteful methods of clean cutting.

We must come to an appreciation of the fact that timber is one of our most important crops. Even though the harvest be delayed, we must make it attractive to landowners to plant and protect their young growth as well on private lands as we are doing in State and National forest areas.

A national survey indicates that large saw timber is already difficult to obtain. The forests growing stocks throughout the East are being steadily reduced, and the last great reservoir of virgin timber in the Pacific Northwest is being fast depleted. According to the best estimates available, our forests are not growing much more than half as fast as they are being cut and destroyed, and this rate of growth does not equal half of our probable future needs.

Any successful program of conservation must recognize the rights as well as the responsibilities of the landowner, of the States, and of the Federal Government. Any such program which depends solely on the initiative of either the owner or of the State or of the Federal Government is doomed to failure. The national Government must participate to provide for its future security and for the welfare of all our people. The States must participate to the fullest extent. Conditions differ throughout this great land of ours. The police power is vested in our local government. Financial assistance from the Federal Government must be had, but no program can succeed unless that government which is closest to the people is an active participant. It is evident that it would be folly to undertake such a program without the fullest cooperation of the man who owns the land. He must be interested in improved methods of forest management, in selective cutting, and in protecting his timber crop from the ravages of fire, disease, and destructive insects. The landowner must be convinced that the energy and funds expended will not be lost, and that he will receive a fair profit for his crop when it matures.

RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We have made a few timid steps toward a cooperative program, combining the efforts of the Federal Government and the States. One of the most helpful has been that of cooperative fire protection. We have made

substantial progress in fire protection in recent years, but much remains to be done. The situation is especially serious in the South, and our losses from forest fires have been staggering.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I have been particularly interested in increasing the Federal contribution to the States for cooperative fire protection. When I assumed this post in 1933 the total cooperative fire protection expenditures in the South by the States, the Federal Government, and the private owners were only $700,000. In 1943 these expenditures reached $3,000,000, of which almost half was contributed by Federal appropriations.

We have made great progress in organizing timber protective organizations in the South, and yet 60 percent of our forest land is still without organized protection. The Federal Government has not yet met its full share of this joint responsibility. The Senate recently enacted a bill authorizing Federal contributions to the State for cooperative fire protection in the sum of $9,000,000 annually. It is to be hoped that this measure will be accepted by the House of Representatives. To meet wartime hazards my committee obtained $6,300,000 for Federal cooperation in the current fiscal year, but these appropriations were made without any basic authorization, and will be increasingly difficult to secure after the war.

We have made a faltering step forward in cooperative farm forestry and in the maintenance and support of nurseries producing forest stock. Without greatly enlarging this phase of the program we cannot hope to meet tomorrow's demands.

The Federal Government has a definite responsibility in the field of research, and in the development of new uses of wood products. The steps taken to demonstrate the enormous possibilities for industrial development in this field are the result of years of painstaking research. The United States Forest Products Laboratory, operated by the Forest Service at Madison, Wis., has rendered a great service in this field. Many of the amazing developments in chemical conversion, wood plastics, timber engineering, seasoning, and preservation, are the results of the work of the scientists there.

Conservation in the use of timber crops is almost as important as conservation in the forest. Much remains to be done in avoiding waste in sawing timber and in utilizing sawdust, limbs, tops, and slabs, but through proper research we may hope that in the future we will be able to use every part and parcel of every tree, instead of leaving 25 percent of it as a monument to man's wastefulness in the piles of sawdust burned or left behind when the sawmill and the planer move on.

Research work dealing with the forest itself is less spectacular than making plastics from sawdust or paper from pine trees, but its importance cannot be overemphasized. There is still much to learn in the field of forest management necessary for the perpetuation of the forest and for the economical harvesting of forest crops. After long years of research we are beginning to have an adequate understanding of the growth habits of the principal commercial species. Through research in the woods we must develop facts about reseeding, fire damage, and proper planting practices. Research has already revealed the necessity for selective cutting and perpetual crops, and this phase can contribute much to the welfare and prosperity of small owners in the South.

I hope that all of these important fields of research may be strengthened, because they are essential to the full realization of the possibilities of our southern forests.

We hear much today about the importance of post-war planning to provide employment for our returning soldiers and those who have been engaged in war work. It may be necessary to embark upon a program of public works. I hope that our forest services, both State and Federal, will in this case be ready with soundly conceived plans. There is an enormous amount of work to be done in the replanting and improvement of our forests. The character of this work will vary considerably in different regions. In the South lookout towers, firebreaks, forest roads, fencing, recreational areas, could have a large place among post-war construction projects.

Equally significant in the long run is the planting of denuded areas, thinning and pruning of overcrowded young stands, and other practices to increase future timber quality and supply.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SOUTH

There can be no more important part of any such program than one which directly affects the conservation of our land and forests for the benefit of future generations. The South has a great responsibility to the Nation for our future timber crop. In national planning for the future by the Forest Service it is contemplated that the Southern States will produce one-half of the Nation's future timber replacements. We cannot do this if we merely balance drain with growth. To achieve this aim it will be necessary to double our annual growth. We cannot do this with our land half stocked with trees as so much of it is today, and we cannot do it if we continue to burn our woodlands as we do now.

To realize fully the golden possibilities of the future will require present work and sacrifice. We must realize that it is a short-sighted policy to harvest all of the crop when the trees are of a size suitable only for pulp or chemical use. If we are to profit in the future from trees of sufficient size for lumber, poles, piling, and railroad ties, we must be foresighted enough to use our new-found pulp industry and other chemurgic developments as implements for more effective forest management by utilizing the trees cut in thinning young stands and getting rid of undesirable or defective trees.

We have always suffered for lack of industries in the South to balance our basic agriculture. New industries based on new uses of wood products will locate where ample supplies of raw material are assured. If we in the South could double our forest growth, it would undoubtedly mean a great expansion and development of the industries using forest products which would spring up everywhere in the immediate future. Forestry as a major activity on Southern farms will supply the needed diversification of agriculture. The industries which will be attracted by these forests will add to the economic stability of our communities and increase the financial strength of the Southern States.

In a strong forestry program lies great promise for more security and better living for our people in all walks of life. We are blessed by nature, which gives us an advantage over any other section of the Nation. Here we can see a second crop of pine come up on millions of acres if fire protection is effective, and nowhere else is growth so rapid.

Forest crops will restore the ravages of erosion and bring back soil fertility, without which other agricultural crops are impossible.

Let us take the fullest advantage of the blessings with which nature endows us. Foresight, hard work, and cooperation will bring rich dividends. We cannot rest in the knowledge that through education and the joint efforts of such splendid organizations as the Mississippi Forestry and Chemurgic Association and your general assembly a growing number of forest owners and operators are adopting better farm practices. Present progress might enable us to balance growth and drain in our forests under ordinary conditions. But we cannot disregard the impacts of war and the opportunities of the future. We must not falter until we have secured a post-war forest policy that will meet these goals and will satisfy the men who we hope will soon return from the four corners of the earth.

It will require comprehensive and united action to assure the full development of our forest resources and allied industries and thus provide permanent employment and continued opportunity for private enterprise, which these men have a right to expect. Even though a program of public works may contribute to the building of our forest resources, these men will not be satisfied long with the expedient of jobs on public works. They toil and fight and sacrifice on every continent and the seven seas for the salvation of this Nation. In order to assure the preservation of a resource so essential to the future well being of the American people as our forests are demonstrated to be, we at home cannot fail in a successful forestry program. Let us meet this challenge to the home front in the same selfless spirit of cooperation manifested by our men in our Nation's uniform.

Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., for February 29, 1944:

SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

Everybody in the United States would like to see the House and Senate agree on a bill that will permit those in service to vote at the forthcoming November election.

It is hoped that a compromise satisfactory to all can be reached that will assure each person in uniform his or her right to cast a ballot.

We do not subscribe to the propaganda put out by Washington sources that Members of Congress do not want the soldiers to vote. That is just so much eyewash. What Congressmen are interested in is the type of ballot to be used, and that States will not surrender their powers and privileges to the Federal Government in time of emergency.

Only last year, prior to the elections in 1943, Secretary of War Stimson said it would be best all around if soldiers did not vote. That theory is supported by many others high in the military world, but as long as the franchise of suffrage is open those in service should have every chance to exercise it.

There are a couple of bills before Congress now. One is called the Lucas bill, or the soldiers' vote bill. Opponents of this measure say it has no right to that title and maintain it should be labeled "An act to disfranchise servicemen from voting for their home-town officers," and that it does not give the serviceman a clear, legal right to vote even for national officers, adding, When in our scheme of government has the ballot for President and national legislators been more important than the ballot for State, county, and municipal officers?

Those who think soldiers should have the right to vote for the fellow who is running for sheriff, county treasurer, county commissioner, mayor, or town council think the Lucas bill an infringement on States' rights.

They quote in their fight against such a measure the words of President Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York State, March 2, 1930, as follows:

"Now, to bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger. Thus, it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing—the most vital thing—if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success."

Unions and the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis is one of labor's most forceful, determined, and efficient leaders. He has a record of getting what he wants. Below is printed what he had to say about the Communists and their activities in labor unions. He should know.

Some of us understood their methods as long ago as the 1937 sit-down strikes in Michigan when the Communists seemed to be in control.

If John will do as good a job in getting them out of the unions as he did for his United Mine Workers, he will have done a worth-while service to those of us who believe in America and her institutions.

As long ago as 1924, John L. Lewis' report said of the Communist Party in America, headed by William Z. Foster:

It is purely a revolutionary organization and makes no pretense at legality. * * * This party has at its head the supreme executive revolutionary committee in America, responsible only to * * * officials of the Communist International.

The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States.

In Senate Document No. 14 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, compiled under the direction of John L. Lewis, then president of the United Mine Workers of America, to lay bare the attempt by Communists to seize the American labor movement and to destroy our Government, we find on page 1 these statements:

Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American continent.

The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.

These statements were no hasty, ill-considered utterances of a man forced to speak at once and without deliberation. They were the result of a prolonged, painstaking, and thorough investigation made under the direction of John L. Lewis and may be accepted as true.

Evidently Mr. Lewis is still of the same opinion for recently we find in the Washington News the following statement:

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH JOHN LEWIS, WHO HATES COMMUNISTS AND READS PEGLER

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When John L. Lewis speaks he does not whisper. And in an exclusive interview given me today he did not whisper about American Communists inside and outside the ranks of organized labor.

The 220-pound labor leader was angry clear through when I brought up the subject, and this is what he said, while I kept one eye on the door. You can't tell what may happen when John L. Lewis really gets mad.

"About once a week," he said "somebody asks me about Communists, as though I saw a place for them in our country's labor picture. There isn't any place for these parasites as far as I am concerned, never has been and never will be. Fifteen years ago I had a clause written into the United Mine Workers of America constitution outlawing any Communist from membership. I do not know a single Communist in that union today and if you can find one in it for me, he will go out on his head tomorrow.

"If I had my way not a single Communist would belong to any labor union in the United States.

TECHNIQUE IS SIMPLE

"As heroic Russia battles against our German enemy, the Communists in our labor movement naturally hang on to the coattails of the Red Army and try to build an ideological bridge between our loyalty to Russia and their own pet schemes. The Communists play hard on the trick idea that America cannot fight side by side with Russia in the war and at the same time fight against American Communists and fellow travelers here. That is an outrageous contention. They do not help the two great nations win the war together. They simply help themselves."

"How can American Communists be so effective in the labor unions when the total membership of the Communist Party in America is supposed to be so small?" I asked. Mr. Lewis fairly snorted his answer:

"Their technique is simple," he explained. "The American Communists limit their membership to only the cleverest schemers they can find. Then they worm their way into key places in local chapters of unions. In this way they control whole organizations which our public, therefore, thinks have 'gone Communist.' But the more the newspapers and our public shout about such a union as a Communist hotbed, the more misunderstood and abused the rank and file of the ordinary members feel—and the thing goes around and around in a vicious circle."

C. I. O. CHIEFS HELPLESS

"Oh, they're clever," the miners' leader continued, "believe me, I know. When I was organizing the C. I. O. we picked up a lot of Communists as we grew—including Harry Bridges. But if I had not resigned the chairmanship and left the C. I. O. in 1940, I can tell you the Communists would have been weeded out.

"Instead, as anyone might expect who has seen them throw their weight around inside labor organizations, the Communists dominate the C. I. O. today. Philip Murray today is the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now—or die.

"This is the way communism takes hold. This is the way it endangers the labor movement, and our country. For the same thing happens in governments. Communism has an antinatural and basically antieconomic quality. History shows that communism is only compatible with primitive and undernourished economic surroundings. In its control and destruction it does not distinguish error from truth, good from evil, justice from injustice. It does not care for history or the experience of humanity, for freedom or for the dignity of man. And the last thing on earth the American Communists are interested in is the American way of life."

"You sound like Westbrook Pegler," I said.

"Believe it or not," said Mr. Lewis, "I read him every day."

Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I must candidly acknowledge a deep-seated, innate predisposition against the principle of renegotiation. From the start, I felt that excessive war profits could and might be recaptured under established tax principles though certainly there has been no discernible adequate procedure evolved to discharge this function. Secondly, I was not convinced that orderly profit restriction could be achieved by multifold administrative boards of the procurement agencies often applying, as the record shows they have, different standards and different rules to interests of the same industrial groups. It is perhaps a fair criticism of the renegotiation process that it has not zealously pursued uniformity of standard and relative equalization of treatment.

I also felt that American industry should be allowed during wartime to accumulate reserves for reconversion and reconstruction, yet the figures show that the tax laws have operated to make available for these desirable purposes as of the end of 1943 about twenty-six billions in post-war refunds.

Moreover I was somewhat disturbed by the absence of opportunity for judicial review of renegotiated contracts though also conscious of the delays, the inordinate burdens on the courts and the uncertainty both for the Government and the contractors that would attend this privilege. Congress has now provided for this review.

In short, I had many serious doubts and questions about the efficacy and jus-

tice of renegotiation which careful examination of the record has entirely resolved or materially altered. I am now convinced that renegotiation, despite its draw-backs and inequities, is not only desirable but imperative if we are to avoid scandalous and unconscionable profit making out of the war.

We began with the commonly accepted proposition that no millionaires were to come out of this war; that if men were to be drafted, wealth and capital were also to be drafted. Equality of sacrifice—so far as it could be achieved—was an agreed objective. I am sorry to say that the story of renegotiation, as well as the history of the past 2 years, conclusively proves that we have failed to reach this goal.

The minority report of the Senate Finance Committee sets forth an incredible number of corporations which even after renegotiation showed enormous profits. These were not confined to novel specialties; they ranged over practically the whole field of American industry. One of the largest war contractors frankly stated in 1942 that profits on government business were "larger than had been anticipated or desired," and afterward voluntarily reduced its prices on standard products. Another company also making standard articles made almost $40,000,000 in 1942 against a peacetime annual average of slightly over two million. After renegotiating twelve and one-half million and paying war profits, this company still had five million left, or about half of its entire profit for the previous 10 years. Still another company, described by a renegotiation official as "not by any means the most unusual," increased its business from a 1936–39 average of sixteen and one-half million to fifty million in 1942 and its average dollar profit before income taxes from 7.4 percent to 25 percent. Ten lumber companies with profits in the base period of five million stepped up profits in 1942 to twenty-six million and 25 woolen-textile companies jumped from profits of three million in the base period to thirty-two million in 1942.

I could go on indefinitely to cite glaring examples of war profiteering, but as a distinguished and able member of the Finance Committee of the other body said, "When the record of profit-making in war contracts is disclosed, the American people will be shocked." The whole record is replete with staggering figures of unconscionable, indefensible profits.

For these reasons I was constrained to approve the continuance of renegotiation. Whatever its inequities, whatever its nonconformity to regular peacetime procedures of taxation and Government relationship to private business, whatever its onerous, bothersome features, I am convinced it is the only method available to the Congress without further delay and complication which will curb the piling up of swollen and utterly unjustified war profits. Nothing could be more destructive of the national morale than the spectacle of some classes making huge profits out of the blood of our boys that will saturate and enrich the soil of many distant parts of the earth. Nothing will do more to lessen confidence in the fundamental righteousness of our business system than the knowledge that many of our great corporations and their leaders have rolled up a colossal golden surfeit out of the war which millions of our boys are offering their lives to win.

In the snake-infested jungles and the steaming, stinking swamps of the South Pacific, in the torrid deserts of Africa, in the icy waters of the North Atlantic, where death is a constant visitor, our boys get $50 per month. Can we longer tolerate that here at home, at the same time and for the same cause, an aviation company executive should be permitted, as he was, to increase his salary from $2,300 to $89,000 in a single year?

Unless we make such inequities and such inequalities of sacrifice impossible for the balance of the war, when it is over we will be faced with social revolution.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Post Gazette, Pittsburgh, Pa., for February 29, 1944:

MANY SERVICE BALLOTS RETURNED UNDELIVERED—ALLEGHENY COUNTY'S EXPERIENCE SHOWS WEAKNESSES OF EXISTING VOTE LAWS

The principal issue between Congress and the President, over whether the Federal Government or the States shall send ballots to the men and women in the armed services, is illustrated by a batch of ballots sent out by Elections Director David Oibum last October 18 and returned after following the addressees all over the United States and perhaps halfway around the world.

These ballots were requested by registered voters of Allegheny County who are now in the services—since otherwise they could not have been mailed originally. The voters gave the elections department their addresses as of the time the applications for the ballots were made. Under the law, the ballots must be sent out not less than 15 days before the election—and they were sent out October 18.

TWENTY-TWO POSTMARKS ON ONE

One, which came back, bore 22 postmarks, chiefly New York. It had been in Navy and Army post offices. Where it traveled on its various trips from and back to New York is not disclosed. It came back here December 20 and was put in the safe to be destroyed later.

One went from Pittsburgh to Jacksonville to Pensacola to Norfolk to the United States Navy, and came back undelivered. One went to San Francisco, traveled in and out of San Francisco half a dozen times, and got back here December 10. One went to Camp Pickett, Va., thence to New York, then to Fort Benning, Ga., and back. One went to Atlanta, Savannah, Hunter Field, Ga., and back.

One ballot left Pittsburgh October 18, got to Los Angeles October 21, and was returned to Forrest, Tenn., October 25, returned to Los Angeles October 29, and was returned November 2. One went to Port Hueneme, Calif., to the United States Navy, to Kodiak, Alaska, again to the Navy, and then home.

ILLUSTRATE LAWS' WEAKNESSES

These are only a few of the ballots that came back undelivered and which, in due time, will be burned. But they are illustrative of the difficulty of sending ballots to individuals as required by State laws. No alternative to the individual delivery of ballots to service men and women has been advanced by the group in Congress which opposes the use of the admittedly incomplete Federal ballot, covering only Federal offices and printed in blank without the names of candidates, which is proposed by legislation now before Congress and is supported by President Roosevelt.

Of the 2,400 voters in the armed services from Allegheny County—a small fraction of the more than 100,000 who have gone from here—who took the trouble to request ballots, only about 1,300 got their ballots in time to be counted in last November's election. Some still are drifting in to the elections department, having finally caught up with their recipients and been filled out and sent back, but too late to be counted.

Seaman (1st cl.) Basil D. Izzi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release:

REAR ADMIRAL WOODWARD PRESENTS NAVY AND MARINE CORPS MEDAL TO SEAMAN (1ST CL.) BASIL D. IZZI

The Navy and Marine Corps Medal was presented today by Rear Admiral C. H. Woodward, United States Navy, retired, chief of the Industrial Incentive Division, Navy Department, to Basil D. Izzi, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve, for the enlisted man's gallantry and ingenuity during 83 days of drifting on a life raft, following torpedoing of his vessel in the South Atlantic Ocean.

Seaman Izzi has toured hundreds of war plants of the Nation, talking to representatives of labor and management, emphasizing the need for increased production of war materials, under the auspices of the Industrial Incentive Division. He is the son of Dominic Izzi, 1 Power Mill Corner, Barre, Mass.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, in the name of the President, recently authorized the awarding of the Navy and Marine Corps Medal to Izzi, with this citation:

"For heroic conduct as member of the United States Navy Armed Guard on occasion of the sinking of a Dutch merchantman by an enemy submarine in the Atlantic Ocean on November 2, 1942. When two torpedoes struck the ship and exploded in rapid succession, Izzi, upon abandonment of the flooding vessel, clung frantically to a bamboo mat until four shipmates, adrift on a life raft, finally hauled him out of the sea. From then on, although two of the men succumbed, he and the others gallantly fought off delirium and death for 2,200 miles, ingeniously subsisting on fish, birds, and rainwater long after their provisions had been exhausted.

Although tortured repeatedly by vain hopes of rescue and painfully weak from prolonged exposure, Izzi bravely disregarded his own plight in a resolute desire to uphold the morale of his companions. His unselfish devotion, fervent optimism, and persistent faith undoubtedly alleviated their suffering and sustained their will to live until a passing ship spotted them 83 days later."

West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a very beautiful poem entitled "West Virginia," the great State which I have the honor in part to represent. The poem was written by Mr. Homer H. Andrews, of North Charleston, W. Va.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA

Of your mountains I sing, lovely mountains
Of grandeur, artistic and bold;
Of your fountains of old, precious fountains
Of wealth in black diamond gold;
Of your early log church, guiding steeple,
God's temple to sons of your sod;
Of your people's firm stand, hardy people
With manly reliance on God.

Of your record I sing, rugged story
That thrills every patriot's breast;
Of your glory unique, modern glory
Of progress on many a crest:
O magnificent State, honored, loved name,
The toast of your mountaineer free,
Dear West Virginia, child of war fame,
You are delightful and lovely to me.

—*Homer H. Andrews.*

NORTH CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Are We Good Neighbors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following interesting and most impressive oration delivered at the annual meeting of the Lynn Catholic Charities Center, Wednesday evening, February 2, 1944, at Lynn, Mass., by Rev. Daniel T. McColgan, Ph. D., professor of sociology, St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass., and Regis College, Weston, Mass.:

My dear friends of Catholic Charities, are you good neighbors?

Your very presence here this evening gives tangible evidence of your neighborly spirit and interest in the welfare and progress of your fellow citizens of Lynn. However, it is not of neighborliness in the provincial, clannish sense, nor of social service in its restricted case or group work connotation that I would comment this evening. It is of your neighborliness in the national sense and of your social service in its broad social action scope that I would speak.

What is social action? What does it mean to be a good neighbor?

Social action may be defined as the righteous group effort to bring about better conditions in society. Those interested in really effective social work have always inevitably been led to activity in the name of social action.

Those interested in the more adequate care of the mentally ill have labored incessantly to secure better public provisions for them. Those devoted to the service of the blind have eventually sponsored the various private and public programs to prevent blindness. Those concerned with the preservation of the health and happiness of women and children in industry have been led to champion measures for the control of the hours, ages, and conditions of child and woman labor. Those eager for better housing have incessantly battled for effective housing regulations. Those determined to improve the lot of the laboring man have been socially active for collective bargaining, minimum wage, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, and other phases of social-security legislation. Men and women who felt concern for the socially constructive care of delinquents have labored through the years for probation and prison reform, as well as for the establishment of juvenile courts. In a word, social action, in the face of social need or abuse, seeks to improve social conditions, mobilizing public opinion and legislation to that end. Social action, as a social-service activity, arises logically out of the basic assumption of social work; that is, out of concern for the well-being of the individual. When case work finds that in a particular instance distress cannot be relieved, or a normal adjustment accomplished, because of external conditions beyond the control either of the agency or of the client, then of necessity case work must be supplemented by social action. Social action is the inevitable reform function of social work.

My brief this evening is for a definite phase of neighborly social action. Therefore, let us first make certain that we know what it means to be a neighbor.

We, as God-fearing Americans know that the spirit of neighborliness is not limited to ties of blood or territory. We know that our neighbors are not alone those who share with us our family, our friends, our coreligionists, our coworkers. None of these social relationships embrace the grand spirit of Christian neighborliness. It is not economic or social station that makes the neighbor. In fact, the best definition of neighbor is supplied by the following set of circumstances.

Wherever it is possible for one who is strong to find and serve a person or a family who is in need of whatsoever kind, the very setting defines neighbor. Service in such a setting and situation, out of love of God, and fellowman, is true neighborliness. Thus, it may be that not merely the closest to us but the farthest away from us are our neighbors.

Who is our neighbor?

Our Lord answered that question in the parable of the Good Samaritan. It was not necessary that he be of the same family, the same class, or the same social station as the one who passed down the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; not the Levite for the Levite, not the priest for the priest, not the Samaritan for the Samaritan. The neighbor was one whom the pagan world would not call a neighbor. The strong Samaritan, traditionally hostile. Why brothers? Because of the fatherhood of God. Blessed brothers! Because good neighbors. "For what you have done to the least of these my brethren you have done unto me."

Who is my neighbor? Is the Negro my neighbor? Is the Latin-American in the United States my neighbor?

What about the Negro? Am I a good neighbor to him. It is a baffling conundrum but a real one that American good-will missions, made at the expenditure of untold millions, find us trying to foster good will everywhere throughout the world, save here within our own America. In fact, our American attitude toward our domestic race question, exploited among our darker-hued allies in South America and elsewhere by clever enemy propagandists, is siphoning off or polluting our vaunted reservoir of good will. Is the Negro my neighbor? There is in our beloved United States a large minority group, 13,000,000 in number, generous and warm-hearted, simple and lovable—yet segregated, persecuted and submerged by their neighbors. The story of the Negro in the United States is at its root a shameful tale of justice flagrantly flaunted. It is a three-century-old tale, not simply of injustice, but of harshness, discrimination, and disdain. The story of white treatment of their American colored neighbors is not a nice story. It is a profoundly disturbing and distressing one, because it tells of poverty and tragedy, of disease, delinquency, and death.

For many years now, many white American citizens, who prided themselves on their lack of hostile spirit toward the colored people, sincerely believed that this so-called race question, conceived in iniquity, was one that might well be let alone to work itself out gradually, to a happy conclusion by the slow, sure formula of peaceful evolution and patient progress. This prevalent philosophy, to a large degree, remains the comfortable, condescending philosophy of a proudly superior group, who were smugly sure (though not expressing it in so many Nazi phrases) that they comprised a master race, whereas the colored men and women were congenitally inferior and actually, at best, only second-class citizens.

But, the present world-wide and devastating conflict has disturbed many previously tranquil consciences, opened many serenely unseeing eyes and posed some stubborn questions that demand and deserve direct and adequate answers. Some of these questions might be phrased like this:

1. Why did the natives of Malaya, Burma, and Java refuse to defend their country when their alien rulers were beset by the Japanese?

2. What truth is there in the Japanese contention that the white races despise men of color—yellow, red, black, etc.?

3. Can we honestly demand that the colored American fight for freedom's sake in Africa and deny him freedom at home?

4. Can we make the Western Hemisphere a bulwark of liberty and law, while we maim and mangle colored youth in the streets of American cities and towns, even when they are clad in the uniform of the Army of the United States?

5. Can we condemn the vast majority of rural and urban colored Americans to starvation wages, bad housing, meager health and educational facilities, and then expect them to be strong, robust defenders of the American way?

6. Can we honestly tell our half a million colored soldiers that dishonorable discharge from the Army will deprive them of civil rights, when they never had any civil rights to speak of in most Southern States?

In a word, can we—the greatest Nation on earth—assume the moral leadership of the world, when economic discrimination, social injustice, political iniquities, race riots, murder, and social disdain darken and disgrace the very name of America?

From these sharp and sobering questions, I would depart for the moment to make other observations. We would be a happier and healthier America if these stinging queries so got under the skin of the vast majority of decent Americans that in their righteous indignation and sense of justice, with correct consciences they agreed to do, and actually set about doing, something to solve this major problem. As Americans, we like to credit ourselves with being "big enough to recognize mistakes, honest enough to correct them, and humble enough to profit by our errors." Recently our President and Senate, in so many words, apologized to our gallant allies, the Chinese, for the mistake we made over half a century ago in passing the Chinese Exclusion Act. However, I humbly suggest that we should feel even greater compunction of soul regarding our cruel treatment of our Negro fellow citizens. America has immense resources and infinite possibilities for Christian development. With so many different racial and cultural elements in its population, what a unique opportunity it has to practice neighborly love. Our immediate concern as God-fearing Americans is to spread abroad the realization that every human being is a child of God. As products of His hand, made in His image, we all are equal. We know that God is the creator of heaven and earth and all things. We know that on earth, God created the vegetable and animal kingdom. In each kingdom there is manifested the splendor and diversity of God's handiwork. God made the flowers. Some of them He made pale white, others an ebony black; some a beautiful red, others a gorgeous yellow; still others a placid brown. As we see garden after garden of these varicolored flowers, unmatched in their glorious God-given splendor, we realize the harmony that blends them together. Had their Creator made them all uniform in height, size, and color they would become monotonous, tiresome, dull. So it is in the kingdom of man. The same God, in His wisdom, introduced variety of color into the groupings of men, in addition to unending diversity of height and size. All for His own good purpose, God made men—some red, some black, some brown, some yellow, some white. It is all God's work—not man's.

The Negro declares: "If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I lack knowledge, I can become educated. But, if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me that."

It ill behooves anyone to criticize the handiwork of his Creator. The poison of racial discrimination and racial hatred ill becomes the genuinely Christian soul. Yes; there are Americans, all too many of them, who find fault with the colored creature whom God made, and whom Christ, the God-man, redeemed. There are hordes of Americans who seek even to cite sacred scripture and the so-called curse of Cham to prove that the Negro is, by divine fiat, an inferior creature. This baseless, diabolical allegation is a convenient shield for those who would justify placing the Negro outside the pale of their charity and justice. To such minds, the Negro has no moral, social, industrial, political, or religious rights which they are bound to respect. In a word, he is divinely destined to be poor, ignorant, and outcast—there being a divine decree to that effect.

Are we true neighbors to our dark-skinned, Spanish-speaking brothers living in the South and especially the Southwest? Right here the thought occurs to me that our relations in this respect again, have been far from neighborly. Perhaps my belief would be more effectively and convincingly depicted, if I bid speak in my stead a Los Angeles priest—Father Thomas J. McCarthy.

Father McCarthy, an esteemed university associate of mine, is at present editor of the Tidings, the diocesan weekly of Los Angeles. Writing in the Commonweal on June 25, 1943, he writes:

"The vigilantes came back to Los Angeles last week in 1943 style with taxicabs instead of horses. They made a sorry spectacle as they took the law into their own hands in an effort to avenge members of the armed forces who had been attacked recently by zoot-suiters. For 4 nights members of the armed forces, accompanied by irresponsible civilians, surged through the downtown and east-side areas of Los Angeles in an outrageous display of mob violence. Traveling in automobile packs, which reached the number of 20 in some cases, they drove through Mexican neighborhoods looking for youths dressed in zoot suits. It made no difference whether there was anything established against them. Just so long as they were wearing long, draped coats, with peg-topped trousers, they were fair game for the chase. The Mexican boys were terror stricken. Most of them remained at home during the harrowing 4 nights, and those who did venture forth have now grave reason to regret it, because the incident of cracked heads and bruised heads and bruised bodies runs very high among their number.

"Theaters, bars, buildings, and some houses were invaded. So reckless did the witch hunters become that they gathered menacingly outside a public building where they heard that a Mexican meeting was going on, and only cool heads prevented their breaking in and causing bloodshed. Youngsters against whom no charge could be made, except the wearing of zoot suits, were stripped naked on the city streets and roundly pummeled for good measure. The Mexican has been pushed around a great deal in Los Angeles and he has seen the okie and the arkie come in and be accepted where he is still considered an outcast. He has been insulted and vilified by sailors and soldiers alike. His faddish type of dress and hair-do have made him a ready target of abuse. In some instances he struck back and immediately all the Mexican youths were exposed to attack. Those who really know the Mexican boys in Los Angeles will testify well in their behalf. They are not in the habit of hiding behind trees and attacking people. If there are those among their number who do so, there are also a lot of Anglo-Americans who do that, and the generalization is just as dangerous when applied to the Mexican as when applied to the Anglo-American."

We should add to these and innumerable other instances of injury and death, the profoundly disturbing companion pieces of poverty, disease, and delinquency among these poor peoples, against whom white neighbors have viciously discriminated. If these despised Americans are sometimes illiterate, whose fault is it but the fault of those who denied them an education and drove them out to work in the days of their youth? If these poor souls are sometimes diseased and delinquent, whose fault is it but the fault of those who from their birth condemned them to the unwholesome atmosphere of poverty and squalor? If these people are sometimes unruly and rebellious, what can you expect from a manhood relegated to a lifetime of social ostracism, deprivation of civil rights, political debasement, and economic servitude? It is most amazing that from these underprivileged families, so many members of our armed forces have been recruited. In many cases five men from one of these benighted families have answered the call to the colors.

These people, the colored, the Spanish-Americans of the Southwest, and other minority groups, are our neighbors. Are we good neighbors toward them? Is our social action real in their regard. Catholics and non-Catholics alike, we should (as Americans) heed the injunctions of the American Catholic bishops recently expressed in these words:

"In the providence of God there are among us millions of fellow citizens of the Negro race. We owe to these fellow citizens, who have contributed so largely to the development of our country, and for whose welfare history imposes on us a special obligation of justice, to see that they have in fact the rights which are given them in our Constitution. This means, not only political equality, but also fair economic and educational opportunities, a just share in public welfare projects, good housing without exploitation and a full chance for the social advancement of their race. When given their rights in fact as in law, they will prize with us our national heritage and not lend ear to agitators whose real objective is not to improve but to destroy our way of life.

"In many of our great industrial centers, acute racial tensions exist. It is the duty of every good citizen to do everything in his power to relieve them; to create a neighborhood spirit of justice and conciliation will be particularly helpful to this end.

"And we plead as well for a general interest in the welfare of our Spanish-speaking population. Many of them go back through a long line to the first settlers who came into our Southwest, and others have come in recent years from Mexico. They, also, have a right to express the full enjoyment of our democratic institutions and that help in social life which is accorded to others. The sincerity of our good-neighbor policy with Latin America, so Christian in spirit and so well calculated to foster right international relations, will be attested by our attitude toward our fellow citizens of Latin-American origin or descent."

What can we do?

The bishops' program is simply one of neighborly social action. If the more than 100,000,000 white Americans practiced the postulates of the American Constitution there would be no race or minority problems in America. The American Constitution, and the American Creed which it embodies, is so wonderful that no social utopia—be its complexion Fascist, Nazi, or Communist—can compete with its promises.

Since, however, sad to say, all are not 100-percent American in this regard, the first step in the program of neighborly, social action is a personal conversion of heart, a correction of views, and an increase of that stern self-discipline which subjects personal information we can read in such books as An American Dilemma, by Gunnar Myrdal, two volumes, Harpers, 1944; Brown Americans, by Edwin Embree, Viking, 1943; New World A'Coming, by Roi Ottley, Houghton Mifflin, 1943; Brothers Under the Skin, by Carey McWilliams, Little, Brown, 1943; the Race Question and the Negro, by John La Farge, Longmans, Green, 1943; The Dove Flies South, by James A. Hyland, Bruce, 1943; The Tenth Man, by Edward F. Murphy, Dolphin Press, 1937; Colored Catholics in the United States, by John Gillard, Josephite Press, 1941.

In our neighborly, social action we can, furthermore, learn the Negro's and the Latin-America's side of the problem by reading his newspapers whenever possible. Therein, also, we shall discover pressing problems and trials about which the white press is significantly silent. We might read with profit the new monthly publication, the compact Negro Digest.

In a courteous, charitable, but impressive fashion we can rebel against so-called nigger jokes and other offensive jibes and appellations. We, of Celtic stock, who have long bristled at the modern propensity to ridicule us and ours in song and joke, should be especially eager to conduct this campaign. We can urge our friends and fellow workers to stop using the words "nigger," "darkie,"

"coon"—little things but barbs that sting and provoke retaliation for insult. We should religiously use titles of courtesy—"Mr.," "Mrs.," Miss"—when speaking to and about Negroes.

We can express our disapproval of segregation, practically and vocally. We can grasp every opportunity positively to show our disregard of segregation, e. g., sitting next to Negroes in theaters, streetcars, busses, etc. It goes without saying that a "white lady" and a "white gentleman" should always extend to ladies and gentlemen of color the courtesies expected of all ladies and gentlemen. A gesture? Yes; but what a gracious and Christian gesture.

We should ourselves—and see to it that others, as well—pay equal and just wages to the Negro worker, paying equal wages for equal service, with no differential based on color.

Furthermore, we must promote and protect the rights of Negroes to belong to unions, to have full rights in unions.

We must act in their behalf for better living accommodations, health, and educational facilities. We can train our children to be, not little Nazis, not adherents of a superrace philosophy, but rather 100-percent democratic citizens. We must train them in racial as well as table manners, to respect all men as dignified individuals with immortal souls, equal in fundamental rights regardless of race of economic status. We can make sure that the schools to which we send our children do not discriminate against Negroes and other minority groups. Finally, in our churches, young people's organizations—fraternal and alumni groups—we must welcome members of the so-called minority groups as equal, free participants, officers, and guests.

We Americans have a unique opportunity to serve our country by proving what blessings our country affords. We can do this by being 100-percent American neighbors. This is a call to social action. Then we shall be good neighbors.

Relief of Prisoners of War in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

We, who are mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and others whose dear ones are prisoners of war or missing in the Philippines, Japan, and other countries of the Far East, assembled in Washington, D. C., in an effort to speed aid to our American soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses who fought the gallant rear guard action to permit Gen. Douglas MacArthur to retire to more advantageous points of combat, do hereby declare, that:

The Nation must, with the greatest speed and efficiency, provide every means to bring about the release of these heroes at the earliest possible moment, and that:

We voice confidence in every individual and agency of Government, the American and International Red Cross and the International Y. M. C. A. that they will aid us in bringing about these desired results, and, that:

We are unalterably opposed, at this time, to committing ourselves to any proposal for a national memorial or foundation, but, do go on record as favoring, at the proper time, such recognition of the heroism of the men and women of Bataan and Corregidor as will engrave their names in letters of gold on the perpetual tablets of memory, and, that:

We pledge ourselves to exert every effort that no stone be left unturned in speeding relief to these heroic men and women of the Philippine campaign, and that:

In view of terrible sacrifices of our gallant men and women in every theater of this global conflict, we demand that final peace terms shall be predicated on the treatment of our nationals who are prisoners of war, and that military and civil officials responsible for cruelty, atrocity, and neglect shall be adequately punished, and, that:

Victory by the United Nations shall be so decisive and peace terms so definite that a war such as this can never occur again, and that:

We pledge ourselves to a persistent and untiring campaign to exert every means of learning the present whereabouts and physical status of all Americans who are prisoners of war in the Far East, and that:

We devote our greatest efforts to expediting the shipment of food, medicine, and clothing to Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel in Japanese prison camps, and that:

We exert every influence to provide that Russian lend-lease vessels loaded from western coast ports carry food packages, medicine, clothing, and mail to the extent of 10 percent of their cargo tonnage capacity, and that:

The proper contacts be immediately made with the authorized authorities in the south Pacific from whom we can learn what steps to take immediately to rush relief to the boys in the Philippines and any other prisoners of the Japanese wherever they may be, and to send representatives, if necessary, to contact these officials in order to effectuate immediate action, and that:

Any and all steps that may be deemed necessary to secure the maximum amount of men, equipment, and supplies for General MacArthur and our forces in the south Pacific war theater shall be taken at once: Therefore be it

Resolved, in order to implement the declarations herein set out, That we band together to coordinate efforts to bring these purposes to early fruition; and that this organization of Nation-wide groups, now or hereafter to be affiliated, shall be known as the Federated Organizations for Bataan Relief.

Unanimously adopted February 10, 1944.

CHARLES H. ADAMS,
Chairman, St. Joseph, Mo.,
Mrs. ELIZABETH PARSONS,
Pontiac, Mich.,
AUSTIN E. ANSON,
Weslaco, Tex.,
Resolutions Committee.

Attest:

P. W. MCCAHON,
Secretary, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

FEDERATED ORGANIZATIONS FOR BATAAN RELIEF

The above-titled organization, formed in Washington, D. C., February 10 last, is the outgrowth of the desire by various units of kinsmen of American soldiers, sailors, marines, nurses, and others who are prisoners of the Japanese in the Far East, for an over-all Nation-wide body through which their efforts to afford relief to the heroes of the Philippine campaign may be speeded.

Some 40 representatives, coming from 20 or more States, conferred at the National Capital for 2 days. Dr. V. H. Spensley, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., was elected president, and P. W. McCahon, also of Albuquerque, secretary; Mrs. Theodore Cuyler Biggers, Atlanta, Ga., first vice chairman; Albert C. McArthur, Lombard, Ill., second vice chairman; and Mrs. Charles A. Cook, Sr., Atlanta, Ga., treasurer. Pioneering a plan for regional headquarters at strategic points in the Nation, President Spensley appointed Charles H. Adams, St. Joseph, Mo., executive director of the Middle West district. Austin E. Anson, Weslaco, Tex., and Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan, a monthly magazine devoted to the interests of the Philippines, are in charge of Washington headquarters. The work of affiliating present units and organizing additional ones is now in progress.

The organization's first national convention will be held in St. Joseph, Mo., Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 4, 5, and 6, next. Official Washington, the International and American Red Cross, and International Y. M. C. A. have been asked to send outstanding representatives to this convention. It is believed 100 or more delegates representing groups in 30 to 40 States, as well as hundreds of mothers, fathers, wives, and relatives of those who served in the Far East will be in attendance.

Saturday, May 6, is the second anniversary of the fall of Corregidor and because of the location of this convention St. Joseph is to be the focal point of a Nation-wide observance of the day.

The city of St. Joseph, its chamber of commerce, patriotic and civic organizations are planning to give St. Joseph Chapter, sponsors of Philippine heroes, the local unit, full cooperation in entertaining the delegates and visitors. Correspondence is now in progress with persons of national importance to participate in the convention programs.

Rosecrans Field, base for the United States Army Air Transport Command, and cooperation by its personnel, will provide a military atmosphere.

Negotiations are in progress with coast-to-coast radio systems to relay the sessions of the convention and the Corregidor observance throughout the Nation.

The convention will be confronted by many important proposals to hasten the combined efforts to learn if American prisoners of war in the Far East are subjected to cruelty, abuse, or neglect; methods of sending them medicine, food, and clothing, as well as means of obtaining their early release.

Washington, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, my esteemed friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] placed in the RECORD an article from the Atlanta Journal, written by Thomas J. Culhane, and entitled "Washington, Ga., First of That Name." The article paints a very attractive picture of this tranquil old southern community, and I am sure that it must make us all wish that we could escape from the turmoil and the sleet of today in Washington, D. C., and take refuge there.

When it comes to the historical aspects of the case, the article is less accurate. I realize that my colleague had no occasion to check on this, and I know he will forgive me if I correct the RECORD in this regard.

The Journal's article does not give an exact date for the naming of the Georgia town; but

it refers to the terrible winter of Valley Forge, which was the winter of 1777–78. It further states that Washington, N. C., was the second town to be named for the Father of our Country, Washington, Ky., the third, and Washington, D. C., the fourth.

The fact is that as early as December 13, 1776, the General Court of the State of New Hampshire granted incorporation to a settlement previously known as Camden under the name of Washington. Washington, N. H., is a beautiful little town of 278 inhabitants, 1,500 feet up in the hills of Sullivan County. It is probably buried in snow today; but next summer visitors from many parts of the country—including, I hope, some from the grand old State of Georgia—will be seeking rest and relaxation in its bracing air.

On Tuesday of next week the citizens of Washington, N. H., will assemble in their annual town meeting, "to choose all necessary town officers for the year ensuing, to raise such sums of money as may be necessary to defray town charges for the ensuing year, and make appropriations of the same * * * [and] to transact any other business that may legally come before said meeting." The New England town meeting as an institution never spread to other parts of the country; but it still lives in full vigor among us and stands to all the world for that immediate concern of every citizen with the affairs of government which is a fundamental American principle and which must never be lost sight of in these days of centralization and bureaucracy, if the citizens of Washington, N. H., and Washington, Ga., and all the other local communities scattered over our broad land are to hand on unimpaired to future generations the heritage of liberty for which our fathers fought and died under their great leader, George Washington.

Abe Lincoln's Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by DeWitt Emery, president, National Small Businessmen's Association:

This afternoon I am going to talk about the peculiar attitude of many Americans toward the men who run our Government, usually referred to as politicians. If you were to ask a thousand people whether or not they are in favor of good government, the chances are 100 to 1 you would not get even 1 negative answer. Then if you asked the same thousand, "Where does good government begin?" the chances are you would get a thousand different answers. This is a strange situation when everyone agrees they all want the same thing, yet no two of them agree on where to start to bring about the desired result. Actually there is only one place where good government can begin—that is in the minds and in the actions of the people.

I know it sounds trite to say that in a republic the people can have any kind of government they want—good or bad, expensive or economical, impartial or one-sided—but, nevertheless, that is an absolute statement of fact. In a republic the people can have any kind of government they want. The fly in the ointment is that not enough of us are willing to do anything more than talk about what we want. When it comes to taking the stump or ringing doorbells and talking to people about our candidate, we just aren't there. Oh, my, no. Why, that would be the next thing to getting into politics, and who in the world wants to get into such a disreputable business? All of which causes me to rise and inquire what's wrong with politics and politicians.

My dictionary defines politics as "the science of civil government," and it defines a politician as "one skilled in political science." Is there anything wrong with being "skilled in the science of government"? If not, then it must follow that there isn't anything basically wrong with a politician.

The surety companies have a saying to the effect that "We never bond a dishonest man," which is undoubtedly true. Yet, these same bonding companies pay out millions of dollars every year to make good on losses. The answer, of course, is that some of those who were honest when they were bonded became dishonest afterward. We don't condemn everyone on whom a bond is issued simply because if he did not have a chance to be dishonest he would not be bonded. We don't condemn all lawyers because there are a few shysters in the profession. Nor do we condemn all doctors because there are a few who indulge in unethical practice. Then why should we condemn all politicians simply because a few of them are crooked and are tied up with corrupt political machines?

We are today honoring the memory of one of the greatest, most widely respected, and loved men who ever lived—Abraham Lincoln. Yet, Lincoln was a politician, a most successful politician; so were Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, James Monroe, and many of the other outstanding men in the history of our country. If we had not had these men and they had not been "skilled in the science of government," we just would not have a country today. Our Republic would long since have fallen by the wayside.

Winston Churchill once said that "The trouble with the development of business in England is that too many of the best brains in the country go in for government." We could very well paraphrase this by saying that "The trouble with government in the United States is that too many of the best brains in the country go in for business." We might go on and add that consequently our development of business has outstripped our development of government, and our economy is therefore out of balance. We are in a period now and are approaching an even more crucial period when it is not only necessary, but absolutely essential, for us to have the best brains in the country in government. One way to bring this about is for us to stop giving the word "politician" an unpleasant meaning which does not rightfully belong to it. As long as we continue to do this, we are taking exactly the right course to keep a lot of good men from going in for politics.

Preserve the Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial entitled, "Preserve the Home," which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Tuesday, March 7, 1914.

PRESERVE THE HOME

Father E. J. Flanagan, founder of the justly famous home for boys in Nebraska that bears his name, is a life-long student of the problems of juvenile delinquency.

His discussions of the subject have nationally recognized authenticity.

He has not only seen the great need for developing programs designed to direct neglected and wayward children into wholesome and useful lives, but has actually developed such a program.

His wonderful Boys Town is an astounding American institution, which since its founding in 1917 has given a home and sound spiritual and practical training to thousands of youngsters.

Accordingly, when Father Flanagan says something about juvenile delinquency it is always important.

And he has now said something especially important.

"Wherever youth organizations which are properly supervised are established," he observes, "marked decreases in juvenile delinquency have always been noted."

He approves wholeheartedly of the "recreational center" type of youth organization, but cautious against making that the sole purpose.

The youth organization which will really solve the problem of juvenile delinquency, he says, is one "where the youth through a self-government program have bound themselves together to promote better citizenship among their youthful associates and to serve the community and at the same time plan a well-rounded program which will keep themselves actively engaged in worthwhile enterprises."

Father Flanagan does not get his theories about youth out of books, but out of his own vast experience.

One of the things he has earned from this experience is that:

"Leisure time improperly used often is the cause of young people becoming behavior cases.

"I have said it and I say it again, make the most of your leisure time and juvenile problems will be immensely reduced."

But Father Flanagan has a final word of caution "to persons feeling this type of program is the solution to this modern day problem."

He does not think there is any substitute for the American home.

The most comprehensive and constructive community programs that can be devised will never take the place of the home.

Even Father Flanagan's own wonderful Boys Town institution does not do so.

In all our thinking and planning about American youth, he says:

"We must not forget the child's own home.

"Here is where his natural interests lie, and the home must be considered the natural place of development for children, spiritually, socially, and morally.

"The home must be made attractive to our youth and the bonds of affection and parental guidance must continue to be the primary forces in a child's development into good citizenship."

This is the soundest and best reasoning about juvenile delinquency the American public has been privileged to hear.

It bears out the long-held and often-expressed conviction of the Hearst newspapers—that it is not half so much a problem in juvenile delinquency with which the Nation must deal as a problem in adult, community, and national delinquency.

It is not the American child who is our problem.

Our real problem is the negligent home, where affection and understanding are lacking and where training in simple honesty and basic citizenship are missing—and where the fault is not with children but with those responsible for children.

Organized community youth programs, properly supervised, are wonderful things, as Father Flanagan says.

But the enlightened, decent, and instructive American home is the essential and indispensable thing we must preserve.

Closing of Army Emergency Relief Offices in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

In answer to his protest against the closing of the district Army Emergency Relief offices in Massachusetts, including the A. E. R. office located in Worcester, which serves many outlying communities, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat), of the Third District, today was told by A. E. R. headquarters in Washington that the closing of these offices was made to prevent duplication of effort on the part of the Red Cross and the A. E. R. and in the interest of a conservation of Army manpower now used in relief work.

Veterans' organizations throughout the State recently communcated with PHILBIN asking that he intercede with War Department officials in an endeavor to keep the A. E. R. offices open in Massachusetts, because these organizations felt that the special assistance given by the A. E. R. in meeting the problems of the servicemen and their families could not be replaced by the social-relief type of work being done by the Red Cross, which has been named to assume the duties and obligations of A. E. R. offices maintained in the larger cities throughout the country.

"The Red Cross has already many burdens and responsibilities brought about by the war and is overworked in many communities," said PHILBIN. "The addition of the duties of the Army Emergency Relief will result, I very much fear, in overloading of Red Cross facilities.

"When the A. E. R. was organized its main purpose could be summed up in the slogan, 'The Army takes care of its own.' The new order of the Secretary of War directing the A. E. R. to close all its sections outside of Army reservations seems to be an abandonment of that salutary policy, and I, for one, will continue to work to the end that the Red Cross be freed of this added responsibility so that it may efficiently perform its manifold works of mercy, charity, and service to the country.

"In order that scrupulous attention may be given our needy soldiers and their dependents, perplexed with so many personal problems, I call upon the War Department to permit the Army Emergency Relief to continue its fine work in all of its functions and that all district offices in the Commonwealth be retained."

PHILBIN also released the text of a letter sent him by headquarters of the A. E. R. in Washington, as follows:

"This will acknowledge your recent letter, addressed to General Wilson, in which you express the satisfaction of the veterans' organizations in your congressional district over the past activities of the Army Emergency Relief section in Worcester, Mass. These words of satisfaction pertaining to the Army Emergency Relief are deeply appreciated.

"Inasmuch as the Army Emergency Relief has just completed arrangements with the American Red Cross, whereby the latter agency will assume the primary responsibility of a broad program of volunteer aid of Army personnel and their dependents, it is necessary that under this change of procedure such sections as are located in cities be closed and that the chapters of the Red Cross assume the functions of such sections.

"This new arrangement with the Red Cross was effected in order to prevent duplication of effort by the Red Cross and the Army Emergency Relief and further in the interest of a conservation of Army manpower now used in relief work. The Red Cross has given every assurance that it will care for the needs of servicemen and their dependents, and the Army Emergency Relief stands ready to supplement that aid in any case where the Red Cross is unable, due to the provisions of its home-service policy, to handle a particular case.

"Thanking you for your communication and assuring you that every effort will be made to maintain the high standard of assistance, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"Lt. Col. J. C. HUTSON,

"Coast Artillery Corps,

"For and in the absence of General Wilson."

The Sperry Gyrocompass—Manufactured by the Dodge Division of Chrysler Corporation—Production Called a Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit News:

MASS PRODUCTION CALLED MIRACLE

Assembly-line mass-production methods have been applied by a Detroit automobile factory in making one of the most intricate and delicate instruments devised by man.

For the last 18 months the Dodge division of Chrysler Corporation has been manufacturing the Sperry gyrocompass for cargo and war ships. The gyrocompass is composed of 10,000 parts and requires manufacturing to be exact to better than one-tenth of one-thousandth of an inch—about one-fiftieth of the thickness of a human hair.

Commander Robert Velz, inspector of Navy matériel, claims the mass-production method accomplished by Dodge is one of the miracles of modern industry. Last Wednesday Velz, in the presence of Mayor Jeffries and K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corporation, at the Statler Hotel, cut a ribbon which revealed the gyrocompass to the public for the first time.

"More than 3,000 of these compasses are now being used on ships fighting the Axis," Velz said.

Large quantities of the Sperry gyrocompass became a vital necessity to the United Nations when special equipment, put on ships to counteract the German magnetic mines, destroyed the accuracy of the old magnetic compass. Once the axis of the gyrocompass has been set to point accurately to north and south, no magnetic or natural cause can affect it.

The compass weighs approximately 600 pounds and Dodge used more than 5,000 tools, jigs, dies, and fixtures in making it. The monthly rate of production is now well into 3 figures, officials say. When completely assembled it is placed in the center of a ship below decks and synchronized with auxiliary compasses scattered throughout the vessel.

It is now being used to help guide submarine chasers, cargo boats, destroyers, gasoline tankers, cargo, and many other kinds of ships.

H. R. 4278

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in rural electrification. Great progress has been made in this program. However, we have only broken the surface.

In the beginning the Creator said, "Let there be light; and there was light." He "saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness." Since the beginning of time men have sought light—freedom from darkness.

America is the richest Nation on earth. We lead in almost everything for the advancement of civilization except farm electrification. I understand that in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany 90 percent of the farms are electrified, and that in France and Italy still a higher percentage are electrified. While it may be true that in these countries the farm population is not as sparsely settled as in the United States, yet in New Zealand where the farm population is scattered approximately 65 percent of the farms are electrified.

I believe that the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration is one of the landmarks of this administration. There should be no opposition to this program. I am not speaking of the policies of the present set-up of the Administration. There has been some criticism of some of the policies and personnel. I do not care to go into this subject at the present time. If there is anything wrong along this line it can be changed. Let us not prejudice this great program because of our like or dislike of any particular person who might be connected with the Administration. As soon as possible this program of the electrification of the farms of America must go forward.

We all realize that at the present time it is impossible to extend the facilities because of the inability to secure critical material. However, we must now prepare for the program so that when the war is over the "go" signal can be given.

Much has been said here of late concerning our debt to the returning service men and women. No one appreciates more than I the gratitude that this Nation owes them. I am afraid that because of the surplus of labor many will not be able to secure jobs in the cities. There should be an opportunity for these to secure farms. Those who are returning to the farms should be given an opportunity to benefit from a rural electrification program.

The reduction of interest and the extension of loans from 25 to 35 years, as provided in this bill, will go a long way toward the extension of this program. Several of the cooperatives are located in my congressional district. I have taken an interest in their affairs and have had an opportunity to appraise their work. All of them are in good financial shape and are served by officers and directors who have a real interest in the success of their cooperative. All of these cooperatives have many applications for service. Give them an opportunity to go forward. They do not ask that this program be a drain upon their Government. The cooperatives will be self-liquidating. Let us hasten the day when every farm home in America will have the service of electricity. Let there be light in every farm home. Let electricity lift the burden from the back of the farm wife of our Nation and we will be a happier, healthier, and more contented people.

This Feuding Is Really Nothing New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the March 5, 1944, issue of the Washington Post entitled "This Feuding Is Really Nothing New":

THIS FEUDING IS REALLY NOTHING NEW—EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE DISPUTES ARE IN THE GREAT AMERICAN TRADITION

"It [the President's veto] is an encroachment of the Executive on the authority of Congress. * * * a more studied outrage on the legislative authority of the people has never been perpetrated; * * * [the President] must confine himself to his Executive duties, to obey and execute, not make the laws."

Sounds familiar, doesn't it? It might have come from the speech of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY when he excoriated the action of President Roosevelt in vetoing the congressional tax bill.

But it came, instead, from a document 80 years old, generated by the bitterness of another historic conflict between a wartime President and Congress. Although battles such as that between Congress and the President over the tax bill may provide 7-day political sensations, they are old stuff in American history.

WASHINGTON'S TROUBLE

America's first President, George Washington, had heavy going with Congress on several occasions. Perhaps the most celebrated of these was on his support of the Jay Treaty with England at the close of the Revolutionary War. The House of Representatives requested Washington to produce some of the documents in connection with the pact. Washington refused, and in the ensuing dispute asserted:

"The attacks (against me) were in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero, a notorious defaulter, or even to a common pickpocket."

It was when Washington went before the Senate to explain an Indian treaty that he broke social relations with that body. When the Senate declined to act immediately on the treaty, Washington exclaimed:

"This defeats every purpose of my coming here."

After that, Presidential messages usually went to Congress in writing.

The Senate formally censured President Andrew Jackson when he removed deposits of Federal funds from the Bank of the United States.

Jackson replied that the Senatorial action was "unauthorized by the Constitution and contrary to its spirit," and demanded to know why, if the Senate wanted to bring charges, it did not impeach him.

BUCHANAN-DOUGLAS

Hostility between the President and the Senate continued almost through Jackson's administration, but in 1837 the resolution of censure was expunged from the record.

Another classic conflict—and one that has a strong likeness to the Roosevelt-Barkley flare-up—was between President James Buchanan and Senator Stephen A. Douglas. The latter, for a long time one of the President's stanchest supporters, broke with him over the form of constitution under which Kansas should be admitted to the Union.

Douglas' power in the Senate was so great that Buchanan never was able to get his own legislation through Congress. The breach thus created widened, helped split the Democratic Party and led to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860.

The indictment of Lincoln—quoted at the beginning of this account—appeared in the Wade-Davis manifesto, prepared by Senator Ben Wade of Ohio and Representative Henry M. Davis of Maryland, in 1864.

In anticipation of a Union victory and the end of the war, Lincoln had offered his reconstruction plan, a moderate program which would have readmitted the Confederate States to the Union rapidly.

But radical Republicans substituted their own bill, which Lincoln killed with a pocket veto, and the manifesto followed.

Thirty years later a small majority of Senate Democrats broke with Grover Cleveland and joined Republicans to rewrite the Wilson tariff bill, which Cleveland had espoused. Cleveland allowed the bill to become law without his signature, but piled scorn upon the Democrats, accusing them of treason, party perfidy, and party dishonor.

JOHNSON'S RECORD

President Teddy Roosevelt saw one of his senatorial mainstays—Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island—turn into a leader of the opposition. Their rift started with T. R.'s foreign policies.

President Wilson had comparatively smooth sailing through his first term and for the duration of the war, but his classic battle came over American post-war foreign policy. Upon his failure to reconcile the Senate's "irreconcilables" he embarked upon a Nation-wide speaking tour that led to his collapse.

No President has approached Andrew Johnson's record for staying in hot water with the lawmakers. It became almost routine for Congress to pass laws over his veto, and he finally was impeached in 1868. The attempt to remove him from office, however, lost by a single vote in the Senate.

Post-War Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the Public Printer explaining why an article I submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was not printed:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1944.

Hon. WALTER E. BREHM,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BREHM: Your extension of remarks entitled "Post-War Employment" is returned herewith as it is a duplication of an extension by Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1944.

Very truly yours,

A. E. GIEGENGACK,
Public Printer.
By P. L. COLE,
Director of Planning Service.

I may say that the gentleman from Mississippi and I submitted this article on the same day.

Congress and the Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is aroused over the recent attacks which have been made upon the legislative branch of Government. Considerable propaganda and misinformation have appeared in newspapers and in radio broadcasts, so that it is extremely difficult for many Americans to appreciate fully the vital need of maintaining the integrity of the Congress as a coordinate branch of Government. Therefore, it is encouraging to know that some of our newspapers are rallying to the defense of Congress in an effort to present the facts to their readers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorial published in the Idaho Daily Statesman on March 2, 1944:

WE AGREE

In last Sunday's Statesman the United Press quoted Thomas E. Dewey as follows: "Now, if ever, Congress needs all the strength it can obtain. No citizen, no man or woman of good will, can fail to reach the conclusion after reading the ominous trend in the news of the fight against Congress, that its very existence, its very function in the plan of American constitutional government, is at stake."

With that statement we agree absolutely. Beyond any question there is a powerful movement, not only within the present administration but also outside it, to discredit

and destroy Congress. It is not a movement that will for the most part come out in plain sight and speak plain words; on the contrary, the attack is by no means always obvious and is therefore all the more dangerous.

But a part of the attack is obvious enough for anyone to see. Even some newspapers not sympathetic to the New Deal are helping to destroy faith in Congress by reporting all the bad about it and ignoring all the good. That is surprising because once Congress is destroyed there will not be and cannot be any freedom of the press in this Nation.

If the people's representatives cannot always see eye to eye with the President. It does not follow that they are motivated any more than he by political motives, or that they have any less integrity and vision.

Many of the ablest men in Congress, including some in the Democratic Party, are convinced that the President is steadily taking this Nation toward totalitarianism. Whether that is true we don't know, but we do know that a lot of American leaders outside of Congress—some of whom have no political ambitions or connections—are also convinced that such is Roosevelt's purpose and the direction of his striving. If Congress is making its fight on that basis—and some Congressmen unquestionably are—then Americans who want to keep the American way should get behind their delegates and support and encourage them.

Of the recent tax bill the President said it was not enough and it may not be; but the fact remains that he asked for 10½ billions and would not come out for a sales tax which is the only sort of tax left that could raise such a sum. It's simply impossible to get that much additional revenue from increases in excise, income, and excess profit and corporation taxes without gravely endangering our economic structure. At least that is the argument of the tax experts in Congress who have spent months considering the matter; and they ought to know. The President wouldn't come out for a sales tax because of politics and votes; but Congress, don't forget, was ready to impose such a tax if he would have supported it.

It is dishonest, therefore, to say that Congress wouldn't give him what he asked for. Congress would have done so in the only way possible but for political reasons he wouldn't have it. It's a fine thing for his own political interests to point with scorn at Congress and say to the American people, "I asked for ten and a half billions; they gave me two." It's dishonest to do that, and Mr. Roosevelt knows it. So let us be done with all this stupid and malicious effort to discredit the representatives of the American people, and remember with Dewey, that the existence of constitutional government is at stake.

And let us remember too that rulers determined to seize great power always strive to discredit the parliamentary bodies representing the people. Mussolini did it, Hitler did it; and if it is to be done in this country we shall then have fascism and we may as well know that now.

Britain Pulls Strings of Puppet Arab Governments and Causes Them to Protest Wright-Compton Palestine Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the Jewish national fund council at the Alcazar, Baltimore, Tuesday, March 7, 1944:

The protests of the Arabs of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Trans-Jordan against the Wright-Compton resolution were timed to follow immediately upon the announcement of bipartisan support for this resolution. The Wright-Compton resolution seeks to remind Britain of her obligation under the Balfour Declaration to facilitate the establishment of a national homeland in Palestine for the Jewish people and demands the abrogation of the infamous MacDonald white paper which precludes Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 31, 1944.

These protests are an insult to the intelligence of the Members of the House. One of them took the form of a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, claiming that the passage of the resolution would be tantamount to a declaration of war against the Arabs in Palestine. This is an attempt to frighten Congressmen into refraining from taking action on the resolution. Such type of protest is as unprecedented as it is outrageous.

The British Colonial Office is behind this whole sordid business of protest. What it has failed to do directly, it seeks to do indirectly and pulls the strings of these puppet governments to make them file these objections. Thus is a duststorm raised to confuse the issue. There is the tiny spot of land called Palestine, one-half the size of the State of Vermont, and the Arabs say that a handful of Jews are attempting to push the Moslems off the map. It is actually a matter of 10,429 square miles which the Jews only partially inhabit as against 7,000,000 square miles in which the Arabs may live, breed, and flourish.

The greater majority of Arabs are in the lowest degree of illiteracy. The average Moslem in Egypt and India, in Tunisia and Algeria, in Iran and Iraq, in Yemen and Morocco doesn't even know where Palestine is. Returning soldiers from these parts tell me that in their conversations with the Moslems concerning Palestine, the latter confess to knowing nothing about Palestine, or if they do, theirs is the attitude of the shrugging of indifferent shoulders.

It suits England's convenience not to keep the pledge she made to 52 nations when she received and accepted the mandate over Palestine, incorporating in all solemnity the Balfour Declaration. It suits Britain to ignore the primary purpose of the mandate, that is, to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people. It suits her convenience to breach unilaterally the treaty made with the United States wherein she agreed no one would be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion.

The failure of our State Department to protest this violation contained in the MacDonald white paper of the Anglo-American treaty remains a mystery neatly wrapped inside an enigma.

The policy of the British Foreign Office to crush Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews to all intents and purposes appears to have become the policy of our State Department.

It has been bruited that the authorities in our Army have likewise stepped into the political picture to voice objection to the Wright-Compton resolution. I fervently hope that that is not so, for should that be the fact, a dangerous precedent has been set. It has never been, and wisely so, the function of the Army to set a political pattern. That is the work of our State Department. It is not within the province of the Army to act as political adviser. The authority of the Army to intervene in matters that concern the national security cannot, of course, be questioned, but the threat to national security must be certain and definite before the Army can be permitted to chart our political course. My research and study of the Palestine question lead me to believe that the situation is primarily political. Were I convinced it were otherwise than primarily political, I would not view with dismay this alleged and curious cross-functioning of the State and War Departments.

The supply of oil is lugged in. We are paying dearly for oil in Saudi Arabia. It has no relation whatever to the Palestine question. In addition to the vast sums of money which the King of Saudi Arabia is getting for the oil concessions and their development there is to be thrown in under lend-lease, 20,000,000 ounces of silver for coinage purposes from our hoard at West Point. That is sufficient bakeesh for Arabia. It has been asserted that Brig. Gen. Patrick Hurley had promised as a further payment the closing of Palestine doors to Jewish immigration.

In the meanwhile, the great sacrifices made by Palestine Jews in furthering the war efforts of the Allies are entirely forgotten. They sweated, toiled, and bled white in the Allied cause. But King ibn-Saud couldn't spare a donkey or a camel to the Allies in their darkest moment. King Farouk, of Egypt, toasted and heiled Hitler for what he believed to be the Axis' coming victories. When Rommel was at the gates of Alexandria, Egypt's Prime Minister was caught conveying messages of Allied troop movements to the Axis. It is not difficult to recall the Iraq revolt which had to be crushed by the British, nor do we easily forget that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, an avowed Nazi agent, escaped to Berlin to continue his work from Naziland of spreading poisonous propaganda among the Arabs in favor of the Axis.

These then, are the Arabs that must be appeased. Our failure to act on the Wright-Compton resolution will not more appease them than did the promulgation of the white paper. Our failure to pass the resolution will no more appease them than did Munich, Germany. You can only whet their appetite for more appeasement. In 1939, before the issuing of the white paper closing Palestine to Jewish immigration, the Arabs similarly protested and objected. They got their white paper, but still in the crucial test were Hitler's friends.

Address of Senator Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN before the Women's National Democratic Club, Monday, March 6, 1944:

We are now in the third year of this terrible war. We are spurred by the grim determination to wage this war relentlessly on all fronts and on all seas until all those who have chosen to live by the sword have perished by it. We now have neither the time nor the inclination for self-appraisal. But when the time comes for the historians to write the record of our participation in this great struggle they will undoubtedly state that at this present period we had reached the turning point of the war. I do not pretend that they will write that within these past 2 years we had accomplished any major part of the fighting which gained the final

victory. The successes of our arms, both on land and sea, are only an indication of the greater victories which must lie ahead. They do prove that our military and naval forces are courageous, well-trained, competently led, and are impelled by the knowledge that they fight for the right.

I do not suggest that the historians will say that at this stage of the war the battle of production had been won. There remain long months and years of toil for the uncomplaining men and women who are producing the food and the materials for war. But I do think that the writers of history will say that at this date our countrymen had conditioned themselves to win the war. We have grimly resolved that no sacrifice is too great for the end we must attain—the complete annihilation of the aggressors who so seriously threaten our democratic existence and ideals. At this point our people are prepared to see their sons die and to return wounded from the battle; to offer their goods, their minds, and their muscles for the benefit of the country we love. Because we have reached this state of mind and have made this high resolve, the victory is certain. It may be long delayed; it may be difficult to attain, but it is no longer doubtful. That, I think, will be the estimate of our present position by those who later describe our participation in this war.

Actuated by this high resolve to exert every ounce of our strength and to spare ourselves no sacrifice until we have won, each American must daily ask himself, "Am I doing my part for my country? Am I contributing my full share to the national effort?" Every American must become a part of our industrial or agricultural or military establishments. There is some worthy contribution—be it large or small, important or seemingly trivial—that every citizen can offer. Each one of us who remains at home is a very necessary member of the army of the home front. It is this army—composed of agriculture, labor, industry, and the home—which must work and toil and sacrifice so that we may produce more food, more guns, tanks, planes, and all the material of war for our gallant men and women who wear their country's uniform. Let each of us in civilian life reappraise our efforts in this terrible conflict and, through our efforts, preserve for our fighting men a Nation worth fighting for. That, in truth, is your job and mine.

The duties of my office carry with it a grave measure of accountability for the conduct of this war. Because one of my assignments carries with it a great responsibility in the production of goods for war, I ask permission to recount the duties of this assignment and the purpose we are trying to effect. I refer to the Special Committee of the United States Senate To Investigate the War Program, of which I had the honor of being named chairman.

But first, let me sketch some of the background of the production situation so that you may know the problems with which we are confronted and can determine the success of our effort to solve these problems.

I resent the continued inferences by some critics of the war effort that America's effort in the war is without plan or coordination. It is true that in the extent of our preparations for war we have been at a grave disadvantage when compared with the position of the violent enemies of democracy who deliberately planned a world conquest and who were able to impose their ruthless will upon the deluded and quaking subjects who are forced to follow the evil banners of their dictatorship. In this great peace-loving country where every individual is guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, no one ever dreamed of planning a war of aggression. Any leader who would have suggested that we should plan a war of aggression and gear our national economy to such a plan, would not have been merely ostracized—he would have risked seclusion in a padded cell.

On the other hand, the irresponsible leaders who willed this terrible war had everything to gain personally and nothing to lose and were free, for their own advantage, to exploit their deluded masses to the limit. For years they fanatically planned and schemed to force their barbaric ideologies upon the free peoples of the world, and to this end they have concentrated all their war-making capacities. Their systems of government were organizations for war, and in order to continue in existence they had no alternative but war.

There were people who sensed our danger from these irresponsible lunatics. Our President certainly was the first to cry that real danger lurked in the mad vaporings of Hitler and Mussolini, and he suggested that the aggressor nations be quarantined. Within the narrow limits of our national attitude toward wars, our military establishments and the Congress took such steps as this attitude permitted. Those intrepid airmen, Doolittle and Eaker, and their comrades, risked their lives to determine the best types of planes and the best routes and landing sites to gain the knowledge which would some day benefit our military establishments. Over 20 years ago, the Congress and the military committees of the American Legion and other veteran organizations studied and made recommendations for the proper mobilization of our resources for war, basing their studies on experiences in the First World War. The industrialists who helped to develop new implements of war and assisted in these plans for industrial mobilization also contributed their part to the plan for our defense. But it was impossible to plan to the extent needed to offset the advantages in planning held by the ruthless dictators.

So with insufficient preparation, our country was suddenly catapulted into war and for its very existence was forced almost overnight to do all that Nazi Germany and Japan had done over a period of a decade as a definite policy. We had to provide instruments of war, not only for the greatest army this country has ever assembled, but also for our allies whose fighting gave us time to prepare. We had to produce food for millions outside of our country and to provide the bottoms to carry it. We had to spend billions to build facilities for this giant industrial program and billions more to pay for the goods which it produced. We drew on our experiences in World War No. 1 to keep the profit motive out of the manufacture of war materials and we drew on that experience to finance our war.

But you must realize that several hundreds of billions of dollars could not be spent without a great many mistakes and some little dishonesty. Even in these times of sacrifice, there are some who seek to profit at the expense of their neighbors' lives and fortunes and many more who are just plain careless. To check these, our Special Committee to Investigate the War Program was created by the United States Senate. I was appointed chairman. It is a bi-partisan committee, and the members from both parties have cooperated harmoniously. The purpose of the committee is to search out the obstacles that are hampering the war program and to remove them. The committee sits continuously and constantly reviews the problems of production and the conduct of the war. It has tried to do its job directly with the persons and services concerned and to avoid publicity except where it is necessary to insure the correction of the mistakes found. It deals impersonally with every situation which threatens the war effort. Above all, our committee has insisted that our production effort be carefully planned and coordinated and that each step and division be carefully coordinated with every other step and division.

You will appreciate that the demands for productive facilities and products are not only gigantic in size and critical in point of time, but that they are competitive within the services. Shall steel be allocated for ships or for tanks or for airplanes? What priority shall a pipe line have over a battleship, if any? These questions cannot all be resolved at one time or frozen as part of one general plan. The need for various materials and products ebbs and flows constantly. Tanks might be the first requirement today; a simple defensive device might relegate them to a secondary position tomorrow. Above all our program must be fluid and must be based on current requirements and upon advice from the men who are actually fighting the war and carrying the goods to battle. We must preserve the delicate balance between production and use. This task of control and guidance is of the first importance. This production must be synchronized with the needs of our allies, as well as our own military establishments. Quantities must be carefully and currently revised. The days of too little and too late must never recur.

In describing the necessities of such a program, I wish to make very clear the part that is played by our committee. Our committee was not organized to tell the services and war agencies what to do or how to do it. Theirs is the responsibility for the fighting and for production. Our function is to insure that intelligent consideration is given to all of the important and difficult problems presented by the war program, to make certain that our victory is gained at the least expenditure in human lives and property.

When we find the management of a steel company permitting falsification of their records of steel plate, we must never be daunted by the fact that the company is one of the greatest corporations in the world. When we find the management of an aviation company has put condemned materials into airplane engines over the protest of the inspectors, we must not turn aside because of that company's long record of achievement. The committee has served notice on all such companies that the only excuse that it will accept is an early and complete correction of the matter and the prompt punishment of those responsible. If management is shown to be incapable, we must record this insufficiency so that the responsibility will flow to shoulders that can bear it and so that power will be wielded by men who know how. The Senate has assigned our committee as a monitor to watch the whole war effort. Other persons and other committees have been assigned similar duties with respect to individual parts of the program. But ours is a general assignment and our responsibility is great. There are no conflicts in jurisdiction or authority, nor will any occur. Before us always is the broad fabric of the war effort and its shuttles move back and forth incessantly to weave the "warp with the woof." We must remain vigilantly on guard to insure that into the resulting material is woven the pattern of victory.

You may not know until after the war ends, the full extent of our war effort or the results of our vigilance. Many of the matters we are called upon to investigate are, of necessity, confidential in their nature and restricted in the distribution of the news concerning them. As to such situations the record is being carefully preserved, so that it may be reviewed by you and your boys when they return from Tokyo and Berlin. This function will enable you in the years following the victory to appraise dispassionately the effort made by those to whom you have entrusted the conduct of the war. We will never lose sight of the fact that as your representatives we stand in your shoes in the situations where immediate action or

secret review is necessary. As your proxies we will check, we will watch, we will report, and will preserve the record for posterity.

As we march forward toward certain victory, we must make the plan for a lasting and just peace. To win a military victory alone would be futile unless we lay a foundation in our post-war world that will secure for all men everywhere their basic human rights. Our President has proclaimed our war objectives as outlined in the "four freedoms." We are fighting now that the "four freedoms" shall be not only freedoms for the United Nations but a heritage for all the peoples of the world. History has bestowed on us a solemn responsibility. We shall—we must—be a mighty force at the peace conference. We failed before to give a genuine peace—we dare not fail this time.

The pattern of post-war action directly affects the lives of every American citizen and will continue to affect the very existence of generations of Americans yet unborn. There have been occasions in the past where we were out-maneuvered. Our counsel, while then appearing well-advised, has now been shown to have been hasty and ill-conceived. We must not repeat the blunders of the past. It will be no easy thing to formulate the good peace. We must evaluate carefully every factor, every possible approach to the problems of post-war living. As each separate problem comes before that peace conference, we should be prepared to meet it intelligently.

The economic and social problems of the past 15 years, as well as the exigencies of the war, have required a tremendous expansion in the tasks assumed by the Federal Government. It is important, in view of this expansion, that we keep before us the truth that in America the Government is us. There has been in some quarters a tendency to think of the Government doing this and the Government doing that without realizing who the Government is. In some places, it is said, "In view of present conditions, our problems are too big for us to handle alone. We must, therefore, ask Washington to do the job."

This abdication from responsibility, though natural under pressure of war conditions, can only lead to confusion and break-down. We can see the result in Europe. The heart of the democratic process is the voluntary initiative of the individual citizen and his government. When communities grip their responsibilities and resolutely face their problems at the source, there comes a new self-respect and a new ability to participate to the full in the destiny of the Nation.

Many Americans today are being led down false paths and enticed by negative un-American brands of thought to fight each other over secondary issues. We need to emblazen across the life of this country the cardinal truths of nationhood—that the real issue is not between group and group within our own country who seem to have conflicting interests. The real issue today is whether we are going to sacrifice personal and group selfishness for the sake of the Nation—or whether we are going to sacrifice our Nation for the sake of our selfishness. The issue also is whether we are going to sacrifice our national selfishness for the sake of the world—or insure World War No. 3 by sacrificing the world for the sake of our national selfishness.

Americans must fight on the real issues. The real issue is whether we, as a Nation of strong-minded men and women, are going to have the courage to sink our differences which arise out of selfish interests and pour everything we have into the Nation's interest. This is crucial if the great lessons of this war are to be mobilized for the building of a united America and a new world.

It has been well said that what we fight for is a pattern of democracy designed by God and worked by everyone. If a rebirth of our American faith is a necessity for total victory in war, as our top militarists believe, it will be even more essential when the guns are silent and statesmen take up the task of putting the world together again. The emergence, then, of America's fighting faith into full maturity and power is an inescapable must for the future. Without it, even the most brilliant military success in Europe and Asia will be of small consequence. Indeed, it will only add to our problems and the world's. It is one thing to occupy a people's territory. It is quite another to occupy their minds and hearts so that the evil we fight can never again be willed by any man or nation.

It has been the history of all nations that their growth and expansion are patterned and shaped by the international struggle for power. The foreign policy of a state has always been determined by the rules of power politics as applied to that state's existing economy. So far, in the world's history, there has been no adequate substitute for power politics. Even if the majority of the nations were to renounce war, it would be merely an idle pretense. As long as there exists one single nation that may make a sovereign choice of war, all other nations must be prepared to do likewise. It is this fundamental international situation—realistic power politics—which confronts our world leaders now, and will be the major problem to overcome in building the foundation for a decent and sane post-war world.

The only logical basis for erecting a lasting peace and reconstructing a war-torn world must be in a now "improved" league of nations made up of the United Nations and controlled by Britain, China, Russia, and the United States, in the name of all and for the welfare of all. We must see to it that there is no post-war scramble for the spoils of war, for more power at the expense of other nations. Lasting peace can be attained only through a new system of collective defense. The world of nations must adopt some adequate substitute for power politics. We must outlaw war by creating a new machine of peace, more powerful than any machine of war. The means of enforcement is a powerful international police force. The question is, Do we really want international law and order and peace, or are we merely talking nice generalities but determined to go back to the old system of international chaos and recurring wars? No government at any level—local, State, or Federal—however limited its functions, ever functioned successfully without having somewhere the force necessary to enforce its rules and punish violations.

The League of Nations created after World War No. 1 outlawed aggression but depended on individual nations to supply the force to make it stick. That did not work. Individual nations will not go to war or risk war simply to save the peace of the world, even though it is now clear that their own peace is involved sooner or later. They will go to war, and this is particularly true of democracies which are devoted to peace, only when their own security is threatened vitally. States will never live in peace among themselves if international law, decency, order, and respect for human life and property are not enforced by armed power wisely wielded by the nations of the world who have pledged themselves to the winning of the war and the accomplishment of a just and lasting peace.

Arabia Oil Line Project as It Will Affect Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herewith a timely article by Mr. Arthur Krock, which appeared in the Sunday issue of March 5. This subject is bound to be a most vital one so far as our Nation is concerned, and Mr. Krock has clearly analyzed the situation:

WASHINGTON, March 4.—The trans-Arabia pipe line, which Secretary Harold L. Ickes (as Petroleum Administrator for War) plans to begin building at once and which most of the oil industry is assailing, enters the spheres of interest and authority of at least five divisions of the war Government and the Congress of the United States. That unusual fact, as well as the intensity and gravity of the issues the project has evoked, has made the subject one of outstanding importance.

Because the decision to build the pipe line is a step in foreign policy, the President and the State Department are concerned. Because it is a step in foreign economic policy, the F. E. A., headed by Leo T. Crowley, is concerned. P. A. W. enters the picture as construction engineer. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are deeply involved because the Army and Navy may be called on to protect the installation, a task both distant and difficult. Both branches of Congress come into the situation because appropriations must be made and an issue of Government ownership has been raised. And the Senate, which is empowered by the Constitution to "advise and consent" to certain kinds of agreements with foreign governments, has that special relation.

FIRST OBSTACLE REMOVED

The President long ago informed his Cabinet that in all questions arising in the war zones the military authority would prevail over the civilian. Under this order the Joint Chiefs of Staff could veto the project, but Mr. Ickes says he has their approval. That removes obstacle No. 1.

The State Department, even if the military authorities saw no objection to the pipe line through what has been accurately called one of the world's most explosive areas, could veto the project as foreign policy, which it conducts for the President. Thus far no clear information of the Department's position is available except that the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, is a member of the F. E. A. Board to which Mr. Ickes explained his plan and apparently encountered no strong disapproval. But even if the State Department has objected, or will, the President is quoted by Mr. Ickes as favorable to the enterprise, which would automatically overcome an adverse position by the Department, since the President is supreme in the field of foreign policy.

CROWLEY APPEARS FOR IT

The head of F. E. A., Mr. Crowley, appears to have gone along with the plan, and it is P. A. W.'s own—through the agency of the R. F. C.-financed Petroleum Reserves Corporation—which disposes of all the executive agencies involved. This still leaves Congress, however, where the project can meet

death through specific prohibition and denial of funds unless the President should decide to proceed anyhow under the Second War Powers Act and find the money in some other pocket of the Government.

After the heavy assault on the pipe-line scheme by James A. Moffett and 55 oil companies, Congress began to take more notice. The President met the protest with the cautious comment that a question of supplies—for the next 50 years and not just for the next 5 or 10—was the point. But a senatorial panel, which will soon be named to review the plan and all its implications, including the matter of future oil reserves, can be expected to survey each of the numerous and critical policy fields the project traverses.

SOME VITAL QUESTIONS

That survey should produce answers to these inquiries about the pipe line which have arisen since Mr. Moffett and other oil-industry spokesmen made their criticisms:

1 Does the prospect of oil supply justify such an adventure?

2. What has been the role, if any, of the State Department in a matter so obviously within its purview; and, if it has had no positive part, is that because the President took over the problem himself?

3. What led up to the reputed approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, since the military authorities are known to be acutely conscious of trouble potentials in the Arab world and would be inclined to oppose anything that might call for increased forces in that region? Was their approval divided, conditional, or otherwise restricted?

4. Is the plan even the thin edge of Government ownership of American industrial activities, beginning with those abroad—an objective which has been attributed to Mr. Ickes by some of his critics?

5. Has the administration fully thought out the trouble potentials of such Government ownership, particularly in an area so remote from our natural military spheres and one already agitated by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER'S resolution in favor of making Palestine a Jewish homeland? Does the administration realize the perilous difference between the crisis that would arise if its own property were expropriated by one of the nations traversed by the pipe line, and the dispute that would be created by the expropriation of privately owned property?

ATLANTIC CHARTER ISSUE?

6. Since the pipe line is designed to carry oil, produced by American companies with rights acquired from Arab nations from the Persian Gulf to Alexandria, and this oil is to belong wholly to the United States—except for the quantity reserved to the King of Saudi Arabia—does that arrangement run counter to article 4 of the Atlantic Charter?

They [the President and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom] will endeavor, with due respect to their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

For, some critics contend, the oil is a world raw material, and, if it must be shared on the basis indicated in the Charter, then why should the Government run the risk of owning the pipe line, and what becomes of the argument that all the oil is needed to add to our reserves?

7. Did Mr. Ickes proceed with his plan on the orderly course that is marked in the chart of the Government's organization, or did he hurry it through bypasses in order to get so far ahead of objectors that they could not possibly overtake him?

SECRECY ON FIRST STEPS

The great secrecy that shrouded the first steps of the enterprise has aroused some suspicion that there is an affirmative answer to the second part of question 7. And the murk that surrounds the position of the State Department increases that suspicion and will continue to do so until it is lifted.

Some days ago the Senate Truman committee noted the lack of a clear national oil policy and urged the evolution of one. This will be pursued by the special Senate panel that is to be created, and implicit in that quest will be these further questions: Does the trans-Arabia pipe line inaugurate a national oil policy; and if so, what is that policy to be? Or is the pipe-line project a step in an oil policy already formulated and which should be clearly stated?

Letter From United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Thomas V. Conner, commander, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Nevada:

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF NEVADA,
Fallon, Nev., March 3, 1944

Hon. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
Congressman from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SULLIVAN: The Department of Nevada, United Spanish War Veterans, take this means of expressing to and through you to the other Members of Congress, our most sincere gratitude and appreciation for the quick and satisfactory manner in which our bill, H. R. 2350, was disposed of by the House of Congress. We, of course, cannot write to each Congressman a personal letter, but we are hoping that you will find some way of informing them as a body, that we are truly grateful for what they have done for us. With very best wishes to you personally, we are,

Sincerely yours,
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF NEVADA,
THOMAS V. CONNOR, *Commander.*
Attest: M. L. TUGGLE, *Adjutant.*

Navy Makes Come-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following timely and well-written article by David Lawrence. It serves to focus attention on the outstanding accomplishments of our fleet in the Pacific:

NAVY MAKES COME-BACK—GREAT LEADERSHIP, SENSATIONAL VICTORIES REGAIN CONFIDENCE LOST AT PEARL HARBOR

(By David Lawrence)

The Navy, by its sensational victories of the last few months, and particularly of the last 2 weeks, has won back the confidence of the American people which it lost temporarily in the Pearl Harbor tragedy of December 7, 1941.

It's the same Navy as then, the same highly trained though more experienced Navy, but free from the restraints imposed at that time when, under our peacetime restrictions, the Navy had to remain on the defensive till an overt act was committed by another nation.

It may be of little advantage now to debate why so many of our ships were concentrated in a harbor and why the land-based planes of the Army were not able to get off the ground in time to mitigate the effects of that attack. But the American people know more today about raids and the difficulties of warding them off. Indeed, while every effort will be made to protect ourselves against attacks from any quarters, the public should not be shocked if the enemy does raid our newly won bases in the Gilberts and Marshalls. The enemy has aircraft carriers, too, and the Pacific Ocean is big enough for sneak moves when our own fleet may be returning or is occupied in force among other bases.

The achievement in bombing Truk and later the Marianas is a glorious one, however, and more than makes amends for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The Japanese could not follow up their attack on Hawaii and gained nothing by it except to put out of commission some obsolete battleships which now have been rebuilt and modernized and are of more use to us than they would have been in December 1941, when we did not have the naval air power anyway to provide the necessary cover or offensive strength to move westward toward the Philippines.

SIZE IS CITED

The Navy which we now have in the Pacific is larger than anything we or any other nation has ever mobilized in any one theater of action. It is a navy in which coordination has played a vital part. Army land-based planes are timed to attack and defend along with naval airplanes flown from decks of numerous carriers.

The American people, and particularly the workers in the shipyards, are to be congratulated for the job done in building so many carriers in such a short space of time. Our aircraft factories and their personnel are especially to be commended for having made possible the air supremacy we now possess over vast areas of the Pacific.

Most significant is the accomplishments of our whole naval command. Admiral King, who became Commander in Chief of the Fleet a month after Pearl Harbor, has put into the organization of the Navy a determination and an efficiency which is reflected in the results already attained. His genius as an organizer has given him already an inestimable place in our naval history.

The country knows little about the part played by the subordinate commanders. It knows little, for instance, about the skill and tactics of Admiral Nimitz, whose planning and resourceful use of every opening offered by the enemy made possible the success of the recent raids. In one instance—a raid that has resulted favorably—it is said that Admiral Nimitz went beyond his plan. Like a halfback who suddenly sees an even better opening than the football play itself requires

and takes instant advantage of it, the commander of our Pacific operations caught the enemy off balance and used the element of complete surprise to the great advantage of our side.

CASUALTIES SMALL

Casualties have been relatively small. The risks taken have been big. The people know only the official words of the communiques, which are modest and restrained. The naval victory of the last few weeks in the Pacific is the greatest in all our history. For we have sent out an armada of ships and supply auxiliaries unprecedented in quantity and strength to operate three to five thousand miles away from our mainland.

Admiral King has reflected the spirit of the entire Navy in pressing constantly for more and more ships and supplies for the Pacific. Given the ships and the weapons, the Navy has demonstrated that it can cut down the length of the war against Japan. And the remarkable part of the achievement to date is that the original nucleus of trained officers and crews has been spread out so that we have an efficient Navy in which 80 percent are boys who have come in as reserves since the outbreak of the war. It's a Navy of American youth capable of learning quickly and a Navy of experienced officers who know how to inspire them.

Intertrain Telephones

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, recent railroad accidents have excited comments on the floor of the House as to the use of intertrain communication by telephone.

Experiments have been conducted in such use of the telephone on the Belvidere-Delaware branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad in New Jersey. The result of these experiments and the progress that is being made were the subject of editorial comment in the Elizabeth Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N. J., in its issue of February 26, 1944. In view of the interest in this subject, I am including the editorial as part of my remarks:

TWO-WAY TRAIN PHONES

Although train telephones making possible communication both ways between moving trains, between trains and wayside stations, and between the ends of trains are still in the experimental stage, tests in actual operation have indicated that they are feasible. Now, it appears, it is only a matter of time and further experimentation before the system can be put into general use.

It is hard to visualize what this can mean toward safety of operation of both freight and passenger trains, as well as simplifying the work of operators and dispatchers as it is related to train movements. Had this system been in general operation heretofore, it is probable that several of the bad train collisions of the past few years could have been avoided. It will supplement block signals in safeguarding lives and railroad property.

The initial installation for experimental purposes was made on the Belvidere-Delaware branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad, running north from Trenton. Tests have proved the soundness of the plan, as applied to the freight-train service on the branch which is of considerable volume. Crews of freight trains and block operators in wayside towers talk to one another at any time it is necessary to transmit orders, reports, and other matters affecting train operation. In like manner the engineer in the locomotive can talk to the conductor of the train in the cabin car.

Necessary equipment has been installed in 10 locomotives and 10 cabin cars and in a block station at Frenchtown, 30 miles north of Trenton, for testing and perfecting the system.

Actually the train telephone is neither radio nor telephone. It incorporates certain features of both types of equipment and eliminates certain features of both. Radio wave bands are limited and use is prescribed and allotted, and transmission must be through paths universally provided by nature—ground and atmosphere. Wires between moving train and stations are impossible. Under the system worked out, on the other hand, transmission paths are restricted to railroad property.

Rails offer a desirable communication transmission path. Those, together with adjacent communication pole lines are used to make the necessary electrical contact.

This truly is the age of marvels such as our grandfathers would have thought impossible.

1944 Farm Production Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a report by an agriculturist of an industrial concern in my district which I think is startling, and I hope that every Member of the House who represents an agricultural district will read it. This party did not know that I would obtain this information or that it would be placed in the RECORD. One might term it somewhat of a confidential report he made to his firm as a result of information he picked up from farmers in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan in which he gives specific cases of things that are occurring incident to the 1944 production program. It follows:

In recent visitations to various elevators I have observed some interesting and changing reactions in relation to the 1944 crop-production program on the part of the farmers that I think you should know about.

There seems to be a very indifferent attitude among the farmers as to whether or not they will put forth their maximum effort for food production in some areas. This is brought about perhaps by two conditions; first, that the farmers have been urged during the last 3 years to increase production necessary to meet the higher domestic needs. This they have done with the utmost confidence that the program would be continued; and if a change was necessary, they would be given a fair chance to change over their production without any serious losses.

Today they feel that much of the foundation of their production program in the form of prices or regulating policies, have been cut out from under them without sufficient warning to adjust their production program; for example: egg prices have dropped severely; the pork situation has been unstable as far as production and prices are concerned; and at the same time the feed price, which they have to put to livestock production, has remained at a high level. They cannot continue to feed and meet production and make any profit. There are several instances that I have come across where farmers are selling their livestock and poultry, and also their feed, feeling they might sell and get the profit out of the feed alone and saving all the work connected with selling it through livestock. In other words, the farmer from this standpoint appears to be taking the path of least resistance to make as much income with the least effort possible.

Another factor which is endangering the farm program for this year is the situation of labor supply. There are many individual farmers whose labor situation is being cut through their boys or hired labor being drafted to such an extent that they cannot operate on the present scale. One reason for this is that the unit bases for draft deferment do not seem to be working out in all cases. I would like to cite one example which I obtained at Frankenmuth. One farmer was milking 20 cows; these cows were all ordinary type and were giving only a fair production. The boy on this farm had the necessary units for deferment. Another farmer was milking 10 to 12 cows; they were all of good type and higher production, and were producing a larger volume of milk than the 20 cows mentioned on the previous farm. The father of this boy was working in a defense plant trying to give some help to the war production, leaving the boy to operate the farm, which was more than he could do individually. Because the boy had only 10 to 12 cows, he did not have enough units to obtain his deferment and has been placed in I–A, subject to call at any time. As a result this boy who has been drafted has held an auction sale of his livestock and tools and will have the farm lying idle during the time he is gone. He mentioned that he was going to plow down 3 acres of strawberries which were planted last year, to save his parents the trouble of trying to secure labor to harvest his crop.

This is typical of a lot of situations that are developing throughout the country. There are perhaps a number of boys that can go to the Army without severely endangering the farm production; but, nevertheless, under the present set-up there are a lot of boys such as the one mentioned who will be taken and cause a serious loss in production.

The farmers in general are not opposed, but in contrast want to do everything they can to help the farm production program. However, they are opposed to the methods by which the farm programs are regulated. The farmers read widely of Government contracts, of costs-plus bases and of industrial labor contracts which attempt to provide a net margin over living costs. They feel that they are not being treated in a similar secured manner as industry and labor are. I might go as far to say that there is a possibility that after planting has been completed through this part of the State, we should not be surprised to see quite a different picture of production possibilities in contrast with the goals that were set. In other words, there is a good possibility that the average production of crops and livestock might drop considerably below present anticipations.

On the support price of beans there has been little comment, but probably because the support price program has not been an-

nounced. The prices in connection with the program were published in the newspapers a few weeks ago. The farmers are inclined to discount these reports when released until they are released by the A. A. A. The A. A. A. has not as yet mentioned the prices in the meetings they have held thus far. I am inclined to believe that when the price is finally announced that the farmers in the light of advances made in other directions, particularly to labor, will not be satisfied, and one of two things is likely to happen, either there will be a demand for a $1 advance, and if there is no advance made it will automatically indicate that the other factors mentioned above will be the guiding influence, in which event the hope for an acreage increase will be out of the question.

True the situation presents some serious aspects. The quiet undertone is indicative of something happening in the farmer's mind and whatever it is I have a strong belief it isn't for the good. I would not go so far as to say that a strike on the part of the farmers is in the making because I have detected no organized effort, but the attitude of the farmers in their present frame of mind might easily have that effect with the resultant serious consequences.

Millions To Destroy Pests and Animal Diseases, But Not One Cent for the Preservation of the Health of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very unusual bill, but the purpose in bringing in this kind of legislation is the result of an unusual situation that exists. It is what might be termed an omnibus authorization bill. Millions can be appropriated if this bill becomes law for the control and eradication of animal and plant pests and diseases. It also authorizes millions more for the protection and management of national forests to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricutural programs and also the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Yes; I say millions for pests, but not a dime for the preservation of the health of children. The bill is one for the relief of agricuture. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] offered an amendment, as a committee amendment, to authorize an appropriation for school-lunch programs.

That was the only feature of the bill that was of some direct benefit to the cities. Indirectly, of course, the cities benefit when agriculture prospers. But it was amazing, Mr. Speaker, to see the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. A division was demanded, 54 Members voting in favor of the amendment and 136 Members voting against the amendment. Every one but about 6 on the Republican side oppose an authorization for school lunches. Of course, that would have been beneficial to agriculture because what would have been purchased under the program would be produced on the farms. This vote is a striking example of how we legislate. Any suggestions offered for the benefit of agriculture are approved, but the same feeling does not exist among the Members when the legislation is beneficial to the cities.

The bill, of course, carried authorizations for many projects, some of them being in existence for 20 years, but there were also many projects authorized in the bill which have been inaugurated during the Roosevelt administration. Those projects were a part of what was termed the New Deal and many critical statements have been made by our Republican friends concerning the New Deal. It was, therefore, interesting to see how strongly our Republican friends supported these New Deal projects in this bill which have proven so beneficial to agriculture. As I said the other day, our Republican friends should remember this bill and their endorsements of many New Deal projects when they attack the New Deal in their political speeches, be honest and tell their audiences that in many instances they indorsed and voted for so-called New Deal legislation.

American Legion Tribute to Colonel Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and resolutions:

American Legion Posts of Chicago and Cook County, Ill., through the Cook County Council of the American Legion which comprises 45,000 members and which has within it active delegates and officers of the 268 individual posts at a meeting held Wednesday night, March 1, 1944, in the council chambers of the City Hall in Chicago, Ill., which was crowded with hundreds of ex-servicemen honored the services both during the First World War and ever since then, including in the present World War of Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni, who did outstanding service as chaplain in the United States Army from the time he entered it during the First World War until his recent retirement on account of age notwithstanding the earnest plea for his continuation in active service by his last commanding officer, Gen. John M. Willis.

After appropriate addresses by W. K. Kleuskens, commander of the Cook County Council of the American Legion, and others Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni was presented with the following resolutions which were beautifully engrossed and framed and which had been unanimously voted by the entire council following their presentation by the Americanization Committee of the American Legion Posts of Cook County, Ill. Colonel Simoni replying pointed out that every Legionnaire and every ex-serviceman had much work to do though not in active war service until victory which is certain to be ours is achieved.

Following are the engrossed resolutions which were read, presented, and enthusiastically applauded by the vast assembly:

"COOK COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS—RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO COL. MSGR. ARISTEO V. SIMONI

"Whereas Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni, now recently retired, went overseas in 1918, as chaplain in the Thirty-third Division, and later served with the Twenty-eighth Division in the Meuse-Argonne offensive; and

"Whereas the gallantry in action of Col. Aristeo V. Simoni earned for him the Distinguished Service Cross and the following citation from Gen. John J. Pershing: 'Aristeo V. Simoni, first lieutenant, chaplain, One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry: For extraordinary heroism in action near LeChene Tondu, France, October 3, 1918. Upon learning that there were six wounded men in front of our lines, Chaplain Simoni asked for two volunteers, and, with the aid of these men, successfully brought the wounded men to our lines through a terrific machine-gun and grenade fire. General Order No. 44, War Department, April 2, 1919'; and

"Whereas the official record of Col. Aristeo V. Simoni states: 'At a time when the shortage of ammunition was great, he not only carried large quantities of it to the line but distributed it among the men on the line.' He also rescued six wounded men, bringing them 'through a terrific machine-gun and grenade fire'; and

"Whereas Colonel Monsignor Simoni served with honor, credit, and efficiency for 15 months at Camp Grant in World War No. 2, up to his retirement on March 31, 1943, on account of age regulations; and

"Whereas religious activities under the leadership of Chaplain Simoni were marked by outstanding examples of patience, attention to duty, sympathetic attitude, kindness, and saintlike attitude, as described by his commanding officer, Gen. John M. Willis, in urging his continuation in active service in spite of the statutory age provisions: Be it

"Resolved by the delegates of 268 posts of Cook County Council of the American Legion, comprising 45,000 members, That we do hereby bespeak the sentiments of appreciation and gratitude of the citizenry of Illinois and of all loyal Americans and convey our esteem and high regard to Col. Aristeo V. Simoni upon his splendid record of extraordinary heroism and bravery on the field of battle, and for his patriotism and fine example in serving the defense of our country, its ideals, and its homes, and for the services rendered our men in our armed forces."

Adopted by executive committee January 5, 1944, and adopted by entire council March 1, 1944, in the city council chambers in the city hall in Chicago, Ill.

W. P. KLEUSKENS,
Commander.
HERBERT W. PORTER,
Adjutant.

Congressman Green's Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK H. DREWRY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Florida, the Honorable LEX

GREEN, has a record of achievement which is worthy of our commendation. The value of a Member of Congress rests largely in his understanding of the needs of his people and of the Nation; his vision to foresee the needs of the future and to meet these needs by appropriate action. His value is tested not by the number of bills introduced but by the importance, directly and indirectly, of such bills, and their bearing upon legislation finally enacted.

His more than 19 years of service here have given him power and influence. He has most efficiently served as assistant Democratic whip for more than 15 years. I, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, know the value of his work here and his worth to the country as a whole. I feel that our administration here in Washington owes him a debt of gratitude for his splendid work and outstanding achievements. Congressman GREEN'S record shows integrity, ability, diligence, and great achievements.

During his services in Congress the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has sponsored many bills. Of great importance among these measures are the following:

NAVAL AIR BASE FOR JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

On March 25, 1938, Congressman LEX GREEN introduced H. R. 10031, which provided for the construction of an air base at Jacksonville, Fla. In 1938, pursuant to special legislation, Secretary of the Navy Swanson appointed a sites inspection board, composed of Rear Admiral A. J. Hepburn, Rear Admiral E. J. Marquart, Capt. J. S. Woods, Capt. A. L. Bristol, Jr., Capt. Ralph Whitman, and Commander W. E. Hilbert. Upon the urgent request of Congressman GREEN, close inspection was made of the Jacksonville, Fla., area.

On January 3, 1939, this board reported to the Congress its recommendations, among which was that we would have a southeastern air base and that it would be located at Camp Foster, Jacksonville, Fla., together with carrier piers at the mouth of the St. Johns River and auxiliary base at Banana River. On January 4, 1939, Congressman GREEN introduced H. R. 1654, to carry out the Hepburn Board's recommendations, insofar as a southeastern air base was concerned.

The House Naval Affairs Committee made two official inspection trips of the proposals offered in the Southeast, including places in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. Hearings were held by the committee and due consideration given to the various sites available in the Southeast. On March 28, 1939, the committee by a vote of 15 to 7 designated Jacksonville as the place for the air base. This bill was promptly passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President.

In this connection let me say that in my opinion the citizens of Jacksonville, Duval County, and as a matter of fact the entire State of Florida, are under lasting obligation to their able and distinguished Congressman, Hon. LEX GREEN, for the valuable aid and assistance he rendered, not only to the committee, but the Hepburn Board in the selection of the site.

I measure my words when I say that during my years of service in the House I have never seen efforts more diligent or successful as Congressman GREEN'S efforts in behalf of this establishment. The then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Lewis Compton, strongly praised him for his diligence in the location and establishment of this station when he said in part, as follows:

You knew as well as we did that it was the proper strategic location and you were determined that Jacksonville would not lose this large Federal establishment. You represented Jacksonville with great credit and you assisted the Navy in carrying out its recommendations.

We are confident that this base will be a great pride to Jacksonville and the surrounding counties as well as Florida and the Nation. I want to thank you for your valuable assistance in helping the Navy locate another line in its defense of the Panama Canal and the southeastern United States.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this, the southeastern naval air station at Jacksonville, Fla., is one of the finest war establishments in the country, and it stands out as a lasting tribute to Mr. GREEN'S outstanding accomplishments to our war effort.

OTHER NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN FLORIDA

The Navy Department has made great expansion in its establishments and its development in Florida. Among these large establishments are those at Jacksonville, Melbourne, De Land, Daytona Beach, Banana River, Boca Chica, Cecil Field, Lake City, Boca Raton, Sanford, Vero Beach, Lee Field, Opa Locka, Whiting Field, Fort Lauderdale, and many others. The older establishments at Pensacola and Key West have been greatly enlarged and augmented.

The War Department has greatly augmented its defense facilities in the State of Florida through several establishments. Camp Blanding, MacDill Field, Tyndall Field, Camp Gordon Johnston, Orlando Army Air Base, Sarasoto Army Airfield, Homestead Army Airfield, and many others are among those of greater magnitude. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has been most active and aggressive in his efforts for national defense and in support of the war effort. It is noteworthy that the largest of these Military Establishments is situated in his old district, at Camp Blanding. He conferred with War Department officials; they inspected possibilities at Camp Blanding and found it to be a most suitable location. It was constructed with speed, and within a few months after decision by the War Department to establish Camp Blanding some 50,000 men were in training there. In this connection and in connection with our defense program, the following letter from the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is significant:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LEX: Reference is made to H. R. 2538, a bill introduced by you.

You are assured that my committee will give consideration to this bill in connection with our deliberations for mustering-out pay and the discharge of service men and women. In the provisions of this bill you have indeed made constructive proposals.

It is indeed significant that Florida is literally filled with military, naval, and shipbuilding establishments. Such major Army establishments in your State as Camp Blanding, MacDill Field, Tyndall Field, Camp Gordon Johnston, Cross City Army Airfield, Dunnellon Army Airfield, Marianna Army Airfield, Orlando Army Air Base, Perry Army Airfield, Sarasota Army Airfield, Drew Field, Morrison Field, Montbrook Army Airfield, Key West Base, Lakeland Army Airfield, Homestead Army Airfield, Buckingham Army Airfield, and many other establishments can justly be credited to your diligent efforts and leadership. These establishments and the Army training program in general in Florida will go down in history as a lasting tribute to your outstanding achievements in this global war effort.

These establishments which you have carried to Florida reflect the constant loyalty, trust, and confidence which your own people in Florida have in you. They have thus been permitted to achieve a major part in the war effort. I commend you for duty well performed.

With very kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

A. J. MAY,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee.

RIVERS AND HARBORS IMPROVEMENTS

Our colleague is now chairman of the Territories Committee and is a member of the following committees: Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, Immigration and Naturalization, War Claims, Invalid Pensions, Indian Affairs, and Claims. Thus he serves on eight regular standing committees of the House. The Rivers and Harbors Committee assignment is of tremendous interest to all States, but particularly to Florida, which has some 1,300 miles of seacoast and numerous navigable rivers. He has been most active and successful in bringing about approval of such outstanding projects as the harbors of Fernandina, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, Miami, Tampa, Cedar Keys, Port St. Joe, Pensacola, Okeechobee flood control, and many others. On April 13, 1936, he introduced H. R. 12258, which is a bill to provide for Federal cooperation to prevent erosion and destruction of beaches and water fronts throughout the country. This problem is gaining the consideration of the Congress.

SOLDIERS' HOME—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

On April 15, 1929, Mr. GREEN introduced a bill for the establishment of a national home for disabled soldiers in the State of Florida. This bill was passed and actually led to the establishment, not only of the home in St. Petersburg—Bay Pines—Fla., but of similar institutions in Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. It was one of the most important pieces of soldiers' relief legislation ever passed.

Mr. GREEN has been instrumental in obtaining numerous appropriations for the enlargement of United States veterans' facility in Lake City, and the one at Bay Pines, Fla. He is now working diligently for the establishment of additional facilities for veterans in Florida.

He introduced H. R. 742, which was referred to the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee. Under the provisions of this bill, substantial increase would be

allowed for existing pensions and compensation for World War veterans. He supported passage by the House of increase bills passed recently affecting World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents, and also Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents. Among these bills was H. R. 2350 for Spanish-American War veterans which has been signed by the President. He supported also increases for pay and dependency allowances for World War No. 2 veterans.

On December 1, 1930, he introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to return to Florida the silver-service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the Florida people. The legislation was passed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1936, roll call No. 3, shows he voted to pass the bonus bill, and the RECORD shows on January 24, 1936, roll call No. 11, he voted to pass the bonus bill over the veto of the President.

He has been a consistent supporter of legislation for the benefit of veterans and their dependents and was in 1933 given the Legion distinguished-service award of the American Legion post of his home county.

After a Member has served here for several years, the question is sometimes asked, What has he done? This is very easy to answer in the case of our colleague from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

FARM RELIEF

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has been a consistent supporter of farm-relief measures, including electrical current for farms. On March 10, 1933, he introduced a bill providing for extension of time on Federal land-bank loans, and for other purposes. This bill gave impetus to the administration's legislation extending time on loans and permitting additional loans by the Federal land banks throughout the country. On January 3, 1935, he introduced H. R. 3020, providing for funds for the control of screwworms in livestock and for the continuance of the tick-eradication program. Funds for both of these necessary farm causes were provided in the 1935 appropriation bill.

BANK DEPOSIT INSURANCE

He supported and voted for legislation which was passed to guarantee and insure the bank deposits throughout the country.

In 1937 he introduced a bill to refund to tobacco growers taxes paid under the Kerr-Smith Act. Legislation for this purpose became a law and claims were refunded to growers.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY CLAIMS

In 1930 the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] was the first to introduce a bill looking toward survey of fruitfly eradication damages in Florida and for payments therefor. His efforts in this behalf have been vigorous. He is the author of H. R. 2542 which is now being favorably reported by the Claims Committee, of which he is a member. Under the provisions of this bill these claims will be paid.

UNLIMITED SUGARCANE PRODUCTION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN has opposed the continental United States sugar-quota laws insofar as they applied to sugarcane production. He has appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and also addressed the House on numerous occasions in an effort to bring about unlimited cane-sugar production, particularly in the Florida Everglades area. On February 5, 1942, he introduced H. R. 6541, which is a bill to suspend sugarcane restriction quota laws within the United States. On February 5, 1942, he addressed the House on this subject, calling for unlimited and continuous sugarcane production in Florida, and pointing out the imminent need for more sugar in our country, particularly during the war period. Emergency war need for sugar has, of course, lifted production restrictions.

TURPENTINE EXPERIMENT STATION

On December 21, 1929, he introduced a bill directing the establishment of a naval-stores experiment and demonstration station on the Osceola National Forest in Florida. The legislation was approved, and the station established at Olustee, Fla., and is giving untold benefits to the naval stores and pine-tree industries. It benefits not only Florida but also the entire South. On March 1, 1944, he appeared before the Appropriations Committee in behalf of added funds for this station to use for further experiments affecting pine-gum production.

FEDERAL AID FOR ROADS

He has supported all legislation for Federal aid to roads, including the national defense highway program. His State has shared most liberally in the general construction program of roads, Federal buildings, and other Federal establishments.

PENSIONS

Mr. GREEN has been a consistent supporter of pensions for the aged and has frequently addressed the House, contending that straight Federal pensions should be paid to the aged without the required State matching as now under the social-security law. He has voted for liberalization of civil-service laws for all Federal workers except Congressmen and Senators. He did not vote for retirement (pensions) for Congressmen and Senators, neither did he participate under it, and on February 24, 1942, on roll call, he voted for the repeal of the law which gave possibility of so-called pensions for Congressmen and Senators. He voted for pensions or retirement bills for railroad employees and has a most liberal and progressive record in this respect.

ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATIONS

He is the author of H. R. 730, upon which hearings have been held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. This bill would provide Federal assistance for the establishment of engineering experiment stations in each State in the Union. It is a constructive measure and in all probability will receive the attention of the Congress after the war.

WAR CRISIS

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed noteworthy that the State of Florida has so many major war establishments and shipbuilding plants. The fact that it is a fortress so great in this war can appropriately be attributed largely to the untiring and successful efforts of our distinguished colleague, Mr. GREEN. Our Nation now faces its most grave crisis. The emergency of the situation challenges America's best leadership. Men who are tried and true should now serve. This is no time to experiment with high public office. Experience is essential to best results in our war effort. Mr. GREEN is experienced; he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. He is a man of high character and is dependable. He possesses the required leadership.

The Congressional Directory reveals the following: LEX GREEN was born in Bradford County, Fla.; graduated from Lake Butler High School and University of Florida; taught school; studied law, Yale University; admitted to the bar, Florida and United States Supreme Court. Married Miss Lucile Harris, of Gainesville; has three children, Lex, Jr., Sandra Lucile, and William Harris Green. Member Florida Legislature, speaker pro tempore; county judge, Bradford County. Representative in Congress from Second Congressional District, Florida, for 18 years, now serving as Congressman at Large. This long service in the Congress has given experience, knowledge, and a broad understanding of the fundamental principles of Government and its actual application. There is no substitute for experience.

The United Jewish Appeal at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me on March 5, 1944:

I firmly believe that no stronger proof of the righteousness of the cause for which we fight, and no more convincing omen of its ultimate victory, could be offered than in the eloquent record of the achievements of the United Jewish Appeal and its agencies.

Broadly speaking, the functions of the three agencies that constitute the United Jewish Appeal are twofold—to save life, and to reconstruct life. These two functions are, of course, inseparable, as are victory in the war for which we fight, and victory in the peace thereafter. But since we can take only one step at a time to have either, so ultimate success on the humanitarian front must go through its separate stages, also.

But such is the nature of the war in which we are engaged, that to accomplish an act of mercy means to work and fight and sacrifice for military victory, while every victory in its final sense becomes also a great act of mercy.

In the long history of the National Refugee Service, and its predecessor agencies—one of the 3 organizations that comprise the United Jewish Appeal—no less than 270,000 refugees from Hitlerism have found a haven in the United States. Most of these immigrants to our shores, fleeing from the tyrannies and deprivations of Europe like all of our ancestors before them, received help in one form or another from the National Refugee Service—help that, to put it as

simply as possible, enabled them to become Americans, and to do so more quickly than they otherwise would.

Of these 270,000 new Americans many when they arrived among us were children brought from Hitler-ravaged countries when they were 8, 10, or 14 years old. Some of them arrived in 1933 and others in each of the terrible years thereafter. Hundreds and thousands of them today—like many of their older brothers who also came here during that decade of disaster—have once more gone overseas, many of them this time wearing the uniform of their adopted country and fighting in its services against the Hitlerism they hate.

Other men and women refugees from Hitlerism who happened to be doctors—more than 2,000 of them, to quote the known figures—have been placed by the National Refugee Service in hospitals and public-health services, or reestablished in private practice here among us, on the drastically undermanned home front. Many of these physicians would have preferred to serve their new country in its armed services, but lack of citizenship barred most of them from doing so. But serving on the home front, who can say they are not a vital part of America's war effort? Can we not truly say, in this case as in many others, that Hitler's great loss is our great gain?

The same is true of our factories, offices, shops, farms, and great institutions, where the national refugee service has placed 22,720 of our fellow Americans, refugees during the past 10 years, in productive and gainful employment, thus restoring them to self-respecting independence and happiness. This same agency has also made nearly 5,000 loans to establish businessmen in constructive commercial activities in which they help not only themselves, but prove again the manifold advantages of the American system of free enterprise.

When we consider the total mobilization of the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal for war purposes, the facts and figures about another of its agencies, the United Palestine Appeal, are even more startling. Over 60 percent of all the aid sent to Palestine from America, reaches it through the United Jewish Appeal. Without that help, without your constant, vigilant support, the achievements of Palestine would not be possible.

There are 28,000 citizens of the small but growing Jewish commonwealth of Palestine now serving with various branches of the British regular armed forces. Your aid goes to the families of these men in British combat forces, in the welcome form of supplementary assistance.

Six hundred new factories have been added to Palestine's industrial resources since the war began, adding not only to its peacetime, civilian usefulness in the future, but some $80,000,000 worth of war supplies annually now, in the shape of uniforms, textiles, shoes, bandages, medical supplies, scientific instruments, motor accessories, and the facilitation of salvage work on tanks, guns, airplanes, and tires.

Recent agricultural developments in Palestine, fostered by your help, have increased the total number of its settlements to 289, thus adding greatly to the granaries of our armies in the Near and Middle East, and thereby saving 1,000,000 tons of the overburdened allied shipping facilities of the Mediterranean lanes. In this connection, I would like to say that much of the food and medical supplies sent to the Polish Jews of war-torn Russia either originate in or are transshipped from Palestine. The full story of Palestine's importance in this war against Hitler has never been told, and for reasons of military confidence, cannot be told at this time—but suffice it to say now that its role has been tremendous.

The full program of human salvage and reconstruction supported by the United Jewish Appeal would indeed be incomplete without inclusion of the record of its agency for overseas relief and rescue—the joint distribution committee. As I said at the beginning of my talk, the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal have two main purposes, to save lives, and to rehabilitate them. The epitome of this statement is to be found in the work of the joint distribution committee.

This agency, which has been active in the field of offering relief to human suffering since 1915, has been the instrument through which, on the average, 900,000 lives were saved, every year—until last year, when the number of people thrown upon its mercy reached the unprecedented height of 1,800,000, and I want to say now, that no one knows how many more thousands, probably millions, of Jewish people, will be cast upon its mercy in the coming months of 1944, as zone after zone and country after country is freed from the grip of Hitlerism.

If the catastrophe of disease and starvation is to be averted among them, it will be only through the intervention of the joint distribution committee, which has a record of ingenuity, valor, and resourcefulness so well known to you that to recount its history in full would be altogether superfluous. So I will simply say that literally hundreds of thousands of Jewish people around the world, from the Arctics to the Tropics, and in every land touched by the seven seas, owe their very lives to this agency, that is, to you sitting here and those you represent. I will not speak of what these hundreds of thousands of people—these millions of people—are contributing directly to the war effort. I only call attention to this: That in a larger sense they are the living, breathing representatives of the very idea and ideals for which we fight, and in that sense, are the final symbol of the war we are waging and shall continue to wage on every front with every ability.

Our common enemy has proclaimed ruthlessness as the best, the only way of life; we have proclaimed humanitarian thought and action as our way of life, and we live this creed, we demonstrate it every hour and every day of our lives. The enemy has proclaimed race superiority, but as we of the Jewish faith combat this pernicious theory—never advanced by us—we daily and hourly prove the fallacy of the enemy's theory.

And that is the thought I would like to leave with you. Whether you of the United Jewish Appeal are remobilizing for war purposes the thousands of your wounded, uprooted, and drifting people, or whether you are saving millions of them, the young and the old, your every act on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal is eloquent proof that we in America support to the hilt the humane, decent, generous, civilized goals for which this war is being waged.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over station WNBF on March 4, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, even as I am speaking tonight, my sponsors, the patriotic women of the Hall Furlough Clubs, are gathering at the Hotel Frederick in Endicott to elect a central council. I am informed that the officers of each individual club will participate in the election of a chairman and several others who will act as a policy guiding body for each member club.

I endorse their idea enthusiastically and wish them every success. These ladies are doing a remarkable job for the sake of their men at the front. They are dedicated to service on the home front and are vitally interested in legislation for now and after the war that will assure our boys a place in the sun.

Recently Congress stopped being a rubber stamp and started to represent the people for a change. This was brought out by its overwhelming rebuff of a Presidential veto. If Congress had not taken this action in defense of the people, every man and woman in the country would pay about three times the taxes they will pay in 1944.

The people can thank Congress for standing up for them and, despite the President's insistence on taking a whole loaf in taxes, which would have impoverished the entire country, Congress settled for half a loaf, thus assuring the people they will have some bread left to feed themselves and their children on.

As the Representative in Congress from this district, I am not selling the country down the river by taking away everything in taxes from them.

We all expect to pay taxes for this war, and heavy ones too. But we cannot carry on the war if we do not have enough to eat and a place to live. Therefore, we must keep a little of the money we earn to keep ourselves alive.

Last week I was the guest of the women of the Johnson City Republican Club and Village Committee at a dinner meeting in your home library. I can speak only in the most glowing terms of the spirit and interest in their Government which these ladies are taking.

The Johnson City Women's Republican Club is typical of all the women's Republican groups in our district and of thousands throughout America. They recognize the necessity of a change and they are determined to follow through to victory. I appreciate the warm reception they accorded me.

I also want to describe another important gathering I attended the same evening. This was the Broome County ground observers' dinner at the Johnson City Legion clubhouse. This group represents an integral part of our home defense system and a necessary branch of the whole air-raid warden service. These men and women are the watchmen of the night. While the country sleeps they keep their posts of vigilance, protecting us all against danger in the skies. True, some of their activities have been discontinued, but I sincerely hope they keep their organization intact.

I know you all will be interested in a personal letter which you will receive before long from me. This is printed on the cover of a list of helpful bulletins and I want you to feel free to answer by requesting these little books.

My letter to you reads:

"DEAR FRIENDS: Every American should know all about the flag. Therefore I am sending you the United States Marine Corps flag book, which I hope will be of interest.

"I firmly believe Old Glory is the most beautiful significant emblem of freedom the world has ever known.

"The Stars and Stripes must wave forever unchanged over the land of the free and the

home of the brave. To this end I promise you my constant effort in Washington.

"Remember also that I am able to help you with a lot of problems these dark days. Is your boy in the service well? Have you heard from your husband lately?

"Have you received allotments yet for you and your children? Their daddy will fight harder if he knows they are taken care of. Your little ones must eat.

"Write me any time. Let me know what I can do to lift the heavy burdens you carry on your shoulders and in your hearts.

"Hoping for early victory and wishing you the best, I remain,

"YOUR CONGRESSMAN."

Political Versus Military Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is no well-known substitute for training and experience, especially in the field of military strategy. Political strategy and military strategy are two different things. The interference by political strategists with military operations of the armed forces has to be paid for with human lives, and this is being fully demonstrated in the Italian campaign. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article which appeared in the Times-Herald of March 8, 1944:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Down in Oklahoma a short time ago they put a new twist on the accepted fourth-term campaign slogan—"Uphold the Commander in Chief."

According to our reports, the distinguished silver-haired New Deal United States Senator ELMER THOMAS told a Roosevelt rally that citizens of the Republic who shy away from the idea of 16 consecutive years in the White House by any one man should be shouted down by the cry: "Don't court-martial your Commander in Chief."

Well, the boys are now talking right out in meeting here in the Capital and declaring that Commander in Chief (of the armed forces only) Franklin D. Roosevelt and his fellow-civilian strategist, Prime Minister Winston Churchill have made a mess of the Italian campaign.

The British and American political leaders, according to outspoken Washington critics, imposed their political desires on their military and naval professionals. The men who have devoted their lives to the science of war and warned against the Italian expedition are now barking back at F. D. R. and Churchill and coldly observing—"I told you so."

These reports, as they sift through the Nation, will drain vigor from the original decision of the White House palace guard—the plan to go to the voters on the issue that President Roosevelt has done a brilliant job of running the war as Commander in Chief and a White House change next November would court military disaster.

It is now just 6 months since American forces landed at Salerno. They reached Naples October 1. The original Churchill-Roosevelt timetable (which the United States military brains didn't like from the start) called for the triumphant entrance of American and British troops into Rome on Christmas Day. This rosy political dream of Churchill and Roosevelt has now turned into a costly and bloody nightmare.

The American generals and admirals who didn't like it from the start—because it was aimed at political and not military objectives—are quick to point out that this is a repetition of the fundamental Roosevelt military error of dispersal of fighting forces, the commitment of too much strength to a side show when sound military intelligence demanded the concentration of all forces for victory in the Pacific and the invasion of western Europe.

The original plan as it sprang from Churchill's brain and later imposed on the military mind of F. D. R. was that a swift invasion of the Italian underbelly of Europe would meet only token opposition from the Germans. The British intelligence, which is usually pretty smart, apparently didn't give Winston the right answers on these questions—if, perhaps, he ever asked for them.

As the soundly informed Constantine Brown reported in his Washington column:

"When it (invasion of Italy) was first suggested after the conquest of Sicily, most American strategists were opposed to it. Their view was that even if we took Rome we would not gain particular military advantage. The fact that we would have air bases in the plains north of the Eternal City was of slight importance. The main thing was not to diffuse our forces further but keep them concentrated for one single military objective—the invasion of France, the core of Nazi resistance.

"Unless the Nazis decided to set up their principal defense line along the Po River, America's principal military thinkers believed Italy would be a bottomless sack into which we would have to pour a large force.

"According to the best available information, this point was emphasized before the two principal Allied strategy framers, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill."

According to reliable information here in the Capital, Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark was told that his Fifth Army would meet only a skeleton German opposition of less than 10,000 men at Salerno. Instead of this, he was hit by a reception committee of 50,000 fighting Nazis with plenty of well-placed artillery.

Result of all of this military campaign dictated by politics and frowned upon by the professionals is that losses among American troops alone topped 30,000 as of February 17; that the entire venture is damned as too costly; and that, while there is no danger of the Germans throwing us out of Italy, the fact is that we are fighting savage defensive battles along the entire front.

At the same time that the fourth-term aspirations of the Commander in Chief are being somewhat deflated by the results of Roosevelt military wisdom as applied to Italy, the once holy and sanctified New Deal war aims—unconditional surrender—"four freedoms" everywhere in our time—the Atlantic Charter—are coming in for some coarse and vulgar booting around and in public.

A few months ago, when we brazenly suggested that there were going to be plenty of conditions tied to F. D. R.'s "unconditional surrender" challenge to Germany, and he'd have to talk cold turkey about specific United States war aims, we noted some cold and disapproving frowns on the faces of the professional do-gooders, world-savers, and other pay-roll patriots. Now, surprise. That proposition is getting general circulation. In the coldly factual United States News we read the blunt statements:

"United States ideas are not to dominate the conditions of peace in Europe. That is becoming clear as the bargaining starts, as first arrangements begin to emerge.

"On the basis of revelations that gradually are appearing * * *

"Unconditional surrender for Germany actually will have conditions; will be based on armistice terms now being considered. That wasn't original United States idea.

"Germany will not be dismembered; will not be sliced into little pieces and made impotent and impoverished. Both Britain and Russia stress that point. United States had thought differently, had figured that Germany would be very roughly handled.

"Russia will be allowed to have her way in eastern Europe. She will get what she wants in the Baltic states, in Poland, in Rumania. That's clear from what Britain's Churchill says. It does not square with United States view of Atlantic Charter.

"There will be some understanding on who is to rule in France, on who among French leaders is to take over as invasion progresses. United States idea had been that there would be no recognition of French leadership until French people could vote.

"And Italy's King is to get another chance to make good.

"That's all quite different than Mr. Roosevelt originally had expected."

Equality Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Equality needed" there appeared in this morning's Washington Post an article outlining the report of the United States Office of Education, which was issued yesterday. This report, which is a four-volume affair, was published and printed at Government expense and, according to this article, contains recommendations and suggestions for the mixing of the races in the institutions of higher learning in the South. In this report Ambrose Caliver, Negro educator, urges—

That they—

The white people and the institutions of learning in the South—

assume increasingly the responsibility of pointing out to the majority group the economic significance and social implication of providing equality of educational and occupational opportunities for Negroes.

This and other recommendations are to be done, according to this report, by commingling the white and black students in the colleges of the South together and thus break down all barriers and restraints against the commingling of the two races in the South.

Mr. Speaker, the last citadel of the rights and prerogatives of our States which remain are its schools and its colleges. Thus far, since the birth of this Republic, they have been supervised by the States without the intervention of the Federal Government. Under our present system, we have pioneered in educational development until our schools and colleges lead the world in the vigor of their development and democracy of

their spirit. Under the free and unfederalized development, our educational institutions have pointed the way to economic development of the United States far ahead and beyond that of any other nation and under this we have progressed from a pioneer people to one schooled in the arts and sciences, the envy and jealousy of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are reaching the point when this citadel of democracy—our free educational institutions—are to be controlled by a Federal bureaucracy. We are to be told in Washington how we shall run our schools in Louisiana and in the South. We are to be told that this must be done by permitting Negroes to attend with the whites the great schools and colleges of the South.

There is not a great Southern State which does not at the present time have institutions of higher learning for the Negro. In my own State of Louisiana Southern University, located on a beautiful spot overlooking the Mississippi River, immediately above the city of Baton Rouge, has been given over to the Negro students and no white man or woman can enter this institution. It belongs to the Negroes just as well as the white institutions belong to the whites. The only purpose which Mr. Studebaker, Director of the United States Department of Education, can serve by his report is to try to bring about a forceable commingling of students of the two races in the South, which is unthinkable. Such a course is intended to break down the barriers which have stood between the Negro and the white races since the birth of the Republic to the present time. It has for its ultimate purpose social equality and the producing of a mongrel race in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as I sat in my office this morning reading the account of the report of the United States Office of Education, a member of one of the school boards of my native State heard this and told me of the increasing pressure from Washington on the educational institutions of the South. The pressure has been well disguised and well covered today; but it is becoming increasingly strong. It should be stopped.

Tragic and puerile would it be, Mr. Speaker, if as our boys fight in every part of the earth today for a government of free institutions, we at home should let our educational system, established in America under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin, become a regimented and federally controlled program. Even more tragic and puerile is it for Mr. Studebaker, Director of the Office of Education, in the midst of a great war, while millions of our men are overseas, to press upon the South an issue which he must know will divide our people and can only result in more trouble to the Negro.

About 2 years ago—toward the beginning of this war—the Federal Bureau of Investigation published a booklet entitled "Divide and Conquer." This bulletin was a graphic word picture of the diplomacy of Adolf Hitler to divide his enemies and then move in and conquer them. On the front of the bulletin was printed in bold relief a satanic figure of grotesque qualities such as to attract the attention of everyone who saw the bulletin. The purpose of it was to put our people on guard against those who would divide them, thereby becoming agents of Hitler and enemies of America.

I do not know whether or not Mr. Studebaker has read this publication of the F. B. I. I commend it to his studious attention. I do know that the report of the United States Department of Education, as shown by the newspapers of today, is calculated to divide our people and to aid our enemies. America—neither North or South—wants Federal control of education; and the South will not accept any doctrine which teaches commingling of Negroes and whites in the schools of our country.

A $25,000 Prize for the Best Essay on Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in making the attempt to read and consider all the mail which the postman brings daily to the office of a Member of Congress, I discover, in addition to the regular mail, so many and such a varied assortment of communications containing articles and treatises proposing programs for post-war planning; many of them from some of the highest sources of learning in our country. It is difficult to find the time to give deserved consideration to many of these proposed plans—plans that embrace everything in human relations from isolation to international cooperation to establish a new world order; from the Baruch report for our own business and political management to plans to set up various forms of supergovernments to rule the affairs of some or all of the nations comprising the human family—communications which convincingly indicate that people in all walks of life are thinking and planning for the future and turning their attention to the subject of government in the present World War emergency as they never have before—thoughtful and earnest people seeking to advise and assist Congress in formulating national policies and enacting laws to chart the future course of our Government.

In considering the merits of the many plans proposed, it is disturbing to find in discussing this class of mail with some of the Members that many of these thoughtful and valuable essays never reach the congressional desk at all, and go unread into the waste basket. I have been on the point of writing an extension of remarks for printing in the RECORD under the heading "The failure of the congressional secretaries," or, better still, suggest that some public-spirited organization offer a prize of $25,000 for the best post-war planning program.

Of the many communications that congressional mail has brought to my attention, the best plan for post-war planning and international cooperation has come out of Canada—presented by the professor of political economy at McMasters University, Prof. H. Michell—reprinted here, and earnestly recommended for the thoughtful consideration of all the Members of Congress and every citizen of this country who is interested in the future stability of business and the preservation of our form of government. Professor Michell's article follows:

THE PLACE OF SILVER IN MONETARY RECONSTRUCTION

(By H. Michell, professor of political economy, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont., Canada)

1. THE PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED

The economic disasters that followed the first war are too painfully in our memories to allow complacency in our anticipations of what will happen after the second. The state of Europe, to say nothing of the Far East, will be appalling, with great devastated areas, ruined cities and factories, and homeless starving millions. To tide the victims of war over their temporary troubles will be difficult, but not impossible. Once that is done, their own industry and ingenuity may be trusted to effect material reconstruction, provided they are not hindered nor frustrated by monetary obstacles. They will need to buy from abroad food and materials, and if they have no money, or only money of dubious or nonexistent value, their struggle for survival will be much more difficult. What they will need and must have, if further disaster is to be avoided, is a sound system of "hard money" that will function satisfactorily as a medium for world trade.

In the tentative proposals put forward by financial authorities for a post-war monetary system designed to facilitate international trade without the obstructions arising from disordered exchanges, it is agreed that a single metal, gold, should be the basis upon which these exchanges should be established. Whether the new unit of denomination be called Bancors of Unitas, or whatever name be found acceptable, they will be, according to these proposals, backed wholly or in part by gold. The Unitas suggested by the United States Treasury shall weigh 137.14 grains of fine gold which is the weight of $10 worth of gold at $35 per ounce. The new international unit would therefore be a $10 gold piece, or a double English sovereign. The actual weight of the new unit is, however, of minor importance; it could be made of any size deemed most convenient. What is significant is that it is wholly of gold. The part that silver might play has either been ignored or overlooked, and it is important that attention be drawn to the claims of a system of international or, if we prefer that newly fashionable word "global" bimetallism as the more suitable for post-war monetary reconstruction.

2. THE REASONS FOR BIMETALLISM

It is unfortunate that a plea for a bimetallic standard is too often met either with impatience or incredulity. The reasons for this attitude are not hard to understand, for it must be frankly acknowledged that the history of the silver question, and more especially its record in the United States, has been unfortunate. Too many nations have burned their fingers over silver to allow of its readoption as a monetary metal to be agreed upon easily. It is too often thought that "doing something for silver," or the

advocacy of bimetallism, is put forward solely in the interests of the producers of the metal and that it is a selfish and sectional plea.

Whatever may have been the failures of attempts to introduce or maintain bimetallism in the past, and admittedly they have been serious and protracted, they have all arisen from one single fact—the bimetallic standard was never, at least in the nineteenth century, upon a world-wide basis. This fact need not be enlarged upon here but more conveniently considered hereafter.

The present proposals rest upon their being accepted by all nations and the reasons which may be argued in their favor may be summarized as follows:

First. There is not enough gold in the world to put the international exchanges upon a hard money basis alone. The world's stock of gold can conveniently, without the least trouble and with only the slightest delay, be reinforced and supplemented by a sufficient quantity of silver to put the exchanges in an impregnable position. This no managed or manipulated system of international paper money could possibly achieve. It would restore to the foreign exchanges the automatic character they bore before the First World War when they were, wholly or largely, based upon the gold pound sterling, and when deviations from par were corrected by shipments of bullion. Admirably though that system worked for a comparatively short time, it is not now feasible, and any attempt to restore it would be fraught with serious difficulties and ultimate failure.

Second. Silver is a precious metal like gold. We measure it in ounces, not in pounds or tons. It is universally accepted and valued for its use in the arts, and for thousands of years has been, and still is, used as money. The domination of gold is of recent origin, within the memory of living man. Great areas of the world in the East still use it as their money and are reluctant to use gold or paper notes.

Third. While it is difficult to make an accurate estimate, yet the world's store of silver is very great, not only in the form of bullion but in fabricated articles, which could readily be melted down and turned into money.

Fourth. To neglect this great reservoir of precious metal, eminently suitable for use as a medium of domestic and foreign exchange, is to ignore an aid to the restoration of world trade whose claims cannot be overlooked. Only a failure to grasp the significance of the proposal to implement a system of global bimetallism can explain opposition thereto.

Fifth. The proposal to introduce a world-wide bimetallic standard is perfectly practicable. Whatever difficulties would be encountered, and they would be few, are all surmountable. Nothing need stand in its way. Agreement among the victorious allies, and the announcement that silver would be accepted in addition to gold in international payments at a fixed and universal ratio of convertibility, would be sufficient to put world-wide bimetallism into operation at once.

Sixth. The fact that a universal bimetallic standard is agreed upon would allow the devastated and impoverished nations of Europe and Asia to restore their domestic currencies, get rid of their worthless paper and mint silver coins that would possess unlimited legal tender. In this way their monetary systems would be set upon a firm basis and confidence restored to countless poor people, bewildered and exasperated by paper notes whose value is partially or wholly nonexistent.

3. INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM

In order to bring the proposal for an international bimetallic standard within the field of practical discussion, it will be best to state at once what steps will be involved in agreement between nations. These, in brief, are as follows:

1. A fixed universal mint or legal ratio of silver to gold, agreed upon and put into effect with free convertibility of one metal with another, subject to certain limitations to be enlarged upon later. This ratio must be fixed at, or near, that of the two metals ruling in the bullion market at the time.

2. Gold and silver coins must be put into free circulation and all banks be required to exchange their notes for gold and silver at a fixed proportion of the two metals.

3. All silver coins must be restored to a fineness of 925 parts in 1,000, and given unlimited legal-tender value.

4. The mints of the various countries must be required to accept silver for coinage to an unlimited amount, charging a small "brassage" fee for their services.

Were these four proposals put into effect all over the world, there is no doubt whatever that international bimetallism would work. That has never been denied by those who have studied it, and even its opponents are constrained to acknowledge the truth of this statement, uncompromising as it may appear at first sight.

4. THE PROPOSALS EXAMINED

It will now be necessary to examine each of these four proposals with care and justify the conclusions to which they point. It will be seen at once that the bedrock on which the whole scheme is founded is contained in the first clause. The legal or mint ratio at which the two metals should exchange one for another must be the same everywhere, in China and India, in Europe, and in North and South America. In order to avoid temporary dislocations at the outset, and even these would be short-lived, the ratio must approximate the market ratio at the moment of introduction. What that might be is difficult to say, to hazard a guess perhaps 50 to 1. Once this mint or legal ratio is accepted universally, all danger of a breakdown of the system is gone. That this must be so can easily be seen when we reflect that it will be impossible for arbitrage operations to be carried out between two countries, because the speculator would be met with the obstacle of the same legal ratio everywhere. He could make no profit in buying silver cheap in one country and shipping it to another to get a higher price. He would get the same price in London or Paris as he would in New York, and he would lose on the cost of carrying the metal across the Atlantic. The moment the same ratio is fixed everywhere arbitrage operations become impossible, or unprofitable, and cease. Speculation only stops when no profit can be made from it; and that goes for speculation in everything at all times.

It might be objected at this point that, although arbitrage operations could be circumvented, yet there might, and probably would, be attempts to defeat the system. Central banks might want to get rid of their silver and store up gold, to await the time when they could safely repudiate their agreement, demonetize their silver, and revert to a monometallic gold standard. Unless steps were taken to forestall any such move, it is not impossible that this might happen, and serious consequences ensue to imperil the whole international monetary set-up. But a move of this nature can be prevented by a simple and highly effective precaution, which is contained in the second clause. Let us suppose that a foreign bank presented Federal Reserve notes in the United States or Bank of England notes in London and demanded payment in bullion. It could legally do so; but could not legally demand payment only in gold, it would be paid in gold and silver in a fixed proportion of the two metals. It might receive 80 percent in silver and 20 percent in gold, and it would take a central bank a long time to accumulate enough gold under those conditions to permit it to take so dangerous a step as to repudiate its adherence to the bimetallic standard.

It might be objected that what we are really proposing is that the world should go on a silver instead of a gold standard. But this is by no means so. The great value of gold as compared with silver would always guarantee it moving freely and, as a matter of actual experience, would no doubt insure it being used in preference to silver, when not enough silver is available at any one point or time for large international payments. The fact that silver would be acceptable at the fixed ratio would give it an international status as a monetary metal, and that in itself would be sufficient to put the foreign exchanges on a "hard money" basis. Gold and silver would move in settlement of international balances just as gold moved from country to country when the international gold standard ruled the foreign exchanges before 1914.

One of the greatest obstacles to a restoration of world trade would be the lack of sufficient bullion to adjust balances and bring the exchanges back to par. Before 1914 the exchanges were kept within the "gold points." If one country accumulated an unfavorable balance with another and its currency was quoted in terms of its creditor's currency at a discount which made it cheaper to ship gold rather than to buy bills of exchange, gold moved across the exchange, the unfavorable balance was adjusted, and the rate of exchange moved back to par. The very fact that this would be the outcome of a deviation from par was sufficient to steady the market and prevent violent dislocations. If the world's stock of silver be added to that of gold, new bullion points could be set up and the disturbing and harmful deviations from par of the foreign exchanges either entirely avoided or largely mitigated.

5. THE MINTING OF SILVER

It is an essential part of the scheme for international bimetallism that the mints of the various countries should agree to accept silver for conversion into coins in unlimited amounts, and that these coins should be given full legal tender value. It would also be necessary that the silver coins of every country be of the same fineness. This would extend to the whole world the system that prevailed within the old Latin Union when France, Belgium, Switzerland, Greece, and Italy minted their silver coins at the same weight and fineness and accepted them as legal tender. It would not, however, be necessary to make the various coins of the same weight. There would be no benefit if the English shilling, the French franc, the German mark and the Indian rupee were made the same weight. So long as their fineness were guaranteed and their universal acceptance as full legal tender acknowledged, they could, and would, function satisfactorily.

It is often, quite erroneously, supposed that the old Latin Union was a failure. A study of its history will reveal that it was not and that it was a success until the monetary dislocations of World War No. 1 threw everything into confusion. It is true that the great inrush of gold into the world after the discovery of the South African mines compelled the mints of the member countries to refuse unlimited coinage of silver. But their silver coins still were accepted as legal tender to any amount, thus putting their currencies upon what was called the limping standard, by which was meant that it was neither wholly bimetallic nor yet monometallic. But even at that it limped along at a very satisfactory gait. Those who can remember conditions in France and other European countries before 1914, will readily

recall the silver 5-franc pieces that circulated freely. It is true they were clumsy and inconvenient to carry in the pocket. But that disadvantage was a very little thing to endure when it was realized that these coins were good hard money, acceptable everywhere within the Union. They were not flimsy pieces of paper of dubious value, or of no value at all, turned out by the government printing presses in astronomical amounts. They were not forced upon bewildered peoples who did not understand what was happening and wondered what was the matter with their one-time prized and trusted money.

The greatest tragedy of the economic chaos that accompanied and followed the First World War was the destruction of confidence in the currencies of the various countries. From this lack of confidence both victors and vanquished suffered. The gold of the world, the only good hard money it possessed, started to find a refuge across the Atlantic where it has remained ever since. After the close of the second war if that confidence be restored, if the flood of worthless paper be stopped, and the peoples of Europe be given good gold and silver coins, francs and marks and lire, then their monetary troubles both in their domestic and foreign exchanges will cease.

It may be said that all over the world even the simplest peasant is so accustomed to the use of paper money that in order to restore confidence in the various currencies it would not be necessary to mint coins. A moment's reflection will be sufficient to dispel that idea. We have but to remember how the Germans in their occupation of the conquered countries of Europe deliberately debauched the currencies and with them looted the unhappy peoples. What will the liberated French think of the paper francs of the Vichy regime? There is no need to expatiate upon the distrust, or rather total rejection, of these dishonest issues. But give them bright new 5-franc pieces and confidence is instantly restored. And with that confidence will come the spirit and courage to set about the task of economic restoration. There are enough courageous men and women in Europe to do it. But their efforts must not be sabotaged by denying them the benefits of a sound monetary system.

6. THE WORLD'S STORE OF SILVER

But where, it will reasonably be asked, will sufficient silver be found to bring about these beneficent results? The world's store of silver is very great, how great it is hard to say. Not only are vast amounts in existence in the form of bullion, but also in fabricated articles, in the shape of jewelry and ornaments, forks and spoons, tea and coffee pots. It may sound strange to speak of such things and to think of floods of silver spoons going into the melting pots. But actually it is not so, but the very reverse. Europe, the Far East, will be desperately impoverished after the war, and when people are bankrupt and starving, regard for their little treasures is apt to vanish. If a European finds that he can turn his silver teapot into good sound money, not some pieces of paper which he distrusts, but coins in which he has implicit confidence, he will sell it and get along with a more utilitarian article. He will feel an enhanced satisfaction in the money that his handsomer silver possession has brought him. Up till then he was unable to realize upon his more showy possessions at any but a ruinous figure in worthless or violently depreciated paper. Now he can turn them into money that is good and stays good, and will be consoled for his sacrifice.

But may not this flood of silver from the bullion stock piles and fabricated articles cause an inflation? Will the world be plagued with a great mass of silver coins that will depreciate in value just as surely as did the paper they have displaced? The answer to that question is emphatically in the negative. The world possesses an immense amount of silver, but not so much as to cause a hard money inflation. To replace the worthless paper notes with silver and gold coins will absorb enough of the precious metals to prevent any inflationary tendencies. The thrifty European peasant will start again to accumulate, confident in the value of his savings. The tremendous strength and stability of a peasantry that toils and saves will be restored. Give the little European or Chinese farmer a chance and he will save himself and his country with him. But with worthless paper as his only money he is beaten before he starts on the heavy task of restoration.

7. OBJECTIONS TO BIMETALLISM

It must be candidly acknowledged that many specialists in monetary theory either oppose, or are indifferent to, the claims of an international bimetallic standard. The reasons for this opposition are not hard to find, but on examination will prove to be founded on a misapprehension of the problem and, unfortunately, on a good deal of prejudice against, or perhaps rather, impatience with the scheme. The first objection that is always advanced is that bimetallism has failed in the past and therefore must fail again in the future. This is not so. What those who argue along that line really mean, and they are correct, is that attempts by a single country to maintain a bimetallic standard have failed and always will fail. France was beaten in her struggle to maintain the double standard after the Franco-Prussian War by the act of Germany adopting the gold standard, demonetizing her silver coins and throwing the bullion on the market for what it would fetch. It may be remarked that, as all students of the history of prices know, the disastrous fall in prices all over the world from 1874 to 1896 was caused, if not wholly at least in part, by the fall in the value of silver that followed on this act of Germany.

But the proposals put forward now are in no danger of failure. Dr. T. E. Gregory, of the London School of Economics, who is not a bimetallist, writing as recently as 1932 in his The Silver Situation: Problems and Possibilities, said:

"There need be no hesitation in admitting the truth that, given a bimetallic ratio near the present market ratio and a large bimetallic area the gloomy anticipations that bimetallism would break down would be falsified."

The present proposals conform exactly with Dr. Gregory's requirements. At the time the plan is put into effect the legal and market ratios will be the same and the area will be world-wide.

International bimetallism will not break down for the very reason that former attempts at national bimetallism failed. If the area is large enough, and Dr. Gregory will certainly agree that the whole world is large enough, all chances of it being sabotaged will be nonexistent. Will world-wide acceptance of a bimefallic standard be possible? Never since the fall of the Roman Empire has there been such an opportunity to obtain universal acquiescence in anything as will be offered to the nations at the end of the Second World War.

The impatience of those who are weary of the plea of "doing something for silver" need not stand in the way. Looking at the proposal from a world standpoint, the silver interests in the United States do not enter into the picture. The British Empire, the Russians, the Chinese are not at all concerned with the American silver miners. It is none of their business, and assuredly they will not be influenced one way or another by the alleged benefits that will accrue to interested parties in the United States. But they are deeply concerned with the impoverished and ruined victims of the war all over the world. They will remember the miseries and disasters that followed in the path of the breakdown of monetary systems after the first war. The German, who will remember the catastrophe of the inflated mark; the Frenchman and Italian, who has seen his franc or lira debauched and made worthless, will not be anxious to face such disasters again. These are the victims who must be helped, and it is of the least importance that help be given to silver in America.

8. THE NOVELTY OF THE SCHEME

It may be objected that a scheme of international bimetallism is too novel, too strange to be accepted readily. Such an argument cannot be seriously entertained. It is far less strange and untried than any scheme that involves the creation of "bancors" or "unitas." The people of continental Europe, those of India, China, or Japan, know nothing of them now and will have to be persuaded, or coerced, into accepting them as media for their foreign trade. But they all know silver and gold, they perfectly understand that they are precious metals, and the feel of hard coin in their hands will be a tonic to the most despairing. After all, the world has used silver as money for countless centuries and gold exclusively for a very few years. In the words of Lord Keynes, gold is a parvenu among the monetary metals, a latecomer whose performances have been very disconcerting and upsetting.

But why, after all, should we bother so much about getting on a hard-money basis? A whole generation has grown up that has never seen a gold coin outside a collection and would be almost embarrassed by the possession of an English sovereign or a $5 gold piece. That would be true were we dealing with any but a desperate emergency in an exhausted world. The confusion in liberated Europe after the war will almost beggar belief, and drastic measures will be necessary to relieve the situation. It is likely that, for a long time after the war, the suspicious peasantry will prefer their gold or silver coins and avoid or reject paper money. For that they need hardly be blamed. But, with the slow but sure recovery of confidence, no doubt bank and currency notes will be more and more used; provided, of course, that the people are convinced by actual experience that they are instantly convertible into coin on demand.

9. THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE SCHEME

It might be asked whether the remonetization of silver on the Continent of Europe is the business of any but the nations involved? If France or Germany or Italy care to use silver coins again as unlimited legal tender, let them do so and good luck to them. This view is erroneous, since the crux of the whole proposal is that the bimetallic standard must be accepted universally, thereby allowing the foreign exchanges to work automatically on a bullion basis.

It will be an immense boon no doubt to the peasant, and he is the backbone of the economy of all lands, that his confidence in his money should be restored. But that is far from being the only benefit derived. An equally beneficent result will arise from the fact that the nations of the whole world will be able to buy what they need outside their own borders. The hard wheat of Canada will flow to feed the starving multitudes, and it will be paid for not in depreciated paper but in good bullion. The plague of debts, with their bitterness and endless recriminations, will be avoided. The restocking of the stricken lands will be an immense task. Not everything that is necessary can be paid for at once, some of it will probably never be paid for. But substantial payments can be made very soon, which will ease the strain and facilitate the restoration of world trade.

The lesson the victorious nations learned after the first war has not been forgotten. A

fantastic amount in reparations was demanded from the vanquished; but how the Germans could pay was beyond the wit of man to solve. Germany had no gold, or very little, and, lacking that, the only method by which she could raise money to meet her obligations was by exporting her manufactured goods, thereby obtaining credit balances, which could be transferred to her creditors. This Germany proceeded to do, and cheap articles from her factories began to flood the markets of the world to undersell the wares of other nations. To prevent dumping and to protect domestic producers, tariffs were raised everywhere and international trade was well-nigh strangled. The gold of the world took refuge in America and has remained there ever since.

In 1925 the Bank of England resumed gold payments, a courageous but, as was seen later, an ill-judged act. The pound sterling simply was not worth its pre-war par with the American dollar. British exporters were penalized and importers subsidized, and the result was the continuation and intensification of the great burden of unemployment, the dole and all the economic troubles that culminated in the great depression. The real tragedy of the post-war era all over the world was that the nations were trying to pay for the war and had not enough money to do it. Or rather they had not enough of the right kind—the hard, good money that alone gives confidence and allows the exchanges to function easily and automatically.

10. THE RETURN OF BIMETALLISM

To those who are not aware of the history of the use of the precious metals as money the idea of a bimetallic standard may appear extraordinary and unprecedented. Nothing is further from the truth. The exclusive use of gold has been no more than an episode in the age-long use of money by mankind. In 1795 Great Britain was forced to abandon the double standard, beaten by arbitrage operators across the channel. The nineteenth century saw the final downfall of silver because the mines of America, Australia, and South Africa poured a great deluge of gold upon the world. And the nations, some of them willingly but most of them reluctantly, were forced to adopt a monometallic gold standard. The great agitation in the United States to restore silver connected with the name of William Jennings Bryan was defeated by South African gold which was then just beginning to pour into the world. But should a bimetallic standard be set up universally none of these disasters could afflict the nations. National bimetallism has always failed; international cannot fail. But even now Americans are still using silver certificates and the stock pile in the Treasury is enormous. France has never forgotten her silver 5-franc pieces and would be glad enough to see them again. The Indian still uses his silver rupees and the Chinese his silver dollars—if he can get them, and will be only too anxious to get rid of his depreciated paper and the dishonest currency of the Japanese invaders. The Arab still uses his quaint silver pieces struck on purpose for him with the image of Queen Maria Theresa of Austria. They are good money, he can feel their weight in his hand and trusts their purity. The world wants good money again, not tawdry bits of paper. It is not without significance that when the emissaries of the Allies landed in north Africa they took with them gold coins. Fine, big, handsome French 5-franc pieces would have been equally acceptable, if they had had a stock of them.

A return to international bimetallism would see the end of the gold era of the world, and it would depart unmourned. It had brought endless trouble with it and at last broke down ingloriously. There is no magic, no sacredness in the gold standard, and even less in a gold coin. The English sovereign was only fixed in 1816 at its present weight. People are still living who were born before the American dollar was fixed at 23.22 grains of fine gold and millions have never realized that within the past decade it has been reduced to 13.71 grains. The successive devaluations of the franc, the lira and the yen brought confusion to the international exchanges, dishonest profits to arbitrage operators, and disturbance to both national and international price levels. Such perils must never be allowed to assail the world again.

11. THE INSUFFICIENCY OF GOLD

We have already stated that there is not enough gold in the world. To add to that, it is apparent that the bulk of what the world does possess is so unevenly distributed that its use is hampered and the free movement of gold bullion across the international exchanges made excessively difficult. How shall the world redistribute the immense stock pile that lies buried in America? Shall the United States simply fling it broadcast over the world, and on what plea shall so extraordinary an action be justified? It is hard to imagine any reason, other than loving kindness, why the United States should rid itself of its gold stock. While such altruism would be beyond all praise it can hardly be thought of as a practical measure.

Another thing that must be taken into serious consideration is the future supply of gold. The great South African mines have almost exhausted their high-grade ores. They are very deep and the practical difficulties of mining are becoming acute. It was the rise in price of gold to $35 per fine cunce that has allowed them to work their lower grade ores profitably. The same is true of the Canadian gold deposits. There is no knowing but that some great gold strike may occur in a place never hitherto suspected; but the world cannot rely on any such piece of luck. In addition therefore, to the fact that the world's stock of gold is inadequate, we must realize that the future offers no assurance of supply of gold sufficient to support a monometallic standard.

So far as can be seen, the supply of silver will be enough to supplement this shortage of gold. Silver is obtained not only from its existing deposits but also as a byproduct of other metals, for instance lead. So far from diminishing, the supply of silver is increasing, and may well increase still more substantially in the future. The reserves of silver in the East, in India, and China are enormous and may be drawn upon. It is hard to think that the use of so precious a metal will be ignored when it lies to our hand, ready for our use.

12. SUMMARY

It will be well now briefly to summarize the conclusions to which we have arrived.

1. An international bimetallic standard will allow the foreign exchanges to function on a bullion basis with automatic settlement of balances by the precious metals.

2. The fact that adverse balances may thus be liquidated by bullion payments will, of itself, steady the exchanges and prevent violent departures from par. The upper and lower limits of the specie points stand as the terminals beyond which, save in exceptional circumstances, the fluctuations of the exchanges will be confined.

3. The confusion into which monetary systems of the occupied countries of Europe and Asia have been thrown by the downfall of their governments, the occupation marks of the German invaders and the inflation in China have been so extreme that their restoration will offer great difficulties. By remonetizing silver the liberated peoples will be given hard money, the soundest basis for confidence and renewed hopes.

4. It has never been questioned that an international bimetallic system will work. Nothing whatever stands in its way and its success is assured.

5. There is not enough gold in the world to support a monometallic standard now, and its future supply is more than doubtful. Added to which the distribution of the gold which the world does possess is so uneven that its redistribution will be, if not impossible, excessively difficult. But there is a vast quantity of silver which lies ready to be utilized.

13. CONCLUSION

One hundred and sixty-seven years ago Adam Smith, the first great Scottish economist, wrote a memorable passage in his Wealth of Nations. He was speaking of the use of paper money which could be printed at will by a government and, in a quaint and arresting phrase, likened it to "a wagon-way through the air." There were many advantages, he said, in so wonderful a means of locomotion. It was very cheap and easy and encountered none of the obstructions and difficulties that beset a more labored progress along the ground. But, he pointed out, it had its dangers, and proceeded to name them, dangers of which the world in recent years has been all too painfully aware. And so, in his forthright, sensible way he came to a conclusion.

"The commerce and industry of the country, it must be acknowledged, though they may be somewhat augmented, cannot altogether be so secure when they are thus, as it were, suspended upon the Daedalian wings of paper money, as when they travel about on the solid ground of gold and silver."

The Mockingbird Made the Official State Bird of Mississippi

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years I have urged that the mockingbird be made the official bird of the State of Mississippi. The school children of the State joined with the clubwomen of the State in such a request.

A few days ago the legislature of Mississippi passed a law making the mockingbird the official bird of that State.

In all the turmoil that surrounds us, one of the notes of gladness that greets me every morning is a mockingbird on the Supreme Court grounds that enlivens the drab surroundings with his cheering, endless melodies, as he inspiringly repeats the songs of other birds.

I congratulate the school children and the clubwomen of Mississippi on the success of their efforts, and congratulate the legislature on complying with their request.

Many years ago I delivered a short address on the mockingbird which was published throughout the country. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting that address at this point.

It reads as follows:

[Extract from a speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, Member of Congress from Mississippi, delivered before the Mississippi Society, in Washington, D. C., on December 11, 1924]

THE SOUTHERN MOCKINGBIRD

Mr. RANKIN. It has indeed been a pleasure to me to listen to your excellent musical program, and especially to the imitations of bird songs as illustrated by that celebrated writer and naturalist, Schuyler Mathews, in his delightful book on Wild Birds and Their Music.

The only suggestion I have to offer is that before he puts out another edition of his wonderful work that distinguished gentleman should take a postgraduate course in his chosen field of study by going down into Mississippi and reveling in the songs of the southern mockingbird—the greatest singer of them all.

I can understand how one who has never heard him can extol in superlative terms the songs of other birds, for as Shakespeare has wisely stated, "The crow doth sing as sweetly as the lark when neither is attended."

And if, as the poet Burton has said, "A nightingale dies for shame if another bird sings better," then one melodious trill of Dixie's matchless songster would put a world of nightingales to instant and shameful death.

He is the master of them all!

The Caruso of field and forest, the Mozart of wild music, the grand opera of nature, he seems to embrace within his boundless repertoire the songs of all the birds that have ever lived and those that are yet to come.

As courageous as the eagle, he guards with valor and with vigilance his nestlings and his mate, repelling the invasion of the dreaded hawk, and scattering a flock of intruding crows in ignominous flight. As gentle as the dove, he manifests the highest attributes of civilization as prescribed by the golden rule by reflecting in his daily life the sentiments of his song.

It has been said that musical expression is confined to the highest natures, and that therefore birds of prey never sing.

The friendless vulture that wafts his way in geometric figures over the sunny landscape, measuring with his fleeting shadow those double circles which meet only at the bedside of death, or on the field of carnage, never sings a song. The weird owl, the nightly terror of all the feathered tribe, the most ghastly and striking emblem of desolation and despair, never warbles a note. The loathsome vampire, that detestable plague of the tropics, that reputed pest to human life, never breathes a tune.

I would rather be the mockingbird which Longfellow has described as "swinging aloft on a willow spray" and shaking from his little throat "such floods of delirious music" that all the world would seem to pause and listen, to live for one short hour, than to be the venomous toad and exist throughout a century, or to be the loathsome reptile and live a thousand years.

We dignify as a national emblem the American eagle that soars and shrieks his screams of defiance from the seclusion of the crags; we perpetuate in verse and story the imaginary song of the mythical dying swan; we praise the inferior songs of other birds—but, in my humble judgment, there is none that deserves more praise, credit, or commendation at the hands of enlightened humanity than the peerless mockingbird, America's sweetest singer, who enlivens the spirit of springtime with his tireless serenade, and thrills every heart with his inspiring note of gladness as he touches the golden harp of nature's sweetest song and "stirs with joy and hope the languid souls of listening men."

Jewish Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a mass meeting called by the Wilmington branch of the Zionist Organization of America at the Y. M. and Y. W. H. A. in Wilmington, Del., on the evening of February 29, 1944 and attended by some 750 persons, a resolution was unanimously adopted calling upon the Delaware delegation in Congress to support Senate and House resolutions favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. The resolution was adopted following an address by Pierre S. van Paassen, foreign correspondent, author, and lecturer, and is as follows:

Whereas persecution against the Jews of Europe has uprooted and made homeless millions of Jewish people who are in dire need of a haven and a home where they may enjoy the elementary rights of human life; and

Whereas the British Government as mandatory to Palestine, has issued the Chamberlain White Paper which would close Palestine to Jewish immigration on March 31, 1944, and prohibit the purchase of land for Jewish settlement in that country, thus closing Palestine as a place of refuge for the millions in such dire need: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we urge upon our Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress that they vote favorably upon the Senate Resolution No. 247 and the House Resolutions Nos. 418 and 419 urging "that the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Twenty Years in Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, probably the most pleasant part of all the experience of a public servant is the approval and cooperation of those he serves. During my almost 20 years in the Congress, the people of Florida have on all occasions cooperated well with me and if I have made any accomplishments here or any services have been well performed, full credit for same should be given to my loyal constituents in Florida. Their kindness to me has ever been an inspiration and an encouragement. I give to them full credit for all worth-while things which have transpired for Florida during my tenure here.

Over the period of years, I have received thousands of telegrams and letters of appreciation from individuals, cities, and organizations in my State. War veterans have written me in their own behalf in gratitude for efforts on individual claims. Veterans' organizations have written me in approval of legislation for the good of the whole. It has been my lot to sponsor many legislative proposals of different posts of the American Legion and of Spanish-American War Camps in my State. Business concerns, chambers of commerce, city councils, mayors, State officials, civic clubs, all have responded quite generously on so many occasions. These kind expressions are by me appreciated far more than are silver and gold because they come from the hearts of loyal and noble constituents. Too much space would be required to print even a reasonable number of these messages which from the bottom of my heart I do appreciate so much; therefore, I shall present to you only a few, as follows:

CLEARWATER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Clearwater, Fla., August 27, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: Your telegram of August 21, advising that project FAS 77-1, covering the extension of the Pinellas-Hillsborough Road No. 17, had been approved by the War Production Board, is very much appreciated.

We believe it will be only a few days until the State road department will begin construction on this road, the completion of which will be a boon to all of Pinellas County, as well as all of central Florida.

We wish to thank you for your cooperation, as we believe that it was through your efforts that the War Production Board gave its approval of this project.

Sincerely yours,

FRED J. LEE, *Secretary.*

JACKSONVILLE AUTOMOBILE
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 18, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Re: Proposed O. P. A. price ceiling on used passenger automobiles.

DEAR SIR: Please accept the sincere thanks of the Jacksonville Automobile Dealers Association for the very fine, prompt, and able response to our pleas for assistance in presenting the case of the automobile dealers of America to the Office of Price Administration in regard to the above matter.

Our latest information is that no ceiling will be forthcoming in the immediate future, and that if a price ceiling is placed on used passenger vehicles the same will be far more equitable than the ceiling on commercial vehicles under MPR-341.

We feel that this result is due primarily to your very able championing of our cause.

Very truly yours,

ALLEN L. POUCHER,
Managing Secretary.

CITY OF WEWAHITCHKA,
Wewahitchka, Fla., March 4, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: It gives me pleasure to be able to advise you that the W. P. A. project covering our city hall has been reopened and the men are there and at work.

I want to extend to you not only my own personal thanks for your efforts in our behalf, but the appreciation of this entire community. We realize that it is largely through your interest that this project was reopened and it is our hope that some day we may be able to show you just how much we do appreciate the time and effort which you have expended on our little city.

Again thanking you, and with best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,
C. L. MORGAN, *Mayor.*

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Jacksonville, May 25, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: This will acknowledge receipt of copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with reference to the proposed Pharmacy Corps bill. I have read with interest and I think this is an opportune time to express to you my appreciation not only for this special act, but for the many favors I know you have rendered to the pharmacists of this State, I can truthfully say that the pharmacists of this State hold you in very high esteem and personally I have as yet to request anything of you that I did not receive your immediate cooperation.

Respectfully yours,
M. H. DOSS,
Director, State Bureau of Narcotics.

AUXILIARY,
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Pontiac, Ill., February 2, 1944.

HONORABLE SIR: Your unanimous approval of H. R. 2350 is appreciated by every member of the National Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans.

Personally and as the national representative of the membership of your district in the State of Florida may I say "Thank you."

Most sincerely,
IRMA HILL VOGEL,
Chairman, National Legislative Committee.

JACKSONVILLE BOARD OF REALTORS,
Jacksonville, Fla., January 19, 1944.
Congressman LEX GREEN,
Washington, D. C.

Re limitation on salesmen's earnings in 1944.

DEAR LEX: As you are probably aware, the Director of Economic Stabilization did not place any limitation on salesmen's earnings in 1944 and on behalf of the members of the Jacksonville Board of Realtors, I wish to thank you most sincerely for your help in securing this ruling from the Director of Economic Stabilization.

I can assure you that we all feel that this will be a great benefit to the real-estate business as a whole.

Sincerely yours,
M. A. COLLINS,
President, Jacksonville Board of Realtors.

THE CITY OF OCALA,
Ocala, Fla., June 16, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: The city council at its regular meeting last night expressed their gratification of your efforts in behalf of our city in obtaining approval under the Lanham Act for funds for this city's recreational program for servicemen.

When you were in Ocala yesterday you probably noticed the large numbers of servicemen here then. Later in the week, and especially on week ends, the number of servicemen here greatly increases.

Permit me to express the thanks of our city officials and citizens for your efforts in our behalf on this and prior occasions.

Very truly yours,
W. ROBERT SMITH,
City Attorney.

STATE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING BOARD OF FLORIDA,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 31, 1943.
Hon. ROBERT ALEXIS GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: May we congratulate you for the work you did in obtaining a victory on the potato-price question. You had a hard, uphill battle, but you won, and you deserve full credit for doing so.

With kindest regards. I am,

Cordially yours,
WILLIAM L. WILSON,
Director of State Markets.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Pensacola, Fla., March 17, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: I feel that I can assume the privilege of addressing you by your first name because you have certainly been a friend of the postal employees and being a post-office clerk I want to express my deep appreciation for all you have done for us.

One thing I have noticed—and others here in this office have commented on it too—is the fact that no matter how busy you may be you have an uncanny ability of answering all letters and telegrams before the ink is dry on the one you received. Keep it up—it really goes over in a big way. If your secretary is responsible for this promptness you should give him or her a raise. It's just human for me or anyone else to feel mighty proud of the fact that his Congressman thinks enough of him to answer correspondence promptly.

Let me thank you once more for the big part you played in bringing about the overwhelming vote in favor of our pay-raise bill. If you should be able to visit Pensacola any time be sure to let me know as I would like to personally thank you and I am sure that all the clerks in this office would enjoy the same opportunity.

With best wishes and a parting but lasting thanks, I am,

Sincerely,
W. B. ANDERSON,
Fourth Vice President, Florida Federation of Post Office Clerks.

CITY OF PENSACOLA,
November 1, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to thank you for your letter of October 29 showing approval of allocation of $100,000 for the development of the municipal airport.

This was indeed good news and I appreciate your interest in this and the many other matters which you have given your undivided attention to for the benefit of Florida.

With kind regards.

Very truly yours,
A. E. LANGFORD,
City Manager.

CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLA.,
March 25, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
Congressman at Large,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: We wish to extend a most sincere thank you on behalf of the city commission and all the people of our community for your efforts in obtaining favorable action on the project of much needed improvements to the Ponce de Leon Inlet.

With kindest personal regards, we are

Sincerely yours,
THE CITY COMMISSION,
New Smyrna Beach, Fla.
By W. E. SWOOPE,
Mayor Commissioner.

TROPICAL BRANCH 1071,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Miami, Fla., April 2, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND LEX: Just a line to let you know we really appreciate the way you went to bat for us in the recent campaign for a salary adjustment. That $300 will surely help out. It does a fellow good to know he has a friend up there when he really needs a friend.

Here's hoping the President will see this thing the same way you fellows did.

Thanks a million, Lex, from all the boys.

Sincerely yours,
CARL W. WRIGHT,
President, Tropical Branch 1071,
National Association of Letter Carriers.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *April 23, 1943.*
Hon. LEX GREEN,
House Office Building:

Your telegram and other valued advices received. Have just had our petition for 45-day stay in log ceiling granted by O. P. A. This is big relief, and we wish to thank you for your support as always.

Regards,
CUMMER SONS CYPRESS CO.,
EDWARD C. ROE,
Vice President and General Manager.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Tallahassee, Fla., October 11, 1943.
The Honorable LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Thank you for the copy of Aunt Sammy's Radio Recipes. We are delighted to have this for use with our teachers. I will call it to their attention as we visit schools and at conferences that we hold with home economics teachers in groups.

Very sincerely yours,
BOLETHA FROJEN,
State Supervisor, Home Economics Education.

THE MIAMI HERALD,
Miami, Fla., November 18, 1943.
Congressman LEX GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: Thank you for your telegram of November 16 dealing with the Virginia Key project. It helped us to prepare an excellent news story.

With every good wish to you, I am

Sincerely,
JOHN D. PENNEKAMP,
Associate Editor.

WINN & LOVETT GROCERY CO.,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 30, 1943.
Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many thanks for copy of letter from Prentiss M. Brown of June

26 regarding the situation on sugar for industrial users. We greatly appreciate your sending this information along to us. You have also, from time to time, sent us other information regarding things we have written you about, and we greatly appreciate your attention.

Yours very truly,
WINN & LOVETT GROCERY CO.,
A. D. DAVIS.

ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE,
St. Petersburg, Fla., May 12, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: We have received word that our college has been reinstated as an approved school for the training of naval aviation cadets under the C. A. A. program.

We realize the valuable work which you have done in helping to bring about a favorable conclusion to this matter, and I wish to express my personal thanks and appreciation for your efforts.

Thanking you most heartily and with cordial good wishes, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,
ROBERT B. REED.

THE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 8, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I acknowledge receipt of your wire advising that the President had approved Florida project 8-M-51, and indicating that the actual cash would soon be at hand.

I made this announcement at a board meeting this afternoon and was instructed by unanimous vote to voice that body's sincere appreciation for your splendid assistance. We are, indeed, grateful to you and hope that you will think of some way whereby we may show our appreciation.

Best regards,
Sincerely yours,
J. W. GILBERT,
Acting Superintendent.

CITY OF FERNANDINA,
Fernandina, Fla., October 22, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want to take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation in securing some houses for us here in Fernandina, Fla.

The National Housing Agency of Atlanta, Ga., informed us today that a housing program has been approved for Fernandina consisting of 60 privately financed units.

We appreciate your efforts and consideration. If at any time we can be of service to you, please feel free to call upon this office.

Sincerely yours,
G. RALPH WOLFF,
Mayor.
W. C. DRAGER,
City Manager.

FOREST FARMERS ASSOCIATION COOPERATIVE,
March 18, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I want to thank you very sincerely for the helpful interest you have shown in making proper provision for forestry research in the naval stores territory.

Your leadership in this important matter is very greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,
C. P. KELLY, *Executive Director.*

General Chickering Discusses the Big Job of Army Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William E. Chickering, Director of the Army Postal Service, recently delivered an address to a group of enlisted men upon their graduation from the Army Postal School at West Chester, Pa. I am asking permission to include some of the highlights of this address at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Army Postal Service is one of the most important agencies of the Army. The problems confronting those who handle the Army mails are tremendous. The constant movement of troops, the large amount of incorrectly addressed mail and the loss of ships and planes that carry mail makes the task at times almost insurmountable. Delivering mail to soldiers all over the globe is far different from peacetime mail service.

General Chickering and those associated with him are striving daily to overcome the many handicaps, and a staff of competent postal experts are hard at work trying to have the huge volume of soldiers mail reach all destinations as safely and as quickly as is humanly possible.

Some of the highlights of General Chickering's speech follow:

Every effort has been made in all of the wars in which our country has been engaged to give the best possible mail service to our troops. In the present war, for the first time, we have global warfare in the fullest sense of the word. Our troops are scattered throughout the world and the Army Postal Service must follow the troops and provide them with the best postal facilities possible under the existing war conditions. In addition, the problem is increased by the number of troops involved which is far beyond anything we have experienced in the past. The planning on which our operations to meet this task are based has been in process over an extended period. In 1939 and 1940 when the Army was preparing for extensive maneuvers this planning was carried further and resulted in an agreement being entered into with the Post Office Department in March of 1940, which clearly defines the division of responsibility between the two departments in the furnishing of postal service to our troops. With that agreement and the splendid cooperation of the Post Office Department, plus the experience of the last war as a basis, we have built up an Army Postal Service of which we are justly proud.

The members of this class were selected because of prior postal service or other qualifications which make them especially suitable for postal duty. Besides these qualifications, however, it is necessary that you have a high concept of the importance of the Army Postal Service and the vital nature of the duties and responsibilities connected therewith. Mail is a vital factor in Army morale. The Secretary of War has made the statement that it is the No. 1 morale factor. Add to the morale of the troops the importance of morale on the home front. The Army Postal Service, with the Post Office Department, reaches into the millions of homes from which these men in the Army have come and forms, in fact, the connecting link between these men and their families. We must strive to keep that link effective and to keep the mail moving with the utmost dispatch.

As most of you have had prior experience with the civil postal system, you know it to be a model of postal efficiency. This experience provides a most valuable background for duty in the Army Postal Service. There is one striking contrast between the two services, however, that should be pointed out. The civil postal system was built up gradually over a period of about two centuries. It is founded on the experience and knowledge of many experts and upon traditions built up during that time. Its operations are now routine, its schedules fixed, and its assignments specialized. This is not so of the Army Postal Service, which has been built up rapidly and is conducting a world-wide postal system under the most trying circumstances of total war with the numerous hazards which that entails. Uncertain schedules, enemy action on the high seas, combat conditions abroad, primitive quarters for A. P. O.'s, movement of troops, misaddressed mail—these are some of the problems with which the Army Postal Service is faced.

Your ingenuity will be taxed, your resourcefulness challenged. You will constantly be faced with new situations and problems and must work out your solutions using the knowledge acquired here as your working tools. This is the challenge you have accepted in coming into the Army Postal Service. It is the challenge the Army Postal Service expects you to meet. In discharging this responsibility you will be making a definite and outstanding contribution to maintenance of the all-important postal link. You will be making a singular contribution to the soldiers whose mail you handle; a contribution that will be reflected in their fighting qualities and in the final achievement of total victory. You will be carrying out the tradition of the great United States Post Office Department, which has always so ably labored under the slogan, "The mails must go through."

Address by Associate Justice Jackson Before the Canadian Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, in behalf of the able and distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the anual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association, at Toronto, Canada, on February 19 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I value your invitation, not only as a personal honor but as an expression of your esteem for the Court on which I sit and of your good will toward the legal profession in the United States. A sense of brotherhood, based on common traditions, always has animated the bars of our two countries. It has been quickened and deepened by the com-

mon character of our perils and problems in the war. I only remind you of what you already know; of the high respect in which the Canadian bench is held in my country; of the fellowship the lawyer of the States feels for the lawyer of the Provinces; and of the ties of friendship that closely bind my Government to your own and my people to your people.

The structure of self-government in both of our lands has been largely the work of lawyers, and our liberties are secured by legal principles. The foundations of Canada and of the United States have so much in common that any weakness in one must be apprehended as a weakness in both. We may well devote an evening to probing at these foundations to see where, if at all, they are undermined or need attention. Of course, my observations about current conditions relate only to the United States. Want of knowledge would put your conditions beyond my consideration, if want of taste did not.

We in the United States are experiencing what many call a period of confusion in the law. It is not, as some who ignore history believe, unparalleled or unprecedented. Instead, it is the kind of unsettlement that always extends to the law when organized society itself is in a period of transition. We can understand the evolution of the law only by reference to shifts in the broader intellectual currents that affect the affairs of government.

Bryce generalized all constitutional history as a ceaseless struggle between what he called centripetal and centrifugal forces and suggested a cycle from anarchy to tyranny and back again. For well over a half century the United States, like most countries, has been in the centralization phase of the historical cycle. The end is not in sight. New ideas about the world we live in continue to react upon our ideas of government. Science seems in a conspiracy to forward concentration of governmental and of economic power. For example, the microscope has altered our world much as the telescope did the medieval one. A new dimension of existence has been revealed by discovery of germs, bacteria, and microscopic life. Some of this is hostile to man without respect to state or national boundaries. We have found it necessary always and everywhere to be mobilized against unseen foes. Resulting health and sanitary requirements exert a powerful socializing and centralizing influence on our society, our government, and our law. They are a constant ally of increasing power in social organization against freedom of the individual and the autonomy of the locality. Pressure in the same direction comes also from the expanding world in chemistry, electric energy, and electronics, in radio and aerodynamics, and from the industrial organization necessary to put these things at the service of the masses of the people.

As the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were characterized by extreme individualization of the law to make it conform with the prevailing social philosophy, so the twentieth century is one of socialization of the law in obedience, likewise, to prevailing social attitudes. The movement today almost universally is toward advancement of collective interests at the expense of individual interests. This, of course, is not to say that we are becoming a collectivist state. Indeed, moderate concessions are thought by some to be the best defense against such extremes. While there are those who resist this drift, our more heated divisions are no longer as to the direction of our movement so much as to its pace.

Many persons have voiced fears or hopes that the post-war world will move rapidly and sharply either to the right or to the left. An extreme movement in either direction would utilize existing centralization and socialization and vastly extend it either to serve the supposed interests of a proletariat, as in Russia, or those of a military-industrialist class, as in Germany and Italy. Whether enough of our people will give way to extremes to carry the balance either way may be doubted and, if so, any estimate as to which extreme might prevail would hardly rise above a guess. But it does seem to me probable that those who have been inclined toward the right will move further to the right, and that those who have been looking hopefully to the left will go further to the left. If this transpires, it makes wider and sharper and deeper division among our people as to the very fundamentals of organized life.

To increase the distance by which the views of men are separated is to intensify the struggle for power. The increased role of central governments in matters such as labor relations, social security, unemployment compensation, price control, industrial regulation, and fiscal policy have raised the stakes of power higher than ever before. Moreover, it is the attitude of extremists that there are no inherent restraints on power, that once in office nothing but their own wills could check them. All of these factors conspire to make future struggles less compromisable. A contest in Canada between the Conservatives and Liberals or in the United States between the Republicans and Democrats can be settled at the ballot box. Their policies are not so far apart as to justify carrying the contest further, and whichever one takes office does so with acceptance of constitutional restraints which make the minority safe in person and property. But a struggle between such extremes as Communist and Fascist Parties could hardly submit to an election, but would tempt to extra-legal tests of strength; for either would fear, and rightly, that the other in power would stop at nothing to destroy all opposition.

Lord Balfour pointed out that the British Government is not adapted to the problems resulting from this kind of strife in words certainly applicable to the United States and, I would assume, to Canada. He said: "Our alternating Cabinets, though belonging to different parties, have never differed about the foundation of society and it is evident that our whole political machinery presupposes a people so fundamentally at one that they can afford to bicker; and so sure of their own moderation that they are not dangerously disturbed by the never-ending din of political conflict. May it always be so."

Thus, the security of democratic institutions may depend on keeping struggles for power from getting out of legal bounds. Primarily the burden of adjustment and reconciliation within the democratic process will fall upon parliaments and congresses and upon the executives. We judges must, I think, be cautious that we do not obstruct them in the exercise of their lawful powers or make their task of governing unnecessarily difficult. In solving these great conflicts our judicial power is no substitute for that of the legislative or the executive, and the future of free government depends upon their adequacy to their problems even more than it depends on any exercise of power entrusted to the judiciary.

Nevertheless, the magnitude and delicacy of the problems of the post-war world inevitably add to the responsibilities and difficulties of courts. More and more controversies that have their origins in phases of this conflict, or which groups are using to bear upon it, find their way into the courts.

In common-law countries, much more than under the civil-law system, the judiciary is entrusted with a large measure of discretion in choosing, interpreting, and sometimes inventing rules by which controversies are decided. We concentrate on rightly deciding individual cases and trust these decisions somehow to fit themselves into a pattern that in matters not controlled by legislation will represent "the law." We may well feel humble and inadequate in the presence of the task, but that method has not proved unsuccessful. I do not think it is a mere coincidence that liberties are and for a long stretch of years have been relatively secure, institutions relatively stable, and all that freemen prize relatively safe where the methods and philosophy of the common law prevail.

The part that legal philosophy has played in the making of our free governments and must continue to play in their successful operation makes its assumptions of more than academic significance. When legal or political principles on which the bench and bar and legislators used to be pretty much agreed are by any substantial group called into question, it has practical implications. It would be impossible to deny that in the United States assumptions once accepted as part of the original concept of our governments are seriously questioned.

In fashioning the institutions and cultures, both of Canada and the United States, resort has been had to two great streams of liberal thought. The history of our two countries has been very different, but I think the influences which have made us what we are may be traced to the same two sources. One was the intellectual and spiritual forces in England which guided the revolt against personal authoritarian government by the Stuart kings; the other source was similar forces in France which guided the reaction against personal authoritarian government by Louis XIV. While there were, of course, important differences in the conduct and consequences of the movements against monarchial totalitarianism on the two sides of the English Channel, there was a striking similarity in the doctrines that generated them, and there was much exchange of thought between those who led them. Locke and Montesquieu are examples that could be multiplied of philosophers whose meditations were made common property.

The liberal movement in both countries was stimulated and guided by a belief that a "natural law" limited the rightful powers of every government and that under it the individual possessed inherent and inalienable "rights." In England, King James, who thought of himself in quite modern authoritarian terms, was boldly and bluntly told by Lord Chief Justice Coke that he was "under God and the law." The battle against "the Divine right" of dictation in England thereafter went forward under that legal doctrine. Locke, theorist of the liberalizing movement in England, was one of the strongest of English influences in the thinking of colonial statesmen and publicists, such as Jefferson, Madison, and Paine. He was an exponent of government limited by natural law, of inalienable rights of man, and of government by consent. But also, and particularly through Jefferson, the French influence in the same general direction was powerful.

In France, much the same ideas were fermenting and slowly gaining ground after the time of Louis XIV. In 1789, the National Assembly of France set forth "a declaration of the rights of man," in which it declared the citizen to possess rights that were "natural, sacred, and inalienable." They were summarized under the terms "liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression." The state was not to interfere with ownership or enjoyment of property nor confiscate it "except in cases of evident public necessity, and then after payment of a just indemnity." Personal security would be guarded by a system of courts and a single system of law and by a presumption of innocence until guilt was proved. The right to oppose and overthrow oppressive government was considered a natural right, inherent in every man.

How closely this resembles the philosophy and even the words of the Declaration of Independence of the United States, announced

a few years before, and the Bill of Rights, adopted a few years later. We declared it "self-evident" that men are "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Later, amendments to the Constitution incorporated the Bill of Rights, by which safeguards were provided for liberty and also for property, which could be taken only for public use and upon "just compensation," as had been declared in France. Thus, the nineteenth century opened with England, France, and most of this continent pretty solidly founded on a system of government of personal liberty and of property-holding, based on the proposition that natural rights of man limit all official authority.

In the United States the years have witnessed a reaction against these natural-law theories. In smart intellectual circles it is regarded as naive to put any credence in natural law and as unsophisticated to think, as did the forefathers, that men may have inherent and inalienable rights. Instead, a multitude of theories of the nature and source of law are offered. We are told by some that all law is the creation of organized society. Some aver that law proceeds from such forces as economic determinism, institutional compulsions, or those explained by Freudian psychoanalysis. Others put its origin in pure reason. Also, we have descendants of that old and influential school of "those who stand up for utility as the test of right and wrong," the creed defined by Mills as one "which accepts as the foundation of morals utility, or the greatest happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness." Other modernists are skeptical as to the exercise of reason in lawmaking and cynical in their disregard of any moral law or principle as a force in its shaping. They believe with almost Marxian fervor in economic determinism.

I shall not speak, I probably am not qualified to speak, of the academic soundness or the logical correctness of any of these doctrines of political and legal rights and wrongs, nor as to the origins or sanctions of natural law, nor whether it is law, nor whether it is natural, nor whether and to what extent it has been abused or carried to excess by its devotees. I am not consciously an advocate or adversary of the verity of any of them. I only venture a few practical observations which have to do with the influence of the legal profession in helping to maintain the kind of free government that the earlier lawyers helped so much to establish.

The abstract concept of "natural rights" was an ecclesiastical as well as a legal one and was, as you know, ancient. What was new was its use, chiefly by lawyers, as a practical standard to rally all sorts and conditions of men to support the struggle against arbitrary government. It is easier to make fun of natural law as an abstract theory than it is to dismiss the great humanitarian ends which the ideas behind that formula furthered. It proved to be a powerful weapon of persuasion and unification of intellectual and spiritual forces in fighting for freedom. So long as that belief dominates the culture of a people, it is not possible for a dictatorship of any sort to gain legitimacy or for authority that is oppressive, cruel, and arbitrary to be given the prestige and moral force of law. For that reason totalitarians scorn and try to displace the natural-rights idea with the doctrine well put by Mussolini that "the Fascist state organizes the nation, but leaves a sufficient margin of liberty to the individual. The latter is deprived of all useless and possibly harmful freedom, but retains what is essential; the deciding power on this question cannot be the individual, but the state alone." "The deciding power is the state alone." Add to that, "I am the state." That is the key to the legal philosophy of the absolutist, whether it be the Stuarts or Louis XIV, or Hitler, or Mussolini, or Lenin, or any future imitator of any of them.

What is at stake in this war and what will be the issue in many post-war conflicts, from the viewpoint of the lawyer, is summed up in those two fundamental and opposing principles of social organization. One attitude puts the state above and before the individual, who receives all of his rights by its grace and during its pleasure. The other is that the state is no mystical end in itself, but obtains its authority by delegation from the citizens as a means to their greater self-realization. The practical difference between these theories may be measured best by the contrast between the behavior of government toward its own citizens in Germany with that in England, Canada, or the United States.

The feature which makes one uneasy about some modern law theory in the United States is that in repudiating natural-law doctrines it pretty much embraces this philosophy of absolutism of the state. Then law becomes only a phase of state policy. When policy is made manifest in legislation or in executive action or administrative decision, it follows that its finality is not to be questioned. From such premises it is hard to avoid the conclusion that in America all is law that has the votes, just as in some parts of Europe all is law that has the guns. We thus have a New World variety of the European philosophies of no law.

But even if these doctrines are not intended to afford support to absolutism, they at best are only feeble instruments of opposition. These theories may be intellectually satisfying, but they arouse no passions in men's breasts. Perhaps it was the religious element in the creed that each man has been endowed by his Creator with rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that lent fervor to its cause. If it was a simple, it also was a fighting, faith. Lawyer leadership never rose to such heights as when it advanced under that standard. Perhaps in becoming a more sophisticated profession "the lawyer has spoiled the statesman," as Disraeli said of Brougham.

It seems to me, however, that there should be enough unity at the bar on propositions that, if debatable in theory, are hardly open to doubt in practice and which are understandable to laymen so that the lawyer may again be leader of the forces that make for freedom of the individual and for limitation upon the power of the state. I am convinced that de Tocqueville's observation in the first half of the nineteenth century holds true in the twentieth. He said: "I cannot believe that a republic could subsist at the present time if the influence of lawyers in public business did not increase in proportion to the power of the people."

My hope that the lawyer and the law may prove again as in the past one of the effective bulwarks of democracy is not at all based on the idea that the world can stand still or that our law can be like that of the Medes and Persians. Indeed, I am sure the world is in for very extensive change and renovation. Democracy does not mean merely holding on to the status quo; it is a method of progression by peaceful and orderly means and by gradual, instead of revolutionary, steps. The law itself and the professional and judicial mind must be receptive to the legal implications of changes in the social order.

We, of course, would not deny that authority is an essential ingredient of law. Many rules of law and procedure represent a choice between reasonable alternatives, and such a choice is the function of authority. But it is a different matter if authority makes a choice that is without reason and is arbitrary or capricious. In that case courts have long found precedent and precept upon which to vindicate reason as against the mere fiat of authority.

We are agreed that there is and must be a spiritual and intellectual inner life that is wholly free. And there is a sphere of action that must be largely free of governmental control in order that the personalities of men may fulfill their potentialities. These include freedom of worship, of conscience and thought, freedom to pursue the sciences, philosophy, the arts, freedom to speak and to listen or not, freedom to print, freedom to make a living by honest and socially useful labor, freedom to benefit by one's own thrift and industry as compared with the consequences of indolence and waste. We uphold the right to criticize and oppose authority and concede to a man the right to make a good bit of a nuisance of himself.

American lawyers have never, however, taken the position that the individual may decide his rights for himself; nor do we admit that we are faced with the dilemma posed by Mussolini that the alternatives are decision solely by the crowd in control of the state or decision solely by the individual. That is where, in our philosophy, the law comes into play—law which binds both the individual and state officials; law interpreted and applied by judges, independent of the individual and, so far as humanly possible, of the state as well. That is what we mean by a government of laws. That trite phrase means something concrete to the lawyer mind. "Decision solely by the state" as a principle in action was illustrated by Hitler's blood purge of 1934, when many, including some eminent associates in his own party, were executed without hearing. What a sense of personal insecurity must have settled upon the citizens of Germany, both high and humble. Contrast this with events in the United States in 1942. The Supreme Court convened specially that summer to inquire whether the President of the United States had departed from the law of the land in summarily condemning to death a group of alien enemy saboteurs. It was taken by the public as a matter of course that they were entitled to a hearing, the President's action was upheld by the Attorney General, and an able lawyer assigned by the President's order represented the prisoners and earnestly presented their cause. That is government by law in action. The humblest man in your streets or ours must feel a dignity and a security and an unfolding of his whole personality to know that between him and legal harm stands such a tradition, such a custom, such a law. It is for this that our people fight.

The decisive victory for our arms that will not be long delayed will cast upon lawyers the duty and opportunity to be more than lawyers. They must not permit preoccupation with ordinary professional routines, or attachment to interests of clients, or risk to themselves to withhold from their countries that leadership in solving post-war problems for which their training and experience give them special competence. Our reasonable way of life under law—laws that bind alike the governors and the governed—will not suffer impairment if lawyers exert their leadership. They can always rally forces to protect free government from real dangers, if they take their stand, not on the ground that it has utility or that it is logically sound, or that it is economically determined, but on the ground that it is the only kind of government that can be morally right.

Address by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell Before Military and Civilian Personnel, Fort Belvoir, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at this hour Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, is delivering an address before the military and civilian personnel at Fort Belvoir, Va. The address refers to the anniversary of the founding of the Army Service Forces, and is being broadcast by the National Broadcasting Co.'s network. I have read the address and find it most inspiring. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This anniversary of the founding of Army Service Forces, it seems to me, is a proper moment for self-appraisal. It is the moment to inventory our successes and our failures, to look backward and look forward, to re-examine our methods and to ask ourselves pertinent questions.

How have we done?

How do we stand?

What does the future hold?

What can each of us in Army Service Forces do and what can each individual American do to hasten peace and assure victory? Is the purpose for which we are spending so much time and treasure and suffering worth all the effort and the agony?

Let us take up these questions, one by one.

How have we done? We have come a long way. I am proud of the men and women in Army Service Forces, our million soldiers and our million civilians here, and the service troops we have sent overseas. I am grateful to American industry and to American workers, to transportation and to agriculture, for their share in the arming of the Nation. Without united effort, military and civilian, the old cry of "too little and too late" would still be ringing in our ears. Thanks to you, to the soldiers and civilians in Army service forces, and to all those men and women who have joined us in our task, nearly everywhere today the story is "enough, on time."

Our job is important, far-reaching, and complex. We feed, clothe, shelter, and transport the Army. We construct its roads, bridges, airfields, and port facilities. We operate its telegraph, telephone, radio, and electronic devices. We protect troops from poison gas and maintain our own supply in case of need. Except certain items peculiar to the Air Forces, we design and procure all arms and ammunition, all tanks and trucks, everything the soldier needs to fight and live. We keep the Army's records, pay its bills, pay each individual soldier and his allotments. We are responsible for morale of troops. Our Corps of Chaplains offers religious consolation. We administer military justice, handle prisoners of war, maintain law and order, keep traffic moving on the roads to battle. We carry the mail to soldiers around the world. We operate the service commands. We maintain the Army's health; we nurse the sick and wounded; we bury the Army's dead.

All this requires an organization so vast that the individual within it sometimes may forget how important his part is, or he may believe that his part transcends all others in importance. The engineer soldier drilling in the mud here must always remember that he is part of the Army that is marching up the road to Rome. The worker making nuts and bolts must constantly remind himself that these are not mere nuts and bolts, that he in reality is hurling high explosives at the enemy. The clerk must realize that those aren't just papers she is shuffling, that each paper represents a gun in a soldier's hands.

So far we have done well, but not well enough to relax for a single minute.

We have armed the largest Army in our history with the world's best weapons. We have helped arm our allies.

We have housed and clothed and fed the Army well.

Our health rate is higher than the rates in civil life.

Our amphibious trucks, bazookas, rockets, signal equipment have changed the complexion of modern war.

We have shipped many million tons of equipment and millions of men overseas.

Today we set our sights on future targets. We must set them accurately. In order to find the range, we must measure carefully what it will require of effort, of suffering, of labor, of planning, of sacrifice, of unity.

We dare not lose our sense of urgency, dare not forget that each of us is a cog in a vast machine and that individual failure may lead to failure at some vital point far up the line. The soldier here at home, the shop worker, and the clerk can save American lives or by a thoughtless action bring death to our fighting men. The decision is ours on whether the war will be short or long.

How long it takes, how much it costs, is the individual concern of each of us. That little extra effort we all can give is vital. Each time we pause, each time we lay down our weapons or our tools we help the enemy. No individual cause dare stand in the way of quick and final victory. Only through unity of action and mutual determination, will we win.

Let us not be deluded by the happy thought that the war is won. Bitter fighting lies ahead. We have only dented the rim of Hitler's fortress and touched the outskirts of Tojo's empire. We haven't licked them yet. We dare not slacken our efforts. Rather we must redouble them. Victory is never cheaply bought.

Even victory is only a means to an end. What is that end? What are we fighting for? Why do we bury our sons and brothers in lonely graves far from home? For post-war wages or post-war profits? For bigger and better business? For softer comforts, new ice boxes, radios, cars? You know the answer. Our men are dying to preserve a way of life. The little luxuries are only by-products. We are fighting for liberty, the most expensive luxury known to man.

We fight for simple things, for the little things that are all important. We fight for the right to lock our house doors and be sure that no bully with official sanction will break the lock.

We fight for town meetings, for the soap box in the public square, for the high-school debating team, for open doors to cathedral and church and synagogue.

We fight for schools built on a foundation of books, not bayonets.

We fight for the country editor and for the metropolitan daily and for the editor's right to say the wrong thing if he thinks it's right.

We fight for the right to organize for any decent purpose, for labor, for employers, for the Grange and the Legion and the Ladies' Literary Club, and for lodge meetings in full regalia on Tuesday nights.

We fight for our candidate for sheriff and for the other fellow's candidate, and for the right to be sorry we elected him and to say so.

We fight for free radio, for the right to listen to what we want and to turn off what we don't want.

We fight for the right to work at jobs of our own choosing, to read the books we want to read, to listen to music that pleases us, without regard to the race or nationality of the composer.

We fight for the high privilege of throwing pop bottles at the umpire.

For these things, we fight.

These rights, these privileges, these traditions are precious enough to fight for, precious enough to die for. They are not easily won. They cannot be acquired by half measures or on half time. Dollars will not buy them. They cannot be attained without sacrifice.

Let me remind you that Tom Paine's words are as true now as they were that snowy night beside the Delaware. Paine wrote them on a drumhead with a stub of pencil. Let us write them in our hearts indelibly.

I quote: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

Thus spoke Tom Paine. His words will give us consolation in our sorrow, strength to combat our weariness, courage to face each new, hard day till peace comes back to the world.

To my troops, to the generals and the captains, the sergeants, and the privates, and to all our civilian workers I say: "Well done." In the year ahead we will strive for greater accomplishment. We can't win the war on the assembly line or the supply line, but we can lose it there. The men who will win this war are the fighting men, in the air and in the mud. These are the men we serve. They will triumph in the end. It is our sacred duty and our high privilege to serve them. No matter what we give, no matter how we labor, we cannot approach their sacrifice. Their valor is a blazing torch to light our way.

The Farm Production Program for 1944

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER O. CARRIER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, a communication has been directed to me from the Shelby County Farm Bureau of Shelby County, Ky., which gives a clear picture of the condition facing farmers in my district as well as every other agricultural district in the Nation. I desire to insert this communication in the RECORD, trusting that the Members of this House will consider its contents with the thought in view of cooperating in every way possible toward solving the

preplexing problem now confronting our farmers. We all know that you cannot take the labor off the farm, at the same time deprive the farmer of agricultural machinery, and produce food necessary to feed the world.

I want to commend the farmers in that they are not asking for any special privilege. They merely desire an opportunity to do their job well. This fact is emphasized in the last paragraph of the letter, "In the light of these facts, we shall trust you to do what is best for the whole Nation."

Mr. Speaker, would it not be more practical at this particular time to allocate more of the available farm equipment to the farmers of our own country instead of sending so much of it to European countries?

The communication follows:

SHELBY COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Shelbyville, Ky., March 6, 1944.

Congressman CHESTER O. CARRIER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our board of directors of the Shelby County Farm Bureau is greatly disturbed concerning the announced intentions of the Selective Service to induct a greater number of men deferred for agricultural reasons into the armed service. Shelby County has already sent over 1,100 men to the various services and any further depletions of the men at home will result in a serious shortage of available labor to harvest our crops this year.

The revised farm units necessary to keep a man on the farm are figured so high that the only men who can attain them are those equipped with a great deal of power-driven machinery. Our farmers cannot get one-fourth of the tractors or tractor implements that they want and need. As an example of the way these units are figured, one man would be supposed to set out, cultivate, and harvest 8 acres of tobacco, and we all know that is impossible. It is not possible to change our methods of farming so quickly and increase our livestock any more than we have because our county is an animal-feed importing area, and all signs point to a feed shortage starting this summer and next fall and winter.

Shelby County is one of the largest dairy counties in the State and in spite of the increased number of cows milked, production is decreasing steadily and will probably be 10 to 15 percent under 1943 in the fall of 1944.

The quantity of labor-saving machinery which we can buy is very limited. I understand that only four hay loaders have been assigned to Shelby County, and we have 16,000 cows and more than 600 dairies in the county. The basis of alloting the machinery has been on past purchases, but this is not adequate because in the past the farmer had labor and did not have money to buy machinery. At the present time he cannot secure labor, but he does have the money to buy the machinery to save it. The machinery which we have had has been no more than enough to replace a part of that which has been worn out. We do not question the wisdom of those who wish to increase the size of our armed forces, but we do want you to know that if it is done from agricultural laborers, our food production will be noticeably decreased.

In the light of these facts, we shall trust you to do what is best for the whole Nation.

Very truly yours,

CALLAWAY BRIGHT,
President.

Our Amphibious Forces

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Nation commemorates with pride on March 14 the second anniversary of our amphibious forces. I have introduced House Resolution 463 to urge that suitable tribute be paid during that week. The resolution follows:

House Resolution 463

Whereas on March 14, 1942, the United States amphibious forces was created to wage the battle for the beaches which are paving the way to victory; and

Whereas in the short space of 2 years our amphibious forces have moved inexorably forward in the Atlantic and the Pacific, spearheading the way to Tokyo and Berlin; and

Whereas the success of the operations of the amphibious forces has been made possible by the outstanding production record of American labor and management in supplying the necessary equipment and supplies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the week of March 14, 1944, be designated as Amphibious Forces Week, during which time suitable tribute will be paid to our gallant fighting men of the amphibious forces and the millions of men and women in America's factories, mines, and shipyards who have demonstrated that they are an integral part of "combined operations."

In the span of but 2 years, our amphibious forces has grown from ingenious plans in the minds of our Chiefs of Staff to a bold and powerful striking force that is now sweeping the enemy off the Pacific and is preparing for the day of final assault on Hitler's fortress Europe.

That we have in so short a space of time created such a force is a tribute to our armed forces and the millions of men and women in factories, shipyards, and mines, who virtually overnight, translated blueprints into thousands of landing craft of all types that are now turning our invasion plans into reality.

It was obvious shortly after Pearl Harbor that a new technique had to be evolved if we were to carry our fighting men and the thousands of items of equipment and supplies they needed to the enemies' beaches. Amphibious warfare was the answer, and it also was the least-known variety of fighting strategy and tactics.

Time was of the essence and the Joint Chiefs of Staff lost none in putting the plans into effect. Men had to be trained. Equipment and supplies had to be marshaled, and a new type of fighting vessel—landing craft—had to be produced by the thousands. Although experiments in amphibious warfare had been conducted by our military forces for many years, we still had a long way to go to fulfill our new requirements.

The early landing craft were, by present standards, crude and inadequate for the job that lay ahead. Extensive experimenting and research were conducted even as our fighting men were going through rough training and orientation in basic amphibious assault tactics.

In February 1942 a decision was reached by President Roosevelt and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—there would be an Atlantic Fleet Amphibious Force. By March 12 the first staff members had been selected. On March 13 dispatch orders went out to eight men who were to comprise the nucleus of this new organization, and the next day, March 14, 1942, Rear Admiral Roland R. Brainard, United States Navy, directed his flag be hoisted without ceremony on his transport, and thus the Atlantic Fleet Amphibious Force came into being.

America's first major amphibious invasion was but 7 short months away—the landings on Africa. Between the date of the creation of the amphibious forces and November 8, 1942, "D" Day in North Africa, America witnessed what will go down in history as a miracle in organization and planning and production.

While our fighting men were being molded into tough, well-equipped, well-trained striking forces, America's shipbuilders and the thousands of subcontracting plants that feed to them the necessary component and battle replacement parts immediately set to work to fulfill a Herculean production task. Impossible schedules were met on time and ahead of time. New types of ships were designed, redesigned, and produced. On the east and west coasts and far inland, in every part of America, our production machine was geared to the building of these vital landing craft.

That was the prelude. Since then our Amphibious Forces has been writing chapter after chapter of glorious history—North Africa, Salerno, Guadalcanal, the Marshalls, the Admiralties—ever driving forward to Tokyo and Berlin.

The battle for the beaches is now in full swing. We are engaged in combined operations on a tremendous scale. We have come to know combined operations in the classical sense as meaning perfectly coordinated attack by land, by sea, and by air. But, combined operations as we know it today embraces two other important elements—labor and management. Our production has been synchronized with our fighting time tables.

We are winning our preliminary bouts. However, we still must mass forces hitherto beyond precedent for our final assaults at the enemies' beaches. To do this our armed forces and labor and management are confronted with a still greater task. That our production schedules will be met, that our amphibious forces will be successful in the final battles, we in America have no cause to doubt. We have a winning, fighting combination of military might, of production prowess, and that extra increment of determination that will balance the scales in our favor on the decisive days that lie ahead.

America salutes our gallant amphibious forces on its second anniversary; it salutes the fighting officers and men that comprise it; it salutes the millions of men and women on the production line who are an integral part of combined operations—operations that will spell final victory.

War Against Opium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

WAR AGAINST OPIUM

If the resolution recently introduced into Congress by Representative JUDD is passed and acted upon, the end of World War No. 2 may also mark the end of the illicit opium traffic. Pointing to the fact that for the first time in the 40-year fight waged against opium by the United States, the British and Dutch Governments have agreed to abolish monopolies in their far-eastern territories, once they are freed from Japan, Congressman JUDD persuasively argues that the time is now ripe for expanding international controls. Since the root of the evil lies in the plant itself, controls, to be really effective, must be established in the remaining poppy-growing countries.

Among these countries pre-war China had virtually eliminated illegal opium cultivation and will presumably take up the good work again after the defeat of Japan. There remain, however, the countries of the Middle and Near East. Actually, Iran is the largest producer. The resolution, therefore, proposes that the President urge that the governments of all poppy-growing countries limit their production to the demands of the legitimate medical market. At this particular time, while the economies of the opium-growing countries are upset by the war, and while they have been made financially prosperous through lend-lease, the United States, it would seem, can bring considerable pressure to bear to expedite a change-over from drug to food crops. "The people of Iran," Representative JUDD rightly asserts, "need good food from their land more than money from opium."

It Won't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "It Won't Work" which appeared in the New York Times of March 9, 1944.

IT WON'T WORK

Governor Dewey truly says that "citizens who fight for their country have the right to vote." The plan which he offers for the State of New York, unfortunately, does not guarantee that all our fighting citizens, and especially those in the most trying and exposed positions, will have a chance to exercise that right. To be sure, it sounds simple. The soldier will apply for a ballot, using a prepared post card or any post card or scrap of paper. The War Ballot Commission will forward these post cards or scraps of paper to the local election boards, which will send out ballots to voters deemed qualified. The service voters will then mark the ballots for national, State, and local offices and they will be returned to the election boards. This proposal is perhaps not inconsistent with the terms of the conference report which has just been laid before Congress. It is merely inconsistent with any serious attempt to get a mass service vote in the coming election.

If every State had a law like this one it is likely that ballots could be collected from service personnel stationed in the United States, on some islands not too far away and possibly even in Britain. There is no prospect that every State will do even this well. Even if every State did so the Army and Navy, as their spokesmen have clearly indicated, would not be able to handle the front-line mail of millions of men, and some women, who are unluckily not stationed at permanent addresses. Governor Dewey does not help his argument by calling this a sham difficulty. He does not help his argument by trying to make us believe that somebody in Washington wishes to leave State and local offices off the ballot because that somebody assumes that the 30-odd Governors and all the State legislatures to be elected this year are not important enough to affect the interest of the soldier at home or abroad. State and local officers were omitted in the Green-Lucas proposals out of deference to States' rights and because a ballot for national offices alone seemed better than no ballot at all.

We do not believe that the Departments of War and the Navy are engaged in a conspiracy to crush the States or to elect or reelect any Presidential candidate. We believe they are fighting a war and are ready to do what they can to protect the rights of fighting men and the women of the auxiliary forces. They have explained what they can do, which is to distribute a uniform set of ballots, collect the marked ballots and turn them over to the States. Under such an arrangement the rights of the States would be amply protected, for no ballot would have to be counted unless it complied with State and local laws. We fail to see any nonpartisan, nonpolitical reason for the furious opposition with which this proposal has been received in Congress and elsewhere.

Such a plan will see to it that most of our service men and women will have a chance to vote in the national elections. If any supplementary plan can provide for State and local elections for 48 States, or even for 1 State, so much the better. But there will be precious little voting, and practically no voting among those who are taking the heaviest risks in this war, if the role of the Federal Government is merely that of a messenger boy running errands for such States as choose to use its services. How this affects the election is of secondary importance. Primarily it will be an injustice which no soldier can or should forget.

Who's a Fascist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the March 4, 1944, issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Who's a Fascist?":

WHO'S A FASCIST?

A few days ago we spoke a word of warning about party leaders indulging in the campaign luxury of calling opponents Fascists. Today we should like to add a plea for a more positive approach—not merely turning away from the psychosis that sees a Fascist under every plank of an opponent's platform but constructively focusing attention on proposals of one's own party for dealing by democratic methods with the issues of our day.

Those who use the term to describe either Democrats or Republicans will defend themselves on the ground that they are awaking the people to the trend of their opponents' acts or policies. Republicans will say that the Roosevelt administration, by centralizing power in a Federal bureaucracy, has taken long steps toward fascism.

A reasoned argument, giving the voters an accurate, full-bodied picture of the steps and the circumstances surrounding them, would be a useful election discussion. To be fair it should not fail to mention that the Republicans themselves now support much of the social legislation put through by the New Deal—a fact which does not make it less paternalistic or Fascist in direction.

Certain ones will say that business leaders have set up dictatorial economic empires which oppress the people. They will charge that some great industrialists are following the lead of conservative groups who helped Mussolini and Hitler to power and that they would resort to violence in America rather than lose their power and privileges. Here again the name "Fascist" is applied to a trend rather than to an established condition.

But in both cases exaggeration for campaign purposes goes so far beyond the fact and stirs up so much fear and hatred that use of the term "Fascist" does far more harm than good. Fascism as developed in Italy and adapted by the Nazis has definite characteristics, chief of which are the submergence of the individual to the state, the destruction of civil liberties, one-party government, suppression of opposition—particularly of labor unions and churches—by force, abolition of free elections and free trial, the persecution of racial groups and the use of concentration camps—as well as the regimentation of industry. It also uses epithets instead of reason in debate.

Fascism has its roots in certain cruel and selfish qualities of the human mind. It is fostered by some economic and social developments. That Americans need to be on guard against it is plain, but that guarding might more profitably keep its eye on democratic models and on the way democratic states such as Sweden and Britain have met the problems Germany and Italy tried to deal with by fascism.

Letter of Representative Plumley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am including a letter which the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY, wrote this year to his home town for town meeting day. The writing of this letter is a traditional custom with him. Copies of the letter are sent to the town clerks of all the towns of Vermont and are read at the meeting by either the moderator or the town clerk in a number of the towns aside from Northfield.

Vermont, as I happen to know, sticks very closely to the idea that the basis of all those things for which we stand is found in the people themselves, to which doctrine I subscribe 100 percent.

It is not too well known, but a fact, that Connecticut is very much interested in everything which affects in any way the rights of the people of Vermont, formerly called New Connecticut.

I recall that the original name of Vermont, taken by reason of the fact that so many people had migrated from my State to that area, was New Connecticut. Records substantiate that statement.

Because some people did not like the idea of the migrators adopting our name, and because some people liked much better the name which Champlain suggested, the name Vermont was adopted. The interest of the descendants now in Connecticut, of those who went out from there to that new area, now Vermont, and for some 20 years fought for independence to the extent that for 14 years they maintained a separate government as an independent republic, has not lessened by the years. They still speak our language.

We must be free or die who speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spake;
The faith and morals hold
Which Milton held.

As a proof of that fact I am inserting in the RECORD the letter of the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY, to his home town, which, as I have said, was read in the meetings of other towns scattered throughout the State.

That doctrine he espouses is one to which a great majority of the people of Connecticut subscribe.

I append the letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1944.

The MODERATOR,
Town of Northfield, Vt.

DEAR MR. MODERATOR: I am sorry not to be able to be present at town meeting. To me the New England town meeting is symbolic of all those things for which our Government stands. Were I not trying as your Representative to discharge my obligation to you as such, and as a citizen unable by reason of such preoccupation to be present, I would be neglecting a duty.

The basic assumption of those who founded our Government on the theory that the closer the Government may be to the people the more healthful and strong will be the body politic was and always should be the dominant principle of our American system of government.

Of the three governmental levels the founders had in mind, namely, Federal, State, and local, to the last-named was entrusted not only the responsibility for maintaining the other two but for conserving the lives, liberties, and happiness of the people themselves.

Way back in 1835, De Tocqueville in his Democracy in America said, with respect to New England townships:

"Although they are now subject to the State, they were at first scarcely dependent on it. It is important to remember that they have not been invested with privileges, but that they seem, on the contrary, to have surrendered a portion of their independence to the State. The townships are only subordinate to the State in those interests which I shall term 'social,' as they are common to all the citizens. They are independent in all that concerns themselves."

You will note that he emphasized the independence of the citizens and the essentially local nature of the American system.

In 1880 Bryce wrote his American Commonwealth. Although the first steps toward centralization of power in the Federal Government were noticed by him as a tendency, he said:

"An American may through a long life never be reminded of the Federal Government."

Today he cannot forget it during his waking hours, and its usurpation of his rights, powers, and liberties gives him sleepless nights and are a nightmare from dark to daylight.

The changing and changed relations between national, State, and local governments in the United States are among the unexplainable phenomena of all governmental growth in history. They contain the dynamite necessary for our destruction, to which the fuse is already attached. We must come to our senses locally and State-wide else we shall have no States or towns so far as the rights of citizens as individuals are concerned. We have very few left to us as it is. The essentials of American Government have been undermined and so far destroyed as to make the problems of their regeneration very weighty indeed.

In my judgment federalization and centralization spell the end of the form and type of government which we have known. In my opinion those of us who have allowed the towns and the States to degenerate while the Federal Government has become dominant are to be severely criticized for taking away from those who come after us their liberties, turning them over to the tyranny of despotism, loading them up with an unpayable and constantly increasing burden of debt that they must pay for our lack of wisdom.

Citizens should reassert themselves as the people; the people should make their local government strong; they should insist that State governments resist usurpation of their rights.

In short, starting with the town meeting, we should try to recapture what has been lost in order to reestablish ourselves upon the plan and the fundamentals promulgated by our wise forefathers who out of their experience handed to us the best plan of government ever conceived by man.

We should be ashamed to let the United States of America become a fascist state. The truth is it is almost too late to stop it now.

My very best regards to all.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress, Vermont.

Roosevelt Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, March 7, 1944, points out the slipshod, reckless, and irresponsible method employed by President Roosevelt in filling offices in the foreign field. The pernicious consequences of such a policy will be a distinct hindrance to the United States at the peace table. It is just as important to win the peace as it is to win a complete military victory, otherwise the sacrifice of lives and treasure will have been in vain.

The editorial referred to follows:

FOREIGN POLICY "BY EAR"

For reasons not made wholly clear, the presence of Mr. Harry Slattery as head of the Rural Electrification Administration became embarrassing to the powers that be in Washington. So Jonathan Daniels, a confidential assistant to President Roosevelt, was authorized to propose that Mr. Slattery resign his job and accept a commission which would take him to Europe. Mr. Daniels has told this to a Senate committee.

Mr. Daniels' reluctance to tell this story is understandable. Indeed, now that he has told it, one may be permitted to wonder whether he realizes its full implications. The following seems to us a fair summary of those implications:

"In a period of war, when political and diplomatic policy may play a part equally important with military policy, the White House can regard assignments abroad as a kind of wastebasket into which can be tossed Government functionaries no longer deemed useful at home."

We are not intimating here that had Mr. Slattery accepted the traveling assignment he would have failed to conduct himself with dignity and circumspection. That is not the point. The point is the casual way in which the President seems to regard appointments which, now of all times, should be made with the utmost care.

During this war a great number of people have been sent on one mission and another to many countries. It has not always been apparent to the naked eye why some were sent. The proposal to Mr. Slattery is partly revealing. Others seem to have gone just for the trip. The exact number that are in what may be termed the casual category is not important. What is important is that these have been a heavy handicap on those who have gone in the sincere belief that their experience could be used for service at this particular time.

It is quite true that many went as "experts" and not as diplomatic officers. It is common knowledge that their status has not prevented them from excursions into diplomacy; that, as representatives of this Government, they have implied promises that cannot be fulfilled; that very often they have openly clashed with and embarrassed the regular diplomatic representatives.

Just what must be the reaction of foreign governments when they see tossed into their midst a host of people whose conception of their duties is as nebulous as their knowledge and experience?

We earnestly suggest that there lies here one reason why at the very time American arms are winning their greatest success

American prestige abroad is falling and not rising; why some Latin-American nations are apparently far from enthusiastic about support of the United States position toward Argentina; why the Atlantic Charter has been overturned and why Marshal Stalin is regarded as the authoritative spokesman of the United Nations.

There are other reasons and concerning them we expect to comment at appropriate times. They include unfulfilled promises and attempts to fabricate a foreign policy out of blithe opportunism.

The Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is obviously deplorable that with the war reaching its climax and every ounce of our national strength needed to achieve victory, we should have to have a Presidential election this year. This means that for the 8 perilous months stretching ahead, politics and partisanship will increasingly saturate both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

It means, too, that the people generally will be diverted from the big thing to the lesser things; it means that bitterness and strife will affect our sense of values; it means that the full national weight will not be used as it should be used. Many things that should be done will not be done and quite as many which should not be done will be done. Yet the campaign and the election are inevitable.

The idea, evolved last year, that the whole business might be called off, is absurd. For one thing, the little matter of the Constitution stood in the way. Nor was there any sense in the suggestion that the two parties agree on a single candidate for President, thus eliminating a contest and making the election a mere form. The impossibility of reaching that kind of agreement was too clear for the suggestion to be taken seriously.

Thoughtful men, including some high up in the armed services, are disturbed over the prospect. It is, they think, unfortunate to have a campaign coincide with the most vital period of the war, but it is particularly unfortunate to have the Commander in Chief a candidate for reelection in that campaign. The reasons are clear.

Looking back 4 years, few persons will contend that the third-term campaign did not set this country back at least a year in preparedness for war. At that time every informed and clear-thinking man knew that soon or late we were sure to be involved. Certainly, Mr. Roosevelt knew that. Certainly, the Chiefs of Staff of our Army and Navy knew it. Yet we went through that campaign with the candidates insisting that we would not get into the war; that American boys would not be sent to fight on foreign soil. And we made none but superficial gestures toward preparedness.

And all the while our participation was inevitable. Pearl Harbor merely hastened an entrance that had been certain since the fall of France. It was the third-term campaign that kept the truth from the people and caused the waste of priceless months during which the country could have made important progress toward preparing itself for the conflict. It is impossible to compute accurately the cost in time and lives of this delay. Nor is it possible now to reckon the cost of the fourth-term campaign.

As a candidate for reelection, Mr. Roosevelt is certain to be handicapped, both as Commander in Chief and as President. He will assume a nonpolitical attitude and hold to the pose of not giving any thought to politics. But only an angel could do that. It is beyond the power of a human being and Mr. Roosevelt is very human, indeed. As a candidate for the Presidency, politics will inevitably be in the front of his mind—as it would be in that of any other man in his position.

This means that every decision he makes during the period of his candidacy will be made with its political effect in mind. That isn't discreditable; it is just the inescapable consequence of his situation. He is not now in position to deal realistically with a great many really vital questions. For example, there is the question of a national service act urged as essential by the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission. It is not possible to pass such an act except through the wholehearted support of the President.

But the President is not able to give that kind of support, because, for one thing, the leaders of organized labor are violently opposed, and without organized labor's support he cannot be elected. It is the same way with the extremely vital tax program. Mr. Roosevelt urges more taxes than Congress has levied, but the necessity of being elected makes it impossible for him to abate his opposition to the general sales tax. Yet, except by a general sales tax, there is no way to raise the additional revenue he demands.

Nor is there any other way to reach the huge surplus funds in the hands of the large lower-income group, which, concededly, constitute the great inflation menace. Two things combine to keep the President from retreating from his position against the sales tax. One is the opposition of the labor bosses; the other his own insistence that it is a tax upon the poor. If he were not a candidate he could sweep both these things aside and take a firm stand in the national interests.

There are many more in the same class. For one, there is the fight against the Little Steel formula, which, if successful, will knock the props from under his whole anti-inflation program. For another, there is the soldiers' vote bill, into the struggle over which his candidacy has injected so much political heat that the facts are badly blurred. So it goes all the way through. Politics will tinge the White House thinking and acting from now on more than before—and there is abundant evidence of the tinge in the past. It would not only be a deep personal humiliation to Mr. Roosevelt, not to be reelected a forth time but, doubtless, he sincerely believes it would be a great misfortune for the country and for the world. As to that, there are, of course, two views.

Resolution of American Jewish Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and resolution which I received from Judge Harry M. Fisher, of the circuit court of Cook County, Ill.:

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY,
Chicago, March 6, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: As chairman of a conference held in our city on March 1, which was attended by more than 2,000 earnest, anxious, serious men and women, I have the honor to forward to you, in conformity with the mandate of that conference, the enclosed copy of a resolution solemnly and unanimously adopted.

Cordially yours,

HARRY M. FISHER.

This conference has been convened by the 2,200 electors of more than 625 Jewish organizations of Chicago with a membership representing the vast majority of the Jews of our city. These electors have heretofore selected the Chicago delegates to the American Jewish Conference and look upon that conference as the most representative body of American Jewry having the right to speak on its behalf.

And it having been reported to us that Rouse Resolutions Nos. 418 and 419, now pending before the Congress of the United States, reflect the hopes and aspirations of the vast majority of the Jews of the world and are in harmony with the program of the American Jewish Conference: Be it

Resolved, That we here endorse those resolutions and respectfully petition the Members of the Congress to support them in their entirety; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator from Illinois, and each Member of the House of Representatives from Chicago.

Sound Finance, or Spending in the Post-War Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Sound Finance, or Spending in the Post-War Era, delivered by me to the American Retail Federation at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on Tuesday, February 29, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the American Retail Federation, it has been my privilege for many years to work with the representatives of those retail stores which have banded themselves together in the American Retail Federation. They have always interested themselves in tax problems, and, unlike some other businessmen whom I see occasionally, their approach has always been rather in the public interest than in the particular effect on their own tax bill. For 12 years I worked in the Ohio Legislature on Ohio tax problems. Mr. George Sheridan, representing the Ohio Council of Retail Merchants in Columbus, was always helpful in spite of the unfortunate fact that he was a Democrat, because

he had a complete knowledge of the problems and a desire to work them out in the soundest possible manner.

There has been tremendous excitement this last week about the current tax policy of the Government, and a great difference of opinion regarding the exact amount which the Government should raise. But, after all, this is only a temporary problem. When the war is over we will have a public debt close to $300,000,000,000, and whether or not we raise $5,000,000,000 more by taxes in the last year of the war will not change materially the problem we face after the war. The President, for this last year ending June 1, 1945, would raise 50 percent by taxes and 50 percent by bonds. Congress would raise 45 percent by taxes and 55 percent by bonds. There is no fundamental issue. Everyone agrees that the war cannot be financed entirely out of taxes, without vast dissatisfaction from those who are doing essential work at home, the crippling of industry for its post-war job, and the present stifling of essential production. I rather favor more taxes, but it is a question of degree.

Far more could be saved by an economical administration of the war. War is inevitably a wasteful process. It is impossible for Congress to quibble about the number of ships or the number of tanks we must throw against the Germans and the Japanese. I have been often critical of the administration, and particularly of its policy at home, but all of us must recognize the tremendous work of organization done by our Army and our Navy. Nothing like it has ever been seen. No army has ever been so well equipped. No such navy has ever existed on the face of the earth. The output of shipping and airplanes is far beyond the wildest dreams of 5 years ago. If we can shorten the war by a month, or save the lives of only a few American boys, we cannot hesitate at the spending of money or the provision of training and equipment. But there is certainly as much possibility of cutting down our borrowings by eliminating wasteful administration as by increasing taxes.

Because we devote our whole energy today to winning the war and are hopeless to prevent a huge debt, there is no reason why we should not face now the post-war problems which are created by this vast expenditure and the extraordinary developments of modern war. Inevitably many people are making plans, and many of those plans are wholly impossible and inconsistent with each other. The press and the people seem to be accepting some ideas about what we should do without adequate thought or analysis, ideas which would destroy our liberty and our national life. The very purpose of this whole war is to insure the retention of liberty here at home, and the opportunity to work out here at home the destiny of the American Republic. We should not permit ourselves to be so distracted by the war, so absorbed in creating freedom abroad, that we let the planners concoct for us post-war arrangements at home likely to destroy the very freedom for which we fight. We have had to tear our industrial structure to pieces in order to achieve victory over our enemies, and the manner in which it is put together after the war will determine for us how we and our children and grandchildren shall live for the next hundred years. Many doubt whether it is possible to fight an all-out modern war and preserve the institutions of freedom for which the war is supposed to be fought. Certainly it can only be done by the soundest kind of foresight and Government policy.

What are the underlying purposes of any post-war policy? The first universally discussed today is the securing of substantially full employment. That full employment must be secured through private enterprise, and not through Government spending.

Second, no matter how prosperous we may be, there will still be some percentage of the population unable to live at a decent standard. The war has emphasized the tremendous productive capacity of the United States. I believe our people are determined that extreme poverty and hardship shall not continue to exist. They are willing to contribute some reasonable share of the proceeds of their labor and their savings in order that assistance be given to the unfortunate who cannot work or cannot fully support themselves.

But, third and most important, we must restore and preserve in this country the liberty and opportunity for which our ancestors fought, on which our progress has been based. An economic prosperity is not the first necessity, although it has filled our thinking for many years past. We can only have a happy and progressive people if they enjoy the independence and the liberty which are essential to the making of character. There is no freedom if States and cities and schools are told what they must do by a paternal and bureaucratic government in Washington. There is no freedom if farmers are told what they must farm and businessmen are told how they must run their business. There is no freedom if workmen are told where they must work, and housewives are told what they must eat.

How do we bring about freedom, full employment, and social welfare? The first step is to terminate the war regulations as quickly as possible. Undoubtedly they must be continued beyond the actual date of the armistice, but the administration should be inspired by a determination to eliminate these controls as to each commodity just as rapidly as reasonably adequate supplies of that commodity are available. My experience with the present bureaus in Washington leads me to believe that most of these bureaus will hang on as long as possible to every control, and find one emergency after another to justify their continuation. We must have an administration that wants to let go.

Obviously the Government in terminating war contracts must take war inventory and machinery off the hands of the manufacturer and settle promptly in cash, in order to provide working capital for peace employment. The manufacturer must make his plans now and go promptly to work. Mr. Baruch has done an excellent job on this question of contract termination. Government-owned plants must be promptly disposed of to private owners, but without the promotion of monopoly. We should go further, and eliminate most of the pre-war regulation, questionnaires, inspections, which doubled your accounting forces and kept the average individual storekeeper doing everything but his own business.

In seeking full employment, we can only hope to succeed by stimulating the machinery of private enterprise. We cannot solve the problem by Government spending and relief even if we wished to. Public works may be important as marginal assistance in hard times, but we have to put 55,000,000 men to work, and only a small fraction can possibly be employed on public work. To give a man a real job on public works costs approximately $2,000 per man. That means that it would cost ten billion a year to give employment to 5,000,000 men, five million out of fifty-five million. The W. P. A. at its height only employed three million, at a cost per employee of less than half the figure mentioned. An increase of 10 percent in the activity and prosperity of private business will do more than the Government can ever hope to do by Government spending.

Government spending is an easy remedy to suggest, and easy and pleasant for a politically minded central government. Of course, it is harder to work out the sound economic remedies to speed up the machine of production and distribution. But we cannot rely on Government spending wihout fatal results. It is utterly destructive of political morality, for the politician can justify a vote for any expenditure and a vote against any taxes. It destroys all sense of values as between different types of Government projects, because spending in itself becomes a virtue. It expands indefinitely the activities and the control of the Federal Government. It destroys ultimately the character of the people, because they learn to lean on Uncle Sam in every crisis, instead of exercising their own ability and their own ingenuity.

Furthermore, after the war the Government will face a dangerous financial problem. We will come out of the war with a debt in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000. That means an annual interest charge of $6,000,000,000. The peacetime departments of the Government today are spending about $4,000,000,000, and all of them have been held down and are planning to increase their activities, so that $5,000,000,000 is a fair estimate. I have no means of estimating the exact cost of the Army and Navy, but I feel confident that the American people are not going to sink any of their ships, and equally confident that they are going to maintain a tremendous air force to assure their safety. Merely as a guess, an expense of $5,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy for many years to come does not seem unreasonable. Furthermore, the services for veterans, judging by the last war and the increased number of wounded, is likely to be at least $2,000,000,000, a year. That means a necessary Federal budget of 17 or 18 billion dollars, without any of the vast spending which is now being proposed.

Prior to the war we never raised more than $6,000,000,000 a year in taxes. Our present burdensome tax system raises approximately forty-two billion on an annual national income of about one hundred and fifty billion. Even if the national income is maintained at one hundred and twenty billion after the war, which seems unlikely, it is not certain that the present tax system would raise much more than called for by the budget I have suggested. Yet everyone is apparently agreed today that taxes must be substantially reduced, that corporations should not pay over 25 percent of net income, that the excess-profits tax should be repealed, that the individual income-tax rates should be lowered and exemptions increased. On any normal level of prosperity the kind of tax system people are thinking of would hardly raise more than ten billion a year.

There is no doubt in my mind that those expenses will be at least eighteen billion, and that the tax system which is necessary will prove burdensome and lie heavily upon all initiative. It is the price we pay for this war. In my opinion, our American system could not survive another all-out modern war, and is seriously threatened by this one. Yet I believe that with our productive capacity we can perhaps pay 25 percent of our national income in Federal, State, and local taxes, say, thirty billion out of one hundred and twenty billion, and maintain an adequate incentive and reward for individual thrift, investment, initiative, and work. But the problem must be faced frankly. The tax burden must be widely distributed. It must not fall exclusively on the thrifty, the risk-takers, and men and women of exceptional energy and ability.

But we face a still greater threat. There seems to be a general theory, passively accepted throughout the country, that after the war there is to be a great outpouring of Federal money. The National Resources Planning Board has listed Federal activity after activity, and proposed that all shall be financed by Federal taxation and borrowing. The Board was possessed by the dangerous fallacy that a people could spend itself into prosperity; that there is no limit to Federal spending; that debt can increase indefinitely, and should; that a national debt is no debt because we owe it to ourselves.

Imagine what the Federal Budget would look like if we went ahead with all the tremendous projects that are proposed today on top of the essential expenditures I have outlined. Take the problem of social security alone. The ideal of the planners is represented in the Beveridge plan proposed for England. Estimating our population at three times that of Great Britain, and the standard of assistance at approximately twice the British standard, the total annual cost of that plan in this country would be $21,000,000,000. Today we are collecting approximately $2,400,000,000 in unemployment and old-age taxes, and the Federal Government spends about four hundred million more for various services in aid to the States. The States spend perhaps seven hundred million more, or a total of three and one-half billion. Of course, part of the expenditures will be financed by the employers and employees, but half of the increase would have to come out of the Federal Treasury. Even the employers' and employees' contributions, since they are compulsory, are largely in the nature of taxes, and have much the same effect in burdening the processes of production. In any event, the increase would be somewhere in the neighborhood of $17,000,000,000.

The idea has been spread abroad that every city, State, county, and school district should make an extensive plan for every kind of public work they can think of in order that they may be ready to receive Federal money. Where did the idea come from? Except for a very brief period, no local community ever did receive money for local buildings or local public works. The P. W. A. was abandoned before I came to the Senate in 1939. I see no sentiment in Congress for returning to a policy of Federal grants for local works. Yet plans are being made, and I have no doubt legislation is being prepared.

A report has been made to the Post-War Planning Committee by experts on the highway problem. They propose an expenditure of $3,000,000,000 for highways every year, of which $1,000,000,000 is to be put up by the Federal Government. This is four times the largest sum ever provided in any year by the Federal Government, outside of W. P. A. work-relief expenditures, and, after all, we made fairly good headway in road building during the twenties and the thirties. Why should the Federal Government do more than assist in the construction of through roads of general interest to the entire country? Road building is undoubtedly one of the best methods of putting people to work quickly, but most of it should certainly be financed by the local governments through the gasoline taxes and license fees which they collect. The people of these communities want roads and are not stingy in providing the money for them.

Of course, there should be a reasonable Federal public-works program in those fields in which the Federal Government has assumed responsibility, and plans for it should be made now. There always has been such a program, and, as the country grows, that program should grow. But it ought only include public works that are really worth the money spent on them. I see no reason to believe that a vast public-works program is necessary to stimulate any revival of peacetime activity just after the war. There is a large accumulated deficit of civilian goods. Demobilization will be effected gradually. Delay will be caused more by a shortage of necessary materials and equipment than by lack of demand, and that will delay public works as well as private. A major public work could hardly get started before private manufacture is operating full tilt. Undoubtedly there is a lot of repair and replacement to be done both by Federal and local governments for which plans and specifications should be made now.

An idea is abroad that every city should tear itself down and rebuild itself on modern lines, and the Federal Government is expected to finance a large number of real-estate projects, the financial soundness of which may well be doubted. Undoubtedly, every city should make its plans. Every city should eliminate its blighted areas and its slum areas. More active intervention by State and local governments is required in the real-estate field, but the extent to which the Federal Government can afford to finance these purely local projects is certainly open to question.

The public-works programs which are proposed are of unlimited scope, but apparently if we include urban redevelopment, they come close to $5,000,000,000 a year.

After all, what is the theory of transferring all these expenses to the Federal Government? It is said that the taxing powers of the State and local governments are necessarily limited, whereas the Federal Government is unlimited. Neither of these propositions is sound. Local financing is limited, not by necessity, but by practical considerations, the competition of neighboring States, the opposition of the people, and the undue burdening of their economic activity. But the Federal Government is limited by exactly the same considerations. It is said that no one can devise a State tax system to do the things which ought to be done, but neither has anyone devised a Federal tax system to produce the money to do these things. In fact, during the past 10 years we have thought it impossible to levy the taxes necessary to pay the existing expenditures of the Federal Government. Certainly those who urge a tremendous increase in the Federal Budget over that which will be forced upon us by circumstances, should describe the tax system which will produce the necessary money.

The National Resources Planning Board advocates a wide extension of Federal aid to education, including primary and secondary schools. A bill to provide $300,000,000 a year was defeated by a close vote in the present Congress, but the Board's report advocates the increase of this subsidy to something like $3,000,000,000 a year, or more than half the cost of an increased educational program. Apart from the danger of subjecting our education to control by a Washington bureau, we may well ask where all this money is coming from to supplement a State and local system which is already the best and most expensive in the world.

Finally, there is a school of thought which considers that the increase of our export market is the only possible road to prosperity. These enthusiasts recognize that most of the countries which offer markets for our goods will have nothing with which to pay for them. They recognize that the impoverished peoples of Europe are going to undersell us on many manufactured products because of the low standard of living in Europe resulting from the war. Therefore they are making plans to finance these exports by government loans. American exports last year were over $12,000,000,000, and imports only 3½ billion dollars. The idea of the planners seems to be that we will go on financing some such excess of exports in order to create prosperity for ourselves. It seems obvious to me that if we can only export by lending the buyers the money with which to pay for the exports, we are in effect giving away the goods that we produce. Loans on any such scale are utterly unsound. When that becomes evident, as it did in the twenties, all loaning will stop, and the artificial manufacture which we have built upon it will come tumbling about our heads.

I believe that we should lend, or give, a moderate amount of dollars to help the devastated countries get the machinery they need to go to work. I would even continue some aid to help backward countries help themselves in the future. But we can't support an export trade by loans, or by any of the international financial panaceas like the Keynes plan or the White plan or the Morgenthau international bank. In their present form the primary purpose of these plans seems to be to get American dollars into foreign hands without going to Congress for direct loans which might not be granted. We may regard the U. N. R. R. A. appropriation of one billion three hundred and fifty million as part of the war cost, but Mr. Morgenthau also proposes an international bank to which we are to contribute about three and one-half billion dollars, and this is to be for reconstruction and permanent development. Since the controlling body will have more than a majority of representatives of countries that wish to borrow money, it does not seem likely that our three and one-half billion dollars will last much more than 6 months.

Foreign trade difficulties, like economic problems at home, can only be solved by hard work and sound principles. The only kind of foreign trade that is worth while is one based on a fair exchange of our exports for goods we really need and can't produce economically. The idea that export markets can be created by the panacea of government spending or government lending, or magic support of exchange, is a mirage that can only lead to disaster.

A table of the proposed expenditures that I have discussed will read as follows:

Interest on public debt	$6,000,000,000
Regular Federal departments	5,000,000,000
Army, Navy, and Air Force	5,000,000,000
Veterans' care	2,000,000,000
Public works	5,000,000,000
Aid to education	3,000,000,000
Additional social security	17,000,000,000
Foreign trade loans	5,000,000,000
	48,000,000,000
State and local	10,000,000,000
	53,000,000,000

Thus the Federal Budget of the planners plus State and local taxes run to nearly sixty billion, or half the highest estimate of national income that any responsible person will predict.

If any such expenditures are undertaken there can be no doubt in my mind about the destruction of freedom in America. If a tax system could be devised to raise any such money, business and individuals would be so weighted down by taxes that there would no longer be any incentive to work, certainly no incentive to initiate job-giving enterprises or do anything except the minimum amount necessary for subsistence. Men aren't going to work half or a third of their time for the Government. Industry would become so unprofitable that no new money would be available. Then the Government would be called in to operate or to finance. Permanent Government financing could only lead to permanent Government operation. The more businesses are taken over by the Government the heavier the burden on the independent business that remains, until gradually industry would be nationalized, and we would find ourselves a socialistic state.

Of course the planners who favor the program I have suggested do not intend to levy taxes. They intend to keep on adding large sums to the public debt. They point to the war deficit spending as the cause of tremendous prosperity in the United States, although the standard of living has in fact been reduced. When asked why Government deficits in the thirties did not produce prosperity, their answer is that $3,000,000,000 a year was not enough; we should have had deficits of fifteen billion a year.

It is undoubtedly true that war spending has created full employment and we can still pay the interest on the debt. But we have seen a substantial increase in wages and in cost of living in spite of strenuous efforts to

control these levels by law and by subsidy. Once peace comes, I believe that any such control would be utterly impossible, and if Government deficits continue to create purchasing power out of thin air, there will be no holding of the price level. A few years of $15,000,000,000 deficits in peacetime and we would face an inflation of prices such as we saw in Germany after the last war. If that happens, we get to the same loss of freedom by another route. The entire financial and industrial structure breaks down. It has to be reconstituted, and that means the Government will put it together. No one can construct a new system of private enterprise out of whole cloth. Once our system has been destroyed, it cannot be put together by all the king's horses and all the king's men, any more than could Humpty-Dumpty. The system may have failed through the attacks of its enemies, but the people will insist on trying some other plan and that plan can only be one in which every detail is directed by the Government. By this path also we reach a socialized state, and one which starts from bankruptcy.

What can we do to avoid this kind of result? The first thing, as I see it, is to get down to earth. We are dreaming of a vast new world of radar, refrigerators, helicopters, and television. Because everyone works in wartime, when 11,000,000 are in the armed forces, we have been sold the idea that past problems of unemployment can be easily solved. As a matter of fact, America after the war will be fundamentally the same as America before the war. Its problems and its difficulties are the same problems and the same difficulties, and we cannot begin to solve them until we exercise from our thinking the idea that the Nation can spend itself into prosperity now any more than it could during the thirties.

Then we have to settle down to real business. We have to eliminate all unnecessary expense and postpone Utopia. We have to work out a Federal tax system to raise $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 a year, at the same time that it avoids the choking of all incentive and all industry and encourages men to put their money into new enterprises that will give other men jobs. We cannot hope to succeed unless every incentive is given to men to exercise their ingenuity and their ability and their strength in increasing production and making work for other men; unless the normal business casualties are much more than replaced by new projects. Consequently in our tax laws we must remove the present discrimination against common stockholders, the people who really take the risk in any business, and must remove the present duplication of tax. I believe myself that we should eliminate the capital gains tax, at least in the field of new industry and the enlargement of old industry. There must be a freer capital market, and ability to finance at reasonable cost. That means that the S. E. C. should confine itself to its original purpose of preventing fraud and misrepresentation, rather than trying to direct the flow of capital. I even believe that the Government should undertake to insure against some part of the risk involved in investment in small business, and I am introducing a bill to carry out the plan I suggested in January to the Boston City Club.

If business is to grow, we must try in every possible way to reduce regulation. The only regulation that seems necessary is that relating to labor and the rules that are advisable to keep competition fair and open. In short, we must change our whole attitude of suspicion toward the businessman and his profits. So long as competition is fair, every reasonable reward should be given to those who strike out for themselves and use their natural abilities to increase production and thereby give more work to more people.

I am convinced that at reasonable cost we can prevent extreme hardship and poverty and improve the present social-security measures. The old-age-pension system and the unemployment-compensation system can be extended to classes that do not now enjoy them. Minimum housing standards can be established, I believe, for all those whom the private building industry cannot serve. The gaps in hospital and health service can be filled without any such huge expense and socialization of medicine as is contemplated in the Wagner-Murray bill. We should provide now a system of work relief and direct relief under the control of the States, to which the Federal Government can contribute small sums in good times and large sums in times of depression.

But we must recognize that the cost of supporting men who do not work or do not fully support themselves must be paid out of the earnings of those who are working at or about the same time. The cost of that support must not be so great as to prevent the increase of industry and employment and discourage those who are asked to pay the cost.

Furthermore, this whole field of social-welfare legislation should be primarily under State and local government control, with Federal financial assistance. These problems are primarily local problems. They can be solved best by intelligent local administration. Some States may fail to do a good job, but in the long run that would be the fault of the people who suffer. The Federal Government doesn't do a perfect job either, and its mistakes are on a much greater scale. Only a State system can avoid the political and bureaucratic dangers that creep into every effort to run our affairs from Washington.

Finally, all of this program should be definitely worked out by Federal statute, not by bureaucratic regulations. Congress is to blame for yielding to constant Executive pressure to give arbitrary discretion to the President or his appointees. It is easier to pass a statute expressing general principles than conferring general powers, but the delegation of legislative power has almost destroyed the independence of Congress. It has made this a totalitarian government in many fields where Congress has enacted a general law. The independence of Congress and the courts was not created in the Constitution by chance. It was provided for the very purpose of preserving democratic government.

I said at the start that the whole purpose of domestic policy, as of foreign policy, is to preserve the freedom of the people of the United States. I am convinced that that freedom depends not only on maintaining local self-government, and the independence of Congress and the courts, but on sound finance, on limited Government expenditure, and a wise tax system to pay for those expenditures in full. Otherwise, we face an economic break-down which will finally end the liberty of the individual.

The whole prosperity of the country, with full employment through private enterprise, depends more than ever before on sound practice in administration of government. It will be destroyed by the panacea of Government spending. The social-welfare program itself depends on a high percentage of employment, and on the taxes which can be produced by such prosperity. There is no simple road to Utopia. We have a new and tougher fiscal problem as a result of all-out war, and it can only be met by the same sound principles of taxation and economy which have animated every President of the United States in our history—except Mr. Roosevelt. This Nation must face the hard facts of life just as every businessman has to face those facts. The only alternative is the bankruptcy court.

Starving Children of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the problem of the starving children of Europe, which appeared in the current issue of Washington News Digest, entitled "Suffer Little Children" which I heartily approve.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN"

The United States Senate is deserving of high praise for their passing, by unanimous vote, a resolution calling on Secretary of State Hull to cooperate with Great Britain, Sweden, and Switzerland in setting up a relief system to feed starving populations in the enemy-occupied countries of Europe. While the resolution has no force of law, we believe it will have the sympathetic support of Mr. Hull.

Some 2,000 years ago there was born in the little town of Bethlehem a humble man whose great sacrifice for all mankind will soon be commemorated throughout the entire world by Christians who still possess the priceless privilege of paying homage to Jesus of Nazareth.

In a world torn by man-made strife and slaughter, might we suggest to you who read these few lines that you close your eyes, for a moment, at least, and see in your mind the picture of the humble Man of Galilee who so loved little children that He said "Suffer the little children to come unto Me * * * for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

We appeal to Mr. Hull to help commemorate the approaching Easter Sunday and tell us that a start has been taken, as the Senate resolution requested, to the end that the pitifully weak and starving children of Europe—those little innocent victims of man's cruelty to man—will be helped and fed insofar as humanly possible. What will it get America? The answer springs clear. It would be the best investment in good will that America has ever made. It will repay a thousandfold dividends in undying gratitude from millions of future men and women who will remember throughout all their lives that back in their childhood, when they were helpless, hungry, and seemingly forgotten, the people of a great nation—the citizens of free America—offered to share their food with these little ones.

Governor Dewey's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Governor Dewey's Position," published in the New York Times of Tuesday, March 7, 1944. I feel that the editorial will commend itself to Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S POSITION

On August 24, 1942, when he accepted the Republican nomination for Governor, Thomas E. Dewey said: "Let me say right now that I shall devote the next 4 years exclusively to the service of the people of New York State." On the following February 25, shortly after his inauguration as Governor, his secretary said in a statement authorized by him: "He is not and will not become a candidate for any other nomination during his term."

These two commitments—the one to "devote the next 4 years exclusively to the service of the people of New York State," the other "not to become a candidate for any other nomination"—have shaped the course which Mr. Dewey has followed with regard to national politics since his election. An excellent Governor, he has continued to emphasize that he is not a candidate for the Presidency. He has entered no Presidential primaries. On the contrary, he has voiced his "strongest disapproval" of the action of delegates (in Wisconsin) who entered the primaries in his name.

This is the official position, but meantime Mr. Dewey's name continues week after week to lead the list of Republican candidates in the unofficial polls. His great popularity is impressive. He is far out in front in the Gallup survey. He is the favorite in most local polls. And while he is still not a candidate for the Presidency, the statement is continually made without contradiction that if he is offered his party's nomination he will have no alternative but to accept it.

The situation thus created is unusual and, so far as the processes of public discussion and democratic decision are concerned, unfortunate. Mr. Dewey is at this moment unquestionably the leading Republican candidate for the Presidency. But because Mr. Dewey is, by his own choice, merely a receptive and not an active candidate for the Presidency, he cannot take the platform to debate national and international issues. Barely 3 months before his party meets to choose a leader whose immense responsibility it may be to finish the greatest war in history, to make the peace and to start the whole world on its way to recovery, Mr. Dewey is silent on the sidelines. He cannot discuss the burning issues with which the whole country is concerned. He cannot discuss measures to win the war, like the proposed National Service Act. He cannot discuss problems of Federal taxation. He cannot discuss Nation-wide strikes or the way to put an end to them. He cannot talk about the shape of the forthcoming peace or the extent of the commitments we should make to it. For all these matters are national issues; and, by reason of his own self-imposed commitments, Mr. Dewey is not a candidate for national office.

The unfortunate consequences of this situation are not measured only by the fact that the great public debate of an election year now goes forward strangely without the participation of the most likely nominee of the Republican Party. Equally unfortunate is the effect upon the elective process itself. Mr. Dewey's voluntary withdrawal from the debate permits politicians in different economic groups and in different sections of the country to interpret his silence on controversial issues as they wish to interpret it for the sake of the most practical political results. Thus, in parts of the country where old-time isolationist sentiment is still relatively strong it becomes possible for local Republican leaders to recall Mr. Dewey's speeches of early 1940, without the benefit of the correction that would be supplied by a strong and continuous affirmation of his position now. In other parts of the country, and on other issues, it is possible to reverse this practice. In short, as matters stand, Mr. Dewey tends to become a man of all colors to all people. To the extent that this happens, the pre-convention campaign loses meaning.

We believe that this situation should be ended promptly by Mr. Dewey's own choice. Either Mr. Dewey ought now to reaffirm the statement made when he accepted his nomination for Governor, to the effect that he will "devote the next 4 years exclusively to the service of the people of New York State"; or he ought now to announce that, while this pledge was given in complete good faith, it is necessary for him to depart from it. In this case he should address himself boldly and frankly and vigorously to the great issues of the day, so that the Nation, and more particularly the delegates to be chosen for the Republican convention will know clearly where he stands.

Soldiers' Vote—Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an article in the Los Angeles Daily News of February 5, 1944, by Manchester Boddy, discusses a number of timely questions worthy of serious consideration. One of them deals with free enterprise as some corporations have chosen to interpret it in their business dealings with our Government and the public at large. In view of the nature and merit of the article, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANCHESTER BODDY

Here is the weekly report from my anonymous political reporter:

"The soldier-vote controversy has developed into a major political issue, with the Republican Party, despite the protests of some of its sincere and prudent members, on the wrong side. Despite the obvious fact that the group of dissident southern Democrats, allied with administration-baiting Republicans in Congress, share the odium for attempting to disfranchise millions of men on the battle fronts, the baby squalls on the G. O. P. doorstep.

"Indignation among the armed forces, reported by many correspondents as wide and demonstrative, will undoubtedly influence their vote, no matter what shape the measure may ultimately take. The irony of the situation is that notwithstanding the palpable fact that it was southern Democrats who defined the issue as involving the supremacy of the white race, stubborn Republicans, seeking to humiliate the president, have maneuvered their party into an indefensible hole.

"The President, not slow to sense the political advantage of his position, continues to press his point that the whole procedure is a fraud and a detriment to the morale of the forces. His demand that Congress stand up and be counted was an effective coup. Considering that the men, now fighting and dying to end the Nazi claim of race supremacy, are intended victims of like injustice at home, the controversy is sure to have serious repercussions in a campaign thus far lacking many clear lines of demarcation.

"Because the Republicans have been professing, for more than a generation, that their party had its birth in the doctrine that States' rights must not conflict with the authority of the Federal Government, it makes the G. O. P. position additionally absurd and untenable.

"Strangely enough, California Republicans have just added fresh fuel to the fire. Before adjourning, on a strictly party vote the Republican majority in the State senate killed a resolution favoring Federal action designed 'to give every fighting man the rights and opportunity for free franchise.' The spokesman for the party at Sacramento voiced the Republican stand as in 'opposition to the Federal Government's encroachment on States' rights.' That was a neat gratuity to California Democrats now hungry for an issue to close ranks and bring harmony to a party which seems to revel in dissension.

"Rumors buzzing around hotel lobbies in the capital concern the President's reference to the boys conspiring to revive the practices of the old 'laissez faire' era in marketing securities of the blue-sky variety. According to some of the gossips there will be a sudden cracking down on a number of these renascent cartels and on individuals and groups making hay while the sun of hurried war production shines.

"While there is evidence aplenty that the great majority of industrialists and investment financiers who enjoyed immunity under the law in the pre-New Deal days have accepted the restrictive legislation which brought safe banking and an end to stock market rigging, there is no doubt that many of the gentlemen now clamoring for 'free enterprise' are thinking about free racketeering. Some have already been nipped by the Department of Justice for chiseling on war contracts. Rumor promises more revelations in that field.

"A notorious example during the week was not without political sidelights: The Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., controlled by the mammoth Anaconda Copper Corporation, was on the receiving end of a staggering blow in an eastern court.

"Found guilty of delivering to Russia and the United States Army Signal Corps equipment dangerously below specifications, the company and some of its minor officials were punished by heavy fines and jail sentences. The court put its finger on the source of the fraud when it declared that those who went to jail were motivated by 'blind loyalty to a corporation that didn't seem to appreciate the loyalty it owed the United States.' Said the judge in conclusion: 'Anaconda Wire & Cable was the real culprit.'

"The Anaconda Copper Corporation, which owns and operates the great copper mines of Butte, Mont., has for years endeavored to keep a tight rein on Montana politics. Owning or controlling, also, most of the State's vast industries—lumber, coal, silver, zinc, public utilities, hydroelectric plants, etc.—it has also added to its assets nearly all the daily newspapers in the Treasure State.

"While the company has rarely succeeded in electing its candidate to the United States Senate or House, it punishes those who offend it politically by forgetting to mention their achievements in the public interests in Washington. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,

consistent supporter of the Roosevelt policies, was the particular victim to such an extent that he was obliged to use the radio and publicly denounce the copper barons for abusing the functions of the press.

"The company's purchased press has laid down a ceaseless barrage on the Roosevelt administration from the beginning. Even those professing to be Democratic in political faith clamor for 'free enterprise' and denounce the 'dangerous bureaucracy' in Washington.

"The corporation's spokesmen, arrogantly proclaiming in behalf of their baronial estates almost literally a privately owned commonwealth, now find themselves embarrassed, not by the bureaucrats in Washington but by the stern action of the courts and the provisions of the law forbidding chiseling and imperiling the lives of Uncle Sam's fighting forces and their allies in wartime.

"FEBRUARY 5, 1944."

Post-War Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a statement made by Mr. J. S. Williamson, State Highway Commission of South Carolina, before the House Committee on Roads.

Mr. Williamson is also a member of the executive committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and formerly was president of this organization. I hope every Member of the House will find time to read the statement presented before the Roads Committee by Mr. Williamson.

We are extremely proud of our highway department in South Carolina and the record it has made since its creation. We South Carolinians believe that we have the best highway system in the United States, and the majority of the credit of these roads is due the highway officials.

The highway officials of South Carolina are heartily supporting H. R. 2426, a bill before the Roads Committee for consideration at the present time.

Section 5 of this bill provides: "The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available by this act shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost thereof."

This provision of the bill is somewhat a departure from previous legislation for regular Federal Aid to States in the construction of highways, in that the ratio of Federal funds to State funds has been increased from a maximum of 50 percent of the total construction cost of Federal aid projects to 75 percent, and I want to present briefly a few pertinent facts in support of this provision of the bill.

Apart from the single purpose of road building, the bill has as one of its primary objectives, as a part of a national welfare program, the creation of useful and meritorious public works to provide employment during the transition period between the cessation of hostilities and completion of the process of reconversion from a war economy to a peace economy. It has always been an accepted fact that road building is one of the quickest, soundest, and most efficient means of providing employment during any period when there is idle manpower. And this general welfare factor should be given weight in proportion to its importance in considering an increase in the pro rata share of Federal aid to the cost of the projects proposed under the provisions of this bill. The advance development of a large, well-planned highway construction program of useful and meritorious projects will achieve the purpose of providing employment and at the same time avoid the necessity of huge appropriations of Federal funds for man-made work as a temporary relief measure.

The responsibility of providing gainful employment for the returning soldiers, as well as those engaged in war work in civilian capacities, is a responsibility of the whole Nation—the Federal Government and the several State governments. I cannot conceive of a situation following the war in which the soldiers, sailors, and marines, who have fought so valiantly to bring about the return of peace, and the civilian war workers, would not be afforded the opportunity of gainful employment. These men will not want a dole. They will want only an opportunity for gainful employment. This does not mean that they will all come home asking for mere jobs—to be put on some employer's pay roll. There will be hundreds of thousands of these men who will be capable of, and who will want to, establish themselves in their own businesses in a national economy with opportunities of individual and free enterprise. In a large number of cases men who have been taken into the armed forces or gone into civilian war work have closed down a business which they had already established before the war. In other instances men who had just completed training for special businesses or professions have had to postpone the day of setting up their business to help fight this terrible war.

The offer of a job is not sufficient for these men. They want an economy affording them opportunities of gainful employment.

This post-war highway bill provides for the creation of opportunity for gainful employment—in jobs, in the supplying of materials and equipment, in construction contracting, in engineering, in transportation, and in many other fields of endeavor. To be effective, however, the program must be sufficient in proportion to afford gainful employment to millions of men; and herein lies the necessity for the Federal Government increasing its portion of Federal funds for the construction cost of the proposed projects from 50 percent of the total cost to 75 percent. It is imperative to launch a Nation-wide highway-construction program after the war of not less than a billion and a half to two billion dollars annually to be of consequential value, and the States are simply not circumstanced to finance a program of anywhere near that proportion on a 50–50 basis. State highway departments' financial positions have been impaired during this war to perhaps a greater extent than any other Government agency. In practically all States the highway departments are set up as self-financed agencies with the gasoline tax and motor-vehicle license fees making up the bulk of their revenues. In many States, however, this revenue was not sufficient to build the needed highways under the slow pay-as-you-go plan. Consequently, State highway departments sold bonds for speeding up road and bridge construction programs, pledging the anticipated revenues for 15, 20, and 25 years for payment of principal and interest on the bonds. The State highway departments have a bonded indebtedness of over one and one-half billion dollars for State road construction, with an annual debt service of about $176,000,000 for payment of principal and interest. These bonds were all issued for new highway construction in an effort to keep the roads up to reasonably modern requirements not possible in many States under the slow pay-as-you-go plan.

The existing State highway systems at the beginning of the war, while far from being in the up-to-date state we would like for them to have been, were sufficiently modern to permit their full use for war-transportation purposes. I shudder to think what our internal transportation situation would have been had it not been for the thousands of miles of roads built from State bond sales. Highway transportation in this war has been one of the signal achievements of our preparedness program. Yet the States have facing them now a condition wherein the States' investments in the roads are not only being impaired by heavy and extensive damages to the roads caused by heavy wartime traffic of Army vehicles and private trucks engaged in hauling war materials but the anticipated revenue from the gasoline tax and license fees hypothecated for payment of the roads has been dangerously reduced because of the war. The revenue from the gasoline tax is already down about 35 percent, and there is no relief in sight. Furthermore, the vehicles causing the greatest damages to the highways are Army vehicles which do not pay any State gasoline taxes or license fees. In fact, traffic on many of the roads is even greater in volume than before the war, but most of the vehicles are Government-owned and are not paying any taxes into the State treasuries. The situation is alarming. The States cannot possibly go along in this program on a 50–50 basis.

On the other hand, it is equally important for the States to bear as heavy a part of the cost of the program as the traffic will bear. It is important from the viewpoint of joint responsibility, as well as for efficiency and economy.

The principle of joint participation of Federal and State governments in the construction cost of highway projects is a principle that has worked successfully for over a quarter of a century since the first Federal Aid Rural Post Roads Act was enacted in 1916.

Under the Federal Aid Rural Post Roads Act of 1916, the States, in cooperation with the Federal Government—under the direction of the Public Roads Administration—have maintained progressive, sound, and uniform standards of construction, design, and methods that would not have been possible otherwise. In so doing the public has benefited in lower construction and maintenance cost, better highways—uniform to a marked degree—throughout the Nation. The only visual evidence of State lines to a motorist is a single State line sign. Roadway widths, load capacities, alinements, and grades, road signs, and markings are generally the same on both sides of the State line. There is little visual evidence of different standards in traveling from Maine to Florida or from New York to California. On construction, construction organizations and suppliers of materials may deal with the State highway department of any State under uniform specifications—except for such variations as may be required by local conditions.

We are all so accustomed to accepting these uniform standards as a matter of course that, perhaps, at times we lose sight of the fact that only through joint participation of State and Federal Governments have these standards been achieved and maintained throughout the years. In fact, this principle of joint responsibility and joint participation in highway construction has

proved so sound and successful that it would not be advisable to depart from it for so critical a program as confronts us during the post-war period.

It has always been recognized that the ownership of the highways should be vested in the State or local authorities. This is necessary for proper control of traffic and for law enforcement, for maintenance operations, and for many other reasons. Without State participation in the construction cost of the highways, and consequent State ownership, it might be argued that since the Federal Government had paid for the entire cost, the Federal Government should own and operate the roads. Such ownership would carry with it responsibility for a maze of local problems which I am sure the Federal Government would not accept, nor which the people would be willing to have placed in the control of the Federal Government.

State ownership of the highways insures protection of the capital investment by the local authorities. Without this local ownership there would be a tendency for the local authorities to neglect to fully protect the investment.

As previously stated, I firmly believe this matter of a post-war highway-construction program should be financed jointly by the Federal Government and the States, with the States participating to the extent that they are financially able to do so, which for a program of this proportion, we estimate at about 25 percent of the construction cost.

In making a survey of all the State highway departments on this subject of joint State-Federal participation I obtained the following answers to a questionnaire:

1. The States unanimously favor joint State-Federal participation in the cost of the work, and the responsibilities of carrying out the program.

2. Only 6 States indicated that they would have difficulty in supplying funds for an amount of 25 percent or less, and in some of these States the situation can be remedied by State legislation, while only 11 States indicated a preference for more than 25 percent participation by the States.

3. Only three States indicated that they could carry out the program on a 50-percent basis.

In 1941 there was approximately $214,000,000 of special State imposts on highway users diverted to nonhighway purposes, and it is feared that if the 25 percent required of the States under this bill is reduced any, it would encourage increased diversion on the part of some States.

The total combined income of all of the States from the gasoline tax, motor-vehicle license fees, and other special imposts on highway users amounted to just a little less than one and one-half billion dollars in 1941, whereas the States' disbursements for collection of revenue, debt service, transfers to local government units, and funds diverted to nonhighway purposes amounted to about $1,000,000,000, leaving only about one-half billion dollars out of current revenue for construction, maintenance, and State highway department administration expenses.

A break-down of these receipts and disbursements for 1941 is as follows:

Receipts from current State revenues:	
Motor-fuel taxes	$948,038,000
Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc	482,834,000
Motor-carrier taxes	21,139,000
Road, bridge, and ferry tolls	16,954,000
Other State imposts	6,547,000
Total receipts	1,475,512,000
Disbursements:	
Administration and collection of revenue	49,579,000
State police	29,413,000
Debt service:	
Principal	282,666,000
Interest	65,725,000
Expenditures and transfers to county and local roads and streets:	
County or local	297,358,000
Local city streets	54,482,000
Debt service	7,160,000
Expenditures and transfers for nonhighway purposes	214,358,000
Balance applied to construction, maintenance, and highway department administration	474,771,000
Total disbursements	1,475,512,000

I do not have any figures on estimates of the States for maintenance requirements for first few years after the war, but it is certain that such maintenance requirements will be far above normal. The normal requirements for maintenance of State highways amounts to about $215,000,000 annually, but since Pearl Harbor, maintenance operations have been drastically reduced, resulting in the accumulation of damages that become progressively worse the longer the work of restoring the damages is postponed. Our experience in South Carolina has been that we have reduced our maintenance expenditures by 50 percent since 1941, and unless we should be able to get some of our bituminous roads retreated this year, which we do not expect to do, we can expect to have an annual maintenance bill for several years to come about double our normal requirements. And it should be borne in mind that Federal aid is not available under this bill, nor under any previous legislation, for participating in this maintenance cost. The States must supply the money for this item, nearly a quarter of a billion dollars annually.

Since the war the highways have been subjected to unusually damaging traffic in the movement of heavy Army vehicles and heavy commercial vehicles. State load and size restrictions have been lifted to permit the hauling of heavy and large size loads for war purposes. As an illustration, in South Carolina, during the year 1943, 385 special permits were issued for overweight and oversize loads, as compared with 95 in 1940—an increase of about 400 percent. In addition to these special permits, it is generally known that with the restrictions on tires, gasoline, and trucking equipment, all trucks are now loaded more heavily than they were before the war. The Office of Defense Transportation has rules and regulations prescribing minimum loads permitted to be carried, some of which even exceed State legal limits.

Figures in South Carolina from our weighing stations show that there has been an increase of about 45 percent in the average weight of the heavy type tractor-semitrailer vehicle since 1937.

All highways are designed with a factor of safety for loading capacity. Our highways will all carry these heavy loads but a preponderance of heavy traffic gradually does material damage to the roads. This is exactly what has happened all over the country, and particularly in certain areas where there is a concentration of military training activity the roads have suffered heavily. Mile after mile of highway has been damaged beyond the point where repairs come in the category of maintenance repairs. Extraordinary maintenance and, in a large number of cases, complete reconstruction is necessary.

All of this extraordinary damage to the roads will draw heavily upon State funds for repairs. The extent in dollars and cents is unknown, and as a matter of fact, cannot be determined at this time. Some of the damage shows up immediately but in most cases it is 1, 2, or 3 years before the full extent of the damage is known.

Of the estimated one-half billion dollars annually of State income available for construction and maintenance a very minimum of one-half, or about one-fourth billion dollars, will be required by the States for maintenance of the State highway system, leaving just about enough State funds to finance the States' share of the program proposed in this bill, and to provide for other incidental work which the States will have to do as non-Federal-aid projects. A good many States will have to finance the program by issuing bonds.

These estimates of State funds are all based on 1941 revenue. Since 1941, restrictions on gasoline, tires, automobiles, etc., have drastically reduced the revenue of the States. Revenue from the gasoline tax is down about 35 percent. It is hoped, however, that as soon as the wartime restrictions are lifted the revenue will again return to the 1941 level. This temporary reduction has, however, served to prevent most States from accumulating any cash reserves for post-war work. As a matter of fact, what cash reserves the States do have will all be needed for maintenance repair work which has been neglected during the war.

As one justification for an increase by the Federal Government in the proportion of the cost of projects from 50 to 75 percent, I think that the Federal Government should take into account the huge extraordinary maintenance and reconstruction bills that the States are going to have to bear as a result of damages to their highway investments from Government operation of heavy vehicles which do not pay one penny of tax to the States. Whereas the States' revenue from the gasoline tax has dropped some 35 percent, the wear on the roads has increased tremendously.

Another justification for increasing the Federal-aid share of construction is that the Federal Government has collected from highway users about $4,730,000,000 since 1918, and at the same time paid out as Federal aid on highway work only about $3,322,000,000 (exclusive of W. P. A. projects).

In conclusion, I should like to summarize the following points in support of the provisions of the bill fixing the pro rata share of Federal aid and State funds at 75 and 25 percent, respectively:

1. It is the joint responsibility of the Federal and State Governments to undertake and carry out this program of post-war highway projects in order to provide employment; to promote efficiency, economy, and uniformity in standards; and for State ownership and control of the highways after construction is completed.

2. The program must be sufficient in size to provide gainful employment to millions of servicemen and civilian war workers during the period immediately following the close of the war, and the States are not in a position to finance more than 25 percent of the cost of a program of this proportion.

3. The States' pro rata share of the cost of the program should not be set at less than 25 percent because this might result in the accumulation of surpluses by some States and thereby encourage diversion of highway users' revenues to nonhighway purposes.

4. It appears that the States can finance about 25 percent of the cost of a program of this proportion.

5. The Federal Government is justified in paying 75 percent of the cost of the work because—

A. While the program provides for, and contemplates, needed and meritorious projects, it does constitute a part of a general rehabilitation and welfare program for which the Federal Government would have to finance otherwise.

B. The capital investments of the States have been impaired tremendously by heavy Army vehicles and privately owned trucks engaged in the transportation of war materials, all of which damages are a part of the cost of the war for which Federal taxes are collected.

C. In providing 75 percent of the cost of this program the Federal Government would be spending only funds collected from highway users, for which the Federal Government has not in years past appropriated for highway purposes.

The Power of a Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, from that fateful day, December 7, 1941, when the unprovoked and treacherous attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor forced this Nation into armed conflict, down to the present moment, a vast number of people, learned and otherwise, have busied themselves with post-war planning. Out of the numberless blueprints so carefully drawn, out of the countless books and pamphlets written on the subject and out of all the editorials, orations, and broadcasts with which the country has been flooded, there has finally emerged but one generally accepted conclusion—our victory in this war must be followed by the participation of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization of free and sovereign nations clothed with adequate power and authority to maintain a lasting peace. To this conclusion both branches of the Congress of the United States have given their approval and it is undoubtedly endorsed by the American public.

As a final and crowning endorsement of such an international organization comes the approval of the four great allies, the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, as evidenced by the joint declaration made to the world by their representatives after their historic conferences at Cairo and Tehran. This endorsement was expressed in the following clear and unmistakable language:

That they—

The Allied Governments referred to—

recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principles of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

To thus become agreed among ourselves and with our allies upon an indisputable right and necessary course of procedure is an admirable accomplishment. It is, therefore, with regret that I am impelled to call attention to the fact that, insofar as our Government is concerned, the accomplishment is just as ineffective as it is admirable. It is commendable in that it is an endorsement by the Nation and the Nation's representatives of a means for the accomplishment of a desired end. It is ineffective because it neither legally binds nor authorizes the Nation's Government to pursue the course of action it approves.

Before the United States can participate in an organization such as that commended by its Congress, endorsed by its citizenship and approved by its Chief Executive, it will be necessary for the Government to conclude a binding agreement with such other sovereign nations as may be acceptable parties to the proposed international organization. Under our Constitution, our laws, our precedents, and the decisions of our courts, such an agreement can only be made by our President. If, however, such an agreement is made and concluded in the form of a treaty, it must, according to a provision of our Constitution, be made "by and with the advice of the Senate provided that two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

There, Mr. Speaker, we have the hurdle that must be surmounted ere the Government of the United States can, by entering into an agreement in the form of a treaty with another nation or nations, become a party to the maintenance of a lasting peace in the manner already approved by our allies, already commended by resolutions adopted by both branches of Congress and already acclaimed by the public. The advance approval by Congress of a proposed international organization cannot possibly be twisted into a ratification of any treaty made or that might hereafter be made by the President, even though the treaty be made for the sole purpose of attaining the very objective commended by Congress. Therefore, it now seems inevitable that when the great war in which we are now engaged is brought to a victorious conclusion, this mighty, peace-loving Nation of ours is destined to find itself in exactly the same situation it faced at the close of World War No. 1—a situation then handled with disastrous results.

Regardless of all post-war planning, however beautifully designed, regardless of congressional resolutions, however expressed, regardless of popular demands, though unanimously voiced, regardless of the solemn declaration of our allies, concurred in by our President, we are destined to face as we did 25 years ago the necessity of choosing between two courses of procedure in the matter of setting up machinery to insure a lasting peace to a war-torn world. We will have to choose either to submit our peace agreement to the Senate as we did then, in the form of a treaty for ratification and thus subject it to a veto of a minority of one-third of the Members of that body who might be present, or we must see to it that the momentous document is not subjected to that danger. At the close of World War No. 1, we chose the former course and the tragedy of that decision is now being written in blood and tears.

In view of the constitutional provision I have quoted, it is, of course, proper and pertinent to inquire how it is proposed to avoid the submission of a peace treaty to the Senate for ratification. The answer is, that no such proposal is made. It is not suggested that any constitutional requirement be either avoided or evaded. It is, however, not only suggested, but earnestly urged: First, that no peace agreement entered into by the United States with other nations at the close of the war be either made or concluded as or in the form of a treaty; second, that no peace agreement involving the establishment of an organization among nations of the world for the preservation of peace be submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification or approval under any rule of procedure whereby such approval or ratification may be denied by a minority of one-third of the Senators present; third, that, at the instigation of the State Department or on the request of Congress, made through the adoption of a resolution either before or after the making of a peace agreement, the agreement may be submitted to Congress for approval by a majority vote in both the House and the Senate.

It is quite to be expected that the legality of the procedure I am urging will be questioned. Most of those who are doubtful will merely point to the treaty provision of the Constitution and there rest their argument. These people overlook the fact that the procedure I am suggesting has frequently been followed in the making of international agreements, frequently questioned and just as frequently sustained by the courts of the Nation. In the course of my further discussion of this vital and important matter, I shall cite a number of the cases, decisions, and precedents to which I refer.

Several months ago my attention was attracted and held by a timely and remarkably able editorial in the Saturday Evening Post. The caption of that editorial posed a question then and now of moment not only to our age but perhaps to all future ages. This caption read, "Can 33 Senators veto peace?"

I preserved that editorial. It is now even more pertinent and timely than it was on the day of its first publication. Although since its appearance the question propounded by its caption has been widely and frequently discussed by other editors and columnists, I have yet to find another article dealing with the same subject with equal clearness, understanding, and logic. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial and in the following discussion will undertake to answer the editor's direct and implied questions.

It seems that regardless of all that has been said upon the subject, the answer to the question in reference to the veto power of a Senate minority has never yet been made clear to the American people. Too long have they been drilled in the doctrine that the founders

of this Government deliberately and by a constitutional provision conferred upon one of our legislative bodies an exclusive and irrevocable right of veto of international agreements, such veto to be effected, not through majority action, but by the refusal of a small minority to concur.

The very form of the question posed by the Post editorial is provocative of serious thought, and a full and complete answer, the verity of which is supported by both law and precedent, may be the saving factor in determining a great issue of the post-war period. In fact, it may mean the difference between the surety of permanent peace and the recurrence within a few years of another devastating war. Such an answer is required by the present crisis and demanded by the American people, civilian and soldier alike, all of whom have a right to know that their sacrifice of blood and treasure in the winning of the war in which we are now engaged will not have been in vain.

Sacrificing brevity for clarity, let us put the question in different form: Can 33 Senators—a minority of one-third plus 1—of our smaller national legislative body, veto any understanding or agreement made between our Government and any other nation or nations for the preservation to the world of a lasting peace?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to this momentous question, as I have already explained, is a conditional "yes." Yes; if any understanding or agreement between our Government and any other nation or nations is made in the form of a treaty and submitted to the Senate for ratification. One-third plus one of the Senators voting can veto any international agreement submitted to the Senate in the form of a treaty. The country has unhappy knowledge of this fact. It learned it as a matter of record in the years 1919 and 1920, when a Senate minority vetoed the League of Nations. The country knows it now in the sufferings of a second world war which could have been avoided, it is generally believed, had not such a Senate minority prevented the entry of the United States into the League of Nations and World Court by vetoing the proposals when presented as treaties.

The able editor of the Saturday Evening Post fully understood all this, of course. He evidently had various other meanings in mind in asking the question, "Can 33 Senators veto peace?"—for fully implied by this question are the following other questions:

First. Must a minority of one-third plus one of the Senators be given an opportunity to veto peace by rejecting a treaty?

Second. Will a minority of one-third plus one of the Senators veto peace if given the opportunity to reject a treaty?

Third. Should a minority of one-third plus one of the Senators be given the opportunity to veto peace by presenting the peace to them in the form of a treaty?

Mr. Speaker, I now proceed to answer in the negative the first of these implied questions, Must one-third plus one of the Senators be given such an opportunity? The editor has perhaps sufficiently answered the question by his direct reference to our congressional history. He says:

> Avoidance of the Senate minority's veto power over treaties is not new or unprecedented. The annexation of Texas was accomplished by a joint resolution of Congress after a treaty for the same purpose had been defeated in the Senate. More than 50 years later, Hawaii was annexed to the Union by the same method and for the same reason. Something similar may happen again.

Sir, that quotation is a statement of a historical fact, and unless Texas be regarded as a mere squatter on the Union, the editor must be right in his contention that a joint resolution of the Houses of Congress may be used instead of the treaty method; otherwise, Texas is not a constitutional member of the Union. Our recent colleague, Congressman Ramsay, of West Virginia, in a brief but meaty speech made on the floor of the House on November 30, 1942, has referred to this matter. He said:

> Of course, the most outstanding incident in our country's history, where Congress and the President accomplished by Executive agreement what they could not do by treaty, was the admission of Texas into the Union, an act which may be accounted as more than an international agreement. It was an amalgamation of peoples as well as the extension of the boundaries of the United States.
>
> The annexation of Texas was first submitted to the Senate by treaty signed by John C. Calhoun, Secretary of State, and by the Texas Representatives, Van Zand and Henderson, on April 12, 1844, whereupon the Senate rejected this treaty by a vote of 16 ayes to 35 nays.
>
> President Tyler then requested action by the Congress, and said:
>
> "The power of Congress is fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished."
>
> In compliance with the request, a joint resolution was introduced in the House to take the place of the formal treaty, and later this resolution was passed in the Senate by the vote of 27 to 25, and in the House by a vote of 132 to 76, and Texas by a majority vote of both Houses took its place in the Union.

Daniel Webster gave a verdict of validity to the Texas procedure in a discussion had in the Senate after the State had been admitted to the Union by adoption of a joint resolution. Referring to it he said:

> It is a law founded on a contract with Texas, and designed to carry that contract into effect. A recognition founded not on any consideration or any contract would not be so strong as it now stands on the face of the resolution. Now, I know no way, I candidly confess, in which this Government, acting in good faith, as I trust it always will, can relieve itself from that stipulation and pledge, by any honest course of legislation whatever. And, therefore, I say again that, so far as Texas is concerned—the whole of Texas south of 36 degrees 30 minutes, which I suppose embraces all the slave territory—there is no land, not an acre, the character of which is not established by law, a law which cannot be repealed without the violation of a contract, and plain disregard of the public faith.

The joint resolution as to Texas was deliberately designed, we know, to avoid a veto by a minority of the Senate of this international agreement with Texas, and was so recognized and challenged. But Clay never challenged it. This quartette lends to the proceeding an evidence of validity that rises high above the least shadow of doubt or quibble. Stephen A. Douglas was for it, as was Levi Woodbury, successor to Story on the Supreme Court.

Taney showed the way in Holmes against Jennison and was joined by Story. It might be said that here was an unanimity of great minds concerning the constitutional validity of this international agreement annexing Texas by the method of action by Congress on a joint resolution rather than the method of treaty.

It was pointed out that the legislature can make contracts which are not treaties within the meaning of section 2 of article 2, requiring advice and consent of the Senate. Douglas pointed out that the Congress had the power to borrow money on a contract with a foreign nation; and it would not be a treaty; Belser, Alabama, said that legislative contracts could be made for territory, trade, or anything else, under the power of sovereignty; Woodbury asserted that most of the powers given to Congress relate to foreign affairs; Bayly, Virginia, cited the opinion of Chief Justice Taney in *Holmes* v. *Jennison* (14 Peters 571)—concurred in by Story, McLean, and Wayne—that the Constitution mentioned not only treaties, but confederations, agreements, and compacts; that these were not empty phrases; supporting his statement by references to Vattel. The Speaker also cited section 10 of article I of the Constitution to show that a State could make an agreement or compact with a foreign nation "with the consent of Congress." Surely, if Congress can permit a State to do so, Congress can do so in its own right.

The Post editorial to which I have referred also cites many precedents supporting the propriety and validity of such action by majorities in the Houses of Congress. The author writes:

> Because the executive agreement can be endorsed by both Houses of Congress by a simple majority vote, instead of the two-thirds vote required for approval of a treaty by the Senate, the popularity of the executive agreements as a means of effecting arrangements with foreign countries has grown since the senatorial battle of the century in 1920. Almost half as many executive agreements have already been made in the 2 decades since the armistice of 1918 as in the 13 decades between 1789 and the armistice. These include agreements to set up a Mixed Claims Commission for Germany, to cancel the Lansing-Ishii Agreement with Japan, to fund the war debts of Great Britain and other countries, to regulate radio communications with Canada, to alter the international courts in Chinese port cities, to stimulate reciprocal trade with various countries. Surely lend-lease and the Atlantic bases-50 destroyers deal affected the United States as definitely as we used to think the League of Nations would. Yet neither was presented to the Senate as a treaty.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to add that the editor has been far from exhaustive in his list of precedents. He might have added that the executive agreements of

the United States number some 1,500, as compared with about 800 treaties, and that the Supreme Court has held that these agreements carried the same validity under our Constitution as do treaties.

The following cases may be consulted as to this conclusion of the Court: United States against Belmont, decided February 2, 1942; *The Altman Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583); *United States* v. *Curtis Wright Export Corporation* (299 U. S. 304).

May I refer also to a statement by Professor Burdick, an authority on this subject and a student of constitutional law, teaching at Cornell University. He said:

The fact that the treaty-making power was created as it was, with the participation only of the President and the consent of the Senate by two-thirds vote, is rather a historical accident. It is also very clear from the Constitution that the Congress, acting through both its branches, is expressly authorized to deal with matters of international relations and particularly and expressly with matters of finance and appropriation. Now, undoubtedly, the two functions of the treaty-making power and of the congressional power overlap, and treaties have not infrequently dealt with matters with regard to which Congress might act, and also congressional action has dealt with matters which might have been dealt with by treaty, and we have been referred this morning to the annexation of Texas and the annexation of Hawaii, which carried the doctrine even further, of congressional action in the field of international affairs which might be covered by treaty. And, of course, we have also the making of peace with Germany by joint resolution—a field which normally is covered by treaty. I think there is no question that those actions were all within the constitutional powers of Congress.

In this connection may I also refer to the view of another able scholar in this subject, James F. Barnett, to be found in the Yale Journal of Law of 1905–06, under the title "International Agreements." He writes:

The making of agreements by virtue of an act of Congress seems to show a tendency toward the practice which prevails in other states of the world. In no European constitution is the approbation of treaties entrusted to one branch of the legislative body alone. A simple majority vote of both branches is the universal requirement. Moreover, the general rule is that only certain kinds of treaties such as those relating to cessions of territory, to commerce, or those imposing financial obligations need be submitted to the legislature (p. 69).

Nor should we overlook the great circumstance of the existence of a body of law known as the law of nations, jus gentium, long since binding all civilized states. This body of law was accepted by us under a resolution passed by the Continental Congress and confirmed under the present Constitution by the Judiciary Act of 1789, using not the treaty method but the legislative power of Congress. Of course, we know that innumerable subjects like the prize court do not rest in treaty; all of which make it evident that the treaty method represents only a special case or extra method of the lawmaking powers under the Constitution to deal with international relations.

It requires a two-thirds vote of both Houses to overcome a veto by the President. But a mere one-third plus one minority of the Senators voting can veto an international agreement if it be presented to the Senate alone in the form of a treaty; and this incongruity in direct contravention of the general legislative principle of majority rule in the Senate and the House. What was the purpose here? Alexander Hamilton explains that it was designed to secure secrecy in treaty making in those particular cases which in that age might invite secrecy. Hamilton said:

It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties, of whatever nature, but that perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch are sometimes requisite. There are cases where the most useful intelligence may be obtained if the persons possessing it can be relieved from apprehensions of discovery. Those apprehensions will operate on those persons, whether they are actuated by mercenary or friendly motives, and there doubtless are many of both descriptions who would rely on the secrecy of the President but who would not confide in that of the Senate, and still less in that of a large popular assembly. The Convention have done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties, that although the President must, in forming them, act by the advice and consent of the Senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such a manner as prudence may suggest.

That secrecy was then and had long been a characteristic of the whole or part of the treaty and a Senate then small in numbers assuredly give the explanation according to Hamilton. But what can be the secrecy now involved in this great subject? Not secrecy but the fullest publicity of legislative discussion is surely a demand of the first order, with world law and order as the subject involved.

Mr. Speaker, continuing with the precedents as to the power of joint action by Congress, I would refer my colleagues to an extensive report made for the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House by the late Senator Burton, then a Member of the House. This memorable examination of this subject was made by the committee a few years ago, and there are no doubt many here who remember this illustrious man of Ohio who brought in the report. He covered the subject with the utmost fairness. The object was to advise the House as to whether entry into the World Court might be effectuated by an act of Congress as well as by treaty. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported as follows:

It seems clear that by a resolution originating in the House adherence to the World Court could be secured by legislation.

Policies of the Nation, both foreign and domestic, are supposed to be expressive of the opinions of people. Treaties and foreign relations are no exception to this rule.

The constitutional provision for the advice and consent of one of the two Houses of Congress is largely based upon the necessity for secrecy and dispatch. No injunction of secrecy has been imposed upon the recommendation for a world court, and as regards dispatch, only 1 day less than 2 years has elapsed since it was presented to the Senate by President Harding.

In his speech to the House Representative Burton also stated:

I have set forth in my report that we could pass a resolution initiated in the House in which, if the Senate concurred, it would be binding. On several occasions the Congress has done that. We annexed Texas by resolution originating in the House after a treaty had failed. We annexed Hawaii by a resolution in this House and passed in the Senate after a treaty had failed. We, the House, took the initiative for peace with Germany in 1921. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 66, pt. 5, p. 5405, Mar. 3, 1925.)

In its labors the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House at that time examined the precedents generally. I shall refer to a few of them in the briefest way. They all support the principle that Congress may act in the field of international relations to effectuate its object through its single and only available organ, the President, when international action is involved.

REQUESTING PRESIDENT TO REVOKE TREATY WITH GREAT BRITAIN

In 1846, Mr. Ingersoll reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs a joint resolution requesting the President to give notice to the Government of Great Britain that the convention of 1827 should be annulled 12 months after such notice. This resolution passed the House on February 9 by a vote of 163 "ayes" to 54 "nays." The Senate amended the resolution and it then went to conference. Both Houses in 1846 went into conference and the amended resolution ultimately was passed.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO ARRANGE FOR ARBITRATION INSTITUTIONS

In 1888 a bill was passed in the House authorizing the President to arrange a conference for the purpose of promoting arbitration and encouraging reciprocal commercial relations between the United States and enumerated countries of Latin America. This bill also passed the Senate and became a law May 24, 1888. It led to the establishment of the International Bureau of American Republics.

AUTHORIZING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—RIO DE LA PLATA

In March 1818, Mr. Clay moved in the House an amendment to an appropriation bill to provide $18,000 for an outfit and a year's salary for a minister to the Government of Rio de la Plata. This motion was rejected on March 30 of that year. However, Mr. Clay again, on April 4, 1820, moved in the House for an appropriation for such an outfit and salary for such minister or ministers as the President might, with the concurrence of the Senate, send to any of the South American governments that had been established and were maintaining their independence against Spain. This motion was carried.

RESOLUTION REPUDIATING NAVAL ACTION IN HAWAII

February 7, 1894, the House passed the following resolution:

Resolved, First, that it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States Minister in employing United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Islands in January 1893, and in setting up in its place a provisional government not republican in form and in opposition to the will of the majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic

and the spirit of our Constitution, and should be and is condemned.

The Senate passed a similar resolution, and the policy of President Cleveland was made conformable to the two resolutions.

DECLINING MANDATE OVER ARMENIA

May 27, 1920, Senator Lodge, from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, submitted a report and concurrent resolution in which the words were employed, "the House concurring," to the effect that Congress declined to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia, as requested in a message of the President May 24, 1920. This resolution was adopted in the Senate.

CONGRESS PROVIDES FOR A WORLD COURT

The naval appropriation bill of June 2, 1916, as passed in the House, authorized the President to invite the governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which should be charged with the duties of suggesting an organization, court of arbitration, or other body to which disputed questions between nations should be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement.

Here you have Congress itself providing for a world court.

BILL AUTHORIZING AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH ARBITRATION, ETC.

March 29, 1886, Mr. William McKinley, afterward President of the United States, introduced a bill authorizing the President of the United States to invite the autonomous governments of America to send delegates to an international congress to arrange the settlements of national differences by arbitration.

February 3, 1911, a resolution (H. J. Res. 278) was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Mr. Garner, expressing the opinion of Congress as to the propriety of a joint agreement between the various governments of America for the mutual guaranty of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH PERSIA

In the year 1882 a resolution was introduced in the House providing for the establishment of diplomatic relations with Persia. This was amended so as to provide for a chargé d'affaires and a consul general at Teheran. This resolution passed the Senate and became a law.

RESOLUTION INTERVENING IN CUBA

The joint resolution of 1898 declaring the necessity for intervention of the United States to remedy conditions in the island of Cuba, originated in the House. It passed the Senate and was approved by the President.

RESOLUTION PROHIBITING TREATIES WITH INDIANS

On March 3, 1871, an act prohibiting the making of further treaties with the Indian tribes as if they were independent nations was approved by the President. Here is an act of Congress. Before that time treaties had been made with these tribes in the same manner as with foreign nations. This prohibition was carried in an appropriation act which originated in the House.

The subject was also considered by the Committee on Finance of the Senate in connection with the Trade Agreement Act of 1934 when the Senate Committee reported:

We consider it is clear that no constitutional legal considerations required ratification of executive agreements.

And here, sir, I should observe that while the subject is in no state of doubt, there is much general ignorance as to this plenary power possessed by Congress to act in international affairs. No doubt, I repeat, because judicial and congressional precedents leave no opening for doubt; but there is a woeful lack of knowledge concerning it. The subject is especially the victim of the one-book man and his failings. Observe him, this one-book man, if you will. He picks up the Constitution and reads some 24 words out of a paragraph of more than 100 words in article II, as follows:

He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Our one-book man immediately concludes that these words set forth the beginning and the end of the power of the Republic to act legislatively in international matters; and thus the idea of action by joint legislation of the two Houses never enters this one-book mind. Even commentators in the press often assume that the above words are exclusive and that the Senate has a monopoly on the subject. They do not positively assert this to be true, but as one-book men on this subject, they know only of the treaty approach; and so unwittingly are preparing us again to fall into the trap of a recalcitrants' minority. The original one-book man of history was doubtless the Caliph Omar, whose conquering general having taken Alexandria asked of Omar what he should do with the Alexandrian Library. The Caliph is said to have answered:

If the books agree with the Koran then the Library is unnecessary; if they conflict, then they are infidel and should be put to the flames.

The torch was applied; and so perished the University of Alexandria, established by Aristotle, the first in history, and repository of the learning of the ancient world, after nearly a thousand years of service to mankind. Well, Mr. Speaker, our judges happily have been more than one-book men. The Supreme Court has had to examine this subject under the various conditions which have developed in our relations with other nations. I have said that there are some 1,500 Executive agreements which find their validity in three sources of authority:

First. Authority imminent in the President's office as the single organ of the Government under the Constitution to act executively in international affairs.

Second. Authority implied as a matter of administrative necessity in effectuating an existing treaty.

Third. Authority derived under an act or joint resolution of Congress. The following cases deal directly with our subject: *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304); *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203).

May I direct the attention of the House to the following extracts from opinions of the Supreme Court:

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies, acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown, not to the Colonies severally but to the Colonies in their collective capacity as the United States of America (*United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright*, supra).

To which the Court added:

The investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution (Curtiss case).

And then continued:

This the Court recognized in each of the cases cited and found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution but in the Law of Nations.

As a member of the family of nations the right and power of the United States in that foreign field are equal to the right and power of the other nations. Otherwise the United States is not completely sovereign.

The Court points out that:

The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation, the power to expel undesirable aliens, the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *U. S.*, 224 U. S. 583-600-601), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality.

As to the validity of such acts, the Court finds:

A treaty is the "Law of the Land" under the supremacy clause (art VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity.

There are many such compacts, of which a protocol, a modus vivendi, a postal convention, and agreements like that now under consideration are illustrations.

The power of the President in respect to the recognition of a foreign government, includes the power to remove such obstacles to full recognition as the settlement of claims of our nationals (Pink case, p. 205).

All constitutional acts of power whether in the executive or in the judicial department, have as much legal validity and obligation as if they proceeded from the legislature (Curtis case, p. 330).

And as to the power of Congress to act through the President, and of the President to act under congressional direction, the Court says:

In view of the delicacy of foreign relations and of the power peculiar to the President in this regard. Congressional legislation which is to be made effective in the international field must often accord to him a degree of discretion and freedom which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved.

Unbroken legislative practice from the inception almost of the National Government supports the conclusion that the joint resolution (supra) is not an unconstitutional delegation of power.

In the above case the validity of a joint resolution of Congress was challenged on the ground that it conferred an unconstitutional delegation of power to the Executive to confer with other American republics and to do such acts as might contribute to the restoration of peace between two countries then at war.

Note, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the Supreme Court has decided that in governing our relations with other nations: First, "International understanding, compacts, and the principles of international law" may be fully employed, without the necessity of a reference of them to the Senate as treaties and thereby incurring the peril of a minority veto.

Mr. Speaker, the noteworthy circumstances among all the examples is that the principle of the authority of Congress to act in this matter is never denied and that as to all the 1,500 Executive agreements negotiated without ratification by the Senate not a single one has been upset by the courts.

It is and should be clear enough, as the Supreme Court has found for us, that our institutions do not leave us as a nation at the mercy of an irresponsible minority in our international relations.

Mr. Speaker, if now the question is put to us, Must a minority of one-third plus one of the Senators be given the opportunity to veto peace, our answer is an unqualified "No." No such exclusive power, no such monopoly of jurisdiction belongs to the Senate, since the Congress clearly possesses plenary power to establish the law to govern us in international matters. And note well that the State Department and the President may decide whether or not the peace document shall go into the hands of such a minority, by sending it to the Senate alone as a treaty, or instead, sending it to the two Houses of Congress for a majority action, as an international understanding or compact.

Now, I come to the second question implied in this pregnant editorial:

> Will a minority of one-third plus one of the Senators veto peace if given the opportunity of treaty rejection?

As to this question, begging a prophecy as it does as to what such a Senate minority will do, I undertake to give no certain answer. I can only refer you and my colleagues to history. But there is such a history. There is a history of minority control, a calamitous history of such control exerted no less than three times in the last generation. A minority of the Senators 1919–1920 vetoed our cooperation with other nations to support peace, law, and order through the League of Nations. A minority again in 1926 vetoed our entry into the World Court, an institution fashioned by the hands of the late Elihu Root, who, his heart driven to despair by Senate action, declared lamentingly:

> Can it be that the people of the United States do not care whether or not anything is done to make it possible to outlaw war?

Again in 1935 a like minority of Senators vetoed our entering that Court though it then had some 57 sovereign states as members, and had known the presence of several American judges, including our recent Chief Justice Hughes. Who will ever forget the campaign of animosity conducted then by the hates of history, of party, and of Woodrow Wilson—the concoctions of misrepresentation composed like the Witches' Broth:

> Double, double toil and trouble;
> Fire burn and cauldron bubble.
>
> Fillet of a finny snake,
> In the cauldron boil and bake,
> Eye of newt and toe of frog,
> Wool of bat and tongue of dog,
> Adder's fork and blind worm's sting,
> Lizzard's leg and owlet's wing.
> For a charm of powerful trouble
> Like a hell-broth boil and bubble.

Mr. Speaker, the press reports that several of the Senators who composed the Wilson delenda est vendetta of 1919–20—for as such only can I describe it—are still Members of that body. Of the minorities who vetoed our adherence to the World Court in 1926 and 1935, many more remain still as Members of the Senate. What will these, the survivors of other victorious battles against the adoption of peace institutions, do? Will they again attempt to veto peace? I do not know. But judging from the rumblings as to their attitudes one sees in the press, the prospect is altogether disheartening.

I do not undertake to prophesy. I do pray with all my soul that no exclusive warrant be given again to the survivors of that "battalion of death" of those days to trample down in destruction and blood the cries of human beings, on every continent and on all the islands of the seas, to live in a peaceful world—a world of law and order.

Do I overstate the danger? Let me read what a sober author, Dr. Fleming, has to say on the subject generally in his great work, Treaty Veto of the American Senate:

> Minority control tends to increase. The two-thirds requirement not only puts it in the power of the opposing party to sabotage our treaties if it thinks the policy will pay in winning the votes of certain States or minority groups, but it enables a small faction of the Senators to dominate the Senate and the country when a crucial treaty is proposed. The group may be composed of a dozen confirmed radicals, or a handful of determined reactionaries, or, if a President has been long in office, of his personal enemies, men who have been crossed in previous political campaigns or disappointed over the distribution of patronage.

Just so, as we too well know. That the minority at first may be less than one-third plus one boots no assurance; for, as Dr. Fleming adds:

> They may not be numerous, but if they are determined they cannot only prolong consideration of the treaty while passions and prejudices and fears are aroused in various quarters of the country, but they can so intimidate the majority that damaging concessions will be given them out of fear that they may wean away just a few votes from the protreaty side and gain the necessary third of the Senate. Some Senators are sure to be uneasy about the effect of the continued fulminations on their constituents, and they may at any time decide that it would be easier to vote for the proposed amendment than to explain to the folks at home why it was unnecessary or inadvisable.

What then? Then it happens that the friends of the treaty begin to appease, appease one Senator after another by granting killing amendments to the treaty, until its virtues and substance have been conceded away and its objective lost. This has indeed been the history of the peace document on the three occasions, 1919–20, 1926, and 1935, when it was presented to the Senate in the form of a treaty.

Mr. Speaker, will history be repeated in the action of the Senate upon any peace agreement made at the close of the war in which we are now engaged, if such agreement is submitted to that body in the form of a treaty for ratification? While hesitating to venture into the realm of prophecy, I believe I have made clear my view that such an agreement would fail of ratification. Let us now listen for a moment to a frank expression of the views of an able and distinguished member of the Senate made before that body as recently as December 13, 1943.

On the date last mentioned, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, introduced in the Senate a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to the making of treaties, an amendment designed to change the present method of ratification. In the course of a brief discussion of his proposal, Senator PEPPER said:

> This matter is particularly important now, because all of us envisage that soon we shall be endeavoring to make the kind of treaty which will protect and maintain the peace of mankind which is being so dearly bought by the men and women of the world. When that treaty comes back here at some time, Mr. President—and God speed the day when it will come to declare world peace—we should let it be received by a machinery in the Congress which would assure it speedy consideration and speedy conclusion and not give the power of filibuster, not give the power of delay, not give the power of obstruction to a little group of Senators who might not reflect the majority sentiment of the Senate or of the House of Representatives or of the country.
>
> If we are fighting for democracy, Mr. President, that means the majority rules. At the present time a minority rules in the Senate with respect to the ratification of treaties, and, of course, the House has no voice in the matter.
>
> I give my solemn assurance, my solemn lamentable belief, that with the present constitutional provision not changed, Mr. President, the Senate would not ratify another treaty which was as adequate in respect to present-day problems as were the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles with respect to the problems following the First World War.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have in no uncertain terms from the lips of a Senator of today the prophetic assurance of what will happen to any peace agreement, if the same should be submitted in the form of a treaty and thus subjected to the veto of a Senate minority. Incidentally, the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida, however, worthy and desirable it may be, has no promise of such favorable and early consideration as would establish it as a remedy for ills of either the present or immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the third and final question raised by the editorial under discussion.

Should a minority of one-third, plus one, be given the opportunity to veto peace by treaty rejection?

To this question an answer can be given, and the answer is an emphatic "No." It is fair to ask, What can the argument be to support the claim that a determination by the will of one-third of the Senators, plus one, should be preferred to the concurring wills of a majority in the Senate and a majority in the House, supported by the approval of the State Department and the President? To this question no answer has been given or even attempted. But besides the objections already given to such a claim and privilege other objections have been stated, including the serious and profound objection that such a privilege not only takes away from the majority the right under the Constitution to govern themselves, but gives that power to a minority instead.

It will hardly be gainsaid that this great struggle for law and order institutions represents a movement against oppressive rulers by the peoples of the world. The war is being waged by the United Nations against dictators, who, having already subjected hundreds of millions to slavery, are brutally intent on subduing and enslaving the rest of mankind. It is a war of democracies, of the self-governing peoples against the privileged orders and self-constituted tyrants. Not special privilege, then, but democracy and democratic methods should determine the objectives of the peace.

Even the most cursory glance at Madison's notes of the discussions of the Constitutional Convention shows that the thought of occasions demanding secrecy, frequent in that day, was the single argument for providing the extra and special method for ratification of treaties. Under the British monarchy the King could make and maintain such secret treaties, not having to report them to Parliament. It was only when he needed an appropriation or a method for enforcing penalties as to his own subjects that he was required to go to Parliament. Meanwhile Parliament also could act on its own initiative to control international relations. The makers of the Constitution thought the occasions for such secrecy would occur here and that some treaties might have to carry secrets, the publication of which would be unwise; but unwilling to give the President the final power inherited by the British monarch, this extra method supplemented by the special safeguard of a two-thirds rule was provided. The truth is that this one-third rule, in application, is tantamount to the rule of legislation only by unanimous consent; and where is the lawmaker, the publicist, or the thoughtful citizen who will not agree that, if generally applied, such a rule would spell, not self-government by the people, but anarchism, that is, no government at all? This is especially true where government by party prevails, and true of all parties. It is so true of political parties as to have become proverbial even in poetry. Was it Scott who lamented the man—

> Who born for the universe
> Narrowed his mind,
> And to a party gave up
> What was meant for mankind.

The fathers themselves recognized this when submitting the Constitution to the several States for adoption. They not only referred it to conventions in the States but left it to a majority vote in each convention. Had they required a two-thirds vote in such conventions for adoption by each State, we should have no Constitution of the United States because only 8 States, not 9, gave it their approval by a two-thirds vote. Of the 13 States, 5 States gave only majority votes, and among the 5 were Massachusetts, New York, and the State of Virginia—Virginia, then primus inter pares—first among equals—in my view, in the making of our Constitution.

Virginia, due to the fiery provinciality of Patrick Henry, gave her adhesion by a majority of only 10 votes. I tremble when I think of the perilous contingency through which our country then passed. Had there been no Washington, no Madison, in Virginia, her adhesion probably would have failed—and with what momentous consequences? The absence of Virginia would have left a gap in the territorial unity of the States adhering as wide as Virginia and extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Lakes. We know the Union could not have survived any such physical disseverance of its essential parts as the absence of Virginia. Yet such would have been the consequence had the provincials of that day been given the power of veto by a one-third plus one vote.

This is just what happened to the League of Nations when the United States failed to enter. Like Virginia, the United States, then primus inter pares among world sovereigns, was indispensable as a member of the League of Nations—all this due to her leadership in its conception, gestation, and birth and the moral prestige denominating her as the keystone of the world arch.

Mr. Speaker, recurring to my topic of the moment, "Should this Senate minority be given the one-third plus one weapon to veto the coming peace as they vetoed and wrecked the last," may I ask bluntly, What does the isolationist propose, what does he plan? Human misery surely demands that a permanent peace be provided. What does he propose? What does he plan? Is it just nothing?

Indeed it seems to be just nothing, as before. He proposed nothing then, he proposes nothing now. But did nothing happen as the result of this isolationist nihilism? Behold the world in the greatest pain and misery it has ever known. Should then the Congress, or the President, both in full possession of the power to deny the use of this minority veto, this weapon of destruction, permit the isolationist to set his trap for another holocaust? The Good Book tells us that "It is in vain the net is spread twice before any bird." Shall the Members of Congress, shall the State Department, shall the President not take wisdom from these words?

But perhaps the isolationist does have a philosophy from which his purpose as to our international relations can be inferred. Can it be in that perversity of opinion which should wall us entirely in and wall the rest of the world entirely out, so that we would have no international relations at all?

Wall in our exports; wall out our imports; wall out the letter, the telegram, the radio; wall out the minds of science; wall out the neighboring world from the benefit of all our moral concepts; wall out the God of men, all of which may be as impossible as to wall in or wall out of our national boundaries the weathers and the winds of heaven. Is this to be taken as a godless world? Or are we to adopt the banner which a pirate ship of the Middle Ages had nailed to its masthead in the Mediterranean, "The friends of God and the enemies of all mankind"?

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a mistake to assume that the one-third plus one minority would be restricted in its make-up to the isolationists alone. It would be recruited from all the forms in which recalcitrancy is to be found, and these are many as Dr. Fleming has pointed out. No halo sets a Senator apart from other men. There is the Senator belonging to the party of the President who has been disappointed in patronage matters; the partisan out of power who surely would have the country win the war, but would not have it win the next election and who figures that a successful treaty might not help his party; the man born antagonistically minded who must be always gotten out of the way if anything constructive is to be done; men of the type who refused to sign the convention draft of the Constitution of our country; the men who seldom ever find anybody else's work formed to their satisfaction.

Also let us not forget the devices of killing amendments, for instance, amendments looking innocent to the uninformed but not acceptable to the other national signatories. Do you think all this merely imaginary? Then please note what such recalcitrants did to destroy our adherence to the World Court as recommended by the then Secretary of State Hughes, amendments which defeated the adhesion and which Secretary Hughes, in silent disgust, refused to even propose to the other court adherents.

Should we not, I earnestly ask you, get something out of all this pain and misery? Poor Mother Humanity mourning for her children like Rachel of old, should she not be given the security of peace so long promised and paid for egregiously through so many centuries of suffering, destruction, and shedding of blood? Since it appears so plainly that the legal power to act clearly resides with us in Congress, functioning by majorities in the respective Houses, is it not a duty to suggest that when and if an agreement or agreements have been reached with other nations as to the essential conditions for permanent peace, the great document or compact should be submitted to the Congress for majority approval

and not as a treaty to the Senate alone to be vetoed by a minority in that body? I am frank to say that were this tremendous responsibility my responsibility I should not give my reliance exclusively to the special method by treaty alone. I believe that that leadership would be highly delinquent who should again risk this incomparable subject to the perils of minority obstruction and defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I have the firm conviction that it would be unwise to neglect the fullest preparation now for welding the United Nations into a union on plans of war prevention while their high purposes carry the temperatures best suited to joining them together. This preparatory work might be done through the adoption of joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) I introduced in the House several months ago and which is now before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration. Or, as an alternative, may I suggest the use of a joint resolution reciting the Kellogg Pact—signed by 63 nations including all those now engaged in the war—and directing the President to come to an agreement with the United Nations fully implementing that treaty to accomplish its great purpose of law, order and permanent peace among the nations. This treaty was approved by every Senator voting except one. And this treaty if adequately implemented, could, with the aid of the World Court, be made to serve the great purpose. This court, which is already well established and highly fitted to effect its purpose, needs only the grant of jurisdiction to apply the law of nations, the treaties of nations, and especially this greatest of all the treaties considering the world's need, the Kellogg Pact. Let me quote to the House from its provisions:

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process. * * *

* * * The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Mr. Speaker, this truly wise and noble document was conceived and executed during the administration of Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, and was ratified as a solemn covenant by the following signatories:

SIGNATURES TO TREATY

Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Free City of Danzig, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hejaz, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, Kingdom of the Serbs and Croats and Slovenes, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Mexico, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Paraguay, Persia, Rumania, Russia, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela; also France, Iraq, Luxembourg, and Netherlands.

Clearly this treaty is adequate if adequately implemented. But how should it be implemented? Why not by vesting the League of Nations with the additional powers and instrumentalities conceded to be essential but not yet vested in it? But the League has failed, you say. Yes; it has failed; like our very own Government under the Articles of Confederation, it has failed. But maybe in forming a constitution for world law and order, just as in forming ours, a first chapter of experimentation and failure was necessary in order to make possible a second chapter of success. Who can doubt that we should have had no Constitution of the United States to be hailed as an unprecedented success had there not been a previous constitution that had failed, and thus shown wise men, by its reasons for failure, the necessary pattern for a splendid success?

SOVEREIGNTY OBJECTIONS

And now it would be of interest to know what objection can objectors have to the introduction of law-and-order institutions to insure peace in the community of nations. When pressed for a specification, these objectors talk hazily of sovereign rights. But what are sovereign rights? Just where and in what respect is the United States sovereign? Well, it is sovereign over territory, over land and water as to which it alone has the right, the exclusive right, to make laws and to apply them through its own courts. It is sovereign in our 48 States, sovereign in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and sovereign over 3 miles of the oceans which wash their shores. But on the high seas it is not sovereign, because the jurisdiction of its courts does not apply to other peoples there. There, however, it does have rights, rights in common with other nations, international rights, but they are not exclusive rights, and therefore cannot be sovereign; they are strictly communal international rights which we share but equally with all other countries, and which only communal international institutions can be made adequate to protect. The man, then, who talks about our sacrificing sovereign rights talks without understanding, is befuddled himself, or seeks to befuddle others.

But I am not done with these recalcitrants who talk only of rights. I would compel them to hold their tongues unless they talk also of the duties that go with such rights. There are no rights, there can be no real rights, except as they are supported, are bulwarked by the discharge of the balancing duties. Rights there were when Ethiopia was invaded, when the Japanese set their foul feet on the soil of Manchuria and violated the integrity of unoffending China; sovereign rights there were, of indubitable character, when Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium were crushed beneath the heels of the cancerous growth in human form now controlling the body politic of the German people. Yea, rights, real sovereign rights that have never been doubted, but have been wholly disregarded by the forces of evil. And what of the rights of the millions who have died, combatants and noncombatants, both of the oppressor and the oppressed, merely that the criminal instincts of some Hitler, Mussolini, or Japanese marauders, eagerly obsessed with thoughts of their places in history may be gratified. Such objectors talk confusedly and utter vague warnings about superstates, when what they mean is that the international community, now without law and order institutions, shall remain anarchistic, and be denied the agencies absolutely necessary to protect its sovereign members against beastly violations of all their rights, sovereign as well as international. I say they talk confusedly about superstates, that is, supergovernments, where there now exists no government at all; no court, no sheriff, no agency with jurisdiction to enforce the laws of peace. How then can men talk of superstates in any community which is frankly anarchistic and that means no government? Let them first establish some government there before they talk of superstates.

POST-WAR PLANS

Mr. Speaker, the elements of post-war structures, essential to protect nationals against war are not difficult to state; they are I think:

First. A law condemning aggressions, thus providing a rule of conduct;

Second. A court, with jurisdiction to decide disputes; and

Third. A sheriff, in this case, the posse comitatus of nations, to enforce obedience to the law against the aggressors.

Of these three essentials, the first is already fully provided in the long existent law of nations, supplemented by existent treaties and especially by the Kellog Pact, obligating some 63 signatories not to engage in acts of aggression or of violence, the 63 signatories including all the nations now at war. As to the second essential, a court, that too, already exists, as the World Court, fashioned by the master hands of one of our greatest statesmen and juris-consults, the late Senator Elihu Root, but a court still lacking the operating attribute of any real court, to wit, authoritative jurisdiction, the pre-essential in any court. Third and finally, the executive or enforcing essential which unhappily does not as yet exist, the League of Nations not having been clothed with this fundamentally necessary attribute.

It has been these defects, lack of real jurisdiction in the World Court and an enforcing function, taken together with the absence of the United States as a crowning defect, which explains the failure of the League, and it is these defects which must be remedied, most assuredly, if we are to safeguard the rights of nations and insure peace, law, and order in the community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, before bringing my remarks to a close I pause for a moment to pay a deserved tribute to two of our former colleagues in this House. First, to my friend, Hon. Robert L. Ramsay, formerly a Representative from West Virginia, who, on November 30, 1942, delivered on the floor of the House a most able address upon the very question I have discussed today. Second, to my friend, David J. Lewis, who for many years served as a Representative from the State of Maryland, and who as far back as May 20, 1932, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in an eloquent and forceful discussion of the same subject.

I feel personally indebted to both of these learned and distinguished gentlemen for blazing a trail that I have been glad to follow—a trail through a wilderness of misunderstanding. I am particularly indebted to Mr. Lewis for his generous and unselfish contribution to this discussion of many hours of patient study and intelligent research. His was indeed a labor of patriotism and devotion to a high ideal without hope of reward other than a sense of duty well and faithfully done.

And now, in closing, let me summarize the conclusions that I believe to be fully justified by the investigation given the questions discussed. It will, I trust, have been noted that these conclusions have not been reached through any devious process of individual reasoning, but, on the contrary, they have been builded upon and are supported by established law and precedents, as well as confirmed by recorded history. For the purpose of summing up, I revert to the questions at issue.

First. Can 33 Senators veto peace?

The answer is a conditional "Yes"; that is to say, a "Yes" only if the peace agreement be submitted to the Senate as a treaty for ratification. If so submitted, any minority exceeding one-third of the Senators voting, say one-third plus one, can defeat ratification, that is, can exercise a veto power over it.

Second. Must the peace agreement be submitted by the President or the State Department to the Senate as a treaty and thus made subject to a veto by such a minority?

The answer is an unconditional "No." The precedents of a century and a half show that Congress, either by authorizing the President, in advance, to enter into the desired agreement or agreements, or by subsequently approving such as the President may make, may act by majority votes in both Houses to accomplish any proper objectives in our relations with other nations; and these precedents have been repeatedly sustained by the Supreme Court.

Third. Will a majority of the Senators veto peace if given the opportunity to ratify or reject a peace agreement submitted to them in the form of a treaty?

The answer cannot be given in either an unconditional "Yes" or "No." The prospect, however, can only be regarded as one utterly deplorable, considering the record of the past and the transcendant importance of the decision to be made. Three times in a generation has such a peace measure been submitted as a treaty to the Senate and three times has the Senate minority accomplished such a veto.

Finally:

Fourth. Should such a minority in the Senate be given the opportunity to veto the peace by rejecting a treaty?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is "No." The conscience of mankind, the bleeding heart of Mother Humanity, the dictates of reason, the soul of justice, the tender spirit of mercy cry out against it. If they could speak, there would come a protest from all the dead who in that other World War hallowed the soil of foreign lands with their life's blood, and whose faith we failed to keep. There is a "No" from the living of today whose sacrifices are great—a "No" for every son, every husband, and every father slain on the battlefields of the aggressors.

All reason, all argument, all lessons of the past as well as the future welfare and security of all peoples, support a protest against again entrusting a great peace document to such a minority. Out of the bitterness of long and unhappy years, out of the graves of buried hopes, out of a past in which we can take no pride—a past of responsibilities evaded and opportunities ignored—comes to us the command that this incomparable decision be made by the Nation through a majority of the Nation's representatives. There is no better, no more democratic way for expressing the will of the American people than through a majority vote of both Houses of the American Congress. An approval of a peace agreement by such a vote will stamp the document with the Nation's approval—and from that action there can be no appeal.

CAN 33 SENATORS VETO PEACE?

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

Only a reckless prophet would predict the nature of the peace which, sooner or later, will be negotiated. Peace may come as a series of isolated break-downs in different areas, which will have to be dealt with on what the stockbrokers call a when, as, and if issued-basis. It might evolve from new and extended councils of war like that last month at Casablanca. Or it may take the form, as in 1918, of a general armistice followed by a full-dress peace conference. The possibilities in means of settlement are as various as the issues to be settled. Certainties are nonexistent, except perhaps one: This time the American people do not want the whole thing to end in a bitter partisan struggle in the United States Senate, with one-third plus one of the Senate having veto power over any treaty proposed. Even those who do not agree with John Hay that this provision "was the irreparable mistake of the Constitution" are uneasy over the prospect of another battalion of death.

MISTAKE OF 1919–20

The treaty fight of 1919–20 was a mixed affair. Not all the blame attaches to the Senators. President Wilson, like most men conscious of a high mission, regarded compromise as an evil weakness. But it must be admitted that even the best of compromises would have had a hard time dealing with the isolationists in the Senate. When we ought to have had nonpolitical and patriotic discussion of the treaty, too many statesmen were using the peace of the world as grist for the propaganda mill in the next election.

The idea that nobody wants another protracted dog fight has penetrated the Senate itself. Back in December, Senator ROBERT TAFT, in a debate on an executive agreement with Panama, pointed out, with a suggestion of nostalgia, that "today there is some sign of a general attempt to guide the foreign policy of the country by executive agreements." That is an understatement.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS CALLING FOR MAJORITY VOTES ONLY, AVAILABLE AS SUBSTITUTE FOR TREATY

Because the executive agreement can be endorsed by both Houses of Congress by a simple majority vote, instead of the two-thirds vote required for approval of a treaty by the Senate, the popularity of the executive agreements as a means of effecting arrangements with foreign countries has grown since the senatorial battle of the century in 1920. Almost half as many executive agreements have already been made in the 2 decades since the armistice of 1918 as in the 13 decades between 1789 and the armistice. These include agreements to set up a mixed-claims commission for Germany, to cancel the Lansing-Ishii agreement with Japan, to fund the war debts of Great Britain and other countries, to regulate radio communication with Canada, to alter the international courts in Chinese port cities, to stimulate reciprocal trade with various countries. Surely Lend-Lease and the Atlantic bases-50 destroyers deal affected the United States as definitely as we used to think the League of Nations would. Yet neither was presented to the Senate as a treaty.

Avoidance of the Senate minority's veto power over treaties is not new or unprecedented. The annexation of Texas was accomplished by a joint resolution of Congress after a treaty for the same purpose had been defeated in the Senate. More than 50 years later Hawaii was annexed to the Union by the same method and for the same reason. Something similar may happen again.

KIND OF PEACE

The peace should provide for a transitional police job, permanent machinery for adjusting disputes and dealing with aggressors, and a flexible framework for revising unworkable arrangements and easing international economic strains as they occur.

That kind of peace, which recognizes the limits as well as the extent of American responsibility and which provides for the eventual cooperation of all countries, including our present enemies, who cannot permanently be omitted, ought to have little serious trouble in Congress.

The American people will never be unanimous on the kind of peace they want. Already many conflicting voices are heard. Some people confine themselves to fascinating speculation on what they would do "if I could get my hands on Hitler." This is more profitable emotionally than politically, although a scholar as reasonable as Nathaniel Peffer advocates bombing Japanese cities even after Japan has been defeated, in order to teach the Japanese that "war is a terrible business." Such intrusions of supposedly moralistic purpose are best avoided, for the best way to learn that war does not pay is to lose a war. Other idealists, like Vice President WALLACE, will be satisfied with nothing less than a world-wide new deal, apparently with American county superintendents taking over the schools of Berlin and Tokyo to unwind the Nazi propaganda. Still others will want to sign almost anything and get back to the normalcy of the corner garage.

THE PRESIDENT'S DUTY

The President, if he is wise, will keep the leaders of Congress informed of what he is doing, for any agreement will be worthless without the support of Congress. This will

be more easily secured if the peace negotiators take account of realities and avoid fantastic Utopias which the American people sometimes delight to contemplate but never support for long. Our preliminary experience in north Africa with Europe's civil war suggests what will happen if we undertake to do for all the world what the world will eventually have to do for itself.

Post-war Program Requires Friends Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, these days we are all beginning to concern ourselves with post-war problems. How can we maintain high production in this country? How can we increase our exports? How can we maintain friendly relations with peoples of foreign nations? These questions have a direct relationship to our post-war problems. They are discussed intelligently and factually by Eliot Janeway in an article which appeared in a recent issue of Fortune magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Janeway's excellent discussion:

TRIALS AND ERRORS—UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY MUST MAKE FRIENDS WHERE THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY WILL NEED THEM

Of all post-war problems, few are more fundamental and none are more practical than that of exports. Between wars it is the only issue concerning foreign relations on which the United States public can be persuaded to approve constructive action, i. e., to help itself. As a matter of fact, a major reason why so many Americans are still reserving their final vote in the great debate over isolationism is that they fear that the United States economy has become too big, and domestic opportunity too little, to provide adequate employment as usual. They are suspending judgment until they can see how many jobs internationalism will produce via exports. Until a large-scale export program crystallizes, they are suspending judgment also on the various methods of financing trade.

The problems facing three countries, each determined to make itself a real power in the world, eloquently illustrate the opportunity awaiting the United States. The countries are China, India, and Brazil. Their troubles—like their prospects and their attitudes—are self-evident.

But United States exporting has troubles too. The reasons why the United States has not done nearly so well in the past as other exporting powers are familiar enough. In recent years a new and peculiarly American development has added to the handicap against which United States exporting has had to work.

This is the growth of what might be called billboard engineering. As tremendous and competing corporate capacities have strained to scoop up the last margin of domestic business, increasing emphasis has been placed on changes in style, on the ability of advertising to brand models as obsolescent. This practice may function as a necessary work maker domestically. But so far as exporting is concerned, the superstylized products of these high-powered and specialized capacities, which are oriented toward domestic need and taste, have become so many instances of conspicuous waste in markets like those of China, India, and Brazil.

The most obvious example of this is the streamlined, chrome-plated, high-speed family automobile. The American public will have nothing less. But these American models are built for competitive performance in congested urban traffic and along high-speed highways. Their designs have made their engines and tires inaccessible, and special tools are required for the most elementary adjustments and repairs. To a lesser extent, the same trend is apparent in our trucks.

Now, countries like China, India, and Brazil need transportation above everything else. They must have transportation in order to build roads and railroads and airports and machine shops. But they need a minimum of ornamentation and a maximum of simple utility. What they will really want are fleets of flivvers (cars and trucks), much higher powered than our own used to be, but immeasurably simpler than anything now made here, and, above all, standardized over a period of time as no car merchandised inside the United States can be.

Since other exporting powers are much closer to this kind of product than the United States, nothing would be more fatal than for us to sit back and take the attitude that our cars are the best in the world. If we expect our export trade to grow with these undeveloped countries—if we expect our cars and trucks to be the instruments of expansion in such economies—we shall have to design new lines for export. Other exporting powers may still be closer to the flivver stage than we are, but none of them can mass-produce a modernized flivver as we could once we set our minds to adapting our product to the needs of our most eager customers. Our wartime experience with motor transport in comparable areas has given us a vast and invaluable backlog of experience and personnel that can be put to good use when the time comes to develop models for export.

Countries like China, India, and Brazil can absorb literally unlimited units of construction equipment. But most American models have, like our automobiles, been gadgeted out of the range of such markets. If comparable ingenuity were devoted to simplifying and standardizing these machines for export, cost would be slashed and outlets abroad multiplied. There is no reason, for example, why a road scraper built for export to primitive areas should be loaded with a complicated mechanism enabling its wheels to follow the contour of the road. Nor is it necessary to streamline road rollers whose speed is 2½ miles an hour. This is conspicuous consumption.

These current models will frighten our potential customers away. Instead of trying to sell them our regular domestic products, which they could not use efficiently or service, we would do better to design a simplified export line of road- and trail-building machines as well as other basic construction equipment. A good deal of old-fashioned equipment, still perfectly usable, is scattered around the country in the hands of various local government agencies. Since most of these agencies would prefer to buy the latest models, these older machines could be profitably sold for export to areas where second-hand equipment would do as well as new.

In addition there is a basic need for an even more important project to be coordinated with such a program. In all the United States not one manufacturer is building a simple, light gasoline engine with interchangeable parts in two-, four-, and six-cylinder sizes. There will be an endless market for such engines, built for rough handling by irreverent natives, hitched up to everything from flivver busses to small electric-light plants.

The machine-tool field is full of similar examples. Any number of units are made for domestic use with as many as 47 speeds and feeds, although only 1 or 2 are really used. In some cases milling machines and lathes are sold as "universal machines" as if they would have to perform every operation in the plant where they and countless other similarly overloaded machines are installed. Nothing so elaborate, so costly, so difficult to keep in repair or requiring what might be called career men to run them is wanted in export markets like these 3 representative ones. Any machines not simplified to perform predetermined and relatively elementary jobs will create as much confusion and waste there as they would have in our own shops 30 and 50 years ago. The essence of the problem of organizing an orderly flow of exports to these semi-industrial economies is to re-create models in vogue in American industry before its developed uses for its present type of machinery.

Of course one of the serious obstacles in the way of the industrial ambitions of these countries is the lack of skilled labor and supervisory, servicing, and managerial personnel. The story of the tragic waste of American trucks on the Burma Road is a glaring instance. We must be prepared to cooperate with these countries by arranging to train groups of their personnel in our institutions and plants. Since the real limit of their capacity to absorb our products is set by their skilled labor force, more precisely by the number of people they have trained to operate American equipment, it would be profitable to charge training to the cost of production for export.

Another consideration that should be faced realistically is that of the size of the economic units to be created. The Chinese, for example, are desperately anxious to equip a modern steel plant on a scale they can operate. The capacity contemplated would be 300,000 tons a year (calling for some 2,500 workers, 1,800 of them mill labor), which is modest. Clearly, two projects to be immediately integrated with it are railroad equipment and farm implements (including foundries for both). The direct flow of steel into such supplementary channels would assure China of optimum exploitation of the steel industry she is most anxious to develop. The United States can serve China better than any other industrial power in these fields—if American industry is sufficiently imaginative and flexible not to expect China to absorb plants as large as our own.

A further illustration of such integration is that of cranes, which are among the most elementary and universal necessities of production. China makes no cranes today. She could easily, especially if she acquires modern steel facilities. But she would need antifriction bearings and engines. Thus, one basic project of a kind calculated to develop an economy starts up a kind of industrial perpetual motion. Every step in this Chinese development is as much in demand in Brazil, where an American steel project is under construction.

The scale on which plants can be launched and be expected to work well enough to snowball economic development in these 3 countries, runs somewhere between 100 and 300 employees. A shop designed to produce 200 medium-sized, simple lathes a year, for example, should be able to operate with only 150 production workers, 50 of them skilled. A plant designed to produce 100,000 sewing machines a year could be organized with only 22 really skilled workers. A bicycle plant, turning out some 200,000 units a year, could work with only 27 highly skilled people. A few dozen integrated plants learning how to operate on this scale would generate more

healthy economic activity (and imports) in these countries than more ambitious but indigestible and specialized plants.

Especially if transportation can give industrial centers some kind of scheduled access to the back country, such projects should be supplemented by much smaller village industries for the local output by the most elementary methods of every variety of small tool (hammers, chisels, files, shovels, screwdrivers, pliers, etc.). In each of these countries such tools could not fail to multiply the productivity of peasant labor, which, otherwise, might be years in receiving the benefits of industrialization; in many cases it would put the peasantry on a cash-crop basis. Since conditions in these countless villages are generally similar, United States industry could easily put the manufacture of package units for local hand-tool workers on a mass-production scale. The units would have to be standard in order for the importing countries to get the villages to use them. This is a really limitless market.

Another tremendous opportunity is offered by these countries in the field of mechanical refrigeration. Clearly, none of them are mass markets for United States refrigerators. But they are the world's greatest market for refrigeration manufacturers and engineers. Refrigerated abattoirs, simple refrigerator units for transportation of food, and larger units for governmental agencies operating in market areas will be in demand. For the first time in their history these countries will have to cope with organizing and controlling "mobile cold." This problem is organically connected with that of reorganizing agriculture and feeding the labor to be recruited into the plants these countries want. Right down to the detail of supplying ammonia, dry ice, and motors, it is a fascinating and humane challenge to the ingenuity of United States industry.

Since these countries lack the foundations necessary to support large-scale industrial operations, the most economic unit for modernization projects is a modest one. Their rivers, instead of being harnessed by modern dams and power plants, have run amuck for generations. Their soil is a shambles, and their forests are either jungle or nonexistent. In some parts of India, for example, many roads have been destroyed by jungle growth, while in others the lack of timber forces the people to dry manure for fuel instead of plowing it back into the earth as fertilizer. The planning and construction of dams, railroads, roads, power projects, and reforestation and land reclamation can help these countries create the wherewithal of plenty.

Once modern concentrations of electric power become available, China can move to overcome her crippling lack of oil. Her large coal deposits can be converted into liquid fuel (and valuable chemical byproducts) by the various processes Germany has employed to keep her fuel production underground; piping fuel from the pit head saves all the transportation required to move coal. China is also short of good iron ore. But she is experimenting now with various processes—related to the much-discussed sponge-iron method—for producing iron and steel from such ore bodies as she has.

Electrification in China faces another problem familiar to us. She happens to be deficient in copper and bauxite. But she does possess large deposits of alunite, the clay source of aluminum against the use of which the aluminum interests have kicked up such a row here. In Brazil (as in India), electrification would be much easier because bauxite deposits are very large there. Brazil now exports her bauxite and imports copper from Chile. If she produced her own aluminum, Chilean copper could be released for China.

But from the broader standpoint of our own national welfare, we must recognize that the only alternative to helping these countries realize their national aspirations during the next generation is to turn our backs. If we are too shortsighted to win their friendship, we may be sure that other powers will be wiser. It is time for us to realize that countries like China, India, and Brazil are not yet markets able to take our tremendous surpluses. If we have to export in order to live, we shall have to create markets large and modern enough to enable us to live well. The only way to do this is by helping these aspiring peoples to help themselves.

These peoples, whom we shall need as customers, we shall also need as friends; and, unless we win them as friends, we are likely to have little chance of getting their business. We dare not assume that international trade will be either an auction or a franchise dominated by those who bid in money values. We shall have to face the fact that we shall need these peoples as customers and friends more than they will need us as sources of supply, as protectors, or as partners.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News, Detroit, Mich., and also an article by the Commentator which appeared in the same issue of the Detroit News:

THE SOLDIER VOTE

A Congress genuinely anxious to provide the means by which 11,000,000 members of the armed forces may vote this fall will see that the means are provided. It will not be thwarted by the Bob Tafts wagging their heads over the legality of the only effective proposals now before the Congress. It will not give in to the obfuscators.

It will go ahead and provide for a simple ballot, designed to reach all absentees in uniform in time to be marked and returned before election. It will provide that these be turned over to the States on which will fall the burden of saying if the voter in each case was qualified by State law, subject only to the Federal statute of 1942 which abrogates State requirements for registration and poll-tax payment as they apply to members of the armed establishments.

If this appears to the Congress too simple to be right, it does not seem so to the President or to the generality of his countrymen. They are one with him in his concern over the fact that the vast majority of these 11,000,000 are to be deprived of their suffrage unless Congress acts promptly and adequately. They are one with him in an inability to understand why the fact that a man is in uniform should disqualify him from voting. They will forgive the President for speaking out on what is, as he says, a matter solely in the discretion of the legislative branch, because he says so well what is in the mind of every American who knows what the things are—beginning with a free suffrage—for which these millions are in arms.

The test faced by Congress is not entirely one of its competence to draw a proper law. It is primarily one of its sincerity, and whether it is truly disposed to look to the interests of those who stand between us and destruction, who maintain no pressure lobby to bulldoze the wavering statesman, but who do expect that as fundamental a right as the ballot will not be withheld from one who, more than most of us, has earned it, and who leaves to us the responsibility of seeing that it is not denied to him. Even the political trimmer must know that the wrath of so many, if they are unfairly dealt with, will be his own undoing in good time. It will not be smart to stand in the way of the soldier vote. On the contrary it will be the intelligent thing to give it every assistance because it is the right thing.

THE COMMENTATOR—VOTES FOR SERVICEMEN

When Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, popped off, without reflection, against the President's message to Congress in favor of votes for soldiers and others in the national service, the tongue in his cheek was joined by the foot in his mouth.

His words, and the raucous laughter of Republicans while the speech was being read, are likely to cost the Republican Party dearly for a few moments of bitter pleasure. For they put the Republican Party in the position of declaring that voting by the armed forces must be facilitated as little as possible, lest the force vote for the President's reelection.

The obvious tactics of those who oppose the President's reelection, and they include men in both parties, were to remain silent, and attempt to amend the Green-Lucas bill as much as possible. By clever reasoning, they might succeed in weakening the measure so that both Houses would become disgusted with it. They might send to the White House a bill that the President would be compelled to veto—whereupon they could accuse him of insincerity. Or if he signed it, the bill might prove so ineffective as to make voting impossible for millions of servicemen.

But no. Senator TAFT had to spout; and he comes up for reelection this fall.

It seems to the Commentator that the position no Member of Congress of either party can afford to take is that men eligible to vote at home should be deprived of their vote when they are fighting for their country, if there is any possible way of letting them vote. The effort should be to find such a way. Maybe the Green-Lucas bill cannot accomplish that object in full, but it seems to go a long distance toward it. One thing it does is to demand that the military and naval authorities provide facilities. Congress has a right to do that, and should do it.

Insuring Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Insuring Prosperity" which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This editorial refers to the recent hearings before the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on Senate Joint Resolution 80, to prohibit the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts. The editorial highlights the importance of reducing war production

costs, particularly through the development of incentives toward greater efficiency, as a means of helping manufacturers of America to adjust their operations to post-war conditions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURING PROSPERITY

Nothing is more important in adjusting this country to post-war economic conditions than to help American industry recover its efficiency. Efficiency is measured by low unit costs. On the whole it has been disregarded in this war by the pressure to turn out war goods for a ready-made market. In general there has been neither time nor experience available for the purpose of checking costs. It has been left to the renegotiation procedure to siphon off undue profits after the contracts have been filled. But this very procedure has encouraged the padding of costs, lest the savings brought about by efficiency be all taken by the renegotiation boards. The result in all its ramifications has been unfortunate. Cost padding has been expressed by the hoarding of valuable materials and labor. It has wasted public money, bred inflation, and left industry in a bad situation to meet post-war competition, when markets will go to the efficient.

Mention has been made of this compelling problem on previcus occasions. But the implications of the necessarily sloppy way of letting war contracts do not seem to have been sufficiently realized hitherto to permit forthright action to be taken. So it is satisfactory to note the announcement by Mr. Nelson before the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that "the Procurement Policy Board has adopted the policy that concerted attack will be made on the pricing of contracts in all the agencies to spur a reduction of costs." By this time enough experience must have been gathered of our wartime industrial operations to enable the procurement officials to insist upon equitable repricing. That experience is available in the renegotiation boards. Since April 1942 these boards have been examining industrial data with a view to skimming off the cream of excess profits. But from the start they were intended to furnish the procurement officials with those data so that new contracts could be let intelligently—that is to say, economically. By mid-1945 at the latest they will be dissolved. So that the task has been expedited of basing prices of war goods in accordance with the knowledge of what industry can accomplish in the light of the know-how that has been built up.

At one time we suggested that the issue was of such moment that arbitrary repricing would be in order, with the renegotiation boards left to renegotiate contracts upward in case prices turned out to be too low for reasonable profit making. Now, according to Mr. Nelson, there is evidence that business will cooperate in the new campaign to reduce the costs of doing war business. It is, of course, a matter of self-interest to our businessmen so to cooperate. Some of them, to our knowledge, have become uneasy about the wartime cloud over industrial efficiency. But after so many bad practices have grown up, the decision to give them a concerted prod by widespread governmental repricing is necessary. Mr. Nelson says that the process of cost cutting will be encouraged by other means as well. There will be rewards and penalties. Thus a businessman who cuts his costs and therefore his prices to the Government will be allowed to retain some of his savings instead of having them taken by the renegotiators. Stiffer renegotiation will be exacted, correspondingly, of the inefficient, so that these will show reduced earnings. Here is an incentive which should pave the way back to that economy in operations which is the traditional hallmark of American industry and upon which the entire country will depend for post-war prosperity.

Peace Aims of America—Russian Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the President by the National Council for Prevention of War, and also the second and concluding portion of an editorial entitled "Constants in Russian Foreign Policy," published in the December 1943 issue of the magazine, the Nineteenth Century and After, a British publication. I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing this matter, which is $105.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Before the Anglo-American forces embark on the difficult and costly adventure of invading western Europe, would it not be fair to the American people, and particularly to their sons who will participate in the invasion, to broadcast to the world our peace aims in the hope that they will appeal to all peoples as the promise of an honorable and worthy peace?

That the American people do not know what they are fighting for is a matter of general comment. The Russian people know that they are fighting to overthrow the Hitlerites and drive them from Russian soil. The British people know that they are fighting, not only to defeat Hitler, but also to assure if possible the future power and prestige of the British Empire. China, too, knows that she is fighting for liberation and for a position of influence in the new order that the Allies hope to establish.

But the American people are not at all clear as to what constructive purposes are to be achieved by military victory either in Europe or in Asia. Even our soldiers, for whose right to vote both you and every Member of Congress are justly solicitous, are reported as not being able to explain what the war is about. Our war correspondents at the front report that when a soldier is asked, "What are you fighting for?" the stock answer is, "To get the war over with and get home." Don't you think they would be more interested in knowing what they are asked to die for than in deciding between Republican and Democratic candidates next November?

The question is particularly pressing right now because you have warned the Nation in the most solemn manner not to expect an early and easy victory, but to anticipate a bloody year. One of your highest officials has predicted that the cost of our invading western Europe may be a half-million casualties. While, as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, you have the unquestioned right to engage in any undertaking which you and the General Staff believe will bring military victory to our arms, does not so momentous an enterprise call for frank consultation with your fellow countrymen as well as with Stalin and Churchill?

The question is not a constitutional but a moral question. It was not very long ago that you proudly signed your name to your tax bill as the employee of "the people of the United States." Vice President WALLACE still calls this a people's war. Yet the American people have not yet been informed even regarding the decisions that were made at Tehran by yourself, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, as to what is to be done with Europe after the projected military victory.

The Atlantic Charter is sometimes mentioned in connection with post-war Europe. It has been adhered to by Russia and our other allies as the basis of our joint effort. It is fair to say that its broad principles, despite their vagueness, have been accepted as the goals of the United Nations in this war.

Not unfortunately the Atlantic Charter has become encrusted with private interpretations, reservations, and exceptions. It means one thing to Russia and quite a different thing to Poland and the Baltic States. It means one thing to India and China and another thing to Great Britain. It is rapidly becoming a divisive influence among its signatories rather than a unifying force. Is it not high time that you, as one of its two authors, state to the world how you and your fellow countrymen interpret it and how you expect its broad principles to be translated into specific agreements that will promote freedom and democracy throughout the world?

There is one grave possibility that is being mentioned more and more frequently in the press and on the radio as likely to follow the Anglo-American invasion of western Europe. I refer to the domination of Europe by Soviet Russia. The distinguished British statesman, General Smuts, in his famous address on November 25, is quoted as having said that the destruction of Germany's power will leave Russia "as the new colossus in Europe, the new colossus that bestrides this Continent." If General Smuts is correct in his judgment, this is a factor in the situation of enormous importance to the American people. Should they not be informed by you as to whether you share General Smuts' opinion? For this outcome of the war would be remote indeed from the goals that have been held out to us hitherto.

The American people are a just and generous people. Members of the Senate and House report that they are receiving thousands of letter at this very moment pleading for a just and lasting peace. We are also a freedom-loving people, opposed to the enslavement of other peoples under a cruel totalitarian dictatorship, whether of the right or of the left. We would feel bitterly disillusioned if we should some day find that the control of Europe had merely been transferred from Hitler to Stalin. There are strong grounds for believing that there are many people in England who would regard such an outcome as a death blow to Britain as a great power.

Unconditional surrender as an objective was apparently abandoned at Tehran. The Free Germany Committee in Moscow seems to be trying to fill the vacuum thus created with a Russian proposal of peace to a non-Hitlerite Germany following the evacuation of Russian soil. May one respectfully urge that you are the one to voice in behalf of your own people, the United Nations and the world a proposal of the terms of a great

peace that would bring comfort and rejoicing to the hungry and desolate millions who are now without hope?

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK J. LIBBY,
Executive Secretary.

CONSTANTS IN RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Concluded)

IV

Just as the rest of the world misjudged Russia before she fought Germany, so Russia misjudged the rest of the world, Germany in particular. She assumed that Great Britain and the United States, being "capitalist" powers, would therefore want Germany to attack Russia and defeat her.[1] But it was the confident Russian expectation that Germany and the western powers would exhaust one another in World War No. 2 and so make Russia the master of Europe. Russia believed that this would be the result of the German-Russian Treaty of 1939—commonly known as the Ribbentrop-Molotov Agreement—which, as she imagined, confirmed the immunity of Russia from German attack and would, therefore, make her arbiter in Europe.

Speaking on March 29, 1940, Mr. Molotov said of this agreement that it "removed the possibility of friction in Soviet-German relations," that all attempts in Great Britain and America to "intimidate Russia by the prospect of the growth of Germany's might" had been "swept aside as worthless" and that the "good neighborly and friendly relations that have been established between the Soviet Union and Germany are not based on fortuitous considerations of a transient nature, but on the fundamental interests of both the U. S. S. R. and Germany."[2]

It seemed, in those days, to many objective observers on the European mainland, that Germany would not be defeated—that, although exhausted and perhaps not the incontestable victor, she would be relatively strong by comparison with the battered Western Powers, but weak by comparison with Russia. And this, would have suited Russia's purpose, for Germany would then, indeed, have served her as a semi-dependent, or even a dependent ally in pursuit of a policy that would make Russia the master. And indeed, on October 31, 1939, Mr. Molotov, having declared that "relations with Germany had radically improved" and that "the Polish State * * * had actually ceased to exist," went on to say that "we (i. e., Russia) have always held that a strong Germany is an indispensable condition for durable peace in Europe."[3]

The German attack on Russia transformed the situation that existed when Mr. Molotov spoke these words. But the transformation has not been as radical as is generally supposed.

Strength in politics is always relative. Russia, no doubt, wants a weak Germany. But weak in relation to what? In relation to Russia, of course. Russia needs a subservient Germany. She is the first of the Allied Powers to demand reparations. But reparations presuppose a solvent economy. To pay reparations, a country must produce. A victorious Russia might destroy German immovable plant and transfer German movable plant—and German skilled labor—to the Urals. But her gain would be short-lived, for the movable plant would soon be obsolete and German skilled labor would deteriorate. Russia would gain far less than she could gain if she established with Germany a relationship that would, while reducing German military power, sustain her productive power.

In one respect the situation today differs radically from the situation that would have arisen out of a conflict confined to Germany and the Western Powers. Thanks to Russia's military achievement, Germany is much weaker and Great Britain much stronger than she would otherwise have been. But it seems to us that the difference is not as big as it might appear.

But England has one great weakness—she is not conscious of her strength. Her military effort is much more impressive than her political effort. She wants to break the enemy and keep him broken, that is certain. But beyond that she wants little—and what that little is, she hardly knows. She has a governing class that is in a process of abdication, and a rising class that is bureaucratic, managerial, without faith, without width or depth, contemptuous of knowledge, suspicious of originality, and not even class conscious. The military effort of a nation is always the effort of the people. It may be impaired by mismanagement and bad generalship. The spirit of the people will overcome these defects. But the foreign policy of a nation is always determined by the governing class, and if that class is abdicating, its foreign policy will be a policy of appeasement. And today, despite her military vigor and initiative, Great Britain's foreign policy has neither vigor nor initiative. It is a policy of appeasement as it was before the war—appeasement, no longer of Germany, but of the United States and of Russia.

In the United States and in Russia the governing classes are strongly self-conscious. They are determined to augment, or at least to maintain, their power at home, and to achieve national greatness in the world. That is why the United States and Russia do not, as England does, regard the war as no more than a job to be finished, that is why they both look beyond the war. Russia looks beyond it with great intensity of vision—she knows what she wants, and she means to get it, both in the war and after.

Happily England has so far been spared the immense slaughter of her youth which she suffered in the last war. Her younger generation, critical, empirical, contemptuous of all those ideologies (which make the contemporary world a world of superstitution) wild sometimes and undisciplined, but fundamentally decent and generous, holds the promise that there will be a revival of her peculiar genius—her political genius which has been the making of her national and imperial greatness.

The United States are far away and nothing that may happen in Europe could conceivably be a mortal menace to them. They may, after the war, participate more closely than ever before in European affairs or they may withdraw into isolation. But whichever course they take, it will be determined by the preponderance of sectional interests and preferences, not by a national necessity.

Great Britain, on the other hand, is committed to Europe. She and Europe are one. The preponderance of any one power in Europe is a matter that concerns her future and the future of her Empire. It is never the concern of any one party, interest, or class, but always of the nation as a whole.

Russia is determined on achieving an effective hegemony in Europe. If she is successful, she will owe her success to her strong will and her clear purpose as much as to her immense natural strength and her prodigious military achievement.

V

Stalin has changed his policy so many times and has committed so many inconsistencies that he is credited with being a complete opportunist. But it will be found, upon examination, that the changes and inconsistencies are often more apparent than real, and that he is more faithful to the teachings of Marx and Lenin than is generally supposed, especially in the realm of foreign affairs.

It seems inconsistent, for example, that there should be formed in Moscow a "Free German Committee" in which Conservatives, officers of high rank, and even a National Socialist, should preponderate, rather than the Communists and the Social Democrats, and that the colors displayed at the opening ceremony were not the Red flag, not the German Republican black, red, and gold, but the German Imperial black, white, and red. But it is certainly realistic. Neither the German Communists nor the Social Democrats have any influence in Germany. They went down unresisting in 1933 and have been unable to rally since. As a potential opposition to the National Socialist dictatorship they must be written off. That the Russians have no use for them, while in England they are taken seriously, merely shows that the Russians understand the German situation and that the English do not.

But does not Russia want a revolutionary rather than a conservative Germany? The answer is that a revolution, carried out by the German left, with Russian support, could not last—and perhaps could not even begin. It would have to be imposed by a Russian army of occupation and would destroy the Germany economic order. But a revolution carried out by the right—that is to say, by National Socialists (though perhaps without Hitler and his immediate collaborators), and by Prussian officers, would not only be more genuine, more revolutionary, than one carried out by the left, it could also last and could preserve the Russian-controlled German economic order, or as much of it as the Russians wish to control for their own use. Stalin himself recognized in national socialism a revolutionary movement.[4]

The mistake made in western countries, under the influence of German Socialists and in the belief that the purpose of every revolution is individual liberty, has been to regard the German right as counterrevolutionary, whereas it has been much more revolutionary than the left. Revolution, as understood by the Russians, is the end of individual liberty. To the English it is the reaffirmation of individual liberty. To the Germans it may be either, but to the National Socialists revolution means the end of individual liberty.

VI

A volume of Marshal Stalin's speeches entitled "Problems of Leninism"[5] was published in 1939. It has run through 11 editions and has circulated in millions of copies. It is to the Russians what Hitler's Mein Kampf is

---

[1] This has not, as far as we are aware, been stated in print. But we have abundant evidence from persons who were in Russia at the time, that this was the view taken by the Russian public and by members of the ruling bureaucracy. It was even believed in Russia that the Munich Agreement was designed by Great Britain to maneuver Germany into an attack on Russia. This belief is shared and expressed by Walter Lippmann, in his recent book American Foreign Policy. Mr. Lippmann may understand his own country, but on Europe he is hopelessly superficial and ill informed.

[2] Molotov, Soviet Peace Policy (p. 13). Mr. Pritt, in his preface to this book, informs us that Mr. Molotov "says what he means and means what he says." Mr. Molotov was equally optimistic about Italy (p. 73).

[3] Ibid., pp. 31–32.

[4] Namely, Emil Ludwig's Führer Europas (p. 319).

[5] J. Stalin, Voprosi Leninizma (Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo politicheskoi literaturi, 1939).

to the Germans—the principal repository of official political doctrine. Some of the speeches were made as far back as 1924, the year when Mein Kampf was completed. They show that the difference between Stalin and Trotzky lies in their tactics, not in their ultimate purpose. It will be seen that Russia, in her foreign policy, pursues this purpose today, and that apparent inconsistencies—the different treatment accorded to Czechoslovakia and to Poland, for example, have an ultimate consistency.

Of the October revolution—that is, the revolution of 1917—Stalin says [6] that it constitutes the first stage of world revolution and a mighty base for its further development. On the despotic character of the Russian regime, even after the new constitution of 1936 was enacted, Stalin is categorical, showing that the regime bears no resemblance to democracy as understood in western Europe:

"I have to admit that the draft of the new constitution does in fact leave the * * * dictatorship of the working class in force, just as it retains without change the present leading position of the Communist Party." [7]

And—

"The state is a machine in the hands of the governing class for suppressing the resistance of its class antagonists. In this respect the dictatorship of the proletariat differs in no way essentially from the dictatorship of any other class." [8]

And—

"In U. S. S. R. there is no basis for several parties, and, therefore, for the freedom of such parties." [9]

The old hostility to social democracy, that is, to the labor parties of the Second International, remains—

"It is impossible to finish off capitalism without having finished off social democracy in the working-class movement." [10]

Every movement of national independence must be supported, no matter to what class its leaders belong, provided that its success will advance the world revolution—

"The Afghan Emir's struggle for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchial type of views held by the Emir and his supporters, because it weakens, disintegrates, undermines imperialism." [11]

And—

"There are times when the national movements for the individual oppressed countries come into conflict with the interests of the development of the proletarian movement. It goes without saying that in such cases there cannot be any talk of support. * * * In the forties of last century Marx supported the national movement of the Poles and the Hungarians against the national movement of the Czechs and southern Slavs. Why? Because the Czechs and Southern Slavs were then reactionary nations, Russian outposts in Europe, outposts of imperialism, whereas the Poles and Hungarians were 'revolutionary nations' fighting against absolutism." [12]

Although today the Poles and Czechs are fighting for national independence against the same enemy, the Poles who were a revolutionary nation, because they were not a Russian "outpost," are today a "reactionary nation" for the same reason. The Czechs were "reactionary" because they were a Russian outpost, but are, for the same reason, "revolutionary" today. The Poles and Czechs have not changed, but Russia has.

The Poles were regarded as the revolutionary nation par excellence by Marxists. They were opponents to czarism within its own frontiers, and of the pan-Slav movements which was the instrument of czarist imperialism abroad. But the Czechs were friendly even to czarist Russia, and they were, on the whole, in favor of the pan-Slav movement. Today the Poles, although fighting for independence against the Germans, are also determined to be independent of Soviet Russia. They are opposed to the revived pan-Slav movement because it is the instrument of Russian imperialism, now as before—and has been revived for no other reason. They have, therefore, become counterrevolutionaries in Russian eyes, all the more so as they are unamenable to communism. The Comintern was dissolved, as the western world was led to believe. But what was known as dissolution was, in reality, something different. The Comintern, when on the defensive, was concentrated within the Russian fortress, as it were. But it has now taken the offensive, and was for that reason mobilized and sent into action, each national Communist Party operating on its own national sector. That there is hardly any communism in Poland makes it all the more necessary for the Russians, from their point of view, not only to annex half the country, the eastern half,[13] but to insist in advance that the rest of Poland have a "friendly government"—friendly, that is, to Russia, and therefore subservient to Russia. It is true that Stalin has declared that Poland shall be strong and independent. But to the Russians this means that Poland—or rather the western half (for the eastern is not considered Poland any longer but a part of the Soviet Union)—is to be strong in the only way they regard as possible, namely, to be a Russian dependency, later on to become a member of the Soviet Union. And by independent the Russians mean that Poland shall be independent just as the different republics of the Union are independent—independent, that is to say, of capitalists, landowners, and imperialists, though not of the centralized Russian state.

The Czechs, or at least those of their ruling class, or that part of it which is represented by Dr. Benes, are pan-Slav and pro-Russian still. They are, therefore, the favorites of Russia today. Their function, as conceived by Russia, is to be an instrument of Russian domination in central Europe. Dr. Benes is, as it were, Stalin's prospective commissar, in what is to be the Russian version of the present German-controlled "protektorat."

The western frontiers of Russia, as indicated on Russian official maps, since 1941, and proclaimed in numerous official speeches and Army orders, include not only eastern Poland and the Baltic states, but also Bessarabia and Moldavia. Beyond these regions, there are others—Bulgaria, for example, Serbia, perhaps Slovenia, Hungary, Austria, and East Prussia and, perhaps, the northern part of Norway,[14] which are conceived as Russian semi-dependencies or at least as within the Russian sphere of interest, with the purpose of dominating the central European industrial area and of securing access to the Atlantic, the Aegean, and, perhaps through Slovenia, to the Adriatic. Similar phenomena are observable in Asia. Russia will not go to war with Japan except, perhaps, in the last stage to expel the Japanese from Manchuria, there to establish a friendly government. The Russian penetration of Persia has gone far, even now. Even in Tehran, where the Russians share the control with the British and the Americans, there is a distinct Russian ascendancy and a powerful Russian influence in Persian internal politics, an influence that will make itself felt in the next Persian elections, with the purpose of securing access to the Persian Gulf.

There is not, and cannot be, the slightest opposition to Russian foreign policy in Russia itself—or indeed, any opposition of any sort, except amongst some of the Asiatic border populations, especially in Caucasia, where it is too localized to be effective. Only the Red Army has an independent spirit, but it is the chief supporter, indeed one of the driving forces in Russian foreign policy. Demobilization will certainly confront Stalin with a most difficult problem. In 1887 Bismarck wrote to Lord Salisbury that the Russian Government would have to consider "the need of giving employment to a numerous and able army, to satisfy the ambition of its generals, and to divert toward foreign policy the attention of the liberals who demand changes in the constitution." [15] Today officers and men of the Red Army are Russia's liberals, in the sense that they not only feel but openly express the need for more freedom—for something that resembles what in western Europe is called democracy. The Russian people as a whole would demand changes in the constitution, if they could, but only the armed forces might be able to do so effectively. Many of them, no doubt, will be transferred to Russian industry and agriculture when the war is over, but for the elite there will be much to do abroad.

Russia sees the prospect of securing abroad all she has coveted throughout her history. Her foreign policy has undergone many changes, but it has certain constants that always bring it back to where it was—and always with cumulative effect.

THE EDITOR.

---

[6] P. 105.
[7] P. 523.
[8] P. 29.
[9] P. 523.
[10] P. 181.
[11] P. 48.
[12] P. 47.

[13] The annexation has been announced many times, most recently by Mr. Umansky (namely, his broadcast from Mexico as reported in the press on Nov. 15); namely, also Soviet War News (November 4), Anniversary Slogans for the Soviet People, which (Slogan 25) refers to Moldavians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and Karelians, as "brothers and sisters"—belonging, that is to say, to the family of Soviet Republics. Ukrainians and Byelorussians are referred to in the same terms—they include the Ukrainian and Byelorussians (White Ruthenians) of eastern Poland. The Poles in this region are regarded as Russian subjects (namely, Poland, Russia, Great Britain, The Nineteenth Century and After June, 1943). With regard to Moldavia, namely, Soviet War News, August 5, 1943.

[14] Russia is promoting disintegration amongst the Nordic states as well as amongst the states of the middle zone between the Baltic and the Aegean. She is opposing any collaboration between Norway, Finland, and Sweden, or even between Norway and Sweden only. At the same time she is representing the Norwegian underground movement as the only movement representing the Norwegian people. On November 14 the Moscow wireless broadcast an article that was published in The War and the Working Class. This article is not only against Finland, but also against Sweden, and, above all, against the formation of any Nordic bloc. Russian hostility to a federation of the middle zone is relentless (namely, for example, The War and the Working Class, as quoted in the Times, August 18, 1943).

[15] Bismarck to Lord Salisbury, November 22, 1887. German Diplomatic Documents, Vol. I, p. 347 (Methuen).

On the Eve of Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, literally millions of American homes are shrines of prayer these days as the moment of European invasion draws rapidly near. The tales of thrilling success in achieving military landings on Pacific islands dominated by the Japanese, the brilliant invasion of Italy, have given the Nation hope that the cost in American lives may not reach the staggering figures our military leadership fears. Yet all of us realize that by comparison with these operations, the frontal attack upon western Europe, wherever and whenever it may come, must be a military effort vastly more dangerous, vastly more costly in human life and courage than anything the world has ever known before.

From the moment the vast armada sets sail from British shores to land across the channel somewhere in Europe, the danger of attack from the skies and from concealed shore batteries must be faced. The risks are so tremendous that they are almost incomprehensible to all but the most objective military mind.

It should be a first principle of our own Government and the governments of our allies to do everything possible to reduce these risks. One way to reduce them has scarcely been exploited or observed. The peoples of Europe, we have good reason to believe, are eagerly awaiting the hour of their liberation. No matter what we may think of the Petain regime in France, we are certain that millions of Frenchmen, trained to a fervent belief in liberty, equality, fraternity, are ready to strike with our landing troops against the Boche. Millions of others in enslaved Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg are equally prepared to strike for liberation.

There must be millions more in such countries as Denmark, Norway, Austria, and every satellite nation of Europe, as well as millions of Germans, who are praying for the day when the war ends and Germany is reduced to the rank of a minor military power. What can our United Nations do before invasion to give heart to these people, both inside and outside Europe?

The world today needs a new "Fourteen Points." It needs the affirmation by the accredited spokesmen of the United Nations of a program for a better world order. So far, the vaguely generous platitudes of the Atlantic Charter have not been defined. No one knows what these platitudes mean specifically. The Poles do not know whether the United Nations have agreed upon the Curzon line or some other boundary for postwar Poland. The Finns, despite our constant importuning for them to "get out of the war," were never told that the United Nations were prepared to guarantee Finnish independence. Even the Free French, fighting valiantly at our side, are in doubt as to the part intended for them in the post-war world.

This is the time—before the invasion begins—for our governments to issue a joint statement to the peoples of the Old World. Tell the people of Bulgaria, of Hungary, of Austria, of Yugoslavia, of Greece, of Norway, of Denmark that they are to play an important, proud, self-respecting role in the world we are fighting to build. Give them courage and reason to welcome the doughboy who may be fighting on their soil in the not far distant future.

Apparently, our leadership has forgotten the importance and the power of the spoken word. When people understand that responsible governments offer them a better chance for decent living by withdrawing from a war forced upon them by others than even their most optimistic visions resulting from victory, they will not long choose to continue the fight.

We have seen to our sorrow how Adolf Hitler and his propagandists neutralized nation after nation in Europe through skillful deception. Promises never seriously intended, treaties written only to gain time, diplomatic conversations discussing already accomplished facts were Nazi Germany's stock in trade. The European world has confidence in our country's pledged word.

This is surely the moment when the United Nations should capitalize upon that confidence. Demoralizing the will of Nazi Europe to resist the army of liberation may hasten the end of the war and save the lives of boys dear to all of us. We must not fail to exert every possible effort to achieve this result.

Senate Report 310

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that a copy of a letter written by the Secretary of the Interior to Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, dated July 6, 1943, in relation to Senate Report 310 be inserted in the RECORD. This letter appears in the hearings held by the Indian Affairs Committee of the House while considering the recommendations made by the committee of the Senate as reported in said Senate Report 310. I do this particularly for the reason that the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman COCHRAN, inserted in the RECORD recently the recommendations contained in the Senate report.

The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 6, 1943.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Your share in the substantial progress that has been made in our administration of Indian affairs during the past decade is so large that it comes as a great shock to find your name attached to a document which contains as many false charges against the record of this administration in Indian affairs as are contained in the "partial report" issued on June 11 by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, under your chairmanship.

The main recommendations of this report are, briefly:

1. That all Indian day schools on allotted reservations be promptly closed (p. 22).
2. That all Indian boarding schools, wherever situated, be closed at the end of the present fiscal year (p. 21).
3. That all Federal payments of tuition for Indian pupils in local public schools be stopped (pp. 7, 20).
4. That all Indian hospitals be abandoned as hospitals for Indians and turned over to the United States Public Health Service for its miscellaneous uses (pp. 9, 22).
5. That the management of Indian forests be transferred to the Department of Agriculture (p. 20).
6. That the Bureau of Indian Affairs be promptly liquidated (pp. 17–22).
7. That all Indian tribal funds be distributed per capita (p. 22).
8. That Federal protection be withdrawn from all Indian property so that such property may be immediately subjected to taxation and alienation (pp. 8–9, 21–22).

Most, if not all, of these recommendations strike at the heart of policies which you have hitherto championed and sponsored. Knowing of your deep concern for the welfare of the Indians in Oklahoma and in all other States, I can only surmise that in signing the document in question you placed confidence in the accuracy of an investigator who did not merit such confidence, and that you will be glad to have brought to your attention the erroneous allegations that vitiate this "partial report."

Let me call to your attention, first, a few inaccuracies which, while typical of many others contained in this document, relate to matters so readily subject to objective verification that their inclusion in the report is particularly hard to justify.

1. At pages 2 and 3, the report charges that the Indian Bureau has built up the Indian population to 400,000 on paper in order to justify larger appropriations. This charge is demonstrably fictitious. Indian Office estimates of Indian population have erred, if at all, on the side of conservatism. In the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1942 you estimated that there were 140,000 Indians in Oklahoma. The figure given by the Indian Office for Oklahoma at that time was 105,437. Again, the estimate of Indians in North Carolina on January 1, 1940, made by the Bureau of the Census (which, the report suggests (pp. 2, 3, 21), is more competent and objective than the Indian Service), amounts to 22,000. The comparable figure used by the Indian Service was 3,472. These discrepancies are accounted for by the fact that the Indian Service excludes from consideration a very large number of persons who have some Indian blood but who are not Indians in a social or political sense.

2. At page 6 the statement is made that Indians own approximately 3 percent of the land area of the United States and constitute less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total population, from which the conclusion is drawn that they own 100 times their share of the land area of this country. The arithmetic of this statement is no better than its economics. Three percent is 10, not 100, times three-tenths of 1 percent. The absurdity of measuring urban real estate against the marginal and submarginal lands of most Indian reservations to compute the meaningless equal share in the land area of the United States owned by each inhabitant is unworthy of a serious approach to the Indian land problem.

3. The report states at page 9: "The Indian Bureau duplicates the functions of the Federal Division of Forestry and Grazing." There is no Federal Division of Forestry and Grazing.

4. The report goes on to say: "There is no longer any excuse for this duplication, and especially so since the Indian Reorganization Act turned over Indian forests and range lands to the public domain under the Taylor Grazing Act." This is a complete fiction. No Indian forests or range lands were turned over to the public domain by the Indian Reorganization Act. On the contrary, that act permitted the restoration to Indian ownership of certain former Indian lands previously held for disposal under the public land laws.

5. The report states at page 10 that "one little tribe, the Tongue River, in Montana, has $2,125,502.93 from the Indian credit fund." This is an exaggeration of more than 1,400 percent. Actually the Tongue River Tribe has $146,715 owing to the United States. The two million figure represents an addition 10 times over of amounts which have been or will be loaned to the tribe each spring over a 10-year period and repaid in the fall after the fall sale of cattle. The tribe has punctually filled its engagements for some years under this agreement.

6. The report charges at page 10 that administration of a revolving loan fund of $4,558,400 (not $10,000 as alleged in the report at page 9) costs $741,200. This is incorrect. The latter figure is an over-all figure which includes the cost of administering $2,708,126.83 of industrial reimbursable loans and $1,486,056.62 of tribal loan funds in addition to the $4,500,000 revolving loan fund.

7. In the portion of the report containing recommendations, it is charged (p. 19) that the Bureau secured $100,000 from private foundations for research in Indian education, and the recommendation is put forward that this procedure be stopped. The fact is that no money has been secured or asked for the Indian Bureau from any private foundation for research in Indian education.

8. The report urges (p. 19) that the abandonment of Federal control of Indian law and order outside of tribal lands would save the Government $250,000 a year. Actually the elimination of Indian Service law enforcement activities as suggested would probably not save the Government any money at all; equivalent services would then have to be performed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States attorneys' offices, and other law-enforcement agencies. But it certainly could not save $250,000 since the total amount now spent in this connection is only $157,000.

9. In its concluding recommendations the report urges (pp. 20–21) that the United States "cease all land purchase under the Indian Reorganization Act," estimating the annual savings to be achieved thereby as "indeterminate but amounting to several million." There are no current appropriations for any such land purchases. The last appropriation made under this heading was contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1942 (Pub. Law 136, 77th Cong.), and amounted to $325,000.

10. A further recommendation, to eliminate all day schools except those on unallotted reservations, is justified on the ground that it will "result in a saving of approximately $2,000,000 to the Federal Government." The total cost of day schools on allotted reservations is not $2,000,000 but $408,200. And little if any of this cost would be saved by eliminating such schools unless the Federal Government also abandoned its present practice of giving financial aid to local school districts to the extent that they extend facilities to considerable Indian groups.

The foregoing are not the most serious of the inaccuracies which your subcommittee's partial report contains, but merely the most readily correctable among them. If all of these inaccuracies were merely the product of carelessness, and if the fact that they are prejudicial to the record of the administration were a mere coincidence, it would be sufficient to say that the number and extent of them render this report unworthy of the standards which the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and its investigating subcommittee have sought to maintain for many years.

Underlying all of the misstatements in this partial report is a single thesis as to the source of all the evils of the present situation and a sublime trust in a single panacea for the solution of all these evils. The thesis is that whatever is bad in Indian administration is ascribable to selfish, grasping, incompetent administrators. The proposed panacea is the elimination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The diagnosis ignores a century and half of history and an impressive body of statutes and treaties recognizing and implementing Federal responsibilities to Indian groups. You must realize as well as I how large a part of the unhappiness which this report ascribes to Indian Bureau maladministration is really the result of accumulated historic wrongs which this administration is gradually and persistently correcting. You, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs since 1935, and as a member of that committee for about 8 years prior to that date, must know how large a part of the policies which this partial report condemns is a product of legislation which you and fellow members of your subcommittee have sponsored and helped to enact.

Let me again offer not an exhaustive list, but a typical list, of instances in which the partial report ascribes to current administrative incompetence or perversity situations which are either ancient wrongs now in the process of correction or deliberate policies approved by the Congress and faithfully administered by the executive arm of the Government:

1. The report suggests (at p. 20) that the Federal Government might save $5,000,000 a year by not contributing to States and school districts serving considerable Indian populations. This is contrary to a legislative policy which has been vigorously maintained by members of your subcommittee. Indeed it has been necessary for this Department from time to time, to recommend the veto of bills favorably reported by your committee which were designed to increase such Federal contributions to local school districts to a degree which this Department considered excessive.

2. The report suggests (p. 19) the elimination of Federal wardship with respect to Indians for whom the Government does not hold property in trust. You know as well as I that it is precisely these Indians who are most in need of Federal aid. You have been active, and quite properly so, in urging the development of hospital facilities and other Federal services for the most neglected groups of Indians, in Oklahoma and elsewhere, who, having lost their land by reason of the premature termination of restrictions on alienation, are unable to pay for services which a civilized government must render.

3. Having proposed the repudiation of Federal responsibilities toward those Indians who are without trust property, the report goes on to recommend the elimination of the Federal trust over all individual Indian lands (at p. 21) and funds (at p. 22). The repudiation of Federal responsibilities would thus be made absolute. You know as well as I how many solemn Federal treaties would be violated by any such renunciation of Federal responsibility, for you have been a leader in the struggle to secure recognition and payment of the pecuniary liabilities arising from past failures of the Federal Government to carry out its pledges. Indeed, you and some of your fellow committee members took the lead in securing congressional extension of trust protection of Indian property, which this "report" denounces. The Thomas-Rogers Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936, is only one of many substantial contributions which you have made to the increased protection of Indian property in Oklahoma.

In each of the foregoing respects the report attacks the Bureau of Indian Affairs for carrying out policies which were laid down by Congress and were in fact largely formulated, in recent years, by yourself and by other members of your subcommittee. I have no doubt that there are serious evils in the present condition of Indians, evils which require treatment that goes beyond any of the present activities of the Indian Bureau. To some of these evils, for example, the difficulty of determining who is an "Indian" and the near monopoly of Indian irrigated lands by white operators, the report calls attention, albeit in an inadequate way. More such exposure and analysis would be all to the good. But actual analysis of current evils is the most meager part of the report in question. And what analysis the report does contain wholly fails to recognize the extent to which ancient evils are now in the process of elimination.

Apart from its extensive but inaccurate description of current Indian administration and its meager and misleading diagnosis of errors in our national Indian policy, the report devotes major emphasis to a proposed cure for all the ills of the present situation. This cure turns out to be nothing less than the ancient remedy of hanging the doctor. The liquidation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which this report proposes is to be achieved in two ways, which are seldom clearly distinguished and which are in fact generally inconsistent with each other. One proposed course is the termination of Federal responsibility in Indian affairs. The other course is the shifting of such responsibility from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to other agencies of the Federal Government.

(1) The unilateral renunciation of Federal responsibilities toward the Indians has often been tried and has always resulted in failure. It has also generally resulted in burdening the Federal Government with liability for broken treaties and with responsibility of restoring to the Indian that of which unscrupulous neighbors have deprived him. You have an example in the Wyandotte Tribe residing within your own State. The tribal existence of this group was terminated, in accordance with the policy proclaimed in your subcommittee's report, as far back as 1850, by solemn treaty. The tribe was again abolished in 1855. In 1935 the abolition had not yet "taken," and Congress again provided for the final distribution of the funds of this tribe. Yet in 1937 the tribe voted unanimously, under the Thomas-Rogers Indian Welfare Act, to adopt a tribal constitution perpetuating its traditional organiza-

tion. You know, too, that since 1898, if not before that date, Congress has been enacting laws for the final dissolution and winding up of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes; yet within the past few weeks the Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion to point out that these tribes still exist and still have important powers.

The only fair and democratic way of terminating historic responsibilities which are the product of nearly 400 treaties is the method of mutual agreement. So far as it has been permitted to do so the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been engaged for the past 8 years or so in securing agreements with various Indian tribes looking to the gradual curtailment and ultimate elimination of Federal responsibility for Indian affairs and the concomitant assumption by Indian groups and individuals of powers so relinquished. It is, I think, unfortunate that for the coming fiscal year the Congress has denied all appropriation to that branch of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which was most directly engaged in this effort. Somehow the effort must continue. But the objective in question cannot be achieved in the cavalier fashion which the partial report of your subcommittee recommends.

(2) Apart from the abolition of Federal responsibility in Indian affairs the report in question seeks to justify the abolition of the Indian Bureau by urging a piecemeal transfer of its functions to other agencies. This solution is urged not on a basis of hostility to the personnel now charged with Federal responsibilities in Indian affairs, but rather on the basis that other governmental agencies are likely to do a more economical job in Indian administration than can be expected of the Indian Bureau itself. Let us see how far this assumption is consonant with the facts, in three fields of work to which this report gives particular attention, i. e., (a) grazing and forestry, (b) public health, and (c) probate.

(a) The proposal to transfer the work of the Division of Forestry and Grazing of the Office of Indian Affairs from that Bureau to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is definitely not in the interest of the Indians or of financial saving. The legal responsibility of the Department's custodianship with respect to the Indian forests is such that it is obligated to manage these resources on a sound business basis and conduct their administration in a manner which will result in substantial returns to the Indians. This responsibility has been fully discharged.

The record shows that during the 30-year period from 1910 to 1939, inclusive, a cash return of $47,085,185 was realized. The cost of administration during the same period totaled $7,448,169, or about 1 cent per acre per year. Approximately 40 percent of this cost was borne by the Indians and the balance from Treasury funds.

In contrast with the high degree of economy which has prevailed in connection with the administration of Indian forests, an investigation of the results of operations on the national forests will reveal that these lands have never returned a net dollar to the Treasury of the United States and that the ratio of cost to income is approximately 250 percent, or a cost of $2.50 for every $1 of income. Obviously, the administration of Indian forests could not be conducted under such a financial policy since these forests are held in trust by the United States and must be managed in a manner which will result in substantial income to the Indians. This objective has been accomplished under the supervision of the Division of Forestry and Grazing of the Indian Service. Judging from the record, however, it seems clear that it could not continue to be realized under the financial policies which govern the management of the national forests.

(b) The proposal to transfer Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service has been explored fully by the Bureau of the Budget, which failed to determine that such transfer would be either in the interest of efficiency or in the interest of economy. Indian Service hospitals are the most economically run of all Federal hospitals, despite the fact that most of them are small hospitals which as a rule are more costly per patient-day to operate. The patient-day costs at the Indian Service hospitals for the fiscal year 1941 were $3.56, while at the United States Public Health Service hospitals, during the same fiscal year, they were $4.23.

(c) The proposal to transfer the probate of restricted Indian estates from the Department of the Interior to State courts in order to save an "actual but indeterminate" amount of money for the Federal Government (p. 20) ignores the fact that the entire cost of Indian probate work is repaid into the Treasury of the United States out of the modest fees collected from Indian estates probated. Thus no saving is possible. What is more important, the minimum cost of determining heirs in the State courts is generally at least $40, while the minimum fee in Indian probate cases (where the value of the estate is between $200 and $250) is only $20, and fees are waived entirely for estates valued at less than $200. It was in recognition of the comparative economy of Interior Department probate determination that you recently sponsored legislation (act of December 24, 1942, Public, No. 833, 77th Cong.) to transfer from the State courts of Oklahoma to the Interior Department jurisdiction over Indian estates consisting of restricted funds or securities valued at less than $2,500.

I do not mean to suggest that there may not be instances where other agencies of government, State or Federal, could perform more economically functions now lodged in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I will say, however, that pursuant to authority conferred by the Johnson-O'Malley Act, we are making every effort to transfer responsibilities in such cases. Thus the States of California, Washington, and Minnesota are now handling the entire education of Indian children within these States. The Federal Government is, of course, contributing to the cost Similar contracts for health services and welfare services have been made. You will appreciate that under our form of Government the transfer of such responsibilities depends not only on the wishes of the Interior Department but equally on the willingness of another agency to assume difficult and complicated responsibilities.

I trust that time will permit you to make the careful check of this report that will indicate how great a disservice it does to your committee, to yourself, and to the purposes, objectives, and achievements of our Government in its dealings with the affairs of our oldest minority.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Keynote Address at the Conference of Negro Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent keynote address delivered by Emmett Cunningham, president of the Michigan Federated Democratic Club, at the conference of Negro Democrats, held in Washington, D. C., on February 25, 1944:

On behalf of the sponsoring committee, let me express our deep appreciation for your response to the call to attend this conference. In this period of extreme stress when the racial problem which can no longer be evaded or ignored has been projected upon the international plane by the war, it is fitting that we as American Negroes meet in solemn session to review the progress of he race under the present administration and to make recommendations to the National Democratic Committee for the continued and accelerated improvement of our conditions in this country.

I am quite aware that you have come here at a sacrifice of your time and your money, for this is not a subsidized meeting, rather it stems from the urgency of our collective desire to improve the conditions of our race. We believe that the most effective agency for improving those conditions is the Democratic Party which during the past 11 years has contributed so much to the betterment of the position of the common man of whatever race, color, or creed.

This is a democratic conference. Various sections of our national life are represented. There are here among us, leaders of the church, representatives of organized labor, women's groups, State and local leaders—all who believe that only through a liberal national Democratic Party it is possible for us to attain our rightful place in American life.

There have been several conferences of Negro groups recently, and various views have been expressed concerning our political objectives. We active Democratic workers believe that it is time that the men and women who carry the burden and fight the battle of the Democratic Party in the States and communities should get together and make known our desires to the national leaders of our party.

The Democratic Party is a great national party. It is not the exclusive property of any section, race, creed, or class. On its broad base and under its great banner men and women of all sections, of all faiths, of all races—the poor and the rich alike—may stand. This is its strength. Under the leadership of our great President Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose deep and understanding humanitarianism has welded these groups into one powerful whole, our party has been successful at the polls three consecutive times.

It has been the party of all the people, and that it must remain. If the Democratic Party fails in this historic mission it will meet the fate which has befallen the Republican Party, which when it became morally bankrupt and failed to serve the needs of any but a particular class group was repudiated by the American people and went down in defeat. When we, as American Negroes, saw this betrayal by the party we thought we could trust we rose in mighty wrath and contributed to its downfall. We transferred our allegiance to the Democratic Party. Now we are an integral and important factor in the ranks of that party.

The Democratic Party is in power today because of our vote in the pivotal States which you represent at this conference. Recognition of our importance comes even from the deep South. John Temple Graves, editor of the Birmingham Age-Herald, writing in the American Mercury of April 1943, admits that our vote is more important to the Democratic Party than that of his own section.

I quote from Mr. Graves: "When the doubtful State of Illinois went Democratic in 1932 by a majority of 382,000, the Negro vote of about 170,000 amounted to a balance of

power. When the normally Republican State of Pennsylvania went Democratic 4 years later by a majority of 531,646 the Negro vote played a big role in the upset. The Republican majority in 1932 in Pennsylvania had been less than 70,000—and there are some 207,000 Negro voters in that State. Pennsylvania counts for more in the electoral college than Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina combined, while Illinois outweighs Virginia and North Carolina put together."

Why have Negroes remained in the Democratic Party for the past 11 years? Because of vast social and economic gains, which, designed to improve the lot of all the underprivileged, inevitably accrued to our benefit. Among these were relief for the suffering masses during the dreary days of the depression, the training of our youth, the providing of adequate shelter through public housing, stabilization of income through wages-and-hours legislation, and recognition of the right of collective bargaining.

After we fought our way out of the depression, our gains continued. New employment opportunities have been opened up through the inclusion of nondiscrimination clauses in war contracts and through the establishment of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. Our young men have been given the opportunity to serve their country in capacities heretofore denied Negroes. The gallant Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron has demonstrated that Negro youth can fly with the best of them. And there is today less discrimination in Government service than ever before in America.

While these gains have been significant and have materially advanced the position of the Negro, the cold facts show that we have not yet attained full and equal rights as American citizens. There is still discrimination in employment. Segregation prevails in the armed services. Our young women are still excluded from the Waves, Spars, and the women's unit of the marines. There are too few Negroes in important policy-making positions in Government service. Reactionaries are still preventing enactment of anti-poll-tax and antilynching legislation.

We are about to enter into a campaign of momentous importance to the American people and to the world. This campaign will determine whether or not this Nation will continue its program of liberal domestic policies and international cooperation or whether it shall revert to calamitous reaction and narrow isolationism.

I am sure that you agree with me when I say that we want a continuation of the policies of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and further that we can gain the support of the masses of Negro voters only for a Vice President who has a proven record supporting liberal and progressive legislation. Furthermore, this Vice Presidential candidate must have demonstrated that he understands the basic needs of the Negro people and is in no way identified with northern or southern reactionaries.

Who wants to swap horses in the middle of the stream anyway? Or trade a thoroughbred like President Roosevelt for one of these nags of the Republican Party?

There is Mr. Willkie, who since his defeat in the last election has become the "champion" of the Negro. In his overwhelming ambition to be President, he has also discovered the Jewish people. Now he is championing the cause of Russia and China. After serving Wall Street the best part of his life, he suddenly gets converted. "Between the stirrup and the ground he mercy sought and he mercy found." He now has that old-time religion that makes him love everybody.

Then there is Governor Dewey, who has become a recent advocate of State rights in his opposition of the soldier-vote bill. Doesn't Mr. Dewey know that the defenders of the institution of slavery used State rights as their chief instrument of oppression? The opponents of anti-poll-tax and anti-lynching bills scream, "State rights." But it is significant to note that none of these advocates of State rights ever advocate Negro rights, or human rights, for that matter.

And lastly, there is Governor Bricker, of Ohio, who recently has come out as the spokesman for big business, though not a whisper he uttered in favor of the rights of the common man. It is no surprise to us that he came out in a recent speech in Washington against public housing. Mr. Bricker doesn't want the people housed, and during the depression he didn't want them fed.

We recall rather vividly during the dark days of the thirties when the mayor and citizens of Cleveland importuned him for aid to feed those who were starving, how he turned a deaf ear to their plea.

Speaking of candidates of the Republican Party brings to mind the challenge which was issued to this conference by Negro Republicans who are expected to foist one of these third-rate politicians on our people. In an article appearing this week in one of our leading papers, Robert R. Church, president of a newly formed Negro Republican Party, called upon Negro Democrats to take a forthright and unequivocal stand on issues affecting the American Negro.

We accept this challenge, Mr. Church. As a matter of fact we have been taking an unequivocal stand for Negro rights for the past 12 years, ever since Mr. Roosevelt has been President. Can Mr. Church say as much for the time he stood out as the powerful political figure during the long years of Republican rule? Think back—Harding, Coolidge, and, yes, don't forget the infamous 4 years of misrule under Hoover's administration. Negroes were starving then, but not one time did Mr. Church raise his voice against these conditions.

Of course, we accept this challenge. Meeting in Chicago recently these Republicans advocated proposals providing for Federal aid to public housing, a permanent F. E. P. C. and sundry other social and economic laws. But this is and has been the Democratic program for the past 12 years. It looks as if Mr. Church has got his parties mixed. He belongs on the Democratic side. Fancy, for instance, Mr. Bricker advocating the right of collective bargaining as the Church group proposed? Let me call to mind that President Roosevelt's program of social legislation progressed rapidly until a vicious reactionary Republican minority coalesced with a small bloc of southerners. Republicans, my friends, helped defeat anti-poll-tax and antilynching legislation, the soldier-vote bill, and subsidies which would keep down the cost of living.

In turn, we challenge Mr. Church to cite one instance where Republicans have sponsored one piece of legislation that is for the benefit of the masses of people, white or black.

During the forthcoming campaign, let us not forget that we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle for world freedom. We may have our differences on the home front, but we must present a united front to the Fascist enemies of humanity. The loyalty of the American Negro is unquestioned in this great struggle. Time and time again we have demonstrated our eagerness to share in the defense of our country. From Bunker Hill to the jungles of the South Pacific and the airfields of southern Italy, we have fought side by side with other Americans, suffering and dying and giving our all to make this a better country and a better world for all mankind. Half a million of our youth are in the armed forces. Our men and women are in the factories and on the farms producing the goods needed to supply the United Nations with the sinews of war. We have invested millions of dollars in War Savings bonds. Our Government knows that we are willing and eager to serve in all capacities needed to bring this war to a victorious conclusion and to reestablish freedom throughout the world.

America needs us as truly as we need America. Our aims and objectives do not encompass Negroes alone; they are part and parcel of our national will to victory, and to the establishment of a just peace. Only a commander in chief who understands and appreciates those objectives is qualified to pilot us through this crucial war period to a conclusive victory. And we firmly believe that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is that man.

"PREAMBLE

"We are moving into the most crucial political campaign in the history of America. This is the issue—Are we to continue under the liberal and humane leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt or shall we revert to the calamatist days of Hoover Republicanism?

"As Negroes and as Democrats we consider the economic and social advancement which has been made during the past 12 years as a new Bill of Rights.

"1. The right to work at a decent wage.

"2. The right to a decent and healthful home.

"3. The right to education for all.

"4. The right to equality before the law.

"5. The right to adequate social security.

"This is our heritage under the Roosevelt administration. We have met here in solemn session to devise ways and means to continue the acquisition and fuller enjoyment of these rights. To this end we consider the following proposals essential:

"ARMED FORCES

"Under our Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Negro soldier, sailor, and marine has achieved a greater degree of participation in the armed forces than at any other period in the history of our country.

"At the same time, we condemn without reservation the mistreatment, discrimination, and segregation of Negro men and women in the armed forces of the United States. As citizens, sharing in the sacrifices necessary for the defense of democracy, we demand that all men and women be granted the full opportunity to fight for the preservation of our democracy, without regard to race, creed, or color.

"WE RECOMMEND

"1. The immediate passage by Congress of anti-poll-tax legislation.

"2. The adoption of the Green-Lucas bill, which allows every soldier the right to vote.

"3. The immediate passage of the Dawson-Scanlon bill, which will guarantee a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee.

"4. The acceptance of a subsidy program which secures an adequate appropriation for the Office of Price Administration, thereby preventing inflation.

"5. The passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bill, which will broaden the benefits of the social-security program.

"6. The elimination of discrimination in the Nation's Capital by the passage of H. R. 1995, as presented to Congress by Representative WILLIAM A. ROWAN, of Chicago.

"7. The adoption of Senate bill No. 637 and its companion House bill, which provides for Federal aid to education.

"8. The continuation and expansion of the low-rent public-housing program of the United States Housing Authority now administered as the Federal Public Housing Authority, to meet the need of the grsater bulk of Negroes and other low-income families. We recommend, further, the continuation of the National Housing Agency as the over-all approach to the solution of the housing problem of the Nation and the extension of the Federal Housing Administration to assist private enterprise to reach the housing problem of a larger part of the middle-income group.

"9. During the Roosevelt administration, Negroes have been appointed as representatives in various administratives offices. We recommend that such appointments be extended to include policy-forming positions in various governmental departments, agencies, and commissions.

"10. We bitterly condemn the unholy alliance of reactionary Republicans and the southern bloc which is undermining the fundamental principles of American democracy. The abolition of the National Youth Administration, the passage of antilabor legislation, and the effort to deprive the armed forces of their right to vote are recent evidences of the destructive work of this alliance. This vicious combination is the great danger to a forward march toward social and economic justice. We call upon Negro voters everywhere to join with all forces fighting for real democracy to use the ballot as the instrument to defeat Republicans or Democrats who make effective this malignant disease in our democracy.

"11. This group heartily commends Vice President HENRY WALLACE for his inherent characteristics of liberalism, as exemplified in his attitude and efforts on behalf of Negroes, labor, all minorities, and his adherence to the philosophy of the common man.

"12. In order to make effective the above proposals and recommendations, this conference goes on record as endorsing the reelection of President Roosevelt, in order to make secure the liberal and humane policies that were initiated by his administration in 1932 and continued into the present.

"Respectfully submitted.

"FRANK M. SUMMERS,
Chairman,
"HERBERT L. BRUCE,
"RUTH BROWN PRICE,
"GEORGE L.-P. WEAVER,
"ROBERT HARTGROVE,
"SILAS F. TAYLOR,
"Resolution Committee."

War-Damage Insurance

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been urging passage of legislation necessary to provide policyholders of war-damage insurance continued protection during the war without further payments of premiums on their policies. I have urged this because the losses so far suffered have been so slight in amount and so few in number that it seems unlikely that any great damage will be caused by attack upon property in the United States during the coming months.

In view of the fact that the policyholders have been paying now for 2 years on these policies, which have been issued, and that there have been no losses during the last month, it seems to me only fair that these policies should be continued until the end of the war without further premiums being paid, and that some method should be worked out for the return to these policyholders of the surpluses which remain in this corporation after the war is over.

I am pleased to submit for the consideration of the Members of the House a statement addressed to National Association of Mutual Savings Banks by Robert E. McGaw, chairman of its Committee on Insurance. Mr. McGaw is president of the Hampden Savings Bank at Springfield, Mass. He has made a study of this subject and I am sure that his views warrant careful consideration by the Members of Congress.

RE WAR-DAMAGE INSURANCE

Within recent weeks a volume of inquiry respecting war-damage insurance has been directed by our banks to the Committee on Insurance. Undoubtedly this is occasioned by the apparent uncertainty within our institutions as to the course that may be adopted by the War Damage Corporation in a prospective approach to an over-all renewal of policies for a third year as of July 1 next. It is therefore felt that the banks within the association should be advised at this time of the activity of the Committee on Insurance, outlining in some measure such progress as has been made in effort to obtain relief from a continuance of premium charge on this type of protection and, at the same time, to set forth the views of the Committee in respect to pertinent points in connection with this subject.

It has been recognized by all concerned that the progress of the war, according to all reports obtainable, has produced a feeling on the part of banks and of all property interests, leading to the belief that the hazards for which this war-damage insurance was established are extremely remote in possibilities, and in consequence the insurance required to be taken out by mortgagers, as well as such policies as are carried by banks on owned real estate, represent an unnecessary protection and a corresponding outlay in expense. Your committee desires to make it entirely clear that it is not prepared to share fully in this apparent common opinion. Its position is one which does not admit of either affirming or denying the soundness of such belief.

However, to assist our banks to such extent as through information and opinions contained herein may prove of possible value, let us first consider the two features relating to this present coverage and the prospect of a continuance thereof. The most pressing need of savings banks relates to the desirability in having this insurance continued after July 1 but with a waiver of premium charge. The reduced hazard in the light of progress of our armed forces referred to above, together with the large sums of money paid in as premiums for two successive years of coverage with negligible losses deductible from such accumulation of capital, apparently would justify some action on the part of Congress in promulgating a plan of this kind—and it must be recognized that it is only through an act of Congress that this may be accomplished because the regulations of the War Damage Corporation and the law upon which those regulations are issued will not permit the continuance of coverage without some premium charge unless the Congress itself acts to correct this feature.

Secondarily, the element of refund of the millions of dollars paid in, or such proportionate amount of this fund as may be remaining at the termination of the war, should be considered. It is the opinion of your committee that our savings banks as a system should not be especially concerned with respect to any future refund to policyholders. By and large the great bulk of real-estate holdings within our banks, whether in the form of mortgages or as foreclosed items, falls within the classification of residential property. There are, of course, in some of our larger metropolitan centers, possible exceptions to this broad rule but, generally speaking, our contacts are largely with the individual. The psychology of such individual who has in effect paid a nominal amount for yearly protection of a residence, does not lead to any anticipation of a future refund which in itself would prove of little monetary value. Likewise, the state of mind does not prompt such individual to any great concern with regard to obtaining a few dollars at some distant date. Moreover, there must be given recognition of the fact that, like all insurance for which premiums have been paid, such premiums have been earned, at least in some part, through the protection afforded against possibilities of damage or destruction. In consequence, it is the belief of your committee that its efforts should continue to be directed toward the main objective which is almost wholly centralized in the elimination of further outlay on the part of our mortgagors and our banks, but with retention of protection.

At the present time there have been introduced into Congress, either through the Senate or the House of Representatives, five bills providing for waiver of premium and, additionally, five bills seeking a plan for refund of unexpended funds at some time in the future and on such basis as may be prescribed. All of these measures have been referred to banking and currency committees and are buried within such committees. Through its contacts with reliable sources and based upon investigations thus far made, your committee expresses the belief that none of these proposed relief measures will ever have favorable consideration and will not emerge from committee for consideration of the Congress. However, your committee is under the impression that this entire subject is receiving the consideration of the War Damage Corporation with the probability that within the early future, some course or plan will be adopted subject to such official approval as may be essential. When and if such so-called green light appears, doubtless a bill will be introduced in the Congress, to be presented by selected leaders in such body, for prompt enactment and approval. Until then your committee is marking time and exercising continued vigilance.

Notwithstanding these probabilities, and with the degree of uncertainty attaching to any future action by the War Damage Corporation or the Congress, there are certain features in this entire perspective to which the attention, study, and analysis on the part of our banks should be directed in order that all may properly and intelligently chart the future course of the individual bank in relation to the problem. Your committee, therefore, invites attention to the following points:

1. Such hazard as is represented through damage or destruction of property occasioned by falling aircraft, especially in those sections where daily travel of military airplanes is perhaps more prevalent than in other sections, should be considered in the light of the source from which reimbursement against such loss could be obtained. There is a line of differentiation in purposes contained in such flights whereby, unless extended coverage on fire policies or straight aircraft policies were employed, it might prove that the war-damage policy in itself would not afford any recovery of value involved. It should be remembered that the coverage in the war-damage policy is not entirely devoid of some uncertainty in respect to this point and, likewise, because of recent revisions of the war-exclusion clause in the fire and extended-coverage policies, it follows that the definitive features of protection on this same point are lacking in clarity. Therefore, factual conditions and purposes must determine each case of this kind that may arise inasmuch as no adjudication appears in either instance. It is recognized that over all, these risks may

be considered negligible and remote in possibility but the question should be given consideration.

2. With some exceptions, our banks have expiring war-damage policies between now and July 1 next. If it is considered that under all conditions it is entirely safe to have these discontinued, and if the War Damage Corporation adopts a course effective as of July 1, which would provide an umbrella of continued protection without cost, then such policies as were discontinued within the intervening period would lose the advantage of coverage afforded to others.

3. It is appropriate to consider the areas in which risks are located, particularly such properties as present a more vulnerable location than would be the case in other sections. Coastal territory or congested points wherein defense plants are operating might lead to the treatment of one section and the requirements attaching, as distinguished from the treatment accorded to other sections wherein the same degree of risk was not apparent. In the thought applied to this factor, it is obvious that sporadic raids, if any, would be directed to the vulnerable and more important production areas.

4. If in the judgment of the bank it is deemed expedient to discontinue this protection as unnecessary in view of all conditions presented, it would seem desirable in localities where more than one savings bank operates to have a uniform program adopted by all banks within the same locality.

5. Such course as individual banks may elect to adopt will naturally be employed with the acceptance of full responsibility connected therewith. The fiduciary status in relation to deposits and investments would appear to be an important factor in arriving at any conclusion. In relation thereto, the question of protecting the mortgage interest held by an institution and treated without regard to the equity of the mortgagor, either at the expense of the bank itself or upon some arranged basis with the mortgagor, would seem to be a point to be determined within the scope of the survey or review of this subject.

This bulletin is prepared and submitted without specific recommendation and is designed to be informative and helpful. Beyond that the Committee on Insurance assumes no responsibilities.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. MCGAW,
Chairman, Committee on Insurance.

The Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles dealing with the Reader's Digest, one from the New Republic of March 6, 1944, and the other from the Commonweal of February 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of March 6, 1944]

THE READER'S DIGEST

The Reader's Digest, which is discussed by Richard H. Rovere on page 310 of this issue, has come in for a surprising amount of publicity lately. It has been denounced on the floor of the Senate by Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, who suggested that its habit of making exclusive contracts with other magazines for reprint rights might constitute a conspiracy in restraint of trade. The New Yorker magazine, as Mr. Rovere reports, declined to renew its contract with the Digest on somewhat the same grounds. Time and Newsweek have carried articles about this development. PM announces that it is about to publish a series of articles dealing with the Digest. The New Yorker is preparing a profile of its editor, DeWitt Wallace.

Walter Winchell in several recent broadcasts has criticized the actions of Paul Palmer, one of the Digest editors. A number of periodicals, including the Nation and the New Republic, have attacked individual articles in the Digest, including Henry J. Taylor's wild charges about "global boondoggling," Louis Bromfield's prediction last August that we should all be starving this February, Max Eastman's tirades against Russia and Senator HUGH BUTLER'S clumsy criticism of the good-neighbor policy. The Digest has also been under attack for a long time by the Communist press, and we understand that some of the editors believe all public criticism of anything in its pages is just a Communist plot. But this is obviously untrue, unless, you describe as a Communist anybody who is not a reactionary Republican. There are, for example, more than 27,000,000 people who voted for Roosevelt in 1940. With their families, they constitute at least 60,000,000 persons, nearly all of whom might be expected to resent the propaganda, which appears so extensively in the pages of the Digest, against bureaucracy, global idealism, and radicalism in the Federal Government.

In the recent public criticism of the Reader's Digest three main points have been made: First, that by its exclusive contracts for reprint it tends to obtain undue influence over all magazine publishing in this country; second, that articles are written by its own staff or by other persons paid by the Digest and then planted in outside periodicals so that they can be "republished" in its pages; and, third, that while pretending to be an impartial magazine which reprints nearly all the best articles from other periodicals, it has developed a definite and aggressive editorial policy of its own.

The charge that the Digest, by paying an annual retainer to magazines for the right to reprint, gets life-and-death control over these magazines, would be brought forward only by someone ignorant of the publishing business. The Digest doesn't pay enough to be of such importance to any periodical which is itself of any importance in the commercial world. It has been suggested that editors might injure the value of their magazines by strenuous efforts to prepare material which they think the Digest will buy at a high price and reprint, but there is no evidence of this. The Digest, we understand, complains that all the magazines available, in combination, do not provide enough material for its pages, and this fact is supposed to be responsible for the comparatively new technique of articles written under its direction and then planted elsewhere to be reprinted. (To some extent, of course, the Digest is now the prisoner of its vast circulation; it fears to print things that will appeal to any audience smaller than one of several millions.)

Some critics have made much of the device of farming out articles, arguing that it enables the Digest to spread its own propaganda in other places. But, in fact, no editor needs to use an article submitted by the Digest if he doesn't want to. He gets no financial advantage from doing so except the comparatively insignificant one of receiving a piece of copy for which he need not pay the author. The editorial cost of the average magazine is such a small part of the total that a single piece of free copy is a small inducement. At a rough guess, 80 or 90 percent of the articles the Digest seeks to farm out in this way are nonpolitical and noncontroversial in character, dealing with science, adventure, or biography. The other 10 or 20 percent go exclusively to periodicals like the American Mercury, which share the Digest's political views. The Digest's own circulation is so tremendous, something like 8,000,000, that preliminary publication of a propaganda article somewhere else adds very little to its total effectiveness.

Among writers the charge is sometimes heard that the Digest pays such high prices everybody in the country is trying to write for it, and is imitating its highly concentrated, depersonalized, and therefore somewhat tasteless style. But a glance at the facts shows that there are plenty of able men who do not appear at all in its pages.

The final criticism of the Digest is to our eyes the most serious. When it began 20 years ago, it did in fact reprint most of the best writing from current American periodicals, and it did so without any predetermined editorial policy of its own. Today it has such a policy, and it rejects a substantial amount of good writing in the magazines which does not conform to its specialized political and social views. That is one reason, and perhaps the chief reason, why the Digest finds it necessary to write articles and give them away in order to have them reprinted. And that is why the New Republic, which was closely associated with the Digest in its earliest days, and accepted a contractual relationship when it was first offered, will no longer use material which originates in the Digest office and is intended for eventual reprint there. If the Digest wants to expose its 9,000,000 readers to some of the good liberal doctrine from the pages of the New Republic we shall be happy to have it do so—happy and surprised, in view of the way its policy has recently been shaped. We are convinced that the early ideals of the Reader's Digest are incompatible with its present aggresive attitude and that unless it returns to its former principles, it will have to take its place openly as an extremely conservative magazine, prepared by its own staff of contributors, and on all fours with other conservative magazines like the Crowell, Curtis, and Hearst chains.

[From the Commonweal of February 25, 1944]

THE NEW YORKER REBELS

Last week the New York press published the text of a communication from the editors of the New Yorker to its contributors, explaining why they had decided not to renew their reprint agreement with the Reader's Digest. Since this communication is not likely to receive wide publicity throughout the country, we are here quoting its most important paragraphs:

"The Digest started out as a reprint magazine but grew into something quite different. Nowadays a large proportion of its contents is frankly original with the Digest and not presented as reprint material; and of the stuff that is presented as reprint material much actually originates in the office of the Digest and then gets farmed out to some other magazine for first publication. The effect of this (apart from spreading a lot of money around) is that the Digest is beginning to generate a considerable fraction of the contents of American magazines. This gives us the creeps, as does any centralization of genius. The fact seems to be that some publications are already as good as subsidized by the Digest. Our feeling is that if the Digest wants to publish a magazine of original material it should do so in a direct manner. We believe it should not operate through other publications to keep alive the reprint myth. We don't want to be in the position of receiving for consideration a manuscript that has al-

ready been bought and paid for by someone else, for we regard such a situation as unhealthy. We were willing to be digested, but we are not willing to be first supplied, then digested.

"The New Yorker, furthermore, has never been particularly impressed with the Digest's capsule theory of life and its assumption that any piece of writing can be improved by extracting every seventh word like a tooth. We have occasionally been embarrassed to see our stuff after it has undergone alterations at Pleasantville. Mostly, however, we object to the Digest's indirect creative function, which is a threat to the free flow of ideas and to the independent spirit."

Anyone familiar with the publishing practice of the Reader's Digest must indeed second the views of the editors of the New Yorker. Particularly unfortunate is the farming-out process described above, for it is certainly tantamount to selling the Digest under false pretenses. In the past The Commonweal has occasionally accepted farmed-out articles of this sort, although for many months nothing the Digest has submitted to us has seemed to us suitable for our publication. There is a further element in the Digest scheme which seems to us an even greater threat to the free flow of ideas. This is the exclusive contractual arrangement made by the Digest for all rights to reprint in this form. Such an arrangement exists with a number of America's best magazines, and it makes it impossible for anyone to compete with the Reader's Digest effectively. Were the Reader's Digest thoroughly nonpolitical, this might not be so objectionable; but for many months now the impact of this magazine has been altogether reactionary. The result is that millions of its readers must assume that all the American press is of like mind, and thereby the forces of reaction are subtly and effectively strengthened.

The Peace Plan That Will Not Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excerpt from a speech by Representative WILLIAM P. ELMER, of Missouri, as published in the Prince Georges Post, Hyattsville, Md., March 2, 1944:

THE PEACE PLAN THAT WILL NOT FAIL

(Representative WILLIAM P. ELMER, outspoken Member of Congress from the Eighth Missouri District, and, while in Congress, a resident of Berwyn, made the following comments which the Prince George Post is glad to pass on to you, our readers. It seems to us that Congressman ELMER has hit the nail squarely on the head in his premise that there will be no lasting peace until the nations—and their leaders—accept the principle of the Golden Rule.—The EDITOR.)

Nearly 2,000 years ago there was a Big Four. They had no army, navy, money, lend-lease, U. N. R. R. A., official prestige or influence. We don't know if they ever met together to lay plans for world conquest or peace. But they did publish a world pact—a universal charter—"four freedoms" and eternal life plan. Their names were Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They told a simple story of "Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward All Men." And then about a tramp preacher who died, or thought he did, at least—to save the world.

Since then billions of people have believed and trusted in that plan and millions do so today. They are stronger in their faith now, than ever before. Those boys from Christian lands, facing each other on battlefields, still look up to that crucified figure of Him who said: "And I, if I be lifted up, from the earth, will draw all men unto Me." They have faith, dying faith, in that plan. After the black smoke, and the red fire of the war gives away to that row upon row of white, the living will silently stand by, heads uncovered, and give thanks for the promise in that plan—"He That Believeth on Me Shall Never Die."

Around the peace table there will be hundreds of plans—all based on selfishness, world power, commerce and international supremacy—man-made schemes that have always, wholly failed. Only one plan—that of the Big Four—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—will point the way to real peace. It has elevated mankind to a higher plane. It is the base of all our ideas of universal peace—Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man. If nations, and people, do not follow it, a just and lasting peace is impossible. It has not prevented all wars, but it has many. It is yet the firmest foundation for peace. When the wars are on, it is the greatest hope of dying soldiers, and when they are over, the greatest consolation of bereaved souls.

Senator Barkley's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that I am including therein statement made by Rev. Dr. James H. Cotter, who is a very distinguished Catholic priest and has served the parish in my home city continuously for more than half a century.

Dr. Cotter is recognized in his church as a scholar and writer of note and merit. He is alert to all public questions as will appear from the following article:

THOUGHTS

(Specially written for the Irish World by Rev. Dr. James H. Cotter, LL. D., Litt. D.)

The tumult raised by the resignation of Senator BARKLEY as Democratic leader in the Senate as a protest against President Roosevelt's veto of the $2,315,200,000 tax brought our mind to another tumult when the independence bell made music in Philadelphia. It was, indeed, for those who believed that Congress was only an amen corner and not a legislative hall, a "declaration of independence," showing the American people that Congress was doing its own thinking and not taking its thought second rate.

This speech of Senator BARKLEY's had the ring of Rienzi's address to the Romans, made popular in our school books, and had its content fired with similar sentiment. It returned confidence to the doubting Thomases of the country and this, in itself, was a blessing for losing faith in Congress is the first step toward its destruction. With Congress, goes the Republic of America, the glory of human rule.

To the Congress itself the speech of the Kentuckian was a relief, for evidently it voiced the pent-up feelings of the big majority. Its character was heartily applauded for this, as well as for the bravery of the orator who dared to love his country more than the friend with whom he exchanged thought for 12 serious years. It was a model for those whoever faltered in expressing their convictions, and this, too, at a time when diplomacy has been worn threadbare, is an immense asset to character, in and out of Congress.

I have taken for my theme the significance of the event itself, absolutely viewed, touching in no manner its political bearing, entirely outside my subject.

Some papers have predicated of the orator this or that motive. This is utterly unjust. His words, fervent with feeling, speak for themselves only on the subject in hand. They would not have reached their purpose so quickly and so enthusiastically had they any other idea sandwiched in expression. Honor—the honor of Congress—was the subject of their story and they told it well to the delight and instruction of millions who joined their applause with the listening audience.

Use of Aircraft in Connection With the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the United States Maritime Commission has a statutory obligation to carry out the policy declared by Congress to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of the American merchant marine. World conditions have so advanced since the creation of the Maritime Commission that participation by the maritime industry in the field of aviation is a requisite to the attainment of the objectives expressed by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which were pointed to the development of foreign and domestic commerce and the aid of national defense through an adequate merchant marine owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as practicable.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, created by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is clothed with the responsibility of developing aeronautics for the promotion of foreign and domestic commerce and the aid of national defense. No person can operate an air line unless granted a certificate of convenience and necessity therefor by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and in foreign transportation, with the approval of the President. Steamship companies have been unable to obtain, to the date of this writing, a consideration of applications filed for such certificates of convenience and necessity upon an equal footing with other party applicants before the Civil Aeronautics Board. There are two reasons underlying the discrimination against steamship companies which have

been publicly stated by members of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

First. Harllee Branch, member of that Board has stated in a public address that permission granted steamship companies to enter aviation would not be conducive to the development of aeronautics because the size of the investment of money by these companies in vessels would lead them to develop steamship business at the expense of aviation. He quoted the Biblical phrase, "Where your treasure is, there is your heart."

Second. The Board, relying erroneously upon its interpretation of the law has held that the history of the Civil Aeronautics Act indicated an intent on part of Congress to rigidly limit the participation of steamship companies in the air-transport field.

There are presently pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board approximately 21 applications for certificates of convenience and necessity filed by companies seeking air-transport rights in the Caribbean area. Six of these applications have been filed by steamship companies. These applications have been set for trial before the Civil Aeronautics Board for May 15, 1944.

At a hearing before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives on January 26, 1944, L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of Civil Aeronautics Board, testified that in two instances wherein American Export Lines, Inc., had endeavored, through application to the Civil Aeronautics Board, to obtain aeronautical rights:

You will recall that the provision (408b (2)) forbids the Board to approve the acquisition of it unless it can find and does find that the transaction will promote the public interest by enabling the surface carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operation and will not restrain competition. * * *

The Board held that it could not approve the acquisition by the steamship company of the air line unless the air-line service was auxiliary or supplementary to the steamship service. This made it impossible to approve the acquisition because at the time of the decision the operations of the air line and the steamship company had little if any relationship to each other, and——

Mr. POGUE. I was coming to that in this way: To the extent that the passenger business does take to the air, the large investment in the steamship passenger vessels will have to be written off one way or the other. That is one of the prices we have to pay for what you call progress, and that writing off will have to take place regardless of whether or not the steamships are in the air business. That certainly will be so unless it should happen that surface carrier control, which is apparently what Congress was thinking about in its broadest terms when these restrictions were put in the law, should so administer the business as to retard the growth of air traffic in an effort to prolong the investment.

I do not want to be misunderstood. We tried at the outset here to let steamships and other common carriers develop new air business without having to meet the restrictions of the proviso. We were wrong, the court said. We have to apply the proviso in all those cases. We are doing it. I want to be frank and make it clear that we are in favor of changing the law or removing the restrictions now that it has gone that far.

A comprehensive history of the position of the Civil Aeronautics Board is contained in the statement of Admiral Land, printed in Committee Document 50 of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House.

Current history evidences increasing foreign interest in transoceanic air transport. British shipping interests, sensing advantage in commerce through the air, are actively cooperating to obtain the right to participate in aviation with governmental support. Unless American shipping can meet foreign competition on terms of equality, on the water and in the air, the merchant marine of this country, representing an important expenditure of public funds, stands endangered. In the immediate Caribbean, unless Congress will express itself upon this subject of steamship participation in aeronautics, the findings of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the public expressions of its members forewarn that the maritime industry can participate in aviation only if certain restrictions not placed upon other applicants are removed. The result, prejudged and announced, must be that steamship companies will be deprived of air rights over trade routes which they, with governmental aid, have, throughout their existence, struggled to build and maintain.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, conscious of its responsibilities, realizes this serious danger to the future of the American merchant marine, and is determined to do all that it can to protect the American merchant marine from destruction.

The merchant marine was necessary to win the war, and it is needed to win the peace. If those seated at the peace table think that our merchant marine is going to be put in a strait jacket, then its value at the peace table may be discounted 50 percent.

Admiral Land, who knows whereof he speaks, says that our merchant marine, which now leads the world, will constitute an ace in the hole at the peace table. Shall we be crippled by failure to preserve our competitive status with the other nations of the world? Shall we repeat the mistakes after the last World War, and thus possibly contribute to another holocaust which civilization and organized governments cannot stand? The issue is before us and we must meet it now.

Mica Wealth of New England Has Been Strangled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Mica Wealth of New England Has Been Strangled," by Bill Cunningham, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, February 20, 1944:

MICA WEALTH OF NEW ENGLAND HAS BEEN STRANGLED—NEGLECTED FOR EAST INDIAN PRODUCT—VAST POSSIBILITIES FOR WAR AND AFTER

(By Bill Cunningham)

Even a native, asked to name the important industries of New England, would probably never say "mining," yet depending strictly upon definition, mining is possibly the most important industry in this region at the moment. Important to the war effort right now, and of tremendous potential importance as an industry after the war, are the mica mines, known and in prospect, from deep in Connecticut to the Rangeley Lakes region of Maine.

And in all the bungling and blocking, the deliberate skullduggery and undercover byplay for post-war monopoly characteristic of some of our bureaucratic war agencies, none surpasses the strangulation being visited upon New England in this particular field. The strangulation is being applied to domestic mica mining in the seven States of this section where the product is found for that matter; but the tightest squeeze has been on this part of the country.

OPERATED ON STOP-AND-GO BASIS

Mica mining doesn't make very much noise. It hasn't been a very big business. It's operated through the years on a stop-and-go basis, and the average citizen has never even heard of it. But, as a matter of fact, it's one of the oldest industries in New England—the Ruggles mine, in Grafton County, N. H.—having first started to produce in 1803. New Hampshire, now, after Nor'h Carolina, the second largest mica-producing State in the Nation, produced all the mica used in this country prior to 1868.

In 1926, the peak year, New Hampshire produced 1,371,890 pounds of mica, representing a value of $235,000. That was the high in a steady climb from 1908, when 12,000 pounds, worth $1,200, was mined, and then it began to slough away until 1939 produced 43,670 pounds, worth $3,738. Last year the State produced 500,000 pounds. It could easily produce a million pounds a year. And there's still Connecticut and Maine, and possibly some parts of Massachusetts to contribute their pounds. There's need for the stuff, war vital need now and post-war need to come.

By absolute test, and contrary to all previous claims, domestic American mica is just as good as any in the world, but because of cartel monopoly and manipulation, the myth has been erected that mica imported from India and Brazil is better, and mica today, officially rated as the most essential mineral of the war effort is being flown to this country from those two far-away places. It has the topmost aerial transport priority, rated only by quinine.

But to start at the first, what is mica? And why is it so important?

A close enough answer is that it's the stuff isinglass is made of. It was big business in these parts back in the old days, when it was mostly used in the fronts of stoves. It fell into a state of desuetude in time partly because the old-fashioned stove heating was supplanted by steam radiators and other improvements. The rest of the reason was because big business moved into the field with the story that India mica was superior, the domestic product was undersold and the domestic mines mostly put out of business. Most of them weren't very big, anyhow.

GRADUALLY GETS NEW IMPORTANCE

Modern inventions, involving the use of electricity, gradually gave mica a new importance, and the war has made it of vital importance. The reason for this is that it's vital in the making of condensers. The whole field of electronics is entirely dependent upon it. There are no substitutes for its essential critical uses.

Mechanized warfare is impossible without it. Not an airplane can leave the ground without it. Every plane, tank, submarine, jeep, truck, battleship, and freighter is absolutely dependent upon it. Radio, radar, and television can't function without it, although such substitutes as oiled paper have worked as feeble temporary stop-gaps.

We're newly dependent upon it in the world at war, and we'll be equally dependent upon it in the world that is to follow. There are probably 50 known mines, big and little, where it can be produced now in New England, and many others in North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, New York, New Mexico, and points farther, yet it's still being flown in, vital as air transport is, from India and Brazil, in such fashion that it's hard to escape the conviction that the monopoly of a cartel is being protected.

It has all the earmarks of the story on rubber, tin, quinine, and kindred essentials we were persuaded to import exclusively, rather than develop ourselves. The handling of the matter has been either a stubborn case of bungling, or deliberate protection of the mica importing industry. Either way, the grip must be broken.

When one realizes that within 2 years, the radio and radar program alone has increased from $20,000,000 per month in actual shipments to $250,000,000, or more, per month, one begins to understand what sort of prize is here at stake.

SO ANOTHER BUREAU IS DECREED

The story of the struggle is interesting—to use an unbiased word. Right after Pearl Harbor, the War Production Board decreed that something must be done to revive the latent mica mining industry in this country, small, scattered and, in places, abandoned, as it was, so another bureau was decreed. It kicked around for a time, trying to find a home, and finally wound up as a stepchild of the Metals Reserve Company, which is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

By processes rather vague, a man named George W. Purcell, a veteran mica importer, domiciled in New Jersey, but president of a mica outfit known as the Colonial Mica Co., was named coordinator, or whatever, by the Honorable Jesse Jones. His job was to stimulate domestic production, and the principal method looked toward encouraging domestic miners to reopen again, by helping them finance equipment, the banks assisting, getting them concessions in labor and supplies, and fixing prices that would make production worth their while.

This was only the first part. The rest was to buy the mica, and all the mica, no domestic operater being allowed to sell to any other buyer but this agency—which was, in actuality, the United States Government. The new agency had to have a name. The name it wound up with was Colonial Mica Corporation, which was Purcell's private company's name, with "Corporation" substituted for "Company."

The word was spread. Domestic mica men rallied, anxious to do their bit for the war, and likewise to make a dollar. The stories differed somewhat in the various States, but here's the New Hampshire one: The New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission created an advisory committee upon the State's geology and mineral industry and sent Dr. Harold M. Bannerman to Washington to find out what New Hampshire could do.

This developed into a request from the Colonial Mica Corporation for a meeting to which potential mica producers of the New England States were invited. The meeting was finally held at Canaan, N. H., May 28, 1942. About 250 people attended, spending probably $2,500 to get there and back. They were eager and enthusiastic. Some of them were ready to go to work the next morning. They had been called together to help tackle a crying war need.

NOTHING READY TO OFFER THEM

The Colonial officials had nothing ready to offer. They had a program they hoped to put through. It included such nebulous bait as trying to get manpower exempt from the draft; possibly persuading ration boards to ease up on tires, gasoline, and oil; leasing machinery and equipment at a nominal fee; providing prospecting and mining services from the Colonial personnel; instruction in processing the product; the assurance of a market. But they said they weren't prepared to talk about prices. Since price was the keystone the entire structure depended upon, they might as well not have come. The meeting broke down there, the potential producers walked out disillusioned, and they finally wound up in a local dispute that did nobody a great deal of good.

A program of sorts finally did get under way, and is under way still, but it's been characterized by bickering, battling, and no real cooperation. The general attitude, according to New England mica men, who are as good as any in the business, is that there is definitely no desire to see the industry reborn in a big way in this general section.

Buyers and fieldmen were imported from other mica States, for instance, New Englanders evidently not being considered good enough. Men were brought up from the South to appraise the New England product. The current representative of the agency is an imported Californian, which is certainly nothing against the gentleman, but a New Englander, loyal to the region and fighting hard for it was fired as being too noisy, too this, and too that.

PROGRAM STAGNATED

The entire program, instead of making speed, was stagnated and is stagnated. New Englanders weren't the only ones who gradually grew red under the collar. The North Carolina mica people likewise raised up. This all terminated in an investigation by the Truman committee last June, and the minutes of that examination are pretty pitiful. They revealed that the southern representative of Colonial, one Burgess, since dropped, was a fourth partner in the outfit from which Colonial bought most of its machinery, although to make it look better he had transferred his stock to his wife for the consideration of love and affection. But he drew a salary from his machinery business, and another as president of a high-sounding outfit, under hammering from the senatorial committee finally broke itself down to consist of one truck.

All this was testified under oath, as were the details of some of the buying, and price fixing which caused many of the operators to quit in disgust. From a study of the testimony, it's hard not to figure that that was the main idea.

It was the New England crowd that led most of the fight, but nothing happened after the hearing—not even more mica. A gentleman named Pitt, who testified under oath, "I had no experience in mica mining before I became president of this company," is now, and was then, the president of the Colonial, or Government, corporation at $12,000 a year, his previous job having been in Australia. Purcell is officially vice president and treasurer, but he is a mica man. He provides the know-how, and, according to those who have business with the agency, he is the principal obstacle to domestic expansion.

MADE UP MIND AGAINST DOMESTIC MICA

The New England protestants grant him sincerity and don't go so far as to charge him with a deliberate foreign tie-up. They merely say he's stubborn in the belief that the only top grade mica is India mica, that he's handled it for many years, has dealt with the firms that control it, that he's made up his mind that domestic mica is no good, and that he won't give it a chance.

He's an old-school type, brought up to believe that mica should be graded by an expert's looking at it, and refusing to accept the proof of a machine developed by the Bell Telephone Co. which says, and which proves by test, that domestic mica is as good as any mined anywhere in the world. In fact, he testified before the Truman committee that, although his job was to encourage domestic production, he hadn't conducted any experiments to find out if perhaps he weren't mistaken.

The Department of Justice, however, evidently isn't so sure that knowingly, or unknowingly, the man isn't serving the interests of another group of companies, that really represent a British-American monopoly in this vital war product. It appears that Purcell was recommended to Jesse Jones by one Howard C. Sykes, who is intimately connected with the British mica interests and who is the head of a company affiliated with the British group specializing in the India import.

FORMS PART OF BRITISH TRUST

And in Bloomfield, N. J., Purcell lives next door to J. P. French, vice president of Eugene Munsell & Co., which is part of the British trust. It's Munsell with which Sykes is affiliated. It's the British trust that has built the theory of Indian mica's superiority so high that the United States produces only 20 percent of its own requirements. And it's the United States Government's Bureau of Standards which says that that is strictly the bunk. Having tested all mica from all parts of the world, the Bureau of Standards says there's no difference whatsoever.

The structure of the British trust is amazing. Over all is the British Electrical Institute. Under that comes the Associated Insulating Products Co. This, in turn, controls the Chrestein Mining Co. and F. F. Chrestein & Co., both of India. Then there's the Mica Insulator Co., of which Howard Sykes, the man who recommended Purcell to Jesse Jones, is chairman of the board, and Munsell & Co., with which Sykes is also connected, and whose vice president lives next door to Purcell.

The British trust claims it gets a lot of competition from the American firm of Blood & Schoonmaker, and here we get the omnipotent Mr. Sykes again. He's the son of Alice Adele Schoonmaker.

NEW ENGLAND GYPPED EITHER WAY

There are further ramifications hooking up Blood & Schoonmaker with the British mica combine by family ties, and the net result looks like an over-all trust covering both the import and, at least the southern end of the domestic business, leaving New England gypped either way.

All this has been previously publicized, Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round column, for one, having carried it in this approximate detail last month. But still nothing's done, and the mica stock pile in this country is understood to be down to a 2 months' supply, at most.

This is a job for the Department of Justice, and the Colonial job is one for some man who's thinking American. And New England deserves more than a break in the shuffle. We've got mica. The war needs mica, and the world will need it afterward. We can use a new industry. How about really going after this one? It's been pretty weirdly handled up to now.

Save Small Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting memorandum entitled "Save Small Steel" which has been submitted to the War Production Board by Mr. Philip Murray as president of the United Steelworkers of America. The memorandum presents a practical plan for keeping a score of small steel producers in operation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE SMALL STEEL

(By Philip Murray, president, United Steelworkers of America)

(Submitted to the War Production Board, March 1944)

PURPOSE

A practical plan to keep 20 small steel firms in business, preserve the livelihood of 27,175 steelworkers (30,200 including supervisory and clerical workers), prevent the deterioration of a dozen thriving communities into ghost steel towns, stop the further concentration of steel production in the huge steel corporations, and to save more than five and one-half million annual tons (5,678,000) of steel-producing capacity for the continued prosecution of the war and for post-war use.

SUMMARY

The Federal Government, having already invested over $60,000,000 in five Defense Plant Corporation blast furnaces, should operate them, instead of leaving them idle, thus securing a return on this investment of taxpayers' money.

The Federal Government should sell pig iron to the small semi-integrated steel producers at below O. P. A. ceiling prices, but not below cost of production, so that they can continue in business, as they are otherwise confronted with disaster and bankruptcy.

The Federal Government should sell returning battlefield scrap iron and steel below O. P. A. ceiling prices to those small semi-integrated producers who, after receiving pig iron at below O. P. A. ceilings, are still noncompetitive with the huge steel corporations.

The Federal Government should render assistance to the small semi-integrated steel producers so that (1) the steel-producing capacity of these firms can be kept intact during the war and (2) these small businesses, and the workers, stockholders, and communities dependent upon them can be protected during the transition period following the war.

THE PLAN

There are at least 20 small semi-integrated steel producers that are presently confronted with disaster and bankruptcy as a result of wartime distortions of the economy.

At the same time the Federal Government has invested over $60,000,000 in five blast furnaces and auxiliary equipment, through the Defense Plant Corporation, which will be either closed down after a brief period of operations or will not be operated when they are completed.

The five blast furnaces have an annual capacity of 2,115,000 net tons of pig iron. Instead of not utilizing these facilities, the Federal Government should direct the present D. P. C. agents for these blast furnaces to operate them for the account of the Defense Plant Corporation—just as the United States Steel Corporation is now operating the $180,000,000 D. P. C. steel plant at Geneva, Utah, for the account of the D. P. C.

The pig iron produced by these five blast furnaces, or such other D. P. C. blast furnaces as may be designated for this purpose, should be sold through the D. P. C. to the small semi-integrated steel producers who otherwise would not be competitive with the huge steel corporations. The pig iron should be sold at that discount below the current O. P. A. ceiling prices of $23 to $25 a gross ton as is found necessary to enable the respective small producers to be competitive, but not less than the cost of production to the D. P. C. Since the modern D. P. C. blast furnaces can produce pig iron at a cost as low as fourteen to seventeen dollars a gross ton, there is a sufficient margin within which the D. P. C. can sell its pig iron without suffering any loss or net cost to the Federal Government.

The War Production Board should appoint a small steel commission to administer this plan, consisting of three persons, one each from the Federal Government, the steel industry, and the United Steelworkers of America. This commission shall be empowered to:

1. Sell pig iron produced in Defense Plant Corporation blast furnaces to the small semi-integrated steel producers at that price which will enable them to live and compete with the huge steel corporations, whose plants have benefited from the addition of modern Government-built; low-cost producing facilities during the war.

2. Sell returning battlefield scrap iron and steel, through the Defense Plant Corporation, to those small semi-integrated steel producers who are not made competitive through the purchase of pig iron at below O. P. A. ceiling prices. This scrap shall be sold to the small producers at that discount below O. P. A. ceiling prices as the Commission finds is necessary to make them competitive.

In order to participate in the purchase of pig iron and returning battlefield scrap at below O. P. A. ceiling prices, the small semi-integrated steel producers shall be required to meet a minimum set of standards, which are defined later.

THE SMALL STEEL PRODUCERS

Of the 20 small steel producers confronted with disaster, one is on the verge of suspending steel-producing operations. Another is operating at only 40 percent of capacity, and several others are confronted with having to abandon operations before the war is won. Few, if any, are operating at capacity. Together, these 20 companies produce 5,678,000 net tons of steel ingots a year, or 5.8 percent of the entire industry's capacity.

These companies are not nonintegrated steel firms. They make their own steel, either in open hearth or electric steel furnaces, and all of them roll, forge, or shape their own steel into finished steel products ranging from ship plates to wire products. However, these small producers are all semi-integrated firms in that they do not produce their own pig iron, but buy it from pig iron producers. The semi-integrated steel producers are not to be confused with the nonintegrated steel firms that buy their steel and only roll, forge, or shape finished products; theirs is still another problem that is not dealt with in this plan.

The 20 small steel producers have 23 plants, located in 12 States running from Delaware to California and Alabama to New York. They employ 27,175 wage earners, and a total of 30,200 employees including supervisory and clerical workers. The wage earners of 17 of the firms are organized into the United Steelworkers of America.

In addition, there are 10 other small semi-integrated steel producers with 13 plants that may also be confronted with disaster and bankruptcy. These 10 small producers have a combined steel producing capacity of 842,000 net tons of ingots a year, and employ a total of 9,000 employees including supervisory and clerical workers. Whether any of these small producers should be permitted to purchase pig iron and battlefield scrap at below O. P. A. ceiling prices should be determined by the Small Steel Commission of course, on the same basis as it makes similar determinations for any of the 20 producers listed.

PEACETIME ECONOMIC POSITION

The 20 small producers, and others similarly situated, are normally dependent for their economic existence upon low-cost scrap iron and steel. The war economy has pushed the price of scrap up to O. P. A. ceiling prices (now averaging $19 a ton) with the consequence that the small semi-integrated steel producers are unable to buy low-cost scrap, as they did in peacetime, for $10 to $14 a ton. In addition, carbon scrap has been scarce and is still stringent, with the result that these semi-integrated producers have had to, and still have to, buy larger than normal amounts of pig iron to make up for the shortage of scrap. Pig iron costs five to six dollars a ton more than scrap iron and steel under O. P. A. ceiling prices. This has still further pushed the wartime production costs of the semi-integrated producers above their peacetime costs. The net effect of these wartime conditions has made it impossible for very many, if any, of these small firms to produce steel products at costs that permit them to sell at O. P. A. ceiling prices.

When the war is won, the price of scrap iron and steel may drop to pre-war levels, and thus enable these small steel producers to again become competitive with the huge steel corporations. Therefore, their present wartime economic plight may be temporary. Since their economic plight, however, is the making of the war economy, the responsibility rests with the Federal Government to take such action as will enable these small businesses to live until at least the return of peacetime economic conditions.

There is no question about the responsibility of the Federal Government to these small producers, as the Federal Government has granted price relief to them during the war to keep them alive and producing, to win the war. The disaster and bankruptcy facing these small producers now grows out of the fact that price relief assistance from the Federal Government has become ineffective, and other forms of relief are needed.

O. P. A. PRICE RELIEF DURING THE WAR

Of the 20 semi-integrated producers listed in appendix 1, 14 have price relief from O. P. A. These 14 firms represent 72 percent of the capacity of the 20 small producers. The O. P. A. ceiling price exemptions granted these 14 firms range from $1 to more than $7 a ton. A conservative estimate is that the average price relief is $2 a ton; the extent to which the price relief averages more than $2 a ton is offset by the extent to which the price relief does not apply to all of the tonnage of the 14 producers. On an annual basis these 14 have a capacity of 2,877,000 net tons of finished steel products. Therefore, the price subsidy granted them by O. P. A. amounts to at least $5,754,000 a year.

This price subsidy has been paid, in the main, by the Federal Government through lend-lease and the several steel-consuming war contractors who have had to purchase the products of these firms at above O. P. A.

ceiling prices. During the period of acute shortage of steel products of all kinds, this form of Federal Government subsidy (price relief) served to keep these small producers in business. The steel consumers, having no other source for steel products, were compelled to pay above O. P. A. ceiling prices and buy from these semi-integrated steel producers.

These conditions, beginning in December 1943, ceased to prevail. The acute shortage of all steel products came to an end, and, in several products, a definite surplus developed. As a consequence, the steel consumers who had been paying above O. P. A. ceiling prices to these semi-integrated producers were no longer compelled to do so by economic circumstances. They could, and did, go to other steel producers able to sell at O. P. A. ceiling prices. The result has been that the small semi-integrated producers (1) either have had to reduce their prices to ceiling levels or (2) lose the business to huge steel corporations who can sell for ceiling prices.

Few of these small producers have been able to sell at O. P. A. ceiling prices. Most of them have had to forego the business. As a consequence, they are operating far below capacity and face disaster and bankruptcy unless quick and effective aid is given them. This aid can only come from the Federal Government. The O. P. A. ceiling price relief assistance that the Federal Government has given these small producers in the last 2 years is no longer effective, because the producers cannot find consumers who are willing to pay above O. P. A. ceiling prices. Even the Treasury Department has turned from these small producers, from whom it bought considerable lend-lease steel, and is instead buying steel for lend-lease from the huge steel corporations, who can sell at O. P. A. ceiling prices.

Thus assistance from the Federal Government in the form of price relief, which was effective during the period of acute shortages of all kinds of steel, is no longer effective. The Federal Government, in granting price relief, assumed the responsibility of keeping these small businesses alive. It is still the responsibility of the Federal Government to keep them alive in the interest of the war, and, therefore, relief should be given the small semi-integrated steel producers in the form of below-ceiling-price sales of pig iron and battlefield scrap.

SUBSIDY FROM LABOR

The workers of the 20 small producers listed in appendix 1, are now giving their companies, and have been for several years, an annual wage subsidy of over four million dollars ($4,348,000). The workers of these small producers have straight-time hourly earnings of 94 cents. This compares with straight-time hourly earnings in the entire steel industry of $1.02 an hour. Thus for each hour of work the workers of the 20 small producers give their companies an 8-cent subsidy.

On an annual basis this 8-cent subsidy amounts to at least $160 (8 cents an hour for 2,000 straight-time hours). For 27,175 wage earners this 8-cents-an-hour subsidy amounts to $4,348,000. When overtime work is included the subsidy amounts to over $5,000,000 a year (4 hours of overtime or 6 hours of pay a week times 52 weeks, times 27,175 wage earners equals $679,000. This added to $4,348,000 equals $5,027,000).

Neither these 20 small steel producers, and others similarly situated, nor the Federal Government can call upon the workers of these small producers to grant their employers any larger wage subsidy. In fact, these workers are no longer able, due to rising living costs, to continue the subsidy they are now giving their employers. Furthermore, a wage subsidy has the same limitations as price relief. As long as there is a substantial surplus of manpower a wage subsidy is helpful. But when manpower becomes tight a wage subsidy is of little avail. It has been only by the most intensive effort that these small steel producers have been able to keep sufficient manpower in their plants.

BASIS FOR PARTICIPATION

In order to participate in the purchase of pig iron and battlefield scrap at below O. P. A. ceiling prices, a small semi-integrated steel producer must submit his entire cost of production figures to the Small Steel Commission—this is no more than is now required to secure O. P. A. price relief.

In addition, the participating small producer must meet the following minimum set of standards:

1. No executive officer shall receive total compensation that, after taxes, nets him more than $25,000 a year.

2. Dividend payments to stockholders should not be above a reasonable level.

3. All outstanding Federal laws and regulations affecting labor shall be adhered to by the participating producer.

Finally, of course, both the amount and duration of relief provided a participating producer shall be determined on the basis of his cost-of-production figures. The Small Steel Commission shall only grant relief to small producers to the amount, and just for as long, as is necessary to make them competitive with the huge steel corporations. The small steel producers shall not receive any competitive advantage over the huge steel corporations, but shall be permitted to purchase pig iron and battlefield scrap at that price and for that length of time as will place them on an equal competitive footing with the huge steel corporations.

BENEFITS OF PLAN

This plan has several distinct advantages that add to the general welfare of the country. These are:

1. The small steel producers will be kept in business.

2. The further concentration of steel production in a few huge steel corporations will be checked.

3. The families and communities that are, in the main, dependent upon these small producers shall not be economically ravaged.

4. The local, State, and Federal Governments shall be saved the large sums of money that otherwise would have to be spent for relief and rehabilitation of the towns and families that would be thrown into despair and economic ruin by the death of these small steel producers.

5. The steel-producing facilities of these small producers—incidentally they are more than 50 percent of the whole capacity of Japan—will be kept intact for the further prosecution of the war, and for the rebuilding of the United Nations in the post-war.

6. The large investments of taxpayers' money in the blast furnaces that otherwise would remain idle will be redeemed, at least in part, and the Federal Treasury will receive some return on the more than $60,000,000 it has invested in these pig-iron-producing furnaces.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 8, 1944.*

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MARTIN: The Italian Dressmakers' Union, Local 89, I. L. G. W. U. composed of 40,000 American workers of Italian extraction strongly urges you to defeat the equal-rights amendment. This 21-year-old proposal of the National Woman's Party hides behind fancy language. Bill would invalidate legislation safeguarding conditions of employment for women.

LUIGI ANTONINI,
General Secretary.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the newest bug demanding an appropriation is the spruce bud worm.

The Washington hotels are full of wolves trying to buy surplus war goods cheap.

The MARTIN DIES speech today in the House was the best on the Hill since BARKLEY day.

The English here have a royal powwow at the Statler once a month in the Congressional Room.

There are three acres of toilets in the Pentagon Building—the seat of a lot of absenteeism.

When Congressman Lawrence Lewis, of Denver, died he left no near relative and the Treasury saved $10,000.

The C. I. O. political action committee may have the tacit endorsement of some who fly but not of Eddie Rickenbacker, hero of two wars and now a peace hero.

There is an easing up on the production of synthetic rubber since victories in the southwest. We may never lay claim to these islands but I would not be surprised if we formed holding companies there.

One item in today's deficiency bill—"including repairs to property which is not Government-owned or leased but which is necessary to assure water supply to the American Legation at Teheran, $325,000."

The man-hours lost unnecessarily on making out income tax and the expense therewith would have been gigantic in concentrated effort, not to say anything of worry and sleepless nights. It proved to be an Axis ally.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine delivered her maiden speech today. This is an all-time woman's record. For three terms she has been a very useful and influential Member and for the past year an active member of Naval Affairs Committee. Think what she has not had to answer for.

The Versatility and Prestige of Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its universal public interest I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Versatility and Prestige of Silver," written by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and published in the Mining Congress Journal of February 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VERSATILITY AND PRESTIGE OF SILVER—ITS NEW WAR AND INDUSTRIAL IMPORTANCE RESULTS IN UNPRECEDENTED DEMAND REDUCING UNITED STATES STOCKS. POSITION ADVANCES IN COMING STABILIZATION OF WORLD CURRENCIES

(By Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, United States Senator from Nevada)

In the November issue of the Mining Congress Journal there appeared an article entitled, "Silver—A Metal of Growing Importance," in which was portrayed an optimistic picture as to the future of silver. This article pointed out that many of the varied war industrial uses of silver would be extended into the post-war period and that silver will always be a commodity indispensable to a large number of vital industries.

Silver is as inseparable from our present civilization as are iron, aluminum, copper, lead, zinc, and tin. Gold may be withdrawn from circulation rather completely without seriously handicapping industrial production; however, if all silver were placed in storage it would prove to be a serious handicap throughout the whole world.

Before Pearl Harbor and especially since we entered the war an unprecedented industrial demand for this precious metal has developed, 69,000,000 ounces being consumed in 1942. That is in addition to the 46,000,000 ounces consumed in 1942 in the manufacture of silverware, jewelry, photographic material, and other civilian articles. Eighty-one million two hundred and fifty thousand ounces were consumed in 1943 for war purposes alone and 43,750,000 ounces in the arts and other civilian lines. It is authoritatively estimated that from eighty-five to ninety million ounces of silver will be consumed in war industry alone during 1944.

Silver and silver alloys are the most desirable and durable high-temperature soldering and brazing materials used. Another metallurgical characteristic of silver is its complete lack of a tendency to combine with unalloyed steels. This property together with the high heat conductivity and plasticity of silver has led to its application as most efficient engine-bearing material. The heat created is carried away much faster, thus lowering the temperature of the bearing and adding to its lifetime.

Silver is the best conducting material for heat and electricity that has been found. In the electrical industry silver is used for contacts in layers, inserts, and buttons, only the contact areas consisting of silver. It is also used in telephone and telegraph systems, railway signaling devices, washing machines, refrigerators and air-conditioning units.

Another outstanding physical quality of silver is its reflectivity of light from the violet to the far infrared region of the spectrum. Its utilization for the backing of mirrors and thermos bottles is world-wide.

INCREASING USES IN CHEMISTRY

Silver is a remarkable corrosion protective because of its resistance to alkalies, organic acids, and certain mineral acids. These qualities have led to a wide use of silver in the chemical industry as a lining for equipment, such as stills, condensers, tanks, piping, heating coils, and reaction vessels, even when tin was readily available. The ability of silver to make strong, corrosion-resistant joints has led to wide use in marine and navy piping, high pressure boilers, transformers, busbar assemblies, and oil floats. The addition of silver in small concentrations to the stainless steels has proven to increase the resistivity of the steels against attacks by brine and sea water. The importance of this application is considerable in view of the desirability of the use of stainless steels for marine purposes.

The photosensitivity of silver salts is the basis upon which the photographic industry has been built. As only silver, in form of its halides, can serve for this process, it is no exaggeration to state that this metal is for this purpose truly indispensable.

A property of silver which appears to bear great promise in the future is its effect upon the living organism. This germicidal power of silver has been realized in the past decade in Europe to a much larger extent than in this country. It has led there to the development of plants for the treatment of water supplies, sanitation of swimming pools, and water sterilization in the wine, beer, vinegar, and soft-drink industries. It should be expected that similar developments will take place in this country. One application of silver as a germicide requires the introduction of silver ions into the liquid to be treated. This can be accomplished by electrolysis or by the insertion of activated carriers into the liquid which emit silver ions at the rate and for the time required. An improvement over this process is one in which an instantaneous germicidal effect is obtained by filtering water through a thin layer of material activated by special silver compounds. The two principal advantages of sterilization by silver are the freedom from off-tastes and odors and the germicidal action which the nonvolatile silver ions provide as long as they remain in solution. Swimming-pool water so treated inhibits algae growth and is not irritating to the mucous membrane.

Some silver compounds have demonstrated therapeutic value, and recent research developments seem to indicate advantages of certain silver-containing materials which may be useful as coatings to be applied to surfaces on which it is important to inhibit bacterial growth. An example of this latter would be coated wrappings for certain phases of the food industry. Another unique property of silver made possible the recent development of a process to render sea water potable.

Laboratory experiments are now in their final stage, out of which will emerge new uses and increased demand for the white metal. The combined consumption of silver in these new uses will probably amount to upward of 30,000,000 ounces a year. In this connection it is interesting to note that an Indianapolis firm specializing in the production of nonferrous alloys used in engine bearings lays great stress on silver's value in automotive and aviation engine performance (Time, January 3, 1944). They state that every warplane engine relies on silver for all engine, reduction-gear, and supercharger bearings, and that approximately 25 percent of the world's production of silver today is going into engine bearings.

SENSATIONAL DEMAND FOR WAR

The Daily Statement of the United States Treasury of February 15, 1944, reveals the fact that 902,622,278.8 ounces of Treasury "free" silver were held by Government agencies for nonconsumptive uses in war industrial plants. This silver has been leased for war uses to serve as a substitute for copper, and will be returned in kind shortly after the cessation of hostilities. In this connection it is interesting to note that 697,210,972.5 ounces of the silver in that category were transferred to the Defense Plant Corporation for use as busbars, principally in war plants producing aluminum and magnesium. Within the past few months 205,411,306.3 ounces of Treasury "free" silver have been transferred to another war agency for a new secret use in connection with the war program. Thus we find that the progress of silver as a war metal is nothing less than sensational.

Silver production of the United States for the calendar year 1943 was 41,372,854 ounces. This is 23.5 percent less than the 1942 output of 54,090,765 ounces. This decline in silver production in the United States has been due partly to shortage of manpower and partly to the closing of gold mines which produced some silver. Canada's production was down 16 percent, Peru's output was unchanged at 16,000,000 [1] ounces, while Mexico's production was estimated to be 87,000,000 [1] ounces, an 8 percent increase over the 80,700,000 [1] in 1942. There was also a very substantial decline in imports in 1943 due in part to lack of transportation and labor difficulties, but principally to increased coinage demand in Mexico and other foreign countries which export silver to the United States, the principal contributors being Mexico, Canada, and Peru.

GOVERNMENT HOLDINGS DECLINE

For the first year since the start of the silver purchase program in 1934, holdings of silver by the United States Government showed a decline. No foreign silver was purchased by the Government in 1943, and acquisitions of newly mined domestic silver amounted to only 5,400,000 ounces. Handy & Harman have estimated that there was a decrease of more than 80,000,000 ounces in the Treasury's silver holdings, most of which was lend-leased to Britain and other United Nations.

Last year the United States used more silver for domestic coinage than in any prior year. For the first 11 months of 1943 such consumption amounted to 95,818,000 ounces, including that in the new "silver" nickels. In addition the United States mints in that period received 12,429,000 ounces of silver for the purpose of foreign coinage.

At the end of 1943, the silver dollars in circulation had increased to $91,581,217, the subsidiary coinage circulation was $671,231,889, and the total silver certificate circulation was $1,564,843,253. These items amount to 11.4 percent of the total money in circulation ($20,439,025,030), which other than silver money consists of gold certificates ($55,218,979), Treasury notes of 1890 ($1,154,262), minor coin ($253,543,280), United States notes ($318,122,169), Federal Reserve notes ($16,730,626,613), Federal Reserve bank notes ($623,711,541), and national bank notes ($128,986,827). On May 31, 1934, the total amount of silver dollars, subsidiary coinage, and silver certificates in circulation amounted to 13.2 percent of the total of all money in circulation at that time, which was just prior to the passage of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

The act of July 12, 1943, authorized the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell at 71.11 cents an ounce for war uses and civilian needs Treasury stocks of silver not required for redemption of outstanding silver certificates, and to lease to war plants

[1] Handy & Harman Annual Review, 1943.

monetized bullion for nonconsumptive uses for a period not to exceed 5 years. This act will expire December 31, 1944.

Under this act the Treasury has received allocations by the War Production Board for the sale of 26,445,900 fine ounces of free silver. Under these allocations the Treasury has delivered, to the end of November, 17,218,466 fine ounces of silver.

In addition, some 40,000,000 fine ounces of silver have been delivered from the free silver in the Treasury to foreign governments under lend-lease arrangements. Almost 50 percent of this amount was delivered to India.

On July 29, 1943, the War Production Board revised its regulations covering the distribution of silver and stated the specific uses which might be made of Treasury silver, foreign silver, and domestically mined silver. Treasury silver may be used in the manufacture of engine bearings, brazing alloys, solder, and official military insignia; foreign silver may be used in the manufacture of medicines and health supplies, electrical contacts, and other miscellaneous products; and domestically mined silver may be used (upon the basis of 50 percent of 1941 or 1942 consumption) in the manufacture of such articles as silverware and jewelry.

There is a steadily growing tolerance on the part of economists and bankers toward the rehabilitation of silver as legal-tender money throughout the world.

In ancient, medieval, and modern times, silver has ranked with gold as the measure of monetary value. It is chiefly international political manipulation within the last 50 years which caused silver to gradually lose its ranking as a monetary standard. The nations of the earth have always preferred hard money, and silver has been preferred to gold by the masses.

The Mexican Bankers Association recently published their views as to what measures should be taken to secure for silver a definite role in any program of economic recuperation that may be adopted at the close of the war. Mexican official quarters state that statistics reveal that silver now discharges monetary functions in many countries and that it is therefore clear in any organization which is finally established that the function of silver will be recognized, thus guaranteeing its international use. They state, "that the importance of silver does not depend simply on the part it plays as merchandise. Something more potent is involved, and this 'something' is that the metal in question constitutes the basis of the daily transactions affecting more than a thousand millions of the inhabitants of our globe. And these daily transactions, although they concern only individuals of limited economic means, add up to an important total in the world markets by reason of the vast number of people involved."

The specific proposals of the Mexican Bankers Association were—

1. To recommend to all the central banks of America the building up of their reserves in gold and silver, with the proportionate values of 75 percent and 25 percent, respectively.

2. That to this end they should institute purchases of silver at prices equivalent in their own national currencies to that paid by the American Treasury.

3. That the valuation of those reserve metals shall be made at the equivalent per ounce, in national currency, of $35 for gold and $1.29 for silver.

ECONOMISTS DISCUSS MONETARY SILVER

Most of the recent discussion of monetary stabilization has revolved about the international gold standard, on the one hand, and exchange clearing through an international fund on the other.

Dr. Frank D. Graham, professor of economics at Princeton University, offers a third suggestion in his article entitled "Fundamentals of International Monetary Policy."[2] This plan, aimed at substantially unchanging price levels in all countries, with fixity of exchange rates, involves the readiness of some international authority, or perhaps merely the central bank of some important country, to buy and, after accumulating a reserve, to sell—freely at fixed prices and in indefinite quantities—warehouse receipts covering composite units of standard, storable commodities. The system could be inaugurated without the slightest disturbance to existing, or traditional, monetary arrangements. All of the present types of money and bank credit could be maintained along with the free purchases of gold at the established price.

Professor Graham states that "There are certain countries in which silver is still favored as the monetary material and it is desirable that such countries have the opportunity to restore, or retain, a silver standard without thereby injecting a disturbing element into international monetary relationships. The best means to this end would be for the United States Treasury to offer to sell silver freely at the same price at which it is prepared freely to buy it." The Treasury has kept stable the dollar price of silver, through the purchase of all the silver offered to it at a designated quotation. He further states that "because the Treasury's stock is enormous, the dollar value of silver could be maintained indefinitely at any designated level (that is to say that its price, in dollars, could be permanently stabilized) through the offer by the Treasury to sell the metal at the same price at which it stands ready to purchase it. The exchange value of the currencies of silver-standard countries would thereby be fixed vis-a-vis the dollar as well as against all other currencies linked with the dollar through gold or in any other manner. The optional right of redemption in silver, rather than in gold or commodity units, could then be given to any holder of dollars; and silver could be used, just as gold, to make international payments to the United States, or to any country maintaining stable exchange rates against the dollar, at an unchanging rate per ounce of the white metal. Silver would then be interchangeable with gold at a fixed weight ratio."

"Under this system," Professor Graham continues, "there could be no appreciable variation in the price level of the goods in the composite, just as, under the traditional gold standard, there could be no appreciable variation in the price of gold. A given amount of gold or silver would always be interchangeable with the composite of goods in the commodity unit. Any country desiring to maintain a stable price level, would resort quite simply to the gold or silver standard."

Professor Graham concludes with the following proposition: "The adoption in any important country of the policy of commodity reserves, along with the restoration of the free purchase and sale of gold and silver at a fixed price, would operate to stabilize price levels and the commodity value of gold and silver both in the country of adoption and in all gold- and silver-standard countries. It would thus furnish the basis for fixed exchange rates between their currencies."

Dr. Elgin Groseclose, a noted economist, in his recent article on "Near Eastern Post-War Monetary Standards,"[3] expresses the opinion that only the hardest of hard white money, silver, is suitable for daily use by the people of the Near East. He recommends for the countries of the Near East "a return to hard white money, freely circulating at its commodity value, enhanced by the confidence in its quality lent by the mint mark, and abandonment of all forms of paper currency, managed currency, or stabilized ratios, and eschewment of efforts to link their currencies to a world standard. While silver coin has practically disappeared from circulation, fair reserves of the metal are to be found locked in the vaults of many of the treasuries and central banks of these countries, and the return to the standard would draw more from existing hoards. Silver is a metal which is familiar to even the poorest; it is sufficiently cheap that a workman can be paid his day's wage in a coin of silver large enough not to be lost in the seams of his clothing, yet sufficiently valuable to be treasured and give him a sense of proprietorship * * *."

Mr. Dickson H. Leavens, in his discussion of Far Eastern post-war monetary standards,[3] concurs in the fact that the Near East and the Far East are, historically and traditionally, a hard-money territory. The masses are suspicious of paper money—they prefer metallic money, and that of a high purity of content.

The Far East was the last stronghold of the silver standard and even after the metal had been everywhere abandoned as standard of value, it is still in demand in India as a store of value.

Mr. Leavens states that, "China was the last country to abandon the silver standard and had an experience of some 60 years with the fluctuation price of the white metal. She underwent some bad effects from the great rise in the price of silver from 1915 to 1920 and from the great decline from 1927 to 1932. On the whole, however, these changes in the price of silver served to adjust China's price level to world commodity prices and saved her from the extremes of inflation suffered by the rest of the world in the former period and from the extremes of deflation in the latter.

"China's post-war currency problems are complicated by the present inflation," he continues. "There is still a considerable amount of monetary silver left in China, * * * perhaps 500,000,000 ounces as compared with a peak of 1,700,000,000 ounces in 1933. This is scattered in large and small hoards among the people, and is clandestinely used in some transactions, especially in the purchase of land. It is quite possible that, if the value of banknotes utterly breaks down, this silver will come out of hiding and provide a temporary currency. Similar things have happened when local and regional currencies in China have depreciated to the vanishing point at various times in the last 30 years. This phenomenon might make the path of least resistance seem to be the reversion to a silver basis."

SILVER "SPEARHEAD" CURRENCY

During 1943 there appeared in circulation in the African and European theaters of war a new special paper currency which attracted considerable attention in financial circles.

The first of these appeared during the invasion of north Africa and is what the Government calls spearhead currency. One of the principal uses of spearhead currency has been the payment of United States troops. It consists of United States silver certificates which differ from those in use at home only in the color of the seal, which on spearhead currency is yellow. This distinguishing mark was used on spearhead currency partly for security reasons to permit the isolation of the currency if it fell into enemy hands, partly to prevent the influx into the area of dollar currency already in the hands of the enemy, and partly to facilitate its entry into the United States by freeing it from present restrictions on ordinary United States currency. Yellow-seal certificates are part of the United States currency stock and

[2] The Monetary Standards Inquiry, October 1943.

[3] The Monetary Standards Inquiry, December 1943.

are included in Treasury statistics of silver certificates outstanding. They are redeemable in silver upon presentation in the United States in the same manner as the silver certificates bearing a blue seal.

The yellow-seal silver certificates consist primarily of new currency issued to replace worn certificates bearing blue seal. When the Army indicates a need for a certain amount of spearhead currency, the Treasury replaces that amount of worn blue-seal certificates with new ones printed with yellow seals. Instead of issuing them through the Federal Reserve banks, the Treasury issues them directly by delivering them to the Army in return for checks drawn against appropriations made by Congress. The Army then transports them to areas where they are needed. This currency is withdrawn from circulation as quickly as the military situation will allow. The yellow-seal certificates are to be replaced by blue-seal certificates for domestic circulation. The yellow-seal dollars used during the early stages of the north African operation were withdrawn from circulation as adequate stocks of local currency became available. Nearly all the yellow-seal dollars used in that area are now in the hands of the United States Army authorities.

Occupation currency is the second kind of invasion currency. This is represented by the occupation lire, first used by our forces during the invasion of Sicily and later introduced into Italy proper. They are intended to supplement and, if absolutely necessary, substitute for the Italian paper currency. They are unlimited legal tender in the invaded areas, but they are not part of the United States monetary stock. The occupation currency is printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the Allied Military Government.

In the other theaters of war our troops have used either American currency or some local currency. In the South Pacific, for example, dollars, Australian pounds, and New Caledonian francs are in use, and in the United Kingdom our troops are paid in sterling.

STABILIZING WORLD CURRENCIES

Recently published criticisms of British economists and bankers make it apparent that the chief objections to the United States Treasury stabilization fund plan are that it is too rigid; on the contrary, American economists and bankers regard the British plan as too flexible. It is, of course, possible to reach a compromise, but doubtful if any acceptable plan can be agreed upon and put into operation, at least, before a partial restoration of world trade has taken place. And it is not likely that the resumption of an orderly world trade can be achieved before the repatriation of large masses of European peoples and their political and civil rehabilitation shall have been accomplished. These readjustments are so fundamentally important and their scope of such magnitude as to require a considerable period of time in which to make world economic recovery possible.

Because of the fact that the United States has enjoyed and will continue to enjoy a large export balance of trade and England will continue to struggle against an inevitable import trade balance, the task of reconciling these diametrically different trade positions offers one of the most puzzling problems confronting the world today. Therefore, conflicting interests, must necessarily enter the picture. England will strive to import raw materials from countries that have low-valued currencies in terms of the pound sterling and to export their processed goods to countries whose currencies are exchanged in higher values. As the advantage is with the exporting country whose currency is maintained at a low exchange value, it will be impossible in the post-war period to adjust currency exchange values in a manner that will be mutually beneficial to the United States and England.

During the period of transition from war to peace, currency orderliness must be restored before any substantial step toward stabilization can be effected. In view of the unprecedented dislocation of commercial activity within the various belligerent and occupied countries of the world, together with the unavailability of sufficient gold and silver to support their currencies, much work must be done preliminary to the establishment of currency exchange values on a sound basis. In the premises how could a World Stabilization Fund be expected to function equitably and smoothly immediately following the cessation of hostilities?

In restoring the normal functioning of currency systems it must be realized that gold and silver reserves of the conquered as well as the satellite countries have been confiscated, and in their stead worthless paper money has been circulated. It is quite probable that 75 percent of the silver coins and bullion of those countries have gone into munitions and implements of war. This together with the shortage of money metals elsewhere makes necessary the redistribution of some of the gold and silver reserves that are now stored in the United States. No doubt our Government will welcome an opportunity to distribute liberally its precious money metals reserves among friendly nations with whom we desire to reestablish trade.

There are many economists, particularly in Great Britain, who do not share with American economists and bankers the opinion that gold and silver are essential to a sound currency. Indeed, there are some American economists and bankers who are disposed to discredit the important role of silver as backing for our paper money. And yet these currency experts can offer no valid reason to substantiate their contention. Nor can they point out, with any degree of conviction, wherein silver-backed certificates and silver dollars have in any way proved detrimental to our currency system.

Some form of international bimetallism in the post-war world must be established if sound currency systems are to be restored on a sound basis in foreign countries. The use of silver along with gold in the settlement of international balances will minimize manipulations and afford greater protection to currency exchange values of the weaker nations. Why is it not reasonable to assume that a currency system based on both gold and silver, such as the system in the United States, would be the most logical, the most substantial, and the most acceptable for any other country? It is inconceivable how any person well informed on currency matters could hold that a paper note is superior to a silver dollar or to an equivalent amount of silver bullion. Yet, such a contention is occasionally voiced.

The wages of more than half of the people of the world are so small as to make difficult and illogical the utilization of gold alone in the payment of their compensation. Silver offers to them the only acceptable means of payment. Furthermore, when we consider that a very small percentage of the people of the world have bank accounts, we realize the hardships that would be imposed on the remaining masses, whose average daily wage is only a few cents in our money, if required to accept and to store away irredeemable paper notes. The distrust of paper money will be reflected in the demand for gold- and silver-backed currencies; and this demand must be met.

The world has suffered, and is still suffering, from the misuse of paper money. Values cannot be maintained for any appreciable period where they are based on paper promises. Stability can be achieved only where the precious metals (gold and silver) are used as a measure of values.

Heavy Ordnance in Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address given by Maj. Gen. L. R. Campbell, Chief of Ordnance of the United States Army, before the Milwaukee post of the Army Ordnance Association, March 8, 1944. I am sure Members of this Congress will be glad to have the information given by General Campbell regarding some of the weapons used in this war. The address, Heavy Ordnance in Battle, follows:

Colonel Coleman, distinguished guests, gentlemen, to meet with you tonight is a pleasure I have anticipated for a long time. This is my first opportunity as Chief of Ordnance of the Army to speak to members of the Army Ordnance Association in this important area. The fame of Milwaukee and of Wisconsin as a producer of heavy machinery is world wide. The Ordnance Department of the Army is a user of heavy machinery on a gigantic scale, and with the aid of private industry is the producer of heavy, powerful weapons on an equally broad front. To say that I, as Chief of Ordnance, feel closely attached to American industry is a truism; but that I appreciate the importance of industry in this locality is an abiding fact which I am privileged to acknowledge here in your presence. I shall have occasion frequently during the course of my brief remarks to emphasize this point. The cooperation of industry and ordnance in the winning of this war is evidence of our industrial strength at home and of our military strength on all the battlefields at this hour.

May I take the liberty, at the start, Mr. Toastmaster, of making a personal reference which I am sure you would not have agreed to had you known about it in advance. It relates to our toastmaster himself. Colonel Coleman symbolizes the very highest type of American industrial executive whose devotion to the national defense of the United States is largely responsible for our present satisfactory ordnance progress. That is a well-considered statement, and I make it with full knowledge of all its implications.

In the last World War Colonel Coleman served as a special assistant on artillery production to Maj. Gen. C. C. Williams, then Chief of Ordnance of the Army. He rendered outstanding service to the Ordnance Department and to the Army in that important office. When the Army Ordnance Association was formed to perpetuate the ordnance lessons of World War No. 1 Colonel Coleman was one of the founding committee. He helped organize the association, and in October 1919 was elected first vice president, an office he has held without interruption for nearly 25 years. During that entire period his loyalty to ordnance, his sacrifice of time and personal effort, his leadership in ordnance thinking, and above all, his sound judgment, helped bring ordnance to its commanding position in world-wide battle today. Our country can never adequately repay Colonel Coleman and other industrial leaders like him who have given so generously of their time and talents to bring about the armament condition now enjoyed by our American fighting forces. I venture to say that the testimony of every fighting man of our forces would bear me out in this ap-

praisal. Colonel Coleman, as Chief of Ordnance of the Army, I thank you most heartily for all that you have done and are doing, not only for the welfare of our country at home but for the victory of our troops abroad.

Tonight, gentlemen, I propose to talk to you about our heavy ordnance in battle. I have chosen this topic for two reasons:

First, because victory in battle at this moment—battles in which our heroic American forces are at death grips with a ruthless enemy—depends upon firepower as never before. Secondly, Milwaukee is noted for its heavy machinery, and is actively engaged in the production of heavy ordnance. What more appropriate place could there be to discuss our heavy guns?

I intend to speak about only three of our big guns, otherwise, I might intrude upon your time beyond the allotted period. These three are pretty good samples to say the least. But they are only a few of the many superior types of American ordnance—known to our enemy and unknown—that we have available.

One of the most impressive and highly revered pieces of heavy artillery now in the hands of our troops is the gun that is affectionately known as "Long Tom." It is the 155-millimeter gun on high-speed carriage. It is one of the most remarkable pieces of fighting equipment the world over. For all its weight of more than 30,000 pounds, it has a range of more than 25,000 yards. It can fire three rounds a minute. It has a muzzle velocity of 2,800 foot-seconds. Its carriage is the split-trail type. It can be towed by a prime mover at the speed of a truck. Its accuracy is so deadly that it is actually accredited with sharp-shooting on the Italian front. This weapon is a tribute to the ordnance designers at our great arsenals at Watertown, Watervliet, and Rock Island. It is also a tribute to the genius of American industry that has built its carriage and component parts with extreme accuracy and precision. "Long Tom," now that our tactics require guns of siege and interdiction fire, is worthy of the best traditions of American ordnance and of American fighters. We of ordnance stand today as we have for the past 100 years for firepower and yet more firepower.

Possibly Dr. Fritz Meske of Berlin had "Long Tom" in mind when he broadcast the other night on the Berlin radio. I would like to quote the doctor verbatim. He spoke in German to listeners in Germany. Said the doctor:

"The enemy's strength lies in his extremely extensive and variegated artillery. Whole batteries fire on every individual soldier or dispatch rider who shows himself, so that attacks and troop movements can hardly be made at all, except at night. Enemy artillery, often supported by heavy naval guns, covers with drum fire of World War dimensions every bit of the ground where the German main line is either found or believed to be. The whole district around Aprilia is covered by a milky smoke of shells. It is a hellish test for the nerves of the grenadiers. Our advance continues over the graves of our dear comrades in the fifth year of the war, as it did in the first. There can be no question that the fighting, on the southern front and in the Nettuno beachhead alike, has become harder to an extent which we have hardly experienced in the big battles in the east. What the enemy cannot reach with his artillery, he attacks with his very strong air force."

"Long Tom" has a long record of high praise. We can now add Dr. Meske's commendation to all the rest.

Now let us advance one step higher in the realm of heavy ordnance in battle and let me tell you about our next larger piece, our eight-inch—that is our 200-millimeter gun. It is a honey. It fires a round a minute to a range of 35,000 yards with a muzzle velocity of 2,600 foot-seconds. Its shells are either high explosive or armor-piercing. Its weight, gun and carriage, is 69,000 pounds. It is one of the most powerful weapons the world over. While we refer to it as eight inch in caliber it would be well to remember that eight inches means 200 millimeter. When you hear that our enemy in Italy is using 170-millimeter guns against our troops, bear in mind that your Ordnance Department—advocate of increased firepower—has available for our fighting forces a much more potent weapon which can greatly out-range its adversary.

Once again let me quote an enemy source of commendation. It might well include our 200-millimeter gun. This time the author of the quotation is an anonymous captured German general. I am indebted to Mr. Andre Maurois, writing in a recent issue of Life magazine, for the quotation:

"If I had to organize an international army, I should choose German infantry, French artillery, British aviation, Italian music, and American ordnance."

And finally there is one more heavy piece well worthy of mention at this time because you people here in Milwaukee are especially responsible for it. Its carriage was actually designed in Colonel Coleman's plant at the Bucyrus-Erie Co., and it is being produced here at this moment. I refer to the 240-millimeter howitzer, the largest mobile artillery in our service short of railway artillery. The carriage of this mammoth gun travels in two sections on rubber-tired wagons. It has a range of more than 25,000 yards. It packs a terrific blow. It is one of the most accurate and most destructive mobile weapons of siege warfare ever devised. It is the embodiment of our ordnance principle of maximum fire power. If a rapier thrust be demanded in battle, ordnance has the weapons to meet the condition. If a battle-ax be required to hack and hew at the enemy position, again ordnance has the weapon available. Our 240-millimeter piece is a modern battle-ax against which few military targets can stand up.

Whom shall I quote to sustain my opinion of this range of heavy weapons? Here I will use the words not of a captured enemy general, but of some of our own famed American leaders from the battle fronts.

From Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers, in command of the north African theater of operations: "Your ordnance equipment is still par excellence with everyone."

From. Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger, in command of the American Sixth Army, "The quality of ordnance supplied to our fighting forces is superb."

From Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, in command of the American Fifth Army: "The Ordnance Department has performed a tremendously fine task in keeping us supplied with arms and munitions."

That, gentlemen, is a hasty résumé of some of our heavy ordnance weapons. They are more than equal to their assigned tasks. They represent the best engineering skill and production technique of American industry. They are the joint production of the industry-ordnance team, than which there is no more powerful, efficient, and effective adjunct of the American fighting man.

Once again I say to the mothers and fathers of American soldiers everywhere, have faith in American artillery. There is none better in the world. It is a worthy companion for your heroic sons. Our guns and their valor are matchless. They are a guaranty of victory.

Address Before Real Estate Board of Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Real Estate Board of Kansas City, Mo., at the Muehlebach Hotel, Friday, February 25, 1944:

This country is more tax conscious today than ever before in its history. Not only are the people tax conscious, but they are worried and uncertain as to the future economic stability of the United States, particularly when the artificial stimulants of our wartime economy are withdrawn. This universal interest in our financial situation has come about because of the millions of new taxpayers who are now on the books but who never paid an income tax until last year, plus the fact that there is a growing realization that our Federal income tax has reached the point of virtual confiscation; that is to say, we have reached a point where the tax is so high that no one is able to accumulate any substantial savings. The answer to our future political freedom and well-being lies in the question of taxation and there can be no hope of permanent financial solvency in our National Government until the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes is sharply curtailed. Two specific remedies which could achieve this highly desirable end have been proposed, and it is my purpose to discuss them in this talk.

It takes real courage and a high degree of optimism to avoid a feeling of hopelessness with respect to the future of our governmental operations. Nevertheless, we have never been, and we trust that we never will be, a Nation with a defeatist psychology. We must proceed on and from the theory that there is an answer to this apparently hopeless situation.

When our national debt reached the sum of thirty or thirty-five billion dollars, I distinctly remember hearing President Roosevelt in a radio address tell us that he had been advised by competent economists that this country could stand a national debt of anywhere from eighty to one hundred billion dollars. Now, through no fault of our own, we will have a debt three times that size. The very item of interest, seven and one-half to nine billion dollars, is twice as much as was our annual budget in 1932, yet this amount does not include appropriations for such essential services as the post offices, the courts, the Army, the Navy, Veterans' Administration, and other essential elements of government. I lay especial emphasis on the word "essential," for if we continue with our present policy whereby the Federal Government dabbles in everything from the birth of babies to the fertilization of a farmer's field, we might just as well accept the inevitable and get ready for repudiation and unbridled inflation.

The statement is continually made that we have pulled out of all other economic crises and that, consequently, we can pull out of this one. This may be true, but the fact must not be overlooked that for the first time we will have a national debt which is three or four times the size of our normal

annual national income. While the war was the factor that shot our debt to astronomical limits, it must be borne in mind that it was sharply increasing for the 10 years prior to Pearl Harbor. In 1930 the debt was a little over $16,000,000,000 but by 1939, the last year of peace, it amounted to forty and one-half billion dollars. Now in 1944 it amounts to approximately $206,000,000,000, with the prospect that if the war continues through 1945, it will reach three hundred billion at a minimum.

Our national finances are in a precarious situation and there is no easy road out of our dilemma. Nothing worth while is ever achieved without work and sacrifice, and the answer to our national problem is no exception to this rule. Deficit spending has been tried for a decade and found totally wanting. Pump priming was used from 1933 to 1939, yet no real prosperity resulted from the lavish outpouring of Federal money. The scarcity theory of economics has been exposed as suicidal. A continuation of this theory and philosophy of government will inevitably result in repudiation, and in the next stage we will see the "funny money man," the governmental quack who will propose and put into effect all sorts of schemes which will result in inflation and ruin, and then will come the "man on horseback," and when dictatorship arrives, the things that we have fought this war for will be merely empty shells.

Before we try to decide what factors brought about a system of government whose expenses brought on a policy of virtual confiscation by taxes, suppose we examine the factors which made us the greatest nation on earth and provided our people with the highest standard of living ever known. Our form of government, which stemmed from our Constitution, was written by real liberals. Gladstone said that the American Constitutional Convention contained the largest collection of real statesmen ever gathered together at one time or place. These men were true liberals in that they sought not only to throw off, but to guard against the shackles of an overwhelming executive department. The present-day so-called liberals are in truth and in fact nothing but pure reactionaries. When they adopt the philosophy that the Government is better able to manage a man's business than is the owner of the business, they are reverting to the reactionary theories of despotism, which our forefathers sought to escape by coming to this country and which they attempted to guard against in writing our Constitution.

The nineteenth century, and particularly the last half of that era, was a period made notable by inventive genius under a helpful rather than a punitive government. This inventive genius, encouraged by a benevolent government, reached out and subdued and consolidated a continent in an unbelievably short time. We still have all the elements of a strong inventive society, as evidenced by the speed with which we converted our economic life from a peace to a wartime economy. We grew powerful while scorning the paternalistic and totalitarian ideas of Europe, and it was only when we began to lose faith in ourselves that we began to adopt the defeatist attitude of Europe, together with the theories of these bankrupt countries. We grew great under a national government which, for the most part, was limited to strictly governmental functions; a government operated and directed by ourselves, through our representatives—in other words, under a congressional form of government. With the hysteria engendered by the depression, we began to look for short cuts to prosperity and voluntarily relinquished rights reserved to the people and to the States, for which Englishmen, and later Americans, had died to obtain and maintain. In our complacency we took for granted, and even now are taking for granted, rights and freedoms which were secured by freedom-loving people at the point of sword, but once these freedoms are surrendered each passing year will make their recapture more difficult and more costly.

At the present time the battle line is being drawn for a fight between the executive and legislative departments, and when I refer to the executive department, I make only casual reference to the present executive department. The trend under any president, Republican or Democrat, has been the same; a constant expansion of the executive branch of government. With all of its faults, Congress offers the people their only chance to participate in and to direct the policies of our National Government.

The framers of the Constitution intended that the congressional branch of the Government should be dominant. An inspection of the Constitution reveals the truth of this statement, for in that document the provisions for the establishment of a Congress come first, the executive department is provided for second, and last of all the judicial department is provided as an arbiter for the other two. Great powers were given to Congress. Only Congress can declare war. Only Congress can provide for the coinage of money, and the Constitution is specific in its statement that all legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States. To be sure a veto power was provided for the executive department, but likewise it was provided that Congress could continue to legislate and to carry out the mandates which it receives from the people by overriding the veto of the Executive by a two-thirds vote. The drafters of the Constitution were correct in providing that Congress should (1) pass laws, (2) appropriate money, (3) investigate the executive departments from time to time to be sure that the department was executing the laws as intended by Congress, and (4) report back to the people from time to time as to the operation of the Federal Government. In recent times, however, the executive department has grown by such leaps and bounds that it is necessary for Members of Congress to spend most of their time in attending to the matters of their constituents before the departments rather than in performing their intended functions.

The right of personal liberty, of property, of comfort, the right of the citizen to lead an individual life, to marry whom he pleases and to earn his livelihood in the manner most agreeable to him are empty rights unless asserted and retained by the people through their representatives. There are those who think that the state is omniscient; that the state, rather than the individual, knows whether a young man should be a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, a mechanic, or what-not. There are those in high places who have openly, within the last few months, made these statements. They are entitled, of course, to their opinion, but most of us are just as anxious that our children shall have the right to select their own occupation and to control their own destiny as did we.

Our country is too vast and too diversified in interests to be governed by a central government in Washington. Only local government can provide democracy. A government where we personally know our rulers and our magistrates is responsive to the wishes and tempers of the people. Democracy can and does exist in our school boards, in our city councils, in our county courts, and in our justices of the peace, but it never can and never will exist in a government with all power centralized in Washington, and where the vital affairs of the people are controlled and regulated by bureaucrats whom the people do not know nor will ever know.

Our National Government was set up in order that the States and the inhabitants of the States might enjoy certain basic advantages and conveniences that only a central government can afford. For 125 years the basic conception of a national government confined to the essentials prevailed in this country, and then the great expansion began. The answer is not hard to find, for up until 1913, at the time of the adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment, which provided for the income tax, the sources of revenue of the National Government were very limited, and it is a matter of common knowledge and common experience that the only time a government does not spend money is when it does not have money to spend. In 1913, at the time of the adoption of the income-tax amendment, the national expenditures were only $700,000,000. In 1916, they had jumped to $1,034,000,000. In 1938, which was a peacetime year, they had jumped to $7,000,000,000. With the big increase in the national income, caused by the adoption of the income-tax amendment, funds were provided for services rendered by the National Government that were never contemplated by the founders. I do not deny that many of these services were beneficial, but I submit that most of these services could and should have been rendered by the States and local governments instead of by a bureaucratic government in Washington. The net result to the taxpayer would have been the same or less, for, of course, the National Government has no money to give away except such amounts as it picks up from the citizens of the various States.

Government departments have a way of mushrooming and growing beyond belief. When the National Department of Agriculture was first set up, it had an appropriation of $3,000 for the purpose of gathering statistics, but by 1938 it was enjoying an annual appropriation of one and one-half billion dollars. The Department of Labor started out with a small appropriation of $25,000 to gather statistics, but by 1938 its annual appropriation amounted to $26,000,000. The National Children's Bureau commenced business with an appropriation of $25,000, but for the coming year Miss Lenroot, the Director, assures the Congress that she must have $25,000,000 in order to carry out her program. Last week I noticed where the department head in charge of free lunches for school children was requesting the sum of $50,000,000 for the coming year. I could go on and on indefinitely, but it seems to me that the height of absurdity was reached last year when the Farm Security Administration loaned the tenant farmers under its jurisdiction money with which to purchase War bonds.

Obviously these rapidly growing departments, together with their increased costs, can only be paid for by a heavy increase in taxes. Consequently, for many years past the lowest rate we have paid on our normal income is 6 percent, and under the new tax bill the rate was raised to 10 percent. Corporate taxes during the last year amounted to 40 percent and excess profits to 90 percent, and now are to be increased to 95 percent. We have gotten to the place where the Federal Government is levying taxes to a point that means the difference between profit and loss, and with no end in sight. To illustrate how the taxing power of the Federal Government has grown, it is interesting to note that when the Sixteenth Amendment was proposed in 1913, Charles Evans Hughes, then Governor of New York, was opposed to the adoption of the amendment, because he was afraid that the time might come when the Federal Government might levy a tax of 10 percent.

However, this is a realistic world, and there is no use in sitting around licking our sores and thinking with nostalgic reverence of the good old days of States' rights. So-called States' rights is not the solution to the problem. On the contrary, State responsibility is our hope, and if the States will assume their responsibility, their so-called rights will take care of themselves.

Fortunately, there is evidence that some of the States and cities are beginning to be aware of the fact that they have a very

definite responsibility in the post-war world, and with this awakening responsibility will come a fear and a realization of the danger and waste of an all-inclusive Federal Government. For instance, the relative small town of Gainesville, Ga., has announced that by a careful fiscal policy it has succeeded in building up a surplus of $8,000,000, which it proposes to expend for worth-while public projects after the war to provide employment. Our little neighbor, Hannibal, Mo., has shown the sort of spunk that used to be typical of American communities. There the school board has very properly refused the aid of the Federal Government in providing free lunches for school children, the board taking the position that the district and the community can and will provide these facilities.

The State of Connecticut has done a good job of looking to the future and in providing a reservoir of public works to provide temporary employment. I use the word "temporary" designedly, for Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut, sums up the situation with a high degree of accuracy when he says, "Public works at best will constitute but a minor phase of the post-war problem." Even more realistic and diagnostic is Governor Baldwin when he says, "What then is most likely to restrain the post-war expansion of business and industry? First and foremost: Taxes."

Pennsylvania has done one of the best jobs of post-war planning of any of the States. Governor Martin sums up the position of the State most admirably when he says, "Pennsylvania recognizes that, to the companies within its borders, taxation may be the difference between profit and loss, and to its citizens it may be the difference between a good job and a mediocre job or no job at all."

Thus it appears that the old pioneer quality of self-sufficiency is still existent in America. It is not only existent, but in my judgment, it is waiting for a chance to come out of hiding and to assert itself, provided it is given encouragement. There is never any use of criticizing an existing order unless we are prepared to offer some specific remedy to alleviate the conditions of which we complain. If we think the executive branch of the Federal Government has become too powerful, do we have any definite and workable plans to reverse this tendency? It would appear that there are two plans under consideration which will produce this result.

1. Fourteen States have memorialized the Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution which, in effect, would be a modifying amendment to the sixteenth amendment and which would provide that, except in time of war, the Federal Government cannot levy a tax in excess of 25 percent on the income of any citizen.

2. Congressman DISNEY, of Oklahoma, one of the ablest and soundest men in the House, has introduced a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to limit the power of Congress to levy taxes. Briefly, the Disney resolution, which I hope will be adopted and submitted to the States in a form of a constitutional amendment, provides that on the first day of the session the President shall submit to the Congress an estimate of anticipated revenues for the ensuing year under the tax laws then in force. The Executive shall then recommend in his message as to how these revenues shall be spent. Except during time of war or for 1 year thereafter, the Congress shall not appropriate money in excess of such estimate except by a three-fifths vote of both bodies unless the Congress shall at the time of the making of an appropriation in excess of estimated revenues provide for new taxes designed to raise the necessary revenue. In order to provide absolute financial soundness, it is provided that these restrictions shall apply to all appropriations except for contingencies of Congress, the courts, or for claims that have been judicially established against the United States—in other words, claims that have been reduced to judgment in the Court of Claims.

The Disney resolution merely provides the same safeguard against the unlimited spending by Congress that is provided in every State constitution with respect to the legislature and with respect to the subdivisions of the State. It is a matter of common knowledge and common experience that the only way that a public body can be kept from spending more money than it takes in is to limit the power of the spending body to appropriate money, and there is no reason why Congress, as well as the States and subdivisions, should not be under these precautionary restrictions.

If these two amendments were adopted, a decentralization of our Government would, of necessity follow, for the reason that the Federal Government would not have the revenue to carry on its present all-inclusive activities. If the Federal Government were precluded from levying income taxes in excess of 25 percent of income, together with the Disney restrictions on appropriations, we would not see the millions of bureaucrats running up and down the country and sticking their nose into every legitimate business transaction carried on by the businessman of this country. The Department of Agriculture and the Children's Bureau would not be able to indulge in every capricious whim of the administrator of the department, and the Farm Security Administration would have some difficulty in loaning tenant farmers the tax money of the country with which to buy Government bonds. Such restrictions would certainly kill for all the time the cradle-to-the-grave philosophy of our starry-eyed idealists, and in its place we might have a government, both local and national, for which we could afford to pay, for when these functions are transferred from an unresponsive remote Government at Washington to the State and subdivisions, where the voters know the people who are responsible for the expenditure of their tax money a far higher degree of responsibility will ensue. We, of course, will never get back to the old concept of States' rights, and with our changing society it is not desirable that we should, but it is to be hoped that we will get back some sort of fiscal sanity.

This is a rich country of almost unbelievable national resources. Our inventive genius is second to none; in fact, it far surpasses anything that the world has known. We can meet and conquer the problems that will confront us after the war, even with our staggering debt three times as great as Mr. Roosevelt said we could safely bear, but we can't do it under the present set-up. The American people and American business did a pretty fair job for 150 years of managing their own lives and their own business without governmental coddling on the one hand and the restrictive directives of the bureaus on the other. Given a chance and a minimum of governmental supervision, we can and we will reassert our national and individual initiative and carry on, to the end that we may maintain a solvent Government and provide a high standard of living for our people.

Capt. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., New Jersey's Leading Air Ace of This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a newspaper editorial describing the excellent war record of Capt. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., a resident of the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey. The editorial follows:

Since last April, when he entered the Southwest Pacific area of operations, New Jersey's leading air ace of this war—now Captain McGuire—has played a funeral dirge with the cannon and machine guns of his P–38 Lightning fighter plane for at least 17 of Hirohito's flyers.

His individual feats have made him the third ranking Army ace in the Southwest Pacific theater and have won him the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal, with numerous clusters. He has participated in more than 115 operational flights.

Until a few months before Pearl Harbor Captain McGuire was an aeronautical engineering student at Georgia Tech, where he played a cornet in the college band. Before that, he had tooted first horn in the Sebring (Fla.) high-school band which won the national interscholastic championship in 1937.

Then, in the spring of 1941, he got the flying bug, won his civilian flying license and enlisted in the Army Air Corps.

After winning his wings at Randolph Field, he served for 6 months in the Aleutians, where he never once sighted an enemy plane, but since his transfer to the Southwest Pacific the Nipponese have seen plenty of him.

McGuire was shot down himself once—the day he got his twelfth and thirteenth enemy planes. He spent a month in Australia, recovering from wounds, but never mentioned that in his letters home.

"I didn't want to worry you," he wrote to his father, a Ridgewood automobile dealer, who got the story from a brother officer in this country on leave. Here's what the returned flyer told the senior McGuire:

"Tommy's wingman was jumped by five Zeros on October 17 when they were coming in from a patrol flight. Tommy wheeled around and dove right into the Japs and sent two of them down in flames before the others got him. One of his engines was hit and his plane caught fire.

"He bailed out and spent 5 hours in a leaking rubber boat, with shrapnel wounds in his arm and two black eyes. Some of our planes found him just before sunset."

For that action, Captain McGuire received the Distinguished Flying Cross from Lt. Gen. George C. Kenney, Chief Air Officer in the southwest Pacific, who wrote to the Ridgewood pilot's wife, the former Marion Geisler, of San Antonio, Tex.:

"It was an award made in recognition of courageous service to his combat organization, his fellow American airmen, his country, his home, and you.

"He was cited for heroism in flight and exceptional and outstanding accomplishments in the face of great danger above and beyond the line of duty."

McGuire was back in action when the Fifth Army Air Force provided cover for the Allied ground forces making their second invasion strike on the coast of New Britain, at Cape Gloucester, the day after Christmas 1943.

Tommy shot down four Japanese Val dive bombers in 15 minutes, which he described to an Army public-relations officer as "probably the busiest 15 minutes I have ever spent."

"There were 16 planes in our formation," he related. "Our job was to patrol the Gloucester area, and protect the shipping proceeding to and lying off the shore, from bomber attack. Along with 'Pudgy,' that's what I call my ship (and she really has stood by me against our little * * * friends), * * * we hit the target area a short time later, and proceeded to circle around waiting for Japs.

"Suddenly one of the planes in our formation sighted between 30 and 40 Zeroes headed

our way. Just as we started to make a direct head-on pass at these 'Zekes,' someone spotted some more of them flying slightly above and to the left of our position. To avoid being closed in by a two-sided attack, we throttled faster under this second group of 'Zekes.' As we started to climb back to gain altitude to meet the 'Zekes,' I sighted about 25 to 30 'Val' dive bombers at an altitude of 18,000 feet.

"Our main job was to protect the shipping, so I signalled to the other men and in a quick dive we headed as fast as we could toward the 'Vals,' which at this time were almost over the shipping. They had already started to swing down toward the destroyers and larger cargo vessels, at an angle of 45 degrees, when we made contact at 8,000 to 10,000 feet. They saw us at that time and the majority immediately salvoed their bombs, and headed fast down toward the water and coast line, as this was their best means of escape.

"I got my first blast at one at 8,000 feet; it burst into flames and clouds of smoke trailed the plane as it dived straight into the sea. By this time most of them that hadn't headed out to sea were flying at a minimum altitude over the water. I made about eight passes from dead astern and caught another about 150 feet from the water, and I saw him explode in the air. A few passes later, it seemed like a couple of seconds, I fired a final burst into a third 'Val' and this, too, crashed into the water."

McGuire's fourth victim that day was not accounted for in the public-relations officer's report.

Another dispatch from this area recently quoted the New Jersey flyer as saying Jap pilots generally run away unless they have heavy numerical superiority, and that they no longer carry the fight to the Allies.

"The Japs now are using more teamwork than before," McGuire said, "but they still range from very poor to very good, whereas our pilots are uniformly pretty good. The Japs will be the first to break from any head-on encounter. Their guns lack the range and fire power of ours."

McGuire was graduated from the Willard School in Ridgewood, and Sebring High School in Florida, where he lived for several years with his mother, the late Mrs. Thomas B. McGuire, Sr. He was in his junior year at Georgia Tech when he enlisted in the Air Forces.

His forebears have been residents of the Paterson area of New Jersey since 1817.

About Federal Grants-in-Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article setting forth a summary of Federal subsidies to the States, to organizations, programs, and individuals within States, recently released by the Michigan Public Expenditure Survey, which I believe gives valuable information in this connection. The date of this issue is February 28, 1944:

This is a digest of a summary of Federal subsidies to the States and to organizations, programs, and individuals within States, recently published by the Citizens National Committee of Washington, D. C., titled "Federal Grants-in-Aid, Boon or Menace to the United States?"

It is a story of the origin and growth of Federal subsidies from 1787 when the Constitution was framed, when State debts growing out of their contributions to the common defense in the Revolution were assumed by the National Government, in the desire to seal their common interest, to the present date when Federal financial aids have mushroomed "from a few millions into billions of dollars a year in less than a generation." So the story follows:

Federal aid direct to the States in the form of grants-in-aid payments by the Federal Government in 1942 totaled $693,900,000. Other Federal payments resembling grants and known as quasi grants, but not made directly to the States, amounted to $2,462,900,000.

It is significant that some States contributed more Federal income than they received in payments, some contributed less than they received. This fact raises the question of the growing degree of Federal control over the States and over the national economy which is now seen to be associated with Federal payments.

"The use of the quasi grant, in particular, challenges the attention of those who are concerned about the changing structure of American democratic government. It has always been an American theory that community life, from the smallest unit up to the State government, ought to be alert, vigorous, assertive, and self-directed. This was not merely a social ideal, based on the principle that local groups can manage their own affairs better than outsiders. It carried with it the notion that the National Government itself would represent and be checked by the smaller units, thus restraining the growth of a Federal bureaucracy and undue Federal dominance."

However, the distribution of Federal grants, particularly the quasi grant, results in the recognition of the State as the topmost socially organized unit for purposes traditionally regarded as local. When those purposes become dependent on the National Treasury, the basis of representative government undergoes a change.

Originally, Federal grants were concerned chiefly with education. At first agricultural grants were limited to research and experiment. Only in the last decade have payments been made to aid production, the financing and marketing of farm produce.

The real beginning of Federal subsidy legislation was the Morrill Act in 1857, establishing the system of land-grant agricultural colleges. This was followed by other agricultural bills, and in 1916 Federal aid moved into the highway field and in 1918 into public health. In 1935 the program bloomed under the social security program.

A brief summary of the more important Federal aids follows:

Public Health, assisting States, counties, and health districts to establish and maintain adequate public health services and personnel. Annual appropriation, $11,000,000. No State matching appropriation required.

Venereal disease control, begun in 1918 and amended in 1935; 1942 appropriation $7,817,000 with grants matched 100 percent.

Child welfare, begun in 1935 to establish the Children's Bureau to cooperate with State public welfare agencies for the care of homeless, dependent, or neglected children. The authorization is $1,510,000 annually. No matching State appropriation required.

Crippled children services, begun in 1935 to enable States to extend and improve service for crippled children, providing medical, surgical care. Authorization is $3,870,000 annually. Matching State appropriation of 100 percent usually required.

Maternal and child health, established 1935 to permit States to extend and improve services protecting health of mothers and children, particularly in rural or economically affected areas. Annual authorization $5,820,000. Matching State appropriation of 70 to 100 percent required.

Federal Public Housing Authority provides for contributions to housing agencies to assist in achieving and maintaining low-rent character of their housing projects. Annual contributions of $28,000,000 are authorized; annual obligations now running about $10,500,000. The receiving agency is required to contribute in tax remissions, tax exemptions, or cash by at least 20 percent of the amount of the Authority grant.

The Social Security Act of 1935—old-age assistance—provides aid to States in furnishing assistance to aged, needy individuals. Expenditures rose from $124,600,000 in 1937 to an estimated $329,000,000 in 1943. In general, the Federal grant is 50 percent of the cost.

Aid to dependent children, to enable each State to furnish financial assistance to needy dependent children. 1943 estimated expenditures are $78,000,000. Grants are made on a 50-percent basis within prescribed limits.

Aid to the blind, to aid States in providing financial assistance to the blind. Estimated expenditures for 1943 are $8,700,000. Grants to be matched 50 percent within limits.

The United States Employment Service, first established in 1933 on a State-participating basis, now an exclusive Federal activity under the War Manpower Commission.

Unemployment Compensation State Administration—provides authorization of $80,000,000 each fiscal year for grants to States, although the Federal share of unemployment taxes runs more than $125,000,000 a year. Federal Aid Highways, includes the Federal Aid Road Act to provide a national highway system; Secondary or Feeder Roads, first provided for in 1933; Grade Crossing Elimination, established 1933; and Public Lands Highways, established 1921. These cover various projects indicated by their titles. Involves authorization of $141,000,000 annually with various degrees of matching appropriations.

Miscellaneous, this group includes Forest Planting Stock; Forest-Fire Cooperation; Wildlife Restoration; State Homes for Soldiers and Sailors, and State Marine Schools. Authorizations vary according to type of project; matching appropriation required in varying degrees. Not all States participate.

The second category of Federal grants—the quasi grants, as stated, amounted to $2,462,900,000 in 1942. Quasi grants have been defined as "direct Federal expenditures that are made for, and are of immediate benefit to, State and local governments." This type of payment has its constitutional roots in the powers conferred upon the Federal Government in support of which money might be spent for such purposes as support of the Army and Navy, the administration of the national tax system, public land, justice, under the national law. Quasi grants are apportioned among the States on the basis of population or representation rather than of the need and usually are not reimbursable.

Agriculture and employment (including public works undertaken without the employment motive) have been the principal outlet for Federal quasi-grants in recent years. "Relief" is the term best covering this field, if relief is interpreted to include not merely assistance to individuals but the bolstering of a depressed industry.

In its earliest depression stages, relief assumed a broader theoretical basis and became mingled with the ideas of "recovery," "stabilization," "adjustment," and "equalization." These policies marked the clear-cut emergence of a new attitude toward public expenditures and a new concept of the function of the Federal Government. It has marked the real point of departure from the free enterprise system.

Among some of the more important and more costly quasi-grants may be included the following:

Agricultural Adjustment Program—crop production control under the Agricultural Adjustment Acts of 1933 and 1938, and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. Expenditures for 1942 were $721,600,000, and for 1943 are estimated at $610,000,000.

Farm Security Administration administers rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy at a cost $67,400,000 in 1942 and estimated $42,000,000 in 1943 and $37,000,000 in 1944.

Civilian Conservation Corps, now discontinued and in liquidation. It cost $385,800,000 in 1937, its peak fiscal year.

National Youth Administration, now transferred to Vocational Education and training as a war agency, but costing $94,600,000 in 1940.

Work Projects Administration discontinued and in liquidation but costing $1,896,000,000 in 1937.

Public Works Administration administers grants to States and public bodies for construction projects. Expenditures will be about $20,000,000 in 1943 and will be in liquidation by 1944.

Another classification under this same category is the Federal receipts shared with the States. This originated from the claim of Western States that much of their areas were untaxed Federal lands, thus reducing their sources of revenue. Among these types of grants are rebates from the proceeds of the sale of public lands, return of certain license fees, receipts from leases of floodway lands and from the use of submarginal lands. Payments of shared receipts in 1942 amounted to $5,225,000.

The trend of Federal aid may best be considered by observing the patterns into which the types of aid fall. Prior to the depression, Federal payments to the States never reached an annual total of more than $200,000,000, and the following table reflects the historical trend:

	Millions
1917	$13.6
1922	124.3
1927	134.1
1932	264.7
1937	393.7
1942	693.9

Aid to agriculture has more than doubled in 10 years and would seem to be at the saturation point.

Education has been generously considered and expenditures are near to saturation.

Health and public welfare is about maximum under present authorization although further grants for venereal disease control, child welfare, crippled children, and maternal and child-health expenditures, and public-housing expenditures will grow and may increase by $26,000,000 in the next few years.

Trends in Federal aid to the States are rather difficult to trace at present. Subsidies to the States are well established as to principle and policy, and there is an inclination to employ them in a number of problems. On the other hand, the States are in good financial condition, and it should be some years before they could press for new needs.

Only Social Security and Public Housing seem to be under possible extensive expansion. There is a strong feeling the Federal Government should bear a larger part of the total cost of public assistance and that it should extend assistance to health, disability, medical, and hospital services, while the Employment Service, now wholly Federal, may continue so, and Unemployment Compensation may join it.

Notwithstanding earlier traditions, Federal aid to the States seems to be accepted as a sound basis of tax equalization among the States and a means of establishing necessary services in low-income States.

Opposition is largely on the grounds that the Federal Government should concern itself exclusively with matters of purely national aspects. Many functions, such as highways, were only purely local but now are national, and a sharp line between Federal and State responsibility is sometimes hard to draw. However, it is difficult to identify agriculture, education, and relief as national functions. Public health may also be classed as a local interest except in matters of interstate concern. A further argument against Federal aid is that it stifles local initiative and responsibility. On the other hand, it sometimes increases initiative, and States have extended themselves beyond their means to take advantage of Federal aid. Another objection is that the wealthier States bear most of the burden.

With Federal money goes Federal control, the conditions and limitations on States increased and strengthened with each new grant, with the result that Federal bureau chiefs now exercise a veto over many State activities. The resulting rupture between national fiscal control and our original political forms based on State independence has resulted in a deterioration of the latter, with Federal leverage on the States introducing a factor which the States to date have not circumvented.

Worse Things Than Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the South Buffalo News. The editorial is entitled "Worse Things Than Inflation" and I am inclined to agree with the editor's views that we have greater dangers to face than inflation:

WORSE THINGS THAN INFLATION

We sometimes think that the threat of inflation is being used as a bogeyman to force the Nation into accepting social reforms and a certain degree of regimentation to conceal from the public the serious economic mistakes of the Government.

Now there are worse things than inflation. Indeed, we are in a period of inflation at the present time. One such thing is Government tyranny, which can occur when people fear inflation more than they love freedom. We may not be able to avoid inflation. It is the price of war. But we can avoid tyranny.

The present rebellion against subsidies is an encouraging indication that the American people prefer to take their inflation straight. For subsidies would open the door to total Government control of the private citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is we are just now going through a period of inflation, but there are no alarming signs at this time that widespread inflation is taking hold on this Nation and this condition must be a great disappointment to those who are trying to scare the public with the inflation bugbear.

It is not difficult to understand the motives behind such threatening talk. Some of the people who are crying inflation are undoubtedly trying to make bigger taxes more palatable and some are apparently hoping to sell subsidies to the American people. Whatever their motives, the fact remains that such dire threats of inflation, if carried too far, might result in disaster.

It seems to me if we are sensible and continue our price controls and stop using the cry of inflation for political reasons, we can take it for granted that the American public also will continue to use the good sense they always have shown, whether in wartimes or in peacetimes.

As this editor states there are worse things than inflation. One such thing is government tyranny.

I do not believe that our soldiers will want to come back to a country they have fought for and find that their lives are to be ordered by a tyrannical Government. It is our duty here to prevent any such system. We are beginning to wake up. No longer can the people be lulled by the high-sounding phrases and empty performances—that is a healthy sign.

If we want to maintain the system of free enterprise that has made this the greatest country on earth—if we are determined that there shall be special privileges for none—but equal opportunity for all—then we must have leaders who will look after the interests of the people and not after their own personal desires for power and more power.

The danger of inflation is mild compared to the danger of becoming victims of bureaucratic dictation of all our acts and desires.

The Carnival of Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, has America grown soft? We admit that for a quarter of a century we talked peace and inculcated the principles of peace into the minds of every man, woman, and child in America. Then came the ruthless Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbor followed by the Nazi declaration of war.

America awakened—we have a war to win. Americans know they face a deadly and vicious enemy. All of us remember well the deadly German air raids on unprotected civilians in London, Plymouth, and Coventry. Americans began to prepare for an all-out attack. And soon the Nazis started to feel American air power—first in Stuttgart, then Rostag, Bremen, Dresden, Hamburg, Schweinfurt, and Berlin. All those places felt the devastating and block-busting round-the-clock bombing of the R. A. F. and the A. A. F. The Germans were beginning to wince, squeal, and cry

"murder," but "they had sown the wind and they were reaping the whirlwind." They asked for it and I believe in letting them have it. They showed no mercy for the helpless little children and other civilians at Plymouth, at Coventry, or any other place; they must be made to pay the price for such savagery.

And now, suddenly, here in this country, a voice of mercy rises for the Nazis. Twenty-eight prominent clergymen and national leaders appeal for a halt on the obliteration of beautiful German cities and this carnival of death. Have they forgotten so soon the Nazi butchery of millions of human beings? Is the memory of man so short that he can forget so soon the ruthless bombing of an undefended Rotterdam; the ruthless invasion of Poland and Greece? I remember. And free people throughout the world can never forget. I would suggest that this group of "prominent clergymen and national leaders" read and digest the splendid editorial which appeared in the March 7, 1944, issue of the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, entitled "The Carnival of Death." I am happy to include this article as part of my remarks:

THE CARNIVAL OF DEATH

"They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."

More than 1,600 American planes roared over Berlin again yesterday, blasting the Nazi capital with tons of explosives and engaging in air battles that knocked down at least 123 of the enemy's fighter craft.

And in this country a voice of mercy arises. Twenty-eight prominent clergymen and national leaders appeal for a halt to the "obliteration" bombings of German cities—"this carnival of death."

Thus the hard reality of war is made to clash with Christian principles and practicality with moral idealism. And who in this thunderous time shall judge or decide?

William Tecumseh Sherman, the most brutal commander perhaps of America's own Civil War, once said: "War is cruel and you cannot confine it." Later he wrote: "War at best is barbarism." And then he succinctly summed up the two in a terse statement that lives as the one best commentary of mass human conflict: "War is hell."

And hell it is. It was hell to the innocent people of Rotterdam, carefully, meticulously charting their neutral course through a politically troubled Europe, when the German Luftwaffe roared overhead to obliterate a section of their city and heap up the dead as a calculated demonstration of the potency of a rearmed Reich.

Hell it was, too, to the gallant defenders of Warsaw, caught in the jaws of a bloody military machine, as they fought and died for 3 weeks under the German terror in the skies. And hell, also, for the British of bomb-rocked London, suffering out the air blitz, and for those of historic Coventry in the hours of stark horror when a city fell, crushed, burning, and bleeding while the Luftwaffe winged aloft.

War at best is barbarism. Nothing truer has ever come from tongue or pen. It was a truism to confront the German people as they went to work with determination to manufacture the armaments, create the Nazi system and plot the destruction of the peace of Europe and the world. Where in that land was the voice of mercy—the appeal to reason then?

There are several possible replies to the 28 American clergymen and national leaders who with Christian principles and sincere mercy, now protest the carnival of death. It might be said that the Germans started the war, therefore they must stand the consequences. It also might be said that an inexorable justice is now at work, beyond, perhaps, the sense of man to understand or interfere.

But more to their line of thought, it can be said that the German-inspired war is still on. And it is total war, waged not alone by uniformed men in battle phalanx but by every man, woman, and child able to lift a hand to fashion an instrument for the death of someone else. It is on in Berlin and Stuttgart as well as at Anzio and Cassino. The dead in German cities are no less horrible than the dead along the fighting lines.

The carnival can be stopped. The Germans can stop it overnight. They can do so by the very simple procedure that on some unpredictable day they will confront as a strict necessity. They can quit fighting. They can surrender and stand the penalties which studied justice will proclaim for their crimes against Christian principles and decent civilization. They can halt this war as abruptly as they started it.

What the 28 men who have seen fit to protest our military policy at this grim juncture fail to appreciate is this: The bombers roaring over Germany are not there to hand out a brutal punishment. They are there, simply and certainly, to help in winning the war. They are there to destroy the plants and factories where death is being devised for Americans and to speed the time when peace can reign again, not for two decades but for ages.

Criminal and un-Christian now is the continued determination of the German people to resist—a flagellant decision by a people who have sown the wind to reap the whirlwind. They deserve no mercy. They shall have none.

Time To Begin Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal for March 5, 1944:

TIME TO BEGIN NOW

The Price Control Act under which the Office of Price Administration is operating will expire on June 30, and confronted as it is with what will probably be a very bitter fight to prevent its extension in present form, it is time for the Congress to get to work on it if it hopes to accomplish anything constructive.

Both major parties are agreed that control is necessary if runaway prices are to be avoided, and undoubtedly the administration would like to have the act continued in present form. For that reason it would prefer waiting until the last moment, as it so often has, and then, with an expiration date immediately ahead, attempt to cram its own version down the congressional throat. It is for that reason that Minority Leader MARTIN is urging immediate consideration by the House Banking Committee before which hearings on the act's extension must be held as a first step.

There are other reasons equally sound. Opponents of food subsidy payments have indicated that the renewed price-control legislation will probably be the vehicle for a third effort at banning food subsidy payments. If that happens, a major congressional row is inevitable. Too, there are the recommendations of the House select committee appointed to investigate executive agencies to be considered.

Those are deserving of most careful congressional consideration in voting extension of the Price Control Act. The committee made an extensive investigation and made some very caustic criticisms of the manner in which O. P. A. currently operates.

The chief weakness of the act as it now stands lies in lack of power limitations. In too many instances O. P. A. has acted in capacity of prosecutor, judge, and jury in clear violation of constitutional safeguards. It has assumed, as the House committee reported, powers which Congress never intended it should have. If the Congress intends to apply the correctives so patently needed it cannot wait until the last minute to determine what they shall be.

The legislation is too important to the welfare of the country to be handled hastily, and realizing full well what needs to be done, there is no valid reason for delay in starting the work.

Brumidi's Gone: His Works Live On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of this city, has written a very beautiful poem entitled "Brumidi's Gone: His Works Live On." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRUMIDI'S GONE—HIS WORKS LIVE ON

The Senate's great Committee on
  Appropriations holds
Its sessions in a Chamber which
  Unconsciously unfolds
Whole chapters in our history,
  As great minds dwell upon
The priceless art productions that
  Brumidi's brush has done.

As elsewhere in the Capitol,
  Brumidi's works in art,
In many noted places, play
  A meritorious part—
The purposed pictures that his hand
  Has left upon these walls
Will, in all likelihood, be there
  Until time's curtain falls.

Some great historic events
  He's pictured with his brush
Upon the walls too feelingly
  For time to ever hush—
Yea, pictures speak a language which
  The wise and unwise know,
For which Americans praise God
  From whom all blessings flow.

Brumidi's wonderworks in art
  Need no interpreter—
They're understood by everyone
  Who is a worshiper
Of nature's great creative God,
  On whom the great and small,
As they bid life on earth farewell,
  Are more than apt to call.

Our military solons were
The favored ones for whom
Brumidi decorated this
Unique committee room—
That's why war scenes predominate,
To signify the fact
That we'll be ready for our foes
Whenever we're attacked.

Brumidi on this masterpiece
Of his could not have smiled
Unless he's glorified it with
The beauty of a child;
For art, to him, fell short of art,
Unless he found a place
To paint the idol of his heart,
A child's inspiring face.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Bombing of German Cities

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been astonished as well as disturbed that some people in our country, and perhaps in England, have become rather hysterical on account of the bombings by the United States and Great Britain recently carried out in Germany, and perhaps particularly with respect to the bombings in Berlin.

I cannot understand this attitude. The analysis of their position seems to be that our soldiers must die; that we cannot effectually prevent the agencies which set on foot this disastrous war from committing wholesale slaughter against our people and those of our allies. To me, this is describable only by the word "silly."

I am asking that I may extend my remarks by including therein the following broadcast by Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, which I think completely and finally answers every objection that has been made or can be made to the program of our own United States and our allies in carrying on this war:

Now that another great raid has been made on Berlin a comment is in order on a matter of the deepest ethical importance, which has been raised by the pronouncement of Vera Brittain, the British pacifiist, supported by 28 American clergymen and others, protesting against what they call this "massacre by bombing." Theirs is a logical pacifist presentation, from persons most of them pacifists before this war. I am sure no one will challenge their utter sincerity. Nor do they claim a monopoly of harrowed feelings over the bombing of German cities. They would not make their appeal if they did not know that nearly everyone hates the conduct of war against civilians, and hates measures of such searing brutality as a mass air attack on a modern city. They have a right to speak their minds, and it would be a sign of a guilt sense not to examine their position. Speaking personally, I do have a guilt sense, but it is not about the bombing of Berlin. It is about the war itself, not because it is war, and hence inexpressibly brutal and brutalizing, but because I myself did not do all I might have done to prevent it. And I feel sure that this guilt sense is shared by tens of millions of Americans, and by a large proportion of the people of Britain, and of France.

The bombing of Berlin, like the previous bombing of London, could have been avoided. The war against civilians, which the Nazis have known how to prosecute with ruthless barbarity, and which the Allies have resorted to with their own measures of blockade and bombing, could have been avoided. No one who gave a thought to this war as it was sure to be fought, in the heyday of industrial and scientific invention, had any doubt that it would be more terrible than any war ever waged before. So there was every humane prompting to stop it at the time it could have been stopped. Miss Brittain, and the clergymen around her, issue what they describe as a call for repentance. But it is not repentance from the greatest failure of the modern world in not preventing this war. They call only for repentance for the measures this war has led to. They ask repentance for the consequence of failure, not for the failure itself. They repent of the bombing of Berlin. They suggest nothing to make sure that some other city in some future day will not be bombed because some later Hitler seeks to dominate the world.

Is it not more to the point to think back along the train of events which brought us to the bombing of Berlin today? One can go back to Munich, where Czechoslovakia was mutilated on the altar of Hitler's greed as a gift of appeasement, by honorable men who loathed war. One can go further back to the day when Ethiopia in chains was given over to Italy, as a cheap way to avoid war with a bullying, belligerent Mussolini. Preceding that was the Japanese descent on Manchuria, an act of wanton evil in any language but that of the conqueror. Or one can go still further back to the days when America's participation in a system of collective security was frustrated, and the hopes of building a more secure peace were mortally weakened.

I do not know whether any of the signers of the call to repentance waited upon Secretary Stimson at the time of the Manchurian crisis and urged him to a joint demarche with Great Britain backed by the sincere intention of using force, if needed. I do not know if any of them preached about the inevitable folly of giving way before the blusterings of Mussolini, or warned of approaching perils in Hitler's reoccupation of the Rhineland or his renunciation of the Treaty of Locarno. If they had a clear record of having opposed the inexorable sequence of events which produced the war with all its horrors, I imagine they would say so, and would say, "We called you to repentance when yet there was time; now we call you to repentance again when you can see the folly of your ways." But that is not their plea or their approach. They find the bombing of Berlin terrible.

And so do the rest of us. It would seem that they can have only one vindication to ask that the bombing of Berlin should cease, that it is not an essential part of war, and indeed not a part of the peace. We know that Berlin is not being bombed so as to kill civilians. It is being bombed to weaken German industry, hence the Nazi ability to kill our soldiers. It is being bombed to reduce the Luftwaffe, so that when the invasion of Europe is ventured more of our soldiers will survive that essential campaign.

There is still another reason why the bombing of Berlin is tolerable. It was the Germans who created the Luftwaffe. Violating their pledges under the peace treaty, they built this vast and unprecedented force and invited chosen witnesses from abroad to open their astonished eyes to it. With this force, at that time invincible, since there was no comparable force to oppose it, the Nazis set out to make themselves dominant in the world. Give Hitler the benefit of the doubt, if you will, that he believed he could make his conquests without war, simply by the weakness of his pacific opponents. But there was that force, capable of terrorizing other nations into subjection and created for that purpose. The accord of Munich was written under the shadow of the wings of the Luftwaffe. France and Britain wrung their hands as they sacrificed Czechoslovakia. We are helpless, their leaders said privately, for we cannot prevent the bombing of Paris and London. If there is to be enduring peace in which the Germans and the Japanese participate sincerely, it must rest on the unforgettable lesson that the Luftwaffe has brought upon its creators the destruction with which they threatened their fellow men.

One can be glad this issue has been raised. It is one that most of us need not shun. And it has not been shunned in this country. If the great majority of Americans had not thought deeply, and I think repentantly, about their responsibilities in the world, we should not now be committed by both our major parties to full collaboration in the maintenance of the peace after this war. Americans have reached this resolve, not by losing their hatred for war and brutality, but as an expression of that hatred. They have studied the events that have followed one after the other within their own view. They have, I am sure, the conviction that there is only one way to avoid great wars, and that is to snuff them out when they are at their early and little beginnings, and to do it then with concerted vigor. So long as this resolve burns in all American minds, and no attempt is permitted to frustrate it, peace, if not pacifism, will have been served.

A true pacifist may argue that I have not fairly argued my case, because I advocate the use of force to prevent wars, whereas pacifism is opposed to violence. Here the difference is between the words "force" and "violence." Law itself is a force, and there can be no world of peace which is not based on law. Sometimes the enforcement of law leads to violence, and if it does, most citizens know the law must prevail. That is the nature of modern lawful society.

But there is a further principle raised by some pacifists; they have sincere scruples against acts of violence even when they feel in the right. This is the faith of the creed of nonresistance or of passive resistance. It has been taught by Gandhi with astounding success. But nonresistance is a force. Perhaps it could become a stronger force than any possible violence. That is what Gandhi taught. However, it does not become a force without the whole spirit behind it, with a frenzy of sacrifice to the point of death itself.

A willingness to die, if sincere and if organized on a large scale, can become very powerful. Gandhi's vision at one time was to overcome all oppression by the fervor of mass martyrdom, nonresistant and unyielding. It might be that a world in which the masses were so imbued and so organized could break down any violent power whatever. Such a movement has never yet been built to great dimensions, though Gandhi at one time seemed to be on his way to one. But that is not the dogma of most American and British pacifists. They are opposed both to violence and force. And because they do not teach the wise use of force, they do not aid the establishment of law, on which peace has to be based. The lesson of this war, including the bombing of cities, is not that wars are brutal and should be less brutal, but that wars are preventable and should be prevented.

He Faced Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 21 long days Eddie Rickenbacker and his companions on a raft in the South Pacific faced death. He and his companions were tortured by thirst and by hunger, and one, unable to stand the strain, died.

On his return to this country, speaking from his heart, remembering the suffering of those who offered their lives for their country, knowing their urgent need for munitions of war, Rickenbacker appealed to the people of our Nation for a wholehearted, all-out support of the war effort, calling attention to various situations and activities which hindered production.

Because he appealed for an end to slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes, he was condemned and vilified by certain labor politicians, and the press reported that his appearance in behalf of war activities was barred from some moving picture theaters.

One labor politician referred to him as the hero of World War No. 1 and the rat of World War No. 2. But the courage which enabled him to become the outstanding ace among American air fighters in the First World War carries him on, not only through the physical dangers of this war but enables him to treat with disdain and publicly refute the vicious, malicious charges hurled against him by those engaged in un-American activities, who make a specialty of smearing everyone who ventures to expose the wickedness of the programs which they support.

From the Washington Times-Herald of this morning comes a report of Rickenbacker's speech made last night at New York.

It is printed herewith and I hope that it will give new courage to some good weak-spined patriotic Americans who perhaps wisely, if discretion be the better part of valor, have hesitated to criticize. Two paragraphs to which all may give heed and read again and again are as follows:

American leaders must learn to show their colors and courage. Failure, through fear of being criticized, smeared, or a loss of a temporary special privilege, is nothing but cowardice and un-American.

From the many pats on the back I received in the darkness of night by those who were afraid to be seen with me in daylight, I am inclined to have added respect for some public servants who at least have the courage to face the public every 2, 4, or 6 years and state their case fearlessly, be they right or wrong.

Mr. Rickenbacker's speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to talk to you tonight about many things—some you may like and some you may not.

However, I wish to make this plain: I have no political fish to fry, and only one Axis to grind.

The reason I speak frankly is because I think the time has come for plain speaking from the very housetops on the part of those of us who really want to preserve the America which was handed down to us as our heritage.

American leaders must learn to show their colors and courage now as never before. Failure, through fear of being criticized, smeared, or a loss of a temporary special privilege, is nothing but cowardice and un-American.

The American people today are craving honesty and sincerity with confidence backed by courage from their business, financial, and political leaders. Their arms are open, their minds and hearts full of gratitude, for those who dare to put country ahead of personal gain.

From the many pats on the back I have received in the darkness of the night by those who were afraid to be seen with me in the daylight, I am inclined to have added respect for some public servants who at least have the courage to face the public once every 2, 4, or 6 years and state their case fearlessly—be they right or wrong.

Must we constantly be reminded of the sacred oath of each and every American—that "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Not since the days when Washington and his followers stood up for American freedom, not since the days when Abraham Lincoln and his followers stood up for American unity, not since those days have the issues before the American public been as far-reaching in human importance as they are today.

We all know there has been, and there still is, a definite trend in this country to belittle and discredit Congress in the public mind.

Unfortunately, these groups of termites are the most disturbing factors in our Government today. Almost to a man, they are bloated with the poison of prejudices and hate against the American way of life. They take every opportunity to stir up feeling of race and creed that has no place in our American way of life.

This has been part and parcel of the policy to build up executive power and prestige at the expense of the two other branches of the National Government, namely, the legislative and the judicial.

Never before, in the history of this country, has Congress been more important to the welfare of this Nation than it is at the present time.

Recently, Gov. Tom Dewey aptly expressed it when he said:

"Now, if ever, the Congress needs all the strength it can obtain. No citizen, no man or woman of good will, can fail to reach the conclusion, after reading the ominous trend in the news of the fight against Congress in Washington, that its very existence—its very function in the plan of constitutional government is at stake."

These would-be "crusaders" are making a fat living through their newspaper syndicates and sponsored radio broadcasts and, to a great extent, their attitude is as artificial as it is arrogant. They can't exist without controversy, without throwing bricks.

Let's remind these venom vendors—the publishers who buy and print their material—and the broadcast sponsors who keep it on the air, that they are directly or indirectly responsible for the flow of propaganda that is designed to poison the mind and becloud the viewpoints of the American public.

In the past few years, there has been a steady and increasing drain on America's natural resources. In a quickly increasing tempo, we have been mobilizing the riches in the earth and the products of the soil to bring about the defeat of our enemies overseas.

It is impossible for anyone to say when the war will end. But, from the standpoint of our resources continuing to supply the demands, the war should end soon. Our cupboard is getting bare. Our stock pile is dwindling. The days of expansive development are narrowing. The era of careful management is at hand.

The golden age of industry and transportation that lifted the world to new standards of progress, began in this country. It began only fourscore years ago when Drake struck oil with the first oil well in the world. It began with a hole in the ground near Titusville, Pa.

And, unless we are mighty careful, this golden age may come to an end with empty holes in the ground where our great oil wells used to be. The miracle—the magic—the Aladdin's lamp of the machine age is petroleum. Nations who have no petroleum will soon be eating crumbs at the second table. Our river of oil is drying up.

As a matter of fact, as far as we know, there are only two major producing areas in the world today. One is in Asia Minor, the other in the Caribbean area. Of the two, the former is by far the richer, and yet 85 percent of the oil being used in the war by the United Nations comes from the United States, Central and South America.

I am not saying this critically. We must and should help our allies with every means at our command. We should all support lend-lease by giving men, munitions, and material to help win the war. But we must also think of the future.

In using up our stores of petroleum, metals, minerals, and food reserves we must take the practical, long-range viewpoint that these lend-lease products must be paid back in kind in the future. The job of solving the lend-lease problem is too serious for impractical ideologists to handle.

To meet this problem we need some good, old-fashioned cracker-barrel thinkers instead of crackpot tinkers. Unless we look to the future—unless we make lend-lease traffic move on a two-way street we will, indeed, be in a bad way.

Of course, it is possible that new materials and important substitutes for present materials may be discovered through further exploration and through the marvels of chemistry, but do not let us count too much on this.

And just to complete the exhibit by putting a gloomy frame around a bleak picture let me say that when and if America should cease to be a producer nation and become a consumer nation, then the American way of life will come to its unhappy ending, because the prices and wages that have made the American standard of living possible would no longer prevail. I say this with all sincerity, and hope that day will never come.

To many of you this may seem a most pessimistic picture of the future of this great country of ours, but it could happen here. However, I know this disaster can be and must be prevented by establishing the proper unity of thought, action, and planning now.

We must make the true meaning of "lend" and "lease" stick. We must be paid back in materials we need. Gold won't pay the bill. We could have all the gold of a Midas and still starve to death as a nation and as individuals.

In the great poker game of planning for the future Uncle Sam has three important aces up his sleeve.

Today he has the largest globe-girdling network of airways as well as the largest fleet of planes with intercontinental range. On the sea he has the greatest maritime fleet in the history of mankind and the invisible radio waves of space are dominated by Uncle Sam's vast communications network.

These three cards of our international policies enable us to play them wisely are important cards in any hand. They are only part of the proof that, in building what the

President calls the arsenal of democracy, Uncle Sam has built rapidly and well.

This vast production has not been due to political incentive, and I am proud to say that it hasn't been due to profit incentive, either. Of course, profit has its place in this world, profit incentive, whether it is in the United States of America or the United States of Russia, has its constructive place. But one of the greatest incentives in building the arsenal of democracy was the eager, tireless, patriotic incentive combined with the American way of knowing how.

I cannot help but have deep respect for the much maligned and abused "economic royalists" and "princes of profit" who have contributed so much toward the making of this arsenal of democracy.

I cannot help but have great pride in the American men and women whose practical patriotism and high morale made them turn out the production job that even won the commendation of Joe Stalin.

Still, in all honesty I must say, with some regret, that this production job by labor was to some extent accomplished despite its leadership, despite slow-downs, despite absenteeism, despite strikes.

How much further ahead we could have been, how much closer to victory, how many more lives of servicemen could have been saved, how much human misery could have been spared, if the 13,500,000 man-days lost due to strikes in 1943 could have been devoted instead to production.

The disturbing factor in these figures is that in 1942 only 4,000,000 man-days were lost due to strikes. And yet men who claim that they speak for labor and lead labor tell us glibly that strikes are out. There will be no strikes, they say, and yet we have strikes.

Recently there have been predictions that the war will end soon. As stated before, no one can say when the war will end or who will tumble first, Tojo or Hitler. But one thing is certain—the road to victory will be hard and long. It will be paved with human lives, the lives of your sons and mine.

And I say to you, anyone who deliberately and directly does anything to retard victory through politics or production is a saboteur and a killer.

You cannot win a war or save the lives of fighting men through gradual effort. You don't shoot a gun gradually. You don't drop a bomb gradually. And you can't provide the material of war gradually.

Up to now we have had almost 200,000 casualties, including 50,000 dead in the Army, Navy, marines, and Coast Guard. This is an impressive and tragic figure. But our men haven't begun to die yet. How many more will die depends entirely upon how long the war will last.

Let me remind you, in these days we hear so much about indispensable persons. Well, my candid opinion is that the only indispensable person in America is the American boy who dies needlessly in combat. Don't forget—every moment wasted in the victory effort means a waste of life.

One of the leading professions in America today is crystal gazing into the future by so-called experts. They would like to have us believe that all world problems, once the war is over, can be solved by the stroke of a pen. They try to make us believe that the era of peace will be an age of leisure and plenty—with a bonus for every baby, and a pension for every adult.

These crystal gazers depict the world as a gigantic filling station where free wheeling pink clouds are inflated with hot air. It is the kind of dreaming we must guard against. If there ever was a time when we must be at grips with reality, it is now—and in the making of the peace. Instead of drifting around on pink clouds, we are apt to find ourselves on a road so rocky that it will seem like we are riding on a roller coaster in an earthquake.

Lately, the newspapers have been lauding world-wide good will. And yet, by now, I think most of us have begun to realize that the early dreams of the United States of Europe, or a United Nations line-up at the end of the war does not stand the chance of realization that it did a year ago—unless practical, hard-headed statesmanship prevails.

I wonder how many of you have given thought to the circles within circles, plus eccentric circles, that make up the existing quilt of the United Nations?

According to the latest available reports, 34 countries now form the United Nations, as against a total of 9 Axis Nations. All 34 United Nations are at war with Germany, but not all of the United Nations are at war with all of the Axis Nations. Complicated? Yes.

The Fighting French are at war only with Germany and Japan. England is at war with Finland, but not with Albania. Norway and India are at war only with Germany, while Brazil, India, Norway, Greece, and Russia are not at war with Japan.

That's how simple it is. Almost as easy to digest as scrambled eggs with the shells left in.

Frankly, we can easily win the war and lose the future. What we must have, above all else, to win the future is a frank and open policy which has the permanency of law and not the transient character of an executive edict that can be changed overnight.

I think we all have reason to feel encouraged and pleased with the Baruch plan. It is a path pointer in the right direction. But no plan, no matter how good it may be, is of permanent value unless it has stability of legislative policy behind it.

The quick appointment of William Clayton to one of the basic posts for post-war conversion is vastly encouraging. Again they have chosen an old economic royalist like Bill Clayton to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. I wish him luck. He'll need it.

Now I trust you will bear with me while I reminisce a bit. Exactly 3 years and 81 days ago tonight I had the pleasure and privilege of addressing this distinguished organization. Many of you here tonight were present then.

Do you remember how many of you were stunned into silence, or thought I was insane, when I predicted that we were enjoying liberties we would never enjoy again in our lifetime? That we were enjoying a standard of living we would never enjoy again as long as we lived? And, regardless of whether we sent a soldier, sailor, or aviator to foreign lands—I was sure we would, and we have by the millions—our national debt would be over $200,000,000,000 if at that time we had set up honest reserves for bad debts and took into consideration the vast appropriations which we were then making in preparation for World War No. 2—a life-and-death struggle for this Nation?

No one arose to tell me that I was insane. No one took issue with me when I stated that the American way of life was in danger. You were too polite. But your disapproval, through lack of understanding, was expressed by a profound silence when I sat down.

And I shall not be surprised if I sit down in silence again tonight at the conclusion of my remarks, for I will have known the limitations of my audience to evaluate the difficult problems ahead.

Today the administration shows a debt of one hundred and eighty-six billions on the books, but I am willing to wager that if honest reserves were set up for bad debts plus war appropriations already authorized our debt would be nearer $300,000,000,000.

And, in my opinion, after facing the facts in a realistic fashion, we will be faced with a national debt of between four and five hundred billions of dollars when this war is over, and only God knows when that will be, meaning the loss of more liberties and further reduction in our standard of living.

Speaking of money in astronomical figures, a few weeks ago we had the rather amazing experience of hearing the President of the United States characterizing the rather formidable sum of $2,500,000,000 as a mere crumb. Since when has a billion dollars become a mere trifle? As a matter of fact, I remember the days when a billion dollars, even in Congress, was an awful lot of money. How times have changed.

How many of us dare face these facts unselfishly and prepare our people for the problems ahead in order that they, and the millions of our men and women in uniform, will find the America they have been fighting, bleeding, and dying for when they come home—those who do come home?

Shall we let them and posterity condemn us for our lack of foresight, selfishness, and greed? Or will our better business brains assert the leadership and accept the responsibilities and obligations as those of the generations that preceded us accepted theirs, leaving the heritage of citizenship of the greatest land on earth? Will we accept our obligation and pass it on for generations to come? I have confidence that an aroused America can and will.

The leadership of this Nation should now promote, create, and sell to the American people a forced-savings plan for post-war stability. Our financial interests should reestablish the payment of a reasonable interest on savings accounts to stimulate for the same reasons.

Every effort should be made by our leadership to devise and stimulate ways and means of saving for our people—from the humblest to the highest—that will get them to liquidate mortgages on their homes and property, as well as debts on their automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and all other personal assets during this period of high wages and easy earnings, with the hope of minimizing the terrible economic shock that must inevitably follow total victory.

The leadership of this Nation should wholeheartedly support a law for universal military training that will give the youth of our Nation physical, mental, and disciplinary benefits, when they will do them the most good, which will keep this Nation revitalized.

Give these youngsters the privilege of rotating with the veterans who will be scattered throughout the world for many years to come, policing and safeguarding America's interests, in order that they may learn how the rest of the world exists, and that they will more fully appreciate the value of America on their return.

Let the industrial and financial leadership of our Nation cooperate with the leadership of our armed forces and our educational institutions in training the youth of our Nation in industry and vocation that will aid them in preparing for a saner and sounder future.

This training will give industry, commerce, and finance, physically and mentally sound apprentices with a fundamental knowledge of how to use both their hands and their heads for the benefit of themselves and for the progress of this Nation.

Further, it is vital and important that the leadership of this Nation put their experts to work now on the rehabilitation program for the soldiers who come home in need of help. There will be many hundreds of thousands crippled and maimed who can and must be salvaged.

Every large concern should put a vocational-training program into effect at the earliest possible moment in order that industry will be able to take these men and women of the service off the hands of our Government or charitable institutions, and prove to them that they are not only useful and productive members of society but also that we on the home front appreciate the great

sacrifices they have made, and the suffering they have endured.

Frankly, I am for America first in order that America may last. We must have progress, prosperity, and unity here at home if we are to take a hand in the making of a world built along our lines of thought.

To obtain peace, prosperity, and progress, we must have unity. There must be unity within the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. There must be unity between the Federal Government and the States. There must be unity between labor and capital—between Government and labor—between Government and capital.

Unity must be our theme song—for without unity there can be no real victory. Let us get away, forever, from Government by epigram and edict. Let us get back to the American way of Government by law.

The mills of legislative bodies may grind slower than the edicts of executives, but human experience has shown that they grind better in the end.

Let us discard the iconoclast with his intrigue and inuendo, and put our trust instead in integrity, industry, and initiative.

In fact, I can think of no better message to leave with you than the inspiring words of Winston Churchill when he said:

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat. You ask, what is our policy? I will say—it is to wage war—by sea, land, and air—with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us.

"To wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalog of human crime. That is our policy.

"You ask, what is our aim? I can can answer in one word. It is victory—victory at all costs—victory in spite of all terror—victory, however long and hard the road may be—for without victory there is no survival."

But, to make this victory possible, we must have men and women with courage—yes, many men and women—led by—

1. A man who has convictions with courage and character to put them into action.

2. A man who will not cater to or coddle minorities or pressure groups.

3. A man who will think in terms of the welfare of the great American majority.

4. A man who will recommend amending our labor laws to protect the American laboring men and women from racketeers and false leadership.

5. A man who will respect States' rights.

6. A man who will guarantee to return all delegated war-time power to the elected representatives of the people when the war is over.

7. A man who will surround himself with America's ablest men and women.

8. A man who will eliminate bureaucracy to the minimum.

9. A man who will reduce and keep government expenses within the earning power of the people to pay.

10. A man who will think in terms of America first, in order that America will last, as Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek, think of their own.

11. A man who will cooperate with other peoples of the world to insure a lasting peace, but not at the expense of the American people alone.

12. A man who believes in free enterprise and our form of government.

13. A man whom the American people can believe after he is elected as well as before.

14. A man who will go to the American people with a promise of legislation for their approval limiting the Presidential term to 6 years, or two terms of 4 years each—our traditional and God-given heritage.

15. A man who will add the fifth freedom to the Atlantic Charter—the freedom of opportunity.

With a fifth freedom—we are then placing a foundation under the four sides of the Atlantic Charter—permitting it to endure and weather the storms of ages as have the pyramids that were builded centuries ago.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of March 9, 1944:

WHY NOT A FEDERAL BALLOT FOR ALL?

Joseph's coat could not match the soldier vote bill for variety. The last purple patch applied by the conference committee gives servicemen from New Mexico and Kentucky the right to use a uniform Federal ballot within the United States. But this only focuses attention upon the thousands of servicemen from 46 other States who cannot use that ballot under the terms of the conference compromise.

What kind of bill is it which gives the Kentucky corporal stationed in Texas a short Federal ballot without ado, but instructs his Illinois sidekick to engage in five separate mailings to and from Springfield if he wants to vote?

Congress cannot fairly draw a line, either between two soldiers stationed in New Guinea granting the vote to one who swears he has applied for a State ballot, but withholding it from the other because he has not made that gesture.

Congress cannot fairly subject the franchise of a sailor aboard a submarine to the vagaries of mail service, and deny him the simple, easy opportunity to vote a Federal ballot when he comes into port.

The constant tinkering by the conference before it finished the job thus served to etch more sharply the requirements of an honest bill. If a Federal ballot is legal for servicemen from Kentucky and New Mexico, why not for those from Illinois and Iowa? If it can be used by any soldiers overseas, why not by all?

The only good answer to those questions is a bill making the Federal ballot universally available to all servicemen wherever they may be, and giving them the privilege to vote a State ballot if they prefer and are able to do so. Any genuine doubts of constitutionality could be resolved by provision for an immediate Supreme Court test.

Unless Congress passes such a bill, it will revoke its responsibility to our fighting men. Nor can the responsibility be discharged merely by enabling a few thousand more to vote than could do so under the 1942 act. The aim is not votes for a few, but votes for all. Senator LUCAS did well yesterday to attack the conference compromise as little better than nothing. In some respects it might be preferable to kill the compromise and leave the 1942 act, inadequate as it was, on the books. But the only really defensible measure is a Federal ballot for all.

The Duty of Congress Toward the Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 7, 1944.*

Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Re House Resolution 166—Indians. Although you do not have an Indian problem in the great State of Ohio, and therefore, you might be classed as a neutral, because you have shown a consistent and tolerant interest in Indian matters heretofore, we would like to take the privilege of submitting to you and through you to the Members of Congress a factual and informative statement concerning the Indian problem which House Resolution 166 would authorize to be investigated.

* * * * *

Today there are some eight to nine thousand Indian Bureau employees on the pay roll. Their annual budget during the last 10 years averages above $30,000,000, and in addition they draw heavily on tribal funds in their hands. In 1933, before he became Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. John Collier claimed there were some 195,000 Indian wards, and this year their wards total some 400,000.

House Resolution 166 would authorize the House Indian Committee to go into the Indian country, so-called, and investigate conditions under which our Indian citizens are living, and following this, "to make recommendations to the Congress so that this body can enact needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the American Indian." There are some who claim there is not sufficient time during the present Congress in which a comprehensive investigaton could be made.

* * * * *

SENATE INDIAN COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 310

The Senate Indian Committee have over the years been engaged in investigating conditions under which the Indians of the Nation have been living as the wards of the Government. Their partial report and recommendations were filed on June 11, 1943. The record of the numerous hearings of the Senate Indian Committee comprises hundreds of pages and many volumes. The Senate Indian Committee made comprehensive investigations into every phase of Indian service—irrigation, forestry, law enforcement, education, welfare, health, and general bureau administration.

A summary of the findings and recommendations of the Senate Indian Committee was printed in the RECORD on March 6, with a statement by the Honorable JOHN COCHRAN of Missouri.

In its report No. 310, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs made an outright recommendation for the "abolishment of the Indian Bureau"—the complete liquidation of that outdated and wholly un-American and wasteful governmental agency. The report did not, however, urge the abandonment of the Indian, as such, but it recommended that various Bureau services—those dealing with Indian education, welfare, health, law enforcement, irrigation, and forestry, etc., be

immediately transferred to certain Federal and State departments already serving other citizens. * * *

BILLS INTRODUCED TO CARRY OUT SENATE REPORT

A number of bills which in effect are intended to put into practice several of the specific recommendations made in the Senate Report No. 310. Here are some of them:

Senate Joint Resolution 55, by Senator WHEELER, provides for the transfer of the Administration of Irrigation Projects on Indian Reservations to the Bureau of Reclamation.

A recent statement by Senator WHEELER, supporting his resolution is attached hereto. It shows that the decision of the Senate Indian Committee was based on many years careful study of the question not only by the members of a special subcommittee but also by three experts, engineers qualified to evaluate the proposed transfer.

Senator WHEELER also shows that Mr. John Collier, in 1933, before he became Commissioner, took a leading part in preparing and writing the recommendations in Senate Report No. 214, Seventy-second Congress (dated February 8, 1933), being "a summary of the conditions of Indians, and an analysis of the Indian problems, etc." This report severely criticized the whole Indian Bureau policy and urged drastic reforms.

S 1608, by Senator BUSHFIELD (for himself and several other Senators), December 15, 1943, would make all Indians and Indian reservations subject to the criminal laws of the States, on the same basis as such laws apply to other persons. It would permit the State and county officers and agents to enter upon such Indian lands to enforce the laws, etc.

S. 1311, by Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, would lift "restrictions on allotted lands of Indians." This proposed bill has the support of leading Indian groups in all sections of the Nation, including California Indians. Hearings have already been held on this bill in Oklahoma. And might we add here that a most interesting and informative statement by one of the outstanding Indian men of the Nation, a Mr. O. K. Chandler, of Oklahoma, was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 25, 1944, by Senator MOORE? We would heartily recommend this article to every American who believes in justice—What a Day! What a Day!

Other bills, we learn, are to be introduced, intending to further carry out the recommendations of Report No. 310.

* * * * *

OUR GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS—OUR REMEDY TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN FOREVER

In dealing with the Indian problem we would try to first learn the legal rights of our Indians. Let us, therefore, see what the Constitution has to say.

Article I, section 8, states:

"SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power * * * to borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes * * *."

Mr. Congressman, there is all there is to it. The United States Constitution clearly limits its power over Indians to the right to "regulate commerce with the Indian tribes." When Indian tribes, as such, ceased to exist, then it was the duty of the Congress to repeal all laws affecting the regulation of commerce with such tribes.

It was obvious why that provision was placed in the Constitution. We had just been at war with England and through the long struggle had won our freedom, and in order to see to it that no foreign nation might, through trading with Indian groups, form relations or plant seed that might cause internal wars or dissension, we provided a way to block potential intrigues by simply giving Congress the right to regulate such trading or commerce with Indian tribes. No Indian groups through their own acts or policies hold themselves segregated as tribes in the sense used in the section of the Constitution quoted.

* * * * *

AFTER CIVIL WAR, THE NEGRO RACE PLACED UNDER SIMILAR COMMISSION

For some 6 years following the close of the Civil War, the three or more million Negroes, just released from slavery, were held under a commission similar to the Indian Bureau system at that time. However, after some 6 short years, the commission recommended that the Negroes be turned free—they had qualified, apparently, for citizenship responsibility. They became free. One may ask why was it possible for the 3,000,000 members of the Negro race to qualify so quickly and be turned free, while the Indian race, surely not less capable in any manner, failed to secure his freedom from the cruel clutches of the Indian Bureau? The answer, we submit, is simple and true: The 3,000,000 Negroes had no property to manage, and so were "found to be ready for full citizenship responsibility and freedom."

But the few hundred thousand Indians, acknowledge then and now, to not be inferior to any other race of people in any test to which they have been subjected, were continued as wards, because (yes, th's is our answer) the Indians owned through immemorial use and occupancy lands and other rights valued at more than $2,000,000,000. Those in charge of the Indian Bureau system then, and just as it has through all administrations, decided to hold the Indian and manage his vast property and thus perpetuate themselves in control. He has been kept as an incompetent ward, and the Congress has allowed this, the most despotic branch of our Government, or of any other civilized Government in the Western Hemisphere, to control the Indian's once vast inheritance and his very life, individually and collectively, until today the Indian Bureau openly defies the Congress—it refuses to submit to reform, but demands more and ever more power.

* * * * *

Therefore, in the light of this factual situation, the Indian, though under law a citizen, arbitrarily and illegally held (under provision of the Constitution above cited) as a ward, please try to picture what is in his mind when he reads the proclamation of our President declaring Sunday, May 21, 1944, as "I Am An American Day." Or please try to make the last six words of the pledge of allegiance to the American flag square with the enforced wardship regulations controlling his life. Here are those last six words: "with liberty and justice to all."

Then test those burning words in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence which mean so much to all other Americans:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Neither do the "four freedoms," supposed to be guaranteed under the Atlantic Charter, mean as much to an Indian as it should to others of us.

If Members of Congress really understood the Indian and his problems, as he sees them, and then if they would try to place themselves in the position of an Indian ward, as we have tried to explain his plight today, then we wonder how would they vote on bills intending to break the bonds of such wardship and to abolish the whole Indian Bureau? It surely is not asking too much in behalf of these worthy humans to ask that each one of you honestly apply this test when you cast your vote on coming Indian legislation.

The time to liquidate and abolish the Indian Bureau is now. It must not be put off until next year. Congress can lay its hands on plenty of factual information as to the injustices of the bureaucratic system to immediately start transferring various so-called services of the Indian Bureau over to Federal and State agencies already functioning. If Congress is interested in stopping waste, extravagance, and duplication, it should start now to sever the tentacles of the Indian Bureau octupus. True, the Indian Bureau, through its army of staff specialists so-called, * * * will bring in reports and surveys made by themselves, proving the life and welfare of the Indian is improving by leaps and bounds. They will be well fortified with facts and figures justifying their requests for an enlarged budget, and for new power to draw further on the fast-dwindling tribal funds still in their hands.

We are able to give the Congress through the Appropriations Committees positive and specific instances of outright waste and duplication in the Indian Bureau school policies in California alone amounting annually to some $400,000. So that if this Congress is ready to cut out a small item of nearly one-half million annually, just in one State, we are ready with the evidence. Here are the two instances where we claim such an amount can be and should be saved. While the Federal Treasury is advancing this sum, in the name of Indian education, it is, according to the opinion of high officials, to be charged back to the California Indians as an offset in a suit they have under a jurisdictional act.

WASTE OF $250,000 ANNUALLY IN SHERMAN INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL

This segregated Indian boarding school is situated in a highly developed citrus and residential district near the city of Riverside, Calif. There are some 450 Indian boys and girls enrolled this year, it is reported. The budget requirements this year calls for some $240,000 for school maintenance and some $40,000 for repairs, or a total of some $280,000. With 450 pupils this makes an annual per capita cost of about $620. The per capita cost for the public schools is reported at from $66 to $100, or about $80 each. Indians in California pay the sales tax, from which practically all the support of the public schools are derived. It is not necessary, however, to be a taxpayer in California in order to have the right to attend the public schools. The public schools of California, under the State constitution, are free. The Indian children enrolled at Sherman Indian Boarding School run from about 12 to 17 years of age. The school is universally considered far inferior to our public schools. If Sherman Indian Boarding School was abolished, no Indian boy or girl enrolled there would necessarily be deprived of an education. Please bear in mind that Indians, like all other citizens of California, pay their school tax when they pay the sales tax. Real estate in California, since the sales-tax law went into effect in 1934, pays but a small percent of the school tax, and that is mostly to apply on old bond issues. Therefore, since Indians already pay the school tax and are entitled to attend the public schools without the payment of any fees, etc., just like all other citizens, there is no need for continuing Sherman Indian School. It is worse than a duplication and waste, in the ordinary meaning of those terms, because, as above stated, Indians of the State are charged back with the annual cost of some $250,000, as a possible offset in the Indian jurisdictional suit. The Sherman Indian Boarding School should, therefore, be abolished immediately.

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA ARE CHARGED WITH THE SUM OF $180,000 ANNUALLY, UNDER CONTRACT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR WITH STATE

Another glaring instance of waste and duplication in the educational program of the Indian Bureau, is in the case of the payment to the State of California annually by the Secretary of the Interior under a contract entered into under the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 (Public, No. 167, 73d Cong.). That act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with a State for the "education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare of Indians in such State."

For some 10 years the Congress has approved an item in the Indian Bureau budget amounting to some $180,000 annually, which sum has been paid into the State treasury, for the education of the some 2,500 to 3,000 Indian children enrolled in the State's public schools. There is no need for the Federal Government to pay that sum or any other sum for the purpose of paying for the education of the Indian children of the State. The State's public schools, under the State constitution, are free. And in addition, Indians pay the school tax in California exactly like any other citizen pays his share—through the payment on the sales tax, as above cited in the Sherman Indian Boarding School instance. There is no getting around this charge that the payment to the State of this large sum—$173,500—this year's budget item is wholly a duplication and waste, and in addition, as in the case cited about Sherman Indian School, the Indians of the State are charged with this sum as an offset in their jurisdictional suit. It really means Indians are paying double the expense paid by other persons as their legal share for upkeep of the public schools. The matter has been reported to the Indian Bureau, but they show no concern over the charge of waste and duplication. That is a peculiarity of the Bureau's policy—not interested in economy.

A summary of the waste in these two instances make an annual total of some $425,000 or for the 10 years of $4,250,000—all pure waste and duplication. * * *

MR. JOHN COLLIER URGED ABOLISHMENT OF ALL ARBITRARY POWER OF THE BUREAU OVER THE INDIAN AND HIS PROPERTY BEFORE 1933

This Congress can get no better picture of the viciousness of the whole Indian Bureau system as it is today, than to correctly understand just what Mr. John Collier, now the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, had to say about the Bureau system in 1933, immediately before he was elevated to that office. Mr. Collier, when he made the clear-cut evaluation of the polices and practices of the Indian Bureau in 1933, was beyond question the outstanding critic and opponent of the wardship system of the Indian Bureau. He was the executive head of a so-called Indian Defense Association, incorporated in several States, but with national headquarters right here in Washington.

Mr. Collier had gathered around himself as directing head of this Nation-wide group, a staff of attorneys and social workers and related minds. They participated in practically every investigation into Indian matters * * *.

* * * * *

Unquestionably the record made by Mr. Collier during the 5 or 6 years ending in 1933, was directly responsible for his being selected to head the Indian Bureau in 1933. Therefore, we believe, it would be eminently fair to make available to the Members of Congress some of the statements of Mr. Collier showing what he considered the outstanding mistakes of the Bureau policies and his recommendations or "remedies" for eliminating such mistaken practices. In no other way can you get a clearer understanding of what Mr. Collier found was wrong with the Indian Bureau.

* * * * *

MR. JOHN COLLIER'S CRITICISM OF BUREAU POLICIES BEFORE 1933, AND HIS REMEDIES

There was no doubt about Mr. Collier's appreciation of the power of organization and publicity on the part of those who opposed the policies of the Indian Bureau, and he and his staff controlling the Indian Defense Association early in 1928 assumed the leadership of all the various welfare organizations participating in Indian investigations. In that year his organization addressed a letter to the Presidential candidates urging drastic reforms in Bureau treatment of its Indian wards. Here is a brief quotation from that statement to the candidates:

"That the Government Bureau to which we have entrusted our guardianship is, ignorantly or willfully, annihilating its 250,000 wards through starvation enforced by waste and misapplication of their income. * * *

"Not only are Indians divested of control of their property but they are without right to challenge the dispositions made by the guardian or to demand an accounting. * * * In a word, the Indians are a dependent people at the mercy of the Federal Government."

And, Mr. Congressman, here is Mr. Collier's all-out indictment of the whole Indian Bureau system (1928):

"THE HISTORICAL RECORD

"To say that the record is disgraceful is an understatement. It has been a disgrace from the beginning. With rare interludes, it has been disgraceful through all administrations.

"The horrors of today may perhaps be paralleled by horrors of the past. The past is irrevocable. The present and future lie in our hands."

Those are Mr. John Collier's words, not ours. The record shows that Mr. Collier had the facts, and that his evaluation of the system and its effect on the Indian race was based on such information. To Mr. Collier's credit, it must be admitted that he gave a remedy for the correction of some of the evils he discovered in the wardship plan. We give here some of his recommendations:

"WHAT THE SITUATION DEMANDS

"1. Abolition of all arbitrary power of the Indian Bureau over Indian property and person.

"2. The extension to Indians of the safeguards to life, liberty, and property accorded under the Constitution to all citizens of the United States.

"3. The right to be consulted as to the disposition of their property with the right to veto any use of which they disapprove.

"4. A right under general statutes to apply to the courts to restrain or require reimbursement for violation of their rights.

"5. The right to be represented in all proceedings by counsel of their own selection.

"6. The abolition of the criminal jurisdiction of the Bureau.

"7. In general, coordination of all appropriate Federal agencies to the ends, and cooperation with the State authorities or relegation of administration to the States * * * in all matters affecting education, agriculture, and relief."

The American Indian Defense Association, of which Mr. John Collier was the executive head, published a monthly magazine in which he carried attacks against the Bureau and his remedies for curing its evils. We will now quote from the January 1933 issue of that pamphlet:

"The Indian Bureau is the real-estate agent for each parcel of allotted land; custodian of the rental or sales proceeds of each parcel; probate officer, settling the Indian estates and determining heirs, and guardian of the individual moneys and the personal lives of each of the Indians. In current years the absolutism and the all-embracing reach of the Bureau's paternalism have been increased.

"A waste exceeding a million dollars a year is involved in the Bureau's policy of doing for the Indians those things in Mexico and Canada they are permitted and helped to do for themselves. * * *

"Such paternalism has destroyed the moral and social fiber of great numbers of Indians. It breeds sterile resentment, blind resistance, dependency, and fatalism in the Indian victims."

DUPLICATION AND WASTE

Mr. Collier, in his small monthly publication, January 1933, listed certain instances of waste, and continued:

"A like duplication, with comparable waste and inefficiency, is found in the forest service maintained by the Indian Bureau. This service duplicates, with inferior technical standards, the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture. It stubbornly squanders the Indians' tribal funds on those reservations where Indian moneys are used to pay the administrative costs of the Indian Bureau.

"ALLOW THE STATES AND THE AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT TO HELP THE INDIANS

"The Indian Bureau in many States duplicates the welfare, health, educational, and agricultural services of the States and counties, while falling indefinitely below the standards maintained in these services. * * *

"The integration of the Indian Bureau's agricultural services with those of the Department of Agriculture, both at Washington and in the field, would bring a genuine agricultural aid to scores of tribes now dependent on the help and advice of the so-called Indian Bureau farmers—job holders who do not know farming and cannot teach it, who do not know the problems of rural life and have never organized anything, and who are in fact nothing but errand boys of the agency superintendents. These job holders can be dispensed with.

"THE PRESENT FACTS OF INDIANS AND THE INDIAN BUREAU

"The Indian situation contains the total problem of a minority race. * * *

"The diversity has been increased through causes operating across the past 100 years, but at present this diversified minority race is held on a Procrustean bed of law and administration, absolutist in character, minute and exhaustive in operations, and practically uniform for all members of the race. * * *

"The excessive costs of administration by the Indian Bureau reflect four conditions, each of which has an imperative significance in relation to the problems of the Indian Service:

"A. The rising costs are the Government's response to the increasing poverty and dependency of the Indians—a response which takes the form of trying or pretending to do for all the Indians, all of the things which they normally would do for themselves.

"B. They are a byproduct of the extension of absolutist bureaucratic control beyond tribal affairs and into the myriad affairs of the individual Indians.

"C. They are a corollary of the policy of concentration within the Indian Bureau, to the exclusion of other agencies, all of the functions bearing upon Indian life, with overhead and field organizations duplicating the overheads and field organizations of such Government bureaus and departments as Agriculture and Reclamation; further duplicating the State and county relief, education, health, and agricultural services, and again, duplicating the Federal courts.

"D. They include a dead net loss—a dead waste—of more than $4,000,000 a year in connection with the Indian Bureau's boarding school system."

We have shown earlier in this statement that the Indian Bureau's boarding school system of waste and duplication continues. (See Sherman Indian School instance above.)

Still quoting Mr. Collier, 1933:

"ILLOGICAL AND FATAL TRUSTEESHIP DOCTRINE

"The United States has derived from the doctrine of trusteeship and guardianship over Indians, conclusions which technically and practically are denials to the ward Indians of constitutional rights and of modern opportunities, whether of education or of business; and from the plenary trusteeship and guardianship, the United States has derived an Indian Service monopolistic, archaic in its internal organization, inordinately expensive, and correspondingly unproductive of results, either for the Government or for the Indians; this Service being itself largely preoccupied with and frustrated by the consequences, in terms of Indian property and Indian group and personal life, of the plenary, unaccountable trusteeship and guardianship and the systematic isolation of the Indian from American life."

In that one paragraph Mr. Collier, in 1933, defined and vividly marked the real problem then and now facing the Congress—the denial to the American Indian of his constitutional rights. Wardship of Indians in 1933, asserts Mr. Collier, was a national disgrace, and tens of thousands of Indians agreed, along with the unanimous verdict of all organizations participating in investigations into Indian conditions at that time. Today, Mr. Collier's defense association is not opposing the Indian Bureau, yet conditions recited by Mr. Collier in 1933 have not been improved but, instead, that arbitrary control has been increased. Most of the leading associates of Mr. Collier in 1933 have been given lucrative berths in the Indian Service and other Federal departments.

IN 1933 MR. COLLIER SAID HE FAVORED GIVING INDIANS THE RIGHT TO REMOVE UNDESIRABLE SUPERINTENDENTS

One of the main reasons why certain organized groups of Indians recommended Mr. Collier for the office of Commissioner in 1933 was his outright promise that he favored a law giving Indians the right to remove their superintendent or other undesirable Bureau employee by a majority vote of the Indians affected. In a letter to the Mission Indian Federation of California in January 1933, Mr. Collier stated he favored such a law. He has steadfastly refused even to discuss the matter with the Indians since he took office, and ignored every appeal to meet and confer with them.

MR. COLLIER IN 1933 URGED THE TRANSFER OF MANY BUREAU AGENCIES—PROMISES NOT KEPT

It is rather odd—or is it—that Mr. John Collier, once he was appointed to the commissionership, made a complete reversal of the position he had taken as a result of his many years' investigation into Indian Bureau practices. Instead of carrying out his announced plans for the abolishment of all arbitrary control of Indians and their property, and to put into effect specific economies by transferring many of the pigmy duplicating agencies practiced by the Indian Bureau, Mr. Collier, apparently, swore allegiance to carry on the very policies he had so ceaselessly opposed.

No one can within reason claim that the Wheeler-Howard bill, sponsored by Mr. Collier in 1934 (and which became a law), gave the Indian a larger share in his constitutional rights, or lessened the arbitrary control of Indians by the Bureau. Under that law—if they voted for the bill—Indians voluntarily gave up a great share of their constitutional rights—everything they might do under a charter was subject to the will of the Secretary of the Interior (the Indian Bureau).

Here are the exact words of Mr. Collier, in 1933, regarding his plan to reduce the arbitrary control over Indians:

"ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION OF THE INDIAN SERVICE

"1. The transfer to, or integration with, the proper Federal agencies, of certain functions now carried out by the Indian Bureau itself in an inefficient and extravagant manner.

"(a) The transfer, outright, of Indian forestry control to the Department of Agriculture.

"(b) Indian irrigation to the Bureau of Reclamation.

"(c) Integration of all Indian agricultural organization work with the several services of the Department of Agriculture.

"(d) A thorough integration of Indian medical, hospital, and health services with the United States Public Health Service.

"(e) Combination between the Government and the States, through contracts, to the end of placing a measure of responsibility for Indian health, education and welfare upon the States."

Mr. Collier, before he became commissioner, was a strong advocate for the transfer of all Indian irrigation over to the Bureau of Reclamation. This proposal had been under consideration and investigation for a number of years, and upon the filing of the Preston-Engle report urging an immediate transfer of Indian irrigation on reservations to the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Collier and his defense organization got squarely behind this proposal. He approved the report by stating in his publication:

"Incredible wastes and futilities by the Indian Bureau are cited in the report".

Coming to the end of our statement, we desire to make brief reference to the historic speech made by Senator William H. King, of Utah, for many years a prominent member of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee. Senator King's speech was delivered in the Senate on February 8, 1933, and was circulated widely as a public document. It was known at the time that Mr. Collier assisted in compiling the material for that speech.

Here are some quotations from that historic speech by Senator King in 1933:

"THE GOVERNMENT A FAITHLESS GUARDIAN

"For many years I have been criticizing the policy of the Government in dealing with the Indians, and have attempted to trace historically the dealings of the Government with the Indian tribes that have inhabited this Republic. * * *

"Mr. President, I have been forced to the conclusion, as a result of my researches and investigations, that our Government has been a faithless guardian of its wards and the agencies which it has set up to deal with the Indians have failed to perform the duties imposed upon them by law. * * * A trustee who squanders the inheritance of his ward or who is indifferent to the latter's welfare, merits the condemnation of all who desire justice. * * *

"DRASTIC REORGANIZATION NEEDED

"As a result of my study of the Indian question and the treatment accorded the Indians and the policy now being followed by the Government in dealing with them, I have reached a definite conclusion that there must be a radical change in the attitude of the Government toward the Indians and a complete reorganization of the Indian Bureau. * * *

"The history of the Indians during the past hundred years is a tragic one, and the record of the Government agencies toward the Indians is blotted and blurred, and calls for condemnation by just men everywhere. Many investigations have been made by committees. * * * Their findings and conclusions warrant a verdict that the Indians have been robbed, plundered, and despoiled of the greater part of their inheritance and subjected to cruel and inhuman treatment * * *.

"The Indian Bureau is a petrified, crystallized machine, indifferent to criticism, hostile to reforms, ambitious for authority, demanding increased appropriations and rapidly expanding personnel * * *.

"Reform is imperatively needed in the Indian Bureau. The whole system under which it operates should be changed * * *.

"So long as tribal funds exist, and so long as there are tribal funds and income derived from the sale of lands, timber, and natural resources, so long as Congress shall desist from changing the Indian Bureau system, the Indian Bureau will continue to spend what it wants to spend * * *.

"My object in presenting these matters is to challenge the attention of the Bureau officials and those who are interested in the welfare of the Indians to the importance of the Indian problem.

"The inefficient and tyrannous bureaucratic system which now prevails and which controls the Indians must be destroyed."

The facts concerning the operation of the Indian Bureau and the criticisms of leading Indian committees and organizations who have studied its policies over the years are conclusive and convincing. There is but one answer—the complete abolishment of the Indian Bureau as such and the immediate transfer to appropriate agencies of the Federal and State Governments, all ordinary functions and services which the Congress might deem essential to the Indians' welfare.

As stated heretofore, we would recommend that the American Indian—the Indian American—be dealt with by our Government henceforth on the basis that he is an American citizen—give him all the benefits of equality under law and require him to meet the full responsibilities of citizenship.

We feel that if the Congress fails to take this important step to liberate the Indian race from enforced wardship control which all men who believe in justice have so clearly condemned, then, we submit, our men and women who today are defending free America in all quarters of the world will have served in vain.

Most respectfully,

PURL WILLIS,
Counselor, the Mission Indian Federation of California.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following article should show what happens when soldier ballots are ruled invalid. It is also important to note the lapse of time between the election and the date of court action. Maybe there are some who would like to see similar situations throughout this land.

One of our concerns is to have the soldier's vote counted, and for that reason I am going to support the conference report on this legislation.

SOLDIER VOTE BAN COSTS OUSTED OFFICIAL $4,397

WILMINGTON, DEL., March 1.—Elijah S. Hughes, who was ousted as Kent County controller after soldier ballots in the 1940

elections were ruled invalid, was ordered in a superior court opinion to pay his successor $4,397 which he collected as salary while in office.

At the time of the 1940 election the Delaware Constitution provided that each voter must cast his ballot in the district in which he registered. The constitution was amended last year to provide for absentee balloting.

Rejection of the 1940 soldier votes gave the controllership to Franklin P. Walker, who brought suit for the salary Mr. Hughes had collected.

Labor's Strike Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the March 3, 1944, issue of the Chicago Sun:

LABOR'S STRIKE RECORD

A few labor-baiting Congressmen have attempted to justify new antistrike proposals with deceptive statistics on man-days lost in industrial disputes, purporting to show that 1943 was second only to 1937. The authoritative Bureau of Labor Statistics now presents an analysis correcting the picture.

The accurate test of strike activity is the proportion of working time lost. Just as industrial accidents increase when the labor force grows larger, so the number of man-days lost in industrial strife is likely to grow, other things being equal, and the percentage is the key. Calculated in this manner, the B. L. S. index shows that in the last 3 years the time lost in strikes, in relation to potential working time, was:

	Percent
1941	0.32
1942	.05
1943	.14

The 1943 record is modified when it is realized that two-thirds of the strike time lost came in the coal industry, during John L. Lewis' deliberate challenge to the Government. Exclude the mine workers' four walkouts, and the figure for all other workers showed less than 0.05 percent time lost—less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of total working time, which is even better than in 1942. All these indexes are far below the 1937 figure, when the labor force was much smaller.

A strike of any type is unjustified during the war, and a walkout led by Mr. Lewis is as serious, of course, as any other. The fact remains that in all democratic countries—where labor is not actually enslaved—some work stoppages do take place. The blunderings of Mr. Lewis do not warrant punitive legislation aimed, like the Smith-Connally law that has proved abortive, at the whole mass of workers. The readiness of the vast majority of union members to renounce special interests measures up very well alongside the persistent effort of old enemies to exploit the war emergency and to distort statistics for the purpose of fastening legal shackles on the collective-bargaining principle.

Mississippi Passes Soldiers' Absentee Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from Hon. Walker Wood, secretary of state, Jackson, Miss., and also the Soldiers' Absentee Voting Act passed by the Legislature of Mississippi and signed by the Governor a few days ago, both of which are self-explanatory.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Jackson, Miss., March 6, 1944.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I congratulate you on the outstanding fight you have made for States' rights. I enclose H. B. 83 that is now the absentee ballot law of Mississippi. Every citizen of Mississippi that is in the armed forces can vote an absentee ballot in all primaries and general elections.

With every good wish, I am
Your friend,

WALKER WOOD,
Secretary of State.

House Bill 83

(As passed by the House and Senate)

An act to amend chapter 202, Laws of Mississippi of 1942, so as to provide for the registration and casting of absentee ballots in the general and primary elections by those who are now or may hereafter be in the armed services of the United States, as herein defined, and for other purposes

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi,* That chapter 202 of the laws of Mississippi of 1942 be, and the same is, hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That, within 60 days next prior to any primary election, and at least within 60 days prior to any general election, to be held in, and by the voters of, any county, upon application first made to the registrar of the county by or in behalf of any person in or serving with the armed services of the United States, merchant marines, or the American Red Cross, shall be sent an absentee ballot and affidavit of registration of the county of which he is a citizen, as if such person were personally present, but who must be absent on the election day because of being in the armed services of his country, or merchant marines, or the American Red Cross, the registrar shall send to such person, who is hereinafter referred to as the absentee, a proper election ballot containing the names of the person or persons or the proposition to be voted for in such election. And with such ballot there shall be sent an official envelope containing upon it in printed form the recitals and data mentioned hereinbelow. Such ballot is hereinafter referred to as an absentee ballot.

"The proper executive committee or ticket commissioner or circuit clerk of the county shall keep all applications for absentee ballots and registration and shall send to such absentee, so making application therefor, one of the ballots and registration blanks, applicable to the first primary, second primary, or general election, as the case may be, immediately after such ballot is officially printed. Only one application is necessary for official ballots for all primaries and general elections in each year. The secretary of the executive committee or clerk of the county election commissioners or ticket commissioner shall deliver all applications for absentee ballots to the circuit clerk of the county, who shall preserve them for 1 year as a record to be furnished to any court or constituted authority for inspection or evidence if properly called for.

"SEC. 3. The absentee, upon receipt by him or her of such absentee ballot and registration application, shall go to some commissioned officer of the armed services of the United States military forces or to any other constituted authority empowered by law to administer oath to such absentee, and shall present his absentee ballot, before voting it, and registration application, to such officer or constituted authority for inspection; and then the absentee shall vote without disclosing his or her ballot or his or her vote to the said officer or authority, and shall seal the ballot in the aforementioned official envelope, and then fill out and sign with his proper signature the printed form of oath shown on the envelope and then shall have the officer administering the oath likewise to sign the certificate applicable for such officer as shown on the envelope, designated:

"No. 1 envelope: First primary absentee vote.

"No. 2 envelope: Second primary absentee vote.

"No. 3 envelope: General election absentee vote.

"No. 4 envelope. Registration application.

"And the sealed envelope, thus signed and certified to, shall be sent as hereinafter indicated. The registration application shall be certified to by absentee voter, sealed, and mailed to the circuit clerk of the home county of voter in envelope designated as: Envelope No. 4, registration application.

"The oath to be subscribed by the absentee and certified to by the official or authority indicated, and the final certificate showing the action of the absentee voter and signed by the official or authority indicated, shall be respectively as follows:

"VOTER'S AFFIDAVIT

"I, _____, do solemnly swear that I am 21 years old, or I will be before the next general election, in the below-named county, and that I have registered as a voter in _____ precinct, in _____ county, in the State of Mississippi, and that I am not disqualified in any respect to vote in the coming primary or general election, and that I have authorized _____ to deliver this ballot to the election officers in _____ precinct to be placed in the ballot box by him or her for me.

"_____
"Signature of voter

"The above is sworn to and subscribed, in my authorized jurisdiction, before me _____ _____ (stating title of officer of United States Army or Navy, or constituted authority administering oath), this the ____ day of _____, 19__.

"_____
"Signature of official

"_____
"Official title

"The commissioned officer or official so administering the oath shall, when the absentee has voted and sealed his ballot, then officially sign the certificate printed on the envelope by requirement of the registrar of the county, which certificate shall be:

"OFFICER'S CERTIFICATE

"I, _____, hereby certify that I administered the oath required

by law to the person whose vote is enclosed in this envelope and sealed; that I have not made any suggestion nor undertaken to exercise any control or authority over the person in making out this ballot; that the ballot was made out in my presence, but without my seeing the voter's choice marked on the ballot.

"_____

"Official title

"Date _____, 19__.

"Said commissioned officer or official shall then send such envelope, sealed, to the person designated for delivery by the voter in his affidavit, or to the Secretary of State of Mississippi, who shall send it to the circuit clerk of the county in which the voter votes, and the circuit clerk shall send it to the officers of election of the voter's precinct.

"At any time between the opening and closing of the polls on such election day, the person so designated by the absentee voter other than the Secretary of State shall deliver the absentee voter ballot securely sealed in such envelope, to one of the managers of the election, and, in case the affidavit is sufficient and the applicant, as a duly qualified elector in such precinct, has not already voted in such election and in case the absentee voter ballot is delivered within proper hours to such manager by the person named in the affidavit, then the manager of such precinct shall enter the name of the absentee on the register as having voted, and shall open the said absentee voter's envelope in such manner as not to destroy or efface the affidavit and data thereon, and shall take out the ballot found therein, and without unfolding it or permitting it to be examined, shall deposit the ballot in the proper ballot box. But in case such affidavit is found to be insufficient or in case such absentee is not a duly qualified elector of the precinct or ward, or if such absentee ballot is delivered by a person not named in the affidavit, then such vote shall not be allowed to be valid, but without opening the absentee vote envelope, the manager of election shall mark across the face thereof 'rejected as defective,' or 'rejected because not an elector,' as the case may be, and affix his own initials thereto. The absentee vote envelope when such absentee vote ballot is voted—and the absentee vote envelope, with its contents unopened, when such ballot is rejected—shall be retained and preserved in the manner and for the time now provided by law for the retention and preservation of official ballots in such elections, as herein provided.

"SEC. 4. The registrar, on request of any person in the armed services or any one interested in persons in the armed services, shall forward registration blanks to the absentee voter or prospective voter, so that any person who is serving, or may hereafter serve in the armed services of the United States, may register as a voter and vote in any primary or general election held in the precinct and the county where he was living at the time of his entry into the armed services of the United States. Such person shall subscribe an affidavit to be administered by any officer of the armed services or constituted authority to administer an oath. Said officers may administer the oath hereinbelow prescribed and certify to it; and said officer or registrant shall mail said registration immediately to the circuit clerk of the county set out in said registration in order that the registrant may be registered 4 monhs before the general election and may vote in the primaries and general elections. Said registrant shall be considered as registered from and after the date of the affidavit. The oath to be taken by the said person shall be as follows:

" 'I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am 21 years old (or will be before the next general election of this county), and that I will have resided in the State of Mississippi for 2 years and in _____ election precinct of _____ County 1 year preceding the general election, and that I am not disqualified from voting by reason of having been convicted of any crime named in the Constitution of Mississippi as a disqualification for an elector; that I will truly answer all questions propounded to me concerning my antecedents so far as they relate to my right to vote, and also as to my residence prior to my citizenship in this district; that I will faithfully support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Mississippi, and will bear true faith and allegiance to the same. So help me God.

" 'Signed _____

" 'Sworn to and subscribed before me, ____ on the ____ day of _____ A. D. 19____.

" '_____

" 'Official Title.' "

"The envelope, the ballot, certificates and affidavits, and all other data to be forwarded to the absentee voter, shall not weigh in excess of 1.2 ounces.

"Upon receipt of the foregoing registration filled out and sworn to in the proper form, the registrar of the county shall place the applicant's name on the registration books, if the statements are found to be true noting on the back of the affidavit that it is an absentee registration; and the registrar shall file the application as a matter of record in his office.

"SEC. 5. Every person who is serving, or may hereafter serve in the armed services of the United States in the present war, may vote in any primary or general election to which he would be entitled to vote had he not entered into the armed services, in the precinct and county in which he lived at the time of his entry into the armed services of the United States, without the payment of any poll tax which such person has not had an opportunity of paying, as required by the constitution of this State, for the payment of which such person shall have become liable or which shall have been levied or assessed, or shall have become due and payable while such person was in the armed services, and being a member of, or being engaged in service with any branch of the armed forces of the United States, shall be sufficient proof that the absentee voter has not had opportunity to pay poll tax as required by the constitution of the State of Mississippi, or otherwise. The manner of preparing and sending to the proper authorities each absentee ballot and registration certificate is herein specified, and on compliance with such requirements all said persons may vote by absentee ballot in any such primary or general election held in the precinct and the county in which they lived at the time of their entry into the United States armed services of any kind. The managers of elections shall be the judges of, and determine the qualifications of, all persons offering to and/or voting under the provisions of this act.

"The term 'armed services' mentioned in this act shall mean and be construed as including enlisted and commissioned members, male and female, of the United States Army, or any of its respective components or various divisions thereof; the enlisted and commissioned members, male and female, of the United States Navy, or any of its respective components or various divisions thereof, or in any division of the armed services of the United States; the merchant marines and members of the American Red Cross, who are citizens of the State of Mississippi.

"SEC. 6. If the absentee voter's ballot is received by the person designated by the voter too late to be voted on election day as herein provided, the designated person shall deliver the vote or ballot to the circuit clerk of the county in which the absentee voter votes; and the said circuit clerk, if the ballot is to be cast in a general election, shall deliver it to the county election commissioners, and, if in a primary election, to the county executive committee of the party with which the voter is affiliated; and the said commissioner or executive committee shall open the ballot when they compile the returns and count the absentee vote or votes, so as not to disclose the identity of the voters and shall hold and treat the contents confidentially as privileged. The envelope containing the vote shall be kept by the said commissioners or committee, and the ballot placed in the ballot box of the voter's precinct, for the period above mentioned.

"SEC. 7. The State selective service and all military organizations, and all citizens of this State are charged with the duty of cooperating with the election and party officials in carrying out the purposes of this act. This act shall be liberally construed in order to accomplish its purposes rather than have a strict and illiberal or extremely technical construction.

"SEC. 8. The county executive committee shall meet on the first day after each primary election; shall receive and canvass the returns which must be made the day following the election; and shall declare the results, announce the names of nominees for county district officers and the names of those candidates to be submitted to the second primary. The vote for State and State district officers shall be tabulated by precincts and all returns shall be certified to and returned to the State executive committee immediately after the returns are canvassed and results declared, and not later than 12 hours thereafter, by registered mail or any safe mode of transmission; and shall certify likewise to the senatorial and flotorial executive committees those returns relating to those officers. The State and said senatorial and flotorial executive committees shall meet on the third day after the day following the first primary election held for State and State district officers, and shall proceed to canvass the returns and to declare the result and to announce the names of those persons nominated for the different officers in the first primary and the names of those candidates whose names are to be submitted to the second primary election. State executive committees and said district executive committees shall also meet the third day after the day on which the second primary election is held and shall receive and canvass the returns for State and district officers, if any, to be voted upon in such second primary. An exact and full duplicate of all tabulations by precincts, as certified under this section, shall be filed with the circuit clerk of the county, who shall safely preserve the same in his office for the period of a year.

"The State executive committee shall furnish to the respective county executive committees a sample ballot containing the names of State and district nominees, immediately after nominees are declared and the county executive committees shall have ballots printed not later than 1 day after receipt of sample ballot.

"The State executive committee shall certify the results of the first and second primary elections to the secretary of state immediately after the nominees are determined.

"As soon as the nominees are certified to the secretary of state, with the approval of the Governor, the secretary of state shall immediately prepare a sample ballot containing the names of the nominees and forward it to the respective county election commissioners. The ticket commissioner shall have official ballots printed immediately and absentee ticket be distributed as herein provided. The county executive committee and county election commissioners shall file with the circuit

clerk of the respective counties all applications for primary or general election absentee ballots.

"SEC. 9. Any person willfully and knowingly violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished as in other cases of misdemeanors not specifically provided for.

"SEC. 10. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby abated and suspended, only insofar as they conflict herewith; otherwise they shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 11. If any section, paragraph, clause, or sentence of this act be declared unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such adjudication shall in no wise affect the other provisions or sections of this act, but the same shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 12. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage, and shall automatically be repealed at the expiration of 6 months after the present war shall officially end."

The Family and the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, delivered at the family life conference sponsored by the family life bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, at the Catholic University of America, February 29–March 2, 1944, by the Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, D. D., bishop of Toledo:

That the State has some responsibility for the welfare of the family and therefore some authority respecting it must be accepted as a postulate of any social order. The pertinent question however is, How much responsibility and how much authority does the State rightfully possess? The answer to that question will be determined not only by the political philosophy which dominates a man's thinking, but also by the religion to which he adheres. The prevailing attitude of any society toward the family, viz its autonomous nature or its subordination to the unrestricted will of the State, will usually be reflected in the fundamental law of a nation. Let us look at some existing State constitutions to illustrate the point.

Neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Bill of Rights makes any mention of the family. All the emphasis is on the rights and duties of the individual citizen. The authority of the State however, is definitely recognized as limited for the document accepts as an axiom or antecedent postulate that every man is endowed by the Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Whilst no definition of these terms is given, it must be admitted as a logical sequence that the terms "liberty and the pursuit of happiness" imply the right to establish a family and achieve its purposes. At the time this document was written, it represented the most advanced thinking of liberal minds in terms of social and political philosophy.

More than a hundred and fifty years have passed since this Constitution was adopted. New social problems have arisen and there is a new orientation of mind reflected in the fundamental law of recently organized states. Both the Communist and Fascist states place the major emphasis not on the individual but on the community as a whole; that means that the collectivity and not the family or the citizen is the ultimate goal of state actions. The organized state is, of course, accepted as the supreme manifestation of the will of the community and as a result of the personal freedom of the citizen and the family have no claims as against the arbitrary interpretation of welfare or the economic efficiency of the collective community.

In spite of this departure from earlier precedent, it is refreshing to find that those states, which retained their hold on fundamental Christian truths still emphasize the rights of the individual. What is new and most encouraging is that they emphasize even more the rights of the family as the fundamental social unit in human society.

In the new Constitution of Ireland, article 41 begins thus: "The state recognized the family as the natural, primary, and fundamental unit group of society, and as a moral necessity possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior to all positive law." Article 42 of the same constitution has this statement: "The state acknowledges that the primary and natural educator of the child is the family."

Even prior to the adoption of the Constitution of Eire we find an equally striking innovation in political thinking embodied in the constitution adopted by Portugal in the year 1933. The whole of section 111 of the first part of this document concerns the position of the family in the new Portuguese state. Article 12 enumerates the claims of the family to the protection of the state: "The state shall insure the constitution and protection of the family, as the source of preservation and development of the race, as the first basis of education and of social discipline and harmony, and as a fundamental of political and administrative order." Article 13 of the same constitution goes into even greater detail. We quote, "With the object of protecting the family it appertains to the state and to local authorities:

"1. To encourage the establishment of separate homes under healthy conditions, and the institution of the family household.

"2. To protect maternity.

"3. To establish taxation in accordance with the legitimate expenses of the family, and to promote the adoption of the family wage.

"4. To assist parents in the discharge of their duty of instructing and educating their children and to cooperate with them by means of public institutions for education and correction, or by encouraging private establishments destined for the same purpose.

"5. To take all effective precautions to guard against the corruption of morals."

It is interesting to note that the celebrated encyclical of Pius XI on Christian marriage entitled, "Casti Connubii" was issued in December of the year 1930. No one who is familiar with this document can fail to observe a striking similarity between the two constitutions mentioned above and the doctrine expounded by Pius XI concerning the rights and duties of families. Pius XI, following in the footsteps of his predecessor, Leo XIII, requires that in the state "such economic and social methods should be set up as will enable every head of a family to learn as much as, according to his station in life, is necessary for himself, his wife, and for the rearing of his children." Furthermore the Pope continues, "if private resources do not suffice, it is the duty of the public authorities to supply for the insufficient forces of individual effort; particularly in a matter which is of such importance to the common weal, touching as it does the maintenance of the family and married people. If families, particularly those in which there are many children, have not suitable dwellings; if the husband cannot find employment and the means of livelihood; if the necessities of life cannot be purchased except at an exorbitant price; if even the mother of the family, to the great harm of the home, is compelled to go forth and seek a living by her own labor; if she, too, in the ordinary or even extraordinary labors of childbirth is deprived of proper food, medicine, and the assistance of a skilled physician, it is patent to all to what an extent married people may lose heart, and how home life and the observance of God's commands are rendered difficult for them; indeed, how great a peril can arise to public security and to the welfare and very life of civil society itself. * * * Wherefore those who have the care of the state and of the common good cannot neglect the needs of married people and their families, without bringing great harm upon the state and on the common welfare. Hence, in making the laws and in disposing of public funds they must do their utmost to relieve the penury of the needy, considering such as one of the most important of their administrative duties."

Our present Holy Father, Pius XII, reiterates this teaching of his predecessor in a broadcast of June 1, 1941, where he speaks of three fundamental values of social and economic life. "In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund roots of its greatness and power. If private property is to contribute to the good of the family, all public standards and specially those of the state which regulate its possession must not only make possible and preserve such a function—a function in the natural order under certain aspects superior to all others—but must also tend to perfect it."

No serious discussion of the interrelationship of the family, the state, and the church with their respective rights and duties is possible unless we establish certain definite principles. It is utterly futile for one who accepts the democratic philosophy respecting the constitution of human society, with its emphasis on the personal dignity of the individual citizen, to debate this subject with one who adheres wholeheartedly to the doctrine of State absolutism with its emphasis on the collectivity. The Christian and the Communist will always remain poles apart in their concepts of ethical values and therefore, of the relationship between the state and the family. What is said concerning communism can be said likewise respecting Fascists and their ideology. The function of the family with its rights and duties will be differently interpreted according as we accept natural law and Christian revelation or whether we reject these standards of judgment or criteria of values. Logically if there is no God, no future life, no spiritual principle called a soul, then there can be no supernatural revelation, no divinely established church. Hence any claim of the church to an authoritative voice in these matters respecting the family in its organization and its function is a fraud and deceit. Religion, as Karl Marx declared, is merely "an opium of the people."

If however, we accept the Christian view of life, then it is all important to know what God has said and decreed about the family; about marriage, parental authority, education of children, respective rights and duties of husband and wife, and so forth. If God has made definite pronouncements in these matters and if we accept these truths, then, certainly, no mere human authority, whether it speaks in the name of science or in the name of social welfare or in the name of the state, has any right to tinker with the divine arrangements. The ethical values and the moral principles established by God concerning the family must in this supposition remain outside the jurisdiction of any state sovereignty.

Pope Pius XI reminds us that there are "three necessary societies distinct from one another and yet harmoniously combined by God, into which man is born—two, namely, the family and civil society belong to the natural order; the third, the church, to the supernatural order. In the first place comes the family, instituted directly by God for its peculiar purpose, the generation and formation of offspring; for this reason it has priority of nature and, therefore, of rights over civil society. Nevertheless, the family is an imperfect society, since it has not in itself all the means for its own complete development; whereas civil society is a perfect society, having in itself all the means for its peculiar end, which is the temporal well-being of the community; and so, in this respect, that is, in view of the common good, it has preeminence over the family, which finds its own suitable temporal perfection precisely in civil society."

There exists, therefore, both an area of agreement and an area of conflict between the state authority and the Christian church. The church recognizes that the state has definite rights and responsibilities concerning the civil effects of marriage, the standards of education for citizenship, the security of the family against the hazards of life such as sickness, disability, old age, or unemployment. The church, in fact, is ready to cooperate with the state in what is a truly scientific program of eugenics, but the church endowed with authority and responsibility regarding the sovereignty of God and the correct interpretation of the moral law, rejects the supremacy of state authority in those things which concern the essential nature of the contract of marriage, its unity and indissolubility, its primary purpose, namely, the rearing of offspring and the suitable training of such offspring for citizenship in the Kingdom of God. The church, therefore, rejects the right of the state to forbid marriage or decree divorce, compel sterilization, birth control, compulsory secular education, or mere civil marriage. We realize clearly that as a result the loyal and faithful Catholic of today faces a difficult dilemma. His loyalty to God will be interpreted as disloyalty to his government. There can be no agreement in principle but only a modus vivendi between the church and such states as arrogate to themselves supreme and unrestricted authority in these matters touching the family. We can only maintain with the apostles that obedience to God takes precedence over submission to an usurped authority of the state. "We must obey God rather than man."

In the final analysis we are safeguarding the fundamental principle of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from unjust aggression. The position of the church is fundamentally that of democracy which stands for the rights and the liberties of the individual, and is opposed to the unrestricted authority of the state. In defending, therefore, the family, its rights, its duties, its functions, we claim to speak as Americans, as honest liberals, but especially as sincere Christians.

France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Big Query," as follows:

BIG QUERY

Lack of a coherent policy in regard to Italy leaves the United States today in the wholly anomalous and unhappy position of supporting a discredited regime that is almost completely without popular backing. This fact has not helped; it has hindered our military operations. After 6 months of bitter fighting, we are still a long way from Rome.

Now we are soon to undertake an invasion of the European Continent that will dwarf into insignificance our move into Italy. But if our political preparations for that invasion prove no better than they were for the invasion of Italy, we can only view the possibilities with dread. We raise the question out of wonder. Clearly the time is rapidly working around to 12 o'clock. Yet so far there is no evidence that we have any announced policy. To be sure, there is a plan, a plan that by recognizing the Committee of Liberation as the French de facto authority to take over the preliminary administration of liberated French areas and govern them until free elections can be held, would relieve Allied military forces of the responsibilities of mixing civil duties with military responsibilities. The delay in making it our announced policy has been so protracted that we are compelled to ask why.

It is an open secret that the plan has the approval of the War Department, the State Department, and the British Government. So far, however, President Roosevelt has refused to give it his approval. What the reasons may be for his negative stand are hard to discover. Certainly even on the low level of military expediency—the justification given for the deal with Darlan and the later deal with Badoglio—the proposed deal with the French Committee of National Liberation has much to recommend it. Besides, the committee itself, by being broadly based and representing a great variety of political parties, appears to be the only body that can at this time speak in the name of France. Indeed, it has the very closest relationship with the underground movement in France itself.

Our deals with Darlan and Badoglio have tended to cast doubts on our democratic professions. By reversing that process through an arrangement with the democratic Algiers committee, we can help restore our vanishing prestige. But there is not much time left. If President Roosevelt has any good reasons for holding up the proposed arrangement with the French committee, he should explain them.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial criticizes the President for not recognizing the French Committee of Liberation headed by General de Gaulle, and while reports were printed in the newspapers that the President and General de Gaulle did not get along so well, I cannot believe that any personal dislike or disagreement with the policies of General de Gaulle actuated the President in withholding recognition of the committee represented by General de Gaulle. I would suggest that in waging this war, there are many things which our President and our military leaders cannot disclose to the public, and it may be that the President has reasons for this attitude. This may be disclosed by events in the future.

Mr. Speaker, while in Louisiana for the Christmas holidays I issued a statement with regard to France, and with your permission, I would like to include the same in my remarks. The statement follows:

OPELOUSAS, LA., January 7, 1944.—While here in Louisiana spending the Christmas congressional recess, I have the thought that a large percentage of the people of this State are of French descent. New Orleans has a large French population, who are direct descendants of the French, and in southwest Louisiana, and in my congressional district, there are also many direct descendants of the French. It is estimated that there are approximately 500,000 descendants of the Acadians in the southern part of Louisiana.

All of our people are, of course, first loyal Americans, but their hearts go out to France and the French people. Especially our people with French blood coursing through their veins have a deep sympathy for the French, aside from the fact that the two countries have been friendly and sympathetic one to the other; as history relates, ties have bound us together since the founding of the United States, and we should never forget the help France gave us to gain our own independence.

What has happened to France in this war is tragic. Where the blame is to be placed is beyond the point. What has happened is water under the bridge. I do believe, however, there is leadership strong enough to redeem France and to reestablish that great republic.

No matter what the internal dissensions may be which have arisen between the new leaders of France, I feel certain that unity will again be established and that the people of France have been and are ready to make all of the sacrifices necessary to regain their freedom.

Not much has been said about the part that France has played in assisting the United States and our allies in taking north Africa, but it is well known that north Africa could never have been taken without the loss of thousands more of American lives, and the success of this venture never could have been accomplished so quickly and so easily without the help, assistance, and cooperation of the French. Without this help and assistance we never would have accomplished in the war thus far what has been accomplished.

The 500,000 French soldiers in north Africa, fully equipped and seasoned, who were under the command of General Giraud, have played an important part in the Tunisian, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns. Thousands more have been equipped with American arms, and are even wearing American uniforms, with the tricolor of France on their shoulders, and are fighting side by side with our boys.

The greater part of the French fleet was turned over to the Allied command and is now fighting valiantly on the high seas in the cause of freedom and justice. The ships that could not be saved were scuttled rather than be turned over to the Germans. Others gave battle in the face of overwhelming odds and escaped under fire. One of the great French battleships, the *Richelieu*, was damaged, but reached American shores under her own steam. One of the most heartening and inspiring sights I have witnessed recently was a news reel showing that gallant French battleship, which had been reconditioned here, steaming back to Europe to give battle to the enemy and to redeem the honor of France and to fight in the cause of freedom.

From the very beginning of the invasion of France by the German hordes the people of France, through the underground, at the risk of their lives, have constantly and relentlessly sabotaged the invaders, and thousands of them have paid with their lives. For months and months the people of France have been working and preparing for the day of their liberation and on the eve of the invasion of the European continent by our allies, at the signal will be ready to spring up and do their part to help crush our common enemy. I marvel that more credit has not been given France, or that more has not been said about the important part that France has played, is playing, and will play in our ultimate victory,

but I know that when the story is told and the sacrifices made are known, that history will recall the great part that France has played in assisting our country and the United Nations to reestablish peace and freedom in the world and that the great French republic and her people will rise and reestablish themselves in all her former glory.

All hail to France and the brave people of France and to the fine assistance that nation is giving to the United Nations. France will come through and we will all again see the tricolor of France waving over that great republic, and there will again be liberté, égalité, and fraternité in one of the greatest countries in the world.

None Escapes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it matters not how patriotic one may be, it makes no difference the service he may have rendered, even though he be serving with distinction, risking his life with the armed forces, he may still be smeared by some New Deal or communistic stooge.

The defeat of more than two-thirds of the peoples' Representatives in Congress has been demanded. The Communists have charged many Senators and Congressmen with disloyalty.

Eddie Rickenbacker, who for 21 days on the raft in the Pacific faced death while serving his country, did not escape the smear of the C. I. O., who now are prepared to spend any part of several million dollars in electing their stooges to Congress.

Now Senator VANDENBERG calls attention to a smear artist in the War Department itself who attempts to blacken the name of General MacArthur.

Read an account of the incident taken from this morning's Washington Times-Herald:

THE M'ARTHUR SMEAR

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The War Department has been caught red-handed in an attempt to smear its greatest field general. There is no other possible interpretation to put upon the project concerning Gen. Douglas MacArthur exposed yesterday by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan.

The schedule of events in this smear is as follows:

A monthly magazine called the American Mercury published in its January issue an article entitled "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend." The author's name was given as John McCarten, identified as one of the workers in the wonderland of Time, Inc.

The content of the article reveals its character and motives better than any brief description here could do. You'd have to read it to appreciate the full force of its effort to make MacArthur what he isn't.

The next development was that a private book-publishing firm, Harper & Bro., issued a circular for the attention of librarians cataloging January magazine material.

It picked up for its catalog almost the exact, literal language of the blurb sent out by the American Mercury in advertisement of the MacArthur smear.

A copy of this effort in due time reached Mr. Luther Evans, chief assistant to the renowned Government poet, Archibald MacLeish, who is also Librarian of Congress by appointment.

Mr. Evans, among his other duties, is delegated to organize a thing called the library bulletin of the Army War College, which is in turn sent out by the War Department to posts and stations around the world, calling to the troops' attention things that ought to be read.

Now, the Army is careful what kind of literature it sends out to the troops. Mr. Evans may propose, but it is the War Department that will dispose, in any case, and accidents don't happen.

Too many people check and recheck.

Here is what went out in the February issue of the Army War College Library Bulletin in reference to Mercury's smear of Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

"A comprehensive and objective appraisal of the general as Presidential timber, with special reference to the character of his backers and an analysis of his military reputation before Pearl Harbor and after."

"Special reference" to such Mercury allegations as this: General MacArthur is a defeated general who didn't plan the defense of the Philippines, and whose execution of the defense was a failure. General MacArthur is a brassed-up politician in uniform whose mind is on anything but war. General MacArthur is unreliable, dangerous, and up to no good.

Again, you would have to read the whole thing to get a full, fair view of it, but the summing up in one word is "smear."

And that is what the Army War College sent out to post libraries—but not with any tag on it saying "this is a publisher's blurb for his own dirty work, folded into another publisher's clipsheet and passed on to you as such."

No, sir. That smear job was advertised in the War Department's bulletin with the estimate above quoted as the Army's own estimate—official.

February 23, Senator VANDENBERG wrote Secretary of War Stimson asking him what the Army's motive was in doing such a thing. When he failed to get a reply by noon of March 9 (yesterday), Senator VANDENBERG took the floor of the Senate and reported the existence of the "appraisal" bulletin.

He said of it, with justice:

"It were better described as a studious smear of a great American character. * * * I do not understand why the War Department should be propagandizing any 'appraisals of Presidential timber.'

"It occurs to me that this is none of the War Department's business."

After he had finished his speech, the Senator went back to his office and there found a special messenger, panting, with a letter from Secretary of War Stimson, delivered by hand and in haste.

It attempted first to explain how the "appraisal" had got into the War Department's bulletin, then to deny any intent to do harm, and then promised never to let such a thing happen again.

This curious kind of explanation just won't work for anybody who knows anything at all about the workings of the smear gang.

"Accidents" of this sort just don't happen, most especially with the chief assistant of that celebrated smearer, Archibald MacLeish, on the job.

That's the same kind of "accident" Uncle Elmer Davis is always claiming whenever the Office of War Information gets caught slipping across one of its fourth-term twists. The "accident" is that it is discovered.

Of one thing you may be sure in the MacArthur case. It was done by the War Department, but it won't be appreciated by the Army.

General MacArthur's career, measured alongside the mud spatters of the American Mercury, takes care of the truth of the case.

The Army venerates that career. MacArthur's life as a soldier is a model for officers and men alike. It can't be hurt by mud. But the mud is disgusting. And that their civilian superiors have helped sling it disgusts many a soldier even more than the mud itself.

New England Air Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many persons of my State, including high officials of municipal and State governments, have sent me emphatic protests against the recent ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board drastically limiting air routes into Boston and New England. From these communications I have received the distinct impression that this bureaucratic opinion rendered by a single examiner of the Civil Aeronautics Board virtually creates a monopoly which bars the effective growth of Boston as an airport and threatens to stifle commercial development, so far as use and employment of air facilities in the New England area is concerned.

If these claims be true, as asserted by so many reputable citizens and public agencies, this opinion, which excludes the applications of several air-line companies, leaves the great seaport and airport of Boston at the end of the line, so to speak, without adequate direct air communications with other parts of the country. As one who does not believe that all wisdom resides in bureaucratic boards of the Federal Government, I have entered my protest against this ruling and have asked the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider it. It must be clear to all that Boston is an especially important—indeed vital—port, not only in our domestic affairs but also in transoceanic air transport, which will assume such great importance when the war is over.

I understand that some of my other colleagues from New England have joined in this protest, and I hope that we will be able to influence the judgments of the Civil Aeronautics Board so as to provide a fair and full opportunity for the port of Boston and New England to be recognized in the development plans for the extension of air service throughout this country and the world. It is clear to me that if this Federal Bureau, which has by its ruling discriminated against Boston, penalized New England, and threatened to check the growth of our commerce and business, will not yield to the appeals of reason, fairness, and justice for this important section of the country we will have no recourse but to try to correct this most unfortunate and harmful situation by legislation.

I am sure that all the Members of this House, realizing and acknowledging the importance of the port of Boston for sea-borne and air-borne commerce, will be most sympathetic with efforts made to insure full opportunity for development and expansion of air facilities under an intelligent, well-coordinated plan.

All we in New England seek is just consideration from the Federal bureaucracy. If we cannot have our rights properly adjudicated before administrative departments of the Government, then we will appeal to the Congress for justice.

Staff Sgt. Roy L. Blackwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, by extending my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a newspaper clipping pointing out a typical example of the enthusiasm and patriotism of the men from my section of the country in the prosecution of the war. Roy L. Blackwell, the subject of the enclosed story, was born at the historic battleground of Cowpens. He has already done more than his share but, as will be seen, seeks to make other and further contributions:

23-YEAR-OLD GREER ARMY VETERAN WOULD ENTER NAVY

COLUMBIA, March 8.—With a piece of shrapnel in his chest and proudly displaying a Purple Heart and five campaign ribbons with stars denoting participation in five major engagements, 23-year-old Roy L. Blackwell, of Greer, a veteran of the African campaign, volunteered for service with the Navy and was temporarily accepted today at Fort Jackson's armed forces induction center, pending further medical investigation of his injury.

Blackwell, a crack shortstop in the Piedmont League will no doubt be the only baseball player in the world—and one of a very few men—to see service in the Second World War with both the Army and the Navy.

A native of historic Cowpens, but with his home now in Greer, where his mother, Mrs. Alice Blackwell, is living, Roy enlisted in the Army on September 7, 1939, at Fort Bragg while a member of the Greensboro, N. C., baseball team in the Piedmont League.

He received field artillery and tank destroyer basic training during his 3 years at Fort Bragg, and during recreation periods aided in establishing a topnotch ball club in his division. He had been playing baseball since the age of 13 and received bids from the Washington Senators, New York Yankees, Boston Red Sox, and Detroit Tigers in 1940 and 1941, while playing with Fort Bragg service teams.

At 8 a. m. on November 8, 1942, Blackwell's north African adventures began when he landed at Oran with his tank destroyer outfit and helped rout the French. But that was only the beginning, as the battle for Tunisia was just ahead. His outfit was with the group that tried to storm through the now famous Kasserine Pass only to be forced back by the hard-charging panzer division of the wily desert fox, Marshal Rommel. A second attempt succeeded, Kasserine Pass was won, and Tunisia spread out before them.

Blackwell, now a staff sergeant, was wounded by shrapnel at Fonduck, Tunisia. It was 15 hours before he could obtain expert medical attention, and he's lavish in his praise for the medics. Upon examination it was found that a piece of shrapnel, approximately a half-inch long and a half-inch in diameter was imbedded in his left chest near the fifth rib. So today, former Staff Sgt. Roy Blackwell carries with him this memento of the Tunisia campaign.

AT COLUMBIA HOSPITAL

After medical attention at the American field hospital Sergeant Blackwell passed through a half dozen evacuation hospitals to a station hospital at Constantine and was then carried by airplane to a general hospital in Casablanca. He left there on Easter Sunday and sometime later arrived at the Lovell General Hospital, in Boston, from which place he went to the Moore General Hospital at Asheville, N. C., where he was given a discharge from the Army. He then spent several days at the Veterans' Hospital in Columbia.

The former Army staff sergeant, husky and handsome with curly black hair and a ready smile, volunteered for further service through his local draft board No. 39 at Greer, and was sent to Fort Jackson for his physical examination and possible induction. He has two brothers in the service, Pvt. (1st cl.) Cecil Blackwell with the marines in the South Pacific theater of war, and Pvt. Raymond Blackwell in the supply depot at Fort Benning.

"The Navy is fighting all over the world," said Blackwell when asked why he preferred the Navy to the Army this time. "The Army moves too slow for me, so I'll try the Navy."

A Man of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from one of the finest men I have ever known. At the present time this man, Lt. Erling Jacobson, is serving as a chaplain in the United States Navy in the Pacific war zone. My opinion of him is, I know, shared by all who have had the privilege of his acquaintance. His kindliness, sense of fair play, and his understanding of his fellow man have endeared him not only to the people of his particular faith, but to those of other faiths as well. Our friendship is of some years' standing. Over that period of time we have discussed many problems and questions concerning our country and its future. It has also been my privilege to appear before his brotherhood group on various occasions to discuss national matters of the moment. The brotherhood group, like their pastor, were vitally interested in the welfare of our Nation, and my contacts with them not only cemented personal friendships, but they also made my faith in America so much stronger.

When Lieutenant Jacobson left his pastorate in Missoula to enter his country's service he did so because he felt there was a real need for the type of work he could perform. I know he felt keenly about leaving Missoula and that that feeling was reciprocated by those who knew him, there is no doubt. He would not have been happy living his life in beautiful and peaceful Missoula while his country was in danger and the world in a state of chaos. Considering his character and his deep sense of duty, he could do no less and no more than follow the course he has chosen in offering his services to the Nation in its hour of need. That he is doing an excellent job is taken for granted, and we, who know him, feel that the ship, regiment, or station to which he is attached is indeed a fortunate unit.

We are looking forward to the day when he will be back with us once again because he is truly one of God's men and we, of Montana, are proud of him.

The letter follows:

SHIPS COMPANY RECEIVING STATION,
FLEET POST OFFICE, NAVY 131,
San Francisco, Calif., February 27, 1944.

The Honorable MICHAEL MANSFIELD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I am going to take a few minutes off this evening at the close of a rather quiet day to write the note that has been clamoring for consideration for months. I realize that it isn't quite the thing to do for a man in the armed forces to write his Congressman. However, there can truly be nothing amiss for a man to write his friend, can there, and especially when he seeks no political largess, nor personal gain? In fact, my only reason for writing this letter, if a reason must be given, is what might prompt a man to go to his telephone and call up his friend and say "How's things?"

I know something of how things are with you. I have been noticing by the occasional newspapers and periodicals that you are doing the kind of a job that many of us some years ago knew you would do if you ever got to Congress; and, incidentally, did it ever please me to hear of your committee appointments, especially the one to Foreign Affairs. The good Lord had His hand in that. If ever we needed level-headed, well-informed, Christian men on that committee it is now and in the years to come. You see I am now in New Caledonia, and I see first hand how difficult international good will is. It is somewhat disillusioning, I must say. I try not to succumb to the temptation to become defeatist, and despairing both so far as domestic and international problems are concerned but I fear I should if I were not a man of faith and if I did not know that we had men in Congress who, like you, are dominated by Christian and humanitarian motives, and who "study to make yourselves approved." May God give you and your colleagues the wisdom, the charity, and the courage which will be required for your tasks when we have finished ours of spanking these nasty men.

I have now been overseas 13 months, 11 months of which were spent in the war zone and forward area. Encountered my share of the hazards to health, life, and limb but thus far have been spared any serious trouble. The wilting heat of these tropics has been one of the most disagreeable features of the life although the monotony of the life wasn't any too enjoyable either. I didn't expect comfort and luxury, however, and it is infinitely better to fight this war away from our shores. As a general rule the boys realize this too and consequently carry on like good sailors.

My work is as challenging and interesting as anything can be. The chaplaincy cannot begin to supplant the civilian ministry in my

affections, however. The contact with family life and homes, and the friendships one forms when one remains in a pastorate for a number of years are priceless beyond words.

My people are very faithful about writing me so I keep up with affairs in beloved Missoula and western Montana. As you know, I am on leave for the duration so I shall return if and when.

The hour is late, MIKE, so I will have to secure. Please give my best regards to Mrs. Mansfield and to the daughter who, I suppose, is getting to be quite a young lady by this time. Again, my best wishes and God's richest blessings.

Fraternally,

ERLING R. JACOBSON.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I have just received from Mr. Albin C. Swenson, of the Swenson Land & Cattle Co., Stamford, Tex., in which he reports the proceedings at a recent Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association convention held in Houston, Tex.

Apparently, deep down in that fine American heart in Texas there is resentment at the intrusion of meddlesome Government. Bureaucracy with all its powers and tin-pan thinking has upset the normal processes of food production to such an extent that the meat supply of the country is endangered. These facts are gradually becoming appreciated by the American people the length and breadth of the land, and resentment against unnecessary Government interference in the lives of our citizens is being manifested in no uncertain terms in recent elections.

Under our system of government as provided by the Constitution, the only remedy that people have in situations of this kind is the ballot box and so long as the right of suffrage is held inviolate there can be no doubt that our beloved country will survive the half-baked and crackpot sophistry of inexperienced and impractical people in authority. I predict that November 7, 1944, will prove to be a day of remembrance as a renaissance of the American constitutional system of government and that fine patriotic heart deep in that great State of Texas will again beat with the glory of true Americanism.

The letter follows:

STAMFORD, TEX., *March 7, 1944.*

The Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I have just attended the annual convention of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, which was held in Houston on February 28, 29, and March 1.

I thought that you would be interested in learning of what transpired, if you have not already been advised. The Houston papers reported the meetings in fair shape only, but I could not find any reference in the New Deal Fort Worth Star Telegram, or that fine and independent Dallas News.

The gist of Claude McCan's remarks (the president of the association) were about as follows:

"There are now approximately 82,000,000 head of cattle, an excess of from 15,000,000 to 17,000,000, but due to the ruination of the feeder almost every animal now being slaughtered produces one-third less beef. A waste of 33⅓ percent in the beef supply.

"The columnist Drew Pearson has been accusing the cattlemen of maintaining a lobby of more than 200 men in Washington, and with possession of unlimited funds. The truth happens to be, as you well know, that there is one man who is working in Washington, and the funds are so scanty that it is ridiculous that such a large industry has so little at its disposal with which to defend itself.

"He quoted Colonel Logan, of the Service of Supply, as having advised him last June that the Army and Navy were only getting 50 percent of their beef requirements and that it was going to be worse.

"Live cattle are not beef, they must go through the intricate channels of feeding, marketing, etc., before beef is available. Through Government regulation and interference the natural laws have so been interfered with that the feeder's cost has risen $20 per head and at the same time, the price at which he can sell to the packer has been lowered, and Vinson advises that they are trying to still lower that price. The feeder is about licked and cannot feed. (As you know the packer receives the subsidies, not the producer or feeder.)

"Calves are worth more as killers to the packer than they would be at a price which would allow the feeder to live.

"Allow the feeder to break even only, and he would function and find the feed. There is no real shortage of feed.

"Every regulation which the O. P. A. has made has discouraged the feeder and if he knew of everything that is going on in Washington, we would be scared to death."

All the above from a Democrat from Victoria, Tex. (In the "Old South" of Texas.)

From the producer's standpoint his protein in the form of cottonseed cake, when he has been able to get it, now costs $60.90 a ton, as against $35 in January 1942 and $40 in January 1943. His bundle feed (sorghum stover), which is so essential to feed the animals over the winter when the grass has dried up or gone, has ranged from 12 to 18 cents a bundle, as against 2 to 3 cents a bundle a few years ago. An animal being maintained over the winter, such as the breeding cows and bulls, and running on dried-up pasturage, needs about 1 to 2 pounds of cake and a bundle of sorghum a day. The producer is working with half the necessary help, and his labor costs have not only gone up but he suffers from the work of inexperienced young boys and old men.

A large percentage of the cattle producers operate on borrowed money from the banks, and it is possible that many will go under, yet they are accused of being on strike and of withholding their animals, in spite of the fact that their feeder market has been taken away from them, and their animals are not fit for market. All of this you know, but it does no harm to repeat it.

Judge Montague, the assistant attorney, made a brilliant speech and received an ovation. This is remarkable when you read the following notes from his talk, and when you consider that he was talking to dyed-in-the-wool Democrats in the South.

He fully explained the "meat plan" and related how it had been accepted as workable and feasible, by the Army, Navy, congressional committees, Marvin Jones and other Government agencies, and at one time the President himself. The plan has never been allowed to be put into effect.

He advised that the purpose of subsidies was to get control of the peoples' food and when this was accomplished, the people would be under the absolute control of the Government. He went on to say that this method has been copied from Hitler, etc., who started out in this manner.

The prices of cattle are much lower than the limits set by Congress when they gave authority to O. P. A. The prices in the law were stated as those of September 1942 but not attention was paid to this and the O. P. A. acts were absolutely illegal.

He related that he had been present at a congressional hearing when four O. P. A. officials openly admitted and boasted that they had been given the job of getting around the law and they seemed very pleased with themselves in their success. He stated that he had never witnessed anything so brazen.

He advised that the President had ordered that the thirteen billions which had been returned from the Army, be kept in a special fund and not returned to the general fund.

The people who are running our Government are trying to change our form of living, and are following the teachings of Karl Marx. Mein Kampf states that the first step in gaining control of the people is to get control of the food.

While our boys are fighting for democracy, our Government is trying to destroy it at home.

He has been persecuted over the telephone in distinct campaigns of intimidation.

He has been thoroughly frightened at the trend of inside events, but has gained a great deal of hope since the Barkley episode. However, a hard battle was ahead of us.

As you no doubt know, Montague comes from Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. R. C. Pollock, general manager of the National Livestock and Meat Board in Chicago, gave a very interesting address on the value of meat as a food, its protein, vitamins, etc., and made direct comparisons with cereals and other substitutes which have been advocated by many radicals in the Government and in certain colleges—Cornell notably. I cannot remember the mass of data which he presented, but he wound up, after stating and giving figures and proof, that 4 ounces of meat equals 5 bowls of oatmeal, and if you didn't like oatmeal you could get the same food value from eating 16 bowls of Post Toasties. He didn't believe that the boys in the Army would like that.

The Honorable RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Corpus Christi, Tex., and who is up for reelection this fall, gave an amazing address for a House Democrat.

He roundly criticized Government bureaus and branded them as nullifiers of the Constitution and defeatists in their philosophy.

"If the administration bureaucrats think that we won't fight for those rights, they are a damn sight more wrong even than they are in their policies."

The days of Valley Forge were the days "that tried men's souls," and these days are here again, and it is strange how men learn from experience and promptly forget. All of this relating to Government policies.

Mentioning him by name, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he stated, "May I pray God that his [Roosevelt's] wisdom and patriotism will prevent him from seeking a fourth term."

Subsidies are wrong in principle and leave money in the hands of the consumer to buy nonessentials. "That looks like inflation to me."

It has been said that without subsidies the cost of meat to the consumer would be ap-

proximately $6 per person per year. This he doubted, but, even if true, stated: "This is too small a price to sell the liberties of Texans and Americans."

The people who are running our Government are not Americans, and the policies of the Government compare with the doctrine of the divinity of kings and the theories of Karl Marx.

The people at home who are making money and who receive subsidies are passing on the bill to the boys who are fighting the war to pay for later.

Referring to F. D. R., "if there is only one man who can run this country, it should be kept a military secret, as it would be our Achilles' heel."

KLEBERG also received an ovation. There is plenty of labor-unionism in his district.

Perhaps you have already received a copy of the resolutions, which were adopted without one dissenting vote, from an aggregation of several hundred, many of whom were very humble farmers and ranchers.

The O. P. A. has failed completely in establishing a proper relationship between feed and livestock, as well as in everything else they have handled, and the Congress is petitioned to bring O. P. A. within the provisions of the law, as passed by Congress in 1942.

The association is in favor of extending the life of O. P. A. on June 30: *Provided, however,* That:

1. There is a special prohibition against subsidies.

2. That there be eliminated from its personnel every man who is not a true American, and that all Fascists and followers of Carl Marx be thrown out.

3. That its methods and rules be simplified.

4. That all citizens be restored to their constitutional rights and to their rights in the courts.

5. That the powers of the O. P. A. be confined to those that are essential.

6. That there be cooperation and an end to confusion.

They endorse the meat-management plan.

They recommend the trimming of herds, and the lowering of the number of cattle. (This is in order to save the herds and pastures, and has been forced on them.)

Urge the members to have as many animals go to slaughter as soon as possible, to help relieve the shortage in spring and summer and the glut in fall. (The regular channel of meat marketing, feeding, etc., used to take care of this. The Government has now destroyed this.)

Blame ceiling prices for the chaotic state of affairs and petition for their rescinding at once. (I haven't seen anybody who believes that the elimination of ceiling prices and the adoption and working of the meat-management plan would increase the price to the consumer.)

Desire to prevent inflation but resent that agriculture is bearing the whole burden.

Deplore the agencies that have taken the place of Congress and urge that Congress assert their rights and make the laws of the future, and allow the courts to function.

The president of the association advised that the above resolutions were the most important that have ever been made and that they are binding on the officers and directors of the association. He further urged that all the members present explain them to their neighbors and secure their support for the principles involved.

Many oldtimers stated that they have never attended this convention when such a unity of purpose was shown.

I circulated around pretty well with those who were present during those few days, and they consisted of the humble little fellow and some of means and large properties. There was not a single one who wanted a cent more for his cattle, nor has there ever been such a demand or request made. They were all unified in the purpose of producing meat for the country and their boys who are in the service, and believed that they had done a real job, under all the trying circumstances and under all the handicaps which have been thrown in their path. They deeply resent the fact that the Government has thwarted them, and curtailed the meat supply just to cater to some labor leaders, whose membership, in spite of their large wages, might have to pay $6 more for beef per annum. They believe that the production of beef is as important as any other war effort.

I am encouraged in the hope that these men will vote as they talk, but should, of course, some other than F. D. R. receive the nomination they will vote as usual.

In talking with feeders from the Corn Belt and Middle West, I find the same spirit, and it would surprise me very much if such States went F. D. R. I wish that you could blow down here and pay us a visit, as I know that it would be very interesting to you, but such pleasure jaunts are just not possible these hectic days. At any rate you cannot accuse me of not having written you a letter.

If you find time to read all of this and its contents bring up any questions in your mind, or should you like to secure data which I might dig up, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

ALBIN C. SWENSON.

We Must Be Different!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of the American people on the home front in this war are indeed great. Not only are we challenged to exert every effort to back up the men and women in the service, in order that victory may be ours on the battlefield, but we must maintain the domestic economy of our country and protect the democratic processes for which all of us are fighting.

At times, some may feel that the load is getting heavy and that perhaps they are doing a little more than their share. If there are times like that, we should think of the boys who are sacrificing their lives, and the families who have received black-edged messages telling them of the loss of a loved one in the armed services of our Nation.

A friend recently sent me a transcript of a sermon delivered by Rev. Carl Fredrick Johnson, of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Thief River Falls, Minn., in memoriam of Leonard Sanders, a young soldier killed in action in a foreign land.

One of the thoughts expressed in this sermon has lingered in my mind constantly:

He will have given his life in vain if we continue to live as if this had not happened. We must be different from now on.

That is how we can in a small way pay tribute to our fallen heroes and assure that they shall not have died in vain.

As the individual changes, so will the home, the community, and the Nation. Suffering creates nobleness of soul and a tolerant, reverent, and understanding heart. We will need all of these virtues before we are victoriously finished with the war and the period of reconstruction and before a lasting Christian peace is attained.

The following digest of the sermon referred to will be of interest to Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A memorial service must endeavor to bring comfort and strength to the bereaved family and friends. It must also bring a message that would indicate the wish of the one who has sacrificed his life. It should also point to what each of us can do as living memorials to those who give their lives in our stead. It shall be our endeavor to bring in these thoughts in this service.

COMFORT TO US FROM GOD'S WORD

No more comforting words can be found than those written in John xiv: 1–3: "Let not your hearts be troubled; believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you I come again and will receive you unto Myself; that where I am ye may be also."

There is room in the Master's heart for all people, and that includes you who are in sorrow. We have a Savior who feels with us our needs and sorrows and what is more, He has a wonderful way to supply those needs. He will stand by us when all other things fail us, we can be sure of that. Because of that we need not fear to go to Him with our burdened hearts. He has promised to receive us. Let us, therefore, go even now to this our great Sympathizer. Not only is there room in the Master's heart, but there is also room in the Father's house. By the letters received from Leonard disclosing his interest in his chaplain and in the religious services, and the card received from the chaplain himself, we are encouraged to believe that Leonard is on his way to the Father's house. We shall meet Him there if we make the necessary preparations now. Place your trust in the Savior who cares and who can help you.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN WHAT HAS HAPPENED

Leonard would not be interested in our praise of him for his great sacrifice. He would rather have us make certain that his going and giving of his life were not in vain. To our minds comes the word of God spoken to Cain after he had killed his brother. "What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground" (Genesis 4:10). Perhaps we have satisfied ourselves that the guilt of this conflict is another's, and that we are innocent. God says, "What hast thou done?" We have not drawn a sword, but we have permitted our neglect of things spiritual and our selfishness to grow to such an extent that it is now necessary for blood to flow on the battlefield. We have not placed God first in our lives and He has not been loved above all things. God and things of God have been placed in the background and self has been placed in the foreground. We have not loved our neighbor as ourselves. For all this Leonard has paid with his life, we have a bereaved family in our midst and a gold star on our flag. Unless we feel our guilt and are ready to make amends, Leonard died in vain and his buddies are continuing the fight in vain. Let us go repentant to the throne of God.

WE SHOULD BE LIVING MEMORIALS

Leonard gave his life, and there will be little satisfaction to him and little comfort

to his family that there are other families and that there will be more families in like circumstances. No Leonard will have given his life in vain if we continue to live as if this had not happened. We must be different from now on. Our interest in the war and its efforts must be increased. We must make the sacrifices which our Government asks of us, and make them cheerfully. Yet if we buy bonds as quickly as they come from the print shop, and fail to become different spiritually, we are prolonging the conflict, and assuring ourselves of another even more deadly than this. We love our flag, but if we wish to insure its safety we must raise the banner of the cross to the proper station. Leonard and others gave their lives and still others are giving theirs to keep for us the freedom to worship as we please or not to worship if we so please. By nonuse we lose the freedom. That which we do not use we have already lost.

"Therefore, let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus, the author and perfector of our faith, who for the joy that was set before endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Hebrews 12:1–2).

There is a way in which we all can help make the sacrifice of this life work for good in this community and throughout the world. God has a place for each of us, and if we find that place and serve faithfully we will be honoring God and those who give their lives. You of the bereaved family can find comfort in doing things for him and for others. May God help us to serve so that Leonard and the others do not give their lives in vain.

Agreement Between Australia and New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following agreement between Australia and New Zealand, signed at Canberra January 21, 1944:

His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand (hereinafter referred to as the two Governments) having met in conference at Canberra from the 17th to the 21st January 1944 and desiring to maintain and strengthen the close and cordial relations between the two Governments do hereby enter into this Agreement.

DEFINITION OF OBJECTIVES OF AUSTRALIAN-NEW ZEALAND CO-OPERATION

1. The two Governments agree that as a preliminary provision shall be made for fuller exchange of information as regards both the views of each Government and the facts in the possession of either bearing on matters of common interest.

2. The two Governments give mutual assurances that on matters which appear to be of common concern each Government will so far as possible be made acquainted with the mind of the other before views are expressed elsewhere by either.

3. In furtherance of the above provisions with respect to exchange of views and information the two Governments agree that there shall be the maximum degree of unity in the presentation elsewhere of the views of the two countries.

4. The two Governments agree to adopt an expeditious and continuous means of consultation by which each party will obtain directly the opinions of the other.

5. The two Governments agree to act together in matters of common concern in the South West and South Pacific areas.

6. So far as compatible with the existence of separate military commands the two Governments agree to co-ordinate their efforts for the purpose of prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion.

ARMISTICE AND SUBSEQUENT ARRANGEMENTS

7. The two Governments declare that they have vital interests in all preparations for any armistice ending the present hostilities or any part thereof and also in arrangements subsequent to any such armistice and agree that their interests should be protected by representation at the highest level on all armistice planning and executive bodies.

8. The two Governments are in agreement that the final peace settlement should be made in respect of all our enemies after hostilities with all of them are concluded.

9. Subject to the last two preceding clauses the two Governments will seek agreement with each other on the terms of any armistice to be concluded.

10. The two Governments declare that they should actively participate in any armistice commission to be set up.

11. His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia shall set up in Australia and His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand shall set up in New Zealand armistice and post hostilities planning committees and shall arrange for the work of these committees to be co-ordinated in order to give effect to the views of the respective Governments.

12. The two Governments will collaborate generally with regard to the location of machinery set up under international organization such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and in particular with regard to the location of the Far Eastern Committee of that Administration.

SECURITY AND DEFENSE

13. The two Governments agree that within the framework of a general system of world security a regional zone of defense comprising the South West and South Pacific areas shall be established and that this zone should be based on Australia and New Zealand, stretching through the arc of islands North and North East of Australia to Western Samoa and the Cook Islands.

14. The two Governments regard it as a matter of cardinal importance that they should both be associated not only in the membership but also in the planning and establishment of the general international organisation referred to in the Moscow Declaration of October 1943 which organisation is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states large or small for the maintenance of international peace and security.

15. Pending the re-establishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security the two Governments hereby declare their vital interest in the action on behalf of the community of nations contemplated in Article V of the Moscow Declaration of October 1943. For that purpose it is agreed that it would be proper for Australia and New Zealand to assume full responsibility for policing or sharing in policing such areas in the South West and South Pacific as may from time to time be agreed upon.

16. The two Governments accept as a recognised principle of international practice that the construction and use in time of war by any power of naval, military or air installations in any territory under the sovereignty or control of another power does not in itself afford any basis for territorial claims or right of sovereignty or control after the conclusion of hostilities.

CIVIL AVIATION

17. The two Governments agree that the regulation of all air transport services should be subject to the terms of a convention which will supersede the convention relating to the regulation of aerial navigation.

18. The two Governments declare that the air services using the international air trunk routes should be operated by an international air transport authority.

19. The two Governments support the principles that (a) full control of the international air trunk routes and the ownership of all aircraft and ancillary equipment should be vested in the international air transport authority and (b) the international air trunk routes should themselves be specified in the international agreement referred to in the next succeeding clause.

20. The two Governments agree that the creation of the international air transport authority should be effected by an international agreement.

21. Within the framework of the system set up under any such international agreement the two Governments support (a) the right of each country to conduct all air transport services within its own national jurisdiction including its own contiguous territories subject only to agreed international requirements regarding safety facilities, landing and transit rights for international services and exchange of mails (b) the right of Australia and New Zealand to utilize to the fullest extent their productive capacity in respect of aircraft and raw materials for the production of aircraft, and (c) the right of Australia and New Zealand to use a fair proportion of their own personnel agencies and materials in operating and maintaining international air trunk routes.

22. In the event of failure to obtain a satisfactory international agreement to establish and govern the use of international air trunk routes the two Governments will support a system of air trunk routes controlled and operated by Governments of the British Commonwealth of Nations under Government ownership.

23. The two Governments will act jointly in support of the above-mentioned principles with respect to civil aviation and each will inform the other of its existing interests and commitments as a basis of advancing the policy herein agreed upon.

DEPENDENCIES AND TERRITORIES

24. Following the procedure adopted at the conference which has just concluded the two Governments will regularly exchange information and views in regard to all developments in or affecting the islands of the Pacific.

25. The two Governments take note of the intention of the Australian Government to resume administration at the earliest possible moment of those parts of its territories which have not yet been reoccupied.

26. The two Governments declare that the interim administration and ultimate disposal of enemy territories in the Pacific is of vital importance to Australia and New Zealand and that any such disposal should be effected only with their agreement and as part of a general Pacific settlement.

27. The two Governments declare that no change in the sovereignty or system of con-

trol of any of the islands of the Pacific should be effected except as a result of an agreement to which they are parties or in the terms of which they have both concurred.

WELFARE AND ADVANCEMENT OF NATIVE PEOPLES OF THE PACIFIC

28. The two Governments declare that in applying the principles of the Atlantic Charter to the Pacific the doctrine of trusteeship (already applicable in the case of the mandated territories of which the two Governments are mandatory powers) is applicable in broad principle to all colonial territories, in the Pacific and elsewhere, and that the main purpose of the trust is the welfare of the native peoples and their social, economic, and political development.

29. The two Governments agree that the future of the various territories of the Pacific and the welfare of their inhabitants cannot be successfully promoted without a greater measure of collaboration between the numerous authorities concerned in their control; and that such collaboration is particularly desirable in regard to health services and communications, matters of native education, anthropolcgical investigation, assistance in native production, and material developments generally.

30. The two Governments agree to promote the establishment at the earliest possible date of a regional organisation with advisory powers which could be called the South Seas Regional Commission and to which, in addition to representatives of Australia and New Zealand, there might be accredited representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America and of the French Committee of National Liberation.

31. The two Governments agree that it shall be the function of such South Seas Regional Commission as may be established to secure a common policy on social, economic and political development directed towards the advancement and well-being of the native peoples themselves and that in particular the Commission shall (a) Recommend arrangements for the participation of natives in administration in increasing measure with a view to promoting the ultimate attainment of self-government in the form most suited to the circumstances of the native peoples concerned;

(b) Recommend arrangements for material development, including production, finance, communications and marketing;

(c) Recommend arrangements for co-ordination of health and medical services and education;

(d) Recommend arrangements for maintenance and improvement of standards of native welfare in regard to labour conditions and participation of natives in administration and social services;

(e) Recommend arrangements for collaboration in economic, social, medical and anthropological research; and

(f) Make and publish periodical reviews of progress towards the development of self-governing institutions in the islands of the Pacific and in the improvement of standards of living, conditions of work, education, health, and general welfare.

MIGRATION

32. In the peace settlement or other negotiations the two Governments will accord one another full support in maintaining the accepted principle that every Government has the right to control immigration and emigration in regard to all territories within its jurisdiction.

33. The two Governments will collaborate exchange full information and render full assistance to one another in all matters concerning migration to their respective territories.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE RELATING TO THE SOUTH WEST AND SOUTH PACIFIC

34. The two Governments agree that as soon as practicable there should be a frank exchange of views on the problems of security post-war development and native welfare between properly accredited representatives of the Governments with existing territorial interests in the South West Pacific area or in the South Pacific area or in both namely in addition to the two Governments, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Netherlands, the French Committee of National Liberation and the Government of Portugal, and His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia should take the necessary steps to call a conference of the Governments concerned.

PERMANENT MACHINERY FOR COLLABORATION AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

35. The two governments agree that (a) their co-operation for defence should be developed by (i) continuous consultation in all defense matters of mutual interest; (ii) the organisation equipment and training and (within) exercising of the armed forces under a common doctrine; (iii) joint planning; (iv) interchange of staff; and (v) the co-ordination of policy for the production of munitions aircraft and supply items and for shipping to insure the greatest possible degree of mutual aid consistent with the maintenance of the policy of self sufficiency in local production;

(b) collaboration in external policy on all matters affecting the peace, welfare and good government of the Pacific should be secured through the exchange of information and frequent Ministerial consultation;

(c) the development of commerce between Australia and New Zealand and their industrial development should be pursued by consultation and in agreed cases by joint plannings;

(d) there should be co-operation in achieving full employment in Australia and New Zealand and the highest standards of social security both within their borders and throughout the islands of the Pacific and other territories for which they may jointly or severally be wholly or partly responsible; and

(e) there should be co-operation in encouraging missionary work and all other activities directed towards the improvement of the welfare of the native peoples in the islands and territories of the Pacific.

36. The two Governments declare their desire to have the adherence to the objectives set out in the last preceding clause of any other Government having or controlling territories in the Pacific.

37. The two Governments agree that the methods to be used for carrying out the provisions of clause 35 of this agreement and of other provisions of this agreement shall be consultation, exchange of information and, where applicable, joint planning. They further agree that such methods shall include (a) conferences of Ministers of State to be held alternately in Canberra and Wellington, it being the aim of the two Governments that these conferences be held at least twice a year; (b) conferences of Departmental officers and technical experts; (c) meetings of standing inter-governmental committees on such subjects as are agreed to by the two Governments; (d) the fullest use of the status and functions of the High Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Australia in New Zealand and of the High Commissioner of the Dominion of New Zealand in Australia; (e) regular exchange of information; (f) exchange of officers; and (g) the development of institutions in either country serving the common purposes of both.

PERMANENT SECRETARIAT

38. In order to ensure continuous collaboration on the lines set out in this agreement and to facilitate the carrying out of the duties and functions involved the two Governments agree that a Permanent Secretariat shall be established in Australia and in New Zealand.

39. The Secretariat shall be known as the Australian-New Zealand Affairs Secretariat and shall consist of a Secretariat of the like name to be set up in Australia and a Secretariat of the like name to be set up in New Zealand, each under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs in the country concerned.

40. The functions of the Secretariat shall be (a) to take the initiative in ensuring that effect is given to the provisions of this Agreement; (b) to make arrangements as the occasion arises for the holding of conferences or meetings; (c) to carry out the directions of those conferences in regard to further consultation exchange of information or the examination of particular questions; (d) to co-ordinate all forms of collaboration between the two Governments; (e) to raise for joint discussion and action such other matters as may seem from day to day to require attention by the two Governments; and (f) generally to provide for more frequent and regular exchanges of information and views, these exchanges between the two Governments to take place normally through the respective High Commissioners.

41. His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand each shall nominate an officer or officers from the staff of their respective High Commissioners to act in closest collaboration with the Secretariat in which they shall be accorded full access to all relevant sources of information.

42. In each country the Minister of State for External Affairs and the Resident High Commissioner shall have joint responsibility for the effective functioning of the Secretariat.

RATIFICATION AND TITLE OF AGREEMENT

43. This agreement is subject to ratification by the respective Governments and shall come into force as soon as both Governments have ratified the agreement and have notified each other accordingly. It is intended that such notification will take place as soon as possible after the signing of this agreement.

44. This agreement shall be known as the Australian-New Zealand Agreement 1944.

Dated this twenty-first day of January one thousand nine hundred and forty-four.

Signed on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand.

Signed on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Rabbi

Leon I. Feuer, director of the American Zionist Emergency Council at Washington, D. C. Rabbi Feuer speaks for the Zionists of America in the absence of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. And I also include a copy of the remarks I made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 8, 1944.

Since receiving this letter I have had the pleasure of a personal visit from Rabbi Feuer, who came to my office in the House Office Building to discuss the pending resolution, and found him to be an intelligent and high-type American with constructive ideas.

The American Zionist Emergency Council include such constituent organizations as Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, Mizrachi Organization of America, Poale Zion-Zeire Zion of America, and the Zionist Organization of America.

The letter from Rabbi Feuer follows:

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FISH: I want you to know how deeply all of us appreciate the fact that you voluntarily appeared to make a statement on the Palestine resolution before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I am sure that the appearance of one of the authors of the original Fish-Lodge resolution must have carried great moral weight with the committee. You have once again done an outstanding service for a great cause, and we are deeply grateful.

I have not had the pleasure of meeting you personally, but I hope to make up for that in a very short time.

Sincerely yours,

Rabbi LEON I. FEUER,
Director, Washington Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the remarks made by me on February 8, 1944, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is a great honor and privilege for me to come back here to this committee table around which I sat for some 20 years as a member of your distinguished committee.

I know very well that any words that I may add to this subject will not be at all persuasive to those of you who have studied this question, but it does not do any harm, I believe, to look at the record. I am not quite sure whether you, Mr. Chairman, were a member of your committee in 1922 when we adopted the so-called Zionist resolution, or the Fish-Lodge resolution in favor of establishing a homeland for the Jews in Palestine. And I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, were you a member of the committee at that time in 1922?

Chairman BLOOM. No.

Mr. FISH. Therefore, nobody on the committee was a member then?

Chairman BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. FISH. And perhaps that is the reason, Mr. Chairman, because I have the highest regard for you personally, that you overlooked the little fact in this pamphlet which I read last night, and which I think has been so ably edited "The Jewish National Home in Palestine," and failed to mention the fact that a member of this committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, introduced in 1922 a resolution endorsing the Balfour resolution, and as a matter of record, and I am very proud of the record, I was the sponsor of that resolution.

It was known then as the Fish-Lodge resolution, and it placed the approval of Congress upon the Balfour resolution for the establishment of a homeland in Palestine for Jews with certain restrictions as to religion.

To have the record correct, it so happened that both the Lodge resolution and the Fish resolution passed our respective Houses, but in the parliamentary mix-up the Fish resolution was the only one that went through and was signed by President Harding. It was an act of Congress and not a proclamation of the President, who merely signed the resolution.

I have noticed in recent years—and I say it with the utmost good humor—that some of the Zionists have perhaps unintentionally overlooked the fact that the author of this resolution, who happened to be a noninterventionist before the war, has been perhaps deliberately overlooked by others as the sponsor of the resolution, but I want to go on record as saying that does not make a particle of difference to me. I do not change my views after I make up my own mind if I believe in a thing and they are my convictions. I stand by it just the same, whether anybody is against me or everybody is against me.

I was a Zionist back in 1922, I am a Zionist today, and I am more of a Zionist than ever before now because there is more need for Zionism today to take care of these homeless Jewish people in Palestine, who are the victims of persecution, hatred, and bigotry, than ever before, so that these hunted and persecuted Jews of central and western Europe may find a refuge in Palestine, which was their original homeland.

This is no new matter, Mr. Chairman, for your committee; since 1922 we have had this matter up many times.

In looking over my files yesterday I came across some telegrams, and I came here not only by the prompting of my own mind and own heart but also was instigated, I am glad to say, by many Jewish organizations in my district as well as many prominent Jewish people. Perhaps before I go any further I should read you just one of the telegrams that I have received. It is addressed to me:

"On behalf of 3,500 Jewish citizens of Newburgh, I urge your immediate public endorsement of House Resolutions 418 and 419 and ask that you notify the Foreign Affairs Committee of your stand. I recall your sponsorship of the Lodge-Fish resolution of a quarter century ago, one of the finest actions taken during your lengthy public service. Today, as never before, it is vital that the United States publicly and officially stand back of Prime Minister Churchill, who has always been a friend of world Jewry in voiding the dastardly white paper which threatens cessation of immigration into Palestine March 31, 1944. Alleged suspension of the white paper as reported in the press is a subterfuge. It merely extends visa rights to several thousand immigrees but closes the door to multithousands who, if denied entry where wanted, will die the Hitlerian death. Establishment of a Jewish commonwealth, as urged in the Lodge-Fish resolution in 1922, is paramount today. Palestine has been in the vanguard of the United Nations, only land in the Near East heart and soul with us in winning the war. Palestine welcomes all the Nazi victims who can be transported, and remember the Mediterranean today is ours. I urge your valiant effort in this matter. Enlist your friends and have them notify the Foreign Affairs Committee of their attitude on this nondebatable humanity-saving proposal."

It is signed "Seymour S. Cohen, president of the Newburgh Jewish Community Council."

I sent them this telegram:

"SEYMOUR COHEN,
"President, Newburgh
Jewish Community, Newburgh, N. Y.:

"In compliance with your friendly and ably worded request as president of the Newburgh Jewish Community Council and that of Freda F. Miller, of the Newburgh Chapter of Hadassah, and Louis Leis, of the Walden Jewish Community Center, and numerous others, I have spoken to Chairman BLOOM and arranged with his complete accord and cooperation to appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee this Tuesday morning in behalf of the Wright-Compton bill, urging that Palestine be opened up to Jewish immigration in accordance with the terms of the Lodge-Fish resolution adopted by Congress 21 years ago. I agree it is more important than ever to provide a homeland in Palestine for the Jewish victims of Nazi brutality and persecution."

Now, Mr. Chairman, this, as I said before, is no new matter for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In looking over my files last evening in preparing a speech to deliver in the Congress at some length so I would not take up the committee's time unnecessarily, I found an original resolution back in 1939, signed by most of the members of the committee who are here including the chairman, on this very question. This is the original with the signatures, and I think I can better read it in the corrected form.

"We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, desire to call to the attention of the House and the State Department a declaration of the British Government announced last Wednesday, May 17, which is a clear repudiation of the convention between the United States and Great Britain with respect to Palestine, dated December 3, 1924."

"Article 7 of that treaty provides:

" 'Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modifications shall have been assented to by the United States.'

"The convention contains as a part thereof the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations mandate. Both the Balfour Declaration and the mandate recite the solemn pledges of the British Government 'to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.'

"In this connection we further call to your attention joint resolution of the Senate and the House, passed unanimously on June 30, 1922, known as the Lodge-Fish resolution, which recites: 'That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.'

"Last Wednesday's declaration of the British Government is a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration, the mandate of the League of Nations, and of direct concern to us, a violation of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, in that the contemplated action of the British Government proposes to restrict further immigration of Jews into Palestine and to reduce the Jewish people in Palestine to a permanent minority status. On neither of these matters has our Government been consulted, as required by the treaty.

"We desire to point out to the Members of the House and to call to the attention of the State Department that Americans have invested over $100,000,000 in Palestine, relying upon the treaty between Great Britain and our Government, and upon which treaty they had the right to rely. It is the duty of the American Government to protect these rights by proper protest and to see to it that the treaty is carried out in good faith.

"As members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, we respectfully request the State Department to advise the British Government that the contemplated action, if carried out, will be regarded as a violation of the British-American convention and will be viewed with disfavor by the American people."

I happen to have written this statement. At that time I was a member of this committee and that is why I have the original in my files.

And it is signed by Sol Bloom, of New York; Luther A. Johnson, of Texas; John Kee, of West Virginia; James P. Richards, of South Carolina; James A. Shanley, of Connecticut; Edward V. Izac, of California; Robert G. Allen, of Pennsylvania; W. O. Burgin, of North Carolina; Hamilton Fish, of New York; George Holden Tinkham, of Massachusetts; Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts; Bruce Barton, of New York; Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania; John M. Vorys, of Ohio; and Andrew C. Schiffler, of West Virginia, all of whom were members of this committee and many of whom are still members of this committee, and this is exactly what you are discussing today.

This was the original white paper that we were protesting back in 1939. We saw the meaning of it at that time, and we protested, and we are still protesting it, because we know if that is carried out it will be the end of immigration into Palestine, and it is in defiance and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate and convention between the United States and Great Britain and the end of the establishment of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine which Congress has gone on record for, unanimously.

I am going to make a statement and will hand it to the press if they want it, because it is very short. I shall deliver a speech this afternoon in Congress on the whole subject and in some detail.

As the author of the Zionist resolution for a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine, enacted into law on September 21, 1922, I urge that there be no retreat, surrender, or compromise with the British betrayal of the promises and pledges given in the Balfour resolution. There can be no compromise with such a perfidious proposal to repudiate her plighted word as set forth in the white paper to practically stop Jewish immigration into Palestine on March 31, 1944.

I hope that the Zionists all over the world will not yield to this proposed breach of trust in order to cajole the Arabs by double-crossing the Jewish people in Palestine and elsewhere and selling them out for a mess of porridge.

I urge the President, the State Department, and the Congress to demand that there shall be no modification of our treaty rights in Palestine without our consent.

The proposed disgraceful and shocking repudiation of the Balfour pledges, under which vast sums of money have gone from America to Palestine to rebuild and establish it as a place of refuge for hundreds of thousands of Jewish people of central Europe, must be vigorously opposed. There never was a time when there was more need for such a homeland. There must be no compromise, otherwise all past efforts will have been in vain.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am going to ask your indulgence for a few minutes more to make a statement that I do not know whether I have ever made publicly or not until this day.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. FISH.

Mr. FISH. It has a bearing on this subject.

I agree with everything the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had to say, except as to one thing, and possibly there my Zionist friends will not agree with me.

I have stated my views openly, clearly, and they have never been changed. I believe in keeping Palestine open for Jewish immigration in peace and war, and more today than ever before, but I do not go to the extent possibly referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that there must be no other homelands, or, rather, places of refuge and haven, for Jewish persecuted people throughout the world. But he may have just carried that inference or I may have even misunderstood him.

However, I want to make a statement to the committee that I do not know whether I have ever made before.

In 1939 I was president of the congressional group, the Interparliamentary Union, composed of 24 Members of the House and 4 Members of the Senate. And one of my main purposes at that time in going abroad was to try to find if there was not some other place besides Palestine for a refugee haven, because eventually even if you put 1,000,000 or so in Palestine there might be a need for a place for more Jews and non-Jews from Spain and elsewhere, and the aim was to see if we could not find some healthy place that would be an additional home and refuge. Americans of great wealth and philanthropies were behind this idea and urged me to take the lead in it, which I did because I was sponsor of the original resolution for a homeland in Palestine.

On my trip to Europe I spoke to Lord Halifax in London on August 4, 1939, and he was very receptive and cooperative even to the extent of having the land set up in the British Empire or sphere of influence or even on British territory. I then saw the French Prime Minister, Mr. Bonet. Then I also saw the French Colonial Minister, Monsieur Mandel, who himself was a Jewish victim, one of the victims of Hitlerism, and I believe was killed. I met him in Mr. Bullitt's office. I had to talk French to him, and it took me considerable time to persuade him a new homeland should be placed in the northern part of Africa and in the highlands so as to take in as many as 10,000,000 people. Finally I convinced him. He arranged for me to come back. I was to telegraph him in advance on September 1, which was the day on which war was declared. He was to call in by air the Governors of equatorial, west, and north Africa, and the purpose was to find the proper place, and then to start immediately a colony to see how it worked out. The money was already available for that purpose. And he was cooperative, they were all cooperative, to that extent. And so it was decided that Palestine alone even if it took 1,000,000 refugees would not be large enough for this problem.

It has always been a deep regret to me this conference could not have been held on account of the war and that a new state should not have been tried out in some healthy undeveloped part of Africa. I say that so that everyone might know the record.

I want to say the British were entirely cooperative and so were the French in every possible way, and I believe it would have gone through. I say that because there are Zionists who believe we should not permit the Jew to go anywhere but Palestine. I am liberal in my view because I believe in sending as many there as it will hold, but there is a limit to everything. This was not, of course, only for Jewish but for refugees from Spain and also any part of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to come here. I am sorry to take up so much of your time. I want to endorse the resolution. I think it is very proper that the Congress of the United States should take action. It is in accordance with action taken in the past. It is entirely up to the committee. But I do believe in the principles of the resolution; I do believe in a homeland for the Jews in Palestine.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we do not expect many Jews from America to go to Palestine. This is meant for the persecuted Jews of central and western Europe. There are more of them today than ever before. There is no place for them to go. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should pass the resolution without delaying too long. Every day we delay hundreds of Jews, maybe thousands of Jews, finding no place to go are dying of starvation and from persecution by Hitler and the Nazis.

The tragedy of this war, the greatest single tragedy of the war, is the beastly, inhuman, and barbaric treatment of the Jews in central Europe. There are more Jews who have died in this war than in all the Allied armies through sheer persecution, hunger, and famine.

It is little enough for us to do to simply express our desires to the British that they keep their plighted word.

Mr. Chairman, I am of British origin. I admire the British. Nobody admires Winston Churchill more than I do. I know him personally. He always put the interests of the British Empire first. I believe in that kind of philosophy. But I also admire him in view of the fact that he is for Zionism and for a homeland for the Jewish people. I see no reason why we should not help him. Whenever there is opposition in England, and there is a great deal of opposition in England, why should not we Americans help Winston Churchill? Why should we not pass a resolution so he can get up in Parliament and say, "Here is a resolution from our greatest friends and allies in favor of keeping immigration open to the Jews"? Because they know and we know if you shut the doors now it is the end of aspirations thousands of years old and a breach of faith by the British Government. We cannot in this war repudiate what we did in the last war and serve notice on the Jews of this war that their aspirations are at an end and they can no longer hope for anything in the way of establishing a homeland in Palestine.

Therefore, I just want to add my voice and to cooperate with you in any properly worded resolution in placing the Congress of the United States and the Government of the United States on record in favor of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine and permitting Jews to continue to immigrate and thus establish a homeland of their own there.

Saturday Evening Post Against Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

The Saturday Evening Post believes:

1. That it is high time for a change in the national administration.

The Post does not subscribe to the doctrine that any one man, or any group of men, is indispensable to our national welfare, to the prosecution of the war, or to the solution of world problems after the war. It does believe that the New Deal has been too long in power; that it has grown arrogant; that its policies of unlimited spending and unlimited bureaucracy eventually would lead to the destruction of democratic government; that its constant encroachment on individual freedom and private enterprise is a growing threat to the American way of life.

2. That an able Republican candidate, standing on a forthright and enlightened platform, would have a better than 50–50 chance of winning the Presidency next November.

3. That, despite this hopeful outlook, there is grave danger that Republican leadership may fumble the ball.

Unhappily, there is undeniable evidence that certain G. O. P. leaders have mistaken public impatience with the minor irritations of war for an inexorable tide which will sweep just any Republican, on any kind of platform, into office. This is the sort of complacency which loses elections. It is the sort of thinking which, even in the case of party victory, betrays the Nation.

4. That there are, within Republican ranks, several men of courage, intelligence, and ability who could lead the party through this political year with honor—and quite possibly to victory.

5. That if, instead of one of these, the G. P. O. compromises on a second-rater and rests its case on a platform of expediency and pussyfooting—or on a program of dreary reaction—then it probably will throw away its best chance in 12 years. And may God help this country!

To those who believe that a Republican victory is practically in the bag, no matter how the party behaves, the Post recommends the blunt logic of Stanley High's article.

BEN HIBBS.

Specifications for a Sound Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, now that the fiscal representatives of world governments are undertaking to devise and put into operation an international monetary system, many thoughtful citizens are giving their attention to the money subject—an issue that must be settled by establishing a sound, workable, adequate money system if we are to have a stable government and a prosperous business economy. In considering this issue a southern correspondent in defining the money functions gives such a comprehensive explanation of the effect of deficient and defective monetary systems in influencing national policies that have undermined and destroyed governments in the past that I present the letter for publication in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *March 4, 1944.*

Hon. COMPTON C. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * * A monetary system that serves all—consumers, producers, transporters—alike is vital to a society. Especially is it so to a representative democracy such as we have been striving to attain to, and which such pioneering giants as Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin thought they were establishing. It looks as though past civilizations have reached a height and then failed because of a lack of adequate monetary systems. Up to a peak of prosperity with luxuries and leisure—then unemployment, like an infectious disease or plague sets in, for which no cure has been found; and the nation is consumed by its own unemployed manpower, or engages its unemployed manpower in going to war, despoiling other nations and cultures and thinking that thereby it is solving its own unemployment.

Rather than making intensive activity within its own boundaries where its problems lie to solve the contagion, a nation at its height expands over terrain of others to impose its sovereignty upon and subdue others. During this process it employs much manpower in armies and navies. But, unemployment is never cured this way. Was it not so with Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Athens, Rome, Spain? And is this what we are going through?

It seems that local monetary systems have always been inadequate; and that the international financier and trader gets the upper hand, makes his business appear to be that of the nation, and expansion of it the cure for the nation's unemployment. So nations go to war for international trade as a cure for unemployment.

In the Agriculture Department Digest of Congressional Proceedings, I noticed that you have said something about money. Any reports, analyses, and recommendations about our monetary system will be appreciated and studied.

Thank you, and yours truly,

ENOCH KARRER.

Colored Press Aroused Over Treatment of Negro Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Afro-American of March 11, 1944, by Edgar G. Brown, entitled "Insult to Soldiers—Stimson Must Go":

INSULT TO SOLDIERS—STIMSON MUST GO

(By Edgar G. Brown)

It remained for the Roosevelt New Deal Democratic administration, through Secretary of War Stimson, to strike the foulest blow ever against the patriotism and valor of the colored soldier.

It came as a bombshell in a letter from the Secretary responding to the demand initiated some months ago by Congressman HAMILTON FISH at the instance of the National Negro Council.

In a reprehensible explanation, Stimson falsely and flatly stated that the breaking up of the former Eighth Illinois Regiment and scores of other artillery, infantry, tank, and mechanized units into labor battalions was necessary because of their low efficiency ratings.

These ratings were so low, he charged, that "many of the colored units have been unable to master efficiently the techniques of modern weapons."

REPUBLICAN FORCES ISSUE

It was a Republican, Congressman FISH, of New York, who exposed this shameful treatment of colored soldiers by their own Government.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, a Democrat, and the only colored Member of Congress, remained silent on the floor of the House of Representatives, to which colored people elected him.

Every colored mother and father of the million colored men in the United States armed forces has cursed the name of these foul slanderers and perpetrators of Jim Crow, discrimination, segregation, and humiliation.

Now come these vilest, meanest, and most prejudiced besmirchers with this allegation against the tradition of heroism and gallantry of colored troops for 150 years.

It seems to portend the subsequent unbelievable abuses to which all colored soldiers have been subjected in a cruel and unrelenting campaign to keep them "in their place," to belittle their contribution, break their spirit, and destroy not only their morale, but that of 15,000,000 equally distressed colored patriots on the home front.

The colored people, North and South, have accepted the challenge. They will fight at home and abroad.

They will continue, if need be, to give their lives as second-class citizens and defenseless victims of a crazed spirit of Nazism.

BALLOT OUR ONLY WEAPON

We have one great and decisive weapon, the ballot, in the North. The 4,000,000 colored voters can strike hard in the 1944 elections.

In 26 States of the North with Republican Governors there is no Jim Crow or disfranchisement. The colored vote can also elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress * * *.

STIMSON OUSTER URGED

Write President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief of the United States armed forces, to remove Secretary Stimson from his Cabinet. You and everybody must act now to join with the National Negro Council, Chicago Citizens' Committee of 1,000, Baptist and Methodist ministers' conference and former Congressman Oscar DePriest.

Sign up and work to get a million names on the petition for the colored soldiers' honor and good name.

We must not cease until this insult is retracted and repudiated by the high officials of the Federal Government in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the New York Amsterdam News, of March 4, 1944, entitled "Stimson Indicts Negro Troops," and includes a demand for the ousting of Henry L. Stimson as Secretary of War for his "unholy slur on Negro soldiers, by Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat of Illinois:

STIMSON INDICTS NEGRO TROOPS—REPRESENTATIVE FISH CHALLENGES HIM FOR SAYING OUR BOYS ARE "INEFFICIENT" IN WARFARE—STORM RAISED IN CAPITAL AFTER SECRETARY OF WAR REVEALS REAL REASON WHY NEGROES AREN'T SEEING COMBAT SERVICE OVERSEAS

(By Dan Burley)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON (Democrat, Illinois), himself a veteran of World War No. 1, last Sunday called on President Roosevelt to oust Henry L. Stimson as Secretary of War for his unholy slur on Negro soldiers. DAWSON said, "Stimson is a moribund Republican who by playing the game of army reactionaries is hampering administration war policies, sabotaging the strenuous efforts of President Roosevelt to give our boys an equal opportunity in the armed forces."

Negro soldier efficiency records are so low that "many of the Negro units have been unable to master efficiently the techniques of modern weapons"

Thus, from the lips of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson has come the most important utterance—and the gravest indictment—concerning the Negro since the war began for the United States at Pearl Harbor in 1941. From Secretary Stimson, who issued the broad indictment, has thus come the first official statement of why Negro troops are not being used in combat theaters overseas.

The War Department's true viewpoint of the Negro's fighting activities and role in the war and why so many Negro units have

been relegated to service units performing stevedore tasks in war zones, was brought to light last week end in an exchange of letters between Stimson and Representative HAMILTON FISH of New York, formerly an officer in the old Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry of World War No. 1 fame. The letters on the subject exchanged between Stimson and FISH are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1944. An extract from Stimson's statement:

CITES NEGRO ILLITERACY

"It so happens that a relatively large percentage of the Negroes inducted in the Army have fallen within the lower educational classifications, and many of the Negro units accordingly have been unable to master efficiently the technique of modern weapons. To have committed such units to combat at the base of conversion, would have endangered operational successes as well as submitted a personnel to unnecessarily high casualty rates.

"Our limitations of manpower and urgent and immediate needs for service units of a type whose missions could be efficiently discharged by persons concerned, left no choice but to include Negro troops in conversion such as those mentioned in your letter."

BRASS HAT OPPOSITION

The opinion in Washington, despite Stimson's accusations of inefficiency regarding Negro troops, has been expressed by high military authorities that there is an aversion on the part of Army brass hats and theater commanders to having combat units under command of Negro officers. The Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and the Nine Hundred and Thirty-first had a complete Negro officer personnel.

It was recalled that although the only combat units made up of Negroes given a chance in this war, the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron, and the Four Hundred and Fiftieth Antiaircraft Battalion, have covered themselves with heroic distinction. Stimson has apparently discounted the Army's 10-percent Negro personnel in computing replacements for battle.

Representative FISH, who is responsible for the bringing into the clear of the actual reason behind the War Department's persistent refusal to give Negro troops the same consideration given any other American fighting men in warfare, voiced the sentiments of most Negro Americans in his reply to Secretary Stimson, in which he voiced open opposition to the official policy of the War Department as outlined by the head of the Department.

I also include an article from the Pittsburgh Courier dated Saturday, March 11, 1944, which has a circulation of approximately 200,000 and is the largest colored newspaper in the United States:

STIMSON STILL UNDER FIRE—ADMINISTRATION MUST ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SLUR

WASHINGTON.—The target for a Nation-wide barrage of resentment to his charge that many Negro soldiers were too dumb to fight, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson has backed down a step or two. But he has not backed down far enough. At his press conference here last Thursday he told newsmen that Negro artillery officers of the Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery Battalions had been ordered for duty with the Ninety-second Division (Negro) to replace white officers now occupying key posts in command of artillery units of the division.

The Stimson charges acted as a bombshell to Negro morale throughout the country. As a matter of fact, Negro people who have been supporting the war effort a hundred percent have been stunned by this charge by the Secretary of War.

And in the light of the fine record of the Negro soldier in all of America's wars, it is wondered just what action the President will take against southern practices in running the United States Army.

In the attempt to soften the blow given Negro morale in his letter to Representative HAMILTON FISH the War Secretary, responding to a question as to whether Negro soldiers could not be made as efficient as British West African troops, who had displayed signal heroism in Burma, stated that it had never been the position of the War Department that Negro troops were not to be used in combat. Oh, no.

STIMSON PULLS AN ABOUT FACE

"The number of troops now in combat units and being prepared for actual combat is a clear indication of our policy," he said.

At several points in his statement at the press conference, Stimson made a complete "about face" from the position taken in his letter to FISH.

In the Fish letter the Secretary of War said the records of the Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery units were unsatisfactory and that they would be converted to combat engineer units.

In his press conference he indicated (his indication later became a fact) that the officers of these units would be transferred to the Ninety-second Division, scheduled for combat.

Thus Stimson's charges—as revealed in his letter—are incompatible with the facts.

The fact is that these outfits—first as components of the One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery Regiment and later as battalions, passed creditably several Army firing tests—were in fact on one occasion officially commended by Lt. Gen. Ben Lear for their fine mastery of the techniques of mechanical fire.

The fact is that every officer in these two units was graduated from Fort Sill, Okla., toughtest Army artillery school in the country; that Lieutenant Colonel Derricks not only went through Fort Sill, but was graduated from advanced schools in artillery and in staff command at Fort Benning.

UNSATISFACTORY OFFICERS BACK TO COMBAT

The fact is that these two units were frequently denuded of personnel, filled with raw recruits and then given another firing test—which, to the suprise of all, they passed—and passed, and passed again.

As a climax at the first small measure of public rensentment, we find Secretary Stimson ordering these same "unsatisfactory officers"—who were slated to service commands—back into combat service as artillery officers with the Ninety-second Division, slated for early action in a combat theater.

His action poses this complex question:

How can the Army train these officers and men for 2 years, announce on February 19, 1944, that their records are unsatisfactory, and then on March 2, 1944—exactly 12 days later—announce that these men will be used as artillery officers in a combat division?

In the Fish letter, Secretary Stimson charged that many Negroes had lower educational classifications and could not be used in combat. The obvious conclusion—since they are taken into the Army—is that they will be used in the Army service forces.

Now that, it so happens, is a branch of the service where the highest kinds and most varied kinds of techniques are required. They demand more varied and more highly skilled men than is the requirement in the infantry, where good physical condition, ability to execute simple commands and to fire a carbine or a rifle constitute the major requisites.

Moreover, an examination of what has happened to white recruits with equally poor educational attainments, will reveal that the latter have readily been used in combat infantry units.

NEITHER DUMMIES NOR COWARDS

Stimson's letter also said Negro troops were not committed to combat because to do so would have been to endanger operations and risk unduly high casualties. At his press conference he admitted that "in all wars, casualties are normally higher at the front in combat than behind the lines where supplies are handled, but this difference is less in this war than in any previous war."

Which leads to the logical conclusion that a man may be 100 miles behind the front lines and still be less than a half hour from sudden death by enemy aircraft. It means, in short, that Negroes risk their lives as service units, but still receive little or none of the glory which is the due of the fighting men on the battlefield.

It has also been pointed out that the broad implications in the Stimson letter are a slander against Negroes as a group, and not against certain poorly educated ones among us. And the Roosevelt administration must take full responsibility for the letter. The educational qualifications of both the men and the officers of the old Eighth were of the highest. Many of the officers and men were college graduates—sober, brave, industrious. They are neither dummies nor cowards.

In his letter to Mr. Stimson, Congressman FISH asked the question, and later supplemented the question with this statement:

"I specifically asked the Secretary of War why the crack Twenty-fourth Infantry regiment, fully equipped and prepared for any eventuality, is performing service duties at docks and supply dumps while awaiting possible assignment to combat."

Twenty-one months have passed since this outfit embarked from California for the South Pacific.

MR. STIMSON'S "SILENT TREATMENT"

"Mr. Stimson simply ignored this question and gave it the silent treatment."

Here are some of the questions Mr. Stimson and the War Department will have to answer:

1. Why is it that four Negro regiments, in 19 months of fighting in World War No. 1, made such enviable records, and now, after 2¼ years of fighting in World War No. 2, no colored infantry troops have been ordered into combat?

2. On what data does the Secretary of War base his statement that the efficiency rating of Negro soldiers is so low that "many of the Negro units have been unable to master efficiently the techniques of modern weapons"?

3. What is the basis for the contention of the N. A. A. C. P. that a group of Negro radio operators and technicians was recently changed over into a labor battalion?

4. Why is it that no Negro combat troops are fighting on the battlefields of Europe and Asia, except the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and a few antiaircraft units?

5. Are there any Negro combat troops preparing to participate in the war in Europe, or is it true that all Negro combat units are being sent into the south Pacific?

OTHER NATIONS HAVE NO TROUBLE

The Associated Negro Press office in Washington, D. C., in an effort to go deeper into the matter of Negro troop usage in combat, queried military spokesmen for the British, Chinese, and Russian Embassies, as well as the French National Committee, over the week end.

All these sources were unanimous in their view that not only were their nationals having no difficulty with the use of American weapons but that colonials and natives of

these governments are performing with reasonable success in important theaters of operations.

"The British," said the release, "are supplying colonials, Dominion troops, and Indian fighters. Fighting under the French tricolor are Senegalese, west Africans, Moroccans, and Sudanese. The Russian Army is made up of many peoples. With the Chinese forces are other orientals. It is no reflection upon those peoples to say that many of them have had less formal education, if any at all, than American Negroes, and so presumably would be less capable of comprehending the 'technique of modern weapons.'"

Freedom of Speech on the Air

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], all of whom have complained about the broadcasts of radio commentators and who urge that time be given by the broadcasting companies to Members who have been attacked to afford them the opportunity or right to answer such attacks. I join with them in urging that that privilege not only be extended to Members of Congress, but, on the other hand, to anyone outside of Congress who is unfairly assailed or attacked by any radio commentator. By the same token, in common justice, any person unfairly or unjustly assailed or attacked on the floor of the House should be given the right to answer any charge bearing on his character, reputation, or veracity.

The complaints of the three gentlemen have been directed mainly against Walter Winchell, but I have not heard them complain or voice their displeasure with the remarks of other commenators who have more viciously and more unfairly assailed Members of Congress than has Winchell. Perchance, if you will leave Winchell alone, he will let you alone.

Personally, I disagree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in his opinion of the radio as a means of communication. Instead of it being an unfortunate medium of transmission, we should be thankful that we have the freedom of the air by which people may express their views to reach the public to spread truth and reveal error. Only about 10 percent or 12 percent of the newspapers bring home to the people all the facts and unbiased reports of the news of the day. They give the country not only extremely biased reports regarding the President, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, but warp their reports concerning the activities and work of the members of the Cabinet and other Government officials, saying nothing as to their comment on Members of Congress who stand by the administration and advocate harmony, unity, cooperation, and progressive, humane legislation.

Only yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] criticized a statement issued by the C. I. O., and also criticized the author of the book, Under Cover, stating that he had smeared many people. Again, it is only a few Members who find fault with Winchell and the Under Cover publication. I say to the gentleman from Texas, and to the country, that nearly all of the charges which appeared in Under Cover can be found in the evidence obtained and presented to the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, his own committee. It may be that this was not called to his attention by the chief counsel and chief investigator of his committee, because the report covering the evidence and disclosures was not given the publicity as was the report on the so-called Communists or labor leaders. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the Appendix, part VII, House Resolution 282, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in which appears the names of 652 individuals, the names of 115 organizations, and the names of 33 publications in connection with the investigation of George Sylvester Viereck and Nazi activities. In fact, I believe it contains more damaging evidence than that which appears in Under Cover.

The major part of the evidence in that publication corresponds with the statement appearing in part VII of the Appendix of the Dies report and contains, I believe, the names of nearly all of the 30 persons now awaiting trial in the District of Columbia on charges of sedition. What was the reason for that report not being given publicity as compared with the publicity given to hundreds of our citizens who since Pearl Harbor have been found 100 percent loyal.

Some gentlemen have suggested that the sale of Under Cover be stopped. I have a suggestion as to how that may be done and that is by having reprints of part VII of the appendix published for which there will be a large demand by reason of the fact that it contains more complete information about the treasonable and seditious activities of the Hitler-financed organizers and publicists.

Social Security Taxes Should Be a Sacred Fund for Insured Wage Earners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler, from the New York World-Telegram of March 3, 1944, dealing with the misuse by the administration of taxes collected for social-security benefits:

THE SOCIAL-SECURITY TAX

(By Westbrook Pegler)

SENATOR BARKLEY in his dramatic huff at the President, was the first to point out that Mr. Roosevelt did not understand the nature of the social-security pool. The President, complaining that Congress had refused to double the social-security tax, said the increase would have yielded $1,100,000,000 in new revenues; he assumed that this money should be available for current spending. In practice this has been so from the beginning through the device of tapping the till of social security and dropping in I O U's bearing 3-percent interest. In favor of this practice it has been argued that if the money were simply allowed to accumulate in the pool it would presently become a menace by its very size and inactivity. Therefore it should be invested. But it has been invested in debt, not security. It is gone, spent, and the I O U's in the shape of bonds must be repaid to meet the demands on social security as they mature. To repay them, the Treasury must sell other bonds to the public or collect other taxes. The ultimate answer is taxes because even if bonds be sold to meet the Government's debt to social security, in the long run those bonds must be financed by taxes, paid, as Mr. Roosevelt himself once said, in the sweat of those who toil. So, eventually, the insured toilers must be swindled of their original social-security payments or taxes. They must pay other taxes in the not necessarily sweet bye and bye to redeem the I O U's left in place of their own money in the special cash drawer.

"In my discussion of that proposal," to freeze the tax at 1 percent, "I stated that I had never regarded the money procured by this tax as anything but a sacred fund to be used for the payment of the worthy purposes contemplated when the social security law was enacted," Mr. BARKLEY said. "I did not, nor at any time would I, vote to increase the tax merely for the purpose of letting the Treasury use it as revenue to carry on the ordinary expenses of the Government."

But whether or not he consciously voted an increase for this stated purpose, that would be the inevitable effect of any such vote by Senator BARKLEY or anyone else. He might tell himself he was voting to double the tax, as he was willing to do in this case, only for the purpose of maintaining the reserve at a prudent figure. But he would know that the money would be drained off and spent as fast as it came in "to carry on the ordinary expenses of the Government." And he would know, too, that, in time, it would be necessary to go back to the people and tax them again, through their incomes, through their theater admissions and in a hundred other ways, to replace their own money. For Government spending is not profitable even under the most idealistic administration. Government is not intended to show cash profits. It is an expensive institution devised to keep order and fight foreign enemies.

Although social security is one of the gaudy landmarks of the New Deal, the President is only one of millions who do not understand it. He thinks the revenues should be available for spending and the people do not even know what benefits they are paying for under an infinite variety of special circumstances.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me in New York on Friday last before the Citizens for Victory:

The other day in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, was discussing the close cooperation between the United Nations in this war, the closest cooperation among allies in military history. Without lend-lease, he said, this cooperation would have been utterly impossible. Alliances always before have been notoriously inefficient due to jealousies and the lack of coordination among the Allies themselves. He quoted Napoleon's statement that if he wished to fight a war he would like to fight against allied nations, for he would divide and defeat them. In response to a question from one of the Members of the House as to the possibility of salvaging lend-lease equipment from our allies after the war, he stated that our agreements provide that lend-lease equipment be returned at the time of peace. We will make a great mistake, he went on, however, if we consider the common job of fighting the enemy as merely a dollar-and-cents transaction, or as a business partnership. In the last war we furnished equipment to our allies on a commercial basis. After the war their inability to pay their debts to us in goods provoked ill will and hostility both at home and abroad.

What is there in lend-lease that makes it at the same time such a dynamic and such a flexible instrument of warfare? It is the principle of mutuality, of common endeavor, the recognition by all the embattled nations that their entire economy and their entire manpower must be dedicated to the task of defeating the enemy. Financial considerations are secondary. Although the amount of our lend-lease aid to our allies and the reverse lend-lease which we receive is recorded in a running account, no attempt is made now to strike a balance or a settlement. Our allies are not merely customers of ours, they are using our equipment to help us fight our own war. We expect and we have received from them good faith and wholehearted cooperation. As an example of this attitude Secretary Knox in discussing our lend-lease relations with Russia and China stated in his testimony: "We in the United States are not worse off but better off as a result of not having received any substantial quantity of supplies under reverse lend-lease from Russia or China. The furnishing of such supplies by the Soviet Union and China while all their resources are needed to combat the great bulk of the enemy forces would have weakened them and thus our common war effort."

He testified that our lend-lease is "a fluid and potent military arm," "a flexible and powerful weapon for victory."

The basic theory of lend-lease is the pooling of the entire military might of the United Nations and the filling of a particular need from that pool wherever it is most handy and available. Lend-lease has supplied food to Britain during that dire period when her food reserves were at a minimum, it has supplied planes, tanks, munitions, and armament which has helped her defend her own land which has since become our most potent advance base, it has supplied seed and agricultural implements to the British in order that they might increase their food by over 70 percent. Now, they have fed our own troops under reverse lend-lease in England and Australia and provided us airports, naval bases, and hospitals. Simultaneously, we have supplied the Russians with food, machine tools, plans, tanks, and barbed wire, and many other supplies. The Russians have made our ultimate task more easy by destroying a large portion of the enemy forces. Our ships bringing supplies to Russia are serviced and fueled in Russian ports. We have achieved a fine-working partnership with our allies.

The lend-lease program is now before Congress for renewal. It would be unthinkable that just before the war reaches its crescendo, we should abandon this brilliant instrument of victory. But doubts intrude themselves in the minds of some few people, now that the going appears more hopeful. Are our allies playing completely fair with us and devoting themselves wholeheartedly to winning the war? Or, as it has been insinuated, are they attempting to improve their post-war position at our expense? I am very happy to state that the responsible officials of our Government are unanimous in their statement that our allies, like ourselves, are playing the game sincerely and honestly. The major battles of the war are probably yet to be fought. They will be fought in the spirit of mutual trust by nations still united for victory, fighting side by side together.

Although we cannot estimate the sacrifice borne by each of the nations in financial terms alone, although the lives lost at Stalingrad and Salerno, in the skies over Germany, and in the South Pacific, cannot be evaluated in economic terms, although the destruction of buildings and art treasures may be irreparable, the only fair comparison that can be made as to the financial sacrifices of the Allies is not the extent of their lend-lease contributions, but the war expenditures in each country in terms of the percentage of its national production.

We find at the end of 1943 the United Kingdom is devoting about 55 percent of its national production to war, Australia 52 percent, Canada 49 percent, and the United States about 47 percent. We also find that lend-lease in reverse, which is the aid given to our troops by our allies, is in a constantly increasing amount.

It might be well to do some reminiscing. Prior to the passage of the original lend-lease bill on March 11, 1941, the Allies could purchase their war material in this country only on a cash-and-carry basis. The purchases by the British and the French in the years of 1939 and 1940 even then were useful to us in building up our own war economy and war production. On the one hand we were gaining precious time while we were gearing ourselves for war. On the other hand our airplane, tank, and other war production, which was being bought by British and French orders, increased our plant capacity for our own war production.

In 1939 we had produced only 2,100 war planes in the United States, most of which were trainers. In the meantime, the British and the French placed large orders for planes and munitions. In the first half of 1940 the British ordered 8,000 planes and 13,000 engines. They spent their own money to build new airplane engine plants in the United States and to equip them with tools. They financed schools to train workers. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, said "without the head start given industry by these foreign orders we would at the present time have been in a very grave situation."

Mr. Stettinus, who so capably headed the lend-lease program at a later date and who is now Acting Secretary of State, stated in 1940 that "our own defenses were helped much more by the foreign-buying program than were the Nation's fighting agression." For, although the orders had been received and our plants were expanding and busy gearing themselves to fulfill their commitments, in those first years only a thin trickle of equipment reached Europe.

Then came Dunquerque and the destruction and loss of practically all of the British equipment. Churchill urgently needed arms to defend Britain. General Marshall turned over, again for cash, our own reserve military supplies, rifles, field guns, machine guns, ammunition, etc., of a total value of $37,000,000. In a statesman like maneuver, the President transferred to the British 50 badly needed overage destroyers for strategic island bases for ourselves. In the meantime, France collapsed and Britain took over her entire orders in this country. But England soon reached the end of her rope. At the end of 1940 she had no more dollars to purchase the ever-increasing necessary war material. She could not pay for them in goods for more and more her industry was being devoted to her own manufacture of war goods.

The lend-lease instrument was devised. Its philosophy was that the defense of our allies was vital to the United States and that pecuniary considerations should not be allowed to hamper our arming our friends against our common enemy. This was no mere commercial relation. Our own safety demanded that the aggressors be checked. This was an unprecedented step for our Nation, and the world remembers the acrimony and heated debate not only in the Halls of Congress but throughout the United States. Many of you gentlemen at this meeting were farsighted enough at that time to contribute substantially to the adoption of this major policy. Witnesses, many of them eminent in all walks of American life, testified, some for and some against, the lend-lease bill. It was passed with a substantial majority. Our foreign policy was thus established. We were not going to let our friends go down in defeat against the brutal aggressors and we were not going to assume a narrow, pecuniary attitude toward the fate of civilization.

The lend-lease machinery was then set up with a minimum staff so designed as to utilize the already existing governmental agencies.

The Munitions Assignment Board was created by Britain, United States, and Canada with a view to analyzing the requirements in the various theaters of war and allocating equipment wherever it would be most useful. Likewise other joint boards were created with the participation of the various governments.

The services of the War Food Administration, Treasury Department, and other Government agencies were utilized in purchasing needed supplies. It was not long before a smoothly geared machinery had been established to purchase materials and provide for their shipment with a minimum of friction and unnecessary effort. As a result of that machinery we have supplied the United Kingdom with lend-lease products to the end of 1943 in the total amount of $6,500,000,000. Our shipments in 1943 were twice as great as in 1942 and 7 times as great as in 1941, in spite of our own 2-front war. When Soviet Russia was attacked June 22, 1941, Hitler had relied upon our former difficulties with Russia and hoped that we would not come to her assistance. But from London, Washington, and Moscow came immediate and positive action which proved that we had progressed a great distance in international understanding since 1939. Churchill in a radio address welcomed the Soviet Union as an ally against Germany. Hull telephoned his associates that it should be made clear that

the United States Government was wholeheartedly behind Russia. President Roosevelt declared that our Government would help Russia to obtain war supplies in this country. Since then we have shipped her a total of 7,800 planes, 4,100 tanks, 231,000 motor vehicles in addition to food and gasoline, ordnance machine tools and other material. We provided her with lend-lease assistance in the manufacture of her own war materials and the feeding of her troops and civilian population. In 1943 we have nearly trebled our lend-lease food shipment to Russia. Among other things supplies of fats and oils which we have delivered have been of vital importance to the Soviet Army's rations in subzero cold. Our engineers have assisted in the overhauling of the trans-Iranian railroad and the building of new highways from the Persian Gulf to Russia. What is particularly cheering is that 99 percent of the ships sailing with lend-lease supplies for Russia reached port in safety in 1943, whereas 12 percent of the ships carrying supplies for Russia were lost in 1942.

China was on the lend-lease list from the very beginning. The fall of Burma and the consequent closing of the Burma Road has created almost an insuperable problem of supply. But we are now steadily increasing our Chinese lend-lease. In the last 3 months of 1943 more air cargo was carried into China than in the preceding 9 months of the year. In the month of December alone twice as much cargo was flown into China as in all of 1942. In January 1944, tonnage of goods flown into China was 15 times that of January 1943. We are training Chinese soldiers in India and Chinese pilots in India and the United States. We are developing the new Ledo Road to take the place of the Burma Road. We have materials stock piled in India ready to be moved as soon as we can get them in.

We are supplying lend-lease to India for its own use. India is in an important strategic position in the far-eastern theater. She is a major supply center in the war against Japan and likewise a military base for our operations against Burma. We have shipped lend-lease exports of war materials to British and Indian soldiers. We have likewise provided industrial and agricultural equipment and also transportation and construction equipment for the use of their great network of railways.

Australia and New Zealand have received lend-lease supplies for the purpose of the equipment of their own forces and of the construction of major bases in those countries to be used in operations against Japan.

Lend-lease exports to Central and South American countries totaled less than $128,000,000 at the end of 1943; of this amount Brazil has received over 60 percent. The program for these republics is designed to strengthen our Western Hemisphere defenses and to encourage their production of war materials essential for our use. In return these countries have equipped antisubmarine patrols to help protect our merchant ships. They have permitted the construction by us of bases in their territory and the use of their harbors and airports.

We have extended lend-lease aid to the fighting troops of the occupied countries, notably to the Dutch, who are fighting with us in the eastern theater, and to the Free French, whose troops we have equipped and who have assisted us so gallantly in Africa and Italy. We have extended lend-lease aid to all nations who are assisting us in the major task of winning the war, and the test applied in granting them aid is the cooperation which they offer us. Argentina, for instance, has received no lend-lease aid from the United States.

Whatever lingering doubt remained in this country as to our stake in the war must certainly have disappeared since we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. We are certain that Germany hoped in this attack to divert our attention exclusively to the Pacific and to thus put an end to the assistance which we were affording the European nations. Again she has failed to properly estimate her adversaries. We have continued to furnish lend-lease to Britain and Russia in greater amounts than ever before. We have intensified our own production and have made notable strides in our war with Japan. But with all this vast program about which I have spoken, amounting to almost $20,000,000,000, we have devoted only 14 percent of own war production to lend-lease; the remainder has been given to our own troops. By this expedient we have certainly saved thousands of American lives, billions of our own money, and have appreciably shortened the war.

An interesting anecdote contained in Mr. Stettinius' recently published book shows the cooperation obtained by the lend-lease weapon. An American officer was asked by an Englishman whether his X-ray equipment was provided by the British or by America. "Well," the colonel said, "the X-ray itself is American, but the plates are all British and the whole adaptation and installation was done by British workmen. It is pretty hard to say which is which, but what does it matter, anyway? We are here because we do not like Hitler any more than the British do."

Who is giving the most to win this war? Certainly the Russian soldier, the British flyers, and our own brave men who are facing enemy fire They are giving more than any of us at home. Certainly an American rifle in the hands of a Russian soldier is contributing directly to our own victory. We are all of us purchasing our national security with the blood and treasure of the entire world.

Shotguns and Ammunition for Farmers

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, our farmers have responded loyally to the request of Uncle Sam to increase food production to win the war.

However, they have been retarded in their efforts by the depredation of predatory birds and animals that have been eating up the crops. For many months I have received complaints from farmers in my district alleging they are unable to get shotgun shells to destroy these pests that have been eating up the grain and other food crops on the farms in Wisconsin.

The recent disclosure that every native and "pistol-packin' papa" in the Amazon Valley was presented with a shotgun and a supply of shells by the Board of Economic Warfare has not helped the situation in Wisconsin.

But I am now glad to state that in response to a request registered with the War Production Board I have just received assurance that the shotgun-shell shortage is to be alleviated, and now our farmers will get a long-sought supply of shells for the destruction of predatory farm pests. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this point to offer a letter from Mr. Arthur G. Eaton, Director of the Government Division of the War Production Board, dated March 9, 1944, addressed to myself regarding this matter and a release from the War Production Board regarding this same subject.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1944.

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I am glad to know of your interest in the needs of farmers for adequate stocks of ammunition to protect their crops from injury by wildlife, and this will acknowledge your letter to Mr. William B. Blanchet, of our Division, and the letter to you from Mr. E. J. Vanderwall, Wisconsin State conservation director, which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Careful consideration has been given to Mr. Vanderwall's suggestion as outlined in his letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the clipping of this letter from the RECORD is enclosed.

The urgent need for larger production of ammunition is recognized by the War Production Board, and because you mentioned having received complaints from farmers in your district concerning the shortage of ammunition, I am sending you several copies of a recent statement, with the thought that you may find it helpful in informing your constituents. It is believed that the enclosed statement will fully meet your needs as it provides information in greater detail than is possible in a letter. The increased quantities of shotgun shells planned for production in the first half of the current year is subject, of course, to military requirements, which at this time cannot be predicted much beyond July. However, we are hopeful that the military situation will permit further increases in production in the latter half of the current year and that some of the restrictions upon the distribution of ammunition for essential civilian use may be relaxed.

Thank you again for your thoughtfulness in bringing Mr. Vanderwall's recommendations to our attention. It is a pleasure to supply the enclosed information.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. EATON,
Director, Government Division.

Plans for increased production of rifle and shotgun ammunition for civilian use were discussed at the meeting of the Ammunition Industry Advisory Committee, the War Production Board announced today.

It was brought out in the meeting that, in the course of a survey of farm needs conducted last fall by the Office of Civilian Requirements, lack of ammunition for protection of livestock and crops from predatory animals and birds was first on the list of farmers' complaints against wartime restrictions. Not even barbed wire and radio batteries, the lack of which constitutes acute problems for rural dwellers, were mentioned as often as shotgun shells and rifle cartridges in the responses to O. C. R.'s questions as to what were the most difficult and important items to obtain.

W. P. B. officials reported that ammunition in process of manufacture would total during the first quarter of this year, some 120,000,000 shotgun shells, 20,000,000 center-fire rifle cartridges and 200,000,000 .22 caliber long-rifle cartridges.

Production is being stepped up to a point where it is expected that 251,000,000 shotgun shells, 30,000,000 center-fire and 475,000,000 .22 caliber cartridges will have been placed in manufacture by July 1, it was said. If production is continued at the same rate for the full year, it will represent 95 percent of a normal year's production of center-fire

rifle cartridges, 55 percent of shotgun shells, and 25 percent of .22 caliber rifle cartridges.

W. P. B. emphasized that deliveries in volume could not be expected before May and that initial shipments would be confined to stocks necessary to fill orders now on dealers' books, from farmers and ranchers and for other essential uses, including police and official preinduction training programs. Also covered in the initial shipments would be essential supplies for Alaska and Territorial possessions.

While it is possible that by fall there will be sufficient ammunition for game shooting, W. P. B. officials said that for the time being none can be spared from supplies necessary to crop and livestock conservation. No ammunition will be made available for amusement purposes, W. P. B. said.

If facilities recently released by the armed services are required for additional military ammunition, even this restricted program will not be fulfilled, it was pointed out.

River Tranportation Upon the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, next week a bill will be before the House affecting the matter of navigation on the Missouri River.

At the present time the shippers along the Missouri River are enjoying a 6-foot channel. The question has been raised by some people as to the value of navigation upon an inland stream like the Missouri River.

I made some inquiry of the Corps of Engineers, and although I have known for a long time that that great water thoroughfare going from Kansas City north to Sioux City and south to New Orleans had been a busy place, moving vast quantities of grain, flour, beans, and other commodities up and down the river, until I received the figures from the War Department I did not know the vastnesss of the volume of shipping on that waterway at this time.

The latest assembled figures cover the year 1941. I am told by very reliable authorities, and it appears to be a matter of common knowledge, that during these busy war times the traffic up and down our river has continued the rising trend.

If there has ever been a time when our entire transportation system is being put to test as ours is being used as one of the vital links in our whole war effort, this time is now.

During 1941, 3,083,426 bushels of grain and miscellaneous grain products were transported on the bosom of the old Missouri River. One hundred and eleven thousand two hundred and seventy-five barrels of flour and 9,500 bushels of beans have also been transported. By comparing the statistics of 1941 and previous years it is clear that for a long time there has been a definite uptrend in the volume of shipments. There have been those who told us that river transportation could not meet competition with the rails. That statement is not only untrue but an examination of the rail rates as compared with water rates will show that the shippers along the Missouri River have been saved vast sums of money by reason of the fact that the water rate is much lower than the rail rate.

For instance, the water rate for shipment of grain from Kansas City to St. Louis is 4½ cents per hundredweight. The rail rate for the same shipment is 12 cents per hundredweight. The water rate on grain from Kansas City to Chicago is 9½ cents per hundredweight. The rail rate on grain per hundredweight from Kansas City to Chicago is 16 cents. The water rate on grain from Kansas City to Vicksburg is 12¼ cents per hundredweight. The rail rate from Kansas City to Vicksburg on grain is 21½ cents per hundredweight.

If you wanted to ship a hundred pounds of grain from Kansas City to New Orleans by water it would cost you 12¾ cents per hundredweight. But if you had to send it over the rails it would cost you 32 cents per hundredweight.

While even under the 6-foot channel which we now enjoy, these vast quantities of grain, flour, and other products have been shipped up and down the Missouri River, the volume of trade in shipment unquestionably will greatly increase when we have a 9-foot channel which is a standard obtaining on the connecting rivers of the inland waterway system.

Radio Address by Hon. Calvin D. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague, Hon. CALVIN D. JOHNSON, Republican, of Illinois, delivered over the facilities of the Blue Network Friday, March 10, 1944:

Good evening, folks; it is quite often, as we gather in the evening and listen to our radios, that we are enthralled by a beautiful song, and the name of that song is God Bless America. As we reflect we realize that God has blessed America with communities such as ours. He has blessed it with a liberty-loving people, your forefathers and mine, who founded upon this continent the greatest nation ever to exist upon the face of the globe, and He peopled it with patriots, men and women who have ever placed love of country before love of self.

Quite often we wonder as to the type of men who founded this Government of ours, so let us press aside that mysterious veil of yesterday and gaze backward down those long corridors of time into a dim and almost forgotten past. Let us parade upon the field of recollection those men and women who gave their all that you and I might be a free and independent people. As they pass in review we are brought to the realization that you and I can take but little credit for what America is today. America of tomorrow is our problem. The law of life decrees that the torch of progress shall slip from the palsied fingers of age to be caught and borne aloft by the supple strength of youth, ever onward, ever upward, ever seeking to improve, that America of tomorrow shall be greater than America of today.

America is great, not because of its mighty mountains, its beautiful rivers, its silent valleys; it is great because it mattered not to the founding fathers whether they were merchant, prince, or laborer—their hopes and ambitions for their children were the same. The goal in life which the pioneer set for himself and because of lack of opportunity or lack of education failed to attain he wanted to see attained by his children, and there was no sacrifice too great for the pioneer dad and mother to make in their efforts to extend to their children the educational and other advantages which in so many instances they themselves were denied. Their hopes were in their children, and today history repeats, for again the future of America rests upon youthful shoulders; even as you and I assemble here, American sons, your sons and mine, are fighting upon the world's far-flung battlefields, fighting to preserve the liberties for which their forefathers died. A few short months ago these boys were with us. They are the same boys who were taught by American mothers to look toward heaven with smiling, trusting faces as the place from whence all blessings came; but today those boys look toward heaven with apprehension and anger, for from the heavens come bombers that rain death and destruction upon them as they march through war's flaming hell; bombers which in many instances were made with American aluminum, powered with American gas, dropping bombs made with American steel which, in our folly, we sold to our mortal enemy, although we knew this enemy had joined in an unholy alliance with the Axis.

The spirits of great Americans hover over this Nation, and by reviewing their lives we find a pattern that shapes our own destiny. They were men of action; men of honor, and men whose every act was motivated by the love of liberty and of country. They were men who were taught by American mothers at the family hearthstone that America was a land of opportunity and that no height was too great for any American to reach. They were men who were taught that individual initiative and a willingness to work would overcome all things, and that sweat was the only cure for economic ills. They were men who were taught that public office was a public trust; that the Supreme Court was akin to holy, and that the Constitution of the United States was sacred and should be held inviolate by every true American, no matter how high or how low his station in life. Those men have passed forever. The curtain of time has forever closed the portals of their tombs. The mantle of authority has been transferred from their shoulders to yours and mine. Our duty is to carry on and preserve the type of government that made America great, the type of government that permitted the progress which, during 150 years, has placed America upon the pinnacle of world domination; the type of government built by incentive, ingenuity, and initiative; the type of government built by men who hewed an empire from a wilderness and who realized that nothing of any value was ever produced that was not the result of the sweat and toil of men's hands. Such were the ideals and government of our fathers.

But folks, today there is a new school of thought in Washington. It is headed by those who would change our Government from a government of laws to a government of men, and who seek to destroy the confidence of the people in their Congress and

the institutions of government founded by their fathers. The history of our Nation is replete with instances wherein the executive and legislative branches of government have had honest differences of opinions, but for the first time the Congress has been charged by the Chief Executive with practicing fraud.

This charge was made regarding the soldier vote. The Congress wanted to send a complete ballot, listing all candidates, to each soldier. The administration wanted to send a short blank ballot that listed none. The administration claimed that a full State ballot could not be sent. The Congress and 45 Governors claimed that it could. The Congress wanted elections controlled by the States, as is provided by our Constitution. The administration wanted to ignore that provision. Both the President and the Congress knew that post cards, prepared for a soldier vote, were already in the hands of our overseas forces and that with these post cards State ballots could be requested. Both knew that the Army had stated that 42 days would be sufficient for a round trip by mail to our most remote outpost, and both knew the State assemblies throughout the Nation have amended their laws to meet this element of time. Both knew that the total weight of all State ballots, if mailed to each member of the armed forces abroad, would be approximately 250 tons, and that 14,000 tons of Christmas mail had been delivered by the Army and Navy from the port of New York alone. All Americans are proud of the fact that the Army delivered turkey for each soldier's Christmas dinner, and Congress believes it can also deliver him a State ballot and permit him to express his opinion in the election of all candidates, not merely President, United States Senator, and Congressman, as proposed by the Federal plan.

In the recent veto message of the President concerning the $2,000,000,000 tax budget the Chief Executive charged that the bill was drawn for "the greedy and not the needy." The unfairness of this statement caused the blast by Senator BARKLEY which rocked the administration to its foundations. Let us analyze that charge.

In 1933 taxes collected by the Federal Government were $2,080,000,000. In 1944 they were $41,185,000,000. In 1933 our national debt was $22,000,000,000. Today it is one hundred and seventy-four billions. Our national debt limit today is two hundred and ten billions. We are to be asked shortly to increase it to two hundred and sixty billions. This amount, when reached, would place a Federal tax burden of $2,000 upon each man, woman, and child in our Nation, or $10,000 for a family of five. Personally, I feel that we are doing our part. Canada's war budget for this year is $4,000,000,000. Russia's is $15,000,000,000. England's is $21,000,000,000. Our country's is $100,000,000,000. We are furnishing 73 percent of the sons to be used in the invasion of Europe and 70 percent of the cash for the entire war.

A recent veto message adroitly mentioning items found on the workers table, stated that if food subsidies were not continued that hamburger would go up 4 cents per pound, pork chops 4½ cents, sliced ham 6½ cents, chuck roast 3½ cents, and round steak 5 cents per pound. Frankly, I do not know how these figures were computed, as the Federal subsidy on beef is $1.10 per hundredweight, and on pork it is $1.30. This subsidy was granted to the packers to offset a 2-cents-per-pound roll-back ordered by the Government, who controls prices, both to producer and consumer. These figures are somewhat similar to those contained in a statement made on the floor of Congress, that the Government price-control program had saved the American public $6,000,000,000 on sugar alone. This amount would be a saving of $47 to every person in the country and, at 5 cents per pound, would purchase 2¼ tons for a family of five.

Let us turn for a moment to those starry-eyed world planners, those dreamers who, with your money, promise a utopia to the entire world.

Recently I stated on the floor of Congress that the American people were being taken for the worst financial sled ride the world has ever known, and that our Capitol had become the headquarters for the Order of the Empty Satchel where delegates assembled in answer to the urging of starry-eyed globats who coursed the world, making lush and ridiculous promises of American goods and American dollars. Tonight I reiterate those charges and cite as proof the farm machinery program of U. N. R. R. A., which I recently exposed. It is the brain child of these crystal gazers whose heads are in the clouds and whose hands are in our pockets, and contains a list of farm equipment, approximately 500,000 items, each representing an essential and necessary piece of machinery for which American farmers have been pleading ever since Pearl Harbor. They propose to distribute this machinery among approximately 15 nations of Europe, every one of which is at present, wholly or in part, occupied by Axis forces, and yet these utopian dreamers demand delivery of portions of this equipment by August 1, 1944.

Thirty thousand tractors are to be sent to parts of Europe, where in many instances the intended recipient has never seen one.

Thirty thousand plows are to be scattered all over Europe and paid for with American dollars.

Thirty thousand separators; 50,000 mowers; 17,000 reapers; 22,900 horse-drawn hay rakes; 40,000 harrows and harrow sections; and 12,000 binders; every item of which Members of Congress have endeavored to obtain for needy farmers.

Thirty thousand pieces of machinery to the Netherlands whose cash reserves in this country are enormous; 15,000 pieces of equipment to Belgium and Luxemburg; 14,000 to Czechoslovakia; 21,000 to Denmark; 212,000 to France; 8,900 to Greece; 12,000 to Norway; 115,000 to Poland; 36,000 to Yugoslavia; 20,000 to the Baltic States; and 10,000 to Italy.

In addition, there are listed 13,000 tons of spare parts to repair machinery in Europe while our American farmers are using bailing wire to hold their equipment together.

Folks, our country has been called upon, through lend-lease, to contribute our wealth and our energies to an embattled world. No Member of Congress begrudges the allocation of war materials to any nation that is actually engaged by participation in the war. I do, however, most vociferously protest the use of our funds for buildings a railroad in Mexico, draining swamps in Venezuela, paying Peruvians to reduce cotton acreage, and the squandering of $78,000,000 in the jungles of Brazil on a rubber project that has given no returns.

I do not charge the follies of the New Deal to true Democrats, although many have acquiesced by their silence to certain of its acts. I do not charge them because the history of their party is long and glorious and one of adherence to our Constitution. The history of the New Deal, however, is brief and shadowy and its record toward our Constitution is one of abrogation and disregard. I merely ask you, my fellow Americans, how much longer are we to follow as gullible children these crystal-gazing Pied Pipers who lead us onward toward bankruptcy. When Members of Congress criticize such activities, certain crackpots call us Fascists and charge us with hindering the war effort.

The American public need have no fear as to the attitude of Congress toward the war. Our sons, 268 of them, march onward with your sons toward complete victory.

We in America had prayed that war would never again come to this great free land of ours, for when we older folks think of war we remember 1917. It seems but yesterday that we stood in awed silence as Old Glory passed, held aloft by those stalwart sons of America. We heard the roll of drums and the echoing tramp of millions of marching feet as the legions of America marched off to war.

We remember the armistice and how the Nation, wild with joy, welcomed our returning soldiers, but folks, they did not all return, and today in America there are more than 100,000 dads and mothers whose hearts are heavy, for down through the years there comes to them the memory of a tousled-headed baby boy that once crawled across their kitchen floor. They remember him when he was just tall enough to stand on tiptoe and reach on the table and grasp at his daddy's pipe. They remember how they toddled him on their knees and taught him to love his country and to revere its flag and the things for which it stood. They remember how he came home in the evening from the little school and excitedly told of the lessons in history and of the patriots who had gone beyond. They remember how proud they were as he marched away in uniform, and they remember the telegram that came from their Government telling them that he would never again return, for their boy sleeps today and until eternity beneath a whited cross upon the battlefields of France.

Friends, the icy hand of death has reached into my own home in this war. On July 29, 1943, my own son made the supreme sacrifice and joined that legion of heroes who march silently through eternity. Above his grave there is a simple cross marked, "Here lies a soldier." I pledge to him, to his comrades in death, and to those who shall return, that I will devote my feeble and untiring efforts to the preservation of the Government of their fathers, a government perpetuated by the consent of the governed. I ask only that history record of me that I had but one prayer—that this Government of ours, this great citadel of freedom, may stand forever as living, throbbing proof that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" has not perished from this earth.

Congress Does Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and informative article entitled "Congress Does Good Job," by David Lawrence, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS DOES GOOD JOB—ANALYSIS SHOWS FINANCES OF UNITED STATES SOUNDER THAN ANY COUNTRY IN WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

When the American people do a good job they should be commended for it. When the Congress does a good job, it should be

commended, too. And when the facts are that the finances of the Government of the United States are in better shape than those of any other government in the world, and better still than they have been since the outbreak of the war, the story should be broadcast as widely as possible.

It would be most regrettable if editorial writers of British newspapers should continue to say that the recent failure of the President to get the tax bill he wanted marks a disregard by Congress of the necessities of the fiscal situation. Here are the facts—some of which may come as a surprise even to many American readers:

1. The American people will pay close to $42,000,000,000 in taxes in the fiscal year 1944, which ends June 30 next, and, assuming the continuance of total war, they will pay about $44,000,000,000 in taxes in the fiscal year 1945, which ends June 30, 1945. Either of these sums in Federal taxes alone is more than the entire national income was in 1932 or 1933, respectively. The Federal taxes paid in the fiscal year 1943 were only $23,000,000,000. A jump of nearly 100 percent from one year to the next is something worth talking about.

2. The American people are financing the difference between tax receipts and total expenditures—that is, the annual deficit—in a manner calculated to prevent inflation. Thus, the total Federal Budget for the fiscal year 1944 is officially estimated now at $99,000,000,000, and when the $41,000,000,000 of taxes—official figures—are subtracted it leaves $58,000,000,000 to be raised by borrowing. To curb inflation it must be the kind of borrowing that comes out of current savings and not from the deposit moneys of commercial banks. The American people are now furnishing such savings at the rate of $45,000,000,000 a year. Both in the War Loan drive last September and the drive just concluded, the purchases by mutual savings banks, corporations, insurance companies, and individuals—that is, sources outside the commercial banks—ran at the amazing rate of $45,000,000,000 a year. This is an extraordinary proportion out of the $58,000,000,000 needed and is all the more notable because it was accomplished without any forced-savings legislation.

3. The Treasury, unintentionally, of course, overestimated for the President the expenditures and underestimated the tax receipts. Thus, in January 1943, the President announced the 1944 Budget at $104,000,000,000, stuck to that figure in August 1943, but revised it down to $99,000,000,000 in his message of January this year. On taxes the President in the January (1943) message estimated $33,000,000,000 as the amount that would be collected, increased his total to $38,000,000,000 in his August 1, 1943, summation of the Budget when the withholding tax came in, and revised his total upward to $41,000,000,000 in his January (1944) message. Actually, the tax receipts will be about $42,000,000,000 and the Budget will be nearer $97,000,000,000 than $99,000,000,000, according to reliable, though unofficial, estimates.

What, then, was all the shouting about? In the January 1943, message the President asked for $16,000,000,000 in additional taxes for the 1944 Budget. By January 1944 he lopped off $5,000,000,000 from the Budget and added $8,000,000,000 to his tax estimate. According to his own figures, the Treasury, therefore, is $13,000,000,000 better off than it was in his survey of January 1943. The President in October 1943, revised his request for additional taxes downward from $16,000,000,000 to $10,500,000,000. So, actually, without counting the revenues from the tax bill just passed, the President got his $10,500,000,000 and had $2,500,000,000 to spare. If we look at the 1945 picture for which Congress has just given the Treasury a net addition of $2,000,000,000, is means that Mr. Roosevelt, in effect, finds the Treasury with $15,000,000,000 out of the $16,000,000,000 he requested in January 1943 and with $4,500,000,000 more than he requested in October 1943, and repeated in January and February 1944.

As for the fiscal year 1945, the Budget picture looks even better. Assuming a continuance of total war, the tax collections should reach $44,000,000,000 with the new revenue just provided by Congress. The Budget may run about $94,000,000,000, even including the outlays of the so-called governmental corporations like the R. F. C. If we use the President's method of counting social-security receipts it means that on a cash basis we shall take in $46,500,000,000. This is more than 50 percent of the money needed for the total budget, and is figured, too, without any increase in the social-security taxes. That's a higher ratio than has generally been thought possible and the President should be happy about it because it meets the wartime objective of financing 50 percent of the total annual Budget out of taxes, as he urged in his January 1943 message.

Press Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of March 10, 1944:

PRESS REPORTS

Congressman KEEFE in Washington this week produced a letter he had just received from a marine in the South Pacific in which was enclosed portion of a mimeographed sheet made up of press reports sent to Navy stations for the purpose of disseminating the news. Among other items on the sheet was one carrying a date line "Minneapolis, Minn.," reading at follows:

"Chairman Robert E. Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, said Tuesday night: 'The election of a Republican President in November would turn the Government over to unpracticed hands and bring inescapable confusion and indecision in windings up the war and planning the peace.' "

In his second major address since his election to the Democratic chairmanship, Hannegan told a Washington Day dinner: "What could hearten Hitler or the Japanese war lords more than tidings that the American people had repudiated the administration of Franklin Roosevelt?"

The marine correspondent in his letter to Congressman KEEFE said:

"This letter strikes at the roots of what America is fighting for—a free choice by election of whom we want for whatever elective office we want to elect him, without any offering the cry of traitor, treason, mutiny, or sabotage. I want the chance to make a choice between Roosevelt and the other candidates, because that's a choice denied the people of Germany, Japan, Italy, France, and the conquered countries.

"While we're free, I want a free ballot, but I don't want either of us to tell the other that his candidate is a 'Hitler-Tojo' candidate.

"It isn't an issue and won't make any votes for them out here, but it is just plain ridiculous that a party after 12 years of the Presidency wants to run the show and steer the campaign and the prospects of the next 4. Hitler and the Japanese war lords will have more to hearten them if the American people don't have a free election, free of all international intimidation."

That marine uttered a mouthful and what he says should serve notice on such men as Chairman Hannegan that he had best temper his speeches with more courtesy and judicial reasoning.

It is perfectly all right for Mr. Hannegan to work his head off to see that the Roosevelt regime is retained in Washington, but when he intimates that Hitler and Tojo would be greatly pleased if a Republican won a seat in the White House, he talks like a schoolboy, not as chairman of a great political party.

To assume for one moment that General Eisenhower or General MacArthur or Admiral Nimitz or Halsey would quit fighting because there was a change in White House occupants, is an insult to American intelligence.

The war will be fought on regardless of who wins the November election, even if Joe Doakes or Elmer Zilch were elected.

Presidential campaigns should be conducted on a high level of intelligence with each party follower in America taking for granted that those who do not agree with him on party issues may have honest differences of opinion.

To publicly state a defeat for President Roosevelt in November would be considered a victory for the Axis Powers is stooping pretty damned low in the field of politics.

It is the same as a personal accusation against every person who might cast a Republican vote in November, accusing them of halting the war effort.

We feel quite sure American boys in uniform are not asked what their political affiliations are. They are determined on but one thing—total victory—and the civilian population feels the same way.

For a while we thought the Democrats had made an excellent choice when they picked Mr. Hannegan as their national chairman. Today we have some doubts.

Liberation and Rehabilitation of Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me in New York City on Saturday, March 11, 1944, on the sixth anniversary of the German invasion of Austria:

We have gathered on this occasion to commemorate a great wrong and to express our faith that it soon will be righted. The wrong was the violation of Austrian independence by Nazi hordes on this day 6 years ago and its forcible annexation by Germany. The righting of the wrong will be the reestablishment of a free Austria, prayed for by all true Austrians within and without that country, and hoped for by the friends of Austria everywhere.

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination. They regard the annexation as null and void, and declared that they wished to

see reestablished a free and independent Austria, thereby opening the way for her people themselves to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria means much to all of us. Many of you have been privileged to see that country and to know it intimately. I have never had the good fortune to visit it, although it is the land from which my father came, but I have been raised to cherish that lovely country in the heart of Europe, with the Alps—the central mountain peaks of the Continent—rising within its boundaries, and with the Danube, Europe's main life stream, flowing through its valleys. A land with a 1,000-year-old history and civilization. The sturdy virtue of the Austrian peasant has given it backbone and inner strength. Its people have a deep love of freedom and of democratic institutions. And the cosmopolitan culture which had grown up in Vienna, at once learned and graceful, has given the world one of its chief centers of civilization.

But even were it not for the special appeal which Austria has to our hearts, we would still feel with her in this hour of her enforced captivity, and we would still be hoping for her deliverance. For the creed of liberty is that every people, every country, great or small, powerful or weak, rich or poor, gifted or ordinary, is entitled to freedom. We know that liberty and freedom is the highest possession of any people. Together with the invasion of Austria we bemoan that march of the Axis across the globe which has resulted in the loss of independence, of freedom, and of security over large parts of Europe, and which has brought such unprecedented destruction to wide areas not only in Europe but on the continents of Asia and Africa and many islands in the Far East. Truly the rape of Austria was but part of a larger tragedy.

But today the flow of barbarism has been checked. Its ebb has begun. Nazi forces have already been compelled to give up vast sections of the areas they have seized. And lately the armies and the Navy of Japan are also forced backward and still further backward. Liberation of the oppressed is inevitably linked with the forward march of the forces of the United Nations. And there is historic justice in the fact that, if in the tragic confusion of the spring of 1938 Austria had found no assistance, from anywhere, it has now been singled out for a solemn promise of renewed independence.

It is clear, of course, that liberation from German occupation is but the beginning of Austria's rehabilitation. A great many patient and resolute efforts will be required to get a free Austria on her feet, to liberate her from the mental and material shackles that will be left behind by the Nazis. The Moscow resolution, in proclaiming her future freedom, has wisely pointed out that in the final settlement, account will be taken of the part which the people of Austria themselves play in the process of their liberation. It can be a significant part, even as far as military operations are concerned.

Friends of Austria, as well as Austrians themselves, are fervent in their willingness and anxiety to cooperate to the fullest measure and in every way in implementation of the Moscow Declaration, but may I say that as far as I can learn, there has been no definite plan or plans advanced by which that willingness and anxiety can be satisfied. In other words, there is no recognition, formally or informally, officially or unofficially, by any of the three great nations which promulgated the declaration, of any agency, or persons to represent Austria. As far as I know, there is no one to whom one can look for guidance or direction. This seems to me to be a deficiency that should be corrected.

May I express the hope that it will not be long before the United Nations will be able to announce their selection of truly representative persons or an agency or some sort of commission, be what it may, to act in behalf of those Austrians who are determined that the Nazi ideologies will never gain a foothold in their country, and that any such seeds which may have been planted will quickly be uprooted.

The people of Austria, who can play an effective part in the process of their liberation—to put it bluntly—should be told what to do, when to do it, and how to do it, by those to whom they can look with confidence for leadership.

A subject which seems to me to need clarification and readjustment is the policy of the United States with respect to the intermingling and confinement of Austrian prisoners of war with German prisoners of war.

Article 9 of the Geneva Convention of 1929, on the subject of prisoners of war, states that they may be separated "according to race or nation." It is now acknowledged without contradiction that the nations of Austria and Germany are separate and distinct. Would it not also be right, therefore, to determine upon a policy of the separation of these two peoples while confined as prisoners of war?

Today there are comparatively few so confined, but in the days to come, when the big push is on and the invasion from the west comes, as it surely will, the number of prisoners of war will increase many, many fold, growing ever and ever larger as the march to Berlin makes headway.

It would be but simple justice to carry out what has already been declared at Moscow; that is, the distinctiveness of the two nations, the innocence of one and the guilt of the other.

Can we consider it wise to permit the one which was conqueror to maintain domination over the one who was conquered? It is known that in the prison camps those who follow the Nazi ideologies hold sway and power over those who hate nazi-ism. We have known of tragedies, but do we know of the humiliations and embarrassments that frequently and inevitably occur, and of which no record is ever made?

Furthermore, I question whether it is in the interest of democracy to permit in the prison camps domination by Nazi ideologists over their enemies, particularly when such camps are under the supervision and control of the leading democratic nation of the world, the United States of America.

Is there not danger that these prison camps are now or will in the future become breeding places for the indoctrination and the spread of the Nazi doctrine to those who have so far escaped the virus? Were this policy to continue until the end of the war it would mean that the Austrians would be the last people to remain under the domination of the Nazi and the Nazi officers. If separate camps were established, it is as inevitable as the coming of the morning sun that the atmosphere would be as different and distinct in one camp as distinguished from the other as is the difference between day and night.

It is my claim that the so-called administrative difficulties are not too great to be surmounted by a simple, systematic, and judicious series of questions. After all, nationality is the real question to be decided. It could readily be determined to which type of camp each prisoner should go. Such questioning should be done at the earliest possible moment after capture—most probably at the receiving center. Of course, there might be a few instances where a proper finding would not be made, but these mistakes would be so few and far between that little harm would result from them when we compare it with the great over-all benefit from every important aspect.

It is my sincere hope that this subject will be immediately considered, and that the United States, at least, will decide and take steps at once to establish separate camps.

From any point of view post-war Austria will have but few claims, and these claims will be modest. Although it was one of the two nuclei of a great empire in the past, German-speaking Austria has long ago lost any imperialistic appetite it may have possessed. Unlike the Germans, and especially unlike the Prussians, the Austrians can, in this respect, be compared with the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Danes, and the Swedes, all of whom have had their hours of worldly greatness, but all of whom have, for a considerable time, more or less cheerfully settled down in their restricted world.

Like these masters of past empires, or vast territories, the Austrians do not have any desire to dominate, to acquire, to rule, or to subject anybody. They will be happy if left by themselves with that minimum of comfort and national income which will enable them to feed their population adequately, to protect the aged ones, to safeguard the health of their children, to enjoy unfettered their theater, art, and music, and to be able to devote themselves to productive work and to the lighter side of life.

Proof of this thoroughly undynamic character of Austria can be found in her international policy in the inter-war period of 1919 to 1938.

Whatever the mistakes of her foreign policy in these years may have been (and her close association with the Italy of Mussolini in the last years of her liberty was one of them), Austria has never shown throughout the years of her independent existence as a small state the slightest sign of aggressiveness. She never developed anything comparable to the German Versailles complex.

Post-war Austria can, in my opinion, be absolutely self-sustaining from an economic point of view. It is perhaps unknown to most of you that quite recently considerable deposits of oil were discovered in a district not far from Vienna, and it is said that this oil pocket will make what is now known as Austria the third or fourth nation of Europe in the production of oil. Those of you who know anything about the economy of that country will instantly appreciate how great an effect this can have on her industrial capacity and upon her self-sufficiency in general.

Oil, one of the most precious of Nature's possessions in this age, is in the hands of Austria in abundance and, therefore, you can look forward to her future with serenity and confidence.

Need I add that this is also a compelling argument as to why Austria need not have, and does not have, any imperialistic designs or program.

But in adjusting themselves to the problems and conditions of the post-war world, the responsibility will lie mainly with the Austrians themselves. We, who are her friends and believe in her people, are hopeful that they will show themselves worthy of this responsibility and will accomplish the task with honor and with intelligence.

Among the problems which the people of Austria will have to solve, few will prove as essential to her welfare as securing true good-neighbor relations with the neighboring peoples. On this planet of ours, nations are no longer isolated from one another. Peaceful and fruitful cooperation between nations is essential, if mankind is to be saved from ever-recurring wars of increasing savagery. This is true even of mighty nations separated by oceans, and it is especially true in the case of the crowded small countries of Central Europe.

Therefore, for the sake of world peace, and especially for the sake of the peace and pros-

perity of the peoples of Central Europe, let us hope that harmony and close cooperation will reign in that part of the world after this war. Austrians and their neighbors have lived together so long that there are many suspicions and recriminations between them.

But there is also a great deal that they have in common. Patience, good will, and self-restraint can accomplish a great deal in laying suspicions at rest. If these qualities will be present, in post-war Austria as well as in her neighbors, harmony in that part of the world should not be difficult to achieve, to the lasting benefit of all concerned.

The one principle which, I hope, will govern international relations in Central Europe or, for that matter, anywhere else, is the principle of voluntary cooperation. There is no point in imposing close relations on unwilling neighbors. In the light of this guiding principle, the people of America will watch the nations of Central Europe with sympathy and understanding and will hope that they find within themselves, the wisdom to settle matters between them to the well-being of all parties.

We who are here belong to different creeds and to many nations. Some of us are Americans of various origins. Some are on their way to join the citizenry of this Republic. Some are refugees looking forward to the day of return to their country. And others are friends of Austria from the four corners of the earth.

Different as our origin is, there is probably a similar difference in our political and social outlook. I doubt whether it would be possible to draw up a detailed program for Austria's future, which would be equally pleasing to all those present here, either those on the platform or those in the audience. But all of us can take equal pride in the things that unite us: These things are our common indignation at the rape of Austria by the Nazis; our common hope that the victory of the United Nations will bring back a free Austria; and our common prayer that in free agreement with her neighbors and with the other nations of the world, the people of Austria will once more take their rightful place among the builders of civilization and peace.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WNBF on March 11, 1944:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, the meeting of the Hall Furlough Club officers at the Hotel Frederick in Endicott a week ago was highly successful. A central council was organized and a chairman for each of the Triple Cities was elected by the council.

Miss Septemia Morlands, who was the first club president, was selected chairman of the greater Endicott area.

Mrs. Dorothy Orzel, president of Club No. 2, will have charge of Johnson City.

Mrs. Janet Virgilio, president of the Tenth Ward Club, was selected chairman for Binghamton.

The clubs represented at the central council gathering were:

Club No. 1, North Side, Endicott.
Club No. 2, South Side, Johnson City.
Club No. 3, west Endicott.
Club No. 4, central Endicott.
Club No. 5, fifth ward, Binghamton.
Club No. 6, seventh ward, Binghamton.
Club No. 7, tenth ward, Binghamton.
Club No. 8, thirteenth ward, Binghamton.
Club No. 9, Vestal.
Club No. 10, Endwell.

It should be pointed out that this group decided only women should be admitted to Furlough Club membership.

It is my understanding that some folks have charged me with trying to make a political organization out of the Hall Furlough Clubs. They say I am attempting to play politics at these ladies' expense.

I am not even a member of the Hall Furlough Clubs so I would have great difficulty trying to sell a group of women on something they didn't want.

When the original club was organized, I was asked to lend my name to its title. I was told that its objectives were to help the boys in service. I was assured of valued support from its members for the Hall Furlough bill now in Congress.

These are high-minded and worth-while objectives, and I gladly gave consent to let my name be used in connection with the Furlough Clubs. But I cannot tolerate for a moment the use of my name by any club which is organized to boost the political stock of some member for public office. This would not be fair to the people I represent in Congress.

I want to thank the presidents and officers as well as the members of the Hall Furlough Clubs who are remaining loyal to the objectives set forth in their bylaws. I suppose some political enemies will accuse me of having a sinister purpose in working for the members of these Furlough Clubs.

If it is political to aid the dependent wife of a man who is away fighting for his country, then the Hall Furlough Clubs are political.

If it is political to help obtain allotments for the children of our servicemen after their mother has exhausted all her income and the children are cold and hungry for want of money, then the Hall Furlough Clubs are political.

If it is political to find out the whereabouts of missing soldiers and sailors and notify their mothers and fathers, wives, or relatives, then the Hall Furlough Clubs are political.

If it is political for club members to write me whenever they find the relatives of servicemen in trouble or distress, then this whole business is political.

In fact, it seems impossible for some people nowadays to breathe the air without the accusation hurled at them that they are being political.

But let me assure the people of my district that the Hall Furlough Clubs will continue their patriotic efforts, and their important work for their men at the front will be carried on, and those who attempt to threaten or bully the members by aspersions and insults will be answered most appropriately.

In their zeal to vent their spleen upon me, political enemies must remember they are smearing the patriotic work of the women of the Hall Furlough Clubs and hurting our soldiers when they try to ape the tactics of Hitler and Hirohito in discrediting representative government and in trying to scare these good women out of the Hall Furlough Clubs.

The political plot engineered by these slick operators behind the scenes has failed and they will find the Hall Furlough Clubs will grow even faster because of their interference.

Government Ownership of Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the February 21 edition of Broadcasting:

GOVERNOR COX SAYS FLY PLANS UNITED STATES OWNERSHIP—1920 NOMINEE POINTS TO STUDIED CAMPAIGN BY CHAIRMAN

A studied campaign toward Government ownership of radio in the United States is attributed to F. C. C. Chairman James Lawrence Fly by former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, newspaper publisher and owner of three stations. Governor Cox in 1920 was the Democratic nominee for President.

"I am convinced that Fly wants radio to be turned over, if not abruptly then by easy stages as political conditions permit, to the Government," Governor Cox said. The disclosure came in a letter to J. Leonard Reinsch, managing director of WSB, Atlanta, WIOD, Miami, and WHIO, Dayton, the Cox-owned stations. A copy of the letter dated January 20 is in the hands of Chairman BURTON K. WHEELER, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

"If we had Federal ownership," Governor Cox commented, "then a Huey Long administration could never be gotten rid of."

Governor Cox had Franklin D. Roosevelt as his Vice Presidential running mate in the 1920 campaign. A close relationship has existed between them since that campaign. The 73-year-old statesman has made few public utterances, however, in recent years, and never has commented publicly on the New Deal or F. C. C. radio policies or regulatory methods.

Governor Cox is publisher of the Dayton Daily News, the Atlanta Journal, and the Miami Daily News, each identified with station operation. He was a Member of Congress from 1909 to 1913 and served 6 years as Governor of Ohio, having been nominated for the Presidency while serving his last term.

In his letter to Mr. Reinsch, who was a witness before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in favor of the White-Wheeler bill (S. 814) to restrict F. C. C. powers, Governor Cox said there were three things high-spotted in his mind regarding the whole radio situation.

"First," he said, "there is the duty of Congress in doing something to clarify the present state of things emphasized by the fact that the Supreme Court has almost supplicated the lawmaking body to indicate the path for a more sensible, efficient, and just regulation of the whole industry.

"Second, I am convinced that Fly wants radio to be turned over, if not abruptly then by easy stages as political conditions permit, to the Government. If we had Federal ownership, then a Huey Long administration could never be gotten rid of.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

"Third Senator WHEELER has put his finger on the very definite need of providing some way, somehow, for an equal division of time in the discussion of vital public questions. It might be difficult to write this into law. Jefferson was a very wise man and he once said that it was a mistake to make either charter of government or statute too specific. The important thing was to express

the principle involved, having some confidence in the intelligence and integrity of both administrative officers and the courts.

"We live in a democracy which cannot go on in good health unless we have a healthy public opinion and that cannot be unless our public has presented to it the truth, and all of it. After all, that is the very essence of democracy and this form of government is not going to live if truth is diluted through misrepresentation. It is as necessary to keep the current of public opinion protected as it is to balance the diet of a baby.

"Elaborating a little upon this basic philosophy, we have a job to do in the making of a world peace. The truth from all over the world must come unshackled. If our civilization knows what is going on, then we can assume that the rightness of things will have a much better chance to prevail than it ever has in the past."

Use of the Flag at Religious Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend O. R. Warford, pastor of the First Congregational Church in my home city of San Diego, has written me a very interesting letter in which he discusses the use and position of the flag of the United States at religious services. Because I believe others will appreciate the opportunity to read this thought-stimulating letter, I have asked that I be permitted to insert it as an extension to my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
San Diego, Calif., February 17, 1944.

Hon. ED. V. IZAC,
House Naval Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The other day my attention was called to the booklet United States Service Symbols by Cleveland H. Smith and Gertrude R. Taylor. There was a foreword by Vice Admiral Waesche, and a foreword by yourself. May I particularly call your attention to page 3 where it says "United States flag must be to right of clergyman or speaker as he faces the congregation"?

I realize that that usage is in keeping with the resolution passed by the Congress some time ago, but I fear that both the book and the resolution are the result of not wholly clear thinking on this point.

During the hour of divine services it is the custom in the Military Establishments to place the symbols of religion above the symbols of the state. In the Navy the chaplain's flag flies above Old Glory. This is a very proper recognition that God is above state, and that seems consistent with the highest patriotism.

A church is dedicated to God always. Any time anyone enters the sanctuary it is the hour of divine worship for that person. Recognizing that fact, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America passed a resolution, some months before the congressional resolution, establishing that usage in churches. You see, a church chancel is not a "platform", and a sanctuary is not an "auditorium". In any secular place you are quite right that the symbols of country should take precedence.

Now, the Christian flag is a relatively new thing, dating back only to 1926, but it is becomingly increasingly accepted as a symbol, and is being used in most churches. It is not the same as a State flag or lodge banner. It symbolizes the Divine. The Federal Council therefore held that if the flags are on the level of the congregation the Christian flag should be to the right of the congregation. If they stand on the pulpit level, the Christian flag should be at the right of the pulpit. If there is a chancel and altar and the flags are inside, the Christian flag should be at the right of the minister as he faces the altar.

Moreover, we have in our beloved land the firm belief in the separation of church and state. Our Pilgrim Fathers recognized, and rightly, that when either holds power over the other it is not good, for it is the function of the church to be the reverent critic of all the common concerns of man. It is the function of the state to devise means of regulating these common concerns. Politics is a method of cooperation, whereas religion is the spirit of cooperation. If the church dominates the state, both become decadent and fail of their function, and corruption is practically certain, as history too adequately teaches. The same is likely to happen where the state seeks to regulate religion. I am sure you will recognize this as a fundamental precept of our country.

If you follow me thus far, it should be clear that it is not the prerogative of the Congress to legislate the use of symbols in the church, nor is it the prerogative of any secular writers to do so. Indeed, it is not the prerogative of the Federal Council to do more than suggest a philosophy of the thing, and the logical procedures from that philosophy. May I humbly but firmly insist that the Christian Church and the synagogue and temple alone are privileged to regulate symbolism within their own sanctuaries.

Cordially yours,

O. R. WARFORD.

Article by Former Congressman Oscar J. Larson, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, just now we hear much about negotiation between Russia and Finland in connection with the peace problem and efforts to end the state of war between those two countries. I am certain that the Members of this House will all be interested in reading the very able and comprehensive article by a former Member of this House dealing with this subject.

Mr. Larson's contribution appears in the Virginia Daily Enterprise, published at Virginia, Minn., on Monday, February 14, 1944. It is as follows:

To the EDITOR:

I have just read with keen interest your excellent editorial captioned "Americans wish for Finland an ending of war and a just peace." I think that it voices the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of Americans. It shows that you have not been influenced by the false and foul propaganda with which the Communists have been flooding our country to poison the minds of the American people against little Finland. As a newspaper editor, you probably know something of the extent of the spider web of communistic publications in this country. An avowed and ardent Communist stated in the New Masses, a Communist weekly, that "The Communist Party * * * published and distributed more pamphlets than any other organization in the United States."

It may not be generally known, but the fact is that at the Head of the Lakes two Communist newspapers are published. One of them is published in the Finnish language at Superior and the other is published in Duluth in the English language. One of the editors of the former spent a year and a half in Russia studying the technique and tactics of communistic propaganda. The publisher of the English-language propaganda sheet is a Russian-born, ardent, and fanatical Communist. In a recent issue of the latter, on the editorial page an article appeared advocating the deportation of Herbert Hoover in lieu of Harry Bridges, the leading Communist on the Pacific coast, who has been ordered to be deported, but who is still in this country.

I hardly need to remind the readers of the Virginia Daily Enterprise that during the existence of the unholy alliance between Hitler and Stalin, the Communists were smearing President Roosevelt as a warmonger, picketing the White House, howling that the "Yanks are not coming," and dauding Finland as the puppet and stooge of the United States and Great Britain, etc., but the moment that unholy alliance between these two humanitarian and beneficent dictators was severed, then these self-same Communists at once, as if by magic, became ardent supporters of the war and loyal and patriotic Americans. They began hounding President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull to bring about a declaration of war against Finland. They spewed from the Communist propaganda mill false and venomous lies about Finland so as to poison the minds of the American people. The evident purpose of all this political stratagem was, and still is, to so callus the American sympathy and good will toward Finland that when Russia was ready to carry out its oft-threatened destruction of Finland, there would be no protest from the American people.

As an American, I am ashamed to say that while this Communist propaganda was pouring into the American minds, the lips of distressed little Finland, by the order of the Department of State, were padlocked. Not only was Finland silenced, she was and still is being threatened that if she does not unconditionally surrender at once to Soviet Russia, she will have to suffer the consequences. So spoke an official representative of the greatest and most powerful, yea, the most beneficient democratic republic on earth to war-torn, God-fearing, peace-loving, law-abiding, liberty-loving, democratic Finland, ever faithful and true friend of the United States who seeks no nation's territories, who covets no nation's goods, who threatens no one's security. Her only crime is that she wants to protect her territorial and governmental security and the liberties of her people from a mighty and ruthless foreign invader. For that she is threatened with utter destruction.

That Soviet Russia is the invader was announced at a press conference of the Department of State, as reported in the New York Times, of June 23, 1941, in these cryptic and tragic words: "Germany invades the Soviet Union; the latter raids Finland."

Leningrad is only about 15 miles from Finland's eastern border. It would seem that if she wanted to make war on Soviet Russia she has had the opportunity to bomb that city, but not one solitary bomb has she dropped on Leningrad. This Russo-Finnish war that seems to be worrying the Secretary of State has, in fact, been until the other day

so quiescent that it has become known as a "sit down war." If Elihu Root who was, if my memory serves me right, the Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt, were still in office, his message to the Kremlin would likely have been: "In the name of humanity and civilization, let little Finland alone if Russia deems it worth while to continue its cordial and friendly relations with the United States."

Is Finland worth saving? Evidently Winston Churchill thought she was, for in a world-wide broadcast he gave utterance to the following tribute: "Only Finland—superb, nay, sublime—in the jaws of peril—Finland shows what freemen can do. The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificient. * * * Everyone can see how communism rots the soul of a nation; how it makes it abject and hungry in peace, and proves it base and abominable in war. We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left to civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death by the dull brutish force of overwhelming numbers. If the light of freedom that still burns so brightly in the frozen north should be finally quenched, it might well herald a return to the Dark Ages, when every vestige of human progress during 2,000 years would be engulfed.

Our own President has repeatedly spoken in very complimentary language about Finland. If space permitted, I could quote other statements favorable to Finland which came from the lips of the President: "Finland, small in size but mighty in honor, occupies an especially warm place in the American hearts." "Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland has any ulterior designs on the integrity and security of the Soviet Union."

I firmly believe that both the President and the Secretary of State deep down in their hearts have a very high regard for the people and the Government of Finland. Both have repeatedly said so. I have no doubt that if these great men would request Soviet Russia to abandon her invasion of Finland they would receive not only the acclaim of America but of the whole world. They have the power to do so and they should exercise that power. It is their concern, and ours also. They probably would like to hear from the people. A few words in a telegram or letter, or even a postal card to them from the readers of the Virginia Daily Enterprise would be gladly received.

Respectfully yours,

O. J. LARSON.

DULUTH, MINN.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 13, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I am in receipt of your letter of March 8, 1944, with reference to traffic on the existing inland waterways. You request a comparison for traffic in 1937 with the latest figures now available.

As you know, the Department in its annual reports makes record, in accordance with the law, of water-borne traffic. The latest figures available to me are those for 1942 which will be published in the annual report to be issued shortly. I am pleased to inform you that comparison of these figures with the records for 1937 shows for:

Mississippi River proper—Minneapolis to the mouth—an increase of 146 percent.

Ohio River proper—an increase of 63 percent.

Warrior-Tombigbee River—an increase of 20 percent.

Tennessee River—an increase of 106 percent.

Gulf—Intracoastal Canal—an increase of 269 percent.

Sincerely yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Do We Deserve Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News of March 17, 1944:

DO WE DESERVE PEACE?

(By David Lawrence)

Millions of persons on bended knee each night pray for peace—and millions more without a sense of spiritual expression hope for and just as earnestly beg for peace.

Millions of persons, too, move on each day in the ordinary pursuits of life bewildered by the war, wondering when it will end and what kind of a world we shall have when it's over.

To all of us at one time or another comes an inner questioning: What can possibly be the meaning of this destructive war?

We grow less and less retrospective about it. The war is here. Whatever its causes, there can be no disputing its terrible evolution so that today every nation feels the instinct of self-defense. To refuse to assist the State is to condone the suicide of the State. All peoples, guilty and innocent, are fighting on with mounting fury impelled only by a determination to destroy or vanquish the enemy.

It is easy to assume an attitude of despair—to say that wars are recurrent and inevitable and that man is doomed to periodic conflict and to the constant mobilization of physical force. It is easy perhaps to say that this war is merely the result of the clash of economic interests whose inequalities gradually sow the seeds of frustration in peoples and make them receptive to dictatorships and hence to aggressive purposes.

These are explanations that may satisfy the historian or even the sociologist. They are but the sorry chronicles of human experience. They do not explain the origin of it all. They do not go to the heart of the problem of eliminating war nor do they during war give us that exaltation of spirit which can make the will to sacrifice so strong.

LIFE IS CHANGED FOR FAMILIES OF MEN OVERSEAS

As we look about us, we see many persons seemingly unaffected by the war. They are seeking the same gains, they are enjoying the same comforts, they are looking forward to the same exercise of economic or political or social power that they sought or enjoyed before the bombs began to drop on Warsaw.

Ten million of our boys and men are in the armed services. Not all of these are in hazardous areas. The fathers and mothers and relatives of the ones who are overseas are not living their normal lives. They are beset with a growing anxiety. For them there is change. It comes slowly and almost imperceptibly at first. But it comes. For those families whose boys are overseas, the life at home is gradually transformed. A different perspective, a different sense of values appears. In time the possession of all worldly goods, the prides of position or the pomp of power are steadily submerged and there emerges only the one thought—what does the future hold in store for us as individuals, what does it mean for our sons if they do come back?

WE MUST SEARCH OUR HEARTS FOR TRAGEDY'S CAUSE

For some parents the war is already over—the overwhelming darkness that sweeps in from the causualty lists makes of post-war hopes only an illusion. For those who have known what it is to lose their sons, no enthusiasm for the maintenance of worldly pursuits can exist unless there has been a regeneration of the individual—an adjustment to God's will or a surrender to Divine purpose.

If in the minds of those who have not met tragedy there could be a recognition of what it has really meant to those who have met it, this would be a different Nation. The imagination does not achieve as accurate a transference of human feeling as comes from reality and actual experience. We cannot know the sufferings of the millions who have lost sons, whether they be Russians or Germans, British or Italian, French or Poles, Japanese or Americans. Human anguish knows no boundaries and recognizes no barriers of race or creed or color.

What does it all mean?

We can cry out in our misery and ask a merciful God to give us the answer. We can ask Him to intimate to us in our hours of meditation why the human race is paying so terrible a price for its failure to learn the simple lessons of human brotherhood, the simple teachings of Jesus to which such wide assent has been given and to which, unhappily, such wide indifference has also been exhibited.

But the answer, when it comes, will not point the finger of blame to some far-off land or to some small group of individuals or to some party or faction which has been able to exploit or aggravate one people to the point of aggression even as another people has felt the justified urge of self-defense against such aggression.

The answer will not come from the victims of the bombing, the men, women, and children who have been driven from their homes in London or Berlin. They cannot tell us why they—so many of them innocent civilians, old people, sick people, infants in arms—have been selected for destruction.

There is no answer from the armies and the navies and the air forces whose brave commanders and courageous men feel only the impulse of disciplined might and somehow try to convince themselves that their own individual exertion or sacrifice will not have been in vain.

We cannot look for the answer in the readers' columns of the press as we perceive the irritations of wartime restriction soon to be translated into protest votes at the polls. We cannot look to our political leaders, so many of whom still think in terms of individual achievement and the satisfaction of ambition or pride of office. We cannot find the answer in the big pressure groups who keep thinking of advantages after the war or in the sincere though misguided men who look upon the

system of private enterprise as justifying individual exercise of vast economic power. We shall not, indeed, find it among the men who interpret or rationalize the public interest as acceptable only when it coincides with their own interest.

Where then shall we find the answer?

We shall find it only in our own individual hearts and consciences. We shall find it only after we have dared to eliminate the wishful thinking that looks upon death and God's judgment of us—the use we have made of our lives—as something that comes only to the other fellow.

We shall find the answer only when we are ready to surmount the defense mechanisms that cause too many of us so glibly to speak of spiritual obligation as maudlin sentimentality and of human brotherhood as a utopian dream. These defenses are merely the carefree alibis of those who do not know as yet the guilt of their own indifference.

SELF-SCRUTINY IS THE BEST WAY TO THE ANSWER

We shall find the answer when we honestly ask ourselves to examine our own course as individuals and our own behavior collectively in the years gone by. Did we acquiesce in the selfish claims of this or that group or nation? Did we rationalize our advances and retreats in the decades following the last war? Did we soothe our consciences with the mischievous doctrine that all property has been given to us for eternity, and did we refuse to believe that we were only trustees of worldly wealth in behalf of God?

Did we quickly come to the support of the imperialist who insisted that his government was making trade and opportunity? Did we accept, oh, so readily, the modern axiom that tradition must supersede justice even if tradition is wrong and injustice provokes bitterness and resentment?

PEACE OF NATIONS TO FOLLOW PEACE OF INDIVIDUALS

Did we foolishly acquiesce in the doctrine that only the possession of weapons and armament makes wars and that hence the cure was to abolish weapons? Did we listen to the well-meaning but involuntary accessories of chaos who told us that if we but took care of America and let the rest of the world "stew in its own juice," we would be able to enjoy the fruits of our own self-sufficiency unmolested?

What we need is not merely individual but national repentance. This war is meaningless if it is not a lesson to man. This war is not due to the wrath of a loving God. It is due to the wrath of unloving man. But above it all there sits a God of justice trying in His mysterious ways to signal to us the true meaning of the sacrifices now being made for us by millions of persons—even as Jesus alone made the supreme sacrifice for human betterment nearly 2,000 years ago. His legacy of ethics eventually must show us the way out of the labyrinth of our own making.

Do we deserve peace? Only if and when individuals in the whole world have caught the meaning of this war and begun unselfishly, courageously, boldly, and in utter disregard of consequence to self, to plan honestly for a world of peace—a peace not just between nations or governments but between men and men in the marts of trade, on the farm and in the factory, and in the home where the frictions of family and friends must yield inevitably to the spirit of a new day and a different set of human compensations.

Some day we shall deserve peace. Perhaps we have not yet suffered to the point of understanding. We have not overcome the evil passions of self-aggrandizement that still leap from within us and which, unless completely subjugated, will merely lie dormant till the next cycle of organized murder begins.

We will deserve peace only when we have made our peace with Almighty God.

Republic of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, adopted unanimously at a meeting held at the Polish National Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Mother of the Rosary, Buffalo, N. Y., February 20, 1944:

Whereas the Polish people have proved through centuries their devotion to the cause of freedom for the people of every nation to develop their own country and civilization; and

Whereas they retained this love of freedom and aspierd to regain it for their homeland during the century in which Germany, Austria and Russia took this freedom from them by superior force and held them in subjection to foreign rule; and

Whereas after the Republic of Poland was reestablished by the victors in the First World War and the boundaries of the Republic were recognized by treaties signed in 1918–20, by all the countries now fighting with the declared purpose of forming a world organization to prevent aggression and seizure of territory from weaker nations by more powerful neighbors; and

Whereas the Republic of Poland, by the efforts of its more than 30,000,000 inhabitants had made notable progress in self-government, education and culture, which was recognized by the rest of the world until the unprovoked invasion by Germany on September 1, 1939, with oppression and slaughter which have shocked the conscience of all freemen everywhere; and

Whereas the Russian Armies have begun to drive the German invaders from the country and the Russian Government has expressed its desire for a strong independent Poland living in friendly intercourse with its neighbors:

Now, therefore, in order to achieve that object and to secure the aim of world peace resting on the firm foundation of justice;

This patriotic meeting held at the Polish National Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Mother of the Rosary, in Buffalo, N. Y.; hereby appeals to the Russian Government and all other governments of the United Nations to restore the Republic of Poland to its own people with the boundaries, which all the world recognized and respected from 1920 until the German invasion; that we believe this request for just treatment of our homeland expresses the sentiment of all the 5,000,000, people of Polish birth or parentage now living in the United States of America; that copies of this resolution be sent to the President and other officers of the United States Government, to the Polish Government in exile, to the Ambassador of the Russian Government at Washington, D. C., and to the representatives in Washington of all the other governments united in the war against Germany to the end that the victory which all are fighting to achieve may fully accomplish the high aims which all have espoused for the free development of the best in all men everywhere.

Ours No One-Man Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently a very enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on the subject of the fourth term. The editorial is entitled "Ours No One-Man Nation." We have come far in this country under our representative form of government, where liberty and freedom have ever been preserved, and our form of government must remain inviolate. The American way of life must be continued under our Constitution. The people are the rulers in our Nation, and this constitutional right must continue in them. It is a frightful threat to behold when one man seeks to overthrow the time-honored custom of a nation and to encroach upon the Constitution which has been the guiding star to our progress as a people.

The editorial follows:

OURS NO ONE-MAN NATION

The stop-Roosevelt advocates in the Democratic Party have not abandoned their plans for entering a candidate to register a protest vote. They have practically conceded, however, the futility of hoping to prevent his nomination. According to a check made, Roosevelt already has tentative promises of four-fifths of the votes needed for a fourth-term nomination. And he has not even admitted that he will be a fourth-term candidate, nor has he given any indication of what will be his platform if he runs.

That 's a serious situation, so far as the party is concerned. It has no candidate but Roosevelt. In fact, there is no Democratic Party, in the accepted meaning of the term. There is a New Deal following that has been attracted to the Chief Executive through 12 years of wasteful spending and the creation of a maze of Federal bureaus, authorities, commissions, and other agencies, some of which have usurped legislative prerogatives and all of which have been supported by Federal funds.

The fourth-term proposal rests on nothing but the despair of getting a nominee who would have any chance of being elected. The New Deal Party, in other words, has no foundation on which any other than its author could be expected to make a stand. That is a pitiful situation for one of the two great political organizations in a country that traditionally conducted its politics on a two-party basis. What would it do if Roosevelt were to decline to run, and what would be the predicament of the Nation if he were the only man who can fill the place and something should happen to him after he had been elected to a fourth term?

Ours is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They are the source of all political authority and power. They are supposed to have policies and to name champions of their policies to do their will. His party and the country are a long way from the firm foundation of popular government when we have no alternative except to rely on one man. We may hoot at Germany, but are we in position to laugh if we have no principles, no international, no post-war program until he speaks?

The New Deal is offering nothing except a candidate who has given no hint of what may

be his platform or what he might do. The only clue to what may be expected is in the record of the first three terms, when platforms and precedents meant nothing. No wonder Senator BYRD and other Democratic leaders are alarmed. They realize the tragedy that would be involved in entrusting the post-war future of the Nation to the visionaries whose pre-war extravagances and theories of federalization and regimentation had all but wrecked the Republic.

Peace Terms for Small Countries of the Old World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, let us recall some facts of the past. Poland was overrun by Hitler and Russia and now exists only on paper. Finland was attacked by Russia. Germany took over Denmark. And so the story goes about all of the small countries of the Old World.

We are now hearing reports about developments in connection with peace negotiations dealing with Poland and Finland, and, of course, Russia is primarily involved. Incidentally, Russia is a beneficiary of our lend-lease policy, which means in plain English that we are sending food and military supplies to Russia, in connection with whatever terms and conditions our administrative leaders may make. Having supported that legislation, I do not here make any criticism. So far it has been a "one way road," because I do not know whether or not any advantages will accrue to the United States, but I do know that Russia is getting needed help in its hour of need. For that reason, I have been amazed at the attitude of Russia toward Poland and Finland in connection with peace negotiations and boundary disputes. In my opinion, the United States is interested in the problems of these and other small countries across the water. We want them treated fairly and honorably. We want Russia to do exactly that. We have a right to demand that treatment.

In an address in the House of Representatives on May 27, 1943, I called attention to the responsibility of our State Department in connection with the small countries of Europe. I said that we should make clear to our allies that in a post-war period we wanted those countries protected.

In the past there has been a lot of talk about what happened when the Atlantic Charter was formed, and the "four freedoms" in the post-war world. Then, of course, there was a meeting at Casablanca, and some of us have wondered what happened at that conference. In due time there was the spectacular meeting held in Cairo, and another in Teheran. Let us hope that those who represented America at these various times and places insisted that strong and powerful countries do justice to the small nations.

Lend-lease should not be a one-way road for the benefit of the strong and powerful, and I am hopeful that those who direct our foreign policy saw to it that commitments were made which would be for the benefit of the small countries in the Old World.

Right now negotiations are going on between Russia and Finland, and in my opinion the sympathy of the Congress of the United States is with the Finnish Republic which following World War No. 1 paid its just obligations to this country, and has consistently conducted itself with honor and distinction in the family of nations.

I submit herewith an editorial from the Virginia Daily Enterprise of Virginia, Minn., under date of March 7, 1944, and I commend it to your careful consideration. It is as follows:

JUST FINNISH-RUSSIAN PEACE DESIRABLE FOR EUROPE'S FUTURE

Russia has offered peace terms to Finland, and though the conditions which are proposed as a requisite to the cessation of war between these two countries have been, so the dispatches say, approved by the British Government, it is by no means certain that these represent the gesture of a magnanimous foe. Finland, incidentally, is the same little nation which only a short while back—in 1939—had the plaudits of Americans and British in standing up to an enemy which then had every advantage except that of soldier and civilian courage. Hitler Germany and Russia were very close at that particular time, through solemn compact, and Finland received no help from Berlin. Indeed, the reverse was true.

Outnumbered and overwhelmed, and with the Allies of that period unable to give Finland much more than moral assistance, Russia won rather a complete capitulation from her little adversary. Russia, be it remembered, was the aggressor. Needless to say, the 1940 peace terms were extremely onerous, and were lamented in the United States and in Great Britain, as well as in other countries. In June 1941 Hitler marched into Russia, and Stalin became a partner of the Allies. But incidents not of Finnish origin had persisted, even with Russia fighting the Nazis, and it appealed to the Finns as an opportune time to stand their ground. There was also a chance that choice territory lost in the unjust Moscow-imposed peace could be recovered. In any event, a new Russo-Finnish war got off to a start which wasn't exactly decried in American circles. As a matter of fact, there was then and there is now a deep sympathy for the difficulties of the little republic.

Finland sorely needs peace today, just as Russia and the world need it, but it should be a peace with honor, if it is to last. If it is true that Britain endorses the present stipulations offered Finland by the Russians, presumably Mr. Roosevelt's government will indicate a like attitude, but there is a challenge to do more than this. Indeed, there is a signal opportunity for the United States to so intercede for Finland that equitable terms, in accord with our own war aims, may result. Surely, Russia needs no part of what is fundamentally Finnish territory. She can well afford to be generous and righteous, and one may well believe that good offices exercised for Finland by Russia's principal ally will go far to make for a European pattern which shall be an effective instrument for an enduring peace. There are other boundaries to be settled, including those of Poland and the so-called Baltic states, and in all of these the will of Russia will govern, for good or ill. There is a challenge to make that will a just one, and there is a challenge to the United States to raise its moral voice now.

A Tribute to the Late Hon. Lucius N. Littauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the untimely death of the Honorable Lucius N. Littauer, a former Member of this House, I wish to include the following resolution which was adopted by his associates in Congress when he retired from public service with the close of the Fifty-ninth Congress. It was a tribute and honor that is seldom bestowed upon a man in a lifetime.

I also include an editorial from the Leader-Republican, of the city of Gloversville, N. Y.

"The Honorable Lucius N. Littauer, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York in the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, Fifty-eighth, and Fifty-ninth Congresses, insisting upon retiring from life, now we,

"The Speaker of the House of Representatives, its officers and Members thereof, with desire to perpetuate our estimate of him, present to him this signed minute:

"Your service has been notable for untiring industry, for conspicuous ability, for integrity of purpose, for accuracy of judgment, for wondrous quickness of perception, and for volume of accomplishment. That you possess in large measure the most admirable traits of mind and heart, each day's intercourse with you has made more apparent. Your service has been of great value to your country. The going out of no man from our inner circle could produce a more poignant pang of regret. We admire you, we respect you, we have for you a strong affection, and we wish you to take with you to private life, this assurance of our esteem and our regret that you have voluntarily severed the ties of association which will ever abide with us as among the most pleasurable memories of congressional life."

This was signed by Joseph G. Cannon, James S. Sherman, James W. Wadsworth, William M. Calder, Frank O. Lowden, George A. Southwick, Nicholas Longworth, J. A. Hemenway, J. Sloat Fassett, James E. Watson, and about 30 others.

Following his service in Congress, Mr. Littauer was elected and served on the Board of Regents of the State of New York from 1921 to 1924. Except for this post, he never again appeared in public life.

[From the Gloversville (N. Y.) Republican-Leader]

Gloversville today mourns the passing of her greatest benefactor, Lucius N. Littauer. Nearly two decades ago a statue of Mr. Littauer was erected by the appreciative people of his native city, and this man of millions could look upon his bronze counterpart

whenever he drove past the corner of North Main Street and Prospect Avenue.

It is unusual for a citizen of America to have a portrait statue erected to his memory during his lifetime—but Lucius Littauer was an unusual man. The younger generation cannot remember him as well as those who are older. A leading industrialist and Member of Congress at the turn of the century, he was dynamic, efficient, gracious, and popular, and became the community's outstanding citizen.

As the years went on he became increasingly conscious of social responsibility and increasingly anxious to help other people. His eagerness to relieve distress grew rapidly with his years; his outlook broadened into a determined desire to aid humanity wherever he could. He gave greatly and he gave wisely and well of his large store of worldly goods. In the city of Gloversville alone his total public and private gifts are estimated to have run well toward the $4,000,000 mark.

In every community, large or small, is some man who has a vision generally well beyond that of his fellow citizens. Lucius N. Littauer was that man in Gloversville. His intelligent distribution of his public gifts cannot be dismissed with the generalization that he had so much and so could give plentifully. Many men of large wealth give little or nothing, and many defer their benefactions until after their deaths. In this respect Mr. Littauer had the pleasure of giving during his lifetime and of entering into the details of the carrying out of his benefactions.

As a man of vision, Mr. Littauer established a hospital in Gloversville in 1894—a full half century ago—when, doubtless, many of his fellow citizens laughed at the idea of a modern hospital in a city as small as we were then. But this was only the beginning of the sightly group of large buildings—of which the Nathan Littauer Hospital, named in honor of his father, is the center—at the top of Littauer Place.

The Nathan Littauer Hospital group—one of the finest equipped in the entire country—comprises Lucius Littauer's greatest gift to Gloversville and the contiguous countryside. It is safe to say of the thousands of patients treated since its establishment, there is hardly a family in the entire city which at one time or another has not had reason to be thankful.

Mr. Littauer also served his home town and Fulton county exceptionally well during his dozen years in Congress where he played an important part in enactment of the McKinley Tariff Act and was largely instrumental in winning the long fight for adequate duty on gloves, making it possible to manufacture women's fine gloves here that could be sold in competition with those formerly brought in through importation.

Among other things, while in Congress, Mr. Littauer also secured for Gloversville its armory and establishment of a National Guard company, which furnished valuable training and discipline for our young men who eventually have served in two World Wars. His many other notable activities were interestingly reviewed in detail in the two-page article in this paper yesterday in connection with his sudden death.

In the matter of benefactions for medical research, Mr. Littauer's gifts were many and noteworthy as a glance at yesterday's review will show. The text of this editorial comment is stressed, not only because Mr. Littauer has given so generously of his millions to the city of Gloversville, but because he has given it with discrimination and for things that really count.

Although Lucius N. Littauer is gone, his name and memory will always be associated with the city in which he spent so many years of his energetic life. The bronze statute referred to in our opening paragraph will stand when the entire present population of Gloversville have passed on, but it will not memorialize his personality to future generations to anywhere near the extent that his public benefactions to the city, and to humanity, will serve to do.

Founders' Day Address by Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, 77 years ago on March 1 Nebraska became a sovereign State. It was a part of the Louisiana Purchase and was later organized a Territory under the name of Nebraska-Kansas Territory.

The early settlers came from the Eastern States, east of the Mississippi River. Pioneers, they were coming to homestead the land, they suffered all the hardships of the early west. With the plow and the axe they carved out their homes. They built towns, schools, and churches. They established a sound economic government, and to discourage extravagance they wrote into the first constitution the provision that the State could not contract debts greater than $100,000. This provision has been retained in subsequent revisions with the result that Nebraska has no bonded indebtedness. It has no general sales tax, no income tax, and the lowest per capita tax of any State in the Union. It has one of the most beautiful capitol buildings in the United States, paid for as it was built.

Nebraska has more miles of running water than any other State. It ranks first in number of sheep, second in the production of winter wheat, third in the production of corn, and fourth in the production of cattle. It has contributed liberally to the affairs of the Nation.

We have had an excellent State government. Our Governor, the Honorable Dwight Griswold, is finishing his second term. His administration has attracted the attention of the Nation. I desire at this point to insert into the RECORD the statesmanlike speech he delivered in Omaha on March 7, at the Founders' Day meeting, which celebrated the seventy-seventh birthday of Nebraska.

THE CHALLENGE OF VICTORY

This Founders' Day, more than any other, is a time for candid appraisal of Republican fitness. It is a time for careful thought, unclouded by the dust of prejudice, unhampered by the hamstrings of habit. It is such a time because the Republican Party at this moment stands upon the threshold of victory.

To the victor this year will fall, not the spoils, but the Herculean responsibility of guiding the steps of a troubled nation through the most critical period in our great history. The question now is not whether this Nation can long endure, but, rather, how this Nation will endure. It is a time for Republicans to look, not to laurels, but to courage and strength and vision.

The issue today involves a great deal more than simply saying "No" to Roosevelt and then turning back to paths we once found pleasant and safe. In the life of a virile nation, as in the life of an active man, there can be no turning back. We all agree the United States is far too young to thrive on the kindly retrospect of old age.

I want to talk with you now merely as one member of our great party. I want to discuss some recent events and how they have impressed me—impressed me, not as a Governor, deeply grateful for the trust placed in me by my State and my party, but as a Nebraskan who believes the real greatness of our Nation still awaits discovery.

Perhaps I had better begin by telling you why I am concerned for the victory that lies within our grasp. I am concerned because the approaching election is no common political choice. It is a great deal more than determining whether the administration of the next few years is to be Republican or New Deal. It goes, rather, to a question of leadership. What kind of a leadership will it be? What will be its aims, its methods, its morals?

Within recent weeks some strange and intriguing events have transpired. One of these was the charge of fraud which Mr. Roosevelt flung in the face of Congress in connection with the soldier-vote legislation. A charge of fraud is always startling because it casts reflection upon motive and sincerity. But a charge of fraud shouted clearly by a President at his Congress is more than startling. It indicates that either the accuser spoke in the heat of uncontrolled anger, or it indicates the open admission of a wide, unspannable breach.

To men who work desperately at the grim business of fighting a war, such outbursts are disturbing, to say the least. If an Executive chosen by the people, and a Congress chosen by the same people, cannot work efficiently and maturely to solve such a relatively simple problem as the distribution of ballots, what, indeed, can be hoped for when it comes to the complex task of providing employment after the war? What can be expected when it comes to arranging for peace? What can be expected when it comes to decisions having a direct bearing upon speedy victory in the war itself?

These are reasonable questions. Surely a man experienced as is Mr. Roosevelt in all the wizardries of inducing public reaction would anticipate them. If, in anger, he was tempted to shout "fraud," it would seem that such anticipation would cause him to hold his fire.

But while thought on the fraud charge persisted, there arrived the greater, the more dramatic incident of the Barkley bolt. With us today are men who had the opportunity to see that confessional at first hand and to fully appreciate its drama. Even to the rest of us, however, the intensity of the Barkley outpouring was clearly apparent.

Just what was going on? Again it seems reasonable that if the President objected to the tax bill—as he had every right to do—that he could have vetoed it, and in calm and quiet words told why he found such action necessary. His failure to agree with Congress surely did not call for indictment of the motives of the men with whom he disagreed, and who, like himself, are pledged to uphold the constitutional precepts of the United States.

The Barkley incident becomes even more interesting when we remember that the President knew Senator BARKLEY was aroused and swarting even before he sent his veto message. It seems reasonable that a friend of 12 years standing might have done what he could to alleviate the suffering of one he has been wont to call "Dear Alben." There would have been no need to withdraw from the dictates of his conscience—he could have vetoed the bill—but at the same time the

innuendoes could have been removed for the sake of a dear friend, if for no other reason. But they were not removed—they were intensified. Even more salt was rubbed into the veto message, rubbed in after Senator BARKLEY had made his attitude fully known, and exposed the height of his temperature at a White House meeting.

And then there was the crowning touch—a small curtain performance of HENRY WALLACE, the Vice President of the United States who, as you remember was presiding, as the Senator from Kentucky arose to bare his soul. When the passionate storm had subsided and Senators, Democrat and Republican alike, crowded around to shake the hand that shook the fist, what did Mr. WALLACE do? He left. He slipped out quietly. He went away. Just how far he went, I do not know. I don't know just how far it is from the Senate rostrum to the nearest private telephone.

In recalling that picture, I like to think of Mr. WALLACE as the personification of the New Deal. He came, he presided, he departed. And behind him he left a mess.

Quite interesting, you say, but just what has all this to do with Republicans and the problems of the future?

Just this: I am convinced we have reached a point where Mr. Roosevelt and Congress no longer can work together in harmony for the good of the Nation.

I am not interested now in the placement of blame for the present stalemate. Rather, I am concerned with its very real existence. The situation is one that simply cannot continue if the tears and blood and sacrifice of the war are not to be in vain.

There is a growing danger that the coming campaign will degenerate into a Roosevelt versus Congress battle, a struggle so heated that such real issues as a speedy victory, full and rapid reemployment, and wholehearted cooperation for the benefit of an enduring peace, such issues as those, will be thrust aside in the excitement.

And I say to you that those issues simply cannot, must not now disappear from our first line of national thought. This Nation gave of its life in a war only 25 years ago, gave of its life in the brutally mistaken belief that it would not soon be called upon to again engage in such barbarism. At the close of that war the seed of a durable peace slipped through our fingers and fell upon sterile ground because, for a few short moments, we took our eyes from the real objective. That must not happen again. If it does, man's precious Christian dream of progress will be blotted out for generations before it again shines forth.

The issue of the coming campaign concerns not the infinitesimal disagreements of public officials, but the ability of our democracy to fulfill the desires of its people and to stand in dignity before the world, a real and living inspiration to people everywhere who believe a man is rightfully the captain of his destiny.

Whatever fears may have been held for swapping horses in the middle of the stream, must have been completely dissipated by the events of the past several weeks. The cold fact is that if any such danger existed, it is now greatly outweighed by the indisputable danger that unless a change is made, our Nation will be made inarticulate by an executive-congressional deadlock at the beginning of the critical post-war period.

I am fully aware there will be those who argue that the fault rests, not with the executive branch of our National Government, but with the legislative. Such an argument is pointless for the simple reason that it is conceded by every student of politics that Congress will be anti-New Deal during the next 3 years.

Even such a good new dealer as Leon Henderson has publicly predicted that Republicans will control the lower House of Congress after next January.

Our difficulty and our national danger is not caused by a fight between two political parties, however; it is instead a fight between two branches of our Government, the executive and the legislative. No matter what party controls Congress, that fight will be continued, if—if President Roosevelt is elected to a fourth term.

It all adds up to the fact that the only way we can have unity in our Government, and unity in this Nation, it is to elect as President in 1944 the nominee of the Republican Party. May God give to the party the wisdom to nominate a man worthy of that trust.

The challenge of victory is full upon the Republican Party. Every recent election proves it. But let us not confuse the hopes of the American people with the confidence of the American people. I am sure we have the first and it is our duty to be worthy of the second. The American people are today looking hopefully to the Republican Party to supply a sorely needed leadership. Thousands upon thousands of voters, whose allegiance belongs to no party, are looking to Republicans today to give them anchorage—to give them a sincere, candid, inspiring pledge worthy of their confidence.

The challenge of victory falls heavily upon the Republican Party because the Democratic Party is now a house divided. Its leadership commands authority within that house only because no other leadership abides there and because the people who live there know it. The New Deal, as such, has expired. Aside from Mr. WALLACE who somehow has acquired a remarkable capacity for dreaming, originators of the New Deal no longer mention its name. Its own father requested it to commit hara-kiri. Here in Nebraska, Democrats even go so far as to decline candidacies on the ground that if they accepted, some misguided soul might think they still believed in the New Deal.

With such chaos under the Democratic roof, the great majority of Americans are looking to Republicans for action. As a party, our position is enviable, but we must be on guard lest we find ourselves trying to be declared the winner by default. We must deserve victory in 1944. We will not deserve that victory if we force the American voter to choose Republican leadership as the lesser of two evils. We must not ask the American voter to give us his ballot without also having reason to give us his confidence.

This, I think, brings us to a consideration of what steps Republicans should take to merit the confidence of the American voter.

I may be outside the bounds of old-time party teaching, but I think we should swallow a little false pride and frankly and openly state that certain innovations of the past 12 years are worth keeping. We have already made such admissions at the State level, and I think the people of this Nation admire us for it. At least, the Republican come-back has proceeded far more rapidly in State government than it has at the national level. We now have 26 Republican Governors, compared with 8 in 1937. These successes have come as the rank-and-file voter became convinced that he would get better administration and better government under Republican guidance. I think the success would have come even more rapidly if more people understood that it is not the desire of Republican leadership to wipe away everything that has been done since 1933.

Surely it is no secret that people do not want to be uprooted and replanted back at the same spot where they stood in 1933. The question, I repeat, is not one of return; the question is, How are we to go forward?

In our own State of Nebraska, for example, under a Republican administration, we have not abandoned the State assistance program; in fact, the payments have been increased; we expanded the public health service, our unemployment insurance funds are in better condition than ever, and still our tax collections are the lowest per capita of all of the 48 States.

At the State level, people have learned that Republican administration gives them the benefits of the programs that are sound and worth while. We have proved by pledge and by administration that our course leads forward; that we can stop waste, that our aim is for better administration, greater economy, adjustment, and improvement.

It is essential that the American voter clearly understands that his selection of a Republican President in 1944 does not mean he has chosen to return to the position he held 11 years ago. It is essential that he understands the Republican course leads forward—forward to a greater nation and to expanded rights for its citizens.

As I have said upon other occasions, I believe Republicans, to win in 1944, must convince the voters of three broad points. First, that a Republican victory will speed the winning of the war. Second, that a Republican victory will insure full employment afterward. And third, that Republicans will wholeheartedly cooperate with other nations to prevent future wars.

First—the war. From the outset it has been divided into two parts—the grim and deadly fight on the battle front and the unrelenting, sometimes discouraging, work on the home front. We are really fighting this war with two teams—the battle-front team, and the home-front team, and the final success of each depends upon the performance of the other. All of us want the backfield of that battle-front team left on the field. We don't want anything to happen that will make them stumble. One of the first things, then, that we must tell the world, is that a Republican administration will retain Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Admirals King, Nimitz, Halsey, and the rest of our battle commanders.

But while the battle-front team has found its stride, the going has been more difficult for the home-front team. It has managed to pile up a good-sized production score, but its work has been complicated by fussy little long-haired umpires who keep changing the rules. Its task has also been complicated by quite a bevy of box-seat holders—guests of the coach—who keep calling key players over for autographs. But an ordinary autograph won't do. They won't let a man just sign his name and hurry back to the job; no—they command him first to fill out a 10-page questionnaire.

So I say, we need to keep the battle-front backfield right in there, but while I don't want to be nasty, yet I can't believe our home-front effort would be impeded if we dispensed with the services of that horny-handed son of toil—Madam Perkins. Likewise, I think the home-front team would be able to score more often without the box-seat benedictions of the three H's — Hopkins, Ickes, and Wallace.

What our Nation needs is a President who will decide each pertinent issue on the basis of how his decision will help to win the war quickly. Too many issues are today being decided on the basis of their effect upon large masses of votes. It is time for us to fight this war with every fiber in our national body. Let's unleash the full power of the home-front team.

The second thing of which we Republicans must convince the voters is that we can do better at creating jobs in the post-war period. There is no party issue on the need for jobs—enough of them for all who want to work and at wages which will make and keep available an American standard of living. The issue is not whether jobs will be needed. It is how they will be supplied.

We know that Mr. Roosevelt will promise jobs, but we know they will be government-made jobs, W. P. A. jobs, leading directly toward state socialism. And we know, too, that those are not the kind of

jobs people want. You can't make me believe that our young men are fighting their hearts out on the battle fronts for "good ol' W. P. A.' Of course they're not. They're out there fighting to get a nasty job over with just as quickly as possible so they can come back home and have a fair chance to realize their ambitions, realize them by virtue of their own initiative and skill and determination.

The New Deal is expecting Federal bureaucracy and the United States Treasury to produce post-war jobs. That is not the place to look for post-war employment. If this Nation had relied upon bureaucracy for its energy and ingenuity, it would have remained an insignificant seaboard nation; its imagination would have been dwarfed, its habits wasteful, and its people nearsighted. Most certainly it would not have become the custodian of the world's hope. The Republican Party must make it plain that it will harness bureaucracy and unharness America.

We should bring about a change in the working atmosphere of this Nation. Right now, even with all the cohesive power of patriotism to hold us together, we find great blocs of our people bewildered and divided. Through its habitual contempt for industrial management, the present administration has kindled a holocaust of hatreds and jealousies. Industrial leaders are mad at the Government and they're disgusted with labor.

Leaders of labor are likewise jealous and hateful toward employers and industrial management generally. Meanwhile, men in the ranks of labor are, in many cases, afraid of their own leaders. They have more and more trouble convincing themselves they are not being used as political pawns, and they can't help wondering if a lack of moderation won't bring painful retribution in the days of peace. This bitter confusion results from nothing but the administration's refusal to give this Nation a definite and fair labor policy. This Nation today has no labor policy. It's more than a disgrace; it's shameful disaster. Intermittently chucked under the chin and socked on the chin, organized labor still can't figure out whether it is the sweetheart of F. D. R. or an outcast of Perkins' Flat.

Men suspicious of each other, men jealous of each other, men who hate each other, do not make good team mates. We need good team mates now, and we are going to need good team mates here in the United States when this war is done if we are going to have full and genuine employment. It remains for Republicans to give capital and labor a chance to trust each other, to respect each other, and to appreciate the talents of each other.

If our doctrine of individual enterprise dies, it will be because employers and employees did not have a decent chance to keep it alive, and I have concluded that there are persons in governmental administrative offices today who want it to die.

We Republicans can say right out that we are going to be friendly to industry. We can reduce these high, punishing tax rates. We can stop this silly, hamstringing regulation of the men who have "get up and go" enough to get ahead. We can invite money to come out of hiding and go to work—go to work creating jobs. Hope for profit is still the greatest stimulus to production and we must not black out that hope.

To win in 1944, as I have said, Republicans must convince the voters that a Republican victory will speed the winning of the war and, secondly, that it will help to insure full employment afterward. The third point Republicans must drive home is that Republican leadership stands ready, willing, and able to place the United States in cooperation with other nations for the purpose of avoiding future world wars.

Paramount with all is the desire for enduring peace. We once sought it alone and unarmed and we failed miserably. We can stagger under the weight of arms and again seek it alone. Or we can carry potent arms and seek it in the company of others. We Republicans should favor the latter course, and we must convince the voters that we mean what we said at Mackinac Island last September.

Because the attainment of world peace is fraught with difficulties which defy the best minds, we are tempted to brand it as an impossible objective. We must not for one moment submit to this temptation. World peace must remain clearly before us as an ultimate goal. With it is bound up a vital moral question of right and wrong. Abraham Lincoln, convinced that slavery was wrong, won its abolition. He did not abandon his objective simply because the way was bitter and bloody. The Saviour, Himself, convinced that the way of the cross was right, did not shrink and turn back simply because the price was too high for ordinary men.

In the years ahead small wars may sometimes be necessary to avoid larger ones, and when such times come we must not hesitate. Never again must we permit ourselves to become so soft that we have no choice but hesitation. The early use of force in Manchukuo might have averted the terrible war now sweeping the entire Pacific. The quick use of force in the Saar Valley might have obviated the present European horror.

As we keep our eyes on the ideal of world peace we must be realistic enough to know that such a goal is not won in a few brief years, nor won free for nothing. Sometimes it will be necessary for the company of nations whose aim is peace to give up some of their national desires. We shall recognize that we, as a member of that company, must be ready to give our share.

In the pursuit of this supreme ideal, we must be honest with our own people. The commitments we make with other nations will be made out in the open, in the plain light of day, for all to see. There is now too much secrecy; too much star chamber; too much chance for deception and sleight-of-hand. The people of the United States are soft-hearted but they are not soft-headed. They don't want America sold out. Rather than risk a sell-out, they would again go isolationist. We Americans know that the United States alone is not going to write the charter. We are realistic enough to respect the prerogatives of Mr. Churchill, Mr. Stalin, Mr. Chiang, and the peoples for whom they speak. I think our people know that the problems of world organization must be refined through the course of years, and not at one fell swoop. Let Republicans, then, make clear they respect the intelligence and understanding of their fellow countrymen by trusting them with their own destiny.

I have said that, to win in 1944, we must convince the voters that Republican leadership will speed the winning of the war, insure full employment, and cooperate with other nations to maintain peace.

We can win this year. We must win. We must win in order to again have unity and coordinated leadership in this Nation. We must win in order to reestablish the American system of government, in order that people will have something solid to work for—to fight for—to die for. We must win in order that future generations will not blame us for throwing away their heritage. We must win in order to make sure that we will not become permanent slaves of a Federal bureaucracy.

To do this the Republican Party must plead, in the words of the poet:

"God give us men, a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who love **honor;** men who will **not** lie."

Address by Bishop Bruce B. Baxter at Funeral Services for the Late Senator McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have just returned from distant Oregon, where with other members of the special committee of the Senate, I went to attend the funeral services for our late lamented colleague, Senator Charles L. McNary.

Bishop Bruce R. Baxter, of the Methodist Church, conducted the services in the beautiful State capitol of Oregon, and grieving citizens from every section of the State crowded the hall of the State house of representatives and every other available space in and about the building.

Bishop Baxter's remarks on that sad occasion were so appropriate and his expressed philosophy so consoling that I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the CONGESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CHARLES L. MCNARY

"May the magnitude of our loss be the measure of our consolation." This personal tribute comes out of 10 years' acquaintance with Senator McNary in which I came to know him and deeply to admire him. As a former dean of Willamette University Law School, he gave me invaluable counsel throughout my presidency of the University. He was always proud of those years when he was dean at Willamette and scattered across the country are the men who got a higher conception of the law because he gave it to them. Out of my acquaintance comes the clear understanding that he would deplore extravagant praise and adulation. He was genuinely a modest man. How many really modest men do you know? He never exploited himself. Senator McNary always kept as far in the background as possible. He made few speeches, but his was a tremendous influence. For 27 years he served in the United States Senate. For 11 years he has been minority leader in the Senate. Just previous to his passing his party unanimously reconfirmed him as minority leader of the Senate, which indicated its continued confidence in him and the expectation that he would speedily resume his duties. He was the Republican Vice Presidential candidate in 1940. He was genuinely a statesman rather than a politician. He was a power for good in his Nation.

Although we shall not fail him by extravagance in speech, those who are here to do him honor would miss that which rightfully belongs to them did we not reflect together upon certain of his qualities and characteristics. As we consider these, at the same time may we look frankly within to see just what could be said of us as honestly as is said of him.

First of all was his unswerving devotion to duty. He stayed by his work when others rested. He stayed by that work when the interests of health required that he also rest. He was tireless. Early morning found him in his office working through endless

details. Then came the Senate session. This was followed by committee meetings. Usually he would take work home to be cared for late into the night. Early in the morning the same round began again. This went on year after year. Up until the last day of his earthly life he kept in touch with his office and the affairs of the Senate. Daily he read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Many of his letters he wrote with his own hand when a lesser man would have demanded complete release from all responsibility. To the very last day he was at work for his State and his Nation. Whenever Congress adjourned, Senator McNary longed to return to his lovely Salem home. Usually duty held him in Washington. He believed that "duties are ours—events are God's." He soon learned that the reward of doing one's duty is finding another duty to be performed. Weak people forever talk of their rights. Strong people say little about it, but think of their responsibilities. He knew the Bill of Rights. He also knew the "bill of responsibilities." Senator McNary was a war casualty as truly as any boy who falls in battle. He has placed a gold star upon Oregon's service flag. He died serving. Now let us ask ourselves just how unselfishly and how unreservedly we serve?

Next we remember his integrity. If we don't have that, we don't have much—we don't have anything. You could count on him in small and in great matters. Whatever he said he would do, he did, and that is all there was to it. Emerson said, "The integrity of your own mind is sacred." Dr. Frederick B. Harris, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church in Washington and Chaplain of the Senate, said of him in the Memorial Service held in the Senate Chamber, "For him party loyalty was ever but an altar of devotion in the greater temple of his undefiled patriotism. He was one who held his convictions firmly, yet without questioning the sincerity of others whose quest of truth led them along other paths. He was one who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation. The sanctified wisdom and the pure humanity made his radiant personality as the candle of the Lord." As a tuning fork catches the note and carries it on, so did others catch the note of fidelity and integrity from him and they in turn, passed it on. In the light of this set of standards and experience what measure of integrity do we possess and what do we pass on to others?

Many men have spoken to me the last few days of his love of people. You can't deceive at this point. Either you love people or you don't love them. There is no halfway ground. He genuinely liked folks. He got on with people without compromising his own convictions. He really believed in them. A leader in a democracy had better believe in people. Perhaps his refusal to contest the election in early days when he was defeated for the Oregon Supreme Court by a single vote was related to this conviction. This defeat really sent him to the United States Senate by the appointment of Governor Withycombe. I know many individuals who were sorely disappointed and were without prospects of success, who were helped and whose future achievements were due to his unselfish aid. As you think of those who loved their fellowmen, his name like that of Abou Ben Adhem led all the rest. Elihu Root once said that he wished most of all to be known for distinguished courtesy. Senator MCNARY measured up to that ideal. His dealings with people were characterized by his distinguished courtesy. There was never anything cheap or condescending about it. He never held spite or malice for any man. When people had treated him unfairly, he would say, "Oh, he isn't so bad," or "We just don't understand him." He loved people.

Then I would speak of his love for his home. Those who knew the heart of the man knew him in his home with its orchards, lawns, and stream, and a house which was a home because mutual respect and love dwelt there. His national duties continually took him away from that home. At this point he paid a frightfully heavy price. I have long been impressed by the fact that here in Salem scarcely anyone ever spoke of him as Senator McNary. Only a few ever said Charles McNary. He was always Charley McNary. That speaks volumes for the attitude of his own people, the ones who knew him best. He loved to come home. And now at last he has come home. What a heritage belongs to Mrs. McNary and Charlotte. I would be remiss did I not speak of the devoted care and attention and protection and love which Mrs. McNary gave him always and particularly in these last difficult weeks.

An eastern philosopher said, "Death is not extinguishing the light. It is putting out the lamp because the dawn has come." His light has not gone out. It has gone on. Just what is it that comes to pass after the incident which we call death? How many there are who are asking this question in a war year at a time when the figure of death as a turnstile through which men pass one by one has been changed to the gate of a great war industry at the time of changing the shifts.

We cannot prove immortality as one proves a theorem in mathematics, but that is true of the deepest values. Just how would you go about it to prove identity or personality or mother love? Science says man may live forever; philosophy, that he wants to live forever; ethics, that he ought to live forever; Christianity, that he does live forever. Science gives us a hint of it. We accept as axiomatic the principle of the conservation of energy. Ours is a universe to which nothing can be added nor from which can anything be subtracted. Nothing can be lost out. This is a universe with plan and purpose. It is not a duoverse. It is not a multiverse. You could not have reason and logic and sense if it were so careful of all except the very highest, personality, which was made in the image of God. Death is not the master of the house. It is the porter at the gate of the King's palace to usher us into the presence of the King.

Immortality is not something which is granted at the end of life. It is an achievement. We are sharing it now as truly as we shall share in it a century hence, for life is a continuous stream. The incident of death does not break that continuous flow. Immortality thus becomes less a problem as it becomes more an experience. Emerson said that the best way to be sure of immortality is to begin to live like an immortal. Of what use would immortality be to a man who had never learned how to use an hour well? Augustine said, "Join thyself to the eternal and thou shalt become eternal." The Scripture puts it, "He hath set eternity in our hearts."

We remind ourselves of the worth of the soul. It is far too valuable to be lost. Here is something which deserves to be immortal. It is not that a man has a soul as much as that man is a soul. Something important is begun here which is finished hereafter. Human life promises far more than can be attained here. Dr. Wilson, dying with Scott at the South Pole, left a note for his wife, "God still has something for us to do together." The Book says, "Thy soul shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God." A life worth living is worth living forever. Therefore, it is not true that a dead man lives again, but that a living man never dies.

As we approach the Easter season, we claim the experience of Jesus. In the triumph of Easter morning Jesus came back from the dead saying, "Rejoice." Our confidence is in Him who conquered death and who said, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

Finally we rest back upon the character of God; upon that which God is like. We cannot be where God is not. He is primarily like a Father. If He does not care for the individual, He is less than God. If He does not enter into the sufferings of men, He is less than God. We cannot conceive of a non-suffering God in a suffering world. Therefore, in times of sorrow and loss we cry out as a child cries in the darkness, "Is anybody there?" We hear no empty echo of our own despairing cry. From the understanding heart of a loving Father God comes the answer of assurance. "The best of all, God is with us." "Life is good, for God contrives it. Death is good, for man survives it." Death is, therefore, like turning over the pages of a book written by an author we have learned to love and trust.

Hidden far away in the depths of the earth is a strange drawing power which men call gravitation. It is a power over men's bodies to hold them to the earth. Far above the earth, hidden in the heart of a loving Father God, is another strange drawing power, not upon men's bodies to hold them down but upon men's souls to lift them up. After that which we call death occurs, that strange drawing power lays hold of the liberated spirit to lift it to itself that where He is we shall be also. Into the hands and heart of that loving Father God we commend the spirit of our friend.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address dealing with national health insurance, delivered by me before the Queens County Medical Society, at Jamaica, N. Y., on Tuesday, February 29, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Queens County Medical Society, I am glad of this opportunity to talk to the physicians of Queens County, and I appreciate the honor of the invitation you have accorded me.

It is a long distance from my Western State of Montana to your seaboard county, I understand, however, that we have some problems in common. I understand that although Queens is a part of the metropolis of New York, you have your semirural or suburban—if not wholly rural—areas, too. Your so-called semirural areas are not as extensive as our great wide stretches in Montana, but there are sections of Queens, I am told, in which it is not always easy to get hospital care—in which people have trouble in obtaining a doctor's services—the same difficulties which on a larger scale confront many of our citizens of Montana. I am sure also that the people of Queens, like people elsewhere in the United States, are not unacquainted with the problem of paying for modern medical care.

I strongly believe, as Dr. Louis Bauer does, that those of us in Washington who are concerned with legislation which affects the medical profession should talk these matters over with the doctors as often as we can. We should get our information about what each

of us is saying and planning from first-hand contacts rather than from what we see in the papers—or in pamphlet handouts from propaganda groups. We all know how often newspapers misquote, distort, or misinterpret; we all know how often pamphleteers misrepresent. Let us have no false or equivocal answers to these questions which must be faced. Let's have the facts and permit no barriers of misunderstanding between us.

You may wonder how I came to be so interested in the subject of medical-care insurance. The legislative work of the Senate of the United States is, as you all know, conducted through a system of committees. The Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, frequently handles legislation concerned with health. Several years ago, as chairman of the subcommittee appointed to study this subject, I presided at extensive hearings on the Wagner health bill of 1939 (S. 1620) which proposed to inaugurate a national health program. A vast amount of testimony was taken at that time which showed a serious lack of medical care suffered by large sections of our population. The following year hearings on the national hospital bill (S. 3230) demonstrated that there was wide-spread need for increased hospital and related facilities in rural and other areas.

Thus, I had a rare opportunity to become familiar with country wide health conditions and health needs. I became convinced that only through adequate national legislation could we make medical care really and readily accessible to tens of millions of our people. Many physicians have been slow to recognize this need, because they see only the people who do receive medical attention and they do not know about those many cases who fail to get proper care. Nevertheless, the evidence taken at our hearings is overwhelming proof that there is a high economic barrier in this country between the average American citizen and the profession and facilities engaged in furnishing medical service. Altogether too many people are denied access to proper care. Millions of our people cannot afford to buy adequate modern diagnosis and treatment when illness comes unexpectedly, is very severe, or involves complex service. Too many go without medical care or delay too long in getting it. The American people do not want charity from a doctor or a hospital. They want to pay for the medical care they need. They know they can do so through a system of insurance.

In altogether too many places in the United States our citizens are getting a quality of medical care not much better than that which their parents or grandparents received. These places are meagerly supplied with hospitals or have none at all. Generally their physicians are elderly. These physicians do the best they can, but they are not equipped to give the kind of service which you who listen to me take for granted in this great metropolitan area. Young men have not been going in to take the places of these elderly doctors when they die or retire. They were not doing so before the war. They will not be inclined to do so after the war ends, unless they have some assurance that they can make a decent living and that they will have access to hospital and other facilities they have been trained to use. Such assurance they can have from a well-integrated insurance program, supplemented by a hospital building program.

It is not only in the rural sections that people do not get enough care or care of good enough quality. The inability to provide for medical care in their budgets prevents many people, even in the large cities, from obtaining the care they need. The doctors and the hospitals may be at hand, but many people cannot afford to pay fees which may appear to be fair and reasonable charges to others and they do not wish to seek charity. They wonder whether there isn't some way out of burdensome medical costs. They have been learning that a system of insurance offers a solution.

The unpredictability of the costs of medical care on an individual basis, the excessive costs from the individual or single family's standpoint, limits the extent to which people get care, prevents them from seeking care early, and is in large part responsible for many defects and disabilities such as the selective service examinations have recently revealed in our young men. The fear of sickness, with its attendant train of costs, is an ever-present specter in every household except those of the well-to-do and the wealthy. If you doubt this, try the experiment of concealing your identity as a doctor and asking this question of people in low- or moderate-income groups. The disastrous effects on a family's economic solvency of severe or long-continued illness is well known to every welfare agency.

Insurance against medical costs is an old and well-established American practice. It has been practiced for decades, in many places, by large and small industrial organizations, by the railroads, the mines, by mutual-benefit associations, by fraternal and cooperative groups. Now, even some medical societies are sponsoring voluntary medical-care plans. Dr. Fishbein who is widely recognized as your national spokesman, now speaks in favor of voluntary insurance, although until recently, as you know, he and your official organization frowned upon prepayment methods of paying for medical care.

Voluntary plans, however, cannot and will not suffice. European countries went through a voluntary stage and found that they had to come to compulsory insurance. Our own experience in the United States is the same. Voluntary plans do not have and cannot hope to have a large enough coverage—a wide enough spread of risks and costs. Commonly, they are too expensive to be within the means of the people who most need insurance against the costs of medical care. Most of them are available to only limited groups of people. Many are so hedged about with restrictions that the people most likely to be sick and incur large medical bills are those least likely to be accepted. Though the prepayment plans which provide medical benefits have had about 50 years of development, they cover only about 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 people, that is only about 3 to 4 percent of our population.

Even the unusually successful hospital service plans cover only about a tenth of our population. Moreover, the rate of growth in the older plans appears to be slowing down. Even if the Blue Cross plans continued to get as many members each year for the next 10 years as they did in their very best year, at the end of such a 10-year period about three-quarters of our population would still be without insurance protection against the costs of hospital care. So Blue Cross turns out to be a plan for the favored few.

Some physicians, I understand, are urging that if there must be compulsory insurance, it be limited to the lower income groups in our population. To do so, would be to come up against the same obstacle that has long been met in voluntary insurance—a reduction in the sperad of risks and costs and a reduction in the insurance funds which would either limit the services which could be provided or reduce the amounts which could be paid to doctors, hospitals, and other agencies providing service.

The people of this country want no poor-man's insurance system. That is the mistake some of the European countries made, and we do not want to repeat it. We have tried to learn from the experience of European and other foreign countries which have had long experience with health insurance. We have not, however, taken over any foreign system. Ours is an American system, for the American people, designed to fit our own American needs and circumstances.

Some of you have, no doubt, followed with much interest the developments in Great Britain. You probably know that they adopted health insurance in 1911, over the bitter opposition of the British Medical Association. But the system worked out well and the B. M. A. came around to endorse it. The B. M. A. acknowledged that the insurance system had improved the quality of medical care and had improved the doctors' incomes. When the B. M. A. criticizes their own health insurance, it is on the ground that it covers too few workers, doesn't apply to the family dependents, and that it doesn't provide specialist, laboratory, hospital, and other services. In short, the B. M. A. says it wants more, not less, health insurance for the British people.

You know that Sir William Beveridge, in his world-famous report, recommended those improvements and expansions in the British health insurance which the B. M. A., among others, have long recommended. More recently (see the British Medical Journal for October 30, 1943, and for January 15, 1944), the B. M. A. adopted a constructive set of proposals, outlining the desirable characteristics for the future of medical services. The B. M. A. has been holding conferences with the Ministry of Health. Less than 2 weeks ago (February 17, 1944), the British Government published its White Paper on this subject, proposing comprehensive health and medical services to be available to all, regardless of the individual patient's ability to pay. The British Government and the B. M. A. have agreed to consult together in order to work out the best possible plan.

It is interesting to note that in all essential principles on which such international comparisons can be made, the proposals of the B. M. A. and the British Government—especially the proposals to protect the practice of medicine and safeguard quality of service—are in agreement with the principles followed in our bill.

Now, to return to our own field. I have said we do not want to repeat the mistakes of European health insurance, with their poor-man's system of the past. Nor do our people want a hand-out from the Government. They want to pay out of their own earnings for the medical care and hospitalization they need. They believe—and we who are sponsoring the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill believe—that they can do this through a system of medical care and hospitalization insurance integrated into the national social-insurance system.

Now, I want to turn to the bill itself. In order not to make this too long a discussion, I will confine my remarks to a few main provisions, especially title IX of the bill, the medical care and hospitalization section, since this is the one in which you are most interested.

From one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five million people would be covered—depending upon the number engaged in gainful work and how many of the needy and poor and other groups are brought within the system by voluntary compacts. I have read criticisms of this extension of benefits of the present old-age and survivors' insurance to groups not now covered—criticisms which imply that this extension is dangerous and undesirable. To me it is one of the virtues of the bill that agricultural workers, small business men, farmers, employees of nonprofit organizations, domestic servants, and others now excluded from old-age and survivors' insurance will no longer be discriminated against. Their social-security needs are quite as great as the needs of the groups covered under the present act. I have already mentioned the wisdom, from an actuarial and financial standpoint, of making the coverage as nearly Nation-wide as possible. It is on this basis that we are able to get these low average costs.

A single premium from employees and employers, or from those in business for them-

selves, will cover all forms of social insurance provided under our bill. The premiums for all purposes will, it is true, be larger than those paid at present, but this will be no hardship because for the additional contributions there will be additional benefits: liberalized old-age benefits, more adequate unemployment benefits, cash benefits to make up for wage loss during periods of temporary or permanent disability, maternity cash benefits for employed women. All these are in addition to the medical care and hospitalization benefits for which 3 percent of earnings are specifically earmarked. The premiums are calculated so that the people will get their money's worth.

The medical benefits include general practitioners' services, specialists' services, X-ray and laboratory services for nonhospitalized patients, hospitalization up to 30 days in any 1 year (to be extended to 90 days when funds permit). We believe these provisions cover the most essential services which can be provided nationally. Dental and nursing care may be added later after a 2-year study to determine ways and means.

Funds to stimulate and support research and medical education, undergraduate and postgraduate, are also included. It is only proper that the insured people who stand to benefit so much from advances in medical science and improvements in medical education, should contribute at least a small share of their premiums to pay for these important activities.

Now I want to discuss a few criticisms of the bill. By this procedure we can see what the bill provides and how it works. The National Physicians Committee pamphlets and other literature directed against the bill, and many of the speeches and editorials which have been based upon the outpourings of this committee have created many false impressions. I'd like to take up a few of the more flagrant examples:

1. It is charged that patients are to be assigned to doctors.

This is nonsense. The bill guarantees each insured person the right to choose his own doctor and to make a change if he becomes dissatisfied.

The critics of the bill have—I fear, deliberately—misinterpreted one special section of title IX in order to make this false statement. The assignment of patients to physicians in this special section applies only in areas where doctors have chosen the per-capita method of payment. It applies only to patients who have not taken the trouble to choose a physician, even after notification that they should do so, and to the occasional patients refused by the physicians they select. Under the per-capita method of payment, doctors are paid an average monthly amount, based on the number of insured persons on their lists, both sick and well, in the area. To receive all the money due them, doctors must be paid for all the insured persons in the area, and, therefore, every insured person's name must be down on some doctor's list. This is a provision to assign dollars, not patients.

2. It is charged that physicians will be "regimented" and "private practice abolished."

These are trick words and phrases, used to arouse animosity against the bill by those who may be unfamiliar with its actual provisions.

The bill guarantees every physician who has a State license the right to accept patients under the insurance plan, and also to reject patients who choose him. Physicians who prefer to do so may limit their practice to noninsured persons or to persons who prefer to purchase their medical care privately (that is, without making use of their insurance benefits) or they may combine insurance and noninsurance practice. Nothing whatever in the bill prohibits that.

The method of payment of the general practitioners in each local area is explicitly left to the choice of a majority of the physicians who enter the system in each area (fee-for service, per capita, salary, or a combination of these methods). Hospitals, group clinics, prepayment, and industrial plans in each local area would also have the right to choose the method of payment, regardless of the choice made by the general practitioners in the area.

3. It is charged that the Surgeon General would have complete and arbitrary power—would become a "virtual gauleiter of American medicine."

These critics minimize the importance of the advisory council which is set up under the bill. That council is authorized to advise only and is not given the power to enforce their recommendations. The council is to consist of persons selected from panels of names submitted by professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical services, medical education, and hospitals, and by other interested groups. No administrator would dare to act contrary to the advice of a council of such a character on any matter of importance unless he had adequate grounds on which he could defend his position publicly.

The Social Security Board also has the power to act as a brake on the authority of the Surgeon General. Final contracts cannot be made without its approval. The check on finances is in the hands of the Board, a nonpartisan body. Its members and the Surgeon General have term appointments which do not coincide with Presidential terms. Congress and the people who pay for medical care through their contributions will also have a lively interest in the type of administration provided.

If our critics would prefer administration by a three-man board instead of by the Surgeon General, why have they not said so? We have asked for constructive criticism of this type.

4. It is charged that enactment of this bill would result in "deterioration of medical practice."

I have already pointed out—and I am sure you doctors will admit the truth of my statements—that the quality of medical care the country over is very uneven at present. I have been assured by very competent and distinguished physicians that the provisions of title IX, far from resulting in deterioration of medical care, should do much to stimulate its progressive improvement.

Removal of the economic barrier between doctor and patient would mean that people would seek the doctor earlier; "too little and too late" need no longer apply to the provisions of medical care. The provisions in title IX for consultation and specialists' services, hospitalization, and laboratory benefits, on the recommendation of the attending physician, should do much to improve the quality of medical care. The practicing physician should be able to do a job more satisfactory to himself and more beneficial to his patient when the state of a patient's pocketbook no longer determines the kind or amount of care his physician is able to give him.

The "Guiding Principles and Provisions for Administration" in the bill set down very definite policies for the Surgeon General to follow. He is instructed to encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished by ensuring adequate payment to doctors, by aiding them to take refresher courses and to carry on post-graduate study, and by encouraging coordination among the services. The grants-in-aid for research and medical education should also stimulate advances in medical science and improvements in professional training which should result in a higher quality of care.

5. It is charged that vast sums of money would be expended. The critics imply that funds to be allocated for medical care would be money that our people would not otherwise be called upon to pay out.

These critics appear to forget that medical care has always cost money, that vast sums are now spent in the United States for this purpose—about $4,000,000,000 for all forms of medical care—and more than $3,000,000,000 by the people themselves in direct expenditures.

The funds raised by insurance premiums and allocated to the medical care and hospitalization program (the equivalent of about 1½ percent of earnings from employees and 1½ percent from employers, or 3 percent from those who are self-employed) will not, for the most part, be new money taken out of people's pockets. In general, it will be the same money they would spend on the average anyway; but under our bill they would spend this money for the benefits provided in title IX—spread over time and averaged among large numbers of individuals in reasonable amounts. As a result, no one would have to pay out a lot when he is ill—the time when he can least afford it—or go without care because he lacks the large amount of money needed to pay for the medical care he immediately requires.

Some additional funds will, it is true, be raised, but these will be used to pay for the additional services which will be requested and supplied under this insurance system.

As for the criticism that the insurance fund would be used to take over medical schools or hospitals, that, of course, is all nonsense. There is nothing whatever in the bill that would do these things or would permit them. Medical service will be expanded and the public good will be served.

In writing the bill, every effort was made to meet the objections raised against the 1939 bill, and to incorporate suggestions made by critics of that bill, medical as well as nonmedical. The objections to 51 varieties of medical care which might have come to pass had the 1939 bill become law were remembered, and a national system is now advocated in S. 1161. For example, section 1111, which makes provision for funds for professional education and research, was included as a result of specific criticism by the medical profession of this lack in the earlier bill. The details concerning hospitalization benefits follow the points on which there was agreement at a joint meeting of representatives of the American Hospital Association, the Protestant Hospital Association, and the Catholic Hospital Association with members of the staff of the Social Security Board.

Of course, we do not consider our bill perfect. Bills are usually improved as a result of criticisms expressed during discussions and hearings. But criticism to be helpful must be constructive. I see nothing constructive in the material put out by the National Physicians' committee. I see nothing constructive in the attacks on the bill in many medical editorials and public addresses. I see nothing constructive in the attitude of those individual physicians and county medical societies who have swallowed wholesale the material being spread across the country by the National Physicians' committee, without apparently analyzing the bill for themselves to see whether the criticisms and accusations were in fact correct.

Proposals for State health insurance systems—instead of one national system—always appear when it looks as though serious attention is to be given to a national system. Most such State proposals are only red herrings. However, we should take serious notice of the studies now being made in Rhode Island. That State is the only one which has a cash sickness insurance system in actual operation. It has been paying sickness wage-loss benefits since April 1943. Early in January 1944 the Governor recommended to the State legislature that they should also provide hospitalization insurance. Medical leaders, however, proposed that the new plans should not be limited to hospital benefits only, but should consider comprehensive medical and hospital services. In accordance

with their suggestion, the Governor has appointed a council to study the whole question. It will be interesting to see what comes out of this recent development in Rhode Island and to observe whether they work out something better or even as good as the proposals in our bill for a national program.

I have reason to know that not all physicians are in sympathy with the position taken and the methods used by the National Physicians Committee and the Journal of the American Medical Association to prevent any objective discussion of the merits of our bill. Letters that I have received, views expressed in some State and county medical societies, and editorials in local medical bulletins indicate strong disapproval of the negative position taken by the A. M. A. Newspaper editorials are becoming increasingly critical of these destructive attitudes. Let me quote from just two. According to the conservative Chicago Journal of Commerce, January 4, 1944:

"Every nation in the world has some variety of health insurance, indicating a universal need—realism suggests that we do not dismiss the proposal merely as a New Deal innovation nor berate it as ever-increasing bureaucracies and Government controls as the Chamber of Commerce of New York State does."

Said the Louisville (Ky.) Times December 3, 1943:

"What has happened in the debate over the bill is that its foes have been so prolific with smear words like 'political medicine,' 'dictatorship,' 'totalitarianism,' 'socialized medicine' that emotion has replaced analysis."

I have spent much time discussing the destructive criticism showered on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill by physicians and some who profess to speak for them. There has been constructive criticism from doctors, too. I have received many letters commending our stand and the purposes of our bill. Perhaps the first was the letter of congratulations from Dr. John Peters, secretary of the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, received shortly after the bill was introduced. More recently, a report on the bill issued by this committee has offered constructive suggestions for its improvement.

The Physicians Forum—and some of you may be members of this organization—recently published a discerning analysis of the bill and made constructive criticisms and suggestions. Dr. Ernst Boas, chairman of the Forum's executive committee, calls the bill "the most realistic legislation yet proposed for improving the quality and distribution of medical service on a national scale" and asserts that "compulsory health insurance is the only practical solution for the medical needs of the American people."

The science of medicine has made tremendous strides forward. The distribution of medical care—its availability—has not kept pace. The public has become educated to know a great deal about what it can expect from modern science, modern medicine. It wants that service; it wants more than it has been receiving at a price within its reach. It wants health services without burdensome costs. It wants medical care without having to take a pauper's oath or charity—whether from a public agency or from the doctor or the hospital. It is willing to pay for all the medical care it needs. It is able to pay for it through social insurance.

There has been a great deal of discussion during recent months on post-war planning. Business groups are pushing for protection of their interests in the period after the war. What are we doing to help the people themselves—the common people on whom the country relies so heavily during wartime? They are the ones who will feel first the dislocations and readjustments which will follow the close of the war. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill provides an opportunity for constructive help to these common people of whom Lincoln said there were so many. The provisions of our bill will help them to help themselves. Inclusion of medical care is essential in a well-rounded program of social security.

The public and we—your elected Representatives—ask you to face the matter realistically and to assist in giving the American people an orderly and systematic method of collecting the funds required to assure them necessary care in sickness and to assure their physicians and hospitals reasonable remuneration. You can aid us in working out a bill which will give the medical profession every needed protection. We want your constructive criticism and help in meeting this need for an effective program of national health.

Usurpation of Power by the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "How Long Shall We Submit to the Usurpation of Power by the President," delivered by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the Republican Editorial Association, Indianapolis, Ind., on March 11, 1944. The address was delivered before an audience of approximately 1,000 persons, and enthusiastically received.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, since I went to the Senate in 1939, I have become more and more concerned with the tendency of Congress to delegate its legislative powers to the Executive, and even more concerned about the assumption of powers and the claim of powers by the Executive which are authorized neither by the Constitution nor by legislation. All of our lives we have heard of the division of powers prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. It has become such a commonplace that any discussion of it is regarded as elementary and uninteresting. People assume, because they see a President, a Congress, and a Supreme Court of the United States all in existence that the division of powers is fundamental and unimpaired. But today it is impaired, and unless we change the course we are pursuing the independent organization of the courts and the legislature will become a mere shell.

The division of powers was no doctrinaire theory. It was devised deliberately for the purpose of securing the permanence of liberty and democracy. The founders of this Government knew that every republic of the past had deteriorated into a tyranny, an empire, or a dictatorship because all the powers of the state were gradually concentrated in one man. The powers granted to him for temporary or emergency periods were never returned to the people. Nothing is so characteristic of a totalitarian state today as the uniting of the legislative and executive functions in one man with control also over the judges. If one man can make the laws, can execute the laws, and can judge the violations of the law, liberty cannot long exist. We may still vote once in 4 years, but the election becomes a mere plebiscite where the only vote is "Ja." The very essence of individual freedom is equal justice under a rule of law, a law to which every man shall be subject and which no executive can modify.

All legislative powers are granted by the Constitution to Congress. Only the executive power is vested in the President, and the essence of his power is found in section 3 of article II, where it is said that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed," that is, the laws made by Congress.

I. CONGRESS IS ABDICATING LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Unfortunately, Congress during the past 20 years has come more and more to delegate authority to make these laws. It has given boards and commissions and the President himself authority to issue rules and regulations having the effect of law. It has created a whole theory of administrative law, eagerly approved by the present Supreme Court. For a while Congress prescribed the principles to be followed by the administrative rules and regulations, but wider and wider authority has gradually been given. This has been due, first, to the complexity of the problems of government in a nation of 135,000,000, people. It has been due, second, to the laziness of Congress. It is far easier to say "These are the general principles we approve" than it is to sit down and work out the details of legislation dealing with a complicated subject. Finally, it is due to the deliberate desire of many administrative agencies to acquire arbitrary power.

Thus we find in the legislation dealing with the Federal Communications Commission a grant of power found by the Supreme Court to be practically unlimited over the radio stations and the broadcasting chains. The opinion last year even implies that the Commission can determine the character of the programs and the broadcasts. Whether that arbitrary power is exercised or not, its very existence has colored and is coloring today the tone of every professional broadcaster in the United States. It is in essence an attack on that most vital bulwark of a free people, the right of free speech.

In the renegotiation law Congress has granted power to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to determine, without limit on their arbitrary judgment, what profits shall be deemed to be reasonable. The effect is practically to delegate to these administrative officers the vital power to enact and enforce a supplemental system of taxation on approximately half of the taxpayers of the United States. The people strongly desire that no one shall make excessive profits, but the question what profits are excessive should be determined by law—by uniform rule applying to every war contractor and subcontractor. It becomes the taking of property without due process of law.

It is said that in dealing with complicated problems it is necessary to change regulations more often than is possible through legislation. I believe the advantage of constant change is greatly overestimated, and that a definite rule upon which all men can rely is an essential of real freedom. Certainly the delegation of legislative power, if carried to extremes, becomes a complete abdication of legislative power and a nullification of the Bill of Rights.

II. POWER IS USURPED BY EXECUTIVE

But a condition exists today which is even more dangerous than the delegation of power. More and more as Congress disagrees with executive wishes there is developing a determination on the part of the executive agencies to usurp power for which there is no legislative authority whatever, or legislative authority intended for some entirely different purpose. More and more I see a strong

belief on the part of the executive agencies that they know better what the law ought to be than Congress itself; that Congress and the people are too dumb to understand. More and more there is a tendency to by-pass Congress and circumvent the expressed wishes of the people of the United States in Congress assembled.

There was such a tendency even before the war. Many of the New Deal agencies were set up without specific legislative authority, notably the N. Y. A., the W. P. A., and in part the National Resources Planning Board. Usually after these were established they were indirectly confirmed by appropriations, but their powers were seldom spelled out and the whole process afforded a constant invitation to new Federal activities of which Congress had never heard. Federal corporations were formed which Congress did not authorize, and were used to by-pass the customary requirements of appropriation.

But the greatest usurpations have occurred since the beginning of the war. The new dealers steadily propagated the theory that the existence of war conferred unlimited powers on the President both as President and Commander in Chief. The Attorney General and many other New Deal lawyers assert that the war gives the President power over the civilian population. Volumes of executive orders have been issued, and most of them begin with the words, "Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered."

The most extreme assertion of this claim was made by the President in his inflation message to Congress on September 7, 1942. He there asked Congress to give him authority to fix prices, salaries, wages, and profits by the 1st of October, and said, "In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act. At the same time that farm prices are stabilized wages can, and will, be stabilized also. This I will do." In short, he boldly asserted the right to legislate by Presidential decree in a manner which would affect millions of daily transactions throughout the United States, participated in by everyone of 130,000,000 civilians. I was one of those who always supported the enactment of price-control and stabilization legislation. As a matter of fact, I proposed legislation to stabilize wages in December 1941, at which time it was killed by the opposition of the President.

But no real American can fail to be alarmed by the claim that in wartime the President of the United States can take over the functions of Congress and legislate without consulting the Representatives of the people. This seems to me a doctrine so revolutionary and so dangerous to the existence of democratic government in the United States as to disqualify from executive position the man who believes in that doctrine. There is nothing in the Constitution which gives the President any more power over the civilian population in time of war than he has in time of peace, except those which derive from the fact that he has the power to direct the operations of the Army and the Navy. This may authorize control of civilians in combat or camp areas, or in case of invasion, but certainly not on the ground they are engaged in war work as practically everyone is. Outside the military field, in dealing with the civilian population and its ordinary day-to-day affairs, the Constitution gives the President no greater power in time of war than at any other time. Article I, section 1 of the Constitution says, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." It does not add to that section the words "except in time of war." The powers of Congress may cover a wider field in time of war, but there is not the shadow of authority for the claim that they are transferred to the President. Other claims are seriously advanced by responsible officials. I heard a member of the War Labor Board maintain that in case of a strike the President might draft any striker into the Army, whether he was subject to draft under the Selective Service Act or not.

I cannot exaggerate the danger of this doctrine. If it is admitted for a moment, it can easily be stretched further to cover the period of the post-war emergency. We all remember how it was argued in 1933 that economic emergencies were as dangerous as war, and therefore justified the same use of the arbitrary powers of a commander in chief. From the immediate post-war period we can go on through a whole series of emergencies until we have established in this country an arbitrary one-man dictatorship. The emergency declared in 1933 has never been officially terminated and was used in 1943 to justify an illegal issue of currency. This is the process developed in many European countries, where the laws are made by executive decree, ukase, or directive. Government by the people will vanish from America.

It is true that the President did not proceed with his threat to set aside a law of Congress and enact the law himself, but to a considerable extent exactly that has been done in specific cases, and I want to refer to a number of instances.

In the first place, the President has set up a vast number of executive bureaus. There has been established a kind of overall management agency in the executive offices, known as the Office for Emergency Management. Within this agency, countless bureaus have been created, abolished and consolidated without even consulting Congress. Among these are the Board of War Communications, the National War Labor Board, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of War Information, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, and the War Relocation Authority. It is impossible for anyone to determine without a detailed investigation whether these boards have any legislative authority on which to act or not, and whether they are acting within that authority. Undoubtedly many emergency powers were conferred on the President, and he may exercise these powers through agents appointed by him. He may also transfer powers from other agencies. But I am quite certain that a study would show that many of these agencies are exercising powers which have no basis whatever.

We are often referred to the First War Powers Act, which authorizes the President to redistribute functions among executive agencies, and to utilize, coordinate, and consolidate executive agencies. Nothing in the act, however, authorizes the creation of a new agency or the abolition of an old one, or confers any powers on such an agency when it is created.

The War Manpower Commission today is issuing many orders for which there is no legislative authority whatsoever, relating to the manner in which men shall seek employers, and employers shall engage workers.

One of the Federal bureaus which is constantly striving to extend its power, with or without legislation, is the Federal Security Agency, which seems to be determined to federalize all unemployment compensation, in spite of the well-known opposition in Congress. On December 19, 1941, the President, in a telegram to the Governors of 48 States, demanded that the States turn over to the United States Employment Service all of their personnel, records, and facilities. The great emergency of Pearl Harbor was used to bypass Congress, and all of the Governors complied, although many stipulated that their personnel be returned after the war. It is at best doubtful whether the President had any authority to take over the State employment offices and the State employees. When the actual transfer was made the Director of the Federal Security Agency insisted on taking over not only the employees who were in the State employment offices but also those who were engaged in receiving claims for unemployment-compensation insurance. It was claimed that these functions were inseparable, although, as a matter of fact, they are conducted by different individuals, and, in many cases, by different offices. Of course, a serious problem will arise when a separation is again made, and it appears that the war situation has been deliberately used to accomplish a purpose disapproved by Congress and advance the cause of Federal unemployment compensation.

Before the passage of the Price Control Act, the Office of Price Administration was created, and Leon Henderson attempted to fix prices without authority of law.

Perhaps the greatest abuse of the First War Powers Act was the practical abolition of the tariff on imports into the United States. For many years there has been on the books a statute reading: "The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make emergency purchases of war material abroad: *Provided*, That when such purchases are made abroad this material shall be admitted free of duty." Of course this was merely intended to permit a naval vessel while abroad to buy its ship supplies without any danger that duty would have to be paid when the supplies were brought into American territory. But an executive order was issued, purporting to transfer this power to every department of the Government. Obviously it only applied to emergency purchases of war material for the Navy, but now even purchases for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which supplies many private industries with materials, are admitted free of duty. It is a general suspension of the tariff. I cannot but admire the brazen effrontery of the gentlemen who drew this Executive order.

Many instances of bureaucratic usurpation have come to my attention. The Surplus Commodities Corporation was authorized to buy agricultural surpluses and distribute them to the needy. This was extended to permit the free distribution of food to schools throughout the Nation for school lunches. Afterwhile there were no longer any surplus commodities. Thereupon the Surplus Commodities Corporation proceeded to pay the schools money as a subsidy for school lunches. The appropriation last year, I think, was over $50,000,000 for this purpose, certainly a purely local concern, and never authorized by Congress.

In the beginning of the war we appropriated money for assistance to States and local governments in the areas around camps and industrial plants for housing and necessary expansion of utilities. Under this act the Federal Works Agency, in order to carry out a Tugwellian plan in Puerto Rico for the consolidation of all power plants, proceeded to confiscate the private utility companies in Puerto Rico. Here was a case where the whole matter could be taken to court, and the court of appeals in Boston promptly nullified the proceedings. The difficulty in most of these cases is that no one can raise the issue of legality. In other cases it appears to the ordinary citizen that he should submit rather than oppose the Government in time of war, although I believe myself that it is more of a public duty to oppose usurpation than it is to comply with an arbitrary order.

The whole subsidy policy of the Food and Price Administrations is based on the flimsiest of legislative authority. The Price Control Act did not intend to authorize subsidies without further appropriation, and

even then the authority was confined to producers. In the act was inserted a reservation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the right to subsidize strategic and critical materials, understood to refer to copper and other minerals. In order to avoid the necessity of an appropriation, the President issued an order finding beef, pork, and butter to be strategic and critical materials. Then he used the R. F. C. money to pay subsidies. In order to get around the provision that subsidies could only be paid to producers, the Attorney General was persuaded to write an opinion finding that manufacturers of flour and packers of meat products were producers of these articles, although the term clearly referred only to farmers in the case of agricultural products.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to buy and sell agricultural products. This power has been extended without the shadow of justification to the payment of milk checks to 3,000,000 farmers in the United States, with whom the Commodity Credit Corporation has no business relations whatever.

The result is that about a billion dollars are being paid out today to maintain a policy which has never been authorized by Congress and for which no money has been appropriated. Of course in time even the R. F. C. and C. C. C. will run out of money, but in the meantime, in spite of a congressional prohibition of subsidies, the usurpation of ungranted authority is sustained by a Presidential veto.

In the labor field, long before any act was passed authorizing the fixing of wages and labor conditions, the Secretary of Labor attempted to issue a rule and modify contracts relating to the amount of pay for Sunday work. Other orders have practically nullified the Federal laws which prohibit the interstate transportation of prison-made goods. Attempt has been made to transfer from the General Accounting Office to the war agencies the power to settle claims, one of the powers expressly reserved to the General Accounting Office even by the provisions of the First War Powers Act.

There is a vast field of minor regulations issued by the War Production Board, by the Office of Price Administration, by the Manpower Commission, and other agencies which seem to me to be clearly invalid. Occasionally a court will find them to be invalid in spite of the strong desire of every judge to uphold the hands of the Government if he can.

Numerous instances have come to my attention in which even the F. B. I. has been used to threaten men with prosecution and public disgrace if they refuse to conform to regulations whose validity, to say the least, is doubtful. Most of the bureaus are wholly reckless in their regard for law. They are inspired with a crusading spirit, and a determination to do those things which they wish to do regardless of the means used to obtain their ends.

In no field is this tendency more dangerous than in that of foreign policy, for here the President's legal power is much greater than it is in the field of domestic legislation. He undoubtedly has the power to initiate all negotiations with foreign countries. The line between executive agreements and treaties is shadowy and uncertain. There is a school of thought even in the State Department which maintains that every international purpose can be secured by executive agreement, and there is some evidence of an intention to make the present peace by a series of executive agreements without ever submitting a treaty of peace.

The so-called Atlantic Charter was never submitted to the Senate for ratification. But that only purports to be a "joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom," making known "certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries."

On January 2, 1942, however, the President entered into something called "the Twenty-six-Nation Agreement," which he executed in the name of "the United States of America, by Franklin D. Roosevelt." I assumed that this United Nations agreement would be submitted to the Senate for ratification, but no such action has ever been taken. It is a simple agreement, one which no doubt the Senate would promptly approve, for it contains only a pledge to employ the full resources of each government against the Axis Powers, and "not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies." But the Constitution clearly gives only Congress the power to declare war. It gives only Congress the power to make a treaty of peace. It is hard to see how the United States of America can be pledged by the President alone not to make peace with its enemies without the consent of foreign nations. In my opinion this agreement should have been submitted to the Senate for ratification, and since it was not submitted is only binding, if at all, on the present administration. Many of the other nations signing it have been authorized to act by their legislatures.

In the various lend-lease agreements the Secretary of State has gone far beyond the purposes and intentions of the Lease-Lend Act. The only purpose of that act was to provide war materials and other assistance to those nations engaged in fighting the Axis Powers. But in every agreement there has been inserted an undertaking for agreed action after the war by the United States and by the nation which we are assisting, which action shall include the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. In my opinion the attempt of the Secretary of State to incorporate these post-war provisions and the post-war provisions and the post-war policies of the Atlantic Charter in an agreement made under the Lease-Lend Act is wholly void and is not binding on the United States Government. The new economic policy may be good or may be bad, but it is one which under our form of government requires the assent of Congress. Last year the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in its report recommending the continuation of the Lease-Lend Act, made perfectly clear its belief that thse clauses are an attempt to extend the authority granted by the Lease-Lend Act and are void. Nevertheless, we are now faced by various proposed agreements relating to a United Nations Bank and a United Nations Stabilization Fund, all of them calling on the United States for vast funds to be used abroad. If the present administration continues in office, I should not be greatly surprised at an attempt to put into effect at least the Stabilization Fund without further authority from Congress.

There can be little doubt that the President completely lacks respect for the legislative process and for Congress as an institution. In the recent soldiers' vote message, there is a sentence which should alarm every American who desires the continuation of our form of government. The President said, "As the Commander in Chief of millions of fighting men, I am sure that I can express their wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discrimination which is being practiced against them." Whatever powers the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy may be given by the Constitution, among those powers is not the right to represent them in civilian affairs or appear for them before Congress. The attempt to appear before Congress as the representative of 10,000,000 fighting men of all parties can only remind us of Oliver Cromwell at the doors of the Long Parliament, with his soldiers at his heels.

The President's action on the tax bill was even more intemperate. I need only quote his own leader and close friend in the Senate, who said, "That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress." No man could make such a calculated and deliberate assault upon a coordinate body who has the slightest interest in preserving the form of government of which it is an essential part.

The basis of the present dispute between the President and Congress is the usurpation of power by executive authority. Men and women who are affected thereby and oppressed hesitate to go to the courts, but they do not hesitate to come to their Congressmen. A constant flow of instances have led Congress and the people to a complete distrust of the fairness of many agencies. But in spite of protest after protest, in spite of the limitation of appropriations, in spite of restrictive legislation, only limited results can be obtained. A bureau once established with executive backing pursues its general purpose without much regard for Congress or the people. There is only one way in which to change the present condition, and that is to elect a President who has a deeply ingrained respect for the American form of government.

We are apparently asked now to elect Franklin Roosevelt to a fourth term. The very length of a 16-year tenure is an invitation to arbitrary action. No man before now has ever been President of the United States for more than 8 years. More and more the judges of the courts owe their appointment to President Roosevelt, and are naturally inclined to support his policies. More and more the executive departments look to him for their support, and not to the people. For years Congress followed the President without protest. Now Congress is the only barrier between the President and complete power. Because only Congress has recovered its independence, we see today a determined assault upon that independence.

If the President is reelected to a fourth term, with a Congress disposed to do his bidding, the people can only expect one course to be pursued—that is the course of steady enlargement of the Executive power. That means the subjection of the States and localities to the Federal Government. It means the subjection of the individual to the arbitrary decrees of a hundred bureaus. It means the removal of every check upon the arbitrary power of a single Executive.

The Palestine Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Palestine Resolution," delivered by me at a community mass meeting sponsored by the Indianapolis Emergency Council for Palestine, at Indianapolis, on March 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, this Indiana World War Memorial Building in which we are gathered this afternoon is dedicated with the following impressive language: "Within this shrine there lives the spirit of brotherhood binding the people of the United States with the nations of the world."

On my way from Washington, I have been reading the Black Book of Polish Jewry, an account of the martyrdom under Nazi occupation. To the hope that pogroms may be changed into ultimate vindication, that de-Judiaziation may give way to de-Nazization, I borrow that same dedicatory language: "Within this meeting may there live the spirit of brotherhood binding the race of Israel with the races of the world."

This building, so replete with symbolism and sentiment, sprang out of the dying embers of World War No. 1. Out of that same war came the modern phase of the vexacious problem of Palestine generically more than 20 centuries old.

The Balfour Declaration, made in good faith and with world-wide approval, has had a tortuous experience in this intervening quarter of a century.

There have been clashes of Arab nationalism with Palestinian aspirations, compromises of commitments, compelled by the demands of this war and the international political implications.

Against the background of the Holy Land, where the simplest things assume a symbolic significance, there is a current historical period shrouded with doubt and uncertainty. Out of the gloom which shortens sight and impedes penetration there looms the specter of the white paper of May 1939.

The listening ear picks up the clatter of firm and adament French occupation. The minds perceive that the strategic location of Palestine throws the Jewish question into maelstrom of war. We sense political and military turmoil brewed by German propaganda.

The investigation, analysis, and interpretation of all these factors of this chaotic east Mediterranean scene await the touch of the scholar and historian.

But the layman cannot be deaf to the wailing chant calling for a Jewish home for all the children who long to return from the four corners of the world where fate has taken them.

That voice has not gone unanswered. The Congress of the United States, reflecting the evolution of a new philosophy and a new concept of international policy, has answered.

The Palestine resolution, omitting the preamble, reads:

"*Resolved*, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

The Palestine resolution calls the world to help—to help to strengthen internal security; to abate the philosophy and practice of exploitation; to encourage development economically, culturally, and intellectually in the interest of the common people.

I reaffirm the belief that unless the world helps the wretched the world itself becomes degenerate.

This help by the remainder of the world must be acquired upon a basis of justice more than charity, understanding more than supercilious toleration. Toleration which is merely a provincial and cultural imperialism will not do. Toleration synonymous with the elimination of racial integrity and nationalistic hopes will not avail.

If this world help acknowledges the justice of collective survival as a legitimate right, it promises a rich harvest. The Zionist program is entitled to encouragement on the basis of justice and rectitude and embodies the hope that it not be required to depend upon crumbs from the table of a patronizing indulgence.

The purpose of this meeting, I assume, is to stimulate that attitude in this great America dedicated to justice, flourishing in an atmosphere of fraternal generosity.

But it must never be forgotten that the failure or success of this long-range enterprise will neither lag behind nor far outrun its Jewish leadership.

Whether the present obstacles spring from the racial and religious fanaticism of the Arab; whether the Jew and Moslem can, and must be made to, live together in amity as neighbors, are concerns made of the very toughest fiber of realism.

Whether Zionism ever may become a badge or catch phrase of a political movement to dominate the Arab and uproot him and transfer him to some new home is factuality itself.

Whether we must be content with a single state for Jew and Moslem; whether we may hope for a separate Jewish state as the civil structure to foster and perpetuate the Jewish faith and culture in the land of its birth and its pristine glory; whether the wandering race is doomed, after all, to an eternal statelessness; and whether it has, or has not, a claim as of right to Palestine, are problems to be solved by realistic assault.

But there are perils in the factual approach merely political in nature. The moral and physical crusades which move through the pages of the Old Testament were realistic; but they were more than that: They possessed a sense of historical consciousness. So, too, there is much of horisticity and philosophy in this present crusade.

If you who are to lead this cause, should surrender that moral age-wise vision held by Abraham and Isaac, Moses and Aaron, David and Solomon, for a clever political bloc-pressure technique, you might fail to gain the help you deserve and might be required to go the balance of your journey by yourselves.

Since I have been in Washington, it has been a joy to hear from so many friends and neighbors in Indiana, thousands of them expressing their hopes and demanding my views in relation to the Palestine resolution. But what the Americans here assembled want, or should want, with a passion born of the meditations of the patriarchs on the plains of Jordan, is not merely the passage of a resolution. You must always hold before your eyes not the declamations of the parliaments of the world, but a home in Israel.

Those who have the Palestine resolution in charge in the Senate of the United States say it has enough friends to pass it now. I am happy to say I have taken my stand behind the sponsors of this resolution.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, whose name the resolution bears, in a very pleasant chat about this meeting and this resolution said: "Give your people in Indiana my heartiest greetings and tell them there are such forces set loose in the world as that I can assure them they will have their home in Palestine."

Zion long has thirsted for peace like the heart panting at the water brook; Isaiah said: "And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting places."

But the hopes of Zion, the promise to Isaiah, will never be realized until all peoples can dwell in peaceable habitations, in sure dwellings, in quiet resting places beside the rivers of water.

Never forget that fact; it is the most vital and important aspect of this modern year.

The election of 1918 which went against the President was the first step in the defeat of a treaty, the ratification of which through the League of Nations is credited with potentialities sufficient to have avoided World War No. 2. A change of world outlook and policy effected by the psychological ultimates of that simple political fact ruined the prospects of peace in 1920. History can repeat itself in 1944. If it does, then will come tumbling down all the dream of Israel, crushed in the wreckage of what might have been a cathedral of just, durable, international, and universal peace.

Isolationism is not dead. It is not even dormant. It lies beneath the log in its natural camouflage, preparing in a wily manner to strike like the adder as soon as it is safe to lift its head. The cause of the Jewry of the world is within and of the cause of world peace; isolation is its most subtle enemy. Will the American people become weary in well doing again as they did 24 years ago? Will you hunger again for the fleshpots of Egypt as your ancestors did more than 24 centuries ago?

Select that Jew who more than anyone else wants a national home in Palestine and you have found the man who more than all others needs to be touched as with a livid fire by the conviction that the Atlantic Charter is a monument to liberty and the "four freedoms" a vehicle of human hope.

If man were tried in some cosmic court, with jurisdiction throughout all the created realm, on some interplanetary indictment, calling into question his actual deserts based on the record of his history, there would be many to offer themselves as exhibits to offset the loves of the felon, the zelot, the traitor, the bigot, the drunkard, the thankless child, the thoughtless parent, the slaver, the imbecile, the tyrant, all the diseased of mind and body, and all the autocrats who have stocked through blood to mount a throne.

Among these, whose heads have been annointed with the touch of divine power would be Moses with his tablets of stone, Confucius writing the laws of man's intrinsic nature, Woodrow Wilson who saw the light of heaven shine on his blade, Socrates draining the world's cup of death, returning it full of his wisdom, Thomas Jefferson writing copybook maxims about government of the people, by the people, and for the people, for Thomas Lincoln's awkward boy, and all the future statesmen of the world—and with these I would want Justice Louis D. Brandeis—a Jew—and Brandeis was an isolationist.

Whether Palestine is the most desirable or the only location for a Jewish home is not the question. If there be a fear that Palestine cannot maintain an independent economic existence without subsidies; if there be doubts as to the likelihood of a solid agricultural basis for the national economy; if the enmity of the Arab suggests the need of perpetual armament; if the resources of that land appear inadequate for all who enter the outward swinging gates; still you will not falter if you are made of the stuff of your ancestors.

A home you must have. This fact is not to be lost in narrow debates as to the wisdom or sufficiency of this particular segment of the earth's surface.

If the pilgrim fathers had waited for the blueprints of Boston before they gave their canvas to the westward winds, there would have never been a Yorktown. If the bearded Mormon with face piercing the setting sun had never crossed the Mississippi until he had known the salty desert could be made to blossom like the rose, there would be no temple bells in Utah, no organ pealing grand amens of patience, dignity, and hope.

You dream of a day when all peoples, creeds, and colors shall have a sameness like the uninterrupted and cloudless dome of heaven; when the sons of men shall have the freedom of transport cherished by the lazy clouds that float their ways serene, so mingling, sharing space unmeasured; yet a day

when men retain the capacity for quick and mighty unity of action to thunder like the storm clouds and the lightning shaking terror from the skies.

You dream of a world wherein all men can walk down to the water's edge, the sandy beaches, the rocky, crooked shorelines of all the continents and islands and know that each is on a level with all his brothers the globe around; yet a world where men retain the energy of the restless sea to do his work like the billows in their ageless task.

You dream of a life in which the deaths of all who slumber in the bosom of the earth; when all whose ships roll with them in the bellies of the seven seas, when the pain of toil, the agony of fear, the tears that salt the waters shall all be requited and redeemed by a universal brotherhood of man. The new home in Zion is a part of your dream. Its building is your task. The world will help you as long as your motives match the honor of high purpose. If you expect to take riches from the rich and moneyed peoples of the world to substitute for your labors, you will remain destitute and poorly armed indeed. If you are ambitious to establish a selfish, cruel, and narrow nationalism, or if you choose a cold materialism, or if you play with the gamblers in isolation, you may expect to trudge the flinty path of persecution till you die.

God gave us an earth to live upon. The continents and oceans alike obey His simple laws and the unfathomable and unsearchable floods of the deep pass not the bounds He has set to it. The continous dawns of all the ages look out upon geological change forever ceaseless. So, too, they look out upon man's endless strife for civilization.

You dream of a home for Israel in a world of peace. But until we can hear the resounding Hosannas of the coming of that day, we all have our labors laid out before us upon the trestle board of human life. What is the task laid out for you?

You who assemble here today to hear words and to dream dreams are, for the most part, of the chosen of the Lord.

But His beneficence and providences are not a sedan in which you are to be carried on the shoulders of others with pomp and circumstance through fields of labor. This choice, this selection of Israel, was not so much a designation of a special beneficiary, as it was an accolade to do His work. You are not the contents of the sacred vehicle. You are the vehicle—the vessel by which His light, love, and encouragement are to be transported to the doorsteps of every toiler in this tired world—a world so badly managed, but so patient—a world, so old, but forever young—a world so weary, but forever refreshed.

Yours is the wisdom and the understanding of the ages. Soon "Thou shalt lie down and thy sleep shall be sweet."

May your tents and tabernacles be guarded by the banners of all the nations of the earth. And may the Stars and Stripes of America stand guard above the door.

I thank you.

The Race Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of John Temple Graves 2d delivered at America's Town Meeting of the Air in New York on February 17, 1944. This address makes a splendid contribution to the discussion of the race problem by one who is thorcughly familiar with that subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Deny, let us pray. Let us pray that nothing tonight will increase the sum total of race hate in America. Let us pray for a good American mixture of fact facing and idealism. In that hope I've come up from Alabama, against much advice. No economic system ever invented can work, no race on earth can advance or hold its own, in such an atmosphere of hate as we had in this country before Pearl Harbor. Hate, between New Dealers and anti's, between management and labor, and then, even as we made war against Hitler, against the greatest race hater in history, the Jim Crow of all the ages, hate in great areas of America between white man and black. It won't work. It won't do. It helps nobody anymore. History is going to put down as one of the follies and fallacies of all time the monstrous idea that this country's race question, the most delicate and difficult with which any people anywhere ever had to deal, could somehow be settled overnight in the middle of a greatest war.

Negroes and white people don't hate each other in the Southern States. They may not treat each other right but they don't hate each other. Or they didn't until this wartime fallacy began to be agitated by outsiders. We have to do too much business with each other down there to hate the way they do in other places. Here in New York are millions of white people who didn't know any Negroes at all. In the South no such segregation as that exists or can exist. All whites and all blacks have some dealings with members of the other race. We may quarrel and be unjust, but we simply can't afford to hate each other. It isn't practical. And the time has come when it isn't practical anywhere else.

I say the States should be left to deal with this problem because it is a problem confined to States. It's a southern problem. You have your Negro problem here in New York, I know, and Carey McWilliams has one in California, but it isn't the same problem, and it isn't the big one. If Negro populations in the South were confined to only 4 percent of the total as here in New York, or only 2 percent as in California, we think we could handle them with no trouble at all. But the Negro population in Mississippi isn't 2 percent. It's 51 percent. In Georgia and Alabama it isn't 4 percent, it's 35 percent. Plain arithmetic makes it a southern problem. There are 40,000,000 people in the South and 10,000,000 are Negroes. There are 90,000,000 people in the rest of the country and only 3,000,000 are Negroes.

It's in the South that the two races have to get along together in greatest numbers and proximities, and it's there that the problem has to be worked out. The solution affects the rest of the country, yes; but that doesn't make it any the less a southern problem—a matter for States' rights, if you will.

Oh, I know we may not handle things right down there. Some of us don't hesitate to get in trouble with others of us by saying so. I know they are enemies, not friends, of States' rights who mean only the right of the selfish to be let alone in selfishness, of the strong to prey on the weak, of the backward to hold the forward back, of the chain gangs of prejudice to stop the march of time. I know that States which demand rights must recognize duties—and see lights. But I know that the race question and many other questions can be settled only at home. This recurring States' rights cry is the old American one for local self-government—the old demand of the community, the individual, to make their own ways. It's the thing for which we are winning this war, not a war for democracy but a war for States' rights—for the right of individual lands, not to be invaded by outsiders, not to be dictated to or aggressed against; and even as we win a war for that principle a great political reaction in America is directed at the same principle—the settlement of problems at home.

And, States' rights or not, that's the only way this Negro problem in the South is ever going to be settled. Not all the laws this Nation can pass, not all the excitement this Nation's race leaders can create, not all the Federal bureaus laid end to end can force 30,000,000 white people of the South to do what they are passionately and deeply resolved not to do in race relationships. Right or wrong, they feel that something as vital as this war—as dear as life itself—is involved for them. However you may judge them, you are bound to face that fact about them, and the depth of that feeling.

Meanwhile the Negro is advancing there and everywhere else. No race ever advanced so far so fast.

A Uniform Federal Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered in Havana, Ill., on February 17, 1944, at a banquet tendered to me by the Havana Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, friends, and neighbors, tonight 11,000,000 fighting men and women are scattered over the earth defending that liberty and freedom which has made America the greatest nation on the face of the globe. Would that each and every one of these brave Americans could at this moment say what I am going to say: "I am at home. This is my country."

During the last 9 years I have frequently returned home, glad to leave momentarily the many perplexing legislative problems in the Nation's Capital.

Today I am with you again upon another important mission. At the request of thousands upon thousands of people in Illinois, I have returned to file my petitions and announce my candidacy for nomination to the United States Senate. I am here tonight as the guest of the Havana Chamber of Commerce. I am happy, I am proud of the fact that my neighbors and friends who know me best could find time in their busy lives to do me this great honor. My gratitude is unbounded when I realize that in this gathering are men and women from all walks of life, who belong to different political faiths and creeds. Years of close and intimate association have strengthened our ties of friendship. Irrespective of what the future holds for me, the memory of this gesture of confidence and good will shall remain with me forever.

It must be remembered that what we say or do here tonight is of little consequence

in the face of the great challenge forced upon us by the most barbaric foe that civilization has ever known. However, under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, no emergency is so great as to waive the holding of elections of qualified citizens to high public office. Therefore, in a democracy it becomes necessary for men and women to carry on political campaigns even in the midst of war.

I pause at this time to express a deep sense of gratitude to the people of my home city and county, to the people of the Twentieth Congressional District, and to the people of Illinois for the confidence and the high honors they have bestowed upon me over a long period of years.

In my public career honest and sincere people have disagreed with me on what I thought was right. I respect those opinions. I do not come before you on this occasion advising that I have made a perfect record upon important and far-reaching legislative problems. No man is infallible. But, my friends, as one of your public servants I have used all of my talents in trying to do the right and prayed to God that He would give me the power to see the right.

While I have consistently and zealously championed the cause of Illinois, her problems and her citizens, irrespective of party labels, yet I have never lost sight of the fact that we are a Nation of 48 States, bound together in an indestructible Union. In other words, a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people which is now being put to the supreme test by the Nazis and the Japs, must always be given paramount consideration by a United States Senator who serves his country best. There has never been a 6-year period in the history of the United States Senate filled with more perplexing, varied, and difficult problems. With the ability that God has given me, I have done my best. Since the infamous attack at Pearl Harbor by the godless Japs, my primary concern has been the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment. That we shall win this war is now a certainty. However, we should give and take, make every sacrifice necessary and remain united in order that we may save human lives and hasten the day when we can bring our soldiers, sailors, and marines back home.

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, I have followed the admonition of men like Cordell Hull, General Marshall, Admiral King, and the Commander in Chief. I voted for the lifting of the embargo, the arming of merchant ships, the lend-lease legislation, and all other measures of defense. Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and Rauschning's "Voice of Destruction" told me definitely the plan of world conquest by Adolf Hitler and his fanatical followers. Japan's unwarranted aggression when she went into Manchukuo in 1931, her unjustifiable war on peaceful China, and the testimony of naval experts developed in executive sessions of the Naval Affairs Committee, convinced me that sooner or later these Asiatic barbarians would strike at our America, a Nation that wanted to live in peace.

In those trying days there were those who disagreed with my viewpoint on the future. I respected their judgment and opinions, but under the constitutional oath that I took when I was sworn in as a United States Senator, I could not evade a duty which was dictated by a conscientious desire to protect my country from the threat of Old World tyranny and despotism that would have destroyed us all.

The death march of Bataan, one of the most bestial mass murders in history, should resolve the last lingering doubt as to the character and purpose of our enemy.

My legislative course on our foreign policy before Pearl Harbor was in harmony with the program of the President of the United States, but the final decision I made upon each and every one of those vital questions came from a deep conviction of my own that America was in danger. Since Japan stabbed us in the back, since Germany and Italy declared war on us the following day, demonstrating beyond the shadow of a doubt the partnership agreement of these Axis criminals, my vote and my voice have been given in full support of the admirals and the generals who are leading us to glorious naval and military victories throughout the world.

So long as I am a member of the United States Senate I shall never lose faith in these great leaders and the men and women under their command. I shall never second guess these men on whose education at West Point and Annapolis the taxpayers of America have spent millions upon millions of dollars for the purpose of defending home and country in a great crisis.

While my votes upon the foreign policy of this Nation have been in keeping with the policies of the President of the United States, I say to you who are assembled here tonight, and you who are listening in, that on domestic issues I have not always agreed with my President. Throughout my public career I have maintained my independence of thought and action. I differed with the President on the Supreme Court issue. I have differed with him on other vital domestic issues. Only recently while presiding over the Senate in the absence of the Vice President I felt it my duty to leave the rostrum and take the floor to speak against the President's veto of an agricultural measure.

I think it is also of interest to the people of Illinois to learn that during my 9 years as a Member of the Congress, the President of the United States has never requested me to vote for the enactment of a single law.

My fellow citizens, I enter this campaign obligated to no living person. The man who did most to confer upon me the great honor of serving in the United States Senate has passed away. I refer, of course, to the late Governor Henry Horner, who in life and in death belongs to Illinois.

No individual or group of individuals, no organization, no newspaper, controls my vote in the United States Senate. It goes without saying that I welcome counsel and advice from everyone. Some of the most thought-provoking and constructive suggestions come across my desk in letters from my constituents in Illinois. I am obligated only to my people in performing honest, efficient, and conscientious public service. I go forth in this campaign seeking nomination and reelection upon my record.

My record on behalf of national defense, agriculture, labor, industry, and small business, is open to all. It is a record of fighting for legislation on the home front that I conceived to be for the best interests of the Nation. I have striven to make a record in defense of the American way of life at home, worthy of the confidence of those who are defending America on the battle front. That, my friends, is the crux of it all.

A news reporter recently asked a boy in Algiers what he was fighting for. His reply was that he was fighting for the opportunity to return home, in order that he might sit unmolested under the old apple tree in the orchard. That is what we are all fighting for. We are a nation engaged in an all-out war to defend those principles summed up in our Bill of Rights. First of all we want to protect the civil liberties of the individual. We want all of our people to decide local, State, and National issues. We want elected representatives, whatever their political faith, to be free to debate and to challenge. We want free elections where people may cast their votes without fear of the concentration camp and threats of death. Finally, we want the good satisfactions of life. We want employment, happy homes, healthy families, and a nation of which we can be proud.

Unless we protect these basic and fundamental rights which have been handed down to us by our fathers in the long ago, we shall have no free nation. One of those rights for which our warriors are now fighting is the right to participate in the civil functions of government. Millions of men and women overseas and millions in the country must not be disfranchised in the coming election.

Congress under the Constitution declared war. Congress under the Constitution passed the Selective Service Act. Uncle Sam ignored State lines in taking men from the homes, the farms, the factories, the shops, and the cities, and sending them to every part of the globe to defend our liberty against a foreign tyranny. By the same token a grateful government must find a way to give those men an opportunity to vote in this coming Presidential election, the importance of which no man can deny. If these citizen soldiers defending the Republic in our greatest crisis are denied the right to participate in this election, it is time to inquire who is worthy of it.

A uniform Federal ballot must be taken to our armed forces, wherever they are fighting or training. Surely, we shall do no less than Canada, New Zealand, and Australia are doing for their fighting men and women in the field. I wish it were possible for the States to handle this gigantic problem, but every thinking, fair-minded individual knows that in the 48 States there are 48 different voting procedures. The Army and Navy say that it is administratively impossible to do a complete job through the States. They specifically state that because of plane space and other transportation difficulties there is only a remote possibility that State ballots can be voted In Illinois alone there would be 102 different ballots from the 102 different counties going to every military post in the world, because no election official knows where the Illinois boys are stationed. You can readily see if this were multiplied by 48, the number of States in the Union, the chaos and confusion which would exist. Remember, planes are needed to fly war supplies, bring home the wounded, carry your letters to your sons, and bring your sons' letters home to you.

Across my desk during the last 90 days have come nearly 10,000 letters, cards, and petitions from those in the service and from their relatives and friends, concerned about this legislation. Ninety-five percent of those writing to me favor a uniform Federal ballot. It is well to remember that this ballot, voted in secret by the soldiers, sailors, and marines, will ultimately find its way into the polling place where the voter resides. It will be counted and canvassed the same as any other absentee ballot here at home.

Recently Miss Jane Cowl, stage celebrity, sent a group of approximately 50 stage, screen, and radio stars to Washington to work for the uniform Federal ballot. She wrote me a letter and said, "I know I speak for hundreds of my coworkers in the theater who cannot appear today in person before you, when I say that in our opinion the armed forces should be granted facility to vote in the simplest, speediest, and most direct way possible."

Recently the editorial column of the Stars and Stripes, published in Algiers by men serving in the armed forces, had this to say about bullets and ballots, "The men overseas object to any bill which leaves voting to 48 States to handle soldier voting under the 48 varieties of laws. They cannot make proper uses of franchise unless Congress passes some kind of uniform law making it simple for citizen soldiers to vote."

Let us hear from Ernie Pyle, noted war correspondent, who lives with our boys on the front day after day. In a recent column, entitled, "Soldiers Want to Vote," he said

"If you ask a soldier if he wants to vote, he will say 'Yes,' but if there is going to be any red tape about it, he will say 'Nuts to it'."

My friends, for some 9 months I have sought to create legislative machinery which would protect the right of franchise of those defending our country. Last week the United States Senate by a vote of 46 to 40 passed the bill I introduced as co-sponsor with Senator GREEN. It was sent to the House of Representatives and is now in conference. Thirty-five Democrats and 10 Republicans and 1 Progressive joined in the support of this bill, while 17 Democrats and 23 Republicans voted against the measure. The debates at times were somewhat bitter and acrimonious. Some Senators said the bill was unconstitutional. Other adverse objections were advanced—for example a certain southern Democratic Senator had the audacity to say that his vote upon this crucial measure was based solely upon white supremacy. The most insincere argument I heard came from Senator TAFT, of Ohio, who said that the officers would control the votes of their men and vote them as they pleased after a great victory or following a questionable military or naval maneuver. In other words, we trust the lives of these boys to the officers. We trust the life of the Nation to the officers, but, under Senator TAFT's argument, we cannot trust them with the ballot. Another Republican Senator, who violently opposed the uniform Federal ballot from the beginning, had the audacity to say to the Senate and the country that if Roosevelt would announce that he was not a candidate for the fourth term, the Senator would vote for my bill and it would be passed within 30 minutes.

My fellow Americans, the right to vote of our citizen soldiers who are willing to die for their country is not a Democratic issue. It is not a State's rights issue. It is not a Republican issue. It is not an issue at all. It is an American right, guaranteed under the Constitution.

No one knows how these boys in the armed service are going to vote. That is their own business. My only concern from the beginning has been to give them a real opportunity to vote. Once again I cry aloud, "If the boy can stop a bullet, he ought to have the ballot."

Notwithstanding the fact that 95 percent of the people who write to me are for this type of soldiers' legislation; notwithstanding the fact that the great majority of the press of the country is for a uniform Federal ballot, I have been charged by some unworthy souls with a conspiracy to steal the soldiers' votes in the 1944 election. They have charged me with fraud. They have charged me with indefatigable dishonesty, as I continued my fight to give our soldiers, sailors, and marines a simple, uniform Federal ballot. But, my friends, the editorials from the Stars and Stripes, the article by Ernie Pyle, and the vote in the United States Senate last week completely answers all these unjustifiable attacks. Tonight another clear and resounding answer comes to these dastardly charges. It comes through this banquet being tendered to me here this evening by my own people from all political faiths and creeds, men and women who have known me intimately in this community for the last 29 years. You are my inspiration as I move into this crucial campaign.

I have lived all my life in and about this small community; I have no fear of a smear campaign. The people of Illinois love a clean and hard fight. The people of Illinois detest those who hit below the belt. If this same group of little men will continue to malign and challenge my integrity and my honor, the people of Illinois who believe in a square deal will rise up in their wrath to my defense.

When I am nominated and reelected to the United States Senate for another term of 6 years, I shall continue to give to the people of Illinois the same type of faithful and diligent service I have rendered in the past.

I shall take my place in the front ranks with those in this Nation who believe that in order to outlaw war forever, there must be established an international collaboration based upon the principles of sovereign equality for all peace-loving states. The United States of America cannot dodge its responsibility in the future if it desires to remain the leading Nation of the world. We must at the proper time take a fearless part in helping chart a course which will bring a lasting peace to the suffering peoples of a tortured world. During the next 6 years will come the crucial test for the establishment of the kind of peace in which you and I are interested. The Senate of the United States must under the Constitution ratify all treaties made with foreign powers. My sincere hope is that the people of this Nation will not make the mistake we made in 1920.

After our armies march victoriously into Berlin and Tokyo, we must be prepared to lead the way in international collaboration with other nations to the end that the scriptural injunction of peace on earth, good will toward men becomes a reality.

Simplify the Income-Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1943, on this floor, I made the suggestion that the Ways and Means Committee begin hearings as soon as possible on a bill to simplify the income-tax law. Many of the people of the United States likewise saw ahead and realized that the clerical burden of paying the income tax would rise to heavy proportions. As the months have passed, it has become increasingly evident that for the purpose of conserving our manpower which is now used in unnecessary tax-return work, if for no other reason, simplification plans should proceed without interruption.

I commend the Ways and Means Committee for considering legislation looking to a far-reaching simplification of our tax laws. Under the able leadership of our genial colleague from North Carolina, BOB DOUGHTON, whose mind fairly glistens with tax figures which have in recent years been growing larger each year, this committee will soon bring in a bill to us for a vote. The House and the country, I am sure, will rejoice in such a step.

In the meantime, I have been working with the Treasury Department on this matter. As a result of my contacts, I have just received a letter from the Honorable Randolph Paul of the Treasury Department making certain suggestions as to simplifying our income-tax laws. For the information of the House, I ask that this letter be introduced in its entirety. The letter is:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 9, 1944.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BROOKS: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of February 26, 1944, respecting the Treasury's recommendations on simplification of the present tax laws.

I am pleased to inform you that representatives of the Secretary's Office and the Bureau of Internal Revenue are currently working with members of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on the problems of simplification. As a result of this joint work it is expected that recommendations respecting simplification of the individual income tax will be made to the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Among the several plans we are examining is one under which the withholding receipt would be adjusted for use as an extremely simple return. Taxpayers whose tax is very largely discharged by withholding would be permitted to file this simple statement with the collectors in lieu of any other return. The collectors would then compute the tax and either assess additional tax or issue a refund as the case might be. Another possibility being examined is a broadening of the privilege of using the short form (1040A). A third possibility is to eliminate returns for some taxpayers. We are hopeful that a truly simple income-tax return will be developed out of these or other alternatives.

I believe the present tax returns for 1943 income are as simple as it has been possible to make them under the law. Most of the complexities of these tax forms are attributable to two major causes, the Victory tax and the transition to a current-payment basis. The second complication is a 1-year worry and will be automatically eliminated after this year. Action on the Victory tax has been repeatedly recommended by the Treasury, and was begun last fall when Congress converted the so-called post-war credit of the Victory tax into a simple current credit. This change simplified the tax computation for 1943 income and allowed the taxpayer to get the credit currently without reporting bond purchases, insurance premiums, and debt payments. As suggested by the Treasury, the Revenue Act of 1943 makes a further simplifying change in the Victory tax. It places the tax for 1944 on a flat 3-percent basis, thus eliminating the complex decimals involved in the 1943 computation. Moreover, the Treasury has urged that Congress eliminate the Victory tax entirely by merging it with the regular income tax.

In addition to changing the Victory tax rate to a flat 3 percent, the Revenue Act of 1943 makes several other changes which will result in a certain amount of simplification. This legislation embodies Treasury suggestions for repeal of the earned-income credit, permitting consolidation of the normal tax and the surtax, and disallowance for nonbusiness purposes of the deduction of Federal excises. This act also determines the taxpayer's status for exemption purposes as of July 1 (on form 1040 as well as form 1040A), and permits the use without penalty of prior-year income in declaring estimated income.

I hope these comments will be helpful to you. If there is further information you would like to receive, please write to us again.

Sincerely yours,

RANDOLPH E. PAUL,
General Counsel.

The Problems of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, March 7, Mr. Louis Adamic, a prominent author, delivered an address at the Book and Authors' Club luncheon given by the New York Herald-Tribune in the city of New York. This address dealt with important events transpiring in Yugoslavia. In discussing these problems, Mr. Adamic is discussing the problems of his own people.

I am sure that those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find in his remarks something of great interest to them. The address will be particularly interesting to those who have viewed with amazement the fact that the people of that small country, oppressed by the terrors of war and bowed beneath a weight of economic woe which is too great for us to understand, are compelled to maintain a useless little king whom the press assures us is receiving $600,000 per annum from funds of Yugoslavia.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In late years many important events occurred in March, and so this is a month of some important anniversaries. But I think none is more noteworthy than the third anniversary of what happened in Yugoslavia on March 27, 1941.

On that day the people of Yugoslavia turned against Hitler and against their own pro-Hitler regime, and thereby treated the depressed anti-Axis world to an extraordinary demonstration of the human spirit. Thereby, also, the Yugoslavs unwittingly assumed the spiritual-political leadership toward a new future in Europe. For inherent in March 27, 1941, was the Partisan-Liberation movement of today, which, led by Tito, carries within itself more meaning and promise for the future than anything else I can see right now.

Three years ago the people of Yugoslavia, surrounded by the Axis on all sides, suddenly overthrew the pro-Hitler dictatorship in Belgrade, which had aimed shamefully to keep them out of war by signing a pact with Hitler.

This act of the Yugoslav people was regarded then by many in America as crazy or unrealistic. There was no doubt that Hitler would attack Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav action of 3 years ago certainly was unique. It may be the only instance of a people toppling over their government partly because it had tried to keep them out of war with a powerful enemy.

At that time Russia and America were not yet in the war, and there was meager faith in the world that brutality was not going to triumph. Hitler was top dog in the world, and his troops were about to pass through Yugoslavia to help Mussolini finish off the Greeks.

But the Yugoslavs decided not to permit that. In Belgrade, the people went into the streets. Peasants poured into the capital. There was a sudden revolutionary mood, especially strong in the Serbians.

This development in the streets of Belgrade and in other parts of Yugoslavia gave courage to a small group of army officers, some of them British agents, who on March 27, 1941, staged a coup and tossed out the pro-Hitler regime.

This was the best news until then.

What happened was a people's spontaneous uprising, a magnificent human upheaval, coupled with a putsch, rather than a political action with aims and a program.

For a dozen years before, Yugoslavia had been a dictatorship, a scene of deep political confusion and unhappiness, which was not a peculiarly Yugoslav situation, but an organic part of the larger European mess.

Now, in the absence of a definite program, there came into office a new government with a newly proclaimed king, the 17-year-old Peter. But this government did not represent the spiritually splendid moment created by the people; rather, it brought to a focus and climax the confusion of the recent past. It included a few good politicians, but also some ministers who had been in the pro-Hitler regime the day before, also a former dictator, also several chauvinists with minds harking back to the Middle Ages.

There was no time for the confusion to clear up, no time to do anything, in fact. On April 6 Hitler struck and in 10 days overwhelmed the Yugoslav army, much as he had overwhelmed the armies of Poland, Norway, and France.

Nonetheless, what happened in Yugoslavia 3 years ago on the initiative of the people was a major contribution to the anti-Axis cause. Hitler's applecart was upset in Yugoslavia, even if only for a few weeks. It delayed Hitler's attack on Russia. That was important, for it gave Russia that much more time to get ready for the invasion by Germany which came in June.

Also, what happened in Yugoslavia 3 years ago had immense morale value in occupied Europe, in Britain, and America—at a time when the world needed a shot in the arm.

The new government with King Peter fled into exile, and now—in mid-April, 1941—the Yugoslav people found themselves under the most brutal occupation.

But as tragic and sordid as the situation was, it had its favorable points. The people were left to their own resources; their old leadership was gone; they had a chance to crystallize their national traditions and instincts. And they lost no time.

Only a week after the collapse of Yugoslavia the first Liberation Front organization was created in my native Slovenia. It was done—as later in Croatia, in Montenegro, in Bosnia, etc.—under the leadership of people who had no previous standing as political figures. One of the leaders was a literary critic, whom I know. He did a fine job of it, and is today head of the Liberation Front in Slovenia, which is engaging five enemy divisions and pressing down the Italian boot.

But to return to April 1941—the people began to go into the woods and mountains—all kinds of people: Serbians, Croatians, and Slovenians; Catholics, Orthodox, Moslems, Jews; people of many political parties: Democrats, Independents, Agrarians, Socialists, and Communists; men and women, and boys and girls even in their early teens; peasants, workers, writers, shoemakers, editors, teachers, fishermen, lawyers, housewives with babies, doctors, and priests—people by the thousands, then tens of thousands, then hundreds of thousands.

Someone killed a German or Italian and took his gun, then killed a few more of the enemy, and thus got more guns, which were passed around.

Thus the resistance grew.

Presently, in the summer of 1941, these people who were arming themselves by killing the enemy began to accept the leadership of men who had fought on the Loyalist side in Spain, or who had been in the underground during the period of dictatorship in Yugoslavia.

Among these new leaders was Tito.

At any rate, reaching into their spiritual resources, the people—without a production and supply system—worked up an amazing military resistance and a political power with post-war purposes.

This was a natural extension of the spiritual demonstration which the Yugoslav people made before the world on March 27, 1941.

Today the people's partisan army, as we call it, numbers close to 300,000 men and women and youngsters.

Tito built up this force from scratch—on nothing but the people's spirit behind it.

Until last September, only a few months ago, this people's resistance movement in Yugoslavia, which is not only resistance but revolution, went almost unrecognized in the American and British press. Why? Well, the Yugoslav government in exile in London controlled the news pertaining to Yugoslavia and was permitted by British censors to attribute the Partisan operations and victories to Mihailovich, the King's man in the country, and whose units instead of fighting the enemy, have actually for 2½ years now been collaborating with the enemy in order to have the arms with which to fight the people's revolution against the past.

The Yugoslav resistance and revolution represent over 90 percent of the people who are determined to clean the country not only of the foreign fascists but domestic as well.

Mihailovich is counterrevolutionary, working with the foreign fascists. But he is scarcely worth talking about; his force now is very small.

Since last fall, the Partisan resistance and revolution have gradually found their proper place in the American and British press. Some American columnists are still confused; some are worse than confused and call those of us who are pro-Partisan Communists.

Well, that makes Mr. Churchill a Communist, for on Washington's Birthday—just 2 weeks ago today—he came out for Tito in very enthusiastic terms. For a moment when I read his speech I was afraid that the great British Tory was getting to the left of me.

Now, in order to be on the safe side, to the left of Mr. Churchill, let me say that, in my opinion, history is going to regard Tito as one of the great leaders of this war—as a general who is also a political leader, who knows what this period is all about, and who as a commander has done more with less than any other general in World War No. 2.

It is only lately that Tito had begun to receive a trickle of supplies from the allies. If those supplies are substantially increased, I am convinced that Tito could raise an army of up to a million men and women and would be in position not only to liberate the Balkans but come down the Italian boot in force and meet us, if not in Rome, then certainly on the Po.

Is everything possible being done to increase the aid to Tito? I am asking a question which I wish others would ask.

Yugoslavia has taken the spiritual-political leadership in Europe. I have no doubt that what has happened there represents a European trend and that Tito is going to be a very, very important man in Europe.

I imagine that a good part of the supplies which the British now are sending in a mere trickle to Tito comes from our lend-lease. But don't let's find too much satisfaction in that. I am, of course, in favor of increasing

material aid to Tito, but I feel even more strongly that we, the people of America, and our Government recognize the Partisan movement for its political character.

We ought to realize that Tito's military force, now so valuable to us, grew as a revolution; grew from political and spiritual motivations in the people which are democratic and in line with the American Revolution.

I am no longer worried so much about Tito and his Partisans. They will pull through in one way or another. They are part of the European trend toward a new kind of future—the leading part of that trend. The worst of their ordeal is probably over; their long Valley Forge may be largely behind them.

But I am somewhat worried about America. Are we interested only in the present, only in defeating the enemy now? Can we not drop mere expediency? Can we not stop playing with European reaction?

I hope we can, for our own internal sake and for the sake of our position in the world. If we don't, that is apt to become a factor in the development of our domestic reaction and fascism, and we are going to lose out in influence abroad.

Mr. Churchill spoke well on Washington's Birthday. Why cannot some important man in Washington speak as well—or a little better?

If we the people of this country feel, as we should, a spiritual and political kinship to the future now stirring in Europe, and which is specially clear in Yugoslavia, then let us do what we can, you and I, to induce or inspire our Government to recognize the political propulsions of the Partisan movement.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, during recent days the attention of the American reading public has been directed to various actions against the two great American news agencies—the Associated Press and the United Press—in Argentina. To those of us who have been reared in the atmosphere of a free press this Nation, of course, is most repulsive. The first action of dictatorship is always directed against a free press. At no time has a dictatorship been able to survive while the press remained free.

The newspapers and newspapermen have done a valiant job in reporting this war. More newspaper correspondents have lost their lives in this war than probably in all the other wars of history combined.

When we think of war correspondents we instinctively limit their "beat" to the actual fighting fronts throughout the world. Not all the glory, however, must go to only those fine reporters who are under actual fire. There are other war correspondents who deserve credit for doing a grand job and who have not as yet smelled of powder or been under actual fire in battle.

During my recent stay in Brazil I fortunately had the opportunity to learn that the war correspondents on the battle fronts are not the only United States newspapermen abroad whose work has, directly or indirectly, contributed to our war effort.

The men in Brazil who are responsible for the distribution to Brazilian newspapers of the news reports of the two leading United States wire agencies during the last few difficult years most certainly have indirectly done much to reinforce the United States position in that strategically important nation.

Talking in Rio de Janeiro with my old friend from Louisiana newspaper days, James Alan Coogan, director in Brazil of the United Press, the oldest United States wire agency operating in Latin America and which has more than 70 daily newspaper clients in Brazil, whose grandfather served in this House for years from the Second District of my State, Robert C. Davey, I was able to appreciate many of the problems he faced since 1940 in attempting to increase the field of publication of the news report of his agency.

Mr. Coogan pointed out that his agency and the Associated Press faced competition from the subsidized European agencies, which contrasted sharply with the strictly independent United States wire agencies depending only upon the revenue from the sale of their news reports to commercial clients. The United States wire agencies, therefore, were seeking to sell their news reports while subsidized European agencies, such as Agence Havas, Transocean, DNB, Domei, and Stefani, were, without any necessity of considering their overhead, deluging Brazilian newspaper publishers with all manner of offers designed to obtain publication, without charge by the agencies or with token payments depending upon the desire of the publisher, of the official and semiofficial news reports of their organizations which were directly or indirectly under Government control.

The assets of the United States wire agencies were their integrity and independence and the competitive merit of their news reports. As the United Press, for example, was able to sell its news reports on a strictly independent commercial basis to publishers in Brazil, more and more publication space was lost to Havas, Transocean, D. N. B., Stefani and Domei and more and more the true facts were available to the Brazilian public, particularly with respect to the United States and with respect to the nations later to be her allies.

We all know that truth is a great weapon in the hands of the United Nations, and the manner in which the United States wire agencies have succeeded in getting the facts before the Brazilian public in newspapers and on the radio undoubtedly has played a large part in forming the public opinion.

It is only fair to point out that the United States wire agencies, headed by United Press, and the Associated Press operating strictly independently and on a purely commercial basis without any Government influence or monetary support whatsoever, were successfully carrying on this battle for publication space in Brazil for a considerable length of time before United States Government propaganda units were set up to combat Axis and Axis-sympathetic propaganda.

It is obvious that the principal weapon against subsidized foreign wire agencies is the public branding of them as such; the chief strength of such agencies is successful masking as independent and unsubsidized, as Agence Havas was able to do for years before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the French Chamber of Deputies unwittingly officially branded it as receiving huge funds annually from the Quai D'Orsay.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

UNJUSTLY ACCUSED

Those who are accusing Congress of attempts to balk plans to give service men and women a vote in the presidential election either have been misinformed or are misrepresenting the facts of the case.

Two methods of taking the service vote have been advanced. One, sponsored by the administration, provides for a ballot in which the voter would express his preference only on the Federal ticket.

The other, sponsored by States' rights Democrats and Republicans in Congress, would permit the service men and women to vote as they would if they were home, for State and local offices as well as for candidates on the national ticket.

It is a dispute over methods of voting, and nothing more.

Of course, there is politics in the dispute. Some profess to see in the Federal ballot plan an attempt by the administration to capitalize on the Commander-in-Chief appeal for the benefit of congressional candidates who are favorable to Mr. Roosevelt and who, it is believed, could not be elected without the service vote.

But Congress is not attempting to disfranchise the service men and women; it is merely striving to see that they have a free expression of opinion on all offices, national, State, and local.

That's what the congressional-administration controversy amounts to, and it had its origin in the recently aroused suspicion in congressional circles of anything, on any subject, sponsored by the administration.

But as far as that goes, it is to be wondered if the political aspect of the affair has not been greatly exaggerated.

In the first place, there is a question whether the service men and women are as greatly interested in the election as we have been led to believe.

Reliable newspaper correspondents who have lived with soldiers in the battle theaters and who have interviewed returning

fighting men say the thought uppermost in their minds is to win the war, come home and marry the girl of their choice, and settle down to a good job.

According to these sources, they show little interest in politics. They just do not feel that the outcome of the war depends on the identity of the occupant of the White House, or the outcome of other elections.

They are of the opinion that they and the folks at home who are supplying them with weapons—industry and labor—are sufficient to accomplish the defeat of the Axis.

So, it would seem, a lot of tears which have been shed into beer (or tea) over furnishing ballots to the services have been wasted.

There are, too, tremendous difficulties to setting up election machinery in the military services. If every man and woman in the service were to be given the opportunity to vote it would mean a complete suspension of military operations for American forces in the battle zones for the time that would be required for the men and women to visit the polling places.

Even if every service man and woman was herded to the polls by his superior officers—and that is unthinkable and un-American as there is no compulsion at home—it is to be doubted that their ballots would swing the election one way or the other.

These men and women—Democrats and Republicans—would vote as they would if in civilian life, and the proportion would be about the same as that of the home vote.

Nobody, Congress, the administration, or the American public, wants to deprive those in the armed services of a vote. And any charges to the contrary are unjustified.

If satisfactory arrangements can be made to give them an opportunity to express a free opinion on the political candidates, if they want that opportunity, it should be granted. But if political maneuvering interferes with the conduct of the war, you may rest assured nobody would resent that fact more than the men and women who are fighting the Nation's battles.

Their main objective is to get the dirty mess over; not to put somebody in political office or kick somebody else out.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a notable series of articles on the subject of health insurance, under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, S. 1161, written by Albert Dutsch and published in the newspaper PM. I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the articles will cost $292.50.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZED MEDICINE AND GANNETT GROUP SMEAR WAGNER HEALTH BILL

(By Albert Deutsch)

I. MEDICINE, POLITICS, AND PROPAGANDA

Organized medicine has joined hands with some of the most reactionary elements in waging a propaganda campaign against the New Deal and the Roosevelt administration that is as unprincipled as it is clever.

The immediate object of the campaign is to defeat the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill (S. 1161) for the expansion of social security and the establishment of a national health-insurance system. The slant of the propaganda, however, strongly indicates an ultimate purpose to discredit the whole New Deal and pave the way for its defeat in 1944.

Spearheading the campaign is a stooge propaganda agency for the American Medical Association, calling itself the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service (N. P. C.). This agency is the product of a backstairs courtship between the American Medical Association and Frank Gannett's ultra-reactionary committee to uphold constitutional government.

Actively abetting organized medicine in this campaign, financially and otherwise, are the Nation's most powerful drug manufacturers, private insurance companies, and right-wing Republican politicos.

Under the guise of striving to keep medicine free from political control, this campaign has plumped organized medicine right into the middle of the worst kind of politicking. Many American doctors who are honestly opposed to the Wagner bill will be stunned and angered, I am sure, by the revelations that will follow, showing how leaders of organized medicine have tied their profession to the purse strings and apron strings of reactionary political and economic forces.

The Nation is being flooded with millions of pamphlets denouncing the Wagner bill as a step toward totalitarian dictatorship, communism, fascism, and general regimentation. The National Physicians Committee has already circulated over 15,000,000 pamphlets on this theme—one for every tenth man, woman, and child in the United States of America. Eight million more National Physicians Committee pamphlets are rolling off the presses.

Workers are being warned that the Wagner bill would cripple their income. Doctors are being panicked by hysterical propaganda informing them that the bill would make them slaves of a superstate. Businessmen are told the bill means the death of free enterprise and that the shackling of all industry would follow that of private medicine.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who would administer the health insurance program under the bill, is painted in this propaganda as a dictator, a czar, and a gauleiter. (Imagine the mild-mannered, democratic, nonpolitical surgeon general, Dr. Thomas Parran, in such a role!)

Twelve thousand newspapers and periodicals are deluged weekly with canned editorials and releases from National Physicians Committee headquarters attacking the Wagner bill and its sponsors. A nation-wide network of speakers has been organized to ride circuit among fraternal and other groups—Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and so forth—urging them to petition members of Congress to kill the bill.

II. THE NATIONAL PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE

The National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, with headquarters in Chicago, claims to be a nonpolitical organization devoted to:

1. The task of securing the most widespread distribution of the most effective methods and equipment in medicine and surgery.

2. Familiarizing the public with the facts in connection with the values, the methods, and the achievements of American medicine.

The facts are:

The N. P. C. is the child of a misalliance between organized medicine and reactionary politics. It has never done anything toward the "extension of medical service." Its almost exclusive function during its 4 years of existence has been to combat Federal legislation for providing adequate medical service to masses of people who are not now receiving it.

Let's take a look at the record of the origin and rise of the N. P. C.

The year 1938 witnessed a powerful drive led by labor and consumer groups for a national health program. This program was embodied in an unsuccessful bill introduced by Senator ROBERT A. WAGNER. To combat this movement and this bill, a Physicians' Committee for Free Enterprise in Medicine was created under the auspices of the Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government. This latter group was founded and then headed by Frank Gannett, the publisher-politician.

The Gannett-sponsored physicians' committee had a twofold purpose. The first aim, openly avowed, was to smash the movement for a national health program under the emblem of "free enterprise." The second aim, which soon emerged to the surface, was to mobilize the pressure-power of the medical profession behind the Gannett committee's anti-New Deal campaign and, perhaps, to further the Presidential ambitions of Gannett himself.

The list of members on the physicians' committee was studded with the names of leading lights in organized medicine, including several ex-presidents of the American Medical Association.

The director of activities, and the brains of the Physicians' Committee for Free Enterprise in the Gannett outfit was John M. Pratt, a former newspaperman, publisher, and advertising executive. He is now executive administrator of the National Physicians' Committee in Chicago.

The Gannett-inspired physicians' committee, like its present-day successor, started off with a splurge of pamphlets addressed to the medical profession and the lay public. These pamphlets subtly depicted the national health movement as part of a New Deal plot to destroy free enterprise in the United States of America, using private medical practice as its first target. The literature artfully hitched the star of private physicians to the wagon of big business.

Two events combined to embarrass the activities of the physicians' committee, however:

Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the parent Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, was exposed in a congressional hearing as a former secret agent of the German Government during World War No. 1. Rumely had served a prison term for his propaganda activities in behalf of the Kaiser.

Frank Gannett announced his intention to run for the 1940 Republican Presidential nomination. This rendered untenable the claim of the physicians' committee that it was an independent and nonpartisan agency. As a matter of fact, Gannett boldly used the mechanism of the physicians' committee to solicit financial support for his campaign from medical men. Later, leaders of the committee urged the medical profession to get behind the Republican nominee, Willkie, for the defense of free enterprise.

The physicians' committee came under the blistering fire of incensed doctors who felt betrayed. It quietly disappeared. In its place, the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service was formed in October 1939, under dubious sponsorship. The American Medical Association claims that it has no official connection with the National Physicians' Committee. The National Physicians' Committee, in turn, denies any connection with the Committee for Constitutional Government, successor to the old Gannett group.

Both claims may be technically correct. But the following facts reveal that the links between the agencies of medical and political reaction remain close and strong.

The membership of the National Physicians Committee itself is a significant index of the tie-up between organized medicine and the Gannett committee:

John M. Pratt, executive administrator of the N. P. C., held the same post in the Gannett-inspired Physicians Committee for Free Enterprise. Although the N. P. C. calls itself an all-physicians committee, its active head is a layman, and an advertising man at that.

Of the 10 members of the N. P. C.'s board of trustees:

Dr. Edward H. Cary, chairman, is a former president of the American Medical Association and a former member of the Physicians Committee for Free Enterprise.

Dr. William F. Braasch, secretary of the N. P. C., is a trustee of the American Medical Association (A. M. A.).

Dr. F. F. Borzell is chairman of an A. M. A. committee, and was a member of the A. M. A. house of delegates in 1942.

Dr. William J. Carrington was vice president of the American Medical Association last year.

Dr. John H. Fitzgibbon is also a chairman of an A. M. A. committee and a 1942 member of its house of delegates.

Dr. Wingate M. Johnson, editor of the North Carolina State Medical Journal, is a former member of the Gannett physicians committee.

Dr. Edward J. McCormick is president of the Ohio State Medical Society.

Dr. William R. Maloney is president of the California State Medical Association.

Dr. James M. Robb is a former member of the Gannett physicians committee.

Dr. Edward H. Skinner is a past president of the Jackson County and a former member of the Gannett physicians committee.

III. THE A. M. A. AND THE N. P. C.

It may be technically true that the American Medical Association has no official connection with the National Physicians Committee, but—

The A. M. A. has officially approved the N. P. C. and voted to encourage its activities as a matter of A. M. A. policy. Nearly every State or local medical society affiliated with the A. M. A. has also voted a resolution of official endorsement.

The N. P. C. has branches in every State and nearly every locality. Invariably the leadership of the State or local N. P. C. branch is identical with the leadership of the medical society in that area.

The A. M. A. and its regional affiliates actively aid the N. P. C.'s solicitation of funds and distribution of propaganda.

Some forthright doctors have asked why the A. M. A. doesn't wage its propaganda campaign openly, instead of through a stooge agency. The answer is that if the A. M. A. engages directly in propaganda work and legislative lobbying, it loses its tax-exemption status—an important consideration in view of the fact that it clears a $600,000-a-year profit from its Journal alone.

Dr. Chester I. Ulmer, chairman of the New Jersey branch of the National Physicians Committee, let the cat out of the bag when he wrote in the New Jersey State Medical Society Journal last year:

"We have received quit a few letters asking why there is a need for a new organization and why cannot the American Medical Association do all of this work?

"There are definite reasons:

"1. By virtue of its charter provisions * * * the A. M. A. has been accorded the status of a nonprofit, scientific, educational foundation. As such it has been granted exemption from income and social security taxation. A departure from established practice would, in all probability, entail the forfeiture of this status. This, in turn, would entail exorbitant taxation.

"2. There are many lay groups and individuals who are vitally affected by present medical trends. * * * The support of all interested should be enlisted. The A. M. A., as such, could not ask for nor accept financial support from many of these. As a case in point, the finding of the (A. M. A.) council on pharmacy could not be kept free from suspicion if the A. M. A. were accepting substantial contributions from a drug manufacturer."

A pamphlet issued by the National Physicians Committee, entitled "The Minutemen of Medicine," contains this revealing passage on how it came to be created:

"Many conferences were held—conferences of physicians, conferences of representatives of the pharmaceutical industry, conferences by representatives of lay groups, and joint conferences of representatives of many of the above.

"The joint conferences resulted in a decision—that it was essential to establish a new institution.

"That institution was named National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service."

And this is the "institution" that palms itself off as an "all physicians" group, representing the "medical profession" purely and simply.

Dr. Morris Fishbein, dynamic factotum of the A. M. A. and editor of its official Journal, played an active role as consultant in the creation of the N. P. C. A speech of his, telling why organized medicine needs the N. P. C., has been reprinted as a pamphlet and widely circulated among physicians.

IV. THE COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Although no direct organizational link exists between the Gannett-inspired Committee for Constitutional Government and the new Physicians Committee, the former continues to wage an intensive drive within and without the medical profession, which ties in neatly with the N. P. C.'s propaganda.

(It should be said that Gannett, founder and former head of the Committee for Constitutional Government, is now vice chairman of the Republican National Committee. Samuel B. Pettengill, former chairman and still chief propagandist of the Gannett committee, is at present finance chairman of the Republican National Committee. Together, Gannett and Pettengill represent the extreme reactionary wing of the Republican Party. Pettengill, who succeeded the discredited German agent, Rumely, is one of the most active propagandists for big business and isolationism.)

The Gannett committee, paralleling the N. P. C. drive, is at present mailing fat packets of anti-New Deal pamphlets to every physician in the United States of America. The envelope in which this batch of propaganda is enclosed has these words printed across its face, in red letters:

"To all physicians: danger ahead * * * Senator Wagner's bill 1161.

"Here are your weapons. Protect your profession from serfdom to the State."

Three pamphlets by Samuel B. Pettengill are included in the packet. The first, entitled "Bismarck's Golden Chain," warns that Senator WAGNER is trying to emulate Bismarck in welding a "golden chain" of social security around the necks of American workers which would destroy their liberty.

The second Pettengill pamphlet, The Welfare State, warns that the "totalitarian state starts out as a welfare outfit" and that New Dealers like Tugwell and WALLACE—"who are kept in power by Mr. Roosevelt"—are conspiring to swallow up free industry by compulsory insurance and other welfare schemes.

The third Pettengill pamphlet addressed to the American medical profession indicts New Deal state socialism as a parallel of "what Hitler did in Germany, Stalin in Russia, and Mussolini in Italy."

It includes a shocking piece of anti-Allied propaganda which, in wartime, steps dangerously close to the edge of sedition:

"Will we wake up some day and find that Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt have by secret covenants, secretly arrived at, repealed the Declaration of Independence and enacted common citizenship for us and all British subjects, as Churchill actually proposed to France and as he hinted recently on American soil?"

This is the kind of propaganda pounded into the medical profession by the unholy trinity under the guise of "nonpolitical" attacks on the Wagner bill.

V. WHO FINANCES THE NATIONAL PHYSICIANS' COMMITTEE?

The budget of the N. P. C., according to John M. Pratt, its executive administrator, amounts to "about $200,000" for the current year. This sum, of course, does not cover the tremendous volume of N. P. C. publicity printed free in medical and lay journals, or N. P. C. propaganda inserted as paid ads in newspapers and other outlets by medical societies, private insurance companies, and drug manufacturers.

About 60 percent of the N. P. C.'s funds comes from the medical profession; the other 40 percent comes from the "medical industry." Dr. George M. Coleman, treasurer of the N. P. C., defines the medical industry as "pharmaceutical firms and that sort of thing." It is known that several of the biggest drug houses contribute large sums to the N. P. C.

The N. P. C. doesn't publish a regular financial statement. It is extremely secretive about the specific sources of its funds.

"We don't broadcast our finances," Dr. Coleman told PM's Chicago correspondent. "We say what we spend. We just don't break it down."

When our correspondent asked Coleman if the N. P. C. propaganda material dealt mainly with legislative matters, he answered:

"Oh, no. We are trying to preserve the practice of individual enterprise, private enterprise, initiative. They're plain words that your man Deutsch probably won't like. But we want to keep medicine the way it's always been. It's done a darn good job."

Besides donating big sums to the N. P. C., big drug manufacturers have offered their facilities to help distribute its propaganda literature. The Portland, Oreg., division of the McKesson & Robbins Wholesale Drug Co., for instance, has packed hundreds of N. P. C. pamphlets in each regular shipment to retail drug stores, for distribution to customers. The Portland Warehousemen's Union, Local 203, A. F. of L., protested against this practice, but to no avail.

Retail drug chains have also enlisted in the N. P. C. propaganda drive. The president of the United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corporation, last month sent a letter to every doctor in the United States of America, denouncing the Wagner bill as an effort to regiment the medical profession and to bring about socialized or state medicine. The letter promised that:

"The enclosed leaflet, issued by the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, will be distributed to our customers in every Whelan drug store throughout the country—we will see to it that your message reaches the general public.

"It is a privilege to serve the medical profession on all occasions."

The N. P. C. would like people to believe that individual doctors are falling over one

another in an eager rush to donate funds to the agency. The fact is that its support from the medical profession seems to consist largely of assessments imposed on members by State and local medical societies, together with contributions jimmied out of doctors by means of high-pressure mail and telephone solicitation by local medical politicians. Many doctors subjected to such pressures find it highly impolite to say no.

Many medical societies have made lump-sum contributions to the N. P. C. The New Hampshire Medical Society last year imposed a State-wide assessment on its members to support N. P. C. activities. The Baltimore County (Md.) Medical Society voted to assess each member $5 for the same purpose. The Erie Co. (N. Y.) Medical Society, including the Buffalo area, recently assessed its membership $25 each N. P. C. support.

Here's a letter sent to Senator WAGNER by an Erie County doctor last week:

"MY DEAR SENATOR: The Erie County Medical Society has just passed a resolution assessing every member $25 for the sole purpose of defeating the Wagner-Murray bill.

"If I should not pay this item, I may be expelled from the Erie County Medical Society and, therefore, from the American Medical Association. According to the statutes of recognized hospitals, only members of the county society and the A. M. A. can be admitted to their staff. Thus, an otherwise reputable physician may lose a full-time position.

"Thus far I have been flooded with literature against the bill, but I have yet to see the first statement in favor of it.

"Why the black-out on information in favor of the bill? Are we introducing here the propaganda methods of a Hitler and Goebbels?"

VI. MEDICAL OPPOSITION ORGANIZED

That doctor is not alone in his disgust at the crude, unfair campaign being waged in the name of organized medicine. Last July the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc., a national group formed in 1936 for obtaining real improvement in medical care, issued a manifesto endorsing the general principles of the Wagner bill.

The membership of this liberal committee includes some of the most eminent names in American medicine. Dr. Channing Frothingham of the Harvard Medical School is chairman.

The July declaration of the committee of physicians denounced the misleading statements of the N P. C., and its general satisfaction with the status quo.

"This is not the time," says the Committee of Physicians, "to be satisfied with the progress already made but rather to continue to solve the problems related to the improvement of medical care which we know exist at the present time and which are almost certain to become still more serious in the post-war period."

Yesterday the Physicians' Forum, another group, consisting of some 250 doctors, sincerely concerned with the problem of improving medical care, came out with a statement endorsing the general provisions of the Wagner bill.

But so far these voices are a minority in medicine. The organized skullduggery goes on, instigated and directed in part by reactionary politicos, and financially supported by powerful outside sources with dubious intentions.

REAL FACTS ON WAGNER BILL

The bill is a 90-page document outlining sweeping improvements in our whole social-security system. The health and medical care sections form only one part of it. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill has been called the legislative equivalent of a Beveridge plan for America. The bill—

Creates a unified national social insurance system, with a Nation-wide network of public employment offices. It liberalizes old-age and unemployment insurance, and provides lump-sum death benefits, maternity benefits, insurance for temporary or permanent disability, and medical and hospital care.

Covers some 15,000,000 people not included in the present social-security system, such as small businessmen, self-employed professionals, farmers, domestics, agricultural workers, and employees of nonprofit institutions.

Sets up a Federal system of medical and hospital insurance for all persons covered by old-age and survivors insurance and for their dependents. This would include about 100,000,000 Americans. The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service would administer the technical and professional aspects of this program. The Social Security Board would supervise the financial phases and social-security relationships.

Here's how the medical and hospital insurance program would work:

Each insured worker and his dependents would be entitled to medical service. He could choose any doctor he wished from among those in the community who voluntarily agree to go into the system. Each person is also entitled, on the doctor's advice, to specialist, consultant, and laboratory services (including X-ray, appliances, eyeglasses, etc.) and necessary hospital care. The latter would be limited to 30 days a year, with a possible maximum of 90 days if the insurance fund could afford it.

Doctors are left free to enter or remain out of the system, to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them. Every qualified hospital is eligible to participate.

Provision is also made for Federal grants-in-aid for medical education and medical research.

An advisory council, consisting of 16 representatives of the medical profession and interested lay groups, would assist the Surgeon General in formulating policies for administering the program.

To finance the entire social-insurance program, all pay rolls would be taxed 12 percent, with employer and employee each contributing 6 percent. This money would go into a social insurance trust fund. One-fourth the total—amounting to an estimated $3,000,000,000 annually, about the size of the present annual medical bill in the United States of America—would be earmarked for the medical care and hospitalization part of the program.

HOW ORGANIZED MEDICINE TWISTS TRUTH IN FIGHT TO KILL HEALTH BILL—PROGRAM NEEDED TO KEEP UNITED STATES WELL IS DISTORTED INTO DICTATORSHIP PLOT

(By Albert Deutsch)

The Medical Society of Christian County, Ky., on October 29, 1943, adopted an astounding resolution. It declared that if Congress ever so much as considered the Wagner bill, which would create a Federal health insurance program as part of the social-security system, members of the society would "close their offices and cease to practice during the time Congress is so considering this bill in order that the public may see that we mean not to have national socialism in the United States and thus start a revolt against this threat to freedom."

What lies behind this unprecedented threat of a medical strike, aimed at forestalling free, democratic congressional debate over a bill duly introduced by two Senators and a Member of the House? What impelled the good doctors of Christian County to disregard so flagrantly the sacred tradition of their profession, the safety of their patients, and the dictates of democratic common sense?

VIRUS SPREADS

The answer is that the Christian County medicos have succumbed to the same propaganda virus that has infected large numbers of their colleagues. This infection has rendered the greater part of the medical profession hysterically allergic to the Wagner bill.

The focal center of this infection is Chicago, headquarters of the American Medical Association and of its stooge propaganda agency, the so-called National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service. From there the virus, loaded in millions of propaganda packages, has been spread throughout the Nation.

Its victims, mainly medical men, are transformed from decent, fair-minded Americans into rabid monomaniacs on the subject of the Wagner bill, filled with blind, irrational fears and hates.

Yesterday we showed how a backstairs courtship between organized medicine—by which we mean the American Medical Association and its State and local affiliates—and the ultrareactionary Committee for Constitutional Government resulted in the birth of the National Physicians Committee as a medico-political propaganda agency against the New Deal. The putative grandfather of this National Physicians Committee (N. P. C.) is Frank Gannett, isolationist publisher, founder of the Committee for Constitutional Government and vice chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The executive administrator and chief propagandist of the N. P. C. is John M. Pratt, an old advertising agent and Gannett associate who was executive director of the Gannett-connected Physicians Committee for Free Enterprise in Medicine until exposures of its political connections forced it out of business in 1939.

John M. Pratt is the author of what is probably the most widely circulated pamphlet ever published in the United States of America. Fifteen million copies of this single pamphlet have already been distributed; millions more are rolling off the press.

This pamphlet is the source and fountainhead of most of the propaganda against the Wagner bill flooding the Nation today. It supplies the chief arguments drummed into the medical profession through editorials in hundreds of official medical journals, and pounded into the public ear from the lecture platform, the press, and the radio.

DISTORTS TRUTH

This pamphlet, as we shall show, is compounded largely of innuendos, half-truths, distortions, and downright lies about the purposes and provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It makes free use of the propaganda equivalents of brass knucks, eye gouging, groin kicking, and rabbit punching in its unprincipled attack on the bill and its sponsors.

Yet this pamphlet has become a bible of organized medicine. Its falsifications are solemnly repeated as gospel truth in medical journals and in floods of printed matter emanating from the headquarters of the American Medical Association and its local affiliates.

The first edition of this pamphlet was entitled "Abolishing Private Medical Practice: $3,048,000,000 of Political Medicine in the United States."

The author's name did not appear on this pamphlet.

Succeeding editions of the same pamphlet bore the title:

"Abolishing Private Medical Practice, or Prelude to Centralized Control of the Professions and of Industry."

These copies all bear the signature of the author, John M. Pratt, erstwhile Gannett

man. When Mr. Pratt was asked to explain the discrepancy, he replied:

MODESTY?

"The first edition was intended exclusively for the medical profession. The others are for general consumption."

Medical men, you see, do not relish having authoritative statements on medical practice written by laymen. So they were spared the signature of the advertising expert, Pratt, in their edition of the pamphlet distributed in the name of organized medicine. The title change in the succeeding editions was artfully aimed at stampeding nonmedical groups into active opposition to the Wagner bill.

The very title of the pamphlet is misleading. The Wagner bill neither strives for nor would lead to the abolition of private medical practice. The bill specifically provides safeguards for private medicine. In many countries, private medical practice flourishes side by side with national health-insurance systems.

The pamphlet, according to the title page, is "a factual analysis of the medical and hospitalization provisions of the Wagner-Murray Senate bill 1161 and an explanation of some of their implications."

It is not a factual analysis but a propaganda-loaded smear; it is not an explanation but a distortion.

The very first sentence of the pamphlet is a plain-faced distortion.

FREE SERVICE?

"Senate bill 1161," it says "makes provision for free general medical, special medical, laboratory, and hospitalization benefits for more than 110,000,000 people in the United States."

Nothing is given away free under the Wagner bill, any more than it would be in any form of contributory insurance, public or private. The medical and hospital care provided by the bill would be paid for by the beneficiaries on a bona fide insurance basis.

Each beneficiary pays 6 percent of his wages up to $3,000 a year into the national insurance fund. In return, he and his dependents get covered for unemployment, old age, disability, medical and hospital insurance, besides death and maternity benefits.

Employers contribute 6 percent of their pay roll into the central insurance fund. Self-employed persons and small businessmen may get coverage on a voluntary basis by contributing 7 percent of their annual income.

It is estimated that a total of $12,000,000,000 a year would be paid into the national insurance fund to cover all the aforementioned benefits. About one-fourth of this total—roughly $3,000,000,000—would be earmarked for medical and hospital care.

The rest of the National Physicians Committee pamphlet is replete with misstatements and skillful distortions. Let's examine some of the more important ones:

Bunk: The pamphlet makes it appear that the $3,000,000,000-a-year estimated cost of the medical and hospital insurance program would represent a brand new financial burden on the American people.

Because: The truth—never mentioned in the pamphlet—is that the annual medical bill of the American people now amounts to nearly $4,000,000,000. The Wagner bill would permit more Americans to get better medical care at less cost.

Bunk: The pamphlet makes it appear that all the 12 percent social-security tax on pay rolls would be new revenue.

Because: Employers already contribute 4 percent of their pay rolls, workers 1 percent of their wages up to $3,000, into the present limited social-security fund.

Bunk: The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who administers the medical and hospital provisions of the bill, is painted in the pamphlet as a virtual totalitarian dictator. Editorials in medical journals based on the pamphlet refer to the Surgeon General as a czar, a gauleiter, a Hitler.

The pamphlet deliberately exaggerates the Surgeon General's powers by omitting important qualifying phrases in the bill. It uses an old smear technique by printing Surgeon General in bold-face type wherever it appears in the pamphlet.

Because: The bill provides for democratic methods of determining policy and procedures. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is given administrative responsibility because his is the logical Federal office to handle medical and hospital care. The Public Health Service has a splendid record of 145 years of nonpolitical, high-caliber health service to all the people. Nobody calls the British Health Minister a dictator or gauleiter because his department happens to administer the national insurance system in Britain.

Bunk: The pamphlet says:

"It (the bill) proposes placing in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the power and authority to hire doctors and establish rates of pay—possibly for all doctors."

Because: The implication that all doctors in the health insurance program must be salaried is false. The bill (sec. 905) says explicitly that the method of payment for the general practitioner's services shall be determined by a majority of doctors in each local area. Payment may be fixed by local decision on a salary, fee-for-service or pro-rata basis.

No doctor would be compelled to enroll in the Federal insurance system. He can go in or stay out, as he chooses.

The bill also states explicitly that the pay for doctors must be adequate to provide incentives for the professional advancement of practitioners and to encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished.

Bunk: "The Surgeon General * * * is given the power and authority to determine the number of individuals for whom any physician may provide service."

Because: The pamphlet implies that each doctor may be given a different number of people to serve—depending, perhaps, on his political pull. The fact is that the bill authorizes the Surgeon General only to set a maximum number of people for all doctors, in order to prevent any physician from assuming the care of more patients than he can handle satisfactorily. Setting this maximum insures higher standards of care for the people covered.

FREE CHOICE

Bunk: The pamphlet—and the propaganda literature of organized medicine based on it—implies that the Wagner bill would destroy the "free choice" system in American medicine.

Because: The bill specifies that any insured person can choose any doctor serving on the insurance panel. The doctor is given the right to accept or reject any patient.

Bunk: The pamphlet makes a lengthy comparison between the estimated $3,000,000,000 annual cost of the health insurance program and the national budgets of pre-war France, the German Government, and the Japanese Empire. The only comment made in the pamphlet on this strange comparison is:

"How much is $3,000,000,000? What can be done with it? What can be accomplished? The potential can be understood only by comparisons."

Because: The comparisons are utterly irrelevant. The only reason for making them, obviously, is to tie up the Wagner bill with our enemies and with the fate of France—a smear technique.

Bunk: The pamphlet makes repeated use of bogey words designed to instill fear and resentment in its medical and lay readers. The Wagner bill is smeared by such catchwords as "totalitarian medicine," "political medicine," "state medicine," "centralized control of the professions," "catering to the ward committeeman." It depicts the doctors under the bill as "mere pawns of politicians."

Because: There is often more politics in private medical and hospital care than in public-health institutions. Tax-supported medical and hospital care is not necessarily any more political than their private prototypes. What of the many medical politicians in private practice? Many of our Government health departments—Federal, State, and local—are operated on a nonpolitical, merit basis with high standards. Our public hospitals are no more political, necessarily, than many private hospitals where medical advancement depends not on individual ability, but on whom you know.

Bunk: The foreword to the pamphlet says:

"The processes proposed and the mechanisms indicated (in the Wagner bill) are designed to act as the catalyst in transforming a rapidly expanding bureaucracy into an all-powerful totalitarian state control. Human rights as opposed to state slavery is the issue."

Because: This is a contemptible smear of the bill's sponsors, attributing to them the sinister and deliberate aim of ushering in a "totalitarian state." The real and laudable aims of the bill's health insurance provisions, as ably stated by its coauthor, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, include:

As nearly universal coverage as possible to insure the widest possible spread of risks and costs of medical and hospital care.

Unrestricted access to all necessary medical care for the people, regardless of how low their incomes.

Preservation of standards of medical care.

Preservation of professional independence for the members of the medical profession.

Bunk: The pamphlet charges that the bill places "in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the expenditure of $3,000,000,000 annually.

Because: The bill specifically places financial control of the program in the hands of the Social Security Board. All financial arrangements for medical and hospital care are subject to the Board's approval. The Social Security Board is a nonpartisan body. Its members, like the Surgeon General, are appointed for terms that do not coincide with Presidential terms.

Bunk: The pamphlet identifies the present fee-for-service practice of private medicine with the "Christian concept of the sanctity of human personality" and with "the American way."

Because: Fee-for-service private medical practice antedated the Christian era. It is practiced among Buddhist, Mohammedan, Hebrew, and Shinto peoples as well as among Christians. There is no record that Jesus ever took a fee for service rendered to those He healed. Neither private nor public medicine is exclusively Christian. It would appear to be both a Christian and American ideal to make modern medical resources available to all who need them, regardless of ability to pay, rather than to deny it to those unable to meet fees when catastrophic illness strikes.

REACTIONARIES IN UNITED FRONT AGAINST HEALTH BILL

(By Albert Deutsch)

A united front among organized medicine, big business, drug manufacturers, chain drug stores, chambers of commerce, private insurance companies and anti-New Deal politicians is rapidly developing in opposition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for an expanded social and health security program.

These forces are being welded together behind the huge propaganda campaign led by the misnamed National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service,

stooge agency for the American Medical Association.

Big business has grabbed the opportunity to have a respectable profession front for its general attack on the New Deal administration. Its well-heeled propaganda agencies, notably the Frank Gannett-created Committee for Constitutional Government, are cleverly steering the anti-Wagner bill bandwagon in the general direction of right-wing Republican party interests.

Even more sinister forces have joined the campaign, trying to exploit propaganda-doped doctors to help finance them. So grave has this situation become, that the New York County Medical Journal—itself rabidly opposed to the Wagner Act—was constrained to carry this warning editorial in its issue of December 4, 1943:

"Aware of the intensity of medical opposition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, certain lay organizations with the suspicious Fascist tinge are circulating the profession for funds on the pretext that they, too, are opposed to this legislation.

"Physicians are determined to resist any attempt to impose bureaucratic dominancy on medical practice—but they need not and will not associate themselves with questionable groups in the fight.

N. P. C. ISN'T CHOOSEY

"To many it will seem a course of wisdom for medical men to concentrate their fighting dollars in the National Physicians Committee. Even if a practitioner is not in accord with the general political viewpoint of the latter's active members, at least he knows they are honest, loyal citizens. * * *

"Some will disagree with this and prefer to support other organizations. Before they do, however, they should carefully investigate the agency of their choice to make sure it is not 'fronting' for dubious groups."

But the National Physicians Committee is not as squeamish as the New York Medical Society about its associates. It not only accepts the support of the most reactionary elements in American society; it actively solicits such cooperation. Its own close tie-up with the ultra-reactionary Committee for Constitutional Government hardly warrants the trust of politically independent doctors.

State and local chambers of commerce have eagerly joined hands with organized medicine in offering their services as "transmission belts" for the untruthful propaganda emanating from the N. P. C. A statement recently issued by the Bronx County (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce illustrates the subtle manner in which the interests of organized medicine and business are tied up in an anti-Roosevelt attack:

The statement declares:

"No time should be lost by this or any other organization in opposing the bill introduced by United States Senators ROBERT F. WAGNER and JAMES E. MURRAY which, under the guise of increased social-security benefits would bring about out-and-out Communism of United States Medicine.

"The Bronx Chamber of Commerce has been on record as opposed to socialized medicine in any form and this is the worst that could be conceived with aspects throughout that would tear down the American way of life.

"We have had much of that policy in the recent past as regards to business, but here we are playing with the health of the Nation."

COMMERCE CHAMBERS JOIN

Many chambers of commerce, egged on by the National Physicians' Committee, are sending resolutions to their Congressmen opposing the Wagner bill. In many areas, chambers are exchanging speakers with local medical societies to strengthen further the ties of conservative business interests and organized medicine.

The National Physicians' Committee recently adopted a new line in its attack on the Wagner bill for national health insurance system. It aims to stimulate private medical insurance plans as a means of heading off the movement for a government-sponsored system.

The N. P. C.'s board of trustees, at their annual meeting held at Chicago last month, voted to plug private medical prepayment plans—which were opposed by organized medicine for many years until the bogey of public health insurance appeared on the scene—as a means of checkmating the Wagner bill.

A resolution unanimously adopted at the N. P. C. meeting, as reported in the American Medical Association Journal for December 11, 1943, included these revealing points:

"Resolved, that the management committee be authorized, and the administrator (ex-advertising man John M. Pratt) be instructed, to proceed with efforts designed to—

"Investigate conditions relating to and inform industry concerning the principles underlying sound participation with employees in prepayment plans for meeting the cost of unusual or prolonged illness and hospitalization.

"Inform private insurance underwriters of the opportunity being offered through cooperation in nationwide efforts to provide group insurance policies for those needing or desiring insurance against the hazards of unusual illness."

ERECTING BARRICADES

The intent behind these long-winded phrases is clear: To mobilize industry and private insurance in the task of erecting barricades against a national health program for all the people.

A recent item in the ubiquitous Dr. Morris Fishbein's column, Dr. Pepys' Dairy, which appears regularly in the American Medical Association Journal, mentions a visit to the executive of a private causalty insurance company. We may be sure the weather wasn't the main topic of conversation.

Meanwhile the private firms handling sickness and accident insurance haven't been blind to the threat to their profits represented by the Wagner bill's health and hospitalization program. The letter displayed on this page shows how they are combating the bill.

The National Physicians Committee, in its anti-Wagner bill propaganda, makes a great point of the "huge administrative costs" entailed by the setting up of a Federal "bureaucracy" under the bill. It estimates that the administrative expense would amount to about 20 percent of the total health-insurance fund. This is a grossly exaggerated estimate.

WHICH IS WASTEFUL?

Even so, the fact is that the administrative costs of private casualty and accident insurance companies in the United States average about 40 percent of their total income—twice the percentage which scares the N. P. C. Which is more wasteful—public or private health insurance?

The drug manufacturers and chain drug stores have also swung heavily behind the N. P. C. campaign, financially and otherwise. For two main reasons:

The passage of the Wagner bill would deal a grave blow to the extremely profitable patent-medicine trade, upon which so many poor people depend for lack of money to pay doctors.

The American Medical Association wields a powerful influence on these drug outfits, many of whom depend on official A. M. A. sanction of their products. On the other hand, it is the lavish advertisements of these drug firms in medical journals that furnishes most of the financial support of organized medicine.

WAGNER BILL GAINS SUPPORT OF DOCTORS; AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ASSAILED

(By Albert Deutsch)

Dr. Ernst P. Boas, chairman of the Physicians Forum, is one of the many thousands of American doctors who stand four-square behind the true Hippocratic tradition in medicine. He knows that the "horse-and-buggy" economic relationships that control the greatest part of American medicine lag far behind the streamlined development of medical art and medical science. He is genuinely disturbed by the fact that large sections of the American people are not getting the medical care they need. Like many of his colleagues, he is anxious to help break down economic barriers that are separating sick people from the rich medical resources of this country.

That is why Dr. Boas favors the general principles of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, in spite of its admitted imperfections in some details. That is why he opposes the completely negative stand of the American Medical Association on this bill.

"It is an accepted fact," says Dr. Boas, who is a prominent practitioner in New York City (and incidentally, the son of the late Prof. Franz Boas, America's greatest anthropologist), "that a large proportion of the population does not receive adequate medical care, and that methods of distributing medical care are unsatisfactory and often too expensive.

"These matters concern all the people and their Government, not doctors alone."

The high ideals traditionally followed by the medical profession, Boas asserts, give first place to the health and welfare of patients. It is part of this tradition to seek for the truth, through study and experiment, in medical science and art.

"How closely has the American Medical Association adhered to these ideals with respect to the social and economic aspects of medicine?" Dr. Boas asks.

"Unfortunately, in recent years the A. M. A. has led the profession into a morass of befuddled and dishonest thinking. Its actions and pronouncements have been guided solely by economic self-interest, with a desire to maintain at all costs the medical status quo for the benefit of those doctors who have reached positions of power and financial comfort. This is true of its position on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, as it was true of its opposition to the Group Health Cooperative of Washington (which led to the conviction of the A. M. A. in Federal court as a monopoly) and its opposition to the National Health Conference of 1939.

"The welfare of the Nation, the objectives of scientific study, are sacrificed to methods of expediency designed to defeat all change and maintain the present unsatisfactory system. Freedom of the press is throttled, for no views that deviate from those officially approved can appear in the powerful press of organized medicine."

Dr. Boas finds no excuse for the distortion of facts and the vituperation employed by the A. M. A. in its propaganda against the Wagner bill. The A. M. A., he adds, "is relinquishing its right to be the molder of medical thought and is making many of its members ashamed of it and of its leadership.

"Some of the young doctors of today, as a result of this false teaching, lose their ideals before they are well started on their careers. But most of them are bewildered and disillusioned. They seek a new leadership which will guide the organized profession into its old channels of service to its fellow men, along paths determined by objective scientific inquiry and investigation."

The Physicians Forum which Boas heads is a group of more than 250 doctors banded together for the study of medical care. Earlier this week the Forum assailed the "medical isolationism" of the A. M. A. and

indorsed the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill as an "epochmaking" step toward improving medical service on a national scale. It described the bill as the "most realistic legislation yet proposed" although it criticized certain details in the measure.

Unlike the A. M. A.—which has bitterly attacked the bill without once offering a constructive suggestion—the Physicians Forum has recommended specific changes. Its recommendations have been gratefully accepted by the congressional framers of the bill, who have repeatedly stated that it was not drafted as a "perfect instrument" and have welcomed all constructive criticism.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER has sent me the following wire:

"Have just inserted the Physicians Forum statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on behalf of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and myself. We are pleased that this important group of physicians has taken this view of our measure. The statement is an effective answer from within the profession to the widespread false propaganda against the bill.

"We are especially gratified that the Physicians Forum has presented constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement. Their proposals will have our earnest, open-minded study, in our continuing effort to improve the health and well-being of the American people."

As for the medical isolationists who control organized medicine and who have made common cause with the political isolationists, when will they emerge from their caverns and offer the American people something constructive for a change?

REACTIONARY MEDICAL CLIQUES WARP VIEWS OF DOCTORS

(By Albert Deutsch)

Lest some readers mistake my criticism of organized medicine for an attack on the medical profession, let me try to clarify the issue.

There is a vital distinction between the medical profession and organized medicine. The medical profession, individually and collectively, represents one of the finest groups of citizens engaged in the noble enterprise of saving lives and promoting human health and happiness. Its established standard of ethics is unparalleled. Its members devote more free time and energy to their needy fellow men than those of any other profession.

Virtually everybody is familiar with at least one physician who approaches the famous radio character, "Dr. Christian"—a kindly, selfless, and trusted family adviser who combines the best and most lovable features of Mr. Fix-it and Mr. Buttinsky.

The present generation of American doctors is probably the best educated and most competent in the world. (It wasn't always so.) Out of the vast wealth of this, the world's richest country, has come a network of rich medical resources.

AVERAGE M. D. IS O. K.

The average doctor is a "good egg," anxious to use his medical skills and knowledge to the best advantage of his patient. There is nothing blameworthy about the individual average member of the medical profession. This writer has no particular ax to grind with him. Most of my best friends, as I've said before, happen to be physicians.

It is different with organized medicine. By organized medicine I mean the American Medical Association, the 54 State and Territorial medical societies, and the two-thousand-odd county medical societies—all affiliated with the American Medical Association at the top. The American Medical Association started nearly a century ago with the praiseworthy purpose of raising the professional, scientific, and ethical standards of American medicine. It developed into a powerful trade association. That's what it is now, in the main.

The guiding genius in this development is Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the A. M. A.'s phenomenally successful (financially) Journal, member of several of its important councils, general factotum, and chief spokesman for organized medicine. He has never practiced medicine on his own, but he's one of the greatest promoters and advertising men this country has ever produced.

RULING CLIQUE

Here's how the magazine Fortune sized up the relationship in analysis of the A. M. A. several years ago:

"If Dr. Fishbein acts and talks and looks and writes like a promoter this is because he is a promoter, and so far he has promoted the A. M. A. from a mild academic body into a powerful trade association. Presumably that is what the doctors want the A. M. A. to be, and if so they have no justification for objecting to Dr. Fishbein's methods. If the A. M. A. were a scientific society exclusively, it would scarcely need Dr. Fishbein to speak for it, but as matters stand he is invaluable."

Dr. Fishbein's services are invaluable to organized medicine's economic interests. But it would be a mistake to regard the A. M. A.'s actions and pronouncements as strictly a one-man show. The A. M. A. is run by a little self-perpetuating clique representing the hierarchy of organized medicine. Its leaders are recruited from the most prominent men in American medicine. They have been eminently successful, financially and otherwise, under the present system of medical practice and distribution. They want to preserve it. They deeply resent any efforts to change it.

UNDEMOCRATIC

While outwardly a democratic organization, the A. M. A. works like a well-oiled oligarchy. Its members are thrice removed from the top officials. Doctors don't join the A. M. A. directly; they become members by joining their county societies. They vote for their county officials, who in turn name delegates to the State societies, who in turn name delegates to the national body. Nominations of A. M. A. officers are controlled by the ruling hierarchy; these are invariably steam-rollered through without opposition.

The average doctor has no voice in making A. M. A. policy. Decisions are made at the top and imposed on the membership. They are usually accepted without question, or at least without protest.

It happens that the economic interests of the average American doctor are not the same as the affluent, prosperous men who head the A. M. A. Reliable studies show that a compulsory health insurance system such as that proposed by the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, would raise the average income of physicians, besides providing better medical care for the people.

The British experience with national health insurance since 1911 has proved this. The British Medical Association opposed the system at the time it was introduced as bitterly as the A. M. A. opposed the Wagner bill. But today it not only accepts compulsory health insurance in principle and in practice, but is actually demanding that the present British system be vastly extended. It has repeatedly declared, in official statements, that the economic status of physicians and the health condition of the people have both been improved by health insurance.

Has Britain gone communistic? Has the British medical profession been "enslaved" by politicians? Just ask the British doctor, who is just as democratic as his American colleague.

But the average American doctor doesn't know these facts. He hasn't been honestly informed by his official medical journals. For years he has been bombarded with untruthful, irresponsible propaganda that serves the interests of a reactionary clique that is often opposed to his own interests.

LOCAL MEDICAL HEAD ATTACKS DO-NOTHING POLICY OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

(By Albert Deutsch)

The propaganda barrage loosed by organized medicine against the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill simply repeats a pattern of inflexible opposition manifested by this group toward any and all national health programs. This pattern, recognizable by the unprincipled smearing of sponsors and supporters of such programs by the hierarchs of organized medicine, was clearly defined years before either Roosevelt or Senator WAGNER appeared on the Washington scene. The present propaganda campaign differs from previous ones only by its amazing mobilization of reactionary political, industrial and medical forces behind it. The destructive and negative attitude of the American Medical Association toward proposals for improved national care, plus its failure to advance any constructive plans of its own, has already disgusted and dismayed several of its local affiliates. Dr. George C. Adie, retiring president of the Westchester County (N. Y.) Medical Society, scathingly denounced the policy of A. M. A. in an address reported in the current issue of the society's bulletin.

"Our national organization (the A. M. A.)," he said, "has been fighting a long succession of stubborn but not too brilliantly executed rear-guard actions. It has acknowledged the existence of new conditions only after they have become too obvious to be denied, and declined new principles or policies long after most of the constituent societies have announced these policies, and sometimes after they have become accomplished facts.

"It is time, we think, to stop fighting rear-guard actions and to formulate policies before the pressure of political interests or public opinion compels us to formulate such policies."

Those are the words of a realistic conservative opposed to the blind reactionary line traditionally followed by the A. M. A.

The A. M. A. has never offered a single constructive suggestion on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, ignoring the repeated invitations of its framers. The 90-page bill, heaven knows, has many defects, some of them serious. I will take up some of these flaws tomorrow. It would be miraculous if the bill—which covers the whole scope of social and health insurance—were not without blemish. Its authors have repeatedly averred that it was not intended as a perfect, finished product but as a draft to be modified on the basis of public hearings and expert discussion.

The A. M. A. has raised a big fuss because it was not consulted in the framing of the Wagner bill. Actually, its authors showed good sense in not giving the A. M. A. a chance to abort the whole project.

They may have remembered the sad experience of the Committee on Economic Security, created by President Roosevelt to draft the report on which the great Social Security Act of 1934 was based. This naive committee consulted the A. M. A. before submitting its final report, which included a recommendation for including national-health insurance in its program.

While the committee was still deliberating the A. M. A. suddenly called a special session of its house of delegates, which forthwith adopted resolutions condemning any and all compulsory health-insurance plans and indicating opposition to the social-security program in toto. That stab-in-the-back action effectively killed the health insurance proposal, and it was taken out of the program submitted to Congress.

It's a good thing the A. M. A. didn't get the opportunity to do the same to this bill before it at least got a public hearing.

DOCTORS' GROUP ANALYZES PROVISIONS OF WAGNER BILL

(By Albert Deutsch)

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for an expanded social-security program gets kudos and criticisms in an analysis made public today by the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care.

This group is not to be confused with the American Medical Association's stooge propaganda agency, the misnamed National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service. The Committee of Physicians is headed by Dr. Channing Frothingham, of Boston, and includes such distinguished medical men as Drs. John P. Peters, Hugh Cabot, Allan M. Butler, H. Clifford Loos, George R. Minot, and G. Canby Robinson.

Although this reporter disagrees with some parts of the committee of physicians' report, he considers it a well-tempered, honest, and constructive statement that stands in sharp contrast to the dishonest and purely destructive propaganda issued in the name of organized medicine.

The committee of physicians has already endorsed the general principles governing the medical and hospital provisions of the Wagner bill. Today's analysis approves some specific parts of the bill, and sharply criticises others.

Its main point of criticism is that the Wagner bill covers too many people—from 100,000,000 to 110,000,000—and that it might be wiser at the outset to limit coverage for medical and hospital benefits to those with incomes of $2,000 or $2,500 a year. (The Wagner bill covers all wage earners and permits self-employed and small businessmen to join the plan by paying 7 percent of their income up to $3,000.) The committee also suggests that it might be better to finance health insurance entirely by general tax funds, instead of making individual workers and employers contribute to it.

This proposal, although well-intentioned, is utterly unrealistic. In the first place, adequate medical care could be guaranteed only by a maximum coverage of the population. To set income limits for the beneficiaries might turn the plan into "poor man's insurance." The Wagner bill covers virtually everybody, and everybody pays something into the jackpot—a sound, democratic principle of insurance that gets away from the old charity concept. Joe Doakes would pay for the medical care he and his family get—although he actually pays less than he does now, without insurance—and J. D. Rockefeller can join, if he wants to.

Unlike the A. M. A. and its stooges, who have raised the cry that the Wagner bill would give the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service the powers of a totalitarian dictator, the physicians committee complains that it doesn't give him enough. Under the present bill, the Surgeon General is empowered to administer the medical and hospital provisions, but ultimate control of the financing is placed solely in the hands of the Social Security Board. The committee wants the Surgeon General to get a larger share in financial control.

The committee of physicians also asks for stronger safeguards to permit beneficiaries in middle and high-income groups to purchase luxury medical care at added costs if they wish, to protect group practice in medicine and even to foster its expansion, and to insure adequate medical representation on the advisory council set up to formulate policies regarding health and hospital insurance.

In some respects the committee's recommendations are far more radical than the Wagner bill's provisions. For instance, the committee urges that the fee-for-service principle be excluded completely from the proposed health insurance system, in order to avoid possible abuses by unscrupulous or incompetent doctors on the panel.

The committee endorses the Wagner bill's provisions for disability benefits, grants-in-aid to States for needy persons not covered by the bill, and Federal aid to medical education and research.

WAGNER BILL PROVIDES GOOD MEDICINE FOR AMERICANS

(By Albert Deutsch)

The refined, frock-coated combine of brass-knuck artists which has ganged up on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill has deliberately distorted the bill's broad scope by magnifying its medical and hospital provisions out of all proportions. Reading the propaganda put out by the coalition of medical, political, and economic reactionaries, the average citizen gets the impression that the measure is a "political medicine" bill, pure and simple, and that he's being asked to fork over 6 percent of his pay for health insurance alone.

The truth is that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill covers a comprehensive system of social insurance. Its medical and hospital provisions take up but a small part of the text. There is nothing essentially revolutionary in the measure; it represents a logical extension of the existing Social Security Act, passed in 1935.

The bill fills vital gaps in our present Social Security System, which is confined almost exclusively to protection against the hazards of unemployment and old age. Here are some of its main provisions, as outlined by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER:

It establishes a Nation-wide system of public employment offices, to help war workers and war veterans (as well as others in search of work) to avail themselves of job opportunities in private industry and on farms.

It covers broadly the main economic hazards of average American families—the cost of medical and hospital care, and loss of income in time of unemployment, temporary sickness, permanent disability, and old age.

It improves the present old-age insurance system and extends coverage to 15,000,000 persons now excluded, such as farm workers, domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions, and the independent farmer, professional and small businessman.

All these changes are established under a unified national system of social insurance, with one set of contributions, one set of records and reports, and one set of local offices. (There are now 48 different systems of unemployment compensation in the country, with much duplication of records and waste of money and manpower.)

Reinforcing the job guaranty in the Selective Service Act, the bill gives the returning veteran and his family paid-up benefit rights in every phase of this insurance protection.

Finally, the bill sets up an improved, unified system for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance (relief for needy people not covered by social insurance) on a variable matching basis, to offset the differences between poor and rich regions of the United States of America.

This comprehensive plan would be financed by equal pay-roll contributions of employees and employers, 6 percent each. Three percent of the insurance fund—1½ percent each from employee and employer—would be earmarked for the medical and hospital provisions of the bill. The average American family now pays 3 percent of its income for medical care, so this would not mean extra expenditures. It actually entails a smaller amount of the worker's total income.

The bill also provides for maternity benefits and for Federal grants to "aid the advancement of knowledge and skill in the provision of health services and in the prevention of sickness, disability, and premature death."

Call it cradle-to-grave or womb-to-tomb security. Honestly, does it add up to "bad medicine" for the American people, as its opponents claim?

Under Cover Loses Round One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article from the National Republic, which challenges the communistic smear book, Under Cover, and its author of many aliases. This article from such an outstanding American publication should prove enlightening to thousands who have been duped into buying this book and to others who have unwittingly used it as a basis for talks before community organizations.

UNDER COVER LOSES ROUND ONE

John Roy Carlson (Derounian), alias George Pagnanelli, alias George Paige, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias John Correa, alias Rudolph Elbers, the alien-born author of Under Cover, the largest gold brick in fiction (misnamed nonfiction), for which thousands of duped Americans have handed over $2,275,000 to date, has lost the first round in his attempted persecution of an American.

Paving the way for the launching of an initial propaganda send-off for Under Cover, Carlson filed serious charges in New York against Policeman James L. Drew, a member of the force for 17 years. Carlson, parading under false colors, did not go into court with clean hands. He filed the charges under an assumed name (John Roy Carlson), also giving an incorrect home address. During the trial he also used the alias Thomas L. Decker, following which the court finally forced him to give his real name (Arthur Derounian) and address. Under examination, he finally admitted that he had not made an investigation of Policeman Drew, and could not, therefore, sustain the charges he made against Drew.

POLICEMAN DREW EXONERATED OF CARLSON CHARGES

Policeman Drew, married and the father of five children, had much more at stake than Carlson and his crowd of smear artists who selected Drew as their initial target in launching Under Cover on the sea of sales. Consequently, Drew employed a renowned attorney to defend him. After hearing all the evidence presented in the case, Deputy Commissioner Lyon decided in behalf of Drew, clearing him and reinstating him to the police force. With this stinging rebuff which opened Under Cover to question in all its phases, the Carlson crowd, augmented by full-fledged Communists and hate-mongers, began the organization of anti-Drew committees in New York City, setting the city aflame with contention. The atmosphere became so tense that Police Commissioner Valentine finally agreed to review the testimony personally. He ultimately announced that he found no evidence to warrant the dismissal of Policeman Drew. The National

Republic condones no wrong Drew may have done in his life, if any. Carlson says this man is guilty, yet admits he cannot prove it and three special courts have now held him not guilty.

This decision merely served to stimulate the now well-organized bands of persecutors who are apparently determined to get Drew's scalp—or else. The situation became so serious that Mayor LaGuardia was finally forced to step into the picture. He appointed an ex-police commissioner and two ex-judges, Frederick Crane, Edward Finch, and George McLaughlin, to review the case again and to report their findings directly to him. On January 13 the three composing the special court submitted the following statement:

"The undersigned, having read the record and the briefs connected therewith, unanimously are of the opinion that this record supports the findings and recommendations of the police commission," which meant Policeman Drew was cleared by what might be compared to three courts.

Although Mayor LaGuardia, in announcing these findings, stated that it settled matters as far as he is concerned, it has not settled matters as far as those behind Under Cover and its would-be persecutors of Patrolman Drew are concerned. Contention is still at fever heat, even though Mayor LaGuardia arranged to have Drew make a statement in self-defense over the air a few weeks ago.

It is easily understood why the Under Cover crown is desperate, for this presents the first challenge of the integrity of the book and its author. They alone are responsible, however, for it was they who brought the charges against Drew for publicity purposes. Unfortunately for them, the case has served as a boomerang, and the sorrowful results may very easily have an adverse effect on the cases which will soon be heard in court, in which Carlson and his backers will be the defendants. Under Cover has had smooth sailing, but it will soon run into stormy seas, and from all indications it will come to a dismal end.

SUITS FILED TOTAL OVER $2,000,000

At least 11 suits have been filed to date against E. P. Dutton & Co., publishers of Under Cover; Carlson, author of the book; Winchell, commentator for Jergen's lotion on the air; the Blue Network; 2 alleged financial backers of the book; and several large book distributors. The total amount involved in these cases is over two and a half million dollars, representing the total income from sales to date. These suits are filed in Boston, Chicago, and Salt Lake City. An army of lawyers has invaded Chicago, setting up shop for the defense—Carlson and his crowd. One group is composed of insurance lawyers, indicating that the group behind Under Cover may have insured against libel. Another group also represents Lloyds of London, which may or may not point to another insurance angle.

The initial case, it is believed, will revolve around the paper cover (jacket) on each issue of Under Cover. The jacket of this book, in addition to the title, carried the words: "America's Quislings." The plaintiffs appear to consider that this directly libels those named in the book, regardless of the use of inferences and quotations in the book by the author in his effort to smear while apparently trying to skate on the outside rim of libel.

In the meantime, the Senate is considering an investigation of Carlson and his associates, and a widely known columnist alleges that Wendell Willkie, who defended William Schneiderman, the alien-born West Coast Communist Party secretary, when the Government threatened to take away his citizenship on the grounds that he held allegiance to a foreign country, will act as defense counsel for John Roy Carlson at the Senate hearings. It is believed that there is also a move afoot in the House of Representatives to look into the Carlson smear effort in an attempt to discover whether or not it is a well-laid plot, who are the real perpetrators, and for what purpose it was launched.

CARLSON ATTACKS SOUTH

While the storm clouds are gathering over Under Cover, Carlson is on a coast-to-coast lecture tour, stimulating the sale of the book. He was scheduled to speak in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of a bookshop, previously denounced as subversive. In San Francisco he addressed Town Hall on January 7. Book sellers recognized as from the Communist book store there were in the audience selling Under Cover. Although hundreds were in attendance, the sale of Under Cover proved very disappointing. Carlson took advantage of distance to develop another party-line smear. This time it was directed against the South. He said, in substance, that the philosophy of the South with regard to the Negro is Fascist, suggesting that the Negroes move North since he saw no immediate solution to their problem in the South.

Carlson who falsely accuses, directly or by inference, many American patriots (in Under Cover) of having associated or collaborated with Nazis, Fascists, and anti-Semites, admits that he not only associated with Nazi, Fascist, and anti-Semites, but that he also collaborated with such un-American forces. He condemns those whom he accuses of having committed similar acts to those of which he was guilty. Some he accused justly, others unjustly. They are all Quislings, while he is pure, according to Carlson.

CARLSON'S INCONSISTENCY

Carlson decries the isolationism of many individuals in 1941, while he personally espoused the same cause in that year in his own publication. He criticizes the anti-Semitism of individuals, while he spread it in his own publication, Christian Defender. He denounces the antiwar crowds such as the American First Committee, while he propagandized against war, not only in 1941 but also as far back as 1936 in a Communist publication which latter incident he remains silent about. He condemns the so-called American Quislings, while in 1936 he was eulogizing an alien form of government. He now fears persecution from the mob, demanding police protection, but he evidently condones the persecution of Policeman Drew and others.

It is indeed significant that Carlson fails to place in the category of isolationists, Quislings, anti-Semites, and the like, the Communists, who in 1940 and 1941 when he was supposedly investigating such elements, were picketing the White House in protest against war, sabotaging our defense plants, and shouting, within hearing distance of even Carlson, "The Yanks are not coming." After the Reds had changed their cry against war, Under Cover went to press, forgetting the Red hue and cry, and attacking all the non-Communists he could cram between the pages of his book.

It is not strange that the Communists have so vigorously pushed the sale of Under Cover. In fact, the Communist bookshops became a veritable network of distribution for it, and "fronters" became its principal boosters.

ONLY 30 OF 452 INDICTED

Thirty of those mentioned in Under Cover have been, it is true, recently indicted for alleged "sedition," but 30 is far short of 452 named in Under Cover and original indictments against most of the 30 preceded Under Cover. In respect to "isolationists" it is interesting to note that Carlson's lecture bureau manager is Clark H. Getts, operating as Clark H. Getts, Inc., who, according to the Wisconsin State Journal of September 7, 1918, was not only an isolationist, but a conscientious objector. Getts, the former University of Wisconsin and Columbia University student, was allegedly removed from Camp Grant to Leavenworth prison on the charge of refusal to obey orders after induction into the national army. The paper stated that Getts was first sentenced to life imprisonment, following which Washington authorities (reviewing the case) approved the findings, but reduced the term to 25 years. The article charges that Getts was a conscientious objector and a follower of the doctrines of Brent Dow Allinson and his guardhouse partner. It would seem, therefore, that Carlson is at least consistent in his selection of associates, in that it is in keeping with his own public antiwar expressions in 1936 and 1941, but not in keeping with his present attacks on so-called isolationists in Under Cover. He, of course, doesn't mention his lecture manager's record in Under Cover, and he slipped in mentioning his pal Shaemas O'Sheel, but has covered up that error by erasing that name from edition 15 of Under Cover. He also fails to mention the Communist end of the leadership of the Dennett movement.

Under Cover is more important for the things it doesn't print, than for what it does print. It is again a case of inconsistency thou art a jewel.

The South and the Freight Rate System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The South Is a Beneficiary, Not a Victim, of Its Freight Rate System," delivered by Alvin W. Vogtle, of Birmingham, Ala., manager, traffic and sales, of the De Bardeleben Coal Corporation, before the Rotary Club of Nashville, Tenn., on November 2, 1943.

I submitted a copy of this address to Mr. C. E. Childe, a member of the Board of Investigation and Research under the Transportation Act of 1940, and asked him to analyze the address, which he did in a letter to me dated January 25, 1944.

I ask unanimous consent that the address and analysis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing these statements. The estimated cost is $225.

There being no objection, the address and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the first place, I want you to know that I regard it very much as a compliment to be invited to address the Rotary Club of Nashville. It is a compliment which any business man would relish by reason of the high standing of Nashville in the industrial world, as well as the leadership which your city has so consistently taken in the dynamic progress of the modern South. It is additionally a privilege to me personally to be invited to talk on the southern freight-rate situation, for that is a subject very near and dear to my heart—a subject which has naturally

been made so by reason of my many years' experience and activity in shippers' organizations, both regional and national.

I understand that I am also in distinguished company when I take up that subject here in this vicinity, since Governor Cooper only recently was telling you about the freight-rate views which are held by a good many of the southern Governors. Some of my friends have been so kind as to tell me what the Governor said, and I want you to know that I respect the sincerity of his convictions, although I find it necessary now and then to differ with his conclusions. I would not for all the world, however, care to give the impression of entering into a debate with Governor Cooper, for I am sure that he and I and all of you are heading in the same general direction and are united in the same general aim—that of doing all we can for the progress of the South, subject only to the greater aim of doing all we can for the progress of the Nation as a whole. Those regional and national ideals, moreover, are seldom if ever in actual conflict, although they may at times give such an appearance on the surface.

My own approach to the freight-rate situation is that of a shipper and a student. As a shipper, I daily make use of southern freight rates and authorize the payment of good hard cash to the railroads for the service they render. As a student, I find it necessary to keep up with the principles and the practices of rate making, seeking information constantly regarding rate relationships, not only between our company and competing shippers in the South but also between the South and the other shipping and receiving regions of the country. If you could only hear some of the arguments in which I have been engaged with railroad rate men, both privately and before commissions, you would have to admit that those studies of mine have been put to some good, cold, practical, commercial use. You would understand, moreover, that I cherish no illusions whatsoever regarding the proper relationships between shippers and carriers and that I gaze with the calculating eye of a shipper upon the proper functions of freight rates in moving goods and their influences in permitting or encouraging this industry or that, this region or that, to prosper and grow strong.

I dare say that 99 percent of you entertain the opinion, as I did originally, that our freight-rate system handicaps the South. Indeed, I think it may fairly be said that our southern people as a whole are obsessed with the feeling that something must be radically wrong. Such a view is publicized daily by our newspapers, our politicians, and our college instructors. Yet it is a view which must be challenged and revised if the South is to retain its present rate of progress in industry and agriculture, in the combined development of which in recent years it is giving an example to the entire Nation.

You will ask, of course, how could a gross misconception of the freight-rate situation, as I contend it is, grow to such overwhelming proportions? For one thing, the belief of injustice to the South has been inspired, encouraged, and constantly publicized by the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Federal agency engaged in the operation of a publicly owned electric-power system in the South, and the public has had no choice but to accept these representations because they have gone almost unchallenged.

Yet southern businessmen, it seems to me, owe our freight-rate system the courtesy of a word in its favor, for they have helped to set it up and have benefited by its many and manifest advantages. It is true enough that the southern freight-rate agitation, which has been a political issue for some years, does not actually have support among the business enterprises of the South. However, there is far too much neutrality. Some business interests are unaware of the dangers they themselves face in the proposed rate-changing program, and others hesitate to offer any opposition because of possible political repercussions.

A belief is entertained by some executives, moreover, that the freight-rate question is so complex and technical as to be difficult of public understanding. I do not think so. I think Sir Isaac Newton's proof of such a complex natural law as that of gravitation—a proof made through the fall of an apple—should encourage us that the effects, good or bad, of an everyday commercial matter like freight rates should also be susceptible of simple proof.

Yet what are the facts regarding the South and its freight rates?

In the earliest report of the T. V. A. on this southern freight-rate question, it was claimed that the South possessed all economic factors necessary for a considerable industrial growth "with the single exception of proximity to markets." This artless statement, which implies an injustice and which reminds us how well an ice-cream salesman could do in Hades, gives the key to the whole southern freight-rate system. Markets, of course, are a major factor in any freight-rate system.

APPEALS TO PREJUDICE

We are told, that the South, in its relation to the North, is the victim of a colonial economy, exporting vast quantities of raw materials, importing most fabricated goods, and that this imposition also is due to the freight-rate system.

Of course, all such appeals to prejudice have considerable emotional value, and we are quite ready to believe that such treatment is exactly what we should expect, especially from the Yankees.

But such accusations are not true. And, plainly speaking, we should resent such contentions, because they are not only blind to the accomplishments of our Southern businessmen, but they reflect also on our Southern ability, enterprise, and judgment.

It is true enough that it is not economically sound to ship any raw material out of the South for processing if a considerable portion is shipped back in a modified form later. Freight rates on almost any level would effectively prevent such a grievous economic mistake. Southern processing in such a case would practically insure a profitable operation just from the freight savings alone on the long haul to and from the North.

The whole contention of freight-rate discrimination is of a piece with the emphasis too often placed in the South on problems and handicaps, an emphasis highlighted eventually by the South's unenviable designation as the "Nation's No. 1 Economic Problem"—a designation which likewise is fortunately no longer true to any appreciable extent. It seems to me our newspapers and our politicians could perform their greatest service for the South by devoting news space and lung power to dispelling—not spreading—such impressions and to advertising truthfully the South's phenomenal progress and marvelous potentialities.

To hear some of our detractors talk, we should believe, if we did not know better, that the South today is the same as the South which was pictured in the great Henry Grady's description of a Pickens County, Ga., funeral in the 1890's:

"A few years ago I attended a burial in Pickens County, Ga. The grave was dug through solid marble, but the marble headstone came from Vermont. It was in a pine wilderness, but the pine coffin came from Cincinnati. An iron mountain overshadowed it, but the coffin nails and screws and the shovels came from Pittsburgh. With hardwoods and metals abounding, the corpse was hauled on a wagon from South Bend, Ind. A hickory grove grew nearby, but the pick and shovel handles came from New York. The cotton shirt on the dead man came from Cincinnati; the coat and breeches, from Chicago; the shoes, from Boston; the folded hands were encased in white gloves from New York; and around the poor neck, that had worn all its living days the bondage of lost opportunity, was twisted a cheap cravat from Philadelphia. That country, so rich in undeveloped resources, furnished nothing for the funeral except the corpse and the hole in the ground, and would probably have imported both of those if it could have done so. And as the poor fellow was lowered to his rest on coffin bands from Lowell, he carried nothing into the next world as a reminder of his home in this, save the halted blood in his veins, the chilled marrow in his bones, and the echo of the dull clods that fell on the coffin lid."

Actually, my boyhood was in that period, and I can assure you the picture was not seriously overdrawn; but the South, like the phoenix, began shortly thereafter to rise from its ashes. My 30 years of business activity, all in the South and in sales and traffic work, have brought me into intimate contact with all our southern business enterprises and have covered the period of the South's development from that stage to its present status, which I will touch on in a moment. But first I will mention here how unlike am I and the early-day southerner described by Henry Grady. I am attired today in exclusively southern products—shirt from Georgia, undershirt and shoes from Tennessee; shorts and socks from North Carolina; suit tailored in Alabama from cloth of Virginia manufacture; belt and hat from Texas; handkerchief from South Carolina; tie from Louisiana; and my summer suits are also from Louisiana. The money in my pocket is earned in the employ of a southern company, which can prosper only as the South progresses. Henry Grady would indeed have another story to tell could he, like Rip Van Winkle, awaken from his long sleep and resume writing today regarding economic conditions in the South.

The crux of the southern freight-rate system is, of course, the necessity of overcoming distance disadvantages. We have few large markets, certainly nothing comparable with New York and Chicago; but we must reach the more populous areas to dispose of our great food crops, our manufactured products, important among which are forest products, and our surplus coal.

DIFFERENCE—NOT DISCRIMINATION

Consequently, because conditions and commodities are, and have been, different here and there; differences have arisen in the basic freight rates applying to the traffic handled. In the North, densely populated, highly industrialized, substantial freight movements are made on one set-up of rates. In the South and Southwest, much less thickly populated, with their peculiar problems of moving agricultural products, lumber, manufactured products, and the like over long distances to reach consuming markets, the great bulk of all freight moves on another set-up of rates provided for just that purpose. An effort to compare these southern and northern rates and to equalize them is like seeking a common denominator for such unlike things as the pulling power of the horse and the milk-giving capacity of the cow.

Yet the very differences do have their advantages for us here in the South. Succinctly stated, the principles of the ideal southern freight-rate system are:

(a) Maintenance of a rate parity to the North on our competitive products when necessary.

(b) Determination of rates on our noncompetitive products on their respective merits.

(c) Requirement that northern products, competitive with ours, pay the southern level

to the South, thereby protecting southern industry.

And that is exactly what we do have, all contentions to the contrary notwithstanding. This southern freight-rate system, established, maintained, and supported by our southern shippers and our southern railroads, and approved in principle by the Interstate Commerce Commission, did not spring full blown into existence, but, through the long period of years, it was developed and adapted to meet our exacting conditions. The chief contribution to its development was the persistent concentration of traffic men in the South on their individual problems, including competitive conditions, in many unrelated fields. The southern freight-rate structure has been built on many minutely adjusted factors, which have been fitted piece by piece into the whole, each for some good and sufficient reason.

EVOLUTION BY EXPERIENCE

In short, the southern freight-rate system has been evolved in accordance with business experience, and its freight rates today are interwoven with our whole business structure. Southern industry has been erected upon this system of freight rates. Millions have been invested upon this basis. Through these invested millions, hundreds of thousands have been given employment. Any drastic change would result in business readjustments on a thousand fronts that would be disturbing and unsettling to all our people and to our entire economy.

The pattern of freight rates for the Nation as a whole is not symmetrical in any dimension. It cannot be reduced to uniform scales or levels, because there is no uniformity in the commerce which it was made to fit. Indeed, as must be apparent to anyone who has had actual experience with the subject commercial conditions are much more nearly the makers of freight rates than freight rates are the creators of commercial conditions. Freight rates do not exist ahead of industry; they follow it. They are made in response to demand. They are made to move the business—whatever business is offered—and they are made, usually, at whatever level it takes to accomplish that result.

Proposals for uniformity must be based on an implied assumption that somewhere there is a rate structure correct for commercial conditions everywhere and that this structure should be applied uniformly to the commerce of every section of the country. Such an assumption is totally unreal. There is not, and there cannot be, one rate structure which is "right" everywhere and under all conditions. Rates grow up to fit commercial conditions as they develop.

A national system of freight rates simply would not be suited to the South because, even with lower freight rates on many movements and mile-for-mile parity on others, we would have to overcome the disadvantages of greater distance and therefore higher freight costs on competitive products to the great markets of the North and East, such as New York and Chicago. We are aided in overcoming these handicaps in part by natural economic advantages. Our processors, too, gather their materials at low cost. Our freight charges within the South for assembling raw materials at the industrial and manufacturing centers of the South are very low in comparison with the North, and this continued aid is an essential if we are to overcome the distance handicap in marketing.

"PARITY" WORKS BOTH WAYS

The common acceptance in the South of "rate parity" is that it implies only reductions in freight rates. But real rate parity would also produce very substantial increases in some rates, probably those on our major southern freight movements, including movements to factories here in the South.

The real question of all this agitation is, then: Shall the South continue to do business under its own pattern of rates, worked out step by step to meet its own developing and varying commercial needs, or shall it have imposed upon it another pattern of rates designed to meet quite other conditions?

The difference between the two schools of thought is in their methods. The overwhelming majority of those who have had practical contact and experience in this matter want to continue to work these things out piecemeal, to meet individual situations as they arise, and to preserve for the South the advantages which have helped, in the last dozen years, to bring about a rate of industrial growth relatively twice as great as that in the East.

If we insist upon changing all this, we may find we are fastening upon the South a rigid pattern of rates developed and designed for quite different conditions.

We should continue, of course, the adjustment of individual rates as need arises to meet individual needs and conditions. We should continue the process of rate making by conference between shippers and carriers, between producers and consumers, between section and section, with public authority sitting as the umpire and, where such action is necessary, as the final and deciding voice. We should by all means continue along the way by which we have come so far and done so well.

In the pattern of this southern freight-rate agitation, and in fact an outgrowth of its political pressure, are the several bills now pending in Congress which would fix freight rates in a rigid pattern, determined by mileage, and mileage alone.

The reaction of the business world, as reflected by the members of the United States Chamber of Commerce, is a report adopted by their transportation committee which I had the privilege of presenting as a member of that committee and which was approved by the board of directors. This report reads, in part, as follows:

"Business and industry in the United States are built on the theory that producers should be able to reach the widest possible markets and that consumers should have the widest possible choice of sources of supply—in short, that there should be a free flow of commerce and the widest possible distribution of goods.

"In accomplishing this result, a flexible and adjustable structure of railroad freight rates has been of prime importance. Generally speaking, these rates have been based upon competitive conditions, recognizing that commerce is a living and changing thing, with needs which vary from place to place and from time to time. That this system of making rates has worked, and worked well, on the whole, is indicated by the growth and variety of American commerce. * * *

"Freight rates, it should be repeated and emphasized, do not make commercial conditions. Commercial conditions make freight rates. In practice, rates are made by shippers who have something to move and carriers who want to haul it, working out together rates which will permit the commerce to move, with everything that is done subject to the approval of public authority as represented by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the several State commissions. * * *

"Passage of any of the bills proposed in Congress, however, would go much further than has even been thought of before toward fixing freight rates on the railroads in a rigid and unyielding pattern, regardless of the varied and ever-changing needs of commerce. * * *

"The result of such rate fixing or rate direction by Congress, if adopted as to some rates for supposed sectional benefit, would be to establish the principle of making all rates by counting votes, rather than after full hearing by an informed and nonpolitical body acting to the best of its judgment upon the facts of record before it. Rate making on such a principle and by such methods would be a continual threat to the commerce of America, and especially to the commerce of those sections which muster no more than minority votes in Congress.

"The committee recommends, therefore, that railroad freight rates should be as closely responsive as may be both to the varying needs of commerce and the revenue requirements of the carriers, that rates should continue to be initiated after discussion between shippers and carriers, and that the final authority to pass upon their lawfulness and propriety should continue to be exercised by the nonpolitical public regulatory bodies created for that purpose, without the prescription by Congress of a rigid and inflexible uniformity based on distance, without regard for the varied and changing circumstances and conditions of commerce. * * *"

A report similar in principle was subsequently adopted by the National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards, representing nine-tenths of the civilian shippers of the United States. The National Industrial Traffic League has appointed a Nation-wide committee to oppose such statutory rate making. And this is likewise a guiding principle of the Southeast-Southwest Shippers Conference, of which I am chairman.

THE PROOF OF PROGRESS

Proof that ours at present is the best system of handling rates is given by any reasonable examination of the progress made in past years by southern industry individually and as a whole. Examples abound all around us of how well the South has done under the existing freight rate arrangement.

The processing of tobacco and the manufacture of cotton into finished goods are activities which properly belong in the region where these raw materials are produced. The tobacco industry long ago saw this advantage and by employing it brought untold wealth into the Southern States.

This process is being duplicated in the field of textile and garment production. The Southeast now processes more cotton than it produces. The textile industry began to gravitate to the South some 50 years ago because of proximity of cotton and other advantages. Today southern textiles dominate that field, and the South possesses the most skillful textile operatives of the Nation, many of them of the second and third generation. The cotton garment industry has been expanding greatly in the South, due to proximity of cloth supply.

And the South now accounts for much of the Nation's supply of hosiery and rayon fabrics.

Another major resource of the South is that of our forests, with southern pine constituting more than one-third of all the lumber used in the United States. We ship about one-half of the manufactured lumber to other sections of the United States, but we retain in the South and process in the South the raw materials, such as those for the pulp and paper, rayon, chemical, and other industries. Other forest products are naval stores, which are especially important under the stress of war.

An industrial newcomer related to our forest products is the pulp and paper industry, manufacturing from southern pine, with plant investments in the neighborhood of a quarter of a billion dollars.

One of our earliest industrial developments was the processing of cottonseed, producing oil with fat value, a meal valuable as fertilizer, and hulls suitable as a constituent of cattle feed. These oil mills are now all over the South, furnishing employment and providing markets for the seeds.

And of course one of the South's greatest industrial developments is in iron and steel. Based on the mineral resources of Birming-

ham, with its narrow valley touching the coal fields on the west and the ore deposits on the east, this industry is the world's masterpiece of natural assembly. Nowhere in the world can iron be produced to greater advantage than right here in the South.

Because the chemical industry is by all odds the most important industry in today's world—whether it is in producing smokeless powder for military needs or creating a new industrial domain from the processing of waste products—its quiet growth here in the South to very large proportions is of major importance. This is an industry which should continue to expand in the South, because we are endowed with every major requirement for the modern chemist from raw materials to fuels and transportation. The chemicals are readily produced from our forests, cotton, sweetpotatoes, petroleum, salt, sulfur, gas, and other southern resources.

And of course the chemical industry attracts other industries essential to diversified development. An example of this sequence in industry is at Baton Rouge, where industry begets industry. The oil refinery was supplemented by a manufacturer of sulphuric acid used in oil refining. Then followed a plant for the manufacture of caustic soda and soda ash, also used in refining. And later a plant was located there for the manufacture of tetraethyl lead, followed by the manufacture of metallic sodium, which is used in the production of tetraethyl lead. And, finally, Baton Rouge has recently been dubbed the "cradle of synthetic rubber."

Everywhere we look we see that the South, with its wealth of natural resources and its fast-growing market outlets, offers advantages in the manufacture of chemicals, plastic materials, and the myriad of new products resulting from research, utilizing such southern resources as coal, limestone, refinery, and natural gases, sulfur, salt, cellulose, and the like. The industrial prospect is indeed bright, and progress will certainly continue, unhampered no more in the future tha. in the past by any imaginary freight rate discrimination.

AN AID TO AGRICULTURE

And side by side with this great industrial development and encouraged by these manufacturing and industrial pay rolls we see also the great promotion of the welfare of the agricultural South. We see how greatly the South has profited by studies of farm conditions, encouragement of diversification and more profitable crops, the introduction of pure-blooded livestock and poultry, the establishment of creameries and condensing plants for the utilization of dairy products. Cash income from livestock and livestock products has grown tremendously.

Rapid industrialization, moreover, has created local markets which enable new southern crops of many types to come into being and to dispose of their output within the South. It has also made available new markets for dairy products, fruits, vegetables, poultry, and other produce in these nearby industrial areas.

In view of all these examples of progress, both industrial and agricultural, how can it possibly be charged that unjust freight rates cause the per capita income and the per capita value added by manufacture to be lower in the South than in the North, retarding southern developments, and that this alleged freight rate discrimination acts as a slow poison in the South's economy? The answer is that freight rates must be absolved and that we must search elsewhere, perhaps in the general industrial histories of the regions involved.

Although the South has been advancing industrially at a rapid pace, it is still behind the North in total industrial development, but that is because industries were established in the North so many years ahead of the South and the growth of these northern industries was furthered by the rapidly increasing requirements of a fast-growing country.

The South was agrarian before the Civil War. At the close of that war, less than 80 years ago, the available resources of the South were exhausted, much of its best manpower killed, no cash or credit available, practically no livestock left, and, with the Negroes freed, labor conditions in a chaotic state. In short, the South was licked and busted. A condition of near paralysis existed. That was the starting point.

Our great strides have come industrially only within the last 30 years, but especially rapid since the development of cheap hydroelectricity and the opening up of our territory through the building of good roads. The South simply has not been able to overtake the North in the 30 years our industrialization has been under way. The period has simply not been long enough to catch up on the head start which the North has so long enjoyed. But, statistically, the South is making greater progress than any other section. We all know that to be true, for the evidence is all around us, although the rate and extent of southern industrial development are probably not as fully known and recognized in the South as they ought to be.

Take the records for the years before our participation in the present war. These statistical records show that the population of the southern-rate territory, comparing 1930 and 1940, increased more than 10 percent while the population of the northern-rate territory increased only 5 percent—and the population of the entire country increased only 7 percent. The employment in manufacturing industries in the southern-rate territory increased 5 percent between 1929 and 1939, while employment in manufacturing industries in the northern-rate territory actually decreased 11 percent in the same period. The value of manufactured products in the southern-rate territory increased $272,300,000 between 1929 and 1939—a gain of 5 percent—while the value of manufactured products in every other rate territory actually decreased; in the northern-rate territory the decrease was as great as 23 percent. These yardsticks show gain for the South over every other part of United States. And they all were made while the present supposedly unfavorable freight-rate situation was prevailing.

The net effect of railroad freight rates has not been to discourage manufacturing in the South. In 1929, 18.1 percent of all the carload tonnage originating in the South was in the manufactured and miscellaneous group. By 1937, this percentage had increased to 20 percent, and 4 years later, in 1941, manufactured products constituted 22.07 percent of all the carload tonnage in the South. This increase in the ratio of manufactured products to total shipments originating in the South between 1929 and 1941 amounted to 17.4 percent—more than twice as great a gain relatively as was made in the East in the same 12 years.

This proves what is really apparent as a matter of observation, which is that the development of the South, and particularly its industrial development, has not been held back for any reason whatsoever. It has gone ahead much faster than that of any region supposedly better favored by freight rates. The South's more rapid progress is due to conditions favorable to industrial development—the availability of raw materials and supplies, cheap fuels and low cost electric power, a good labor situation, lower living costs, favorable tax rates, friendly laws and public relations.

THE FACTS IN FOCUS

All the facts I have been able to gather may be brought into simple focus upon conclusions in favor of the belief that the freight rate structure of the South is built on principles which are substantially correct:

1. We are not exporting our raw materials to the North, but instead are increasingly processing them here in the South.

2. We are not buying most of our fabricated articles in the North, but instead are diversifying and expanding our manufacturing facilities at a substantial and constantly increasing rate for the supply of our home markets and other markets, including the North.

Since freight rates permit this and, in fact, actually help to bring it about, then clearly the South's development is not being retarded by them, but instead is undoubtedly being greatly stimulated. This is simple proof, as the fall of the apple is proof of gravity, that our southern freight rate system is correctly adapted to the South's economy.

The South is really in a doubly fortunate position. It can do business locally as well as in the distant markets. We have products which, by reason of climate, cannot be produced in the North. On the other hand, there is no bar in the South against the production and marketing of those products which are now manufactured elsewhere. There is no bar of climate, no bar of fuel or power resources, no bar in labor supply, and—strange as this may sound to those who have heard nothing but denunciation of the much-maligned southern freight rates—no bar in freight rates.

To these natural and manufactured products which are peculiar to the South, there is steadily being added the production and marketing of a widely diversified range of manufacture, using our southern resources of materials, fuel, power, and labor. It is true that the South continues to bring in machinery and equipment of a high precision type and those nationally advertised and trademarked goods which, by reason of the very fact that they are produced in low-cost mass quantities and are nationally advertised and distributed, can be sold in the South without regard to the lower freight rates applying from the southern manufacturing points. Quite naturally goods of this sort have long been manufactured in the older established northern industrial centers which enjoy proximity to the densely populated areas. But the South has favorable opportunities to develop the manufacture of products of this sort, and there is actually a substantial and continuing progress in their manufacture in the South.

There will be more of that in post-war days. And it will be needed. It is a very fine thing to hear in the South right now so much discussion of post-war planning by leaders of industry and commerce and agriculture. Certainly such planning must be done if we are going to provide jobs for the many thousands of soldiers who will be returning to civilian occupation when the victory is won.

THE FUTURE IS BRIGHT

Looking into the future, it seems to me I see great possibilities in southern post-war developments of such industries as that of the manufacture of newsprint—the paper stock on which our newspapers are published and which has been severely curtailed by war-time shortages up North. New mills are needed. A start has already been made in that direction, and it enjoys the hearty endorsement of our southern newspaper publishers, railroad men, bankers, and business interests generally. We have the materials, the methods, and the opportunity—and of course we shall have exactly the freight rates we need when we are ready for them.

Another post-war field that looks promising is that having to do with the extension of southern participation in railway supplies. The rolling of rails, of course, and the manufacture of some freight cars are nothing new to us, but we can offer a good many attractions for the building of locomotives and passenger equipment and accessories. In

anything involving the use of aluminum, especially, we shall have considerable advantages. Thus, if this development comes about, the railroads will join us additionally as customers, thereby increasing their already great stake in the industrial progress of the South and further insuring their interest in the protection of southern business relationships.

In a modest way, our own company is seeking to make its contribution to this desirable objective by helping create and develop outlets for products and commodities that are grown, mined or made in the South. Under the direction of an expert widely experienced in both selling and purchasing, we are beginning a program which is aimed at broadening the purchases of southern products for our entire operations. And we expect to carry this program a step further. After we have ascertained the southern commodities now available or that can be manufactured in the South for our own operations, we expect to contact buyers of other companies and acquaint them with these sources of supply. Thus we hope to be of some practical help in stimulating the development of home resources.

I do not wish to be interpreted as giving a blanket endorsement to the buy-at-home idea. If carried too far, if each State confined its purchases exclusively to home commodities, each State would build a wall around itself and erect trade barriers that would impede the free flow of goods. But there are many instances where small manufacturers and producers can be aided by helping make a home market for them.

In the post-war period, we shall all need the helping hand of friends and neighbors. We shall need their encouragement. We shall need their cooperation. But, above all, from a practical viewpoint, we shall need their business. And freight rates are so set up today as to make such local purchasing and selling not only possible but also probable and profitable. And in our southern markets we enjoy what we can never attain in the North—and that is the advantage of proximity to market.

STICK TO THE SOUTHERN SYSTEM

And certainly continued flexibility in southern freight rate making, rather than rigid adherence to some other system, such as a northern pattern, developed and adapted to northern needs, is essential if, as heretofore, our freight rates are to keep step with the accelerated post-war developments. We must protect the dynamic advantages possessed by the South in all raw materials for the new world of chemicals and plastic now emerging over the horizon. We must protect the advantage of our long growing season, which will produce enlarged agricultural income in the widened markets for our food crops through dehydration and quick freezing. We must protect our limitless opportunities in new crops grown to industrial specifications. We must be prepared to march forward in the post-war world along the lines of development which have so strikingly emerged in the South in the years of achievement recorded in our recent history.

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH,
TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940,
Washington, January 25, 1944.

Hon. TOM STEWART,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STEWART: This is in reply to your letter of January 15, requesting that I comment on Mr. Alvin W. Vogtle's pamphlet, The South Is a Beneficiary, Not a Victim, of Its Freight Rate System.

Mr. Vogtle paints a picture of southern industry and southern freight rates as they should be, but not as they are today. He speaks feelingly of the South's wealth of natural resources and widening markets, and points to what he terms the "great strides that have come industrially only within the last 30 years" in "the production and marketing of a widely-diversified range of manufacture." He argues that "since freight rates permit this and, in fact, actually help to bring it about, then clearly the South's development is not being retarded by them, but instead is undoubtedly being greatly stimulated." "This," he says, "is simple proof, as the fall of the apple was proof of gravity, that our southern freight rate system is correctly adapted to the South's economy." From these premises, Mr. Vogtle concludes that the establishment of a parity of Southern and Northern freight rates would be "disturbing and unsettling to all our people and to our entire economy," and urges that the bills now pending in Congress, to provide uniformity of class rates, should be defeated.

For the most part, Mr. Vogtle's defense of the freight-rate structure of the South and argument for its retention is a repetition of the railroad arguments, about which I wrote you October 21, 1943 (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. A4515-18). These arguments were echoed in a report of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States Transportation Committee, which Mr. Vogtle says was presented to that committee by him. Mr. Vogtle also refers to similar views of the National Association of Shippers' Advisory Boards, a railroad-sponsored institution, of which Mr. Vogtle was recently president; the National Industrial Traffic League, whose membership is largely in eastern rate territory; and the Southeast-Southwest Shippers' Conference, of which Mr. Vogtle is chairman. Mr. Vogtle is in the coal business. Coal is a commodity, largely used by the railroads, which has been given special rates by the southern railroads on about the same average level, mile for mile, as the coal rates in the North. This may explain the difference between Mr. Vogtle's point of view in contending that "the southern freight agitation" is "a political issue," which "does not actually have support among the business enterprises of the South," in contrast with statements to the contrary, by veteran traffic men representing southern industries, such as T. M. Henderson, commissioner, Nashville Traffic Bureau. I quote from a statement by Mr. Henderson, published December 10, 1943, in reply to Mr. Vogtle:

"I am commissioner of the Nashville Freight Bureau, * * * which position I have held for the past 33 years. * * * I have been a member of the board of governors of the Southern Traffic League since its organization June 1918, and have served one term as president, several terms as chairman of its board of governors, and have been executive secretary of the league since April 1930. I am a member of the traffic committee of the Southern Governors' Conference. * * * I have for many years believed that the class rates within the South, and between the South and the North and the East, unjustly discriminate against the South and unduly favor the North and East. * * * The repeated statement of the opponents that the proceedings now before the Interstate Commerce Commission is merely a political issue, and that the efforts of the Southern Governors' Conference to secure an equality of class rates is not supported by industry in the South, is without foundation and contrary to the facts of record. * * *

"It was not until May 11, 1937, that the Southern Governors' Conference became actively engaged in these proceedings and took over the responsibility of prosecuting the case. This was 3 years after representatives of southern industry made the first request to the rail carriers for a conference to consider a readjustment of these rates. The action of the southern Governors was in response to a public demand for equal treatment for the South with the northern and eastern territory in the matter of class rates. * * * The Nashville Freight Bureau includes in its membership practically every line of industry in Nashville, the consumers of large quantities of basic commodities and raw materials, such as coal, coke, pig iron, lumber, etc., and manufacturers and distributors of a varied line of goods. The same is true of the membership of the Atlanta Freight Bureau * * *, Chattanooga Manufacturers Association * * *, Cotton Manufacturers Association of South Carolina * * *, North Carolina Cotton Manufacturers Association * * *, American Cotton Manufacturers Association * * *, Cotton Manufacturers Association of Georgia * * *, Alabama Cotton Manufacturers Association * * *, Georgia-Alabama Textile Association * * *, Southern Furniture Manufacturers Association * * *, Jacksonville Freight Bureau * * *, Memphis Freight Bureau * * *, Tampa Traffic Association * * *, Greater Miami Traffic Association * * *, North Carolina Traffic League. * * * The record shows that the members of these organizations are supporting the Southern Governors in the class rate case, and that they represen. a major part of the industries in the South who pay the freight charges."

It is evident that Mr. Vogtle's opinion that southern freight rate discriminations are merely a political issue, and that southern shippers are satisfied, is based on lack of contact with the large body of shippers in the South who are suffering from the present rate discriminations. Likewise, Mr. Vogtle's belief that the South has been making "phenomenal progress" in industrial development, as compared with the East, is based on a misunderstanding of the facts.

Mr. Vogtle states "the value of manufactured products in the southern rate territory increased $272,300,000 between 1929 and 1939—a gain of 5 percent—while the value of manufactured products in every other rate territory actually decreased; in the northern rate territory, the decrease was as great as 23 percent." Mr. Vogtle has used incorrect figures here. If he will refer to the Census reports of 1940 and 1930, he will find that the value of manufactured products for the eight States (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee) comprising southeastern rate territory, in 1939, totaled $4,696,509,000, and in 1929, $4,667,100,000. The increase for the 10-year period was $29,400,000, not $272,300,000, as stated by Mr. Vogtle. However, in the same period, the value of manufactured products in the State of Virginia increased from $745,901,000 to $988,813,000, an increase for Virginia alone of $242,912,000. If this increase is added to the increase of $29,400,000 for the eight States in southeastern rate Territory, it makes a total of $272,300,000, which is the figure used by Mr. Vogtle. It is apparent that Mr. Vogtle included Virginia as being in southern rate territory, whereas, as a matter of fact, Virginia is in eastern rate territory (except 11 counties containing 14 percent of the population, along the southern border). The fact that the increase in the value of Virginia's manufactured products was 10 times as great as the increase in all the eight States comprising southeastern rate territory might indeed be cited as an indication of the benefits of eastern rate levels, rather than "simple proof," as contended by Mr. Vogtle, that the "southern freight rate system is correctly adapted to the South's economy."

Furthermore, if Mr. Vogtle had analyzed carefully the census reports, he would have found that, although the total value of manufactured products in the eight southern rate territory States increased $29,400,000 in the 10-year period, actually the values of most

manufactured products decreased. As shining exceptions to the general decreases, the value of textiles in North Carolina increased more than $100,000,000 and the value of North Carolina tobacco manufactures increased nearly $100,000,000; in South Carolina, the value of textiles increased more than $20,000,000. The increases in these two items in the Carolinas totaled over $200,000,000; had it not been for them, the South's manufactures as a whole would have shown a decrease for the 10-year period of more than $190,000,000, instead of a $29,000,000 increase. It should be noted that both the textile and the tobacco industries have succeeded in getting, from the railroads or through proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, special freight rates to northern markets, which, while not on the whole as low as northern rates, are much closer to the northern rate levels than the class rates applying on miscellaneous southern manufactured goods.

Mr. Vogtle's statistics of manufacturing in the South and East may also be misleading in that they compare 1929—which was a boom year in the East, but not so much so in the South and West—with 1939—when the country was emerging from the depression years. A more accurate idea of the industrial development of the South and the East during the past 30 years is gained by comparing the census figures of 1939 with those of 1909. The value of the South's manufactured products in 1909 was $1,236,133,000, and of the manufactured products of the eastern rate territory States was $15,799,070,000. In 1939 the southern rate territory's manufactures values had increased $3,460,376,000 (to $4,696,509,000), whereas the eastern rate territory's manufactures values had increased $25,344,411,000 (to $41,143,481,000). In other words, the eastern manufactures increased in value more than eight times as much as the southern manufactures.

Mr. Vogtle is likewise mistaken in his statement that the South is not exporting raw materials to the North and purchasing most of its fabricated articles from the North. The studies made by the Board of Investigation and Research of the Nation's railroad traffic in 1939 shows that in that year the South shipped out 36 percent of its production of raw materials, 25 percent of its semiraw and processed materials, and 45 percent of its finished manufactured articles. Sixty-five percent of the tonnage of the South was raw materials, 27 percent semifinished and processed articles, and only 8 percent finished manufactured goods. The South received 15 percent of its tonnage of raw materials, 19 percent of its semifinished and processed articles, and 48 percent of its finished manufactured articles from outside.

However, the South's trouble is not that it ships out too large a volume of raw materials or ships in too many manufactured articles. The real difficulty is that the South, notwithstanding its vast natural resources, does not produce its fair share, either of raw materials or manufactured articles, and does not buy and consume enough finished products, either of its own or from the outside. The truth is that, although the South is fully as rich in raw materials as the East, the South produces only 12 percent of the national rail tonnage, whereas the East produces 60 percent. The South consumes only 10 percent of the rail tonnage, and the East consumes 64 percent. The East produces 5 times more raw materials, 3 times more semiraw materials, and 10 times more finished manufactured goods than the South, and sustains more than 3 times the population, and pays each worker more than double the income, simply because the East has a highly developed and diversified manufacturing industry, whereas the South's industrial development is low and lacking in wide diversification.

In order to attain a prosperity comparable with the East, the South does not need to take manufacturing industries away from the East, but it needs to increase its own production of raw materials, it needs a greater and more diversified agricultural production, and it needs above all more factories to utilize its raw materials and support a greater population, with higher incomes and improved standards of living. The South cannot successfully develop diversified manufacturing against the handicap of discriminatory freight rates. Favorable rates for diversified manufacturing cannot be obtained through negotiations with the railroads in each individual case, or by long-drawn-out individual proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A declaration of congressional policy, such as is proposed by the bills now pending in Congress, requiring the removal of rate inequalities, with only such exceptions as are justified by differences in transportation conditions, is, in my opinion, the only quick and certain way of removing the rate handicaps of the South. Mr. Vogtle is, of course, mistaken in his statement that the pending bills would impose upon the South a rigid pattern of rates determined by mileage, and mileage alone. The bills would leave to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the interested carriers and shippers the adjustment of rates in accordance with actual transportation conditions. The bills would only enforce the long-established but neglected rule of equal treatment for all shippers, by requiring uniformity where transportation conditions and transportation costs are substantially similar and forbidding discriminations unless they are shown to be justified. Such a rule, by removing the freight-rate handicaps of the South and West, and encouraging industrial development, would promote, not harm, the interests of the carriers and shippers alike of the whole country.

Yours very truly,

C. E. CHILDE.

Abuses Revealed in Sedition Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, which, in spite of the New Deal, is still the world's greatest newspaper:

ABUSES REVEALED BY THE SEDITION CASES

It is well that Congress has been in session at the same time that the sedition conspiracy proceedings have been under way in Washington. The Senators and Representatives have had a ringside seat. They can hardly be unaware of the very serious defects in our judicial system which have been revealed in these prosecutions and which Congress has it in its power to correct.

The sixth amendment to the Constitution says: "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

Most of the defendants in these cases have been indicted three times. The first two indictments were so battered by the court that heard the pleadings that the Government chose not to go to trial on what remained. Nevertheless, the earlier indictments stand and the guaranty of a speedy trial has been nullified.

Likewise these people are not being tried in their own States and districts. The sixth amendment was intended, among other things, to prevent a tyrannous government from sending men and women for trial far from their homes into districts where the climate of public opinion was favorable to the prosecution. This wholesome provision of the Constitution has been overcome by charging the defendants with conspiracy and alleging that some part of the conspiracy occurred in Washington. By this device the trial is being held in the Capital though the defendants do not live there and no doubt have been put to heavy expense to maintain themselves there.

Use of the conspiracy theory to evade the intent of the sixth amendment is a grave abuse, calling for corrective measures by Congress. It would have been bad enough if the trial had been placed in a remote corner of the country, but to hold it in Washington greatly aggravates the wrong, for the vast majority of the people in Washington are dependent upon the Government for their livelihood. They cannot be counted upon to be impartial jurors in litigation in which the Government is a party. Plainly the Judicial Code should be amended to exclude Government employees and their dependents from juries hearing cases in which the Government is a party. If an employee of General Motors may not be a juryman in a case brought by General Motors the same limitation should apply to Government employees in Federal prosecutions.

Furthermore, in these sedition cases, the prosecution has been violating the spirit of the fifth amendment with its insistence on grand jury indictments. That provision was intended to assure every citizen on trial that, even before he entered court, he would know precisely what crime he was charged with committing, for only so could he prepare his defense. Even the Government's bill of particulars in the present sedition case is vague. The defendants are charged with promoting "general suspicion between all groups and classes in an attempt to cause national disintegration and paralysis."

"Suspicion and hatred between various groups," the bill continues, "between different economic classes, between different religious groups, between different geographical groups with varying economic interests were promoted by every means and in every way so that when proper disintegration had been accomplished selected persons in strategic positions would then, acting together, be able to seize power."

This may describe what the Attorney General thinks was in the minds of the defendants and it describes equally what a vast number of people in this country, in all probability a majority of them, think is in the minds of the New Dealers.

If men can be held to trial on that kind of a bill of particulars it is clear that the Federal Practice Act is in need of amendment at this point also.

Veterans' Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am talking today to the discharged veterans of World War No. 2. I am talking to our

armed forces fighting and dying on every battle front of a war-mad world. I am talking to the wives and the children, the fathers and mothers, and the brothers and sisters of the soldiers of America.

Congress is aware that this war is not over. There will be many more sad homes and firesides. We—who remain at home—must not let up. Each of us must make more sacrifices. We must see that our armed forces get all the equipment and food they need. Congress must see to it that the wealth and resources of this Nation are used for war efforts. While our sons are fighting for democracy abroad, we must preserve it at home. We must not tolerate graft and corruption. We must not be afraid to give constructive criticism. That is our part of the war.

I know there are grave international and national problems confronting the Nation. These cannot be solved by wishful thinking. They cannot be solved by slogans. The "four freedoms" slogan has already gone glittering down the aisle of time—gone into oblivion the same as the slogan "War to end wars." The big three of the United Nations are already dividing the spoils. There are complications and danger ahead.

Our foreign policy must square itself with our ideals. We went into this war to defend the territorial integrity of the smaller nations. Their boundaries should long ago have been—if they have not been—taken into consideration. These nations must be resurrected and protected from aggressors. We must never permit ourselves to become a party to aggression. We owe it to our allies and to the world to announce a definite foreign policy. That policy must not permit the grabbing of the territory of any nation—of smaller nations.

We must have a domestic policy as well as a foreign policy. Charity begins at home. Our first concern must always be our soldiers—the soldiers who are willing to give their lives for their country. The nation that does not protect its protectors cannot long endure. No nation is great enough to ignore its defenders. Patriotism is the feeling that you are a somebody. It is the feeling that you belong to a nation that is not only powerful but that is interested in your welfare. Without this feeling of security and reciprocity there can be no true patriotism—no real national defense.

Therefore, I am going to discuss with you the all-important subject, Veterans' Rehabilitation. We have already discharged a million men. These were discharged because of injuries, because of physical or mental disability, or because they were over 38 years old. Some of these are permanently disabled. Some are suffering, and will suffer, severe physical pain and mental anguish throughout their lives. Many have seen overseas service. All have made sacrifices and suffered hardships far beyond that of those of us who remained at home.

But history repeats itself. Cheers for the boys when they are inducted. The cold shoulder when they are discharged. In World War No. 1 after our soldiers had made "the world safe for democracy"—after they had won the "war to end all wars"—their Uncle Sam, whose banner they had carried to victory, handed them a miserly little check of $60 with which to buy civilian clothes, and get a new start in life.

When this cruel and brutal war is over, there will be 15,000,000 who are now working in war plants seeking other employment. There will be another 12,000,000 discharged veterans who will demand—and who will have a right to demand—that the Government that inducted them into the armed forces give them, at least, an opportunity to readjust themselves back into civilian life. The solution of this problem challenges both our integrity and our ingenuity.

So far Congress has been very niggardly in dealing with the World War No. 2 veterans. It passed a mustering-out pay bill giving to the discharged veterans from $100 to $300, depending upon length of service. One hundred dollars for those who served less than 60 days, $200 for those who served from 60 days to 2 or more years, and $300 for those who saw overseas service. But not one penny—not even civilian clothes—for those who were discharged because they were over 38 years old.

It is claimed that the veterans over 38 years of age requested their discharge. This is not a correct statement. Many of these made the application at the urgent request of Army officers. They were told that they should ask for a discharge and make room for younger men. To omit these veterans from the mustering-out pay now does not do justice to Congress.

Out of the mustering-out sums the veteran has to buy civilian clothes when he stores away his uniform. With the balance, if there is any, he is asked to readjust himself back into the life he left when he was inducted. Any soldier who has been inducted into the armed forces has had his life interrupted. He has lost far more than $100, the minimum allowed in the pay-off bill. It will take far more than $300, the maximum allowed, to get a new start in civilian life.

We have been very liberal with all except our soldiers. We voted $69,000,000,000 lend-lease. We build roads, landing fields, railroads, and lay pipe lines for other countries. We finance nations that are taking no active part in the war. We give tractors and farm implements to foreigners that we deny to our own farmers. We give diapers, which we deny to our own babies, to Arabians. Washington has developed an inferior foreign complex.

We pay every civilian for every war effort. We again make millionaires out of cost-plus contracts—out of the blood, the tears, and the agony of an insane world. We pay interest on bonds to finance the war. We permit waste and graft in the name of war. We even give consumers' subsidies to the idle so that our soldiers, when they return, will have to help pay the board bill of the stay-at-homers.

It is billions for destruction, billions for foreign nations, millions for cost-plus contractors, and interest for bond buyers. But, when it comes to appreciating the sacrifices that our soldier boys have and are making on all battlefronts, in order to save the honor and glory of our Nation, then we hear talk about red-blooded Americanism and patriotism not being for sale. No, not for sale, but it can at least be appreciated.

In order to keep faith with our armed forces, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have caused bills to be introduced. I favor those bills. I feel, however, that in order to avoid another depression, provisions must be made to give the veterans of World War No. 2 an opportunity to get a new start in life.

Therefore, I have introduced a veterans' rehabilitation bill. This bill would prevent unemployment, chaos, and confusion when the war ends. It would promote private, productive enterprise by enabling the veterans to engage in such enterprise, and thereby not only employ themselves, but furnish jobs for others in place of asking for jobs that will not exist.

This bill provides for a paid-up life-insurance policy to be issued to each honorably discharged veteran. The amount of such insurance would be $100 a month for services rendered from October 16, 1940—the date that the draft went into operation—to December 7, 1941, and thereafter $300 a month for overseas service and $150 a month for home service, with a maximum of $10,000. In order for any veteran to get the maximum under this bill he would have to serve the equivalent of over 33 months overseas, or over 66 months home service. Such policy would not be assignable and not subject to attachment, lien, or pledge for any debt—public or private.

The bill provides that any veteran who wishes to engage in any productive enterprise may make a loan for that purpose, through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on such policy, in an amount equal to 85 percent of the insurance. Such loan to be paid back in 20 equal, annual installments, with interest at 1½ percent. In order to give the veteran time to get a new start, the interest is to begin to run 2 years from the date the loan is completed and the first installment to become due at the end of 3 years.

The proceeds of such loan must be used exclusively for such individual, productive enterprise which may consist of any business, professional, or agricultural undertaking, or in paying incumbrances, indebtedness, or taxes on any such enterprise, or in obtaining an education.

It provides further that any number of veterans may use the proceeds of such loan to form a partnership, association, or corporation for the purpose of establishing, purchasing, or carrying on any such productive enterprise. The income from all such productive enterprise to be exempt for a period of 5 years, in an amount equal to the loan, from all Federal and State income tax.

The funds with which to make these loans is to be raised by the sale of veterans' rehabilitation bonds. These bonds to draw interest at the rate of 1½ percent and become payable in 30 years from the date of issue. The bill provides further that it shall be the duty of the

Secretary of the Treasury, in conjunction with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to sell these bonds at not less than par through various veterans' organizations and other patriotic institutions.

These bonds will sell readily. We have printed, and put into circulation, over $20,529,000,000 where we never had over $5,700,000,000 before. This additional $14,000,000,000 must find an outlet when the war ends, or there will again be drastic deflation—depression—the same as after World War No. 1. These bonds will give an opportunity for gradually tapering off inflation.

Under this bill any bank may invest its funds, including surplus and net profits, in "Veterans' rehabilitation bonds." If any such bank needs ready money, it can exchange the bonds at par for Federal Reserve notes. It provides that, when the war ends, all unexpended lend-lease funds, all unexpended funds in any other civilian war agency, and all funds received from the sale of surplus war materials shall be available for making such loans.

In addition, it provides that, if necessary, 5 percent of the net of all revenues received by the Government shall be set aside for the purpose of making these loans, and for carrying out the other provisions of the bill. It affords a real opportunity to change from a nation at war to a nation at peace without a financial collapse. The payments to the veterans under this bill would be spread over a period of 50 years. The number of policies becoming payable each year would depend upon the normal death rate.

We must not confuse this paid-up insurance with the soldiers' term insurance. That insurance is only for the duration of the war. It is cheap insurance while the war lasts. But, after the war the premiums go up. The soldier must then convert it into another form of insurance. In World War No. 1 the amount of such term insurance was over $39,606,000,000, but it dropped to less than $3,000,000,000 in 6 months after the discharge of the Army was completed.

The reason for this was that the veterans did not have the money to make the conversion or to pay the higher premiums. This time, let us give our soldiers, when they return victorious, something real—a paid-up life-insurance policy, a policy without strings or further premiums, a policy on which they can make a loan up to 85 percent of its face for the purpose of engaging in productive enterprises. Let us show that we appreciate their patriotism and their service. That is the least that we, as a grateful nation, can do. Let us not make the same mistake that we made after World War No. 1.

The men in the armed forces are the Nation's real defense. Without them there could be no defense—not a single tank would go into action. Without them not a single gun would fire a shot—not a plane would take to the air. Without them not a submarine would plunge into the ocean depths, not a single battleship would move. Then, why always become so patriotic and so red-blooded that you cannot appreciate the patriotism and the sacrifices that these boys have made?

Kangaroos in the Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in the magazine Nation's Business, issue of February 1944, there appeared an article entitled "Kangaroos in the Freight Rates," by A. J. Ribe.

I do not personally know Mr. Ribe, but the article describes him as follows:

Mr. Ribe is employed either as traffic manager or as traffic consultant by 65 shippers of raw materials, semifinished articles, and manufactured goods—all of them in the South and none of them what is commonly called big business. One of the best-known rate men in the South, he was employed from 1937 to 1939 as chief rate adviser for the Southern Governors' Rate Conference in developing and filing the complaint in the Southern Governors' rate case and was the chief rate witness for the complainants in the hearing of that case.

Because this article is so interesting, and seems to throw considerable light on a subject which is causing more than a little controversy, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANGAROOS IN THE FREIGHT RATES

THE POPULAR IMPRESSION THAT SOUTHERN FREIGHT RATES ARE TOO HIGH HAS LED TO A DEMAND FOR NEW LAWS. HERE'S HOW ONE SOUTHERN BUSINESSMAN FEELS ABOUT IT

(By A. J. Ribe)

Is our freight-rate structure unfair to the South? Is there a rate wall around the South? Is the South being drained of raw materials by a ruthless conspiracy? Is southern industry being strangled by lopsided rate making? Does southern industry favor the proposed legislative changes?

The popular opinion in the South seems to be that these questions should be answered in the affirmative. The belief is so general that southern Senators and Congressmen have introduced bills in Congress to bring about uniformity in rates to correct these supposed discriminations.

If these things are not true, then why does the average man think they are, and why do office seekers and public servants make political capital out of them?

The false impressions concerning the southern freight-rate situation spring from two sources. One is the misinformation which has been bandied about for some years by theorists inexperienced in production, manufacturing, marketing, or rate making. The other is the failure of the railroads to inform the public.

The charge of unfairness to the South comes from the belief that, on a given commodity between a northern point and a southern point, the northbound rate is higher. This simply is not true. Actually, the rates are the same in both directions, or, where there is a difference, the north-bound rate is lower. These exceptions are numerous. They apply to most of the moving northbound traffic.

Generally speaking, the examples of discrimination which critics of our rate structure cite are comparisons of "live" rates and "kangaroo" rates—sometimes called "paper" rates; in other words, rates on which commodities actually move compared with rates on which nothing moves except sporadic shipments, but which the carriers publish to take care of anything that might be offered for shipment.

It must be understood that the railroads are required to publish, file, and post for public inspection, rates on every sort of article which might be offered for movement between any two of nearly 100,000 points—altogether about 200 trillion individual rates.

Consequently, in the maze of railroad freight tariffs there is a published rate on kangaroos from Kankakee to Kalamazoo or Kokomo, or anywhere else. Also, in these same schedules there are rates on pig iron from Miami, bananas from Detroit, tobacco from Reno, grapefruit from Minneapolis, pineapples from St. Louis, and cotton from Spokane, to any place in the United States.

That there should be differences between the rates on which commerce actually moves and rates of the "kangaroo" variety is, therefore, inevitable and ordinarily innocuous.

E. L. Thornton, traffic manager of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, puts the point well:

"If the Audubon Park Zoo in New Orleans happens to have an extra baby elephant and wants to ship it to Bayou Goula, La., it may do so on a rate provided for the occasional and sporadic shipment. But if the zoo should decide to go into elephant raising as a business, it could consult the railroads, and, if found to be necessary, a line of rates on baby elephants from New Orleans would be put into effect."

In a magazine article, Gov. Sam Jones, of Louisiana compared the rates on shoes from Lake Charles, La., and Boston, Mass., to Chicago. The Governor might as well have compared the rates on kangaroos or baby elephants. Shoes are not made at Lake Charles. Shoes are made at New Orleans, La., Nashville, Tenn., and Buford, Ga., and the rates from these points to the North, including Chicago, are on a lower level than the rates from Boston. Proposed uniformity would reduce the "kangaroo" rates from Lake Charles, and increase the "live" rates from the actual southern points of shipment.

SOUTHERN PORTS HAVE LOW RATES

In the same article, Governor Jones discussed some other rates in an effort to show discrimination against the Port of New Orleans—and, again, he was in error. These are the export-import rates, and are very much alive. The fact concerning them is that, to and from southern ports, including New Orleans, and points in the North anywhere comparable in distance with the eastern seaboard, the rates were purposely made lower than to and from the eastern seaboard to attract some of the traffic through southern ports.

The question might be asked, if these rates to which objection is made were kangaroo rates, on which little or no traffic moves, what harm would there be in reducing them? This question seems logical enough on the surface but overlooks the fact that a rate may be of the kangaroo variety in one direction but an actual going rate in the other. The practical effect of reducing the northbound kangaroo rate in such cases would be to reduce the southbound live rate. Governor Jones' shoe rates from Lake Charles are kangaroo rates, but the same rates in effect to Lake Charles are live. Just how reducing his northern competitors'

rates would help a prospective manufacturer of shoes at Lake Charles get started in business is impossible to see.

The South's rate structure, which has grown up to fit its needs, is marked by three characteristics, all of them favorable to the development of southern industry and agriculture.

First, there are the rates for raw materials between points within the South which are lower than corresponding rates between points in the North. Some, as in the instances of pig iron and pulpwood, are as low as one-half the northern rates.

Second, there are the rates on products actually moving from the South to the North made on, or in relation to, the lower graded scale of rates in effect in the East.

And finally, there are the rates on manufactured goods moving into the South from the North, and on agricultural products from the near West, made on or in relation to the higher graded southern scale of rates.

True, there are rate walls at the Ohio River, but according to the way traffic moves, these walls operate against manufactured goods from the North, and dairy and other agricultural products from the near West. As long as the same goods and products are not produced in quantity in the South, the walls are not discriminatory and hurt no one.

STOVES IN FORT LAUDERDALE

Recently, a Florida witness testified before the Small Business Committee of Congress:

"That on a shipment or a carload of stoves from Fort Lauderdale to Pittsburgh, the transportation rate would be 30 percent higher than it would be if the same carload of stoves was shipped from Pittsburgh to Fort Lauderdale"—from which the committee concluded:

"Articles manufactured in the East could be shipped into the South and the West at a much lower rate than articles manufactured in the South and the West could be shipped (on a comparable mileage basis) into the East."

Both statements are inaccurate. The north-bound rate is not 30 percent higher than the south-bound rate—but, whatever it is, it is a "kangaroo" rate, because no stoves are made at Fort Lauderdale.

Stoves have been treated by the I. C. C. interterritorially in both directions. The southbound rates are on basis of the higher-graded southern scale. The northbound rates are on basis of the lower-graded eastern scale. These conflicting levels cannot be brought together without hurting the southern stove manufacturer, whether his market is in the North or South. Stoves are made in Cleveland, Tenn., and in Cleveland, Ohio. The rates per ton on coal stoves, carload, between these points are $13.40 southbound and $9.60 northbound. Similar differences exist on coal stoves, less than carload, and on gas stoves, carload and less than carload.

Another false impression is that the North is draining raw material from the South. Critics of our rate structure have said this so often that the public has accepted it as true. That claim was true 40 years ago, and, to a lesser extent, 20 years ago. It is not true now.

A recent study of 34 commodities, or groups of commodities, clearly recognizable as raw materials—such as cotton, hides, coke, pig iron—shows that the South, in a 12-year period ending with 1941, shifted from an exporter of such materials with a net outbound balance of 1,000,000 tons, to an importer, with a net in-bound balance of 1,377,000 tons.

True, the South ships lumber, coal, fruits, and vegetables to the North, but these are not "raw materials" in the sense in which the agitators of this subject use the term.

Southern coal moving north-bound competes with northern coal. That the rates applied to the southern coal are on a lower level than those applied to northern coal, distance considered, is well known.

Does any southern interest wish to stop the South's shipments of fruits and vegetables? That is what they are raised for!

The tremendous increase in the use of raw materials in the South—some coming from the North and some from the West—has been accomplished under the present rate structure.

AGITATION OVER PAPER RATES

The existence of innocuous differences in paper rates has become the foundation of a vast, prolonged, and almost unchallenged agitation of the idea that the South is a victim of a planned and oppressive rate policy in favor of the North. As a result, more than a dozen bills proposing to do away with the alleged discrimination are now pending in Congress.

No one would claim that this maligned southern freight-rate structure is perfect in all its details—but neither can any of its vociferous critics in or out of Congress suggest a formula for its "unification" with rates in other sections which will not actually crucify the South.

"Rate uniformity" sounds nice but what does it mean? One of its advocates, Henry B. Kline, associate economist for the T. V. A., thinks it would do away with much "wasteful transportation required because so much of present industry is located with no eye to the conservation of human and physical energies."

The North has had such a head start on the South that any new industry in the South, unless it is a branch of a national industry already well established, must crawl in its home State before it can walk to adjoining States, and walk to adjoining States before it can run to distant markets. Until the South has its industry walking and running the present rate structure is best suited for its needs.

Rates cannot be unified with those in the North without hurting the South. If limited to manufactures and agricultural products, as some critics advocate, and if the unification is accomplished by a leveling process, rates on moving traffic from the South to the North will increase, and those on traffic from the North and near West will be reduced.

If, on the other hand, to prevent such sweeping reductions in the south-bound rates, the northern scale is regraded, that regraded scale, when turned around and applied in the opposite direction, would result in sweeping increases in the north-bound rates on moving traffic from South to the North.

A decree establishing uniform rate levels where there is no uniformity of conditions will not eliminate discrimination. The I. C. C. has not been able to do that entirely in more than a half century of conscientious effort. How, then, does the blindest believer in the efficacy of "passing a law" suppose it can be accomplished at a stroke by an act of Congress? We might as well pass a law requiring realtors to sell all business property at the same price per front foot, regardless of locations.

The agitation, and the legislative proposals which have grown from it, are usually heralded as the result of a coalition of the South and West seeking relief from oppression on the part of the North.

Most advocates of these changes are honest in their beliefs, I am sure, but too often their approach is political, has no regard to its broad effects; or is one of theory, unembarrassed by experience, and unrestrained by responsibility for results.

PRESENT RATES WORK WELL

The businessmen, the traffic managers, the men who produce the goods, direct its movement, and pay the bills emphatically do not want Congress to fix rate levels, no matter for whose supposed benefit it is done.

Industry throughout the country, including the South, has been built up on such rates as will market the product, and this agitation for legislative action did not originate with the shippers. They are beginning to see the evils that will result from such a policy, and they may well anticipate the damage to southern industry that will follow destruction of the rate fabric on which our southern industry has been developed.

The National Industrial Traffic League, the most broadly representative organization of experienced shippers in the United States, has expressed its opposition to what it aply terms the political or pressure method of rate making. Like action has been taken by commercial and shipping organizations all over the country, without regard to section.

Of course, there are individual instances of rate discriminations and there always will be, not only in the South, but throughout the entire country. These are but the growing pains of an expanding industrial and agricultural economy in free competition, and should be handled individually, as in the past. This, at least, constitutes a far healthier situation than if discriminations in rates and disjointing of industrial progress were the result of the cold, clammy hand of a rigid rate system.

Shippers do not always like the decisions of the I. C. C. They are rarely entirely satisfied with all their rates. They sometimes feel that somewhere someone has an advantage. But they do believe in the time-tested machinery for dealing with these things, for continually adjusting rates to meet changing conditions and for carrying out, as well as possible, the broad and basic prescription of the law; that the rates shall be reasonable, and shall neither prefer nor discriminate as among shippers, classes of commerce, commodities or localities.

New Patterns for America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Parma (Mich.) News carries an editorial in which is included a letter written by a man in the military service. The letter evidences sound reasoning on the part of our soldiers and is well worth reading. It is as follows:

NEW PATTERNS FOR AMERICA?

A soldier writes: "What do they mean, fussing around about what kind of an America we servicemen want when we get home? Do they value America as something that can be changed with the seasons the same as women's hats and clothes?

"We can't escape the notion here that some people back home are trying to fashion new patterns for America—running around with tape measure, shears, chalk, and things, and quarreling among themselves as to what style of a tailor-made country will please us after the war.

"You tell these self-appointed designers to let Uncle Sam alone. When we get back, we want to see his swallow-tail coat still there, and his boot-straps, tall hat, and everything else that's familiar. His way of dressing has been all right for a long time. It's what we're fighting to keep all right for a long time to come. Leave him be. Just have him there to say 'Hello' when we return—dressed the way we know him.

"It's swell that our first few months in civvies are getting some forethought instead of

the hindthought—or no thought—of the last time.

"When that period is over all that we want is to be free to work at what we can do best—with an employer who is free to expand—all of us managed by someone who knows how to weld us into a going business to the end that our work and risk in a fair, open market, will bring reasonable returns that we'll be free to use for building family and country into a still wondrous future."

Doesn't it make sense?

Mr. Speaker, it does make sense.

Polish Navy and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me at the celebration of the salute to the Polish Navy and merchant marine at Manhattan Center, New York City, March 12, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my Polish friends, when I was asked to speak, I naturally inquired as to the nature of the meeting. When I heard that the purpose was to "Salute the Polish Navy and merchant marine," and to explain to the American people that the Polish Navy and merchant marine did since the war started, running supplies, ammunition, and soldiers to nearly every theater of the war, not excluding the evacuation of Dunkirk and the landing at Salerno; saving the crew of our own U. S. S. *Campbell* by the Polish ship *Burza;* the saving of about eleven hundred British seamen from a torpedoed British vessel in the Mediterranean, overloading the capacity of the Polish ship to double its available space and in danger of sinking because of that but reaching the nearest port safely and intact with all on board, I unhesitatingly accepted.

As a matter of fact, I accepted with a great deal of pride, feeling as I do, honored to be able to stand before you, and publicly pay tribute to the gallant deeds of both the Polish Navy and merchant marine. Yes, that goes for the wonderful Polish Army, which so gallantly defended Warsaw and all of Poland, until overwhelmed by sheer numbers. Poland never surrendered! Poland never quit! The Polish soldiers, seamen and flyers fought as they have always fought, to the last ounce of energy they posssessed.

Let us remind ourselves, and all of those who have forgotten, for forgetting in this game of international politics and chess is the easiest thing to do—that Poland was the first to resist and fight. Let us also remember and not forget that the protection of Poland's sovereignty was the ostensible cause of this war. Remember that! Do you remember what Poland was told? You go ahead and fight and we will see to it that you will be taken care of when the time comes. But what a sad commentary. A partition is being discussed. Is that what one would call gratitude? Is that what one deserves when they save a friend from disaster and destruction? Truthfully, ingratitude is the thanks of the world.

I know that the Polish people throughout the world, scattered as they are over all the corners of the globe, feel very sad and depressed right now. I know that because I come from Rochester where I have many Polish friends and they express their feelings to me. However, although you are sad now, and the outlook surrounding the country of your forefathers seems clouded and uncertain, you must have faith. During the 150 years Poland was subjugated and under the yoke of the worst tyrants the world has ever known, she never lost faith. Faith in God, faith in her people and faith in their fellow man. Then, when the time came, Poland's contribution to the history of the world was not forgotten. The result was a free and independent Poland with access to the sea. With lungs to breathe, and by that I mean that you had an outlet to the Baltic, even though it was only 45 miles long, it gave you an opportunity to develop your commerce, your navy and your merchant marine. Without this, the body politic would die.

Poland took advantage of that small strip of coast and what a magnificent job she did. From nothing to Gdynia, one of the marvel ports of the world. Poland's navy increased steadily, and merchant ships under the Polish flag were seen in many ports of the world where they had never been seen before. For that achievement alone, I salute. I know very well that Poland did all this with very little outside help and therefore she deserves still more credit.

Then the war came. The German army, under Hitler and by his orders, without provocation and without a declaration of war, attacked Poland, both on land and sea, in the early gray morning hours of September 1, 1939. Did the Polish Army flinch? Did the little Polish Navy and the little band of men at Westerplatte quit? Absolutely not! That is not the Polish spirit. Whenever the principle of freedom is involved and when oppression looms, the Poles fight in defense of their time honored heritage and slogan—"For our freedom and yours."

Poland has never been an aggressor nation, but it has always come to the defense of the other fellow. At Vienna, remember, Christianity was threatened. The Poles, under their King, John Sobieski, defeated the Turks. That saved Europe from the Moslems and the Poles deserved the undying thanks of the world. Yet, what happened? That very Austria was one of the powers which later partitioned Poland. Here, in our own United States, we remember Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and others, who fought for our liberty. And, again in this war, Poland fights for freedom and liberty. The Poles are fighting on land, on the sea, and in the air. Untiringly, the Polish Navy cruises the seas seeking the Germans. With the same indomitable courage so characteristic of the Poles, a Polish destroyer was the first to sight the mighty German battleship *Bismarck.* Doggedly the Polish destroyer hung onto the *Bismarck,* calling for the British Navy to hurry along and make the kill. Such is the typical and inherent spirit of the Poles. Submarines, which escaped the trap of the Germans in the Baltic, go out to sea and harass German shipping and sink their cargoes. In the defense of London, Polish airmen fought with the British. In Scotland the Polish Army is ready. In the Near East, it is not only ready, but is already fighting alongside the famous British Eighth Army. I see several Polish women in uniform similar to our WAC's as so, too, the women are organized. The most striking proof of Polish vitality and patriotism is the underground organization, functioning in full harmony and under orders of the Polish Government in London. Remember, too, that Poland never produced a Quisling or a traitor. Everywhere, Polish men and women, sailors, soldiers, workers, farmers, professors, and all others are awaiting the day of retribution and the liberation of their land from the enemy.

That shall never be denied them.

Remember, Poland has the right to self-determination which is implicit in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Force must be put behind them to operate for the freedom of all nations as it was intended. That force is the force of public opinion.

We in America are not unmindful that American boys of Polish ancestry, sons of this citizenry of honest, hard-working, and loyal Polish-Americans who live throughout the length and breadth of the country, are fighting and dying in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. We shall not fail you. We will fight in the defense of Poland, as some of your ancestors fought for ours. Poland shall and will again be a free and independent country with its territory inviolate. With faith in God, it shall be so.

Extension of Social Security Benefits to State and Municipal Employees and Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals.

This bill will accomplish two things. In the first place, it will cover State, county and city employees, or the employees of any other political subdivision of the State, in cases where the State, or political subdivision thereof, consents to come under the provisions of the act. And second, it will extend the act to include self-employed individuals, who desire to come within its terms.

In my judgment, there is no sound basis for denying social-security benefits to an individual merely because he happens to work for the State, county, city or other municipality. These persons should have the right to make social-security contributions the same as persons in private employment and receive the same benefits when they reach retirement age.

Likewise, there is a large group of self-employed persons in the country who would like to make social-security contributions and thus receive the benefits thereof at retirement age. These self-employed individuals in most cases are employers only in a technical sense. The barber, the small grocery store owner, the garage and gas station operator, and hundreds of other small business and professional groups which are too numerous to mention here, are at present denied the opportunity to avail themselves of the privileges granted by the social-security law. These small employers are in most cases no better off financially than their employees. And for that reason the law should be amended to permit their coverage under the social-security system, providing they

are willing to comply with its requirements.

I hope this bill will receive early committee consideration and be enacted into law.

The 1942 Soldier Vote Act Affords the Greatest Number of Servicemen and Servicewomen To Exercise Their Right To Vote Than Under the Provisions of the Emasculated Lucas-Green-Worley Bill—the 1942 Soldier Vote Act Is Constitutional

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 13, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the conference report on the servicemen and servicewomen's vote bill as agreed to by the Senate and House conferees should pass the Senate, I shall be compelled to vote against it and, if opportunity is given, I shall oppose it on the floor as beyond doubt instead of increasing the number of servicemen and servicewomen privileged to vote under the original 1942 Soldier Vote Act it will actually reduce the number of their constitutional right to vote.

It has been my aim and purpose ever since the enactment of the 1942 Soldier Vote Act to broaden the provisions of that act. To that end I introduced a bill which, if enacted, would not only have permitted a larger number of members of our armed forces to vote, but would have also extended the voting privilege to thousands of civilians serving in our forces in a quasi military capacity who, I believe, as citizens are also entitled to cast their absentee votes. I appeared before the House Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and strongly urged that it be acted upon favorably, but as the War and Navy Department officers were in doubt as to possible complications and interference with the casting of votes of the servicemen and servicewomen, I stated at the hearing that I would support and vote for any bill that would assure the greatest number of those in our armed forces of their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and the country I am going to give a short résumé of the provisions of the original 1942 Soldier Vote Act, and anyone reading it must come to the conclusion that the original act is by far a better and more effective voting procedure than is now provided under the provisions of the emasculated Lucas-Green-Worley bill that has been agreed to by the Senate and House conferees.

The original act permits voting by members of the armed forces in both the primaries and general elections. Of course, this right is confined solely for voting for Federal officers such as President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. It has been said that this act cannot be enforced. There can be little doubt whatever that every member of the armed services can vote under the present law if the said officer whose duty it is to enforce the same will honestly and fearlessly act under its provisions and grant these absentee voters the rights every officer in the United States professes to be in favor of.

This 1942 act in section 1 eliminates the necessity of registration of qualified voters.

In section 2, it also provides that no poll tax shall be necessary in order to vote for such Federal officers.

The mechanics of the act begin in section 3 which provides that after the 1st day of February the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall cause to be printed and distributed to each member of the land and naval forces an adequate number of post cards directed to the secretary of state of the State in which the voter usually resides, requesting that a ballot be mailed to him wherever he may be located in such service.

It will be noted that this provision is mandatory. I understand that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have and are mailing such post cards.

Section 4 of the bill provides that when the secretaries of the respective States receive such post cards, they shall cause to be transmitted to each canvassing board the statement containing the names and addresses and such other information appearing on the post cards so that they will have a list of the voters who will properly attempt to vote under this act. This was placed in the act giving such officers the opportunity to determine from the information printed on the post cards whether such voters were qualified voters in the person designated.

Section 5 provides that the secretary of state of each State shall cause to be printed a sufficient number of official war ballots to provide for voting for electors for President, Vice President, and representatives in Congress, and may, in case the State legislature of the State shall have authorized it, also provide for voting for candidates of State, county, and other local offices.

Section 6 of the act provides that the secretary of state shall cause to be printed an appropriate number of official envelopes for use in connection with such official war ballots and printed thereon is an oath required from the voter showing his eligibility as a voter. This section also provides that the secretary of state shall cause to be printed instructions to the voters how and when they shall vote, and may be in booklet form if desired.

Section 7 of the act provides that the secretary of state of each State shall transmit to every member of the land and naval forces of the United States who makes application in accordance with this act as soon as practicable after the receipt of such application a Federal war ballot and envelope, voting instructions, and explanations as is set forth above. It will be noted that this provision is also mandatory and after the secretaries of state comply with the law most of the secretaries of state can send their ballots to the applicants shortly after the national conventions are held. At least this is true in a large number of States, as most primaries are held before the national convention.

Section 8 provides that the applicant, in casting such vote, shall appear before any commanding officer of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who has authority to administer the oath required by this act that will appear on the back of the envelope containing their ballot. This section further provides that the envelope should be immediately mailed by the voter to the secretary of state and such secretary of state upon receiving the same shall promptly transmit it to the proper election officials of the district or precinct of the voter's residence, so that the same may be counted in the same manner and at the same time votes are cast under the State law. Any vote polled under this act goes through the same process as a vote polled under the State law and is subject to the same channels with the exception of the system of registration and the payment of poll taxes.

Section 10 of the act provides that all costs of printing such ballots and holding such elections shall be paid by appropriations made by the Congress of the United States.

This act further provides that in case any service member has voted a Federal ballot under this act and at the same time has voted under the State law, then his Federal ballot vote shall not be counted by the board of canvassers under this act. It seems apparent to me that under the provisions of this act there is ample time to give every member of the armed forces an opportunity to vote for at least all of the Federal candidates regardless of whether he is registered or not. I know that without this act many men and women who enlisted in the service under age and who are not registered will be deprived of their vote. Does any man sincerely and honestly believe that a man's or woman's name appearing on the registration list of voters makes him or her better qualified or more entitled to cast a ballot than a young man or woman who is and has enlisted in the armed services of the United States, offering their lives on the altar of sacrifice for the special privilege of living under a free government?

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the Republicans who seem to be in control of the House have forced amendments to the Lucas-Green-Worley bill which, instead of increasing the opportunities of servicemen and servicewomen to vote, will reduce the number to exercise their constitutional right to vote. I say to them that neither our soldiers or sailors or their families or relatives are being fooled by their hue and cry of "States' rights" because, as I have stated, the original act provides that in the event of a Federal and State ballot being received by the secretary of any given State, the State ballot shall go

into the ballot box and be counted. I fully appreciate that the Republicans feel that the vast majority of our patriotic citizenry serving in the armed forces would vote, if given the opportunity, for their Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, to aid him to bring about an early victory and lasting peace. It is indeed regrettable that the Republicans are following in the footsteps of the Republicans who, after the First World War, refused to approve the League of Nations that would have served to prevent this war. Never in my long service have I witnessed the deplorable assaults and attacks upon a President such as those to which President Roosevelt has been subjected. Regardless of the protestations of the Republicans, they are again playing politics at the expense of our country and denying to those most deserving members of our armed forces the fullest exercise of their right to vote. They continuously go out of their way to harass and embarrass the President who, thank God, is able to withstand the brunt of their unfair opposition.

Mr. Speaker, only day before yesterday one of the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol charged that the War Department was circulating through the Army War College a certain magazine review bearing on a critical article on General MacArthur, which has since been shown to be without foundation. His statement received a great deal of publicity at the time, but the explanation since given by the librarians of the Army War College that the review did not reflect derogatorily on General MacArthur has been conveniently ignored and does not appear in the press.

I read in this morning's paper that retired Gen. Robert E. Wood, president of the Sears, Roebuck Co., head of the America First Committee, conveniently disbanded after Pearl Harbor, met with General MacArthur a few weeks ago somewhere in Australia. I wonder as to the purpose of their meeting—whether to assure General MacArthur that if he is a candidate for the Presidency he will have the support of the isolationists and the Fascists in this country. I hope that this report is not based on facts and is just another one of the many statements or charges that the Republicans make.

A further press comment came to my attention in which the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, my personal friend, is advising the womenfolk of our country, if I recall the article correctly, to write the boys at the front that the President is not doing all he can for them. This brought to my mind the statement of the Chairman of the Republican National Committee of about 2 weeks ago, that he obtained the services or cooperation of Army officers to canvass our soldiers abroad, who reported that a majority of them proclaimed to be opposed to President Roosevelt's reelection. If Chairman Spangler obtained such report it must have been from Republican Army officers who made themselves believe that such was the case, but if Mr. Spangler believes it to be true why do the Republicans in Congress oppose giving the members of our armed forces the right to vote? There are so many things that are being said on the floor and in the press that tend to create discord and disunity, not only at home, but within the ranks of our armed forces that, saying the least, is extremely unfortunate and deplorable. Instead of cooperating to help to win the war the politically conscious Republicans are going back to pre-Pearl Harbor days and continue in their efforts to gain a little political advantage.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SOLDIER VOTE ACT OF 1942

Mr. Speaker, the oft-repeated statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that my bill or the Lucas-Green-Worley, as well as the original 1942 Soldier Vote Act, is unconstitutional is not borne by Supreme Court decisions on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the constitutionality of the various bills pending in Congress giving the Federal Government power to control the method of voting for Members of Congress by the armed forces appears to lose sight of fundamentals. There are two provisions of the Constitution which justify the proposed Federal control. Article I, section 4 provides that Congress may at any time regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for its Members; article I, section 8 gives Congress full power to declare war and maintain the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, the only right the States have over voting in States for Federal officers springs from the Constitution, and not from State constitution or statutes. See *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 171), and in *Mosely* v. *N. S.* (238 U. S. 383), where the Court said:

> Congress by appropriate legislation may protect this right.

In 1842 Congress partially regulated the subject when it passed a law authorizing the States to elect Congressmen from congressional districts so they would not all be elected at large.

In the case of *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. Rept., at page 389), the Court held Congress had the right by legislation, in the election, to pass laws regulating and imposing duties upon State election officers whenever any candidates for Federal office where to be voted for.

This case, decided in 1879, further held Congress has the right to supervise all such elections and make entirely new regulations, or add to, alter, or modify the regulations made by the States.

Likewise, under the war power Congress necessarily has complete control over the rights and duties of the members of the armed forces. This power has been exercised in many fields without challenge. Thus State statutes of limitations have been superseded—see *Stewart* v. *Bloom* (11 Wall. 493)—and the civil rights of those in the armed forces protected by suspending litigation in State as well as Federal courts. See *Konkle* v. *State* (168 Wis. 335); *Hoffman* v. *Charlestown Five Cents Savings Bank* (231 Mass. 324). The extension of this principle to the voting rights of soldiers cannot seriously be doubted.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the membership that they read a brief filed by our former colleague, the Honorable Robert L. Ramsay, of West Virginia, author of the 1942 Soldier Vote Act, appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 2550–51, as well as his two addresses on the subject appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 23, 1942, pages 6546–48, and September 7, 1942, pages 7059–60. They are most enlightening and anyone reading them must come to the conclusion that the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are erroneous and contrary to the many rulings of the Supreme Court and the Constitution itself.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News:

LEST WE FORGET

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt is now serving his twelfth year at the White House, and while the people of the Nation are facing the great problems of war, it would be well they recall the devastating economic war that raged prior to the time our President assumed office in March of 1933.

A Nation bordering on revolution entered a period of national reconstruction. Some 16,000,000 people unemployed roamed the highways and byways for food, clothing, and shelter. Thousands were seen in the soup kitchens and bread lines, and countless thousands sold apples on the streets. Life savings of thousands were lost through bank failures. Homes, paid for by working men through blood, sweat, and tears were taken away from them because they could not meet their mortgage payments. No security for the men and women who toil. No protection for the workingman to organize into labor unions. No hope for the future for the common man. All appeared lost for the toiler, small businessman, the average American citizen, and the war veteran.

Roosevelt took over the reins of government. He was the man for the poor, the man for the worker, the man for the aged, the man for the masses. He introduced drastic and unprecedented measures to restore confidence in the Nation, to halt an incipient revolution, and to bring order out of economic chaos. It was not without surmounting obstacles laid in his path by the reactionaries, who were appalled at passing any legislation, however necessary, that laws were enacted to save the country from serious disaster.

Roosevelt won because he was right. He won because he had the courage and determination to better the lot of the common people. The C. C. C., T. V. A., N. Y. A., and other such emergency measures necessary to relieve national distress came into existence only after a hard, bitter fight.

The farmers were given relief to alleviate their suffering by the farm relief programs enacted at the suggestion of our President hurdling many obstacles from the obstructionists and double talkers.

Thousands were employed on W. P. A. projects, resulting in modern school houses, public buildings, bridges, playgrounds, and highways. People today are protected by unemployment compensation, while the aged are protected by the social security. The stock market gamblers have been driven into oblivion and the market today is conducted on a safe and sound basis. The banks' deposits are protected up to $5,000 by the Government. Workers are permitted to select unions of their own choosing and bargain collectively. All these rights have been preserved despite the country being engaged in the greatest war in its history.

Roosevelt can be credited with all these accomplishments despite the hard reactionaries' efforts to take away the benefits given to the workingman by the man of the people.

Roosevelt should be highly commended because for the first time in history the problems of labor have been recognized as of primary national importance and under his leadership more liberal, progressive, and humane legislation has been enacted than had ever been achieved through the history of our Nation.

We believe that every American willing and capable of working shall receive a just and living wage which will enable him to maintain and educate his family according to the standards of American decency.

President Roosevelt fought for the security at home through his brilliant diplomacy. He was far ahead of Congress in world affairs. He made every effort to defend this Nation by arming it. He warned against gangsterism. He fought the people who would sell America. He predicted the European conflict while others denounced him as a war-monger.

Then came December 7, 1941. Surrounded by the ablest leadership in the Nation, Congressman John W. McCormack, the majority leader of the House, and Alben Barkley, majority leader of the Senate; Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, and Secretary of War Henry Stimson, the most brilliant generals, admirals, and other officers, President Roosevelt led the Nation from a defensive to an offensive war. Just recall the dark days starting in December of 1941, and observe what we have today.

Production has made this Nation the greatest power in the world in 2 years. We now have the largest Navy in the world. The largest Army. The largest Air Force. And we are just beginning to grow great. One man alone is responsible for such a miraculous accomplishment. There were strong forces against us in Germany and Japan, prepared for war for 25 years or more. But we survived the crisis, and one man was responsible for the miraculous and astronomical achievement. He is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We have supported President Roosevelt three times. We do not regret our stand in his behalf. On the contrary we are proud of our stand. We support Roosevelt because he is our President, because he places human rights above dollar rights, because he is liberal, tolerant, and honorable.

He has fought the reactionaries who oppose necessary legislation to improve the stability and economic freedom of every American and make him and his family secure. He has fought that element who contested every move to alleviate the plight of the oppressed and the exploited.

Upon the principles and policies laid down by our great leader we will carry this war to a victorious conclusion and honorable peace. The American people have confidence in his leadership as they have demonstrated by keeping him in the White House for three terms and call upon him to accept a fourth term as his brilliant administrative knowledge and ability are needed now more than in 1933 when he assumed the Presidency.

Twenty-seventh Monthly Message to the People of Japan by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my twenty-seventh monthly radio message to the people of Japan.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Today marks the twenty-seventh month since the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor while they were at peace with the United States, and attempted at one stroke to destroy most of the American Navy in the Pacific. As has been his custom on the 8th day of each month since that time, United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS today addresses a special message to the people of Japan. Senator THOMAS is the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor and a noted authority on the Far East. He has been, ever since his first visit to Japan many years ago, a friend of the Japanese people. His monthly messages present frankly the problems that beset the people of Japan because of their betrayal by their war lords. You will now hear the special message to the Japanese people by United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS. To the people of Japan.

It is now some months since the reorganization of your government again, in recognition of the increasing danger to you from the United Nations and our constantly growing offensive. The first announcements came as a great surprise to many of you, who had been led to believe that Japan was winning the war. Dismay must have struck your hearts at the realization that all your sacrifices and the mustering of your sons into your armed forces had been entirely inadequate to accomplish more than some initial successes, and that now your military masters have lost the offensive and were calling on you for superhuman efforts to postpone the disaster which even they were beginning to realize will be inevitable.

From that time up to the recent change in command of both your Army and Navy, you have had a series of shocks even greater than the first warnings given to you. These came through the multiple attacks and occupations by the United Nations of your positions in the southwest and central Pacific.

Just as the war lords who dominate your lives, changed from a policy of deceiving you about winning the war, and told you frankly of its crucial nature, so in the last few weeks they have continued by telling you for the first time real facts about your great losses of warships, airplanes, men, and strategic bases. The accounts that have come to you in your newspapers and over the wireless have not been the full truth, but they have been so much closer to it than in the 2 years before, that the change was really startling.

On the surface, therefore, your military masters are beginning to appear to be more honest with you than in the past. Many of the facts about Japanese reverses you can now learn openly, instead of through whisand worked with many Japanese leaders.
pers, rumors, and secret reports from returned soldiers and others in your midst. This apparent turn to frankness is of course for the reason of stimulating you to greater efforts than you have made before, because of the imminence of even greater and stronger offensives closer to your mainland.

The truth is, however, that Prime Minister Tojo and your other officials are being just as dishonest with you today as they have been for many years. They are deceiving you just as surely as in the past.

They are betraying your Emperor with the same wanton disregard of honor and truth as when they brought on the attack on Pearl Harbor 27 months ago.

Their deception lies in posing as your friends and benefactors, when in fact they are your most deadly enemies. It is they who are bringing disaster to you, and who, in the face of that coming disaster, are making it more certain for you in a desperate effort to hold off the retribution that will come surely to them from the United Nations and, later, from you yourselves, the people of Japan.

When the day of unconditional surrender comes, and it is sure to come, you will know what perfidy has been practiced upon you. Your only hope today lies first in realizing that your war lords are your enemies, and second in refusing to prolong a useless struggle which is already sapping the very vitals of your nation.

Japan stands alone today, with no aid possible from her failing partner, Germany, and her fallen partner, Italy. She faces a united group of nations composing 80 percent of all the people in the world, with inexhaustible resources, with constantly increasing strength, and with the greatest spiritual force in history, the spirit of liberty and of justice.

It is for you today, people of Japan, to make the vital decision to be faithful to the traditions of your fathers and to reject the false and shameful practices of your military masters, which have brought disgrace to your nation. For the sake of preserving that which is good, you must expel that which is low and discourteous and bad.

For more than 2 years I have been telling you in these monthly messages the simple facts which I have repeated just now. Exactly a year ago today I said: "You Japanese people now have the simple choice of dying ignominiously with your leaders and making the name Japan a foul thing which will be eternally infamous, or you may realize before the awful death and destruction begins to fall from the skies of Japan itself that the only way Japanese can ever again join world society is to return to the ways of decency and to learn how to live in peace with your neighbors. Remember the words recently spoken by President Roosevelt: 'In our uncompromising policy we mean no harm to the common people of the Axis Nations. But we do mean to impose punishment and retribution in full upon their guilty, barbaric leaders.'"

People of Japan, what I said then is even more urgently true today.

ANNOUNCER. From the United States of America we have presented a special message to the people of Japan. On this day in every month since January 1941, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, has addressed a special message to the people in whom he has taken a deep interest for nearly 40 years. Senator THOMAS spent a number of years in Japan, where he earned the respect and confidence of those with whom he came in contact. Since that time he has been active in far-eastern affairs and has known and worked with many Japanese leaders.

Address by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, Before Charleston Branch, United Nations Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on March 8, 1944, before the Charleston Branch of the United Nations Association at the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School Auditorium.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was reading the other day an old book written by an Englishman early in the eighteenth century. He was saying that considering the geographic proximity of France and Germany, it was highly important that England maintain good relations with them. With more distant Italy it was also important, but less so because of the distance between. As to what goes on in China, said he, "that can have no effect upon us whatsoever."

What a striking contrast between this point of view and that of advertisements put out by our air lines today, which proclaim that "the most distant country is our next-door neighbor."

The log of a sea captain sailing from Liverpool to Canton in the year 1700 might show 6 months to a year between the two points. The vessel might be gone 2 years or more before it came back—if it came back at all. No wonder the English writer of the eighteenth century could assert with much certitude that events in China could have no bearing on life in England.

Today the concept has changed from one of days and degrees of longitude on the ocean sea to one of miles-per-second in the rarified ocean of the substratosphere. Today by great-circle routes, St. Louis is only 17½ hours from La Paz, Bolivia; Detroit is only 20 hours from Moscow and New York 22½ hours from Cairo; a plane can go in 32 hours from Philadelphia to Capetown and in 34½ hours from San Francisco to Singapore. What goes on in China is bound to have a great deal of effect upon us when an airplane can go from Albuquerque to Chungking in 30 hours.

The breathtaking advances in science and technology have made the world a neighborhood. However, to live at peace in a community of neighbor nations requires the establishment of an economic good-neighbor policy, not necessarily because of any altruistic motives, but because it is the sine quo non of our own future national well-being.

The rise of fascism, with all its totalitarian variations, that ultimately led to the outbreak of the grim wars which engulf the entire world, is making dramatically clear the need for coming to grips with the basic causes for these destructive social ills. The rise of these totalitarian theories, the recurrence of social unrest and war are, to my mind, brought about to no small extent by the existence of grave economic disparities within and between nations. First and foremost, we must realize the need for taking affirmative measures and taking the leadership for the correction of these disparities. In my judgment, without permanent world peace and security, there can be no American peace and security.

The world today views with admiration, respect, and sometimes fear our American manufacturing techniques. The productiveness of the American worker is something that is hard for other nations to understand. American technology, although often restrained because of financial considerations, represents to them a wonderful accomplishment. Consequently, America's business attitudes in the post-war world will undoubtedly have vital meaning for all nations, as well as for our own.

Modern history has provided ample evidence of the observation that military warfare to a great extent is but an advanced phase of economic warfare. The sooner we realize this—the sooner we take positive action in establishing a realistic economic policy which encourages economic security and welfare—then the sooner we will avoid the pitfalls of another world war.

Because our national economic policy and our world economy have been in the past handled by private interests for private interests, restrictive economic measures have resulted all over the world. The productive potentialities of the world have been harnessed and controlled but not, I fear, in the best public interest. The cartel system, consisting of monopolistic groups with similar interests, have controlled much of the world's resources for the benefit of the few instead of for the good of all peoples.

The monopoly economy, the cartel economy, is based not so much on protection from competition by agreement as it is based on a protection by an obsolete or outmoded mechanism for the sole purpose of furnishing a rich return.

What has been the result of this kind of economic control, and what have we as a nation to boast of in our national policy over the past period? We were in possession of tremendous industrial power. If we had properly harnessed that power, we would not have a war with Japan today. We could have produced constructive, creative goods and made them available to Japan. We could have given the Japanese Government and the Japanese people a clear-cut statement of our interest in the peaceful development of their country. We could have offered to help them in this development and to have given them help. We had in our hands, at one time, the power to strengthen the will of the Japanese people to break with the feudal, militaristic powers which enslaved them. We did none of these things. Our lack of a constructive affirmative economic policy encouraged enterprising cartel groups. It was immaterial to these groups whether they dealt with imperialistic or democratic forces. It was apparently of no consequence that their "business activities" made it possible for American gunpowder to throw American scrap iron from Japanese guns—at Americans.

What economic encouragement did we offer the weak and struggling democratic state of Germany in the 1920's, to enable her to build up a sound economy? What help did we offer Germany's democratic forces to become strong and representative in the few years when Germany teetered on the brink of economic chaos? None.

Under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover we drew up the Dawes and Young plans to settle the reparations problem of Germany. After washing our hands of political responsibility we engaged actively in financial affairs of Germany. In a few years American bankers sold to Americans close to a billion and a half of loans which went to Germany, apart from loans made directly by banks and corporations to German banks and German corporations. Of course, the German corporations accepted this money and credit most graciously and proceeded most thoughtfully to repay us by stocking munitions and building a war machine, looking to eventual world conquest. We closed the gates of our Nation to the exchange of economic goods and services for the mutual development of both our countries. We did not offer the opportunity to the German people to produce the goods of peace to pay us and our allies their war debts.

It should have been patent that a democratic government then could not survive unless the economy was good—unless people had work, and could live decently, and feel themselves economically solvent. Instead, industrial production and employment were kept at low ebb and prices were high. The Junkers, the cartelists, and the war lords took advantage of the internal confusion and social unrest. They organized their underground and fomented revolt. They plotted and organized and paid their stooges to prevent democratic organization of trade-unions. Finally, when the time came, one of their stool pigeons, an obscure Austrian house painter, was put in charge of the Government.

Was our economic policy geared to combat the specter of fascism in Germany? Did we confront Hitler, the custard-pie window dressing of the cartelists, with economic sanctions that would have forced him from his course? We did not. Instead, we strengthened the hand of the German cartelists, who weakened us by agreements with American cartel members while they strengthened Germany. The cartelists calculated the industrial and technological handicaps they would impose upon us before were finally forced into this war.

Our Government must add to its political policy a new and different economic policy in dealing with the other countries of the world. We must write this fundamental principle into our foreign policy. We must never again leave it to cartels to manage independently our international economic affairs. It has been disastrous in the past; it would be catastrophic in the future.

Our Government has this responsibility not merely because of our obligation to the other United Nations, but because it has such a direct bearing upon the welfare of our own people. Enlightened, long-term selfishness makes necessary the development of such a policy.

Wars cost too much. Wars waste too much. Wars are a bad investment from any hard-headed, materialistic point of view. They result in an erosion of our human and material resources. Each time they leave a deeper gash on the face of the Nation, each time they spread farther and farther, carrying away more of the topsoil of human life and the subsoil of material resources. If a faulty economic policy brings wars—which it does—then what is needed is a change in our economic policy.

We have worked our national resources heavily in this war. We have drawn upon them without inhibition. We have unleashed great national resources of science and technology to fight this bitterest war of all time.

We have discovered that our economy is capable of producing a national income of almost $200,000,000,000 a year, with 10,000,000 of our most physically capable young men and women serving outside the productive field, in the armed forces of the Nation. While we have been spending our resources, material and human, we have also come to a great economic self-realization as a nation. If we can produce at a rate of $200,000,000,000 a year with 10,000,000 of our people away from home, what cannot we do when they come back.

With this economic self-realization comes national economic responsibility. We must maintain and increase the national output. We must keep on increasing it. Many of the great technological strides made in the course of this war can be turned to peacetime use. Technology has found the philosopher's stone, so much sought after in the Dark Ages, which would transform the baser metals to gold. In our scientific processes we can transform more materials to basic uses than those hunting the philosopher's stone could have dreamed of.

Synthetic materials, which are nothing more than new materials, can help us build greater post-war prosperity. In the one field of housing, if technology is given free play, Americans can have better homes, made of glasses and plastics and fitted out with electronic household appliances, than they have ever had before. A consumer survey by the United States Chamber of Commerce finds that 1,540,000 families expect to have more than $7,000,000,000 to spend on new homes after the war. This should be taken as the minimal and most conservative figure. America could spend ten billions a year for 10 years before the entire population is decently housed. This higher goal should be aimed at.

Officials of the Civil Aeronautics Authority visualize 300,000 planes plying the skies over America within 3 years after the war. The main problem will not be to build 300,000 planes—we can turn out that many new planes at present rates of production in the 3 years after the shooting stops. But, just as every transportation development has resulted in a boom in this continent-wide Nation, so will the development of aviation require a colossal network of facilities. The automobile required new roads all over the country, filling stations, traffic lights, repair shops, auto-parts shops, roadside facilities for travelers, overpasses and underpasses, and a thousand and one necessities and conveniences and safety devices that have become commonplace.

The highways of the air will need no pavement, but the landing fields will need new and better pavement to withstand the impact of flying giants—already in England bomber runways have been built that are 9 feet of solid concrete. There will arise new problems in airway traffic engineering that will dwarf those experienced up to now, either in peacetime or wartime. There must be new fields, new runways, new radio devices, new control towers, new radio ranges, new airway beacons, new airway terminals at new fields, new terminals at old fields as present facilities are outgrown. Flight training, with facilities and equipment, will develop into a vast educational system. Touring by air will expand into a gigantic commercial enterprise.

In addition to the post-war job of producing new automobiles and washing machines and refrigerators and other consumer goods which have been out of production for the duration, there will be a great and vast range of possibilities in the fields of health, recreation, hospitalization, education, which will offer more jobs, a better standard of living, and the realization of our technological potential.

American productive capacity will be infinitely greater after the war than in 1939. If we permit our domestic standards of consumption to fall short of what the country is able to produce, we are faced with the specter of unemployment. Granted such a condition, the obvious method of avoiding such unemployment is the capturing of foreign markets. This brings into play considerations not only of the American tariff and its relation to international trade but of the effect upon the living standards of other people resulting from the loss of their foreign trade through American competition. What becomes necessary, therefore, is to create conditions which would permit the fullest resumption of international trade for the purpose of increasing the consuming power of backward countries. This means a policy of capital investment and development in such countries as India, China, and Africa; this means the raising of the standards of living in these backward countries which will encourage an increase in their consuming purchasing power and will result in an increase in demand for the products of our Nation. This plan is based on a philosophy different than that of economic imperialism, for economic imperialism is based upon the theory of the exploitation of poorer states by larger states. Full economic development must be encouraged in all of these countries—otherwise we will be repeating the errors of the past and laying the foundation for the entrance of the Third World War.

At the same time, as our economic policy is increasing production and raising the standard of living at home, we must engage in raising the standard of living in other countries. We must do it, in our own interest, and we have the means to do it. When the cease-firing order comes and the guns are stilled around the globe, we will have on hand more machine tools than all the rest of the world. Our home needs for machine tools will be less than our supply. But to the less economically developed nations machine tools will be more precious than rubies. For these are the machines that make machines, and machines are what these nations need. If we sell machine tools to South America, to China, to Russia, to India, to the Near East, we will help them to build their own prosperity, and in exchange we can obtain raw materials for which we have need.

Industrial leaders foresee in the industrialization of South America after the war an enormous market for capital goods. Here is a need to be filled for the economic good of 84,000,000 people. Machinery, machine tools, and the know-how about machines can be poured into the Latin-American countries for years before these nations are entirely converted from peonage to industrial production.

China, a country with a population of 458,000,000 people, has already made a 5- to 10-year plan to develop basic industries, and expects to have a larger over-all plan of 20, 30, or even 50 years to bring this great nation to the full flower of its possibilities. China will be a market for machinery, machine tools, and industrial know-how for many years to come.

Russia, with its 193,000,000 people, perhaps more than any other country, will have immediate need for vast amounts of equipment, machines, and tools to help restore its peacetime life. But Russia has already advanced far toward technological self-sufficiency, and more than any other nation is prepared to trade with the United States of America on a quid pro quo basis.

India, with its 389,000,000 people, when it is freed from colonial status, will open new avenues for the entry of American heavy goods.

The nations of Africa, the Near East, and other parts of the world, will develop in great economic strides if given the opportunity. And with every one there can be worked out agreements of a peaceful and friendly economic nature which will act for prosperity and against the possibilities of another war. With good management we can increase the consumers of the world by 1,000,000,000—or in other words, double the world's production and consumption.

The United States must take the leadership in this kind of international economics. We are highly industrialized, we are a large and a strong nation with many resources, and we are capable of leadership. We should accept the role of leadership.

In many ways the Germans have shown superior ability in marshaling their economic resources, though no one in his senses can justify the ruthless and unscrupulous manner and purposes of their economic mobilization. They encouraged and sponsored research and technology, and with limited natural resources they have been able to wage a war which will require the best efforts of the three greatest world powers to defeat them. When they found themselves lacking in natural petroleum, they set to work to discover the oil that can be processed from coal and from vegetable sources. They extracted medicines, dyes, and perfumes from coal. In this country we have put thousands of research people to work investigating petroleum, which is a limited natural resource, and merely tens of technologists to work on coal, of which we have a supply capable of lasting hundreds of years.

What the Germans lacked, they set their scientists to work to discover in the materials they already had or could get. The term "ersatz" has become one of amusing opprobrium in this country, but Germany fights a very effective war, much of it with ersatz materials.

We need to emulate the good things the Germans have done, and improve them in our own way. We need to sponsor research and technology, while at the same time keeping free labor and free industry. We need to know what we have and can have, so we will never again be caught short on such strategic necessities as rubber and quinine.

We must step into the international field, not haphazardly and catch-as-catch-can, but with scientific study and with our eyes wide open. We need to train people in commerce and government. If we are going to send a man to do business in Brazil, we need not only to teach him Portuguese but give him the entire background of Brazil, its customs and traditions and history as well as its products and the operations of its Government. We have had too much of the club type of businessman in our foreign relations. We need representatives who have a genuine understanding of people in the various countries—people who go there not only to get but to give—and the giving and getting need to be in terms of the foreign country's background, not merely in the American tradition and method.

Our schools and colleges and universities will need to apprehend the fact that we are becoming an international trading unit. They will need to train people thoroughly for work in other countries. We are going to need an international specialist corps as we have never needed one before, and it is the job of the schools to prepare it. It is the job of government to back and subsidize this training, in order that our national economic policy abroad can accomplish what we have laid out for it.

In order to achieve a $200,000,000,000-a-year production at home, in order to achieve our ideal of relieving other countries from economic want and from the fear of new wars arising from economic want, we must desert the theory of high prices of the monopolist and cartelist—prosperity through scarcity. That theory has been tried and found wanting. That theory promised us two cars in every garage and two chickens in every pot. That theory went down with the depression, and no attempt should ever be made to dredge it up.

The encouragement of scientific and technical development in America will do much to free the American businessman from the entanglements of foreign-dominated cartels. It has been argued in some quarters that in

some instances American business interests entered into foreign-cartel arrangements as a defensive measure, i. e., to protect them against the inroads of ruinous competition provoked by the existence of more advanced scientific and technological inventions and discoveries abroad. If this is true, one method for curbing the need for the defensive cartel is to excel other nations in technical and scientific development. If we can encourage the development of new inventions, new processes, etc., to enable us to produce materials and commodities to compete successfully with foreign inventions and discoveries, we would then not only be destroying the apology for the defensive cartel but we would at the same time be raising the standard of living at home for the American consumer. New inventions, new discoveries, would make it possible to produce better commodities in greater quantities and at lower cost to the consuming public.

We must achieve prosperity through maximum production and consumption. The cornucopia never produced much out of the little end of the horn and it cannot be expected to do so now. We must have the fullest production and the largest sales to the greatest number of people at the lowest possible price throughout the world. We must abolish the idea of unit profit and adopt the principle of long-range profit. This is an American way of doing business. It has been tried by the acid test of practice, and it has worked.

Let us, as American businessmen, put it into practice in a bigger and better international way than has ever been tried before. That way lies success for all businessmen, whether in an office or in a mine or on a farm. That way lies the only possible hope for prosperity and the only possible hope of preventing further wars.

Smearing Our Great Heroes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday night, while listening to Walter Winchell smear General MacArthur, in the same way that he and Drew Pearson smeared General Patton some time ago, I was reminded of what happened to Andrew Jackson more than 100 years ago, when he was prosecuted in a New Orleans court for trespass in making preparations to defend this country against a foreign power. In the Memphis Commercial Appeal, under the heading "News of Bygone Days," is found this statement, dated March 11, 1844:

In the Washington news letter received the day before yesterday was an article about the Senate and House of Representatives having passed a bill to restore $1,000 to Gen. Andrew Jackson, of the Hermitage, near Nashville, which is the amount of a fine imposed on him in New Orleans. The bill was signed by J. W. Jones, Speaker of the House; Willie P. Mangum, President of the Senate; and approved February 16, 1844, by John Tyler, President.

Maybe some day we will wake up and put a stop to the smearing of our great heroes in time of war.

Missouri Reunion in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a letter written by Lt. Arthur Keimel, United States Naval Reserve, who is the chairman, and First Lt. Lyman D. Field, of the Marine Corps, advising me there was to be a Missouri reunion in the Pacific, Sunday, March 26. This is a very interesting letter and under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

DEAR FELLOW MISSOURIAN: Missourians in the armed services of this area will hold a Missouri reunion in the Pacific at Kulamanu Studios and Gardens, near Diamond Head, on Sunday, March 26, 1944, 1100 to 1700. It will be a joyous occasion for the meeting of old friends and the making of new friends. Joining us in this gathering for good fellowship will be civilian residents and war workers who hail from old "Mizzoo."

Lt. Col. T. R. Yancey, United States Army, will deliver a real, old-time Missouri oration extolling the ideas and ideals, the sons and daughters of Missouri and their notable achievements. There will be a reverent silence during the prayer in memory of the brave sons and courageous daughters of Missouri who in the current conflict have made the sacrifice of supreme devotion for our country and the holy cause of human freedom under God. Chaplain A. L. Jamison, United States Army, will offer this prayer. The Missouri State flag will wave in the breeze alongside Old Glory. Missouri songs will be sung. A program worthy of Missouri's honor and traditions will be present.

We Missourians out here would be pleased to receive greetings and good cheer from you Missourians back home. So, I am asking you to send us your greeting by return special-delivery air-mail letter.

May God bless you all always; grant our country and our courageous comrades in this common struggle for freedom a deserved victory, and give us both the wisdom and the compassion to win and maintain a just, righteous, and lasting peace for all humanity.

Heartily yours,

ARTHUR KEIMEL,
Chairman, Lieutenant, Chaplain Corps, United States Naval Reserve.

Address reply to First Lt. Lyman D. Field, United States Marine Corps, Headquarters, Fifth Amphibious Corps, care of Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

Oil-Meal Distribution in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Conservation Committee:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Madison, Wis., March 11, 1944.

Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: You know that the triple A has been designated to take care of the mechanics of getting the dairy feed payments out to farmers and I thought that you might be interested in the amount of money paid out by counties. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of this summary. One is for the month of October only and the other is for the 2 months November and December.

We have made another payment for January but the reports are not all complete, and if you would be interested in it, I will be glad to send you one of them as soon as we have it.

We are starting right now making the February payment. The March and April payment will be made in one check, the same as the November and December payment, probably the early part of May.

I am also enclosing a summary of the oil-meal distribution in the State of Wisconsin. The State triple A committee has appointed a feed advisory committee to assist in an equitable distribution to mixers, dealers, and feeders of the meal received under Food Production Order No. 9 (Rev. 3), which is the 20-percent set-aside order. We are attaching the names of the State feed advisory committee. We have made several surveys of the State and find that the shortage of oil meal was about the same over the entire State and for that reason, to date, have used primarily as a distribution pattern the animal units of each county.

Upon a motion of the committee for the last 2 months 15 percent of the amount allocated to the State was given to the big mixers of which we have five in the State. Our definition of a big mixer has been someone selling his mixed feeds in two or more States and the balance is distributed through the triple A committee in the county to dealers showing the most need for it.

I might say that in our last month's allocation triple A committees designated the dealers who were to receive the car, pay the bill of lading, and divide the meal as requested by the county triple A committee.

The county triple A committees were asked to report back to the State triple A committee, the names of the dealers and the amount received by each. To date 63 counties, of the 69 receiving meal, 2 counties in the northernmost part of the State were not interested, have reported and they will all be in within a few days, part of this delay being caused by the late shipment of meal.

The 63 counties that have reported back report that 786 dealers received meal out of the amount allocated by the State feed advisory committee which is an average of 5.47 tons per dealer. When complete reports are in I am sure that approximately every dealer in the State will have had some meal out of the February allocation of 5,695 tons.

Without any doubt the lack of protein meals has held back milk production somewhat in the State of Wisconsin and anything that can be done to get a more adequate supply to the dairy farmer will greatly aid in keeping up the milk production and any suggestions that you might have of a more equitable distribution after it is received would be very welcome.

Yours very truly,

WALTER F. KATTERHENRY,
Chairman, Wisconsin Agricultural Conservation Committee.

February, 20 percent set-aside protein meal distribution

County (Wisconsin)	Tonnage allocated	Number of dealers	Average ton per dealer
Crawford	30	7	4.25
Grant	120	38	3
Iowa	95	10	9.50
Juneau	30	6	5
La Crosse	30	3	10
Lafayette	90	8	11
Monroe	90	14	6
Richland	90	10	9
Sauk	120	16	7.5
Vernon	90	4	22

Dairy Feed Payment Summary

OCTOBER—PRODUCTION SOLD PERIOD

County (Wisconsin)	Number of producers	Hundredweights of whole milk sold	Pounds of butterfat sold	Payment
La Crosse	1,596	43,812	106,649	$17,409.56
Monroe	3,281	100,721	94,876	34,011.34
Juneau	1,640	40,809	48,492	14,200.38
Crawford	1,847	70,984	33,372	22,630.08
Grant	4,154	172,191	82,473	54,956.22
Iowa	2,426	153,384	18,327	46,748.28
Lafayette	2,362	167,836	11,369	50,805.56
Richland	2,806	133,895	6,003	40,408.62
Sauk	3,034	119,948	65,626	38,609.44
Vernon	4,112	155,334	54,761	48,790.64

NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER—PRODUCTION SOLD PERIOD

La Crosse	1,575	95,525	234,739	$38,047.06
Monroe	3,270	206,731	180,187	69,226.78
Juneau	1,608	84,381	86,155	28,760.50
Crawford	1,784	93,588	41,453	29,734.52
Grant	4,036	254,070	103,328	80,354.12
Iowa	2,281	196,954	21,957	59,964.48
Lafayette	2,391	200,808	15,407	60,858.68
Richland	2,750	185,718	8,610	56,059.80
Sauk	3,131	237,905	135,694	76,799.26
Vernon	3,960	218,471	79,702	68,729.38

Twenty-first Illinois Congressional District Goes Over Top in War Bond Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the splendid record achieved by the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, which I am privileged to represent in Congress, with reference to the sale of War bonds in the Fourth War Loan drive which ended recently.

I am proud to report to my colleagues that all four counties in my district—Christian, Macoupin, Montgomery, and Sangamon—far surpassed their quotas, not only for E bonds, but for all other bonds as well, and that their records as individual counties exceeded the State-wide percentage in Illinois.

The information I cite, which is from data compiled by Mr. Omer Poos, well-known attorney at law of Hillsboro, Ill., Montgomery County, follows:

Percentages sold

Counties	E bonds	All other bonds
Christian	185.1	164.5
Macoupin	121.3	132.2
Montgomery	172.3	164.1
Sangamon	170.9	117.7

The total percentage for the State of Illinois was 133.5 percent; the average percentage quota for the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois for E bonds was 162.4 percent; and the general average for all other bonds was 144.62 percent. Thus it is observed that the Twenty-first Illinois Congressional District oversold the State percentage by 11.12 percent.

Once more has the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois demonstrated its determination to support the war effort to the fullest capacity. This has been true, not only in the present instance, but in every campaign regardless of whether it has dealt with manpower, salvage, finance, or charity.

The Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois is 100 percent plus behind the successful prosecution of the war, and its citizens will continue to make every possible contribution to hasten that day of complete and final triumph over the enemies of our Nation.

Ships on the Ohio River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial from the Enquirer, of Cincinnati, issue of March 10, 1944, concerning the construction of ships on the Ohio River. The article reads as follows:

SHIPS ON THE OHIO

The seafaring men who settled Marietta in 1788 built sailing vessels. These they loaded with salt meat and grain and, successfully making the long inland voyage to the Gulf, went their several ways to distant salt water ports. This was regarded then as a miracle of enterprise; indeed it was. We in Cincinnati built a brigantine that went to Philadelphia.

And how history is repeating itself. On the upper Ohio we are building for the Army and Navy many ships of from 3,000 to 5,000 tons capacity. It reveals no military secret to say that we have seen dozens of them passing the public landing and, slipping under our bridges, go westward and southward accompanied by our good wishes and high hopes. It may be when the war is over Uncle Sam will send one of them back, a battle-scarred veteran, flying its flags in triumph to gladden our eyes.

A few years ago it seemed ridiculous and beyond imagination to think of constructing seagoing vessels in the heart of the continent. But in these days nothing is impossible. And if the 9-foot channel in the Ohio is deepened, there is no reason why what is now a wartime necessity may not be a permanent industry.

The State Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial reprinted in the New York PM for March 13, 1944:

THE STATE SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

If that abomination of abominations, the compromise soldier-vote bill, is adopted by Congress and is not vetoed by the President, then the State of New York will require some such measure as that recommended by Governor Dewey in his special message if New York soldiers are to have any chance of voting.

The suggested New York bill, however, simply proves the absurdity of this insistence on State ballots. Here's what is going to happen if Congress adopts the so-called compromise and New York, as a result, passes the bill which the Governor recommends. Some Watertown boy in a fox hole over in New Guinea decides that he would like to exercise his American right of franchise. The result is, he sends in an application for a New York State ballot. After the application reaches Albany, if it ever does, a ballot is mailed to him. By that time he may be in the Marshall Islands or in Attu. When the ballot catches up with him, the next President will have been inaugurated.

What injustice to America's fighting men. Here are the men who are fighting our war to preserve our democracy and a studied attempt is being made to make it just as difficult for them to vote as possible. Consider our own boys from Jefferson County, just by way of an example. They are scattered from one end of the world to the other. They are in Burma, in India, in North Africa, in the Middle East, in Italy, in Great Britain, in the Aleutians, in the southwest Pacific, in the Gilberts.

Yet in order that these boys vote some one must get to them not a ballot, simply, but their own particular ballot, the ballot which contains the names of the nominee for member of assembly from Jefferson County, the ballot which contains the names of the congressional nominees for this particular district.

And what applies to the Watertown boys applies to the boys of tens of thousands of different communities all through this country. Instead of one ballot, we are going to have tens of thousands of ballots, all different, and no one can vote unless he gets his own particular ballot.

Back in the days of the Civil War when regiments were organized from one particular section, such State ballots might be feasible. For example, then we had the Tenth

New York Heavy Artillery or the One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Pennsylvania Infantry. But today 1 company may contain men from all the States in the Union. It is conceivable that for the men in that company to vote, 58 separate ballots may be necessary and perhaps more because in the State of New York alone, there may be nearly 40 separate ballots.

Picture the men of such a company lined up, anxious to register their choice for President of the United States. A worried company clerk sorts over his ballots. "Are you from Pennsylvania?" the clerk asks the first man in the line. "No," he replies, "I live in Oregon." "Sorry," says the clerk with finality, "the Oregon ballots missed. All we have are the ballots for Pennsylvania and Georgia."

And this is the way the Congress of the United States intends to provide the right of franchise to the fighting men of America with the open sanction and approval of the two Members of Congress from northern New York.

Southern Milk versus Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Southern Milk versus Oleo," together with an accompanying table, both of which were published in Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the article, together with the accompanying table, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SOUTHERN MILK VERSUS OLEO

One of our readers has asked us to comment on an editorial appearing in the Texas edition of the Progressive Farmer, but for some reason omitted from the Carolinas-Virginia edition. This editorial takes the organized dairymen to task for their interest in anti-oleomargarine legislation and argues that the manufacture of oleomargarine raises the price of cottonseed oil and so is of large value to the southern farmer.

In seeking factual data on this old-time controversy, we consulted various Government reports and from them compiled the accompanying table. For the purpose of bringing the comparison to a per farm basis, we used data for the 10 leading cotton States as well as the United States as a whole. If we had used all the States producing cotton, we would have shown up this old oleomargarine propaganda in an even worse light.

During the past 10 years milk production in the 10 cotton States has increased 20 percent and total sales of milk from farms increased by 31 percent. In the same period creamery butter production advanced 50 percent and factory cheese production was tripled. Thus it would appear that the farmers in these States had an increasing interest in protecting the dairy market from an imitation product.

Cottonseed and dairy data for 1939

	United States	10 cotton States [1]	
		Totals	Per farm
Number of farms		2,713,500	
Cottonseed:			
Seed produced, tons	5,260,000	4,722,000	1.75
Seed delivered to mills, tons	4,160,000	[2] 3,744,000	1.38
Farm income	$83,485,000	$68,347,000	$25.18
Value of cottonseed products at mill:			
1,325,241,460 pounds crude oil	$77,561,000	[2] $69,805,000	
1,882,217 tons meal	54,003,000	48,603,000	
1,054,778 tons hulls	8,728,000	[2] 7,855,000	
1,072,339 bales linters	18,920,000	[2] 17,028,000	
Total value	159,212,000	[2] 143,291,000	
Usages of cottonseed oil:			
Cooking compounds, pounds	904,950,000	[2] 814,455,000	
Oleo, pounds	98,657,000	[2] 88,791,000	
Other edible, pounds	233,442,000	[2] 210,098,000	
Inedible and lost, pounds	84,141,000	[2] 75,727,000	
Total used, pounds	1,321,190,000	[2] 1,189,071,000	
Cottonseed oil used in oleo:			
Amount, pounds	[2] 8,657,000	[2] 88,791,000	32.7
Percent of total	7.5		
Value at mill	$5,771,000	[2] $5,194,000	$1.92
Farm value [3]	$2,886,000	[2] $2,597,000	$0.96
Cottonseed meal:			
Amount, tons	1,882,217	[2] 1,693,995	.62
Value at Memphis price	$54,003,000	[2] $48,603,000	$17.91
Farm value [3]	$27,002,000	[2] $24,302,000	$8.96
Farm income comparisons:			
Dairy products		$313,514,000	$115.54
Cottonseed	$83,485,000	$68,347,000	$25.18
Cottonseed oil [3]	$38,780,000	[2] $34,902,000	$12.86
Cottonseed meal [3]	$27,002,000	[2] $24,302,000	$8.96
Cottonseed oil in oleo [3]	$2,886,000	[2] $2,597,000	$0.96
Other edibles, cottonseed oil [3]	$33,298,000	$29,968,000	$11.04
Dairy production:			
Milk produced, pounds		16,641,000,000	6,133
Milk sold, pounds		7,180,000,000	2,642
Creamery butter produced, pounds		126,475,000	47
Factory cheese produced, pounds		50,619,000	19

[1] 10 largest cotton States are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

[2] Estimated as 90 percent of report for United States this being the percent of cottonseed produced.

[3] Farm value based on 50 percent of factory value as reported.

The Soldier-Vote Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Times of March 11, 1944:

THE SOLDIER-VOTE MESS

An Army chaplain—Charles L. Austin—has made a lot of Congressmen mad. He wrote to those who had fought the Federal ballot for men and women in the military services:

"It is not exactly clear to me why you are opposed to a bill which is drawn in such manner as to permit a soldier to vote. Are you afraid he will not vote according to your desire; is it that he will be politically ignorant and therefore unworthy to express his judgment?

"These questions call for an answer and you, sir, better have a good one."

Mr. Roosevelt called a previous State ballot bill a "fraud." Governor Dewey thinks the Federal ballot was "a blank piece of paper." The thing on which Congress has compromised is a mess. By the time the soldiers overseas learn all about it, we may have a major political issue.

Our Irresponsible Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Irresponsible Government," written by Charles A. Beard and published in the Progressive of March 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

(By Charles A. Beard)

Two things the American people have long taken for granted, like the air they breathe: the liberties and the rights of self-government which they enjoy under the constitutional system of the United States. They have seemed to imagine that no matter what they think, say, and do, these liberties and rights will endure forever, like the hills and the stars.

Yet they have, within the past 25 years, witnessed the destruction of civil liberties and the collapse of popular governments far and wide over the surface of the earth. They have seen parliament after parliament paralyzed by incapacity to legislate and control executive aggression, and then either disappear entirely or sink into utter futility.

They have seen great nations disgusted by factionalism and negationism in legislative chambers and willing to surrender to demagogs prepared to promise them peace, action, and security.

Is it possible that the American people actually regard themselves as utterly and forever immune to the calamities which have marked the march of despotism in Europe and Asia?

Is it possible that the Congress and President of the United States can pursue unscathed in the coming half century the methods they have followed during the past 25 years? Are they prepared by organization, procedure, knowledge, and spirit to cope successfully with the pressing and complicated issues of government already crowding in upon them—issues almost certain to become more pressing and more complicated in the years immediately ahead?

THREE SLEEPING RESOLUTIONS

That a few Members of the present Congress are disturbed by such questions is made evident in three resolutions which have been introduced since it opened in January 1943.

The first is a proposal by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., Wisconsin Progressive, for reducing and streamlining the committees of the Senate in the interest of a more efficient transaction of public business.

The second is a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER to amend the rules in such a way as to make it possible for the House to invite heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the House.

The third is a joint resolution, sponsored by Representative MONRONEY and Senator MALONEY, which calls for the creation of a joint committee empowered to investigate and report on the whole problem of efficient congressional procedure and efficient methods for conducting the relations between Congress and the President.

But at the moment these resolutions seem to be sleeping in committee rooms and there are few overt signs that a majority of Senators and Representatives are looking beyond their noses in this respect or ever dream that the deluge may come in their own time, instead of after they are safely interred in their graves.

After all, aren't they working hard in committees, answering letters and telephone calls, running errands for constituents, making speeches on the floor, talking fast and furiously in cloak rooms and caucuses, and answering back when the President tells them that they are trying to commit a fraud on the people of the United States? Yes. But is that enough?

Meanwhile questions asked in Congress and by citizens seeking information concerning their Government remain unanswered. Meanwhile, save on rare occasions, debates in the House and Senate are as desultory as ever, grave issues continue to be undefined, to say nothing of joined, and an air of irresponsibility seems to hang thickly over the Capitol Hill as well as the White House.

Now, exact information and a sense of responsibility on the part of public authorities are certainly indispensable to the conduct and maintenance of constitutional government, at least in the long run. Surely none will deny the essential truth of this proposition. Nevertheless, it is repeatedly flouted in Congress and by the President.

In order to make this point clear and explicit, let us take a single illustration out of the many available to anybody who studies and observes the transaction of public business in Washington.

On November 26, 1943, Senator HUGH A. BUTLER, of Nebraska, made a report to the Senate on our financial operations in Latin America. Now, I do not know Senator BUTLER. Nor do I pretend to judge here the merits of his argument or the case he raised, although I have probably given more time to the matter than the average busy American citizen. Nor do I here pass upon the motives of Senator BUTLER or his critics. All I want to do is to call attention to the way in which a piece of public business is handled in Washington.

In the course of his report, Senator BUTLER stated: "Our actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit in or for Latin America during the 3 years 1942, 1943, 1944 total more than $6,000,000,000." The Senator went on to say that a considerable part of this money was being spent in ways that did not advance good relations between the United States and Latin America.

ALL IS CONFUSION

Leaving out of account the rhetoric of the business, there stands the Senator's statement about the $6,000,000,000. Surely Congress and the people have a right to know whether the figure is approximately true or is grotesquely false.

The Constitution provides explicitly: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." Since no military secrets were involved in the mere fact of the $6,000,000,000, Congress and the people were entitled to know about it. Well, what did they learn?

According to the Associated Press, Nelson Rockefeller issued a statement as follows: "Spending and commitments to spend in Latin America in the last 3 years by all Government agencies, including military and naval installations, total less than $6,000,000,000." In other words, it seemed that Senator BUTLER was 10 times wrong, absurdly wrong.

On the same day, Senator MCKELLAR, acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who, if anybody, might be supposed to know, declared cautiously: "If I understand correctly, $2,207,000,000 is all that has been spent down there for every purpose, including the purchase of war materials." So it looked for a moment as if Senator BUTLER was either careless or frightfully ignorant, and trying to make trouble for the administration. Either that or the three gentlemen did not know what they were talking about or were talking through their hats.

In any event, that queer bird known as John Q. Citizen, who has to pay taxes to meet the bill whatever it is must have felt more cross-eyed than ever. For his edification, newspapers, magazines, and columnists poured out ink like cuttlefish, making the air thicker than a London fog. After reading a bale of clippings I felt like Old Ben Turpin himself, and awaited more enlightenment.

On January 20, 1944, Senator BUTLER opened up again. He presented to the Senate a long and detailed schedule, checked by certified public accountants and citing the documentary sources of each major item. According to this schedule, the total figure in the case in question was $5,733,953,534, as far as independent Latin-American countries alone were concerned. That is not far from the original claim, $6,000,000,000.

Some debate then took place. There seemed to have been some confusion among Senator BUTLER's critics over the period covered. But his figures were not refuted. Senator MCKELLAR, instead of tearing them to pieces and giving the facts, if he could, laid special emphasis on the importance of maintaining the good-neighbor policy. Senator BUTLER agreed with him on that policy but wanted to know whether the methods of expenditure pursued were actually doing good or harm.

After Senator BUTLER's new accounting was made public, a person supposed to be speaking for the State Department deplored the incident as injurious to the good-neighbor policy, but did not, perhaps could not, tear into Senator BUTLER's schedule item by item and give the correct total.

The story could be extended indefinitely, but that figure of $6,000,000,000 still remains a mystery.

My point is made. There is something fundamentally wrong and irresponsible in a legislature and an executive department which cannot settle such a question on the basis of positive knowledge within 24 hours. In any efficient and responsible government it could be so settled and would be. No military secrets are involved—just the brute fact of a $6,000,000,000 bill which taxpayers will have to meet or not.

Here the case is rested and I submit to candid readers the proposition that the methods and machinery of the legislative and executive departments at Washington need a drastic overhauling in the interest of safety for constitutional government.

Save the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement entitled "Save the Soil," which was prepared by Jerry Eddings, a member of the Mound Valley 4-H Club, of Hominy, Okla.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George Washington said, "Nothing, in my opinion, would contribute more to the welfare of the State than the proper management of lands." And today more than ever before, the future of the entire Nation is dependent upon the soil. If all the thin covering of fertile soil would suddenly vanish all life would cease from the earth within a year. Many people have begun to realize this is gradually happening to our soil, but not enough people are doing anything about it. If you will just look around at the deep gullies, the eroded hillsides, and the farms where the soil has become too poor for one to obtain a living from it you will realize the problems we are facing today. But, my friends, it takes more than realization—it takes action. We must remember that soil conservation is a problem in the entire Nation and cannot be solved by just a few conscientious farmers.

The flood-control measures that are being considered will help greatly in controlling the water that has carried away millions of tons of our fertile soil, but we must carry on other soil-conservation practices. We must carry on practices that will not only prevent the further depletion of soils, but we must also rebuild the soil that has been washed or blown away. The place to begin is on our own individual farms. We must not wait until our soil is deposited in river beds. The wind and water erosion of our land has depleted more soil, has caused more poverty, has brought more business failures, has

brought more short-time school terms, has closed more churches, and brought about more depression than all other factors combined.

We, as 4–H Club members, are the future farmers. We are the men and women of tomorrow, and these are our problems. Now is the time for us to start doing something about it. We must encourage terracing on our own and our neighbor's land; we must plant the crops that will rebuild our soil and increase its fertility. We must cooperate with agencies that are sponsoring soil conservation. But it takes more than cooperation; it takes action on our part. We cannot wait for someone else to do our work. Like our forefathers who builded their own log houses, it is our job to protect our own lands and put into practice the knowledge we have gained from our county agents. We must accept the responsibility and advance the soil conservation of America, keeping in mind that it is not America's job to protect our soil, but our job, as Americans, to protect, reclaim and rebuild our soil.

Numbers of gullies now remind us
We should build our land to stay,
And departing leave behind us
Fields that will not wash away.

When our boys assume the mortgage
On the land that's had our toil,
They'll not have to ask the question,
"Here's the farm, but where's the soil?"

Post-War Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the problem of post-war air transportation as it relates to ships is now of great moment. It requires the consideration and most earnest thought of every Member of the Congress. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I present a statement of Admiral Land made before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries January 13, 1944, on the subject.

If denied the right to use aviation, the American merchant marine is put in a strait jacket, competition with foreign shipping will be destroyed, and the merchant marine will again be driven from the seas. The merchant marine is essential to the maintenance of foreign commerce, to the promotion of foreign commerce, and to the maintenance of peace in the world. If we had possessed an adequate merchant marine in the days before World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, I am confident that neither of those wars would have come.

STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL E. S. LAND, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH RESPECT TO OCEAN-AIR TRANSPORTATION ON JULY 13, 1944

You have asked me to express my views with respect to legislation pertaining to Civil Aeronautics, particularly the bill (H. R. 3421) now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which directly affects the American merchant marine and its place in the post-war economy. I am glad to have this opportunity and you know that I appreciate to the fullest the zeal and the intelligence which this committee applies in all matters having to do with the merchant marine.

The Maritime Commission is planning on the assumption that the broad policy of the United States with the coming of peace will include the development and expansion of American import and export foreign commerce to encourage a maximum of employment at home, to meet responsibilities devolving upon the United States in regard to areas and peoples abroad, and to secure to our people the overseas transportation facilities and experience as a bulwark of national defense. The American merchant marine is an instrument for the maintenance and stimulation of the export and import commerce of the United States. The same thing is true of our overseas air services, present and future. Ships and planes are not an end in themselves; they are a means to an end. They are arms or instruments of the nation, its people, and its government, to carry on and to insure the movement of its overseas commerce to meet the needs of commerce and national defense in time of war or peace.

That commerce and the instrument of that commerce, as you know, are peculiarly subject to competition from the aims and plans and instruments of foreign countries playing leading parts in the world economy.

These fundamental matters, I believe, place a duty upon the Maritime Commission to look forward in the interests of keeping the merchant marine and developing it in such ways as to enable it to function as an effective instrument of our foreign commerce in the face of foreign competition. This is quite a different matter than the supervision and promotion of domestic commerce. In the domestic field, the Government has absolute control subject to the constitutional requirements with respect to due process, and so forth. In the international field the Government has no such breadth of control. Different considerations therefore apply in administering policies in the field of foreign commerce and overseas transportation. Transportation on and over the international waters calls for facilities, experience, and policies geared to meet national needs in relation to international considerations.

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, was enacted to enable the United States to develop an American merchant marine and to maintain it in the face of the very effective competition from the merchant marines of other countries. This competition of foreign shipping companies will continue after the war and it is certain that our air lines engaged in foreign transportation will be faced with very active competition from foreign air lines.

In many foreign countries the transoceanic air lines and steamship companies have been even before the war and will be further combined or coordinated so that these countries will obtain the advantages of such integrated operations. It is natural and logical to coordinate these forms of overocean transportation. A number of foreign shipping companies have publicly indicated their intention of operating air services, some are now participating in proposed trans-Atlantic air lines, and before the war there were many instances of affiliation between various foreign steamship lines and air lines, all with the approval of their governments.

I do not need to labor the importance of overseas transportation as a bulwark of national defense. I remind the Congress of it, and will continue to remind everyone of it, because some persons might even forget the lessons of this war.

The Maritime Commission made a report to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to the bill, H. R. 3421, which involves primarily the question of making use of the facilities of shipping companies in transocean air-lines services. The Maritime Commission has suggested to the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of that committee, amendments which it deems desirable to help to carry out the objectives I have just outlined. I have a copy of this report for your information. I feel sure that every member of this committee and every Member of Congress after they have an opportunity to study these matters will realize the importance in the post-war period of preparedness for the rebuilding and expansion of our foreign trade and the imperative need for striking off any shackles that may exist in the law, or as a result of the interpretation of the law, which would fetter us in a manner that other nations are not fettered. This Nation must not turn over its present ascendency in the air and on the sea to possible competition of other nations.

The report of the Maritime Commission to the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, points out the provisions of law and more particularly the interpretation of law which prevents complete and full development of foreign transportation both on and over the sea. Since the Civil Aeronautics Board in its decisions emphasizes matters of legislative history relative to the enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the proposed amendments to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which were suggested by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in connection with a series of amendments enacted in 1938, I wish to point out and emphasize with care and in some detail that interpretations placed upon the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act are inconsistent with the expressed intent and understanding of Congress and in some respects are contradictory to the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Act itself. It seems to me that the intent and aim of Congress has been misinterpreted and that the stated objectives of Congress in enacting the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, cannot be attained without amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act. Your committee is familiar with much of this history, and particularly with the amendments proposed in 1938 to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

The United States Maritime Commission believes in the future of the American merchant marine. The United States Maritime Commission believes in the future of American aeronautics. The combined strength of the merchant marine and the air marine of tomorrow will be the gage of the strength of the United States in foreign and domestic commerce. The weakness of one will be reflected in any power of the other.

The United States Maritime Commission has been directed by Congress to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine adequate both for national defense and for the needs of our foreign and domestic commerce. The Civil Aeronautics Board has been empowered by Congress to exercise its powers and duties for the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system, properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. Both the United States Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board have similar obligations to encourage the growth, promote the development, and strengthen the weakness of the services under their guidance and control. The stated policies of Congress are practically identical in

the respective objects sought for the merchant marine and the air-transport system of the United States—a strong virile organization, untrammeled by restrictions expressed or implied, complementary and auxiliary to each other, helping not hindering the growth of the other.

In 1937, prior to the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the United States Maritime Commission reported to Congress in an economic survey of the American merchant marine that—

"In view of the fact that aircraft have a definite place in overseas trade, and in view of the further fact that there is a close relationship between shipping and overwater flying, it is recommended that responsibility for the economic development of this new form of transport be lodged in the Maritime Commission."

The policy of Congress, with relation to the development of the merchant marine, states that "it is necessary for the national defense."

The policy of Congress with relation to civil aeronautics states that "The Board shall consider * * * as being in public interest and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity, (a) the encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs * * * of the national defense.

In the development of both the merchant marine and civil aeronautics the United States Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board are instructed, directed, and empowered by Congress to strengthen national defense. Today the Navy, in the operation of its surface transport system, superbly aided by the merchant marine, finds in the Air Forces of the United States help and protection. The phrase "keep them sailing" has become an accomplished fact through the effectuation of the American purpose expressed in the phrase "keep them flying." The Civil Aeronautics Board has had occasion during the present national emergency to utilize the transportation system developed by steamship companies as well as air-line companies in the cause of national defense, conscious of its value and possibilities in the development of the future commerce of this Nation. The Civil Aeronautics Board in one case early in the war stated:

"We find that, on the basis of national defense considerations, the air transportation of mail, persons, and property as proposed by export between the terminal ports of New York, N. Y., and Foynes, Irish Free State, is required by the public convenience and necessity * * *. We believe that the needs of national defense would be adequately met by a temporary certificate to be continued in force for as long as the emergency likely to occasion the need for such service may exist."

This decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board recognized the auxiliary and complementary character of the air service to the merchant marine. The granting of the afore-mentioned certificate is a clear indication that the ownership of air lines by steamship companies is an aid in the development of civil aeronautics.

H. R. 3421, now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, provides in section 408 (b) that the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Commission shall not be granted to a common or contract carrier other than an air carrier allowing participation in aeronautics unless "it finds that the transaction or the maintenance of such relationship will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operations and will not restrain competition."

This provision of the Civil Aeronautics Act has been narrowly interpreted by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In an address delivered by Mr. Harllee Branch, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, on November 11, 1943, he stated:

"The Board has determined that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act rigidly restrict the participation of the older forms of transportation in the air-transport field, and this determination is amply supported by well-established congressional policy."

Mr. Branch implied in his speech that this determination is based upon the Biblical quotation, "For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also," implying that steamship companies having much heavier investments in surface operations will, if permitted to engage in air transportation, devote their major energies to surface operations at the expense of air operations. This quoted excerpt from the speech of Mr. Branch follows the language used in the opinion of the Board in the American Export Lines case when, in referring to section 408 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, it stated:

"Nevertheless, this proviso is extremely restrictive and only those limited air-transport services which are auxiliary and supplementary to other air-transport operations and which are therefore incidental thereto, can meet the conditions laid down by that proviso."

Further on in an independent opinion Mr. Ryan, member of the Board, stated:

"Thus, a construction of the Civil Aeronautics Act which rigidly limits the participation of a surface carrier in the air-transport field to cases where the surface carrier is enabled to use aircraft in its own operation to public advantage is in harmony with the well-established preexisting congressional policy."

These two excerpts from the leading case discussing the right of steamship-company control over air lines are consonant with the position taken by the opponents of ownership of air lines by companies operating other forms of transportation. I believe that rigid restrictions imposed upon steamship companies are contrary to the wording and spirit of the declaration of policy, for Civil Aeronautics Board, adopted by Congress when it stated:

"The Board shall consider * * * the encouragement and development of civil aeronautics."

The Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled that its denial of the right of a steamship company to enter the air-transport field "is also in harmony with well-established congressional policy."

This statement of the Board is, I believe, contradictory to the declaration of policy adopted by Congress for civil aeronautics. It is drawn from a comparison between railroad control of steamship companies (and motor service) and common-carrier control of air-transportion system. There is no factual basis for such comparison. Development of the air is not dependent upon or restricted by tracks upon which trains operate or roads over which bus lines travel or routes necessarily followed by vessels. The Civil Aeronautics Board has stated in discussing the relationship of its decisions in the American Export Line cases with similar cases under the Panama Canal Act and the Railroad Transportation Act that—

"As a matter of general principle we recognize that, in view of the dissimilarity of the operation of motor carriers and air carriers the principles which have governed the Interstate Commerce Commission in its determination of cases involving railroad control of motor carriers (and which in a fairly well developed form were before Congress at the time of the enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act) should not be strictly applied under the second proviso of section 408 (b)."

And yet despite this statement in the matter of the application of the Boston & Maine Railroad Co., and other cases, the Civil Aeronautics Board holds that a construction of the Civil Aeronautics Act which rigidly limits the participation of other forms of transportation in the air-transport field, is in harmony with the intent of Congress as established by the language used in the act and by the legislative background of various transportation acts.

It is thus apparent that an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act must be enacted by Congress before the Civil Aeronautics Board will remove present-day restrictions upon the entrance of steamship companies into the air-transport field. Further argument to the Civil Aeronautics Board that the interpretation placed upon the Civil Aeronautics Act by it is contrary to the spirit and intent and words of Congress in its declaration of policy relative to future development of civil aeronautics will presumably be of no avail. Civil Aeronautics Board evidently believes that it is expressing congressional intent in precluding the shipping industry from participation in the air-transport field.

Congress authorized and directed the United States Maritime Commission to study and to cooperate with vessel owners in devising means by which "there may be constructed by or with the aid of the United States express-liner or superliner vessels comparable with those of other nations, especially with a view to their use in national emergency, and the use in connection with or in lieu of such vessels of transoceanic aircraft service," and "to make recommendation to Congress, from time to time, for such further legislation as it deems necessary better to effectuate the purpose and policy of this act."

The participation of the maritime industry in civil aeronautics is necessary if the United States is to have a merchant marine adequate for the development of its foreign and domestic commerce. European nations, through their steamship companies, have entered the field of aviation. Competition with the merchant marines of other nations therefore, demands that the American merchant marine be unshackled by arbitrary and narrow interpretation of civil aeronautics law. Postwar competition in shipping will be keener and more serious than any heretofore met by American steamship companies. Cooperation between air-transport systems and the merchant marine is a condition precedent to meeting this post-war competition and the maintenance of at least an equal position in foreign commerce with those nations who place no restrictions upon the operation of steamship companies in the aviation field.

The Maritime Commission believes that the Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board should advise each with the other before final determination in any transaction wherein aeronautics problems involve or affect the maritime industry. The United States Maritime Commission believes that these two boards should collaborate in determining matters of this nature not only when ship lines operate air lines but also on routes where the American shipping industry does not operate air lines. There should be no inhibitions, no prohibitions, statutory or otherwise.

The United States Maritime Commission is suggesting an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act to accomplish this end. The amendments proposed are entirely in accord with the stated declaration of policy adopted by Congress for civil aeronautics. Permission to the maritime industry to engage in aeronautics would tend to "encourage and develop an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of national defense."

It would provide additional "competition in aviation to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of foreign and domestic commerce."

On August 23, 1943, the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of the application of

the Boston & Maine Railroad and Maine Central Railroad Co. with respect to their interest in Northeast Airlines, Inc., under section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, stated:

"The provisions of section 408 carry into the Civil Aeronautics Act a well-established national policy that the various forms of transportation should be mutually independent. That this has long been the prevailing congressional intent is conclusively established by the legislative background of the various transportation acts and by the language of the Civil Aeronautics Act itself. We are convinced that a construction of this act which rigidly limits the participation of other forms of transportation in the air-transport field is in harmony with the intent of Congress, and is necessary to attain a full and sound development of our national air-transportation system. Congressional action clearly indicates a conclusion that the public interest requires that the various forms of transportation be kept distinct, so that each can operate in its own sphere independently of the others. We must therefore scrutinize carefully each situation in which there exists a relationship between an air carrier and another common carrier in order to determine, first, if there has been an acquisition of control within the meaning of the act, and, if so, whether such acquisition would be consistent with the public interest and in accord with the provisions of section 408 (b)."

The Board in its opinion again relied upon its interpretation of the Panama Canal Act and the Motor Carriers Act, upon which it believes the provisions of section 408 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act were patterned, forgetting that—

"The purpose of the Panama Canal amendment to the act was not to forbid railroad ownership, operation, or control of steamship lines but to forbid the use of such ownership or control in such a manner as to restrict movement of interstate commerce in the interest of that railroad's competing rail lines" (77 Interstate Commerce reports at 137).

There are presently pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board 11 applications by the railroads or their subsidiaries, 80 applications by motor-carrier companies, and 8 applications by steamship lines. The steamship companies requesting the right to participate in aeronautics are Waterman, Moore-McCormack, United Fruit Co., Pan Atlantic Coastal Lines, Matson Navigation, and Grace Lines.

Mr. Branch, in his speech hereinbefore quoted, further stated:

"Frequently someone inquires whether there should be any imposed limit on the number of our carriers operating in both the domestic and international fields. Those who ask this question might be able to answer it for themselves if they bore in mind that the Civil Aeronautics Act requires the Board to 'foster sound economic conditions in the air-transportation services.'

"Congress, in giving the Board this directive, undoubtedly desired to avoid in air transportation anything similar to the economic tragedy of the short-line railroads. Most of us know that 40 or 50 years ago the public enthusiasm for railroad transportation rose to such a high peak that large numbers of short-line railroads were built to serve the smaller cities and towns throughout the country. Millions of dollars were invested in these short-line railroads, and practically all of these vast sums came from towns, counties, municipalities, and individuals who had a fervent faith in the prosperity of these enterprises.

"The era of the short-line railroads forms a sad chapter in our history. It is a story of failure, of bankruptcy, of great losses to investors and, in many instances, the complete impoverishment of those who had invested their life savings in these railroads.

"No one who has the sound development of the air-transportation industry at heart wishes to see its future endangered by overexpansion. The Civil Aeronautics Board is duty bound to resist any pressure directed toward uneconomic or unsound expansion. Its decisions on applications for new routes must be founded on something more substantial than enthusiasm and overoptimism."

The United States Maritime Commission shares with the Civil Aeronautics Board the conviction that pressure directed toward uneconomic or unsound expansion of aeronautics should be resisted, but is convinced that lack of faith in the future of the industry based upon past failures of railroad and steamship companies is both uneconomic and unsound.

One primary difficulty immediately facing the future of the air-transport industry is the uncertainty facing the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of the future basic international aviation policy which this Government may be called upon to undertake in the immediate post-war period. The Board has stated on occasion that:

"In view of the enormous importance of air transportation in future international relations whatever general reconsideration of basic international aviation policy which this Government may be called upon to undertake in the immediate post-war period should not be hampered by a decision of the Board granting an unlimited authorization in this proceeding. This is especially desirable in view of the fact that all other certificates involving foreign air transportation issued by the Board during the present emergency have been granted on a terminable basis and thus are subject to reconsideration in the post-war period."

Pan American Airways, Inc., recognized this decision in an application filed by United Airlines Transportation Corporation with Civil Aeronautics Board when it advised the Board by letter dated May 20, 1943, that it was their position that action on United applications should be withheld pending a determination of the United States Government's future policy with respect to international air transportation. It is apparent that the doubt of the Board as to future governmental policy permeates the aeronautics field.

The amendments suggested by the United States Maritime Commission are not with a view to the control of aeronautics. They are prompted by the considered judgment that it is necessary for the maritime industry to participate in the air transport field, if the objectives of the congressional policy established for the merchant marine are to be attained and the position of the merchant marine in foreign trade is to be a fact. The future of the merchant marine in post-war competition lies at stake in the decision to be made by Congress upon the proposed amendments. United States Maritime Commission would point out that the exclusion of the merchant marine by the Civil Aeronautics Board has been based upon its finding that the inclusion of the merchant marine would not be in the public interest. The Civil Aeronautics Board, however, has defined public interest as used in the act by saying that "is not a mere general reference to public welfare but has a direct relation to fixed statutory objectives."

Thus section 2 of the Civil Aeronautics Act directs the Board to consider specific objectives as being in public interest. This section contains the declaration of policy to be followed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board has stated:

"The evidence * * * must be examined, therefore, in the light of the criteria of public interest thus provided by the act. If any provision of the contract under consideration is found to be in contravention of all or any one of the above enumerated factors, such provision must be held to be adverse to the public interest."

It is submitted that the argument against intrusion of the merchant marine in aeronautics is based upon a protection of existing monopoly in direct contradiction to the statement of policy contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act. The Civil Aeronautics Board neglects to consider that the question involved is not American capital, but the position of America in world commerce. In the future development of world aeronautics, the dollars of the few cannot be placed ahead of national interest in foreign commerce.

Judicial interpretation of legislative enactments governing domestic and national problems of competition are not sound precedent for judicial decision governing international and foreign commerce. As we approach the problems of the post-war period we must not fail to realize that American problems are no longer those of an isolated people but are global in scope, needing international-minded vision and decision. The decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board appear to overlook the problem of control of air lines as one affecting the position of the United States in world trade.

Progress is a fact and world changes demand administrative genius unhampered by local convention or rule. America is to Persia or China or Russia but a far-off place to be reached quickly for its wealth and opportunity. Persia, China, and Russia must be actualities to America. These places are reached now by our merchant marine. American commerce, its development and growth, must not be stinted and thwarted by any administrative ruling which would say to the maritime industry in effect, "You cannot have new rights, new hopes, new ambitions. What was good enough for father is good enough for you." Such is not the spirit of America—yesterday, today, and will not be tomorrow. I believe that there should exist equal opportunity in the air for all, under progressive constructive governmental regulations, whose objectives are a prosperous and secure foreign trade as well as domestic commerce, national defense as well as international greatness. Preclusion of the merchant marine from aeronautics stifles these objectives.

Bonus for Veterans—Unemployment and Taxes After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Bonus Bill," and the other entitled "And Taxes After the War," published in the Washington Times-Herald, as well as an article entitled "Twenty-five Million Idle Seen at Post-War Peak" published in the same newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION IDLE SEEN AT POST-WAR PEAK

America's post-war unemployment peak will find 25,000,000 out of work, Ewan Clague, Director of the Bureau of Employment, Social Security Board, told officials representing

Government, industry, and labor last night at a meeting of the International Association of Public Employment Services in the Interior Department auditorium. Millard Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans' organization, warned that the Veterans' Administration will have all it can do to handle disabled servicemen and proposed that able-bodied servicemen be cared for through other agencies.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

THE BONUS BILL

A $30,000,000,000 bonus for veterans of the present war is proposed in a bill, drafted by five organizations of veterans of previous wars, which has been introduced in both branches of Congress.

The bill would credit service men and women with $3 a day for home service up to a maximum of $3,500 each, and $4 a day for overseas service up to $4,500, with an extra $500 credit for the wounded. All payments above $300 would be in the form of nonnegotiable, tax-free Government bonds, not more than one-third of which could be cashed in the first 5 years. The bonds would bear 3-percent simple interest for those 5 years and 3-percent compound interest for the next 5.

"I insist," says Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, one of the bill's Senate sponsors, "on the right to vote $30,000,000,000 of taxpayers' money to our boys and girls before it is all given away to other people." The cost of the bonus, says Representative LESINSKI, of Michigan, would be less than the cost of 4 months of war.

And that, of course, is one way of looking at it. What a $30,000,000,000 addition to the cost of this war might do to the country is another question. And whether the Congressmen who are eager to vote this bonus would be equally eager if—in line with a proposal by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland—they were required at the same time to vote increased taxes to pay it, is still another.

The American Legion is not among the organizations backing this bill. The Legion, of course, does not oppose the bonus principle, and it is fighting for other benefits for veterans of World War No. 2—help in returning to civilian life, overcoming physicial and educational disabilities, finding jobs. But up to now the Legion has taken the position that the veterans of this war should be allowed to decide for themselves whether they want bonuses, in what amounts, and on what terms.

And that, we think, is a right position. It does seem a trifle presumptuous for stay-at-home oldsters to undertake to decide such questions for young men and women not now in a position to speak for themselves.

We have no idea what the 10,000,000 or more veterans who return from this war may want. If it's the sort of bonus now proposed, they may get it. But it seems to us possible that they'll be more interested in opportunities to earn their own livings, make their own ways, prosper in a country that can start working out of debt instead of going deeper in. We believe Congress can serve them best at this time, by concentrating on measures to have productive jobs ready for them in abundance when they come home.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

AND TAXES AFTER THE WAR

While the Ways and Means Committee is simplifying, and we hope strengthening wartime taxes, it had better begin the spadework on post-war taxes. Whether millions of our fighting men return to jobs and opportunities—or to unemployment—will depend upon how wisely and speedily a peacetime tax program is put into effect.

Incidentally, it might be a good idea for the Ways and Means Committee to invite Messrs. Baruch and Hancock to propose for its consideration a post-war tax program in detail. It would be a pretty tough order, but the team of Baruch and Hancock is not one that shrinks from rugged assignments.

Competition Between Oleomargarine and Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Cries?" from Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO CRIES?

"Organized dairymen have never learned to face legitimate competition without crying on the Government's shoulder."

So ends a recent editorial in the Texas edition of the Progressive Farmer. The editor attempts to answer certain criticisms of the recent McNutt oleomargarine rulings as made by the National Milk Producers' Federation. He emphasizes in particular the great value to the southern farmer of the market for cottonseed oil supplied by the manufacturers of oleomargarine.

Without arguing the question, let us examine facts as to where lies the real interest of the southern farmer:

1. Southern oil mills produced 1,325,241,000 pounds of cottonseed oil in 1939. Of this production 98,657,000 pounds were used in oleomargarine. In other words, oleomargarine took less than 8 percent of the production of cottonseed oil. In comparison, 86 percent was devoted to other edible products and 6 percent was devoted to inedible products. Where does the interest of the South lie in this market?

2. The value at the mill of all cottonseed oil produced in 1939 was $77,561,000. Assuming the farmer got 50 percent of this, the farm value of the 7½ percent used in oleomargarine was $2,886,000. In other words, the southern farmer received from the oleomargarine market less than 4 percent of the mill owner's return from the sale of cottonseed oil. Is this 4 percent of major interest to the South?

3. There were nearly 2,000,000 tons of cottonseed cake and meal produced in 1939, and this had a wholesale value of $54,000,000. If the cotton farmer received 50 percent of this he received nearly 10 times as much from the sale of cottonseed meal as from the sale of cottonseed oil to the manufacturer of oleomargarine? Is the southern farmer more interested in the dairy farm market for cottonseed meal or in the oleomargarine market?

4. The farmers in the 10 Southern States producing the most cotton had an income of $313,514,000 from dairy products in 1939. Compare this with the $2,597,000 farm value of cottonseed oil used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. In other words, for each dollar received from the sale of cottonseed oil to be used in oleomargarine the farmers in these 10 States received $121 from dairy products. Does this ratio of over 121 to 1 represent the significance of the dairy market to the southern farmer?

5. There are 2,713,500 farms in the 10 largest cotton States. (We use these particular States because they represent the cotton States having the least interest in dairying.) The farmers in these 10 States averaged a dairy income of $115 in 1939 as compared with $25 from the sale of cottonseed, $9 from the sale of cottonseed meal, and $1 from the sale of cottonseed oil used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. Does the self-interest of the southern farmer lie in the $1 received from the oleomargarine manufacturer or in the $9 received from cottonseed meal, or the $115 received from dairy products?

Further statistical data on this same subject will be found in a table appearing in another column of this issue of Hoard's Dairyman. We can say to the editor of the Progressive Farmer that the dairyman has and is using his best efforts in securing legislation that will protect his industry. Indeed, we might add that the organized dairymen were largely responsible for the present excise tax of 5 cents on certain imported oils, a fact that has had a material effect on the price of cottonseed oil. Indeed, it was this tax that switched the oleomargarine market from the use of coconut oil to domestic oils such as cottonseed and soybean. In this respect, at least, the dairy industry "crying on the Government's shoulder" seems to have been highly beneficial to the cotton farmer.

In specific reply to some other points raised by the editor of the Progressive Farmer we might add that creamery butter is the real barometer of the entire dairy market. The churn takes the surplus from all other dairy markets, and for this reason, as well as because of the wide spread of the market, it has ever been the indicator of what the prices of other dairy products will be at any particular time. For this reason the competition of oleomargarine that may reduce the price of butter does have an effect upon the entire market for all dairy products, as well as directly upon the demand and supply situation in the butter market itself. Further, the present increase in the price of cottonseed oil is largely due to greatly reduced imports of vegetable oils and to the general economic situation.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 10, 1944.*

ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred of our radio performers from Chicago are serving in the armed forces in the United States and abroad. All of them want to vote in the coming elections. Guarantee them their right by a workable Federal ballot plan. Defeat this ridiculous conference committee compromise and pass the original Green-Lucas bill or a similar workable Federal plan.

VIRGINIA PAYNE.

Army Camp Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Pvt. Igor Cassini dealing with Army camp life, published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Pvt. Igor Cassini)

A. P. HILL-ARITIES

"Three men on a horse" is a well-known title. I could call this story I'm about to write Four Men in a Pup Tent. For a double pup tent, which I shared with three companions, is what I called home for approximately the last 3 weeks. In fact, during that time I lived a rather primitive existence under conditions which might have seemed extreme even for Robinson Crusoe.

To tell you the truth, Robinson's hut would have seemed to us, who were camping at A. P. Hill Military Reservation, as luxurious as the new Statler Hotel in Washington.

Now let me tell you my saga. The last 3 of the 17 weeks of training provided by Camp Lee's Quartermaster Replacement Training Center are by far the roughest and the most intensive. There, for the first time, the soldier-trainee meets conditions similar to those in the battlefield.

There, for the first time since he has been in the Army, he has to learn how to operate on his own and to use his own initiative, rather than to just obey the thousand and one orders thrown at him by officers, "ferocious" first sergeants, and vociferous basic corporals.

He no longer just follows an officer or a non-com around. He's left in the thick of the woods, in a terrain he doesn't know, and he has to find his direction back to camp with the aid of a compass and a map. He's left to guard an isolated outpost, in simulated battle maneuvers, and on his shoulders may rest the responsibility whether his party or "the enemy" will win the engagement. Or he has to act as a creeping, silent scout.

Or if he drives a truck, he must do it under complete black-out conditions, through narrow paths between trees and ravines. He must know how to deal with mud that engulfs him up to his waist when he marches 22 miles in a day or with freezing cold that makes his steel helmet and rifle feel like blocks of ice. He must know how to operate through thick vegetation. After this training he's well prepared for any terrain, be it in Italy, Alaska, or some Pacific island.

Ever since I arrived at Camp Lee 4 months ago I had heard of the horrors of The Hill. According to popular tales, Dante handed it softer to the damned souls in hell in his Divine Comedy than the trainees get it at A. P. Hill. Every time some of us trainees rode to Washington, before hitting Fredericksburg we would glance at the large sign which reads: "A. P. Hill Military Reservation," and I would think of the immortal lines with which Dante marked the entrance to the inferno: "All hope abandon, ye who enter here * * *."

So I arrived to the doors of Hell Hill well armed for any eventuality. Admiral Byrd himself, I bet, wasn't as fully equipped with accessories on his expedition to the Arctic as yours truly was when he landed from a truck at the reservation on a cold, rainy morning. I was carrying in my barracks bag about half a dozen chemical heating pouches, all kinds of heavy underwear and sweaters, and endless numbers of candy bars which I had concealed furtively among my G. I. equipment.

But hell turned out to be purgatory. For, while there's no denying that the going there is quite rigorous and the soldier is encouraged to improvise as much as possible, he's luckily not abandoned to his own fate. For instance, the chow prepared by trainees is probably the best I have eaten in the Army, and many times in civilian life—no kidding. Except, of course, when every other day icy rain mixes with the food in your mess gear and dilutes your coffee.

Nor is it too comfortable to sleep four in a tent the size of a dog house (no double meaning, please) and find enough room in it for your rifles, gas masks, helmets, barracks bags, shoes, overshoes, leggings, cartridge belts, overcoats, raincoats, uniforms, blankets, comforters, and all the other items that a soldier carries with him the first time he goes on the field.

That business of sleeping in such crowded conditions on the ground is what I found most difficult. Something was always in my way. Every time I moved or turned a bit of a catastrophe of some sort occurred. I either kicked or hit one of my companions, or knocked down one of the tent poles, or my rifle poked me between the ribs, or I jerked off the covers from my sleeping partner. Not wishing to freeze to death he would naturally try to recapture his covers, and then my feet or side would be left exposed.

Exhausted by these continuous struggles we finally decided that no one could move without giving advance notice to his partner. From then on we moved only as real good soldiers—by the numbers.

One night, however, when it was so dark Jimmy Durante himself couldn't have seen the end of his nose, I lost myself and could in no way find my tent. I had no flashlight, nor did my compass or past studies in azimuth reading and star gazing help me much in that black night. Besides all tents look alike in the dark. I tried tent after tent, knocking politely on the pole. But the reception I got was not too good, I'm afraid.

The last tent I tried I knocked a little too hard on the pole and the whole structure collapsed.

My first apologies were drowned by the angry cries of the rudely awakened dormients. I then vanished as silently and swiftly as a Filipino scout. I was all ready for sleep in the brush when another lost soul, but with a flashlight, came around. Together we finally found our forsaken domiciles.

All these inconveniences go with life in the field. But, at the same time, we realized how much luckier we were those nights than the boys in Italy, who have also to dodge bullets. The efficiency of the training is what impressed me. Along with hard hikes by day and night, pitching tents in the dark and rain, "attacks" in the night, the QM soldier receives there invaluable technical experience. Clerks, maintenance men, truck drivers, cooks, bakers, tailors, shoe repair, laundry and fumigation and bath men perfect their skill there.

At the beginning of this war, when we needed men for combat duty immediately and desperately, soldiers could not benefit from the training which we, who came in later, are lucky enough to receive.

On the grounds of A. P. Hill, where General Patton's tank corps and other famous armies have trained for battle, the soldiers of the QM are really learning how to fight and to furnish vital supplies and services. It's a tough existence for a few weeks among men who have to learn to be tough to fight a tough enemy. But it's this kind of training that will save thousands of lives and bring a quicker end to the war.

Second Surrender of Lee to Grant

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, in the city of Indianapolis, a distinguished honor will be conferred upon the Indianapolis Power & Light Co., an outstanding business institution of our city which ranks at the top of organizations of its kind throughout the country.

In the presence of representatives of the Federal, State, and city governments, and with ceremonies appropriate to the occasion, the company will be presented the National Security Award. This is the highest award that can be conferred upon a power and light company for efficiency in promoting the war effort.

Only four other electrical utilities in the United States have received this award, three of them being in Pennsylvania and one in Ohio. The award to the Indianapolis Power & Light Co. will be the first award granted to an electrical company in the State of Indiana. The text of the award that will be presented to the company, of which Mr. H. T. Pritchard is president, is as follows:

The United States Office of Civilian Defense presents the National Security Award to the Indianapolis Power & Light Co., recognizing the maintenance of a superior standard of protection and security. Effective joint efforts to safeguard production, employees, and property have made possible this achievement, which stands as a mark of distinction in the Nation's war effort.

The basis of the award is defined by the Office of Civilian Defense as follows:

To maintain around-the-clock production of guns, tanks, planes, and other weapons of war for speedy shipment to the battle fronts—the industrial, manufacturing, transportation, and power facilities of America must maintain around-the-clock protection from fire, sabotage, accidents, and air-raid attack.

Because the Indianapolis company has signally done its part to maintain around-the-clock production of war materials, it was nominated by the appropriate Government agencies for the National Security Award. The nomination was approved by the Industrial Protection Council, comprising the National Security Award board of review, comprised of the following:

Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, Chief, Protection Branch, United States Office of Civilian Defense (chairman); William

W. Brainard, Jr., Plant Protection Section, United States Office of Civilian Defense (secretary); Thomas M. Brennan, secretary, War Committee, National Association of Manufacturers; Percy Bugbee, general manager, National Fire Protection Association; Paul L. Hardesty, assistant manager, Insurance Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Carl G. Hoff, assistant president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; George J. Richardson, secretary, International Association of Fire Fighters; Edward S. Webb, manager, National Safety Council (Washington office); R. E. Wilson, associate manager, National Bureau for Industrial Protection.

Every employee of the company will be entitled to a button showing his individual contribution to the war effort.

At the ceremony on March 22, when the honor will be conferred, the city of Indianapolis will be represented by its mayor, Robert H. Tyndall, a former major general of the United States Army; the State of Indiana by Gov. Henry F. Schricker; and the Federal Government by Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant.

And thereby hangs a tale. General Grant is a grandson of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant of Civil War fame. Wallace O. Lee, vice president of the Indianapolis Power & Light Co., is a descendant of Gen Robert E. Lee.

"A descendant of Lee cordially invites a descendant of Grant to attend this ceremony," was the invitation messaged from Indianapolis to Washington. The invitation was accepted with enthusiasm and alacrity.

The only thing Lee will surrender to General Grant at Indianapolis will be the keys of our city and the open door to the hearts and affections of our people. But the surrender will be "unconditional."

Growth of the Air Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] were present, he would request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article which, in his enforced absence, I shall ask to have printed in the Appendix. The article is entitled "The Amazing Growth of the Air Mail Service," and appeared in the Postmasters' Advocate of February 1944. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMAZING GROWTH OF THE AIR MAIL SERVICE

In the course of his speech before the members of the Collectors' Club and the Washington Air Mail Society, Mr. Gregg, Director of Press Relations in the Post Office Department, gave some figures showing the huge increase in the use of both air-mail stamped envelopes and adhesive postage stamps, during the past 2 years. "It is surprising in this connection," said Mr. Gregg, "that the armed forces of our country are using air mail-stamped envelopes and adhesive stamps, despite the fact that they are entitled to free mail privileges."

Then, Mr. Gregg went on to say:

"There has been a tremendous increase in the use of both air-mail stamped envelopes and adhesive stamps during the past 2 years. Air-mail envelopes issued to postmasters in the fiscal year 1942 amounted to 33,000,000; in the fiscal year 1943 the issues increased to 207,000,000. During the present fiscal year, the issues to postmasters will total well over 400,000,000 air-mail envelopes. Air-mail stamps are also being used to an extent never experienced in post office history. The figures for the issuance of air-mail stamps in the fiscal year 1942 were 252,000,000. This item took a tremendous jump in the fiscal year 1943 to 899,000,000, and from figures available at the present time it looks as though the issues of air-mail stamps to postmasters during the fiscal year 1944 will amount to well over 1,000,000,000.

"The increase in the use of air-mail envelopes and stamps is due largely to the frequent use of these items by our armed forces. The Department is experiencing no difficulty in supplying the air-mail stamps, but, because of limited manufacturing facilities at our envelope plant, it has been barely possible to supply the needs of the armed forces for air-mail stamped envelopes. In fact, just recently it was necessary to restrict the issuance of air-mail envelopes to only the post offices which supply the armed forces in foreign theaters of operation. At the present time, the entire output of 9,000,000 air-mail envelopes per week is being sent to New York and San Francisco.

"The Post Office Department is encouraging the use of adhesive air-mail stamps for domestic mailings, so that all of the air-mail stamped envelopes will be available for use of the boys in the armed forces. When it is known that our armed forces are scattered to all parts of the globe, where envelopes are not available, I am sure that those of us who are left at home will gladly use adhesive air-mail stamps so that the boys can have these air-mail envelopes. Such places as the Hawaiian Islands, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and the Marshall Islands, Australia, and other South Pacific points are urgently in need of an ever-increasing supply of air-mail envelopes, and every effort is being made to supply their demands."

Studies of Foreign Trade and Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of March 14, 1944. The editorial is entitled "Joint Inquiry," and has reference to the so-called Thomas of Utah-Kilgore-Truman resolution, which provides for the creation of a legislative-executive commission for studies of foreign trade and foreign-trade policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT INQUIRY

An example of legislative-executive cooperation which we have already noted is the work that has been done in preparing the American case on international air regulation. Step by step an interdepartmental committee kept the Clark subcommittee in the Senate informed on its findings. Thus the case as finally developed might be considered, if not a joint, at least a correlative product. This approach to the development of American policy will be improved upon if the resolution introduced by Senators THOMAS of Utah, KILGORE, and TRUMAN is approved. The resolution would create a legislature-executive commission for preliminary studies on foreign trade and foreign trade policy. It would further authorize the President to work with members of the United Nations on problems of post-war economic collaboration. It is to be hoped that the resolution will be passed forthwith by Congress.

Already there has been a tremendous amount of investigation on the subject matter of the Thomas-Kilgore-Truman resolution. Most of the work, no doubt, is admirable. But the major defect of these studies is that they are not representative. In other words, at the recommendation stage they reflect the views of a mixed group of legislators or mirror the opinions of a select number of bureaucrats. Thus they are worthless as the basis either of a legislative or of a conference program. What is needed, as the THOMAS-KILGORE-TRUMAN group realized, is a focal point for all these studies, so that recommendations can be framed in the light not only of the facts but also of various opinions. Only in that event is there likely to emerge a common denominator of policy which will have a chance of congressional support.

An illustration of how the commission that is envisaged could come to grips with a specific problem is the question of cartels in international trade. This seems to be in course of investigation in half a dozen departments, and, though much of the work is correlated in the State Department, nevertheless, there must be a lot of it done in isolation—as, for instance, in the Department of Justice. How much of the existing studies will be of service in the formulation of international policy is questionable. Yet this is a subject that lies at the root of economic relations in the post-war world. While the British seem inclined to favor a considerable cartelism after the war, the tendency of this administration is toward the maximization of rugged individualism in the foreign-trade field. This is the type of problem on which the proposed commission would be called upon to hammer out a policy recommendation.

In the general field equally the commission would be expected to develop conclusions which would be acceptable to both branches of government. The facts can be readily assembled. The issue is, What shall be done about them? When this war is over the United States will be in a creditor position of commanding eminence. There will be plenty of buyers, in other words, but few sellers in addition to the United States, and the problem of the buyers will be to develop their own battered economics so that they can produce the means for buying. Thus, the United States will first have to use its creditor position to forward reconstruction. In consequence there will probably have to be a sort of interim trade policy before a permanent policy can be implemented. Such an approach to the problem is obvious enough. The usefulness of the proposed

commission would be that, in addition to economizing the present labors on post-war trade policy, it would be so comprehensively constituted as to see the problem as a whole. This was no doubt one purpose of the sponsors, for the Senators provide in their resolution for the inclusion on the commission of representatives of the public.

Far too often of late months the legislature has been left unprepared for the announcement of executive policies in which the legislature must sometime or other be consulted. It was a mistake, in our opinion, to leave the Congress unrepresented on the American delegation to the U. N. R. R. A. conference at Atlantic City. A current issue which should have been worked out with Congress is the policy on middle eastern oil. It is merely inviting unnecessary trouble to keep Congress in the dark on any subject as to which the President one of these days must depend on Congress for final action. In these circumstances the White House ought to welcome the Thomas-Kilgore-Truman initiative.

International Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Plot Laid to United States Bureau," published in a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA PLOT LAID TO UNITED STATES BUREAU

In a memorandum entitled "Bureau of Globaloney," John T. Flynn, author and former newspaperman, has warned Members of Congress that the United States Office of Education is secretly planning to create a Government-financed division of international propaganda, it was learned yesterday.

Flynn, a member of the New York City Board of Higher Education, charged that the proposed division would distribute propaganda pamphlets to schools, provide lecturers on internationalism, distribute teaching aids for the propagation of the "globaloney faith," and send representatives abroad "to be indoctrinated with internationalist philosophy."

BLAMES DR. KOTCHNIG

The author of the scheme, Flynn said, is the Austrian-born Dr. Walter Kotchnig, "one of those inevitable emigre professors who has been in this country less than 10 years and who is now prepared to take over the formation of the crude, untutored American mind in the interest of his internationalist passions."

Miss Bess Goodykoontz, assistant United States Commissioner of Education, admitted yesterday that Dr. Kotchnig, professor of education at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., had made a study of international aspects of the Office of Education program, but asserted that he had not proposed the international division.

"Formation of a division of international education is being considered," Miss Goodykoontz said. "This would be a merger of the Division of Comparative Education and the Division of Inter-American Educational Relations. The merger is planned only for reasons of administrative efficiency."

Miss Goodykoontz said Dr. Kotchnig had made his study at the request of John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education, and had not been on the pay roll of the Office of Education.

The Comparative Education Division studies and interprets European educational systems, according to Miss Goodykoontz. The Inter-American Division arranges the exchange of Latin-American teachers and students by American schools and colleges and fosters the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese in American schools, she said.

Flynn told the Congressmen in his memorandum that Dr. Kotchnig was being considered as head of the proposed international education division.

Flynn urged all Members of Congress to be on guard against any attempt of the Office of Education to create a division which would be used to spread internationalist propaganda, declaring that such a move would be "un-American and indefensible."

"It is time to call a halt," Flynn said, "to this persistent drive of recently arrived teachers—some of them refugees—who keep everlastingly at the job of inserting themselves into our Government to control its thinking and shape its decisions in favor of the objectives which are dear to them not because they are Americans but because they are the angry or injured or vengeful victims of enemies in other lands."

Letter From the Postmaster General to Washington Collectors' Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated January 18, 1944, from Postmaster General Walker to Mr. William M. Stuart, vice president of the Collectors' Club, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1944.

Mr. WILLIAM M. STUART,
Vice President, Collectors' Club,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STUART: Through Ike Gregg, who tells me he is to address a joint meeting of your club and the Washington Air Mail Society this evening, I want to extend my greetings to the members of both organizations who, despite the global war, have maintained their deep interest in stamp collecting.

I wish there was something of a definite nature I could convey to your members with respect to the philatelic program of the Post Office Department for the present year. While some suggestions have reached me regarding the issuance of new postage stamps, including one or more depicting various phases of the activities of our armed forces on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, these are still in the tentative stage.

But I want you and the members present tonight to know that I am deeply interested in your problems and wishes, and to assure you that I intend to give careful consideration to all meritorious claims from stamp organizations which desire new issues before passing final judgment on the ones to be selected during the present calendar year.

With best wishes for a happy New Year to you and to those assembled at tonight's meeting, I am

Sincerely, yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Post-War Export Lumber Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a printed circular entitled "Charles E. Dant Answers Some Questions and Expresses His Opinion on Various Phases of Post-War Export Lumber Problems." This statement has been circulated to some extent on the Pacific coast. In my opinion, it should be read by every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I make this request because of my profound respect for the opinion of Mr. Dant upon the subjects of timber shipping, foreign markets, and exchange, of which he speaks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES E. DANT ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS AND EXPRESSES HIS OPINION ON VARIOUS PHASES OF POST-WAR EXPORT LUMBER PROBLEMS

For the purpose of obtaining his views on conditions likely to develop in the post-war period, particularly as to foreign markets, West Coast Lumberman recently submitted some questions to Charles E. Dant, president of Dant & Russell, Inc., Portland, and who recently became interested in the Coos Bay Lumber Co., Marshfield Oreg. For many years Mr. Dant has played a leading part in the export of western forest products and will again be an important factor in that field after the war. The questions and their answers follow:

"Question. Will the reciprocal trade-agreement policy be restricted or expanded after the war, and what commodities will be mainly affected by expansion of the policy? Would a restricted policy be adverse to foreign trade in lumber?

"Answer. Of course, you understand that we have no reciprocal trade treaties with any British country. They are a one-sided arrangement whereby we allow British countries the unconditional most-favored-nation tariff rates; that is, our lowest tariff rates, and none of them allow us their lowest tariff rates. Therefore, in my opinion, they do not deserve the name of reciprocal treaties with British countries because they are not reciprocal.

"For instance, we allow Canada our lowest tariff rates while she has the so-called Empire preference, or Ottawa agreements. In my opinion the Ottawa agreements were largely responsible for the present war, and they will

create one war right after another as long as they are left in existence.

"Canada is a free and independent country. So is Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. They have their own tariff rates, their own regulations of commerce, and their own courts. These countries are just as free as the United States and have been since 1931; as a matter of fact, long before that but at that time there was a Westminster Statute which put in writing what had been implied before that date.

"They invented the so-called British Commonwealth of Nations, which was simply a device for allowing each other preferential tariff rates, and bleeding Great Britain while in the process because it allowed all the dominions to dump their raw materials into Great Britain free of duty and at the same time put up any tariff rates they wanted to against British-manufactured goods.

"I do not want to write too much on this subject, but I have realized for a long time that the so-called dominions, led mainly by Canada, were dominating both London and Washington by playing one against the other, and as long as they are allowed to do this it will keep the world in a constant state of turmoil and breed war after war.

"Question. What are your opinions concerning lumber export to——

"Answer. The East? I presume you mean the east coast. It will be on a much smaller scale than it has been in the past because the lumber will not be available.

"South America? This was always a small trade and will continue about as before.

"Africa? This market will be of no benefit to us so long as there are preferential tariffs in favor of Canada.

"Europe? We ought to do some business in continental Europe, but unless we do away with the Ottawa agreements we will again be shut out of England, the same as we have been since 1932.

"Many people will answer these statements by talking about the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. In reply to that I would simply say that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill allowed all countries the same tariff rates. It was not a discriminating tariff; not the kind of a tariff that causes wars. Agreements similar to the Ottawa agreements have been causing war after war for the last 2,000 years. At the time the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill went into effect it really amounted to nothing when you took into account the depreciation of foreign currencies, which is well known to your Mr. Miller Freeman.

"Question. Where do you place Russia in the lumber picture when the war is done?

"Answer. Russia will need lumber for rebuilding her own country, but will probably continue to export a certain amount.

"Question. Will China be able to command commodities in this country, or is she bled white of purchasing ability?

"Answer. I have lots of faith in China. If she can get the foreigners off her neck, and get rid of export duties, she will come back very fast.

"Question. What anticipations do you hold respecting world currency after the war? Will gold return as a standard medium, or will straight across exchange of goods be the solution?

"Answer. I would have our own currency, and have it based on gold. I would not fall for any managed currency. In Europe you have the most astute lot of international swindlers the world ever produced and we will do well to figure out our own problems and not fall for theirs.

"Question. How much will the vast accumulation of war debts by belligerent nations influence trade, and in what manner?

"Answer. I look for a general depreciation of world currency. It will be all right to distribute our gold providing Europe goes to work in building something besides warships, guns and shells, and airplanes, but if they are going to spend the gold for these things, then we might as well keep it.

"Question. Any expression about domestic depreciation of currency?

"Answer. Our currency is being depreciated all the time by issuing billions of dollars with nothing behind it.

"I am sending you a book called Time to Inquire, by Samuel Crowther, in which I have marked some places to read. I recently sent this book to all of the 48 Governors.

"Question. Will we continue on the devaluated dollar, with continued purchases of gold at the $35 rate, or will gold be permitted to seek its own level in relation to all other commodities?

"Answer. My answer to this is that I would let it seek its own value, and you would find it rather high.

"Question. Where will Chinese silver money stand in relation to a maintained gold rate, and to gold which is permitted to level itself in relation to other goods?

"Answer. I would loan China gold so that she could go on a gold standard basis, but I would see to it that the money was not stolen by individuals after it is loaned."

Christian Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the contents of a little leaflet entitled "Christian Service," prepared by Harry G. Hogan, general warden, Fort Wayne Civilian Defense, of Allen County, Ind.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE TO MAN—THE SOLDIER

"Unlike material things, he cannot be reproduced. He is irreplaceable."

(Statement of Harry G. Hogan, general warden, emphasizing service to soldiers and their families by civilian defense)

CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Over the centuries Christianity has made the world inspiringly aware of the Crown of Thorns, the Cross of Calvary, the five wounds to the flesh and body, the death on Golgotha of Jesus Christ the Man.

Every soldier in this war—made in the image and likeness of God, who in human form died on the cross—was born out of the womb of time, long ahead of any of the material things to which we are selfishly attached.

Each of our flesh-and-blood soldiers so conceived concurrently with the birth of time itself, thoughtfully fashioned through generations, sacrificed on the altar of his country, misses with eternal finality his expected part in the mortal caravan of posterity. Unlike material things, he cannot be reproduced; he is irreplaceable.

We honor and dignify war production, finance, and the like—aids to the pay-off of battle—to symbolize our devotion and sacrifice. We express irritation over money waste, damage to cities, art treasures, and sacred altars. Yet all too often, we seem unmindful that there is no nobler production, no more beautiful altar in the sight of Almighty God, than man made in His image.

So this war, lest we perish, must be a Christian war based on the Christian concept of the nobility and dignity of man. To be that kind of a war, it must be sheared of the worldly ambitions of selfish society, free from religious and racial intolerance.

No part of the theme of this war should primarily stress the loss or damage to material things, but instead the sacrifice of flesh and blood. For only through devotion to such a theme can we lessen the sacrifice of lives or modify any practice that impairs the full enjoyment of future life, or reverently recognize the sacrifice of the soldier dead.

This war can be made a people's war, a Christian war, through that kind of soldier service now being defined by civilian defense.

Each effort in such Christian service leads to a deeper and more discerning understanding of the purposes of divine providence. Through such service from neighbor to neighbor there comes a deeper meaning to home-front kinship with soldier sacrifice, final, actual, or potential. Man, the flesh and blood sacrifice of soldiers, must be glorified to foster a grateful chastening awareness.

The war must and will go on to victory, but, even more importantly, the dignity and nobility of man must, through Christian service, be made triumphant.

A Test for Japs and Biddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I offer an editorial which appeared in the San Fernando (Calif.) Reporter on February 10, 1944, which bears the apt title of "A Test for Japs and Biddlers."

As this well-written editorial voices approval of the bill (H. R. 4137) which I have recently introduced, legislation which, I confidently believe, will rid our country of some 30,000 disloyal American citizens of Japanese ancestry, I commend it to the membership in the hope that it may arouse in them an insistence that the measure be brought on for early consideration.

If we are to rid our country of its disloyal elements it must be done now, not when the war is over when our blood has cooled. To forego action now would be folly indeed.

The editorial to which I have made reference is the following:

A TEST FOR JAPS AND BIDDLERS

A bill to require all Japanese in this country to renounce any allegiance to Japan and pledge support of the United States has been drafted by Representative GEARHART, of California. It would make the failure to file such an oath punishable by loss of United States citizenship and ultimate deportation to Japan. According to Representative GEARHART, such a bill would reveal that at least 30,000 Japanese in this country are disloyal to the United States—20,000 having already refused to give any written expression of loyalty and nearly 3,000 having requested deportation to Japan.

We can see no reason why this bill should not be passed by a viva voce vote of Congress, without delay. Certainly it is urgently needed as a means of providing a legal method for dealing with those Japs, a very large number, who will not declare their allegiance to this country. Our sentimental liberals, who have been so anxiously concerned lest the Japs be deprived of their citizenship rights, should support the Gearhart measure, if only because it would probably strengthen the position of those who are willing to pledge allegiance to America.

Many persons may object to this on the grounds that none of the Japanese can be trusted during a war which is emphasizing their racial difference and in which their sympathies must lie with Japan. Granting that there is sound reason for this view, the Gearhart measure would still have the great advantage of placing all our Japanese-Americans on record, of extracting a definite pledge from those professing their loyalty, and of depriving the W. R. A. and Attorney General Biddle of any excuse for coddling the large number who are frankly pro-Japan. It would provide a needed test for Biddlers as well as Japs.

Relationship Between Legislative and Executive Branches of the Government

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1944, it was my privilege and honor to address members of the Social Security Board and its staff, including bureau chiefs, heads of divisions, and other interested persons connected with the Federal Security Agency. The subject assigned was the Relationship Between Legislative and Executive Branches of the Government. Under leave granted by the House, I am including a copy or summary of my remarks, which follow:

Mr. Chairman, I understand this is the beginning of a program you and your staff have inaugurated for the purpose of fostering a better understanding of the work and relationship between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. I congratulate you and others responsible for the idea, and trust the program will prove to be of great value to representatives of both branches. I appreciate the honor accorded by the privilege of being your first speaker. I will not be able to give you a complete analysis or a thorough discussion of the subject assigned, but hope I may be able to furnish a basis of approach by those to follow me during the year.

It will be necessary at the outset to make reference to some matters that are to you quite elementary, although I consider them very essential in the discussion program you have inaugurated.

When the 57 delegates arrived in Philadelphia in 1787 to form a more perfect union of the 13 States, they were very much in agreement as to the type or form of government they wanted. They were not long in deciding that the new government should be made up of three separate but coordinate branches to be known as the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. These departments collectively were to constitute the Government of the United States. The delegates had two outstanding common purposes in mind. One was to see to it that the new Government did not appropriate the rights and powers of the uniting States; the other was that neither of the departments should absorb the powers and discharge the functions of the other. The delegates were not unmindful there would be times when one department would be inclined to exercise the functions of another or undertake to discharge the functions of the States; and in order there could be no misunderstanding in the matter they proceeded to specifically enumerate the powers of each. Then to make more certain their common purpose, it was made clear that any powers not delegated to the departments individually or collectively were reserved to the States or to the people. They were specific in saying that the laws should be enacted by the Congress—the legislative branch—and were to be administered or enforced by the executive branch. It was felt that with specific powers lodged with the different branches it would be an easy matter for each to discharge its functions and there would be little or no excuse for one to trespass upon the rights and responsibilities of another. This was particularly true as applied to the legislative and executive branches, for it was thought the executive branch would be content to look after only those matters specifically required or authorized by the legislative branch. But here is where the forefathers were mistaken for one time. In actual practice it was soon found that most administrative or executive officers, instead of being content to administer what was specifically and clearly provided in a law, were inclined to enlarge the work of their offices by reading into the law additional allied matters or what they refer to as "necessarily implied activities."

It was emphasized that the legislative branch was to be primarily the people's branch of the Government and that it would devote its time to the study and enactment of legislation and take no part in the administration of the law. Again our forefathers were somewhat mistaken because as soon as a new law became operative and was administered to the inconvenience of some people they knew of no one to whom they could make complaint except their Representative in the legislative branch—their Congressman—who would then become busy and proceed to suggest or direct how and to what extent the law should be administered or enforced. There was not only a possibility, therefore, but an inclination for the two branches to infringe upon the powers and functions of the other. Opportunities for increasing their respective services have been enlarged in recent years on account of increased legislation in which individuals participate directly, such as farm credits, social security benefits, soil conservation, rural electrification, farm security, old-age assistance, grants for crippled children, aid to the blind, compensation for dependents of men in military service, employment facilities, etc., all of which increased the duties of many Members of the legislative branch and the work of their offices, thereby reducing the time to be given to a study of legislation and legislative policies, and under the stress for such time conceded increased powers to be exercised by the executive branch.

All of us now understand how the work or duties of a member of the legislative branch may increase to the point it is physically impossible to perform such duties efficiently and find time to give the required attention to all legislative matters. The situation is well illustrated by an observation made by one of our members when he spot-checked the work of his office for the month of last November. Counting the telegrams received, the telephone calls, personal calls, air mail, special deliveries, and other mail he found the number of inquiries or requests requiring his attention totaling an average of approximately 100 per day. If it should take on an average of 3 minutes of his time to answer an inquiry or comply with a request, that will total 300 minutes, or 5 hours per day. He was a member of a committee that conducted hearings practically every day for the first 5 months of the year, these hearings lasting about 5 hours per day. This means another 5 hours, or a total of approximately 10 hours per day, leaving only a limited time he may devote to purely legislative matters apart from those considered by his own committee. Most members take the position that their first duty is to their constituents because they are servants of the people. This is a logical attitude because it was contemplated when the Constitution was ratified the legislative branch was to be the people's forum and it was their representatives to whom they naturally and logically could make inquiries and complaints. It is not difficult to see, therefore, that Members are anxious to personally look after matters coming from their constituents, and it is not hard to understand that under pressure for time there is a temptation to transfer some of the functions of the legislative branch to the administrative branch or why the executive branch should undertake to assume some of these duties and responsibilities.

Although the legislative branch is often charged with being extra liberal in providing appropriations for running the Government it should be observed that it has been less generous in providing facilities for efficient discharge of its own functions than to other branches of the Government. To illustrate, according to figures furnished by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, appropriations for operating expenses of the legislative branch were four times as much in 1940 as in 1900, whereas the appropriation for the executive branch was 17 times greater, showing that the legislative branch has not increased its facilities for discharging its functions in proportion to its increased duties and responsibilities but apparently has delegated some of its functions or powers to the executive branch. This transfer of responsibilities began several years ago when the legislative branch resorted to a practice of incorporating into new legislative bills a provision giving the executive branch the right to "make such rules and regulations as the administrator may find to be necessary in the administration or enforcement of the law."

With the inclusion of such a provision, the rules and regulations generally made have full force and effect of law and are considered by some as being equivalent to turning on the green light for the development of what we know in recent years as the "bureaucrat." Of course, the Congress felt that such a provision should aid and facilitate efficiency in the administration of a law, but there seems to have been a hidden danger the Congress did not recognize. (I refer to the Congress and the legislative branch synonymously.) Delegating to an administrator the power to make rules and regulations he considers advisable in the administration of a law virtually gives him the right and power of interpreting and enlarging the scope of the law almost without limit.

The Congress seems not to have fully recognized that with such a power practically any administrator subject to human frailities could be expected to enlarge his powers in the application of the law. The Congress further failed to recognize that the love of power is one of the strongest passions of the human soul and, like any other human passion, grows by what is feeds upon, and that a little power invariably begets a love for more power. The modern bureaucrat, therefore, is not an accident, and I would not say his existence is due to any well-laid designs or plans on the part of anyone; he is simply an ambitious person

to whom a little extra power has been given to be used in the administration of a law. We sometimes speak abusively of bureaucrats, and I have no sympathy for their exercise of unwarranted powers, but the legislative branch cannot offer a complete alibi when charging them with having usurped the authority of the Congress for, in many cases, they were first given an "inch" of additional power and then they just naturally took an "ell."

The creation of the Budget Bureau was designed originally to assist or aid the legislative branch in its work, but it was a mistake to place it in the executive branch, because in actual experience it has not proven to be of great value to the legislative branch for the reason it is still necessary for the Congress to review the work of the Budget Bureau almost to the same extent as formerly.

We said earlier in our remarks that "a little power begets a love for more power." We could have observed further that a gradual and growing increase in the exercise of a power by anyone or a Government agency will eventually convince such person or agency that the added power is properly placed and therefore presents an increased responsibility that must be discharged. I would not have you infer I am alleging there is designedly too much power or authority being exercised or lodged in the executive branch, but it leads me to make the observation that some agencies have reached a point where they feel that they have a greater right or responsibility to speak and act for the people than the legislative branch; they insist that they are responsible for the supervision and direction of the people in their economic activities and their plans for economic security. There is hardly a day passes but what someone in the executive branch frankly and openly undertakes to tell or advise the legislative branch what the people are doing, what they are thinking, and how they feel about this, that, or the other, and then insist that the Congress should proceed to act in accordance with his or her suggestions. They seem to lose sight of the fact that Members of the legislative branch are the servants and direct representatives of the people, and as a rule, have a much better opportunity of knowing "what the people are doing, what they are thinking, and how they feel about this, that, or the other." Members of the legislative branch are in contact with a hundred or more people of their districts practically every day and therefore have first-hand information as to what they are doing and what they are thinking about. Only last week several persons representing different agencies in the executive branch were telling a committee of the legislative branch they had recently received information that our men in the armed forces are definitely dissatisfied with the many strikes in our war-industry plants and are now insisting that the legislative branch do something about it.

Just why these people should think they were bringing news to Members of the legislative branch is hard to understand, because the legislative branch has been in possession of such information for the past 2 years. In fact, Members of the House of Representatives had this information on December 3, 1941—4 days before Pearl Harbor—when it passed H. R. 4139, a bill designed to obviate or prevent further strikes in war-industry plants. Apparently the executive branch did not feel the legislation was necessary or advisable and succeeded in having it stopped in the other body. The entire legislative branch had this same information nearly a year ago when it enacted what is known as the Smith-Connally law, designed to obviate or prevent further strikes in war-industry plants, but apparently this action of the legislative branch did not impress the executive branch until recently, when it seems to have picked up the information somewhere that our soldiers and sailors, including our civilian population, are not very well pleased with strikes in our war-industry plants and their home-front sympathizers and now want to blame the legislative branch for not having seen and corrected the situation heretofore.

I want to make it clear that I am in no way reflecting upon the integrity, devotion, or patriotism of any individual or group of individuals, but I am trying to emphasize the thought that it is indispensable for every branch of the Government to follow and adhere strictly to certain fundamentals established by the Constitution. Neither branch can afford to allow itself to follow the line of least resistance and develop a habit of doing things for the sake of expediency and establishing policies and programs that distort the powers and functions definitely lodged with the three branches of our Government. We have been told that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and that a kingdom divided against itself will come to desolation.

These statements are not mere observations; they represent a fundamental established by a law of nature. The maximum service can only be obtained by the studied and unselfish efforts of each branch acting within the scope of its constitutional authorities. There is a special field for each and ample opportunity for all. Neither can succeed permanently by failure to discharge its responsibility or by a successful effort to exercise the authority of another. Neither can lay claim to the highest degree of efficiency and loyalty when it knowingly neglects its responsibilities or when it knowingly undertakes to discharge the functions of another. Repeated or continued violation of this principle can only interrupt or destroy the symmetry or our governmental structure and operate to divide it against itself, the future of which is then doomed. Neither agency can excuse or justify itself in exercising unwarranted powers upon the ground that the other has failed to exercise or discharge its functions. The executive branch cannot justify its actions by pointing out that the legislative branch has delegated its powers or neglected to exercise them to the fullest extent, nor can the legislative branch excuse itself in any way by showing that the executive branch is appropriating or exercising powers and functions not contemplated by the Constitution. Our Government cannot permanently endure if the specific powers and functions of one branch are absorbed by either of the others. This is fundamental, and if mistakes or errors have been made by either or both, the great question is how such mistakes or errors are to be corrected. It is not a one-man problem; it is not a one-agency problem; it is the responsibility of the individual and collective leadership of all; the responsibility cannot be shifted.

The problem will not be solved by complaining and criticizing. I have never seen two persons succeed in solving a problem of mutual interest by continually finding fault with the other, but I have never seen a failure where they were equally anxious to find the law and follow it. Policy-making programs are primarily the function of the legislative branch. No doubt the executive branch has the power and duty to advise the legislative branch from time to time on the state of the Union and offer such suggestions as may be appropriate, but the legislative branch has a greater responsibility than the mere ratification of suggestions. Under a policy which has existed for a number of years bills introduced by members of the legislative branch are first submitted to the executive branch for an expression of opinion as to their merits. Should the report be unfavorable, the proposal rarely receives further consideration. That is, it is almost impossible under existing relationship for the legislative branch to give consideration to legislation designed for the benefit of the people unless it is first approved by someone in the executive branch, which means that the latter has and exercises a veto power in advance and more often such power is exercised by a bureau chief or a department head, neither of which is clothed with such constitutional power and have no direct responsibility to the people further than to see that laws are properly administered. The legislative branch has no right or authority to transfer or delegate its powers and responsibilities to the executive branch. If additional facilities are necessary in order to discharge its functions, such facilities should be provided. If they are not available, they should be made available. Sir Philip Sidney gave expression to this idea when he said: "Either I will find a way or I will make one." If the legislative branch has more to do than can be done with existing facilities, it should enlarge such facilities and retain its responsibilities.

Shintoism and the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of the thoughtfulness of my fellow Californian, the Honorable Chauncey Tramutolo, of San Francisco, at the moment a special assistant to the Postmaster General, who called it to my attention, I am able to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks, an article from the capable pen of Ann Hagner which appeared in the Washington Post of March 2, 1944, under the caption of "Pessimism of Japs Seen as Trickery," an article in which is revealed the true character of our despised enemy in the Pacific and, in a large measure, the reasons for his treacherous behavior.

As it is with these revealed traits of character with which the legislation (H. R. 4137) which I recently introduced would deal, legislation which would, if enacted, denaturalize and provide a procedure for the expulsion from our country of some 30,000 disloyal American citizens of Japanese ancestry, the inclusion of Miss Hagner's most excellent article ought to contribute greatly to a better understanding of the measure which I have proposed.

The article to which I have made reference is the following:

PESSIMISM OF JAPS SEEN AS TRICKERY

(By Anne Hagner)

The new Japanese policy of broadcasting pessimistic reports on the war to their own nation and to the United States yesterday was cited as another example of the Japs' efforts to build up American overconfidence by Col. Carlos P. Romulo, secretary of information for the Philippine Commonwealth.

By indicating that their own power in the Pacific is waning, Colonel Romulo declared, the Japs hope to lure the American Fleet farther and farther from its bases so that a great battle ultimately may be fought in Japanese home waters.

Romulo himself served as aide to Gen. Douglas MacArthur and was the last man to leave Bataan before it fell into the enemy's hands. As the editor of several Manila newspapers before the war, he is familiar with Nipponese propaganda methods.

"Americans are likely to forget that Japanese religion is in itself a potent factor in national unity," Colonel Romulo said. "The creed of Shintoism is that everyone in the country belongs to one family, with the Emperor as the supreme father. As one Jap feels so does the other.

"Before Pearl Harbor America was honeycombed with Jap spies—but did you ever hear of one Jap selling plans of any kind to us? Were it not for their intense loyalty to each other, we might have had some inkling of the December 7 attack.

"Shintoism is an essential item of national life there—the populace is absolutely one family. Before the war there were militarists and liberals, but this was erased at the outset so that there is no such difference now.

"The Japs realized that they are a pygmy nation combating a giant.

"But they are convinced that they have certain imponderables that will weigh against their lack of tangibles.

"First, they have courage that is fanaticism—the courage of ignorance, actually, because they know only what is ladled out to them. Secondly, they have trained themselves for privations, they are used to nothing, and the American minimum of comfort is their maximum. The Jap neither knows nor cares for ordinary American comforts. Our great productivity here is diverted into many channels—the war, civilian goods, black markets. But whatever the Jap has is only for the war—he is trained to live with nothing. That is the kind of enemy we are fighting in the Pacific."

The World-Wide Broadcasting Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The World-Wide Broadcasting Foundation—A Record of Achievement," written by Eric Underwood, and published in the magazine World-Wide Listener.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD-WIDE BROADCASTING FOUNDATION—A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

(By Eric Underwood)

What the foundation has done, what it is doing, and what it hopes to do is a story as amazing in its way and as important to the winning of the war and of the peace as many of the doings of generals and statesmen. It has also a touch of the heroic in the unselfish devotion which its founder and his collaborators have given and are giving to its work. As those who have done the work are altogether too modest to talk about their achievement, perhaps I, an unofficial English visitor who has had an opportunity of seeing something of it from many angles, may try to tell others its story.

The World Wide Broadcasting Foundation was founded 8 years ago "to foster, cultivate, and encourage the spirit of international understanding and to promote the enlightenment of individuals throughout the world," says the preamble to its charter. Its founder, Walter S. Lemmon, is one of the world's noted inventors. He first came into public notice in 1919 when, already a distinguished radio engineer at the age of 22, he became a radio officer to President Wilson during the Paris Peace Conference. "At that conference," said Mr. Lemmon, "I saw the chief trouble was that the people of the different countries didn't understand each other. They'd never had a chance to. The result was a peace treaty that had the germs of another war."

On the way back from Paris, Mr. Lemmon suggested to President Wilson the idea of an international university of the air by means of the radio to bring together the peoples of the world in common understanding and friendship. Broadcasting was then only experimental but Mr. Lemmon foresaw its immeasurable possibilities. How, in a few months' time, countless millions of listeners throughout the world might learn over the air what would take many years through the older media of school and college lectures, or the study of books. President Wilson realized the importance of the suggestion. "Lieutenant Lemmon," he said, "you have a magnificent idea. I'll work with you on it." But before plans could be worked out, Wilson was a broken man, and it was not till 1935 that Mr. Lemmon could realize his dream. By then he had sold certain important inventions and with the proceeds instituted his World Radio University. He inspired others with his enthusiasm; university professors of languages, science, history, literature, and art. These contributed to day and evening courses sent out by WRUL, the station Mr. Lemmon had set up in Boston, Mass., not only to the United States of America but to 30 foreign countries, the aim of all instruction being the promotion of international understanding and good will.

At the very outbreak of the present war in 1939, Mr. Lemmon and his associates decided to make WRUL a really potent weapon in the fight for freedom. They appreciated what so many of our leaders even today fail to understand, but what Napoleon and Hitler quickly realized, that in warfare the spirit is more important than the sword, that if you control men's minds you control their actions. Long before America came in as a combatant, WRUL "armed with truth" was fighting Hitler 16 hours a day in 24 languages, to such effect that Goebbels had repeatedly to warn the German people against listening to WRUL "with its democratic drivel"—"the troublemaker in Boston unjustifiably interfering with the establishment of the new Hitler order in Europe."

But the positive achievements of WRUL are more important as a contribution to winning the war than any mere nuisance caused the Nazi gangsters.

In Yugoslavia, when Prince Paul's government was about to make a deal with Hitler, WRUL broadcast to the Yugoslav people urging them to resist and thereby upset Hitler's schedule and delayed the German attack on Russia. When it is remembered how nearly to Moscow the Nazi hordes advanced, the military importance of this delay can scarcely be overestimated.

WRUL has also been credited with preventing the Norwegian merchant fleet from falling into the hands of the Nazis. When the Germans took possession of Norway they forced Norwegian shipowners to broadcast to the masters of the ships at sea messages that all was well and they could go back to Norwegian ports. But within a few hours WRUL sent out the truth and not one ship returned to Norway. In this way some 900 ships, one of the largest merchant fleets in the world, was saved for Allied use at a moment when every ounce of tonnage was vitally needed.

In addition daily messages of comfort and encouragement were sent to millions of citizens of all occupied countries: France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and others, and in England alone WRUL is said to have had three-quarters of a million listeners.

It was WRUL which organized the Friendship Bridge Hour during the early days of which English children evacuees to America spoke words of cheer to their parents and friends in England.

That all this work of morale building has been effective is proved by the daily mail of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation. Letters have poured in at the rate of a hundred a day from listeners in all parts of the world in every language, censored and uncensored—letters full of hope, determination, and unshaken confidence. A letter from Holland strikes the keynote: "The spiritual help you give is almost more important than bread or clothing."

The educational work—"World Radio University"—done by the Foundation before the war, if not so spectacular is no less important. Associated with Harvard, Yale, Mount Holyoke, M. I. T., Boston University, and other outstanding colleges, the Foundation has conducted instruction courses, cultural and technical, in literature, languages, music, economics, astronomy, aviation, and technical radio. It had student listeners in over 30 foreign countries, no less than 3,000 having enrolled for its basic English course in South America alone.

Today practically all of WRUL's time has been taken over by the United States Government for official broadcasting to foreign countries. But the World-Wide Broadcasting Foundation is still functioning independently a part of every day—"Friendship Bridge" is still doing its beneficial work of explaining the English-speaking peoples to one another; and in America a splendid "Beyond Victory" series of talks is in operation.

As to the future, it is clear that after the war WRUL's wonderful work will be needed more than ever: A war-torn generation, deprived of years of formal education, will demand the aid of this independent and impartial World Radio University to bring it inspiration, knowledge, understanding, and courage to face the stupendous problems which will arise with the coming of peace. The world will need, as never before, the counsels of our wisest minds and highest characters for the healing of the nations, if intelligence and magnanimity are to prevail.

The Gross Income Tax in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which was written by Mr. William Borthwick, tax commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii, to Mr. John C. Cuneo, an eminent tax economist of Modesto, Calif., a letter which contains factual evidence of the great success of the gross

income tax in this our outlying possession, a means of raising revenue which has produced tax yields far beyond that which was predicted by any of its most enthusiastic proponents.

As this method of taxation has been long and earnestly advocated by Mr. Cuneo both for National and State use as a means of raising revenue out of which old-age retirement annuities might be paid, I know the information contained in the Borthwick letter, proof of his oft-repeated assertions, must have been very pleasing to him as it will be helpful to the membership during the days that lie immediately ahead when tax simplification is occupying the attention of the country.

The letter to which I have just referred is the following:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
BUREAU OF THE TAX COMMISSIONER,
Honolulu, Hawaii, February 3, 1944.

Mr. JOHN C. CUNEO,
Modesto, Calif.

DEAR MR. CUNEO: Please let me congratulate you on your attempt to secure a gross income tax in California. If you are successful you will confer a great favor on the citizens of your State, as it will be the only tax they can understand. It may be that is one reason why the gross income tax meets with opposition. The people have been so long burdened by taxes that they cannot understand that when one comes along that they can grasp, they feel that it is too good to be true and oppose it.

Being the original proponent of a gross income tax and having administered it for the last 10 years, I can say honestly that it is the best form of taxation that we have. It was originally hoped that it would produce $2,500,000 per year. It is now producing more than $10,000,000 each year and at the original rate with which we started. It met with some opposition at first, but at the present time it has the unqualified endorsement of all honest businessmen in the Hawaiian Islands. It is true that the impact of the war and defense work has increased the revenue from the tax, but long before the war broke, it was producing more than twice the original estimate. Any ordinary businessman with a common-school education can make his own gross income return. This cannot be said to be true of the net income tax, and it has been surprising to me that the men who first opposed it are now its most ardent supporters.

Our plan here is to license each business activity—the doctor, the undertaker, the plumber, the carpenter, and all retailing pay $1 for a license and they pay 1½ percent of their gross income. The squawking has entirely ceased. This tax is paid monthly, except in certain instances permission is granted for a quarterly return. Under this plan there is very little delinquency and it can soon be checked up.

The regulations put out by the Federal Government on the net income tax contain almost 1,400 pages in small type, and no man on earth can say he fully understands the provisions. The cost of collection is enormous, while under the gross income tax the cost of collection is the lowest of any form of tax that we have. I am sure that it will produce far beyond your expectations and I am convinced that if you succeed in getting the gross income tax in accordance with your plan, you will have conferred upon the people of California the greatest blessing that they ever have as regards tax law.

I would suggest that as your net income tax is based upon a gross income return, you should get some figures, so that you can fully explain to the people about how much you hope to realize. If your experience with this tax is anything like our own, within a few years you will be able to abolish the most of your nuisance taxes and have money far beyond your expectations.

It saved the Territory of Hawaii from bankruptcy and it will do the same for you properly administered.

Very truly yours,
WM. BORTHWICK,
Tax Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, shocking though the revelation may be to some of the more resistant of our brethren, this method of taxation which has proven so successful in Hawaii is the same method which is proposed in H. R. 1649, the system of revenue raising which Dr. Townsend has been advocating for over 10 years.

H. O. L. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that there were three sides to every question: What the other person might think, what I might think, and the facts in the case.

No one is opposed to the continuation of unnecessary bureaus which have served their intended purpose more than I am. However, I wonder whether the continuation of certain bureaus whose need at the present time may not appear apparent have in reality outlives their usefulness.

As a private citizen, I felt that the Congress was to be congratulated on enacting the H. O. L. C. at the time this legislation was passed. I know what it meant in my own community. In fact it came very close home to me. It has been said that the only time an individual can borrow money is when he does not need it and during the bank failures in 1930, at least in my own district, this was certainly the case.

However, as I understand it, the issue is not whether the H. O. L. C. was needed, as I believe most everyone will agree that it was. Rather the issue now seems to be whether it should be liquidated as unnecessary for further activities.

It seems to me that in all fairness to the H. O. L. C. that certain individuals in key positions in the H. O. L. C. who have lived with the organization and have gone through its embryonic stages are better qualified to administer this agency than some of those who were not interested in these loans a few years back.

If the personnel of the H. O. L. C. is overstaffed, then naturally I favor the curtailment of this personnel as a matter of economy. True, there do appear to be many governmental agencies whose functions have ceased to be imperative to our citizens, but it does seem in all fairness that if the H. O. L. C. now have their loans in a position where they are one of the existing governmental agencies doing a legitimate business, they should be permitted to continue under their present status.

No one can foresee the future following the present conflict. I know that it will be argued that if the need again arises the Congress will be in session and appropriate legislation can again be reenacted to take care of a situation which might arise similar to that which necessitated the H. O. L. C. in the beginning.

However, any manufacturer knows that if his business is forced to close down, his sales force scattered, and his business completely liquidated, it requires many months before he can again become engaged in productive activity. Does not the same reasoning apply regarding the H. O. L. C.?

If it is now liquidated and another emergency should arise justifying its reestablishment, is it not true that many individuals may suffer during the intervening months until the new agency is again in operation?

This may be a crude illustration, but if a person becomes violently ill, a physician is summoned and the patient rushed to a hospital. It hardly makes sense that when the patient is again well, he would want his physician to depart to a new address, leaving no word as to where he might be reached or any justification in abandoning the hospital. Another sudden illness might prove fatal to the patient if much time and confusion elapsed before his physician could be found or a hospital located.

However, I do feel that this illustration might be very applicable to an individual facing a foreclosure. My past record will speak for itself in proving that I favor free enterprise and am opposed to governmental competition in business except in those rare instances wherein private enterprise lacks the vision or the courage to undertake new enterprises.

I am informed that while certain private lending agencies would be interested in acquiring certain loans of the more preferred type from H. O. L. C., that they are not interested in acquiring all of the run-of-the-mine loans and that there are other sound private lending agencies who are not interested in acquiring any of these loans, and so in conclusion it just appears to me that in the spirit of fair play that the Congress is hardly justified in taking from the H. O. L. C. their good, substantial, paying loans and leaving them only the offal in which the private lending agencies would not be interested and which in the end might work a hardship upon these individuals.

Reorganize the H. O. L. C. if the Congress deems necessary, but do not eliminate it so that its identity will become lost if it is found desirable to resurrect it at some time in the future.

THE BANKERS GUARANTEE
TITLE & TRUST CO.,
Akron, Ohio, February 3, 1944.

The Honorable WALTER E. BREHM,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re: H. O. L. C. liquidation.

DEAR SIR: We have given much thoughtful consideration to the matters about which you wrote in your letter of January 7 and are pleased to present our views as to those matters. In this connection it would seem in order that we identify ourselves as to the

nature of our business and as to our experience in it. Since organization of our company in 1911 we have operated as a real estate first mortgage, real estate brokerage, and real estate title service company. We have made, guaranteed and serviced a large volume of first mortgage loans for life insurance companies, banks, for our own account and for other investors.

From our observation and consideration we do not believe there is any good reason to justify a liquidation of H. O. L. C. From 1933 to 1936 we had a great deal of contact with that agency and have known of its operation since that period. Since it outgrew the difficulties of its initial operations that were largely due to the enormous volume of business that was thrust upon a new organization, we believe it is a Government agency that has functioned with outstanding efficiency, that has rendered, and is rendering invaluable service and if permitted to finish the job it was set up to do will liquidate itself without loss and possibly with profit to the Government, that is to taxpayers.

It does not seem possible to us that the assets of H. O. L. C. can be sold upon a basis that will save the Government from loss and at the same time be attractive to buyers. Our company would not be interested in purchasing any loans with balances of less than $2,000, with balances in excess of 75 to 80 percent of value of property, nor without privilege of inspecting properties and making selection. We do not believe this would be fair to the Government and its taxpayers or that you would favor sale of assets on such a basis as would leave the loans with H. O. L. C. that incur loss while being deprived of profitable loans to balance such losses.

Furthermore, we feel sure it has been necessary for H. O. L. C., as a matter of good business, and as many other holders of full loans have done, to refinance many loans that are now a higher percentage of value of property than many large investors, such as banks, insurance companies, mortgage loan companies and building and loan companies are permitted by law to buy, so that it would seem impossible to sell all of the assets of H. O. L. C. at par value.

Our conclusion is that it is not necessary, advisable, or feasible to liquidate H. O. L. C. in any other manner than that contemplated in the act which brought it into being and thereby saved a million or more home owners, building and loan companies, banks and mortgage companies from financial ruin. While our company is now in need of real-estate mortgage investments, we are not unmindful of the great assistance we received through H. O. L. C. in solving our financial difficulties, nor do we favor any change in law that will result in loss to the Government that we, others in the mortgage business, and mortgage investors might secure a possible profit.

Very truly yours,

F. S. CARPENTER,
President.

Mexican Farm Labor in California

REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my privilege to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most timely article from the capable pen of the Honorable Paul Scharrenberg, director of the California state department of industrial relations.

As Mr. Scharrenberg is widely known throughout the length and breadth of this country as one of the best-informed persons in the United States in respect to the manpower problem in its relation to the war effort, I am sure that that which he has written will not only be interesting to the membership but highly informative as well.

Mr. Scharrenberg's article, to which I have just made reference, is the following:

MEXICAN FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

(By Paul Scharrenberg, director, California State Department of Industrial Relations)

In August of 1942, the Governments of the United States and Mexico concluded an agreement making possible temporary migration of Mexican farm workers into the United States to help meet the farm labor shortage.

Since the inception of the program, October 1, 1942, 74,618 Mexican nationals have entered and have been distributed over the United States. Of this number California has received 58,222.

Laborers were also needed to maintain the rights-of-way of the various railroads to enable them to keep their rail lines in suitable condition to meet the tremendous increase in haulage. For this employment a ceiling height of 20,000 Mexican nationals was set as the maximum number that could be in the United States at any one time. Of this number, around 12,000 are at present employed by railroads in the 5 Western States.

As is generally the case when there is conflict over jurisdiction, a great deal of confusion was in evidence upon the arrival of the first contingents of Mexicans. This was largely due to the fact that both Federal and State agencies were and are still involved in the same problem. This condition prevailed for several months, creating a more or less chaotic situation. Finally, as a result of conferences between the Regional Director of the War Food Administration and the Chief of the California Division of Immigration and Housing, a mutually satisfactory agreement was reached clearly defining the respective jurisdiction and duties of Federal and State agencies.

With confusion and uncertainty cleared away, the present very harmonious program has been in effect. The division of immigration and housing, functioning within the California Department of Industrial Relations, became the certifying agency for all camps in which Mexican nationals are housed. Such camps must comply with the provisions of the California labor code relating to labor camps, and the War Food Administration has agreed that if an employer persists in violating the Labor Camp Sanitation Act the Mexicans shall be removed from his camp forthwith. In addition, such employer is liable to the penalties provided in the Labor Camp Sanitation Act.

Immediately upon the consummation of the before-mentioned agreement, information was printed in the Spanish language covering practically all phases of labor camp requirements. This information was printed on large placards and on mimeographed sheets. These were distributed to the Mexican nationals upon entry into the United States and in the various camps where they live. Supplementing the literature, one of the division's inspectors, who is highly qualified in all phases of camp sanitation and housing, and who is familiar with the habits and customs of the Mexican nationals, was assigned to visit the camps and to deliver short talks in their native language so as to better acquaint them with their rights and privileges as well as their duties and responsibilities. This inspector listened to all complaints, and, if in his judgment they were justified, took them up immediately with the employer for adjudication. The success of this method is best evidenced by the cooperation received from all concerned, including employers, both in agriculture and industry.

As required by California law, all Mexican farm workers admitted for this seasonal work were insured against the hazards of industrial accidents. The problem of providing adequate coverage for such industrial injuries involved considerable work. In the interest of all others concerned, the State insurance commissioner's office, after consultation with the industrial accident commission approved the issuance of a single master policy to the group of employers insuring the imported Mexicans from the time they are delivered by the War Food Administration until they are returned into the custody of the War Food Administration. In every instance satisfactory evidence of insurance was required by the War Food Administration.

The California State Compensation Insurance Fund interested itself in this problem from the very beginning and endeavored to assist in every way possible. The fund wrote 11 single master policies to sponsoring labor groups. The loss experience of the State fund on Mexican nationals contracted through labor associations has been uniformly favorable; factors which contributed to this result have been the experience of the Mexicans in farm work and the tendency of employers to assign work not involving use of machinery. The outstanding hazard was the necessity of transporting large numbers to and from work.

It is generally agreed that the Mexican nationals who came to California during the past year performed a real job in the agricultural fields where they harvested a large proportion of the tree, vine, and root crops. It is also generally agreed that without the help of the Mexican nationals many thousands of tons of agricultural crops could never have been harvested.

When it is understood that the value of California's agricultural products in 1943 totaled a billion and a half dollars, and Mexican nationals were credited for harvesting at least 15 percent of the total crop, the valuable contribution made by these men to the success of our agricultural program and the war effort will have universal recognition.

Over 40,000 nationals have been ordered for this year, the first contingent of 700 having left Mexico City February 17, 1944. Other contingents will follow at 3-day intervals.

NOTE.—The authority for all quoted figures, both on the value of California's agricultural products and also of the number of Mexican nationals employed in the United States, particularly in California, were obtained from the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and also from the Office of War Food Production, Office of Labor. The authority for the figures mentioned for Mexican nationals employed on the railroads was obtained from the Railroad Retirement Board, acting as agents for the War Manpower Commission.

Income Tax Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the confusion resulting from the income-tax forms, prepared by the Treasury

Department of the Government, is growing daily. The average person cannot make out his or her income-tax return upon this form, because they are confused and misled when they read the form and they cannot understand the same, or what the Government really wants to know. It is a sad commentary for the people to learn that the officials in the Treasury Department, who prepared and distributed the income-tax forms, could not make a simple and an understandable form for distribution to the people for their preparation. It is my considered opinion that had the Treasury Department made an effort to make the income-tax forms confusing and incapable of being understood they could not have done a better job than they did on the present forms.

Mr. Speaker, when the average person examines the income-tax form, which the Treasury Department prepared, and sent out to the people, they immediately become confused, and they are compelled to take the same to some high-powered tax expert and pay a fee for advice and aid in preparing their tax schedule. That is wrong. The income-tax forms should be simple, and they should be made understandable, so the people can make out their own tax return—and so they may fully understand them after they have been prepared and filed. It has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that many people who have had the advice and assistance of so-called tax experts in the preparation of their income-tax returns, upon the present confusing forms, have thereafter stated that they have completed their tax return but they did not understand it. That is a most unhealthy condition. The Treasury Department should immediately cause such tax returns to be simplified so every citizen can readily understand them, and if, thereafter, they should be questioned regarding their tax return they can explain the same.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee of the House will cause such pressure to be brought upon the Treasury Department that a simplified tax return will be adopted, all to the end that this utter confusion and misunderstanding will be entirely eliminated.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks, I include herein a brief editorial appearing recently in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on this same subject, which editorial follows:

SIMPLE TAX SYSTEM

Promise of a simplified system of reckoning Federal income taxes is held out by members of the House Ways and Means Committee. Tentative plans call for a direct, understandable program. The major plank on which the committee is working would eliminate the need for 30,000,000 of the 50,000,000 income taxpayers having to file any report. The withholding levy taken from wages and salaries would be the actual tax for those whose only income is derived from such sources. There would be no loopholes if the tax were deducted from all pay rolls.

The Representatives also contemplate merging the Victory, normal, and surtaxes in one levy. This would simplify calculations for persons in the higher income brackets and those deriving income from sources other than wages and salaries.

The American people never will be able to understand why such a method was not perfected for payments due by March 15. Temperamental Treasury bureaucrats must bear the brunt. They scurried hither and yon seeking new sources of revenue, yet remained stubbornly adamant against imposition of a general sales tax. On the other hand, the extreme of confusion and absurdity reached in the present forms may react beneficially in arriving at greater simplicity to allay the growing taxpayer storm that might otherwise have been expected.

The Need for the Hungry Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will shortly have the opportunity to consider H. R. 3570, a bill to authorize the construction of a dam on the Hungry Horse site in northwestern Montana. This project is needed now more than ever because of the extremely dry year we are having in the entire Northwest and the consequent danger to our production and power facilities in carrying on our war activities there. Bonneville and Grand Coulee will need the water the Hungry Horse site can furnish to keep our industries going. This project is not to be considered as a hand-out but as a self-liquidating unit which will not only pay for itself—and soon—but will also contribute to the irrigation and reclamation possibilities of Montana and to the power possibilities of Montana and the entire Northwest as well.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an article and an editorial from the Flathead Monitor of Kalispell, Mont., relative to precipitation in Montana and the Northwest this year. Mr. Harry Kelly, the editor of this weekly, is an outstanding authority not only on irrigation and reclamation, but more particularly is an expert on the possibilities of the Hungry Horse. No one knows more about this project than he, and no one has devoted more time and energy than Harry Kelly in pushing its approval over the years. He is truly one of Montana's great men, and I respect, most deeply, his judgment and ability.

[From the Flathead Monitor, Kalispell, Mont., of February 24, 1944]

PRECIPITATION RECORD LOWEST FOR 45 YEARS—LESS SNOW IN MOUNTAINS—DROUGHT HAS CONTINUED PAST 8 MONTHS

For the past 7 months and 20 days the Kalispell weather bureau has established a drought record for all time, or at least for the past 45 years that the Federal bureau has been keeping records at Kalispell. The only previous record that approaches this season was in 1939–40.

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

The records in the local weather bureau show that for the months of July 1943 to and including 20 days of February 1944, 20 days over 7 months, the precipitation has been considerably less than one-half of the average. The total for this year from July 1, 1943, to February 20 of this year, was 4.12 against an average for the same period of 9.46, a deficiency of more than half of the average. Here is the record by months for the period covered this year, together with the average for the same period:

1943–44

July	0.45
August	.42
September	.23
October	1.28
November	.83
December	.28
January	.27
20 days of February	.36
Total	4.12

Average

July	1.10
August	.57
September	1.24
October	1.06
November	1.35
December	1.45
January	1.57
20 days of February	.83
Total	9.46

The closest approach to the above record in any one year for the same period was in 1939–40, when the precipitation for the same months was 4.75, or more than a half inch more than this year, indicating that we may look for a real dry year. In 1940 after a drought second only to this year, the heavy July rains saved the day, and an average crop was harvested. Whether the rains will be as favorable this year remains to be seen.

One favorable aspect is that there was considerable moisture in the ground last fall when the freeze came, which has lasted all winter, and it is expected that when the spring thaw comes there will be enough moisture left to give crops a good start, but it will be necessary to have good rains during the growing season to assure an average crop.

[From the Flathead Monitor, Kalispell, Mont., of February 24, 1944]

DROUGHT CONDITION HERE

That there will be a shortage of water in the entire Northwest is a foregone conclusion when one studies the lack of precipitation for the late summer, fall, and winter months for the year 1943–44. It is said on the best authority that the snow in the mountains, which furnishes the water for our rivers and streams, is not more than 30 percent of average at this time. In consulting the precipitation records at the local weather bureau, we find that for the period starting July 1 to the 20th of February, more than 7½ months, our precipitation is only 4.12 inches against the average for the same period of 9.46, considerably less than one-half the average. In fact, the past, we might say 8 months, is the lowest for the same period since the Government weather bureau has been operating here, some 45 years. It is said that a similar condition in regard to precipitation and snowfall is very deficient in the entire Northwest and it is likely there will be a shortage of water this year that will cause serious concern, especially at Grand Coulee and other power plants along the Columbia and its tributaries, as well as in irrigation sections of the Northwest.

In view of this condition it would seem that no time should be lost by Congress in passing the Hungry Horse Dam bill now before it. While the upper Flathead water would not relieve the apparent shortage of water this year, there is no way to determine just what next year will bring. Another season like the present one would prove a serious blow to the Northwest, unless added water could be had through quickly constructed reservoirs, such as the proposed Hungry Horse

Dam. Although the snow in both the South and North Forks of the Flathead is exceptionally short, there would still be enough to fill the dam to the point contemplated by the partial construction plan for use in 1946. The average annual run-off in the South Fork is placed at 3,000,000 acre-feet, and even if next year's snowfall in the mountains would be considerably short of the average, there would be ample to fill the reservoir through the partially completed dam designed to hold 1,000,000 acre-feet of water.

The present outlook for water in the Northwest is anything but encouraging for this year, and it would seem that every effort should be made to protect the future by constructing as many dams and reservoirs as possible this year on the tributaries of the Columbia River to avoid in future what might prove a disaster to our power and food production during the critical years of the immediate future.

Slavery Is What We Are Fighting Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which appeared in the March issue of the American Federationist:

The first contention of proponents of national service legislation is that it would help to solve manpower problems and to promote war production. I cannot conceive on what factual grounds that theory is based. A national service act would only substitute compulsion and regimentation for the free enterprise of American labor and American management.

The Nazis and the Fascists believe in the totalitarian principle of slave labor and slave industry. That is their system. We in America have always believed that the free and voluntary service of our people is superior to coercion. Free enterprise is our system. Enactment of the Austin-Wadsworth bill would constitute a catastrophic retreat and an inglorious confession of failure of the American way of life.

Have we failed? The record of this war to date proves incontestably otherwise. In the 2 short years since Pearl Harbor, America alone has outproduced the combined forces of the Axis by more than 2 to 1. The facts speak for themselves. Between January 1942, and January 1944, America doubled the size of her Navy by building 3,700,000 displacement tons of new fighting ships. In the same period we produced 27,000,000 tons of merchant shipping, equal to the size of the entire world's fleet before the war. We turned out 134,000 airplanes, despite temporary shortages of materials and constantly changing designs and specifications—and we are now building the finest and most effective planes in the world at the rate of almost 10,000 a month. We have produced 148,000 tanks, 1,200,000 military trucks, 424,000 pieces of artillery, and more than a billion rounds of artillery ammunition.

These are the Government's own figures. They add up to a production miracle—a miracle which no other country in the world can duplicate, a miracle which was accomplished through the efforts of the great army of free American workers.

Surely this record cannot be classified as failure. On the contrary, our own allies have hailed it as the great triumph of this war. Premier Stalin of Soviet Russia is reported to have declared at the Tehran Conference that the United Nations would never have been able to turn the tide of battle and start the new and victorious offensives without the vast output of munitions made by American labor and American industry.

Nor is there any substantial indication that future production cannot be sustained at these high levels or even increased. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that our country is now producing more war material in many categories than the armed forces of all the United Nations can use. That is why we hear about cut-backs being ordered in the production of aluminum and steel and tanks and ammunition. That is why shipyards have been ordered to abandon Sunday work. True, we still are bending every effort to increase production of several vital items of war production, such as planes and landing craft and certain radio equipment. But for the most part the war production program already has passed its crest. During this year the war-production program in general will probably begin to enter a declining stage—not because we can't make more but because the Government will not need so much. As this process develops, manpower surpluses will arise instead of shortages.

I would be the last to deny that difficult manpower and production problems still confront us in some localities and in certain lines of production. The question before us, however, is whether resort to compulsion and regimentation will help us out of these difficulties or render them even greater. This is a question which the Nation's leaders in the field of industry, labor, and agriculture are best qualified to answer. They gave their answer last November—a unanimous answer. They declared:

"The American people will provide greater output under a voluntary system than under one of compulsion and regimentation.

"The solution depends upon leadership, coordinated and understood plans, and efficient administration; not upon broadened control and regimentation."

These statements were contained in a declaration made public by the Policy Committee of the War Manpower Commission. The declaration was signed, among others, by the presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the American Federation of Labor, and the C. I. O. It was a unanimous statement, and it rejected the proposal for a national service act without qualification.

It is interesting to explore the basic cause of this agreement among the representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture. It springs from their experience with the controls already put into effect by the War Manpower Commission and other Government agencies. These experiences have not been happy. Instead of bringing about order, instead of simplifying procedures, instead of promoting efficiency, the record of Government intervention in this field spells only confusion, red tape, contradictory policy, and frustration.

Because of such experiences, the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture fear and dread the impact of utter chaos if and when a national service law is enacted and the Government attempts to administer it.

Organized labor has done more on its own account to solve manpower problems in war production than all the various bureaus and agencies of the Government combined. And we have done it without fuss and without any expense to the Government. Time after time the War Department, the Navy Department, and other agencies have called up our union headquarters and asked for so many thousand carpenters, or bricklayers, or other skilled workers needed at the site of various projects at a definite time. And each time the unions, through their own recruitment facilities, have had the men on the job at the appointed hour.

The combined know-how of American labor and industry also has contributed importantly to the solution of manpower problems. A typical example is furnished in the report made by the West Coast Aircraft War Production Council, which revealed that the man-hours of labor necessary to build typical fighter and four-engine planes had been cut 95 percent since the original models were made. These figures were disclosed in order to show that although aircraft plants on the west coast are expected in 1944 to build 50 percent more airplanes, in terms of weight, than in 1943, it would be possible to do so with relatively small increases in manpower.

A new argument advanced in support of a national service act is that it would help to prevent strikes. This argument also is theoretical and the theory behind it is demonstrably unsound. The only way a national service act could deal with strikes would be to place the strikers in jail, as this bill provides, for 6 months. But we already have a Federal law, known as the War Labor Disputes Act, which provides jail penalties for strikers. The War Labor Disputes Act has not prevented strikes. Neither would a national service act.

We have only to examine the experiences of Great Britain for further confirmation. Britain has a national service law, adopted in the national emergency which followed Dunkerque. This law has not prevented strikes in Britain. On the contrary, the records show that there have been more strikes proportionately in Great Britain while the national service law was in effect than there have been in this country during the same period.

No one in America has been more outspoken in condemnation of wartime strikes than I have. Repeatedly I have urged the membership of the American Federation of Labor to live up to our no-strike pledge, and they have followed this advice to the extent of more than 99 percent. There can be no possible justification for strikes at a time when the fate of the Nation and the lives of thousands of American boys hang in the balance.

But we must face the facts. Strikes have occurred, and they will occur so long as the war economy of our country is out of line and out of balance. The major cause of strikes is that the Government is attempting to enforce wage stabilization while it has failed to stabilize the cost of living. The way to prevent strikes is to readjust the stabilization program so that the purchasing power of the wage dollar is restored. This can be done either through upward revision of wage rates or, even more effectively, by rigid reduction and control of prices of the necessities of life. Unfortunately, neither the Congress nor the executive branch of the Government have thus far seen fit to put such a program into effect.

The final argument raised in behalf of a national service act is that it would allocate the burden of war sacrifice more equitably among the American people. It is said that if the Government can conscript young men to serve in the armed forces and risk their lives against the enemy, it should likewise draft those on the home front to work at the particular job and in the particular place the Government deems best calculated to promote the war effort.

This argument appears plausible at first glance, but careful analysis will show that it is empty, false, and irrelevant. There can be no true comparison between drafting citizens to serve in the armed forces for the defense of their country and drafting other citizens to work by compulsion in industries operating

for private profit. Neither can there be any Nation-wide draft of labor without a correspondingly drastic draft of capital. Such measures are abhorrent to the American way of life, fatal to the free-enterprise system and clearly violative of the Constitution, because they involve involuntary servitude and confiscation.

A national-service act would increase the burden of sacrifice borne by those serving on the home front, but it would do so without rhyme, reason, or necessity. If such a law should be enacted and strictly enforced, it is appalling to consider the fearful consequences of placing such unrestricted power in bureaucratic hands. Millions of American families might be broken up, thousands of small business enterprises might have to be abandoned. Every American citizen would be thrown into a state of uncertainty and insecurity.

Apparently, the danger of such consequences has impressed itself upon the minds of the leading supporters of this legislation, for Senator AUSTIN declared only recently that he did not believe everyone would have to be drafted by this national-service bill. He said it would only give the Government the authority to draft workers when needed, just as Congress has given the Government authority to seize property under certain conditions.

If this statement of the purposes of the bill by one of its authors can be relied upon, then the argument of equal sacrifice topples of its own weight. If the great majority of American citizens will be left undisturbed in their present occupations by this bill, if idlers and dilettantes and nonproductive individuals are to be permitted to pursue their own sweet way, if only certain groups of workers are to feel the brunt of enforced labor, then the idea behind a national service act is fraudulent and the burden of war sacrifice will be even more unfairly distributed than it is at present.

Generally speaking, the workers of this country are making sacrifices for the winning of this war that are comparable to those of the average American citizen. In one respect, however, labor's burden of sacrifice is particularly heavy.

The Office of War Information reports that since Pearl Harbor industrial accidents have killed 36,600 workers, 7,500 more than the military dead. Such accidents on the job, furthermore, have permanently disabled 210,000 additional workers and temporarily disabled 4,500,000 others. These casualties are 60 times more than the military wounded and missing.

Yes, our soldiers and sailors and marines who are risking their lives against enemy fire are entitled to feel that Americans at home are backing them up to the limit. But they are also entitled to the assurance that the free America they are fighting for will be kept intact by us at home, that their homes and jobs will be protected, that they will not have to come home and be demobilized after the war ends only to be redrafted for service in a job not of their own choice.

In the final analysis, the proposal for a national service act must stand or fall upon this major test: Will it, or will it not, promote the war effort and hasten the day of victory? In my opinion, enactment of a national service law would not add a single plane, a single ship, a single tank, or a single bullet to the Nation's war production. On the contrary, it would threaten to cripple the amazingly successful production program we are now carrying on.

There are two outstanding issues involved in the present World War which must be definitely settled one way or another by its final outcome.

First, shall totalitarian or democratic government survive and function?

Second, is the slave-labor system of totalitarianism superior to the free labor of our democracy?

Enactment of a national service law would defeat our war aims because it would constitute an open confession that Hitler is right and we are wrong.

Why send our young men abroad to fight and die in a war against totalitarianism when it is foisted upon us here at home through the expedient of a national service act?

Labor wants this issue to slave labor versus free labor to be determined on its merits. We accepted the challenge on December 7, 1941, and we have given our answer to the enemy with the greatest outpouring of the munitions of war the world has ever seen.

Labor insists and demands that it be permitted to carry on its fight against enemy doctrines without being impeded and chained down by enemy methods.

Labor insists and demands that our final victory in this war be recognized and acknowledged as a victory for free labor and the death knell for slave labor throughout the world for all time.

The States Must Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of March 13 on the subject of Federal control of public education.

It seems incredible that the cause of education in the United States is to become the subject of propaganda, lobbying, and bureaucracy. The issue will soon be presented to the people of the United States whether or not the schools of this country are to be conducted or managed by the time-honored and time-tested local boards of education or someone sitting behind a desk in Washington a thousand miles away. The States must awaken to the danger that confronts them or lose control of the public schools within their borders.

WHAT'S HATCHING

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There is among the laws of Congress one entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," written by Senator CARL HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico, and designed to keep the vast governmental bureaucracy out of pressure politics. On Friday, last, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Robert E. Hannegan, said that he wished the Hatch Act could be amended. It is easy to guess why.

If Mr. Hannegan could get his hooks into the millions of Federal officeholders as he learned to do in his early career with the notorious political machines of his native Missouri, you can bet which way he would pull them in a hurry.

Fortunately, the main parts of the Hatch Act are still in force. They do not actually prevent pernicious political activities on the part of politicians in office, but they do make the work a little more difficult.

What happens when any part of the Hatch Act is worn away by amendment is pretty well demonstrated by a change made in 1942 to relieve of its restrictions school teachers who draw Government pay.

Schools, according to most people's ideas of good government, should be kept out of politics in every possible way.

Money should be appropriated liberally for public education—on that every common-sense mind is agreed. And teachers should be allowed to hold their jobs as long as they stick to teaching the courses of education approved by appropriate authority.

But teachers, like others, must show some sense of limitation about lobbying in their selfish interests. When the Hatch Act applied against them in the matter of pernicious political activity, teachers' lobbies were careful of their political conduct.

Nowadays, however, the teachers' lobby in Washington is really rolling in high gear for a federalized, bureaucratic central control of public education in the U. S. A. Their trade paper, the Journal of the National Education Association, is angling editorial messages with great skill to spread the word of just how to slip this project across.

And a few days ago there came to hand another item, labeled Defense Bulletin No. 8 of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

This organization, with headquarters at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., in this city, described the bulletin as a confidential paper "primarily for the information of, and action by, members of the commission, State secretaries, and N. E. A. directors."

It is in fact, campaign material telling how to lobby for the largest possible Federal appropriations in education, and advises that: "Teachers should plan their action in the 1944 election campaign with their Senators' attitudes on Federal aid in mind."

It lists the Senators whose terms expire this year, gives their stands on Federal financing of education in the States, and forecasts the probable shape of the Senate in 1945 as 48 Democrats, 47 Republicans and 1 Progressive.

(If that is how things work out, incidentally, the Vice President in 1945 will be the most powerful in history. As President of the Senate he always has power to cast a tie-breaking vote, and it is certain the next Senate will have many a close squeeze on important issues.)

In the matter of the House, the bulletin says to get out and work for candidates who favor federally financed education.

It then runs on with long detailed analyses of what teachers can use as propaganda, and even furnishes them with a party line as to candidates for President.

Now, teachers are American citizens and as such they should have the right to vote and to enjoy the other liberties this Nation affords.

But there is a difference between such freedom and extraordinary license to conduct such bald lobbying as above disclosed. Teachers, after all, are governmental employees, except for the few in private educational systems.

And as employees of government they have to face up to some rule of restraint as to lobbying for greater governmental expenses.

This country has seen in W. P. A. what mass lobbying by governmental employees can do. When people are brought together by the millions and marshaled under unified command to yell simultaneously for more and more and more, they can yell just about any administration into submission.

By means of the W. P. A., the Roosevelt administration was able to organize a political discipline unparalleled in this Nation's history.

And that discipline was used to raid the pockets of all the people for tax money at a rate also unparalleled in this Nation's history.

And now we see the consequences in train. With high-sounding labels hung around their headquarters, a group of lobbyists here in Washington is attempting to organize the teachers of America for a fresh raiding expedition.

Their example will, unless checked, be followed by many others. And in a few short years government will be utterly reduced to a reckless scramble for the last dollar in the American pocket.

Of course none of that bothers Democratic National Chairman Hannegan. He just wants the Hatch Act watered down some more so he can make the short run for 1944. He's desperate.

Keep the Crepe Off 500,000 American Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by me:

The Allied Nations today in control of sea and air should continue the attack and blasting of Germany for at least 3 months longer before attempting an invasion by land forces. Such a program should prove so destructive to Germany's morale, that if it did not result in revolt, it would at least destroy a great portion of the defense works which unless destroyed must be responsible for the death of thousands of our boys. To those persons who agitate for the immediate invasion of Germany without a 90-day bombing it is only necessary to direct attention to two examples that are outstanding in the present war—the Marshall Islands and Tarawa.

The air forces and the Navy conducted an assault upon the Marshall Islands for a period of many days, so destructive that when the landing parties went ashore the dead and injured were extremely few. At Tarawa, the invasion was started after but 2 days of bombing and provided this might have been permitted to continue for a full 5 days or a week, the ghastly toll of death and injured would have been unnecessary. At Tarawa nearly 3,000 were killed and injured and yet the territory taken by them was in no way comparable in size to the Marshall Islands and provided we had failed to carry out the bombing and naval program at the Marshall Islands for more than 2 days and then had attempted landing parties, the dead and injured would have been greater than at Tarawa. Thoughtful Americans are demanding that there be no more Tarawas, insofar as our armed forces are concerned, and are likewise insistent in a demand that the bombing of Germany continue for a period of 90 days and provided this is done there is every indication that the losses will be reduced and instead of losing the lives or limbs of 500,000 American boys we may keep it perhaps at one-tenth of that number. The pressure for immediate invasion is unquestionably great upon the part of the nations allied with us in the winning of the war, but a delay of the termination of hostilities for even 3 months, is better than the needless sacrifice of life and limb of 500,000 or more American boys.

The official report on the air war as presented under date of January 4, 1944, by Gen. H. H. Arnold is the most lucid, comprehensive, and courageous presentation that has been made by any Government official from the beginning of the present war. General Arnold occupies a most unique position in that he has been a pioneer for aviation for more than one-quarter of a century. When Billy Mitchell was demanding an air program, General Arnold was one of a very limited number of men in the Army of the United States who took sides with Mitchell and who shared his views as to the indispensable part that could be played through control of the air. Under his brilliant and able leadership the impossible has become the possible, and from 1938 the total military personnel in the Air Forces has increased from 21,125 to the present force of 2,385,000 in 1944. The military airplane production under his splendid leadership in 1938 represented a total weight of air frames of 5,500,000 pounds, and in 1943 this has increased to 667,000,000 pounds. It is today accepted that control of the air and control of the sea mark the end of German and Japanese power and that from now on they are destined to lose battles and it is but a question of time when both will be defeated.

The proposition that the United States furnish more than 70 percent of the armed forces to be utilized in the invasion of Germany, coupled with the growing demand that the invasion begin at the earliest possible date can mean but one thing, the loss of upward of 500,000 American boys.

Personally I can see no great harm that would result in a prolongation of the war for a period of perhaps 3 months provided that during this period the Air Forces continue to bomb German territory and German-held territory, since from the character of destruction that has been wrought during the past 30 days invasion might then be possible at the end of 3 months' period without imperiling the lives of too many of our American boys. The reports that have emanated from Germany in those sections where intensive bombing has taken place, like Berlin, indicate that the loss of lives in this one city alone has to date been in excess of 250,000.

A continuance of bombing on an increased scale might result within a period of 60 to 90 days in an overthrow of the Hitlerites, making unnecessary the bloody invasion and hand-to-hand fighting by our boys which would result in crepe on the doors of more than 500,000 American homes.

I have been repeatedly asked the question by men in the service and others, "What is America fighting for?" and provided we proceed on the invasion of Germany without bombing for a period of 3 months, it becomes an impossible question to answer since there is but one answer—we are fighting to destroy the manhood of America for the benefit of other nations.

I do not want to see crepe on the doors of the homes of 500,000 American boys provided we can prevent it, and I believe by following the judgment and the leadership of General Arnold in the bombing of German-held territory for a period of 3 months we can prevent it and it is clearly our duty to do this in the interest of America and American boys, American mothers, and American homes.

It is estimated that between the collapse of France in May 1940 and March 1942 the Renault Motor Vehicle & Armament Works produced approximately 10,000 trucks, and a substantial amount of military material such as armored cars, guns, munitions, and aircraft engines. On March 3, 1942, the Royal Air Force carried out a successful night bombardment attack which damaged and burned out most of the plant. The importance which the Germans attached to this industrial unit was indicated by the rapidity with which repair and reconstruction were undertaken. In December 1942 Renault output had again reached the pre-bombardment rate of production. By the beginning of 1943 the plant accounted for approximately 10 percent of total German production of this type of war material.

On April 4, 1943, our Eighth Bomber Command dispatched 97 B–17's to execute high-altitude bombardment against the reconstructed Renault Works. The British Ministry of Home Security estimated that as a result of this attack the output of the Renault plant could not be restored to pre-bombardment level in less than 5 months. One authoritative evaluation characterizes the effect of this mission as equivalent to an estimated loss of 3,000 trucks.

Rubber is a highly expendable essential in modern war.

The western Axis had almost no stocks of natural rubber.

A large percentage of Germany's total supply was concentrated at Huls and Schkopau.

On June 22, 1943, bombers of our Eighth Air Force almost totally destroyed the plant at Huls. As a result of the battle, 3 months of synthetic-rubber production is estimated to be lost to the Axis. Subnormal operation may have lasted 6 months. The supplies of synthetic rubber to Sweden have been altogether stopped.

On August 16, 1943, the plant was still inactive and few repairs had been made. There was no rolling stock in the main works, and bomb craters had not been filled in. This loss in production must be borne principally by Germany's armed forces, since her civilian and industrial consumption of synthetic rubber normally amount to only 15,000 tons annually, a quantity that can hardly be pared down.

On July 24, 1943, we struck a blow at the largest and most ambitious industrial project undertaken by the Germans in Norway—the Herova magnesium, alumina, and aluminum plant. The estimated capacity of this vast self-contained production unit was 10,000 tons of magnesium, 25,000 tons of alumina, 12,000 tons of aluminum, and 3,000 tons of cryolite. Had its operation not been suspended by our attack it would very shortly have been functioning at full capacity. In a few moments, however, it was transformed into a gigantic, if not impossible, repair task. The British Ministry of Economic Warfare considers it unlikely that this plant will ever be repaired.

Similarly, in our attack on the Focke-Wulf assembly plant at Marienburg, in East Prussia, October 9, 1943, only 2 out of 100 B–17's were lost. The concentration of bomb bursts on this target was so great that there is sound reason to evaluate this as one of the finest examples of precision bombing to date. The attack was made in daylight from altitudes between 11,000 and 13,500 feet. Several hundred 500-pound B. P. bombs and 1,300 100-pound incendiaries were dropped. Study of reconnaissance photographs has convinced photo interpreters in the United Kingdom that every factory building and all the hangars had been damaged. And this plant had been turning out about one-half (110 per month) of all Germany's FW–190 fighters.

It is possible that the Schweinfurt mission in which we lost 60 of our bombers may prove to have been one of the decisive air actions of the war. The plants of Schweinfurt produced over 50 percent of Germany's ball bearings. The vital importance of ball bearings in industry and the fact that it is not practicable to assemble large stock-piles of them, made these plants a first priority target. A bottleneck in ball bearings is a bottleneck in essential industry. The intensity of fighter opposition made clear that the Germans are fully aware of this.

More than 300 German fighters participated in the action, making more than 700 separate attacks. Ninety-nine of these fighters were destroyed, 30 probably destroyed, and 14 damaged. But more important, all five of the works at Schweinfurt were either completely or almost completely wiped out.

five of the works at Schweinfurt were either completely or almost completely wiped out. Our attack was the most perfect example in history of accurate distribution of bombs over a target. It was an attack that will not have to be repeated for a very long time, if at all.

The price of 24 B–17's that we paid for our midday attack on the Messerchmitt aircraft factory at Regensburg is, in perspective, relatively small. It is estimated by competent authority that this single action caused a loss of production of 500 ME 109's. The Luftwaffe was hurt in the air almost as seriously as it was on the ground. More than 200 fighters of several types pressed a strong attack; 140 were destroyed, 19 probably destroyed, and 36 damaged. Tremendous efforts are being made to get this plant back into production.

In view of the high rate of attrition of German fighter aircraft on the western front, the near future appears likely to be a crucial period which may determine the survival or destruction of the Luftwaffe as an effective air force. If the present rate of attrition keeps up, and German aircraft factories producing these fighters continue to suffer progressive destruction, a point will be reached where German reserves are exhausted and only a trickle of new replacements can be supplied.

The destruction wrought by Allied bombers has shown that the operations of the Army Air Forces and the Royal Air Force are complementary. The R. A. F. and A. A. F. work together. In recent weeks the Royal Air Force bombardments of military objectives in Berlin are worthy of special praise. During a single night more than five million pounds of high explosives were dropped on chemical works and war industries in Berlin and its suburbs. Although the Nazis have increased their production of fighter planes, they have not stopped the bombers from taking total war to the German capital.

It is difficult to appraise the present struggle for air supremacy as representing anything short of a major turning point in the war. What American and Royal Air Force bombers can do to the whole German war machine, once the German fighter force is rendered impotent, needs no comment. The issue hangs now on which side first falters, weakens, and loses its punishing power.

Clearly the cost in money, men or equipment for the few isolated missions—much less for one mission—is never a reliable basis for judging the success of our strategic operation as a whole. It is the over-all cost to us, in relation to our ability to bear that cost, measured against the over-all result and the enemy's ability to endure that result, which must decide for or against the resolute prosecution of a military campaign.

To a question posed in those terms, there is only one answer, we will not falter.

Price Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the Price Control Act was before Congress, many Members of both Houses were of the opinion that limitations should be placed in the act. One of the amendments to which I refer is the one that provided an expiration date of June 30, 1944. It was thought at the time that a safeguard of this character would be for the best interests of all concerned. That is to say, that inasmuch as Congress is in almost continuous session during the war years, a resolution extending the act would be given attention and consideration. Also it was thought that an agency having the broad powers as continued in the Price Control Act should take into account the interests of the consuming public, the farmer, the businessman, and all elements of the population. I am of the opinion that the placing of the time limitation on the act has caused the officials of the Office of Price Administration to do a better job than would have been the case had there not been such a provision written into the act.

Price controls are necessary during the period of this war in order to prevent skyrocketing of the prices on commodities that the citizens must buy. All are agreed that some type of price-control measure will be enacted into law before the expiration date of June 30. The provisions to be carried into the new act is a major issue now confronting the country. Whether a provision will be written into this new act outlawing consumer subsidies will be one question that must be given adequate attention. Many recommendations have been made by the House committee investigating governmental agencies that are exceeding the authority given them by acts of Congress. These, too, will be before congressional committees of both House and Senate. Since this legislation is of such far-reaching importance it is necessary that close study and adequate consideration be given to the many problems which experience has shown could, and should, be remedied by express language written into the new act. Early hearings should be held on this legislation.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, mutual friends have just handed me a letter from one of my young constituents, Horace Downing, of Wichita Falls, Tex., written to his folks at Christmas time from somewhere in Italy. This letter is an eloquent story of high morale and heroic action. Furthermore, it pays timely tribute to the outstanding service of American chaplains and the American Red Cross. I offer this letter for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it is certainly worthy of preservation:

SOMEWHERE IN ITALY,
Christmas Day, 1943.

DEAR FOLKS: My second Christmas away from home has been so different that I thought you might like to hear about it, and other things where we are now. Looking back, it seems a mighty short year since last Christmas, which we celebrated as best we could. At that time we were living in tents, but had buildings for the hospital. On Christmas Eve, just before midnight, about 20 of us met with Chaplain Laird in a tiny room that was used as a chapel, but it was also used for a lot of other things, such as a conference room for our psychiatrist, a morgue where some autopsies were done, and as the place where disciplinary cases were talked to as only an Army officer can talk to a man. But on this occasion, the chaplain had fixed a little altar, with some candles and holly, and there were benches for us to sit on. The service was not long, but was very impressive. Our chaplain reminds me of Dr. Martin at home in that he always knows just what to say for every occasion, and how to say it. Early Christmas morning John Gordon came to my tent before I had gotten up and gave me the first Christmas present I received last year—it was a cork, with a comic head of some kind of an animal on it. I have sent it home, and will keep it as a reminder of Christmas 1942. Ruth's fruitcake was the first real present I got, as all the others waited to get my A. P. O. and the presents were about a month late. Christmas night a dozen or so of us had a feast in a tent. A French lady across the street had given us roast pork, salad, and several other things, and we had bought a lot of French pastries, so it made quite a feed.

This Christmas we are entirely under field conditions, and although we do not have as many patients as we have had several times before, we feel that we are rendering a better service than we ever have. We get lots of wounded, and lots of times have six operations going on at once, with other patients waiting. We have lost very few patients, and everybody is busy all the time. I have not seen a man who would not volunteer to do whatever he could for the patients any time he knew there was something to do. In our office, we have given up two men to serve as litter bearers as long as they are needed, and all of us come over early each morning to help load into ambulances those patients who are being sent back to general or convalescent hospitals. Most of them are unable to walk, and the regular litter bearers, plus the extras that have been added recently, cannot handle all of them; it is really hard work.

Yesterday was the first time I had helped get patients into the ambulances to leave, and although I had been around in the wards quite a bit, it was an experience that awakened me to what is happening to a lot of the boys. The first one we loaded was a typical case.

We went into the ward and called out the name of the first man we were to get, and a cheerful blond kid of about 21 or 22, who was propped upon his elbows, answered. There was nothing about his manner to indicate that anything was wrong with him, and he was obviously in the best of spirits. When we pulled the blanket off him, before putting him on the litter, his injury showed up—one leg was off just below the knee, and it was either a very recent amputation or he had had a hemorrhage, as it had been bleeding some. He bounced over onto the litter without assistance and airily asked us if we had a place on the litter for his old peg leg. When we placed him in the ambulance, he thanked us and wished us luck. His attitude is typical. Some say that their life at the front has been so nearly unbearable that they are glad to get away, whatever the cost. But I think it is just plain guts, plus a feeling of appreciation for the best treatment we can give them, that keeps their spirits so high. Another boy that we carried out had an arm and a leg in casts, bandages all over him, and his face was scratched and cut all over, like a shell had

exploded close and ground dirt and gravel into his skin. He felt very apolcgetic because the nurse had to help him onto the litter. He said that if he were not so sore and stiff he wouldn't need any help. Some of the patients have so many head injuries that they have the entire head, except the nose and mouth, covered with bandages. In one ward the fellows in three consecutive beds had lost an arm. Yet you never hear one groan or complain. In one ward we went into the Catholic chaplain was praying over an unconscious man whose head was completely bandaged. It makes us feel mighty good when the patients wish us luck on leaving, and tell us that they were never treated better than we treated them. Those that can walk eat in the mess hall, and you can see them lined up, wearing outing pajamas or dirty uniforms. Some of the boys at the front haven't had their clothes off for a month and a half. If some of the people in the States could see the wrecked bits of humanity that we unload from ambulances, it would give them a different perspective on the boys in the combat units. The medics have gotten credit for doing a swell job in this war, and I think they deserve it, but their life, except for the aid men on the front, is a picnic compared to that of the combat units. The medics, like the chaplains, are everywhere—on the front, in the paratroops, etc. Among other unpleasant features here, mud is one of the worst. The engineers are doing all they can to put in roads and walks, but lots of times we had to carry litters through slimy, slippery mud that made walking difficult and doubly so when carrying a man on a litter. Even the aisle down the middle of the ward tents was muddy. We have a bunch of Italian civilians working for us, most of them on the roads and walks. They are glad to get the work at 40 cents a day; there is no John L. Lewis in Italy. Several boys came with us from the last place we were located and will probably follow us as long as we will let them. Among these are three or four barbers and two musicians that work in the kitchens and play for us at mealtime. They are really good on their accordion and violin, and one is a very good portrait painter.

But back to Christmas—the spirit first caught on last Sunday, when we had a songfest in the chapel (a ward tent), after the regular Sunday evening service. Then during the week, musicians from other units came and entertained the patients. Yesterday a group of Italian Red Cross workers came, and brought candy for all the patients and for us. Today, two very high ranking officers visited us—we can't give their names or even their ranks. They looked over various parts of the hospital and visited with lots of the patients. About a dozen of us followed them around and took quite a few pictures of them. One was the highest ranking officer I have ever seen, except General Pershing, and as I was waiting outside a tent, he came out and stopped long enough for me to get a picture and said, "Merry Christmas, Sergeant." It may not seem out of place to you civilians, but afterward it occurred to me that I proceeded to take pictures without remembering to salute him. There were Signal Corps soldiers taking movies and flash pictures; you may see some of them in the papers and magazines. He commended us highly on the work we are doing. Our mess halls (dining rooms in a tent to you civilians) were decorated for Christmas, even to a little tree, and we had a real Christmas dinner. There was lots of good turkey, dressing, cranberries, olives, apple pie, cake with chocolate frosting, good coffee, real butter, and several other things. Believe you me, it was a far cry from the C rations we have so often. Nearly everybody was busy over Christmas, but a few of the boys found the time and wherewith to get drunk. One bit of slapstick comedy was furnished by two boys. The mud is so slippery that it is all a sober man can do to walk around without falling, and these two boys were drunk enough that they spent half their time picking each other up. Even though they got slimy mud all over them, they seemed to enjoy it as much as the onlookers did.

I have written before of the fine work our chaplains are doing, but to my mind, the most unselfish persons I have ever seen are our Red Cross workers, Miss Ruth Buffington, of Cleveland, Ohio; and Miss Frances Carter, of Virginia. They work in shifts, as patients are coming in at all hours, day and night. When the patients are first brought in, one of the Red Cross ladies is there to serve them hot soup, cocoa, coffee, and so forth, and to give them comfort articles, such as cigarettes and toilet articles and supplies. Anyone who does not think the Red Cross is worth while should see these ladies doing things for the boys. For instance, the little things like lighting a cigarette for a soldier who is so badly injured that he can't light his own means a lot to a boy who has been at the front for weeks. They maintain a day room for the patients, with a phonograph, radio, piano, and musical instruments, games, and reading material. When necessary, they run all kinds of errands for patients, and make them loans and write letters and send wires for them. Miss Buffington joined us when our nurses did, last March, and during our periods of idleness, she worked all the time doing things for the personnel of our unit. She had a lot to do with the sightseeing trips that we got to take in French Morocco, and later after we came to Italy. We agree with the patients that she is the best in the world, but all the Red Cross workers I have seen at other units and at all the fine service clubs maintained by the Red Cross, are exceedingly high-class people. Miss Carter joined us shortly before we came to Italy, and she is rapidly winning a place in our hearts. The Red Cross is making boosters out of every man that is overseas by their generosity and good work.

At our last station before we moved here, we handled a lot of nervous, or mental, cases. In the last war they were called "shell shock" cases, but now they are marked "exhaustion." I had occasion to handle reports for our psychiatrist, and enjoyed studying the case histories he wrote up. The treatment is heavy sedation, good food, and rest. While they are partly under the influence of sedatives, they are encouraged to talk, and this is the source of a lot of the information for their case histories. The psychiatrist finds out all he can about their family and personal history from childhood on. I noticed lots of them came from families who had not gotten along, or alcohol had caused trouble. Lots of the cases had a history of childhood tantrums, and so forth. A lot of cases indicated that their trouble actually was exhaustion—they just stood all they could, then blew up. Nearly all wanted to make good; lots wanted to return to their units, while others said they just could not stand life at the front again, but wanted to serve somewhere in the Army. The chief concern of lots of them was the fate of their buddies. As I read the record of the events prior to their break-down, I could easily imagine myself doing the same thing under the circumstances. The psychiatrists are doing a wonderful job in getting them in condition to return to some kind of duty in the Army, as well as being able to return to civilian life as stable, normal men.

I have a lot to be thankful for this Christmas. Every place I have been has made me appreciate the good old United States more than ever. Knowing that your family and friends are safe means a lot after seeing whole cities torn up, and so many people in mourning. Both here and in Africa, the men wear a black ribbon either on the lapel or around the arm for a while after losing a relative, and I have seen hundreds of them. I have been very lucky in the number and kind of Christmas presents received; after opening all my packages, I can't think of a single thing I want or need.

If any of you want to do something for the patients, send any kind of reading material, small games, jig-saw puzzles, sheet music or records to me, and I will turn it over to the Red Cross for the use of the patients. It doesn't matter if the reading material is old, because the men at the front don't get to keep up to date anyway.

If you want to do something for any soldier, write lots of letters; they are the source of the greatest pleasure to him.

As I write this, I am thinking about all of you on Christmas day; I hope you have a happy New Year, too, and that we can celebrate the next one together.

Thanks again for the nice package.

Love,

HORACE.

What Is Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with permission from the House to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a brief editorial entitled, "What Is Labor?" This editorial appeared in the Union Labor Record, of Springfield, Mo., on March 8, 1944. It is written by Ruth Taylor, whose articles are carried in many publications over the Nation each week. I commend this editorial to your attention.

WHAT IS LABOR?

(By Ruth Taylor)

What is labor?

It is not a class, set apart by barriers of tradition and age-old customs, and bound over to pass on its menial tasks from father to son throughout the coming generations.

It is not a party, a pressure group that can be counted upon to vote as a unit at the order of a leader. There is no trade-union official who has ever been able to deliver the vote of his organization.

What is labor?

It is the rank and file of the productive workers of the country—the men and women who make things, who keep the wheels of industry turning. They may work in office, shop, or factory, in the fields or on the sea. It does not matter where they work, whether it be in teeming city, or on a lonely hillside farm, whether the sound in their ears is that of whirring machinery or the slap of waves against a small fishing boat. So long as they produce or help in production proves they are labor.

What is labor?

It is the average American, doing his best at the job for which his own particular skill best fits him, working hard to make a living for his family and to see to it that his children get a better education, a better start in life than he did, as did his father before him.

What is labor?

It is the men and women who believe in the principles of democracy, in the right of all men to be free, to work usefully and creatively through the productive years at a

wage adequate to furnish the necessities and some of the luxuries of life; who for these rights and those guaranteed to them by our Constitution are willing and eager to fulfill all the duties and obligations of citizenship.

What is labor?

It is the great mass of Americans who throughout the years have learned how to work together for the common good and who are an integral part of our great Union of States, built upon the firm foundation of freedom and equality of opportunity for all men, regardless of class, creed, or color.

Unity at Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

UNITY AT WASHINGTON

Appeals for national unity during the war emergency have streamed out of Washington like sparks from a Fourth of July skyrocket.

The American people are somewhat bewildered by this implication they are not united in a determination to win the war.

And their bewilderment is increased by frequent displays of disunity at Washington.

The most striking evidence of disunity at Washington is that which has Congress and the executive branch of the Government pulling in different directions.

There is no disunity on the war program; Congress has given the administration every dollar it has asked for war purposes, and every bit of authority it has requested under appeals to promote military efficiency.

It is in matters on the home front where the President and Congress are at a parting of the ways.

Mr. Roosevelt has already vetoed the legislation banning subsidies on food, and Congress sustained the veto by a narrow margin.

He likewise vetoed the new tax bill, accusing Congress of having passed an inept measure which he charged provides relief not for the needy but the greedy.

A clash between the two branches over which shall control the demobilization program is in the cards, each side having presented its program.

The probability of service men and women having a vote in the forthcoming election is decreasing each day, because the administration and Congress cannot compose their differences of opinion on the method to be followed.

The roots of some of these controversies go deep; they involve, in some instances, fundamental American principles, and they promise to provide issues which will increase the bitterness of the Presidential campaign.

It has been charged that Mr. Roosevelt has deliberately set out to destroy the faith of the American people in their legislative body.

These charges may be unjustified, but there is no denying that the clashes between Congress and the administration are setting a bad example for the people, are adding nothing to the successful prosecution of the war, and are lending aid and encouragement to the enemy who get an exaggerated idea of political differences in the United States.

The situation is the result of congressional-administration relationship during Mr. Roosevelt's occupancy of the White House.

In the early years of the New Deal, Congress was overwhelmingly Democratic, and in those days Democrats in Congress thought the New Dealers and Democrats were identical.

In that era Mr. Roosevelt got everything he demanded from Congress; and he didn't request in those days—he demanded. Legislation was even written by "brain trusters" and not in Congress, and the legislators dared not deviate from it.

That's where Congress was at fault. Its attitude gave the President good reason to believe he could have everything his own way; that all he had to do was notify Congress of his intentions.

But the Jeffersonian Democrats could stand that just so long, and then they revolted. In the meantime some elections had been held and Republicans greatly reduced the Democratic majority in Congress.

Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats joined forces in some instances, and, through this united action, reestablished the independence of Congress.

Congress now is striving to recover the prestige it lost in the "rubber stamp" era and to recover some of the authority it voted to surrender to the President.

And Mr. Roosevelt is loath to surrender the power conferred upon him in the lush days of the early thirties. His attitude is easily understood, but the support of the American people should be behind Congress, for Congress is battling for a return to constitutional government in preference to government by directive, the system now in effect.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th day of March 1944, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Admiral Vickery, Commissioner of the United States Maritime Commission, and table which showed construction of ships from February 1939 to January 31, 1944. I ask now to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Admiral Vickery, showing the completion in American shipyards during the month of February 1944, of 134 ships, totaling 1,372,864 tons dead weight, bringing deliveries since December 7, 1941, to 2,909 vessels of 29,998,127 tons. On February 29, there was delivered the first Victory ship, the S. S. *Victory*.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am forwarding herewith a chart showing tonnage deliveries under the Commission's program to the end of February 1944.

During the month of February, American merchant shipyards completed 134 ships, totaling 1,372,864 tons dead weight. At the end of the month, deliveries since December 7, 1941, aggregated 2,909 vessels of 29,998,127 tons.

Last month's output, although less than the rate attained during the later months of 1943, showed a substantial gain over January and exceeded the deliveries of February a year ago. The first Victory ship, the S. S. *United Victory*, was delivered by the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation on February 29, and from now on the shipyards which have converted from the construction of Liberties to Victories are expected to contribute an increasing portion of the total tonnage completed each month.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Truman Report Repudiates Proposals for Labor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service for March 7, 1944:

TRUMAN REPORT REPUDIATES PROPOSALS FOR LABOR DRAFT

HIGHLIGHTS OF TRUMAN REPORT

WASHINGTON, D. C.—By accident or design, the daily press overlooked or ignored the great tribute to American labor's record in this war which was contained in the 200-page third annual report of the Senate's Truman committee, which is charged with the duty of investigating the war program on the home front.

Because this report is authoritative and because it shows up the widely circulated attacks on labor's record as false propaganda, the following excerpts from the Senate committee's findings are of utmost importance:

To fulfill the Government's huge production needs, the report says, "Our workers engaged in manufacturing, mining, and agriculture contributed nearly 45 percent more man-days of work in 1943 than in 1939, despite the fact that more than 10,000,000 men were withdrawn from the labor pool for the armed forces. In manufacturing alone, our workmen contributed 89.6 percent more man-days in 1943 than in 1939.

"This astounding performance exceeds anything of its kind ever achieved in the history of the world. The results obtained are the best answer to the critics of the home front. They do not indicate perfection, but they do evidence accomplishment of a high order.

"All Americans who have participated can be justly proud, because the success is due to the accumulated efforts of the millions of people who have each done their share rather than to any miraculous planning of a few experts at the top.

"Women in particular deserve credit for filling the huge gap created by manpower requirements of the armed services. Older men who had retired from active work have returned to their jobs and because of their experience are among the most valuable of workers.

"The job that has been done not only assures that victory will be won but it assures that it will be won more quickly and with

fewer casualties. Our armed forces have more and better equipment than our foes.

"Unquestionably there have been excesses which are subject to the severest condemnation. However, we must not allow those excesses to obscure the fact that, on the whole, the performance by labor has been very good.

"The difference between man-days lost at our rate of strikes and man-days lost at the English rate of strikes when compared to total man-days worked in the United States, is only 0.025 percent.

"Strikes receive a very great amount of attention in the press because of their dramatic character and news value, and because the public properly resents these violations of labor's pledge not to obstruct the war effort by striking. However, strikes in mining, manufacturing, and construction in 1943 resulted in a loss of manpower of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the manpower actually used, whereas the manpower contributed by labor in that period exceeded that used in 1939 by 76 percent

"Recognition must be given to the difficulty of labor's present position. Its traditional aims, such as higher wages, better working conditions, and shorter hours, run counter to war needs, and for the most part labor has given up voluntarily its principal weapons for enforcing its rights. Many of the critics of labor have not done as much.

"The situation has been made more difficult by the division of labor into groups hostile to each other, and by the action of a few selfish leaders, whose success has embarrassed other no less able leaders, who have refrained from asserting demands at the point of a pistol in the hour of the country's greatest emergency."

Representation for Smaller Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address entitled "Representation for Smaller Business," delivered November 19, 1943, by Mr. Ernest H. Gaunt, of Lawrence, Mass., to the Greater Cleveland Council, Smaller Business of America, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio:

I am genuinely glad to be in Cleveland again. When I was a salesman, and later executive director of national trade associations of manufacturers, I used to visit Cleveland about twice a year for many years.

Cleveland is a great city, with a great past and present and future.

I am particularly happy and fortunate to meet with you today because I believe your Greater Cleveland Council, Smaller Business of America, to be the most continuously progressive association of smaller business in the whole United States. Fred Virkus, the able, sincere, and progressive leader of the Illinois Small Business Men's Association (which has no connection whatever with the National Small Business Men's Association of Akron), might challenge this statement of mine—but the subject is not worth argument because Mr. Virkus and his group are at least a close second to your Cleveland group.

And there is glory enough and opportunity enough for all in this small-business movement, which is only in its infancy. Some day there will be a strong, independent national organization of independent smaller businessmen who deeply believe in the preservation and advancement of competitive capitalism which made this country great. Several attempts have been made to bring about such an independent national organization. Some of you here tonight know about these attempts.

Your Cleveland group has been very wise, I think, in confining your efforts in the past year or two to greater Cleveland, in order to develop a pattern of local organization, despite your ambitious name of Smaller Business of America. I can think of some present backward local and regional groups of smaller businessmen which would be fortunate to become local or regional councils of Smaller Business of America, Inc., thus becoming coordinated with your Greater Cleveland Council into what might later become a strong, vigorous, effective, independent national group of independent smaller businessmen who believe in competitive capitalism and can and will fight to regain and maintain it against all its enemies—economic, political, monopolistic, or bureaucratic.

I stress competitive capitalism because most independent smaller businessmen do not believe in monopoly capitalism whether by the State or by any few large private aggregations, or by any "coprosperity" coalition of the two latter, as occurred in Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Falangist Spain. A prominent United States Senator from New England, himself a successful, independent, competitive small businessman, in a personal letter to me recently said—"I think it a safe assertion to say that there are people in this country powerful and well-financed who believe in Fascism—big Army, big Government, big business controlling everything, with all the little fellows working for them. I am not enough of an admirer of the German and Italian governments, however, to want to emulate them."

Independent smaller businessmen are not enemies of big businesses which are completely competitive, as are Henry Ford's and Henry Kaiser's concerns. These two, and some other large businesses, have grown big under conditions of full, fair, and free competition, without any artificial help from Government by any special legislation, subsidies, or patents. Such use as they have made of patents has been legitimate. As you all know, Henry Ford, even when a struggling small businessman, fought off the monopolistic system proposed under the Seldon patents.

Independent, smaller businessmen do not all want to grow big, as some big and even some small businessmen seem to believe; but many of them prefer to have well-rounded, self-contained, owner-operated businesses where they can sit in the driver's seat and drive the horses, instead of having the horses running wild, as often happens in large-scale businesses.

Independent smaller businessmen realize that there are some areas in which they have interests in common with large-scale business, but they also realize that there are areas where the interests of small and big business diverge, and some where the interests of these two are opposed. Smaller businessmen who have reflected carefully on the whole economic situation, do not subscribe to the slogan advanced by many big businessmen or some smaller businessmen dependent mentally or physically upon big business, that "the interests of large and small business are identical." Such thoughtful smaller businessmen also realize that there are certain dangers inherent in big business—for instance, that it can, more easily than small-scale business, become monopolistic; and can more easily be taken over by a monopolistic state Socialist government, as was done in Italy and Germany. If the big banking interests of Wall Street had been able to take over Henry Ford's concern some years ago when they made the attempt, there is no question but that the Ford Motor Co. would have united with other banker-controlled automobile companies to introduce monopolistic practices. We are all proud of the automobile industry in the United States which, under complete competition, has done a miraculous job for the consumer, the worker, and the investor—(and management has done all right, too). It was the complete competition always prevalent in that industry which gave us the fastest, best, and cheapest highway transportation that exists in the world today. Under monopolistic control we would not have had the three-way prosperity, with constantly decreasing prices for a better article, that we have received from the automobile industry.

The automobile industry has also proved of tremendous benefit to other industries which could similarly adopt mass-production methods. Even smaller concerns have learned much from the Ford Motor Co. as to factory technique. But there has been one big error by some big concerns in other than the automobile industry which really were not adapted to mass production—and even many smaller businessmen and the public have made this error—that of believing that everything big was necessarily better.

Independent smaller business, when it is not adaptable to mass production, is nevertheless usually more flexible and more efficient in operation than big business. Smaller business usually needs only adequate financing to be more efficient, in non-mass-production industries, than is big business in those industries. This was proved in part by a report made by T. N. E. C. entitled "Relative Efficiency of Large, Medium, and Small Concerns." Because all big businesses have been shown by students of scientific management like Frederick A. Taylor, to be nothing but an aggregation of small units, supposedly given an over-all efficient coordination by management—independent, owner-operated small units in any fair race, do not need to fear an undue growth of their big-business competitors if the smaller units receive adequate financing and if the larger units get no special privileges from the Government.

But the fact is, that big business has received many artificial advantages over smaller business. This can never be sufficiently stopped until independent, competitive, smaller businessmen are well organized in voluntary organizations which are all their own. A prominent Senator from the West, who has proved his steady and sincere friendship for small business (not Senator MURRAY in this case, although he, too, is of course a strong, sincere friend of small business), wrote me on October 16 in regard to S. W. P. C., "my own feeling is that we cannot find a solution of the problems of small business from Washington bureaus, whatever their name." He believes as do many others who have tried to help smaller business by Federal legislation, that such legislation has its limits in restoring full opportunity for smaller business. All smaller businessmen and their friends would take away any legislation which gives special privileges or Government financing or subsidies to big business—in other words, they would restore a fair field with no favor. But independent, competitive smaller business must chiefly act continuously and effectively to save itself and to advance and develop, asking for Government help only in such cases as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, when big business has already received

special help from Government. In such cases, competitive independent smaller businesses will need Government help in order to counterbalance the help already given to big business, and in order to be able to compete on fair and even terms.

It is clear to all who have been intimately associated with the small-business movement for the past 5 years or longer—that independent, competitive, smaller business will never be able to get a square deal from Washington bureaucrats, whether the administration is Democratic or Republican, until smaller business has adequate representation in Washington on all boards and bureaus where big business has representation.

On this subject Mr. Roger W. Babson wrote me eloquently on November 4 in reply to my request to him for a copy of an article he had written recently on small business. Mr. Babson wrote, "Times have certainly changed since you and I were in Washington during World War No. 1. At that time I was Assistant Secretary of Labor and well remember the day we spent making the rounds of a few of the Government agencies.

"At that time—25 years ago—I was very much interested in small businessmen. In fact, I had a little business of my own. My interest in this small group, who constitute the real economic backbone of our country, has continued to grow. Occasionally I have a few words to say about them as witnessed by my enclosed article.

"If I had not been Assistant Secretary of Labor during the last war, the job I would have most preferred would have been one in the Department of Commerce. This is really the one Department which can most help small business. Incidentally, I note that there is before the Senate bill No. S. 883, through which it is proposed to create a new office headed by an assistant secretary of commerce for small business. I am heartily in favor of this bill.

"Certainly, the independent and competitive small businessmen should have much more representation in the Department of Commerce than they now have. Especially, this group should be represented on the Business Advisory Council. I know there are men on the council assigned to represent the small business group, but really it seems to me that in themselves they are the big business type. I have wondered at times if they really were personally acquainted with the many problems which continually face the owners and the managers of average-sized businesses.

"A city or a town without a small business would be a good deal like a city or a town without a Sunday School. Unfortunately, it seems to me that neither the church nor the small businessman gets the public support that they deserve. Personally, I should hate very much to be dependent for my business and my personal requirements upon 'big business.' I should far rather continue to live under an economy in which small competitive businesses played an important and necessary part."

"Unfortunately the small business groups and those associated with them, who are most interested in and dependent upon their goods and services, are not alive to the dangers which face them. Certainly, they should get busy and insist upon a square deal from Washington."

The bill now before the Senate, S. 883 (and its companion bill in the House, H. R. 2201), deal with only part of the larger question—namely, adequate representation for small business in the Government wherever big business is represented. For instance, as Drew Pearson wrote on October 29, even the Smaller War Plants Corporation never succeeded in disengaging itself completely from W. P. B. which as you all know was largely staffed and controlled by $1-a-year representatives from big business. Although the Senate Committee on Small Business, together with the House Committee on Small Business, had refused to be intimidated by Jesse Jones of the R. F. C. when they created S. W. P. C., because Jesse Jones' R. F. C. had made a dismal failure of helping to finance small business—Mr. Pearson said it is a fact that S. W. P. C. never has been able to completely divorce itself from W. P. B.

Prior to S. W. P. C., Robert L. Mehornay, a Midwest small businessman, attempted to help small business when he was in charge of a "defense contract service." The second attempt was made under O. P. M. by Floyd Odlum, a sincere friend of small business who himself has a small business of his own outside of his large investment corporation. The third move was the creation of S. W. P. C., which was passed despite tough opposition from Jesse Jones, the modern Pooh-Bah of Washington who with his many other jobs is Secretary of Commerce.

S. W. P. C. was amply financed, with a splendid national board first headed by Lou Holland, a small businessman from Kansas City who was sincere and hard-working but unaccustomed to red tape and the "bloody bickering of Government agencies." W. P. B., jealous of the new outfit, insisted on keeping it on a strangle-hold leash. S. W. P. C. could not employ a messenger or spend a dime without W. P. B.'s approval which was controlled by 1,150 $1-a-year-men, who were in W. P. B. manipulating affairs for their own big companies and freezing out smaller firms.

All of the work of S. W P. C. outside of Washington was done by W P. B. field employees. S. W. P. C. put up the money and W. P. B. spent it, very inefficiently Drew Pearson reported that when assailed behind closed doors for this mismanagement, Wade Childress, Director of W. P. B. field operations brazenly told S. W. P. C. officials coldly—"Well, what of it? When you were not looking we spent your money. What are you going to do about it?"

Able, sincere small businessman Lou Holland was doomed from the start. Following him came Brig. Gen. Robert Johnson, medium-sized businessman who was hard-hitting, idealistic, and determined to do a job for independent smaller business. He worked very hard for small business. But W. P. B. refused to let him have the 1,700 field employees whose salary S. W. P C. actually paid. He had to be content with only 400, largely undesirables.

Now General Johnson has had to retire, suffering from stomach ulcers.

The latest move is the probable appointment of Morris L. Cooke, an able industrial engineer, to become chairman of S. W. P. C. and to unravel what Drew Pearson calls "the toughest economic job of the war—the plight of small business."

All of the foregoing has a decided bearing on S. 883 which proposes to create an assistant secretary of commerce for small business. As I testified before the Senate Commerce Committee when it held a hearing on S. 883 on May 27, 1943, this new office could be one way of giving smaller business additional representation, and within that department of the Government which, as Roger Babson pointed out, "is really the one department which can most help small business." But in my testimony I also pointed out that if this new office were weakened or perverted or not given a sufficient appropriation, or with the wrong man at its head, it might turn out to be just another disappointment to smaller businessmen, who would think they were actually getting something by the mere passage of this bill using the name of small business.

My feeling today regarding S. 883, is that it has already been weakened by some amendments accepted by the Senate Commerce Committee at the suggestion of Jesse Jones. None of the safeguarding amendments which I suggested to that committee were accepted.

My view of the situation today regarding this bill is that unless the proper and adequate safeguarding amendments are made—it would better be killed. We do not want to have another governmental agency which uses the name of small business, used to do a job on small business for big business rather than for small business.

Such a job on small business may be done unless smaller businessmen, who are alert, as your group is, to the possibility for good or evil in this measure, will give further study to it and will vigorously support safeguarding amendments to S. 883, and to have all weakening amendments thrown out.

I believe that the best way to have this done is to have this bill, S. 883, given another hearing, this time before the Senate Committee on Small Business which consists of able and sincere and vigorous friends of competitive, independent smaller businessmen, as proved by the practically unanimous way in which that whole committee, consisting of men from both parties, have from the start, voted together. It appears now that there is a very good chance that this bill, S. 883, may be given a hearing soon by the Senate Committee on Small Business if small business groups, as yours, will vigorously press their Senators to have this done. If so, this will furnish a second opportunity to perhaps provide for an assistant secretary of commerce for small business within the Department of Commerce, which can be a real start toward more adequate representation within the Department of Commerce for independent, competitive, smaller businessmen. I say this despite the fact that I do not believe Jesse Jones, the head of that Department, is a sincere or understanding friend of smaller business. I do not discount his great ability or his power, but I do not consider him, a big businessman, the type who should ever have been made Secretary of Commerce, to serve the 98 percent of business which small business is.

An alternative to having this proposed assistant secretary of commerce for small business put under Jesse Jones could be to have a separate bureau set up like the Federal Trade Commission which would be frankly called the Department of Small Business with its head a member of the Cabinet. I know that some important and thoughtful friends of small business have been thinking along these latter lines.

It is the functions which an Assistant Secretary of Commerce should carry on, which are important, whether they are carried on by the proposed Assistant Secretary to serve within the Department of Commerce; or whether in a new and separate agency; or whether they be assigned to S. W. P. C. under new legislation divorcing it completely from W. P. B. and making S. W. P. C. ready to become a Smaller Peace Plants Corporation to have control over the disposal of the $25,000,000,000 of Government-owned war plants and equipment and the $50,000,000,000 of probable surplus war goods when the war ends.

I personally look upon the last-named possibility as the very best way to give adequate additional representation to smaller business, that is to greatly strengthen S. W. P. C. and make it into a permanent post-war agency.

Referring again to S. 883, there has not been enough crystallization of thought by small businessmen as to what these functions should be. What do you think such an Assistant Secretary of Commerce should be expected to do? Shall he, at the start, simply be an information center regarding all governmental activities in Washington which do or may affect smaller business? That would

be a very valuable function, because if such an Assistant Secretary were the proper man with ample funds, he could save smaller businessmen who have the temerity to go to Washington thinking they can accomplish something there—from getting the brush-off and the run-around by small or big bureaucrats. Such a proper information bureau solely for the purpose of helping independent, competitive smaller businessmen, had it been in existence when this war started, might have saved the bacon of many smaller businesses which have been forced out of business or are now on the edge of bankruptcy, or will be, when this war is over. It would be the nearest thing to the many well-financed lobbies in Washington, of big business, of labor, or of the big corporation, and commercial farmers.

This friend of small businessmen, even though well-run and amply financed, would, however, suffer the same fate as did N. R. A., and as has S. W. P. C. to too great a degree—unless it were constantly protected by many live, ably conducted, progressive and forward-looking groups like yours here in Cleveland. These groups in turn would need to have some kind of national coordination without giving too much power to the central organization.

Such an alert group of coordinated smaller business associations could prevent the complete perversion of the office of assistant secretary of commerce for small business even if it were put under Jesse Jones. It would be properly protected only by immediate and widespread exposure of any perversions by the Department of Commerce under Jesse Jones, or by any other agency or person in the Government that was working to use it for the purposes of big and monopoly business, or to make it "run the errands of big business or big business organizations; or do a job on small business instead of doing a job for small business."

The proper kind of assistant secretary of commerce for small business, the new office proposed in S. 883 would, among other things, if it had been in existence 5 years ago, have issued long before now, a small business manual such as has recently been definitely proposed to the Small Business Unit of the Department of Commerce, to be prepared and issued by that Small Business Unit. Such a small business manual would have all the statistics and facts which have been widely distributed during the past 5 years, but never collected authoritatively in any one volume. It would show the great assistance which the various agencies of the Federal Government, especially the many divisions of the Department of Commerce, could specifically give to smaller businessmen.

The nearest approach to such a small business manual is a publication by the Small Business Unit of the Department of Commerce, issued in July 1943, entitled "Small Business—a National Asset." Another publication of that Small Business Unit, titled "390 Bills—a Digest of Proposals Considered in Congress in Behalf of Small Business—1933–42," will be released to the press tomorrow, November 20.

S. W. P. C. was started 2 years too late. The new office proposed by S. 883 is also late in even being proposed, and it may be very late when it even gets properly and adequately established. But it is true that "better late than never." It has been the hope of myself and many others, for a long time, that small businessmen would some day be sufficiently self-conscious of their distinctive and separate interests from those of big business, and would crystallize its ideas and implement them with a strong national coordinated group of local and regional small business associations—so that small business would not always be too late with too little.

One of the best-informed and most intelligent friends of smaller business now in Washington in an important position—who himself is an independent, competitive, smaller businessman—wrote me on November 10 saying that he had been working to get each governmental agency to establish a small-business unit and then to tie these together into a small-business council. The Small Business Unit already established in the Department of Justice would cooperate in such a council, but it is doubtful whether Jesse Jones would allow the Small Business Unit now in the Department of Commerce to give real cooperation to such a council. If he had really wanted to give real cooperation to small business, he could have arranged to have the functions of the proposed assistant secretary of commerce assigned to the existing Small Business Unit in the Department of Commerce. Why have this additional agency of assistant secretary of commerce for small business which, by the way, is really the "baby" of the Department of Commerce? Does Jesse Jones think he can fool us again—merely by giving us a new agency with the name of small business in its title? If he had a real desire to help smaller business, why didn't he, long ago, give real representation to it on the Business Advisory Council? And why didn't he give real power and funds to his present Small Business Unit?

The philosophy that good things come slowly is not a sufficient excuse to keep smaller businessmen throughout this Nation from going ahead very much faster in their organizational work than they have done during the past 5 years. There were feeble attempts made in Germany to get smaller businessmen to get together voluntarily before the advent of Hitler, but these attempts were altogether too feeble and altogether too late. What happened was that Hitler took into camp the smaller businessmen of Germany and the middle class, completely fooling them, while he was secretly being financed and was forming a coprosperity alliance with the big and monopoly business of Germany. I have recently seen it stated by an anti-Nazi, who knows Germany well, that the middle class and independent, smaller business in Germany are now totally eliminated and probably will stay permanently eliminated. Such smaller businessmen as will exist in Germany will be permanent dependents upon big and monopoly business, or permanent subcontractors in an industrial feudal empire wherein they are vassals to a few prime contractors who will have the entire control and nearly all the profits.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of T. N. E. C., in a recent final statement of T. N. E. C., Senate Document No. 39 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, titled "The Preservation of Economic Freedom," has warned against exactly this kind of industrial feudalism within the United States and against the coprosperity alliance in this country of United States big business and the United States Government. He says, in part, "Small business has been swallowed up by big business and big business is now confronted with the danger of being swallowed up by Government. * * *

"If we are to avoid an all-powerful central government, we have no recourse but to reestablish and encourage free, private enterprise; that is to say, private enterprise which will be free from the arbitrary control of private organization as well as public organization." He recommends, among other things, "the effective and thorough enforcement of the antitrust laws to maintain competition and to prevent all combinations and agreements that destroy business"; and "the encouragement of new business and small enterprise * * *"; and a national conference called by Congress of the various organizations representative of business (small as well as big), labor, agriculture, and consumers—in order to concentrate public thought and opinion on the objectives on which there is general agreement, instead of, as now, on the objectives concerning which there is only misunderstanding, suspicion, and disagreement."

To close by summing up—regulation of smaller businessmen by Government—maybe even regimentation is coming—without representation for smaller businessmen in the Government, is tyranny. This tyranny over small business showed its ugly head first under N. R. A., and again under W. P. B. The first sign of cutting off that dragon's head was S. W. P. C., but that agency will pass out or be neutralized or emasculated, unless it is immediately freed completely from W. P. B. and given additional strength.

Most of the foolish handicaps placed upon small business during this war—and I refer only to those regulations and reports which were really foolish—would have been prevented if independent, competitive, smaller business had been adequately represented in Washington in all agencies where big and/or monopoly business had representation.

In the post-war period, we smaller businessmen are going to need representation in all Government agencies fully as much as we have needed it and still need it during this war.

Where there's a will, there's a way. Jesse Jones and W. P. B. haven't had the will.

Gentlemen of the Greater Cleveland Council, smaller business of America—have you the will? I believe you have, and that you also have the brains and ability and independent spirit.

I pass the ball to you.

Columbia Basin Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior:

Discussions which will pave the way for construction of canals to irrigate a million acres of land from Grand Coulee Dam, part of the Columbia Basin reclamation project in Washington, will be opened during the week of March 12, Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, announced today.

Repayment contracts will be discussed with directors of three irrigation districts concerned. The meetings will be called by Regional Director Frank A. Banks, with Regional Counsel H. R. Stinson, recently named to that post, assisting him. Time and places of the conferences will be announced later by Mr. Banks.

Commissioner Bashore also announced that several preliminary determinations that are basic to the terms of the repayment contract have been made by the Secretary of the Interior. Principal among these determinations is that $85 per irrigable acre shall be the average amount of irrigation-construction costs to be paid by the water users, based on net irrigable acreage in the project. This will mean that the total amount for

construction to be paid by the water users will be approximately $85,000,000.

Three other related and important determinations were made at the same time. These were: (1) That repayment contracts would be drafted to permit of the maximum development period of 10 years for each block of irrigation land, (2) that the repayment contracts would provide for the maximum repayment period of 40 years for each block of irrigation land exclusive of the development period, and (3) that the contracts would provide for the adjustment of the annual payments on a basis that reflects the current year's farm income as compared with what might be regarded as the normal farm income for that year.

In announcing these preliminary determinations, Mr. Bashore pointed out that there were several matters bearing on the repayment obligations of each of the three irrigation districts in the project yet to be determined. Among these are the determinations of the total amount each district is to assume and the manner in which the obligation is to be distributed among the irrigable lands of each district. It is expected that determinations on these matters will be made early this summer after drafting of the repayment contracts has progressed further.

A Few Kind Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as we move further toward a glorious and successful termination of this global war, we recall the several stages we have passed.

As evidence of the far-sightedness of my own people, I beg leave to insert herewith a newspaper clipping from the Anderson (S. C.) Independent, as quoted from the New York Herald Tribune's editorial.

Indeed, all of us have a rich heritage in the record now being made by our men across the seas:

A FEW KIND WORDS

It is not often that a northern newspaper is gracious enough to come out editorially and say good words for the South.

When that happens, it is an event worth recording.

Hence the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune is welcomed with open columns:

Says the forceful anti-Roosevelt, anti-anything-Democratic newspaper, under the heading: "Ready as always."

"Resistance to tyrants came naturally to men of southern upbringing, and willingness to fight for liberty and against aggression has been part of their history since the landing in Jamestown.

"There are few isolationists among southern statesmen, and they, for the most part, are considered alien to their heritage and are held in considerable disesteem.

"The recent record of the South in world affairs is inspiring. Lend-lease would have been beaten in Congress but for southern votes.

"When the first year of the first draft expired, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, it was southern Members of Congress who insured its extension.

"When, by 1 vote, Congress decided not to send all the soldiers home it was the South that turned the scale. Representatives of 12 Southern States cast 102 votes in favor of extending the draft and only 6 votes against it.

"The farsighted view of affairs across the oceans, illustrated by these statesman-like steps in time of world crisis, is the more remarkable when it is remembered what might have been the South's natural preoccupation with its growing interest in foreign markets, and particularly in export of cotton and tobacco.

"It is reassuring to find that other parts of the United States, undisturbed by economic changes and the terrific ordeal of civil war, maintain their patriotism and that it responds instantly to challenge."

Kibitzing the Gwibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the All-American Gwibit—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 15, 1943, page 10730, for definition—continues to plague and perplex the Republic although there are encouraging signs from several sources indicating that an aroused populace is beginning to insist effectively that bureaucracy be trimmed and efficiency extended. An even greater cause for encouragement is the increasing attention which Congress is devoting to distinguishing between good public civil servants and bumbling, bumptious bureaucrats. It is as important to protect and preserve the former as it is to detect and decrease the latter.

When I addressed the House last December 15 on the theme of how to stop a "gwibit," I did so with the humble hope that in some small way I might help focus public attention upon some of the foibles of bureaucracy, upon the demonstrable fact that our present army of more than 3,000,000 bureaucrats is far in excess of actual wartime needs, and upon the fact that an informed and aroused public opinion could and should take appropriate steps to insist that manpower hoarding in Washington be terminated and that functions of government formerly handled by State and local governments be systematically returned to them. It was also my purpose to emphasize that by refraining from calling upon government in Washington to handle matters which can be taken care of by citizens or communities every individual can contribute to the prevention of the continued expansion of the bureaucratic machine.

Since last December, I have been gratified by the many communications I have received offering cooperation in the crusade against the all-American "gwibit." Many magazines and newspapers have reprinted all or portions of my remarks, cartoonists have added their talents to depicting the antics of the "gwibits," poets have been kibitizing the "gwibit" in verse, and several trade journals and individuals have circulated reprints of the address. I, myself, ordered two sets of reprints which were mailed out until the supply was exhausted and I no longer felt justified in circulating them at my own expense. Such publications as Pathfinder magazine, the New York World-Telegram, the Industrial News Review, Newsweek, Finance, the New York Times, the Washington Times-Herald, the Farmer-Stockman of Oklahoma City, and others, have been helpful in giving widespread circulation to the war on the "gwibit."

Several poems have recently come into the office on the subject in addition to two songs—neither of which I shall attempt to sing to you. All in all, the manner in which the "gwibit" goes marching along and the volunteers to the stop "gwibit" movement continue to be recruited indicate that America is awakening to the fact that in this Republic we always get the type of government which we deserve and that we can have the kind of government we want provided we want it bad enough to work for it. In other words there is never anything wrong in this country which we cannot correct at the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude these remarks with a verse entitled "The Gwibit," which came to me through the mails this week and which appeared as part of the syndicated newspaper column the Once Over, widely published by H. I. Phillips.

THE GWIBIT

Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, proposes the organization of a guild of Washington incompetent bureaucratic idea throat cutters to be known as Gwibits.

A Gwibit loves his desk so grand
To hold things he can't understand;
He must have clips and spikes and files
And wire baskets in all styles;
And as he fills 'em, one by one,
He blithely chirps, "Well, now that's done!"
When anything has gone astray
"We're looking into that," he'll say.

A Gwibit thinks it is such fun
When ten words do the work of one.
He thinks long letters are a gem—
That is if he is writing them.
He loves ideas, however slim,
Provided they're thought up by him.
This is the phrase that makes him glow:
"We'll check on that and let you know."

A Gwibit is a fellow who
Resents ideas that come from you;
He sees no good in plans by gents
Who've had a wide experience;
It fills him full of deepest doubt
If you know what you talk about;
These words he worships, boy, and how:
"It's under our advisement now."

If he suspects you know your stuff
A Gwibit's way is extra rough;
He loves to take a plan that's sound
And see it get the run around;
Great satisfaction does he get
From saying, "File this—and forget!"
When Gwibits die they tell Saint Pete,
"You'll have to wait; just take a seat."

—*H. I. Phillips.*

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Chicago Times, and I repeat, the Chicago Times.

This article contains an expression from one of the country's foremost citizens, Mr. Marshall Field 3d, a man with a splendid military record who, unlike other rich men, is not seeking to accumulate greater wealth but who is using his wealth to aid the cause of the common people of his country. He is the publisher of two of the most independent newspapers in the United States, neither of which is published for profit but for the purpose of giving to the people factual information and true unbiased news. The article is as follows:

F. D. R. NEEDED FOR FOURTH TERM, FIELD DECLARES

CLEVELAND, March 11.—Publisher Marshall Field, of Chicago and New York, here to address the City Club, remarked today in an interview that President Roosevelt "is needed in this time of trouble."

Smiling, Field added: "If Mr. Roosevelt will consent to a fourth term, it won't make a damn bit of difference whom the Republicans nominate."

Field declared the Nazi war effort "would entail far less danger were there not in the United States a noisy minority who, day by day and month by month, strive to destroy America's confidence in her allies."

"These champions of disunity," said Field in an address before Cleveland's City Club, "seeks to incite a positive hatred of the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Some of them have enough venom left over to preach the same hate of China."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from congratulating this great, independent, fearless American for his fearless expression. I observe that he keenly resents the unfair and unjustifiable attacks made upon the President, and I believe with him that regardless of these scurrilous attacks they will not avail his haters as I feel, in the interest of the future of our country, he will consent to serve the country for another 4 years. There is no doubt in my mind that the honest, intelligent people will reelect him, because there is no other man who can better safeguard and protect our country's interests at the peace table and who also enjoys the confidence of the people of other nations. After this hellish war that we have been forced into is over, it will require strong and representative leaders to bring about agreement for a lasting peace and the elimination of future wars.

Secretary for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, 11,000,000 men and women will have worn the uniform of the United States by the time this war is over. Except for a small number of them, most of these American citizens will be returned to their peacetime pursuits and occupations. Although there is a lot of talk and paper planning with regard to ways and means of handling the problems of these veterans, there has not yet emerged a single comprehensive plan that will meet the situation adequately.

Even those veterans who are being discharged now for medical and other reasons are finding it bewildering to make the proper contact with the right agency to help them with their immediate problems.

A veteran does not know which way to turn or where to go. He is shunted from the United States Employment Service to the War Manpower Commission, to the Veterans' Administration for rehabilitation, perhaps to the United States Civil Service Commission for public jobs, to the State unemployment insurance system for unemployment insurance benefits, to the Social Security Board to ascertain his old-age benefit rights, to the Army Emergency Relief or the Navy League for immediate aid, to the War Risk Insurance office to check on the continuance of his insurance, and so forth.

Not only is the veteran bewildered and amazed but he soon discovers that one Federal agency does not mesh gears with other agencies dealing with the problems which confront him upon his release from service.

The necessity is obvious for immediate coordination of all of the services and facilities now provided and to be provided for veterans. When we consider that the problem of the returned veteran is not his alone but affects all of the members of his family, we realize that from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 will be affected directly or indirectly by a full veterans' program after the war. It is good common sense to stop, consider, and realize that any program which affects so many millions of people is worthy of the best thinking and planning that American brainpower and ingenuity can devise. With so gigantic a problem, the obvious solution is to set into our Government framework a new department headed by a Cabinet officer called secretary for veterans.

Such a new department would immediately take to itself all of the scattered divisions, bureaus, units, and so forth, in various governmental agencies and weld them together into one cohesive organization with a single purpose, namely, effective aid to the veteran and his dependents.

Such a new veterans' department headed by a Cabinet officer would provide the following services and facilities for veterans:

First. Obtaining employment for the veteran in occupations for which he is fitted by training and experience, thus giving the right job to the right man, without waste of ability and skills in humdrum jobs.

Second. Retraining well and wounded veterans to take bigger jobs than they left before going into service. This means providing technical schools, training schools, home aids, and so forth, for them.

Third. Providing intelligent vocational guidance for veterans, especially for those young men who never had a job but went directly from high school into the Army. This would provide an intelligent searching of a man's capabilities in order to guide him to the right vocation for the rest of his life.

Fourth. Full educational opportunities at the primary-shool, high-school, and college level for the veterans who want to obtain education to fit them for better places in life.

Fifth. Opening opportunities for veterans in public service, giving them preference in civil-service positions.

Sixth. Allowing opportunities to veterans to make homesteads for themselves in undeveloped areas of the country and in Alaska, giving them the land, the tools, and the equipment on the most liberal of terms.

Seventh. Undertaking a vast public-works program with preference given to veterans in it.

Eighth. Providing veterans with unemployment insurance benefits until they get adjusted.

Ninth. Providing adequate medical, dental, and nursing care for veterans and their families, possibly under a broad scheme of health insurance for them.

Tenth. Encouraging and aiding veterans to continue their war-risk insurance during their civilian lives.

Eleventh. A comprehensive public-housing program with preferences to veterans.

Twelfth. Intelligent and scientific facilities to restore the shell-shocked and mentally disturbed veterans to normal life.

Thirteenth. Promulgation of adequate laws to protect veterans in seeking return to their former jobs and restoring to them all their seniority rights and privileges as if they had never gone into service.

Fourteenth. A system of free scholarships to children of veterans to enable them to complete their education.

Fifteenth. An adequate and sensible system of pensions to the survivors of veterans when they pass on.

Sixteenth. An intelligent and comprehensive program of disability insurance to wounded and disabled veterans with full medical care and financial aid.

The panoramic scope of a full veterans' program, which is by no means exhausted by the foregoing 16 points, makes it imperative that all of these things and more should not be dissipated by being distributed among various agencies and having a clash of administration. Good, common sense dictates that there should be coordination of all these efforts without duplication and without shunting the returned veterans from pillar to post.

The time is now, and not when certain victory comes. We must be prepared for the peace in direct contrast to our lack of preparation for the war. We were caught unawares at Pearl Harbor, and that should be a lesson to us. We must not be caught unawares when peace comes.

Few, if any of us, can ever erase from our memories the horrible spectre of those who risked their lives in World War No. 1 reduced to the menial peddling of apples on the street corners of our great metropolises. This must never happen again, for it can be eliminated with positiveness by appropriate action here and now.

Having gone through that war myself, and having seen men struggle, suffer, bleed, and die, or return to the even greater torture of a belabored and handicapped future without an eye, or an arm, or a leg, I am perhaps more keenly sensitive of their problems and the almost insurmountable difficulties which stand in their way of solving them. These men do not want charity. They have already proven themselves the greatest givers of charity. They have demonstrated and written into history with their blood, and many of them with a life of suffering, that they are the modern exemplaries of the age-old biblical words, "Greater love than this no man hath, than that he lay down his life for his friend." They did just that, and they are uncomplaining.

But is that any reason why we of the Congress should forget them, or neglect our solemn duty to the men who made such supreme sacrifices that we here might continue to legislate freely for a free people? I do not think so. It is merely a case of too many other matters of apparently immediate urgency, which cause us at times to put off what should and must be done first.

It is for this reason that I propose, through bill No. 4208, to consolidate all veterans' activities under a Cabinet head, responsible directly to the President of the United States. These veterans and the millions which will be added to their ranks when this war is over are the plain, simple folks of your districts and mine. Many of them do not understand complicated administrative procedures and routines, and when such complicated administrative machinery, in its spread-eagle distribution hither and yon through governmental agencies, goes beyond the understanding of the veteran, he invariably interprets it as a side-stepping of the sacred duty toward him, which we in the Congress acknowledge and act upon, but which too often bogs down in a maze of administrative procedures.

I sincerely ask this Congress to inquire, Is there any group in this great land which is more deserving of the greatest and highest attention to their problems than the men who risked their lives and gave their blood, their faculties, and their limbs on the battlefield that this Nation might live? Are they less entitled to a Cabinet chair for the direction of their affairs than the farmers, or labor, or business, each of which now enjoys that dignity?

Right now over 10,000,000 persons are affected directly or indirectly by the administration of veterans' affairs. When the war is over another 20,000,000 will be added to that, counting in all dependents. Can we afford to overlook or ignore so large a section of our national life? And their problems will become more involved and multiplied as the years pass.

We cannot let them down.

Now on the question of altering the voting age for men and women in service. Someone away back in history decided that children cease to be infants only after they reach the age of 21. And in accordance with that idea or theory, the right to vote was withheld and men were not permitted a voice in government until they had reached that age.

But now we are virtually dependent for the survival of all forms of decent government on young men from 18 and beyond. Dint of circumstance has forced us to change our concepts about when boys become men. Young men under 21 now fight and die to preserve a government in which they have no voice. In 1776 men rebelled because they were refused representation in government. Yet, today, we ask them to die and do not offer them even that.

In the last World War, I was a member of New York's "Fighting Sixty-ninth" at 17 years of age. Of course, no one asked me to do that, and it was not required as it is today, from men under 21. At 18 I went through hell in France for a cause I believed in and a country I loved. By the ripe old age of 20, I had gone through the battles on seven fronts and was maimed for the rest of my life. And all this to preserve a system which denied me a vote.

Gentlemen, let not history record our short-sightedness in measuring the right to vote by the passage of chronological time, rather than by the willingness of men to face fire and blood and imminent death to preserve the right to vote—for all of us. By giving all members of the armed forces over 18 the right to vote let us proclaim to our sons and daughters, and for history, that our supreme confidence in them does not extend to or stop at their courage and ability to defend and preserve us in war with their blood, but carries over to their wise and judicious use of our greatest peacetime right—the free exercise of the ballot.

Give them at least this, as a paltry exchange for all they are giving us.

Joint Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial:

House Joint Memorial 1

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

Whereas documented reports of our State Department and continuous despatches from Europe, while telling a horrible story of the atrocities to which the conquered peoples of Europe are being subjected, definitely reveal that the Jewish people of these occupied countries have been specifically earmarked for utter annihilation; and

Whereas until now the world has, with great horror, learned that more than 3,000,000 of innocent Jewish men and women and children have been subjected to death by tortures unparalleled in human history in lands where their fathers and forefathers have lived for centuries; and

Whereas there now remains in these occupied countries many millions of those who escaped these mass annihilations by the generosity of their non-Jewish friends, who are engaged in heroic underground activities to defeat our common enemy and who are waiting for the hour of liberation; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America, on behalf of civilized humanity, initiated the War Refugee Board, a governmental agency, to do all it can to save those who can still be saved; to find for them havens of refuge; and

Whereas we must recognize that while it is our duty to secure the rights of each individual to return to his or her former residence, hundreds of thousands of these Jewish victims will be unable to return to their former countries, which inevitably will recall to them the horrible death of their loved ones, thus clearly demonstrating the urgent need to end the homelessness of the Jewish people; and

Whereas we have observed with admiration the reconstruction of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, resulting from the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations' mandate entrusted to Great Britain with the sanction of our country, and have watched with pride the great role played in the upbuilding of Palestine by the Jewish people, a community which contributed greatly to the war efforts of the United Nations and simultaneously absorbing hundreds of thousands of refugees from European countries; and

Whereas Palestine possesses, through modern irrigation and industrial development, the absorptive capacity, and Palestinian Jewry is willing to assume the responsibility of resettling their brethren, victims of the Nazi persecution in large numbers; and

Whereas resolutions have been presented in the House of Representatives and the Senate

of the United States of America on this subject, and read as follows:

"Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved 'That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected'; and

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Legislature now in special session at Olympia, Wash., hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to reaffirm the unanimous stand of the Congress in June 1922, and adopt the above-mentioned bipartisan resolution, which will bring succor to the victims of Nazi persecution by keeping the doors of Palestine wide open and enable the Jewish people to reconstitute there a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Passed the house March 2, 1944.

EDWARD J. REILLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 3, 1944.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

White Paper Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 6, at an exceptionally large mass meeting of citizens held in Union City, N. J., at which I was privileged to speak, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State to exert their best efforts to have abrogated the white paper issued by the British Government in 1939:

Whereas Lord Balfour on behalf of the British Government in 1917 issued the now famous declaration pledging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; and

Whereas 52 nations, including the United States, endorsed the mandate of Palestine to Great Britain for the eventual establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; and

Whereas contrary to the mandate and the spirit thereof the Chamberlain government during the period of the inglorious appeasement policy issued the white paper which prohibits and restricts Jewish immigration and land settlement in Palestine after March 31, 1944, at a time when millions of Jews have suffered horrible persecution and extermination at the hands of the Nazis and are now homeless and wandering throughout Europe; and

Whereas out of Palestine alone, tens of thousands of Jews are engaged in the Allied ranks giving their lives on many fronts; and

Whereas certain inimical forces are now trying to stop an overwhelmingly favorable Congress from passing the pending resolutions for the abrogation of the white paper by raising the unfounded but clever subterfuge of delaying tactics because of military considerations: Now be it

Resolved, That at an emergency mass meeting of the communities of Union City, Weehawken, West New York, North Bergen, Guttenberg, Secaucus, and Hoboken, in Hudson County, N. J., we do hereby memorialize Congress and the President of the United States and Secretary of State to the end that they exert their best efforts toward the immediate support and passage of the present resolutions in their entirety with respect to the abrogation of the white paper and the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth now pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee known as the Wright-Compton resolutions (H. R. 418, 419) and the Wagner-Taft resolution pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That telegrams expressing the sentiments of this mass meeting be immediately wired to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, and the committees and their representatives before whom such resolutions are now pending.

White Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the editorial printed in Il Progresso, of New York City, on March 12, 1944, entitled "Justice for Salaried People," is indeed an eloquent plea for justice on behalf of white-collar workers.

Time and again reference has been made on this floor to the economic plight of the white-collar workers. Much sympathy has been expressed on their behalf and, yet, nothing has been done to alleviate their condition.

Perhaps, if more newspapers follow the example of Il Progresso and continue to focus attention on the unfairness of the treatment being accorded to these workers, then we may be able to crystallize public opinion, so as to force relief for them. As matters now stand, the plight of those workers is a national disgrace.

The editorial follows:

JUSTICE FOR SALARIED PEOPLE

Recent weeks have seen arguments fly thick and fast among economic experts over the rising cost of living. Leaders of organized labor have challenged the correctness of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics yardstick for measuring the mounting prices. Economists for the more than 12,000,000 unionized workers have shown pretty strong proof that living costs have soared far higher than official figures indicate. We believe that the average housewife will very largely agree with them.

But there is another angle to this dispute that deserves immediate attention—and correction. We have in mind the economic plight of the salaried people—the so-called white-collar workers, lower paid Government employees like firemen, teachers, and sanitation department workers and other folks who must exist on fixed incomes in the face of rapidly increasing costs of living. Fifteen million in this group have been suffering real injustice. Being largely unorganized, they have not had the means to bring pressure to bear for lifting their static salaries so as to meet the skyrocketing prices. So sad is their state of affairs that even William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, who has consistently resisted wage increases, has pleaded in their behalf before the Senate subcommittee inquiring into the plight of salaried people.

It is crassly unfair to force hundreds of thousands of school teachers and other employees of city, county, and State governments to fall so hopelessly behind in the heartbreaking race to catch up with the cost of living. No formula is sacred enough to serve as an excuse or reason for not making the necessary adjustments. Elementary fairness demands that the salary inequities and substandards of living should be corrected. Those who might think that this is a debate over some abstract theories, should consult the concrete and detailed testimony presented to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

We refer, for instance, to the graphic and convincing picture painted by John Alessi, a truck driver for the New York City department of sanitation, of his difficulties in making ends meet for his family of five. Skyward prices, higher income taxes and other deductions, long hours of labor, hazardous work especially during snow clearing, and a frozen salary were no combination to bring joy into his home. When in the midst of it all, his wife gave birth to twins and his wages were garnisheed, it was very hard for Mrs. Alessi to get up even a week end macaroni dinner.

And the story told by a local librarian was no less touching: "I make my own clothes and I get one good and cheap meal a day at the library, but after 4 years of college training plus another year's study of library work and 9 years actual library work, I still can't afford life insurance." No matter how much granite-hearted economists may juggle their figures, no one can refute or keep silent about these simple and striking facts of life brought home so effectively by the librarian, Miss Kortenbeutel.

That women salaried workers have been particularly up against it, is confirmed beyond a shadow of doubt by the report just issued by the New York State Department of Labor. This study discloses that the average working woman in the Empire State receives a weekly salary of $29.97—and is taking home much less after bond purchases, income, and social security tax payments are deducted. Obviously, many of our expert statisticians have been dead wrong when they were complaining and telling us that salaried women workers have been pouring out their "fabulous" incomes for fur coats and orchids.

We hope that the subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee will not merely listen to stirring pleas by salaried workers or their spokesmen. We hope that our worthy Senators will be able to work out some practical legislation for remedying this crying need of our many millions of salaried employees and their families. Continued substandard conditions of life are a threat not only to the welfare of those hard hit by them.

The health of our entire community will be endangered unless prompt and energetic steps are taken to abolish this rank injustice to so many millions of Americans.

We must never forget that a healthy home front is vital to a triumphant battle front. A weakened America is not an America at its best. We cannot conquer injustice abroad if we allow injustice to plague us at home. And what all mankind needs most today is an America that is just—an America that is at its best.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article by M. W. Fodor, which appeared recently in the Chicago Sun, entitled "Who Dares to Judge Value of Lend-Lease?"

WHO DARES TO JUDGE VALUE OF LEND-LEASE?

(By M. W. Fodor)

During a recent visit to Washington I attended a hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on lend-lease. Under Secretary of State Stettinius and the Administrator of lend-lease, Leo Crowley, testified. I was surprised by the almost unanimous respect that Mr. Stettinius enjoyed from all members of the committee. Mr. Crowley was subjected to rougher handling from the Republican side. I found it, however, most significant that all sides have begun to refer to lend-lease as the "lend-lease debt" which may leave the same impression after this war as the war-debt question left after the last world conflagration.

Yet only 3 days after this hearing I heard a colonel of the American Air Force on the Sunday Columbia World Round-up speak from London about his exploits over Berlin. This was soon after the first all-American raid on the German capital. The colonel, from Texas, vividly described the magnificent work carried out by his flyers. What interested me most, however, was his reference to the weakness of German aerial defenses, especially the absence of fighting planes during that raid.

LEND-LEASE IN REVERSE?

"When we raided Bremen 3 months ago we were met by as many as 300 German fighting planes that made our work rather hot over the German port. Since then the R. A. F. has succeeded in bringing such destruction to the German fighting-plane factories, that our boys, despite other difficulties, were happy to miss German fighter opposition on a large scale," stated the Texan officer.

Is not the magnificent achievement of the Royal Air Force a kind of reverse lend-lease? After all, the sacrifice and losses by the British Air Force have enabled us to fly over Germany now with losses much reduced since the days of Schweinfurt.

It is the same with Russia. Her sacrifice in lives will make our invasion of Europe easier. Russia has suffered losses amounting to twenty to twenty-five million dead in this war, consisting of those killed in battles, in air raids, through starvation and disease. Can we measure her lend-lease in lives against our lend-lease in dollars?

HOW TO AVOID ANOTHER WAR

No doubt, our sacrifices are great in money. For a long time our pockets will feel the brunt of this war through taxation. Yet money can be restored through new effort, new work, new industry. The lives of the lost pilots of the R. A. F. and the Russian fighters of the eastern front are a permanent loss to their countries.

We are a young and vigorous country with immense resources. We still think that we can rely on ourselves or that our physical strength will always be enough to withstand future attacks. Yet this war should have taught us that no country is strong and rich enough to resist a coalition of enemies. Even Germany whose military machine was built up through 200 years, required allies in this war. Can we remain aloof after victory and retire to our own frontiers as some of the "nationalists" suggest? That is impossible. And if we fail to understand the necessity of cooperation with other nations to avoid another world war, then the next one will find us isolated. We were "isolationists" before this war of our own choice; in the next war we may be "isolated" because others may combine against us if we refuse to cooperate.

To avoid such an isolation we will have to seek collaboration with others, and lend-lease of all kinds, be they blood money, can best forge the ties of a friendship which will prevent the recurrence of another catastrophe.

Enough of This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 8, 1944.

What this editorial says about the educational advantages in Tennessee for Negroes is equally applicable to my own State of South Carolina:

ENOUGH OF THIS

To "recommend" that white colleges in the South make their facilities available to Negro students, the United States Office of Education must first ignore the fact that the finest Negro colleges and universities in the world exist in the South; public institutions, publicly maintained, and open to any Negro student qualifying for enrollment.

Mr. Studebaker, his colleagues and advisers, must also ignore the fact that southern Negro students for the most part do not desire enrollment in the white institutions; that rather are they proud of their own institutions, and properly so, and resentful of such professional, political interference as is doing them a distinct disservice.

Not the least of these institutions are in Nashville and environs. They are institutions which competent examination has shown to be on a par with white universities. On the basis of what considerations, therefore, and what objectives, does the Office of Education overlook the obvious to attempt to cram down the throat of the South something which the overwhelming majority of the South—both white and Negro—not only does not want but will not have?

The Banner has spoken before of the effrontery of those who seek by establishing control of education in Federal hands to dominate and dictate the policies of the education system. Here is a sample, in the guise of a "recommendation," but illustrative of the tendency, and preliminary to the dictation that would ensue once the power of recommendation became the power of directive. It fits the pattern of the sociological philosophies entertained by outsiders, agitators, males and females, among the broadminded who neither understand nor care about the principles with which they are so recklessly meddling.

The South will not tolerate this meddling much longer. On the matter in question, the thinking Negro's voice will be raised in unison with the white voice for a shouted "no" that can be heard from here to Washington—or to the Caribbean, too, for that matter.

Around the Town With Charles B. Smith and the Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Sunday Journal-Star of Peoria, Ill., February 27, 1944, titled "Around the Town With Charles B. Smith and the Staff":

AROUND THE TOWN WITH CHARLES B. SMITH AND THE STAFF

It was at the Washington's Birthday banquet of the Creve Coeur Club in 1935 that the Honorable James A. Farley, then Postmaster General of the United States, was the chief speaker. And his address was a masterpiece of historic interest and eloquence. His topic was Problems of the Presidents.

I happened to be a member of the C. C. C. speakers' committee that year, with Hiram Todd as chairman. When it was suggested that Mr. Farley be invited to speak, it started something of a tempest in a teapot. Mr. Todd liked the idea but others recalled that the Postmaster General was the brains of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential ship and feared his address would be partisan in tone. There are two themes usually taboo by unwritten law at these banquets—politics and religious bias. But Mr. Todd and a majority were sure "Big Jim" was too astute a diplomat to intrude politics at such a banquet. And they were right.

Mr. Todd wrote the invitation, and I never saw a finer letter. A tentative acceptance was received. Mr. Farley had never been in Peoria and would like very much to come here but it was not until early in February a definite acceptance came.

President Arnold Salzenstein, of the C. C. C., and a committee met the distinguished visitor and his executive secretary, Ambrose O'Connell, in Chicago. President James Gorman, of the Rock Island Lines, had placed his private car at the disposal of the Peorians and was a royal host. So was General Passenger Agent Leahy, ably assisted by Adolph Langfeldt, then Rock Island's Peoria representative. The party arrived in the early afternoon in a driving snowstorm and went direct to the Creve Coeur Club. I

will always remember Mr. Farley and Henry B. Morgan, then the oldest living Peoria postmaster, posing in an archway for their picture, with arms around each other's shoulders.

The grand ballroom of the Hotel Pere Marquette was crowded to overflowing with 600 guests, distinguished and otherwise, the great and the near great. Among scores of notables was Admiral V. Y. Dallman of the Sangamon River Fleet, a personal friend then as now of "Big Jim." And to take care of the overflow, tables were spread and loudspeaker gadgets installed in the LaSalle room, the lounge, and ballroom lobby. It was an ingathering of postmasters of Illinois. Chicago was represented by Postmaster Ernest J. Kruetgen, other patriots of the United States mail service from Podunk and Illinois at large, and many from neighboring States, were among the other men of public and private affairs who gathered. And Mr. Farley, wise in his day and generation, didn't intrude politics, partisan, in the abstract, or any other brand. He traced the troubles of Presidents from the administration of George Washington down to the present incumbent—historical in character—and told the interesting inside story of each, the off-the-record and high lights of their Executive dilemmas without an iota of bias or propaganda.

I am free to confess there was also an ulterior reason for the invitation. Peoria wanted a new post office. Mr. Farley, with Postmaster Tom Cody and Mayor Charles O'Brien as guides and mentors, was shown all over the picturesque ruin then doing duty. Its crowded, ill-arranged, shabby, and inadequate facilities were emphasized. He was shown the basement where space better adapted for a coal cellar had been enclosed in chicken wire and used to handle parcel post. It made an impression. Peoria got a new post office and the Honorable James A. Farley then, and ever after, was Peoria's friend. It was his first visit and he had a good time, enjoyed it, and made many lasting friends here, and still has them.

C. B. S.

Justice for Small Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted at a meeting held by American citizens of Polish ancestry, at the Civic Opera House in Chicago, Ill., on February 6, 1944:

We, American citizens of Polish ancestry, assembled at the civic opera house in Chicago, Ill., this 6th day of February A. D. 1944, at the meeting of representatives of our large fraternal orders, the clergy, the press, and the radio arranged under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, inspired at this crucial and trying moment for America, by the patriotic addresses of His Excellency Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois; the Honorable Edward J. Kelly, mayor of the city of Chicago; Congressman Martin Gorski, of Illinois; Prof. Waclaw Lednicki, of Harvard University; Dr. Francis X. Swietlik, censor of the Polish National Alliance and dean of the Marquette University school of law, under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, do hereby solemnly resolve as follows:

I

As loyal and faithful citizens of the United States to support conscientiously and unflinchingly our great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and our Government, and to do everything within our power and ability which may help the President and our Government in reaching an early conclusion of the war and attaining a just and permanent peace for the world, by—

(a) Loyal and conscientious performance of our duties as citizens.

(b) Willingly sending our sons and daughters, as heretofore, into the service of our country, that they may contribute in the fight for the freedom of America and justice for all nations.

(c) Increased purchases, within the utmost limit of our abilities, of War bonds and Treasury certificates, thus to back the attack of our sons and kinsmen in this bloody and heroic conflict, which we are firmly convinced will result in victory for our country and the Allied Nations.

(d) Increased contributions to the American Red Cross and other recognized war relief agencies, thus enabling them to perform their missions of mercy.

(e) Conscientiously and zealously performing our tasks, whether in war plants or other positions, so that the production of war weapons may be increased and the Allied Nations thus enabled to bring this war to an early victorious end.

II

As citizens of the United States, enjoying the privileges of free men and women, we are deeply concerned with the trying and desperate plight of the people in Poland, the native land of our forefathers, the first to take a determined and courageous stand against the might and aggression of Hitler's Germany and valiantly defend her freedom and sovereignty to nigh the last drop of blood, until tragically she fell under the superior force of her two neighbors, who perpetrated a fourth partition of Poland and between them divided her domains. In keeping with her old and great watchword, "For your and our liberty," Poland has always been found on the field of battle wherever the freedom and the liberties of peoples were involved.

It is with a sense of deep apprehension for the future peace of the world that we contemplate the efforts of the eastern neighbor of Poland and a powerful ally of the United Nations, who on the basis of a unilateral decision attempts even now, to retain by force nearly one-half of eastern Poland, those territories which for centuries belonged to the Republic of Poland, until the time of the three partitions by her three neighbors—Austria, Germany, and Russia—in the years 1772, 1793, and 1795. After the last World War, Poland regained her independence and sovereignty and recovered her former territory under the provisions of the Treaty of Riga in the year 1921, signed voluntarily by the representatives of Russia, the Soviet Ukraine, and Poland, which by mutual agreement fixed the eastern boundaries of Poland.

III

We avail ourselves of this occasion to stress that the Polish Government in exile at London, with President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz and Prime Minister, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk and his Cabinet, is the lawfully constituted Government of Poland, recognized as such by the Polish Nation, the Governments of the United States, of Great Britain, and of the other nations. We highly commend and express our sincere admiration for the position adopted by the Polish Government upon the subject matter of the eastern boundary line, indicative of its good will and a sincere desire to effect an amicable adjustment in the spirit of unity which of necessity must underlie the efforts of the United Nations, when it manifested a willingness and desire to submit the entire controversy to mediation and sought the good offices of the United States and of Great Britain to act as mediators. This tactful offer was rejected by the Union of Soviet Republics despite the fact that both the United States and Great Britain have indicated their willingness to act as such mediators. We convey to the Government of the United States and to the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, assurances of our sincere appreciation of the position taken in transmitting to the Government of the Soviet Republics the offer of the Government of the United States to mediate in the controversy and to use the good offices of the Department of State toward this end, and to the Government of Great Britain, its Prime Minister, Hon. Winston Churchill, and its Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hon. Anthony Eden, for the tireless and persevering effort toward the solution and adjustment of the controversy and the resumption of diplomatic relations between Poland and the Union of Soviet Republics. We deem the position of the Government of Poland indicative beyond doubt of its good will in the premises.

IV

Bearing in mind the foregoing facts, we are actuated today by a firm conviction that the Government of these United States and, in particular, our great President, will not suffer or permit, after hostilities shall cease and the proper moment shall arrive, the perpetration of so gross an injustice to Poland, for her great sacrifice and long endured sufferings, the gallantry and valor of her armies, her magnificent contribution to the common cause, in sanctioning the seizure by neighboring power, through force and arms, of territory, which from all historical considerations lawfully belongs to her and to which she is rightfully entitled. For to suffer this to be done would be to challenge and contravene the fundamental principles and the basic humanities of the Atlantic Charter, which had its inception at the meeting of and was inspired by the statesmanlike vision and considerations of human values of the President of these United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Hon. Winston Churchill, ratified by the Government of these United States, and signed by all of the United Nations, including the Union of Soviet Republics and Poland.

Motivated by these considerations, we appeal in all sincerity to our Government in Washington, and in particular to our President, to use the good offices of this Nation, the weight and import of his counsel on behalf of the righteous cause of Poland, in order that the world may be assured a just and permanent peace.

As a prophetic and auspicious omen for the future, we draw on this occasion the inspiration to be found in the memory of the two great American advocates of human liberty, Washington and Lincoln, the anniversary of whose birth we observe this month. We sense the spiritual presence in our midst at this solemn moment of those great Polish generals who fought for the independence and integrity of these United States, Thaddeus Kosciusko, Casimir Pulaski, Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski, and Joseph Karge, and within the very walls of this hall we divine their assurance to the Polish Nation that the Government and the President of

the United States, and the American Nation will not forget Poland's great contributions—Poland's just and rightful claims—will not tolerate the perpetration of an injustice.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, Chairman.
JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President, Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, Secretary.

B'nai B'rith Honors Negro Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the B'nai B'rith firmly believes in humanity, equality, and philanthropy. It has always manifested its leadership in interfaith and interracial good will. This was clearly evidenced recently in Cleveland, Ohio, when the Cleveland B'nai B'rith war-service council, represented by my colleague on the B'nai B'rith national war-service committee, Hon. Leo M. Ascherman, presented a portrait oil painting of Lt. Sidney P. Brooks, Cleveland airman and Negro pilot killed in this war to the Karamu House, a Negro community center. This presentation was made in the presence of many outstanding white and Negro civic and educational leaders.

I am happy to include as part of my remarks highlights of this proceeding as released by the Office of War Information:

Manifestation of interracial understanding was displayed in Cleveland, Ohio, recently when an oil painting of Lt. Sidney P. Brooks, Cleveland airman and Negro pilot killed in this war, was presented to Karamu House, a Negro community center, by the Cleveland B'nai B'rith War Service Council in the presence of white and Negro civic and educational leaders.

Commissioned by B'nai B'rith, the portrait was first unveiled before the entire school assembly of Central High School, of which Lieutenant Brooks was an alumnus. Leo M. Ascherman, member of B'nai B'rith National War Service Committee, presented the portrait, which was accepted by Russell Jelliffe, director of Karamu House.

Others present at the exercises included Mrs. Lucille Brooks, widow of Lieutenant Brooks, Mr. and Mrs. T. Brooks, his parents; J. W. Brooks, his brother; R. W. Watson, principal of Central High School; Dilworth Lupton, Cleveland Press columnist; Alfred A. Benesch, president of the Cleveland school board; Superintendent of Schools Charles Lake; and Ormonde A. Forte, editor of the Cleveland Herald. The portrait, the work of Elmer Brown, art director of Karamu House, is now being exhibited at public and private high schools throughout Cleveland.

In a letter to Mr. Ascherman, Mrs. Brooks said: "This means so very much to us and his loved ones, and to our race as a whole. We do so much appreciate your most gracious gift. It was very, very kind of you, and I just had to try, somehow, to express my thanks—our thanks—with the words that I find so inadequate at a time like this. Thanks so much again to you and your organization. Perhaps, yet, there may come about the existence of the true democracy—among the peoples that folks like you and us dream of."

Lieutenant Brooks, who was a member of the Army Air Forces first all-Negro fighter squadron, was killed in action last September in north Africa. He was awarded the Air Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster for aiding in fighting off German bombers attempting to raid Pantelleria.

Presentation of the portrait of Lieutenant Brooks was accompanied by an announcement by Mr. Ascherman that B'nai B'rith has furnished 20 recreation facilities for Negro military personnel at various Army installations throughout the country. These facilities include the following:

Two day rooms for the Three Hundred and Seventy-second Infantry encampment in Brooklyn; a day room in the Colored Officers' Club in the Hotel Theresa, New York; a recreation center in the Twenty-third Street Armory, New York; a day room for Negro troops at the Staten Island port of embarkation; a day room at Fort Wadsworth in the Bronx; a room in the Negro War Service Center in Harlem; a room in the Negro War Service Club in Brooklyn; a day room at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; a squadron room for a Negro regiment at Selfridge Field, Mich.; two day rooms at the Army Air Base, Maldin, Mo.; a day room at Patterson Field, Dayton, Ohio; a day room at Hill Field Camp, Ogden, Utah; a day room at Lake Muroc, Calif.; a day room at Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.; a day room at Fort Sheridan, Ill.; and a library and lounge for a Negro transportation unit at Indiantown Gap, Pa.

The B'nai B'rith also presented a set of colors to Carver Chapel where Negro military personnel at Fort Warren, Wyo., worship, while in Hot Springs, Ark., B'nai B'rith initiated the campaign to establish a U. S. O. center for Negro servicemen.

Some weeks ago, the Harlem Defense Recreation Center presented a special citation to the New York City B'nai B'rith War Service Council in recognition of its services in providing recreation facilities for Negro military personnel in the New York area.

The Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. FAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, on the question of my vote on bill H. R. 1247, S. 1285, now before the House, I desire to record my reasons for voting against it. Regardless of what has here been advanced in favor of it as a compromise measure to provide men and women in service with the machinery for voting, this bill does not provide the serviceman with the protections of his ballot which I conceive to be his absolute right. I fully realize the necessity for compromise in many matters which come before this House, but too often in the past, compromises have been blandly accepted and then through inertia have engrafted themselves permanently into our law, with never another effort to improve them, or to offset the difficulties which made the initial compromise necessary. I want the service men and women to have the vote more than I want anything which I can ever hope to achieve for them through my efforts here or elsewhere, but I am unwilling to hazard their rights with a compromise of this type when more positive relief for their voting problems is possible. Through the defeat of this bill, I am confident that the servicemen will not be left without a vote, but will be assured one, in more proper and adequate legislation. But I realize this bill will be passed, but I would rather by far to be among the losers, who were for what is best for the servicemen, than be a winner in fact and a loser to my conscience and my conviction of what is best for them.

Reciprocal Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from testimony of Col. Spencer B. Eddy, G. S. S., Office of the General Purchasing Agent of the United States Army Forces in the Far East, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, March 7, 1944:

Colonel EDDY. It is covered in the statement, but I want to emphasize the extent of what you might call natural aid.

We give them something on lend-lease; we get something back on reverse lend-lease.

Take this question of food, for example. There is a fellow in Santa Barbara, Calif., who grows lima beans. There is also a fellow in Gallatin Valley, in Montana, who grows peas; there is a fellow in Ohio who grows golden bantam corn. All those men raise those for seed. The United States Government takes the seed and sends it to Australia on lend-lease. That seed is turned over to a farmer in Australia and he plants a crop. Part of the units of his fertilizer, one of the units, is probably phosphate from Florida; some of his farm machinery came from Illinois; some of his canning machinery came from the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did anything come from Texas?

Colonel EDDY. He got some sulfur from Texas. All that came to Australia on lend-lease.

The Australian Government made a contract with that farmer to grow a crop which the Australian Government will pay for. The Australian Government pays the canner to can it and the canner puts it in a can made of American tin plate which came in or through lend-lease from Pittsburgh; and then it takes the can and it has to be put in a wooden case, and the chances are that he got the wood with which he made the box from New Zealand. Then it is shipped on an Australian railway on reverse lend-lease and put in an American warehouse that the Australian Government built and paid for and turned over to us from reverse lend-lease; and then when it is time to use that up it goes down to the docks, it is loaded by Australian stevedores that the Australian Government pays and it is put on a boat that Australia gives on reverse lend-lease and the boat is provisioned and powered under reverse lend-lease. If it is coal that is used for power, that came from Australia, and that was under reverse lend-lease. When the boat

gets up north and it is unloaded on some of the docks that they built up in the islands out of Australian timber with Australian hardware which Australia paid for, then the food is stored in a temporary hut which is made of Australian steel and paid for by Australia. I might say, incidentally, that we are taking one-half of the sheet steel produced in Australia for our houses and warehouses at the present time. Then when it comes down to the problem of eating the food the can is opened by an Australian-made can opener, it is cooked in an Australian-made stove, and it is eaten with Australian knives and forks, out of an Australian mess kit, and all of that comes out of reverse lend-lease. The American boy who eats the food has completed the cycle, because the chances are that somewhere along the line his father back home had something to do with some of the products that eventually produced that product. That is reciprocal aid the way it works out in the field.

The Why of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of March 9, 1944:

THE WHY OF IT

The controversy which has developed over termination of war contracts legislation reemphasizes the point of difference between legislative and executive. Both branches are committed to the program in question, but the dispute rages as to where ultimate authority shall be vested.

How delaying and protracted the argument is, is attested by the fact that it has been going on since last fall and yet remains far from settlement. When the proposed measure was first considered by a House Military Affairs Subcommittee Comptroller General Lindsay Warren objected to the War and Navy Departments, which negotiated the original contracts, having the final word on their termination because of his belief that these Departments would be too lenient. He urged that the settlements be examined by the General Accounting Office. A month ago, however, the subcommittee voted, 13 to 7, against the Warren request; but a minority report will also be filed when this group reports back to the full committee, and warning is sounded that in event the majority report is accepted the fight will be shifted to the floor of the House itself. It is apparent, therefore, that the fight may go on indefinitely. Meanwhile there is urge for action as the need for enabling legislation in this field becomes acute and John Q. Public pays for the delay.

Washington reports have it that a compromise may possibly show the way out. But such an outlet as indicated does not make sense either. It would, as suggested, provide for a separate, independent agency to be headed by a $12,000-a-year director who would, of course, have his staff and be advised, to add to the cumbersomeness, by representatives of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, Reconstruction Finance, and Smaller War Plants Corporation, Maritime Commission, Foreign Economic Administrator, War Production Board, and the Attorney General. From that array it is concluded that the new agency would spend the major portion of its time listening to advice.

The point we raise here is simple and direct: Why establish a new agency, add to the Washington hodgepodge and expense, when the General Accounting Office is available and ready to take on the job? This setting up of new boards, commissions, bureaus, and what-not, accountable to nobody in particular, outside the established structure and representing so much Topsyian growth, illustrates to considerable degree what's the matter with the Federal Government these days. You can't recognize the body politic for its patches, parasites, and appendages.

Fort Pitt Steel Casting Wins Second Gold Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., of McKeesport, Pa., was recently awarded its second Gold Star. This honorable and coveted distinction is another feather in the cap of this company, which only a year ago was awarded the Maritime M in recognition of its outstanding production achievement in the Commission's shipbuilding program.

As Representative of a great industrial district which includes the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., I salute both Mr. Fred Grotts, liberal, humane, and understanding president of the company, and Mr. Charles "Ace" Oncea, president of the C. I. O., Local 1406, for their true American spirit of give-and-take cooperation. We need more men like them. If this kind of spirit prevailed everywhere, Gold Star and Maritime M awards would be numerous, but more than that, it would hasten the day of victory.

I am happy to include in my remarks the letter from H. L. Vickery, Commissioner of the United States Maritime Commission, and the reply of Fred Grotts, president of the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co.:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, February 22, 1944.

Mr. FRED GROTTS,
President, Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co.,
McKeesport, Pa.

DEAR MR. GROTTS: In recognition of your continued achievement in completing wartime schedules in the manufacture and delivery of merchant-ship components, the Maritime Commission Board of Production Awards has awarded your company its second gold star, to be added to your maritime M pennant, and badges of production merit for all employees added to your rolls since August 30, 1943.

The employees of your company should feel proud of this award, for it has been justly earned, and with it goes permission to fly the maritime M pennant over your plant for another 6 months.

As the intensity of this war increases it is my hope that your employees will continue their cooperative efforts and better their production record whenever and wherever possible until victory is achieved.

Very truly yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

FEBRUARY 25, 1944.

Mr. H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner, United States
Maritime Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICKERY: We received your notification of February 22 with respect to our second gold star, to be added to our maritime M pennant; also badges of production merits for our new employees.

The employees and management of the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. feel very proud indeed over this award. The attaining of this recognition is made possible through the cooperative efforts of our labor and management organizations.

You can rest assured that we will continue these cooperative efforts and that production records will be equaled or even bettered in the months to come.

Yours very truly,

FORT PITT STEEL CASTING CO.,
FRED GROTTS, *President.*

Valor of the Celt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, March 17 will be St. Patrick's Day and those of the Celtic race will be hosts to their friends in all parts of the world. I take pleasure in offering for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem, entitled "Valor of the Celt", composed by my friend of many years, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia Bar, who is a veteran officer of the First World War:

VALOR OF THE CELT

What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies,
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Brotherhood Week Address at Leominster, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Leominster (Mass.) Enterprise:

CONGRESSMAN SPEAKER AT BROTHERHOOD WEEK MEETING HELD HERE—MEN'S CLUB, K. OF C. GUESTS OF B'NAI B'RITH

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, was the principal speaker at the meeting of Achdus Lodge, B'nai B'rith of Leominster and Fitchburg, last night in the synagogue here. The meeting was in conjunction with the observance of Brotherhood Week and was attended by 200 persons.

Guests were members of Leominster Council, Knights of Columbus; the Men's Club of the Unitarian Church, the following chaplains from Fort Devens, Charles A. Earle, Aloys Marschner and Max B. Wall, and Rev. Earle R. Steeves, minister of the Unitarian Church. All spoke briefly.

GREETINGS

Greetings were extended by Solomon Rosenbaum, president of the organization; Louis A. Montagna, grand knight of the Knights of Columbus, and Lawrence J. Hadley, president of the Men's Club.

A highlight of the meeting was a ceremony in which tribute was paid to soldiers of all faiths who have died in World War No. 2. Taps were sounded by Sgt. Henry J. Gauvin of the Massachusetts State Guard.

Refreshments were served after the meeting. Arrangements were in charge of Max Sanders.

ADDRESS

Congressman PHILBIN said:

"I am particularly honored and privileged to be able to join with you in this impressive meeting. It is most appropriate that we should gather here in this House of Worship of a most ancient and respected faith, whose members have made such magnificent contributions to our American life and Government. It is particularly fitting also that we should be favored tonight by the presence of high-ranking officials of the Army and Navy and representatives drawn from all religious groups, from every faith and segment of the community.

"This offers conclusive proof that all our people are not only united in our mighty war effort, but are united in the equally great task confronting us of maintaining, upholding and preserving those ideals and principles of representative, democratic government which have been responsible in the past for our unprecedented growth, prosperity, happiness, and freedom.

"War brings evil consequences which the human kind never seems to anticipate, however terrible the experiences of the past. It upsets our ways of life. It invariably attacks existing institutions. War promotes a breakdown in the social structure and ushers in a period of moral relaxation, political unrest, social discontent, group antagonism, class hatred, and many other kindred ills of which the country is suffering today as we steadily march forward to ultimate victory. One of the most unfortunate of these concomitant ills of war is the growth of group antagonism and friction between classes of our people who, in times of peace, ordinarily live in friendship and harmony.

"All too frequently, it is sad and tragic to acknowledge, religious intolerance and racial bigotry typify these differences. To what extent these excused group feelings are due to modernistic social theories like communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and other strange totalitarian cults, we cannot accurately estimate, but we do know that these feelings emerge into public light from time to time directed against some of our most patriotic and respected citizens, and inflame minds of the unsuspecting, the gullible and the unenlightened."

DO MUCH

"Movements such as the one in which we so proudly participate tonight can do much to dissipate these clouds of dissension and racial and religious antipathies. To promote complete understanding, mutual respect and confidence between all the component parts of our American body politic must be not only our fervent desire but our never ceasing aim. I care not from what source it may come. We cannot permit the selfishness, greed, impracticability, and visionary notions of radical social reformers, preaching doctrines of hate, to disunite our people at a time when, more than ever before in our history, we will require whole-hearted and unremitting solidarity of effort. We cannot permit bigots or reactionaries, or propaganda from whatever source, to destroy through innuendo, falsehood, and misrepresentation that mutual respect and confidence which our people have felt for each other in the past and which have enabled us to work together constructively as Americans for the welfare of our country and the betterment of our Government and economic and social institutions."

DIFFICULT

"It is difficult to place the blame for these dangerous un-American movements where it belongs because bigotry and intolerance operate in the dark. In free America, they cannot stand the light of day. They dare not show their face. But one outstanding fact must be recognized and that is, that bigotry, intolerance, and race hatred are deplored and deprecated by virtually the entire American people who are inflexibly determined to move promptly to repudiate those responsible for spreading these evil and pernicious doctrines. In acting, as we should, will, and must, to eradicate intolerance ourselves. In safeguarding the right of bold, honest criticism and in recognizing in full the right of political contention and debate, let us record our emphatic disapproval of the cheap appeals of the demagog, the smear artist, the vilifier, and all those who seek to substitute abuse and vituperation for rational arguments in denouncing those who disagree with them. In our American public life, in the heat of political activity, we expect red-blooded, two-fisted opposition and strong, outspoken declarations on all sides of the question, but let us keep our discussions on high plane, let us never stoop to misrepresentation, falsehood, or unfair assaults upon those who hold opposite views."

OPINION

"The American forum of public opinion exists for all to express their views and it must never be polluted by calumny or slander of individual, race, creed, or group.

"We must remember also, if we would keep and preserve these great ideals of religious and civil liberty of our proud American heritage, that encroachments upon any of these great basic rights outlined in the Constitution of the United States lead inevitably to the danger of encroachments upon all. Political, religious, and civil freedom are bound up inextricably with economic freedom. We cannot expect to put manacles on our businessmen, on our middle and working classes, on the rich or the poor through regimentation and still be able to retain those broader privileges of free speech, free assembly, and free religious worship and toleration. The history of free government proves beyond doubt that freedom is all-inclusive. You may lay out certain limits for its enjoyment by requiring all to live within the law, but when you intrude upon any sphere of legitimate human activity and permit the Government, through the exercise of arbitrary dictatorial powers to confine and restrict free enterprise within that sphere, you are endangering the whole fabric of individual liberty and if usurpations are tolerated all basic rights are ultimately destroyed."

MINDFUL

"We must also be mindful that it does not suffice alone to enjoy these rights. In order to retain them, we must be willing to assume the responsibility and duty of ordering the affairs of our own Government, in brief, exercising the obligations of active and useful American citizenship. Above all, we cannot make distinctions between groups of our own people based on political privileges. The enjoyment of all these great privileges must be willingly granted and extended by law and common consent to all law-abiding citizens irrespective of race, color, or creed. For the colored, for the white according to our laws and traditions, for the Jews, for the Catholics, for the Protestants and every other religious faith according to our Constitution, we must guarantee absolute protection and absolute equality before the law of the land—justice and liberty for all, special privileges for none. We must always remember that in America all men, whatever their station, are equal before the law and we cannot tolerate for one moment that any citizen or, in fact, any person living within the confines of our great land shall be persecuted, smeared, vilified, or discriminated against because of his racial background or religious affiliations. To secure these rights for all our citizens is our sacred obligation and our soundest basis for true brotherhood.

"This brings me to another question of human brotherhood, namely, the present plight of our Jewish brethren in the occupied countries of Europe where they have undergone such pitiable and indefensible persecution by Hitler and his minions of hate. Millions of innocent Jews, many of them aged and infirm, others helpless women and children, are wandering over the face of the European Continent tonight, driven from pillar to post, from one country to another—homeless, shelterless, friendless, and without food and nourishment to keep body and soul together. Because of the exigencies of the war and some very unfortunate and regrettable diplomatic developments, the doors of most countries have been closed to these pathetic refugees. There is only one place remaining where they can seek refuge and haven with convenience, safety, and security and that is the Palestine homeland.

"Notwithstanding this situation which stirs the sympathy of all true Americans, yet by the terms of the so-called white paper entrance to that single, practicable refuge is barred at the end of March unless some action is taken now. Under the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which was subsequently approved by a joint resolution of the United States Congress and a treaty convention between Great Britain and the United States, the establishment in Palestine of a National Home was guaranteed for the Jewish people. Time does not permit me to go into the background and reasons for this declaration. It suffices to say that its object was to secure for the Jews the right to inhabit and develop their ancient homeland under their own auspices and under their own institutions—a right which no fair-thinking American can deny.

"But to abrogate that declaration and that oft-reiterated policy now when so many Jewish refugees are seeking a haven from cruel

persecution constitutes a challenge to the whole world, yes to humanity itself. Fortunately the American Congress has provided a possible solution to this grave situation in the form of the so-called Wright-Compton resolution now pending in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which calls upon the United States to use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

"If we would have regard for the long-endured and patient sufferings of these persecuted peoples, if we would be true to our own traditions of toleration, religious and civil liberty and encouragment and help of the weak and the oppressed, we will all as loyal Americans, lend our support and efforts to the immediate enactment of this most salutary measure which will prevent Europe from being turned into a sepulchre for millions of innocent Jews."

ONE WAY

"This would be one concrete way by which we can demonstrate to the whole world that we, of free America, will not tolerate, for one moment, religious bigotry, civil persecution, or the denial of human rights but that on the other hand, we are willing to work to extend relief, succor, and humanitarian treatment to the poor unfortunates who have felt the lash of barbaric and cruel punishment and persecution for no reason other than that they bore the mark and professed the faith of the ancient House of Abraham.

"So far as I am concerned as your Congressman and your representative to the National Government, I propose to leave nothing undone within my power that will make possible the early establishment of a national homeland for the Jews. I pledge my voice, my vote, and every effort I can humanly make to this campaign for human brotherhood, for mutual understanding, for mutual trust, mutual respect, and mutual affection between all groups and classes of our people, and for the elimination once and for all from our American political and social life, of the accursed stigma and blemish of religious intolerance and racial hatred.

"Congratulations, citizens of Leominster, for this fine contribution to the cause of American toleration and human brotherhood. May the impulses of this patriotic gathering be diffused throughout our country and throughout the world to promote friendship, cooperation, and mutual understanding among all our people and among the nations of the earth. And may we soon gain for our own arms the glorious victory which we hope will insure the perpetuation of our democratic institutions and permanent peace for all the world."

A Call to War Veterans To Rally to the Colors in a Peacetime Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from an address of President Roosevelt before the American Legion convention, Chicago, Ill., October 2, 1932:

We realize now that the great human values, not for you alone but for all American citizens, rest upon the unimpaired credit of the United States.

It was because of that that we undertook to take the National Treasury out of the red and put it in the black. And we have done it. And in the doing of it we laid down two principles which directly affected benefits to veterans, benefits to you, benefits to veterans of other wars.

* * * * *

The second principle is that no person, because he wore a uniform, must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his Government a benefit which no other citizen receives. It does not mean that because a person served in the defense of his country, performed a basic obligation of citizenship, he should receive a pension from his Government because of a disability incurred after his service had terminated, and not connected with that service.

Can America Feed and Clothe the World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, hunger is one of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. All over the world people are starving to death, or in a state in which a broken mind still lingers in an emaciated body. We have recently seen horrible pictures from the famine area of India; and, after all, India is well removed from the actual fields of battle. How much more terrible must be the sufferings in those unfortunate lands through which the fighting armies move, spreading utter destruction over homes and fields, laying waste to that which generations have been building up, destroying culture, monuments, churches, schools, hospitals and public utilities, farms and factories. The work and achievements of centuries are being wiped out. The achievements, the savings of every little family are being destroyed in the most cruel and merciless way. Every time we read in our paper about army advances, or, for that matter, about army withdrawals, there is another side to the picture which is little considered or appreciated, namely, the utter destruction of homes, the devastation of all means of livelihood, of obtaining daily bread. Such destruction becomes so vast as to be incomprehensible even to those helping to bring it about.

Some time ago I read an article in the New York Times which gave such a horrible picture of conditions in that part of Italy occupied by American and British troops that I believe we who are, after all, collectively to some extent responsible, should know the facts and thus gain an understanding of our present and future obligations. You know, of course, that an adult doing normal work needs somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 calories of food a day in order to maintain normal body weight. Also, that he will starve to death if, over a period of time, he gets less than 1,500. In that part of Italy which at present is occupied by American and British troops, there are living some 10,000,000 or more people. Most of them are small farmers and workers, of that kind which it has become customary to refer to as "the common man." Mr. Harold Callendar, the author of the article I referred to a moment ago, tells us that our experts with the Allied Military Government figure on an absolutely necessary average diet for these millions of people of 1,789 calories, barely above the 1,500 minimum. Of these 1,789 calories, not less than 1,006 calories must be shipped to Italy, since only 783 calories can at present be obtained locally.

It is, indeed, a practical question that must be faced; who is responsible for keeping these millions of people alive. The world cannot let them die. The Italians seem to take the attitude that those foreigners who have occupied their country by force, and who have destroyed their means of livelihood, carry the full responsibility. Mr. Callendar adds that this is not the allies' view. It is, of course, obvious that if the fate of the nations into whose country our armies move is wholesale starvation, in addition to complete destruction of their homes and means of existence, then a cry of wrath is likely to rise against us. Yet most of the destruction of necessities and all of the looting has been wrought by the Nazi armies while they occupied Italy, and as they retreated.

Mr. Callendar has figured out that in order to feed the Italians in that southernmost part of Italy now occupied by our troops, it will require nearly 100,000 tons of foodstuffs monthly. Now, if you look at a map of Europe indicating the area occupied by the Germans, and compare it with that small strip of land we have so far been able to wrest from them in southern Italy, you will realize that as our invasion armies move forward toward Berlin, we shall be confronted with problems of saving so many millions—even hundreds of millions—of people from famine that I am at a loss to see how America alone can possibly handle such a responsibility. We, in the United States, are not brutes. We always have had a warm heart and a generous attitude toward the people in distress everywhere in the world.

But we in this country are only some hundred and thirty million people. We still live fairly well on the rations allotted us from the products of our farms. We also have to supply our British friends and our Russian Allies with a good share of their daily bread, and we do that gratis, in the form of gifts under lend-lease. Assuming that we could tighten our belts still further, how many millions of additional people do you think we could feed with American wheat and milk, meat and sugar? How many millions could we clothe and shelter? Surely not a population far bigger than our own. Yet so many, believing the extravagant promises being made by our representatives, will stretch out their hands toward us begging for their daily

bread, of which they will be deprived by military operations. I wish I could give you a satisfactory solution of that question but I admit that I stand appalled before such a problem.

I know, however, one good rule expressed in those wise words, "Charity begins at home." I hope the war will not finally inflict upon our people the indescribable misery of famine. I hope we may be spared from those tribulations which are afflicting, and for some time to come will afflict, almost every nation in the Old World. But I am not so sure that we may not eventually be confronted with domestic problems of such a serious character as we have never before faced.

Irresponsible propagandists promise us the marvels of a post-war world. I do not see why we should fool ourselves or let them fool us. The post-war world is not going to be a marvelous world. The post-war world will be a very sick world; and it will be a very poor world. It will be a world in which we shall face a great many heart-breaking problems, such as the care of those who will become terribly incapacitated during the war; problems of helping our millions of soldiers to make the difficult readjustment from military life to peaceful employment. We shall face the tremendous problem of resettling large parts of our population now camped around the war plants. And most difficult of all, we shall face the problem of cleaning the hearts of our youth, who in so many cases will tend to drift, deprived of the greatest asset in life—the memories of a happy childhood home with mom and dad.

Only a sound America can help lead the rest of the world back to sanity. Therefore America's problems must receive our first consideration. Those are the responsibilities we first must meet. We cannot help a world in chaos by going down into chaos with it. Nobody is saved by everybody being starved. We may as well recognize the horrible tragedy we shall face; that America cannot produce enough of the vital necessities of life to go around for all the world. It is impossible to let loose a destruction of a magnitude such as we are now witnessing, and expect, or hope, that the nations will escape dreadful hardships and suffering.

We Americans like to think of our war as a war of liberation. Altruistically inclined as we are, we like to believe our boys will be welcomed as liberators in all the oppressed countries—France, Belgium, Luxemburg and Holland, Denmark and Norway, Poland and Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Greece. We like to think those millions of unfortunate people who have suffered for years under German domination will receive our boys with open arms and tears of joy. The reality, harsh and bitter as we have seen it in southern Italy, may become very different from what we expect. The advent of the Allied troops may be more dreaded than anticipated. I tell you this bluntly, because I do not believe in the use of propaganda designed to distort the facts and obscure the problems.

In desperate times such as those we are now experiencing, in times of scarcity and deprivation, there is one problem more important than any other, and that is that more and ever more food and other consumers' goods be produced in every part of the world. Every conceivable effort must be made to once more put our Nation and all other nations to work, to produce those commodities which together give us the material basis for a decent standard of living. We cannot wait until a clumsy bureaucracy acts. We cannot depend upon incompetent and inefficient boards and bureaus. We cannot depend upon power-lustful politicians who are seeking to use hunger and suffering as the means of making whole peoples do their bidding. It is the American farmer, the American laborer, the manufacturer, and the businessman who must do the job for America; on the hundreds of thousands of independent and enterprising individuals will rest the hope for the future in this country, as the future of other countries will rest with their farmers, their laborers, their manufacturers, their businessmen, and their enterprising individuals.

The salvation of humanity lies neither with the politicians nor with the preachers of Utopia, but with the men and women everywhere in the world who have the spirit of enterprise required to get back to the hard work of remaking a destroyed civilization. And each nation must, for the most part, do that for itself. America cannot feed and clothe the whole world.

Opposition to National Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to voice my opposition against any sort of a national service act. I am against the Austin-Wadsworth bill, and will oppose any other bill under any name, whether it be one drawn under the suggestion of the President sometime back when he indicated to the Congress and the people that under certain conditions he would favor a national service act that would draft all people to serve under the centralized power and control of the Federal Government here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed for the past many years the centralization of power and control of the people which has been constantly increasing year by year. Naturally, under the impact of war and the great struggle we are in, there has been less opposition to Government control, because all of the people want to do everything they can do, and all of the people are willing to sacrifice and are anxious to coordinate their efforts toward the winning of the war. There has been much necessary extension of control and regimentation of the people, but under the guise of war there has been much unjustified control fastened upon them and much unjustified centralization of power.

There is a great danger in such times of stress and struggle of such controls and regimentation and centralization of power being carried entirely too far, and it is my candid opinion, and I believe the opinion of the majority of the Members of this Congress, that that point will have been reached and passed if this Congress should approve and pass a national service act.

Certainly such an act should not be passed unless there is unquestioned proof that it is necessary. Certainly such an act is not in step with democracy. It is in step with the theory of a totalitarian form of government. The questions arise, Will it help to increase production of the implements of war? Will it help to increase the production of food on the farms of this country? Will it help to move more goods and materials over the transportation systems of America? Will it release more manpower for the military service of our country?

Of all the articles I have read upon this subject, and of all the speeches I have listened to, I must confess that I have not been convinced that there is a necessity now for a national service act and I have not been convinced that such an act will lead to greater production from our mines, in our industrial plants for the winning of the war, or that it will bring any greater production from the farmers of our Nation, or that it will hasten the delivery of goods over the railways or the transportation systems of our country. In fact, I fear that the passage of a national service act would retard all these endeavors which are so necessary to the well-being of the Nation in these times of stress. Freemen will bring forth greater production than men who are forced and regimented.

Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to depart from the democracy of this country which has served it so well and embark upon such a totalitarian course unless it be proven without doubt that our manpower situation is so desperate that we must take in this country such a dangerous step in a last final effort to get the production that is necessary to win the war. And if we take this step, we are following in the very footsteps of the Nazi government which early in the war did the same thing to all of the people of that nation.

I think the American farmers and the American workmen, all of them, whether or not they belong to any labor organization, when we take into consideration the miracle of production on the farms and in the factories that has been turned out under the democracy of this country, that they and we have demonstrated that democracy in action can be swift enough even during wartimes to maintain its democracy and at the same time develop the greatest food supply and war machine in the world. There is no question but that the men and women of this Nation have not only produced the best and greatest army in the world in the shortest length of time but they have produced the greatest amount of food, munitions of war, including airplanes, tanks, trucks, guns, and battleships, of any nation in the world. And, in addition, the American people, through production and lend-lease, have sent bil-

lions of dollars' worth of farm products and of war equipment to all of the nations of the world. They now have their fighting men on all of the battle fronts of the world, and they have poured twice as much money into this fight, money sacrificed from the savings of the people of this country, than all of the rest of the Allied Nations combined. Yet we are told we must do more, that we must draft every man and woman from the ages of 18 to 65 years, and that under such a law all of these people would be at the beck and call of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the right of workers to higher wages or their right to transfer from one job to another without permission would be denied under the law. All of them would be subject to the assignment and call of the Government.

This step should not be taken. We had better look back into the history of this country and try to hold to some of the sound, fundamental principles that have made this country great. We had better be a little more proud and a little more satisfied with the accomplishments that the American men and women have been able to bring to bear in this great crisis because they have achieved miracles in production on the farms and in the mills and factories, and they have laid out their money and sent their boys throughout the world in this struggle with a devotion to this Nation exemplifying as deep a patriotism as can be found in the history of any nation in the world. The American people are still sound. They still respect the fundamental principles of American democracy and they want to maintain this country along the same lines of Government that has made it the greatest nation in the world.

It might be well for some of those who want to try this new departure to get a better composite viewpoint of the American people as they move and act and think in the great West, out in the Mississippi Valley and from coast to coast, to understand the pride and thoughts of the men and women on the farms and in the factories, in the small business houses and the professions—their pride and their thoughts for the great accomplishments this country has made and their hopes for its future along American lines.

These people do not want more centralization of power in Washington; they do not want a national service act that will cause them to be subject to the beck and call of any government. They know that free labor will bring greater production to this country than forced labor. They believe in and respect the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and at this point may I give you a short quotation from that great man who occupied the White House during the terrible struggle of 4 long years of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln? During the war he uttered this statement, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." "This," he said, "expresses my idea of democracy." Quoting him further, he said, "Whatever differs from this to the extent of the differences is not democracy."

Forced labor and regimentation, in my judgment, will slow down production—hence, slow down the war effort. I do not believe it can be justified on any premise. It is my opinion that if there ever was any excuse for a national service act that time passed over a year ago. Even Mr. McNutt, at the head of the War Manpower Commission for the past year, while there has been talk of the national service act, has said, "It is not necessary."

Such an act will place too much power in the hands of any government.

Such an act is too far a departure from democracy in this country.

Such an act, in my opinion, is unjustified and should not be approved by this Congress.

Servicemen's Absentee Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it has been my hope, right up until the filing of the conference report on the servicemen's absentee voting bill, that the conferees would bring in a bill that could have been supported by every Member of the House. Unfortunately, the bill recommended by the conferees, and now before us for action, denies a ballot to men and women from the so-called poll-tax States. Certainly no Governor of a poll-tax State can certify that ballots cast under this legislation could be counted, if the soldier or sailor submitting the ballot had failed to pay his poll tax.

Frankly, I prefer the provisions of Public Law 712, approved September 16, 1942, rather than the bill now before us. At least there is a minimum of red tape involved in voting under the provisions of the 1942 act. If the so-called Federal ballot is legal and constitutional—and I believe it is—why all the red tape? The men serving in the fox holes, the hellholes, and other far-flung battle fronts lose all track of days and dates. To expect them to keep track of all the dates referred to in this bill is simply ridiculous. If a serviceman desires to write home for an absentee ballot and the ballot reaches him in time to be filled out and returned to his home precinct, well and good. However, why not allow those who wish to vote only for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, to cast a short ballot? There should be no restriction on the use of a Federal ballot, particularly when the State ballot fails to reach the serviceman who desires to vote.

In many States on every election day there are thousands of voters who do not vote a complete ballot. They vote for the top six or seven candidates and quit at that point. I believe that the Lucas-Worley bill would have permitted more servicemen to cast a secret ballot and have such ballot counted than under any other proposal yet presented to Congress.

I cannot accept this compromise. It completely ignores the testimony of representatives of the War Department who testified that it was a practical impossibility to deliver individual State absentee ballots to every battle front and get them back to the States in the time available. This conference report does not meet the test of practicability.

Washington, N. C., First Town Named After Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Hon. PAUL BROWN, inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Atlanta Journal headed "Washington, Ga., first of that name." On March 7 the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, Hon. FOSTER STEARNS, extended his remarks in the RECORD calling attention to the fact that Washington, N. H., was granted incorporation December 13, 1776.

So as to keep the record straight, I desire to call to the attention of the House the fact that Washington, N. C., was incorporated prior to October 1, 1776, for the first recorded mention of the town of Washington, N. C., is dated Monday, October 1, 1776, and is an order of the Council of Safety at Halifax, N. C. It reads:

That Cap. John Forrester, commander of the armed brig *The General Washington*, now lying at Washington, do proceed with all possible despatch to Ocracock Bar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the State Magazine, published at Raleigh, N. C.; an article from the Clip Sheet, George Washington Bicentennial; and certain data secured from the Library of Congress, the genealogy of Col. James Bonner, who founded the town of Washington.

[From the State Magazine of Raleigh, N. C.]

MR. CULHANE CAN'T DO THIS!—WHEN HE COMES FORWARD WITH THE CLAIM THAT WASHINGTON, GA., IS THE FIRST TOWN TO HAVE BEEN NAMED FOR GEORGE WASHINGTON, HE IS TREADING UPON EXTREMELY DANGEROUS GROUND

Mr. Thomas J. Culhane, of Washington, Ga., can't do this to us.

We Tarheels positively and absolutely refuse to submit calmly to the statement he makes in a communication which appeared on the editorial page of the Atlanta Journal last week and which was dated February 22.

We went through all of this 10 or 15 years ago. We fought it out with Washington, Ga., at that time and we definitely convinced the good people of that fine town that their place of residence was not the first town in the country to be named for the immortal George.

And now, Mr. Culhane is making us do it all over again.

A FAR-FETCHED CLAIM

Here's what he says in his communication: "To the State of Georgia belongs the

honor of naming the first town Washington. Nestled among the red hills of the Peach State lies the historic town of Washington, the first of all American villages, towns, or cities to be named in commemoration of the Father of our Country."

We didn't know about all this until last Friday, when we received 17 letters—highly indignant letters—from expatriated Tarheels who, in a moment of weakness, decided to leave North Carolina for Georgia.

"For God's sake, do something about this," was the tenor of these communications.

We cannot disregard or cast aside this plea for help. We wouldn't be loyal to our town of Washington, N. C., if we ignored this important matter. You see, we lived in Washington for about 20 years before moving to Raleigh, and we participated actively in the fight between Washington, N. C., and Washington, Ga., when it came up before.

To Mr. Culhane, to the people of Washington, Ga., and to the people of Georgia generally: The Washington in your State was not the first Washington in these United States. That honor and distinction belongs to Washington, N. C.

"Oh, yeah!" you may scornfully exclaim. "Where's your proof?"

Don't worry, beloved friends: we have the proof. Plenty of it. Proof that cannot be refuted or denied. Proof that will stand up in any court, including a Georgia court.

Here we go:

On November 30, 1771, the general assembly authorized James Bonner to establish a town at the forks of the Tar River, which Colonel Bonner later named for his commander in chief. The George Washington Bicentennial Commission established the fact that of all the cities and towns in the Nation named for George Washington, this town on the banks of the Pamlico River was the first.

FINAL AUTHORITY

The Washington Bicentennial Commission, you may recall, was an organization which helped to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth. That was back in 1932. Congressman SOL BLOOM, of New York was Chairman of that Commission. They made their pronouncement about Washington, N. C., after thorough and prolonged research. They've got the facts to back it up.

"But," you folks in Georgia may protest, "how about a definite date?"

We're coming to that. The earliest recorded mention of the place as Washington is in an order of the council of safety at Halifax, N. C., dated October 1, 1776.

Now the chances are that the place was named Washington before this date, but we're not taking advantage of that. We're willing to accept October 1, 1776, as the official date, because the official records give it.

What does Washington, Ga., have to say?

We quote from Mr. Culhane's piece: "It is interesting to note how the county seat of Wilkes County came to be changed from Heard's Fort to Washington and the role it has played in history since that time. The thought was born in the hearts of the patriots of Wilkes County in that never-to-be-forgotten winter at Valley Forge, when George Washington was begging the Continental Congress to send aid to his half-starved brave little army. They appealed to their State lawmakers to authorize the changing of Heard's Fort to Washington. This was eventually done in accord with a legislative act which stated 'that a town has been ordered and laid out in the county of Wilkes at a place called Washington.' Thus Washington, Ga., was the first of many towns to be named after our first President."

Oh, it was, was it?

THE VALLEY FORGE EPISODE

Wait a minute, Mr. Culhane. George Washington and his troops spent the winter of 1777–78 at Valley Forge. We'll give you every advantage in this argument. We'll let you claim that the people of Heard's Fort took recognition of Washington's predicament during the first month of winter—December 1777. Of course, that is unlikely, but we'll let you get away with it if you want to.

What does that add up to?

Washington, N. C., October 1, 1776.

Washington, Ga., December something, 1777.

Which is the earlier date, Mr. Culhane?

Certainly it is.

Which, therefore, is the first town in the world to be named for Washington?

Thank you, Mr. Culhane. We appreciate your fairness in the matter. No; it isn't necessary for you to make a public apology; just forget it.

But don't forget that Washington, N. C., is the first Washington.

[From the Clip Sheet, George Washington Bicentennial]

WASHINGTON, N. C., FIRST TOWN NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON

New York has its Saratoga, Massachusetts its Bunker Hill, and Virginia its Yorktown, but there is probably no city in the United States to which the coming George Washington Bicentennial Celebration will have more significance and where it will be observed with more patriotic fervor than a little town in North Carolina with a population of but 7,000.

This little town is named Washington, and although there are 422 cities and towns throughout the country having the same name, Washington, N. C., has the distinction of being the first town named after the first President. This event took place as early as 1775 or 1776, according to official record.

As a result of this distinction, ex-Congressman Lindsay C. Warren, Chairman of the Bicentennial Commission of that town, has conferred with Congressman SOL BLOOM, associate director of the United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission, to arrange plans for this little town to pay homage in a special way to the first President of the United States, including a specially arranged pageant.

The settlement out of which grew Washington, N. C., has an interesting history. According to ex-Congressman Warren, on November 20, 1771, James Bonner, founder of the town, presented, and had passed a bill by the North Carolina Assembly, held at Hillsboro, for the establishment of a town on his plantation. This fact is recorded in the colonial records of North Carolina. At that time the town was called Forks of the Tar River, and James Bonner was a wealthy planter who owned all the land on which the town was situated.

He was a personal friend of General Washington and when Washington took command of the American armies at Cambridge, Mass., on July 3, 1775, Bonner was shortly afterward appointed a colonel.

"I am unable to say exactly just how soon after his appointment as colonel, James Bonner named the town he had founded after his Commander in Chief, but it is thought to have occurred in 1775, or early in 1776," said ex-Congressman Warren.

"The first recorded mention of the town as 'Washington' is dated Monday, October 1, 1776, and is on an order of the council of safety at Halifax. It reads, 'That Capt. John Forrester, commander of the armed brig, *The General Washington*, now lying at Washington, do proceed with all possible despatch to Ocracock Bar.'

"The first deed for a lot in the town of Washington," said ex-Congressman Warren, "was dated December 23, 1776, and is recorded in the office of the register of deeds of Beaufort County, at Washington, the county seat.

"The town of Washington was incorporated by the general assembly meeting at Hillsboro on April 13, 1782. On the United States post-office building at Washington, N. C., is a tablet reading:

"'To commemorate the first post office named 'Washington' in the United States. Established A. D. 1789 in Washington, Beaufort County, N. C. The first town named 'Washington' in the United States, December 1776.

"The tablet," ex-Congressman Warren observed, "was placed there by the Daughters of the American Revolution, but, of course, the United States Post Office Department thoroughly investigated the matter before permitting the tablet to be affixed to the building. I have a letter from the Postmaster General, stating that the official records of the Department show conclusively that Washington, N. C., was the first post office by that name in the United States."

In addition to Congressman Warren, the town bicentennial committee recently appointed by Mayor S. R. Fowle, Jr., consists of W. B. Rodman, Jr., Edmund H. Harding, Edmund T. Buckman, Carl Goerch, Rev. W. D. McInnis, Paul McAvoy, Richard C. Leach, J. W. Oden, Mrs. Harry McMullan, Mrs. Frank C. Kugler, and Mrs. Marcia M. Knott.

From the early part of the eighteenth century the Bonner family have held places of trust in the church, the State, and the Nation, particularly in connection with the history of Beaufort County, and Washington, N. C. Early in the eighteenth century, Thomas, James, and William Bonner, who had emigrated from England earlier, came to Beaufort County and settled around what is now known as the town of Washington. Prior to 1776 it was known as Pea Town or the "Fork on the Tar."

Thomas Bonner located on what is now known as the Sycamore of Bonner Hill. Here he was buried, and the inscription on his tomb reads: "Beneath this stone lies the body of Thomas Bonner, Esq., who departed his life April 7, 1765. Age 75. In 1759 he was sheriff of Beaufort County. He married Abigail ———, who bore him the following children: Henry, Thomas, Elizabeth, Sarah, Abigail, Mary, Ann, and James."

As early as 1750 James Bonner was given grants of land in Beaufort County, and in 1769 he was serving on a Committee of Claims for the Province of North Carolina. In 1770 and 1771 he was a member of the general assembly. On November 30, 1771, he introduced a petition for the charter of the present town of Washington which reads in part:

"Petition of sundry of the inhabitants of the counties of Beaufort and Pitt, for altering the boundary lines between said counties, and praying a town may be erected at the head of the Pamplico, on the plantation of Maj. James Bonner, and William Boyd, a minor."

While the charter for the town of Washington, N. C., does not include the date of the month or day, we do find that as early as October 21, 1776, the town of Washington is mentioned on one occasion.

In 1783 John and James Bonner were given a charter to clear a road through the swamp and to operate a ferry from the south side of the town of Washington across the Pamlico River. In 1784 the county seat of Beaufort was moved from Bath to Washington and provisions were also made for the erection of a courthouse and other buildings.

While the Bonners were stanch churchmen, they were among the first to join the forces of the American Revolution. On September 9, 1775, when the third provincial congress of North Carolina provided for the county militia, James Bonner was appointed colonel and Thomas Bonner, lieutenant colonel for Beaufort County. When the new appointments were made on April 22, 1776, they were reappointed and Henry Bonner was made a second major and Thomas Brown first major. Throughout the American Revolution the Bonner family continued to serve in positions of trust and influence.

The genealogy of the Bonner family of Beaufort County is printed in J. R. B. Hathaway, edition, The North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register, II (1901), pages 115–120, 171–178, 405–411.

Labor's Great Part in Winning the War

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very significant letter from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, which gives a graphic description of the part labor has performed in producing the implements that are necessary to win the war.

This letter from the man on whom rests the tremendous responsibility of seeing that the war-production program is carried out satisfactorily ought, I think, to bring about two distinct and positive results.

First. It should immediately put an end for all time to the unthinkable, un-American, totalitarian proposal to "draft labor" in the United States.

Second. It should be helpful in bringing about the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and the wholly uncalled for and unwarranted injustice which labor as a whole has had to suffer by the passage of that act. I believe Mr. Nelson's letter demonstrates two facts conclusively—

First. That the proponents of the Austin-Wadsworth universal national conscription bill, otherwise known as the "National Service Act" and the "Labor Draft," or "Forced Labor," bill do not have a leg to stand on.

Second. That the passage of the Smith-Connally bill was a cruel, stinging insult to honest patriotic labor which has made a record of production beyond all comparison.

I have promptly referred Chairman Nelson's letter to the committees that are considering the Austin-Wadsworth bill and the bills that have been introduced to repeal the Smith-Connally Act and I shall follow up and see that the letter receives the attention its importance merits.

A few days ago I wrote to Chairman Nelson asking him to give me the true picture of labor's performance in producing the implements of war. If it was a bad picture, I wanted to know it and if, on the other hand, it was a pleasing picture, I wanted the facts so that, in justice to labor, I might present the truth to the House and to the country. In his reply Mr. Nelson says it is his "firm belief" that "American labor has done a truly splendid job in war production" and that "labor has met the heavy responsibilities with real patriotism and determination." Then he proceeds to present statistics of production that are staggering in their immensity.

But I think the amazing story of labor's part in the war effort is best told in Mr. Nelson's own words. His letter to me is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Thank you for telling me about your plan to make an address on labor's part in the production of the implements of war. I hope that the following material will be of some use to you:

You ask my opinion as to the part labor has performed in war production. Taking the production program as a whole, and considering all of the difficulties which have been encountered, it is my firm belief that American labor has done a truly splendid job in war production. Labor and management alike have of course been under great pressure during the last 2 years and have had to work at very high tension. Mistakes have been made, naturally, and the strain which is normal at a time like this has from time to time brought about unfortunate misunderstandings and disagreements; yet I do not see how anyone can look at the great volume of production that has been achieved since Pearl Harbor without realizing that labor has met the heavy responsibilities with real patriotism and determination. The important thing is that the job is being done.

The production of arms and munitions since Pearl Harbor has very substantially exceeded even the most optimistic expectations any of us had before this country got into the war. In 1941, for example, when what then appeared to be a very large defense program was under way this country produced munitions valued at less than $3,000,000,000. In 1942 that figure was raised to $31,238,000,000, while in 1943 it stood at more than $57,622,000,000. I do not believe that anyone in the fall of 1941 anticipated that such prodigious increases — properly balanced among the hundreds of different categories — could be achieved so rapidly.

The following figures showing increases made in different categories of production may be of interest to you:

From July 1940 through December 1941 we produced 23,200 military airplanes. In 1942 we produced 47,900. In 1943 we produced 85,900.

From July 1940 through December 1941 we turned out 4,300 tanks. In 1942 we made 23,900. In 1943 we made 29,500.

From July 1940 through December 1941 this country manufactured 126,100 machine guns. In 1942 we made 666,800. In 1943 we made 830,400.

From July 1940 through December 1941 we made 370,500 rifles and carbines. In 1942 we made 1,552,000. In 1943 we made 5,624,000.

In small-arms ammunition 1,200,000,000 rounds were produced from July 1940 through December 1941. In 1942 there were produced 9,800,000,000 rounds. In 1943 production was 19,700,000,000 rounds.

We had produced one piece of self-propelled artillery by the end of 1941. In 1942, 8,300 were produced and in 1943 production was 22,200.

By the end of 1941, 270,000 displacement tons of naval ships had been constructed. In 1942 this figure was raised to 865,000 displacement tons, and the displacement tonnage constructed in 1943 stood at 2,618,000.

I trust that this material will be of some use to you in your speech.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

Ceiling Price on Strawberries

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days a large number of Members of this House and Members of the Senate have met with representatives of the Office of Price Administration to discuss a proposed ceiling price on strawberries. We have taken a great deal of time of the Members and the employees of the Office of Price Administration with no discernable effect other than a sense of frustration on the one hand and irritation on the other. The strawberry, as everyone knows, is not one of the major crops of this Nation and is not included in the index of the cost of living. It is definitely a luxury item of a highly perishable nature and is not considered an essential element in the diet of anyone.

It is common knowledge that the production of strawberries is one of the most hazardous of all agricultural undertakings. Its extremely perishable nature makes the growing of the berry very difficult. The price fluctuates traditionally, even in normal years, as much as 100 percent within the space of a few weeks, and sometimes within a few days.

I do not propose to take the time of this House to discuss all of the facts concerning strawberries which make ceiling prices impracticable and inadvisable. I refer those who are especially interested to the report of the advisory committee of the Office of Price Administration and the transcript of the meeting in the Senate Office Building on last Wednesday.

The principal point which I wish to make is that in the administration of the Office of Price Administration there seems to be a great reluctance on the part of the administrators to exercise any discretion or discrimination in the administering of the act. There are few members, I believe, who think that there should be no control whatever over the principal items constituting the cost of living. On the other hand, I do not believe that the Congress intended, when it passed the Price Control Act, that every

single commodity, even to the most insignificant produced in the country, should be subjected to the complicated machinery of price ceilings. It has been said that the Congress should be more specific in its legislation. I believe that it is more reasonable to say that it is the duty of the agency administering the law to exercise some judgment and discrimination in the administering of the acts as passed. To illustrate what I mean, I think there are few who would disagree that bread and meat should not be controlled. On the other extreme, it seems to me that such things as fresh strawberries, raspberries, and fresh cherries need not be controlled. The difficulties inherent in the control of a perishable item such as fresh strawberries makes it impracticable and unreasonable to treat this item as one may treat wheat, pork, and corn. Furthermore, I do not see that strawberries are competitive to any other item which might disrupt the basic cost of living and seriously compete with the labor supply for the harvesting of other crops.

As a matter of good administration, it seems to me that the Government bureaus must take the responsibility for drawing the line somewhere between those articles which, because of their nature and their importance to the people, must be controlled, and those which need not be controlled. It is my belief that unless this judgment is exercised, the whole program of price control may break down, causing disastrous inflation. We all know that it is the interference with small matters which often causes the greatest resentment among the people. One reason for this is that when it is clear to people that a particular control is important and justifiable because of its effect on the war effort, they will accept it with good grace, but when there is no reasonable relation between the item and the objective to which we are all committed, this causes so much resentment that it threatens to break down the whole program.

From the point of view of the Members of this House, who must explain and justify the legislation adopted here to their constituents, it is too much to expect that we can justify a price ceiling on strawberries. This forces us to denounce the bureaucrats who refuse to use common sense and judgment in the administration of the law. I think it is a good illustration of why there is so much quarreling and animosity prevailing between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

In the parliamentary system of government, where the executive is a part of and directly responsible to the legislative power, this condition is not likely to exist, but under our system of separation of powers it is absolutely necessary if there is to be an efficient administration of government, that the executive departments exercise some discretion in the administration of the laws, particularly when they find that the legislative body practically unanimously disapproves of their methods.

For the sake of over-all price-control program, as well as the livelihood of many farmers, I sincerely hope that the Office of Price Administration will reconsider its decision to impose a price ceiling on strawberries.

Let Not This Country Surrender Control of Its Own Economy

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to note in last evening's edition of the Washington Star an article, the heading of which reads as follows: "Allies Near Accord on Post-War Fund to Stabilize Exchange." This article, which I beg leave to have inserted with my remarks, went on to state that "Early and complete agreement among Russian, British, American, and Canadian monetary experts on a multi-billion-dollar, gold-based fund to stabilize post-war foreign exchange was believed imminent today." The article further stated that "Mr. Harry D. White, Treasury monetary expert, proposed an $8,000,000,000 fund to be made up of gold and local currency contributions of participating nation." The article follows:

ALLIES NEAR ACCORD ON POST-WAR FUND TO STABILIZE EXCHANGE

Early and complete agreement among Russian, British, American, and Canadian monetary experts on a multibillion-dollar, gold-based fund to stabilize post-war foreign exchange was believed imminent today.

That belief grew following the disclosure that parallel conversations have been in progress here with British authorities, while a Russian delegation was being acquainted with the so-called White currency-stabilization plan.

An official who told of the new Anglo-American talks said one more meeting was expected to eliminate the final point at issue, described as a minor one and unrelated to the question of gold.

GOLD WAS POINT AT ISSUE

Heretofore the White (American) and Keynes (British) plans have been at wide variance as to whether gold should play a leading or subordinate role in balancing international trade and credit transactions.

Harry D. White, Treasury monetary expert, proposed an $8,000,000,000 fund to be made up of gold and local currency contributions of participating nations. Lord Keynes, Bank of England director, suggested instead a clearinghouse arrangement without original assets and using a quota system based on foreign-trade volume.

RUSSIA FAVORS WHITE PLAN

There was no indication that any of the recent talks brought representatives of the three powers together at the same time. However, it was known to the British as well as to the Americans that Russia, as a major gold holder, regarded the White plan as the more acceptable. This Russian attitude was believed to have caused British capitulation to American views.

Canada already has drafted its own plan, strikingly similar to the latest White proposal.

A Treasury official said he expected at least a couple more Russo-American conversations, last on the agenda before the State Department issues formal invitations to an international monetary conference to consider currency stabilization as well as a world bank for reconstruction and development.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been disturbed by learning indirectly of agreements being made by the Chief Executive and executive departments of the Government with the governments of the United Nations, which may have the effect of committing the citizens of these United States to vast expenditures or responsibilities which they may not be inclined to accept.

I believe that this Congress should serve notice on the governments of all friendly nations that while the American people will bend every effort to the winning of this war, and that the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds for this purpose, yet the fact remains that every piece of war legislation terminates with the cessation of hostilities. I, for one, am jealous of the reputation of the United States. It must stand by its legal commitments, but everyone should know that, particularly in matters of finance and the appropriating of the people's money, sole authority rests in the Congress.

It is my belief that the American people will accept their proportionate responsibility in the post-war period, but I feel certain that they will want to be fully apprised of just what obligations are being undertaken for their account.

The Treasury Department has so far not made public its final agreements, nor how far they have attempted to bind this Government. It is well known, however, that the Treasury thinking is somewhat along these lines: The Treasury believes that the matter of greatest importance is the stabilization of all world currencies in order that world commerce may recommence. How this is to be achieved, however, is a matter open to great question The Treasury and Lord Keynes, of England, are the authors of a plan of international collaboration, through an international stabilization fund, under which the strong nations of the world shall loan foreign exchange to the weaker nations. The board of directors of the central fund could through coercion control the economic life of the weaker nations through the making of loans or withholding of credit, as the board of directors of the central fund may in their wisdom decide.

In other words, the Treasury and Keynes plan provided a type of bureaucratic control of the economic destinies of the nations of the world and there is even a provision that should the United States find itself in the position of exporting more goods than it imports, the central finance fund may bring pressure on this Government to change the value of its currency and lower its tariff rates in order that the world currency stabilization may be maintained.

Some day in the distant future when the war has been won and the various governments of the world are stable, this

country may find it to its advantage to enter into some international agreement, but it is common knowledge today that the millenium has not yet been reached and that there is not full accord between the governments of some of the United Nations as to post-war frontiers or post-war aspirations. This being the case, is it advisable at this time to join up and invest our taxpayers' earnings and probably capital in an international bank in which there can only be many questions of policy impossible of solution today and difficult of solution for a number of years to come?

I believe that this country should prepare itself to meet its obligations. First, in assisting some of the devastated countries of the world in cooperation with other countries of good will; and secondly, in assisting our friends of the United Nations in working out some of the financial and economic problems that will face them when the war ends, but I challenge any man or group of men to be able to write a plan at this time that will cover all of these requirements.

It is my belief that each case should stand on its own feet. Take, for instance, the questions that will face one of the smaller nations which has suffered great destruction due to invasion. There are a number of such countries and the problems of each will be different. We should prepare now to set up some central organization provided with capital under the complete control of our Government, the officials of which organization would sit in with the officials of other nations and work out ways and means that will restore the economic life of the country in question.

In this way all the nations of good will can participate in each undertaking to the extent they feel able either in cash or in kind, and the nation assisted will commence rebuilding on a sound foundation, which in turn will bring stability of currency and over a period of a few years permit it to engage in foreign trade to the extent the growing economy of the country will permit.

Any other plan is as unsound and will bring as few favorable results as trying to lift oneself by one's bootstraps.

As far as offering assistance to the United Nations in the post-war world is concerned, the requirements of each will be quite different. It is well known that our good friend and ally, England, will find herself in a difficult foreign exchange position as regards paying for foreign imports of necessary raw materials, and finding a solution for the repayment of deposits to the dominions, India and a number of foreign creditors. Such deposits are in great sums, and probably could not be transferred at one time.

The requirements of Russia or of China will be quite different but of equal importance, and over and above all of these, what will be the ability of our own country to participate?

I cannot agree with the philosophy of some of the economic advisors of the executive departments that our national public finance is only a matter of bookkeeping and that a rising public debt, instead of having adverse consequence, is on the contrary a boon to the country.

With all the good will in the world to be of assistance, let not this country surrender its control of its own economy. On the other hand, let us prepare to participate in all matters that will aid in bringing the world back to full peacetime endeavor as soon as possible. This cannot be accomplished except in the manner prescribed by England's great Prime Minister, by work and sweat. No fantastic panacea will take their place.

Jewish Homeland in Palestine

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are demanding that something be done on the pending Compton resolution—House Resolution 419—dealing with the Palestine question. I am in receipt of a letter from the Oil City Ministerial Association, an outstanding group of spiritual leaders who represent the various branches of the Protestant Church life in my community. They say:

OIL CITY MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION,
Oil City, Pa., March 13, 1944.

Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GAVIN: At a special meeting of the Oil City Ministerial Association, held this morning, the following resolution was adopted:

"We, the members of the Oil City Ministerial Association, earnestly desire to go on record imploring you to favor the resolution pending in Congress concerning Palestine as a homeland of the Jews.

"We feel in this manner justice would be done to this suffering people, and therefore profoundly urge the passing of the resolution."

Most sincerely yours,
DANIEL HARTMAN,
President.
A. M. TURNEY,
Secretary.

I have a letter from the First Methodist Church, Wayne Furman, minister, in which the following statements are made:

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Warren, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. GAVIN: There are two matters concerning which I wish to register with you my opinions.

The first is in regard to opening up Palestine to the Jews. Personally, I think that it should be done. Anything our Government may be able to do to achieve this end I believe should be done.

* * * * *

Yours truly,
WAYNE FURMAN.

I call attention also to the following telegram:

Congressman LEON GAVIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted by our Grange No. 1025 the Congress of the United States reaffirms the resolution unanimously adopted on June 30, 1922, reading as follows that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

Dr. C. J. FRANTZ, *Master*
Mrs. MARGARET JOHNSON, *Secretary,*
Warren Grange No. 1025.

However, there is seemingly nothing the Members of the Congress can do on this legislation until the Foreign Affairs Committee releases this Resolution 419 so the Membership of the House by their action can indicate to the British Empire the attitude of the American people on this momentous question.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, let us be bold and honest in a Presidential campaign, even in the midst of a world war, and let the chips fall where they will.

It is a little paradoxical to say we are fighting for freedom and at the same time insist on being a permanent part of a superstate.

We do not claim to be a prophet or the relative of one, but we will bet that HENRY WALLACE has never lost caste with the indispensable and will be tagged the nominee for Vice President again.

Ireland will learn in the end that international law is all right in peacetimes, but it does not apply right or wrong in a world war, even for neutrality, and the same goes for Spain.

The Barkley incident did more to free the Senate from the Executive than any election that ever happened—and remember it is the Senate's right to ratify or repudiate treaties—the biggest club in the post-war planning.

Pearl Harbor stimulated our entrance into the war, but the penetrating purpose of the successful pursuit of victory in the Southwest Pacific is that we shall not be denied equal opportunity at least of the products of the East Indies.

A great deal is being said about soldiers—too much cannot be said in praise of them and the job they are doing—but here is one Congressman who does not make a practice of writing to them because they are not allowed to write us. Why embarrass them?

On my first night back home I heard the coyotes just beyond the sheep in their

roofless house. After making a noise to scare them away I went to sleep thinking of how only a little while ago the Congress was where the sheep were last night.

Speaking again of post-war planning and freedom, let us remind England that if our boys can fight and die in Africa we might have some right there later. If we are definitely committed to internationalism, I for one would like to make it realistic.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a copy of an address made by Paul A. Keetz, of Malvern Preparatory School, Malvern, Pa., which he had given on the Philadelphia Junior Town Meeting of the Air program over Station KYW. Of course, this address had been prepared and delivered before the vote was taken in the House yesterday on the conference report on the soldiers' vote bill. In his address young Paul Keetz said in a few words everything that could possibly be said on this controversial question and his conclusions are unanswerable. It occurred to me that every Member of the House should be given an opportunity to read his address, and my only regret is that a copy of his remarks could not be delivered to every Congressman's office before the final vote was recorded yesterday. His address over radio station KYW follows:

Our armed forces can be divided into three major categories: those actually fighting, those stationed overseas, but not in combat service, and those stationed temporarily or permanently in this country. In all three divisions, it can be said that very few even considered their right of suffrage until the political leaders brought up the question.

Take the first division, the front line combat soldier. He wants to vote but actually does very little about it. He neither thinks about it nor talks it over with his buddies. In the words of Ernie Pyle who spent some time in the South Pacific war theater, "If you offered the average soldier his choice between voting in November and finding a dirty cow shed to lie down in out of the rain, the cow shed would win." The combat soldier if he is going to vote at all, wants the simplest ballot, therefore, the Federal ballot. He wants no red tape. Nine-tenths would not vote on a State ballot because of the lack of leisure time, questionnaires, affidavits, and so forth. He knows that the folks back home are competent enough to elect the right men for public office. They are in a position to know the true facts. He does not demand his vote.

Then we have the overseas troops, who have not seen combat service, such as those in England, Australia, and India. These men feel they are in a better position to know the facts than their comrades in the fox holes. They show a more active interest in political affairs by writing to service publications, such as Stars and Stripes stating their views. The majority favor the Green-Lucas bill, the Federal ballot, and the use of V-mail for voting. But all in all there is no burning desire to manifest their preference for one candidate or another. Theirs is a rather passive interest.

Lastly, there are the servicemen in the United States itself. The greater number of these feel they know as much about what is at stake as the civilians. But even so, they want the easiest form of voting possible. They want the minimum of inconvenience. They'll vote if it doesn't cost them anything. Their desire is more pronounced than the other two classes, but, nevertheless, many are indifferent. All will vote, however, on a Federal ballot.

The officers' opinions echo those of their men. They prefer a Federal ballot because of its simplicity and the fact that even in peacetime they seldom voted. They consider themselves citizens of the Nation rather than of a particular State.

The principal fear of the men themselves is that they will have to vote en masse under military direction and that they will be overwhelmed with propaganda.

Sweden Celebrates One-Hundredth Anniversary of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Cooperative League of the United States has called my attention to the plans being made in Sweden for the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first cooperative society at Rochdale, England, in December 1844. During those hundred years the cooperative method of doing business whereby ordinary citizens with very little capital have found it possible to operate businesses of all sorts for themselves and for their own benefit, has spread throughout the world. Those principles are today largely responsible for the effective and heroic resistance of the Chinese against Japanese aggression. The cooperatives have been able to pierce the tyranny of Hitler in Europe and offer the best and most solid hope for the rehabilitation of that continent. They have contributed probably more than any other single force to the constructive solutions of problems faced by American farmers and with the spirit of the movement that can make a like contribution to the problems of the American consumers generally. It is, however, in Sweden that cooperatives have perhaps exerted their greatest and most salutary influence upon the life of any nation. I, therefore, include herewith in the RECORD a brief article appearing in the February 12 issue of the Cooperative News, published in England, which discusses plans being made in Sweden for the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the cooperatives:

SWEDISH PLAN FOR MEMORABLE YEAR

When Swedish citizens set out for their work or on pleasure bent on New Year's Day, they saw posters on all the hoardings telling them that this was the memorable year—the centenary year of the Rochdale cooperative movement.

The keynote for the coming 6 months of all the extensive Swedish propaganda about the movement will be this memorable year slogan. It will appear in parcels and letters, in shop-window displays with pictures of the Toad-lane store, and in newspaper advertising. With its usual enterprise and thoroughness, the Swedish cooperative movement has set up an office, with a special staff, to run the centenary program, and already the results of its work can be seen. The first of a series of articles, written by Mr. Thorsten Odhe, has appeared in 60 Swedish papers of all political shades.

The memorable year campaign will have its culmination in the cooperative congress, which will cover 3 days instead of the usual 2, and will have Rochdale as its main theme. During the coming months Kooperativa Forbundet is spreading abroad knowledge of the cooperative movement and what it means through an offer of 10,000 Swedish kronor ($4,537) for the best novel with a cooperative theme, British or Swedish; a cooperative film, to be made and shown during the year; the setting up of a special good housekeeping institute. At this institute prominent experts are testing and valuing household goods in everyday use, whether expensive or cheap, and all articles which receive their approval are labeled accordingly. Also, two books are to be published, one dealing with the history of the Swedish movement, by Axel Pahlman, Kooperativa Forbundet's librarian; and the other by Thorsten Odhe, who is at present in this country gathering material on the British cooperative movement.

In connection with congress there will be a large exhibit in Stockholm featuring the Toad-lane store and showing the entire development of the Swedish movement, and photographs of the British movement. After congress this exhibition will go on tour throughout Sweden. Stockholm, too, will have its historical pageant, which will be given as a grand finale to congress.

Another feature of the congress will be the presentation to 28 Swedish cooperative pioneers of special honors and medals for their faithful service. A proposal is also to be submitted by the board of Kooperativa Forbundet for the creation of a Rochdale scholarship fund to enable young cooperators to study cooperation in Great Britain.

After an interval of 2 months, the Swedish movement will begin a new phase of its campaign, with a new slogan "the cooperative century," which will also be posted throughout the country. Cooperative societies will hold festivals, with speeches by prominent leaders, and will carry on an intensive canvassing campaign.

All this will lead up to a thrilling climax on the night of December 21, when in Stockholm and all other Swedish cities there will be a torch procession. At the end of this the mothers will be asked to return to their homes and listen on the radio to a play about cooperation written by a famous Swedish author.

Throughout the year special courses are to be given for young students in the English language and in social and economic questions. Students who have attended these courses will be given a special badge in the British colors with "Rochdale 1944" printed on it. These students will then be available as guides to English-speaking visitors to Sweden.

Russia's Attitude on Poland Scored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 16, 1944:

RUSSIA'S ATTITUDE ON POLAND SCORED—GROUP URGES UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN TO TAKE UP QUESTION OF FRONTIERS WITH SOVIET—BREACH OF FAITH CHARGED—STATEMENT POINTS TO DANGERS OF REVIVING ISOLATIONISM, WRECKING PEACE HOPES

A group of 36 educators, jurists, publicists, and religious leaders issued yesterday a statement calling upon the American and British Governments to raise with the Soviet Government the question of its unilateral efforts to settle the controversy over Poland's future frontiers and government, and other problems affecting successful collaboration of the United Nations in the task of establishing a stable democratic world order.

The statement also appealed to the Soviet Government for a more conciliatory attitude and the renunciation of unilateral action in Poland and elsewhere, and warned that if the Soviet Government continued to follow policies in contradiction with the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow Declaration there would be a revival of isolationism in this country that would wreck the hopes of a future world equilibrium.

RISK OF ESTRANGEMENT SEEN

"If Russia values America's friendship, as we believe she does, she must not use her power to impose either an unjust frontier or a puppet government upon the Polish people," the statement declared. "Russia must choose. She can impose her will, but she cannot impose it without estranging millions of Americans whose opinions may be decisive in the development of our foreign policy. And Russia will estrange others besides Americans, for what will millions of citizens of the small conquered (and satellite) countries have to hope from an Allied victory, if this is how we discharge our obligations to Poland? Such a default would be worth many battalions to Hitler. We hope, therefore, that Russia's immense power will enable her to be generous."

Among the signers of the statement were George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College; Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College; Justice Ferdinand Pecora, Raymond Leslie Buell, former chairman of the Foreign Policy Association; Maj. George Fielding Eliot, military commentator; former Justice Jeremiah T. Mahoney, William Agar, acting president of Freedom House; the Reverend Robert W. Searle, general secretary of the Greater New York Federation of Churches; Ernest Angell, president of the Council for Democracy, and the Right Reverend Malcolm Peabody, bishop of central New York.

POLAND'S PROBLEM RECALLED

Recalling that "Poland was the first nation to halt Hitler's procession of bloodless victories which made him all but invincible," the statement continued:

"The Poles determined to fight even though many foresaw that war meant the temporary conquest and enslavement of Poland, because they believed that the justice of Poland's cause and the loyalty of her allies would insure her resurrection in the end.

"They made this declaration at a time when Russia thought it necessary to collaborate with Hitler, and yet Poland, after suffering untold agony, is now asked to surrender far more to Russia than what she refused to give Hitler. The Curzon line frontier demanded by Russia is close to the Hitler Stalin line of 1939. It means a loss of 46 percent of pre-war Poland, while it represents a gain of less than 1 percent for the Soviet Union.

"The Polish Government has declared its readiness to discuss concessions, but no government, least of all a government-in-exile, could make such concessions as this without the express consent of its people."

WOULD LEAVE CHOICE TO POLAND

"As for the Polish Government-in-exile," the statement declared, "it is not our concern to pass judgment on the merits of some of Russia's complaints against it. But it is at least a legitimate Government, supported by the Polish underground and composed almost entirely of men and parties who opposed the dictatorship of the Polish colonels.

"It is for the Polish people and for them alone to decide how far they will recognize the present Government when they are free. In the meantime if improvements along democratic lines are to be made they cannot be dictated from outside, least of all dictated by one great power which is not now a democracy.

"Once more we repeat, that if we are left uncertain whether or not Russia intends to disregard the feelings and convictions of those millions of the United Nations who are looking forward to the triumph of democratic justice in the relations of all nations, great and small, there exists an urgent danger that Americans will revert to isolationism. This must not happen, regardless of political difficulties, for it would mean that humanity's hopes for a united world would be disappointed again.

"Therefore, in the interest of all the United Nations we urge the British and American Governments to raise these questions with the Soviet Government, and we ourselves appeal to our Russian Allies to take cognizance of the legitimate disquiet of the American people. We ask this not only because it would strengthen our unity in the war and hasten the day of victory, but because it would cement the friendship between the Russian and American peoples in the crucial years to come."

The War and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 9, 1944, in the New York Herald Tribune, I find the following editorial. The last paragraph of this editorial indicates the proper direction our effort should take in developing a program for the relief of the suffering Jewish people in the war-ridden countries of Europe:

THE WAR AND PALESTINE

Congress is under strong pressure to pass a resolution, now introduced in both Houses, reiterating the principles stated in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and resolving: "That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country * * * so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." Under the provision of the British white paper of 1939, Jewish immigration to Palestine will be barred after this month unless the Palestinian Arabs acquiesce in its continuance.

The resolution is prompted by Americans' sense of justice and great sympathy for the Jewish people. However, Congress has been requested by Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of State Hull to drop the resolution. Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, has backed their request in closed hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We do not know the precise basis for the request, but no doubt it turns on the protests of the Arab states, and no doubt it is the conviction of our highest military authorities that the resolution will create difficulties in the prosecution of the war. It is our considered opinion that the advice of the military authorities must be accepted.

Acceptance is hard because Americans generally feel that strict application of the 1939 white paper at this time of peril and uncertainty for the Jews of Europe is regrettable and they want to make their protest known. They believe that the Balfour Declaration promised Palestine to the Jews as a homeland and that the white paper, in effect, withdraws that promise. But the white paper was a war measure in 1939 and obviously is still considered a war measure in 1944. It goes without saying that it cannot be considered as prejudicing future settlement of the Palestine issue.

It seems to us that it is within the province of the State Department to make, and that the State Department should make, the strongest possible representations to the British Government that interpretation of the immigration provision be as generous as possible; that every effort be made to facilitate the issuing of 30,000 unused visas which will be still available after this month, and to secure Arab consent for emergency reception of refugees. At a later date, when military considerations are not compelling, the Congress might well go on record with a resolution affirming the American viewpoint.

Fourteen Mighty Cents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1944:

FOURTEEN MIGHTY CENTS

For Americans facing simultaneous declarations of war against them by such well-prepared enemies as Japan and Germany, allies were as necessary as armaments and trained fighters Even now that the United States has built its war machine up to unprecedented proportions and efficiency, it cannot without allies assure itself of the decisive victory which is required if a durable peace is to be achieved.

The Russians have acknowledged that the war against Hitler cannot be won without American supplies. The British have likewise evaluated the American contribution. However, American experience in the war has

shown that without the achievements of the Russian Armies, the British Navy, and the R. A. F. and British and Commonwealth land fighters, the United States would hardly have been able to marshal its forces in time to preserve a world in which a freedom-loving nation could be safe.

Lend-lease figures cited by Leo T. Crowley before the House Foreign Affairs Committee show that Americans have obtained the priceless services of their allies, and the precious time in which to develop American power potentials, for 14 cents of the war dollar. That is the portion of American war expenditures going into lend-lease—14 percent.

Whatever value lend-lease may have for America's allies, it has been as big a bargain for Americans. British civilians bombed by the Nazis, Russian soldiers offering themselves by the millions—just these two items among many help to explain what has been added to that 14 percent to make it pay the dividends America is now reaping.

True, the United States is still investing 86 cents out of every war dollar in enterprises that must be underwritten by the lives of its own men. But the 14 cents is saving American lives in numbers favorably disproportionate to the cost of the insurance. A vote in Congress to extend the Lend-Lease Act is a foregone conclusion.

Lend-Lease Aid to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 28, 1944:

LEND-LEASE AID TO RUSSIA

One of the reasons why the Russians were able to stem the tide of German conquest and then send it into reverse is American lend-lease aid. An idea of the colossal stature of this assistance is to be found in the cold figures released Sunday by the Foreign Economic Administration.

Among the weapons, equipment, and supplies this country had shiped to Russia by the end of 1943 were 7,800 airplanes, 4,700 tanks and tank destroyers, and 177,000 tons of explosives, Administrator Leo T. Crowley reported.

A total of 8,400,000 tons of arms and supplies flowed from American factories and farms to Russia in a little more than 2 years, from the time the Soviet air program began in October 1941 until the end of 1943. Some of the items are: More than 225,000 vehicles including 170,000 trucks and 33,000 jeeps; 740,000 tons of oil products, including aviation gasoline, other fuels, and lubricants; 1,350,000 tons of steel, 384,000 tons of aluminum, copper, and other metals; and $400,000,000 worth of machinery and machine tools; more than 6,000,000 pairs of army boots.

The value of these shipments had mounted to $4,243,804,000 by the end of the year. The tonnage for 1943 was almost double that for 1942—5,400,000 tons as against 2,800,000—reflecting a steady increase in lend-lease aid to Russia which reached the peak for the 27 months in December.

More than one-fourth of the total shipments, consisted of food: 2,250,000 tons of wheat, flour, sugar, meat, dried peas and beans, powdered milk, dried eggs; more than 580,000 tons of fats and oils; 50,000 tons of butter.

Among the machinery and machine tools sent to assist the Russians in building up or rebuilding destroyed manufacturing facilities, thus lightening the burden on our own production and easing the shipping situation, are 145,000 tons of refinery equipment for producing aviation gasoline. Machinery for a complete factory to make 1,000,000 tires a year from Russian-produced rubber also has been sent.

As to losses in transit, a vast improvement was made last year when only 1 Russia-bound lend-lease ship was sunk out of each 100 leaving our shores. The year before the ratio of losses at sea was 12 out of each 100. Last year several hundred more ships were dispatched than in 1942, the report pointed out. More than 3,000 of the 7,800 planes sent to Russia were flown all the way, thus saving time and shipping space.

There may be no way to measure accurately the lend-lease contribution to the total Russian war effort. Certainly, however, it has been a most vital factor and it might well have been the deciding factor. But for it, the Germans might have reached the oil fields of the Caucasus, and they might still be there. But for this Nation's tremendous industrial power, including its capacity to build ships, and but for the remarkable record made by merchant marine crews and convoy vessels in getting the goods through, the military picture in Russia would have been much different to what it is today.

A Soldier's Candidacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, some indication of what the boys in the service are thinking about can be gleaned from an advertisement of a young man from my district in the State of Washington who announced his intention to run for Congress from the Fifth District when the war is over.

Today he says:

I am serving our country as an officer in the United States Navy. My goal in life is to continue serving my country, giving my best efforts as a representative of the people in our National Congress. Now, during the rest of the war, and when peace comes again, I ask you to keep this pledge of sincerity in mind.

He insists that his candidacy is inspired by a desire deeply rooted in years of planning and preparation for the task, and the advertisement is signed "Roy I. Carriker."

I have known this young man's parents since before Roy was born, and I have nothing but commendation for those who aspire to give their best to the Nation, as I am convinced that the Members of this Seventy-eighth Congress are doing. Good government is based upon good motives and a sincere intention to fully prepare and capably perform. It is encouraging to see this unselfish interest of the boys in the service, to preserve and improve the American way of life.

A Good Citizen Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 16, 1944:

A GOOD CITIZEN SPEAKS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In at least two respects Mr. Eric Johnston's speech at Boston University had a different sound from a great many other speeches. He was able to tell the labor leaders the homely truth and to give them some very good advice without being self-righteous about it. As president of the United States Chamber of Commerce he had the grace and the plain humanity to tell them that management had its faults—and morally they were the same faults—as labor. Thus, he tried to speak the whole truth, not just that side of it he happened to be directly identified with.

And, speaking the whole truth, he was more than the advocate of management. He was a citizen, a man concerned with solving a problem and not solely with winning his case. What he said was, therefore, persuasive; it was capable of making men think and change their minds because he himself showed that he had thought and had his own mind open.

If only this could become a fashion in public speech, how different would be the coming campaign and how much more adult, how much saner, our public life. For we are cursed with the endless declamations of men who charge, accuse, berate, defend, but never seek to persuade. Only too rarely do we hear citizens discussing the state of the Nation, humbly looking for truth and earnestly seeking the light.

The air is loud with the shrill voices of men who see only the good in their own case and only the error in the other man's.

Mr. Johnston was unusual in another respect. He is an opponent of the New Deal who has not forgotten the 12 years that preceded it and led up to the New Deal. This, it seems to me, is the acid test of an intelligent conservative—that he should not for one moment allow himself to be intoxicated with the notion that if it were not for Roosevelt and the new dealers we should restore happily and successfully and lastingly an economy of free enterprise. Mr. Johnston knows better. "From 1921 to 1930 we had everything all our own way, a friendly administration in Washington, a friendly public," and from it the country got "a balloon boom that had to burst."

Surely, if after the war free enterprise is not only to be restored but to remain restored, it will be because businessmen start thinking where Mr. Johnston has started, and then insist that the politicians who set up to be their best friends start their thinking there, too. For if businessmen miss this chance which is going to be given them, they are not likely ever to get another chance.

In 1921 and thereafter they were led through illusion to a disaster by politicians who promised them normalcy. What Harding and his successors meant by normalcy was the world as it had been, and the conditions of business as they were in the time of McKinley. That world and those conditions had passed away forever. It was as impossible to return to them as it was to bring Queen Victoria to life and to enjoy again the effortless security

of the nineteenth century. The Republicans of the twenties who did not know this led the country to the catastrophe which produced the New Deal. For though Franklin Roosevelt has been in the White House what seems like a lifetime, as a matter of fact, he was put there by an election in 1932 when the country was looking for someone to save it from the abnormal consequence of 12 years of Republican normalcy.

Therefore, it makes a true conservative shiver when he hears so many Republican voices which seem to say that all we now need is to return to normalcy. For if normalcy was impossible after the First World War, it is altogether impossible after the second.

A platform which consists of not being New Deal may be enough to elect the Republicans in 1944. But it does not begin to be enough to keep them in office if they are elected. Nor is it enough to conserve the real interests of business and of the economy of free enterprise. That will take a lot more constructive thinking and doing than is contained in berating the New Deal, the bureaucrats, and regimentation.

Mr. Johnston might then set a new fashion. Just as he remembers the pre-New Deal twenties as well as the New Deal thirties, so he might begin to fix men's minds on the post-New Deal forties. He might then point out how much the Republicans will need wisdom and foresight if they come into power on a reaction against the New Deal, and how much they must remember in that case that, unless they do very well, there will then be a reaction against the reaction which favored them, for millions of soldiers and war workers and preoccupied citizens, who may not have much of a voice in this election, will be on hand to pass judgment on the consequences of it.

Graduation Address by Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and timely address by Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel, at the graduation and commissioning exercises of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and V–12 Units at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, February 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Graham, Captain Popham, and fellow Americans, I am honored to return to North Carolina, and, in the presence of your distinguished Governor and that grand old statesmen, Mr. Josephus Daniels, to take part in this program.

As I have stated publicly before, the Navy is proud of its personnel who claim this State as home, and proud of the fine ships which bear names intimately connected with this State. Particularly is it proud of the battleship which bears the name *North Carolina*. This fine ship, one of the most powerful men-of-war afloat, has proven her worth in numerous actions against the enemy.

These exercises represent a significant landmark in the lives of you who are being commissioned as officers in the Navy and you who are completing your V–12 training. In the months ahead you will not have time to reflect upon this. Yet today it is fitting to observe the occasion appropriately, and I am pleased to have the privilege of participating in it.

You are here because the Navy needs your services as soon as you can be prepared for duty.

I congratulate those of you who become officers today, and I welcome you into the ranks of a select group of men. In accepting your commission you accept the duties and responsibilities, the rights and privileges, of full-fledged men-at-arms—officers in the world's finest fighting service.

You who are completing your V–12 work still have your training as midshipmen or marine officer candidates before you. You have proved yourselves capable of sustained work at the college level, under the pressure of an accelerated training program. You are well on your way, and I urge you to even greater effort in the few months of formal professional training still before you.

In war as in peace this great university has had a tradition of enlightened service. By preparing you and others for ultimate duty as officers, the university is keeping faith with its historic and enviable past.

The Navy is deeply grateful to the officers and staff of the university for encouraging you to make the most of your assignment here. It is especially grateful to Dr. Frank P. Graham. As president of the university, he has made Chapel Hill a recognized symbol of confident America, bent on the preservation of democratic principles. The administrative burden of coordinating the university's wartime activities has clearly been enormous. Yet, Dr. Graham has been ever mindful of the Navy's developing needs and has moved promptly to help meet them. His foresight and cooperation have been potent factors in the university's wartime record of achievement.

I am aware that it has not been easy for your professors and instructors to complete this phase of your training in the time allowed and still maintain high academic standards. But the job has been well done. If there have been many headaches, it should be remembered that headaches are the common lot imposed by the necessities of the war. The need for trained young naval officers is very great.

Consequently, the patriotic obligation of the universities and colleges participating in the Navy's college program remains equally great. Without these institutions and without the unremitting efforts of capable, experienced naval instructors, of whom your commanding officer, Capt. William S. Popham, is an outstanding example, it would be next to impossible for the Navy to obtain trained young officers in sufficient numbers to meet scheduled timetables.

Today approximately 75,000 prospective officers are training under the V–12 program at 241 universities and colleges. Other thousands, yet to be selected, will enter training this year. Designed to insure a continuing source of young officers, the Navy's college program is based upon the requirements of the fleet. Since fleet requirements are still expanding, it has been necessary to accelerate your training.

You men who are leaving Chapel Hill are fully aware of the pressing demand for your services as officers.

By this time you have demonstrated your ability to accumulate knowledge. As naval officers you will be required to continue accumulating it in increasing volume and with dispatch. For the most part it will be specialized knowledge of immediate use in the performance of your duties. Strive to excel in mastering detail. Thoroughness and accuracy are necessary attributes of the competent officer.

The willing and expert digestion of detail, however, does not assure competency. The alert officer never forgets the true nature of war. Admiral Mahan described it in these words:

"War acknowledges principles and even rules, but these are not so much fetters or bars, which compel its movements aright, as guides which warn when it is going wrong * * * the conduct of war is an art, having its spring in the mind of man, dealing with very various circumstances, admitting certain principles; but beyond that, manifold in its manifestations, according to the genius of the artist and the temper of the materials, with which he is dealing. To such an effort dogmatic prescription is unsuited."

The more you train, the larger your experience in the naval service, the greater will be your realization that the answers to the most difficult problems frequently are not in the book.

This is truer in the present war at sea than in any other war in sea history. New and vastly more powerful weapons, and evolving combat techniques, make it so.

Technical "know-how," at which Americans excel, gives us an important margin over the enemy. Your task as naval officers is to increase this margin by exploiting the intelligent use of technical knowledge. It is not enough to be technically master of your job—the enemy is master of his. You must also be prepared to improvise, to out think and out guess him. Upon your ingenuity may depend the lives of your men and the success of your mission.

Early this month, when it was clear that our forces were successfully established in the Marshall Islands, the enemy broadcast from Tokyo the propaganda claim that we were conducting "a leap in the dark offensive" by placing confidence in our quantitative superiority.

Yes; the Navy prefers overwhelming superiority in the number of ships, guns, planes, and trained personnel to be directed at any given objective. Wars are decided by force, massed and handled effectively. For the enemy's information, however, the Navy also relies on a not-so-secret weapon: The proven superior confidence and military initiative of American officers and men.

This is no new phenomenon. It has displayed itself in every war in which we have participated. It has been an indispensable element in the creation and maintenance of the Navy's offensive tradition. It was admirably expressed by Capt. (now Commodore) Edward J. Moran at the Battle of Cape Esperance, November 19, 1942. After sighting a far superior Japanese force, Captain Moran gave his order: "Pick out the biggest and commence firing."

The confidence and aggressiveness of the American fighting man spring partly from our national background and partly from the nature of American training. Competitive sports have fostered this spirit. In battle, where the fighting is for keeps, teamwork can be decisive. Individuals may shine in sports, but it is superior teamwork in combat that is winning victories for the Navy.

Never underestimate the part that pride in your unit plays in the quality of teamwork. Battle reports of fleet actions in the Pacific invariably reflect the pride of commanders in the officers and men under them. See to it that you feel and that you make your men feel that yours is the finest unit in the service. Much of the Navy's fighting effectiveness depends upon officers who inspire their men with pride in their unit and in the naval service.

Some of the men whom you will eventually command will be older than you and will possess considerable experience afloat. Yet

the Navy places a premium on youth. You will have ample opportunity to prove yourselves. Remember that confidence comes from know-how, and usually comes quickly, bringing with it a maturity of outlook that inspires respect.

It is true that sometimes, in training, know-how does not come as quickly as desirable. There was, for example, the case of the midshipman at Columbia University, who was under instruction in navigation. He was endeavoring to discover his geographical position with a sextant. After making his calculations, he shook his head dubiously, then reverently removed his cap.

"What's the matter?" inquired his instructor.

"Sir," he said, "according to my calculations, we are now inside the Cathedral of St. John the Divine."

That young man was not much of a navigator at that stage in his training—but, at least, he knew how to conduct himself in church.

War demands necessarily limit the length of your formal instruction. Yet you should appreciate now that you will, in turn, instruct others.

You will drill men under your command so that they function efficiently and use equipment with maximum speed, economy, and effectiveness. It will not be enough for you merely to inspect or supervise them. You must teach them, imparting as best you can enthusiasm and the desire to learn. This may be difficult at first. But seek always to master the art of instruction. It will help win the respect of your men and will improve your value as naval officers.

I am told that some of you are concerned that the major part of the fighting at sea will be over before you are ready for duty. This concern is unwarranted. No officer with whom I have talked, who has come to grips with the enemy, expects anything but a bitter struggle of mounting ferocity. Gradually, we are assuming the offensive on a scale that has hitherto been impossible. But we are still a long, long way from Tokyo.

The magnitude of the job ahead is indicated by statistics of amphibious operations. Under certain conditions, to put ashore a single regiment of Army troops totaling some 3,000 men, may require an equal number of naval personnel in the landing operations alone. Moreover, not included in this estimate are the personnel required to man the many combatant ships of the fleet which must be present for protection throughout the attack.

Landing operations on a far greater scale are planned. The landing-craft program already announced entails the production of 80,000 vessels, miscellaneous small craft, and rafts. This staggering total is an index of the Navy's mounting personnel requirements, and of the need for accelerated training in the Navy's college program.

You who are about to leave Chapel Hill for further training elsewhere will not be too late for this fight. Before victory is won you will be experienced, competent officers in the most powerful navy in history. You will know hardships and utter fatigue as thousands of naval officers and men already know them. You may know fear, but you will learn to disregard it as they disregard it.

Best of all, you will know the enduring satisfaction of active participation in conquering the enemy and in achieving his final destruction. When this is accomplished, you will have completed the job to which you dedicated yourselves by entering the Navy's college program. The challenge is unmistakable; the opportunity for service, unlimited.

To those here at Chapel Hill who have been concerned with instruction, I wish again to express the Navy's appreciation. Their work in the college program continues, and I am confident it will be discharged wholeheartedly and with renewed understanding of the Navy's needs.

Your naval careers lie ahead. Proceed to your new duties with enthusiasm, high resolve, and steadfast purpose. The Navy needs your brains and your physical stamina. It needs your courage, and, above all, your indomitable will to victory. Good luck and Godspeed.

What Changes?

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent said to me recently: "I pity the next President of the United States. He will be faced with an awful mess. Everything will have to be changed." I replied that the present condition is heaven compared with what confronted Franklin D. Roosevelt when he took office. Have you forgotten conditions then? What a mess that was.

What became of the bank stock you owned? Assessed.

What about the bank deposits you lost? Gone.

Have you forgotten the unemployment, the suffering, the hunger, the poverty of that day?

Oh, yes; changes had to be made then.

A bank holiday had to be declared and financial institutions had to start from scratch.

The Roosevelt administration inaugurated a sound banking system. Do you want to change that?

Federal guarantee of bank deposits was provided through Federal Deposit Insurance. No more loss of bank deposits. Do you want to change that?

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was set up to save thousands of homes from foreclosure. Many a man owns his home today, which he would otherwise have lost. Should this have been changed?

The Farm Credit Administration saved many farms from the sheriff's hammer. Should this have been different?

Because the Government established the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee River was harnessed, the Grand Coulee and Bonneville and Shasta Dams and the Boulder Dam were made to generate electric power and give to the town and the farm of those sections electricity at a fraction of the former cost.

Because of this electric companies in the East were scared into reducing rates and making possible the electrification of many eastern farms. Should this be changed?

Flood control has been established through legislation so that we are now on the way to preventing the awful floods of the past. In my own State of Pennsylvania the city of Johnstown, which twice suffered devastating floods, now boasts that it is a city safe from floods. Should this be changed?

The Farm Mortgage Act and Soil Conservation Act, Farm Tenancy Act, became laws. Farm cooperatives have been encouraged, crop insurance and parity payments have carried the farmer over periods of distress. Various agricultural programs have been a godsend to the farmer. Should this be changed?

Public-works projects have been carried out in every section. The result is many permanent improvements—highways, bridges, dams, stream control, public buildings, and recreational projects. Should this be changed?

The National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation camps were a great blessing to the youth of the Nation. Would you have had this otherwise?

Legislation was passed providing that the truth be told to investors in securities. Should this be changed?

Reciprocal trade agreements have been made with many countries. Should this be changed?

The National Labor Relations Board has been established and has proven an effective means of handling labor disputes. Should this be changed?

The good-neighbor policy has brought about a better understanding with other nations on this western continent. Should this be changed?

Service men and women have been aided by increased compensation and greater benefits for their dependents. Should this be changed?

Unemployment insurance has been provided for workers.

Above all, the aged have been provided for by the Social Security Act and old-age pensions, both unknown before this administration acted. What greater blessing can come to a people than a feeling of security and comfort in old age, a confidence free from fear and uncertainty? Should this be changed?

Is this the awful mess referred to by our opponents?

I have mentioned but a few of the blessings that have come to America during the Roosevelt administration.

What are the changes that are demanded by our opponents?

Do they want to go back to the mess that confronted Franklin D. Roosevelt when he became President?

Perhaps they do. I know that the voters will not want to go back to that mess.

Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, the two most essential elements necessary to sustain the force of our Nation in making its utmost contribution in winning the war and the peace are the best implementation of our fighting forces and

encouraging the morale of the people at home. In supplying the fighting men, we must not permit our production personnel to suffer unnecessary hardships, if they can be avoided.

I am somewhat alarmed at the prospect of a critical coal shortage in the United States in the coming fall and winter. I want to quote officials of the Solid Fuels Administration of the Department of the Interior and the Office of War Information:

As stated in the report of the Office of War Information which was given to the newspapers for use on Tuesday, December 14, 1943, sources consulted were the Department of Interior, Solid Fuels Administration and the Fuel and Allocations Branch of the War Production Board. Following are quotes from this release: "O. W. I. said that the United States will enter 1944 with a bituminous coal shortage of approximately 25,000,000 tons, according to figures of the Solid Fuels Administration for War, projected from the year's records to recent date.

"The deficit will appear in depleted stock piles—coal stored in the bins of industrial users and retail dealers—which on October 1 amounted to a 45-day supply. Stock piles will have been reduced from 86,000,000 tons at the beginning of 1943 to approximately 60,000,000 tons at the beginning of 1944. This will be only a little more than a month's backlog.

"From information supplied by the Solid Fuels Administration, the situation may be summarized as follows:

"(1) The coal shortage is acute now, and most factors point to an increasing deficit next year.

"(2) It is not sudden but has been progressive from the first of this year.

"(3) It is a delayed shortage, in that it draws on stock piles. But its effect is immediate to the consumer under the stress and dislocation of distribution.

"(4) Demand for 1944 will be increased by shipments to Europe to sustain military operations and to meet essential needs. This will be necessary even though England is scheduled to supply more coal to Europe next year."

Under heading of "Prospects for 1944" this statement appeared: "At the rate of coming requirements coal stocks above ground by March 31, 1944 will represent considerably less than a month's supply for the Nation—a dangerously low level. If stocks cannot be replenished in the summer, the situation next fall, when the heavy burning season begins, will approach catastrophe."

Under the heading "Progressive stock pile decline" it was said: "In December 1942 the stock piles in industrial bins and retail yards amounted to 90,608,000 tons. By October 1, 1943, this protective supply had dropped to 72,866,000 tons. In September alone the stocks were depleted by about 2,500,000 tons. This September decline occurred at a time of relatively light use and before any production was lost by the last general strike or sporadic wildcat work stoppages.

"Because there isn't enough coal to meet all the demands of civilians and of war production, the Government's job of controlling consumption is a matter of judicious robbing of Peter to pay Paul.

"Fuel oil cannot ease the country's coal position because, although it is anticipated that fuel-oil quotas will be met, there will be no excess."

My attention was attracted to the shortage of coal that existed in the large urban centers of our Nation, and particularly in the largest city of the district I represent, this past winter. The coal situation there had reached the point where orders were issued by the Solid Fuels Administration to reduce the size of deliveries due to the scarcity. These orders specified that not more than 1 ton could be delivered to a residential consumer at a time. This brought about a condition that practically stopped deliveries for the reason that about 85 percent of the deliveries being made were under a contractual relationship between the owners of hauling units and the coal distributors. It is not difficult to understand that a person attempting to maintain a business of hauling coal on a basis of so much per ton would quickly reject an order reducing his limitation of delivery to 1 ton. This policy demanded a prohibitive increase in the cost of delivery because it would take three trips to yield the same return as one trip did before in delivering an order of 3 tons, which was the minimum load under the contract between the distributor and the truck owner or hauler.

When this circumstance arose, I was contacted by the coal dealers of my district. Upon presenting the facts to the Solid Fuels Administration, a compromise was effected whereby the haulers were permitted to deliver 2 tons, to which they agreed.

The Office of Price Administration had fixed a ceiling price on the coal without regard to margin of profit, and of course any additional cost was imposed on some agency between the source of production and the place of consumption. Margins of profit had been fixed by the O. P. A. as of a certain date about a year prior to the time when this order concerning deliveries was issued. The dealers had been caused to absorb certain additional costs in labor, repair of equipment, increased prices in replacement materials, and an increased cost in the delivery of coal on a contractual basis. Because these additional costs could not be added to the retail price without a cent being added to profit margin, many dealers were caused to go out of business. Statistics furnished me by the Coal Dealers' Association revealed that approximately 30 percent of the dealers had been forced out of business in this way. This situation naturally imposed a greater responsibility on those remaining in the business.

Another difficulty was brought about by tire rationing and O. D. T. regulations reducing the number of delivery units, which threw responsibility of delivery upon those remaining in the hauling business. It was reported to me that 30 percent of the truckers quit. In addition to all this, the metropolitan community—the city of Akron, Ohio—had more than 8,500 housing units constructed, and a greater part of them were dependent upon coal for heating purposes. Due to a power beyond our control, we were blessed with a mild winter season this past year that had not been experienced for a long time. It is my profound conviction that only for this reason was dire suffering prevented.

As we approach the winter of 1944–45, there are warning signs that our difficulties are going to be much more acute, and I believe that real suffering will be experienced by the people in the low-temperature areas unless something is done to forestall it at the earliest possible time. The coal production of the United States is not as great as it should be. I am not sure I know all of the reasons for this situation, but I am aware of some of them.

First, because the O. P. A. and the Solid Fuels Administration are seemingly bent upon holding the retail price of coal at a certain place, and are failing to recognize that the facilities to handle this business are more costly; and that this automatic reduction of margins materially reduces the incentive of all concerned to do their best job.

No later than March 13, 1944, the newspapers published an article wherein certain operators were accused of deliberately sabotaging coal production by reducing their operations to a 5-day week.

Second, with a reduced production the demands of exporting coal tonnage to Canada will remain substantially the same, and in addition, it now appears as though we will have to export coal to England and southern Europe if our troops and the people dependent upon the United States are to be fed and kept warm. I say this because word has come to me that the English production of coal in the mines of South Wales was below normal, and also the strike now in progress in England will reduce the potential supply for 1944 and 1945. I am reliably informed that the production of coal in South Wales is an alarmingly reduced percentage of the coal produced in this country, although it demands a materially increased manpower. My informant says that for this reason we are shipping machinery to England to mechanize their mines in the hope of obtaining greater production. I foresee difficulties in this move as well, which may make further demands upon our supply.

Third, by reason of the continually increasing reduction of natural gas and fuel oil, there is portended an increased demand for local production of coal to replace the reduction in other fuels. I am very much perplexed by the fact that the scientific means for the conservation of coal, the use of which makes little or no demands upon materials necessary for the prosecution of this war, are so seriously regulated and hindered in their use that we are constantly adding to the difficulties before us. It is estimated that if we were to use the scientific means available, that a reduction in the requirement for coal, particularly, could be made from 28 to 35 percent to do the same job of heating the homes of the American people. Yet I find that the industries responsible for making the implements necessary to reduce the consumption of fuel are hampered, and in many instances prevented from doing the kind of a job that must be done if we are to avoid suffering on the part of the people. I refer to the War Production Board and the drastic demands of the Selective Service System.

There is a paradoxical situation arising between the Solid Fuels Administration of the Department of the Interior and the War Production Board on critical materials. The Solid Fuels Administration,

through an advertising program, has conveyed to the people the need for employing every implement necessary to the conservation of fuel, such as the insulation of their homes by storm doors and windows, rock wool, and other things, and yet we find the companies who manufacture these items are having the utmost difficulty in trying to obtain permission from the War Production Board in the use of glass, low-grade malleable steel, screen, lumber, and other materials.

I cannot understand why the manufacturers should have trouble in getting sufficient materials to carry out this most important job when the manufacturers of glass and steel are now both on a reduced schedule. I want to further quote the Office of War Information after it consulted with the Solid Fuels Administration and Allocations Branch of the War Production Board, as follows:

O. W. I. release, September 3, 1943: "More than forty-four and one-fourth million gallons of oil and more than a million tons of coal can be released for war if only 3 percent of the homes heated with these fuels are completely weatherproofed before next winter, on the basis of a study by the Federal Housing Administration.

"Huge amounts of these diminishing resources are wasted every winter because an estimated 75 percent of the houses in the country are still not weatherproofed."

I predict without hesitancy that unless the industries producing these weather-proofing materials are given wider study and understanding by officials so that they may be properly manned and supplied with sufficient materials the people of the United States will suffer severely this coming winter.

I predict that unless this matter is given proper consideration immediately the problem will become of such widespread proportion as we approach the winter season that it will be utterly impossible to cope with it. I believe the Government, by the authority vested in it, should direct all coal production to go on a 6-day schedule at once. I believe that an agency should be set up to correlate both the production of coal and all industries supplying materials for the conservation of coal at the earliest possible moment.

I further believe that this Congress should direct the proper committee to bring about an investigation as soon as it can, so that we may see that the people suffer as little as possible during this war emergency. This situation is very critical and demands our immediate attention.

William F. Cody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the month of February the citizens of this Nation had an opportunity to observe the anniversaries of the birthdays of a number of famous citizens. Not the least of these was the anniversary of the birth of William Frederick Cody, better known to most Americans as Buffalo Bill.

On February 26, 1944, I had the privilege of attending exercises commemorating the anniversary of the birth of William F. Cody, held in my home town of Cody, Wyo., which was founded by Buffalo Bill. On that occasion I delivered an address over the radio on a Statewide hook-up, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM F. CODY

We, the citizens of Cody, Park County, Wyo., meet here today to do honor to a true and great American, the founder of our city—William Frederick Cody, better known to most Americans as Buffalo Bill. Most of you know how Cody got the title of Buffalo Bill, but I feel I should once again explain this, as there may be some in the vast radio audience listening to this program who do not know. When Cody was about 25 years of age, he entered into a contract with the Kansas Pacific Railroad to supply meat to the laborers then building the railroad across the continent. The contract lasted 17 months, and during that period, Cody killed 3,280 buffalo, thus earning for himself the title of Buffalo Bill.

Buffalo Bill's active life started at a tender age as a Pony Express rider—and later as a scout in the famous Cavalry regiments during the Indian wars—including his famous and victorious hand-to-hand conflict with the redoubtable Sioux Indian, Chief Yellow Hand—all this naturally imbued him with the spirit of adventure. It also imbued in him a type of Americanism—which means a love of freedom—which gives every man and woman the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own hearts—which gives to every man the right to work without paying tribute to any other man—which gives to every man the right of life unfettered and untrammelled by countless Federal rules and regulations.

Buffalo Bill—a great pioneer of the West—was a man of law and order. At one time, he was a member of the Nebraska State Legislature. His great work as a pioneer of the West—developing its resources—was always undertaken with due regard to law and order.

He was a happy man. He loved to make other people about him happy. He was in every sense of the word a Westerner. He loved the West. He loved the life in the West—the freedom of the great open spaces—the clear, crisp, exhilarating air of Wyoming acting on him like a tonic. There were comparatively few people, then in America who knew the West, and one of his great ambitions was to bring the West to all the peoples, not only of the Americas but of the world. To do this, he organized his great Wild West show. This was not any fancied imagination of what might be or what should be, but an actual representation of daily occurrences in the great West he loved so dearly.

We honor Buffalo Bill as the founder and a great citizen of our city. We honor him even more as a citizen of America. Many of us knew him well—and we are very conscious today that he belongs, not only to us, but to America. We gladly share our love, our admiration and our respect for this great American with all the citizens of this country. Truly, he earned the right to an early choice on the great historical American team of all time.

Over the mantel in my office in the United States Senate there is a large picture of Colonel Cody, presented to me by a number of my friends in Cody on my election to the United States Senate. On the opposite wall is a very fine colored panoramic photograph of Wyoming's Jackson Hole. It is a winter scene and depicts over 1,000 elk on the feeding grounds. I often look at Cody, looking across the room to that picture of a country he loved so much, and I sometimes try to imagine him alive today and what his thoughts would be and what he would be doing. If he were a young man I know and you know he would be in the Army. I think he would be in the Solomons, probably one of the first to land on Guadalcanal. His great scouting knowledge—his keen eye—his expert rifle shooting, would stand him good stead. If he were a little older, I can see him training regiments of western troops, all expert riders and great shots. I can see a little pang in his heart as a jeep might come alongside of his horse.

But Buffalo Bill was a pioneer, and he would have been the first to take advantage of every modern device to win the battle. He loved a fight, but he was a clean fighter and he liked his opponents to fight cleanly. There was nothing mean or petty about this man. If in my thoughts he was an older man, I can see him in the Halls of Congress, fighting for the America he loved so much—fighting every "ism" that he thought was contrary to the great American ideals of which he was the living embodiment. Such a man as this could never have put up with the regimentation of the country as exists today Can you imagine this great, brave, dauntless hero, hedged in, in his great work of western pioneering and development, by the countless bureaus and bureaucrats? Can you imagine a scene where a young eastern bureaucrat would tell Buffalo Bill that he could not do this or that because of some administrative bureaucratic directive drawn up by some sallow-faced lawyer who had never been farther west than Pittsburgh?

Surely here is a great lesson for us. Surely we can get an inspiration from this hero of our boyish dreams. Surely that lesson is that we must recapture for America—for the United States—for the individual State of the Union—that spirit of Buffalo Bill—that love of America, a great America, free, independent, so that all the people can live in freedom—yes, freedom from fear of tyrannical Government pressure and regulation; freedom from fear of an insolvent nation; freedom from fear that the Nation we are handing down to our children is not the Nation that Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln handed down to us.

Let us take inspiration from Buffalo Bill. Let us from today go forward determined that the America he loved and served will be the America we will love and serve—an America founded on liberty, justice, freedom—an America governed by the consent of the governed—where every man and woman can work out their lives and destiny free and untrammeled.

Cotton and the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

by Oscar F. Bledsoe, of Greenwood, Miss., in which he discusses the cotton situation. Mr. Bledsoe is one of the leaders in the cotton business, and for years has carried the torch for equality for the cotton farmer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Any attempted analysis of the future of cotton growing will of necessity have to take into consideration the substitution of man-made laws and artificial prices for the natural laws of supply and demand. From this viewpoint, it would seem that the following statement would be practically within the realm of reasonable expectation:

Under the direction of the Federal Government, our cotton production has been cut from over 40,000,000 acres to 21,000,000 acres. Some of the least productive acres were eliminated, as the reductions were by States and counties. The increased use of commercial fertilizer and winter cover crops has maintained a production of slightly over one-half bale per acre, or eleven to twelve million bales yearly. Our normal domestic consumption was at the rate of one-half of this production when sold at world prices, while our present artificial price structure maintained by law by the Commodity Credit Corporation at 90 percent of parity prices is practically 50 percent above the price of comparable Brazilian cotton, our nearest world competitor. With our domestic price structure 50 percent above world prices, is this not practical economic isolationism? The farmers of the United States are producers of abundant food and fiber for our 135,000,000 population, with a surplus to insure us against a famine. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the farmers' price insurance agency, and either consumer subsidies or unexportable agricultural surpluses will kill it. How will the politicians handle this situation? Will they reduce our production to domestic consumption and run the risk of famine?

In the case of cotton, the best one-half of our present acreage, or 10,000,000 acres, could amply supply our domestic market. The level lands which are subject to mechanical cultivation, with the flame blower to keep the grass out of the drill, together with mechanical harvesting, could naturally produce the cheapest quality cotton to compete with synthetic fibers. The mechanical harvester has demonstrated it can harvest 7 bales per day with 70 times less human labor days than required with hand picking; and proper cleaning machinery at the gin can average Strict Low Middling, the present average of hand-picked cotton in high-yield areas.

After the enormous consumption for World War No. 2, the present situation is that we have on hand about 10,000,000 bales of surplus cotton, and we are still producing more than we can consume. The Federal Government has subsidized the synthetic fiber industry by allowing a 20-percent cost of plant charge-off annually out of profits before income taxes. This simply means free factories for fiber competition. After the war is over natural fiber production will have to gradually reduce its cost of production by substituting machines for human labor in order to meet this domestic competition.

Is the answer reduction to domestic consumption or world trade? Would the rebate of import duties (export taxes) under the condition that world trade accept surplus agricultural products help solve the problem? Agricultural surpluses being about one-half of 1 percent of our annual volume of business, would this action prove that we were going to cooperate in world trade and world affairs? While the National Government is begging for the production of surplus agricultural products for export to feed the world, have your national party platform declare, in language a farmer can understand, just what method will be used to export our surplus agricultural products when World War No. 2 is over. The present method of giving away our agricultural products is not a sound basis for the American farm business, the solid foundation of the existence of this Nation. A continuation of these policies will cause the disintegration of this Nation, like the French debacle. We have strayed far from the sound constitutional foundation of our forefathers.

This is your business and duty. Start the new year by taking time out and supplying your own answer to your representatives in the Federal Congress. Suggest that the agricultural West and the cotton and tobacco South be included in the good-neighbor policy.

Tribute to Senator Overton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times, of Shreveport, La., of Tuesday, March 14. The editorial is entitled "Senator OVERTON."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR OVERTON

Unless Senator JOHN H. OVERTON can be prevailed upon to reconsider his decision not to run for reelection, the United States as a Nation and Louisiana as a State will lose the services of a great Senator at a time when both State and Nation need them most.

As the balance swings toward victory for the Nation in war and as the trying problems of peace approach, men of calm and tested judgment and unquestioned accomplishment are vital to successful guidance of our public affairs.

The record proves Senator OVERTON to be such a man.

His record in the United States Senate has mounted steadily in the stature of its accomplishments during his two terms. It is a record of service and loyalty to all parts of Louisiana—north, south, east, and west—regardless of their voting records, and of stalwart leadership in national welfare regardless of whether such action placed him in opposition to the national administration or in support of it. The frequently demonstrated respect, esteem, and confidence in which he is held by his colleagues of all parties and factions in the Senate attest his ability, his political courage, and his unselfishness.

We believe that the people of Louisiana who place State and National welfare above petty political factionalism and selfish personal ambition should urge Senator OVERTON to reconsider and to push aside his natural desire for the quiet of private life, which doubtless was the paramount factor in his decision not to seek reelection.

Originally we did not support him and often we have vigorously opposed his Louisiana political faction. But Senator OVERTON'S record far transcends any factionalism and it should be viewed solely in that light. He well deserves the quiet of private life which he is seeking, but he should be urged to postpone it until after the war. The respect with which he is held by fair-minded people throughout Louisiana would assure him success at the polls. His health is excellent.

Senator OVERTON'S record in public office attests not only to the volume of service he has rendered but to the importance of that service. He is a member of the Senate Appropriations, Commerce, and Irrigation and Reclamation Committees—three very important Senate bodies. Even more important, he is chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Flood Control and of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations. In the latter capacity he has been the senatorial manager for all legislation for Navy appropriations during his tenure of the post. He guided Navy construction appropriations through the shoals of "small Navy" men and semipacifists in the pre-war days. Through his efforts, the launching of the huge pre-war warship-construction program became possible. That program enabled the Navy to replace Pearl Harbor losses and put the biggest and strongest Navy in the world into action, after war came, as much as 2 or 3 years earlier than would have been possible otherwise. The Navy that is licking the Japs today was built on financial legislation which Senator OVERTON steered to passage.

An example of his power in the Senate and of his political independence came in the effort of President Roosevelt to fill a Louisiana place on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals with a non-Louisianian—the Allred case. Although opposed by the entire Roosevelt administration forces, Senator OVERTON launched what was virtually a single-handed fight and won, with a Shreveporter, Judge Elmo Lee, named for the post. This fight not only was vital to Louisiana, but to the Federal judiciary itself. In making it, Senator OVERTON was serving National as well as State welfare. With such an issue, he did not hesitate to risk possible political retaliation by fighting and defeating the national administration. Previously he had shown his political independence even more strongly when he opposed the Roosevelt plan in 1937 to pack the Supreme Court and did so against the desires of the then Gov. Richard Leche and the latter's Louisiana political associates.

As chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Flood Control, Senator OVERTON has authored or sponsored much legislation affecting the lower Mississippi Valley from Cairo, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico—including all of Louisiana. No flood-control measure of any kind has passed the Senate while he was subcommittee chairman without his specific approval, and he has been the means of blocking much proposed legislation questionable as to its true purpose. He has fought unendingly against the St. Lawrence seaway plan as both a needless extravagance, politically conceived, and as a blow aimed at the commercial and industrial interests of the South. He now is chairman of a special subcommittee considering the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

If Senator OVERTON does not return to the Senate, these subcommittee chairmanships he holds, so vital to interests of Louisiana and the South generally, would not be filled by his Senate successor, but by new appointment, which might mean the undoing of much good he has done. For example, the Commerce Committee, under which flood-control legislation comes, now has only two members, in addition to Senator OVERTON, from the entire deep South and only one of the two is from the Mississippi Valley area. Many pending flood-control projects, important to Louisiana, thus would come under new hands.

In his efforts in behalf of flood control and water development, Senator OVERTON has worked impartially for all parts of Louisiana. His Senate resolution brought reinvestiga-

tion of the proposed $50,000,000 post-war navigation channel paralleling the Red River from above Shreveport to the Mississippi—a project which is vital to post-war development of our entire area. Where the project had been given negative treatment originally, it now is expected that through Senator OVERTON'S efforts there will be a favorable report from Army engineers. It was at his insistence in Washington that a Federal survey of caving Red River banks around Shreveport was ordered, in response to the efforts of local groups. He was one of the front-rank stalwarts in bringing about construction of the $50,000,000 Denison Dam, now about completed. He got the Bodcaw Bayou and Wallace Lake bills through the Senate and has worked earnestly in behalf of Barksdale Field, just as he has worked tirelessly with all Louisiana Members of the House in behalf of projects in their districts.

Through Senator OVERTON'S efforts or through his amendments to appropriations bills, the Gulf Intracoastal Canal has been widened and deepened from Carabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex. The present appropriation bill carries funds, through an amendment by Senator OVERTON, for extending the canal on toward the Rio Grande. Under his resolution the tidewater channel from the inner harbor canal at New Orleans to the Gulf now is being studied by Army engineers, with a report expected soon. His efforts brought appropriations to build up the main Mississippi River levees to the new grade and section, including the fuse-plug levees at the head of the old Boeuf basin; the construction of the Morganza floodway and Federal construction of railway and highway crossings over this floodway; development of the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau rivers; the dredging, clearing, and improving of many northeast Louisiana streams, including the Tensas and Boeuf rivers and Bayou Macon. He was largely instrumental in establishment of the Eighth Naval District at New Orleans, and in bringing to central Louisiana the Army maneuvers area—resulting in construction of tens of millions of dollars worth of Army camps and specialized training area. He is author of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940.

Like all of us, Senator OVERTON is human and has perhaps made mistakes, but he has been a good Senator and such a record should be continued, not ended.

We believe it will be for the highest interests of Louisiana and of the Nation if Senator OVERTON will reconsider his present decision and give the people of Louisiana the opportunity to tell him at the polls to carry on with the many fine blows he has struck in their behalf during the 12 years he has represented them so ably in Washington.

We therefore unhesitatingly cast aside all past political affiliations to request fellow Louisianians to join with us in urging Senator OVERTON to reconsider his announcement not to seek reelection.

Andrew Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate and that of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a most lucid and, indeed, eloquent review of the reasons why Andrew Jackson is entitled to be regarded as a great man. I refer to an article published in the Washington Star last evening which was written by our distinguished and able colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. Within the space of less than a column he made a summary of the record of this great American leader which I think ought to be read by every citizen. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HATCH EXPLAINS WHY HE DEEMS JACKSON GREAT

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Recently there appeared in the Star a letter signed "Bewildered Student," asking why Andrew Jackson was so generally honored by Democrats when, as a matter of fact, many school histories sharply criticize him for a variety of things.

The letter cited various and sundry of Jackson's alleged sins, the implication being that the widespread admiration for "Old Hickory" among millions of Americans might be misplaced.

Therefore, it is perhaps fitting that today—March 15, Andrew Jackson's birthday—the editor of the Star be requested to print a letter in the nature of a reply to "Bewildered Student."

First, strange as it sounds, our school history books have not given fair treatment to the general and President. Nor is this surprising. Claude Bowers has pointed out that the early historians were Whigs, members of a party bitterly opposed to Jackson and whose idol—Henry Clay—was Jackson's chief political opponent. They certainly did not go out of their way to give Jackson his due.

Examine the myth about Jackson as a "spoilsman." Some of our school histories actually say that Jackson initiated the "spoils system" in the United States and that his motto was: "To the victors belong the spoils."

As a matter of fact this is not true. No up-to-date authority on American history, with the facts before him, will make any such statement. Most elaborate of the studies made of this myth is that by Prof. Erik M. Ericksson, writing in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review under the title, "President Jackson and the Civil Service." Professor Eriksson reveals that less than one-fourth of all the employees in the Government service were removed and many of these for cause. Incidentally, Claude Bowers in Party Battles of the Jackson Period and more recently Hugh Russell Fraser in Democracy in the Making reveal that most of Jackson's principal removals were for fraud—that is, the victims later were tried by the courts and sent to jail for embezzlement.

Likewise, Jefferson's removals were found to be greater proportionately than Jackson's. Out of 433 postmasters of the Presidential class, Jefferson removed 109. He removed 14 district attorneys out of 22, 15 marshals out of 22, 41 collectors out of 82, 18 surveyors out of 30, and 67 miscellaneous out of 150.

Yet, no one would suggest that Jefferson was a spoilsman or that John Quincy Adams, who sent 78 nominations to the Senate at a moment when he knew he would be President only 5 more hours, was in a similar category. And, so far as Jackson is concerned, more than three-fourths of the Government employees during Jackson's term were members of the opposite party.

How did this myth get started? We now know. In April 1830 Senator John Holmes, of Maine, a member of the opposition party, made a speech in the Senate, in which he charged that Jackson had made 1,981 removals. The figures later were proven wholly false. But the Whig press took up the cry, the false charge was picked up by the Whig historians and later repeated, without investigation, by subsequent historians.

The spoils system, actually, was of slow growth. No one man is to blame for it. And the suggestion that Jackson was a spoilsman or ever subscribed to the doctrine, "To the victors belong the spoils," simply is not true. The phrase itself originated with Governor Marcy, of New York.

That brings us to Jackson's so-called Kitchen Cabinet, a group of brilliant, high-minded men who could not be purchased by money or any special interests. These men—Amos Kendall, Frank Blair, Isaac Hill, Roger Taney—constituted the first Presidential "brain trust" in American history.

Two of them—Kendall and Taney—later were appointed to high Government positions, and the latter finally as Chief Justice of the United States. Jackson's "brain trust" was needed when he discovered that most of the members of the Cabinet were under the influence of Calhoun. Finally these members were forced out and Jackson had loyal and disinterested advisers.

Why was Andrew Jackson great?

First. Because he raised the United States to a world power by his conquests in Florida and his victory at New Orleans.

Second. Because he destroyed the first great monopoly to arise in the United States—the Second Bank of the United States (Philadelphia). This monopoly at one time was so powerful that it could ruin almost any businessman in the country who opposed it and at the moment Jackson challenged it was reaching out to control the Government itself.

Third. Because Jackson championed "the humble, the lowly, the disinherited, and dispossessed of the earth." Repeatedly he had asked Congress to limit the public lands to actual settlers, not make them the prey of speculators.

Fourth. Because his famous "specie circular" of 1836, making it necessary to pay only gold or silver for the public lands, stopped a wild inflation and speculation which a Whig-dominated Congress had allowed to grow until it culminated in the depression of 1837.

Fifth. Because Jackson as President in 1832 scotched the first great challenge to the supremacy of the Union by his vigorous action in the South Carolina nullification crisis.

And finally, because Jackson's great courage, his devotion to the welfare of the people as a whole, instead of a rich and powerful minority, constitute one of the most inspiring chapters in the epic that is America.

CARL A. HATCH.

Enemy Propaganda

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to reports which I understand have been laid before at least two investigating committees of Congress, the Jergens Co., the president of which is Andrew Jergens, the Cincinnati perfume manufacturer—and I hope his perfume has a more pleasing odor than Winchell's broadcasts—and who finances Winchell's smear of General MacArthur on the

radio, may not dare to cancel the contract under which he pays Winchell $260,000 a year. Jergens is not content to have Winchell smear the people's Congress by calling it "a House of Reprehensibles"; he is not content to furnish propaganda material to Hitler, Hirohito; he is not content to have his stooge refer to some of his customers, purchasers of his products, as "damned fools," but he pays Winchell when Winchell links his own name with George Washington.

Like so many who seek to obtain a degree of respectability by horning in where they have no right to be, by linking their own names with those of unquestioned respectability, Winchell attempts to associate his own name with that of George Washington. Winchell charged in one of his more recent broadcasts that Washington had changed his name.

A gentleman who has been in Washington for something like 22 years and who is an authority on matters relating to Washington's life and ancestors, wired the Jergens Co. as follows:

If you want to save your business I suggest you take Walter Winchell off your radio program at once like the Navy took him out of uniform for when he resorts to lies about the Father of our Country as he did tonight, it's about time to act if you want people to buy your products. Winchell lied about George Washington having his name changed and I defy him to come to the Library of Congress and try to prove it. My address is 115 Second Street NE., Washington. My name is T. G. Abbott and I claim to be an authority on the life of George Washington.

Jergens, as is the custom, merely referred it to Winchell. The gentleman then handed me a genealogy of Washington, extending back to 1169, which is as follows:

THE TRUE DERIVATION OF THE NAME OF THE FATHER OF OUR COUNTRY, GEN. GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By T. G. Abbott)

Genealogy is the mathematics of the human race and serves to identify the individual, or family, of whom a history has been preserved.

This article is written beginning with the progenitor of the Washington family in England, from whom was derived the name of the Father of Our Country, George Washington, and has been compiled to refute once and for all the incorrect statement that Washington had changed his name, recently made by a nationally known news commentator in his broadcast over a national hook-up. The writer feels such aspersions regarding the hallowed name of George Washington should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Of all the noble families in England, that of Washington's is the most ancient and one of the most illustrious, and is traced back through the royal line of Denmark to that great hero, King Odin, the founder of Scandinavia, in the year 70 B. C.

The remarkable resemblance of character between Odin and George Washington, separated by 18 centuries, is so great as to excite profound and devout astonishment—one the founder of the most eminent race of kings and conquerors, and the other of the great and grand Republic of the United States of America.

From Odin, 70 B. C., to George Washington, A. D. 1732, involves a period of 18 centuries, covering 55 generations.

Odin died in the year 50 B. C. and about 1,000 years later his direct descendant, Thorfin the Dane, was born of the thirty-second generation from Odin, in the year A. D. 1010.

The lack of dates sometimes occasions inferences, which are errors, but the following is the correct line of descent from father to son, which without a question of doubt establishes the fact that the name Washington, from which George Washington received his name, came to him in an unbroken line from the son of John de Washington who was born in England in A. D. 1330 and whose name was also John, but he dropped the "de" which means "of," so his full name was just John Washington.

Nine hundred years before Thorfin the Dane, there were no controversies regarding names, but in the tenth and eleventh centuries there was considerable confusion owing to the anxiety to identify a number of individuals as belonging to our Washington family on account of a similarity of cognomen.

Advantage was taken of the fact that in those, and all preceding centuries, there were no surnames; but many bearing the names of DeWass, d'Oulston, deWeston, de Walston, de Wessyngton, ad infinitum, and all derived from the names of the place or locality where they resided. Frequently the name changed in the case of removal to another town or country and then taking the name of the new location. The spelling and the pronunciation also being different in the various countries had a lot to do with the changing of names.

Thorfin the Dane, descendant of Odin, was the Earl of the Orkney Isles, also called Torkill of Richmondshire, England, Baron and Lord of Tanfield, as stated herein before, was born in the year A. D. 1010. He settled in Yorkshire, England, about A. D. 1030–1035, prior to the Norman Conquest, and was the founder of the Washington family in England.

Thorfin died about 1080 A. D. leaving a son; his son was Bardolf fil (son of) Thorfin, 1035–1120; his son was Akarsis fil Bardolf, 1080–1161; his son was Bondo fil Akersis, 1122–1200; his son was Walter fil Bondo de Washington, 1169–1245; his son was Robert de Washington, 1195–1260; his son was Robert de Washington, 1230–1300; his son was Robert de Washington, 1265–1325; his son was John de Washington, 1305–86; his son was John Washington, 1330–1405; his son was John Washington, 1365–1425; his son was Robert Washington, 1400–79; his son was John Washington, 1430–1501; his son was Robert Washington, 1467–1517; his son was Thomas Washington, 1493–1560; his son was Laurence Washington, 1515, he was living in 1543; his son was Laurence Washington, 1540, he was living in 1588; his son was Laurence Washington, 1569, he was living in 1629; his son was Leonard Washington, 1595–1657; his son was Col. John Washington, 1627–77; his son was Laurence Washington, 1685–97; his son was Augustine Washington, 1694–1743; he married Mary Ball and was the father of Gen. George Washington, who was born in the year of our Lord 1732 and died in 1799.

Col. John Washington, 1527–1677, migrated to America and was the one who established the Washington family in these United States. He was the great grandfather of George Washington.

So endeth the true family history of our greatest citizen and the first and greatest President of the United States. His two hundred and twelfth birthday anniversary has just passed and when that birthday shall be forgotten, liberty will have perished from the earth.

The writer is fully cognizant of the fact that the adult educated patriotic citizens of the United States, positively know that General Washington never changed his name, nor did any of his ancestors for 400 years before him; but as many of our younger generation may have heard this commentator (Walter Winchell) make the erroneous statement that Washington changed his name several times and fearing it might tend to confuse them and might destroy their patriotism, love, and admiration for the Father of their Country, this article has been written not in criticism of the commentator personally, but solely to refute his statement. It is quite possible for all of us to at some time make mistakes—that is one reason they put erasers on pencils—and in this broadcast of Mr. Winchell's he has been misinformed, which, however, does not take from him the privilege of saying whatever he wishes to say, for thank the Lord, we live in a democracy which gives us that right and it is to be hoped that it will continue so. The most important lesson to learn is to be definitely sure you are absolutely right when you make such statements about people, no matter who they are, and in the writer's opinion, extraordinary care should be taken when making statements about the Father of our Country, who made possible this great Nation in which we live today.

Mr. Speaker, many heard Winchell some 2 weeks ago by insinuation and innuendo attempt to call in question the patriotism of General MacArthur by stating over the radio that General MacArthur had a mysterious conference with General Wood. Winchell failed to state that General MacNider, who has been wounded in this war, also attended conferences with both General MacArthur and General Wood. What of it? All three are loyal citizens and two of them are hazarding their lives—one has been wounded in this war. Yet the foul, unspeakable Winchell, the sawdust sailor, lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve, without uniform, without pay, without duty, has the effrontery, over the air to attempt to besmirch the name of General MacArthur.

It probably is a good thing for Winchell and for Jergens, his sponsor, that more courageous men could not, when they first heard his broadcast slurring MacArthur, get their hands on him.

Why does Jergens keep Winchell on his pay roll? Has Jergens something to hide? Winchell once made the statement, in substance, "orchids to Jergens for his exposure of Nazi spies."

I would like to have Jergens come before a committee of Congress and explain just what he meant by that statement, a statement apparently simple on its face—what is there hiding behind it?

In the record of the Department of Justice, of the F. B. I., in the court records, is there something which Winchell is holding over the head of Jergens?

For his own good and for the good of the country, the Dies committee should summon Jergens to explain why he permits, why he sponsors the continuance of the vicious attacks upon Congress, upon those in the armed forces, by Winchell. In view of Winchell's record, it is pertinent to inquire of Jergens whether Winchell has any hold upon him, which prevents him from taking steps to curb his spokesman, his employee, in the face of mounting public indignation.

There is said to be a printed record in Government files, thus far withheld from the public under the faithful old alibi "not in the public interest," which sheds an illuminating light upon the relationship between sponsor and broadcaster.

If he is a patriotic American citizen, and let us for the moment assume that

he is, unless Jergens himself has a perverted mind, he should welcome an opportunity to testify and perhaps thus escape through publicity from the clutches of this specialist of slander.

Perhaps Jergens, if he took the stand, might disclose that the F. B. I., under J. E. Hoover, has in its files information to which Winchell has access, and might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition.

Undoubtedly the Department of Justice is fully informed of the incidents to which reference is made, but Winchell has never mentioned them. If he did, and gave those incidents full publicity, perhaps he would no longer have any hold on Jergens.

The administration has interned many citizens. It has acted arbitrarily in many instances to further the war effort. If it either will not or cannot protect its generals on the fighting fronts from a smircher like Winchell, it is time for Congress to act and, in the interest of the war effort, put Winchell, his sponsors, and the broadcasting company which furnishes him a medium off the air.

Free speech is one thing, but in wartime a vicious, false statement calling in question the patriotism of a commanding officer is something else again.

Leave T. V. A. Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my section, and I believe of the entire Tennessee Valley, are opposed to the amendments affecting the T. V. A. which have been included in the independent offices appropriation bill by the Senate committee. Most of the newspapers in the Tennessee Valley have had forthright editorials in opposition to these amendments. As examples, I include some editorials from papers of my State.

The Chattanooga Times of March 11:

THE WAR ON T. V. A.

The amendments affecting T. V. A. which have been tacked on the vital $8,557,000,000 independent offices appropriation bill in the Senate raise the most critical situation the Tennessee Valley development has faced since its inception.

The Times has no hesitancy in saying that if the old Insull interests were to burn the midnight oil thinking up crippling restrictions on T. V. A., they could hardly do a more complete job than these various amendments do. The present temper of the Senate, the tendency of both Senate and House to override the President's wishes, contribute to a crisis which the people of the Tennessee Valley must consider before it is too late.

Chattanooga is placed in a cruel position. This city wishes to cooperate with Senator McKELLAR because we frankly need his help on the airport issue and in various other ways.

But let us consider one amendment alone as it affects Tennessee and Chattanooga—the Bankhead amendment which would direct that the principal offices of T. V. A. be moved to Muscle Shoals, Ala.

One clause in this Bankhead amendment bars "paying the compensation of any member of the board of directors of the Authority, or any officer or employee of the Authority having general supervisory powers over any phase of its activities throughout its area of operations, who does not maintain his principal place of business and office in the immediate vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala." Apparently, if the Bankhead amendment becomes law, the T. V. A. could maintain only field offices in places other than Muscle Shoals.

We believe that such an amendment might require the removal of practically all of the T. V. A. officers from this city to Muscle Shoals, for Chattanooga is the center of some of the most important of the T. V. A. general offices.

What would be the effect of the removal of these offices? For instance, Chattanooga has the headquarters of the power operations for the entire Tennessee Valley. This certainly is one of the chief offices of T. V. A. The Power Operations Division occupies the entire Power Building at Sixth and Market, two additional floors in the Power Building at Sixth and Cherry, and two floors of the James Building at Eighth and Broad.

In addition, we have the headquarters of the Lands Acquisition Division of T. V. A., which occupies part of the James Building.

The T. V. A. occupies 16 offices in the new post-office building for important hydrologic and weather data.

Another of the general offices of T. V. A. located here is the headquarters of the department of health and safety. This is in the old post-office building on Eleventh Street. All of that building is used by the T. V. A. Other principal T. V. A. divisions which have their headquarters there are the Division of Construction and Maintenance and the Division of Reservoir Clearance.

The T. V. A. occupies all of the Pound Building on Eleventh Street. In that building are located the headquarters for the large Maps and Surveys Division of the entire T. V. A. This division is at present doing 90 percent war work of a nature which is so important that it cannot be divulged.

The T. V. A. also occupies an entire building at 1140 Market Street and a garage on Eleventh Street.

The T. V. A. family here comprises 1,500 employees, most of whom are in the higher salary brackets of the T. V. A. because of the importance of the work they do.

The Bankhead amendment would jeopardize most of these offices here.

Alabama's delegation in both Senate and House have opposed Senator McKELLAR's anti-T. V. A. campaign. But are they to be appeased by an amendment which would take the T. V. A. personnel out of Tennessee and shift it to Muscle Shoals?

The McKellar amendments hit at Chattanooga's interests as well as those of 129 municipalities and rural electric cooperatives. The T. V. A. has contracts with all these, and the McKellar amendments, taking away funds of T. V. A. and requiring appeals to Congress for all appropriations, endanger T. V. A.'s ability to live up to its contracts with Chattanooga and all the others.

The McKellar amendment requiring Senate confirmation of all governmental agency employees earning $4,500 a year affects hundreds of high-salaried T. V. A. employees and throws their offices into politics. The T. V. A. directors—Messrs. Lilienthal, Pope, and Morgan—are not affected by this amendment, since they already are confirmed by the Senate, but hundreds of key experts in the T. V. A. are affected.

The McKellar amendments and various other amendments introduced in this unprecedented drive on T. V. A. take away the funds for research, in which T. V. A. is so important to the southern region, and stop work on important T. V. A. dams.

One provision would deny T. V. A. the right to use $30,000 for audits. T. V. A. has been employing the most widely respected auditing firm in the country to make audits of its affairs; Congress has been harping on the needs for such audits, and now it is proposed to wipe them out suddenly.

That Senator McKELLAR might be in agreement with the movement to shift all T. V. A. general offices from Tennessee to Muscle Shoals is indicated in a part of his questioning of Mr. Lilienthal at a recent Senate hearing. Part of that questioning, taken from the Senate record, follows:

"Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Congress authorize the moving of the offices of the T. V. A. from Florence and Sheffield to Knoxville?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. I'm afraid I did not hear the question.

"Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Congress authorize the moving of the offices of the T. V. A. from Florence or Sheffield to Knoxville?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Oh, the headquarters?

"Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Well, the law provides that—I have forgotten the phrasing exactly, but the——

"Mr. McKELLAR. Wait until I get the act.

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. The principal offices—that is the expression—the principal offices shall be at or near Muscle Shoals. We have established other offices all over the valley where it would be most economical and established the large and main administrative offices in Knoxville.

"Mr. McKELLAR. That is the chief office of the company, is it not?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. We were advised that the provision of the law was the same as that——

"Mr. McKELLAR. And personally I would like very much for you to be at Knoxville, but as I read the law you began violating it when you moved it from Muscle Shoals, the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, to Knoxville."

The Chattanooga News-Free Press:

PUBLIC INTEREST OR PERSONAL FEUD

One external war should be enough war for the nation to tackle at one time.

It is unfortunate that the war on the T. V. A., which has Washington sizzling, should have been launched at a period when every national production resource needs to be in use at top capacity for victory. The T. V. A. war is sure to curtail production in this section for the moment, whatever its eventual effect.

This newspaper has differed with Chairman David Lilienthal, of the T. V. A., on numerous occasions, but the present campaign against him by Senator KENNETH McKELLAR apparently is an episode in the feud between them, the Senator's motive being to vent his personal hatred rather than serve the public interest.

In principle, Senator McKELLAR is right. There are far too many Federal agencies handling Federal money over which Congress, though responsible for the country's finances under the Constitution, has no control. Since the New Deal went in, the Government has steadily shifted from a people's government, through the legislative branch and the Supreme Court, to a government by the executive and his appointed bureaucrats.

In the case of T. V. A., however, there should be a dividing line to permit of smooth handling of the Authority's business. As a purveyor of power, the Authority must have, as the President originally prescribed for it, something of the flexibility of a private cor-

poration or else it cannot serve the Valley. If the Authority thus being engaged in a large business enterprise, involving promotion, salesmanship, and research, has to subject every sale and every appointment of an employee to Congressional red tape, it is not unlikely that its work would soon be in a serious snarl.

In his anxiety to make a big showing out of T. V. A. operations, Mr. Lilienthal has proceeded exactly like the head of a big corporation would do. How he tried to evade his contract with the local power board and deal with the V. O. W. plant direct is a matter of poignant memory here. At the same time, it is this very desire to make a showing, though it necessitates frequent assertions of local rights, that tends to make a successful, forward-looking organization out of T. V. A.

It is difficult to conceive that Senator McKELLAR, through support of the Bankhead amendment, will enter what amounts to a campaign against his own State. If the T. V. A. headquarters is moved from Knoxville, some 1,500 employees will be lost to that city. When the blow falls in Chattanooga under the same amendment, not less than 1,500 employees, many of them fine, civic-minded citizens, will be moved to the Muscle Shoals area. Both Knoxville and Chattanocga will have office buildings vacant and many homes without occupants. Chattanooga can ill afford to lose the T. V. A. folk who have been adopted thoroughly as Chattanocgans.

It will be necessary, if the amendment passes, for the T. V. A. to build hundreds of new homes and a number of office buildings in the Muscle Shoals area, a needless expense to the Government of millions of dollars, as well as using tons of critical material. Senator McKELLAR is quoted as saying frankly the original act provides that the headquarters be placed in "the immediate vicinity of Muscle Shoals" and that means Tennessee cannot legally have the headquarters. In other words, if Chattanooga were in Alabama, at this distance, it would be "in the immediate vicinity," but since Chattanooga is in Tennessee, it is ruled out. That is a peculiar position for a Tennessee Senator to take.

It is entirely possible that the potential effects of the Bankhead-McKellar campaign have been exaggerated; but at this distance from the Capital and here in the heart of the area which will be directly affected, it seems a fine time to let well enough alone.

The Memphis Press-Scimitar and the Knoxville News-Sentinel, and all other Scripps-Howard papers carried the following editorial on March 13:

KEEP T. V. A. OUT OF POLITICS

Senator McKELLAR, of Tennessee, is a vigorous fighter. Sometimes he is found in praiseworthy crusades for the public interest and for the prerogatives of Congress. But he is a patronage hunter, and it is in that role that we find him waging a fight year after year on Chairman David E. Lilienthal of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a fight which now become a personal vendetta, will succeed this year unless friends of good government stop the rampaging Tennesseean.

Senator McKELLAR has not been able to dictate appointments in T. V. A. Appointments have been made on merit without regard to politics.

Senator McKELLAR has put into the independent offices appropriation bill a requirement that T. V. A. revenues must go into the Treasury's general fund, a requirement that Senate approval be required for all employees with salaries of $4,500 or more, and other provisions that would hamstring T. V. A.

The danger is that some Senators and Congressmen will mistake the McKellar proposal for a part of the present wholesome movement by Congress to reassert its importance, responsibility, and dignity. It is just the reverse.

Congress was functioning in a statesmanlike way when it set up T. V. A., laid down its objectives and its method of operation, and then allowed it to function as a business corporation, managing its own funds, free from Washington bureaucracy and free from national and local politics. Congress, which is commendably looking toward modernization to give itself collective efficiency and prestige equal to the ability of its individual Members, should not take a step backward in the matter of T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR is not opposed to public power; he merely wants to control it personally. His proposal will not bring back a single private company. It will merely make a mess of the public's investment.

Analysis of the Operation of Petroleum Administrative Orders 1 and 5 and Directive 59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Petroleum Importers Conference is a group of independent distributors and dealers in petroleum products located in the east coast area. This organization has prepared the following analysis of the workings of some of the orders issued by the Petroleum Administration for War and the manner in which those orders have favored the major integrated oil companies and worked to the detriment of independent companies in this business. Under unanimous consent, I include this report with my remarks in the RECORD:

The following is an outline of the initiation, development, operation, and administration of Petroleum Administrative orders Nos. 1 and 5, and directive 59, all issued by the Petroleum Administration for War.

Directive 59 is chronologically first. It was evolved in the summer of 1942 for the express purpose of alleviating the transportation facilities shortage by allocating supplies of principal petroleum products in the east coast States among those who are first in the line of distribution. Prior to its issuance on September 25, 1942, the Petroleum Administration for War (at that time Office of the Petroleum Coordinator) had appointed in each one of its designated districts certain advisory committees made up of outstanding executives from primarily major oil companies. In each one of the districts there was appointed by Ickes a general committee with a chairman, the other members of which were chairmen of standing committees for the production, refining, transportation, and marketing of petroleum. The general committee with its four standing committees was to function purely as an advisory group within each district. In district 1 which composes the east coast the chairman of the general committee was J. A. Brown, president of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. Originally the members of his committee and the members of the standing committees were executives from major integrated oil companies. It was this group which in the summer of 1942 set about to develop a plan for the pooling of terminal and transportation facilities in order to expedite the utilization of substitute overland means of transportation. Secretly and behind closed doors this little group worked on their plan. Naturally any plan which evolved from their meetings would provide for them being in the most advantageous position. Their concern was apparently to preserve first and foremost their competitive position and secondly to promulgate a plan for Government subsidy to compensate them for increased transportation costs. The manifestation of these plans was Petroleum directive 59, issued by the Petroleum Administration for War and the Petroleum compensatory adjustments regulation No. 1 issued by the Defense Supplies Corporation.

Independent jobbers, intermediate suppliers, gasoline and fuel-oil dealers were not informed of the preparation of these plans nor were they given an opportunity to share in the making of the plans. More recently subcommittees have been appointed on which there are one or two independent oil men. However, at the time the plan was originated only the big integrated companies had anything to do with it.

The committees above named and mentioned were limited to their own sphere of operation to such an extent that a special committee was needed which would overlap the functions of all of the committees in order to provide for the proposed distribution plan. This committee was appointed as the Subcommittee on Supplies and Distribution. It might be well to mention that its chairman is Mr. S. B. Eckert, vice president of the Sun Oil Co.; Jacob Blaustein, American Oil Co.; J. D. Collins, Tide Water Associated Oil Co.; W. L. Faust, vice president of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; R. R. Griffin, Shell Oil Co.; J. A. Kelly, Cities Service Oil Co.; W. H. Kershaw, the Texas Co.; Wiley L. Moore, Wofford Oil Co. (owned by the Pure Oil Co.); O. D. Robinson, Republic Oil Co.; H. G. Shad, Atlantic Refining Co.; W. A. Slater, vice president, Gulf Oil Corporation; C. F. Smith, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; A. E. Watts, Sinclair Refining Co.; Russell A. Keck, Kendall Refining Co.; and the one nonmajor oil company executive, J. W. Scott, of Buckley & Scott Utilities Co., Watertown, Mass.

This committee appointed by the general committee which derives its existence from P. A. W. is not truly a governmental body. The only compensation received by its members are the respective salaries they receive from their company, yet this committee was given carte blanche authority and responsibility for the operation of the supply and distribution directive 59. They have set up operating groups in offices in New York City for the general operation of the plan and have also established offices in each of the six zones of district 1, all of the employees of which are from major oil companies and who receive their only remuneration from such major oil companies paid into a pool and thence to them.

Directive 59, as administered by this Supply and Distribution Committee and its operating groups, is outlined briefly as follows:

District 1, comprising 17 East Coast States and the District of Columbia, was divided into 6 zones. For each zone the operation is identical; therefore, the detailed operation will be given for only 1 zone. All those oil companies which were importing petroleum into that zone from the Midwest or Southwest (P. A. W. districts 2 and 3), and all companies refining petroleum within the zone in the year 1941 are considered to be original suppliers. The total sales of original suppliers for the year 1941 were divided into each original supplier's sales to determine the percentage that each original supplier is entitled to of all petroleum sales. Each of the original suppliers

is charged with the responsibility of importing or refining as much petroleum products as they can for the zone. Several days prior to the 1st of each month they file with the Supply and Distribution Committee a proposed schedule showing what amount of the various petroleum products they will have available within the zone. The Supply and Distribution Committee then adds up these figures for all of the original suppliers, deducts out that which will be needed for military purposes, and gives for the month in question each original supplier his percentage share of what is left. The result of this computation is termed to be the original supplier's allocation for the month.

Each original supplier then nominates what portion of this allocation for the zone he wishes to withdraw for sale within each one of the supply areas (a further geographical breakdown of the zone). His discretion in making such nominations can, of course, be very greatly influenced by his wishes as to what sections he wants to make available the greatest amount of petroleum products and as to where he might have the greatest profit. After the nominations to the supply areas, the original supplier can also use his discretion to distribute as equitably as possible these products to secondary suppliers, jobbers, distributors, dealers, and consumers.

The importation of petroleum products to the various points within the zone is for the most part by overland means (pipe line, railroad tank cars, barge, transport trucks). The use of these transportation facilities runs the cost of delivery from origin point to destination far above the former pre-war tanker cost. Under the petroleum compensatory regulation No. 1 of the Defense Supplies Corporation each original supplier is entitled to compensation for these increased costs on the following basis: The normal cost of tanker distribution is subtracted from the present cost, the difference being the amount which can be claimed as subsidy. Thus, in actuality, all original suppliers get a laid-down cost for product the same as the computed pre-war normal. To finance this plan the Office of Price Administration authorized increases in the price on all principal petroleum products. In most sections of district No. 1 these increases amount to 30 cents per barrel on residual fuel, 1.5 cents per gallon on fuel oils, and 1.2 cents per gallon on gasoline. These increases were reflected in the price paid by the consumer and reflected on back through to the original supplier who is required to pay into the Defense Supplies Corporation petroleum compensatory pool the entire amount of this authorized revenue increase. The revenues so collected by Defense Supplies Corporation are used to pay the transportation subsidy. At the present time it is understood that the plan is self-liquidating. Any other supplier than an original supplier is denied the right to secure this subsidy unless his request is recommended to the Defense Supplies Corporation by the Petroleum Administration for War which, due to its constitution and staff personnel, is most usually disinclined.

Under the operation of this directive 59 there are many evils which adversely affect not only the independent petroleum operators but also the public at large. As stated before each original supplier has an allocation which he is to receive either by importing the products himself or by having the products assigned to him from some other supplier who happened to bring in more than his allocation. Each original supplier is encouraged by the directive to import or refine more than what he needs so that the surplus might be made available for others who are not in as favorable a position. But there is one thing lacking in this plan, i. e., sufficient financial incentive. The original supplier who has made available more than his allocation must deliver to other original suppliers with less than their allocation on a formula price prescribed in the directive which allows only a small handling charge and no visible profit other than that which might be enjoyed at the source through the production of crude oil and the refining of the product. Since this incentive was lacking the east coast of the United States has never received as much petroleum as it might have.

Since the physical product made available within district 1 has never been as much as it could have been it is obvious that some petroleum suppliers either original or secondary were unable to secure enough product to take care of their committed requirements. The only check on original suppliers for the distribution of product to their secondary suppliers and dealers is a monstrous order, Petroleum Administrative Order 1, which merely says that they should distribute the product equitably. Each original supplier has interpreted this order as he himself wished with the result that no two original suppliers used the same method for determining equitable distribution. Discrimination became rampant. Original suppliers were wont to think more favorably of their direct business sold through their own owned and controlled facilities than they were of the business done by their jobbers and distributors.

The foremost reason for this is that in direct operations they would make sales at wholesale with an operating cost for distribution of approximately 1½ cents a gallon, whereas to jobbers and distributors by contract and custom they were obligated to sell the product at from 2 to 2½ cents below the wholesale price. Jobbers and distributors therefore found themselves in the position of being unable to secure their fair share of their original supplier's allocation. The normal inclination for those jobbers and distributors who were ingenious was to develop additional sources of supply through their own negotiations directly with independent refiners in areas outside of district one. Many of these developed means of transportation and were successful in importing supplementary supplies. This condition naturally provoked the original suppliers; however, some of the original suppliers themselves took advantage of this loophole and connived to have their jobbers import products from such original suppliers' refineries in districts two or three with the understanding that the jobber would make the product available to the original supplier and give him an extra amount over and above what his allocation entitled him to. Naturally with such a condition increasing, the entire cartelized plan (directive 59) was threatened. Some of the larger participants in the directive threatened the Supply and Distribution Committee with complete withdrawal from the plan if the importation by secondary suppliers was not halted. Rather than to have the plan collapse the committee amended an old order, P. A. O. 5, by rewriting it to prohibit anyone from bringing in petroleum products to district 1 by barge or tank car except by special permission or unless the individual was complying with and a member of directive 59 group. It is important at this time to touch upon the difference between a directive (No. 59) and an order (No. 5).

Originally, under the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, recommendations were made to the industry. Certain members of the O. P. C. staff felt that the word "recommendation" was not as strong as the word "directive." Therefore subsequent to the issuance of some 56 recommendations all future such regulations were termed directives. A directive does not have the force of law. Directive 59 in question is merely permissive in that it provides a plan whereby the oil industry can collude and work together without fear of prosecution under the Federal antitrust laws. The authority for this directive is derived from the Second War Powers Act in which the President is authorized to allocate or ration short commodities. The power of the President having been delegated to the War Production Board, this directive is certified by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, to be essential to the war effort despite any beliefs to the contrary by the Department of Justice. Throughout the directive all of the provisions are phrased in words of "may" rather than "must." Up until a recent amendment of this directive there was no requirement that any Government representative approve or authorize the actions done under this directive by the Supply and Distribution Committee. However, in a recent amendment in the committee at the insistence of the Department of Justice provisions were added which required a staff representative of the Petroleum Administration for War to be present at all committee activities and that all actions of the committee be considered only as recommendations to P. A. W. or collaboration with P. A. W. This is the first instance of any actual governmental control within the directive. Nevertheless, all those complying with the directive do so voluntarily, since there are no penalties provided for under the directive for noncompliance.

An order is not a permissive and has the force of law in that it contains a provision for penalty of fine or imprisonment. P. A. O. 5 is such an instrument. As it is written it says that for all shipments of petroleum to district 1 exclusive of those under directive 59 permits must be secured, which permits are to be issued if the transportation to be used is efficient and the product is needed at the point of destination but this is not the way it operates. Any person who does not comply with directive 59 (a permissive) and who brings in petroleum product to district 1 is automatically in violation of P. A. O. 5. One must recognize then that the Petroleum Administration for War has used an order to give force of law to a directive. Of course an application can be made for a permit but instead of judging such under the provisions laid down in the order the staff of P. A. W. judges it on whether or not the applicant is in compliance with the provisions of directive 59. The order says that if an applicant is using efficient transportation and the product is needed at the point of destination a permit should be granted. However applications have been denied in writing for the reason that the applicant by receiving such product would have more than his directive 59 calculated sales position would entitle him to.

Applications for this order are reviewed by the New York district office staff of the Petroleum Administration for War which is composed almost entirely of major-oil-company employees. An independent's application is reviewed by a biased group. The entire staff of P. A. W. is primarily major-oil-company men many of whom are still paid partial salaries by their respective companies and which staffs contemplate returning to full time employment by the same major companies after the war and whose thinking was and is constantly and inevitably influenced by their background and post-war ambitions which naturally are partial to the interests of major companies and in discrimination against the many thousands of independent oil jobbers. Furthermore an applicant has the right to appeal the denial of an application. His appeal is heard by an appeal board. The appeal board is made up of exactly the same identical individuals in the P. A. W. New York office who originally denied the application. Rather than having the appeal heard by an impartial

group made up of a composite of all segments of the petroleum industry an independent jobber is tried by his peers.

By the refusal of P. A. W. to grant applications to independent jobbers or to allow them the same right of importation as the original suppliers the east-coast area is denied millions of gallons of sorely needed petroleum products. The Petroleum Administration for War will say that the original suppliers will be only too glad to bring in that which the jobbers were bringing in and in some instances they may do it. However the jobber was importing directly from the refinery source and by the original supplier stepping in as a middleman between the refiner and the jobber the jobber may be forced to pay a price as much as one-half cent higher.

Now that the Big Inch pipe line has been completed for the transportation of crude oil to New York and Philadelphia harbor area refineries and since the Little Inch pipe line is now delivering petroleum to the New York and Philadelphia harbor areas and now since submarine sinkings along our east coast have virtually ceased and tankers in increasing quantities are being made available for civilian domestic use, there is obviously no longer valid reason for the existence of an allocation directive along the east coast. The shortage of petroleum is today principally that of crude oil. Such shortage plus the shortage of transportation is Nation-wide and applies to each and every State in the United States almost equally. Gasoline and fuel-oil rationing has been extended Nation-wide. The system of coupon rationing is functioning satisfactorily. There is not now nor has there been any form of double rationing such as the allocation under directive 59 in that portion of the United States west of district 1. Petroleum suppliers both large and small have survived very well in those areas without an allocation plan even though at this very moment the major oil company men in P. A. W. are proposing allocation plans in those areas. In the Midwest and Southwest sections where there are many more thousands of jobbers than there are in district 1 such proposals have met militant opposition.

In view of all these circumstances that are now present and even upon the admission of many of the executives of the large major oil companies there is no longer a need for an allocation plan. Allocation under directive 59 is dual rationing. The Office of Price Administration is able through its coupon plan to adequately control consumer demand in district 1 and through the flow-back of their coupon system supplies can flow to the sources of coupon demand.

In summary this is merely a brief outline as to the actual operation of directive 59 with its various ramifications. There are many other phases including the means for cheating on the part of original suppliers among themselves which were not included in this outline to save further confusion. Additional and supplemental information can be provided together with facts and evidence.

Health Provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have been receiving a great many communications relating to S. 1161, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. There has been so much misrepresentation of this proposed legislation that I have prepared a series of questions and answers dealing with its specific provisions which I think will be helpful to Members of Congress in replying to letters relating to the health-insurance provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE HEALTH-INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL (TITLE IX OF S. 1161 AND H. R. 2861)

1. Does the bill provide for socialized medicine?

No. The term "socialized medicine" has been loosely used for a number of years to describe any changes in the provision of medical services to which medico-political leadership is opposed. If it were charged, more correctly, that the bill proposes to make medical services more nearly "social medicine" than they are today, that charge would be valid and would be a compliment to the bill.

2. If, as Dr. Fishbein declares in his editorials in the Journal of the American Medical Association, health conditions and the standards of medical service are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world, why is a change necessary?

Dr. Fishbein presents a very favorable over-all picture. He neglects to state that conditions are not nearly so satisfactory in poor agricultural States, in rural regions of wealthy States and in low-income sections of our large cities as national statistics indicate. Take, for example, the infant and maternal mortality rates. In 1941, while 45 babies in the entire United States died at birth for every 1,000 born alive, in the South the rate was 58. The rate for mothers who died in childbirth was 60 percent higher in the Southern States than in New England. The number of Negro mothers who died when their babies were born was twice the number of white mothers. Twenty-five percent more mothers died in towns and villages with less than 10,000 population than in the cities with populations of 100,000 or more.

We are proud of our steady reduction in deaths from tuberculosis. Here again, however, the over-all favorable picture conceals many inequalities. In New York City one overcrowded district has a death rate from this cause which is 30 times the rate in more favored districts.

Length of life is often considered a measure of the health of the people. Yet statistics of life expectancy for males in pre-war years showed a number of countries in which the average future length of life was greater than in the United States. For example: At birth, life expectancy was greater in 8 countries than in the United States. At age 20, life expectancy in 12 countries exceeded that in the United States. At age 60, the United States was exceeded by at least 9 countries.

Most of these are health-insurance countries. In the United States, inability to pay the costs of medical care prevents a good many people from receiving the care they need and limits doctors in the kind and amount of care they can provide. People who don't see a doctor don't get any kind of care—good or bad. Many doctors are unable or unequipped because of the cost to the patient to make use of the developments of medical science which Dr. Fishbein describes so glowingly. Patients of these doctors get a type of medical care not much better than that their fathers or grandfathers received.

3. The National Physician's Committee pamphlet says that if the recommendations of the bill are enacted into law "they will destroy the private practice of medicine in the United States."

This statement is not true. If the bill is enacted into law, physicians will continue to practice medicine much as they do now. They will have the choice of practicing full time under the insurance system, of combining care of patients paid for by insurance with care of uninsured patients and of those who prefer to pay for their care privately (that is, without making use of their insurance benefits), or of continuing to practice full time outside the insurance system.

Patients will be free to choose their general practitioners and to change them if their first choice proves unsatisfactory. Doctors will be equally free to accept or reject patients who choose them. Free choice is explicitly guaranteed in the bill (sec. 905).

4. Does the bill make provision for free care?

No. The bill does not set up a system of free medical care; it sets up a system of medical-care insurance. Insured persons will not need to pay for their medical care or hospitalization at the time they become sick, because it will already have been paid for in advance through their insurance contributions.

5. It has been said that the bill makes no provision for the "indigent" who have no money at all to pay for their medical care and hospitalization. Is this true?

No. This is not true. Under the insurance system, the indigent may be given the same medical and hospital benefits as the insured persons, if the public-welfare agencies agree to pay insurance premiums for them (sec. 910).

In addition, under title XII of the bill (unified public assistance program), provision is made for "needy individuals" in the States and localities. The Federal grants-in-aid to State assistance plans would apply to medical services provided for "needy individuals."

6. Isn't it true that under the bill the "entire medical profession in the United States would be placed under the direction of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service"?

No. This is not true. Section 903 in the bill, which relate to administration is not concerned with the administration of medical practice but with the administration of a system of paying for medical care. The provisions in the bill do not interfere with the professional aspects of medical practice. It should be emphasized that the bill specifically provides that the Surgeon General is "authorized to negotiate and periodically to renegotiate agreements or cooperative working arrangements" with the medical profession and with hospitals to "utilize their services and facilities and to pay fair, reasonable, and equitable compensation for such services and facilities." The method of making payments to general practitioners is to be that which is elected by the majority of physicians in any given local area.

In adopting the basic policies that would guide these arrangements, the Surgeon General is required to consult with the National Advisory Medical and Hospital Council, on which the medical profession will be adequately represented through members they nominate. The final contractual, financial arrangements must be approved by the Social Security Board, a nonpolitical group, whose chief concern will be to make sure that the working people of the United States who pay for their medical and hospital care through regular contributions receive what they pay for.

7. It is said that the National Advisory Medical and Hospital Council will have no authority—will be merely a "puppet council." Is this true?

No. This is not true. This council has been given no final administrative authority, because a council of 17 persons is too large to do an effective job of administration. An explicit statement in the bill which bound the Surgeon General to follow the advice of the advisory council in every instance would hamper his freedom of action to an unreasonable extent. He is, however, bound to consult them on all matters of policy. The bill is explicit and detailed in its description of the administrative policies on which the Surgeon General is authorized to act only after consultation with the council (see. 905).

In appointing the members of the advisory council the Surgeon General is required to select them from panels of names submitted by professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical services and education, with the operation of hospitals and from other persons, agencies, or organizations informed on the need for or provision of medical, hospital, or related services and benefits. It will, therefore, be a council composed of experts in the various fields. No responsible administrator would dare to act contrary to the advice of an advisory council of this character on any matter of importance unless he had adequate grounds on which he could defend his position publicly.

8. Isn't $3,000,000,000 a year an enormous amount of money to spend on medical care and hospitalization?

Absolutely not. The sums of money to be allocated to the medical care and hospitalization account will not for the most part represent new expenditures. To the extent that they do—through budgeted insurance expenditures—the people will receive somewhat more service than they do today. Only to that extent will people spend any more for the types of services to be provided.

Medical care ordinarily costs the people of this country in direct payments and through taxation about $4,000,000,000 a year. Direct expenditures by the people themselves amount to about $3,000,000,000. About two-thirds of this sum is now expended for the benefits which will be provided under the bill.

Moreover, it is probable that the $3,000,000,000 estimate made by the National Physicians' Committee is rather high for the long run. Three percent of wages or earnings of all persons, up to the taxable maximum of $3,000 a year, is to be allocated to the medical care and hospitalization account. How large the total amount received will be will depend upon the number of employed individuals and the size of pay rolls and other earnings. It may not amount to more than $1,800,000,000; it may run as high as $2,700,000,000.

9. Is it true that the Surgeon General will assign all patients to all doctors?

Certainly not. Patients will have free choice of all general practitioners within the system. Critics of the bill have misinterpreted paragraph 905 (11) of the bill in order to make this false statement. This paragraph states that in localities where physicians are paid on a per capita basis, the Surgeon General is authorized to distribute on a pro rata basis among the practitioners of the area those individuals who, even after they have been notified to do so, fail to select a general practitioner or those who have been refused by the doctor they select. Such individuals will, of course, be free to make a change if they do not like the physicians to whom they have been referred.

The purpose of this paragraph is to insure that in any area where the doctors have chosen to be paid on a per capita basis, they will actually get their full pay, even for the insured persons who have failed to make a selection or who, having made a selection (one or more times) have been unable to get any practitioner to accept them. In other words, this paragraph was included to protect the physician. It provides mainly for the assignment of dollars rather than of patients.

10. Will the hospitalization provisions in the bill "destroy the voluntary hospital system"?

No. This is nonsense. Nothing in the bill provides for or would even permit any interference in the internal management of any hospitals—private, public, or sectarian. All hospitals which meet acceptable standards—such standards as those utilized by the American Medical Association in determining whether or not hospitals shall be included in its annual register—would as a matter of course be included in the list of hospitals eligible to receive insured patients. In communities where hospital facilities are sparse, there will undoubtedly be common sense relaxation of these standards. There is explicit provision in the bill for this (915 (f)). The object is to make hospital care more available to people—not less available.

The assurance of adequate funds through the hospitalization benefits should enable hospitals to improve their facilities. The type of records which will be required will be no more difficult for hospitals to keep—perhaps less difficult—than those required by the Blue Cross plans.

11. Will the provisions for grants-in-aid for medical education mean that medical education will be "controlled" by the Surgeon General and that he will dictate which men and women may become medical students?

Of course not. The provisions of section 1111 of the bill give the Surgeon General no such authority. The purpose of this provision is to provide needed funds for the stimulation and support of research and medical education. Projects must be initiated by the medical schools and research foundations themselves. Such requests must, of course, be approved by the Surgeon General after consultation with the advisory council, to make sure that public funds are wisely spent.

This provision was put in the bill as a result of suggestions made by the medical profession in regard to the earlier Wagner health bill. It seems only proper that the people who profit so much by the advancements of medical science and improvements in medical education should contribute in this way to these desirable ends.

12. Is it true that the insurance fund would be used to take over medical schools and hospitals?

Of course not. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would authorize or even permit this. Nothing in the bill permits interference in the internal management of either medical schools or hospitals. The payment of hospital benefits to hospitals and of grants-in-aid to medical schools will provide a financial security that many institutions have never before possessed. This assurance of necessary funds should strengthen and stimulate them to do more effective work than they have ever done before, without in any way giving up independence and freedom of action.

13. Is it true that the enactment of the bill will plunge the physicians into political slavery?

This statement has been made by opponents of the bill to confuse and disturb physicians and others. There is nothing political about the Social Security Board or about the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The Social Security Board is not governed by politics. Its members have term appointments which do not coincide with Presidential elections. The Surgeon General's is also a term appointment. The United States Public Health Service has a long and honorable record of almost 150 years. Many of the advances in public health which the editorials in certain medical journals credit to the private practitioners of medicine have been stimulated by the activities of the Public Health Service and by similar public agencies.

14. Is it true that under the hospitalization provisions of the bill people will not be able to choose their hospitals?

People do not usually have free choice of hospitals today. Ordinarily, they go to the hospital in which the physician treating them has a staff appointment. Sometimes they have a choice of two or more hospitals in the community. They will have the same freedom under the provisions of the bill. They will have as much free choice of hospitals as they have today under the Blue Cross plans. All hospitals of good standing will undoubtedly elect to receive insured patients in order to obtain the assurance of guaranteed income which will be available to them.

15. Will people be obliged to take any doctor the insurance system tells them to, if this bill becomes law?

Certainly not. The bill expressly provides free choice of general practitioners (sec. 905 (2)). Ordinarily, a patient will go to a specialist only on the recommendation of his physician. This is for the protection of the patient. Most people should see a general practitioner first before they go to a specialist. The patient who goes to a specialist on the advice of a physician is likely to be taken care of more satisfactorily than if he follows the suggestion of a neighbor or picks out a name in the telephone book.

16. The bill says the Surgeon General can limit the number of patients a physician will be allowed to treat. Won't this keep people from having the doctor of their choice?

Not any more than at present when the patient chooses a doctor who already has all the patients he can take care of. This provision in the bill (905 (10)) is merely permissive. It states that "the Surgeon General may prescribe maximum limits to the number of potential beneficiaries for whom a practitioner may undertake to furnish medical benefits * * *." It does not require him to do so. Protection of patients and doctors was the only purpose in giving the Surgeon General permission to set a maximum. Such a maximum would undoubtedly be the largest number of persons whom one doctor could take care of satisfactorily. It would therefore be a larger number than doctors ordinarily take care of. As a result, this provision, if the Surgeon General found it wise to establish it, would rarely, if ever, interfere with the guaranteed freedom of insured persons to choose their own doctors.

17. Will the enactment of the bill result in the deterioration of medical practice?

On the contrary, it should improve the standards of medical practice. Many doctors are hampered today in their treatment of patients by the inability of the patient to pay for special diagnostic and treatment services he requires. The provisions for consultant and specialist services, for hospital care, and for X-ray and laboratory services as benefits under title IX of the bill will mean that doctors can make use of these services whenever they consider it advisable, without considering the patient's pocketbook.

18. Doesn't the phrase "with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed" used in section 905 of the bill mean that the Surgeon General will have too much power?

This phrase was emphasized in the national physicians committee pamphlet and has been frequently quoted in other criticisms of the bill to convey just this impression. No administrator can administer without setting up certain rules and regulations. It is a phrase commonly used in bills. It has no sinister significance. It merely gives the administrator the power to establish necessary administrative measures. He cannot use the rules and regulations to act contrary to the other provisions of the bill.

19. Newspaper advertising against the bill, sponsored by medical and drug groups, says

that if it becomes law people must depend upon "a doctor who is paid by the Government and is presumably working 8 hours a day instead of 24." Won't this make it very hard for people to get a doctor if they need one at night or on holidays?

Certainly not. Any such idea is nonsense and an insult to the medical profession. There is not one statement in the bill which even implies that doctors are to work any specified number of hours. Many a doctor who answers a patient's call today has no idea when, or whether, he will be paid for his services. Why should we assume that doctors will look after their patients less conscientiously when they know they will be paid than they do today when payment is often problematical?

20. Does the bill place "in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the power and authority * * * to designate which doctors can be specialists?"

This is the kind of question which can't be answered with a flat "yes" or "no." The bill provides that in determining what services and which practitioners shall be compensated at the higher rates of payment as specialist services and specialists—solely for the purposes of rates of compensation under the insurance program—the Surgeon General is to establish general standards for this purpose, but only after consultation with the 16 members of the advisory council, and by utilizing the standards and certifications already developed by the agencies set up by the doctors, themselves.

Justice for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if we are to follow the logical consequences of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, then, indisputably, the argument forces itself upon our consciousness that the people of India and their descendants are deserving of no less equal and equitable treatment.

But leaving aside the potent arguments that from the Chinese have been removed the unconscionable stigma of "lesser breed", and leaving aside the equally unanswerable argument that the soldiers of India have bravely fought a common foe on the battle fronts of Burma, Italy, north Africa and against the Japanese in southeastern Asia, a higher morality demands that we prove to ourselves, and to our allies, all our allies, that our preachments of democracy are not empty tenets. We cannot, on one hand, revile the Nazi theories of racial supremacy, and, on the other, ignore the sinister implication of our immigration legislation that bars one people and not another, restrictions based on no moral or ethical ground save that of a man's origin.

We are paying a bitter price to learn the lesson of the interdependence of the world and its inhabitants. We fight in brotherhood, recognizing our mutual debts. Can we not underscore the brotherhood away from the death-drenched battlefields?

Practically, the amendment of the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, will make permissive the admission of somewhat less than 100 Indians annually.

The hue and cry that will rise in opposition to the proposed establishment of an immigration quota for Indians and their right to citizenship, making much of the competitive labor argument and of the evils of widening immigration legislation, have, therefore, no validity, no foundation in fact.

It is not a special privilege we accord the Indians in establishing for them an immigration quota, nor is it an act of condescension from our favored heights. It would be, rather, the acknowledgment of our sincerity in our battle cries, a renewal in the faith of our founders.

Moreover, and while this thought cannot take precedence over our American basic principles of equity and justice for all, the decisive, overt act of placing the Indians within the embrace of our immigration-quota laws, on the basis comparable to those of the other peoples, and citizenship, will rob the Axis of their most telling barbed weapon on the battle of psychological warfare. But were it a time of peace, we could do no less.

For these reasons, I have this day introduced a bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives, and descendants of natives, of India, a copy of which bill follows:

A bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives and descendants of natives, of India

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, natives of India, and persons descended from natives of India, may enter the United States (1) as immigrants allocated to the quota for India computed under the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 211), and (2) as nonquota immigrants under section 4 (b), (d), (e), and (f) of such act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 204). A preference up to 75 percent of the quota for India shall be given to natives of India resident in India. As used in this section the term "India" includes the dependencies of India.

SEC. 2. So much of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provisions of this act shall extend only to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere, Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent, and natives of India and dependencies thereof."

Protection of Congressional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Detroit Times of March 10 entitled "Bridges Asks Crusade To Protect Our Congressional Government."

This is an account of the speech I made in the Senate on March 9.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES ASKS CRUSADE TO PROTECT OUR CONGRESSIONAL GOVERNMENT

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following are excerpts from the speech of Senator STYLES BRIDGES (Republican) of New Hampshire delivered on the floor of the Senate yesterday:

"Only a few days ago, the Members of the Senate and the citizens of our great Republic were thrilled to the marrow by a demonstration of principle beyond partisanship.

"The majority leader of the Senate moved us all to the quick because it was crystal clear that he spoke, not as a New Dealer nor an old dealer, not as a Democrat, not even as a Senator. He spoke in a capacity that surpasses all of these—he spoke as an American.

"He felt it necessary to defend the honor and the integrity of the Congress of the United States against shocking accusations by the President of the United States. It was for him a particularly harsh task because he had, for so many years, served faithfully, whether in fair or foul political weather, as the President's spokesman in the Senate.

"Americans everywhere were quick to feel the drama of our colleague's action. It is to be devoutly hoped that they will not be slow to understand its deeper meaning.

"They will grasp, I trust, that, in defending the dignity and integrity of Congress, the Senator from Kentucky was not protecting us as individuals. His primary purpose, I feel sure, was to protect the legislative branch of our Federal Government—because he knows it to be the heart of American democracy.

"If it were true, as the President has charged in his veto of the tax bill and on too many previous occasions, that this Congress is not a genuinely representative body but an instrument of 'greed' and 'special privilege,' it would mean that our democracy is corrupt at heart. And that we know, each of us in his private conscience, to be profoundly untrue.

"Reduced to its simplest terms, the question raised by political events in these last three administrations is this:

"Shall Congress continue to make the laws of the land or shall that central task be transferred, in large measure if not entirely, to the Executive?

"Shall Congress, as the most direct and most sensitive instrument of the popular will, be permitted to play its constitutional role, or shall it be reduced and degraded into a blotter for the thoughts and wishes and purposes of the executive branch?

"Let us be forewarned: If Congress, whether by connivance with the Executive or by default, loses the full force of its law-making functions American democracy is finished. I am weighing my words. I dare pose the matter so sharply because I consider the issue too vital for double-talk and evasion.

"What we have witnessed in these critical years is not simply an attempt of the Executive to influence and shape legislation. It has been, in effect, a consistent attempt by the Executive to legislate.

"Through the mechanisms of Executive orders, arbitrary edicts by appointive officials, directives flowing in tumultuous abundance from the various executive agencies, decisions have been made which have the force and the function of law. Repeatedly, the Executive has sought to accomplish, by administrative fiat, results that have not been authorized—or that have been specifically rejected by Congress.

"We are all aware of the unprecedented extent to which the President has concentrated the spending power of this Government in executive hands. What makes his recent veto of the tax law, and especially the strange language in which it was couched, so significant and so alarming is that it raises the danger of Presidential concentration of the taxing power as well.

"But each of us knows and the country knows that the control of the Nation's purse strings must remain firmly in the grip of Congress. To do less is to court disaster. The to-do about the tax veto was therefore both justified and wholesome.

"We cannot permit this President or any President, whether we get a New Deal or a new deck, to intrude upon the taxing and spending functions of Congress.

"The greatest danger that confronts the American democratic system at this time is that powers handed to certain administrative bodies for definite purposes and for what we thought were specific periods of time may be exercised too long or even in perpetuity. Because it is the greatest danger, it is also the greatest challenge to our sense of vigilance.

"Official agencies have a tendency to entrench themselves and perpetuate themselves. That is human nature and, more to the point, that is in the nature of power itself. Authority loaned for a given time becomes a habit. It takes on the psychology of permanence. Rare indeed is the administrative body that can be left free to fix its own life span. The emergency which may have brought it into being somehow is never liquidated.

"Are the President, the W. P. B., the W. L. B., and the rest of the alphabet bureaus to continue sending forth thousands of directives with the force of law long after hostilities are over?

"Is our economy to remain in its wartime straitjacket, or some new one that may be designed by these bureaus, until the official guardians themselves decide when, if ever, to release us?

"That certainly was not the intent of Congress in voting wartime authorities to the administration.

"It seems to me, and to many others, of the utmost importance that Congress should apply itself without further delay to the urgent problem of setting a juridical terminus upon all wartime powers. We dare not, if we value our constitutional Government, leave any margins of doubt or any unclarity on this matter.

"At a time when national unity is of such paramount value, it is truly heartbreaking that an unprecedented competition in the domain of legislation should have been set up by the executive branch of the Government.

"It is deeply to be deplored that attacks not only on the actions but on the intentions of Congress should have become almost second nature for the President and a portion of his political entourage.

"I am thoroughly convinced that the balance can be restored, unity achieved, not by appeasement of the President but by ordered and self-respecting restoration of the full rights and total functions of Congress.

"Some months ago, I read an article on Congress by the eminent historian, Prof. Charles A. Beard. After citing some ripe samples of the abuse against Congress, Professor Beard wrote:

" 'If such statements are true, their representative government is dead in the United States. And, more ominous still, the people of the United States, who elect these Senators and Representatives, are incapable of self-government. In that case, what have we to look forward to except one-man tyranny of some variety?'

"Of course, he denied that those accusations had any truth in them and concluded with words that sum up what I tried to convey today:

" 'The faults of our Congress,' Professor Beard wrote, 'are, in the last analysis, our faults. We cannot kill off Congress without committing suicide as a democratic nation. We cannot hamstring Congress without hamstringing our own American civilization. American talents should be concentrated on the problem of maintaining and improving constitutional government in America—the most precious institution of liberty, the most certain bulwark against servitude that we, as a people, possess.'

"I regard the reestablishment of the full functions of Congress as the most important single domestic problem facing the American people, and I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate share this view.

"I call upon you all, I plead with you, to join with me in a crusade to safeguard congressional government without reference to party or to differences on other issues.

"Only thus can we leave our own republic as we found it, a government of three coordinated branches working in unity and harmony under the genius of our Constitution."

The Fourth Term—Debate in Print Between Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, and Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Town Meetings in Print, published in the Washington News Digest. This town meeting is a debate in print between the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and myself on the subject of should there be a fourth term?

As might be expected, my answer to the question is "No," while that of the Senator from New York is "Yes."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THERE BE A FOURTH TERM?

NO!

(By STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator from New Hampshire)

In a debate several months ago on the question of whether President Roosevelt should run for a fourth term, I was asked whether the American people should be denied the right to vote for him. It is quite manifest that they not only have that right, but that they will have the opportunity.

Nevertheless, the question over simplifies a very serious situation in this country. To my mind, it is a very serious situation when a sizable part of our population comes to such a mental state as to consider that any man should serve four terms in the White House; that any one man is indispensable. That is not the proper state of mind for a people capable of self-government. It raises the question of whether we are actually capable of this vaunted self-government.

It goes without saying that if a majority of the people of this country want Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term they will certainly have him. But that in no way removes its self-evident evils; it in no way disputes our contention that this is the road to dictatorship.

No invidious comparisons are intended, but the plain and unchallengeable facts are that the German people voted their republic away; they voted their legislative body into impotency; they voted the dictatorship which they have. Now, we are told, and there is reason to believe, that they would like to get away from it and end the war, but they can't.

Similarly, we are up against the inescapable situation in this country that Mr. Roosevelt's nomination will not be the result of any burning desire for him on the part of the members of his own party. It will be the result of power politics. He will be drafted not by any great group of thinking people. He will be drafted by a group of jobholders wholly dependent upon him. They have no other choice.

We must be realistic about these things. We must face the facts of political life. Our system of electing Presidents is not one whereby 135,000,000 people, or the percentage of them of voting qualifications, stop on a stated day and determine judiciously upon one in their midst to be President, unswayed by prejudices, pressures, obligations, selfishness—the thousand and one experiences which shape our conduct generally. We have not attained perfection on earth, as have no other people, of course. We know of the countless factors which enter into a fraternity election, an election in the church. We make decisions in business based on obligations we have assumed or the hold over us which some other man has gained. In a greatly organized and complicated society there is no such thing as complete freedom of action, and, not as much as we should like to believe, of thought.

One of the most effective appeals of the New Deal has been that big business, or powerful corporations, formerly dominated the people. Assuming for the purpose of argument that this is true, how did they come to attain this domination if it was not that they slowly built up their power over the years? Power begets power. Why isn't it similarly true then that men in politics acquire power? Politics is but a vast industry out of which men seek to carve careers, just as in business or the professions. Since the beginning of time men have been seeking power over their fellow men. They choose different vehicles for the purpose.

Our politicians work at the business of politics just as bankers work at the business of banking, physicians at the business of doctoring, and so on. And, more generally than otherwise, each group sticks to its last and acquires little knowledge of how the other group operates. You have heard a thousand times a doctor or a banker or a businessmen say: "I do not know anything about politics."

The Presidency is our highest office in the field of politics. The man getting that office assumes tremendous power immediately he takes the oath. In the brief period of a minute or so he acquires a vast patronage army. He has the careers of our military men, those of our diplomatic service, of millions of our citizens, in the palm of his hand. I am not referring to the power over the people generally, which is his. The Presidency of the United States has rightfully been described as the most powerful office in the world. I am referring, however, to the direct power which he has over the jobs of men, the way in which they make their living. These men are directly beholdened to him. These millions are selfishly interested in his remaining in office.

We all recall that there were selfish politicians who wanted President Coolidge to run again. Their political kites were tied to him. There were some men of this mind who had considerable stature themselves, but it meant political profit for them for Mr. Coolidge to remain in the Presidency.

I have heard many students of government since express the opinion that had Mr. Cool-

idge been nominated again he would have been elected. Aside from his own desires in the matter, the mechanics of politics, so to speak, prevented his being nominated—the rivalries of politics, if you please.

Mr. Roosevelt's dangerous accomplishment in the 11 years of his tenure has been utterly to crush these rivalries within his own party, to greatly weaken them and intimidate them even outside of his party or of the field of politics altogether.

He has been able to take under his control, for their own selfish forces, such air tight political machines as Kelly's in Chicago and Frank Hague's in Jersey, thousands of mayoralty and gubernatorial machines throughout the country, thousands of our business leaders; our leaders in the professional world are obligated and beholdened to one or more governmental agencies of his creation. Men so obligated or beholdened are not really "free" men. They are utterly removed from the legitimate field of political criticism. They dare not, regardless of what they may think deep in their minds, seek to use their leadership abilities against the set-up. More likely they use it to perpetuate it. Why bring their house down on them, they ask selfishly.

It is my fear that after what Mr. Roosevelt has accomplished in this direction in 11 years he will completely have crushed all opposition in another 5 years. That is the dictatorship danger which we face. He succeeded in crushing the independence of our legislative system. Those of his own party came to be mere rubber stamps and those of the opposition party were more or less intimidated by the nature of things from too much self-assertiveness. Congress has bounded back with the 1942 elections. This vote of the people encouraged independence of action. But after this wholesome manifestation by the people, what will be the attitude of Congress should he, perchance, be reelected? Congress will drop back to a state of impotency. There will be little independence of action. This is the way of men. We of Congress will have made a hard fight. But we will have become worn out.

And the very fact that the tremendous propaganda facilities at Mr. Roosevelt's command has succeeded in convincing many of our people of his indispensability shows what his acquired power had done to our minds. This is not the proper state of mind for a people who would remain free.

YES!

(By JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator, New York)

Any thought given to the question of a fourth term for the present occupant of the White House must, of necessity, involve the consideration of the present world-wide emergency. This war, the most widespread and devastating in all the history of humankind, necessarily overshadows every other question before the people of this country and of the world. Any important step taken now by the American people, and for that matter by any of the peoples engaged in this war, will naturally affect favorably or adversely the progress of the war.

Only one short year ago the position of the United Nations in the conflict against the Axis was most grave, and to many critics and military experts the outlook was dark and ominous. Hitler had launched a three-point campaign upon which he expected victory for the Axis. Included in this three-point program was his drive on Stalingrad which, if successful, would find his armies in complete control of the great oil reserves of the Caucasus. And upon the success of this drive for Stalingrad and the oil fields beyond, he gambled Germany.

Next to his drive into the Caucasus was the importance he attached to the success of Rommel's army in Africa, and you will recall that they were virtually pounding at the gates of Cairo and Alexandria. Rommel had already overrun north Africa and, after taking Cairo, he, too, would go beyond the Suez and into the precious petroleum fields of Iran and Iraq. This would give the forces of Hitler all the petroleum supplies of the Old World so necessary for the armies of Russia as well as those who were carrying the banner of the United Nations in the Middle East and in India.

Hitler's third step for victory was in the Atlantic where wolf-packs of his undersea boats sank our shipping even faster than we were then able to construct new tonnage.

Hitler's acquirement of the oil fields of the Caucasus and the Middle East, if followed with the success of his U-boat campaign in the Atlantic, would render the armies of our allies impotent, leaving the United States alone to resist the rising menace of the Axis Powers. Fortunately for us and as the direct result of carefully planned strategy emanating from conferences in which our President participated, the situation is changed today and the picture looks brighter. Rommel was not only stopped, but driven out of Africa; Stalingrad proved the turning point of the war in Russia, and, in both instances, the volume and the might of America's lend-lease assistance contributed substantially to the success of the United Nations. The U-boat menace was met in similar fashion, and today our ships are sailing the seven seas with a higher degree of safety.

Good leadership in the past rescued the cause of the United Nations. Good leadership in the future will hasten the day of victory and bring our boys home to us with less casualties from the brutal conflict. The war, therefore, remains the predominant problem before the peoples of the world. By the same token, the biggest job in the world is that of the Presidency of the United States. The action, therefore, that we will take in the forthcoming Presidential campaign will naturally affect our fortunes far beyond our own individual opinions.

From present indications, we hope the war in Europe will be terminated within a year's time. In another year we expect to destroy the treacherous enemy of the Pacific and then the period of demobilization of the military and reconversion of our economy will take place. There will also occur during the years immediately following the war the organization of the peace. In the great conferences among the leaders of the nations of the world it behooves us to be represented by the most effective, resourceful, and influential leadership possible. A review of the President's record, his qualifications, and his experiences will, in my opinion, lead anyone to believe that he is equipped beyond any candidate for the Presidency currently receiving consideration. The President's familiarity with the problems of the war, his intimate acquaintance with the leaders of the United Nations, and his knowledge gained throughout the progress of the emergency make him invaluable in the conferences ahead.

It is inconceivable in my opinion to expect that Great Britain will dispose of the leadership of her renowned Prime Minister or that Russia will drop Stalin, Premier and Commander in Chief of the brave Soviet forces or that China, with its great hopes and aspirations for the future, will dismiss the services of General Chiang Kai-shek. And, by the same reasoning, it is inconceivable in my opinion that the majority of the people of the United States will dispose of the man who has been leading us so effectively and so valiantly since the coming of the emergency. It is my humble opinion, gained from my observations while visiting the battle fronts throughout the world, that this is our best-run war, that the selections of the men who lead our military and naval forces have been unquestionably of the highest possible character. It is likewise my opinion that the choice of the laymen who head our war-production agencies have been excellent selections which is plainly shown by the record. In the First World War we were unable to produce an effective fighting plane for our overseas forces. During that war our armies were supplied with planes and necessary heavy equipment by English and French munition producers. However, in this war under the outstanding leadership we now enjoy, we have amazed the world and broken every known record by supplying not only our own forces with their every need, but by meeting in large measure the military needs of every one of our allies.

This record has been indeed miraculous. Turning out military planes at the rate of 10,000 a month and seagoing tonnage at the rate of 20,000,000 dead-weight tons a year, together with all of the thousands of items of modern warfare in record-breaking numbers is indeed a most creditable performance. All of this did not just happen. It was not accidental, I assure you. There is of necessity real leadership involved in such a gigantic undertaking and that leadership is the leadership that we enjoy in the White House today. That leadership represents America's greatest single asset at this time. That leadership should be drafted until the job of the war and the foundations of the peace have been completed.

Clearing Up the Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 14, 1944:

CLEARING UP THE FOG

No question in recent months has aroused as much controversy as the soldiers' ballot. It is befogged by ignorance, beclouded with partisanship and bedeviled by political slickers who think they see in it a fine chance to gather up a lot of votes this fall for the fourth-term candidate. It is woefully misunderstood by the public.

The Federal ballot which Mr. Roosevelt and his henchmen want sent to the soldiers and sailors will not work. Some hope is held by the Democrats that the men and women in the armed forces would vote for their Commander in Chief. On the other hand, there is some suspicion that they would vote against the man who conferred on labor the power to strike and who numbers its leaders among his political friends. This antistrike feeling is strong among our fighters.

We may skip this and ask how the voting of our armed forces would be conducted through use of the Federal ballot. This ballot would be confined to Presidential electors, United States Senators and Congressmen. Presidential electors and United States Senators are elected by States. There is no mention of any State on the Federal ballot.

The Federal ballot would deprive soldiers and sailors from Pennsylvania, for instance, from voting for their State senators, representatives, members of the supreme and superior courts, auditor general, and State treasurer. There are 34 Governors to be elected this fall. The Federal ballot excludes them.

How would the voting of the Federal ballot be handled? Would there be ballot boxes at the front, or at the bases? Would they be in all the camps, headquarters, and hospitals?

Who would guarantee the integrity of this operation? Please do not go hypocritical and ask us if we wish to impugn the honesty of our fighting men. In politics one cannot trust his brother.

Let us concede that the ballots would be marked in good faith by all those entitled to mark them. Will there be a judge of election and two inspectors to oversee the operation? Suppose more ballots came back to Pennsylvania than there were Pennsylvania voters in the armed services. Would this vitiate the entire Pennsylvania soldier vote? How would the fraud be eliminated?

Would the ballot boxes be properly sealed and their contents carefully guarded until they were delivered to the election authorities at home? How would we know the voters were qualified or would it make any difference if minors voted?

Do the American people want this slipshod arrangement when it comes to registering their preference for President and Congress of the United States? Besides, this operation would be clearly unconstitutional. The ballot is left to the States for the reasons we have stated. But after what the New Deal has already done to the Constitution, why should we wonder at this?

Very well. What do the States have to offer? Every person in the armed services entitled to vote will be mailed a post card telling him how to request a ballot. He will then get one which he can mark for all State and Federal offices and mail it back to the proper board. The envelope he uses will be the evidence of the vote's integrity. This vote will be counted in the district from which the voter hails as it would in an ordinary election. As several months will be allowed for this procedure no voter need be missed.

This is simple enough, but the New Deal mayor of New York takes Governor Dewey to task for opposing the Federal ballot and supporting the State method. La Guardia rolls up terrifying figures about the mailing volume. Poppycock! There are just three pieces of mail for every person in the armed forces. What does this amount to alongside any soldier's or sailor's private mail?

We have gone into this explanation to clear up a lot of fog, misrepresentation, and downright political skullduggery. There is no other way to conduct soldier voting and guarantee its honesty than by using the regular, legal State method.

The Polish Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an article written by Mr. F. A. Voigt, who is the editor of the Nineteenth Century and After, which I understand is one of the most important political magazines in England.

I am advised that as editor of the Nineteenth Century, that he is frequently the spokesman of the permanent officialdom of the Foreign Office as well as a close friend of the former Under Secretary of State Lord Vansittart, who represents the conservative strongly anti-German group of the British government.

It is understood that foreign governments throughout Europe pay a great deal of attention to what Voigt has to say.

POLAND

I

The Russian declaration of January 11th[1] has uncovered the biggest political crisis of the Second World War so far. All Europe is looking on. The conflict between Russia and Poland does not concern the "Curzon Line," it does not really concern the frontiers of Poland or her demographic structure.

The questions are not:

Shall her eastern border be shifted westward? Shall she lose her eastern territories, or, losing them, acquire, in their place, western territories at the expense of Germany?

The question is: Shall Poland exist?

Beyond this, there is another question: Shall Europe exist—the Europe we have known, and hope to know again, the Europe for which the war is being fought, the Europe which alone gives the war any meaning, a Europe that is neither anarchy, nor servitude, the Europe that is a balanced integral whole, the Europe of systems and ideas, varied yet related, the Europe of many sovereign states, big and small, the Europe that is so much more than a geographical expression, Europe, the stronghold of the Graeco-Roman and Christian heritage? That is the question.

Without Poland there can be no such Europe. That is why, in September 1939 England and the Empire went to war. The threat to Polish independence was a threat to Europe—and, therefore, to Great Britain and the Empire. The threat to Polish independence is still a threat to Europe, no matter whence it comes. The threat was twofold in 1939, for hardly had Poland been invaded from the west, when she was invaded from the east and, for the fourth time in her history, partitioned—this time between Russia and Germany.

Today the threat is twofold still. What the Russians, in effect, demand is this: that Great Britain and the United States recognize the partition accomplished in connivance with the Germans. But with this difference, that, whereas the eastern half of Poland is to be annexed by Russia, the western regions shall form a vassal state on the border of the Soviet Union.

The Drang nach Osten was thrown back at Stalingrad. It has now been succeeded by the Drang nach Westen. Poland is the victim of the one, as of the other. But not Poland only. Three recent events mark the opening moves, as it were, of the Drang nach Westen: the appointment of Tito as field marshal and head of a rival government in Yugoslavia, the treaty between Russia and Czechoslovakia, and the Russian declaration of January 11th.

The declaration is not at all conciliatory, as it is made out to be; it is not devised to bring the conflict between Poland and Russia to an end. It is devised to accentuate the conflict, to increase the fearful pressure to which Poland has so long been subjected, and force her to accept terms incomparably harsher than any terms which Great Britain and the United States would think of imposing on a defeated Germany. The terms, if accepted, would mean the end of Polish independence.

The Russian Declaration is not mere propaganda, though it contains propaganda. It is not a mere statement of policy. It is a formidable political action, undertaken by one of the most formidable of great powers.

Let us examine the declaration in detail:

It twice refers to the Polish Government as "émigré." The term "émigré" has been endowed with derogatory meaning by Russian propaganda as well as by world-wide propaganda that serves the interests of Russia. The term "émigré" when so used of a government in exile is meant to convey that such a Government is not representative democratic, popular, or legitimate, no matter whether it is really so or not. The term is used of every exiled government which the Russians do not favor. It is not used of the Norwegian Government, for example, nor of the Czechoslovak Government. There was a time when the Czechoslovak Government had not, as yet, found favor in Moscow, and was therefore qualified as "émigré." The Yugoslav Government in exile was not émigré until Russia began to disapprove of its policy. Nor was the Polish Government émigré when the military situation in Russia was so critical that the help of every possible ally was needed.

The term "émigré" might seem a title of honor. The Allied Governments who are émigré left their countries because they refused to surrender and were resolved to continue the fight on the side of England against Germany. Poland was fighting on England's side during the darkest days of the war, when France had fallen and she stood alone. The Polish Air Force played a glorious part in the Battle of Britain, Polish soldiers and sailors showed marvelous skill and valor in the common cause. Yugoslavia dared to reject the alluring terms offered by the enemy. She came into the war on the side of Great Britain after France had fallen and before Russia was an ally. Nevertheless both the Polish and Yugoslav Governments qualified as "émigré" with disparaging intent and damaging effect—so powerful is ingratitude, and gratitude so weak.

To the Russians, the term "émigré" recalls those who fled from Russia during the revolution, and conspired against the newly established régime. They were represented as reactionaries and enemies of the people. The term émigré, therefore, which is placed in the first and final paragraphs of the declaration, gives it a polemical twist, although the term is in itself correct.

Is the Polish Government in London reactionary or undemocratic or unrepresentative of the Polish people, as it is made out to be?

When a government is exiled from its own country and when that country is occupied by a hostile army, there can be no elections and no effective legislation. How, then, can any such government be representative or, if it is so, be sure that it remains so?

It can, by wireless and by courier, be in close touch with its own nation, and can follow the trend of public opinion. When the nation is united against an external foe (as the Poles are) and when there is an efficient secret organization that embodies the national will (as there is in Poland), then the government in exile can be representative as a kind of delegation abroad or as a trustee.

The Polish prime minister is a peasant of humble origin. Polish industrial labor is "represented" by Socialists, of whom one is a member of the Jewish bund which favors a radical form of socialism.[2] On the whole, the Polish Government is as "representative" as is humanly possible. If seen through a medium undistorted by propaganda, it appears on balance, moderate, democratic, leftish. Although the machinery of popular representation cannot operate in Poland, the government could be repudiated overnight by the Polish people, who, through their organizations, can unmistakably give effect to their will. Even if the Polish Government wished to accept the Russian claim to eastern Poland it could not do so, because the people of Poland are uncompromising in their refusal to sacrifice national territory—just as the people

[1] For official text v. The Times, January 12, 1944.

[2] To be fully "representative," the Polish Government should include few Ukrainians. It does not; however if it did the conflict with Russia would be further exacerbated—and the British Foreign Office further embarrassed.

of England would be, if she were unhappy enough to find herself in a similar situation. In this there is no difference between the Polish right, middle and left. All are equally hostile, not only out of personal conviction, but also out of the knowledge that if they were to sign away Polish territory, they would be repudiated by the Polish people.

It is stated in the Russian declaration that "the territories of western Ukraine * * * and the territories of western Byelorussia" (the names given by the Russians to the eastern half of Poland) "were incorporated in the Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia" (and therefore in the Soviet Union) "in accordance with the will of the population * * * as expressed in a plebiscite, which was carried out on a broad democratic basis in 1939." Let us examine this statement.

II

Poland was invaded by Russian troops without a declaration of war on September 17, 1939.[3] The Russians occupied the eastern half of Poland by arrangement with the Germans, who held the western half. The Russians set up a military and civilian administration and divided the occupied territory in two districts, calling them "Western White Russia" and "Western Ukraine," and treating them as extensions of the White Russian [4] and Ukrainian Soviet Republics which are part of the Union of Soviet Republics.

The heads of the administration were mostly Russians from the Soviet Union, though a few Polish Communists were admitted. The Polish police were replaced by Russian militiamen. Law courts were suppressed, and many Polish schools and churches were closed down. As in the Baltic States later on, so in eastern Poland, vast numbers of citizens were arrested and deported to Russia with their families.

The deportations which began almost immediately, went on for many months. They were carried out in accordance with an elaborate system, which appears to have been essentially the same in Poland as in the Baltic States later on. All "anti-Soviet elements," as the Russians called them, were liable to arrest and deportation. These included magistrates, police, judges, lawyers, members of parliament, prominent members of political parties (and all members of parties and organizations of a real or supposedly anti-Russian character), members of patriotic leagues and societies, persons in any way associated with the outside world—such as representatives of foreign firms, persons employed by foreign legations, consulates, or chambers of commerce, persons engaged in trade or correspondence with foreign countries, former members of the Red Cross, former civil servants, priests, members of the nobility, merchants, industrialists, landowners, and owners of hotels and restaurants.[5]

The deportations in eastern Poland were not confined to Poles, but also to White Ruthenians and Ukrainians. Almost all the Ukrainian political leaders, in particular the leaders of the U. N. D. O. (Ukrainian National Party), were deported. So were many Ukrainian farmers and peasants.

For a comprehensive account of these deportations a whole volume would be needed. They make up one of the most awful tragedies of our time. We cannot, here, do better than give the brief summary of the main facts, which appeared in the Manchester Guardian.[6]

'These unfortunate people were transported in cattle trucks hundreds and thousands of miles into the remote and desolate regions of Asiatic and Arctic Russia. Many of them died on the way. The rest were imprisoned or put in labor camps or on collective farms in Kazakstan and elsewhere. Some were forced to work in mines in Karaganda and Kolyma, others along the Trans-Siberian Railway or in brickworks and sawmills in many districts of central Russia. Thousands died from overwork, illness, and under-nourishment—particularly the old people and young children. They were forced to live in overcrowded barracks without sanitation, in stables, earth huts, and even pig sties without light or heating in many cases. Those who were too old or ill to work usually received no food or money and had to be maintained by their families or friends. Quite small children thus often supported their aged or ailing relatives. The mortality of these children was fearful. Precise figures are unobtainable, but it is estimated that between 25 and 30 percent succumbed of about 180,000 children deported from Poland and roughly 30,000 from the Baltic States. Many families were broken up and dispersed to different regions—wives were separated from husbands and children from their parents.

We have mentioned these deportations, which had begun before the plebiscite held by the Russians in eastern Poland (and subsequently in the Baltic States), because they exercised a powerful influence on the vote, seeing that persons who, by their words or actions before and during the poll, could be classified as anti-Soviet were, therefore, liable to deportation.

III

The ethnography of eastern Poland is disputed. We give the Polish official figures, though with the proviso that these figures have been challenged by some authorities. The Ukrainians of eastern Galicia, in particular, dispute the figures relating to themselves.

According to the Polish census of the year 1931, eastern Poland, that is to say the Polish territories occupied by the Russians in 1939, had a population of 13,200,000: 5,274,000 Poles (40 percent); 4,841,000 Ukrainians (36.7 percent); 1,596,000 White Ruthenians (12 percent); 1,109,000 Jews (8.4 percent), (the remainder is made up of Russians, Germans, Lithuanians, Czechs, and others).

The elections for "Popular Assemblies" to represent the Polish White Ruthenian and Ukrainian territories were held on October 22, 1939. Space does not allow us to describe in detail the complicated procedure by which elections of a type unknown in Poland, were organized in about a fortnight. Only a few days were allowed for dividing a population of 12,662,000 people [7] in 2,424 constituencies. The electorate was not made really aware what the "Popular Assemblies" were for. The Municipal Council of Lemberg (Lwów) did issue a statement that the Assemblies were to decide upon the future national status of the Polish Ukraine. A similar statement was published in the Russian newspaper Izvestia. But the population as a whole cannot have known what really was afoot. The citizens of Lemberg probably knew. Perhaps that is why, when the elections came, they produced such a meager poll. It is hardly conceivable that the primitive peasants of remote villages in White Ruthenia could have known.

The Election Committees were composed of persons who were, for the most part, strangers. It may be that local Communists had a share in them, but it must at best have been a very humble share. The elections were organized by the Russian military and civil administration under the superintendence of the Russian higher authorities. Many Russian officials—including members of the N. K. V. D. (secret police)—arrived from Moscow as organizers.

The candidates were not chosen by the electorate. They were appointed by the Russian authorities and were, as a rule, persons quite unknown in the constituency. Many, if not most, were politruks (political officers) who had been sent from Russia. Some factories tried to put forward their own candidates, but were invariably overruled by the "Politruks." In come constituencies the candidates were members of the Russian military and civil administration. In one constituency, the candidates were Mr. Molotov and Marshal Voroshiloff.[8] In some of the rural constituencies the candidates were illiterate.

While multitudes of the electorate—Polish, Polish Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian political leaders and organizers—were being deported to Russia, many persons arrived from Russia not only to organize but also to vote as "permanent or temporary residents." Agitators were also imported from Russia.[9] Speeches and lectures, and propagandist plays (some of them with well-known Russian casts) were given. "Propaganda trains" of the kind used in Russia during the revolution, were sent to Poland. Russian troops took part in the canvassing—"the soldier agitator was here and there and everywhere." [10]

The propaganda was directed against imperialism and capitalism, against the Polish land-owning class,[11] in particular, against Ukrainian nationalism, and, of course, for the Soviet Union and its achievements.

The polling was as follows:

There was only one name—the name of the one candidate—on the ballot paper. There was a screen behind which voters could retire to mark their papers. Some did so, crossing out the name of the candidate or scribbling some comment of their own on the paper. But they were observed, and a mark would often be put against their names in the register. In some polling stations voters were "advised" by the officials present—Russian militiamen, soldiers, agents of the N. K. V. D. or an occasional local Communist—to drop their papers into the ballot without going behind the screen. Many persons arrived who had no identity card and were not on the register, and were yet allowed to vote. Their names were entered in the register subsequently. Many Russian soldiers voted.

The voting, though theoretically free, was in practice compulsory. Agents of the N. K. V. D. would call on persons who did not appear and warn them. They feared that if they did not vote they would be deported to Russia.

---

[3] The Nineteenth Century and After, June, 1943, p. 245.

[4] White Ruthenian and White Russian are alternative appellations. "Ruthenian" is a Latinized form of Russian.

[5] We have in our possession a copy of an official document—an order of the Russian Commissary of the Interior at Kowno (November 28, 1940, No. 0054)—which classifies "anti-Soviet elements" according to 14 categories and numerous sub-categories. It may seem queer that stamp-collectors and Esperantists could be considered dangerous, but they are entered in category 10, i. e., "persons in personal relations or in correspondence with foreign countries, with foreign legations or consulates, Esperantists and philatelists."

[6] The Manchester Guardian, December 23, 1943.

[7] Those residing in the region ceded to Lithuania being excluded.

[8] Constituency IV, Krzemieniec (Pravda, October 19, 1939). It does not appear that Mr. Molotov and the marshal ever showed themselves in this constituency.

[9] One hundred thousand agitators were drafted into White Ruthenia (Pravda, October 22, 1939), in Zolkiev there were 600 agitators for 11,000 inhabitants (Pravda, October 15).

[10] Izvestia, February 2, 1940.

[11] "Polish landlords" and "British imperialists" were sometimes classed together: "Is there another people in the world, with the only exception of the peasants of India, groaning under the boot of British imperialists, which has gone through such a tragedy as the Ukrainians and White Russian people under the yoke of the Polish landlords?" Pravda, October 2, 1939.

The votes were counted by "regional committees" appointed by the Russian authorities. The regional committees forwarded their returns to the central committees similarly appointed. The electorate had no means of checking the counts. The published results were:

Electorate:

Western Ukraine---------- 4,776,275
Western White Ruthenia---- 2,763,191

Votes:

Western Ukraine, 4,433,997, or 92.83 percent.
Western White Ruthenia, 2,676,280, or 96.71 percent.[12]

In some localities, when noon approached, and none or few turned up to vote, Russian troops or militiamen rounded up the constituents and escorted them to the polling station. In some districts the polling was preceded by numerous arrests. In some, many of the younger men fled and disappeared in the forests.

Returns were published for regions made up of several constituencies and for some of the larger towns, but none for individual constituencies.

In some villages there was much abstention, but it was not to be traced in the returns. In Lemberg the poll amounted to only 43.48 percent. The Russian authorities ordered a new election—it was never held.[13]

Out of 1,495 candidates for all eastern Poland, 1,484 were returned. Many of them—especially those from White Ruthenia—were illiterate.

The returned candidates formed the two national assemblies—White Ruthenian and the Ukrainian—which met at the end of October. The latter was attended by Marshal Timoshenko. Both assemblies passed the following resolutions—not by ballot, but by a show of hands, and unanimously.

1. That western White Russia and western Ukraine pass into the hands of the working class.
2. That western White Russia and western Ukraine be admitted to the Soviet Union.
3. That the big estates be confiscated.
4. That the banks and industries be nationalized.
5. That homage be paid to the great Stalin.[14]

This was the plebiscite referred to in the Russian Declaration of January 11, 1944. In this way eastern Poland was annexed by Russia.

The three Baltic States were similarly annexed in the year 1940.

According to the Declaration, "the injustice committed by the Riga Treaty of 1921 * * * was in this way rectified * * * the incorporation of western Ukraine and western Byelorussia (White Ruthenia) in the Soviet Union not only did not violate the interests of Poland, but, on the contrary, created a reliable basis for stable and permanent friendship between the Polish people and its neighbors the Ukrainians and Byelorussians (that is to say, with the populations of the annexed territories and, thereby, with the Soviet Union itself. * * *[15]

"The Soviet Government has repeatedly declared that it stands for the reestablishment of a strong and independent Poland and for friendship between the Soviet Union and Poland."

By this incorporation Poland lost 51.6 percent of her territory, 37.3 percent of her population, more than half her timber, about half her chemical industry and of her peat for fuel, more than 40 percent of her water power, about 85 percent of her oil and natural gas, her potassium mines, phosphates, and most of her grain. It is not easy to see how such losses in territory, population, and wealth could be conducive to strength and independence, and to "friendship" with the power which had inflicted them.

IV

Let us examine the thesis advanced by the Russians, that the majority of the inhabitants of eastern Poland are "brethren" of their "neighbors," the White Ruthenians and Ukrainians across the Russian border, and that to incorprate them in the Soviet Union was therefore just. It is commonly represented as the exercise of the right of self-determination. It is true that these "brethren" are ethnologically akin. But it does not follow that to join them within the Soviet Union is to apply the principle of self-determination.

The two principles—ethnological kinship and self-determination—are entirely distinct. The ethnological principle, which is but Hitler's racial doctrine, would, if consistently applied, incorporate Holland, Flanders, German-speaking Switzerland, as well as Austria and the Sudetenland, in the German Reich. The German-speaking Swiss do not want to become Germans, and to incorporate them in the German Reich, in accordance with the racial doctrine, would violate the principle of self-determination. If that doctrine were to be accurately applied, Switzerland would be partitioned between Germany, France, and Italy.

Poland, like Switzerland, is a multinational state—so is Russia—only 52.91 percent of the inhabitants of the Soviet Union are Russians.[16] The White Ruthenians and Ukrainians of Poland do not want to be incorporated in the Soviet Union—they did not want to in 1939, and they do not want to now, indeed, less than ever now, after their experience of Russian domination from September 1939 to June 1941.

Although they—and especially the Ukrainians—were not contented under Polish rule, they have come to realize that Polish rule is preferable to German or Russian rule. When war came, the White Russian and Ukrainian troops were loyal to the Polish state. It is true that when the Germans invaded Russia, they found support amongst the Polish-Ukrainians who dreamed of becoming part of a Ukrainian empire, extending from the Caucasus into central Europe, but independent of Moscow. The Polish-Ukrainians were completely disillusioned, both by their German masters and by their "brethren" in the Soviet Ukraine, who, contrary to German expectations, were loyal to the Russian state. They found that with these "brethren" they had nothing in common. They might be amongst their "brethren"; they were no longer in Europe.

The eastern Polish frontier is the dividing line between two civilizations. The White Ruthenians and the Ukrainians who live west of the frontier are different to the point of mutual incomprehension from those who live east of the frontier. West and east of this frontier lie different worlds.

The Russia of today is a new civilization—a civilization unique in the world. Poland belongs to the west—to Christendom. We do not suggest that Christendom is better than non-Christendom, but only state that they are different.

Poland was partitioned three times before 1939, and each partition was regarded as a crime by the civilized world.[17] But the difference between her and Russia is far greater now than it was in the eighteenth century—the century of the three partitions.[18] The crime today would be incomparably greater than it was then, because the victims would be incorporated in a state which is much more alien, by comparison with their own, than it was then. The consequences, in terms of change, displacement, of readaptation, of human suffering, would be much greater, the more so, because the means of coercion at the disposal of a modern state are much more formidable than those at the disposal of the eighteenth century state.

Reasons of ethnology and of racial doctrine in the affairs of nations are not reasons of justice or humanity—least of all are they reasons of genuine brotherhood.

The injustice and inhumanity today would be far greater even than it would have been as recently as in 1921, when the present eastern frontier of the Polish Republic was drawn. In 1921 Russian civilization was not as developed as it is today. Poland, too, was in a more primitive state than the subsequent years of constructive national effort were to make her. The two civilizations were not so deeply differentiated then as they are now. This is particularly so with regard to religion. Poland is Christian, Russia is secular. The White Ruthenians, who are politically the most primitive amongst the inhabitants of the Polish Republic and have little sense of nationhood, have a strong sense of religion.

The Polish Republic is not as integrated as some of the multinational states, like Switzerland, for example, and Great Britain. But the republic had existed only a score of years when the Second World War came, and had not the time needed for complete integration—always a gradual process. But she had achieved a great measure of integration. Twofold invasion and twofold occupation have been the severest possible test of integral nationhood. Poland has stood that test as no other country occupied by the enemy has stood it. Another partition would be yet another tearing asunder of a living community, a community more closely knit together in spirit than ever before.

V

The Russian Declaration refers to the eastern frontier of the Polish Republic as "the injustice committed by the Treaty of Riga." It was as fair a frontier as could be devised, as we shall try to show. The Declaration does not insist upon precisely the frontier claimed by Russia as the result of the "plebiscite" in 1939, the frontier of the Fourth Partition, the so-called Ribbentrop-Molotoff line, which had been agreed upon between Hitler and Stalin shortly before the Second World War. The Declaration insists upon "approximately" the Curzon line, which is more favorable to Poland insofar as it would deprive her of a little more than a third of her territory instead of one-half.[19]

But even if the "Curzon line" had been fair when it was proposed in 1919, it would be so no longer, for the integration of the Polish state has advanced since then. But it was not fair even then. We shall not here discuss the proposal that bore the name of Lord Curzon except to state that the line follows the eastern boundary of the homogeneously

---

[12] Pravda, October 25, 1939.

[13] Pravda, October 25, 1939.

[14] Pravda, October 28, 29, 30, 1939.

[15] Before they were enlarged by the annexation of eastern Poland, the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics of the Soviet Union comprised 21.22 percent, and 3.22 percent, respectively, of the total population of Soviet Russia. V. Census of 1926 (The U. S. S. R. in Figures, Soyouzorgoutchot, Moscow, 1934).

[16] The U. S. S. R. in Figures (Soyouzorgoutchot, Moscow, 1934).

[17] Cf. Richard Brinsley Sheridan's tremendous indictment of the Second Partition (speech in the House of Commons, April 25, 1793). Sheridan is as fierce in his denunciation of the deportations carried out under Catherine the Great as he would have been of the deportations carried out under Stalin had he been living today.

[18] 1772, 1793, 1795.

[19] Bialystock would remain Polish. But under the "plebiscite" in 1939 it "voted" by an "overwhelming majority" for incorporation in the Soviet Union. If the Russian contention is accepted, the workers and peasants of Bialystock would once more become the "slaves" of the Polish "landowners and capitalists."

Polish region[20] and the western boundary of the heterogeneous Polish, White Ruthenian, and Ukrainian area, that a fair line(as fair, that is to say, as can humanly be to Poland, to Russia, and to the populations immediately concerned) would pass about halfway through the heterogeneous area. Such a line was, in fact, drawn under the Treaty of Riga, the line that became the frontier between the Polish and Russian Republics, the line that is the legal frontier between them still.

The Russian Declaration, in referring to the frontier agreed upon at the Riga Conference as "unjust," and implying that the "Curzon line" would be just, is refuted by Russian evidence. Although the Russian armies were advancing victoriously against the Poles in July 1920, yet when Great Britain offered to mediate and proposed the "Curzon line,"[21] Chicherin, in his reply, stated that "the Soviet Government expresses its willingness to a territorial frontier more favorable for the Polish people."[22]

The Russian-Polish war was not won by the Poles, whose original plan of establishing a federation composed of the Polish, the Ukrainian, and the Russian Republics,[23] miscarried, chiefly through lack of Ukrainian support. It is true that the Russians nearly captured Warsaw and conceived a plan for revolutionizing Poland, so that she should become a Soviet Republic which would affiliate with the Soviet Union. But they in their turn were driven back.

The negotiations at Riga were not easy. But it was the chief Russian delegate himself, Joffe, who declared, when the conference was over, that "the difficulties" were "especially in the settlement of economic and financial problems," not, therefore, in the settlement of the frontier.

The Russians waived their claim to a frontier more unfavorable to Poland when the Poles agreed to accept a smaller portion of the gold in the former Imperial Bank of Russia. Joffe declared the "conclusion" of the conference to be "satisfactory."[24]

At no time was there any Russian protest against the new frontier, which was, indeed, amongst the few of the new European frontiers which was not the object of constant complaint, and of claim and counterclaim. According to an authoritative work, issued by the Soviet State Institute in Moscow, it represents that frontier as relatively unfavorable to Poland because "Soviet Russia emerged victorious even from this struggle."[25]

It is evident that the Russian Declaration of January 11, 1944, in referring to the frontier accepted under the Treaty of Riga as an "injustice" which was "imposed upon the Soviet Union" is serving a political purpose, rather than presenting historic truth.[26]

On July 30, 1941, when Russia herself was attacked by Germany, and in need of all the help she could obtain, she renounced her claim to eastern Poland in an agreement signed by Mr. Maisky and General Sikorski in London. The agreement was endorsed on the same day by the British Government in a note signed by Mr. Eden, stating that Great Britain recognized no territorial changes made in Poland since August 1939. On July 31 a similar statement was made on behalf of the United States. The legality of the Polish eastern frontier and the illegality of the claim made in the Russian declaration are therefore beyond all doubt.

Why have the Russians disinterred, as it were, the Curzon line? The reason is plain. The line bears a respected name. If it becomes a frontier of the fourth partition, it will give that partition the stamp of respectability.

VI

The declaration refers to the Union of Polish Patriots in Russia as offering "the possibility of the regeneration of Poland," and denounces the émigré Polish Government in London as "inescapable of establishing friendly relations" with Russia and "of organizing an active struggle against the German invaders in Poland itself." The significance of these statements will emerge if we consider events in Yugoslavia as well as in Poland.

It was the Russian Government which broke off relations with the Polish Government, merely because the latter had invited the International Red Cross to investigate the fate of 8,300 Polish officers, who had been prisoners of war in Russian captivity, and had vanished in the spring of 1940, when their relatives in Poland ceased receiving any more letters from them. The Russians never accounted for their disappearance—the assertion that they were massacred by the Germans is unconvincing, for the Germans did not invade Russia until the summer of 1941.[27] The Polish request for an inquiry may or may not have been impolitic, but it did not warrant a rupture of diplomatic relations—it was the excuse for the rupture, not the cause. The violence and the persistence of the attacks made by Russia in broadcasts and in the press—attacks that have culminated in the declaration—leave no doubt of her resolve to eliminate the legitimate Polish Government, and to replace it by a government made up of persons drawn from among the Union of Polish patriots and maintained under Russian control. But as long as the legitimate Polish Government is recognized by the other allies and as long as it has the united support of the Polish people, there can be no Polish Tito—Tito is possible only in a country which, like Yugoslavia, is divided against itself, where a rival to the legitimate government can be set up and find a following.

Nor is Poland in a state of civil war as Yugoslavia is. The Polish Secret National Army is a powerfully organized force which is directed from London. Only in eastern Poland is there civil war. A partisan movement made up of deserters, a few Polish communists, perhaps a few Ukrainians, but chiefly parachutists from Russia, has instigated a kind of anarchy in eastern Poland under the German occupation. But so far it has been unable to create a following for a Polish Tito.

According to the declaration, Poland, while called upon to renounce her eastern territories, is to acquire "ancient Polish lands which were wrested from her by the Germans" and so to "unite the whole Polish people" and secure an "outlet to the Baltic Sea." It is not clear what lands are meant, for those she lost to the Germans "in ancient times" are inhabited by Germans, and to acquire them would not be so conducive to Polish unity—unless the German inhabitants are deported. It would seem that East Prussia is one of the lands which are to be Polish, for on June 18 the Moscow wireless broadcast a statement on the aims of the Union of Polish Patriots,[28] who are but instruments of Russian foreign policy. According to this statement, Poland is to receive East Prussia (as the "outlet to the Baltic," subsequently referred to in the declaration). But the East Prussians are Germans, indeed intensely so.[29] It would, however, seem that the ethnological principle, which applies to eastern Poland, does not apply to western. According to the same broadcast, Poland is to acquire Silesia, which at least has a population that is largely a mixture of German and Polish.

The Polish Government has consistently refused to accept the principle of compensation—to sacrifice Polish territory, in return for alien territory. If Poland is entitled to compensation—and she is as much entitled as any of the Allied Powers—it is for loss and injury inflicted upon her by the Germans. For the permanent loss of her own eastern territories there can be no compensation. To accept the principle of compensation for their territories would be to attribute legitimacy to an illegitimate act of spoliation.

Besides, a Poland immensely weakened by such a loss would be the more helpless as a neighbor of a vengeful Germany. For the loss of, say, 10,000,000 of her own subjects who, White Ruthenian and Ukrainian as well as Polish, stood against the common foe in 1939, she would acquire, say, five or six million Germans who would rise against her at the first opportunity, or, if deported, would become the principal instigators of a German "revanche." To push all Poland westward, as it were, to make her dominate or deport five or six million Germans, is to establish a permanent state of conflict between Germans and Poles.

It is true that a change in the status of East Prussia is needed for strategic and political security in eastern Europe. That is a matter neither for Poland alone nor for Russia alone, but for the United Nations as a whole to decide. It is for them to invite Poland to carry out whatever may be her share in the general task of maintaining security in eastern Europe and more particularly in the Baltic and, therefore, to assume special obligations with regard to East Prussia.

A mutilated Poland and one with a government under Russian control, whether direct or whether indirect in guise of the "friendly government" constantly demanded by the Russian press, would be a vassal state, especially if there were no protection against Germany except in the strength of Russia. Russia, on the other hand, would acquire great bargaining power. By holding former German territories in pawn, as it were—with a vassal Poland as a nominal trustee—she would, if a new international situation arose, be able to change her German policy, and transform the balance of power to her and, perhaps, to Germany's advantage.

It is not only Poland who is being pressed into conformity with a European order that does not correspond with the declared war aims of the United Nations, least of all with the outlook of the western democracies. By the disintegration of Yugoslavia, especially of Serbia, the strongest national unit in the Balkans, and by the mutilation and enfeeblement of Rumania, as well as of Poland, Czechoslovakia, will be completely isolated. Czechoslovak industry has greatly expanded under German domination. When the war is over Czechoslovakia will be the leading in-

[20] Alternative extensions of the Curzon line (the Botha lines, A and B) were proposed for Eastern Galicia, the one excluding and the other including Lemberg in the Polish Republic. Lemberg is the third Polish city, so that its exclusion or inclusion is important. The Russian declaration does not indicate which alternative is demanded.

[21] The Curzon line had been proposed in 1919 as the eastern boundary "within which Poland was entitled to maintain an administration," but without prejudice to her claims to territories farther east.

[22] Chicherin to Mr. Leslie (Reval), July 18, 1940.

[23] The Soviet Union was not so integrated then as it is now. The Russian and Ukrainian Soviet Republics had separate delegates under Joffe at Riga.

[24] Vide Stanislaw Grabski, the Polish Soviet Frontier, p. 35.

[25] The Great Encyclopedia, volume 46, page 247.

[26] History is further falsified in Soviet War News (January 14, 1944) which, while asserting that Poland refused the Curzon line during the Russian-Polish War, suppresses the fact that Russia also refused it, and then goes on to say that the Riga line was "forced upon" the Soviet Union.

[27] The Nineteenth Century and After, January 1943.

[28] Daily Mail, June 19, 1943.

[29] East Prussia contributes, relatively, more recruits to the German armed forces than any other part of Germany.

dustrial country in Europe, for German industry will have undergone vast destruction (though it may be that Czechoslovak industrial plants will also be bombed). There is widespread collaboration with the Germans in Czechoslovakia—far more, indeed, than in France. In Poland there is none. Poland, whose "Secret National Army" is derailing German trains and slowing up German depots and so assisting the advance of the Russian Army, is the object of bitter hostility and of disruptive coercion. Czechoslovakia, the most "collaborationist" of all Allied countries, is the most favored in Moscow. Poland, the least "collaborationist" of all, is the least favored.

But will the opportunism of Dr. Benes profit his own country in the end? According to article 4 of the Treaty of Czechoslovakia and Russia,[20] "economic relations will be developed on the largest possible scale, and each party will give each other every economic assistance after the war." Russia has a socialist economy, Czechoslovakia an economy that is still largely individualistic. A relationship of the kind denoted in article 4 of the treaty is impossible without a process of economic adaptation—a Gleichschaltung, as it were, of the two economic, and, to some extent, of the two political systems. If eastern Poland is annexed, Russia will be a neighbor of Czechoslovakia. If the racial doctrine which is being applied to Poland was applied to the Czechoslovakian Republic, that republic would be dismembered—one part would become Russian, another German, another Hungarian, while two parts, Slovakia and Bohemia-Moravia, would enjoy a precarious independence.

While Poland and Yugoslavia have been under disruptive pressure, Czechoslovakia has been treated with the utmost consideration. Nevertheless, hardly had the treaty with Russia been signed when a warning comes from Moscow. The Czechs were told that their "National Liberation movement lags behind that of other occupied countries," although "the prerequisites for mass guerilla warfare exist," there is a "lack of central leadership," too many Czechs believe that "liberation from Hitlerite tyranny would come only from without," and "the spread of this belief encourages a passive attitude."[21]

If the process perceptible from the Baltic to the Ægean continues, the process, that is to say, by which Czechoslovakia is being isolated and, for the time being, preserved, while Poland and the Balkans are subject to territorial and social disruption, Russia will be master of the central European industrial area—and of much more.

It is said that England cannot afford to quarrel with Russia. And indeed she cannot. Nor can Russia afford to quarrel with England. But it is necessary for England, no less than Russia, to have a clear and positive policy.

Even the annexations already declared by Russia—the Baltic States, Eastern Poland, Bessarabia and Moldavia—represent a tremendous displacement. They mean the total extinction of three countries that enjoyed independence in 1930 (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) and the mutilation of two (Poland and Rumania). They would place a population of 22,000,000 Europeans under alien rule. And yet these annexations represent the minimum of Russian demands upon Europe.

Of these countries, Poland is an Ally—the one Ally that remained true when Great Britain stood alone, an Ally whose fate is under the protection of successive pledges made by Great Britain. But the issue, now, is bigger than the future of Poland—it is bigger than the future of Russia, the future of Germany, the future of Great Britain. The issue is the future of Europe. That is why all Europe is looking on.

THE EDITOR.

[20] For full text vide The Times, December 14, 1943.

[21] War and the Working Class (quoted by The Daily Worker, January 3, 1943).

Civilian Contribution to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief résumé of a booklet entitled "Bill Bailey Got the Credit, But the Man Behind the Gun Was Mr. Dooley," which was recently published by the General Cable Corporation of New York.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL BAILEY GOT THE CREDIT, BUT THE MAN BEHIND THE GUN WAS MR. DOOLEY

Here's a salute to Mr. Dooley.

Remember 'way back when everybody was singing the song, Mister Dooley? Forty-odd years ago, that was. There was a parody that went like this: "Bill Bailey got the credit, but the man behind the gun was Mr. Dooley." Mr. Dooley was sort of an unsung hero of his day.

Nowadays we have lots of Mr. Dooleys, and Mrs. Dooleys, too. The war has created a bumper crop. They are men and women who work hard, who work on essential jobs, who are back of every gun fired. But they get very little credit. Medals and decorations, somehow, don't come their way.

About a year ago men and women of General Cable received the Army-Navy E. That was recognition, a tribute to the spirit that inspired workers throughout American industry after Pearl Harbor. We got the M flag, too. More recognition, and a further stimulus to greater effort. Our men and women cheered at the presentation ceremonies; we all felt proud; we worked harder than ever.

But we knew there were others worthy of recognition. Men and women, by the hundreds of thousands, working in vital services, the public utilities, the electrical supply houses, the railways, the communications systems, services not included in the E and M awards. Was that fair, we asked ourselves? Certainly they are doing a big part—an all-important part. Why were they getting so little recognition for their truly inspiring wartime performance?

We felt that something should be done about it, something to call attention to all these Mr. Dooleys, and the big war job they were performing. For we realized from first-hand experience the salutary effect that public acclaim has on war-worker morale and war-worker effort. We felt we could make a real contribution to the efforts of these men and women on the home front by publicizing their accomplishments where all could see. We turned to the press, we put it in the papers where the public at large could read and remember.

What happened then is a matter of record. Month after month, attention was called to these unsung heroes. Their part in the war became the theme of a series of full-page newspaper and magazine advertisements.

America got the idea quickly. It appealed to the public's sense of fair play. And letters of approval poured in. In effect, they said, "You're right. Keep up the good work." They were signed by far-sighted leaders in labor and management, by executive of many of America's leading industries, by men in public life. The idea was spreading—over the air waves, in union meetings, in front offices, through the rank and file of the workers.

In June 1943 the editor of the Dallas Morning News took his pen in hand, and wrote a powerful editorial. This editorial follows:

"POWER FOR VICTORY

"In the war news, the big headlines go to the air raids, the commando landings, and the taking of large territories and great cities. The loudest acclaim naturally goes to those who take the biggest risks and make the most sensational achievements. Yet full credit should also go to those on the home front whose daily service is essential to victory. This vast group includes not only those who build ships, planes, tanks, and other war equipment, but every person who works faithfully in an industry that is bolstering the war effort.

"The electric power industry, for instance, is one without which no other war industry could operate. There must be power for the lathes, punches, riveters, and other machines that make our war weapons, power to light our factories for night shifts, power to take workers from their homes to their jobs and back. One of our main defense aims is to protect our power plants; one of the main objects of our bombers is to destroy the enemy's generating plants.

"General Cable Corporation, which makes wires and cables through which electric power is transmitted, does well to call public attention to what the power industry is doing to hasten the day of victory. This industry has given the United States more electric generating capacity than all the rest of the world and has delivered this power to the places where it was most needed and could most readily be harnessed to the war effort. In this and other essential industries, every worker should know that victory depends on his doing his part and should have recognition for unusual performance."

This was the forerunner of many similar editorials in some of the leading newspapers of the United States, all of which called attention to the wartime achievements of men and women in our service industries.

In publicizing throughout the Nation the wartime accomplishments of the service industries, General Cable not only expressed its own beliefs but successfully encouraged many others to join hands with it. In doing this, General Cable believes it has made a contribution to morale of men and women of our service industries and thus to the war effort.

Will They Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will They Vote?" from the Newark Evening News of Wednesday, March 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THEY VOTE?

Four months ago the Congress set out to simplify and broaden the voting process for men and women of the armed forces. What finally emerged in the Senate yesterday is a compromise which does neither. Before the service vote can be polled, under the so-called compromise, prospective voters will have to surmount added barriers of transportation, application blanks, consent legislation by the States and consent decrees by all governors.

Ostensibly the purpose of the committee compromise is to protect States' rights. So sedulously have the conferees and the Senate protected States' rights at the expense of men and women in service that even Representative RANKIN, whose State of Mississippi disqualifies citizens from voting by the wholesale, is satisfied. The practical result of this legislation, if the House concurs, and the evidence points to quick concurrence, will be to complicate, not simplify, soldier voting.

The politics of a presidential election year, which has helped to weaken the original and reasonable Senate compromise, was evident in yesterday's vote. Southern Democrats and Republicans combined to give the 47 votes for the bill which Senator CONNALLY of Texas called "the best we could get."

An interesting aspect of the vote was the manner in which New Jersey's Senators divided. The roll call found Senator WALSH, Democrat, in agreement with Governor Edge that the compromise added to the complexities and confusion of the problem. Mr. WALSH aligned himself with the opposition. Senator HAWKES, Republican, obviously did not share Mr. Edge's alarm. He voted with the so-called States' rights coalition.

The test of any Federal soldier vote law should be whether or not it will make voting easier in a presidential election for the men who are doing most to preserve the franchise. By this standard the legislation now on its way through the Congress fails woefully.

Subsidizing Schools for Political Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement from the Detroit News of March 12, 1944, quoting Dr. Alexander G. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan.

It must be obvious to every clean-thinking citizen that there is a deliberate plan on foot to obtain political control of the public schools through lobbying, propaganda, and bureaucracy set up in Washington.

Just recently, on the floor of the House, I charged that there was a definite trend on the part of the Office of Education to gain control of the public schools of the States. Now comes a statement from the president of a great university, one of the greatest in the United States, that virtually every agency of the Federal Government here in Washington is concerned with some phase of education, not for the purpose of promoting understanding but as a means of distributing subsidies and wielding political power.

Let every friend of public education take notice of the warning issued by this great educator of the Middle West.

RUTHVEN SAYS UNITED STATES FUMBLES EDUCATION

ANN ARBOR, MICH., March 11.—In a scathing denunciation of bureaucracy run riot, Dr. Alexander G. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, today charged that virtually every agency of the Federal Government is concerned with some phase of education, not for the sake of fostering learning or promoting understanding and goodwill here and abroad, but as a means for distributing juicy subsidies and for wielding political power.

Dr. Ruthven warned that the United States can never again return to narrow provincialism, after the war. But, he declared, because of manifest defects in its system of education it is unprepared to foster international cooperation.

"This," he asserted, "like the internal order, cannot be assured by political guaranties, economic nostrums, force, blood relationships, or fear, but only through thorough knowledge, mutual understanding and the equalization of opportunity in every phase of living.

LACK LONG VIEW

"Colleges and universities are peculiarly able to further international relations through training for world citizenship. But funds must be made available and the politicians who vote them are usually disinclined or unable to take the long view and to estimate costs with an eye to values which are to accrue principally to their children rather than to themselves.

"Too many of them do not easily set their sights beyond the next election. They must be made to see that if a nation can afford to expend more than $80,000,000 for a single battleship which will be obsolete in a few years, most nations can afford to gamble at least this much in the hope that fewer such instruments of destruction need be built in the future."

Specifically, Dr. Ruthven urged the immediate formulation of a Government program to promote education on the collegiate level, with special emphasis on its international implications, continuing education for adults and a well-defined, adequately financed plan for veteran training and rehabilitation.

"Politics, central domination, departmental jealousies and fumbling by inexperienced men and ineffective agencies can all be eliminated by the simple device of a Federal advisory commission composed of eminent educators, appointed by the President for staggered terms and with their chairman sitting with the Cabinet," Dr. Ruthven asserted.

"This body should nominate the United States Commissioner of Education and supervise the activities of his office as well as other agencies dispersing funds for educational purposes.

"It would not place all educational activities under one administrative agency but it could maintain a continuing review of all in terms of a national program, insure a maximum of coordination and a minimum of political interference and bureaucratic control."

PROGRESS DELAYED

Dr. Ruthven characterized as ridiculous the dispersal of educational activities among governmental agencies and added that, "To make the situation more absurd, there is little or no cooperation between these agencies in regard to this function. On the contrary, there are many evidences of a struggle for funds and for the power which can be wielded through subsidies. Moreover, we are learning that few chiefs of bureaus can for long be charged with the allocation of subsidies without developing a Messianic complex."

"Year after year, educational progress is being delayed and schoolmen are wearing out shoe leather tramping the streets of the Capital, while Federal jurisdiction over education becomes paradoxical as it may seem, ever more rigid and more diffuse."

Dr. Ruthven predicted that dissatisfaction with Federal policies will become even more evident when the "weakness, unintelligence, delay, and uncertainty" characterizing plans for veteran education are generally perceived.

"Of course, Congress will vote funds for this purpose, but who will administer them?" Dr. Ruthven demanded. "To what extent shall educational opportunities be provided? Is it enough to give the returning soldier training for a mere job when we have destroyed all prospects of the career which he had planned before he went to war?

"Should the Veterans' Bureau handle casualties only or be charged with the responsibility for all former soldiers? What part is the Office of Education to play in the program of rehabilitation?

"MANY PROBLEMS SEEN

"How can the facilities of the schools best be utilized? To what extent must the States lend their aid? And, finally, what about the war workers who have interrupted their life plans to serve their country on the home front?

"All these questions and many others of equal importance are now unanswered. Further, there is little chance that the problems they represent will be solved satisfactorily unless some reason can be injected into the national educational organization.

"In the meantime, thousands of soldiers are being returned to civilian life and other thousands of war workers are facing unemployment and the need for retraining both for jobs and for citizenship. In respect to this situation, the future will not begin with demobilization; it is here."

Ceiling Price on Strawberries Will Ruin Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have written to Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: It is my understanding that the O. P. A. is contemplating a ceiling price on fresh strawberries. As Louisiana is

one of the largest strawberry-producing States in the Union, I feel it is my duty as both a citizen and a Congressman of Louisiana that I convey to you the unanimous protest of over 8,000 growers against any direct or indirect ceiling price on fresh strawberries.

In the first place, a ceiling price on fresh strawberries is impracticable, impossible, and unworkable. If the O. P. A. had 50,000 employees designated to supervise and organize a ceiling price on fresh strawberries, even with that great number it would end up in a miserable failure, with the grower perhaps bearing the brunt of the loss. A ceiling price is unworkable and impracticable for the following reasons, to wit:

1. Strawberries are the most highly perishable crop grown in commercial quantities.

2. Due to weather conditions both at shipping point and at consumer point, the market fluctuates to such an extent that a ceiling price for any designated time or date is impossible.

3. There is no set date during the season when a definite quantity will be shipped.

4. When extreme weather such as ice and snow grips the North and East, and quantity production is shipped from Louisiana, the price tends downward due to sufficient supplies with unseasonable consumer weather.

5. There is no standard package. Florida ships in 36-pint crates, Louisiana 24-pint, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Maryland, Virginia, Michigan, and others ship in 24-quart crates. Some States ship 12-pint, while others ship in 36-quart containers.

6. Fresh strawberries are absolutely a luxury and are not essential to the consuming public.

7. Due to rapid fluctuations in the market of strawberries, where jobbers cannot help but speculate, a ceiling price would create an intensive black market.

8. It is contemplated in this proposed ceiling price that all transportation, either freight or express, be applied, regardless of the State or location, from Hammond, La., which would be gross discrimination against Louisiana and Florida, as well as other States, and in violation of the Constitution in the taking of people's property without due process of law. However, any ceiling price on fresh strawberries would be a violation of the Constitution on the above grounds.

9. If a ceiling price were placed on strawberries it would have to be so high to be fair to the growers that it would be of no effect at all and the O. P. A., the consumer, and the grower would be better off minus such ceiling price.

10. When the strawberry grower asked a Federal agency for aid during the depression he was told that due to the fact strawberries were a luxury no Federal aid was forthcoming. Why, then, if berry growers received no help when other agricultural producers were receiving subsidies in the depression, should they now be severely penalized with a ceiling price? If strawberries were a luxury then, surely they are a luxury now.

The Louisiana strawberry farmers averaged over $4 a 24-pint crate last year. However, berries sold as high as $8 and as low as $2.50 per crate, the general average being over $4 for the season. If the farmers had not received a big price in the beginning and on favorable market days, their season average would have been such as to cause them to lose money. Yet, last year, with the $4 or better average and strawberries selling as high as $8, the crop this year is 50 percent, or some estimates give 60 percent, short of normal acreage.

The strawberry farmers tell me that if a ceiling price is put on that the industry will be ruined, and that they will leave their farms to do public work. Already many have left. This would increase the food burden, which is already staggering, to other farmers, as strawberry growers produce, in addition to their money crop of strawberries, enough food for themselves and sometimes a little more for the surrounding towns and cities of eggs, poultry, milk, cabbage, string beans, lettuce, cucumbers, squash, eggplant, sweetpotatoes, Irish potatoes, bell peppers, a few head of hogs, and a few head of beef cattle.

Thus with the cash money they receive for strawberries, their main money crop, they produce these additional crops which not only supply them but defense workers and urban people in surrounding cities.

There is not the same successful argument that can be made against a ceiling price on cold-pack strawberries as has been made as above set forth on fresh strawberries, as when strawberries are quick frozen or cold packed they lose their high perishability and then become in the same category as frozen beef, poultry, Irish potatoes, or other products that are kept for months on cold storage. Cold-pack strawberries also become more of a stable since they are used in preserves which are needed both for Army and consumer consumption to take the place of butter and other similar products. However, in Louisiana a cold-pack strawberry is entirely a byproduct of the fresh strawberry and unless the grower gets a good price for his fresh strawberries, due to the exceptionally high cost of production, no reasonable or even a high price on cold-pack strawberries will be sufficient to cause him to grow his strawberries for cold pack alone. Therefore, if a ceiling price in Louisiana will ruin the fresh-fruit industry, then it follows that the needed and necessary cold-pack strawberries will be lost, also. The growers of Louisiana state, however, that unless a ceiling price of 25 cents per pound is allowed on cold-pack strawberries that this year thousands of pounds of strawberries will probably rot in the fields, as the growers feel they cannot get sufficient labor to harvest them for less money.

Due to the fact that Florida overlaps Louisiana, Louisiana overlaps Arkansas and Tennessee in shipments, a ceiling price on pints and quarts, even though theoretically mathematically perfect, would cause the consumer to lean and show preference to the strawberries of one State rather than the other and when each State has competitive strawberries on the market at the same time a great loss and discrimination is sure to befall either the shipper of quarts or the shipper of pints, or the strawberries of one State or the strawberries of another.

Then, too, Louisiana and Florida face pack their strawberries, whereas the States farther north who ship in quarts jumble or rumble pack their berries. The cost of production in each State varies. Florida perhaps is the highest; Louisiana second highest. Louisiana growers replant their strawberries every year and mulch them with pine straw. Other States replant theirs anywhere from 3 to 5 years and many do not use pine straw. Therefore, unless Louisiana gets a relatively higher price for her product her growers lose money due to the excessive high cost of production.

Florida has been shipping since December 15. That season will end in some 2 or 3 weeks, and in all probability cannot extend more than 4 weeks longer, regardless of weather conditions. Would it not be unfair to let Florida ship the season through with no ceiling price and then pick on Louisiana as the first victim, to be followed by Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, etc.?

I have talked to many Members of Congress and yet I have not found one single Congressman who has told me that the Price Control Act, which is the foundation of the O. P. A., ever intended to have the O. P. A. place a ceiling price on such a highly perishable luxury as strawberries. Nobody puts a gun on a consumer to buy a pint or quart of strawberries, and yet every man, woman, and child could go without strawberries if they wanted to. A ceiling price might be justified were strawberries a basic food, such as potatoes or meat. On the other hand, if you destroy the money or cash crop of the strawberry grower by a ceiling price, you are at the same time destroying thousands of individual food producers of such products as beef, poultry, pork, and vegetables, which are produced on the same farms strawberries are. These strawberry farmers not only provide food for themselves but they provide food for countless others. However, due to the small size of the average strawberry farm, he could not exist by producing these other products and not produce strawberries. If he is forced to abandon the growing of strawberries by an unfair ceiling price, then he will fold up his farm, go to the city, and thereby not only fail to help feed others but will have to look to some other farmers to feed himself and his family. This causes acute housing shortage, acute food shortage, and in many instances a bottleneck in transportation facilities.

The O. P. A. has waited 2 years to attempt to put a ceiling price on strawberries and there has not been one person hurt as a result of this delay. Yet, on the other hand, should a ceiling price be put on at this late date, over 1,000,000 people directly or indirectly connected with the fresh strawberry industry will suffer and many will sustain an unreasonable loss. A ceiling price on such a perishable crop as strawberries when grades and kinds cause high market spreads, in reality places a penalty on a grower of first-class strawberries and a premium on a grower of second-grade or inferior fruit.

What the farmers cannot understand is that Members of Congress create bureaus such as the O. P. A., either by direct act or by giving the President the power of a directive in wartime, and yet when they are unanimously opposed to an impracticable, impossible, and unworkable ceiling price, these Congressmen whom the people elected and whom they have trusted to represent the majority, cannot prevent a creature of their own creation from bludgeoning them with such a disaster as this proposed ceiling price against their will.

As one farmer told me just before I left his farm, "Jimmy, it looks like to me that the O. P. A. is trying to shave us without using any soap. I believe you and the other Congressmen can stop them. I am counting on you to put up a hard fight, but don't come home unless you either win or have a lot of battle scars on you. I only wish I could be there to personally explain to the O. P. A. what I have put up with as a strawberry farmer for the past 10 years."

In conclusion, Mr. Bowles, I have worked with every Louisiana strawberry farmer on an almost intimate basis for the last 5 years. I have served as attorney for the Louisiana Farmers Protective Union, which I helped create, which has in its membership all of the 8,000 strawberry growers of Louisiana. I know their problems as well as any one living man, and I assure you that a ceiling price on fresh strawberries will create within him the same feeling of injustice that would be in any innocent man who would be hanged for a crime he did not commit.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress

Tampa Shipbuilding Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I enclose herewith copies of two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, which are self-explanatory. The letters follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 18, 1943.

MR. GEORGE B. HOWELL,
c/o Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc.,
Tampa, Fla.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: By settlement No. U. S. 10382, dated March 22, 1943, this office certified you to be indebted to the United States in the amount of $1,926,568.52 on account of certain transactions between the United States Maritime Commission and the Navy Department on the one hand and the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc., on the other, the details in connection with the said indebtedness having been set forth in the said settlement.

Under date of July 22, 1943, the matter of the said indebtedness was referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate action and by letter of September 17, 1943, the Attorney General advised, in substance, that upon the basis of the facts disclosed by the record and upon his analysis of the legal questions involved he was of the opinion that there is no basis for bringing suit. By reason of the Attorney General's action in the matter, I have issued instructions directing the cancelation of the said settlement and the matter will be considered as closed.

Respectfully,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 18, 1943.

TAMPA SHIPBUILDING CO., INC.,
Tampa, Fla.

GENTLEMEN: By settlement No. US-10381, dated March 22, 1943, this office certified the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and your company to be jointly and severally indebted to the United States in the amount of $1,926,568.52, on account of certain transactions between the United States Maritime Commission and the Navy Department on the one hand and the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and your company on the other, the details in connection with the indebtedness having been set forth in the said settlement.

Under date of July 22, 1943, the matter of the said indebtedness was referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate action and, by letter of September 17, 1943, the Attorney General advised, in substance, that upon the basis of the facts disclosed by the record and upon his analysis of the legal questions involved he was of the opinion that there is no basis for bringing suit. By reason of the Attorney General's action in the matter, I have issued instructions directing the cancelation of the said settlement and the matter will be considered as closed.

Respectfully,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Army Commissions Promised Instructors and Men in C. A. A. Pilot-Training Program

EXTENSION OI REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the United States should never welsh on a promise made to any of the men who have given up their regular work to enlist in any branch of our Military Establishment. We are, however, practically repudiating the promises we made to entice nearly 15,000 young men to enter the civilian army air-training program.

A bill, H. R. 4269, has recently been introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman BROOKS, at my request, to authorize commissions so that we may partially make good on our original promises.

I have recently received a letter from one of the disillusioned young men who entered the service mentioned, which I include in my remarks:

ARE YOU ACQUAINTED WITH THE FOLLOWING FACTS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO THE WAR EFFORT?

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In June 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Administration announced that the old civilian pilot training program was to be enlarged and that men between the ages of 18 and 37 would be given flight training to become flying instructors in the Army, transport pilots in Air Transport Command, liaison pilots in the artillery, glider pilots, service pilots in the Army Air Forces, air-line pilots, and pilots in the Ferry Command.

All applicants had to pass a detailed screening test, pass the regular physical examination for a commercial pilot and, if accepted, volunteer for service in the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps. Literature furnished the men at the time their applications were accepted contained the following general terms: 1. Service with the Army in the above mentioned flying capacities. 2. Commissions to those physically qualified when the final course at Randolph Field (see below) was completed. 3. Eight months of flying training preparatory to assignment to Randolph Field as follows (during this time, the trainee was to receive no pay except room and board): A. Primary—35 to 45 hours in light aircraft plus approximately 240 hours of ground school. B. Secondary—40 to 50 hours in heavier aircraft and approximately 240 hours of ground school. C. Cross-country—50 to 60 hours in light and heavy aircraft and approximately 160 hours ground school. D. Instructor course—55 to 60 hours in heavy aircraft and approximately 140 hours ground school. E. Army instructor course at Randolph Field, 100 hours in heavy aircraft and approximately 100 hours ground school (on beginning this course, the trainees were to be paid $150 per month).

NOTE: After several months of this program another course was added to follow the cross-country course. This was a Link and instrument course consisting of 16 to 20 hours in the Link trainer and 20 to 25 hours in instrument planes. About 120 hours ground school were given.

Due to a scarcity of airplanes, overenlistment of trainees, inclusion of Link and instrument course, the time for consummating the program was greatly lengthened from the original period of 8 months to a probable period of 18 months. At any time a trainee was found unsatisfactory in either flying, ground school, or in his capacity as an officer, he was eliminated from the program and subjected to call to active duty in the Army Air Forces. Many found themselves financially unable to continue the program beyond the original 8 months and requested termination. As a result of considerable agitation, legislation was passed in 1943 authorizing the payment to trainees of $50 per month retroactive to December 15, 1942, but made no provision for the period July 1, 1942, to December 15, 1942.

In the latter part of 1942, the glider training program was discontinued, and men then on active duty and rated as staff sergeants on completing glider training were given the option of continuing in the Army on active duty or being discharged back to their local draft boards. In June of 1943, after investigation of the needs for pilots, the Army, in conjunction with the C. A. A., announced that the program was to be reduced from approximately 14,000 trainees to 7,000. All those remaining in the program would be called to active duty as soon as possible, would have to pass the regular Army 64 physical examination (same as for Army pilots), and would be reassigned to war training service schools to continue their pilot training. Three options were given: 1. Continue in training to become flight instructors. 2. Discharge from enlisted reserves back to civilian status, 3. Transfer to active duty in the Air Forces to be assigned to technical schools as qualified. Those remaining in the program were assured that there was a real need for this many pilots.

Due to acceptance of discharges, transfer to air cadets, and inability to pass the physical examination, the men actually continuing in the program numbered some 5,000, which has since been further reduced to about 4,000. These figures can be verified by the C. A. A. War Training Service. The program continued as before except that the men were on active-duty status until January 15, 1944. At that time, there were some 250 men at Randolph Field who had finished all the courses and a similar number at Brooks Field who were ready for transfer to Randolph Field for a final month of training. The rest of the men were in various stages of training in War Training Service schools. At this time the entire W. T. S. program was closed without any previous notice or advice.

All the trainees were shipped to basic training centers for reassignments. There they found that nearly all the technical schools had been closed. According to current prospects, their future will in no way utilize any of their pilot training to date.

The men in the latter part of this training are well qualified for commissions for the following reasons: 1. They are mature, have good judgment, and in the main were leaders in their communities in civil life. 2. At every induction center, the W. T. S. men generally made by far the highest scores on the Army general classification test than any other group. 3. The majority are college educated, have the social and mental bearing essential in officers, and from their W. T. S. training have accumulated a considerable knowledge of such subjects as meteorology, navigation, aircraft engine navigation, aerodynamics, psychology of instruction, civil air regulations and military science. 4. Their flying training varies from a minimum of approximately 225 hours in the cases of those who finished the Link or instructor course to 300 hours or more to those who have finished

at Randolph. This time compares very favorably to that of air cadets who are commissioned when they have only about 200 hours. About 1,500 of them are now licensed commercial pilots.

In general these men are very discouraged over their treatment and the outlook for their future. All volunteered with the understanding they were to become pilots in some flying status. Many are married men with children, and were in essential industries, but wanted to fly. They were assured of their great need and were told that they could serve their country better in the capacity for which they were volunteering. But for the opportunity to fly, some would have preferred service in the Navy or Marines, and quite a number, if released from the Army, even now could obtain commissions in the Navy. They want to fly, want to serve their country, and feel that they are entitled to consideration. Many feel that if the air forces cannot use them in the original capacity, they should be given discharges to allow them to enter other branches of the service where they can be of more use. Although they would rather return to pilot status, they feel that if the glider pilots can be given discharges back in 1942 when most programs were greatly expanding, they should surely merit the same treatment now that technical training programs are contracting. However, they would prefer their return to pilot status, either in ferrying, artillery liaison, air evacuation of the wounded, or any other flying capacity. Jobs are apparently available, else why continue to train women as service pilots at great additional cost?

The facts contained herein are a matter of public record. Do you not think that this perplexing situation merits your immediate attention?

GWEN GIBSON.

The Palestinian White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the special service and public meeting of the Freeport Zionist District, at Temple Israel, Freeport, N. Y., Sunday, March 5, in protest of the Palestinian white paper.

Being with you this morning is a real pleasure. We often hear what a delightful place Washington is. Well, it can also be a very hectic place, and to find the opportunity, at more or less frequent intervals, to leave the Capital does not distress me, I assure you.

The subject before this meeting, the Jewish National Home in Palestine, is one of great interest to me. However, in discussing it briefly, I am reluctant to approach it from merely a legalistic or political viewpoint, in terms of the Balfour Declaration, the Mandate, the action of the League Council, the convention between England and ourselves, or any of the so-called white papers, especially the one of 1939.

I do not want to be led onto the bypaths of political and legal conflicts that it is claimed influence the question. I do not want to be led into the maze of twisting and tortuous thinking on this subject.

To me there is but one highway of approach. In my view, it is straight and it has a solid foundation. I know, taking this main road of thinking, that in the terms and the acceptance of the Balfour Declaration, the Jewish aspirations were not only stated, but they were welcomed, embraced. The Jews were to be given a National Homeland, a true homeland. It was to be theirs by right and not on sufferance. It is needless to go into the history attending this declaration, its whys and wherefores. We here know that history and the world knows it, too.

The Mandatory—the British Government—assumed the solemn obligations laid down in the Mandate, purposing the creation of a true Jewish National Homeland. Outstanding among those obligations were two—that the British Government "shall facilitate Jewish immigration" and "shall encourage close settlement by the Jews on the land." These objectives were necessarily essential, fundamental, to the creation of the home. They were, and they are, indeed, the bricks and the mortar from which the structure—the home—must rise.

These obligations were imposed upon and accepted by the British Government. They were pledges of good faith and of action in terms of translation, under the mandate. They were the tools with which the national homeland was to be fashioned and protected.

Facilitation of Jewish immigration was promised. Now we see it, for all purposes, stopped. And to be stopped for all time to come unless the Arab population give their assent. There is the dark picture and it traces out a dark story. In effect, the British Government as the Mandatory has assigned its obligations affecting Jewish immigration for execution by the Arabs. It has put into their keeping the determination—Arab determination—of what Jewish immigration shall be permitted to enter what was to be the Jewish homeland. If this is not a betrayal of faith, the shattering of a solemn pledge, then I am simply unable to properly assess the ordinary meaning that is to be attached to the action taken. Palestine, under the British white paper, is not to have a Jewish homeland. Instead, it is to be converted into the homeland of the Arabs!

The British policy under the white paper means one thing—abject surrender to the Arabs. The Jews are to be left as a hopeless minority. They are to be politically and economically fenced in. They are to be placed in a political and economic corral. Yet the British white paper dares to characterize this adjustment as equitable and fair and comporting to their word and bond to succor and advance Jewish aspirations for a true Jewish national homeland.

The white paper of 1939 is wholly infamous. Bluntly, it is crafty, tricky. But not alone on the subject of immigration. Under the Mandate, there is also the definite injunction that the Mandatory shall encourage close settlement by Jews on the land. Between the announced policy under the Mandate and the practical policy under the white paper is a terrible chasm. In effect, the white paper bodily lifts the word "encouragement" out of this injunction and substitutes the word "discouragement." The white paper, to state the present British policy correctly should read that the Mandatory shall practice a policy of discouragement in settlement by Jews on the land. Land and immigration are inseparably tied together. Under the policy of restriction of land sales from Arab to Jew, there is simply no way for Jews to acquire land. Here, again, we have the Arab veto in prospect.

In the early days the British applied the policy of economic absorptive capacity. That was the policy once. Now, evidently, it is to be the policy of political absorptive capacity—leaving it again to the Arabs to determine how many Jews they are willing that Palestine should take in. When the Balfour Declaration was made, when the Mandate was given, we did not hear anything about Jewish immigration and Jewish settlement on the land being based on political absorptive capacity of the country.

The rising star of Jewish aspirations in Palestine has been arrested in its course. The fear is that it may fall. Frankly, I share that fear.

The ominous course now under way in Palestine must be corrected. The broken pledge has not only to be mended, but it has to be made whole. Otherwise there cannot be any true upbuilding of the Jewish National Homeland. And the aspirations of Jews in Palestine to shape their own constitutional processes will be forever lost if the white paper is not abrogated. It must be.

The British Government has one of two courses to follow: To persist in the betrayal that is made known to the world in the white paper, or to reaffirm and renew its attachment to Jewish aspirations for a true Jewish National Homeland by outright abrogation of the white paper.

I hope earnestly that the British Government will elect the second course. That is the right course. It is the only decent course. And our Government, under the convention with Great Britain, I believe, has the duty and should insist that this course should be taken.

I know, although imperfectly, necessarily, as against the knowledge of men and women more intimately acquainted with the Palestine return movement, the record of achievement that the Jews in Palestine have built. It is a magnificent one, a grand one, and affects not only the Jews, themselves, but their Arab and other neighbors.

And let us here, Jew and Gentile alike, ponder that record and what perfecting it can mean and will mean to humanity everywhere.

Let's Take a Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 5, 1944, issue of the Atlanta Journal, written by the Honorable James M. Cox, a former Governor of Ohio and a former Member of the House:

LET'S TAKE A LOOK

(By J. M. C.)

On this Sabbath morn let us take a look at the world's perimeter and see what we see. There is much that is reassuring. Let us appraise it in frankness and candor and fairness. There is good accord between us and our Allies. Russia, which many people thought was hard to get on with, is playing the game squarely. We are doing well with England and we are all doing well with each other and by each other. In the Pacific, the Japs have discovered that an overambitious possession of islands and what-not creates a very long line of defense to be maintained. She is being attacked so often, in so many places and so successfully, that she hardly knows which way to turn. Amidst the gloom of Tokyo, it is admitted that a military purge is necessary. It might not be surprising to know one of these days, that Japan is running out of steel. We are not predicting, but there

is no law against some wishful thinking to the effect that the proud gangsters of the Orient may fall before the Nazis.

In Italy, the much-exploited crack troops of Hitler have been turned back and we may be on our way to Rome one of these days. We are beginning to understand now the troubles of Napoleon when he had to get out of Russia. The rout of the Nazi army seems to be complete. Convoys miles in length are landing troops and supplies in England, all giving strength to the arm of invasion that may strike at any hour against Hitler. Production goes on apace, not only in volume of ammunition and supplies, but in quality. Occasionally we hear something of a secret weapon evolved by the evil genius of the Nazis, but we always seem to have something better. No matter where our defenders are, whether in the air, on the sea or on land and no matter at what remote spot in the world, they are getting food and essentials of war.

There have been strikes—too many of them. Not one can be condoned and yet, the volume of production lost by strikes is so small in relation to the tremendous output of our factories that it is quite infinitesimal.

We are justified in not only a confidence, but a pride in our military leaders. Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Clark, Arnold, Nimitz, Halsey have given conspicuous evidence of great ability. These men did not come into the picture automatically. They were carefully selected.

Now all of this, the building of armies, industrial production, transportation to points thousands of miles away, a foreign policy which seems to be doing well, must in truth be recognized as the operations of the executive branch of our Government. Congress has appropriated the funds to maintain it all and although sometimes haltingly, enacted enabling acts to keep things moving. And yet, the cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government has not been anything to boast about. There has been a tremendous load of responsibility on the executive branch and its peace of mind has not been promoted by an occasional sniping movement—the species of opposition that occasionally bears the suspicion of political purpose.

On the other hand, Congress, fresh from the people, the seat of power under the Constitution, is a temperamental body. It always has been. It probably always will be. It may be that it is overconscious of its responsibility under our charter of government. At any rate, we repeat that it is and always has been a temperamental body. Moreover, every Member of Congress who wants to stay where he is must be elected this fall and maybe he has been in a griping mood because his constituents themselves are griping a good deal. The White House should understand this and seek to get on better with Congress. Neither the lawmakers nor the President can get on alone. They must work together and the greater the harmony, the greater the efficiency.

There have been mistakes made, but we must not forget that this is the most tremendous movement in all the history of the world and by a Nation that would not prepare itself for war. Government is no more infallible than the people who create it. It has had a hard job to deal with. The going has been rough. Let us remember that there are even many pitfalls on the way to Heaven.

Let's all take stock of ourselves. It might be well for press and public to stop egging on the "row" in Washington. And then let us declare a truce in our splenetic impulses. We are going on in our way of living more or less normally. If one were to drop down from Mars, he would hardly know that a war is going on. It is far removed from our shores and it might be difficult to convince some that it is even waging on this planet. We are getting ample food and clothing, we are going to the movies, those who want to play favorites and "long shots" at the races seem someway, somehow to get there. The time may have come for a real process of introspection. Let us all be as fair in our judgment as men in our military forces all over the world are brave in their movements.

Development of Florida's Rivers and Harbors

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1944

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained from the Board of Army Engineers a most interesting summary of the development of river and harbor projects in Florida. This report indicates a most comprehensive waterways program for the entire State. It indicates more than 60 regular authorized projects and also indicates surveys for additional projects, some of which are included in a broad range planning program for post-war utilization and development. All projects are of importance but of course some may contribute more to the commerce and economic life of our Nation than others.

STUART-FORT MYERS CANAL

Among really important projects may be listed the development to a depth of at least 8 feet of the canal reaching from Fort Myers on the Gulf to Stuart on the Atlantic. This waterway extends through Lake Okeechobee. At Lake Okeechobee, large sums of Federal money have been expended in flood control and navigation and of course these funds have made useful and effective State funds in Florida and local funds in Florida which have been expended in the vast Everglades drainage districts. The Army engineers now are giving further consideration to recommending to the Congress additional depth of this canal to as much as 12 feet. If such should be deemed feasible by the Army engineers and carried out by the Congress, it would then carry same depth as the Florida East Coast Canal of 12 feet as is projected in this report. From Jacksonville to Miami, portions of this existing East Coast Canal are only 8 or 9 feet. A project in this report calls for deepening of this channel to 12 feet.

MIAMI TO KEY WEST CANAL

Another project of unusual importance is extension of the East Coast Canal from Miami to Key West. This will give a protected route, passing through the Florida keys to the splendid harbor at Key West. It is an important project and one which has been approved and desired by local interests for more than a century.

VIRGINIA KEY

Another outstanding project is the Virginia Key project at Miami, Fla. Its ultimate development calls for not only harbor improvements but also a larger harbor and airfield. Local contribution on this project is also large.

FLOOD CONTROL

The report contains also a summary of flood-control projects in Florida. Outstanding among these are the famous Kissimmee River Valley project and others. These projects likewise are of tremendous importance and will provide a great post-war flood-control program for the State.

LAKE WORTH INLET

The Army engineers are now considering several additional projects in Florida, surveys are being made, and reports will be made to the Congress. Consideration is now being accorded to improvement of the Lake Worth Inlet project in Palm Beach County, Fla. It is hoped and believed that this project may be favorably reported by the Army engineers in time for inclusion by the Congress in the pending river and harbor bill. Our Committee on Rivers and Harbors has just reported a bill which gives the new projects and project extensions as are outlined in this report. It is expected that the House may in the very near future pass this bill. It is wise of the Congress to approve and enact into law worthy river and harbor and flood-control projects for post-war development, employment and improvement. I commend the substance of this bill to the entire membership of the House for favorable consideration.

During my almost 20 years in Congress and during my long service on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee and also on the Flood Control Committee, it has been my pleasure to cooperate for and work for the development of this great chain of commerce arteries in my State. With some 1,300 miles of sea coast, of course Florida should have substantial funds appropriated for its river and harbor improvement. During my 20 years in Congress, about half of all moneys expended in the history of Florida's Federal waterways program has occurred. I am pleased to say, however, that with the completion of the projects as outlined in this report, my State will have a completed river and harbor program second to no State in the Union.

ST. MARYS RIVER, GA. AND FLA.

Project in 1925: Channel 17 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the mouth to Crandall, 12.5 miles, and channel clearing to Kings Ferry, 37 miles above the mouth.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Completed in 1914.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $15,688; maintenance, $55,265.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $19,080.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 33,930 tons; 1940, 74,736 tons; 1941, 74,965 tons.

FERNANDINA HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel over the outer bar by means of twin jetties supplemented by dredging so as to provide a channel 26 feet deep and for its extension to the south bend of the Florida Terminal Co., a distance of 7 miles.

Modification since 1925: Deepening channel to 28 feet.

Status: Project completed in 1940.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $3,287,000; maintenance, $752,178.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $145,000; maintenance, $242,244.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 163,376 tons; 1940, 275,586 tons; 1941, 251,844 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (S. Doc. 284, 77th Cong.) to provide for minor changes in the anchorage and channel alinement.

Estimated first cost: None additional.

WATERWAY BETWEEN CUMBERLAND SOUND AND ST. JOHNS RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide, a distance of 25 miles.

Modification since 1925: Channel 12 feet deep, including a cut-off in Kingsley Creek.

Status: Project completed in 1941.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $361,849; maintenance, $142,713.

Cost since June 30, 1925: (Break-down for this section not available.)

Commerce, calendar year 1924 (not available for this section); 1940, 287,407 tons; 1941, 313,620 tons.

ST. JOHNS RIVER, JACKSONVILLE TO THE OCEAN

Project in 1925: Channel 30 feet deep with minimum width of 300 feet from the ocean to Jacksonville with an anchorage basin opposite Mayport, jetties at the entrance, and related works.

Modification since 1925: Widening the bend at Dames Point and widening Drummonds Creek, Trout Creek, and Six Mile Creek cuts. A channel 30 feet deep and 400 feet wide along the terminals at Jacksonville. Length of project 25 miles.

Status: Project completed in 1937, and maintenance operations are undertaken annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $8,780,000; maintenance, $10,035,000.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $1,900,000; maintenance, $6,613,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 3,266,000 tons; 1940, 3,112,958 tons; 1941, 3,536,571 tons.

Recommended modification of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 322, 77th Cong.) provides for maintenance of channel widths as they now exist and, subject to revision of harbor lines, for further improvement as follows: (a) Widen terminal channel between its present westerly edge and the new pierhead-bulkhead line to a depth of 30 feet; (b) dredge to a depth of 28 feet the area between the foot of Laura Street and the Duval County highway bridge; (c) dredge a navigation and floodway channel 200 feet wide and 26 feet deep, along the south side of the Commodore Point terminals; and (d) dredge an approach and mooring basin 20 feet deep in front of the Naval Reserve Armory in South Jacksonville, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $725,000.

ST. JOHNS RIVER, JACKSONVILLE TO PALATKA

Project in 1925: Channel 200 feet wide and 13 feet deep from Jacksonville to Palatka, 55 miles, and improvement of Deep Creek.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Completed in 1915, except for Deep Creek which is 50 percent completed. Entire project 94 percent completed. No work done in recent years.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $205,700; maintenance, $116,300.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $43,310.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 133,800 tons; 1940, 281,100 tons; 1941, 303,724 tons.

ST. JOHNS RIVER, PALATKA TO LAKE HARNEY

Project in 1925: Channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Palatka to Sanford and 5 feet deep thence to Lake Harney.

Modification since 1925: Cut-offs at Butcher Bend, Snake Creek, and Starks Creek and easing of existing bends at other points. Length, 114 miles.

Status: Project completed in 1942.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $210,060; maintenance, $268,000.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $27,910; maintenance, $159,855.

Recommended modification of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 603, 76th Cong.) provides for a channel 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep from Palatka to Sanford, with a side channel of like dimensions to Enterprise, and for cut-offs and easing of bends, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $290,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 172,800 tons; 1940, 446,919 tons; 1941, 459,356 tons.

CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 23, 1942, authorized the construction of a high-level lock barge canal across northern Florida from the St. Johns River to the Gulf of Mexico via Withlacoochee River, with project depth of 12 feet and minimum bottom width of 150 feet.

Status: Under the provisions of Public Law 64, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 2, 1943, detailed investigations and studies required for the preparation of plans and specifications for this authorized waterway are in progress.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $8,337; maintenance, none.

LAKE CRESCENT AND DUNNS CREEK

Project in 1925: Channel 100 feet wide and 8 feet deep from St. Johns River to Crescent City, including three cut-offs in Dunns Creek, 15¼ miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project 16 percent completed, work remaining is dredging cut-offs for which rights-of-way have not been furnished.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $10,276; maintenance, $5,724.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 8,700 tons; 1940, 1,570 tons; 1941, 2,640 tons.

OKLAWAHA RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 6 feet deep from the mouth to the head of Silver Springs Run and channel clearing thence to Lake Griffin, subject to certain provisions, with a view to obtaining a navigable depth of 4 feet to Leesburg. Length 86.5 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Except for the easing of several sharp bends and for obtaining project dimensions in the lower reach of the river, the work of improvement has been completed, and maintenance operations are undertaken annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $315,260; maintenance, $367,843.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $98,700; maintenance, $295,785.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 16,400 tons; 1940, 1,400 tons; 1941, 5,102 tons.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI

Project in 1925: Channel in Indian River 5 feet deep and 75 feet wide, 77 miles.

Modification since 1925: Channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide, 372 miles, and a turning basin in the vicinity of Jacksonville Beach.

Status: Project was completed in 1935 except for provision of the turning basin.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $7,346,800; maintenance, $2,697,250.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $7,263,300; maintenance, $2,552,644.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 12,688 tons; 1940, 453,558 tons; 1941, 442,304 tons.

Recommended modification of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 336, 76th Cong.) provides at Sebastian, Fla., an entrance channel 100 feet wide and 8 feet deep from the Intracoastal Waterway to and including a turning basin of the same depth, 600 feet long and 300 feet wide, in front of the town, at an estimated first cost of $19,000, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation; also (H. Doc. 261, 76th Cong.) provides near Vero Beach a basin 8 feet deep extending from the Intracoastal Waterway to the easterly shore, at an estimated first cost of $7,300, subject to certain provisions of local cooperation. A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on June 9, 1943, included consideration of the proposed improvement of the Inland Waterway Channel between Jacksonville and Miami to a depth of 10 feet or 12 feet.

Total first cost, $26,300.

ST. AUGUSTINE HARBOR

Project in 1925: Jetty or groin construction.

Modification since 1925: Entrance channel 27 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the ocean through North Point to deep water in Tolomato River, about 1½ miles.

Status: New work dredging was completed in 1940, and construction of a sand trap completed the project in 1941.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $464,090; maintenance, $80,649.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $392,686; maintenance, $60,649.

Commerce, calendar year 1924 (not available); 1940, 4,745 tons; 1941, 36,028 tons.

COURTENAY CHANNEL

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Dredging 8-foot channel from Intracoastal Waterway to and including turning basin at Courtenay.

Status: Project completed in 1940.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $22,845; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 5 tons; 1941, none.

EAU GALLIE HARBOR

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Enlargement of improvement constructed by local interests to provide a turning basin in Elbow Creek and channel 8 feet deep to Indian River.

Status: Project completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $9,627; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1940 (not reported); 1941, none.

MELBOURNE HARBOR, FLA.

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 8 feet deep from the Intracoastal Waterway to and in Crane Creek with a turning basin at the inner end.

Status: Project completed in 1938.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $17,696; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 19,494 tons; 1941, 1,631 tons.

FORT PIERCE HARBOR

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Maintenance and amplification of the project developed by private interests to provide a channel 27 and 25 feet deep from the ocean to a turning basin at Fort Pierce.

Status: Project was completed in 1938 and maintenance dredging was undertaken during 1942.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $337,180; maintenance, $530,658.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $337,180; maintenance, $530,658.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 100,407 tons; 1941, 102,585 tons.

ST. LUCIE INLET

Project in 1925: Provided for limited expenditure for dredging 18-foot channel across the ocean bar preliminary to securing a channel of that depth from the ocean to Sewall Point.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: This project was not carried to completion and no work has been done in recent years.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $26,690; maintenance, none.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 1,000 tons; 1940, 2,074 tons; 1941, 1,685 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. No. 391, 77th Cong.) provides

for a channel 200 feet wide and 10 feet deep across the outside rock reef at the seaward entrance to the inlet, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $46,000.

LAKE WORTH INLET

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Maintenance and amplification of the improvements constructed by local interests to provide a channel 20 feet deep and varying in width from 200 to 300 feet from deep water in the ocean to a turning basin at the Port of Palm Beach, for restoration of the existing jetties, and for certain other improvements.

Status: Project was completed in 1938 and maintenance dredging to restore project dimensions has been underway.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $653,660; maintenance, $351,984.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 129,569 tons; 1941, 108,889 tons.

PALM BEACH, SIDE CHANNEL AND BASIN

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Anchorage basin 16 feet deep, 750 feet wide, and 2,000 feet long opposite Tangier Avenue, Palm Beach, and a channel of the same depth connecting the basin with the Lake Worth inlet channel to the north.

Status: No work has been done on this project.

HOLLYWOOD HARBOR (PORT EVERGLADES)

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Maintenance and amplification of the improvements constructed by local interests to provide a channel 35 feet deep and variable widths from the ocean to the existing turning basin in Lake Mabel and for enlargement of the turning basin.

Status: The project was completed in 1940. During the 1942 fiscal year repairs were made to the north and south jetties.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $1,436,800; maintenance, $239,850.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 876,727 tons; 1941, 1,324,960 tons.

MIAMI HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel 25 feet deep and of variable width from that depth in the ocean through a jetty-protected entrance and across Biscayne Bay to the Port of Miami.

Modification since 1925: Depth of 30 feet from the ocean to and in the municipal turning basin and enlargement of that basin, length of channel about 6 miles.

Status: Project was completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $6,570,800; maintenance, $1,337,180.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $4,545,600; maintenance, $1,160,761.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 1,106,000 tons; 1940, 1,831,756 tons; 1941, 1,675,415 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. 470, 76th Cong.) to provide for an approach channel to and turning basin at the site of terminal development on Virginia Key, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation. A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on October 30, 1943, included consideration of the proposed modification of the recommended Virginia Key development to provide for a harbor 35 feet deep and an airport-seaport island approximately 1,920 acres in area.

Estimated first cost, $5,781,000.

MIAMI RIVER, FLA.

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 15 feet deep, varying widths to a point 5.5 miles above the mouth, and channel 6 feet deep at seaplane base at Dinner Key, and 8 feet deep along the easterly side of the Dinner Key Channel.

Status: Project completed in 1933. No work done in recent years.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $646,915; maintenance, $3,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 648,811 tons; 1941, 479,395 tons.

Modification of existing project: A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on June 2, 1942, included consideration of a channel 250 feet wide and of appropriate depth from Brickell Point near the mouth of the river to the Miami-Florida Bay section of the Intracoastal Waterway; a channel 200 feet wide and 15 feet deep between the Miami River project and the Municipal Turning Basin; a channel 150 feet wide and 15 feet deep across the bay connecting the river with Government Cut; and an access channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Miami River to Palmer Lake, or to a comparable harbor of refuge.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM MIAMI TO FLORIDA BAY

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 75 feet wide and 7 feet deep from Miami to point immediately south of Mangrove Banks, 63 miles.

Status: Project completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $201,362; maintenance, $282.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 17,121 tons; 1941, 124,991 tons.

Modification of existing project: A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on June 9, 1943, includes consideration of the proposed improvement of a channel 7 feet deep and of suitable width along the inside route all the way from Miami to Key West, Fla.

KEY WEST HARBOR

Project in 1925: Authorized the removal of coral heads and reefs from the main ship channel and anchorage so as to give a clear depth of 30 feet, for a northwest entrance channel 17 feet deep, protected by stone jetties, and for widening the channel opposite the wharves.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Except for completion of jetties at the northwest entrance channel, which is not considered necessary at this time, new work under the project is completed. Maintenance dredging was undertaken in 1940.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $1,040,400; maintenance, $238,700.

Cost since June 30, 1943: New work, $40,000; maintenance, $128,300.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 1,260,000 tons; 1940, 104,540 tons; 1941, 158,968 tons.

CHANNEL FROM NAPLES TO BIG MARCO PASS, FLA.

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 6 feet deep, from southern limits of town of Naples to Big Marco Pass.

Status: Project completed in 1940.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $37,525; maintenance, $2,725.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 1,666 tons; 1941, 1,570 tons.

ORANGE RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 4 feet deep and 50 feet wide from the mouth to Buckingham, 5.7 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Completed in 1903. No work done in recent years.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $2,000; maintenance, $8,571.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $2,471.

Commerce calendar year 1924, 1,900 tons; 1940, not reported; 1941 not reported.

CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER AND LAKE OKEECHOBEE DRAINAGE AREAS

Project in 1925: Channel 12 feet deep over the bar at the entrance to the Caloosahatchee River, thence 10 feet deep to Fort Myers with a turning basin at that point and a channel 4 feet deep thence to Fort Thompson and related works, length 64.8 miles.

Modification since 1925: Improvement of the Caloosahatchee River and Canal from Lake Okeechobee to the Gulf of Mexico by straightening and by dredging a channel which will provide a discharge outlet capacity of 2,500 cubic feet per second from that lake and a navigation channel at least 6 feet deep, including necessary control works. The present project also provides for a levee and a navigation channel 6 feet deep following in general the south shore of the lake, for a north shore levee, for replacing existing locks Nos. 1 and 2 on St. Lucie Canal with a single new lock, together with a new weir structure, for the protection of the St. Lucie Canal from erosion and silting, and for improving St. Lucie River to provide a channel 6 feet deep from St. Lucie Canal to Indian River, thus providing for a continuous 6-foot waterway across the State.

Status: The project for the Caloosahatchee River below Fort Myers was completed in 1913, and the recently constructed new spillway and protective dike at the new St. Lucie lock completed the existing project, except for minor installations.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $17,982,000; maintenance, $5,745,032.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $17,835,404; maintenance, $5,579,978.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 59,700 tons; 1940, 117,443 tons; 1941, 47,455 tons.

Recommended modifications of the existing project (H. Docs. Nos. 469 and 696, 76th Cong.) provide for raising and enlarging sections of the Lake Okeechobee levee in division No. 9, at an estimated cost of $3,930,000, and for a channel 8 feet deep from Fort Myers to the Intracoastal Waterway near Stuart, with widths of 90 feet from Fort Myers to Moore Haven, 80 feet in the existing channel along the southerly shore of the lake to the hurricane-gate structure at Clewiston, 100 feet wide, thence along a relocated channel to deep water on the south side of the lake, 100 feet from deep water on the east side of the lake to St. Lucie Lock No. 2, and thence 80 feet to the Intracoastal Waterway, at an estimated first cost of $208,000, all subject to certain conditions of local cooperation. A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on October 15, 1943, includes consideration of the provision of a boat basin at Stuart and improvement of the entrance to the basin at Fort Myers.

Estimated first cost: $4,173,100.

KISSIMMEE RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel width of 30 feet and depth of 3 feet from the town of Kissimmee to Fort Bassenger and also in Istokpoga Creek.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project completed. No work required in recent years.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $23,500; maintenance, $25,200.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, none.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 6,734 tons; 1940, 499 tons.

CHARLOTTE HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel 27 feet deep and generally 300 feet wide from the Gulf of Mexico to Boca Grande. Also a channel 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide at Pine Island Sound from Punta Rosa to Charlotte Harbor.

Modification since 1925: Entrance channel 30 feet deep and thence a channel 10 feet deep to Punta Gorda with a turning basin at that point.

Status: Project was completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $312,960; maintenance, $387,000.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $191,380; maintenance, $329,840.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 521,500 tons; 1940, 569,590 tons; 1941, 596,381 tons.

CASEYS PASS (VENICE INLET)

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Provides for dredging a new outlet channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide, connecting deep water in Roberts Bay with deep water in the Gulf of Mexico, protected by two converging jetties.

Status: The project was completed in 1937. Maintenance work involving protection for the jetties was undertaken during the 1942 fiscal year.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $154,000; maintenance, $187,100.

Commerce: Calendar year 1940, 12,319 tons; 1941, 110 tons.

Recommended modification of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 371, 76th Cong.) provides for adoption of a project to include the existing projects for Sarasota Bay, Caseys Pass, and channel from Clearwater Harbor through Boca Ciega Bay to Tampa Bay, to provide for improvement of the section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River to a depth of 9 feet and bottom width of 100 feet, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: $3,200,000.

SARASOTA BAY

Project in 1925: Channel 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Tampa Bay through Sarasota Bay to Sarasota and thence 3 feet deep and 75 feet wide through Little Sarasota Bay to Venice, length 38 miles.

Modification since 1925: For a more protected channel at Sarasota Bay in lieu of the existing channel in Long Boat Inlet.

Status: The project is completed except for rock removal in the channel through Little Sarasota Bay, which work is not required by existing commerce.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $249,630; maintenance, $134,160.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $9,530; maintenance, $63,570.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 14,600 tons; 1940, 3,269 tons; 1941, 3,000 tons.

Recommended modification: Recommended modification of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 371, 76th Cong.) provides for adoption of a project to include the existing projects for Sarasota Bay, Caseys Pass, and channel from Clearwater Harbor through Boca Ciega Bay to Tampa Bay, to provide for improvement of the section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River to a depth of 9 feet and bottom width of 100 feet, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: $3,200,000.

MANATEE RIVER, FLA.

Project in 1925: Channel 13 feet deep from Tampa Bay to McNeils Point; thence 9 feet deep to Rocky Bluff, thence 4 feet deep to Mitchellville Bridge. Terra Ceia Bay cut-off 6 feet deep, length of project channel about 24 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project 90 percent complete. Work remaining consists of removal of small amount of rock at entrance below 12-foot level not required at present.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $123,350; maintenance, $101,214.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $19,500.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 63,345 tons; 1940, 23,331 tons; 1941, 24,830 tons.

TAMPA HARBOR

Project in 1925: Entrance and various other channels 27 feet deep, Hillsboro River 12 feet deep, and channel from Port Tampa to the Gulf of Mexico 26 feet deep.

Modification since 1925: Increasing the depth of the entrance channel to 32 feet, and other channels, with the exception of Hillsboro River, to 30 feet. A turning basin at the entrance to the Port Tampa terminals, and for construction of a breakwater at Peter O. Knight Field, Davis Islands, and certain other work.

Status: The project was completed except for certain channel widening and enlargement of the turning basin at the west end of Garrison Channel. Construction of a breakwater at the seaplane landing basin, Davis Islands, was completed in January 1941. Maintenance is carried out annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $9,588,000; maintenance, $1,829,413.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $4,336,184; maintenance, $1,464,607.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 2,532,599 tons; 1940, 3,953,724 tons; 1941, 4,162,400 tons.

Recommended modifications of the existing project (H. Doc. No. 119, 77th Cong. and S. Doc. No. 16, 77th Cong.) provide in Hillsboro River a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the upper end of the existing project to a point 2,000 feet upstream from the Michigan Avenue Bridge, and for removal of snags, wrecks, and piling, thence to the Florida Avenue Bridge, at an estimated first cost of $60,000; and for a channel 25 feet deep and 150 feet wide from the ship channel in Hillsboro Bay to and including a turning basin in the Alafia River, 600 feet wide and 1,025 feet long, at an estimated cost of $189,000, all subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost $249,000.

ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel from Tampa Harbor into Bayoro Harbor 10 feet deep, 200 to 285 feet wide, with a jetty on the south side.

Modification since 1925: Entrance channel deepened to 19 feet, 21-foot basin at St. Petersburg, 20-foot channel from easterly end of entrance channel to Tampa Bay and 16-foot channel on easterly side of Point Pinellas lighted beacon.

Status: Project completed in 1939, and maintenance dredging to restore project dimensions was undertaken in 1943.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $221,580; maintenance, $76,050.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $188,900; maintenance, $57,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 133,813 tons; 1940, 278,315 tons; 1941, 274,144 tons.

CHANNEL FROM CLEARWATER HARBOR THROUGH BOCA CIEGA BAY TO TAMPA BAY

Project in 1925: Channel 5 feet deep through Boca Ciega Bay to Blind Pass, 7 feet deep through lower Boca Ciega Bay, and 8 feet deep to Tampa Bay, length 26 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project was completed in 1920.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $105,877; maintenance, $111,964.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $79,930.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 4,611 tons; 1940, 32,969 tons; 1941, 33,030 tons.

ANCLOTE RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 6 feet deep to Sponge Harbor and 4 feet deep to county bridge at Tarpon Springs; 4½ miles.

Modification since 1925: Deepening channels to 9 feet.

Status: Project completed in 1938.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $178,427; maintenance, $75,305.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $126,776; maintenance, $34,214.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 9,766 tons; 1940, 15,172 tons; 1941, 20,982 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. No. 243, 76th Cong.) provides for extension and enlargement of the channel upstream to form a turning basin, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $10,000.

HOMOSASSA RIVER

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 5 feet deep through 4 bars at the entrance to the river.

Status: Project completed in 1936.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $3,999; maintenance, none.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 1,063 tons; 1941, 1,359 tons.

CRYSTAL RIVER, FLA.

Project in 1925: Channel 6 feet deep and 60 feet wide to town of Crystal River, 9 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project completed in 1906. Maintenance work performed in 1941.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $25,000; maintenance, $19,990.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $10,990.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 427 tons; 1940, 2,209 tons; 1941, 2,134 tons.

WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FLA.

Project in 1925: Channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide to Port Inglis and thence 2 feet deep to Pembertons Ferry, 85 miles above the mouth.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project 74-percent completed. Work remaining is widening entrance channel additional 15 feet which work is not considered necessary at present.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $315,085; maintenance, $75,405.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $53,100.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 5,952 tons; 1940, 75,321 tons; 1941, 96,910 tons.

CEDAR KEYS HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel 10½ feet deep from Cedar Keys to the Gulf of Mexico, 5½ miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project 95-percent complete. Removal of ledge rock not required at present, as existing channels are adequate for commerce.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $147,021; maintenance, $30,000.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $42,520; maintenance, $30,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924 (not reported); 1940, 4,015 tons; 1941, 2,852 tons.

SUWANNEE RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 5 feet deep to Rolands Bluff and 4 feet deep to Ellaville, 135 miles, and 6-foot channel through Derrick Island Gap at south end of Suwannee Sound.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project 25-percent completed. Removal of rock shoals and widening at several places not required by existing commerce.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $76,418; maintenance, $37,400.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $15,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, none; 1940, 563 tons; 1941, 253 tons.

GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY BETWEEN APALACHEE BAY, FLA., AND THE MEXICAN BORDER

Project in 1925 (Florida): A channel with depths from 5 to 9 feet deep and widths 65 plus feet wide via Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla., and Choctawhatchee Bay to Pensacola Bay, Fla.

Project in 1943 (Florida): Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 23, 1942, authorized the enlargement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex., and its extension to the vicinity of the Mexican border, so as to provide throughout the entire length of the waterway a channel 12 feet deep with a minimum width of 125 feet. Public Law 75, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 17, 1943, authorized the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla., subject to the conditions recommended in the report submitted in House Document 257, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Status: Project as a whole 65-percent complete. The authorized depth of 12 feet has been provided between Carrabelle, Fla., and New Orleans, La.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $4,651,000; maintenance, $1,173,800.

Commerce	1925	1940	1941
Section of waterway:			
St. Marks River to Apalachicola River, Fla		97,282	103,986
Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla	4,692	239,223	239,056
West Bay to Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla		479,248	569,848
Choctawhatchee Bay to Pensacola Bay, Fla		426,884	624,941
Pensacola Bay, Fla., to Mobile Bay, Ala		506,832	632,587
Mobile Bay, Ala., to New Orleans, La		2,050,553	3,053,738

Recommended modifications of project (H. Doc. No. 442, 76th Cong.) provides for the construction by the United States of a movable span in railroad bridge crossing the Ochlockonee River near McIntyre, Fla., subject to local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: $32,500.

STEINHATCHEE RIVER

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Channel 6 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico to Steinhatchee, 3¾ miles.

Status: Project completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $135,050; maintenance, $395.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 761 tons; 1941, 681 tons.

ST. MARKS RIVER

Previous project: Between 1824 and 1844 obstructions in the river were removed.

Project in 1943: Channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Apalachee Bay to and including a turning basin at the town of St. Marks, a distance of 6 miles, and removal of obstructions from the present channel between St. Marks and Newport.

Status: Project was completed in 1940.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $133,890; maintenance, $5,806.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $97,880; maintenance, $5,806.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 372 tons; 1940, 51,879 tons; 1941, 55,189 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. No. 345, 77th Cong.) provides for straightening the channel in the vicinity of Big Bayou, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: $71,000.

CARRABELLE BAR AND HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel at East Pass 20½ feet deep and in outer harbor 18 feet deep, together with a turning basin, thence 10 feet deep to the wharves at Carrabelle.

Modification since 1925: Deepening the channel from the Gulf of Mexico to 27 feet and through St. George Sound and Carrabelle River to 25 feet to turning basin of same depth at Carrabelle.

Status: Project completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $363,890; maintenance, $209,220.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $284,830; maintenance, $73,772.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 6,540 tons; 1940, 22,795 tons; 1941, 12,209 tons.

APALACHICOLA BAY

Project in 1925: Channel 18 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico through West Pass and Link Channel, 10 feet deep across the bar at the mouth of Apalachicola River, and 9 feet deep through Bulkhead Shoals.

Modification since 1925: Channel 10 feet deep in West Pass.

Status: Project was completed in 1925, and maintenance dredging is undertaken annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $216,760; maintenance, $761,892.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $359,803.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 25,700 tons; 1940, 112,875 tons; 1941, 122,084 tons.

APALACHICOLA RIVER, THE CUT-OFF, LEE SLOUGH, AND LOWER CHIPOLA RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 6 feet deep in Apalachicola River, 5 feet deep through the cut-off, Lee Slough, and lower Chipola River.

Modification since 1925: Improvement of Styx River and Florida River, tributaries, to secure depth of 6 feet.

Status: Project was completed in 1939 and maintenance dredging and snagging operations carried out annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $141,570; maintenance, $360,900.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $20,100; maintenance, $246,150.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 209,596 tons; 1940, 253,440 tons; 1941, 278,376 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. No. 342, 76th Cong.) provides for the construction of two locks and dams, supplemented by dredging and contraction works to secure a navigable depth of 6 feet to Columbus, Ga., on Chattahoochee, and to Bainbridge, Ga., on Flint River, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation. Recommendation is also made that the general plan presented in the report for the full development of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint River system in the combined interest of navigation and power be approved.

Estimated first cost: $6,500,000.

UPPER CHIPOLA RIVER FROM MARIANNA TO ITS MOUTH

Project in 1925: Channel 3 feet deep and 60 feet wide from the foot of the Dead Lakes to Marianna, a distance of 55 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Improvement of the 20-mile reach from and including Look and Tremble Shoals to Marianna, on which there is no commerce, remains to be done to complete the project.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $36,780; maintenance, $63,190.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $28,420.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 17,096 tons; 1940, 957 tons; 1941, not reported.

GULF COUNTY CANAL

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, an extensive projects has been developed by the Government at St. Josephs Bay. It includes the harbor at Port St. Joe and other facilities. The Army Engineers' summary of it is as follows:

ST. JOSEPHS BAY

Project in 1925: Channel 24 feet deep and 300 feet wide across the bar at the entrance.

Modification since 1925: Deepening the bar channel to 29 feet and providing a channel 27 feet deep and 200 feet wide in the bay to Port St. Joe, with a turning basin at municipal pier.

Status: Project was completed in 1938. Maintenance dredging is undertaken annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $124,100; maintenance, $81,533.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $104,000; maintenance, $81,129.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 33,075 tons; 1940, 249,460 tons; 1941, 318,053 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (S. Doc. No. 17, 77th Cong.) to include the existing south channel at its present dimensions, 27 feet deep and 200 feet wide, from the turning basin at Port St. Joe to the 27-foot contour in the bay, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: None ($5,000 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required).

Gulf County, Fla., in 1938 completed, at its own expense, a channel about 6 miles in length, extending from Port St. Joe northerly to connect with the intracoastal canal. County bonds in the sum of $200,000 were issued for this purpose. It was planned to retire the bonded indebtedness from the county through toll revenues derived from commerce traversing the canal. In case of shortage of funds derived as result of tolls, then the properties of Gulf County became liable for payment of bonds. It was constructed to accommodate commerce in general but primarily to accommodate local tonnage which came about as result of paper industry and lumber industry at Port St. Joe. The canal was constructed 70-foot width, 9-foot depth.

At the beginning of the war, traffic on this canal greatly increased, much of it in larger barges. Plying of larger barges and their passing in the canal filled the bottom of the canal to such an extent that reasonable traffic was not possible. The Army engineers made surveys looking toward improvement of the canal through dredging, and so forth. It was found that $112,000 would be required for same. The Army engineers recommended that this improvement be made, primarily to take care of war oil tonnage going from the coastal canal through the Gulf County canal to pipe lines near the south end of the canal. Demand for fuel from these pipe lines of course greatly increased through war emergency. Tankers were forced to give up a large portion of deep-water service. Thus, it became the responsibility of the Federal Government to devise ways and means for transit of this oil through the Gulf County canal to the mouth of the pipe lines. The Federal Government was not willing to purchase outright Gulf County's interest in the canal and to pay off the remaining approximately $180,000 indebtedness against the canal and against the taxpayers of Gulf County. Members of the Florida delegation and other interested parties held a series of conferences with the Board of Army Engineers, the Secretary of War, the Director of Inland Water Transport in the Office of Defense Transportation, and other high Government officials. It was finally concluded to hold hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

The hearings were held on May 5, 1943. The Army engineers presented their report calling for improvement of the canal. Gulf County was represented by Mayor J. L. Sharit, of Port St. Joe, and others. As result of these hearings, the committee in executive session thereafter approved legislation whereby the Federal Government would improve the canal but permit Gulf County to continue to collect tolls until bonded indebtedness was retired; after retirement of bonded indebtedness, then Gulf County to cede its rights in the canal to the Federal Government. It developed at the hearing that the increased war tonnage through the canal should raise sufficient tolls in from 2 to 3 years to retire existing bonded indebtedness.

As acting chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, it was my privilege to work vigorously for the

committee's approval of this legislation. After committee approval, of course, the Congress passed the legislation and it became law. This is an instance whereby the Federal Government cooperated for the relief of a high tax burden against the Gulf County citizens. The Federal Government, of course, in the future will maintain the canal and endeavor to keep it to its present improved width of 100 feet, not less than 9 feet in depth. The canal should be dredged to 125 feet wide and to 12-foot depth eventually, which is the standard size of the intracoastal canal leading from New Orleans and west of New Orleans to Port St. Joe.

I deem it a great privilege to have been placed in a capacity where I may have been able to contribute at least some service for the Federal Government and for the citizens of Gulf County on this important project.

ST. ANDREWS BAY

Project in 1925: Channel 22 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the Gulf of Mexico through East Pass to St. Andrews Bay.

Modification since 1925: Abandonment of previous project and adoption of a channel extending from the Gulf across Lands End to deep water in the bay, protected by jetties, with depths of 29 feet in the approach channel in the Gulf and 27 feet across Lands End and in the bay.

Status: Project was completed in 1934 and maintenance operations are undertaken annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $785,520; maintenance, $1,572,100.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $581,960; maintenance, $1,269,487.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 89,257 tons; 1940, 939,707 tons; 1941, 956,346 tons.

Recommended modification of existing project (H. Doc. No. 555, 76th Cong.) to provide for a channel in Watson Bayou 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep from that depth in St. Andrews Bay to the highway bridge, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost: None ($1,000 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required).

CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVER

Project in 1925: Improvement of Cypress Top Outlet, maintenance of a navigable channel at low water from the mouth to Geneva, Ala., a distance of 96 miles, and for a channel 3 feet deep and 60 feet wide thence to Newton, Ala., a further distance of 44 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project was completed in 1906.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $171,880; maintenance, $258,910.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $86,450.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 66,885 tons; 1940, 350 tons; 1941, not reported.

HOLMES RIVER

Project in 1925: Provides for securing a navigation channel from the mouth to Vernon, Fla., a distance of 25 miles, by the removal of obstructions.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project is completed.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $8,560; maintenance, $36,650.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $330.

Commerce: Calendar year 1924, 3,256 tons; 1941, none reported since 1924.

LA GRANDE BAYOU

Project in 1925: Channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the mouth of the bayou to the mouth of Four Mile Creek, a distance of about 2 miles.

Modification since 1925: Deepening of the channel to 9 feet from that depth in Choctawhatchee Bay and its extension to Freeport, a distance of 4½ miles.

Status: Project was completed in 1937.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $64,150; maintenance, $8,575.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $64,150; maintenance, $6,414.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 7,118 tons; 1940, 85,725 tons; 1941, 60,783 tons.

EAST PASS CHANNEL FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO INTO CHOCTAWHATCHEE BAY

Project in 1925: None.

Project in 1943: Maintenance of channel 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, from Choctawhatchee Bay to the Gulf of Mexico.

Status: Maintenance work is performed when needed to provide a 6-foot channel.

Cost to June 30, 1943: Maintenance, $31,071.

Commerce, calendar year 1940, 1,621 tons; 1941, 972 tons.

PENSACOLA HARBOR

Project in 1925: Channel 30 feet deep, 500 feet wide, from the Gulf of Mexico to dock line at east end of Pensacola.

Modification since 1925: Deepening entrance channel to 32 feet and provision of additional inner channels. Also a channel 15 feet deep to Bayou Chico and 14 feet deep in the bayou for 5,800 feet terminating in a turning basin 500 feet square.

Status: Project completed in 1939.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $1,092,700; maintenance, $1,052,329.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, $146,300; maintenance, $538,756.

Commerce, calendar year 1925, 672,414 tons; 1940, 651,041 tons; 1941, 676,306 tons.

Modification of existing projects: A restricted favorable report transmitted to Congress on July 31, 1943, included consideration of the proposed deepening of the entrance and inner harbor channels; deepening of the channel in Bayou Chico to 20 feet; and dredging of a channel 50 feet wide and 6 feet deep in Bayou Texas.

ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FLA. AND ALA.

Project in 1925: Dredged channel 5½ feet deep at mouth of river and a navigable channel to Patsaliga Creek, 147 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project completed about 1882. Recent operations have been confined to channel at mouth and to the bar immediately inside. Maintenance dredging performed during 1941.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $118,336; maintenance, $109,568.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $28,138.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 29,157 tons; 1940, 131 tons; 1941, 18,122 tons.

BLACKWATER RIVER

Project in 1925: Channel 9 feet deep, 100 feet wide from mouth to Milton, 10 miles.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Project completed in 1916. Maintenance work performed in 1940 and 1941.

Cost to June 30, 1943: New work, $41,650; maintenance, $106,083.

Cost since June 30, 1925: New work, none; maintenance, $53,000.

Commerce, calendar year 1924, 64,883 tons; 1940, 95,275 tons; 1941, 193,452 tons.

REMOVING WATER HYACINTHS

Project in 1925: Provides for removal of water hyacinth in the navigable waters of the State insofar as they constitute an obstruction to commerce.

Modification since 1925: None.

Status: Work of removal is carried out annually.

Cost to June 30, 1943: Maintenance, $770,351.

Cost since June 30, 1925: Maintenance, $564,050.

PROJECTS RECOMMENDED TO CONGRESS FOR ADOPTION NOT HERETOFORE UNDER IMPROVEMENT BY UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER 1943—INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER

Recommended project, House Document No. 371 (76th Cong.), provides for improvement of an Intracoastal Waterway 9 feet deep at bottom width of 100 feet, and the adoption of a single project to include the existing projects for Sarasota Bay, Caseys Pass, and channel from Clearwater Harbor through Boca Ciega Bay to Tampa Bay, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $3,200,000.

CANAVERAL HARBOR

Recommended project, House Document No. 367 (77th Cong.), provides for a turning basin 27 feet deep near the easterly shore of Banana River, an entrance channel 27 feet deep extending from the basin to deep water in Canaveral Bight, protected by jetties, and a barge canal 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the basin to the Intracoastal Waterway, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $1,661,000.

LITTLE MANATEE RIVER

Recommended project, House Document No. 552 (76th Cong.), provides for a channel 100 feet wide and 6 feet deep from that depth in Tampa Bay to a point about one-half mile above the railroad bridge at Ruskin and 75 feet wide and 6 feet deep in Marsh Branch to and including a turning basin at the highway bridge at Ruskin, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $77,000.

NEW RIVER

Recommended project, House Document No. 553 (76th Cong.), provides for dredging a channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide through the rock shoal between the Intracoastal Waterway and Tarpon Bend and for removal of sunken vessels and snags in New River and its South Fork to the intersection of Dania Cut-off Canal, subject to certain provisions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $60,000.

PITHLACHASCOTEE RIVER

Recommended project, House Document No. 86 (77th Cong.), provides for a channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf of Mexico to and including a basin of the same depth immediately downstream from the highway bridge at Port Richey, a total distance of 3.2 miles, subject to certain conditions of local cooperation.

Estimated first cost, $51,000.

Pending investigation in the State of Florida

FOR NAVIGATION

Locality	Authorization
Anclote River to St. Marks, Intracoastal Waterway, and connection across Florida with St. Johns River.	Commerce Committee resolution of Feb. 6, 1940.
Apalachicola Bay	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Apr. 29, 1937.
Apalachicola River and tributaries, Ga. and Fla., for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1, River and Harbor Act, Jan. 21, 1927.
Apalachicola River, inland waterway to New Orleans, La., and Apalachicola and Chattahoochee Rivers to Columbus, Ga.	River and Harbor Act, Mar. 3, 1925.
Atlantic Ocean to Gulf of Mexico, waterway across Florida, via the St. Lucie River and Canal, Lake Okeechobee, and Caloosahatchee Canal and River (War Emergency).	Commerce Committee resolution of June 17, 1942.

Pending investigation in the State of Florida—Continued

FOR NAVIGATION

Locality	Authorization
Caloosahatchee River from Fort Myers to Gulf of Mexico	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Apr. 30, 1935.
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, modify existing project.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Jan. 24, 1939.
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, waterway, Punta Rasa to Fort Pierce and Stuart, Fla.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Oct. 13, 1943.
Chipola River, Fla. and Ala., for navigation, flood control, power, and related purposes.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Jan. 21, 1942.
Choctawhatchee Bay to Pensacola Bay, Intracoastal Waterway	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Oct. 5, 1940.
Crescent Lake to Flagler Beach, waterway via Haw Creek to Bunnell, thence via land cut.	River and Harbor Act of Aug. 26, 1937.
DeLeon Springs to St. Johns River Waterway	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Apr. 13, 1939.
Eau Gallie Inlet	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Sept. 17, 1941.
Hollywood Harbor (Fort Everglades), reimbursement for dredging and jetty work.	Commerce Committee resolution of Feb. 14, 1938.
Jupiter Inlet, Fla	Commerce Committee resolution of Nov. 8, 1943.
Lake Worth Inlet	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Apr. 20, 1937.
Pirates Cove Channel in Sacarma Bay, Pirates Cove, and Johnsons Pass.	Commerce Committee resolution of May 27, 1936.
Ponce de Leon Inlet	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Mar. 25, 1938.
St. Augustine Harbor	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of June 10, 1941.
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean	Commerce Committee resolution of Oct. 19, 1943.
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, straighten channel at Dames Point, Browns Creek, and St. Johns Bluff.	Do.
St. Johns River to Kissimmee River, and thence to Okeechobee Cross Florida Canal.	River and Harbor Act of Aug. 30, 1935.
St. Johns River to Indian River, channel from Sanford to near Titusville.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Jan. 27, 1937.
St. Johns River, Sanford to Lake Harney	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of May 20, 1941.
St. Marks River to New Orleans, La., Intracoastal Waterway	Commerce Committee resolution of Apr. 2, 1940.
St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla., for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1, River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.
Sebastian Inlet	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Aug. 8, 1941.
Suwannee River, Fla. and Ga. for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1 of River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.
Tampa Harbor	Commerce Committee resolution of Nov. 14, 1939.
Withlacoochee River for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1 of River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.
Withlacoochee River, Fla	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of May 20, 1942.

FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Apalachicola River and tributaries, Ga., and Fla. for navigation, flood control, power and irrigation.	Sec. 1, River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927.
Broward County, Intracoastal Waterway throughout	Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936.
Do	Flood Control Act of June 26, 1936.
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, protection of Kremmer, Ritta, and Torry Islands in Lake Okeechobee.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of May 29, 1940.
Chipola River, Fla. and Ala., for navigation, flood control, power, and related purposes.	Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of Jan. 21, 1942.
Estero River, Imperial River, Corkscrew River (Herse Creek), Gordon River, Rock Creek, Hendry Creek, Mulock Creek, and Six Mile Cypress Slough.	Flood Control Act of Aug. 28, 1937.
Indian River and tributaries	Flood Control Act of Aug. 18, 1941.
Kissimmee River and its tributaries	Do.
Kissimmee River, including regulation and stabilization of water levels.	Flood Control Act of Aug. 11, 1939.
Kissimmee River Valley and tributaries	Flood Control Act of Aug. 28, 1937.
St. Johns River (upper) and March, and tributaries	Flood Control Act of Aug. 18, 1941.
St. Lucie River, North Fork, and tributaries	Do.
St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla., for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1, River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.
Suwannee River, from Florida-Georgia State line to Gulf of Mexico.	Flood Control Act of Apr. 10, 1936.
Suwannee River, Fla. and Ga., for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1 of River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.
Withlacoochee River	Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936.
Withlacoochee River, for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation.	Sec. 1 of River and Harbor Act of Jan. 21, 1927.

Smearing General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this House and the country what seems to be a deliberate attempt by anti-American smear artists of a termite variety who are now peddling their vicious venom in an attempt to poison the minds of the American people by launching a near slanderous and abusive attack upon a great commander in our armed forces. I believe the attack in the Communist Daily Worker, PM, and echoed by Walter Winchell, king of the smear artists, comes as near being a treasonable act as I have ever read. These individuals should realize that they are attacking a great general in the armed forces. He is not a candidate for President. Apparently the henchmen of the New Deal are worried about him becoming a candidate. It is quite possible that this outstanding and experienced soldier will be drafted by the Republican Party to carry on, come the elections of 1944. General MacArthur has a magnetic personality. He is a born leader of men. He has vision, courage, and understanding of human nature. He is doing an outstanding job in the Pacific with so very little. He is doing it without complaining. His losses have been few. It is true that by tradition, ability, character, and experience this military man is eminently qualified for the office of President of the United States. He is a great and experienced commander.

Perhaps the people of the United States will decide that an experienced soldier in the White House will help shorten this war. Should he be drafted for the nomination and accept it with the understanding that he would serve for one term only, announcing that he would depend upon Congress and the best minds of the country to help guide him through this one term I am certain nothing could stop his election as President of the United States.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the New Deal does not feel that he may be drafted and have therefore instructed their smear artists to continue a deliberate and malicious campaign to undermine and destroy this great soldier. They should realize that they are striking a blow for Tojo and are not helping the war effort when they attack a man of the integrity and ability of General Douglas MacArthur.

Four Freedoms on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on February 4, 1944, a group of farmers and small businessmen met at Washington Crossing on the Delaware River and formed an organization built around Four Freedoms on the Home Front, namely:

Freedom from racketeering labor leaders.

Freedom from bureaucracy, red tape, and wasteful spending.

Freedom of enterprise and individual opportunity.

Freedom of State and local rights from Federal domination.

This local committee is undertaking a Nation-wide effort to enlist the interest of those who believe in the principles which they have laid down as their goal. It is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which this committee addressed to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives on February 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR FREEDOMS ON THE HOME FRONT,
Washington Crossing, N. J.,
February 22, 1944.

DEAR SIR: On February 4 some of us farmers and small businessmen met on the banks of the ice-covered Delaware River at Washington Crossing to put up a fight against the rocks pushed in our road by the New Deal.

Attempting the uphill battle to win the war has made it hard for everybody, but we saw no reason why the jobholders in Government should go out of their way to make our battle more difficult.

All of us at that first meeting spoke our minds. We agreed that our first demand is to win the war decisively and quickly without claims for political credit. We don't like the way Government is butting into our affairs more than the war makes necessary. So we named a committee to see what they could do to keep us joined on the home front against strikes and labor leaders, loose spending, too many bureaus and Federal jobholders, too many forms and too complicated.

First, we were convinced that every bit of credit be extended to our armed forces and the ability of their leaders to win the war, in spite of a fumbling New Deal, rather than because of it. We resent, as all our fellow citizens in uniform must, the "Dr. Win the War" theory. The implication is horrid to every patriotic American. No individual and no political party will be responsible for winning the war. We will win only by united efforts—on the battle front and on the production front.

By working together on the home front—by discussion and public meetings, by issuing pamphlets, using paid space in daily and weekly papers, and by radio—we believe that we can—

Aid the morale of our men at the front by demanding action against strikes and labor leaders who hurt the war effort;

Demand that our Government cut out red tape and politics and get down strictly to the business of winning the war;

Encourage our Senators and Congressmen to think and act independently for the good of the people;

Enlighten the citizens who need to be aroused to the danger of government's taking away our freedoms while we are anxiously watching the war and working for victory. Let's remember the words of George Washington who said "It is essential that public opinion should be enlightened"; and

Influence both party conventions to support platforms with sound principles rather than political catch phrases.

We are agreed that the very least that Americans at home can do is to fight for four down-to-earth freedoms while our boys are fighting on foreign soil for freedom for others. That's why we appointed a committee of neighborhood citizens to help arouse millions of patriotic and long-suffering citizens in this country to the need to reduce power in our Central Government; to make public job holders our servants rather than our masters. To this end we dedicate ourselves to fight for the following four freedoms at home:

Freedom from supergovernment by racketeering labor leaders.

Freedom from bureaucracy, red tape, and wasteful spending.

Freedom of enterprise and individual opportunity.

Freedom of State and local rights from Federal feudalism.

We firmly believe that these simple demands are shared by the majority of Americans today—those peaceful citizens who have been quiet too long. We intend to speak these principles, their principles, far and wide, to help restore old-fashioned virtues of honesty, economy, and courage in high office.

And we invite others to join us and help in a county-wide, a State-wide, and even a Nation-wide crusade.

Respectfully yours,

Committee: William Blackwell, secretary, Washington Crossing, N. J., former president, county board of agriculture; Robert Dilatush, Clarksville, N. J., farmer, president tri-county cooperative auction market; Henry Jeffers, Jr., Plainsboro, N. J., president, Walker-Gordon Farms, member, New Jersey Dairy Council; James Kerney, Jr., Trenton, N. J., editor, Trenton Times; I. B. Lippman, Washington Crossing, N. J., master of county grange; Mrs. Charles Maddock, Trenton, N. J., housewife, former president, State Federation of Women's Clubs; William Starr Myers, Princeton, N. J., professor of politics, Princeton University; Ted Reed, Pennington, N. J., feed dealer and dairy farmer; Fred Schluter, Princeton, N. J., dairy farmer and manufacturer, director, State Agricultural College; S. Terhune, Trenton, N. J., fruit grower, president, Farmers' Cooperative Association; Herbert Voorhees, Hopewell, N. J., dairy farmer, president, New Jersey Farm Bureau, president, Free Farmers, Inc.

Demobilizing the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner entitled "Demobilizing the New Deal."

This is an editorial comment on the speech I made in the Senate on March 9, 1944, on the subject of the maintenance of the dignity and authority of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOBILIZING THE NEW DEAL

One thing that the New Deal does not contemplate in its proposals for post-war demobilization is the demobilization of excessive Federal Government.

But unless such a demobilization takes place, there will be very little value in demobilizing either the war industries or the 10,000,000 men drawn into the armed forces.

Notwithstanding the reticence of the New Deal, however, the subject is not to be ignored.

It has already been brought to the attention of Congress in a forceful address by Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire.

Discussing the expansion of bureaucracy and the aggrandizement of executive power as against the legislative and the judicial, Senator BRIDGES said:

"Congress itself, of course, must share the blame for the fact that more and yet more blank-check powers have been concentrated in Executive hands. * * *

"This body has been hasty and occasionally frivolous in the complacency with which it relegated functions and tied its own hands.

"The process of executive concentration of authority beyond anything known in the past was far and dangerously advanced at the time we declared war on the Axis.

"Since then the exigencies of war unavoidably have accelerated that process. * * *

"The very circumstance, however, that the Congress majority has itself been guilty in this matter makes it that much more imperative for Congress to undo the mischief."

That is incontestably true. For obviously, neither an entrenched bureaucracy nor a willful Executive can be expected to dispossess itself.

As Senator BRIDGES declared:

"Rare indeed is the administrative body that can be left free to fix its own life-span.

"The emergency which brought it into being somehow is never liquidated.

"In the nature of the case, it would be ludicrous if we left it to those who wield wartime authority to decide when they should give it up."

The importance of Senator BRIDGES' speech does not lie in the warning he gave that, unless Congress does its duty, democracy is done in the United States, but rather in the fact that he has formulated a definite governmental demobilization program for Congress to follow.

The prevalent condition has arisen from four major causes.

First. Congress has too frequently extended administrative duties to Federal agencies without clearly defined administrative standards.

Second. Executive departments and agencies have taken advantage of this congressional laxity to usurp legislative functions.

Third. Emergency powers have been delegated to the Executive without limitation as to either the extent or the duration of the emergency.

Fourth. Vast appropriations have been granted to the Executive with no restraints upon the expenditures to be made by him.

As a consequence, Senator BRIDGES recounted:

"What we have witnessed in these critical years is not simply an attempt by the Executive to influence or shape legislation.

"It has been, in effect, a consistent attempt by the Executive to legislate. * * * Repeatedly the Executive has sought to accomplish by administrative fiat results that have not been authorized—or that have been emphatically rejected—by the Congress.

"We are all aware of the unprecedented extent to which the President has concentrated the spending power of the Government in Executive hands. What makes his recent veto of the tax law, and especially the strange language in which it was couched, so significant and so alarming is that it raises the danger of presidential concentration of the taxing power as well.

"The greatest danger that confronts the American democratic system at this time is that powers handed to certain administrative bodies for definite purposes or for what we thought were specific periods of time may be exercised too long or even in perpetuity."

As the logical and lawful corrective for these dangers and evils, Senator BRIDGES proposed to Congress:

"We must devote ourselves without delay to the all-important job of retrieving the congressional authority that has been siphoned off.

"Calmly but resolutely we must reexamine every blank check and set a reasonable and

safe limit upon the amount to which it can be drawn.

"The teeming commissions and bureaus and administrative offices which batten and fatten on these snowballing powers must * * * be carefully checked by Congress with a view to their elimination or rigid regulation. Executive powers and the officers exercising them must be brought into line. They cannot be permitted to run wild.

"Each of us knows and the country knows that the control of the Nation's purse strings must remain firmly in the grip of Congress. * * *

"We cannot permit this President or any President * * * to intrude upon the taxing and spending powers of Congress.

"If we are to restore to Congress the full measure of its constitutional functions, then it is of particular importance to set a term upon each and every major power we have delegated to the Executive in recent years.

"Congress should apply itself without further delay to the urgent problem of setting a juridical terminus upon all wartime powers. We dare not, if we value our constitutional government, leave any margins of doubt or any unclarity on this matter."

Announcing his own intention of sponsoring remedial legislation, Senator BRIDGES anticipated a defensive New Deal campaign of "ridicule, vilification, moral abuse" against Congress, and the desperate opposition of "every bureaucrat" having a "vested interest in his job and his power."

He is afraid of neither prospect.

"The way back to congressional government will be long and hard," he said, "but we cannot regain our self-respect and fulfill our democratic destiny unless we retrace our steps.

"There is more bogus 'indispensability' per square foot in Washington than there is per square mile in the rest of workaday America."

Youth Looks to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that the high school students of today are not acquainted with the principles of the Constitution, American history, and the importance of the Congress in preserving the American way of life. If this be true, and I do not concede that it is, it certainly does not apply to Miss Charlotte Goss and Mr. Bill Schleich, two high school students from Springfield, Mo., in my congressional district. These two students have just been awarded war bonds by the Mississippi Central Railroad Co. for the excellent letters they wrote to their Congressman. These letters were on the subject of How to Keep America American.

These two young citizens, in whose hands we must trust a share of the future of this Republic, have so well stated their conception of the responsibilities of the Congress in this critical hour that I feel their letters worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend them to the attention of the Congress and the country.

The letters follow:

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *February 13, 1944.*

The Honorable MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a high-school student just 15 years old, but I am interested in my country and its future. The settlements that are made at the end of the war will greatly affect the young people of my age, so surely we are to be considered and our ideas must be of interest. Now, you as well as others may question the sincerity and concern of a person my age, so may I explain my feelings? I am a natural-born American, and I'm very proud of my country. I realize it is not extraordinary for young people to be patriotic, and I'm no different from thousands of others. We like what we have learned to associate with the name America. We appreciate the fact that it is a land of opportunity for all people, and we want it to always be just that. We hope that all the ways of living can again become normal and that we can again enjoy the American way of life; in short, we are interested in keeping America American.

Now, what do we mean by keeping America American? I can only express my own ideas, but I believe they are general with others. It means that Johnny Doe will play sand-lot baseball, fly a kite, or shoot marbles with his friends instead of learning to click heels, salute, and march in best military form. Mary Doe might go to school with the children of Jewish, Polish, Italian, or any other race and call them her friends. It means that a poor boy might come from the ghetto and become Eddie Cantor, or that a rail splitter from Illinois might become President. It means that our country has forever held a promise for all men, regardless of wealth, social background, religious or political beliefs. It means that each person may cast his own secret vote on any political issue or candidate without the supervision of a Government agent. That each person shall be allowed to work at any type of labor or profession he feels himself best fitted for and that his relationship as a worker or as an employer shall not be dictated or forced in any way by any political party. We must hold with firm hands all that our founders of this country held so dearly and outlined distinctly in the Declaration of Independence. Truly, "the American Republic will endure as long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue to be dominant."

Our country holds an enviable place in the world as a financial and political power, but surely our Government must continue to be the kind as Lincoln said, "A government by the people and for the people," or we can lose our position in a short time. We want to always hold this reputation, but we don't want to become egotists and feel that we are a master race. We want to continue to be fair to all people. The morale of a nation requires the interest of the government and to some extent the guidance of governmental bodies, but these bodies must realize that interest and guidance is all that is required, and to go further than this will be damaging. "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges."

You, as a member of a legislative group, are in a position to lend your efforts toward really accomplishing this task of keeping America American. It is most necessary that cooperation be maintained between the people of a nation and their government, and you will have the cooperation of these two if there is a feeling of mutual trust and confidence. This brings a quotation to my mind that describes such a situation. It is, "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people on the pretense of caring for them they must be happy."

Care must be taken so that a feeling of vindication does not follow the peace settlements after victory is ours Each nation and individual must be given his chance to help himself. In our own country the return of soldiers and the revision of manufacturing plants may create an employment problem. Help may be given to some extent but it might be advisable to follow this quotation from the Bible, "And even when we were with you this we commanded you that if any should not work neither should he eat." In our relationship with other countries we must be wise in our settlements At the present time we hate our enemies. However, if we tear that statement apart we realize that it is their policies and actions that we dislike. If these policies are to be changed they can be best changed if we aim toward a just settlement without any feeling of punishment for those who do not believe as we do. We find in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence a statement of Thomas Jefferson, "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men; deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This was written to apply to our own Nation but it should be followed in dealing with all people for that is truly the American way.

Very truly yours,

CHARLOTTE GOSS.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *February 13, 1944.*

Congressman MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: The title of this letter is to be "How We Can Keep America American." It is necessary that every Congressman know the wishes of his people and to follow them as much as possible if the ideas are sound and practical. It also works the other way. It is the duty of citizens to inform their Congressman of their ideas, beliefs, and wishes. This is truly, as Lincoln said in his Gettysburg Address, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is just a high-school pupil's opinion, but we are America's future leaders.

To keep America American we must first win this war. To do this we all must work for the common good. We must buy War bonds and fight inflation. We must write our friends or loved ones in the service. We must fight rumors. We must produce all the war goods we can. The one of these contributions a high school can best help in are the War bonds. The Government is demanding more and more money from taxes and War bonds to fight this war. But look at them. They are spending money like water. Sometimes the money is spent for unnecessary things. Sometimes the projects are worthy, but many times the amount of money necessary is spent, and vital labor is wasted. Congress is the only one left to stop this waste, because the administration seems to promote it. Thomas Jefferson said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should want bread." I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, and not a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans and for increasing by every device the public debt on the principle of its being a

public blessing. What has our present Government done but this? It has created many offices, each one with an excess of labor. It has spent the public's money for these unnecessary employees' salaries. It has deferred them from the draft, hoarding vital manpower. It is the duty of the people's representatives in Congress to curb this waste of money, manpower, and skilled workmen. In the Bible, I Timothy v: 8, it says, "But if any provide not for his own and especially for those of his own house he hath denied the faith and is worce than an infidel."

During this time of international conflict all over the world we must strive to save the freedoms that our forefathers fought so hard to get. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." This is the first amendment to our Constitution, the first of the 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights. The fifth amendment to our Constitution, also the fifth part of the Bill of Rights, says "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property b' taken for public use without just compensation." The second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are constituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." All of these famous quotations make the people the power behind the Government. We are fighting to uphold these ideals in this present war. But our Congress has, rather blindly, given the President considerable powers not given him by the Constitution. He has started to use these in ways which Congress had not intended to use them. When the war is over we, the people, must be stronger than when we went in. It is up to Congress to strengthen the people's rights.

There haven't been many strikes lately, but they did enough damage a few months ago. I don't see why coal miners and other workers can strike and receive wage increases when white-collar workers receive none at all. The coal miners argued that the cost of living had increased a great deal when their wages increased only part of this. But what of the white-collar worker? His didn't increase any of that increase in the cost of living.

In conclusion I would like to say that it is the duty of every Congressman to represent the people of his district to the best of his ability. It is his duty to stand up against various pressure groups that don't represent the people as a whole. It is his duty to stand for what is right no matter who is against him. The tenth part of the Boy Scout law says, "A scout is brave. He has the courage to face danger in spite of fear, and to stand up for the right against the coaxing of friends or the jeers or threats of enemies, and defeat does not down him." This is a good rule for anyone to follow. To keep America American our Congressmen must fight for the rights of the people and the betterment of their welfare.

Yours very truly,

BILL SCHLEICH.

Our Servicemen Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of March 14, 1944:

OUR SERVICEMEN VOTE

Minnesota has taken the kind of action every State ought to take—and which most other States have taken or will take—to make sure that all men and women in service who are eligible and who wish to do so will have a chance to vote in this year's elections.

That action consists simply of clearing away, for citizens in the armed services, the read tape which encumbers absentee voting, and providing enough time between the primary and general elections so that ballots can be printed and got to service people in distant parts of the world in plenty of time.

The legislature is to be commended for having accomplished this in a brief and business-like special session.

What Congress finally decides to do about votes for service men and women will not affect Minnesota now because all of our people in service are enabled to vote—not only in the November election, but in the primary, which is to be held in July instead of September for the very purpose of making soldier voting possible.

If Congress should pass a Federal voting law and some Minnesotans in service should cast Federal ballots, the presumption is that they would not be counted here, because State ballots are legally available to them either on their own request or that of any near relative.

How many Minnesotans in service will vote, nobody knows. A considerable proportion of them—perhaps a quarter to a third—did not vote in peacetime, when they were at home. A lot of the rest are not old enough to vote. Some men overseas say that they know little and care less about candidates; their big job is fighting. But any eligible voters in service who want to vote—and it is to be hoped that a majority will want to—ought to have the opportunity, for the right of a citizen to vote should never be abridged as a result of patriotic service to his country. The legislature has provided that opportunity.

Probably the voting machinery will fail to do a 100 percent job of delivering ballots to and collecting them from battle zones. We cannot foresee what may be happening on any front in July or November. But this problem of logistics would exist whether the men in service were given State ballots or a Federal ballot. Solving it is, and would be in any event, up to the postal, military and naval authorities.

The responsibility for enabling citizens to vote belongs to the States, under the Constitution. The proposal that the Federal Government take over this power was dangerous and presumptuous. There is no reason why the States cannot discharge the task better than the Federal Government, making it possible as in the case of Minnesotans in service, for those in the armed forces to vote not only for President and for national officers but for State and local officials.

It is true that in some States there is not equality of voting rights—as between Negroes and whites, for example. But two wrongs do not make a right. It would flout a constitutional fundamental for the Federal Government to usurp power, extraconstitutionally, to set up electoral machinery. And even those who have favored such action can hardly blink the fact that any Federal-ballot plan would be challenged in the courts—with the possible result that months might elapse after election, perhaps in the gravest period in this country's history, in which doubt about who had been elected would contribute to a national chaos which we could in no wise afford.

President Roosevelt sought to picture the issue as one of whether service men and women were to have a vote or not. That never was the issue. Even the administration did not propose that servicemen under 21 should have a vote (as maybe they ought to) or that residents of the District of Columbia should have a vote.

The issue has been simply whether the States will do their duty and enable their eligible citizens in service to vote. Minnesota has done everything that can be done—and more than the Federal Government could do—to extend full suffrage to the Minnesotans who are fighting our battles all over the world.

Florida Air Ace Missing in Action Over Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with personal sorrow that I announce to the Congress the probable loss to the Air Forces of a gallant young man, a national hero, and the leading United States ace in the European theater of operations. Maj. Walter Carl Beckham, 27, of De-Funiak Springs, Fla., with 18 Nazi planes to his credit, disappeared in a flaming Thunderbolt over Europe recently, after strafing a German airdrome from tree-top level in the face of murderous ground fire. We hope he had a chance to bail out safely.

Major Beckham, whose magnificent career as a fighter pilot thrilled the Nation, comes from a small town in northwest Florida. Only short weeks ago that fine and cultured little city was saddened by news of the death of another hero son, Lt. Ewart Sconiers, who died in a Nazi prison camp.

Some Social Gains in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill, from the Boston Sunday Globe of March 12, 1944:

SOME SOCIAL GAINS IN WAR—TASK AHEAD WILL BE TO MAKE THESE PERMANENT, BUT ONLY A LASTING PEACE ON A STRONG DEMOCRATIC BASE WILL JUSTIFY THE SACRIFICES

(By Charles A. Merrill)

General Sherman's definition of war must be labeled another classic example of understatement. Let us put it this way: For sinners encumbering the earth, this war is basic training for the hereafter. They need have no fear of the future. Hell on earth must be worse than the realm where Satan is the unchallenged and legitimate sovereign.

War is organized madness. We plan for it and treat it as if it were a normal, respectable business; indeed, we place it on a higher plane than any other business. Yet, what is it save mass murder, of women and children as well as of men; sabotage of man's creative instinct; cruel and abusive treatment doled out by an assembly line girdling the globe, a whirlwind of destruction? Nature sometimes goes on a rampage, but this is as nothing compared to a convulsion of human nature, the brutalization of what is sometimes euphemistically referred to as the human family.

Every sane American knows this. This it is which tears at the heart of the normal, thinking American. We are not Prussianized automatons, or Shintoistic apes. What we are now going through we could not possibly endure unless we could rationalize it. Fortunately, we are able to do so. Stating the situation in its simplest terms, we are in a dilemma, and we are trying to fight our way out of it.

THERE IS NO CHOICE

There happens to be no choice. It may still be argued, though the burden of proof is on the affirmative, that we had a choice in World War No. 1. If we had remained out, that war might possibly have ended in a stalemate, and even if the Germans had been victors, theirs was then a conventional government which, while insisting on top place in the European hegemony, might very well have dictated acceptable peace terms and have constituted no immediate threat to the United States. In any event, Hitler and nazi-ism would probably never have climbed into a position to plague humanity.

It cannot be said about our intervention in this war that America or certain Americans had a financial stake in Allied victory. When the war started, we had neutrality laws which prohibited this. We are at war today because we decided that the alternative was worse than war. The alternative was the greater tragedy of subservience, perhaps in perpetuity, to the hateful tyranny of fascism, that reactionary revolution which proposed as a remedy for economic maladjustment, not the emancipation but the enslavement of mankind.

Thus we are reconciled to the cross America must carry in what might have been our golden age. Somewhere, elusively around the corner, lie victory and the chance to justify all the sacrifices. We must unflinchingly follow the rough road which leads to this objective. What we need to carry us through is serenity and faith.

EVIL TIPS THE SCALES

So, if it is difficult to rationalize war, we may at least take cognizance of the compensations we as a people are receiving for the sacrifices we must make. It is impossible to strike a balance between good and evil. Evil must tip the scales. But it may help our morale to take note of certain by-products of our present-day major industry, waging war, that accrue to our benefit and must be entered in the books as national assets.

Starting with items of lesser importance, we defer dipping our pens in blood and making those entries on the debit side of the ledger which can never be balanced, and take stock of material things.

Shall we start by saying that seven-tenths of everything that our gigantic industrial plant is today producing is being fabricated merely to destroy and to be destroyed like Fourth of July firecrackers? This is incredible waste. It is as if every morning the foreman of a factory working on three shifts ordered the 24-hour production taken out to the vacant lot next door and touched a match to it, then herded all the employees back into the plant for another day of feverish production, to be disposed of in the same manner.

Of course, in the normal peacetime world, everything that is produced is produced for consumption. The difference is that in wartime, industrial products are consumed much more rapidly. We use them as fast as they are turned out, which means that we are running up a bill which must be met by denying ourselves things which we customarily consider essential or which must be paid for by future generations.

SO MUCH IN SO LITTLE TIME

But, here, a fact emerges from which we may take comfort. Under the spur of war necessity, the American people have discovered the productive capacity of an industrialized society. We had not dreamed we could produce so much in so little time. We have learned that we can make use even of unskilled labor and train it to play a vital part in mass production. This means that in the future, provided we have the ingenuity to adjust the profits system to our productive capacity, so that purchasing power is more widely diffused, there will be more of the things that make life better to be distributed among the people, and possibly an end to the vicious cycle of boom and depression. And if we produce and distribute things more abundantly, the sooner the war bill now being run up can be liquidated.

Indeed, it almost goes without saying that, in the post-war world, we shall have to gear our financial system to man's demonstrated capacity to produce. One of the great ironies of this tragic war is that, for the first time in generations, our submerged class in this land of plenty is getting enough to eat. Labor is at a premium. There are, for the moment, jobs for all, even for the physically handicapped.

Sir William Beveridge, author of the British plan for post-war social security, remarked last spring before a gathering of Boston businessmen that for the first time in their lives thousands of men and women in the United Kingdom had a feeling that they were needed in the world. As an antidote to war depression, visualize the men you used to see cluttering up doorstoops and street corners, and see them today, in this war year of 1944, streaming on the double-quick through the gates of our war-production plants. This will give you a picture of what life may be like in post-war America.

LEARNING FRUGALITY

Also, as we try to balance the account, remember this: Americans as individuals are notoriously wasteful. But, now that we are dedicated to waste on a world-wide scale as a patriotic duty, lo and behold, individual Americans are learning frugality. They are being trained to salvage and save. Food is rationed, and, as it turns out, garbage pails are more empty than stomachs. In England, children eat less food and are better nourished. So it may be here, as we learn the rudiments of nutrition.

Let us decide, here and now, that sentimentalizing about war is out for the duration. The rules governing the relation between the sexes are relaxed, with results not pleasant to contemplate. Mother is helping to win the war by tack welding at the shipyard, and juvenile delinquency is on the increase. But, just the same, in this emergency woman is demonstrating that she is a person in her own right, no mere dependent on a lord and master.

In wartime, even in America, civil rights and liberties are suspended. We chafe under regimentation. But, after all, is it regimentation or the discipline democracy must impose upon itself if it is to survive in this complex age? Who are the regimenters on the local draft and ration boards except our friends and neighbors?

DURABLE PEACE ONLY COMPENSATION

We come now to the point where we dip our pens in blood. Where shall we seek compensation for the expenditure of American lives, the lives of our youth, suckled and nursed and reared with such infinite patience and care, brought to the threshold of their careers, then led to the sacrifice?

There can be no compensation for the suffering and death and grief which this war is spreading around the globe save a durable peace on a solid democratic foundation.

A peace like that framed by the Congress of Vienna, which liquidated human aspirations, parceled out real estate among princes, made the world safe for divine right and, in a "horse and buggy" age, kept European quarrels within continental boundaries for a century, will hardly suffice today.

This is a global war, and must end in a global peace, peace that will make the world unsafe, not only for aggression and autocracy, but for plutocratic privilege and imperialistic exploitation of any people, be they white, black, brown, or yellow.

In our quest for an American peace plan, why not stand by the Atlantic Charter?

Legislative Program for World War No. 2 Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the most important economic and social question confronting the people of the United States today is the creation and continued maintenance of an adequate system to provide security for our returning veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents.

Many of the individual States of the Union have already undertaken to solve this problem. My own great State of Illinois, under the leadership of Gov. Dwight H. Green, has taken the lead in this respect.

However, it now remains for the Federal Government to create and develop a program of national scope to correlate the efforts of the individual States and to assure just and equal benefits for

every American man and woman returning from the battlefields of this global war.

The American Legion long since recognized the need for a correlated veterans' relief and rehabilitation program, and out of the many theories and suggestions advanced has come the American Legion's so-called bill of rights for veterans, which is now pending before the United States Senate. It has been incorporated into S. 1767 and H. R. 4357, the titles of which are: "To provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans."

This omnibus bill of the American Legion presents a comprehensive legislative program for World War No. 2 veterans. It is the product of 25 years' experience in the field of veterans' rehabilitation and is the result of intensive studies by appropriate national committees of the American Legion and of mandates of national conventions on the subjects embraced within the bill.

In their present form, S. 1767 and H. R. 4357 represent a scientific approach to the readjustment of America's 13,000,000 fighting men and women back to civilian life. It has been estimated the measure will affect the lives of more than 40,000,000 Americans.

I am advised by the United States Veterans' Administration that as of February 29, 1944, a total of 293,480 returning veterans of World War No. 2 have already applied for compensation due to disability, and that, as of the same date, 80,231 such claims have been approved. I am further advised that 18,311 of these applications have been filed in the veterans' hospital at Hines, Ill., and that 3,899 veterans from my own State of Illinois already are receiving pensions.

Thus the problem of providing benefits for our returning service personnel is demanding immediate attention and it should not be delayed further.

In view of this fact, the American Legion's bill of rights for service men and women of America should be considered immediately and enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

As one of those Representatives in Congress who has consistently supported all equitable legislation providing just benefits for our fighting men and women of all wars, as well as for their dependents, I urge that proper steps be taken at once.

Food Production in 1944

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the food situation is growing more desperate each day. The National Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, has issued a food program for 1944 setting forth our needs. Last year, however, it took 8 points to keep a farm hand on the farm. This year it is going to take 16.

Now, it is much more important that we have manpower on these farms than it is that we get a Federal subsidy to stimulate production. This is going from one extreme to the other, and unless some relief is given by this administration, according to the Food Administrator, we are going to find ourselves, and not only ourselves but the whole world, in a desperate food situation. I sincerely hope that the administration will see fit to let us farmers have some help to do the job they expect us to do.

UNITED STATES NOT WORLD FOOD BASKET, JONES WARNS

War Food Administrator Marvin Jones said yesterday the Nation will be able to meet essential military and civilian food needs, but warned it cannot be expected to carry the load of post-war relief feeding.

In a balance-sheet report, prepared at the request of War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, Jones made this forecast for 1944:

"While supplies of some foods (for civilians) will be less than would be needed with unrestricted demand, other foods will be available in ample supply so that everyone can have enough good and nutritious food to satisfy his needs.

"Foods available for export constitute only a small proportion of the food requirements of the United Nations and of liberated areas.

"In considering the responsibility of the United States in helping to meet food requirements of the United Nations, it should be kept in mind that the United States is not the food basket of the world."

Of the total exportable supplies available from all the United Nations, Jones said, this country has only 7 percent of the wheat, grain and flour, one-fourth of the fats and edible oils, a third of the meat, fish and rice, and somewhat larger proportions of canned fish, dried fruits, and of beans and peas.

"As the food demands of reoccupied territories increase," the Food Chief said, "food production will need to be increased in the other United Nations, and also in areas to which they have access."

This country's foreign relief contribution, Jones said, will have to be limited mainly to dry beans and peas, cereals, soya products, and "certain minimum amounts of animal proteins and concentrates."

Because feed reserves have been used up, it is not possible to maintain livestock at 1943 levels, he continued. Hence, future production programs must place greater emphasis upon direct food crops rather than on livestock.

The report said this year's productive efforts will be handicapped by a heavy drain to trained farm workers and by further deterioration of farm-transportation facilities.

The Recent Cut in Gasoline Rations in the Middle West Is a Boon to the Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Office of Price Administration in cutting the A gasoline coupon from 3 gallons to 2 gallons in the interior of the country was most unwise. If the civilian economy of America breaks down, it will not help the war effort. Travel and transportation are not luxuries, but are necessities.

Out in the Middle West, and I am speaking particularly of Nebraska, we must contend with great distances. The towns are far apart. The entire economy of the State is geared to automotive transportation. Busses and streetcars are not available to the extent that they are in those parts of the country with a greater population. Many of our branch-line railroads have been discontinued. The car owner with only an A book cannot take care of those things which must be taken care of in view of this reduction.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Office of Price Administration does not go after the real evil—that of the black market? Two representatives of the O. P. A. admitted in my office recently that right here in the Capital City of the Nation there is a scandalous black market. Gasoline is being sold without coupons. Coupons are being printed and secured in other mysterious manners. Why does not the O. P. A. do something about it? Instead of stopping the flow of illegal and black market gasoline and saving this gasoline for the war effort, the O. P. A. makes a further reduction of the gasoline consumed by the honest, conscientious people.

No one in America is opposed to giving to the war effort an absolute first priority on all the gasoline they need and can use, but they are opposed to taking the gasoline that is necessary for law-abiding people to get along with and at the same time doing nothing about the illegal flow of gasoline in those great metropolitan centers where New Deal patronage makes up the bulk of the population.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration should reconsider their action with respect to this reduction of gasoline for the Middle West. After acquainting themselves with the necessities of the territory and taking notice of the fact of the lack of other transportation facilities, I am sure that their recent action would be rescinded.

No Anti-Semitism in the Fox Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article entitled "No Anti-Semitism in the Fox Holes," written by National Commander Archie H. Greenberg, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States:

Just when I begin to feel that the outlook for democracy is rather bleak, something

happens on the constructive side of the scale to offset that empty, unhappy feeling. For instance, we've all been reading about the outbreak in the Washington Heights section of New York. There hoodlums followed the same pattern we saw used in Boston—threats and beatings of Jewish youngsters, desecration of synagogues and some Protestant churches, filthy words to match their equally below-the-belt actions. Then, strangely and happily enough, there comes a neutralizer. This time it came in the form of some very welcome words from Ray Bolger, who just returned from a tour of the southwest Pacific, where he entertained thousands of our fighting sons.

"Discrimination? There's no such thing in the islands of the southwest Pacific," said Ray with great emphasis. "You're too busy fighting off the Japs to be poisoned by such talk. It doesn't matter if a guy's a Jew, a Catholic, or a Negro—he's your pal—and that's all that counts out there. The men seem to realize we're all soldiers of God and they believe in God. There's more religion in the Army than you can imagine. One air raid and everyone—yes, everyone—is praying, in his own way, of course. And there's more respect for religious differences than I've seen in a long time—and I've been around quite a lot, too. I guess when those boys get back they'll show us what real understanding is—and you can bet your bottom dollar they won't stand for any of this race hatred talk either."

Then, from Boston—the same Boston that only a few months ago was the scene of anti-Semitic street fights—comes the statement of Capt. Roy L. Lewis, Chief Chaplain of the First Naval District, who declared that the American fighting man is angered by news that there isn't as high a degree of tolerance on the home front as there is among the fighting men.

"The morale of the men on the battle front and on the high seas," said Chaplain Lewis, "is dependent on the news he receives from the home front. When he knows that his family is surrounded by friendly neighbors his faith strengthens. Whatever disturbs them disturbs him. The men cannot understand why religious bigotry and intolerance sometimes exist on the home front when men of all sorts of religious convictions are able to live aboard ship in perfect harmony."

Then, there's the story told by Joseph Parker, private, first-class, United States Marine Corps, who was with the first landing party of marines at the Solomon Islands on August 7, 1942. Back in this country, recuperating from wounds, Private Parker believes in religious miracles. He also believes that a man's religion isn't the measure of a man. Private Parker says that there were no atheists in the fox holes at Guadalcanal. "This phrase," he said, "was first used on Bataan. But I know it was true on Guadalcanal, because I was there, and I am sure it's just as true in Italy, or in the Marshalls, or in New Guinea, or anywhere else where there are Americans in fox holes. When a man is moving up under fire and sees an enemy mortar shell land in a spot he himself occupied less than a minute before—he knows there's some divine power watching over him. Miracles don't happen by accident.

"When you are sharing a fox hole with another man—a man on whom your life may depend—you don't care much what his religion is. All you care is that he's fighting on your side. You don't ask him what church he goes to back home. In America nobody tries to say you can't go to any particular kind of church; you're free to worship as you please. Maybe it takes a fox hole to show a man how precious freedom of worship is.

"After all, isn't tolerance what we're fighting for? Isn't it tolerance that gives us our freedom of speech as well as freedom of worship? It's worth fighting for, I know; I only hope that not all Americans will have to learn the lesson from a fox hole."

All this is good to hear, and it takes a bit of the sour edge off those anti-Semitic stories that emerged from Boston, New York, and elsewhere on the home front. We hope with Private Parker that Americans won't have to learn the lesson of tolerance from a fox hole. We are happy to hear that the boys overseas are more conscious of the true essence of Americanism than many of us on the home front. But, of course, we don't intend to wait until the boys get back to tell those professional hate-mongers off. The boys out in the South Pacific—and all over the world—are doing their job. Let's do ours, too, right here at home.

I liked what Congressman MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, of Nevada, had to say. "This book is a very valuable contribution to the history of the United States and it should serve to remind some people in this country that patriotism is not a matter of race or creed or color, but is the product of our Democratic institution and no particular body in the United States has a monopoly in this respect."

And leave it to Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida to hit the nail on the head: "This book is a factual attestation of the way the Jewish people have met the challenge of their country's danger in every one of its wars. They have been builders, patriots. I commend you for the record you have prepared of their dutiful service." The Honorable WILLIAM A. ROWAN, of Illinois, names the book "one of the most unusual volumes I have read in recent months."

"It is factual and, therefore, carries far more weight than any expression of opinion might do," is really a truism from the lips of Congressman WILLIAM B. BARRY, of New York. From Senator MURRAY, of Montana, comes the message, "It is all the more a pleasure for me to have the information contained in your book at this critical period when sinister forces are trying to divide us. * * * The facts which you have marshalled between its covers should go a long way to dispel any doubts that some of our citizens might have about the contributions of the American Jews to the victories of the past and to the victory which we are now fighting to achieve."

Emphasizing the contribution our boys are making in the current struggle, Congressman BALDWIN, of Maryland, concludes his statement with the "hope that when the present war is over, the oppressed Jews throughout the world will have a just share in the democracy for which their sons are fighting today."

Is the Republican Party the Party of Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address entitled "Is the Republican Party the Party of Inflation?" made by me over the Columbia network, from the studios of WTOP in Washington, on Tuesday, March 14, 1944:

I have chosen my topic tonight deliberately. The Republican Party is the party of inflation. This is a statement that is supported by the record, and is confirmed by the present reckless political tactics the Republicans are now using in Congress in a desperate attempt to gain partisan advantage.

In times of peace and prosperity, this great country of ours can afford the luxury of purely partisan struggle over issues of national policy. In fact, the vitality of our democratic processes is based upon opposing viewpoints, and genuine partisan discussion is an important safeguard to the proper democratic decision. In time of war and national peril, however, there should be no important differences over fundamental policies and objections. There is too much at stake to tolerate purely political debate in this hour of crisis.

Yet there is developing in Congress an irresponsible partisan conspiracy by the Republican leadership, which may cause great and lasting harm to the Nation. I will be specific.

On March 3, the distinguished minority leader in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, announced that there should be immediate hearings upon the renewal of the Emergency Price Control Act, which expires on June 30 next. Mr. MARTIN accused the Democrats of attempting to delay consideration of this matter until the last minute, and then to undertake a renewal of the existing law.

Now the Republican leader is a very astute gentleman, skilled in the artifices of political manipulation. He knows what he wants when he wants it, and I think I know what that is.

Therefore, I accuse the Republican leadership of attempting to cause in time of war a prolonged and partisan debate over a question upon which there should be no difference of opinion. That question is whether the cost of living should be effectively controlled. Beginning in the summer of 1941, lengthy hearings were held on the price control bill. There was strong Republican opposition to the administration program to hold down the cost of living at that time.

However, the bill was passed in spite of the Republican opposition and the machinery for preventing inflation was established.

Time does not permit a complete review of what has been accomplished by price control. I do not claim that its administration is without fault. I fully appreciate the irritations that have been caused. Mistakes have been made—many of them. But as against this, there is a record of solid achievement and a real disaster has been prevented because of the effectiveness of these controls.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS A DAY SAVED ON COST OF WAR EVERY DAY

It is just a matter of simple arithmetic to prove that in the cost of the war alone, $50,000,000 are being saved every day. By this I mean, if prices had followed the same pattern in this war as they did in the last, the Government purchases for war purposes would have been $65,000,000,000 more.

CONTROLS TO PREVENT ECONOMIC ANARCHY

No one believes more firmly than I do in the benefits of a free economy. In common with other American citizens, I look forward to the day when free enterprise in the real meaning of the term will be given an opportunity to function. When we shall have won victory on the battle front, and our production and supply situation permits, I will be among the first to advocate the abandonment of these controls. However, they are necessary in time of war to prevent a kind of economic anarchy that would destroy our ability to produce and wipe out the value of our savings, including War bonds.

HAM $2 A POUND AND TIRES $105 EACH IN MEXICO

I have recently had the opportunity to talk with a friend just returned from Mexico. They have been operating their economy

without the aggravation and the annoyances of price ceilings, rationing, quotas, allocation, priorities, and other controls. The wages of Mexican labor have risen to about three times of what they were. But the significant thing is that prices of everything the wage earner buys have gone way beyond that. For example, a Mexican laborer can take his higher wages to the market place and does not have to have a ration coupon to buy ham upon which there is no price control. But he must pay $2 a pound if he gets it. I think that we in this country will put up with the annoyance of price control and rationing if we obtain our fair share of the available supply at prices that are reasonable to producer and the consumer alike. A Mexican citizen does not need any rationing certificate to buy a tire. He can go to his service station and get it without checking with any board. That is, he can buy it if he has the equivalent of $105 in American money and this is just for a single tire.

DOES REPUBLICAN REVISION MEAN EMASCULATION?

I am convinced that it is unnecessary to attempt to persuade the American people of the necessity for a continuation of price control in substantially its present form. Even the Republican leaders say we must have control with revisions. I asked the minority leader on the floor of Congress if by revision he really didn't mean emasculation. I have had no satisfactory reply up to this moment. Tonight I repeat the question and ask the Republican leadership just what prices and profits they want to increase. I think the American people would be interested in a bill of particulars.

REPUBLICANS HAVE BLOCKED MOST EFFECTIVE PRICE CONTROL

The Republican record since the enactment of the Emergency Price Control Act is one of obstruction and negation. They have undertaken and have been successful to a degree to so hamstring the Office of Price Administration that it has been hindered in the performance of its duties. I have always felt, and I feel now, that it is the duty of the Government to make available to all of the people the facts about the issues which face us in this crisis. I am convinced that there is a real understanding of the problems of inflation and the steps that have been taken by the Government to hold down the cost of living. However, there is much more information that should be made available. The Republican Party, voting as a solid bloc, prevented the Office of War Information from having sufficient funds to properly advise the people about the dangers of inflation.

The Republican Party even more significantly voting as a unit in the House of Representatives reduced by $35,000,000 the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration, thus crippling that agency in the performance of its services to the people. I say to you tonight that if you have to stand in line to get your ration coupons, or if your application for some price adjustment is delayed, you should blame the Republican Party, which has stood solidly against permitting effective price control.

I could detail other measures which would have been helpful for the smooth and efficient functioning of price control and would have further minimized the dangers of inflation where the Republican leaders of the House have voted as a unit against such measures.

DEMOCRATS IN MINORITY WHEN REPUBLICAN-DEMOCRATIC COALITION OPERATES

The Democrats in the House of Representatives have only six votes more than the Republican minority. It is not unique in our political history when the minority party standing as a unit has been able to control the course of legislation. It has happened before and it is occurring with respect to the Price Control Act. Therefore, I assert that the Republican Party has control—actual control—of the cost-of-living program. Its fate rests squarely in the hands of the Republican leadership in Congress. I further charge that, although the Republicans have the power and the responsibility, they are seeking to make political capital by plunging this country into a state of economic confusion. In short, the Republican Party is playing a reckless and irresponsible game with the value of your War bonds.

I am hopeful that the American people will not be misled by this political conspiracy. The cost of living is not a partisan question. The value of your War bonds, your insurance policy, your home, your savings is at stake.

PRICE CONTROL ACT BEING SCUTTLED

I would, therefore, appeal to all citizens, Democrats and Republicans alike, to make known to the Republican leadership in Congress their emphatic disapproval of the Republican plan to gamble with the country's economic welfare for the sake of political advantage. The Republican strategy in scuttling the Price Control Act without appearing to do so is obvious to those of us who are day after day subjected to their guerrilla warfare. It is all too apparent that the Republican leadership would put this Nation on the road to ruin if they thought it would help them in the next election. Your War bonds would not buy those things you have been planning if the Republicans get away with their scheme. The allotments to our fighting men's families will not begin to make ends meet if the Republican Party is successful in torpedoing price control, as they apparently plan to do.

PRICE CONTROL FIRST TIME IN HISTORY HAS WORKED

The price control and stabilization program has actually worked. In the War of the Revolution the purchasing power of the dollar shrank to 33 cents, in the War Between the States it shrunk to 44 cents, and in the First World War it shrank to 40 cents. For the first time in history our Nation has in this war attempted price control. The results, without any experience to guide us, have been amazing. We are saving $50,000,000 every day on the cost of the war alone and another $25,000,000 on civilian purchases.

It is true that many people are not receiving the amount in wages and salaries, or the amount in rents, or the prices that will give them the profits and earnings that they believe they are justly entitled to receive, but they have the consolation of knowing that each dollar they receive purchases more goods and services than any other "war dollar" has ever purchased in the history of this or any Nation.

We are saving by price control an average of $200 per capita each year at a cost of $1.15 per capita.

It is easy to determine savings for the reason that we have a definite period during a former war to compare prices with. In the First World War, for instance, steel advanced 187 percent and then it advanced up to 690 percent; but during this war—during the past 4½ years—steel has not advanced one penny, and steel is an important item in the cost of any war. Many similar instances could be cited.

EFFECTS OF RUN-AWAY INFLATION

Run-away inflation will make our money practically worthless. People will not work for worthless money. Our country is too big and our business is too enormous to reduce our country to barter and carry on production and distribution. It would not be possible. Therefore, if we permit inflation, we run a great risk of stopping production here at home and leaving our fine, brave servicemen stranded on the battlefields of the world.

In conclusion, permit me to summarize my contentions:

1. The Price Control and Stabilization Act must be reenacted into law by June 30 next, or there will be no price control of any kind whatsoever.

2. The Republicans in the House have been voting solidly against effective price controls and they have given notice that they expect to insist upon major changes in the law extending the act.

3. These changes, if adopted, will greatly weaken, if not entirely scuttle, the entire price-control program.

4. The Republicans will write the kind of extension they desire, since they are voting as a solid bloc, and enough Democrats have joined them, both in the committee and in the House, to enable them to dictate the kind of law the extension will be.

5. In this instance the surgeon who is wielding the knife is not anxious for the patient to live.

6. Relief could not be satisfactorily administered when we were giving something to people. It is more difficult to administer a law that takes something away from the people, especially when there are 8,000,000 commodities and products involved in price control, which is causing 1,000,000 telephone calls to O. P. A. offices every day and has resulted in an average of more than 1,000 applications for price increases being made to O. P. A. every day.

7. Mistakes in such a huge program administered by an organization affected by efficient manpower shortage are obviously unavoidable.

8. We could look the country over and could not find four better men with good, common horse sense and fine judgment and discretion, who have the respect and confidence of the Congress and the country, to administer this law than we have in the four gentleman who are directly in control of it, namely, Mr. Justice Byrnes, Judge Fred Vinson, Mr. Chester Bowles, and Judge Marvin Jones.

9. Remember, while our sons are fighting and dying upon the 55 battlefields of the world, we can destroy our country here at home by inflation, so let us not run the risk.

I repeat that a solid and unified Republican bloc, eager for power but unwilling to accept responsibility, has come to get control in the committee which has charge of the renewal of the Price Control Act. By voting as a unit, they can also determine the course of the bill when it reaches the floor. I pray that the Republican leadership will not submerge their patriotism to blind partisanship, but will join with their Democratic colleagues in taking the action that is best for the country's welfare.

The Army Chaplain Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Gen. William R. Arnold, Chief of Chaplains, United States Army:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1944.

The Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: In response to your telephone request of March 11, 1943, I am happy to furnish you the information desired relative to the general activities of the Chaplain Corps.

On December 7, 1941, there were 1,478 chaplains on duty with the Army. As the Army has grown in size so also has the Chaplain Corps. As of December 31, 1943, there were 6,998 chaplains on duty, of whom 2,743 were without the continental limits of the United States. These chaplains are found wherever the men of the Army are located in sufficient number, the ratio being approximately 1 chaplain to every 1,000 officers and men.

The affairs of the Chaplain Corps are administered by the Chief of Chaplains, who is under the Director of Personnel in the Army Service Forces. In accordance with the plan set up by his office, the major recognized denominations of the United States have been asked to furnish their clergymen to minister to the spiritual needs of the men and women of the Army. Every chaplain is an ordained or accredited minister in the denomination which he represents and has been endorsed by it for service in the Army as a chaplain. This safeguard insures that the religious ministry to the men of the Army shall be of the same high type as that provided to civilian churches in the United States. Physical requirements are the same as those for any other officer in the Army.

Chaplains are assigned to posts, camps, and stations and are attached to tactical units of the armed forces, and wherever the men and women of the Army may go there also the chaplain goes.

Thus we find chaplains with reception centers, replacement training centers, hospitals, staging areas, and transports, with the paratroopers, the infantry, the artillery, with task forces, air forces, amphibious units, antiaircraft units—in short, wherever the soldiers may be. These chaplains come into the Army prepared by their own churches to perform their religious ministrations. The Chaplain Corps has the Chaplain School at Harvard University to orient these chaplains to the specific requirements of the Army. At this school they study such subjects as military courtesy, military law, defense against chemical warfare, map reading and related matters. In this manner the chaplain learns, by knowing how to take care of himself, to be of maximum use to the military unit.

Certain aids have been furnished the chaplains in order that they may adequately minister to the needs of the Army. In 1940 there were only 17 permanent chapels on Army posts. By the end of 1943 there were a total of 1,532 army chapels and these chapels were so constructed that they could be used, when suitably appointed, by Catholic, Jew and Protestant alike. Simple dignity marks the outward appearance of an Army chapel. Such an impact has been made by the chapels in the United States that many chapels have been constructed in various theaters of operation for the men stationed there. Among other places we have chapels in Newfoundland, Egypt, India and the Persian Gulf Command. It is interesting to note that in the South Pacific, where the building needs are not as rigorous as in other territories, the soldiers themselves have taken the initiative and have constructed temporary chapels out of salvage material and in their rest hours when not engaged in military activities.

In addition to the Army chapels, ecclesiastical appointments for the chapels have been furnished as well as portable altar and communion sets to be used in the field. Transportation has now been authorized in the form of a jeep and trailer for each chaplain attached to a tactical unit. Each chaplain may also requisition, among other things, a portable organ, a chaplain's flag, 150 song and service books and a field desk. This makes it possible for a chaplain to be a self-contained unit insofar as religious work is concerned. By means of his transportation he visits his men even though they are at widely separated locations. Upon reaching his men he sets up his portable altar, has religious services, and makes himself available for personal counseling and help.

Portions of Scripture with the foreword by the President as Commander in Chief, and an after-word by the Chief of Chaplains, have been made available to the personnel of the Army. The New Testament (King James version) has been provided for Protestant personnel; the New Testament (Douay version) has been provided for Catholic personnel; selected songs and readings from the Old Testament have been provided for the Jewish personnel. To date, 5,888,025 copies of these portions of Scripture have been distributed. Testaments have also been put on lifeboats and in liferafts.

During the first 6 months of 1943 chaplains officiated at 25,532 marriages and at 7,145 baptisms. Marriage certificates and baptismal certificates are currently being made available for the use of chaplains.

Chaplains have also been assigned to camps where prisoners of war are kept in custody, to minister to the religious needs of those of our enemy who have been captured.

The contribution of civilian churches in relinquishing their pastors for service in the Army has been recognized by the issuing of a certificate of award to each church whence a chaplain has come. Since some chaplains in their civilian ministry served more than one church, more than 9,000 of these certificates were issued during 1943. Chaplains have come from every State in the Union and from Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama, Mexico, South America, Hawaii, Alaska, the South Sea Islands, China, Greenland, and west Africa. Churches in the Philippine Islands that are entitled to certificates will be sent theirs when the emergency is ended.

The chaplain in the Army has a restricted group to which to minister. This group is restricted as to age and in great measure as to sex. The number of religious services conducted by or under the supervision of the chaplains and the attendance thereupon is phenomenal. During 1943 alone more than 1,350,000 services were conducted under the supervision of or by Army chaplains for Army personnel. The attendance at these services was nearly 81,000,000. These attendance records are based upon the official reports made by the chaplains monthly to the chief of chaplains. The attendance upon the church services for any month is equivalent, on the average, to 97.5 percent of the Army strength. This attendance does not include soldier attendance at services in civilian communities, nor the services conducted by chaplains in their civilian contacts. The sacraments of the several denominations were administered on more than 865,000 occasions with more than 10,500,000 participants.

The chaplains made nearly a million visits to hospitals and guardhouses during the year.

In their pastoral ministry to the men of their units, which includes such items as personal interviews, welfare cases, personal services rendered, and visits to the home of military personnel, the chaplains had more than eight and a quarter million pastoral functional occasions during the year during which the chaplains made slightly under 70,000,000 individual contacts.

The totaling of all the chaplain activities for the year, with approximately 2 percent of the chaplains yet to be heard from, indicates that the chaplains had eleven and three-quarter million functional occasions involving approximately 201,000,000 individual contacts not including marriages, baptisms, and funerals. Also excluded from the above figures are the professions of faith which have averaged nearly 5,000 per month and the distribution of religious tracts and literature, devotional aids and secular papers, and magazines. These items, which are casually distributed by all chaplains, would have run the total number of contacts into well over a billion.

Chaplains in their ministry to the men of their units have given a service far in excess of that which has been demanded by their military obligation. This service has been recognized on the field of battle by numerous citations and awards which have been made to the members of the Chaplain Corps. By the end of 1943 the Chief of Chaplains knew of 81 chaplains who had been decorated 1 or more times. They have received such decorations at the Distinguished Service Cross, the Croix de Guerre, Silver Star, Legion of Merit, and the Soldier's Medal. Thirty-nine chaplains have received the Purple Heart. Three percent of the chaplains in the theaters of operation have been decorated. It is significant that these chaplains have won these coveted ribbons not for killing but for spiritual ministry under the hazardous conditions of combat.

This service to the men of their units has not been without its toll in the lives of the chaplains. To date there have been 21 chaplains who have sealed their service with their lives either by being killed in action or have died as a result of wounds received in action. Only the Army Air Forces and Infantry have a higher battle casualty rate among their officers than the Chaplain Corps.

It should be noted in closing that much of the ministry of the chaplain does not lend itself to statistical computation for his is a ministry of the spirit, dealing with the imponderable values of life. For that reason the influence of the Chaplain Corps has been all out of proportion to its size.

In the files of the office, Chief of Chaplains are many unsolicited statements, which bear out the impact of religion and chaplains on the lives of the soldiers. I quote two of them:

A mother writes to a chaplain: "I thank the Lord for giving us good men like you to lead our boys in the right way while they are so far away from home."

A soldier writes: "I can't begin to tell you how much our chaplains mean to the boys and have meant to me, when I was wounded, it was a chaplain who came for me and carried me to the hospital. And, when you move into a new area and pass along the rows of tents, you get a feeling of comfort and inner satisfaction when you see the blue flag of the chaplain waving above one of those tents. You know that inside that particular tent there's a man of God on whom you can count."

It is obvious that the benefits of the current achievements of the Chaplain Corps will not cease with the termination of hostilities. Chaplains and soldiers alike will be the leaders of tomorrow. The future development of our political, economic, social, and religious life will reflect the magnificent services of our chaplains.

Thanking you for your interest in the work of the Chaplain Corps, I am,

Very truly yours,

WM. R. ARNOLD,
Chief of Chaplains.

Courage of American Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a letter which I recently received from a resident of my district, Mr. Arthur E. Cole, Sr., and

which, to my mind, exemplifies the fighting spirit of those parents who have suffered the sad loss of their fighting sons in this war. I pay tribute to this kind of bravery; it is a type of stubborn courage which is prevailing against that most terrible of all set-backs, the sudden loss of one dearly beloved. That loss is worse when it takes away a young relative, a boy in the prime of his strength, still carrying the gloss of fresh youth, still with a whole lifetime ahead of him.

I think the American parents at home, who daily bear up under such losses, should be counted among the finest heroes and heroines of this war. Theirs is a kind of bravery which defies any description, no matter how eloquent. It is particularly laudable when we find, as in the case of Mr. Cole, that even the tragic loss of a fine son does not deter these parents from the path that was laid out for them when Uncle Sam took their boys away to fight for home and country. We see these parents going on along that path, alone, still fighting in their own ways, humble as they might be, to earn for America the final victory which will come. We see their great losses reacting to crystallize their civilian fighting spirits. We see their greater determination to win, and their greater drive to vanquish the foe, born anew in the agonizing blow which the war fates have dealt to them. To my mind, that is a kind of quiet, little-noted courage in which the children of these parents and, indeed, in which all Americans, can take a fiery pride. Mr. Cole's letter follows:

NORTH BONNEVILLE, WASH.

Hon. FRED NORMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your information and sympathetic letter of March 2. We have just received details of the mission on which our son, Second Lt. Arthur E. Cole, Jr., was lost, and it leaves us little hope that he may be alive at the present time.

We had not wished to give this much, but in this war of races, which the Japs intend it to be, we must all be prepared to give whatever it may take to send these barbarians back to their mud-hut stage of civilization which will better balance with their character. That is un-Christian, of course, but a stark necessity—"made in Japan."

And thank you for your offer of service. We shall be glad to use it when needed.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. COLE, Sr.

Maintaining Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, if there is one subject which occupies the American mind today, next to the war effort and the winning of the war, it is the post-war period and what is to come after the peace is signed. This is a young man's war. Young men are fighting on foreign fields in order that our way of life at home will survive. This country was built on free enterprise, free initiative, and, yes, "rugged individualism," if you please. It was not builded on regimentation, bureaucratic autocracy, and Executive orders. America came to its position because our forefathers were willing to use their hands as well as their brains in building for the future. It is this kind of America which I hope will be the America of the future as well as the America of the past. Our young men, our young brains, our young energy, our young thinkers, have as important a part to play in the America to come as our recognized leaders and mature statesmen.

There has come to my desk a plan advanced by a young man which I desire to bring to the attention of this House for its consideration. I offer it on its own merits, without comment, except with the observation that it is refreshing to know that even in our college halls of professorial ranks there are young men who are thinking about the maintenance of free enterprise in our American colony.

Henry C. Langer, Jr., a young professor at Keuka College, Keuka, N. Y., has prepared a paper which he calls Maintaining Full Employment, which was published in the American Economic Review recently. This paper indicates that our young men have a full realization of the problems which are to come. Mr. Langer admits that his proposition suggests a rather drastic change in one element of free enterprise economy but believes the proposal is sound and is one of the methods by which we can retain free enterprise after the war is over.

I am first and foremost trying to promote an idea that I believe will be of tremendous value to the American economy—

He writes me.

I surely am afraid that the next depression (not the conversion period) will see the death of free enterprise. After that happens, the freedom of the individual lives on borrowed time.

While we may or may not agree with Mr. Langer's plans, I am sure that most of us will agree with his observation on the danger of the full extermination of free enterprise if we continue down the road we are now walking without recognizing the danger signs along the way and the economic traffic admonitions to stop, look, and listen, lest we be overrun by the traffic, which is not conducive to the fundamentals upon which this country was founded and builded. Here is Mr. Langer's article. While all of us may not agree with it and some of us may, I am sure we will find it stimulating as coming from the mind of a thinking young American, and thinking is most important nowadays.

MAINTAINING FULL EMPLOYMENT

The recognition of the present inevitability of depressions in the free-enterprise system, coupled with the fact that the individual enterprise is the unit of productive decision and the focal point for distributive decision, points to the conclusion that as an economy we are doing one of two things: (1) Either necessary changes in the environment in which the business enterprise operates are being neglected, or (2) necessary changes in the legal framework of the business enterprise to adapt it to the existing environment are being neglected.

In the free-enterprise economy the automatic interaction of enterprises is depended on to bring about adjustment and maintain full activity in the economy. But adjustment is stifled at its source by the legal framework of the business enterprise which allows a discard of workers without any regard for the ability of the workers to shift their services to other enterprises. In order to maintain full activity in the economy, enterprises must be designed to recognize the fact that workers are not shifted immediately by the process of placing them in the ranks of the unemployed. Ignoring the lack of ability on the part of discharged workers to shift immediately relegates the workers to idleness, which in turn forces other enterprises to discard some of their workers, and does not contribute to an orderly redistribution of effort. It appears, therefore, that the legal framework of the business must be changed with particular reference to the ability of the enterprise to discard immediately its unwanted workers.

The following statement of a general proposal is, in my opinion, a proper method to employ in adjusting the enterprise to the environment.

1. The enterprise must be obligated legally to pay for, and to have the right to use, the services of the people it employs until those people move to other enterprises.

The burden of the cost of this change in enterprise rights must be borne jointly by all elements of society, including government.

2. The major elements of the machinery needed to carry out the above change are as follows:

(a) A law stating the responsibility in the contract of employment.

(b) An insurance fund to which all elements of the society contribute, and from which enterprises draw liquid funds when such funds are needed to fulfill the financial responsibility called for by the proposal.

(c) A designation of enterprises that need the insurance benefits, the designation to be based on a precise definition of out-of-pocket losses.

(d) A centralized employment service to determine and contribute to the shiftability of people that are subject to discard, and to determine those individuals that need special training or other special consideration.

The procedure of operation of the proposal would be simple. If any enterprise wished to discharge workers it would notify them and register them with the Nation-wide employment service, but the enterprise would continue to pay the workers and to have the use of their services.[1] The employment service would then proceed to submit openings in other enterprises to the workers listed with it. Since all workers do not like to move, a certain limit must be set on the number of openings that can be refused; if the number is exceeded the worker is discharged and is on his own resources. If the Government so desires, it can set limits on the salary reduction a changing worker can be forced to accept, or it can provide training schools or allowances for those with obsolete skills. It might even provide moving allowances.

In the meantime, the business enterprise would be paying for and using some employees that it would rather not have. The business enterprise that wished to discard some of its workers in order to reduce production might be faced with losses during the time that it was prevented from taking

[1] There is no intent to apply this restriction to those individuals that the enterprise wished to discharge for inefficiency or insubordination. The restriction would apply only to those individuals that the enterprise wishes to discharge in the interests of a change or contraction in production.

such action. Indeed, any enterprise in such a position might find itself in grave difficulties, as one of its main elements of adjustment toward profitableness is no longer present. No enterprise could continue under such conditions indefinitely; and in many cases, where labor is a very large element in cost, the enterprise would face an immediate and rapid loss of liquid funds. To meet this eventuality, the enterprise would draw liquid funds from the insurance fund as soon as out-of-pocket losses occurred.[2] In other words, as soon as the amount of money disbursed in production and distribution exceeds the income from sales, the enterprise applies for insurance payments in an amount corresponding to the lesser of (1) the total amount of the salaries or wages of the workers listed to be discharged, or (2) the total amount of out-of-pocket losses. The payments from the fund will enable the enterprise to meet its current obligations and continue as a producer. As the employees move to other enterprises the amount of the payments will be reduced. These payments will not provide for the long-term needs of the enterprise for depreciation and for capital remuneration, nor is it the intent of the proposal to do so, any more than such a provision exists at the present time. The purpose of the payments is the continuance of the enterprise during the period of time that is required to move unwanted employees to other enterprises. When out-of-pocket losses disappear or the listed employees move elsewhere the enterprise will be left to provide for itself the funds needed for its continued existence.[3]

The fund from which the payments would be made to enterprises would be a national insurance fund, set up and underwritten by the Government. Contributions to the fund is a matter of governmental preference and opinion, and the size of the fund is a matter for experimental determination. The size of the fund, however, is not likely to involve the Government in serious financial difficulties. In the first place, there will be no demand for funds until out-of-pocket losses appear. In the second place, except in periods of contraction and depression, which the proposal is designed to limit, the number of enterprises in difficulty is not great. And of the enterprises that are in difficulty, not many are totally unprofitable; most are partially overexpanded in one way or another.

At first glance, the influences of the proposal on the flexibility of the individual enterprise are not pleasant for the intrepreneur to contemplate, any more than the inflexibility introduced into enterprise structure by the need for large amounts of fixed and specialized capital is pleasant. Part of the presently existing flexibility of the enterprise to make a profit would be removed, and to that extent the hazards of business would be increased. However, a good part of the need for flexibility would also be removed. Changes in cost and demand would continue to occur, and would continue to influence some enterprises to greater profit and others to loss. Such loss influences that did occur, however, would be frozen in the enterprises directly influenced until the shifts in productive forces demanded by changes and evidenced by the cost and demand picture had been accomplished.

In other words, every entrepreneur would have to worry about his relative competitive position, but he could cease to worry about the large swings in the prosperity of the entire economy. The decreased flexibility of the individual enterprise would contribute to the flexibility of the entire economy and leave the entrepreneur vulnerable to his own mistakes, but it would protect him from the major indirect influences of the mistakes of others.

The interest of the economy is in the flexibility for profit making of the business enterprise only insofar as actions toward profit contribute to the wants of the people in the economy. At the present time enterprises in difficulty do not contribute to the maintenance of production or employment by adjusting to a more profitable position via the channel of a reduction in the use of labor. By such adjustment enterprises contribute to idleness throughout the entire economy. The first step in the present enterprise action forces some productive elements to become idle; the further influence of this idleness is more idleness.

If the ability of the enterprise to reach profitableness by a direct and immediate discharge of employees is removed, the enterprise is forced to use other methods. If the enterprise shifts its own production, there is an obvious benefit to the economy. If a shift in production is not possible, the enterprise is forced to mark time until other enterprises that are moving in the direction of increased profit by expansion can take up the slack of the contracting enterprise and so maintain the activity of the economy.

During the period of "marking time," the changes that helped some enterprises will have time to react without the cumulative obstruction of the influences that would arise out of a decrease in employment and production by those enterprises not so favorably situated. During this same period, the adversely influenced enterprises will be taking some action to maximize profits or minimize losses. If they strive to reduce other costs they are contributing in some manner to increased efficiency, since the enterprise can save very little by not using the productive forces which they are paying, and as the enterprise must continue the purchase of some raw materials for labor to use.

Likewise any action the enterprise takes toward increased income will be beneficial as it will depend on the best use, not disuse, of the existing productive facilities. In many cases an enterprise striving to get the most revenue out of an overexpanded production, without piling up a tremendous amount of inventory, will lower prices. Lower prices will have a further influence by enabling present customers to shift some of their expenditures and thereby tend to increase the ability of other enterprises to take listed employees. In other words, under the proposal the enterprises in difficulty will, in many cases, take action toward increased profitableness that will be direct or indirect influences to a redistribution of effort in the economy. In no case, will the enterprises in difficulty take action that will force direct idleness on some productive labor.

This tendency to use and pay for the productive forces of the economy obviously is a direct force exerted toward the maintenance of the real income produced and consumed by the economy, and a material aid in the orderly redistribution of productive effort. At the same time, individual enterprise is not hampered in its decisions and initiative any more than the obligations assumed under long-term financing are considered hampering. The proposal is merely a set of rules designed to recognize by legal contract the implications in a situation that exists in fact—workers do not have the ability to shift their services immediately.

The type of responsibility suggested by the proposal has a strong precedent in the American economy. Most agriculture is carried on by farms that are both family and enterprise units, and as such, they have never considered family workers to be economic forces that are subject to discard at the whim of enterprise expediency. Agriculture has placed itself at a disadvantage in its dealings with the industrial section of the economy by assuming an additional responsibility. Even though agricultural workers have moved into industrial production during periods of expansion (when they were needed most on the farm), these same workers have returned to the land when they were discharged by industry during the periods of economic contraction and depression (when they were needed least on the farm).

That this responsibility in agriculture was and is based on a family rather than a legal relationship does not remove the fact that the responsibility has tended to maintain the real income produced and the employment of the factors of production in agriculture when other sections of the economy were declining. As long as agriculture was the dominant section of the economy and thereby provided the major portion of the real income of the economy, this responsibility tended to mitigate the worst results of an industrial contraction. The disappearance of the frontier and the dominance of industrially produced goods now places the problem squarely on the doorstep of the industrial section of the economy.

It is true that agriculture has not prospered in recent times and that farming is a way of life as well as a business enterprise, which gives agriculture a staying power that the industrial enterprise does not have. Nevertheless, the fact that the farmer has made a living while he assumed an additional responsibility under the worst possible circumstances—alone—should indicate that enterprises in general could prosper if the responsibility was universally adopted to increase the flexibility of the economy and thereby maintain production and employment in the entire economy.

HENRY C. LANGER, Jr.

[2] Out-of-pocket losses are not to be construed as including interest payments or depreciation or other expenditures in capital control.

[3] There is nothing in this proposal to prevent the business enterprise from building up depreciation reserves or surpluses during its profitable years to enable it to provide for its long-run capital fund remuneration and capital equipment replacement needs.

Milk Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address recently made by Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator:

No food has a more important place in our wartime supply than milk and its products, and in many ways the dairy cow is our most important farm animal. Today, with the success of our armies depending so largely on efficient food management at home, dairy products deserve the Nation's earnest and thoughtful attention.

This importance of milk and the dairy cow is as old as the first chapter of Genesis. Since the Creator first made cattle and gave man dominion over them, cattle have shared, through the ages, man's struggle for food and survival. For centuries cattle have been called the mother of the human race. In addition they have helped man clear his forests and plow his lands and grow his crops. Fnally, they have provided him meat to sustain his strength, leather to protect his feet, and their bones to enrich his lands again.

Today milk and its products have gone to war once more, as they have through the ages, even before the time when David provided his soldiers with cheese and butter as they prepared to meet the hosts of Absalom.

But never before in all that long history has milk gone to war on so many fronts and in so many different forms as now. It is dropped by parachute in the remotest jungles in the Pacific. It goes with our planes above the earth and with our submarines beneath the seas, and it nourishes our soldiers on the beaches and in the deserts and the mountains on all the continents between.

And never has it gone to war in such tremendous quantities as now. American farmers produced 60 percent more milk last year than in any year during the other war. Our civilians consumed more milk per capita last year than in 1918. And we exported last year for our allies more than twice as much as in any year during the other war.

These are records to be proud of—particularly since we produced more milk during the past 2 years than any other 2 years in our history, with fewer people on farms than at any time in the last 25 years.

There are two significant facts that I want to mention about this tremendous production. One is that not only has the Nation increased dairy production but it has made a much better use of what it produced. Last year 63 percent of the nonfat solids was used for human food compared with 54 percent during and before the war.

The other is that, through careful distribution, including rationing of butter, cheese, and canned milk, these concentrated products that could be efficiently stored and shipped were sent to our soldiers and fighting Allies. While our civilians consumed somewhat less of these products last year they consumed a good deal more fluid milk and fluid cream per capita—405 pounds per person as compared with 342 pounds pre-war.

Milk production reached an all-time high in 1942 with 119,000,000,000 pounds. And our farmers came within 1 percent of breaking even that record last year. For 1944 the goal is 121,000,000,000 pounds or about 2½ percent above last year's production. That does not mean the goal will be reached. Since we have about 2 percent more milk cows than a year ago, a very slight increase per cow would make the goal—but there are many problems. Records such as I have mentioned do not come without problems and there are many today. They are to be expected. They are to be met. They are to be overcome if possible.

In connection with these difficulties there are some important facts to consider.

Why should we increase dairy production in 1944? There are several reasons.

First, the total needs for milk and its products for our military, lend-lease, and civilian uses are more urgent than for many other foods. The needs for concentrated milk products and for our military and lend-leases are especially pressing now, although they received only 13 percent of our production last year.

Second, the dairy cow is the most efficient converter of feed to human food. A hundred pounds of feed will produce more protein, if fed a milk cow, than when fed in any other way, and will produce many times as much of important minerals and vitamins. Producing more milk, therefore, means getting more food from our limited feed supplies.

Third, this is the time when we need that most efficient use of our feed. We began the war with the largest feed supplies in our history and have been blessed with the largest production of corn and other feeds the Nation has ever produced, but our livestock numbers have increased even more. The big problem facing all livestock producers now is to make our livestock pattern fit our feed supply and to make that feed supply as large as possible. It is not easy to increase further our sources of food. Most of our increases from now on will come only by getting the maximum return from every resource used. Fortunately we can increase the yields of grass, and the maximum return from grass and other feeds comes through the dairy cow.

Now, what are some of the problems that dairy farmers face in their effort for greater production in 1944? Feed is a No. 1 problem, which I have already mentioned. Another major problem is the relationship of milk prices with prices of other farm products. If returns from other products are more favorable than from milk, feed and labor resources may be diverted to some extent from dairy production.

That is why the dairy-payments program was developed by the War Food Administration last fall. The dairy payments have helped to restore more nearly normal price relationships, and thus have helped maintain production. These payments have also increased whole-milk deliveries, and this has helped to increase production of powdered milk and other milk products.

The supply of skilled labor and machinery continues to be a problem, of course, and must be expected in time of war. But our farmers have already proved that they can overcome this kind of difficulty. Their steady increase in number of cows milked is proof enough of that. No one ever needs to worry about the American farmer meeting the kind of a war problem that he can tackle with his own hands, his own courage, and his own skill—the kind of problem that he can lick with resourcefulness and hard work.

All over the Nation's farms these problems are being met and overcome. And we must remember that cows are being milked on nearly 5,000,000 of our slightly more than 6,000,000 farms in this Nation today.

I have talked so far about production, because production is, of course, a basic factor. But efficient distribution is almost equally important. The problem has been to supply our own civilians and, at the same time, to meet the needs of our military forces and our allies. In spite of all our enormous production, neither group has been able to get all the dairy products they have asked for.

Because of our increased national income, our civilians have more money to spend than ever before for foods like milk and ice cream and butter and cheese. Our high all-time record for the past 2 years has been at a rate of about 119,000,000,000 pounds a year—but it has been estimated that about 145,000,000,000 pounds would have been required to meet all the demands. Because of these tremendous demands, and in spite of our increased supply, it has been necessary to examine all these demands carefully and to make the best allocation possible of the milk and milk products available.

This distribution problem is further complicated by the fact that milk may be consumed in so many forms—as fresh milk, ice cream, butter, cheese, evaporated milk, cream, cottage cheese, etc. Not only does efficient distribution for the best interests of all call for wise provision for the various people who ask for it but it also calls for the best balance between different kinds of milk products.

It was necessary to limit the use of certain forms of milk, in order to channel the maximum milk and butterfat into those products that are most needed for the war effort, such as evaporated milk, butter, cheese, and powdered milk Farmers have been urged wherever possible to deliver whole milk rather than farm-separated cream.

The result has been a more nearly complete use of all the food value that there is in our total supply of milk.

These problems have not all been solved. New problems appear almost as fast as the old ones disappear. We have learned to expect this in time of war. In the meantime the War Food Administration will continue to welcome the advice and cooperation of the farmers and dairymen of this Nation, as well as the processors and all the others who have had their part in this great business of producing and efficiently distributing this important food.

After the war the problems which confront the dairymen may prove to be less difficult than the problems which the producer of some other farm products will be called upon to face. The long-time demand for dairy products appears to be upward. The greatly increased use of milk and its products in so many forms will have left its effect on the Nation's continuing demand.

From the time when Columbus brought a few cattle on his second voyage to America their importance in our economy and in our diet has continued to grow. Today we are the greatest dairy country in the world, and in normal years the sale of milk and its products accounts for about one-fifth of our total farm income from all sources. An industry of this tremendous size, with such an impressive past, can be expected somehow to solve its problems in the future. Today milk has gone to war, and when peace comes it will continue, as it has through the ages, to serve mankind.

Churchill and the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Churchill Buries the Atlantic Charter", by William Henry Chamberlin, from The Progressive, LA FOLLETTE'S magazine, for Monday, March 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL BURIES THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The one thing that a people is sure to get out of a war is the fight. But prolonged conflicts have a way of making mincemeat out of the idealistic aspirations and programs which have been announced as war aims.

Central Europe was ravaged and almost barbarized in the first half of the seventeenth century by an international struggle that is known in history as the Thirty Years War. This war started over Bohemia, just as the Second World War seemed likely to start over Czechoslovakia in 1938. But by the time the Thirty Years War was ended by the peace of Westphalia the Bohemian dispute had been forgotten amid the press of other aims and ambitions, political, dynastic, religious.

The Second World War actually began not over Czechoslovakia but over Poland. But at the present time it seems, ironically enough, that one of the certain results of the conflict will be the loss by Poland of about 40 percent of its prewar territory. And one of the probable results will be the loss by Poland of any genuine independence, its decline into the status of a vassal state of the Soviet Union.

The ideological battle flag of the United Nations has been the Atlantic Charter. It has

been the equivalent of Wilson's Fourteen Points in World War No. 1. Imperfect as it is in many matters of concrete detail, it is the clearest available statement of the war aims of the United Nations. And now it has been formally buried by Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of one of the leading belligerents.

WHAT CHURCHILL SAID

In his speech before Parliament February 22, his first major public utterance in several months, Mr. Churchill specifically repudiated the Atlantic Charter as regards Germany, an enemy, and implicitly renounced it as applying to Poland, an ally, the very country for whose sake Great Britain ostensibly took up arms in the first place. The pertinent passage in Mr. Churchill's speech reads as follows:

"I cannot feel that the Russian demand for reassurances about her western frontiers goes beyond the limits of what is reasonable or just. Marshal Stalin and I also spoke and agreed upon the need for Poland to obtain compensation at the expense of Germany both in the north and in the west.

"Here I may point out that the term 'unconditional surrender' does not mean that the German people will be enslaved or destroyed. It means, however, that the Allies will not be bound to them at the moment of surrender by any pact or obligation. There will be no question, for instance, of the Atlantic Charter applying to Germany as a matter of right and barring territorial transferences or adjustments in enemy countries.

"Unconditional surrender means that the victors have a free hand."

Now, there is not the slightest basis in the phrasing of the Atlantic Charter to warrant Mr. Churchill's arbitrary assumption that it does not apply to Germany. Against the cynical chicanery of the proposal to hand over a large slice of Poland to the Soviet Union, which already contains about one-sixth of the land surface of the globe, and to "compensate" Poland with an undefined slice of purely German territory set the plain, unambiguous language of the first three points of the document in question. The Atlantic Charter proclaims:

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In this language of the Charter there are no exceptions for any power—allied, neutral, or enemy. And all the United Nations governments have announced their adhesion to the Atlantic Charter. If its plain meaning is set aside by one great power after another on transparently fictitious pretexts, what confidence can be placed in any international obligation or commitment? What reason will there be to regard any war aims except naked plunder as possessing any valid existence?

It is sometimes argued that the Soviet Union is not bound by the Atlantic Charter as regards its annexations in eastern Europe because these annexations were carried out before the Atlantic Charter was drawn up on August 14, 1941. But this argument does not rest on any firm foundation. What would have been the reaction if Hitler had announced his acceptance of the Atlantic Charter on August 15, adding as an afterthought that he would keep the territorial loot he had acquired up to that time?

FUTURE PEACE THREATENED

Moreover, the Soviet Union, at its own initiative, concluded treaties of nonaggression and neutrality with its five western neighbors—Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia. All these treaties were based on respect for existing frontiers. As recently as July 31, 1941, the Soviet Government concluded an agreement with the Polish Government-in-exile recognizing that "the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland have lost validity."

It is not only the sanctity of international treaty obligations that has been very gravely called into question by Mr. Churchill's formal repudiation of the plain content of the Atlantic Charter. To be sure, this is no light matter. Much of the propaganda in favor of American participation in the war before Pearl Harbor was based on the contention that it was impossible to live in permanent peace with governments that repeatedly violated their engagements.

But the kind of unscrupulous deal, bartering people as if they were cattle, that would be involved in arbitrary one-sided territorial changes in the frontiers of Poland and Germany, is not only morally wrong but very dangerous and inexpedient from the standpoint of future peace. There was no such clear-cut violation of the principle of self-determination in the Treaty of Versailles.

HOW TO WEAKEN POLAND

It is, moreover, very important to maintain the principle of self-determination not for the sake of some abstract doctrinaire theory, not certainly out of any special tenderness for Germans, but because this principle is a cornerstone of any lasting peaceful settlement in Europe. It was criminal and absurd for the Nazis to try to make Poles, Frenchmen, Czechs into Germans. It would be just as criminal and absurd to reverse this process and to try to turn Germans into Frenchmen, Poles, or Czechs.

Because Germany was defeated in the last war, it received the worst of every doubt in the delimitation of its eastern boundary. It would be a fair price to pay for acquiscence in Hitler's rule that this boundary should be restored. Germany should be left with the consciousness that it gained nothing by resort to violence. But the incorporation of such a solidly German region as East Prussia in Poland would be a source of weakness, not of strength to the future Poland.

No conceivable German Government, however, republican or socialist, would ever accept this settlement as final, just as no French Government was willing to recognize the justice of the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, although the racial make-up of those Provinces, especially in the case of Alsace, was much more mixed than is the case in East Prussia. Consequently, a Poland that accepted a gift of such dubious value at the hands of Stalin would fall into perpetual dependence on the Soviet Union, which alone could protect it against German demands for the return of the lost territory.

And one can imagine the bitterness that must be welling up in the hearts of Poles all over the world (and tens of thousands of them have been fighting bravely in the United Nations forces as aviators, soldiers, and sailors) at Churchill's endorsement of Stalin's territorial demands. The racial, political, and economic situation in eastern Poland is very complex, too complex to analyze in any adequate detail here.

But the minimum that the Poles had a right to expect, in view of their long struggle against overwhelming odds, was that there should be no change in their 1939 boundaries except as a result of a free plebiscite. Churchill's speech, with its blanket endorsement of Stalin's demands, seems to deny this minimum and to leave the Poles at the mercy of whatever political and territorial demands Stalin may choose to put forward.

HARDLY A RIPPLE HERE

A new Munich has been enacted, with Poles, Letts, Lithuanians, Estonians in the role of the Czechs, with Stalin following the tactics of Hitler, and Churchill, cigar and all, following in the footsteps of Neville Chamberlain, of umbrella fame. It is to the credit of British political independence and of the British sense for the significance of international developments that Churchill's speech did not pass unchallenged in Parliament.

According to the dispatch of James B. Reston in the New York Times of February 24, the Prime Minister was accused of making agreements with the Soviet Union that he was "positively ashamed to reveal to the country." One oppositionist called him "a Charlie McCarthy for Marshal Stalin."

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden does not seem to have been very happy over the policy of capitulation that was implicit in Churchill's speech. "I can only promise the House," he said, "plenty of difficulties, plenty of disappointments, and much deception in the times that lie ahead." Perhaps Eden was thinking of the Pravda canard and of Stalin's contemptuous disregard of the machinery for consultative action that had been set up at the Hull-Eden-Molotov conference in Moscow last autumn.

It is to the discredit of American awareness of international trends that Churchill's burial of the Atlantic Charter scarcely produced a ripple in this country. This fateful statement closely followed a Nation-wide drive which the Methodist Church had sponsored to stimulate interest in a just peace among its members. The Baptists and other denominations are supposed to launch similar movements in the near future.

Certainly the creation of conditions for an enduring peace should be an important concern for members of every religious group, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, and for all Americans of good will. But some of the participants in the Methodist drive seemed to be thinking in the unreal terms of "collaboration" versus "isolationism." It should certainly be clear after Churchill's speech that what is significant is not "collaboration," as such, but the terms and aims and purposes of this collaboration.

Despite the exaggerated legend of American isolationism between the two wars, the record shows that America never rejected constructive cooperation for peace. But cooperation pointed toward the unscrupulous division of the world into spheres of influences dominated by a few strong powers, where territories are bartered about with no regard for the will of the peoples concerned—this is something very different.

It is high time that our diplomacy became more effective in world affairs and that our people learned more of the facts they must know if our diplomacy is to be intelligently and democratically directed. Tehran is a sort of unknown idol, before which we are supposed to bow down and worship in silent awe. But Mr. Churchill has lifted a bit of the curtain that conceals what actually went on in the Iranian capital, and the picture is not a pretty one.

PRETTY FRAGILE FOUNDATION

About all we know from Mr. Roosevelt about Tehran is that, in his own words, he "got along fine" with Marshal Stalin. This strictly personal agreement is a pretty fragile foundation for a structure of world peace based on justice. If the American people want to get more out of this war than the fight it is high time that their representatives should begin to put a few blunt and direct questions as to whether Tehran meant the scrapping of the Atlantic Charter, as implied in Mr. Churchill's speech, and, if so, just what are the objectives for which we are supposed to be fighting.

Personally I cannot imagine anything more salutary or more conducive to a post-war settlement on just principles than the affirmation, by resolution of the Senate, of belief in the right of self-determination of peoples

and the refusal, in advance, of approval of any treaty or international settlement in which that right is denied, especially to peoples who were independent before 1939. Regions annexed in defiance of the will of the inhabitants should be specifically excepted from any arrangement underwritten by the United States.

Governors of Nine States Schedule Action on Missouri River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the river improvements on the Missouri River proposed in the legislation now before us from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I hope Members will realize that the so-called Pick plan for Missouri River development is now before the House Committee on Flood Control, where extensive hearings have been held on its feasibility and advisability. Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation has promised to have a complete report available for Congress by May 1 on the irrigation and reclamation possibilities and potentialities in the Missouri River watershed. Out of all these engineering studies and reports it is hoped to bring before the present session of Congress a proposal for the comprehensive, all-purpose development of the entire Missouri River system.

Recently I have sent every Member of the Senate and the House a copy of a booklet on the Missouri River entitled "The Future Development of the Missouri River Valley." It is a 64-page booklet, bound in blue covers, which was issued by the Council of State Governments. I hope Members will take the time to examine this booklet as it contains information of significance and value to the entire Republic.

I have also sent every Member of the Senate and the House a copy of the February 29 issue of the Evening Huronite, daily newspaper published in Huron, S. Dak. Section two of this paper, which is the annual farm edition of the Evening Huronite, contains a diagram indicating how irrigation can be used to increase the production of foodstuffs in the great agricultural State of South Dakota and the printed matter in this edition stresses the national importance of bringing into production the many comparatively idle acres in this area.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I shall include with these remarks a newspaper reprint from the March 14 issue of the World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., which reports the results of a conference attended by the nine Governors of the Missouri River Valley. Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, was chairman of this conference and the results of the meeting indicate a clear desire to proceed with river development on the basis of getting the maximum benefits from this great undeveloped asset and of working together so that river improvement may not only eliminate the costly floods now rushing down the Missouri River Valley almost annually but so that it will also bring to this area the greatest possible constructive dividends.

The article follows:

GOVERNORS OF RIVER STATES TO NAME ENGINEERS' BOARD—RIVER BOARD TO BE NAMED—EACH STATE TO HAVE ENGINEER IN GROUP

The nine Governors of the Missouri River States committee, in their final session here Tuesday morning, voted to establish a board of engineers composed of one representative of each State to study the technical aspects of valley-wide development. This will be a subcommittee of the general committee.

Emphasizing the need for speedy action, the Governors authorized their chairman, Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, to call an organization meeting of the board of engineers as soon as possible. This board is requested to make its technical report not later than June 1.

The Missouri River States committee will come to Omaha for another meeting as soon as desired information is available.

Governor Sharpe told newsmen that the engineering board will consult with Army engineers and the bureau of reclamation, as well as other Government agencies, in an effort to find how much water is available, and how it can be apportioned to best satisfy all proposed uses.

The board will try to satisfy itself whether or not there is sufficient water in the Missouri basis for needed irrigation and a 9-foot channel. Army engineers say that there is. The bureau of reclamation expresses skepticism on that score.

Each of the several resolutions passed Tuesday morning met unanimous approval. The Governors had agreed that they would not take any action that was not unanimous.

SPEED URGED

Another resolution directed Sharpe to exert all influence to get speedy action from the Government agencies, which have an interest in the Pick plan. This resolution included a request that the bureau of reclamation have its final report ready as soon as possible—and not later than mid April. All reports are to be coordinated.

ALL PLEASED AT RESULTS

After the meeting ended, the Governors were unanimous in expressing their satisfaction over the results of the meeting.

"It fulfilled all my hopes," said Governor Sharpe. "It accomplished more than I expected. It's quite plain we can achieve a united effort."

Governor Dwight Griswold said the meeting worked out even better than he had anticipated. "I feel there is definite hope for overall development," he said, "and Nebraska, situated right in the center, is vitally interested in it."

Gov. John Moses, of North Dakota, said he felt the meeting had "gotten down to earth."

"I'm satisfied that if we continue to approach this matter in the same spirit of fairness, we will be able to give everybody his just needs," he said.

The Tuesday morning meeting was a closed session.

At the meeting also were Brig. Gen. Roscoe C. Crawford, chief of the Army engineers' Missouri River division, and members of his staff, as well as a dozen officials from the various States.

The chairman, Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, said that Tuesday's executive session would take up where Monday's open meeting left off. But it was impossible to predict what developments, if any, would result from the executive session.

A note on States' rights and States' independence was struck Tuesday morning by Gov. Sam C. Ford, of Montana, when he said Montana wants to pay its own way on any reclamation work done in that State.

"In Washington and also here in Omaha I've heard discussions to the effect that all of these proposed improvements would be at Government expense, and that the States would receive free water for reclamation," he said.

"We in Montana have always been willing to pay our way for reclamation development. These projects should be self-liquidating.

"We've heard a great deal of complaint about Government encroachment on States' rights. If we accept these projects they will remain under Federal control, and the States will lose their rights."

At Monday's meeting spokesmen for all nine States put their cards on the table, told of their own requirements, and listened to the other fellow's side of the picture. At the conclusion of the all-day session, Governor Sharpe summed the results in these words:

TELL OWN NEEDS

"Our effort in behalf of this great project took a long step forward today. From the talks it was obvious that there is a desire on the part of all nine States to accomplish this project, and the various States evidenced their intention to cooperate until they do get it. It is also plain that they will waive any nonessential rights in favor of getting a valleywide plan adopted," Sharpe went on.

"I was especially impressed by the great spirit of frankness which pervaded the talks."

Each Governor, also called on Representatives of his State. Scarcely a speaker failed to express his desire to cooperate toward achieving the basin-wide development. But neither did the speakers mince words about the fundamental water needs of their own States, and the necessity for safeguarding those requirements.

The picture presented Monday was not complete, because the Reclamation Bureau's report is lacking. The group was told that the plan will be finished by April 10. Several speakers were skeptical, saying that they had been advised that the plan was ready 4 years ago.

Spokesmen for the upper river States advised against taking any action until that report is in. Typical was the remark of Hunt when he said:

"Wyoming is anxious that this comprehensive plan be adopted. But we need to know that our present and future water rights will be protected. We don't know exactly what the over-all plan provides for. We don't know, for example, how much water a 9-foot channel will require. Wyoming must be cautious because in the past we have lost tremendously important water rights."

UNDULY ALARMED

Moses said that his State found the Pick plan not so comprehensive as it had been led to believe. "All we ask," he said, "is that we have the whole plan in one package. We don't want it to come piecemeal."

North Dakota needs water to stabilize its farming industry, he said, so that it will not again be necessary for the Federal Government to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for relief in the western area.

Moses said that he feels that the lower States are unduly alarmed about the diversion of water into the Cheyenne River (and on to Canada), for not more than 5 percent of a comparatively small diversion will go into Canada. Moses said he regretted the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation plan was not available.

D. P. Fabrick, of Montana, suggested that, rather than providing open-channel navigation, the answer may lie in establishing a system of locks and dams on the river. This type of navigation would require only a fraction of the water, he said. He added that he

had heard the chairman of Congress' Rivers and Harbors Committee suggest such plugs as the solution.

But other speakers pointed out that this would pose a problem as to stream pollution and sewage disposal.

Hickenlooper said that Iowans generally accept the Pick plan in principle, though they have little understanding of it. "I think the people of Iowa are anxious to see development of this river valley on a practical basis," he said.

"We visualize two great arteries of transportation on our borders" he said. "We already have one in the Mississippi, and we hope the 9-foot channel in the Missouri will be completed soon."

Schoeppel warned that he intended to "keep one eye cocked" to see that the States have a hand in the control of the development. Schoeppel said Kansas "would go a long way" to cooperate with the other States.

BETTER TO WAIT THAN ERR

Cautioning against any definite action until the Reclamation Bureau's report is in, O. S. Warden, Montana's president of the National Reclamation Association, said, "We have at last attracted the attention of the statesmen in Washington. It is better to wait 3 or 4 weeks than to make serious errors. We are determined to win, and not to get into a scrap."

John Forsyth, Niobrara, president of the Upper Missouri Valley Association said that organization, in a meeting at Yankton, S. Dak., had favored the Pick plan. "We would like to see a navigable channel up as far as Mobridge, S. Dak.," he said.

RIVER TRAFFIC SAVING

Speaking for the Mississippi Valley Association, Lachlan Macleay, St. Louis, asserted that $172,000,000 (much of it W. P. A. money) has been spent to build a 6-foot channel to Sioux City. "By spending $6,000,000 more," he said, "the Army engineers could provide a 9-foot channel to Sioux City, and then you would have a standard gage channel."

Omaha Park Commissioner Roy N. Towl said he favors the Pick plan in principle, but asserted that last spring's flood was due to construction of the navigation channel. "All we at Omaha ask," he said, "is that you lower the channel and reduce the constriction which has caused the costly flood."

W. H. Bunston, of Douglas, Mont., president of the Yellowstone River Development Association, said that only 5 percent of the land in that basin can be irrigated, but the State must irrigate all of that. "And we don't want any more Fort Peck dams," he declared. "Below that dam are 1,250,000 acres of land that need irrigation—and not a single diversion canal to take water to it."

Monday evening the visitors were guests of the chamber of commerce and the Greater Omaha Association at a dinner at the Fontenelle Hotel.

The governors spoke briefly at the evening program. Leo Bozell, president of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, presented Sharpe, Griswold introduced the others.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Senator O'Mahoney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Meaning of St. Patrick's Day," delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Washington, D. C., on March 17, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Fourteen hundred and fifty years ago, there died in Ireland a bondsman who had become a bishop, and annually for 15 centuries men and women of Irish lineage have assembled upon the anniversary of that loss to pay homage to the saint who brought the Christian faith to their ancestors.

There is a deep significance in the fact that we assemble upon the anniversary of our patron saint's death, and there is significance also in the fact that this great spiritual leader of Christianity rose to world-acknowledged eminence from a position of servitude.

In these two circumstances, that we pay tribute to the memory of this man as though we were gathered around his bier, and that we render homage with love and respect to the individual achievements of a man who rose from bondage to a bishopric, may be found the secret of Irish character. In the ascent of this man and in the age-long loyalty of the people of Ireland and of the Irish race to his memory may be found the reason for those spiritual virtues which we like to believe are the treasured possession of the Celtic race.

This day that we celebrate here in Washington, throughout the United States, and throughout the civilized world, wherever the sons and daughters of Ireland have gone, is not so much a day upon which to commemorate the achievements of our people, as it is a day upon which to weigh the values of the moral ideals which the life of Patrick teaches, and which have been handed down to us year by year since a day that antedates by centuries any government now existing.

We are told that when the young Patrick succeeded in making his escape from the ancient Irish master by whom he had been captured he formed a high resolution to return to Ireland as a free man. When in the course of time he had been ordained as a priest and commissioned as a missionary bishop it was by his own voluntary choice that he undertook to carry the Christian faith to Ireland. He must have recognized in the Irish people of that early day the qualities that convinced him they would accept the message it was his privilege to convey. He must have learned to love them while he was a prisoner among them.

We are told that when he approached Tara's Hill to be received, as all visitors from foreign lands were always courteously received at the court of the high King, the Druids, beholding the campfire built by Patrick and his followers within the area prohibited by pagan tradition, solemnly warned the ancient King, "Unless yon flame which is lighted tonight shall be extinguished before dawn it will never die out in Erin." It was not extinguished. And it has not died.

To Ireland Patrick brought the faith that God Himself created man free, that God Himself gave to every man not only a free will, but placed upon him the responsibility for the proper exercise of the gift. Patrick taught the pagan Irish this doctrine of individual freedom and individual responsibility, this doctrine of Christianity that each man must be for himself the judge of his own conduct. From that day on down through history the people of no race or land have been more ready than the Irish to defend the principles of freedom and tolerance.

We read the past only as a guide to the future. When, on St. Patrick's Day, we cast our eyes backward over the centuries which have gone it is altogether fruitless unless we do so in order to chart the course we are to follow. It avails us nothing to boast of the achievements of our fathers unless we are ready to emulate their example. And so tonight, when we think of the ancient love of liberty instilled in the Irish people by St. Patrick, when we think of the spirit of tolerance which has always characterized them, it must be for the purpose of drawing from the practice and teaching of those who have gone before the determination to preserve now and to hand on to coming generations the same high devotion to principle that they bequeathed to us.

On St. Patrick's Day it can only be a matter of pride to every man and woman in whom the blood of Erin flows that the great Protestant historian (W. E. H.) Lecky is authority for the statement that even in the "fearful calamities" which marked the reign of Queen Mary and of James II there was no persecution of Protestant refugees in Ireland. The Huguenots and the Jews found sanctuary in Ireland, and in 1871 the Chief Rabbi of the Jews speaking at Dublin said that he had long desired to visit Erin for many reasons, but principally "because it was the only country in which his race had never been persecuted."

A thousand similar instances could be cited. We all know that in the long years before the final passage of the Emancipation Act, Protestant Irishmen like Emmett, Wolfe Tone, and Henry Grattan repaid the tolerance of the Irish by their own patriotic leadership in the struggle for freedom. We know that even in modern Ireland the Protestant Parnell was the leader of the Protestant cause, and that free Eire elected the Protestant Dr. Douglas Hyde as President.

I like to remember that men and women of Irish blood have brought the same spirit of freedom and tolerance with them to America. That this is true this very organization itself demonstrates. The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was brought into existence before the American Revolution, founded, as you all know, in Philadelphia in 1771. From that time until the present hour it has drawn no lines of religious or political division. In Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, wherever since the early days of the American Colonies men and women of Irish blood banded together, they did so in the kindly spirit of tolerance and understanding.

I like to think of the fact that when the Negro citizens of Massachusetts held what was probably the first great mass meeting of their race in this country in Fanueil Hall in Boston on December 7, 1885, they chose as the orator of the day an immigrant Irish patriot and poet, John Boyle O'Reilly. I like to remember the stirring message that he gave them:

"No race or nation is great or illustrious except by one test—the breeding of great men. Not great merchants or traders, not rich men, bankers, insurance mongers, or directors of gas companies. But great thinkers, great seers of the world through their own eyes, great tellers of the truth and beauties and colors and equities as they alone see them. Great poets—ah! great poets above all—and their brothers, great painters and musicians and fashioners of God's beautiful shapes in clay and marble and bronze.

"The Negro will not take his stand beside or above the white man till he has given the world proof of the truth and beauty and heroism and power that are in his soul. And only by the organs of the soul are these delivered; by the self-respect and self-reflection, by philosophy, religion, poetry, art, sacrifice, and love. One poet will be worth a hundred bankers and brokers, worth 10 Presidents of the United States to the Negro race. One great musician will speak to the world for the black man as no thousand editors or politicians can.

"The wealth of our western soil, in its endless miles of fertility, is less to America than the unworked wealth of the rich Negro nature."

We know now that the prophetic vision of O'Reilly has been justified. The Negro race has produced its poets, its musicians, its scientists. Paul Dunbar in literature, Marion Anderson and Paul Robeson in music, and George Washington Carver in science have already demonstrated that in the atmosphere of freedom and tolerance, the Negro nature can, as O'Reilly predicted, produce great men, "great tellers of the truths and beauties and colors and equities."

So from the past we take the lesson for the future. Never in all history was there a time when mankind stood in greater need than it does now of leadership to hold aloft everywhere the banners of freedom and of tolerance. Never was there a time when men stood in greater need of realizing that there can be no salvation, no prosperity, no peace, until all men everywhere are willing to acknowledge that their brothers are and of right ought to be free.

The whole world is engulfed in an appalling war because the evils of intolerance and imperialism have once more been let loose upon mankind by those who would substitute tyranny and thraldom for liberty.

The history of the century-long conflicts of Irish patriots and people has been the history of their struggle for economic and political freedom. We shall not understand the resistance of Ireland to British domination unless we recall that it was based upon the determination of the people of Ireland not to accept the subordination of individual liberty that accompanied the feudal system. William the Conqueror crossed from Normandy, conquered Britain, and imposed feudalism upon its people, but though he and his successors maintained for centuries their effort to conquer the Irish, they were never able to make Ireland accept feudalism, because Irishmen knew that the land was the means of livelihood. Private ownership of the land was the only security which the individual could have, and so the Irish through every succeeding generation insisted that the means of production should not be owned and controlled by the few while the many endured misery and want. The Irish would never consent to allow the people to be deprived of free access to the means of production.

It is the loss by the individual of this free access to the means by which to maintain his economic freedom that has brought about all the tragic ills from which the world now suffers. Men and nations have insisted through the application of force upon the exploitation of their fellowmen.

It is a policy that is now and always has been completely alien to the Irish character. The Irishman who is true to the traditions of his blood does not seek conquest, does not undertake to control any man's conscience, does not challenge the right of any man to the free exercise of his own individuality, but stands on the indestructible principle of individual freedom. For 1,500 years this has been the record of the race.

But we can take no pride whatever in what has gone before unless we now, drawing renewed loyalty from the record of devotion that has been handed down to us, take our place without reservation in the struggle for the preservation of human liberty and the abolition of the principles of imperialism and totalitarianism.

Gentlemen of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, I give you the toast that was committed to me: To the day we celebrate, to the devotion, to the heroism, to the tolerance of the men who have gone before us. May we rededicate ourselves to the great ideals they have defended. May God grant that we shall never lose their faith in freedom, nor the courage that was theirs to maintain it.

Post-War Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Post-war Prospects, delivered by me in Milwaukee, Wis., March 16, 1944, before the Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, it seems to be very fashionable of late to talk on the post-war picture. I thoroughly agree that it is desirable to do everything humanly possible to plan for the post-war period. We all know that the peace period may bring tests even greater than the war itself.

I do not believe, however, that it is possible to make any accurate forecasts on what lies ahead—until we have more information as to what Government itself will do. Frankly, I don't believe it is possible for industry to do much intelligent planning until certain assurances are forthcoming from Government itself.

Up to now, part of our Government policy has been written in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency. The remaining part of Government policy has been directed toward a steady advance into the field of private industry until it appears to me that the continued existence of private industry is seriously menaced.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I am not in any way referring to necessary war restrictions or regulations. It goes without saying that we all will make any sacrifice to win the war and to perpetuate freedom.

I am talking now about the preservation of those freedoms in the post-war period.

It would be presumptious for me to attempt to tell you what you can do in your industry to assure post-war prosperity. It would be the sheerest kind of crystal gazing for me to try to tell you the volume that your industry can expect to hit in the post-war period.

I can tell you that in my judgment your industry—as is true of all industry—is confronted with a dual problem.

1. What can we do to plan ahead?
2. What will the Government do?

Within certain limits you can answer the first question.

Your industry can engage in research. You can develop new products—new single-coat paints—new weather-resistant varnishes—new types of lacquers. You can study the housing trends and try to keep in line. If the trend is toward prefabrication, you can develop paints particularly suited to prefabricated panel units and factory application.

You can make surveys of the extent of homes renovation and proposed new housing and you can attempt to predict to some degree the potential market for your industry.

You can survey the Nation's industrial plants and you can attempt to figure how much of a maintenance volume there will be after the war. Incidentally, with the present tax load, industry has every reason to do a perfect job of plant maintenance during the war—so there probably won't be a very big volume of this business after the war.

You can engage in a crusade of advertising designed to create a post-war market for your products. You can create a demand for your new products. You can resell your old products.

These things you can do. What you cannot do, however, is predict the extent to which government will invade your business. What you cannot do is to predict the extent to which you will be taxed. What you cannot do is predict the extent to which you will be permitted to establish reserves. What you cannot do is predict the extent to which government will invade the housing field. What you cannot predict is the extent to which government will adopt policies which will perpetuate large producers to the exclusion of small producers.

These things you cannot do, and because you cannot, your plans and your future are necessarily extremely uncertain.

We hear a lot of scientific economic twaddle from Washington on the post-war picture. I say to you here tonight that the best thing Washington could do for the post-war economy is to adopt a clearly-defined, definite policy of preserving free enterprise.

Let Washington give us a bill of rights for business. Let Washington adopt a policy which will for all time scrap the lurid legend of the economic royalist. Let Government frankly admit the honesty and vitality of the profit motive. Let Government adopt a policy which will permit business to establish adequate reserves for the post-war period. Let Government adopt a policy which will leave a little seed corn for free enterprise.

I realize that the term free enterprise has become shop-worn and dusty. It has been used so much that it is somewhat bromidic. Nevertheless, I don't believe it is necessary for me here tonight to define it—because each of you here this evening represents a very vital part of that free enterprise.

I don't want to oversimplify, but I do believe that the greatest single impetus toward confidence for a post-war America would be a little indication from the Federal Government that business and industry would regain its rightful stature in the post-war period—that there would be no more period of business-baiting.

I am not one of the carefree optimists who take post-war prosperity for granted. In 1929 we had 48,000,000 people employed. There were less than a million unemployed.

Ten years later, in 1939, we employed 43,000,000 people, and we had eight to ten million unemployed. Yet we produced more than we did in 1929.

In 1944, we will produce about twice what we did in 1939, but our labor force will be only about 54,000,000. In other words, we are producing more per man.

This trend toward greater production per man is just as it should be. Nevertheless, it means that after the war we will have a terrific problem in balancing consumption, production, and employment.

Despite all this evidence, I still refuse to believe in selling America short. I still refuse to be a pessimist. While we are keenly conscious of the problem up ahead, we must nevertheless believe in the future.

In this industry, for example, you face a prebuilt, prefabricated housing boom with a million-unit-a-year output. In San Francisco recently, one concern completed 700 3-bedroom homes in 693 working hours. This was done by prefabrication. Four weeks after the ground was broken, a completed home was ready for occupancy every 30 minutes of the working day.

We'll need a million housing units annually in the decade following the war if housing

is to hold its own with the balance of our living economy.

The challenge to your industry and the relating housing industry is to develop homes for people of all income levels. We know that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has already demonstrated a prefabricated plywood home which can be shipped by air and erected by five men in 1½ hours. Those units are made from 4-foot panels folded together, 12 by 16 feet. The shipping weight of every building is 4,000 pounds. That is less than half the weight of similar buildings of conventional design.

Your industry may face a complete scientific revolution in the days up ahead. You can emerge greater than ever in the post-war period—if government will let you do the job. There are those within our Government who believe that industry and business cannot do the job. There are those within our Government who already have the blueprints of a future with jobs provided by Government.

Post-war planning is not new. American business always planned ahead. The only new element about it is the Federal Government itself. You can anticipate marketing, distribution, costs, credit, and even competition—but you can't anticipate government controls.

Today we have control and regimentation of the last degree. Much of it is necessary in a wartime economy. Much of it is unnecessary under any situation. Yet, you and I know that the hardest job is not establishing regulations—it's withdrawing them.

Today we have a $20,000,000,000 industrial empire built in a period of less than 3 years. We have put up 1,500 new plants in this country. More than 1,100 of them are owned by Uncle Sam. Assuming that conditions do not change greatly between now and the end of the war, our Government will control 50 percent of the Nation's annual aluminum output. Ninety-two percent of our magnesium capacity will be owned by the Government. Nearly 100 percent of our synthetic rubber and high octane gasoline production will be owned by the Government. Half of all our machine tools and about 90 percent of our aircraft manufacture will be owned by the Government.

Today Uncle Sam buys 50 percent of our entire industrial output. Today our Government owns $60,000,000,000 worth of ships, tanks, guns, shoes, trucks, cars, medical supplies and Lord knows what. If the war ended tomorrow, we would have in this country about $75,000,000,000 in war contracts outstanding.

Moreover, Uncle Sam has become a great landowner to the extent of at least an additional 50,000 square miles of land, or an area the size of the New England States.

Back in 1940, we had forty-six and one-half million people employed, and less than one-half million were in war production. Our total production of goods ran about $100,000,000,000, of which only one-fiftieth or $2,000,000,000 was for the Nation's defense. Our military strength was estimated to be about six hundred thousand, and the Sixteenth Decennial Census indicated eight to nine million unemployed.

At the close of 1943, based on 1940 price levels, our production hit an estimated $155,000,000,000. More than one-half of this total—about $84,000,000,000—was war goods. Our total employment figures were in the neighborhood of 64,000,000 persons—almost a 50-percent increase over 1940. In 1944 we'll probably have a labor force of fifty-four million. Here in Milwaukee our increase has been greater than 75 percent.

In the Nation about 10,000,000 people are employed in the manufacture of munitions. Another ten million are in essential industries, and another ten million in the armed forces. At the close of 1942 it was estimated that there were between one and one-half and two million unemployed. Today our unemployment rolls have dwindled to zero.

Seventy-eight percent of the Nation's new industrial facilities which have been financed since June 1940 (the time when authority was granted to set up the Defense Plant Corporation and its many allied units) is controlled by Government capital. The other 22 percent is private capital.

What is going to happen to this vast industrial empire when the war is over? We may need an answer even before the war is over. A collapse of the enemy in Europe is certain to bring sharp changes in our military requirements.

What is going to happen to the firm that has a contract canceled? The Army and Navy are trying to work out a solution to this problem. On the other hand, the Comptroller General indicates that it is his job. The Senate committee headed by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, is tackling this assignment. But final action—favorable action—must come soon. Failure to act on this problem in the very near future, in view of cancelations already being made, may well lead to breaking the back of small business, and small business represents the backbone of the free enterprise system.

One idea that exists in the minds of some bureaucrats is the thought that business firms could take over some of the newly constructed plants and produce consumer goods for war-torn Europe. Our Government would pay them a price which would allow a fair profit, but the Government, in turn, would sell it to the nations of Europe and the rest of the world at cost. Who is paying for the losses involved? As usual, it is every taxpaying citizen.

One serious misunderstanding in the minds of many people today is the fact that manufacturing industries must absorb all of the labor supply if we are to have optimum employment. This is not true. Our labor supply must find its way into the employment rolls of every kind of business.

If the restrictions, regulations, and regimentation shackles are removed from business, and if our business environment is conducive to investors' capital, the surplus that will be provided as the result of our industries' gains will be reflected in every type of business.

No matter how successful post-war planning is, the results will not be utopian, as some people seem to think. However, if we are to have free enterprise, we will have to produce more items—items of better quality and at lower cost. If we are successful in this, we will find that we will be able to provide jobs for the American people.

An outstanding example of this is the fact that in 1920 we thought there wouldn't be a market for any more automobiles than were manufactured in that year. When the automobile industry developed its great production lines, we soon discovered we hadn't begun to tap the American market.

There are only two roads open to us. One is the traditional route of free enterprise. There will be no barriers to initiative; there will be no black-out of inventive genius; America will continue to be a great nation.

The other road is the drab, dreary road of Government regulation, regimentation, and control. There will be a barrier for initiative—a black-out of inventive genius—progress will go into hibernation, and America, with that kind of economy, could perhaps within a generation become a second-rate power.

It is free enterprise that has made a great American economy. It is free enterprise that will continue to make America great.

Development of Foreign Oil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Should the United States Government Develop Foreign Oil Resources?" delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] at America's Town Meeting of the Air on March 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The issue submitted for discussion is "Should the United States Government Develop Foreign Oil Resources?" The answer to this question is emphatically "No." Conversely, the desirability of the development of foreign oil resources by the private enterprise of our nationals must be as emphatically answered in the affirmative. Not only should foreign oil reserves be developed by our nationals in a world of free economy and open competition with the nationals of other nations, but our Government should lend active and firm diplomatic support and encouragement to their efforts and at all times should stand ready and willing to give every legitimate protection to the property rights secured by our nationals under such circstances.

Those who debate the desirability or undesirability of our Government developing foreign reserves or the physical construction of oil pipe lines, refineries, or other facilities within the boundaries of other countries entirely sidestep the issue. The question involved is whether the United States shall desert its principles of private enterprise and engage upon a reckless venture of owning and operating corporations for profit in competition with its own citizens and abdicate its policy of diplomatic support for its nationals abroad in favor of a policy of imperialism.

The proposal of some of our Government officials to engage the United States in the oil business, through the medium of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government organization which has entered into a tentative contract committing our Government to the building and permanent operation of a pipe line from the Persian Gulf, across Saudi Arabia, through Trans-Jordan and Palestine to a point on the eastern Mediterranean for the purpose of transporting oil from the concessions of the Standard Oil Co. of California, the Gulf Oil Corporation, and the Texas Co., is the initial step of the Government in the participation of the development of foreign oil resources.

But before discussing the hazards and difficulties involved let me first most emphatically and definitely refute the misleading inference that the construction, ownership, and operation of an oil pipe line across Saudi Arabia will ever at any time, now or in the future, create one single additional barrel of petroleum, gasoline, or other petroleum products for any consumer in the world. The pipe line does not discover a single barrel of oil reserve that is not already known. The pipe line does not make any new oil available to the United States or any other market. The proposed line would connect seaports that are now served by tanker transportation at a cost,

exclusive of Suez Canal charges, less than the cost involved in the pipe-line movement. The entire oil industry, without a single exception, has condemned the project as impractical and a noncommercial enterprise. Even the companies supposed to be benefited by this large expenditure of the taxpayers' money have not heretofore deemed the project of sufficient commercial merit to risk their own capital on it. If it were a commercial project you may be assured the companies would be anxious to build the line rather than give the Government a complete monopoly on their reserves, which is provided by the contract they have entered into with Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

The Petroleum Industry War Council, appointed by Mr. Ickes as Petroleum Administrator for War to advise him upon oil matters, at their last meeting, on March 1, without a single dissenting vote, condemned the project and recommended that the final contract between the Government and the oil companies not be executed and that the Petroleum Reserves Corporation be dissolved.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, made up exclusively of independent producers, who foresee the darkening clouds of Government ownership, acting through their board of directors, unanimously condemned the project as foolhardy, impracticable, noncommercial, and un-American.

The 35 to 40 percent of the known oil reserves now owned in the Middle East by American nationals and the 75 to 80 percent owned in the Caribbean and South American countries was secured through the private enterprise of our American industry. Every barrel of that oil, wherever located, is available today and will always be available for our military needs if our naval strength is sufficient to keep the sea lanes open. On the contrary, if we are unable to keep the sea lanes open, the oil would not be available regardless of who owned it.

There are, however, more cogent and compelling reasons why our Government should not enter upon a policy of owning and operating corporations in competition to the private enterprise of our own people. It was this philosophy of government that destroyed Italy and has brought Germany to ruin. Already the mere announcement that our Government would build, own, and permanently operate a pipe-line transportation system upon and over the soil of a foreign country, for profit, has chilled the American oil industry with fear for its very existence. Likewise, every phase of American private enterprise is fearful that this bold move is the beginning of an offensive on all business. If it is proper for government to develop foreign oil reserves, then why not rubber, tin, aluminum, and all other natural resources? Businessmen know that when government moves in private enterprise moves out. The two are incompatible and irreconcilable. Government corporations are not required to earn a profit. They are not answerable to investors, stockholders, bondholders, or public regulatory bodies, similar to private corporations. A deficit to a Government corporation merely means another deduction from the pay-roll checks of American taxpayers. They pay no taxes but, on the contrary, are tax eaters. Private enterprise cannot compete with this type of competition.

Private enterprise has been America's great preparedness for war. Unlike the Axis Powers, America has not spent her energies in long years of preparation for war. On the contrary, the mass productive powers of private enterprise in America have made us the greatest and strongest Nation in the world. In 2 short years the ingenuity and native genius of private enterprise have equipped the finest Army and the greatest two-ocean Navy the world has ever seen. In the meantime we have kept a continual stream of war necessities flowing to every fighting front on the globe.

It is almost inconceivable that Americans, reared in such atmosphere, would be willing to gamble the destinies of America on a program that has proved so utterly devastating in other countries.

The Middle East is the only presently known oil-producing area open to the participation of our Government outside the United States and its possessions. Our good neighbors to the South have made it unlawful for any foreign government, directly or indirectly, to participate in any form in the development of their oil resources.

It is well recognized that the Middle East presents a complicated, diplomatic jigsaw puzzle. The ever-changing, unstable governments of the kingdoms and sheikdoms of that area, all within the sphere of British influence, are potential international dynamite. The Arabian-Palestine controversy has been the hottest problem in the British foreign office for many years. The hopes and desires of Russia in the post-war period in the Near East must be recognized and settled. It would, of course, be impossible for the Government of the United States to develop foreign oil reserves or to construct, maintain, and operate a transportation system such as is proposed without also maintaining a military force sufficiently large to protect our proprietary rights. No clairvoyant ability is needed to understand that such international activity is a constant threat to the peace and security of the people of the United States. Our intervention in the Middle East will probably be welcomed by the British. In the first place, the difficult job of maintaining the peace between Arabia and Palestine would be shared, if not entirely assumed, by our forces. If Russia is given a warm-water outlet on the Persian Gulf, as she will probably demand at the termination of the war, then American soldiers would stand as sentinels between the British-controlled Mediterranean on the west and the Russian expansion on the east, much to the comfort of the British.

American mothers and fathers are looking forward to the day when their sons and their daughters will have achieved the victory and be brought home to commence life again where they left off. I cannot believe that these fathers and mothers will approve of keeping the young manhood of this country in the Arabian Desert to guard Government oil resources or a Government-owned pipe line that is needless, useless, impractical, and fraught with the international complications, dangers, and hazards that are so apparent.

It is argued that, although the pipe line cannot be completed in time for any effective use in the European conflict, it would be a valuable military asset to the Pacific war against the Japs. The simple answer is that the pipe line is designed to transport the oil from west to east and away from the Pacific battle front. The sponsors of the line then fall back on the Rube Goldberg theory that it will make the Arabian reserves more easily available to the European market ordinarily supplied by South America and, in turn, the South American reserves would be shipped to the Pacific. This, of course, is an evasive argument, but assuming for the moment it is sound, I call attention to the proven reserves in Iraq, which are probably as large as the Arabian reserves and lie within 600 miles of the Mediterranean. These reserves are already connected to Mediterranean seaports by pipe lines. Experts tell us that with additional pipe-line facilities at less than half the cost and with half the steel that would be required for the Arabian pipe line, they can, within a short time, put a half million barrels of oil on the Mediterranean seacoast, and I may add without one cent of cost to the American taxpayers. American interests own 25 percent of the developed reserves in Iraq. These interests for months have been in Washington begging the Petroleum Administrator for War and the War Production Board for material with which private enterprise might build additions to their existing pipe lines in Iraq. But to date the material has been refused while plans are going ahead to build the Government-owned Arabian pipe line. Mr. Ickes, I ask you, Is this competition with private enterprise or not?

Those who would put our Government in the business of developing foreign oil resources insist that it is insurance against domestic oil famine. I deny the soundness of this argument. It is not true that we are faced with immediate exhaustion of our oil reserves in this country. It is true, that since 1938 we have drawn on our oil reserves at a rate in excess of new discoveries. There is a very substantial reason for this fact which our imperialistic Government officials would not know about. All students of the oil industry are perfectly aware of the fact that since the discovery of the great east Texas field in 1930 and through the greater part of 1940 there was a surplus of production in the United States.

The States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and California, accounting for over 80 percent of our petroleum output, all had potential production greatly in excess of market demand. During this entire period, the production in these States was severely cut back under the applicable State laws. As a consequence and as a reflection of the law of supply and demand the price of crude oil was low, and there was no particular incentive for exploration by independent producers who have been responsible for opening almost every large field in the United States. Beginning in 1941, our military requirements have consumed our surplus production. In the meantime, the industry has been entangled with red tape and burdensome regulations. The price of crude oil was frozen below the cost of production for a substantial portion of our petroleum outlet. The industry, since 1941, has faced a severe shortage of material, equipment, and manpower. Notwithstanding these handicaps, the industry, through new discoveries and the extension of old pools, closed the year 1943 with an estimated reserve of 20,064,152,000 barrels as compared to 20,082,793,000 barrels at the close of 1942—only 18,600,000 barrels difference, or slightly more than 4½ days of current production out of balance. This means that the oil industry replenished its known inventories, within practical limits, with the 1,500,000,000 barrels it was required to produce during 1943 for our own and Allied military forces. Given a fair price, relief from burdensome regulation, and a fair allocation of material and manpower is all that our American industry needs to insure a continued and adequate supply of petroleum for many years to come.

Assuming for the moment that we are faced with an immediate shortage of petroleum, which I certainly do not grant, is there any reason to believe that governmental bureaucracy will be more successful in finding and developing our oil resources at home or abroad than American private enterprise has been in the past? The history of Russia and Mexico, where the oil resources are Government monopolies, certainly does not encourage us to believe that there is any magic in Government ownership. Only last week it was announced in Washington that our Government had loaned the Mexican Government $10,000,000 in order that it may carry on its Government-owned petroleum operations. Who will loan Uncle Sam money when we fall into the same error?

Protection of Small Business After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address on the subject Must Government Controls Be Continued After the War To Protect Small Business? which I delivered before the American Business Congress, in New York City, on March 17.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question is: To what extent, if any, must Government controls be continued after the war to protect small business?

My answer is that the protection of American business, small and large, as well as the protection of American labor and American agriculture does not depend primarily on governmental controls. In a secondary sense, some continuance of governmental controls will help them all. If, however, governmental controls become the dominant or primary element of our post-war policy, they are likely to wreck, rather than to save, business, labor, and agriculture.

America will face her post-war recovery under the greatest handicap in her history. Her taxes will far exceed those before the war and her debt will be at least 10 times what it was before the war. We must pay these taxes and service this debt. The bonds evidencing our national debt are held by every bank, insurance company, church, trustee, and practically every family in America. Default on it would mean depression, unemployment, and suffering. It would open the door to such a totalitarian regimentation of our scarcity as to make us wonder whether we had won or lost the war.

To carry these taxes and this debt, we must create a condition of abundance. We must have a production of real wealth in America that will substantially exceed our production before the war. We have the high records of war production, we have the plants, the materials, the tools, the new inventions, the skilled workmen, the skilled supervision, the manpower for distribution and operation, and we have an ample demand here and abroad for our products.

To finance such development calls for a flexible flow of capital into countless enterprises. It calls for dynamic initiative and effort such as can be the product only of individual enterprise. It calls for a minimum of governmental expenditures for nonproductive supervision and reporting. It calls for a minimum of delay in making business decisions. It calls above all for stability and reasonable assurance of stability for a substantial number of years ahead so that private plans can be made and investments can be risked upon the probability of future developments. It calls also for governmental protection of fair practices and for governmental protection against economic dictatorships that can be as bad as political dictatorships.

Our primary obligation is to win the war and secure international peace and stability. This makes sound foreign policy a domestic necessity.

Our secondary obligation is to adjust the reins of governmental controls so as to encourage the vigorous development of private initiative, private employment, the investment of private capital, and the development of small, as well as large, private enterprises. Equally important is the need for passing from our war economy to our peace economy as smoothly and quickly as possible so that there may be no unnecessary moment of unemployment and no unnecessary delays in production.

In the place of the governmental direction of business, we urge governmental encouragement of individual enterprise through the adjustment of taxation. This is an appropriate field of indirect governmental control that is pregnant with productive possibilities. The first need in this field is to reduce governmental expense so as to reduce the need for taxes. The second need is to adjust the burden of the taxes so as to encourage the investment of large and small private capital in new and productive private enterprise, the turning back into further productive enterprise of the earnings of industry, and the cordial sharing of the earned proceeds with those who labor to produce them.

The burdens of regimentation and of taxation fall with especial weight upon the small businessman and especial attention needs to be given to relieving him of unessential reporting, to encouraging his use of the corporate form without unfair handicaps of taxation, and to the announcement of tax policies as far in advance as possible so that the businessman may have a long-term basis for post-war planning.

Rationing of the consumption of particular items of which there is a continuing shortage and retention of price control in the interest of checking price inflation where shortages exist will be needed for a time that cannot now be measured.

Our emphasis should be on the freeing as quickly as possible of the means of production so as to reduce all shortages. This means the early inventory and sale of surplus governmental plants, tools, materials, and supplies not needed for the war or for essential civilian requirements.

It is in the field of nonessential civilian articles that the scope for discretion comes. Here the policy can tend toward either a maximum or minimum of governmental guidance and control of materials and of governmental selection of individual producers. The Truman committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, in its recent annual report recommends a minimum of such control.

We recommend such release of surplus materials even during the war. We urge private enterprise to pick up these materials for all simpler uses of them that can be made, especially by small business, while larger and more complicated uses of them is impossible because of the military or essential civilian needs for some critical incidental items such as electric motors or ball bearings.

The committee expressly states "that we should have confidence in the operation of the free democracy for which the war is being fought. The committee therefore believes that a manufacturer should be allowed to make any article he desires to make and thinks he has the facilities to make providing:

"1. Basic commodities * * * that are required * * * are not required for the manufacture of war or essential civilian items;

"2. The proposed manufacturing operations are not undertaken in an area * * * having an acute manpower shortage; and

"3. The manufacturer has not been offered a contract or subcontract for a war item, or notified * * * that a contract probably will be offered him in the immediate future."

On the other hand, constructive governmental control will be needed to protect the war industries, the production of articles for essential civilian needs, and for a limited number of less essential civilian articles that will face a temporary shortage of materials for their production.

We recognize the need for continued protection of small business against monopoly and unfair methods of trade and competition. We believe that the best protection for small business is to win the war, to provide a stable international peace, to adjust taxes so as to encourage the use of private capital in productive enterprises, and to assure impartial administration of labor laws.

We believe that the best protection for small business is to give it the benefit of governmental attention, consultation, and cooperation, but to free it, and all other business, as much as possible from governmental control.

Equal Justice Under Law—Tolerance Essential to Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Equal Justice Under Law—Tolerance Essential to Democratic Government," delivered by me before the Akron Chamber of Commerce on March 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Over the entrance to the great building of the United States Supreme Court, opposite the Capitol, is written in huge letters of stone the slogan "Equal Justice Under Law." Those who chose that motto did not do so without a profound knowledge of the basis of the American Republic. I assume that a democracy is literally so called because it is a rule by majority of the people, but American democracy is more than that. It is a state in which every individual citizen, no matter how humble, and every minority, no matter how small, has certain basic rights, protected by laws and by impartial tribunals. Among the results of our form of government, nothing is so vital as the guarantee of equal justice under law to every citizen within the community. If that result is not accomplished, democracy has not achieved its principal aim. If it is long neglected, there is little hope that democracy will survive.

The spirit of justice has certain necessary corollaries. Any people who feel that justice is guaranteed are likely to be a peaceful and tolerant people. They are willing to abide by the decision of the courts, no matter how wrong they think it may be in that instance. They are willing to accept a law passed in a legislative body by a majority of one vote, however much they may disagree with it. They are prepared to accept the officers elected at fair popular elections by the closest plurality. Once they lose confidence in their ability to secure justice from the

courts, from the Congress, from fair elections by the people, there is an invitation to revolution, an invitation to the use of force to obtain the ends which never can be otherwise attained. Furthermore they come to realize that their point of view may be wrong, and that they have no right to condemn those who have a different religion, a different race or a different point of view, found by impartial tribunals to be right on the issue involved, or at least protected by the Constitution.

A democratic people must be a tolerant people or they will not long remain democratic. If we lose our sense of tolerance, if we lose our sense of justice to others, then we cannot sustain here the principles for which this Nation was founded.

Dictatorship, whether Fascist or Communist, whether empire or tyranny, has always been a denial of these principles. The dictator is always right. Law is suspended at his will. Justice depends on the individual whim of the dictator, and is subject to a complete disregard if it interferes with the dictator's purpose. Instead of justice between men we find inevitably the acceptance of the principle that the end justifies the means, no matter how unjust or illegal those means may be.

During the past 10 years we have seen more and more of the growth throughout the world of this prineiple of dictatorship. We have seen the growth of the totalitarian state—the state which can do no wrong, the state which controls the courts, the state whose word is final. Here in this country we consider ourselves a democratic country, but we cannot escape the infection of the totalitarian world philosophy, so that many of our own people are thinking along totalitarian lines while they pay lip service to democracy. More and more they have come to look to the Federal Government to help them out of all their afflictions—to solve every problem which is presented by Federal spending or Federal control. More and more they are drifting away from a reverence for law to a demand for action, regardless of law or fairness.

In Europe this has led to an almost hopeless situation. Democracy has been crushed between the two arbitrary doctrines of communism and fascism. We talk glibly about setting up new democracies in Europe, but the truth is there are few real democrats left in Europe. The Communist insists on the acceptance of communism no matter what the majority may be against it. He regards everyone who does not accept communism as a contemptible bourgeois, inspired only by a greedy desire for personal advantage. The Fascist regards his enemies as so many revolutionaries, whose crime of existence justifies their complete liquidation. The strength of this intolerance is so great that it makes the peaceful acceptance of democracy in which all groups may live at peace almost impossible. Our State Department is in trouble because any man they choose to back for a temporary leader in an occupied European country is likely to have had a Communist or Fascist history, subjecting him to bitter attack from a large section of his own people.

This conflict is extending into this country with increasing intolerance. The character of our anti-Semitic publications has been recently exposed, but we canot say that anti-Semitism or anti-Negro prejudice has in any way decreased. On the other hand, we have the left wing and Communist newspapers like PM and the Daily Worker, whose stirring up of those who have suffered from intolerant attacks is doing the minority groups more harm than good, and creating among them the same intolerance against which they protest.

All of these groups base their publicity on a complete distortion of the facts. They abandon argument and substitute personal attacks on their opponents. No one who reads their publications finds the slightest admission of possible error in their own position or any fair statement of their opponents' position. They are the exponents of smear tactics, regardles of fairness or justice. Both sides are antidemocratic.

To a less degree we are working in the same direction through our various blocs of special economic interests. Individual businessmen, farmers, workmen, teachers, are fair and reasonable. Ninety percent of them are firm believers in the principles of the American Republic, but the modern craze to organize in special interest associations, and employ people to represent those interests creates intolerance. The representative of the farmers is bound to look only at the farmer's interest. The heads of the labor unions regard themselves as advocates only of the interests of labor. The chambers of commerce represent only the businessman. The National Education Association represents only the teachers. Many of these leaders become wholly intolerant of any argument against them, and of anyone who opposes them, even in the best of faith. The C. I. O. Political Action Committee, under Mr. Hillman, for instance, issues tables attempting to show that Congressmen have voted against labor, because they have disagreed with C. I. O. positions on various measures, many of which may have no labor relation at all. In short, they attempt to judge every public issue solely from a labor standpoint, and purge every Congressman who does not agree with them. The same technic is used to a less degree by many other lobbying associations. For instance, because I believe firmly that the Federal Government should not begin to finance common-school and high-school education, I am attacked by many publications sent to teachers by the national educational associations, although many of the ablest individual teachers agree with me. These are the tactics which lead finally to autocracy.

During the 9 years before the war many innovations were introduced into our governmental structure. We may differ about the wisdom of some of these measures, or the wisdom of Federal intervention, but not one was undertaken except for a praiseworthy purpose. But the character of the bureaus and agencies established, the procedures followed, and the decisions made have in many cases caused the most violent resentment. Many of these bureaus have relegated justice to the back seat, and adopted any means to reach the goal they consider desirable.

I think particularly of the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage-Hour Division, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. These New Deal Agencies were set up for an excellent purpose, but they have been inspired by a crusading fanaticism which in their view places them above the law. Careless drafting of statutes by Congress, and broad interpretations by the courts have given them tremendous and arbitrary powers, and these powers have often been exercised without any regard for justice or fairness. I listened for 3 months to an account of the decisions made by the National Labor Relations Board. That record I think contains the greatest miscarriages of justice which this country has ever seen. At one time every decision was governed by the desire of the Board to unionize all industries in the country through C. I. O. unions. Justice to the employer, in procedural matters or in substantive decision, justice to the workman, justice even to the A. F. of L. unions, was wholly forgotten if it interfered with the purpose of the crusade.

The Federal Communications Commission has assumed to regulate the broadcasting chains in a way which was never intended by Congress. It has canceled licenses arbitrarily or threatened to do so. The effort to suppress the present inquiry into its activities certainly suggests that the power to refuse licenses has been used with complete disregard of equal treatment.

To a large extent, arbitrary action is necessary in time for war, but I believe the war agencies have adopted the totalitarian philosophy with much more enthusiasm than is required by any real necessity. In the early days of the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. the theorists were in full control. Their theories of what was necessary were far more important to them than justice to the producer or the distributor or the consumer.

Some of them rather favored injustice because they thought the people weren't inspired sufficiently with the war spirit, and needed to be aroused. Many small businesses were completely eliminated. Margins were set so low that small packing houses which had been in business for a hundred years were obliged to close. It is this unfairness, and not the control, which has produced the resentment against the regulations. To my office in Washington has come one man after another with serious complaints of unfair treatment by the agencies. Some were justified and some were not, but all were inspired by a deep feeling of injustice, that they had not had a square deal. In very few cases could I secure any modification from the bureaus. A Government bureau, once it is embarked on a cause of action rolls on like a juggernaut until it runs up against a court decision or a change of administration. And nowadays there aren't many court decisions.

The Little Steel formula itself created a sense of injustice. No man felt that he should be limited to a 15 percent increase when the standard of living had gone up 25 percent. The public sympathy for the miners and railroad men arose from the apparent injustice of this formula when many war workers had received a much greater increase, often through Government intervention or support. Instead of changing the rule, the Labor Board found every possible excuse to get around that rule in the case of the strong unions like the United Mine Workers and the railroad men. But it is ruthlessly enforced against many of the weaker unions, and is under bitter attack.

Furthermore, these war agencies have not hesitated to usurp power which has never been conferred upon them by Congress. There is little legal basis for the actions of the War Manpower Commission. The opposition to subsidies is brought about in part because most of them have never been authorized by Congress. These agencies have felt that they are above the law. The public has been fed some nonexistent doctrine of war powers over civilians without legislation. The President himself was one of the worst offenders when in September 1942, he threatened to enact price- and wage-control laws by Executive order if Congress did not do so by October 1. This is a complete denial of the very basis of law on which justice depends.

The War Department is subject to much the same criticism. One promise or implied promise after another to men in the Army has been broken on the ground that the change is required by the imperative necessity of the war. Men enlisted for 1 year's training were required to stay on when no war had begun. Men have undertaken college training or courses for flight instruction with the understanding that it would lead to an opportunity to become officers, only to find themselves assigned to routine work in which the training is of no value. When the A. S. T. P. was curtailed great solicitude was expressed for the financial condition of

powerful colleges, but the Army gave not the slightest consideration to the position of the 18-year-old boys excluded from all opportunity to secure commissions. While Selective Service boards have worked at great sacrifice to themselves and justice to their own selectees the lack of uniform rules and laws throughout the country has created the greatest injustice between individuals subject to the control of different boards. No doubt many of these difficulties are unavoidable, but what I criticize is the apparently complete absence of any feeling that justice and fairness to the individual in the Army should be given consideration.

The armed services and other departments have insisted upon the right to renegotiate contracts, and have resisted every effort to subject that process to some standards imposed by Congress. No one wishes excessive war profits to continue, but the feeling of resentment arises from the fact that the determination of excessive profits rests in the arbitrary discretion of individual men. There is neither law nor justice in that system.

If these practices are continued after the war, and many urge that they be continued, we will be a long way toward the end of democratic government. The reason that I don't think we will continue along that road is that the American people resent the whole thing so bitterly that it has created the greatest dissatisfaction on the home front. It is unfortunate indeed that there should be these differences and lack of unity, but at least it shows that the American people are fundamental believers in justice for every individual in the United States; that they resent the idea that an end, no matter how vital, shall be taken to justify whatever means an arbitrary government may choose. In the beginning of the war we had to take many emergency short cuts.. There is no reason now why there should not prevail here at home a rule of law, justice, and tolerance.

There can be a little better example of intolerance than the last two messages of the President of the United States. In the message on the soldiers' ballot, the President said of the bill passed by the Senate, "I consider such proposed legislation a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines now training and fighting for us and for our sacred rights. It is a fraud upon the American people.". This was merely an attempt to smear. All the men who sincerely supported a State ballot because they believe that the Constitution granted no right to the Federal Government to regulate elections for President, and all the men who felt that the bobtail ballot, with only Federal officials on it, deprived soldiers of their right to vote for State and local officers, were accused of fraud. That is the Communist and Fascist technique. It is an utter departure from tolerance.

There is another phrase in that message which certainly contains a threat of dictatorship. The President said, "As the Commander in Chief of millions of fighting men, I am sure that I can express their wishes in this matter and their resentment against the discrimination which is being practiced against them." Such an attack on Congress is certainly reminiscent of Oliver Cromwell at the doors of the Long Parliament, with his soldiers at his heels.

The message vetoing the tax bill was even more intemperate. "In this respect" the President said, "it is not a tax bill, but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy. * * * The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indispensable special privileges to favored groups, but sets dangerous precedents for the future." As Senator BARKLEY said, "That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they please, but, as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down." In other places Senator BARKLEY points out the complete disregard of fact which characterized the message.

There may be many differences of opinion on public issues. That is unimportant. The important thing is that in the discussion of those issues we be guided by a spirit of tolerance; that we do not impute motives to our opponents; that we be fair and just in our expressions as we desire others to be fair and just to us. If a man disagrees with me, it is one thing to say he is dead wrong. It is another to say that he is a crook. Senator BARKLEY has performed a real service in expressing the indignation of the American people at those who wrote the President's message in complete disregard of justice. Other nations may fight a war successfully with complete unity under a dictator. Perhaps even if that unity does not exist, it is unimportant among such peoples.

But the way to win the war in this country is to be guided by the basic principles which have animated the Anglo-Saxon peoples for centuries. Our Government should be guided by law. In the administration of that law it should insure equal treatment to all of its citizens.

Equal justice under law is the principle by which we can hope to retain in the United States the spirit of tolerance, democracy, and freedom for which the war is being fought on every ocean and every continent on the earth.

Administration of the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 I extended some remarks in the RECORD regarding the letters which I had written to the chairmen of the various war price and rationing boards in Connecticut, inviting them to offer their suggestions and advice relative to the administration of the O. P. A. My action was prompted by the contemplated hearings on the extension of the Price Control Act. The response was gratifying and I am sure the information received will be of material assistance when this legislation is considered.

Pertinent to this matter, I am happy to include in the RECORD a letter which I received from Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration:

MARCH 10, 1944.

The Honorable B. J. MONKIEWICZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONKIEWICZ: My attention has been called to the statement which you made before the House on February 21 regarding your letters to the chairmen of War Price and Rationing Boards throughout Connecticut. I think your idea was a splendid one and deserves the highest commendation, for if anyone knows the way in which the price control and rationing program is working out it is the chairmen of our boards out in contact with the public.

In fact, your idea is so good that I am directing a personal letter to the chairmen of our boards all over America asking them for their suggestions so that we may consider them in making our proposals to Congress for changes in the Price Control Act.

I have received through out Connecticut office copies of approximately 25 replies to the letters which you sent out in your district, but I am sure that there are many others. It would be a very great service to me if you could give me some kind of a digest of these letters, showing first, administrative changes which they think would be desirable, second, changes in the Price Control Act which they believe would result in improvement. They are so interesting that I wish we might have a digest of all the letters you receive.

I wish that every Member of Congress would follow your example and write to the chairmen of our War Price and Rationing Boards. The result, I believe, would be most helpful.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Guard Duty in Navy Yards by Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter written by Earl J. Thomas, commander, Navy Yard Garrison No. 580, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, to Vice Admiral Adolphus Andrews, of the United States Navy, together with Admiral Andrews' reply to that letter.

The correspondence referred to deals with the unselfish offer of a considerable number of ex-servicemen to devote a certain portion of their free time each week to the guarding and patrolling of the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Mr. President, I believe that this patriotic gesture on the part of the members of Navy Yard Garrison No. 580 is worthy of sincere commendation, and I sincerely trust that the plan which they put forward in their letter to Vice Admiral Andrews will be very carefully considered by the Navy Department, especially in view of the critical manpower shortage with which we are now confronted.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA NAVY YARD
GARRISON NO. 508,
ARMY AND NAVY UNION, U. S. A.,
February 29, 1944.

Vice Admiral ADOLPHUS ANDREWS,
Senior Member, Navy Manpower
Survey Board, New Navy Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL ANDREWS: It was a pleasure to meet and talk with you again this afternoon, and I am happy to submit, upon behalf

of the ex-servicemen, all civil-service employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, their offer to devote 8 hours of their spare time each week to guard duty in the navy yard or such other duties as the Commandant of the Fourth Naval District may assign to them as members of the Naval Reserve Corps.

I was authorized by a meeting of ex-servicemen last Sunday evening to make this offer on their behalf and instructed to present it personally in Washington to the proper Navy authority.

I assure you at least 1,000 ex-servicemen who have had military or naval training and experience are willing to provide the Commandant of the Fourth Naval District with an organized experienced organization, subject to call within 30 minutes' time in the case of need or emergency at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Further, we ex-servicemen are willing to perform guard duty each day or night when we are not engaged in our civilian capacity. By utilizing this additional manpower, we feel that the Government will not only be saving some $8,000 to $12,000 each week, but we feel that by reason of our familiarity with the navy yard, we are better fitted for this duty than others, and that we can thus release additional manpower where it is more needed in the war effort. At the same time, we want to take advantage of the opportunity which would be presented to us if we were enrolled in the Naval Reserve Corps to offer our service to our country in a time of need, and each of us individually have the satisfaction of knowing that we are doing our small bit toward the winning of the war.

Under this plan, every ex-serviceman, whether he served during wartime or peacetime, who is now employed on a civil-service status, regardless of any affiliations he might or might not have with any veterans' organization, would be given the opportunity to serve as indicated. There are now approximately 8,000 such ex-servicemen employed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. This additional voluntary service will in no manner conflict with the regular duties of these ex-servicemen, some of whom are employed on day shifts and others on night shifts.

If this offer is accepted, the commandant will have at his disposal on short notice at least 1,000 trained and armed men for use in the event of any emergency occurring within his naval district.

Just how to accomplish this, I offer no suggestion, but leave it solely to you.

I wish to thank you for the many kindnesses shown me in the past and assure you that when we men in the Philadelphia Navy Yard are given an opportunity to demonstrate our loyalty and cooperation, that we will not be found wanting.

Respectfully yours,

EARL J. THOMAS,
Commander, Navy Yard
Garrison No. 508,
Army and Navy Union, U. S. A.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
NAVY MANPOWER SURVEY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1944.

Mr. EARL J. THOMAS,
Commander, Navy Yard Garrison No. 508,
Army and Navy Union, U. S. A.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: This will acknowledge your splendid letter of February 29 offering on behalf of some 1,000 ex-servicemen, now civil-service employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, to devote 8 hours of their spare time each week for guard duty in the navy yard or on such other duties as the Commandant of the Fourth Naval District may assign to them as members of the Naval Reserve Corps.

I am referring your letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Ralph A. Bard, and I trust that you will receive in due course a reply from his office. In the meantime I assure you that the action of you and your associates is another fine example of the patriotic support evidenced by ex-servicemen who are unable because of age or other reasons to reenter the Army or the Navy for active duty but who are giving great aid in our war efforts in other ways.

With my best regards to you and the members of Navy Yard Garrison No. 508, Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., I remain

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPHUS ANDREWS,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy
(Retired).

Senator McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama, in tribute to the late Senator Charles L. McNary.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR M'NARY

S–enator Charles L. McNary is dead—
E–very one who ever knew him reveres
N–ow the brave life that he fearlessly led,
A–nd will revere it, all down thru the years.
T–ruth, sacred honor, and justice, and right,
O–n all occasions, thrilled him with delight,
R–ound which he centered his thought, day and night.

C–autiously Senator McNary laid
H–is purposed plans for the national good,
A–nd, after seeking the Great Spirit's aid,
R–eadily, he went to work, as he should,
L–eaving no stone, within his reach unturned,
E–ver for his country's good more concerned,
S–urely, than for the amount that he earned.

L–ong as American hist'ry is read,

M–en, down the ages, will, out of the past,
C–all the great principles for which he pled,
N–obly, yet fearlessly, down to the last—
A–lways he lived so that he might respond,
R–eady, at death's call, to break the last bond—
Y–es, he was ready for God's Great Beyond.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

A List of Republican Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, first, foreign policy: We are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts a triple responsibility on the Nation.

a. We must preserve and protect all of our own national interests.

b. We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world. This does not necessarily mean a U. S. A. policed universe or a world W. P. A.

c. We must make our contribution to a program for permanent peace among nations.

Second. We believe in a system of plenty instead of one of scarcity.

Third. We must evolve a tax program to permit "seed money" to be plowed back into business in order to create more productive jobs.

Fourth. We must simplify the Federal income tax forms.

Fifth. We stand for a free-enterprise system financed and controlled by American individuals and against a system financed and controlled by the Government.

Sixth. We believe in a system where the people are the masters and the politicians are servants.

Seventh. We must continue our constitutional system of "checks and balances," where Congress makes the laws, the executive administers them, and the judiciary interprets them.

Eighth. Our people must be governed by law and not by Executive orders and directives from Federal bureaus.

Ninth. No group in America shall achieve special favoritism to the detriment of other groups.

Tenth. We believe that free enterprise must lead the way, unfettered by Federal restrictions.

Eleventh. We believe American teamwork should replace the New Deal practice of pitting class against class.

Twelfth. Our policy of good management and persuasion will replace the New Deal policy of regimentation and compulsion.

Thirteenth. We will present a satisfactory plan for the disposal of Federal-owned plants, equipment, and surpluses.

Fourteenth. We will have real jobs ready for our returning servicemen and war workers. The Republican Party will continue its practice of keeping faith with those in the service.

Fifteenth. We will revise our social-security system and provide adequate protection to the elders of America.

Sixteenth. We believe that labor and management can solve their problems through collective bargaining.

Seventeenth. We must eliminate subsidies and give the farmers a fair price for their products.

Eighteenth. We are opposed to the New Deal policy of "spend, waste, borrow, and tax."

Nineteenth. We are opposed to the "kangaroo courts" of the O. P. A.

Twentieth. We will aid the manpower problem by reducing materially the 3,000,000 on the Federal pay roll.

Twenty-first. We will keep faith with the American people by giving them the facts.

Twenty-second. We believe that military and naval officers who have made a life study in the art of war must be in complete control of war operations.

Twenty-third. We must nominate a man to lead the Republican Party to victory, who will give first consideration to the United States and who can gain respect for our firmness and fairness with other nations.

Twenty-fourth. We will combat inflation through correcting the New Deal program of reckless deficit spending and unwise economic administration.

Marketing of Print Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I have received several complaints from butter associations of Wisconsin alleging that there is an O. P. A. regulation compelling farmers' cooperative butter associations to give up their outside markets for print butter.

The ruling complained of is that butter printed by the cooperative associations sold to outside towns more than 50 miles distant must be sold for approximately 2 cents a pound less than the same butter is sold for within the 50-mile limit.

These associations complain that because of this O. P. A. ruling, they cannot profitably sell their butter to merchants in the larger cities that happen to be more than 50 miles away from the factory. For that reason the merchants are putting oleomargarine on their shelves against their better judgment and their own wishes. Thus, the O. P. A. ruling indirectly puts butter off the grocers' shelves and replaces it with oleomargarine.

First of all, I would like to know if this is a fact, and if it is, why this regulation was put into effect by the O. P. A.

I wish that you would give this matter careful consideration with the view of lifting this regulation if it is now in effect. May I hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1944.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 6 regarding the sale of print butter by the Farmers Cooperative Butter Association of Wisconsin.

Amendment 25 to Maximum Price Regulation 289 (a copy of which is enclosed) provides certain mark-ups for the services performed by different classes of individuals who handle the butter between the creamery and the consumer.

A jobber of butter is defined as: Anyone who sells to, and makes delivery to the physical premises of, an individual retail store, a non-Federal Government user (such as a State or municipal hospital), an individual commercial user (such as a restaurant, hotel, or club), an individual institutional user (such as a hospital or school), or an individual industrial user (such as a baker or other food processor who uses butter in his manufacturing process). No one shall be deemed a jobber unless he owns or maintains a warehouse in the marketing area in which the physical premises of the above-described purchaser are located." For these services a mark-up of 2 cents per pound for deliveries of 1 to 1,500 pounds, inclusive, is provided. However, this mark-up does not apply to any sale by a creamery to any purchaser whose physical premises are located more than 50 miles from the place where the creamery is located.

The purpose for this limitation was to prevent creameries from evading the price ceilings on butter which occurred when they were able, in certain instances, to perform the function of the jobber for less than the stipulated amount allocated for this service, and use the difference in bidding up the price of cream. This practice of store-door delivery was also disrupting the normal flow of butter from the creamery to the consumer, which resulted when creameries tried to by-pass the normal trade channels through which butter moved.

Thus, we found it necessary to put this provision in our order for the purpose of maintaining normal trade practices in the butter industry.

Sincerely,
CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Thank you for your letter of March 15, in which you have explained the rule set up by the Office of Price Administration which prohibited creameries from selling butter to outside towns more than 50 miles distant.

It is apparent that amendment 25 to Maximum Price Regulation 289 was, and is, the cause of the shortage of butter in the urban areas.

Ihave been advised by the creameries in my district in the State of Wisconsin that they could not place their quality product on the market in cities located more than 50 miles away from their plants at the reduced cost which this regulation calls for, at the current price they are paying for butterfat.

Had the regulation been amended to let them sell their butter in the city markets outside their areas, their product would not have caused any undue hardship on any butter jobber located in the area, as these jobbers did not have butter enough to fill the needs of their regular customers. The result was that the rural areas had an overabundance of butter, and the urban district suffered a severe shortage which forced many people to use butter substitutes. This may have an adverse effect on the butter market in the years to come, and, of course, will cause injury to the many farmers who are producers of butter.

I, therefore, request that you reexamine this amendment so as to let our producers of butter sell on the open market outside the 50-mile limit without a reduction in the market price, and thus avoid the present situation which is gradually causing retailers to replace butter on their shelves with oleomargarine.

I should like to thank you for this courtesy in advance.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress.

Addresses by Pearl S. Buck and Admiral H. E. Yarnell in Commemoration of Sun Yat-sen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses, both in honor of Sun Yat-sen, one delivered by Pearl S. Buck and the other by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, on Sunday, March 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PEARL S. BUCK

We are met together here today in memory of a man who would, I think, be astonished if he could know why we are here. Who can explain these great humble men who are born in the humblest homes, whose parents and brothers and sisters remain humble and obscure people?

Sun Yat-sen was born into a small house such as you can see in any Chinese village. It was not the poorest house in the village, indeed it seems to have been one of the better ones, but it was plain enough. The floor was of bricks at best, or perhaps only of beaten earth. The furniture was simple and useful rather than beautiful. His father was a farmer. His mother was sunburned and hard working, for she went into the fields to help her husband when she could spare the time from her cooking and sewing and spinning. It was an old-fashioned Chinese home. Sun Yat-sen used himself to tell how it broke his heart to hear his little sister crying because her feet were being bound. Who can tell? Perhaps those cries were what moved him to his first rebellion. Why should her feet be bound so that she could not be free to run, to play? Because we have always bound the feet of our girls, his mother would have said.

This answer to so many questions, "because we have always done so," may have been what drove him to rebellion. Because we have always been poor, we common folk, because we have always been illiterate, because we have always lived in poverty—against this "always" he rebelled.

I do not know what it is in the life of one man and not another which makes that one man waken into being more than his common self. Of course, there has to be something in the person himself, something like a sensitive plate, which receives and feels what he sees. Many people may go through exactly the same experiences and nothing

happens to them. Millions of Chinese brothers have heard their little sisters crying because their feet were being crippled and they did not remember the cries. Callousness is the common quality of the ordinary spirit. But Sun Yat-sen's was not the ordinary spirit.

He had another early experience which awakened him. He was sent to Honolulu when he was 12 years old or so to live with his older brother who was a merchant there. While he was in Honolulu he went to an American school and he learned the principles of a people's democracy.

This, too, was not an unusual experience. Many Chinese boys go to American schools in Honolulu. But the sensitive plate which was the mind of Sun Yat-sen received and really believed in these principles. All his young rebellions and sympathies for others took form. Perhaps, he said, if his people were free from an oppressive imperial government, free to go to school and learn to read and write, free to speak, free from poverty, they would be happier. It seemed to him that the government was the basic wrong in China, that alien Manchu government, the cold-hearted Manchu empress who took the funds given for a navy and made a marble boat.

And yet his plans were not made in a moment, nor even quickly clear to himself. He trained himself, after he went back to China, as a surgeon. He seems always to have felt keenly the physical suffering of his people, their pains and diseases unalleviated. It is revealing that his first expression of his longing to do something to help them took the form of being a doctor. But it was not long before he grew impatient with this slow one-by-one healing. He felt the pressure of time, the shortness of his one life, the millions of his people. He thought with continual anger of the callousness of the government and he renewed his belief that if this government could be driven out and if good men and Chinese men could govern China, then the people could be saved.

There is no doubt that in all his thinking and working Sun Yat-sen was continually obsessed with the need to help the people. He was not a Hitler or a Mussolini, not a man whose ambitions were for himself. This is perfectly obvious to all who know his life. He never had money for himself, he never grew rich, he never owned anything except his house and a few books. Nor did he seek a high place for himself. He allowed Yuan Shih Kai to be the first president after the successful revolution, and would have been quite happy in the choice had not Yuan Shih Kai turned out to be a traitorous self-seeking man.

I do not know what makes a man like Sun Yat-sen, a man who cannot help loving people and not himself. The ordinary man puts himself first always and when he is successful he uses his success merely to make more power for himself. But some souls are born who seem to have within themselves the comprehension of all other souls, a universal understanding and a necessity to share the goods of life, and these are never content to glorify themselves. They find no pleasure in self-aggrandizement. Sun Yat-sen was one of these souls. He was never ambitious for himself. He was untiringly ambitious for the betterment of people, and since his own suffered much, for his own people. He had a passion for people's freedom, because he himself loved freedom.

This man had no great personal rewards for his life. His was a life of incessant work and travel, little relaxation or time for what others call pleasure. For many years he had no real home life, for his first wife was chosen for him by his parents and he never made a home with her in the real sense, although their son is one of the great men of modern China. You will hear Dr. Sun Fo's voice in a little while for yourselves.

It is comforting to think that in the hard middle years of Sun Yat-sen's life he found Soong Chinling. She was the daughter of a long-time friend. I suppose this young girl had often seen and heard Sun Yat-sen. She admired him very much and when she came back from school in the United States she admired him still more, for she was better able to understand what he was trying to do. She was woman to match his man—they felt the same way about people. They were both sensitive, honorable, and without ambition for themselves. She left her home against her parents' will to work with him and they were married.

I think Dr. Sun Yat-sen would not be content, if he could see this meeting today, if we were not to speak much of Mme. Sun Yat-sen. She has in some ways been without sufficient honor in her own country and perhaps even abroad because she happens to have been at variance at times with some of the other followers of Sun Yat-sen. For this woman, who was still young and beautiful when her husband died, has held steadfastly to his care and feeling for the people. She too has never had ambitions for herself. She dresses plainly and lives frugally. Today in a capital where some grow rich she remains poor, as Sun Yat-sen remained poor all his life. I think she would be ashamed not to be poor.

Time and again in the 19 years since he died her voice has spoken clearly and plainly for the rights of the common man and woman. Even her enemies—and she has enemies, as all have who dare to speak against the tide of the times—even her enemies have never dared to question the integrity of Mme. Sun Yat-sen. Even those who accuse her of communism have never believed that she was proclaiming a political theory. They know that she is one of those who, in all the impurity in these impure times, have continued to believe in the people, not only of China, but of all the world.

She keeps alive and quickened today that essential democracy, the respect for the individual whatever his place, the belief in human freedom which was the spirit of Sun Yat-sen. This remains now, as then, the single hope for the world's people.

And now, in a few minutes, you will hear her voice. Listen closely to what she says. She will speak not only for herself, but she speaks for Sun Yat-sen.

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL H. E. YARNELL

There are but few men in history who, through their ideas and the consecration of their lives to the fulfillment of those ideas, have exercised a dominating influence over great masses of people and have changed the destinies of nations.

Such a man is the one in whose honor we are meeting today. We are too near the time of the momentous events of recent years to make a true appraisal of Sun Yat-sen and the position he will occupy in history. But as time passes and relations grow closer between China and the United States, the American people will come to look upon him with increasing interest and respect. For in his character were traits which appeal strongly to Americans.

He was a sincere and fearless revolutionary leader whose devotion and self-sacrific were not in the interest of any special class or group but on behalf of the whole Chinese people. His integrity of character and his endurance and self-sacrifice for the welfare of the common people of China compel a deep and lasting loyalty among his true friends and supporters. Against seemingly hopeless odds he was an unwavering champion of the principles in which he believed. He foresaw the emergence of a new China, free and equal among the great nations of the world, living in friendly harmony and cooperation with those people who were willing to treat her on a basis of equality. He was an ardent advocate of political and social democracy. He was fond of quoting as an ideal, this phrase from the Confucian classics: "All under heaven will work for the common good."

Like Abraham Lincoln, Sun Yat-sen transcends national boundaries, and in the years ahead he will increasingly become not only a national but a world figure.

Born of humble parents in the south of China, he was, even as a boy, animated by a spirit of rebellion against ancient superstitions, and by a hatred of the Manchu dynasty, with its corruption and oppression of the people by the viceroys. He was of strong convictions and fearless when questions of his beliefs were concerned. Once he had decided to devote his life to bringing about the overthrow of the ruling dynasty and the installation of democratic government in China, he never swerved from that end. His life is a record of danger, disappointment, hard work, exile, and, in the end, death before the final achievement of his great task.

The three principles of the Kuomingtang as enunciated by Sun Yat-sen are nationalism, democracy, and livelihood. These are simple—perhaps elementary. But they were such as to have a profound influence on the Chinese people.

As a boy, Dr. Sun had realized that foreign domination of China must end. He was born and lived in the period when China was at the mercy of the western powers and Japan, due to her weakness as a nation. It was an era of special and unequal treaties, concessions and infringements on national authority, inflicted on a weak and corrupt government by powerful foreign nations. This must end, he rightly argued, before China could become great.

In his will Dr. Sun said:

"For 40 years I have devoted myself to the cause of the people's revolution with but one aim in view—the elevation of China to a position of freedom and equality among the nations."

By his second principle—democracy—Dr. Sun aimed to destroy the autocratic Manchu dynasty, and to place the power of government into the hands of the people. He drafted the plan of the present Nationalist Government, with the five "Yuans" for administering the affairs of the country. While the war with Japan has prevented the realization of democratic government according to Dr. Sun's constitution, the years following the war will see its fulfillment.

These three principles are the basis of the present Nationalist Government and are responsible for the remarkable progress made between 1927 and the Japanese invasion in 1937. For the first time in their history, the Chinese people had a government which was committed to an improvement of their lot, both nationally, politically, and individually. This faith in their Government and its principles has sustained the people and their rulers through these long, bloody, tragic years since 1937. It has been responsible for the millions of unknown soldiers who have died in order that their land may be free. It has inspired the generalissimo to declare from the first that China will not lay down the sword until every invader has been driven from her soil.

So, to my Chinese friends, I would say, "Have faith in the future. We believe in you. Already you have thrown off the shackles of inequality as Dr. Sun Yat-sen urged. As allies, we are now moving steadily and relentlessly toward a climax in the war which will make certain the full independence, equality, and respect among the nations for which he yearned, and which you will so fully have earned. That respect will grow as you give proof, not only of your right to freedom but also of your capacity for unity and responsibility in the great program of na-

tional reconstruction which Dr. Sun Yat-sen so nobly envisaged. We may rest assured that those who truly follow Dr. Sun Yat-sen will not betray their leader or the aims for which he gave his life."

In the years following this war, China will play a predominant part in the maintenance of peace and order in the Far East. In this connection, the following statement of Dr. Sun in his discussion of nationalism is significant:

"It is essential, however, that China should endeavor to preserve her ancient morality. The great powers have always attempted to destroy other nations, and China should not copy the imperialism of the rapacious powers and attempt to crush the smaller nations by force, but should follow the ancient morality and teachings of the sages in her international dealings. When China becomes a powerful nation, she should endeavor to lift up the weak and rescue the fallen."

This statement was reiterated by the Generalissimo in a message to the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Current Problems on November 17, 1942, in which he said:

"Among our friends there has been recently some talk of China emerging as the leader of Asia, as if China wishes the mantle of an unworthy Japan to fall on her shoulders. Having herself been a victim of exploitation, China has infinite sympathy for the submerged nations of Asia, and toward them China feels she has only responsibilities—not rights * * * China has no desire to replace western imperialism in Asia with an Oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of anyone else."

The effect of Dr. Sun's philosophy, as opposed to the Japanese philosophy of ruthless domination by force of arms, will, we hope, have a profound effect on the future peace, security, and prosperity of the Far East and of the world.

National Liquor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper clipping from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of March 11, 1944:

NATIONAL LIQUOR BILL

To the News:

Doubtless many were surprised at the recent announcement that $6,000,000,000 was spent during 1943 for liquor in the United States. But this is only the initial cost of our national drinking spree. Add to this our resultant costs of national drinking, such as loss of time, lack of efficiency, law enforcement, court proceedings, juvenile delinquency, and funerals, then you have the total bill.

I doubt that the initial cost of our national drinking exceeds the resultant cost, much, if any. The big whisky interests and those who patronize them need to face the figures and then tell us if it paid the Nation to drink in 1943. Let them tell the public whether or not the drinking spree helped the war effort. Let them say whether or not it encouraged or discouraged good morals. While they are at it, let them say whether it is best for a soldier to go into battle in a drunken condition.

Give us a few more years to increase our output of whisky and to increase our crop of drinkers, then we will rot out morally and spiritually. Like the Prodigal Son, when we come down to the hogpen, maybe then we will come to our senses and prohibition will return for keeps. The first war with Germany was won, then lost. Now we are fighting her again, but this time we will win and not lose. The first fight for prohibition was won, then lost. We are now entering the second fight; this time we shall win and not lose.

JOHN W. HEDGE.

JACKSONVILLE, TEX.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley under the auspices of the Catholic Club of St. Louis, in St. Louis, Mo., on the 17th of March.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No matter what the occasion, I should hold it a high privilege to address a gathering in this renowned city at the junction of two of the great rivers of the continent. Louis IX, saint and king of France, has left no nobler earthly monument to his name. Here any American may well feel that he is truly home. And I am also truly home, as a man always is among his friends.

But this is more than an ordinary occasion, and so it affords me something more than a mere privilege. In addressing men of Irish blood, I speak to my own. I speak from my whole heart. You know my language, and I know yours. Indeed, we Irish know each other so well that among ourselves we have no need to speak with the ordinary convention and reserve that mark the boundary between what may be professed and what must be held back when thoughts are exchanged among strangers. To cast off reserve is always a delight to an Irishman.

Now, you might think that a privilege and a delight would be all that any man could ask at one time. And I agree. I would ask no more, for I am a man grateful to providence for whatever befalls. Yet, such is the nature of saints that, taking their cue from the Master, they give us more than we ask, or even hope. When I was asked to come to St. Louis to speak to you and to take as my subject that most heart-warming of all Irish themes, Patrick of Tara—saint and apostle of Ireland, scourge of demons and last judge of the Gael—I was delighted. However, my delight at being accorded this signal honor was necessarily tempered by the overwhelming responsibility it imposed.

For, mark you, while it may be of little account, in the eternal measure, what is said to the Medes and Persians about Xerxes, or to the Macedonians about Philip or Alexander, it does indeed make all the difference what is said to Irishmen about Patrick. Of those to whom much is given, much will be asked. That is true of the Irish race, to whom Patrick has been given. It is also true of me tonight, to whom the theme of Patrick has been given.

But what will a simple man like myself say about Patrick? What is there that is both worthy of this overpowering figure and also fitted to my own modest capacity of expression?

The temptation is almost irresistible to stay on familiar terrain—to dwell with natural enthusiasm on the record of Patrick's sons in the history, military and political, of our own land—to sketch briefly the dominant virtues of the Irish character, and to pledge Celtic hearts and Celtic blood, figuratively and even literally, to the cause of peaceful and orderly government. To adopt this approach would not demean the great saint. I have myself adopted it more than once, in the belief that the virtues of Patrick's spiritual descendants give glory to the saint himself.

It happens, however, that the very circumstances of this occasion suggest to me a different treatment of my theme. Perhaps it is less familiar. I trust it will not be less pleasing. Most of all, I hope it will serve to crystallize a thought or two which I know have been in the minds of many Americans of Irish blood these past few years.

I have already recalled that I am visiting a city named after a king who was also a saint. It is not really strange that in such a city I should be speaking of a saint who, in the most true and lasting sence, was and is also a king.

It may have been an accident that the capacity to be a saint should have developed in Louis, who was born to rule. But it was no accident that Patrick, who made himself a saint in Ireland, should, by force of the very qualities of his saintliness, have made himself for 1,500 years the ruler of the hearts of the Irish people, and that the Irish people in turn should develop an unrivaled genius in the art of free government.

I say this was no accident, and I propose to remind you of the reasons why. Not to show you—merely to remind you. And it is important that you—and I, too—should be reminded of this frequently and forcibly, for it is only when we are so reminded that we realize clearly why the things for which the Irish stand firm are the only hope of America.

Supreme among the writings which the great saint left behind him is that magnificent poetic prayer known as the Breastplate of Patrick. It is too long to bear quotation in full, but one passage I do want to read, for I think it supplies the keynote of the spirit of Patrick and of the Irish people. Here are the lines:

"I arise today
Through God's strength to pilot me,
God's might to uphold me,
God's wisdom to guide me,
God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to be before me,
God's hosts to save me
From snares of the devil,
From temptations of vices,
From everyone who desires me ill,
Afar or near,
Alone, or in a multitude."

Here is the distinguishing mark of the saint, expressed in language and unrivalled for clarity and power. In the front of Patrick's mind, carried as the first thought of the morning, is a profound recognition of humanity's utter dependence on Divinity for a peaceful and orderly life. Now, that dependence is the prime fact from which all political philosophy must proceed if it is to make any sense. No matter who is willing to admit it, or who professes to deny it, the fact is that we are all here on earth

because the Lord put us here, and made us in a certain way, and gave each of us a certain work to do. We must make our livelihood and save our souls. One of the characteristics He gave us is that we need each other, and so we must live in societies. Another of our characteristics is that we have different estimates of our rights and obligations toward each other. So we must have governments in order that these conflicting estimates may be controlled, and the maximum of peace and order be secured among us.

Two important consequences flow from this primary fact. The first is that all the rules of action which govern relationships between individuals are imposed by God because they are necessary so that we may live in peace and order and also perform our religious obligations toward God Himself. You can state the same thought in another way. Granted that men are what they are, there is not a single one of the Ten Commandments which is not absolutely necessary for peaceful existence—not one which reason itself would not have discovered even if it had never been formally pronounced.

The second consequence is that there is no essential difference between the principles which govern the relationships between individuals and those which should guide governments and the men to whose charge the affairs of governments are committed.

It is quite possible for a philosopher to perceive this with his mind, and some of the great ones have indeed done so. But it is only the saint who both perceives it with his mind and accepts it with all his heart. Where the saint is also a great teacher, like Thomas Aquinas, he may even found an enduring school of profound and lucid thinking on the subject. But the saint who is the patron of the Irish race—there is the man who can make such principles light the world.

Why? Because he has been blessed not only in his preeminent sancity but also in having been chosen as the spiritual leader of a race truly unique in history.

This race of Patrick's, to begin with, always did have a rare capacity for establishing and conducting a stable and enlightened government and social order. Tara, after all, was already there, first to challenge and then to welcome Patrick, and the conversion of the island was aided in no small measure by the high development of the social organization which was characteristic of Ireland during the time of his ministry.

So that the Irish soul was truly fertile ground in which to plant the principles of good government which Patrick's Christian revelation brought to the Gael.

And there was a second thing—probably more important even than the first: The way the Irish took a firm grip on the entire Christian revelation and never let go. It is a commonplace that never in history has any race embraced and held the religion of Christ as stanchly and unwaveringly as the Irish. No lukewarmness, no timidity, no intellectual pride has ever in all these centuries availed to seduce the Irish from the light. Nowhere else has there been any such glorious and blessed record.

And the more you reflect on the necessity of true Christian principles as the bedrock of good government, on the essential identity of religious and political truth, the more natural it appears that steadfast insistence on the political rights of man and the moral obligations of rulers should have no sturdier champions than the men of Erin.

But something else was working, too—something which was perhaps the most elemental and basic of all, and at once the reason for the Irish genius for government and for their reception of Patrick's teaching. That something was the Irish spirit. I have no gift to do justice to the Irish spirit, or even to attempt to define or describe it. But you will understand what I mean when I say that I am talking about that spiritual quality that makes great poetry and songs, rides high heartedly over storm and famine and scorns human respect.

The Irish spirit has manifested itself in many ways to the no small gain of all who have come into contact with it. But there has been no more characteristic manifestation of that spirit than a consuming urge to political independence, a fierce and unyielding determination that no man, or group of men, or, indeed, any nation, shall rule others to any greater degree than the moral law requires—in other words, beyond their consent, because the instinct of man always leads him to consent to be ruled as far as the law of his nature makes necessary.

Nowhere in geography or history will you find another people as blest as the Irish with this almost miraculous combination of qualities—the instinct for good society, devotion to the Author of society, and hatred of oppression. And there you have the secret of history's greatest paradox. Neither Rome, which held her legions like a whip over Asia, Africa, and most of Europe, nor Britain, whose writ runs with the sun, ever subdued Ireland. Britain, God knows, tried hard enough, and even an Irishman must admit that the Saxon has few peers when it comes to persisting in an effort.

The Irishman, in other words, knows better than anyone else where the rights of rulers begin, and where they end, and why. That is to say, he, above all, knows what things are Caesar's. And when you try to exact from an Irishman something more than the lawful coin of the tribute, you've got a raging tempest on your hands.

All that I have said so far has a direct bearing on the record of the Irish in America, and on the salutary influence which the Irish can and ought to have on American public affairs now and in the future.

The record is familiar. I said at the beginning, that I would not rehearse it, but try to explain it. That much I hope I have been able to do. I think it must be clear that in the battle of America for political integrity, external and internal, the Irish have always been found directing the fire where the going was toughest for the simple reason that they were who they were, and knew what it was all about. For them it was no matter of empty slogans that wither and die on the mind like old posters on a brick wall. They were no well meaning dunderheads, seduced by the bright colors of political apples of Sodom. And when blood had to be shed for a principle, they gave their own.

And why? That must be clear by now. They not only pledged but gave their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in the cause of human liberty, because they knew that human rights come from God and are ordained by God, as are the consequent obligations that must be performed if those rights are to be preserved. The duty to serve and to fight in that cause is therefore like the obligation to be faithful to religion, and the Irishman will gladly lay down his life for either sake. He will lay it down like a man, because he knows the reason why he does it, and he will lay it down like a good, staunch and faithful man because his reason is the best of all reasons.

Now, the founders of the republic thought along precisely these lines. No wonder, then, that they produced a sound and enduring work. The blood of many of them was Irish; the thinking of all of them was straight, profound, and true, and, therefore, Irish too.

They held certain truths to be self-evident. Imagine that. Try and hold a truth to be self-evident today and see where it gets you. They thought that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. That was a sacred and comforting doctrine. For those of us who believe in God it remains so. It's really a wonderful thing to realize that you get your rights from the Creator. A right that comes from Him is something with which no state, and no man or combination of men in control of a state, can play at ducks and drakes. There is no room in that sturdy philosophy for the supine resignation that take it as a matter of course that the lives of citizens should be shunted right or left depending on what muddled impression some neurotic ex-college professor has drawn from the book he read last.

Of course, there isn't a man alive who doesn't know that if it came to a life and death struggle for all the things the fathers of the republic taught and made law, the Irishman would shout like Gull MacMorna for an iron tug to his flail and lay about him like the avenging archangel. But there are many things about the Irish championship of freedom that are not so well known—things that the Irish themselves perhaps do not think about enough.

Liberty and good government, you know, are not lost in sudden cataclysms. Political cave-ins occur only where the ground is soft. It's the erosion and rotting of the ground that really do the damage. And the pity of it is that few are sensitive enough in eye or ear to perceive what is going on.

But there are a few plain symptoms, and I want to mention two or three of them, because they illustrate how well inoculated the men of Ireland are, and why they remain strong as a mountain that cannot be moved.

One symptom is carelessness with the truth. Political adventurers are past masters at the art of manipulating language so that the false that serves their purpose is presented to the people rather than the truth that does not serve them so well. It is not only a matter of direct falsehood, but of suppression of truth, and the suggestion of the false by adroit phrasing and implication.

I need to suggest no examples, for you hear that sort of thing in public affairs day in and day out. Now, manipulation of the truth is an art most easy to practice when the public mind has been prepared for it by a propaganda of confusion designed to create the impression that everything is relative anyway and no one can really know what the fact is. That kind of nonsense makes a good deal of headway with many soft-headed people. But not with the Irish. No one is kidding the Irish about what's absolute and what's relative, and whether it is possible to arrive at the truth or not. The Irish have been tried in the fire of centuries of warfare on truth and moral certainty, and they know such rubbish for exactly what it is.

Another symptom is lack of moral scruple—a lax willingness to let expediency be the guide to all political action. If there is an advantage to be gained, do not be restrained by any moral principle binding in conscience, for there is no such thing. Take whatever action will gain your end. Here I remember one example so apt that I cannot resist the temptation of citing it. A former official who represented the Government in tax matters said that if to win a tax case for the Government on Monday he had to claim that a certain principle was true, and if, to win another tax case on Tuesday, he had to protest that the same principle was completely false, he would not hesitate to do both.

The Irish will have none of this monkey business. They will neither indulge in it themselves, nor tolerate it in others. If they hadn't had the conscience and the heart to steel themselves against the goad of years when surrender to expediency might have won them peace and plenty, their history would never have been so proud and glorious.

A third sympton. Abject reliance of the citizen on the State. To put it in biblical terms, a willingness to sell your political soul for a mess of economic pottage. This is beyond question the most serious of all discernible tendencies in modern States, includ-

ing our own. The hard fact is that nowhere, in politics, economics or anywhere else, do you get something for nothing. It's the third temptation of Christ all over again.

Thus it happens that the public conscience becomes debauched and whole peoples sell themselves, imperceptibly but irrevocably into bondage. We have seen it happen in our own time.

That it hasn't happened here is due in no small measure to the fact that it never happened in Ireland. The strong Irish influence in American political life has brought with it no more valuable contribution to social sanity and health than the tough and realistic Irish moral fiber that knows things for what they are and is neither deceived nor charmed by the seductive errors of collectivism and statism.

This, above all, is America's debt to Patrick. His sons have leavened the land with such an instinct for liberty, justice, and integrity that it has impregnated the whole people. History knows no comparable antitoxin. And the Irish, thank God, are not only prospering but increasing all the time. Among the many doctrines that have never made any headway with them is the odd notion that the way to increase your influence is to restrict your offspring.

Some day America will acknowledge with gratitude its obligation to the Irish and to Patrick. I venture to predict that when we have outridden the tempest, as we shall, and reflect in tranquillity on what it was that saved us, we shall see, with the clarity of hindsight, that we drew no little of our strength from the towering figure of the saint whose feast we celebrate today. From him the Irish took and gave, with Celtic generosity, to all America the courage to dare and overcome the terrors of the frontier, the blood and pain of revolution, and the heartache of forging a new nation, took and gave the patience and energy to build an economic and political system unrivaled in history, took and gave the moral stamina to withstand the siren songs of foreign theories and the fatigue and discouragement of universal war, to emerge triumphantly, a light and hope to all the world.

Second Anniversary of the Organization of Army Service Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which I have addressed to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell and Hon. Robert P. Patterson under date of March 10, 1944, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the organization of the Army Service Forces:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1944.

Lt. Gen. BREHON SOMERVELL,
Army Service Forces,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Undersecretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: To you, General Somervell, as Commanding General of the United States Army Service Forces, and to the Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Undersecretary of War, has been given the job of organizing and transporting whole armies en masse, fully manned, trained, and equipped, across the seas to such task commanders as General MacArthur, in the Southwest Pacific, General Eisenhower, in Egypt, Africa, Italy, and England, to our American Army Task Force Commanders, and to other Army Task Force Commanders wherever they might be throughout the world.

That job, coupled with mobilizing the production and transportation of food, clothing, munitions, tanks, jeeps, ordnance, furnishing highly trained and efficient Engineer Corps, Medical Corps, Signal Corps and Transportation Corps—with every accouterment supply, is probably the most stupendous task ever imposed upon any two men.

Congratulations to you both on this, the second anniversary of the organization of the Army Service Forces which you command.

Your many friends in Congress join with me in expressing our appreciation of your having given to our country the greatest military fighting forces ever associated to the defense of our Nation and of freedom in all history.

That God may bless and preserve General Somervell and Undersecretary of War Patterson is the prayer of

Your friend,

FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Rubber After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, one of America's principal war and post-war problems is that of the production of rubber and of that elastic plastic usually referred to as synthetic rubber. Ohio, as the leading State in rubber products and synthetic rubber products, is keenly alive to its share of the responsibility for meeting this problem.

I am glad, therefore, to call to the attention of the Senate an illuminating, readable, and encouraging article entitled "What About Rubber After the War?" which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for March 4, 1944, and which was written by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., the capable president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio.

Because the printing of this article might require a little more than two pages of the RECORD, I have, in accordance with rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, secured an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing this article. I submit that estimate showing that the article will require two and one-fourth pages at a cost of $101.25, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT RUBBER AFTER THE WAR?

(By Harvey S. Firestone, Jr.)

It took a war to do it, but at last we Americans are independent in the vital matter of rubber. Never again shall we be dependent upon foreign sources for the raw materials for our automobile tires. And of almost equal importance is the happy fact that our synthetic rubber will be able to compete on equal terms with natural rubber. Moreover, our synthetic rubber industry will need no subsidies, no tariff walls, no special considerations.

This year, America will have an annual productive capacity in its own synthetic-rubber plants nearly 25 percent greater than our average annual consumption of rubber in the last 3 pre-war years. In 2 years of war, we have licked, for good and all, one of the greatest problems which car owners of America have constantly faced for the past quarter of a century. The importance and scope of this victory cannot be fully appreciated unless one is familiar with the history of rubber—unless one recalls its ups and downs, which have plagued the rubber industry, and, indirectly, the American motorist, since the early days of the automobile.

DURING THE LAST WAR

During the last war, American manufacturers not only paid high prices for Dutch and British rubber but also were put to considerable inconvenience because of the complete control by Great Britain of the principal sources of rubber. With characteristic thoroughness and attention to minute detail, the German General Staff had made painstaking preparation for war, but, unaccountably, it had overlooked the all-important item of rubber. Early in the war, the Germans realized this error of omission and tried desperately to bring in supplies of rubber from America and other neutral countries. Britain immediately informed our Rubber Control Committee that there would be no more rubber for us unless we guaranteed that not one ounce of it would reach her enemy. Strict embargoes were honestly imposed by the United States, and, as a result, only one or two small shipments ever succeeded in running the blockade. The British embargo and the restrictions that Britain held over us were by no means harsh or unreasonable. But it was clear to all American rubber people that we were completely at the mercy of a foreign rubber control. The lesson was brought home even more forcefully after the war.

1921—12 CENTS A POUND

The widespread price decline of 1920 sent rubber prices tumbling from 56 cents a pound to 16 cents. A year later, rubber prices had dropped to below 12 cents, which was about half its then average cost of production. At that time, 67 percent of the world's rubber was grown in British far eastern possessions, and, through British ownership of plantations in the Dutch East Indies, the Empire actually controlled 75 percent of all the rubber in the world. At the same time, we were consuming 75 percent of the world's production. If the Dutch planters in Java and Sumatra could be induced to join with the British in an agreement to limit production, tire manufacturers in the United States could be forced to pay considerably higher prices for rubber, and this, in turn, would boost the price to the automobile manufacturers and to the car-owning public.

THE BRITISH RUBBER RESTRICTION ACT

The British rubber growers appealed to the Colonial Secretary of Great Britain, and a committee under the chairmanship of Sir James Stevenson was appointed to draw up recommendations for a restriction act. The Colonial Secretary at that time was an imaginative and resourceful statesman by the name of Winston Churchill. There was much talk of war debts at the moment. Finally, on November 1, 1922, a restriction act was approved by Mr. Churchill, who remarked, "One of our principal means of paying our debt to the United States is in the provision of rubber."

In simplest terms, the Stevenson Restriction Act provided for a pivotal price of 30 cents a pound on 60 percent of the normal production of each plantation. As prices went up, there was to be a corresponding increase in tapping. It looked like a perfect arrangement for the growers, but three things were to doom it to failure. One was the independence of the Dutch, who at the start controlled 23 percent of the world production, and who resisted all efforts to induce them to join the British. The second reason for failure was the fact that as the world price went up, small Dutch native planters greatly increased their output.

"AMERICANS SHOULD PRODUCE THEIR OWN RUBBER"

The third cause of the eventual break-down of the monopoly was the crusade waged almost singlehanded by my father under the banner, "Americans should produce their own rubber." To give substance to his own protests he sent me on a world-wide search to determine where Americans could best grow their own rubber. Eventually Liberia was chosen, and during the last 18 years a large holding there has been carefully developed, until today there are 75,000 acres of planted rubber. During the past year alone we have increased output by more than 75 percent over the last pre-war year. My father was joined in his fight by his close personal friends, Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford. Mr. Ford established rubber plantations in Brazil. Mr. Edison, during the last 6 years of his life, devoted much of his time to seeking plants that could be grown and harvested in the United States and which would be capable of producing rubber in practical quantities.

1925—$1.23 A POUND

It was not, however, until 1925 that the American people really awakened and changed from sympathetic spectators to active participants in the struggle. By July of that year, when the monopoly was 2½ years old, the price of rubber had shot up to the outrageous figure of $1.23 a pound. By contrast, shortly before the British Rubber Restriction Act went into effect, rubber was selling for 14 cents a pound. It is a very interesting and significant fact that during the 6 years that this plan was in operation Americans paid $1,250,000,000 more for their rubber than would have been the case if the price had remained the same as it was before the Rubber Restriction Act was passed.

With the country thoroughly aroused protests were made on every side. Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, became an outright and active champion in the rubber fight. As a first step, he urged that we start reclaiming all of our used rubber, and that we actually curtail the use of rubber if such a move became necessary to break the monopoly.

Likewise, there was considerable opposition to the Rubber Restriction Act in England. It centered in the rubber manufacturers, whose association fought it vigorously. Incidentally, they used language as strong as did those opposing it in America, in denouncing the monopoly as uneconomic and unsound. Their opposition proved of no avail, as their stake in rubber was not to be compared with the vast millions invested by the rubber planters.

But this fantastic price squeeze of $1.23 a pound was the straw that broke the camel's back. In the 5-year period of high prices, between 1922 and 1927, the tenacious Dutch planters increased their rubber acreage by 147 percent. As a result, the production of rubber in the Netherlands East Indies grew from 23 percent to 37 percent of the world's supply. It was the increased flow of this independently grown product that contributed much to the failure of the restriction act.

1932—3 CENTS A POUND

The end came swiftly and dramatically. On April 4, 1928, Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin announced bluntly in the House of Commons that the restriction act would formally end on November 1. But even this good news was soon forgotten in the mad boom of the latter twenties. America's expanding motorcar industry cried for more and more rubber. But the end was to come with the 1929 crash. Everything hit bedrock, including the price of rubber. In 1932 it touched the bottom of the pit—3 cents a pound, or about one-fourth of what it probably cost to produce at that time.

INTERNATIONAL CARTEL

Obviously, the 3-cent rubber of 1932 was as uneconomic and unsound as the $1.23 rubber of 1925. So it was that in 1934 when Great Britain and the Netherlands, together with Siam and French Indo-China, quietly formed a new and all-encompassing international cartel for the control of rubber output and prices, the United States said little about it and did nothing to prevent it. The producers had learned their lesson. And never has this new international restriction group attempted to force their biggest customers to pay the outrageous prices of former times.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Meanwhile, synthetic rubber was beginning to win attention. By the end of World War No. 1, Germany was turning out some 300 tons of synthetic rubber a month, but it was poor in quality and high in cost. In the early years of peace, the Germans abandoned their search for a rubber substitute, but in 1925, when rubber hit that $1.23 mark, German chemists hurried back to their test tubes. Using coal and limestone as bases, they eventually developed a type of synthetic which they called Buna N. This type had many excellent qualities but was of questionable value for tires. After continued research, they developed still another type, called Buna S, and this variety proved to be more satisfactory for making tires.

When Hitler rose to power in January 1933 the order was to accelerate the manufacture of Buna S rubber. Later the Nazis put a duty of about 100 percent on all natural rubber and it was reported that the money derived from this was turned over to the companies making Buna S rubber and synthetic-rubber tires.

EARLY AMERICAN RESEARCH

In the meantime we in America had been far from asleep. The research departments of Goodrich, Goodyear, United States Rubber, and Firestone had been conducting synthetic-rubber experiments, as had the laboratories of the du Pont Co. and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. As early as 1933, Firestone was experimenting with tires made from synthetic rubber—and actually made some tires with synthetic rubber for military planes at that time.

American rubber manufacturers were learning the hard way, advancing step by step along the rough trail of techniques and formulas. And let me make it clear right here that the pre-war manufacture of synthetic rubber for tires in this country was, for all practical purposes, purely experimental. We tire and rubber manufacturers were consciously pointing toward synthetic-rubber production, but it took the shock of the war and the dramatic loss of 90 percent of the world's natural-rubber supply to hurl us into a 24-hour-a-day concentrated application to the problems that remained unsolved.

NATURAL RUBBER STOCK PILE

In 1939, with war clouds gathering in Europe, certain men in our Government began to think in terms of global war. Through the foresight and able leadership of Mr. Jesse Jones, plans were made to accumulate reserve supplies of many critical materials for which the United States was dependent on foreign sources of supply. One of these was rubber. Shortly after the tragedy of Pearl Harbor blew us into war, the reserve stock pile had been built up to approximately 634,000 tons of natural rubber, enough for more than one year of normal consumption. If the attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred even 6 months later, enough rubber undoubtedly would have been added to this stock pile to avert the rubber crisis.

As soon as war was declared, the demand for rubber products for our fighting forces was tremendously increased. The armed services required millions of tires and also hundreds of other products made from rubber. Drastic steps were immediately taken to protect this supply. Overnight, Ceylon, Liberia, and South America had become the principal remaining sources of natural rubber, and it was apparent that huge new sources had to be found.

Following the report of the Baruch committee, the way was cleared for more concentrated efforts on the development and manufacture of the one type of synthetic rubber best suited for tires. But before it could be produced in the needed quantities, it was first necessary to erect plants, not only for the manufacture of the synthetic rubber itself but also for making the raw materials, butadiene and styrene.

As a result of the untiring work of former Rubber Director William M. Jeffers and his successor, Col. Bradley Dewey, in cooperation with the rubber industry and officials of Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Plant Corporation and Rubber Development Corporation, the rubber crisis has been licked. At the end of 1943, approximately 140,000 tons remained in our stock pile of natural rubber, and this year there will be in operation synthetic-rubber plants with an annual capacity of 850,000 tons. In addition, we shall obtain increasing quantities of natural rubber from Ceylon, Liberia, South America, and other rubber-growing areas still open to the United Nations.

AN UNSUNG VICTORY

Possibly, it is just as well that about all the average citizen knew of the fantastically expanding synthetic-rubber industry of the past 2 years was the pessimistic and critical reports, accusations, and mud slinging that he read in his newspapers or heard over his radio. The surprise attending the full realization of how successful this thrilling program has been will be all the sweeter in its telling. For it has been successful to a degree matched only by such phenomenal wartime records as that set, for instance, by the automobile and airplane industries.

As a nation, we have spent $700,000,000 of the people's money to gain an economic freedom the value of which is beyond computation. There are some enthusiasts who feel it is just about the best national investment that we have ever made. No other insurance policy begins to match it, for it absolutely guarantees us rubber freedom. And $700,000,000 is certainly a small cost for a paid-up insurance policy which, for example, could likely have saved American car owners $1,250,000,000 in the short span of 6 years of the British Restriction Act.

At the outset we didn't make very good tires of synthetic rubber, but we have been learning fast. We have service records now which show that, with proper care and under wartime driving regulations, passenger-car tires made of 100 percent synthetic rubber will give about the same performance as 100 percent natural-rubber tires. Synthetic tires, however, are more easily damaged under abusive conditions. We have had less success with heavy-duty truck and bus tires.

To put it simply, the high heat generated within these heavily loaded tires operating at high speeds prematurely deteriorates the syn-

thetic rubber and fabric. To build satisfactory large-size truck and bus tires, it is still necessary to mix a good proportion of natural rubber with the synthetic material.

To us in the rubber business these facts are not in the least discouraging. After all, it took us 40 years to learn how to build natural-rubber tires to give the high mileage and at the low cost of pre-war days. The industry has high hopes that eventually synthetic tires of all kinds of sizes will equal the natural-rubber product in every way.

It should be remembered that processing synthetic rubber is quite a different art from the processing of natural rubber. All our expert knowledge and long experience, all the processes and formulas developed over a period of 40 years, were of little value to us when it came to making products out of synthetic rubber. We practically had to start all over again and work out completely new methods, for synthetic and natural rubber are two entirely different materials and cannot be handled alike. About all of the past that we could use was the machines, and it is another proof of American ingenuity and inventive and productive genius that within a scant 2 years two new and complicated manufacturing arts were developed—the making of synthetic rubber and the manufacture of this material into finished products.

Back in the summer of 1941 each of the four largest rubber companies had been asked by the Government to build, with funds provided by the Defense Plant Corporation, a synthetic rubber plant that would produce 2,500 tons of synthetic rubber annually and to operate these plants under Government contracts. Almost immediately orders came to enlarge these plants to 10,000-ton capacity, and a little later the capacity became 15,000 tons.

MULTIPLIED MAGIC

With the loss of Singapore, orders were sent to duplicate immediately the 15,000-ton units. That meant a potential output of four times 30,000 tons, or a grand total of 120,000 tons of synthetic rubber, and still that was only a starter. Plantation factories rose like magic mushrooms out of the earth. Fifteen-thousand-ton plants were doubled; then redoubled. More brand-new plants were ordered. In 1944 Firestone alone will operate Government-owned plants with an annual capacity of 150,000 tons of synthetic rubber. The total output will exceed 700,000 tons, with a total capacity of 850,000 tons by the end of the year. For most purposes it will be as good as natural rubber, and we shall probably make it cheaper than the average price we have paid in recent years for natural rubber.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER ESTIMATED AT 15 CENTS A POUND

The price of natural rubber for the stock pile agreed upon by Great Britain and the United States was 22½ cents a pound. Before long, synthetic rubber is likely to be produced in the more economical plants for around 16 cents a pound. And there are many people who believe that synthetic will be produced at a cost as low as 10 cents a pound. More conservative authorities insist that it will be best to set the figure of 15 cents as a safe and sound estimate of future cost.

Many qualified experts says that natural rubber cannot be grown profitably on the great modern plantations of the Far East for less than 15 cents a pound. This figure leaves a fair margin of profit, and includes the costs of reforestation and replacement. Here again we are taking an average figure.

If synthetic and natural rubber can be sold at the same price after the war, it is likely that synthetic tires will not cost much more than natural-rubber tires of similar quality just before the war. At the moment, synthetic rubber tires take more time to manufacture, require more equipment and more operations, but these added cost factors doubtless will be reduced as we gain experience.

On the face of the matter, this might appear to spell the doom of rubber plantations. If we in this country can produce more than the annual pre-war consumption, if we can do the job economically and if the quality of the product is as good as natural rubber, then, many people will ask, what difference does it make what happens to the rubber plantations when peace comes?

POST-WAR DEMANDS

For the first year or two after the war ends, the world will need every pound of synthetic and natural rubber that can possibly be produced. It is estimated that the automobile industry will turn out no less than 4,500,000 new cars during the first 12 months of peace. Four and a half million new cars will take 22,500,000 new tires. And during this same critical 12 months we shall need some 55,000,000 more new tires to replace the worn-out tires on some 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 old passenger cars and trucks. That adds up to about 77,500,000 new tires for this country alone. The most tires the industry ever built in recent pre-war years in America was 61,540,000 in 1941.

Now let's look at the rest of the world for a moment. The British Isles, all of Europe, most of Asia and part of Africa will have to be rehabilitated. Many nations will probably embark on a building boom that will include millions of new trucks and cars. All these must have tires. Every continent will require rubber products in quantities far beyond any previous needs.

There are conservative rubber economists who believe that the world will need as much as 1,850,000 tons of natural and synthetic rubber annually during the first few post-war years. In the last 3 pre-war years, we in the United States used an average of 670,000 tons of natural rubber. The rest of the world used possibly half that amount, making a total of around 1,000,000 tons of natural rubber each year. Yet, the moment peace comes, there will be a call for nearly twice that amount of rubber each year for several years. That means basic rubber production will have to be nearly doubled over the average of recent pre-war years.

POST-WAR RESOURCES

Where will this tremendous increase come from? In the first place, we'll have an immediate source in our synthetic-rubber plants producing some 850,000 tons a year. Natural-rubber plantations will have to produce the remaining 1,000,000 tons of crude rubber—and that is where the difficulties arise. Except during the 6 wild unrestricted years between the end of the Stevenson Restriction Act in 1928 and the forming of the new cartel in 1934, there has never been a time in the last quarter of a century when the vast far eastern plantations were tapped to their full capacity. Surely, if they remain intact, the old natural-rubber plantations could, in the future, furnish all of the desired 1,000,000 tons needed.

But no one, excepting the Japanese, knows the exact status of the captured rubber plantations. We are quite certain that the British and Dutch owners and managers practiced little or no scorched-earth policy. We suspect, however that much rubber machinery was wrecked for scrap metal by the Japanese. And it is probable that many plantations have been uncared for and left largely to their own devices.

Anyone who has had any experience in tropical lands knows how fast the jungle recaptures its own. In 4 or 5 years, well-cleared plantations go back to jungle. At the very least, 1 or 2 years of hard work, plus large expenditures of money, will be necessary to bring them back into production. It is doubtful whether the far eastern plantations will give us more than 500,000 tons of rubber annually during the first year or two after the Japanese are driven out.

This means that, in all probability, during the first few years of peace there will be a shortage of rubber. Natural-rubber plantations and the synthetic-rubber industry must both shoulder the burden of filling the demands of a transportation-hungry world.

Our experience with both synthetic and natural rubber proves conclusively that each has its advantages and that both will be used in large quantities in the post-war world. Certain products can be made from synthetic rubber which would be impractical with natural rubber, because of the greater resistance of certain types of synthetic rubber to acids, alkalis, oils, and other substances which adversely affect natural rubber. Consequently, we shall be able to use synthetic rubber for a wide range of new products which could never be made with natural rubber.

Though the quantity of synthetic rubber that will be used for ultimate peacetime production may not be so large as the present capacity, it should be sufficient to assure the continued operation of a good part of the synthetic-rubber plants. Furthermore, I believe that new uses will be found for the raw materials used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. Styrene, for example, will probably be required in large quantities for the greatly increased manufacture of plastics, and post-war uses for butadiene are being developed. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the manufacture of 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber annually, and the raw materials which go into it, requires some 30,000 employees. It would require approximately 4,500,000 acres of rubber trees and 850,000 tappers to produce the equivalent amount of natural rubber.

We, in this fortunate country of ours, could go about our business without ever again importing a single pound of natural rubber. But do we want to do that? Do we want to help kill the Malayan goose that lays a golden egg of export markets for us? Do we want to be responsible for throwing the entire economic structure of the Dutch East Indies and British Malaya out of kilter? Remember, much of their economy certainly is based on natural rubber.

It is both an economic and a moral issue. And it is one that the American people must decide for themselves. The lusty, young, synthetic-rubber industry will look after itself, no matter what the decision may be.

The Late Representative, Hon. James A. O'Leary, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of my friend the Honorable JAMES A. O'LEARY, who so ably served the American people in this House of Representatives. At this time in our country's history his passing is a distinct loss to the Nation, the House of Representatives, and the people of the district he so ably represented.

It was my pleasure to be associated with our late colleague throughout his

entire membership in Congress as a member with him on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His intimate knowledge of the problems of the American merchant marine, to which he devoted his able and constructive mind, made him a staunch and true friend who dedicated his capacity to its development.

Likewise our colleague knew intimately the problems of his people from the highest to the lowest, and to these problems he devoted a courage and faithfulness unsurpassed. His innate sense of justice, coupled with his jovial and unselfish personality, made him the friend of all. We shall miss him greatly in the days ahead. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter dated March 15, 1944, from Mr. Harry Philbin, of Baltimore, Md., formerly vice president and trustee of the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation and the United States Lines, now a transportation consultant, containing some very interesting data on waterway projects in Soviet Russia and outlining the importance of inland waterway development in the United States:

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 15, 1944.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your extension of remarks re the Tombigbee-Tennessee Canal project as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1944, is most constructive and timely. Therefore I feel it is my duty to call to your attention, and through you to the Congress and to the American public, the absolute necessity for the Congress to pass H. R. 3961 without any amendments, for all of these projects are in the public interest. The key project which will materially help most all of the inland-waterway projects in this bill is the Tombigbee-Tennessee Canal project. Just visualize for a moment, had the Tombigbee-Tennessee Canal project been in existence before the outbreak of the present war, an enormous overcrowding of our inland transportation would have been avoided.

Right here I think it is quite appropriate to cite to you what the Soviet Russian Government has accomplished by giving primary attention to her inland-waterway problems, for in her first 5-year plan she expended over $2,000,000,000 connecting her rivers and deepening same for navigation. It was this foresight on their part that made available for water transportation the movement of her war equipment and supplies after the Hitlerites overran and in some instances destroyed her railroads.

Therefore, the development of the Nation's inland waterways ought to be carried on comprehensively as a major enterprise of the Federal public-works program. The Government could add enormously and permanently to the national wealth by providing better channels of inland-waterway navigation. The waterways program should include an adequate canal system. Naturally, it would include an irrigation and flood-control program. Railroads, in the early days, started to put the existing canals and waterways out of business and to monopolize the carriage of freights which paid the highest returns. The waterways should be restored and the system augmented to embrace the entire country for commerce and prosperity. Every section clamors for the enhanced buying power which the financing of these needed public works would bestow upon the country as a whole.

We have only to look at the map of Soviet Russia to see that they like ourselves have all the natural conditions for a network of waterways covering the whole country, linking all of its various regions and giving them access to the seas.

In the past life of Russia, under the Tsar, these splendid natural conditions of Russia's waterways were sadly neglected. The Dnieper River was a fine water highway to the Black Sea, stretching 1,400 miles through one of their richest mineral and agricultural sections. But the rapids some 200 miles from its mouth were allowed to block the way to the Black Sea, a condition which recalls to historians that 1,000 years ago, water travel from Scandinavia to Constantinople meant hauling boats part of the way overland. In the North, boats plying between what was formerly the capital, now Leningrad, and the important White Sea port of Archangel, 650 miles away, had to embark on a long voyage over 2,800 miles, through the Baltic Sea, around Scandinavian countries, across a long section of the Arctic Ocean. The Volga River, the chief water artery of Russia, which wanders over 2,300 miles of Soviet territory before reaching the Caspian Sea, was allowed to become shallow and choked with silt. As for water power development—there was none.

The backward country of pre-revolutionary Russia had to be content with what small canal building had been done in the nineteenth century. This system was of course wholly inadequate for the rapidly increasing production under the Soviet Union regime. They found that it would be entirely too costly to transport the growing mass of goods over their railroads, even assuming it were physically possible. Hence, a broad plan of waterway development was a necessity for their rapidly progressing country.

In 1932 the completion of the Dnieprostroy Dam with its system of locks opened the Dnieper River to navigation for its full length for the first time in history. In 1933 the Baltic-White Sea Canal, connecting Leningrad and Archangel, was completed, and the distance between these two centers was cut by over 75 percent when this was completed. They immediately started tackling the Volga River. Before their second 5-year plan was completed, which ended in the year of 1937, the Moscow-Volga Canal had passed out of the blueprint stage into actuality, opening up new avenues for the production of some of the most important regions of their country.

Of course, all this required heavy outlays. In 1933 the Soviet Union invested 500,000,000 rubles in the improvement of waterways transportation and the building of new waterways. In the following year, 1934, this figure of 500,000,000 rubles ran close to a billion rubles. During the period of the second 5-year plan the total expenditures ran over 4,000,000,000 rubles.

The Soviet Union realized the great advantages accruing by expenditure of this huge sum for developing her waterways and that nearly all of the work in this direction meant also creating new sources of electric-power development and irrigation possibilities, at the same time providing for cheaper means of transport.

An outstanding accomplishment of what this development policy is is clearly shown in the Volga River system. This not only created a deep waterway connecting with the whole country but the irrigation of drying lands on the east side of the Volga, which won their war against the fight of the advance of the desert. Dry winds from central Asia are the cause of recurring droughts along the Volga River. These winds in some years absorb from the wheat-producing plains three times as much moisture as they get during the whole summer rain period. In the irrigating of these lands on the east side of the Volga, a barrier had been created against what the Soviets call the desert tongue advancing to the European part of the country, and the 10,000,000 acres have been made secure against future dangers of droughts. This work on the Volga included the building of five dams for navigation, at the same time provided water for irrigation, electric energy, and cheap transportation for their country.

The reconstruction of the Volga River is a part of a great system of inland waterways linking together all the centers of production of their country, also giving these areas access to the sea. The Volga River is the greatest river of the European part of the Soviet Union and it provides the best illustration of what waterway development in one's country means in the public interest. The Soviet Union's Volga River had an inadequate water connection with Moscow, their capital. The Moscow River connection, being of shallow water, was wholly insufficient to bear the requisite water traffic of this great center. Therefore, the Soviets proceeded to build the Moscow-Volga Canal. This permitted part of the waters of the upper regions of the Volga to be deviated into the Moscow River, to rejoin the Volga again near the city of Gorky (formerly Nizhni-Novogorod). This constructive effort made for a waterway into Moscow. Thus Moscow, Russia's greatest industrial and consuming center became a great inland port. The length of this canal approximates 80 miles at a cost of something over 700,000,000 rubles.

It has been an old dream of the Russia of the past to connect the Volga River with the Black Sea. Peter the Great attempted the undertaking, but with no success. On the map it looks very simple. Near Stalingrad the Volga comes close to the Don River, which empties into the Black Sea. Soviet Russian regime completed the 62 miles of canal connecting the Volga and the Don Rivers. The result is the whole center and north and European portion of the Soviet Union has achieved an outlet to the Black Sea, via this connection. But this is not all. The north is developing rapidly, and requires more waterways. A thousand miles northeast of Leningrad lies the Pechora region, rich in minerals and timber. This is linked with the Kama River and through the Kama with the Volga, thereby providing an outlet to the south for this region, and the Volga River with its twin outlets on the Black and Caspian Seas, will be linked with the Arctic Ocean via the Pechora River. The development permits commodities to be taken direct to the port of Indiga, which in spite of its northern location, practically never freezes.

The connection between the Volga River and the Baltic Sea has long been in existence; however, much improvement was necessary and approximately some 400,000,000 rubles was spent to enable vessels of adequate size to navigate same; the completion of which now unites Moscow with Leningrad and the Volga to all four seas.

In addition to the river-to-river connections, the Soviet Union has practically completed welding direct connections between the four seas. This was a remarkable achieve-

ment and will pay dividends to Russia's industry, agriculture, mining, and her national defense.

Time does not permit me to go on describing the various other works undertaken or projected for the improvement of waterways in the Soviet Union. However, I would like to briefly call attention to the fact that large-scale developments are taking place in Siberia—also very important projects in the Far East. I might also mention the works that are projected in the Central Asiatic Republics of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, including the change in direction of the Amo Darya and possibly the diversion of that river into the Caspian Sea. This will mean transforming a great desert into a fertile, irrigated plain.

Before closing this brief summary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics intense inland waterways development, I would like to add that the entire length of navigable waterways of the Soviet Union was increased during the course of their first Five-Year Plan by 30,000 kilometers (20,000 miles). The second Five-Year Plan increased this by another 17,000 kilometers (11,500 miles), bringing the total length of their waterways to 101,000 kilometers, or 62,700 miles. This is over three times the inland waterway developed in the United States.

The U. S. S. R. by their activities and accomplishments, through their waterway developments, feel that such investments are important. They don't talk about it but go ahead with their projects, as they feel that no expenditure gives better returns than their outlay on waterways. With their by-products of power and irrigation, they are becoming one of the most important elements in the national economy of the Soviet Union.

The wonderful accomplishments of the U. S. S. R. in the present conflict proves that their vision and willingness to stand the costs in the development of their inland waterways has proven beyond a doubt that the development of a country's inland waterways makes for prosperity and national defense.

Sincerely yours,

J. HARRY PHILBIN.

Message of Gov. William H. Willis to the General Assembly of Vermont in Special Session, March 15, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks a certified copy of the message which the Honorable William H. Willis, Governor of the State of Vermont, delivered to the Joint Assembly of the Special Session of the Legislature of Vermont, convened on March 15, 1944, primarily to consider necessary amendments to our laws to afford every citizen of Vermont in the service of their country an opportunity to vote:

Members of the General Assembly, two major problems have arisen, since last the General Assembly was in session, which require legislative action at this time.

It was for the purpose of placing these problems before you and to recommend specific action thereon that this special session was called.

In the first place, it is the manifest desire of the people of Vermont to make available the full voting privilege to all members of the armed forces, irrespective of the latter's geographical station. Our present election laws are inadequate and do not allow this desired result to be attained. Were corrective legislation to fail of enactment such failure would deny to a great number of our citizens a right that both in justice and good conscience is not ours to deny. Whenever one has taken from him the basic and essential privilege of citizenship, the right to vote, he thereby has denied to him those things which constitute a guaranty of all the rights which he enjoys.

No one, it seems to me, has any more vital interest in the issues confronting the citizenry at election time than the earnest patriot who, with considerable personal sacrifice, has gone forth from his Vermont village to give his life, if need be, to conserve, preserve, and perpetuate our heritage of freemen living under constitutional liberty.

We of this day should do no less than did our predecessors during the Civil War when the voting right was extended to include the soldiers serving in the field. Applicable today as they were then are the sentiments expressed by Governor Poland when, in urging the general assembly to make provision for soldier voting, he said:

"I am fully confident that it is in the power of the legislature to frame a law, which while it will secure the State to all reasonable extent against frauds and abuse, will also secure to the citizen soldiers a privilege which it is ungenerous to deny, and which can, in all soundness of convincing argument, be urged and claimed as a right. They are rendering high service to the country * * * They have gone from among the sovereign people, intelligent freemen, constituent elements of the government, to contend for a cause in which they have a personal interest, and to maintain principles which, when the contest is finally closed, will affect them in common with all the rest, and are fully entitled to the privilege of exercising this right."

Proceeding, therefore, in accord with the sentiments I have expressed above, diligent preliminary study was given to this particular problem. I asked the commission to codify the election laws, created by the general assembly in the regular session of 1943, to make a thorough study of existing law.

I further instructed the commission to recommend amendments necessary to make adequate provision whereby the fact of service in the armed forces would be no bar to the exercise of the full voting privilege. It was and is my desire to have made available to those in the armed forces from Vermont the same privilege available to those who will be able to enter the polling booth on election day.

This study was undertaken. Recommendations were submitted to me. I thereupon conferred not only with the commission but with the lieutenant governor, the speaker of the house, and the legislative draftsmen. The result of those studies and conferences was yesterday placed in a proposed bill form before the members of the house and senate committees of this body named by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house. The results of their deliberations are before you in the form of a bill for your consideration and action.

At the time this message was sent to the printer final Federal action had yet to be taken on the soldier vote bill. The conference report was still to be acted upon by the two houses of Congress.

I have had copies of the conference report made available to you. I am informed that either the bill upon which the conferees have agreed will become law or Public Law, No. 712, enacted by the Seventy-seventh Congress, will remain in force.

The proposed legislation before the Congress would appear to protect the rights of the States. I believe, therefore, that there should be definite authorization for the use of a Federal ballot.

A provision to that effect, section 45, was incorporated in the bill presented to your committees on yesterday.

By virtue of such a provision in our law, every possible advantage will be extended to those serving in the armed forces. I can think of no greater service to the brave men and women who wear the uniform of their country than a unanimous vote upon these proposals.

Now I wish to speak of the second major problem to be placed before you. I refer to the pressing need for increased financial aid to towns by the State to combat an acute teacher shortage.

Presently new contract arrangements for the fall term will be made with the teachers in the various Vermont localities. Experience of the past year indicates that unless greater inducement can be offered to the individual teachers many will accept, and should not be criticized if they do accept, more lucrative positions in their profession in our neighboring States or in industry either at home or abroad. Unless corrective measures are taken, this shortage will continue to grow more critical during, and for some years after the war. Our normal school enrollments moreover are greatly reduced. This means that fewer teachers will be available from Vermont. Other States from which Vermont has been accustomed to secure beginners have no oversupply.

Low salaries paid to Vermont teachers is the chief reason why girls do not wish to enter normal schools. They can secure as much or more in other occupations which require less preparation.

Vermont's 269 school districts pay about 83 percent of the total cost of education—a much higher percentage than in the average State. Furthermore, many towns are now taxing local property to the limit. Our State government pays only about half the percentage of the total cost of education as does the average State. Yet Vermont ranks toward the middle of the States of the Union in per capita wealth and per capita income.

Provision should be made now to increase the financial assistance given to the towns by the State and thus, so far as practicable, further assist them to meet the emergency which exists today. This can be done by increasing the amount made available per equated pupil from $16.50, as voted by the last regular session of the general assembly, to $20.

The appropriation for such an increase in the rate per equated pupil will require an additional appropriation of $182,000. This amount can be made available from our surplus funds without disturbing existing budgets or requiring additional taxes. Whether on consideration you wish to go further than this is a matter for your determination.

The friendly woods and streams of the Green Mountains are cherished memories in the heart of many a young Vermonter now in the service of his country.

So that, while on furlough or leave, he may the more readily enjoy such recreation as our woods and streams afford, I propose that legislation be enacted whereby, for the war's duration, hunting and fishing privileges will be made available to those serving in the armed forces without cost.

There is now before the Congress specific legislation sponsored by one of the leading veterans' organizations that appears, through its beneficial provisions, to anticipate many of the problems which will be encountered

by veterans of the present war when they leave the service of our country.

It is my understanding that the particular legislation to which I have reference, among other benefits, authorizes appropriations for adequate hospital facilities to cope with any casualty load that may arise; for the speedy settlement of claims by those who have been disabled in their country's service, as well as extending aid to them in the period of rehabilitation and relocation after their discharge.

The principles involved in this so-called G. I. bill of rights appear to be such as to commend the measure to our attention and to enlist our support.

We are primarily interested in the welfare of these young men now serving throughout the globe. These are your boys. Be proud of them. Thank God for them, and live up to them!

I wish to speak to you briefly about the flood control controversy concerning which so much has been written both in Vermont and metropolitan newspapers since last the general assembly was in regular session.

As Governor of Vermont, a sovereign State, the encroachment by the centralized Federal Government on the rights, prerogatives, and domain of the State have caused me considerable concern. In general, this same feeling is shared, I know, by a majority of chief executives of our sister States.

Here in Vermont, however, in the West River Valley, we have had a specific example that has brought this whole subject into the foreground.

The Federal, so-called Omnibus Flood Control Law of 1936 provided for Federal-State cooperation. This act provided that the State and the localities benefited by a flood-control project should acquire and pay for the lands and rights needed, that the Federal Government should pay the construction costs, and that the States should take over and operate it after completion. It also authorized two or more States to enter joint agreements or compacts involving flood control and to submit such compacts to Congress for approval.

Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut thereupon instituted a careful and exhaustive study of their common flood-control problems. A definite program to prevent floods by the construction of flood control dams in strategic locations was the purpose of the four-state compact which resulted. This compact was ratified by the legislatures of all four States and was submitted to the Congress for an approval which was never forthcoming.

In its stead, the basic policy of the 1936 law was abruptly changed by the Barkley amendment of 1938. The latter was an Administration sponsored device the effect of which, by giving the Federal Government full authority to acquire sites and build dams wherever it wished, was and is to exclude Vermont, and every other sovereign State, from having any voice in determining what may be done within its borders.

Under existing Federal law, therefore, the Federal Government can come into Vermont, prepared to spend not the $6,000,000 originally proposed but $36,000,000 to erect not a flood control but a multipurpose dam at this West Dummerston site and in the process not only inundate the land but destroy the agriculture, commerce, and industry of the area. It can do this without the State being consulted or having any voice in the matter. It can do the same thing not only at West Dummerston but elsewhere in the State.

The basic law, permitting such a situation to exist, I believe, is wrong. Only by a change in this basic law can the States recapture that which has been surrendered to the central government. In pursuing this belief, the cooperation of our fellow compact States has not only been enlisted but assured; appearances have been made before congressional committees. Conferences and correspondence has been had with Vermont's delegation in the Congress and positive action there has been taken designed to amend existing law and thereby restore to the States the rights which are theirs.

There is an inherent danger in this whole situation of which we should all be aware; if the central government can take one resource of the State, it ultimately can take not only one, it can take all. If it can take water it can and will take and direct the use of land; and land is our greatest natural resource.

I bring this matter to your attention in the expectation that it may be your pleasure, by proper resolution, to place the general assembly on record in respect to this particular subject.

The need for action on the matters to which I have referred in the foregoing is apparent. There are many other subjects, not of an emergency nature, that could be considered at this special session but, the great majority of these will not suffer if left for action by the next regular session of the general assembly.

I know that many of you have been put to personal inconvenience to attend this special session. I appreciate wholeheartedly the spirit in which you have convened to consider these important matters.

The inconveniences experienced by us, however, are minor when compared to the sacrifices which are being made by the men in our armed forces, and it is in their interest that we meet today.

Our major efforts should continue to be devoted to the strengthening of the democratic way they are fighting to preserve. We can do no less.

Baruch's Bonus for Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Baruch's Bonus for Big Business," by Addison Steele, from the Progressive, for March 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARUCH'S BONUS FOR BIG BUSINESS

(By Addison Steele)

In case anyone has wondered, it is now clear that big businessmen of the country will not be selling apples on street corners as a reward for their wartime "sacrifices." Barney Baruch, late of Wall Street, his helper, John Hancock, presently of Wall Street, R. F. C. head Jesse Jones, Will Clayton, the world's biggest cotton merchant, and Jimmy Byrnes will see to that.

These gentlemen have just arranged that the lion's share of the war-created wealth of the Nation is to be turned over to a handful of major corporations. The veterans, the people, little business, and the American system of competitive enterprise can take a licking while Standard Oil, Alcoa, United States Steel, du Pont, and a few others reap the major post-war financial benefits.

The blueprint for all these good things for corporate wealth is the recently released Baruch-Hancock report, and the tool chosen to insure the result is Will Clayton, the new Surplus Property Administrator.

THOSE GOVERNMENT PLANTS

The Government in the course of the war has spent $15,000,000,000 for wartime production; $15,000,000,000 buys a lot of plants and equipment.

This money has been spent on plants that for the most part are being run by private industries to produce war materials. Far, far too many of them are managed by a few companies, since 70 percent of all Government construction contracts is under the control of 100 corporations.

Not all of these plants can be used after the war. Some, as for example, the munitions factories, will be unnecessary the day we have no use for an extra thousand 16-inch guns. But most of them—the Baruch report estimates about $10,000,000,000 worth—can produce peacetime products. Synthetic rubber, aluminum, magnesium, and airplanes are only a few of the examples.

The question of who is going to get that $10,000,000,000 worth of plants and equipment and how much is to be paid for them has agitated Washington for months. War Mobilization Director Byrnes asked Mr. Baruch for the answers and the result is the Baruch-Hancock report.

SELLING OUT TO CORPORATIONS

It is obvious that whoever controls the disposition of the Government plants controls the economic future of the country. These plants can be shut down to keep them out of competition with private industries or they can be run to provide jobs for thousands of people. The can be turned over to a handful of businesses to benefit a few companies under eastern financial control or they can be sold to small businesses scattered throughout the country.

What ought to be done is clear. The Government should get fair value for what it sells. It should keep title to the plants and lease their operation so that if the operators violate the antitrust laws or profiteer excessively, the leases can be canceled. It should keep yardstick plants in every important industry to maintain a measure of reasonable profits. In determining the prices to be charged and the plants to be shut down, it should encourage businesses scattered throughout the country.

The Baruch report categorically rejects every one of these objectives. It demands less Government in business and then proposes a "financial kit" offering different special favors to business. Its sole "concession" to small business is the inclusion of the Attorney General on an advisory board of 13. It rejects the notion of regional development and specifically refuses to give added bidding opportunities to small business.

It rejects the yardstick control entirely, and shrinks in horror at the thought of any Government competition with such outrageous monpolies as the Aluminum Co. of America. It rejects the leasing method, thus abandoning all control of the manner in which the plants will be used. It rejects every conceivable proposal to steer the property out of the hands of the 100 ruling corporations and as a matter of course rejects all proposals to prevent these corporations from shutting down and junking any plant that might afford competition.

One industrialist, worried about post-war competition with his own business, recently said of a Government plant which he managed: "When this war is over, I am going to take the roof off that Government plant and let the rain come in." The Baruch report is wholly in accord with this philosophy.

To insure that only the few would benefit from the property disposition, Director Byrnes

designated the R. F. C. to administer the program and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Will Clayton, to be in charge. The R. F. C. has been ladling out the United States Treasury to big corporations for 12 years and has plenty of experience in giving away something for nothing. Clayton, a Jesse Jones man, who contributed $10,000 to the Liberty League in 1936 and supported the Associated Farmers, is one of the slickest and most reactionary men in the Government.

HEAVEN FOR BIG BUSINESS

The Baruch report barely mentions veterans. It gives their problems approximately 4 pages in a 100-page report, promises them that each community will have a booth at which they can learn their rights, and gives them a work director, with vague and unspecified duties. Washington observers don't believe that veterans will get much from a program consisting of little more than Barney's comfort stations.

Press comment has varied. The big-business press, including David Lawrence and the Washington Times-Herald, have praised the report for its "sound conservatism." Labor, publication of the railroad brotherhoods, describes the report as "Business' idea of heaven," and notes that business pressure groups "have been given everything they have had the nerve to demand." James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, has written to President Roosevelt that under the Baruch report his organization sees "the peace being won by the money changers."

Congress should throw out the Baruch-Hancock report and start all over again.

Address at Moultrie, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before a congressional committee and the public at Moultrie, Ga., March 16, 1944:

My friends, I have not come to intrude upon your plans nor to interfere with your preparations. I have come, however, to evidence by my presence my deep appreciation of your steadfast loyalty and my gratitude to the people who have repeatedly bestowed upon me the honor of representing them in the Congress of the United States. How well I have met every responsibility and discharged every duty, my record must be my witness.

We are assembled during one of the most fearful periods of all time. Practically the whole world is at war. The roar of cannon, the whine of flying missiles and falling bombs, the shrieks of agony and the groans of death fill the air wherever fighting man meets fighting man. The whole face of the earth is drenched with human blood.

All over the world our sons are in deadly conflict with our enemies. Young and immature as they are, they are pitted against the best trained and most experienced military machine ever assembled. These boys are fighting their way up the frozen slopes of Italian mountains, foot by foot, driving the entrenched enemy ahead of them on their way to the Eternal City and the conquest of Italy. Others are fighting in the swamps and jungles of the Southwest Pacific, driving the enemy back island by island on their way to Tokio and the defeat of the land of the Rising Sun. Still others fly over fortress Europe destroying the arsenals of the enemy, laying waste his cities and his sources of supply. In China our sons carry the war directly against the invading horde, driving them from the lands of our eastern ally. Everywhere, all over the world, American boys are engaged in the fight for freedom. Thousands of these boys already have given their lives in the struggle against tyranny and oppression. Thousands more will give their lives, for they still must face the ordeal of invasion. Thousands, too, are being returned, maimed and wounded, to find their place anew in our domestic economy. My friends, our primary obligation is to those boys. We must support them with all of the resources of the Nation—material, moral, and spiritual. We must win this war as quickly as possible, whatever the cost, whatever the material sacrifice, in order that we may bring our sons back home to us with a minimum loss of life and limb. I have supported the war effort of our Government in all its phases. I never have criticized the conduct of the war and I do not criticize it now. Considering our unpreparedness in the beginning and the disaster at Pearl Harbor, we have made incredible progress against the enemy on land, at sea, and in the air. Since seizing the offensive our boys have known neither retreat nor defeat. They continue on the march toward ultimate victory.

While I have full faith and confidence in our leadership on the fighting front, it is with deep regret that I must say that the conduct of domestic affairs on the home front has not been such as to meet with my wholehearted approval. While our sons face the tyranny of despotism and the oppression of conquest abroad, here at home we are confronted with the tyranny of dictatorship and the oppression of bureaucracy. The New World planners have come a long way during recent years. They have acquired constantly increasing authority over the affairs of our people and our private industry. Congressional grants of power have been enlarged by administrative interpretation and used to bring the people under a government of men rather than a government of law.

The great economic principles underlying our success as a people and a Nation have been freedom of enterprise and individual initiative. These principles made us ingenious and inventive at home and invincible abroad. We were unassailable so long as we held steadfast to them.

Our farmers, once the Nation's most independent individualists, have lost much of their erstwhile independence. They are now subjected to the snooping operations of a vast horde of bureaucratic agents who swarm over the land like a plague of parasites sucking the lifeblood of their tax-ridden hosts. They have virtually lost control of their own agricultural operations. They are so completely regimented that bureaucrats dictate the number of acres they may sow, the kind and quantity of crops they may grow, and the price at which they may sell. They are charged with being the stumbling block in the war effort, or as being interested only in profits, and with responsibility for such inflation as we have had. They are subjected to concerted effort to make scapegoats out of them and to be sent off to the mountains as sacrificial burnt offerings. The truth is that the farmers of America never have asked for anything but fair treatment. It is not unreasonable that they should want the dollar they get out of their crops to buy as much of the goods and services they are compelled to buy as the dollar they are compelled to put into their crops. It is not disloyal that they should want their dollars stabilized the same as the dollars of the industrial workers are stabilized. They cannot understand why their dollar should be cheap when the prices of things they must buy are dear, and dear when the prices of things they must buy are cheap. They do protest, and they have the right to protest, against being burned at the stake for the good of their own souls.

There are no people in the world more loyal than the farmers of America. It was their forefathers who fought for and achieved American independence, and it is that independence which they must maintain. The only place on God's green footstool where two blades of grass can be made to grow where only one grew before is the soil. The only place where nature provides honest increase as the fruit of honest toil is on the farm. Destroy the farm and there will not remain a single vestige of any kind of economy.

While it has been almost impossible for you to secure farm machinery, our global philanthropists have been sending it all over the world, even to nonbelligerents. You may be sure they did not overlook Africa, where Nylon hose and galloping dominoes prove far more acceptable than tractors or plows. Under their latest program these international spendthrifts plan to give away to foreign nations 250,000 American plows. Do you need a plow? They plan to give away 20,000 American drills—seed, fertilizer, and lime drills. They plan to give away 40,000 harrows and harrow parts. Do you need a harrow? They plan to give away 10,000 binders, 10,000 cultivators, 6,000 reapers, 50,000 mowers, 30,000 tractors, 30,000 trailers, 30,000 separators, and 20,000 rakes, together with thousands of parts—a grand total of some 500,000 items of American farm machinery or parts; while American farmers and their Representatives in Congress who intercede for them are denied enough machinery or enough parts with which to provide the food necessary for our fighting boys or our civilian population.

Our farmers are partially organized, but they must become completely so, for it is the multiplied strength of individuals, big and little, that adds up to irresistible power. I should like to see every farmer in Georgia identify himself with the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation headed by our friend and neighbor, Lynwood Wingate. I witnessed the fight recently conducted by him that brought about the change of the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation affecting peanuts. While he did not get all he demanded, he was able to get an increase of $10 per ton in the price of peanuts, and that means millions of dollars to the farmers who produce peanuts.

I do not contend that war may not have necessitated some program of equitable distribution of our resources; but I do insist that to live in a state of regimented chaos is to live in slavery. Bureaucratic domination and dictatorship is not something new. It was old when the Pharaohs were building the pyramids and is today the outworn mode of a dead past. Thomas Jefferson knew the dangers of autocratic rule by a bureaucracy drunk with power. He stated his views in these words:

"An elected despotism was not the government we fought for but one which should not only be founded on true free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among general bodies of magistracy as that no one could transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restrained by the others."

My friends, love of country is not the exclusive property of the bureaucrats at Washington. Patriotism is not a noble emotion peculiar only to those in places of public power. Desire to win this war is not confined to the hearts of those who are willing, apparently, to tear down the traditional governmental, economic, and social system of this Nation, while their fellow citizens are battling on foreign lands to preserve that system. Love of country, love of home and patriotism is not confined to any class, any section, or any political party in this country. All honest men love liberty. All well-balanced, intelligent people believe in the kind

of government we have if they have lived under it in America long enough to know its blessings.

There was a line recently used in a document called the Manifesto on British Liberty. This manifesto was written by members of different political parties in British public life who desire to restore and see perpetuated the spirit of individual liberty and responsibility which characterized not only Britain's period of greatness, but which has characterized the nobility, the lofty purpose, and the courageous sacrifices, which have marked the pathway of the United States of America for 150 years. The line in that manifesto is one which has been true throughout all history. It was true in the days of man's dawning consciousness. It was true when the taskmasters were driving the slaves to the building of the pyramids. It was true when Rome fell, and it is true in this day of peril and conflict. Let me quote it to you: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Let me say to you what George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and every great statesman in our history knew—that is—that there is only one depository of complete governmental power which power does not corrupt and that depository is in the people. Thomas Jefferson said: "No government can continue good but in the control of the people."

Just the minute that great power, vast control, adulation, and an avalanche of honors come to any man, if it is too long continued, it does something to him. That is what these wise men meant when they said: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

My friends, we must win this war. All that our heroic forbears fought for, bled for, died for, sacrificed for, worked for, is in the balance. All that posterity could hope for is in the balance. We stand in the awful spot between the sacrifices of those who have gone before us and the sacrifices of those who are to come after us and we in this day and generation have the terrible, the awful, task of deciding whether the blood and sacrifice of our forbears was in vain and at the same time whether the sacrifices of those who shall come after us shall be in vain. It is our task in our day and generation to protect the heritage which has been handed down to us, the heritage of liberty; the heritage of a great, rich, resourceful country; the heritage of the Bill of Rights; the heritage of spiritual and cultural progress and the opportunity to continue that progress Only in doing that can we contribute to the spiritual and cultural progress of the other peoples of the world. Let me say to you that it is only a sound, solvent, free America that can help the other peoples of the world at all. Only a sound, solvent, free America can hold aloft the beacon of liberty to light the way of other nations and other peoples back to sanity, peace, and progress.

It is only a sound, solvent, free America that can have the strength to uphold humanity's ideals in the doubtful days which are bound to follow this awful conflict. Only a sound, solvent, free America can help to compose the terrible hatred, can help to minimize the plagues, and help repair the destruction wrought in this mad orgy of war.

My friends, I said that I have not been able to give my wholehearted approval to the conduct of public affairs on the home front. I will tell you why. I have not been able to give approval to the labor policy of the administration. I think it has been a disgrace to the Nation. I have condemned the collusion between the administration and large groups of our people that has led to strikes while our sons have been fighting and dying. I have condemned the collusion that has pillaged the public purse and penalized the right of any citizen to work. No one should have the right to claim privileges greater than those to which our soldiers are entitled. If one of our soldiers should strike for smoking privileges in the midst of battle, or lay down his gun because he does not like his commanding officer, or leave his battalion because he thinks his pay is not adequate, he would be court martialed and shot.

I have protested against the prosecution of so-called social reforms under the cloak of war. I have resisted with all my might and power the effort to federalize the Nation and everything that is in it. I do not want our womanhood nationalized and made public property. I do not want our little children stripped of parental care and made the wards of government. I want to preserve the home. I want to preserve the institutions that our fathers and our fathers' fathers established. I have protested against the effort to make a melting pot of the South and I have resisted the campaign to mongrelize our people.

I have defended the sovereignty of the States and upheld the doctrine of home rule and self-determinism. I do not want to see the rights of the States and the liberties of the people fed into the greedy maw of the general government.

My friends, we must keep the covenant which the founding fathers made with destiny. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights never must be exchanged for glittering promises of new-world-order makers.

There must be no vested interest in this gigantic struggle in which we are now engaged. Our Nation's danger must not be exploited by any individual, class, or group for the gains of profit or power.

There can be no picket line in the victory line.

A strike against production is a strike against victory.

Whenever the workers on the home front throw down their tools they are inviting our soldiers to throw down their guns. Disrupted industry means disrupted production. Disrupted production means delayed deliveries. Delayed deliveries mean defeats and defeats mean slavery and death.

Strikes and all other causes of disruption and delay in the production of machines and munitions are no longer within the realm of social reform or political consideration. They imperil every man, woman, and child in this Nation. They imperil all the men, women, and children in all the other nations, either those now subjugated by the dictators or those who are fighting with us to stop this slaughter of the despots.

Only a strong, united, producing America can win this war.

My friends, I plead not for self or party, but for America. When our sons of glory come marching home I want them to find the same strong, virile America which they left when they went to war to fight for its preservation. I do not want to see our government of the people, by the people, and for the people completely uprooted and utterly destroyed. I want to see the Southern States of this Union emerge from the status of a conquered province. I do not want to see the South longer treated as a guinea pig for the experimentations of the New World builders. I do not want to see it made longer to serve as the tail of its own political kite. I want to see it stand on its own feet and fight for its own existence and for the preservation of its own civilization. What has been done and what is being done to it now by its supposed friends is no less iniquitous than the outrages it was compelled to suffer during the carpet-bag rule of the last century at the hands of its confessed foes.

When the two-thirds rule governing the nomination of Democratic Party candidates for Presidency and Vice Presidency was abrogated, the South completely lost its power independently to influence national party affairs. The abrogation of this rule puts into the hands of a single Northern State that rarely goes Democratic, power to outvote a half dozen Southern States that never go any other way. It is true that the South may still vote in national elections, but only for candidates chosen by others. So long as the South submits to this, a single Northern State in the politically doubtful column and with only a handful of people will continue to receive governmental favors far in excess of those received by a half dozen Southern States with large populations. It would mean that a single State in the North that rarely goes Democratic will continue to be the recipient of governmental favors far exceeding those bestowed upon the entire South. It will mean that the South will continue to be the Lazarus of its own party and the step child of the Nation.

Now is the time for the South to make itself heard. A national election is ahead of us. Let the Governors, the national committeemen, party organizations, and others in the Southern States demand of the national nominating convention that the two-thirds rule be reenacted and that the people responsible for the life of the Democratic Party and for the victories it has won be given some voice in the election of candidates for whom they are expected to vote. Let the demand be made upon candidates for Presidency and Vice Presidency before the convention is held that they make disclosure of their attitude toward the proposal to reenact this two-thirds' rule. Here is presented an opportunity to improve an unhappy relationship that needs to be improved, for this business of the tail wagging the dog has already continued too long.

My friends, let me say in conclusion that every consideration must be subordinated to the task of winning the war. Only a strong, united, producing America can win it. Only that unity which is practical and productive can win it. Unity is not merely a slogan; it is not an empty phrase; it is intelligent cooperation translated into action.

No matter how bravely our soldiers fight, this war cannot be won unless we make our productive forces efficient and energetic beyond anything we have ever attempted. It is for us in the United States of America to say whether the future shall hold only tears and toil and taxes, or whether it shall glow with hope, progress, and prosperity.

It is for us in the United States of America to say whether or not the cause of liberty shall be betrayed by selfishness and greed, indolence and indifference, or whether we shall prove ourselves worthy of the great heritage of freedom and culture which our forefathers sacrificed and bled to give us.

My friends, it rests upon us and America to say whether ours shall be an elective despotism, which was not the government our fathers fought for, or a government founded on true, free principles; a government in which power shall be so divided and balanced as that none can transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restored by the owners.

Finally, my fellow citizens, it rests upon us here at home to determine whether those heroic men fighting on the far-flung battle fronts shall suffer and die in vain, betrayed by their own people behind the lines, or whether with our help they shall win a victory so decisive and conclusive that America may help to write an enduring peace.

We must, if necessary, give all we have. We must spare no effort; we must shrink at no sacrifice; we must hesitate at no task to win this war.

It is we who must preserve freedom, assure liberty for ourselves and our posterity, and guarantee for all the world that the free spirit of mankind shall not be destroyed, that the glory of the stars that stud the firmament

shall continue the joy and comfort of those who love truth, render justice, and worship God; that the toll that liberty takes from hearts that bleed and break in her cause shall not have been taken in vain.

Discussions on Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, there has just been brought to my attention a most interesting booklet describing a program that has recently been inaugurated by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Because of its very nature I consider it rather a duty to give my reactions to the basic thinking that inspired this work.

The gap that has existed for too many years between the individual Congressman and his constituents has been like a plague to us all. Too rarely do the thinking people of the Nation pay much attention to their Government and those who represent them in the legislative branch.

The United States Chamber has recently issued a booklet entitled, "Wanted: Men Who Know." This interesting document proposes a Nation-wide series of lecture discussions on free enterprise. It frankly raises the question of whether or not the American business leader understands what he is supporting in a system that has been given many high-sounding terms.

I can think of nothing more fundamentally sound in this period of war than to rekindle in the hearts and minds of Americans the fact that they are the recipients of a system, term it what you will, that has provided us with the highest standard of living the world has ever known, the flexible qualities that we have seen in the past few years of swinging from peacetime to concentrated wartime production, and with all of these preserving jealously the rights of freemen.

I want to commend here the farsighted, sound thinking that prompted the creation of this program. Its benefits will be recorded in a strengthening of our free political institutions, in raising the standard of sound public thinking, and in placing in the minds of the people a warmer and deeper respect for representative government and its place in a free country.

The first series of programs of this noture was sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles and was conducted at Olympia, Wash. Those who participated were high in their praise of the good resulting from the meetings.

It is refreshing to learn that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is fostering free enterprise discussions throughout the Nation. There could be no more opportune time for the promotion of such a movement.

The A B C's of Post-War Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a post-war tax committee has been set up by Minority Leader JOE MARTIN to draft a post-war tax program for the Nation. Anticipating the day when the Republican Party will once more have control of the Congress and assume the responsibility of post-war problems, this committee has been set up to make a thorough study of the tax situation, to plan a post-war tax program that will insure a sound and prosperous national economy, and to prepare recommendations to present to the next Congress. It is felt that simplification of the present tax muddle is necessary, and that a return must be made to sound tax principles.

In recent years the taxing power has been used too often for punitive purposes rather than for revenue purposes. Our post-war-tax policy and tax program will determine whether new industries arising out of the war will be permitted to develop by encouraging the investment of risk capital. Business and industrial expansion must be the chief aim of a post-war-tax program in order to prevent another era of unemployment. As a member of this Post-War-Tax Committee, I realize the committee has been given a tough assignment.

The people of the Nation, as well as the Members of Congress should be interested in the fundamentals of taxation. We need information on this subject because taxation affects the lives, the standard of living, the opportunities for jobs of all the people. It will determine the future of America. I am therefore including in my remarks a copy of an editorial by James H. McGraw, Jr., president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., because I consider the editorial covers the A B C of post-war taxation, and really gives a thumbnail sketch of the fundamentals of a tax program. This editorial on taxation deserves study and serious thought by every Member of the Congress, in both House and Senate. I consider it the best and clearest exposition of the theory of taxation, in short form, that I have ever seen. It is the alpha and omega of taxation expressed in simple language. I recommend its thoughtful consideration:

[From the Washington Post of March 16, 1944]

OUR PRESENT TAX SYSTEM WILL KILL POST-WAR JOBS

There are three principal ways of making a living. First, getting on someone's pay roll. About three out of four of us fall in this group; we are jobholders.

Second, lending one's savings to business enterprises. Millions of us get some income, large or small, by lending our savings, directly as in stocks and bonds, or indirectly through such channels as insurance companies and banks. We are suppliers of loan capital.

Third, starting or helping to start a business enterprise. About one out of four of us has his own business enterprise, and several millions of us are part owners of business enterprises. Those of us who go into business for ourselves and those of us who are part owners of enterprises are job makers.

The number of men who attempt to make their living in whole or in part by starting new businesses or by expanding old ones depends upon the outlook for profits. When the outlook for profits improves, thousands of new jobs open up and thousands of men go to work; and, as men go to work, everybody benefits.

When the prospect for profits is bad, the demand for labor, capital, and raw materials drops. It may be roughly estimated that an improvement in the prospect for profits of $1,000,000,000 raises the amount of wages for labor anywhere from two to five billion dollars. In other words, for every $1 of profit, $2 to $5 of wages is created for job holders.

One of the principal factors in the outlook for profits is the amount and the kind of taxes. After the war the Federal Government will need to raise each year about $20,000,000,000 in taxes—three times the amount required before the war and six times the amount required in the twenties.

Obviously, the bigger the tax needs, the greater the danger that the Government will discourage enterprise and so diminish the number of jobs, after the war. That's why it is so important for every American to understand the part that taxes play in determining the level of employment.

Our present tax system is full of needless complexities—a source of confusion and despair. In fact, it would seem almost as if our tax laws had been written for the purpose of making private enterprise unworkable. When the war is over there must be a thorough reform of our entire tax system.

The tax system should be coordintaed with the broader objectives of monetary and fiscal policy. Federal, State, and local tax policies should be integrated as to principles and objectives.

Taxes play too important a role in our total economic life to ignore the adverse consequences of unrelated and inconsistent policies of different taxing jurisdictions. The following reform measures are needed:

Make all taxes apparent, not concealed. Taxes should be levied, in the main, directly upon individuals so that each of us will know how much our Government is costing him.

Repeal the tax-exempt privilege for all new securities issued by all governmental jurisdictions. Eliminate excise (hidden) taxes which place a disproportionate burden on persons with lower incomes so as to encourage greater consumption and provide an expanded market for our vast industrial capacity.

Rely upon the personal income tax as the main source of revenue, with broad coverage, but reduce the upper range of personal income tax rates to a maximum of perhaps 50 or 60 percent, so that risk-taking and job-making investments will be encouraged.

Coordinate corporation and individual income taxes so as to avoid double taxation and impediments to risk taking. Full credit should be given to stockholders for all corporate income taxes paid.

Repeal the excess-profits tax so that industry can use this "seed money" for creating peacetime jobs. The excess-profits tax will destroy all incentive to do a larger volume of business than in 1939, since it appropriates virtually all increase in profits above the level of 1939.

Encourage formation of new enterprises by allowing tax exemptions for a period of 5 years. Provide for averaging of incomes over a period of years, in order to remove discrimination against those with irregular incomes and those who take risks of loss in business ventures.

Reform tax administration to simplify forms and procedures, to broaden the scope of enforcement, and to encourage the spirit of fairness.

Develop United States Mineral Resources First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. W. L. Batt, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, delivered an address in New York City, in which he advocated extensive imports of minerals from South America, because he contended that the war demands have virtually exhausted mining resources in the United States.

During the war, the State of Idaho has contributed vast quantities of critical and strategic minerals, including tungsten and mercury, and it is pertinent to observe that domestic mineral deposits offer almost unlimited potential development.

Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen, of Idaho, has criticised the proposals now being made to give preference to imports at the expense of our own production. It is likely that a national policy will soon be formulated in reference to raw materials for the post-war period. Therefore, I am submitting the views outlined in a letter by Governor Bottolfsen, in which he contends that the development of our our mineral resources should take precedence:

STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, March 14, 1944.

Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
Representative, Second District of Idaho, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DWORSHAK: I have your letter under date of March 7 in which you enclose a letter you have received from Mr. W. L. Batt, vice chairman of the War Production Board, under date of March 3. With Mr. Batt's letter was enclosed a copy of an advance release of the War Production Board in which appears the text of an address by Mr. Batt made on February 23, 1944, before the Bond Club in New York City under the title "Peace and Foreign Trade." In this outline and also in the letter Mr. Batt attempts to justify the policy he proposes to close down existing mines and to build up a stock pile reserve by purchasing metals from our South American neighbors.

I presume that Mr. Batt's policy is in line with the so-called "good neighbor" program now being advanced, and I wish to emphasize again that Idaho is vigorously opposed to such a destructive proposal. As I stated in my former letter to you, Idaho's producing mines—and there are several—have ore bodies blocked out which guarantee production of the present high-production record for from 50 to 100 years. It so happens also that mining is Idaho's third largest industry at the present time and we certainly are opposed to a theory of government which destroys an industry so important to our State.

May I call your attention also to the fact that in Idaho we have a vast mineral area—5,000,000 acres—largely unexplored, in which, we are confident, there are millions of tons of several strategic metals sufficient adequately to supply the Nation's needs for the next century. We cannot agree to a philosophy or theory of government that would summarily destroy such an important industry, and I think Mr. Batt's suggestion that our mines remain inactive while we acquire our needs from foreign countries is not good business for our State or Nation.

I believe that foreign imports of ore would prove the ruination of not only Idaho's metal mines but mines in other Western States. It seems to me that it is necessary to expose the scheme of the War Production Board to bring about foreign ore imports as a national objective. The present protective tariff on metals must be maintained in order to guard against those who would destroy this industry by importation from countries where living standards are low and prices lower.

Mr. Arthur Campbell, State mine inspector, made the following statement recently in an annual report:

"The mining industry is acknowledged as an important economic asset, and the mineral potentialities of Idaho are well established. This department and the mining fraternity are looking forward with confidence and enthusiasm to an even greater expansion of the mining industry in Idaho. The future depends upon the success with which the problems of low-grade ores are solved and upon the encouragement given this mining development. Big mines are no longer found; they are made."

I wish to quote again from Mr. Campbell's report as follows:

"The entire history and development of the State of Idaho has a background of mining. At present, mining is the third largest industry in the State and the source of livelihood for more than 50,000 persons. It is the principal industrial support of many thriving communities. Its expenditures for labor, materials, and supplies, power, and transportation run into millions of dollars annually. It uses millions of feet of timber each year, forms a real and ready market for food commodities produced in the State's agricultural sections, and furnishes one of Idaho's important sources of employment. Wages and salaries paid by the industry each year amount to approximately $9,000,000. It spends more than $5,000,000 for materials and supplies. Another $6,000,000 is spent for ore transportation and smelting. The industry pays approximately $2,000,000 each year in taxes."

Here is another statement made by Mr. Campbell, quoting the Wallace Miner, a weekly newspaper, which I think emphasizes again the importance of our industry: "Newly discovered strategic mineral resources in Idaho have within the past few months made the United States independent of foreign supplies which were suddenly discontinued due to shipping hazards resulting from the war."

The war has brought about the development of new mineral resources in our State. In addition to the leadership we have already established in lead, silver, zinc, copper, gold, and other so-called ordinary metals, we have also large deposits of aluminum, antimony, chromium, manganese, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quicksilver, tin, and tungsten. In fact, we have tungsten deposits in our State sufficient to operate at present high production for over 100 years.

It seems strange that so much stress is being laid upon our presumed "have not" condition and so much emphasis is being laid upon the need for developing and improving the mineral resources of foreign countries. Idaho must definitely and emphatically lend its voice and influence against destruction or even curtailment of those vast resources as embraced in our mining areas. I again request that our Idaho delegation use every means possible to thwart the efforts of the Production Board in what appears to be a well-defined plan to destroy the mining industry of the West.

Yours very truly,
C. A. BOTTOLFSEN,
Governor.

Progress Reported in A. A. F. Program To Utilize Former C. A. A. Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a statement from the War Department which forcefully tells the partial story of what the Army Air Forces have been accomplishing during the cooperative pilot-training program with the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I believe all Members of Congress will be interested in the information which follows:

The Army Air Forces has reported progress in its program to utilize approximately 5,000 trainees and enlisted reservist instructors formerly in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, War Training Service, the War Department announced today.

Trainees and instructors alike have been given their choice of continuing in the following training program of the Army Air Forces: (1) Aviation cadet, if qualified; (2) volunteering for glider training, if qualified; and (3) volunteering for technical training. In addition, instructors have been given the opportunity of qualifying for pilot assignments. The Army Air Forces will give special flying tests and physical examinations to such applicants, and all instructors who meet the qualifications will be employed as commissioned officers.

Of the 4,687 trainees, all of whom are enlisted personnel in the Army, the Army Air Forces reported 974 qualified for aviation cadet training, 651 for glider training, 2,618 for technical training, 310 for specialist duties; and 134 were hospitalized, given furloughs, and are otherwise accounted for.

Among the 651 enlisted reservist instructors in the program, 94 have been reemployed by the C. A. A. W. T. S. in other activities, 229 have applied for assignment to the Air Transport Command, 47 have been reported by the C. A. A. to the A. A. F. for activation or discharge, and the final 245 are in process of being reported by the C. A. A. to the A. A. F. for activation or discharge.

The A. A. F. Transport Command is accepting C. A. A.-W. T. S. pilots who have 1,000 flying hours, 200 of which are in aircraft of 200 horsepower or more; 6 months' time in the Enlisted Reserve; can pass the Army Class 2 physical examination; can pass comprehensive flight tests in basic type Army trainer; and successfully complete both the course in instrument flying and the twin-engine transition course now being conducted at various A. A. F. training establishments. Because the C. A. A. men generally are qualified to fly only light airplanes, it will be necessary for the A. A. F. to give those who meet A. A. F. requirements further instruction at Army schools to qualify them for their duty with A. T. C., which will consist primarily of ferrying combat type aircraft. Candidates meeting all the requirements will be eligible for service-pilot rating, commissions as second lieutenants and assignment to ferrying activities.

The termination of the C. A. A.-W. T. S. program and the subsequent availability of a number of male pilots in varying stages of flying proficiency has attracted public attention to the Women's Air Force Service pilot program. The Wasp program to utilize women pilots for noncombat flying assignments has been found to be militarily sound and necessary. Men released by the termination of the C. A. A.-W. T. S. program can be used for services for which women are not suited, whereas women pilots are qualified for certain flying duties which they can discharge as competently as men. Women are currently ferrying combat aircraft of virtually all types from factories to points of delivery to combat crews. They also fly tow-target planes, planes for gunnery training by air-crew members, and do aerial courier work.

The foregoing is in keeping with Army Air Force's policy to employ both men and women in such manner as to contribute the maximum to the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as a member of the House Civil Service Committee, to listen to testimony by General Arnold, of the Air Forces, in a hearing June 24, 1943. He said at that time:

When we started this thing, as you remember, there were a lot of "cant's" thrown right in our face. You can't fly the North Atlantic. You can't take small-engined airplanes across. You can't take fighters across. You can't fly the Pacific. We have not only flown the Pacific and the North Atlantic, but have actually taken fighter airplanes across the North Atlantic. We have taken them across the Pacific and they all got to their destination in Australia.

General Arnold then said:

We, in the United States have one wonderful thing, and that is the American youth. The American youth who does not know the meaning of the word "can't." It has been a tremendous help to us.

I made the observation, following his remarks, in the following language:

I cannot allow the hearing to close without saying that I consider General Arnold not only a personality but a guiding genius of the Army Air Forces, which will be the decisive factor in the winning of this war. I speak in no disparagement of the other allied branches of our armed forces, but I say to you, General, that the American people and the people of the world are increasingly becoming cognizant that you and those who have gathered with you are going to bring to a successful conclusion this terrible conflict. I feel it deeply, and I must express it.

My colleagues of the House, the report of the splendid work which has been done cooperatively, is a further indication of that spirit and performance bringing America nearer to victory. I commend General Arnold and those who work effectively under his command.

The Country's Call to One and All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE COUNTRY'S CALL TO ONE AND ALL

The country's call comes to us all—
Let him, who can, respond,
And purchase, when he hears the call,
At least one Vict'ry bond.
If he can't do this, let him buy
A few stamps every week.
Let's keep Old Glory floating high,
And win the peace we seek.

To purchase War bonds is to loan
To our own Government,
And help her save what is our own.
And save this continent,
The greatest continent on earth,
From horrors wrought by war,
That freedom may have that new birth
Which we are fighting for.

In buying stamps and bonds we are
Providing the supplies,
The needed implements of war,
Wherein our safety lies,
For those now bravely fighting in
Our stead—then let us give
For those who fight that we may win,
Who die that we may live.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

John Barry, First Commodore and Father of the United States Navy Under the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me Friday, March 17, 1944, St. Patrick's Day, at Franklin Square, Washington, D. C., the site of the monument to Commodore John Barry, in the presence of the Irish War Veterans on the occasion of the placing by them of a wreath on the Barry monument:

We are assembled here today to pay tribute to John Barry, captain and commodore of the Revolution and ranking commodore and father of the United States Navy under the Constitution. His monument, erected by a grateful Nation and dedicated May 14, 1914, stands before you. Another stands in Independence Square at Philadelphia, dedicated Saturday, March 16, 1907, under the auspices of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. St. Patrick's Day fell in that year on the next day, a Sunday, and it is fitting that our tribute here should come again with the observance of St. Patrick's Day.

John Barry was born in County Wexford, Ireland, in 1745. He died in Philadelphia on his estate on Strawberry Hill, in 1803, 3 years after the death of his friend and sponsor, George Washington, and 9 years before the War of 1812, for which he vainly preached a plan of preparedness. From boyhood he served 11 years as a sailor and for more than 25 years, first under the Continental Congress and later under the Government of the United States, he was in the forefront on the sea and in the planning, fitting and command of our infant Navy, besides rendering service on land in the battles of Princeton and Trenton.

Barry's services were first placed at the command of the Revolutionary fathers in 1775 when he placed the brig *Black Prince* of which he was captain, in the service of the Colonies. His first important command was as captain of the American brig *Lexington* in 1776, carrying 16 14-pounder guns and a crew of 70 men. This ship was the first vessel of the American Navy to whom the flag of an enemy nation was struck in actual battle. The *Lexington* captured the British sloop *Edward* attached to the frigate *Liverpool*, April 7, 1776. From there the *Lexington* went on to achieve fame for America and disgrace for her enemies.

Lexington was so named at Barry's suggestion in memory of the Battle of Lexington where on April 19, 1775, was fired "the shot heard 'round the world." Here was recorded the first British defeat in the Revolution. The name "Lexington" was carried in the Civil War by the Mississippi River ironclad, and later passed on to the aircraft carried *Lexington*, sunk in the South Pacific and replaced by the newer and greater *Lexington* which still menances the Japanese Navy.

The principal achievements of Barry in the Revolution were as captain of the *Alliance*, a frigate which spread glory on American arms, and later in the undeclared war on France in 1798. It was the *Alliance*, under Barry, that saved the *Bon Homme Richard* under John Paul Jones from defeat at the hands of the *Serapis*.

On February 22, 1797, on his birthday, George Washington, after his second term of office as President, but effective as from June 4, 1794, commissioned John Barry as captain of the Navy, commanding the frigate *United States* with the rank of commodore and senior commander of the new United States squadron. The *United States*, together with the *Constitution*, *Constellation*, and other vessels was then building and was launched May 10, 1797. Under the act of 1798 creating the Navy Department under Barry's recommendation and plans, these ships were commissioned and navy yards were established at Portsmouth, N. H., Charlestown (near Boston), Philadelphia, Washington, and Norfolk, Va.

In 1801, the emergency with France being tided over, the disposition arose to neglect the Navy. But the error of these advocates of disarmament, appeasement, and a peacetime navy appeared to our regret when the War of 1812 came along with disgrace to us except for "Barry's boys" including Stephen Decatur who also distinguished himself in 1815 in bringing the Bey of Algiers and the pirates of Tunis to terms.

Throughout his life John Barry, standing 6 feet 4 and weighing 230 pounds, was a man of action, of courage, and of exemplary character—a devout Roman Catholic having great love of Ireland where he was born and of America the land of his allegiance. After the Revolution ended April 11, 1783, the officers of the British ship *Sibyl* which he captured and brought to port, called on him, and he returned the visit of courtesy. Commander Sweeney hailed him as a "fellow countryman," emphasizing their common birth in Ireland. "Not exactly so," said Barry with dignity, "You are a Briton in British uniform and service; I am an American in American uniform and service."

While Captain Barry over a period of 8 years of service in the Revolution and 20 more years in service of the United States as a nation, fought and lived as an American, he never lost his love of Ireland or his hope for her freedom. In this he had the support of Washington, himself. George Washington Parke Custis, the adopted son of Washington, took a leading part in the movement carried on in the United States for the purpose of strengthening the hands of Daniel O'Connell in his fight for the Catholic emancipation of Ireland. Custis relates that often in the halls of the Great Chief (Washington), notable Irishmen, including Barry, Moylan, and Fitz-Gerald were welcome visitors and comrades in

arms. At Valley Vorge in 1776 an Irish officer approached Major Forrest and inquired if the oath prescribed by Congress might not well pledge attachment to the independence of Ireland (an early "four freedoms" idea everywhere in the world). Major Forrest said that that was taking in too much territory but suggested that "While we are engaged with England on one side, let Ireland seize the golden opportunity and assail her on the other side." The Irish officer agreed and added that "If Ireland fails to do it, let her sons from henceforth and forever, boil their potatoes in a wooden skillet."

Ireland failed however during the American Revolution, being restrained by the eloquence of Grattan and Flood and being content with the measure of reforms granted in 1782. So it came about that for 150 years more the Irish people whistled "The Rising of the Moon," in the dark.

Barry (like Billy Mitchell) sometimes got into trouble with the brass hats, owing to his pugnacious disposition and his interest in the Navy. He did not like it when this Government in 1795 concluded a treaty with the Dey of Algiers involving payment of nearly a million dollars of tribute including the gift of the frigate *Crescent*. He protested as it automatically stopped work on three frigates then building for the new navy and their fittings. This was an early sample of appeasement and disarmament, contrary to Barry's brand of Americanism. The disgrace was later wiped out by one of Barry's "boys," Stephen Decatur, in 1815.

Barry also had a war with two members of the Navy board when they ordered him to scuttle the *Effingham*, his ship, and the *Washington*. The British had taken Philadelphia in 1777 and although Barry said he could fight his ships and take care of himself and flatly refused to scuttle, he was compelled to do so and charges were laid against him with Congress. Nothing came of it, however, but when the Navy board later attempted to raise the sunken ships they were unable to do so. Barry believed in fighting—not in appeasement—and in sinking enemy ships—not our own.

It is to be wondered why with the example of John Barry before them, the American people ever fell into the error of appeasement or disarmament. The traditions of Barry inspire and govern our Navy today—to sink enemy ships, not our own; to have peace even if we have to fight for it. When this war is ended with that victory now so certainly promised, the American Navy will again take a high place in fame, headed by its first founder and squadron commander, that captain of the first *Lexington*—John Barry.

Bankers Guarantee Title & Trust Co., Akron, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, under permission to extend my remarks, I included a letter from Mr. F. S. Carpenter regarding the position of the Bankers Guarantee Title & Trust Co., of Akron, Ohio, relative to their acquiring certain mortgage loans now held by the H. O. L. C. This letter was sent to me by Mr. Carpenter as a copy of his letter sent to Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and was not in reply to any letter of mine to Mr. Carpenter. My sole purpose in submitting this statement is for clarification of the RECORD as it now appears.

They Give Their Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a remarkable letter from Capt. Robert M. White 2d, of Mexico, Mo., written to his father, L. M. White, national president of the Inland Press Association, and published as an editorial in the Mexico Ledger:

THEY GIVE THEIR LIVES—THEY DO NOT LOSE THEM

The following letter from Capt. Robert M. White 2d, of this city, who was recently returned to Australia after 6 months' combat duty in New Guinea, is particularly pertinent in its comment as the casualty lists grow with the intensity of the war:

FEBRUARY 17, 1944.

DEAR DAD: I have just received the December 9th Weekly Ledger.

It is an historic issue for on page 1 are pictures of the 14 Audrain County lads who have met death in the war to date.

But there was one thing I didn't understand. The headline over those pictures read: "Audrain County men who have lost their lives in service."

That isn't like the Ledger. Men in service don't lose their lives. People lose umbrellas, golf balls, and at poker; but men in service don't lose their lives.

They give their lives.

Once a man faces the stark reality of death under fire he knows why he is in service. He's not wearing a uniform merely to fiddle around in training camps in the States, to march up and down parade grounds with a rifle on his shoulder, to go to U. S. O. dances.

No; there is only one reason to be in service and that is to fight the enemy. And fighting the enemy is to look death in the eye. It's not easy to do.

There are no volunteers or selectees on the battlefield. When the order comes to charge, there is no draft board there to pick you up and lead you forward into fire. You get up on your own and with your own freely given strength charge forward amid the blasting, screaming hell which may mean death.

You can't say a man loses his life under those conditions. He gives it. He gives it knowingly and for good reason. The reason he is there, in service, is to help bring victory for a cause.

Our cause today is not "to make the world safe for democracy" or any other pat phrase lifted from some politician's speech. Our cause is to kill off the enemy and defeat him before he can gain strength to come to America and there rain horror among those we love. Can there be a better cause?

True, some of our 14 lads didn't die under fire. Some of them died in accidents, in hospitals, sick, and in airplane wrecks. But there is no difference. It is just that they gave their lives while en route to the battlefield. That is where they were going. They were just unlucky. Maybe "unlucky" isn't the right word, for to die for a cause is not to be unlucky. It is, rather, to follow the footsteps of another Young Man who long ago fought for His cause and did not hesitate to give, not lose, His life.

Sincerely,

BOB.

New Deal Would Socialize the Wisconsin Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am offering herewith a timely editorial which appeared in the Janesville Gazette of Janesville, Wis., on Thursday, March 16. It is obvious that the editor of the Gazette has correctly analyzed the import of propaganda now being spread by Government bureaucrats. The Congress and the country will have to wake up to this threat very soon or it will be too late:

NEW DEAL WOULD SOCIALIZE THE WISCONSIN FARMER

There are 1,400 farmers in this area who now have electric power to light their homes and operate their machinery and who did not have it before rural electrification was established. They appreciate its usefulness, its comfort, and its potentialities.

There is a great field for further electrification of farms, and it may be that the Government will have to help private industry to extend the necessary lines. But that is not the aim of this administration.

Joseph P. Schaenzer, Government rural electrification expert, painted a beautiful picture of the new easy-way farming with electrical helps as he talked to rural folks at Madison this week. All Wisconsin farms should have power, he believes, and it would cost only $70,000,000 to electrify the remaining 100,000 farms, he estimated.

But the joker came in Mr. Schaenzer's next suggestion. How is the farmer going to know what electrical equipment to buy?

"The farmer must not be 'stung' on new equipment which will be urgently needed after the war," the expert declared. "Before the new equipment is ready, a neutral testing and ranking agency for farm equipment should be established."

Mr. Schaenzer apparently does not believe in the American system. He would have a "neutral testing and ranking agency" predetermine what equipment manufacturer is worthy of the farmer's patronage.

Mr. Farmer, who all these years has proved himself the most independent and perhaps the most capable bargainer, should not depend upon his own judgment of a manufacturer's integrity and of trade-marked equipment; he should, according to the Agriculture Department's expert, rely upon a "neutral" (Government?) agency, which supposedly would test in some kind of laboratory the farm equipment, and then tell the farmer which manufacturer's machinery was good, what was only fair, and what should be avoided.

It sounds to us mighty like those consumer cooperative buyers' catalogs put out by the antiadvertising zealots of 10 years back. Some had, perhaps still have, would-be

laboratories which test everything. From the number of strokes a toothbrush will stand against a simulated set of false teeth, they tell their clientele whether it's a good buy. The toothpaste also comes in for testing, but usually the factors of personal taste for color, smell, shape, and other appeals are disregarded as of no importance.

When Government openly advocates socializing business, it is time for America to wake up. Mr. Schaenzer's proposal strikes at the heart of American enterprise, which in this war has proved to be the only answer to the combined Axis attack—production and more production. No other system on earth could perform the miracle which American industry has already performed.

The magnificent production of war materials here in Janesville alone is proof enough that American industry, such as General Motors, Parker Pen, Gilman Engineering, Rock River Woolen, and others, was developed upon the solid foundation of private enterprise and branded merchandise. Neither rural nor urban Americans are liable to fall under the Socialists' spell. The American enterprise system and our ingenuity and capacity for production are now responsible for the kind of America we're now fighting for.

Resolution of the Executive Council of the Oklahoma Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the central committee of the executive council of the Oklahoma Bar Association, That the Members of Congress from Oklahoma be requested to work for and secure the passage of an amendment to the Federal statute to the end that any member of the bar of any State be permitted to practice before any Board or Commission, or any Department of the Federal Government without securing any license or permit to practice before such Board, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to every Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Oklahoma, and to the executive secretary of the American Bar Association.

Our Future Petroleum Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, Petroleum Administrator for War, and President of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, on the Town Hall of the Air program, New York City, March 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator MOORE, ladies and gentlemen, it is barely a year since the Petroleum Reserves Corporation was no more than a twinkle in a bureaucrat's eye, but already it has been accused of throwing rocks at the neighbors, trespassing on the sand pile of the kids across the street, and slyly leaving banana peels where its Uncle Samuel would step unwarily upon them. All of this is bad enough, but you can imagine the shock to me, its nursemaid, when I actually heard the whisper that it wasn't even legitimate.

I have been amused, but the fact is that any question involving the ability of the Government to see to it that the people have enough gasoline for their cars and sufficient oil for heating purposes, to say nothing of making sure that the armed forces have plenty to satisfy their needs, is a most serious one and should be so treated.

It is easy to impugn motives and call names—to shout "socialist," "bureaucrat," "Communist"—but these prove nothing, except a lack of convincing reasons for opposing a sound and reasonable plan to assure gasoline to our citizens. It is just as absurd for certain elements in the oil industry to go to the other extreme and charge that the proposed pipe line in Saudi Arabia is a Fascist approach by the Government. If it is fascistic for the United States to build a pipe line in Saudi Arabia then we must regard as completely Fascist such countries as Great Britain, Russia, Holland, and France. These nations, as to oil, go far beyond anything that the United States is contemplating.

Perhaps the Government has embarked upon a sound course after all, if it is attacked both from the extreme left and from the extreme right.

You know what our oil situation is. Year by year lately the amount of new oil discovered in this country has been less than we have been consuming. The oil industry, as a whole, has been so concerned about the widening gap between supply and demand that unanimously it has been insisting upon a higher price for crude oil as an incentive to new discoveries.

So I say that we should give heed to our future oil position. One way to do this is by looking to foreign oil resources, as recommended by the Truman committee.

Please understand me: I do not say that we are going to run out of oil. I say that we are going to run out unless we do something to prevent it. Please understand me also on another point: I do not say that the development of foreign oil resources is our only hope. I look upon foreign oil resources as just one important phase of an over-all program. Nor do I envisage this program as a Government program, or as one that would give Government a toehold in the oil business.

There are some members of the oil industry who have denounced the proposed pipeline project as a projection of Government into business. I do not believe this to be true. Apparently the three companies concerned—Standard of California, Texas, and Gulf—do not believe it either or they would have nothing to do with it. The Government will have nothing to say about how any one of these companies conducts its business in Saudi Arabia or in Kuwait. The Government will own no stock in any of them. The Government will have no member on any board of directors. The Government will dictate no policy.

Does anyone seriously charge that the Government is now in the oil business because it builds roads over which tank trucks transport petroleum products or because loaded tankers carry oil through the Panama Canal? Is the Erie Canal in the oil business, or the inland waterways, because they furnish an outlet for oil? I would like to be told whether the building of the "big inch" pipeline put the Government into business. If so, then it went even deeper into business when it completed the 20-inch pipe line recently.

I hope that the Senator from Oklahoma will make it clear to you whether he believes that the Government should support its nationals who are legally doing business in foreign lands. If he would not go so far as to furnish a facility to make it possible for American nationals to get their oil to market just how far would he go?

Suppose that American nationals, competing with foreign nationals, with which their governments are active partners, ask for the help of their own Government? Would he deny them all help, or even encouragement, and attempt to soothe their fears by patting them on the shoulder and saying: "There, there, don't worry"? Does the Senator believe that the United States Government should limit the aid that it furnishes to its nationals in other lands to the good offices of the Diplomatic Service? If it is so heinous for the Government, by the proposed pipe line, to provide a facility for its nationals, how would the Senator characterize an active business partnership, not between American nationals and their Government, but between American nationals and a foreign government? There are one or two other points that I trust Senator MOORE will clarify.

Although the Senator's name was affixed to a resolution that has passed the upper House calling for an investigation of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, and although he will be a member of that committee, he has prejudged the case upon which he is to sit. He has come here tonight probably prepared to announce his fixed conviction before the taking of any evidence. Ordinarily a judge will disqualify himself, if he is biased, even without a suggestion that he do so. At a recent press conference I politely proposed such a course to the Senator but my good offices were not appreciated. Just the same, under the American system the man sitting at the prosecutor's table does not mount the bench in the middle of the trial.

The Senator was the first to charge, well in advance of the hearing that he himself had demanded, that this was a socialistic, if not a communistic, undertaking. I have not noted that anyone else on the floor of either House has made such a reckless charge. In this connection, it might be well to call the roll of the Socialists or Communists (the Senator does not seem to be able to distinguish between them) that compose the board of directors of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

First in dignity and in public regard stands Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. There follow the Secretary of War, that well-known "radical," Henry L. Stimson; the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, who will bear watching by any conservative; the Secretary of the Interior, about whom the less said the better; and the Foreign Economic Administrator, Leo Crowley, banker and prominent businessman, who must feel restless to find himself in such bad company. These constitute the Communist cell which, according to a Member of the Senate, who always carefully weighs his words, have embarked their country upon a reckless and communistic career.

So far as I know, none of the gentlemen whom I have named has or has had any financial interest in any oil business. I know that I neither have nor have had. None of us stands to lose or gain by the building of this pipe line, either financially or otherwise, directly or indirectly. It is to be hoped

that all who are so generously flinging epithets and indulging in opprobrious language can stand before the bar of public opinion and plead as complete disinterest.

In a recent report on the question of oil in foreign lands, the Truman committee said:

"The acquisition of foreign oil rights has become affected with a strong national interest. To secure possession of such rights would be a determining factor in preventing future wars, for aggressive nations will hesitate to attack us if they know that we have the petroleum, as well as the other weapons, with which to defend ourselves." The committee added: "The Petroleum Administrator has properly stated that he believes that this Government should take some action to obtain additional petroleum concessions abroad."

The Truman committee suggested a policy. It did not suggest a means to the end that is considered desirable. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma will tell us how to carry out the policy if he agrees with it.

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation, not satisfied to occupy a merely oratorical or negative position, has proposed a method—a pipe line from Saudi Arabia to the Mediterranean that will make it possible for American nationals holding concessions legally acquired to get their oil to market. Not only has this proposal been approved by the State Department, the War and Navy Departments, Interior, and the Foreign Economic Administration, but it has the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. These men are properly concerned with the future of our country in the event of another war.

I was prejudged by a Senate committee when I began the clamor that finally brought into this eastern area, first the 24-inch pipe line, and later, the recently completed 20-inch. Believing that I was right and that the future would prove it, I stood my ground. Is there any voice now—except the yodeling one of Jimmy Moffett—that would venture to say that the two pipe lines in question, built with Government funds as the one in Saudi Arabia will be, and therefore just as socialistic (or would you say communistic, Senator?) as the one we propose to build in Saudi Arabia, are of no use and that their service should be discontinued?

Even today we are experiencing a shortage of crude oil in this country. This being so, and with the certainty of huge demands even after the war, it just would not make sense, certainly not American common sense, to fail to look ahead and provide for the future. Of course, we hope that great new stores will be discovered in our own country in the future.

We know that there is still a lot of oil in this country. Prospectors continue to search for it but it is harder and harder to find, especially in pools of considerable size. Moreover, we are developing the art of making it synthetically, from coal and shale. We confidently believe that a way to extract it cheaply from tar sands will be developed. We know that gasoline in large quantities can be wrung from natural gas, but we do not know what any of these synthetic processes will cost. Comparatively speaking, natural oil is cheap oil.

However, we ought to have more than one string to our bow. After all, oil is where you find it, and if we want oil for our own pressing needs, we must go to its source and secure what we need, while at the same time seeing to it that the other peaceful nations of the world are given the right to their equitable share. My own view is that the Government that provides sufficient cheap oil for its people—for war, if needs must—and for peace, in any event—will be conferring a lasting blessing.

If this makes me a Socialist or a Communist, as Senator MOORE has lilted, or a Nazi, as some in the oil industry insist, I adopt the epithets, although they seem to me to cancel each other out.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of social security which I delivered before the United Automobile Workers in Detroit, Mich., on March 10.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here tonight to take part in this symposium on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for social security.

The previous speakers have outlined some of the major features of the bill. They have given you some insight into the controversies it has aroused. I want to leave with you a clear understanding why I think a national social-insurance program is vitally important to America today.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL

Every thoughtful person in this country knows we are at a critical point in our history. We will win the war, of course. But will we win the peace? Will we plan wisely for the years ahead?

At the outset, I want to emphasize my deep conviction that social security is essential if we are to remain a free and independent people. Social security is not just something which would be nice to have. Social security is not a distant goal toward which we can afford to move slowly and gradually, with due regard for the convenience of vested interests. If we really want a democratic society, we must make it possible for the ordinary man and woman and family to have security. And if we are to have social and economic security, we must begin to act now. Ten years, 5 years from now may be too late.

The history of the world since 1918 is the history of mistakes on a world-wide scale—mistakes within nations as well as among nations. The sufferings of a world in anguish prove to us that political freedom alone is not enough to give men real freedom, real security, or real stability. Political freedom which is not supported by economic freedom is always in mortal danger. Social security is essential for economic freedom.

THREE THREATS TO SECURITY

For many years, the opening up of vast new territories and the building of tremendous industries in this country provided economic opportunities for the average man and woman. But during the past half century, our economic life has vastly changed, more and more of us have become wholly dependent upon wages, living under the constant threat that wages or earnings may stop and our families be left without any income. Dr. Sigerist has discussed this. Now, we cannot act as responsible and independent citizens if we have to live in constant fear of insecurity.

The major threats to economic and social security are of three kinds. First, there is the danger that there will not be enough jobs paying adequate wages or any wages. When jobs are scarce, the farmer, the small businessman, and the professional men are also hard up and find it difficult to earn a decent living. Many steps are necessary if we are to get our economic system under control. We are not discussing that problem directly tonight. Indirectly, however, social security can help us achieve full employment. Also, it is a necessary safeguard while we are working toward the goal of full employment.

The second threat to family security is the ever-present danger that earnings will be cut off as a result of individual misfortune. The worker may become sick or permanently disabled; he may be too old to work; he may die prematurely, leaving a widow and young children. And no matter how successful we are in bringing about conditions favorable to full employment, there will always remain some unemployment. At the very least, there will be the unemployment that results when industries and processes change, or when workers move about in search of better jobs.

We may not be sure how to achieve full employment. But, fortunately, we know how to meet the threat to security from interruption of earnings. Knowing how to meet it, we should act. Individual workers cannot protect themselves. For many workers, wages are too small to buy even the food and clothes and housing the family should have. Even if wages were higher, individual savings would not meet the need. Sickness and accident may strike too early, before savings are accumulated. Disability may last too long, after savings and credit are exhausted. You know the answer as well as I. What the individual cannot do, the large group can do. If we all join together to organize a social-insurance system, we can all make small regular payments while we are earning. Any one of us who meets misfortune and is unable to earn will then be entitled to basic insurance benefits for a definite period or as long as he is unable to work. The uninterrupted flow of insurance income to families will not only give them basic security, but will also supply purchasing power and will help to provide jobs and job opportunities for those who can work.

The third threat to security today comes from the high cost of medical services and the resulting failure of large numbers of people to get adequate—or indeed, any—medical care. Dr. Sigerist has discussed how and why these costs have increased. Poor health is ordinarily the most common cause of economic insecurity for individuals and families. In time of peace, as well as in time of war, it is the source of tremendous waste of manpower. It lays a toll of billions of dollars on our economic system. Much of this waste and insecurity would be prevented if we applied the scientific knowledge we already possess. Modern medicine has made tremendous advances. But only a fraction of the people have access to really modern medical care. Too many people in this country are still getting medical care not much better than that which their grandparents received. Too many, because they are afraid of the costs, go without care entirely, or wait to see the doctor until it is too late.

The fact that many physicians render services to poor patients free of charge is indeed a great credit to them. But it is no credit to the state of our society that makes it necessary for self-supporting people to accept charity—even from a doctor. It is also unfair to the doctors.

Many people, because they think in terms of average costs, fail to understand why med-

ical costs are hard to meet. But almost no one has to pay the average cost. During a given year, most families will need no medical care or very little, while others need long-continued and expensive services.

Individual savings are not the answer to this problem of unpredictable medical costs. A serious illness can wipe out the savings of a lifetime. Averaging the cost through insurance is the solution. Through a social insurance system, each of us can pay an average cost of medical care, year in and year out, while we are working and earning. If we pay our share into a common fund, there will be enough in such a fund to pay for the services which any of us may need.

SECURITY AND FREEDOM

The social insurance method of paying for medical care allows us to build on existing practices and to avoid interference with the individual doctor-patient relationship or with the professional aspects of medicine. The social insurance fund will pay doctors and hospitals fair reimbursement for their services. Our bill provides for different methods of payment, according to what is mutually agreeable to the insurance system and to the doctors and hospitals. All licensed doctors are guaranteed the right to participate. Insured persons have the right freely to choose a doctor from among all those in the community who are participating, and the right to change doctors. All qualified hospitals are also guaranteed the right to participate.

Our bill will not only increase the amount but will also improve the quality of medical care received by most persons in this country. It will make it possible for most doctors to practice better medicine than they are practicing now and thus to do a job more satisfactory to themselves and to their patients. It will make it possible for doctors to locate in communities where they cannot now make a decent living. It will do all these things not through bureaucratic dictation or interference, but through pooling all our small contributions and thus making sure that there is money to pay for whatever service—general practitioner, specialist, laboratory, X-ray, hospital—any of us needs.

The insurance benefits of our bill will, of course, be payable without any question as to what private sources of income the family may have. The amounts of the cash insurance benefits are related to the individual's previous earnings and the number of his dependents. Many families will want to supplement their social insurance protection with additional private insurance, according to their individual circumstances and plans. Social insurance involves the minimum of interference with the affairs of the individual. It is a method of having both security and freedom.

SOCIAL INSURANCE SHOULD BE NATIONAL

Is a national social insurance system necessary? I think it is. With anything less than a national system, there will always be some persons who are unprotected or who lose their protection, as they move from one State to another, or because the State in which they live or to which they move has failed to establish an insurance system. The first State workmen's compensation law in this country was passed in 1911; today, 33 years later, there is still one State without such legislation and there are many which provide most inadequate protection.

Or consider our State-by-State system of unemployment compensation. There is no good reason why a worker on one side of a State line should receive a benefit of $6 a week when he is unemployed while a worker on the other side of the line, who has had identical earnings, receives $15. There is no question here of different standards of living in the two States; the insurance benefit is related to previous earnings, thus avoiding any such question. There is no reason why employers should make reports to the different State agencies or why each of these agencies should maintain separate wage records. There is no reason why workers should have to go to several different local insurance offices. The administrative savings of a unified national system would be tremendous. Because of the wide spreading of risks, a national system could provide workers with more adequate benefits for a smaller contribution than they could get from separate State systems.

A social insurance system should be national. But it can be and should be administered on a decentralized basis. As I have suggested, the collection of contributions and the keeping of wage records from which the benefit would be determined, should be a central operation. But I see nothing sinister or dangerous in this. The taking of claims, the payment of benefits, the detailed arrangements with doctors and hospitals, the hearing of appeals, would all be carried on in the local community. I firmly believe that the insurance system should be guided at all levels of administration by the advice of workers, employers, doctors, and other groups who have a large stake in the system. This is the way to assure democratic and responsible administration. The elected representatives of the people in Congress would maintain an over-all watch on the workings and the effectiveness of the system.

If we are agreed that we want Nation-wide security, then it follows that we want social insurance and not voluntary insurance. Probably no one—least of all the insurance companies—would argue today that we should give up the old-age and survivors insurance system and let the voluntary insurance companies alone try to provide old-age retirement for the aged of this country and insurance pensions for the widows and orphans of workers who die young. But the argument is being made that we should trust to voluntary insurance for medical care and hospitalization insurance. I believe this would be a tragic mistake. Voluntary plans do not have and cannot hope to have a large enough coverage. Commonly—because of high administrative costs, high salaries, large reserves, and in some cases high profits—they are too expensive to be within the means of the people who most need insurance against the costs of medical care. Most of the voluntary plans are open only to limited groups of people. Though the prepayment plans which provide medical benefits have had about 50 years of development, they still cover less than 5,000,000 people, that is less than 4 percent of our population. Voluntary insurance has always and everywhere, here and abroad, failed to do the basic job. It has to be done through compulsory insurance.

Even the unusually successful hospital service plans cover only about a tenth of our population. Moreover, the rate of growth in the older plans is slowing down. Even if the Blue Cross plans continued to get as many members each year for the next 10 years as they did in their very best year, at the end of such a 10-year period about three-quarters of our population would still be without insurance protection against the costs of hospital care.

A system of medical care and hospitalization insurance, developed as part of a national social insurance system, would cover between 80 and 90 percent of our population in the first year.

FRIENDLY AND CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM IS WELCOME

People sometimes say to me:

"But your bill tries to do too much at once. Why not go slowly, experiment, meet only one kind of opposition at a time?"

My answer is that the people of this country want security. They do not want only a cash benefit when family income is cut down by unemployment and nothing when it is cut down by sickness. They do not want only a cash benefit in place of wages when they are sick, but no insurance protection against the costs of medical care. We began experimenting with a limited system in 1935. It is high time we stopped experimenting just to please or satisfy some special-interest group. It is high time we stopped discriminating against farmers, small businessmen, professional persons, and others excluded from coverage under the present act. It is also time we stopped discriminating against the disabled and the sick and the persons who work in more than one State.

The opponents of a national unemployment-insurance system, of disability benefits, of medical-care insurance are all really opponents of social security. I do not think we gain anything by putting ourselves in the position of fighting the one battle for social security on three fields and at three different times.

Let me make my position clear on this point. I have no patience with those who merely oppose social security or who deliberately mislead the public through misrepresentation of our bill. However, there are many who have reasonable doubts and criticisms of provisions in the bill. We owe it to them and to ourselves and to the people of this country to listen attentively to such critics, to derive all possible improvements in the bill. All of us who have sponsored the bill have repeatedly emphasized our deep interest in constructive criticism. The door is always open to fair-minded critics who want to help.

ACTION NOW IS NEEDED

I believe it is tremendously important that we have a strong social-security program in operation at the war's end. Such a program will be needed to help carry workers through the inevitable periods of unemployment while industries are converting from war to peacetime production. It will be needed by the older workers who will be ready to retire after the extra service they have given during the war years. It will be needed by the returning soldiers and sailors to help their readjustments to civilian life. It will be needed by all the people to give them security against sickness.

The way in which we demobilize will influence the course of events in this country for many years. Thus far, most of the discussion about post-war planning has been in terms of planning for business, for the owners of plants and equipment. Our social-security bill is a post-war plan for human beings, for the common man. It is a blueprint for action that will vastly strengthen our freedom and the freedom of our children. It offers a rallying point for concerted, progressive, political action by citizens in all walks of life who are ready to demand real and comprehensive social security in our time.

Thousands of American Citizens Are Hoping That House Concurrent Resolution 50 Will Be Adopted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Italian language newspapers of the

United States, speaking for many thousands of good, loyal American citizens of Italian ancestry, are asking the Foreign Affairs Committee to report, and Congress to pass, House Concurrent Resolution 50, which proposes that the Congress of the United States, acting on behalf of its principal, the people of America, shall extend hands across the sea to the people of Italy and welcome them to the family of liberated nations.

Societies representing thousands of American sons of Italian forefathers, good American citizens who love the home of their ancestors, encouraged by the approval which the State Department and the Office of War Information have given to this resolution, are joining in the movement to secure its passage, believing that this recognition of the real people of Italy by the American Congress would be a tremendous inspiration to the Italian patriots in their efforts to throw off Nazi domination which is impoverishing and enslaving them; that it would be notice to the world that the Atlantic Charter is not a dead letter but a vital, pulsating policy to which the United States is firmly and everlastingly committed, and that the act of kindness contemplated in the resolution would have far-reaching possibilities for propaganda and psychological purposes, and would be of great value to the cause of the United States.

INTRODUCED 6 MONTHS AGO

This resolution was originally introduced in Congress by me on September 21, 1943, 6 months ago today. Soon after it was introduced the State Department gave its approval to the resolution in a letter to Representative SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have heard many expressions of regret that the committee has not acted on the resolution during the 6 months it has been pending in committee. Chairman BLOOM has promised me that he will submit the resolution to the committee for a vote, and I am hopeful that he will do so soon and that the committee's action will be favorable. Quite a number of members of the committee have assured me, orally and in writing, that they are ready to vote to report the bill the minute it is submitted for committee action.

The leadership of Chairman BLOOM and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in reporting out and securing the passage of the Fulbright resolution was acclaimed from ocean to ocean. That resolution expressed the sentiment of America springing right up from the grass roots, and Congress is being honored no end for the statesmanship which gave expression to the popular mind. I believe that the adoption of my resolution would be similarly acclaimed, not that it is as important from the policy standpoint as the Fulbright resolution, but because it would be accepted as an honest, sincere statement by Congress along righteous lines.

PEOPLE EXPECT CONGRESS TO ACT IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I am sure that it is most pleasing to our entire Nation to witness the renaissance of interest by the Congress of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. The people are hoping, almost praying, I think, that what Congress has done is only the beginning, and that it will continue to assert its responsibilities in that field in which American destiny is so historically and vitally interwoven. The people of America are looking to their representatives to speak for them in matters of important foreign relations. The adoption of this resolution would be notice to the world that the Congress, which represents the people, is squarely behind the Executive and Commander in Chief in support of the broad humanitarian principles of the Atlantic Charter. After hearing indirectly and directly from millions of people who approve this resolution and who are convinced that it would have a humane and effective bearing on the war and on our international relations, I would consider myself derelict in duty if I failed to exhaust all of the means at my disposal to try to secure its adoption.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

The text of House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of Fascist rule, and to downtrodden oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support by all reasonable and constitutional means the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

I am proud to be able to announce that this resolution has the approval of the State Department, which has as its main responsibilities the conduct of our foreign relations, and the Office of War Information, which has exclusive charge of our propaganda efforts in foreign countries.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPROVES

Under date of October 8, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, wrote to me as follows:

I have your letter of October 1, 1943, addressed to Secretary Hull, enclosing a copy of a resolution which you submitted to the House September 21, welcoming the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. The resolution has been carefully read and I find no conflict with the foreign policy of this Government. It embodies the spirit of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the people of defeated countries, and also reflects, I am convinced, the attitude of the great majority of American citizens toward the unfortunate Italian people.

Mr. Stettinius adds that he heartily concurs in the sense of the resolution, to which he refers as "your generous message."

The Office of War Information, after giving the resolution the most careful consideration, finds it to be in harmony with the foreign policy of our Government, with the Atlantic Charter, and with the Moscow Agreement.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION APPROVES

The Office of War Information has indicated that it would like to have this resolution adopted for propaganda purposes. Wars are not won entirely by bullets and cold steel. The right sort of propaganda, in which the rule of kindness is a predominant element, may be a great factor in winning wars. The sort of propaganda to which I refer as the right sort is the sort that has its wellsprings in the warmth of our humanitarianism, in our honesty of purpose, and our sincere earnestness to serve mankind. Propaganda of the right kind is often more effective in winning wars than big guns and battleships.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF SONS OF ITALY

My primary purpose in arising today was to present to the House some of the many evidences that have come to me of the great interest that is being taken in this resolution by American citizens who have deep sympathy, through ties of relationship or otherwise, with the oppressed Italian people who are the tragic victims of Fascist rule.

Salvatore Parisi, supreme secretary of the Supreme Lodge, Order of Sons of Italy in America, wrote under date of December 11, 1943:

I am pleased to inform you that the supreme convention of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, assembled in Cleveland, Ohio, on November 11, 12, and 13, 1943, approved the House concurrent resolution and the Supreme Lodge expresses its thanks and appreciation to you for having filed such a resolution.

Felix Forte, supreme venerable of the Supreme Lodge, Order of Sons of Italy in America, wrote to me from Belmont, Mass., under date of February 5, 1944:

I shall appreciate it very much if you will send me copies of your resolution, introduced on September 21, 1943, proposing that Congress adopt a resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. I shall be grateful for as many copies as you can send me.

IL POPOLO ITALIANO

The following letter from the publisher of Il Popolo Italiano and copy of a postal card received by that paper came to me under date of February 16, 1944:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 16, 1944.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed you will find a translation of a postal card received at our offices in reference to your recent congressional resolution.

We agree with you that the passage of such a resolution would be encouraging to the millions of Americans of Italian extraction.

Very truly yours,
IL POPOLO ITALIANO,
REMO ZUECCA,
Publisher.

IL POPOLO ITALIANO: We have read with great pleasure, in your newspaper that the

Honorable LUDLOW declared himself in favor of the Italian people, asking that they be considered as members of the family of liberated nations. Inasmuch as we are grateful to this gentleman we should like his address so that we might be able to send a letter of thanks to this modern apostle.

We trust that Congress will treat this subject with impartiality and will decide immediately to relieve those poor people who are so torn and afflicted.

MESSAGE TO THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

The following editorial, entitled "A Message to the Italian People" appeared in the Corriere del Connecticut of New Haven on February 18, 1944:

A MESSAGE TO THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

The immense and awful tragedy of the Italian people betrayed by fascism and subjected to the most atrocious physical and moral tortures by the Nazis has found recently an echo of human sympathy in the midst of Congress through the eloquent and moving words of the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW of Indiana, who has introduced in Congress a resolution of great value both spiritually and morally.

The Honorable LUDLOW has proposed that in the name of the Congress of the United States and in the light of the principles for which it stands and on the part of the people of America, the Italian people at present so sorely tried, be sent a message of friendship and of welcome into the family of free nations.

The resolution itself has been approved in advance by the Department of State and by the Office of War Information and has been submitted to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Honorable LUDLOW in deciding to take this step of great importance and significance has been impelled by various reasons and inspired by various laudable ideals. Above all, he wants to bring out that wars are not won only by iron, fire, and bayonets, but also by efficacious and humanitarian propaganda, which does not come difficult to a nation such as America, architect of the Atlantic Charter and teacher of liberty and true justice to all the world, to whom it has given generous and brotherly asylum.

The Honorable LUDLOW, at the same time, is sure that the friendly voice coming from the American Congress will serve to imbue with fresh spirit the Italian people still under German oppression and (incite them) to break the chains of their slavery by rebelling against the tyrants.

But there is also another reason, touchingly sentimental and pure, which has induced the Honorable LUDLOW to exhort Congress to extend friendly hands across the sea to the Italian people; and this reason is of special concern to the family of Italian-Americans made up, as the distinguished Congressman from Indiana has justly added, of "good, honest, hard-working, God-fearing citizens," who, everyone well knows, have fulfilled and are continuing to fulfill their duty toward America.

Every American cannot but help greet with sympathy and approval the step taken by the Honorable LUDLOW, but especially the family of Italian-Americans greets it with enthusiasm and gratitude, for, together with the victory of America and the Allies, they yearn for the liberation of Italy, for its return among the free nations of the world, and for her resumption of that traditional friendship which has always linked the two people.

LA TRIBUNA ENDORSES RESOLUTION

Under the caption "The conscience of a Congressman," La Tribuna, of Stamford, Conn., printed the following on February 24, 1944:

Since the time of the unconditional surrender we have been expecting, as we are still expecting, that Italy be given the same opportunity as other European nations to become a part of the family of Allied Nations and be no longer called an enemy nation. The time has now come to encourage the Italian people to have faith in the promises that for better or for worse were laid down in the historic Atlantic Charter. In Congress the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW has introduced a resolution to this effect, which has met the approval of the State Department and of the Office of War Information.

The Italian-Americans of the United States are certainly grateful to the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW for having interested himself in giving encouragement to the Italian people to drive out the Germans from their homeland, and to make common cause with all the other nations liberated, as well as to be liberated.

"LIGHT ON DARKNESS"

On February 17, 1944, Mr. Ettore Patrizi, editor of L'Italia, of San Francisco, wrote to me:

In the name of the people of Italian race, we beg to thank you for your noble action, assuring you that same created a wide echo of approval.

Enclosed you will find a marked tear sheet of our newspaper regarding your resolution and a short editorial note about the same.

The editorial referred to, entitled "Light on Darkness," was as follows:

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, Member of the House of Representatives, has recently introduced in Congress a resolution, which, if and when passed, will recognize Italy as a liberated nation as well as a cobelligerent. The resolution proclaims that "the United Nations welcome the Italian people for having freed itself from the horrors and slavery of fascisms" and that America in the spirit of the "four freedoms" and of the Atlantic Charter binds herself to help the Italians toward national reconstruction in peace and with security. This noble resolution has the approval of the Department of State, and there is no doubt that Congress will pass it * * * when Rome will have been liberated. The Ludlow resolution is light cast on the shadow, which has become ever thicker since July 25, 1943, when the Fascist regime was overthrown by the selfsame architects—belatedly repenting—of the national misfortunes.

It has been announced that this motion of the Honorable LUDLOW has received the support of the Department of State and of the O. W. I., and that it will receive due consideration in accordance with important military developments in Italy.

The Honorable LUDLOW, in presenting the motion, delivered an eloquent speech in which he brought out in bold relief the virtues of the Italian people and how fascism, taking advantage of the good nature of this people, first made slaves of them and then chained them to nazi-ism, thus dragging them to the brink of ruin.

The Late Honorable Francis D. Culkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of my predecessor, Francis D. Culkin, the Nation and the Thirty-second Congressional District, which he served for nearly 15 years in the House of Representatives, lost one of their most able and conscientious public servants.

The deep affection with which he was held by his people and by his colleagues speaks more eloquently than can I of his distinguished service to the cause of sound Americanism. He will long be remembered.

Judge Culkin was born in Oswego, N. Y., and following a brief career as a newspaperman, he enlisted as a soldier in the Spanish-American War. Returning to his native city after the victory had been won, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar.

Common sense in an uncommon degree is what the world calls wisdom, and because of his exceptionally keen mind and ability to quickly arrive at logical conclusions, Judge Culkin soon became outstanding as an attorney.

He served as city attorney of Oswego for 4 years, and won such recognition in this field that he was elected to office as district attorney of Oswego County, a post which he held for 12 years subsequently.

He became widely known as a fearless prosecutor and defender of the rights of the people. He launched a vigorous attack against the underworld which rid the county of commercialized vice, gangsters, and other evildoers who were preying on the citizenry. More than 30 years after this successful campaign was concluded, his efforts in this direction are remembered and praised by the people whom he served.

As was to be expected, Judge Culkin was later elevated to the post of county judge. He became an outstanding jurist whose rulings had far-reaching effects. He was unrelenting in his search for truth and justice in every case which appeared before him, and wrongdoers in his court were dealt with fairly but vigorously. However, many of those whom he sent to prison later turned to him for help and in no instance, where assistance was merited, was this denied. As a result of his interest, many potential criminals were rehabilitated and became decent, law-abiding citizens.

Judge Culkin also took a deep interest in domestic relations problems, especially as they affected children. He was instrumental in the establishment of State laws which gave under-privileged children the chance to which they were entitled. He did a great work and his sole reward was the satisfaction that he had made whole many broken lives.

In 1928 a vacancy in the House of Representatives occurred in the Thirty-second Congressional District of New York, and Mr. Culkin was the unanimous choice of the Republican Party to fill this post.

He was elected to the House by a large majority and was subsequently reelected by greater majorities. He was a Member of the House at his death, which occurred in Oswego, August 4, 1943. His passing was universally mourned, and the tributes paid him in the Congress at that time and in the district were eloquent

testimony of the great regard in which he was held.

While a Member of the House, Judge Culkin was most faithful in his attendance at the meetings of his committees. He was a member of both the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and he made many significant contributions to the national welfare through his interest in legislation emanating from these bodies.

Few men have been more devoted to the welfare of their constituents and of our Nation. His public service spanned a period of more than 40 years, and it is men like him which have made America great. With Pope, I would say this of Judge Culkin:

Statesman, yet friend to truth, of soul sincere;
In action faithful, and in honor clear!

The Production of Food and the Further Drafting of Farm Boys

REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Jones, speaking for the War Food Administration, has just filed a 96-page report with Director James S. Byrnes, of the War Mobilization Office. In this report Mr. Jones points out the need of farm labor for 1944 as follows:

The production goals for the coming year call for 71,900,000 more man-days than were required last year. This means we need an additional 287,600 men. Approximately 80,000 more farm workers will be needed in April; 400,000 more in June; 350,000 more in July; and 400,000 more in September than were needed the year before.

On all farms in the United States the number of laborers is 4,000,000 less than the working force in April 1940. In order to approximate the goals of production for 1943, 1,300,000 farm resident women and childen were employed. Of the male workers employed on farms last year 14 percent or 828,251 were 65 years of age or older.

This does not tell all the story, for in the year 1943 the average farm worker put in 12 hours per day, and many of the children doing men's work on farms were less than 13 years of age. Personally I saw a boy under 11 years of age operating a combine, with no other help in sight.

The shortage of farm machinery and repairs and a reduction in the use of gasoline renders it a physical impossibility to produce as much as was produced in 1943. Still the goal for production is 122 percent of what was produced last year, an increase of 22 percent.

In spite of these facts, the Director of Selective Service now declares that the farms must give up more young men. Practically all of the young men engaged in agriculture were skilled operators of farm machinery and when once taken in the draft their places cannot be filled at once. It takes time to develop a skilled operator. If the Selective Service insists on taking all physically fit men between the ages of 17 and 26, married and single, and the plan is carried out on farms, it becomes apparent at once that we are doing the most unpatriotic thing that can be thought up.

The President has declared that our food responsibilities will increase as we occupy additional territories and that we must be prepared to share with those who, without our help, might be faced with want.

Everyone who knows anything about war knows that food is as essential as guns, and more essential in territories which we liberate. They will have no particular use for guns, but until they can again produce, hunger must be fought.

In view of the heavier demands on the United States for food, the policy now proposed by the Selective Service will defeat its own purpose. If the plan is followed without change, we shall wake up some morning in the fall of 1944 and find we are not only short of food to send to Europe but short of food for our own people here at home.

Farm production is as essential to our war effort as any other production, and that includes the production of engines of war. It is almost impossible to convince anyone here on the Atlantic seaboard that farming is a business, a skilled business, and a business without which we could not prosecute a war.

To meet our production quota, farm boys must be left on the farms and machines and repairs and gasoline must be furnished the farmers. The Selective Service, in substance, says, "Your farm boys are good fighters and we must have them." The war records show that they are not only good fighters but as good as the best, but that does not settle this production muddle.

I have asked the Selective Service officials this question: Can you supply other laborers—skilled workers—to take the place of these boys? They frankly admit that they cannot supply other workers who are equally as good and equally competent.

The training of troops and actual fighting takes first place in our war effort. Transportation is another necessary activity. Production of engines of war is another. And the production of food is another.

No one of these can be considered as the one and only necessary activity in our united war effort. All should be considered together and one will not succeed without the other. Has the war administration completely overlooked the importance of the production of food? The further drafting of farm boys would indicate that the war administration is not fully aware of the tremendous need for maximum production of food. At least it appears to consider it of minor importance.

The Hourly Labor Subsidy to the Producers of Food and Fiber Engaged in Different Systems of Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on page 1363 of the February 7, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a detailed report by Dr. Wylie Goodsell, of the hourly returns received by the producers of foods and fibers of the Nation. These studies have been made since 1935 with complete and careful records.

The following table is from the information received from Dr. Goodsell:

The average amount per hour for labor from Government payments

	Average payment per hour, 1942	Total average amount per hour for labor including Government payments, 1942
Winter wheat	$0.16	$1.67
Wheat-corn	.12	.84
Wheat grain and sorghum	.14	1.33
Hog-dairy, Corn Belt	.03	.49
Cash grain, Corn Belt	.11	.96
Hog-beef raising, Corn Belt	.04	.47
Central New York dairy	—.01	.52
Southern Wisconsin dairy	.01	.47
2-mule Georgia cotton	.02	.22
Mississippi cotton	.02	.31
Texas cotton	.02	.19

What are the significant facts brought out by these studies? We are soon to have the 1944 agricultural appropriation bill and this information should be of value to every Member of Congress.

Reliable conclusions to be drawn are:

First. That there is about as much disparity in hourly incomes to farmers as there is in hourly income of labor.

Second. That while we have been appropriating $400,000,000 to $800,000,000 per year, largely as soil conservation, we have really been subsidizing soil-depleting crops instead of stimulating livestock farming which would best insure soil conservation and soil fertility. Livestock farming means pasture land which plays an important part in soil conservation. Livestock farming means feeding a large percentage of the crops on the farm with the least loss of fertility from the farm.

Third. This study shows that only a small amount per hour for labor really went to the man who raised cotton. Of the 19, 22, and 31 cents per hour, only 2 cents per hour was received as Govern-

ment payments by the cotton farmers that raised the cotton.

Fourth. The Dr. Goodsell study will also reveal that the subsidy per hour, as Government payment to the producers of some farm crops, was greater than the total hourly income received by producers of other crops. For example, in 1939 the winter-wheat producer received a 19-cent-per-hour subsidy and the wheat, grain, and sorghum farmer received a 22-cent-per-hour subsidy; the Corn Belt hog-dairy farmer received but 20 cents per hour as a total income, the hog-beef raising farmer in the Corn Belt received but 18 cents per hour total hourly income, the two-mule Georgia cotton farmer received a 9-cent hourly income, the Mississippi Delta cotton farmer had a 15-cent hourly income, and the black-waxy Texas cotton farmer received but a 10-cent hourly labor income for the same year.

Can you not better understand the rumblings from Texas when you realize the 15- to 19-cent hourly labor returns? Is not this situation all the more apparent when one realizes that in the same year 3,300 big farm operators in Texas were subsidized over $6,000,000?

In fairness it should be stated that less hours were worked on the winter-wheat and winter-wheat and sorghum farms than on these other types. That would somewhat effect the hourly wage returns. It should also be stated that wheat brought but 74 cents per bushel for 10 years, and even when the subsidy by Government payments is added, the wheat farmer still had less than he did for his wheat 10 years previous to official planning, which was 94 cents per bushel.

I feel that these facts should be presented. The situation might have been improved if the incentive-payment program of the last year had been in operation but which was prevented by the Cannon amendment. As long as we, the Congress, appropriate money for a program and stipulate by law how it is administered, we cannot avoid the responsibility for the program. We cannot in justice criticize a program as long as the law is carried out, and we must be willing to accept the responsibility for the lack of a broader agricultural program.

In conclusion I once more ask, how can one from a State where the producer receives 15 to 19 cents per hour for his efforts be supporting roll-back subsidies to the consumer? In addition I also ask how the roll-backers can expect the American farmer, in the majority of instances, to produce foods and fibers any cheaper than he is for groups with incomes, in many cases, many times the income of the food and fiber producers of our country?

The above table should also indicate why our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable STEPHEN PACE, feels justified in his efforts to have farm labor taken into account when arriving at parity. Would not any Member be justified in taking a similar position if the producers in his district, that were above the average, received only 22 cents per hour in 1942?

Resolution of Polish-American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

We, the delegates to the annual meeting of the second district of the Polish American Council, assembled at New Haven, Conn., on February 27, 1944, representing 350,000 Americans of Polish descent in the State of Connecticut, do hereby unanimously resolve that:

We reaffirm our allegiance and loyalty to the United States of America and our trust in the leadership of our great President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We subscribe without reservation to all the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, that Magna Carta of human liberty, and we do particularly affirm our belief that all nations, both large and small, have an unqualified right to exist free from fear of aggression by other nations and free to pursue their national existence by forms of government of their own choosing.

We believe that these principles should be adhered to without qualifications in the present dispute between Russia and Poland and that the future peace of the world is to a large extent dependent upon a proper solution of this question, entailing as it does the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

We most earnestly urge the State Department to continue to refuse to recognize any conquests of territory made by force and any changes of government which are not made with the consent of the governed.

We believe that the Polish government-in-exile in London is the sole legitimate authority empowered to speak for the people of Poland and that any attempts by Soviet Russia to discredit the Polish government by setting up ex parte puppet regimes are in cynical disregard of the principles of self-government set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

We are firmly convinced that upon historical, moral, ethnological, and economic grounds the eastern part of Poland, which is the basis of the present Russo-Polish dispute, belongs and should belong to the Republic of Poland and that any pretensions to this territory by Russia lack factual basis on any of the grounds enumerated.

We believe that any arguments advanced to the effect that the acquisition of this territory by Russia is necessary to her national defense against future aggression are without validity in these days of mechanized warfare and particularly in view of the major part played by air forces in present-day combat; and we therefore believe that these arguments, in effect, would protect large nations at the expense of smaller ones.

We believe that Poland's contribution to the cause of democracy and freedom merits the appreciation of the entire civilized world, embodying as it did the first armed resistance against Nazi aggression in the face of overwhelming odds and continuing to the present day both by the activities of the armed forces of Poland and of the vast network of underground resistance: We do, therefore, hereby unanimously

Resolve, That we believe it to be the solemn duty of the United States to stand fast by the principles of the Atlantic Charter and to do everything in its power and influence to further the just claims of Poland in the present dispute with Russia; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Connecticut.

Dr. B. L. SMYKOWSKI, *President.*
Mrs. W. DUCH, *Vice President.*
RICHARD T. MOKRZYNSKI, *Financial Secretary.*
Rev. A. MAZURKIEWICZ, *Treasurer.*
Dr. F. C. TYBURSKI, *Secretary.*

The Polish-Russian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. ROWAN Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to a representative of the Polish National Alliance, of Chicago. The letter bears on the Polish-Russian question:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1944.

Mr. PETER MACIEJEWSKI, *President,*
Mr. ALBERT J. DANISCH, *Secretary,*
Industrial Society of Polish Mechanic Group 3, Polish National Alliance, Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: This is in acknowledgment of your letter in which you advise that your society by unanimous request asks that I espouse the cause of Poland, and I wish to assure you that whatever influence I possess shall be exerted to aid the liberty-loving people of that country.

As you are perhaps aware, during the last war, in cooperation with Professor Paderewski, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I did all in my power to aid in bringing about the adoption of the resolution to recognize the freedom and independence of Poland. At that time I introduced the first resolution to recognize Polish regiments and, later on, another resolution to grant Poland its independence. It is my hope that I again will have the opportunity to aid in reestablishing Poland's independence and freedom of which she has been so ruthlessly deprived by the barbaric Nazis.

You may know that for a number of years I have advocated giving aid and assistance to Russia in their heroic struggle against the Nazi hordes, naturally believing that the cause of Poland can only be aided by the victory of Russia over the Nazis, and I feel that Poland, the same as Russia, is entitled to its freedom and liberty. Further, in the interest of the future peace of Europe, Poland should be made even stronger than it was before the Nazi destruction.

Millions of the Russian people, the same as the Polish people, have been ruthlessly murdered and deprived of their all and,

therefore, it is inconceivable to me that they would endeavor, as sometimes reported, to take away from Poland any territory or lands which by right are and should be a part of the new Polish Republic.

In conclusion let me say that I am cooperating with Congressmen GORSKI and GORDON, of Chicago, and the Detroit Polish Congressman who are interested, like you and I, in seeing that justice is done to Poland.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

Should State and Municipal Employees and Self-Employed Persons Receive the Benefits of the Social-Security Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me yesterday evening over the radio:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, when Congress passed the Social Security Act a few years ago it took a far-reaching and important step to adopt a program of retirement benefits for working men and women in this country who had reached the age when they would ordinarily retire if they were financially able to do so. Through the centuries one of the chief worries of the average person has been whether or not he could achieve financial independence during the fruitful years of his life and thus be able to live his later years free from financial anxiety of any kind.

The basic theory of the Social Security Act is that if both employer and employee would lay aside small sums each month and each year to be placed in a fund and permitted to accumulate it would eventually reach a sum that would permit withdrawals sufficient to take care of the individuals concerned when it became time for them to retire, or in the event of death before retirement age to take care of dependents who survived. The act had at least two main objectives: First, it would permit the workingman to retire at an earlier age than he otherwise would, and thus provide additional jobs for younger men; and, second, it would permit him to quit work with some feeling of financial security. Naturally the law is not perfect, but it is definitely a step in the right direction. Its benefits are not as ample as they should be nor as extensive. But corrective measures can and undoubtedly will take care of that. Experience has shown that it has worked out very well and is enthusiastically accepted by the beneficiaries of its provisions. One of the principal difficulties is that there has been omitted from within its purview large groups of working men and women who are in the same category as the present participants of social-security benefits except that they happen to work for a State or municipality or are self-employed.

I introduced a bill in the House last week to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals. The passage of this bill will correct the inequities which I have just described.

This bill will accomplish two things. In the first place, it will cover State, county, and city employees, or the employees of any other political subdivision of the State, in cases where the State or political subdivision thereof consents to come under the provisions of the act. And, second, it will extend the act to include self-employed individuals who desire to come within its terms.

In my judgment, there is no sound basis for denying social-security benefits to an individual merely because he happens to work for the State, county, city, or other municipality. These persons should have the right to make social-security contributions the same as persons in private employment and receive the same benefits when they reach retirement age.

Some of our States, counties, and municipalities have adequate existing retirement or pension systems. Most of them do not have any such program. It is not my intention to disrupt or interfere with State, county, or municipal retirement pension plans which adequately take care of the employees covered thereby. Rather it is my intention primarily to provide retirement pension coverage for those not now covered and, secondly, to permit those units of government now having such plans to supplement it by Social Security Act benefits. Inasmuch as my amendment makes it optional for these governmental units to have their employees covered by the Social Security Act, those already adequately provided for by their own retirement laws can continue under their present system. But social-security benefits would not interfere or be a substitute for retirement pay because in most cases retirement pay is not sufficient to provide the individual with an adequate living. Then, too, these benefits under the Social Security Act would accrue to hundreds of thousands of city, county, and other municipal employees who do not at present have any retirement or other old-age benefits whatsoever. This is particularly true of the many small cities and other small municipal agencies throughout the Nation. These agencies are in most cases financially unable to provide any retirement assistance even in a small degree, no matter how much they would like to care for aged employees. So, if they are to be taken care of at all, it must and should be under the broad plan of Federal social security, the machinery and framework of which has already been created and established.

I am not one of those who believe in or subscribe to the so-called cradle-to-grave plans of social security, some of which have already been presented to Congress. Most of these schemes are fantastic and unworkable and so designed that, if enacted and put into effect, they would eventually destroy our system of free enterprise and our whole economy as well. What we can and ought to do now is perfect our already existing system of social security so as to eliminate its inequities and imperfections, and thus care for the large group of our working men and women who, through no fault of their own, have been left out in the cold.

We have hundreds of thousands of State and municipal employees in this country who have given the better part of their lives to that particular service. It should not be expected that they should run the risk of giving up their present jobs to seek private employment in order to be eligible to receive social-security benefits.

Likewise, there is a large group of self-employed persons in the country who would like to make social-security contributions and thus receive the benefits thereof at retirement age. These self-employed individuals in most cases are employers only in a technical sense. I say "technical sense" because as a practical matter a man with only one, two, or three employees is not considered an employer in common parlance or usage of the term. Furthermore, the average employer with only a few employees comes within the $3,000 per annum salary limitation which makes a person eligible for benefits under the act. When we consider that the over-all purpose of the Social Security Act was to provide financial security for the latter years of his life, to the so-called low-income-bracket worker, then we can find no reasonable or sensible basis for excluding the small employer. The barber, the plumber, the small merchant, the garage and gas-station operators, and hundreds of other small business and professional groups, too numerous to mention here tonight, are at present denied the opportunity of availing themselves of the privileges of this law. They wonder why they are excluded and, to my knowledge, no one has been able to give them a satisfactory explanation. Actually there is no answer except that they have been arbitrarily discriminated against without justification. The letters I receive indicate that people in the categories mentioned are anxious to have this discrimination removed, and in my judgment Congress should take immediate steps to remove it. These municipal employees and self-employed persons are no better off in the majority of instances than people who work in the factories and mills and, in a good many cases, they are not as well off as people who work for private employers. To illustrate what I mean I want to cite you a few comparisons.

For example, Tom Jones who reads meters for a private electric company is covered by the Social Security Act while his neighbor, Bill Smith, who reads water meters for the city at the same wage rate is excluded from the act. Bill Smith is no better off financially than his neighbor, yet he is penalized by our present Social Security Act simply because he happens to be working for the city instead of a private employer.

Now, take the case of a self-employed individual. I could give you a good many examples if time would permit, but this one will serve to illustrate my point. Everyone knows of a barber in his city or town who has but one employee. This employee is covered by social security, but the barber who runs the shop is not. In the great majority of instances the barber who runs the shop is no better off financially than the man who works for him, yet no matter how badly he wishes to avail himself of this protection, the present law will not permit him to do so. Even the news dealer on the street corner and the hot-dog vendor are out in the cold. In other words, any person who is an employer in the strictly technical and legal sense of the word, no matter how small and insignificant his business and income may be, is nevertheless a "self-employed individual" within the meaning of the Social Security Act and hence not entitled to any protection under it. My bill would merely amend the act to take care of this very unfair and inequitable situation. There are many other inequalities which exist under this law and the administration of it which my bill does not attempt to correct. In my judgment, there is considerable merit to the contention that present benefits are inadequate in amount and ought to be increased. I am hopeful that this particular phase of the law will receive early congressional consideration and be remedied. My purpose in making the present proposal, however, is to take care of the hundreds of thousands of our people who are at present completely excluded from any form of social security. They should have been taken care of

long ago, but there certainly is no good reason for further delay. I am hopeful that this bill will receive early consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, to which it has been referred and favorably reported by that committee. I am confident that when it reaches the floor of the House it will pass without difficulty.

Thank you for listening, and good night.

American Mint Industry Threatened by Inadequate Ceiling Prices and Duty-Free Imports From Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, you are probably aware of the fact that Michigan and Indiana produce about 80 percent of the Nation's supply of mint oil. This oil is an essential crop and large quantities of it have been purchased in the form of gum and candy for our armed forces, as oil for medicinal purposes and for lend-lease export.

Extremely wet weather last spring resulted in a very weedy condition of many of our mint fields so that large areas were entirely abandoned or now have such a poor stand of mint roots that growers must plant new fields, if they are to continue to maintain their acreage. They will not go to this additional expense or effort if there is to be no future in producing the mint crop. Unless the Office of Price Administration makes an adjustment in the inadequate ceilings which have been decreed, mint growers will abandon the industry. They are today calling upon the O. P. A. to fix new ceilings, taking into consideration possible unfavorable weather conditions such as they experienced last year which caused them a considerable loss.

Large manufacturing consumers of mint oil have recognized the seriousness of the situation and have met with the O. P. A. in Washington. They have urged a ceiling of $7 for the 1943 oil. They were given sufficient encouragement by the O. P. A. so that the manufacturers advised the growers to hold their oil, made from the 1943 crop, until the ceiling prices are adjusted. These consumers have agreed to pay these higher prices and not to increase the price of their products in order to insure a sufficient acreage of mint in 1944.

Within another month mint growers should be setting out new fields. Right now they should be ordering fertilizer for their fields, repairs for their mint stills and other machinery. Instead, they are discouraged and have been attending meetings to decide on whether they should substitute other crops. At present they see in an unrestricted importation of mint oil from Brazil nothing but ruination for the United States mint industry and aid to the enemy—Japan. They feel that the Brazilian mint oil, which is coming in duty free, either comes from Japan or has been produced by Japanese in Brazil.

Besides demanding an immediate adjustment of ceiling prices by the O. P. A., Michigan and Indiana mint growers predict that unless a duty of $2 per pound is placed on Brazilian mint oil the industry in America will be destroyed.

In this connection, I ask permission to extend my remarks to include a letter from Mr. N. P. Beebe, president of the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, and a resolution recently adopted by that organization:

ESSENTIAL OIL GROWERS OF MICHIGAN,
March 11, 1944.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: At a meeting of the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, held at East Lansing February 4, which was attended by representatives from all the principal mint districts of Michigan, the accompanying resolution was adopted. This resolution was adopted on account of the following orders issued by the O. P. A. and W. F. A.:

I. O. P. A. issued an order August 14, 1942, establishing a ceiling price of $5.50 on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint to the dealer. This ceiling did not work out satisfactorily to the dealer because the growers sold their crop direct to the consumer.

II. A letter was sent out by O. P. A. July 14, 1943, stating a proposed price of $5 on peppermint and $3 on spearmint and asking for suggestions. In reply to this letter, the directors of the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan met at East Lansing and adopted resolutions protesting against this price and asking for a price of $7.50 for peppermint and $5 per pound for spearmint, and forwarded same to the O. P. A. in Washington. Further, we sent a committee to Washington who met with the O. P. A. and presented figures showing the cost of production, but accomplished nothing. They preferred to use the parity rule established by some theorist in Washington which does not take into consideration the higher cost of everything entering into production, and especially higher wages and the inefficiency of labor.

III. Order No. 81, September 23, 1943, from W. F. A., freezing peppermint and spearmint oils. By this order the crops were placed under the supervision of a director appointed by W. F. A., with authority to delegate his powers to any person employed by the Department of Agriculture, also to give manufacturers a right to use a certain percent of the amount of oil they used in 1941. Under this order the growers were not allowed to sell any portion of their crop without a permit. This order has worked a hardship and an injustice on the growers. They have been compelled to put the expense of growing the crop in 1943 income and to sell the crop in 1944.

IV. Order No. 472, September 24, established the prices to the grower of $5.50 per pound on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint and placed the ceilings 50 cents per pound higher to the dealers.

V. Amendment No. 1, effective November 1, 1943, revoking order of September 23, 1943, and permitting consumer to use quantities higher than limitations contained in original order.

VI. Order January 1, 1944, set forth the amount different manufacturers can use. Provided how they could get relief, i. e., by petitioning the Director, but giving Director absolute and final power to make the decision.

VII. January 28, 1944, consumers ordered to file inventory of oil on hand.

Now we find that thousands of pounds of menthol, dementholized oil, and natural peppermint oil are available from Brazil. This is being offered in lots up to 100,000 pounds. The Drug Reporter, a drug paper published in New York, in a recent article estimates that Brazil will have a million pounds of peppermint oil which is equal to the yearly average in the United States for the last 10 years. It is reported that this oil is being admitted duty-free by virtue of the power delegated to the President to remove the duty. We claim that it is impossible for Brazil to increase its production in a few years to the above amount and we believe that a large portion of said oil was produced in Japan and was brought into Brazil through certain South American countries and then sold duty-free to importers in the United States.

We, the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, request a duty of at least $2 per pound. Unless we have protection, the essential-oil growers of the United States, who have invested large sums of money in land and equipment, are ruined.

At the present ceiling price established by the W. F. A.—namely $5.50 on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint—many growers will have to discontinue the growing of essential oils. At a representative meeting of Essential Oil Growers of Michigan held February 4, 1944, 96.9 percent declared that they would decrease their acreage or entirely discontinue the production of peppermint and spearmint oil, provided the O. P. A. and W. F. A. did not raise the ceiling price.

Anything you can do to protect the essential-oil growers and dealers in the United States by securing a higher duty and higher ceiling price will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

N. P. BEEBE, *President.*

Whereas certain governmental agencies of this Nation, and especially the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. branches, have failed to recognize the war essentiality of peppermint oil as a crop; and

Whereas the activities of these agencies have tended to discourage the production of this crop in this Nation, and have encouraged its production in foreign countries and the importation of competitive foreign oils, to the threatened complete destruction of the peppermint industry in the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, assembled at Michigan State College at East Lansing this fourth day of February 1944, do hereby protest against this continued discrimination against the United States peppermint industry by the O. P. A. and W. F. A. branches of the Government by their enforcement of lower-than-cost-of-production ceilings, and that we urge the placing of tariffs against the importation of peppermint oil which will guarantee to the United States producer at least as much net return as would be received by the foreign producer competing with the American mint grower; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States for such assistance as will insure the life of the United States peppermint industry, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the several Senators and Representatives who represent the mint States.

Resolution of Montana B. R. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Montana Bataan Relief Organization I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a statement and a resolution which reached my desk this morning:

MISSOULA, MONT., *March 14, 1944.*
Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We the members of the Montana Bataan Relief Organization hereby request that you present to the House of Representatives this enclosed copy of a resolution which we have adopted. To know where the responsibility actually lies is our aim. To eliminate inefficiency or worse is our duty, both to our sons who are still fighting, and to our country.

Sincerely yours,
MONTANA BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
OPAL I. BARTHOLF, *President.*
JOE GAMACHE, Sr., *Secretary.*

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR HELD BY JAPAN

We, the mothers, wives, loved ones, friends, and relatives of prisoners of Japan, with full realization of the many problems of war that confront our Government, ask that consideration for immediate action be given our request—

Save our sons and husbands while they are still alive.

Send them food and medical supplies.

Send it now.

Tomorrow may be too late.

Enlist the aid of Russia or the Vatican or any agency that will save the lives of our loved ones. In the name of God and for the sake of humanity, nothing should be left undone toward sparing these heroes further suffering and sacrifice.

RESOLUTION OF BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION

Whereas Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in his report of September 11, 1943, published in Army Time, a daily news bulletin, Washington 5, D. C., stated that on July 1, 1941, the international situation was extremely critical and that menacing preparations of Japan in the Pacific prefaced attacks upon the British and Dutch possessions in the Philippines, and that, in view of these potentialities, orders had been issued in February 1941 to evacuate dependents of Army personnel stationed there; and

Whereas in the late summer of 1941 troops were ordered to the Philippines; and

Whereas pertinent statements of our Chief of Staff show beyond any doubt that those in authority knew that war with Japan was inevitable, and in view of these potentialities and the American-Japanese negotiations in process in the late summer and fall of 1941, the American people naturally assumed that the administration, Army, and Navy officials entrusted with the guarding of our Nation's safety would be on the alert sufficiently to prevent any possibility of such an attack as occurred at Pearl Harbor, as was their duty according to their oaths of office; and

Whereas the removal from active duty of two high-ranking Army and Navy officers entrusted with the defense of Pearl Harbor can obviously be rightfully taken by the American people as an admission of criminal negligence since that negligence jeopardized the life and freedom of our entire Nation and it is beyond question of doubt that their dereliction of duty brought about the extent of the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor and the needless loss of many thousands of American lives and there is a question in the minds of American people as to whether that dereliction of duty ended with the responsibility of those two officers or whether it extends to other military and naval officers or of some civil authorities in high position; and

Whereas the problem of responsibility for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor must be solved if the Nation is to obtain the highest degree of morale, which is necessary for a complete, all-out war effort; and

Whereas a train crew in charge of a passenger train would at least be charged with manslaughter if it neglected its duty to the extent of the loss of one human life, men under oath of office entrusted with the Nation's safety neglect their responsibility to the extent that thousands of lives are lost directly and thousands of others are needlessly sacrificed to the fate of years of imprisonment in Japan's prison camps as a result and yet after 2 years a thorough investigation has not been made or responsibility fixed or the American people advised as to where the responsibility lies; and

Whereas it cannot now be asserted as a reason for not fixing the responsibility as to do so might hamper the war effort and it is most obvious that the removal of the men responsible for the many defeats in the Pacific in the early days of the war emanates from the primary defeat at Pearl Harbor, is imperative if we are to obtain and maintain the most efficient direction of the war effort, and that the removal of those responsible will raise the morale not only on the home front but also among our fighting forces, who are required to serve under provided leadership; and

Whereas denial of food, medical and other supplies to our fighting men at Bataan and Corregidor, who were sent to the Pacific to defend the American right and protection of our flag resulted in needless sacrifice and torture at the hands of a known ruthless enemy and the veracity of all statements made at that time and since, that it was impossible to send them aid, is seriously questioned by us; and

Whereas it is our opinion that adherence to the prescribed duties of those charged with the protection of America and in accordance with traditional humanitarian principles of America would have prevented the enormous loss of life before and after the surrender of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam and Wake, and it is our further opinion that the dereliction of duty of those in authority constitutes the writing of the blackest page in American history and the resulting torture of the mothers, wives, and other relatives of the heroes of Bataan and Corregidor, caused by the diabolical atrocities so heartlessly described in the Army and Navy release of January 28, 1944, is the acknowledged signature of that black page: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bataan Relief Organization (B. R. O.) and its affiliates representing the mothers, fathers, wives and other relatives, sweethearts and friends of our sacrificed men in our armed forces in the Pacific, who lost their lives and the others who are left and who are suffering the most intense mental and physical anguish, are entitled as free Americans to petition the Congress of the United States, in accordance with the Constitution, for an immediate and thorough investigation to fix the responsibility and guilt of those in authority in order to bring about the speedy conclusion of this case, regardless of whom it may involve; and be it further

Resolved, That after termination of such investigation that trial by court martial proceedings, impeachment or any other means necessary to bring about immediate justice and thorough punishment of those found guilty of the dereliction of duty which they accepted when they took their oaths of office, shall be instituted.

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
OPAL I. BARTHOLF, *President.*

Attest:

JOE FARNACKE, Sr.,
Secretary.

Corn Crisis Results From New Deal Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in Nazi Europe, when the Hitler government wants any property or commodity it seizes it, paying the owner a price determined by the Nazis. Theirs is an ugly method, forcibly confiscating property against the will of the owner, and violating his right to keep the fruits of his own labor. The Nazis, of course, have a careful explanation of the necessity for this method of operation. But we all know it is simply naked brute force.

Last summer the Government of the United States used this same method to obtain corn from 26 grain elevators in this country. Its explanation was similar to that used by the Nazis—the need for corn was an emergency, and so the Government forcibly seized it, paying the price it determined was satisfactory. This seizure was called "requisitioning," because that word sounds so legal. Few people sensed the significance of the violent seizure of this corn.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to point out the serious danger of a recurrence of this method of emergency action in 1944.

Here is the factual situation, as reported to me by the Department of Agriculture. On October 1, 1943, corn stocks (new crop and carry-over) totaled 3,443,000,000 bushels. By January 1, 1944, these stocks had declined to 2,008,000,000. This decline indicated corn consumption of 1,435,000,000 in the October-December quarter. This rate of consumption showed almost a 10-percent (9.8 percent) increase over the comparable use in 1942. This increase is accounted for by the larger livestock population plus added commercial needs.

We started the calendar year 1943 with 2,316,000,000 bushels of corn, and in July the Government was seizing privately owned stocks of corn. We started 1944 with a corn stock of 2,008,000,000 bushels, or 308,000,000 less than in 1943. Based upon the indicated 10 percent increased consumption, commercial stocks available for industry will have completely disappeared before July 1, 1944. Even if the consumption should only be at the 1943 rate, there will not be sufficient com-

mercial corn available to supply essential demands.

I hope this disastrous shortage does not occur. Upon the basis of the figures furnished me by the Department of Agriculture, however, it appears probable. Already corn-processing firms are reporting dangerously low supplies.

The facts I have outlined, plus other significant data, have all been in the hands of the agricultural and O. P. A. officials running the war-food program of the United States. The danger I have outlined here has been called to their attention by many able folks in the grain industry. They should be fully aware of every aspect of this situation, and possibly their grain purchases from other countries will solve this dangerous problem.

Should an emergency and crisis develop in the corn industry during 1944, however, full responsibility lies in the lap of this administration and its experts. The crisis will be of their own making. In that event, their failure and the resulting catastrophe must not be used as a springboard to the use of Hitler's methods of seizure and virtual confiscation of property. The solution will be to throw out those who bungled this vital problem last year and stupidly and inexcusably will have allowed a similar crisis to arise in 1944.

Hitler's failures in Germany were followed by enslavement of the people and seizure of the fruits of their labor. The American way, before the New Deal, has always been to throw out those officials who bungled their critical responsibilities. If a grain crisis develops, we must turn a deaf ear to alibis and excuses. The methods of violence used by Hitler will not meet this emergency; the answer is new leadership.

Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the glaring examples of double talk has been illustrated by the Vice President of the United States. Evidently he speaks in order to please his listeners at the particular time at which he delivers his address, and without realizing that he has spoken before, and without any regard to the acts which he has heretofore directed, the commission of which has retarded both progress and essential food in this country. It is a sad commentary that the Vice President of the United States of America would try to mislead the people of this country, in time of war, for mere political purposes. His own utterances and his own acts are conclusive proof of his miserable attempt to confuse and mislead the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the proper time for any double talk on the part of any American citizen, and this is certainly not the time for any double talk on the part of any of the leaders in this country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Post, on March 20, 1944, which editorial is as follows:

DOUBLE TALK

Vice President WALLACE'S full conversion to an economy of abundance has now been amply demonstrated. There was a time, back in the early beginnings of the new world in 1933, when Mr. WALLACE seemed to teeter on the fence. "America must choose" was his thesis. Then he plunged furiously into a program of plowing under corn and cotton and slaughtering little pigs. Apparently the choice had been made. The idea of an economy of abundance was put into the discard and Mr. WALLACE became famous as the Secretary of Agriculture who put into effect an economy of scarcity. In pursuit of that policy he paid farmers hundreds of millions of dollars for not producing a large variety of crops.

Now that we are confronted by many wartime food shortages, this bit of history seems to rankle in Mr. WALLACE'S mind. So he has been stumping the country like a sort of political John the Baptist proclaiming the coming of an economy of abundance in the post-war era. "The phenomenal success of American industry in producing for war has demonstrated convincingly," he says, "that we can produce a national income of one hundred and fifty billion to two hundred billion dollars in the early post-war years, and that that income can be progressively enlarged, if we preserve a free dynamic economy." There is to be no more plowing under, no more curtailment, and no more surpluses. With fear of overproduction conquered by both industry and agriculture, the century of the common man will be ushered in. We scarcely see how he can avoid proclaiming, in his next installment, that there will be two cars in every garage and two chickens in every pot.

As if to demonstrate his present devotion to the economy of abundance, Mr. WALLACE has also given us a unique illustration of the mass distribution of words. Without a national hook-up, he attempted to reach the country's entire radio audience. Nearly 570 of our 800 broadcasting stations accepted his offer to supply them with free records supposedly carrying part of his speech to the American Business Congress in New York. There is no indication as to how many of these requested the record only out of courtesy. But a great many of the stations must have used it in the belief that they were reproducing a speech by Mr. WALLACE at the Waldorf-Astoria. Actually there were striking differences between the speech and the records, the speech being toned down so as not to grate too harshly on the ears of a business audience. The talk that went out over the air through this clever method was a more specious appeal to class prejudice. Apparently Mr. WALLACE didn't have a single message to give to the American people, but took advantage of his appearance before the American Business Congress to secure mass distribution of propaganda carefully selected for different audiences.

If the Vice President wants his conversion to the economy of abundance to be taken seriously, he may well contemplate the plight of the Daily Worker. That organ of the comrades is probably read today more for amusement than enlightenment because of the frequency with which it changes its party line without warning. In the face of that record, how does Mr. WALLACE expect even the economy of abundance to hold its appeal when he puts out two party lines at the same time? This effort to be all things to all men is scarcely becoming to one who, like Mr. WALLACE, takes pride in his high ethical standards.

Shall the Republic Change to Monarchy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends whose thought and philosophy is typical of the citizenship of the best over-all agricultural county in the State of Oklahoma—Alfalfa County—recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Enid Daily News and Eagle. The letter is so provocative of sound thinking, that under previous order authorizing me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the same herewith:

SHALL THE REPUBLIC CHANGE TO MONARCHY?

EDITOR, ENID NEWS,

Enid, Okla.:

Did not our forefathers of 1776 fight to overthrow the tryranny of one-man continuous rule? Did they not provide a constitutional safeguard against its recurrence by ordering the election of Chief Magistrate every 4 years? Did not their first President, first in war, peace, and the hearts of his countrymen, by declining a third term set a worthy example for his successors? And did not the 29 succeeding Presidents observe this salutary precedent?

Did not the founder of a great political party, Thomas Jefferson, write in his autobiography: "The example of four Presidents voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year has given it such precedent and usage that should a President consent to run for a third term, I trust he should be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views?" And did not the seventh second-termer, Grover Cleveland, leave fatherly warning, "When we consider the patronage of this great office, the temptation to retain public office once gained aided by a horde of officeholders eager to hold their jobs, we recognize the serious danger to a government of the people"? And did not the twenty-ninth President, Calvin Coolidge, after two terms, say in his autobiography, "A President should not only not be selfish, but he ought to avoid the appearance of selfishness. Men in high office live in an atmosphere of adulation and exaltation which sooner or later impairs their judgment. It is wholesome for Presidents to return to the people."

Did not 144 years of presidents not going beyond their eighth year display the progress and prosperity of a republic unparalleled among other forms of world government? Are the farewell messages of Washington and other Presidents, all solicitous for the future welfare of their country, now to be set at naught by one President's selfish ambition? At this late day, is our beloved Republic to be changed into a monarchy where the same man rules all the time? Is this to be the ignoble end of a republic that has risen to the highest pinnacle of success by its own private and corporate endeavor in a land blessed by God-given freedom?

And who is the first President to put his country in reverse to gratify a selfish ambition? Can it be none other than the last White House incumbent—the one who entered with cards stacked for a new deal—the

one who, receiving from his immediate predecessor the soundest credit ever possessed by any nation, accumulated the largest pile of gold ever in one world place—the one who by lavishly expending money where it would do the most vote-getting good has selfishly sought a term of Presidential office exceeding that of George Washington, the Father of his Country?

Last question. Shall the United States people now swap an unbeatable republic horse for a worn-out monarchy nag?

CHARLES BUTTZ TITUS.

CHEROKEE, OKLA.

Text of Resolutions Adopted by the Ninth Virginia Democratic Convention on March 18, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Ninth Virginia Democratic Convention which was held in Bristol, Va., last Saturday, March 18, 1944:

Tom Fugate, Lee County banker and farmer, served as chairman of the Ninth Virginia Congressional District Democratic convention resolutions committee yesterday which called for the renomination and reelection of President Roosevelt. Other members of the committee were Mrs. J. N. Walker, of Bland; C. J. Harkrader, of Bristol; V. C. Smith, of Buchanan; H. M. Sutherland, of Dickenson; C. J. Stafford, of Giles; T. B. Fugate, of Lee; H. W. Huff, of Pulaski; E. F. Hargis, of Russell; E. M. Craft, of Scott; Charles E. Anderson, of Smyth; Hubery Peery, of Tazewell; Thomas Phillips, of Washington; and George L. Taylor, of Wise.

The committee adopted the following resolutions:

We, the Democrats of the Ninth Virginia District in convention at Bristol, Va., on March 18, 1944, having in mind the immediate purpose of the convention and the critical time through which our country is passing, do set forth and resolve as follows:

We record with regret the deaths of several leading Democratic Party figures since we last met. Our sincerest sympathies are extended to the relatives of the Honorable James H. Price and Mrs. Price, and Senator Aubrey Weaver, the latter two of whom passed away in the recent unfortunate fire at Richmond; we mourn the loss of the Honorable Sam J. Thompson, of Tazewell County; the Honorable Dan M. Crosby, of Washington County; and the Honorable Frank M. Henson, of Russell County, all of whom met and deliberated with us for many years.

This convention meets today for the nomination of a Democratic candidate for Congress from the Ninth Virginia District. We commend to the consideration of the Democratic convention here assembled the record and services of JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., during the years past. Aside from his ability as a Member of Congress, and his conscientious and successful efforts to represent the people of this district, he has shown the ability to hold our party together in unbroken ranks, and the present outlook bids fair to project that fine record into the future. His loyalty to President Roosevelt and his administration, and his advocacy of the policies advanced by the President, deserve and will receive the acclamation of all Democrats who have at heart the happiness and prosperity of the country and of its people.

We take pride and comfort in the knowledge that we are represented in the Senate of the United States by CARTER GLASS and HARRY FLOOD BYRD, and at the head of the government of the State of Virginia by Colgate W. Darden, Jr., in the ability and patriotism and high purposes of all of whom we have unlimited confidence.

We take this occasion to express our gratification and pride in being counted as members of the great Democratic Party of this country, and we give voice to renewed and increased hope for the continuation of the record which it has made during the past 11 years, the intelligent solicitude it has shown for all of our people, and the accomplishments for their happiness which it has added to its historic record.

The administration of the Government under Democratic leadership has appealed and continues to appeal to all men and women throughout the land who admire the motives and promptings of leaders who have at heart the good of all men, their happiness and prosperity, and their adherence to honest ideals. The great leaders of the Democratic Party from its beginning to the present time have always had uppermost the hope and the purpose of making those attributes of good government fruitful and generous. Those who lead us at this time fully sustain and exemplify that historic hope and purpose.

We renew our pledge of allegiance to the Democratic Party and take pride in its accomplishments and increased hope for its future, and for the future of this country. We call upon all our people—Democrats and Republicans—for sympathy and cooperation with President Roosevelt as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of our armies, to the end that we may continue as now to be solidly and devoutly united in the prosecution of the war in which we are now engaged. This sympathy, this cooperation from our people of every political faith we are sure we have and it is with deep thankfulness that we record that fact.

We voice our unwavering confidence in the sincerity, the ability, and the devotion of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in all his relationships and efforts in guiding the Nation at this time of great stress and peril. Along with other patriots we pledge to him our entire and continuing support, individually and collectively, that his hands may be upheld in the vast and responsible task which the suffrages of the Nation laid upon him, and this pledge we shall carry out without criticism, and without diminution of our zeal and loyalty. We make a like pledge to those in authority by his appointment—Democrats and Republicans—and a like pledge to the Congress of the United States and to our State government.

While we are meeting in a Democratic mass meeting, we are not confining our thoughts to political party considerations. We would lay aside at this time all thought of political party controversy. We would call upon, and do call upon, all the people of our Nation to assume this same attitude and join in one vast army of patriots, laying aside every consideration that might hinder or adversely affect the one high purpose uppermost in our minds—the utter defeat of our enemies who seek to destroy our freedom.

To our soldiers on land, on sea, in air, wherever they may be, we send our thankful greetings, and to their relatives here we express our feeling of gratitude, with the assurance that we share in their hope for the welfare of their sons and brothers. We pray for success to the arms of these soldiers, and for their return home with the thanks of the people they are fighting to save: Be it

Resolved, That this convention recognizes the unequivocal fact that the reelection of President Roosevelt is absolutely necessary for the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment, thereby saving the priceless lives of many of our boys who are so unselfishly fighting our battle for freedom. Franklin D. Roosevelt is the sole hope of a bleeding and agonized world; and to remove him from leadership in this pregnant hour would so seriously weaken Allied effort and confidence that this war might continue through many weary years of heartache. This convention dedicates its every thought and action to securing a quick victory by urging the continuance of the matchless leadership of our great President; be it further

Resolved, That this convention believes that the reelection of President Roosevelt will be the only sure and safe method of securing a just and permanent peace after the war is won by the Allies. He is the only person of world-wide reputation and experience who can adequately envision a world of equitable peace and at the same time possess the necessary authority and influence to secure the adoption of such terms of peace as will satisfy the patriotic and just desires of the nations of the earth, victor and vanquished alike. All over the world the nations look to the United States for far-sighted and fair leadership in the new and confused life that will follow the furling of battle flags and the roar of death-dealing weapons, a world distraught and dazed with violent death and destruction. What man commands the full confidence of the people of the world? What American leader measures up to the exacting demand of this fateful occasion? None but President Roosevelt. America and an agonized world look alone to him for this great labor of love and hope.

The Late Honorable James A. O'Leary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, JIM O'LEARY, who left us at the untimely age of 55, was a Member who endeared himself to many by his cheerful manner, his readiness to help, and his extreme amiableness. His friends in this House were legion not because he was one of those who scan every bill and try to act as watchdogs of the Treasury, but because he gave to each piece of legislation that human sympathy which was the outstanding trait of O'LEARY'S character.

In spite of the fact that his service in this House was not quite a decade, there is not a Member of this body who did not at one time or another converse with O'LEARY or spend some time in his company.

O'LEARY was a born companion and nearly every Member of the House knew him affectionately as "Jim."

O'LEARY'S life was spent in business pursuits and at the time of his death he was the general manager of the North Shore Ice Co., of Staten Island, and an official in numerous other Staten Island business enterprises. He was devoted to his home and family and his son is now a member of the armed forces, being a

lieutenant in the United States Coast Guard, while his two daughters are married to members of our armed forces, one being the wife of a lieutenant in the Coast Guard and the other the wife of a captain in the United States Army. O'LEARY's family is therefore well represented on the roster of our armed services, and because of his intimate interest in our Army and Navy, O'LEARY was a consistent advocate of national preparedness and supported all legislation in favor of our war veterans.

We will miss his genial smile and pleasant manner, and the committees of which he was a member, particularly the Committee on Pensions and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, will miss an indefatigable worker.

The F. E. P. C.: A Reaffirmation of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing considerable discussion of the operations of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice and of Executive Order 9346, under which it operates. A great deal of heat has been generated about this matter, but, as is so frequently the case in matters which touch us deeply, the amount of light shed has been considerably less.

It seems to me that the Executive order itself well states that this committee's function is to "reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of any person in war industries or in Government by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin." One of the basic principles of democracy, it seems to me, is expressed in that statement: That there shall be equality of opportunity for all, regardless of differences in religion or race or background. While we have not always lived up to this ideal, we have held it before us as the goal which we have wanted to attain in this democratic society of ours.

As a matter of fact, there is much in our history to substantiate such a policy. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this House several such examples, concrete illustrations of the fact that equality of opportunity has been inherent in governmental tradition.

First. Behind our civil-service merit system there stands established the national policy that employment of civil servants shall be based on merit and on qualifications for the job, not on discrimination of one kind or another which has nothing to do with the applicant's ability. That policy of fairness in the civil service is deeply anchored in "the American way." Our fair employment policy calling for fair treatment of all workers is, therefore, rightfully a reaffirmation of national policy.

Second. Several decisions of the United States Supreme Court have turned on the point that all American citizens are entitled to equal treatment, equal opportunities, and equal facilities and that race and color are not legal excuse for denying a citizen the considerations enjoyed by all other citizens. In other words, it is a part of our national policy that all citizens be treated fairly and equally. The Commitee on Fair Employment Practice goes no further than to attempt to secure such fair and equal employment considerations for all.

Third. In appropriating millions of dollars to land-grant colleges and for other educational aid to the States, whether expressed or not, the idea of the Congress has been that all groups in our population should benefit equally and without handicap because of class, religion, or creed.

Fourth. During the years of depression, numerous congressional acts provided that the benefits of relief, of emergency public works, of public housing, and of youth training and rehabilitation should not be kept from any who were in need because of their race or color or other irrelevant reasons. These provisions were put into law because it is good Americanism to be fair.

Fifth. In providing funds for defense training in 1940, the Congress stipulated in the appropriation act that "No trainee under the foregoing appropriation shall be discriminated against because of sex, race, or color"—another indication of Congress keeping the faith with our historic policy of fairness.

Sixth. In legislation setting up the Selective Service System, Congress specifically provided that there should be no racial discrimination in recruiting the men who would later carry the war against totalitarianism to all corners of the earth.

Seventh. A number of steps were taken to put the greatest number of men and women to work producing the vital tools and instruments of victory. The blueprint and timetable of war would not allow us to waste a single capable individual. Consequently our Commander in Chief reaffirmed what had long become a national policy: that there should be fairness in the employment of war workers, both by private industry and by the Government. When this policy was promulgated it sounded brand new to some. As I have tried to bring out, however, our entire history and the long view of congressional acts and court decisions point in but one direction—that the national policy to which we subscribe is one of fairness and equal opportunity for all, each according to his abilities and his capacities.

When we are engaged in total war, how even more vital and important it is that we follow a policy which means that every citizen will have his chance to contribute all his interest, all his training and skill, and all his enthusiasm for the common objective of preserving democracy and bringing a speedy and complete victory.

The Committee on Fair Employment Practice has been a symbol to the world that this Nation is taking seriously its historic pronouncements as a subscriber to the "four freedoms," as a proponent of the doctrine of equality of opportunity, and as a stanch believer in fairness. F. E. P. C. has also been symbolic of the fact that even in the midst of war our Nation is deadly in earnest about trying to make democracy really work.

As was so well stated in an editorial in the Washington Post of March 7, 1944:

It would be genuinely tragic if race prejudice caused the liquidation of this agency. To American Negroes whose loyalty to the United States and devotion to democracy has remained steadfast in the face of bitter deprivations, the F. E. P. C. is a vital symbol. To renounce it would be to slam a door upon the legitimate hopes which our own American litany has engendered and encouraged.

The Nation's Need: Executive Cooperative Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Nation's Need: Executive Cooperative Leadership, delivered by me before a Republican group in Waukesha, Wis., on March 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak before this fine group of representative citizens of Wisconsin and discuss with you some of the obligations and responsibilities that each of us owe to the Nation.

It has become very apparent to every thinker—with the world being contracted through the genius of human inventions—that the domestic policies of any nation and the foreign policies of that nation are not only interrelated but are intertwined.

Since before the opening of this century, the Government of the United States has taken a leading part in the creation, maintenance, and observance of international law. We have stood for arbitration of disputes between nations, for adjudication by international tribunals of justiciable questions. We have believed in and taken steps to get other nations to limit armaments, hoping by so doing to lift the burden of preparation for war from the people. We have taken the position that war should be outlawed, and that all nations should reject war as a means for the adjustment of controversies. We have believed in, and we have practiced, hemispheric solidarity. We have made every effort to cooperate with like-minded nations for peace and order, law and justice. But still we have war after war.

The freeing of the world from war, or, conversely, the establishment of world-wide peace, presents the greatest problem of our time, or any other time. It is one which confronts every nation on the globe, and for that reason it is a problem which should be handled internationally.

At Mackinac last September, the Republican conference there propounded a dynamic statement. That statement set forth that

this war should be prosecuted by the United Nations to a conclusive victory; that this Government should participate in a post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression, and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world. The conference recognized in no uncertain terms that the American citizen of the present owes an obligation to keep America American, to preserve for the entire world this lighthouse of liberty.

Shortly thereafter, the Senate of the United States passed a resolution which was substantially the same as the Mackinac declaration. I believe that, by and large, these two declarations not only expressed the judgment of the Mackinac conference and the Senate of the United States, but also the judgment of the American people.

But, my friends, the mere passage of resolutions won't do the job. We have had too many examples of passing laws, making treaties, initiating international pacts that have fallen by the wayside because there was not back of them the vital and dynamic support and will of the people. If we in America are to play the part that fate seems to have destined for us, in order that America may be safe and humanity at large may be served, it is our job to dedicate ourselves to seeking the way that will make for international cooperation. That has been America's attitude in the past, and it will be her attitude in the future.

Our problem has been to find nations of like mind. Not all the nations of the world have loved the ways of peace, as America has. But I believe it is the hope of all thinking people, that out of the stress of this war, out of its suffering and sacrifice, will come a world-wide desire and will for peace—that many nations will become like-minded on this subject and will get together in some kind of a cooperative effort which will result in freeing the world from war. This does not mean the loss of sovereignty. It simply means that sovereign nations will sit around the table together and work out a plan and a method, a way, to peace.

Now, in thinking about this matter of peace in a war-torn world—and many people whose sons are fighting all over the world write me on this subject—we have also to consider the problems that confront us on our home front. They are manifold. We have dangers that would seem to threaten our industrial and economic life. I am now speaking of fundamental problems within our country which challenge the perpetuity of our governmental system, our economic system, and our way of life.

This year our tax burden will be over $44,000,000,000. In another year our national debt will approach $300,000,000,000—which amounts to approximately an average of $2,200 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This calls for serious consideration, for the application of constructive economic methods, for efficiency in government.

We must get out of Government those who would, as one Senator said, "spend and spend, tax and tax in order to elect and elect." When the present administration went into power it was on the basis of economy, or reducing governmental organization. We all know what happened. Our Government bureaus, instead of being curtailed as promised, mushroomed in growth, and have resulted in a confusion in our economy approaching the chaotic. The people of this country are demanding simplification in government, as well as simplification in tax laws and tax forms. The people of this country demand more than simplification. They demand that bureaucracy be reduced to the minimum, and that the spending of Government be curtailed, and the people's money spent only where it is necessary to spend it. It is my belief that only the Republican Party can accomplish this. I shall tell you why later.

We have seen several years back before the people became aroused, a great attack upon the legislative branch of Government by the Executive. That was before the Congress began to assert its independence.

When I ran on the Republican ticket in 1938, there were only 15 Republicans in the Senate. The Democrats outnumbered us more than 5 to 1. Eight of us were elected in that year. We added to our numbers in 1940, and again in 1942, until the Republicans are now 37. There are still 59 Democrats, and they have had absolute control of the Senate and every committee.

It is for the people to restore the dignity of the legislative branch of our Government, and I believe they will do it this coming fall. In our American concept of government, it is not the function of the Executive to be the legislature. It is the function of the legislature to originate legislation; but for a good many years the Executive has dominated the legislature. Then when the people started to take a hand and send more and more Republicans to Washington, the complexion of Congress changed. Congress became conscious of its power; a healthy condition had come back to our governmental system, and it was no longer lop-sidedly Democratic. All this means that once more the people are loyal to the constitutional provision for the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branches to each be independent of the others instead of being dominated by one branch—the executive.

Independence does not mean lack of cooperation, and cooperation does not mean that one branch of Government shall have its way entirely. It means that all should join together for the general welfare.

I believe the American people without reservation condemned the assault made upon our judicial system some years ago by the Executive, when he wanted to pack the Supreme Court. And I believe the American people will again condemn assaults by the Executive and his cohorts upon the legislative branch of Government.

The people are sick and tired of government by boards, bureaus, and commissions, and other inferior agencies of government. It will be the job of the Republican Party after January next, to remedy this situation. I believe that in recent years, the people have become thoroughly aroused to the need of maintaining our dual system of government. I believe the people want to preserve the prerogatives and functions of the States, instead of depending upon a centralized government. They recognize, as the fathers who created our Government recognized, that each has a sphere of appropriate action—that local matters can best be looked after by localities and States, rather than by Washington.

The people have also seen how, in this great war effort, the enterprise of the average American "went to town." Labor and management have performed miracles of production, and as a result, I believe the people are going to say that when this war is over, they want as little governmental interference in the lives and enterprise of the citizen as is practicable. They fully realize how interference by bureaus harasses and paralyzes free enterprise.

Economic chaos would spell political chaos, and political chaos would spell the loss of American freedoms. A sound political structure can be maintained by utilizing constitutional processes. The provisions of our Constitution provide for a limitation on governmental powers; they provide security against autocratic rule; they provide bulwarks against fascism and communism. They give opportunities for a fuller and richer life to all those who would live by the yardstick of the Constitution.

Even in wartime we have found that the constitutional system of checks and balances is the best system to preserve freedom for men. It is by constructive investigation and criticism that the faults in the administration have been brought to light and corrected. The function of the minority party is just that—not to indulge in personalities, but to uncover mistakes, to bring to light the abuse of power, the misuse of public funds. It is by these means that the minority party can aid in preserving the Government for those sons of ours who are out on the battle fronts of the world, so that when they come home to the land they love they will find it a going concern, a place of opportunity, a secure place in which to live, a Government and a land worth preserving.

Recent history demonstrates clearly to us that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Ideologies and isms from abroad still seek to corrupt and destroy us. The three most potent of these ideas are communism, fascism, and statism, or centralization of authority in Washington. It is our job to reject all three of these concepts. We must preserve our constitutional system—that system which vests the sovereignty of the Nation in the people—not in the Executive.

The need—the great need of our country at present and for the future—is an Executive leadership that can, and will, play ball with the legislative branch. It is absolutely essential at this critical time for the executive and the legislative branches of government to work together. The present leadership cannot do that. It does not know how to do it. For 10 years the President has been the dominant figure in America (and I use that language advisedly). He has not only been the Executive, he has been, in large measure, the legislative branch. I have already stated that in 1938, when I ran for office, there were only 15 Republicans in the Senate. From 1933 until a year or so ago we had the era of the "yes men."

We are now witnessing a great revolt. It began in 1938 when the people elected eight of us Republicans to the Senate. It isn't a question of swapping horses. It is a question of getting teamwork in America. As the twig is bent, so will the tree be. For 10 or 11 years the twig has been bent, and now the tree cannot straighten up.

Strong Democrats stood it as long as they could, and then they, too, sensing the public reaction, asserted their independence—that independence which was the idea of the founding fathers—the independence of the legislative branch. (Witness Majority Leader BARKLEY and Senator RUSSELL.)

To the American people who want America to cooperate and collaborate with like-minded nations, it is important that the next President be one who, by training and by practice, can first put those qualities of cooperation into operation on the home front. I believe the American people are sensing that. They know that there must be a close knitting together of these two branches of Government, by mutual understanding, before a united home front can be presented for collaboration and cooperation on the international front.

Several years ago I suggested the creation of a foreign relations advisory council, a liaison between the Senate and the Executive, for the purpose of getting together on foreign policies. The executive branch, as indicated by the letters of Secretary of State Hull, poohpoohed the idea.

There is no need of indulging in personalities to discuss this vital issue. It is just common sense. I believe that under new leadership insuring collaboration on the home front, the winning of the war would be speeded up. I further believe that such spirit of collaboration would mean that in the post-war period America can go forward in an economic way, can insure full employment,

can rebuild America, and can raise the standard of living for the substandard groups. There will then naturally follow a realistic approach to world problems, with wholehearted cooperation on the part of America being demonstrated to other nations of like mind.

When two strong men get together to plan and to execute a given undertaking, one does not say, "Do it my way." No; they talk things over. They compromise with each other and arrive at a mutual understanding. They comprehend that it is a process of give and take. That was my reason for suggesting the liaison between the executive and the legislative branches.

Well, the legislative branch of this Government has been reborn. There are 37 Republicans in the Senate now, and there will be a lot more after next November, and the House of Representatives will be predominantly Republican. It just makes sense—and the American people are demonstrating it—that there should be a Republican President.

The people are worn out with sonorous phrases, tired of great promises. Wherever one goes, one can literally feel the sentiment of the people as being that of "get down to earth, get your feet on the ground, get together, do the necessary thing."

A new leadership is necessary, imperatively necessary, in the post-war period, to make sure that labor and management get together. There has been too much fostering o internal jealousy and hatred between labor and capital, too much fear of each other generated. This is due in large measure to the fact that the administration has no definite labor policy and has been using, or been used by, some of the labor leaders as pawns to the detriment of the general welfare.

No football team ever won a game when the players hated each other, were jealous of each other, played independently of each other. No touchdowns were ever made that way. But when the teammates played together, trusted each other, respected each other, and aided each other—well, such a team can win. In the post-war period the world will be looking to America for teamwork.

If we fail the world in this—and a leadership that does not coordinate all the players will bring about such a failure—then the world will be more chaotic than ever. And what is more, if that occurs, the American system of Government will be supplanted by the bankrupt ideas of State socialism or communism. Then only through much suffering and chaos, and proving all over again that these systems are ineffective and unworkable and destructive, even as they have everywhere they've been tried proved to be, would we again struggle upward toward the light which was visualized by the founding fathers and which was realized in the American way of life.

I don't think we are going to make that mistake; I don't think we are going to fail ourselves and the rest of the world. I don't think private enterprise will fail, because I believe that in the common man there is a reservoir of common sense that will demand a pulling together in this crucial period. I believe that, not only will leadership be found in the political field, but that leaders will arise in labor and industry—because of the demand of the people themselves for such leadership.

I believe that, as in the days of Lincoln, the Republican Party will be called to that leadership, and that that leadership will take this American team, made up of the best artisans and workers, the most productive farmers, the greatest inventors, the finest mothers and fathers, the sanest thinkers, the clearest spiritual minds the world has ever seen, and make it into the greatest Nation in purpose and endeavor for good, that the world has ever seen. But all this won't "just happen." We must organize for it, work for it, in every little community, in every State of the Nation, if we want to bring it about.

Yes; the Republican Party is dedicated to the purpose that when this war ceases we shall remain united, that labor and management shall cooperate to build America anew, that the farmer shall receive what it costs him to produce and a margin over, that the returning veterans who have suffered the ordeal of war shall be given every opportunity to rebuild their lives. And we are also dedicated to the purpose that America shall remain a solvent Nation, that waste and fraud and extravagance shall end, and that the citizen shall have removed from him the shackles of bureaucracy and regimentation.

Let me conclude with these words of the immortal Lincoln: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, and to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Office of Public Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Civic Association of America, located in Denver, Colo., offers some pertinent advice to Members of Congress when we consider the extension of the Price Control Act:

"OFFICE OF PUBLIC ABUSE"

The Price Control Act expires on June 30 and we are certain that Congress understands full well that the majority of the public are of the opinion that price ceilings and reasonable rationing of necessary items have the support of the public, but we also have full confidence that Congress, in authorizing the extension of this act, will take into consideration that the policy of regimentation should cease, and this should become an office of public assistance. Granting of too much money to this organization will naturally continue their policy of harassing business and the public.

We know of no one who is, in the very remotest degree, desirous of any measure that would increase the prospects of inflation, but we still contend that the great masses of the American people, and the American businessman, and particularly the independent businessman, are honest and true Americans and should be treated as such. Future directives and edicts issued by bureaus and bureaucrats, if they must be issued, should be issued in plain sensible English language that any average intelligent person can understand. We sincerely trust that Congress will give business the incentive to wish to stay in business, by eliminating any possibility of conveyance of un-American acts, such as have been emanating from the various bureaus and particularly the "Office of Public Abuse," and the War Production Board.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Representative Philbin, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and impressive St. Patrick's Day address delivered by Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Representative in Congress from the Third District of Massachusetts. The address was delivered at Lawrence, Mass., on March 16, the eve of St. Patrick's Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, before I commence my address, I should like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the generous, considerate, and loyal friendship I have enjoyed with your able fellow-member, townsman, and very distinguished Congressman, TOM LANE. During my service in Washington his courtesy to me has been unfailing, his association most cordial and cooperative, and his personal and public relations most pleasant and profitable to me in very many ways. I have the greatest respect and affection for my esteemed colleague and I am very happy to pay well-deserved tribute to him as a true friend and a loyal and faithful public servant.

I also congratulate you upon the attainment of the diamond jubilee of this outstanding organization which has played so conspicuous and constructive a part in the development and growth of this beautiful city. Judge Fenton and now National President Kerrigan, by their high character and outstanding ability, have particularly honored this division. I wish you long life, good health, prosperity, and strength to continue your battle for the perpetuation of your high ideals.

As a proud fellow Hibernian, it is my great honor and happy privilege on this great night made sacred by religion, memorable by glorious events, and hallowed by a mighty people's fond remembrance, for me to respond to the toast of the day we celebrate.

Throughout the whole world, wherever men and women of Irish blood may be tonight, they pause in their activities and turn their hearts and minds back to the Emerald Isle to render their tribute of affection and reverence to the great patriot, St. Patrick, and to thoughts of the virtues of old Erin, its courageous sons and daughters, its poetry, its music, its glorious history, its proud heritage and its magnificent contributions to civilization.

As a great Irish poet sung:

"O Erin! O my mother! I will love thee
Whether upon thy green Atlantic throne
Thou sitt'st august, majestic and sublime
Or on thy empire's last remaining fragment
Bendest forlorn, dejected and forsaken:
Thy smiles, thy tears, thy blessings and thy woes,
Thy glory and thy infamy, be mine."

Down the unbroken channels of time, suffering under the cruelties of oppression and tyranny, denied their God-given rights as free men, evicted from their homes, subjected to

poverty, want, famine, and pestilence, and finally cast as exiles over the seven seas, there is no story more pathetic, more touching, or more inspiring than the story of the Irish people. In the land of saints, scholars, heroes, and martyrs, whose people have always been passionately devoted to the cause of freedom and the cause of Christ even the Dark Ages were not able to extinguish the fiercely burning zeal of the Irish for learning and culture.

The beautiful Sweet Innisfallen of Thomas Moore portrays some of the deathless hope of the Irish, some of their optimism and patient faith:

"Weeping or smiling, lovely isle,
And all the lovelier for thy tears,
For though but rare thy sunny smile
'Tis heaven's own glance when it appears."

The world can never repay the debt it owes to the sainted scholars of Erin who, when the rest of the civilized world was submerged in bloodshed, ignorance, superstition, and feudal bondage, kept alive the faint sparks of civilization which were later to glow during the Renaissance with such brilliance and subsequently bestow such glorious benefits and blessings to men of every race and nation.

Nor have the people of Ireland ever failed to love and fight for freedom. Someone has well said that Ireland is a drama of seven acts, every act a century and every scene a tragedy, though that would seem an understatement. Perhaps no people in all history ever struggled so valiantly and so long against overwhelming odds to ward off oppression and tyranny as the Irish. Their indomitable will to be free men and women knew no defeat, and throughout long centuries of want, suffering, poverty, affliction, and other indescribable handicaps, fighting against the might and power of one of the greatest imperial governments the world has ever known, the Irish never lost heart. They never gave up the struggle until freedom was theirs and their nation took its place, as the great patriot Emmett promised it would, among the other self-respecting, independent nations of the earth.

Many were the outrages and injustices perpetrated against the Irish people, too numerous to record here, but interesting to us of this generation is the sorrowful fact that between 1848 and 1852, 250,000 Irish families were evicted from their homes, 750,000 died of famine, and 1,250,000 persons of Irish blood were driven as exiles from their native land to every part of the world. No history records the millions of our race who grew to manhood and womanhood stunted, diseased, and broken in bodily health, though never in spirit, by years of persecution and privation.

In the veins of most of us here tonight runs the rich red blood of these Irish martyrs who loved liberty and God so much that they would rather die than live in security and plenty under institutions which would deny them the right to be free and the right to worship their God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

The lash of the oppressor fell with heartless cruel force, and the tyrant inflicted bitter wounds that never healed, yet all the power and might of oppression and tyranny exerted down through the long centuries were not able to stifle in the breasts of Irish patriots their immortal love of freedom, religion, democracy, and justice.

Many present here tonight can vividly remember the columns of Irish immigrants that wove through our New England cities, towns, and villages during the closing years of the last and the early years of this century who were so typical of those who came to America seeking refuge and opportunity. Often they came with no earthly possessions save the clothes they wore on their backs, but loving relatives and loyal friends who had journeyed here before them provided for their needs until they procured employment and were initiated into the broad opportunities of our America. Here they found work, happiness, a chance to raise their families under free institutions of their own preference where their noble sons soon stood among the foremost citizens of the land. Yes; indeed, the sons of these impoverished humble Irish immigrants entered into every walk of American life and rapidly took places of leadership and great influence in the professions, in the public service, in the religious and business life, and in all the callings of the American people, in which from early American history they have made distinguished, outstanding contributions to the social, economic, and political institutions of our Nation.

As early as 1737 the Irish celebrated St. Patrick's Day in this country. Many fitting celebrations and festivities were held during the Revolutionary period and continued through later years. For example:

A recorded newspaper announcement of March 17, 1832, states as follows:

"The Merry Sons of St. Patrick will celebrate the anniversary of their tutelar saint tonight. It is cold and wet without, but we have no doubt that it will be all warmth and sunshine within."

And another on the same date, 1820, reads:

"The Hibernian Society will celebrate St. Patrick tonight. The members are at liberty to invite their Republican friends."

And still another in 1812:

"Those gentlemen who wish to join the Juvenile Sons of Erin in celebrating the anniversary of St. Patrick will please leave their addresses with Mr. O'Flannagan at the Commercial Building. The committee of arrangements intend regulating everything for this merry meeting in March."

The day which began, according to custom, with attendance at holy mass ended, so the news account goes, with this toast:

"The land we live in—the asylum of oppressed humanity.
May the union of the States last as long as their liberty and may both be eternal."

On St. Patrick's Night, 1822, the day was celebrated with characteristic—I quote—"glow of feeling" at Masonic Hall in New York City. Patrick O'Rafferty aroused the gathering with Daniel O'Connell's immortal words: "The timid may hesitate, the suspicious may accuse; but the patriot stands undaunted—a beacon to his countrymen."

At Boston, March 17, 1837, the day was fittingly celebrated by the Charitable Irish Society, with Gov. Edward Everetts, Mayor Samuel Eliot, and other non-Irish notables in attendance. Hon. John P. Bigelow, the then secretary of state of our great historic Commonwealth, gave the following toast:

"St. Patrick destroyed Ireland's creeping things of other days. May his disciples speedily exterminate the political reptiles of the present age."

Those words, I repeat, my friends, were spoken by the Massachusetts Secretary of State, St. Patrick's night, 1837.

In fond memory we recall them as they celebrated St. Patrick's days of the more recent past, the ever-present sprig of shamrock which, according to legend, St. Patrick first used to illustrate the Blessed Trinity, or green ribbon, the songs and ballads of Old Erin, the recitals of the glories of the Irish, the tear-dimmed stories of the Auld Sod, the smiling valleys of the Shannon, the beautiful lakes of Killarney reflecting the spotless blue vaults of the Irish heavens, the white strands of the west coast, the thatch-covered cottages of Athlone, Kerry, Donegal, Mayo, Galway, Cork, Limerick, and other shrines of Irish affection. And they sang of the Emerald Isle:

"For 'tis green, green, green, where the ruined towers are gray,
And it's green, green, green all the happy night and day,
Green of leaf and green of sod, green of ivy on the wall,
And the blessed Irish shamrock with the fairest green of all."

We remember them, too, in more recent years as they marched in stately dignity in full regalia to the churches of our own communities where they thanked God for the freedom of America and for the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship that had given to them and their families a new happiness they never expected again to enjoy.

The ranks of these early Irish immigrants have dwindled but their spirits will march as long as America endures, as long as freedom lives on this earth.

That the Irish have taken a conspicuous part in maintaining our precious American freedom and saving our cherished form of government no one can deny. The pages of American history fairly glisten with the names and patriotism of men like John Barry, the father of the American Navy; Montgomery, hero of Quebec; O'Brien, who won the first naval battle of the American Revolution, the Rileys, Murphys, Kelleys, Sullivans, McCarthys, Donovans, Ryans, Burkes, Delaneys, and Connellys, and others of Irish lineage comprised 38 percent of the fighting men in the American Revolution. These men were of all creeds—Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and other religious faiths. Even in 1788 the Irish chronicler Matthew Carey was able to say:

"From northern Quebec where Montgomery fell
To Georgia's most southerly scene,
Each State has beheld—each commander can tell
How brave have our countrymen been."

Our own Declaration of Independence was signed by four men who were born in Ireland and five others of Irish heritage and, as you recall, John Carroll, who signed his name to that immortal document as John Carroll of Carrollton, so that the forces of the King would never mistake his identity, gave truly invaluable assistance to the cause of the American colonists.

The unexcelled patriotism of these great heroes of the Revolution was reenacted by the Irish of every succeeding generation whenever our country was in danger. Irish names people the rosters of all our wars and outstanding military and religious figures of Irish blood furnished inspiring leadership, gallantry, and devotion to every struggle. From Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown to the battlefields of Gettysburg and Flanders Fields our Irish-American patriots have saturated the soil of every war to preserve America, with their precious blood and in untold numbers have gladly offered the supreme sacrifice to the cause of American freedom. First in citizenship and loyalty to America at home—for surely none excelled them—first in upholding the sacred banner of Christ, first in fighting for American institutions and the honor of the American flag, the Irish have been in the vanguard of every fight for liberty.

Their sacrifices are greater than ever in the present terrible conflict. Was it not the gallant Colin Kelly who sank the first Jap ship in this war even in yielding up his own young life in this noble task? Was it not the intrepid Edward O'Hare who shot down the first Jap plane and after a succession of heroic exploits, he, too, finally perished; and Dick Fleming who was the first human torpedo; and Dan Callaghan the first American admiral

to be killed in action at his post of duty in the South Pacific and "Mike" Moran the first American naval officer to sink six Jap ships in a single battle? Was it not the illustrious Irish couple, Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan, the first to give five of their precious sons in one battle for our country's cause? Do we need more proof than this of the daring, indomitable, self-sacrificing spirit that animates the Irish character, of his love of America and his willingness to sacrifice and die for it? As Irish-Americans our hearts may well thrill with pride for these superlative contributions of our fellow Irishmen to American freedom.

Irish contributions have not been confined to the military alone. As I said, they have influenced for the good practically every phase of American life—the church, the courtroom, the hospital, the market place, and the public platform. But the Irish have brought no radical, alien theories to America, they have brought no subversive movements, they have brought no dictatorships dressed up as bureaucracies, no willingness to attach themselves to communism, Fascism, or other isms that would destroy the rights of the individual and kill human freedom. They have brought no supine surrender to the will of unbridled unconstitutional authority, no weak hearts, no cowardice in the face of danger. They have brought no intolerance, no bigotry, no hatred of others, no feelings of class or caste, no bitterness in their hearts for their fellow American. Their sense of humor, their wit, their simple philosophy of live-and-let-live embellish the Irish character more than any words of mine.

On the other hand, the Irish have brought love of family, devotion to home, obedience to law and constituted authority, love of God, and love of liberty. They have brought loyalty to America, loyalty to freedom and democracy, loyalty to American institutions, tolerance and justice toward their fellow man, and they will never bring themselves to join the ranks of modern destructionists now visible on every hand, who through stealth, subterfuge, and secret conspiracy have infiltrated the American body politic with the poisonous doctrines of communism, hate, and social disorder. For the Irishman knows, from 700 years of tragic struggle for liberty, that when man surrenders personal freedom for temporary security he thereby turns himself over to the whim and caprice of dictators and soon will lose both security and freedom. He knows that if men expect to receive tolerance, they must be tolerant themselves and that bigotry, racial and religious persecution are but the means to ultimate self-destruction, as well as the betrayal of democracy's basic rights.

How anyone can gaze even so briefly at the history of the Irish people and then conclude that they can be dragooned into surrendering their independence, their right to self-determination, is beyond my comprehension. As one great Irish patriot said of the oppressors of his country, "They may kill every man in Ireland and the women of Ireland will rise up and fight them. They may kill every woman in Ireland and the little children will rise up and fight them. They may kill every child in Ireland and then the blades of green grass growing on holy Irish soil will rise up and fight them."

I hope that our own great Nation, in the making and preserving of which the Irish have contributed so nobly, shall never be the instrument by which the Irish people shall be deprived of any single attribute of their hard-won sovereignty, whatever the pretext. And I also oppose, as I believe all true lovers of liberty and self-determination must, that our own Nation, which I serve with all the strength, loyalty, and ability the Creator has given me, shall ever be a party, by affirmative act or by silent acquiescence, in the conquest and domination by superior forces of gallant little Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, or any other free, independent nation, large or small. If we fight for anything worth while in this war, surely human freedom must be our first great aim.

The indomitable spirit, the daring, and courage of such a people, wherever they may be, can never be denied. They will never willingly endure oppression or tyranny; they will ever seek independence and personal liberty, because they believe, as our own noble American forefathers did, and as we do, that these rights are inalienable, are derived from the Creator they worship with all their hearts and with all their souls. Such a loyalty to country, as the Irish of America have so eloquently demonstrated, can never be excelled by that of any other racial group.

And so tonight, as we turn back in memory to the great heroes, scholars, orators, and saints that have graced and blessed the history of the Irish race, as we listen in poem and story to the rapturous, thrilling melodies of the ancient homeland, as we recapture the spirit of sacrifice, piety, and courage of the great patron saint of Ireland, as we pay fitting tribute to the traditions, the accomplishments, and achievements of our people in every land and clime, in war and in peace, and especially as we gratefully acknowledge their contributions to our beloved America which they have served with a passion hardly less strong than that with which they have served their God, let us resolve to take renewed inspiration from the great heritage of the gallant, noble ancestors who have gone before us.

Let us again breathe our fervent thanks and gratitude to the mothers, wives, and sisters of Irish blood whose inutterable selflessness and love have done so much to give courage, wise counsel, and the material assistance of bitter sacrifice to those who were forging the mighty, loyal leadership of our people in every phase of distinction in American life.

And as we sing again tonight the ringing, inspiring tunes of Tara's Hall and the Minstrel Boy, the Wearing of the Green, and the beautiful melodies of the dear old Emerald Isle, let our hearts be infused more than ever with the sternest determination never to abandon the cause of human freedom, never to be unworthy of our great faith in God, in justice, and our American institutions. Let us prayerfully resolve always to be prepared, if need be, to give our "last full measure of devotion" to save, keep, and preserve our blessed land for which our Irish blood has been so lavishly poured, free from the ravages of communism and the assaults of external and internal enemies who even today are trying to destroy our glorious institutions and substitute in their stead the slave state of modern revolutionary tyranny.

As proud Irishmen, faithful soldiers of Christ, and loyal Americans, whose loyalty will endure to the end of time, let us rejoice in our heritage and in the immortal words of the rune of St. Patrick:

"At Tara today in this fateful hour
I place all Heaven with its power,
And the sun with its brightness
And the snow with its whiteness
And fire with all the strength it hath
And lightning with its rapid wrath
And the winds with their swiftness along this path
And the sea with its deepness
And the rocks with their steepness
And the earth with its starkness,
All these I place
By God's almighty help and grace
Between myself and the powers of darkness."

And may the sacred cause of our American arms gain speedy victory in this terrible war so that it may soon be ended and lasting peace, based upon principles of Christian charity and justice, shine upon all the earth. And may our brave dear boys of every creed and race who fight so nobly to preserve our beloved country and all its matchless institutions on the land, seas, and airways of virtually every nation on earth, soon be returned to their homes, their loved ones, and their own country.

Victory Recipe-Menu Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the union-label trades department of the American Federation of Labor, of which Mr. I. M. Ornburn is secretary-treasurer, has recently announced what it calls a Victory recipe-menu contest. Seven hundred dollars in War bonds and stamps are offered as prizes.

The contest represents a serious effort by the union-label trades department of the federation to arouse public appreciation of responsibilities and obligations on the food front. The work which is being carried on will sustain the conservation of food, and will, I think, be an important contribution to the war effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the rules of the contest be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the rules were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor is offering $700 in War bonds and stamps to be given as prizes for the best recipe of the principal dish of the main meal and menus for all three daily meals. This victory recipe-menu contest has received the highest praise from officials of the Federal Government who are in charge of food and nutrition.

There are five kinds of recipe-menu combinations in the competition. They are as follows:

1. No-ration-point recipe, which is one that requires no coupons. (Some food items in the menus for the other two meals may require ration points.)

2. Low-point, a main-dish recipe requiring few food coupons. (Some food items in the menus for the other two meals may require points.)

3. A quick-cooking recipe which can be prepared in less than half an hour.

4. A recipe for a foreign dish, such as goulash or chop suey, which would be easily acceptable to the American public.

5. A recipe for a new food, such as soybean, tastefully prepared.

A $50 War bond will be awarded to the winner of each of the five kinds of recipe-menus. Twenty-five dollar War bonds will be awarded for second and third places in each type of recipe-menu. Other prizes of $5 in War stamps will be given to each of 40 other contestants—eight in every group—of recipe-menus.

A recipe-menu requires the contestant to submit one recipe with the proper proportion of ingredients and complete details for its preparation or cooking. In addition to the one complete recipe for the principal

meal the contestant should list the various food items to be served with the full-course dinner and, also, a list of food items for breakfast and lunch, thus completing the basic seven-food-group requirements for one day.

Regardless of how good the recipe may be no one can win unless the day's food items are well balanced, which means that all three meals together must contain the basic seven-food groups, a chart of which can be obtained by writing Mr. I. M. Ornburn, secretary-treasurer, Union Label Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, Washington 1, D. C.

RULES FOR CONTEST

1. Write full name and complete address in upper right-hand corner of each page. Use one side of sheet only.

2. Write title which is "Victory Recipe-Menu Contest."

3. Give one recipe for principal dish for dinner or main meal of the day with list and proportion of all its ingredients and complete details about preparation or cooking.

4. Give a list of other food items for the dinner. (It is not necessary to give recipes for these other items to complete the full-course dinner.)

5. Menu for dinner should be followed by complete menus for breakfast and lunch. (Recipes for other items in addition to the principal one for dinner are not required.)

6. Confine all writing to the dinner recipe and the complete menus for the three daily meals.

7. Anyone may submit recipe-menus in any or all of the five groups. However, the same person can win only one prize.

8. The recipe-menus will be judged by a committee of seven prominent and competent experts.

9. All material must be submitted by midnight May 31, 1944. Winners will be announced on June 30, 1944.

10. The Victory recipe-menus of the winners will be published in booklet form by the union-label trades department.

Profit in Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, so much testimony has been given before our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the effect that the Government is the one to finance slum clearance that it is refreshing to find that some people still believe as I do in private enterprise, even in this field. The following editorial from the Washington Star of March 20, 1944, is submitted for the information of the House:

PROFIT IN SLUM CLEARANCE

The bitterness, most of it wholly unnecessary, between public and private builders, over low-cost housing tends to obscure the significance of the discovery by representatives of private enterprise that a legitimate profit incentive lies in the reclamation of city slums. If this discovery is a genuine one, uninfluenced merely by the fears of private builders over Government encroachments, it is highly important.

In his testimony before the Burton subcommittee last week, Edward R. Carr, a director of the Home Builders' Association of Metropolitan Washington, explained that "In the past we have built houses in the higher brackets and have felt that perhaps slum clearance would have to be done by such public agencies as the N. C. H. A. We have accepted all too complacently the statement 'Private enterprise cannot do the job.'"

Why does private enterprise believe it can do a job now that it never felt it could do in the past? Mr. Carr's testimony in this respect is interesting. Slum clearance for low-cost housing is coming to be regarded as sound business. While the profit is small on each unit, the long-term investment is safe. There will be an active market after the war in higher priced dwellings and successful builders will soon run into high income tax brackets, with a resulting incentive to invest some of their capital in low-rental housing. Long-term mortgages at low interest rates were not available in the past to many builders, but have been promised now. By dividing efforts between low-cost housing and more expensive housing, the latter market will not be glutted and employment will be spread over a long period. "We will do this job because for the first time we realize fully the importance of getting at the thing and getting it done, the tremendous amount of business to be generated by rebuilding and replanning large areas in the old city of Washington."

Mr. Carr does not claim to have all the answers. He and his colleagues frankly admit that if they assume a responsibility which they cannot discharge they will have discredited themselves with the people, and public housing, which they fear, will be stronger than ever. The Government's part of the program would lie in the exercise of the power of eminent domain for assembly of the land to be reclaimed, which the private builders cannot do; to determine the use and to set the standards for the housing to be provided.

The proof is in the pudding, not yet baked. But it does look promising.

The New Deal Versus a Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal has never been for a fair deal, so why expect the Roosevelt administration to be fair with Gen. Douglas MacArthur?

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

AUSTRALIANS ASK FAIR DEAL IN MEN, ARMS FOR MACARTHUR

CHICAGO, March 20.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur has not received a fair deal in the Allied distribution of soldiers and war materials, according to the average Australian soldier and civilian. That's the assertion of Harry W. Morgan, president of the Shire (county) of Port Stephens. He is touring the United States on an inspection of war production for the Australian Government.

"In the pubs, on the street, every place you go, you'll hear people talking about MacArthur," said Mr. Morgan during a stopover in Chicago. "We believe he is close to a genius as a commander, but for some reason has not been allowed to exercise his full powers. He has never been given enough men or materials to have a 'fair go' at the Japs."

"General MacArthur has come to occupy a place in the hearts of the Australian people never before achieved by an outsider. Their respect for him is doubled because he does not flaunt his medals or achievements, but remains among his soldiers at the fighting front. One of the quickest ways to pick a fight in Australia is to say something against General MacArthur. Our diggers who have fought side by side with American doughboys are ready to back the General with their fists."

Mr. Morgan declared that many Australians suspect that General MacArthur has not received a free hand in the conduct of the Pacific war because of "political reasons or administrative malpractice."

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, during the days and weeks of discussion regarding the soldier vote legislation, thousands of words were written and spoken by various individuals and obviously for various reasons.

At times the chaff was flying so thick and fast that it was rather difficult to separate the grain. Mr. Frank Kent, has in my opinion, eliminated the chaff in his short, intelligent article appearing in the Washington Star, and sums up in a few words the logical reasons why I supported a complete, constitutional ballot for our fighting forces. His article is as follows:

The buncombe by which the fourth-termers endeavored to maneuver themselves into the politically advantageous position of sole champions of the right of the men in the armed services to vote, thus casting all others for the sinister role of conspirators who sought to deprive them of this right—for the moment, anyway—has obscured the basic facts of the situation.

After the controversy concerning the method of voting is finally over, these facts will emerge again and demagogic phrases, such as "ballots as well as bullets for our boys at the front," will be recognized as the cheap political demagoguery they really are. For the outstanding fact is that, whether or not the President vetoes the soldier-vote bill sent to him by Congress, every soldier, sailor, and marine entitled to vote, and who wants to vote, will be able to vote this time. He will be able to vote under the laws of his own State.

Moreover, he will be able to vote with considerably less trouble than the civilian at home, as he will have neither to register nor go to the polls. Without trouble, he can do the whole thing by mail, with the Army and Navy cooperating, as they must, in transporting the ballot. In addition, he will be able to vote for State and local officials as well as for Federal. Regardless of Mr. Roosevelt's action on this bill—and by the time this is printed he may have acted—he, of course, can be counted on to make a good case out of the purely Federal ballot to

which he was committed and to deplore the States' rights bill enacted by Congress.

But that will not alter the fact that with or without the bill he now has, long before the election and in ample time for the soldier to make his request, get his ballot, vote and return it to his State, the State legislatures will have acted to make this possible, easy, and constitutional. Most of them have done so already. The rest are expected to do so before July. The idea that the ballots or the procedure will be too complicated for the soldiers does not hold water. It will be exactly the same ballot as used by the civilians and the procedure will be simpler because registration will be waived. If, in fact, anything more, without disregarding the basic law of the land, can be done to facilitate voting for the servicemen, at home and abroad, who want to vote, it is difficult to think what it is.

Of course, it would be easier if the original administration bill, introduced by the two New Deal, fourth-term wheel horses, Senators LUCAS and GREEN, had been enacted. Under that bill, the States were wholly ignored, the Constitution disregarded, a small ballot provided upon which only the names of Federal candidates appeared. The whole business was put under a war ballot commission to be named by the President. This made it possible for the election to be conducted by the Army under its own rules. The soldiers could have been voted by battalions, regardless of their age or other voting qualifications. And, the war ballot commission had the power to throw out the entire vote of a State if it refused to count soldier ballots cast in conflict with State laws.

That there was a strong probability that the result of an election under this bill would have been contested was evident. It would, it was contended, have been taken at once into the courts and the title of the man chosen for President would have been clouded for months.

There also was a possibility that the election might have been thrown into the House of Representatives and a generally chaotic condition created. The opposition came from two quarters: First, those who saw in the bill a political scheme to vote the soldiers en bloc for the Commander in Chief; second, from those who felt that if the Federal Government could sweep aside the rights of the States in this instance and in this way they could never be recovered and there would be no limit to the domination of the Federal authorities.

Some of the most thoughtful Democrats in the Senate regard the defeat of this bill as the most important action taken by Congress in a long time—and the most creditable. When the history of this period is fully written, they say, the successful fight made against the Green-Lucas bill will stand out as of greater significance than the fight against the President's Supreme Court packing bill. Had it become law, the rights of the States to conduct elections under their own laws would have been knocked out and Federal control really established.

As things have turned out, the efforts of the administration to make it appear that the opposition was solely due to fear that the soldiers would all vote for Mr. Roosevelt, and that rather than risk that his opponents were willing altogether to deprive the soldiers of their vote, just can't be made to stick. Unquestionably, there was politics, as well as principle, in the opposition, but the clear political purpose in the original bill made that unavoidable. However, it never reached the point where there was the remotest thought of depriving the soldiers of their vote. The truth is, everybody wanted the soldiers to vote. It was the administration's determination to have him vote the way it wanted that created the controversy.

Participation by the State of Washington in Lanham Act War Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1944, my friend and respected colleague the Honorable FRED NORMAN, of the State of Washington, challenged the findings of the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas with respect to the failure of the State to assist adequately its war-congested communities in the inordinate share of the war burdens that the communities are carrying.

He stated:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to prove today to the House and to my home State that these charges are unfounded, and that, as a matter of unassailable fact, the State of Washington leads the entire Nation by a very wide margin in its effort to take care of the war problems of its communities.

The gentleman from Washington further stated:

I am happy to disclose that the Federal Works Agency, which administers the Lanham Act and distributes these funds for these various shortages in war-boom communities, completely substantiates my statement that my home State leads the Nation in its efforts and expenditures for its war-boom cities and towns.

The latest annual F. W. A. report gives the official figures for all States.

The F. W. A. report shows that, as of mid-1943, a total of 109 of these war public-works projects had been authorized or built in Washington. It shows that they cost a total of $27,838,992. It shows that of this sum slightly more than five millions went for projects that were exclusively Federal in character. Of the balance, it shows that Washington contributed a total of $12,779,127 and that the Federal grants amounted to $9,242,522. In other words, it shows that my State bore 58 percent of the cost of such projects and that only 42 percent came from the Federal Government.

These statements amazed me, Mr. Speaker, for I reciprocate my colleague's expressed amity and respect for me. If his statements were true then the Subcommittee on Congested Areas had made a grave mistake for which I was greatly responsible as chairman of that subcommittee. For, in substance, the gentleman from Washington charged that our criticism was unfounded; that the State of Washington had contributed a total of $12,779,127, or 58 percent, as compared to the Federal Government's contribution of $9,242,522, or 42 percent, of the cost of Lanham Act war public works projects; that the latest F. W. A. report substantiated his charges; and that the subcommittee "picked the wrong State to pick on."

I then made inquiry of the Federal Works Agency and I submit for the record a letter from the Administrator of that agency:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, March 14, 1944.

Hon. E. V. M. IZAC,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. IZAC: In answer to your further inquiries as to the extent of participation by the State of Washington on Lanham Act war public works, the following information is revealed by an analysis of the records of this agency.

The amount of $12,779,127 described as non-Federal participation and given to Congressman NORMAN by Regional Engineer Durkee dated June 30, is now superseded by the current amount of $12,599,966. Of this amount, the State of Washington contributed $1,019,808 or 8.09 percent, which percentage is approximately the same as the June 30 proportion of $12,779,127 given to Congressman NORMAN.

The pertinent information is presented in the table below:

War public works, includes construction, State of Washington

Year	Federal		Non-State applicants		State	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1941	$5,224,155	84.06	$443,711	7.14	$547,204	8.80
1942	7,104,298	38.70	10,844,160	59.07	410,604	2.23
1943	3,490,301	90.78	292,287	7.60	62,000	1.61
Total	15,818,754	55.66	11,580,158	40.74	1,019,808	3.59

Mr. Durkee stated in his letter to Congressman NORMAN:

"The State of Washington and its communities have contributed, under the Lanham Act, practically three times as much money as any other State in the Union."

This statement, if used for the purpose of comparison with other States, should be modified by a reduction of $10,260,000, which represents the total sponsors' participation of two projects in the State of Washington neither of which has a direct parallel in any other State. These projects are the Whatcom County power job and the Seattle dock facilities for which the applicants, in anticipation of revenue, will contribute $8,300,000 and $1,960,000, respectively. The total of the above projects, including Federal funds, is as follows:

Whatcom County power	$10,231,748
Seattle docks	2,824,000
Total	13,073,748

Reducing the total of $12,779,127 by the amount listed for the two projects described leaves a net of $2,519,127 for use as comparative data.

The analysis of the State of Washington and its communities in comparison with other States and their communities should be based upon the amount of $2,519,127. This is 17 percent of the total estimated cost of all projects exclusive of the two named projects. On this basis, the State of

Washington and its communities rank tenth of the 48 States.

Sincerely yours,

BAIRD SNYDER
(Acting for Philip B. Fleming, Major General, U. S. Army, Administrator).

Now at the outset of my reply to the defense of his State made by the gentleman from Washington I want to make certain points clear. The House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas criticized the State of Washington for not adequately aiding its war-congested municipalities—and commended the municipalities for their valiant efforts in carrying the brunt of the war burden. The distinction between the State and the municipalities is fundamental and the crux of this matter. The gentleman from Washington attempts to credit his State with contributing $12,779,127 to Lanham Act war public works and thus contend that his State leads the entire Nation, when as a matter of fact the State of Washington actually contributed only $1,019,808—it is the municipalities, not the State, that have contributed the preponderant amount of the total. This is the very point made in the subcommittee's report. The statistics presented in the letter above by the very authority and on the very standard chosen by the gentleman from Washington disprove clearly and conclusively his defensive assertions for they show that, first the State of Washington actually contributed only 8.09 percent of the amount he seeks to credit the State with; second that the municipalities contributed 91.91 percent of the amount; third that the State of Washington has contributed only 3.59 percent of all funds for Lanham Act war public-works projects in the State of Washington; and fourth that the State of Washington contributed only 1.61 percent of all funds for Lanham Act war public-works projects in the State of Washington in 1943—and only 2.23 percent in 1942 when the State increased its sales-tax take from 2 to 3 percent.

The table in the F. W. A. letter above speaks simply and briefly but with telling clarity—by the very authority and standard chosen by Mr. NORMAN his State of Washington stands convicted, not acquitted, of the subcommittee's charges. I invite his close attention to this simple table—I invite the attention of Mr. Durkee, the F. W. A. regional engineer, who greviously misled my respected colleague, and suggest that he apprise himself of these accurate facts furnished by the Administrator of the agency for which he works. I invite the attention of Congressman HAL HOLMES, Mayor Herbert G. West, Governor Langlie, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, the Seattle Times, and all those who attack the findings of my subcommittee, to this simple table. Representative HOLMES' placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Governor Langlie's attack on my committee constituted my first actual notice of his protest, as neither he nor any representative of his has at any time contacted me or any member of the committee.

I am afraid that the gentleman from Washington is unaware of the fact that the Subcommittee on Congested Areas criticized the State for lack of adequate assistance to the war-congested municipalities. Please get this clearly for, in fact, we commended the municipalities for their valiant efforts.

Since the gentleman from Washington has chosen the Lanham Act war public works project as the standard and the F. W. A. as the authority in this matter, I am happy to take the standard and the authority so chosen by him to disprove his charges against my subcommittee and to substantiate the findings of my subcommittee. From the figures given above by his chosen authority, the F. W. A., and his chosen standard, the Lanham Act war public works, it is apparent that:

First. The State, and make no mistake about this, for I say the State, did not contribute the alleged $12,779,127, or 58 percent. Rather the State contributed only $1,019,808, or only 8.09 percent of the total $12,599,966 non-Federal funds. It was the local governments, the municipalities and communities, that contributed the preponderant amount of the non-Federal funds. They contributed $11,580,158, or 91.91 percent. These figures show that over 90 percent of this amount, which the gentleman from Washington seeks to credit to the State of Washington, actually came from the municipalities, not the State, which is exactly what our committee found and which is the crux of the whole discussion.

Second. Broken down by participation, the percentages are 55.66 percent of the total Lanham Act war public works projects in Washington by the Federal Government, 40.72 percent of the total by the local governments—and now get this accurately—only 3.59 percent of the total by the Washington State government.

Third. The participation of the State has diminished as the war period continues, for its 8.8 percent of 1941 fell to 2.23 percent in 1942—the first full year of the war and the year when the State sales tax "take" was increased from 2 percent to 3 percent—and to an infinitesimal 1.61 percent in 1943, the past year. Contrast this to the 90.78 percent carrying of these costs by the Federal Government in the past year of 1943.

So that searching accuracy shrinks the misrepresented participation of 58 percent to only 3.59 percent for the entire period and only 1.61 percent for the past year. But the gentleman from Washington made other statements which I cannot permit to pass unchallenged. If he had read, or given credence to, the facts and statistics of my letter of February 3, 1944, to Mr. J. E. Carroll appearing in the February 7, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I do not believe that he would have made these statements. He said:

> In the face of these facts, I consider that the investigating committee picked the wrong State to pick on.

As I clearly stated during the hearings in Seattle, the Congested Areas Subcommittee has criticized States wherever it was of the opinion that they were not doing their share. The State of Washington has not been singled out for we have made the same observation of my own State, California, and the State of Maine. In the San Francisco Bay area report of the subcommittee published on May 17, 1943, long before the Puget Sound area report publication date of January 5, 1944, the subcommittee made this statement on page 809:

> The Federal Government is spending many hundreds of millions of dollars in this area through pay rolls in shipyards and other industries. The purchasing power flowing from these pay rolls is not susceptible of taxation except through the medium of a sales tax, which in California is being levied by the State but not through local communities. The communities do not benefit by the sales tax other than through a redistribution of some of the sales-tax revenue collected by the State of California. It is the opinion of the committee that the State should in part share the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist these communities.

The gentleman from Washington further states:

> My State has contributed under the Lanham Act three times as much as any other State.
>
> * * * * *
>
> My State of Washington, beyond all question, has done a most outstanding job in helping to solve the problems of war-congested communities within its borders. It has done the best job in the country. Who can say it should have done better when already it has done three times as well—not relatively but actually—as any other State in the whole Union?

Such is far from the actual facts, as the contribution of the State of Washington is not $12,729,127, as contended by the gentleman from Washington—it is only $1,019,808. His praise should be directed to the local governments of Washington, as was our report—not to the State—for it was the local governments that contributed $11,580,158. It is obvious that the State of Washington has not done three times as well as any other State on Lanham Act projects. These statistics and those that I quoted in my letter to Mr. Carroll conclusively prove that the State of Washington has not done the best job in the country—to the contrary, the State of Washington has done one of the poorest jobs, for at the very time when it was (1) benefiting from the highest percentage increase in revenue and Federal aid of all States, (2) increasing its sales-tax rate from 2 percent to 3 percent, greatly at the expense of imported Federal workers, and (3) thus building up its surplus and trust funds—during that very time, I repeat, its aid to local governments was among the lowest of all States. This is proved by the published studies of the Division of State and Local Government of the Census Bureau of the United States Department of Commerce, quoted in my letter to Mr. Carroll—the detailed statistics may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1944.

Even the State of Washington, and its communities, have not done the outstanding job—certainly not three times as well, actually or relatively, as any other State in the whole Union—for the letter from the F. W. A. points out that the State of Washington, and its communities, is outranked by nine other States

and their communities. Do not forget that distinction between States and their communities.

The gentleman from Washington implied that the subcommittee's findings and criticism of the State of Washington were political in character when he stated:

> But I certainly cannot let the committee's reflection of my own State and its Republican administration go unchallenged and unrefuted.

I wonder if the gentleman studied the composition of the subcommittee that sat in Seattle and issued the report. I am afraid that he did not, for there were four Republicans and only two Democrats, Mr. FOGARTY and myself. If he will read the record closely, he will find that two members of the subcommittee, both Republicans from Republican States, were far more vigorous in criticism of the State of Washington than I. Obviously, the subcommittee's attitude on this matter has not at any time been dictated by political party affiliation.

Finally he states:

> Yet I feel that his committee was grievously misled by somebody, somehow, in its work in Washington.

I think that the facts presented show that it is the gentleman from Washington, not the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas, who has been misled. I prefer to give the gentleman from Washington the benefit of the doubt.

The Right of Petition Still Exists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some propagandists and some newspaper columnists seem to have an idea that the right of petition as provided under the Constitution exists for everybody but businessmen. They follow a plan, whether a preconceived and definite plan, or just a general agreement of views it is difficult to say, of trying to read into every conference between outstanding business leaders and public officials, such as officials of the Treasury, congressional committees, or individual Members, some sinister and unusual meaning. They go to the length of implying that some evil purpose motivates these business leaders and that in some way they are going to seduce the officials of the Treasury, or hypnotize the committees of Congress, or mislead the individual Members.

This is a sinister and harmful practice in which these professional smearmen indulge, and one which tends to deprive public officials of excellent advice and great assistance in the admittedly difficult business of government.

Many of us, personally, know some of the business leaders who have recently been attacked by these smearmen for having dared to confer with officials concerning the public business. We know those men to be able, honest, liberal, patriotic—vastly concerned with the present and future welfare of their country. Some of them we know to have been distinguished for their service in the first World War, which is more than can be said of some of their detractors.

This practice of these smearmen in trying to terrorize and discourage able, honest, patriotic businessmen from discussing public affairs with public officials is not only an attempt to deny a very important class of our citizens the right of petition to their Congress, it is an attempt to deny millions of Americans who own stock in American industry the right to have their representatives and managers confer with their public servants. This practice goes further and attempts to set up a denial of the fundamental principles of our free government—and I for one believe it is intended to do just that. Our Government is founded on the principles laid down in the Constitution. Right of petition is one of those principles. Our American social and economic organization rests upon a foundation of free enterprise, and if these smearmen could wreck our free enterprise system they would succeed in wrecking our free constitutional governmental system as well, and at the same time. Manifestly, it is vastly important to the welfare of every man, woman, and child in this Nation that free enterprise under proper governmental regulation, and fairly and legally conducted, succeed not only in its job of providing the machines and material of war, but in making a successful readjustment to peacetime activities in order to provide jobs—about 57,000,000 jobs—for those who will find themselves confronted with the loss of their wartime jobs.

Another principle underlying the foundation of our free, constitutional governmental system and of our free society is that of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. Whenever we attempt to deny any considerable and important segment of our people and our economic mechanism the right to participate in that process, we to just that extent weaken the processes of democracy.

It is a singular fact that these smearmen appear to have a blind spot. They talk about being liberals. They very properly want labor to have a voice in government and in industrial management through collective bargaining; they very properly want our veterans to have a voice in government; they very properly want agricultural organizations to have a voice in government, all of which is entirely desirable. But at that point apparently the blind spot in these so-called liberals begins to operate and they can see no other element in our economic structure entitled to a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious that these smearmen know what they are doing. Apparently they mean to weaken our free constitutional governmental system. Their liberalism, about which they prate so much and so loudly, is that peculiar brand of thinking which concludes that only the way of these smearmen is the liberal way and that that way must necessarily exclude the managers of industry from any participation in the counsels of government. This is a tenet of communism. It is one of the elements of fascism. It is the central theme of socialism, and has become pretty much the practice of New Dealism.

Daily the committees of the Congress and high executive officials find the advice, the counsel, and the discussions of these businessmen helpful, enlightening, and certainly as unselfish as that of any other group which participates in our counsels of Government.

These smearmen appear to see nothing wrong about calling on American industry, under the guidance of these men whom they attack, to overcome in a matter of 3 short years all of the accomplishments of intensified war preparations in Germany under Hitler for 12 years; in Italy under Mussolini for 20 years; in Japan under the war lords for 40 years. And American business and industry, under the able and loyal guidance of these managers, and with the able and loyal help of the workers, have done just exactly that. The accomplishment of American industry, managers and employees alike, in the war effort stands today as a miracle of modern productive achievement. It is the greatest feat of production ever wrought in the history of mankind. And yet these smearmen, disregarding all of that, sweeping aside all the facts, ignoring the contributions being made by many able business executives at nothing a year to the Government in advisory posts, immediately attack these industrial managers as having a sinister purpose to serve when they dare to come to Washington to confer with public officials who in many instances seek their advice.

This war is not a social experiment, Mr. Speaker, it is a battle for life and liberty; the life and liberty of this Nation.

No fair-minded person can view without grave disquiet the state of affairs which exists, the invariable practice of these smearmen to attack any outstanding businessman who offers his aid to public officials. The American people cannot expect businessmen, industrial managers, working 12 or 14 or more hours a day, conducting their businesses on a narrow margin of profit, trying as they are in honor-bound to try, to preserve the properties of their stockholders, to continue to lend their support and their advice to public officials if their return is to be unjust accusations, unmerited abuse, unfair inferences, and character assassination.

We all know industrial managers, Mr. Speaker, who have near and dear ones at the front in active service, and who have the same earnest desire to faithfully and unselfishly serve their country that we or any other Americans have, and yet these professional smearmen are ready to close their eyes to all that, and to read something sinister and evil into the loyal efforts of these businessmen who, through their experience and advice, desire to assist the public officials in

solving the intricate and numberless problems of government in these troublous times.

I want to say here and now that I hope these industrial managers will not be driven from their present course of helpfulness by these scurrilous and despicable attacks upon them.

I am certain that the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress feel, as I do about this, namely, that the help of these managers of business has proven a valuable contribution to the solution of the many vexatious problems arising from the war, and that the departments of the Government may continue to have the assistance of the best minds in this country in solving the problems of the peace to come. Our fair-minded people will approve of and be deeply grateful to all those who unselfishly and patriotically devote their time and their talents to helping their Government over the toughest road it has traveled in all its national life.

Your Congress: It Is Your Board of Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article which appeared in the March issue of a publication of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington, Washington, D. C.

It is an article which every Member of Congress should read. It sets forth undisputed facts. It presents to the Nation observations in regard to the people's Congress. It ought to be known by everyone. Congress is the board of directors of the United States and as such has its solemn duty to perform in the conduct of national affairs. I commend the reading of this article to every Member of Congress.

YOUR CONGRESS: IT IS YOUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS

This statement will illustrate what has happened to Congress and parliamentary government everywhere in the intervening century and 25 years. Many had time to think and brood and ponder a hundred years ago. During these times and in recent years the Members do not have 15 minutes a day of uninterrupted time for the real business they are sent here for—to write the Nation's laws.

The contrast shows not only what has happened, but how necessary it is for us to understand the difficulties and the hurried atmosphere in which a modern Congress meets.

When Webster spoke in 1830 there were only 48 Senators in place of 96, 203 Congressmen in place of 435, a population of 13,000,000 in place of 135,000,000. The first locomotive was still scaring Old Dobbin; the first oil well had not been dug; the modern age of technology, chemistry, medicine, and power were just knocking at the door.

But while mankind has been scaling the peaks of science and invention we have slipped down in the field of constitutional government. At home, for the past 20 years at least, we have seen the Executive power grow at the expense of Congress. Here, as abroad, we have been moving toward one-man government. No one who loves this country and his children can view this trend without deep misgiving.

It seems, therefore, of the utmost importance for the average citizen to increase his respect for Congress, the "sheet anchor" of his liberties, and for Congress to earn his increasing respect. Senator REYNOLDS recently said he has thought many times of the poor impression Congress must make on those who see it for the first time from the galleries. Yet, if the visitor followed his own Congressman around for 1 typical day he would come home with a growing respect for one of the hardest working groups of men in America.

Let us look both at the appearance and the reality. The daily session begins sharply at noon and continues for 4 or 5, sometimes 8, 10, or 12 hours. What the visitor sees from the gallery is actually a ratification meeting on some proposal that has been already thoroughly thrashed out in committee. In every session, thousands of bills are introduced. They are referred to some 40 committees in the House of Representatives and a corresponding number in the Senate. An important committee will have referred to it in a single session several hundred bills. Some of these are of the greatest importance. When a committee takes up one of these bills, hearings are held at which a "day in court" is given both to those who favor and those who oppose. This is the American way. No judgment is formed on the important matter until both sides have been heard.

When 1 of these 40 committees finally reports a bill for action to the full House or Senate, the subject matter will have generally already come to the attention of all Members, because if the bill is at all important, each Congressman, even though not a member of the committee, will probably have been bombarded for weeks with hundreds of letters and telegrams both for and against its passage. Constituents from his district who are interested in the bill will have come down to Washington to present their claims to him in person. The result is that by the time the bill reaches the floor, the average Member already knows a great deal about it and probably has made up his mind how he is going to vote.

Each of the 40 committees is a little congress in itself. Unless the work were thus subdivided, it would be impossible for Congress to consider a tenth or a hundredth part of the legislation that actually passes during a session.

All Members of Congress have a great deal of confidence in the members of various committees. When a committee, therefore, reports a bill favorably, it is natural that the other Members of Congress, who have been busy themselves on the work of their own committees, will accept the recommendations of the committee having charge of the bill.

In addition to his legislative work, the modern Congressman's office receives from 100 to 500 letters a day, and sometimes an equal number of telegrams. The senders always expect at least the courtesy of an acknowledgment, and most of them really desire a careful answer. Besides that, a Congressman receives hundreds of requests to go up to one of the departments and plead the cause of a constituent.

It is a killing pace. The mortality of Members is much higher than the average in civil life for men in the same age brackets. Sessions which formerly lasted only 3 months are now almost a year-round affair.

Congressmen should not be condemned for using the frank to send speeches into their districts. Again, the amount of free mail franked out by the executive departments is 20 times as great as that sent out by Congress; yet, these razzle-dazzle boys who make up so much of the alleged news never tell you that. To listen to them, you would think that Congress was sending you to the poor house on account of their franked mail. The congressional frank is sometimes abused, but, on the whole, we thoroughly approve of its use by Members of the Congress. It is often true that not a single newspaper in his district is open to the sitting Congressman, although he is actually there because the majority of his people want him there. If he were not enabled to state his position to his constituents by franked mail, he would often be precluded from any real chance of having them understand his position on important matters. Meantime, a rival back home who has no congressional duties could constantly undermine him.

Congress makes the laws; the Executive administers them; the Judiciary interprets the. Our fathers intended each branch to be coordinate and independent from each of the others. They recognized the teaching of all history that unlimited power can be trusted to no one, not even to the largest majority, as the constitution of Wyoming states. This is our great system of checks and balances, perhaps the most important political idea that ever came from the mind of man. Incidentally, don't let any one tell you that the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—is the heart of the American Constitution. If we had to choose the chief safeguards of freedom, we would put in the first place this great principle of checks and balances embedded in the original Constitution before it had been amended. Preserve that, and liberty has still a continent to dwell on.

A body of representatives over whom the people have such a close control can be trusted with the people's liberties. The people can dismiss them if they fail, different from the law with reference to many minor officials back in the States who sit until the successors are elected to actually qualify. No Congressman can sit for a single day after the expiration of the 2-year period for which he was elected unless, of course, he is reelected. In England, there is no such basic law. The British Parliament is supreme. It can vote itself indefinite tenure in office, and there is no law to prevent Parliament from voting itself in office for life or from making the office hereditary to their own sons.

Dangers to our system lurk in subtle ways. Among them may be the following:

1. Disparagement of Congress. We have signs of this, especially by communistic groups and certain radio commentators, who could not win a single seat in Congress in any State, who seek places of power by boring from within in the Executive departments.

2. The gradual transfer of the powers and responsibilities of Congress to executive departments and bureaus, which, in increasing fashion, are writing rules and regulations having the force and effect of absolute law.

3. Another danger that confronts Congress as an institution of freedom is the power of propaganda which has been so tremendously augmented in recent years by the silver screen and the radio. There is no one man who can speak for the 535 Members of the House and Senate. There is no way for all of them to speak collectively over the radio. When the President or a Cabinet Member presents his case to the people, the press, the radio, and the silver screen focus upon him as a single human being. In the use of propaganda, therefore, Congress is at a great disadvantage. These new inventions in the field of mass communication have been largely responsible for the rise of dictators and the twilight of representative govern-

ment in many lands. We must recognize them in this country for what they are—instruments capable of great good or immense harm.

Congress should and must devise methods by which Congress or the opposition on every important question shall have equal radio time with the President on an equal number of stations. Surely a Member of Congress who has been smeared by a radio commentator should be given equal radio time to make reply and defend himself. The American people are entitled to hear both sides. That privilege is enjoyed by few people on this planet today.

Don't blame Congressmen or Senators for not doing a better job today. They neither have time to carefully answer their mail nor to run all the errands for their constituents and, certainly, not enough time to spend months in uninterrupted study of important bills. If they did take the necessary time to be legislators as men could do from 1789 to 1889, they would be defeated at the next election for failing to answer letters.

Senators TYDINGS, BYRD, and GEORGE, Congressmen DIRKSEN, LANHAM, and LAFOLLETTE, and many others of both parties are trying to get Congress to hire itself a set of modern tools. The country should tell Congress to go ahead.

Fear of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial by Mr. Angelo Scott in the Iola (Kans.) Register of March 13, 1944.

Mr. Scott, though a young man, has grasped here the spirit of the pioneer whose self-reliance developed this country of ours and opened the West. His philosophy here reflects the motto of Kansas, "Ad astra per aspera"—to the stars through difficulty. It is the language of the West and of Kansas. I commend this philosophy of courage to the serious consideration of all of us who are concerned with the problems which lie ahead:

FEAR OF PEACE

Unfortunately, there will never be a way to prove it, but I'd like to lay a wager that the United States would have completely recovered from the collapse of 1931 and 1932 in 3 years if government had done absolutely nothing about it; if the New Deal had never been dreamed of; if wages and prices had been permittted to go clear to rock bottom; if the devil had been permitted to take the hindmost.

Eventually there would have had to be reached a balance between the demand for labor and the price at which it could be hired, and the demand for goods and the price at which they could be bought. Once in balance again, economic forces would have pushed their accustomed way to the levels from which they had been toppled.

It would have been a rough go at the bottom of the hill, rougher perhaps than things actually were in 1933, but I'll always believe that the recovery would have been three times as rapid and three times as sound as it was under the political management that we chose to substitute for unrestrained economic forces.

This observation is offered as introduction to a comment on a recent article by Bernard DeVoto in Harper's Magazine, the conclusion of which is that "America is afraid of the future, afraid of peace."

Mr. DeVoto doesn't attempt to account for the fear, but simply to analyze it. He finds that the fear which is growing upon us is a fear of the unknown in economics and a social fear. The fear "that once the external discipline of war is relaxed, there will be grave danger of our collapsing into disorder, disunity, civil and social strife. That whereas war has brought us hope, or at least courage, the coming peace may bring despair."

If this is true, and I am inclined to believe that it is to a disquieting degree, what is the reason for it? Isn't it paradoxical that a nation which has courage enough to fight and win the most terrible war in human history should quail and shrink before the prospect of the very peace which is the goal of all this fighting?

Perhaps it isn't paradoxical. We have never lost our self-reliance in matters of war. We have never been whipped. It is logical enough that we should have tackled this war with complete assurance and confidence that we could carry it through to the same victory which has crowned our efforts in previous wars.

But we have lost our self-reliance in matters of peacetime economic affairs. We lost it during the 1930's when, frightened by the panic of 1929 and discouraged by the depression that followed, we turned as a people to government for help.

For 11 years—half a generation—we have leaned on government for the solution of all our problems. We have accepted government aid and have submitted to government direction in all of our affairs. In the fight for economic recovery and social stability, we have not even been participants, we have only been observers—and critics—of what government has done.

If we had come out of the mess by ourselves, if we had drunk the dregs of complete deflation and yet survived to build a new prosperity through our efforts as citizens, laborers, and businessmen—not as voters at an election or philosophers on a soap box—do you think we would fear the future now?

It is a simple law of nature that too much coddling produces weakness; that strength and vigor and courage come only through self-reliance and self-help.

The mother bird pushes her young out of the nest to fly or die. Nothing less drastic will teach the fledgling that only in his own strength can he hope to survive in a world of struggle and strife.

Nobody pushed a cowering America out of its nest in the 1930's. We sat with our mouths open waiting for Mother Government to provide with food, and squawking if she didn't provide enough. It isn't much wonder that even today we are still flabby and weak, regarding the future with the fear of inexperience, rather than with the confidence of one who has tried his strength and knows what he can do.

A large size dose of the good old philosophy of survival of the fittest would be about the best medicine this country could have as a tonic for its post-war future.

The Hourly Labor Subsidies to the Producer Vary From Less Than 1 Cent to 15 Cents per Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official table from Dr. Wylie Goodsell, of the United States Department of Agriculture, shows the yearly subsidy, as Government payments, to producers engaged in various types of farming:

Estimated ratio Government payments to hours of man labor, for specified types of farms

[Dollars Government payment per hour-man labor]

Year	Winter wheat			Corn Belt			Dairy		Cotton		
	Wheat	Wheat-corn	Wheat-grain sorghum	Hog, dairy	Cash grain	Hog-beef raising	New York	Wisconsin	2-mule Georgia	Mississippi	Texas
1935	0.19	0.12	0.17	0.04	0.05	0.04	(1)	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03
1936	.19	.09	.25	.03	.06	.04	(1)	.01	.02	.01	.02
1937	.08	.03	.13	.01	.02	.02	(1)	.01	.02	.01	.02
1938	.09	.04	.12	.01	.04	.02	(1)	.01	.02	.05	.04
1939	.19	.10	.22	.03	.09	.04	(1)	.02	.03	.04	.05
1940	.16	.10	.16	.03	.08	.04	(1)	.01	.03	04	.05
1941	.15	.10	.15	.03	.08	.04	(1)	.02	.03	.04	.05
1942	.16	.12	.14	.03	.11	.04	(1)	.01	.02	.02	.02
Average	15	.08¾	.16¾	.02⅝	.06⅜	.03½	−.01	.01¼	.02⅜	.03	.035

[1] Less than $0.01 per hour.

Source: Dr. Wylie Goodsell, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Farm Management and Costs, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The detailed report of Dr. Goodsell's studies can be found on page 1363 of the February 7, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is apparent that dairy, general livestock, and the man that really raises the cotton received but small hourly subsidies in comparison to the cash grain producer of the Corn Belt and the winter wheat, grain sorghum producer, and the wheat and grain producer of the Winter Wheat Belt. The base for any agricultural program should extend across the board and it is hoped that during wartime a production program that will result in the greatest maximum amount of food will be substituted for the program. This approach did not meet general approval even in peacetime, and most assuredly does not make sense in wartime.

A Thinking Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very thoughtful letter received from a businessman residing in Hartford, Conn. This man has evidently given serious thought to many of the problems faced by the Congress. I think his conclusions are sound and will be of interest to Members of the House.

The letter follows:

MARCH 13, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM J. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for your letter of December 1, which was read with much interest. I read Senator BUTLER'S speech with hearty approval. You and I agree on most things, which is saying a great deal for any two people.

It seems to me the important things before Congress, before all of us, are:

1. Win the war.
2. Rigid economy of government.
3. A return to States' rights.
4. Free enterprise by our people without bureaucratic restrictions.

WIN THE WAR

Under this heading we are all united, even though the bureaucrats often impede our efforts and tremendous sums are wasted.

RIGID ECONOMY

So far Congress has made just a start along this line. There are many places where drastic cuts are necessary. A number of Federal agencies should be scrapped in their entirety by withholding funds or any other way possible, such as:

Agricultural Adjustment Administration: There is no need for the 200,000 farm agents throughout the country. Let them spend their time producing. We have State departments of agriculture and State agricultural colleges to advise the farmer.

Commodity Credit Corporation: The farmer should plan his crops and marketing as any other businessman, and make or lose by it, as any other businessman must. If a manufacturer makes goods, giving employment to labor and paying that labor, it is his judgment, good or bad, that shows him a profit or loss. Why should the Government play Santa Claus to the farmer? Let him stand on his own ability and energy, as any other businessman.

Farm Security Administration: Let the farmer finance himself, like any other businessman, locally where people know him, and take the Government and its staff of employees out of this business.

Soil Conservation Service: If land is not important enough for its owner to conserve it, the Government should not spend money on it.

Rural Electrification Administration: If rural electrification can pay its own way private companies will go into it, and they can do it more economically than the Government, even after paying taxes. If it will not pay its own way, then the Government should not spend the taxpayers' money on it. I suggest further funds be withheld from it, and if it cannot support itself let such lines be sold and we take the loss now rather than a loss each year.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Farm Credit Administration: Both of these can be dispensed with.

Small War Plants Corporation: If the small war plants have not enough ability and energy to get business these days, they do not deserve existence (and we are a small war plant). Too many businessmen like the farmer expect a paternalistic government to take care of them and we can't do it except by bankrupting the Government.

National Highway System: Let's let the States build the roads out of their gasoline tax and use the Federal tax on gasoline to help pay our staggering war debt. Talk of a $3,000,000,000 road appropriation seems preposterous with at least $250,000,000,000 Federal debt at the close of the war. How are we going to pay it?

National Housing Agency: In this group are a half dozen loan and other agencies whose funds should be clipped, first merging them all into one to wind them up.

Various Federal lending agencies: Today there are more than 40 Federal agencies lending or otherwise distributing the cash the taxpayer pays into the Federal Treasury for seeds, war plants, houses, electric lines, feed, and a score of other things, and they frequently get terms no banker could offer, but the banker cannot draw on the resources of the United States Treasury to cover his losses and service costs. If a man is worthy of credit he can get it locally. If he is not worthy the taxpayer should not have to pay it. The Farm Credit Administration and Farm Security Administration hold many thousands of farms possessed on delinquent loans. These 2 bureaus should be merged, further funds withheld, and the property sold now while farm prices are high. After the war, selling them will be at a heavy loss. The R. F. C. should be curbed from making further loans and should collect those outstanding.

Other bureaus: I have touched on only a few bureaus. Now 14 different agencies have a finger in national labor policy, from the Department of Labor and W. M. C. through W. P. B.'s Labor Division, National Mediation Board, N. L. R. B., W. L. B., Department of Agriculture, W. F. A., and Department of Interior, plus special wartime advisory committees and boards, with no integration or coordination. Why not put this in one board, whose say is final?

Federal land: Millions of acres the Government owns are controlled by about 60 different departments or bureaus. Why not put them under the General Land Office?

Three million Government employees: Senator BYRD has splendid ideas on this subject. If departments were merged, overlapping and unnecessary functions clipped, unnecessary ones discontinued, we should be able to drop about 1,000,000 from the Federal pay roll and reduce the expense of Government materially.

United States' help for States: Already the States are clamoring for aid. Mayor LaGuardia is foremost among those clamoring. Let the States and cities pay their own way. The Federal Government has a tremendous job meeting its interest and reducing its debt after the war, and won't have any money for the States. The President's budget summary for the next fiscal year shows a public debt at the end of the year of $258,000,000,000. What are you going to do about it?

STATES' RIGHTS

You have made a start toward a return to States' rights, but only a start. We are now drifting speedily toward totalitarian or dictator government. May I suggest that each measure be studied and, where possible, the function of government be given back to the States. All agriculture should be given back now, and the Department of Agriculture simply tabulate statistically the reports made by the various States, giving them out for publication. State agricultural departments are better fitted to handle the various matters in the States. The Pure Food and Drugs Department should be retained by the Federal Government. After the war, labor problems should be handled by the States except railroads, telephones, and radio.

Congressman HATTON W. SUMNERS expresses my ideas on this subject: "The promoters of centralization are more and more resorting to the exercise of unlimited power against which no constitutional barrier will ever stand: the control of purse strings. By making the units of State government financially dependent on the Federal Government, that Government is acquiring the power to control the units of State government. When this is fully consummated, the sovereignty of the State government will be liquidated. This will be done with money sent by Washington in the form of loans and gifts to States, towns, school districts, etc."

FREE ENTERPRISE

Let us get back as speedily as possible to free enterprise, easing such restrictions as possible now, and much more after the war. Taxes must be lowered somewhat then, to encourage money to be invested in new industries and new products to give employment to labor. Between 1900 and 19330, millions of us invested $100,000,000,000 in new industries and expansion of old ones, which at the end of that period found one-third of the workers owing their jobs to this new venture money. This is far better than boondoggling or W. P. A. If Government lets business go ahead with only reasonable and sensible restrictions, business can take care of post-war employment.

You hear a lot of post-war planning in Washington by the "palace guard." To us citizens that means public works, Government spending, and Government jobs. Where is the money coming from? Remember after the last war how Liberty bonds were thrown on the market and went down to 83 or 85? After this war, this same amount will have to be redeemed by the Government at cost plus interest, and where is the money coming from? And the return from taxes will be much reduced. Post-war planning by industry means buying or building new machines to produce products to sell low enough to attract enough buyers to make jobs for everybody who really wants to do a full day's work.

LEND-LEASE

This should have come under the heading of rigid economy. If the committee investigating lend-lease would go over all orders placed under lend-lease for any 30-day period they would think as I do—we are darn fools. Lend-lease is necessary, but we are being worked to a frazzle, not only by the nations by whose side we are fighting, but by others who are doing no fighting, and were as much afraid of Hitler as anyone could be.

FREEDOM OF RADIO

This is as much a national liberty as freedom of the press, though the bureaucrats are partially controlling it. It is time this was stopped.

TAXES

Simplifying taxes would be a good thing, but reduction is not to be thought of now. We must collect all we can now to keep our deficit down so the men and women who have fought our battles won't have so much to pay when they come home, and when our national revenues will be much smaller. In fact, we should add a sales tax to help increase our revenue, notwithstanding labor and the farmers are against it, even though they are both making more money than ever before.

While on the subject of taxes, the tax on oleomargarine should be repealed. Many people in all classes have to eat it now. It is a good substitute for butter. At any rate it should not be taxed to aid the dairy farmers, and that is the only reason it is taxed. It is about as sensible to tax it as it would be

to tax a low-priced radio that would give the same service as one double the price of the one taxed. In the business world every product must hold its own or be relegated to the scrap heap. There is no place for subsidies. The American dairy farmer has not availed himself of his opportunities. He expects a paternalistic government to look after him. With the war on he has had a splendid opportunity to put on the market some good cheeses to take the place of the imported ones shut out, and what has he done? The American cheeses are very poor, as you know.

PARITY

I think this word should be dropped from our national vocabulary. Every product or service must rise or fall on its ability to fill a niche in our everyday economy.

BUDGET BUREAU AND AUDITING

Would it not be well to keep these two departments responsible to Congress, particularly the auditing? Now some of the fifty-odd bureaus of the Government audit their own books. Congress is responsible to the people for the money it appropriates and it should see that it is spent for the purpose appropriated.

$4,500 BONUS TO SERVICEMEN

I could hardly credit my eyes when I read this in last Tuesday's papers. Any Member of Congress who would give this serious consideration is either mentally of kindergarten age in sound sense, or a demagog of the first water, willing to saddle a $35,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000 debt on the country already overburdened with debt, simply to hope to get votes. It makes no difference whether paid in cash or bonds, it is debt and must be paid.

I do not begrudge the soldier anything we can do for him, but we cannot do this. It is entirely racketeering on the part of a pressure group. We do and must continue to take good care of the wounded and sick veterans and those incapacitated, as well as their families, but that is all we can do.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Would it not be wise to consolidate the O. P. A. and various other agencies that have to do with food into one agency?

The Republican Party has a splendid opportunity to distinguish itself in Congress now and win the next national election. I am sure that they will do it and I hope they draft Governor Dewey, who is both fearless and economical. We need such a man.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours.

Bill To Equalize Status of the Natives of India Under Immigration Act of 1924 and Nationality Act of 1940 Calls for Establishment of Immigration Quota and Citizenship Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if we are to follow the logical consequences of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, then, indisputably, the argument forces itself upon our consciousness that the people of India and their descendants are deserving of no less equal and equitable treatment.

But leaving aside the potent arguments that from the Chinese have been removed the unconscionable stigma of "lesser breed," and leaving aside the equally unanswerable argument that the soldiers of India have bravely fought a common foe on the battle fronts of Burma, Italy, north Africa, and against the Japanese in southeastern Asia, a higher morality demands that we prove to ourselves, and to our allies, all our allies, that our preachments of democracy are not empty tenets. We cannot, on one hand, revile the Nazi theories of racial supremacy, and, on the other, ignore the sinister implication of our immigration legislation that bars one people and not another, restrictions based on no moral or ethical ground save that of a man's origin.

We are paying a bitter price to learn the lesson of the interdependence of the world and its inhabitants. We fight in brotherhood, recognizing our mutual debts. Can we not underscore the brotherhood away from the death-drenched battlefields?

Practically, the amendment of the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, will make permissive the admission of somewhat less than 100 Indians annually.

The hue and cry that will rise in opposition to the proposed establishment of an immigration quota for Indians and their right to citizenship, making much of the competitive labor argument and of the evils of widening immigration legislation, have, therefore, no validity, no foundation in fact.

It is not a special privilege we accord the Indians in establishing for them an immigration quota, nor is it an act of condescension from our favored heights. It would be, rather, the acknowledgment of our sincerity in our battle cries, a renewal in the faith of our founders.

Moreover, and while this thought cannot take precedence over our American basic principles of equity and justice for all, the decisive, overt act of placing the Indians within the embrace of our immigration quota laws, on the basis comparable to those of the other peoples, and citizenship, will rob the Axis of their most telling barbed weapon on the battle of psychological warfare. But were it a time of peace, we could do no less.

For these reasons, I have introduced a bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives, and descendants of natives, of India, a copy of which bill is hereto annexed.

The bill has been sent to the Department of Justice, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, for interpretation and suggested amendments. It may be necessary to limit the meaning of the term "natives of India" to persons of the East Indian race.

H. R. 4415

A bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives, and descendants of natives, of India

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, natives of India and persons descended from natives of India may enter the United States (1) as immigrants allocated to the quota for India computed under the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 211), and (2) as nonquota immigrants under section 4 (b), (d), (e), and (f) of such act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 204). A preference up to 75 percent of the quota for India shall be given to natives of India resident in India. As used in this section the term "India" includes the dependencies of India.

SEC. 2. So much of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provisions of this Act shall extend only to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere, Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent, and natives of India and dependencies thereof or persons descended from natives of India and dependencies thereof:".

Northwest Florida Fights, Too!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me in my district:

My friends, we are in the third year of war, and we are spurred by the grim determination to wage war relentlessly on all fronts and on all seas until those who have chosen to live by the sword shall have perished by it. We have seen America's war machine grow into a powerful striking force, prepared to meet our enemies on any ground, carrying the fight to our foes on every front. Our forces are courageous, well trained, competently led, and impelled by the knowledge that they fight for the right. We take pride in their gallant and heroic spirit.

We know, too, that America is fulfilling its promise of production. In January 1944, 8,798 planes were produced, a new plane every 5 minutes. But in February plane production reached an all-time high, 350 planes a day, 1 every 4 minutes. Present production and training schedules are making it possible to send to the fighting fronts as many planes and pilots each 15 days as we had in the entire Air Forces shortly before Pearl Harbor.

In December 1943 American shipyards delivered to the merchant marine 208 ships. Change-overs to the faster, larger, new type ships which will figure so strongly in the post-war merchant marine necessarily slowed down January and February production, but deliveries were 124 and 134 ships, respectively. Compare this with 99 ships for the entire year 1941 and 746 in 1942; 1943 deliveries were 1,896 ships, grossing over 19,000,000 deadweight tons.

We can take great pride in the fact the Wainwright yard has probably the outstanding ship-production record in the Southeast. Thirty-five launchings attest to the efficiency and driving force of this great combination of management and labor. The yard is launching almost a ship a week. Already worth a hundred million dollars to the Panama City area, it is just getting into its stride. * * * And we must join forces with great determination to see that its facilities are utilized in the post-war period.

I take pride, too, in the fact that the Pensacola shipyard is contributing to this great production story. Many of you know

of the very great difficulties under which we labored to overcome Navy and Maritime prejudice and the onus of unscrupulous promoters in order to get this yard into production. It is inspiring to me that Pensacola people finally showed that this yard can be operated successfully, and that it is now recognized in official circles for its true value. With orders for 8 oil tankers, a dozen big steel barges, and repair and renovation work, the yard employs 900 to 1,000 men and has a weekly pay roll of $50,000. It is operating at capacity, and can get more orders when they are desired. Charlie Smith and his associates have done a great job.

On the military side, the Army is 60 times as large as in pre-war days. Increased fire power and mobility give it a striking power 100 times as great. The Army is now ready to strike hardest, just as the war is reaching its decisive stage. It is close to its planned strength of 7,700,000 men. One-third of it is overseas, another third is going over this year. With increased shipping and more trained replacements, many battle-weary veterans will get deserved furloughs back home this year. My Committee on Military Affairs is given large credit for inducing the War Department to adopt this furlough system for as many as possible of the members of the armed forces who have been in battle or isolated overseas posts for 1½ to 2 years.

The Navy's growth has been even more spectacular. In the battle for the Marshalls more American ships participated than we had in our entire fleet at the time of Pearl Harbor. We have in the Pacific approximately three times the number of battle craft the Japs are known to possess. And this year's deliveries will nearly double the size of the fleet. No wonder Tojo doesn't sleep well anymore.

Florida has trained a million men for the armed forces, and it is highly encouraging to us in the Third District to realize that we have contributed greatly to both Army and Navy training programs. One of our bases in particular enjoys a Nation-wide reputation and strategic importance second to none. It is, of course, the great Pensacola Naval Air Training Center, the birthplace of naval aviation. It is no secret that this base has a personnel of 20,000 and that it brings $50,000,000 annually into the Pensacola area, directly employing thousands of workers and greatly stimulating trade. It ranks all other naval air training establishments in the Southeast. Its enlargement during the war period makes it more than ever the No. 1 project in Pensacola, and every effort must be coordinated to insure its continuation as the premier naval aviation training center of the Southeast. I shall work very closely with our people there to protect and maintain this historic center.

I want to ask your indulgence while I read one paragraph from a letter written to me by the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY, chairman of the powerful Committee on Military Affairs, in connection with my district's military training program. I quote:

"DEAR BOB: I believe that your people already know and appreciate your strong interest in and your very active work for the military establishments of your district. It has been a source of gratification to me to have you cooperate so closely in building and maintaining these installations. They have been very important in the Army's training and defense program. Your district has been fortunate over many others in having such outstanding installations as Eglin Field, Tyndall Field, the Marianna Air Base, Dale Mabry Field, the Apalachicola Air Base, Camp Gordon Johnson, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens, and your people can be proud of your services for these bases and for the fine work you have done as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee for the Nation at large."

It is signed, ANDREW J. MAY.

I don't want to fail to include the farmer in my references to the war effort, for the farmer has done one of the greatest production jobs in history. His production for 1942 and 1943 were 50 percent above World War No. 1 averages and 35 percent above prewar averages. A substantial increase over the preceding year was shown in 1942 and again in 1943. We must have the food and the fibers of war, and the farmer's accomplishments in the face of shortages of farm labor, machinery, gasoline, and fertilizer have been superhuman.

Florida business had its biggest year in 1943, registering gains far greater than those of other States. In general business activity, Florida registered in 1943 a gain of 34 percent over 1942, compared with a national gain of 23 percent. But let's look away from the gains, the industrial activity, and the production records. We know in our hearts that the successses of our arms are only the beginning. We know there remain long months and years of toil for those who are producing the food and matériel of war, long months and years of the greater sacrifices required of those who bear their breasts to enemy fire. Very recently responsible officials warned that some Americans are forgetting there is a war on. But they are not only warning against overconfidence and complacency. They see that groups and individuals—an industrial minority, some farm-bloc leaders, a few union labor chieftains, and some politicians—are beginning to pull out of the war effort and to advance their own special interests, regardless of the Nation's intersets.

Jap atrocities on American war prisoners, disease and insect ridden South Sea jungles, the losses at Tarawa, the Anzio beachhead, the thousands of miles that separate our forces from Tokyo, the uncracked might of Hitler's European fortress, the ever swelling lists of dead and wounded and maimed—should carry their own warning against overconfidence, complacency, selfishness, and politics as usual. The war is not yet won. It will be won, but Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, and others who know warn that the toughest fighting still lies ahead. Many, many thousands of American boys are yet to die in bitter combat. How many of them will die will depend in part on the job that each of us does here at home.

Then—after the war there is the post-war period with the readjustments which inevitably must follow. They will not be easy. Industry now is booming. Business is good. Jobs are plentiful. Farm prices are up and there is no limit on production. The seafood industry finds a ready market for its catch. War production requires all our facilities. But will there be jobs in the post-war period? When war orders are cancelled, what of the people now employed in war plants and shipyards? What of the returning soldiers? Where will they find work? Will the demand for farm products again drop to the blighting depths of prewar days?

Obviously we must carry on at full speed, with all our might until victory is won, and we must make every effort to be ready for the post-war period. Careful planning and hard work might have averted the depression of the thirties. By doing nothing now, we invite another equally as devastating. Northwest Florida particularly is susceptible to the ruinous effects of a post-war slump. Our prosperity is the greatest in history, but a great part of it is founded on war activities.

There are means by which post-war readjustments can be made less damaging to our economy. In brief, I believe that first emphasis should be placed on conversion of war plants to commercial pursuits; next, the maintenance of adequate national defense establishments, particularly Army and Navy air bases and shore bases for the fleet. As a part of this program there must be a comprehensive plan of rehabilitation and job placement for the returning veteran. We shall need a well-defined public-works program—roads, airports, waterways, harbors, and public buildings—and I do not mean W. P. A. There should be a vastly expanded merchant marine and commercial airways program. Freight rates to the South must be reduced. A new farm program without the old A. A. A. crop-production restrictions must be developed. I advocate a huge post-war private-home-building program, both city and rural. We shall extend rural electrification. And finally, no post-war plan will be complete without a program by which society goes to the rescue of any of our fellow travelers along the way of life who are no longer able to carry on alone. The aged, the sick, and the crippled, the mothers of families without a breadwinner to care for their own children deserve our compassion and our help. When any of these fall by the wayside it is our public responsibility to aid and succor them. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Let me touch quickly on two or three of these items. War brings many responsibilities, and none of them is greater than the responsibility of a nation to its returning soldiers. They are the ones who make the real sacrifices. They are the ones who gave up jobs or forfeited opportunities. They are the ones who risk injury and disease and death on far-flung battle fronts. They are making possible a continuation of the American way of life. I am proud that I helped provide good equipment, higher pay, and higher dependents' allotments for them. Now the time has come for the enactment of a complete program of aid for the returning soldier. Hospitalization, rehabilitation, and training, and job-placement plans should not wait until after the war. My committee, which deals with many of these problems, is hard at work, and I am happy to reveal that plans for the veterans are far advanced. Already we can say with honest pride that no other nation has provided for its service men and women as well as the United States. However, there are some inequalities to be adjusted and some legislation for which there is a need. It is far better that we put these good Americans on their feet when they return home than to have them fall by our neglect and then require our help.

Perhaps one of our greatest opportunities lies in the development of our ports and waterways. They have demonstrated their worth many times over in the present emergency. My bill in 1942 provided for the completion of the intracoastal waterway from Carrabelle to Corpus Christi to a depth of 12 feet and a width of 150 to 200 feet. Pipe lines from St. Joe northward and from Carrabelle eastward, plus expanded barge-line facilities, have made it possible for upper Gulf coast ports to play a key part in coastal and foreign shipments of essential war matériels. The tonnage on the intracoastal in 1942 increased 22 percent over the volume for 1941, which in turn exceeded the 1940 tonnage by 49 percent; 1943 showed another great increase. It is not too much to say that Florida's coastal waterways and ports made possible the success of the tremendous task of supplying oil to the east. Pensacola, Freeport, Panama City, Port St. Joe, Apalachicola, Carrabelle, and St. Marks have all had a hand in this great work. Conversely, the importance of post-war shipping to these ports cannot be overemphasized. We know that the post-war construction program must include useful and meritorious employment. Testimony based on records maintained by the Chief of Engineers reveals that 75 cents of every dollar expended on rivers and harbors projects goes to direct or indirect employment. With full realization of the value of waterway and harbor development, I have worked for 3 years to insure the inclusion of a number of items in the rivers and harbors bill now before the Congress. Construction of my projects will go far to connect many

presently uncompleted waterways and to strengthen the economy of Florida and the Southeast. I would like to mention some of them which are of local interest.

They include a project for St. Marks River as provided in House Document No. 345 for the elimination of critical bends at the mouth of the river and at a point opposite Big Bayou.

The Intraccastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to the St. Marks River is an authorized but unconstructed link in the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. An alternate route possessing certain very desirable advantages will also be considered.

The improvement of Watson Bayou, on St. Andrews Bay at Panama City, contemplates a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the bay to the head of navigation in Watson Bayou, a distance of approximately 1¾ miles.

There is a proviso in the bill which calls for great improvement in St. Josephs Bay, including a bar channel 32 by 300 feet, an inner harbor channel 30 by 200 feet, a turning basin 30 by 300 by 871 feet. My bill for the improvement of the Gulf County canal and its acquisition by the United States was passed last year.

The improvement of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers in Georgia and Florida in the interest of navigation, flood control and power development and other purposes has been proposed. Few projects can match this one in importance to the entire southeast. Panama City with its new industrial importance will benefit markedly from cheap transportation to the Chattahoochee valley.

Preliminary work has been done by the United States engineers with a view to improving the Chipola River in Florida in the interest of navigation, flood-control, and power development. Further study is authorized.

A resolution calling for the improvement of LaGrange Bayou at Freeport includes the construction of a turning basin in the docking area which will greatly facilitate the discharge of oil and other cargoes at this point.

Extensive improvements are provided for in the bill for Pensacola harbor, including deepening and widening the channels.

A waterway from the intercoastal waterway south across Santa Rosa Island to a point near Deer Point light is proposed.

Improvement of the entrance to Perdido Bay (Alabama and Florida) from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in the Perdido Bay is included in the bill.

There is a resolution in the bill which calls for a waterway which will connect the Escambia and Alabama Rivers (Florida and Alabama).

These latter four items should be considered in their entirety for they contribute jointly to port and shipping developments at Pensacola. This is one of the few ports of Florida strategically located to drain the rich and vast area of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and the industrial empire known as the Tennessee Valley.

The proposal to connect the port of Pensacola with the Alabama is to enable Pensacola to have a link with the proposed $100,000,000 Alabama-Coosa waterway project from Mobile to Rome, Ga.

With this connection, Pensacola would be able to obtain competitive rail rates, because of the water competition, which would be another great advantage for waterborne commerce.

The Alabama and Georgia territory is rich in such products as coal, steel, cement, cotton, and textiles. The Escambia link would place Pensacola closer to Selma, Montgomery, Gadsden, Anniston, and other points on the waterway to Rome, Ga., than competing port. About 25 towns, ranging from 3,000 to 25,000, are situated in the river basin.

With the development of the Escambia link and the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee waterway, a gateway to northwest Florida ports would be opened from one of the most rapidly advancing industrial areas in the Nation.

Major activities of that area which have been stepped up by the war are steel, textiles, and chemical products. Mineral products include bauxite, Selma chalk for cement, coal, iron, arsenic ores, fluxing materials, lead, granite, marble, and slate.

In 1929 a survey by the United States engineers showed 2,000,000 tons of freight potentially available annually. Now it is estimated that from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 would be available.

Direct connections for this area through Florida ports and waterways, with the Mississippi Valley and its great agricultural production, and with the oil producing areas of the Southwest could lead to a trade and manufacturing revival of unprecedented proportions. The opportunity is there if we will capitalize on it.

Florida and the Nation stand to gain enormously by the logical development of its waterways.

Knowing full well how many small counties are hard hit by adverse business conditions, I have proposed a county industrial rehabilitation plan which has attracted Nation-wide attention and endorsement from many officials and business leaders. It would extend help to counties which have lost population and developed unemployment problems, help them to be self-sustaining rather than have them resort to W. P. A. or similar programs. It provides funds for promotion, research, advertising, and other activities designed for the expansion of existing industries or the development of new industries through the utilization of the resources and labor of the several counties. Before counties can participate in the program, their respective States must have passed enabling legislation and matched the Federal funds allocated. Obviously such an undertaking is not without its difficulties, but at the same time it offers a challenge and an opportunity for counties which seek to be self-sustaining. It is now before Congress.

I am glad to say that plans are being made to assist small business in the post-war period on a scope never before attempted. Every type of small business is included, and every town and village will be able to benefit under the plans now outlined. These plans arise from a growing awareness that unless a great deal of practical assistance is given to small enterprises, their death rate will be very high in the period of reconversion from war to peacetime operations. And small business is extremely important because it has been the life of an independent citizenry and one of the chief supports of a democratic form of government. Lumber and naval stores operations are included in these plans.

Now I want to quote briefly from the Florida Times-Union's editorial page of December 11, 1943. This will be of interest to Panama City, Pensacola, Tallahassee, and other northwest Florida cities which have much at stake in the post-war commercial air program. I quote:

"The future of post-war commercial aviation looms larger. The spotlight has been thrown upon this matter of late by the report of the aviation subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, following an inspection of bases in Central and South America.

"Florida, vitally interested in hemispheric aviation, was represented on the subcommittee by R. F. SIKES, of the Third Congressional District. The group made a plane tour of 14,567 miles, and brought back some definite recommendations. Most important of these was the assertion that the United States should take immediate steps to secure post-war commercial aviation rights in Latin-American air installations.

"The United States furnishes a large market for many of the major products of South America. It is true also that in South America, products of the United States may find great opportunities for increased distribution. This should contribute to a steadily increasing trade, a cultural exchange, and a general unifying of the interests and the life of the people of the hemisphere.

"It is apparent that air transportation must have a most vital role in this tightening of the bonds of friendship and economy. Therefore, the sooner we prepare to implement and facilitate the development of the aerial arteries by which the process must be largely speeded, the better for us, and for our neighbors."

By way of comment let me say simply that we in the third district are already hard at work on this vital matter.

Likewise of greatest importance is the present prospect that the South will soon be freed from the unjust discrimination in freight rates which has held back southern progress for generations. Not only have unfair freight rates hindered the growth of southern manufacturers, commerce, and cities but this situation has prevented southern farmers from having the large and prosperous city markets that have meant so much to northern farmers, truckers, dairymen, stockmen, and poultrymen.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that in 1941, as the result of legislation passed by the Congress to provide a support-price policy and to establish floor prices, farm-crop prices have made strong increases. They were the first significant increases received by farmers since depression days, as they well remember. That year farm income went up 29 percent. Farm income was the highest since 1920. Since that time the demands of war have continued to increase farm-crop prices, but at the same time production costs have been advancing out of proportion. Today the farmer must have more money if he is to meet mounting food demands in the face of constantly increasing production costs. It is a case of simple justice to a third of the Nation's population which now is receiving not much more than a tenth of its income. Right-thinking Americans do not want to deprive the farmer of a decent living and his family of the good things of life. They know that no farm product should sell below parity based on present-day costs. Let me say, too, that there is no place in our agriculture for the old restrictions of A. A. A. days. It was not until the United States was well into the war program that the Department of Agriculture reluctantly gave up the production restrictions which had strait jacketed American agriculture for years. But when those paralyzing controls were eliminated there was an immediate tremendous increase in production despite great obstacles. These production controls must be removed permanently. That type of regimentation is out of place in America. We must find other means of adjusting our surplus production problems. The farmer wants to be, and should be, a working partner in our great national program.

I want to stress the fact that this is a time for realism, for the use of our best brains and our soundest experience. I recall a line of Scripture which should apply to the methods we use and the men who administer them—"Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them." We can't take chances on the future of this country.

I seek simplification and straightforwardness in government. I seek a Government which confidently leads its people through sound principles and sensible economies. I would be the last to reflect upon this Nation's great wartime achievements, but I seek also a successful home front. This is not impossible of accomplishment even in wartime. There are legitimate home-front differences. There are home-front weaknesses which can be and should be corrected by our Government. This I have argued time and again. I have frequently been concerned by

official muddling which is completely out of place in war. There are too many complicated regulations. Funds are being expended unnecessarily. There are too many Government employees. I resent interference in the constitutional rights of my State by Federal officials. And I resent activity by any person which leads to racial and class discord. But, like most people, I do not object to sacrifices. And I am glad to pull in harness with our leadership in order to bring victory at the earliest possible moment. I know that lack of faith in our democratic government and lack of faith in its world leadership cause disunity, and disunity in war can lead only to distress, suffering, and hardship. It can make the war last longer, and by making the war last longer, disunity kills American boys who otherwise would live to come back.

And now a personal word in conclusion.

For the great honors which have been bestowed upon me, I owe to you, the people of the Third District, an eternal debt of gratitude, and my humble abilities and the benefit of my experience are pledged faithfully to your service. The record of my work is one to which I respectfully invite your closest study.

I want you to help me carry on the work of our district, and I earnestly solicit your advice on the problems before us. To the many new citizens who are now with us, I extend a most cordial greeting and a warm welcome to northwest Florida, and my personal pledge of cooperation and service. From all of you, I ask your suggestions, and I want you to feel free to call on me at any time I can be of service. I will welcome the opportunity to serve you to the very best of my ability.

My friends, there are many vacant places in our communities. One after another of the finest young manhood of our land has gone out to meet death unafraid. And in one American home after another, broken hearts try to capture solace in the knowledge that these great sacrifices have not been made in vain. But oh, how hard it is, their cross to bear. My friends, the work of our hero dead is done, our work just begun. We cannot, we must not fail these men, for we know that they who are absent would have us carry on. Let us rededicate ourselves in their name to an untiring effort to win the war, to win the peace that follows, and in some distant day to find again the spirit that makes for peace on earth and good will among men.

Thank you. This is BOB SIKES, saying goodbye, and may God bless you all.

One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry of the Connecticut National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, last week marked an important anniversary for a large number of families residing in and near Hartford, Conn. It was just 3 years ago that the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry, Connecticut National Guard, left Hartford as part of the Forty-third Division for Camp Blanding, Fla. After spending a few months at Blanding, the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry went to Louisiana for maneuvers and, upon completion of these maneuvers, left for the southwest Pacific. During the past 2 years the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry, as well as other units of the Forty-third Division, have established a glorious record for themselves. The Forty-third Division has been commended by the War Department in a recent press release. All of New England is proud of the Forty-third Division and Hartford, Conn., is especially proud of the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry. May I express the sincere hope that before another anniversary rolls around, the members of this regiment will have returned to their homes, at least for an extended furlough, even if the god of war has not brought this war to its successful conclusion by that time.

Barkley's Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of Spencer Canary, editor of the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune:

BARKLEY'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

To Americans who for the past 11 years have looked with growing apprehension upon the Chief Executive's grasp of power from the Congress of the United States, Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY's statement in the Senate Wednesday seems worthy a place in history alongside our Revolutionary fathers' Declaration of Independence.

Referring to President Roosevelt's statement in vetoing the tax bill that it was not a tax bill but a relief bill—"relief not for the needy but for the greedy," Senator BARKLEY declared: "This is a calculated and deliberate assault on the legislative integrity of every Member of the Congress of the United States."

A hundred years ago the Senator's fellow Kentucky statesman, Henry Clay, declared he "would rather be right than be President." In stating his purpose to resign the majority leadership of the Democratic Party in the Senate Senator BARKLEY made a declaration which, like Clay's, will be repeated a century hence. He declared there is "something more precious to me than any honor the Senate, or the people, or the President can confer on me. That is the approval of my own conscience. I am grateful that my happiness does not depend on the continuance of my office as majority leader for a single day more."

The apt comparisons which Senator BARKLEY made ripped the President's veto message to pieces, and it should be read by everyone as published in the Sentinel-Tribune Wednesday; but, regardless of the merits or demerits of the tax bill, the thing that most thrills apprehensive Americans is that Senator BARKLEY raised the Congress of the United States to the place where it belongs under the Constitution—the place of legislation by duly-elected representatives "of the people, by the people, for the people"—a declaration by another great Kentuckian, Abraham Lincoln.

When one considers how closely Senator BARKLEY has worked with President Roosevelt during the last 12 years, the strength of his outraged declaration against the rape of Jeffersonian Democracy's principles is better appreciated. For 7 years he has been the administration's leader in the Senate. To him fell the task of convincing fellow Senators that support should be given the President for the bills he has sought. His has often been a grueling assignment; and Senator BARKLEY risked his own popularity with his fellow legislators in doing it at times. Before the President vetoed this tax bill, Senator BARKLEY not only advised him not to veto it but implored him not to do so.

What thanks is given him? The President stamps him and every Member of Congress who voted for the tax bill as being more willing to give relief to the greedy than to the needy. He thereby impugns the good faith, the conscience, and the intelligence of representatives of the people chosen to make our laws.

Thus the declaration of independence from the Chief Executive and the verbal castigations given him must have racked the emotions of Senator BARKLEY. He is no chameleon. He does not change the color of his political principles with the passing throng. What his fellow Democrats of the Senate will do today remains for the news columns to tell; but, certainly, if ever a man deserved well from his fellow Americans for his real statesmanship, Senator BARKLEY is such a man.

The Soldiers' No-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio speech delivered by me on Saturday, March 11, 1944:

I would like to talk to you about the soldiers' vote. As you know, the soldiers' vote bill has been discussed here in Congress for 4 or 5 months. Recently the House of Representatives appointed conferees and the Senate appointed conferees, and the two groups have been meeting trying to reach some agreement, some compromise.

And now the conferees of the two Houses have reached an agreement. They have reported out a compromise soldiers' voting bill. The Senate is going to consider the new compromise soldiers' vote bill this coming Monday. The House will be considering it soon afterward. This so-called compromise bill is a very bad bill. I am strongly opposed to it because it doesn't aid soldiers to vote; it restricts soldiers from voting. And yet it is very likely that this phony compromise will pass both the Senate and the House and go to the President. I don't know whether the President will veto it or not, but I hope he does.

This new compromise, which I call the soldiers' no-vote bill and which appears so likely to pass, will effectively keep from seven to eight million men now in the armed forces from voting. I have carefully checked this bill. I have considered the approximate number of men overseas and those at home. I have before me the figures for the approximate flying time between the United States

and our principal foreign bases. I have considered the State laws and the approximate number of men from each State.

In my considered judgment, if this bill passes less than 5 percent of the men overseas and less than 20 percent of the men in this country will get to vote.

If any of you people listening have sons or relatives in the armed forces, and you want them to participate in the democracy they are fighting to defend, then you must protest this soldiers' no-vote bill.

As a matter of fact, many experts feel that fewer soldiers will vote if this bill is passed than if no bill is passed. I agree with that. I think this soldiers' no-vote bill will restrict more men who can now vote, than it will add men able to vote.

The reason for that is because 2 years ago, Congress passed a very good measure called Public Law 712. This Public Law 712 said that a soldier did not have to pay a poll tax, nor did he have to appear in person to get his ballot.

This new soldiers' no-vote bill effectively repeals Public Law 712. Under the new bill if a soldier has not paid his poll tax, his vote can be thrown out. Under the new bill, if a soldier has not personally appeared to get his ballot (in those States which require personal appearance), his vote can be thrown out.

That is why I feel that this no-vote bill is worse than Public Law 712. It takes away all the good provisions of Public Law 712 and puts back nothing in return. This no-vote bill prohibits more soldiers from voting than it permits.

Why has this soldiers' voting been so whittled down to where now it is not only nothing, but worse than nothing? Do you want to know the truth? What columnists call the real, inside dope? Well, this is it:

There are 11,000,000 men in the armed forces. The Republicans, for reasons best known to themselves, think that most of those eleven million are going to vote for President Roosevelt. So, the Republicans have been moving heaven and earth to see that as few of those eleven million as possible get to vote. That is the unvarnished truth.

That is called hard-boiled politics. And we have had it before on this soldier-voting question. This same question of the soldiers' vote came up during the Civil War. Only at that time, it was the Democratic Party that tried to block the soldiers' vote, and it was the Republican Party that was working for it. Today, the party positions are completely reversed.

If it were not for politics, the American soldier would be balloting in this coming election. He would be voting a simple, direct, Federal ballot (in case his State ballot did not arrive). And, he would be doing it under the Constitution with complete legality.

There is nothing unconstitutional about a Federal ballot, nor is there anything unconstitutional about the Green-Lucas bill which gives the soldier a Federal ballot. Under the Green-Lucas bill, the Federal Government simply drops a bunch of ballots on the doorsteps of the different States and says, in effect:

"We hand you herewith the Federal ballots of your soldier sons. We, the Federal Government took away hundreds of thousands of your young men and stationed them in distant parts for the defense of our country. Our transportation is desperately needed for war supplies and these young men, through no fault of their own have been unable to communicate satisfactorily with you, their State. We, the Federal Government are responsible for this condition, and so, to all those unable to receive a State ballot because of war conditions, we have supplied a secret Federal ballot. It is transmitted to you as the expression of your soldier sons. You may use it or not, as you wish."

Now that completely avoids the constitutional question.

Also, there is no conflict between State and Federal ballots. Federal ballots only exist when the State ballots have failed to arrive. The Federal ballot is a reserve, a sort of back stop. It is a consolation ballot which the soldier receives when his State ballot does not come. A man cannot truthfully say he wants to substitute a State for a Federal ballot, because the Federal ballot only comes into being in situations where no such substitution is physically possible.

If it were not for the war there would not be the great need for a Federal ballot. But under wartime conditions, State ballots simply cannot get to the soldiers overseas, or even in this country in any large numbers.

Every Member of Congress knows that. We have the full report from the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Transport Command. We know that already the Army has to send much of its air mail by ship because air transportation is being used for war materials; that the air transportation is so tight that the Army cannot always even carry all its V-mail, and we know that the average State ballot, with its extra envelopes, for secrecy, and its instructions for voters, even when printed on thin paper, takes up the weight of 1,000 V-mail letters on microfilm. So, we can see how impossible it will be to fly millions of State ballots overseas and back again.

We know that there are 10,000 transfers a day in the Army, that millions of requests for a State ballot will have to be forwarded and reforwarded as the men are transferred from one Army camp to another. Every Member of Congress knows all that, because the Army and the Navy have constantly testified that few troops in the United States and fewer overseas will get to vote under State procedures.

And there is why all the hullabaloo over the Federal ballot. There wouldn't be all this political interest if State ballots could get to everyone except a few hundred thousand troops. But the physical fact of transportation dictates that for some 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 troops, it is going to be a Federal ballot or nothing. That is why it is a political question. These 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 men can be disfranchised or not depending upon the act of Congress.

If those millions are to vote, it will require a maximum good will on the part of Congress which writes the law, and also on the part of the people who administer it. Well, there is very little of good will toward the American soldier written into this new, compromise soldiers' no-vote bill.

Let me give you three specific examples of why this is a bad bill:

Under this compromise, a soldier in the continental limits of the United States cannot secure a Federal ballot under any conditions. Notice this hamstringing restriction. I submit that if a Federal ballot is legal for men overseas it is legal for men in this country. If a man in this country applies for a State ballot, and then just the day before it arrives he is suddenly transferred clear to the other end of the United States, so that by the time his mail finally reaches him it is too late to be sent back to the State in time to be counted; if that occurs, which is a condition of war beyond a soldier's control, then why can't a man at home get a Federal ballot? If a man overseas gets a ballot under those conditions, why can't the man at home? If it is legal in one case, it is legal in the other. To restrict the Federal ballot only to troops overseas is simply a purposeful maneuver to block off from the ballot a major segment of the American Army.

The second example: This new soldiers' vote bill says that the Governor of a State must certify that a Federal ballot is authorized by State laws. Now get that wording: Authorized by State laws.

Now some States require a poll tax before you can vote. It is in the State law. But the Federal Government has passed Public Law 712 which says that soldiers do not have to pay a poll tax. But that is Federal law not State law.

At present no Governor from any poll-tax State can certify that a Federal ballot will be acceptable under his State's law, for it can't. But Governors could so certify if two words were added: or Federal. If those two words were added and the wording changed to read: Authorize by State or Federal law, that would allow Governors from the South to take advantage of Public Law 712.

Public Law 712 is a legal, constitutional law, which has never even been questioned by any of the States. Yet, the soldiers from the South are not given the aid of Public Law 712 by the addition of two simple words. In the new soldiers' vote bill, those two words are out, and a poll tax on soldiers is in.

A third example where this new bill is carefully calculated to hold down the soldiers' vote is in the date on which the Governor must certify that Federal ballots are accepted under his State laws.

At first the Governors were to be given to August 15 to pass proper soldier-vote legislation. Later, that was chiseled down to August 1, and then it was chiseled down still further to July 15. That means the States will have to act more rapidly. And also, it means that fewer States will be able to ratify the Federal ballot, because some States require a time delay to change their voting procedure.

There are many other examples. But most of them are too complex to explain easily. This new soldiers' vote bill is the most complicated, confused thing you ever saw. I could go on at great length to point out how in one clause they make it possible for the Governors of some States to certify that a Federal ballot would be O. K. and then in the very next clause they add a new restriction so that the Governor can't.

Suffice it to say that this new soldiers' vote bill, which will be considered by Congress next week, will effectively keep many millions of American soldiers both at home and abroad from voting. And many, if not most, of the restrictions which will keep them from voting will not be because of State law, but because of the bad clauses in the new soldiers' vote law.

The average American doesn't seem to know all this. The average American seems to feel that, "Oh, well, the soldiers will get the vote somehow. It will all work itself out in the end."

Well, we play politics for keeps down here. If some seven or eight million men can be kept from voting, that might determine the outcome of the elections. This soldiers' vote business is big-time political business.

I think it is one of the duties we have here in this country to support those men overseas in every way possible. They have no one here to speak for them, or to fight their battles, except you, their friends and relatives. If you are indifferent to their issues, why then there is nothing the soldiers can do about it.

If you think that the soldier should vote, then let the Members of Congress from your district know how you feel about it. If you don't know who your Congressman is, or how he voted, call up your local newspaper and find out. I hope you will help the men overseas by doing all you can to request that your Member of Congress give the American soldier a chance to participate in the democracy he is fighting to preserve.

Farm Machinery for the U. N. R. R. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter and a statement sent to me by Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, relating to farm machinery for U. N. R. R. A. and the liberated areas:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
March 21, 1944.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: In accordance with your request, as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, for information about the handling of farm machinery for the U. N. R. R. A. program, I am sending you herewith a statement on the facts and policy relating to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

FARM MACHINERY FOR U. N. R. R. A. AND THE LIBERATED AREAS

1. No farm machinery has yet been procured for U. N. R. R. A. and no United States funds will be used for that purpose until money is appropriated for U. N. R. R. A. by the Congress.

2. The so-called "U. N. R. R. A. program" for which the War Production Board made an allocation to F. E. A. of 30,000 tons of steel is a misnomer. This allocation, when put into production, is primarily intended to meet the farm-machinery requirements of the liberated areas during the period of military responsibility, when the equipment will be distributed under the authority of the theater commander. No procurement under this allocation has as yet been undertaken nor will it be undertaken until a definitive farm-machinery program for the military period is worked out with the military authorities. It should be clearly understood that the purpose of this allocation—or any allocation—is merely to enable machinery to be scheduled within the production schedules of domestic farm machinery manufacturers. Such a step is always necessary far in advance of any actual contracts that may later be let and is desired both by the War Production Board and the War Food Administration and by the manufacturers themselves, so that they can plan for the period involved. It does not in any sense represent the commitment of funds. It does not in any way guarantee that delivery will be made to the agency obtaining the allocation.

3. The farm-machinery program for liberated areas introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an U. N. R. R. A. program is a program of estimated needs developed by United States and United Kingdom officials for the purpose of planning and appraising production possibilities in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. This program is intended to cover the period of military responsibility in the liberated areas and also to apply toward the subsequent period of civilian responsibility. It includes the requirements of the countries which will be able to pay cash for their supplies and represents supplies to be obtained, not only from the United States, but from other sources as well. No procurement action has as yet been taken against this program. No contracts have been let, and no money has been obligated.

4. In the meantime, U. N. R. R. A. is in the process of formulating its own estimates of farm machinery requirements for the period of civilian responsibility and will soon present them to the combined boards and to the F. E. A. for consideration in relation to the impact on the supply situation in the United States and elsewhere and for recommendations as to allocations. In formulating these estimates, U. N. R. R. A. will naturally give careful consideration to the United States-United Kingdom program referred to above. No procurement with United States funds against U. N. R. R. A.'s estimates, when formulated, will be made until money is appropriated for U. N. R. R. A. by the Congress.

5. Estimates of the farm-machinery needs of the liberated areas will have to be kept flexible. No one now knows, for example, when the need for farm machinery in a liberated area will arise, in which of several potential liberated areas it will first arise, or precisely how great that need will be when it actually arises. Nor can the full extent of the increased production of farm machinery as a result of the easing in other war contracts be ascertained with certainty now. Domestic production of farm machinery, as a whole, has already been authorized at a level as high as that ever attained in this country before 1941. Further increases in production are likely if other war contracts decline.

6. It is clear that occupied areas when liberated will be in extremely urgent need of farm machinery of all kinds. Farm machinery will enable the liberated peoples both to put into production and to harvest many millions of acres of land which would otherwise remain unproductive. Unless the liberated peoples are put in a position to help themselves in this way, it will be impracticable and impossible for them to obtain the consumable supplies which are essential to the maintenance of life and health. Helping them to help themselves in this way is the least expensive and the most effective method of providing relief.

7. It is similarly clear that farm machinery, to meet the urgent needs of the liberated peoples, should be ready for immediate delivery when the occupied areas are first liberated. It is particularly important that farm machinery should be promptly made available in order to catch the earliest crop year. If a crop season is missed because of the lack of farm machinery, a whole growing year is lost. Production should, therefore, be started as soon as possible on at least the minimum portion of the farm machinery requirements which the United Nations will be called upon to furnish to the liberated peoples.

8. It is, of course, conceivable that military operations may not progress as rapidly as now hoped for and, therefore, that not all of the farm machinery produced for the liberated areas will be needed at the exact time when the finished machinery is available. In such a case the finished farm machinery being almost entirely standard equipment would to the extent possible be made available to American farmers. This would, of course, be in addition to the 1,799,573 tons of materials allocated for the production of farm machinery for American farmers for the period from July 1, 1944 to July 1, 1945. This would mean then that the demands of American farmers for farm equipment would be satisfied more fully at an earlier date than would have been the case if production had not been begun to meet the potential needs of the liberated peoples.

Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that one of the outstanding problems we have to contend with is the disposal of surplus property. Hon. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, delivered an excellent address before the chamber of commerce at Manchester, N. H., on this subject, and under the permission granted me I include his address as part of my remarks. The address follows:

I suspect that all of us here tonight agree that the most important issue before this country today is the winning of this war. Everything we are and everything we believe in is in jeopardy until this war is won. I wonder if there is a man in this room who would prize life itself if he had to live that life under the yoke of the Nazis or the Japs. I realize that this is a strong statement. It might be well to think it over before you go to bed tonight. It is a good way to check up and to discover just what your own personal stake in victory is.

Second in importance to the winning of the war and of primary importance once the war is won is the problem of securing a just and enduring peace. Just as everything we are depends upon victory in the war, so, too, does everything we hope to be depend upon a lasting peace. For the second time in a generation the dogs of war have been unleashed without provocation upon the people of this country. On neither occasion did the American people shrink from their responsibilities in those two great conflicts. But we do shrink in horror from the stupidity of a bungling peace which begets more wars and which threatens to visit a repetition of the same disasters on our children. I think I can state by common consent that without victory in this war and a just and enduring peace life will hold very little for any of us.

But when these two have been accomplished they must be implemented by the practicalities of everyday life, by the assurance of a continuing high standard of living, by the assurance of permanent employment for all who wish to work, by a confidence that when this war is won and the peace has been secured, we can then with assurance resume the task of making of this America the happiest, most prosperous land in the world.

Many problems will require solution before we know we are on a safe, sound road back. I believe one of the most important problems is our immediate post-war economy, for unless our post-war economy is established on sound principles at the earliest possible moment after the cessation of nostilities, all of the institutions which have made America great and powerful will be in temporary jeopardy at least. Perhaps the phase of this problem that is first in point of time is the problem of the dosposal of post-war surpluses, and it is of this subject that I wish to talk to you tonight.

Yours was a timely invitation. This group of industrial and commercial leaders of Manchester, N. H., constitute a most appropriate audience for the discussion of post-war surpluses, and I think that it is fortuitous that this discussion is being held, not in a great

metropolis, but in a representative American city. For many of the objectives of the disposal of post-war surpluses are directed at the rehabilitation and strengthening of medium-sized and small manufacturers and merchants.

I am well aware of the danger of discussing post-war surpluses or post-war anything at a time when we are barely on the threshold of driving back the oppressors. This war is far from over and I want to assure you that those people who are thinking and talking about post-war problems are not doing so because they believe peace is imminent. They are working on these problems now because they are aware of the complexity of the problems, the difficulties of solving them, and the tremendous importance of arriving at proper solutions well in advance of the time for the execution of those post-war plans.

The importance that the Congress attaches to the post-war problem is evidenced by the fact that there are now five committees of the House and Senate which are concerning themselves with general problems of post-war planning and ten committees of the House and the Senate which are investigating specific problems all of which relate to our post-war economy. The entire membership of the House and the Senate are alert to the problem and I am sure will be prompt and helpful in passing whatever legislation will be required to implement our present governmental machinery.

You may be able to appreciate how vitally every person in this room is interested in the sensible disposal of post-war surpluses when I remind you that the United States since entering the war has invested in defense-plant properties $15,000,000,000. To be sure some of these plants will be retained by the Government in a stand-by status. But the majority of them will be disposed of. I don't think I need to spell out for any industrialist or realtor in this audience the catastrophe that would result from the indiscriminate dumping of these properties upon the market.

The Army and the Navy since Pearl Harbor have bought literally millions of shoe, sheets, shirts, flashlights, automobiles, underwear, and every conceivable consumers' commodity. For instance, for the north African invasion there were required more than 700,000 different items of equipment and supply. There were 390 different items of clothing and individual equipment. The Signal Corps had more than 10,000 different items. The Medical Corps had 68,000 different items. The engineers in north Africa had more than 100,000 different items, including everything from bridges and bulldozers to storage tanks. There were 250,000 different ordnance items.

The total war activities' expenditures for fiscal years 1943 and 1944 are estimated at $172,000,000,000. Much of this huge sum was used to purchase goods which may be surplus at the end of the war. I am sure I don't need to point out to any Manchester retail merchant what would happen to the value of his stocks and inventories if these surpluses were dumped on the market or were sold in tremendous lots at sacrifice prices to speculators.

My talk to you folks tonight is predicated on the assumption that there will be great surpluses after the war. It doesn't require a brilliant mind to conclude that if we win this war there will be a tremendous surplus, and I know we are going to win it. I have met some people who seem to have the idea that a post-war surplus is a result of bungled planning, and that our armed services should be able to plan their procurement with such exactitude that the last can of beans will be eaten by the last soldier mustered out. I beg to differ. History has never known a victory without some surplus, nor a defeated nation which had at its disposal at the time of its surrender an over-all surplus adequate for continued military resistance and for the home front.

When a campaign is planned our General Staff must assume the worst possible complications. It must assume that the weather will turn for the worst, it must presume that our enemy will be astute, it must anticipate break-downs in a certain percentage of automotive and combat equipment. The General Staff plans for all of those adverse contingencies. Then it concluded that it will require 4 months to take the objective of that campaign, and it accumulates vast stores for that 4-month campaign—with a generous margin of reserve for those unforeseen contingencies which, somehow or other, develop in every campaign. In formulating these plans for supplies and equipment the General Staff is likewise moved by the fact that generally speaking the army with the largest amount of the best equipment is the army that suffers the fewest casualties and I know that we all applaud and approve a General Staff that is mindful of the safety of its men regardless of the expenditure of matériel.

The tremendous stores of supplies and equipment are accumulated. The zero hour arrives and the offensive is on. The weather continues to be on our side. The terrain is less difficult than was anticipated, the expected percentage of breakdowns fails to occur, the enemy makes two or three serious mistakes, and the campaign that was planned for 4 months achieves its objective in 2 months. One of the inevitable results of an easier than expected victory is a surplus—a surplus that would not have existed had that campaign lasted 4 months.

May I suggest to you that in this war as in every war, there may come a time when one battleship, when one squadron of planes, when one battalion of field artillery may tip the scales in a minor engagement which will tip the scales in a larger engagement. Believe me it would be folly if the procurement branches of our armed services didn't make sure that we had that extra battleship, that extra squadron of planes, that extra battalion of field artillery when that time comes—and of course there will be extras backing up extras. Poor planning? Oh, no! The very best planning, and oh, how the Japs and the Nazis wish they had the kind of a surplus some of our folks are beginning to worry about.

I know that many people in this audience recall the amounts of surpluses left after the last war. I doubt if there are many people here who approved the manner of disposal of those surpluses. Stated briefly, the problem is to avoid those mistakes when we dispose of this war's huge surplus. We must dispose of it in a manner that will not only do no violence to our post-war economy, but in a way that will help to rehabilitate and develop our post-war economy and revive our current wartime economy.

I am sure that many of you have read in the newspapers over the week end the splendid report of Bernard Baruch and John Hancock on post-war problems. Perhaps some of you have read that part of the report that related to post-war surpluses. Since the time this report was given to the President an Executive order has been issued setting up a Surplus War Property Administration. Under that order the disposal of all consumer goods, other than food, is placed in the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. The War Foods Administration is made responsible for the disposal of food, the Maritime Commission is made responsible for the disposal of ships and maritime property, and capital and producers' goods, including plants, equipment, materials, scrap, and other industrial property are to be disposed of by a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Executive order provides for the appointment of a Surplus War Property Policy Board composed of representatives of 12 Government departments and agencies of which the Treasury Department is one.

I am sure all of you can appreciate the concern of the Treasury as the central fiscal agency of the Government in the over-all post-war problem. Perhaps some of you are wondering why the Treasury is to play such an active part in the disposal of particular types of commodities. For many years the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department has been one of the largest buyers of merchandise in the world. We buy whatever is needed for the operation of all Government departments and bureaus except the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and Government corporations. We handle over a million different items, and in the last 10 years we have bought for Government departments, for lend-lease, and for the Red Cross more than $5,000,000,000 worth of goods. You see the 5,000 employees of the Treasury Procurement Division have had some experience in business.

I think it is obvious that I am in no position to speak for the Surplus War Property Administration nor for the Surplus War Property Policy Board which has not yet met. Nevertheless I think it might be helpful to you if I told you something of the thinking that has been going on in the minds of men who will be charged with disposing of these surpluses.

The great concern of many men in industry, and in retail and wholesale business is that when this war is over there will be left hanging over the head of American business, such vast stores of surplus property that it will suffocate all initiative of private industry to reconvert from the job of war production, which it has been doing so well, to manufacture once again its normal peacetime commodities.

I am well aware that a not inconsiderable proportion of these surpluses can also be used to great advantage for the relief and rehabilitation of destitute populations in many tragic parts of the world. I am convinced however that regardless of our desire and our determination to bring aid and comfort to these people through goods and equipment not necessary for our own productive efficiency there may still be left awaiting disposal a tremendous accumulation of goods of all kinds. Occasionally it is suggested that perhaps the easiest solution to our problem would be the destruction of these goods. Speaking for myself I advise you that I can forsee no combination of circumstances which from the economic, social or moral point of view could in any way justify the destruction of 5 cents worth of usable goods.

Still other people suggest that we can best promote the reconversion of industry by locking up these goods in sealed warehouses and leaving them there until some future date when they can be introduced into our markets without jeopardy to our economy. I find little merit in that suggestion. I see no one in this audience tonight who would be willing to invest $50,000 in a shoe factory if he knew that in a Government warehouse in Boston there were stored 10,000,000 pairs of shoes which could be released upon the market at any time. It is my conclusion that such surpluses as remain unexpended in this country will hang like the sword of Damocles over American industry until they have been absorbed by our domestic markets.

Today the best solution of this problem seems to be the rapid and equitable distribution of all such goods as fast as the armed services find them to be in surplus. As long as the war lasts the markets will be hungry for practically everything which a civilian can use. Even when peace comes there will still be great shortages of most civilian goods until private industry can reconvert to peacetime production. And I am not worried about industry lacking for markets after we distribute this surplus. The civilian demand for all commodities is so great—and civilian purchasing power so vast—that industry will

have clear sailing if our surpluses are out of the way.

The essence of the whole plan seems to be timing. Already the services have started to turn over to us some commodities which are either temporarily or permanently surplus to their needs. Insofar as it is possible, it is our intention to dispose of these commodities through the regular channels of trade. We do not intend to sell them to speculators. And if anyone is suggesting to you that you invest your money in a concern being organized to buy up Government surpluses, I would recommend that you forego the opportunity, because I can assure you the Treasury Department intends to do business with the people who have been doing business up and down the main streets of our American communities year in and year out, and we are determined to have no truck with any concern that is organized for the purpose of making money out of the war.

Between now and the end of the war, in most commodities we shall enjoy a seller's market. Today there exist unsatisfied demands in the civilian economy, and not only are civilians short of many commodities but the retail stores of this country, the hardware stores, the plumbing supply concerns, the dry goods stores, are short of things to sell. It is our conclusion that we can provide the most equitable distribution of these commodities among the civilian population by disposing of them through regularly established trade channels. We believe that by doing this we shall not only achieve the highest possible degree of equity of distribution but we shall be able to resuscitate many failing retail concerns. It is our intention that the people who are in position to perform a useful service in the disposition of these articles shall be allowed to make a fair, honorable profit on the transaction. It is our determination that the ultimate consumer will not suffer from unreasonable mark-ups by any of these distributors. We are resolved that such commodities as come into our possession will be disposed of in lots of a size which will give the small-town merchant the same opportunity to fill his requirements as the largest department store in the land enjoys.

We intend to conduct this business in a goldfish bowl with every record and every transaction open to the whole wide world for examination. Following Secretary Morgenthau's long-time policy of publicly announcing the details of any new Treasury venture before it goes into effect we intend to make known to the Congress, to the trade, and to the public the technicques to be used in disposing of various commodities. And if our plans are unsound, there will be ample opportunity for anyone to help us correct them.

I am hopeful that the experience we gain in the coming months in disposing of such relatively small amounts of surplus commodities as are now becoming available will be helpful to us in perfecting our techniques of distribution before huge surpluses become available. I think you will agree with me that we would be derelict in our duty if we failed to make all of our plans now to dispose of postwar surpluses. I don't think there is any man in the country who is smart enough to walk into his office the morning after the armistice and ever catch up with this problem unless long before that armistice his plans are perfected.

For instance, it may very well happen that it will be impossible to move all different kinds of commodities at the same time. Obviously, the thing to do is to first move those goods which private industry can most quickly reconvert to manufacture. In order that we will know at all times what priority we should accord the scheduling of the various commodities, it is our purpose to establish a small section which will conduct continuing studies of the three factors involved in this particular problem. These three factors in each type of commodity are: 1. The probable postwar surplus; 2. the probable civilian shortage; and 3, the probable length of time it will take industry to reconvert to manufacture that particular type of commodity.

The reason why I say this study must be continuing is because all three factors vary from month to month. Even the last factor—the length of time required for a given industry to reconvert—varies. Many of these industries are using in their present war production much machinery it would use in civilian production. But that machinery is wearing out. How much of it will be available for civilian production depends upon the length of the war.

In planning the distribution of these consumer commodities, the Treasury Department intends to rely heavily upon the advice of individual businessmen and upon the counsel of trade associations. I am confident that we shall encounter no reluctance on the part of any American businessman to leave his own interests and come to Washington to assist us in solving this problem. I am sure that every businessman will realize that unless this problem is solved for his particular type of commodity his services back home will be of little value. Accordingly, in the very near future the Treasury Department will invite to Washington many representatives of the merchandise industry. We expect to call upon the experience of chain stores, large department stores, and small retail merchants for our problem is the problem of every type of merchandiser. We expect to form committees for each category of consumers goods and we will ask each committee to formulate for us two plans of distribution—the first to be operative during the period from now until the end of the war, and the second to plan for the distribution of the vast surpluses that will follow the end of the war.

Throughout this war there has been magnificent cooperation of American industry and American labor with their Government. Never have we known such an inspiring example of teamwork. I bespeak for the Government a continuation of this cooperation in a joint effort to solve the problems of peace. If we can look forward to a continuation of this same close working partnership between labor and industry and Government, then there is little doubt that we can efficiently convert the destructive process of war into constructive processes of peace—there is little doubt in my mind that we can transform these wartime surpluses, which today appear to many as a threat to our economy, into a bulwark of national welfare and national power.

Yes; I would like to suggest to you that these surpluses about which we worry today can be a great blessing to our Nation. They constitute established wealth—usable national assets. If they are administered wisely and courageously, they will contribute to the national well-being. We can use some of them effectively to control run-away prices and thus curb inflation. Much of our surpluses of partly finished goods and of the tools which equip our great war plants can be used to hasten industrial reconversion, to stimulate industry and commerce, and to speed reemployment. Vast quantities of war plant machine tools can be used to replace old or worn-out tools in civilian production—with the result that America's new peacetime manufacturing plants can become the last word in efficiency. In that way we can maintain our low-cost mass production of goods, and at the same time preserve our wage and living standards. Finally, the surplus wealth of every kind which will be ours when the war ends will be a tremendous asset to us in our task of helping to reconstitute a free world and will add to the weight of our words at the peace table.

I have every confidence that this great democracy which is successfully meeting the challenge of total war will, with equal success, solve the problems of total peace.

Your Congress—And the Handicaps Under Which It Operates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a radio speech delivered by me over station WHP, Harrisburg, Pa., on March 12, 1944. This covers some recent developments in the Federal Government which seem to me of great importance to every citizen of the United States.

In a number of my speeches back home I have called attention to one of the great difficulties which faces your Congress and which gives those who seek its destruction and disintegration as one of the three coordinate branches of the Government an opportunity to disparage and belittle it through misrepresentation, and by obscuring the true nature of a legislative body. Legislative bodies really cannot act directly, except on an occasional instance. It is true that Congress does pass the laws which lay down the broad general principles which control the actions of the citizens of the United States and their rights. After these laws are passed by the Congress, then the execution and enforcement of those laws lies entirely with in the jurisdiction of the executive department of the Government. All too frequently we hear the cry, "Why doesn't Congress do this? Or that?" when the doing must, in the nature of things, be done by others. A deliberative body of 531 can declare policies, appropriate money for others to spend, and so forth. It cannot act as a unit, that is, as an individual or as a person, can and does act. It cannot build roads and bridges.

The Executive appoints every administrator and agent of the Government and only a few of these even need to be confirmed by the Senate. Furthermore, in general, the Executive can remove or dismiss these men at will, and so they are solely responsible to the Executive—and not to the Congress—for their actions. These men can and do make the orders and regulations—as distinguished from the broad general laws and policies—which today govern you and control your every action under the present extensive regimentation under which we live. They are the bureaucrats, supreme in their own domain, responsible solely to their immediate superiors and ultimately to the Chief Executive. If they carry out the law in a way not intended by the Congress, the citizens' remedy lies in the courts. More and more the courts tend to deny appeal and thereby leave the bureaucrats' supremacy undisputed. In other words, as soon as a statute is placed on the books, or as soon as any agency or bureau or department of Government is created, then its administration lies entirely within the hands of the Executive. (You must understand this if you are to understand Congress and the handicaps under which it operates). This caused one noted statesman of long ago to say that a

bad law well administered is better and more in the public interest than a good one badly administered. This is an obvious exaggeration and overstatement, yet one so striking that it sticks in the mind, and one containing such a large grain of truth that it is well worth remembering.

The basic controls which Congress does have are the powers of the purse and that of levying and collecting taxes, plus the relatively few remaining powers not yet delegated. Congress can eliminate agencies, or in practice force them to change their mode of conduct or their policies, either by paring down or cutting off entirely the money to run those agencies. A slow process perhaps, but deadly effective in the long run. Yet here again Congress too often meets the obstacles that a badly managed bureau, nevertheless, is one performing functions vital to the war effort and which render its continuance essential. Another control which Congress has, but one not nearly so quick or direct, is that of investigation, frequently followed by new legislation based upon its findings. The trouble here is that the results are known only after a large amount of harm and damage has been done. You see, until there is trouble, no reason to investigate exists. But frequently Congress does thus stop existing evils, either through turning the spotlight of publicity upon the evil or by corrective legislation. Sometimes past wrongs are remedied also, as in the case of the renegotiation refunds, when many corporations and individuals paid back large war profits voluntarily. There is a good deal of "locking the stable door after the horse is stolen" involved, but it represents an effort to act as directly as the nature of a legislative body will permit.

PRESENT CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Why I mention all this today is because at present there is a certain amount of conflict along three different lines between the executive department and the Congress. These disputes are very important, and go to the root of our republican form of government, and I would like to point out to you just what they are, briefly. First of all, Congress' power to investigate has been attacked by the refusal of the executive to permit certain people to testify before Congressional investigating committees. Here is a specific case. Early in January or February of 1943, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the War and Navy Departments recommended to the President that the control of the Radio Intelligence Division of the Federal Communications Commission be transferred to the Army in the interest of winning the war quickly. Later the House appointed a select committee to investigate the F. C. C. For some months it has been holding hearings. Eventually it sought to discover about this communication by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The President wrote a letter to Secretary of the Navy Knox, and Secretary of War Stimson, instructing them to refuse to permit any officer to testify, and to produce certain documentary evidence on this subject for the benefit of the committee. The reason he gave was that to do so would be "incompatible with the public interest." It is important to note that he did not say that information of military value to the enemy might be disclosed and hat he acted as self-appointed judge and jury of what was "incompatible with the public interest."

Inasmuch as this branch of the F. C. C. had been handling many foreign broadcasts, it seems logical that its control should rest with the Army. Yet this question might be open to argument, and in the absence of complete information I will not express an opinion about that. The real crux of the matter is that if the Congress, through its duly authorized committees, cannot secure testimony from all those in position to know, then Congress, and its committees, is not in position to make the correct decisions in the matter, and therefore its power of investigation and, collaterally, its power of intelligent legislation, are being directly interfered with and curtailed by the Executive.

Later this same matter came before the Appropriations Committee in connection with the appropriations for the F. C. C. including its Radio Intelligence Division. The Appropriations Committee ascertained that the letters written early in 1943 by the joint Chiefs of Staff had never been withdrawn by the military. In view of that circumstance, and in view of the absence of other information they cut the appropriation for this particular branch of the F. C. C. and the House and Senate supported their action. This latter action indicates how Congress can exercise control through the power of the purse, for the net effect should be to force the Radio Intelligence Division into the War Department because it no longer will have the money to conduct it—unless it is given money from some other source than Congress. I will touch on this question later. I hope sometime also to give you a summary of the Jonathan Daniel's case in the Senate, which involves this same point.

Another conflict involves appropriations. A striking example was brought to light by Representative ENGLE of Michigan in connection with the far-famed Pentagon Building. Congress appropriated $35,000,000 for this project and was assured that would be sufficient. It has cost $86,000,000, but those responsible for the project never came back to Congress to ask for or to get more money. In all probability the Congress would have given them more money on a proper showing that it had become necessary for the completion of the building, and for the protection of the investment already made, and if it had been shown that no unreasonable waste had occurred. However, what was done, was that the money was taken from funds appropriated by Congress for other purposes. They took $24,700,000 from a fund appropriated to the War Department to "expedite production of equipment and supplies." They took an additional $16,000,000 from a special lump sum appropriated to the Chief of Engineers for "engineering service," and $10,640,000 from funds given to the Commissioner of Public Roads for "access" roads. If the Executive, or any Government department, or agency, uses funds for other purposes than those for which the Congress specifically granted them, or if the Executive transfers appropriated money around about as he sees fit and uses it where he thinks it best, then (no matter how wise his decisions) the stark fact remains that the power of the purse is being taken away from the Congress. Thereby a most grave issue is created. Thereby freedom is endangered.

Friends and constituents of mine in the district have asked me time and time again whether it would ever be possible for Congress to regain the vast grants of power which have been given to the President in the past 11 years, and in particular those it has been necessary to grant more recently for the purpose of prosecuting and winning the war. I have always answered that as long as Congress retained complete power of the purse and over taxes, that all or any of these powers could be regained or regulated in due course. I am convinced this is so, but, that is why Congress must always keep vigilant guard on the purse strings. English history shows that every power which the Parliament in England or Congress here ever did secure, was won by the control over the purse strings and the refusal to grant money except upon its own terms and conditions.

In this connection, Government corporations, of which there are now ninety-odd, create a problem in the retention of the power of the purse. These Government corporations have great elements of danger, although in many cases they do serve useful purposes and are of benefit to the national welfare. Most of them have been, and are, deriving their operating capital not from taxes levied and collected and then appropriated from the Treasury but upon the strength of a delegation of the right to get money and raise funds on their own notes, bonds, and debentures, which are fully guaranteed, both as to principal and interest by the United States. It has been estimated that the extent to which they are authorized to issue such evidences of indebtedness is about $50,000,000,000. Some of this has been used but much remains available to them. This huge sum is a pledge, or a potential pledge, of the credit of the United States which the taxpayer will have to meet if the corporations fail to pay out or go broke. Some have already lost huge sums. Also these funds are sometimes used for purposes for which Congress has not appropriated funds, and even on occasions for purposes for which Congress has refused to appropriate funds. In other words, the Executive uses these corporations as a device to get money to do what he wants without having to come to the Congress for a grant of funds for that purpose. And so Congress to a great degree loses the power which purse control should vest in it. Obviously here again is a very serious threat to the basic power of Congress—the control of the purse strings.

Here are two striking examples, (1) The Commodity Credit Corporation, with a lending authority of $2,650,000, started a program of paying consumer subsidies on domestically produced foods. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation (lending authority $15,750,000) finances ths program. There has been no authorization by Congress for such a subsidy program and Congress has never appropriated funds for it. The Executive gets the R. F. C. to use its money and borrowing capacity to obviate the need of applying to Congress. No matter what your opinion as to the wisdom of subsidies, certainly we can agree that there is great danger in thus freeing the Executive from this restraint and giving him his freedom from control over his pocketbook. (2) The Petroleum Reserves Corporation—yet another Government corporation—has undertaken to build a 1,250-mile pipe line project in the Near East at an estimated cost of one hundred and thirty to one hundred and sixty-five million. It is using its own money without any recourse to Congress for it. The Executive again is acting on his own with these enormous sums at his disposal which free him of congressional control. There is a big fight on as to the wisdom of this program. Many people contend it will thrust our Government into near-eastern squabbles and wars for all time to come. There are strong arguments in favor of this action, also. But without attempting to pass on the merits or the wisdom of the policy, it is crystal clear that here is yet another case where the Executive has entirely tossed aside the reins of congressional appropriations. It is serious. It deserves thought. How can we preserve the benefits, and advantages of the Government without such vast loss of controls over the purse.

Also many of these corporations are incorporated in States where charters with the broadest powers are granted. Thus these corporations, subject only to the limitations of their charters, are often able to do things which the Constitution prohibits the departments and agencies themselves, and the Government itself from doing. It is possible that it may become a regular method of circumventing the Constitution itself. Here is another grave danger to our republican Constitutional Government.

I spoke about the tax bill veto in my broadcast 2 weeks ago, emphasizing danger of yielding to the Executive in even the slightest degree the right to dictate how taxes were to

be raised, and in what amount. So I shall not repeat on this point now, much as I am tempted to do so as it is so important. It is the third general battle ground between the executive and legislative branches of government: (1) investigations, (2) appropriations, (3) taxation.

Norway Pays Its Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I read an article in the Saturday Evening Post by Leslie Roberts, a well-known Canadian author and journalist. Mr. Roberts told of how Norway, even though its land was occupied by the Germans, was able to pay its own way in the united Allied fight against the common enemy.

As an American of Norwegian descent, I could not help but feel a thrill of pride at the courage and moral integrity displayed by those loyal Norwegians, living, working, and fighting in all parts of the world, hoping for the day when they might be able to return to see their beloved relatives and friends and homeland.

The article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, March 11, 1944, follows:

NORWAY PAYS ITS WAY

The check said to pay the Royal Norwegian Air Force $1,000,000, and Director General Erling H. Samuelsen, of the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission in Canada, signed with a flourish, as he does for equal or larger amounts whenever the Norse fliers ask for money. More goes from the mission in New York, for its merchant navy has been paying for Norway's war effort ever since German warships steamed up Oslo Fjord on April 9, 1940, and Quisling became another name for traitor.

At Little Norway, the airdrome in Northern Ontario where young Norwegian falcons learn to be fighter pilots, the commandant had talked about the war aims of the youngsters who have escaped from the homeland to fight. What they have on their minds, he said in back-of-the-throat English, is to set Norway free, nothing else. That is enough to occupy them for the present, because to each youngster freeing Norway means freeing his own family, his own girl, his own village, from the Nazi yoke. Focusing on such an objective leaves no time for abstract speculations. Gripped by an obsession, thousands of young Norwegians have escaped across the North Sea to Britain and Canada, thousands more through the back door into Sweden, thence overland across Siberia to take ship to North America. Before Pearl Harbor many journeyed down through Japan in search of ocean passage. Others went by way of India, and some even trekked from Sweden to ports on the African coast. Often they took a year to make the base in Canada.

They were training under Norwegian instructors to do a special job for Norway. After polishing off in a Canadian service flying school, they would be shipped to Britain for induction into Norwegian squadrons which retain their national identity from C. O.'s office to cookhouse. They fly with the R. A. F., and up to the late fall of 1943 had won 170 awards for bravery while amassing an ominous record in enemy aircraft destroyed, for which circumstance they give full credit to team flying.

EARNING FREEDOM THE HARD WAY

The commandant bristled visibly when asked, "Who pays the bills? Does the Canadian Government provide the air stations, hangars, aircraft, uniforms, food, and pay?" The query prompted the visit to the shipping mission, where the director general provided answers which every citizen of the United Nations should paste in his hat to remember when judgment day comes and war's accounts are tallied.

At the time of invasion, Norway's merchant fleet tallied almost 5,000,000 tons and was the world's fourth largest. More important, almost 50 percent of the ships were less than 10 years old and many of them were fast Diesel-driven tankers and ships specially designed to carry perishables. Even before invasion, 54 ships, under charter to the British, had been lost by enemy action. Now wireless orders went to every Norse master, instructing him to make for the nearest friendly port and go to work for his own government.

Without one exception, the captains complied. Through 1941 and 1942 they carried half the oil and a third of all the foodstuffs which reached Britain. Throughout the battle of the North Atlantic a ship went down every second day. But the merchant fleet kept on slugging, taking such replacements as it could get and working the whole fleet under forced draft. By such devices less than 30,000 Norwegian sailors have footed the bill for their country's war effort while the homeland itself has been locked in bondage. The sailor even pays his taxes as he would at home. Every krone of revenue, every öre of compensation, gas gone into the government's coffers, alongside the country's gold reserves, which were sneaked out of Norway while the battle was at its height.

Paying for the war effort is not the only job. Other commitments are met on the nail. In 1943, a loan of $20,000,000, floated in 1923 in the United States, was paid in full on maturity. Norway is ready to send its check for a similar loan which will come due this year.

The result is a serious case of hero-worship of the merchant seamen on the part of the youngster in a Norwegian uniform. Without them, he says, "We would have been fighting on the charity of our allies." You gather that the last thing any upstanding young Norseman wants is any part of any man's charity. He has a job on his hands—to set his beloved Norway free and to pay the bills as he goes.

LESLIE ROBERTS.

Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. is one of the greatest railways in America. Its great passenger trains are the finest and best in the world. Its Pullman facilities are the most comfortable and finest to be found in the entire world. Its managerial personnel are experienced railroad operators, and most of them are in the upper strata of statesmanship. Their advertising is not only brilliant, but shows a controlling spirit of patriotism as evidenced by the following:

MISSING . . .

"Missing in action." You know what that can mean.

Mom says you must be brave. "It's what your father would expect of us," she tells you when its bedtime and your chin starts to feel shaky. Then she kisses you extra hard and turns her head away so you can't see her eyes.

You've never let her see you cry. Not once, since that telegram came and she twisted it all up in a ball, then smoothed it and put it in the desk.

But, lying in bed, you play "Pretend"—pretend you can hear his steps as he comes up to your room—pretend you can feel a stubble brush your forehead. And sometimes, in the dark, you can almost smell a cigarette-y suit close to your face.

Later you dream—dreams that you don't tell about. And in the morning you wake up with that funny, empty feeling in your stomach.

Poor little guy. We—all of us—wish there something we could do. Perhaps there is. Why shouldn't it be this?

We can resolve that the plans your father had for you shall remain within you reach, that you shall have the chance to grow and learn, that your opportunities will be bounded only by your own get-up-and-go, that you will progress and prosper in direct relation to your own ability—in a land of freedom and opportunity.

Those are the things your Dad valued, the things for which he gave his life. Though some may strive to change all that—provide you with the "benefits" of an all-powerful Government, the "advantages" of regimentation, the "blessings" of bureaucracy—we can resolve they won't succeed.

You, son, won't read these words, and if you did, they wouldn't mean much to you now. But your father's friends—known and unknown—are making you a promise, just the same.

You may never hear it from their lips. But if you were older you would read it in their faces—recognize it in their spirit. They are determined to keep America free, to keep it a land in which Government is the servant, not the master of the people, to keep it the kind of America your Dad wanted to preserve—for you.

CHESAPEAKE & OHIO RAILWAY.

Anonymous Statements Relating to Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was a victim of the weather. I was interested in the legislation to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution. I asked on two occasions that this bill go over while discussing amendments with the author of the measure. Last week the author submitted to me a draft of a new bill.

Although I doubted the constitutionality of the original bill as well as the new draft, I realized that I was very much in the minority and could not prevent the passage of the measure, but I was a bit encouraged by the inclusion of words in the new draft that would have exempted any article or editorial in a newspaper enjoying second-class mailing privileges. I saw no reason why newspapers in this class should be included, because the law provides that annually not only the owners but the editors as well as the bondholders be printed in the publication.

I knew that the author of the bill was out of the city on official business attending the funeral of our late colleague, Mr. O'Leary, so I contacted a friend and asked that the bill not be passed unless the amendments were added. I notice in the RECORD where the bill was passed with minor amendments, but did not include the amendment that the author of the bill said he would offer.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive that the Senate will pass this bill in its present form, but I do hope the author of the bill will submit to the Senate committee the new draft which he submitted to me and recommend it as a substitute.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Vermont in special session assembled, supporting the bill sponsored by the American Legion, and introduced in Congress, known as the G. I. Bill of Rights, as follows:

Whereas there are many and varied bills now before the United States Congress, the object of which is to provide diverse types of benefits for the veterans of the present war; and

Whereas after careful study there has been sponsored by the American Legion and introduced in the Congress a comprehensive bill known as the "GI Bill of Rights" in which are incorporated provisions that will be of immediate benefit and lasting value to the service men and women upon their separation from services: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont delegation in the Congress be urged to support the principles incorporated in this particular measure; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to forward to each Senator and the Representative of this State in the Congress, and to the national commander of the American Legion, a copy of this resolution.

ASA S. BLOOMER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 16, 1944.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

Hearings of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the obverse of the medal "In times of peace prepare for war" should read "In times of war prepare for peace." With that thought in mind, the House Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources has been conducting hearings from time to time on the effect of the war upon the wildlife resources of the Nation as a basis for the formulation of plans for an appropriate and adequate post-war conservation program. Copies of the most recent hearings are being distributed to Members of the Congress, State game and conservation departments, national conservation associations, and numerous colleges and libraries.

The hearings of this Select Committee constitute the only full and accurate report of the conservation agencies of the Federal Government and are therefore in great demand by conservation workers throughout the Nation.

The current hearings cover the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service. For the benefit of busy Members of the House, who do not have time to read voluminous reports on Government activities, but who would like to know where to find information concerning some particular phase of the wildlife conservation work, the following summary of the current hearings is given:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Participating in the war program as fully as possible the Fish and Wildlife Service has during the past years emphasized food production and conservation in the wildlife field. Its greatest opportunities in that direction have been in its fishery relationships.

Proof of the success of its program for the management and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska to assure a continued adequate yield is revealed by the fact that more than 306,000,000 pounds of fishery products valued at more than $56,000,000 were prepared for market despite dislocation of the industry caused by manpower shortages, transportation difficulties, and other upsets due to the war.

In its work with the fisheries, the Service is developing and carrying out a 10-point program to provide more than a score of Federal agencies, numerous State agencies, and the commercial industry with essential statistical, economic, marketing, and technological information to enable them to make fullest use of the commercial fisheries; explore and develop new sources of, and methods for, taking aquatic products for use as foods, vitamin oils, and animal foods; to aid in protecting present sources, and to assist in the development of additional sources of vitamin A to satisfy the domestic demand and to supply the requirements of the United Nations through the office of Lend-Lease Administration; to maintain current data on the supplies and equipment necessary to enable the commercial fishing industry to produce essential foodstuffs, vitamin concentrates, oils, meals, and other commodities; to develop methods of dehydrating fish to save critical tin plate as well as shipping and storage space; to develop methods of preserving and processing species not at present used or which are utilized for food to an extent far below immediate production capacities; to improve sanitation in the handling of fishery products; to investigate sources and test substitutes for manila fibers used in manufacturing cordage for fishing gear; to conduct vitamin analyses of aquatic products; to promote by public education, wider consumption of economical sea foods to provide a balanced diet; to encourage greater consumption of local fishery products not utilized in proportion to available supplies; and to guide wise utilization of our fishery resources so that necessary increases in production may occur through orderly, warranted expansion of activities consistent with the available supplies and through such management, avoid dangers of depletion and post-war collapse of the fishing industry

The coordination program of the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, a wartime office of the Service, has been generally successful. This is particularly significant when it is remembered that the Army and Navy commandeered a great number of the largest and best fishing vessels, that the Navy found it necessary to close certain waters to fishing and, for security purposes, to institute certain port restrictions.

Commencing on page 77 of the testimony of the Fish and Wildlife Service, during our last hearings, will be found full information and detailed plans for the construction of farm-fish ponds. Another discussion of farm-fish ponds will be found at page 180, in the testimony of the Soil Conservation Service. It is hoped that all State fish and game departments will make wide distribution of that material among the farmers of their respective States, since the development of farm-fish ponds will serve a triple purpose, namely, to increase food supplies, increased revenue to the farmers and also provide for recreation to farm boys and girls and their friends.

As a result of the declaration of Alaska as a military defense area, the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries caused a concentration of the Alaskan salmon fishery industry. This resulted in a pack of 5,481,000 cases of salmon during 1943, or 305,000 more cases than were packed in 1942.

In cooperation with the Army, which contributed some of the personnel necessary, a harvest of 117,000 seal skins was taken from the Pribilof Islands. To the United States Treasury these are worth about $5,000,000 and in addition, the small processing plant on St. Paul

Island produced 390 tons of meal and 55,000 gallons of oil.

Cooperative predator and rodent control has been responsible for a substantial contribution to the war-food program of the Nation, doing much to protect livestock, poultry, range forage, agricultural crops, and stored food and feed supplies against the ravages of predatory animals and injurious rodents. In many rural areas rat damage has increased materially because grain and livestock feedstuffs have been stored in improvised granaries and other non-rodent-proof structures. The Service has given much attention to the control of rats in warehouses where processed food materials have been assembled for military and civilian uses, and important cooperation has been extended to the Surgeon General's office of the Army in the problem of controlling on military reservations rats and other rodents that are carriers of dangerous human diseases. Because of a serious shortage of red squill, the most satisfactory known rodenticide, the wildlife research laboratories of the Service have conducted studies to develop toxic substances to replace or supplement this agent.

Of outstanding importance during the year has been the domestic rabbit production to increase meat and fur. Indications are that the goal of 33 percent increase will be fully met.

Food production on wildlife refuges has proceeded satisfactorily and it is anticipated that here again the production will exceed the estimates. Grazing on these lands has been materially increased and much farming equipment normally used is being rented to local farmers. New construction activities on the refuges have been entirely eliminated but due to exceptionally high waters in some sections, extensive repair work has been necessary. More than 4,500,000 acres of refuge lands have been released to various branches of the armed forces for maneuvers, aerial gunnery ranges, bombing ranges, observation stations, et cetera. The Aleutian Island Refuge in Alaska has been a base for military operations against Japan.

Surmounting the many difficulties resulting from the war, the regular investigations to determine the current status of the migratory game birds, as a basis for sound regulatory action, have been continued. The results indicated that again we were blessed with an exceptionally good breeding season. A good flight of ducks came south this past fall and the success of the restoration of this resource is the most spectacular accomplishment in the entire history of conservation. There also has been a satisfactory improvement in the numerical status of the mourning dove and the woodcock, but further decreases were recorded for the Wilson's snipe. Damage by ducks to agricultural crops, particularly to rice in California and to corn in North and South Dakota, was fully investigated and action was taken for relief.

Wildlife Resource surveys in the United States and Alaska were an important source of factual information for the Office of Strategic Services of the War Department. As one high ranking Army officer put it, "the Fish and Wildlife Service was the only agency that knew more about the Aleutians than the Japs." The Service has provided from its records much valuable information and has prepared special reports on diverse subjects at the request of the intelligence services of the Army and Navy, and is giving technical guidance on many aspects of foreign rehabilitation and relief of captured and reoccupied territories.

The fur-fiber laboratory of the Service has expanded its research into the utilization of fur fibers and fur waste, including special studies on felts and the wearing qualities of furs and fabrics to be used by the armed forces.

Enforcement officers of the Service have continued to vigorously and effectively enforce the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and other Federal wildlife laws and have intensified their cooperative relationships with other departments in furnishing information regarding individuals suspected of subversive and other illegal activities.

Under the Pittman-Robertson Act, the States have given greater emphasis to field investigations into wildlife management problems. During the last hunting season the Nation's supply of meat was increased a quarter of a billion pounds by wildlife taken as a byproduct of wholesome recreation. The accumulated balance to the credit of this act resulting from the excise tax imposed on sporting arms and ammunition, is $9,441,556.91.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior aims to preserve all wildlife in the national parks, in its natural state and in proper relation to all other species. To accomplish this it has been found necessary to continue the control of excessive populations of large mammals. The best example was the reduction in 1942 of the northern Yellowstone elk herd to a number in keeping with its available food supply. Six thousand five hundred and thirty-nine elk were killed by hunters outside of the park and 691 were killed by rangers within the park. This was the first instance of drastice control measures within the boundaries of a national park, but was fully justified. The action was necessary to reduce elk numbers to the carrying capacity of the winter range and thus to insure survival of the elk herd. This range furnished forage, not only for elk, but also for the bighorns, pronghorns, and buffalo which share it. The reduction of the elk herd was accomplished with the full cooperation of the Montana Fish and Game Commission, and it had the support of conservation organizations throughout the Nation. Studies of range conditions, calf survival, winter losses, and the interrelationships of the elk and other wild species are being conducted. Upon these will be based a management program which will result in balanced populations.

Other overpopulation problems exist in Wind Cave, Sequoia, Zion, and Rocky Mountain National Parks. Minor adjustments were made during the year in Wind Cave National Park, where 37 elk were killed; in Rocky Mountain National Park, where 68 beavers were trapped by the Colorado Game and Fish Commission and transplanted in various sections of Colorado; and in Sequoia, Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Mount Rainier National Parks, where unnatural concentrations of deer in certain regions made it necessary to live-trap and distribute small numbers of the animals to remote sections of the parks. Further steps will be taken in 1943–44 to reduce the deer population in Zion National Park and Sequoia National Park, to kill the annual surplus of elk in Wind Cave National Park, to reduce the excess of buffaloes in Yellowstone National Park, and to control the increment in the elk herds of Rocky Mountain National Park.

As to bears, the situation as to personal injury or property damage caused by these animals has improved. This is due in part to a decline in the number of visitors and coincident reduction of unwise feeding of bears, to the reduced bear population brought about by control measures of previous years, to improved methods of garbage disposal, and to more stringent enforcement of the regulation which prohibits bear feeding.

Livestock interests have continued to seek grazing privileges in many areas of the National Park Service. In order that their demands might be met with full understanding of the grazing resources of National Park Service areas, a thorough study was made by the National Park Service of the history of grazing in these areas and all grazing values were inventoried. The studies reveal that the total lands within the National Park Service that might be utilized for grazing constitute one-seventh of 1 percent of the total grazing lands in the United States—an insignificant factor in the Nation's food supply. Grazing now exists in 10 national parks and 30 national monuments and other service areas; about 1,366,000 acres are grazed. Most of this grazing represents continuation of privileges that existed when the lands were placed in the National Park Service. In certain historical areas and in some recreational areas new permits authorizing grazing as a wartime measure have been issued, but the ultimate aim of the Park Service is to eliminate all grazing in scenic-scientific areas, and this long-established policy was reaffirmed by the Secretary of the Interior following the grazing studies of 1943.

Under cooperative agreements, the Fish and Wildlife Service continued its studies of aquatic resources to determine fish planting policies in National Park waters. Due to shortages in transportation and labor facilities, the number of fish planted in 1942 was smaller than in previous years. Seventeen and one-half million eggs and fish were stocked in waters of 16 park areas. The Fish and Wildlife Service and some State conservation commissions supplied the fish; the planting was done by the National Park Service.

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service reports continued progress in wildlife accomplishments on the national forests. Beginning with the

first decade of this century they entered into the program of restoration and protection of game species and in improving the habitat for game. Supplementing natural restoration by transplants of elk and deer and restocking fish in barren or depleted lakes and streams, they helped build up game populations to a level which indicated that in many places a change in emphasis was necessary. Consequently, husbandry involving management and utilization and avoidance of overpopulations became essential parts of their wildlife program. Likewise, management areas are replacing the sanctuaries and refuges since the latter tended to concentrate and often to ultimately decimate or destroy the desired species.

Estimates and census of game populations began as early as 1913 and have been continued to the present. These indicate an astonishing recovery. In 1942 there were 3.6 times as many big-game animals as in 1921, or over 6 big-game animals per square mile of the gross area. Of these animals, deer are by far the most numerous, followed numerically by elk, black bear, antelope, mountain goat, bighorn, moose, peccary, grizzly and Alaska brown bear, and wild boar. Fur bearers, small upland game, and birds are especially important and have profited by the protection afforded by good land management. Notwithstanding the hunter take during the last 16 years amounting to about 6.8 deer for every 100 on the forests, deer have increased annually in addition to this take by about 7.7 per 100 per year. This indicates that to hold the deer stationary at the present population level the hunter take should be doubled. With elk the hunter take the last 16 years was 8.3 elk for every 100 on the forest and an increase in addition to that of 6.7 animals per 100 per year.

Important as are these larger animals, the fur bearers and upland small game and birds offer great opportunity for increasing national-forest production. Only a beginning has been made in managing land for the production of fur and small game as a byproduct to other uses of national-forest land. A notable example of this beginning is found in Virginia. Here by State statute each hunter and fisherman on national-forest land, in addition to the regular license paid the State, contributes a dollar to the management of the wildlife on the national forests. It is an outstanding example of a means of management which brings to the citizens of the State an opportunity for fishing and hunting advantages commonly enjoyed by individuals who belong to exclusive hunting clubs.

The importance of wildlife is indicated by estimates made this year which indicate the following monetary values of the annual crop of wildlife produced on national forests only:

Dressed meat, at 40 cents a pound	$46,660,000
Hides	820,000
Furs at current wholesale prices	9,150,000
Total	56,630,000

In addition, a million and a half hunters, fishermen, and trappers have used the forests, and about 27,000,000 came for recreation, nature study, and other recreational use to which wildlife makes a very important contribution.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

During the past year farmers and ranchers in nearly 900 soil-conservation districts throughout the Nation, as part of their wartime agricultural program, have bettered conditions for many kinds of wildlife. More than 3,000 farm ponds were placed under careful fish management for the production of a home supply of high protein, vitamin-rich food. A million and a half shrubs were planted by farmers on field borders and other eroding areas where they not only served to check soil washing and furnish food and cover for wildlife but provided the farm home with a source of honey and wild fruits. A living fence of multiflora rose was proven valuable as a practical land use and wildlife management measure. Farmers also gave attention, particularly in the management of woodlots and marshes, to improving conditions for valuable fur-bearers, such as the raccoon and muskrat.

Soil-conservation practices applied to the land are now known to increase average yields of our major agricultural crops about 20 percent. They also increase yields of wildlife, for strip-cropped fields, protected woodlots, and properly grazed range have been shown to support twice the number of birds found on comparable areas not farmed in accordance with conservation measures intended to conserve soil and retard water run-off.

The Soil Conservation Service assists farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts to plan their land according to its capacity and adaptability to produce various kinds of crops. "Selective service for every acre" is the objective. Farm planners work with farmers to delimit individual parcels of land for the use of tilled crops, pasture, woodland or wildlife. Thus, wildlife welfare becomes an integral part of the coordinated objective of a soil-conservation program for each operating unit of land.

The Biology Division of the Soil Conservation Service is cooperating with many agencies—Federal, State, and private—in order to carry to soil-conservation districts the most useful, practical, and locally instructions for rendering the "wildlife lands" of agriculture most productive of the wild plants and animals those lands are most capable of producing. These practices have, during the past year, centered around the following land-use measures beneficial to wildlife: First, marsh management; second, beaver management; third, hedges; fourth, management of odd spots; fifth, management of spoil banks; sixth, pond management; seventh, stream-bank management; and, eighth, wildlife borders.

Biologists of the Service have also given assistance to farmers in soil-conservation districts in the control of various pests affecting the production of wartime agricultural crops. Through cooperation with various entomological agencies, attempts were made to determine the relationship of conservation measures to a serious new insect pest, the white-fringed beetle. Conservation measures correlating erosion-control practices with cultural control of grasshoppers and the corn borer have also shown promise. Further progress has been made with the control of weeds through the application of appropriate soil conservation and good land-use practices.

The investigations of the select committee will be continued throughout the current year and, pursuant to the resolution creating it, a report on the past 2 years' work of the committee will be filed on or before January 3, 1945. As has been pointed out on more than one occasion, no select committee of the House in the past decade has operated on a more economical basis than this committee, and none has dealt with a subject in which more people were vitally interested. Under legislation sponsored by the committee we have seen millions of acres of refuges and breeding grounds established for migratory birds, and the duck supply increased more than 400 percent since 1936. The program for the improvement of the supply of upland game and inland fish recommended by the committee has been efficiently carried out by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service in its vast domain of about 175,000,000 acres, by the Soil Conservation Service and by the C. C. C. camps during the period they were in operation. That far-flung program has fully demonstrated the fact that all the needs of modern civilization can be met without consuming the great natural resource of fish and game and leaving a country once as richly endowed in that respect as any other country in the world like a sucked orange.

In view of the fact that the contribution of hunters to the Nation's food supply last year was approximately 225,000,000 pounds of meat, to say nothing of the indirect contribution growing out of predator control, your committee has urged the War Production Board and other agencies in control of the production of ammunition to make available to the hunters this year as large a supply of shotgun and rifle shells as can be done consistent with the best interests of the war effort. The program of the War Production Board is covered by the following letter of March 15 from Chairman Donald M. Nelson and the news release of March 5:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1944.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTSON: We are glad to have the opportunity your letter of March 9 affords us to present the most recent information available at this time on the program for the manufacture of ammunition for civilian use.

I trust that you will have room in your summary statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include a recent statement of the War Production Board (WPB-5115) which is enclosed. Also you may wish to have the enclosed Information Letter (Infl-28) and Supplementary Order L-286-A, on the special program for hunting last year. The quantity of ammunition to be produced in the first half of this year calls for 6,000,000 pounds of brass and it is the considered judgment of competent military authorities that this

amount is all that may be safely allocated at this time. A normal year's production of civilian ammunition would require approximately 27,000,000 pounds of copper. What can be done for the third and fourth quarters will depend upon military requirements later on in the year and upon the needs of other essential civilian services, particularly electric power transmission line extensions in areas of vital war production.

You may be assured that all of us are aware of the useful purpose served by the expenditure of ammunition to maintain wildlife resources in balance and to supplement the supply of meat and we are hopeful that by next fall the supply of ammunition will be sufficient to justify relaxation of present restrictions upon its use for harvesting surplus game. This will depend upon conditions which no one can foresee at this time. It is the intention of the War Production Board to remove all restrictions on the manufacture and distribution of ammunition just as soon as conditions permit.

In order that you and the members of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources may be fully informed, I am enclosing General Limitation Order L-286, which governs the manufacture and distribution of nonmilitary ammunition. Thank you again for your thoughtfulness in writing and if we can be of any further service in supplying information please let us know as we are anxious to cooperate in every possible manner.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

[Advance release of War Production Board, for Sunday papers March 5, 1944—Cleared and issued through facilities of the Office of War Information]

Plans for increased production of rifle and shotgun ammunition for civilian use were discussed at the meeting of the Ammunition Industry Advisory Committee, the War Production Board announced today.

It was brought out in the meeting that, in the course of a survey of farm needs conducted last fall by the Office of Civilian Requirements, lack of ammunition for protection of livestock and crops from predatory animals and birds was first on the list of farmers' complaints against wartime restrictions. Not even barbed wire and radio batteries, the lack of which constitutes acute problems for rural dwellers, were mentioned as often as shotgun shells and rifle cartridges in the responses to O. C. R.'s questions as to what were the most difficult and important items to obtain.

W. P. B. officials reported that ammunition in process of manufacture would total, during the first quarter of this year, some 120,000,000 shotgun shells, 20,000,000 center-fire rifle cartridges, and 200,000,000 .22-caliber long-rifle cartridges.

Production is being stepped up to a point where it is expected that 251,000,000 shotgun shells, 30,000,000 center-fire, and 475,000,000 .22-caliber cartridges will have been placed in manufacture by July 1, it was said. If production is continued at the same rate for the full year, it will represent 95 percent of a normal year's production of center-fire rifle cartridges, 55 percent of shotgun shells, and 25 percent of .22-caliber rifle cartridges.

W. P. B. emphasized that deliveries in volume could not be expected before May and that initial shipments would be confined to stocks necessary to fill orders now on dealers' books, from farmers and ranchers, and for other essential uses, including police and official preinduction training programs. Also covered in the initial shipments would be essential supplies for Alaska and territorial possessions.

While it is possible that by fall there will be sufficient ammunition for game shooting, W. P. B. officials said that for the time being none can be spared from supplies necessary to crop and livestock conservation. No ammunition will be made available for amusement purposes, W. P. B. said.

If facilities recently released by the armed services are required for additional military ammunition, even this restricted program will not be fulfilled, it was pointed out.

From the standpoint of contribution to the war effort, the greatest pride and pleasure of members of your select committee have been derived from the fact we feel a contribution is being made to the future pleasure and happiness of millions of American boys now undergoing untold hardships and privations on foreign battlefields in defense of our freedom and of a better world in which to live. Members of Congress think they know the meaning of nerve strain as they wrestle with difficult legislative problems. Those who have spent weeks and months in the hell of high-explosive shells will understand better than we the meaning of the words: "He makes me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters."

A Mexican View of Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the money questions it is apparent that every fair-minded economist in this country and abroad recognizes the deficiency in the supply of gold as the support of the money systems of the several nations—and while the monetary experts of our Government are cudgeling their brains to devise plans for "the more economical use of gold"—they should recognize a better solution to this problem to increase the value of money of ultimate redemption by returning to the system of bimetallism, the subject of an article appearing in the January issue of the Mexican-American Review, inserted herewith for the consideration of the Members of the House:

WHAT THE MEXICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION THINKS AND SUGGESTS CONCERNING THE SILVER PROBLEM

Among the monetary topics of the last 100 years, the most debated has undoubtedly been that of the metals employed in the currencies, or, to put it in a more concrete way, the question of the expediency of abolishing gold and silver bimetalism in favor of gold monometalism.

Bimetalism, which had reigned unchallenged for so many years in Europe and America, received its first blow with the introduction of gold monometalism in England in 1816. During the next 26 years, however, this innovation met with serious difficulties, owing to the variations in equivalency between gold bullion and current gold coin, and it was not until 1844 that the Bank of England, in obedience to a law enacted by the British Government, assumed the obligation of fixing that equivalency by unlimited buying and selling of gold at fixed prices, calculated in current coin.

In that year the struggle between the two monetary systems, monometalism and bimetalism, may be said to have begun, but it was not until the close of the Franco-German War that events came to a head with the successive adoption of the gold standard by several European nations, and the defeat of bimetalism culminated with the adoption, in 1900, of the same system by the United States, following on an agitated political and economic campaign which lasted from 1893 to 1900.

In after years, other and less important nations found themselves compelled to adopt gold monometalism, so that by 1910, this problem was thought to have disappeared, and the triumph of monometalism was considered as definite.

In effect, the champions of monometallism then believed that the question of bimetallism was dead and buried, and that on its tombstone they could inscribe the epitath, "Here lies silver currency; silver now survives only as a mercantile commodity."

THE PHANTOM OF BIMETALLISM

Nevertheless, every time that an economic crisis has arisen, there has been a resuscitation of the phantasm of bimetallism, which has never lacked defenders, either in the conclaves of famous economists, or in the political spheres of several countries, more especially in the United States.

A decade ago we saw a revival of this nature, in which men of great prestige in banking and economic circles, both in Europe and America, devoted themselves to the discussion of the endlessly debated problem, some frankly proposing a return to bimetallism, and others, the majority, temporizing with gold monometallism, while demanding legislative and economic measures which would prevent a collapse in the price of silver in the market.

We are now in the throes of the most colossal war in history, and we foresee that at its close a no-less colossal economic struggle is coming for the restoration of peace and tranquility in all the countries that have been scourged by this devastating conflict. And it is quite certain that in the post-war period this dreaded phantasm will once again make its appearance, and there will not be lacking those who advocate that silver shall be reinstated to play again its part in monetary affairs.

With such a situation looming ahead we are of the opinion that this question should be given careful study, and, while refraining from hasty judgments on the fundamental monetary problem, we would advise that adequate measures be taken to secure for silver a determinate value, which will allow its being employed in any program of economic recuperation that may be adopted at the close of the war.

That epitaph on the tombstone of the supposedly dead and buried silver does not enshrine any absolute truth, for if silver were simply merchandise, its fluctuations in price would not merit the concentrated attention of statesmen and economists. There are a great many different mercantile commodities necessary to human activities, such as cotton, wheat, meat, etc., each of which represents values greater than that of the total production of silver, and yet the daily fluctuations of these have never taken up the attention of entire periods of the American Congress.

BASIS OF TRANSACTIONS EVERYWHERE

This fact demonstrates that the importance of silver does not depend simply on the part it plays as merchandise. Something more potent is involved, and this "something" is that the metal in question constitutes the

basis of the daily transactions affecting more than a thousand millions of the inhabitants of our globe. And these daily transactions, although they concern only individuals of limited economic means, add up to an important total in the world's markets by reason of the vast numbers of the people involved. Thus the part played by silver as a monetary medium continues to arouse considerable interest.

As we have already stated, in the years prior to 1933, owing to the economic crisis that affected the world in general and the United States in particular, the problem of silver was again brought up an engaged the attention of the economists who came from all countries to attend the World Economic Conference in London in the autumn of 1933.

The partisans of monometallism, who dominated that conference, as much by sheer weight of numbers as by their political representation, would not sanction even a statement of the case of bimetallism; all that was permitted was a discussion of the desirability of enacting measures which would impede a collapse in the price of silver. This ended in the approval of the measures recommended by the American Senator Kay Pittman, which provided for an agreement between the silver-holding and the silver-producing countries, with the object of restricting sales of silver, and the controlling of a certain proportion of its production. The principal supporter of this plan was the United States Government, which assumed the responsibility of absorbing the major part of the silver produced.

UNITED STATES SUSTAINS SILVER

In the United States Congress, discussions were continued, for the purpose of determining what would be the best means of carrying into practical effect the obligation thus contracted, and finally, in May 1934, a measure was approved by virtue of which the American Treasury undertook to buy silver at a price above $0.50 per ounce until the Government's metallic reserves of silver should reach a proportion of 25 percent of the gold reserves or the price should reach $1.29 per ounce. All purchases were to be suspended when the price of silver in the world market should reach the stipulated monetary value of $1.29 per ounce.

The lack of a determinate monetary equivalent for silver provoked active speculation and a rise in the price of the metal; the American Treasury, having followed for some months the tendencies of the market, finally adopted a firm attitude, and proceeded to fix prices without direct relation to those prevailing in the market, since in point of fact the Treasury had now become the sole buyer.

In recent years, the American Government has sustained the price of $0.7111 per ounce for silver produced within the country, and has paid lower prices for that which has come from outside. In any case it has given important support to the production of the metal.

These protectionist measures have become the object of sharp criticism and of attacks by a multitude of economists and businessmen who consider such measures as an unjustifiable subsidizing of silver mining, to the detriment of taxpayers, who have to foot the bills for such subventions. Practically 10 years have elapsed since the measures referred to were first put into force, and it is therefore now time to examine their scope, their effect and importance.

SILVER-PURCHASING STRENGTHENS CHINESE RESISTANCE

The importance of such legislation is evident in two sectors: First, in that of silver-producing countries, since a price which is high, or at least is little subject to fluctuation has enabled them to keep their mines in production, with the consequent and undeniable advantage to their internal economy, and at the same time to maintain their international trade. Second, and in a similar way, the silver-producing countries, especially China, have been benefited by this measure.

What we have just said refers to the price of foreign silver. Now, to the people of the United States, a stimulus thus applied to the internal economy of silver-producing and silver-holding countries might appear of secondary importance, but subsequent events have justified the policy in a very striking manner. Since the outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan, it has been, thanks to those purchases of silver that the Chinese people have been able to sustain, and are still sustaining, their heroic resistance to the dominion of the Jap invader.

If this had been the only result of the measure we are now considering, the policy of the Roosevelt administration would have been amply justified, since, beyond any doubt whatever, our yellow enemy is rendered far less formidable for us by reason of the enormous attrition he suffers in the Chinese campaign, and of his being compelled to sustain the struggle on that front instead of being able to concentrate all his strength against the United States.

If all this is, as we have already intimated of such magnitude, the importance of the measure in its bearing on the interior economy of the United States is probably of yet greater scope, even though this may be less apparent.

In the waging of any war, but more particularly in the present one, three metals are of paramount importance—copper, lead, and zinc. Hence the great interest that the democratic governments have shown in intensifying the production of these metals, more especially since at the commencement of the war their reserves of the metals in question were small, and the organization in the mines that produced them deficient. Notwithstanding this situation, the rise in price of the metals named has not been extraordinary, the rhythm of production has been maintained, and even increased, while prices have been little higher than in normal times.

If we examine the statistics of silver production in the United States, we will find that the greater part of the metal does not come from purely argentiferous deposits; the silver so obtained does not amount to more than 10 percent of the total production; the remaining 90 percent comes from mixed ores, which yield a low and limited proportion of silver.

ENCOURAGES PRODUCTION OF OTHER METALS

In world production, the proportion of industrial metals, in whose ores, at the price of $0.7111, represents more than 15 percent of total value, is as follows:

	Percent
Copper	5.2
Lead	52.7
Zinc	37.4
Tin	16.0

Now, if silver legislation had never been enacted, the producers of the industrial metals mentioned would never have received this important aid, and that would have meant a rise in price of the metals vital to the war effort, and at the same time an enormous diminution in the reserves that could possibly exist of the same, since deposits of relatively low-grade ore never would pay for working.

We thus find the so-called subsidizing of silver producers turns out to be a real and effective subsidizing of producers of war metals, so that, in fine, we should regard that apparently protectionist measure, which to all outward appearances was benefiting only a small and privileged group of producers, as a plan that has been beneficent and has had far-reaching results, since it has permitted us to keep in production, in times of peace, mines whose ores yield a relatively low proportion of industrial metals, and has thus enabled us to face our vast war needs, simply by the intensification of such exploitation.

In short, the legislation of May 1934, so heatedly contested, stands revealed today as a very important factor in the triumph, which we are so happily witnessing, of the Allied arms.

All the foregoing is a simple presentation of facts, which constitute an ample and well-deserved eulogy of those statesmen and legislators who, putting aside selfish points of view, and notwithstanding the criticism of men of limited vision, brought into being the legislation which has helped heroic China to stand up to the unwarranted and grossly unjust assault of powerful Japan, and at the same time has helped the Allied democracies to count on plentiful supplies of metals which are indispensable to their war effort.

If that legislation had never seen the light of day many mines which actually produce these industrial metals would not have paid for working; the outbreak of the war would have found them idle, which means that the Allies would have faced a shortage of these vitally necessary materials.

Happily, the triumph of the democracies is at last in sight, and it now becomes incumbent on the statesmen and economists of this group to study, and make their preparations for the post-war situation. To this end, it will be necessary to examine this question, and decide which of the monetary and economic systems will be the best to adopt.

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

As was remarked at the outset, the contest between monometallism and bimetallism will once again be brought up, and while this is not an opportune time to go deeply into these problems, the ground must be cleared, so that when the time comes for the discussion of the case the experts may have at their disposal sound facts with which to set about at the construction of the new economic world which they have to build. So that:

"Whereas silver is still the favored medium of exchange among nearly half of the inhabitants of the globe, the devaluation of that metal would bring about a tremendous upset among all these millions of people; and

"Whereas there is a universal desire for investment in the firmest and most tangible of those which are considered monetary metals; and

"Whereas in the labor of reconstruction in the countries devastated by the war vast quantities of industrial metals will be needed, if silver is devalued these metals will go up in price, and reconstruction will thus become more difficult and costly; and

"Whereas American legislation, by a stroke of the pen, succeeded in maintaining without fluctuations the value of silver, and at the same time increased the production of industrial metals; and

"Whereas this attitude has up to now maintained and encouraged the capacity of the silver-producing countries to compensate their purchases o. merchandise in other countries, thus helping international trade; and

"Whereas the extension of that measure of sound economic policy to other countries outside the United States would augment its beneficent effects and above and beyond the direct, material results there will come into play an influence of psychological character, we hereby propose:

"1. To recommend to all the central banks of the Americas the building up of their reserves in gold and silver, with the proportionate values of 75 percent and 25 percent respectively.

"2. That to this end, they should institute purchases of silver, at prices equivalent in their own national currencies to that paid by the American Treasury.

"3. To request the American Treasury not to alter the established price without having previously consulted the central banks of the other American countries.

"4. That the valuation of those reserve metals shall be made at the equivalent, in national currency, of 35 dollars for gold, and 1.29 dollars for silver.

"5. To provide for ample sales of silver to private purchasers, either in bars, or in silver certificates, at prices slightly higher than those of purchase."

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a poem, In Memoriam, written by Mrs. Helen Hall Bucher, of Highland Terrace, Boiling Springs, Cumberland County, Pa. The beautiful thoughts expressed in these verses are dedicated to the young men and women who have sacrificed their lives in the present war so that love and justice may reign in this country and so that other nations may have the opportunity to enjoy the blessings made possible by American freedom.

IN MEMORIAM

To thee, our brothers, who fought and died
On the fields of battle grim,
You have paid the price of a victor's crown
For the sake of a tyrant's whim.
But the deeds of valor and prowess won
By the strength of your mighty hand
Shall be sung from America's rock-bound coast,
To India's coral strand.

Bring flowers to deck the silent tomb,
Bring cypress for the dead,
The snows shall be their winding sheet,
The frozen earth their bed.
For many a cheek of rosy hue,
And many a bright blue eye
Has paid the toll of sacrifice
As the Angel of Death sped by.

The rose and the lily again shall bloom
In many a dewy bower,
And trees their leafy honors shed
In many a golden shower,
But never again will the pulseless heart
E'er throb to pleasure or pain,
Hopes now are crushed, and voices hushed,
That will never be heard again.

Entwine the laurel, the garlands gay
Deck the graves of our heroes brave,
Let the tocsin sound its praises oft
For the nations they sought to save.

l'Envoi

Then a long farewell to our soldier dead
Till we meet on that sunlit shore,
Where those we loved and have lost a while,
Will join us forever more.

What Will Our Boys Come Home To?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "What Will Our Boys Come Home To?" written by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and published in the February issue of the magazine Spotlight.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WILL OUR BOYS COME HOME TO?

(By Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

Our veteran, when he comes home from this war, will return to an America which has done much, and is still planning to do much, for his welfare. This attitude of doing has become a national policy. Everyone in America is anxious to help the man who helped us by defending our shores and preserving for us the "four freedoms." We here in Congress are responsible for a large share of the doing, especially and almost exclusively for the planning on a large scale. We must be responsible for formulating the legislation and making the large grants of money which will be necessary to carry through the programs. Since the beginning of the war, then, we have been planning, and that planning, I do not hesitate to say, has been better and more logical than ever before. We have planned not only from the standpoint of the veteran's welfare but also from the standpoint of the Nation's welfare. True, we find that these two standpoints are synonymous. What will benefit the one will most certainly benefit the other.

First of all, we drafted a law which provides for hospitalization and insurance for the men in this way. We did not stop at this point, however. We decided that it is the responsibility of the Government to help rehabilitate vocationally the disabled veteran, training and placing him in an appropriate position in industry. In theory, any veteran with a service-connected disability is taken care of in some way. If he needs hospitalization, he gets it. If he is entitled to a pension, he gets that. If his disability is such that he is unable to take again the place which he left in industry, he is given training which will enable him to do another job. This piece of legislation will do much to help the disabled veteran make a successful readjustment and to appreciate better the opportunities which he has helped to save for America.

Then, when the plans for the soldier's physical well-being had been drawn, it was realized that something should be done to further his economic security. The Selective Service Act, from the beginning provided that the serviceman should be restored to the job which he left when he was called to the service. In many cases, however, we realize for one reason or another, this will not be feasible or possible, so we have now formulated legislation which will give the veteran mustering-out pay. Everyone knows that there will be a period of adjustment for the soldier, that it takes time for the Government to do its necessary paper work in taking care of the veteran, so there might be a period when real want may come into his life if he isn't assisted. This bill has been passed by the Senate, its first great hurdle, and is presently under consideration in the House of Representatives. It appears that they will cut the amount of the payment but they, too, are in favor of making a payment to the soldier who is in need of such assistance. This legislation should certainly do much to convince the returning veteran that America has appreciated his sacrifices and that the ideals of our democracy are worth fighting for.

Thus far we have reviewed the measures America has taken to provide for the returning veteran's physical and economic well-being. Now we must discuss the third great bill which Congress is writing. The Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1944. I have been associated with all of the above-mentioned measures and am now the author of this measure. This bill will make it possible, if it becomes a law, for the soldier boy whose education was interrupted to continue his education; and for those who are properly qualified and selected, the education may continue for 4 years.

Since the soldier's education and training will be entirely on a voluntary basis—that is, the Government will make the offer to the returning soldier, and he will accept it if he wishes to—no one knows how many of our soldier boys will apply for this education and training. We do know, however, that the task will tax the ability of all our educational institutions that now exist. The variety of training needed and required will be as broad as our whole educational system. There will be a place in the scheme for private, public, and endowed schools, for elementary, secondary, and college institutions. The more diverse the training the greater will be the benefit to the Nation economically and socially. The whole aim of the bill is based upon the theory of placing the soldier back in that type of life from which he came or helping him to reach that to which he aspires. Never has a government offered a greater opportunity to its returned soldiers.

The Rehabilitation Act was necessary and it was statesmanlike. The mustering-out pay bill is just; it gives to the soldier what he has earned. The Education and Training Act not only bespeaks justice but also it is a national necessity in order that the Nation will not lose its future leadership. This educational bill is evidence of the human interest in men and women which this democracy of ours demands.

The returning soldier will be older, more experienced, and more thoughtful than he would have been at the same time had he not gone into the war. He may have any number of nonadjusted problems. This we must face. We do not want to fit him into a groove. He must be free to find his proper place through his own action. The education phase, therefore, of the soldier-benefit legislation is the most important of all. It will reach more persons. American life is complex. American education must reflect this life. The education bill must therefore offer training in all phases of American life. The best America has to offer should be available to the soldier who is to become our future leader. That means an education bill that will protect our educational traditions and keep our educational habits American in every sense of the word.

The world may be put back years as a result of the war. The men and women who are called to fight have all made sacrifices, all great and some ultimate; but the healing influence of the education and training bill upon those who will receive its benefits and upon the communities in which they in future life will live, offers a blessing of immeasurable consequence. The soldier boys and girls who embrace the opportunity will know the worth of living in the blessed land of America.

Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of March 16, 1944, the Los Angeles Times stated editorially that JERRY VOORHIS is responsible for the gasoline shortage on the west coast.

Pernaps I should appreciate the Times' implication that I possess the power single-handed and alone to cause a gasoline shortage all over the west coast. But what the Times says is utterly untrue and one of the most childish distortions not only of the facts but of ordinary common sense that I have ever seen in print—even in the Times. The editorial attempts to blame me for the shortage of gasoline on the ground that I have "stopped drilling" at Elk Hills. Of course, the truth is that neither I nor anyone else ever stopped drilling at Elk Hills for the simple reason that drilling has not stopped. Nothing has ever been done to remove from control by the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California the control of drilling at Elk Hills. The fact is that the interim agreement between the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. now in effect provides for the taking of oil from Elk Hills on the same basis that has pertained for a considerable length of time.

What I did do was exert every effort at my command last summer to stop an indefensible contract from continuing in effect. That contract would have handed over control of Elk Hills to the Standard Oil Co. of California under terms decidedly against the public interest of the American people. That I was right in my contention seems to me to be proven by the fact that that contract was subsequently canceled.

The most serious aspect, however, of the Times article is not the untruth about me, but that it takes the position that the way to cure the gasoline shortage is to drain the naval reserve at Elk Hills. I am perfectly willing to take any blame or responsibility which anyone wants to place upon me for opposing the draining of that naval oil reserve under any circumstances not approved by the Navy itself. There have been loud outcries from a number of directions—notably from some of the major oil companies—to the effect that the Navy's present limitation on the pumping of oil from Elk Hills by the Standard Oil Co. should be lifted. What the Times is really doing is joining in this outcry.

In my judgment, the Times is insulting the people of California when it implies, as it does in this editorial, that they would like to see the greatest naval oil reserve in our own country exhausted in order to make gasoline available for civilian use. I can think of no policy with regard to petroleum more short-sighted than that. Elk Hills oil should be used just as fast as the Navy believes it ought to be used—no faster and no slower.

The gasoline shortage is not due to the efforts of JERRY VOORHIS to protect the Navy's interest and the people's interest in Elk Hills oil reserve. One reason for that shortage is a certain war in the Pacific, which the Times editorial fails to mention. Another reason, in my opinion, which the Times, of course, would not mention is the inordinate influence which major oil companies have exerted over Government policies with regard to petroleum from the beginning of this war and the restrictions on drilling and development generally which have consequently been imposed by the Petroleum Administration for War.

I shall be mighty glad to submit to the people of my district the decision as to whether they think I am right in attempting to conserve the Navy's oil for Navy uses and the winning of the Pacific war, or whether they agree with the Times that the thing to do is to exhaust that naval oil reserve for immediate use in the civilian economy. There are a lot better ways of meeting the gas shortage than the method proposed by the Times.

Wages per Hour to the Producers of Food and Fiber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some of the most ridiculous performances that are taking place today are the speeches being made by O. P. A.'ers and others wherein they tell of the huge profit made by farmers. They all seem to have the same line of chatter. They tell about the nineteen billion farm income in 1943 but do not go on to tell all of the story. A business may have a large income and still be run at a loss. If there are over 6,000,000 farmers and they do have an average income of over $3,000 each, that is not conclusive of anything.

They then go on to tell how much farm prices have increased since 1939. Again they do not tell the whole story. They neglect the fact that in 1939 the whole New Deal agricultural program had bogged down, and that most farm commodities were only 50 to 75 percent of parity. They do not tell that we saw 5-cent hogs, 11-cent cheese, and 54-cent wheat in 1939. In 1939 Wisconsin had its greatest number of farm foreclosures ever recorded by the Federal land bank. They evidently want the consumer to feel badly for himself by showing how much the farmer gets as a result of the war prices.

Everyone knows that in producing speculative crops profits can be made or lost in peacetime and that the same holds true in wartime. Oklahoma wheat producers, with their 3,800,000 acres of wheat land, produced in 1942 16½ bushels to the acre, a total of 57,000,000 bushels. In 1943 the Oklahoma wheat producers again raised 3,800,000 acres of wheat and had 9½ bushels to the acre, or a total of 31,000,000 bushels. When the State average was 9½ bushels to the acre, do you think these wheat producers really made unconscionable profits out of their operations? And what do you think about the incomes of the thousands of Oklahoma wheat producers who must have had a lower yield than the 9½-bushel State average.

The official tables from the studies of Dr. Wylie Goodsell, of the United States Department of Agriculture, show the hourly returns from various types of farming. If interested, you can find details of this study on page 1363 of the February 7, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These official tables show the hourly returns as net cash and noncash returns to all labor. The net cash and noncash returns mean the return without deducting the things the farmer ate and used that were produced on his own farm. Then this net cash and noncash return would be comparable to the wage one would receive if he worked in a factory or any other job.

Here are extracts from the official table that show the hourly net cash and noncash return:

Hourly cash and noncash return

Farm	1936	1939	1942
Winter wheat	$0.64	$0.42	$1.67
Winter wheat-corn	.30	.10	.84
Winter wheat-grain sorghum	.53	.50	1.33
Hog-dairy	.30	.20	.49
Corn Belt cash grain	.47	.43	1.08
Hog-beef raising	.20	.18	.47
Southern Wisconsin dairying	.25	.22	.47
Central New York dairying	.27	.27	.52
2-mule, Georgia	.12	.09	.22
Mississippi Delta	.21	.15	.31
Black waxy, Texas	.14	.10	.19

One would not expect to see the support for roll-back subsidies coming from a State where the selected, above-average cotton farmers received but 19 cents per hour in 1942, would one?

Last week, while in Wisconsin, I met an income-tax collector who expressed surprise to find that a large percentage of farm income went into the cost of producing the income. He seemed to have been a victim of the O. P. A. and allied propaganda and led to think that these dairy farmers were getting rich. Evidently he was disillusioned as to the blanket statements. He did find that under above-average conditions, where everything clicked just right, some of these dairymen had received a very satisfactory return for their efforts. Who can expect or should expect or wish to collect large income taxes from groups receiving 19 to 47 cents per hour?

There are two approaches we can make that will be constructive; one, we can show conclusively to the people of our country that the rural people have at no time asked for higher prices than were needed for maximum food production; and, two, we can show the consumer that his food is produced in large part by the lowest hourly wage found in our country today as well as before the war. Abundant food production should

be our objective, and this is not going to be obtained by criticizing a group of our people that has produced more with less as the farmers have most assuredly done.

What Has the R. F. C. Done for Small Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Has the R. F. C. Done for Small Business?", delivered by former Senator Charles B. Henderson at the dinner of the American Business Congress at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, March 17, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In considering the question which I have been asked, I know you will be interested in learning what the R. F. C. has done for small business.

The R. F. C. Act was approved January 22, 1932. It was enacted as a peacetime emergency measure to assist the economic stability of the country, and continues on this basis.

As of March 10, 1944, the R. F. C. had made over 20,744 business loans. Of this number, over 18,790 loans were of $100,000 or less in amount. The break-down as to the classification of such loans is as follows:

	Number of loans
$5,000 and under	6,720
$5,001 to $10,000	3,240
$10,001 to $25,000	4,305
$25,001 to $50,000	2,585
$50,001 to $100,000	1,940

The R. F. C. made approximately 1,954 business loans in excess of $100,000 in amount, but the number of loans of $100,000 or less comprise 90.5 percent of all business loans that the Corporation has made. You will see from this that it is the small businessman rather than the large who has more often requested and received R. F. C. financial assistance.

The Congress enacted the Murray-Patman Act in May 1942 to prevent and relieve distress among dealers in articles and commodities which were rationed in connection with the war effort. R. F. C. was authorized under this act to make loans to such dealers upon the security of any such article or commodity. Under the Murray-Patman Act, as of March 14, 1944, the Corporation had made 2,437 loans aggregating $56,691,891.39 (average about $23,000). The collateral securing such loans consisted of rationed automobiles and commercial vehicles, oil-burning and gas-burning equipment, commercial refrigerating equipment, etc. Under the Murray-Patman Act the Corporation has also made 539 purchases of rationed articles aggregating $1,669,841.05. In addition, the R. F. C. has indirectly assisted small business under this act by entering into take-out agreements with 142 banks and finance companies. These banks and finance companies assisted automobile dealers in financing over 200,000 vehicles aggregating $180,000,000. This has certainly been of great assistance to the dealers of the country.

In order to expedite the granting of assistance to small-business enterprises to convert from peacetime to wartime conditions, we authorized our loan agencies in February 1942 to make loans without reference to our Washington office in all cases where the amount did not exceed $100,000. Since that time the agencies have made over 3,923 business loans aggregating $135,757,047, averaging about $34,000 per loan.

We are sympathetic to the needs of small business in the post-war period, and we have notified our loan agencies to be prepared to carry out our responsibility in the exercise of our statutory lending powers for war demobilization, contract termination, and conversion to peacetime operations. We will give careful and sympathetic consideration to all such inquiries and applications.

In order to maintain the health of small business for the national economy we must have the financial structure of such businesses upon a sound and healthy basis. We must exercise business judgment and we must make loans on which the prospect of repayment is reasonable. Unless we do so, we would in the long run do more harm than good. It has been my experience that businessmen do not want grants or gifts of public funds.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the agricultural appropriation bill does not provide for continuation of the school-lunch program. If the bill is approved in this form and if that program is not specifically authorized by other legislation, it means that Federal aid to community school-lunch projects all over the country will stop at the end of the present school year.

The committee report on this bill states, on page 12, that:

The Budget included an estimate of $50,000,000 for the continuance of the school-lunch program in the same amount as was provided for that program in 1944. As in 1944, the Budget proposed the money be taken from the so-called 30-percent fund provided under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. Since this program is not authorized by law, the committee has excluded from the bill any appropriation therefor.

You will remember that about 2 weeks ago this House considered and rejected a school-lunch bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] as an amendment to H. R. 4278 entitled "The Department of Agriculture Omnibus Act of 1944."

I recall that at that time several of my colleagues expressed the view that school lunches are desirable, but that they should be provided by the local communities and by the parents. I have made a special point of finding out more about how the Department of Agriculture is now administering the school-lunch program and particularly to what extent the local communities are carrying the load. I find that in those schools now receiving Federal assistance, the Department of Agriculture is merely helping to defray a portion of the food cost. On the average its contribution amounts to one-third of the cost of the lunch program. The other two-thirds is provided by the parents and the local community.

The local people run their own program as they believe it should be run. They are asked only to follow a few general guides and standards regarding the quality of the lunch to be served and are asked to keep simple records of their food purchases so that they can be reimbursed for a part of the cost. The local community pays for the rest of the food, all of the labor, all of the equipment and supplies, the utilities and the supervisor where one is needed.

I find that roughly two-thirds of the Nation's 30,000,000 school children—ages 5 to 17—are in schools that provide lunch facilities. But only five to six million children are involved in the Federal school-lunch program. The reason for this is that aid is being given to those schools that need help in order to provide a good lunch program. Many schools are now able to operate their own programs, and therefore have not applied for Federal assistance. Many more applied and were turned down because local financial resources were found to be ample. Out of the $50,000,000 which was provided for the program this year, the Department will actually spend only about $40,000,000. The schools in need are being assisted. There are many thousands of schools that would have to discontinue their lunch programs if Federal funds are not provided for next year.

In my State—Oklahoma—the school-lunch program was considered so important that a fund of $175,000 has been provided by the State to hire school-lunch supervisors to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture in developing a really good program throughout the State. We have a fine program and I would not like to see thousands of those children deprived of their lunches.

I am informed that some other States have provided even larger funds to improve the school lunches. In all, more than 20 States have set aside money and provided personnel to work with the Department of Agriculture for this purpose. State legislation has been enacted in many States and is pending in others. I want to say that I think the Department should be commended for the way it has administered the school-lunch program. It has been developed from small contributions of surpluses in 1935 and 1936 to a program of national significance and great public interest. Department representatives have emphasized the importance of local initiative and local responsibility. Last year they asked State governments to assume as much responsibility for the program within their States as their funds and personnel would then permit. Coopera-

tive agreements were entered into with State agencies in 26 States. Local and State participation are rapidly increasing as a result of the Federal program.

Gentlemen, the folks back home like the school-lunch program and want it continued. It can be continued either by providing for an additional appropriation or by authorizing the use of funds already available to the Secretary of Agriculture out of the 30 percent of the customs receipts referred to in the committee report. Those funds are ample for this purpose. I think it would be tragic to cut this program off at the close of this school year; and I urge, therefore, that appropriate legislation be enacted to authorize its continuance.

Judging from the debate on March 7, questions may again arise on the following point on which there was confusion and misunderstanding:

First. Is this a continuation of the old W. P. A. program? Not at all. The W. P. A. program was a program of providing employment. They furnished cooks and some supervisors and occasionally equipment. These costs are now met locally. They never provided food. The Department of Agriculture's program has always been limited to food. Its program ran concurrently with W. P. A.'s—sometimes in the same schools.

Second. Is the Department selling this program to communities? The agency issued very firm instructions at the beginning of this year's program against any form of promotion or selling to communities which did not indicate interest or show a need for the program. These instructions were in force throughout the year. Every school must apply for the program and must certify that Federal assistance is needed. In a few isolated instances, overzealous representatives have had to be called to task for departing from instructions against promoting, but they have been the exception. In some instances some members and leaders in a community have requested the program and have pointed out the need, but other community leaders have opposed the program. In a few of such cases the Department's representatives have urged such opposing persons to reconsider, particularly where the need for the program seems apparent.

War Food Administration, Office of Distribution, school-lunch program, fiscal year 1944

State	Estimated Federal expenditures for food [1]	Estimated peak participation (children)	State participation in administration [2]	
			Funds	Personnel
Alabama	$1,190,300	155,000	$8,000	Supervisor and 2 clerks.
Arizona	295,000	42,900		
Arkansas	884,100	114,200		Supervisor.
California	1,080,000	154,000		
Colorado	250,700	31,800		
Connecticut	179,000	29,700		Do.
Delaware	59,400	12,500		Do.
Florida	862,000	115,800		Supervisor and secretary.
Georgia	2,263,000	300,300	32,000	Supervisor and 10 assistants.
Idaho	163,000	24,500		
Illinois	1,457,300	272,850	750,000	Supervisor and 2 assistants.
Indiana	683,760	121,650		
Iowa	613,700	109,800		
Kansas	450,300	54,300		
Kentucky	994,000	132,450	6,000	Supervisor and 3 clerks.
Louisiana	1,502,500	196,950	250,000	Supervisor.
Maine	284,000	54,000		
Maryland	249,000	45,300		
Massachusetts	721,400	141,900	32,000	Supervisor and 2 clerks.
Michigan	1,312,000	253,500		
Minnesota	875,200	166,500	20,000	Supervisor and 4 aides.
Mississippi	648,900	90,300		
Missouri	757,500	138,300		
Montana	98,000	14,700		
Nebraska	327,000	61,350		
Nevada	13,000	1,800		Supervisor.
New Hampshire	117,200	22,500		
New Jersey	842,000	153,300		
New Mexico	128,500	16,050		
New York	2,463,300	479,000	10,000	Do.
North Carolina	972,900	131,400	13,114	Supervisor and 4 assistants.
North Dakota	172,400	33,450		
Ohio	791,000	143,700		
Oklahoma	742,300	96,150	178,000	Supervisor and 42 aides.
Oregon	226,000	40,650		
Pennsylvania	1,116,400	200,500	10,000	Supervisor.
Rhode Island	159,000	30,000	15,000	Supervisor and 31 others.
South Carolina	2,332,200	300,000	183,300	Supervisor and 47 assistants.
South Dakota	110,720	19,650		
Tennessee	1,689,700	237,600	25,000	Supervisor and 5 assistants.
Texas	2,178,500	268,350		
Utah	293,000	43,500	400,000	Supervisor and 42 assistants.
Vermont	107,100	21,900	28,500	Supervisor and clerk.
Virginia	731,800	98,000	4,000	Supervisor.
Washington	517,300	79,000	20,000	Supervisor and 5 assistants.
West Virginia	427,500	78,300	106,500	Supervisor and 3 clerks.
Wisconsin	994,000	186,600		
Wyoming	55,100	7,950		
Alaska	1,800	300		
District of Columbia	51,300	10,200	69,000	Supervisor and assistants.
Hawaii	362,400	54,450		Supervisor.
Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands	2,500,000	250,000	650,000	
Total	38,297,480	5,838,850	2,810,414	

[1] Does not include commodities purchased in price support programs and distributed directly to schools.
[2] Includes only contributions from State governments for administration and, in a few States, direct aid to schools. Local contributions for additional foods, supervision, labor, and equipment are approximately twice the Federal expenditures.

What Is Going On in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Is Going On in Washington," which I delivered before the Eagles at Milwaukee, Wis., on March 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first and most logical question which any of you ask of one who serves you in the United States Senate is: What is going on in Washington?

It is my duty and my responsibility to know what is going on in Washington. It is my responsibility and my duty to tell you what is going on.

In this instance, there are only two limitations on my performing my full duty and responsibility. You are busy men. What you are doing is essential to the total civilian effort needed to win this war. I am going to confine what I have to tell you within the boundaries of time generously allotted to me. My other limitation is that, since this is a nonpolitical group, I shall avoid the discussion of subjects with direct political implications.

Your Congress is interested in the same subjects which mean so much to you. Congress is interested in winning this war. Congress is interested in securing a just and equitable peace, an enduring peace which will confer lasting benefits upon the American people.

All the efforts of Congress are devoted toward furthering the advancement of these prime interests.

Congress—like you—is fighting to preserve the best features of American life, to remove those features which hold back our progress, and to provide through constitutional processes the legislative assistance necessary for our national advancement. Like you—your elected public servants are doing all within their power to shorten the war.

Congress represents the veins through which the products of American ingenuity, American farmers. American white-collar workers and American labor and management course into the sinews of war—our armed services. Congress is the legislative network through which American energy is piped to our fighting fronts. Its job—like your own—has never been as vital, as important, as it is today.

The committee system of your Congress is closely in touch with the armed services. The Naval Affairs and Military Affairs Committees of both the House and the Senate meet regularly to examine and study the needs of our armed forces, both at home and abroad. The Committees on Labor meet to bring about the breakup of bottlenecks in manpower and in production. It is the job of appropriations committees to recommend spending legislation. It is the job of Ways and Means Committee to initiate matters of taxation.

Individual, in committees and as a whole, your Congress is on the job; striving to bring about the results which you want brought about.

What Congress says and does contributes to the psychological warfare against our enemies. Acts of Congress providing for the rehabilitation of former servicemen and those which make the future of servicemen's dependents more secure have a far-reaching effect on military morale. Constant contact and communication between Congress and our military and naval leadership has given us an appreciation of that leadership and its needs. The enormity of those needs is self-evident. Without the guns, the planes, the tanks, and the ships it would be impossible to win through to victory. We have seen other nations try to stave off defeat through sheer courage. No matter how brave the people of these nations have been, they have not been able to meet machine with machine. The people of the United States have been able to do so.

Yet, there are other factors to be considered besides that of procurement legislation. The Nation must find the money through legislative processes to pay for equipping our armed services. To do this, savings must be brought about in nonwar executive agencies. To do this, taxes must be levied.

Taxation is complicated. The burden of taxation must rest equally on the shoulders of all Americans. It must not be assumed by the few to ease the lot of the many, or the many to ease the lot of the few. The great middle group of Americans—the shopkeepers, the small busines men, the professional men and women—must not suffer at the hands of their elected representatives. If there is a burden, and there is a burden, it must, and by right ought to be, shared by all Americans, according to their ability. We know that the power to tax is the power to destroy. It is decidedly not the intention of Congress to destroy the incentive of labor to progress or the incentive of industrial leaders to provide more jobs for more workers. Members of Congress adhere, as you do, to the American Creed "with liberty and justice for all." The American Creed is the unwritten law of Congress.

In Washington, Congress is talking about what will come after the certain United Nations victory. We must prepare for the international relationships to come. We must not suffer a Pearl Harbor of peace. During the war we will have established working arrangements between our Nation and other nations. After the war, those contacts as brothers in arms may be of the greatest assistance in bringing about a lasting peace. But we must not put all of our eggs in one basket. Our future policy as a Nation among nations must not be determined by a single consideration. When the small nations are liberated they cannot be forgotten. They have paid in blood and suffering for the right to an independent existence. They have given much to civilization and they have much more left to give. The tie between the United States and the small free nations will enter into any post-war arrangements provided for under our Constitution.

Then, too, through the experience of the past 2 years we have learned that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. We must never again be caught off guard, for the destruction of another World War would surpass this, even as the destruction in this war has surpassed that of 1917–18. Congress is looking ahead and thinking ahead toward the providing of a substantial defense system. There is little disposition upon the part of Congress to court attack by encouraging weakness. It is our prayerful hope that we shall have, after this war, powerfully equipped and strongly manned bases throughout the Pacific and in the Atlantic. It is not just that another generation of Americans be required to suffer and sacrifice as this generation has been required to suffer and sacrifice.

Both Houses of the Congress are concerned about the economic picture of America in the post-war period. We know, as you know, that the world faces the greatest readjustment period in its history. America, who has turned such a great proportion of her production effort into war channels, faces that same problem. But we face it courageously, fearlessly. We know that the injunction "Fear not" is meant for you and me in this period, that we may prove adequate to meet any emergency.

With the reconversion of our industries back into civilian production, with eight or nine million of our armed forces turned back into civilian life, with $50,000,000,000 worth of war matériel on hand, with the demand for rebuilding America, with the commerce of the world in the argosies of the air, with hundreds of millions of the white race in need of food and shelter and rehabilitation, with new inventions and discoveries in the field of the sciences, with new nations occupying the position of leadership in the world, with a changed and broadened outlook of millions of our people with billions of dollars of new demands for automobiles, rebuilding railroads, superhighways, new homes, remade cities, public improvements, accumulated repairs, etc.—America faces a tremendous test of her moral fiber, economic ability, and her political wisdom. Your Congress is just the spearhead of your own thinking.

There are those who are ever ready to criticize Congress—most of them synthetic thinkers who are swayed by some commentator's word or some columnist's sentence.

Take the Senate of the United States. It is made up of 96 individuals—individuals is the term—no 2 of whom have the same economic, social, political, racial, religious, and geographical background. And this is well. For we see in this great legislative body the operation of that very system of checks and balances which our founding fathers translated so well into the political system when they created the Constitution. It is only in a Hitler land where people have the same background that they can be whipped into one channel, making a Hitler possible.

In the Senate we recognize the validity of having men with different viewpoints, different perspectives, different backgrounds; and because men differ, because they arrive at different conclusions, they never impute to another Senator that his motive is unworthy or unbecoming a Senator (rule 19).

Long before this moment, you have realized that Congress thinks and talks like you do—because, when it comes down to basic principles, you are Congress. The men and women in Congress were elected to represent your way of thinking. When they think as you do, they are doing the job you have chosen for them to do.

You are Eagles. The eagle is the symbol of our great Nation. At this very moment, even as I am speaking to you, other eagles—eagles of destiny—young Americans, some of whom are members of this very fraternal order, are flying against the enemy. Their word to you is: "We will never let you down." The Congress of the United States—with the great contribution of the eagles of destiny and of their comrades on the land and on the sea ever in mind—may well say to you: "Have confidence in the legislators of your Republic, for your Congress has confidence in the enduring wisdom and integrity of the American people."

A Congressman's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Frank I. Weller, which appeared in the Sunday, March 19, edition of the Washington Post:

I've just spent a day with a Congressman, and I've come to the conclusion that home folks who tell Congressmen to pay more attention to lawmaking shouldn't give them so many jobs they weren't sent here to do.

In 20 years of watching Congress from the Press Gallery I never have seen the Capitol Hill boys jump so fast and so frequently at the call of constituents. This Member (necessarily anonymous) whose day I clocked managed to squeeze in 2 hours on the floor, minus five interludes to:

Get a farmer a tractor priority.

Take a flying wedge of home boys into the House Restaurant for a taste of its famous bean soup and beer.

Assure a mixed delegation of railway executives, bankers, and distillers, respectively, that he would (a) try to swing more Federal-financed industries for their district, (b) vote to kill off H. O. L. C. so they could have a free hand at home-loan financing, and (c) rout out an official denial that liquor consumption was to be cut 99 percent during the war.

ADVISES A LOBBYIST ON BUTTER

Advise a dairy lobbyist that he would oppose substitution of oleomargarine for butter in Federal institutions.

Convince a soldier's sweetheart not to worry because he has been in Alaska so long that Eskimo women look like white girls.

The Congressman was up at 6 a. m.; had breakfast with an antiadministration politician from home who wanted to get "fixed right" for a favor from O. P. A. and W. L. B.; rode in a cab to his office with a farm lobbyist against price ceilings and farm price subsidies; was nailed at his door by a steel manufacturer here to protest against his lend-lease quota of ingots. Then he told his staff how to answer 51 letters from his district asking everything from war-censored information on where a local draftee would be sent to fight, to his opinion on whether Russia would do anything antagonistic to the United States after the war.

HE WENT "INTO CONFERENCE" OVER PHONE CALLS

Tried to figure out how to vote on one of 100 Federal agencies asking appropriations that day.

Answered his telephone 32 times and steadfastly contended that he was "in conference" 27 times.

Relayed a request to the Navy Department to name a new cruiser for his home town.

Told the editor of a great metropolitan newspaper he would write an article for a Sunday magazine section.

Gave seven colleagues his opinion on pending legislation and asked the opinion of 15 others.

Escorted a home-towner around trying to get him hired as a Government building guard.

Sat, ill-prepared, through part of a day-long committee hearing.

Appeared at another long enough to give his views, and hastened to the floor of the House.

BULK OF LETTERS PRESS FOR FAVORS

Back at his office again, he found the five daily mail deliveries had run his mail up to 96 letters.

Few had anything to do with legislation. The bulk pressed for favors. Examples:

1. A chamber of commerce wanted him to get busy "right now" to lift gasoline and tire rationing.

2. A determined young woman demanded that he instruct the Army to transfer her boy friend from Africa to a service post she named back home.

3. A club woman wanted "some information on world production."

4. An aged couple put their trust in him to find their youngest son, reported missing in action.

5. Parents asked him to represent them at the opening of a strongbox left here by their sailor son killed in action.

6. A politician wanted a portrait of the President personally autographed "from Frank to Willie."

7. A club wanted either W. P. B. Chairman Nelson or War Mobilization Director Byrnes to address its next meeting.

8. The principal speaker for an anti-Roosevelt meeting wanted to know how long the war would last and how much it would cost.

9. "Taxpayer" wanted him to put an end to "lend-lease gifts to foreigners and other immoral people."

10. "American mother" urged him not to vote for post-war world cooperation "unless they do what we say."

11. "Wife of God" wrote she wouldn't be able to send in any more divine guidance for a few days "as I am going to the hospital to have a baby."

SQUEEZES IN A COCKTAIL—LEAVES QUICKLY

He put in a "must" appearance at a cocktail party but left when he inadvertently dropped a remark that set five other Congressmen off on speeches they had practiced for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He had an early dinner at his hotel with two colleagues on world planning, then went to his room to write a weekly column for his district newspapers, read up on bills he would vote on tomorrow, and turned his lights off at 10 p. m., 16 hours after he had turned them on.

This is the average Congressman's day submitted by reformists as evidence that Congress should be streamlined.

Streamliners propose to combine the functions of overlapping committees.

For instance, at one time the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Naval Affairs Committee, Agriculture Committee, Appropriations Committee and numerous investigating committees were working on identical problems of the war program.

They want to call witnesses before committees of the whole House or Senate so all can have first-hand information and not depend on what bickering individual committee members may say it is.

They want to save the war time of Government officials, recalling that R. F. C. Chairman Jones appeared 18 times before different committees, speaking 2 hours each time on the same subject, and often waiting half an hour for members to arrive.

Minnesota Meets the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota men and women in the armed services have been guaranteed the right to vote a complete ballot by legislation recently adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature. I have just received a copy of the law from the Honorable Mike Holm, secretary of state of Minnesota.

This legislation will give the Minnesotans of voting age in the armed forces from May 10 to July 10 to secure their ballots for the primary elections July 10 and return them to their respective county auditors. A similar period, 2 months, is given for the general election on November 7.

Because I feel that our Minnesota legislators did an outstanding job, I submit a copy of the law for inclusion in the RECORD. It follows:

Chapter 2—H. F. No. 1

An act relating to elections and to facilitate voting by Minnesota electors serving in the armed forces of the United States at the primary and general elections of 1944, making an appropriation therefor, and repealing certain laws

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

SECTION 1. In recognition of the State's responsibility to enact appropriate legislation to facilitate so far as practicable the voting by its qualified electors who are serving in the armed forces of the United States, at elections held within the State, the legislature by this enactment makes necessary adjustments in the absent voting law and in the election statutes to provide adequate time for the preparation and transmission of ballots to such electors within and without the United States and for the return of such ballots in due time to be recorded at such elections. All county and local clerks and all election officials throughout the State are directed to cooperate to the fullest possible extent in order to effectively carry out the purpose and intent of this act.

SEC. 2. This act applies only to the primary and general elections to be held in 1944.

SEC. 3. Except as modified by this act, the provisions of chapter 345, Laws 1939, and acts amendatory thereof, and other statutes relating to elections shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 4. The term "armed forces" as used herein shall refer to and include the Army and Navy of the United States, or the merchant marine of the United States, or the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, the Salvation Army, the United Service Organizations, and all other persons connected in any capacity with the Army or Navy of the United States.

SEC. 5. Registration for the primary and general elections to be held in 1944 may be made by or for any member of the armed forces over 21 years of age who will attain the age of 21 years on or before July 10, 1944, desiring to vote at the primary election on said date, and any member of the armed forces over the age of 21 years or who will attain the age of 21 years on or before November 7, 1944, desiring to vote at the general election, by the member of the armed forces himself or by a parent, spouse, or a brother, sister, or child over the age of 18 years, by filing in the office of the county auditor of the county of which he was a resident prior to his entrance into the armed forces, a request for ballot in substantially the following form, whether said request for ballot is upon a form prepared and distributed by the War and Navy Departments or otherwise:

REQUEST FOR BALLOTS

To the County Auditor of _____ County, Minnesota, United States of America:

The name of the person for whom ballots are requested is _____. He is a member of the armed forces of the United States. He expects to be absent from his place of residence in Minnesota on the primary and general election dates. Request is therefore made that ballots be furnished to him to be used by him in voting at such elections and be sent to him at the address herein stated. He is a citizen of the United States. He is a resident of the State of Minnesota and has been such resident for more than 6 months last past.

He was born on the _____ day of _____ _____ in the year _____. His home and place of residence is and on said election days will be at _____ in the (town, city or village) _____ of _____, county of _____, State of Minnesota.

His voting precinct or district according to the best information of the undersigned is _____ (Give precinct and ward number or name of precinct if you know it.)

Ballots are to be sent to said member of the armed forces at the following address:

_____.

(If this request is signed by the spouse, parent, or a brother, sister, or child over the age of 18 years, of the member of the armed forces, fill in the following paragraph.)

The relative who signs this request is the _____ of said voter above named, and is of the age of 18 years or over.

_____

(Signature of member of armed forces or relative.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 1944.

_____.

(State title of office. If officer of armed forces, must be a commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below rank of sergeant or its equivalent. Affix seal, if any.)

Any such communication or request filed with or received by the county auditor after January 1, 1944, shall be registered by the county auditor in a permanent record kept by him for such purpose, and the entry of said name in such register shall constitute the only registration necessary to entitle any member of the armed forces to vote at the primary or general elections to be held in the year 1944. Registrations under this act may be challenged in the manner provided for in laws of 1939, chapter 345, except that the county auditor shall not be required to give notice to the voter, and all reasonable doubt shall be resolved in favor of the validity of such registration. If it appears from the communication or request that the applicant is not qualified to vote at the primary election but will be qualified to vote at the general election, then no primary ballot shall be forwarded to the applicant, but such communication or request shall nevertheless constitute a request for ballot for the general election. Should any such request or a communication in the form thereof be addressed to the secretary of state or any

other election official, the same shall immediately upon its receipt by said election official be forwarded to the county auditor of the county of residence of such registrant, as specified in such request, and shall have the same force and effect as if it were addressed to the county auditor. The county auditor shall in no event send more than one set of ballots to any member of the armed forces for each election.

Every county auditor shall forthwith prepare, at the expense of his county, a sufficient supply of blank forms to be used to request that ballots be furnished a member of the armed forces and shall furnish such blanks to any person applying therefor.

SEC. 6. The county auditor shall, as promptly as possible, mail an official ballot, or ballots if more than one are to be voted at the election, to every absent member of the armed forces who has been registered in accordance with the foregoing provisions. Registration for the primary election shall entitle the registrant to receive a general-election ballot without further application, notwithstanding that the registrant may have failed to vote in the primary election. Said ballot or ballots shall be mailed by air mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope upon which shall be printed "Official ballot." There shall also be sent in the same envelope a return envelope addressed to the county auditor of the county in which said vote is to be cast, upon which shall be printed "Official war ballot" and upon the back of which shall be an affidavit in the following form:

THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED IN ORDER THAT THE ENCLOSED BALLOT BE COUNTED

I, _____, do solemnly swear that I am over the age of 21 years or will be 21 years on or before July 10, 1944, ____ or on or before November 7, 1944 ____ (check one); that I am a citizen of the United States; that for more than 6 months prior to my entrance into the armed forces I was a resident of the State of Minnesota; that for more than 30 days prior thereto I resided at _____; that I have not cast another vote or returned another ballot for this election to any voting district; and that I am otherwise qualified to vote the enclosed ballot which I personally marked and sealed in this envelope without exhibiting it to any other person, or which, in case of my physical incapacity, has been marked for me and sealed in this envelope under my personal direction.

_____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ------ day of _____ 1944.

_____

(State title of office. If officer of armed forces, must be a commissioned, noncommissioned or petty officer (not below the rank of sergeant or its equivalent). Affix seal, if any.)

NOTE.—Temporary change of dwelling place made necessary by military service does not affect the voter's residence.

Priority in mailing shall be given to all ballots to be sent outside the United States. In the event the Government of the United States or any branch, department, agency, or other instrumentality thereof shall make provision for sending of any voting matter provided for in this act through the mails postage free, or otherwise, the election officials of the several counties of the State are authorized to make use thereof.

No envelope, return envelope, or explanatory note shall contain the name of any person who is a candidate at the election to which the enclosed ballot pertains.

SEC. 7. Any affidavits made by an absent voter pursuant to the provisions of this act may be executed before a commissioned officer, warrant officer, or noncommissioned officer not lower in grade than sergeant or its equivalent Navy rating, or any other person authorized to administer oaths.

SEC. 8. The ballots used under this section shall conform to the requirements of chapter 345, Laws 1939, and acts amendatory thereof, except that if modification of the size of ballot or envelope, or weight or color of paper, is necessary to conform to mailing requirements of the Federal authorities, State and county officials in charge of the preparation of such ballots and envelopes shall cause such modifications to be made. Ballots shall be marked pursuant to instructions contained thereon and shall be returned in the return envelope provided therefor.

SEC. 9. Upon receipt of the returned ballot, the county auditor shall stamp upon the ballot envelope the date of its receipt in his office and shall check the elector's name with his temporary registration book to insure that the ballot is from a voter entitled to vote and that he has not already returned another ballot for the same election. Any discrepancy or disqualifying fact shall be noted by the county auditor on the envelope. In other respects the provisions of chapter 345, Laws 1939, and acts amendatory thereof as to deposit and counting of such ballots shall apply, except that failure to return unused ballots shall not invalidate the marked ballot, which shall be counted; except that no ballot contained in a return envelope in which the affidavit upon the back thereof is not properly executed shall be counted. All ballots received by the county auditor before the closing hours of the polls shall be delivered by him to the proper polling places.

SEC. 10. If any person entitled to vote under the provisions of this act casts his ballot in person on election day, then no absentee ballot shall be counted for such elector. If more than one absentee ballot is received from any elector entitled to vote under the provisions of this act, the ballot of such elector bearing the latest county auditor's date stamp shall be cast.

SEC. 11. Whenever it shall be made to appear by due proof to the judges of election that any elector who has marked and forwarded his ballot as provided in this act, has died prior to the opening of the polls on the date of the election, then the ballot of such deceased elector shall be returned by the judges of election in the same manner as provided for rejected ballots; but the casting of the ballot of a deceased elector shall not invalidate the election.

SEC. 12. A separate record of the ballots of absent voters under this act shall be kept in the various voting districts.

SEC. 13. There shall be no limitation of time for filing and receiving applications for ballots under this act.

SEC. 14. The dates for the performance of acts in preparation for and the holding of the primary and general elections are changed as follows:

March 15: First day for filing for primary.

April 17: Last day for filing for primary.

April 20: Last day to withdraw.

Not later than April 25: Secretary of state to certify names to county auditors.

Not later than April 28: Ballots to be in hands of printers.

Not later than May 10: Ballots to be in hands of county auditors.

July 10: Primary date. The polls at the primary election shall remain open until 9 p. m.

Not later than July 11: Local judges to report returns to county auditors.

July 12: County canvassing boards meet.

July 17: Primary election returns reported to secretary of state.

July 18: State canvassing board meets.

July 21: First day for filing nominations by petition.

Petition for recount proceedings must be made not later than July 22.

August 1: Last day for filing nominations by petition.

Not later than August 3: Withdrawals by nominees must be filed.

Not later than August 10: Vacancies in nominations must be filled.

August 15: Secretary of state to certify names to county auditors.

Not later than August 21: Ballots to be in hands of printers.

Not later than September 6: Ballots to be in hands of county auditors.

November 7: General election date.

All other dates or times for the performance of acts in preparation for the primary or general election, including the meeting of any State central committee, are advanced proportionately when necessary to conform to the changes in dates made in this section. The secretary of state shall determine what advancements of such dates or time are necessary and give such notice as he may deem advisable.

SEC. 15. Payment by the secretary of state to the various counties of nomination fees of candidates filed in his office shall, for the year 1944, be made on July 1 in the manner otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 16. There is hereby appropriated out of the funds in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,500 to the secretary of state for election expense, including the printing and distribution of such information as the secretary of state deems advisable to publicize the change in the date of primary election and changes in dates or times for the performance of acts in connection with the elections to which this act applies.

SEC. 17. The county auditors of the several counties are hereby authorized and empowered to incur such expenses and expend such amounts for clerk hire, postage and other expenses as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, the same to be paid from the general revenue funds of the counties.

SEC. 18. The provisions of this act shall constitute the exclusive requirements for absentee voting by members of the armed forces.

SEC. 19. Chapter 554, Laws 1943, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 20. Elections to be held in the year 1945 shall be carried on and held in the same manner as though this act had not been passed.

Approved March 13, 1944.

The Late Honorable Joseph B. Eastman

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a brief tribute to the late Joseph Bartlett Eastman who died on March 15 and was buried from All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church in Washington on Friday afternoon, March 17.

We all knew and greatly admired Commissioner Eastman. He was, in my opinion, a civilian casualty of this war be-

cause he worked endless hours each day including Sundays. Rarely did he take time away from his desk for a rest and a holiday and, as a result of his many added war duties, he worked late into the night each and every day.

Mr. Eastman was born in the village of Katonah, of my home State, on June 26, 1882. After his graduation from Amherst he settled in Boston and took an active interest in all questions concerning the public utilities and particularly problems of transportation. In 1915 he was appointed by Gov. David I. Walsh—now United States Senator—from Massachusetts to membership on the public service commission and was reappointed in 1917.

From what I learn, upon the suggestion of the late Louis D. Brandeis, Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Eastman was appointed by President Wilson in 1918 to the Interstate Commerce Commission. He was also honored by President Harding, President Hoover, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt with appointments to the Commission and only recently completed 25 years as a member of the Commission.

At a testimonial dinner held on February 17 at the Hotel Statler and attended by legions of Joe Eastman's friends, I heard our departed fellow public servant relate his "credo" on the duties and responsibilities of the administrative agency.

It follows verbatim:

1. With the country as big and complex as it is, administrative tribunals like the Interstate Commerce Commission are necessities. Probably we shall have more rather than less. To be successful, they must be masters of their own souls and known to be such. It is the duty of the President to determine their personnel through the power of appointment, and it is the duty of Congress to determine by statute the policies which they are to administer; but in the administration of those policies these tribunals must not be under the domination or influence of either the President or Congress or of anything else than their own independent judgment of the facts and the law. They must be in position and ready to give free and untrammeled advice to both the President and Congress at any time upon request. Political domination will ruin such a tribunal. I have seen this happen many times, particularly in the States.

2. The courts were at one time much too prone to substitute their own judgment on the facts for the judgment of administrative tribunals. They are now in danger of going too far in the other direction. The principle that it is an error of law to render a decision not supported by substantial evidence is a salutary principle. The courts should enforce it.

3. An administrative tribunal has a broader responsibility than a court. It is more than a tribunal for the settlement of controversies. The word "administrative" means something. The policies of the law must be carried out. If in any proceeding the pertinent facts are not fully presented by the parties, it is the duty of the tribunal to see to it, as best it can, that they are developed of record. A complainant without resources to command adequate professional help should be given such protection. The tribunal should also be ready to institute proceedings on its own motion, whenever constructive enforcement of the law so requires.

4. There is no safe substitute in the procedure of the tribunal for full hearing and argument of the issues, when they are in controversy, although the hearing need not always be oral. This takes time, but it is time well spent.

5. The decisions of the tribunal should present succinctly the pertinent facts, as they are found to be, and the conclusions reached, but also state clearly the reasons for the conclusions.

6. The statutes which the tribunal administers should be well, simply, and carefully framed, but the personnel which does the administering is more important than the wording of the statute. Good men can produce better results with a poor law than poor men can produce with a good law.

7. It is not necessary for the members of the tribunal to be technical experts on the subject matter of their administration. As a matter of fact, you could not find a man who is a technical expert on any large part of the matters upon which the Interstate Commerce Commission finds it necessary to pass. The important qualifications are ability to grasp and comprehend facts quickly and to consider them in their relation to the law logically and with an open mind. Zealous, evangelists and the crusaders have their value before an administrative tribunal, but not on it. Other important qualifications are patience, courtesy, and a desire to be helpful to the extent that the law permits.

8. Moral courage is, of course, a prime qualification, but here are often misapprehensions as to when it is shown. The thing that takes courage is to make a decision or take a position which may react seriously in some way upon the one who makes or takes it. It requires no courage to incure disapproval, unless those who disapprove have the desire and power to cause such a result. Power is not a permanent but a shifting thing. I can well remember the time when it was a dangerous thing to incur the displeasure of bankers, but there has been no danger in this since 1932. It became a greater danger to incur the displeasure of farm or labor organizations. There is nothing more important than to curb abuse of power, wherever it may reside, and power is always subject to abuse.

9. Selection of the members of an administrative tribunal from different parts of the country has its advantages, but they turn to disadvantages if the members regard themselves as special pleaders for their respective sections.

10. Sitting in dignity and looking down on the supplicants from the elevation of a judicial bench has its dangers. A reversal of the position now and then is good for the soul. It has for many years been my good fortune to appear rather frequently before legislative or congressional committees. They are a better safeguard against inflation than the O. P. A.

11. In any large administrative tribunal, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, a vast amount of the real work must necessarily be done by the staff. It is a difficult problem to give the individual members of the staff proper recognition for work well done—recognition on the outside as well as the inside. It is very important that this problem be solved, but I am frank to say that its full solution has not yet been reached.

12. One of the great dangers in public regulation by administrative tribunals of business concerns is the resulting division of responsibility, as between the managements and the regulators, for the successful functioning of these concerns. For example, there was a tendency at one time, and it may still exist, on the part of those financially interested in the railroads to think of the financial success of those properties solely in terms of rates and wages and the treatment of rates and wages by public authorities. Sight was lost of the essentiality of constant, unremitting enterprise and initiative in management. The importance of sound public regulation cannot be minimized, but it must not be magnified to the exclusion of those factors in financial success upon which ordinary private business must rely.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all can applaud the ideas of Mr. Eastman as contained in his credo and, I am equally sure, that we, as Members of Congress, hope his theory and philosophy of the rights and obligations of an administrator would be adopted and embraced by the multitude of persons now occupying administrative positions in our Government.

It was my privilege to have known Commissioner Eastman since I came to Congress in 1930 and throughout the years I have always regarded him as a gentleman of the highest rank and a public official without peer. In the passing of Joseph Bartlett Eastman I have lost a friend, the State of New York a distinguished son, and the Nation an outstanding citizen and a model public officer.

Thousands of messages of condolence and praise were uttered upon the death of Commissioner Eastman by the men and women of America but I believe the statement by the president of the New York Central Railroad, Col. F. E. Williamson, sums up the views of all. It was, "Joseph B. Eastman was Public Official No. 1 in the United States."

Dr. Robert Morss Lovett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT

The Daily News (St. Thomas, V. I.) dedicates its issue of March 13 to "Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, a gentleman of high order, a great public servant, a leader, a friend." Such is the impression Dr. Lovett made on the people of the islands during more than 4 years as Government secretary and a few months as executive secretary. Yet he had to resign because Secretary Ickes believed, as Dr. Lovett interpreted his position in an interview with a News reporter, that his "presence in the islands, in view of the personal hostility of Members of Congress, is a burden which the Department of the Interior cannot longer carry."

The circumstances are not in dispute. Dr. Lovett was brought down by the blunderbuss of the Dies committee. His name was found on the mailing lists of organizations which this famous but not dispassionate agency believed to have a Communist backing. He was in favor of things like free speech. He was against injustice. So, according to their own assertions, were the American Communists. The Dies crusade was taken up by a subcommittee of the House

Appropriations Committee, which induced Congress to cut off Dr. Lovett's salary. Since October he has been serving his country without salary. Now he can't do that any more—not in the Virgin Islands.

The St. Thomas Daily News saw Dr. Lovett as "a sincere, tolerant, hard-working public servant." His multitude of friends in this country know him as such. His services are lost because of an accusation unsupported by anything a court would call evidence.

Irish Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Binghamton Sun March 18, concerning the St. Patrick's Day speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee. The editorial follows:

IRISH SPIRIT

Probably no man in this land of the free is better qualified to speak on the record of the Irish in America than James A. Farley, former member of the President's Cabinet and still a great power in the Democratic Party. His St. Patrick's Day address in St. Louis yesterday has a double significance. No finer tribute was paid that day to the patron saint of the Irish, and nothing finer could be said of the contribution Irish citizens everywhere have made to the cause of freedom.

This is a troubled hour for the Irish. They are torn between two great loyalties. And these loyalties are outstanding among their much admired characteristics, since it is taken for granted that the first loyalty is here.

Mr. Farley truly stated that the Irish spirit has manifested itself in many ways to the gain of all who have come in contact with it. And no more characteristic manifestation of that spirit, he said, has been exhibited than a consuming urge to political independence, "a fierce and unyielding determination that no man or group of men or, indeed, any nation shall rule others to any greater degree than the moral law requires—in other words, beyond their consent, because the instinct of man leads him to consent to be ruled as far as the law of his nature makes necessary."

He said:

"Nowhere in geography or history will you find another people as blessed as the Irish with this almost miraculous combination of qualities—the instinct for good society, devotion to the Author of society, and hatred of oppression. And there you have the secret of history's greatest paradox. Neither Rome, which held her legions like a whip over Asia, Africa, and most of Europe, nor Britain, whose writ runs with the sun, ever subdued Ireland. Britain, God knows, tried hard enough, and even an Irishman must admit that the Saxon has few peers when it comes to persisting in an effort."

And that is as near as he came to touching on the present problem in Ireland. He did, however, elaborate on the theme of liberty and good government which, he said, are not lost in sudden catacylsms. Only when the ground is soft, said the former Democratic national chairman, do political cave-ins occur. "It's the erosion and rotting of the ground that really do the damage. And the pity of it is that few are sensitive enough in eye or ear to perceive what is going on," he added.

Pointing to "a few plain symptoms" because they illustrate how well the men of Ireland are inoculated, Mr. Farley said:

"One symptom is carelessness with the truth. Political adventurers are past masters of the art of manipulating language so that the false that serves their purpose is presented to the people rather than the truth that does not serve them so well. It is not only a matter of direct falsehood, but of suppression of truth and the suggestion of the false by adroit phrasing and implication.

"I need to suggest no examples, for you hear that sort of thing in public affairs day in and day out. Now, manipulation of the truth is an art most easy to practice when the public mind has been prepared for it by a propaganda of confusion designed to create the impression that everything is relative anyway and no one can really know what the fact is. That kind of nonsense makes a good deal of headway with many soft-headed people. But not with the Irish. No one is kidding the Irish about what's absolute and what's relative and whether it's possible to arrive at the truth or not. The Irish have been tried in the fire of centuries of warfare on truth and moral certainty, and they know such rubbish for exactly what it is."

"Jim" Farley still yields a mighty influence, and his words are going to sink in. No particular chart or diagram is needed to clarify what he had in mind; but if any clarification is needed, he may be expected to furnish it in subsequent addresses. Frankness and consistency are Irish qualities Mr. Farley possesses to a marked degree.

A Tribute to Brumidi, Italian-American Artist and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a poem, "Yes; Brumidi Is Gone, But His Pictures Live On," written by Horace C. Carlisle, of the Office of the Capitol Architect. I take this occasion also to pay a tribute to Constantino Brumidi, the subject of this poem. Brumidi, born in Rome, July 26, 1805, attended the Academy of Fine Arts in Rome where he studied modeling under Thorwaldson and Canova and painting under Baron Camuccini. He was commissioned to restore the Loggia of Rafael in the Vatican. He also served as a captain in the National Guards at Rome. As an officer he refused to order his troops to fire upon the people and in consequence was imprisoned for 14 months after which he came to America in exile. This great Italian democrat adopted America as his country and spent 25 years of his life decorating the Capitol with frescoes and other mural paintings. His work extended from 1855 to 1880. He combined in his art the finest artistic traditions of Italian mural painting with the highest democratic traditions of America. Mr. Carlisle's poem follows:

YES, BRUMIDI IS GONE, BUT HIS PICTURES LIVE ON

Amongst the majestic, immortal productions,
In pictures, by Brumidi's hand
Adorning the Capitol, none in constructions
Or beautiful sentiments stand
Above those portrayed in the corridors, reaching
Across it, upon the ground floor,
From its northern entrances, justly beseeching
That we love America more.

Brumidi was master of natural hist'ry—
Through pictures he, rather than words,
Described, in a manner that still is a myst'ry,
Profusely, the flowers and birds,
And reptiles, and many of God's living creatures,
In whom every scientist prides,
Which elevates him amongst history's teachers
In whose hearts his mem'ry abides.

The walls of those corridors, gleaming with glory,
And ceilings of perfected hue
Tell silently there, in pictures, the story
Of Brumidi's dream coming true.
What we have achieved, and today are achieving,
And will yet achieve, he has told,
In pictures, from which he'll continue receiving
Just praises by both young and old.

Brumidi has painted the great occupations
Of men, through the tools they employed,
By which they attained their deserv'd expectations,
Or whereby their foes they destroyed—
These historic pictures nobody can question,
As true as the instinct of birds—
Whole chapters of hist'ry they teach by suggestion,
Through pictures, more welcome than words.

He studied the acts passed by God's legislature,
And was versed in natural law—
By instinct he followed the teachings of nature,
As he, with prophetic eye, saw
Far into the future, whose coming expanses,
In this way he loved to record—
For our works are making us, as time advances,
A Nation whose God is the Lord.

Through nature Brumidi beheld God in action—
Her law he resolved to obey;
But God's divine law shaped his every transaction,
And kept him from going astray;
While Nature's law guided him in his endeavor
To paint pictures on the stone walls
Of yesterday—and of today and forever—
To live until time's curtain falls.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Flood Control Versus Navigation on Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am personally concerned, and I am

sure I voice the sentiment of the people in my district when I say my only interest in the deeper channel would be, that the deeper it is, the greater will be the carrying capacity of the river to better insure us against floods. So far as transportation is concerned, in my estimation it will make little difference whether the channel is knee deep or 9 feet deep. In this connection I wish to read part of an editorial by A. M. Piper of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, of recent date, which I believe expresses the majority opinion of the people in that section of Iowa. I quote:

The Nonpareil agrees with Western States Congressmen and Governors that channel development should be excluded from Missouri River development plans.

Navigation of the upper Missouri is a delusion, a pipe dream that ought to be banished from consideration now and forever.

To begin with, it is not needed. Our efficient railroad systems can move all the heavy freight that this region has to transport, and more. In addition we have a great network of highways over which thousands of trucks carry all kinds of commodities, picking up shipments at the place of production and delivering same to consumers of local distributors.

Practically all the money spent to construct a 9-foot channel from Kansas City north would be wasted. Fact is the money spent on the present chanel has been wasted. The Government ought not to squander another dollar on this absurd scheme.

Not enough freight will ever move up or down the river to justify even a fraction of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that the billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money that has been spent in the past to improve and develop our inland waterways has been a great benefit to the water carriers who operate on the large rivers of the Nation. But the railroad carriers must keep up their own roadbeds and, in addition, must pay great sums in taxes, and the truck carriers must pay a large license to operate on our highways while the water carriers have been getting by almost scot free. Now, some may say, "Yes; but the rivers are Federal property and belong to all the people." To that I would say that is true if they had been left in their original state, but when we take billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to build docks and to improve the waterways, those who use the water highways in competition to other common carriers should pay a tax commensurate with the taxes and charges levied against the competitors of the water carriers. That is no more or less than pure and simple American justice.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and to make my position perfectly clear, I shall oppose this expenditure of $6,000,000 for a 9-foot channel, for the reason that, in my studied judgment, the benefits, if there are any which will be derived, do not warrant this expenditure of public funds. And I feel very certain the flood waters of the Missouri River will be sufficiently, if not completely, harnessed after the over-all Missouri River Basin flood-control program, now proposed by the Army engineers, has been completed, and I have no doubt but that the proposed program will, in due and proper time, be adopted by Congress. Furthermore, I shall vote against the passage of this whole bill, H. R. 3961, because it smells too much of "pork barrel" to suit me.

Puerto Rican Labor Opposes Senate Bill 981

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted unanimously by the C. I. O. Latin American Committee in opposition to those provisions of Senate bill 981 which divert Puerto Rico's revenue from the sale of rum from the Puerto Rican treasury to that of the United States:

Resolution to request from the Congress of the United States the disapproval of bill No. S. 981 that intends to deprive the island of Puerto Rico, through an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code, of the rum income revenue, which by virtue of existing legislation belongs to the people of Puerto Rico

Whereas there is a bill before consideration of Congress, providing that 50 percent of the rum income revenue, collected on rums exported from Puerto Rico, must be deposited in the United States Treasury, to be used by Congress, on Federal sponsored projects in Puerto Rico; and

Whereas one of the most important of the basic problems of Puerto Rico is the problem of unemployment, and the several appropriations made by our Congress during the last few years for rehabilitation purposes in the island, had failed in accomplishing the solution of this problem in a permanent way; and

Whereas in accordance with the provisions of the Organic Act, Puerto Rico has never been included in the Federal Fiscal System, and the United States Government is not supposed to retain and use for Federal purposes any taxes levied upon imports and exports of Puerto Rican products; and

Whereas any action of this kind, exercised either by the Government or the Congress of the United States, will amount to a confiscatory act of revenues that as a result of previous legislation belong to the Puerto Rican people and will be equivalent to taxation without representation, and a violation of the constitutional rights of due process of law; and

Whereas the Government of Puerto Rico is using these funds for the development of its public welfare and social justice program, and any action of this nature will interrupt the successful prosecution of this program and will deprive the Puerto Rican workers of its benefits; and

Whereas it has been a firmly established policy of the Roosevelt administration to maintain a betterment of Inter-American relations based in hemispheric solidarity for the winning of the war; and

Whereas the attitude of the Government of the United States toward the people of Puerto Rico has been a unanimous preoccupation of the Latin American countries, to the extent that the policy followed by the Government of the United States in respect to Puerto Rico is taken by the people of the Latin American countries as an index of the policy to be followed in respect to the Latin American people themselves; and

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico have not attained yet complete power to handle their affairs; and

Whereas by ratifying the Treaty of Paris, the Congress of the United States accepted the obligation to be the depository of the political and economic power of Puerto Rico, being the duty of Congress to give immediate and proper attention to all the basic problems of the island of Puerto Rico, to be solved for the good of its people; and

Whereas an estimate of about 70 percent of the Federal appropriations for Puerto Rico are used mainly for military purposes of national defense, either in direct military establishments, or in nearby sanitary complementary services for the benefit of the armed forces of the United States and its allies.

Now, through this projected legislation, it is the intention to take away moneys that belong to the people of Puerto Rico on products produced by the Puerto Ricans.

It was the intention of the insular government of Puerto Rico to appropriate these funds for strengthening the health and means of the people, and now these funds are taken away for Federal projects that will not respond to the immediate needs of the Puerto Rican people, ignoring that by taking a primary care of the health and means of life of the Puerto Ricans, the will and intelligence of these people will be strengthened. This projected legislation tends to weaken the first line of defense, that is, the people; a people that has proved in the battlefields of the world, by blood and fire, its eradicable faith in liberty and democracy. The black forces of reaction, fascism, and the fifth column operating in the Americas will be strengthened by this proposed legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, To request from the Congress of the United States, the disapproval of bill S. 981, as an act of political self respect, and as an act of justice to the Puerto Ricans, today fighting together with the people of the United Nations for the victory of democracy, and the establishment of a better world, based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of justice for the oppressed people of the world, the only guarantee of a stable peace among the nations; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all the affiliated bodies of the C. I. O. in the United States, requesting from all the different unions a full mobilization of their respective memberships, in contacting their Congressmen in the most effective way, for the defeat of this discriminatory legislation against Puerto Rico and the vital interests of its workers; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, to the Department of State, to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, to the Department of the Interior, to the press, and to the Latin American Confederation of Workers.

Keystone Harbor Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the projects included in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill is that known as

the Keystone Harbor project in the State of Washington. This project would provide an adequate harbor at or near Keystone, Island County, State of Washington, which would serve to connect Fort Worden and the Olympic Peninsula with the highway leading from Fort Casey across Whidbey Island to the mainland. This project is approved by all the citizens of the State of Washington as it would provide a very vital link in the road transportation system in the Puget Sound area. This connecting link is of the greatest possible importance, both to the military defense of this area of Puget Sound and the future econom' development of this area.

To demonstrate the vital need of this project, I wish to state that with unanimous voice all the trade organizations, chambers of commerce, and labor unions of the Puget Sound area have enthusiastically endorsed this project. It has received the support of the Puget Sound Regional Planning Commission, the Washington State Planning Council, and the National Resources Planning Board.

The military necessity of this project is demonstrated by the fact that it has been approved by the district and national offices of the United States engineers, War Department, and the commanding general of the Puget Sound defense area. It has also been approved by the naval authorities of the Thirteenth Naval District.

I therefore wish to urge most strongly that Congress authorize this project in the omnibus river and harbor bill and that, furthermore, because of its military necessity, the Appropriations Committee make funds available for the initiation of immediate construction on this project which is so vital to the defense of the Puget Sound area.

F. E. P. C. Is Insurance at Low Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the President and the Bureau of the Budget have sent to the Congress a proposed budget for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, asking for a total of $585,000. This sum will support the Committee—F. E. P. C.—and the work it is doing to insure that every man and woman gets a chance to help produce the materials we need to win this war.

Incidentally, the committee has as great a value from the point of view of national morale. Every step we take to show all segments of our population that we are not hypocrites, that this is a nation of all the people, and that every American is wanted, helps to keep everyone enthusiastic for our war effort. Everytime an employer says to a Negro, a Jew, or a Spanish-American that he cannot do a job, only because of his race, or his religion, or his national background, millions of Americans have their faith in America shaken and other millions wonder whether this war is really serious. If it is, we cannot afford to turn down anyone who is willing, anxious, and ready to help.

The purpose and program of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice appears to me constructive and essential, but even if I had any doubts, I would still consider it more profitable to support such a program than run the risk of our war effort losing the wholehearted support or the full benefits of millions of loyal citizens. In a certain sense the fair employment policy expressed in Presidential Executive Order 9346 is nothing more than good insurance—protecting our home fences, insuring against any attempted inroads on a united front, helping to insure the highest national morale. And the cost of this insurance is low.

The budget of the Committee on Fair Practice is $585,000. If Tojo felt he could corrupt just 1,000 of our Negro citizens into saboteurs, he would gladly spend 10 times that amount to enlist them in his cause. If Hitler dreamed he could turn our 3,000,000 Spanish-Americans of the Southwest against this Nation he would spend not half a million but many millions to do his dirty work. What a pittance, therefore, is $585,000 if it is used to strengthen democracy and to demonstrate to substantial segments of our people that they have a stake in this country.

Indeed, $585,000 means that every American will be investing less than one-half of 1 cent—forty-five one-hundredths of a penny—in this experiment in human relations and democracy. And who would say that the experiment is not even worth the trial? I think it is worth it, and I think, like the quality of mercy, it will bless and benefit both those who sponsor the experiment and those for whom it is intended. Our merest imagination can easily tell how much more expensive it might be if our so-called minority groups—racial, religious, and so on—were not fighting on our side, united to defeat Hitlerism.

Laundry Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE LAUNDRY BOARD OF TRADE
OF PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 21, 1944.

Mr. WALTER THOMPSON,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The O. P. A. Regional Office in New York has issued an order granting price increases to the Philadelphia laundries.

On behalf of our committee I wish to take this occasion to go on record as expressing our appreciation of the prompt and energetic manner in which the New York and Philadelphia staffs completed the processing of our applications and issued the order.

The War Labor Board issued their decision on December 14. Final information from the individual laundries as to the exact cost of the wage increase reached the Philadelphia O. P. A. office during the week of December 29, and the price increases were publicly announced January 7 to be effective January 10. This prompt action, we believe, deserves the recognition that is here expressed.

Very truly yours,

CHANTRY W. DAVIS,
Secretary.

Do You Want To Work for Your Board and Clothes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to judge from the stream of letters being received by the Members of Congress from many sections of the country advocating technocracy, it is apparent that many thoughtless people fail to appreciate the blessings they enjoy under our form of government or understand the longing of people in foreign lands to come to America and share the blessing of good government that is the birthright of every United States citizen.

In answer to one of these critics there is inserted herewith a letter from a technocrat and my reply:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR. In answer to a letter that I wrote you some time ago I received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which had technocracy's total conscription program in it. It also had received the coup de grace of Washington cess-pool politics. Across the top was written, Do you want to work for your board and clothes? This is a direct sneer and double-cross of those 12,000,000 American boys that have been stripped of the privilege to chisel their fellow Americans, which politics still enjoys.

About 97 percent of Americans never had anyway near the food and clothes that they could consume. Total conscription would be a rise in the standard of living to these people, plus the elimination of the functional incompetent in our Congress.

Politicians can do only two things—that is tax their fellow Americans and then spend the money keeping themselves in office. The great American "sucker" has been trimmed so many times for his golden fleece that he has turned out to be a Mexican hairless. The social winds are again blowing in the Mountain States. One billion four hundred million pounds of wood surplus; mines, steel mills, ammunition plants closed, with the cattle and agricultural industries losing money. Yes, Mr. Senator, board and clothes will look pretty good to the people of Idaho and Utah by the time this year rolls around to an end.

We, the people, are interested in getting the war over, and it doesn't matter if we are fed and clothed a little poorly, as we have always managed to get along on a half-empty stomach and thread-bare clothes, while our wizards of Washington voted themselves more salary or retirement benefits. About one more year of political bungling and the people will retire all politicians permanently.

Total conscription was endorsed by the Nez Perce, Idaho, Grange and many of the local unions so my friends have told me. Uncle Sam is the largest and most reliable paymaster on this continent, therefore, we all want on his pay roll the same as you Mr. Senator. Can you blame us after reviewing the surrounding circumstances that Idaho and Utah are faced with?

Sincerely yours,

T. E. PATTISON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1944.

Mr. T. E. PATTISON,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. PATTISON: Answering your undated letter recently received, it is interesting to have an expression of your views as deduced from your consideration of the proposal for universal conscription made by the supporters of technocracy.

If the effect of human experience in experimenting with the several forms of government that have been tried in the past, and the hardship and misery that has been endured by humanity as a result of the failure of these forms of government to vouchsafe to man the blessing he sought to achieve is lost on you—then your lack of perception is to be regretted. All the benefits you and the Technocrats seek to bestow on the American people were the portion of the Russian people under the regime of the Bolsheviki—commonly called communism—collective farming and industry, socialized family relations—with its trail of hunger, destitution, slavery, and death—with the difference that the Russians had never known or enjoyed the civilizing influence of good government, a birthright the American people can lose by experimenting with technocracy and its dictators.

America is a good place—and has a good government. Russia may be a better place, and have a better government in your estimation. Russia is a vast country rich in resources, backward in development, thinly populated, and strongly governed by conditions that doubtless fit in with your ideals. It may be that the solution of your problem, and the vindication of your ideals of government, would be effected by a transfer from our misgoverned country to this land of vast resources, ideal principles of civilization, and strong government control. If you decide to make the experiment, it will be very interesting to compare notes with you after a prolonged experience in testing the form of government you now propose for this country.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Pacific Theater of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on how our Government has conducted the war in the Pacific, delivered by my friend and colleague from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] over radio station KFUN, Las Vegas, N. Mex., last Sunday, March 19, at a public service program series known as Your Public Representative Speaks, in which the Governor, the Senators, and the Members of Congress from New Mexico participate in rotation, providing them an opportunity to make regular reports to their constituents.

The address follows:

Fellow citizens, I am grateful for the opportunity of speaking to you on this program. My time is limited, of course, and I shall speak only on one subject—one on which New Mexico is peculiarly interested—the Government's conduct with respect to the Pacific theater of war.

When Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, Germany and Italy immediately declared war on the United States. That meant we were suddenly at war with three powerful nations, the most dangerous of which, immediately and in the long run, was Germany.

At that moment Germany was the strongest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. She stood poised at the gates of Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad. The Ukraine had been conquered, and the Germans were within reach of the Caucasus.

On the British front Germany and Italy were closing in on the Suez Canal. The fall of Suez was confidently expected by them. That would effectively close the Mediterranean to the world, cut the British in two, and would make possible a pincer movement between Germany and Japan that would result in their joining hands across India.

Pearl Harbor was only one more piece in the Nazi pattern of war which Hitler had said would determine the destiny of Germany for the next 1,000 years. Germany, Italy, and Japan together formed the Axis, but Germany supplied the guiding spirit—the brains and the strategy. Germany's supreme moment to round out her master race theory of world domination had arrived, and Germany chose the time and place for Japan's contribution.

The Pearl Harbor move in that design was simple.

Get Japan to strike by stealth at Pearl Harbor, and the angry, impulsive Americans would send their pitifully inadequate fleet racing to the Pacific, and to death and destruction. So Hitler thought. That would relieve the archenemy in the Atlantic.

Get Japan to strike at Singapore—bastion of British power—and Britain would be forced by its people to do likewise. So Hitler thought.

Had we so acted, Germany's purpose to close the Suez Canal and strike through the Near East to join hands with Japan across India and Burma would have been consummated.

But Germany miscalculated once again the character and capacity of a free people to think and act in time of peril and distress.

On the day of Pearl Harbor we had a total of 1,157 combat planes. Of those, 526 were strategically located to meet possible attack on the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. Within a few hours that number had been reduced to 176.

I have no figures as to the British, but you will remember that the powerful British battleships, *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*, were in the area, and within 3 days they lay at the bottom of the sea—sent there because the Japanese had airpower and the Allies had not.

With death and destruction raining from the air, the American and Filipino soldiers fought for months, anxiously scanning the skies for help that never came. They did not know it had been destroyed at Pearl Harbor. Their valor can only be matched by the suffering and patient fortitude of their fathers, mothers, and wives at home these many months.

While the battle raged in the Philippines, and we listened with grief to the reports, the natural impulse of a people under such circumstances would have been to demand that the ships and soldiers, and the few planes we had, be dispatched immediately to that front over 6,000 miles away. That is what Hitler counted on. Our people knew better. They knew that without tremendous air and sea forces of the kind needed under the situation created by the treachery of the Japs, it would be murder for our boys—suicide without the least hope of reaching the objective. We would decimate our forces and make more distant the day of liberation.

Be it said to the credit of our American people that they did not behave as Hitler thought and planned that they would. It is not the first time that American democracy has demonstrated its capacity for discernment and restraint.

What forces we did have, we did not shelve.

Within 30 days after Pearl Harbor a contingent of our soldiers landed in Ireland. Within 90 days another contingent was landed there. Trucks, tanks, guns continued to flow to England and Russia, contrary to Germany's expectations, and much to her dismay. Our military chiefs announced to the world that Americans and British would proceed to defeat Germany first. The weary defenders of Europe were heartened, morale held—their efforts were redoubled. Germany did not close the Suez Canal. Instead, she and Italy were thrown out of the Mediterranean.

Realizing her error, Germany forsook her Japanese ally and co-conspirator, and has been engaged ever since trying to save her own self. By grabbing at the throat of the German aggressor close at hand, we kept that enemy from assisting Japan until we could reach for its throat.

As the days and weeks stretched into months, and as our power grew and began to be felt in north Africa and elsewhere in Europe, very naturally the American people, in the Congress, in the press, and on the street, showed signs of impatience in regard to the Pacific, and many were the grief-stricken citizens who angrily concluded that their demands for greater help to MacArthur were being ignored and unheeded.

The fact is that those demands, perfectly proper and understandable, were not only heeded but anticipated from the very inception of the war.

Strategy with respect to the Pacific had not been neglected or ignored. It was fully determined as to every detail by conferences participated in by our military chiefs. But its details and its operation had been concealed for obvious reasons. That important strategy, we were told, would be revealed by guns in action and thus only.

It could not be told then, but it can be told now, that our Government set about immediately to build and transport to the Pacific a naval and air armada so strong that at the appointed time it could strike "from north, from the south, from the east, and from the west," in pincer movements of our own, designed to overwhelm and defeat the Japanese on such broad fronts that they could never tell where it would strike next. So carefully was the secret guarded, that few realized what was going on. Listen to the words of the late Raymond Clapper, one of the best-informed reporters in Washington, when, on last January, he went to Australia.

"I have already visited," he said, "some of the Pacific and have seen acres of supplies. Even the first quick glance shows that preparations for the Pacific war are far more advanced than I had realized. Certainly our forces in the Pacific are not being starved.

On the contrary, there has been a long period of building up."

While the war in Russia and Europe and our part in it has been dramatized daily, many of our good citizens wondered, and wept, at what they thought was heartless inaction in the Pacific. But when the deeds of the Nation come to be recorded by history, the secret gigantic work of America in the Pacific will stand out above and beyond the battles of Europe in magnitude of achievement.

A fleet such as the world has never seen was built, equipped, transported and made ready for concerted action, while we carried on a holding fight from the cold Aleutians on the north to Guadalcanal, thousands of miles to the south.

At the appointed time, on January 23, this armada began to speak through its guns and planes and bombers. It will continue to roar death and destruction until Japan is conquered. On January 23, the Marshall Islands, 2,400 miles from Pearl Harbor, were breached by 2,000,000 tons of ships. Subsequent events proved that the offensive had begun—an offensive on a waterfront more than twice as long as the Russian front.

Over on the Burma end, British, American, and Chinese land forces are on the move, with 2,000 Japs killed at the first onslaught and more on the run.

On February 16 the biggest force of aircraft carriers ever assembled, guarded by destroyers, cruisers, and battleships, launched an attack on Truk and left 200 planes burning and sent 19 Japanese ships to the bottom. It was here, in their most important base, that the Japanese were caught completely by surprise and their planes burned on the ground. The Chiefs of Staff of the Japanese Imperial Army and Navy were fired.

In a period of a few weeks attack after attack in widely separated groups of islands have been made hundreds and thousands of miles apart—in the Admiralty Islands, at Kavieng, and north on the Marianas, and at Paramushiro, north of Tokyo. Last Sunday the press reported that one-half million Japanese have been killed in the Pacific up to date. MacArthur reports 72,000 Japs now isolated at Rabaul, Kavieng, and New Guinea, and destined to defeat or starvation. It is important to note that it will not be necessary to take every island on the way. Many will be bypassed, their supply line cut, and the Japanese left to starve or surrender.

Germany has not been licked yet, but Admiral Nimitz, Commander in Chief of the Pacific, has made it plain that the war against Japan need not wait the outcome in Europe. "The war in Europe," he said a month ago, "is another war."

The fact of the matter is, that, notwithstanding what your Government has said in the past for the benefit and enlightenment of the enemy, we have fought and will continue to fight vigorously the two wars at the same time. When two enemies attack, you do not grapple with one and permit the other to stab you in the back.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was taken from the annual report of Butler Bros., for the year ended December 30, 1943, issued to its stockholders over the name of its president, Thomas B. Freeman.

This company is a Chicago business house, doing a wholesale and retail business totaling $121,000,000, with operations extending throughout the Nation.

Said Mr. Freeman, its president:

In general, price advances at all distribution levels have been slow and gradual, and they have not approached World War No. 1 proportions. We believe that the Office of Price Administration has made a genuine contribution to the Nation's economy.

Such a statement coming from one of our Nation's business leaders and made to his 16,000 stockholders is an expression of the growing appreciation on the part of business of the great service being rendered to the Nation by the Office of Price Administration. It deserves the attention of the Congress.

Plight of Mint Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from Prof. Paul M. Harmen, of Michigan State College, and Mr. N. P. Beebe, president of the Essential Growers of Michigan, concerning the threatened extinction of the American peppermint industry.

These letters tell a sorry story of how the Washington bureaucrats have set out to utterly destroy an entire industry—an industry which is the lifeblood of hundreds of farmers in northern Indiana and Michigan. I call them to the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in preserving a sound economy for the American farmer:

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE OF
AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
East Lansing, March 18, 1944.

The Honorable GEO. W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: I am enclosing herewith a letter from Mr. N. P. Beebe, together with a resolution. Mr. Beebe planned to write this letter to you several weeks ago but, unfortunately, his illness prevented it.

I wish to add a word regarding this matter of governmental regulation of the peppermint oil industry. I have just completed a series of all-day muck meetings in 17 of the muck counties of the State, in the course of which I have contacted a large number of mint growers. The question which has been asked me time after time, has been, "Shall I cut my acreage of mint or do you think the O. P. A. still may give us a fair deal?"

You are probably aware of the fact that Indiana and Michigan together produce about 80 percent of the Nation's supply of mint oil. This oil is an essential crop and large quantities of it have been purchased in the form of gum and candy for the armed forces, and as oil for lend-lease export. The extremely wet conditions of last spring resulted in a very weedy condition of many fields, so that large areas were entirely abandoned or now have such a poor stand of mint roots that the growers must plant new fields if they are to continue to maintain their acreage. They will not go to this additional expense if there is to be no future in producing the crop. Because of the unfavorable weather conditions, most of the growers produced their mint oil at a considerable loss. If the O. P. A. will not make any adjustment in ceiling for such a disastrous season as 1943, what can the mint growers hope for in the future?

The large manufacturing consumers of mint oil have recognized the seriousness of the situation and have met with the O. P. A. in Washington and have urged a $7 ceiling for the 1943 oil. They were given sufficient incouragement by the O. P. A. so that they advised the growers, when the oil was released for sale on January 1, that they hold their oil until the ceiling is raised. These consumers have agreed to pay this higher price, and not to increase the price of their products, in order to insure a sufficient acreage of mint in 1944.

In a month's time, the mint growers should be setting out new fields. Right now they should be ordering ample fertilizer for these fields, repairs for their mint stills, and other machinery. Instead they are disgusted and discouraged, and have been attending my meetings for the purpose of deciding on whether they should substitute other crops or seed their land down. At present they can see, in the unrestricted importation of Brazilian oil, nothing but ruination for the United States mint industry and aid to the enemy. They all feel that the imported oil either came from Japan originally or was produced by Japanese in Brazil, with the same ultimate result.

Thanking you for any assistance you can give this group of farmers, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL M. HARMEN,
Professor of Soil Science.

ESSENTIAL OIL GROWERS OF MICHIGAN,
March 18, 1944.

Hon. GEO. W. GILLIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: At a meeting of the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, held at East Lansing February 4, which was attended by representatives from all the principal mint districts of Michigan, th accompanying resolution was adopted.

This resolution was adopted on account of the following orders issued by the O. P. A. and W. F. A.:

I. O. P. A. issued an order August 14, 1942, establishing a ceiling price of $5.50 on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint to the dealer. This ceiling did not work out satisfactorily to the dealer because the growers sold their crop direct to the consumer.

II. A letter was sent out by O. P. A. July 14, 1943, stating a proposed price of $5 on peppermint and $3 on spearmint and asking for suggestions. In reply to this letter, the directors of the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan met at East Lansing and adopted resolutions protesting against this price and asking for a price of $7.50 for peppermint and $5 per pound for spearmint, and forwarded same to the O. P. A. in Washington. Further, we sent a committee to Washington who met with the O. P. A. and presented figures showing the cost of production, but accomplished nothing. They preferred to use the parity rule established by some theorist in Washington which does not take into consideration the higher cost of everything entering into production, and especially higher wages and the inefficiency of labor.

III. Order No. 81, September 23, 1943, from W. F. A., freezing peppermint and spearmint oils. By this order the crops were placed under the supervision of a director appointed by W. F. A., with authority to delegate his powers to any person employed by the Department of Agriculture, also to give manufac-

turers a right to use a certain percent of the amount of oil they used in 1941. Under this order the growers were not allowed to sell any portion of their crop without a permit. This order has worked a hardship and an injustice on the growers. They have been compelled to put the expense of growing the crop in 1943 income and to sell the crop in 1944.

IV. Order No. 472, September 24, established the prices to the grower of $5.50 per pound on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint and placed the ceilings 50 cents per pound higher to the dealers.

V. Amendment No. 1, effective November 1, 1943, revoking order of September 23, 1943, and permitting consumer to use quantities higher than limitations contained in original order.

VI. Order, January 1, 1944, set forth the amount different manufacturers can use. Provided how they could get relief, i. e., by petitioning the Director, but giving the Director absolute and final power to make the decision.

VII. January 28, 1944, consumers ordered to file inventory of oil on hand.

Now we find that thousands of pounds of menthol, dementholized oil, and natural peppermint oil are available from Brazil. This is being offered in lots up to 100,000 pounds. The Drug Reporter, a drug paper published in New York, in a recent article estimates that Brazil will have a million pounds of peppermint oil which is equal to the yearly average in the United States for the last 10 years. It is reported that this oil is being admitted duty free by virtue of the power delegated to the President to remove the duty. We claim that it is impossible for Brazil to increase its production in a few years to the above amount and we believe that a large portion of said oil was produced in Japan and was brought into Brazil through certain South American countries and then sold duty free to importers in the United States.

We, the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, request a duty of at least $2 per pound. Unless we have protection, the essential oil growers of the United States, who have invested large sums of money in land and equipment, are ruined.

At the present ceiling price established by the W. F. A.—namely, $5.50 on peppermint and $3.50 on spearmint—many growers will have to discontinue the growing of essential oils. At a respresentative meeting of Essential Oil Growers of Michigan held February 4, 1944, 96.9 percent declared that they would decrease their acreage or entirely discontinue the production of peppermint and spearmint oil, provided the O. P. A. and W. F. A. did not raise the ceiling price.

Anything you can do to protect the essential oil growers and dealers in the United States by securing a higher duty and higher ceiling price will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

N. P. BEEBE,
President.

Whereas certain governmental agencies of this Nation, and especially the O. P. A. and W. F. A. branches, have failed to recognize the war essentiality of peppermint oil as a crop; and

Whereas the activities of these agencies have tended to discourage the production of this crop in this Nation, and have encouraged its production in foreign countries and the importation of competitive foreign oils, to the threatened complete destruction of the peppermint industry in the United States of America; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Essential Oil Growers of Michigan, assembled at Michigan State College at East Lansing this fourth day of February, 1944, do hereby protest against this continued discrimination against the United States peppermint industry by the O. P. A. and W. F. A. branches of the Government by their enforcement of lower-than-cost-of-production ceilings, and that we urge the placing of tariffs against the importation of peppermint oil which will guarantee to the United States producer at least as much net return as would be received by the foreign producer competing with the American mint grower; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States for such assistance as will insure the life of the United States peppermint industry, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the several Senators and Representatives who represent the mint-producing States.

The National Defense Requires the Annexation of the Mandated Japanese Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most timely editorial which appeared within the week of March 13, 1944, in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee, central California newspapers of widespread circulation under the title or caption of "Pacific Islands Should Be America's for Keeps."

As these islands are of tremendous strategic value in the defense of our country, a failure to recognize the importance of their annexation and to govern ourselves accordingly would be folly, indeed, a folly that might well be the cause of a third world war, a contemplation too tragic for adequate description.

The editorial to which I have just referred is the following:

PACIFIC ISLANDS SHOULD BE AMERICA'S FOR KEEPS

Edward Stettinius, Acting Secretary of State, shortly will go to London for a series of conferences with British and Russian Foreign Office officials respecting vital nonmilitary aspects of the war.

One of the subjects almost sure to be discussed is the Allied policy with respect to post-war Germany, upon which to date no general agreement has been reached.

Another of particular interest to Americans on the west coast is the ultimate disposition of the Pacific islands already taken by American forces or later to be occupied in the drive toward the Philippines and China.

Twice in the past American diplomats failed dismally to assess these Pacific islands at their true value.

After the Spanish-American War, when the United States took the Philippines from Spain, most of these atolls also could have become the property of Uncle Sam. Instead, they were left under Spanish sovereignty and Spain thereafter ceded them to Germany.

The ball was muffed for the second time after World War No. 1, when, with American approval and consent, the mandate was given to Japan, under the pledge that none of them was to be fortified.

Americans generally were naive enough to believe then this pledge would be kept. We have been educated differently now, but at what a cost!

In his message to Congress on September 17, 1943, President Roosevelt said:

"Japan will never again have authority over the islands mandated to her by the League of Nations."

If not Japan, who?

Is there any other answer than the United States?

That is not "power politics" or a "new American imperialism," as some pacifists already are saying, but plain common sense.

In a post-war period of air power, their permanent possession is vital to the future security of America and also to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. They constitute a life line to the Philippines and to China and a bulwark against any aggressive moves which future Japanese war lords might contemplate.

Had they thus been developed in the 20 years after 1919 the probabilities are there would have been no aggression by Japan in the Orient.

The disposition of these islands, therefore, is a matter on which our diplomats should take a stand just as strong as has Russia regarding her western boundary.

They are or soon will be in America's possession.

Let us keep them that way.

Lawyers on the Staff of the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LOUIS E. MILLER in the course of his Lincoln Day address, reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A804, said:

> One agency of this New Deal octopus, the O. P. A., boasts a proud pay roll listing over 2,700 lawyers while a similar organization in England after which the Washington plan was largely copied gets along with only 10 attorneys.

On February 23, 1944, Congressman GAVIN made a similar statement which appears in the RECORD of that date on page 1973.

Actually there are not now and never have been 2,700 lawyers employed by the Office of Price Administration. The fact is that as of the end of 1943 there were 1,360 lawyers on the O. P. A. staff, 1,340 less than the total claimed by Congressman MILLER. Of these 1,360 lawyers, 297 serve the national office of O. P. A., and the remaining 1,063 the 9 regional offices, 106 district offices, and more than 300 defense rental areas. They handle all legal work on price, rent, and rationing regulations, including drafting, interpretations—amounting to 150,000 per month—adjustments, litigation in the Emergency Court of Appeals, and all enforcement activities.

The statement with reference to England and its 10 attorneys is wholly misleading. In England there are 10 attorneys in the Ministry of Food. However, there are 4 other agencies in England which handle price and rationing. These are the Board of Trade, the Ministry of Supply, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Fuel and Power. We do not have the number of attorneys employed

in these other agencies but it should be noted that the figure of 10 used by Congressman MILLER applies only to the main office of 1 of the 5 agencies having to do with price control, rationing, and rent in England. This does not include a very large number of attorneys employed in the field offices of the Ministry of Food, as well as those of the other agencies.

In the absence of precise figures on numbers of attorneys employed in each of the 5 different agencies which compare with the Office of Price Administration, certain points should be noted: In the first place, British industry is relatively compact, closely integrated, and uniform; secondly, British wartime controls are much tighter and much more direct than those in this country. Thus virtually all food in England is purchased by the Government and distributed under its direct control; clothing is regulated through a high degree of standardization and there is no gasoline for nonoccupational purposes. All of this enormously simplifies the formulation, administration, and enforcement of regulations. Add to this fact that England's population is less than one-third that of the United States, while the area of the United States is more than 32 times that of England.

It is also worth noting that the Ministry of Food in England in 1942 handled 33,811 enforcement proceedings through attorneys not on the pay rolls of the Ministry of Food but specifically retained for each particular case in accordance with British custom. If we assume that each case required only 8 hours for complete handling, the full-time service of 108 attorneys would be required.

Thus, putting aside the wholly different legal background in England, the O. P. A. legal staff is certainly not at all out of line with British experience.

Protecting the Interests of Fighting Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to amplify and supplement my speech on the floor of this House 2 days ago, March 20, with reference to my support of the American Legion's "bill of rights" for American veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents.

As you will recall at that time I urged Members of the House to take proper steps at the earliest possible moment to enact the proper legislation into law, subject, of course, to complete and open hearings so that the interests of all categories of service men and women are fully protected, and premised on the basic principles of the Legion's "bill of rights."

At this time I want to remind my colleagues of the fact that since I have been privileged to represent the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois, beginning on January 3, 1941, and continuing up to the present time, I have actively supported all equitable legislation providing not only for the welfare and interests of every man and woman who has worn or who is wearing the uniform of the armed services of the United States, but also for their families and dependents as well. I am glad to observe that even before the American Legion's "bill of rights" was introduced in both the Senate and the House; that the membership of both bodies had already passed a series of bills of this nature, and they are now accepted laws of the United States.

So that the Members of this House can be more fully advised, I recently requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a compilation of legislation of this nature considered and approved by the Seventy-seventh Congress and also the Seventy-eighth Congress extending over a period from January 3, 1941, long before Pearl Harbor, up to and including the present time.

I am pleased to include herein the aforesaid compilation, together with my voting record with reference thereto, to demonstrate to you and also to the good citizens of the Twenty-first Illinois Congressional District of Illinois my wholehearted support of all equitable legislation of a national character relating to American veterans, man and woman alike.

The compilation, made on the basis of the official transcripts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, follows:

VOTING RECORD OF HON. EVAN HOWELL, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST ILLINOIS DISTRICT (CHRISTIAN, MACOUPIN, MONTGOMERY, AND SANGAMON COUNTIES)

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS (JANUARY 3, 1941–DECEMBER 29, 1942)

Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (to raise pay of enlisted men of sixth grade from $48 to $54, and those in seventh grade from $42 to $50). Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

On passage. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

On conference report with instructions that the House insist on base pay of $50 per month. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

On conference report with instructions on provisions for certain retired officers. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, paired "for."

On conference report. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, paired "for."

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS (JANUARY 6, 1943, TO PRESENT TIME)

Liberalization of family allowances for servicemen's dependents. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

Mustering-out pay ($100 for veterans of less than 60 days; $200 for veterans serving in excess of 60 days in continental United States; $300 for overseas veterans). Congressman HOWELL was recorded in favor of this bill by means of a general pair, since he was absent from Washington when it was called up on January 19, 1944, inasmuch as he was a member of the House and Senate special committee accompanying the remains of the late William H. Wheat, Representative in Congress from Champaign, Ill., who died January 16.

On agreeing to conference report. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

Increasing monthly rate of compensation or pension. Final passage. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

Increasing rate of pensions of World War veterans. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

Emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men. Mr. HOWELL'S vote, "yea."

If the Democratic Process Is To Be Preserved, the Constitution Should Be Amended To Vindicate the Principle of Majority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many of our fellow Americans who are beginning to believe as a consequence of the frequent vetoes of legislation which has been regularly enacted by substantial majorities by the representatives of the people, vetoes which, in effect, give the Chief Executive a greater voting power in the legislative branch of our Government of which he is not a Member than is possessed by one less than two-thirds of its membership, this coupled with the frequently repeated efforts of the Chief Executive to avoid the plain mandates of the Constitution relating to the ratification of treaties by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate by arbitrarily renaming our international compacts "Executive Agreements" and treating them as something different than treaties, this, as his apologists assert, to prevent a minority control in that Chamber, that the Constitution will have to be amended if the democratic process is to be vindicated.

An amendment which will grant to the Representatives of the people in the national legislature the right to reenact legislation by a simple majority vote after a Presidential veto has been announced, and an amendment which will authorize the ratification of treaties by a majority vote of the Members of both Houses of the Congress, rather than by the votes of more than two-thirds of Members of the Senate alone, as the Constitution now provides, seems to be the answer to the problem which now grows so rapidly in stature.

As one of the greatest and most profound thinkers of our Western States, the Honorable Chester H. Rowell, editor in chief of the San Francisco Chronicle, a newspaper of widespread circulation, has recently expressed himself in respect to one of these subjects in a recent editorial of unusual excellence, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The editorial to which I have just referred is the following:

MINORITY POWER TO JAM TREATIES IN SENATE

(By Chester Rowell)

In a recent work on The American Senate and World Peace, Prof. Kenneth Colegrove, of Northwestern University—as befits his profession—goes also into the technical law and mathematics of it. Even on these technicalities, he outlines some very practical situations, as well as some novel suggestions for meeting them.

The unique position of our Senate rests (1) on the fact that representation of the States in the Senate, regardless of population, is equal, and that this is the only provision in the Constitution that cannot be amended even by the processes otherwise provided therein; (2) that the Senate alone, and not Congress, shares with the President sole authority over foreign relations; and (3) that the Constitution itself requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present (provided they are a quorum) to ratify a treaty.

The first of these provisions, for the equal votes of small and large States, is, of course, beyond remedy, since it is the only unamendable clause in the Constitution, but the others could be met, some by changes in the rules or customs of the Senate itself and others by constitutional amendments in the regular way.

Since the required vote is two-thirds of the Members present, if a quorum, and a quorum at a minimum is 49 of the 96 Senators, ratification would require 33 of these 49, representing 16½ States, while it could be defeated by 17, representing 8½ States.

In the most extreme instance, of the negative votes coming from the 9 smallest States and the affirmative ones from the 16 largest, those for the treaty would represent 88,646,234 people, while the opposition would represent 3,584,511. Nevada, with 110,248 population, has the same vote as New York with 13,479,142. Thus the largest State with its 2 votes has the same population as the 18 smallest, with their 36. Or, in the whole Senate, the votes representing one-twelfth of the people could block the will, in foreign relations, of those representing eleven-twelfths.

Of course it never goes quite to this mathematically possible limit. But under the Senate rules of seniority and of unlimited debate, it can and often does happen that a very few Senators, from relatively minor States, block or defeat the most important international policies.

And, Senators being very human and jealous of their personal privileges, the motives for this opposing minority can be of the most various, including sometimes the pettiest. This did happen, in the defeat of the League of Nations and of the World Court, as Professor Colegrove points out in detail, to which I, as a personal observer at the time, could add many more. On the other hand, motives equally personal and petty influenced the virtually unopposed action of the Senate in authorizing, even without a treaty, American membership in the International Labor Office. All this is a tale which would require volumes, instead of a paragraph. But the cost of it is now unlimited billions and nobody can yet guess how many American lives.

The rule of seniority, by which the official leaderships in the Senate are held, sometimes by its most grossly incompetent or unworthy members, and the fact that there are such members, could only be cured by a reform in the intelligence and character of senatorial action, and of less localism and more responsibility by the people in choosing them. Neither of these is now in sight, though there are indications of waking up, toward more adult reactions.

The objection to proposing other changes by constitutional amendments has been the assumption that there would be neither the time nor the votes to do it now, and that unless done now it would be too late to meet the present emergency and might obstruct doing it in any other way by starting a delaying debate on irrelevancies.

To this Professor Colegrove replies that the movement among the people is already so strong, and it is having so much effect even on Senators who are hearing from home, that the necessary votes might be had even within a few months. This, obviously, is debatable.

But if the votes in Congress could be had, there is a little-realized way to speed ratification of an amendment by the States. Congress has the authority to provide that the ratification be either by the legislatures or by specially elected conventions. It has never been tried, and therefore never decided, that Congress, in prescribing the convention method, could also determine the date on which these conventions should be chosen, and also the time at which they should meet and within which they must cast their votes. The professor thinks this could be done.

In that event, future amendments to the Constitution could be proposed, submitted, and ratified within a year or less.

All of which, if correct, may prove very important. The present tendency is to sidestep treaties by submitting joint resolutions by the two Houses instead. So long as a Senate minority obstructs, this may be the only way. But it is not the best way.

An Old Friend Talks Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham, from the Boston Herald of March 7, 1944:

AN OLD FRIEND TALKS POLITICS

(By Bill Cunningham)

NEW YORK, March 6.—Your correspondent mentally chewed his nails. The dinner had been good. The panatellas had the rich, nutty flavor of fine old sherry. It had been a shirt-sleeve job of three gentlemen dining through benefit of room service in a suite on the sixteenth floor of that city-under-one-roof known as the Waldorf-Astoria, and now the greatest first baseman they ever had up around Haverstraw, N. Y., had strolled in and was talking with machine-gun vigor about life and times and politics and the war.

They knew him up around Haverstraw as "Stretch" Farley, for, with his 6 feet 3 inches he could go after the high ones and, no matter how wild the third baseman might be, Stretch could save him if the throw came within 7 feet of the pillow. The world knows him, however, as the Honorable James A. Farley, and although old friends still call him Stretch, the new ones call him General, a hold-over from the days when he was Postmaster General.

Your correspondent chewed his nails because, while the General talked freely, and even historically, about the New Deal that he had helped create, its figures, its present, and its future, as he sees it, annotating it with quotations and observations of leaders he's talked with, and is talking with constantly, in all parts of the country, it was "all in the room," which is to say, off the record.

GENERAL'S NAME NEVER LOWER THAN THIRD

From the standpoint of a reporter, that's the curse of Job, but it's the canny characteristic of most of these gentlemen around whom the lightning of Presidential nomination even theoretically plays. I don't think Mr. Farley figures himself entirely out of it. Not from anything he said, but just from common information, coupled with the fact that, in all split-off movements such as the Woodring wedge, Farley's name is never lower than third, in the anti-fourth-term Democratic nominational possibilities. Unless it's first.

I gathered, too, that the gentleman at least wasn't shocked by the mention of himself as a candidate even for the Vice Presidency, for I told him how a Wellesley police officer, after reading me a lecture one midnight for driving a little too eagerly on the way home from a speech, fell to discussing politics. I explained that the gendarme didn't commit himself as to his personal politics, but that he did say that, in his opinion, a hard ticket to whip would be MacArthur for President and Jim Farley for Vice President.

"MacArthur to run the war," I quoted the constable as explaining, "and Farley to handle the politics."

The general didn't change expression nor say a word. There were only a couple of seconds' silence, and the conversation rolled along without any reference to the Wellesley nomination. Silence, as the saw has it, means consent, I always heard.

The general is officially on record concerning the coming campaign. He was against the third term and he's still against it. That means he's against the fourth. He has stated publicly, and he stated again in that room, that he's against any man being President more than two terms. He has stated publicly, however, that he will not bolt the party. He is against the fourth term evidently and will do all he can to block it. If he fails, however, and Mr. Roosevelt is renominated, he will vote for his party's choice.

He didn't say that latter within my hearing, but that's the common understanding. Furthermore, that's the sort of politician the General is. In politics that's supposed to be "a right guy."

FAVORITE DISSIPATION, LEMON ICE CREAM

Probably there is not a finer physical specimen in the political scene, nor one in closer personal touch with political thought in all sections. Most of the major statesmen are droopy-looking jobs, with sagged bellies, stubby dewlaps, and narrowing shoulders. Farley is 6 feet 3 and as straight as a pine. He related that he and former Gov. (and former Democratic nomination candidate) Al Smith had just been swapping yarns in a mid-town Turkish bath, and he said at the conclusion of the performance, as he trod on the scales and tipped the indicator at exactly 214. His face was as pink and as free from lines as a baby's. His eyes were clear and blue and his teeth as white as a toothpaste ad's. He neither smokes nor drinks, but lets go a fragment of language occasionally that would unstick the wig of your maiden Aunt Minnie. His favorite dissipation is lemon ice cream.

Farley was possibly the greatest politician the Washington scene ever has known. He brought to the business the personal touch. However he did it, nobody in the newspaper business ever knew, but all even an obscure newspaperman had to do was to mention Jim Farley in friendly or complimentary fashion, and, in surprisingly short order, a letter came from the great man calling the scribe by his first name, thanking him warmly, and closing, "Yours, Jim."

He was probably the greatest sender of Christmas cards the world ever has known. Each Christmas more than 275,000 people received his personal card, so expertly engraved in his own handwriting that not even he could tell the engraving from the original.

Friends come and go, men die and new figures replace them, but Farley today probably has a vastly larger list of people who consider themselves his personal friends than any other man in America. Furthermore he keeps his contacts and is constantly making new ones. The story is that he left Washington "without a dime," meaning that he was strictly honest. But now he has a big job heading the foreign business of the Coca-Cola Co. And he works at it. In fact, he was in Boston yesterday, and may still be there, in connection with it.

TRAVELS ENCOMPASS WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Because of his job he steadily travels all over the United States, and all over the Western Hemisphere, as to the matter of that, but in the United States part of it he can't avoid, and doesn't try to avoid, meeting former friends and new political personalities.

Recently he talked with California's Warren in Sacramento, for instance. Shortly before that, on his way into and out of Mexico on Coca-Cola business, he dropped into Uvalde, Tex., for a visit with former Vice President John Nance Garner. With all this new information and his recent Washington background, his lifetime in politics and his personal knowledge of all concerned, he comes about as close to being able to utter a guess as any American living.

Here in the Waldorf, in the presence of two of his business associates and myself, one of those newspaper men who've received the famous "Yours, Jim" letters and who therefore rates as "a personal friend," he told where he thought the fight would be, the strengths and the weaknesses of all concerned.

He made one considered statement, which, properly featured in this story, would move it automatically out to page 1, and another which just might cause it to lead the paper, depending on what the boys are doing over Berlin at the moment, or even maybe despite what they're doing.

But to a dealer in news it was the same as a flea-bitten and slavering hound trying to get at a fat bone plainly seen through a fence, but definitely and finally barred by said fence. Off the record is off the record in this book, but maybe I can cheat enough to give you a hint. He thinks the fourth term is no cinch.

Joint Resolution of the Vermont Legislature Endorsing the Provisions of H. R. 4719

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont endorsing the provisions of H. R. 4719 designed to amend the Flood Control Act:

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress a measure designed to recapture for the States certain rights, privileges, and prerogatives that by right belong to them; and

Whereas H. R. 4719, introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the Representative from Vermont, the Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, has as its objective the amendment of Federal flood-control law so that such a result may be accomplished; and

Whereas this measure, if enacted, would reestablish the right of an individual State to have a dominant voice in the construction of flood-control projects within its borders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont not only hereby endorses wholeheartedly the principles embodied in this particular legislation but, as well, urge the legislative bodies of Vermont's sister States to take similar action; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to send copies of this resolution to Vermont's congressional delegation, to the presiding officers of the legislatures and to the attorneys general of our sister States.

Administration of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me I wish to insert the following:

On December 14, 1943, I placed in the RECORD a letter from a department store, calling attention to efforts of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor to bring such stores under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

During the holiday recess, I received the following letter from the Administrator of the Division, Mr. L. Metcalfe Walling. In all fairness it should also be made a matter of record:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
LABOR, WAGE AND HOUR AND
PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1943.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: I have noted in your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 14, 1943, a letter from a department store in Cleveland. The letter says that a representative of the Division advised this store that its manufacture of candy for shipment in interstate commerce brought it under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Also, the letter expresses the opinion that the Division is starting a drive to apply the act to retailers in general.

I can categorically state that no such drive has been undertaken or is contemplated by the Division. As you may know, the Administrator has no power under the act to exclude or include employees from the benefits contained therein. This function can only be performed by courts of competent jurisdiction. One exemption which was placed in the act by Congress is that contained in section 13 (a) (2) which provides an exemption from the wage-and-hour provisions of the statute for any employee engaged in any retail or service establishment the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce. The Division has always interpreted this exemption as being applicable to retail stores whether they be large or small. However, the courts have uniformly held that manufacturing activities are not within the scope of this exemption.

It appears to me that the letter from which you quote is almost identical with other letters which have been written by the Famous Barr Co. stores to other Senators and Congressmen in States where the company chain operates. This matter arose out of a complaint filed against the St. Louis unit of the chain which alleged that the company was engaged in the manufacture and shipment in interstate commerce of candy and that the employees involved were not being compensated in accordance with the requirements of the wage-and-hour law. Although the representatives of the firm advised our inspector that they would be most happy if the entire establishment could be held to be subject to the wage-and-hour law since it would solve the wage-stabilization difficulties which the firm at that time had and would enable the firm to distribute money to certain employees for which it had not yet received the necessary approval from the War Labor Board, our inspector advised the company that such a ruling was not possible under the Wages and Hours Act and that without doubt most of the employees of the store would be within the retail exemption of the act.

Only a preliminary inspection of the candy manufacturing aspect of the company's business was made, with no objection being raised by the company, and when the company requested that completion of the inspection be postponed until the first week in January while the company was involved in other matters our St. Louis office agreed to the request.

My St. Louis representative is alleged to have told the company that regardless of the intention of Congress it was my present intention wherever possible to bring retailing under the act and that certain stores were being selected for test cases for the purpose of assembling sufficient evidence to establish coverage of retail establishments. I want to state categorically that I have no such purpose in mind. If any such statement has been made by an employee of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, it is unwarranted and does not represent my views.

I recognize, of course, that Congress exempted from coverage of the act retail activities and this position was taken by our representative in St. Louis with the company. I think it is equally clear, however, that Congress did not intend to exempt employees who are engaged in manufacturing goods which are shipped outside the State merely because they happen to be employed by a retailer who also operates a store in which sales are made to individual customers.

It might also be well for me to point out that the section 13 (a) (2) exemption for retail establishments exempts employees in such establishments only from the wage and hour provisions of the act. As you know, the act contains provisions prohibiting the shipment or delivery in interstate commerce of goods produced in or about an establishment in which oppressive child labor has been employed. The prohibition against the employment of child labor would apply to any establishment, including any retail establishment, if goods are produced in or about the establishment for shipment or delivery in interstate commerce.

I have been advised by our Cleveland office that no inspection has been made of the Cleveland Famous Barr Store so that this statement in the letter to you is erroneous. In view of the erroneous impression which has been unintentionally created by you through the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the letter from the Cleveland department store which so distorts my position, I should appreciate it if you would place this comment also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my position may not be misunderstood.

In the meantime, if I can get any further information for you or you wish any further

clarification of my position, I shall be only too happy to provide it for you.

Sincerely yours,

L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator.

Red Tape Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred F. Flynn, from the Wall Street Journal of March 9, 1944:

RED TAPE REFORM—O. P. A. CUTS PENCIL WORK FOR BUSINESS, ABANDONS 296 REPORTS AND FORMS—FORM A'S 20 PAGES SHRINK TO 4—16 PAGES OF INSTRUCTION BECOME SINGLE SHEET—DR. S. B. SELLS PLOTS CHANGES

(By Alfred F. Flynn)

WASHINGTON.—Moaning and groaning of businessmen over the number and complexity of O. P. A. reports and forms is reported growing fainter.

Pain-killer Chester Bowles, the agency's Administrator, has spurred his Statistical Standards Division to unprecedented heights of simplicity. Under increasing impetus, it has entirely eliminated within the past 12 months 171 reports and 32 forms once required under price regulations and 70 reports and 23 forms once demanded under ration rules. Surviving paper work is losing weight.

Example 1: Form A, used by firms to make annual financial reports to O. P. A., has been drastically revised. The new model occupies 4 pages instead of 20; accompanying instructions are contained on a single sheet rather than in a 16-page booklet; reading time of form and instructions is 16 minutes instead of 72. The new report will save the Government 9,350 pounds of paper for every 20,000 copies printed. It will save the businessmen who must mail it back to Washington $5,000 per 20,0000 copies in postage. And form B, for interim financial reporting, has been revised similarly. These documents gather basic information used in establishing and altering price ceilings and in testing their effects on industry.

TIRE CERTIFICATES COMBINED

Example 2: The emergency certificate for new tires or tubes has been consolidated from four forms, each for a specific purpose, into one brief all-purpose form. The new forms are printed in "gangs" to permit continuous typing of certificates with one insertion of carbon paper. Clerical operations are halved and 132,000 pounds of paper will be saved yearly.

Man behind the scenes in O. P. A.'s small revolution is youthful Dr. S. B. Sells (he prefers to be called Mister), formerly of the Columbia University faculty, an inveterate pipe smoker and a paragon of efficiency. He has at hand a calendar revised hourly, to which he can turn at any minute of the day and see what reporting form each of his drafting experts and specialists is revising. They have a big job ahead of them yet. Complaints still come in, though many are considered hangovers from a more aggravating era. Most O. P. A. forms were instituted when the agency was dominated by what legislators called juvenile lawyers.

The experts are guided by two manuals prepared by Mr. Sells. One, entitled "Criteria for Review of Public Reporting Forms and Surveys," deals with a multitude of ways not to irritate the populace. It specifies simplicity of wording—nontechnical, nonlegal. It outlines the science of timing (surveys are not to be conducted during holiday periods or rush seasons). Queries should be attuned to the accounting systems which companies use. Questions should be specific—Dr. Sells submits evidence that 57 different meanings can attach to price, so the word should be modified.

EYE APPEAL SOUGHT

The other manual is the "O. P. A. Forms Standardization Manual," which presents the science of style in designing forms. Eye appeal is deemed necessary; colors are frequently used in achieving it.

Currently O. P. A. uses a total of 144 forms in carrying out price regulations. Of these, however, only 26 are regularly required of businessmen and individuals. The rest are known as single appeal or request for approval forms; they are for the use of individuals or firms seeking relief from the general rules of the agency.

Under rationing regulations 82 forms are used. Of these, 29 are registration and report forms while the remainder are applications for new or supplementary rations.

Rent control calls for 31 forms of all kinds. Of these, 7 are registration, 5 are for legal enforcement and the remainder for petioning relief.

A Nation as large as the United States is bound to require a certain number of variations, it is contended. For instance, O. P. A. can scarcely overlook men who do business in Spanish, along the Mexican border. They get forms printed in Spanish.

Here are other simplifications of which O. P. A. boasts:

Application for clearance statement for auto registrations: 2 forms reduced to 1; four parts reduced to two; 33 applicant entries down to 14; 21 local board entries cut to 17; one-third the paper required

Consumer application for rubber boots and work shoes: 22 applicant entries reduced to 14; 22 employer entries down to 15.

Application for supplemental gasoline ration: 50 percent saving in paper.

Application for fuel oil: Reduced from 4 parts to 2; from 72 entries by the public to 33; 50 percent saving in paper.

Registration report by handlers of sugar, processed foods and meat: Combination of three reports into one.

Stephen Raushenbush

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 20, of this week, I addressed the House in reference to the rivers and harbors bill. In my remarks, which appeared on page 2769 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, I alluded to Mr. Stephen Raushenbush, an employee in the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

It appears that information furnished me as to Mr. Raushenbush's age, as it referred to his draft status, was incorrect. He has written me a letter giving the facts as to his age and I am willing to accept his statement. From this letter it will appear that he was not of draft age at the time referred to and therefore I regret that any reference to his draft status or age was made. In justice to Mr. Raushenbush, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be made a part of my remarks. I would not knowingly do an injustice to anyone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MARCH 21, 1944.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You commented on me yesterday on the floor of Congress. I realize that I am fair game on the interpretation of something I wrote in 1926. I have stated that I was describing views which I did not share, and present everything I have written and done since then in support of my statement. You evidently prefer not to accept this, but instead to interpret it as if I shared now or at that time the views I was then describing.

However, I have never been called a draft dodger before, and I hope you will think your accusation or suggestion serious enough to note the following facts:

I am now 47 years and 10 months old, since I was born on May 12, 1896. I was old enough for service in the last war, I volunteered, and had about 2 years' overseas service with the A. E. F.

No draft board has ever thought of inducting me in this war, as far as I know. It is my understanding that no person over 45 years of age has been subject to the draft. Incidentally, I had a child at the time I went to work for the Navy, and that fact probably would have affected the draft situation if I had been 37½ instead of 46½. At the time I began work for the Navy (November 6, 1942) I was 46 years and 6 months old.

I was not commissioned in the Navy, but was sent to London as a part of the Civilian Technical Section attached to the Office of the Naval Attaché.

I feel rather proud of what I was able to do there, having been told by my superiors that I had a right to feel proud. I felt I was doing something for the country. I returned from the Navy assignment when it was completed.

It takes all the satisfaction out of it for me to have the whole thing put up to Congress and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of a draft-dodging act.

Since the inference about draft dodging was so unfair, and I am sure unintended, would you feel that it was possible for you to amend your remarks for the permanent RECORD, and also to call attention of the House to this mistake both in regard to my age and the interpretation which resulted from it?

I should appreciate this as a very decent action on your part.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN RAUSHENBUSH.

Duggan Logical Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., for March 19, 1944:

DUGGAN LOGICAL CHOICE

Current indications are that I. W. Duggan, Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, will be appointed Governor when the incumbent, Dr. George Black, resigns to take a place overseas with the State Department. Mr. Duggan is the logical choice and his appointment would be heartening, helpful, and agreeable to a vast majority of the individuals and organizations concerned with agriculture. Mr. Duggan has had long and successful experience with the needs and problems of American agriculture. Formerly a member of the faculty of Mississippi State College, and until early this year director of the southern division of the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, Mr. Duggan is fully aware of the farm scene. In addition to that, he has proved himself capable of cooperation in friendly, constructive ways, and the manner of what he has accomplished has largely increased the value of it. He has won the right to advancement and is qualified to render service commensurate with the importance of the position for which he appears slated.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission given to me, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD a letter I have recently received from Joseph L. Moreau, who is manager of the Hop Creek Farms at Holmdel, Monmouth County, N. J.

Mr. Moreau is in charge of a large herd of pedigreed Hereford cattle, is a man of considerable experience and very much alive to the problems facing his industry and farmers generally. Mr. Moreau is a modest man and it was with reluctance that he gave me permission to have his letter published in the RECORD, but it contains so much real common sense and so many practical suggestions that it seemed hardly fair to keep it to myself.

I hope those who read his letter may benefit by it.

HOP CREEK FARMS,
Holmdel, N. J., March 14, 1944.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: * * * Not too many farmers really canceled fertilizer and seed orders for the coming spring, but they did cancel immediate deliveries of these goods until they knew more how they stand on the labor situation; and the consequences will be if they are not quite certain of enough experienced labor to handle the equipment for putting in these crops this spring, there will be, without any doubt, several cancelations.

Most farmers are broadminded enough to go along with our national service heads in most of their drafting policies, but there must be some real keymen left on the farms to accomplish any worth-while crops and very essential crops. The sooner some of the higher-ups conceive the idea that any old man, girls, women, young boys, etc., cannot do a large part of farming, the better, as they are only kidding themselves.

It is very true the above-mentioned can help out to a great degree in the harvesting of some crops, but they are very little help in the spring work of putting in most crops. No one knows these facts better than the real dirt farmer.

I will outline my own experience last year, 1943:

My son, now 24 years old, is my keyman; it is his job to run all of the more important pieces of machinery and keep watch over the other help in my absence, which is occasionally very necessary. Last year I lost another real good man who was able to handle and manage jobs of seeding, etc., and do it in the right way. In this man's place I had to hire a man about 26 years old, a big strong, willing worker, but very lacking in gray matter, has the mentality of about a 10- or 11-year-old boy. I had two more just like him, not one of the three are able to take a tractor and plow and do the right kind of work. Consequently, instead of putting in our full acreage of soybeans and corn, we were forced to put in less and we did not get the things done right and on time for lack of efficient labor. Many times our tractors, when they should have all been working, one or two of the three were idle because we had no one capable of operating them the right way.

There is no sense of a farmer buying a lot of seed and fertilizer and piling it up in a building if there is no way of getting it in the ground at the proper time and in the proper manner, as otherwise it spells failure.

I very well know that in wartimes it is absolutely necessary for drafting of some farm labor, rationing of many commodities, etc., but this following may sound very strange to many; to manage close to 900 acres of farm land and get the work done in normal times in the right manner is no small task, but when one has to get it done with mostly trash labor, and spend about one-third of one's time (my time) running up and down the roads to ration boards, draft boards, and many many more details which are just a mess of unnecessary red tape, it is rather disgusting.

Most farmers are in the same position as I am these days. We do not know just what to do for the best, but we do know that we cannot do the impossible.

These foregoing facts are not only local conditions but universal. Although we are hit very hard now in this immediate vicinity due to the facts of our nearness to the new cantonment (Earle, N. J.); 3 weeks ago an advertisement for "500 laborers wanted at Earle immediately." If a farmer had to match their prices for labor he would be licked before he got started, but that is what we are up against locally.

Personally, I feel if Uncle Sam went into many of these unnecessary offices and took out these unnecessary red tape alphabetical orders, using the office forces of these to better advantage, it would really be common sense; it would also help out on the paper shortage.

Fortunately, I honestly believe that our nearby draft boards are of sound-thinking men and understand the situation as is, but their superiors need to be a little more considerate and not too hasty in their decisions on more farm help for the good of the cause.

If I were not too pressed for time I would have used the typewriter. Hoping you can make sense from this hurried, so-called letter.

Yours very truly,

JOS. L. MOREAU.

P. S.—In your letter you ask regarding the poultry feed situation. The poultry feed situation is about in the same shape as the dairy feeds, etc. This section could use to very good advantage more and better feeds. The lack of concentrates is where the feed troubles lie. Personally, our beef cattle are far from normal from lack of essential concentrates. But on the whole, I think the feed situation is some better than a while back.

MOREAU.

Independence of Small Nations

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent attempt to interfere with the sovereignty and autonomous status of Eire by economic sanctions and other forms of intimidation has served conspicuously to bring into the focus of our American public opinion grave threats against other small nations that characterize present diplomatic and military policies of some of our allies in this fateful hour.

Is it surprising, therefore, that our American people should be questioning developments in Europe and asking what the outcome will be of the obvious movements to destroy the independence of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, and lay the ground work for ultimate physical reduction and control of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, France, Italy, and other free nations of Europe as well as to deny the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine?

Is it surprising that our people should demand complete answer to this situation? The aggressions I refer to are being executed or threatened by a power that is allied with one phase, though not the other, of our present war effort. They are made possible in part by American arms, tanks, planes, and supplies in voluminous quantities which we have poured in a steady, unbroken stream into that country at fabulous expense to the American taxpayer, sacrifice to American consumers and to our own war on the Japs, and considerable loss of American life.

Thus we have the ironical paradox, never intended by our people, of American instruments of warfare—weapons, food, and materials of every kind and description—actually being used in making possible aggression against friendly, weaker nations which until the advent of Hitler were free and independent.

That is not all. These nations are being, or, we have every good reason to believe, will be, communized and their population rendered subject to Marxian dictatorship of the proletariat. According to recent dispatches, communistic riots and demonstrations, promoted by radicals, are already occurring, even in southern Italy, which is presently occupied by our American forces and governed, so far as this Congress knows, by American military government.

There are the indisputable facts. But they constitute a serious challenge to the national interests of America. The

issue is clear: Does this Congress intend, not only to approve or tolerate these policies of aggression and revolutionary socialistic infiltration, but also to furnish the material means by which many traditionally free peoples are being, and will be, overrun, communized, and subjugated—their basic rights to self-determination obliterated and destroyed. Is it any wonder that the American people should demand clarification of our war objectives?

In the past, this Congress has voted lend-lease assistance because we were informed and believed that our American resources would be used against our common enemies. It is now clear that these resources are also used, and will be used in the future, to conquer and ultimately enslave within the communistic dictator system many free nations and many friendly independent peoples to whom communism is most objectionable.

Has not the time arrived therefore, when in our own self-interest, not to speak of our own high American ideals, we must use sound, American common sense and restrict further lend-lease assistance to nations that are engaged in invading the territorial integrity and violating the political independence of the small weak nations of Europe.

A Veto Won't Help Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Friday, March 17, edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer:

A VETO WON'T HELP SOLDIERS

President Roosevelt has correctly stated that the crux of the soldier vote issue is whether more or fewer servicemen could vote under the new law just passed by Congress.

It is to help him decide that point that he has asked the Governors whether or not the proposed Federal ballot will be declared acceptable by their respective States.

Veto or approval of the bill will depend largely, presumably, on the conclusion reached by Mr. Roosevelt on this issue. It is a sensible way to test the value of the measure. If fewer men will be able to vote under its provisions than without them its enactment would be an idle move.

But if the bill's provisions are examined fairly and disinterestedly, without any of the partisan prejudice that has beclouded the question in Congress for weeks past, there will be found much in the measure's favor.

It is not perfect by any means. It is a compromise and reflects the weaknesses of give-and-take. But to say that it is worse than no law at all is to take an extreme and unjustifiable position, a surly dog-in-the-manger attitude that is indefensible.

Without any new rules, soldier voting would return to the wholly unsatisfactory terms of the 1942 law, with its legally questionable provisions that might result in all sorts of litigation, delaying the count and confusing the results of a Presidential election in the midst of war. The small number of servicemen who have cast absentee ballots in past elections is the best testimonial to the need for a new law.

This compromise bill represents an attempt to bring together two opposing points of view. One side had originally advocated a Federal ballot for all servicemen, under the wholly partisan supervision of a Government-named Commission, and with the States utterly ignored. Its proposal was one-sided and undemocratic. It would have stressed the two top places on the Federal ticket, deprived the soldiers of the chance to vote for State and local officials, opened the way to fraudulent manipulation, and directly countered the States' constitutional authority.

Those on the opposite side of the political fence, on the other hand, projected a bill that would have bypassed the Federal ballot and dumped the whole problem on the States' laps, without Government assistance.

The bill as finally adopted recognizes the rights of the States. But it permits use of the Federal ballots for overseas men who are citizens of States that have accepted that ballot and who have not received their own State ballots within a specified time.

By bowing to the States' authority in election matters the measure avoids post-election litigation. At the same time, it spurs the various States either to accept the simple form of the Federal ballot or to devise practicable methods for soldier use of State ballots.

Few States, surely, including our own, would fail to take necessary action to expedite soldier participation in elections. The responsible officials of those that should fail could be left to the mercies of their servicemen citizens.

The bill just passed by Congress is a bugle call to the Governors to mend their State voting laws so as to fit them for current wartime use. Without this bill, many of the States might lapse into apathy and indifference, with the result that only a comparative handful of servicemen would be able to cast ballots this year.

Veto of the bill would not help soldier voting. It might seriously hamper it.

The Bureaucrat Betrays the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the issue here is sharply drawn and rather simple.

We are confronted with this question: Shall Congress continue to permit money earmarked for the electrification of rural America to be used to bail out Wall Street holding companies by the purchase of broken-down, obsolete "cats and dogs" of city electrical systems which they are dumping on the market at outrageously high prices? Shall R. E. A. be permitted to break the law and rob the farmer?

The question is as simple as that.

We now know that money that Congress has appropriated in the past for the farmer has found its way into the bank accounts of holding companies without 1 cent of benefit to any farmer.

The Rural Electrification Administration has made hundreds of purchases of existing private systems, all of them in violation of the R. E. A. Act.

That act was intended solely for the purpose of bringing electricity into farm homes which had never received the benefit of this modern convenience and necessity. And to effectuate this objective Congress deliberately, and after full and free debate, inserted certain strictures into the law.

At one point the law says that rural electrification funds shall be extended to farmers not already receiving electrical service. This provision was made in order to husband the funds available and to insure that all of it would go to farmers who did not already enjoy the benefits and conveniences of electricity. Obviously, to acquire city electrical properties where people for a generation had been accustomed to electrical service, is a clear violation of the law.

Again, in another section of the act, Congress foresaw the dangers of an overzealous bureaucracy which might seek to expand its activities into urban communities. In this section a specific provision was inserted that R. E. A. shall confine its activities to—and I quote—"rural areas" which was then defined in the law as communities not larger than 1,500 population. Yet in numerous instances, some in my own State, this rural area provision has been cast aside. The law has been an ignored "scrap of paper"; has been deliberately broken and the appropriations filched from the farmers to whom it was granted.

In legal justification for this acquisition program the R. E. A. is guilty of a mendacious deception. In fact, the R. E. A.'s annual report contains a bald and bold lie. The annual report states that it has been backed up in its acquisition program by two decisions—mind that word, "decisions"—by the Comptroller General of the United States. At another place in its annual report the R. E. A. states that these opinions or decisions were contained in a letter to me dated December 1, 1942, from the Comptroller General, and in a second letter dated March 12, 1943.

I here declare to you that the R. E. A. deliberately falsified when it stated it had even one decision from the Comptroller General of the United States. No such decision had been rendered at the time the report was written and I do not believe there ever has been a controlling decision by the Comptroller General. In his letter to me the Comptroller General stated that he could not legally render an opinion or a decision except under certain circumstances and that these circumstances precluded the rendering of a decision at the request of a Member of Congress. Therefore, neither of these so-called opinions or decisions, which were merely informal letters, had legal force or effect.

Furthermore, in neither of these alleged opinions by the Comptroller General was any reference made to the legality of invading communities larger than the limitation set up in the law. No attempt was made in either of these so-called opinions to give the color of legality to acquisitions of properties in towns of greater than 1,500 population. Yet, making a virtue of malfeasance, the

annual report says that it had held up its acquisition program to some extent because of the doubtful legality of that program and did not proceed until it had the reassurance of these alleged decisions. This is another fraud upon Congress inasmuch as the only opinion on this subject in existence, that of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, dated November 24, 1942, starts out by stating that already there had been 245 such acquisitions before the R. E. A. got around to obtaining a general legal justification for these activities.

This opinion was rendered, after 245 acquisitions had been made, only as a sort of afterthought. In October 1942, I wrote to the Comptroller General and asked his opinion of the legality of this sort of work by R. E. A. He in turn queried the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. And only then did the legal brains of that Department see fit to find a legal excuse for the violations of the law which it had perpetrated in at least 245 instances.

The opinion is a marvel in cerebral gymnastics; a casuistic classic.

It required 8,500 words of tortured abuse of the English language in this attempt to prove that black is white and that Congress did not mean what the law clearly says Congress meant and which the debates in committee and on the floor in this House and in the Senate clearly demonstrated. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture takes the words "to construct" and by this mental trapeze work tries to say that Congress meant in the words "to construct" that R. E. A. was permitted to buy already constructed systems and the cast-offs of utility holding-company systems. I have seen some weird distortions in language in my time but nothing to equal this document.

As an example of the type of reasoning by which the Solicitor supports his contention I give you some of the exact language of the document. I quote—page 15298 of the opinion:

> It should be noted that this matter may lend itself to the familiar rule that long-established administrative practice is a fact to be considered in a problem of statutory interpretation.

If that theory is followed elsewhere, then Louis Lepke, the so-called president of Murder, Inc., should never have been tried, and if tried, acquitted, on the grounds that he had been committing murder for so long it had become an established practice of his syndicate. By the same reasoning a burglar could commit so many crimes that he could legalize his profession. Society takes a different view, however, and has enacted habitual criminal acts by which we put a man away for life after he has been convicted of a certain number of felonies. The theory that R. E. A. presents is that since it has become a habitual violator of the Rural Electrification Act, it has legitimatized these activities. If we are to accept that doctrine, Congress might as well adjourn and surrender its duties and prerogatives to bureaus of the Government.

But I did not come here today to urge the legal aspects of this case. In an appearance before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations last week I dwelt at length on the merits of this opinion. I think it is more important to consider the farmer and what this policy is doing to him than it is to consider how far the bureaucrats have stretched the law. I need only add here that this weird document concocted by the Department of Agriculture is clearly a self-serving device—and only that. It was made after the acquisition program was well underway. It has no weight or standing. Only the courts could render a binding decision. Even the Comptroller General himself, the R. E. A. falsehoods to the contrary notwithstanding, has not rendered such an opinion as a perusal of the published decisions for the fiscal year covered by the current annual report clearly shows.

The staff of the R. E. A. has long held an attitude of antagonism toward the private electrical industry. Why, then, this sudden solicitude for the private companies which, under the "death sentence," are putting their properties on the market and seeking to bail out their investment? Has this policy of antagonism to private industry been mere lip service? Why this strange picture of Wall Street and R. E. A. bureaucracy cuddled up in bed together? Why these strangely high prices for obsolete properties?

Do you know that the Long Valley (Idaho) Cooperative was induced to buy out a property at Grimes Pass, Idaho, at a price three times as much as was offered by a private buyer? Do you know that this Grimes Pass property had once been turned down by the R. E. A. as illegal because the man then in charge—Mr. Falkenwald—of loan applications declared that an examination proved that the purchase would not be self-liquidating? And do you know that 6 weeks after the R. E. A. bureaucrats had unloaded this property onto these farmers and bailed out, the holding company owned it, the Grimes Pass water-power dam, its principal asset, washed out and was destroyed? It was as fraudulent a transaction as Teapot Dome. The Long Valley farmers were deceived, cheated, and plundered.

The economic as well as the legal justification for this acquisition program is set forth by R. E. A. that these purchases are, and I quote, an "incidental means" of reaching so-called or alleged pocketed areas which otherwise could not be reached. In the case of the Grimes Pass Power Co. the application of the incidental means theory is absurd and ridiculous. It is pure fantasy to conceive in this and many other cases how the incidental means theory can possibly be stretched to cover these cases. In such cases as this the clear result of such distortion of legality and economics is that R. E. A. has become a party to a conspiracy to bilk the farmer and load him with a debt which will lengthen his period of bondage to bureaucratic shylocks.

And what happens to the farmers with cooperatives when city communities are forced by a shotgun wedding to merge without their consent into rural cooperatives? It is quite apparent to anyone who knows anything about rural electrification that the type of service and the type of load that meets the requirements of the farming community is wholly different than the needs of an urban community.

In most of these cases the urban population will outnumber the farmer members of the cooperative. The urban members are part of a close-knit community. They all live together in a small area. There will be a natural tendency for them to vote as a unit. The farmers, on the other hand, are scattered about naturally, are unable to maintain daily contact, and are necessarily at a disadvantage. The tail simply will not wag the dog and the farmer cooperative will lose its identity as such. And money dedicated to rural electrification will have brought this to pass.

In Missouri there is a cooperative of the holding-company type. Some thirty-odd small distributing cooperatives are joined together in a holding-company cooperative called the Sho-Me Cooperative. This Sho-Me Cooperative, with a capital stock of $75,000, was given nearly $5,000,000 to purchase and rehabilitate the Missouri Electric Power Co. This company has possibly 10,000 customers, more than 97 percent of whom, according to the Federal Power Commission statistics, are urban. Unless these urban citizens join a farm electric cooperative which they had no part in forming, nor right to belong to, the United States Treasury Department will step in and slap a corporate tax on Sho-Me. Our tax laws protect the Treasury from tax avoidance by fake cooperatives with a provision that states that 85 percent of the gross revenues of any cooperative must come from bona fide members. This is a wise provision. Otherwise the board of directors of the Potomac Electric Power Co. could dissolve their corporation and form themselves into a cooperative which could then purchase the properties of the corporation and avoid the regulation of the Public Utilities Commission and the payment of several millions of dollars in taxes. It would be a fake cooperative, of course, and a fraud upon the public, but unless there was such a provision in the Federal law, it might be legal.

In the case of the Sho-Me purchase of this utility the Public Service Commission of Missouri gave its reluctant approval only after it reserved to itself the right to continue to regulate the rates and services of the property involved. Thus the farm electric cooperative lost one of its principal characteristics. As a cooperative serving its own members and its own members only it is a distinctly different activity than that of a privately owned and publicly regulated utility. The members can freely determine their own rates and services without consulting anybody. Now Sho-Me has lost its identity; no one knows what its legal identity is, it is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. It is neither a private corporation nor a bona fide cooperative.

The Missouri Electric Power Co. is located down in the Ozarks, but, of the member cooperatives of Sho-Me, some are located nearly 200 miles away.

How can R. E. A. justify this purchase of city properties in the name of farm electrification? Why, they even bought three ice plants and a city waterworks in the same deal. If they can use farm electrification funds for buying city waterworks and ice plants, what is to stop them from buying newspapers and radio stations, candy stores, or undertaking parlors? If we are to follow this theory to its logical conclusion, would they not also constitute incidental means of bringing electricity to the farmer? If owning an ice plant is incidental to bringing electricity to the farmer, why should not opening and operating a theater, a pool hall, or a funeral parlor be incidental to bringing electricity to the farmer?

It is worthy of notice that the pattern of these acquisitions varies from State to State in accordance with the laws of each State.

For example, when the Grimes Pass power dam was washed out the farmers of the Long Valley Cooperative were forced to resort to a pair of obsolete Diesel engines as a source of power to supply its new customers in Grimes Pass. Instead of cheap water power they were forced to buy oil which increased the cost of service considerably. The purchased property was 22 miles from their nearest poles and they were unable to obtain the necessary materials to connect the property.

As a result the farmers were forced to increase the rates to these customers. The Grimes Pass customers appealed to the State public-service commission for relief from this increased rate. Had the company remained in private ownership the public-service commission would have had jurisdiction and could have resisted this attempt to raise electrical rates. But in the State of Idaho it was held that since these customers were now the property of a farm cooperative, the public-service commission no longer had jurisdiction and these customers were without remedy.

In these lunatic schemes the bureaucrat had his personal motive.

In the spring of 1942 after the Military Affairs Committee of this House had brought forth its scathing denunciation of R. E. A.'s waste of millions of pounds of copper in building transmission lines instead of farm-distribution lines, the War Production Board issued drastic curtailment orders. That left R. E. A. bureaucracy high and dry. They had funds but they could not at the moment spend them after the fashion that Congress had directed, that is, in building farm-electrification lines.

It was obvious to them that if they returned to Congress and showed a record of unspent money, two disturbing things would happen to their little nest of bureaucracy. First, the unspent funds would be returned to the Treasury and their annual appropriation would be cut down; and, second, an even more drastic personal calamity would befall them because Congress, taking cognizance of the reduced activities of this agency, would therefore reduce the personnel of R. E. A. for the war period. This meant that their personal jobs were at stake in finding a way to spend money by the millions to use up their appropriation.

I think it is a significant fact that the Sho-Me deal was concluded on June 12, 1942, just before the conclusion of the fiscal year and just after the War Production Board finally closed down on R. E. A.'s high line construction program.

This misfeasance in channeling funds intended for real farm electrification into the coffers of Wall Street holding companies may have been due to a fatuous solicitude for the welfare of Wall Street. But I doubt it. The more logical motive can be found in the love of a bureaucrat for his job. It is as simple as that.

But every time the Rural Electrification Administration purchases a private corporation doing business in the electrical field, it wipes out from the Federal tax rolls many thousands of dollars of income that must be reflected back in the total taxes the public must pay. At a time when the Nation is struggling with the greatest tax load in history and buying bonds until it hurts, the R. E. A. is in poor case if not downright unpatriotic in seeking its own aggrandizement at the cost of the Federal taxpayer.

And now in conclusion I should like to point out that if any merit existed in the solicitor's opinion justifying the acquisition of properties in towns in excess of 1,500 population, the action of this House on Tuesday, March 7, in adopting the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 completely disqualified any validity contained in the solicitor's opinion insofar as it is addressed to the question of legality of acquisition of existing facilities in towns in excess of 1,500 population. You will find in the colloquy of the Monday debate on the organic act of 1944, beginning on page 2265, that this House once again, and after all of these acquisitions have been made, reasserted in the bill as passed the stipulation that there shall be no acquisitions in towns larger than 1,500 population. You will find that an attempt was made to increase the limitation to 10,000 population and it was the unanimous vote not only of the subcommittee but of the full Agricultural Committee that the original stipulation of 1,500 population should be retained. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], chairman of the subcommittee, and sponsor of the bill, stated—and I quote him—

> I may say that the Committee on Agriculture is unanimous that it would not favor the R. E. A. going into any community in excess of 1,500 so long as there is a single farmhouse in the United States without this R. E. A. service.

I find myself in complete harmony with that viewpoint and the fact that Congress, on Tuesday, March 7, adopted title V of this organic act with the distinct understanding that the 1,500 population limitation is retained in the act is a reaffirmation of the clear intent of Congress; and all the opinions, all the tortured reasoning, all the bureaucratic wishful thinking cannot alter that fact. Congress has spoken—once in the enactment of the R. E. A. Act; and now, in adopting title V of this organic act of 1944, has spoken again. It only remains for Congress to effectuate its decision by suitable limitation on the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration.

My amendment will do three things:

First. It will insure that the farmer receives the money that we here today appropriate for the farmer, and in your vote you can say if the farmer is to get this money or if the utility companies are to get it.

Second. My amendment will indict the outlaw—the renegade bureaucrat—who operates a black market for utility companies to sell their inferior merchandise at inflated prices.

Third. It will give every Congressman a clear opportunity to go on record in favor of a government of law or in favor of a government of men with arbitrary power to suppress and nullify law and substitute in its stead their own capricious will.

Future Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in Bloch's book entitled "Future of War," published in 1899, Mr. Bloch states that from 1496 B. C. to 1861 of our own era there were but 227 years of peace.

The time elapsing between these two dates is 3,357 years, which means that we had 13 years of war for each 1 year of peace.

Since 1861, or the past 83 years, there has been no year in which a war was not being waged in some part of the world.

When we contemplate this historical fact and realize that today in this year of 1944 the peoples of the world are engaged in the most destructive of all wars, it causes me to wonder whether we should continue to boast of our so-called modern civilization and our super intelligence, or whether we should not begin to psychoanalyze this animal which we so proudly hail as the noblest work of God.

Further contemplation naturally brings to mind the problems facing us now and in the future if we expect to succeed in the fulfillment of our hopes and desires in bringing to a torn and shattered world the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Only 227 years of peace on all the earth at one and the same time, compared with 3,203 years of war. It exceeds the imagination to contemplate the mental, spiritual and physical advancement possible for the human race had those three-thousand-odd years been spent in construction instead of destruction.

I firmly believe that if only for self-preservation, we, as a nation, must assume an active leadership in any peace organization.

I further believe that any enduring peace which is based on a purely economic standard of living is doomed to failure. Unless we incorporate moral and spiritual standards in conjunction with our economic planning, distrust is inevitable. With distrust comes lack of

faith and with faith lost, the entire scheme will collapse.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, in order that America may demand the respect of other nations in promoting any plan to advance moral and spiritual standards of living, we must maintain a sound economy here at home.

Farm Problems in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the problems of agriculture in New Jersey, known as the Garden State, have recently been discussed at four regional meetings held by the State A. A. A. committee.

In my own district, which contains many of the most productive farms in America, farmers are deeply concerned over the probable effects of the new selective-service regulations pertaining to deferments. The feeling is general throughout the State that the importance of food in the winning of the war and the peace to come is not being properly measured at the moment. Farm labor is scarce and too many farmers have either become broken in health or sold out.

The following is a letter addressed to me by Mr. H. Earl Propst, executive assistant of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Department of Agriculture, New Brunswick, N. J., relative to the topics discussed by New Jersey farmers at the regional meetings referred to:

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
New Brunswick, N. J., March 17, 1944.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: I thought you would be interested in having a short résumé of the topics discussed by the farmers at our recent meetings.

About 300 farmers from New Jersey attended the 4 regional meetings held by the State A. A. A. committee. The production goals for 1944 were reviewed and discussed. As you probably know a general goal meeting was held in Trenton on October 19 and 20, when subcommittees on the important crops studied the various goals and presented their recommendations to the entire group.

At each meeting held this month the farm machinery outlook, farm labor, selective service directives, support prices for farm production, and the machinery set-up for putting such supports into operation were explained and discussed. O. P. A. ceilings were also a subject of much discussion.

Farmers in general are really worried over the new selective service regulations. Much of the production depends on those young skilled workers because of their ability to handle the farm machinery skillfully thus making their rate of production very high. Because of the high rate of employment in industry and the loss already caused by the armed forces, labor for our farms is very scarce.

New Jersey farmers could use more farm machinery than is now available. Through the very careful work of our county farm-machinery committee, it was felt that the limited amount is being placed where it will be best used.

Most of the farmers present felt that if ceilings are to be placed on farm products then either this ceiling should be high enough to have the farmers make enough during high prices to overcome the loss that usually occurs when there is a glut of produce on the market; if this ceiling price cannot be placed high enough then some sort of a support price should be placed on the products. They realize the difficulty of supporting a market on fresh fruits and vegetables during a heavy marketing period.

At the Hightstown meeting, Dr. Martin, dean of the College of Agriculture, who probably knows more about potatoes than any other man in New Jersey, was the special speaker. He asked the New Jersey potato growers not to plant more acres than last year but to become more efficient in production. Because of the general light yield and inefficiency of some producers about 35 percent of the growers did not make cost of production in 1943. Potato acreage in 1943 was 71,000 acres compared to 56,000 acres in 1942. The announced Government support price was greatly responsible for this increase.

At the Bridgeton meeting, Dr. Frank App was the guest speaker and in his talk he told the farmers present that agriculture in general has increased its production one-third since 1939 and that A. A. A. played an important part in obtaining this over-all production.

At the Morristown meeting Professor Cox, of the College of Agriculture, spoke on the fertilization of hay and pasture land. Because of the shortage of feed grains, it is necessary that milk producers grow as much feed for their animals in 1944 as possible. The agricultural conservation program has aided those farmers through payment for liming and use of superphosphate to have their pastures and hay lands in a good condition.

At the Livingston meeting, vegetables for market was the main topic of discussion. There again the question of ceiling prices and support prices was discussed.

The attitude of the farmers in general was very encouraging. It was the consensus of those attending that production in New Jersey may not be as high in 1944 as it was in 1943 but that farmers would do everything possible to produce the crops needed. They realize the importance of food to the war effort and will accept the responsibility placed upon them by the consumers of the State.

Very truly yours,

H. EARL PROPST,
Executive Assistant.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of Willkie's six points in his proposed farm policy is based on "horse sense." Good!

The tax law is bound to be simplified next year, but painfully multiplied.

The coming probe of Winchell's smear tactics will disclose more than Under Cover.

The draft now is taking more essential men and fathers. One might think that the country were being invaded.

The people at home are suspicious that the Barkley incident was not honest. Out West we do not kiss so much after a fight.

The notorious income-tax blanks asked you how many months of the year you had lived with your wife. It carried a hint of the Rooseveltian way.

The assistant janitor in a second-class city post office of my district has been pressed into full-time service as a carrier on a temporary basis.

The sun rose in the middle of the road this morning and set there tonight. Spring must make an accounting June 20. What shall the harvest be, politically?

What is going on now in the choosing of delegates to the Chicago convention in June is more vital and interesting to the wise than the shouting later.

People who will drive through many miles of snow and rain, using precious gasoline and tires solely to help save democracy when it is threatened, are the salt of the earth.

When the Governors were asked their opinion on a bill before executive action it was a new day. The world is interesting to live in for all the new things that come along.

Should Treat Eire Same as Any Neutral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of March 16, 1944:

"SHOULD TREAT EIRE SAME AS ANY NEUTRAL"—PHILBIN

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, an Irish Democrat from Clinton, Mass., broke the tight-lipped silence evident among Capitol Hill Irishmen on the Eire situation and declared today, "there is no reason why Ireland should be treated by our State Department any differently than any other neutral."

"I hope that our great Nation in the making and preserving of which the Irish have contributed so nobly, shall never be the instrument by which the Irish people of Eire, or any other free people shall be deprived of any single attribute of their hard-won sovereignty, whatever the pretext," Philbin said.

HUMAN FREEDOM

"This question," he continued, "is infinitely broader than Ireland alone. It involves the whole cause of human freedom. Fundamentally in principle, there is no reason why Ireland should be treated by our State Department any differently than any other neutral honestly struggling to maintain true neutrality in a world of turmoil and bloodshed. No free people should be blamed or punished for conscientiously trying to avoid the horrors of war.

RIGHTS OF FREE PEOPLE

"Ominous events are transpiring in Europe, but I hope and pray that our own Nation shall never be a party, by affirmative act or by silent acquiescence, to the suppression of the rights of any free people, or the conquest and domination by superior force of Ireland, gallant little Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, or any other free independent nation, large or small.

"If we, as Americans fight for anything worth while in this war, surely human freedom must be our first great aim, and this eternal principle, for which so many Irishmen have fought, bled, and died right here in our own country and elsewhere, must be applied to Ireland as well as to every other free nation."

Use of Alcoholic Drink Retards the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by me at the spring convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday evening, March 22, 1944:

I want to pay a personal tribute to the members of your organization and similar organizations throughout the country for the untiring and unceasing effort you have made in support of those principles and ideals that contribute to the happiness of a free people. The sincerity of your efforts to make this country a better place within which to live and to safeguard a free, representative government has always remained unquestionable. Those who have taken issu with you, and who may not agree with your views with respect to use of intoxicating liquors, all admit your desire and your effort to sustain an enlightened democracy has been above reproach.

Let me say, too, that although your numbers may not seem comparatively large, the influence of your organization is far more effective and far more important upon the people of this country, than many organizations who of number are many times your size.

Although your organization at the present time is engaged principally in an attempt to do away with the use of intoxicating liquors and other influences that tend to break down the morals and the well-being of the people of this country, your group has been jealous of the protection of the principles of representative government.

I want to emphasize this is a time when thinking American citizens everywhere may well give serious thought to the fact that representative government is on trial as it has never been before, and that the light of democracy, as we know it, is burning pretty low in America. It is for organizations like yours, as well as other organizations who have the welfare of our Government at heart, to see to it that while our boys are fighting to preserve American ideals and American principles and the American way of life, as we know it, that we do not lose free, representative government right here in the United States of America. I cannot impress this upon you too strongly.

I realize the subject matter that concerns your organization most at the present time is the increase in the use and sale of intoxicating liquors in this country and its influence upon our people. It is rather strange that at a time when our country is waging war against a ruthless enemy and when it needs every bit of human strength and human endeavor and thought to carry on such war it would permit its people to deal in a commodity that would in any wise lower its physical strength and ability to carry on such war. It does not even make sense that a segment of our people should be diverted from the very necessary occupations to carry on the war effort and be permitted to engage in things that are not required and are not even helpful.

We are selecting and training the men of our country who are best qualified physically and mentally to carry on a war. We put in their hands the most intricate instruments that have ever been invented. They require the best judgment and steadiest nerves to handle. And then these men, if they desire to do so, may use a drug that would dull their senses and impair their fitness for the most important responsibility they have ever assumed.

It does not make sense while we are fighting an all-out war, and need the concerted strength and effort of all people, to permit the increased use of alcoholic liquor when it is admitted that liquor does not in any way contribute in the prosecution of the war.

The thing that concerns me tonight with regard to this question in particular is that American consumers last year spent more than $6,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages. Last year 17 percent more was spent for alcoholic beverages than the year before. We spent 80 percent more than in 1939.

Last year we spent $46 per capita for liquor. It is three times as much as we spent for elementary and high-school education. It is twice as much as we spent for all our churches. It is more than we spent for the Red Cross. As a matter of fact, the $6,000,000,000 would go a long way on our public debt. Just think of it. We spent, or wasted, more than $200 per family for liquor in this country last year. Is that what you call sacrifice in the war effort?

I asked the War Food Administrator to furnish me a report with respect to the amount of grain used during 1943 for brewing purposes. Here is what he says: "Reports indicate that there were used in brewing during the fiscal year ending June 1943, 2,383,069,857 pounds of malted barley, 721,680,908 pounds of corn, and 152,038,154 pounds of rice." That makes a total of 54,000,000 bushels of grain raised in this country that ought to have been used for food. It could have been used to relieve the starving people of Europe; but instead it was made into liquor that went for no good purpose at all. Would it not have been better to have furnished 50 pounds of food for each of 50,000,000 starving women and children of Europe than to have permitted it to be wasted in liquor?

Patriotic appeals are being made to farmers in all sections of the country to produce more and more food. They are meeting that appeal in a wonderful way. Farmers and their wives and their children are working from daylight to dark to see to it that an adequate supply of food is provided for the members of the armed forces and for those who are engaged in the production of war materials. What will they think when they find out that 50,000,000 bushels of grain they produced did not go for food but was used for making liquor.

I mentioned the question of manpower. It seems odd that in the midst of this most devastating war, when millions of men and boys are sacrificing their life's blood for their country, that we still have groups of citizens who go merrily on, wasting their money and their energy for various kinds of extravagances and spend their time, among other things, in the use of intoxicating liquors.

Right here in Washington, where a quarter million people are employed by their own Government, more money is being spent and more time is being used in drinking liquor than in any other large city in this country. You can't tell me that men and women sitting in cocktail bars and drinking places in Washington and other places until late hours in the morning are thereby contributing their best efforts to the winning of this war.

Right now newspaper dispatches are telling us about the shortage of manpower and womanpower in this country and yet we have more than a half million men and women who are engaged in the manufacture and dispensing of intoxicating liquor in this country today. Do you or does anyone else think these people are helping the war effort? Why not let those who are physically qualified join the armed forces and the rest of them take jobs in important places that might be helpful for the prosecution of this war.

There is a shortage of gas and tires and trucks in this country, and yet trucks by the thousands roll down streets in our cities hauling liquor from place to place.

Only recently the local papers have warned us of a shortage of fuel and the need for cutting down the use of our electric lights and heat, and yet cocktail bars and drinking places remain open until all hours of the night. Are the owners of these places giving everything they have got for the promotion of the prosecution of the war?

Let me call your attention to something else. Last year, out of more than 20,000 jail commitments in the District of Columbia more than 60 percent were on account of intoxication. A similar situation exists in other parts of the country.

One of the principal arguments used by those who oppose prohibition is that it cannot be enforced. In answer to that, let me suggest that a government that can put 10,000,000 men in uniform and send them to all parts of the world, a government that can cut your gasoline supply down to 2 gallons per week and ration your sugar and your shoes, that can take away your tires, your automobiles, and your typewriters because they are needed for war purposes, certainly can do the small thing of prohibiting the use and sale of intoxicating liquors during a war period.

Even Canada has recognized the menace of liquor in the success of the prosecution of the war and has appealed to the nation to practice temperance and cut down the use of liquor. No liquor advertising by radio, press, or movies has been permitted since February 1, 1943. After all, the question of the sale and use of liquor is one of attention.

I regret very much that my Government and yours sees fit to spend from two hundred to three hundred thousand dollars annually for liquor to be used by our foreign diplomatic representatives in the entertainment of representatives of foreign countries abroad. Can it be possible that we have such weakness in representative government that it is necessary to spend Government money for high-powered liquor in order to reach a better understanding with those who repesent govenments abroad?

An appeal must be made on the broad ground that liquor does not contribute to the moral nor the physical well-being of the people of this country and that its use and sale does not contribute to the prosecution of the war, and that its use does not belong to a people in a representative democracy.

The time has come when the people of this country must take a position one way or the other. Whether it is for the best interests of the welfare of the people of this generation

and the generations to come and whether in an enlightened Nation like ours we are willing to continue the waste of manpower, of money and morals on alcoholic liquor; or whether we have the courage and nerve to get rid of it.

I would repeat that the menace of liquor traffic must be dealt with on a much broader scope than in the past. It must be done through educational processes. People must be convinced that the use of it is not only detrimental, but that it deters people physically and economically, not only individually, but as a nation. And that if we are to survive as the leading nation in this world and wield the influence to which we are entitled, it will require the best equipped bodies and the best trained minds that can be produced. Alcohol has no place in that program.

Let me reiterate that the flickering light of representative government is burning pretty low. Those of us on the home front have the responsibility of making sure that the light does not go out while the boys on the war front are fighting in the four corners of the world to preserve free American Government and the American way of life.

When Johnny Comes Marching Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1944

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we are all giving much thought and consideration today to conditions that will prevail upon the successful termination of the war and just what our domestic conditions will be when our boys come home from the fighting fronts.

Recently there appeared in an issue of Southern California Business, published by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, an article entitled "When Johnny Comes Marching Home," reading as follows:

When Johnny comes marching home he's going to be in a critical mood about home-front happenings during his absence.

Johnny has heard a lot about strikes for higher pay going on when he was in a muddy fox hole; going on when he was eating condensed foods, if any—or if he had time to eat them; going on when he was being shelled or bombed or shot at. Johnny is likely to think labor played him a pretty dirty trick.

But after Johnny arrives home investigations will get under way. War profiteering will be a favorite subject. Unethical, if not illegal, practices of certain business firms will be dramatized and exposed to public gaze. Our soldier boy may then decide that business, too, was pretty rotten.

JOHNNY WILL MAKE A MISTAKE

In this confusion and disillusionment Johnny won't be long in turning to the only haven of virtuousness that occurs to him, some American Society of Johnnies. He will try to find some organization that will satisfy his emotions and his picture of things as he thinks they ought to be. Yet, because people are always people, the grouping he finds will be as mixed in its vices and in its virtues as the ones he is trying to avoid or oppose.

Johnny's mistake, like that of most of us, originates in a habit of oversimplification. Rather than being specific about individuals we lazily generalize about groups. And doing this, we become group conscious and fight among ourselves as groups.

Victimized by our own careless thinking and aided by clever word-changers, we say that business is good or that it is evil, according to which side we are on. Likewise we say that labor is greedy or productive, malicious or patriotic. We say that politicians are demagogs or statesmen, and that farmers have their hands in the "pork barrel" or that they are America's economic underdogs.

GROUPINGS CANNOT BE PERSONALIZED

In fact, however, business, labor, politicians, farmers, or even "Johnnies" have, in each grouping, few characteristics in common. These groupings cannot and must not be personalized. Individual businessmen are no more alike than business and labor. These broad generalizations are only handy terms for describing certain broad differences in functions. They are abstractions, like carpentry, architecture, or plumbing, which tell us little or nothing concerning the character of the widely differing individuals carrying on those occupations.

No two businessmen are alike. No two laborers are alike. Similarly with the others. Badness and goodness are not characteristics of any grouping. Neither are brilliance and ignorance. Neither are maliciousness and patriotism. The only things that can be personalized are persons—individuals. Some businessmen have committed war sins. So have some politicians. So have some soldiers. So have some farmers. So have some laboring men. The vast majority of all American citizens are honest, patriotic, sincere, faithful, hard working.

WHY POPULAR NOTIONS ARE WRONG

Albert Edward Wiggam, the noted psychologist, says that popular notions are usually wrong because they are based on exceptions to the general rule of things and a guess as to what causes the exceptions. For example, when some trade-union officer expresses an opinion, in the press or over the radio, he is supposed to express the opinion of labor. Nonsense. Most laboring individuals are unaware of the opinion. When some businessman defrauds the Government, all business is thought to be dishonest. More nonsense. Most businessmen deplore the deed along with the Department of Justice. Thus fallacies spring from overemphasis on exceptions, as Wiggam says.

We can and should rid ourselves of this collectivist thinking, or personalized abstractions, of compartmentizing a population of individuals. If we do this, you and I and Johnny will have our axes out for those individuals who do us wrong. We will applaud those individuals who serve us and our country right. Further, we will make it impossible for the dishonest and the unscrupulous to hide behind such abstractions as business and labor. America is a nation of individuals.

The Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in casting my vote today for overriding the veto of the tax bill, I am thinking especially of human rights, which I have always placed above property rights, and I am thinking especially of the welfare of labor.

I have seen much of the background of this veto proposal and of the atmosphere surrounding it, and I believe that the question as to whether there shall be a labor draft in the United States is linked with what we do here today.

It is currently bruited around the Capital that forces of enormous strength and power are being marshaled for an early effort to put a labor-draft bill through Congress. If a strong centralized Executive authority could push through Congress the kind of tax bill it wants, drafted according to its plans and specifications, it could by the same strong tactics secure the passage of a universal national conscription act that would draft labor and compel our citizens to work under directions issued from the bureaus in Washington. I am unalterably opposed to the labor draft proposal. I believe it is un-American to the last degree and that it would bring to America a taint of totalitarianism that has no place on our free American soil.

I hope that the action of Congress in overriding the tax-bill veto will put an end to the labor-draft movement, and I believe there is much ground for that hope. I have the highest respect for the man in the White House, but no man is always right, and I do not believe that any President, however well-meaning he may be, should have the power to dominate Congress at will.

When the President sent his belligerent veto message to Congress an issue was immediately created that makes the tax bill pale into insignificance. The issue that was precipitated was greater than the tax bill, and greater than all tax bills combined. There are features of the tax bill which I strongly disapproved and which I have opposed, but in the face of the new issue that has arisen—which I conceive to be of no less importance than the preservation of the integrity of the American form of government—there was only one vote that I, as an American, could cast, and that was a vote to override the veto, and thus serve notice that Congress at long last is alive to its responsibilities and is determined to exercise the full measure of its powers as a coordinate branch of Government. No one has criticized Congress more freely than I have in the past for pusillanimous surrender of its authority inch by inch and mile by mile to a strong centralized bureaucracy. For that reason I felt a special obligation to vote to override this veto, by which action Congress will declare in clarion tones its intention to assert and defend its constitutional rights, and I predict that this will have a far-reaching wholesome effect for the future of America.

The issue created by the President's message arose so suddenly that I have not had time to learn the reaction of my constituents, but I feel certain that our people of the Eleventh Indiana District, without distinction of party or occupation—our laboring people, our manufacturers, our business and professional men, and our women in all walks of life—would want me to do whatever seems to me to be necessary to protect and main-

tain our constitutional system. I am acting under that implied mandate in casting a vote which I believe is in the interest of the people of America.

Explosive as this episode, culminating in the passage of the bill over the President's veto, has been, I think it is a mighty good thing. It clearly reestablishes the rights of Congress, which have been lost in the twilight zone. It is a good thing for the Congress, a good thing for the President, and a good thing for America. The President in his letter to Senator BARKLEY has shown a wholesome recognition of Congress and a fine spirit of compliance. It has been said that "all's well that ends well" and I believe that this fight between the Executive and the lawmaking branch is ending very well, indeed. In my opinion the overriding of the Presidential veto will prove to be a great victory for the people because it will tend far toward reestablishing the three coordinate branches of government in their proper orbits where they will function constitutionally.

A Suggested Program for the Maximum Development and Utilization of the Agricultural and Industrial Resources of the 3,070 Counties in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter which I have just received from Mr. Oswald Wilson, the editor of New Agriculture, a farm journal of wide circulation and high influence, in which this able and outstanding authority on agriculture advocates a Victory program of great promise, one well worthy of the careful and sympathetic consideration of all of those who are interested in finding proper solutions of the problems of the post-war era, problems already beyond the numbering.

The letter to which I have just referred is the following:

NEW AGRICULTURE,
San Francisco, Calif., March 14, 1944.

Hon. B. W. GEARHART,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Subject: The maximum development and utilization of the agricultural and industrial resources of the 3,070 counties in the United States.

DEAR "BUD": Our most urgent problem today and for post-war prosperity is—not the problems of Europe or the welfare and prosperity of all the nations of the world—but the maximum development and utilization of all the agricultural and industrial resources of each of the 3,070 counties in the United States.

Because it is from these 3,070 counties—and not from any foreign nation, or bureau, or governmental department at Washington, must come:

The billions of new wealth that our Government needs and must have to meet the cost of this war and to redeem War bonds and pay taxes, and

From these counties must come the raw materials that industry needs and must have, and

The new buying power and demands for all lines of agricultural and industrial goods and services, and

The gainful employment that returning armed forces need and must have.

Official Government records show that less than 50 percent of the resources of these counties are utilized and that in these 3,070 counties there are annually produced, on their farms, in their forest and in the refuse from the cities—at an expense of time, labor, and soil fertility, more than 350,000,000 tons of valuable food and fiber by-products—but from which no income is derived because these byproducts cannot be utilized in their present form (S. Doc. No. 65, April 1939, p. 51).

Under the new and improved plans, processes, machinery, and equipment developed by Farm and Timber Industries, under the sponsorship of New Agriculture (a monthly magazine published at San Francisco, Calif.)—all of these 350,000,000 tons of farm and timber byproducts can be utilized at a profit and converted into low-cost primary raw materials for which there is a constant and increasing demand, local, State, Nation, and world-wide.

These primary raw materials will have a potential economic and financial value far in excess of the raw material derived from all mines and oil wells (S. Doc. No. 65, p. 357).

The utilization of farm and timber byproducts will come under two plans:

1. PROTEIN SUPPLEMENT FEED MILLS

All perishable byproducts from farms, canneries and food-processing plants, packing and shipping sheds, and city refuse can be utilized at a profit and converted on a sound economic basis into low-cost protein supplement feeds that our livestock, dairy, and poultry industries need and must have to produce the additional high-quality meats and dairy and poultry products for which there is a local, State, Nation, and world-wide demand.

The president of Armour & Co., Mr. Cobell, in an address, said: "The people of the United States could consume to their benefit 50 percent more meats, dairy and poultry products, and almost unlimited foreign markets can be developed if we will improve the quality and lower the cost by producing more protein-supplement feeds."

Every animal, every chicken, must have an adequate daily ration of protein supplements, in addition to pasture, hay, and grain.

To supply each animal and chicken in the United States with its annual minimum ration of protein supplements would require at least 26,500,000 tons, and there is less than 12,000,000 tons annually available from domestic production and foreign imports. Therefore, there is an established demand and urgent market for at least 15,000,000 tons of low-cost protein supplements.

The production of protein-supplement feeds from byproducts is not new nor an experiment. Alfalfa, leaf meal, sugar-beet pulp, orange pulp, tomato pumace, apple pumace are established as protein supplements with a ready market.

The first protein-supplement feed mill to utilize and convert byproducts from the canneries—asparagus butts, celery trimmings, and cull potatoes—into protein supplement feeds is now under construction at Stockton, Calif., and will be ready for operation by June 15, 1944, and the capacity will be 3 to 5 tons of feed per hour, depending on moisture content, and at a cost not to exceed $20 per ton.

There will be available 9,000 tons of tomato by-products from the canneries, and 6,000 tons of cull potatoes from the farmers—July to December—from which approximately 4,300 tons of protein supplement feed can be processed, with a protein content of not less than 15 percent which will be equal to other protein supplements now on the market. See feed analysis.

The entire output is under contract at $40 per ton freight on board plant. It is anticipated that the production will approximate 9,000 tons of protein supplement feeds in 1945.

The total cost including land, buildings, machinery, equipment, and working capital will approximate $50,000—all local capital—no Government financing.

A similar protein supplement feed mill can be financed, constructed, and successfully operated on the same basis in every county in the United States, where there is an available supply of farm and vegetable perishable by-products.

Thereby, "converting waste into wealth."

The Stockton, Calif., project has the support and endorsement of the War Food Administration and the necessary authorization and priorities for the purchase and installation of the machinery and equipment were issued by the War Production Board, March 3, 1944.

The War Food Administration, Industry and Operations Division, writes:

"We hereby certify that the construction of a proposed plant by Farm and Timber Industries, Inc., financing for which has been applied for on your Form DPC–1, is a war necessity.

"Feedstuffs, particularly those of high-protein content, are in short supply both for domestic purposes and for territorial and foreign shipments.

"The production of such vital necessities as milk, butter, eggs, and meat is currently being restricted because of the lack of supply of feedstuffs.

"We recommend the approval of this project."

The California State Department of Agriculture writes:

"The projected plant at Stockton, Calif., appeals to me as a most necessary and desirable one, an enterprise with an assured market. California agriculture is today suffering from an acute shortage of concentrated stock feeds, a lack of which threatens to seriously curtail our production of valuable and most necessary livestock and livestock products, including poultry."

California Dairy Council writes:

"Milk production in California is declining largely because of the drastic shortage of concentrated protein and carbohydrates feedstuffs, which are essential components of the dairy cow's feed.

"The shortage of protein feedstuffs is Nation-wide, consequently California cannot supplement its own production of these commodities by drawing from other areas.

"We feel this proposed mill can make a very definite contribution to the war effort.

"Our Government has asked the dairymen of California to increase milk production 10 percent over that of 1941. It cannot be done, largely because of insufficient supplies of protein feeds. This Stockton project will help very greatly."

2. NONCHEMICAL PULP MILLS

Official records show that for every ton of lumber produced there are approximately 2 tons of valuable timber byproducts left in the forest or destroyed at the mills, and that for every ton of cotton, grain, and fruit the farmer must produce 2 tons of byproducts in the straws, stalks, hulls, culls, tree, and vine prunings and from which no income is derived. But under the new and improved plans, processes, machinery, and equipment developed by farm and timber industries—under sponsorship of New Agriculture—all of these farm and timber byproducts can be utilized at a profit and converted

on a sound economic basis into low-cost nonchemical pulps, as the primary raw material for the manufacture therefrom by industrial plants of decorative and building materials, plastics, paper, paper products, sugar, rubber, alcohol, fuel, explosives, clothing, food, feed, fertilizers, chemicals, and hundreds of items that are daily, military, and civilian necessities (S. Doc. No. 65, p. 357).

A nonchemical pulp mill that will annually manufacture 6,000 tons of nonchemical pulp from farm and timber fiber byproducts will cost for land, buildings, machinery, and equipment installed and ready to operate not to exceed $50,000.

This pulp will have a ready market at $20 to $60 per ton f. o. b. plant and the cost will range from $10 to $20 per ton, depending upon quality; and

One or more pulp mills can be financed, constructed, and successfully operated at each timber mill and in each farm district where there is an annual production of cotton, grains, and fruit. There is more cellulose left in the stalk and hulls than is sold as lint cotton.

All that is needed to establish one or more feed and pulp mills in each county is the support and cooperation of Congress and the removal of unnecessary restrictions and the necessary authorization and priorities for the purchase and installation of the machinery and equipment—the necessary raw materials are available in abundance in every county and local capital is seeking investment. In many counties there are available plants that are only part-time operated or idle which can be converted into feed and pulp mills at a small cost.

Will Congress aid and encourage the maximum development and utilization of the agricultural and industrial resources of each and every one of our 3,070 counties?

Thank you.

Yours for victory,

OSWALD WILSON,
Editor of New Agriculture.

CALIFORNIA FEED MILLS—PROTEIN SUPPLEMENT FEEDS

Materials	Tons available	Tons feed	Digestible protein	Total digestible nutrients	Nutritive ratio	Protein	Fat	Fiber	Nitrogen free extract	Minerals	Price carlot, f. o. b. plant	Vitamins
	1944		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*		
Tomato pulp (canneries)	9,000	3,000	10.4	55.3	4.3	22.6	14.8	32.1	21.6	3.2	$40–$42	A–B–C.
Potato culls (farms)	6,000	1,200	6.6	69.6	18.9	8.6	.6	5.0	71.0	3.7	40–45	B–C.
	1945											
Asparagus butts (packing sheds)	18,000	3,000	9.7	47.1	----------	15.6	.9	31.1	35.4	----------	40	
Celery trimmings (packing sheds)	12,000	2,000	10.0	51.0	----------	18.8	4.8	9.8	26.5	----------	40	A.

PRESENT FEEDS ON MARKET—COMPETITIVE

Alfalfa meal	----------	----------	10.8	53.4	4.0	15.2	1.9	28.4	37.9	10.0	$45–$47	A–B–E–G.
Beet pulp molasses	----------	----------	6.1	74.3	11.2	9.9	.7	15.9	60.1	----------	46–47	
Orange pulp	----------	----------	6.1	74.4	11.9	7.7	1.5	8.0	67.3	----------	46–47	
Apple pumice	----------	----------	1.7	60.5	34.6	4.5	5.0	15.6	62.1	2.2	45–50	
Barley (good)	----------	----------	10.2	67.6	5.6	13.2	3.5	8.4	61.0	4.0	55	

The Mystery of the Arabian Pipe Line

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no recent event in this country has aroused so much justified concern as the announcement of February 6 by Secretary Ickes that the United States Government intends to build and operate an oil pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea. It would link the American oil concessions in Saudi Arabia and in the Sheikdom of Kuwait with a Mediterranean port, either Alexandria in Egypt or Haifa in Palestine. The pipe line would traverse some 1,250 miles of desert country populated only by migrating tribes of Bedouins. The whole project, as I said, gives just cause for concern, and for several reasons.

First, we are being told that, in supplying 70 percent of all the oil and 95 percent of all the aviation high-octane gasoline used in this war, we are running out of oil in this country and that our known oil reserves have dwindled to a mere 14-year supply. We shall now have to import oil in order to keep our automobiles running, our houses heated, and our industries operating. We are being quite frankly told that we cannot "oil another war."

Now the amazing thing is that the oil industry, through the central organization, the Petroleum Industry War Council, tells us that the scare Secretary Ickes is giving us has little or no foundation in the facts. It is admitted that we shall be running out of oil soon if the present Government interference with the industry be continued, but we are also told that if the oil industry be released from Government control and restriction, new venture capital will be encouraged to finance that search for new reserves which has so far produced an abundant flow of oil despite the record-breaking consumption of this Nation.

The industry, furthermore, points out that if we require additional oil, especially in case of another world war, our logical source of emergency supplies would be Central and South America, where vast opportunities for American oilmen lie in wait. Our administration, however, does not appear particularly interested in that region, because several of the Latin-American republics by law prohibit operation on their territory by companies owned or controlled by foreign governments. Oil from our neighbors to the south can only be obtained by the private oil industry with the normal diplomatic aid of the Government, but without its active participation.

Secretary Ickes, in a recent magazine article, has given us a gloomy picture of our oil situation. He tells us that at the end of this war—I quote:

> One of our first undertakings ought to be to store in this country vast quantities of crude, and even, if necessary, of refined products. We shall be carelessly exposing ourselves to grave risks unless we build up and maintain reserves that will last at least 20 years. We should buy and buy and buy, and store and store and store, until we are able to face the whole world, if necessary.

The Petroleum Industry War Council has pointed out that such a program of large-scale storage would be incredibly costly. If we should store up some 2,000,000,000 barrels to last us through another 4-year war, the cost would amount to somewhere between eight and thirteen billion dollars if held for 20 years as the Secretary suggests. The oilmen also point out that the very presence of such a volume of stored-up oil would paralyze the industry, because one would never know what day the Government would decide to liquidate its excessive holdings to the demoralization of the oil market.

The announcement by the Secretary of the Interior has another and even more serious aspect. This project marks the first official step of the administration into the hotbed of foreign power politics. Moreover, they want to take that step without asking the consent of the American people through their Congress. It is said that when the Versailles Treaty was signed at the end of World War No. 1, Field Marshal Foch pointed on a map to the city of Danzig and said, "This is where the next world war will start." His statement was indeed a prophetic one. It does not require the experience of a field marshal nor the faculties of a prophet to predict that World War No. 3 will be a fight for survival by the British Empire against Soviet Russia. When that clash comes, we shall see our projected Arabian pipe line in the very center of a principal area of conflict. This is not mere fancy. British and Russian interests have always clashed in the Near and Middle East, and it is a safe bet that history will repeat itself.

Now what is Mr. Ickes suggesting that we do? American oil companies on their own initiative have already secured rich oil concessions in an area which politically is dominated by Great Britain. Apparently it has been no handicap to our enterprising oil men that the region they explored was definitely within the

political sphere of interest of another great nation. Neither did it operate to their disadvantage that the British Government holds stock in one of the British companies operating in that area. Furthermore, it is pointed out by the oil industry that Mr. Ickes' project does not add a barrel of oil to the supply available to American nationals and automatically, in case of emergency, to the American Nation. Why, therefore, should our Government enter the oil business in these far-away lands and particularly engage in a pipe-line project? As the real reason is obscure, it is no wonder that all kinds of theories have been suggested to explain this unprecedented venture of our administration. The ones good reason for building a pipe line, namely, that it will cut transportation costs, does not seem to hold in this case. The industry insists that if the pipe line can be made a paying proposition, the oil companies are ready to build it themselves.

It has been suggested that the administration may want to establish a naval base in the eastern Mediterranean Sea, although it is difficult to see which American interests such a base would protect other than the same Government pipe line. It has also been suggested that the administration may be planning to fortify the shaky British position in the Near and Middle East. A quite different view has been voiced that the administration is preparing a strategic position in case of a future economic oil conflict between this country and Great Britain.

Unfortunately, these are not the only possible sources of trouble in the area in which Mr. Ickes proposes to place our pipe line. There is a permanent and fanatical conflict between the native Arabian population and the Jewish immigrants in Palestine, the British being inclined to support the Arab cause, and our administration looking with more favor on the Jewish standpoint. It is impossible to foresee the consequences if internal strife breaks out in the territory where our Government owns property. The possible necessity of patrolling and safeguarding the pipe line might easily lead us into military occupation of parts of foreign countries.

However you look at Mr. Ickes' proposition, it is easy to see the potential dangers, and extremely difficult to see the advantages to this Nation. It is, furthermore, disturbing that our Government apparently has not taken the trouble to confer with our British friends about the matter. The British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden, on February 19 stated in the House of Commons, I quote:

> That Great Britain has not yet approved the proposal to construct an American pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, and that the government would be concerned profoundly about any such project so deeply affecting British interests.

Let me finally call your attention to one more fact. There is one man who benefits greatly by the project, namely, King Ibn-saud of Saudi Arabia. He is getting a royalty on every barrel of oil produced by the American companies, and he will have to give his consent to the laying of the pipe line, and that consent, of course, will not be given gratis. As a matter of fact it appears there is in the picture at this time a little matter of a twenty-five-million-dollar gift from this Government to King Ibn-saud which will soon be probed by a Senate committee.

The other day I read a little note in the paper—a United Press report from Saudi Arabia. I quote:

> Machine-gun-armed American troops stood guard today as $1,520,000 in Saudi-Arabian silver coins, minted in Philadelphia under lend-lease, were heaved like so many sacks of potatoes on the dock here.

If that story is correct, lend-lease not only helps our allies with implements of war and food but even furnishes deserving Arab chieftains with American-made silver coins. I assume these silver coins will not be returned after they have used them.

Mr. Ickes is under an obligation to the American people to make it intelligible why in the wide world this Government should start on such an unprecedented venture as to build and operate an oil pipe line in Arabia which will prove dangerous to the future peace of this country. The project obviously has no relation whatever to the prosecution of the present war because the oil pipe line cannot be ready for use in the next 2 years at least.

One thing, however, is sure. The project does definitely put the Government into the oil business. It is a big step forward toward Government-owned, Government-controlled, and Government-regimented industry, and toward a national economy based on Marxistic economic principles. These principles, which so effectively have enslaved the Old World, we propose to keep off our shores. This is still America, and it is to preserve this America that we went to war—not to fall victims ourselves to the ills of dying Europe.

We Should Be Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1944

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, at least three-fourths of the more physically and mentally fit young Americans will soon be in the armed service. Some 5,000,000 of our sons may soon be on the fighting front. A million may die. Those who have been drafted, who will be called, who are or will be leaving their homes, their loved ones, have the right to know the purpose of the battles they must fight, the objectives they must reach before the war can end.

The farm boy, the clerk, the miner, the factory worker, each had some idea of the magnitude of his daily task, the goal toward which he was striving. But the boy who is to fight has not yet been told when his task will be accomplished. He knows the war must be won, but neither he nor those who are supporting him, have been told how far, nor into what countries he and his comrades must carry the flag before the survivors can say "Our job has been finished," can return to the homeland.

Our natural resources are being drained for the war effort. Millions of our finest young men are being sent abroad while hundreds of thousands of foreigners are coming into this country to replace them; to take their seats at the table; to sleep in their beds; to live in their, or similar, homes; to receive the education, the professional training which, were it not for the war, our boys would be given.

The Atlantic Charter was a declaration of our purposes. It was a blueprint of our job. It proposed no territorial changes by the nations of the world without the consent of the people concerned. It promised all people the right to choose their own form of government.

The Detroit Free Press on August 15, 1941, the day after it was disclosed, praised it, said we were "at war." But March 19, 1943, the same Detroit Free Press said the Atlantic Charter "was so full of weasel words and platitudes it never meant anything anyway." The attitude of the Free Press is typical of the inconsistencies of the editors who demand that Congress follow their lead. Churchill is now asking a further interpretation of the Atlantic Charter.

WHERE ARE WE AT?

Today the demand on our resources, on our manpower, has become so great, the objectives of the war so confused, that last week 24 of the more recently elected Republicans, practically all of them from the eastern seaboard, and all more or less ardent supporters of the President's international policy of intervention, joined in a letter to Secretary of State Hull asking that the country be told the particulars of the task assigned those who are to fight and die.

The men in the service, their families, their relatives, want to know what they have the right to know—whether, when this war is over, for example, the people of the smaller nations of the world are to have the right to determine their own form of government. When for instance, we have aided in freeing Poland from Nazi domination, are we to be asked by Britain or some other nation to fight Russia to reestablish the Polish and other so-called Republics? When Germany and Japan have been defeated, must we fight some other people, some other nation? Are we to fight Britain to establish the independence of India? Are we to fight Russia to give Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Bessarabia, Finland, self-government? These are practical questions.

In short, what armies and navies must our men defeat? What countries must they conquer? How far across the world must they go? When can the fighting boys say: "The victory has been won, now we can turn our faces homeward?"

Those who are about to die have the right to know, they must be told, the present objectives of the war. They and

those who are supporting them must have defined for them the job which they are to do. A free people should not be asked to fight blindly for an unknown objective. The soldier who knows why he is fighting, for what he is fighting, the end of the road down which he is traveling and from which when reached he can turn homeward, will fight with renewed courage and determination.

Let the administration tell the American people now, as requested by the 24 Republican Members of Congress, who have faithfully supported its international intervention policy, where it is leading us, what must be done before the boys may come home.

Who Will Look Out for America if We Do Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that we in America do some careful, clear thinking. We must be able, intelligently, and with sincere conviction, to answer that age-old question—Where are we going? Already, many thousands of our boys have met a tragic fate far away from their American homes. Moreover, we are being told to be prepared for very much heavier losses in the year to come. I believe the American people have the right to be fully informed of our foreign problems and policies. I believe the New Deal administration is grossly underestimating the intelligence and the patriotism of the people of this Nation when its powerful propaganda machine goes on repeating such deceptive slogans as, "We are fighting the battle of democracy," or that "We are fighting for the American way for the other peoples of the world." Even the Prime Minister of South Africa, a man held in great esteem by all Britishers, Field Marshal Smuts, recently told the Parliamentary Association in London that these words were but "catchwords and vague slogans" which would not lead us very far.

I believe the American people should be left in no doubt as to what we are fighting for and as to what the objectives of our allies are. I thoroughly disagree with the British economist, Geoffrey Crowther, the editor of the Economist, in London, when he, in a recent article to which I shall make several references tonight, concludes:

> Though it would be an advantage to know what we are fighting for, it is enough to know what we are fighting against.

Of the three great powers on our side in the war, I am afraid Soviet Russia is the only one that has a very positive conception of her war aims. David Dallin, a Russian historian and economist, opened a recent article in the American Mercury with this statement:

> The instrument of protection is a mutual-aims for post-war Europe reminds one of Poe's purloined letter. While experts were hunting for it in clever hiding places, it was in plain sight all the time, ignored because in full view.

Dallin states that—

> The Kremlin is deeply pessimistic about a prospect of durable peace. Where Americans and Britishers look for the war to end, Soviet leaders expect it merely to subside in greater or lesser measure. Right or wrong, this conception has a determined effect on Soviet policy. Lacking faith in the durability of post-war alliances, it seeks to win strategic positions, in territory and politically, for its own protection. The Soviet regime hopes to accomplish this by extending its strategic frontiers as far west as possible, and by drawing the remaining area, with a population of over 100,000,000, under its political protection. The pattern for such protection was drawn long ago in Outer Mongolia. That country is not a part of the Soviet Union, but Red Army forces are garrisoned there. The instrument of protection is a mutual assistance pact made between the Soviet Union and Outer Mongolia on March 12, 1936.

Unfortunately, the conferences in Moscow and in Teheran, together with subsequent events, have contributed nothing toward removing the fear that Mr. Dallin may be right. On February 23, 1942, Stalin listed the three Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as "Soviet land." No responsible official has so far contradicted the claims of many Russian authorities that the Soviet Union means to keep not only those three small, unfortunate countries, but also large parts of Poland, Finland, and Rumania, lands which became victims of Russian aggression during the war we are now fighting.

Furthermore, we see Soviet Russia fomenting in other countries Communist revolutions led by Soviet-trained propagandists and supported by propaganda radio centers located on Soviet territory. It seems to me disgraceful that we have been induced to support the Communist revolutionaries in Yugoslavia, whose aim it is to overthrow by force the legal government, recognized by us as such, and to fight the loyal forces under General Mihailovich, who is the Minister of War of the Yugoslav Government. Similar revolutions are fomented by Russia in Greece and in Poland. The conclusion is evident that we may face a Sovietized eastern Europe, although it is known that in none of those countries would the Communists have a chance if the people were permitted to express and exercise their will.

All this may seem irrevelant to a casual observor. We may think that the fate of Poland and Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the latter of whom the other day took the fateful step of signing, as Outer Mongolia did, a mutual assistance pact with Russia, can never disturb the peace of America. But we should remember that it was the Danzig question, and the consequent German attack on Poland that caused England to declare war on Germany, and thus brought us into the present conflict. The editor of the British magazine, the Nineteenth Century and After, Mr. Voigt, has in a recent article in his magazine, which I have previously mentioned in these broadcasts, explained why England went to war. He bluntly discards the commonly accepted view that Germany made war to dominate the world, and explains that whatever power is master of eastern Europe, is master of all Europe, and he argues:

> England has no permanent foe in Europe. Her only foe is that power which may endeavor to dominate Europe. Against that foe she must always be ready, always be strong, and always have allies. As her foe varies so will her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow. As soon as the balance of power is challenged every collective system will collapse and England will, if she is not to perish, make the counterchallenge. Russian aspirations contain the stuff of all Anglo-Russian tension for the last hundred years. They would, in the end, compel Great Britain, whether she liked it or not, to modify her attitude toward Germany. A Russian domination of Eastern Europe would bring upon Europe deep division, economic ruin, and political disaster, from which Great Britain could not escape, and the gainer in the end would not even be Russia but Germany.

Field Marshal Smuts clearly realizes the dangers ahead. He is afraid the British Commonwealth will be the weakest partner in the post-war trinity. He, therefore, suggests expansion of the British Commonwealth to include the countries of western Europe, which, he says, are lost standing by themselves on the Continent.

We may as well realize that the power that succeeds in dominating the continents of Europe and Asia will be the strongest power on earth—stronger, in fact, than the United States and the British Empire taken together. If the outcome of the war should create such a power, the peace of this country will be in greater danger than ever before in our history.

Mr. Crowther, in his article in the Economist, deplores the fact that nobody knows today what an Allied victory would mean. He quotes a statement from Mr. Carr's book, Conditions of Peace, in which the author concludes that the dominant ideas of the nineteenth century, namely, in domestic politics, representative democracy, in economics, free enterprise; and in international affairs; the sovereignty of self-determined nations, are dead. Mr. Crowther adds:

> In general, though I differ with Mr. Carr in matters of degree, I find it impossible to refute the substance of his charge. The western democratic world is perilously close to a vacuum of faith. * * * But the trouble about a vacuum is that it gets filled, and if there are no angels available to fill it, fools—or worse—rush in.

Mr. Crowther does not feel certain that the trend from democracy to dictatorship, from individual capitalism toward rigid State control, from the sovereignty of the Nation-State to concentration of power in the hands of a few, will be changed at the end of the war. He says:

> Propaganda plus the concentration of economic power plus blitzkrieg technique add up to fascism; or they may be made to add up to something new that may be compatible to democratic ideals. But whatever else they

add up to, they certainly do not add up to the sort of democracy that our fathers thought of. The plain truth is that Hitler has an answer to the problems of the twentieth century and we, as yet, have not. It follows that whatever happens in the present war, Hitler will be hot on our heels for the rest of our lives. This dilemma can be solved only by the birth of a new faith.

I want to repeat what I have said before. This Nation is fully prepared for any sacrifice to protect our liberties, our democratic form of government, and our American way of life. On the other hand, the American people will have been gravely misled if our boys are sent out to die to replace a German domination of Europe by a Russian domination of Europe; to replace the ideology of the Nazis by the ideology of the Communist; to replace stable governments which have had the confidence of the nations by revolutionary governments based on force. If, after this war, we shall continue to underwrite the perpetuation of the British Empire, we must not again be left to the passive part of being forced to go to war because His Majesty's government chose to do so. Some statesmen seem to have forgotten that we have long ago ceased to be colonials. If every few years we are to sacrifice lives and prosperity to save the world, if we are to be expected to feed the world and deplete our economic resources every time the nations of the world commit economic suicide, if the wealth of America, the life of its youth, is to be scattered over the surface of the globe, leaving us as poor as the rest, then the time will have come when the people of this country will rebel against such a position and against such obligations. If our future statesmen do not then choose to look out for America as carefully, as meticulously, as efficiently as Churchill and Stalin now look after their countries, there is bound to be trouble. Even in this country under such conditions we might see revolution follow war.

In the future, and under all circumstances, we must look out for the safety of the America we love, and the American way of life we cherish, under the Bill of Rights.

Republicans and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 18, 1944:

REPUBLICANS AND PEACE

Not enough public attention has focused on peace plans of the Republican Party. For whether the Republicans win the Presidency or not, they are sure to have such a strength in the Senate that no peace will be made without their agreement. The thinking among Republican leaders on foreign policy in Congress may be as important as the views of the party's Presidential candidate. For that reason deep interest attaches to the new set-up of Republican leadership in the Senate.

Senate Republicans have refused to let either Senator WHITE or Senator AUSTIN, the most recent acting leaders, succeed to the place vacated by the passing of Senator McNary. Instead, leadership functions were split three ways, with Senator TAFT taking a strategic position as chairman of the new steering committee. Washington observers believe that if the Republicans organize the next Senate Mr. TAFT will step into full leadership, a possibility which makes his views on the peace well worth examination.

Many Republican leaders seem to feel that they can avoid making enemies by not defining their position, that the public will be satisfied with the generalities of Mackinac. Not so the Senator from Ohio. Long considered an isolationist, he has explained that he has always thought America should be willing to make "definite commitments in advance" if by joining with other nations "we could discourage the beginning of war."

He oppcses an international police force, but differs from the isolationist insistence that the United States must keep a free hand. In a recent statement in the New York Times Magazine he urged something like a League of Nations, with "laws dealing with relations between nations," and went so far as to say that America should obligate itself to take up arms "to prevent law violation which is defined as aggression and found to be aggression by an international council."

This is certainly a hopeful advance over the old isolationist no-commitments position. It appears to go further than many of the Republican leaders have been willing to go. Is it an adequate peace program? That question will be better answered if more of the outline can be filled in by the developing discussion of peace problems. If the TAFT outline is to become a Republican foreign policy platform, one most pertinent question will be whether it includes any departure from traditional Republican high-tariff policies which would almost surely produce economic war and political crises if again attempted.

The most vital thing about any plan is the spirit in which it is carried out. And the spirit depends to a large extent on how much understanding of international affairs has been achieved. Many Americans believed that even a German victory over Britain in 1940 would have left America living in a tolerable world. They seemed to have no concept of the way in which Nazi dominance in Europe would have pushed forward fascism in South America—and in North America. Could the fashion of Quislings and Vichyites have been held east of the Atlantic? And would not Japan have gained a position from which American resistance would have been doubly difficult?

Actually Americans couldn't go further on the road of appeasement because instinct and moral indignation and national leadership wouldn't let them. They adopted lend-lease, stopped supplies to Japan before Pearl Harbor. Senator TAFT, while agreeing now to join in preventing war, says he believed in 1941 that a German victory would "not bring about a successful attack on the United States." It is not clear that he yet sees how America was being attacked in every way except militarily.

We believe the key to peace is for Americans to realize that they cannot tolerate attacks on their ideals, and those who uphold them could not long be safe, even militarily, if they did. Any peace program which fails to carry that understanding and to follow through with positive measures for preventing or quickly halting such attacks is likely to fail.

After the War "Come West, and Just Let the Rest of the World Go By"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, way out past where the West begins—out where the big beautiful delicious apples come from—where we have the big baked potatoes—out where contented cows give the milk—and where the bees gather the honey, the Government is preparing a new frontier where the returning soldiers can settle down in peace and contentment.

Here is a line of advice from a sagebrush poet:

Ten acres, a house, a garden, and a cow,
Twelve little pigs from a registered sow
That's the program of Columbia Basin
So settle down Mister, and quit your chasin'.

—*Edwin Weyant Davis,*
Poet O' the Sage.

Colorado River Water—Proposed Treaty With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 7), 1944

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, under the leave granted me during the course of my remarks earlier today, I present for publication in the Appendix the speech which I had prepared in opposition to the proposed treaty between the United States and Mexico relating to Colorado River water.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate a proposed treaty with Mexico which attempts to allocate the waters of the Colorado River between that country and our own.

That treaty is now pending before this body only because Congress in 1928 authorized the building of Boulder Dam to conserve the waters of the Colorado River.

A careful examination of the treaty and of the conditions leading to its proposal having convinced me that it is wholly unfair to citizens and communities of western America, it is with some hope that the terms of the compact may be further considered by our Chief Executive and the State Department that I am making this statement. I hope, therefore, what I am about to say will receive the attention not only of the Members of this body, but likewise of the President and the Secretary of State.

In spite of the facts—

That Boulder Dam was built entirely on American ground, by American initiative, engineering genius, and money;

That the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized the building of Boulder Dam for storage of water for use "exclusively within the United States";

That, as authorized by the Project Act, the United States has solemnly contracted with American communities and States to deliver them quantities of Boulder water and power, which are indispensable to their development;

That American citizens have, in reliance on the Project Act and those contracts, committed themselves to pay hundreds of millions of dollars for construction of works with which to use their Boulder water and power;

That the American communities, not the United States, are, under their contracts, standing the entire cost of Boulder Dam;

That the United States does not ask and will not gain anything from Mexico in respect of the Colorado River.

It is now proposed—

To guarantee to Mexico, for all time, 1,500,000 acre-feet per annum of Colorado River water, twice what Mexico ever had used prior to construction of Boulder Dam, twice what Mexico could ever have gotten from the river without Boulder Dam;

To store, regulate, and deliver this water, as ordered by Mexico, free of charge to Mexico;

To extend to Mexico the benefits of Boulder Dam, in flat contravention of the Project Act;

To create in Mexico a first right on the Colorado River to which all American rights must yield in event of conflict;

To deny water to American communities, in cycles of dry years, such as have occurred and will recur, in order to supply Mexican lands;

To impair the ability of the United States to perform its outstanding contracts with its own citizens;

To deprive American citizens of vested rights without compensation and without due process;

To deprive American communities of the benefits of works built and owned by them, for the advantage of Mexico;

To authorize construction of works in Mexico which would endanger and damage lands within the United States.

The following statement outlines, in brief, the physical and legal facts. It is submitted in the belief that, if these facts are known, the Senate of the United States will preserve the good faith of the United States, and will protect the vested contract rights of American citizens, by declining to ratify the proposed treaty.

I. PHYSICAL FACTS

1. The Colorado River is a major continental stream draining one-thirteenth of the land area of the United States.

2. Its basin in the United States comprises 242,000 square miles; in Mexico, 2,000 square miles.

3. Its basin is divided into an upper basin (Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah) and a lower basin (Arizona, Nevada, and California).

4. All of its water comes from the United States; none from Mexico.

5. Its water supply, available in the future to satisfy all uses in the United States and Mexico below Boulder Dam during extended dry cycles, is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at not over 8,500,000 acre-feet per annum.

6. Its unregulated flow was extremely irregular from year to year and was characterized by an early summer flood season of 2 to 3 months, followed by 9 to 10 months of low flow.

7. There are, in the United States, many natural sites where storage reservoirs have been or can be constructed to capture and conserve floodwaters of the river. Mexico has none.

8. There are needs and opportunities for use, within the United States, of all of the water of the Colorado River. Accordingly any gift of water to Mexico, as a matter of comity, will pro tanto curtail the development of communities in the United States.

II. HISTORICAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT

1. In the United States, prior to construction of Boulder Dam, development of irrigation and domestic projects, using water from the main stream and many tributaries, proceeded independently in each of the seven States and chiefly under local, public, or private agencies. Such uses, before Boulder Dam was built, reached such a great extent that they, together with Mexican uses, consumed the entire low-season flow, and indeed were, in dry years, subject to severe shortages.

2. Mexican uses, prior to Boulder, reached a maximum of 750,000 acre-feet per annum; averaged 600,000 acre-feet over a 10-year period; and in 1932 amounted to only 228,000 acre-feet. All such uses were made possible by irrigation works and protective levees provided by American initiative and capital. The water was even diverted in the United States, through structures built and owned by Americans.

III. COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

In order to protect existing development in the United States and permit expansion by conservation of floodwaters, Boulder Dam was proposed. The Upper Basin States objected, fearing that, by early development, the lower basin would appropriate so much water that the upper basin would be foreclosed from development. A solution was found in the formulation of the Colorado River Compact, an agreement among the States, in 1922, which apportioned certain water to each basin.

IV. BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

In 1928 Congress adopted the act for construction of Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal. The act approved the Colorado River Compact. However, section I provides that the waters conserved by Boulder Dam shall be for "beneficial use exclusively within the United States." (The extension of the benefits of Boulder storage to Mexico would flatly violate the principle of the act, namely, that the only permissible grant of water to Mexico must be measured by Mexico's use from natural flow.) Section 1 also authorized construction of a power plant at Boulder Dam. Section 5 of the project act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the delivery of stored water and prohibited use of stored water without such contract. Section 4 (b) prohibited construction of the dam until the Secretary should have procured executed water and power contracts which would assure repayment to the United States of the cost of the dam and power plant.

V. BOULDER DAM CONTRACTS

1. California contracts: the Secretary of the Interior executed, with public and private agencies in southern California, contracts for water and power which the Attorney General of the United States held sufficient to guarantee repayment of the cost of the dam and power plant. (Without these contracts, the dam could not have been built. Act, sec. 4 (b).) These contracts were made by the California agencies in good faith and in reliance upon the good faith of the United States in observing the requirement of section 1 of the project act that the stored water be used exclusively in the United States. These agencies, and others, in reliance upon their contracts, have expended and obligated themselves to expend, for construction of works and facilities for the use of Boulder Dam water and power, more than half a billion dollars. The California contracts obligate the United States to deliver for domestic and irrigation uses, 5,362,000 acre-feet per annum.

2. Arizona and Nevada contracts: The Secretary of the Interior has also executed contracts with the State of Nevada for 300,000 acre-feet per annum and with the State of Arizona for 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum.

VI. THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

1. Beside authorizing Boulder Dam, section 1 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized construction of a diversion dam across the Colorado River, now known as Imperial Dam and a main canal "located entirely within the United States," to carry water to an area of 1,000,000 acres in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California. This All-American Canal was, by the terms of the act, dedicated to the beneficial use of the waters conserved by Boulder Dam "exclusively within the United States".

2. Section 4 (b) of the act required that before construction of the canal should commence, the Secretary of the Interior must procure executed contracts which would insure repayment of the entire cost of the canal.

3. Section 7 of the act grants to the agencies which contract to pay for the canal the power privileges on the canal. There are a number of important power drops on the canal. One of the largest, known as Pilot Knob, is located on the bank of the Colorado and so situated that water may be discharged from the power plant directly back into the river.

4. The Secretary of the Interior has executed, with Imperial irrigation district, Coachella Valley County water district, and the city of San Diego, contracts wherein the United States agreed to construct Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal. The three public agencies agreed to pay to the Government the entire construction cost. The contracts provide that on completion of the works Imperial irrigation district shall assume operation and maintenance of them. They also provide that all of the power possibilities on the canal shall belong to the three agencies and that the net proceeds from power development shall be theirs, to be paid on contractual debt to the United States until it is retired and thereafter to belong to the agencies. The Imperial irrigation district contract provides specially that there shall be built for that agency, and it shall pay for, additional canal capacity for 3,000 second-feet of water from the dam to Pilot Knob, for power generation by the district at the Pilot Knob plant. The three agencies agreed to pay for 2,000 second-feet of capacity in the canal from the dam to Syphon Drop, to carry water free of cost for the Yuma project of the Bureau of Reclamation in Arizona. The three agencies also agreed to pay a sum of $1,600,000 to the United States on account of the cost of Laguna Dam, originally built in 1908 for the Yuma project, but now considered a necessary appurtenance of Imperial Dam.

VII. THE MEXICAN TREATY

By proposed treaty the United States is obligated with reference to the Colorado River:

1. To allot to Mexico a guaranteed annual minimum of 1,500,000 acre-feet of the surface flow of the river, to be increased, when water is available unused in the United States, to 1,700,000.

2. To deliver until 1980, 500,000—and thereafter 375,000—acre-feet of the guaranteed 1,500,000 through the All-American Canal and the remaining 1,000,000—or 1,250,000, after 1980—in the bed of the river, at the boundary. This water is all to be delivered according to certain schedules, but practically as and when ordered by Mexico.

3. To give Mexico a share of the net revenues of the Pilot Knob power plant on the All-American Canal.

4. To construct, operate, and maintain, at its own cost, the Davis Dam, which will be used, in part, to regulate the comparatively equal monthly discharges from the Boulder power plant so as to meet the unequal monthly needs of Mexico.

5. To permit Mexico to build a permanent diversion dam at any point below the California-Mexico boundary—upper boundary. This Mexico is forbidden by present treaties to do.

6. To construct or acquire, and operate and maintain, all works needed to deliver water to Mexico.

VIII. SUMMARY OF WATER SUPPLY AND REQUIRED USES

The total water supply is subject to alternating wet and dry cycles of from 7 to 11 years. It is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation upon studies of stream flow over a 44-year period, that the average outflow from Boulder Dam, in the future, during critical dry cycles extending over 10 or more years, will be 8,500,000 acre-feet per year. The supply and draft thereon is estimated as follows:

	Acre-feet
Supply:	
Outflow from Boulder Dam	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder Dam	600,000
Available for use	7,900,000
Requirements:	
Nevada contract	300,000
California contracts	5,362,000
Arizona contract	2,800,000
Proposed Mexican treaty	1,500,000
Total	9,962,000
Available supply	7,900,000
Requirements	9,962,000
Overdraft	2,062,000

It is thus demonstrated that any guaranty of water to Mexico must invade the commitments made by the United States to its own projects.

IX. INTERNATIONAL LAW ACCORDS MEXICO NO RIGHT TO ANY COLORADO RIVER WATER

1. The rule of international law, as practiced by the United States, has often been declared by the highest responsible authorities of the United States. Attorney General Judson Harmon, in 1895, ruled in a formal opinion to the State Department that the lower nation on an international river (in that case Mexico) has no legal right to the continuance of any flow of the river from the upper nation. Any other rule, he declared, would give the lower nation a servitude or easement within the territory of the upper, inconsistent with the exclusive sovereignty of the latter within its borders (21 Ops. Atty. Gen. 274).

2. Elihu Root, Secretary of State, in 1905, in dealing with Mexico, affirmed the same principle (H. Doc. No. 359, 71st Cong., 2d sess., p. 402).

3. Alvey A. Adee, Acting Secretary of State, also in dealing with Mexico in 1905, reached the same conclusion (H. Doc. No. 359, supra, p. 398).

4. In 1929 and 1930, a treaty commission appointed under acts of May 13, 1924, and March 3, 1927, studied this problem exhaustively in the course of extended treaty negotiations with Mexico on the allocation of the Colorado River. In its report the American section of the Commission, which was composed of outstanding men, emphatically adhered to the decisions of Harmon, Root, and Adee (H. Doc. No. 359, supra, pp. 8, 9, 65).

5. Mexico herself has urged this same principle. The American section of the abovementioned treaty commission asked that Mexico concede to the United States a right to water to serve existing American uses on the lower Rio Grande. (On this river about 70 percent of the water comes from Mexico; on the Colorado all the water comes from the United States.)

Mexico replied:

"Mexico cannot admit a limitation on the future development of its tributaries to consolidate and even increase the present uses made in the United States. The acceptance of views of the American section would mean for Mexico to renounce to the development to which the Mexican side is entitled. And Mexico would also be required under such views, to renounce to the development of its own tributaries" (H. Doc. No. 359, supra, p. 75).

6. Careful investigation has disclosed no instance in which any responsible American diplomat has ever suggested that Mexico has any legal right to the use of any water of the Colorado River.

7. Any claim by Mexico to Colorado River water must, therefore, depend upon comity, not on international law.

X. INTERNATIONAL COMITY DOES NOT REQUIRE NOR JUSTIFY ANY ALLOTMENT TO MEXICO EXCEEDING HER USE OF WATER BEFORE CONSTRUCTION OF BOULDER DAM

1. Before construction of Boulder Dam, Mexico was able to use from the Colorado a maximum in any one year of 750,000 acre-feet; a yearly average of 600,000 for the 10 years of her greatest use; and a minimum (1932) of 228,000. This was all she could get from an unregulated river. The low flow of the river frequently furnished her less than the average. Hence she could neither expand her development nor even depend on being able to harvest crops nourished by as much as the average amount of water she received. She had no storage sites in the flat delta; and therefore could not capture any of the wild floodwater which wasted in the Gulf. The floods, moreover, limited her agriculture by devastating great portions of the delta and menacing the rest of it. She maintained a relatively permanent agriculture on a part of the delta, made possible only because American agencies had constructed in her territory extensive levee works, almost all at the expense of American farmers.

2. There are many sites on the Colorado River in the United States where great storage dams can be built. The construction of such reservoirs to salvage vast quantities of floodwater has been planned for several generations. Examples of such dams which have now been constructed are Green Mountain, Boulder, and Parker Dams on the main stream, and Roosevelt, Bartlett, and Coolidge Dams on the Salt, Verde, and Gila tributaries. It has never been conceived, prior to the present negotiations, that the United States was under any obligation in equity, good conscience, or international comity, to share with a foreign nation the benefits of such works, built at the cost of the United States, in her territory, to conserve a natural resource solely available to her. On the contrary, the American section of the 1930 Treaty Commission emphatically declared that no such obligation existed and that an allowance to Mexico of the maximum amount she had theretofore used, 750,000 acre-feet, was "just and generous" (H. Doc. No. 359, supra, p. 9). Comity, or the principle of fair and friendly dealing with a neighbor, does not require the United States to divide with Mexico water resources which nature has made available to the United States and not to Mexico, any more than it requires Mexico to divide with the United States, free of cost, her great natural resources, such as oil and silver.

3. It was for these very reasons, explicitly stated during the final Senate debates on the Boulder Canyon Project Act, that the Congress determined that Mexico should not have the benefits of the floodwater salvaged by Boulder Dam, and that the stored waters should be used "exclusively within the United States." That language was put into section 1 of the act, not by accident, but with the firm and vigorously expressed intention of protecting the rights of the United States and of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin and of serving notice on Mexico and on the world that Mexico should never be entitled to share in the water conserved by Boulder Dam (vol. 70, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, pp. 337, 338, 593).

XI. ANALYSIS OF AMOUNT OF WATER CONCEDED TO MEXICO

The treaty purports to allot to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet per annum. This is not a ceiling. It is a guaranteed minimum. In addition, though it is not disclosed in the treaty, Mexico will receive and may use the following water:

1. Return flows from American projects which seep underground and first appear in the river at points below the lower boundary (Arizona-Mexico boundary, 20 miles below the California-Mexico, or upper boundary).

2. Drainage from the Gila project in Arizona which seeps underground into Sonora and does not return to the river, but is available to Mexico by pumping.

3. Flood discharges from the Gila River or the Colorado, too great to be conserved in the United States. These floods will periodically recharge the large underground storage basin known to exist in the Mexican delta and will remain there available for pumping to supplement the water delivered by the United States.

4. Discharges from Boulder Dam, which exceed required uses in the United States and Mexico. Such discharges will necessarily occur in cycles of wet years. They cannot be used in the United States, but can be used in Mexico, since they can be "firmed up" during dry cycles by pumping from underground water resources of the Mexican delta.

While the foregoing quantities cannot be precisely estimated now, it is plain that they will be substantial and are not taken into account nor charged to Mexico in the treaty.

XII. THE TREATY WOULD NOT BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GOOD FAITH WHICH THE UNITED STATES OWES, AND HAS ALWAYS OBSERVED, TOWARD ITS OWN PEOPLE

1. California communities accepted the good faith of the United States as being beyond question. When the legislative branch of government adopted the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the Executive approved it, the California communities accepted the national policy to be as therein declared. That policy was that the floodwaters conserved by Boulder Dam should be used "exclusively within the United States." The corollary was that in any future treaty Mexico could not be granted more than the water she was able to put to beneficial use from the natural, unregulated flow of the river.

2. Acting in reliance upon the express words of the Congress, the State of California, by act of its legislature, ratified the Colorado River compact and thereby accepted grave burdens and responsibilities. In addition, California adopted the limitation act which was imposed on her by section 4 (a) of the Project Act. Thereby she subjected herself and her citizens to a harsh and perpetual limitation of the amount of Colorado River water which could ever be used within her boundaries. This limitation barely provides for supplying the known projects in California which were contemplated by the Project Act and forever barred the development of other feasible projects in California. By these acts California, in the legal phrase, "changed her

position to her detriment" and became entitled, in good morals as well as law, to depend upon the scrupulous adherence by the United States to the law which limits the use of the water conserved by Boulder Dam "exclusively within the United States." Had those words not been the keystone of the act, California would not have ratified the compact nor adopted the limitation act.

3. Furthermore, acting in reliance on the express words of the Congress, the California communities changed their position to their detriment and by solemn contracts pledged themselves and their resources to repay the entire cost of Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal. Without their guaranty, the dam and canal would never have been built. By the contracts, the United States pledged itself to deliver to the California communities the quantities of water and power specified therein. This pledge was solidly founded on the policy declared in the Project Act.

4. Relying upon the law and contracts executed under the law, the California communities have committed themselves to the expenditure of over half a billion dollars, for the construction of works with which to utilize Boulder water and power. These obligations are:

Boulder Dam and Power Plant	$125,000,000
Metropolitan Aqueduct	274,000,000
All-American Canal	78,000,000
San Diego Aqueduct	16,000,000
Power transmission lines of the City of Los Angeles and private power companies	56,000,000
Total	549,000,000

Of the foregoing, more than $400,000,000 have now been actually expended and are represented by bonds and contracts to repay.

5. Additional hundreds of millions, aggregating at least another half billion dollars, have been expended or committed for the construction of great industries, homes, shops, and other public and private facilities, all of which are dependent on the good faith of the United States in performing its contracts for water and power.

6. Contracts and commitments made by the Secretary of the Interior to furnish water to the States of Nevada and Arizona have led to large commitments and expenditures by and in those States.

7. Now the executive department reports to the Senate a treaty with Mexico which, if ratified, would mean:

a. That the United States would repudiate its contracts with its own communities and States.

b. That the United States would do this knowingly, since its own engineers estimate the water supply of the Colorado River to be less than the total of the water-delivery obligations created by the American contracts and those which would exist under the proposed Mexican treaty.

c. That, since there is not water enough to go around, thousands of fertile American acres would be doomed to remain forever barren desert and the growth of existing communities would be curtailed.

d. That, insofar as the treaty would grant water conserved by Boulder Dam to Mexico, would grant Mexico the use of the All-American Canal and would grant Mexico a share of the power revenues at Pilot Knob, which belong to the California agencies to which the Project Act grants the power privileges at Pilot Knob, it would be in flat contravention of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. That act is a constitutional statute, under which property rights have now vested in the California water and power contractors and in the States of Arizona and Nevada. The treaty provides neither due process nor compensation. It is, therefore, unconstitutional.

e. That the economy of the American Southwest has been geared in many ways to the successful and continued operation of the several Boulder Dam water and power projects on which vast expenditures and commitments have been made. This economy would be disrupted by the proposed treaty and the actual and potential wealth of the entire Nation would be lessened.

8. Communities of American citizens in the Pacific Southwest will pay the whole cost of Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal. They are entitled to the benefits of the project for which they are paying. The United States has formally and solemnly contracted to deliver those benefits to them. If the United States has the constitutional power to take those benefits from them and give them to a foreign nation, such an act would be oppressive and unjust. No nation has a moral right to treat a large section of its own people unfairly on the ground that it finds it politic to be generous to the people of a neighboring nation.

XIII. THE POWERS OF THE COMMISSION ARE VAST AND NOT SUBJECT TO CONTROL BY THE CONGRESS

The treaty sets up a perpetual joint commission which is to have tremendous and unusual powers. It is to be a great construction bureau authorized to plan, build, and operate many dams on three river systems; some parts of the program are to commence at once, but the program is to extend and expand indefinitely.

It is to engage in production and disposal of great quantities of electric power and water, without limitation as to cost, rates, fields of service, or use to which revenues shall be put.

The two engineers who are to constitute the commission are given the extraordinary judicial power to determine the extent of their own jurisdiction and the extent to which the two nations are to be obligated under the treaty.

All customary checks and limitations on such an agency are lacking, save only that the commission must report its decisions for approval or veto to the Government, which for this purpose is specifically defined as being the Department of State (art. 2). No plans and cost estimates need ever to be submitted to Congress, nor is Congress to be consulted at all. When the commission has made a decision and the Department of State has approved, Congress must appropriate, or breach the treaty.

The commission will command and control the water supply of the Colorado River Basin and on its determination of policy will hang far-reaching consequences to industry, agriculture and the economic welfare of millions of American citizens in the regions affected.

XIV. THE TREATY JEOPARDIZES PROJECTS ON THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER

1. The treaty requires a permanent diversion dam to be built by Mexico below the upper boundary within 5 years. It admits that such dam will jeopardize existing American communities in the Yuma, Imperial, and Coachella Valleys, for it requires Mexico to provide works to protect them from floods and seepage. Competent engineering opinion of the locality holds that adequate protection against these dangers cannot be afforded, hence that the dam would inevitably cause disastrous damage to the three valleys named. More striking, the treaty authorizes Mexico to build at once, in the United States, a temporary diversion weir across the river, without providing any protection works.

2. The treaty makes no provision for the protection of American public agencies respecting millions which they have invested in flood-protection levees irrigation works in Mexico.

3. No provision is made to protect American projects in California against the discharge from Mexico of waste and drainage waters into Salton Sea, which would greatly damage the American valleys.

XV. CONCLUSION

The proposed treaty is not transitory or temporary. It is perpetual. Article 28 provides that it shall continue in force until terminated by another treaty. Plainly Mexico will never give it up, unless she could secure one more favorable to her. Once this treaty is ratified, the wrongs done by it can never be undone.

The proposed treaty takes away from States and communities of the lower basin water and property to which they have vested rights under contracts authorized by act of Congress.

The powers granted to the commission are likewise perpetual, are vast, not subjected to customary checks and limitations and are not subject to the control of the Congress.

The proposed treaty jeopardizes the safety of established American projects by creating a new hazard of flood and seepage damage.

The treaty would guarantee to Mexico twice the maximum amount of water Mexico received prior to the construction of Boulder Dam; twice what she ever could have obtained from the river, except for its regulation by Boulder Dam; twice what the Congress, in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, declared she should have; and twice what the 1930 Treaty Commission declared would be "just and generous" to her. The right so guaranteed to Mexico would be superior to every water right in the Colorado River Basin in the United States.

Mr. President, on this floor I have often contended that our foreign policy should be guided by honor and justice and that, to the fullest reasonable extent, we should give aid to the Nations of the New World, but I deny that the National Government should sacrifice domestic rights upon the altar of foreign good will. How can we condone liberality to another country that would violate Federal contracts already made with American citizens, that would injure or entirely destroy American investments believed to be firmly founded on the pledge of the National Government? World honor, peace, commerce, and progress will, it seems to me, never be conserved by a reckless international utopianism that does internal injustice to gain external good will. In the long pull, will not internationalism itself be fatally stricken if our Government attempts to build its structure upon broken domestic pledges and the disappointment, ruin, and resentment of its own citizens?

In this chaotic period I regret the necessity of opposing any treaty and if the views I am expressing were prompted by a selfish regard for my own State, or by political opportunism then I would deserve your censure.

I, therefore, hasten to assert that in resisting the pending proposal I am not suggesting the sacrifice of any Mexican right. California people desire only what is fairly theirs, nothing more, but certainly nothing less. We do not want injustice done Mexico, but we do not intend that injustice shall be done ourselves—if we can help it.

Nevertheless, I deem it unfortunate that disputes, destructive of international good will, may develop before this treaty is settled, and it is with some slight hope that controversy may be avoided that I have made this statement—first to express California's opposition to the treaty and then to appeal to our President and the State Department that the present compact shall be withdrawn and a fairer agreement substituted in its place.

A Four-Plank Platform for War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and the article referred to therein:

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
RALEIGH, N. C., *March 17, 1944.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: Every day, almost every hour, you hear the voice of urban America. Every day you read city daily papers and city magazines; every day you hear city men speak in person and by radio.

But all too rarely, no doubt, do you hear from rural America.

The enclosed article "A four-plank platform for war and peace" we believe expresses the views of a tremendous section of rural America—of nearly 1,000,000 southern farm families—and what these families say, we believe, is what most farmers in the North and West would say.

Especially should we like for you to ponder the section, Save Lives by Making Peace Terms Clearer. Among men I talk with there is almost unanimous agreement that refusal to clarify peace terms will cost tens of thousands, and possibly hundreds of thousands, of lives. As the New York Times declared on March 4:

"The failure of the United Nations thus far to present to the world a united, inspiring, and convincing peace program remains their greatest weakness."

And in this one matter you yourself, by speaking out or by failing to speak out, may be holding now the power of life or death over nobody knows how many soldiers—your sons, perhaps, and mine. One Congressman like you, with your high position and great responsibility, might turn the tide the right way.

It is hoped that you will take time to read all this message from rural America, but at least the two sections, Save Lives by Making Peace Terms Clearer and Cooperate to Prevent Future Wars.

An expression from you about any of these matters would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor.

[From the Progressive Farmer of April 1944]

A FOUR-PLANK PLATFORM FOR WAR AND PEACE—ON BEHALF OF 1,000,000 READERS WE APPEAL TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

To the President of the United States.
To the Members of the United States Senate.
To All Representatives in Congress.

GENTLEMEN: You have come to one of the most critical and pregnant hours in all the history of our human race.

Not for a thousand years past has there been a year of such limitless potentialities for world progress or disaster. Possibly not for a thousand years to come will there be another such opportunity both to achieve unprecedented victory and to make that victory worth its staggering cost in human life and happiness.

Because this is probably the world's most fateful year and because you now control the destiny of the world's most powerful nation, we make this appeal to you. It is an appeal, not for ourselves but on behalf of virtually 1,000,000 southern families, from Virginia to Texas, inclusive, who regularly read the Progressive Farmer. An overwhelming proportion of them have sons, brothers, kinsfolk in the service.

We hear from these people about the war. They talk to us. They write to us. They have been doing so ever since Pearl Harbor. We believe we know their feelings, the deep emotions of their hearts—the convictions that they express to us and would like for us to express to you.

What, then, is the message that we believe 1,000,000 southern families would like to send to you—the sort of message other millions of plain Americans who man the home front and whose sons man the battle fronts would also like to send you?

COMPLETE COOPERATION FOR VICTORY

Four things, we believe, an overwhelming proportion of these people would like to say to you:

First, we want redoubled cooperation and effort of all kinds to win this war, to win it thoroughly, and to win it with all possible speed. We feel as did Gen. Bernard Montgomery the other day when he said: "This war began a long while ago. I am getting fed up with the thing. I think it is nearly time we finished it." We feel as does Alfred P. Haake when he says, "The longer the war and the greater the cost, the greater will be the danger that our free institutions may not survive the war." Let's redouble all effort to get the job done.

With what our generals and admirals are doing on land and sea, there is little complaint. But with what is going on here on the home front, the plain people are not satisfied. We want more and better cooperation to win and end this war—better cooperation between President and Congress; better cooperation between Democrats and Republicans; better cooperation between labor and capital; better cooperation between farm organizations, labor organizations, and business organizations; better cooperation between bureaus and agencies of government themselves; better cooperation between government agencies and military agencies.

SAVE LIVES BY MAKING PEACE TERMS CLEARER

Next, besides using all the weapons we are now using to win this war—food, guns, tanks, planes, ships, material supplies of every kind—let's use one more weapon we have not used adequately—the psychological weapon. To us there seems abundant evidence that Hitler and Tojo are immeasurably stiffening and prolonging the resistance of their people by daily declarations that our peace terms will be viciously barbaric and inhuman. The terms, of course, will not be soft, even for the masses of German and Japanese people, but Hitler and Tojo portray them as 10 times harsher than they will be. Are we not playing into their hands by failing to make it clear that we will exact justice and safety, but not vengeance and destruction? Here let us quote from three valiant supporters of America's war effort—the New York Times, United States News, and Liberty magazine.

In a recent editorial, the New York Times referred to two factors that it said "will continue to stiffen German resistance until it is broken by * * * tremendous sacrifice in treasure and blood." One of these two factors being that—

"Germany has been offered only one alternative, and that is unconditional surrender, not only in a military but in a political sense, to an unknown future."

Upon this point David Lawrence writes in the United States News:

"Is revenge alone to guide us in attempting to reconstruct the world after this war? Are we all of us ready to exterminate the German race or put a nation of 90,000,000 in bondage? If these are not our motives, then we should avow our opposite purposes now."

From Chungking, China, Selwyn Speight cables to Liberty magazine:

"The Japanese people have been told, and believe, that Allied victory would mean extinction of their nation. Japanese propagandists have made skillful use of declarations by some of the Allied leaders that Japan must be crushed forever. As a consequence, the people are enduring almost intolerable policies and conditions."

"We want to win this war as much as the President and generals do," the people are saying. "We want to use every weapon we are now using—but let's use psychological weapons also, including much stronger and more convincing assurances that while guilty leaders and everybody responsible for barbarities and crimes against civilians will be adequately punished, the humble masses of every enemy nation may expect magnanimity rather than bloody and barbaric vengeance—declarations which might greatly shorten war with both Germany and Japan."

WIN IT—THEN END IT

Let's win this war thoroughly—then end it promptly. This is the third thing the plain people of America—all of us who have sons and kin in the fighting forces—want. The American people are courageous, but they are not militaristic. They want victory and clean-cut victory adequately implemented to safeguard future peace—and then let the boys come home without any unjustified sacrifice of American lives (or enemy lives) merely to gratify any spirit of hate or vengeance on those who have already surrendered.

COOPERATE TO PREVENT FUTURE WARS

The final thing that the plain people of America want is this—that we shall not only speed victory and end this war but keep it ended. Said one of America's foremost news commentators after a recent trip across the United States:

"The most important undercurrent of thought emerging from the American people today is how they can prevent their children from going to war again in the future."

But our children may go to war again in the future—and almost certainly will go if a selfish isolationism again controls this country. As was said on this page 7 years ago this summer:

"The sublimest sentence that came out of the World War was probably the declaration of Edith Cavell, the English nurse, just before she was shot as a spy: 'Patriotism is not enough.' She saw that the world had become a slaughterhouse simply because citizens of every nation had been taught to think only of that nation's selfish interests. * * * America's selfish isolation, our unwillingness to help other nations establish a world court and a league of nations for adjusting international disputes, may yet lead to catastrophes that will engulf us in another world conflict. * * * We can never have enduring peace and security in our own country—and perhaps, in the view of Almighty God, we simply never ought to have—until we are willing to cooperate with other nations to help insure peace and security the world over."

About future world peace there are but two choices for America to make:

1. We can join with other nations in a world organization and world court to prevent aggression and punish aggressors, to settle disputes between nations without resort to war, and to promote trade and prosperity among all nations.

2. Or we can go it alone, leaving little nations at the mercy of the powerful, having European, Asiatic, and South American nations arm and combine in fear of us and of one another, while we arm and combine in fear of them until universal bankruptcy and a third world war complete the suicide of civilization itself.

In this hour the supreme appeal of the American people to President and Senators and Representatives, in our opinion, is this—

Let's have complete cooperation to win this war thoroughly * * * let's use both material weapons and psychological weapons, including a more clear-cut declaration of peace terms as a means of winning the war more quickly * * * when won, let's end it promptly and without brutal vengeance for our enemies * * * and let's cooperate with all nations to save the next generation from the unutterable horrors of World War No. 3.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARENCE POE,
Chairman.
EUGENE BUTLER,
Vice Chairman.
W. C. LASSETTER,
ALEXANDER NUNN,
SALLIE F. HILL,
Editorial Board, The Progressive Farmer.

The American Indian

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1944

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, just now the Congress is giving attention to the condition and status of Indians in the United States and has appointed a committee to make some inquiry into this and collateral questions regarding our Indians. There are 350,000 of them. They have been under a guardianship for 100 years or more, and it seems that inquiry ought to be made as to when they can get rid of this guardianship and whether such action would be wise. Charles Curtis, for instance, our Vice President at one time, was an Indian under guardianship. In connection with this inquiry it seems to me that if Indians can with safety be set free to handle their own property it ought to be done. I notice an article which has just now come into my hands, entitled, "The Indian in the United States," most of which is very relevant and proper in this inquiry, and I am incorporating it as part of my remarks:

THE INDIAN IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Mrs. Fred S. Bennett)

No other group in this country has so complicated a relationship to the Federal Government as have the 350,000 American Indians. A recent compilation prepared by the Federal Government shows 389 treaties made with Indian tribes and 4,267 laws enacted by Congress concerning them. "During the century and a half covered by this compilation," says the foreword, "the groups of human beings with whom Indian laws deal have undergone changes in living habits, institutions, needs, and aspirations far greater than the changes that separate from our own age the ages for which Moses, Lycurgus, or Justinian legislated. * * * This compilation reveals a tremendous mass of obsolete and anachronistic legislation which weighs upon the backs of Indians and Indian Service officials * * * blocking the attainment of objectives desired alike by the Indians, by the Indian Service, and by Congress."

Many friends of the Indian people welcome the above study as showing the anomalous position of the North American Indian, as a step toward a more clear-cut and understanding policy for these people and toward their establishment on a basis of citizenship that is unhampered by restrictions not applicable to American citizens of all races.

From time to time various tribes had been accorded citizenship but it was not until 1924 that by act of Congress this standing was given to all Indians born within the United States. Such act did not, however, for Indians any more than it does for whites, carry with it the privilege of the vote—a right that may be conferred or abridged by an individual State; but while "it is beyond the constitutional power of any State to deny the right of Indians to vote simply because they are Indians * * * a few States, particularly in the extreme South and Southwest, have attempted to discriminate against the Indians as with the Negroes, by setting up rigid requirements as to registration, residence, etc., so as to make it as difficult as possible for voters in these two classes to meet such requirements."

There are still about 200 tribes—some of them mere remnants but retaining individual languages and dialects. Reservations have been allotted to these tribes, most of them west of the Mississippi River. On these reservations live some 200,000 Indians. Others have left these homes to go out to mingle with the white population of the country, a trend that seems inevitable as government, church, and other agencies give to the younger people modern education that is broadening and challenging. Increasingly numbers of these young Indians have found employment in the Government Indian Service so that by 1940 it enrolled 4,682, many of whom were in the Office of Indian Affairs in Washington, D. C.

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, adopted by a majority of the tribes, seems utterly at variance with the above tendencies in educational opportunity for its trend is toward the continuance of Indian peoples as units within, yet isolated from, the body politic. Certain phases of the Reorganization Act, such as the provision for preservation of Indian land, for better standards of living and for training in collective service, merit only praise, but one may ask whether a "group destiny" be possible for so small a number of people in a commonwealth of 130,000,000 population.

"Apparently," says a student of Indian affairs, "the Indian is at once to cling to his own folkways and to learn all the white men can give. It is an enticing ideal; but it demands the lack of mental coordination which would lead one to dance in propitiation of the rain gods and at the same time rely on the advice of the Department of Agriculture."

The increasing intermarriage of Indians and white must gradually produce a people less race conscious than an unadulterated blood group might be. The Chippewas, for example, have but 15 percent full bloods and other tribes have large admixtures of white blood, a process that began in the very early days and became particularly noticeable after the French and English wars. "What constitutes an Indian?" is a frequent question. Often one sixty-fourth of Indian blood is recognized as enabling an applicant to be enrolled in a tribe.

THE PROBLEM OF WARDSHIP

A most fundamental difficulty facing the majority of the Indians is that caused by their wardship—a peculiar relation they bear to the Federal Government. It is not possible to explain Indian wardship with brevity or simplicity. In 1831 the Cherokees, then in Georgia, maintained that they constituted a nation, and as such could appeal to the court for action against the State of Georgia. The matter was referred to the Supreme Court of the United States and the decision rendered by Chief Justice John Marshall was:

"It may well be doubted whether these tribes which reside within the acknowledged boundaries of the United States can, with strict accuracy, be denominated foreign nations. They may, more correctly, perhaps, be denominated domestic dependent nations. They occupy a territory to which we assert a title independent of their will, which must take effect in point of possession when their right of possession ceases. Meanwhile they are in a state of pupilage. Their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to a guardian."

This relationship has never been clearly defined in the more than 100 years since Justice Marshall's statement, yet it controls and limits Indian life and relationships at every turn. An Indian may freely leave his home and acreage without specific permission but he may not in many cases sell that same acreage without specific permission obtained through act of Congress. He became a citizen but this did not abrogate his wardship per se and at every turn he is hampered by his dual relationships.

In spite of the more than 4,000 laws, as noted in the recent compilation, none appears to define in terms applicable to all tribes, or for all tribes in severalty, the exact and detailed relationship of Indian wards and the Federal Government, or to make better the anomalous position of peoples declared to be citizens of a free country who yet are restrained in this citizenship by the not fully determined terms of their wardship. Each case that arises is decided individually and through the years these have built up much of the "obsolete and anachronistic legislation" on the statute books.

Only Congress can define, limit, or abolish wardship. Many people, both Indian and white, feel that the time for such action has come. Laws, treaties, landholdings, and trust funds held for the Indian by the Federal Government are all affected by this undefined relationship. Twenty-eight laws regarding Indians were passed during a recent session of Congress, thus continuing the accumulation of detailed and often petty laws, whereas a few wisely drawn laws might make the relationship of these people to the land of their fathers the same as that of other citizens; the need for special enactments would thus disappear.

In this year, 1942, when democracy is our watchword, when men are fighting for that ideal around the world, when Indian men in large numbers have joined the American forces, one may seriously raise the question if this is not the time for the United States to more carefully study its relationship to this small minority of its own population and strive to accord to it, with generosity overflowing, a full if belated measure of justice and fellowship. What a gift this would be to those Indian men now fighting in foreign lands to keep freedom and democracy alive in the world.